

## BEHAVIOR OF THE BERGMAN KERNEL AND METRIC NEAR CONVEX BOUNDARY POINTS

NIKOLAI NIKOLOV AND PETER PFLUG

(Communicated by Mei-Chi Shaw)

ABSTRACT. The boundary behavior of the Bergman metric near a convex boundary point  $z_0$  of a pseudoconvex domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is studied. It turns out that the Bergman metric at points  $z \in D$  in the direction of a fixed vector  $X_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$  tends to infinity, when  $z$  is approaching  $z_0$ , if and only if the boundary of  $D$  does not contain any analytic disc through  $z_0$  in the direction of  $X_0$ .

For a domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  we denote by  $L_h^2(D)$  the Hilbert space of all holomorphic functions  $f$  that are square-integrable and by  $\|f\|_D$  the  $L_2$ -norm of  $f$ . Let  $K_D(z)$  be the restriction on the diagonal of the Bergman kernel function of  $D$ . It is well known (cf. [5]) that

$$K_D(z) = \sup\{|f(z)|^2 : f \in L_h^2(D), \|f\|_D \leq 1\}.$$

If  $K_D(z) > 0$  for some point  $z \in D$ , then the Bergman metric  $B_D(z; X)$ ,  $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , is well defined and can be given by the equality

$$B_D(z; X) = \frac{M_D(z; X)}{\sqrt{K_D(z)}},$$

where

$$M_D(z; X) = \sup\{|f'(z)X| : f \in L_h^2(D), \|f\|_D = 1, f(z) = 0\}.$$

We say that a boundary point  $z_0$  of a domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is *convex* if there is a neighborhood  $U$  of this point such that  $D \cap U$  is convex.

In [4], Herbort proved the following

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $z_0$  be a convex boundary point of a bounded pseudoconvex domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  whose boundary contains no nontrivial germ of an analytic curve near  $z_0$ . Then*

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} B_D(z; X) = \infty$$

for any  $X \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$ .

Herbort's proof is mainly based on Ohsawa's  $\bar{\partial}$ -technique. The main purpose of this note is to generalize Theorem 1 using more elementary methods.

---

Received by the editors January 21, 2002.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32A25.

*Key words and phrases.* Bergman kernel, Bergman metric.

For a convex boundary point  $z_0$  of a domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  we denote by  $L(z_0)$  the set of all  $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$  for which there exists a number  $\varepsilon_X > 0$  such that  $z_0 + \lambda X \in \partial D$  for all complex numbers  $\lambda$ ,  $|\lambda| \leq \varepsilon_X$ . Note that  $L(z_0)$  is a complex linear space.

Then our result is the following one.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $z_0$  be a convex boundary point of a bounded pseudoconvex domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  and let  $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then*

- (a)  $\liminf_{z \rightarrow z_0} K_D(z) \operatorname{dist}^2(z, \partial D) \in (0, \infty]$ ;
- (b)  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} B_D(z; X) = \infty$  if and only if  $X \notin L(z_0)$ . Moreover, this limit is locally uniform in  $X \notin L(z_0)$ ;
- (c) if  $L(z_0) = \{0\}$ , then (a) and (b) are still true without the assumption that  $D$  is bounded.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* To prove (a) and (b) we will use the following localization theorem for the Bergman kernel and metric [2].

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a bounded pseudoconvex domain and let  $V \subset\subset U$  be open neighborhoods of a point  $z_0 \in \partial D$ . Then there exists a constant  $\tilde{C} \geq 1$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}^{-1} K_{D \cap U}(z) &\leq K_D(z) \leq K_{D \cap U}(z), \\ \tilde{C}^{-1} B_{D \cap U}(z; X) &\leq B_D(z; X) \leq \tilde{C} B_{D \cap U}(z; X) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $z \in D \cap V$  and any  $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . (Here  $K_{D \cap U}(z)$  and  $B_{D \cap U}(z; \cdot)$  denote the Bergman kernel and metric of the connected component of  $D \cap U$  that contains  $z$ .)

So, we may assume that  $D$  is convex.

To prove part (a) of Theorem 2, for any  $z \in D$  we choose a point  $\tilde{z} \in \partial D$  such that  $\|z - \tilde{z}\| = \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial D)$ . We denote by  $l$  the complex line through  $z$  and  $\tilde{z}$ . By the Oshawa-Takegoshi extension theorem for  $L^2$ -holomorphic functions [7], it follows that there exists a constant  $C_1 > 0$  only depending on the diameter of  $D$  (not on  $l$ ) such that

$$(1) \quad K_D(z) \geq C_1 K_{D \cap l}(z).$$

Since  $D \cap l$  is convex, it is contained in an open half-plane  $\Pi$  of the  $l$ -plane with  $\tilde{z} \in \partial \Pi$ . Then

$$(2) \quad K_{D \cap l}(z) \geq K_{\Pi}(z) = \frac{1}{4\pi \operatorname{dist}^2(z, \partial \Pi)}.$$

Now, part (a) of Theorem 2 follows from the inequalities (1), (2) and the fact that  $\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial \Pi) \leq \|z - \tilde{z}\| = \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial D)$ .

To prove part (b) of Theorem 2, we denote by  $N(z_0)$  the complex affine space through  $z_0$  that is orthogonal to  $L(z_0)$ . Set  $E(z_0) = D \cap N(z_0)$ . Note that  $E(z_0)$  is a nonempty convex set. So, part (b) of Theorem 2 will be a consequence of the following:

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $z_0$  be a boundary point of a bounded convex domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then:*

- (i)  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} B_D(z; X) = \infty$  locally uniformly in  $X \notin L(z_0)$ ;

(ii) for any compact set  $K \subset\subset E(z_0)$  there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$B_D(z; X) \leq C\|X\|, \quad z \in K^0, X \in L(z_0),$$

where  $K^0 := \{z_0 + tz : z \in K, 0 < t \leq 1\}$  is the cone generated by  $K$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.* To prove (i) we will use the well-known fact that the Carathéodory metric  $C_D(z; X)$  of  $D$  does not exceed  $B_D(z; X)$ . On the other hand, we have the following simple geometric inequality [1]:

$$C_D(z; X) \geq \frac{1}{2d(z; X)},$$

where  $d(z; X)$  denotes the distance from  $z$  to the boundary of  $D$  in the  $X$ -direction, i.e.,  $d(z; X) := \sup\{r : z + \lambda X \in D, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, |\lambda| < r\}$ . So, if we assume that (i) does not hold, then we may find a number  $a > 0$  and sequences  $D \supset (z_j)_j, z_j \rightarrow z_0, \mathbb{C}^n \supset (X_j)_j, X_j \rightarrow X \notin L(z_0)$ , such that  $B_D(z_j; X_j) \leq \frac{1}{2a}$ . Hence  $d(z_j; X_j) \geq a$  which implies that for  $|\lambda| \leq a$  the points  $z_0 + \lambda X$  belong to  $\bar{D}$  and, in view of convexity, they belong to  $\partial D$ . This means that  $X \in L(z_0)$ , a contradiction.

To prove part (ii) of Theorem 4, we may assume that  $z_0 = 0$  and  $L := L(0) = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : z_1 = \dots = z_k = 0\}$  for some  $k < n$ . Then  $N := N(0) = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : z_{k+1} = \dots = z_n = 0\}$ . From now on we will write any point  $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$  in the form  $z = (z', z'')$ ,  $z' \in \mathbb{C}^k, z'' \in \mathbb{C}^{n-k}$ . Note that  $L \in \partial D$  near 0, i.e., there exists a  $c > 0$  such that

$$(3) \quad \{0'\} \times \Delta_c'' \in \partial D,$$

where  $\Delta_c'' \subset \mathbb{C}^{n-k}$  is the polydisc with center at the origin and radius  $c$ . Since  $K \subset\subset E := E(0)$  and since  $E$  is convex, there exists an  $\alpha > 1$  such that  $K \subset\subset E_\alpha$ , where  $E_\alpha := \{z : \alpha z \in E\}$ . Note that  $K^0 \subset E_\alpha$ . Using (3), the equality

$$(z', z'') = \frac{1}{\alpha}(\alpha z', 0'') + (1 - \frac{1}{\alpha})(0', (1 - \frac{1}{\alpha})^{-1}z''),$$

and the convexity of  $D$ , it follows that

$$(4) \quad F_\alpha \times \Delta_\varepsilon'' \subset D,$$

where  $\varepsilon := c(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha})$  and where  $F_\alpha$  is the projection of  $E_\alpha$  in  $\mathbb{C}^k$  (we can identify  $E_\alpha$  with  $F_\alpha$ ). For  $\delta := c(\alpha - 1)$  we obtain in the same way that

$$(5) \quad \tilde{D} := D \cap (\mathbb{C}^k \times \Delta_\delta'') \subset F_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \times \Delta_\delta''.$$

Now, let  $(z, X) \in K^0 \times L$ . Note that  $z = (z', 0'')$  and  $X = (0', X'')$ . Then, using (4) and the product properties of the Bergman kernel and metric, we have

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} M_D(z; X) &\leq M_{F_\alpha \times \Delta_\varepsilon''}(z; X) \\ &= M_{\Delta_\varepsilon''}(0''; X'') \sqrt{K_{F_\alpha}(z')} \leq C_1 \|X\| \sqrt{K_{F_\alpha}(z')} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C_1 > 0$ . On the other hand, since  $K^0 \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^k \times \Delta_\delta''$ , by virtue of Theorem 3 there exists a constant  $\tilde{C} \geq 1$  such that

$$K_D(z) \geq \tilde{C}^{-1} K_{\tilde{D}}(z).$$

Moreover, in view of (5), we have

$$K_{\tilde{D}}(z) \geq K_{F_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}(z') K_{\Delta_\delta''}(0'')$$

and hence

$$(7) \quad K_D(z) \geq (C_2)^2 K_{F_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}(z')$$

for some constant  $C_2 > 0$ . Now, by (6) and (7), it follows that

$$(8) \quad B_D(z; X) = \frac{M_D(z; X)}{\sqrt{K_D(z)}} \leq \frac{C_1}{C_2} \|X\| \sqrt{\frac{K_{F_\alpha}(z')}{K_{F_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}(z')}}.$$

Note that  $z' \rightarrow \alpha^{-2}z'$  is a biholomorphic mapping from  $F_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$  onto  $F_\alpha$  and, therefore,

$$(9) \quad K_{F_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}(z') = \alpha^{-4k} K_{F_\alpha}(\alpha^{-2}z').$$

In view of (8) and (9), in order to finish (ii) we have to find a constant  $C_3 > 0$  such that

$$(10) \quad K_{F_\alpha}(z') \leq C_3 K_{F_\alpha}(\alpha^{-2}z')$$

for any  $z' \in H^0$  with  $H^0 := \{tz' : z' \in H, 0 < t \leq 1\}$ , where  $H$  is the projection of  $K$  into  $\mathbb{C}^k$  (we can identify  $K$  with  $H$ ).

To do this, note first that  $\gamma := \text{dist}(H, \partial F_\alpha) > 0$  since  $K \subset\subset E_\alpha$ . Fix  $\tau \in (0, 1]$  and  $z' \in H^0$ , and denote by  $T_{\tau, z'}$  the translation that maps the origin in the point  $\tau z'$ . It is easy to check that

$$(11) \quad T_{\tau, z'}(\bar{F}_\alpha \cap B_\gamma) \subset F_\alpha,$$

where  $B_\gamma$  is the ball in  $\mathbb{C}^k$  with center at the origin and radius  $\gamma$ . To prove (10), we will consider the following two cases:

Case I.  $z' \in H^0 \setminus B_{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \subset\subset F_\alpha$ : Then

$$(12) \quad K_{F_\alpha}(z') \leq \frac{m_1}{m_2} K_{F_\alpha}(\alpha^{-2}z'),$$

where  $m_1 := \sup_{H^0 \setminus B_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}} K_{F_\alpha}$  and  $m_2 := \inf K_{F_\alpha}$ .

Case II.  $z' \in H^0 \cap B_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$ : By Theorem 3 there exists a constant  $\tilde{C}_3 \geq 1$  such that  $\tilde{C}_3 K_{F_\alpha} \geq K_{F_\alpha \cap B_\gamma}$  on  $F_\alpha \cap B_{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$ . In particular,

$$(13) \quad \tilde{C}_3 K_{F_\alpha}(\alpha^{-2}z') \geq K_{F_\alpha \cap B_\gamma}(\alpha^{-2}z').$$

On the other hand, by (11) with data  $T := T_{1-\alpha^{-2}, z'}$  it follows that

$$(14) \quad K_{F_\alpha \cap B_\gamma}(\alpha^{-2}z') = K_{T(F_\alpha \cap B_\gamma)}(z') \geq K_{F_\alpha}(z').$$

Now, (12), (13), and (14) imply that (10) holds for  $C_3 := \max\{\frac{m_1}{m_2}, \tilde{C}_3\}$ . This completes the proofs of Theorem 4 and part (b) of Theorem 2.  $\square$

*Remark.* The approximation (5) of the domain  $D \cap (\mathbb{C}^k \times \Delta'_\delta)$  by the domain  $E_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \times \Delta'_\delta$  can be replaced by using the Oshawa-Takegoshi theorem [7] with the data  $D$  and  $N$ .

Finally, part (c) of Theorem 2 will be a consequence of the following two theorems.

**Theorem 5** ([6]). *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a pseudoconvex domain and let  $U$  be an open neighborhood of a local (holomorphic) peak point  $z_0 \in \partial D$ . Then*

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} \frac{K_D(z)}{K_{D \cap U}(z)} = 1$$

and

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} \frac{B_D(z; X)}{B_{D \cap U}(z; X)} = 1$$

locally uniformly in  $X \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$ .

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $z_0$  be a boundary point of a bounded convex domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $z_0$  is a (holomorphic) peak point;
- (2)  $z_0$  is the unique analytic curve in  $\bar{D}$  containing  $z_0$ ;
- (3)  $L(z_0) = \{0\}$ .

Note that the only nontrivial implication is (3)  $\implies$  (1). It is contained in [8]. Now, part (c) of Theorem 2 is a consequence of this implication, Theorem 5, and part (b) of Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 6.* The implication (2)  $\implies$  (3) is trivial.

The implication (1)  $\implies$  (2) easily follows by the maximum principle and the fact that there are a neighborhood  $U$  of  $z_0$  and a vector  $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $(\bar{D} \cap U) + (0, 1]X \subset D$  (cf. (11)).

Denote by  $A^0(D)$  the algebra of holomorphic functions on  $D$  which are continuous on  $\bar{D}$ . Now, following [8] we shall prove the implication (3)  $\implies$  (1); namely, (3) implies that  $z_0$  is a peak point with respect to  $A^0(D)$ . This is equivalent to the fact (cf. [3]) that the point mass at  $z_0$  is the unique element of the set  $A(z_0)$  of all representing measures for  $z_0$  with respect to  $A^0(D)$ , i.e.  $\text{supp } \mu = \{z_0\}$  for any  $\mu \in A(z_0)$ .

Let  $\mu \in A(z_0)$ . Since  $D$  is convex, we may assume that  $z_0 = 0$  and  $D \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \text{Re}(z_1) < 0\}$ . Note that if  $a$  is a positive number such that  $a \inf_{z \in D} \text{Re}(z_1) > -1$  ( $D$  is bounded), then the function  $f_1(z) = \exp(z_1 + az_1^2)$  belongs to  $A^0(D)$  and  $|f_1(z)| < 1$  for  $z \in \bar{D} \setminus \{z_1 = 0\}$ . This easily implies (cf. [3]) that  $\text{supp } \mu \subset D_1 := \partial D \cap \{z_1 = 0\}$ . Since  $L(0) = 0$ , the origin is a boundary point of the compact convex set  $D_1$ . As above, we may assume that  $D_1 \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \text{Re}(z_2) \leq 0\}$  ( $z_2$  is independent of  $z_1$ ) and then construct a function  $f_2 \in A^0(D)$  such that  $|f_2(z)| < 1$  for  $z \in D_1 \setminus \{z_2 = 0\}$ . This implies that  $\text{supp } \mu \subset D_1 \cap \{z_2 = 0\}$ . Repeating this argument we conclude that  $\text{supp } \mu = \{0\}$ , which completes the proofs of Theorems 6 and 2. □

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was written during the stay of the first author at the University of Oldenburg, supported by a grant from the DAAD. He thanks both institutions, the DAAD and the Mathematical Department of the University of Oldenburg.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Bedford, S. Pinchuk, *Convex domains with noncompact automorphism groups*, Sb. Math. 82 (1995), 1-20. MR **95e**:32037
- [2] K. Diederich, J.E. Fornæss, G. Herbort, *Boundary behavior of the Bergman metric*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 41 (1984), 59-67. MR **85j**:32039
- [3] T.W. Gamelin, *Uniform algebras*, Chelsea, New York, 1984. Originally published by Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1969. MR **53**:14137
- [4] G. Herbort, *On the Bergman metric near a plurisubharmonic barrier point*, Prog. Math. 188 (2000), 123-132. MR **2001g**:32079
- [5] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *Invariant distances and metrics in complex analysis*, Walter De Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1993. MR **94k**:32039
- [6] N. Nikolov, *Localization of invariant metrics*, Arch. Math. 79 (2002), 67-73.
- [7] T. Ohsawa, K. Takegoshi, *Extension of  $L^2$  holomorphic functions*, Math. Z. 195 (1987), 197-204. MR **88g**:32029
- [8] N. Sibony, *Une classe de domaines pseudoconvexes*, Duke Math. J. 55 (1987), 299-319. MR **88g**:32036

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 1113 SOFIA, BULGARIA

*E-mail address:* `nik@math.bas.bg`

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, CARL VON OSSIETZKY UNIVERSITÄT OLDENBURG, POSTFACH 2503, D-26111 OLDENBURG, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* `pflug@mathematik.uni-oldenburg.de`