

ON THE RESIDUAL MONGE-AMPÈRE MASS OF PLURISUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS, III: A SINGLE FREQUENCY

WEIYONG HE, LONG LI, AND XIAOWEI XU

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this article is to study the residual Monge-Ampère mass of a plurisubharmonic function with an isolated unbounded locus. A general decomposition formula for the residual mass is obtained, under the Sasakian structure of the unit sphere. In complex dimension two, we further obtain an upper-bound estimate, provided with the uniform directional Lipschitz continuity. As an application, the zero mass conjecture is confirmed, if the function further has a single frequency on its alternating part.

1. INTRODUCTION

The zero mass conjecture, raised by Guedj and Rashkovskii, has been recently studied with the circular symmetry, see [25], [23]. It is in fact proved in this case that the residual Monge-Ampère mass is bounded from the above by the Lelong number and the *maximal directional Lelong number* at the singularity. Then the conjecture follows as a direct consequence of this upper-bound estimate. There have been many beautiful works related to this topic. For more details, the readers are referred to [18], [27], [28], [29], [32], [8], [30] and [14].

It turns out that the understanding of the *standard Sasakian structure* on the unit sphere S^{2n+1} is a key in the proof of the upper-bound estimate, see [9], [31]. More precisely, we obtain a *decomposition formula* under the circular symmetry. It describes the push-forward of the complex Monge-Ampère mass from the Kähler cone $(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})^*$ to its base manifold $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ under the Sasakian structure, see Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 5.3 in [23].

In this paper, we continue our study on the residual Monge-Ampère mass of a general plurisubharmonic function u with an isolated unbounded locus, say, at the origin. First of all, we are aware of the natural decomposition of the standard complex structure on \mathbb{C}^{n+1} under the Kähler cone structure. This actually brings us a new characterization of the plurisubharmonicity of a function via the Sasakian geometry, see Proposition 3.2.

Next we study the complex Monge-Ampère mass of a general plurisubharmonic function that is C^2 -continuous outside the origin. Fortunately, a similar but more complicated decomposition formula has been obtained, see Theorem 4.1. As we expect, it boils down to the push-forward formula once the function is circular symmetric.

However, there are several new difficulties to utilize this formula to approach the upper-bound estimate. For instance, there is no convexity of the function on any complex line (or holomorphic curve) that passes through

the origin, if we do not take the supreme or average along the S^1 -direction in the front. Moreover, the arise of these higher order terms, involving the complex Hessian of the function, in the decomposing formula will break up our previous iteration process in higher dimensions, see Section 6.2.

This suggests that we need to take a closer look at the basic properties of plurisubharmonic functions with isolated unbounded locus. First, there are several advantages to consider these functions with zero Lelong numbers, cf. [6], [10]. Moreover, we give two sufficient conditions on zero maximal directional Lelong numbers, provided with the circular symmetry. For more details, see Lemma 2.3 and 2.4.

Now we consider the class $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$ with plurisubharmonic functions on the unit ball that have an isolated unbounded locus at the origin, see Definition 2.1. Then we can decompose such a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ into two parts as

$$(1.1) \quad u := u_s + v,$$

where u_s is the S^1 -invariant part, and v is the alternating part of u . In fact, the function u_s is the S^1 -symmetrization of u , and hence itself is in the family $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$. Therefore, the Lelong number and the maximal directional Lelong number of u are equal to the these numbers of u_s at the origin, respectively. For a later purpose, we also introduce the so called *strong maximal directional Lelong numbers*, see Definition 2.5. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that this number is also finite, see Lemma 2.6.

During the seeking of the upper-bound estimate, we have to introduce an even better condition called *uniform directional Lipschitz continuity*. For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, this continuity condition means that its first derivative ru_r is uniformly bounded in a small ball centered at the origin. Then it gives us a new quantity after taking the limit as

$$(1.2) \quad \kappa_u(0) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \|ru_r\|_{L^\infty(\bar{B}_r)}.$$

It is clear that $\kappa_u(0)$ is finite if u satisfies this continuity condition. Thanks to the Pohozaev inequality [26], we reach the following upper-bound estimate on the residual mass in the lower dimensions.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 5.7). *Suppose a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ in \mathbb{C}^2 is uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin. Then we have the following estimate:*

$$\tau_u(0) \leq 4\kappa_u(0) \cdot \nu_u(0).$$

As a direct consequence, the zero mass conjecture follows in this case, see Corollary 5.8. It is clear that all functions in $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$ with circular symmetry satisfy this continuity condition. However, there are still plenty of examples that fail to be uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous, see Example 2.8 and Example 6.1.

Nevertheless, one possible way to approach this problem is to utilize the Fourier expansion along the S^1 -direction. That is to say, we can write the function v in equation (1.1) as

$$(1.3) \quad v \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\cos k\theta \cdot v_k + \sin k\theta \cdot w_k),$$

where v_k and w_k are circular symmetric functions. In fact, the S^1 -invariant part u_s exactly corresponds to the constant term in the above expansion.

However, this expansion in equation (1.3) unfortunately depends on the local coordinates. Hence we have to first specify a suitable complex Hopf-coordinate, and then invoke the idea of *having a single frequency* in the alternating part, see Definition 5.9.

Thanks to the finiteness of the strong maximal directional Lelong numbers, we can infer that a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ with a single frequency (in its alternating part) indeed has the desired continuity condition. Hence the zero mass conjecture also follows in this case.

Corollary 1.2 (Corollary 5.10). *Suppose a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ in \mathbb{C}^2 has a single frequency in its alternating part. Then we have*

$$\nu_u(0) = 0 \Rightarrow \tau_u(0) = 0.$$

Finally, we give some remarks on further difficulties along this approach. Especially, what happens in the higher dimensional case is mentioned. Furthermore, we propose that the upper-bound estimate, and hence the zero mass conjecture, should also hold for a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ that has finite frequencies in its alternating part.

Acknowledgment: The authors are very grateful to Prof. Xiuxiong Chen for his continuous encouragement and support in mathematics. It is also a great pleasure to thank Song Sun, Gao Chen, Per Åhag, Haozhao Li, Wei Sun and Mingchen Xia for lots of useful discussions.

2. THE MAXIMAL DIRECTIONAL LELONG NUMBERS

Let D be a domain in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} that contains the origin, and $D^* := D - \{0\}$ the punctured domain. A plurisubharmonic function u on D is an upper semi-continuous function such that its restriction to each complex line in D is subharmonic. In the following, we are going to consider a sub-collection of the family of all plurisubharmonic functions on D .

Definition 2.1. *A plurisubharmonic function on D is in the family $\mathcal{P}(D)$, if it is locally finite on D^* .*

In order to perform calculus on D^* , we further introduce the following family with better regularities.

Definition 2.2. *A plurisubharmonic function on D is in the family $\mathcal{P}^\infty(D)$, if it is C^2 -continuous on D^* .*

It is clear that we have the inclusion $\mathcal{P}^\infty(D) \subset \mathcal{P}(D)$. Suppose a function u is in the family $\mathcal{P}(D)$. Thanks to the upper semi-continuity, we further assume the normalization condition

$$\sup_D u = -1.$$

Moreover, the *unbounded locus* of a plurisubharmonic function is the set of points that it is never bounded near these points. In other words, the unbounded locus of a $u \in \mathcal{P}(D)$ is either empty or the origin.

Thanks to the Demailly-Bedford-Taylor product, the complex Monge-Ampère operator is therefore well defined as a positive Borel measure, see [3], [4], [13]. Then we have on the domain D the following operator:

$$\text{MA}(u) := (dd^c u)^{n+1},$$

where we have used the normalized operator

$$d^c := \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\partial} - \partial), \quad \text{and} \quad d := \partial + \bar{\partial}.$$

Let B_R be the ball centered at the origin with radius $0 < R < 1$, and then the residual Monge-Ampère mass of u is defined as a measure

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_u(0) &:= \frac{1}{\pi^{n+1}} \text{MA}(u)(\{0\}) \\ (2.1) \quad &= \frac{1}{\pi^{n+1}} \lim_{R \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_R} (dd^c u)^{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

2.1. The circular symmetry. From now on, we will take the domain D to be the unit ball $B_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Then a function u is said to be *circular symmetric* or *S^1 -invariant*, if it satisfies

$$u(z) := u(e^{i\theta} z),$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z \in B_1$.

If a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ is circular symmetric, then we say that it is in the family $\mathcal{F}(B_1)$. Similarly, it is in the sub-family $\mathcal{F}^\infty(B_1)$, if it is circular symmetric and further in $\mathcal{P}^\infty(B_1)$. For more details on circular symmetric plurisubharmonic functions, see [5], [24].

The Lelong number (at the origin) of a plurisubharmonic function u is defined via its average or maximal on the sphere $S_r := \partial B_r$, i.e. we take

$$S_u(r) := \frac{1}{a_{2n+1}} \int_{|\xi|=1} u(r\xi) d\sigma(\xi),$$

where a_{2n+1} is the volume of the unit sphere, and

$$V_u(r) := \sup_{|\xi|=1} u(r\xi).$$

It is a well known fact [19] that S_u and V_u are both non-decreasing and convex function of the variable $t := \log r \in (-\infty, 0)$, and then the Lelong number is

$$(2.2) \quad \nu_u(0) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r \partial_r^- S_u(r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r \partial_r^- V_u(r),$$

and there is no difference to use left or right derivatives in the above equation.

Furthermore, we can discuss the so called *directional Lelong numbers* as follows. First, we note that all the complex directions in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} can be parametrized by points in the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$, via the famous Hopf-fibration as

$$S^1 \hookrightarrow S^{2n+1} \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n.$$

Fixing a point $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$, a complex line ℓ_ζ through the origin can actually be written as

$$\ell_\zeta := \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lambda \cdot [\zeta] \},$$

where $[\zeta]$ is its homogeneous coordinate in $(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})^*$. Then the directional Lelong number (in the complex direction ζ) is the Lelong number $\nu_{u|_{\ell_\zeta}}(0)$ at the origin of the restriction $u|_{\ell_\zeta}$, and we define it to be infinity, if the restriction is identically $-\infty$.

It is also convenient to introduce a parametrization $(r, \theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ of the space $(\mathbb{R}^{2n+2})^* \cong (\mathbb{C}^{n+1})^*$ induced by the fiber map p of the Hopf-fibration. Then a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ can be written as

$$u(z) := u(r, \theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}).$$

Here $r := |z|$ is the radius function, and θ denotes the angle in the S^1 -direction. More precisely, the three variables $(\theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ together gives a local embedding of the unit sphere S^3 , and a local trivialization like this is called a *complex Hopf-coordinate*, see [25], [23] for more details.

Take a change of variables as $t := \log r$. The maximal directional Lelong number $M_A(u)$ of a function $u \in \mathcal{F}(B_1)$ at a distance $A > 0$ is defined as

$$M_A(u) := \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n} \partial_t^+ u(\zeta)|_{t=-A}.$$

Thanks to the log-convexity and non-decreasing properties of $u|_{\ell_\zeta}$, the number M_A is certainly non-increasing in A . Moreover, it is proved in [25] that it is always a non-negative real number. In fact, it controls the variation w.r.t. the radius r of the infimum of u on the sphere S_r , see [23].

A natural question is when this maximal directional Lelong number is equal to zero. For instance, we have the following two results.

Lemma 2.3. *For a function $u \in \mathcal{F}(B_1)$, we have*

$$u(0) > -\infty \Rightarrow \lambda_u(0) = 0.$$

Proof. First we note that $u(z) \geq u(0)$ for all $z \in B_1$, since $u|_{\ell_\zeta}$ is subharmonic and S^1 -invariant for each $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ fixed.

Suppose not. Then there exists a real number $\delta > 0$, such that we have $M_A(u) > 2\delta$ for all $A > 0$. Take a sequence $A_i \rightarrow +\infty$, and points $\zeta_i \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ with the following condition:

$$\partial_t^+ u(\zeta_i)|_{t=-A_i} > \delta.$$

Consider the straight line

$$y_i(x) := \delta(x + A_i) + u(0)$$

It is clear that the convex curve $u|_{\ell_{\zeta_i}}$ in t is always above the line y_i , but then we have $y_i(-1) > 0$ for each A_i large enough. This contradicts our normalization condition $\sup_{B_1} u = -1$. □

If a plurisubharmonic function is finite at a point, then its Lelong number is zero at the same point. Then we can further ask what happens to its maximal directional Lelong number, and a partial result is obtained.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose $u \in \mathcal{F}(B_1)$ is continuous on B_1^* . Then we have*

$$\nu_u(0) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_u(0) = 0.$$

Proof. If u has the zero Lelong number at the origin, then it is a well known fact that each directional Lelong number $\nu_{u|_{\ell_\zeta}}(0)$ is zero for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$. Then we can consider the following slope function:

$$(2.3) \quad \phi_t(\zeta) := t^{-1}u(e^t, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$$

This is a positive continuous function. Moreover, it is also non-decreasing and convex in t . Hence, for each ζ fixed, we can take its decreasing limit as

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \phi_t(\zeta) = \nu_{u|_{\ell_\zeta}}(0) = 0.$$

Then Dini's lemma implies that the convergence of ϕ_t is uniform. However, we also have the following control due to the convexity:

$$(2.5) \quad \phi_t = \frac{0 - u(e^t, \cdot)}{0 - t} \geq \frac{u(1, \cdot) - u(e^t, \cdot)}{0 - t} \geq \partial_t^+ u.$$

In other words, we have

$$\sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n} \phi_{-A}(\zeta) \geq M_A(u),$$

and then our result follows. \square

2.2. The general case. Comparing with the circular symmetric case, we can ask the question if there is any reasonable way to define the maximal directional Lelong number for a general $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$. One way is to decompose this function into

$$u := u_s + v,$$

where u_s is S^1 -symmetrization of u , and it can be written as

$$u_s := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} u(e^{i\theta} z) d\theta.$$

As the average of a plurisubharmonic function, the function u_s itself is plurisubharmonic. In fact, it is clear that it is also in the family $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$.

Moreover, the function v is the alternating part of u , i.e. we have

$$\int_{S^1} v(e^{i\theta} z) d\theta = 0.$$

Then we can define the maximal directional Lelong numbers as

$$M_A(u) := M_A(u_s); \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_u(0) := \lambda_{u_s}(0).$$

However, in order to understand the alternating part, we need more informations this time. Inspired from Lemma 2.4, we can consider the following function:

$$(2.6) \quad \phi_t(\zeta) := \phi(t, \zeta) = \frac{\sup_{S^1} (u|_{\ell_\zeta})}{\log r},$$

for each $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ and all $t = \log r < 0$. In other words, this is the slope of the supreme of the subharmonic function $u|_{\ell_\zeta}$ over the S^1 -direction, and then it can be rewritten under the complex Hopf-coordinate as

$$(2.7) \quad \phi_t(\zeta) = t^{-1} \hat{u}(t, \zeta),$$

where we take

$$(2.8) \quad \hat{u}(t, \zeta) := \sup_{\theta} u(e^t, \theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}).$$

Then it is a standard fact for subharmonic functions that \hat{u} is a non-decreasing and convex function of t , and the limit of ϕ_t is exactly the directional Lelong number, i.e. we have

$$(2.9) \quad \nu_{u|_{\ell_\zeta}}(0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \phi_t(\zeta).$$

Therefore, it is reasonable to introduce the following concept.

Definition 2.5. For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, the strong maximal directional Lelong number of u at a distance $A > 0$ is defined as

$$N_A(u) := \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n} \phi_{-A}(\zeta).$$

In priori, this number could be infinitely large. However, it is not difficult to see that it must be finite for all A positive.

Lemma 2.6. For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, we have for all A positive

$$0 \leq N_A(u) < +\infty.$$

Proof. The function ϕ_t is non-decreasing in t , and then the number N_A is non-increasing in A . Hence it is enough to prove the finiteness for a certain positive number A_0 . This is because our function u is locally bounded on the punctured ball B_1^* , and then there is a pointwise lower bound C_{A_0} of u on the sphere such that we have

$$u|_{S_{R_0}} \geq -C_{A_0},$$

where $R_0 := e^{-A_0}$. It follows that we further have

$$(2.10) \quad \phi_{-A_0}(\zeta) \leq \frac{C_{A_0}}{A_0},$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$. Then our result follows. \square

Thanks to the convexity of \hat{u} in t again, we can further obtain the following estimate as in equation (2.5):

$$(2.11) \quad N_A(u) \geq \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n} \partial_t^+ \hat{u}|_{t=-A}.$$

This also implies that the R.H.S. of equation (2.11) is also finite for all A positive. Finally, we further introduce the following concept for a later purpose.

Definition 2.7. A function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ is said to be uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin, if the derivative ru_r is an L^∞ -function in a smaller ball, i.e. we have

$$L_A(u) := \|ru_r\|_{L^\infty(\bar{B}_R)} < +\infty,$$

for some large constant $A := -\log R$.

It is clear that the function L_A is non-increasing in A , and hence we can also define the directional Lipschitz constant of u at the origin as

$$\kappa_u(0) := \lim_{A \rightarrow +\infty} L_A(u) \in [0 + \infty].$$

In other words, the non-negative number $\kappa_u(0)$ is finite, if u is uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin. However, this number is not always finite for the general case. For instance, consider the following function in the unit disk in \mathbb{C} :

$$(2.12) \quad f(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} \log \left(|z - k^{-1}|^2 + e^{-k^5} \right).$$

This subharmonic function is well-known because it is finite everywhere, but its unbounded locus is the origin, and hence is discontinuous there. Moreover, we note that its derivative ru_r grows like r^{-3} on the real axis towards the origin. Hence it is not uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous. In fact, we can also use it to construct more examples in higher dimensions.

Example 2.8. *The following construction is inspired from Example 4.6, [2]. Let $z := (z^0, z^1)$ be the complex rectangle coordinate on \mathbb{C}^2 , and then we define*

$$(2.13) \quad u(z) := \max \{ f(z^0), \log |z^1| \}.$$

This function u is plurisubharmonic in the unit ball. It is everywhere finite, and its unbounded locus is also the origin. Hence it is in the family $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$. However, its restriction to the complex line $\{z^1 = 0\}$ is exactly the function f . Therefore, it is not uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin.

Finally, we note that there is a technique [1] to replace our function by a larger pluri-complex Green function with the same residual mass. In fact, given a general function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, we can take its envelope as

$$u^r := \sup \{ v \in \mathcal{P}(B_1); v \leq u \text{ on } B_r \},$$

and then the sequence $\{u^r\}$ increases pointwise to a function $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$. It is clear that we have $\tilde{u} \geq u$, and hence $\nu_{\tilde{u}}(0) = 0$ due to Demailly's comparison theorem. Moreover, it satisfies

$$(dd^c \tilde{u})^n = \tau_u(0) \delta_0.$$

Therefore, it is interesting to ask whether a pluri-complex Green function in $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$ is uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous or not.

3. POSITIVITY AND SASAKIAN STRUCTURES

There is a natural Kähler cone structure on the space $(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})^* \cong (\mathbb{R}^{2n+2})^*$ that induces the standard Sasakian structure of the unit sphere S^{2n+1} . The standard almost complex structure I on \mathbb{R}^{2n+2} is a $(1, 1)$ -tensor field as

$$I := \sum_A \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^A} \otimes dx^A - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^A} \otimes dy^A \right).$$

Then the *Reeb vector field* is defined as

$$\xi_0 := -I(r\partial_r),$$

and its dual is the so called *contact 1-form* as

$$\eta_0 := I(r^{-1}dr).$$

Moreover, we also take its normalization as $\eta := -\eta_0/2$. There is another $(1,1)$ -tensor field Φ_0 that plays the role of the almost complex structure of the cone as

$$(3.1) \quad \Phi_0 := I - (r\partial_r) \otimes \eta_0.$$

Then it is clear to see $\Phi_0(\xi_0) = 0$. Moreover, the tangent space of the unit sphere can be split as

$$TS^{2n+1} = L_{\xi_0} \oplus \mathcal{D},$$

where L_{ξ_0} is the trivial line bundle generated by ξ_0 , and $\mathcal{D} := \ker(\eta_0)$ is the so called *contact sub-bundle*. Then the restriction of Φ_0 to the tangent space TS^{2n+1} gives the following relation:

$$\Phi_0^2 = -\mathbb{I} + \xi_0 \otimes \eta_0.$$

Combining with the compatible metric cone structure, it follows that the *almost CR-structure* $(\mathcal{D}, \Phi_0|_{\mathcal{D}})$ is integrable, and we have a splitting as

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{D} \otimes \mathbb{C} = \mathcal{D}^{1,0} \oplus \mathcal{D}^{0,1} \quad \text{with} \quad \overline{\mathcal{D}^{1,0}} = \mathcal{D}^{0,1},$$

where $\mathcal{D}^{1,0}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{0,1}$ are eigenspaces of Φ_0 with respect to the eigenvalues i and $-i$, respectively. Here the integrability condition means the following relation:

$$[\mathcal{D}^{1,0}, \mathcal{D}^{1,0}] \subset \mathcal{D}^{1,0} \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathcal{D}^{0,1}, \mathcal{D}^{0,1}] \subset \mathcal{D}^{0,1}.$$

For more details about Sasakian geometry, the readers are referred to the book by Boyer and Galicki, [9].

3.1. Local frames and coframes. The complex Hopf-coordinate on the Kähler cone $(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})^*$ is introduced in [23], and we recall it here. Consider the holomorphic functions $\zeta^\alpha := z^\alpha/z^0$ on the set $\{z^0 \neq 0\}$ for all $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$. Let $r = |z|$ be the radius function, and then a real coordinate system on $(\mathbb{R}^{2n+2})^*$ can be written as

$$(r, \theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) := (r, \theta, \zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^n, \bar{\zeta}^1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}^n),$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta^\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Here the complex variable ζ can be thought of as a point on the projective space $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ via the Hopf-fibration. Moreover, we have used the following embedding:

$$(3.3) \quad z^0 := r e^{\frac{i}{2}\theta} \frac{\varrho(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{(1 + \sum_\beta |\zeta^\beta|^2)^{1/2}}; \quad z^\alpha := r e^{\frac{i}{2}\theta} \frac{\zeta^\alpha \cdot \varrho(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{(1 + \sum_\beta |\zeta^\beta|^2)^{1/2}},$$

where the factor is

$$\varrho(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) := \prod_{\alpha=1}^n (\bar{\zeta}^\alpha |\zeta^\alpha|^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then we can introduce a corresponding *local basic function* as

$$(3.4) \quad h(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) := \log \left(1 + \sum_{\alpha} |\zeta^{\alpha}|^2 \right) - \sum_{\alpha} \log |\zeta^{\alpha}|,$$

and we can also write it as

$$(3.5) \quad h(z, \bar{z}) = \log \left(\sum_A |z^A|^2 \right) - \sum_A \log |z^A|.$$

Furthermore, we obtain a local defining equation of the contact 1-form as

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta &= \frac{1}{4} \{ d\theta - i(\partial_{\zeta} h - \bar{\partial}_{\zeta} h) \} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left\{ d\theta - \sum_{\alpha} \cos \kappa_{\alpha} \cdot \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{d\zeta^{\alpha}}{\zeta^{\alpha}} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote

$$\cos \kappa_{\alpha} := 1 - \frac{2|\zeta^{\alpha}|^2}{1 + \sum_{\beta} |\zeta^{\beta}|^2}.$$

In other words, we have

$$(3.7) \quad \eta_0 = - (d\theta/2 + d^c_{\zeta} h).$$

Then it follows

$$(3.8) \quad \xi_0 = -2\partial_{\theta},$$

and

$$(3.9) \quad d\eta = \frac{1}{2} dd^c h = \omega_{FS},$$

where ω_{FS} is the Fubini-Study metric on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ with total volume π^n .

Next we are going to construct the standard frame fields with respect to the Kähler cone structure. First, along the complex line L_{ζ} through the origin in a fixed direction ζ , we define

$$(3.10) \quad X_0 : = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_r + ir^{-1}\xi_0) = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_r - 2ir^{-1}\partial_{\theta});$$

$$(3.11) \quad \bar{X}_0 : = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_r - ir^{-1}\xi_0) = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_r + 2ir^{-1}\partial_{\theta}).$$

Moreover, on the complexified contact sub-bundle $\mathcal{D} \otimes \mathbb{C}$, we have the following frame equations corresponding to the splitting in equation (3.2):

$$(3.12) \quad X_{\alpha} : = \partial_{\alpha} + \frac{i}{4\zeta^{\alpha}} \cos \kappa_{\alpha} \cdot \xi_0 = \partial_{\alpha} + i(\partial_{\alpha} h)\partial_{\theta};$$

$$(3.13) \quad \bar{X}_{\alpha} : = \partial_{\bar{\alpha}} - \frac{i}{4\bar{\zeta}^{\alpha}} \cos \kappa_{\alpha} \cdot \xi_0 = \partial_{\bar{\alpha}} - i(\partial_{\bar{\alpha}} h)\partial_{\theta},$$

where the operator ∂_{α} stands for $\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^{\alpha}}$ for all $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$. Then it is standard to check that we have

$$I(X_A) = iX_A; \quad I(\bar{X}_A) = -iX_A,$$

for all $A = 0, 1, \dots, n$. In conclusion, the following vector fields build a local frame of the tangent space $T(\mathbb{R}^{2n+2})^*$ as

$$\{X_0, X_{\alpha}, \bar{X}_0, \bar{X}_{\alpha}\}.$$

Moreover, its dual basis in fact builds a coframe as follows:

$$(3.14) \quad \lambda^0 := dr - irr\eta_0; \quad \bar{\lambda}^0 := dr + irr\eta_0;$$

$$(3.15) \quad \lambda^\alpha := d\zeta^\alpha; \quad \bar{\lambda}^\alpha := d\bar{\zeta}^\alpha;$$

Then the $(1, 1)$ -tensor field Φ_0 restricted to the sphere can be re-written as

$$\Phi_0 := i \sum_{\alpha} X_{\alpha} \otimes d\zeta^{\alpha} - i \sum_{\alpha} \bar{X}_{\alpha} \otimes d\bar{\zeta}^{\alpha},$$

since we have

$$(3.16) \quad \Phi_0(X_{\alpha}) = iX_{\alpha}; \quad \Phi_0(\bar{X}_{\alpha}) = -i\bar{X}_{\alpha}.$$

After a standard computation, we come up with the following commutators:

$$(3.17) \quad [X_{\alpha}, X_{\beta}] = [\bar{X}_{\alpha}, \bar{X}_{\beta}] = 0;$$

$$(3.18) \quad [X_{\alpha}, \partial_r] = [\bar{X}_{\alpha}, \partial_r] = [X_{\alpha}, \partial_{\theta}] = [\bar{X}_{\alpha}, \partial_{\theta}] = 0;$$

$$(3.19) \quad [X_{\alpha}, \bar{X}_{\beta}] = ih_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}\xi_0;$$

$$(3.20) \quad [X_{\alpha}, X_0] = [\bar{X}_{\alpha}, X_0] = [X_{\alpha}, \bar{X}_0] = [\bar{X}_{\alpha}, \bar{X}_0] = 0;$$

$$(3.21) \quad [X_0, \bar{X}_0] = -ir^{-2}\partial_{\theta}.$$

Finally, we note that the vector fields $\{\xi_0, X_{\alpha}, \bar{X}_{\alpha}\}$ build a frame of the tangent bundle TS^{2n+1} with its dual basis $\{\eta_0, \lambda^{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}^{\alpha}\}$.

Remark 3.1. *It is worthy mentioning that the above frames and coframes actually come from the Sasakian structure. In other words, the same equations will hold under the vary of local coordinates, possibly with a different basic function h and a renormalized angle θ . For more details about Sasakian manifolds, see [16], [17], [22], [20] and [21].*

3.2. The complex Hessian. Next we are going to compute the complex Hessian of a function $u \in \mathcal{P}^{\infty}(B_1)$ with respect to the Sasakian structure. First, we compute its first derivatives as follows:

$$(3.22) \quad \partial u = (X_0 u)\lambda^0 + (X_{\alpha} u)d\zeta^{\alpha};$$

$$(3.23) \quad \bar{\partial} u = (\bar{X}_0 u)\lambda^0 + (\bar{X}_{\alpha} u)d\bar{\zeta}^{\alpha},$$

and hence we have

$$(3.24) \quad d^c u = \frac{i}{2} \{(\bar{X}_0 u)\lambda^0 - (X_0 u)\lambda^0\} + \frac{i}{2} \{(\bar{X}_{\alpha} u)d\bar{\zeta}^{\alpha} - (X_{\alpha} u)d\zeta^{\alpha}\}.$$

Equipped with equation (3.9), (3.10) and (3.12), we obtain

$$(3.25) \quad d^c u = u_t \eta - u_{\theta} dt + \frac{1}{2} u_{\theta} dh + d_{\zeta}^c u,$$

where we denote the operator d_{ζ} by

$$d_{\zeta} := \partial_{\zeta} + \bar{\partial}_{\zeta}.$$

Before moving on, we need to perform the following computations:

$$(3.26) \quad \partial \bar{\lambda}^0 = \partial dr + i\partial r \wedge \eta_0 + ir\partial\eta_0,$$

where

$$\partial\eta_0 = -\frac{1}{2}(i\partial\bar{\partial}_{\zeta}h), \quad \text{and} \quad \partial r = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^0.$$

Hence we have

$$(3.27) \quad \partial\bar{\lambda}^0 = \frac{1}{2r}\lambda^0 \wedge \bar{\lambda}^0 + r\partial\bar{\partial}_\zeta h.$$

Finally, we obtain

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial\bar{\partial}u &= \partial(\bar{X}_0u) \wedge \bar{\lambda}^0 + (\bar{X}_0u)\partial\bar{\lambda}^0 + \partial(\bar{X}_\beta u) \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^\beta \\ &= \left\{ X_0\bar{X}_0u + \frac{1}{2r}\bar{X}_0u \right\} \lambda^0 \wedge \bar{\lambda}^0 \\ &\quad + (X_\alpha\bar{X}_0u) d\zeta^\alpha \wedge \bar{\lambda}^0 + (X_0\bar{X}_\alpha u) \lambda^0 \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^\alpha \\ &\quad + \{ X_\alpha\bar{X}_\beta u + r(\bar{X}_0u)h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \} d\zeta^\alpha \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the commutators in equations (3.17) - (3.21), we can further check the following equation:

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial\bar{\partial}u &= -\bar{\partial}\partial u \\ &= \left\{ \bar{X}_0X_0u + \frac{1}{2r}X_0u \right\} \lambda^0 \wedge \bar{\lambda}^0 \\ &\quad + (\bar{X}_\alpha X_0u) \lambda^0 \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^\alpha + (\bar{X}_0X_\alpha u) d\zeta^\alpha \wedge \bar{\lambda}^0 \\ &\quad + \{ \bar{X}_\beta X_\alpha u + r(X_0u)h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \} d\zeta^\alpha \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

This formula is in fact well known among experts, and it is the complex Hessian of u under the Sasakian structure. Here we use it to give a new description of the plurisubharmonicity of a function. First we define the following two matrices:

$$S(u) := \begin{pmatrix} X_0\bar{X}_0u + (2r)^{-1}\bar{X}_0u & X_0\bar{X}_\beta u \\ X_\alpha\bar{X}_0u & X_\alpha\bar{X}_\beta u + r(\bar{X}_0u)h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$S^*(u) := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}_0X_0u + (2r)^{-1}X_0u & \bar{X}_\beta X_0u \\ \bar{X}_0X_\alpha u & \bar{X}_\beta X_\alpha u + r(X_0u)h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thanks to equation (3.28) and (3.29), these two matrices are actually equal, i.e. we have proved $S(u) = S^*(u)$. Then our positivity result follows.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose u is a C^2 -continuous function on a domain $D \subset (\mathbb{C}^{n+1})^*$. Then it is plurisubharmonic, if and only if the matrix $S(u)$, or its different version $S^*(u)$, is everywhere semi-positive. Moreover, it is strictly plurisubharmonic, if and only if the matrix is positive on D .*

Let us take a closer look at the matrix $S(u)$. First, the $(1, 1)$ -entry of this matrix is exactly the Laplacian of the restriction of u to the complex line ℓ_ζ through the origin in a direction $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$, i.e. we have

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} &4(X_0\bar{X}_0u + \frac{1}{2r}\bar{X}_0u) \\ &= u_{rr} + r^{-1}u_r + 4r^{-2}u_{\theta\theta} \\ &= \Delta(u|_{\ell_\zeta}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we compute the $(n \times n)$ -submatrix on the lower-right corner in the complex Hopf-coordinate as

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} & X_\alpha \bar{X}_\beta u + r(\bar{X}_0 u) h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \\ &= u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \frac{1}{2} u_t h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + i(h_\alpha u_{\theta\bar{\beta}} - h_{\bar{\beta}} u_{\theta\alpha}) + h_\alpha h_{\bar{\beta}} u_{\theta\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

and then it gives us a positive $(1, 1)$ -form Θ as

$$\Theta := \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^n (X_\alpha \bar{X}_\beta u + r(\bar{X}_0 u) h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) i d\zeta^\alpha \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^\beta \geq 0.$$

Moreover, we can also write down the mixed terms as

$$(3.32) \quad X_\alpha \bar{X}_0 u = \frac{1}{2} \{u_{r\alpha} - 2h_\alpha r^{-1} u_{\theta\theta} + i(2r^{-1} u_{\theta\alpha} + h_\alpha u_{r\theta})\},$$

and

$$(3.33) \quad X_0 \bar{X}_\alpha u = \frac{1}{2} \{u_{r\bar{\alpha}} - 2h_{\bar{\alpha}} r^{-1} u_{\theta\theta} - i(2r^{-1} u_{\theta\bar{\alpha}} + h_{\bar{\alpha}} u_{r\theta})\}.$$

Finally, we note that the matrix $S(u)$ boils down to the following, if u is circular symmetric:

$$S(u) := \begin{pmatrix} r^{-2} u_{tt} & \frac{1}{2r} u_{t\bar{\beta}} \\ \frac{1}{2r} u_{t\alpha} & u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \frac{1}{2} u_t h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

4. PUSH-FORWARD OF THE MONGE-AMPÈRE MASS

In this section, we are going to compute the following $(2n+1)$ -form on the sphere S_r , and obtain the decomposition formula for the complex Monge-Ampère mass of a function $u \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(B_1)$:

$$d^c u|_{S_r} \wedge (dd^c u|_{S_r})^n.$$

First we rewrite equation (3.24) as

$$(4.1) \quad d^c u|_{S_r} = (ru_r)\eta + \frac{i}{2} (\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} u - \partial_{\mathcal{D}} u),$$

where $\partial_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the exterior derivative towards the directions in $\mathcal{D}^{1,0}$, and $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is its complex conjugate. Thanks to the commutation relations in equation (3.17), we still have

$$\partial_{\mathcal{D}}^2 = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}^2 = 0.$$

However, we note that the following operator

$$\partial_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} + \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} \partial_{\mathcal{D}}$$

is no longer zero, since the commutator in equation (3.19) is non-trivial. Furthermore, we rewrite equation (3.28) as follows

$$(4.2) \quad i\partial\bar{\partial}u|_{S_r} = \Xi + \Theta,$$

where the 2-form Ξ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.3) \quad \Xi : &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n i \{ (X_\alpha \bar{X}_0 u) d\zeta^\alpha \wedge \bar{\lambda}^0 + (X_0 \bar{X}_\alpha u) \lambda^0 \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^\alpha \} |_{S_r} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \{ (X_\alpha \bar{X}_0 u) d\zeta^\alpha + (X_0 \bar{X}_\alpha u) d\bar{\zeta}^\alpha \} \wedge (2r\eta) \\
&= \{ \partial_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{X}_0 u) + \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}(X_0 u) \} \wedge (2r\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence it follows

$$(4.4) \quad (i\partial\bar{\partial}u|_{S_r})^n = \Theta^n + n\Theta^{n-1} \wedge \Xi,$$

since we have $\eta \wedge \eta = 0$. Combing with equation (4.1) and (4.4), we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad d^c u|_{S_r} \wedge (i\partial\bar{\partial}u|_{S_r})^n = (ru_r)\eta \wedge \Theta^n + nd_{\mathcal{D}}^c u \wedge \Xi \wedge \Theta^{n-1},$$

where we simply write

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}^c u := \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u - \partial_{\mathcal{D}}u).$$

Next we rewrite the (1, 1)-form Θ as

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.6) \quad \Theta &= i\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u + r(\bar{X}_0 u)\omega \\
&= -i\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}\partial_{\mathcal{D}}u + r(X_0 u)\omega,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\omega := dd^c h$ is a Kähler form on the base manifold $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ with $\omega = 2\omega_{FS}$, see equation (3.9). Then we can further write the first term on the R.H.S. of equation (4.5) as

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.7) \quad (ru_r)\eta \wedge \Theta^n &= \frac{1}{4}d\theta \wedge (i\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u + r(\bar{X}_0 u)\omega)^n (r\bar{X}_0 u) \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}d\theta \wedge (-i\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}\partial_{\mathcal{D}}u + r(X_0 u)\omega)^n (rX_0 u),
\end{aligned}$$

since Θ^n is an (n, n) -form in the base direction. Moreover, we have the following expansions:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.8) \quad \Theta^n &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (i\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^k \wedge (r(\bar{X}_0 u))^{n-k} \omega^{n-k} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-i\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}\partial_{\mathcal{D}}u)^k \wedge (r(X_0 u))^{n-k} \omega^{n-k}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the second term on the R.H.S. of equation (4.5) can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.9) \quad &(2nr)d_{\mathcal{D}}^c u \wedge \{ \partial_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{X}_0 u) + \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}(X_0 u) \} \wedge \eta \wedge \Theta^{n-1} \\
&= \frac{inr}{4}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u \wedge \partial_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{X}_0 u) \wedge \Theta^{n-1} \wedge d\theta \\
&- \frac{inr}{4}\partial_{\mathcal{D}}u \wedge \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}(X_0 u) \wedge \Theta^{n-1} \wedge d\theta,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that the top degree in the base directions is (n, n) . Let $k = 1, \dots, n$, and then we are going to consider the following integrals

on the sphere:

$$(4.10) \quad \int_{S_r} \partial_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{X}_0 u) \wedge \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} u \wedge (i\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^{k-1} \wedge (r\bar{X}_0 u)^{n-k} \omega^{n-k} \wedge d\theta$$

Denote d_{S_r} by the exterior derivative on the sphere S_r , and then it acts under the frame $\{\xi, X_\alpha, \bar{X}_\alpha\}$ and its dual basis as follows:

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & d_{S_r} \left\{ (\bar{X}_0 u)^{n-k+1} \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} u \wedge (\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^{k-1} \wedge \omega^{n-k} \wedge d\theta \right\} \\ &= d_\xi \left\{ (\bar{X}_0 u)^{n-k+1} \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} u \wedge (\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^{k-1} \wedge \omega^{n-k} \wedge d\theta \right\} \\ &+ (n-k+1)\partial_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{X}_0 u) \wedge \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} u \wedge (\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^{k-1} \wedge (\bar{X}_0 u)^{n-k} \omega^{n-k} \wedge d\theta \\ &+ (\bar{X}_0 u)^{n-k+1}(\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \wedge d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Here the operator $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}$ does not contribute in the above computation because of the degree reason again. Moreover, the first term on the R.H.S. of equation (4.11) vanishes after taking the integral along the S^1 -direction, and this will be proved in Lemma 4.2.

Hence we obtain the following integration by parts for the first term on the R.H.S. of equation (4.9):

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & -(inr) \int_{S_r} \partial_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{X}_0 u) \wedge \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}} u \wedge \Theta^{n-1} \wedge d\theta \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n-1}{k-1} \frac{n}{n-k+1} \int_{S_r} (r\bar{X}_0 u)^{n-k+1} (i\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \wedge d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

and the second term is equal to its complex conjugate as

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & (inr) \int_{S_r} \bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}(X_0 u) \wedge \partial_{\mathcal{D}} u \wedge \Theta^{n-1} \wedge d\theta \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n-1}{k-1} \frac{n}{n-k+1} \int_{S_r} (rX_0 u)^{n-k+1} (-i\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}\partial_{\mathcal{D}}u)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \wedge d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Then we are ready to prove the following decomposition formula.

Theorem 4.1. *For any function $u \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(B_1)$, we have*

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{S_r} d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^n \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n+1}{k+1} (-1)^k \int_{S_r} \left\{ (r\bar{X}_0 u)^{k+1} + (rX_0 u)^{k+1} \right\} \omega^k \wedge \Theta^{n-k} \wedge \frac{d\theta}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Combing with equation (4.7), (4.8), (4.12) and (4.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{S_r} d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^n \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n+1}{k} \int_{S_r} (r\bar{X}_0 u)^{n-k+1} \omega^{n-k} \wedge (i\partial_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}u)^k \wedge \frac{d\theta}{4} \\
&+ \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n+1}{k} \int_{S_r} (rX_0 u)^{n-k+1} \omega^{n-k} \wedge (-i\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{D}}\partial_{\mathcal{D}}u)^k \wedge \frac{d\theta}{4}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.15}$$

Then our decomposition formula follows, after applying a combinatoric identity as in Corollary (5.3), [23]. \square

Finally, we provide the following Lemma 4.2 to justify the integration by parts in equation (4.12) and (4.13).

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose f is a smooth $2n$ -form on the sphere S_r , and it has degree $(n-1, n)$ in the directions of the base manifold $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$. Then we have*

$$\int_{S_r} d_{\xi} f = 0.
\tag{4.16}$$

Proof. Locally we can write the form f as

$$f := f_j d\zeta^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\hat{\zeta}^j \wedge \cdots \wedge d\zeta^n \wedge d\bar{\zeta} \wedge d\theta,$$

where $d\bar{\zeta}$ stands for the $(0, n)$ form $d\bar{\zeta}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{\zeta}^n$. Thanks to equation (3.7), we can further write the following exterior derivatives as

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{\xi} f &= \xi(f_j)\eta_0 \wedge d\zeta^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\hat{\zeta}^j \wedge \cdots \wedge d\zeta^n \wedge d\bar{\zeta} \wedge d\theta \\
&= \sum_j \{H_j(\partial_{\theta} f_j)\} d\theta \wedge d\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta},
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.17}$$

where $H_j := H_j(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ is a basic function for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. Hence we can take the integral as

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S_r} d_{\xi} f &= \sum_j \int_{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n} H_j d\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta} \int_{S^1} (\partial_{\theta} f_j) d\theta \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.18}$$

This is because f is a smooth form on the sphere S_r , and then its coefficients f_j 's must be periodic in the S^1 -direction. Therefore, our result follows. \square

5. THE LOWER DIMENSIONAL CASE

In this section, we will study the residual Monge-Ampère mass of a function $u \in \mathcal{P}^{\infty}(B_1)$ in complex dimension two, i.e. we assume $n = 1$. The reason is that the decomposition formula in Theorem 4.1 only contains two terms, and there is no higher order of the $(1, 1)$ -form Θ appearing. Therefore, it is supposed to be the most fundamental case.

5.1. Basic properties. Before moving on, we will invoke some useful properties of a plurisubharmonic function with isolated unbounded locus. The following results, Lemma 5.1 - Lemma 5.5, were first stated in [25] with the assumption of circular symmetry. However, their proofs actually do not account on any symmetry condition. For this reason, we only recall them as follows.

Lemma 5.1. *For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, the complex Monge-Ampère mass of its standard regularization u_ε converges on a ball as*

$$\text{MA}(u)(B_R) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{MA}(u_\varepsilon)(B_R),$$

for almost all $0 < R < 1$.

The convergence in the above Lemma actually holds for every $R \in (0, 1)$, provided with $u \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(B_1)$. Hence we further have the following result via the Stokes Theorem.

Lemma 5.2. *For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(B_1)$, we have for all $R \in (0, 1)$*

$$\int_{B_R} (dd^c u)^{n+1} = \int_{S_R} d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^n.$$

Then we conclude the following Friedrichs's type estimate.

Lemma 5.3. *For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, and a point $z \in B_{1-2\delta}^*$, we have*

$$|r\partial_r(u * \rho_\varepsilon)(z) - r(\partial_r u * \rho_\varepsilon)(z)| \leq 2\varepsilon \|\nabla u\|_{L^1(B_{1-\delta})}$$

It is known by Blocki [7] that a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ is in fact in the Sobolev space $W_{loc}^{1,2}(B_1)$. Therefore, we can write

$$(5.1) \quad r(\partial_r u)_\varepsilon(z) = u_{\varepsilon,t} + O(\varepsilon),$$

for all z in a smaller ball in B_1 . Hence we have the following convergence due to the slicing theory.

Lemma 5.4. *For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, and any constant $1 < A < B$, there exists a subsequence u_{ε_k} such that the following integral on the boundary sphere S_r converges as $k \rightarrow +\infty$*

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1} \left(\int_{S^1} u_{\varepsilon_k,t} d\theta \right) \omega_{FS} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1} \left(\int_{S^1} u_t d\theta \right) \omega_{FS},$$

for almost all $t := \log r \in [-B, -A]$.

Finally, we need a slightly stronger version of Lemma 6.6 in [25].

Lemma 5.5. *Fixing any constant $A > 1$, there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that we have*

$$L_A(u_\varepsilon) \leq L_A(u) + C\varepsilon,$$

for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ where $\varepsilon_0 := (e^{-1} - e^{-A})/2$.

Proof. First we note that the first order linear operator $r\partial_r$ can be rewritten in real coordinates as

$$r\partial_r u = \sum_m x^m \partial_{x^m} u,$$

where $m = 1, \dots, 2n + 2$. For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ and a point $x \in \overline{B}_r$, we can first commute the convolution and the derivatives as

$$(5.2) \quad x^m \partial_{x^m} (u * \rho_\varepsilon) = x^m (\partial_{x^m} u * \rho_\varepsilon).$$

Then we further compare the following two terms as

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & |x^m (\partial_{x^m} u * \rho_\varepsilon) - (x^m \partial_{x^m} u) * \rho_\varepsilon| \\ & \leq \int_{|y| < 1} |x^m - (x^m - \varepsilon y^m)| |\partial_{x^m} u(x - \varepsilon y)| \rho(y) d\lambda(y) \\ & \leq \varepsilon \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |\nabla u| d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$(5.4) \quad |(r \partial_r u)_\varepsilon - r \partial_r u_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla u\|_{L^1(\overline{B}_{r+\varepsilon})}.$$

Therefore, our result follows from Blocki's estimate. \square

5.2. The upper-bound estimates. Recall that our positivity condition in \mathbb{C}^2 in Proposition 3.2 is reduced to the following semi-positive (2×2) -matrix:

$$S(u) := \begin{pmatrix} \Delta(u|_{\ell_\zeta})/4 & X_0 \bar{X}_1 u \\ X_1 \bar{X}_0 u & X_1 \bar{X}_1 u + r(\bar{X}_0 u) h_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\zeta := z^1/z^0$ is the holomorphic coordinate on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$. Then we have two positive terms in complex Hopf-coordinates as follows:

$$(5.5) \quad \Delta(u|_{\ell_\zeta}) = e^{-2t} (u_{tt} + 4u_{\theta\theta}),$$

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & X_1 \bar{X}_1 u + r(\bar{X}_0 u) h_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \\ & = u_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} + \frac{1}{2} u_t h_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} + i(h_\zeta u_{\theta \bar{\zeta}} - h_{\bar{\zeta}} u_{\theta \zeta}) + |h_\zeta|^2 u_{\theta\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the mixed term can be written as

$$(5.7) \quad X_1 \bar{X}_0 u = \frac{1}{2r} \{u_{t\zeta} - 2h_\zeta u_{\theta\theta} + i(2u_{\theta\zeta} + h_\zeta u_{t\theta})\}.$$

Next we are going to utilize the decomposition formula in \mathbb{C}^2 to study the upper-bound estimate. First, we compute as follows:

$$(5.8) \quad r \bar{X}_0 u + r X_0 u = u_t,$$

and

$$(5.9) \quad (r \bar{X}_0 u)^2 + (r X_0 u)^2 = \frac{1}{2} (u_t^2 - 4u_\theta^2).$$

Thanks to Theorem 4.1, the complex Monge-Ampère mass is reduced to

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & 4 \int_{S_r} d^c u \wedge dd^c u \\ & = 2 \int_{S_r} u_t \{X_1 \bar{X}_1 u + r(\bar{X}_0 u) h_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}\} d\theta \wedge (id\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta}) \\ & - \int_{S_r} (|u_t|^2 - 4|u_\theta|^2) d\theta \wedge \omega_{FS}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we are going to investigate the second term on the R.H.S. of the above equation for each $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ fixed, i.e. we can write it as

$$\int_0^{4\pi} (|u_t|^2 - 4|u_\theta|^2) d\theta = \int_{S^1} (|u_t|^2 - |\xi_0 u|^2).$$

Here we need to invoke a famous inequality in harmonic map flows, see Lemma 2.4, [26]. A proof is provided for the convenience of the readers.

Lemma 5.6 (Pohozaev inequality). *Let u be a C^2 -continuous subharmonic function on the unit disk. Then the following integral along the boundary of a smaller disk D_R for some $0 < R < 1$ can be estimated as*

$$(5.11) \quad \left| \int_{S^1} (|u_t|^2 - |\xi_0 u|^2) \right| \leq 2L_A \int_{S^1} u_t,$$

where $A = -\log R$.

Proof. For simplicity, we will slightly change our notations in this proof, and hope that it will be clear enough. Let $z := re^{i\theta}$ be a complex coordinate on \mathbb{C} , and also take $t := \log r$ for all $r > 0$. Then we perform the following integration by parts as

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} - \int_{D_R} (ru_r) dd^c u &= \int_{D_R} u_r dr \wedge d^c u + \int_{D_R} r du_r \wedge d^c u - \int_{\partial D_R} (ru_r) d^c u \\ &= \int_{D_R} du \wedge d^c u + \int_{D_R} (r du_r - u_\theta d\theta) \wedge d^c u - \int_{S^1} |u_t|^2 d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where $d^c := i(\bar{\partial} - \partial)$. Then we further compute as

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} (r du_r - u_\theta d\theta) \wedge d^c u &= (r^2 u_{rr} u_r - r^{-1} u_\theta^2 + u_{r\theta} u_\theta) dr \wedge d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} r^2 \partial_r (u_r^2 + r^{-2} u_\theta^2) dr \wedge d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence perform integration by parts again, and we obtain

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{D_R} (r du_r - u_\theta d\theta) \wedge d^c u \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{S^1} (|u_\theta|^2 + |u_t|^2) d\theta - \int_{D_R} du \wedge d^c u. \end{aligned}$$

Equipped with equation (5.12) and (5.14), we have the equation

$$(5.15) \quad 2 \int_{D_R} (ru_r) \Delta u = \int_{S^1} (|u_t|^2 - |u_\theta|^2).$$

Then our result follows from the definition of L_A , see Definition 2.7. \square

Now we are ready to state our main theorem. It is an estimate on the upper bound of the complex Monge-Ampère mass in \mathbb{C}^2 .

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ is uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin. Then we have the following estimate:*

$$\tau_u(0) \leq 4\kappa_u(0) \cdot \nu_u(0).$$

Proof. Let a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ be uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin. Then we consider the sequence of its standard regularizations $u_\varepsilon := u * \rho_\varepsilon$, and it is in the family $\mathcal{P}^\infty(B_{1-\delta})$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$ small.

Hence we can apply Theorem 4.1 to this sequence, and the first term on the R.H.S. of equation (5.10) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1} \left(\int_{S^1} u_{\varepsilon,t} \{X_1 \bar{X}_1 u_\varepsilon + r(\bar{X}_0 u_\varepsilon) h_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}\} d\theta \right) id\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta} \\
& \leq L_A(u_\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1} \left(\int_{S^1} \left\{ u_{\varepsilon,\zeta \bar{\zeta}} + \frac{1}{2} u_{\varepsilon,t} h_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \right\} d\theta \right) id\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta} \\
& = L_A(u_\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1} \left(\int_{S^1} u_{\varepsilon,t} d\theta \right) \omega_{FS} \\
(5.16) \quad & \leq 4\pi^2 L_A(u_\varepsilon) \cdot M_A(u_\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the positivity of equation (5.6) on the second line of the above inequality, and Fubini's Theorem is utilized on the third line.

Moreover, the second term on the R.H.S. of equation (5.10) can be estimated by the Pohozaev inequality (Lemma 5.6) as

$$(5.17) \quad \left| \int_{S^1} (|u_{\varepsilon,t}|^2 - |\xi_0 u_\varepsilon|^2) \right| \leq 8\pi^2 L_A(u_\varepsilon) \cdot M_A(u_\varepsilon).$$

Combing with the estimates in above equation (5.16) and (5.17) with Lemma 5.5, we obtain for some uniform constant $C > 0$

$$(5.18) \quad \int_{S_R} d^c u_\varepsilon \wedge dd^c u_\varepsilon \leq 4\pi^2 L_A(u) \cdot M_A(u) + C\varepsilon,$$

for $R = e^{-A}$. Thanks to Lemma 5.1 and 5.2, we take $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and finally obtain

$$(5.19) \quad \text{MA}(u)(B_R) \leq 4L_A(u) \cdot M_A(u).$$

Then our result follows by taking $A \rightarrow +\infty$. □

Hence the zero mass conjecture follows under the same condition.

Corollary 5.8. *Suppose a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ is uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin. Then we have*

$$\nu_u(0) = 0 \Rightarrow \tau_u(0) = 0.$$

5.3. Fourier expansions. As we have seen the example in equation (2.13), the uniform directional Lipschitz continuity may fail in general. Then one possible approach is to consider the Fourier expansion of the alternating part of u along the S^1 -direction, i.e. we try to write $v := u - u_s$ under a complex Hopf-coordinate as

$$v \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\cos k\theta \cdot v_k + \sin k\theta \cdot w_k),$$

where v_k and w_k are functions of $(r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ only. In other words, the S^1 -symmetrization u_s is exactly the constant term in the Fourier series.

However, this Fourier expansion rather depends on the chosen local coordinate, and it may vary under different local embeddings. For instance, we can consider the following function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ in \mathbb{C}^2 :

$$(5.20) \quad u(z^0, z^1) := u_s(z^0, z^1) + \operatorname{Re} z^1,$$

where u_s is any function in $\mathcal{F}(B_1)$.

On the one hand, the complex Hopf-coordinate that we usually mentioned actually corresponds to the local embedding:

$$(5.21) \quad (r, \theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \rightarrow \left(\frac{r e^{\frac{i}{2}\theta} (|\zeta|/\zeta)^{1/2}}{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^{1/2}}, \frac{r e^{\frac{i}{2}\theta} (|\zeta| \cdot \zeta)^{1/2}}{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^{1/2}} \right),$$

and then the expansion of the alternating part of u is

$$(5.22) \quad v(z) = \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \left\{ r \cos\left(\frac{\varphi}{2}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\eta}{2}\right) \right\} - \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \left\{ r \sin\left(\frac{\varphi}{2}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\eta}{2}\right) \right\},$$

where φ, η are the Euler angles of S^2 and we have $\zeta = \tan(\eta/2)e^{i\varphi}$.

On the other hand, there is another often used local embedding as

$$(5.23) \quad (r, \theta', \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \rightarrow \left(\frac{r e^{i\theta'} \zeta}{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^{1/2}}, \frac{r e^{i\theta'}}{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^{1/2}} \right).$$

Then the Fourier expansion under this embedding is simply

$$(5.24) \quad v(z) = \frac{r}{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^{1/2}} \cos \theta'.$$

Therefore, we need to clarify a ‘‘nice’’ complex Hopf-coordinate, before discussing about the Fourier expansion.

Let p denote the fiber map of the circle bundle $S^1 \hookrightarrow S^3 \xrightarrow{p} S^2$. Then a complex Hopf-coordinate means that there exists an open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$, and a local trivialization of the fiber map p as

$$\phi : S^1 \times U \rightarrow p^{-1}(U) \subset S^3,$$

such that the induced map

$$\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times S^1 \times U \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2)^*$$

defined as $\Phi(r, \theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) := (r, \phi(\theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}))$ is a local embedding. Moreover, we say that this complex Hopf-coordinate is *proper* if the the complement of U has measure zero in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$.

For instance, the two local embeddings in equation (5.21) and (5.23) both induce proper complex Hopf-coordinates. Inspired from the example in equation (5.24), we introduce the following concept as a first attempt.

Let $f(\theta)$ be a continuous function on the unit circle S^1 that its average vanishes, and we write

$$(5.25) \quad \sup_{\theta} f = K, \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\theta} f = -k.$$

Definition 5.9. *For a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$, we say that u has a single frequency in its alternating part, if we can write u near the origin under a proper complex Hopf-coordinate as*

$$u := u_s + f(\theta)v$$

where $v := v(r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ is a circular symmetric $W_{loc}^{1,2}$ -function.

Here *having a single frequency* (in the alternating part) in fact means that the function v can almost separate variables in the S^1 -direction and other directions. The upshot is that this kind of functions in fact satisfy our uniform continuity condition, and the zero mass conjecture follows.

Corollary 5.10. *Suppose a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ has a single frequency in its alternating part. Then we have*

$$\nu_u(0) = 0 \Rightarrow \tau_u(0) = 0.$$

Proof. Thanks to Corollary 5.8, it is enough to prove that u is uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin. Then it boils down to prove that the function v_t is in fact L^∞ in a smaller ball.

To this end, we fix a complex direction ζ that is in the defining area of the proper complex Hopf-coordinate. Then we can write the alternating part for almost all points $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ as

$$u - u_s = f(\theta)v.$$

If the function $f(\theta)$ is identically zero, then we have $u = u_s$ almost everywhere. This means that we are back to the S^1 -invariant case.

Hence we can assume that the function $f(\theta)$ is non-trivial. It follows that the two constants K and k must be positive. Take a new constant as $c := (K - k)/2$, and we denote g by the following function

$$g(\theta) := f(\theta) - c,$$

and then we have

$$(5.26) \quad \sup_{\theta} g = -\inf_{\theta} g = (K + k)/2.$$

Hence the alternating part can be rewritten as

$$u - u_s = cv + g(\theta)v,$$

where u_s and v are both S^1 -invariant functions.

Next we take the difference between the supreme of u and its average along the circle. Thanks to equation (5.25) and (5.26), we have

$$(5.27) \quad \sup_{S^1} u - u_s = cv + \sup_{\theta} \{v \cdot g(\theta)\} = \frac{1}{2}(K + k)|v| + \frac{1}{2}(K - k)v.$$

Recall that we denoted \hat{u} by the supreme as

$$\hat{u}(t, \zeta) = \sup_{\theta} u(e^t, \theta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}).$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.6, we obtain

$$(5.28) \quad -M_A(u) \leq (\partial_t^+ \hat{u} - \partial_t^+ u_s)|_{t \leq -A} \leq N_A(u),$$

since the numbers M_A and N_A are both non-increasing in A .

Then we note that the functions v and hence $|v|$ are in the $W_{loc}^{1,2}(B_1)$ Sobolev space, see Lemma 7.6 in [15]. This further implies that their first

derivatives are L^2 -functions, and exist in the classical sense for almost all points. Therefore, the following equation holds for almost all points:

$$\frac{1}{2}(K+k)\partial_t|v| + \frac{1}{2}(K-k)\partial_tv = \begin{cases} Kv_t & \text{for } v > 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } v = 0, \\ -kv_t & \text{for } v < 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows that we have the bound almost everywhere as

$$(5.29) \quad -\max\left\{\frac{M_A(u)}{K}, \frac{N_A(u)}{k}\right\} \leq r\partial_rv \leq \max\left\{\frac{N_A(u)}{K}, \frac{M_A(u)}{k}\right\}.$$

In other words, we have proved that the L^2 -function $r\partial_rv$ is in fact uniformly bounded almost everywhere, and hence is an L^∞ -function in a ball. Hence our result follows. \square

6. REMARKS

In this section, we are going to make several remarks to reveal further difficulties along this approach. Moreover, a conjecture about plurisubharmonic functions with finite frequencies will be given, perhaps as a middle step towards the zero mass conjecture.

6.1. Another example. In Example 2.8, we have seen a function in the family $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$ but is not uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous. In the following, another such example will be provided in \mathbb{C}^2 , even if it has certain symmetry, see [12].

Example 6.1. Let $z := (z^0, z^1)$ be the complex Euclidean coordinate in \mathbb{C}^2 , and then we consider the following function for any integer $n \geq 2$:

$$(6.1) \quad u(z) := \frac{1}{2n} \log(|z^1 - (z^0)^n|^2 + |z^1|^{2n}).$$

It is clear that this function is in the family $\mathcal{P}(B_1)$, and it has the so called $(1, n)$ -symmetry. Moreover, it can be transformed into a circular symmetric function, after passing to a finite holomorphic cover near the origin, see [25]. However, we claim that this function fails to be uniformly directional Lipschitz continuous near the origin. This shows that the Sasakian structure is not fit to the change of holomorphic coordinates.

Consider the following complex Hopf-coordinate:

$$z^0 := \frac{re^{i\theta}}{(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}}, \quad z^1 := \frac{re^{i\theta} \cdot \xi}{(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}},$$

where $\xi := z^1/z^0$ is a holomorphic coordinate on the open set $\{z^0 \neq 0\}$. Then we further compute as

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} z^1 - (z^0)^n &= \frac{re^{i\theta} \cdot \xi}{(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}} - \frac{r^n e^{in\theta}}{(1+|\xi|^2)^{n/2}} \\ &= re^{i\theta} \cdot \frac{\xi(1+|\xi|^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} - r^{n-1}e^{i(n-1)\theta}}{(1+|\xi|^2)^{n/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that we can infer the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & |z^1 - (z^0)^n|^2 + |z^1|^{2n} \\ = & \frac{r^2 |\xi|^2 (1 + |\xi|^2)^{n-1} + r^{2n-2} (1 + |\xi|^{2n}) - 2r^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}\{e^{-i(n-1)\theta}\xi\} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{(1 + |\xi|^2)^n}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2n-2} (2nr u_r - 2) \\ = & \frac{r^{2n-2} (1 + |\xi|^{2n}) - r^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}\{e^{-i(n-1)\theta}\xi\} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{|\xi|^2 (1 + |\xi|^2)^{n-1} + r^{2n-2} (1 + |\xi|^{2n}) - 2r^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}\{e^{-i(n-1)\theta}\xi\} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

If we further take the following two complex numbers

$$a := \xi (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}, \quad b := r^{n-1} e^{i(n-1)\theta},$$

then equation (6.4) can be re-written as

$$(6.5) \quad 1 + \frac{\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{b}) - |a|^2}{|a-b|^2 + r^{2n-2} |\xi|^{2n}}.$$

Pick up an angle θ such that we have $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{b}) = |a||b|$, and then it boils down to estimate the term

$$(6.6) \quad \frac{|a|(r^{n-1} - |a|)}{(r^{n-1} - |a|)^2 + r^{2n-2} |\xi|^{2n}}.$$

However, we can choose r and ξ small enough such that $|a| = (1 - k^{-1})r^{n-1}$ for an integer $k > 0$, and equation (6.6) further reduces to

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{(k-1)r^{2n-2}}{r^{2n-2} + k^2 O(r^{2n^2-2})} = \frac{k-1}{1 + k^2 O(r^{2n^2-2n})} \geq \frac{k-1}{2},$$

for all r small enough. Then it is clear that equation (6.7) can be arbitrarily large, and our claim follows.

6.2. Higher dimensional cases. Next we would like to discuss some difficulties on the estimate in higher dimensions, e.g. in \mathbb{C}^3 . Consider the decomposition formula in Theorem 4.1, and then we have the term for $k = 2$ as

$$(2rX_0u)^3 + (2r\bar{X}_0u)^3 = 2(u_t^3 - 12u_t u_\theta^2).$$

Hence we can still use the Pohozaev inequality to estimate this term, since the order of u_θ is even and we already have L^∞ -bound on u_t .

However, we have the following mixed term for $k = 1$ as

$$(6.8) \quad \int_{S_r} (4|u_\theta|^2 - |u_t|^2) \omega \wedge \Theta \wedge d\theta.$$

Unfortunately, there is no way to use the Pohozaev inequality, since the $(1,1)$ -form Θ involves the t -variable in a complicated way. Therefore, we need to consider to add one more condition on the uniform bound of the derivative $|u_\theta|$ at this time.

Moreover, the last term is the integral for $k = 0$ as

$$(6.9) \quad \int_{S_r} (ru_r)\Theta^2 \wedge d\theta.$$

Here we still need to invoke the positivity of Θ to perform estimates. However, the integration by parts on the S^1 -direction for the form Θ^2 is no longer easy, since it involves quadratic terms of the second derivatives of u .

In conclusion, our computations indicates that it would be easier to find counter-examples to the conjecture in higher dimensions, if there is one.

6.3. Finite frequencies. Finally, we put some remarks on a plurisubharmonic function and its Fourier expansions. Like in Definition 5.9, we say that a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ has finite frequencies in its alternating part, if it can be written near the origin under a proper complex Hopf-coordinate as

$$u := u_s + \sum_{k=1}^m (\cos k\theta \cdot v_k + \sin k\theta \cdot w_k).$$

As we have seen from the above, there are plenty of such examples. Inspired from Corollary 5.10, we would like to arise a weaker version of the zero mass conjecture.

Conjecture 6.2. *Suppose a function $u \in \mathcal{P}(B_1)$ has finite frequencies in its alternating part. Then we still have an upper-bound estimate on its Monge-Ampère mass, and it follows*

$$\nu_u(0) = 0 \Rightarrow \tau_u(0) = 0.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Åhag, U. Cegrell, and P.-H. Hiep, *On the Guedj-Rashkovskii conjecture*, Ann. Polon. Math. **123** (2019), 15-20.
- [2] ———, *Monge-Ampère measures on subvarieties*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **423** (2015), 94-105.
- [3] E. Bedford and A. Talyor, *The Dirichlet Problem for a Complex Monge-Ampère equation*, Inventiones math. **37** (1976), 1-44.
- [4] ———, *A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions*, Acta Math. **149** (1982), 1-41.
- [5] R. Berman and B. Berndtsson, *Plurisubharmonic functions with symmetry*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **63** (2014), 345-365.
- [6] S. Biard and J. Wu, *Equivalence between VMO functions and zero Lelong numbers functions*, arXiv:2403.03568.
- [7] Z. Błocki, *On the definition of the Monge-Ampère operator in \mathbb{C}^2* , Math. Ann. **328** (2004), 415-423.
- [8] S. Boucksom, C. Favre, and M. Jonsson, *Valuations and plurisubharmonic singularities*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **44** (2008), no. 2, 449-494.
- [9] C.P. Boyer and K. Galicki, *Sasakian Geometry*, Oxford Math. Monogr. (2008).
- [10] Bo-Yong Chen and Xu Wang, *Bergman kernel and oscillation theory of plurisubharmonic functions*, Math. Z. **297** (2021), 1507-1527.
- [11] S. S. Chern and J. G. Wolfson, *Harmonic maps of the two-sphere into a complex Grassmann manifold II*, Ann. Math. **125** (1987), 301-335.
- [12] D. Coman and V. Guedj, *Quasiplurisubharmonic Green functions*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **92** (2009), 456-475.

- [13] J.P. Demailly, *Monge-Ampère operators, Lelong numbers and intersection theory*, Complex analysis and geometry, Univ. Ser. Math., Plenum, New York, (1993), 115-193.
- [14] S. Dinew, V. Guedj, and A. Zeriahi, *Open problems in pluripotential theory*, arXiv: 1511.00705.
- [15] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Springer, Classics in Mathematics **224**.
- [16] M. Godliński, W. Kopczyński, and P. Nurowski, *Locally Sasakian manifolds* (2000).
- [17] Pengfei Guan and Xi Zhang, *Regularity of the geodesic equation in the space of Sasakian metrics*, Advances in Mathematics **230** (2012), 321-371.
- [18] V. Guedj, *Propriétés ergodiques des applications rationnelles.*, Quelques aspects des systèmes dynamiques polynomiaux S. Cantat, A. Chambert-Loir, V.Guedj Panoramas et Synth. **30** (2010).
- [19] V. Guedj and A. Zeriahi, *Degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations*, EMS (2017).
- [20] He Weiyong, *The Sasaki-Ricci Flow and compact Sasaki manifolds of positive transversal holomorphic bisectional curvature*, J. Geom. Anal. **23** (2013).
- [21] W. He and S. Sun, *Frankel conjecture and Sasaki geometry*, Advances in Mathematics **291** (2016).
- [22] W. He and J. Li, *Geometric pluripotential theory on Sasaki manifolds*, The Journal of Geometric Analysis **31** (2021).
- [23] W. He, L. Li, and X. Xu, *On the residual Monge-Ampère mass of plurisubharmonic functions with symmetry, II*, arxiv.org/2309.13288.
- [24] Long Li, *The Lelong number, the Monge-Ampère mass and the Schwarz symmetrization of plurisubharmonic functions.*, Ark. Mat. **58** (2020), 369-392.
- [25] ———, *On the residual Monge-Ampère mass of plurisubharmonic functions with symmetry in \mathbb{C}^2* , Math. Z.
- [26] Fanghua Lin and Changyou Wang, *Energy identity of harmonic map flows from surfaces*, Calc. Var. **6** (1998), 369-380.
- [27] A. Rashkovskii, *Lelong numbers with respect to regular plurisubharmonic functions*, Results Math. **39** (2001), 320-332.
- [28] ———, *Relative types and extremal problems for plurisubharmonic functions.*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2006 Art. ID 76283, 26 pp.
- [29] ———, *Analytic approximations of plurisubharmonic singularities.*, Math. Z. **275** (2013), no. 3-4, 1217-1238.
- [30] ———, *Some problems on plurisubharmonic singularities.*, Mat. Stud. **45** (2016), 104-108.
- [31] S. Sasaki and Y. Hatakeyama, *On differential manifolds with contact metric structures.* (1962).
- [32] J. Wiklund, *Pluricomplex charge at weak singularities.*, arXiv:math/0510671.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OR, USA, 97403.

Email address: `whe@uoregon.edu`

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE AT SHANGHAI TECH UNIVERSITY, 393 MIDDLE HUAXIA ROAD, PUDONG, SHANGHAI, CHINA, 201210.

Email address: `lilong1@shanghaitech.edu.cn`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, USTC, HEFEI, ANHUI, CHINA, 230026; CAS, WU WEN-TSUN KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS.

Email address: `xwxu09@ustc.edu.cn`