A COMPLETE NORMAL FORM FOR EVERYWHERE LEVI DEGENERATE HYPERSURFACES IN $\mathbb{C}^3$

M. KOLAR AND I. KOSSOVSKiy

Abstract. In this paper, we construct a complete convergent normal form for everywhere 2-nondegenerate real-analytic hypersurfaces in complex 3-space. We do so by developing Moser’s homological approach in the 2-nondegenerate setting. This seems to be the first such construction in the case of infinite Catlin multitype. Our approach is based on using a rational model, which is the local realization due to Fels-Kaup of the well known tube over the future light cone.

As an application, we obtain a criterion for the local sphericity (i.e. local equivalence to the model) for a 2-nondegenerate hypersurface in terms of its normal form.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Historic outline. Understanding invariants and symmetries of real hypersurfaces in complex space is one of the central goals in Several Complex Variables. The study of them was initiated in the seminal 1907 work of Poincaré [Po07] who discovered, first, the finite-dimensionality of the
local automorphism group for nondegenerate real hypersurfaces, and second, the non-triviality of the holomorphic mapping problem for them (which is due to existence of local holomorphic invariants of hypersurfaces).

Under the assumption of the Levi-nondegeneracy of a real hypersurface, a complete picture of invariants and symmetries has been provided in the well known work of Cartan [Ca32], Tanaka [Ta62], Chern and Moser [CM74]. The differential-geometric constructions of Cartan, Tanaka, and Chern are certain developments of Cartan’s moving frame method. They provide a solution to the problem via presenting a canonical frame on a certain bundle associated with a hypersurface. Unlike that, Moser uses an approach inspired by Dynamical Systems and provides a convergent normal form for a hypersurface. Such a normal form provides a distinguished choice of local holomorphic coordinates for a hypersurface, in which its defining equation is approximated "as much as possible" by that for the local polynomial model: a real hyperquadric

\[ \text{Im } w = Q(z, \bar{z}), \quad (z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C} \]  

(1.1)

(here \(Q(z, \bar{z})\) is a nondegenerate Hermitian form on \(\mathbb{C}^n\)). A biholomorphic transformation bringing a hypersurface to a normal form at a point is defined uniquely, up to the automorphism group of the model (1.1). That is, Moser’s normal form is complete. Symmetries of a hypersurface can be read subsequently from the constructed normal form (see e.g. Beloshapka [Bel79] and Kruzhilin-Loboda [KLo83]).

The problem of describing invariants and symmetries of a real hypersurface appears to be much more difficult when a hypersurface is Levi-degenerate at the reference point \(p \in M\). A powerful approach here is coming from the notion of Catlin multitype of a real hypersurface [Ca84] at a point, which is often used in the theory of subelliptic estimates. For hypersurfaces of finite Catlin multitype at a point, an approach of studying symmetries and normal forms was developed by Kolar-Meylan-Zaitsev [KMZ14] (see also the subsequent work of Kolar-Meylan [KM18]). We shall emphasize that a hypersurface of finite Catlin multitype still contains Levi-nondegenerate points. More precisely, a genetic point in a hypersurface is Levi-nondegenerate, and this allows to read a lot of information on the CR-structure in a neighborhood of the degeneracy point from the nearby nondegenerate points.

Probably one of the most intriguing phenomena in CR-geometry is the existence of everywhere Levi degenerate real hypersurfaces in complex space of dimension 3 and higher, which still posses a finite-dimensional local automorphism group. The relevant nondegeneracy concepts for such hypersurfaces are due to Freeman [Fr77] (freeman sequences), Stanton and Baouendi-Ebenfelt-Rothschild [Sta96, BER96] (holomorphic nondegeneracy), and Baouendi-Huang-Rothschild [BHR96] (finite nondegeneracy). We refer to the book of Baouendi-Ebenfelt-Rothschild for precise definitions and further details. For the hypersurfaces under discussion, the situation changes dramatically compared to the finite multitype case: since there are no Levi-nondegenerate points in \(M\) at all, Cartan-Tanaka-Chern-Moser invariants at nearby points can not be used anymore for describing invariants at a given point \(p \in M\) of Levi-degeneracy.

In this paper, we address everywhere 2-nondegereate hypersurfaces. For a hypersurface \(M\) sitting in \(\mathbb{C}^N\), \(N \geq 3\), the latter means the validity of the following two conditions. First of all, the Levi form of \(M\) has everywhere rank \(N - 2\) (and hence the distribution \(K\) of pointwise Levi kernels \(K_p \subset T^\mathbb{C}_p M\) is well defined). Once the first condition is satisfied, the second one can be formulated on the language of local sections of the complex tangent bundle, namely, it requires:

\[ [K, T^\mathbb{C} M] \subset K. \] (1.2)
For an alternative definition of 2-nondegeneracy, due to Baouendi-Huang-Rothschild, we refer, again, to \[BHR96\] and \[BER99\]. We note that hypersurfaces satisfying the first condition but not the second are \textit{holomorphically degenerate} and hence their automorphism group is infinite-dimensional (see \[BER99\]).

The simplest example of a 2-nondegenerate hypersurface is the well known \textit{tube over the future light cone}

\[ C = \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : y_1^2 + y_2^2 = y_3^2, \quad y_j = \text{Im} z_j, \ y_3 \neq 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^3. \]  

This hypersurface has everywhere Levi rank 1 (and hence a 1-dimensional Levi kernel) and is everywhere 2-nondegenerate. This hypersurface has the "large" but still finite-dimensional automorphism group $SO(3,2)$. Notably, it is \textit{holomorphically homogeneous} (that is, its automorphism group acts transitively on it).

The example of the hypersurface $C$ in (1.3) motivated the long-lasting and somewhat intriguing study of the class $C_{2,1}$ of real hypersurfaces $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ which are, in the same manner as $C$, \textit{everywhere 2-nondegenerate} (and hence have everywhere Levi rank one and a finite-dimensional local automorphism group, see e.g. \[BER99\]). Earlier work here includes the work of Ebenfelt \[Eb06\], where a partial (formal) normal form for real-analytic hypersurfaces $C_{2,1}$ was obtained (notably, this normal form already provides a finite-dimensional reduction of the equivalence problem), then the work of Ebenfelt \[Eb06\], where a canonical frame for a smooth $C_{2,1}$ hypersurface was provided under certain additional assumptions, the work of Beloshapka \[Bel05\] where the optimal dimension bound for the (full) automorphism group of a real-analytic $C_{2,1}$ hypersurface was obtained, the work of Kaup-Zaitsev \[KZ06\] where the full automorphism group of the tube (1.3) was finally established correctly (as a Lie group), the work of Fels-Kaup \[FK07\] where a useful local rational model for tube (1.3) was discovered and the automorphism group of it was subsequently computed explicitly (see also Section 1.3 below for details), and finally the work of Fels-Kaup \[FK08\] (\textit{Acta Math.}, 2008) where locally homogeneous hypersurfaces of class $C_{2,1}$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$ where classified. More recent work here includes the work of Isaev-Zaitsev \[IZ13\] where the equivalence problem for smooth $C_{2,1}$ hypersurfaces was solved, an independent solution of the equivalence problem due to Medori-Spiro \[MS14\], explicit CR-curvature computation for $C_{2,1}$ hypersurfaces due to Pocchiola \[Poc13\], the work of Beloshapka-Kossovsky \[BK15\] on the parameterization of the stability group of a $C_{2,1}$ hypersurface by that of the sphere $S^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, and a development of the work \[IZ13\] and \[MS14\] in complex dimension 4 due to Porter-Zelenko \[PZ17\]. Notably, in the cited work, the role of the tube over the future light cone (1.3) as the "model" hypersurface for the class $C_{2,1}$ was clearly demonstrated. In particular, it follows that maps between (germs of) two hypersurfaces of class $C_{2,1}$ are parameterized by the stability group of the model (1.3).

We note that the tube over the future light cone admits higher dimensional generalizations

\[ C_{k,l} = \{(z_1, \ldots, z_{k+l}) : y_1^2 + \cdots + y_k^2 = y_{k+1}^2 + \cdots + y_{k+l}^2, \ y_j = \text{Im} z_j, \ y_1^2 + \cdots + y_k^2 \neq 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{k+l} \]

for $k,l \geq 1$, $k+l \geq 3$. All the tubes $C_{k,l}$ have a Levi kernel of rank one everywhere, are everywhere 2-nondegenerate and their full automorphism group is $SO(k+1,l+1)$ (see Fels and Kaup \[FK08\]). The tubes $C_{k,l}$ are important in that they are boundaries of \textit{Hermitian Symmetric Domains}. There exist further classes of 2-nondegenerate hypersurfaces related to Hermitian Symmetric Domains, for example, \textit{Lie spheres}. The latter fact further motivates the study of everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurfaces and their mappings. We shall mention here recent results of Mir \[Mir17\] and Kossovskiy-Lamel-Xiao \[KLX16\] and their applications in studying proper holomorphic maps of Hermitian Symmetric Domains due to Xiao-Yuan \[XY17\].
1.2. Overview of the results. The above mentioned substantial study of everywhere 2-
nondegenerate hypersurfaces still leaves completely open the following aspect of the problem: 
extend Moser’s normal form theory for the class of (real-analytic) everywhere 2-nondegenerate 
hypersurfaces. That is, we aim for a complete convergent normal form for real-analytic every-
where 2-nondegenerate hypersurfaces. The main goal of this paper is to provide such a normal 
form, accordingly, is defined uniquely up to the stability group of the model: the tube over the future light cone (1.3). Notably, we are able to present any hypersurface of 
class $C_{2,1}$ as a perturbation of (the local rational realization of) the model, and then set up, in 
the spirit of Moser, a homological procedure for investigating maps between two hypersurfaces. 
The latter is accomplished by a choice of weights for the coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^3$ where the coordinate 
corresponding to the Levi kernel gets weight 0. Somewhat surprisingly, even though this approach 
leads to natural difficulties (for example, ”weighted polynomials” are not polynomials anymore 
but power series), we are still able to reduce the space of mappings between hypersurfaces to 
studying the kernel of an appropriate homological operator. The kernel of the latter operator is 
precisely the automorphism algebra of the model (given below).

Similarly to the situation of Chern-Moser, the convergence is achieved by employing chains: 
distinguished curves in $M$, pointwise transverse to the complex tangent and being mapped by 
normalizing transformations into the standard ”vertical” curve (see (3.2) below). Since orbits of 
the linear part of the stabilizer do not act transitively on transverse directions anymore (unlike the 
Levi-nondegenerate situation), possible directions of chains form in the tangent space a certain 
canonical cone (given in appropriate coordinates by (3.9)). The construction of chains and their 
properties are discussed in detail in Section 3.2. We shall also mention that certain (degenerate) 
chains were previously used by Kossovskiy-Zaitsev in [KZ19], [KZ15] for proving convergence of 
normal forms of finite type hypersurfaces. Chains for submanifolds of high codimension were also 
used in the work [ES96] of Ejov-Schmalz.

We shall emphasize that, importantly, 2-nondegenerate hypersurfaces have infinite Catlin multi-
type. (In fact, they can be considered as the first possible nondegeneracy class within the category 
of infinite multitype hypersurfaces). That is why, to the best of our knowledge, the present paper 
gives the first known development of Moser’s homological method for infinite Catlin multitype 
hypersurfaces.

As an application of our theory, we obtain, similarly to the situation in Chern-Moser’s theory, a 
characterization of sphericity for an everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface (i.e., the property 
of being equivalent to the model). The sphericity then amounts to the pointwise vanishing of two 
specific coefficients in a normal of the hypersurface at a point (see Theorem 2 below).

1.3. The future light cone and its automorphisms. Before stating our main results, we 
shall describe in detail the local model for the tube over the future light cone (1.3) obtained by 
Fels-Kaup in [FK07] and its automorphism. 

According to [FK07], the cone (1.3) is locally bi-rationally equivalent to the real hypersurface 

$$v = P(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}), \quad \text{where} \quad P(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) := \frac{|z|^2 + \text{Re}(z\bar{\zeta})}{1 - |\zeta|^2}, \quad (z, \zeta, w) \in \mathbb{C}^3. \quad (1.4)$$

In [FK07], the infinitesimal automorphism algebra of (1.4) is described using a grading by complex 
integers. Our approach is different though. We introduce the following choice of weights playing 
a crucial role in our construction:

$$[z] = [\bar{z}] = 1, \quad [\zeta] = [\bar{\zeta}] = 0, \quad [w] = [\bar{w}] = 2 \quad (1.5)$$
The rational model (1.4) is then a *homogeneous hypersurface* with respect to the choice of weights (1.5).

Let us now employ the weight system (1.5) to present the infinitesimal automorphism algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of (1.4) as a graded Lie algebra. Let us set:

$$
[z] = 1, \quad [\zeta] = 0, \quad [w] = 2, \quad \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] = -1, \quad \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \right] = 0, \quad \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right] = -2.
$$

(1.6)

Now the results in [FK07] can be interpreted as presenting $\mathfrak{g}$ in the form:

$$
\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{-2} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{+1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{+2},
$$

where the negatively graded components are

$$
\mathfrak{g}_{-2} = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right\},
$$

$$
\mathfrak{g}_{-1} = \text{span} \left\{ (1 - \zeta) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + 2iz \frac{\partial}{\partial w}, \quad i(1 + \zeta) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + 2iz \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right\},
$$

(1.7)

the zero component is split as $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}_0^c \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0^s$ with

$$
\mathfrak{g}_0^c = \text{span} \left\{ z \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + 2w \frac{\partial}{\partial w}, \quad iz \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + 2i\zeta \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \right\},
$$

$$
\mathfrak{g}_0^s = \text{span} \left\{ -z\zeta \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + (1 - \zeta^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} + iz^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial w}, \quad iz\zeta \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + i(1 + \zeta^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} + z^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right\},
$$

(1.8)

and the positively graded components are

$$
\mathfrak{g}_1 = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + 2(z + \zeta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} + 2zw \frac{\partial}{\partial w}, \quad (iz^2 + w + \zeta w) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + 2i(z\zeta - z) \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} + 2izw \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right\},
$$

$$
\mathfrak{g}_2 = \text{span} \left\{ zw \frac{\partial}{\partial z} - iz^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} + w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right\}.
$$

(1.9)

The 0-subcomponents $\mathfrak{g}_0^c, \mathfrak{g}_0^s$ are called in what follows *classical* and *special*, respectively. Further, we conclude that the stability subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is decomposed as

$$
\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}_0^c \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2.
$$

(1.10)

The stability group $G$ of the rational model (1.4) is generated by the algebra (1.10). Its subgroup $G_0^c$ generated by the component $\mathfrak{g}_0^c$ consists of the scalings

$$
z \mapsto r e^{i\varphi} z, \quad \zeta \mapsto e^{2i\varphi} \zeta, \quad w \mapsto r^2 w, \quad r > 0, \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R}.
$$

(1.11)

The subgroup $G_+^c$ generated by the subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_+ := \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$ consists of certain rational transformations. As the respective rational expressions are cumbersome and are not used in the paper, we do not provide them here.
1.4. **Main results.** Let \( M \subset \mathbb{C}^3 \) be an everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface. The tangent bundle \( TM \) is endowed then with the canonical subbundles \( T^C M \) and \( K \), where \( K_p \) is the Levi kernel at \( p \). Accordingly, the quotient bundles \( TM/T^C M \) and \( TM/K \) are well defined.

Further, let us introduce the space \( \mathcal{N} \) of real-valued formal power series
\[
\Phi(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u) = \sum_{k+l+\alpha+\beta \geq 5} \Phi_{k\ell\alpha\beta}(u) z^k \zeta^l \bar{z}^\alpha \bar{\zeta}^\beta
\]
satisfying, in addition,
\[
\Phi_{k00} = \Phi_{k10} = \Phi_{k20} = 0, \ k, l \geq 0; \\
\Phi_{4001} = \Phi_{3011} = \Phi_{4011} = \Phi_{3030} = 0.
\]
(1.12)

Here \((z, \zeta, w)\) are the coordinates in \( \mathbb{C}^3 \).

**Definition 1.1.** We say that a (formal or analytic) hypersurface \( M \subset \mathbb{C}^3 \) passing through 0 is in normal form, if it is given by a defining equation
\[
v = P(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) + \Phi(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u),
\]
(1.13)
where \( P \) is as in (1.4) and \( \Phi \in \mathcal{N} \).

We now formulate our main result. We make use of the local representation (2.1) below for an everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( M \) be a real-analytic everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface in \( \mathbb{C}^3 \), and \( p \in M \). Then, there exists a biholomorphic transformation \( H : (\mathbb{C}^3, p) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^3, 0) \) mapping \( M \) into a hypersurface in normal form. A normalizing transformation \( H \) is determined uniquely by the action of its differential \( dH_p \) on the quotient space \( T_p M/K_p \) and the transverse second order derivative at \( p \) of the transverse component of \( H \).

In turn, in any coordinates (2.1), a normalizing transformation is unique up to the right action of the 5-dimensional stability group of the model (1.4).

By combining Theorem 1 with the result of Pocchiola \cite{Poc13}, we obtain a criterion for the sphericity of a general hypersurface, i.e. its local equivalence to the model: the tube over the future light cone.

**Theorem 2.** Let \( M \subset \mathbb{C}^3 \) be a real-analytic everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface, and \( p \in M \). Then \( M \) is locally biholomorphic near \( p \) to the tube over the future light cone (1.3) if and only if for every point \( p \in M \) nearby \( p \) we have
\[
\Phi_{3002}(0) = \Phi_{5001}(0) = 0
\]
(1.14)
for the coefficients of some (and hence any) normal form at \( p \).

**Remark 1.2.** The assertion of Theorem 2 can be extended to the class of smooth everywhere 2-nondegenerate submanifolds \( M \). In this case, one has to employ the formal normal form for \( M \), which is still available in the smooth case.

2. **A formal normal form**

2.1. **The future light cone as a model.** Recall that, according to Ebenfelt \cite{Eb98b}, in appropriate local holomorphic coordinates a germ of an everywhere Levi degenerate but holomorphically nondegenerate hypersurface \( M \subset \mathbb{C}^3 \) can be represented as:
\[
v = |z|^2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} Q^k(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u),
\]
(2.1)
where all $Q^k$ are homogeneous polynomials of weight $k$ with respect to the grading system
\[ [z] = [\zeta] = [\bar{z}] = [\bar{\zeta}] = 1, \quad [w] = [\bar{w}] = 2, \]
and, in addition,
\[ Q^3 = \frac{1}{2}(z^2\bar{\zeta} + \bar{z}^2\zeta). \] (2.3)
Furthermore, as shown in [BK15], we may assume (after a formal coordinate change) that all terms of the kind
\[ z^k\zeta^l\bar{z}^0\bar{\zeta}^0u^m, \quad z^k\zeta^l\bar{z}^1\bar{\zeta}^0u^m, \quad (k,l) \neq (1,0), \quad z^k\zeta^l\bar{z}^2\bar{\zeta}^0u^m, \quad (k,l) \neq (0,1) \] (2.4)
and their conjugates are not present in (2.1).

**Definition 2.1.** In what follows, a (formal) hypersurface (2.1), satisfying (2.3) and the condition of absence of terms (2.4) is called prenormalized.

As discussed in the Introduction, the key point of this paper is using, in contrast to (2.2), the non-standard weight system (1.5). We make at this point the following

**Convention 2.2.** We say that a formal series in $z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u$ has weight $k \geq 0$ in the grading (1.5), if each Taylor polynomial of it has the weight $k$ in the grading (1.5).

Our immediate goal is to show that, with respect to the weights (1.5), any everywhere Levi degenerate hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is a perturbation of (the rigid model of) the future light cone (1.4).

Let us denote by $P(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ the right hand side of (1.4).

**Proposition 2.3.** Let $M$ be a (formal or analytic) prenormalized hypersurface (2.1). Then the defining equation of $M$ can be written as
\[ v = P(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) + \sum_{k \geq 3} \Phi_k(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u), \] (2.5)
where each $\Phi_k$ has weight $k$ with respect to the grading (1.5).

**Proof.** It is convenient to switch to the complex defining equation
\[ w = \Theta(z, \bar{z}, \bar{w}) \]
in (2.1) (see [BER99]), and write the result as
\[ w = \bar{w} + 2i\left( |z|^2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} Q^k(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, \bar{w}) \right) \] (2.6)
(the polynomials $Q^k$ in (2.1) and (2.6) are in principle different, but we keep the same notations for simplicity). Let us denote by $Q_0^k$, $k \geq 3$, the polynomials $Q^k$, as in (2.6), corresponding to the model hypersurface (1.4). That is,
\[ Q_0^{2j} = |z|^2|\zeta|^{2j-2}, \quad j \geq 2, \]
and
\[ Q_0^{2j+1} = \frac{1}{2}(z^2\bar{\zeta} + \bar{z}^2\zeta)|\zeta|^{2j-2}, \quad j \geq 1. \]
The assertion of the proposition reads then as
\[ Q^k = Q_0^k + O(|z|^3) + O(|z||\bar{w}|) + O(|\bar{w}|^2). \] (2.7)
Recall that the Levi determinant in terms of the complex defining equation equals to
\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\theta_{\bar{z}} & \theta_{\bar{\zeta}} & \theta_{\bar{w}} \\
\theta_{\bar{z}z} & \theta_{\bar{z}\zeta} & \theta_{\bar{z}w} \\
\theta_{\bar{z}\zeta} & \theta_{\bar{\zeta}\zeta} & \theta_{\bar{\zeta}w}
\end{vmatrix}
\]
(see [BER99]). Accordingly, the uniform Levi degeneracy condition for \(M\) reads as
\[
\begin{vmatrix}
2iz + 2i \sum Q_k^k & 2i \sum Q_k^k & 1 + 2i \sum Q_k^k \\
2i + 2i \sum Q_k^k & 2i \sum Q_k^k & 2i \sum Q_k^k \\
2i \sum Q_k^k & 2i \sum Q_k^k & 2i \sum Q_k^k
\end{vmatrix} \equiv 0. \quad (2.8)
\]
We then inspect a series of identities obtained by collecting in (2.8) terms of a fixed weight \(k - 2\), \(k \geq 3\) with respect to the standard grading (2.2). For \(k = 3\) such an identity holds in view of (2.3). However, for \(k \geq 4\) we obtain non-trivial conditions involving the polynomials \(Q_3, \ldots, Q_k\).

It is not difficult to see that these conditions have the form:
\[
-4Q_k^{k+1} = \cdots, \quad (2.9)
\]
where dots stand for a polynomial expression in \(Q_j^k, j < k\) and their derivatives (and also in \(z\)).

We will prove (2.7) by induction in \(k \geq 3\). For \(k = 3\) it holds in view of the above discussed formula for \(Q^3\). For the induction step, we assume that (2.7) holds for all \(j \leq k\), and consider the identity obtained by collecting in (2.8) terms with weight \(k - 1\). In view of (2.9), this identity has the form
\[
-4Q_k^{k+1} = \cdots \quad (2.10)
\]
We claim that, in fact, (2.10) has the more specific form
\[
-4Q_k^{k+1} = -4 \left( Q_0^{k+1} \right)_{\zeta\zeta} + \cdots, \quad (2.11)
\]
where dots stand for terms of the form
\[
O(|z|^3) + O(|z|^2|\bar{w}|) + O(|\bar{w}|^3). \quad (2.12)
\]
To prove the claim, we apply (2.7) in the right hand side of (2.10) and conclude that we have there two kinds of terms: those arising from \(Q_0^j\) only (with \(j \leq k\)) and all the others.

For the first group of terms, we note that they must have simply the form \(Q_0^k\) to the model hypersurface (1.4) itself. To analyze the second group of terms, we first observe that the (1, 2) and the (3, 2) entries of the determinant (2.8) already have the form (2.12). Hence it is enough to consider only the two "diagonal" products within the expansion of the determinant (2.8), assuming that at least one \(Q^j\) within these products is substituted by an expression of the form (2.12). Note that, within the two diagonal products, the \(Q_j\)'s are either differentiated once in \(z\), or once in \(\bar{z}\), or once in \(\bar{w}\) (and further possibly differentiated in \(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}\) which is of no interest to us). Putting all this information together, it is not difficult to conclude now that the second group under discussion has the form (2.12), and this proves the claim.

It remains to deal with the identity (2.11) that holds true according to the claim. Integrating this identity in \(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}\), we get:
\[
Q^{k+1} = Q_0^{k+1} + R_1 + R_2, \quad (2.13)
\]
where a remainder \(R_1\) has the form (2.12), while \(R_2\) satisfies \((R_2)_{\zeta\zeta} = 0\). In view of the absence of the terms (2.4), this gives \(R_2 \equiv 0\), and implies (2.7). Proposition is proved now.
Proof. The basic identity for the map \( H = \tilde{\Phi} \circ \Lambda \), such that \( H \) can be decomposed as \( H = \tilde{\Phi} \circ \Lambda \), where the (formal) map \( \tilde{\Phi} \) has the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
    z &\mapsto z + f_2 + f_3 + \cdots, \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta + g_1 + g_2 + \cdots, \quad h = w + h_3 + h_4 + \cdots, \\
    f &= f(z, \zeta, w), \quad g = g(z, \zeta, w), \quad h = h(z, \zeta, w), \quad w = u + iP(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) + i\sum_{j \geq 3} \Phi_j(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u).
\end{align*}
\]

(2.14)

Comparing in (2.15) terms of weight 0, we get

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{Im} h_0(\zeta) &= P(f_0(\zeta), g_0(\zeta), \bar{f}_0(\zeta), \bar{g}_0(\zeta)) + \sum_{j \geq 3} \Phi_j^*(f_0(\zeta), g_0(\zeta), \bar{f}_0(\zeta), \bar{g}_0(\zeta), \text{Re} h_0(\zeta))
\end{align*}
\]

(2.16)

(note that weight 0 components can depend on \( \zeta \) only). Recall that both hypersurfaces are prenormalized, hence the right hand side in (2.15) does not contain harmonic terms and we conclude that \( h_0 = 0 \). We next claim that \( f_0 = 0 \). Indeed, assume that \( m \) := ord_0 f_0(\zeta) < \infty. Then the hermitian term in \( P \) gives in the right hand side of (2.16) gives a non-zero term with \( \zeta^m \bar{\zeta}^m \). On the other hand, no other terms in the right hand side of (2.16) contribute to \( \zeta^m \bar{\zeta}^m \) (this follows from \( h_0 = 0 \) and from the fact that all \( \Phi_j^* \) have weight at least 3). Thus we conclude that \( f_0 = 0 \). Finally, since the map \( H \) is invertible, we can claim that \( g_0(\zeta) \) has a nonzero linear part.

We next collect terms of weight 1 in (2.15). Since we have \( f_0 = h_0 = 0 \), this simply gives:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{Im} h_1(z, \zeta) &= 0, \quad \text{so that} \ h_1 = 0. \quad \text{For the components} \ f_1, g_1 \ we \ observe \ that \ they \ have \ respectively \ the \ form \ zF_1(\zeta), zG_1(\zeta). \ The \ invertibility \ of \ the \ map \ also \ gives \ F_1(0) \neq 0 \ and \ h_w(0, 0, 0) \neq 0.
\end{align*}
\]

As the last step, we collect in (2.15) terms of weight 2. This gives:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{Im} h_2 &= P(f_1, g_0, \bar{f}_1, \bar{g}_0), \quad w = u + iP(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}).
\end{align*}
\]

(2.17)

We conclude that the invertible map

\[
(z, \zeta, w) \mapsto (f_1(z, \zeta), g_0(\zeta), h_2(z, \zeta, w))
\]
is an automorphism of the future light cone (1.4). In view of the explicit description given by (1.8), (1.9), (1.10), this implies
\[ f_1 = \lambda z, \quad g_0 = \mu \zeta, \quad h_2 = \nu w, \quad \lambda, \mu, \nu \neq 0. \]
Substituting the latter into (2.17) and comparing terms with \( z^2 \zeta \), we obtain:
\[ \mu = e^{2i\varphi}, \quad \nu = r^2, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda = re^{i\varphi}, \quad r > 0, \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.18} \]
The identity (2.18) (together with the earlier obtained description of the weighted components of the map \( H \)) implies the assertion of the proposition. □

We end this subsection by noting that any map \( H \), as in (2.14), can be further decomposed in a unique way as
\[ H = \tilde{H} \circ \psi, \tag{2.19} \]
where \( \psi \) is an automorphism of the future light cone (1.4) belonging the subgroup (??), and the map \( \tilde{H} = (z + f, \zeta + g, w + h) \) has the form (2.14) and satisfies, in addition,
\[ f_{zz} = 0, \quad \text{Re} h_{ww} = 0. \tag{2.20} \]
That is why, in what follows, for the normalization procedure we may consider only maps of the special form (2.20).

2.3. Homological operator and formal normal form. Let us consider a map \( H : (M, 0) \to (M^*, 0) \) between two prenormalized (formal) hypersurfaces \( M, M^* \), which is decomposed as in (2.14) and satisfies, in addition, (2.20). Let us consider, for each fixed \( m \geq 3 \), the equation obtained by collecting in the basic identity (2.15) all terms of weight \( m \). In view of (2.5), (2.14), it is not difficult to see that such an identity must have the following form:
\[ \text{Re} \left( i h_m(z, \zeta, w) + 2 f_{m-1}(z, \zeta, w) P_z + 2 g_{m-2}(z, \zeta, w) P_\zeta \right) |_{w = u + iP} = \Phi^*_m - \Phi_m + \cdots, \tag{2.21} \]
where \( \Phi_j^*, \Phi_j \) are as in (2.5) and dots stand for a polynomial expression in: (i) \( \Phi_j^*, \Phi_j \) with \( j < m \) and their derivatives of order \( \leq m - 1 \); (ii) the collections \( (f_{j-1}, g_{j-2}, h_j) \) with \( j < m \) and their derivatives of order \( \leq m - 1 \); (iii) the local coordinates \( z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u \). This leads to the consideration of the homological operator
\[ L(f, g, h) := \text{Re} \left( i h(z, \zeta, w) + 2 f(z, \zeta, w) P_z + 2 g(z, \zeta, w) P_\zeta \right) |_{w = u + iP}, \tag{2.22} \]
defined on the linear space \( V \) of tuples \( (f(z, \zeta, w), g(z, \zeta, w), h(z, \zeta, w)) \) of the kind
\[ f = f_2 + f_3 + \cdots, \quad g = g_1 + g_2 + \cdots, \quad h = h_3 + h_4 + \cdots \tag{2.23} \]
satisfying, in addition, (2.20), and valued in the space \( W \) of series \( \Phi(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, u) \) of the kind
\[ \Phi = \Phi_3 + \Phi_4 + \cdots. \]
We shall recall now that the normal form space \( N \), as in (1.12) is given in more detail by the conditions:
\[ \Psi_{\alpha \beta 00} = \Psi_{\alpha \beta 10} = \Psi_{\alpha \beta 20} = 0 \tag{2.24} \]
for all \( \alpha, \beta \), then
\[ \Psi_{4011} = \Psi_{3001} = \Psi_{4001} = 0 \tag{2.25} \]
and finally
\[ \Psi_{3030} = \Psi_{3011} = 0. \tag{2.26} \]
Let us then take into consideration the range \( R \) of the operator \( L \). We shall prove the following
Proposition 2.5. The operator $L$ is injective on $V$. Moreover, the target space $W$ described above can be decomposed as the direct sum

$$W = \mathcal{R} \oplus \mathcal{N},$$

where $\mathcal{N} \subset W$ is the above normal form space.

Proof. The assertion of the proposition can be reformulated like that: an equation

$$2L(f, g, h) = \Psi, \quad \Psi \in W$$

has a unique solution in $V$, modulo an element of the space $\mathcal{N}$ standing in the right hand side of (2.27).

To solve an equation (2.27), let us expand

$$f(z, \zeta, u + iP) = f(z, \zeta, u) + f_w(z, \zeta, u)iP - \frac{1}{2}f_{ww}(z, \zeta, u)P^2 - \frac{i}{6}f_{www}(z, \zeta, u)P^3 + \cdots,$$

and similarly for $g, h$. Further, we use the expansion

$$f(z, \zeta, u) = \sum_{k,l \geq 0} f_{kl}(u)z^k\zeta^l,$$

and similarly for $f, g, h$. We now substitute (2.28), (2.29) into (2.27), and apply to the resulting identity all the linear functionals, annihilating the above subspace $\mathcal{N}$. This amounts to collecting certain terms in (2.27), which we do step-by-step.

Collecting all terms of the kind $z^k\zeta^l\bar{z}^0\bar{\zeta}^0u^j$ gives:

$$i h_{kl}(u) = 0, \quad k, l \geq 0,$$

except for $(k, l) = (0, 0), (1, 0), (2, 0)$. For these values we obtain, respectively,

$$ih_{00} - i \bar{h}_{00} = 0,$$

(2.31)

$$2\bar{f}_{00} + ih_{10} = 0,$$

(2.32)

$$\bar{g}_{00} + ih_{20} = 0.$$

(2.33)

For terms of the form $z^k\zeta^l\bar{z}^0\bar{\zeta}^0u^j$, we get for $k > 0$ and $l \geq 0$:

$$-h_{k-1,l} + 2f_{kl} = 0, \quad k, l \geq 0,$$

(2.34)

except when $(k, l) = (1, 0), (2, 0), (3, 0), (1, 1)$. If $k = 0$ and $l > 1$ we obtain

$$2f_{0l} = 0.$$

(2.35)

For $z\bar{z}$ terms, i.e. $(k, l) = (0, 1)$ we obtain

$$2\bar{g}_{00} + 2f_{11} - h'_{01} = 0.$$

(2.36)

Further, for $z\bar{z}$ terms, i.e. $(k, l) = (1, 0)$, we have

$$-h'_{00} - \bar{h}'_{00} + 2f_{10} + 2\bar{f}_{10} = 0.$$

(2.37)

for $\zeta\bar{z}$ terms, i.e. $(k, l) = (0, 1)$,

$$2f_{01} + 2\bar{f}_{00} = 0,$$

(2.38)

for $z^2\bar{z}$ terms, i.e. $(k, l) = (2, 0)$,

$$-h'_{10} + 2f_{20} - 2if_{00} + \bar{g}_{10} = 0,$$

(2.39)

and finally for $z^3\bar{z}$ terms, i.e. $(k, l) = (3, 0)$, we obtain

$$-i\bar{g}'_{00} + 2f_{30} - h'_{20} = 0.$$

(2.40)
Next, consider terms of the form \( z^k \zeta^l \bar{z}^2 \bar{\zeta}^0 u^j \). For \( k > 1 \) and \( l > 0 \), except for \((k, l) = (2, 1)\), we obtain

\[
- \frac{1}{2} h'_{k,l-1} - \frac{i}{2} h''_{k-2,l} + 2i f'_{k-1,l} + g_{kl} = 0
\] (2.41)

When \( k > 3 \) and \( l = 0 \), i.e. for the coefficients of \( z^k \bar{z}^2 \) we have

\[
- \frac{i}{2} h''_{k-2,0} + 2i f'_{k-1,0} + g_{k0} = 0
\] (2.42)

If \( k = 1 \) and \( l > 0 \) i.e. for the coefficients of \( z \zeta^l \bar{z}^2 \), except for \((k, l) = (1, 1)\), we have

\[
- \frac{1}{2} h'_1,l-1 + 2i f'_{0,l} + g_{1l} = 0.
\] (2.43)

Finally, if \( k = 0 \) and \( l > 2 \), i.e. for \( \zeta^l \bar{z}^2 \) we obtain

\[
- \frac{1}{2} h'_0,l-1 + g_{0l} = 0.
\] (2.44)

Further, for \((k, l) = (0, 2)\) we obtain

\[
\bar{g}_{00} - \frac{1}{2} h'_{0,1} + g_{02} = 0
\] (2.45)

For \((k, l) = (1, 1)\) we obtain

\[
- 3i f'_{00} + 2g_{10} - \frac{1}{2} h'_{10} + 2i f'_{01} + g_{11} = 0
\] (2.46)

For \((k, l) = (3, 0)\) we obtain

\[
- ig'_{10} - \frac{i}{2} h''_{10} + 2i f'_{20} - \bar{f}_{00} + g_{30} = 0
\] (2.47)

For \((k, l) = (0, 1)\) we obtain

\[
- \frac{1}{2} h'_{00} - \frac{1}{2} h''_{00} + 2f_{10} + g_{01} = 0
\] (2.48)

For \((k, l) = (2, 0)\) we obtain

\[
\frac{i}{2} h''_{00} - \frac{i}{2} h''_{00} + 2i f'_{00} + g_{20} - 2i f'_{10} + \bar{g}_{20} = 0
\] (2.49)

For \((k, l) = (2, 1)\) we obtain

\[
- \frac{5}{2} i g'_{00} - \frac{1}{2} h''_{00} - \frac{i}{2} h''_{00} + 2i f'_{10} + g_{21} = 0
\] (2.50)

Collecting all terms of the kind \( z^3 \bar{\zeta} u^j \) gives:

\[
- \frac{1}{2} h'_{10} + 2f_{20} - i f'_{00} = 0
\] (2.51)

Collecting all terms of the kind \( z^3 \bar{z} \bar{u}^j \) gives:

\[
\text{Re}(\frac{1}{6} h''_{00} - f''_{10} + ig'_{20}) = 0
\] (2.52)

Further, collecting terms with \( z^4 \bar{\zeta} u^j \) we get:

\[
- \frac{1}{2} h''_{20} + 2f_{30} - \frac{i}{2} g'_{00} = 0.
\] (2.53)
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Collecting all terms of the kind $z^3 \bar{z} \zeta u^i$ gives:
\[-\frac{i}{2} h''_{00} + 3i f'_{10} + 2g_{20} + \frac{i}{2} h''_{00} - if'_{10} - i\bar{g}'_{01} = 0 \tag{2.54}\]

Finally, collecting all terms of the kind $z^4 \bar{z} \zeta u^j$ gives:
\[-\frac{i}{2} h''_{10} + 3i f'_{20} - f''_{00} + 2g_{30} - \frac{i}{2} \bar{g}'_{10} = 0 \tag{2.55}\]

Now all the terms appearing in the normal form space conditions (2.24), (2.25), (2.26) are considered, and we have to solve show that the resulting system of equations for $f_{kl}, g_{kl}, h_{kl}, kl, l \geq 0$ determines the latter ones uniquely. We do it step-by-step. We also make use of the following Convention. In what follows, dots stand for linear expressions in the previously determined coefficient functions $f_{kl}, g_{kl}, h_{kl}$.

Equation (2.30) determines $h_{kl}$ for all $(k, l)$, except for $h_{00}, h_{10}, h_{20}$.
Equation (2.31) determines $\text{Im} h_{00}$.
Equation (2.32) expresses $h_{10}$ by $f_{00}$, namely
\[h_{10} = 2i f_{00}. \tag{2.56}\]
Equation (2.33) expresses $h_{20}$ by $g_{00}$, namely
\[h_{20} = i\bar{g}_{00}. \tag{2.57}\]
Equation (2.34) determines $f_{kl}$ for $k > 0$, except for $f_{10}, f_{20}, f_{30}$ and $f_{11}$.
Equation (2.35) determines $f_{01}$, except for $f_{00}, f_{01}$.
Equation (2.36) expresses $f_{11}$ by $g_{00}$, namely
\[f_{11} = - \bar{g}_{00} + \ldots \tag{2.58}\]
where here and below dots stand for already determined coefficients.
Equation (2.37) expresses $\text{Re} f_{10}$ by $\text{Re} h'_{00}$, namely
\[\text{Re} f_{10} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} h'_{00}. \tag{2.59}\]
Equation (2.38) expresses $f_{01}$ by $f_{00}$, namely
\[f_{01} = - \bar{f}_{00}. \tag{2.60}\]
Equation (2.39) expresses $f_{20}$ by $f'_{00}$ and $g_{10}$, namely
\[f_{20} = 2i f'_{00} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{g}_{10}. \tag{2.61}\]
Equation (2.40) expresses $f_{30}$ by $g'_{00}$, using (2.33), namely
\[f_{30} = \frac{1}{2} h'_{20} + \frac{i}{2} \bar{g}'_{00} = i\bar{g}'_{00}. \tag{2.62}\]
Equation (2.41) determines $g_{kl}$ for $k > 1$ and $l > 0$, except for $g_{21}$.
Equation (2.42) determines $g_{k0}$ for $k > 3$. In particular, $g_{40}$ is expressed by $g'_{00}$, as
\[g_{40} = \frac{i}{2} h''_{20} - 2i f'_{30} - \frac{3}{2} \bar{g}''_{00}. \tag{2.63}\]
Equation (2.43) determines $g_{1l}$ for $l > 0$, except for $g_{11}$.
Equation (2.44) determines $g_{01}$, except for $g_{00}, g_{01}$ and $g_{02}$.
Equation (2.45) expresses $g_{02}$ by $g_{00}$, namely
\[ g_{02} = -\bar{g}_{00} + \cdots. \] (2.64)

Equation (2.46) expresses $g_{11}$ by $g_{10}$ and $f_{00}$, namely
\[ g_{11} = 6i\bar{f}'_{00} - 2\bar{g}_{10} + \cdots. \] (2.65)

Equation (2.47) expresses $g_{30}$ by $g'_{10}$ and $f'_{00}$, namely
\[ g_{30} = 2i\bar{g}'_{10} + 4f''_{00} + \cdots. \] (2.66)

Equation (2.48) gives $g_{01}$ by $\text{Im} f_{10}$ and $\text{Re} h_{00}$, namely
\[ \text{Im} g_{01} = 2 \text{Im} f_{10} \] and
\[ \text{Re} g_{01} = \text{Re} h'_{00} - 2 \text{Re} f_{10} \] (2.67)

Equation (2.49) gives $\text{Re} g_{20}$ by $\text{Im} f_{10}$, namely
\[ \text{Re} g_{20} = 2 \text{Im} f'_{10} + \cdots \] (2.68)

Equation (2.50) gives $g_{21}$ by $g'_{00}$ and $\text{Re} h_{00}$, namely
\[ g_{21} = \frac{5}{2}i\bar{g}'_{00} + \frac{-2}{i} \text{Re} h'_{00} + \cdots \] (2.69)

Next, equations (2.51) and (2.55) give a system for $f_{00}$ and $g_{10}$, namely
\[ 2if'_{00} - \bar{g}_{10} + \cdots = 0 \] (2.71)
\[ 6f''_{00} - \frac{i}{2} \bar{g}'_{10} + \cdots = 0 \] (2.72)

Equation (2.53) determines $\bar{g}'_{00}$, by
\[ i\bar{g}'_{00} + \cdots = 0 \] (2.73)

The real part of equation (2.54) determines $\text{Im} f'_{10}$,
\[ -2 \text{Im} f'_{10} + \cdots = 0 \] (2.74)

The imaginary part of (2.54) together with (2.52) give a system of two real equations for $\text{Re} h_{00}$ and $\text{Im} g_{20}$, namely
\[ \text{Re} h''_{00} + 2 \text{Im} g_{20} + \cdots = 0 \] (2.75)
and
\[ \frac{1}{6} \text{Re} h'''_{00} - \text{Im} g'_{20} + \cdots = 0 \] (2.76)
which determines $\text{Re} h_{00}$ and $\text{Im} g_{20}$.

Proposition 2.5 and the relations (2.21) imply, in the standard manner, the following proposition, which is the first part of the convergence Theorem 1.

**Proposition 2.6.** For the germ at a point $p$ of any (formal or real-analytic) everywhere 2-non-degenerate hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$, there exists a formal transformation $H : (\mathbb{C}^3, p) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^3, 0)$ mapping $M$ into a hypersurface in normal form (1.12). In any (formal or holomorphic) local coordinates (2.1), a normalizing transformation is unique up to the right action of the 5-dimensional stability group $G$ of the model (1.4).
3. Convergence of the formal normal form

The proof of Theorem 1 is accomplished by Proposition 2.6 and the following convergence theorem.

**Theorem 3.** Any formal transformation bringing a uniformly 2-nondegenerate real-analytic hypersurface \((2.1)\) to the normal form \((2.24) - (2.26)\) is convergent.

**Proof.** We will show that the transformation \((2.14)\) bringing a hypersurface \(M\) as in \((2.1)\), to a normal form is convergent. Recall that the factorization \((2.19)\) allows to deal with all the other normalizing transformations.

The proof is split into several steps. We keep the notation

\[
v = P(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) + \sum_{k,l,\alpha,\beta \geq 0} \Psi_{k\alpha l \beta}(u) z^k \zeta^l \bar{z}^\alpha \bar{\zeta}^\beta \tag{3.1}
\]

for the defining equation of \(M\).

### 3.1. Proof of Theorem 3.

**Step I: choice of a transverse curve.** We make a special choice of a smooth real-analytic curve \(\gamma\) transverse at 0 to the complex tangent. The choice is specified later in Step VIII.

**Step II: removing harmonic terms.** Next, we do a local biholomorphism at 0 which eliminates the harmonic terms in \((3.1)\) (that is, we get \(\Psi_{k0l0} = 0\)) and, at the same time, straightens the curve \(\gamma\), that is, \(\gamma\) becomes

\[
\Gamma = \{z = \zeta = 0, \text{Im } w = 0\}. \tag{3.2}
\]

The latter is possible due to e.g. \([BER99], [LM07]\). In what follows, we consider only transformation preserving \((3.2)\).

**Step III: cleaning the 2-jet.** We perform a gauge transformation

\[
z \mapsto f(w)z, \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta, \quad w \mapsto w
\]

with an appropriate \(f(w), f(0) = 0, f'(0) = 1\) in order to achieve \(\Psi_{1010}(u) = 0\) (we use \(\Psi_{1010}(0) = 0\)). Further, we use the nondegeneracy of the term \(z \bar{z}\) in \((3.1)\) to eliminate terms \(z \bar{\zeta} u^m\) in \((3.1)\) by means of a transformation

\[
z \mapsto z + f(w) \zeta, \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta, \quad w \mapsto w
\]

with an appropriate \(f(w)\). Geometrically, this means straightening the Levi kernels along \(\Gamma\) (alternatively, one can consider the 3-dimensional variety constructed as the union of Levi curves through points of \(\Gamma\) and then a holomorphic transformation, straightening the surface and the curves and preserving \(\Gamma\)). We end up with the additional normalization condition \(\Psi_{0001} = 0\) achieved. Furthermore, since the Levi rank along \(\Gamma\) is constantly 1, this also implies \(\Psi_{0101} = 0\). Note that now the only term of degree \(\leq 2\) in \(z, \bar{z}, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}\) in \(\Psi\) is \(z \bar{z}\).

**Step IV: cleaning the 3-jet.** We first perform a gauge transformation

\[
z \mapsto z, \quad \zeta \mapsto g(w) \zeta, \quad w \mapsto w
\]

with an appropriate \(g(w), g(0) = 0, g'(0) = 1\) in order to achieve \(\Psi_{2001}(u) = 0\) (we use \(\Psi_{2001}(0) = 0\)). Next, we perform a transformation

\[
z \mapsto z + z^2 f(w), \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta + g(w)z, \quad w \mapsto w
\]
with appropriate $f(w), g(w)$ to eliminate in (3.1) the term $\Psi_{2010}$ and at the same time $\Psi_{3001}$. To accomplish this, we note that the latter two terms transform as follows:

$$\Psi_{2010} \mapsto \Psi_{2010} + f(u) + \frac{1}{2}g(u) + \cdots, \quad \Psi_{3001} \mapsto \Psi_{3001} + f(u) + \cdots,$$

where dots stand for expressions analytic in $u$ and polynomial in $f, \bar{f}, g, \bar{g}$, which either have degree $\geq 2$ in $f, \bar{f}, g, \bar{g}$, or have degree 1 in the above but then have a factor vanishing at $u = 0$. The latter follows from the previously achieved normalization conditions (compare also with (2.39), (2.51)). Now the desired choice of $f, g$ is accomplished by applying the implicit function theorem.

Finally, we remove in this step the $z\zeta\bar{z}$ term by a transformation

$$z \mapsto z + z\zeta f(w), \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta, \quad w \mapsto w$$

with an appropriate $f(w)$. Now $\Psi_{1110} = 0$.

Note that, arguing identically to the proof of Proposition 2.3, it is easy to conclude that the terms $\zeta^2 \zeta, z\zeta \bar{\zeta}$, and $\zeta \bar{z}$ (with $u^0$) are not present now in (3.1). At the same time, we observe that one can shift the basic point $(0, 0, 0)$ to $(0, 0, u_0)$, $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ (the latter is still within the curve $\Gamma$, as in (3.2)). Then the shifted function $\Psi$ must satisfy the same property, so that we get $\Psi_{0201} = \Psi_{1011} = \Psi_{0210} = 0$.

We end up with a hypersurface (3.1) for which all terms of degree $\leq 3$ in $z, \bar{z}, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}$ in $\Psi$ vanish. Further, repeating the above argument, we get for the fourth order terms $\Psi_k$:

$$(\Psi_k)_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} = 0, \quad |k| = 4. \quad (3.3)$$

**Step V: choosing an orthonormal basis within the Levi kernel.** We now perform a transformation

$$z \mapsto ze^{i\varphi(w)}, \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta e^{2i\varphi(w)} + g(w)z^2, \quad w \mapsto w,$$

where $\varphi(w), g(w)$ satisfy $\varphi(0) = 0, \varphi(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}, g(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}$, in order to achieve simultaneously $\Re \Psi_{3011} = 0$ and $\Psi_{2020} = 0$. Geometrically, the latter transformation fixes an orthonormal basis within the Levi kernel $\{\Im w = 0, z = 0\}$ along the transverse curve $\Gamma$. Indeed, for a hypersurface satisfying the previous normalization conditions, it is not hard to compute (using, in particular, (3.3)) that the desired terms change as

$$\Re \Psi_{3011}(u) \mapsto \Re \Psi_{3011}(u) - \frac{1}{2}\varphi'(u), \quad \Psi_{2020}(u) \mapsto \Psi_{2020}(u) - 2\varphi'(u) + g(u).$$

This shows the desired choice of $\varphi, g$.

**Step VI: removing terms hol \cdot \bar{z} and hol \cdot \bar{z}^2.** For a hypersurface (3.1) satisfying the normalization conditions achieved in Steps I-IV, we perform a Chern-Moser type transformation of the kind

$$z \mapsto z + f(z, \zeta, w), \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta, \quad w \mapsto w, \quad (3.4)$$

where $f$ preserves the origin and has degree at least 3 in $z, \zeta$. If one denotes now the sum of all nonzero terms in $\Psi$ of the kind $z^k \zeta^l \bar{z}^m \bar{\zeta}^n$ with $k + l \geq 3$ by $\chi(z, \zeta, w)\bar{z}$, then, using the previous normalization conditions, we see that one can simply take

$$f(z, \zeta, w) := \chi(z, \zeta, w)$$

and obtain a hypersurface satisfying, in addition, $\Psi_{k110} = 0$.

Further, we perform a Chern-Moser type transformation of the kind

$$z \mapsto z, \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta + g(z, \zeta, w), \quad w \mapsto w \quad (3.5)$$
where $g$ preserves the origin and has degree at least 2 in $z, \zeta$. If one denotes then the sum of all nonzero terms in $\Psi$ of the kind $\bar{z}^k \zeta^l z^2 \zeta^0 u^m$ with $k + l \geq 2$ by $\rho(z, \zeta, u) \bar{z}$, then a direct calculation shows that one can simply take

$$g(z, \zeta, w) := \rho(z, \zeta, w)$$

and obtain a hypersurface satisfying also $\Psi_{k\ell 20} = 0$. This implies, in particular,

**Proposition 3.1.** For an analytic everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface, a transformation elimination the terms $(2.4)$, as suggested by [?], can be chosen to be holomorphic.

We now apply Proposition 2.3 and conclude that the hypersurface $M$, in particular, satisfies the condition $(2.5)$. Furthermore, collecting all the above information, we conclude that all terms of degree $\leq 4$ in $z, \bar{z}, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}$ in $\Psi$ vanish.

We shall now discuss in a separate section the distinguished choice of a transverse curve mentioned in Step I.

### 3.2. Chains

We are now aiming to specify a curve chosen in Step I. An appropriate choice of this curve leads to the additional normalization conditions $\Psi_{4001} = \Psi_{4011} = 0$. A curve with this property is called a chain.

Recall that the complex tangent bundle $T^C M$ is endowed with the canonical (holomorphically invariant) subbundle $K$, where $K_p$ is the Levi Kernel for $M$ at $p$. Hence, we may consider the canonical (holomorphically invariant) bundle $TM/K$ over $M$ as well as its projectivization

$$X := \mathbb{P}(TM/K).$$

(3.6)

Every biholomorphism $H : M \mapsto M^*$ naturally extends to one between $TM/K$ and $TM^*/K^*$ and hence to one between the projectivizations (3.6). Further, any smooth curve $\gamma \subset M$ naturally lifts to the projective bundle $X$. In turn, if $M$ is in the form (2.1), the fiber of $TM/K$ at $0 \in M$ can be identified with the $(z, u)$-subspace in $T_0 M$. The bundles $TM/K$ and $X$ are very convenient for describing (formal) transformations into a normal form $M^*$ geometrically. Namely, for $p \in M$ and for each direction $l_p \subset T_p M/K_p$ transverse to $T_p^C M/K_p$ (which can be, in fact, seen as an element of the fiber of $X$ at $p$), there is a normalizing transformation $H : (M, p) \mapsto (M^*, 0)$ such that its extension to $X$ maps $(p, l_p)$ into $(0, L_0)$, where $L_0$ is the point in $X^*$ corresponding to the “vertical direction” (3.2). In turn, for $M$ given by coordinates (2.1), choice of $l_0$ corresponds to the action of the algebra $g_1$, as in (1.9), on the normal forms by the formula (2.19). Note also that the subalgebras $g^0_1$ and $g_2$ from the isotropy algebra (1.10) preserve the condition of being in normal form (this can be seen by a straightforward calculation). Besides, they preserve the curve $\Gamma$. That is why any two transformations $H_1, H_2$ bringing $M$ to a normal form and mapping the same direction $l_p$ into $L_0$ are related as

$$H_2 = \psi \circ H_1.$$  

(3.7)

Let us now fix $p \in M$ and a pair $(p, \nu) \in X$, and consider a (formal) transformation $H : (M, p) \mapsto (M^*, 0)$ bringing $M$ into a (formal) normal form $M^*$ at $p$, and such that the induced map $\bar{H} : X \mapsto X^*$ maps $(p, \nu)$ into $(0, L_0)$. Let $\bar{\Gamma}$ be the lifting of the curve $\Gamma$, as in (3.2), to the bundle $X$. Consider finally

$$d\bar{H}^{-1}|_{(0, L_0)}(T_0 \bar{\Gamma}) \subset T_{(p, \nu)} X.$$  

(3.8)

For a fixed $\bar{H}$, (3.8) defined a direction in the tangent space $T_{(p, \nu)} X$. We claim that the latter direction does not depend on the choice of $H$. Indeed, this follows from (3.7) and the fact that $g^0_1$ and $g_2$ preserve $\Gamma$, while their extensions to $X$ preserve $T_0 \bar{\Gamma}$. 
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The latter means that (3.8) defined a direction field in $X$. In turn, in any coordinates (2.1), the value of this direction field at $(0, v) \in X$ amounts to the complex numbers $f_{w_w}(0)$ and $g_{w_w}(0)$, where $H = (f, g, h)$ is the (formal) normalizing transformation. (And, as discussed above, a choice of a direction $l_0$ amounts to the complex number $f_w(0)$).

We next prove

**Proposition 3.2.** The direction field in $TM/K$ defined by (3.8) is in fact analytic.

**Proof.** First, we note that the coordinates (2.1) (actually achieved by a bi-cubic change of variables in $\mathbb{C}^3$) depend on the point $p$ analytically. This can be easily seen from the procedure in [Eb98b] and the implicit function theorem.

Second, as follows from Proposition 3.1, terms (2.4) can be removed by a holomorphic transformation (and hence the representation (2.5) can be achieved by the same holomorphic transformation). In turn, we may choose such transformation as a composition of Steps I to VIII above (with an arbitrary choice of a transverse curve in Step I). The explicit procedure in Steps I to VIII combined with the implicit function theorem imply then that coordinates (2.5) depend on the point $p$ analytically as well.

The latter means that, for proving the proposition, we have to prove the following claim: for a hypersurface (2.5) and a (formal) normalizing transformation $H = (f, g, h)$ with $f_w(0) = a$, the functions $\chi(a) := f_{w_w}(0)$, $\tau(a) := g_{w_w}(0)$ are real-analytic in $a$.

The proof of the claim is a slight modification of the proof of a similar claim in e.g. [KZ19]. We note that, for a normalizing transformation $H = (f, g, h)$, the parameter $a$ is a part of the collection $H_j = (f_{j-1}, g_{j-2}, h_j)$ with $j = 3$, while $\chi(a)$ is a part of the one with $j = 5$ and $\tau(a)$ is a part of the one with $j = 4$. The collections $H_4, H_5$ are obtained by solving the equations (2.21), with the initial data corresponding to the element of the flow of $g_1$ in (1.10) with $f_w(0) = a$. In view of (2.21) and Proposition 2.5 (arguing by induction), all the collections $H_j$ with $j \geq 3$ are obtained by solving a system of linear equations with nondegenerate (and fixed) matrix and the right hand side depending polynomially on $a, \bar{a}$. That is why, in particular, $H_4, H_5$ are polynomial in $a, \bar{a}$ and so are $\chi(a), \tau(a)$, as required. This proves the claim and the proposition. 

We now integrate the direction field (3.8) and obtain a foliation of $X$ by smooth real-analytic curves $\tilde{\gamma}$. This leads to the following

**Definition 3.3.** Canonical projections of the curves $\tilde{\gamma}$ on $M$ are called chains.

As follows from the above procedure, through each point $p$ there is a unique chain in a fixed direction $l_p \subset T_pM/K_p$ transverse to $T^0_pM/K_p$. Furthermore, importantly, the family of chains is biholomorphically invariant, as follows from its definition. As follows, again, from the definition, chains are mapped by normalizing transformations into the standard "vertical" curve (3.2).

We shall remark that, as discussed in the Introduction, orbits of the linear part of the stabilizer (1.10) of the model do not act transitively on transverse directions anymore (unlike the Levi-nondegenerate situation). It is not difficult to compute that, for a hypersurface (2.1), the orbit of the "vertical" direction (3.2) in $T_0M$ is the cone

$$\{(z, \zeta, u) : \zeta u + iz^2 = 0, u \neq 0\} \subset T_0M.$$ (3.9)

**Definition 3.4.** The cone (3.9) is called the canonical cone for $M$ at 0.

Clearly, the canonical cone at $p$ does not depend on the choice of coordinates (2.1) and is furthermore biholomorphically invariant. That is, each everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface
$M$ is equipped with a field of canonical cones in tangent spaces. Possible directions of chains form in the tangent space are precisely the directions from the canonical cone.

3.3. End of proof of Theorem 3.

**Step VII: applying the chain property.** We are now able to specify Step I below. Namely, for a hypersurface (2.1), we choose $\gamma$ to be the unique chain in the ”vertical” direction (i.e. the direction corresponding to the line line (3.2)).

We finally have to prove that, with the above choice of $\gamma$, we have $\Psi_{4001} = \Psi_{4011} = 0$ upon completion of Steps I – VI. In view of the invariancy in $u$ of the pre-normal form achieved in Steps I to VI, it is enough to prove $\Psi_{4001}(0) = \Psi_{4011}(0) = 0$. Consider a (formal) transformation $H = (f, g, h)$, as in (2.14), bringing $(M, 0)$ into a normal form. By the definition of the chain, it satisfies:

$$f_{ww}(0) = 0, \ g_w(0) = 0.$$ (3.10)

In view of that and the outcome of Step VI, when solving the equations (2.21) for the map $H$, for $j = 3$ we get the same result as for the identity map. For $j = 4$, it is straightforward to see from the basic identity (2.15), the outcome of Step VIII and the fact that $H$ coincides with the identity map to weight 3 that the weight 4 identity gives precisely the same equations for the collection $H_4 = (f_3, g_2, h_4)$ as in the formal procedure in Proposition 2.5 besides the only equation for the $z^3\zeta$ terms (analogous to (2.53)) which gives $\Psi_{4001}(0)$ in the right hand side instead of 0. Then, by using the second condition in (3.10), we conclude that $\Psi_{4001}(0) = 0$. Very similarly, when considering $j = 5$ and the $z^4\bar{z}\zeta$ terms, we use the first condition in (3.10) and obtain $\Psi_{4011}(0) = 0$.

As a result, we end up with a hypersurface satisfying, in addition, $\Psi_{4001} = \Psi_{4011} = 0$.

**Step VIII: choice of a parameterization along the chain.** The last remaining conditions for $\Psi$ to belong to the normal form space are $\text{Im } \Psi_{3011} = 0$ and $\Psi_{3030} = 0$.

We achieve the latter ones by means of a transformation

$$z \mapsto f(w)z, \ \zeta \mapsto \zeta + ig(w)z^2, \ w \mapsto h(w),$$

where

$$f(0) = 1, \ h(0) = h''(0) = 0, \ h'(w) = f^2(w), \ f(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}, \ g(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}.$$ Similarly to the Levi-nondegenerate case [CM74], such a transformation corresponds to a choice of parameterization along the chain. It is then possible to compute (employing the previously achieved normalization conditions) that

$$\Psi_{3011} \mapsto \text{Im } \Psi_{3011}h' - \frac{1}{2}h'' + \frac{1}{2}gh', \ \Psi_{3030} \mapsto h'\Psi_{3030} + \left(\frac{1}{6}h''' - \frac{1}{2}\frac{h''^2}{h'}\right) - \frac{1}{2}g'(u).$$ (3.11)

Now the conditions $\text{Im } \Psi_{3011} = \Psi_{3030} = 0$ turn (3.11) into a system of analytic nonsingular ODEs, which we solve uniquely with the Cauchy data $h(0) = 0, h'(0) = 1, h''(0) = 0$. (To see this, one has to solve the first equation for $g$ and substitute the result into the second, which makes the second equation a nonsingular third order ODE in $h$; the latter is solved uniquely with the above initial data, and then $g$ is found from the substitution).

This completely proves the theorem.

\[\square\]

Theorem 3 immediately implies Theorem 1.
Proof of Theorem 2. According to [Poc13], the local equivalence of an everywhere 2-nondegenerate hypersurface to the model (1.4) amounts to vanishing of the two basic invariants $W$ and $J$ (given by lengthy expressions in terms of the defining function and the CR-vector fields, which we do not provide here). It is straightforward to check then that, for a hypersurface in normal form (1.12), the invariant $W|_0$ is proportional to the normal form coefficient $\Psi_{3002}(0)$, and, as long as $\Psi_{3002}(0)$ vanishes, the invariant $J|_0$ is proportional to the normal form coefficient $\Psi_{5001}(0)$. This immediately implies the assertion of the theorem. □
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