

ON THE GEODESICS OF THE SZEGÖ METRIC

ANJALI BHATNAGAR

ABSTRACT. We explore the existence of closed geodesics and geodesic spirals for the Szegö metric in a C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, which is not simply connected for $n \geq 2$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the article is to identify the shared properties by the Szegö and Bergman metrics, which continues our prior work [BB24]. The Bergman metric is an active area of research while the Szegö metric with respect to the Fefferman surface area measure was recently introduced by Barrett-Lee [BL14] to study an invariant version of the Szegö metric. This metric is called the Fefferman-Szegö metric—which has been further investigated in [Kra19, KW21]. In contrast, the Szegö metric relative to the Euclidean surface area measure is generally not invariant under biholomorphisms, except in one dimension. We have explored the intrinsic properties of the Szegö metric such as geodesics, curvature, and L^2 -cohomology in non-degenerate finitely connected planar domains in [BB24] and draw the similarity between the theories of the Bergman and Szegö metrics. We have also provided the comparison between the Carathéodory and Szegö metrics, and established the existence of domains where the curvatures of the Szegö metric achieves both positive and negative real-values. It can also be observed from [BB24, Zwo10] that there are domains in which the curvatures of the Bergman and Szegö metric have opposite signs.

To deepen this comparison, we continue to study geodesics that remain in a compact subset of domains. Such geodesics are either closed or non-closed—the latter is called *geodesic spiral*. This was explored by Herbort for the Bergman metric in [Her83]. To set the stage, we briefly recall the setup. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain with C^∞ -smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. The Hardy space $H^2(\partial\Omega)$ is defined as the closure in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ of the set of functions whose Poisson integrals are holomorphic in Ω . The Szegö kernel $S_\Omega(z, w)$ associated with $H^2(\partial\Omega)$ is uniquely determined by the following properties: for each $z \in \Omega$, $S_\Omega(\cdot, z) \in H^2(\partial\Omega)$, for all $z, w \in \Omega$, $S_\Omega(z, w) = \overline{S_\Omega(w, z)}$, and for each $h \in H^2(\partial\Omega)$,

$$h(z) = \int_{\partial\Omega} h(w) S_\Omega(z, w) d\sigma_E \quad \text{for all } z \in \Omega,$$

where $d\sigma_E$ denotes the Euclidean surface area measure.

Furthermore, $S_\Omega(z, w)$ can be expressed in terms of any complete orthonormal basis $\{\phi_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ of $H^2(\partial\Omega)$ as follows

$$S_\Omega(z, w) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \phi_i(z) \overline{\phi_i(w)},$$

where the series converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\Omega \times \Omega$. Consequently, the function $g_\Omega(z) = \log S_\Omega(z, z)$ is a C^∞ -smooth strongly plurisubharmonic function and therefore induces the Kähler metric on Ω called the Szegő metric defined as

$$ds_{s_\Omega}^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 g_\Omega(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} dz_j d\bar{z}_k.$$

Example 1. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$ be the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n . Recall that

$$S_{\mathbb{B}^n}(z, w) = \frac{(n-1)!}{2\pi^n} \frac{1}{(1 - z \cdot \bar{w})^n},$$

where $z \cdot \bar{w} = \sum_{\ell=1}^n z_\ell \bar{w}_\ell$, and hence

$$\frac{\partial^2 g_{\mathbb{B}^n}(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} = n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} \log \frac{1}{1 - |z|^2} = n \left(\frac{\delta_{j\bar{k}}(1 - |z|^2) + \bar{z}_j z_k}{(1 - |z|^2)^2} \right).$$

Example 2. ([BB24]) For $r \in (0, 1)$, let $\Omega = A_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : r < |z| < 1\}$ denotes the annulus. It is known that

$$S_{A_r}(z, w) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(z\bar{w})^n}{1 + r^{2n+1}}.$$

Now, let \wp be the Weierstrass elliptic \wp -function with periods $2\omega_1 = -2 \log r$ and $2\omega_3 = 2i\pi$. Then, the Szegő metric on A_r can be expressed as

$$ds_{s_{A_r}}^2 = \frac{\wp(2 \log |z|) - \wp(2 \log |z| + \omega_1 + \omega_3)}{|z|^2} |dz|^2.$$

We now recall some definitions to state our main result.

Definition 1. Let (X, \tilde{g}) be a complete Riemannian manifold.

- (a) A geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ is called a *geodesic spiral*, if c is non-closed and there exists a compact subset K of X such that $c(t) \in K$ for all $t \geq 0$.
- (b) Let $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ be a nontrivial geodesic, and let $x_0 \in X$. If there exist $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t_1 < t_2$ such that $c(t_1) = c(t_2) = x_0$, then the segment $c|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is called a geodesic loop passing through x_0 .

Theorem 1.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain which is not simply connected, equipped with the Szegő metric $ds_{s_\Omega}^2$. We have

- (a) Every nontrivial homotopy class of loops in Ω consists a closed geodesic.
- (b) Suppose the universal cover of Ω is infinitely sheeted. Then, for each point $z_0 \in \Omega$ that does not lie on a closed geodesic, there exists a geodesic spiral passing through z_0 .

Acknowledgements. The author expresses gratitude to D. Borah for suggesting the problem and to D. Kar for his valuable suggestions.

2. CLOSED GEODESICS

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 (a). We first recall a general result of Herbort.

Theorem 2.1. [Her83, Theorem 1.1] Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain that is not simply connected such that the following holds:

- (i) For each $p \in \overline{G}$, there is an open neighbourhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ of p such that $G \cap U$ is simply connected.
- (ii) The domain G is equipped with a complete Riemannian metric \tilde{g} which has the following property: (B) Given $S > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$, such that for each $p \in G$ with $d(p, \partial G) < \delta$ and every $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\tilde{g}(p, X) \geq S\|X\|^2$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm.

Then, every nontrivial homotopy class of loops in G contains a closed geodesic for \tilde{g} .

Thus, it is crucial to establish the completeness of the Szegö metric, which is provided by the following result.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain. Then, the Szegö metric ds_{s_Ω} is complete.*

This lemma follows from the fact that the Carathéodory metric is complete on C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains. Since the Szegö metric dominates the Carathéodory metric, which can be shown using similar lines of reasoning as for the Bergman metric—see [MP93, Theorem 12.8.1]. To see this, we start by recalling the Carathéodory metric ds_{c_Ω} on a bounded domain Ω : Let $z_0 \in \Omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$ds_{c_\Omega}(z_0, \zeta) = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\partial \phi(z_0)}{\partial z_j} \zeta_j \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} : \phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \text{ holomorphic and } \phi(z_0) = 0 \right\}.$$

Lemma 2.3. *For all $z \in \Omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we have*

$$ds_{s_\Omega}(z, \zeta) \geq ds_{c_\Omega}(z, \zeta).$$

Proof. First, we express the Szegö metric in terms of maximal domain functions $J_\Omega^{(j)}$, $j = 0, 1$, which are defined by

$$J_\Omega^{(0)}(z, \zeta) = \sup_{f \in H^2(\partial\Omega)} \left\{ |f(z)|^2 : \|f\|_{H^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq 1 \right\}, \text{ and}$$

$$J_\Omega^{(1)}(z, \zeta) = \sup_{f \in H^2(\partial\Omega)} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_j} \zeta_j \right|^2 : f(z) = 0, \|f\|_{H^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq 1 \right\},$$

for $z \in \Omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Fix $z_0 \in \Omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$, there exists an orthonormal basis $\{\phi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ of $H^2(\partial\Omega)$ such that for all $k \geq 2$,

$$\phi_0(z_0) \neq 0, \quad \phi_{k-1}(z_0) = 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \phi_k(z_0)}{\partial z_j} \zeta_j = 0. \quad (1)$$

Using (1), it can shown that

$$ds_{s_\Omega}(z_0, \zeta)^2 = \frac{J_\Omega^{(1)}(z_0, \zeta)}{J_\Omega^{(0)}(z_0, \zeta)}, \quad \text{and} \quad J_\Omega^{(0)}(z_0, \zeta) = S_\Omega(z_0, z_0).$$

Now, we define

$$f(z) = \frac{S_\Omega(z, z_0)}{\sqrt{S_\Omega(z_0, z_0)}} \phi(z),$$

where $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ is an arbitrary holomorphic function with $\phi(z_0) = 0$. It is evident that $\|\phi\|_{H^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq 1$ and $\phi(z_0) = 0$. Therefore, it can be concluded that

$$ds_{s_\Omega}(z_0, \zeta)^2 \geq ds_{c_\Omega}(z_0, \zeta)^2.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (a). It is enough to verify the hypothesis of the Theorem 2.1 for $G = \Omega$ and $\tilde{g} = ds_{s_\Omega}^2$. Clearly, Condition (i) is satisfied by the smoothness of $\partial\Omega$. For Condition (ii), observe that the completeness of the Szegő metric follows from the preceding lemma. Therefore, it remains to verify Property (B), which can be deduced from [Hen73, Lemma 1]. Thus, the proof is complete. □

Remark 1. The unit ball \mathbb{B}^n has no nontrivial closed geodesic for the Szegő metric because $(\mathbb{B}^n, ds_{s_{\mathbb{B}^n}}^2)$ is a Hadamard-Cartan manifold.

3. GEODESIC SPIRALS

Our next goal is to prove Theorem 1.1 (b). We start by recalling a result of Herbort.

Lemma 3.1. ([Her83]) *Let (X, \tilde{g}) be a complete Riemannian manifold whose universal cover is infinitely sheeted, and let $x_0 \in X$ such that there are no closed geodesic passes. If there exists a compact subset K of X with the property that each geodesic loop passing through x_0 lies within K , then there exists a geodesic spiral for \tilde{g} passing through x_0 .*

From Lemma 2.2, the Szegő metric on smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains is complete. Therefore, the existence of a geodesic spiral for $ds_{s_\Omega}^2$ reduces to identifying an appropriate compact subset K of Ω —which is addressed by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\Omega = \{\rho < 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ where $n \geq 2$, be a C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain with a C^∞ -smooth strongly plurisubharmonic defining function ρ . Then there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(\Omega) > 0$ such that for every geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Omega$ of the Szegő metric $ds_{s_\Omega}^2$ satisfying $(\rho \circ c)(0) > -\epsilon$ and $(\rho \circ c)'(0) = 0$, it follows that $(\rho \circ c)'(0) > 0$.*

Before giving a proof of Theorem 3.2, let us complete the proof of the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (b). Let $z_0 \in \Omega$ be a point through which no closed geodesic passes and let ρ and ϵ be as in Theorem 3.2. Now, we define

$$\epsilon_1 = \min\{\epsilon, -\rho(z_0)\} \text{ and } K = \{z \in \Omega : \rho(z) \leq -\epsilon_1\}.$$

It can be seen that the compact set K has the desired property as stated in Lemma 3.1. Indeed, let $c|_{[t_1, t_2]} : [t_1, t_2] \rightarrow \Omega$ be a geodesic loop that passes through z_0 and assume that $c|_{[t_1, t_2]}([t_1, t_2]) \not\subset K$. Since $(\rho \circ c)|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a continuous real-valued function, it achieves maximum at some point $t_0 \in (t_1, t_2)$. Thus, by the definition of K , it follows that

$$(\rho \circ c)(t_0) > -\epsilon, (\rho \circ c)'(t_0) = 0 \text{ and } (\rho \circ c)''(t_0) \leq 0.$$

This, however, contradicts Theorem 3.2. Therefore, by Lemma 3.1, the proof of (ii) is established. □

Finally, to present a proof of Theorem 3.2, we recall one of the most elegant results in complex analysis: the asymptotic expansion of the Szegö kernel, given by Fefferman [Fef74] and Boutet de Monvel-Sjöstrand [BdMS76].

Theorem 3.3. (Fefferman [Fef74], Boutet de Monvel-Sjöstrand [BdMS76]) *Let $\Omega = \{\rho < 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain. Then, there exist functions $\Phi, \Psi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\Phi(z) > 0$ near $\partial\Omega$ such that the diagonal values of the Szegö kernel satisfies*

$$S_\Omega(z, z) = \frac{h(z)}{|\rho(z)|^n} = \frac{\Phi(z) + \Psi(z)|\rho(z)|^n \log |\rho(z)|}{|\rho(z)|^n}. \quad (2)$$

We now introduce some notations. When the domain Ω remains fixed throughout the proof, we omit Ω from the notation. For instance, we write $S_\Omega(z, z)$ as $S(z, z)$, and so forth. Let f be a C^∞ -smooth real-valued. For $j, k, l = 1, \dots, n$, define

$$f_j = \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}, \quad \bar{f}_j = \overline{f_j}, \quad f_{jk} := \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial z_k}, \quad f_{j\bar{k}l} = \frac{\partial f_{jk}}{\partial \bar{z}_l}, \quad f_{j\bar{k}} = \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial \bar{z}_k} \text{ and so on.}$$

Let $L_f(z) = \left(f_{j\bar{k}}(z)\right)_{j,k=1}^n$ denotes the Levi matrix. If $L_f(z)$ is positive definite, then $f_{j\bar{k}}(z)$ represent the coefficients of its inverse $L_f(z)^{-1}$. Moreover, we set $g(z) = -\log |\rho(z)|$, $h(z) = \log h(z)$ and $\nabla \rho(z) = (\rho_1(z), \dots, \rho_n(z))$, $\overline{\nabla} \rho(z) = (\rho_{\bar{1}}(z), \dots, \rho_{\bar{n}}(z))$ and $\nabla \rho(z)^t$ denote the transpose of $\nabla \rho(z)$. Finally, for two C^∞ -smooth functions f_1 and f_2 on Ω , we write $f_1 = O(f_2)$ if there exists a positive constant C , depending only on Ω , such that

$$|f_1| \leq C|f_2|$$

on Ω . In this case, for each $z \in \Omega$, we write $f_1(z) = O(f_2(z))$. The following lemmas are the key to proof Theorem 3.2.

Lemma 3.4. *For $a, b, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have*

(a)

$$h_b = \begin{cases} O(\log |\rho|) & \text{for } n = 1 \\ O(1) & \text{for } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

(b)

$$h_{b\bar{j}} = \begin{cases} O((\log |\rho|)^2) + O(\rho^{-1}) & \text{for } n = 1 \\ O(\log |\rho|) & \text{for } n = 2 \\ O(1) & \text{for } n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

(c)

$$\mathfrak{h}_{ab\bar{j}} = \begin{cases} O(\rho^{-2}) + O((\log |\rho|)^3) + O(\rho^{-1} \log |\rho|) & \text{for } n = 1 \\ O(\rho^{-1}) + O(\log |\rho|) & \text{for } n = 2 \\ O(\log |\rho|) & \text{for } n = 3 \\ O(1) & \text{for } n \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

Proof. This result follows from the bare-hand computations on these terms \mathfrak{h}_b , $\mathfrak{h}_{b\bar{j}}$, and $\mathfrak{h}_{ab\bar{j}}$. Indeed, we have

$$\mathfrak{h}_b = h_b h^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

Observe that $h_b = O((\rho^n \log |\rho|)_b)$, where

$$(\rho^n \log |\rho|)_b = \begin{cases} O(\log |\rho|) & \text{for } n = 1 \\ O(1) & \text{for } n \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

This completes the proof of (a). Next, from (3),

$$\mathfrak{h}_{b\bar{j}} h^2 = h_{b\bar{j}} h - h_b h_{\bar{j}}. \quad (5)$$

So, by computing $h_{b\bar{j}}$, we get

$$h_{b\bar{j}} = \Phi_{b\bar{j}} + \Psi_{b\bar{j}} \rho^n \log |\rho| + \Psi_b (\rho^n \log |\rho|)_{\bar{j}} + \Psi_j (\rho^n \log |\rho|)_b + \Psi (\rho^n \log |\rho|)_{b\bar{j}}. \quad (6)$$

Hence, $h_{b\bar{j}} = O((\rho^n \log |\rho|)_{b\bar{j}})$, where

$$(\rho^n \log |\rho|)_{b\bar{j}} = \begin{cases} O(\log |\rho|) + O(\rho^{-1}) & \text{for } n = 1 \\ O(\log |\rho|) & \text{for } n = 2 \\ O(1) & \text{for } n \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Then, using (4), (6) and (7) in (5), we are done. Similarly, the proof of $\mathfrak{h}_{ab\bar{j}}$ follows. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ where $n \geq 2$, be a C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain. Then,*

(a) For each $j = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\frac{[L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t]_j}{\rho^2} = O(1),$$

(b)

$$\frac{\bar{\nabla} \rho \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t}{\rho^2} - \frac{1}{n} = O(\rho \log |\rho|).$$

Proof. Using (2), we obtain

$$g_{j\bar{k}} = n g_{j\bar{k}} + h_{j\bar{k}},$$

where

$$g_{j\bar{k}} = \frac{\rho_{j\bar{k}}}{-\rho} + \frac{\rho_j \rho_{\bar{k}}}{\rho^2}. \quad (8)$$

Then,

$$L_g = n \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right) \cdot L_g.$$

Hence,

$$L_g^{-1} = \frac{1}{n} L_g^{-1} - \frac{L_g^{-1}}{n^2} \cdot \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right)^{-1} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

From (8),

$$L_g^{-1} = |\rho| \left(L_\rho^{-1} - \frac{L_\rho^{-1}}{|\rho| + \mathcal{Q}} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t \cdot \bar{\nabla} \rho \cdot L_\rho^{-1} \right), \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{Q} = \bar{\nabla} \rho \cdot L_\rho^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t$. This implies that

$$\frac{[L_g^{-1} \cdot \nabla \rho^t]_j}{\rho^2} = \frac{[L_\rho^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t]_j}{|\rho| + \mathcal{Q}}, \quad (11)$$

and

$$\frac{\bar{\nabla} \rho \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t}{\rho^2} = \frac{\bar{\nabla} \rho \cdot L_\rho^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t}{|\rho| + \mathcal{Q}}. \quad (12)$$

From (9), it is enough to examine $\frac{1}{\rho^2} \left[L_g^{-1} \cdot \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right)^{-1} \cdot L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right]$. So, we proceed by considering

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\rho^2} \left[L_g^{-1} \cdot \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right)^{-1} \cdot L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t \right]_j \\ &= \sum_{s,l,k=1}^n g^{j\bar{l}} \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right)^{l\bar{s}} h_{s\bar{k}} \frac{[L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t]_k}{\rho^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\rho| + \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{s,l,k=1}^n g^{j\bar{l}} \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right)^{l\bar{s}} h_{s\bar{k}} [L_\rho^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t]_k \quad (\text{by (11)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\rho| + \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{s,l,k=1}^n g^{j\bar{l}} h_{s\bar{k}} \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right)^{l\bar{s}} [L_\rho^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t]_k. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (10), for fixed $z \in \Omega$ and for any $X \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\frac{\bar{X}^t \cdot L_g(z)^{-1} \cdot X}{|X|^2} = O(\rho(z)). \quad (13)$$

This implies that $g^{j\bar{k}} = O(\rho)$ for all $j, k = 1, \dots, n$. Then, by Lemma 3.4 (b), we have

$$g^{j\bar{l}} h_{s\bar{k}} = \begin{cases} O(\rho(\log|\rho|)^2) + O(1) & \text{for } n = 1 \\ O(\rho \log|\rho|) & \text{for } n = 2 \\ O(\rho) & \text{for } n \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

It follows that the entries of $(L_h \cdot L_g^{-1})(z)$ approach zero as $z \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ for $n \geq 2$. Consequently, all coefficients of $\left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1}\right)^{-1}$ remain bounded on Ω . Hence,

$$\frac{1}{\rho^2} \left[L_g^{-1} \cdot \left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \right)^{-1} \cdot L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla\rho)^t \right]_j = O(\rho \log|\rho|) \quad \text{for } n \geq 2. \quad (15)$$

Thus, the proof of (a) is complete. To prove (b), one can observe that

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\bar{\nabla}\rho \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla\rho)^t}{\rho^2} - \frac{1}{n} = \frac{\mathcal{Q}}{n(|\rho| + \mathcal{Q})} - \frac{\mathcal{Q}}{n\mathcal{Q}} = -\frac{|\rho|}{n(|\rho| + \mathcal{Q})}. \quad (16)$$

Therefore, the proof (b) follows from (15) and (16). \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$ be a geodesic of the Szegö metric $ds_{S_\Omega}^2$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho \circ c)'' &= -2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{a,b,j=1}^n \left[\left(h_{ab\bar{j}} - \frac{n}{\rho} \rho_{ab\bar{j}} \right) \left[L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla\rho)^t \right]_j (c) \cdot c'_a c'_b \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{\rho(c)} \operatorname{Re} \left(c' \cdot (L_h \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla\rho)^t)(c) \right) \left[\nabla\rho(c) \cdot (c')^t \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \left(1 - \frac{n}{\rho^2} \bar{\nabla}\rho \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla\rho)^t \right) (c) \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_{a,b=1}^n \rho_{ab}(c) c'_a c'_b \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{\rho(c)} \operatorname{Re} \left(\nabla\rho(c) \cdot c'^t \right)^2 + 2c' \cdot L_\rho(c) \cdot \bar{c}'^t. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows exactly the same lines of reasoning used in the proof of [Her83, Lemma 3.4]. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Suppose to the contrary, there exists a sequence $(c_i)_{i \geq 1}$ of geodesics that satisfies the following:

- (i) There exists a point $a_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $a_i = c_i(0)$ converges to a_0 as $i \rightarrow \infty$.
- (ii) The unit vectors $v_i = \frac{c'_i(0)}{|c'_i(0)|}$ converge to a unit vector v_0 .
- (iii) We have $(\rho \circ c_i)'(0) = 0$ and $b_i = \frac{(\rho \circ c_i)''(0)}{|c'_i(0)|^2} \leq 0$ for each i .

Using Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 b_i - 4 \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\nabla \rho(a_i) \cdot v_i^t)^2}{\rho(a_i)} - 2v_i \cdot L_\rho(a_i) \cdot \overline{v_i^t} \\
 &= -2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{a,b,j=1}^n \left[\left(\mathfrak{h}_{ab\bar{j}} - \frac{n}{\rho} \rho_{ab\bar{j}} \right) \left[L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t \right]_j(a_i) \cdot (v_i)_a (v_i)_b \right] \\
 &\quad - \frac{4}{\rho(a_i)} \operatorname{Re} \left(v_i \cdot (L_{\mathfrak{h}} \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t)(a_i) \right) \left[\nabla \rho(a_i) \cdot v_i^t \right] \\
 &\quad + 2 \left(1 - \frac{n}{\rho^2} \overline{\nabla \rho} \cdot L_g^{-1} \cdot (\nabla \rho)^t \right)(a_i) \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_{a,b=1}^n \rho_{ab}(a_i) (v_i)_a (v_i)_b \right) \\
 &= A_i + B_i + C_i, \quad (17)
 \end{aligned}$$

say. Before proceeding into the examination of these terms, from (ii), we observe that $(\nabla \rho(a_i) \cdot v_i^t)_i$ is a sequence of imaginary numbers. Thus, by (iii), we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(b_i - 4 \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\nabla \rho(a_i) \cdot v_i^t)^2}{\rho(a_i)} - 2v_i \cdot L_\rho(a_i) \cdot \overline{v_i^t} \right) < 0. \quad (18)$$

In what follows, we will derive a contradiction to (18).

The term A_i : By Lemma 3.4 (c) and Lemma 3.5 (a),

$$A_i = \begin{cases} O(\rho(a_i)^2) & \text{for } n = 2 \\ O(\rho(a_i)^2 \log |\rho(a_i)|) & \text{for } n = 3 \\ O(\rho(a_i)^2) & \text{for } n \geq 4. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Hence, $A_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

The term B_i : By Lemma 3.4 (b) and Lemma 3.5 (a),

$$B_i = \begin{cases} O(\rho(a_i) \log |\rho(a_i)|) & \text{for } n = 2 \\ O(\rho(a_i)) & \text{for } n \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Thus, $B_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \geq 2$.

The term C_i : By Lemma 3.5 (b),

$$C_i = O(\rho(a_i) \log |\rho(a_i)|) \quad \text{for } n \geq 2. \quad (21)$$

This implies $C_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, using (19), (20) and (21) in (17), we obtain the contradiction to (18). \square

Concluding remarks. The techniques used to establish the existence of geodesic spirals in this article fail in the case of C^∞ -smoothly bounded, non-simply connected

planar domains. This is due to the lack of information regarding the boundedness of

$$\left[\left(I + \frac{1}{n} L_{\mathfrak{h}} \cdot L_{\mathfrak{g}}^{-1} \right)^{-1} \right]_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Even if the boundedness of these terms is known—implying that the right-hand sides of (a) and (b) in Lemma 3.5 is $O(1)$ —which does not ensure the convergence of A_i, B_i, C_i to zero in (17) in the proof of Theorem 3.2 because of (b) and (c) of Lemma 3.4. Nevertheless, the scaling method remains applicable in this scenario; see [BB24].

The qualitative behaviour of geodesics for the Szegő metric on an annulus remains unknown, in contrast to the Bergman metric; see [Her83, Theorem 4.2]. However, based on Example 2, we expect the geodesics of the Szegő metric on an annulus to exhibit behaviour similar to those for the Bergman metric.

Does there exist a strongly pseudoconvex C^∞ -smoothly bounded domain Ω such that $(\Omega, ds_{s_\Omega}^2)$ is not a Hadamard-Cartan manifold which possesses neither closed nor geodesic spirals? The existence of such kinds of domains holds for the Bergman metric; see [Her83, Theorem 5.1].

On another note, it is natural to ask whether a geodesic $c(t)$ for the Szegő metric, which does not remain within a compact subset of a C^∞ -smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ for all $t \geq 0$, will eventually hit the boundary $\partial\Omega$?

REFERENCES

- [BB24] A. Bhatnagar and D. Borah. Some remarks on the carathéodory and szegő metrics on planar domains. *arxiv*, page 28, 2024. [doi:arXiv:2410.20955v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.20955v2).
- [BdMS76] L. Boutet de Monvel and J. Sjöstrand. Sur la singularité des noyaux de Bergman et de Szegő. In *Journées: Équations aux Dérivées Partielles de Rennes (1975)*, volume No. 34–35 of *Astérisque*, pages 123–164. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1976.
- [BL14] David Barrett and Lina Lee. On the Szegő metric. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 24(1):104–117, 2014. [doi:10.1007/s12220-012-9329-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12220-012-9329-x).
- [Fef74] C. Fefferman. The Bergman kernel and biholomorphic mappings of pseudoconvex domains. *Invent. Math.*, 26:1–65, 1974. [doi:10.1007/BF01406845](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01406845).
- [Hen73] G. M. Henkin. An analytic polyhedron is not holomorphically equivalent to a strictly pseudoconvex domain. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 210:1026–1029, 1973.
- [Her83] G. Herbort. On the geodesics of the Bergman metric. *Math. Ann.*, 264(1):39–51, 1983. [doi:10.1007/BF01458049](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01458049).
- [Kra19] S. G. Krantz. The Fefferman-Szegő metric and applications. *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.*, 64(6):965–978, 2019. [doi:10.1080/17476933.2018.1489800](https://doi.org/10.1080/17476933.2018.1489800).
- [KW21] S. G. Krantz and P. M. Wójcicki. On an invariant distance induced by the Szegő kernel. *Complex Anal. Synerg.*, 7(3):Paper No. 24, 9, 2021. [doi:10.1007/s40627-021-00085-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40627-021-00085-w).
- [MP93] Jarnicki M. and P. Pflug. *Invariant distances and metrics in complex analysis*, volume 9 of *De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1993. [doi:10.1515/9783110870312](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110870312).
- [Zwo10] W. Zwonek. Asymptotic behavior of the sectional curvature of the Bergman metric for annuli. *Ann. Polon. Math.*, 98(3):291–299, 2010. [doi:10.4064/ap98-3-8](https://doi.org/10.4064/ap98-3-8).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, PUNE 411008, INDIA

Email address: anjali.bhatnagar@students.iiserpune.ac.in