

Defn: Let G be an open set in \mathbb{R}^N with $p \in \partial G$.

We say G has C^k ($k \leq \infty$) smooth boundary at $p \in \partial G$ if \exists a small nbhd $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and a real-valued function $\varphi \in C^k(U)$ s.t

- (i) $U \cap G = \{x \in U : \varphi(x) < 0\}$
- (ii) $d\varphi(x) \neq 0, x \in U$

If ∂G has C^k smooth boundary at $\forall p \in \partial G$, then we say G has C^k -smooth boundary.

Any function φ satisfying (i)-(ii) is

called a local defining function at p

proposition: If G is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N with C^k boundary, then \exists a global defining function of G . That is, \exists a nbhd U of ∂G and $\varphi \in C^k(U)$ s.t

$$G \cap U = \{x \in U : \varphi(x) < 0\}.$$

Defn: Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with C^1 boundary. φ is a local defining function at $p \in \partial G$.

Set

$$T_p(\partial G) = \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N : \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_j}(p) \xi_j = 0 \right\}.$$

as the tangent space of ∂G at p .

Thm: Let G be a domain in \mathbb{R}^N with C^2 smooth boundary. Then TFAE:

- (1) G is convex
- (2) G is geometrically convex

(3) For every $K \subset \subset G$,

$$\hat{K} = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^N : L(z) \leq \sup_{g \in K} L(g) \text{ for } \forall \text{ real linear } L \right\} \subset \subset G$$

(4) For every $p \in \partial G$ and every local defining function φ of ∂G at p , it holds that

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(p) \xi_j \xi_k \geq 0$$

for $\forall \xi \in T_p(\partial G)$.

Remark: If it holds that

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(p) \xi_j \xi_k > 0, \xi \in T_p(\partial G), \xi \neq 0.$$

We say G is strictly convex at p .

- If G is strictly convex at every $p \in \partial G$, we say G is strictly convex.

Now we discuss the pseudoconvexity setting.

Now we discuss the pseudoconvexity setting.

Definition: Let $G \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain with C^1 boundary, with local defining function φ at p . The holomorphic tangent space of ∂G at p is defined as:

$$T_p^{(1,0)}(\partial G) = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{C}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial z_j}(p) w_j = 0 \right\}.$$

Definition: We define the Levi form of ∂G at p .

$$L_p(\varphi, w) = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k}(p) w_j \bar{w}_k$$

where $w \in T_p^{(1,0)}(\partial G)$.

We say ∂G is Levi pseudoconvex at p if

$$L_p(\varphi, w) \geq 0 \text{ for } \forall w \in T_p^{(1,0)}(\partial G)$$

If ∂G is Levi pseudoconvex at every $p \in \partial G$,

we say ∂G is Levi pseudoconvex

In particular, if $L_p(\varphi, w) > 0$ for $\forall 0 \neq w \in T_p^{(1,0)}(\partial G)$,

we say ∂G is strictly Levi pseudoconvex at p .

Thm: Let $G \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain with C^2 boundary.

Assume G is convex, $\Rightarrow G$ is Levi pseudoconvex

Pf: One can verify directly by definition. It also follows from the following theorem.

Thm: Let $G \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a ^{bounded} domain with C^2 boundary.

Then G is pseudoconvex iff G is Levi pseudoconvex

Pf: " \Rightarrow " Assume G is pseudoconvex. we have proved that $-\log d(z, \partial G) \in \text{PSH}(G)$. As G has C^2 boundary, $d(z) = d(z, \partial G)$ is a C^2 function in U for some nbhd U of ∂G . Then

$$L_z(-\log d, w) \geq 0, z \in U, w \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

pick a defining function r of G as

$$r(z) = \begin{cases} -d(z) & z \in G \\ 0 & z \in \partial G \\ d(z) & z \in \mathbb{C}^n - G. \end{cases}$$

Again $r(z) \in C^2(U)$. we compute. when $z \in G$.

$$\frac{\partial^2 (-\log d(z))}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} = -\frac{1}{d(z)} \frac{\partial^2 d(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} + \frac{1}{d^2(z)} \frac{\partial d(z)}{\partial z_j} \frac{\partial d(z)}{\partial \bar{z}_k}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{r(z)} \frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} + \frac{1}{r^2(z)} \frac{\partial r(z)}{\partial z_j} \frac{\partial r(z)}{\partial \bar{z}_k}$$

Thus

$$L_z(-\log d, w) = -\frac{1}{r(z)} L_z(r, w) + \frac{1}{r^2(z)} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial r(z)}{\partial z_j} w_j \right|^2$$

$$L_z(-\log d, w) = -\frac{1}{r(z)} L_z(r, w) + \frac{1}{r^2(z)} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial r(z)}{\partial z_j} w_j \right|^2$$

For a fixed z and $w \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 r(z)}{\partial z_j^2} w_j = 0$.

We have since $L_z(-\log d, w) \geq 0 \Rightarrow$

$$L_z(r, w) \geq 0 \text{ for } w \in \mathbb{C}^n \text{ satisfying } \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 r(z)}{\partial z_j^2} w_j = 0.$$

Let $z \rightarrow p \in \partial G$. We get

$$L_p(r, w) \geq 0 \text{ for } w \in T_p^{(1,0)}(\partial G).$$

Hence ∂G is Levi pseudconvex at p for $\forall p \in \partial G$

" "

\Leftarrow Assume ∂G is Levi pseudconvex at $\forall p \in \partial G$. Let ρ be a local defining function at p .

Claim: Levi pseudconvexity at $\forall p \in \partial G$

\Leftrightarrow For every $p \in \partial G$, \exists a neighborhood U of p and $c > 0$ s.t

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \rho(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{w}_k + c \|w\|^2 \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho(z)}{\partial z_j} w_j \right|^2 \geq 0 \quad (*)$$

for $\forall z \in \partial G \cap U$, $\forall w \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

Pf: We only prove " \Rightarrow ":

At every $z \in \partial G$, write $\vec{n}(z) = \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_n} \right) \Big|_z$

$$\text{Then } w \in T_z^{(1,0)}(\partial G) \Leftrightarrow \langle w, \vec{n}(z) \rangle = 0$$

We decompose $w \in \mathbb{C}^n$ into $w = w' + w''$.

where

$$\langle w', \vec{n}(z) \rangle = 0, \quad \langle w'', \vec{n}(z) \rangle = \langle w, \vec{n}(z) \rangle.$$

Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{w}_k$$

$n \quad n \quad \geq 0 \quad \dots \quad (\dots)$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{w}_k} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{w}_k + O(\|w\| \|w''\|) \\
&\geq A \|w\| \|w''\|, \quad A \in \mathbb{R} \text{ depends on } \left| \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} \right| \text{ on } U \\
&\geq -C \|w\| \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j}(z) w_j \right|
\end{aligned}$$

This is because

$$\|w''\| = \frac{\|\langle w'', \bar{\pi}(z) \rangle\|}{\|\bar{\pi}(z)\|}, \text{ and } C \text{ depends on } \|\bar{\pi}(z)\| \text{ on } U \quad \square$$

By shrinking U if necessary, and apply Implicit function theorem we can assume P takes the form

$$\phi(\operatorname{Re} z_1, \operatorname{Im} z_1, \dots, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}, \operatorname{Im} z_{n-1}, \operatorname{Re} z_n) = \operatorname{Im} z_n$$

Then in this case, since P depends linearly on $\operatorname{Im} z_n$, all derivatives of P are independent of $\operatorname{Im} z_n$. We have (*) still hold for $z \in U \cap G$.

Write $u = -\log(-P)$ in U , then in $U \cap G$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{w}_k \\
&= \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{w}_k + \frac{1}{P^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{w}_k \\
&\geq \frac{-2(\frac{C}{2})}{|P|} \|w\| \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j} w_j \right| + \frac{1}{P^2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j}(z) w_j \right| \\
&> -\frac{C^2}{|P|} \|w\|^2 - \frac{1}{|P|} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j}(z) w_j \right| + \frac{1}{P^2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j}(z) w_j \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq -\frac{c^2}{4} \|w\|^2 - \frac{1}{\rho^2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_j} (z) w_j \right| + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho(z)}{\partial \bar{z}_j} w_j \right|$$

(As $-2ab \geq -a^2 - b^2$)

$\Rightarrow u(z) + \frac{c^2}{4} \|z\|^2$ is psh in $G \cap U$.

Assume $U = B(p, r)$ for some r . Then the function

$\max \left\{ -\log(r - \|z - a\|), u(z) + \frac{c^2}{4} \|z\|^2 \right\}$ is a psh

exhaustion function for $B \cap G$. Thus $B \cap G$ is pseudoconvex.

It follows from the next thm that G is pseudoconvex.

Thm: Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{C}^n . If to every pt in $\partial\Omega$ there is a nbhd w such that $w \cap \Omega$ is pseudoconvex, then Ω is pseudoconvex.

Pf: See P47 in Hörmander's book.