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ABSTRACT. In this paper we attempt to develop a general $p$–Bergman theory on bounded domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$. To indicate the basic difference between $L^p$ and $L^2$ cases, we show that the $p$–Bergman kernel $K_p(z)$ is not real-analytic on some bounded complete Reinhardt domains when $p \geq 4$ is an even number. By the calculus of variations we get a fundamental reproducing formula. This together with certain techniques from nonlinear analysis of the $p$–Laplacian yield a number of results, e.g., $\frac{1}{2}$–Hölder continuity of the off-diagonal $p$–Bergman kernel $K_p(z, \cdot)$ for fixed $z$, and stability of $K_p(z, w)$ as $p$ varies. We also show that the $p$–Bergman metric $B_p(z; X)$ tends to the Carathéodory metric $C(z; X)$ as $p \to \infty$ and the generalized Levi form $i\partial\bar{\partial}\log K_p(z; X)$ is no less than $\frac{p}{2(p-1)} B_p(z; X)^2$ for $p \geq 2$ and $\frac{2}{p} C(z; X)^2$ for $p \leq 2$. Several comparison results of $K_p(z)$ and $K_2(z)$ for bounded pseudoconvex domains with $C^2$–boundary are obtained.
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1. Introduction

In the early twentieth century Stefan Bergman discovered an important link between function theory, geometry and Hilbert space theory, namely the theory of Bergman kernel and Bergman metric. The Bergman theory makes essential use of complete orthonormal bases in the Bergman space, which sheds a particular light on the real difficulty of extending the Bergman theory to the $L^p$ case.

In this paper we attempt to develop a general $p$–Bergman theory. For a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ we define $A^p(\Omega)$ to be the $p$–Bergman space of $L^p$ holomorphic functions on $\Omega$. We start with a minimizing problem which was also considered by Bergman himself in the case $p = 2$:

\begin{equation}
    m_p(z) := \inf \{ \|f\|_p : f \in A^p(\Omega), f(z) = 1 \}.
\end{equation}

There exists at least one minimizer for $p > 0$ and exactly one minimizer $m_p(\cdot, z)$ for every $p \geq 1$. We then define the $p$–Bergman kernel by $K_p(z) = m_p(z)^{-p}$ for $p > 0$ and the off-diagonal Bergman kernel by $K_p(z, w) = m_p(z, w)K_p(w)$ for $p \geq 1$. Note that $K_2(z)$ and $K_2(z, w)$ are standard Bergman kernel and off-diagonal Bergman kernel respectively. After the early work of Narasimhan-Simha \cite{26} and Sakai \cite{30}, the study of $K_{2/m}(z)$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ has attracted much attention in recent years (see e.g., \cite{32}, \cite{34}, \cite{35}, \cite{9}, \cite{2}, \cite{3}, \cite{37}, \cite{36}, \cite{27}, \cite{33}, \cite{14}).

Our first result will indicate the basic difference between $K_p$ and $K_2$ when $p > 2$.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $\Omega$ be a bounded complete Reinhardt domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then the following properties hold:

1. If $K(z, w)$ is not zero-free, then there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $K_{2k}(z)$ is not real-analytic on $\Omega$ for any integer $k \geq k_0$.

2. Suppose there exist $\zeta_0, z_0 \in \Omega$ such that $K_2(\zeta_0, z_0) = 0$ and ord$_{z_0}K_2(\zeta_0, \cdot) = 1$. Then $K_{2k}(z)$ is not real-analytic on $\Omega$ for any integer $k \geq 2$. Moreover, either Re $m_p(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ or Im $m_p(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ is not real-analytic on $\Omega$ for any rational $p > 2$.

In \cite{25}, Lu Qi-Keng asked: for which domains is $K_2(z, w)$ zero-free? It turns out that for most pseudoconvex domains $K_2(z, w)$ is not zero-free; among them most explicit examples are bounded pseudoconvex complete Reinhardt domains (cf. \cite{6} and \cite{22}). We will verify that the Thullen-type domain $\{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1| + |z_2|^{2/\alpha} < 1\}$ for $\alpha > 2$ satisfies the hypothesis in Theorem 1.1(2) by using the calculation in Boas-Fu-Straube \cite{7}.

Note that $m_p(\cdot, z)$ and $K_p(\cdot, z)$ are holomorphic on $\Omega$ for fixed $z$. On the other hand, the function theory of $m_p(z, \cdot)$ or $K_p(z, \cdot)$ for fixed $z$ is completely mysterious. Using the calculus of variations, we get the following fundamental reproducing formula

\begin{equation}
    f(z) = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} \overline{K_p(z, \cdot)} f, \quad \forall f \in A^p(\Omega).
\end{equation}

The nonlinear factor $|m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2}$ causes the real difficulty for applications. Thus the reproducing formula is of limited use without the help of some techniques from nonlinear analysis of the $p$–Laplacian (cf. \cite{23}). This also indicates the major difference to the Bergman theory.
It is fairly easy to show that $m_p(z)$ and $K_p(z)$ are locally Lipschitz continuous. However, the regularity problem for $m_p(z, \cdot)$ or $K_p(z, \cdot)$ is more difficult. Regularity in a minimizing problem is classical and goes back to Hilbert’s famous problem-list.

**Theorem 1.2.**

1. For any $p > 1$ and any compact set $S \subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that
   \[
   |m_p(z, w) - m_p(z, w')| \leq C|w - w'|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall \ z, w, w' \in S.
   \]
2. Let $S_w := \{m_1(\cdot, w) = 0\}$. For every open set $w \subset \subset \Omega \setminus S_w$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that
   \[
   |m_1(z, w) - m_1(z, w')| \leq C|w - w'|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall \ z, w', \in U.
   \]

The same conclusions also hold for $K_p$.

**Remark.** It is interesting to point out that Theorem 1.2 plays an essential role in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Note that the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives
\[
|K_2(z, w)| \leq K_2(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} K_2(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad 2\text{Re} K_2(z, w) \leq K_2(z) + K_2(w).
\]

Surprisingly, these inequalities remain valid for general $p \geq 1$.

**Theorem 1.3.**

1. $|K_p(z, w)| \leq K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{p}} K_p(w)^{\frac{1}{q}}$, where $1/p + 1/q = 1$.
2. $\text{Re} \left\{K_p(z, w) + K_p(w, z) \right\} \leq K_p(z) + K_p(w)$.

Each equality holds if and only if $z = w$.

**Remark.** In particular, we have $|K_1(z, w)| \leq K_1(z)$, so that $K_1(z, \cdot)$ is a bounded function on $\Omega$ for fixed $z$.

We also investigate the $p-$Bergman metric given by
\[
B_p(z; X) := K_p(z)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \sup_f |X f(z)|
\]

where the supremum is taken over all $f \in A^p(\Omega)$ with $f(z) = 0$ and $\|f\|_p = 1$. It is easy to see that $B_2(\cdot; X)$ is the standard Bergman metric. The $p-$Bergman metric is an invariant (Finsler) metric for simply-connected bounded domains, and is always no less than the Carathéodory metric $C(z; X)$ (the case $p = 2$ goes back to Lu Qi-Keng [25]; see also [18]). More interestingly, we have

**Proposition 1.4.** $B_p(z; X) \to C(z; X)$ as $p \to \infty$.

For a real-valued upper semicontinuous function $u$ defined on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, we define the generalized Levi form of $u$ by
\[
i \partial \bar{\partial} u(z; X) := \liminf_{r \to 0^+} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(z + re^{i\theta}X) d\theta - u(z) \right\}.
\]

A natural question is to find the relationship between $i \partial \bar{\partial} \log K_p(z; X)$ and $B_p(z; X)$. Using the variation method, we are able to verify the following
Theorem 1.5.
\[ i\partial \bar{\partial} \log K_p(z; X) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{p}{2(p-1)} B_p(z; X)^2 & \text{for } p \geq 2 \\ \frac{p}{2} C(z; X)^2 & \text{for } p \leq 2. \end{cases} \]

Remark. In particular, \( \log K_p(z) \) is a (continuous) strictly psh function.

In [37], Yau suggested to investigate the relationship between the \( p \)-Bergman metrics when \( p \) changes. Motivated by the spectrum theory of the \( p \)-Laplacian (cf. [24]), we will show

Theorem 1.6. (1) \( \lim_{s \to p^-} m_s(z, w) = m_p(z, w) \) for \( p > 1 \) and \( \lim_{s \to p^+} m_s(z, w) \) exists for \( p \geq 1 \). Moreover, if \( A^{p'}(\Omega) \) lies dense in \( A^p(\Omega) \) for some \( p' > p \), then
\[ m_p(z, w) = \lim_{s \to p^+} m_s(z, w). \]

(2) \( \lim_{s \to p^+} B_s(z; X) \) exist for \( p > 0 \) and \( B_p(z; X) = \lim_{s \to p^-} B_s(z; X) \). Moreover, if there exists \( p' > p \) such that \( A^{p'}(\Omega) \) lies dense in \( A^p(\Omega) \), then
\[ B_p(z; X) = \lim_{s \to p} B_s(z; X). \]

Conclusion (1) also holds for \( K_p \).

On the other hand, we have

Proposition 1.7. Let \( \Omega = D \setminus S \) where \( D \) is a bounded domain in \( \mathbb{C} \) and \( S \) is a compact set in \( D \) which has positive \( 2 \)-capacity but zero \( p \)-capacity for every \( p < 2 \). Then
\[ K_2(z) > \lim_{p \to 2^+} K_p(z). \]

Recall that the \( p \)-capacity of \( S \) is given by \( \text{Cap}_p(S) := \inf_{\phi} \int_D |\nabla \phi|^p \) where the infimum is taken over all \( \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{C}) \) such that \( \phi \geq 1 \) on \( S \). The condition of Proposition 1.7 is satisfied for instance, if the \( h \)-Hausdorff measure \( \Lambda_h(S) \) of \( S \) is positive and finite where \( h(t) = (\log 1/t)^{-\alpha} \) for some \( \alpha > 1 \).

Due to the failure of \( L^p \)-estimates for \( \bar{\partial} \) on general pseudoconvex domains when \( p > 2 \) (compare [17]), it is plausible to study the boundary behavior of \( K_p(z) \) through comparison with \( K_2(z) \). With the help of \( L^2 \) estimates for \( \bar{\partial} \), we are able to show the following

Theorem 1.8. Let \( \Omega \) be a bounded pseudoconvex domain with \( C^2 \)-boundary and \( \delta \) denotes the boundary distance. Then the following properties hold:

(1) There exist constants \( \gamma, C > 0 \) such that the following estimates hold near \( \partial \Omega \):
\[ K_p(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} / K_2(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \delta(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} |\log \delta(z)| \frac{n(p-2)}{4p^2}, \quad p \geq 2, \]
\[ K_p(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} / K_2(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq C^{-1} \delta(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} |\log \delta(z)|^{-\frac{n+1}{4p}}, \quad p \leq 2. \]

(2) For every \( 2 \leq p < 2 + \frac{2}{n} \) there exists a constant \( C = C_{p, \Omega} > 0 \) such that the following estimate holds near \( \partial \Omega \):
\[ K_p(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} / K_2(z) \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq C^{-1} \delta(z) \frac{(n+1)(p-2)}{4p} |\log \delta(z)|^{-\frac{(n+1)(p-2)}{4p}}. \]

It is a straightforward consequence of the Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem [29] that \( K_2(z) \geq \delta^{-2} \) holds for bounded pseudoconvex domains with \( C^2 \)-boundary. Thus
Corollary 1.9. If $\Omega$ is a bounded pseudoconvex domain with $C^2$--boundary, $K_p(z)$ is an exhaustion function for every $2 \leq p < 2 + \frac{2}{n}$.

Remark. It was shown in [27] that $K_p(z)$ is an exhaustion function for any $0 < p < 2$ and any bounded pseudoconvex domain.

It is reasonable to ask the following

Problem 1. Is $K_p(z)$ an exhaustion function for any $p > 2$?

Remark. The answer is affirmative when $\Omega$ is a simply-connected uniformly squeezing domain or smooth strictly pseudoconvex domain (cf. [14]).

Most results in this paper extend to the $p$--Bergman space related to Hermitian line bundles over complex manifolds. Nevertheless, we stick to the simplest case of bounded domains with trivial line bundle in order to make the arguments as transparent as possible.

2. Definitions and basic properties

2.1. The $p$--Bergman space. For a domain $\Omega \subset \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ we define the $p$--Bergman space to be

$$A^p(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) : \|f\|_p^p := \int_\Omega |f|^p < \infty \right\}.$$

Proposition 2.1 (Bergman inequality). For any compact set $S \subset \Omega$ there exists a constant $C_S > 0$ such that

$$\sup_S |f|^p \leq C_S \|f\|_p^p. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. Set $r = d(S, \partial \Omega)$. For any $z \in S$, we have $P(z, r/n) := \prod_{j=1}^n \Delta(z_j, r/n) \subset \Omega$. It follows directly from the mean-value inequality of psh functions that

$$|f(z)|^p \leq \frac{1}{|P(z, r/n)|} \int_{P(z, r/n)} |f|^p \leq \frac{1}{\pi^n (r/n)^{2n}} \|f\|_p^p. \tag{2.2}$$

□

Proposition 2.2. $A^p(\Omega)$ is a Banach space for $p \geq 1$.

Proof. It suffices to verify that $A^p(\Omega)$ is a closed subspace in $L^p(\Omega)$. Let $\{f_j\} \subset A^p(\Omega)$ satisfy $f_j \to f_0$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. By (2.1) we know that $\{f_j\}$ forms a normal family so that there exists a subsequence $f_{jk}$ converging locally uniformly to some $\hat{f}_0 \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$. Fatou’s lemma yields

$$\|f_{jk} - \hat{f}_0\|_p \leq \liminf_{m \to \infty} \|f_{jk} - f_{jm}\|_p \leq \liminf_{m \to \infty} [\|f_{jk} - f_0\|_p + \|f_{jm} - f_0\|_p] = \|f_{jk} - f_0\|_p,$$

which implies that $\hat{f}_0 \in A^p(\Omega)$ and $f_{jk} \to \hat{f}_0$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. Thus $f_0 = \hat{f}_0$ holds a.e. on $\Omega$. □

Remark. Analogously, one can show that $A^p(\Omega)$ is a complete metric space for $0 < p < 1$, where the metric is given by $d(f_1, f_2) := \|f_1 - f_2\|_p^p$. 
2.2. A minimizing problem. For a bounded domain in \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n \), we consider the following minimizing problem:

\[
(2.3) \quad m_p(z) = m_{\Omega,p}(z) = \inf \{ \|f\|_p : f \in A^p(\Omega), f(z) = 1 \}.
\]

**Proposition 2.3** (Existence). There exists at least one minimizer in \((2.3)\).

**Proof.** Take \( \{f_j\} \subset A^p(\Omega) \) such that \( f_j(z) = 1 \) and \( \|f_j\|_p \to m_p(z) \) as \( j \to \infty \). The Bergman inequality implies that \( \{f_j\} \) is a normal family so that there exists a subsequence \( \{f_{j_k}\} \) which converges locally uniformly to some \( f_0 \in O(\Omega) \). By Fatou’s lemma, we have

\[
\int_{\Omega} |f_0|^p \leq \liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} |f_{j_k}|^p = m_p(z)^p.
\]

On the other hand, since \( f_j(z) = 1 \), we have \( f_0(z) = 1 \) and \( \|f_0\|_p = m_p(z) \), i.e., \( f_0 \) is a minimizer. \( \square \)

**Proposition 2.4** (Uniqueness). For \( p \geq 1 \) there is only one minimizer in \((2.3)\).

**Proof.** Let \( f_1, f_2 \) be two minimizers of \((2.3)\). We take \( h := \frac{f_1 + f_2}{2} \). Clearly, \( h \) belongs to \( A^p(\Omega) \) and satisfies \( h(z) = 1 \). Note that

\[
\left| \frac{a_1 + a_2}{2} \right|^p \leq \frac{|a_1|^p + |a_2|^p}{2},
\]

and equality holds only when \( a_1 = a_2 \). It follows that if \( f_1 \neq f_2 \) then

\[
\int_{\Omega} |f_1|^p < \int_{\Omega} |h|^p < \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f_1|^p + |f_2|^p}{2} = m_p(z)^p,
\]

which is absurd. \( \square \)

**Remark.** It is not known whether the uniqueness result holds for \( 0 < p < 1 \).

Let \( m_p(\cdot, z) \) denote a minimizer in \((2.3)\) (one warning: \( m_p(z, z) = 1 \neq m_p(z) ! \)).

**Definition 2.1.** We call \( K_p(z) := m_p(z)^{-p} \) the \( p \)-Bergman kernel for \( p > 0 \) and \( K_p(z, w) := m_p(z, w)K_p(w) \) the off-diagonal \( p \)-Bergman kernel for \( p \geq 1 \).

**Proposition 2.5.** For every \( p > 0 \) we have

\[
(2.4) \quad K_p(z) = \sup \{ |f(z)|^p : f \in A^p(\Omega), \|f\|_p = 1 \}.
\]

**Proof.** Take \( f_0 \in A^p(\Omega) \) with \( f_0(z) = 1 \) and \( \|f_0\|_p = m_p(z) \). We have

\[
\sup_{f \in A^p(\Omega)} \frac{|f(z)|^p}{\|f\|_p^p} \geq \frac{|f_0(z)|^p}{\|f_0\|_p^p} = m_p(z)^{-p} = K_p(z).
\]

On the other hand, for \( f \in A^p(\Omega) \) with \( \|f\|_p = 1 \) we see that \( \hat{f} := f / f(z) \in A^p(\Omega) \) satisfies \( \hat{f}(z) = 1 \). It follows that

\[
m_p(z) \leq \|\hat{f}\|_p = 1 / |f(z)|, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad |f(z)|^p \leq m_p(z)^{-p} = K_p(z).
\]

\( \square \)
In particular, if \( \Omega \subset \Omega' \), then
\[
K_{\Omega,p}(z) \geq K_{\Omega',p}(z) \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega.
\]

Moreover, we have
\[
|\Omega|^{-1} \leq K_p(z) \leq C_n \delta(z)^{-2n}
\]
in view of (2.2), where \( \delta = \delta_\Omega \) denotes the boundary distance.

Let us present a few elementary properties (some of them are known).

**Proposition 2.6** (Transformation rule). Let \( F : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2 \) be a biholomorphic mapping between bounded simply-connected domains. Let \( J_F \) denote the complex Jacobian of \( F \). Then
\[
\begin{align*}
m_{\Omega_1,p}(z) &= m_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z))|J_F(z)|^{-2/p}, \quad p > 0, \\
K_{\Omega_1,p}(z) &= K_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z))|J_F(z)|^2, \quad p > 0, \\
m_{\Omega_1,p}(z, w) &= m_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z), F(w))J_F(z)^{2/p}J_F(w)^{-2/p}, \quad p \geq 1, \\
K_{\Omega_1,p}(z, w) &= K_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z), F(w))J_F(z)^{2/p}J_F(w)^{1-2/p}J_F(w)^{-2/p}, \quad p \geq 1.
\end{align*}
\]
Moreover, equalities hold for arbitrary bounded domains when \( 2/p \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \).

**Proof.** Since
\[
\int_{\Omega_2} |f_2|^p = \int_{\Omega_1} |f_2 \circ F|^p |J_F|^2,
\]
we conclude that \( f_2 \in A^p(\Omega_2) \) if and only if \( f_1 := f_2 \circ F \cdot J_F^{2/p} \in A^p(\Omega_1) \) (only here we have to use the assumption that \( \Omega_1 \) is simply-connected). If \( f_2(F(z)) = 1 \), then \( f_1(z)J_F(z)^{-2/p} = 1 \), so that
\[
m_{\Omega_1,p}(z)^p \leq |J_F(z)|^{-2} \int_{\Omega_1} |f_1|^p = |J_F(z)|^{-2} \int_{\Omega_2} |f_2|^p.
\]
Take minimum over \( f_2 \), we get
\[
m_{\Omega_1,p}(z)^p \leq |J_F(z)|^{-2}m_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z))^p.
\]
Consider \( F^{-1} \) instead of \( F \), we get the inverse inequality in (2.6).

Next, we define for fixed \( w \in \Omega_1 \), a holomorphic function by
\[
f_1(z) := m_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z), F(w))J_F(z)^{2/p}J_F(w)^{-2/p}.
\]
Clearly, we have \( f_1(w) = 1 \) and
\[
\int_{\Omega_1} |f_1|^p = |J_F(w)|^{-2} \int_{\Omega_2} |m_{\Omega_2,p}(\cdot, F(w))|^p = |J_F(w)|^{-2}m_{\Omega_2,p}(F(w))^p = m_{\Omega_1,p}(w)^p
\]
in view of (2.6), (2.8) follows immediately from Proposition 2.4

The remaining equalities follow from the relations
\[
K_p(z) = m_p(z)^{-p} \quad \text{and} \quad K_p(z, w) = m_p(z, w)K_p(z).
\]

\(\square\)

**Remark.** The simply-connected hypothesis can not be removed (see [27, Remark 2.3]).
Proposition 2.7 (Product rule). Let $\Omega'$ and $\Omega''$ be bounded domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{C}^m$ respectively. Set $\Omega = \Omega' \times \Omega''$ and $z = (z', z'')$. Then we have
\[
m_{\Omega, p}(z) = m_{\Omega', p}(z') \cdot m_{\Omega'', p}(z''), \quad p > 0,
m_{\Omega, p}(z, w) = m_{\Omega', p}(z', w') \cdot m_{\Omega'', p}(z'', w''), \quad p \geq 1.
\]
The same conclusions also hold for $K_p$.

Proof. For fixed $z' \in \Omega'$ and $z'' \in \Omega''$ we take $f_1 \in A^p(\Omega')$ and $f_2 \in A^p(\Omega'')$ such that $f_1(z') = f_2(z'') = 1$ and
\[
m_{\Omega', p}(z') = \|f_1\|_p, \quad m_{\Omega'', p}(z'') = \|f_2\|_p.
\]
Fubini’s theorem gives
\[
\int_{\zeta' \in \Omega'} \int_{\zeta'' \in \Omega''} |f_1(\zeta') f_2(\zeta'')|^p = \|f_1\|_p^p \cdot \|f_2\|_p^p = m_{\Omega', p}(z')^p \cdot m_{\Omega'', p}(z'')^p.
\]
Thus
\[
m_{\Omega, p}(z) \leq m_{\Omega', p}(z') \cdot m_{\Omega'', p}(z'').
\]
On the other hand, for every $h \in A^p(\Omega)$ we have
\[
|h(z', z'')|^p \leq K_{\Omega, p}(z') \cdot \int_{\Omega'} |h(\cdot, z'')|^p \\
\leq K_{\Omega', p}(z') \cdot K_{\Omega'', p}(z'') \cdot \int_{\Omega'} \int_{\Omega''} |h|^p,
\]
so that
\[
K_{\Omega, p}(z) \leq K_{\Omega', p}(z') \cdot K_{\Omega'', p}(z'').
\]
Since $K_p(z) = m_p(z)^{-p}$, the first equality follows immediately.

Next, we note that for fixed $w \in \Omega$ the function
\[
f_0(z) := m_{\Omega', p}(z', w') \cdot m_{\Omega'', p}(z'', w'')
\]
is holomorphic on $\Omega$ and satisfies $f_0(w) = 1$,
\[
\int_{\Omega} |f_0|^p = \int_{\Omega'} |m_{\Omega', p}(\cdot, w')|^p \int_{\Omega''} |m_{\Omega'', p}(\cdot, w'')|^p \\
= m_{\Omega', p}(w')^p m_{\Omega'', p}(w'')^p \\
= m_{\Omega, p}(w)^p.
\]
By uniqueness of the minimizer we immediately get the second equality. \qed

Proposition 2.8. For the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ we have
\[
(2.10) \quad K_p(z, w) = K_{\mathbb{B}^n, p}(z, w) = \frac{n!}{\pi^n} \frac{(1 - |w|^2)^{(n+1)(\frac{p}{2} - 1)}}{(1 - \langle z, w \rangle)^{\frac{2(n+1)}{p}}},
\]
Proof. For any $f \in A^p(\mathbb{B}^n)$ with $f(0) = 1$ we have

$$1 = |f(0)|^p \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{B}^n|} \int_{\mathbb{B}^n} |f|^p,$$

while for $f_0 \equiv 1$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^n} |f_0|^p = |\mathbb{B}^n| \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}^n} |f|^p.$$

Thus $f_0$ is a minimizer at 0, so that

$$m_p(\cdot, 0) = f_0(\cdot) \equiv 1,$$

and

$$K_p(\cdot, 0) = \frac{m_p(\cdot, 0)}{m_p(0)^p} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{B}^n|} = \frac{n!}{\pi^n}.$$

For $a \in \Delta$ we set $w_a := (a, 0')$. Consider the following automorphism of $\mathbb{B}^n$

$$F_a : z \mapsto \left( \frac{z_1 - a}{1 - \bar{a}z_1}, \frac{\sqrt{1 - |a|^2} z'}{1 - \bar{a}z_1} \right).$$

A straightforward calculation shows

$$J_{F_a}(z) = \frac{1 - |a|^2}{{1 - \bar{a}z_1}^{n+1}}, \quad J_{F_a}(w_a) = (1 - |a|^2)^{n+1}.$$

It follows that

$$K_p(z, w_a) = K_p(z, F_a^{-1}(0)) = \frac{n!}{\pi^n} \left(1 - |a|^2\right)^{n+1} (1 - \bar{a}z_1)^{2(n+1)} (1 - \langle z, w_a \rangle)^{2(n+1)}.$$

For general $w \in \mathbb{B}^n$ we take a unitary transformation $U$ with $U(w) = (|w|, 0')$. Thus

$$K_p(z, w) = \frac{n!}{\pi^n} \left(1 - |U(w)|^2\right)^{n+1} (1 - \langle z, w \rangle)^{2(n+1)}.$$

This proposition combined with the product rule gives
Proposition 2.9. For the unit polydisc $\Delta^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ we have

\begin{equation}
K_p(z, w) = K_{\Delta^n, p}(z, w) = \frac{1}{\pi^n} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(1 - |w_j|^{2})^{\frac{q}{p}} - 2}{(1 - w_j \overline{z})^{\frac{q}{p}}}. \tag{2.11}
\end{equation}

Proposition 2.10. (1) Both $m_p(z)$ and $K_p(z)$ are locally Lipschitz continuous for $p > 0$.

(2) Both $m_p(z, w)$ and $K_p(z, w)$ are continuous in $(z, w)$ for $p \geq 1$.

Proof. (1) Let $S$ be a compact set in $\Omega$ and $z \in S$. Take $f \in A^p(\Omega)$ with $\|f\|_p = 1$ such that $|f(z)|^p = K_p(z)$. It follows from Cauchy’s estimates that for any $w \in S$,

$$K_p(z)^{1/p} = |f(z)| \leq |f(w)| + C_S|z - w| \leq K_p(w)^{1/p} + C_S|z - w|,$$

i.e., $K_p(z)^{1/p}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in $z$, so are $K_p(z)$ and $m_p(z)$.

(2) It suffices to verify continuity of $m_p(z, w)$. Let $z_0, w_0 \in \Omega$ be fixed. We first verify that

\begin{equation}
\lim_{w \to w_0} m_p(z_0, w) = m_p(z_0, w_0). \tag{2.12}
\end{equation}

Let $w_j \to w_0$. Since

$$\int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, w_j)|^p = m_p(w_j)^p = \frac{1}{K_p(w_j)} \leq |\Omega|,$$

so $\{m_p(\cdot, w_j)\}$ forms a normal family so that there exists a subsequence $\{m_p(\cdot, w_{jk})\}$ converging locally uniformly to a function $f_0 \in O(\Omega)$. Fatou’s lemma yields

$$\int_{\Omega} |f_0|^p \leq \liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, w_{jk})|^p = \liminf_{k \to \infty} m_p(w_{jk})^p = m_p(w_0)^p.$$

On the other hand, Cauchy’s estimates yield

$$\frac{|m_p(w_0, w_{jk}) - m_p(w_{jk}, w_{jk})|}{|w_0 - w_{jk}|} \leq C \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, w_{jk})| \leq C||m_p(\cdot, w_{jk})||_p |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C|\Omega|$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $C$ depends only on $w_0$. We then have

$$f_0(w_0) = \lim_{k \to \infty} m_p(w_0, w_{jk}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} m_p(w_{jk}, w_{jk}) = 1,$$

so that $f_0 = m_p(\cdot, w_0)$ by uniqueness of the minimizer. Consequently,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} m_p(z_0, w_{jk}) = m_p(z_0, w_0).$$

Since the sequence $\{w_j\}$ can be chosen arbitrarily, we get (2.12). Finally,

$$|m_p(z, w) - m_p(z_0, w_0)| \leq |m_p(z, w) - m_p(z_0, w)| + |m_p(z_0, w) - m_p(z_0, w_0)|$$

$$\leq C_0|\Omega||z - z_0| + |m_p(z_0, w) - m_p(z_0, w_0)|$$

$$\to 0$$

as $z \to z_0$ and $w \to w_0$. \qed
2.3. A reproducing formula. Throughout this subsection we always assume that \( p \geq 1 \).

**Lemma 2.11.** For any \( f \in A^p(\Omega) \) with \( f(z) = 0 \), we have

\[
\int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} m_p(\cdot, z) f = 0. 
\]

**Proof.** We will use the calculus of variations. For fixed \( f \) we consider the family

\[
f_t = m_p(\cdot, z) + tf \in A^p(\Omega), \quad t \in \mathbb{C}.
\]

Since \( f_t(z) = 1 \), we see that the function \( J(t) := \|f_t\|_p^p \) attains the minimum at \( t = 0 \). Rewrite

\[
|f_t|^p = \left( |m_p(\cdot, z)|^2 + tf \overline{m_p(\cdot, z)} + t f m_p(\cdot, z) + |t|^2 |f|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}.
\]

Since

\[
\frac{\partial |f_t|^p}{\partial t} = \frac{p}{2} |f_t|^{p-2} \overline{f_t} f,
\]

we have

\[
\left| \frac{\partial |f_t|^p}{\partial t} \right| = \frac{p}{2} |f_t|^{p-1} |f| \leq \frac{p}{2} |f| (|m_p(\cdot, z)| + |f|)^{p-1} =: \phi
\]

whenever \( |t| \leq 1 \). Analogously, we may verify that

\[
\left| \frac{\partial |f_t|^p}{\partial t} \right| \leq \phi.
\]

Note that

\[
\int_{\Omega} \phi \leq \frac{p}{2} \|f\|_p^p \|m_p(\cdot, z)| + |f||_p^{p-1} < \infty
\]

in view of Hölder’s inequality when \( p > 1 \). The inequality for \( p = 1 \) is clearly trivial. It then follows from the dominated convergence theorem that

\[
0 = \frac{\partial J}{\partial t}(0) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial |f_t|^p}{\partial t} \bigg{|}_{t=0} = \frac{p}{2} \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} m_p(\cdot, z) f,
\]

i.e., (2.13) holds. \( \square \)

Now we reach the following fundamental fact.

**Theorem 2.12** (Reproducing formula). For any \( f \in A^p(\Omega) \) we have

\[
f(z) = m_p(z)^{-p} \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} \overline{m_p(\cdot, z)} f = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} \overline{K_p(\cdot, z)} f.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( f \in A^p(\Omega) \). With \( f \) replaced by \( f - f(z) \) in (2.13), we obtain

\[
\int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} m_p(\cdot, z) f = f(z) \cdot \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} \overline{m_p(\cdot, z)}.
\]

Substitute \( f = m_p(\cdot, z) \) into (2.15), we obtain

\[
m_p(z)^p = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} \overline{m_p(\cdot, z)}.
\]

This combined with (2.15) yields (2.14). \( \square \)
Let us present a few simple consequences of Theorem 2.12.

**Proposition 2.13.** Given two distinct points \( z, w \in \Omega \), \( m_p(\cdot, z) \) and \( m_p(\cdot, w) \) are not parallel, i.e., \( m_p(\cdot, z) \neq cm_p(\cdot, w) \) for any \( c \in \mathbb{C} \).

**Proof.** Suppose on the contrary that \( m_p(\cdot, z) = cm_p(\cdot, w) \) for some complex number \( c \). It follows from Theorem 2.12 that for any \( f \in AP(\Omega) \),

\[
    f(z) = m_p(z)^{-p} \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} m_p(\cdot, z) f \\
    = m_p(z)^{-p} |c|^{p-2} \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{p-2} m_p(\cdot, w) f \\
    = |m_p(w)/m_p(z)|^p |c|^{p-2} f(w).
\]

On the other hand,

\[
    m_p(z)^p = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p = |c|^p \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, w)|^p = |c|^p m_p(w)^p.
\]

Thus we have \( f(z) = f(w)/c \). But this is absurd since one can choose \( f \in AP(\Omega) \) with \( f(z) = 0 \) and \( f(w) \neq 0 \).

**Problem 2.** Let \( w_1, \ldots, w_m \) be different points in \( \Omega \). Is it possible to conclude that \( m_p(\cdot, w_1), \ldots, m_p(\cdot, w_m) \) are linearly independent?

**Proposition 2.14.** We have

\begin{align}
    |m_p(z, w)| & \leq m_p(w)/m_p(z) & (2.16) \\
    |K_p(z, w)| & \leq K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{p}} K_p(w)^{\frac{1}{q}} & (2.17)
\end{align}

where \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \), and equality holds if and only if \( z = w \).

**Proof.** Substitute \( f = m_p(\cdot, w) \) into (2.14), we obtain

\[
    |m_p(z, w)| = m_p(z)^{-p} \left| \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} m_p(\cdot, z) m_p(\cdot, w) \right| \\
    \leq m_p(z)^{-p} m_p(z)^{p-1} m_p(w) \quad \text{(Hölder’s inequality)} \\
    = m_p(w)/m_p(z).
\]

Clearly, equality holds if \( z = w \). On the other hand, if equality in (2.16) holds then there exists \( r > 0 \) such that

\[
    |m_p(\cdot, w)|^p = r \left( |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} |m_p(\cdot, z)| \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} = r |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p. \\
    \text{(2.18)}
\]

Set \( h := m_p(\cdot, z)/m_p(\cdot, w) \) and \( S_w := \{ m_p(\cdot, w) = 0 \} \). Since \( m_p(w, w) = 1 \), it follows that \( S_w \) is an analytic hypersurface of \( \Omega \) and \( h \) is holomorphic on \( \Omega \setminus S_w \). By (2.18), we see that \( |h| \) is a constant on \( \Omega \setminus S_w \). Thus \( h \) has to be a constant, i.e., \( m_p(\cdot, z) = cm_p(\cdot, w) \) for some complex number \( c \) on \( \Omega \setminus S_w \). By continuity, the same equality holds on \( \Omega \), so that \( z = w \) in view of Proposition 2.13.
Proposition 2.15. For fixed \( z \in \Omega \), \( m_p(z, \cdot) \neq \text{const} \).

Proof. Note that
\[
|m_p(z, w)| \leq m_p(w)/m_p(z) = K_p(w)^{-\frac{1}{p}} m_p(z)^{-1}.
\]
Since \( \Omega \) is bounded, there exists a ball \( B \supset \Omega \) such that \( \partial \Omega \cap \partial B \neq \emptyset \). For any \( w_0 \in \partial \Omega \cap \partial B \), we have
\[
K_{\Omega, p}(w) \geq K_{B, p}(w) \to \infty \quad (w \to w_0),
\]
which implies \( m_p(z, w) \to 0 \) as \( w \to w_0 \). On the other hand, we have \( m_p(z, z) = 1 \). Thus \( m_p(z, \cdot) \neq \text{const} \). \( \square \)

Problem 3. Is it possible to conclude that \( m_p(z, \cdot) \) can not be locally constant?

2.4. An application to properly discontinuous groups. For a domain \( \Omega \subset \subset \mathbb{C}^n \) we denote by \( \text{Aut}(\Omega) \) the group of holomorphic automorphisms of \( \Omega \). A subgroup \( G \) of \( \text{Aut}(\Omega) \) is said to be properly discontinuous if for every compact set \( S \subset \subset \Omega \) there are only a finite number of elements \( g \in G \) with \( S \cap g(S) \neq \emptyset \). A well-known result of H. Cartan states that \( \Omega/G \) is a complex space if \( G \) is properly discontinuous.

Let \( L(G_z) \) denote the set of limit points of \( G_z := \{ g(z) : g \in G \} \). Set
\[
L(G) := \bigcup_{z \in G} L(G_z).
\]
Since \( G \) is properly discontinuous, we have \( L(G) \subset \partial \Omega \).

Proposition 2.16. Let \( \Omega \subset \subset \mathbb{C}^n \) be a bounded simply-connected domain and \( G \subset \text{Aut}(\Omega) \) a properly discontinuous group. For any \( 0 < p < \infty \) and any \( w \in L(G) \), there exists \( f \in A^p(\Omega) \) such that
\[
\limsup_{z \to w} |f(z)| = \infty.
\]

Proof. By a classical result of Poincaré-Siegel (cf. \[31\]) we know that
\[
(2.19) \quad \sum_{g \in G} |J_g(z)|^2 < \infty, \quad \forall z \in \Omega.
\]
Take \( z_0 \in \Omega \) and \( \{g_j\} \subset \Gamma \) such that \( z_j := g_j(z_0) \to w \). By Proposition 2.6 we have
\[
K_p(z_0) = K_p(z_j)|J_{g_j}(z_0)|^2,
\]
so that
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_p(z_0)}{K_p(z_j)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |J_{g_j}(z)|^2 < \infty
\]
in view of \((2.19)\), which implies
\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} K_p(z_j) = \infty.
\]
Suppose on the contrary that
\[
\sup_j |f(z_j)| < \infty, \quad \forall f \in A^p(\Omega).
\]
By the Bergman inequality, we see that the continuous linear functional
\[ F_j : f \in A^p(\Omega) \mapsto f(z_j) \]
satisfies \( \sup_j |F_j(f)| < \infty \), so that \( \sup_j \|F_j\| < \infty \) in view of the Banach-Steinhaus theorem. Since
\[ \|F_j\| = \sup_{f \in A^p(\Omega)} \frac{|f(z_j)|}{\|f\|_p} = K_p(z_j)^{1/p}, \]
we obtain \( \sup_j K_p(z_j) < \infty \), a contradiction! \( \square \)

**Corollary 2.17.** For any neighborhood \( U \) of \( w \in L(G) \), the Hausdorff dimension of \( \partial \Omega \cap U \) is no less than \( 2n - 1 \).

*Proof.* Suppose on the contrary that there exist \( \alpha < 2n - 1 \) and a neighborhood \( U \) of \( w \) such that
\[ \Lambda_{\alpha}(\partial \Omega \cap U) = 0, \]
where \( \Lambda_{\alpha} \) means the \( \alpha \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure. It follows that \( \partial \Omega \cap U \) is a polar set, so that \( D := U \setminus \partial \Omega \) is connected and \( D \subset \Omega \). Since \( K_{D,p}(z) \geq K_{\Omega,p}(z) \) for \( z \in D \), we infer from the proof of Proposition 2.16 that
\[ \lim_{z \to w} K_{D,p}(z) = \infty, \quad \forall 0 < p < \infty. \]
On the other hand, thanks to a theorem on removable singularity due to Harvey-Polking [19], we have \( A^p(D) = A^p(U) \) for \( p = \frac{2n-\alpha}{2n-\alpha-1} \), so that
\[ \lim_{z \to w} K_{D,p}(z) < \infty, \]
a contradiction! \( \square \)

Let \( w \in L(G) \). We would like to ask the following

**Problem 4.** Does there exist \( f \in A^\infty(\Omega) \) which can not be extended holomorphically across \( w \)?

**Problem 5.** Is it possible to conclude that \( \Lambda_{2n-1}(\partial \Omega \cap U) > 0 \) for any neighborhood \( U \) of \( w \)?

2.5. **The \( p \)-Bergman metric.** For \( X = \sum_j X_j \partial/\partial z_j \) we define the \( p \)-Bergman metric to be
\[ B_p(z;X) := K_p(z)^{-1} \sup_f |Xf(z)| \]
where the supremum is taken over all \( f \in A^p(\Omega) \) with \( f(z) = 0 \) and \( \|f\|_p = 1 \). Note that \( B_2(z;X) \) is the standard Bergman metric. A normal family argument shows that the "sup" in (2.20) can be replaced by "max". For the sake of convenience, we set
\[ \mathcal{M}_p(z;X) := \sup \{ |Xf(z)| : f \in A^p(\Omega), f(z) = 0, \|f\|_p = 1 \} \]
and define \( \mathcal{M}_p(\cdot,z;X) \) to be the maximizer of (2.21), i.e., \( \mathcal{M}_{\Omega,p}(z;X) = X \mathcal{M}_p(\cdot,z;X) \).

**Proposition 2.18.** Let \( F : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2 \) be a biholomorphic mapping between bounded simply-connected domains. Then
\[ B_{\Omega_1,p}(z;X) = B_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z);F_*X). \]
Moreover, (2.22) holds for arbitrary bounded domains whenever \( 2/p \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \).
Proof. By Proposition 2.6, it suffices to verify
\[ \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_1,p}(z; X) = \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z); F_*X)|J_F(z)|^{2/p}. \]
If \( f_2 \) is a test function for \( \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z); F_*X) \), then \( f_1 := f_2 \circ F \cdot J_F^{2/p} \) is a test function for \( \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_1,p}(z; X) \). Then we have
\[ |X(f_2 \circ F)(z) \cdot J_F(z)^{2/p}| = |Xf_1(z)| \leq \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_1,p}(z; X). \]
Take supremum over \( f_2 \in A^p(\Omega_2) \), we get
\[ \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_2,p}(F(z); F_*X)|J_F(z)|^{2/p} \leq \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_1,p}(z; X). \]
Consider \( F^{-1} \) instead of \( F \), we get the inverse inequality. \( \square \)

**Proposition 2.19.** For the unit ball \( \mathbb{B}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n \) we have

\[
(2.23) \quad B_p(z; X) = c_{n,p} \left( \frac{|X|^2}{1 - |z|^2} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n |z_j X_j|^2}{(1 - |z|^2)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]
where
\[
c_{n,p} = (\pi^n/n!)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(0)|}{\|z_1 f\|_p} : f \in A^p(\mathbb{B}^n) \right\}.
\]

**Proof.** For \( z \in \mathbb{B}^n \) we take an automorphism \( F \) of \( \mathbb{B}^n \) such that \( F(z) = 0 \). By (2.22), we have
\[
\frac{B_p(z; X)}{B_2(z; X)} = \frac{B_p(0; F_*X)}{B_2(0; F_*X)}.
\]
It suffices to compute the ratio \( B_p(0; X)/B_2(0; X) \). After a unitary transformation, we may assume \( X = |X| \partial/\partial z_1 \). Since every \( f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) \) with \( f(0) = 0 \) admits a decomposition \( f(z) = \sum_j z_j f_j(z) \) for certain \( f_j \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) \), we obtain
\[
B_p(0; X) = \frac{|X|}{K_p(0)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \cdot \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(0)|}{\|z_1 f\|_p} : f \in A^p(\mathbb{B}^n) \right\}.
\]
Since \( K_p(0) = n!/\pi^n \) and \( B_2(0; X) = (n + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}|X| \), we obtain (2.23). \( \square \)

**Problem 6.** What is the product rule for \( B_p \)?

Recall that the Carathéodory metric is defined by
\[
C(z; X) = C_{\Omega}(z; X) := \sup \left\{ |X f(z)| : f \in A^\infty(\Omega), f(z) = 0, \|f\|_\infty = 1 \right\}.
\]

**Proposition 2.20.** \( B_p(z; X) \geq C(z; X) \).

**Proof.** Take \( h \in A^p(\Omega) \) and \( f \in A^\infty(\Omega) \) with \( f(z) = 0 \) and \( \|f\|_\infty = 1 \). Set \( g = f \cdot h \). Then we have \( g(z) = 0, \|g\|_p \leq \|h\|_p \) and
\[
|Xg(z)| = |Xf(z)| \cdot |h(z)|,
\]
so that
\[
\mathcal{M}_p(z; X) \geq \frac{|Xg(z)|}{\|g\|_p} \geq \frac{|Xf(z)| \cdot |h(z)|}{\|h\|_p}.
\]
Take supremum over \( f \) and \( h \), we immediately get the desired conclusion. \( \square \)
**Proposition 2.21.** \( \lim_{p \to \infty} B_p(z; X) = C(z; X). \)

**Proof.** Take a sequence \( p_j \to \infty \) such that
\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} B_{p_j}(z; X) = \limsup_{p \to \infty} B_p(z; X).
\]
We also choose \( f_j \in A^{p_j}(\Omega) \) with \( \|f_j\|_{p_j} = 1, f_j(z) = 0 \) and
\[
B_{p_j}(z; X) = |X f_j(z)| / K_{p_j}(z)^{1/p_j}
\]
for every \( j \). Since
\[
|f_j(\zeta)|^{p_j} \leq C_n \delta(\zeta)^{-2n},
\]
it follows that \( \{f_j\} \) forms a normal family, so that there is a subsequence \( \{f_{j_k}\} \) converging locally uniformly to some \( f_\infty \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) \) which satisfies \( f_\infty(z) = 0 \) and for any \( \zeta \in \Omega, \)
\[
|f_\infty(\zeta)| = \lim_{k \to \infty} |f_{j_k}(\zeta)| \leq 1
\]
in view of (2.24). Since \( \lim_{p \to \infty} K_p(z)^{1/p} = 1 \) in view of (2.5), we have
\[
C(z; X) \geq |X f_\infty(z)| = \lim_{k \to \infty} |X f_{j_k}(z)| \cdot \lim_{k \to \infty} K_{p_{j_k}}(z)^{-1/p_{j_k}} = \lim_{k \to \infty} B_{p_{j_k}}(z; X) = \limsup_{p \to \infty} B_p(z; X).
\]
This combined with Proposition 2.20 yields the conclusion. \( \square \)

**Remark.** We may define the \((p, q)\)-Bergman metric by
\[
B_{p,q}(z; X) := K_q(z)^{-1/p} \cdot \sup_f |X f(z)|
\]
where the supremum is taken over all \( f \in A^p(\Omega) \) with \( f(z) = 0 \) and \( \|f\|_p = 1 \). Analogously, we may verify that
\[
B_{\Omega_1, p,q}(z; X) = B_{\Omega_2, p,q}(F(z); F_* X)
\]
for any biholomorphic mapping \( F : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2 \) between bounded simply-connected domains.

3. **Zeroes of \( K_2(z, w) \) and non real-analyticity of \( K_p(z) \)**

**Proposition 3.1.** If \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{r} \), then
\[
(3.1) \quad m_r(z) \leq m_p(z) \cdot m_q(z)
\]
\[
(3.2) \quad K_r(z)^{\frac{1}{r}} \geq K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot K_q(z)^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\]

**Proof.** It suffices to verify (3.1). Take two holomorphic functions \( f_p \) and \( f_q \) on \( \Omega \) with \( f_p(z) = f_q(z) = 1 \) and
\[
\|f_p\|_p = m_p(z), \quad \|f_q\|_q = m_q(z).
\]
Set \( f_r := f_p f_q \). Then \( f_r \) is a holomorphic function on \( \Omega \) satisfying \( f_r(z) = 1 \) and Hölder’s inequality gives
\[
\|f\|_r \leq \|f_p\|_p \cdot \|f_q\|_q = m_p(z) \cdot m_q(z).
\]
By definition of \( m_r(z) \) we immediately get (3.1). \( \square \)
Proposition 3.2. Let $p \geq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We have $K_p(z) = K_{pk}(z)$ if and only if $m_p(\cdot, z) = m_{pk}(\cdot, z)^k$.

Proof. Suppose $K_p(z) = K_{pk}(z)$. Since $f_k := m_{pk}(\cdot, z)^k$ is a holomorphic function satisfying $f_k(z) = 1$ and

$$\int_{\Omega} |f_k|^p = \int_{\Omega} |m_{pk}(\cdot, z)|^{pk} = m_{pk}(z)^{pk},$$

it follows from uniqueness of the minimizer that $f_k = m_p(\cdot, z)$.

The other direction follows from

$$m_p(z)^p = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p = \int_{\Omega} |m_{pk}(\cdot, z)|^{pk} = m_{pk}(z)^{pk}.$$  \hfill \Box

Proposition 3.3. Suppose that $\Omega$ is a bounded simply-connected domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $m_p(\cdot, z)$ is zero-free for some $p \geq 1$ and $z \in \Omega$. Then

(1) $K_s(z) = K_p(z)$ for any $s \geq p$.

(2) $m_s(\cdot, z) = m_p(\cdot, z)^{p/s}$ for any $s \geq p$.

Proof. (1) By the hypothesis we may define $f_{p,s} := m_p(\cdot, z)^{\frac{p}{s}} \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ with $f_{p,s}(z) = 1$. Since

$$\int_{\Omega} |f_{p,s}|^s = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p = m_p(z)^p,$$

we have

$$K_s(z) \geq \frac{|f_{p,s}(z)|^s}{\|f_{p,s}\|^s} = \frac{1}{m_p(z)^p} = K_p(z).$$

On the other hand, Proposition 3.1 yields that if $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{t} = \frac{1}{p}$ then

$$K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{t}} \geq K_s(z)^{\frac{1}{t}} \cdot K_t(z)^{\frac{1}{t}} \geq K_s(z)^{\frac{1}{t}} \cdot K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{t}}$$

in view of (3.3) since $t \geq p$. Thus we get $K_p(z) \geq K_s(z)$.

(2) Note that $f_{p,s} \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ satisfies $f_{p,s}(z) = 1$ and

$$\int_{\Omega} |f_{p,s}|^s = m_p(z)^p = m_s(z)^s.$$  \hfill \Box

An immediate consequence is

Corollary 3.4. Let $\Omega$ be a bounded simply-connected domain. If $K_p(z) \neq K_{2p}(z)$ for some $p > 2$ and $z \in \Omega$, then $K_2(\cdot, z)$ has zeroes.
For a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ we set

$$\mathcal{F}(\Omega) := \{z \in \Omega : K_2(\cdot, z) \text{ is zero-free}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(\Omega) := \Omega \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Omega).$$

Since $K_2(\zeta, z) = K_2(z, \zeta)$, we conclude that if $K_2(\zeta, z) = 0$ then $\zeta, z \in \mathcal{N}(\Omega)$.

**Proposition 3.5.** $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)$ is a closed subset and $\mathcal{N}(\Omega)$ is an open subset.

**Proof.** Suppose on the contrary that $\mathcal{N}(\Omega)$ is not open, i.e., there exist $z_0 \in \mathcal{N}(\Omega)$ and a sequence of points $\{z_j\} \subset \mathcal{F}(\Omega)$ such that $z_j \to z_0$ as $j \to \infty$. Since $K_2(\cdot, z_j) \to K_2(\cdot, z_0)$, it follows from Hurwitz’s theorem that either $z_0 \in \mathcal{F}(\Omega)$ or $K_2(\cdot, z_0) \equiv 0$. The latter cannot happen since $K_2(z_0, z_0) > 0$. Thus we get a contradiction. □

For a set $E$ we denote by $E^o$ the set of inner points of $E$. Then we have

**Theorem 3.6.** Let $\Omega$ be a bounded simply-connected domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that both $\mathcal{N}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)^o$ are nonempty. Then the following properties hold:

1. There exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $K_{2k}(z)$ is not real-analytic in $\Omega$ for any integer $k \geq k_0$.
2. Suppose furthermore that there exists $\zeta_0, z_0 \in \mathcal{N}(\Omega)$ with $\ord_{z_0} K_2(\zeta_0, \cdot) = 1$. Then $K_{2k}(z)$ is not real-analytic in $\Omega$ for any integer $k \geq 2$. Moreover, either $\Re m_p(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ or $\Im m_p(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ cannot be real-analytic in $\Omega$ for any rational $p > 2$.

**Proof.** (1) By Proposition 3.3, we have $K_{2k}(z) = K_2(z)$ for any $z \in \mathcal{F}(\Omega)$. Suppose on the contrary that $K_{2k}(z)$ is real-analytic in $\Omega$. Then $K_{2k}(z) = K_2(z)$ for any $z \in \Omega$ by the uniqueness theorem for real-analytic functions since $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)^o \neq \emptyset$. It then follows from Proposition 3.2 that

$$m_2(\cdot, z) = m_{2k}(\cdot, z)^k, \quad \forall z \in \Omega.$$

Take $\zeta_0, z_0 \in \mathcal{N}(\Omega)$ so that $K_2(\zeta_0, z_0) = 0$. Then $m_2(\zeta_0, z_0) = 0$, which implies $m_{2k}(\zeta_0, z_0) = 0$. Set $k'_0 := \ord_{z_0} K_2(\zeta_0, \cdot) = \ord_{z_0} m_2(\zeta_0, \cdot)$. Since $K_2(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ is holomorphic and not identically zero, we conclude that $k'_0 < \infty$. Since $m_{2k}(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ is locally $\frac{1}{2}$-Hölder continuous in view of Theorem 4.7 in the next section, we see that for $k \geq k_0 := 2k'_0 + 1$,

$$\ord_{z_0} m_2(\zeta_0, \cdot) < \ord_{z_0} m_{2k}(\zeta_0, \cdot)^k,$$

which is contradictory to (3.4).

(2) For any $k > 2$, we have

$$\ord_{z_0} m_2(\zeta_0, \cdot) = 1 < \ord_{z_0} m_{2k}(\zeta_0, \cdot)^k,$$

so that the first assertion follows analogously as (1). For the second assertion we write $p = k/l$ for $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. By Proposition 3.3, we have $K_p(z) = K_2(z)$ and $m_p(\zeta_0, z)^k = m_2(\zeta_0, z)^2l$ for any $z \in \mathcal{F}(\Omega)$. Suppose on the other contrary that both $\Re m_p(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ and $\Im m_p(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ are real-analytic in $\Omega$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)^o \neq \emptyset$, it follows from the uniqueness theorem for real-analytic functions that

$$m_p(\zeta_0, z)^k = m_2(\zeta_0, z)^2l, \quad \forall z \in \Omega.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\ord_{z_0} m_2(\zeta_0, \cdot)^{2l} = 2l < k \leq \ord_{z_0} m_{2k}(\zeta_0, \cdot)^k$$

since $m_{2k}(\zeta_0, \cdot)$ is real-analytic, which is a contradiction. □
**Remark.** Actually we have proved a stronger conclusion that $K_{2k}(z) - K_2(z)$ does not enjoy the unique continuation property, i.e., it vanishes identically if it vanishes on a nonempty open subset. There are plenty of non real-analytic functions which still verify the unique continuation property.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let $\Omega$ be a bounded complete Reinhardt domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$B_\varepsilon(0) := \{ z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z| < \varepsilon \} \subset \mathcal{F}(\Omega).$$

**Proof.** Note that

$$K_2(z, w) = \sum_\alpha a_\alpha z^\alpha \bar{w}^\alpha, \quad a_\alpha = 1/\int_\Omega |z|^{\alpha}|^2.$$

Take $r \ll 1$ so that $B_r(0) \subset \Omega$. The series expansion above implies that

$$K_2(z, w) = K_2(rz, w/r), \quad \forall z \in \Omega, \ w \in B_{r^2}(0)$$

(this observation is essentially due to S. R. Bell). Thus for $r \ll 1$ there exists a constant $C_r > 0$ such that

$$|K_2(z, w)| \leq C_r, \quad \forall z \in \Omega, \ w \in B_{r^2}(0),$$

and Cauchy’s estimates gives

$$|K_2(z, 0) - K_2(z, w)| \leq C_r |w|, \quad \forall z \in \Omega, \ w \in B_{r^2/2}(0).$$

Since $K_2(z, 0) = 1/|\Omega|$, it follows that if $\varepsilon$ is sufficiently small then $K_2(z, w) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \Omega$ and $w \in B_{\varepsilon}(0)$, i.e., $B_{\varepsilon}(0) \subset \mathcal{F}(\Omega)$. □

**Remark.** Since complete Reinhardt domains are always simply-connected, we see that Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 3.6 and Proposition 3.7.

Finally we will show that the following Thullen-type domain

$$\Omega = \left\{ (z_1, z_2) : |z_1| + |z_2|^{2/\alpha} < 1 \right\}$$

verifies the hypothesis of Theorem 3.6(2) for every $\alpha > 2$. It is known from (9) in [7] that

$$K_2((z_1^2, 0), (w_1^2, 0)) = \frac{1}{4\alpha \pi^2 x} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} \left[ \frac{1}{(1-x)^{\alpha}} - \frac{1}{(1+x)^{\alpha}} \right]$$

$$= \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{4\alpha \pi^2 x} \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{(1-x)^{\alpha+2}} - \frac{1}{(1+x)^{\alpha+2}} \right]$$

when $x := z_1 w_1 \neq 0$. It is easy to see that if $\alpha > 2$ then equation

$$\frac{1}{(1-x)^{\alpha+2}} = \frac{1}{(1+x)^{\alpha+2}}$$

has a solution with $0 < |x| < 1$ if

$$\frac{1}{1-x} = e^{2\pi i/(\alpha+2)} \frac{1}{1+x}, \quad \text{i.e., } \ x = \frac{e^{2\pi i/(\alpha+2)} - 1}{e^{2\pi i/(\alpha+2)} + 1} =: x_\alpha.$$
Note that the function $\eta(x) := (1 - x)^{-\alpha - 2} - (1 + x)^{-\alpha - 2}$ satisfies

$$\eta'(x_\alpha) = (\alpha + 2) \left[ \frac{1}{(1 - x_\alpha)^{\alpha + 3}} + \frac{1}{(1 + x_\alpha)^{\alpha + 3}} \right]$$

$$= \frac{\alpha + 2}{(1 + x_\alpha)^{\alpha + 3}} \left[ e^{2\pi i \frac{\alpha + 3}{\alpha + 2}} + 1 \right]$$

for $\alpha > 2$. Thus for $z_1, \alpha = \bar{w}_1, \alpha = \sqrt{x_\alpha}$ the order of $K_2((x_\alpha, 0), \cdot)$ at the point $(\bar{x}_\alpha, 0)$ equals 1.

4. Hölder Continuity of $m_p(z, \cdot)$ and $K_p(z, \cdot)$

Throughout this section we always assume that $p \geq 1$. Let us introduce a useful auxiliary function as follows

$$H_p(z, w) := K_p(z) + K_p(w) - \text{Re} \left\{ K_p(z, w) + K_p(w, z) \right\}.$$  

Clearly, $H_p(z, w) = H_p(w, z)$ and $H_p(z, z) = 0$. Moreover, we have

**Proposition 4.1.** For every compact set $S \subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|H_p(z, w)| \leq C|z - w|, \quad \forall z, w \in S.$$  

**Proof.** It suffices to verify

$$|K_p(z, w) - K_p(w)| \leq C|z - w|, \quad \forall z, w \in S.$$  

This follows from the fact that $K_p(\cdot, w)$ is holomorphic and uniformly bounded in a small neighborhood of $S$ in view of (2.17). □

A less obvious observation is

**Theorem 4.2.** We have $H_p(z, w) \geq 0$ and equality holds if and only if $z = w$.

For the proof of Theorem 4.2 and the regularity results in the sequel, the following "elementary" inequalities play a key role.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. The following inequalities hold.

1. For $p \geq 2$ we have

$$\text{Re} \left\{ (|b|^{p-2}b - |a|^{p-2}a)(b - a) \right\}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2}(|b|^{p-2} + |a|^{p-2})|b - a|^2$$

$$\geq 2^{1-p}|b - a|^p;$$

2. For $1 \leq p \leq 2$ we have

$$\text{Re} \left\{ (|b|^{p-2}b - |a|^{p-2}a)(b - a) \right\}$$

$$\geq (p - 1)|b - a|^2(|a| + |b|)^{p-2}$$

$$+ (2 - p)|\text{Im}(a\bar{b})|^2(|a| + |b|)^{p-4};$$
(3) For $p > 2$ we have
\begin{equation}
|b|^p \geq |a|^p + p\text{Re}\left\{ |a|^{p-2}\bar{a}(b - a) \right\} + \frac{1}{4p+3}|b - a|^p;
\end{equation}

(4) For $1 < p \leq 2$ we have
\begin{equation}
|b|^p \geq |a|^p + p\text{Re}\left\{ |a|^{p-2}\bar{a}(b - a) \right\} + A_p|b - a|^2(|a| + |b|)^{p-2}
\end{equation}
where $A_p = \frac{8}{2} \min\{1, p - 1\};$

(5) For $p = 1$ we have
\begin{equation}
|b| \geq |a| + \text{Re}\left\{ |a|^{-1}\bar{a}(b - a) \right\} + A_1|\text{Im}(\bar{a}b)|^2(|a| + |b|)^{-3}
\end{equation}
where $A_1 > 0$ is some numerical constant.

These inequalities have their origins in nonlinear analysis of the $p-$Laplacian (see e.g., [23]). We will provide the proof in Appendix.

**Lemma 4.4.** For $p \geq 2$ we have
\begin{equation}
|m_p(z, w) - m_p(z, w')|^p \leq \frac{2^{p-1}K_p(z)}{K_p(w)K_p(w')} \cdot H_p(w, w') .
\end{equation}

**Proof.** Substitute at first $a = m_p(\cdot, w)$ and $b = m_p(\cdot, w')$ into (4.1) then take integration over $\Omega$, we obtain
\begin{align*}
2^{1-p} \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^p & \leq \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w')|^p - \text{Re} \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w')|^{p-2}m_p(\cdot, w') m_p(\cdot, w) \\
& + \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w)|^p - \text{Re} \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{p-2}m_p(\cdot, w) m_p(\cdot, w') \\
& = m_p(w')^p + m_p(w)^p - \text{Re} \left\{ m_p(w')^p m_p(w', w) + m_p(z)^p m_p(w, w') \right\} \\
& = \frac{H_p(w', w)}{K_p(w)K_p(w')} .
\end{align*}
where the first equality follows from the reproducing formula. Since
\begin{equation}
|m_p(z, w') - m_p(z, w)|^p \leq K_p(z) \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^p ,
\end{equation}
we immediately get (4.6).

**Lemma 4.5.** For $1 < p \leq 2$ we have
\begin{equation}
|m_p(z, w) - m_p(z, w')|^p \leq \frac{C_pK_p(z)}{K_p(w')K_p(w)} \left[ K_p(w') + K_p(w) \right]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} H_p(w, w')^{\frac{p}{2}}
\end{equation}
where $C_p = \frac{2(2p-1)}{2} / (p - 1)^{\frac{p}{2}}.$
Proof. Let \( f_1, f_2 \in A^p(\Omega) \). Hölder’s inequality yields

\[
\int_{\Omega} |f_2 - f_1|^p = \int_{\Omega} |f_2 - f_1|^p(|f_2| + |f_1|)^{p(p-2)/2}(|f_2| + |f_1|)^{p(2-p)/2} \\
\leq \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |f_2 - f_1|^2(|f_2| + |f_1|) \right\}^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} (|f_2| + |f_1|)^p \right\}^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \\
\leq \left\{ \frac{1}{p-1} \int_{\Omega} \text{Re} \left[ (|f_2|^{p-2}f_2 - |f_1|^{p-2}f_1)(f_2 - f_1) \right] \right\}^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} (|f_2| + |f_1|)^p \right\}^{\frac{1-p}{p}}
\]

in view of (4.2). Take \( f_2 = m_p(\cdot, w') \) and \( f_1 = m_p(\cdot, w) \), we obtain

\[
\int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^p \leq \left\{ \frac{1}{p-1} \frac{H_p(w', w)}{K_p(w')} \right\}^{\frac{p}{2}} \cdot \left\{ 2^{p-1} [m_p(w')^p + m_p(w)^p] \right\}^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \\
= \frac{C_p}{K_p(w')K_p(w)} [K_p(w') + K_p(w)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} H_p(w', w)^{\frac{p}{2}}.
\]

This combined with (4.7) gives (4.8). \( \square \)

Lemma 4.6.

\[
(4.9) \quad \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\text{Im}\{m_1(\cdot, w')m_1(\cdot, w)\}|^2}{(|m_1(\cdot, w')| + |m_1(\cdot, w)|)^3} \leq \frac{H_1(w, w')}{K_1(w')K_1(w)}.
\]

Proof. It suffices to take \( b = m_p(\cdot, w) \), \( a = m_p(\cdot, w') \) in (4.2) with \( p = 1 \), then take integration over \( \Omega \). \( \square \)

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Lemma 4.4–4.6 give \( H_p(z, w) \geq 0 \). Now suppose \( H_p(z, w) = 0 \). It follows from Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5 that \( m_p(\cdot, z) = m_p(\cdot, w) \) whenever \( p > 1 \), so that \( z = w \) in view of Proposition 2.13. It remains to deal with the case \( p = 1 \). Consider the following proper analytic subset in \( \Omega \)

\[
S_{z,w} := \{ m_p(\cdot, z) = 0 \} \cup \{ m_p(\cdot, w) = 0 \}.
\]

Let \( V \subset U \subset \subset \Omega \setminus S_{z,w} \) be two open sets. We take

\[
h := m_1(\cdot, z)/m_1(\cdot, w) \in \mathcal{O}(U).
\]

Since \( |\text{Im} h|^2 \) is subharmonic on \( U \), it follows from the mean-value inequality and Lemma 4.6 that for every \( \zeta \in V \)

\[
|\text{Im} h(\zeta)|^2 \leq \int_U |\text{Im} h|^2 = \int_U |\text{Im}\{m_1(\cdot, z)\overline{m_1(\cdot, w)}\}|^2 |m_1(\cdot, w)|^{-4} \\
\leq \frac{\int_U |\text{Im}\{m_1(\cdot, z)\overline{m_1(\cdot, w)}\}|^2}{\int_U (|m_1(\cdot, z)| + |m_1(\cdot, w)|)^3} \\
\leq \frac{H_1(z, w)}{K_1(z)K_1(w)} = 0.
\]
Since $V$ and $U$ can be arbitrarily chosen, we conclude that $\text{Im } h = 0$ on the domain $\Omega \setminus S_{z,w}$, so that $h = \text{const.}$, i.e., $m_p(\cdot, z) = cm_p(\cdot, w)$ holds on $\Omega \setminus S_{z,w}$ for some complex number $c$. By continuity, the same equality remains valid on $\Omega$, so that $z = w$ in view of Proposition 2.13. □

**Theorem 4.7.** For any $p > 1$ and any compact set $S \subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(4.10) \quad |m_p(z, w) - m_p(z, w')| \leq C|w - w'|^{1/2}, \quad \forall \ z, w, w' \in S.$$  

The same conclusion also holds for $K_p$.

**Proof.** It suffices to verify the conclusion for $m_p(z, w)$ since $K_p(z, w) = m_p(z, w)K_p(w)$ and $K_p(z)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. Lemma 4.5 together with Proposition 4.1 immediately yield (4.10) for $1 < p \leq 2$. Analogously, Lemma 4.4 combined with Proposition 4.1 gives

$$|m_p(z, w) - m_p(z, w')| \lesssim |w - w'|^{1/2}$$

for $p > 2$, which is weaker than (4.10), however. We have to adopt another approach. Substitute at first $a = m_p(\cdot, w)$ and $b = m_p(\cdot, w')$ into (4.1) then take integration over $\Omega$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega (|m_p(\cdot, w')|^{p-2} + |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{p-2})|m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^2 \leq \frac{2H_p(w, w')}{K_p(w')K_p(w)} \lesssim |w - w'|,$$

which implies

$$\int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{p-2}|m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^2 \lesssim |w - w'|.$$

Now fix an open set $U$ with $S \subset U \subset \subset \Omega$. Since $\{m_p(\cdot, w) : w \in S\}$ is a continuous family of holomorphic functions on $\Omega$ (in view of Proposition 2.13), it follows from the celebrated theorem of Demailly-Kollár [13] on semi-continuity of the complex singularity exponent that there exist positive constants $c = c(S)$ and $M = M(S)$ such that

$$\int_U |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{-c} \leq M, \quad \forall \ w \in S.$$  

Fix $\alpha := \frac{2c}{p-2+c} < 2$. By Hölder’s inequality, we have

$$\int_U |m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^\alpha \leq \left\{ \int_U |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{p-2}|m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^2 \right\}^{\alpha/2} \cdot \left\{ \int_U |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{-\frac{p-2+2\alpha}{2}} \right\}^{1-\alpha/2} \leq \left\{ \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{p-2}|m_p(\cdot, w') - m_p(\cdot, w)|^2 \right\}^{\alpha/2} \cdot \left\{ \int_U |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{-c} \right\}^{1-\alpha/2} \lesssim |w - w'|^{\alpha/2}.$$  

This combined with the mean-value inequality gives (4.10). □
Theorem 4.8. Let $S_w := \{m_1(\cdot, w) = 0\}$. For every open set $w \in U \subset \Omega \setminus S_w$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

\[(4.11) \quad |m_1(z, w) - m_1(z, w')| \leq C|w - w'|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall z, w' \in U.\]

The same conclusion also holds for $K_1$.

Proof. First of all, (4.9) implies

\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\text{Im}\{m_1(\cdot, w')m_1(\cdot, w)\}|^2}{|m_1(\cdot, w')| + |m_1(\cdot, w)|} \leq H_1(w', w) \lesssim |w - w'|.
\]

Take open sets $U', U''$ with $U \subset \subset U' \subset \subset U'' \subset \subset \Omega \setminus S_w$. It follows from the mean-value inequality that

\[
\sup_{U'} |\text{Im}\left\{ \frac{m_1(\cdot, w')}{m_1(\cdot, w)} \right\}| \lesssim \int_{U''} \left| \text{Im}\left\{ \frac{m_1(\cdot, w')}{m_1(\cdot, w)} \right\} \right|^2 \lesssim \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\text{Im}\{m_1(\cdot, w')m_1(\cdot, w)\}|^2}{|m_1(\cdot, w')| + |m_1(\cdot, w)|} \lesssim |w - w'|.
\]

Set $h := \frac{m_1(\cdot, w')}{m_1(\cdot, w)} - 1$. Then we have

\[
\sup_{U'} |\text{Im}\ h| \lesssim |w - w'|^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

To proceed the proof, we need the following cerebrated Borel-Carathéodory inequality

\[(4.12) \quad \sup_{\Delta_r} |f| \leq \frac{2r}{R - r} \sup_{\Delta_r} \text{Im} f + \frac{R + r}{R - r} |f(0)|\]

where $\Delta_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < r\}$ and $f \in O(\Delta_R)$ for some $R > r$. Take a ball $B_R(w) \subset \subset U'$. Apply (4.12) to every complex line through $w$, we obtain

\[
\sup_{B_{R/2}(w)} |h| \leq 2 \sup_{B_R(w)} \text{Im} h + 3|h(w)|.
\]

Note that

\[
|h(w)| = |m_1(w, w') - 1| = |m_1(w, w') - m_1(w', w')| \lesssim |w - w'|.
\]

Thus we obtain

\[
\sup_{B_{R/2}(w)} |h| \lesssim |w - w'|^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

Take a chain of balls connecting $w$ and $z$ and apply (4.12) analogously on each ball, we obtain

\[
|h(z)| \lesssim |w - w'|^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]

from which (4.11) immediately follows. \hfill \Box

Problem 7. Let $z \in \Omega$ be fixed. Are $m_1(z, \cdot)$ and $K_1(z, \cdot)$ locally $\frac{1}{2}$–Hölder continuous on $\Omega$?

Problem 8. What about the metric structure or analytic structure of the level set $\{m_p(z, \cdot) = c\}$ where $c \in \mathbb{C}$?
5. $B_p(z;X)$ AND $i\partial\bar{\partial} \log K_p(z;X)$

For a real-valued upper semicontinuous function $u$ defined on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, we define the generalized Levi form of $u$ by

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}u(z;X) := \liminf_{r \to 0^+} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(z + re^{i\theta}X)d\theta - u(z) \right\}$$

where we identify $X = \sum_j X_j \partial/\partial z_j$ with $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ for the sake of simplicity. Note that if $u$ is $C^2$ then $i\partial\bar{\partial}u(z;X)$ is the standard Levi form of $u$.

**Theorem 5.1.** For every $p \leq 2$ we have

$$i\partial\bar{\partial} \log K_p(z;X) \geq \frac{p}{2} C(z;X)^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)

We need the following simple fact.

**Lemma 5.2.** For every $p > 0$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p f = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.2)

for all $f \in A^\infty(\Omega)$ with $f(z) = 0$ and $\|f\|_\infty = 1$.

**Proof.** Given $f \in A^\infty(\Omega)$ with $f(z) = 0$ and $\|f\|_\infty = 1$, we define

$$f_t = m_p(\cdot, z)(1 + tf), \quad t \in \mathbb{C}.$$  \hspace{1cm}  

Clearly, $f_t$ belongs to $A^p(\Omega)$ and satisfies $f_t(z) = 1$. We then have

$$m_p(z)^p \leq \int_{\Omega} |f_t|^p = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p \left( 1 + 2Re\{tf\} + |t|^2|f|^2 \right)^{p/2}$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p \left( 1 + pRe\{tf\} + O(|t|^2) \right)$$

$$= m_p(z)^p + pRe \left\{ t \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p f \right\} + O(|t|^2)$$

as $t \to 0$. Take $t = se^{-i\arg f_0}|m_p(\cdot, z)|^p f$ with $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we immediately get (5.2). \hfill \Box

**Proof of Theorem 5.1** Fix $r > 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ for a moment. For $t \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|t| = O(r)$ and $f \in A^\infty(\Omega)$ with $f(z) = 0$ and $\|f\|_\infty = 1$ we define $f_t = m_p(\cdot, z)(1 + tf)$ as above. We have

$$|f_t(z + re^{i\theta}X)|^p = |m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z)|^p |1 + tf(z + re^{i\theta}X)|^p$$

$$= |m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z)|^p |1 + tre^{i\theta}X f(z) + O(r^3)|^p$$

$$= |m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z)|^p \left( 1 + pRe \left\{ tre^{i\theta}X f(z) \right\} + O(r^3) \right)$$

$$\geq (1 + pRe \left\{ tre^{i\theta}X f(z) \right\})$$
and
\[
\|f_i\|_p^p = \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p \left(1 + 2\Re\{tf\} + |tf|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
= \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^p \left(1 + p\Re\{tf\} + \frac{p(p-2)}{2}(|\Re\{tf\}|^2 + O(r^3))\right) \\
\leq m_p(z)^p \left(1 + \frac{p|t|^2}{2} + O(r^3)\right)
\]
for \(p \leq 2\), in view of Lemma 5.2.

Take \(t = \varepsilon re^{-i\theta}Xf(z)\) where \(\varepsilon > 0\) is a constant to be determined later. Then we have
\[
|f_i(z + re^{i\theta}X)|^p = |m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z)|^p \left(1 + p\varepsilon r^2|Xf(z)|^2 + O(r^3)\right)
\]
and
\[
\|f_i\|_p^p \leq m_p(z)^p \left(1 + \frac{p}{2}\varepsilon r^2|Xf(z)|^2 + O(r^3)\right),
\]
so that
\[
K_p(z + re^{i\theta}X) \geq \frac{|f_i(z + re^{i\theta}X)|^p}{\|f_i\|_p^p} \geq \frac{|m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z)|^p}{m_p(z)^p} \cdot \frac{1 + p\varepsilon r^2|Xf(z)|^2 + O(r^3)}{1 + \frac{p}{2}\varepsilon r^2|Xf(z)|^2 + O(r^3)}.
\]
Thus we have
\[
i\partial\bar{\partial} \log K_p(z; X) \geq \liminf_{r \to 0^+} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log \frac{|m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z)|^p}{m_p(z)^p} d\theta - \log K_p(z) \right\} \\
+ p\varepsilon |Xf(z)|^2 - \frac{p\varepsilon^2}{2} |Xf(z)|^2 \\
\geq p\varepsilon (1 - \varepsilon/2)|Xf(z)|^2 \\
= \frac{p}{2}|Xf(z)|^2
\]
when \(\varepsilon = 1\). Here the second inequality follows by applying the mean-value inequality to the subharmonic function
\[
u(t) := \log |m_p(z + tX, z)/m_p(z)|^p
\]
with \(u(0) = \log 1/m_p(z)^p = \log K_p(z)\). Take supremum over \(f\), we obtain (5.1).

An immediate consequence is the following

**Corollary 5.3.** \(\liminf_{p \to 0^+} \frac{1}{p} i\partial\bar{\partial} \log K_p(z; X) \geq \frac{1}{2}C(z; X)^2\).

**Theorem 5.4.** For every \(p \geq 2\) we have
\[
i\partial\bar{\partial} \log K_p(z; X) \geq \frac{p}{2(p-1)} B_p(z; X)^2.
\]

**Proof.** Fix \(r, \theta\) for a moment. Take \(f \in A^p(\Omega)\) with \(f(z) = 0\) and \(\|f\|_p = 1\). For \(t \in \mathbb{C}\) with \(|t| = O(r)\) we define
\[
f_i := m_p(\cdot, z) + tf.
\]
Analogously we have
\[
|f_t(z + re^{i\theta}X)|^p = |m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z) + tf(z + re^{i\theta}X)|^p \\
= |m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z) + tre^{i\theta}Xf(z) + O(r^3)|^p \\
= |m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z)|^p (1 + pRe \{tre^{i\theta}Xf(z)\} + O(r^3))
\]
since \(m_p(z + re^{i\theta}X, z) = 1 + O(r)\). A straightforward calculation yields
\[
\frac{\partial |f_t|^p}{\partial t} = \frac{p}{2} |f_t|^{p-2} f_t f \\
\frac{\partial^2 |f_t|^p}{\partial t^2} = \frac{p(p-2)}{4} |f_t|^{p-4} (f_t f)^2 \\
\frac{\partial^2 |f_t|^p}{\partial t \partial \bar{t}} = \frac{p^2}{4} |f_t|^{p-2} |f|^2.
\]
Set \(J(t) := \|f_t\|^p\). From the proof of Lemma 2.11 we have already known that
\[
\frac{\partial J}{\partial t}(0) = \frac{\partial J}{\partial \bar{t}}(0) = 0.
\]
Note that for \(|t| \leq 1\) we have
\[
\left| \frac{\partial^2 |f_t|^p}{\partial t^2} \right| \leq \frac{p(p-2)}{4} |f_t|^{p-2} |f|^2 \leq \frac{p(p-2)}{4} (|m_p(\cdot, z)| + |f|)^{p-2} |f|^2 = \frac{p(p-2)}{4} \cdot g \\
\left| \frac{\partial^2 |f_t|^p}{\partial t \partial \bar{t}} \right| \leq \frac{p^2}{4} \cdot g,
\]
while Hölder’s inequality gives
\[
\int_{\Omega} g \leq \|f\|^2_p \left\{ \int_{\Omega} (|m_p(\cdot, z)| + |f|)^p \right\}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} < \infty.
\]
It follows from the dominated convergence theorem that
\[
\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t^2}(0) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial^2 |f_t|^p}{\partial t^2}(0) = \frac{p(p-2)}{4} \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-4} \left( \frac{m_p(\cdot, z) f}{f} \right)^2 \\
\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t \partial \bar{t}}(0) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial^2 |f_t|^p}{\partial t \partial \bar{t}}(0) = \frac{p^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} |f|^2.
\]
Thus we have
\[
J(t) = J(0) + Re \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t^2}(0) t^2 \right\} + \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t \partial \bar{t}}(0) |t|^2 + o(|t|^2) \\
\leq m_p(z)^p + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} |t|^2 \int_{\Omega} |m_p(\cdot, z)|^{p-2} |f|^2 + o(|t|^2) \\
\leq m_p(z)^p + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} m_p(z)^{p-2} |t|^2 + o(|t|^2)
\]
in view of Hölder’s inequality. Take \( t = \varepsilon r e^{-i\theta} X f(z) \) as above, we obtain

\[
K_p(z + re^{i\theta} X) \geq \frac{1}{m_p(z)^p} \frac{1 + p\varepsilon r^2 |X f(z)|^2 + O(r^3)}{1 + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \varepsilon^2 r^2 |X f(z)|^2 / m_p(z)^2 + o(r^2)},
\]

so that

\[
i\partial \bar{\partial} \log K_p(z; X) \geq p \varepsilon |X f(z)|^2 - \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \varepsilon \frac{|X f(z)|^2}{m_p(z)^2}
\]

\[
= p \varepsilon |X f(z)|^2 \left(1 - \frac{p-1}{2} \frac{\varepsilon}{m_p(z)^2}\right)
\]

\[
= \frac{p}{2(p-1)} |X f(z)|^2 m_p(z)^2
\]

when \( \varepsilon = \frac{m_p(z)^2}{p-1} \). Take supremum over \( f \), we obtain (5.3). \( \square \)

Theorem 5.4 together with Proposition 2.20 yield the following

**Corollary 5.5.** \( \liminf_{p \to \infty} i\partial \bar{\partial} \log K_p(z; X) \geq \frac{1}{2} C(z; X)^2 \).

By Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.4, \( \log K_p \) is a continuous strictly psh function on \( \Omega \). In particular, we have

**Corollary 5.6.** The minimal set of \( K_p(z) \) defined by

\[
\text{Min}_p(\Omega) := \{ z \in \Omega : K_p(z) = \inf_{\zeta \in \Omega} K_p(\zeta) \}
\]

is either empty or a totally real subset of \( \Omega \).

**Problem 9.** What about the metric structure of \( \text{Min}_p(\Omega) \) ?

### 6. Stability of \( m_p, K_p \) and \( B_p \) as \( p \) varies

We first prove the following

**Proposition 6.1.**

1. \( \lim_{s \to p \pm} K_s(z) \) exists for \( p > 0 \) and

\[
(6.1) \quad \lim_{s \to p^+} K_s(z) \leq K_p(z) = \lim_{s \to p^-} K_s(z).
\]

2. If there exists \( p' > p \) such that \( A^{p'}(\Omega) \) lies dense in \( A^p(\Omega) \), then

\[
(6.2) \quad K_p(z) = \lim_{s \to p} K_s(z).
\]

**Proof.** (1) Let \( 0 < p < s < \infty \) and \( f \in A^s(\Omega) \). By Hölder’s inequality, we have

\[
\|f\|_p \leq \|f\|_s \cdot |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{s}},
\]

so that

\[
K_p(z)^\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{|f(z)|}{\|f\|_p} \geq \frac{|f(z)|}{\|f\|_s \cdot |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{s}}},
\]
Take supremum over \( f \in A^s(\Omega) \), we obtain
\[
\text{(6.3)} \quad |\Omega|^\frac{1}{p} : K_p(z)^\frac{1}{p} \geq |\Omega|^\frac{1}{2} : K_s(z)^\frac{1}{2}.
\]
It follows that both \( \lim_{s \to p^-} K_s(z) \) and \( \lim_{s \to p^+} K_s(z) \) exist and
\[
K_p(z) \leq \lim_{s \to p^-} K_s(z); \quad K_p(z) \geq \lim_{s \to p^+} K_s(z).
\]
To achieve the inequality
\[
K_p(z) \geq \lim_{s \to p^-} K_s(z),
\]
we first take \( f_s \in A^s(\Omega) \) with \( \|f_s\|_s = 1 \) and \( |f_s(z)| = K_s(z)^\frac{1}{2} \). Clearly \( \{f_s\} \) forms a normal family so that there exists a sequence \( s_j \uparrow p \) with \( f_{s_j} \) converging locally uniformly to some \( f_p \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) \). By Fatou’s lemma, we have
\[
\int_\Omega |f_p|^p \leq \liminf_{j \to \infty} \int_\Omega |f_{s_j}|^p \leq \liminf_{j \to \infty} \left[ \int_\Omega |f_{s_j}|^s \right] \frac{p}{s} \cdot |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{s}} = 1.
\]
It follows that
\[
K_p(z) \geq \frac{|f_p(z)|^p}{\|f_p\|^p} \geq |f_p(z)|^p = \lim_{s \to \infty} |f_{s_j}(z)|^p = \lim_{s \to \infty} K_{s_j}(z)^\frac{p}{s} = \lim_{j \to \infty} K_{s_j}(z) = \lim_{s \to p^-} K_s(z).
\]

(2) Let \( \mathcal{M}_p(\cdot, z) \) be the maximizer in (2.4). Suppose there exists a sequence \( \{f_j\} \subset A^{p'}(\Omega) \) for some \( p' > p \) such that
\[
\int_\Omega |f_j - \mathcal{M}_p(\cdot, z)|^p \to 0
\]
as \( j \to \infty \). It follows that for every \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \) there exists \( j_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) such that
\[
\|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_p \leq 1 + \varepsilon
\]
and
\[
|f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)K_p(z)^\frac{1}{p}
\]
in view of the mean-value inequality. Since
\[
|f_{j_\varepsilon}|^s \leq 1 + |f_{j_\varepsilon}|^p' \in L^1(\Omega)
\]
for every \( s \leq p' \), we have
\[
\int_\Omega |f_{j_\varepsilon}|^p = \lim_{s \to p^+} \int_\Omega |f_{j_\varepsilon}|^s
\]
in view of the dominated convergence theorem. Thus
\[
\lim_{s \to p^+} K_s(z) \geq \lim_{s \to p^+} \frac{|f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)|^s}{\int_\Omega |f_{j_\varepsilon}|^s} \geq \frac{|f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)|^p}{\int_\Omega |f_{j_\varepsilon}|^p} \geq \left( \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right)^p K_p(z).
\]
Since \( \varepsilon \) can be arbitrarily small, we obtain \( \lim_{s \to p^+} K_s(z) = K_p(z) \) so that (6.2) holds. \( \square \)

A bounded domain \( \Omega \) in \( \mathbb{C}^n \) is said to have positive hyperconvexity index if there exists a negative continuous psh function \( \rho \) on \( \Omega \) satisfying \( -\rho \lesssim \delta^\alpha \) for some \( \alpha > 0 \) (cf. [11]). It follows from Proposition 1.4 in [11] that if \( \Omega \) has positive hyperconvexity index then \( A^p(\Omega) \) lies dense in \( A^2(\Omega) \) for some \( p > 2 \). Thus we have
Corollary 6.2. If $\Omega$ has positive hyperconvexity index, then
\[ K_2(z) = \lim_{p \to 2} K_p(z). \]

Let $E$ be a compact set in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathcal{O}(E)$ be the set of functions which are holomorphic in a neighborhood of $E$ and $L^p_\alpha(E)$ the set of functions in $L^p(E)$ which are holomorphic in $E^\circ$. It is well-known [20] that $\mathcal{O}(E)$ lies dense in $L^p_\alpha(E)$ for $p \in [1, 2)$. Since $\mathcal{O}(E) \subset A^\alpha(E^\circ)$ for every $s > 0$, we have

Corollary 6.3. If $\Omega$ is a bounded fat domain in $\mathbb{C}$, i.e., $\overline{\Omega'} = \Omega$, then (6.2) holds for $p \in [1, 2)$.

The following proposition can be used to produce plenty of examples with (6.4)
\[ K_2(z) > \lim_{p \to 2^+} K_p(z). \]

Proposition 6.4. Let $\Omega = D \setminus S$ where $D$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and $S$ is a compact set in $D$ which has positive $2-$capacity but zero $p-$capacity for every $p < 2$. Then (6.4) holds.

Recall that the $p-$capacity of $S$ is given by
\[ \text{Cap}_p(S) := \inf \int_C |\nabla \phi|^p \]
where the infimum is taken over all $\phi \in C^\infty_0(C)$ such that $\phi \geq 1$ on $S$. The condition of Proposition 6.4 is satisfied for instance, if the $h-$Hausdorff measure $\Lambda_h(S)$ of $S$ is positive and finite where $h(t) = (\log 1/t)^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 1$.

Proof of Proposition 6.4. It is a classical result that $A^p(\Omega) = A^p(D)$ if and only if $\text{Cap}_q(S) = 0$ where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ (cf. [8] and [21]). Hence
\[ K_{\Omega,p}(z) = K_{D,p}(z) \leq C_n d(S, \partial D)^{-2n} \]
for all $z \in \Omega$ with $d(z, S) \leq d(S, \partial D)/2$. On the other hand, since $\text{Cap}_2(S) > 0$, i.e., $S$ is non-polar, so there exists a regular point $a \in S$ for the Dirichlet problem on $\Omega$. Then we have
\[ \lim_{z \to a} K_{\Omega,2}(z) = \infty \]
(see [28]). Thus we obtain
\[ K_{\Omega,2}(z) > \lim_{p \to 2^+} K_{\Omega,p}(z) \]
whenever $z$ is sufficiently close to $a$. \hfill \square

Theorem 6.5. (1) For $p > 1$ we have
\[ \lim_{s \to p^-} m_s(z, w) = m_p(z, w). \]

(2) $\lim_{s \to p^+} m_s(z, w)$ exists. Moreover, if $A^p(\Omega)$ lies dense in $A^p(\Omega)$ for some $p' > p$, then
\[ m_p(z, w) = \lim_{s \to p^+} m_s(z, w). \]

The same conclusions also hold for $K_p$.
Proof. (1) We first consider the case \( p > 2 \). Fix \( 2 < s < p \). Apply (4.3) with \( a = m_s(\cdot, w) \), \( b = m_p(\cdot, w) \), and \( p \) replaced by \( s \), we obtain

\[
C_s \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
\]

\[
\leq \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w)|^s - \int_\Omega |m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
\]

\[
- p \text{Re} \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w)|^{s-2} m_s(\cdot, w) [m_p(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w)]
\]

\[
\leq |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{s}{p}} \left[ \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w)|^p \right]^{\frac{s}{p}} - m_s(w)^s
\]

\[
= |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{s}{p}} m_p(w)^s - m_s(w)^s.
\]

Thus we have

\[
|m_p(z, w) - m_s(z, w)|^s \leq K_s(z) \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
\]

\[
\leq C_s^{-1} K_s(z) \left\{ |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{s}{p}} m_p(w)^s - m_s(w)^s \right\}.
\]

This combined with (6.1) gives (6.5).

Now suppose \( 1 < p \leq 2 \). Fix \( 1 < s < p \). Let \( f_1, f_2 \in A^s(\Omega) \). Hölder’s inequality yields

\[
\int_\Omega |f_2 - f_1|^s = \int_\Omega |f_2 - f_1|^s(|f_2| + |f_1|)^{s(s-2)/2}(|f_2| + |f_1|)^{(2-s)/2}
\]

\[
\leq \left\{ \int_\Omega |f_2 - f_1|^2(|f_2| + |f_1|)^{s-2} \right\} \left\{ \int_\Omega (|f_2| + |f_1|)^s \right\}^{1 - \frac{s}{2}}
\]

\[
\leq \left\{ A_s^{-1} \int_\Omega [|f_2|^s - |f_1|^s - s \text{Re} (|f_1|^{s-2} \bar{f}_1 (f_2 - f_1))] \right\}^{\frac{s}{2}}
\]

\[
\cdot \left\{ \int_\Omega (|f_2| + |f_1|)^s \right\}^{1 - \frac{s}{2}}
\]

(6.7)

in view of (4.4). Take \( f_2 = m_p(\cdot, w) \) and \( f_1 = m_s(\cdot, w) \), we obtain

\[
|m_p(z, w) - m_s(z, w)|^s
\]

\[
\leq K_s(z) \int_\Omega |m_p(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
\]

\[
\leq K_s(z) \left\{ A_s^{-1} \left[ |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{s}{p}} m_p(w)^s - m_s(w)^s \right] \right\}^{\frac{s}{2}}
\]

\[
\cdot \left\{ 2^{s-1} \left[ |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{s}{p}} m_p(w)^s + m_s(w)^s \right] \right\}^{1 - \frac{s}{2}}
\]

which gives (6.5).
We first consider the case \( p \geq 2 \). Let \( p \leq s < r \). Apply (4.3) with \( a = m_s(\cdot, w), b = m_r(\cdot, w) \), and \( p \) replaced by \( s \), we obtain
\[
C_s \int_{\Omega} |m_r(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
\leq \int_{\Omega} |m_r(\cdot, w)|^s - \int_{\Omega} |m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
-p \text{Re} \int_{\Omega} |m_r(\cdot, w)|^{s-2} m_s(\cdot, w) (m_r(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w))
\leq |\Omega|^{1-\frac{s}{r}} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |m_r(\cdot, w)|^r \right\}^{\frac{s}{r}} - m_s(w)^s
= |\Omega|^{1-\frac{s}{r}} m_r(w)^s - m_s(w)^s.
\]
Thus we have
\[
|m_r(z, w) - m_s(z, w)|^s \leq K_s(z) \int_{\Omega} |m_r(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
\leq C^{-1} K_s(z) \left\{ |\Omega|^{1-\frac{s}{r}} m_r(w)^s - m_s(w)^s \right\}.
\]
(6.8)
Since \( \lim_{s \to p^+} m_s(w) \) exists, it follows that \( \{m_s(z, w)\} \) forms a Cauchy family as \( s \to p^+ \), so that \( \lim_{s \to p^+} m_s(z, w) \) also exists.

Next suppose \( 1 < p < 2 \). Let \( p \leq s < r < 2 \). Take \( f_2 = m_r(\cdot, w) \) and \( f_1 = m_s(\cdot, w) \) in (6.7), we obtain
\[
|m_r(z, w) - m_s(z, w)|^s \leq K_s(z) \int_{\Omega} |m_r(\cdot, w) - m_s(\cdot, w)|^s
\leq K_s(z) \left\{ A_s^{-1} \left[ |\Omega|^{1-\frac{s}{r}} m_r(w)^s - m_s(w)^s \right] \right\}^{\frac{s}{r}}
\cdot \left\{ 2^{s-1} \left[ |\Omega|^{1-\frac{s}{r}} m_r(w)^s + m_s(w)^s \right] \right\}^{1-\frac{s}{r}},
\]
from which the assertion immediately follows.

Finally, we deal with the case \( p = 1 \). Let \( 1 \leq s < r \). By a similar argument as the case \( p \geq 2 \) with (4.3) replaced by (4.5), we obtain
\[
A_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{\text{Im} \{m_r(\cdot, w) m_s(\cdot, w)\}}{|m_r(\cdot, w)| + |m_s(\cdot, w)|}^3 \leq |\Omega|^{1-\frac{s}{r}} m_r(w)^s - m_s(w)^s.
\]
(6.10)
Since \( \{m_r(\cdot, w)\}_r \) and \( \{m_s(\cdot, w)\}_s \) are normal families, there exist subsequences \( \{m_{r_j}(\cdot, w)\} \) and \( \{m_{s_j}(\cdot, w)\} \) which converge locally uniformly to certain holomorphic functions \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) respectively. Clearly, we have \( h_1(w) = h_2(w) = 1 \).

For fixed \( w \) we set \( S_w := h_1^{-1}(0) \cup h_2^{-1}(0) \). For any open sets \( V \subset U \subset \Omega \setminus S_w \) there exists a constant \( C \gg 1 \) such that
\[
C^{-1} \leq \min \{ m_{r_j}(z, w), m_{s_j}(z, w) \} \leq \max \{ m_{r_j}(z, w), m_{s_j}(z, w) \} \leq C, \quad \forall z \in U
\]
for all $j \gg 1$. Thus (6.10) combined with the mean-value inequality gives

$$\left| \text{Im} \frac{m_{r_j}(z, w)}{m_{s_j}(z, w)} \right|^2 \lesssim |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{1}{2}} m_{r_j}(w)^{s_j} - m_{s_j}(w)^{s_j} \to 0 \quad (j \to \infty), \quad \forall z \in V,$$

which implies that $\text{Im} \frac{h_j}{h_2} = 0$ on $V$, hence on $\Omega \setminus S_w$. It follows that $h_1/h_2 = \text{const.}$ on $\Omega \setminus S_w$, hence on $\Omega$. As $h_1(w) = h_2(w) = 1$, we obtain $h_1 = h_2$.

In general, we consider two arbitrary convergent subsequences $\{m_{r_j}(\cdot, w)\}$ and $\{m_{r_j}(\cdot, w)\}$ of $\{m_{r}(\cdot, w)\}_r$. Let $\{s_j\}$ be a subsequence of $\{r_j\}$ with $s_j < r_j$. By the above argument we know that the sequences $\{m_{r_j}(\cdot, w)\}$ and $\{m_{s_j}(\cdot, w)\}$ has the same limit, which is also the limit of $\{m_{r_j}(\cdot, w)\}$. Thus $\lim_{p \to 1^+} m_p(z, w)$ exists.

If $A^p(\Omega)$ lies dense in $A^p(\Omega)$ for some $p' > p$, then we have $m_p(w) = \lim_{s \to p} m_p(w)$. Thus (6.8) together with (6.9) yield (6.8) for $p > 1$. Apply (6.10) with $s = 1$ in a similar way as above, we obtain (6.6) for $p = 1$.

**Corollary 6.6.** Let $\Omega$ be a bounded domain with positive hyperconvexity index. If $K_2(\cdot, w)$ is not zero-free for some $w \in \Omega$, then there exists a number $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(w) > 0$ such that $K_p(\cdot, w)$ is also not zero-free for $p \in (2 - \varepsilon, 2 + \varepsilon)$.

**Proof.** Suppose on the contrary that there exists a sequence $p_j \to 2$ such that $K_{p_j}(\cdot, w)$ is zero-free for all $j$. It follows from Theorem 6.5 and Hurwitz’s theorem that $K_2(\cdot, w) \equiv 0$, which is clearly impossible.

**Proposition 6.7.** (1) $\lim_{s \to p^+} B_s(z; X)$ exists for $p > 0$ and

$$B_p(z; X) = \lim_{s \to p^+} B_s(z; X). \quad (6.11)$$

(2) If there exists $p' > p$ such that $A^{p'}(\Omega)$ lies dense in $A^p(\Omega)$, then

$$B_p(z; X) = \lim_{s \to p^+} B_s(z; X). \quad (6.12)$$

**Proof.** (1) Similar as the proof of Proposition 6.1, we have

$$|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |X M_p(\cdot, z; X)(z)| \geq |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |X M_s(\cdot, z; X)(z)|,$$

so that $\lim_{s \to p^+} |X M_s(\cdot, z; X)(z)|$ exist and

$$|X M_p(\cdot, z; X)(z)| \leq \lim_{s \to p^+} |X M_s(\cdot, z; X)(z)|$$

$$|X M_p(\cdot, z; X)(z)| \geq \lim_{s \to p^+} |X M_s(\cdot, z; X)(z)|.$$

A normal family argument yields

$$|X M_p(\cdot, z; X)(z)| = \lim_{s \to p^+} |X M_s(\cdot, z; X)(z)|.$$

This combined with Proposition 6.1 gives

$$B_p(z; X) = \lim_{s \to p^+} B_s(z; X).$$
(2) Suppose that $A^{p'}(\Omega)$ lies dense in $A^p(\Omega)$ for some $p' > p$. We may choose a sequence $f_j$ of functions in $A^{p'}(\Omega)$ such that

$$
\int_{\Omega} |f_j - \mathcal{M}_p(\cdot, z; X)|^p \to 0
$$
as $j \to \infty$. It follows that for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exists $j_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that

$$
|f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad |X f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|X \mathcal{M}_p(\cdot, z; X)(z)|,
$$
and

$$
\|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_p \leq 1 + \varepsilon.
$$
Again we have

$$
\int_{\Omega} |f_{j_\varepsilon}|^p = \lim_{s \to p^+} \int_{\Omega} |f_{j_\varepsilon}|^s.
$$
Since

$$
\|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_p \leq \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_s \cdot |\Omega|^\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{s} \quad \text{and} \quad \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_s \leq \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_{p'} \cdot |\Omega|^\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p'},
$$
it follows that

$$
\|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_s - \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_p \leq \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_s - \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_s^\frac{1}{s} + \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_s^\frac{1}{s} - \|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_p \to 0
$$
as $s \to p^+$. By using the test function $f_{j_\varepsilon} - f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)$, we obtain

$$
\lim_{s \to p^+} |X \mathcal{M}_s(\cdot, z; X)(z)| \geq \liminf_{s \to p^+} \frac{|X f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)|}{\|f_{j_\varepsilon} - f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)\|_s}
$$
$$
\geq \liminf_{s \to p^+} \frac{|X f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)|}{\|f_{j_\varepsilon}\|_s + |f_{j_\varepsilon}(z)| |\Omega|^\frac{1}{p}}
$$
$$
\geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon |\Omega|^\frac{1}{p}} \cdot |X \mathcal{M}_p(\cdot, z; X)(z)|.
$$
Thus (6.12) holds. \(\square\)

7. Comparison of $K_p(z)$ and $K_2(z)$

**Theorem 7.1.** Let $\Omega$ be a bounded pseudoconvex domain with $C^2$—boundary. Then there exist constants $\gamma, C > 0$ such that the following estimates hold near $\partial \Omega$:

$$
K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \delta(z)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} |\log \delta(z)|^{\frac{n(p-2)}{2p\gamma}}, \quad p > 2,
$$

$$
K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq C^{-1} \delta(z)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} |\log \delta(z)|^{-\frac{(n+\gamma)(p-2)}{4p\gamma}}, \quad p < 2.
$$

**Proof.** The argument is essentially similar as [12] (see also [11]). Recall that there exists a smooth negative psh function $\rho$ on $\Omega$ such that $-\rho \asymp \delta^\gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$ (cf. [15]). It then
follows from a very useful estimate of Blocki [4] for the pluricomplex Green function that there
is a constant $C > 1$ such that for any $z$ sufficiently close to $\partial \Omega$,
\begin{equation}
\{ g_\Omega (\cdot, z) \leq -1 \} \subset \left \{ C^{-1} \delta (z) | \log \delta (z) |^{-\frac{1}{p}} \leq \delta \leq C \delta (z) | \log \delta (z) |^{\frac{1}{p}} \right \},
\end{equation}
where $g_\Omega (\zeta, z)$ is the pluricomplex Green function defined by
\[ g_\Omega (\zeta, z) = \sup \left \{ u (\zeta) : u \in PSH^- (\Omega) \text{ and } u (\zeta) \leq \log | \zeta - z | + O (1) \text{ near } z \right \}. \]
Note that $g_\Omega (\cdot, z)$ is a continuous negative psh function on $\Omega \setminus \{ z \}$ which satisfies
\begin{equation}
- i\partial \bar{\partial} \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) \geq i\partial \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) \wedge \bar{\partial} \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) )
\end{equation}
as currents. For $p > 2$ and $z \in \Omega$ we take $f \in A^p (\Omega)$ with $\| f \|_p = 1$ and $f (z) = K_p (z) \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a cut-off function such that $\chi \big|_{( - \infty, - \log 2]} = 1$ and $\chi \big|_{[0, \infty)} = 0$. Set
\begin{equation}
v := f \chi ( - \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) ) \bigg). \end{equation}
By (7.4) we have
\[ i\partial \bar{\partial} \leq | f |^2 \chi' ( - \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) )^2 \cdot \left [ - i\partial \bar{\partial} \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) \right ] \] .
The Donnelly-Fefferman estimate (cf. [16], see also [11, 5]) then yields a solution of the equation $\partial u = v$ (in the sense of distributions) such that
\[ \int_{\Omega} | u |^2 e^{2 n g_\Omega (\cdot, z)} \leq C_0 \int_{\Omega} | f |^2 \chi' ( - \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) )^2 e^{2 n g_\Omega (\cdot, z)} \]
\[ \leq C_n \int_{\{ \delta \leq C \delta (z) | \log \delta (z) |^{\frac{1}{p}} \}} | f |^2 \quad \text{(by (7.3))} \]
\[ \leq C_n \{ \delta \leq C \delta (z) | \log \delta (z) |^{\frac{1}{p}} \} | \log \delta (z) |^{- \frac{2}{p}} \| f \|_p^2 \]
\[ \leq C \delta (z)^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} | \log \delta (z) |^{- \frac{n (p - 2)}{2 p^2}} \]
where the third inequality follows from Höllder’s inequality. Here for the sake of simplicity we use the symbol $C$ to denote any large constant depending only on $\Omega$. Set
\[ F := f \chi ( - \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) ) - u. \]
Clearly, we have $F \in \mathcal{O} (\Omega)$. Since $g_\Omega (\zeta, z) = \log | \zeta - z | + O (1)$ as $\zeta \rightarrow z$ and $u$ is holomorphic in a neighborhood of $z$, it follows that $u (z) = 0$, i.e., $F (z) = f (z) = K_p (z) \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. Moreover, we have
\[ \int_{\Omega} | F |^2 \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} | f \chi ( - \log ( - g_\Omega (\cdot, z) ) ) |^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} | u |^2 \]
\[ \leq C \delta (z)^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} | \log \delta (z) |^{\frac{n (p - 2)}{2 p^2}} \]
since $g_\Omega (\cdot, z) < 0$. Thus we get
\[ K_2 (z) 2 \geq | F (z) | \geq C^{-1} K_p (z) \delta (z)^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}} | \log \delta (z) |^{\frac{n (p - 2)}{2 p^2}}, \]
i.e., (7.1) holds.
Next we define
\[ A^2_{\alpha, \varepsilon} (\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) : \| f \|_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^2 := \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 (-\rho + \varepsilon)^\alpha < \infty \right\}, \quad \alpha, \varepsilon > 0. \]

Let \( K_{\alpha, \varepsilon} \) denote the Bergman kernel associated to the Hilbert space \( A^2_{\alpha, \varepsilon} (\Omega) \). We first compare \( K_p (z) \) with \( K_{\alpha, \varepsilon} (z) \) for \( \alpha = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \frac{2}{p} - 1 \right) \) and \( \varepsilon = \delta(z) \gamma \) when \( p < 2 \). Take \( f \in A^2_{\alpha, \varepsilon} (\Omega) \) such that \( \| f \|_{\alpha, \varepsilon} = 1 \) and \( f(z) = K_{\alpha, \varepsilon} (z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \). By Hölder’s inequality we have
\[
\int_{\Omega} |f|^p = \left( \int_{\Omega} \left| f \right|^p (-\rho + \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})} (-\rho + \varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})} \right)^{\frac{p}{\gamma}} \leq C \left[ \int_{\Omega} (-\rho + \varepsilon)^{\alpha} \right] \left[ \int_{\Omega} (-\rho + \varepsilon)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \left\| f \right\|_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \log \delta(z)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.
\]

It follows that
\[
(7.6) \quad K_p(z)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq \frac{|f(z)|}{\| f \|_p} \geq C^{-1} K_{\alpha, \varepsilon}(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \log \delta(z)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.
\]

Now we compare \( K_{\alpha, \varepsilon}(z) \) with \( K_2(z) \). Set \( \psi := -\alpha \log(-\rho + \varepsilon) \). Clearly, \( \psi \) is psh on \( \Omega \). Similar as above, we first take \( f \in A^2(\Omega) \) with \( \| f \|_2 = 1 \) and \( f(z) = K_2(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \) then solve the equation \( \partial u = v \) (where \( v \) is given by (7.5)) with the following estimate
\[
\int_{\Omega} |u|^2 e^{-\psi - 2ng_\Omega(z)} \leq C_0 \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 |\chi'(-\log(g_\Omega(\cdot, z)))|^2 e^{-\psi - 2ng_\Omega(\cdot, z)} \leq C_n \int_{\{ \delta \leq C \delta(z) | \log \delta(z) |^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \}} |f|^p (-\rho + \varepsilon)^{\alpha} \leq \sup \left\{ (-\rho + \varepsilon)^{\alpha} : \delta \leq C \delta(z) | \log \delta(z) |^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \right\} \cdot \| f \|_2^2 \leq C \delta(z)^{\frac{2}{p} - 1} | \log \delta(z) |^{\frac{n(2-p)}{2p}}.
\]

Thus \( F := f \chi(-\log(g_\Omega(\cdot, z))) - u \) is a holomorphic function on \( \Omega \) which satisfies \( F(z) = f(z) = K_2(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \) and
\[
\| F \|_{\alpha, \varepsilon} \leq C \delta(z)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} | \log \delta(z) |^{\frac{n(2-p)}{2p}}.
\]

Thus
\[
K_{\alpha, \varepsilon}(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{|F(z)|}{\| F \|_{\alpha, \varepsilon}} \geq C^{-1} K_2(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta(z)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} | \log \delta(z) |^{\frac{n(2-p)}{2p}}.
\]

This together with (7.6) yield (7.2).
Theorem 7.2. Let $\Omega$ be a bounded pseudoconvex domain with $C^2$-boundary. For every $2 \leq p < 2 + \frac{2}{n}$ there exists a constant $C = C_{p, \Omega} > 0$ such that the following estimate holds near $\partial \Omega$:

\[
\frac{K_p(z)^\frac{1}{p}}{K_2(z)^\frac{1}{2}} \geq C^{-1} \delta(z)^\frac{(n+1)(p-2)}{2p} |\log \delta(z)|^{-\frac{(n+1)(p-2)}{2p}}.
\]

Here $\gamma$ is the same as above.

Proof. For $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ we define

\[
A_{2-\alpha}^\cdot (\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) : \| f \|^{2-\alpha} := \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 \delta^{-\alpha} < \infty \right\}.
\]

Let $K_{-\alpha}$ denote the Bergman kernel associated to $A_{2-\alpha}^\cdot (\Omega)$. We first compare $K_p(z)$ with $K_{-\alpha}(z)$. Let $f \in A_{2-\alpha}^\cdot (\Omega)$. Since $\log |f|^2 - \alpha \log \delta$ is psh on $\Omega$, so is $|f|^2 \delta^{-\alpha}$. Apply the mean-value inequality to the psh function $|f|^2 \delta^{-\alpha}$ on certain polydisc with center $z$ and volume $\approx \delta(z)^{n+1}$, we have

\[
|f(z)|^2 \delta(z)^{-\alpha} \leq C_n \delta(z)^{-n-1} \| f \|^{2-\alpha}_{-\alpha}.
\]

It follows that

\[
I_p(\varepsilon, f) := \int_{\{\delta = \varepsilon\}} |f|^p dS \leq \sup_{\{\delta = \varepsilon\}} \| f \|^{p-2} \cdot I_2(\varepsilon, f)
\]

\[
\leq C_n \varepsilon^{-\frac{(n+1-\alpha)(p-2)}{2}} \| f \|^{p-2}_{-\alpha} \cdot I_2(\varepsilon, f).
\]

Here $dS$ denotes the surface element. Note that

\[
\alpha = \frac{(n+1-\alpha)(p-2)}{2} \iff \alpha = \frac{(n+1)(p-2)}{p}
\]

and

\[
\alpha < 1 \iff p < 2 + \frac{2}{n}.
\]

We fix such $\alpha$ and take $f \in A_{2-\alpha}^\cdot (\Omega)$ with $f(z) = K_{-\alpha}(z)^\frac{1}{2}$ and $\| f \|_{-\alpha} = 1$. For certain $\varepsilon_0 \ll 1$,

\[
\int_{\Omega} |f|^p = \int_{\{\delta \geq \varepsilon_0\}} |f|^p + \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_0} I_p(\varepsilon, f) d\varepsilon
\]

\[
\leq C + C_n \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_0} \varepsilon^{-\alpha} I_2(\varepsilon, f) d\varepsilon \quad \text{(by (7.9))}
\]

\[
= C + C_n \| f \|^{2}_{-\alpha} = C + C_n
\]

where $C = C_{p, \Omega}$. Thus

\[
K_p(z)^\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{|f(z)|}{\| f \|_p} \geq C^{-1} K_{-\alpha}(z)^\frac{1}{2}.
\]

Next we compare $K_{-\alpha}(z)$ with $K_2(z)$. Put

\[
\varphi = 2ng_{\Omega}(\cdot, z) - \log(-g_{\Omega}(\cdot, z) + 1).
\]
Take $f \in A^2(\Omega)$ with $f(z) = K_2(z)^{1/2}$ and $\|f\|_2 = 1$. If $v$ is given as above, then
\[ i\bar{v} \wedge v \leq |f|^2|\chi'(-\log(-g_\Omega(\cdot, z)))|^2 \left(\frac{-g_\Omega(\cdot, z) + 1}{g_\Omega(\cdot, z)^2}\right)^2 \cdot i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi. \]

By Theorem 1.1 in [10] we may solve $\bar{\partial}u = v$ with the following estimate
\[ \int_{\Omega} |u|^2 e^{-\varphi} \delta - \alpha \leq C_{\alpha, \Omega} \int_{\Omega} |f|^2|\chi'(-\log(-g_\Omega(\cdot, z)))|^2 \left(\frac{-g_\Omega(\cdot, z) + 1}{g_\Omega(\cdot, z)^2}\right)^2 e^{-\varphi} \delta - \alpha \]
\[ \leq C_{\alpha, \Omega} \int_{\{\delta \geq \delta(z)\log(\delta(z))\}} |f|^2 \delta^{-\alpha} \quad \text{by (7.3)} \]
\[ \leq C_{\alpha, \Omega} \delta(z)^{-\alpha} |\log(\delta(z))|^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}}. \]

It follows that
\[ F := \chi(-\log(-g_\Omega(\cdot, z)))f - u \]
is a holomorphic function on $\Omega$ satisfying $F(z) = f(z) = K_2(z)^{1/2}$ and
\[ \int_{\Omega} |F|^2 \delta^{-\alpha} \leq C_{\alpha, \Omega} \delta(z)^{-\alpha} |\log(\delta(z))|^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}}. \]

Thus
\[ K_{-\alpha}(z) \geq \frac{|F(z)|^2}{\|F\|_{-\alpha}^2} \geq C_{\alpha, \Omega}^{-1} K_2(z) \delta(z)^{\alpha} |\log(\delta(z))|^{-\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}}. \]

This together with (7.10) yield (7.7). \hfill \square

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

There are two interesting functions related to the limiting case $p = 0$. The first one, which is introduced by Tsuji [36], is defined to be
\[ K_0(z) := \left(\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{K_{2/m}(z)}\right)^* \]
where $(\cdot)^*$ denotes the upper semicontinuous regularization. The second one, which arises from Siu’s work on invariance of plurigenera [32], is defined by
\[ \widehat{K}_0(z) := \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_m K_{2/m}(z) \]
where $\{\varepsilon_m\}$ is a sequence of positive numbers satisfying $\sum \varepsilon_m < \infty$. By (2.5) we see that both $K_0$ and $\widehat{K}_0$ are well-defined so that $\log K_0$ and $\log \widehat{K}_0$ are psh on $\Omega$; moreover, $K_0$ always dominates $\widehat{K}_0$ while the latter is continuous. By Proposition 2.6 we immediately obtain
\[ K_{\Omega_1,0}(z) = K_{\Omega_2,0}(F(z))|J_F(z)|^2 \]
\[ \widehat{K}_{\Omega_1,0}(z) = \widehat{K}_{\Omega_2,0}(F(z))|J_F(z)|^2 \]
for any biholomorphic mapping $F : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2$. 

The functions $K_{2/m}(z)$ ($m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$), $K_0(z)$ and $\hat{K}_0(z)$ can be used to produce various invariant Kähler metrics. Following Narasimhan-Simha [26], we introduce the following weighted Bergman space

$$A^2_p(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 / K_p < \infty \right\}.$$ 

Let $K_{2,p}(z)$ denote the Bergman kernel associated to $A^2_p(\Omega)$. Then

$$ds^2_{2/m} := \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log K_{2,2/m}(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} dz_j \otimes d\bar{z}_k$$

gives an invariant Kähler metric on $\Omega$ (cf. [30]; see also [9]). Analogously, we may introduce the following weighted Bergman spaces

$$A^0_0(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 / K_0 < \infty \right\}$$

$$\hat{A}^0_0(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 / \hat{K}_0 < \infty \right\}.$$ 

Let $K_{2,0}(z)$ (resp. $\hat{K}_{2,0}(z)$) denote the Bergman kernel associated to $A^0_0(\Omega)$ (resp. $\hat{A}^0_0(\Omega)$). It is not difficult to see that

$$ds^2_0 := \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log K_{2,0}(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} dz_j \otimes d\bar{z}_k$$

$$\hat{ds}^2_0 := \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log \hat{K}_{2,0}(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} dz_j \otimes d\bar{z}_k$$

give invariant Kähler metrics on $\Omega$.

**Problem 10.** Is it possible to construct an invariant complete metric on any bounded pseudo-convex domain by using the $p-$Bergman kernel?

It is also valuable to study the following high order minimizing problem:

$$m_p^{(\alpha)}(z) := \sup \left\{ \|f\|_p : f \in A^p(\Omega), \partial^{(\alpha)} f(z) = 1 \text{ and } \partial^{(\beta)} f(z) = 0, \forall \beta < \alpha \right\}$$

where for $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n)$ we define $\beta < \alpha \iff |\beta| < |\alpha|$ or $|\beta| = |\alpha|$ and $\beta_j = \alpha_j$ for $j < k$ while $\beta_k > \alpha_k$. Analogously, one can show that there exists exactly one minimizer $m_p^{(\alpha)}(\cdot, z)$ for $p \geq 1$, and many properties of $m_p(\cdot, z)$ extend to $m_p^{(\alpha)}(\cdot, z)$. An elegant observation due to Bergman states that for every $z \in \Omega$, \{\begin{align*}
m_2^{(\alpha)}(\cdot, z) / \|m_2^{(\alpha)}(\cdot, z)\|_2 \end{align*}\}$_{\alpha}$

is a complete orthonormal basis of $A^2(\Omega)$.

**Problem 11.** Does \{\begin{align*}
m_p^{(\alpha)}(\cdot, z) / \|m_p^{(\alpha)}(\cdot, z)\|_p \end{align*}\}$_{\alpha}$ form a Schauder basis of $A^p(\Omega)$?
9. APPENDIX

Proof of (4.1). A straightforward calculation shows

\[
(b^{p-2} + |a|^{p-2})|b - a|^2 = |b|^p + |a|^p + |b|^{p-2}|a|^2 + |a|^{p-2}|b|^2 - 2\Re(b|^{p-2}\overline{ba}) - 2\Re(|a|^{p-2}\overline{ab}).
\]

\[
(b^{p-2} - |a|^{p-2})(|b|^2 - |a|^2) = |b|^p + |a|^p - |b|^{p-2}|a|^2 - |a|^{p-2}|b|^2.
\]

Summing up, we obtain the following basic equality:

\[
(b^{p-2} + |a|^{p-2})|b - a|^2 + (b^{p-2} - |a|^{p-2})(|b|^2 - |a|^2) = 2|b|^p + 2|a|^p - 2\Re(b^{p-2}\overline{ba}) - 2\Re(|a|^{p-2}\overline{ab})
\]

(9.1) \[= 2\Re\left\{ (b^{p-2}\overline{b} - |a|^{p-2}\overline{a})(b - a) \right\}.
\]

For every \( p \geq 2 \) we have

\[
|b - a|^{p-2} \leq (|a| + |b|)^{p-2} \leq 2^{p-2} \max\{|a|^{p-2}, |b|^{p-2}\} \leq 2^{p-2}(|a|^{p-2} + |b|^{p-2}).
\]

This combined with (9.1) gives (4.1).

Proof of (4.2). Let \( 1 < p \leq 2 \). The Newton-Lebnitz formula yields

\[
|b|^{p-2}\overline{b} - |a|^{p-2}\overline{a} = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt}\left\{ |a + t(b - a)|^{p-2} \cdot a + t(b - a) \right\} dt
\]

\[
= (\overline{b} - \overline{a}) \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-2} dt + (p - 2) \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-4}\Re\left\{ t|b - a|^2 + a(\overline{b} - \overline{a}) \right\} \frac{a + t(b - a)}{a + t(b - a)} dt,
\]

so that

\[
(b^{p-2}\overline{b} - |a|^{p-2}\overline{a})(b - a)
\]

\[= |b - a|^2 \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-2}
\]

(9.2) \[+ (p - 2) \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-4}\Re\left\{ t|b - a|^2 + a(\overline{b} - \overline{a}) \right\} \frac{t|b - a|^2 + a(b - \overline{a})}{t|b - a|^2 + a(b - \overline{a})} dt.
\]
It follows that
\[ \text{Re} \left\{ (|b|^{p-2}b - |a|^{p-2}a)(b - a) \right\} \]
\[ = |b - a|^2 \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-2} \]
\[ + (p - 2) \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-4} \text{Re} \left\{ t|a|^2 + a(\bar{b} - \bar{a}) \right\}^2 dt \]
\[ = (p - 1)|b - a|^2 \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-2} dt \]
(9.3)
\[ + (2 - p) |\text{Im} \{a\bar{b}\}|^2 \int_0^1 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-4} dt \]

since
(9.4)
\[ (\text{Re}\{\bar{a}(b - a)\} + t|b - a|^2)^2 + (\text{Im}\{a\bar{b}\})^2 = |b - a|^2 |a + t(b - a)|^2. \]
(9.3) implies (4.2) since
\[ |a + t(b - a)| = |(1 - t)a + tb| \leq |a| + |b|, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1. \]

Proof of (4.4). Set
\[ \eta(t) := |a + t(b - a)|^2 = |a|^2 + 2t \text{Re}\{\bar{a}(b - a)\} + t^2 |b - a|^2 \]
\[ \kappa(t) := \eta(t)^{p/2} = |a + t(b - a)|^p. \]

A straightforward calculation yields
\[ \kappa'(t) = \frac{p}{2} \eta(t)^{\frac{p}{2} - 1} \eta'(t) = p|a + t(b - a)|^{p-2} \left( \text{Re}\{\bar{a}(b - a)\} + t|b - a|^2 \right) \]
and
\[ \kappa''(t) = \frac{p}{2} \eta(t)^{\frac{p}{2} - 1} \eta''(t) + \frac{p}{2} \left( \frac{p}{2} - 1 \right) \eta(t)^{\frac{p}{2} - 2} \eta'(t)^2 \]
\[ = p|b - a|^2 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-2} \]
\[ + p(p - 2)|a + t(b - a)|^{p-4} \left( \text{Re}\{\bar{a}(b - a)\} + t|b - a|^2 \right)^2. \]

This combined with (9.4) gives
\[ \kappa''(t) = p|a + t(b - a)|^{p-4} (\text{Im}\{a\bar{b}\})^2 \]
(9.5)
\[ + p(p - 1)|a + t(b - a)|^{p-4} \left( \text{Re}\{\bar{a}(b - a)\} + t|b - a|^2 \right)^2. \]

Thus we have
\[ \kappa''(t) \geq p \min\{1, p - 1\} |a + t(b - a)|^{p-4} \]
\[ \cdot \left\{ (\text{Im}\{a\bar{b}\})^2 + (\text{Re}\{\bar{a}(b - a)\} + t|b - a|^2)^2 \right\} \]
(9.6)
\[ = p \min\{1, p - 1\} |b - a|^2 |a + t(b - a)|^{p-2}. \]
On the other hand, integral by parts gives
\[ \kappa(1) = \kappa(0) + \kappa'(0) + \int_0^1 (1-t)\kappa''(t)dt, \]
that is,
\[ |b|^p = |a|^p + p\text{Re}\{ |a|^{p-2}\overline{a}(b-a) \} + \int_0^1 (1-t)\kappa''(t)dt. \]
This combined with (9.6) gives
\[ |b|^p \geq |a|^p + p\text{Re}\{ |a|^{p-2}\overline{a}(b-a) \} \]
\[ + p \min\{1, p-1\} |b-a|^2 \int_0^1 (1-t)|a+t(b-a)|^{p-2}dt. \]
(9.8)

Since \( |a + t(b-a)| \leq |a| + |b| \), we see that (4.4) follows from (9.8).

**Proof of (4.3).** Suppose \( p > 2 \). Note that
\[ I(t) := \int_0^1 (1-t)|a + t(b-a)|^{p-2} \geq \int_0^1 (1-t)|a-t(b-a)|^{p-2}. \]
If \( |a| \geq |b-a|/2 \), then
\[ I(t) \geq |b-a|^{p-2} \int_0^{1/4} (1-t)(1/2-t)^{p-2} \geq \frac{7}{4^{p+3}} |b-a|^{p-2}. \]
If \( |a| \leq |b-a|/2 \), then
\[ I(t) \geq |b-a|^{p-2} \int_{3/4}^1 (1-t)(t-1/2)^{p-2}dt \geq \frac{1}{4^{p+3}} |b-a|^{p-2}. \]
These combined with (9.8) gives (4.3).

**Proof of (4.5).** This follows directly from (9.5) and (9.7).
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