

BOUNDARY BEHAVIOUR OF THE CARATHÉODORY AND KOBAYASHI-EISENMAN VOLUME ELEMENTS

DIGANTA BORAH AND DEBAPRASANNA KAR

ABSTRACT. We study the boundary limits of the Carathéodory and Kobayashi-Eisenman volume elements on smoothly bounded convex finite type domains and also on Levi corank one domains.

1. INTRODUCTION

Denote by \mathbb{B}^n the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n . For a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, the Carathéodory and Kobayashi-Eisenman volume elements on D at a point $p \in D$ are defined respectively by

$$c_D(p) = \sup \{ |\det \psi'(p)|^2 : \psi \in \mathcal{O}(D, \mathbb{B}^n), \psi(p) = 0 \},$$

$$k_D(p) = \inf \{ |\det \psi'(0)|^{-2} : \psi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D), \psi(0) = p \}.$$

By Montel's theorem $c_D(p)$ is always attained and if D is taut then $k_D(p)$ is also attained (see Section 2 for more details). Under a holomorphic map $F : D \rightarrow \Omega$, they satisfy the rule

$$v_D(p) \geq |\det F'(p)|^2 v_\Omega(F(p))$$

where $v = c, k$. In particular, equality holds if F is a biholomorphism. Accordingly, if k_D is nonvanishing (which is the case if D is bounded or taut), then

$$q_D(p) = \frac{c_D(p)}{k_D(p)}$$

is a biholomorphic invariant and is called the *quotient invariant*. If $D = \mathbb{B}^n$, then

$$c_{\mathbb{B}^n}(p) = k_{\mathbb{B}^n}(p) = (1 - |p|^2)^{-n-1},$$

and thus $q_{\mathbb{B}^n}$ is identically equal to 1. In general, an application of the Schwarz lemma shows that $q_D \leq 1$. It is a remarkable fact that if D is any domain in \mathbb{C}^n and $q_D(p) = 1$ for some point $p \in D$, then $q_D(z) = 1$ for all $z \in D$ and D is biholomorphic to \mathbb{B}^n . This was first proved by Wong [22] with the hypothesis that D is bounded and complete hyperbolic, which was relaxed by Rosay [20] to D being any bounded domain. Dektyarev [7] further relaxed this condition to D being only hyperbolic and later Graham and Wu [9] showed that no assumption on D is required for the result to be true, in fact, it is true for any complex manifold. Thus q_D measures the extent to which the Riemann mapping theorem fails for D . This fact is a fundamental step in the proof of Wong-Rosay theorem and several other applications can be found in [10–12].

In this note, we study the boundary limits of these volume elements on smoothly bounded convex finite type domains and Levi corank one domains in \mathbb{C}^n and obtain boundary behaviour of the quotient invariant. Boundary behaviour of the quotient invariant on strongly pseudoconvex

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 32F45, 32T27, 32A25.

Key words and phrases. Carathéodory volume element, Kobayashi-Eisenman volume element, Levi corank one domain, scaling method.

The first named author was partially supported by the DST-INSPIRE grant IFA-13 MA-21.

domains had been studied by several authors, see for example [5, 10, 13], and in particular it is known that $q_D(z) \rightarrow 1$ if $z \rightarrow \partial D$ for a strongly pseudoconvex domain D . Recently in [18], a relation between the Carathéodory volume element and the Bergman kernel was observed in light of the multidimensional Suita conjecture. Our purpose is to compute the boundary asymptotics of these volume elements in terms of the distinguished polydiscs of McNeal and Catlin devised to capture the geometry of a domain near a convex finite type and Levi corank one boundary point respectively. In order to state our results, let us briefly recall these terminologies. First, let $D = \{\rho < 0\}$ be a smoothly bounded convex finite type domain and $p^0 \in \partial D$. For each point $p \in D$ sufficiently close to p^0 , and $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, McNeal's orthogonal coordinate system $z_1^{p,\epsilon}, \dots, z_n^{p,\epsilon}$ centred at p is constructed as follows (see [17]). Let $D_{p,\epsilon}$ be the domain

$$D_{p,\epsilon} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) < \rho(p) + \epsilon\}.$$

Let $\tau_n(p, \epsilon)$ be the distance of p to $\partial D_{p,\epsilon}$ and $\zeta_n(p, \epsilon)$ be a point on $\partial D_{p,\epsilon}$ realising this distance. Let H_n be the complex hyperplane through p and orthogonal to the vector $\zeta_n(p, \epsilon) - p$. Compute the distance from p to $\partial D_{p,\epsilon}$ along each complex line in H_n . Let $\tau_{n-1}(p, \epsilon)$ be the largest such distance and let $\zeta_{n-1}(p, \epsilon)$ be a point on $\partial D_{p,\epsilon}$ such that $|\zeta_{n-1}(p, \epsilon) - p| = \tau_{n-1}(p, \epsilon)$. For the next step, define H_{n-1} as the complex hyperplane through p and orthogonal to the span of the vectors $\zeta_n(p, \epsilon) - p, \zeta_{n-1}(p, \epsilon) - p$ and repeat the above construction. Continuing in this way, we define the numbers $\tau_n(p, \epsilon), \tau_{n-1}(p, \epsilon), \dots, \tau_1(p, \epsilon)$, and the points $\zeta_n(p, \epsilon), \zeta_{n-1}(p, \epsilon), \dots, \zeta_1(p, \epsilon)$ on $\partial D_{p,\epsilon}$. Let $T^{p,\epsilon}$ be the translation sending p to the origin and $U^{p,\epsilon}$ be a unitary mapping aligning $\zeta_k(p, \epsilon) - p$ along the z_k -axis and $\zeta_k(p, \epsilon)$ to a point on the $\text{Re } z_k$ axis. Set

$$z^{p,\epsilon} = U^{p,\epsilon} \circ T^{p,\epsilon}(z).$$

The polydisc

$$P(p, \epsilon) = \{z^{p,\epsilon} : |z_1^{p,\epsilon}| < \tau_1(p, \epsilon), \dots, |z_n^{p,\epsilon}| < \tau_n(p, \epsilon)\}$$

is known as McNeal's polydisc. The scaling method (which will be briefly explained later) shows that every sequence in D that converges to $p^0 \in \partial D$ furnishes limiting domains

$$(1) \quad D_\infty = \left\{ z = (z', z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n : -1 + \text{Re} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n b_\alpha z_\alpha + P_{2m}(z) < 0 \right\},$$

where b_α are complex numbers and P_{2m} is a real convex polynomial of degree at most $2m$ ($m \geq 1$), where $2m$ is the 1-type of ∂D at p^0 . The polynomial P_{2m} is not unique in general and depends on how the given sequence approaches p^0 . The limiting domains D_∞ are usually called local models associated with D at p^0 . It is known that every such D_∞ is complete hyperbolic.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $D = \{\rho < 0\}$ be a smoothly bounded convex finite type domain in \mathbb{C}^n and $p^j \in D$ be a sequence converging to $p^0 \in \partial D$. Let $\epsilon_j = -\rho(p^j)$. Then for $v = c, k$, and up to a subsequence,*

$$v_D(p^j) \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \tau_\alpha(p^j, \epsilon_j)^2 \rightarrow v_{D_\infty}(0)$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$, where D_∞ is a local model associated with D at p^0 .

Now we consider the Levi corank one case. Recall that a boundary point p^0 of a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is said to have Levi corank one if there exists a neighbourhood of p^0 where ∂D is smooth, pseudoconvex, of finite type, and the Levi form has at least $(n-2)$ positive eigenvalues. If every boundary point of D has Levi corank one, then D is called a Levi corank one domain.

This includes the class of *all* smoothly bounded pseudoconvex finite type domains in \mathbb{C}^2 . A basic example in higher dimension is the egg

$$E_{2m} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z_1|^{2m} + |z_2|^2 + \dots + |z_n|^2 < 1\}$$

where $m \geq 2$ is an integer. Write $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) = (z, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$. In general, if ρ is a local defining function for D at a Levi-corank one boundary point p^0 , then it was proved in [6] that for each point p in a sufficiently small neighbourhood U of p_0 , there are holomorphic coordinates $\zeta = \Phi^p(z)$ such that

$$(2) \quad \rho \circ (\Phi^p)^{-1}(\zeta) = \rho(p) + 2 \operatorname{Re} \zeta_n + \sum_{\substack{j+k \leq 2m \\ j,k > 0}} a_{jk}(p) \zeta_1^j \bar{\zeta}_1^k + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} |\zeta_\alpha|^2 \\ + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{j+k \leq m \\ j,k > 0}} \operatorname{Re} \left((b_{jk}^\alpha(p) \zeta_1^j \bar{\zeta}_1^k) \zeta_\alpha \right) + R(p, \zeta)$$

where the error function $R(p, \zeta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ faster than one of the monomials of weight 1 (see for example [1] for the definition of weight). To construct the distinguished polydiscs around p , set

$$A_l(p) = \max \left\{ |a_{jk}(p)| : j+k = l \right\}, \quad 2 \leq l \leq 2m, \\ B_{l'}(p) = \max \left\{ |b_{jk}^\alpha(p)| : j+k = l', 2 \leq \alpha \leq n-1 \right\}, \quad 2 \leq l' \leq m.$$

Now define for each $\delta > 0$, the special-radius

$$(3) \quad \tau(p, \delta) = \min \left\{ \left(\delta / A_l(p) \right)^{1/l}, \left(\delta^{1/2} / B_{l'}(p) \right)^{1/l'} : 2 \leq l \leq 2m, 2 \leq l' \leq m \right\}.$$

It was shown in [6] that the coefficients b_{jk}^α 's in the above definition of $\tau(p, \delta)$ are insignificant and may be ignored, so that

$$(4) \quad \tau(p, \delta) = \min \left\{ \left(\delta / A_l(p) \right)^{1/l} : 2 \leq l \leq 2m \right\}.$$

Set

$$\tau_1(p, \delta) = \tau(p, \delta) = \tau, \tau_2(p, \delta) = \dots = \tau_{n-1}(p, \delta) = \delta^{1/2}, \tau_n(p, \delta) = \delta.$$

The distinguished polydiscs $Q(p, \delta)$ of Catlin are defined by

$$Q(p, \delta) = \left\{ (\Phi^p)^{-1}(\zeta) : |\zeta_1| < \tau_1(p, \delta), \dots, |\zeta_n| < \tau_n(p, \delta) \right\}.$$

The scaling method (which is well known in this case and will be briefly explained later) shows that every sequence in D that converges to $p^0 \in \partial D$ furnishes limiting domains

$$(5) \quad D_\infty = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C}^n : 2 \operatorname{Re} z_n + P_{2m}(z_1, \bar{z}_1) + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} |z_\alpha|^2 < 0 \right\}$$

where $P_{2m}(z_1, \bar{z}_1)$ is a subharmonic polynomial of degree at most $2m$ ($m \geq 1$) without harmonic terms, $2m$ being the 1-type of ∂D at p^0 . Such a limiting domain D_∞ is called a local model associated with D at p^0 . It is known that the local models D_∞ are complete hyperbolic. We will denote the point $(0, -1) \in D_\infty$ by b .

Theorem 1.2. *Let $D = \{\rho < 0\}$ be a smoothly bounded Levi corank one domain in \mathbb{C}^n and $p^j \in D$ be a sequence converging to $p^0 \in \partial D$. Let $\delta_j > 0$ be such that $\tilde{p}^j = (p_1^j, \dots, p_n^j + \delta_j)$ is a point on ∂D . Then for $v = c, k$, and up to a subsequence,*

$$v_D(p^j) \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \tau_\alpha(\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j)^2 \rightarrow c(\rho, p^0) v_{D_\infty}(b)$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$, where $c(\rho, p^0)$ is a positive constant that depends only on ρ and p^0 , and D_∞ is a local model associated with D at p^0 .

As an immediate consequence of the above theorems, we obtain the following boundary behaviour of the quotient invariant:

Theorem 1.3. *Let D be a smoothly bounded convex finite type domain or a Levi corank one domain and $p^j \in D$ be a sequence converging to $p^0 \in \partial D$. Then up to a subsequence*

$$q_D(p^j) \rightarrow q_{D_\infty}(b)$$

for some local model D_∞ associated with D at p^0 , and where $b = 0$ in the convex case and $b = (0, -1)$ in the Levi corank one case.

Naturally, the following question arises at this stage: given a smoothly bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ that is either convex finite type or Levi corank one, is the function q_D bounded below by a positive constant that depends on D alone? Note that q_D is continuous (which we will show in Section 2) and so on a compact subset of D , this is the case. In the convex case, by estimating the volume elements on local models, we will show in Section 3 that near the boundary of D , q_D is bounded below by a dimensional constant, thereby answering the question affirmatively in this case. We will also recover an analog of Corollary 6 of [18] on such domains using Theorem 1.1.

We conclude the article by showing an efficacy of the quotient invariant in determining strong pseudoconvexity—a property enjoyed by the squeezing function and its dual the Fridman invariant as well. We refer the reader to the recent articles [16, 19] and the references therein for the definition and other relevant materials related to these two invariants. Let us denote the squeezing function for a domain D by s_D and the Fridman invariant by h_D . It is known that if D is a smoothly bounded convex finite type domain then D is strongly pseudoconvex if $s_D(z) \rightarrow 1$ as $z \rightarrow \partial D$, see for instance [23], and Mahajan and Verma [16] showed that the analog of this holds for the Fridman invariant h_D as well. Similarly if D is a smoothly bounded h -extendible domain, i.e., D is a smoothly bounded pseudoconvex finite type domain for which the Catlin and D'Angelo multitypes coincide at every boundary point, then D is strongly pseudoconvex if either $h_D(z) \rightarrow 0$ or $s_D(z) \rightarrow 1$ as $z \rightarrow \partial D$. We have the following analog for the quotient invariant:

Theorem 1.4. *Let D be a smoothly bounded convex finite type or Levi corank one domain. Then D is strongly pseudoconvex if $q_D(z) \rightarrow 1$ as $z \rightarrow \partial D$.*

It would be interesting to see if an analog of this result holds for h -extendible domains as well.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank K. Verma for his support and encouragement. Some of the material presented here has been benefited from conversations that the first author had with G.P. Balakumar, S. Gorai, and P. Mahajan. We would like to thank them for their valuable comments and suggestions.

2. REGULARITY OF THE VOLUME ELEMENTS

In this section we prove continuity of the volume elements that is required for the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The arguments are similar to the case of the Carathéodory-Reiffen and Kobayashi-Royden pseudometrics and we present them only for convenience. First, a few remarks. If $D \subset \mathbf{C}^n$ is any domain and $p \in D$, then $c_D(p)$ is attained. Indeed, choose a sequence $\psi^j \in \mathcal{O}(D, \mathbb{B}^n)$ such that $\psi^j(p) = 0$ and $|\det(\psi^j)'(p)|^2 \rightarrow c_D(p)$. By Montel's theorem, passing to a subsequence if necessary, ψ^j converges uniformly on compact subsets of D to a map $\psi \in \mathcal{O}(D, \overline{\mathbb{B}^n})$. Since $\psi(p) = 0$, by the maximum principle $\psi \in \mathcal{O}(D, \mathbb{B}^n)$, and it follows that $c_D(p) = |\det \psi'(p)|^2$. In particular, this implies that $c_D(p)$ is always finite. Note that $c_D(p)$ can vanish (for example if $D = \mathbb{C}$), but is strictly positive if D is not a Liouville domain. Likewise, if D is taut then similar arguments as above shows that $k_D(p)$ is attained. Observe that $k_D(p)$ is finite for any domain D because we can put a ball $B(p, r)$ inside D and consequently $\phi(t) = rt + p$ is a competitor for $k_D(p)$, giving us $k_D(p) \leq r^{-2n}$. It is possible that $k_D(p)$ can also vanish but if D is bounded, then by invoking Cauchy's estimates we see that $k_D(p) > 0$. Similarly, if D is taut, then also $k_D(p) > 0$ as it is attained. We will call a map $\psi \in \mathcal{O}(D, \mathbb{B}^n)$ satisfying $\psi(p) = 0$ and $|\det \psi'(p)|^2 = c_D(p)$ a Carathéodory extremal map for D at p . Similarly, a Kobayashi extremal map for D at p is a map $\psi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D)$ with $\psi(0) = p$ and $|\det \psi'(0)|^{-2} = k_D(p)$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain. Then c_D is continuous. If D is taut, then k_D is also continuous.*

Proof. We will show that c_D is locally Lipschitz which of course implies that c_D is continuous. Let $B(a, 2r) \subset\subset D$ and fix $p, q \in B(a, r)$. Choose a Carathéodory extremal map ψ for D at p . Then

$$\begin{aligned} c_D(p) - c_D(q) &\leq |\det \psi'(p)|^2 - |\det \psi'(q)|^2_{c_{\mathbb{B}^n}(\psi(q))} \\ &= |\det \psi'(p)|^2 - \frac{|\det \psi'(q)|^2}{(1 - |\psi(q)|^2)^{n+1}} \leq |\det \psi'(p)|^2 - |\det \psi'(q)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the distances of p and q to ∂D is at least r , by Cauchy's estimates the right hand side is bounded above by $C_r |p - q|$ where C_r is a constant that depends only on r . Thus we can interchange the role of p and q to have $|c_D(p) - c_D(q)| \leq C_r |p - q|$ that establishes local Lipschitz property of c_D .

For k_D , first we show that it is upper semicontinuous for any domain D . Let $p \in D$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D)$ with $\phi(0) = p$ such that

$$(6) \quad |\det \phi'(0)|^{-2} < k_D(p) + \epsilon.$$

Let $0 < r < 1$ and set for $z \in D$,

$$f^z(t) = \phi((1-r)t) + (z-p), \quad t \in \mathbb{B}^n.$$

Since $\phi(B(0, 1-r))$ is a relatively compact subset of D , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $z \in B(p, \delta)$, then $f^z \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D)$. Also $f^z(0) = z$ and so f^z is a competitor for $k_D(z)$. Therefore,

$$k_D(z) \leq |\det(f^z)'(0)|^{-2} = (1-r)^{2n} |\det \phi'(0)|^{-2}.$$

Letting $r \rightarrow 0^+$ and using (6), we obtain that

$$k_D(z) < k_D(p) + \epsilon$$

for all $z \in B(p, \delta)$ which proves the upper semicontinuity of k_D .

Next we assume that D is taut and show that k_D is lower semicontinuous. Let $p \in D$. If possible, assume that k_D is not lower semicontinuous at p . Then $k_D(p) > 0$ and there exist $\epsilon > 0$, a sequence $p^j \rightarrow p$, such that

$$k_D(p^j) < k_D(p) - \epsilon.$$

Since D is taut, there are Kobayashi extremal maps g^j for D at p^j . Again by tautness and the fact that $g^j(0) = p^j \rightarrow p \in D$, passing to a subsequence, g^j converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n to a map $g \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D)$. Therefore,

$$k_D(p^j) = |\det(g^j)'(0)|^{-2} \rightarrow |\det g'(0)|^{-2}.$$

But g is a competitor for $k_D(p)$ and so $k_D(p) \leq |\det g'(0)|^{-2}$. Thus we have

$$k_D(p) \leq k_D(p) - \epsilon$$

which is a contradiction. This proves the lower semicontinuity of k_D and thus k_D is continuous if D is taut. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Let us recall the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1: We are given a smoothly bounded convex finite type domain $D = \{\rho < 0\}$ and a sequence $p^j \in D$ converging to $p^0 \in \partial D$. Without loss of generality assume that $p^0 = 0$. The numbers ϵ_j are defined by $\epsilon_j = -\rho(p^j)$. The maps $U^{p^j, \epsilon_j} \circ T^{p^j, \epsilon_j}$ satisfy

$$U^{p^j, \epsilon_j} \circ T^{p^j, \epsilon_j}(p^j) = 0.$$

3.1. Scaling. Consider the dilations

$$\Lambda^{p^j, \epsilon_j}(z) = \left(\frac{z_1}{\tau_1(p^j, \epsilon_j)}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{\tau_n(p^j, \epsilon_j)} \right).$$

The scaling maps are the compositions $S^j = \Lambda^{p^j, \epsilon_j} \circ U^{p^j, \epsilon_j} \circ T^{p^j, \epsilon_j}$ and the scaled domains are $D^j = S^j(D)$. Note that D^j is convex and $S^j(p^j) = 0 \in D^j$, for each j . We recall the following properties of D^j from [8]. The defining functions $\rho^j = \frac{1}{\epsilon_j} \rho \circ (S^j)^{-1}$ for D^j , after possibly passing to a subsequence, converge uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbf{C}^n to

$$\rho_\infty(z) = -1 + \operatorname{Re} \sum_{k=1}^n b_k z_k + P_{2m}(z),$$

where b_k are complex numbers and P_{2m} is a real convex polynomial of degree less than or equal to $2m$. This implies that after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the domains D^j converge in the local Hausdorff sense to $D_\infty = \{\rho_\infty < 0\}$. Also for all large j , D^j and hence D_∞ are contained in the intersection of the half spaces $H_1 \cap H_2 \cap \dots \cap H_n$, where

$$(7) \quad H_k = \left\{ z \in \mathbf{C}^n : \operatorname{Re} \left(c_{kk}(z_k - 1) + \sum_{l=k+1}^n c_{kl} z_l \right) < 0 \right\},$$

where $c_{kl} = \frac{\partial \rho_\infty}{\partial z_l}(e^k)$, $e^k = \Lambda^{p^j, \epsilon_j}(\zeta_k(p^j, \epsilon_j))$, and $c_{kk} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$.

3.2. Stability of the volume elements.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\phi^j \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D^j)$ and $\phi^j(0) = a^j \rightarrow a \in D_\infty$. Then ϕ^j admits a subsequence that converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n to a map $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D_\infty)$.*

Proof. Since D^j are contained in the intersection of half spaces $\cap_{i=1}^n H_i$, the family ϕ^j is normal. Also, $\phi^j(0) = a^j \rightarrow a$. Hence, the sequence ϕ^j admits a subsequence, which we denote by ϕ^j itself, and which converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n to a holomorphic map $\phi : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$. We will now show that $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D_\infty)$.

Let $0 < r < 1$. Then ϕ^j converges uniformly on $B(0, r)$ to ϕ , and so the sets $\phi^j(B(0, r)) \subset K$ for some fixed compact set K . Since $\rho^j(\phi^j(t)) < 0$ for $t \in B(0, r)$ and for all j , we have $\rho_\infty(\phi(t)) \leq 0$, or equivalently $\phi(B(0, r)) \subset \overline{D}_\infty$. Since $r \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary, we have $\phi(\mathbb{B}^n) \subset \overline{D}_\infty$. Since $\phi(0) = a \in D_\infty$, the maximum principle implies that $\phi(\mathbb{B}^n) \subset D_\infty$. \square

Proposition 3.2. *For any $a \in D_\infty$,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v_{D^j}(a) = v_{D_\infty}(a),$$

where $v = k, c$. Moreover, this convergence is uniform on compact subsets of D_∞ .

Proof. We will give the proof for $v = k$ only as the case $v = c$ is similar. Assume that k_{D^j} does not converge to k_{D_∞} uniformly on some compact subset $S \subset D_\infty$. Then there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$, a subsequence of k_{D^j} which we denote by k_{D^j} itself, and a sequence $a^j \in S$ satisfying

$$|k_{D^j}(a^j) - k_{D_\infty}(a^j)| > \epsilon_0$$

for all large j . Since S is compact, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, $a^j \rightarrow a \in S$. Since D_∞ is complete hyperbolic, and hence taut, k_{D_∞} is continuous by Proposition 2.1. Hence for all large j , we have

$$|k_{D_\infty}(a^j) - k_{D_\infty}(a)| \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}.$$

Combining the above two inequalities we have

$$(8) \quad |k_{D^j}(a^j) - k_{D_\infty}(a)| > \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$$

for all large j . We will deduce a contradiction in the following two steps:

Step 1. $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{D^j}(a^j) \leq k_{D_\infty}(a)$. Since D_∞ is taut, we have $0 < k_{D_\infty}(a) < \infty$ and there exists a Kobayashi extremal map ψ for D_∞ at a . Fix $0 < r < 1$ and define the holomorphic maps $\psi^j : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ by

$$\psi^j(t) = \psi((1-r)t) + (a^j - a).$$

Since the image $\psi(B(0, 1-r))$ is compactly contained in D_∞ and $a^j \rightarrow a$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $\psi^j \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D^j)$ for all large j . Also, $\psi^j(0) = \psi(0) + a^j - a = a^j$ and thus ψ^j is a competitor for $k_{D^j}(a^j)$. Therefore,

$$k_{D^j}(a^j) \leq |\det(\psi^j)'(0)|^{-2} = (1-r)^{-2n} |\det \psi'(0)|^{-2}.$$

Letting $r \rightarrow 0^+$, we get

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{D^j}(a^j) \leq k_{D_\infty}(a).$$

Step 2. $k_{D_\infty}(a) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{D^j}(a^j)$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small. Then there exist $\phi^j \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D^j)$ such that $\phi^j(0) = a^j$ and

$$(9) \quad |\det(\phi^j)'(0)|^{-2} < k_{D^j}(a^j) + \epsilon.$$

By Lemma 3.1, ϕ^j admits a subsequence which we denote by ϕ^j itself, and which converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n to a map $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D_\infty)$. Then from (9)

$$|\det \phi'(0)|^{-2} \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{D^j}(a^j) + \epsilon$$

But ϕ is a competitor for $k_{D_\infty}(a)$ and ϵ is arbitrary. So we obtain

$$k_{D_\infty}(a) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{D^j}(a^j)$$

as required.

By Step 1 and Step 2, we have $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{D^j}(a^j) = k_{D_\infty}(a)$ which contradicts (8) and thus the proposition is proved. \square

3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1. By the transformation rule

$$v_D(p^j) = |\det(\Lambda^{p^j, \epsilon_j} U^{p^j, \epsilon_j} T^{p^j, \epsilon_j})'(p^j)|^2 v_{D^j}(0).$$

Since $|\det(\Lambda^{p^j, \epsilon_j})'(0)|^2 = \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \tau_\alpha(p^j, \epsilon_j)^{-2}$ we get

$$v_D(p^j) \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \tau_\alpha(p^j, \epsilon_j)^2 = v_{D^j}(0).$$

Recall that the domains D^j converge in the local Hausdorff sense to D_∞ upto a subsequence and hence in view of Proposition 3.2, a limit of the right hand side is $v_{D_\infty}(0)$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

3.4. Bounds on local models. While the local models D_∞ defined by (1) are not unique, they can be bounded from below and above uniformly up to biholomorphism. Indeed, fix any such D_∞ . From [17], observe that D_∞ contains the ball $B(0, 4^{-n})$. Also, recall that D_∞ is contained in the intersection $\cap_{k=1}^n H_k$ where the half-space H_k is defined in (7). The linear map $w = T(z)$ defined by $w_k = \sum_{l=k}^n c_{kl} z_l$ transforms H_k onto the half space

$$\tilde{H}_k = \{w \in \mathbf{C}^n : \operatorname{Re} w_k < c_{kk}\},$$

and the Cayley transform $\zeta = \Psi(w)$ defined by

$$\zeta_k = \frac{w_k}{2c_{kk} - w_k}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n,$$

maps $\cap_{k=1}^n \tilde{H}_k$ into Δ^n . Note that

$$\det T = \prod_{k=1}^n c_{kk} \quad \text{and} \quad \det \Psi'(0) = \left(2^n \prod_{k=1}^n c_{kk}\right)^{-1}.$$

To summarise, we have

$$(10) \quad B(0, 4^{-n}) \subset D_\infty \subset \cap_{k=1}^n H_k,$$

and $\Psi \circ T$ maps $\cap_{k=1}^n H_k$ injectively into Δ^n with $\det(\Psi \circ T)'(0) = 2^{-n}$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let D be a smoothly bounded convex finite type domain. Then there exists a neighbourhood U of ∂D such that*

$$q_D(z) \geq 2^{-4n^2 - 2n} n^{-n}$$

for $z \in U \cap D$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.3, it is enough to prove that

$$(11) \quad q_{D_\infty}(0) \geq 2^{-4n^2-2n} n^{-n}$$

for the local models D_∞ associated with D . Fix such a model D_∞ . Then the first inclusion in (10) implies that

$$k_{D_\infty}(0) \leq k_{B(0,4^{-n})}(0) = 4^{2n^2},$$

and the second inclusion together with the fact $c_{\Delta^n}(0) = n^{-n}$ (see [3] or [14]) implies that

$$c_{D_\infty}(0) \geq |\det(\Psi \circ T)'(0)|^2 c_{\Delta^n}(0) = 2^{-2n} n^{-n}.$$

Combining both the inequalities, (11) follows. \square

With similar arguments, we now recover an analog of Corollary 6 of [18]. For a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, denote by

$$K_D(z) = \sup \left\{ |f(z)|^2 : f \in \mathcal{O}(D), \int_D |f|^2 d\lambda \leq 1 \right\}$$

the Bergman kernel (on the diagonal) associated with D . Here, λ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{C}^n . By the transformation rule for the Bergman kernel and Ramadanov type stability result Lemma 2.1 in [2], we see that Theorem 1.1 holds for $v = K$ also. Note that if D is a bounded domain then both c_D and K_D are continuous and nonvanishing, and hence on a compact subset of D the ratio c_D/K_D is bounded above and below by positive constants which may depend on D .

Proposition 3.4. *Let D be a smoothly bounded convex finite type domain. Then there exists a neighbourhood U of ∂D such that*

$$2^{-4n^2-2n} n^{-n} (n!)^{-1} \pi^n \leq c_D(z)/K_D(z) \leq 2^{4n^2+2n} \pi^n$$

for $z \in U \cap D$.

Proof. Since c_D and K_D have the same boundary asymptotics, the proposition would be proved once we establish

$$(12) \quad 2^{-4n^2-2n} n^{-n} (n!)^{-1} \pi^n \leq c_{D_\infty}(0)/K_{D_\infty}(0) \leq 2^{4n^2+2n} \pi^n$$

for the local models D_∞ associated to D . Fix a model D_∞ . The first inclusion in (10) implies

$$K_{D_\infty}(0) \leq K_{B(0,4^{-n})}(0) = 4^{2n^2} n! \pi^{-n}$$

and $c_{D_\infty}(0) \leq 4^{2n^2}$. The second inclusion implies

$$K_{D_\infty}(0) \geq K_{\cap H_k}(0) = |\det(\Psi \circ T)'(0)|^2 K_{(\Psi \circ T)(\cap H_k)}(0) \geq 2^{-2n} K_{\Delta^n}(0) = 2^{-2n} \pi^{-n},$$

and we have already observed in the previous proposition that $c_{D_\infty}(0) \geq 2^{-2n} n^{-n}$. Combining these facts, (12) follows. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

4.1. **Change of coordinates.** Let $D = \{\rho < 0\}$ be a smoothly bounded Levi corank one domain and $p^0 \in \partial D$. We may assume that the Levi form of ρ has exactly $n - 2$ positive eigenvalues. We recall the definition of the change of coordinates Φ^p that transform ρ into the normal form (2). The maps Φ^p are actually holomorphic polynomial automorphisms defined as $\Phi^p = \phi_5 \circ \phi_4 \circ \phi_3 \circ \phi_2 \circ \phi_1$ where ϕ_i are described below. For convenience, we assume two things. First, $\partial\rho/\partial z_n(p^0) \neq 0$, and hence there is a neighbourhood U of p^0 such that $(\partial\rho/\partial z_n)(p) \neq 0$ for all $p \in U$. Thus

$$\nu = \left(\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial z_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial z_n} \right)$$

is a nonvanishing vector field on U . Note that the vector fields

$$L_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}, \quad L_\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_\alpha} - b_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}, \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1,$$

where $b_\alpha = \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial z_\alpha} / \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial z_n}$, form a basis of $T^{1,0}(U)$. Moreover, for $1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1$, $L_\alpha \rho \equiv 0$ and so L_α is a complex tangent vector field to $\partial D \cap U$. Our second assumption is

$$[\partial\bar{\partial}\rho(L_\alpha, \bar{L}_\beta)]_{2 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n-1}$$

has all its eigenvalues positive at each $p \in U$, shrinking U if necessary.

(i) The map ϕ_1 is defined by

$$\phi_1(z) = (z_1 - p_1, \dots, z_{n-1} - p_{n-1}, \langle z - p, \nu(p) \rangle)$$

and it normalises the linear part of the Taylor series expansion of ρ at p . In the new coordinates which we denote by z itself, ρ takes the form

$$\rho \circ \phi_1^{-1}(z) = \rho(p) + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_n + O(|z|^2).$$

(ii) Now

$$A = \left[\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta}(p) \right]_{2 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n-1}$$

is a Hermitian matrix and there is a unitary matrix $P = [P_{jk}]_{2 \leq j, k \leq n-1}$ such that $P^* A P = D$, where D is a diagonal matrix whose entries are positive eigenvalues of A . Writing $\tilde{z} = (z_2, \dots, z_{n-1})$, the map $w = \phi_2(z)$ is defined by

$$w_1 = z_1, \quad w_n = z_n, \quad \tilde{w} = P^T \tilde{z}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{\alpha, \beta=2}^{n-1} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta}(p) z_\alpha \bar{z}_\beta = \tilde{z}^T A \tilde{z} = (\bar{P} \tilde{w})^T A (\overline{P \tilde{w}}) = \tilde{w}^T D \tilde{w} = \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} \lambda_\alpha |w_\alpha|^2,$$

where $\lambda_\alpha > 0$ is the α -th entry of D . Thus, denoting the new coordinates w by z again,

$$\rho \circ \phi_1^{-1} \circ \phi_2^{-1}(z) = \rho(p) + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_n + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} \lambda_\alpha |z_\alpha|^2 + O(|z|^2)$$

where $O(|z|^2)$ consists of only the non-Hermitian quadratic terms and all other higher order terms.

(iii) The map $w = \phi_3(z)$ is defined by $w_1 = z_1, w_n = z_n$, and $w_j = \lambda_j^{1/2} z_j$ for $2 \leq j \leq n-1$. In the new coordinates, still denoted by z ,

$$(13) \quad \rho \circ \phi_1^{-1} \circ \phi_2^{-1} \circ \phi_3^{-1}(z) = \rho(p) + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_n + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^m 2 \operatorname{Re} ((a_j^\alpha z_1^j + b_j^\alpha \bar{z}_1^j) z_\alpha) \\ + 2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} c_\alpha z_\alpha^2 + \sum_{2 \leq j+k \leq 2m} a_{jk} z_1^j \bar{z}_1^k + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} |z_\alpha|^2 + \sum_{\substack{\alpha=2 \\ j+k \leq m \\ j,k > 0}}^{n-1} \sum 2 \operatorname{Re} (b_{jk}^\alpha z_1^j \bar{z}_1^k z_\alpha) \\ + O(|z_n||z| + |z_*|^2|z| + |z_*||z_1|^{m+1} + |z_1|^{2m+1})$$

where $z_* = (0, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1}, 0)$.

(iv) Next, the pure terms in (13), i.e., $z_\alpha^2, z_1^k, \bar{z}_1^k$, as well as $z_1^k z_\alpha, \bar{z}_1^k \bar{z}_\alpha$ terms are removed by absorbing them into the normal variable z_n in terms of the change of coordinates $t = \phi_4(z)$ which is defined by

$$z_j = t_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \\ z_n = t_n - \hat{Q}_1(t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}),$$

where

$$\hat{Q}_1(t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}) = \sum_{k=2}^{2m} a_{k0} t_1^k - \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^m a_k^\alpha t_\alpha t_1^k - \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} c_\alpha t_\alpha^2.$$

(v) In the final step, the terms of the form $\bar{t}_1^j t_\alpha$ are removed by applying the transformation $\zeta = \phi_5(t)$ given by

$$t_1 = \zeta_1, t_n = \zeta_n, \\ t_\alpha = \zeta_\alpha - Q_2^\alpha(\zeta_1), \quad 2 \leq \alpha \leq n-1,$$

where $Q_2^\alpha(\zeta_1) = \sum_{k=1}^m \bar{b}_k^\alpha \zeta_1^k$. In these coordinates, ρ takes the normal form (2).

It is evident from the definition of Φ^p that $\Phi^p(p) = 0$,

$$\Phi^p(p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}, p_n - \epsilon) = \left(0, \dots, 0, -\epsilon \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \bar{z}_n}(p) \right),$$

and

$$(14) \quad \det(\Phi^p)'(p) = \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \bar{z}_n}(p) (\lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{n-1})^{1/2},$$

where $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}$ are the positive eigenvalues of

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta}(p) \right]_{2 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n-1}.$$

4.2. Scaling. Suppose $p^0 = 0$ and ρ is in the normal form (2) for $p = p^0$; in particular, $\nu(p^0) = (0, 1)$. Let $p^j \in D$ be a sequence converging to p^0 . The points $\tilde{p}^j \in \partial D$ are chosen so that $\tilde{p}^j = p^j + (0, \delta_j)$ for some $\delta_j > 0$. Then $\delta_j \approx \delta_D(p^j)$, where $\delta_D(p) = d(p, \partial D)$ is the distance of p to the boundary of D . The polynomial automorphisms $\Phi^{\tilde{p}^j}$ of \mathbb{C}^n as described above satisfy $\Phi^{\tilde{p}^j}(\tilde{p}^j) = (0, 0)$ and

$$\Phi^{\tilde{p}^j}(p^j) = (0, -\delta_j d_0(\tilde{p}^j)),$$

where $d_0(\tilde{p}^j) = \partial \rho / \partial \bar{z}_n(\tilde{p}^j) \rightarrow 1$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Define a dilation of coordinates by

$$\Delta^{\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) = \left(\frac{z_1}{\tau(\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j)}, \frac{z_2}{\delta_j^{1/2}}, \dots, \frac{z_{n-1}}{\delta_j^{1/2}}, \frac{z_n}{\delta_j} \right).$$

The scaling maps are $S^j = \Delta^{\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j} \circ \Phi^{\tilde{p}^j}$ and the scaled domains are $D^j = S^j(D)$. Note that D^j contains $S^j(p^j) = (0, -d_0(\tilde{p}^j))$ which we will denote by b^j and which converges to $b = (0, -1)$. It was shown in [21] that the defining functions $\rho^j = \frac{1}{\delta_j} \rho \circ (S^j)^{-1}$ for D^j , after possibly passing to a subsequence, converge uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbf{C}^n to

$$\rho_\infty(z) = 2 \operatorname{Re} z_n + P_{2m}(z_1, \bar{z}_1) + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} |z_\alpha|^2,$$

where $P_{2m}(z_1, \bar{z}_1)$ is a subharmonic polynomial of degree at most $2m$ ($m \geq 1$) without harmonic terms, $2m$ being the 1-type of ∂D at p^0 . This implies that after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the domains D^j converge in the local Hausdorff sense to $D_\infty = \{\rho_\infty < 0\}$.

4.3. Stability of the volume elements.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\phi^j \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D^j)$ and $\phi^j(0) = a^j \rightarrow a \in D_\infty$. Then ϕ^j admits a subsequence that converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n to a map $\phi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n, D_\infty)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.11 in [21], ϕ^j is a normal family. Also, $\phi^j(0) = a^j \rightarrow a \in D_\infty$. Therefore, ϕ^j admits a subsequence which we denote by ϕ^j itself and which converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n to a holomorphic mapping $\phi : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$. Now arguments similar to Lemma 3.1 implies that $\phi(\mathbb{B}^n) \subset D_\infty$. \square

With this lemma and the fact that D_∞ is taut, the proof of the following proposition is exactly similar to that of Proposition 3.2 and so we do not repeat the arguments.

Proposition 4.2. *For any $a \in D_\infty$,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v_{D^j}(a) = v_{D_\infty}(a),$$

where $v = k, c$. Moreover, this convergence is uniform on compact subsets of D_∞ .

4.4. Proof of Theorem 1.2. Recall that we are in the case when $p^0 = 0$ and ρ is in the normal form for $p = p^0$. Therefore, $\Phi^{p^0} = I$, the identity map. Observe that by the transformation rule

$$v_D(p^j) = |\det(S^j)'(p^j)|^2 v_{D^j}(b^j),$$

where $S^j = \Delta^{\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j} \circ \Phi^{\tilde{p}^j}$ are the scaling maps. Since

$$\left| \det(\Delta^{\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j})'(\Phi^{\tilde{p}^j}(p^j)) \right|^2 = \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \tau_\alpha(\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j)^{-2},$$

we get

$$(15) \quad v_D(p^j) \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \tau_\alpha(\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j)^2 = |\det(\Phi^{\tilde{p}^j})'(p^j)|^2 v_{D^j}(b^j).$$

Now $|\det(\Phi^{\tilde{p}^j})'(p^j)| \rightarrow |\det(\Phi^{p^0})'(p^0)| = 1$, and recall that after possibly passing to a subsequence, the domains D^j converge in the local Hausdorff sense to D_∞ . Hence by Proposition 4.2, the right hand side of (15) has $v_{D_\infty}(b)$ as a limit, proving the theorem in the current situation.

For the general case, assume that $(\partial\rho/\partial z_n)(p^0) \neq 0$ and make an initial change of coordinates $w = T(z) = \Phi^{p^0}(z)$. Let $\Omega = T(D)$, $q^0 = T(p^0) = 0$, and $q^j = T(p^j)$. Then

$$(16) \quad v_D(p^j) = |\det T'(p^j)|^2 v_\Omega(q^j).$$

To emphasise the dependence of Φ^p , τ , and τ_α on $D = \{\rho < 0\}$, we will write them now as Φ_ρ^p , τ_ρ and $\tau_{\alpha,\rho}$ respectively. Note that the defining function $r = \rho \circ T^{-1}$ for Ω is in the normal form at $q^0 = 0$. Choose η_j such that $\tilde{q}^j = (q_1^j, \dots, q_{n-1}^j, q_n^j + \eta_j) \in \partial\Omega$. Then by the previous case

$$(17) \quad v_\Omega(q^j) \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \tau_{\alpha,r}(\tilde{q}^j, \eta_j)^2 \rightarrow v_{D_\infty}(b)$$

upto a subsequence. Since $\delta_\Omega \circ T$ is a defining function for D , we have $\delta_\Omega \circ T \approx \delta_D$ and hence $\delta_j \approx \delta_D(p^j) \approx \delta_\Omega(q^j) \approx \eta_j$. Also, by (3.3) of [21],

$$\rho \circ (\Phi_\rho^{p^j})^{-1} = r \circ (\Phi_r^{q^j})^{-1}.$$

It follows from (2.9) of [6] that $\tau_\rho(\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j) \approx \tau_r(\tilde{q}^j, \eta_j)$. Hence, after passing to a subsequence if necessary,

$$(18) \quad \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\tau_{\alpha,\rho}(\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j)}{\tau_{\alpha,r}(\tilde{q}^j, \eta_j)} \rightarrow c_0$$

for some $c_0 > 0$ that depends only on ρ . Also,

$$(19) \quad |\det T'(p^j)| \rightarrow |\det T'(p^0)| = \left| \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial \bar{z}_n}(p^0) \right| \prod_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} \lambda_\alpha^{1/2},$$

by (14), where λ_α 's are the positive eigenvalues of

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta}(p^0) \right]_{2 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n-1}.$$

It follows from eqs. (16) to (19) that

$$v_D(p^j) \prod_{i=1}^n \tau_{\alpha,\rho}(\tilde{p}^j, \delta_j)^2 \rightarrow c_0^2 \left| \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial \bar{z}_n}(p^0) \right|^2 \left(\prod_{\alpha=2}^{n-1} \lambda_\alpha \right) v_{D_\infty}(b)$$

upto a subsequence. This completes the proof of the theorem.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In view of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 of [16], it is enough to prove that $h_D(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \partial D$. First let D be a convex finite type domain and $p^0 \in \partial D$. Let $p^j \in D$ be any sequence converging to p^0 . Denote by D^j the domains obtained by scaling D with respect to p^j and recall that they converge in the local Hausdorff sense to a model domain D_∞ after possibly passing to a subsequence. Moreover $q_D(p^j) = q_{D^j}(0)$ and $h_D(p^j) = h_{D^j}(0)$. By the stability result Proposition 3.2 we have $q_{D^j}(0) \rightarrow q_{D_\infty}(0)$ and similarly from [16] (see Lemma 6.3 therein) we also have $h_{D^j}(0) \rightarrow h_{D_\infty}(0)$. Thus the hypothesis $q_D(p^j) \rightarrow 1$ implies that $q_{D_\infty}(0) = 1$ and hence D_∞ is biholomorphic to the unit ball \mathbb{B}^n . This in turn implies that $h_{D_\infty}(0) = 0$ and therefore $h_D(p^j) \rightarrow 0$. Since p^j is an arbitrary sequence we have proved that $h_D(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow p^0$.

The Levi corank one case follows exactly similarly with the stability result Proposition 4.2 and similar analog for h_D that follows from Proposition 3.6 in [1]. This completes the proof of the theorem.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. P. Balakumar, Prachi Mahajan, and Kaushal Verma, *Bounds for invariant distances on pseudoconvex Levi corank one domains and applications*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **24** (2015), no. 2, 281–388.
- [2] G.P. Balakumar, Diganta Borah, Prachi Mahajan, and Kaushal Verma, *Remarks on the higher dimensional Suita conjecture*, To appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.
- [3] C. Carathéodory, *Über die Abbildungen, die durch Systeme von analytischen Funktionen von mehreren Veränderlichen erzeugt werden*, Math. Z. **34** (1932), no. 1, 758–792 (German).
- [4] David W. Catlin, *Estimates of invariant metrics on pseudoconvex domains of dimension two*, Math. Z. **200** (1989), no. 3, 429–466.
- [5] Wing Sum Cheung and B. Wong, *An integral inequality of an intrinsic measure on bounded domains in \mathbf{C}^n* , Rocky Mountain J. Math. **22** (1992), no. 3, 825–836.
- [6] Sanghyun Cho, *Boundary behavior of the Bergman kernel function on some pseudoconvex domains in \mathbf{C}^n* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **345** (1994), no. 2, 803–817.
- [7] I. M. Dektyarev, *Criterion for the equivalence of hyperbolic manifolds*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **15** (1981), no. 4, 73–74 (Russian).
- [8] Hervé Gaussier, *Characterization of convex domains with noncompact automorphism group*, Michigan Math. J. **44** (1997), no. 2, 375–388.
- [9] Ian Graham and H. Wu, *Characterizations of the unit ball B^n in complex Euclidean space*, Math. Z. **189** (1985), no. 4, 449–456.
- [10] Robert E. Greene and Steven G. Krantz, *Characterizations of certain weakly pseudoconvex domains with noncompact automorphism groups*, Complex analysis (University Park, Pa., 1986), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1268, Springer, Berlin, 1987, pp. 121–157.
- [11] ———, *Biholomorphic self-maps of domains*, Complex analysis, II (College Park, Md., 1985), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1276, Springer, Berlin, 1987, pp. 136–207.
- [12] Steven G. Krantz, *The Kobayashi metric, extremal discs, and biholomorphic mappings*, Complex Var. Elliptic Equ. **57** (2012), no. 1, 1–14.
- [13] Daowei Ma, *Boundary behavior of invariant metrics and volume forms on strongly pseudoconvex domains*, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), no. 3, 673–697.
- [14] ———, *Carathéodory extremal maps of ellipsoids*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **49** (1997), no. 4, 723–739.
- [15] Prachi Mahajan and Kaushal Verma, *Some aspects of the Kobayashi and Carathéodory metrics on pseudoconvex domains*, J. Geom. Anal. **22** (2012), no. 2, 491–560.
- [16] ———, *A comparison of two biholomorphic invariants*, Internat. J. Math. **30** (2019), no. 1, 1950012, 16.
- [17] Jeffery D. McNeal, *Estimates on the Bergman kernels of convex domains*, Adv. Math. **109** (1994), no. 1, 108–139.
- [18] Nikolai Nikolov and Pascal J. Thomas, *Comparison of the Bergman kernel and the Carathéodory-Eisenman volume*, To appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.
- [19] Nikolai Nikolov and Kaushal Verma, *On the squeezing function and Fridman invariants*, arXiv:1810.10739v1.
- [20] Jean-Pierre Rosay, *Sur une caractérisation de la boule parmi les domaines de \mathbf{C}^n par son groupe d'automorphismes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **29** (1979), no. 4, ix, 91–97.
- [21] Do Duc Thai and Ninh Van Thu, *Characterization of domains in \mathbf{C}^n by their noncompact automorphism groups*, Nagoya Math. J. **196** (2009), 135–160.
- [22] B. Wong, *Characterization of the unit ball in \mathbf{C}^n by its automorphism group*, Invent. Math. **41** (1977), no. 3, 253–257.
- [23] Andrew Zimmer, *A gap theorem for the complex geometry of convex domains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **370** (2018), no. 10, 7489–7509.

DIGANTA BORAH: INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, PUNE 411008, INDIA
E-mail address: dborah@iiserpune.ac.in

DEBAPRASANNA KAR: INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, PUNE 411008, INDIA
E-mail address: debaprasanna.kar@students.iiserpune.ac.in