

THREE CIRCLE THEOREM ON ALMOST HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS AND APPLICATIONS

CHENGJIE YU¹ AND CHUANGYUAN ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we extend Gang Liu's three circle theorem for Kähler manifolds to almost Hermitian manifolds. As applications of the three circle theorem, we obtain sharp dimension estimates for holomorphic functions of polynomial growth for almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature and rigidity for the estimate, and Liouville theorems for pluri-subharmonic functions on almost Hermitian manifolds. We also discuss the converse of the three circle theorem on Hermitian manifolds which turns out to be rather different with the Kähler case. In order to obtain the three circle theorem on almost Hermitian manifolds, we also establish a general maximum principle in the spirit of Calabi's trick so that a general three circle theorem is a straight forward corollary of the general maximum principle. The general maximum principle and three circle theorem established may be useful in other applications.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the recent breakthroughs in the study of the structures of nonnegatively curved complete noncompact Kähler manifolds is a series of works [15, 14, 13, 12] by Liu which finally solved Yau's finite generation conjecture and Yau's uniformization conjecture under the assumption of nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature and maximal volume growth. The later conjecture was also solved by Tam and his collaborators in a series of works [4, 10, 11] using Ricci flow following the pioneer work of Shi [21]. It is an interesting problem to extend the aforementioned results to complete noncompact Hermitian manifolds. There is a similar problem in the compact case. It was shown by Siu-Yau [22] and Mori [17] independently that compact Kähler manifolds with positive holomorphic bisectional curvature must be biholomorphic to the complex projective space. In fact, Mori's result is more general. He solved the Hartshorne conjecture in algebraic geometry which at least implies that a compact Hermitian manifold with positive curvature in the sense of Griffiths must

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C55; Secondary 32A10.

Key words and phrases. almost Hermitian manifold, holomorphic function, three circle theorem.

¹Research partially supported by GDNSF with contract no. 2021A1515010264 and NNSF of China with contract no. 11571215.

be also biholomorphic to the complex projective space. It is a folklore problem in geometric analysis to give an analytic proof of the aforementioned fact.

For analytic methods dealing with the Hermitian case, similar to Ricci flow, there are Chern-Ricci flow introduced by Gill [8] and Tosatti-Weinkove [23]. So, analogous to the Kähler case, there must be a similar approach to Liu's [15] for the Hermitian case. The starting point of Liu's approach is an elegant and clever generalization of Hadamard's three circle theorem to complete non-compact Kähler manifolds with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature in [15]. So, the first step to extend Liu's approach in the Hermitian case is to extend the three circle theorem to Hermitian manifolds. This is the motivation of our work. In fact, we are able to extend the three circle theorem to the more general almost Hermitian case.

Let's recall Liu's ([15]) three circle theorem first.

Theorem 1.1 (Liu [15]). *Let M be a complete Kähler manifold. Then M satisfies the three circle theorem if and only if the holomorphic sectional curvature is nonnegative. Here, a complete Kähler manifold is said to satisfy the three circle theorem if for any $p \in M$, $R > 0$ and holomorphic function f on $B_p(R)$, $\log M(f, r)$ is a convex function with respect to $\log r$ for $r \in (0, R)$ where $M(f, r) = \max_{x \in B_p(r)} |f(x)|$.*

The purpose of this paper is to extend Theorem 1.1 to Hermitian manifolds or almost Hermitian manifolds and give some applications.

Recall that an almost Hermitian manifold (M^{2n}, J, g) is a manifold M with real dimension $2n$ equipped with an almost complex structure J and a compatible Riemannian metric g :

$$g(JX, JY) = g(X, Y)$$

for any tangent vectors X and Y . When J is integrable, (M^{2n}, J, g) is called a Hermitian manifold. The Levi-Civita connection on (M, J, g) is denoted as ∇ . Note that ∇ is torsion free and compatible with g but may not be compatible with J . That is, $\nabla J \neq 0$ unless (M, J, g) is Kähler. The Chern connection on (M, J, g) is denoted as D . Note that D is the unique connection on M compatible with J and g with vanishing $(1, 1)$ part of the torsion. More precisely, let

$$(1.1) \quad \tau(X, Y) = D_X Y - D_Y X - [X, Y]$$

be the torsion of D . Then,

$$(1.2) \quad \tau(\xi, \bar{\eta}) = 0$$

for any $(1, 0)$ -vectors ξ and η . Or equivalently,

$$(1.3) \quad \tau(X, JY) = \tau(JX, Y)$$

for any tangent vectors X and Y . Note that all the operations on vector fields are all extended to complex vector fields by complex linear extension, and a complex-valued function f on M is said to be holomorphic if $\bar{\partial}f = (df)^{1,0} = 0$.

By examining Liu's work [15], we know that a key observation in Liu's argument is a comparison result for $\text{Hess}(r)(J\nabla r, J\nabla r)$ where Hess means the Hessian operator with respect to Levi-Civita connection ∇ and r is the distance function with respect to some fixed point. On almost Hermitian manifolds, such a comparison was essentially already known in Gray's work [9] using Levi-Civita connection and in the first named author's work [26] using Chern connection. Such a comparison was also obtained for Hermitian manifolds in the work [6] of Chen-Yang. More precisely, all of these works contains the following conclusion in an implicit form:

$$(1.4) \quad \text{Hess}(\log r)(\nabla r, \nabla r) + \text{Hess}(\log r)(J\nabla r, J\nabla r) \leq 0$$

within the cut-locus of the fixed point under the curvature assumption

$$(1.5) \quad R^L(X, JX, JX, X) - \|(\nabla_X J)X\|^2 \geq 0$$

for any tangent vector X where R^L is the curvature tensor for the Levi-Civita connection (see [9]), or equivalently

$$(1.6) \quad R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} - \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i1}^1 + \tau_{i1}^{\bar{1}}|^2 \geq 0$$

for any unitary $(1,0)$ -frame e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n where R is the curvature tensor for the Chern connection (see [6] for the Hermitian case and [26] for the almost Hermitian case). The equivalence of (1.5) and (1.6) can be seen by using the curvature identities derived by the first name author in [25] (See Lemma 2.3 for details). According to these results, we call the right hand side of (1.5) or (1.6) the holomorphic sectional curvature for the almost Hermitian manifold (See Definition 2.1). The three circle theorem we obtained for almost Hermitian manifolds is as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete noncompact almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature and $o \in M$. Then, for any $u \in C^2(B_o(R), \mathbb{R})$ with*

$$(1.7) \quad L[u] := \text{Hess}(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u) + \text{Hess}(u)(J\nabla u, J\nabla u) \geq 0$$

on $B_o(R)$, $M_o(u, r)$ is a convex function with respect to $\log r$ for $r \in (0, R)$. Here $M_o(u, r) = \max_{x \in S_o(r)} u(x)$ with $S_o(r) = \partial B_o(r)$, and for completeness of an almost Hermitian manifold, we mean metric completeness.

The basic idea of proving the result is similar to that in [15]. Following the work [2] of Calabi, we extract the arguments in [15] to formulate a general maximum principle which seems have not been mentioned before. Then, the

general three circle theorem becomes a straight forward consequence of the maximum principle. The general maximum principle we derived may be useful in other applications. We would like to mention that an analogue of Liu's three circle theorem in the case of CR manifolds was obtained in [3].

Note that a real-valued function u on an almost complex manifold (M, J) is said to be pluri-subharmonic if $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u$ is a nonnegative $(1, 1)$ -form. Here, for any $\omega \in A^{p,q}(M)$, $\partial\omega := (d\omega)^{p+1,q}$ and $\bar{\partial}\omega := (d\omega)^{p,q+1}$. Moreover, because $\log(|f_1|^2 + |f_2|^2 + \cdots + |f_k|^2 + \epsilon)$ is pluri-subharmonic for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any holomorphic functions f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k on M , we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1.1. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete noncompact almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature and $o \in M$. Then, for any pluri-subharmonic function $u \in C^2(B_o(R), \mathbb{R})$, $M_o(u, r)$ is a convex function with respect to $\log r$ for $r \in (0, R)$. In particular, for any holomorphic functions f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k on $B_o(R)$, $\log M_o(|f_1|^2 + |f_2|^2 + \cdots + |f_k|^2, r)$ is a convex function with respect to $\log r$ for $r \in (0, R)$.*

Similarly as in [15], we have the following Liouville theorem for functions satisfying (1.7) on almost Hermitian manifolds with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature. Such a Liouville theorem for pluri-subharmonic function on complete Kähler manifolds with nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature was first obtained by Ni-Tam [20].

Corollary 1.2. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete noncompact almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature, $o \in M$, and $u \in C^2(M, \mathbb{R})$ satisfying (1.7) and*

$$(1.8) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{M_o(u, r)}{\log r} \leq 0.$$

Then, u must be a constant function. In particular, any pluri-subharmonic function u satisfying (1.8) must be a constant function.

Similarly as in the Kähler case, we denote the ring of holomorphic functions on M as $\mathcal{O}(M)$. A function f on M is said to be of polynomial growth if there are $C, d > 0$ such that

$$(1.9) \quad |f(x)| \leq C(1 + r(x)^d), \quad \forall x \in M.$$

Denote the ring of holomorphic functions on M of polynomial growth as $\mathcal{P}(M)$. Denote $\mathcal{O}_d(M)$ the space of holomorphic functions such that (1.9) holds for some $C > 0$. For each $f \in \mathcal{P}(M)$, define

$$(1.10) \quad \deg f = \inf\{d > 0 \mid f \in \mathcal{O}_d(M)\}$$

which is called the degree of f . Then, similar to [15], we have the following consequence of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.3. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete noncompact almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature and $o \in M$. Then,*

$$(1) \ f \in \mathcal{P}(M) \text{ if and only if } \liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log M_o(|f|, r)}{\log r} < +\infty;$$

$$(2) \text{ for any } f \in \mathcal{P}(M),$$

$$\deg f = \liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log M_o(|f|, r)}{\log r} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log M_o(|f|, r)}{\log r};$$

$$(3) \text{ for any } f \in \mathcal{P}(M),$$

$$\log M_o(|f|, r) - \deg f \cdot \log r$$

is decreasing on r ;

$$(4) \text{ for any holomorphic function } f \not\equiv 0 \text{ on } B_o(R),$$

$$\log M_o(|f|, r) - \text{ord}_o(f) \cdot \log r$$

is increasing for $r \in (0, R)$;

$$(5) \text{ for any } f \in \mathcal{P}(M) \text{ with } f \not\equiv 0, \text{ord}_o(f) \leq \deg f.$$

Here $\text{ord}_o(f)$ means the vanishing order of f at o .

We would like to mention that the sharp vanishing order estimate

$$\text{ord}_o(f) \leq \deg f$$

on complete noncompact Kähler manifolds was first obtained by Ni [18] under the assumptions of nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature and maximal volume growth. Later, the assumption of maximal volume growth was removed by Chen-Fu-Yin-Zhu [5]. Liu [15] relaxed the curvature assumption to nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature. For vanishing order estimate which is not sharp, it was first obtained by Mok [16] under some more restrictive geometric assumptions.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.3, we have the following Liouville theorem of Cheng-type for holomorphic functions.

Corollary 1.3. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete noncompact almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature. Then, any holomorphic function of sublinear growth on M must be a constant function.*

Note that Cheng's Liouville theorem is for harmonic functions and under the curvature assumption of nonnegative Ricci curvature. Here, the curvature assumption in Corollary 1.3 is rather different.

Moreover, similar to [15], as a consequence of Theorem 1.3, we have the following sharp estimate for the dimension of $\mathcal{O}_d(M)$. This sharp estimate and its rigidity on complete noncompact Kähler manifolds was first obtained by Ni [18] under the assumptions of nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature and maximal volume growth. Later, Chen-Fu-Yin-Zhu [5] removed the assumption

of maximal volume growth. The curvature assumption was relaxed to nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature by Liu [15].

Theorem 1.4. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete noncompact almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature. Then, for any positive number d ,*

$$(1.11) \quad \dim \mathcal{O}_d(M) \leq \mathcal{O}_d(\mathbb{C}^n).$$

Moreover, the equality is true for some positive integer d if and only if M is biholomorphically isometric to \mathbb{C}^n .

The second part of this paper is to consider the converse of the three circle theorem for Hermitian manifolds. We don't consider this for almost Hermitian manifolds because when the almost complex structure is not integrable, the almost Hermitian manifold may support no local holomorphic functions. By following the local arguments in [15], we find that the situation for Hermitian manifolds is quite different with the Kähler case. We don't get necessary and sufficient conditions.

Definition 1.1. Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be an almost Hermitian manifold. If for any $o \in M$, $R > 0$, and any holomorphic function f on $B_o(R)$, $\log M_o(|f|, r)$ is a convex function with respect to $\log r$ for $r \in (0, R)$, we say that (M, J, g) satisfies the three circle theorem.

By following the idea in [15], we have following converse of the three circle theorem for Hermitian manifolds.

Theorem 1.5. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a Hermitian manifold satisfying the three circle theorem. Then*

$$R^L(X, JX, JX, X) + 3\|(\nabla_X J)X\|^2 \geq 0$$

for any real tangent vector X . Or equivalently

$$R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} + \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i1}^1|^2 \geq 0$$

for any unitary $(1, 0)$ -frame e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some preliminaries on almost Hermitian geometry. In Section 3, we give a general maximum principle and a general three circle theorem which set up the framework for latter applications. In Section 4, we obtain the main results for almost Hermitian manifolds by applying the framework set up in Section 3. Finally, in Section 5, we consider converse of three circle theorem on Hermitian manifolds.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON ALMOST HERMITIAN GEOMETRY

Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be an almost Hermitian manifold of real dimension $2n$. Denote its Chern connection as D and its Levi-Civita connection as ∇ . Let τ be the torsion of D . Then,

$$(2.1) \quad \tau(\xi, \bar{\eta}) = 0$$

for any $(1, 0)$ -vectors ξ and η . Or equivalently,

$$(2.2) \quad \tau(X, JY) = \tau(JX, Y)$$

for any tangent vectors X and Y . Denote the curvature tensor of D and ∇ as R and R^L respectively. More precisely,

$$(2.3) \quad R(X, Y, Z, W) = \langle D_Z D_W X - D_W D_Z X - D_{[Z, W]} X, Y \rangle$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad R^L(X, Y, Z, W) = \langle \nabla_Z \nabla_W X - \nabla_W \nabla_Z X - \nabla_{[Z, W]} X, Y \rangle.$$

The difference of ∇ and D is given by the following identity:

$$(2.5) \quad \langle \nabla_Y X, Z \rangle = \langle D_Y X, Z \rangle + \frac{1}{2} [\langle \tau(X, Y), Z \rangle + \langle \tau(Y, Z), X \rangle - \langle \tau(Z, X), Y \rangle]$$

for any tangent vector fields X, Y, Z (For a proof of this identity, see [7]).

Recall that the Nijenhuis tensor for an almost complex manifold is a vector value two-form defined as

$$(2.6) \quad N_J(X, Y) = [JX, JY] - J[JX, Y] - J[X, JY] - [X, Y]$$

for any tangent vectors X and Y . A direct computation gives us that $N_J = 0$ if and only if $\tau(\xi, \eta)^{0,1} = 0$ for any $(1, 0)$ -vectors ξ and η (See [25] for example).

For $\omega \in A^{p,q}(M)$, denote $\partial\omega = (d\omega)^{p+1,q}$ and $\bar{\partial}\omega = (d\omega)^{p,q+1}$. Note that when the complex structure is not integrable, we don't have $\partial\bar{\partial} = 0$, $\bar{\partial}\partial = 0$ or $\partial\bar{\partial} = -\bar{\partial}\partial$ in general.

For any smooth function f on M , we denote

$$(2.7) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f) = Ddf$$

the Hessian of f with respect to the connection D . Note that $\text{Hess}_D(f)$ may not be a symmetric tensor because D may have non-vanishing torsion. In fact, we have

$$(2.8) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f)(X, Y) - \text{Hess}_D(f)(Y, X) = \tau(X, Y)(f).$$

for any tangent vectors X, Y . Then, by (2.1) and (2.2),

$$(2.9) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f)(\xi, \bar{\eta}) = \text{Hess}_D(f)(\bar{\eta}, \xi)$$

for any $(1, 0)$ -vectors ξ and η , and

$$(2.10) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f)(X, JX) = \text{Hess}_D(f)(JX, X)$$

for any tangent vectors X . So, for any $\xi = X - \sqrt{-1}JX$ with X a real tangent vector,

$$(2.11) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f)(\xi, \bar{\xi}) = \text{Hess}_D(f)(X, X) + \text{Hess}_D(f)(JX, JX).$$

Moreover, by direct computations, we have the following identities between $\partial\bar{\partial}f$ and $\text{Hess}_D(f)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (M, J, g) be an almost Hermitian manifold. Then,*

$$(2.12) \quad \partial\bar{\partial}f(\xi, \bar{\eta}) = \text{Hess}_D(f)(\xi, \bar{\eta}) = -\bar{\partial}\partial f(\xi, \bar{\eta})$$

for any smooth function f and $(1, 0)$ -vectors ξ and η .

Proof. By definitions and (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\bar{\partial}f(\xi, \bar{\eta}) &= d\bar{\partial}f(\xi, \bar{\eta}) \\ &= \xi(\bar{\partial}f(\bar{\eta})) - \eta(\bar{\partial}f(\xi)) - \bar{\partial}f([\xi, \bar{\eta}]) \\ (2.13) \quad &= \xi\bar{\eta}(f) - [\xi, \bar{\eta}]^{0,1}(f) \\ &= \xi\bar{\eta}(f) - D_\xi\bar{\eta}(f) \\ &= \text{Hess}_D(f)(\xi, \bar{\eta}) \end{aligned}$$

The other identity can be shown similarly. \square

The same as on complex manifolds, a real-valued function f on an almost complex manifold is called a pluri-subharmonic function if $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}f$ is a non-negative form. By Lemma 2.1, this is equivalent to

$$(2.14) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f)(\xi, \bar{\xi}) \geq 0$$

on an almost Hermitian manifold, for any $(1, 0)$ -vector ξ . By (2.11), this is also equivalent to

$$(2.15) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f)(X, X) + \text{Hess}_D(f)(JX, JX) \geq 0$$

for any real tangent vector X . The same as in the case of complex manifolds, one has the following conclusion.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (M^{2n}, J) be an almost complex manifold with real dimension $2n$ and $\Omega \subset M$ be an open subset. Then, $\log(|f_1|^2 + |f_2|^2 + \cdots + |f_k|^2 + \epsilon)$ is pluri-subharmonic on Ω for any holomorphic functions f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k on Ω and $\epsilon > 0$.*

Proof. By using Lemma 2.1, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.16) \quad & \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log(|f_1|^2 + |f_2|^2 + \cdots + |f_k|^2 + \epsilon) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |f_i|^2 + \epsilon \right)^{-2} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^k |f_i|^2 + \epsilon \right) \sum_{j=1}^k \sqrt{-1}\partial f_j \wedge \bar{\partial} f_j - \sqrt{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{f}_i \partial f_i \right) \wedge \left(\sum_{j=1}^k f_j \bar{\partial} f_j \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we know that

$$(2.17) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |f_i|^2 \right) \sum_{j=1}^k \sqrt{-1} \partial f_j \wedge \bar{\partial} f_j - \sqrt{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{f}_i \partial f_i \right) \wedge \left(\sum_{j=1}^k f_j \bar{\partial} f_j \right) \geq 0.$$

Then, the conclusion of the lemma follows directly. \square

The Hessian operator with respect to the Levi-Civita connection is denoted as

$$(2.18) \quad \text{Hess}(f) = \nabla df.$$

By direct computation using (2.5),

$$(2.19) \quad \text{Hess}_D(f)(X, Y) = \text{Hess}(f)(X, Y) + \frac{1}{2} [\langle \tau(X, Y), \nabla f \rangle + \langle \tau(Y, \nabla f), X \rangle - \langle \tau(\nabla f, X), Y \rangle]$$

for any tangent vector fields X and Y . Let

$$(2.20) \quad L[f] := \text{Hess}_D(f)(\nabla f, \nabla f) + \text{Hess}_D(f)(J\nabla f, J\nabla f) = \text{Hess}_D(f)(\xi_f, \bar{\xi}_f)$$

where $\xi_f = \nabla f - \sqrt{-1}J\nabla f$. Then, by (2.19) and (2.2),

$$(2.21) \quad L[f] = \text{Hess}(f)(\nabla f, \nabla f) + \text{Hess}(f)(J\nabla f, J\nabla f) = \text{Hess}(f)(\xi_f, \bar{\xi}_f).$$

For each nonzero real tangent vector X , we denote the normalization of the $(1, 0)$ part of X as $\mathbf{U}(X)$. More precisely,

$$(2.22) \quad \mathbf{U}(X) := \frac{X - \sqrt{-1}JX}{\|X - \sqrt{-1}JX\|}.$$

Next, we give the definition of holomorphic sectional curvature for almost Hermitian manifolds. This notion was naturally arisen in the works of Gray [9], Chen-Yang [6] and the first named author [26].

Definition 2.1. Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be an almost Hermitian manifold. Let ξ be a unit $(1, 0)$ -vector. Define the holomorphic sectional curvature $H(\xi)$ along the direction ξ as

$$(2.23) \quad H(\xi) = R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} - \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1 + \tau_{i\bar{1}}^{\bar{1}}|^2$$

where we have fixed a unitary frame (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) with $e_1 = \xi$.

As mentioned in the introduction, such a notion was formulated in terms of Levi-Civita connections in Gray's work [9]. In fact, by using the curvature identity in [25], one can see that Gray's formulation is the same as Definition 2.1. More precisely, we have

Lemma 2.3. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be an almost Hermitian manifold and $\xi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X - \sqrt{-1}JX)$ with X a unit real tangent vector. Then,*

$$(2.24) \quad H(\xi) = R^L(X, JX, JX, X) - \|(\nabla_X J)(X)\|^2.$$

Proof. Note that for any tangent vector fields X and Y , by (2.5) and (2.2),

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (\nabla_X J)(X), Y \rangle \\ &= \langle (\nabla_X J)(X), Y \rangle - \langle (D_X J)(X), Y \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla_X(JX) - D_X(JX), Y \rangle - \langle J(\nabla_X X - D_X X), Y \rangle \\ (2.25) \quad &= \frac{1}{2}(\langle \tau(X, Y), JX \rangle - \langle \tau(Y, JX), X \rangle) + \langle \nabla_X X - D_X X, JY \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\langle \tau(X, Y), JX \rangle + \langle \tau(JX, Y), X \rangle) + \langle \tau(X, JY), X \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \tau(X, Y), JX \rangle + \frac{3}{2} \langle \tau(JX, Y), X \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let $e_1 = \xi, e_2, \dots, e_n$ be a local unitary frame. Then, $X = \frac{e_1 + \bar{e}_1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $JX = \frac{\sqrt{-1}(e_1 - \bar{e}_1)}{\sqrt{2}}$. By (2.25),

$$(2.26) \quad (\nabla_X J)X = -\sqrt{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\tau_{1\bar{i}}^{\bar{i}} + \tau_{1\bar{i}}^{\bar{i}} \right) e_i + \sqrt{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\tau_{1i}^1 + \tau_{1i}^{\bar{1}} \right) \bar{e}_i.$$

Hence

$$(2.27) \quad \|(\nabla_X J)X\|^2 = 2 \sum_{i=2}^n \left| \frac{1}{2}\tau_{1i}^1 + \tau_{1i}^{\bar{1}} \right|^2.$$

Combining this with Corollary 3.1 in [25], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & R^L(X, JX, JX, X) - \|(\nabla_X J)X\|^2 \\ &= R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}}^L - 2 \sum_{i=2}^n \left| \frac{1}{2}\tau_{1i}^1 + \tau_{1i}^{\bar{1}} \right|^2 \\ (2.28) \quad &= R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|\tau_{1i}^{\bar{1}}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|\tau_{1i}^1|^2 \right) - 2 \sum_{i=2}^n \left| \frac{1}{2}\tau_{1i}^1 + \tau_{1i}^{\bar{1}} \right|^2 \\ &= R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} - \sum_{i=2}^n \left| \tau_{1i}^1 + \tau_{1i}^{\bar{1}} \right|^2 \\ &= H(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

□

At the end of this section, we give a proof of (1.4) for completeness. Because the distance function may not be smooth and motivated by Calabi's trick [2], we say that a continuous function v satisfies $L[v] \leq 0$ in the sense of barrier

on an open subset Ω . If for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega$, there is a smooth function $v_{x,\epsilon}$ define on an open neighborhood $U_{x,\epsilon} \subset \Omega$ of x such that $v \leq v_{x,\epsilon}$ on $U_{x,\epsilon}$, $v(x) = v_{x,\epsilon}(x)$ and $L[v_{x,\epsilon}](x) \leq \epsilon$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature. Then, for any $o \in M$,*

$$(2.29) \quad L[\log r_o] \leq 0$$

in the sense of barrier, on $M \setminus \{o\}$. Here $r_o(x) = r(o, x)$.

Proof. For simplicity, we write r_o as r . Let e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n be a local unitary frame with $e_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\nabla r - \sqrt{-1}J\nabla r)$. Then,

$$(2.30) \quad r_1 = r_{\bar{1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ and } r_\alpha = r_{\bar{\alpha}} = 0 \text{ for } \alpha > 1.$$

Let $f = r_{i\bar{j}}r_{\bar{i}}r_j = r_{1\bar{1}}/2 = L[r]/4$. Here $r_{i\bar{j}} = \text{Hess}_D(f)(e_i, \bar{e}_j)$. Then, by equation (3.27) in the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [26],

$$(2.31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{df}{dr} \\ &= -4f^2 - \frac{1}{4}R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} - \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|r_{1\bar{i}}|^2 - 2\text{Re}\{r_{1\bar{i}}(\tau_{i\bar{1}}^{\bar{1}} + \tau_{i\bar{1}}^1)/\sqrt{2}\} + \frac{1}{4}|\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1 + \tau_{i\bar{1}}^{\bar{1}}|^2 \right) \\ &= -4f^2 - \frac{1}{4}(R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} - \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1 + \tau_{i\bar{1}}^{\bar{1}}|^2) - \sum_{i=2}^n \left| r_{1\bar{i}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1 + \tau_{i\bar{1}}^{\bar{1}}) \right|^2 \\ &\leq -4f^2 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, note that $f(r) \sim \frac{1}{4r}$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$. So, by comparison of Riccati equation (See [19]),

$$(2.32) \quad f(r) \leq \frac{1}{4r}$$

and hence

$$(2.33) \quad L[r] \leq \frac{1}{r}$$

within the cut-locus of o . Then, by direct computation,

$$(2.34) \quad L[\log r](x) = \frac{L[r]}{r^3} - \frac{1}{r^4} \leq 0$$

for any x is not a cut point of o .

When x is on the cut-locus of o , let R_o be the injectivity radius of o and $\gamma : [0, l] \rightarrow M$ be a normal minimal geodesic with $\gamma(0) = o$ and $\gamma(l) = x$. For

$\epsilon \in (0, R_o/2)$ small enough, let $p = \gamma(\epsilon)$. Then, x is not a cut point of p . By the triangle inequality, we have

$$(2.35) \quad r \leq r_p + \epsilon \text{ and } r(x) = r_p(x) + \epsilon.$$

Moreover, by (2.33), we know that

$$(2.36) \quad \begin{aligned} & L[\log(r_p + \epsilon)](x) \\ &= \frac{L[r_p](x)}{(r_p(x) + \epsilon)^3} - \frac{1}{(r_p(x) + \epsilon)^4} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{r_p(x)(r_p(x) + \epsilon)^3} - \frac{1}{(r_p(x) + \epsilon)^4} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{r_p(x)(r_p(x) + \epsilon)^4} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2}{R_o}\right)^5 \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

by noting that $r_p(x) \geq R_o/2$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

3. MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE AND THREE CIRCLE THEOREM

In this section, motivated by Calabi's work [2], we obtain a general maximum principle and three circle theorem which set up the framework for further applications.

Theorem 3.1. *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m be $(1, 1)$ -tensors on M , and Q be a $(0, 3)$ tensor on M . For any smooth function f on M , define*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{L}[f] = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Hess}(f)(T_i \nabla f, T_i \nabla f) + Q(\nabla f, \nabla f, \nabla f).$$

Let Ω be a precompact open subset in M , and u and v be two continuous function on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega$, there are two smooth functions $u_{x,\epsilon}$ and $v_{x,\epsilon}$ defined on some neighborhood $U_{x,\epsilon}$ of x , and a positive constant c_x independent of ϵ , satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $u \geq u_{x,\epsilon}$ on $U_{x,\epsilon}$ and $u(x) = u_{x,\epsilon}(x)$;
- (2) $\mathcal{L}[u_{x,\epsilon}](x) \geq -\epsilon$;
- (3) $v \leq v_{x,\epsilon}$ on $U_{x,\epsilon}$ and $v(x) = v_{x,\epsilon}(x)$;
- (4) $\mathcal{L}[v_{x,\epsilon}](x) \leq \epsilon$;
- (5) $\sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla u_{x,\epsilon}, \nabla u_{x,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla v_{x,\epsilon}, \nabla v_{x,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x) \geq c_x$;
- (6) $u|_{\partial\Omega} \leq v|_{\partial\Omega}$.

Then, $u \leq v$ in Ω .

Proof. We will proceed by contradiction. Suppose $u > v$ for some point in Ω . For each $\delta > 0$ small enough, let $u_\delta = a_\delta \ln(e^u + \delta) - b_\delta$ where $a_\delta = \frac{1}{1+\delta}$ and

$$b_\delta = \frac{\ln(e^{-\delta \min_{\partial\Omega} u} + \delta e^{-(1+\delta) \min_{\partial\Omega} u})}{1 + \delta}.$$

Then, $u_\delta|_{\partial\Omega} \leq u|_{\partial\Omega}$. Similarly, let $v_\delta = A_\delta \ln(e^v - \delta) + B_\delta$ where $A_\delta = \frac{1}{1-\delta}$ and

$$B_\delta = \frac{\ln(e^{\delta \min_{\partial\Omega} v} - \delta e^{-(1-\delta) \min_{\partial\Omega} v})}{1 - \delta}.$$

Then, $v_\delta|_{\partial\Omega} \geq v|_{\partial\Omega}$. Note that $u_\delta \rightarrow u$ and $v_\delta \rightarrow v$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$. So, we can fix $\delta > 0$ small enough, such that $\max_{\overline{\Omega}}(u_\delta - v_\delta) > 0$. Let $x_\delta \in \Omega$ be a maximum point of $u_\delta - v_\delta$. For each $\epsilon > 0$, let

$$(3.2) \quad u_{\delta,\epsilon} = a_\delta \ln(e^{u_{x_\delta,\epsilon}} + \delta) - b_\delta$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad v_{\delta,\epsilon} = A_\delta \ln(e^{v_{x_\delta,\epsilon}} - \delta) + B_\delta.$$

Then, it is clear that x_δ is a maximum point of $u_{\delta,\epsilon} - v_{\delta,\epsilon}$ in the neighborhood $U_{x_\delta,\epsilon}$ of x_δ by the assumptions (1) and (3). So,

$$(3.4) \quad \nabla u_{\delta,\epsilon}(x_\delta) = \nabla v_{\delta,\epsilon}(x_\delta)$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad \text{Hess}(u_{\delta,\epsilon})(x_\delta) \leq \text{Hess}(v_{\delta,\epsilon})(x_\delta).$$

So,

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{L}[u_{\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta) \leq \mathcal{L}[v_{\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta).$$

Moreover, by direct computation and the assumptions (2) and (4),

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[u_{\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta) &= \left(\frac{a_\delta e^{u(x_\delta)}}{e^{u(x_\delta)} + \delta} \right)^3 \left(\mathcal{L}[u_{x_\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta) + \frac{\delta}{e^{u(x_\delta)} + \delta} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla u_{x_\delta,\epsilon}, \nabla u_{x_\delta,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x_\delta) \right) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{a_\delta e^{u(x_\delta)}}{e^{u(x_\delta)} + \delta} \right)^3 \left(-\epsilon + \frac{\delta}{e^{u(x_\delta)} + \delta} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla u_{x_\delta,\epsilon}, \nabla u_{x_\delta,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x_\delta) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[v_{\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta) &= \left(\frac{A_\delta e^{v(x_\delta)}}{e^{v(x_\delta)} - \delta} \right)^3 \left(\mathcal{L}[v_{x_\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta) - \frac{\delta}{e^{v(x_\delta)} - \delta} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla v_{x_\delta,\epsilon}, \nabla v_{x_\delta,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x_\delta) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{A_\delta e^{v(x_\delta)}}{e^{v(x_\delta)} - \delta} \right)^3 \left(\epsilon - \frac{\delta}{e^{v(x_\delta)} - \delta} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla v_{x_\delta,\epsilon}, \nabla v_{x_\delta,\epsilon} \rangle^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.9) \quad & \mathcal{L}[u_{\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta) - \mathcal{L}[v_{\delta,\epsilon}](x_\delta) \\
& \geq - \left[\left(\frac{a_\delta e^{u_\delta(x_\delta)}}{e^{u_\delta(x_\delta)} + \delta} \right)^3 + \left(\frac{A_\delta e^{v_\delta(x_\delta)}}{e^{v_\delta(x_\delta)} - \delta} \right)^3 \right] \epsilon + \min \left\{ \frac{\delta a_\delta^3 e^{3u(x_\delta)}}{(e^{u(x_\delta)} + \delta)^4}, \frac{\delta A_\delta^3 e^{3v(x_\delta)}}{(e^{v(x_\delta)} - \delta)^4} \right\} \\
& \quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla u_{x_\delta,\epsilon}, \nabla u_{x_\delta,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x_\delta) + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla v_{x_\delta,\epsilon}, \nabla v_{x_\delta,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x_\delta) \right) \\
& \geq - \left[\left(\frac{a_\delta e^{u(x_\delta)}}{e^{u(x_\delta)} + \delta} \right)^3 + \left(\frac{A_\delta e^{v(x_\delta)}}{e^{v(x_\delta)} - \delta} \right)^3 \right] \epsilon + \min \left\{ \frac{\delta a_\delta^3 e^{3u(x_\delta)}}{(e^{u(x_\delta)} + \delta)^4}, \frac{\delta A_\delta^3 e^{3v(x_\delta)}}{(e^{v(x_\delta)} - \delta)^4} \right\} c_{x_\delta} \\
& > 0
\end{aligned}$$

when $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough. This contradicts (3.6) and completes the proof of the theorem. \square

By the maximum principle above, we have the following generalized three circle theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m be $(1, 1)$ -tensors on M , and Q be a $(0, 3)$ tensor on M . For any smooth function f on M , define*

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{L}[f] = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Hess}(f)(T_i \nabla f, T_i \nabla f) + Q(\nabla f, \nabla f, \nabla f).$$

Let Ω be an open subset in M , and u and v be two continuous function on Ω such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega$, there are two smooth functions $u_{x,\epsilon}$ and $v_{x,\epsilon}$ defined on some neighborhood $U_{x,\epsilon}$ of x , and a positive constant c_x independent of ϵ , satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $u \geq u_{x,\epsilon}$ on $U_{x,\epsilon}$ and $u(x) = u_{x,\epsilon}(x)$;
- (2) $\mathcal{L}[u_{x,\epsilon}](x) \geq -\epsilon$;
- (3) $v \leq v_{x,\epsilon}$ on $U_{x,\epsilon}$ and $v(x) = v_{x,\epsilon}(x)$;
- (4) $\mathcal{L}[v_{x,\epsilon}](x) \leq \epsilon$;
- (5) $\sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla u_{x,\epsilon}, \nabla u_{x,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle T_i \nabla v_{x,\epsilon}, \nabla v_{x,\epsilon} \rangle^2(x) \geq c_x$;
- (6) $v : \Omega \rightarrow (\inf_\Omega v, \sup_\Omega v)$ is proper;
- (7) $M_v(u, t) := \max_{x \in S_v(t)} u(x)$ is increasing on $t \in (\inf_\Omega v, \sup_\Omega v)$ where $S_v(t) = \{x \in \Omega \mid v(x) = t\}$.

Then, $M_v(u, t)$ is a convex function of t in $(\inf_\Omega v, \sup_\Omega v)$.

Proof. For any $\inf_\Omega v < t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < \sup_\Omega v$. If $M_v(u, t_3) = M_v(u, t_1)$, by that $M_v(u, t)$ is increasing on t , we know that $M_v(u, t)$ is a constant when $t \in [t_1, t_3]$.

So,

$$(3.11) \quad M_v(u, t_2) = \frac{t_3 - t_2}{t_3 - t_2} M_v(u, t_1) + \frac{t_2 - t_1}{t_3 - t_1} M_v(u, t_3).$$

When $M_v(u, t_3) > M_v(u, t_1)$. Let

$$(3.12) \quad \tilde{v} = \frac{M_v(u, t_3) - M_v(u, t_1)}{t_3 - t_1} v + \frac{M_v(u, t_1)t_3 - M_v(u, t_3)t_1}{t_3 - t_1}.$$

Then $\tilde{v} \geq u$ on $S_v(t_1) \cup S_v(t_3)$. So, by Theorem 3.1,

$$(3.13) \quad \tilde{v} \geq u$$

in $A_v(t_1, t_3) := \{x \in \Omega \mid t_1 < v(x) < t_3\}$. Then, for any $x \in S_v(t_2)$,

$$(3.14) \quad u(x) \leq \frac{M_v(u, t_3) - M_v(u, t_1)}{t_3 - t_1} t_2 + \frac{M_v(u, t_1)t_3 - M_v(u, t_3)t_1}{t_3 - t_1}.$$

and hence

$$(3.15) \quad M_v(u, t_2) \leq \frac{t_3 - t_2}{t_3 - t_1} M_v(u, t_1) + \frac{t_2 - t_1}{t_3 - t_1} M_v(u, t_3).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

4. THREE CIRCLE THEOREMS ON ALMOST HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS AND APPLICATIONS

In this section, we prove the main results for almost Hermitian manifolds by applying the framework that set up in the last section. We first come to prove Theorem 1.2. Before proving the theorem, we need the following maximum principle for functions satisfying (1.7).

Lemma 4.1. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a complete noncompact almost Hermitian manifold with nonnegative holomorphic sectional curvature. Let Ω be a precompact open subset in M and $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $L[u] \geq 0$. Then, $u \leq \max_{\partial\Omega} u$.*

Proof. Let $o \in M$ be such that $r(o, \overline{\Omega}) > 2$. Then, for any given $\delta > 0$, by Lemma 2.4, we know that u and $v = \max_{\partial\Omega} u + \delta \log r_o$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 with $\mathcal{L} = L$ on Ω . So

$$(4.1) \quad u \leq \max_{\partial\Omega} u + \delta \log r_o$$

for any $\delta > 0$. Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ we get the conclusion. \square

Now, Theorem 1.2 is a straight forward corollary of Theorem 3.2 and the last lemma.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Lemma 4.1, $M_o(u, r)$ is increasing. By Lemma 2.4, we know that u and $v = \log r_o$ satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 3.2 on $\Omega = B_o(R) \setminus \{o\}$ for $\mathcal{L} = L$. So $M_o(u, r)$ is a convex function with respect to $\log r$ for $r \in (0, R)$ by Theorem 3.2. \square

We next come to prove Corollary 1.1.

Proof of Corollary 1.1. By Lemma 2.1, (2.20) and (2.21), we know that a pluri-subharmonic function $u \in C^2(B_o(R))$ will satisfy (1.7) automatically on $B_o(R)$. So, by Theorem 1.2, $M_o(u, r)$ is a convex function of $\log r$ for $r \in (0, R)$. By Lemma 2.2, we get the second conclusion. \square

By Theorem 1.2, we can prove the Liouville-type result in Corollary 1.2

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Note that for any $p \in M$, by Lemma 4.1,

$$(4.2) \quad M_p(u, r) \leq M_o(u, r + r(o, p)).$$

So,

$$(4.3) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{M_p(u, r)}{\log r} \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{M_o(u, r + r(o, p))}{\log r} \leq 0.$$

Moreover, by that $M_p(u, r)$ is convex with respect to $\log r$, for any $0 < r_1 < r_2 < r_3$,

$$(4.4) \quad M_p(u, r_2) \leq \frac{\log r_3 - \log r_2}{\log r_3 - \log r_1} M_p(u, r_1) + \frac{\log r_2 - \log r_1}{\log r_3 - \log r_1} M_p(u, r_3)$$

Taking $\liminf_{r_3 \rightarrow +\infty}$ in the last inequality, we get

$$(4.5) \quad M_p(u, r_2) \leq M_p(u, r_1).$$

Then, by Lemma 4.1,

$$M_p(u, r_1) = M_p(u, r_2)$$

for any $0 < r_1 < r_2$. Letting $r_1 \rightarrow 0^+$ in the last equation, we get

$$(4.6) \quad u(p) = M_p(u, r_2)$$

for any $r_2 > 0$. So $u(p) = \max_M u$. Note that p is arbitrary. So u is a constant function. \square

We next come to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. (1) It is clear by (1.9) that if $f \in \mathcal{P}(M)$, then

$$(4.7) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log M_o(|f|, r)}{\log r} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log M_o(|f|, r)}{\log r} < +\infty.$$

Conversely, suppose that $\liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log M_o(|f|, r)}{\log r} = \lambda$. Then, by Corollary 1.1, $\log M_o(|f|, r) - \lambda \log r$ is a convex function of $\log r$ and hence

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \log M_o(|f|, r_2) - \lambda \log r_2 \\ & \leq \frac{\log r_2 - \log r_1}{\log r_3 - \log r_1} (\log M_o(|f|, r_3) - \lambda \log r_3) + \frac{\log r_3 - \log r_2}{\log r_3 - \log r_1} (\log M_o(|f|, r_1) - \lambda \log r_1) \end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < r_1 < r_2 < r_3$. Taking $\liminf_{r_3 \rightarrow +\infty}$ in the last inequality, we know that $\log M(|f|, r) - \lambda \log r$ is decreasing. So,

$$(4.9) \quad \log M(|f|, r) \leq \log M(|f|, 1) + \lambda \log r$$

for any $r > 1$. Thus $f \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda(M) \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$.

(2) and (3) is clear from the proof of (1).

(4) By taking $\lambda = \text{ord}_o(f)$ in (4.8), letting $r_1 \rightarrow 0^+$, and noting that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log M(|f|, r)}{\log r} = \text{ord}_o(f),$$

one gets the conclusion.

(5) is a direct corollary of (3) and (4). \square

Remark 1. For a holomorphic function f on a domain Ω , by Lemma 2.1, we know that $\Delta_D f = 0$ where $\Delta_D = \text{tr}_g \text{Hess}_D$ is the Laplacian operator with respect to D . Then, by the unique continuation theorem of Aronszajn [1], if $f \not\equiv 0$, then $\text{ord}_p(f)$ is finite for any $p \in \Omega$.

By the argument in proving (4) of Theorem 1.3, we can proof Corollary 1.3, a Liouville theorem of Cheng-type for holomorphic functions.

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Let f be a nonconstant holomorphic function on M such that

$$(4.10) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{M_o(|f|, r)}{r} = 0.$$

Let $h = f - f(o)$ and $k = \text{ord}_o(h) \geq 1$. By (4) of Theorem 1.3, $\frac{M_o(|h|, r)}{r^k}$ is an increasing function. So,

$$(4.11) \quad \frac{|f(o)| + M_o(|f|, r_2)}{r_2^k} \geq \frac{M_o(|h|, r_2)}{r_2^k} \geq \frac{M_o(|h|, r_1)}{r_1^k}$$

for all $r_2 > r_1 > 0$. Letting $r_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ in the last inequality and by (4.10), we have $M_o(|h|, r_1) = 0$ for any $r_1 > 0$. Therefore $h \equiv 0$ and $f \equiv f(o)$ is a constant. This is a contradiction. \square

At the end of this section, we come to prove Theorem 1.4. Before proving Theorem 1.4, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be an almost Hermitian manifold of real dimension $2n$ and $o \in M$. Let (U, z) a local complex coordinate at o such that $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}|_o \in T_o^{1,0}M$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and f be a holomorphic function on U such that*

$$\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} f}{\partial z^\alpha}(o) = 0$$

for any multi-index α with $|\alpha| \leq m$. Then, $\text{ord}_o(f) \geq m + 1$.

Proof. Suppose that

$$J \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} = J_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} + J_i^{\bar{j}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{\bar{j}}}$$

and

$$J \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{\bar{i}}} = J_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} + J_i^{\bar{j}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{\bar{j}}}.$$

It is clear that $\overline{J_i^j} = J_i^{\bar{j}}$ and $\overline{J_i^{\bar{j}}} = J_i^j$ and moreover $J_i^j(o) = \sqrt{-1}\delta_i^j$ and $J_i^{\bar{j}}(o) = 0$ since $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}|_o$ is a $(1, 0)$ -vector. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.12) \quad \bar{\partial}f &= (df)^{(0,1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(df + \sqrt{-1}Jdf) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z^i} dz^i + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^{\bar{i}}} dz^{\bar{i}} + \sqrt{-1} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z^j} J dz^j + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^{\bar{j}}} J dz^{\bar{j}} \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z^i} + \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^j} J_i^j + \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^{\bar{j}}} J_i^{\bar{j}} \right) dz^i + \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z^{\bar{i}}} + \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^j} J_i^j + \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^{\bar{j}}} J_i^{\bar{j}} \right) dz^{\bar{i}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$(4.13) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^{\bar{i}}} + \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^j} J_i^j + \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^{\bar{j}}} J_i^{\bar{j}} = 0.$$

This implies that, in a neighborhood of o ,

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} = A(z) \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}$$

where $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} = (\frac{\partial f}{\partial z^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^n})^T$ and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} = (\frac{\partial f}{\partial z^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^n})^T$. Here A is the product of the inverse matrix of $(\delta_i^j + \sqrt{-1}J_i^{\bar{j}})_{i,j=1,2,\dots,n}$ and $-(\sqrt{-1}J_i^j)_{i,j=1,2,\dots,n}$.

We next come to prove that

$$(4.15) \quad \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|+|\beta|} f}{\partial z^\alpha \partial \bar{z}^\beta}(o) = 0$$

for any multi-index α and β with $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$ by induction on $|\beta|$. The claim is clearly true when $|\beta| = 0$ by assumption. Suppose the claim is true for

$|\beta| \leq k < m$. When $|\beta| = k + 1$, let γ be a multi-index with $|\gamma| = k$ such that $\beta_i = \gamma_i + 1$ for some fixed i . Then, by (4.14),

$$(4.16) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^i} = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij}(z) \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^j}.$$

So,

$$(4.17) \quad \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|+|\beta|} f}{\partial z^\alpha \partial \bar{z}^\beta}(o) = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|+|\gamma|}}{\partial z^\alpha \partial \bar{z}^\gamma} \left(A_{ij}(z) \frac{\partial f}{\partial z^j} \right) (o) = 0$$

by the induction hypothesis.

By (4.15), we know that the partial derivatives of f vanishes up to order m . Thus $\text{ord}_o(f) \geq m + 1$. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let (z^1, z^2, \dots, z^n) be a local complex coordinate at o such that $z^i(o) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}|_o$ is a $(1, 0)$ -vector for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Let $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_d(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{[d]}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ be such that

$$\Phi(f) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq [d]} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} f}{\partial z^\alpha}(o) z^\alpha.$$

If Φ not injective, then there is a nonzero $f \in \mathcal{O}_d(M)$ such that $\Phi(f) = 0$. By Lemma 4.2,

$$\text{ord}_o(f) \geq [d] + 1 > d \geq \deg f.$$

This contradicts the sharp vanishing order estimate in (5) of Theorem 1.3. So, we have proved the dimension estimate:

$$(4.18) \quad \dim \mathcal{O}_d(M) \leq \dim \mathcal{O}_d(\mathbb{C}^n).$$

When the equality holds for some positive integer d , the map Φ defined above is an isomorphism. So, there are $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n \in \mathcal{O}_d(M)$ such that $\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial z^i}(o) = \delta_{ij}$. Then f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n form a local holomorphic coordinate at o . Because the point o can be arbitrarily chosen, the complex structure J is integrable. Thus $\tau_{ij}^k = 0$ for any $i, j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

For each $\xi \in T_o^{1,0}M$ with $\|\xi\| = 1$, let (z^1, z^2, \dots, z^n) be a holomorphic coordinate at o with $z(o) = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}|_o = \xi$ and $g_{i\bar{j}}(o) = \delta_{ij}$. By that Φ is an isomorphism, there is a holomorphic function $f \in \mathcal{O}_d(M)$ such that

$$(4.19) \quad f(z) = (z^1)^d + O(r(z)^{d+1})$$

Because $\text{ord}_o(f) = d \geq \deg f$, by Theorem 1.3, $\text{ord}_o(f) = \deg f = d$ and

$$(4.20) \quad M_o(|f|, r) = d \log r + c$$

for some constant c . For each $\epsilon > 0$, let $z_\epsilon \in S_o(\epsilon)$ with z_ϵ attaining the maximum modulus of f on $S_o(\epsilon)$. Let

$$F(x) = \log |f|(x) - d \log r(x) - c$$

where $r(x) = r_o(x)$. Then, $F \leq 0$ and $F(z_\epsilon) = 0$. Noting that $f(z_\epsilon) \neq 0$ and $L[\log |f|](z_\epsilon) = 0$ since f is holomorphic. We have

$$(4.21) \quad \nabla \log |f|(z_\epsilon) = d \nabla \log r(z_\epsilon)$$

and

$$(4.22) \quad L[\log r](z_\epsilon) \geq 0$$

because z_ϵ is a maximal point for F . Thus, by Lemma 2.4,

$$(4.23) \quad L[\log r](z_\epsilon) = 0$$

and hence by (2.31) in the proof of Lemma 2.4 and (2.19),

$$(4.24) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tau_{i\bar{1}}^{\bar{1}}(z_\epsilon) = r_{1\bar{i}}(z_\epsilon) = \text{Hess}(r)(z_\epsilon)(e_1^\epsilon, \bar{e}_i^\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \tau_{i\bar{1}}^{\bar{1}}(z_\epsilon)$$

for $i = 2, \dots, n$. Here, at z_ϵ , the unitary frame $e_1^\epsilon, e_2^\epsilon, \dots, e_n^\epsilon$ is chosen to be such that

$$e_1^\epsilon = \mathbf{U}(\nabla r)(z_\epsilon) = \mathbf{U}(\nabla |f|^2)(z_\epsilon).$$

Note that $\mathbf{U}(\nabla |f|^2)(z_\epsilon)$ sub-converges to $\lambda \xi$ with $|\lambda| = 1$ by (4.19). Then, by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ in (4.24), since

$$(4.25) \quad \text{Hess}(r)(z_\epsilon)(e_1^\epsilon, \bar{e}_i^\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ for $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$ (See [24, Lemma 2.2]), we know that

$$(4.26) \quad \tau_{i\bar{1}}^1(o) = 0$$

for $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$, where the unitary frame at o is a sub-convergent limit of $(e_1^\epsilon, e_2^\epsilon, \dots, e_n^\epsilon)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Then $\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1(o) = 0$ for any $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$. This implies that

$$(4.27) \quad \langle \tau(\eta, \xi), \bar{\xi} \rangle = 0$$

for any $\eta \in T_o^{1,0}M$ with $\eta \perp \xi$. Because ξ is arbitrary chosen and τ is skew symmetric, we know that

$$(4.28) \quad \langle \tau(\eta, \xi), \bar{\xi} \rangle = 0$$

for any $\eta, \xi \in T_o^{1,0}M$. Then

$$(4.29) \quad \langle \tau(\eta, \xi + \zeta), \overline{\xi + \zeta} \rangle = 0$$

and

$$(4.30) \quad \langle \tau(\eta, \xi + \sqrt{-1}\zeta), \overline{\xi + \sqrt{-1}\zeta} \rangle = 0$$

for any $\eta, \xi, \zeta \in T_o^{1,0}M$ which implies that

$$\langle \tau(\eta, \xi), \bar{\zeta} \rangle = 0$$

for any $\eta, \xi, \zeta \in T_o^{1,0}M$. Thus $\tau_{ij}^k(o) = 0$ for any $i, j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Because o is arbitrary chosen, we know that $\tau_{ij}^k = 0$ all over M . Hence τ vanishes and (M, J, g) is Kähler. Finally, by the rigidity part of [15, Theorem 4], we know that (M, J, g) must be biholomorphically isometric to \mathbb{C}^n . \square

5. CONVERSE OF THREE CIRCLE THEOREMS ON HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS

In this section, we will discuss the converse of the three circle theorem on Hermitian manifolds and prove Theorem 1.5.

For completeness, we first compute the equation for geodesics in a local holomorphic coordinate. Here, for geodesics we always mean geodesics with respect to the Levi-Civita connection.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a Hermitian manifold and $o \in M$. Let γ be a geodesic starting at o and $z = (z^1, z^2, \dots, z^n)$ be a local holomorphic coordinate at o . Suppose that $z(\gamma(t)) = (z^1(t), z^2(t), \dots, z^n(t))$. Then,*

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{d^2 z^i}{dt^2} + \Gamma_{jk}^i \frac{dz^j}{dt} \frac{dz^k}{dt} + g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}} \frac{dz^{\bar{j}}}{dt} \frac{dz^{\bar{l}}}{dt} = 0$$

where Γ_{ij}^k is the Christoffel symbol for the Chern connection D .

Proof. Let $X = \nabla_{\gamma'} \gamma' - D_{\gamma'} \gamma' = -D_{\gamma'} \gamma' = X^i \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} + X^{\bar{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^i}$. Then, by (2.5),

$$(5.2) \quad \left\langle X, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} \right\rangle = \left\langle \tau \left(\gamma', \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} \right), \gamma' \right\rangle.$$

Thus, by noting that $\tau_{ij}^{\bar{k}} = 0$ because of the integrability of complex structure. We have

$$(5.3) \quad X^i g_{i\bar{j}} = \tau_{ij}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}} \frac{dz^{\bar{j}}}{dt} \frac{dz^{\bar{l}}}{dt}.$$

Therefore,

$$(5.4) \quad X^i = g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}} \frac{dz^{\bar{j}}}{dt} \frac{dz^{\bar{l}}}{dt}.$$

Moreover, note that

$$(5.5) \quad D_{\gamma'} \gamma' = \left(\frac{d^2 z^i}{dt^2} + \Gamma_{jk}^i \frac{dz^j}{dt} \frac{dz^k}{dt} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} + \left(\frac{d^2 z^{\bar{i}}}{dt^2} + \overline{\Gamma_{jk}^i} \frac{dz^{\bar{j}}}{dt} \frac{dz^{\bar{k}}}{dt} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^i}.$$

So, the equation for geodesics in local holomorphic coordinates is (5.1). \square

We next need the following lemma for the existence of good local holomorphic coordinates for Hermitian manifolds.

Lemma 5.2. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a Hermitian manifold. Then, for any $o \in M$ and e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n of $T_o^{1,0}M$, there is a local holomorphic coordinate (z^1, z^2, \dots, z^n) at o such that $z(o) = 0$, $e_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}|_o$,*

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^k(o) = \Gamma_{ij}^k(o) + \frac{1}{2}\tau_{ij}^k(o) = \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_{ij}^k + \Gamma_{ji}^k)(o) = 0$$

and

$$\partial_i \tilde{\Gamma}_{jk}^l(o) X^i X^j X^k = \partial_i \Gamma_{jk}^l(o) X^i X^j X^k = 0$$

for any $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$. We call this coordinate a normal local holomorphic coordinate at o for the basis (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) of $T_o^{1,0}M$ on the Hermitian manifold.

Proof. Let \tilde{D} be the connection defined by $\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^k$. Then \tilde{D} is a torsion free connection compatible with the complex structure. So, by standard argument, we know the existence of the local holomorphic coordinate w at o such that $w(o) = 0$, $e_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial w^i}|_o$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_{w^i w^j}^{w^k}(o) = 0$. Let z be another holomorphic coordinate at o to be determined such that $z(o) = 0$, $\frac{\partial w^i}{\partial z^j}(o) = \delta_j^i$ and $\frac{\partial^2 w^k}{\partial z^i \partial z^j}(o) = 0$. Then, it is clear that $e_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}|_o$ and by the transformation of Christofel symbol

$$(5.6) \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_{z^i z^j}^{z^k} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^\lambda w^\mu}^{w^\nu} \frac{\partial w^\lambda}{\partial z^i} \frac{\partial w^\mu}{\partial z^j} \frac{\partial z^k}{\partial w^\nu} + \frac{\partial^2 w^\nu}{\partial z^i \partial z^j} \frac{\partial z^k}{\partial w^\nu}$$

we know that $\tilde{\Gamma}_{z^i z^j}^{z^k}(o) = 0$. Moreover, note that

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{z^i} \tilde{\Gamma}_{z^j z^k}^{z^l}(o) &= \partial_{z^i} \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^\lambda w^\mu}^{w^\nu} \frac{\partial w^\lambda}{\partial z^j} \frac{\partial w^\mu}{\partial z^k} \frac{\partial z^l}{\partial w^\nu} + \frac{\partial^3 w^\nu}{\partial z^i \partial z^j \partial z^k} \frac{\partial z^l}{\partial w^\nu} \\ &= \partial_{w^i} \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^j w^k}^{w^l}(o) + \frac{\partial^3 w^l}{\partial z^i \partial z^j \partial z^k}(0) \end{aligned}$$

So, we require that

$$(5.8) \quad \frac{\partial^3 w^l}{\partial z^i \partial z^j \partial z^k}(0) X^i X^j X^k = -\partial_{w^i} \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^j w^k}^{w^l}(o) X^i X^j X^k$$

for any $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$. This requirement can be satisfied by chosen z such that

$$(5.9) \quad \frac{\partial^3 w^l}{\partial z^i \partial z^j \partial z^k}(0) = -\frac{1}{3} \left(\partial_{w^i} \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^j w^k}^{w^l} + \partial_{w^k} \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^i w^j}^{w^l} + \partial_{w^j} \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^k w^i}^{w^l} \right)(o)$$

by noting that $\tilde{\Gamma}_{w^i w^j}^{w^k} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{w^j w^i}^{w^k}$. This completes the proof of lemma. \square

Remark 2. The requirement that $\partial_i \tilde{\Gamma}_{jk}^l(o) X^i X^j X^k = 0$ for any $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is the same as requiring that

$$(5.10) \quad \partial_i \tilde{\Gamma}_{jk}^l + \partial_j \tilde{\Gamma}_{ki}^l + \partial_k \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^l(o) = 0.$$

It is also equivalent to

$$(5.11) \quad \partial_i \Gamma_{jk}^l + \partial_i \Gamma_{kj}^l + \partial_j \Gamma_{ki}^l + \partial_j \Gamma_{ik}^l + \partial_k \Gamma_{ij}^l + \partial_k \Gamma_{ji}^l(o) = 0.$$

Next, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let (M^{2n}, J, g) be a Hermitian manifold, $o \in M$, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n be a unitary basis of $T_o^{1,0}M$, and $z = (z^1, z^2, \dots, z^n)$ be a normal local holomorphic coordinate for (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) . Let γ be a normal geodesic with $\gamma(0) = o$ and $\gamma'(0) = X = X^i e_i + X^{\bar{i}} \bar{e}_{\bar{i}} \in T_o M$. Suppose $z(\gamma(t)) = (z^1(t), z^2(t), \dots, z^n(t))$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & z^i(t) \\ &= X^i t + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{ij}^{\bar{k}}(o) X^{\bar{j}} X^k t^2 + \frac{1}{6} \left(\left(R_{j\bar{i}k\bar{l}} + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\lambda j}^i \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{l}}^{\bar{k}} - \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{\lambda j}^l \right) (o) X^j X^k X^{\bar{l}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\partial_\mu (\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^\mu X^l + \partial_{\bar{\mu}} (\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^{\bar{\mu}} X^l + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{k\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{\mu}}(o) X^{\bar{\lambda}} X^\mu \right) X^{\bar{j}} \right) t^3 + O(t^4). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Substituting the initial data $z^i(0) = 0$ and $\frac{dz^i}{dt}(0) = X^i$ into (5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (5.12) \quad & \frac{d^2 z^i}{dt^2}(0) = -\Gamma_{jk}^i(o) X^j X^k - g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}}(o) X^{\bar{j}} X^l \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \tau_{jk}^i(o) X^j X^k - \tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}}(o) X^{\bar{j}} X^k \\ &= \tau_{ij}^{\bar{k}}(o) X^{\bar{j}} X^k \end{aligned}$$

by that $\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^k(o) = 0$ and $g_{i\bar{j}}(o) = \delta_{ij}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} (5.13) \quad & \frac{d^3 z^i}{dt^3}(0) \\ &= -\partial_l \Gamma_{jk}^i(o) \frac{dz^l}{dt} \frac{dz^j}{dt} \frac{dz^k}{dt}(0) - \partial_{\bar{l}} \Gamma_{jk}^i(o) \frac{dz^{\bar{l}}}{dt} \frac{dz^j}{dt} \frac{dz^k}{dt}(0) + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{jk}^i(o) \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{dz^j}{dt} \frac{dz^k}{dt} \right) (0) \\ & \quad - \partial_\mu (g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) \frac{dz^\mu}{dt} \frac{dz^{\bar{j}}}{dt} \frac{dz^l}{dt}(0) - \partial_{\bar{\mu}} (g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) \frac{dz^{\bar{\mu}}}{dt} \frac{dz^{\bar{j}}}{dt} \frac{dz^l}{dt}(0) \\ & \quad - g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}}(o) \frac{d^2 z^{\bar{j}}}{dt^2} \frac{dz^l}{dt}(0) - g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}}(o) \frac{dz^{\bar{j}}}{dt} \frac{d^2 z^l}{dt^2}(0) \\ &= R_{j\bar{i}k\bar{l}}(o) X^j X^k X^{\bar{l}} - \partial_\mu (g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}}(o) X^\mu X^{\bar{j}} X^k - \partial_\mu (\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^\mu X^{\bar{j}} X^l \\ & \quad - \partial_{\bar{\mu}} (g^{\bar{\lambda}i} \tau_{j\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{k}}(o) X^{\bar{\mu}} X^{\bar{j}} X^k - \partial_{\bar{\mu}} (\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^{\bar{\mu}} X^{\bar{j}} X^l - \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{\lambda j}^l(o) X^j X^k X^{\bar{l}} \\ & \quad - \tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{k\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{\mu}}(o) X^{\bar{\lambda}} X^\mu X^{\bar{j}} \end{aligned}$$

by noting that $\partial_k \Gamma_{ij}^l(o) X^i X^j X^k = 0$, $R_{j\bar{i}k\bar{l}}(o) = -\partial_{\bar{l}} \Gamma_{jk}^i(o)$ and using (5.12). Furthermore, note that

$$(5.14) \quad \partial_\mu g^{\bar{\lambda}i}(o) = -\partial_\mu g_{\lambda \bar{i}}(o) = -\Gamma_{\lambda \mu}^i(o) = \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\lambda \mu}^i(o)$$

and

$$(5.15) \quad \partial_{\bar{\mu}} g^{\bar{\lambda}i}(o) = -\partial_{\bar{\mu}} g_{\lambda\bar{i}}(o) = -\Gamma_{i\bar{\mu}}^{\bar{\lambda}}(o) = \frac{1}{2} \tau_{i\bar{\mu}}^{\bar{\lambda}}(o).$$

Substituting these into (5.13), we get

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d^3 z^i}{dt^3}(0) \\ &= \left(R_{j\bar{i}k\bar{l}} + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\lambda j}^i \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{l}}^{\bar{k}} - \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{\lambda j}^l \right) (o) X^j X^k X^{\bar{l}} \\ & \quad - \left(\partial_{\mu}(\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^{\mu} X^l + \partial_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^{\bar{\mu}} X^l + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{k\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{\mu}}(o) X^{\bar{\lambda}} X^{\mu} \right) X^{\bar{j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Taylor expansion, we get the conclusion. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Suppose the conclusion is not true. Then, there is a point $o \in M$ and a unitary basis e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n at o such that

$$(5.17) \quad R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} + \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1|(o) < 0.$$

Let (z^1, \dots, z^n) be a normal local holomorphic coordinate for (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) at o .

In the following, let the notations be the same as in Lemma 5.3. Let

$$f(z) = z^1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \tau_{1\bar{i}}^{\bar{i}} z^i \right)$$

and

$$p(z) = z^1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \tau_{1\bar{i}}^{\bar{i}} z^{\bar{i}} \right).$$

Then f is a holomorphic function near o and $|f| = |p|$. Because $\log M(|f|, r)$ is a convex function of $\log r$, by (4) of Theorem 1.3, we know that $\frac{M_o(|f|, r)}{r}$ is increasing. On the other hand, by Lemma 5.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & p(z(t)) \\ &= X^1 t + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j,k=2}^n \tau_{1\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}}(o) X^{\bar{j}} X^k \right) t^2 + \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \left(\left(R_{j\bar{1}k\bar{l}} + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\lambda j}^1 \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{l}}^{\bar{k}} - \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{1}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{\lambda j}^l \right) (o) X^j X^k X^{\bar{l}} + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{1\bar{i}}^{\bar{i}} \tau_{ij}^k(o) X^j X^{\bar{k}} X^1 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\partial_{\mu}(\tau_{j\bar{1}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^{\mu} X^l + \partial_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau_{j\bar{1}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^{\bar{\mu}} X^l + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{j\bar{1}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{k\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{\mu}}(o) X^{\bar{\lambda}} X^{\mu} + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{1\bar{i}}^{\bar{i}} \tau_{1\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} X^k X^{\bar{i}} \right) X^{\bar{j}} \right) t^3 \\ & \quad + O(t^4). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |f(z(t))|^2 \\
&= |p(z(t))|^2 \\
&= |X^1|^2 t^2 + \Re \left\{ \left(\sum_{j,k=2}^n \tau_{i\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}}(o) X^{\bar{j}} X^k \right) X^{\bar{i}} \right\} t^3 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3} \Re \left\{ \left(R_{j\bar{i}k\bar{l}} + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\lambda j}^1 \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{l}}^{\bar{k}} - \tau_{\bar{\lambda} \bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{\lambda j}^l \right) (o) X^j X^k X^{\bar{l}} X^{\bar{i}} + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{i\bar{l}}^{\bar{i}} \tau_{ij}^k(o) X^j X^{\bar{k}} |X^1|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(\partial_\mu (\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^\mu X^l + \partial_{\bar{\mu}} (\tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} g_{l\bar{k}})(o) X^{\bar{\mu}} X^l + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{j\bar{i}}^{\bar{k}} \tau_{k\bar{\lambda}}^{\bar{\mu}}(o) X^{\bar{\lambda}} X^\mu + \frac{3}{2} \tau_{i\bar{l}}^{\bar{i}} \tau_{1\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} X^k X^i \right) X^{\bar{j}} X^{\bar{i}} \right\} t^4 \\
&\quad + O(t^5) \\
&\leq |X^1|^2 t^2 + \frac{1}{3} (R_{1\bar{i}1\bar{i}} + \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1|^2)(o) |X^1|^4 t^4 + C \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - |X^1|^2 \right) t^3 + t^4 \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} - |X^1|^2} + t^5 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C and when t is small enough, by noting that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |X^i|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$$

since $\|X\| = 1$ and $g_{i\bar{j}}(o) = \delta_{ij}$. Note that

$$(5.18) \quad \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} - |X^1|^2} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{2} - |X^1|^2 \right)$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is chosen to satisfy

$$(5.19) \quad \frac{C\epsilon}{4} = -\frac{1}{24} (R_{1\bar{i}1\bar{i}} + \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1|^2)(o).$$

So, when t is small enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.20) \quad |f(z(t))|^2 &\leq |X^1|^2 t^2 + \frac{1}{3} (R_{1\bar{i}1\bar{i}} + \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1|^2)(o) |X^1|^4 t^4 \\
&\quad + C \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - |X^1|^2 \right) t^3 + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{2} - |X^1|^2 \right) \right) t^4 + t^5 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, when t is small enough, the function

$$(5.21) \quad F_t(x) = x + \frac{1}{3} (R_{1\bar{i}1\bar{i}} + \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i\bar{1}}^1|^2)(o) x^2 t^2 + C \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - x \right) t + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{2} - x \right) \right) t^2 + t^3 \right)$$

is increasing for $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Thus $F_t(x) \leq F_t(\frac{1}{2})$. So,

$$(5.22) \quad |f(z(t))|^2 \leq \frac{t^2}{2} + \frac{1}{24}(R_{1\bar{1}1\bar{1}} + \sum_{i=2}^n |\tau_{i1}^1|^2)(o)t^4 + Ct^5 < \frac{t^2}{2}$$

when $t > 0$ is small enough. This implies that

$$(5.23) \quad \frac{M_o(|f|, r)}{r} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$$

when $r > 0$ is small enough. On the other hand, it is clear that

$$(5.24) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{M_o(|f|, r)}{r} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

This contradicts the fact that $\frac{M_o(|f|, r)}{r}$ is increasing.

The equivalence of the two curvature conditions can be seen in the proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Aronszajn N., *A unique continuation theorem for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations or inequalities of second order*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 36 (1957), 235–249.
- [2] Calabi E., *An extension of E. Hopf's maximum principle with an application to Riemannian geometry*. Duke Math. J. 25 (1958), 45–56.
- [3] Chang Shu-Cheng, Han Yingbo, Lin Chien, *On the three-circle theorem and its applications in Sasakian manifolds*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 58 (2019), no. 3, Paper No. 101, 23 pp.
- [4] Chau Albert, Tam Luen-Fai, *On the complex structure of Kähler manifolds with non-negative curvature*. J. Differential Geom. 73 (2006), no. 3, 491–530.
- [5] Chen Bing-Long, Fu Xiao-Yong, Yin Le, Zhu Xi-Ping, *Sharp dimension estimates of holomorphic functions and rigidity*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 358 (2006), no. 4, 1435–1454.
- [6] Chen Zhi Hua, Yang Hong Cang, *Estimation of the upper bound on the Levi form of the distance function on Hermitian manifolds and some of its applications*. (Chinese) Acta Math. Sinica 27 (1984), no. 5, 631–643.
- [7] Fan Xu-Qian, Tam Luen-Fai, Yu Chengjie, *Product of almost-Hermitian manifolds*. J. Geom. Anal. 24 (2014), no. 3, 1425–1446.
- [8] Gill Matt, *Convergence of the parabolic complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds*. Comm. Anal. Geom. 19 (2011), no. 2, 277–303.
- [9] Gray Alfred, *Curvature identities for Hermitian and almost Hermitian manifolds*. Tohoku Math. J. (2) 28 (1976), no. 4, 601–12.
- [10] Huang Shaochuang, Tam Luen-Fai, *Kähler-Ricci flow with unbounded curvature*. Amer. J. Math. 140 (2018), no. 1, 189–220.
- [11] Lee Man-Chun, Tam Luen-Fai, *Chern-Ricci flows on noncompact complex manifolds*. J. Differential Geom. 115 (2020), no. 3, 529–564.
- [12] Liu Gang, *On Yau's uniformization conjecture*. Camb. J. Math. 7 (2019), no. 1-2, 33–70.
- [13] Liu Gang, *Gromov-Hausdorff limits of Kähler manifolds and the finite generation conjecture*. Ann. of Math. (2) 184 (2016), no. 3, 775–815.

- [14] Liu Gang, *On the volume growth of Kähler manifolds with nonnegative bisectional curvature*. J. Differential Geom. 102 (2016), no. 3, 485–500.
- [15] Liu Gang, *Three-circle theorem and dimension estimate for holomorphic functions on Kähler manifolds*. Duke Math. J. 165 (2016), no. 15, 2899–2919.
- [16] Mok Ngaiming, *An embedding theorem of complete Kähler manifolds of positive bisectional curvature onto affine algebraic varieties*. Bull. Soc. Math. France 112 (1984), no. 2, 197–250.
- [17] Mori Shigefumi, *Projective manifolds with ample tangent bundles*. Ann. of Math. (2) 110 (1979), no. 3, 593–606.
- [18] Ni Lei, *A monotonicity formula on complete Kähler manifolds with nonnegative bisectional curvature*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 17 (2004), no. 4, 909–946.
- [19] Royden H. L., *Comparison theorems for the matrix Riccati equation*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 41 (1988), no. 5, 739–746.
- [20] Ni Lei, Tam Luen-Fai, *Plurisubharmonic functions and the structure of complete Kähler manifolds with nonnegative curvature*. J. Differential Geom. 64 (2003), no. 3, 457–524.
- [21] Shi Wan-Xiong, *Ricci flow and the uniformization on complete noncompact Kähler manifolds*. J. Differential Geom. 45 (1997), no. 1, 94–220.
- [22] Siu Yum Tong, Yau Shing Tung, *Compact Kähler manifolds of positive bisectional curvature*. Invent. Math. 59 (1980), no. 2, 189–204.
- [23] Tosatti Valentino, Weinkove Ben, *On the evolution of a Hermitian metric by its Chern-Ricci form*. J. Differential Geom. 99 (2015), no. 1, 125–163.
- [24] Tam Luen-Fai, Yu Chengjie, *Some comparison theorems for Kähler manifolds*. Manuscripta Math. 137 (2012), no. 3–4, 483–495.
- [25] Yu Chengjie, *Curvature identities on almost Hermitian manifolds and applications*. Sci. China Math. 60 (2017), no. 2, 285–300.
- [26] Yu Chengjie, *Hessian comparison and spectrum lower bound of almost Hermitian manifolds*. Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B 39 (2018), no. 4, 755–772.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, GUANGDONG, 515063, CHINA

Email address: `cjyu@stu.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, GUANGDONG, 515063, CHINA

Email address: `12cyzhang@stu.edu.cn`