

WEAKLY HOLOMORPHIC HOMOGENEOUS REGULAR MANIFOLDS

ANDREW ZIMMER

ABSTRACT. We introduce a class of complex manifolds which we call weakly holomorphic homogeneous regular manifolds (wHHR) manifolds. As the name suggests, this class contains the so-called holomorphic homogeneous regular manifolds but also other classes of complex manifolds such as two dimensional finite type domains and simply connected Kähler manifolds with pinched negative sectional curvature. For wHHR Stein manifolds we prove that the Bergman and Kobayashi metrics are biLipschitz equivalent.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Kobayashi and Bergman metrics are in general not uniformly biLipschitz on a complex manifold (even for domains in complex Euclidean space). However, for certain special classes of complex manifolds they are, such as

- (1) finite type domains in \mathbb{C}^2 [Cat89],
- (2) simply connected negatively curved complete Kähler manifolds [WY20],
- (3) the holomorphic homogeneous regular (HHR) manifolds introduced by Liu–Sun–Yau [LSY04] and independently by Yeung [Yeu09], which include:
 - (a) strongly pseudoconvex domains,
 - (b) Kobayashi hyperbolic convex domains, and
 - (c) Teichmüller spaces.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a new class of non-compact complex manifolds which contains all of the above families and where the Kobayashi and Bergman metrics are uniformly biLipschitz.

We begin by recalling the definition of holomorphic homogeneous regular manifolds.

Definition 1.1. [LSY04, Yeu09] A complex m -manifold M is a *holomorphic homogeneous regular (HHR) manifold* if there exists $s > 0$ such that: for every $\zeta \in M$ there is a holomorphic embedding $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ with $f(\zeta) = 0$ and

$$s\mathbb{B}^m \subset f(M) \subset \mathbb{B}^m,$$

where $\mathbb{B}^m \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is the unit ball.

Remark 1.2. HHR manifolds are sometimes called manifolds with the *uniform squeezing property*, see for instance [Yeu09].

For a general complex manifold, it is very difficult to construct bounded holomorphic functions much less bounded embeddings into complex Euclidean space (see

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WI, USA
E-mail address: amzimmer2@wisc.edu.
Date: March 25, 2025.

for instance Yau's long standing conjecture [Yau82, Problem 38]). Motivated by Sibony's [Sib81] lower bound on the Kobayashi metric, we replace the existence of a bounded holomorphic embeddings of M into \mathbb{C}^m with the existence of a bounded plurisubharmonic function with large Levi form.

In the following definition let $\mathcal{L}(f)$ denote the Levi form of a \mathcal{C}^2 function f and let g_{Euc} denote the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{C}^m .

Definition 1.3. A complex m -manifold M is a *weakly holomorphic homogeneous regular (wHHR) manifold* if there exists $s > 0$ such that: for every $\zeta \in M$ there exist a holomorphic embedding $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ and a \mathcal{C}^2 plurisubharmonic function $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $\Phi(0) = \zeta$ and

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}} \text{ on } \mathbb{B}^m.$$

If, in addition, $M \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is a domain, then we call M a wHHR domain.

As the name suggests every HHR manifold is an wHHR manifold.

Observation 1.4. If M is a HHR manifold, then M is also a wHHR manifold.

Since the proof is short we include it here.

Proof. Suppose $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ is a holomorphic embedding with $f(\zeta) = 0$ and $s\mathbb{B}^m \subset f(M) \subset \mathbb{B}^m$. Then define $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ by $\Phi(w) = f^{-1}(sw)$ and define $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\phi(z) = \|f(z)\|^2$. Then ϕ is a \mathcal{C}^2 plurisubharmonic function and $\phi \circ \Phi(w) = s^2 \|w\|^2$. So

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) = s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on \mathbb{B}^m . □

Like HHR manifolds [LSY04, Yeu09], we will show that the Kobayashi distance is Cauchy complete on a wHHR manifold.

Theorem 1.5 (see Corollary 4.4 below). *If M is a wHHR manifold, then the Kobayashi distance on M is Cauchy complete.*

Combining Theorem 1.5 with results of Royden [Roy71, Corollary pg. 136] and Wu [Wu67, Theorem F] we deduce that wHHR domains are taut and pseudoconvex.

Corollary 1.6. *If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is a wHHR domain, then Ω is taut and pseudoconvex.*

We can also estimate the Bergman metric on wHHR manifolds, but require the additional assumption that the manifold is Stein.

Theorem 1.7 (see Theorem 8.3 below). *If M is a wHHR Stein manifold, then:*

- (1) *The Bergman metric on M is a complete Kähler metric with bounded geometry (in the sense of Definition 8.2 below).*
- (2) *The Kobayashi and Bergman metrics on M are uniformly biLipschitz.*

Notice that a wHHR domain is always Stein by Corollary 1.6. We require that the manifold is Stein in Theorem 1.7 so that we can solve the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation in weighted L^2 spaces.

1.1. A pointwise version. The *squeezing function*, introduced by Deng–Guan–Zhang [DGZ12], on a complex m -manifold M is defined by

$$\mathbf{sq}_M(\zeta) := \sup\{r : \text{there exists an holomorphic embedding } f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^m \text{ with } f(\zeta) = 0 \text{ and } r\mathbb{B}^m \subset f(M)\}.$$

Notice that a manifold is **HHR** if and only if the squeezing function has a positive lower bound. Further, if M admits no bounded embeddings, then $\mathbf{sq}_M \equiv -\infty$.

The squeezing function can be useful in some arguments because it provides a localized version of the **HHR** condition, see for instance the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [Zim21b] or the arguments in Section 4 of [AFGG24]. Motivated by this utility, we make the following definition.

Definition 1.8. Given a complex m -manifold M the *weak squeezing function*

$$\mathbf{wsq}_M : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

is defined as follows: $\mathbf{wsq}_M(\zeta)$ is the supremum over all $s \in [0, 1]$ where there exist a holomorphic embedding $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ and a C^2 function $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $\Phi(0) = \zeta$, $\phi(\zeta) = 0$, $\log \phi$ is plurisubharmonic, and

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on \mathbb{B}^m .

Remark 1.9. The conditions on ϕ in Definition 1.8 might seem stronger than the conditions in Definition 1.3, however it is straightforward to modify the function ϕ in Definition 1.3 to satisfy the assumptions in Definition 1.8 for a possibly smaller value of s . The additional assumptions on ϕ in Definition 1.8 are motivated by Sibony’s lower bound for the Kobayashi metric [Sib81].

This function has the following basic properties.

Proposition 1.10 (see Propositions 5.1 and 5.3 below). *If M is a complex manifold, then*

- (1) $\mathbf{sq}_M(z_0) \leq \mathbf{wsq}_M(z_0) \leq 1$ for all $z_0 \in M$.
- (2) M is a **wHHR** manifold if and only if \mathbf{wsq}_M has a positive lower bound.

We will prove the following pointwise version of part (2) in Theorem 1.7.

Theorem 1.11 (see Theorem 8.1 below). *For every $s \in (0, 1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $C = C(s, m) > 1$ such that: If M is a Stein m -manifold, $z_0 \in M$, and $\mathbf{wsq}_M(z_0) \geq s$, then the Bergman and Kobayashi metrics are C -biLipschitz at z_0 .*

We also prove the following rigidity result.

Proposition 1.12 (see Proposition 5.5 below). *If M is a taut complex manifold and $\mathbf{wsq}_M(z) = 1$ for some $z \in M$, then M is biholomorphic to the unit ball.*

It would be interesting to know if the tautness assumption can be removed from Proposition 1.12 and more generally if the supremum in Definition 1.8 is always realized.

1.2. The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator. In the last part of the paper we will establish a necessary condition for the compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator on $(0, q)$ -forms.

Given a pseudoconvex $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ and $1 \leq q \leq m$, let $L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega)$ denotes the space of $(0, q)$ -forms with square integrable coefficients and let $\bar{\partial}^*$ denote the L^2 adjoint of $\bar{\partial}$. The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator $N_q : L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega)$ is the bounded inverse to the unbounded self-adjoint surjective operator $\square := \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}$ on $L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega)$. These operators have been extensively studied and we refer the reader to [FK72, Kra92, BS99, CS01, Str10] for details.

It is generally believed that analytic varieties in the boundary should be an obstruction to the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator being compact (assuming the boundary of the domain is sufficiently regular), see the discussion in [FS01]. For wHHR domains we can use the methods in [Zim21a] to prove this is indeed the case.

Theorem 1.13 (see Theorem 9.1 below). *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is a bounded wHHR domain with \mathcal{C}^0 boundary. If $\partial\Omega$ contains a q -dimensional analytic variety, then $N_q : L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega)$ is not compact.*

To be precise, we say

- (1) Ω has \mathcal{C}^0 boundary if for every point $x \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a neighborhood U of x and there exists a linear change of coordinates which makes $U \cap \partial\Omega$ the graph of a \mathcal{C}^0 function.
- (2) $\partial\Omega$ contains a q -dimensional analytic variety if there exists a holomorphic map $\psi : \mathbb{B}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ where $\psi(\mathbb{B}^q) \subset \partial\Omega$ and $\psi'(0)$ has rank q .

It would be interesting to know if the converse of Theorem 1.13 is true for bounded wHHR domains with \mathcal{C}^0 boundaries. This would probably require developing a new way to show that the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator is compact.

1.3. Examples. By Observation 1.4 every HHR manifold is also an wHHR manifold. Hence the following families are all wHHR manifolds:

- (1) The Teichmüller space of hyperbolic surfaces with genus g and n punctures (by the Bers embedding, see [Gar87]).
- (2) Kobayashi hyperbolic convex domains or more generally \mathbb{C} -convex domains [Fra91, KZ16, NA17].
- (3) Bounded domains where $\text{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts co-compactly on Ω .
- (4) Strongly pseudoconvex domains [DFW14, DGZ16].

In [Zim21a], we introduced a class of bounded domains called *domains with bounded intrinsic geometry*. By [Zim21a, Theorem 1.12] any domain with bounded intrinsic geometry is an wHHR domain. Hence, by the discussion in Section 2 in [Zim21a] the following families are all wHHR manifolds:

- (5) Finite type domains in \mathbb{C}^2 .
- (6) Simply connected negatively curved complete Kähler manifolds.

Showing that finite type domains in \mathbb{C}^2 have bounded intrinsic geometry uses deep work of Catlin [Cat89] and showing that simply connected negatively curved complete Kähler manifolds have bounded intrinsic geometry uses deep work of Wu–Yau [WY20].

1.4. Some questions. We end this introduction by listing some questions.

Question 1.14. *Is every wHHR manifold Stein?*

Question 1.15. *Is the supremum in Definition 1.8 always realized?*

Question 1.16. *Does a wHHR (Stein?) manifold have a complete Kähler–Einstein metric? If so, is it biLipschitz to the Bergman and Kobayashi metrics?*

Question 1.17. *Is it possible to characterize the finite type pseudoconvex domains which are wHHR domains? Are they the h -extendible finite type domains?*

Griffiths [Gri71] proved that if X is a smooth quasi-projective algebraic variety and $x \in X$, then there exists a Zariski dense open set \mathcal{O} of X containing x so that the universal cover $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ of \mathcal{O} is biholomorphic to a bounded domain in complex Euclidean space.

Question 1.18. *Are the domains $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ constructed by Griffiths wHHR or HHR domains?*

Acknowledgements. This work was partially supported by a Sloan research fellowship and grant DMS-2105580 from the National Science Foundation.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notations. In this section we fix any possibly ambiguous notation.

Approximate inequalities: Given functions $f, h : X \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ we write $f \lesssim h$ or equivalently $h \gtrsim f$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $f(x) \leq Ch(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Often times the set X will be a set of parameters (e.g. $m \in \mathbb{N}$).

The Levi form: Given a complex m -manifold M and a \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth real valued function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *Levi form* $\mathcal{L}(f)$ of f is the possibly indefinite Hermitian form defined in local holomorphic coordinates z^1, \dots, z^m by

$$\mathcal{L}(f) := \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq m} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z^j \partial \bar{z}^k} dz^j \otimes d\bar{z}^k.$$

2.2. Solutions to $\bar{\partial}$. Given a Kähler metric g on a complex m -manifold M let dV_g denote the associated volume form. Recall that g induces a norm on forms as follows: If z^1, \dots, z^m are local coordinates centered at z_0 where $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^1}|_{z_0}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^m}|_{z_0}$ are orthonormal with respect to g and

$$\eta = \sum \alpha_{I,J} dz^I \wedge d\bar{z}^J \in \Lambda_{z_0}^{(p,q)}(M),$$

then

$$\|\eta\|_g = \sqrt{\sum |\alpha_{I,J}|^2}.$$

When η is a $(m, 0)$ -form, we have the following formula (see [Ber10, Section 3.2])

$$i^{m^2} \eta \wedge \bar{\eta} = \|\eta\|_g^2 dV_g.$$

We will use the following existence theorem for solutions to $\bar{\partial}$ which is established in [Dem96, Theorem 8.8] (similar versions appear in [SY77, Proposition 2.1], [GW79, Proposition 8.6], [Ohs84, Proposition 4], [Ber10, Theorem 5.1.1]).

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose M is a Stein m -manifold and g is a (possibly incomplete) Kähler metric on M . Let λ_1, λ_2 be plurisubharmonic functions on M . Assume λ_1 is \mathcal{C}^∞ smooth and*

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda_1) \geq cg$$

for some continuous positive function $c : M \rightarrow (0, \infty)$.

If f is a smooth $(m, 1)$ -form and $\bar{\partial}f = 0$, then there exists F a smooth $(m, 0)$ -form with $\bar{\partial}F = f$ and

$$i^{m^2} \int_M e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} (F \wedge \bar{F}) \leq \int_M \frac{\|f\|_g^2}{c} e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} dV_g,$$

assuming the right hand side is finite.

3. THE PLURICOMPLEX GREEN FUNCTION

In this section we establish local estimates for the pluricomplex Green function. We will use these estimates in Sections 4 and 7.

Definition 3.1. Suppose M is a complex manifold and d_M is some distance on M induced by a complete Riemannian metric. The *pluricomplex Green function* $G_\Omega : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup (-\infty, 0]$ is defined by

$$G_\Omega(z, z_0) = \sup \psi(z)$$

where the supremum is taken over all negative plurisubharmonic functions ψ such that $\psi(z) - \log d_M(z, z_0)$ is bounded from above in a neighborhood of z_0 .

Remark 3.2. In the definition, we assume that $\psi \equiv -\infty$ is a plurisubharmonic function.

We will use the following fact.

Proposition 3.3. [Kli85, Theorem 1.1] *If M_1, M_2 are complex manifolds and $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is a holomorphic map, then*

$$G_{M_2}(f(z), f(z_0)) \leq G_{M_1}(z, z_0)$$

for all $z, z_0 \in M_1$. In particular, if f is a biholomorphism, then $G_{M_2}(f(z), f(z_0)) = G_{M_1}(z, z_0)$ for all $z, z_0 \in M_1$.

The main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 3.4. *For every $r, s \in (0, 1)$ there exists $C = C(r, s) > 0$ such that: If M is a complex m -manifold, $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ is a holomorphic embedding, $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a plurisubharmonic function with $\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$ on \mathbb{B}^m , then*

$$\log \|w - w_0\| - C \leq G_\Omega(\Phi(w), \Phi(w_0)) \leq \log \|w - w_0\| + C$$

for all $w, w_0 \in r\mathbb{B}^m$.

Proof. Fix a compactly supported smooth function $\chi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of $r\mathbb{B}^m$. Then pick $A > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_w \left(\chi(w) \log \frac{\|w - w_0\|}{2} \right) \geq -A g_{\text{Euc}}$$

when $w \in \mathbb{B}^m$ and $w_0 \in r\mathbb{B}^m$. We claim that $C := A/s^2 + \log(2)$ satisfies the theorem.

Fix M, Φ , and ϕ as in the statement of the theorem. Then fix $w_0 \in r\mathbb{B}^m$. Define $\psi : M \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\psi(z) = \begin{cases} \chi(\Phi^{-1}(z)) \log \frac{\|\Phi^{-1}(z) - w_0\|}{2} + \frac{A}{s^2}(\phi(z) - 1) & \text{if } z \in \Phi(\mathbb{B}^m) \\ \frac{A}{s^2}(\phi(z) - 1) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that ψ is negative and $\psi \circ \Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow [-\infty, 0)$ is plurisubharmonic since

$$\mathcal{L}(\psi \circ \Phi) \geq -Ag_{\text{Euc}} + \frac{A}{s^2} \mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq 0.$$

Fix a distance d_M on M which is induced by a Riemannian metric. We claim that $\psi - \log d_M(\cdot, \Phi(w_0))$ is bounded from above in a neighborhood of $\Phi(w_0)$. Since Φ is an embedding, there exist $C' > 1$ and a neighborhood W of w_0 such that

$$\frac{1}{C'} \|w - w_0\| \leq d_M(\Phi(w), \Phi(w_0)) \leq C' \|w - w_0\|$$

for all $w \in W$. Then $\psi - \log d_M(\cdot, \Phi(w_0))$ is bounded from above on $\Phi(W)$, which a neighborhood of $\Phi(w_0)$. Then, by the definition of G_M ,

$$G_M(\Phi(w), \Phi(w_0)) \geq \psi(\Phi(w)) \geq \log \|w - w_0\| - \frac{A}{s^2}.$$

for all $w \in r\mathbb{B}^m$.

For the upper bound, first notice that

$$G_{\mathbb{B}^m}(w, w_0) \leq \log \|w - w_0\| - \log(2)$$

since $w \mapsto \log \|w - w_0\| - \log(2)$ is negative and plurisubharmonic. So by Proposition 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} G_M(\Phi(w), \Phi(w_0)) &\leq G_{\Phi(\mathbb{B}^m)}(\Phi(w), \Phi(w_0)) = G_{\mathbb{B}^m}(w, w_0) \\ &\leq \log \|w - w_0\| - \log(2). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

4. THE KOBAYASHI METRIC

In this section we use the estimates on the pluricomplex Green function in Theorem 3.4 to bound the Kobayashi metric.

Definition 4.1. Suppose M is a complex manifold. The (*infinitesimal*) *Kobayashi metric* is the pseudo-Finsler metric

$$k_M(z; X) = \inf \{ |\xi| : \xi \in T_0 \mathbb{C} \simeq \mathbb{C}, \varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow M \text{ holo.}, \varphi(0) = z, d(\varphi)_0 \xi = X \}$$

when $X \in T_z M$. The *Kobayashi distance* is the pseudo-distance

$$d_M^K(z_1, z_2) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 k_M(\sigma(t); \sigma'(t)) dt : \begin{array}{l} \sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M \text{ is a piecewise } \mathcal{C}^1\text{-smooth} \\ \text{curve joining } z_1 \text{ to } z_2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

We will frequently use the following fact.

Observation 4.2. If M_1, M_2 are complex manifolds and $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is a holomorphic map, then

$$k_{M_2}(f(z); d(f)_z X) \leq k_{M_1}(z; X)$$

for all $z \in M_1$ and $X \in T_z M_1$.

The main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 4.3. *For every $r, s \in (0, 1)$ there exists $C = C(r, s) > 1$ such that: If M is a complex m -manifold, $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ is a holomorphic embedding, $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a plurisubharmonic function with $\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$ on \mathbb{B}^m , then*

$$(1) \quad \frac{1}{C} \|X\| \leq k_M(\Phi(w); d(\Phi)_w X) \leq C \|X\|$$

for all $w \in r\mathbb{B}^m$ and $X \in T_w\mathbb{C}^m \simeq \mathbb{C}^m$. Moreover, if $w_1, w_2 \in r\mathbb{B}^m$, then

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{C} \|w_1 - w_2\| \leq d_M^K(\Phi(w_1), \Phi(w_2)) \leq C \|w_1 - w_2\|.$$

Delaying the proof of Theorem 4.3 we state and prove one corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *If M is a wHHR manifold, then the Kobayashi distance on M is Cauchy complete.*

Proof. Fix $s \in (0, 1)$ and a family of embeddings $\{\Phi_\zeta : \zeta \in M\}$ satisfying Definition 1.3. Then fix $r \in (0, 1)$, and a constant $C = C(r, s) > 1$ satisfying Theorem 4.3.

Suppose $(z_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (M, d_M^K) . Then there exists $N \geq 1$ such that

$$d_M^K(z_N, z_n) < \frac{r}{2C}$$

for all $n \geq N$. Then by Equation (2) and the definition of the Kobayashi distance, we must have $z_n \in \Phi_{z_N}(\frac{r}{2}\mathbb{B}^m)$ for all $n \geq N$.

Then

$$\|\Phi_{z_N}^{-1}(z_{n_1}) - \Phi_{z_N}^{-1}(z_{n_2})\| \leq C d_M^K(z_{n_1}, z_{n_2})$$

when $n_1, n_2 \geq N$. So $\{\Phi_{z_N}^{-1}(z_n) : n \geq N\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{C}^m . So

$$w := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{z_N}^{-1}(z_n) \in \frac{r}{2}\overline{\mathbb{B}^m}$$

exists. Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = \Phi_{z_N}(w). \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Fix $r \in (0, 1)$. To establish the estimates in (2) we will have to establish the estimates in (1) for a larger ball. So fix $r_1 \in (r, 1)$ and a constant $C_0 = C_0(r_1, s) > 0$ satisfying Theorem 3.4 for r_1, s .

Fix M, Φ , and ϕ as in the statement of the theorem. Let

$$C_1 := \max \left\{ e^{C_0}, \frac{1}{1-r_1} \right\}.$$

We claim that if $w \in r_1\mathbb{B}^m$ and $X \in T_w\mathbb{C}^m \simeq \mathbb{C}^m$, then

$$(3) \quad \frac{1}{C_1} \|X\| \leq k_M(\Phi(w); d(\Phi)_w X) \leq C_1 \|X\|.$$

For the upper bound on the Kobayashi metric, define $\phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow M$ by

$$\phi(\lambda) = \Phi \left(w + (1-r_1) \frac{X}{\|X\|} \lambda \right).$$

Then $\phi(0) = \Phi(w)$ and $d(\phi)_0 \frac{\|X\|}{1-r_1} = d(\Phi)_w X$. So by definition

$$k_M(\Phi(w); d(\Phi)_w X) \leq \frac{1}{1-r_1} \|X\| \leq C_1 \|X\|.$$

For the lower bound, fix $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist $\xi \in T_0\mathbb{C} \simeq \mathbb{C}$ and a holomorphic map $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow M$ with $\varphi(0) = \Phi(w)$, $d(\varphi)_0 \xi = d(\Phi)_w X$, and

$$|\xi| \leq \epsilon + k_M(\Phi(w); d(\Phi)_w X).$$

Then fix $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(\delta\mathbb{D}) \subset \Phi(r_1\mathbb{B}^m)$. Then for $\lambda \in \delta\mathbb{D}$ we have

$$\log |\lambda| = G_{\mathbb{D}}(\lambda, 0) \geq G_M(\varphi(\lambda), \Phi(w)) \geq \log \|\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(\lambda)) - w\| - C_0.$$

So $\|(\Phi^{-1} \circ \varphi)(\lambda) - w\| \leq e^{C_0} |\lambda|$ when $\lambda \in \delta \mathbb{D}$. Thus $\|d(\Phi^{-1} \circ \varphi)_w\| \leq e^{C_0}$. So

$$\|X\| = \|d(\Phi^{-1} \circ \varphi)_w \xi\| \leq e^{C_0} |\xi| \leq e^{C_0} (\epsilon + k_M (\Phi(w); d(\Phi)_w X)).$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, then

$$\frac{1}{C_1} \|X\| \leq e^{-C_0} \|X\| \leq k_M (\Phi(w); d(\Phi)_w X).$$

Now we prove the ‘‘moreover’’ part of the theorem. Fix $w_1, w_2 \in r \mathbb{B}^m$. Equation (3) implies that

$$d_M^K(\Phi(w_1), \Phi(w_2)) \leq C_1 \|w_1 - w_2\|.$$

For the lower bound, let $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a piecewise \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth curve with $\sigma(0) = \Phi(w_1)$ and $\sigma(1) = \Phi(w_2)$. If the image of σ is contained in $\Phi(r_1 \mathbb{B}^m)$, then

$$\int_0^1 k_M(\sigma(t); \sigma'(t)) dt \geq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{C_1} \|(\Phi^{-1} \circ \sigma)'(t)\| dt \geq \frac{1}{C_1} \|w_1 - w_2\|.$$

If the image of σ is not contained in $\Phi(r_1 \mathbb{B}^m)$, then there exist sequences $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that: $\sigma([0, a_n] \cup [b_n, 1]) \subset \Phi(r_1 \mathbb{B}^m)$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(\Phi^{-1} \circ \sigma)(a_n)\| = r_1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(\Phi^{-1} \circ \sigma)(b_n)\|.$$

Then Equation (3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 k_M(\sigma(t); \sigma'(t)) dt &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0, a_n] \cup [b_n, 1]} \frac{1}{C_1} \|(\Phi^{-1} \circ \sigma)'(t)\| dt \\ &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{C_1} (\|(\Phi^{-1} \circ \sigma)(a_n) - w_1\| + \|w_2 - (\Phi^{-1} \circ \sigma)(b_n)\|) \\ &\geq \frac{2(r_1 - r)}{C_1} \geq \frac{r_1 - r}{C_1 r} \|w_1 - w_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

So $C := \max \left\{ C_1, \frac{C_1 r}{r_1 - r} \right\}$ satisfies the theorem. \square

5. THE WEAK SQUEEZING FUNCTION

In this section we prove Propositions 1.10 and 1.12 from the introduction. We start by proving part two of Proposition 1.10.

Proposition 5.1. *A complex manifold M is a wHHR manifold if and only if wsq_M has a positive lower bound.*

Proof. It is clear that if wsq_M has a positive lower bound, then M is a wHHR manifold. So suppose that M is a wHHR m -manifold and $s > 0$ satisfies Definition 1.3. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and a compactly supported smooth function $\chi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ on $\delta \mathbb{B}^m$. Then pick $A > 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_w(2\chi(w) \log \|w\|) \geq -Ag_{\text{Euc}}$$

when $w \in \mathbb{B}^m$. Let $\lambda := \frac{A}{s^2}$. We will show that wsq_M is bounded below by $\sqrt{\frac{\delta^2}{4\lambda e^\lambda}}$.

Fix $z_0 \in M$. Then fix a holomorphic embedding $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ and a \mathcal{C}^2 plurisubharmonic function $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\Phi(0) = z_0$, $\phi(z_0) = 0$, and

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on \mathbb{B}^m .

Let $\phi_1 := e^{-1+\phi} : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Notice that if $X = \sum_j x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} \in T^{(1,0)} \mathbb{B}$, then

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)(X, \bar{X}) = e^{-1+\phi \circ \Phi} \mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) + e^{-1+\phi \circ \Phi} |X(\phi \circ \Phi)|^2$$

and hence

$$|X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)|^2 = e^{-2+2\phi \circ \Phi} |X(\phi \circ \Phi)|^2 \leq \mathcal{L}(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)(X, \bar{X}).$$

Define $\phi_2 : M \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ by

$$\phi_2(z) = \begin{cases} \|\Phi^{-1}(z)\|^{2\chi(\Phi^{-1}(z))} e^{\lambda\phi_1(z)} & \text{if } z \in \Phi(\mathbb{B}^m) \\ e^{\lambda\phi_1(z)} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\phi_2(z_0) = 0$ and $\log \phi_2$ is plurisubharmonic by our choice of A and λ . We claim that

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi_2 \circ \Phi) \geq \frac{1}{4\lambda}.$$

on $\delta \mathbb{B}^m$. To that end, fix $w \in \delta \mathbb{B}^m$ and $X = \sum_j x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} \in T_w^{(1,0)} \mathbb{C}^m$ with $\|X\| = 1$ and let

$$L := \mathcal{L}(\phi_2 \circ \Phi)_w(X, \bar{X}).$$

Notice that

$$\phi_2 \circ \Phi(w) = \|w\|^2 e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi(w)}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} L &= e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi} \left(\|X\|^2 + 2\lambda \operatorname{Re}(X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi) \cdot \langle w, X \rangle) \right) + \|w\|^2 \mathcal{L}(e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi})(X, \bar{X}) \\ &\geq e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi} (1 - 2\lambda |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)| \|w\|) + \|w\|^2 \mathcal{L}(e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi})(X, \bar{X}). \end{aligned}$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi})(X, \bar{X}) &= e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi} \left(\lambda \mathcal{L}(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)(X, \bar{X}) + \lambda^2 |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)|^2 \right) \\ &\geq e^{\lambda\phi_1 \circ \Phi} \left(\lambda |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)|^2 + \lambda^2 |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

So

$$L \geq \lambda |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)|^2 \|w\|^2 + (1 - \lambda |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)| \|w\|)^2.$$

Now if $\lambda |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)| \|w\| \leq 1/2$, we have

$$L \geq 0 + \frac{1}{4} \geq \frac{1}{4\lambda}$$

and if $\lambda |X(\phi_1 \circ \Phi)| \|w\| \geq 1/2$, we have

$$L \geq \frac{1}{4\lambda} + 0 = \frac{1}{4\lambda}.$$

So the claim is true.

Finally define $\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ by $\tilde{\Phi}(w) = \Phi(\delta w)$ and $\tilde{\phi} : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\tilde{\phi}(z) = e^{-\lambda\phi_2(z)}$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\phi} \circ \tilde{\Phi}) \geq \frac{\delta^2}{4\lambda e^\lambda} g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on \mathbb{B}^m . So $\operatorname{wsq}_M(z_0) \geq \sqrt{\frac{\delta^2}{4\lambda e^\lambda}}$. \square

For part one of Proposition 1.10 and Proposition 1.12, we will use Sibony's Schwarz lemma for subharmonic functions on the disk.

Theorem 5.2 (Sibony [Sib81, Proposition 1]). *Suppose $\psi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is \mathcal{C}^2 in a neighborhood of the origin, $\psi(0) = 0$, and $\log \psi$ is subharmonic. Then*

- (1) $\psi(z) \leq |z|^2$ on \mathbb{D} with equality at some point different from 0 if and only if $\psi(z) = |z|^2$ for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$.
- (2) $\Delta\psi(0) \leq 4$ with equality if and only if $\psi(z) = |z|^2$ for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

Using Sibony's result, we verify Proposition 1.10 from the introduction.

Proposition 5.3. *If M is a complex manifold, then*

$$\mathbf{sq}_M(z_0) \leq \mathbf{wsq}_M(z_0) \leq 1.$$

Proof. We first show that $\mathbf{sq}_M(z_0) \leq \mathbf{wsq}_M(z_0)$. Suppose $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ is a holomorphic embedding with $f(z_0) = 0$ and $s\mathbb{B}^m \subset f(M) \subset \mathbb{B}^m$. Then define $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ by $\Phi(w) = f^{-1}(sw)$ and define $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\phi(z) = \|f(z)\|^2$. Then $\Phi(0) = z_0$, $\phi(z_0) = 0$, ϕ is a \mathcal{C}^2 function, and $\log \phi$ is plurisubharmonic. Further, $\phi \circ \Phi(w) = s^2 \|w\|^2$ and so

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) = s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on \mathbb{B}^m . Hence $\mathbf{wsq}_M(z_0) \geq s$, which implies that $\mathbf{sq}_M(z_0) \leq \mathbf{wsq}_M(z_0)$.

Next we show that $\mathbf{wsq}_M(z_0) \leq 1$. Suppose $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ is a holomorphic embedding with $\Phi(0) = z_0$ and $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a \mathcal{C}^2 plurisubharmonic function where $\phi(z) = 0$, $\log \phi$ is plurisubharmonic, and

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on \mathbb{B} .

Fix a unit vector $X \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and consider the function $\psi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined by $\psi(z) = (\phi \circ \Phi)(zX)$. Then ψ is \mathcal{C}^2 , $\psi(0) = 0$, $\log \psi$ is subharmonic, and

$$\Delta\psi(0) = 4\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi)_0(X, \bar{X}) \geq 4s^2.$$

So by Theorem 5.2 we must have $s \leq 1$. □

To prove Proposition 1.12, we will use the following lemma (which is similar in statement and proof to [MV15, Proposition 3.6.2]).

Lemma 5.4. *If $\psi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is \mathcal{C}^2 , $\Delta\psi \geq 4s^2$ on \mathbb{D} , and $\psi(0) = 0$, then*

$$s^2 r^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(re^{i\theta}) d\theta$$

for all $r \in [0, 1)$.

Proof. Define $f : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$f(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(re^{i\theta}) d\theta.$$

Notice that f is \mathcal{C}^2 and $f(0) = 0$. Further

$$\begin{aligned} f''(r) + \frac{1}{r} f'(r) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) \psi(re^{i\theta}) d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (\Delta\psi)(re^{i\theta}) d\theta \geq 4s^2 \end{aligned}$$

since $\Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2}$ and $\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \psi(re^{i\theta}) d\theta = 0$. So

$$\frac{d}{dr} (rf'(r)) \geq 4s^2r.$$

Then integrating we have $rf'(r) \geq 2s^2r^2$ and so

$$f(r) = \int_0^r f'(t) dt \geq s^2r^2. \quad \square$$

Proposition 5.5. *If M is taut and $\text{wsq}_M(z_0) = 1$ for some $z_0 \in M$, then M is biholomorphic to the ball.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{wsq}_M(z_0) = 1$. Then there exist $s_n \nearrow 1$, a sequence of holomorphic embedding $\Phi_n : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$, and a sequence of \mathcal{C}^2 functions $\phi_n : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $\Phi_n(0) = z_0$, $\phi_n(z_0) = 0$, $\log \phi_n$ is plurisubharmonic, and

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi_n \circ \Phi_n) \geq s_n^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on \mathbb{B}^m . Notice that $\phi_n = e^{\log \phi_n}$ is also plurisubharmonic.

Since M is taut, by passing to a subsequence we can suppose that Φ_n converges to a holomorphic map $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ with $\Phi(0) = \zeta$. By Theorem 4.3, for every $r \in (0, 1)$ there exists $C_r > 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C_r} \|w - u\| \leq d_{\Omega}^K(\Phi_n(w), \Phi_n(u)) \leq C_r \|w - u\|$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $p, q \in r\mathbb{B}$. Thus Φ is injective.

Since ϕ_n is a bounded sequence of plurisubharmonic functions, by passing to a further subsequence we can suppose that ϕ_n converges in $L^{1,\text{loc}}(M)$ to a plurisubharmonic function $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$, see [H07, page 229]. By Theorem 5.2

$$\phi_n \circ \Phi_n(z) \leq \|z\|^2$$

and by Lemma 5.4

$$s_n^2 r^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu(\mathbb{S}^{m-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} (\phi_n \circ \Phi_n)(rz) d\mu(z)$$

where $\mathbb{S}^{m-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is the unit sphere and μ is the surface area measure on \mathbb{S}^{m-1} . So we must have $(\phi \circ \Phi)(z) = \|z\|^2$ almost everywhere. Since ϕ is upper semicontinuous, this implies that $(\phi \circ \Phi)(z) \geq \|z\|^2$ for all $z \in \mathbb{B}^m$.

Next we claim that Φ is onto. Since Φ is injective, Φ is an immersion and hence $\Phi(\mathbb{B}^m)$ is open. So it is enough to show that $\Phi(\mathbb{B}^m)$ is closed. Suppose not. Then there exists $z \in \overline{\Phi(\mathbb{B}^m)} \setminus \Phi(\mathbb{B}^m)$. Then there exists a sequence $(w_j)_{j \geq 1}$ in \mathbb{B}^m with $z = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(w_j)$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|w_j\| = 1$. Then

$$\phi(z) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (\phi \circ \Phi)(w_j) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|w_j\|^2 \geq 1.$$

Then by the maximum principle, $\phi \equiv 1$ which is impossible. So Φ is onto.

So $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$, being one-to-one and onto, is a biholomorphism. \square

6. THE BERGMAN KERNEL AND METRIC ON MANIFOLDS

In this expository section we recall the definition and basic properties of the Bergman kernel, metric, and distance on a complex manifold.

Given a complex m -manifold M , let $\mathcal{H}(M)$ denote the Hilbert space of holomorphic $(m, 0)$ -forms with inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{i^{m^2}}{2^m} \int_M f \wedge \bar{g}.$$

The *Bergman kernel* of M is the (m, m) -form on $M \times M$ defined by

$$K_M(z, w) = \sum_j \phi_j(z) \wedge \overline{\phi_j(w)}$$

where $\{\phi_j\}$ is some (any) orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}(M)$. We will also consider the (m, m) -form on M defined by

$$(4) \quad k_M(z) = \sum_j \phi_j(z) \wedge \overline{\phi_j(z)}$$

where again $\{\phi_j\}$ is some (any) orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}(M)$.

When $k_M(z)$ is non-vanishing, the *Bergman (pseudo-)metric* is defined in local holomorphic coordinates z^1, \dots, z^m by

$$g_M = \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq m} \frac{\partial^2 \log \hat{k}(z)}{\partial z^j \partial \bar{z}^k} dz^j \otimes d\bar{z}^k$$

where

$$k_M = \hat{k} dz^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz^m \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\bar{z}^m.$$

6.1. Classical formulas for the Bergman metric and kernel. In this section we recall and prove some classical formulas for the Bergman metric and kernel on a complex manifold. Fix a holomorphic embedding $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$. Then define $\hat{k} : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Phi^* k_M = \hat{k} dz^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz^m \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\bar{z}^m.$$

Likewise, for $f \in \mathcal{H}(M)$ define $\hat{f} : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Phi^* f = \hat{f} dz^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz^m.$$

Notice that

$$(5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |\hat{f}|^2 d\text{Leb} = \frac{i^{m^2}}{2^m} \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \Phi^* f \wedge \overline{\Phi^* f} = \frac{i^{m^2}}{2^m} \int_{\Phi(\mathbb{B})} f \wedge \bar{f} \leq \|f\|^2.$$

The following formulas are very well known, but since the argument is short we include it here.

Theorem 6.1.

(1) If $z \in \mathbb{B}^m$, then

$$\hat{k}(z) = \max \left\{ |\hat{f}(z)|^2 : f \in \mathcal{H}(M), \|f\| = 1 \right\}.$$

(2) Suppose k_M is non-vanishing (and hence the Bergman metric exists). If $z \in \mathbb{B}^m$ and $X = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \in T_z^{1,0} \mathbb{C}^m$, then

$$\Phi^* g_M(X, \bar{X}) = \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)} \max \left\{ \left| X(\hat{f})(z) \right|^2 : f \in \mathcal{H}(M), \|f\| = 1, \hat{f}(z) = 0 \right\}.$$

Proof sketch. Fix $z \in \mathbb{B}^m$ and $X = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \in T_z^{1,0} \mathbb{C}^m$.

Define $\ell_1 : \mathcal{H}(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\ell_1(f) = \hat{f}(z).$$

By Cauchy's integral formula and Equation (5), ℓ_1 is continuous. Hence there exists $\psi_1 \in \mathcal{H}(M)$ such that

$$\hat{f}(z) = \ell_1(f) = \langle f, \psi_1 \rangle$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{H}(M)$. Next define $\ell_2 : \psi_1^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\ell_2(f) = X(\hat{f})(z).$$

Again by Cauchy's integral formula and Equation (5), ℓ_2 is continuous. Hence there exists $\psi_2 \in \psi_1^\perp$ such that

$$X(\hat{f})(z) = \ell_2(f) = \langle f, \psi_2 \rangle$$

for all $f \in \psi_1^\perp$.

Let ϕ_1, ϕ_2 be orthogonal unit vectors such that $\psi_1 \in \mathbb{C} \cdot \phi_1$ and $\psi_2 \in \mathbb{C} \cdot \phi_2$ (it is possible for ψ_1 or ψ_2 to be zero). Notice that, if $f \in \psi_1^\perp$, then

$$(6) \quad \hat{f}(z) = \langle f, \psi_1 \rangle = 0.$$

Likewise, if $f \in \psi_1^\perp \cap \psi_2^\perp$, then

$$(7) \quad X(\hat{f})(z) = \langle f, \psi_2 \rangle = 0.$$

Now extend $\{\phi_1, \phi_2\}$ to an orthonormal basis $\{\phi_j\}$. Then by Equation (6),

$$(8) \quad \hat{k}(z) = \sum \left| \hat{\phi}_j(z) \right|^2 = \left| \hat{\phi}_1(z) \right|^2 = |\langle \phi_1, \psi_1 \rangle|^2 = \|\psi_1\|^2.$$

Further, if $f = \sum c_j \phi_j \in \mathcal{H}(M)$, then

$$\left| \hat{f}(z) \right| = |\langle f, \psi_1 \rangle| = |c_1| \|\psi_1\| \leq \|f\| \|\psi_1\|.$$

Thus (1) is true.

Now suppose that $\hat{k}(z) \neq 0$. Since

$$\Phi^* g_M(X, \bar{X}) = X \bar{X} \left(\log \hat{k} \right) (z) = \frac{X \bar{X} \left(\hat{k} \right) (z)}{\hat{k}(z)} - \frac{\bar{X} \left(\hat{k} \right) (z)}{\hat{k}(z)} \cdot \frac{X \left(\hat{k} \right) (z)}{\hat{k}(z)}$$

and $\hat{k} = \sum \left| \hat{\phi}_j \right|^2$, Equations (6), (7), and (8) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^* g_M(X, \bar{X}) &= \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)} \sum \left| X \left(\hat{\phi}_j \right) (z) \right|^2 - \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)^2} \left| \sum \overline{\hat{\phi}_j(z)} X \left(\hat{\phi}_j \right) (z) \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)} \left(\left| X \left(\hat{\phi}_1 \right) (z) \right|^2 + \left| X \left(\hat{\phi}_2 \right) (z) \right|^2 \right) - \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)^2} \left| \overline{\hat{\phi}_1(z)} X \left(\hat{\phi}_1 \right) (z) \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)} \left| X \left(\hat{\phi}_2 \right) (z) \right|^2 = \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)} |\ell_2(\phi_2)|^2 = \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)} |\langle \phi_2, \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{\hat{k}(z)} \|\psi_2\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Further, if $f = \sum c_j \phi_j \in \mathcal{H}(M)$ and $\hat{f}(z) = 0$, then $f \in \psi_1^\perp$ and so Equation (7) implies that

$$\left| X(\hat{f})(z) \right| = |\langle f, \psi_2 \rangle| = |c_2| \|\psi_2\| \leq \|f\| \|\psi_2\|.$$

So (2) is true. \square

6.2. Bounds on the Bergman kernel in local coordinates. Results in [WY20] provide uniform bounds on the Bergman kernel in local coordinates.

Proposition 6.2. [WY20] *For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in (0, 1)$ there exist constants $\{C_{a,b}\}_{a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m}$ such that: If M is a complex m -manifold, $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ is a holomorphic embedding, and $\beta : \mathbb{B}^m \times \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined by*

$$(\Phi \times \Phi)^* \mathbf{K}_M = \beta(u, w) du^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge du^m \wedge d\bar{w}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{w}^m,$$

then

$$\left| \frac{\partial^{|a|+|b|} \beta}{\partial u^a \partial \bar{w}^b}(u, w) \right| \leq C_{a,b}$$

for all $u, w \in r\mathbb{B}$.

To prove the proposition we use the following lemma from [WY20].

Lemma 6.3. [WY20, Corollary 24] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ be domain. Let $(h_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of holomorphic functions on Ω with the following property: There is an integer $N_0 \geq 0$ such that for all $N \geq N_0$,*

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N c_j h_j(z) \right|^2 d\text{Leb} \leq \sum_{j=1}^N |c_j|^2 \quad \text{for all } c_1, \dots, c_N \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Then the series

$$H(z, w) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} h_j(z) \overline{h_j(w)}$$

converges uniformly and absolutely on every compact subset $\Omega \times \Omega$. Furthermore, there exists $C = C(m) > 0$ such that for every compact subset $E \subset \Omega$,

$$\max_{(z,w) \in E \times E} \left| \frac{\partial^{|a|+|b|} H}{\partial z^a \partial \bar{w}^b} \right| \leq \frac{C a! b!}{d_{\mathbb{C}^m}(E, \partial\Omega)^{2m+|a|+|b|}}$$

for all multi-indices a, b .

Proof of Proposition 6.2. We argue as in the proof of [WY20, Lemma 26]. Fix an orthonormal basis $\{\phi_j\}_{j \in J}$ of $\mathcal{H}(M)$. Define $h_j : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Phi^* \phi_j = h_j dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m.$$

Then

$$\beta(u, w) = \sum_j h_j(u) \overline{h_j(w)}.$$

Further, if $J' \subset J$ is finite and $(c_j)_{j \in J'}$ are complex numbers, then applying Equation (5) to $f := \sum_{j \in J'} c_j \phi_j$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \left| \sum_{j \in J'} c_j h_j(w) \right|^2 d\text{Leb} \leq \|f\|^2 = \sum_{j \in J'} |c_j|^2.$$

So the proposition follows from Lemma 6.3. \square

6.3. The Bergman kernel on a domain. We now specialize to the case where $M = \Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is a domain. In this case, the Bergman kernel is often defined using holomorphic functions instead of forms. In particular, let $A^2(\Omega)$ denote the space of holomorphic functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which are square integrable with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then the *Bergman kernel* is defined by

$$K_\Omega(z, w) = \sum_j \phi_j(z) \overline{\phi_j(w)}$$

where $\{\phi_j\}$ is some (any) orthonormal basis of $A^2(\Omega)$.

Arguing as in Equation (5), the map

$$f \in A^2(\Omega) \mapsto f dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^m \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega)$$

is an isomorphism of Hilbert spaces and hence

$$K_\Omega(z, w) dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^m \wedge d\bar{w}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{w}^m$$

coincides with the differential form definition of the Bergman kernel.

7. LOWER BOUNDS ON THE BERGMAN KERNEL AND METRIC

Given a complex manifold, recall that g_M denotes the Bergman metric and k_M denotes the diagonal Bergman kernel in Equation (4) on a complex m -manifold M . In this section we establish lower bounds on both for wHHR Stein manifolds.

Theorem 7.1. *For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(m, s) > 0$ such that: If M is a Stein m -manifold, $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ is a holomorphic embedding, $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a plurisubharmonic function with $\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$ on \mathbb{B}^m , then:*

(1) *If $X = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} \in T_0^{1,0} \mathbb{C}^m$, then*

$$g_M(d\Phi_0 X, d\Phi_0 \bar{X}) \geq \epsilon \|X\|.$$

(2) *$\hat{k}(0) \geq \epsilon$ where $\hat{k} : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is defined by*

$$\Phi^* k_M = \hat{k} dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^m \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}^m.$$

Remark 7.2. The following argument is based on the proof of [GW79, Proposition 8.9] which itself is based on work of Hörmander [H65]. See also [Cat89, Section 6] and [McN94, Theorem 3.4].

Theorem 7.1 is an immediate consequence of the following lemma and Theorem 6.1.

Lemma 7.3. *For every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in (0, 1)$ there exists $C = C(m, n, s) > 0$ such that: If M is a Stein m -manifold, $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ is a holomorphic embedding, $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a plurisubharmonic function with $\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$ on \mathbb{B}^m , $f : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is holomorphic, and $\int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |f|^2 d\text{Leb} < \infty$, then there exists a holomorphic $(m, 0)$ -form F on M where:*

(1) *If $\Phi^* F = \hat{F} dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m$, then*

$$\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} \hat{F}}{\partial w^\alpha}(0) = \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} f}{\partial w^\alpha}(0)$$

for all multi-indices α with $|\alpha| \leq n$.

(2) $\|F\|_{\mathcal{H}(M)}^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |f|^2 d\text{Leb}$.

We will use the following observation.

Observation 7.4 (see for instance [Ber10, Lemma 6.4]). If $g_1 \leq g_2$ are Kähler metrics on a complex m -manifold M and T is (m, q) -form, then

$$\|T\|_{g_2}^2 dV_{g_2} \leq \|T\|_{g_1}^2 dV_{g_1}.$$

Proof of Lemma 7.3. Fix $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in (0, 1)$. Also fix $\chi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$, a compactly supported smooth function with $\chi \equiv 1$ on a neighborhood of 0.

Suppose M, Φ, ϕ , and f satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem. Since M is Stein, there exists a complete Kähler metric g_0 on M and there exists a strictly plurisubharmonic function $\phi_0 : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$. By scaling g_0 we can assume that

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) > g_0$$

on $\Phi(\text{supp}(\chi))$. Then consider the Kähler metric

$$g := \mathcal{L}(\phi) + g_0.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} T &:= \bar{\partial}(\Phi^{-1})^*(\chi f dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m) = (\Phi^{-1})^* \bar{\partial}(\chi f dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m) \\ &= (\Phi^{-1})^* \left(f \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial w^j} d\bar{w}^j \wedge dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m \right). \end{aligned}$$

We will apply Theorem 2.1 to α with the metric g and weights $\lambda_1 := \phi + \phi_0$, $\lambda_2 := 2(m+n) \mathbf{G}_M(\cdot, \Phi(0))$. Notice that

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}g$$

on $\Phi(\text{supp}(\chi))$.

Since $\Phi^*g \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$, Observation 7.4 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \|T\|_g^2 e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} dV_g &= \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \|\Phi^*T\|_{\Phi^*g}^2 e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \circ \Phi} dV_{\Phi^*g} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \|\Phi^*T\|_{s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}}^2 e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \circ \Phi} dV_{s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}} \\ &= \frac{1}{s^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |f|^2 \|\bar{\partial}\chi\|^2 e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \circ \Phi} d\text{Leb}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $\bar{\partial}\chi \equiv 0$ on a neighborhood of 0, Theorem 3.4 implies that there exists $C_1 > 0$ (which only depends on m, n, s , and χ) such that

$$\int_M \|T\|_g^2 e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} dV_g \leq C \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |f|^2 d\text{Leb}.$$

By Theorem 2.1 there exist $C_1 > 0$ (which only depends on m, n, s , and χ) and a smooth $(m, 0)$ -form F_0 such that $\bar{\partial}F_0 = T$ and

$$\frac{i^{m^2}}{2^m} \int_M e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} (F_0 \wedge \bar{F}_0) \leq C_1 \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |f|^2 d\text{Leb}.$$

Let $\hat{F}_0 : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the function satisfying

$$\Phi^*F_0 = \hat{F}_0 dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m.$$

Then by Equation (5),

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |\hat{F}_0|^2 e^{-\lambda_2 \circ \Phi} d\text{Leb} \leq \frac{i^{m^2}}{2^m} \int_M e^{-\lambda_2} (F_0 \wedge \bar{F}_0) < +\infty$$

Further, Theorem 3.4 implies that

$$e^{-\lambda_2 \circ \Phi} = O\left(\|z\|^{-2(m+n)}\right).$$

Thus, we must have

$$(9) \quad \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} \hat{F}_0}{\partial w^\alpha}(0) = 0$$

for all multi-indices α with $|\alpha| \leq n$.

Let

$$F := (\Phi^{-1})^*(\chi f dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m) - F_0.$$

Then $\bar{\partial}F \equiv 0$ and so F is holomorphic. Further, if $\Phi^*F = \hat{F}dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m$, then Equation (9) implies that

$$\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} \hat{F}}{\partial w^\alpha}(0) = \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}(\chi f)}{\partial w^\alpha}(0) = \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} f}{\partial w^\alpha}(0)$$

for all multi-indices α with $|\alpha| \leq n$. Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\mathcal{H}(M)} &\leq \|(\Phi^{-1})^*(\chi f dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m)\|_{\mathcal{H}(M)} + \|F_0\|_{\mathcal{H}(M)} \\ &\leq \|f dw^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dw^m\|_{\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{B}^m)} + \|F_0\|_{\mathcal{H}(M)} \\ &\leq (1 + \sqrt{C_1}) \left(\int_{\mathbb{B}^m} |f|^2 d\text{Leb} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and so the proof is complete. \square

8. THE PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.7 AND 1.11

In this section we prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.11 from the introduction.

Theorem 8.1. *For every $s \in (0, 1]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist constants $C > 1$, $\iota > 0$, and $(A_q)_{q \geq 0}$ such that: if M is a Stein m -manifold, $z_0 \in M$, and $\text{wsq}_M(z_0) \geq s$, then*

- (1) $\frac{1}{C} k_M(z_0; X) \leq \sqrt{g_M(X, \bar{X})} \leq C k_M(z_0; X)$ for all $X \in T_{z_0}^{(1,0)} M \simeq T_{z_0} M$.
- (2) The injectivity radius of g_M^B at z_0 is at least ι ,
- (3) $\|\nabla^q R|_{z_0}\|_g \leq A_q$ where R is the curvature tensor of g_M .

Delaying the proof for a moment, we state one definition and one corollary.

Definition 8.2. A complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) has *bounded geometry* if the injectivity radius of (M, g) is positive and for every $q \geq 0$ we have

$$\sup_M \|\nabla^q R\|_g < +\infty,$$

where R is the curvature tensor of g .

Since the Kobayashi metric induces a Cauchy complete distance on a wHHR manifold (see Corollary 4.4), we have the following corollary to Theorem 8.1.

Corollary 8.3. *If M is a wHHR Stein manifold, then:*

- (1) *The Bergman metric on M is a complete Kähler metric with bounded geometry.*
- (2) *The Kobayashi and Bergman metrics on M are uniformly biLipschitz.*

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Suppose M is a Stein m -manifold and fix $z_0 \in M$ with $\text{wsq}_M(z_0) \geq s$. By definition exists a holomorphic embedding $\Phi : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ and a \mathcal{C}^2 plurisubharmonic function $\phi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\Phi(0) = z_0$ and

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}.$$

As in Section 6.2, define $\beta : \mathbb{B}^m \times \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\beta(u, w) du^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge du^m \wedge d\bar{w}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{w}^m = (\Phi \times \Phi)^* K_M.$$

Then by definition,

$$\Phi^* g_M = \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq m} \frac{\partial^2 \log \beta(w, w)}{\partial w^j \partial \bar{w}^k} dw^j \otimes d\bar{w}^k.$$

For $u \in \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{B}^m$, define $\Phi_u : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow M$ by $\Phi_u(w) = \Phi(u + \frac{1}{2}w)$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi \circ \Phi_u) \geq \left(\frac{s}{2}\right)^2 g_{\text{Euc}}.$$

So by Theorem 7.1 there exists $\epsilon > 0$, which depends only on s and m , such that

$$(10) \quad \beta(u, u) \geq \epsilon$$

for all $u \in \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{B}^m$ and

$$\epsilon g_{\text{Euc}} \leq \Phi^* g_M$$

on $\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{B}^m$.

Part (1) of Theorem 8.1 is a consequence of Theorem 4.3 and the following lemma.

Lemma 8.4. *There exists $C_1 > 1$, which depends only on s and m , such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_1} g_{\text{Euc}} \leq \Phi^* g_M \leq C_1 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on $\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{B}$.

Proof. By Equation (10), the definition of g_M , and Proposition 6.2 there exists $C_0 > 0$, which depends only on s and m , such that

$$\Phi^* g_M \leq C_0 g_{\text{Euc}}$$

on $\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{B}$. Then let $C_1 := \max\{C_0, \epsilon^{-1}\}$. □

Lemma 8.5. *There exist constants $(A_q)_{q \geq 0}$, which depend only on s and m , such that*

$$\sup_{z \in \Phi(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{B}^m)} \|\nabla^m R\|_{g_M} \leq A_q.$$

Proof. This follows from Proposition 6.2, Lemma 8.4, and expressing the curvature tensors in the local coordinates induced by Φ . □

Lemma 8.6. *There exists $\iota > 0$, which depend only on s and m , such that the injectivity radius of g_M at z_0 is at least ι .*

Proof. This follows immediately from [LSY05, Proposition 2.1] and Lemmas 8.4 and 8.5. \square

\square

9. COMPACTNESS OF THE $\bar{\partial}$ -NEUMANN OPERATOR

In this section we prove Theorem 1.13 from the introduction.

Theorem 9.1. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is a bounded wHHR domain with \mathcal{C}^0 boundary. If $\partial\Omega$ contains a q -dimensional analytic variety, then $N_q : L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega)$ is not compact.*

The proof is very similar to the proof of Proposition 11.6 in [Zim21a], which in turn is similar to arguments of Catlin [Cat83, Section 2] and Fu–Straube [FS98, Section 4].

9.1. Some notation. Given a holomorphic map $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ between open sets $\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{m_j}$, we let $\Phi'(z)$ denote the m_2 -by- m_1 complex Jacobian matrix and let $\|\Phi'(z)\|$ denote the operator norm (relative to the Euclidean norms on $\mathbb{C}^{m_1}, \mathbb{C}^{m_2}$).

Given a (p, q) -form $\alpha = \sum \alpha_{I,J} dz^I \wedge d\bar{z}^J$ on a domain Ω , we will let $\|\alpha\|$ denote the function

$$z \in \Omega \mapsto \left(\sum |\alpha_{I,J}(z)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

and let

$$\|\alpha\|_\Omega = \left(\int_\Omega \|\alpha\|^2 d\text{Leb} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Similarly, we will let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the pointwise inner product on (p, q) -forms, that is

$$\left\langle \sum \alpha_{I,J} dz^I \wedge d\bar{z}^J, \sum \beta_{I,J} dz^I \wedge d\bar{z}^J \right\rangle = \sum \alpha_{I,J} \bar{\beta}_{I,J}.$$

Notice that $\|\alpha\| = \sqrt{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$.

9.2. Proof of Theorem 9.1. Suppose $\partial\Omega$ that contains a q -dimensional analytic variety and suppose for a contradiction that $N_q : L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega)$ is compact.

Define $S_q : L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega) \cap \ker \bar{\partial} \rightarrow L^2_{(0,q-1)}(\Omega)$ by $S_q := \bar{\partial}^* N_q$. Then S_q is a *solution operator* for $\bar{\partial}$, i.e. $\bar{\partial} S_q(f) = f$ for all $f \in L^2_{(0,q)}(\Omega) \cap \ker \bar{\partial}$. Further, since N_q is compact so is $S_q = \bar{\partial}^* N_q$, see [FS01, Lemma 1].

By assumption there exists an holomorphic map $\psi : \mathbb{B}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ where $\psi'(0)$ has rank q and $\psi(\mathbb{B}^q) \subset \partial\Omega$. By rotating Ω we can assume that

$$\psi'(0) \mathbb{C}^q = \mathbb{C}^q \times \{0_{\mathbb{C}^{m-q}}\}.$$

Let $x := \psi(0)$. Since Ω has \mathcal{C}^0 boundary, we can assume that there exist $\epsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$, and a unit vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^m$ such that

$$x + tv + \psi(\epsilon \mathbb{B}^q) \subset \Omega$$

for all $t \in (0, \delta]$.

Fix $\{t_n\} \subset (0, \delta]$ converging to 0 and let $\zeta_n := x + t_n v$. Since Ω is a wHHR domain, there is some $s > 0$ such that for every $n \geq 1$ there exist a holomorphic

embedding $\Phi_n : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \Omega$ and a \mathcal{C}^2 function $\phi_n : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\Phi_n(0) = \zeta_n$ and

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi_n \circ \Phi_n) \geq s^2 g_{\text{Euc}}.$$

Precomposing each Φ_n with a rotation, we can assume that

$$\Phi'_n(0)(\mathbb{C}^q \times \{0_{\mathbb{C}^{m-q}}\}) = \mathbb{C}^q \times \{0_{\mathbb{C}^{m-q}}\} = \psi'(0)\mathbb{C}^q.$$

Lemma 9.2. *There exists $C > 1$ such that: If $n \geq 1$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^q \times \{0_{\mathbb{C}^{m-q}}\}$, then*

$$\frac{1}{C} \|X\| \leq \|\Phi'_n(0)X\| \leq C \|X\|.$$

Proof. Since Ω is bounded, Cauchy's integral formulas imply that there exists $C_0 > 1$ such that

$$\|\Phi'_n(0)X\| \leq C_0 \|X\|.$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^m$.

The other bound requires more work. Since $\psi'(0)$ is injective, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|\psi'(0)Y\| \geq \epsilon_1 \|Y\|$$

for all $Y \in \mathbb{C}^q$. By Theorem 4.3, there exists $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that

$$k_\Omega(\zeta_n; \Phi'_n(0)X) \geq \epsilon_2 \|X\|$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^m$.

Now fix $n \geq 1$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^q \times \{0_{\mathbb{C}^{m-q}}\}$. Then there exists $Y \in \mathbb{C}^q$ with $\psi'(0)Y = \Phi'_n(0)X$. Since the Kobayashi metric is distance decreasing under holomorphic maps and

$$\zeta_n + \psi(\epsilon \mathbb{B}^q) \subset \Omega,$$

we have

$$k_\Omega(\zeta_n; \Phi'_n(0)X) = k_\Omega(\zeta_n; \psi'(0)Y) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|Y\|.$$

Thus

$$\|X\| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon \epsilon_2} \|Y\| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2} \|\psi'(0)Y\| = \frac{1}{\epsilon \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2} \|\Phi'_n(0)X\|.$$

So $C := \max\{C_0, (\epsilon \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2)^{-1}\}$ suffices. □

Consider the $(0, q)$ -forms

$$\alpha_n := \frac{K_\Omega(\cdot, \zeta_n)}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(\zeta_n, \zeta_n)}} d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}^q$$

on Ω . Then $\|\alpha_n\|_\Omega = 1$ and $\bar{\partial}\alpha_n = 0$. Let $h_n := S_q(\alpha_n)$. Since S_q is compact, after passing to a subsequence we can suppose that h_n converges in $L^2_{(0, q-1)}(\Omega)$. Since h_n converges, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact subset $K \subset \Omega$ such that

$$(11) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \int_{\Omega \setminus K} \|h_n\|^2 d\text{Leb} < \epsilon.$$

Define $\tilde{\alpha}_n : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\tilde{\alpha}_n := \det(\Phi'_n(w)) \langle \Phi_n^* \alpha_n, d\bar{w}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{w}^q \rangle.$$

Lemma 9.3. *After passing to a subsequence, we can assume that $\tilde{\alpha}_n$ converges locally uniformly on \mathbb{B}^m to a smooth function $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}(0) \neq 0$.*

Delaying the proof of Lemma 9.3 to the end of the section, we complete the proof of Theorem 9.1 by proving the following.

Lemma 9.4. *There exists a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{B}^m$ such that*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Phi_n(K)} \|h_n\|^2 d\text{Leb} > 0.$$

Hence we have a contradiction with Equation (11).

Proof. Since $\tilde{\alpha} \neq 0$, there exists a smooth compactly supported function $\chi_0 : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$0 \neq \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \tilde{\alpha}(w) \overline{\chi_0(w)} d\text{Leb}.$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}_n$ converges uniformly to $\tilde{\alpha}$ on the support of χ_0 we have

$$0 \neq \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \tilde{\alpha}(w) \overline{\chi_0(w)} d\text{Leb} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \tilde{\alpha}_n(w) \overline{\chi_0(w)} d\text{Leb}.$$

Then by the definition of $\tilde{\alpha}_n$,

$$0 \neq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \langle \det(\Phi'_n(w)) \Phi_n^* \alpha_n, \chi \rangle d\text{Leb}$$

where $\chi := \chi_0 d\bar{w}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{w}^q$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\Phi'_n(w)) \Phi_n^* \alpha_n &= \det(\Phi'_n(w)) \Phi_n^* \bar{\partial} h_n = \det(\Phi'_n(w)) \bar{\partial} \Phi_n^* h_n \\ &= \bar{\partial} [\det(\Phi'_n(w)) \Phi_n^* h_n], \end{aligned}$$

we then have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \langle \bar{\partial} [\det(\Phi'_n(w)) \Phi_n^* h_n], \chi \rangle d\text{Leb} \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}^m} \langle \det(\Phi'_n(w)) \Phi_n^* h_n, \vartheta \chi \rangle d\text{Leb} \right| \\ &\lesssim \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\text{supp}(\chi)} |\det(\Phi'_n(w))|^2 \|\Phi_n^* h_n\|^2 d\text{Leb} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where ϑ is the formal adjoint of $\bar{\partial}$. By Cauchy's integral formulas,

$$\max_{w \in \text{supp}(\chi)} \|\Phi'_n(w)\| \lesssim 1.$$

So

$$\|\Phi_n^* h_n|_w\| \leq \|\Phi'_n(w)\|^{q-1} \|h_n|_{\Phi_n(w)}\| \lesssim \|h_n|_{\Phi_n(w)}\|$$

for $w \in \text{supp}(\chi)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\text{supp}(\chi)} |\det(\Phi'_n(w))|^2 \|h_n|_{\Phi_n(w)}\|^2 d\text{Leb} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Phi_n(\text{supp}(\chi))} \|h_n\|^2 d\text{Leb}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the first part of the lemma is true with $K := \text{supp}(\chi)$.

Next we show that the first part of the lemma is incompatible with Equation (11). In particular, by Equation (11), we can fix a compact set $K' \subset \Omega$ such that

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} \int_{\Omega \setminus K'} \|h_n\|^2 d\text{Leb} < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Phi_n(K)} \|h_n\|^2 d\text{Leb}.$$

However, by Corollary 1.6, Ω is pseudoconvex. Then since $\Phi_n(0) = \zeta_n \rightarrow x \in \partial\Omega$, we have

$$\Phi_n(K) \cap K' = \emptyset$$

for n large. So we have a contradiction. \square

9.3. Proof of Lemma 9.3. Define functions $f_n, J_n : \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$f_n(w) = \det(\Phi'_n(w)) \frac{\mathbf{K}_\Omega(\Phi_n(w), \zeta_n)}{\sqrt{\mathbf{K}_\Omega(\zeta_n, \zeta_n)}}$$

and

$$J_n(w) = \langle \Phi_n^*(dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^q), d\bar{w}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{w}^q \rangle.$$

Then

$$\tilde{\alpha}_n(w) = f_n(w)J_n(w).$$

We will analyze f_n and J_n separately.

Lemma 9.5.

(1) For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{w \in \delta \mathbb{B}^m} |f_n(w)| < +\infty.$$

(2) $\inf_{n \geq 1} |f_n(0)| > 0$.

Proof. Define $\beta_n : \mathbb{B}^m \times \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\beta_n(z, w) = \mathbf{K}_\Omega(\Phi_n(z), \Phi_n(w)) \det \Phi'_n(z) \overline{\det \Phi'_n(w)}.$$

Notice that with $\Phi = \Phi_n$, β_n coincides with the function β appearing in Proposition 6.2 and $\beta_n(0, 0)$ coincides with $\hat{\mathbf{k}}(0)$ appearing in Theorem 7.1. Thus

$$\inf_{n \geq 1} |\beta_n(0, 0)| > 0$$

and for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{w \in \delta \mathbb{B}^m} |\beta_n(w, 0)| < +\infty.$$

Since

$$f_n(w) = \frac{\beta_n(w, 0)}{\sqrt{\beta_n(0, 0)}} \left(\frac{\overline{\det \Phi'_n(0)}}{|\det \Phi'_n(0)|} \right)^{-1},$$

the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 9.6.

(1) $\overline{J_n(w)} = \det \left[\frac{\partial(\Phi_n)_i}{\partial w^k}(w) \right]_{1 \leq j, k \leq q}$, in particular each J_n is anti-holomorphic.

(2) For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{w \in \delta \mathbb{B}^m} |J_n(w)| < +\infty.$$

(3) $\inf_{n \geq 1} |J_n(0)| > 0$.

Proof. Notice that

$$\Phi_n^* d\bar{z}^j = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\overline{\partial(\Phi_n)_j}}{\partial w^k} d\bar{w}^k$$

and so part (1) follows from the definition of the determinant. For part (2), Cauchy's integral formulas imply that each $\frac{\partial(\Phi_n)_j}{\partial w^k}$ is uniformly bounded on $\delta \mathbb{B}^m$ and hence by part (1) so is J_n . For part (3), recall that $\Phi'_n(0)$ maps $\mathbb{C}^q \times \{0_{\mathbb{C}^{m-q}}\}$ to $\mathbb{C}^q \times \{0_{\mathbb{C}^{m-q}}\}$. Hence

$$\Phi'_n(0) = \begin{pmatrix} L_n & ? \\ 0 & ? \end{pmatrix}$$

where $L_n := \left[\frac{\partial(\Phi_n)_j}{\partial w^k}(0) \right]_{1 \leq j, k \leq q}$. Then Lemma 9.2 implies that

$$|J_n(0)| = |\det L_n| \geq C^{-q}. \quad \square$$

Applying Montel's theorem to the sequences $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\bar{J}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we can pass to a subsequence so that $\tilde{\alpha}_n$ converges locally uniformly on \mathbb{B}^m to a smooth function $\tilde{\alpha}$ and

$$|\tilde{\alpha}(0)| \geq \left(\inf_{n \geq 1} |f_n(0)| \right) \left(\inf_{n \geq 1} |J_n(0)| \right) > 0.$$

REFERENCES

- [AFGG24] Leandro Arosio, Matteo Fiacchi, Sébastien Gontard, and Lorenzo Guerini. The horofunction boundary of a Gromov hyperbolic space. *Math. Ann.*, 388(2):1163–1204, 2024.
- [Ber10] Bo Berndtsson. An introduction to things $\bar{\partial}$. In *Analytic and algebraic geometry*, volume 17 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 7–76. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [BS99] Harold P. Boas and Emil J. Straube. Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem: a survey of the L^2 -Sobolev theory. In *Several complex variables (Berkeley, CA, 1995–1996)*, volume 37 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 79–111. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [Cat83] David Catlin. Necessary conditions for subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 117(1):147–171, 1983.
- [Cat89] David W. Catlin. Estimates of invariant metrics on pseudoconvex domains of dimension two. *Math. Z.*, 200(3):429–466, 1989.
- [CS01] So-Chin Chen and Mei-Chi Shaw. *Partial differential equations in several complex variables*, volume 19 of *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Boston, MA, 2001.
- [Dem96] Jean-Pierre Demailly. L^2 estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator on complex manifolds. Msanuscrit on webpage at https://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/manuscripts/estimations_12.pdf, 1996.
- [DFW14] K. Diederich, J. E. Fornæss, and E. F. Wold. Exposing points on the boundary of a strictly pseudoconvex or a locally convexifiable domain of finite 1-type. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 24(4):2124–2134, 2014.
- [DGZ12] Fusheng Deng, Qian Guan, and Liyou Zhang. Some properties of squeezing functions on bounded domains. *Pacific J. Math.*, 257(2):319–341, 2012.
- [DGZ16] Fusheng Deng, Qi'an Guan, and Liyou Zhang. Properties of squeezing functions and global transformations of bounded domains. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(4):2679–2696, 2016.
- [FK72] G. B. Folland and J. J. Kohn. *The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann complex*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1972. Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 75.

- [Fra91] Sidney Frankel. Applications of affine geometry to geometric function theory in several complex variables. I. Convergent rescalings and intrinsic quasi-isometric structure. In *Several complex variables and complex geometry, Part 2 (Santa Cruz, CA, 1989)*, volume 52 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 183–208. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991.
- [FS98] Siqi Fu and Emil J. Straube. Compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on convex domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 159(2):629–641, 1998.
- [FS01] Siqi Fu and Emil J. Straube. Compactness in the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem. In *Complex analysis and geometry (Columbus, OH, 1999)*, volume 9 of *Ohio State Univ. Math. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 141–160. de Gruyter, Berlin, 2001.
- [Gar87] Frederick P. Gardiner. *Teichmüller theory and quadratic differentials*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1987. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [Gri71] Phillip A. Griffiths. Complex-analytic properties of certain Zariski open sets on algebraic varieties. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 94:21–51, 1971.
- [GW79] R. E. Greene and H. Wu. *Function theory on manifolds which possess a pole*, volume 699 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 1979.
- [Hö65] Lars Hörmander. L^2 estimates and existence theorems for the $\bar{\partial}$ operator. *Acta Math.*, 113:89–152, 1965.
- [Hö07] Lars Hörmander. *Notions of convexity*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007. Reprint of the 1994 edition [of MR1301332].
- [Kli85] M. Klimek. Extremal plurisubharmonic functions and invariant pseudodistances. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 113(2):231–240, 1985.
- [Kra92] Steven G. Krantz. *Partial differential equations and complex analysis*. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992. Lecture notes prepared by Estela A. Gavosto and Marco M. Peloso.
- [KZ16] Kang-Tae Kim and Lijou Zhang. On the uniform squeezing property of bounded convex domains in \mathbb{C}^n . *Pacific J. Math.*, 282(2):341–358, 2016.
- [LSY04] Kefeng Liu, Xiaofeng Sun, and Shing-Tung Yau. Canonical metrics on the moduli space of Riemann surfaces. I. *J. Differential Geom.*, 68(3):571–637, 2004.
- [LSY05] Kefeng Liu, Xiaofeng Sun, and Shing-Tung Yau. Canonical metrics on the moduli space of Riemann surfaces. II. *J. Differential Geom.*, 69(1):163–216, 2005.
- [McN94] Jeffery D. McNeal. Estimates on the Bergman kernels of convex domains. *Adv. Math.*, 109(1):108–139, 1994.
- [MV15] Jeffery D. McNeal and Dror Varolin. L^2 estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ operator. *Bull. Math. Sci.*, 5(2):179–249, 2015.
- [NA17] N. Nikolov and L. Andreev. Boundary behavior of the squeezing functions of \mathbb{C} -convex domains and plane domains. *Internat. J. Math.*, 28(5):1750031, 5, 2017.
- [Ohs84] Takeo Ohsawa. Boundary behavior of the Bergman kernel function on pseudoconvex domains. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 20(5):897–902, 1984.
- [Roy71] H. L. Royden. Remarks on the Kobayashi metric. In *Several complex variables, II (Proc. Internat. Conf., Univ. Maryland, College Park, Md., 1970)*, pages 125–137. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 185. Springer, Berlin, 1971.
- [Sib81] Nessim Sibony. A class of hyperbolic manifolds. In *Recent developments in several complex variables (Proc. Conf., Princeton Univ., Princeton, N. J., 1979)*, volume 100 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, pages 357–372. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1981.
- [Str10] Emil J. Straube. *Lectures on the \mathcal{L}^2 -Sobolev theory of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*. ESI Lectures in Mathematics and Physics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2010.
- [SY77] Yum Tong Siu and Shing Tung Yau. Complete Kähler manifolds with nonpositive curvature of faster than quadratic decay. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 105(2):225–264, 1977.
- [Wu67] H. Wu. Normal families of holomorphic mappings. *Acta Math.*, 119:193–233, 1967.
- [WY20] Damin Wu and Shing-Tung Yau. Invariant metrics on negatively pinched complete Kähler manifolds. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 33(1):103–133, 2020.
- [Yau82] Shing Tung Yau, editor. *Seminar on Differential Geometry*, volume 102 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982. Papers presented at seminars held during the academic year 1979–1980.

- [Yeu09] Sai-Kee Yeung. Geometry of domains with the uniform squeezing property. *Adv. Math.*, 221(2):547–569, 2009.
- [Zim21a] Andrew Zimmer. Compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on domains with bounded intrinsic geometry. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 281(1):Paper No. 108992, 47, 2021.
- [Zim21b] Andrew Zimmer. Smoothly bounded domains covering finite volume manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 119(1):161–182, 2021.