

# AN EXAMPLE OF A BOUNDED $\mathbb{C}$ -CONVEX DOMAIN WHICH IS NOT BIHOLOMORPHIC TO A CONVEX DOMAIN

NIKOLAI NIKOLOV, PETER PFLUG AND WŁODZIMIERZ ZWONEK

ABSTRACT. We show that the symmetrized bidisc is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain. This provides an example of a bounded  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain which cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex domains.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Recall that a domain  $D$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is called  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex if any non-empty intersection with a complex line is contractible (cf. [2, 9]). A consequence of the fundamental Lempert theorem (see [12]) is the fact that any bounded  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain  $D$  with  $C^2$  boundary has the following property (see [8]):

(\*) *The Carathéodory distance and Lempert function of  $D$  coincide.*

Any convex domain can be exhausted by smooth bounded convex ones (which are obviously  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex); therefore, any convex domain satisfies (\*), too. To extend this phenomenon to bounded  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains (see Problem 4' in [14]), it is sufficient to give a positive answer to one of the following questions:

(a) *Can any bounded  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain be exhausted by  $C^2$ -smooth  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains?* (See Problem 2 in [14] and Remark 2.5.20 in [2].)

(b) *Is any bounded  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain biholomorphic to a convex domain?* (See Problem 4 in [14].)

The main aim of this note is to give a negative answer to Question (b).

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32F17.

*Key words and phrases.*  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain, linearly convex domain, symmetrized  $n$ -disc.

The paper was initiated while the third author's research stay at the Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg which was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. The third-named author was also supported by the KBN Research Grant No. 1 PO3A 005 28. The first and second named authors were supported by grants from DFG (DFG-Projekt 227/8).

Denote by  $\mathbb{G}_2$  the so-called symmetrized bidisc, that is, the image of the bidisc under the mapping whose components are the two elementary symmetric functions of two complex variables.  $\mathbb{G}_2$  serves as the first example of a bounded pseudoconvex domain in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with the property (\*) which cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex domains (see [3, 6]). We shall show that  $\mathbb{G}_2$  is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain. This fact gives a counterexample to the question (b) and simultaneously, it supports the conjecture that (cf. Problem 4' in [14]) *any bounded  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain has property (\*)*. Note that the answer to the problem (a) for  $\mathbb{G}_2$  is not known. The positive answer to this question would imply an alternative (to that of [4] and [1]) proof of the equality of the Carathéodory distance and Lempert function on  $\mathbb{G}_2$  whereas the negative answer would solve Problem 2 in [14].

Some additional properties of  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains and symmetrized polydiscs are also given in the paper.

## 2. BACKGROUND AND RESULTS

Recall that a domain  $D$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is called (cf. [9, 2]):

- $\mathbb{C}$ -convex if any non-empty intersection with a complex line is contractible (i.e.  $D \cap L$  is connected and simply connected for any complex affine line  $L$  such that  $L \cap D$  is not empty);
- linearly convex if its complement in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is a union of affine complex hyperplanes;
- weakly linearly convex if for any  $a \in \partial D$  there exists an affine complex hyperplane through  $a$  which does not intersect  $D$ .

Note that the following implications hold

$\mathbb{C}$ -convexity  $\Rightarrow$  linear convexity  $\Rightarrow$  weak linear convexity.

Moreover, these three notions coincide in the case of bounded domains with  $C^1$  boundary.

Let  $\mathbb{D}$  denote the unit disc in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $\pi_n = (\pi_{n,1}, \dots, \pi_{n,n}) : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be defined as follows:

$$\pi_{n,k}(\mu) = \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq n} \mu_{j_1} \dots \mu_{j_k}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \quad \mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

The set  $\mathbb{G}_n := \pi_n(\mathbb{D}^n)$  is called *the symmetrized  $n$ -disc* (cf. [1], [11]).

Recall that  $\mathbb{G}_2$  is the first example of a bounded pseudoconvex domain with the property (\*) which cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex ones (see [3, 6]). On the other hand,  $\mathbb{G}_n$ ,  $n \geq 3$ , does not satisfy the property (\*) (see [13]). In particular, it cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex domains, either.

In this note we shall show the following additional properties of domains  $\mathbb{G}_n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ .

**Theorem 1.** (i)  $\mathbb{G}_2$  is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain.

(ii)  $\mathbb{G}_n$ ,  $n \geq 3$ , is a linearly convex domain which is not  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex.

Theorem 1 (i) together with a result of [3] and [6] gives a negative answer to the following question posed by S. V. Znamenskii (cf. Problem 4 in [14]):

*Is any bounded  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain biholomorphic to a convex domain?*

Moreover, it seems to us that Theorem 1 (ii) gives the first example of a linearly convex domain homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $n \geq 3$ , which is not  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex, is not a Cartesian product and does not satisfy property (\*). To see that  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , observe that  $\rho_\lambda(z) := (\lambda z_1, \lambda^2 z_2, \dots, \lambda^n z_n) \in \mathbb{G}_n$  if  $z \in \mathbb{G}_n$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then setting  $h(z) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \{|\mu_j| : \pi_n(\mu) = z\}$  and  $g(z) = \frac{1}{1-h(z)}$ , it is easy to see that the function  $\mathbb{G}_n \ni z \mapsto \rho_{g(z)}(z) \in \mathbb{C}^n$  is the desired homeomorphism.

These remarks also show that  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is close, in some sense, to a balanced domain, that is, a domain  $D$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $\lambda z \in D$  for any  $z \in D$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ . On the other hand, in spite of the properties of  $\mathbb{G}_n$ , one has the following.

**Proposition 2.** *Any weakly linearly convex balanced domain is convex.*

This proposition is a simple extension of Example 2.2.4 in [2], where it is shown that any  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex complete Reinhardt domain is convex.

We may also prove some general property of  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains showing that all *non-degenerate*  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains, that is, containing *no* complex lines, are *c*-finitely compact. For definitions of the Carathéodory distance  $c_D$  of the domain  $D$ , *c*-finite compactness, *c*-completeness and basic properties of these notions we refer the Reader to consult [10].

Observe that a degenerate linearly convex domain  $D$  is linearly equivalent to  $\mathbb{C} \times D'$  (cf. Proposition 4.6.11 in [9]). Indeed, we may assume that  $D$  contains the  $z_1$ -line. Since the complement  ${}^c D$  of  $D$  is a union of complex hyperplanes disjoint from this line, then  ${}^c D = \mathbb{C} \times G$  and hence  $D = \mathbb{C} \times {}^c G$ . On the other hand, we have

**Proposition 3.** *Any non-degenerate  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain is biholomorphic to a bounded domain and *c*-finitely compact. In particular, it is *c*-complete and hyperconvex.*

**Remarks.** (i) In virtue of Proposition 3, we claim that one may conjecture more than Question (a) (see [15]), namely, any  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain containing no complex hyperplanes can be exhausted by bounded

$C^2$ -smooth  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains (this is not true in general without the above assumption); then the Carathéodory pseudodistance and Lempert function will coincide on any  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain.

(ii) The hyperconvexity of  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is simple and well-known (see [7]). The above proposition implies more in dimension two. Namely, it implies that the symmetrized bidisc is  $c$ -finitely compact. Although the symmetrized polydiscs in higher dimensions are not  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex the conclusion of the above proposition, that is, the  $c$ -finite compactness of the symmetrized  $n$ -disc  $\mathbb{G}_n$ , holds for any  $n \geq 2$ . In fact, it is a straightforward consequence of Corollary 3.2 in [5].

(iii) Finally, we mention that, for  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is starlike with respect to the origin if and only if  $n = 2$ . This observation gives the next difference in the geometric shape of the 2-dimensional and higher dimensional symmetrized discs. Recall that the fact that  $\mathbb{G}_2$  is starlike is contained in [1]. For the converse just take the point  $(3, 3, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ .

### 3. PROOFS

*Proof of Theorem 1 (i).* We shall make use of the following description of  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains. For  $a \in \partial D$ , denote by  $\Gamma(a)$  the set of all hyperplanes through  $a$  and disjoint from  $D$ . Then a bounded domain  $D$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $n > 1$ , is  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex if and only if any  $a \in \partial D$  the set  $\Gamma(a)$  is non-empty and connected as a set in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  (cf. Theorem 2.5.2 in [2]).

So we have to check that  $\Gamma(a)$  is non-empty and connected for any  $a \in \partial \mathbb{G}_2$ .

Let us first consider a regular point  $\partial \mathbb{G}_2$ , that is, a point of the form  $\pi_2(\mu)$ , where  $|\mu_1| = 1$ ,  $|\mu_2| < 1$  (or vice versa). Then the complex tangent line to  $\partial D$  at  $a$  is of the form  $\{\pi_2(\mu_1, \lambda) : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ , which is obviously disjoint from  $\mathbb{G}_2$ . So  $\Gamma(a)$  is a singleton.

Now we fix a non-regular point of  $\partial \mathbb{G}_2$ , that is, a point of the form  $\pi_2(\mu)$ , where  $|\mu_1| = |\mu_2| = 1$ .

After a rotation we may assume that  $\mu_1 \mu_2 = 1$ , that is,  $\mu_2 = \bar{\mu}_1$ . Then  $\mu_1 + \mu_2 = 2 \operatorname{Re} \mu_1 =: 2x$ , where  $x \in [-1, 1]$ .

We shall find all the possible directions of complex lines passing simultaneously through  $\pi_2(\mu)$  and an element of  $\mathbb{G}_2$ . Any such line is of the form  $\pi_2(\mu) + \mathbb{C}(\pi_2(\mu) - \pi_2(\lambda))$ , where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}^2$ . So the

$$A := {}^c\Gamma(\pi_2(\mu)) = \left\{ \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 2x}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 - 1} : \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D} \right\}.$$

In particular,  $\Gamma(\pi_2(\mu)) \neq \emptyset$ .

To show the connectedness of  $\Gamma(\pi_2(\mu))$ , we shall check the simple-connectedness of  $A$ . Let us recall that the mapping  $\frac{z-\alpha}{z-\beta}$ , where  $|\beta| > 1$ ,

maps the unit disc  $\mathbb{D}$  into the disc  $\Delta(\frac{1-\alpha\bar{\beta}}{1-|\beta|^2}, \frac{|\alpha-\beta|}{|\beta|^2-1})$ , so

$$\left\{ \frac{\lambda + \lambda_1 - 2x}{\lambda\lambda_1 - 1} : \lambda \in \mathbb{D} \right\} = \Delta\left(\frac{2x - 2\operatorname{Re} \lambda_1}{1 - |\lambda_1|^2}, \frac{|2x\lambda_1 - \lambda_1^2 - 1|}{1 - |\lambda_1|^2}\right) =: A_{\lambda_1}.$$

Consequently the set  $A = \bigcup_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{D}} A_{\lambda_1} \subset \mathbb{C}$  is simply connected.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1 (ii).* For the proof of the linear convexity of  $\mathbb{G}_n$  consider the point  $z = \pi_n(\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathbb{G}_n$ . We may assume that  $|\lambda_1| \geq 1$ . Then the set

$$B := \{\pi_n(\lambda_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_{n-1}) : \mu_1, \dots, \mu_{n-1} \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

is disjoint from  $\mathbb{G}_n$ . On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$B = \{(\lambda_1 + z_1, \lambda_1 z_1 + z_2, \dots, \lambda_1 z_{n-2} + z_{n-1}, \lambda_1 z_{n-1}) : z_1, \dots, z_{n-1} \in \mathbb{C}\},$$

so  $B$  is a complex affine hyperplane. Hence  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is linearly convex.

To show that  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is not  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex for  $n \geq 3$ , consider the points

$$a_t := \pi_n(t, t, t, 0, \dots, 0) = (3t, 3t^2, t^3, 0, \dots, 0),$$

$$b_t := \pi_n(-t, -t, -t, 0, \dots, 0) = (-3t, 3t^2, -t^3, 0, \dots, 0), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Obviously  $a_t, b_t \in \mathbb{G}_n$ . Denote by  $L_t$  the complex line passing through  $a_t$  and  $b_t$ , that is,

$$L_t = \{c_{t,\lambda} := (3t(1-2\lambda), 3t^2, t^3(1-2\lambda), 0, \dots, 0) : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Assume that the set  $\mathbb{G}_n \cap L_t$  is connected. Since  $a_t = c_{t,0}$  and  $b_t = c_{t,1}$ , then  $c_{t,\lambda} \in \mathbb{G}_n$  for some  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2} + i\tau$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ . It follows that

$$c_{t,\lambda} = (-6i\tau t, 3t^2, -2i\tau t^3, 0, \dots, 0).$$

We may choose  $\mu \in \mathbb{D}^n$  such that  $\mu_j = 0$ ,  $j = 4, \dots, n$ , and  $c_{t,\lambda} = \pi_n(\mu)$ ,  $\mu \in \mathbb{D}^n$ . Then  $-36\tau^2 t^2 = (\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3)^2 = \mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2 + \mu_3^2 + 6t^2$  and hence

$$t^2 = \frac{|\mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2 + \mu_3^2|}{36\tau^2 + 6} < \frac{3}{36\tau^2 + 6} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore,  $\mathbb{G}_n \cap L_t$  is not connected if  $t \in [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 1)$  and so  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is not a  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Set  $D^* := \{w \in \mathbb{C}^n : \langle z, w \rangle \neq 1, \forall z \in D\}$ . We shall use the fact that a domain  $D$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  containing the origin is weakly linearly convex if and only if  $D$  is a connected component of  $D^{**}$  (cf. Proposition 2.1.4 in [2]).

Since our domain  $D$  is balanced, it is easy to see that  $D^*$  is balanced. We shall show  $D^*$  is convex. Then, applying this fact to  $D^*$ , we conclude that  $D^{**}$  is a convex balanced domain. On the other hand,

it follows by our assumption that  $D$  is a component of  $D^{**}$  and hence  $D^{**} = D$ .

To see that  $D^*$  is convex, suppose the contrary. Then we find points  $w_1, w_2 \in D^*$ ,  $z \in D$  and a number  $t \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\langle z, tw_1 + (1 - t)w_2 \rangle = 1$ . We may assume that  $|\langle z, w_1 \rangle| \geq 1$ . Since  $D$  is balanced, we get  $\tilde{z} := \frac{z}{\langle z, w_1 \rangle} \in D$  and  $\langle \tilde{z}, w_1 \rangle = 1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.* Let  $D$  be non-degenerate  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . For any point  $z \in {}^cD$  consider a hyperplane  $L_z$  through  $z$  and disjoint from  $D$ . Let  $l_z$  be the orthogonal line through 0 and orthogonal to  $L_z$ . Denote by  $\pi_z$  the orthogonal projection of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  onto  $l_z$  and set  $a_z = \pi_z(a)$ . Observe that  $D_z = \pi_z(D)$  is biholomorphic to  $\mathbb{D}$ , since it is connected, simply connected (cf. Theorem 2.3.6 in [2]) and  $\pi_z(z) \notin \pi_z(D)$ . Moreover, since  $D$  is a non-degenerate linearly convex domain, it is easy to see that there are  $n$   $\mathbb{C}$ -independent  $l_z$ s. We may assume that these  $l_z$  are the set  $C$  of coordinate planes. Then  $D \subset G := \prod_{l_z \in C} \pi_z(D)$  and  $G$  is biholomorphic to the polydisc  $\mathbb{D}^n$ . In particular,  $D$  is biholomorphic to a bounded domain, hence it is  $c$ -hyperbolic.

Further, we may assume that  $0 \in D$ . To see that  $D$  is  $c$ -finitely compact, it is enough to show that  $\lim_{a \rightarrow z} c_D(0; a) = \infty$  for any  $z \in \partial D$  and, if  $D$  is unbounded,  $z = \infty$ . But the last one follows by the fact that  $G$  is  $c$ -finitely compact. On the other hand, if  $a \rightarrow z \in \partial D$ , then  $a_z \rightarrow \pi_z(z) \in \partial D_z$  and hence  $c_D(0; a) \geq c_{D_z}(0; a_z) \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Agler, N. J. Young, *The hyperbolic geometry of the symmetrized bidisc*, J. Geom. Anal. 14 (2004), 375–403.
- [2] M. Andersson, M. Passare, R. Sigurdsson, *Complex convexity and analytic functionals*, Birkhäuser, Basel–Boston–Berlin, 2004.
- [3] C. Costara, *The symmetrized bidisc and Lempert’s theorem*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 36 (2004), 656–662.
- [4] C. Costara, *Dissertation*, Université Laval (2004).
- [5] C. Costara, *On the spectral Nevanlinna–Pick problem*, Studia Math. 170 (2005), 23–55.
- [6] A. Edigarian, *A note on Costara’s paper*, Ann. Polon. Math. 83 (2004), 189–191.
- [7] A. Edigarian, W. Zwonek, *Geometry of the symmetrized polydisc*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 84 (2005), 364–374.
- [8] D. Jacquet,  *$\mathbb{C}$ -convex domains with  $C^2$  boundary*, Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations 51 (2006), 303–312.
- [9] L. Hörmander, *Notions of convexity*, Birkhäuser, Basel–Boston–Berlin, 1994.
- [10] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *Invariant Distances and Metrics in Complex Analysis*, Walter de Gruyter, 8 (1993).

- [11] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *Invariant distances and metrics in complex analysis—revisited*, Diss. Math. 430 (2005), 1–192.
- [12] L. Lempert, *La métrique de Kobayashi et la représentation des domaines sur la boule*, Bull. Soc. Math. France 109 (1981), 427–474.
- [13] N. Nikolov, P. Pflug, W. Zwonek, *The Lempert function of the symmetrized polydisc in higher dimensions is not a distance*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear (arXiv:math.CV/0601367).
- [14] S. V. Znamenskii, *Seven  $\mathbb{C}$ -convexity problems* (in Russian), Complex analysis in modern mathematics. On the 80th anniversary of the birth of Boris Vladimirovich Shabat, E. M. Chirka (ed.), FAZIS, Moscow, 2001, 123–131.
- [15] S. V. Znamenskii, L. N. Znamenskaya, *Spiral connectedness of the sections and projections of  $\mathbb{C}$ -convex sets*, Math. Notes 59 (1996), 253–260.

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

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

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

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

INSTYTUT MATEMATYKI, UNIwersytet Jagielloński, Reymonta 4, 30-059 KRAKÓW, POLAND

*E-mail address:* Wlodzimierz.Zwonek@im.uj.edu.pl