

d -BALANCED SQUEEZING FUNCTION

NAVEEN GUPTA AND SANJAY KUMAR PANT

ABSTRACT. We introduce the notion of d -balanced squeezing function motivated by the concept of generalized squeezing function given by Rong and Yang. In this work we study some of its properties and its relation with the Fridman invariant.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to extend the notion of generalized squeezing function for balanced domains introduced by Rong and Yang in [16]. We have extended it to d -balanced domains. Before giving our definition we give, in chronological order, the notions preceding it.

\mathbb{B}^n denotes unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n and $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is used for bounded domain. The set of all injective holomorphic maps from D to a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{O}_u(D, \Omega)$.

For $z \in D$ the squeezing function S_D on D is defined as

$$S_D(z) := \sup_f \{r : B^n(0, r) \subseteq f(D), f \in \mathcal{O}_u(D, \mathbb{B}^n)\},$$

where $B^n(0, r)$ denotes ball of radius r centered at the origin.

In our recent article [8], we introduced a definition of squeezing function T_D corresponding to polydisk \mathbb{D}^n in \mathbb{C}^n :

$$T_D(z) := \sup_f \{r : \mathbb{D}^n(0, r) \subseteq f(D), f \in \mathcal{O}_u(D, \mathbb{D}^n)\},$$

where $\mathbb{D}^n(0, r)$ denotes polydisk of radius r , centered at the origin.

In [16], Rong and Yang introduced the concept of generalized squeezing function S_D^Ω for bounded domains $D, \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, where Ω is a balanced domain.

Let us quickly recall the notion of balanced domains and Minkowski function. We say that a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is balanced if $\lambda z \in \Omega$ for each $z \in \Omega$ and $|\lambda| \leq 1$. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded, balanced, convex domain. The Minkowski function denoted by h_Ω on \mathbb{C}^n is defined as

$$h_\Omega(z) := \inf\{t > 0 : z/t \in \Omega\}.$$

For $0 < r \leq 1$, let $\Omega(r) := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : h_\Omega(z) < r\}$. It can be seen easily that $\Omega(1) = \Omega$. For a bounded domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ and a bounded, balanced, convex domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, Rong and Yang introduced the notion of generalized squeezing function S_D^Ω on D as

$$S_D^\Omega(z) := \sup\{r : \Omega(r) \subseteq f(D), f \in \mathcal{O}_u(D, \Omega), f(z) = 0\}.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32F45, 32H02.

Key words and phrases. squeezing function; extremal map; holomorphic homogeneous regular domain; quasi balanced domain.

It follows from the definition that S_D^Ω is biholomorphic invariant and that its values lie in semi-open interval $(0, 1]$. As for squeezing function in general, a bounded domain D is holomorphic homogeneous regular if its generalized squeezing function S_D^Ω has a positive lower bound.

Motivated by the notion of balanced domains, Nikolov in his work [14] gave the definition of d -balanced (quasi balanced) domains: Let $d = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+$, $n \geq 2$, a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is said to be d -balanced if for each $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \Omega$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, $(\lambda^{d_1} z_1, \lambda^{d_2} z_2, \dots, \lambda^{d_n} z_n) \in \Omega$, where \mathbb{D} denotes unit disk in \mathbb{C} . Note that balanced domains are simply $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -balanced.

For a d -balanced domain Ω , there is a natural analogue of Minkowski function called the d -Minkowski function on \mathbb{C}^n , denoted by $h_{d,\Omega}$ and is defined as

$$h_{d,\Omega}(z) := \inf \{t > 0 : \left(\frac{z_1}{t^{d_1}}, \frac{z_2}{t^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{t^{d_n}}\right) \in \Omega\}.$$

For each $0 < r \leq 1$, we fix $\Omega^d(r) := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : h_{d,\Omega}(z) < r\}$. It is easy to observe that for a bounded d -balanced domain Ω , $\Omega^d(1) = \Omega$ (Remark 3.1). Finally we are in a position to introduce the definition of our d -balanced squeezing function.

Definition 1.1. For a bounded domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, and a bounded, convex, $d = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ -balanced domain Ω , d -balanced squeezing function corresponding to Ω of the domain D , denoted by $S_{d,D}^\Omega$ (also called the d -balanced squeezing function for brevity) is given by:

$$S_{d,D}^\Omega(z) := \sup \{r : \Omega^d(r) \subseteq f(D), f \in \mathcal{O}_u(D, \Omega), f(z) = 0\}.$$

For notational convenience, we denote the squeezing function $S_{d,D}^\Omega$ by S^d unless otherwise stated. It is easy to see that S^d is biholomorphic invariant and its values lie in the semi-open interval $(0, 1]$. As with generalized squeezing function here also D is holomorphic homogeneous d -regular if its squeezing function S^d has a positive lower bound.

Recall that a domain is said to be homogeneous if its group of automorphisms acts transitively on it. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be bounded and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be bounded, homogeneous. Fridman invariant on D , denoted by g_D^d , is defined as

$$g_D^d(a) := \inf \{1/r : B_D^d(a, r) \subseteq f(\Omega), f \in \mathcal{O}_u(\Omega, D)\},$$

where d_D is the Carathéodory (or Kobayashi) pseudodistance c_D (or k_D) on D and $B_D^d(a, r)$ is the c_D (or k_D) ball centered at a of radius $r > 0$. For comparison purpose, we consider h_D^d , defined as

$$h_D^d(a) := \sup \{\tanh r : B_D^d(a, r) \subseteq f(\Omega), f \in \mathcal{O}_u(\Omega, D)\}.$$

This work is devoted to general properties of $S_{d,D}^\Omega$ and h_D^d , and some connections between them. The question arises: given all the information that the (standard) squeezing function already provides, what could be the utility of $S_{d,D}^\Omega$? We point to a host of results where, given D as above and a point $p \in \partial D$ around which ∂D is smooth, if $\lim_{z \rightarrow p} S_D(z) = 1$ then, based on additional geometric information about ∂D around p , it is inferred that ∂D is strongly Levi-pseudoconvex at p : see [2] and the references therein. Now, $S_{d,D}^\Omega$ would play an analogous role in understanding alternative Levi geometries. By “understanding alternative Levi geometries” we

mean the following type of problem: with Ω fixed and $d \neq (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ and with some additional geometric information about ∂D around p , studying what the inertia of the Levi-form of ∂D must be in terms of the non-1 entries of d if $\lim_{z \rightarrow \partial D} S_{d,D}^\Omega(z) = 1$. (Note how $d = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k)$ is vital to such problems.) Some of the properties of $S_{d,D}^\Omega$ exposed below would be needed for the latter class of problems. Now, what sort of geometric information about ∂D around p would be needed, one may ask. See [1, Section 8] for a range of natural conditions and for a general discussion on what ingredients the solutions of the latter problems need.

Layout of the paper: In the second section we show that product of holomorphic homogeneous regular domain is holomorphic homogeneous regular. An inequality related to d -Minkowski function is the main feature of section three. The fourth and final sections contain the usual results about squeezing functions for d -balanced domains and Fridman invariant. We would like to point out specifically the results concerning Fridman invariant and the Lemma 4.8 achieved by tweaking a result of Bharali [1]. This lemma was mainstay for our continuity result 4.9 in the fourth section. We would also like to mention the continuity result regarding the construction of a particular function g .

2. ON GENERALIZED SQUEEZING FUNCTION

We begin with the following observation:

Lemma 2.1. *For $0 < r < 1$, $\Omega(r) = r \Omega(1)$.*

Proof. Let $z \in \Omega(r)$, thus $h_\Omega(z) < r$. This, using homogeneity of h_Ω [10, Remark 2.2.1(a)], gives us $h_\Omega(\frac{1}{r}z) < 1$. Thus $\frac{1}{r}z \in \Omega(1)$. Therefore $z = r(z/r) \in r \Omega(1)$.

Let $z \in r \Omega(1)$, then $z = ra$ for some $a \in \Omega(1)$. Now using homogeneity of h_Ω , we get $h_\Omega(ra) < r$, which clearly shows that $ra = z \in \Omega(r)$. \square

Remark 2.2. Let $\Omega_1 \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ and $\Omega_2 \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ be balanced domains and let $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. We know that product of balanced domains is balanced, then by the above lemma one can see that for any $r > 0$, $\Omega(r) = \Omega_1(r) \times \Omega_2(r)$.

Remark 2.2 can also be deduced from [10, Remark 2.2.1]. On the lines of our result on product domain [8], we deduce a similar result about generalized squeezing function on product domain.

Proposition 2.3. *If we consider*

- $\Omega_i \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$, ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k$) *bounded, convex and balanced domains.*
- $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times \dots \times \Omega_k \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, *where $n = n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k$.*
- $D_i \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$, ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k$) *bounded domains and $D = D_1 \times D_2 \times \dots \times D_k$.*

Then for $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in D$,

$$(2.1) \quad S_D^\Omega(a) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} S_{D_i}^{\Omega_i}(a_i).$$

Proof. By [16, Theorem 3.4], for each $a_i \in D_i$, there exists an extremal map. That is for each i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, there exist injective holomorphic map $f_i : D_i \rightarrow \Omega_i$ with $f_i(a_i) = 0$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \Omega_i(S_{D_i}^{\Omega_i}(a_i)) \subseteq f_i(\Omega_i) \subseteq \Omega, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

Consider the map $f : D \rightarrow \Omega$ defined as

$$f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k) := (f_1(z_1), f_2(z_2), \dots, f_k(z_k)).$$

Clearly, f is an injective holomorphic map with $f(a) = 0$. Let $r = \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} S_{D_i}^{\Omega_i}(a_i)$. It follows from Remark 2.2 that $\Omega(r) = \Omega_1(r) \times \Omega_2(r) \times \dots \times \Omega_k(r)$. Let $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k) \in \Omega(r) = \Omega_1(r) \times \Omega_2(r) \times \dots \times \Omega_k(r)$. By Equation 2.2, there exists $b_i \in D_i$, such that $f_i(b_i) = w_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, since $\Omega_i(0, r) \subseteq \Omega_i(S_{D_i}^{\Omega_i}(a_i))$ for each i . Thus $w = f(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)$ and as w was arbitrarily chosen, we conclude $\Omega(r) \subseteq f(D)$. Thus it follows from the definition that $S_D^\Omega(a) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} S_{D_i}^{\Omega_i}(a_i)$. \square

A trivial consequence of the above inequality (2.1) is that the product of holomorphic homogeneous regular domains is holomorphic homogeneous regular.

3. FEW RESULTS ON d -MINKOWSKI FUNCTION

Remark 3.1. For a d -balanced domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, the following holds: (see [10, Remark 2.2.14])

- (1) $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : h_{d,\Omega}(z) < 1\}$.
- (2) $h_{d,\Omega}(\lambda^{d_1} z_1, \lambda^{d_2} z_2, \dots, \lambda^{d_n} z_n) = |\lambda| h_{d,\Omega}(z)$ for each $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.
- (3) $h_{d,\Omega}$ is upper semicontinuous.

Minkowski function h_Ω for a bounded, balanced, convex domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is a \mathbb{C} -norm [16, Lemma 3.3], in particular it satisfies triangle inequality. In this direction, for a d -balanced, convex domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a d -balanced, convex domain. Then for $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,*

$$h_{d,\Omega}(\alpha z + (1 - \alpha)w) \leq h_{d,\Omega}(z) + h_{d,\Omega}(w).$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary and $a = h_{d,\Omega}(z) + \epsilon/2$, $b = h_{d,\Omega}(w) + \epsilon/2$. Then there exists $t, s > 0$ with $t < a$, $s < b$ such that $(\frac{z_1}{t^{d_1}}, \frac{z_2}{t^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{t^{d_n}}) \in \Omega$ and $(\frac{w_1}{s^{d_1}}, \frac{w_2}{s^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{w_n}{s^{d_n}}) \in \Omega$. Since $t/a < 1$, $s/b < 1$ and Ω is d -balanced, we get that $(\frac{z_1}{a^{d_1}}, \frac{z_2}{a^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{a^{d_n}}) \in \Omega$ and $(\frac{w_1}{b^{d_1}}, \frac{w_2}{b^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{w_n}{b^{d_n}}) \in \Omega$. Let $c = \max(a, b)$, then we get $(\frac{z_1}{c^{d_1}}, \frac{z_2}{c^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{c^{d_n}}) \in \Omega$ and $(\frac{w_1}{c^{d_1}}, \frac{w_2}{c^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{w_n}{c^{d_n}}) \in \Omega$. Using convexity, we get $(\frac{\alpha z_1 + (1-\alpha)w_1}{c^{d_1}}, \frac{\alpha z_2 + (1-\alpha)w_2}{c^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{\alpha z_n + (1-\alpha)w_n}{c^{d_n}}) \in \Omega = \Omega^d(1)$. Therefore we get

$$h_{d,\Omega}\left(\frac{\alpha z_1 + (1-\alpha)w_1}{c^{d_1}}, \frac{\alpha z_2 + (1-\alpha)w_2}{c^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{\alpha z_n + (1-\alpha)w_n}{c^{d_n}}\right) < 1,$$

which upon using Remark 3.1(2) gives us $h_{d,\Omega}(\alpha z + (1 - \alpha)w) < c$. Noting that $c = \frac{1}{2}(a + b + |a - b|)$, we get $h_{d,\Omega}(\alpha z + (1 - \alpha)w) < h_{d,\Omega}(z) + h_{d,\Omega}(w) + \epsilon$. Since ϵ was arbitrary, we conclude that $h_{d,\Omega}(\alpha z + (1 - \alpha)w) \leq h_{d,\Omega}(z) + h_{d,\Omega}(w)$. \square

4. d -BALANCED SQUEEZING FUNCTION

We first recall few results that we will be using in this section. Note that [12, Theorem 1], [11, Theorem 1.3] and the Remark 1.6 therein yields the following.

Result 4.1. *For a convex domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, $c_\Omega = k_\Omega = \tilde{k}_\Omega$, where \tilde{k}_Ω denotes the Lempert function on Ω .*

Combining Result 4.1 with [3, Theorem 1.6], we get the following.

Result 4.2. *For a bounded, convex, $d = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ -balanced domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$,*

$$\tanh^{-1} h_{d,\Omega}(z)^L \leq c_\Omega(0, z) = k_\Omega(0, z) \leq \tanh^{-1} h_{d,\Omega}(z),$$

where $L = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i$.

Result 4.3 ([4, Theorem 2.2]). *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain and $z \in D$. Let $\{f_i\}$ be a sequence of injective holomorphic maps, $f_i : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, with $f_i(z) = 0$ for all i . Suppose that $f_i \rightarrow f$, uniformly on compact subsets of D , where $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$. If there exists a neighborhood U of 0 such that $U \subseteq f_i(D)$ for all i , then f is injective.*

Result 4.4 ([13, Lemma 2.4]). *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain and $f, g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be holomorphic such that*

$$\|f(z)\| < \|g(z)\|, z \in \partial D.$$

Then f and $f + g$ have the same number of zeroes in D , counted according to multiplicities.

For a bounded domain D and a bounded, convex, d -balanced domain Ω , an injective holomorphic map $f : D \rightarrow \Omega$ with $f(z) = 0$ is said to be an extremal map at $z \in D$, if $\Omega^d(S^d(z)) \subseteq f(D)$. Before proving the existence of extremal maps for squeezing function S^d we prove the following useful lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be d -balanced domain and $r_k \rightarrow r$, $0 < r_k, r < 1$ be such that for every k , $\Omega^d(r_k) \subseteq A$, where A is some subset of \mathbb{C}^n . Then $\Omega^d(r) \subseteq A$.*

Proof. Let $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \Omega^d(r)$, that is $h_{d,\Omega}(z) < r$. Thus r is not a lower bound for B , where $B = \{t > 0 : (\frac{z_1}{t^{d_1}}, \frac{z_2}{t^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{t^{d_n}}) \in \Omega\}$. Therefore there is $t_0 > 0$ such that $t_0 \in B$ with $t_0 < r$.

For $\epsilon = r - t_0$, choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_N > t_0$. Thus $h_{d,\Omega}(z) = \inf B \leq t_0 < r_N$. This gives us $z \in \Omega^d(r_N) \subseteq A$. Thus we get $\Omega^d(r) \subseteq A$. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be bounded, convex and d -balanced domain and $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain. Then for $a \in D$, there exists an injective holomorphic map $f : D \rightarrow \Omega$ with $f(a) = 0$ such that $\Omega^d(S^d(a)) \subseteq f(D)$.*

Proof. Let $a \in D$ and $r = S^d(a)$. Let r_i be a sequence of increasing numbers converging to r and let $f_i : D \rightarrow \Omega$ be injective holomorphic map with $f_i(a) = 0$ such that

$$\Omega^d(r_i) \subseteq f_i(D), \text{ for each } i.$$

Since each $f_i(D) \subseteq \Omega$, therefore the sequence f_i is locally bounded and hence normal. Thus by Montel's theorem, there exists a subsequence f_{i_k} of f_i such that $f_{i_k} \rightarrow f$ uniformly on compact subsets of D . Clearly, $f : D \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$ is a holomorphic map with $f(a) = 0$. As r_i is an increasing sequence therefore $\Omega^d(r_1) \subseteq f_i(D)$ for every i . As we know that $h_{d,\Omega}$ is upper semicontinuous therefore $\Omega^d(r_1)$ is open. Now using Result 4.3, we get that f is an open map. We know that Ω being convex is a fat domain [9, Remark 1.4.1(h)], which results in $f : D \rightarrow \text{int } \overline{\Omega} = \Omega$. Now we

show that $\Omega^d(S^d(a)) \subseteq f(D)$. For this, it suffices to prove that $\Omega^d(S^d(r_j)) \subseteq f(D)$ for each fixed j . Finally Lemma 4.5 concludes the proof.

Note that for each $i > j$ (j is fixed), $\Omega^d(r_j) \subseteq \Omega^d(r_j) \subseteq f_i(D)$. Now consider map $g_i : \Omega^d(r_j) \rightarrow D$ defined as $g_i = f_i^{-1}|_{\Omega^d(r_j)}$ for each $i > j$, then $f_{i_k} \circ g_{i_k} = \text{Id}_{\Omega^d(r_j)}$ for $i_k > j$. By Montel's theorem, sequence g_{i_k} has a subsequence, naming it again g_{i_k} , uniformly converging to a function $g : \Omega^d(r_j) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ on compact subsets of $\Omega^d(r_j)$. It can be seen easily that g is locally biholomorphic.

Clearly, $g : \Omega^d(r_j) \rightarrow \overline{D}$. We claim that $g : \Omega^d(r_j) \rightarrow D$. For this, first note that g is defined on some neighborhood of the closure $\overline{\Omega^d(r_j)}$. Suppose there is $\zeta \in g(\Omega^d(r_j))$ such that $\zeta \notin D$. Let $\tilde{g}_{i_k}(z) = g_{i_k}(z) - \zeta$ and $\tilde{g}(z) = g(z) - \zeta$ for $z \in \Omega^d(r_j)$. Since $g_{i_k}(\Omega^d(r_j)) \subseteq D$, therefore \tilde{g}_{i_k} has no zero in $\Omega^d(r_j)$ and \tilde{g} has a zero in $\Omega^d(r_j)$. Let $z_0 \in \Omega^d(r_j)$ be such that $g(z_0) = \zeta$, that is, $\tilde{g}(z_0) = 0$. Since g is locally biholomorphism, there is some $\delta > 0$ such that z_0 is the unique zero of \tilde{g} on $\overline{B^n(z_0, \delta)}$. Take $\epsilon = \inf\{|\tilde{g}(z)| : \partial B^n(z_0, \delta)\}$ and note that $\epsilon > 0$. Now using convergence of \tilde{g}_{i_k} for this ϵ and then using Result 4.4, we get that \tilde{g}_{i_k} has a zero in $B^n(z_0, \delta)$ for sufficiently large k . It is a contradiction therefore $g(\Omega^d(r_j)) \subseteq D$ for each j . □

The following corollary is an immediate consequence.

Corollary 4.7. *If $S^d(z) = 1$ for some $z \in D$, then D is biholomorphically equivalent to Ω .*

Note that for a bounded, convex d -balanced domain Ω , $a\Omega$ is also bounded, convex d -balanced for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$. We need the following lemma to prove continuity of S^d , whose proof follows on the same lines as the proof of [3, Theorem 1.6]. We include its proof here for the sake of completion.

Lemma 4.8. *For a bounded, convex, d -balanced domain Ω ,*

$$h_{d,\Omega}(z) \leq B_{a\Omega} \left(\tanh \tilde{k}_{a\Omega}(0, z) \right)^{1/L},$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $B_{a\Omega} > 0$ is such that $h_{d,\Omega}(z) \leq B_{a\Omega}$ for every $z \in a\Omega$ (existence of the bound $B_{a\Omega}$ is easy to check.)

Proof. Observe that if $a = 0$, the conclusion is obvious, therefore we assume that $a \neq 0$. Let $L = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i$. For any $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}^*$, where \mathbb{D}^* is punctured unit disc in \mathbb{C} , denote by $\tau_1(\zeta), \dots, \tau_L(\zeta)$ distinct L th roots of ζ . Let $z \in a\Omega$ and $\phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow a\Omega$ be holomorphic such that $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi(\sigma) = z$ for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{D}$. Since $\phi(0) = 0$, therefore $\phi(\zeta) = (\zeta\phi_1(\zeta), \dots, \zeta\phi_n(\zeta))$ for $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$, where $\phi_i : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

Consider function U defined on \mathbb{D}^* as

$$U(\zeta) := \sum_{j=1}^L h_{d,\Omega}(\tau_j(\zeta)^{L-d_1}\phi_1(\zeta), \dots, \tau_j(\zeta)^{L-d_n}\phi_n(\zeta)).$$

Following verbatim the argument in the proof of [3, Theorem 1.6], we obtain that U extends to a subharmonic function on \mathbb{D} and for each $r \in (0, 1)$,

$$r^{1/L}U(\zeta) = Lh_{d,\Omega} \circ \phi(\zeta) < LB_{a\Omega} \text{ for every } \zeta \text{ with } |\zeta| = r.$$

This implies that $U(\zeta) \leq LB_{a\Omega}$ for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$. Therefore

$$Lh_{d,\Omega}(z) = Lh_{d,\Omega} \circ \phi(\sigma) = |\sigma|^{1/L} U(\sigma) \leq LB_{a\Omega} |\sigma|^{1/L}.$$

So we get

$$\tilde{k}_{a\Omega}(0, z) \geq \rho \left(0, \frac{1}{B_{a\Omega}^L} h_{d,\Omega}(z)^L \right) = \tanh^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{B_{a\Omega}^L} h_{d,\Omega}(z)^L \right),$$

where ρ denotes Poincaré distance on \mathbb{D} and this completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Theorem 4.9. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be bounded, homogeneous, d -balanced domain and $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be bounded. Then squeezing function, S^d is continuous.*

Proof. Let $z_1, z_2 \in D$. Using Theorem 4.6 for z_1 , there exists an injective holomorphic map $f : D \rightarrow \Omega$ with $f(z_1) = 0$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad \Omega^d(S^d(z_1)) \subseteq f(D).$$

Set $\mathcal{K} = (\tanh k_D(z_1, z_2))^{1/L}$, and $k = B_{-\Omega} \mathcal{K}$ where $L = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i$ and $B_{-\Omega}$ is as in Lemma 4.8 for $a = -1$. If $h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2)) \geq S^d(z_1)$, then obviously

$$S^d(z_2) > 0 \geq \frac{S^d(z_1) - h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2))}{1 + k}.$$

Let us consider the case when $h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2)) < S^d(z_1)$. Consider $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ defined as

$$g(z) := \left(\frac{f_1(z) - f_1(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_1}}, \frac{f_2(z) - f_2(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{f_n(z) - f_n(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_n}} \right).$$

Notice that g is injective holomorphic with $g(z_2) = 0$. We first claim that $g(D) \subseteq \Omega$. For $z \in D$ we show that $g(z) \in \Omega^d(1) = \Omega$. By using Remark 3.1[1 and 2] and Proposition 3.2 for $\alpha = 1/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{d,\Omega}(g(z)) &= h_{d,\Omega} \left(\frac{f_1(z) - f_1(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_1}}, \frac{f_2(z) - f_2(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{f_n(z) - f_n(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_n}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1+k} h_{d,\Omega} \left(\frac{f(z) - f(z_2)}{2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1+k} (h_{d,\Omega}(f(z)) + h_{d,\Omega}(-f(z_2))) \\ &< \frac{1}{1+k} (1 + h_{d,\Omega}(-f(z_2))). \end{aligned}$$

Now using Lemma 4.8(for $a = -1$) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{d,\Omega}(g(z)) &< \frac{1}{1+k} (1 + h_{d,\Omega}(-f(z_2))) \\
&< \frac{1}{1+k} (1 + B_{-\Omega} \tanh k_{-\Omega}(0, -f(z_2))^{1/L}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1+k} (1 + B_{-\Omega} \tanh k_{h(D)}(h(z_1), h(z_2))^{1/L}) \\
&= \frac{1}{1+k} (1 + B_{-\Omega} (\tanh k_D(z_1, z_2))^{1/L}) \\
&= 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where $h : D \rightarrow -\Omega$ is defined as $h(z) = -f(z)$. Next we claim that

$$\Omega^d \left(\frac{S^d(z_1) - h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2))}{(1+k)} \right) \subseteq g(D).$$

Let us take $w \in \Omega^d \left(\frac{S^d(z_1) - h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2))}{(1+k)} \right)$. Therefore $h_{d,\Omega}(w) < \frac{S^d(z_1) - h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2))}{(1+k)}$, which upon using Remark 3.1(2) and Proposition 3.2(for $\alpha = 1/2$) yields

$$h_{d,\Omega}(2w_1(1+k)^{d_1} - f_1(z_2), \dots, 2w_n(1+k)^{d_n} - f_n(z_2)) < S^d(z_1).$$

This further gives us

$$(2w_1(1+k)^{d_1} - f_1(z_2), \dots, 2w_n(1+k)^{d_n} - f_n(z_2)) \in \Omega^d(S^d(z_1)) \subseteq f(D).$$

Therefore $(2w_1(1+k)^{d_1} - f_1(z_2), \dots, 2w_n(1+k)^{d_n} - f_n(z_2)) = (f_1(a), \dots, f_n(a))$ for some $a \in D$. Thus we get

$$w = \left(\frac{f_1(a) - f_1(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_1}}, \frac{f_2(a) - f_2(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_2}}, \dots, \frac{f_n(a) - f_n(z_2)}{2(1+k)^{d_n}} \right) = g(a).$$

This establishes our claim and hence we obtain

$$S^d(z_2) \geq \frac{S^d(z_1) - h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2))}{(1+k)}.$$

Now it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
S^d(z_1) &\leq S^d(z_2)(1+k) + h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2)) \\
&= S^d(z_2) + S^d(z_2)k + h_{d,\Omega}(2f(z_2)) \\
&\leq S^d(z_2) + k + B_{2\Omega} (\tanh k_{2\Omega}(0, 2f(z_2)))^{1/L} && \text{(using Lemma 4.8)} \\
&\leq S^d(z_2) + k + B_{2\Omega} (\tanh k_{h'(D)}(h'(z_1), h'(z_2)))^{1/L} \\
&= S^d(z_2) + k + B_{2\Omega} (\tanh k_D(z_1, z_2))^{1/L} \\
&= S^d(z_2) + A_\Omega \mathcal{K},
\end{aligned}$$

where $B_{2\Omega}$ is as in Lemma 4.8 for $a = 2$, $A_\Omega = B_{-\Omega} + B_{2\Omega}$ and $h' : D \rightarrow 2\Omega$ is defined as $h'(z) = 2f(z)$. On the similar lines, we can obtain that

$$S^d(z_2) \leq S^d(z_1) + A_\Omega \mathcal{K}.$$

Therefore we get

$$(4.2) \quad |S^d(z_1) - S^d(z_2)| \leq A_\Omega \mathcal{K} \text{ for every } z_1, z_2 \in D$$

and hence S^d is continuous. \square

Remark 4.10. Let $\Omega_i \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$ be d^i -balanced $d^i = (d_1^i, d_2^i, \dots, d_{n_i}^i) \in \mathbb{N}^{n_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Let $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times \dots \times \Omega_k \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, $n = n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k$. It is easy to see that Ω is $d = (d^1, d^2, \dots, d^k)$ -balanced and $\Omega^d(r) = \Omega_1^{d^1}(r_1) \times \Omega_2^{d^2}(r_2) \times \dots \times \Omega_k^{d^k}(r_k)$ (See [10, Remark 2.2.14(e)]).

Proposition 4.11. *Let $\Omega_i \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ be bounded, convex and d^i -balanced domains, $d^i \in \mathbb{N}^{n_i}$. Let $D_i \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ be bounded domains. Let $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times \dots \times \Omega_k \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, where $n = n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k$ and $D = D_1 \times D_2 \times \dots \times D_k$. Let $d = (d^1, d^2, \dots, d^k)$, then for $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in D$,*

$$(4.3) \quad S^d(a) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} S^{d^i}(a_i).$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.6, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, there exist an extremal map f_i at $a_i \in D_i$. That is, $f_i : D_i \rightarrow \Omega_i$ is injective holomorphic with $f_i(a_i) = 0$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad \Omega_i \left(S^{d^i}(a_i) \right) \subseteq f_i(D_i) \subseteq \Omega_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

Consider the map $f : D \rightarrow \Omega$ defined as

$$f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k) := (f_1(z_1), f_2(z_2), \dots, f_k(z_k)).$$

Clearly, f is injective holomorphic with $f(a) = 0$. Let $r = \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} S^{d^i}(a_i)$. It follows from Remark 4.10 that $\Omega^d(r) = \Omega_1^{d^1}(r) \times \Omega_2^{d^2}(r) \times \dots \times \Omega_k^{d^k}(r)$. Let $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k) \in \Omega^d(r) = \Omega_1^{d^1}(r) \times \Omega_2^{d^2}(r) \times \dots \times \Omega_k^{d^k}(r)$. By Equation 4.4, there exists $b_i \in D_i$, such that $f_i(b_i) = w_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, since $\Omega_i^{d^i}(r) \subseteq \Omega^{d^i}(S^{d^i}(a_i))$ for each i . Thus $w = f(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)$ and as w was arbitrarily chosen, we conclude $\Omega^d(r) \subseteq f(D)$. Thus it follows that $S^d(a) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} S^{d^i}(a_i)$. \square

The following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 4.12. *Product of holomorphic homogeneous d^i -regular domains is holomorphic homogeneous d -regular, where $d = (d^1, d^2, \dots, d^k)$.*

Recall that we say a sequence of subdomains $\{D_n\}$ of D exhausts D if for each compact subset $K \subseteq D$, there exists $N > 0$ such that $K \subseteq D_k$ for every $k > N$.

Theorem 4.13. *If a sequence $D_n \subseteq D$ exhausts D , then $\lim_n S_{D_n}^d(z) = S^d(z)$ uniformly on compact subsets of D .*

Proof. This theorem can be proved in a similar manner as in [16, Theorem 3.8] using Equation 4.2. \square

This theorem—using the argument as in [5, Theorem 1.2]—gives the following theorem.

Theorem 4.14. *A d -balanced domain exhausted by a holomorphic homogeneous d -regular domain is holomorphic homogeneous d -regular.*

5. THE SQUEEZING FUNCTION S^d AND THE FRIDMAN INVARIANT

In [15], authors discussed the relation between the squeezing function and the Fridman invariant. Similar relation was discussed for between the Fridman invariant and the squeezing function corresponding to polydisk, generalised squeezing function [8, 16]. We have the following theorem in this direction.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be bounded, convex, d -balanced. Then for $a \in D$,*

$$S^d(a)^L \leq h_D^c(a),$$

where $L = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i$.

Proof. For $a \in D$, let $f : D \rightarrow \Omega$ be injective holomorphic map with $f(a) = 0$. Let $r > 0$ be such that $\Omega^d(r) \subseteq f(D)$. Consider $g : \Omega \rightarrow D$ defined as

$$g(z) := f^{-1}(z_1 r^{d_1}, z_2 r^{d_2}, \dots, z_n r^{d_n}).$$

Recall that $h_{d,\Omega}(z_1 r^{d_1}, z_2 r^{d_2}, \dots, z_n r^{d_n}) = r h_{d,\Omega}(z)$, using Remark 3.1(2). Thus for $z \in \Omega = \Omega(1)$, $(z_1 r^{d_1}, z_2 r^{d_2}, \dots, z_n r^{d_n}) \in \Omega^d(r)$ and therefore g is well defined. We claim that $B_D^c(a, \tanh^{-1} r^L) \subseteq g(\Omega) \subseteq D$. Let $w \in B_D^c(a, \tanh^{-1} r^L)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \tanh^{-1} r^L &> c_D(a, w) \\ &= c_{f(D)}(f(a), f(w)) \\ &= c_{f(D)}(0, f(w)) \\ &\geq c_\Omega(0, f(w)) \\ &\geq \tanh^{-1}(h_{d,\Omega}(f(w)))^L. \end{aligned}$$

We are using Result 4.2 in the last step. This gives us $h_{d,\Omega}(f(w)) < r$. Thus $w \in f^{-1}(\Omega^d(r))$, which upon using Remark 3.1(2) gives us $w \in g(\Omega)$. Therefore $r^L \leq h_D^c(a)$ and hence we get $S^d(a)^L \leq h_D^c(a)$. \square

Theorem 5.2. *If $D, \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ are bounded, d -balanced, convex then*

$$h_D^c(0)^L \leq S^d(0),$$

where $L = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i$.

Proof. For $0 \in \Omega$, let $f : \Omega \rightarrow D$ be an injective holomorphic map with $f(0) = 0$. Let $r > 0$ be such that $B_D^c(0, r) \subseteq f(\Omega)$. Define $g : D \rightarrow \Omega$ as

$$g(w) := f^{-1}(\alpha^{d_1} w_1, \dots, \alpha^{d_n} w_n),$$

where $\alpha = \tanh r$. Note that for $w \in D$, $h_{d,D}(w) < 1$, which on using Remark 3.1(2) gives us $h_{d,D}(\alpha^{d_1} w_1, \dots, \alpha^{d_n} w_n) < \alpha$ and therefore g is well defined. Also, g is injective holomorphic with $g(0) = 0$.

We next claim that $\Omega^d(\alpha^L) \subseteq g(D)$. To see this, let $z \in \Omega^d(\alpha^L)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^L &> h_{d,\Omega}(z) \\ &\geq \tanh c_\Omega(0, z) \\ &= \tanh c_{f(\Omega)}(f(0), f(z)) \\ &\geq \tanh c_D(0, f(z)) \\ &\geq (h_{d,D}(f(z)))^L. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $h_{d,D}(f(z)) < \alpha$, and thus we get our claim. This further yields $S^d(0) \geq \alpha^L = (\tanh r)^L$, which implies that

$$h_D^c(0)^L \leq S^d(0).$$

□

Remark 5.3. Observe that under the assumption of Theorem 5.2, using Theorem 5.1 we get

$$S^d(0)^L \leq h_D^c(0) \leq S^d(0)^{1/L}.$$

In case when D, Ω are bounded, balanced and convex this inequality gives [17, Theorem 3].

Theorem 5.4. *For a bounded, convex, d-balanced and homogeneous domain Ω , let $D = \Omega \setminus \{0\}$. Then*

$$S^d(z)^L \leq h_{d,\Omega}(z) \leq S^d(z)^{1/L} \text{ for all } z \in D.$$

Proof. It follows directly from the proof of [16, Theorem 4.5] and Theorem 5.1. □

Remark 5.5. Note that when Ω is bounded, convex, balanced and homogeneous, then Theorem 5.4 reduces to the theorem of Rong and Yang [16, Theorem 4.5], which states that

$$\text{for } z \in D = \Omega \setminus \{0\}, S_D^\Omega(z) = h_\Omega(z).$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are thankful to Gautam Bharali, Peter Pflug and Kaushal Verma for reading our manuscript and suggesting many changes. We are also thankful to Fusheng Deng for sending the new arguments for their proof [4, Theorem 2.1]. We profusely thank the referee for comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Bharali, A new family of holomorphic homogeneous regular domains, arXiv:2103.09227.
- [2] T. Ninh Van, D. Nguyen Quang, Some properties of h-extendible domains in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} , *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **485**(2) (2020), 123810, 14pp.
- [3] G. Bharali, Non-isotropically balanced domains, Lempert function estimates, and the spectral Nevanlinna-Pick theorem, arXiv:0601107.
- [4] F. Deng, Q. Guan, L. Zhang, Some properties of squeezing functions on bounded domains, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, **57**(2) (2012), 319–342.
- [5] F. Deng, X. Zhang, Fridman's invariants, squeezing functions and exhausting domains, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)*, **35**(2019), 1723–1728.

- [6] B. L. Fridman, On the imbedding of a strictly pseudoconvex domain in a polyhedron, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **249**(1) (1979), 63–67.
- [7] B. L. Fridman, Biholomorphic invariants of a hyperbolic manifold and some applications, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **276** (1983), 685–698.
- [8] N. Gupta, S. K. Pant, Squeezing function corresponding to polydisk, *Complex Anal. Synerg.* **8**, 12 (2022), DOI:10.1007/s40627-022-00100-8.
- [9] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, First steps in several complex variables: Reinhardt domains, EMS Textbooks in Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.
- [10] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, Invariant Distances and Metrics in Complex Analysis, 2nd edition(extended), De Gruyter Expositions in mathematics, Berlin, 2013.
- [11] L. Kosiński, T. Warszawski, Lempert theorem for strongly linearly convex domains, *Annales Polonici Mathematici* **107**(2) (2013), 167–216.
- [12] L. Lempert, Holomorphic retracts and intrinsic metrics in convex domains, *Anal. Math.* **8** (1982), 257–261.
- [13] N. G. Lloyd, Remarks on generalising Rouché’s theorem, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **20**:2 (1979), 259–272.
- [14] N. Nikolov, The symmetrized polydisc cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex domains, *Ann. Polon. Math.* **88** (2006), 279–283.
- [15] N. Nikolov, K. Verma, On the squeezing function and Fridman invariants, *J. Geom. Anal.*, **30**, 1218–1225 (2019).
- [16] F. Rong, S. Yang, On Fridman invariants and generalized squeezing functions, *Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B* **43**, 161–174 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11401-022-0320-y>.
- [17] F. Rong, S. Yang, On the comparison of the Fridman invariant and the squeezing function, *Complex variables and elliptic equations*, DOI:10.1080/17476933.2020.1851210.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF DELHI, DELHI–110 007, INDIA

Email address: ssguptanaveen@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DEEN DAYAL UPADHYAYA COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF DELHI, DELHI–110 078, INDIA

Email address: skpant@ddu.du.ac.in