

PRECISE SUBELLIPTIC ESTIMATES FOR A CLASS OF SPECIAL DOMAINS

TRAN VU KHANH AND GIUSEPPE ZAMPIERI

ABSTRACT. For the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on a regular coordinate domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, we prove ϵ -subelliptic estimates for an index ϵ which is in some cases better than $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2m}$ (m being the *multiplicity*) as it was previously proved by Catlin and Cho in [4]. This also supplies a much simplified proof of the existing literature. Our approach is founded on the method by Catlin in [3] which consists in constructing a family of weights $\{\phi^\delta\}$ whose Levi form is bigger than $\delta^{-2\epsilon}$ on the δ -strip around $\partial\Omega$.

MSC: 32F10, 32F20, 32N15, 32T25

1. INTRODUCTION

Regular coordinate domains have ϵ -subelliptic estimates; we discuss here about the optimal ϵ . These domains are defined by

$$(1.1) \quad 2\operatorname{Re} z_{n+1} + \sum_{j=1}^N |f_j(z)|^2 < 0, \quad \text{for } (z, z_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C},$$

where the f_j 's are holomorphic functions in a neighborhood of 0 which satisfy $f_j = f(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ and $f_j(0, \dots, 0, z_j) \neq 0$. We denote by m_j the smallest index such that $\partial_{z_j}^{m_j} f_j \neq 0$ and define $m := \prod_{j=1, \dots, n} m_j$. The

D'Angelo's type D is the order of contact of $\partial\Omega$ with any complex 1-dimensional complex variety. For these domains it is readily seen that $\sum_j |f_j|^2 \gtrsim |z|^{2m}$ which implies $D \leq 2m$. Moreover, according to Catlin [1], we must have $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{D}$ and, conversely, it is a conjecture by D'Angelo's [7] that $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2m}$. (Indeed, the conjecture is formulated for more general special domains and in this case the integer m is the *multiplicity*.) We present a simplified proof of a recent result by Catlin and Cho [4] which gives positive answer to the conjecture for coordinate domains. More important, we find an intermediate number $\frac{1}{2m} \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \leq \frac{1}{D}$ obtained by combining vanishing orders of the f_j 's in different directions and prove subelliptic estimates for ϵ coinciding with this new number $\frac{\gamma}{2}$. For instance, consider the domain defined by (1.1) for the choice $f_1 = z_1^{m_1}$

and then

$$(1.2) \quad f_j(z) = z_j^{m_j} + z_{j-1}^{l_j}, \quad l_j \leq m_{j-1}, \quad j = 2, \dots, n.$$

According to Theorem 2.3, we set $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{m_1}$, define inductively $\gamma_j = \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{l_i}{m_j} \gamma_i$ and write γ for γ_n . (In particular, when $l_j = m_{j-1}$ and $m_j \geq m_{j-1}$ for any j , then $\gamma_j = \min_{i \leq j} \frac{1}{m_i}$.) Then we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$.

Note that we always have $\frac{\gamma}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2m}$ with equality holding only if $l_j = 1$ for any j . On the other hand we have

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{\gamma}{2} \geq \frac{1}{D},$$

which shows that our index of subellipticity is optimal in this example. To prove (1.3), we have just to notice that the curve

$$\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n+1}, \quad \tau \mapsto (\tau^{\frac{21}{\gamma}}, \dots, \tau^{\frac{\gamma_{n-1}}{\gamma}}, \tau, 0),$$

has order of contact equal to $\frac{2}{\gamma}$. On the other hand, the presence of ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$ assured by our theorem, yields equality in (1.3).

2. PRECISE SUBELLIPTICITY INDEX FOR A CLASS OF SPECIAL DOMAINS

Let $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be coordinates in \mathbb{C}^n and (z, z_{n+1}) coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}$. We deal with regular coordinate domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, that is, domains defined by (1.1) for f_j holomorphic which satisfy $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ and $\partial_{z_j}^{m_j} f_j \neq 0$ for some m_j . For these domains we consider the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem and, in particular, the ϵ -subelliptic estimates. These are of the type

$$(2.1) \quad |||u|||_\epsilon^2 \lesssim ||\bar{\partial}u||_0^2 + ||\bar{\partial}^*u||_0^2 + ||u||_0^2,$$

for any $C_c^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ -form u of degree $k \geq 1$ in the domain $D_{\bar{\partial}^*}$ of $\bar{\partial}^*$. Here $|||\cdot|||_\epsilon$ is the *tangential* Sobolev norm of index ϵ . This is said an estimate with ϵ -fractional gain of derivative. It is classical (see [5]) that it implies the local hypoellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem. The canonical solution u of $\bar{\partial}u = f$, that is, the solution orthogonal to $\ker \bar{\partial}$, is C^∞ up to $\partial\Omega$ precisely at those points of $\partial\Omega$ where f is C^∞ . In particular, the Bergman projection preserves C^∞ smoothness. The following theorem has been recently obtained by [4]; we give here a much simplified proof.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a regular coordinate domain defined by (1.1) with the f_j 's satisfying $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$. Write*

$$(2.2) \quad f_j = z_j^{m_j} + O(z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, z_j^{m_j+1});$$

then ϵ -subelliptic estimates hold for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2m_1 \dots m_n}$.

Proof. According to Catlin [3] it suffices to find a family of bounded weights $\{\varphi^\delta\}$ for $\delta \searrow 0$ whose Levi form satisfies $\sum_{ij} \varphi_{ij}^\delta u_i \bar{u}_j \geq \delta^{-\frac{1}{m_1 \dots m_n}} |u|^2$ over the strip of Ω about the boundary $S_\delta = \{z \in \Omega : -r(z) < \delta\}$. Once the functions φ^δ have been found, we have to deform them to new functions $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta$, bounded and plurisubharmonic not only in S_δ but in the whole Ω , satisfying the same Levi conditions as the φ^δ on $S_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$; for this we refer to Lemma 2.2 after the end of the proof of Theorem 2.1. To define the functions φ^δ , we put $\gamma_0 = 1$, $\gamma_j = \frac{1}{m_1 \dots m_j}$, choose $\alpha \geq 1$ and put $\alpha_j = \alpha m_{j+1} \dots m_n$. Note that $(\alpha_{j-1} - 1) - \alpha_j(m_j - 1) = \alpha_j - 1$. We choose a cut off function χ which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \text{supp } \chi \subset (0, 2), \\ \chi \equiv 1 \text{ on } (0, 1), \end{cases}$$

and also take a small constant c to be specified later. We also rewrite the inequality (1.1) which defines Ω as $r < 0$ and define

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi^\delta = & -\log\left(\frac{-r + \delta}{\delta}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^{m_j-1} \frac{1}{|\log *|} \log \left(|\partial_{z_j}^h f_j|^2 + \frac{\delta^{(m_j-h)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}} \right) \\ & + c \sum_{j=1}^n \chi\left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}}\right) \log \left(\frac{|z_j|^2 + \delta^{\gamma_j}}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $* = \frac{\delta^{\gamma_j(m_j-h)}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}}$. Notice here that $\log * \simeq \log \delta$. The weights φ^δ that we have defined are bounded in the strip S_δ . We use the notations

$$A_j = \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 \quad B_j^h = \delta^{-(m_j-h)\gamma_j} |\partial \partial_{z_j}^h f_j \cdot u|^2.$$

We also denote by cC_j the Levi form of the third term of (2.3) applied to u ; note that $C_j \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$ for $|z_j| \leq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, but, otherwise, C_j can take negative values; however, $|C_j| \lesssim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$. We also set

$$D_j = A_j + \sum_{h \leq k_j} B_j^h + cC_j.$$

We first prove an auxiliary statement: the assumption

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{i \leq i_o} D_i \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i_o}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{i_o}-1} |u_{i_o}|^2 + \sum_{i \leq i_o-1} \delta^{-\gamma_i} |u_i|^2,$$

implies, for any $j \geq i_o + 1$

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} \sum_{i \leq j} |u_i|^2.$$

In fact, by iteration, it suffices to prove the statement for $i_o = j - 1$. For that, we first notice that $\delta^{-\gamma_i} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i_o}} |\log \delta|^k$ for any k and for any $i \leq i_o - 1$. It follows

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{j-1}-1} \left(|\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |u_i|^2 \right) + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{j-1}-1} |\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Assume at this point $|\partial_{z_j} f_j| \geq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-1)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j}}$; then (2.6) can be continued by

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}+(m_j-1)\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{(\alpha_{j-1}-1)-(m_j-1)\alpha_j} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that this controls cC_j when this gets negative; this happens in all cases which follow; hence we avoid to recall it at each step. If not, we can assume $|\partial_{z_j} f_j| \leq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-1)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j}}$ and then use B_j^1 . We have

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} B_j^1 + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j(m_j-1)} \frac{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j}}{|\log *|} \left(|\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j|^2 |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |u_i|^2 \right) + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}+\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j-1} |\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j|^2 |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $|\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j| \geq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-2)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-2)\alpha_j}}$, then (2.7) can be continued by

$$\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}+\gamma_j+\gamma_{j-1}-2\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2.$$

If $|\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j| \leq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-2)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-2)\alpha_j}}$, we pass to B_j^2 . In this way we jump from $\partial_{z_j}^{h-1} f_j$ to $\partial_{z_j}^h f_j$ until we reach $B_j^{m_j-1}$. At this stage we have $|\partial_{z_j}^{m_j-1} f_j| \leq \frac{\delta^{\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1}}$ which yields readily

$$B_j^{m_j-1} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2.$$

This proves that (2.4) for $i_o = j - 1$ implies (2.5). By iteration the conclusion is true for any $i_o \leq j - 1$. We now prove that, for any value of z_j

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2,$$

whereas, when $|z_j| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j}$

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \gtrsim \begin{cases} \text{either} & \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j - 1} |u_j|^2 \\ \text{or} & \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |z_j|^{2(m_j - 1)} |u_j|^2. \end{cases}$$

We proceed by induction over j . The first step $j = 1$ is easy. In fact $C_1 \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_1} |u_1|^2$ for $|z_1| \leq \delta^{\gamma_1}$ and

$$A_1 \gtrsim \max(\delta^{-\gamma_1}, \delta^{-1} |z_1|^{2(m_1 - 1)}) |u_1|^2 \quad \text{for } |z_1| \geq \delta^{\gamma_1}.$$

In particular, when cC_j takes negative values, these are controlled by A_1 for suitably small c . This proves (2.8) and (2.9) for $j = 1$. Suppose that (2.8) and (2.9) are true up to step $j - 1$ and prove them for j . If $|z_j| \leq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, then $C_j \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$. Otherwise, assume $|z_j| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j}$. We show now that, under this assumption, we must have (2.4) for some $i_o \leq j - 1$ unless the second alternative in (2.9) holds. In fact, let $|z_{j-1}| \gtrsim |z_j|^{m_j - 1}$; then $|z_{j-1}| \gtrsim \delta^{\gamma_j(m_j - 1)} \geq \delta^{\gamma_{j-1} - \gamma_j}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |z_{j-1}|^{2(m_{j-1} - 1)} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2} + \gamma_j(m_{j-1} - 1)(m_j - 1)} \\ &= \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2} + \gamma_{j-2} - \gamma_{j-1} - \gamma_j m_{j-1} + \gamma_j} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^k \quad \text{for any choice of } k. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any choice of $i \leq j - 2$, we have

$$\delta^{-\gamma_i} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^k.$$

This implies (2.4) for $i_o = j - 1$ which implies in turn (2.5). Otherwise, we assume $|z_{j-1}| \lesssim |z_j|^{m_j - 1}$. Now, we point our attention to z_{j-2} . If $|z_{j-2}| \gtrsim |z_j|^{m_j - 1}$, then $|z_{j-2}| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j(m_j - 1)} \geq \delta^{\gamma_{j-1} - \gamma_j}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-\gamma_{j-3}} |z_{j-2}|^{2(m_{j-2} - 1)} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-3} + (m_{j-2} - 1)(\gamma_{j-1} - \gamma_j)} \\ &= \delta^{-\gamma_{j-3} + m_{j-2} \gamma_{j-1}} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |\log \delta|^k. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have for any $i \leq j - 3$, $\delta^{-\gamma_i} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |\log \delta|^k$. This implies

$$(2.10) \quad \sum_{i \leq j-2} D_i \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{j-2}-1} \sum_{i \leq j-2} |u_i|^2.$$

The same argument which shows that (2.4) implies (2.5) also serves in proving that (2.10) implies (2.4); in turn, (2.4) implies (2.5). We can therefore assume

$$|z_{j-2}| \lesssim |z_j|^{m_j-1}.$$

We repeat the argument that we developed for $i = j - 1$ and $i = j - 2$ for any other index $i \leq j - 1$. This can be explained by the fact that the second of (2.9) implies the first at each step $i \leq j - 1$ (with the cases $i = j - 1$ and $i = j - 2$ having already been proved). In fact, if $|z_i| \geq |z_j|^{m_j-1}$ and hence $|z_i| \geq \delta^{\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}} |z_i|^{2(m_i-1)} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}+(\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j)(m_i-1)} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}+m_i\gamma_{j-1}} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_i} |\log \delta|^k. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (2.4) and thus also (2.5) unless

$$(2.11) \quad |z_i| \leq |z_j|^{m_j-1} \quad \text{for any } i \leq j - 1.$$

On the other hand, when (2.11) holds, then

$$|\partial_{z_j} f_j| \gtrsim |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \leq j-1} |z_i|^2 \gtrsim |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)}.$$

It follows

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i &\geq \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} (|z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |u_i|^2) + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is in any case $\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$ and also that it controls $c\tilde{C}_j$, for suitable c when \tilde{C}_j gets negative. So, in this case we have the second alternative in (2.9). This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

It remains to prove the technical lemma which shows how to modify the functions φ^δ to $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta$ so that they are plurisubharmonic on the whole of Ω .

Lemma 2.2. *There are $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta$, plurisubharmonic and bounded on Ω and such that*

$$\tilde{\varphi}^\delta = \begin{cases} e^{2\frac{r}{\delta}} + e^{-2}\varphi^\delta & \text{on } S_{\frac{\delta}{2}}, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Omega \setminus S_\delta. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We take $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, $t \mapsto \theta(t)$, convex increasing, that is, satisfying $\dot{\theta} \geq 0$, $\ddot{\theta} \geq 0$ and such that

$$\theta = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \leq 2e^{-2}, \\ t & \text{for } t \geq e^{-1}, \end{cases}$$

set $\psi^\delta := e^{2\frac{r}{\delta}} + e^{-2}\varphi^\delta$ and define $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta := \theta \circ \psi^\delta$. Remember that φ^δ take values in $[0, 1]$ and notice that $S_{\frac{\delta}{2}} \subset \{z : \psi^\delta \geq e^{-1}\}$ and $\Omega \setminus S_\delta \subset \{z : \psi^\delta \leq 2e^{-2}\}$; thus $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta = \psi^\delta$ on $S_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus S_\delta$. \square

We now prove subelliptic estimates for a class of domains with a better index $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2m_1 \dots m_n}$; in particular, for the domains defined by (1.1), this index coincides with the optimal value $\epsilon = \frac{1}{D}$. To achieve our goal, we have to specify the vanishing order of f_j in different directions z_i for $i \leq j$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a regular coordinate domain defined by (1.1) with $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ and $\partial_{z_j}^{m_j} f_j \neq 0$. We denote by l_j^i , $i < j$, the vanishing order of f_j in z_i , that is, we write*

$$(2.13) \quad f_j = z_j^{m_j} + O_j(z_1^{l_j^1}, \dots, z_{j-1}^{l_j^{j-1}}, z_j^{m_j}) \quad \text{for } l_j^i \leq m_i.$$

Assume that each O_j contains no power of z_j of degree $\leq m_j - 1$ and define $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{m_1}$ and, inductively,

$$\gamma_j = \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{l_j^i}{m_j} \gamma_i$$

and also write γ for γ_n . Then we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for any $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$.

Proof. Let k_j be the highest power $\leq m_j - 1$ of z_j in O_j and let $r < 0$ be the inequality which defines Ω . We define

$$(2.14) \quad \varphi^\delta = -\log\left(\frac{-r + \delta}{\delta}\right) + c \sum_{j=1}^n \chi\left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}}\right) \log\left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} + 1\right)$$

and prove that for any $u \in C^n$, φ^δ satisfy $\sum_{i,j} \varphi_{ij}^\delta u_i \bar{u}_j \geq \delta^{-\gamma} |u|^2$ over the strip S_δ . We denote by $c \sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_j$ the second term in the right hand

side of (2.14) and define

$$A_j = \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2, \quad C_j = \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi_j(u, \bar{u}), \quad D_j = A_j + cC_j.$$

We wish to prove that

$$(2.15) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \gtrsim \sum_{i \leq j} \delta^{-s_i \gamma_i} |z_i|^{2(s_i-1)} |u_i|^2 \text{ for any } s_i \leq m_i.$$

It is easy to prove the first step, that is,

$$D_1 \gtrsim \delta^{-s \gamma_1} |z_1|^{2(s-1)} |u_1|^2 \text{ for any } s \leq m_1.$$

Suppose we have already proved (2.15) for any $i \leq j-1$. We have to prove that

$$(2.16) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \geq \delta^{-s \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(s-1)} |u_j|^2 \text{ for any } s \leq m_j.$$

We recall here that $l_j^i \leq m_i$ and notice that $\gamma_i \leq \frac{1}{m_i}$; in particular, $l_j^i \gamma_i \leq 1$. We have

$$A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \gtrsim \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 + \sum_{i \leq j-1} \delta^{-s_i \gamma_i} |z_i|^{2(s_i-1)} |u_i|^2.$$

We fix our choice of the s_i 's as $s_i = l_j^i$ which are smaller than m_i ; thus $l_j^i \gamma_i \leq 1$. It follows

$$A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \geq \sum_{i \leq j-1} \delta^{-l_j^i \gamma_i} \left[|\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 + |z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)} |u_i|^2 \right].$$

On the other hand

$$|\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 \gtrsim |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)} |u_i|^2,$$

and therefore, since $l_j^i \gamma_i \geq m_j \gamma_j$ for any $i \leq j-1$, we conclude

$$(2.17) \quad A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \gtrsim \delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2.$$

This proves (2.15) for the choice $s = m_j$. We prove now (2.15) for $s = 1$; for this we have to call into play C_j . We have

$$(2.18) \quad \frac{1}{2} C_j + \delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} \gtrsim (\delta^{-\gamma_j} + \delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)}) |u_j|^2.$$

In fact, if $|z_j|^2 \leq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, then $C_j \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$. If, instead, $|z_j| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, and thus C_j gets negative, we have on our side the fact that $\delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2 \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$ and therefore it controls cC_j for suitably small c . From (2.17) we conclude that $A_j + cC_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i$

bigger than the right side of (2.18), which yields (2.15) for $s = 1$ and $s = m_j$. The estimate (2.15) for general s with $1 \leq s \leq m_j$ is just a combination of the two opposite cases $s = 1$ and $s = m_j$. □

Remark 2.4. The theorem applies in particular to the class of examples described by (1.2).

We have a final statement which collects in a unified frame the conclusions of Theorems 2.1 and 2.3.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a regular coordinate domain defined by (1.1) for $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ which satisfy (2.13). Define $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{m_1}$ and, inductively*

$$\gamma_j = \begin{cases} \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{1}{m_j} \gamma_i & \text{if } O_j \text{ contains some power of } z_j \text{ in degree } \leq m_j - 1, \\ \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{l_j^i}{m_j} \gamma_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and also write γ for γ_n . Then we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$.

Proof. We use in this situation the family of weights

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^\delta = -\log\left(\frac{-r + \delta}{\delta}\right) + & \sum_{\{j:k_j \neq 0\}} \sum_{h \leq k_j} \frac{1}{|\log *|} \log \left(|\partial_{z_j}^h f_j|^2 + \frac{\delta^{(m_j-h)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}} \right) \\ & + c \sum_{j=1}^n \chi \left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} \right) \log \left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the theorem is a combination of those of Theorem 2.1 and 2.3. □

Example 2.6. Let us consider in \mathbb{C}^4 the domain defined by

$$2\operatorname{Re} z_4 + |z_1^6|^2 + |z_2^4 - z_1 z_2|^2 + |z_3^4 - z_2^3 + z_1|^2 < 0.$$

Here $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{6}$, $\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{6.4}$ and $\gamma_3 = \frac{3}{6.4.4}$; we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma_3}{2}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] **D. Catlin**—Necessary conditions for subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem, *Ann. of Math.* **117** n.2 (1983), 147-171
- [2] **D. Catlin**—Boundary invariants of pseudoconvex domains, *Ann. of Math.* **120** (1984), 529-586
- [3] **D. Catlin**—Subelliptic estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains, *Ann. of Math.* **126** (1987), 131-191

- [4] **D. Catlin and J.S. Cho**—Sharp estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on regular coordinate domains, *arXiv:0811.0830v1*, (2008)
- [5] **G.B. Folland and J.J. Kohn**—The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann complex, *Ann. Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton N.J.* **75** (1972)
- [6] **J. D’Angelo**—Real hypersurfaces, order of contact, and applications, *Ann. of Math.* **115** (1982), 615–637
- [7] **J. D’Angelo**—Several complex variables and the geometry of real hypersurfaces, *CRC Press* (1992)
- [8] **J.J. Kohn**—Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains: sufficient conditions, *Acta Math.* **142** (1979), 79–122 **156** (2002), 213–248
- [9] **T.V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**—Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on a weakly q-pseudoconvex/concave domain, *arXiv:0804.3112v* (2008)

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA, VIA BELZONI 7,
35131 PADOVA, ITALY

E-mail address: `khanh@math.unipd.it`, `zampieri@math.unipd.it`