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#### Abstract

Suppose that $E$ and $E^{\prime}$ denote real Banach spaces with dimension at least 2 and that $D \subset E$ and $D^{\prime} \subset E^{\prime}$ are domains. In this paper, we establish, in terms of the $j_{D}$ metric, a necessary and sufficient condition for the homeomorphism $f: E \rightarrow E^{\prime}$ to be FQC. Moreover, we give, in terms of the $j_{D}$ metric, a sufficient condition for the homeomorphism $f: D \rightarrow D^{\prime}$ to be FQC. On the other hand, we show that this condition is not necessary.


## 1. Introduction and main results

During the past few decades, modern mapping theory and the geometric theory of quasiconformal maps has been studied from several points of view. These studies include Heinonen's work on metric measure spaces [5], Koskela's study of maps with finite distortion [7] and Väisälä's work about quasiconformality in infinite dimensional Banach spaces [18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. Our study is motivated by Väisälä's theory of freely quasiconformal maps in the setup of Banach spaces [18, 19, 20]. The basic tools in Väisälä's theory are metrics and the notion of uniform continuity between metric spaces, in particular the norm metric, the quasihyperbolic metric and the distance ratio metric are used. We begin with some basic definitions and the statements of our results.

Throughout the paper, we always assume that $E$ and $E^{\prime}$ denote real Banach spaces with dimension at least 2 , and that $D \subset E$ and $D^{\prime} \subset E^{\prime}$ are domains. The norm of a vector $z$ in $E$ is written as $|z|$, and for each pair of points $z_{1}, z_{2}$ in $E$, the distance between them is denoted by $\left|z_{1}-z_{2}\right|$. The distance from $z \in D$ to the boundary $\partial D$ of $D$ is denoted by $d_{D}(z)$.

For each pair of points $z_{1}, z_{2}$ in $D$, the distance ratio metric $j_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right)$ between $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ is defined by

$$
j_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right)=\log \left(1+\frac{\left|z_{1}-z_{2}\right|}{\min \left\{d_{D}\left(z_{1}\right), d_{D}\left(z_{2}\right)\right\}}\right) .
$$

[^0]The quasihyperbolic length of a rectifiable arc or a path $\alpha$ in the norm metric in $D$ is the number (cf. [3, 18]):

$$
\ell_{k}(\alpha)=\int_{\alpha} \frac{|d z|}{d_{D}(z)}
$$

For each pair of points $z_{1}, z_{2}$ in $D$, the quasihyperbolic distance $k_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right)$ between $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ is defined in the usual way:

$$
k_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right)=\inf \ell_{k}(\alpha)
$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable $\operatorname{arcs} \alpha$ joining $z_{1}$ to $z_{2}$ in $D$. Gehring and Palka [3] introduced the quasihyperbolic metric of a domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Many of the basic properties of this metric may be found in [2]. We remark that the quasihyperbolic metric has been recently studied by many people (cf. [4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14]).
Definition 1. Let $D \neq E$ and $D^{\prime} \neq E^{\prime}$ be metric spaces, and let $\varphi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ be a growth function, that is, a homeomorphism with $\varphi(t) \geq t$. We say that a homeomorphism $f: D \rightarrow D^{\prime}$ is $\varphi$-semisolid if

$$
k_{D^{\prime}}(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varphi\left(k_{D}(x, y)\right)
$$

for all $x, y \in D$, and $\varphi$-solid if both $f$ and $f^{-1}$ satisfy this condition.
The special case $\varphi(t)=M t(M>1)$ gives the $M$-quasihyperbolic maps or briefly $M$-QH. More precisely, $f$ is called $M$-QH if

$$
\frac{k_{D}(x, y)}{M} \leq k_{D^{\prime}}(f(x), f(y)) \leq M k_{D}(x, y)
$$

for all $x$ and $y$ in $D$.
We say that $f$ is fully $\varphi$-semisolid (resp. fully $\varphi$-solid) if $f$ is $\varphi$-semisolid (resp. $\varphi$-solid) on every subdomain of $D$. In particular, when $D=E$, the subdomains are taken to be proper ones in $D$. Fully $\varphi$-solid mappings are also called freely $\varphi$-quasiconformal mappings, or briefly $\varphi$-FQC mappings.

If $E=E^{\prime}=\mathbb{R}^{n}$, then $f$ is FQC if and only if $f$ is quasiconformal (cf. [18]). See [ $1,15,25]$ for definitions and properties of $K$-quasiconformal mappings, or briefly $K$-QC mappings.

It is well-known that for all $z_{1}, z_{2}$ in $D$, we have (cf. [18])

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right) \leq \inf \log \left(1+\frac{\ell(\alpha)}{\min \left\{d_{D}\left(z_{1}\right), d_{D}\left(z_{2}\right)\right\}}\right) \leq \inf \ell_{k}(\alpha)=k_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha$ is a rectifiable arc joining $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ in $D$. Hence, in the study of FQC maps, it is natural to ask whether we could use $j_{D}$ metric to describe FQC or not. In fact, we get the following conditions for a homeomorphism to be FQC.

Theorem 1. A homeomorphism $f: E \rightarrow E^{\prime}$ is $\varphi_{1}$-FQC if and only if for every proper subdomain $D \subset E$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{2}^{-1}\left(j_{D}(x, y)\right) \leq j_{D^{\prime}}(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varphi_{2}\left(j_{D}(x, y)\right) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $x, y \in D$, where $\varphi_{1}$ and $\varphi_{2}$ are self-homeomorphisms of $[0, \infty)$ with $\varphi_{i}(t) \geq t$ $(i=1,2)$ for all $t$, and $\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}$ depend only on each other.

Theorem 2. Let $\varphi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ be a homeomorphism with $\varphi(t) \geq t$ for all $t$, and let $f: D \varsubsetneqq E \rightarrow D^{\prime} \varsubsetneqq E^{\prime}$ be a homeomorphism. If for every subdomain $D_{1} \subset D$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi^{-1}\left(j_{D_{1}}(x, y)\right) \leq j_{D_{1}^{\prime}}(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varphi\left(j_{D_{1}}(x, y)\right) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x, y \in D_{1}$, then $f$ is $\varphi_{1}$-FQC with $\varphi_{1}=\varphi_{1}(\varphi)$. Moreover, if $D_{1}=D$ and $\varphi(t)=M t(M \geq 1)$, then $f$ is $M_{1}-\mathrm{QH}$ with $M_{1}=M_{1}(M)$.

Theorem 3. The converse of Theorem 2 is not true.
The proofs of Theorems 1, 2 and 3 will be given in Section 3. In Section 2, some necessary preliminaries will be introduced.

## 2. Preliminaries

For an open ball with center $x \in E$ and radius $r>0$ we use the notation $\mathbb{B}(x, r)$. The boundary of the ball is denoted by $\mathbb{S}(x, r)$. The closed line segment with endpoints $z_{1} \in E$ and $z_{2} \in E$ is denoted by $\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$.

For convenience, in what follows, we always assume that $x, y, z, \ldots$ denote points in $D$ and $x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}, z^{\prime}, \ldots$ the images in $D^{\prime}$ of $x, y, z, \ldots$ under $f$, respectively. Also we assume that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ denote curves in $D$ and $\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}, \ldots$ the images in $D^{\prime}$ of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ under $f$, respectively.

Definition 2. A domain $D$ in $E$ is called c-uniform in the norm metric provided there exists a constant $c$ with the property that each pair of points $z_{1}, z_{2}$ in $D$ can be joined by a rectifiable arc $\alpha$ in $D$ satisfying (cf. [12, 17, 19])
(1) $\min _{j=1,2} \ell\left(\alpha\left[z_{j}, z\right]\right) \leq c d_{D}(z)$ for all $z \in \alpha$, and
(2) $\ell(\alpha) \leq c\left|z_{1}-z_{2}\right|$,
where $\ell(\alpha)$ denotes the length of $\alpha, \alpha\left[z_{j}, z\right]$ the part of $\alpha$ between $z_{j}$ and $z$.
It is well known that each ball $B \subset E$ is 2-uniform and a half space $H \subset E$ is $c$-uniform for all $c>2$ (cf. [22, Example 10.4]).

In [19], Väisälä characterized uniform domains by the quasihyperbolic metric.
Theorem A. ([19, Theorem 6.16]) For a domain $D$ in $E$, the following are quantitatively equivalent:
(1) $D$ is a c-uniform domain;
(2) $k_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right) \leq c^{\prime} \log \left(1+\frac{\left|z_{1}-z_{2}\right|}{\min \left\{d_{D}\left(z_{1}\right), d_{D}\left(z_{2}\right)\right\}}\right)$ for every pair of points $z_{1}$, $z_{2} \in D ;$
(3) $k_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right) \leq c_{1}^{\prime} \log \left(1+\frac{\left|z_{1}-z_{2}\right|}{\min \left\{d_{D}\left(z_{1}\right), d_{D}\left(z_{2}\right)\right\}}\right)+d$ for every pair of points $z_{1}, z_{2} \in D$.

In the case of domains in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, the equivalence of items (1) and (3) in Theorem D is due to Gehring and Osgood [2] and the equivalence of items (2) and (3) due to Vuorinen [24].

Theorem B. ([19, Lemma 6.7]) Suppose that $D$ is a c-uniform domain and that $x_{0} \in D$. Then $D_{0}=D \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ is $c_{0}$-uniform with $c_{0}=c_{0}(c)$.

Theorem C. ([19, Lemma 6.5]) For $x_{0} \in E, E \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ is 10-uniform.
For the case of $G=\mathbb{R}^{n} \backslash\{0\}$ the sharp constant $d$ in the inequality $k_{G}(x, y) \leq$ $d j_{G}(x, y)$ was found by H . Linden [11], and it is $\pi / \log 3$.

Recall that an arc $\alpha$ from $z_{1}$ to $z_{2}$ is a quasihyperbolic geodesic if $\ell_{k}(\alpha)=k_{D}\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right)$. Each subarc of a quasihyperbolic geodesic is obviously a quasihyperbolic geodesic. It is known that a quasihyperbolic geodesic between every pair of points in $E$ exists if the dimension of $E$ is finite, see [2, Lemma 1]. This is not true in arbitrary spaces (cf. [21, Example 2.9]). In order to remedy this shortcoming, Väisälä introduced the following concepts [19].

Definition 3. Let $D \neq E$ and $c \geq 1$. An $\operatorname{arc} \alpha \subset D$ is a $c$-neargeodesic if and only if $\ell_{k}(\alpha[x, y]) \leq c k_{D}(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \alpha$.

In [19], Väisälä proved the following property concerning the existence of neargeodesics in $E$.

Theorem D. ([19, Theorem 3.3]) Let $\left\{z_{1}, z_{2}\right\} \subset D$ and $c>1$. Then there is a $c$-neargeodesic in $D$ joining $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$.

A map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is uniformly continuous [18, Section 3.1] if and only if there is $t_{0} \in(0, \infty]$ and an embedding $\varphi:\left[0, t_{0}\right) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ with $\varphi(0)=0$ such that

$$
|f(x)-f(y)| \leq \varphi(|x-y|)
$$

whenever $x, y \in X$ and $|x-y| \leq t_{0}$. We then say that $f$ is $\left(\varphi, t_{0}\right)$-uniformly continuous. If $t_{0}=\infty$, we briefly say that $f$ is $\varphi$-uniformly continuous.

Lemma E. ([18, Lemma 3.2]) Let $X$ be c-quasiconvex and let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a map. Then the following conditions are quantitatively equivalent:
(1) $f$ is $\left(\varphi, t_{0}\right)$-uniformly continuous;
(2) $f$ is $\varphi$-uniformly continuous.

In [18], Väisälä proved the following theorem.

Theorem F. ([18, Theorem 5.13]) Suppose that $f: E \rightarrow D^{\prime} \subset E^{\prime}$ is fully $\varphi$ semisolid. Then
(1) $D^{\prime}=E^{\prime}$;
(2) $f$ is $\phi$-FQC with $\psi=\psi_{\varphi}$;
(3) $f$ is $\eta$-QS with $\eta=\eta_{\varphi}$.

## 3. The proofs of Theorems 1, 2 and 3

Before the proofs of our main results, we list a series of lemmas. From the proof of Theorem 5.7 and summary 5.11 in [18], we get the following.

Lemma G. Let $\varphi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ be a homeomorphism with $\varphi(t) \geq t$ for all $t$. Suppose that $f: D \rightarrow D^{\prime}$ is a homeomorphism. If for every point $x \in D$, $f: D \backslash\{x\} \rightarrow D^{\prime} \backslash\left\{x^{\prime}\right\}$ is $\varphi$-solid, then $f$ is $\psi$-FQC with $\psi=\psi(\varphi)$.

Lemma H. ([18, Lemma 6.25]) Suppose that $D \neq E, D^{\prime} \neq E^{\prime}$ and that $f: D \rightarrow D^{\prime}$ is a $\theta$-QM homeomorphism (for definition see $[16,18]$ ). Then

$$
j_{D^{\prime}}(x, y) \leq M j_{D}(x, y)+C
$$

for all $x, y \in D$ with $M$ and $C$ depending only on $\theta$.
The following result is from [16].
Lemma I. ([16, Theorem 3.2]) Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is $\eta$-QS. Then $f$ is $\theta$-QM where $\theta$ depends only on $\eta$.

Lemma 1. Suppose that $f: E \rightarrow E^{\prime}$ is $\varphi$-FQC. Then for every proper subdomain $D \subset E$,

$$
j_{D^{\prime}}(x, y) \leq c j_{D}(x, y)+d
$$

with $x, y \in D$, where $c, d$ are constants depending only on $\varphi$.
Proof. By Theorem F, we know that $f$ is $\eta$-QS with $\eta$ depending only on $\varphi$. Then for every proper subdomain $D \subset E, f: D \rightarrow D^{\prime}$ is an $\eta$-QS homeomorphism. Hence, Lemma 1 follows from Lemmas H and I.

Lemma 2. Let $D \subset E$ be a domain, and let $x, y \in D$. If $|x-y| \leq s d_{D}(x)$ for some $s \in(0,1)$, then

$$
k_{B_{x}}(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{1-s} \log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{d_{D}(x)}\right),
$$

where $B_{x}=\mathbb{B}\left(x, d_{D}(x)\right)$.
Proof. For each $w \in[x, y]$, we have $d_{B_{x}}(w) \geq d_{D}(x)-|x-w|$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{B_{x}}(x, y) & \leq \int_{[x, y]} \frac{|d w|}{d_{B_{x}}(w)} \leq \int_{d_{D}(x)-|x-y|}^{d_{D}(x)} \frac{d t}{t} \\
& =\log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{d_{D}(x)-|x-y|}\right) \leq \log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{(1-s) d_{D}(x)}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{1-s} \log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{d_{D}(x)}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

from which our lemma follows.
We remark that when $E=\mathbb{R}^{n}$, Lemma 2 coincides with Lemma 3.7 in [25].

Now we are ready to prove our main results.
3.1. The proof of Theorem 1. We first prove the sufficient part and we assume that $f: E \rightarrow E^{\prime}$ is $\varphi_{1}$-FQC. Let $D$ be a proper subdomain in $E$. For $x, y \in D$, by symmetry, to prove (1.2), we only need to prove the right hand side inequality. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $d_{D}(x) \leq d_{D}(y)$.

If $|x-y| \leq \frac{1}{2} d_{D}(x)$, let $B_{x}=\mathbb{B}\left(x, d_{D}(x)\right)$. Then (1.1) and Lemma 2 show that

$$
\begin{align*}
j_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) & \leq k_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq \varphi_{1}\left(k_{D}(x, y)\right)  \tag{3.1}\\
& \leq \varphi_{1}\left(k_{B_{x}}(x, y)\right) \leq \varphi_{1}\left(2 \log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{d_{D}(x)}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \varphi_{1}\left(2 j_{D}(x, y)\right)
\end{align*}
$$

If $|x-y|>\frac{1}{2} d_{D}(x)$, then

$$
j_{D}(x, y)=\log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{d_{D}(x)}\right)>\log (3 / 2)
$$

which, together with Lemma 1, shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq c j_{D}(x, y)+d \leq(c+d / \log (3 / 2)) j_{D}(x, y) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c$ and $d$ are constants depending only on $\varphi_{1}$.
Hence, by (3.1) and (3.2), inequality (1.2) holds with $\varphi_{2}(t)=\max \left\{\varphi_{1}(2 t),(c+\right.$ $d / \log (3 / 2)) t$.

In the following, we prove the necessary part. For fixed $a \in E$, let $D_{a}=E \backslash\{a\}$. Then from Theorem C that both $D_{a}$ and $D_{a}^{\prime}$ are $c$-uniform with $c=10$. Hence, Theorem A yields that there is a universal constant $c^{\prime}$ such that for each pair of points $x, y \in D_{a}$,

$$
k_{D_{a}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq c^{\prime} j_{D_{a}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \text { and } k_{D_{a}}(x, y) \leq c^{\prime} j_{D_{a}}(x, y)
$$

Therefore, it follows from (1.1) and (1.2) that

$$
\varphi_{2}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{c^{\prime}} k_{D_{a}}(x, y)\right) \leq k_{D_{a}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq c^{\prime} \varphi_{2}\left(k_{D_{a}}(x, y)\right)
$$

which shows that $f$ is $c^{\prime} \varphi_{2}$-solid in $D_{a}$, and so from Lemma G that $f: E \rightarrow E^{\prime}$ is $\varphi_{1}$-FQC with $\varphi_{1}$ depending only on $\varphi_{2}$.

Hence the proof of Theorem 1 is complete.
3.2. The proof of Theorem 2. We first prove the first part. Let $D_{1}$ be a subdomain of $D$. By symmetry, we only need to prove that there exists a homeomorphism $\varphi_{0}$ such that for each pair of points $x, y \in D_{1}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq \varphi_{0}\left(k_{D_{1}}(x, y)\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Choose $0<t_{0}<1$ such that $\varphi\left(t_{0}\right) \leq \log (3 / 2)$. Let $x, y \in D_{1}$ be points with $k_{D_{1}}(x, y) \leq t_{0}$. Then (1.3) gives

$$
j_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq \varphi\left(j_{D_{1}}(x, y)\right) \leq \varphi\left(k_{D_{1}}(x, y)\right) \leq \log (3 / 2)
$$

which shows that

$$
\left|x^{\prime}-y^{\prime}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2} d_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right)
$$

Let $B_{x^{\prime}}=\mathbb{B}\left(x^{\prime}, d_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right)$. Then by Lemma 2, (1.1) and (1.3), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) & \leq k_{B_{x^{\prime}}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq 2 \log \left(1+\frac{\left|x^{\prime}-y^{\prime}\right|}{d_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right)}\right) \\
& \leq 2 j_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq 2 \varphi\left(j_{D_{1}}(x, y)\right) \\
& \leq 2 \varphi\left(k_{D_{1}}(x, y)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we see from Lemma E that (3.3) holds.
Now, we prove the second part. Let $a=1-e^{-\frac{1}{3 M}}$. We only need to prove that there exists a constant $M_{1}=M_{1}(M)$ such that for each pair of points $x, y \in D$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq M_{1} k_{D}(x, y) . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We divide the proof into two cases.
Case 1. $|x-y| \leq a d_{D}(x)$.
Then

$$
d_{D}(y) \geq d_{D}(x)-|x-y| \geq(1-a) d_{D}(x)
$$

Hence,

$$
j_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq M j_{D}(x, y)=M \log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{\min \left\{d_{D}(x), d_{D}(y)\right\}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{3}
$$

which shows that

$$
\left|x^{\prime}-y^{\prime}\right|<\frac{1}{2} d_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right)
$$

Let $B_{x}^{\prime}=\mathbb{B}\left(x^{\prime}, d_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right)$. Then Lemma 2 yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) & \leq k_{B_{x^{\prime}}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq 2 \log \left(1+\frac{\left|x^{\prime}-y^{\prime}\right|}{d_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right)}\right) \\
& \leq 2 j_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq 2 M j_{D_{1}}(x, y) \\
& \leq 2 M k_{D}(x, y)
\end{aligned}
$$

Case 2. $|x-y| \geq a d_{D}(x)$.
It follows from Theorem D that there exists a 2-neargeodesic $\gamma$ in $D$ joining $x$ and $y$. Let $x=z_{1}$, and let $z_{2}$ be the first intersection point of $\gamma$ with $\mathbb{S}\left(z_{1}, a d_{D}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)$ in the direction from $x$ to $y$. We let $z_{3}$ be the first intersection point of $\gamma$ with $\mathbb{S}\left(z_{2}, a d_{D}\left(z_{2}\right)\right)$ in the direction from $z_{2}$ to $y$. By repeating this procedure, we get a set $\left\{z_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{p}$ of points in $\gamma$ such that $y$ is contained in $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(z_{p}, a d_{D}\left(z_{p}\right)\right)$, but not in $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(z_{p-1}, a d_{D}\left(z_{p-1}\right)\right)$. Obviously, $p>1$. Hence Case 1 yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} k_{D^{\prime}}\left(z_{i}^{\prime}, z_{i+1}^{\prime}\right)+k_{D}\left(z_{p}^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq 2 M\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} k_{D}\left(z_{i}, z_{i+1}\right)+k_{D}\left(z_{p}, y\right)\right) \\
& \leq 2 M \ell_{k}(\gamma[x, y]) \\
& \leq 4 M k_{D}(x, y)
\end{aligned}
$$



Figure 1. $\gamma^{\prime}$ is a quasihyperbolic geodesic joining $x_{0}^{\prime}$ and $y_{0}^{\prime}$ in $D^{\prime}$
Hence, inequality (3.4) holds, which complete the proof of Theorem 2.
3.3. The proof of Theorem 3. We prove this theorem by presenting two examples.

Example 3.5. Let $E=\mathbb{R}^{2} \cong \mathbb{C}$ and $f$ be a conformal mapping of the unit disk $\mathbb{B}(0,1)=\{z:|z|<1\}(=D)$ onto $D^{\prime}=\mathbb{B}(0,1) \backslash[0,1)$. There exist points $x, y \in D$ such that (1.3) does not hold.

Proof. By [2, Theorem 3], we know that conformal mapping is $M$-QH mapping for some constant $M \geq 1$. Hence, $f$ is $\varphi$-FQC with $\varphi(t)=M t$.

Now, we prove that there is some domain $D_{1} \subset D$ such that (1.3) fails to hold. Let $w_{0}^{\prime}=\left(-\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \in D^{\prime}$ and let $D_{1}=D \backslash\left\{w_{0}\right\}$. Since each ball is 2-uniform, Theorem B yields that $D_{1}$ is $c_{1}$-uniform, where $c_{1}$ is an universal constant. For each pair of points $x, y \in D_{1}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{k_{D}(x, y)}{M} \leq k_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leq M k_{D}(x, y) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Take $x_{0}^{\prime}, y_{0}^{\prime} \in D_{1}^{\prime}$ with $x_{0}^{\prime}=\left(\frac{1}{2}, t\right)$ and $y_{0}^{\prime}=\left(\frac{1}{2},-t\right)$ (see Figure 1). Let $\gamma^{\prime}$ be a quasihyperbolic geodesic joining $x^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime}$ in $D^{\prime}$. Then by (1.1),

$$
k_{D^{\prime}}\left(x_{0}^{\prime}, y_{0}^{\prime}\right) \geq \log \left(1+\frac{\ell\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)}{d_{D^{\prime}}\left(x_{0}^{\prime}\right)}\right) \geq \log \left(1+\frac{1}{t}\right)
$$

and

$$
j_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x_{0}^{\prime}, y_{0}^{\prime}\right)=\log \left(1+\frac{\left|x_{0}^{\prime}-y_{0}^{\prime}\right|}{\min \left\{d_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(x_{0}^{\prime}\right), d_{D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(y_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right\}}\right)=\log 3 .
$$

But (3.6) yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
j_{D_{1}}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) & \geq \frac{1}{c_{1}} k_{D_{1}}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \geq \frac{1}{c_{1}} k_{D}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \geq \frac{1}{c_{1} M} k_{D^{\prime}}\left(x_{0}^{\prime}, y_{0}^{\prime}\right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{c_{1} M} \log \left(1+\frac{1}{t}\right) \rightarrow \infty, \text { as } t \rightarrow 0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, there is no self-homeomorphism $\varphi$ of $[0, \infty)$ such that (1.3) hold. The proof of Example 3.5 is complete.

Note that we could also choose $D_{1}=D$, and conclude from a similar proof that (1.3) does not hold.

Example 3.7. Let $E$ be an infinite-dimensional separable real Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\left(e_{j}\right)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ where all vectors $e_{j}$ have a constant norm. Setting $\gamma_{j}^{\prime}=\left[e_{j-1}, e_{j}\right]$ we obtain the infinite broken line $\gamma^{\prime}=\cup\left\{\gamma_{j}^{\prime}: j \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$. Let $\gamma$ denote the line spanned by $e_{1}$, and let $D=\gamma+\mathbb{B}(r)$ with $r \leq \frac{1}{10}$ and $f$ be a locally $M$-bilipschitz homeomorphism from $D$ onto a neighborhood $D^{\prime}$ of $\gamma^{\prime}$ (for a detailed explanation we refer to see [18, section 4.12] or [23]). Then there exist points $x, y \in D$ such that (1.3) does not hold.

Proof. By [18, Theorem 4.8], we obtain that $f$ is $M^{2}-$ QH. Let $x, y \in D$ with $x=\sqrt{2} e_{1}, y=m \sqrt{2} e_{1}$. Then $d_{D}(x)=d_{D}(y)=r$. Because $f$ is locally $M$-bilipschitz, we get

$$
d_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{r}{M} \text { and } d_{D^{\prime}}\left(y^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{r}{M} .
$$

Since $D^{\prime} \subset \mathbb{B}(0,2)$, we find that

$$
j_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)=\log \left(1+\frac{\left|x^{\prime}-y^{\prime}\right|}{\min \left\{d_{D^{\prime}}\left(x^{\prime}\right), d_{D^{\prime}}\left(y^{\prime}\right)\right\}}\right) \leq \log \left(1+\frac{4 M}{r}\right)
$$

but

$$
j_{D}(x, y)=\log \left(1+\frac{|x-y|}{\min \left\{d_{D}(x), d_{D}(y)\right\}}\right)=\log \left(1+\frac{\sqrt{2}(m-1)}{r}\right) \rightarrow \infty
$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence (1.3) does not hold.
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