

Bergman-Einstein metrics, hyperbolic metrics and Stein spaces with spherical boundaries

Xiaojun Huang ^{*} and Ming Xiao [†]

Abstract

We give an affirmative solution to a conjecture of Cheng proposed in 1979 which asserts that the Bergman metric of a smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n , $n \geq 2$, is Kähler-Einstein if and only if the domain is biholomorphic to the ball. We establish versions of various classical theorems that are used in the solution for Stein spaces. Among other things, we construct a hyperbolic metric over a Stein space with spherical boundary. We also prove the Q. K. Lu type uniformization theorem for Stein spaces with isolated normal singularities.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 32E10, 32Q20, 32D15, 32Q45.

1 Introduction

Canonical metrics are important objects under study in Complex Analysis of Several Variables. Since Cheng-Yau proved in [7] the existence of a complete Kähler-Einstein metric over a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n with reasonably smooth boundary, it has become a natural question to understand when the Cheng-Yau metric of a bounded pseudoconvex domain is precisely its Bergman metric. S. Y. Cheng conjectured in 1979 [6] that if the Bergman metric of a smoothly bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain is Kähler-Einstein, then the domain is biholomorphic to the ball. Cheng's conjecture was previously obtained by Fu-Wong [16] and Nemirovski-Shafikov [28] in the case of complex dimension two. There are also closely related studies on versions of the Cheng conjecture in terms of metrics defined by other canonical potential functions. The reader is referred to work of Li [22],[23], [24] and the references therein on this matter

The main purpose of this paper is twofold. One is to present a solution of the Cheng conjecture in any dimensions. The other is to use this opportunity to generalize several classical results used for the solution of the Cheng conjecture to Stein spaces with singularities, which might be of independent interest and importance in their own right.

^{*}Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1665412.

[†]Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1800549

The paper is divided into three parts. In the first part of the paper, we give an affirmative solution to Cheng's conjecture [6], based on deep works of many mathematicians in the past 40 years. Namely, we prove the following:

Theorem 1.1. *The Bergman metric of a smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n ($n \geq 2$) is Kähler-Einstein if and only if the domain is biholomorphic to the ball.*

To verify the Cheng conjecture, we first show that the Einstein property of the Bergman metric over a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain Ω forces the boundary $\partial\Omega$ to be spherical. Namely, at each point of $\partial\Omega$ there is a small open piece of $\partial\Omega$ that is CR-diffeomorphic to an open piece of the sphere of the same dimension. To prove that, we will fundamentally make use of the work done in Chern-Moser [9], Fefferman [11][12][13], Christoffers [10], Fu-Wong [16], etc. Once this is known, as in the work of Nemirovski-Shafikov [29], one can use the classical Kerner theorem [21] to prove that Ω is a ball quotient (This can also be proved by applying the extension theorem in Chern-Ji [8] instead of the general Kerner theorem, once Ω is known to have a spherical boundary). In the second part of the paper, we establish the following Kerner type theorem for Stein spaces even with isolated complex singularities. Indeed, we will prove a more general version of the multi-valued Hartogs extension result, (see Theorem 3.3), which gives Theorem 1.2 as a special case. See Section 3 for the explanation of terminologies used below.

Theorem 1.2. *Let Ω be a Stein space (of complex dimension at least two) with possibly isolated singularities and connected compact strongly pseudoconvex smooth boundary $M = \partial\Omega$. Let (f, D) be a non-constant CR mapping, where D is an open connected subset of M . Let $C > 0$ be a constant such that $\|f\| \leq C$ over D . Suppose that (f, D) admits a CR continuation along any curve in M and for each CR mapping element (g, D^*) with $D^* \subset M$ obtained by continuing (f, D) along a curve in M , it holds that $\|g\| \leq C$. Then (f, D) admits a holomorphic continuation along any curve γ with $\gamma(0) \in D$ and $\gamma(t) \in \text{Reg}(\Omega)$ for $t \in (0, 1]$. Moreover, for any holomorphic mapping element (h, U) with $U \subset \text{Reg}(\Omega)$ obtained from continuation of (f, D) , we have $\|h\| < C$ on U .*

Here $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ denotes the set of smooth points in Ω . We mention that in the above theorem we do not have in general the extension up to the singular points even if the singularities are normal, which is different from the classical Hartogs extension theorem. (See Remark 3.5). Kerner's original theorem and his method of proof [21] do not apply to Stein spaces with singularities. Also in the work of Chern-Ji [8] on the spherical boundary case with (f, D) being a CR diffeomorphism to a piece of the sphere, the lift of (f, D) was proved to extend along any curve in the extended G-structure bundle over Ω which implies the bimeromorphic extension of (f, D) on the base manifold Ω along any curve. In their proof, it is crucial for Ω to be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n . For the proof of Theorem 3.3 and thus Theorem 1.2, we will employ a different but in fact more elementary and self-contained argument than those used in [21] and [8], based on the Lewy and Baouendi-Treves extension theorem [2], Morse function theory and the Phragmén-Lindelöf principle. Making use of Theorem 1.2, we can construct a hyperbolic metric over Ω :

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\bar{\Omega}$ be a Stein space of dimension at least two that has a connected compact smooth boundary and possibly isolated singularities in the interior. Assume the boundary $\partial\Omega$ is spherical. Then there is a hyperbolic metric ω_0 on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ that is complete at infinity.*

We mention that Theorem 1.3 is only new when Ω has singularities. Also, a Kähler metric is called hyperbolic if it has constant negative holomorphic sectional curvature. We say the metric is complete at infinity if for every real number $R > 0$, the ball centered at $p_0 \in \text{Reg}(\Omega)$ with radius R (with respect to the metric) has compact closure in Ω .

When Ω in Theorem 1.3 is not smooth, the hyperbolic metric may not be complete at the singular point. For instance, as proved in Huang [19], if $\bar{\Omega}$ is embedded in a complex Euclidean space with $\partial\Omega$ spherical and algebraic, then Ω has exactly one singular point which is a finite quotient singularity of the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. The naturally inherited hyperbolic metric is then not complete at the singular point. On the other hand, if the hyperbolic metric in Theorem 1.3 is complete at the singular point, then Ω must be a completion of a non-compact ball quotient space. A typical example of such a domain is obtained by taking the quotient space of \mathbb{B}^n for a lattice $\Gamma \subset \text{Aut}(\mathbb{B}^n)$ with a fundamental region having one boundary component shrinking to a point on the unit sphere and one boundary component being an open piece of the unit sphere. The possible non-completeness at the singularities makes it subtle to study the uniqueness of such hyperbolic metrics. The following Example 1.4 shows that the hyperbolic metric in Theorem 1.3 may not be unique (even up to scaling) in general in the dimension one case. When the dimension is at least two, we will establish a uniqueness result of the metric under a geodesic completeness assumption near the boundary. (See Proposition 3.12).

Example 1.4. *Let Δ be the unit disk and let X be the Riemann surface with singularity in \mathbb{C}^2 give by $\{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : w^2 = z^3\} \cap \Delta^2$. It is indeed the image of the map $t \rightarrow (t^2, t^3), t \in \Delta$, and has an isolated singularity $(0, 0)$. Note $X^* := X \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ is biholomorphic to the punctured disk $\Delta^* := \Delta \setminus \{0\}$. Then the hyperbolic metric on Δ^* induces a hyperbolic metric ω_1 on X^* and the Bergman metric on Δ^* induces a hyperbolic metric ω_2 on X^* . Notice that ω_1 is complete near the singularity while ω_2 is not. And they are both complete at infinity. A scaling cannot make them identical.*

Back to our description of the proof of Theorem 1.1, once the domain Ω is known to be a ball quotient (since a domain in \mathbb{C}^n has no singularities), one can apply a classical theorem of Qi-Keng Lu to conclude that Ω is biholomorphic to the unit ball. The last part of our paper is devoted to establishing the Lu type theorem for a Stein space with possibly normal singularities:

Theorem 1.5. *Let Ω be a Stein space with possibly isolated normal singularities of complex dimension $n \geq 2$ with Bergman metric ω^B . Assume that the Bergman metric is complete at infinity and the induced Bergman-Bochner map is one-to-one (over $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$). Then Ω is biholomorphic to the unit ball \mathbb{B}^n if and only if $(\text{Reg}(\Omega), \omega^B)$ has constant holomorphic sectional curvature.*

Here the Bergman-Bochner map is a map from the smooth part of Ω to \mathbb{P}^∞ through an orthonormal basis of the Bergman space of Ω . See §4 for more details of its definition.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) > 0\}$ be a strictly pseudoconvex domain with a smooth defining function ρ . In [11], Fefferman showed that the Bergman kernel function $K(z) = K(z, \bar{z})$ of Ω has the asymptotic expansion

$$K(z) = \frac{\phi(z)}{\rho^{n+1}(z)} + \psi(z) \log \rho(z),$$

where $\phi, \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\phi|_{\partial\Omega} \neq 0$. In particular, if the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω is spherical, then ψ vanishes to infinite order at the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

We first recall the notion of Fefferman defining functions or Fefferman approximate solutions. Consider the following Monge-Ampère type equation introduced in [12]:

$$J(u) := (-1)^n \det \begin{pmatrix} u & u_{\bar{\beta}} \\ u_{\alpha} & u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \end{pmatrix} = u^{n+1} \det \left(\left(\log \frac{1}{u} \right)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \right) = 1 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

with $u = 0$ on $b\Omega$. Fefferman proved that for any bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain Ω with smooth boundary, there is a smooth defining function r of Ω such that $J(r) = 1 + O(r^{n+1})$, which is called a Fefferman approximate solution or a Fefferman defining function of Ω . Moreover, if r_1, r_2 are two Fefferman approximate solutions, then $r_1 - r_2 = O(\rho^{n+2})$, where ρ is a given defining function of Ω .

We next recall the Moser normal form theory [9] and the notion of Fefferman scalar boundary invariants (cf. [13], [17]): Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a real analytic strictly pseudoconvex hypersurface containing $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$ (Assume here that $n \geq 3$). There exists a coordinates system $(z, w) := (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, w)$ such that in the new coordinates, $p = 0$ and M is defined near p by an equation of the form:

$$u = |z|^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \geq 2, l \geq 0} A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l z^\alpha \bar{z}^\beta v^l, \quad (1)$$

where $w = u + iv$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), \beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$ are multiindices. Moreover, the coefficients $A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy the following:

- $A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l$ is symmetric with respect to permutation of the indices in α and β , respectively.
- $\overline{A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l} = A_{\beta\bar{\alpha}}^l$.
- $\text{tr} A_{2\bar{2}}^l = 0, \text{tr}^2 A_{2\bar{3}}^l = 0, \text{tr}^3 A_{3\bar{3}}^l = 0$, where $A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l$ is the symmetric tensor $[A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l]_{|\alpha|=p, |\beta|=q}$ on \mathbb{C}^{n-1} and the traces are the usual tensorial traces with respect to $\delta_{i\bar{j}}$.

Here (1) is called a normal form of M at p . When M is merely smooth, the expansion is in the formal sense. $[A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l]$ are called the normal form coefficients. Recall that a boundary scalar invariant at $p \leftrightarrow 0$, or briefly an invariant of weight $w \geq 0$, is a polynomial P in the normal

form coefficients $[A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l]$ of $\partial\Omega$ satisfying certain transformation laws. (See [13] and [17] for more details on this transformation law). Using a Fefferman defining function in the asymptotic expansion of the Bergman kernel function:

$$K(z) = \frac{\phi(z)}{r^{n+1}(z)} + \psi(z) \log r(z), \quad (2)$$

with $\phi, \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, $\phi|_{\partial\Omega} \neq 0$, then $\phi \bmod r^{n+1}, \psi \bmod r^\infty$ are locally determined. Moreover, if $\partial\Omega$ is in its normal form at $p = 0 \in b\Omega$, then any Taylor coefficient at 0 of ϕ of order $\leq n$, and that of ψ of any order is a universal polynomial in the normal form coefficients $[A_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^l]$. (See Boutet-Sjöstrand [4] and a related argument in [13].) In particular, we state the following result from [10]. (See also [17]):

Proposition 2.1. (*[10], [17]*) *Let Ω be as above and suppose that $\partial\Omega$ is in the Moser normal form up to sufficiently high order. Let r be a Fefferman defining function, and let ϕ, ψ be as in (2). Then $\phi|_{\partial\Omega} = \frac{n!}{\pi^n}$, $\phi = \frac{n!}{\pi^n} + O(r^2)$ and $P_2 = \frac{\phi - \frac{n!}{\pi^n}}{r^2}|_{\partial\Omega}$ defines an invariant of weight 2 at 0. Furthermore, if $n = 2$, then $P_2 = 0$. If $n \geq 3$, $P_2 = c_n \|A_{2\bar{2}}^0\|^2$ for some universal constant $c_n \neq 0$.*

As mentioned earlier, Theorem 1.1 is known in the case of $n = 2$ in [16] and [28]. We next assume that $n \geq 3$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Recall the Fefferman asymptotic expansion:

$$K(z) = \frac{\phi(z)}{\rho^{n+1}(z)} + \psi(z) \log \rho(z) = \frac{\phi + \rho^{n+1}\psi \log \rho}{\rho^{n+1}} \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega \quad (3)$$

with $\phi, \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\phi|_{\partial\Omega} \neq 0$, where $\rho \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is a smooth defining function of Ω with $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) > 0\}$. Since $K(z) > 0$ for $z \in \Omega$, we have

$$\phi + \rho^{n+1}\psi \log \rho > 0 \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega. \quad (4)$$

Thus

$$(K)^{-\frac{1}{n+1}}(z) = \frac{\rho}{(\phi + \rho^{n+1}\psi \log \rho)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}} \quad (5)$$

is well-defined in Ω .

Let Ω be a smoothly bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain. We notice that the Kähler-Einstein condition of the Bergman metric is equivalent to the fact that $\log K(z)$ is a Kähler-Einstein potential function of Ω . More precisely, we have $J \left[\left(\frac{\pi^n}{n!} K(z) \right)^{-\frac{1}{n+1}} \right] = 1$ for $z \in \Omega$. (See [16]). Let $r_0(z) := \left(\frac{\pi^n}{n!} K \right)^{-\frac{1}{n+1}}$. We hence have that $r_0(z) > 0$ and $J(r_0) = 1$ in Ω . We next recall the following result of Fu-Wong [16]:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho > 0\}$ be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain with a smooth defining function ρ . If the Bergman metric of Ω is Kähler-Einstein, then the coefficient of the logarithmic term in Fefferman's expansion (3) vanishes to infinite order at $\text{b}\Omega$, i.e., $\psi = O(\rho^k)$ for any $k > 0$.*

As a consequence, $\phi + \rho^{n+1}\psi \log \rho$ extends smoothly to a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$. Since $\phi|_{\partial\Omega} \neq 0$, we have

$$\phi + \rho^{n+1}\psi \log \rho > 0 \text{ for all } z \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Hence r_0 extends smoothly to a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$ and it is then easy to conclude that r_0 is a Fefferman defining function of Ω . Then from the way r_0 was constructed, it follows that

$$K(z) = \frac{n!}{\pi^n} r_0^{-(n+1)}. \quad (6)$$

Comparing (6) with (2), we arrive at the conclusion that if we let $r = r_0$ in (2), then $\phi \equiv \frac{n!}{\pi^n}$. Then it follows from Proposition 2.1 that $P_2 = c_n \|A_{2\bar{2}}^0\|^2 = 0$ at $p \in \partial\Omega$ if $\partial\Omega$ is in the Moser normal form up to sufficiently high order at p with $A_{2\bar{2}}^0$ being the Chern-Moser-Weyl-tensor at p . Consequently, $A_{2\bar{2}}^0 = 0$ in each Moser normal coordinates at each $\partial\Omega$, for $c_n \neq 0$. That is, every boundary point of $\partial\Omega$ is a CR umbilical point. By a classical result of Chern-Moser, $\partial\Omega$ is spherical. We then apply Theorem 1.3 to conclude that Ω has a complete hyperbolic metric ω_0 . As in [28], by the uniqueness of result of Cheng and Yau [7], the Bergman metric of D is proportional to the metric ω_0 and hence has constant holomorphic sectional curvature. Finally it follows from a well-know result due to Qi-Keng Lu [25] or Theorem 1.5 that Ω is biholomorphic to the unit ball. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2 and 1.3

In this section, we give a proof for Theorem 1.2 and 1.3. Recall that Ω is called a Stein space with possibly isolated singularities if Ω is a Stein space and its singular set $\text{sing}(\Omega)$ consists of only isolated points if it is not empty. Let Ω be such a Stein space with a compact smooth boundary M . In the following context, we write $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega \cup M$, $\text{Reg}(\Omega) = \Omega \setminus \text{sing}(\Omega)$ and $\text{Reg}(\bar{\Omega}) = \bar{\Omega} \setminus \text{sing}(\Omega)$.

We next introduce some standard terminology in the study of extensions of CR and holomorphic functions.

We say (f, D) is a (continuous) CR function element on M if D is a connected open piece of M and $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ is a continuous CR map. Similarly, we say (g, U) is a holomorphic function element on $\text{Reg}(\bar{\Omega})$ if U is a connected open subset of $\text{Reg}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ is a continuous map that is holomorphic in $U \cap \Omega$. Note in this article, a "function" can be vector-valued. We will also sometimes use the notion of germs of functions. Fix a CR function element (f, D) on M and $p \in D$. We write $(f)_p$ for the germ of CR function f at p on M . Similarly, for a holomorphic function element (g, U) and $q \in U$, we denote by $[g]_q$ the germ of holomorphic function g at q .

Fix a CR function element (f, D) on M and a curve $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\sigma(0) \in D$ (resp. a curve $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ such that $\sigma(0) \in D$.) We make the following definition.

Definition 3.1. *We say (f, D) admits a holomorphic continuation along σ (resp. admits a (continuous) CR continuation along σ) if there exists a collection of holomorphic function elements $\{(f_j, U_j)\}_{j=0}^k$ on $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ (resp. a collection of CR function elements $\{(f_j, U_j)\}_{j=0}^k$ on M) such that*

- (1) $f_0 = f$ near $\sigma(0)$ in $U_0 \cap D$,
- (2) There is a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{k+1} = 1$ such that $\sigma([t_j, t_{j+1}]) \subset U_j$, for all $0 \leq j \leq k$;
- (3) $f_j = f_{j+1}$ on $U_j \cap U_{j+1}$ for $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$.

Here (f_k, U_k) is called a branch of (f, D) obtained by holomorphic (resp. CR) continuation along σ . Fix a plurisubharmonic function $\psi : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\psi(f) \leq 0$ on D . We further say (f, D) admits a holomorphic continuation with ψ -estimate along σ (resp. admits a CR continuation with ψ -estimate along σ) if there is a choice of $\{(f_j, U_j)\}_{j=0}^k$ such that $\psi(f_j) \leq 0$ on U_j for all j .

Definition 3.2. *Let (f, D) and ψ be as above, and $\hat{\Omega}$ an open connected subset of $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ containing D . We say (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic continuation in $\hat{\Omega}$ (resp. admits unrestricted CR continuation in M) with ψ -estimate if (f, D) admits a holomorphic continuation with ψ -estimate along every curve σ in $\hat{\Omega}$ with $\sigma(0) \in D$ (resp. if (f, D) admits a CR continuation with ψ -estimate along every curve γ with $\gamma(0) \in D$ in M).*

In particular, we say (f, D) admits unrestricted bounded holomorphic continuation in $\hat{\Omega}$ if in Definition 3.2 ψ can be taken to be $\psi(z) = \|z\|^2 - C$ for some $C > 0$. We define unrestricted bounded CR continuation in a similar way.

To make notations simple, we will say the function element (g, U) is a holomorphic branch of (f, D) in $\hat{\Omega}$ if (a). $U \subset \hat{\Omega}$, and (b). There exists a path σ in $\hat{\Omega}$ with $\sigma(0) \in D$ and $\sigma(1) \in U$ such that (g, U) can be obtained by holomorphic continuation of (f, D) along σ . Similarly, we say $[g]_q$ is a holomorphic branch of (f, D) in $\hat{\Omega}$ if there exists a holomorphic branch (g, U) of (f, D) in $\hat{\Omega}$ in the above sense and $q \in U$.

To prove Theorem 1.3, we will need the following result which establishes the Kerner type theorem [21] for the Stein space with possible singularities. It also contains Theorem 1.2 as its special case.

Theorem 3.3. *Let Ω be a Stein space with possibly isolated singularities and connected compact strongly pseudoconvex boundary $M = \partial\Omega$. Let (f, D) be a CR function (or map) element on M and $\psi : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a plurisubharmonic function such that $\psi(f) \leq 0$ on D . Then the following conclusions hold.*

- (1) Suppose that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\Omega) \geq 3$ and (f, D) admits unrestricted CR continuation in M with ψ -estimate. Then (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic continuation in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ with ψ -estimate.
- (2) Suppose that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\Omega) = 2$ and (f, D) admits unrestricted bounded CR continuation in M with ψ -estimate. Then (f, D) admits unrestricted bounded holomorphic continuation in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ with ψ -estimate.

Moreover, in both cases, assume there is a holomorphic branch (h, U) of (f, D) in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\psi(h(p)) = 0$ at some point p in $U \setminus M$. Then $\psi(g) \equiv 0$ for any holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) . In particular, $\psi(f) \equiv 0$ on D .

The last part of Theorem 3.3 immediately implies that if we additionally assume $\psi(f)$ is not constantly zero on D , then for any branch (g, V) of (f, D) in $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$, it holds that $\psi(g) < 0$ on V . Besides this, we also have the following consequence.

Remark 3.4. Assume in Theorem 3.3 that ψ is strictly plurisubharmonic on \mathbb{C}^N . If (f, D) is not constant, then for any holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) in $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$, it holds that $\psi(g) < 0$ on V . Indeed, suppose there is a holomorphic branch (h, U) of (f, D) in $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ such that $\psi(h(p)) = 0$ for some $p \in U$. By Theorem 3.3, $\psi(g) \equiv 0$ for every holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) . Since ψ is strictly plurisubharmonic, we know $\{\psi = 0\}$ contains only trivial complex varieties. But $\psi \circ g \equiv 0$ on V . We conclude g must be constant for every branch (g, V) . This contradicts with the assumption that (f, D) is not constant.

Remark 3.5. In general, (f, D) does not admit holomorphic continuation across a singular point (even normal singular point) of Ω , as demonstrated by the following example.

Example 3.6. Let $\overline{\Omega}$ be the Stein space with boundary defined by

$$\overline{\Omega} = \{W = (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : \sum_{j=1}^3 |w_j|^2 \leq 1, w_2^2 = 2w_1w_3\}.$$

Let $\pi : \overline{\mathbb{B}^2} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$ be given by $\pi(z_1, z_2) = (z_1^2, \sqrt{2}z_1z_2, z_2^2)$. Note π is 2 to 1 covering from $\mathbb{B}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ to $\Omega \setminus \{0\}$ and $\pi(0) = 0$. Fix $p_0 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \in M := \partial\Omega$. Let D be a small open piece of M containing p_0 and (f, D) a CR mapping element given by $f(W) = (\sqrt{w_1}, \sqrt{w_3})$. Here $\sqrt{w} = \sqrt{|w|}e^{i\frac{\theta}{2}}$ for $w = |w|e^{i\theta}$ with $-\pi < \theta < \pi$. Notice that f maps D into $\partial\mathbb{B}^2$. Since M is spherical, (f, D) admits unrestricted bounded CR continuation in M by a result of Burns-Shnider [3]. By Theorem 3.3, (f, D) admits unrestricted bounded holomorphic continuation in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$. We claim, however, it does not always admit holomorphic continuation across the singular point 0. Set γ_1 be a curve in $\overline{\Omega}$ such that $\gamma_1(0) = p_0$ and $\gamma_1(1) = (\epsilon, 0, 0)$ for some small $\epsilon > 0$ such that γ_1 never intersects $\{w_1 = 0\}$ and let the curve γ_2 in $\overline{\Omega}$ be given by $\gamma_2(t) = (\epsilon t, 0, 0), 0 \leq t \leq 1$. Write $\gamma = \gamma_1 + (-\gamma_2)$. Note $\gamma([0, 1])$ does not pass through $\{w_1 = 0\}$. We know for every $0 \leq t_0 < 1$, if we write (h, V) for the branch we obtain at

$\gamma(t_0)$ with $h = (h_1, h_2)$ on V , then h_1 equals either $[-\sqrt{w_1}]_{\gamma(t_0)}$ or $[\sqrt{w_1}]_{\gamma(t_0)}$. Without loss of generality, we assume it is the latter when $t_0 (\neq 1)$ is close to 1. Suppose we can extend (f, D) holomorphically along γ to get a holomorphic branch (g, U) at $\gamma(1) = 0$ (In particular $0 \in U$). Write $g = (g_1, g_2)$ on U . Then $g_1 = \sqrt{w_1}$ near $(\epsilon_0, 0, 0)$ for a sufficiently small ϵ_0 . But this is impossible as we can find a loop σ in U given by $\sigma(t) = (\epsilon_0 e^{2\pi i t}, 0, 0) \in \overline{\Omega}, 0 \leq t \leq 1$, so that we get a different branch when applying holomorphic continuation to $\sqrt{w_1}$ along σ .

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is long and we will split it into several steps, to be established in the following two subsections §3.1 and §3.2.

Before proceeding to the proof, we first fix a Morse plurisubharmonic defining function ρ of $\overline{\Omega}$. More precisely, we choose a bounded plurisubharmonic exhaustion function $\rho : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow [-\infty, 0]$ of Ω such that $\rho \equiv 0$ on $M, \rho < 0$ in Ω and $\rho(z) = -\infty$ if and only if z is a singular point of Ω . In addition, $d\rho|_M \neq 0$ and ρ is smooth strongly plurisubharmonic on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$. Moreover, ρ has only finitely many critical points in $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ and they are all non-degenerate. The existence of such a ρ is guaranteed by the assumption on $\overline{\Omega}$ and Morse function theory (The local existence of such a function near a singular point can be found in Milnor [27]. Away from singular points, we refer to the book of Forstnerič [14] for such a construction. Then one applies the Morse approximation to get our ρ).

We then fix a Riemannian metric ds^2 over $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ which induces a distance function $\hat{d}(x, y)$ for $x, y \in \text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$. Write X_ρ for the dual vector field of $-d\rho$ with respect to ds^2 over the places in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ away from the critical points of ρ .

3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.3: Part I

This step is the same for the two cases (1), (2) in Theorem 3.3 and it aims to prove (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic continuation in a tube neighborhood of M . We emphasize that the boundedness assumption in case (2) is not used in §3.1 to derive the extension. We choose three finite open convex cover $\{W_j^{(k)}\}_{j=1}^m, k = 1, 2, 3$ of $(M, ds^2|_M)$ with $W_j^{(1)} \subset\subset W_j^{(2)} \subset\subset W_j^{(3)}$ for each j . Moreover, we make $W_j^{(3)}$ sufficiently small for each j so that a neighborhood of $\overline{W_j^{(3)}}$ on M is CR diffeomorphic to a strongly pseudoconvex hypersurface in \mathbb{C}^n . Write D_j for the union of all smooth holomorphic disks attached to $W_j^{(3)}$ which can be deformed through a continuation family of disks to points in $W_j^{(3)}$. For $0 < \epsilon_1 \ll 1$ and $1 \leq k \leq 3$, we let $\widehat{W}_{j, \epsilon_1}^{(k)}$ be the open subset of $\overline{\Omega}$ obtained by flowing each point $p \in W_j^{(k)}$ along X_ρ with time $0 \leq t < \epsilon_1$. Note we can find an $\epsilon_1 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $\widehat{W}_{j, \epsilon_1}^{(2)} \subset\subset (D_j \cup W_j^{(3)})$ for each j , and that $\widehat{W}_{j, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ is topological trivial (recall $W_j^{(2)}$ is chosen to be convex). Fix such an ϵ_1 . Write for $r_2 < r_1 \leq 0$,

$$\overline{\Omega}_{r_2, r_1} = \{p \in \overline{\Omega} : r_2 < \rho \leq r_1\}.$$

We emphasize that $\overline{\Omega}_{r_2, r_1}$ only contains its outer boundary but not its inner boundary.

Let $0 < \epsilon_2 \ll \epsilon_1$ be small enough such that $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^m \widehat{W}_{j,\epsilon_1}^{(2)}$. Define $J_{\epsilon_2} : \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0} \rightarrow M$ for the retract of $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ to M which maps every point p in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ through the orbit of X_ρ to the corresponding point on M . Note J_{ϵ_2} is a smooth map for small ϵ_2 . By the Lewy-Baouendi-Treves theorem, we see that every continuous CR function h on $W_j^{(3)}$ extends to a holomorphic function in $\widehat{W}_{j,\epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ that is continuous up to $W_j^{(2)}$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ be a curve. There is a corresponding curve $\hat{\gamma} := J_{\epsilon_2} \circ \gamma$ on M . By making ϵ_1, ϵ_2 sufficiently small, we note from the definition of J_{ϵ_2} , that $\gamma(t) \subset \widehat{W}_{j,\epsilon_1}^{(k)}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq m$, $1 \leq k \leq 3$ if and only if $\hat{\gamma}(t) \subset W_j^{(k)}$. We next prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *Let (f, D) and ψ be as in the assumption of Theorem 3.3. Fix a curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ with $\gamma(0) = p_0 \in D$ and let $\hat{\gamma}$ be as above.*

(1) *We can find $\{W_{j_l}^{(2)}\}_{l=0}^k$ and $\{\widehat{W}_{j_l,\epsilon_1}^{(2)}\}_{l=0}^k$ with $0 \leq j_l \leq m$, together with CR function elements $\{(f_l, W_{j_l}^{(2)})\}_{l=0}^k$ on M and holomorphic function elements $\{(g_l, \widehat{W}_{j_l,\epsilon_1}^{(2)})\}_{l=0}^k$ in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that the following hold:*

- (a) *The point $p_0 \in W_{j_0}^{(2)}$ and $f_0 = f$ in a neighborhood of p_0 on M .*
- (b) *There is a partition $0 = \delta_0 < \delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{k+1} = 1$ of $[0, 1]$ such that $\gamma([\delta_l, \delta_{l+1}]) \subset \widehat{W}_{j_l,\epsilon_1}^{(2)}$, $\hat{\gamma}([\delta_l, \delta_{l+1}]) \subset W_{j_l}^{(2)}$ for $0 \leq l \leq k$.*
- (c) *$f_l = g_l$ on $W_{j_l}^{(2)}$ for $0 \leq l \leq k$.*
- (d) *$f_l = f_{l+1}$ on $W_{j_l}^{(2)} \cap W_{j_{l+1}}^{(2)}$ and $g_l = g_{l+1}$ on $\widehat{W}_{j_l,\epsilon_1}^{(2)} \cap \widehat{W}_{j_{l+1},\epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ for $0 \leq l \leq k-1$.*

Consequently, $\{(g_l, \widehat{W}_{j_l,\epsilon_1}^{(2)})\}_{l=0}^k$ (resp. $\{(f_l, W_{j_l}^{(2)})\}_{l=0}^k$) induces a holomorphic (resp. CR) continuation of (f, D) along γ (resp. $\hat{\gamma}$).

(2) *It holds that $\psi \circ g_l \leq 0$ on $\widehat{W}_{j_l,\epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ for all $0 \leq l \leq k$. Moreover, assume there is some $0 \leq l_0 \leq k$ and a point $q \in \widehat{W}_{j_{l_0},\epsilon_1}^{(2)} \setminus M$ such that $\psi \circ g_{l_0}(q) = 0$. Then $\psi(g) \equiv 0$ for any holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.7: By the uniform continuity of $\hat{\gamma}$ on $[0, 1]$ and Lebesgue's number lemma, we can find some $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any sub-interval I^* of $[0, 1]$ with length bounded by ϵ , there exists some $1 \leq j(I^*) \leq m$ satisfying $\hat{\gamma}(I^*) \subset W_{j(I^*)}^{(1)}$. Note $p_0 = \gamma(0) = \hat{\gamma}(0)$ is contained in $W_{j_0}^{(1)}$ for some $1 \leq j_0 \leq m$. Set $\delta_0 = 0$ and let $\delta_1 \in (0, 1]$ be the (unique) number (if exists) such that $\hat{\gamma}([0, \delta_1]) \subset W_{j_0}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_1) \notin W_{j_0}^{(1)}$. Note here we choose j_0 such that δ_1 takes the largest value and thus we must have $\delta_1 \geq \epsilon$ if it exists. If such a number δ_1 does not exist, this means $\hat{\gamma}([0, 1]) \subset W_{j_0}^{(1)}$ and consequently $\gamma([0, 1]) \subset \widehat{W}_{j_0,\epsilon_1}^{(1)} \cap \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$. Note first by the unrestricted CR continuation assumption, the germ of f at p_0 extends to a CR function f_0 on $W_{j_0}^{(3)}$ as $W_{j_0}^{(3)}$ is simply connected. Secondly $(f_0, W_{j_0}^{(2)})$ can be extended to a holomorphic function element $(g_0, \widehat{W}_{j_0,\epsilon_1}^{(2)})$. Then $(g_0, \widehat{W}_{j_0,\epsilon_1}^{(2)})$ induces a holomorphic continuation of (f, D) along γ and the first part of lemma is established.

Now assume such a δ_1 exists. First, as above the germ of f at p_0 extends to a CR function f_0 on $W_{j_0}^{(3)}$ and f_0 extends to a holomorphic function element $(g_0, \widehat{W}_{j_0, \epsilon_1}^{(2)})$ (Thus (c) holds for $l = 0$). We then look at $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_1)$. Note $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_1) \in W_{j_0}^{(2)} \subset W_{j_0}^{(3)}$ and there exists some $1 \leq j_1 \leq m$ such that $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_1) \in W_{j_1}^{(1)}$. By the same reason as above, the germ of f_0 at $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_1)$ extends to a CR function f_1 on $W_{j_1}^{(3)}$ and f_1 extends to a holomorphic function element $(g_1, \widehat{W}_{j_1, \epsilon_1}^{(2)})$ (Thus (c) holds for $l = 1$). Note f_1 and f_0 coincide near $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_1)$. Moreover, $W_{j_0}^{(3)} \cap W_{j_1}^{(3)}$ and $\widehat{W}_{j_0, \epsilon_1}^{(2)} \cap \widehat{W}_{j_1, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ are simply connected by our construction. We conclude that $f_0 = f_1$ on $W_{j_0}^{(3)} \cap W_{j_1}^{(3)}$ and $g_1 = g_0$ in $\widehat{W}_{j_0, \epsilon_1}^{(2)} \cap \widehat{W}_{j_1, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ (Thus (d) holds for $l = 0$).

Then we pick the (unique) number δ_2 (if exists) such that $\hat{\gamma}([\delta_1, \delta_2]) \subset W_{j_1}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_2) \notin W_{j_1}^{(1)}$. Note again we choose j_1 such that δ_2 takes the largest possible value if exists and thus we must have $\delta_2 - \delta_1 \geq \epsilon$. And we run the same procedure as above to obtain $1 \leq j_2 \leq m$ such that $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_2) \in W_{j_2}^{(1)}$, along with a CR function element $(f_2, W_{j_2}^{(3)})$ and a holomorphic function element $(g_2, \widehat{W}_{j_2, \epsilon_1}^{(2)})$ such that $f_1 = f_2$ on $W_{j_1}^{(3)} \cap W_{j_2}^{(3)}$, and $g_1 = g_2$ in $\widehat{W}_{j_1, \epsilon_1}^{(2)} \cap \widehat{W}_{j_2, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$.

By repeating the above procedure for at most $\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil + 1$ times, we arrive at some positive number δ_k such that $\delta_k + \epsilon \geq 1$. More precisely, we obtain a partition $0 = \delta_0 < \delta_1 < \dots < \delta_k < \delta_{k+1} = 1$ of $[0, 1]$ and a collection of integers $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_k \leq m$ such that $\hat{\gamma}([\delta_l, \delta_{l+1}]) \in W_{j_l}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}(\delta_{l+1}) \notin W_{j_l}^{(1)}$ for $1 \leq l \leq k$ (In particular, $\hat{\gamma}([\delta_l, \delta_{l+1}]) \in W_{j_l}^{(2)}$ for all k). Moreover, there are a collection of CR function elements $\{(f_l, W_{j_l}^{(3)})\}_{l=0}^k$ and holomorphic function elements $\{(g_l, \widehat{W}_{j_l, \epsilon_1}^{(2)})\}_{l=1}^k$ satisfying condition (c) and (d). This proves Part (1) of the lemma.

To prove Part (2), we note every $p \in \widehat{W}_{j_l, \epsilon_1}^{(2)} \setminus M$, there exists a smooth holomorphic disk Δ_p attached to $W_{j_l}^{(3)}$ such that $p \in \Delta_p$. Moreover, $\psi \circ g_l$ is subharmonic in Δ_p and is continuous up to $\partial\Delta_p$, and it agrees with $\psi \circ f_l$ on $\partial\Delta_p$. By assumption (f, D) admits unrestricted CR continuation with ψ -estimate in M and thus in particular $\psi \circ f_l \leq 0$ on $\partial\Delta_p \subset W_{j_l}^{(3)}$, we conclude by the maximum principle that $\psi \circ g_l(p) \leq 0$. As p is arbitrary, we have $\psi \circ g_l \leq 0$ on $\widehat{W}_{j_l, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ for all $0 \leq l \leq k$. Now suppose there is some $0 \leq l_0 \leq k$ and a point $q \in \widehat{W}_{j_{l_0}, \epsilon_1}^{(2)} \setminus M$ such that $\psi \circ g_{l_0}(q) = 0$. This means $\psi \circ g_{l_0}$ achieves its maximum at an interior point q . Since $\psi \circ g_{l_0}$ is subharmonic in $\widehat{W}_{j_{l_0}, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$, we conclude that $\psi \circ g_{l_0} \equiv 0$ in $\widehat{W}_{j_{l_0}, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$. As $g_l = g_{l+1}$ on $\widehat{W}_{j_l, \epsilon_1}^{(2)} \cap \widehat{W}_{j_{l+1}, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$, we have each $\psi \circ g_l$ attains its maximum at an interior point and thus is constant. In particular, $\psi \circ g_0 \equiv 0$ in $\widehat{W}_{j_0, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ and $\psi \circ f_0 = 0$ in $W_{j_0}^{(2)}$. Now let (g, U) be a holomorphic branch of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$. Then there is a path σ in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$ connecting p_0 to some point $p_1 \in U$ such that (g, U) is obtained by holomorphic continuation of (f, D) along σ . By part (1) of Lemma 3.7, writing $\hat{\sigma} := J_{\epsilon_1} \circ \sigma$, there exist holomorphic function elements $\{(\tilde{g}_l, \widehat{W}_{i_l, \epsilon_1}^{(2)})\}_{l=0}^\nu$ and CR function elements $\{(f_l, W_{i_l, \epsilon_1}^{(2)})\}_{l=0}^\nu$ that satisfy the conditions (a), (b), (c), and (d), and induce a holomorphic continuation and a CR continuation of (f, D) along σ and $\hat{\sigma}$. By uniqueness of holomorphic continuation, we have $g = \hat{g}_\nu$ near q in $U \cap \widehat{W}_{i_\nu, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$. Note we have $\tilde{f}_0 = f_0$ near p_0 and $\tilde{g}_0 = g_0$ near p_0 . Then we have $\psi \circ \tilde{g}_0 \equiv 0$ on $\widehat{W}_{i_0, \epsilon_1}^{(2)}$. Applying the

maximum principle for subharmonic functions as above, we obtain that $\psi \circ \tilde{g}_l \equiv 0$ in $\widehat{W}_{i,\epsilon_1}^{(2)}$ for every $0 \leq l \leq \nu$. In particular $\psi \circ g \equiv 0$ on U . This proves Lemma 3.7. ■

By Lemma 3.7, we immediately have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *Let (f, D) be as in Theorem 3.3. The function element (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic continuation in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ with ψ -estimate (In the dimension two case (2), (f, D) admits unrestricted bounded holomorphic continuation in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ with ψ -estimate). Moreover, if there is a holomorphic branch (h, U) of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ such that $\psi(h(p)) = 0$ at some point p in $U \setminus M$. Then $\psi(g) \equiv 0$ for every holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$.*

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3: Part II

In this step, we finish the proof of Theorem 3.3. We emphasize that the treatment for the two cases are different. We will apply the method of continuous family of holomorphic curves which is a typical machinery in the study of holomorphic continuation problem. The use of the Morse function theory to study the holomorphic continuation of multiple-valued holomorphic functions near the boundary to the interior of the pseudo-convex domain first appeared in §5 of the paper by Huang-Ji [20]. In the paper by Merkel-Porten [26], they employed the Morse function theory to re-investigate the Hartogs extension theorem. In our argument here, besides the Morse function theory, the Phragmén-Lindelöf principle will also play a fundamental role.

To start with, we make the following definition. Let (f, D) be as in Theorem 3.3, i.e., it satisfies the assumption in (1) in the three or higher dimensional case, and satisfies the assumption in (2) in the dimension two case. Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a connected open subset of $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $D \subset \tilde{\Omega}$. We say $\tilde{\Omega}$ has the extendable property if, in the three or higher dimensional case, (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic continuation with ψ -estimate in $\tilde{\Omega}$; and in the dimension two case, (f, D) admits unrestricted bounded holomorphic continuation in $\tilde{\Omega}$ with ψ -estimate, where $D \cap \Omega \subset \tilde{\Omega}$. To establish Theorem 3.3, we will need to prove $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ has the extendable property. Now set

$$A = \{a < 0 : \text{The set } \overline{\Omega}_{a,0} \text{ has the extendable property}\}.$$

We first note that A is not empty as $-\epsilon_2 \in A$. Set $b = \inf(A) < 0$. Note if $b = -\infty$, then Theorem 3.3 is established. Indeed note every curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ must be contained in $\overline{\Omega}_{c,0}$ for some $c < 0$ and thus $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ has the extendable property. We will therefore assume $b > -\infty$ in the following context. Note it follows from the definition of b that $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ has the extendable property. Writing $\inf(\rho) := \inf\{\rho(z) : z \in \overline{\Omega} \setminus \text{sing}(\Omega)\}$, we have two cases:

Case I: We first consider the case if $b = \inf(\rho)$. In this case, since $b > -\infty$, we must have that $\text{sing}(\Omega) = \emptyset$. Write $\rho^{-1}(c)$ for the level set $\{z \in \overline{\Omega} : \rho(z) = c\}$. Note in this case we have $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0} = \text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus \rho^{-1}(b)$. Fix any $\hat{q} \in \rho^{-1}(b)$. By assumption \hat{q} is an isolated critical point of ρ . Moreover, the real Hessian of ρ is nondegenerate and thus strictly positive definite at \hat{q} . For every such \hat{q} , choose a small neighborhood $U_{\hat{q}}$ of \hat{q} and real coordinates x with $x(\hat{q}) = 0$ such

that \hat{q} is the only critical point in $\overline{U_{\hat{q}}}$ and $\rho(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} x_j^2 + b$ in $U_{\hat{q}}$. Then there exists a negative number $c(\hat{q}) > b$ such that $\rho^{-1}(c) \cap U_{\hat{q}} \subset\subset U_{\hat{q}}$ is a sphere whenever $b < c \leq c(\hat{q})$. Moreover, this sphere is of real dimension at least three, and thus is simply connected. Take $c_0 > b$ to be smaller than $c(\hat{q})$ for all $\hat{q} \in \rho^{-1}(b)$. And write $V(\hat{q}, c_0) := U_{\hat{q}} \cap \{\rho(x) < c_0\} \subset\subset U_{\hat{q}}$ for $\hat{q} \in \rho^{-1}(b)$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ be any curve with $\gamma(0) \in D$. We will show (f, D) admits holomorphic continuation along γ with ψ -estimate (and with the boundedness in dimension two case). Note this follows immediately from the fact that $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus \rho^{-1}(b)$ has the extendable property if γ does not intersect $\rho^{-1}(b)$. Now assume γ intersects $\rho^{-1}(b)$. By the uniform continuity of $\rho \circ \gamma$ on $[0, 1]$, there exists some small $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $\rho(\gamma(t^*)) = \hat{q} \in \rho^{-1}(b)$ and $|t - t^*| \leq \delta$, we have $\gamma(t) \in V(\hat{q}, c_0) \subset\subset U_{\hat{q}}$. Let t_0 be the minimum number such that $\gamma(t_0) \in \rho^{-1}(b)$ and write $q_0 = \gamma(t_0)$. Let $t_2 = t_0 + \delta$ (Or, let it be 1 if the number does not lie in $[0, 1]$). Let t_1 be the largest number t such that $t < t_0$ and $\gamma(t) \notin V(q_0, c_0)$. Then $\rho(\gamma(t_1)) = c_0$ and for every $t \in (t_1, t_2]$, $\rho(\gamma(t)) \in V(q_0, c_0) \subset\subset U_{q_0}$. By assumption, (f, D) admits holomorphic continuation along $\gamma([0, t_1])$ and we get a holomorphic branch at the point $q = \gamma(t_1) \in \rho^{-1}(c_0)$. Write this branch as (g, B) . Let $W_0 \subset\subset W_1 \subset\subset U_{q_0}$ be two small simply connected tube neighborhoods of $\rho^{-1}(c_0) \cap U_{q_0}$. As $W_1 \subset \text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus \rho^{-1}(b)$, (g, B) can be holomorphically extended along any path in W_1 , thus it induces a well-defined holomorphic function G in W_1 . And (G, W_1) satisfies the ψ -estimate by assumption. Then by the Hartogs extension, G extends to a holomorphic function, which we still denote by G , to an open subset W^* that contains q_0 . Here W^* equals the union of $V(q_0, c_0)$ and W_1 . Note G also satisfies the ψ -estimate on W by the maximum principle. In this way, we are able to extend (f, D) holomorphically along γ over the interval $[0, t_2]$ with the desired estimate. In the dimension two case, the boundedness of the continuation also follows from the maximum principle.

Write $W = V(q_0, c_0) \cup W_0$. Note $\gamma([t_1, t_2]) \subset W \subset\subset W^*$. If $\gamma([t_2, 1]) \subset W$, then the proof is finished. Now assume there is some $t > t_2$ in $[0, 1]$ such that $\gamma(t) \notin W$, we let t_3 be the smallest such number. We can perturb $\gamma([t_1, t_3])$ in \overline{W} , with the endpoints fixed, to a new curve $\tilde{\gamma}([t_1, t_3])$ such that it avoids q_0 and gives the same branch of function at the point $\gamma(t_3)$. In this way, $\gamma([0, t_1]) + \tilde{\gamma}([t_1, t_3])$ lies in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus \rho^{-1}(b)$. If γ intersects $\rho^{-1}(b)$ again after t_3 , we repeat the above Hartogs extension argument. After applying this argument for at most $\lceil \frac{1}{\delta} \rceil + 1$ times (recall $|t_2 - t_0| = \delta$), we will finally arrive at $\gamma(1)$. Thus (f, D) admits holomorphic continuation along γ with the desired estimate. As γ is arbitrary, this implies $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ has the extendable property. This finishes the proof in case I.

Now it remains to consider the case $b > \inf(\rho)$. We will prove this indeed cannot happen.

Case II: We first assume $b > \inf(\rho)$ and $M_b := \rho^{-1}(b)$ has no critical points of ρ . In this case, we note $M_{b'}$ is a smooth strongly pseudoconvex hypersurface in Ω for $b' \approx b$. Recall by the definition of b , $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ has the extendable property. Then we apply the same argument in §3.1 with b' being sufficiently close but greater than b to obtain a small $\epsilon > 0$ such that (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic extension in $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon,0}$ with ψ -estimate. We thus conclude $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon,0}$ has the extendable property. This is, however, a contradiction to the definition of b .

Case III: If $b > \inf(\rho)$ and ρ has critical points on M_b . Let $p \in \rho^{-1}(b)$ be a critical point

of ρ . Then choose a neighborhood U_p of p such that p is the only critical point of ρ in U_p . And choose certain holomorphic coordinates z on U_p such that $z(p) = 0$ and ρ takes the following form near p :

$$\rho = \|z\|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j z_j^2 + O(\|z\|^3) + b. \quad (7)$$

Here we have $0 \leq \lambda_j < \infty$ and $\lambda_j \neq \frac{1}{2}$ by the non-degeneracy assumption. Recall that the z_j -direction is called elliptic if $0 \leq \lambda_j < \frac{1}{2}$, and hyperbolic if $\lambda_j > \frac{1}{2}$. Also, in some smooth coordinates x on U_p with $x(p) = 0$, we have

$$\rho(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j^2 - \sum_{m+1}^{2n} x_j^2 + b.$$

By the plurisubharmonicity, we have $m \geq n$. For any small number $\epsilon > 0$, set $V_\epsilon := \{q \in U_p : \|x(q)\| < \epsilon\} \subset\subset U_p$. One can directly verify that $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ is connected for small $\epsilon > 0$. We will need the following crucial lemma:

Lemma 3.9. *For sufficiently small $\epsilon_3 > 0$, it holds for every $q \in V_{\epsilon_3} \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, that if $[g]_q$ is a holomorphic branch of (f, D) obtained by holomorphic continuation along a curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, then $[g]_q$ extends to a single-valued holomorphic function in V_{ϵ_3} with ψ -estimate (and with the boundedness in the dimension two case).*

Proof. We choose holomorphic coordinates z in a small neighborhood $U = U_p$ of p mentioned above (in particular (7) holds and p is the only critical point of ρ in U). It holds that for a sufficiently small δ and a small $\|z\|$ that

$$\rho \geq (1 - \delta)\|z\|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j z_j^2 + b. \quad (8)$$

(a): We first assume ρ has an elliptic direction at $z(p) = 0$, say the z_1 -direction (i.e., $\lambda_1 < \frac{1}{2}$). Write Δ for the unit disk in \mathbb{C} . Fix small numbers $0 < \tilde{\epsilon} \ll 1$ and $0 < \eta \ll 1$. We define for $0 < t < \tilde{\epsilon}$, a continuous family (parametrized by t) of holomorphic disks with boundary $\phi_t(\xi) : \overline{\Delta} \rightarrow U_0 \subset\subset U_p$ given by $(\eta\xi, \eta t, 0, \dots, 0)$. By (8) we have for $\xi \in \overline{\Delta}$,

$$\rho \circ \phi_t(\xi) \geq (1 - \delta)\eta^2|\xi|^2 + \lambda_1\eta^2(\xi^2 + \overline{\xi}^2) + (1 - \delta + 2\lambda_2)\eta^2 t^2 + b. \quad (9)$$

Choosing δ small enough such that $\frac{\lambda_1}{1-\delta} < \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\rho \circ \phi_t(\xi) \geq b + (1 - \delta + 2\lambda_2)\eta^2 t^2 > b.$$

Thus we have $\phi_t(\overline{\Delta}) \subset\subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$. Now for $\xi \in \partial\Delta$, it follows from (9) again that

$$\rho(\phi_t(\xi)) \geq (1 - \delta - 2\lambda_1)\eta^2 + b. \quad (10)$$

In the following context, we set $d(z, w) = \max\{|z_j - w_j| : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ for $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ and $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ in \mathbb{C}^n . Set $d(X, Y) = \inf\{d(z, w) : z \in X, w \in Y\}$ for two subsets X, Y of \mathbb{C}^n . Write $\mathbb{P}(z_0, r) \subset \mathbb{C}^n, r > 0$, for the polydisk $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : d(z, z_0) < r\}$.

Note (10) implies there exists a positive number A_1 independent of t such that

$$d(\phi_t(\partial\Delta), \partial(\overline{\Omega}_{b,0} \cap U)) \geq A_1 \text{ for all } t. \quad (11)$$

Note there also exists a positive number A_2 independent of t such that

$$d(\phi_t(\overline{\Delta}), \partial U) \geq A_2 \text{ for all } t. \quad (12)$$

Set $A = \min\{A_1, A_2\}$. Now pick $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that $V_\epsilon \subset U$ and $d(z, 0) < \frac{A}{2}$ whenever $z \in V_\epsilon$. Now fix any branch $[g]_q$ with $q \in V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ as in the assumption of Lemma 3.9. As $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ is connected, we can first extend $[g]_q$ holomorphically along certain curve in $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ to obtain a new branch $[h]_{\hat{q}}$ with $\hat{q} = \phi_t(0) = (0, \eta t, 0, \dots, 0) \in V_\epsilon \cap \phi_t(\overline{\Delta})$ for sufficiently small $0 < t < \tilde{\epsilon}$.

We also note that

$$d(\mathbf{0}, \phi_t(0)) = \eta t \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

As for each fixed small t , $\phi_t(\overline{\Delta}) \subset\subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, we can extend $[h]_{\hat{q}}$ holomorphically along any curve inside a small neighborhood of $\phi_t(\overline{\Delta})$. Since $\phi_t(\overline{\Delta})$ is simply connected, $[h]_{\hat{q}}$ extends to a well-defined holomorphic function, which we still denote by h , in this small neighborhood of $\phi_t(\overline{\Delta})$. Moreover, if $q_0 \in \phi_t(\partial\Delta)$, then by (11) and (12), we can extend $[h]_{q_0}$ to a holomorphic function in the polydisk $\mathbb{P}(q_0, A)$. By the continuity principle, we conclude that for any $w \in \phi_t(\overline{\Delta})$, the Taylor expansion (in z -coordinates) of $[h]_w$ about p converges in $\mathbb{P}(w, A)$. In particular, $[h]_{\hat{q}}$ (Recall $\hat{q} = \phi_t(0)$) extends to a holomorphic function, still called h , in $\mathbb{P}(\hat{q}, A)$ and note for sufficiently small t , $\mathbb{P}(\hat{q}, A)$ contains V_ϵ . By the uniqueness of holomorphic maps, we have $[g]_q = [h]_q$. In this way, we extend $[g]_q$ to a holomorphic map h in V_ϵ .

To obtain the ψ -estimate on h , we need to shrink V_ϵ . For small $\lambda, \mu > 0$, define a complex $(n-1)$ -parameter family (parametrized by $\tau \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$) of holomorphic disks $\varphi_\tau(\xi) : \Delta \rightarrow U$ given by $\varphi_\tau(\xi) = (\lambda\xi, \tau)$ with $\|\tau\| < \mu$. Note there exists c that only depends on ϵ such that if we choose $\lambda, \mu < c$, then $\varphi_\tau(\overline{\Delta}) \subset V_\epsilon$ for all $\|\tau\| < \mu$. Now we fix $0 < \mu < \lambda < c$ such that $\varphi_\tau(\partial\Delta) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ for all $\|\tau\| < \mu$ (the existence of such μ, λ is due to (8) and the fact that $\lambda_1 < \frac{1}{2}$). Then we note there is a small $0 < \epsilon_3 < \epsilon$ which only depends on λ and μ such that $V_{\epsilon_3} \subset \cup_{\|\tau\| < \mu} \varphi_\tau(\overline{\Delta})$. We claim V_{ϵ_3} is the desired region in Lemma 3.9. Indeed, for any $q \in V_{\epsilon_3} \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, if $[g]_q$ is a holomorphic branch of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, then by the above argument, $[g]_q$ extends to a holomorphic function h in V_ϵ . Furthermore, as $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ is connected, for each τ we can find some path in $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ connecting q to any point $q_0 \in \varphi_\tau(\partial\Delta)$. This implies $[h]_{q_0}$ is a branch of (f, D) obtained by holomorphic continuation along a curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$. By the assumption on $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, we conclude $[h]_{q_0}$ satisfies the ψ -estimate for every $q_0 \in \varphi_\tau(\partial\Delta)$. Now by the maximum principle for subharmonic functions, h also satisfies the ψ -estimate on $\varphi_\tau(\overline{\Delta})$ for all τ . In particular, h satisfies the ψ -estimate in V_{ϵ_3} . The boundedness in the dimension two case follows similarly.

(b): Next we consider the case where there are no elliptic directions (i.e., all $\lambda_j > \frac{1}{2}$). When $n \geq 3$, we replace the holomorphic disks $\phi_t(\xi)$ by

$$\phi_t(\xi) = \eta(\sqrt{\lambda_2}\xi, i\sqrt{\lambda_1}\xi, t, 0, \dots, 0), 0 < t < \tilde{\epsilon},$$

where η and $\tilde{\epsilon}$ are fixed small positive numbers. Then by (8) we have for $\xi \in \overline{\Delta}$,

$$\rho \circ \phi_t(\xi) \geq (1 - \delta)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\eta^2|\xi|^2 + (1 - \delta)\eta^2t^2 + 2\lambda_3\eta^2t^2 + b \geq b.$$

Thus we have $\phi_t(\overline{\Delta}) \subset\subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ for all t . Furthermore, if $\xi \in \partial\Delta$, it yields that

$$\rho \circ \phi_t(\xi) \geq (1 - \delta)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\eta^2 + b. \quad (13)$$

Replacing (10) by (13), the same argument in **(a)** yields that for sufficiently small ϵ , and for every $q \in V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, if $[g]_q$ is a holomorphic branch of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, then $[g]_q$ extends to a single-valued holomorphic function h in V_ϵ . It remains to establish the desired ψ -estimate. We will also need to shrink V_ϵ . For fixed small $\lambda, \mu > 0$, we define a complex parameter family (parametrized by $\tau \in \mathbb{C}, \chi \in \mathbb{C}^{n-2}$) of Riemann surfaces with boundary $\overline{E}_{\tau,\chi}$, with $|\tau|, \|\chi\| < \mu$, given by

$$\overline{E}_{\tau,\chi} := \{z = (z_1, z_2, \chi) \in U : \lambda_1 z_1^2 + \lambda_2 z_2^2 = \tau; \quad 2\lambda_1|z_1|^2 + 2\lambda_2|z_2|^2 \leq \lambda^2\}.$$

Note there exists $\hat{\lambda} > 0$ such that if we choose $0 < \lambda, \mu < \hat{\lambda}$, then $\overline{E}_{\tau,\chi} \subset V_\epsilon$ for all $|\tau|, \|\chi\| < \mu$. Furthermore, note for $z \in \partial\overline{E}_{\tau,\chi}$, we have

$$\rho(z) \geq (1 - \delta)\|z\|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}\tau + 2\operatorname{Re}\sum_{j=3}^n \lambda_j z_j^2 + b \geq (1 - \delta)\frac{\lambda^2}{2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2} - 2\mu - 2\mu^2\left(\sum_{j=3}^n \lambda_j\right) + b.$$

Thus we can choose $0 < \mu \ll \lambda < \hat{\lambda}$ such that $\partial\overline{E}_{\tau,\chi} \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ for all $|\tau|, \|\chi\| < \mu$. Fix such a pair λ and μ . Then there is a small $0 < \epsilon_3 < \epsilon$ which only depends on λ and μ such that $V_{\epsilon_3} \subset \cup_{|\tau|, \|\chi\| < \mu} \overline{E}_{\tau,\chi}$. We claim V_{ϵ_3} is the desired region in Lemma 3.9. Indeed, for any $q \in V_{\epsilon_3} \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, if $[g]_q$ is a holomorphic branch of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, then by the above argument, $[g]_q$ extends to a holomorphic function h in V_ϵ . Furthermore, as $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ is connected, for each τ, χ we can find some path in $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ connecting q to any point $q_0 \in \partial\overline{E}_{\tau,\chi}$. This implies $[h]_{q_0}$ is a branch of (f, D) obtained by holomorphic continuation along a curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$. By the assumption on $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, we conclude $[h]_{q_0}$ satisfies the ψ -estimate. Now by the maximum principle for subharmonic functions, h also satisfies the ψ -estimate on $\overline{E}_{\tau,\chi}$ for all τ and χ . In particular, h satisfies the ψ -estimate in V_{ϵ_3} .

(c): We then consider the more difficult case when $n = 2$ and both directions are non-elliptic, i.e., $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > \frac{1}{2}$. Recall in this dimensional two case (2), we additionally assume the holomorphic continuation of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ is bounded. Fix $0 < \tilde{\epsilon} < \eta \ll 1$. Consider a continuous family (parametrized by t) of Riemann surfaces with boundary $\overline{E}_t, 0 < t < \tilde{\epsilon}$, in U defined by

$$\overline{E}_t := \{z = (z_1, z_2) \in U : \lambda_1 z_1^2 + \lambda_2 z_2^2 = t; \quad 2\lambda_1|z_1|^2 + 2\lambda_2|z_2|^2 \leq \eta^2\}.$$

We apply a holomorphic change of coordinates $w_1 = \sqrt{\lambda_1}z_1 + i\sqrt{\lambda_2}z_2, w_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_1}z_1 - i\sqrt{\lambda_2}z_2$, i.e., $z_1 = \frac{w_1+w_2}{2\sqrt{\lambda_1}}, z_2 = \frac{w_1-w_2}{2\sqrt{\lambda_2}i}$. Then \overline{E}_t is defined as follows in the new coordinates:

$$w_1w_2 = t, \quad |w_1|^2 + |w_2|^2 \leq \eta^2.$$

This is equivalent $w_2 = \frac{t}{w_1}, |w_1|^2 + |\frac{t}{w_1}|^2 \leq \eta^2$. This yields \overline{E}_t is biholomorphic to an annulus $e^{a_1} \leq |w_1| \leq e^{a_2}$ for some $a_2 > a_1$ depending on η and t . Furthermore, by using the w -coordinates, we note \overline{E}_t is covered by a closed strip $\mathcal{S}_t := \{\xi \in \mathbb{C} : a_1 \leq \operatorname{Re}(\xi) \leq a_2\}$. Indeed the map $\pi(\xi) = (e^\xi, te^{-\xi})$ gives a covering map from \mathcal{S}_t to \overline{E}_t . In particular, writing ∂E_t for the boundary of \overline{E}_t , $\pi(\{\operatorname{Re}(\xi) = a_1\})$ corresponds to one component of ∂E_t , and $\pi(\{\operatorname{Re}(\xi) = a_2\})$ corresponds to the other.

Note by (8), for any point $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \overline{E}_t$, we have $\rho(z) \geq (1 - \delta)||z||^2 + 2t + b > b$. Hence we have $\overline{E}_t \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$. On the other hand, if $z = (z_1, z_2)$ is on the boundary ∂E_t of \overline{E}_t , it follows from (8) that

$$\rho(z) \geq (1 - \delta)||z||^2 + 2t + b > (1 - \delta)\frac{\eta^2}{2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2} + b.$$

As before, this implies there exists a positive number A_1 independent of t such that

$$d(\partial E_t, \partial(\overline{\Omega}_{b,0} \cap U)) \geq A_1 \text{ for all } t. \quad (14)$$

Note there also exists a positive number A_2 independent of t such that

$$d(E_t, \partial U) \geq A_2 \text{ for all } t. \quad (15)$$

Set $A = \min\{A_1, A_2\}$. Let ϵ be a small positive number such that $V_\epsilon \subset U$ and $d(z, 0) < A$ whenever $z \in V_\epsilon$. Write for $0 < t < \tilde{\epsilon}$, $z_t = (\sqrt{\frac{t}{\lambda_1}}, 0)$ and note $z_t \in \overline{E}_t$ and $z_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Now fix any branch $[g]_q$ with $q \in V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ as in the assumption of Lemma 3.9. As $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ is connected, we can first extend $[g]_q$ holomorphically along certain curve in $V_\epsilon \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ to obtain a new branch $[g_0]_{z_t}$ for sufficiently small $0 < t < \tilde{\epsilon}$. Then note \overline{E}_t and thus a small neighborhood of it are connected (but not simply connected). We can thus extend $[g_0]_{z_t}$ to a multi-valued function, still denoted by g , in a small neighborhood V of \overline{E}_t . By the boundedness assumption on the holomorphic continuation in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, the norm of any branch of g is bounded by some constant $C > 0$. Since $\overline{E}_t \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0} \cap U$, there exists a constant $r_t > 0$ depending on t such that the polydisk $\mathbb{P}(z, r_t) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0} \cap U$ for any point $z \in \overline{E}_t$. Then any branch $[g]_z$ of g at z extends to a single-valued holomorphic function, still denoted by g , in $\mathbb{P}(z, r_t)$. We apply Cauchy's estimate to g on $\mathbb{P}(z, r_t)$ to obtain for any multiindex $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$,

$$|D^\alpha g(z)| \leq \frac{C\alpha!}{(r_t)^{|\alpha|}}. \quad (16)$$

Let p be a point on $\partial \overline{E}_t$. By (14) and (15), we see that $\mathbb{P}(p, A) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0} \cap U$. Then any branch $[g]_p$ of g at p extends to a single-valued holomorphic function \hat{g} in $\mathbb{P}(p, A)$. As $\overline{E}_t \cup \mathbb{P}(p, A) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, by

the boundedness assumption on holomorphic continuation in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$, we have $|\hat{g}| \leq C$ in $\mathbb{P}(p, A)$. It then follows from Cauchy's estimate that for any multiindex $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$,

$$|D^\alpha \hat{g}(p)| \leq \frac{C\alpha!}{A^{|\alpha|}}. \quad (17)$$

By the monodromy theorem, the multi-valued g (respectively its derivatives $D^\alpha g$) on \overline{E}_t lifts to a single-valued holomorphic function h (respectively its derivatives $D^\alpha h$) in the covering \mathcal{S}_t which is holomorphic in the interior of \mathcal{S}_t and continuous to the boundary $\partial\mathcal{S}_t$. Moreover, it follows from (16) that $|D^\alpha h(\xi)| \leq \frac{C\alpha!}{(r_t)^{|\alpha|}}$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{S}_t$. Thus $D^\alpha h$ is bounded on \mathcal{S}_t . It follows from (17) that $|D^\alpha h(\xi_0)| \leq \frac{C\alpha!}{A^{|\alpha|}}$ for $\xi_0 \in \partial\mathcal{S}_t$. We apply the Phragmén-Lindelöf principle to $D^\alpha h$ on \mathcal{S}_t to obtain that for all $\xi \in \mathcal{S}_t$, $|D^\alpha h(\xi)| \leq \frac{C\alpha!}{A^{|\alpha|}}$. This implies that for every $z \in \overline{E}_t$, we have

$$|D^\alpha g(z)| \leq \frac{C\alpha!}{A^{|\alpha|}} \text{ for any branch of } g \text{ at } z. \quad (18)$$

In particular it holds at $z = z_t \in \overline{E}_t$ and for the branch $[g_0]_{z_t}$. Hence the Taylor expansion of $[g_0]_{z_t}$ about z_t is convergent in $\mathbb{P}(z_t, A)$, and thus $[g_0]_{z_t}$ extends to a holomorphic function in $\mathbb{P}(z_t, A)$. In particular, $[g_0]_{z_t}$ extends to a holomorphic function h in V_ϵ as $V_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{P}(z_t, A)$ for small $t > 0$.

Finally, we prove the ψ -estimate on h . We will also need to shrink V_ϵ . For fixed small $\lambda, \mu > 0$, we define a complex parameter family (parametrized by $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$) of Riemann surfaces with boundary $\overline{E}_\tau, |\tau| < \mu$, given by

$$\overline{E}_\tau := \{z = (z_1, z_2) \in U : \lambda_1 z_1^2 + \lambda_2 z_2^2 = \tau; \quad 2\lambda_1 |z_1|^2 + 2\lambda_2 |z_2|^2 \leq \lambda^2\}.$$

Then we apply the same argument as in **(b)** to get the desired region V_{ϵ_3} and the ψ -estimate. And the boundedness follows similarly.

This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.9. □

Now we let $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ be the critical points of ρ on M_b . By Lemma 3.9, we can choose for $1 \leq j \leq k$ small simply connected neighborhoods $V_{1,j} \subset\subset V_{2,j} \subset\subset V_{3,j}$ of p_j such that any branch $[g]_q$ of (f, D) with $q \in V_{3,j} \cap \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ (obtained by holomorphic continuation along some curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$) extends to a holomorphic function in $V_{3,j}$ with ψ -estimate. Moreover, by making $V_{1,j}$ sufficiently small, we can assume $V_{3,j} \setminus V_{1,j}$ is connected for all j . Let δ_1 be such that if $z_1 \in V_{2,j}$ and $\hat{d}(z_1, z_2) < 2\delta_1$, then $z_2 \in V_{3,j}$. Now choose $0 < \epsilon' \ll 1$ such that there is a continuous retract J of $(\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}) \cup \overline{\Omega}_{b+\epsilon',0}$ into $\overline{\Omega}_{b+\epsilon',0}$ (See §3.1). Here J maps a point in $\overline{\Omega}_{b+\epsilon',0}$ to itself and maps the other points along the orbit of X_ρ to $M_{b+\epsilon'}$. Then by applying a similar argument as in §3.1, we obtain a sufficiently small $\epsilon' > 0$ such that (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic extension in $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$ with ψ -estimate. More precisely, write \mathcal{D} for the union of all small holomorphic disks attached to $M_{b+\epsilon'}$ that can be continuously

deformed to a point in $M_{b+\epsilon'}$. Choosing ϵ' small, we make $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',b+\epsilon'} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$ be contained in \mathcal{D} . We can further make ϵ' small such that for any curve σ in $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$ with $\sigma(0) \in D$, we can deform σ to a $\tilde{\sigma}$ in $\overline{\Omega}_b$ through J such that $\sigma(0) = \tilde{\sigma}(0)$ and $\sigma(t), \tilde{\sigma}(t)$ are sufficiently close for each $t \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, the holomorphic continuation of (f, D) along the two curves are induced by the same branch at each t .

The above means $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$ has the extendable property. Now we make the following claim:

Claim: $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0}$ has the extendable property.

Proof of Claim: Let γ be any curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0}$ with $\gamma(0) \in D$. We first find a δ^* such that whenever $\gamma(t) \in \overline{V}_{1,j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $|t - t'| < \delta^*$ with $t, t' \in [0, 1]$, we have $\gamma(t') \in V_{2,j}$. Note if $\gamma([0, 1]) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$, then the proof is done. Now assume there is some t_1^* such that $\gamma([0, t_1^*)) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$ and $\gamma(t_1^*) \in \overline{V}_{1,j_0}$ for some $1 \leq j_0 \leq k$. Fix a number \hat{t}_1 with $\hat{t}_1 < t_1^*$ and close to t_1^* such that $\gamma(t) \in V_{2,j_0}$ when $\hat{t}_1 \leq t \leq t_1^*$. By the above argument, deforming $\gamma([0, \hat{t}_1])$ if necessary, we can assume there is some $0 < t_0 < \hat{t}_1$ such that $\gamma([0, t_0]) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ and $d(\gamma(t), \gamma(\hat{t}_1)) < 2\delta_1$ if $t_0 \leq t \leq \hat{t}_1$. But since $\gamma(\hat{t}_1) \in V_{2,j_0}$, we have $\gamma(t) \in V_{3,j_0}$ when $t_0 \leq t \leq \hat{t}_1$ (and thus $\gamma(t) \in V_{3,j_0}$ for $t_0 \leq t \leq t_1^*$). Writing $[f]_{\gamma(t)}$ for the holomorphic continuation of (f, D) along γ , we conclude $[f]_{\gamma(t_0)}$ is a branch of (f, D) obtained by holomorphic continuation along a curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0}$ to a point in $\overline{\Omega}_{b,0} \cap V_{3,j_0}$. It follows from our assumption on $V_{3,j}$ that $[f]_{\gamma(t_0)}$ extends to a holomorphic function h in V_{3,j_0} with ψ -estimate and thus $[f]_{\gamma(t)}$ is the restriction of h at $\gamma(t)$ for $t_0 \leq t \leq t_1^*$. If $\gamma([t_1^*, 1]) \subset V_{3,j_0}$, then clearly (f, D) admits holomorphic continuation along γ with ψ -estimate. If $\gamma([t_1^*, 1]) \not\subset V_{3,j_0}$, then there exists some t_2 with $t_1^* < t_2 < 1$ such that $\gamma([t_1^*, t_2]) \subset V_{2,j_0}$ and $\gamma(t_2) \in V_{3,j_0} \setminus V_{2,j_0}$. Since $\gamma(t_1^*) \in \overline{V}_{1,j_0}$, we must have $|t_2 - t_1^*| \geq \delta^*$. Moreover, by the proceeding argument, we can deform $\gamma([t_0, t_2])$ in V_{3,j_0} with endpoints fixed such that γ avoids V_{1,j_0} and we still get the same branch at $\gamma(t_2)$. In other words, we can obtain the same branch of function at $\gamma(t_2)$ by extends (f, D) along a curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$. Next we consider $\gamma([t_2, 1])$. If $\gamma([t_2, 1]) \subset \overline{\Omega}_{b-\epsilon',0} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k V_{1,j}$, then the proof is done again. Otherwise we repeat the above argument for at most $\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^*} \rceil + 1$ times to arrive at $\gamma(1)$ and complete the proof of the claim. ■

The above claim gives a contradiction to the definition of b and thus **Case III** cannot happen. And it finishes the proof of part (1) and (2) in Theorem 3.3.

To prove the last part of Theorem 3.3, we assume there is a holomorphic branch (h, U) of (f, D) in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\psi(h(p)) = 0$ for some $p \in U \setminus M$. But by part (1) and (2) of Theorem 3.3, $\psi(h) \leq 0$ on U . Since $\psi \circ h$ is subharmonic, it follows from the maximum principle that $\psi(h) \equiv 0$ in U . Let σ be the curve in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ along which we obtain (h, U) by applying holomorphic continuation to (f, D) . And we write $\{(h_l, U_l)\}_{l=0}^\nu$ for the holomorphic continuation of (f, D) along σ with $U_\nu = U$ and $h_\nu = h$. Since $h_l = h_{l+1}$ on $U_l = U_{l+1}$, we have each $\psi(h_l)$ attains its maximum at an interior point and thus $\psi(h_l) \equiv 0$ on U_l for all l . This in particular holds for $l = 0$ and note $U_0 \cap \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$ has a component containing $\sigma(0) \in D$. Then by Corollary 3.8, we have $\psi(g) \equiv 0$ for every holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2,0}$. This

in particular implies $\psi(f) \equiv 0$ on D . Moreover, as every curve in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ from (f, D) must pass through $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$, it also follows that $\psi(g) \equiv 0$ for every holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$. This establishes Theorem 3.3.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section, we use Theorem 1.2(or Theorem 3.3) to prove Theorem 1.3. Write n for the complex dimension of Ω and \mathbb{B}^n for the complex unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n . By assumption, for any $p_0 \in M$, there is a small open piece D containing p_0 of M and a smooth CR diffeomorphism f from D to $\partial\mathbb{B}^n$. Fix such a CR function element (f, D) . By Alexander [1], any two CR diffeomorphisms from a connected open piece of M to $\partial\mathbb{B}^n$ must differ by an automorphism of \mathbb{B}^n for $n \geq 2$. This implies (f, D) admits CR continuation $[f]_{\sigma(t)}$ along any path σ in M with the image of $[f]_{\sigma(t)}$ in $\partial\mathbb{B}^n$ by Burns and Shnider [3]. In particular, taking $\psi(z) = \|z\|^2 - 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, (f, D) admits unrestricted (bounded) CR continuation in M with ψ -estimate. Furthermore, for any $p \in M$ and any two CR branches $[f_1]_p$ and $[f_2]_p$ of (f, D) , we must have $f_2 = G \circ f_1$ near p for some automorphism G of \mathbb{B}^n . Let Γ_p be the collection of all such G 's. Apparently, Γ_p is a subgroup of the automorphism group of the unit ball. By uniqueness of CR functions extending to the pseudoconvex side, we have $\Gamma := \Gamma_p$ is independent of $p \in M$.

By Theorem 3.3, (f, D) admits unrestricted holomorphic continuation in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ with ψ -estimate. Note our choice of ψ is strongly pseudoconvex in \mathbb{C}^n and f is not constant. By Remark 3.4, the image of any holomorphic branch (g, V) must stay in \mathbb{B}^n if $V \subset \text{Reg}(\Omega)$. Let $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$ be as in the proof of Theorem 3.3. It follows readily from the construction of the holomorphic continuation in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$ that any holomorphic branches $[g_1]_q$ and $[g_2]_q$ of (f, D) at some $q \in \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$ must satisfy $g_2 = G \circ g_1$ for some automorphism $G \in \Gamma$. We further claim the following statement.

Claim: For any two branches $[h_1]_q$ and $[h_2]_q$ of (f, D) at some $q \in \text{Reg}(\Omega)$, it must hold that $h_2 = G \circ h_1$ for some automorphism $G \in \Gamma$ with G depending on h_1 and h_2 .

Proof of Claim: Let γ_1 and γ_2 be the two curves with $p_0 = \gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) \in D$ along which we obtain the two branches $[h_1]_q$ and $[h_2]_q$ respectively by holomorphic continuation of (f, D) . Set the path α to be the sum of γ_1 and the reverse $-\gamma_2$ of γ_2 : $\alpha = \gamma_1 + (-\gamma_2)$. More precisely, $\alpha(t) = \gamma_1(2t)$ if $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha(t) = \gamma_2(2 - 2t)$ if $\frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1$. We pause to recall the following proposition proved by Huang-Ji in [20], (see Lemma 5.2 [20]), which in particular implies that the branches obtained by continuing along loops in $\overline{\Omega}_{r_2, 0}$ based on $p \in \overline{\Omega}_{r_1, 0}$ with $r_1 > r_2$ are exactly those obtained long loops inside $\overline{\Omega}_{r_1, 0}$ based on p :

Proposition 3.10. *Let γ be a curve in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\gamma(0) \in D$ and $\gamma(1) \in \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$. Then γ can be continuously deformed inside $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ with endpoints fixed to a new curve $\tilde{\gamma} \subset \overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$ and thus we obtain the same branch at $\gamma(1) = \tilde{\gamma}(1)$ by continuing (f, D) along the these two curves.*

By Proposition 3.10, α can be deformed with endpoints fixed to a curve in $\overline{\Omega}_{-\epsilon_2, 0}$ without changing the holomorphic branch we obtain at the endpoint p_0 . Then by the preceding discussion, writing (\hat{f}, U) with $p_0 \in U$ for the holomorphic branch we get by holomorphic continuation

of (f, D) along α , we must have $\hat{f} = H \circ f$ on V for some automorphism $H \in \Gamma$. This yields that if we apply holomorphic continuation to $(H \circ f, D)$ along γ_2 , we get the branch $[h_1]_q$ at q . Consequently, we have $h_2 = G \circ h_1$ near q where $G = H^{-1}$. This proves the claim. ■

Now we define the complex analytic hyper-variety $E \subset \text{Reg}(\Omega)$ to be such that, for any branch (f^*, U^*) of (f, D) , $E \cap U^*$ is the zero of the Jacobian of f^* . Then we see from the above claim that E is well-defined and is independent of the choice of the chosen branch. Since $E \cap \Omega_{-\epsilon_2, 0} = \emptyset$, we see that $E = \emptyset$. Namely, f^* is always a local biholomorphism.

We now define the hyperbolic metric ω_0 on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ in the following way. Writing $\omega_{\mathbb{B}^n}$ for the Bergman (hyperbolic) metric on \mathbb{B}^n , for any holomorphic branch (g, V) of (f, D) in $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$, we define $\omega_0 = g^*(\omega_{\mathbb{B}^n})$ on V . The above claim guarantees that ω_0 is a Kähler metric which is independent of the choice of (g, V) as the hyperbolic metric on \mathbb{B}^n is invariant under automorphisms. And thus the metric ω_0 is well-defined on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$. Finally we notice that for any $p \in M$, there are a neighborhood W_p of p in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ and a smooth diffeomorphism F from W_p to a certain open subset W'_p of $\overline{\mathbb{B}^n}$ such that (i) $\partial_0 W_p := W_p \cap M$ is an open subset of M containing p and $\partial_0 W'_p := W'_p \cap \partial \mathbb{B}^n$ is an open subset of the unit sphere $\partial \mathbb{B}^n$ (ii) F is CR diffeomorphism from $\partial_0 W_p$ to $\partial_0 W'_p$ and extends to a biholomorphism from $W_p \cap \Omega$ to $W'_p \cap \mathbb{B}^n$ (iii) $\omega_0 = F^*(\omega_{\mathbb{B}^n})$ on $W_p \setminus M$. This implies ω is complete near M . This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.3. ■

To end this section, we give a result on the uniqueness of the hyperbolic metric on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$. Fix $p_0 \in M$. We emphasize that an important feature of the metric ω_0 is that there is a small neighborhood W of p_0 in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\omega_0 = F^*(\omega_{\mathbb{B}^n})$ on $W \setminus M$, where F is a CR diffeomorphism from $W \cap M$ to an open piece of $\partial \mathbb{B}^n$ that extends to a holomorphic embedding from $W \setminus M$ into \mathbb{B}^n . This property makes the metric unique in the case of complex dimension at least two. Indeed, we will establish a uniqueness result for the hyperbolic metric under a weaker boundary condition. Let $\hat{\Omega}$ be a connected open subset of $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$. Assume $\hat{\Omega}$ has $\hat{M} \subset M$ as part of its smooth boundary with $p_0 \in \hat{M}$.

Definition 3.11. *Let ω be a metric on $\hat{\Omega}$. We say ω is boundary complete at $p_0 \in M$ if there exists a small simply connected open subset U of $\hat{\Omega}$ with p_0 on its smooth part of boundary, a point $q_0 \in U$ and an open piece $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{S}^{2n-1} \subset T_{q_0}U$ such that for every $v \in \Gamma$, there is a geodesic (with respect to ω) $\gamma_v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow U$ with $\gamma_v(0) = q_0$, $\gamma'_v(0) = v$ and $\gamma_v(t)$ converges to some point on M as t goes to infinity. Moreover, writing V for the union of the geodesics $\{\gamma_v(t)\}_{v \in \Gamma}$, there is a neighborhood V_0 of p_0 in $\text{Reg}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $V_0 \setminus M \subset V$.*

We note the metric ω_0 we construct is boundary complete in the sense of Definition 3.11. We will show that a hyperbolic metric must be unique if it is boundary complete in the sense of Definition 3.11 and the dimension is at least two.

Proposition 3.12. *Let Ω be the Stein space as in Theorem 1.3 of dimension at least two, and $\hat{\Omega}, \hat{M}$, and p_0 be as above. There exists a unique metric on $\hat{\Omega}$ up to scaling with the following property.*

(a) ω is hyperbolic on $\text{Reg}(\hat{\Omega})$.

(b) ω is boundary complete at p_0 .

Proof. The existence of the desired metric follows from Theorem 1.3. Indeed, we can obtain the desired metric ω by restricting the metric ω_0 (we constructed in Theorem 1.3) to $\hat{\Omega}$.

We now prove the uniqueness part. By assumption, we can assume the statement in Definition 3.11 holds and let U, q_0, γ_v, V be as there. First since ω is hyperbolic, there exists a small open subset U_0 of U and a holomorphic isometric map $F : (U_0, \lambda\omega) \rightarrow (\mathbb{B}^n, \omega_{\mathbb{B}^n})$ for some normalizing constant $\lambda > 0$. By a classical theorem of Calabi [5], F extends holomorphically along any path in $\hat{\Omega}$. By the monodromy theorem, it extends to a holomorphic isometric immersion, still denoted by F , from $(U, \lambda\omega)$ to $(\mathbb{B}^n, \omega_{\mathbb{B}^n})$. In particular, we have $F^*(\omega_{\mathbb{B}^n}) = \lambda\omega$ on U .

Recall V denotes the union of traces of all $\gamma_v, v \in \Gamma$. It is a consequence of the classical Rauch comparison that manifolds of nonpositive curvature have no conjugate points and the exponential map is a local diffeomorphism. We thus have V is an open subset of U . Moreover, V has a piece of smooth boundary $M_0 \subset M$. By composing with an automorphism of \mathbb{B}^n , we assume $F(q_0) = 0 \in \mathbb{B}^n$.

Claim: F maps every geodesic γ_v to a (straight) ray with initial point 0 in \mathbb{B}^n . Moreover, F is an embedding from V to \mathbb{B}^n , and the image of V under F is a conic region W in \mathbb{B}^n .

Proof of Claim: First since F is local isometric and $F(q_0) = 0$, $F(\gamma_v)$ must be a geodesic in (\mathbb{B}^n, ω) with initial point at 0, which is a ray in this case. Furthermore, F maps two distinct geodesics γ_{v_1} and γ_{v_2} to two different rays in \mathbb{B}^n . Also we claim F maps two different points $\gamma_v(t_1)$ and $\gamma_v(t_2), 0 \leq t_1 < t_2$, on a geodesic to two different points on a ray. Otherwise, $F \circ \gamma_v(t_1) = F \circ \gamma_v(t_2)$ and there must exist some $t_1 < t_3 < t_2$ such that $F \circ \gamma_v(t)$ is not embedding near t_3 , a plain contradiction to the fact that F is a local embedding. This implies F is an embedding on V . Recall V is the union of the traces of all geodesics. The other part of the claim follows as well. ■

Now by the above claim, F is a biholomorphic map from V to W , and maps a geodesic in V (which converges to a point on M) to a ray in W which converges to a point on $\partial\mathbb{B}^n$, respectively. By a theorem of Forstnerič-Rosay (Page 239 in [15]), as M and $\partial\mathbb{B}^n$ are strongly pseudoconvex, F extends continuously up to a piece of smooth boundary $N \subset M$ of V such that $F(N) \subset \partial\mathbb{B}^n$. Since M is spherical, it then follows from Alexander [1] that F is a smooth CR diffeomorphism from N to $F(N)$. We run our process to (F, N) in Theorem 1.3 to obtain the metric ω_0 on $\text{Reg}(\hat{\Omega})$. We claim this metric ω is identical with ω_0 on $\hat{\Omega}$ after an appropriate scaling. Indeed, recall to obtain ω_0 , we extend to (F, N) holomorphically the pseudoconvex side and apply holomorphic continuation along any path to get a new branch (g, V_1) . Then pull back the hyperbolic metric $\omega_{\mathbb{B}^n}$ on \mathbb{B}^n by g to get the metric ω_0 on V_1 . But the holomorphic extension of (F, N) to the pseudoconvex side is precisely (F, V) and thus the metric ω_0 on V is given by $\omega_0 = F^*(\omega_{\mathbb{B}^n})$. Thus $\omega_0 = \lambda\omega$ on V . Since both $\lambda\omega$ and ω_0 are real analytic and $\hat{\Omega}$ is connected, we finally conclude $\lambda\omega$ is the restriction of ω_0 on $\hat{\Omega}$. This proves the uniqueness of the metric. □

We revisit Example 1.4 to show the uniqueness in Proposition 3.12 fails in one dimensional case.

Example. (Example 1.4 in §1) Let Δ be the unit disk and X be the Riemann surface with singularity in \mathbb{C}^2 give by $\{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : w^2 = z^3\} \cap \Delta^2$. It is indeed the image of the map $t \rightarrow (t^2, t^3), t \in \Delta$ and has an isolated singularity $(0, 0)$. Note $X^* := X \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ is biholomorphic to punctured disk $\Delta^* := \Delta \setminus \{0\}$. Then the hyperbolic metric on Δ^* induces a metric ω_1 on X^* and the Bergman metric on Δ^* induces a metric ω_2 on X^* . Note ω_1 is complete near the singularity and ω_2 is not. We claim that both ω_1 and ω_2 satisfy the boundary completeness in Definition 3.11. Indeed, ω_2 is identical with the Bergman metric of Δ near boundary and thus satisfies the boundary completeness in Definition 3.11. To understand ω_1 , we look at the covering map $\pi(\xi) = e^{i\xi}$ from the upper half plane $\mathcal{H} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im } \xi > 0\}$ to Δ^* . Note π maps $\{\xi \in \mathcal{H} : 0 < \text{Re } \xi < 2\pi\}$ to an open subset of Δ^* whose boundary contains an open piece of the circle. This implies the induced hyperbolic metric on Δ^* and thus ω_1 on X^* satisfies the boundary completeness at some boundary point in the sense Definition 3.11. Hence we have two distinct metrics on X^* that satisfy both (a) and (b).

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5

The section is devoted to establishing Theorem 1.5. Let Ω be a Stein space with possibly isolated singularities and write $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ for its regular part. Write $\Lambda^n(\text{Reg}(\Omega))$ for the space of the holomorphic n -forms on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ and define the Bergman space of Ω to be $A^2(\Omega) = \{\alpha \in \Lambda^n(\text{Reg}(\Omega)) : \int_{\text{Reg}(\Omega)} \alpha \wedge \bar{\alpha} < \infty\}$. Assume $A^2(\Omega)$ is not empty. Then $A^2(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert space with inner product:

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle := \frac{1}{i^{n^2}} \int_{\text{Reg}(\Omega)} \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta} \text{ for } \alpha, \beta \in \Lambda^n(\text{Reg}(\Omega)).$$

Let $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be an orthonormal basis of $A^2(\Omega), m \leq \infty$, and define the Bergman kernel to be $K_\Omega = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \wedge \bar{\alpha}_j$. In a local holomorphic coordinate chart (U, z) of $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$, we have

$$K_\Omega = k(z, \bar{z}) dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n \wedge d\bar{z}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}_n \text{ in } U.$$

Here $k(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{j=1}^m |a_j|^2$ if $\alpha_j = a_j dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n, j \geq 1$, in the local coordinate chart. Assume K_Ω is nowhere zero on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$. We define a Hermitian $(1, 1)$ -form to be $\omega^B = \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \log k(z, \bar{z})$. We call ω^B the Bergman metric if it induces a (positive definite) metric on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$.

To further study the Bergman metric, we pause to recall the definition of holomorphic maps from a complex manifold X to the infinite dimensional projective space \mathbb{P}^∞ . Let F be a map from X to \mathbb{P}^∞ . We say F is holomorphic if for any $p \in X$, there is a local holomorphic coordinate chart (U, z) with $p \in U$ and a set of holomorphic functions $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ on U such that

1. The set of functions $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is base point free, i.e., they have no common zeros.

2. The infinite sum $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |f_j|^2$ converges uniformly on every compact subsets in U .
3. $F = [f_1, \dots, f_n, \dots]$ on U .

If X is equipped with a Kähler metric ω , we further say F is isometric if

$$\omega = \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |f_j(z)|^2 \right)$$

on U . Let Ω be as above, equipped with the Bergman metric ω^B and $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^m$ an orthonormal basis of $A^2(\Omega)$. Then it induces a natural holomorphic map F from $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ to \mathbb{P}^{∞} given by

$$F = [\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j, \dots].$$

Here if m is finite, we then add zero components to make the target be \mathbb{P}^{∞} . The right hand side of the above equation is understood as follows. In a local holomorphic coordinates chart $(U, z) : [\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j, \dots] = [a_1(z), \dots, a_j(z), \dots]$ if $\alpha_j = a_j dz_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n$. Note this definition is independent of the choices of coordinates. Indeed, if $\alpha_j = b_j dw_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dw_n$ in another coordinates chart (V, w) , then on $U \cap V$ every b_j just differs from a_j by the same factor, i.e., the Jacobian of the change of coordinates. We also remark that $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^m$ must be base point free by the fact that K_{Ω} is nowhere zero. We will call F the Bergman-Bochner map from $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ to \mathbb{P}^{∞} and denote it by \mathcal{B}_{Ω} . We are now at the position to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5: The *only-if* part is trivial and we only prove the converse statement. Assume $(\text{Reg}(\Omega), \omega^B)$ has constant holomorphic sectional curvature λ . *A Priori* λ can be of any sign or zero. Write (X_0, ω_{st}) for the space form where the metric is normalized so that the holomorphic sectional curvature equals λ . More precisely,

- If $\lambda < 0$, then we let $X_0 = \mathbb{B}^n$ and ω_{st} the (suitably normalized) Poincaré metric;
- If $\lambda = 0$, then we let $X_0 = \mathbb{C}^n$ and ω_{st} the standard Euclidean metric;
- If $\lambda > 0$, then we let $X_0 = \mathbb{P}^n$ and ω_{st} the (suitably normalized) Fubini-Study metric.

Then by assumption, there is a connected open subset U of $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ and a holomorphic isometric map $f : (U, \omega^B) \rightarrow (X_0, \omega_{st})$. By a classical theorem of Calabi [5], f extends holomorphically along any path $\gamma \in \text{Reg}(\Omega)$ with $\gamma(0) \in U$. In other words, f extends to a possibly multi-valued map F from $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$ to M_0 . We will prove F must be indeed single-valued.

We will need the following two lemmas. Consider the case $\lambda > 0$. Then X_0 is the projective space \mathbb{P}^n and ω_{st} is the normalized Fubini-Study metric. That is, writing $[\eta] = [\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_n]$ for the homogeneous coordinates of \mathbb{P}^n , ω_{st} is given by $\omega_{st} = \mu \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \log \|\eta\|^2$ for some constant $\mu > 0$.

Lemma 4.1. *In the case $\lambda > 0$ as above, we must have μ equals some positive integer m .*

Proof of Lemma 4.1: By shrinking U , we assume U is contained in some holomorphic coordinate chart. And by a holomorphic change of coordinates, we assume $z(p) = 0$ for some $p \in U$. Recall $K(z, \bar{z}) = k(z, \bar{z}) dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n \wedge d\bar{z}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}_n$ on U . Without loss of generality, assume $f(0) = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$. Shrinking U further if necessary, assume $f(U)$ is contained in the Euclidean cell $V_0 = \{[\eta_0, \dots, \eta_n] : \eta_0 \neq 0\}$ of \mathbb{P}^n . Write g for the inverse of f defined from a small neighborhood V of $f(0)$ to U . Note g is also isometric: $g^*(\omega^B) = \omega_0$. This yields if we write $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ for the nonhomogenous coordinates of \mathbb{P}^n on V_0 , then

$$\mu \partial \bar{\partial} \log(1 + \|\xi\|^2) = \partial \bar{\partial} \log k(g(\xi), \overline{g(\xi)}) \text{ on } V.$$

Thus the difference of $\log(1 + \|\xi\|^2)^\mu$ and $\log k(g(\xi), \overline{g(\xi)})$ equals to a pluriharmonic function ψ . Shrinking V if necessary, assume $\psi = h + \bar{h}$ for a holomorphic function h on V . We thus conclude

$$k(g(\xi), \overline{g(\xi)}) |e^{h(\xi)}|^2 = (1 + \|\xi\|^2)^\mu.$$

We then use the definition of $k(z, \bar{z})$ and apply the Taylor expansion of $(1 + x)^\mu$ on $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| < 1\}$ to get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |e^{h(\xi)} (a_j \circ g)(\xi)|^2 = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(\mu-1) \cdots (\mu-k+1)}{k!} \|\xi\|^{2k}$$

Fix $l \geq 1$. Apply $\frac{\partial^{2l}}{\partial \xi_1^l \partial \bar{\xi}_1^l}$ to both sides of the equation and evaluate at $\xi = 0$. The left hand side always gives a nonnegative number. But if μ is non-integer, the right hand side will give a negative number for some sufficiently large l , a plain contradiction. Hence μ must be a positive integer. ■

Lemma 4.2. *The normalized space form (X_0, ω_{st}) can be isometrically embedded into \mathbb{P}^∞ by a holomorphic map \mathcal{B} .*

Proof of Lemma 4.2: We start with the case when $\lambda > 0$. By Lemma 4.1, we have in this case $X_0 = \mathbb{P}^n$ and $\omega_{st} = m \partial \bar{\partial} \log \|\eta\|^2$ for some positive integer m . We know (M_0, ω_{st}) can be holomorphically isometrically embedded into $(\mathbb{P}^N, \omega_{FS})$ by the m^{th} Veronese embedding for some appropriate N . Here ω_{FS} is the standard Fubini-Study metric on \mathbb{P}^N . Furthermore, $(\mathbb{P}^N, \omega_{FS})$ can be canonically embedded into \mathbb{P}^∞ (by adding zero components). This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.2 in the positive λ case.

We next consider the case $\lambda < 0$. In this case, $X_0 = \mathbb{B}^n$ and $\omega_{st} = -\mu \partial \bar{\partial} \log(1 - \|w\|^2)$ for some $\mu > 0$, where $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ is the coordinates of $\mathbb{B}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. We use the Taylor expansion of $(1 - x)^{-\mu}$ about the point $x = 0$ on $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| < 1\}$ to obtain

$$(1 - \|w\|^2)^{-\mu} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(\mu+1) \cdots (\mu+k-1)}{k!} \|w\|^{2k}.$$

The right hand side converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n . This implies there exists a sequence of monomials $\{P_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ in w such that $(1 - \|w\|^2)^{-\mu} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |P_j(w)|^2$, which converges

uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{B}^n . This leads to a natural isometric map $\mathcal{B} = [P_1, \dots, P_j, \dots]$ from (X_0, ω_{st}) to \mathbb{P}^∞ . It is clear that F is an embedding as the w'_j 's, $1 \leq j \leq n$, (with appropriate coefficients) are among the P'_j 's.

The proof for the case $\lambda = 0$ is similar. Note $\omega_{st} = \partial\bar{\partial}\|w\|^2 = \partial\bar{\partial}\log(e^{\|w\|^2})$ where w is the coordinates of $X_0 = \mathbb{C}^n$, and we use the Taylor expansion of $e^{\|w\|^2}$ at $w = 0$ to obtain an isometric embedding from X_0 to \mathbb{P}^∞ . This establishes Lemma 4.2. ■

Now $U \subset \text{Reg}(\Omega)$ can be isometrically embedded into \mathbb{P}^∞ in two ways: (1). \mathcal{B}_Ω embeds (U, ω^B) isometrically into \mathbb{P}^∞ , and (2). (U, ω^B) is isometrically embedded into \mathbb{P}^∞ by $\mathcal{B} \circ f$. By Calabi's theorem [5], there is a rigid motion of T of \mathbb{P}^∞ such that

$$T \circ \mathcal{B}_\Omega = \mathcal{B} \circ f \text{ in } U. \quad (19)$$

As mentined above, (f, U) can be extended holomorphically along any path by [5]. Let γ_1, γ_2 be two curves connecting $p \in U$ to some point $q \in \text{Reg}(\Omega)$. Write (f_1, V) and (f_2, V) for the two holomorphic branches obtained from holomorphic continuaion of (f, U) along the two curves. By the uniqueness of holomorphic continuation, we know (19) is preserved along the continuation. Thus we have

$$T \circ \mathcal{B}_\Omega = \mathcal{B} \circ f_1 = \mathcal{B} \circ f_2 \text{ in } V.$$

But note $\mathcal{B}_\Omega, \mathcal{B}$ and T are all embeddings. This implies $f_1 = f_2$ in V . Hence (f, U) extends a well-defined holomorphic map F on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$, which is local isometric. By (19) again, we have $T \circ \mathcal{B}_\Omega = \mathcal{B} \circ F$ on $\text{Reg}(\Omega)$. This yields that F is an embedding map.

We next prove that the singular set $\text{sing}(\Omega)$ of Ω is empty. Suppose not and let $p \in \text{sing}(\Omega)$. First note we can assume (Ω, p) is embedded into some \mathbb{C}^K with $z(p) = 0$. For a sufficiently small ϵ , consider the link $N_\epsilon = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^K : \|z\| = \epsilon\} \cap \Omega$ at p and $D_\epsilon = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^K : \|z\| < \epsilon\} \cap \Omega$. Note F is a holomorphic map in $D_\epsilon - \{p\}$ and extends holomorphically across N_ϵ . Recall F is an embedding. Then $\tilde{N} = F(N_\epsilon)$ is a (connected) closed strongly pseudoconvex hypersurface in X_0 (See Milnor [27]) and $F(D_\epsilon - \{p\})$ is contained in some pseudoconvex domain \tilde{D} in X_0 which has smooth boundary \tilde{N} . We remark that when $X_0 = \mathbb{P}^n$, \tilde{D} is defined to be the set of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \setminus \tilde{N}$ that can be path-connected to a small analytic disk attached to \tilde{N} . Clearly \tilde{D} defined in this way is connected and open. To show \tilde{D} has \tilde{N} as its smooth boundary, we observe any point q that is on the pseudoconcave side of \tilde{N} and close to \tilde{N} cannot be contained in \tilde{D} . Indeed, suppose $q \in \tilde{D}$. Then we find a point q' on the pseudoconvex side to \tilde{N} and close to q . Moreover, pick a short smooth curve γ_1 from q and q' that cuts \tilde{N} transversally. On the other hand, there is a curve γ_2 in \tilde{D} from q' to q . Set $\gamma = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$. By the construction of γ , the intersection number of γ and \tilde{N} is ± 1 . By the simply connectedness of X_0 , however, this interesction number must be zero, a plain contradiction. This proves \tilde{D} is a pseudoconvex domain with smooth boundary \tilde{N} .

Since p is normal, note we can assume F is the restriction of some holomorphic map \hat{F} on $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^K : \|z\| < \epsilon\}$ to D_ϵ . This follows from the property of normal singularities if X_0 is \mathbb{B}^n

or \mathbb{C}^n , and needs some justification when X_0 is \mathbb{P}^n . In this case, we use a theorem of Takeuchi [31] to see \tilde{D} is Stein, which can be embedded as a submanifold of some $\mathbb{C}^{K'}$. Hence F can be regarded as a map to $\mathbb{C}^{K'}$, and again by the property of normal singularities, F extends continuously across p . Furthermore, we can shrink ϵ to make \tilde{D} be contained in one Euclidean cell of \mathbb{P}^n and the observation follows readily.

As above by shrinking ϵ if necessary, we can assume the image $F(D_\epsilon)$ is contained in some coordinate chart (U, w) of X_0 . Now consider the inverse of $F|_{N_\epsilon}$, which we denote by $H : \tilde{N} \rightarrow N_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. By the Hartogs extension, H extends to a holomorphic function in \tilde{D} , which we still denote by H . By the uniqueness of holomorphic maps and by the maximum principle, $H(\tilde{D})$ is contained in D_ϵ . Furthermore, we have $\hat{F} \circ H$ equals the identity map on \tilde{D} . (In particular, H is embedding). On the other hand, we also have $H \circ F$ equals identity on $\overline{D_\epsilon} - \{p\}$ and by continuity, it also equals identity on $\overline{D_\epsilon}$. This implies H is a biholomorphic map from \tilde{D} to D_ϵ . Hence we prove $\text{sing}(\Omega)$ is empty.

Once we know Ω has no singularities and thus it is a complete Kähler manifold equipped with the Bergman metric, a standard argument will show that Ω must be biholomorphic to the ball. Indeed, we now have a holomorphic isometric immersion F from Ω to X_0 . On the other hand, we consider the local inverse (g, V) of (f, U) , where $V = f(U)$. It is a local isometric embedding from $f(U)$ to Ω . Since now (Ω, ω^B) is complete, $(g, f(U))$ extends holomorphically along any path in X_0 (See Proposition 11.3, 11.4 in [18]). As X_0 is simply connected, we thus obtain a holomorphic map G from X_0 to Ω . Note $f \circ g$ equals the identity map on V and $g \circ f$ equals the identity map on U . By the uniqueness of holomorphic functions, $F \circ G$ and $G \circ F$ equal to the identity map on X_0 and Ω , respectively. We thus conclude Ω is biholomorphic to X_0 . Finally, it follows from the assumption on Ω and ω^B that X_0 can only be the complex unit ball. Furthermore, as the holomorphic sectional curvature of the Bergman metric is a biholomorphic invariance, we have $\lambda = -\frac{2}{n+1}$. ■

References

- [1] H. Alexander, Proper holomorphic mappings in \mathbb{C}^n , *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 26 (1977), 137-146.
- [2] S. Baouendi, P. Ebenfelt, L. Rothschild, Real Submanifolds in Complex Space and Their Mappings, Princeton Mathematical Series 47. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- [3] D. Burns and S. Shnider, Spherical hypersurfaces in complex manifolds, *Invent. Math.*, Volume 33 (1976), 223-246.
- [4] L. Boutet de Monvel and J. Sjöstrand, Sur la singularité des noyaux de Bergman et de Szegö, *Jourées, Équations aux Dérivées Partielles de Rennes (1975)*, pp. 123-164. *Asterisque*, No. 34-35, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1976.

- [5] E. Calabi, Isomeric imbedding of complex manifolds, *Ann. of Math.*, 58 (1953), 1-23.
- [6] S.-Y. Cheng, Open Problems, Conference on Nonlinear Problems in Geometry held in Katata, Sep. 3-8, 1979, p.2, Tohoku University, Department of Math., Sendai, 1979.
- [7] S.-Y. Cheng and S.-T. Yau, on the existence of a complete Kähler metric on non-compact complex manifolds and the regularity of Fefferman's equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 33 (1980), 507-544.
- [8] S. S. Chern and S. Ji, On the Riemann mapping theorem, *Ann. of Math.*, Volume 144 (1996), 421-439.
- [9] S. S. Chern and J. Moser, Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds, *Acta Math.* 133 (1974), 219-271.
- [10] H. Christoffers, The Bergman kernel and Monge-Ampère approximations, Chicago Ph.D. thesis, 1980.
- [11] C. Fefferman, The Bergman kernel and biholomorphic mappings of pseudoconvex domains, *Invent. Math.* 26 (1974), 1-65.
- [12] C. Fefferman, Monge-Ampère equations, the Bergman kernel, and the geometry of pseudoconvex domains, *Ann. of Math.* 103 (1976), 395-416.
- [13] C. Fefferman, Parabolic invariants theory in complex analysis, *Adv. in Math.* 31 (1979), 131-262.
- [14] F. Forstnerič, Stein manifolds and holomorphic mappings. The homotopy principle in complex analysis (2nd edn.). *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge / A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics* 56. Berlin: Springer, 562 p. (2017).
- [15] F. Forstnerič and J. Rosay, Localization of the Kobayashi metric and the boundary continuity of proper holomorphic mappings, *Math. Annalen* 279 (1987), 239-252.
- [16] S. Fu and B. Wong, On strictly pseudoconvex domains with Kähler-Einstein Bergman metrics, *Math. Res. Lett.* 4 (1997), 697-703.
- [17] R. Graham, Scalar boundary invariants and the Bergman kernel, *Springer Lecture Notes in Math.* vol. 1276, pp. 108-135.
- [18] S. Helgason, Differential geometry and symmetric spaces, *Pure and Applied Math.*, Vol. 12, Academic Press, New York, 1962.
- [19] X. Huang, Isolated complex singularities and their CR links, *Science in China Series A: Mathematics* 49(2006), 1441-1450.

- [20] X. Huang and S. Ji, Global holomorphic extension of a local map and a Riemann mapping theorem for algebraic domains, *Mathematical Research Letters* 5 (1989), 247-260.
- [21] H. Kerner, Überlagerungen und Holomorphiehüllen, *Math. Ann.*, 144 (1961), 126-134.
- [22] Song-Ying Li, Characterization for Balls by Potential Function of Kähler-Einstein Metrics for domains in \mathbb{C}^n , *Comm. in Anal. and Geom.*, 13(2005), 461–478.
- [23] Song-Ying Li, Characterization for a class of pseudoconvex domains whose boundaries having positive constant pseudo scalar curvature, *Comm. in Anal. and Geom.*, 17(2009), 17–35.
- [24] Song-Ying Li, On plurisubharmonicity of the solution of the Fefferman equation and its applications to estimate the bottom of the spectrum of Laplace-Beltrami operators, *Bull. Math. Sci.* 6(2016), no 2, 287–309.
- [25] Q.-K. Lu, On Kähler manifolds with constant curvature, *Acta Math. Sinica* 16 (1966), 269-281 (Chinese). (transl. in *Chinese Math.-Acta* 8 (1966), 283-298.)
- [26] J. Merker and E. Porten, A Morse-theoretical proof of the Hartogs extension theorem, *J. Geom. Anal.* 17(2007), 513-546.
- [27] J. Milnor, Singular Points of Complex Hypersurfaces. (AM-61) *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, vol. 61, Princeton Univ. Press, 1968.
- [28] S. Nemirovski and R. Shafikov, Conjectures of Cheng and Ramadanov, *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 61 (2006), 780.
- [29] S. Nemirovski and R. Shafikov, Uniformization of strictly pseudoconvex domains, I, *Izv. Math.* 69 (2005), 1189-1202.
- [30] I. P. Ramadanov, A characterization of the balls in \mathbb{C}^n by means of the Bergman kernel, *C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci.* 34 (1981), 927-929.
- [31] Takeuchi, A. , Domains pseudoconvexes infinis et la métrique riemannienne dans un espace projectif, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* 16 (1964) 159-181.

X. Huang, Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, USA. (huangx@math.rutgers.edu)

M. Xiao, Department of Mathematics, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive La Jolla, CA 92093, USA. (m3xiao@ucsd.edu)