PROCEEDINGS OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 130, Number 2, Pages 387–394
S 0002-9939(01)06209-8
Article electronically published on September 19, 2001

ON THE THEOREM OF HAYMAN AND WU

S. ROHDE

(Communicated by Juha M. Heinonen)

ABSTRACT. We show that the Hayman-Wu constant Ø is strictly smaller than 4π. Previously it has been shown that $\pi^2 \leq Ø \leq 4\pi$. A main tool in our proof is an analysis of the hyperbolic geodesic curvature of straight lines in simply connected domains.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a simply connected domain, L a line or a circle, and $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{D}$ a conformal map of Ω onto the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$. The Hayman-Wu theorem [5] asserts the existence of a universal constant C such that

$$\ell(f(L)) \leq C,$$

where ℓ denotes one-dimensional Hausdorff measure, i.e. length. We denote the smallest such constant, often called the Hayman-Wu constant, by Ø in memory of Knut Øyma [7], [8].

Many authors have contributed to problems related to the Hayman-Wu theorem. For the sake of brevity we will only mention the results that are directly concerned with the constant Ø. The first estimate $Ø \leq 2 \times 10^{35}$ appeared in [5] by Hayman and Wu. Garnett, Gehring and Jones [3] obtained a shorter proof, but did not use it to estimate Ø. Fernández, Heinonen and Martio [2] showed that $Ø \leq 4\pi^2$. They offered a conjecture for the value of Ω, but this conjecture was disproved by Øyma [8] who showed $Ø \geq \pi^2$ by means of an example: For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a domain and associated conformal map such that $\ell(f(L)) > \pi^2 - \varepsilon$. Previously Øyma [7] shocked the community by proving $Ø \leq 4\pi$ on just two pages. More precisely, he showed that $\ell(f(L)) < 4\pi$ for every triple (Ω, L, f), and he conjectured

$$Ø = \pi^2$$

In oral communication, he asked the more modest question whether $Ø < 4\pi$, that is, to show $\ell(f(L)) \leq 4\pi - \varepsilon$ for some universal $\varepsilon > 0$ and every triple (Ω, L, f).

Theorem 1.1. *The Hayman-Wu constant satisfies*

$$Ø < 4\pi.$$

Received by the editors February 29, 2000.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30C35.
Research supported by NSF grant DMS-9970398.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 combines the method of Øyma with an analysis of the geodesic curvature of $f(L)$. The idea of using the geodesic curvature was introduced by Fernández and Granados [4] in their proof that the Hayman-Wu constant for convex domains is 2π.

If $\gamma \subset \mathbb{D}$ is a smooth (C^2, say) curve through 0, then the absolute value of the geodesic curvature of γ at 0 in the hyperbolic metric of constant curvature -1 can be defined by

$$k_h = k_h(\gamma, 0) = \frac{1}{2}k_e, \tag{1}$$

where k_e denotes the absolute value of the euclidean curvature of γ at 0. The factor $1/2$ accounts for the fact that our hyperbolic metric has curvature -1 rather than -4. At points $z \neq 0$ in γ, the geodesic curvature is then defined through conformal invariance: $k_h(\gamma, 0) = k_h(T \circ \gamma, T(0))$ for every automorphism T of $\mathbb{D}$. See [6] and [4] for more information about geodesic curvature.

Theorem 1.2. *Let Ω be a simply connected domain bounded by an analytic curve, and let $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{D}$ be a conformal map. If L is a straight line, then $f(L)$ can be parametrized as follows: There is an open set $A \subset \mathbb{T}$, consisting of finitely many arcs, and a smooth map $\phi : A \to f(L)$, such that*

$$\frac{1 - |\phi(\zeta)|^2}{|\zeta - \phi(\zeta)|^2} \geq [2 + k_h(f(L), \phi(\zeta))] \frac{|\phi'(\zeta)|}{1 - |\phi(\zeta)|^2} \tag{2}$$

for all $\zeta \in A$. Furthermore, $f(L) \setminus \phi(A)$ consists of finitely many points only.

Notice that (2) immediately implies $|\phi'| \leq 2$, which in turn implies $\ell(f(L)) \leq 2\ell(A) \leq 4\pi$. By exhausting a given simply connected domain with analytically bounded domains, we obtain in a different way Øyma's result $\text{Ø} \leq 4\pi$.

A crucial element in some of the proofs of the Hayman-Wu theorem is some control over the change of the density λ_Ω of the hyperbolic metric of a domain Ω when passing to another domain $\tilde{\Omega}$ (for instance by symmetrization). In this direction, we obtained in joint work with J. Fernández the following estimate.

Theorem 1.3. *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 and Ω_3 be simply connected planar domains, such that*

$$\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \subset \Omega_3.$$

Then

$$\lambda_{\Omega_3}(x) \leq \lambda_{\Omega_1}(x) + \lambda_{\Omega_2}(x)$$

for all $x \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$.

As a simple consequence we obtain that the method of [2] actually gives $\Omega \leq 2\pi^2$ rather than $\Omega \leq 4\pi^2$. This is explained in section 3.

Section 2 contains the proofs of the theorems. Some consequences, remarks and open questions are discussed in section 3.

2. Proofs

Notation. Throughout the rest of the paper, λ_Ω will denote the density of the hyperbolic metric of the planar domain Ω, in particular $\lambda_{\mathbb{D}}(z) = 2/(1 - |z|^2)$ and $\lambda_{\mathbb{H}}(z) = 1/\operatorname{Im}(z)$. The hyperbolic distance will be denoted d_Ω. Given a simply connected planar domain $\Omega \neq \mathbb{C}$, a curve $\gamma \subset \Omega$ and a point $x \in \gamma$, the hyperbolic curvature $k_h(\gamma, x, \Omega)$ of γ at x is defined by means of (1) and conformal invariance.

For sets $A \subset \mathbb{C}$, we write $\tilde{A} = \{\overline{z} : z \in A\}$ for the reflection of A in $\mathbb{R}$. In what follows we normalize the line L to be the real axis.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on Øyma's construction [7] and the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be simply connected, let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \cap \Omega$ and consider the component Ω' of $\Omega \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ that contains x_0. Then*

$$\lambda_{\Omega'}(x_0) \geq \frac{k_h(\mathbb{R}, x_0, \Omega) + 2}{2} \lambda_\Omega(x_0). \tag{3}$$

The estimate is sharp: For every $0 \leq k \leq 2$ there is a domain Ω and a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \cap \Omega$ such that equality holds in (3) and $k_h(\mathbb{R}, x_0) = k$. Indeed, straightforward calculation shows that equality in (3) holds for $x_0 = 0$ and for all domains of the form $\Omega_t = \mathbb{C} \setminus ([-i, -i\infty) \cup [it, i\infty))$ if $t > 0$. As t varies from 1 to ∞, the curvature of $\mathbb{R}$ at 0 increases from 0 to 2, proving sharpness for every $0 \leq k \leq 2$.

Inequality (3) contains the idea behind the proof of Theorem 1.1: Locally, either $\mathbb{R}$ is close to a geodesic (curvature near zero), or the density of the hyperbolic metric increases by a definite amount when passing from Ω to Ω'. However, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is easier if we use the following:

Lemma 2.2. *In the situation of Lemma 2.1, if $\frac{\lambda_{\Omega'}(x_0)}{\lambda_\Omega(x_0)}$ is close to 1, then $\mathbb{R}$ is close to a geodesic near x_0. More precisely, for every $M > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $\frac{\lambda_{\Omega'}(x_0)}{\lambda_\Omega(x_0)} < 1 + \delta$, the following holds: If $\sigma(t)$ is the hyperbolic geodesic through x_0 tangent to $\mathbb{R}$, parametrized by hyperbolic arc length and such that $\sigma(0) = x_0$, then*

$$d_\Omega(\sigma(t), t) \leq \varepsilon$$

for all $-M \leq t \leq M$.

Proof of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2. Since Ω' is simply connected, we may consider the conformal maps $f : \mathbb{D} \to \Omega$ and $g : \mathbb{D} \to \Omega'$, normalized by $f(0) = g(0) = x_0$ and $f'(0) > 0, g'(0) > 0$.

Then

$$\phi(z) = f^{-1}(g(z)) = a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + ...$$

is a univalent function from $\mathbb{D}$ into $\mathbb{D}$ with $a_1 > 0$. Because Ω' is symmetric with respect to $\mathbb{R}$, we have $\Omega' \cap \mathbb{R} = g((-1,1))$. Thus

$$k_h(\mathbb{R}, x_0, \Omega) = k_h(\phi((-1,1)), 0, \mathbb{D}) = \frac{1}{2} k_e(\phi((-1,1)), 0, \mathbb{D}) = \frac{|\operatorname{Im} a_2|}{a_1^2}.$$

Since ϕ/a_1 is a normalized univalent function bounded by $1/a_1$, we have

$$|\frac{a_2}{a_1}| \leq 2(1 - a_1)$$

by Pick's theorem (see [9], p.23, problem 8). It follows that

$$k_h(\mathbb{R}, x_0, \Omega) \leq 2\frac{1 - a_1}{a_1}.$$

Lemma 2.1 now follows from

$$\frac{\lambda_{\Omega'}(x_0)}{\lambda_\Omega(x_0)} = \frac{f'(0)}{g'(0)} = \frac{1}{a_1}.$$

Lemma 2.2 follows since ϕ is close to the identity if a_1 is close to 1. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Following Øyma [7], we consider the (finitely many) components Ω_n of $\Omega \cap \tilde{\Omega}$. Each of them is simply connected, symmetric with respect to $\mathbb{R}$, and bounded by piecewise analytic arcs. Let Ω' be one of these components, and let g be a conformal map from Ω' onto the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$ such that $\mathbb{R} \cap \Omega'$ maps to the imaginary axis. The map

$$\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto i|x| \tag{4}$$

from $\partial\mathbb{H}$ onto $i\mathbb{R}_+$ corresponds via g to a map from $\partial\Omega'$ onto $\mathbb{R} \cap \Omega'$. This map is two-to-one. Restricting it to those open arcs of $\partial\Omega'$ which are also contained in $\partial\Omega$, we obtain a one-to-one parametrization of $\mathbb{R} \cap \Omega'$ by arcs of $\partial\Omega$. In case Ω was already symmetric with respect to $\mathbb{R}$, just restrict to $\partial\Omega' \cap \mathbb{H}$. Since the domains Ω_n are disjoint, the parametrizations coming from different components use disjoint arcs of $\partial\Omega$. We thus obtain a smooth map

$$\psi : B \to (\mathbb{R} \cap \Omega) \setminus P$$

defined on a finite union B of open arcs on $\partial\Omega$, where P is the finite set of points corresponding to the corners of Ω_n'. Now set $A = f(B)$ and $\phi = f \circ \psi \circ f^{-1}$, where $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{D}$ is the given conformal map. In order to prove (2), consider two nearby points $\zeta, \zeta' \in A$ together with the component Ω' of $\Omega \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ that contains $z = f^{-1}(\phi(\zeta))$. If ζ' is sufficiently close to ζ, we find that $x = f^{-1}(\zeta) \in \partial\Omega'$ and $x' = f^{-1}(\zeta') \in \partial\Omega'$ are close to each other and that $z' = f^{-1}(\phi(\zeta))$ belongs to Ω'. Denote $C(x, x')$ the (shorter) arc of $\partial\Omega'$ between x and x'. Using (4) and conformal invariance, we obtain

$$\omega(C(x, x'), z, \Omega') = \frac{1}{2\pi} d_{\Omega'}(z, z')(1 + o(1))$$

as $\zeta' \to \zeta$. Since $\Omega' \subset \Omega$, we obtain

$$\omega(C(x, x'), z, \Omega) \geq \frac{1}{2\pi} d_{\Omega'}(z, z')(1 + o(1)) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\lambda_{\Omega'}(z)}{\lambda_{\Omega}(z)} d_{\Omega}(z, z')(1 + o(1)).$$

Applying f and letting $\zeta' \to \zeta$ yields

$$\frac{1 - |\phi(\zeta)|^2}{|\zeta - \phi(\zeta)|^2} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\Omega'}(f^{-1}(z))}{\lambda_{\Omega}(f^{-1}(z))} \frac{2|\phi'(\zeta)|}{1 - |\phi(\zeta)|^2}. \tag{5}$$

The theorem now follows from Lemma 2.1. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be simply connected and $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{D}$ conformal. Replacing Ω by $f^{-1}(\{z : |z| < r\})$ if necessary, we may assume that $\partial\Omega$ is an analytic curve.

Denote by $p(z) = z/|z|$ the projection onto the unit circle. The following observation is easily proved using the fact that geodesics meet the unit circle radially: There are constants $M > 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that every arc $\gamma \subset \mathbb{D}$ of hyperbolic length M that has hyperbolic Hausdorff distance $\leq \varepsilon_1$ from some geodesic arc has a subarc $\hat{\gamma}$ of hyperbolic length 1 such that

$$\ell(p(\hat{\gamma})) \leq \frac{1}{8} \ell(\hat{\gamma}). \tag{6}$$

Let δ_1 be the constant from Lemma 2.2 associated with these constants M and ε_1.

Let $\phi : A \to f(\mathbb{R})$ be the parametrization from Theorem 1.2. Subdivide $f(\mathbb{R})$ into pairwise disjoint arcs Γ_n of hyperbolic length M. We claim that there is a universal constant ε_0 such that

$$\ell(\Gamma_n) \le (2-\varepsilon_0)\ell(\phi^{-1}(\Gamma_n)) \tag{7}$$

for all n. Then the theorem immediately follows by summing over n and using the disjointness of the $\phi^{-1}(\Gamma_n)$.

To prove (7), fix n and let us first assume that

$$\frac{\lambda_{\Omega'}(f^{-1}(z))}{\lambda_\Omega(f^{-1}(z))} \ge 1+\delta_1$$

for all $z \in \Gamma_n$, where again Ω' denotes the component of $\Omega \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ that contains $f^{-1}(z)$. Then (5) implies $|\phi'(z)| \le 2/(1+\delta_1)$ and (7) follows for this n.

Otherwise we apply Lemma 2.2 and obtain a subarc $\hat{\gamma}$ of hyperbolic length 1 satisfying (6). We may assume that $\hat{\gamma} \subset \{|z| \ge \frac{1}{2}\}$, since otherwise $|\phi'| < 2-\varepsilon_2$ on $\phi^{-1}(\hat{\gamma})$ by (5) and (7) would easily follow using the fact that $\ell(\hat{\gamma})$ and $\ell(\Gamma_n)$ are comparable with universal constants depending only on M.

Now $\ell(\phi^{-1}(\hat{\gamma})) \ge \frac{1}{2}\ell(\hat{\gamma})$ since $|\phi'| \le 2$. Hence there is a set $B \subset \phi^{-1}(\hat{\gamma})$ with $\ell(B) \ge \frac{1}{4}\ell(\hat{\gamma})$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(\zeta, p(\hat{\gamma})) \ge \frac{1}{32}\ell(\hat{\gamma})$ for all $\zeta \in B$. For these ζ we have

$$1-|\phi(\zeta)| \le (1-\varepsilon_3)|\zeta-\phi(\zeta)|$$

and obtain $|\phi'| \le 2(1-\varepsilon_3)^2$. Again (7) follows since $\ell(\hat{\gamma})$ and $\ell(\Gamma_n)$ are comparable. The proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We write $A^c = \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A$ and $A^* = \{1/z : z \in A\}$ for sets $A \subset \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Fix a point $x \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ and denote by f_k $(k=1,2,3)$ conformal maps from $\mathbb{D}$ onto Ω_k with $f_k(0)=x$. Then

$$\lambda_{\Omega_k}(x) = \frac{1}{|f_k'(0)|}. \tag{8}$$

Since $1/(f_k(1/z)-x)$ is conformal in $\Delta = \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and fixes ∞, we obtain

$$\lambda_{\Omega_k}(x) = \mathrm{cap}(\partial\Omega_k - x)^*,$$

where the right-hand side is the logarithmic capacity of the image of $\partial\Omega_k$ under $z \mapsto 1/(z-x)$. Now

$$\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \subset \Omega_3$$

implies

$$(\Omega_3 - x)^c \subset (\Omega_1 - x)^c \cup (\Omega_2 - x)^c,$$

which yields

$$((\Omega_3 - x)^c)^* \subset ((\Omega_1 - x)^c)^* \cup ((\Omega_2 - x)^c)^*.$$

The theorem follows from $\mathrm{cap}\, A = \mathrm{cap}\, \partial A$, (8) and the subadditivity of the capacity of connected unions ([9], chapter 22), noticing that $((\Omega_1 - x)^c)^* \cup ((\Omega_2 - x)^c)^*$ is connected (through 0). □

Remark. The proof shows that the conclusion of the theorem is true under the slightly weaker assumption that $\partial\Omega_3 \subset \Omega_1^c \cup \Omega_2^c$.

3. Remarks and questions

The Hayman-Wu theorem if usually formulated as $\ell(f(L)) \leq C$ whenever L is a *circle or a line.* One is tempted to argue that there is no difference between circles and lines by composing with an automorphism of $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. However, most proofs of the Hayman-Wu theorem make essential use of the fact that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ rather than $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, and then the case of L bounding a disc D that is compactly contained in Ω requires an extra argument: In this case it is known that D is hyperbolically convex, and according to a theorem of Brown-Flinn [1], the boundary of any hyperbolically convex subset of the *unit disc* has length $\leq \pi^2$. Hence $\ell(f(L)) \leq \pi^2$ in this case.

Let us restrict our attention to simply-connected planar domains Ω and circles L whose center x_0 is contained in Ω. It is no loss of generality to assume that $L = \mathbb{T}$ and $x_0 = 0$. Let us further consider only those conformal maps $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{D}$ that fix 0, and denote by Ω_1 the smallest universal bound for $\ell(f(L))$. Obviously $\emptyset_1 \leq \emptyset$, and Øyma's example [8] is easily seen to give $\emptyset_1 \geq \pi^2$.

Conjecture 1. $\emptyset_1 = \emptyset$.

It might be easier to determine $\emptyset_1$ than $\emptyset$, for the following reason:

Proposition 3.1. *For every pair* (Ω, f) *as above and every* $M > 0$ *there is* $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{f})$ *with*

$$\ell(f(\mathbb{T})) < \ell(\hat{f}(\mathbb{T}))$$

and such that the hyperbolic distance of $\hat{f}(\mathbb{T})$ *from* 0 *is at least* M.

In other words, there is no extremal configuration, and in determining $\emptyset_1$ we may assume that the circle is hyperbolically as far out as we want.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Set $\phi = f^{-1}$ and consider the n-th root transform $\psi(z) = \phi(z^n)^{1/n}$. Then

$$\psi^{-1}(\mathbb{T}) = \{z \in \mathbb{D} : z^n \in f(\mathbb{T})\}$$

and we obtain

$$\ell(\psi^{-1}(\mathbb{T})) = n \int_{f(\mathbb{T})} |\frac{z^{\frac{1-n}{n}}}{n}||dz| > \ell(f(\mathbb{T})).$$

Choosing n large enough we see that $\psi^{-1}(\mathbb{T})$ gets as close to $\mathbb{T}$ as we please. The proposition follows with $\hat{f} = \psi^{-1}$. □

We now turn to the approach of Fernández, Heinonen and Martio [2]. Using the notation $\tilde{z} = x + i|y|$ for $z = x + iy$ and $\tilde{E} = \{\tilde{z} : z \in E\}$, they associate with any simply connected planar domain Ω the following simply connected domain $\hat{\Omega}$: Setting $a = \inf\{z : z \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}\}, b = \sup\{z : z \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}\}$, and $E = (-\infty, a) \cup \partial\Omega \cup (b, \infty)$, then $\hat{\Omega}$ is the component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \tilde{E}$ that contains the lower half plane. If $z_0 \in \Omega$ is in the lower half plane, if f resp. $\hat{f}$ are the conformal maps of Ω resp. $\hat{\Omega}$ onto $\mathbb{D}$ sending z_0 to 0, if g resp. $\hat{g}$ denotes the (positive) Greens functions with pole at z_0, and if $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}$, then

$$2|f'(x)| = \frac{2|f'(x)|}{1 - |f(x)|^2}(1 - |f(x)|^2) = \lambda_\Omega(x)(1 - e^{-2g(x)}).$$

Baernstein [2] proved $g(x) \le \hat{g}(x)$, hence

$$|f'(x)| \le \frac{\lambda_\Omega(x)}{\lambda_{\hat{\Omega}}(x)} |\hat{f}'(x)|. \tag{9}$$

From the Koebe one-quarter theorem it easily follows that $\lambda_\Omega(x)/\lambda_{\hat{\Omega}}(x) \le 4$, so that $|f'(x)| \le 4|\hat{f}'(x)|$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Now the result $\ell(f(\mathbb{R})) \le 4\pi^2$ of [2] follows at once from the aforementioned result of Brown-Flinn. The use of the Koebe one-quarter theorem is not optimal: Indeed, from Theorem 1.3 (apply the remark after the proof of Theorem 1.3 to $\Omega_1 = \hat{\Omega}$, $\Omega_2 = \overline{\hat{\Omega}}$ and $\Omega_3 = \Omega$), we conclude $\lambda_\Omega(x) \le 2\lambda_{\hat{\Omega}}(x)$, obtain $|f'(x)| \le 2|\hat{f}'(x)|$ and finally have $\ell(f(\mathbb{R})) \le 2\pi^2$. The inequality $|f'(x)| \le 2|\hat{f}'(x)|$ is best possible, equality is attained only (up to linear transformations) for $\Omega = \mathbb{C} \setminus ((i, i\infty) \cup (-i, -i\infty))$ and $x = x_0 = 0$. Notice that this domain is symmetric about $\mathbb{R}$. The inequality $g \le \hat{g}$ is optimal, too, but here equality occurs in the unsymmetric case $\Omega = \hat{\Omega}$. Hence the estimate $|f'(x)| \le 2|\hat{f}'(x)|$ should improve if x is far from x_0. We formulate this as

Conjecture 2. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ (independent of Ω) such that

$$|f'(x)| \le (1+\varepsilon)|\hat{f}'(x)|$$

whenever $x_0 \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{H}^-$ and $d_\Omega(x, x_0) > \delta^{-1}$.

From Conjecture 2 it follows that $\varnothing_1 = \pi^2$: Indeed, by Proposition 3.1 we may assume that $\mathbb{R}$ is hyperbolically far from x_0, and the above reasoning gives $\ell(f(\mathbb{R})) \le (1+\varepsilon)\pi^2$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

A first draft of this paper contained the following conjecture, which would have constituted an alternative approach to proving $\varnothing = \pi^2$.

Conjecture 3. If $\gamma \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ is a smooth curve with both endpoints on $\mathbb{T}$ and otherwise contained in $\mathbb{D}$, if A is an open subset of $\mathbb{T}$ and if $\phi : A \to \gamma$ is a parametrization of γ minus finitely many points satisfying

$$\frac{1 - |\phi(\zeta)|^2}{|\zeta - \phi(\zeta)|^2} \ge [2 + k_h(\gamma, \phi(\zeta))] \frac{|\phi'(\zeta)|}{1 - |\phi(\zeta)|^2}$$

on A, then

$$\ell(\gamma) \le \frac{\pi}{2} \ell(A).$$

By means of Theorem 1.2, this would immediately prove $\varnothing = \pi^2$. However, in joint work with Ana Granados we found counterexamples to this conjecture. These examples, together with other results, will be presented in a forthcoming joint paper.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank P. Duren, A. Granados, F. Gehring and J. Heinonen for our discussions on this subject, J. Fernández for his permission to include our Theorem 1.3 in this paper, and the referee for helpful comments.

References

[1] B. Brown-Flinn, *Hyperbolic convexity and level sets of analytic functions*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 32 (1983), 831–841. MR **85b:**30010

[2] J. Fernández, J. Heinonen, O. Martio, *Quasilines and conformal mappings*, J. Analyse Math. 52 (1989), 117–132. MR **90a:**30017

[3] J. Garnett, F. Gehring, P. Jones, *Conformally invariant length sums*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 32 (1983), 809–829. MR **85a:**30033

[4] J. Fernández, A. Granados, *On geodesic curvature and conformal mapping*, Algebra i Analiz 9 (1997), 220–244; translation in S. Petersburg Math. J. 9 (1998), 615–637. MR **98k:**30010

[5] W. Hayman, J.-M. Wu, *Level sets of univalent functions*, Comment. Math. Helv. 56 (1981), 366–403. MR **83b:**30008

[6] B. Osgood, *Some properties of f''/f' and the Poincaré metric*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 31 (1982), 449–461. MR **83j:**30019

[7] K. Øyma, *Harmonic measure and conformal length*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 115 (1992), 687–689. MR **92i:**30007

[8] K. Øyma, *The Hayman-Wu constant*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 119 (1993), 337–338. MR **93k:**30031

[9] Chr. Pommerenke, *Univalent functions*, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht (1975). MR **58:**22526

Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195-4350