

## The $C^{1,1}$ Regularity of the Pluricomplex Green Function

ZBIGNIEW BŁOCKI

If  $\Omega$  is a domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\zeta \in \Omega$ , then the pluricomplex Green function in  $\Omega$  with pole at  $\zeta$  is defined as

$$g = \sup\{u \in \text{PSH}(\Omega) : u < 0, \limsup_{z \rightarrow \zeta} (u(z) - \log|z - \zeta|) < \infty\}$$

(see [5] for details). The main goal of this note is to prove the following result.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a  $C^\infty$  strictly pseudoconvex domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , and let  $g$  be the pluricomplex Green function of  $\Omega$  with pole at some  $\zeta \in \Omega$ . Then  $g$  is  $C^{1,1}$  in  $\bar{\Omega} \setminus \{\zeta\}$  (that is,  $g$  is  $C^{1,1}$  in  $\Omega \setminus \{\zeta\}$  and the second derivative of  $g$  is bounded near  $\partial\Omega$ ).*

An example given in [1] shows that  $g$  need not be  $C^2$  smooth up to the boundary. It remains an open problem if, in that example,  $g \notin C^2(\Omega \setminus \{p\})$ .

In [4], Guan claimed to prove the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity for every  $\alpha < 1$ . However, the proof was incomplete because the inequality (3.6) in [4] is false. In a correction to [4], written after I had sent him a preliminary version of this paper (with the proof of Theorem 1), Guan has given a new proof of the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity.

Our proof will be based on a construction from [4] of an approximating sequence for  $g$  and an idea from [2] used to show  $C^{1,1}$  regularity for the solutions of the complex Monge–Ampère equation in a ball (see also [3]).

Using similar methods, one can also characterize domains where the Green function is Lipschitz up to the boundary. We recall that a domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is called *hyperconvex* if it admits a bounded PSH exhaustion function.

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded hyperconvex domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , and let  $g$  be the Green function of  $\Omega$  with a pole at  $\zeta \in \Omega$ . Then  $g \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega} \setminus \{\zeta\})$  if and only if there exists  $\psi \in \text{PSH}(\Omega)$  with*

$$-C \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) \leq \psi(z) < 0, \quad z \in \Omega,$$

for some  $C > 0$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We may assume that  $\zeta = 0$ . Choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B_\varepsilon \Subset \Omega$ , and set  $\Omega_\varepsilon = \Omega \setminus \bar{B}_\varepsilon$ . By [4], there is a sequence of functions  $u^\varepsilon \in \text{PSH}(\Omega_\varepsilon) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$  which increase locally uniformly to  $g$  on  $\bar{\Omega} \setminus \{0\}$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  and

---

Received June 15, 1999. Revision received September 29, 1999.  
Partially supported by KBN Grant no. 2 PO3A 003 13.

which satisfy  $u^\varepsilon = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and  $u^\varepsilon = \log|z| + \psi$  on  $\partial B_\varepsilon$ , where  $\psi$  is smooth in  $\bar{\Omega}$  and  $\det(u_{i\bar{j}}^\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ . It follows that the tangential derivatives of the second order of  $u^\varepsilon$  with respect to  $\partial B_\varepsilon$  are bounded; that is,

$$\|\nabla^2(u^\varepsilon|_{\partial B_\varepsilon})\| \leq C_1. \tag{1}$$

In addition, it was shown in [4] that the  $u^\varepsilon$  satisfy

$$\|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{\partial\Omega}, \|\nabla^2 u^\varepsilon\|_{\partial\Omega} \leq C_2. \tag{2}$$

Here  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are constants depending only on  $\Omega$ .

Fix  $K \Subset \Omega \setminus \{0\}$ . By  $C_3, C_4, \dots$  we will denote positive constants depending only on  $\Omega$  and  $K$ . We need to show that

$$\|\nabla^2 u^\varepsilon\|_K \leq C_3. \tag{3}$$

For  $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$  with  $|\zeta| = 1$ , let  $\partial_\zeta$  denote the directional derivative in the direction  $\zeta$ . Since  $u^\varepsilon$  is plurisubharmonic, we have

$$\partial_\zeta^2 u^\varepsilon + \partial_{i\bar{i}}^2 u^\varepsilon \geq 0.$$

This easily gives

$$|\nabla^2 u^\varepsilon(a)| = \sup_{|\zeta|=1} \partial_\zeta^2 u^\varepsilon(a) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{u^\varepsilon(a+h) + u^\varepsilon(a-h) - 2u^\varepsilon(a)}{|h|^2} \tag{4}$$

for  $a \in K$ .

We will need a lemma as follows.

LEMMA. *Let  $0 < \varepsilon_0 < r_1 < r_2$  and  $R > 0$ . Then there exist  $\delta > 0$  and a  $C^\infty$  smooth mapping*

$$T: [0, \varepsilon_0] \times (\bar{B}_{r_2} \setminus B_{r_1}) \times \bar{B}_\delta \times \bar{B}_R \mapsto \mathbb{C}^n$$

( $B_r$  stands for an open ball centered at the origin with radius  $r$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} T(\varepsilon, a, h, \cdot) &\text{ is holomorphic in } B_R, \\ T(\varepsilon, a, h, \cdot) &\text{ maps } \partial B_\varepsilon \text{ onto } \partial B_\varepsilon, \\ T(\varepsilon, a, h, a) &= a + h, \\ T(\varepsilon, a, 0, z) &= z. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

*Proof.* Let  $T(\varepsilon, a, h, \cdot)$  be a holomorphic automorphism of  $B_\varepsilon$  (defined, in fact, on  $B_R$ ) of the form  $U \circ P$ , where

$$P(z) = \varepsilon \frac{\frac{\langle z, b \rangle}{|b|^2} b + \sqrt{1 - |b|^2} \left( z - \frac{\langle z, b \rangle}{|b|^2} b \right) - \varepsilon b}{\varepsilon - \langle z, b \rangle},$$

$|b| < R/\varepsilon$  (see [6]), and  $U$  is a linear orthogonal mapping with

$$P(a) = \frac{|a+h|}{|a|} a, \quad U\left(\frac{|a+h|}{|a|} a\right) = a+h.$$

One can check that the first condition is satisfied if  $b = \varepsilon\alpha a$ , where

$$\alpha = \frac{|a + h| - |a|}{|a|(|a + h||a| - \varepsilon^2)}.$$

This gives

$$P(z) = \frac{\frac{\langle z, a \rangle}{|a|^2} a + \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2 \alpha^2 |a|^2} \left( z - \frac{\langle z, a \rangle}{|a|^2} a \right) - \varepsilon^2 \alpha a}{1 - \alpha \langle z, a \rangle}.$$

The existence of an appropriate  $U$ , depending smoothly on  $a$  and  $h$  and in fact independent of  $\varepsilon$ , is clear. □

*Proof of Theorem 1 (cont.).* Let  $\Omega'$  and  $\Omega''$  be domains such that  $K \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega'' \Subset \Omega$ . We will use the foregoing lemma with  $r_1, r_2$  and  $R$  such that  $K \subset \bar{B}_{r_2} \setminus B_{r_1}$  and  $\Omega \subset B_R$ . For  $z \in \bar{\Omega}''$  and  $h, \varepsilon$  small enough, set

$$v(z) := u^\varepsilon(T(\varepsilon, a, h, z)) + u^\varepsilon(T(\varepsilon, a, -h, z))$$

so that it is well-defined and  $v(a) = u^\varepsilon(a + h) + u^\varepsilon(a - h)$ .

A Taylor expansion about the origin of an arbitrary smooth function  $f$  gives

$$f(h) + f(-h) = 2f(0) + \frac{1}{2}(\nabla^2 f(h') + \nabla^2 f(h'')) \cdot h^2$$

for some  $h' \in [0, h]$  and  $h'' \in [0, -h]$ . Therefore, by (1) and (2),

$$v(z) \leq 2u^\varepsilon(z) + C_4|h|^2, \quad z \in \partial B_\varepsilon. \tag{6}$$

On the other hand,

$$v(z) \leq 2u^\varepsilon(z) + \tilde{C}|h|^2, \quad z \in \partial\Omega'', \tag{7}$$

where

$$\tilde{C} = \sup_{|h'| \leq |h|, z \in \partial\Omega''} |\nabla_h^2(u^\varepsilon \circ T)(\varepsilon, a, h', z)|.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{C} \leq C_5(\|\nabla^2 u^\varepsilon\|_{\bar{\Omega} \setminus \Omega'} + \|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{\bar{\Omega} \setminus \Omega'}^2) \tag{8}$$

for  $h$  small enough. Since the mapping  $A \mapsto (\det A)^{1/n}$  is superadditive on the set of positive hermitian matrices, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\det(v_{i\bar{j}}))^{1/n} &\geq \varepsilon^{1/n} (|JacT(\varepsilon, a, h, \cdot)|^{2/n} + |JacT(\varepsilon, a, -h, \cdot)|^{2/n}) \\ &\geq \varepsilon^{1/n} (2 - C_6|h|^2). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Let  $M > 0$  be such that  $|z|^2 - M \leq 0$  for  $z \in \Omega$ , and define

$$w(z) = v(z) - \max\{C_4, \tilde{C}\}|h|^2 + \varepsilon^{1/n} C_6|h|^2(|z|^2 - M).$$

Then  $w$  is PSH in  $\Omega''$ ,  $w \leq 2u^\varepsilon$  on  $\partial B_\varepsilon \cup \partial\Omega''$  by (6) and (7), and  $\det(w_{i\bar{j}}) \geq 2^n \varepsilon$  in  $\Omega''$  by (9). The comparison principle (see e.g. [2]) now implies that  $w \leq 2u^\varepsilon$  in  $\Omega''$ . In particular,  $w(a) \leq 2u^\varepsilon(a)$ , and this coupled with (4) and (8) gives

$$|\nabla^2 u^\varepsilon(a)| \leq C_7(\|\nabla^2 u^\varepsilon\|_{\bar{\Omega} \setminus \Omega'} + \|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{\bar{\Omega} \setminus \Omega'}^2) + C_8.$$

Since  $\Omega'$  can be chosen to be arbitrarily close to  $\Omega$ , (3) follows thanks to (2).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* The “only if” part is obvious. Assume again that  $\zeta = 0$  and fix  $K \Subset \Omega \setminus \{0\}$ . Let  $r > 0$  be such that  $B_r \Subset \Omega$ . For  $0 < \varepsilon < r$ , define

$$u^\varepsilon := \sup\{v \in \text{PSH}(\Omega) : v < 0, v|_{B_\varepsilon} \leq \log(\varepsilon/r)\}.$$

Then one can easily show that  $u^\varepsilon \in \text{PSH}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ ,  $u^\varepsilon = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ,  $u^\varepsilon = \log(\varepsilon/r)$  on  $\bar{B}_\varepsilon$ , and  $u^\varepsilon \downarrow g$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  (see e.g. [5]). Since  $g$  is a maximal PSH function near  $\partial\Omega$ , we may assume that

$$u^\varepsilon \geq g \geq \psi \text{ near } \partial\Omega. \quad (10)$$

For  $a \in K$ ,  $\varepsilon$  as before, and  $h$  small enough, define

$$\Omega' = \{z \in \Omega : T(\varepsilon, a, h, z) \in \Omega\}.$$

By (10) and the assumption on  $\psi$  we have

$$u^\varepsilon(z) \geq \psi(z) \geq -C \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) \geq -C'|h|, \quad z \in \partial\Omega',$$

where  $C'$  depends only on  $K$  and  $\Omega$ . Hence, for  $z \in \partial\Omega'$  we have

$$u^\varepsilon(T(\varepsilon, a, h, z)) \leq 0 \leq u^\varepsilon(z) + C'|h|.$$

Since  $u^\varepsilon$  is maximal on  $\Omega' \setminus \bar{B}_\varepsilon$ , (1) gives

$$u^\varepsilon(T(\varepsilon, a, h, z)) \leq u^\varepsilon(z) + C'|h|, \quad z \in \Omega'.$$

Thus, if  $z = a$  for  $a \in K$  and  $|h| < \delta$ , where  $\delta$  depends only on  $K$  and  $\Omega$ , we have

$$u^\varepsilon(a+h) \leq u^\varepsilon(a) + C'|h|$$

and the theorem follows.  $\square$

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT.** This paper was written during my Fulbright Fellowship at the Indiana University in Bloomington and the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. I would also like to thank Professor E. Bedford for calling my attention to [4].

## References

- [1] E. Bedford and J.-P. Demailly, *Two counterexamples concerning the pluri-complex Green function in  $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Indiana Univ. Math. J. 37 (1988), 865–867.
- [2] E. Bedford and B. A. Taylor, *The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge–Ampère equation*, Invent. Math. 37 (1976), 1–44.
- [3] A. Dufresnoy, *Sur l'équation de Monge–Ampère complexe dans la boule de  $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Ann. Inst. Fourier 39 (1989), 773–775.
- [4] B. Guan, *The Dirichlet problem for complex Monge–Ampère equations and regularity of the pluri-complex Green function*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 6 (1998), 687–703.

- [5] M. Klimek, *Pluripotential theory*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991.
- [6] W. Rudin, *Function theory in the unit ball of  $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Grundlehren Math. Wiss., 241, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.

Institute of Mathematics  
Jagiellonian University  
Reymonta 4  
30-059 Kraków  
Poland

blocki@im.uj.edu.pl