



Research Paper

A Step on $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman Kernel for Bounded Domains in \mathbb{C}^n

Mohammed Abdallah⁽¹⁾ and ShawgyHussein⁽²⁾

(1) Sudan University of Science and Technology, College of Education, Department of Mathematics, Sudan.

(2) Sudan University of Science and Technology, College of Science, Department of Mathematics, Sudan.

Abstract

Following the way of J. Ning, H. Zhang, and X. Zhou [23], we show some properties of the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernels by applying $L^{2-\epsilon}$ extension theorem. We also show that for any bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n , it is pseudoconvex if and only if its $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel is an exhaustion function, for any $0 < \epsilon < 2$. As an application, we give a negative answer to a conjecture of Tsuji.

Keywords:

Received 01 Aug., 2025; Revised 09 Aug., 2025; Accepted 11 Aug., 2025 © The author(s) 2025.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. Introduction

The authors in [16] proved the Ohsawa-Takegoshi L^2 extension theorem, which turns out to be useful in several complex variables and complex geometry. [2] proved the $L^{2/m}$ version of Ohsawa-Takegoshi theorem for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Recently, [9] obtained optimal estimate for $L^{2-\epsilon}$ ($0 \leq \epsilon < 2$) extension as an application of their solution of a sharp L^2 extension problem.

Here, we study the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernels for bounded domains in \mathbb{C}^n , and apply $L^{2-\epsilon}$ extension theorem to give some properties of $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernels (see [23]).

We can introduced a $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel as follows:

Definition 1.1. For a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ and $0 \leq \epsilon < 2$, the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergmann kernel $K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}$ is denoted by

$$K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) = \sup_{f_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega)} \sum_j \frac{|f_j(z^2 - 1)|^{2-\epsilon}}{\int_{\Omega} |f_j|^{2-\epsilon}}$$

where

$$A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega) = \left\{ f_j \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} \sum_j |f_j|^{2-\epsilon} < +\infty \right\}$$

Where the integral on Lebesgue measure.

According to the extreme property, the usual Bergman kernel is just 2-Bergman kernel for the case $\epsilon = 0$ and $j = 1$ in the above definition, which has been studied for years.

Let S be a closed complex subvariety of a domain $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. It's known that one has the same Bergman kernels on U and $U \setminus S$, since for any $f_j \in A^2(U \setminus S)$, one can holomorphically extend the sequence of functions f_j to U . That is to say, one can not distinguish U and $U \setminus S$ by the Bergman kernel.

However, the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel may give some distinction. We will show that for a bounded domain, it is pseudoconvex if and only if its $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel is an exhaustion function for any $0 < \epsilon < 2$. Besides, the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel is interesting per se. We'll also give estimate about the boundary behavior of the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel for a bounded pseudoconvex domain. Lastly, we'll answer negatively a conjecture of [20].

II. The $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel

Note that when $\epsilon = 0$ and $j = 1$, the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergmann kernel is just the usual Bergman kernel. For simplicity, we write K_Ω for $K_{\Omega,2}$. The $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergmann kernel has some properties similar to the usual Bergman kernel, for example, it is easy to see that $K_{\Omega_1,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq K_{\Omega_2,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$ for $(z^2 - 1) \in \Omega_1$ and two domains $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega_2$, and the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergmann kernels are plurisubharmonic.

We will study some more properties of $K_{\Omega,2-\epsilon}$.

Proposition 2.1 (see [23]). Let $\Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be simply connected domain and $\Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain. Then for any $\phi_j: \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ biholomorphism, we have $K_{\Omega_1,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) = K_{\Omega_2,2-\epsilon}(\phi_j(z^2 - 1))|J\phi_j(z^2 - 1)|^2$, where $J\phi_j$ is the determinant of Jacobian of ϕ_j . In particular, if $(2 - \epsilon) = \frac{2}{m}$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is no need for the condition that Ω_1 is simply connected.

Proof. As Ω_1 is simply connected and $J\phi_j$ is nonvanishing, we can choose a single valued holomorphic function of $\log J\phi_j$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi: A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega_2) &\rightarrow A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega_1) \\ f_j &\mapsto f_j \circ \phi_j e^{\frac{2}{2-\epsilon} \log(J\phi_j)} \end{aligned}$$

is isometric, since

$$\int_{\Omega_2} \sum_j |f_j|^{2-\epsilon} = \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_j |f_j \circ \phi_j|^{2-\epsilon} |J\phi_j|^2 = \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_j \left| f_j \circ \phi_j e^{\frac{2}{2-\epsilon} \log(J\phi_j)} \right|^{2-\epsilon}.$$

When $(2 - \epsilon) = \frac{2}{m}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we take

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi: A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega_2) &\rightarrow A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega_1) \\ f_j &\mapsto f_j \circ \phi_j (J\phi_j)^m, \end{aligned}$$

in this case, the simply connected condition is not needed any more.

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\Omega_2,2-\epsilon}(\phi_j(z^2 - 1)) &= \sup_{f_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega_2)} \sum_j \frac{|f_j(\phi_j(z^2 - 1))|^{2-\epsilon}}{\int_{\Omega_2} |f_j|^{2-\epsilon}} \\ &= \sup_{f_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega_2)} \sum_j \frac{|f_j(\phi_j(z^2 - 1))|^{2-\epsilon}}{\int_{\Omega_1} |f_j \circ \phi_j|^{2-\epsilon} |J\phi_j|^2} \\ &= \sum_j \frac{1}{|J\phi_j(z^2 - 1)|^2} \sup_{f_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega_2)} \left| \frac{f_j \circ \phi_j(z^2 - 1) e^{\frac{2}{2-\epsilon} \log(J\phi_j(z^2 - 1))}}{\int_{\Omega_1} |f_j \circ \phi_j e^{\frac{2}{2-\epsilon} \log(J\phi_j)}|^{2-\epsilon}} \right|^{2-\epsilon} \\ &= \sum_j \frac{K_{\Omega_1,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)}{|J\phi_j(z^2 - 1)|^2} \end{aligned}$$

It's easy to see that, if $J\phi_j$ is constant, then the above proposition is still true without the assumption that Ω_1 is simply connected. For example, if the domain Ω is a G -invariant domain w.r.t. a linear action of a semisimple Lie group G , then the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergmann kernel is G -invariant.

The condition that Ω_1 is simply connected is necessary for some $0 < \epsilon < 2$ (see Remark 2.3).

Similar to the usual Bergman kernel, the following proposition holds for the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel.

Proposition 2.2 (see [23]). Suppose that $\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ are bounded domains and $\Omega_j \subset \Omega_{j+1}$ for $j \geq 1$, $\bigcup_{j=1}^\infty \Omega_j = \Omega$, where Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Then for $0 \leq \epsilon < 2$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{\Omega_j,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) = K_{\Omega,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$$

and the convergence is uniform on compact subsets of Ω .

Proof. As $K_{\Omega_j,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$ is decreasing,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{\Omega_j,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$$

exists and $\geq K_{\Omega,2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$.

For fixed $(z^2 - 1) \in \Omega$, we may assume $(z^2 - 1) \in \Omega_{j_0}$. There is $f_{j_0} \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega_{j_0})$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega_j} |f_{j_0}|^{2-\epsilon} = 1$$

and

$$|f_{j_0}(z^2 - 1)|^{2-\epsilon} = K_{\Omega_{j_0, 2-\epsilon}}(z^2 - 1)$$

for each $j \geq j_0$.

By the Montel theorem, there is a subsequence of $(j_0)_k$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_{(j_0)_k}$$

is uniformly convergent to $f_j \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$.

It is easy to check that

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_j |f_j|^{2-\epsilon} \leq 1$$

By the definition, we have

$$K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq \sum_j |f_j(z^2 - 1)|^{2-\epsilon} = \lim_{j_0 \rightarrow \infty} K_{\Omega_{j_0, 2-\epsilon}}(z^2 - 1)$$

As $K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$ is continuous and $K_{\Omega_{j_0, 2-\epsilon}}(z^2 - 1)$ is decreasing, it follows that $K_{\Omega_{j_0, 2-\epsilon}}(z^2 - 1)$ converges uniformly to $K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$ on compact subsets of Ω .

Theorem 2.3 (see [23]). Let Ω be one of the classical domains (see [11], [12], [13]):

$$\mathfrak{R}_1 := \{(Z^2 - 1) \in M(m, n): I^{(m)} - (Z^2 - 1)(Z^2 - 1)' > 0\}$$

$$\mathfrak{R}_2 := \{(Z^2 - 1) \in M(n, n): I^{(n)} - (Z^2 - 1)(Z^2 - 1)' > 0, (Z^2 - 1) = (Z^2 - 1)'\},$$

$$\mathfrak{R}_3 := \{(Z^2 - 1) \in M(n, n): I^{(n)} - (Z^2 - 1)(Z^2 - 1)' > 0, (Z^2 - 1) = -(Z^2 - 1)'\},$$

$$\mathfrak{R}_4 := \{(Z^2 - 1) \in M(1, n): |(Z^2 - 1)(Z^2 - 1)'| + 1 - 2(Z^2 - 1)(Z^2 - 1)' > 0, |(Z^2 - 1)(Z^2 - 1)'| < 1\}.$$

Then

$$K_{\Omega, 1+\epsilon}(Z^2 - 1) = K_{\Omega, 2}(Z^2 - 1)$$

for $(Z^2 - 1) \in \Omega$ for $\epsilon \geq 0$.

Proof. For $(Z^2 - 1) \in \Omega$ and $|t| \leq 1$, we have $t(Z^2 - 1) \in \Omega$.

For any $f_j \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_j |f_j(e^{i\theta}(Z^2 - 1))|^{1+\epsilon} d\theta \geq \sum_j |f_j(0)|^{1+\epsilon}$$

Then by the Fubini Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |f_j|^{1+\epsilon} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{\Omega} |f_j(e^{i\theta}(Z^2 - 1))|^{1+\epsilon} dV_{(Z^2 - 1)} d\theta \\ &= \int_{\Omega} dV_{(Z^2 - 1)} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_j |f_j(e^{i\theta}(Z^2 - 1))|^{1+\epsilon} d\theta \geq \sum_j |f_j(0)|^{1+\epsilon} \text{Vol}(\Omega) \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$K_{\Omega, 1+\epsilon}(0) = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\Omega)}$$

As Ω is homogenous, it is well known that Ω is also simply connected, combining with the above proposition, we have $K_{\Omega, 1+\epsilon}(Z^2 - 1) = K_{\Omega, 2}(Z^2 - 1)$ for $(Z^2 - 1) \in \Omega$.

Remark 2.1. The above result is true for any complete circular and bounded homogeneous domain. It's known that any bounded symmetric domain is such a domain.

For a general bounded homogenous domain Ω , we have $K_{\Omega, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq K_{\Omega, 2}(z^2 - 1)$. It is well known that $K_{\Omega}(z^2 - 1, w)$ is zero free and Ω is simply connected, we can define a holomorphic function $\log K_{\Omega}(z^2 - 1, w)$ for $(z^2 - 1) \in \Omega$ and fixed $w \in \Omega$. Then $e^{\frac{2}{1+\epsilon} \log K_{\Omega}(z^2 - 1, w)} \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Omega)$, and it is easy to get $K_{\Omega, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq K_{\Omega, 2}(z^2 - 1)$.

It seems to be strange that the $(1 + \epsilon)$ -Bergmann kernel may be independent of $(1 + \epsilon)$ for some domains. From the following theorem, we can deduce that, in general, $K_{\Omega, 1+\epsilon}$ is dependent on $(1 + \epsilon)$.

Lemma 2.4 (see [23]). For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, we have

$$K_{\Omega, \frac{2-\epsilon}{m}}(z^2 - 1) \geq K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$$

for any $0 < \epsilon < 2$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. If $f_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, then

$$f_j^m \in A^{\frac{2-\epsilon}{m}}(\Omega)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_j |f_j|^{2-\epsilon} = \int_{\Omega} \sum_j |f_j^m|^{\frac{2-\epsilon}{m}}$$

By the definition of $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel, we have

$$K_{\Omega, \frac{2-\epsilon}{m}}(z^2 - 1) \geq K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$$

The next theorem needs the $L^{2-\epsilon}$ extension theorem. We state it in the following. For the proof, see [2] or [9].

Theorem 2.5. (see [2] or [9]) Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n , L be a complex affine line in \mathbb{C}^n , and $\Omega \cap L \neq \emptyset$. For $0 \leq \epsilon < 2$, then for any $f_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega \cap L)$, there is $F_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, such that $F_j|_{\Omega \cap L} = f_j$ and

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_j |F_j|^{2-\epsilon} \leq C \int_{\Omega \cap L} \sum_j |f_j|^{2-\epsilon}$$

where C is a constant depending only on $\text{diam}\Omega$ and n .

Theorem 2.6 (see [23]). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded pseudoconvex domain, $0 < \epsilon < 2$ and $l = \max\{s \in \mathbb{N}_+ : s < \frac{2}{2-\epsilon}\}$. Then we have

$$K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{\delta(z^2 - 1)^{(2-\epsilon)l}}$$

where $\delta(z^2 - 1) = \inf_{w \in \partial\Omega} d(z^2 - 1, w)$ and $(1 + \epsilon)$ is a constant positive number.

Proof. For any complex line L , after a unitary transform, we may assume $L = \{(z^2 - 1)_2 = \dots = (z^2 - 1)_n = 0\}$.

Let $(z^2 - 1)^0 = ((z^2 - 1)_1^0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \partial\Omega \cap L$, take

$$f_j = \frac{1}{((z^2 - 1)_1 - (z^2 - 1)_1^0)^l} \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega \cap L)$$

From the $L^{2-\epsilon}$ extension theorem 2.5, we get $F_j \in A^{2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ such that $F_j|_{\Omega \cap L} = f_j$, and

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_j |F_j|^{2-\epsilon} \leq C \int_{\Omega \cap L} \sum_j |f_j|^{2-\epsilon} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon}$$

for some constant $\epsilon \geq 0$, $(1 + \epsilon)$ depends only on $\text{diam}\Omega$ and n .

Then

$$K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)|_{\Omega \cap L} \geq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{|(z^2 - 1)_1 - (z^2 - 1)_1^0|^{(2-\epsilon)l}}$$

As we can choose arbitrary complex line and boundary points, we get

$$K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{\delta(z^2 - 1)^{(2-\epsilon)l}}$$

According to the above theorem and the fact that the $(2 - \epsilon)$ -Bergman kernel is plurisubharmonic, we can easily get the following interesting theorem.

Theorem 2.7. For any bounded domain Ω in \mathbb{C}^n , Ω is pseudoconvex if and only if $K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$ is an exhaustion function for $0 < \epsilon < 2$.

Remark 2.2. The condition that Ω is bounded is necessary. If we consider $\Omega = \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta$, then $K_{\Omega, 2-\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$ is bounded near ∞ for $0 \leq \epsilon < 2$.

Theorem 2.8 (see [23]). Let $\Delta^* = \{(z^2 - 1) \in \mathbb{C}: 0 < |z^2 - 1| < 1\}$ and $0 \leq \epsilon < 2$, then we have $K_{\Delta^*, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) = O\left(\frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^{1+\epsilon}}\right)$.

Proof. For any $f_j \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Delta^*)$, we have $f_j(z^2 - 1) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_j a_n^j(z^2 - 1)^n$, then $g_j(z^2 - 1) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_j a_n^j(z^2 - 1)^n$ is holomorphic on $\Delta = \{(z^2 - 1) \in \mathbb{C}: |z^2 - 1| < 1\}$.

In the present proof, we denote by $\|f_j\|_{1+\epsilon} = \left(\int_{\Delta^*} \sum_j |f_j|^{1+\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\epsilon}}$ for $f_j \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Delta^*)$.

Obviously, $\int_{\Delta_\tau^*} \sum_j |g_j(z^2 - 1)|^{1+\epsilon} < \infty$, where $\Delta_\tau^* = \{(z^2 - 1) \in \mathbb{C}: 0 < |z^2 - 1| < \tau\}$ and $0 < \tau < 1$.

It's easy to see that

$$\int_{\Delta^*} \left|\frac{1}{z^2 - 1}\right|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy = \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r^{-\epsilon} d\theta dr = \frac{2\pi}{1 - \epsilon}$$

From

$$\|g_j + h_j\|_{1+\epsilon} \leq \|g_j\|_{1+\epsilon} + \|h_j\|_{1+\epsilon}$$

we get

$$h_j(z^2 - 1) := \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-2} \sum_j a_n^j(z^2 - 1)^n \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Delta_\tau^*).$$

We want to prove $h_j = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta_\tau^*} \sum_j |h_j(z^2 - 1)|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy &= \int_{\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_{\frac{1}{\tau}}} \sum_j \left|h_j\left(\frac{1}{z^2 - 1}\right)\right|^{1+\epsilon} \frac{dx dy}{|z^2 - 1|^4} \\ &= \int_{\frac{1}{\tau}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r^3} dr \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_j \left|h_j\left(\frac{e^{i\theta}}{r}\right)\right|^{1+\epsilon} d\theta \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{h}_j(z^2 - 1) = h_j\left(\frac{1}{z^2 - 1}\right)$, then \tilde{h}_j is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_{\frac{1}{\tau}}$ and

$$\tilde{h}_j(z^2 - 1) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_j a_{-n}^j(z^2 - 1)^n$$

If \tilde{h}_j is not 0, then there is $n_0 > 1$ such that $a_{-n_0}^j \neq 0$ and $a_{-n}^j = 0$ for $1 < n < n_0$. Write $\tilde{h}_j(z^2 - 1) = (z^2 - 1)^{n_0} (f_j)_1(z^2 - 1)$, where $(f_j)_1(z^2 - 1) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_j a_{-n}^j(z^2 - 1)^{n-n_0}$.

By the submean property

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \sum_j \left|(f_j)_1\left(\frac{e^{i\theta}}{r}\right)\right|^{1+\epsilon} d\theta \geq 2\pi \sum_j |a_{-n_0}^j|^{1+\epsilon}$$

and $n_0(1 + \epsilon) - 3 > -1$, it follows that

$$\int_{\Delta_\tau^*} \sum_j |h_j(z^2 - 1)|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy \geq 2\pi \sum_j |a_{-n_0}^j|^{1+\epsilon} \int_{\frac{1}{\tau}}^{\infty} r^{n_0(1+\epsilon)-3} dr = \infty.$$

Therefore, $h_j = 0$. That is to say, for any $f_j \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Delta^*)$, we have $f_j(z^2 - 1) = \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} \sum_j a_n^j(z^2 - 1)^n$.

Note that

$$K_{\Delta^*, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq \frac{1}{\int_{\Delta^*} \left|\frac{1}{z^2 - 1}\right|^{1+\epsilon}} \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon}{2\pi |z^2 - 1|^{1+\epsilon}} \quad (1)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} |z^2 - 1|^{1+\epsilon} K_{\Delta^*, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) &= |z^2 - 1|^{1+\epsilon} \sup_{f_j \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Delta)} \sum_j \frac{\left|\frac{a^j}{z^2 - 1} + f_j(z^2 - 1)\right|^{1+\epsilon}}{\int_{\Delta^*} \left|\frac{a^j}{z^2 - 1} + f_j(z^2 - 1)\right|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy} \\ &= \sup_{f_j \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Delta)} \sum_j \frac{|a^j + (z^2 - 1)f_j(z^2 - 1)|^{1+\epsilon}}{\int_{\Delta^*} \left|\frac{a^j}{z^2 - 1} + f_j(z^2 - 1)\right|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

From (1), for $(z^2 - 1)$ near 0, we may take $a^j = 1$. For $f_j \in A^{1+\epsilon}(\Delta)$

(a) If $\|f_j\|_{1+\epsilon}^{1+\epsilon} > 2^{(1+\epsilon)} \frac{2\pi}{1-\epsilon}$, then $\left\|f_j(z^2 - 1) + \frac{1}{z^2 - 1}\right\|_{1+\epsilon} \geq \|f_j(z^2 - 1)\|_{1+\epsilon} - \left\|\frac{1}{z^2 - 1}\right\|_{1+\epsilon} > \frac{1}{2} \|f_j(z^2 - 1)\|_{1+\epsilon}$, so

$$\sum_j \frac{|1 + (z^2 - 1)f_j(z^2 - 1)|^{1+\epsilon}}{\int_{\Delta^*} \left|\frac{1}{z^2 - 1} + f_j(z^2 - 1)\right|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy} < \sum_j \frac{2^{(1+\epsilon)}(1 + |(z^2 - 1)f_j(z^2 - 1)|^{1+\epsilon})}{(1/2^{(1+\epsilon)}) \int_{\Delta^*} |f_j|^{1+\epsilon}} \\ < 2^{2(1+\epsilon)} \left(\frac{1 - \epsilon}{2^{(2+\epsilon)\pi}} + |z^2 - 1|^{1+\epsilon} K_{\Delta, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \right).$$

(b) If $\|f_j\|_{1+\epsilon}^{1+\epsilon} \leq 2^{(1+\epsilon)} \frac{2\pi}{1-\epsilon}$, then $|f_j(z^2 - 1)| \leq C$ for all $(z^2 - 1)$ near 0, where C is a positive constant independent on f_j .

Since

$$\int_{\Delta^*} \sum_j \left| \frac{1}{z^2 - 1} + f_j(z^2 - 1) \right|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy = \int_0^1 r^{-\epsilon} dr \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_j |1 + re^{i\theta} f_j(re^{i\theta})|^{1+\epsilon} d\theta \\ \geq 2\pi \int_0^1 r^{-\epsilon} dr = \frac{2\pi}{1 - \epsilon}$$

then

$$\sum_j \frac{|1 + (z^2 - 1)f_j(z^2 - 1)|^{1+\epsilon}}{\int_{\Delta^*} \left|\frac{1}{z^2 - 1} + f_j(z^2 - 1)\right|^{1+\epsilon} dx dy} < \frac{(1 - \epsilon)(1 + |z^2 - 1|C)^{1+\epsilon}}{2\pi}$$

According to (a) and (b), we get that $|z^2 - 1|^{1+\epsilon} K_{\Delta^*, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$ is bounded near 0.

From the above theorem, we know the lower bounds of Theorem 2.6 is optimal.

Remark 2.3 (see [23]). Let $D = \{(z^2 - 1) \in \mathbb{C} : |z^2 - 1| > 1\}$, for $0 < \epsilon < 2$, there is $(1 + \epsilon) = (1 + \epsilon)^2 > 0$ such that

$$K_{D, 1+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \leq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{|z^2 - 1|^{2(1+\epsilon)}}$$

for $|z^2 - 1| \gg 1$.

Let $\varphi: \Delta^* \rightarrow D, (z^2 - 1) \mapsto 1/(z^2 - 1)$. For $0 < \epsilon < 2$,

$$K_{\Delta^*, \frac{4}{3}+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \neq K_{D, \frac{4}{3}+\epsilon}(1/(z^2 - 1)) \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^4}$$

Proof of the Remark:

For any $f_j \in A^{\frac{4}{3}+\epsilon}(D)$, we have

$$f_j(z^2 - 1) = \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} \sum_j a_n^j (z^2 - 1)^n + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_j b_n^j (z^2 - 1)^{-n}$$

Let $(f_j)_1(z^2 - 1) = \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} \sum_j a_n^j (z^2 - 1)^n$ and $(f_j)_2(z^2 - 1) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_j b_n^j (z^2 - 1)^{-n}$.

It is easy to check that there is $r \gg 1$ such that $\int_{\{|z^2 - 1| > r\}} \sum_j |(f_j)_2|^{1+\epsilon} < \infty$ holds.

Hence $\int_{\{|z^2 - 1| > r\}} \sum_j |(f_j)_1|^{1+\epsilon} < \infty$.

If $(f_j)_1$ is not 0, we may choose k to be the integer such that $a_n^j = 0$ for $n < k$, $a_k^j \neq 0$, then

$$\int_{\{|z^2 - 1| > r\}} \sum_j |(f_j)_1|^{1+\epsilon} = \int_{\{|z^2 - 1| > r\}} \left| \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \sum_j a_n^j (z^2 - 1)^n \right|^{1+\epsilon} \\ = \int_r^{\infty} \sum_j \rho_j d\rho_j \int_0^{2\pi} (\rho_j)^{k(\frac{4}{3}+\epsilon)} \left| \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} a_n^j (z^2 - 1)^{n-k} \right|^{1+\epsilon} \geq \sum_j 2\pi |a_k^j|^{1+\epsilon} \int_r^{\infty} (\rho_j)^{1+k(\frac{4}{3}+\epsilon)} = \infty.$$

Therefore, $(f_j)_1 = 0$.

We get $K_{D, \frac{4}{3}+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \leq \frac{1+\epsilon}{|z^2 - 1|^{2(\frac{4}{3}+\epsilon)}}$ for $|z^2 - 1| \gg 1$.

By the above theorem, $K_{\Delta^*, \frac{4}{3} + \epsilon}(z^2 - 1) = O\left(\frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^{\frac{4}{3} + \epsilon}}\right)$.

As

$$K_{D, \frac{4}{3} + \epsilon}(1/(z^2 - 1)) \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^4} \leq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{|z^2 - 1|^{4 - 2(\frac{4}{3} + \epsilon)}}$$

for $|z^2 - 1| \ll 1$,
if $\epsilon > 0$, then

$$K_{\Delta^*, \frac{4}{3} + \epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \neq K_{D, \frac{4}{3} + \epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^4}$$

We have finished the proof of the remark.

III. A conjecture of H. Tsuji

We first recall a definition for complex manifolds, see H. Tsuji [20].

Definition 3.1. Let M be a complex manifold with the canonical line bundle K_M , for every positive integer m , we set

$$(Z^2 - 1)_m := \left\{ \sigma_j \in \Gamma(M, \mathcal{O}_M(mK_M)) \left| \int_M \sum_j (\sigma_j \wedge \bar{\sigma}_j)^{\frac{1}{m}} < +\infty \right. \right\}$$

and

$$K_{M,m} := \sup \left\{ |\sigma_j|^{\frac{2}{m}}; \sigma_j \in \Gamma(M, \mathcal{O}_M(mK_M)) \left| \int_M \sum_j (\sigma_j \wedge \bar{\sigma}_j)^{\frac{1}{m}} \leq 1 \right. \right\}$$

where the sup denotes the pointwise supremum.

Then let

$$K_{M,\infty} := \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} K_{M,m}$$

and $(h_j)_{(1+\epsilon)a^j n, M} :=$ the lower envelope of $\frac{1}{K_{M,\infty}}$.

Lemma 3.1 (see [23]). For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, we have

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} K_{\Omega, \frac{2}{m}}(z^2 - 1) = \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon < 2} K_{\Omega, 2+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} K_{\Omega, \frac{2}{m}}(z^2 - 1) = \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon < 2 \cap \mathbb{Q}} K_{\Omega, 2+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1).$$

If $f_j \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ and $\int_{\Omega} \sum_j |f_j|^{2+\epsilon} < \infty$, then

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 2+\epsilon, q < 2+\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} \sum_j |f_j|^q = \int_{\Omega} \sum_j |f_j|^{2+\epsilon}$$

So

$$\sup_{0 \leq \epsilon < 2 \cap \mathbb{Q}} K_{\Omega, 2+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) = \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon < 2} K_{\Omega, 2+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1)$$

and the lemma follows.

For $\Delta^* = \{(z^2 - 1) \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < |z^2 - 1| < 1\}$, since the canonical bundle K_{Δ^*} is trivial, so when we consider $K_{\Delta^*, \infty}$ and $(h_j)_{(1+\epsilon)a^j n, \Delta^*}^{-1}$, we can omit the form dt .

H. Tsuji [20] proposed the following conjecture (see Conjecture 2.16 in [20]):

$$(h_j)_{(1+\epsilon)a^j n, \Delta^*}^{-1} = O\left(\frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^2 (\log |z^2 - 1|)^2}\right)$$

holds.

However, we get the following theorem:

Theorem 3.2 (see [23]). One has

$$(h_j)_{(1+\epsilon)a^j n, \Delta^*}^{-1}(z^2 - 1) \geq K_{\Delta^*, \infty}(z^2 - 1) \geq \frac{1}{2\pi e} \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^2 |\log |z^2 - 1||}$$

for $0 < |z^2 - 1| < e^{-1}$.

Proof. Since

$$\int_{\Delta^*} \left| \frac{1}{z^2 - 1} \right|^{2+\epsilon} = \frac{2\pi}{-\epsilon}$$

by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\Delta^*, \infty}(z^2 - 1) &= \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} K_{\Delta^*, m}(z^2 - 1) = \sup_{m \geq 1} K_{\Delta^*, m}(z^2 - 1) \\ &= \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon < 2} K_{\Delta^*, 2+\epsilon}(z^2 - 1) \geq \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon < 2} \frac{-\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^{2+\epsilon}} \end{aligned}$$

For $0 < |z^2 - 1| < e^{-1}$, let

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{\log |z^2 - 1|} \in [1, 2]$$

therefore

$$\frac{-\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^{2+\epsilon}} = \frac{1}{2\pi e} \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^2 |\log |z^2 - 1||}$$

so

$$K_{\Delta^*, \infty}(z^2 - 1) \geq \frac{1}{2\pi e} \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^2 |\log |z^2 - 1||}$$

Hence

$$(h_j)_{(1+\epsilon)\alpha^j n, \Delta^*}^{-1}(z^2 - 1) \geq K_{\Delta^*, \infty}(z^2 - 1) \geq \frac{1}{2\pi e} \frac{1}{|z^2 - 1|^2 |\log |z^2 - 1||}$$

From the above theorem, we know that $(h_j)_{(1+\epsilon)\alpha^j n, \Delta^*}^{-1}$ is not integrable near 0.

References

- [1] B. Berndtsson, The extension theorem of Ohsawa-Takegoshi and the theorem of Donnelly-Fefferman, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 46 (1996), no. 4, 1083-1094.
- [2] B. Berndtsson and M. Păun, Bergman kernels and subadjunction, *arXiv: 1002.4145 v 1*.
- [3] J.-P. Demailly, Complex analytic and differential geometry, [http:// www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/books.html](http://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/books.html).
- [4] J.-P. Demailly, *Analytic Methods in Algebraic Geometry*, Higher Education Press & International Press of Boston, Beijing/Boston, 2010.
- [5] F. S. Deng, H. P. Zhang, and X. Y. Zhou, Positivity of direct images of positively curved volume forms, *Math. Z.* 278 (2014), 347-362.
- [6] Q. A. Guan and X. Y. Zhou, Optimal constant problem in the L^2 extension theorem, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 350 (2012), no. 15-16, 753-756.
- [7] Q. A. Guan and X. Y. Zhou, Generalized L^2 extension theorem and a conjecture of Ohsawa. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Ser. I.* 351 (2013), no. 3-4, 111-114.
- [8] Q. A. Guan and X. Y. Zhou, Optimal constant in L^2 extension and a proof of a conjecture of Ohsawa, *Sci. China Math.* 58 (2015), no. 1, 35-59.
- [9] Q. A. Guan and X. Y. Zhou, A solution of an L^2 extension problem with optimal estimate and applications, *Ann. of Math.* 181 (2015), 1139-1208.
- [10] L. Hörmander, L^2 -estimates and existence theorems for the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator, *Acta Math.* 113 (1965), 89-152.
- [11] L. K. Hua, *Harmonic Analysis of Functions of Several Complex Variables in the Classical Domains* (in Chinese), Science Press, Beijing, 1958. (English translation, AMS, 1963.)
- [12] Qikeng Lu, *Classical Manifolds and Classical Domains* (in Chinese), Shanghai Scientific & Technical Publishers, 1963; reprint by Science Press, Beijing, 2011. On p -Bergman kernel for bounded domains 899
- [13] Qikeng Lu, *New Results of Classical Manifolds and Classical Domains* (in Chinese), Shanghai Scientific & Technical Publishers, 1997.
- [14] J. F. Ning, H. P. Zhang, and X. Y. Zhou: Proper holomorphic mappings between invariant domains in \mathbb{C}^n , *Transaction of AMS*, accepted, 2015.
- [15] T. Ohsawa, On the extension of L^2 holomorphic functions. III. Negligible weights, *Math. Z.* 219 (1995), no. 2, 215-225.
- [16] T. Ohsawa and K. Takegoshi, On the extension of L^2 holomorphic functions, *Math. Z.* 195 (1987), 197-204.
- [17] I. Ramadanov, Sur une propriete de la fonction de Bergman (French), *CR Acad. Bulgare Sci.* 20 (1967), 759-762.
- [18] Y.-T. Siu, Complex-analyticity of harmonic maps, vanishing and Lefschetz theorems, *J. Differential Geometry* 17 (1982), 55-138.
- [19] Y.-T. Siu, The Fujita conjecture and the extension theorem of OhsawaTakegoshi, in: *Geometric Complex Analysis*, Hayama, World Scientific, 1996, pp. 577-592.

- [20] H. Tsuji, Canonical singular hermitian metrics on relative log canonical bundles, arXiv:1008.1466v2.
- [21] Xiangyu Zhou, Some results related to group actions in several complex variables, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002), 743-753, Higher Edu. Press, Beijing, 2002.
- [22] L.-F. Zhu, Q.-A. Guan, and X.-Y. Zhou, On the Ohsawa-Takegoshi L^2 extension theorem and the twisted Bochner-Kodaira identity with a nonsmooth twist factor, J. Math. Pures Appl. 97 (2012), no. 6, 579-601.
- [23] Jiafu Ning, Huiping Zhang, and Xiangyu Zhou, On p -Bergman kernel for bounded domains in \mathbb{C}^n , Communications in Analysis and Geometry Volume 24, Number 4, 887–900, 2016.