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Abstract. Given a pair of smoothly bounded domains \(D_1, D_2 \subset \mathbb{C}\), the purpose of this note is to obtain an inequality that relates the Carathéodory metrics on \(D_1, D_2, D_1 \cap D_2\) and \(D_1 \cup D_2\).

1. Introduction

Let \(\lambda_D(z)|dz|\) denote the Poincaré metric on a hyperbolic domain \(D \subset \mathbb{C}\). To quickly recall the construction of this metric, note that there exists a holomorphic covering from the unit disc \(\mathbb{D}\) to \(D\),

\[ \pi : \mathbb{D} \to D \]

whose deck transformations form a Fuchsian group \(G\) that acts on \(\mathbb{D}\). The Poincaré metric on \(\mathbb{D}\),

\[ \lambda_\mathbb{D}(z)|dz| = \frac{|dz|}{1-|z|^2} \]

is invariant under \(\text{Aut}(\mathbb{D})\) (hence in particular \(G\)) and therefore, for \(z \in D\), the prescription

\[ \lambda_D(\pi(z))|\pi'(z)| = \lambda_\mathbb{D}(z) \quad (1.1) \]

defines the Poincaré metric \(\lambda_D\) on \(D\) in an unambiguous manner. For an arbitrary \(z \in D\), we may choose the covering projection so that \(\pi(0) = z\) and hence (1.1) implies that

\[ \lambda_D(z) = |\pi'(0)|^{-1}. \]

Solynin [6], [7] proved the following remarkable relation between the Poincaré metrics on a pair of hyperbolic domains and those on their union and intersection:

Let \(D_1, D_2 \subset \mathbb{C}\) be domains such that \(D_1 \cap D_2 \neq \emptyset\). Suppose that \(D_1 \cup D_2\) is hyperbolic. Then

\[ \lambda_{D_1 \cap D_2}(z)\lambda_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z) \leq \lambda_{D_1}(z)\lambda_{D_2}(z) \]

for all \(z \in D_1 \cap D_2\). If equality holds at one point \(z_0 \in D_1 \cap D_2\), then \(D_1 \subset D_2\) or \(D_2 \subset D_1\) and in this case, equality holds for all points \(z \in D_1 \cap D_2\).

A direct proof of this was given by Kraus-Roth [4] that relied on a computation reminiscent of the classical Ahlfors lemma and the fact that

\[ \Delta \log \lambda_D(z) = 4\lambda_D^2(z), \quad (1.2) \]

which precisely means \(\lambda_D(z)|dz|\) has constant curvature \(-4\) on \(D\). Solynin’s result follows from a comparison result for solutions to non-linear elliptic PDE’s of the form

\[ \Delta u - \mu(u) - f = 0, \quad (1.3) \]
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Furthermore, the constant $C > D$ considered and only depends on $D$. Clearly, this reduces to the curvature equation (1.3) by writing $u = \log \lambda_D$ and letting $u(x) = 4e^{2x}$ and $\equiv 0$.

The purpose of this note is to prove an analogue of Solynin’s theorem for the Carathéodory metric on planar domains. Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a domain that admits at least one non-constant bounded holomorphic function. Recall that for $z \in D$, the Carathéodory metric $c_D(z)|dz|$ is defined by

$$c_D(z)|dz| = \sup\{|f'(z)| : f : D \to \mathbb{D} \text{ holomorphic and } f(z) = 0\}.$$ 

This is a distance-decreasing (and hence conformal) metric in the sense that if $h : U \to V$ is a holomorphic map between a pair of planar domains $U, V$, then

$$c_V(h(z))|h'(z)| \leq c_U(z), \quad z \in U.$$ 

If $U \subset V$, applying this to the inclusion $i : U \to V$ shows that the Carathéodory metric is monotonic as a function of the domain, i.e., $c_V(z) \leq c_U(z)$ for $z \in U$. Furthermore, for each $\zeta \in D$, there is a unique holomorphic map $f_\zeta : D \to \mathbb{D}$ that realizes the supremum in the definition of $c_D(z)$ – this is the Ahlfors map.

2. Statement and proof of the main result

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $D_1, D_2 \subset \mathbb{C}$ be smoothly bounded domains with $D_1 \cap D_2 \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(D_1, D_2) > 0$ such that

$$c_{D_1 \cap D_2}(z) \cdot c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z) \leq C c_{D_1}(z) \cdot c_{D_2}(z)$$

for all $z \in D_1 \cap D_2$.

Note that $D_1 \cap D_2$ may possibly have several components. The notation $c_{D_1 \cap D_2}(z)$ refers to the Carathéodory metric on that component of $D_1 \cap D_2$ which contains a given $z \in D_1 \cap D_2$. Furthermore, the constant $C > 0$ is independent of which component of $D_1 \cap D_2$ is being considered and only depends on $D_1$ and $D_2$. The proof, which is inspired by [4], uses the following known supplementary properties of the Carathéodory metric:

First, $c_D(z)$ is continuous and $\log c_D(z)$ is subharmonic on $D$ – see [1] for instance. The possibility that $\log c_D(z) \equiv -\infty$ can be ruled out for bounded domain since for every $\zeta \in D$, the affine map $f(z) = (z - \zeta)/a$ vanishes at $\zeta$ and maps $D$ into the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$ for every positive $a$ that is bigger than the diameter of $D$. The fact that $f'(z) \equiv 1/a > 0$ shows that $c_D(\zeta) > 0$ and hence $\log c_D(\zeta) > -\infty$.

Second, Suita [8] showed that $c_D(z)$ is real analytic in fact and hence we may speak of its curvature

$$\kappa_D(z) = -c_D^{-2}(z)\Delta \log c_D(z)$$

in the usual sense. The subharmonicity of $\log c_D(z)$ already implies that $\kappa_D \leq 0$ everywhere on $D$, but by using the method of supporting metrics, Suita [8] was also able to prove a much stronger inequality namely, $\kappa_D \leq -4$ on $D$. Following this line of inquiry further, Suita [9] (see [2] as well) showed that if the boundary of $D$ consists of finitely many Jordan curves, the assumption that $\kappa_D(\zeta) = -4$ for some point $\zeta \in D$, implies that $D$ is conformally equivalent to $\mathbb{D}$.

Finally, it is known that this metric admits a localization near $C^\infty$-smooth boundary points – see for example [3] which contains a proof for the case of strongly pseudoconvex points that
works verbatim in the planar case too. That is, if \( p \in \partial D \) is a \( C^\infty \)-smooth boundary point of a bounded domain \( D \subset \mathbb{C} \), then for a small enough neighbourhood \( U \) of \( p \) in \( \mathbb{C} \),

\[
\lim_{z \to p} \frac{c_{U \cap D}(z)}{c_D(z)} = 1.
\]

Using this, it was shown in [5] that the curvature \( \kappa_D(z) \) of the Carathéodory metric approaches \(-4\) near each \( C^\infty \)-smooth boundary point of a bounded domain \( D \subset \mathbb{C} \). The point here being that as one moves nearer to such a point, the metric begins to look more and more like the Carathéodory metric on \( \mathbb{D} \) – the use of the scaling principle makes all this precise. It follows on any smoothly bounded planar domain \( D \), \( \kappa_D \approx -4 \) for points close to the boundary and for those that are at a fixed positive distance away from it, there is a large negative lower bound for \( \kappa_D \) as a result of its continuity. Hence for every such \( D \subset \mathbb{C} \), there is a constant \( C = C(D) > 0 \) such that

\[-C \leq \kappa_D(z) \leq -4\]

for all \( z \in D \). Another consequence of the localization principle is that \( c_D(z) \rightarrow +\infty \) as \( z \) approaches a smooth boundary point. Indeed, near such a point, \( c_D(z) \approx c_{U \cap D}(z) \) and the latter is the same as the Carathéodory metric on the disc \( \mathbb{D} \) (since \( U \cap D \) can be taken to be simply connected) which blows up near every point on \( \partial \mathbb{D} \).

To prove the theorem, let \( \kappa_1 \) and \( \kappa_2 \) be the curvatures of the Carathéodory metric \( c_{D_1}(z)|dz| \) and \( c_{D_2}(z)|dz| \) on \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) respectively.

Consider the metric

\[
c(z)|dz| = \frac{c_{D_1}(z) \cdot c_{D_2}(z)}{c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z)}|dz|
\]

on the possibly disconnected open set \( D_1 \cap D_2 \). What follows applies to each component of \( D_1 \cap D_2 \) without any regard to its analytic or topological properties and hence we will continue to write \( c(z)|dz| \) to denote this metric on any given component. Its curvature is

\[
\kappa(z) = -e^{-2}(z)\Delta \log c(z)
\]

\[
= -e^{-2}(z)\left( \Delta \log c_{D_1}(z) + \Delta \log c_{D_2}(z) - \Delta \log c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z) \right)
\]

\[
= I_1 + I_2 + I_{12},
\]

where

\[
I_1 = -e^{-2}(z)\Delta \log c_{D_1}(z),
\]

\[
I_2 = -e^{-2}(z)\Delta \log c_{D_2}(z)
\]

and

\[
I_{12} = e^{-2}(z)\Delta \log c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z).
\]

Note that \( I_{12} \geq 0 \) since \( \log c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z) \) is subharmonic and hence

\[
\kappa(z) \geq I_1 + I_2.
\]

To analyze each of these terms, note that \( c_{D_1} \geq c_{D_1 \cup D_2} \) and \( c_{D_2} \geq c_{D_1 \cup D_2} \). Combining this with the fact that the curvature of the Carathéodory metric is negative everywhere, it follows that

\[
I_1 \geq \kappa_1(z)
\]

and

\[
I_2 \geq \kappa_2(z).
\]
Hence there is a constant \( C = C(D_1, D_2) > 0 \) such that
\[
\kappa(z) \geq \kappa_1(z) + \kappa_2(z) > -C
\]
for all \( z \in D_1 \cap D_2 \).

Let \( U \) be a component of \( D_1 \cap D_2 \). Since \( D_1, D_2 \) have smooth boundaries, \( U \) has finite connectivity, say \( m \geq 1 \) and is non-degenerate in the sense that the interior of its closure coincides with itself. In particular, its boundary cannot contain isolated points. Let \( U_\epsilon \) be an \( \epsilon \)-thickening of \( U \). For all sufficiently small \( \epsilon > 0 \), \( U_\epsilon \) also has connectivity \( m \) and is non-degenerate. Furthermore, \( U_\epsilon \to U \) in the sense of Carathéodory as \( \epsilon \to 0 \).

For a fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \), let \( c_\epsilon(z)|dz| \) be the Carathéodory metric on \( U_\epsilon \). Consider the function
\[
u(z) = \log \left( \frac{c_\epsilon(z)}{\sqrt{C/4} \epsilon(z)} \right)
\]
on \( U \). Since \( U \) is compactly contained in \( U_\epsilon \), \( c_\epsilon \) is bounded on \( U \) and if \( \xi \in \partial U \), then as \( z \to \xi \) within \( U \),
\[
\lim_{z \to \xi} \frac{c_{D_1}(z) \cdot c_{D_2}(z)}{c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z)} \geq \lim_{z \to \xi} c_{D_2}(z) = +\infty,
\]
where the inequality follows from the monotonocity of the Carathéodory metric, i.e., \( c_{D_1}(z) \geq c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z) \). The fact that \( \xi \) is a smooth boundary point of \( D_2 \) implies that \( c_{D_2} \) blows up near it and this means that \( u(z) \to -\infty \) at \( \partial U \). Therefore, \( u \) attains a maximum at some point \( z_0 \in U \). As a result,
\[
0 \geq \Delta u(z_0) = \Delta \log c_\epsilon(z_0) - \Delta \log c(z_0)
\]
\[
\geq -\kappa_\epsilon(z_0)c_\epsilon^2(z_0) - C\epsilon^2(z_0)
\]
\[
\geq 4\epsilon^2(z_0) - C\epsilon^2(z_0),
\]
where \( \kappa_\epsilon \) is the curvature of \( c_\epsilon(z)|dz| \). It follows that
\[
u(z_0) = \log \left( \frac{c_\epsilon(z_0)}{\sqrt{C/4} \epsilon(z_0)} \right) \leq 0.
\]
For an arbitrary \( z \in U \), \( u(z) \leq u(z_0) \leq 0 \) and this gives
\[
\log \left( \frac{c_\epsilon(z)}{\sqrt{C/4} \epsilon(z)} \right) \leq 0
\]
or
\[
c_\epsilon(z) \leq \sqrt{C/4} \epsilon(z)
\]
which is same as
\[
c_\epsilon(z) \cdot c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z) \leq \sqrt{C/4} c_{D_1}(z) \cdot c_{D_2}(z)
\]
and this holds for all \( z \in U \). It remains to show that \( c_\epsilon \to c_U \) pointwise on \( U \) for then we can pass to the limit as \( \epsilon \to 0 \), keeping in mind that \( C \) is independent of \( \epsilon \), to get
\[
c_U(z) \cdot c_{D_1 \cup D_2}(z) \leq \sqrt{C/4} c_{D_1}(z) \cdot c_{D_2}(z)
\]
as claimed. Fix $p \in U$. To show that $c_\epsilon(p) \to c_U(p)$, it suffices to prove that $|f'(p)| \to |f'(p)|$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, where $f_\epsilon : U_\epsilon \to \mathbb{D}$ and $f : U \to \mathbb{D}$ are the respective Ahlfors maps for the domains $U_\epsilon$ and $U$ at $p$. What this is really asking for is the continuous dependence of the Ahlfors maps on the domains. But this is addressed in [10] – indeed, Theorem 3.2 therein can be applied as the domains $U_\epsilon, U$ have the same connectivity by construction and the $U_\epsilon$’s decrease to $U$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. The nuance, in this theorem, about the base point being the point at infinity can be arranged by sending $p \mapsto \infty$ by the map $T(z) = 1/(z - p)$ and working with the domains $T(U_\epsilon)$ and $T(U)$. This completes the proof.

**Question:** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a domain on which the Carathéodory metric $c_\Omega(z)|dz|$ is not degenerate. Does its curvature $\kappa_\Omega$ admit a global lower bound?
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