

WEAK GEODESICS IN THE SPACE OF KÄHLER METRICS

TAMÁS DARVAS AND LÁSZLÓ LEMPert

ABSTRACT. Given a compact Kähler manifold (X, ω_0) , according to Mabuchi, the set \mathcal{H}_0 of Kähler forms cohomologous to ω_0 has the natural structure of an infinite dimensional Riemannian manifold. We address the question whether points in \mathcal{H}_0 can be joined by a geodesic, and strengthening the finding of [LV], we show that this cannot always be done even with a certain type of generalized geodesics. As in [LV], the result is obtained through the analysis of a Monge–Ampère equation.

1. Introduction.

Let X be a connected compact complex manifold of dimension $m > 0$ and ω_0 a smooth Kähler form on it. In the 1980s Mabuchi discovered that there is a natural infinite dimensional Riemannian manifold structure on the set \mathcal{H}_0 of smooth Kähler forms cohomologous to ω_0 , and on the set

$$\mathcal{H} = \{v \in C^\infty(X) : \omega_0 + i\partial\bar{\partial}v > 0\}$$

of smooth strongly ω_0 -plurisubharmonic functions. He also showed that \mathcal{H} is isometric to the Riemannian product $\mathcal{H}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$, [M]. In [LV], answering a question posed by Donaldson, Vivas and the second author proved that in general there is no geodesic of class C^2 between two points in \mathcal{H} , resp. in \mathcal{H}_0 ; in fact, there is not even one of Sobolev regularity $W^{1,2}$.

Since geodesics and their generalizations, weak geodesics, potentially play an important role in the study of special Kähler metrics (for geodesics, see [D1, M]), it is of interest to know whether two points in \mathcal{H} can be connected at least by a weak geodesic. What the notion of weak geodesic should be is suggested by Semmes' reformulation of the geodesic equation in \mathcal{H} , see [S]. Let $S = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < \text{Im } s < 1\}$ and ω the pullback of ω_0 by the projection $\bar{S} \times X \rightarrow X$. With any C^2 curve $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto v_t \in \mathcal{H}$ associate a function $u : \bar{S} \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$u(s, x) = v_{\text{Im } s}(x),$$

itself a C^2 function. Then $t \mapsto v_t$ is a geodesic if and only if u satisfies the Monge–Ampère equation $(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u)^{m+1} = 0$. Therefore a C^2 geodesic connecting $0, v \in \mathcal{H}$ gives rise to a solution $u \in C^2(\bar{S} \times X)$ of a boundary value problem for this

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32Q15, 32W20.

*Research supported by NSF grant DMS0700281. Part of the research was done while the second author enjoyed the hospitality of the Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris.

Monge–Ampère equation on $\overline{S} \times X$; furthermore $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u \geq 0$. This latter is expressed by saying that u is ω –plurisubharmonic. By a weak, or generalized, geodesic connecting, say, $0, v \in \mathcal{H}$ one then means an ω –plurisubharmonic solution $u : \overline{S} \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the problem

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} (\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u)^{m+1} &= 0, \\ u(s + \sigma, x) &= u(s, x), \quad \text{if } (s, x) \in \overline{S} \times X, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(s, x) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \text{Im } s = 0 \\ v(x), & \text{if } \text{Im } s = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It has to be assumed that u is sufficiently regular so that $(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u)^{m+1}$ can be given sense; for example, according to [BT], the continuity of u more than suffices. X.X. Chen has indeed proved that for $v \in \mathcal{H}$ (1.1) admits a continuous ω –plurisubharmonic solution for which the current $\partial\bar{\partial}u$ is represented by a bounded form, see [C] and complements in [Bl]. In other words, any two points in \mathcal{H} can be connected by a weak geodesic. One should keep in mind, though, that a weak geodesic u need not give rise to a curve in \mathcal{H} , first because $v_t = u(t, \cdot)$ is not necessarily C^∞ , not even C^2 , and second because even if v_t is C^∞ , there is no reason why it should be strongly ω_0 –plurisubharmonic.

In this paper we show that the regularity that Chen obtains cannot be improved: (1.1) may have a solution with $\partial\bar{\partial}u$ bounded, but in general it will not have a solution with $\partial\bar{\partial}u$ continuous.

If \overline{Z} is a complex manifold, possibly with boundary, and $Z = \text{int } \overline{Z}$, we define

$$C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\overline{Z}) = \{w \in C(\overline{Z}) : \text{the current } \partial\bar{\partial}(w|_Z) \text{ is represented by a form continuous on } \overline{Z}\}.$$

Given $w \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\overline{Z})$, we will simply write $\partial\bar{\partial}w$ for the continuous form on \overline{Z} that represents the current $\partial\bar{\partial}(w|_Z)$, and if z_1, z_2, \dots are local coordinates on Z , we write $w_{z_j\bar{z}_k}$ for the coefficient of $dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_k$ in $\partial\bar{\partial}w$.

Clearly $C^2(\overline{Z}) \subset C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\overline{Z})$, and it is well understood in harmonic analysis that the inclusion is strict. For example, if $\overline{Z} = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\zeta| \leq 1/2\}$ and $k = 2, 3, \dots$, the function

$$w(\zeta) = \begin{cases} \zeta^k \log \log |\zeta|^{-2}, & \text{if } 0 < |\zeta| \leq 1/2 \\ 0, & \text{if } \zeta = 0 \end{cases}$$

is not in $C^k(\overline{Z})$, but $w_{\bar{\zeta}} \in C^{k-1}(\overline{Z})$ and $w_{\zeta\bar{\zeta}} \in C^{k-2}(\overline{Z})$.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose a connected compact Kähler manifold (X, ω_0) admits a holomorphic isometry $g : X \rightarrow X$ with an isolated fixed point, and $g^2 = \text{id}_X$. Then there is a $v \in \mathcal{H}$ for which (1.1) has no ω –plurisubharmonic solution $u \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\overline{S} \times X)$. One can choose v to satisfy $g^*v = v$.*

The proof will show that among symmetric potentials the $v \in \mathcal{H}$ in Theorem 1.1 even form an open set.

Theorem 1.1 corresponds to [LV, Theorem 1.2], but the C^3 regularity from [LV] has been lowered. The proofs here and in [LV] are similar in that, denoting by $x_0 \in X$ an isolated fixed point of g , in both proofs we analyze the behavior of a regular solution u in a neighborhood of $\bar{S} \times \{x_0\}$. The upshot of the analysis is a condition on the Hessian of the boundary value at x_0 , a condition that not all $v \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy. In [LV] the analysis involved the Monge–Ampère foliation associated with a $u \in C^3(\bar{S} \times X)$, and it was crucial that the foliation was of class C^1 . The foliation method is not available when u is only $C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}$, and we will have to be thrifter with our tools, but in spite of this, we will recover the same condition on the Hessian as in [LV] when $m = 1$. When $m > 1$, the present condition is slightly stronger than the one in [LV].

2. Generalities.

In this section we collect a few simple facts concerning currents and the homogeneous Monge–Ampère equation.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow Z$ be a holomorphic map of complex manifolds, φ and ψ continuous forms on Z satisfying $\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi = \psi$ as currents. Then $\partial\bar{\partial}f^*\varphi = f^*\psi$ as currents.*

Proof. We can assume Z is an open subset of some \mathbb{C}^n . Regularizing φ and ψ by convolutions gives rise to sequences of smooth forms φ_k and $\psi_k = \partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_k$ that converge locally uniformly to φ , resp. ψ . Therefore $f^*\varphi_k \rightarrow f^*\varphi$ and $\partial\bar{\partial}f^*\varphi_k = f^*\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_k \rightarrow f^*\psi$ locally uniformly, whence the claim follows from the continuity of $\partial\bar{\partial}$ in the space of currents.

Next consider a complex manifold Z and a plurisubharmonic $U \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(Z)$. Suppose $Y \subset Z$ is a one dimensional, not necessarily closed complex submanifold and $TY \subset \text{Ker } \partial\bar{\partial}U$. The normal bundle $NY = (T^{1,0}Z|_Y)/T^{1,0}Y$ is a holomorphic vector bundle and $\partial\bar{\partial}U$ induces a possibly degenerate Hermitian metric h on it. With $p: T^{1,0}Z|_Y \rightarrow NY$ the canonical projection, the metric is

$$h(p\zeta) = \partial\bar{\partial}U(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \geq 0, \quad \zeta \in T^{1,0}Z|_Y.$$

Thus h is continuous, but can degenerate, i.e., vanish on nonzero vectors as well.

Proposition 2.2. *The metric h is seminegatively curved in the sense that $\log h \circ \sigma$ is subharmonic for any holomorphic section σ of NY over some open $Y' \subset Y$. (Here it is convenient not to exclude from subharmonic functions those that are identically $-\infty$ on some component of Y' .) Further, on the line bundle $\det NY$ the metric induced by h is also seminegatively curved.*

When h is smooth and nondegenerate, and moreover $(\partial\bar{\partial}U)^{\dim Z} = 0$, the seminegativity of $\det NY$ was first proved by Bedford and Burns in [BB, Proposition 4.1], and [CT, Theorem 4.2.8] gives the seminegativity of N itself. For possibly degenerate h [BF, Lemma] represents an equivalent result, albeit without the curvature interpretation, and under the assumption that U is C^2 . Our proof is a variant of the proof in [BF].

Proof. For the first statement we only need to prove that $\log h \circ \sigma$ has the sub-meanvalue property, and this at points where $h \circ \sigma \neq 0$. To do so, we can assume $Z \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is the unit polydisc, $Y = Y' = \{z \in Z : z_2 = \dots = z_n = 0\}$, and that $\sigma(z_1, 0, 0, \dots) = p(\partial/\partial z_2)$. Thus

$$(2.1) \quad (h \circ \sigma)(z_1, 0, \dots) = U_{z_2 \bar{z}_2}(z_1, 0, \dots).$$

Green's formula implies for $0 < r < 1$

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{1}{r^2} \int_0^1 (U(z_1, r e^{2\pi i t}, 0, \dots) - U(z_1, 0, 0, \dots)) dt = \\ \frac{i}{\pi r^2} \int_{|z_2| \leq r} (\log r - \log |z_2|) U_{z_2 \bar{z}_2}(z_1, z_2, 0, \dots) dz_2 \wedge d\bar{z}_2,$$

certainly if U is C^2 , but then upon regularizing by convolutions, whenever U and $\partial\bar{\partial}U$ are continuous—as in our case. Proposition 2.1, with f the embedding $Y \rightarrow Z$, implies $\partial\bar{\partial}(U|_Y) = (\partial\bar{\partial}U)|_Y = 0$. Hence the left hand side of (2.2) is a subharmonic function of z_1 , and so is the right hand side. As $r \rightarrow 0$, these functions converge locally uniformly to $U_{z_2 \bar{z}_2}(z_1, 0, \dots)$; in light of (2.1) $h \circ \sigma$ is therefore subharmonic.

If $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(Y)$ and σ is replaced by $e^{\varphi/2}\sigma$, we obtain that $e^{\operatorname{Re} \varphi} h \circ \sigma$ is also subharmonic. Therefore it satisfies the maximum principle, and so does $\operatorname{Re} \varphi + \log h \circ \sigma$; knowing this for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(Y)$ is equivalent to the subharmonicity of $\log h \circ \sigma$, see e.g. [H, Theorem 1.6.3].

Now given any holomorphic vector bundle $E \rightarrow Y$ of rank r , endowed with a seminegatively curved, possibly degenerate continuous Hermitian metric h , the induced metric on the line bundle $\det E$ is also seminegatively curved. Indeed, denoting by $h(e, e')$ the inner product of $e, e' \in E_y$, $y \in Y$, so that $h(e) = h(e, e)$, for (local) sections $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ of E the induced metric is given by

$$(2.3) \quad h^{\det}(\sigma_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma_r) = \det(h(\sigma_j, \sigma_k)).$$

If h is smooth and nondegenerate and $y \in Y$, any nonzero holomorphic section of $\det E$ in a neighborhood of y can be written as $\sigma_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma_r$, where the σ_j are holomorphic sections of E near y , and $h(\sigma_j, \sigma_k)$ vanish to second order at y for $j \neq k$. Thus $\det(h(\sigma_j, \sigma_k)) - \prod_{j=1}^r h(\sigma_j, \sigma_j)$ vanishes to *fourth* order at y . By virtue of (2.3) this implies that at y

$$i\partial\bar{\partial} \log h^{\det}(\sigma_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \sigma_r) = i\partial\bar{\partial} \log \prod_{j=1}^r h(\sigma_j, \sigma_j) \geq 0.$$

Therefore h^{\det} is seminegatively curved when h is smooth and nondegenerate. To prove for a general h we can assume $Y \subset \mathbb{C}$ is connected, $E = Y \times \mathbb{C}^r$ is holomorphically trivial, and h^{\det} degenerates nowhere. We can regularize h by convolutions, and obtain h^{\det} as the locally uniform limit of seminegatively curved metrics, hence itself seminegatively curved.

Lastly we record a uniqueness result and its corollary:

Proposition 2.3. *Given a compact Kähler manifold (X, ω_0) and $v \in \mathcal{H}$, the equation (1.1) has at most one ω -plurisubharmonic solution $u \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\bar{S} \times X)$.*

The result follows from [Bl, Proposition 2.2 or Theorem 2.3] or from [PS, p. 144], once one checks that for ω -plurisubharmonic $u \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\bar{S} \times X)$ the Monge–Ampère measure $(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u)^{m+1}$, as defined e.g. in [BT], agrees with what is obtained by taking the exterior power of the continuous form $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}u$. Alternatively, the more elementary arguments for [D1, Lemma 6] and the first paragraph of the proof of [LV, Proposition 2.3] also give uniqueness, provided one first checks the following: if Z is a complex manifold and $w \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(Z)$ is real valued, then $i\partial\bar{\partial}w \geq 0$ at any local minimum point of w . Because of Proposition 2.1, it suffices to verify this latter when $\dim Z = 1$, and then it is straightforward: if $i\partial\bar{\partial}w < 0$ at a point, then $i\partial\bar{\partial}w < 0$ in a neighborhood, whence w is strongly superharmonic there, and has no local minimum.

Corollary 2.4. *Suppose $v \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfies $g^*v = v$, and $u \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\bar{S} \times X)$ is an ω -plurisubharmonic solution of (1.1). Then $u(s, x) = u(s, g(x))$.*

3. The proof of Theorem 1.1.

Let X, ω_0, ω , and g be as in Theorem 1.1, and let $x_0 \in X$ be an isolated fixed point of g . Using [LV, Proposition 2.2] we choose local coordinates z_1, \dots, z_m in a neighborhood $V \subset X$ of x_0 in which g is expressed as $(z_j) \mapsto (-z_j)$.

Proposition 3.1. *If an ω -plurisubharmonic $u \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\bar{S} \times V)$ solves (1.1) and $u(s, x) = u(s, g(x))$, then $u(s, x_0) = a \operatorname{Im} s$ for $s \in \bar{S}$, with some $a \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof (essentially taken over from [BF, Proposition]). The symmetry assumption implies that $u_{s\bar{z}_j}(s, x_0) = 0$, and so

$$(3.1) \quad 0 = (-i\omega + \partial\bar{\partial}u)^{m+1} = (-i\omega + \partial_X\bar{\partial}_X u)^m \wedge \partial_S\bar{\partial}_S u$$

at points of $\bar{S} \times \{x_0\}$. Hence for any $s \in \bar{S}$ either $(-i\omega + \partial_X\bar{\partial}_X u)^m$ or $\partial_S\bar{\partial}_S u$ vanishes at (s, x_0) . The goal is to show that it is always the latter that vanishes.

We claim that on $S \times \{x_0\}$

$$\lambda = \log \left(-i\omega + \partial_X\bar{\partial}_X u \right)^m \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_m} \right)$$

is subharmonic and not identically $-\infty$. Indeed, by Proposition 2.1 $(\partial\bar{\partial}u)|_{\{s\} \times X} = \partial\bar{\partial}(u|_{\{s\} \times X})$ for $s \in S$, and by the continuity of $\partial\bar{\partial}$, also for $s \in \bar{S}$. But $u(0, \cdot) = 0$ is strongly ω_0 -plurisubharmonic, hence $\lambda(s, x_0) > -\infty$ when $s = 0$, and also when $s \in \bar{S}$ is near 0. As to subharmonicity, it suffices to verify it on the open set

$$S_0 = \{s \in S : \lambda(s, x_0) > -\infty\}.$$

Choose a smooth w_0 in a neighborhood of $x_0 \in X$ such that $\omega_0 = i\partial\bar{\partial}w_0$, let $w(s, x) = w_0(x)$ and $U = u + w$. By what has been observed above, $U_{s\bar{z}_j}(s, x_0) =$

$U_{s\bar{s}}(s, x_0) = 0$ if $s \in S_0$; in other words, $S_0 \times \{x_0\}$ is tangential to $\text{Ker } \partial\bar{\partial}U$. By virtue of Proposition 2.2 λ is subharmonic on $S_0 \times \{x_0\}$, hence on $S \times \{x_0\}$, as claimed.

Once we know $\lambda|_{S \times \{x_0\}}$ is subharmonic, it follows that S_0 is dense in S ; since by (3.1) $u_{s\bar{s}}$ vanishes on $S_0 \times \{x_0\}$, it vanishes on all of $S \times \{x_0\}$. The Proposition now follows, because a harmonic function on S that depends only on $\text{Im } s$ must be a linear function of $\text{Im } s$.

In the proof of the next lemma we will make use of the Poisson integral representation of harmonic functions in a strip. If ψ is harmonic S , continuous and bounded in \bar{S} , then we have the following integral representation (for more on this see [W]):

$$(3.2) \quad \psi(\xi + i\eta) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P(t - \xi, \eta)\psi(t)dt + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P(t - \xi, 1 - \eta)\psi(t + i)dt,$$

where P is the following Poisson kernel:

$$P(\xi, \eta) = \frac{\sin \pi\eta}{2(\cosh \pi\xi - \cos \pi\eta)}.$$

As expected, the above integral representation formula also gives a recipe to generate bounded continuous harmonic functions in \bar{S} given bounded continuous boundary data on ∂S .

Let $\omega_0 = \sum_{j,k=1}^m \omega_{jk} dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_k$ on $V \subset X$.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and u is a bounded continuous ω -plurisubharmonic function in $\bar{S} \times V$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} u(s, x) &= 0, & \text{if } (s, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times V, \\ u(s, x_0) &= a \text{Im } s, & \text{if } s \in \bar{S}. \end{aligned}$$

If $v = u(i, \cdot)$ is twice differentiable at x_0 and $dv = 0$ there, then

$$(3.3) \quad \left| \sum_{j,k=1}^m v_{z_j z_k}(x_0) \xi_j \xi_k \right| \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^m (2\omega_{jk}(x_0) + v_{z_j \bar{z}_k}(x_0)) \xi_j \bar{\xi}_k \quad \text{for } \xi_j \in \mathbb{C}.$$

and this estimate is sharp.

Proof. We will assume $a = 0$ (otherwise we replace $u(s, x)$ by $u(s, x) - a \text{Im } s$). Thus $u(s, x_0) = v(x_0) = 0$. By passing to a slice, the proof is reduced to the case $m = 1$. We will denote the local coordinate on V by $z = z_1$; it identifies V and x_0 with a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and with $0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $m = 1$, we need to verify

$$(3.4) \quad |v_{zz}(0)| \leq 2\omega_{11}(0) + v_{z\bar{z}}(0).$$

Suppose $f : \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is bounded and holomorphic with $f(\alpha) = 0$ for some $\alpha \in S$. Let $q = v_{zz}(0)$, and choose real numbers $p > v_{z\bar{z}}(0)$ and $r > \omega_{11}(0)$. With a neighborhood $V' \subset V$ of 0 we will have

$$v(z) \leq p|z|^2 + \text{Re } qz^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega < i\partial\bar{\partial}r|z|^2$$

for all $z \in V'$. Clearly, this implies that the function $U(s, z) = r|z|^2 + u(s, z)$ is plurisubharmonic in $S \times V'$ and if ζ is sufficiently small then

$$\phi(s) = U(s, \zeta f(s)) = r|\zeta f(s)|^2 + u(s, \zeta f(s))$$

is a subharmonic function of $s \in S$. On the boundary of \bar{S} we have the following estimates:

$$\phi(s) \begin{cases} = r|\zeta f(s)|^2, & \text{if } \operatorname{Im} s = 0 \\ \leq (p+r)|\zeta f(s)|^2 + \operatorname{Re} q\zeta^2 f(s)^2, & \text{if } \operatorname{Im} s = 1. \end{cases}$$

We take ζ such that $q\zeta^2$ is nonnegative. Then $\operatorname{Re} q\zeta^2 f(s)^2 = |q\zeta^2| \operatorname{Re} f(s)^2$.

Let ψ_1, ψ_2 and ψ_3 be bounded, continuous and harmonic functions on \bar{S} defined by the following boundary data:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1(s) &= |f(s)|^2, \quad \text{if } s \in \partial S, \\ \psi_2(s) &= 0, \quad \text{if } \operatorname{Im} s = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_2(s) = |f(s)|^2, \quad \text{if } \operatorname{Im} s = 1, \\ \psi_3(s) &= 0, \quad \text{if } \operatorname{Im} s = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_3(s) = \operatorname{Re} f(s)^2, \quad \text{if } \operatorname{Im} s = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since ψ_1, ψ_2, ψ_3 and ϕ are all bounded on \bar{S} , by the maximum principle we obtain

$$(3.5) \quad 0 = u(\alpha, 0) = \phi(\alpha) \leq r|\zeta|^2 \psi_1(\alpha) + p|\zeta|^2 \psi_2(\alpha) + |q||\zeta|^2 \psi_3(\alpha).$$

We will show that $\psi_2(\alpha)/\psi_1(\alpha)$ can be chosen arbitrarily close to $1/2$ and $\psi_3(\alpha)/\psi_1(\alpha)$ can be chosen arbitrarily close to $-1/2$. We can work with any $\alpha \in S$, but if $\alpha = \xi + i\eta = i/2$, Poisson's formula (3.2) simplifies and gives $\psi_1(i/2) = (I + J)/2$, $\psi_2(i/2) = J/2$ and $\psi_3(i/2) = K/2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I = I(f) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{|f(t)|^2}{\cosh \pi t} dt, \quad J = J(f) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{|f(t+i)|^2}{\cosh \pi t} dt, \\ K = K(f) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\operatorname{Re} f(t+i)^2}{\cosh \pi t} dt. \end{aligned}$$

We need to choose f so that $I \approx J \approx -K$. No matter what f , clearly $|K| \leq J$; to achieve $J \approx -K$, the integrands in J and K must be negatives of each other, at least approximately and for most $t \in \mathbb{R}$ that make the integrands large. This means that $f(t+i)$ must be close to imaginary. If also $|f(t)| \approx |f(t+i)|$, then $I \approx J$. Now $f(s) = e^{\pi s/2} - e^{\pi i/4}$ satisfies both conditions and vanishes at $i/2$, but it is unbounded. Instead, with a large $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ we let

$$f_\lambda(s) = \frac{e^{\pi s/2} - e^{\pi i/4}}{1 + e^{\pi(s-\lambda)/2}}.$$

We claim that $I(f_\lambda) \sim J(f_\lambda) \sim 2\lambda$ and $K(f_\lambda) \sim -2\lambda$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. This will be verified only for $J(f_\lambda)$, the other two are treated similarly. We have

$$J(f_\lambda) = \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 + \int_0^\lambda + \int_\lambda^{+\infty} \right) \frac{|ie^{\pi t/2} - e^{\pi i/4}|^2}{|1 + ie^{\pi(t-\lambda)/2}|^2 \cosh(\pi t)} dt.$$

Since in the first integral the numerator is bounded, and in the last it is $O(\cosh \pi t)$, both integrals have bounds independent of λ . After a change of variables $\tau = t/\lambda$ in the middle integral, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\lambda \frac{|ie^{\pi t/2} - e^{\pi i/4}|^2}{(1 + ie^{\pi(t-\lambda)/2})^2 \cosh(\pi t)} dt &= \lambda \int_0^1 \frac{|ie^{\pi \lambda \tau/2} - e^{\pi i/4}|^2}{|1 + ie^{\pi \lambda(\tau-1)/2}|^2 \cosh(\pi \lambda \tau)} d\tau \\ &= 2\lambda \int_0^1 \frac{|i - e^{\pi(i/4 - \lambda \tau/2)}|^2}{|1 + ie^{\pi \lambda(\tau-1)/2}|^2 (1 + e^{-2\pi \lambda \tau})} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

This last expression has bounded integrand, and the dominated convergence theorem implies $J(f_\lambda) \sim 2\lambda$, as claimed. Letting $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.5) (with $\alpha = i/2$) we obtain $0 \leq p - |q| + 2r$, and letting $p \rightarrow v_{z\bar{z}}, r \rightarrow \omega_{11}$, (3.4) follows.

To prove the sharpness of estimate (3.3), suppose that $V \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the unit disc and $\omega = i\partial\bar{\partial}|z|^2$. Let

$$u(s, z) = -\frac{2 \operatorname{Im} s}{\varepsilon + \operatorname{Im} s} (\operatorname{Re} z)^2$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Clearly u is bounded and continuous on $\bar{S} \times V$, $u(s, z) = 0$ for all $(s, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times V$, and $u(s, 0) = 0$ for all $s \in \bar{S}$. One verifies that u is ω -plurisubharmonic in $S \times V$ by checking that

$$\begin{vmatrix} u_{s\bar{s}} & u_{s\bar{z}} \\ u_{\bar{s}z} & 1 + u_{z\bar{z}} \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

and observing that $1 + u_{z\bar{z}} > 0$. This confirms that the Levi form of $|z|^2 + u$ is semi-positive everywhere. If $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ then $2 + v_{z\bar{z}}(0) = 2 + u_{z\bar{z}}(i, 0) \rightarrow 1$ and $|v_{zz}(0)| = |u_{zz}(i, 0)| \rightarrow 1$; hence the estimate (3.3) is indeed sharp.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Given a g -invariant $v \in \mathcal{H}$, suppose (1.1) has an ω -plurisubharmonic solution $u \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\bar{S} \times X)$. By Corollary 2.4, $u(s, x) = u(s, g(x))$; since $dv(x_0) = 0$ is automatic for g -invariant v , by Proposition 3.1 and by Lemma 3.2 u then satisfies (3.3). Conversely, if a g -invariant $v \in \mathcal{H}$ does not satisfy (3.3), then (1.1) will have no ω -plurisubharmonic solution $u \in C^{\partial\bar{\partial}}(\bar{S} \times X)$. Such v certainly exist (and form an open set among g -invariant potentials in \mathcal{H}), because the matrices $(v_{z_j \bar{z}_k}(x_0)) = (p_{jk})$ and $(v_{z_j z_k}(x_0)) = (q_{jk})$ can be arbitrarily prescribed for g -invariant $v \in \mathcal{H}$, as long as $(\omega_{jk}(x_0) + p_{jk})$ is positive definite, see [LV, Lemma 3.3].

REFERENCES

- [BB] E. Bedford, D. Burns, *Holomorphic mapping of annuli in \mathbb{C}^n and the associated extremal function*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (4) **6** (1979), 381–414.
- [BF] E. Bedford, J. Fornæss, *Counterexamples to regularity for the complex Monge–Ampère equation*, Invent. Math. **50** (1979), 129–134.
- [BT] E. Bedford, B.A. Taylor, *The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge–Ampère equation*, Invent. Math. **37** (1976), 1–44.
- [Bl] Z. Błocki, *On geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics*, dedicated to Shing–Tung Yau, Proc. Conf. in Geometry (to appear).

- [C] X.X. Chen, *The space of Kähler metrics*, J. Diff. Geom. **56** (2000), 189–234.
- [CT] X.X. Chen, G. Tian, *Geometry of Kähler metrics and foliations by holomorphic discs*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **107** (2008), 1–107.
- [D1] S.K. Donaldson, *Symmetric spaces, Kähler geometry and Hamiltonian dynamics*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 196; Amer. Math. Soc., Providence RI, 1999, pp. 13–33.
- [D2] S.K. Donaldson, *Holomorphic discs and the complex Monge–Ampère equation*, J. Sympl. Geom. **1** (2002), 171–196.
- [H] L. Hörmander, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.
- [LV] L. Lempert, L. Vivas, *Geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics*, arXiv:1105.2188.
- [M] T. Mabuchi, *Some symplectic geometry on compact Kähler manifolds I*, Osaka J. Math. **24** (1987), 227–252.
- [PS] D.H. Phong, J. Sturm, *The Monge–Ampère operator and geodesics in the space of Kähler potentials*, Invent. Math. **166** (2006), 125–149.
- [S] S. Semmes, *Complex Monge–Ampère and symplectic manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. **114** (1992), 495–550.
- [W] D.V. Widder, *Functions harmonic in a strip*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1961), 67–72.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907