

WORM DOMAINS ARE NOT GROMOV HYPERBOLIC

LEANDRO AROSIO¹, GIAN MARIA DALL'ARA², MATTEO FIACCHI³

¹ *Department of Mathematics, University of Rome "Tor Vergata"*

² *Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica "F. Severi", Research Unit SNS Pisa*

³ *Department of Mathematics, University of Pisa*

ABSTRACT. We show that Worm domains are not Gromov hyperbolic with respect to the Kobayashi distance.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Gromov hyperbolicity – Basic definitions	2
3. Worms and pre-Worms	3
4. Holomorphic fiber bundles are not Gromov hyperbolic	7
5. Barrett's scaling and proof of main theorem	9
References	12

1. INTRODUCTION

A central problem in contemporary several complex variables is to determine when a Kobayashi complete hyperbolic domain $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is Gromov hyperbolic when endowed with its Kobayashi distance. Assume in what follows that Ω is smoothly bounded.

Some families of relevant domains are Gromov hyperbolic: Balogh–Bonk [2] proved it for strongly pseudoconvex domains, and Zimmer [18] showed it for convex domains of D'Angelo finite type. The third-named author showed it [12] for pseudoconvex domains of finite type in \mathbb{C}^2 . On the other hand, Gaussier–Seshadri [14] proved that for smoothly bounded *convex* domains $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ an analytic disc in the boundary is an obstruction to Gromov hyperbolicity. This result was later strengthened by Zimmer [18], who showed that the same is true if Ω is a smoothly bounded \mathbb{C} -*convex* domain. The following important question remains open.

Question. *Is an analytic disc in the boundary an obstruction to Gromov hyperbolicity for a smoothly bounded Kobayashi complete domain $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$?*

In this paper we study the Gromov hyperbolicity of the Worm domains introduced by Diederich–Fornæss [10], which have a holomorphic annulus in the boundary and are highly non- \mathbb{C} -convex. Worm domains play a central role in several complex variables as they provide

Date: August 4, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 32F45; Secondary 32T20, 53C23.

counterexamples to several important questions. See, e.g., [16] for a review of the properties of Worm domains. We actually consider a more general class of *Worms* (see Definition 9), with an open Riemann surface in the boundary, and prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *Worms are not Gromov hyperbolic w.r.t. the Kobayashi distance.*

The proof is based on Barrett’s scaling (cf. [4, Section 4]). We rescale the Worm W obtaining in the limit a holomorphic fiber bundle, which we call a *pre-Worm*, with base an open hyperbolic Riemann surface and with fiber the right half-plane. We show that such a pre-Worm cannot be Gromov hyperbolic. Since the Kobayashi distance is continuous with respect to this scaling, this yields the result.

Acknowledgements. LA is partially supported by a MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, CUP E83C18000100006. GD acknowledges the support of Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica “F. Severi”. Finally, we thank Caterina Stoppato for communicating us a proof of Proposition 17 for the Diederich–Fornæss Worm.

2. GROMOV HYPERBOLICITY – BASIC DEFINITIONS

In this section we will review some basic definitions and properties of Gromov hyperbolic spaces. The book [7] is one of the standard references.

Definition 2. *Let (X, d) be a metric space. For every $x, y, o \in X$ the Gromov product is*

$$(x|y)_o := \frac{1}{2}[d(x, o) + d(y, o) - d(x, y)].$$

The metric space (X, d) is δ -hyperbolic if for all $x, y, z, o \in X$

$$(x|y)_o \geq \min\{(x|z)_o, (y|z)_o\} - \delta.$$

Finally, a metric space is Gromov hyperbolic if it is δ -hyperbolic for some $\delta \geq 0$.

Definition 3. *Let (X, d) be a metric space, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and $A \geq 1$ and $B \geq 0$. A function $\sigma : I \rightarrow X$ is*

(1) *a geodesic if for each $s, t \in I$*

$$d(\sigma(s), \sigma(t)) = |t - s|;$$

(2) *a (A, B) -quasigeodesic if for each $s, t \in I$*

$$A^{-1}|t - s| - B \leq d(\sigma(s), \sigma(t)) \leq A|t - s| + B.$$

A (A, B) -quasigeodesic triangle is a choice of three points in X and three (A, B) -quasigeodesic segments connecting these points, called its sides. If $M \geq 0$, a (A, B) -quasigeodesic triangle is M -slim if every side is contained in the M -neighborhood of the other two sides.

Finally, recall that a metric space (X, d) is proper if closed balls are compact, and geodesic if any two points can be connected by a geodesic. A fundamental property of geodesic Gromov hyperbolic spaces is that quasi-geodesics are uniformly close to geodesics, a fact which implies the following characterization of Gromov hyperbolicity.

Proposition 4. [7, Corollary 1.8] *A geodesic metric space (X, d) is δ -hyperbolic if and only if for all $A \geq 1$ and $B \geq 0$ there exists $M \geq 0$ such that every (A, B) -quasi-geodesic triangle is M -slim.*

3. WORMS AND PRE-WORMS

Let X be an open Riemann surface, and let $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth ‘‘angle’’ function. Consider the domain in $X \times \mathbb{C}$ defined as

$$Z(X, \theta) := \{(z, w) \in X \times \mathbb{C} : \Re(we^{-i\theta(z)}) > 0\},$$

which is readily seen to be a smooth fiber bundle with base X and fiber a half-plane.

Proposition 5. *If the function θ is harmonic, then $Z(X, \theta)$ is a holomorphic fiber bundle.*

Proof. Let v be (minus) a local harmonic conjugate of θ , so that $F(z) = v(z) + i\theta(z)$ is a holomorphic function on an open set $U \subset X$. Then $Z(X, \theta)$ is locally defined over U by $\Re(we^{-F(z)}) = \Re(we^{-v(z)-i\theta(z)}) > 0$, and $(z, w) \mapsto (z, e^{-F(z)}w)$ is the desired local trivialization. \square

Definition 6 (pre-Worms). *If the function θ is harmonic, we call the holomorphic fiber bundle $Z(X, \theta)$ a pre-Worm.*

Remark 7. *Pre-Worms are sectorial domains in the sense of [5] (see in particular Example 2.2).*

Now we proceed to the definition of the Worms. First of all, given two compact intervals $I, J \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $I \subset J^\circ$, we denote by $\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ any smooth function satisfying the following properties:

- on I the function η vanishes identically;
- on $\mathbb{R} \setminus I$ the function η is real-analytic and satisfies $\eta'' > 0$ (in particular η is strictly positive and $\eta' \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus I$);
- $J = \{\eta \leq 1\}$.

The precise choice of a function η satisfying the above properties is completely irrelevant for what follows.

Next, given an open Riemann surface Y equipped with a smooth angle function $\theta : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and two compact intervals I, J as above, we define

$$W := \{(z, w) \in Y \times \mathbb{C} : |w - e^{i\theta(z)}|^2 < 1 - \eta(\theta(z))\}.$$

We assume the following:

- θ has no critical points where $\theta(z) \in \partial I$ or $\theta(z) \in \partial J$;
- $\theta^{-1}(J)$ is a compact subset of Y .

The reader may find a picture of a Worm in Figure 1.

Proposition 8. *The domain $W \subset Y \times \mathbb{C}$ has smooth boundary. Moreover, if θ is harmonic, then W is Levi-pseudoconvex.*

Proof. The precompactness of the domain W is a consequence of our assumption that $\theta^{-1}(J)$ is compact. The domain W has defining function

$$r(z, w) = w\bar{w} - we^{-i\theta(z)} - \bar{w}e^{i\theta(z)} + \eta(\theta(z)).$$

We show that $dr \neq 0$ for all $(z, w) \in \partial W$. If $\partial_{\bar{w}}r \neq 0$ this is clear. Since $\partial_{\bar{w}}r = w - e^{i\theta(z)}$ vanishes only if $w = e^{i\theta(z)}$, we may assume that this identity holds. Then necessarily $\eta(\theta(z)) = 1$, that is, $\theta(z) \in \partial J$, in which case

$$\partial_{\bar{z}}r = i\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta(z)we^{-i\theta(z)} - i\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta(z)\bar{w}e^{i\theta(z)} + \eta'(\theta(z))\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta(z) = \eta'(\theta(z))\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta(z) \neq 0$$




FIGURE 1. A Worm, whose underlying Riemann surface Y (depicted above) has genus zero and three boundary components. In this picture, the harmonic angle function θ is represented as a height function for visual clarity. In the two boxes below one finds a generic w -slice of the worm over a point $z_1 \in \theta^{-1}(I)$ (on the left) and $z_2 \in \theta^{-1}(J \setminus I)$ (on the right). Notice that, because of the indicated choice of I and J , the surfaces X_{in} and X_{out} have the same topology (albeit in general different conformal structures).

by our assumption about the critical points of θ . This proves that W has smooth boundary.

Since Levi-pseudoconvexity is a local property, we may restrict the z variable to an open set $U \subset Y$ where $\theta(z)$ admits a harmonic conjugate $v(z)$, as in the proof of Proposition 5. A local defining function for the boundary of W is then given by

$$e^{-v}r = |e^{-\frac{F}{2}}w|^2 - 2\Re(we^{-F}) + e^{-v}\eta \circ \theta,$$

where $F(z) = v(z) + i\theta(z)$ is holomorphic. Recalling that moduli squared (resp. real parts) of holomorphic functions are plurisubharmonic (resp. pluriharmonic), we see that $e^{-v}r$ equals a plurisubharmonic function plus $e^{-v}\eta \circ \theta$, which is a function of the variable z alone. If we show that the latter is subharmonic, we are done. One computes

$$\Delta(e^{-v}\eta \circ \theta) = \Delta(e^{-v})\eta \circ \theta + 2\nabla(e^{-v}) \cdot \nabla(\eta \circ \theta) + e^{-v}\Delta(\eta \circ \theta),$$

where Δ and ∇ are the ordinary real Laplacian and gradient in $\mathbb{C} \equiv \mathbb{R}^2$. We claim that for all $z \in U$ we have $\nabla(e^{-v}) \cdot \nabla(\eta \circ \theta) = 0$. In fact, this is clear if $\nabla\theta(z) = 0$. If instead $\nabla\theta(z) \neq 0$, then $F = v + i\theta$ is conformal near z and thus the level curves of v and θ are transversal. Next, notice that $e^{-v} = |e^{-\frac{F}{2}}|^2$ is subharmonic. Since η and e^{-v} are nonnegative, all we are left to do to check the nonnegativity of $\Delta(e^{-v}\eta \circ \theta)$ is to verify that $\Delta(\eta \circ \theta) \geq 0$. By direct computation, we see that

$$\Delta(\eta \circ \theta) = 4|\partial_{\bar{z}}\theta|^2\eta'' \circ \theta,$$

which is nonnegative thanks to our convexity assumption on the auxiliary function η . \square

Definition 9 (Worms). *If the function θ is harmonic (and satisfies the assumptions on page 3), we call the domain $W \subset Y \times \mathbb{C}$ a Worm.*

Remark 10. *By Docquier–Grauert [11] every Worm is Stein.*

For a more refined analysis, we split the boundary of W into four regions:

- the spine of the Worm

$$S := \{(z, w) : \theta(z) \in I, w = 0\},$$

- the body of the Worm

$$B := \{(z, w) : \theta(z) \in I, \partial_z\theta(z) \neq 0, w \neq 0\},$$

- the exceptional set

$$E := \{(z, w) : \partial_z\theta(z) = 0, w \neq 0\},$$

- the caps

$$C := \{(z, w) : \theta(z) \in J \setminus I, \partial_z\theta(z) \neq 0\}.$$

The condition $(z, w) \in \partial W$ is implicit in all the definitions above.

Remark 11. *Identify the slice $\{w = 0\} \subset Y \times \mathbb{C}$ with the Riemann surface Y . Inside Y the spine S is the closure of the domain*

$$X_{\text{in}} := \theta^{-1}(I^\circ) \subset\subset Y.$$

Since the angle function θ has no critical point $z \in \theta^{-1}(\partial I)$, the domain X_{in} is smoothly bounded. X_{in} is a Riemann surface contained in the boundary of the Worm W , hence every point of the spine S is of D’Angelo infinite type.

In what follows an important role is also played by the smoothly bounded domain

$$X_{\text{out}} := \theta^{-1}(J^\circ) \subset\subset Y.$$

Remark 12. *The classical Worm domains introduced by Diederich–Fornæss [10] correspond to the case where $Y = \mathbb{C}^*$, $\theta(z) = \log|z|^2$. In this case X_{in} is a holomorphic annulus contained in the boundary of W , whose conformal class depends on the choice of the interval I .*

A “genus zero” generalization of the Diederich–Fornæss Worms is obtained choosing $Y = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ and $\theta(z) = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \log|z - a_j|^2$ (where $\lambda_j > 0$). If $I = [-a, b]$ with a and b large enough, the spine S has $k + 1$ boundary components.

Proposition 13. *The caps C and the body B consist of strongly pseudoconvex points, the exceptional set E consists of finite-type points, and the spine S consists of infinite type points.*

Proof. We already remarked that S consists of infinite type points.

In the proof of Proposition 8, we saw that the boundary of a worm has a local defining function admitting the representation

$$\tilde{r} = |e^{-\frac{F}{2}} w|^2 + e^{-v} \eta \circ \theta + \text{ph},$$

where ph denotes a pluriharmonic function, and that

$$\Delta_z(e^{-v} \eta \circ \theta) \geq e^{-v} |\partial_{\bar{z}} \theta|^2 \eta'' \circ \theta.$$

Since the latter quantity is positive on the caps (thanks to the strict convexity assumption on η), we conclude that the Worm is strictly pseudoconvex at every point of C where ∂_w is *not tangent* to the boundary, that is $\partial_w r \neq 0$ (or, equivalently, the vector $(0, 1)$ is not in the complex tangent to ∂W). If instead $\partial_w r = 0$, then we have $\theta \in \partial J$ (cf. the beginning of the proof of Proposition 8) and we may exploit the strong plurisubharmonicity of $|e^{-\frac{F}{2}} w|^2$:

$$\partial_w \partial_{\bar{w}} |e^{-\frac{F(z)}{2}} w|^2 = |e^{-\frac{F(z)}{2}}|^2 > 0.$$

Thus, every point of C is strongly pseudoconvex.

We now study points (z, w) in the body B , where $\eta \circ \theta \equiv 0$. Calculating the Levi form $\mathcal{L}_{(z,w)} \tilde{r}$ we obtain, for $(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{(z,w)} \tilde{r}(a, b) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{a} & \bar{b} \end{pmatrix} |e^{-\frac{F(z)}{2}}|^2 \begin{pmatrix} |w|^2 \frac{|F'(z)|^2}{4} & -\bar{w} \frac{F'(z)}{2} \\ -w \frac{F'(z)}{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence $L_{(z,w)} \tilde{r}(a, b)$ vanishes if and only if $(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is a multiple of $(2, wF'(z))$. This readily shows that the Worm is strongly pseudoconvex at every boundary point of the body where $(2, wF'(z))$ is *not in the complex tangent* to the boundary. But a simple computation shows that the vector $(2, wF'(z))$ is never complex tangent to the boundary since

$$(2\partial_z + wF'(z)\partial_w) \tilde{r} = wF'(z)e^{-F(z)} \neq 0.$$

This shows that every point of the body B is strongly pseudoconvex.

We are left with the proof that every point of the exceptional set E is of finite type. By the Cauchy–Riemann equations, the critical points of θ are the same as the critical points of the (locally defined) holomorphic function F , and hence they are isolated. Thus, E is a finite union of circles and circles with one point deleted (the point with $w = 0$, in case the circle crosses the spine). Moreover, since θ has no critical points on ∂I , the boundary of the Worm is real-analytic in an open neighborhood of E . Thus, to verify that every point of E is of finite type, we need to check that no positive dimensional complex analytic variety lies in such a neighborhood (see, e.g., [3]). This is easy, because any point of such a variety would be of infinite type and, since we already checked that B and C consist of strongly pseudoconvex points, this would force the variety to be contained in E , which is impossible by dimension considerations (or by the open mapping theorem). \square

Remark 14. *The Worms are examples of domains with nontrivial, yet nicely behaved, Levi core. See [8] and [9], where this notion has been introduced by the second-named author and S. Mongodi. As a consequence of Proposition 13, the Levi core of a Worm is the $T^{1,0}$ bundle of its spine. A straightforward computation using [8, Proposition 4.1, part vi)] shows that the de Rham cohomology class on the spine S (or, equivalently, X_{in}) induced by the D’Angelo class of the Worm is represented by $i(\bar{\partial} - \partial)\theta$, which is exact if and only if the angle function θ is*

globally on X_{in} the real part of a holomorphic function (that is, the pre-Worm $Z(X_{\text{in}}, \theta|_{X_{\text{in}}})$ is trivial as a fiber bundle). This is in turn equivalent to the condition that the Diederich–Fornæss index of the Worm is 1. We refer to [8, Section 4] for a review of the basic theory of D’Angelo classes and to [1, 8] for the implications on the Diederich–Fornæss index.

We end this section proving the Kobayashi completeness of Worms (a pre-Worm $Z(X, \theta)$ with hyperbolic base X is also Kobayashi complete, see Proposition 20 below). For this, we observe that a Worm W is naturally associated with two pre-Worms.

Definition 15. *Set*

$$W_{\text{in}} := Z(X_{\text{in}}, \theta|_{X_{\text{in}}}), \quad W_{\text{out}} := Z(X_{\text{out}}, \theta|_{X_{\text{out}}}),$$

where we are using the notation of Remark 11.

The following lemma is proved in [13, Lemma 2.1.3].

Lemma 16. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ be a domain and k_D its Kobayashi distance. If $z_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial D$ and ξ admits a local holomorphic peak function then for every neighborhood U of ξ we get*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} k_D(z_n, D \cap U^c) = +\infty.$$

Proposition 17. *Worms are Kobayashi complete.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exists a nonconvergent Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}_n$ in W . Passing to a subsequence, we can assume that $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial W$. We write $x_n = (z_n, w_n)$ and $\xi = (z_0, w_0)$.

If $w_0 \neq 0$ then by Proposition 13 ξ is a pseudoconvex finite type point, so by [6] (see also [17, Section 4]) it admits a local holomorphic peak function and hence it can not be a Cauchy sequence by Lemma 16.

Assume next that $w_0 = 0$, so that in particular $\xi \in \partial W_{\text{out}}$. Since $W \subset W_{\text{out}}$, it follows that $\{x_n\}_n$ is also a Cauchy sequence w.r.t. $k_{W_{\text{out}}}$, which converges to $\xi \in \partial W_{\text{out}}$. This contradicts the completeness of the pre-Worm W_{out} (Proposition 20 below). \square

4. HOLOMORPHIC FIBER BUNDLES ARE NOT GROMOV HYPERBOLIC

We recall two classical results from the theory of Kobayashi hyperbolic complex manifolds. If E is a complex manifold, we denote by k_E the Kobayashi distance of E and by $B_E(p, r)$ the k_E -ball of center p and radius r .

Proposition 18 ([15], Proposition 3.1.19). *Let E be a Kobayashi hyperbolic complex manifold. Let $p \in E$ and $R, \epsilon > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ depending only on ϵ such that*

$$k_{B_E(p, 3R+\epsilon)}(x, y) \leq Ck_E(x, y), \quad \forall x, y \in B_E(p, R),$$

and thus the metrics k_E and $k_{B_E(p, 3R+\epsilon)}$ are biLipschitz equivalent on $B_E(p, R)$.

The fact that C depends only on ϵ is not stated explicitly in [15, Proposition 3.1.19], but it is clear from the (first paragraph of the) proof. We will actually use this result in the following simplified form.

Corollary 19. *Let E be a Kobayashi hyperbolic complex manifold. Then there exists an absolute constant $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$k_{B_E(p, 4R)}(x, y) \leq Ck_E(x, y), \quad \forall x, y \in B_E(p, R),$$

for all $R \geq 1$ and all $p \in E$.

Proposition 20 ([15], Theorem 3.2.15). *Let $\pi : E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic fiber bundle with fiber F . Assume that F and X are both (complete) Kobayashi hyperbolic. Then E is (complete) Kobayashi hyperbolic.*

We introduce the following definition.

Definition 21. *Let $\pi : E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic fiber bundle and $z \in X$. Then*

$$r(z) := \sup\{r > 0 : \text{the bundle trivializes over } B_X(z, r)\}$$

Notice that $r(z) > 0$ for every $z \in X$ if X is Kobayashi hyperbolic.

We can now prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 22. *Let X, F be Kobayashi complete hyperbolic complex manifolds. Let $\pi : E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic fiber bundle with fiber F and such that $\sup_{z \in X} r(z) = +\infty$. Then (E, k_E) is not Gromov hyperbolic.*

Proof. We will construct a sequence $\{T_n\}_n$ of quasigeodesic triangles in E violating the definition of Gromov hyperbolicity. Let $\{z_n\}_n$ in X be such that $r_n := r(z_n) \rightarrow +\infty$. We define

$$\Omega_n := \pi^{-1}(B_X(z_n, r_n/2)),$$

and let

$$\Psi : B_X(z_n, r_n/2) \times F \rightarrow \Omega_n$$

be a holomorphic trivialization. Let $q \in F$ be any point of F . Let $C \geq 1$ be the universal constant given by Corollary 19. Set $t_n := \frac{r_n}{16C}$.

We construct the triangles in the following way. Let $\gamma_n : [0, t_n] \rightarrow X$ be a geodesic of X with $\gamma_n(0) = z_n$, and let $\sigma_n : [0, t_n] \rightarrow F$ be a geodesic of F with $\sigma_n(0) = q$. Notice that $\gamma_n([0, t_n]) \subset B_X(z_n, r_n/8)$, so by Corollary 19 the curve γ_n is a $(C, 0)$ -quasigeodesic w.r.t. the Kobayashi distance of $B_X(z_n, r_n/2)$ (we may assume that $r_n \geq 8$ for every n). The curve $\Sigma_n := \Psi \circ (z_n, \sigma_n)$ is a geodesic w.r.t. k_{Ω_n} and the curve $\Gamma_n := \Psi \circ (\gamma_n, q)$ is a $(C, 0)$ -quasigeodesic w.r.t. k_{Ω_n} . The curves Σ_n and Γ_n are two sides of the triangle T_n . The third side is the curve $H_n : [0, 2t_n] \rightarrow \Omega_n$ defined by

$$H_n(t) = \begin{cases} \Psi(\gamma_n(t), \sigma_n(t_n)) & \text{if } t \in [0, t_n] \\ \Psi(\gamma_n(t_n), \sigma_n(2t_n - t)) & \text{if } t \in [t_n, 2t_n]. \end{cases}$$

The curve H_n is a $(2C, 0)$ -quasigeodesic w.r.t. k_{Ω_n} . Hence $T_n := [\Sigma_n, \Gamma_n, H_n]$ is a $(2C, 0)$ -quasigeodesic triangle in Ω_n . Notice that T_n is not t_n -slim w.r.t. k_{Ω_n} because

$$k_{\Omega_n}(H_n(t_n), \Gamma_n([0, t_n]) \cup \Sigma_n([0, t_n])) \geq t_n.$$

Since the map $\pi : E \rightarrow X$ is nonexpanding w.r.t the Kobayashi distance, we have

$$B_E(\Psi(z_n, q), r_n/2) \subset \Omega_n.$$

The triangle T_n is contained in $B_{\Omega_n}(\Psi(z_n, q), r_n/8)$, and hence it is contained in $B_E(\Psi(z_n, q), r_n/8)$. By another application of Corollary 19, T_n is not $(C^{-1}t_n)$ -slim w.r.t. the distance k_E . It follows that E is not Gromov hyperbolic. \square

We conclude this section highlighting an interesting class of holomorphic fiber bundles satisfying the condition $\sup_X r = +\infty$.

Proposition 23. *Let Y be a complex manifold and let $\pi : E \rightarrow Y$ be a holomorphic fiber bundle. Let $X \subset Y$ be a domain. Assume that there exists a point $\xi \in \partial X$ which admits a local holomorphic peak function. Then the restricted holomorphic bundle $E|_X$ has the property $\sup_X r = +\infty$.*

Proof. Let U be an open neighborhood of ξ in Y such that $\pi : E \rightarrow Y$ trivializes over U . Let $\{z_n\}_n$ be a sequence in X converging to ξ . By Lemma 16 we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} k_X(z_n, X \cap U^c) = +\infty.$$

Hence for each $R > 0$ we have $B_X(z_n, R) \subset X \cap U$ for n large enough, which implies $r(z_n) \rightarrow +\infty$. \square

Corollary 24. *The pre-Worms W_{in} and W_{out} are not Gromov hyperbolic w.r.t. its Kobayashi distance.*

Proof. The domains

$$X_{\text{in}} \subset\subset X_{\text{out}} \subset\subset Y$$

are smoothly bounded (see Remark 11), and thus every point in their boundary admits a local holomorphic peak function. Hence by the previous proposition the pre-Worms W_{in} and W_{out} satisfy $\sup_X r = +\infty$ and Theorem 22 yields the result. \square

5. BARRETT'S SCALING AND PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

In this section, \mathbb{D} denotes the unit disc and k_M and K_M denote the Kobayashi distance and the Kobayashi–Royden metric of a complex manifold M . The latter is defined on the holomorphic tangent bundle TM of M .

We recall the following classical definition.

Definition 25. *Let M be a complex manifold and let $X \subset M$ be a domain. Then X has simple boundary in M if for all $\phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow M$ holomorphic mappings with $\phi(\mathbb{D}) \subset \bar{X}$ and $\phi(\mathbb{D}) \cap \partial X \neq \emptyset$ one has $\phi(\mathbb{D}) \subseteq \partial X$.*

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the following result, showing the stability of the Kobayashi distance and of the Kobayashi–Royden metric under a particular type of convergence of domains $D_n \rightarrow D_\infty$.

Proposition 26. *Let M be a taut complex manifold and let $\{D_n\}_n$ be a sequence of domains of M . Let $D_\infty \subset M$ be a Kobayashi complete hyperbolic domain with simple boundary. Assume that*

- i) *if $\{x_n\}_n$ is a sequence converging to $x_\infty \in M$ and $x_n \in D_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x_\infty \in \bar{D}_\infty$;*
- ii) *for every compact $H \subset D_\infty$, there exists N such that $H \subset D_n$ for $n \geq N$.*

Then as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ we have $K_{D_n} \rightarrow K_{D_\infty}$ uniformly on compact subsets of TD_∞ , and $k_{D_n} \rightarrow k_{D_\infty}$ uniformly on compact subsets of $D_\infty \times D_\infty$.

See, e.g., [15, Chapter 5] for the notion of tautness. The proof of Proposition 26 is based on two lemmas, valid under the assumptions of the proposition. We denote by $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$ the canonical projection.

Lemma 27. *For every $H \subset D_\infty$ compact and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N such that for all $n \geq N$ and for all $v \in \pi^{-1}(H)$ we have*

$$K_{D_n}(v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)K_{D_\infty}(v).$$

Proof. Set $r := (1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \in (0, 1)$. Define $\widehat{H} \subset D_\infty$ as

$$\widehat{H} := \{\phi(\zeta) \mid \phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\infty \text{ holomorphic, } \phi(0) \in H, |\zeta| \leq r\}.$$

The set \widehat{H} is compact. Indeed, let $\{z_n\}_n$ be a sequence in \widehat{H} , i.e., there exist $\phi_n : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\infty$ such that $\phi_n(0) \in H$, and $|\zeta_n| \leq r$ such that $z_n = \phi_n(\zeta_n)$. Since $\phi_n(0) \in H$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and D_∞ is taut (by [15, Theorem 5.1.3]), we can assume that ϕ_n converges uniformly on compact sets to a holomorphic map $\hat{\phi} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\infty$ and that ζ_n converges to $\hat{\zeta}$ with $|\hat{\zeta}| \leq r$. But then $z_n \rightarrow \hat{\phi}(\hat{\zeta}) \in \widehat{H}$. This proves that \widehat{H} is compact.

Now, for each $v \in \pi^{-1}(H)$ let $\phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\infty$ be such that $\phi(0) = \pi(v)$ and

$$K_{D_\infty}(v)\phi'(0) = v.$$

Using property (ii) there exists N such that for all $n \geq N$ we have $\widehat{H} \subset D_n$, which implies that if $\phi_r : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\infty$ is defined by $\phi_r(z) := \phi(rz)$ then $\phi_r(\mathbb{D}) \subset \widehat{H} \subset D_n$. Finally, using the definition of the Kobayashi–Royden metric we have

$$K_{D_n}(v) \leq r^{-1}K_{D_\infty}(v) = (1 + \epsilon)K_{D_\infty}(v).$$

□

Lemma 28. *For every $H \subset D_\infty$ compact and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N such that for all $n \geq N$ and for all $v \in \pi^{-1}(H)$ we have*

$$K_{D_\infty}(v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)K_{D_n}(v). \quad (1)$$

Proof. Fix an hermitian metric on TD_∞ . The result immediately follows if we prove (1) for all $v \in \pi^{-1}(H)$ such that $\|v\| = 1$. Assume by contradiction that there exist $H \subset D_\infty$ compact, $\epsilon > 0$ and $n_k \rightarrow +\infty$, $v_k \in \pi^{-1}(H)$ such that $\|v_k\| = 1$ and

$$K_{D_\infty}(v_k) > (1 + \epsilon)K_{D_{n_k}}(v_k).$$

We can assume that $v_k \rightarrow v_\infty \in \pi^{-1}(H)$. Let $\phi_k : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_{n_k}$ be a holomorphic map such that $\phi_k(0) = \pi(v_k)$ and $\alpha_k \phi_k'(0) = v_k$, where $\alpha_k \leq (1 + \epsilon)^{1/2}K_{D_{n_k}}(v_k)$. In particular, $\alpha_k \leq (1 + \epsilon)^{-1/2}K_{D_\infty}(v_k)$ and hence α_k is uniformly bounded in k . We may therefore assume that α_k converges to a limit α as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

Since M is taut and $\phi_k(0) \in H$, we can assume that the sequence $\{\phi_k\}_k$ converges uniformly on compact sets to a holomorphic map $\phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow M$, which satisfies the identity $\alpha\phi'(0) = v_\infty$. Using property (i) we have $\phi(\mathbb{D}) \subset \overline{D_\infty}$. Since D_∞ has simple boundary in M it follows from $\phi(0) = \pi(v_\infty) \in D_\infty$ that $\phi(\mathbb{D}) \subset D_\infty$. Finally using the definition of the Kobayashi–Royden metric we have

$$K_{D_\infty}(v_\infty) \leq \alpha \leq \lim_k (1 + \epsilon)^{-1/2}K_{D_{n_k}}(v_k) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-1/2}K_{D_\infty}(v_\infty),$$

which is a contradiction. □

Proof of Proposition 26. The uniform convergence on compact subsets of the Kobayashi–Royden metric follows from Lemmas 27 and 28. We now prove the local uniform convergence of the Kobayashi distance. In what follows, we denote by $\ell_M(\gamma)$ the Kobayashi–Royden length of a curve γ on the manifold M .

Let $H \subset D_\infty$ be a compact set, and set $R := \text{diam}(H)$. Given $p, q \in H$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow D_\infty$ be a piecewise C^1 curve joining p with q and satisfying $\ell_{D_\infty}(\gamma) \leq k_{D_\infty}(p, q) + \epsilon$. Fix $o \in H$. Then, for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$k_{D_\infty}(o, \gamma(t)) \leq k_{D_\infty}(o, p) + k_{D_\infty}(p, \gamma(t)) \leq R + \ell_{D_\infty}(\gamma) \leq R + k_{D_\infty}(p, q) + \epsilon \leq 2R + 1,$$

i.e., the support of γ is contained in $\overline{B_{D_\infty}(o, 2R + 1)}$ which is a compact subset of D_∞ by the completeness of D_∞ . By Lemma 27 there exists N such that for all $n \geq N$ and for all $v \in \pi^{-1}(\overline{B_{D_\infty}(o, 2R + 1)})$ we have $K_{D_n}(v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)K_{D_\infty}(v)$, which implies $\ell_{D_n}(\gamma) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\ell_{D_\infty}(\gamma)$. Hence

$$k_{D_n}(p, q) \leq \ell_{D_n}(\gamma) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\ell_{D_\infty}(\gamma) \leq (1 + \epsilon)(k_{D_\infty}(p, q) + \epsilon) \leq k_{D_\infty}(p, q) + O((1 + R)\epsilon).$$

In particular,

$$k_{D_n}(p, q) = O(1 + R) \tag{2}$$

for $n \geq N$.

For the converse, notice that by (ii) H is eventually contained in the domains D_n . Given $p, q \in H$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $\gamma_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow D_n$ be a piecewise C^1 curve joining p with q and satisfying $\ell_{D_n}(\gamma_n) \leq k_{D_n}(p, q) + \epsilon$. Fix $o \in H$ and define

$$t_n := \sup\{t \in [0, 1] : \gamma_n([0, t]) \subset B_{D_\infty}(o, 2R)\}.$$

We have that $k_{D_\infty}(p, \gamma_n(t_n)) \geq k_{D_\infty}(p, q)$. Indeed, this clearly holds if $t_n = 1$. If $t_n < 1$, then $k_{D_\infty}(o, \gamma_n(t_n)) = 2R$ and thus

$$k_{D_\infty}(p, \gamma_n(t_n)) \geq k_{D_\infty}(o, \gamma_n(t_n)) - k_{D_\infty}(p, o) \geq 2R - R = R \geq k_{D_\infty}(p, q).$$

Since $\overline{B_{D_\infty}(o, 2R)}$ is compact, by Lemma 28 there exists N such that for all $n \geq N$ and for all $v \in \pi^{-1}(\overline{B_{D_\infty}(o, 2R)})$ we have that $K_{D_n}(v) \geq (1 + \epsilon)^{-1}K_{D_\infty}(v)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} k_{D_n}(p, q) + \epsilon &\geq \ell_{D_n}(\gamma_n) \geq \ell_{D_n}(\gamma_n|_{[0, t_n]}) \geq (1 + \epsilon)^{-1}\ell_{D_\infty}(\gamma_n|_{[0, t_n]}) \\ &\geq (1 + \epsilon)^{-1}k_{D_\infty}(p, \gamma_n(t_n)) \geq (1 + \epsilon)^{-1}k_{D_\infty}(p, q), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$k_{D_\infty}(p, q) \leq (1 + \epsilon)(k_{D_n}(p, q) + \epsilon) \leq k_{D_n}(p, q) + O((1 + R)\epsilon),$$

where we used (2). \square

Let W be a Worm. We call *Barrett's scaling* the one-parameter group of automorphisms of $Y \times \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$B_\lambda : (z, w) \mapsto (z, \lambda w) \quad (\lambda > 0),$$

which played a key role in [4, Section 4].

For all $n \geq 1$ we set $D_n := B_n(W)$, $D_\infty := W_{\text{in}}$, and $M := W_{\text{out}}$.

Remark 29. *Properties i) and ii) of Proposition 26 are satisfied in this case.*

Lemma 30. *The domain W_{in} has simple boundary in W_{out} .*

Proof. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow W_{\text{out}}$ be a holomorphic map such that $\varphi(\mathbb{D}) \subset \overline{W_{\text{in}}}$. Assume that there exists $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ such that

$$(z_0, w_0) := \varphi(\zeta_0) \in \partial W_{\text{in}}.$$

Clearly $z_0 \in \partial X_{\text{in}}$. If $\pi_1 : X_{\text{out}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X_{\text{out}}$ denotes the projection to the first variable, then $\pi_1 \circ \varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow X_{\text{out}}$ is a holomorphic function with image contained in $\overline{X_{\text{in}}}$ and such that $(\pi_1 \circ \varphi)(\zeta_0) \in \partial X_{\text{in}}$, hence by the open mapping theorem $\pi_1 \circ \varphi$ is constant. Thus $\varphi(\mathbb{D}) \subset \partial W_{\text{in}}$. \square

We are finally able to prove our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1. By contradiction, assume that there exists $\delta \geq 0$ such that for each $o, x, y, z \in W$ we have

$$\min\{(x|y)_o^{k_W}, (y|z)_o^{k_W}\} - (x|z)_o^{k_W} \leq \delta.$$

Now since for all $n \geq 1$ the Barrett's scaling B_n is an isometry between W and $B_n(W)$ we have, for each $o, x, y, z \in B_n(W)$,

$$\min\{(x|y)_o^{k_{B_n(W)}}, (y|z)_o^{k_{B_n(W)}}\} - (x|z)_o^{k_{B_n(W)}} \leq \delta.$$

By Proposition 26 we have, for all $o, x, y, z \in W_{\text{in}}$,

$$\min\{(x|y)_o^{k_{W_{\text{in}}}}, (y|z)_o^{k_{W_{\text{in}}}}\} - (x|z)_o^{k_{W_{\text{in}}}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \min\{(x|y)_o^{k_{B_n(W)}}, (y|z)_o^{k_{B_n(W)}}\} - (x|z)_o^{k_{B_n(W)}} \leq \delta.$$

Thus W_{in} is Gromov hyperbolic, which contradicts Corollary 24. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Adachi, J. Yum, *Diederich–Fornæss and Steinness Indices for Abstract CR Manifolds*, J. Geom. Anal. **31.8** (2021), 8385–8413.
- [2] Z. Balogh, M. Bonk, *Gromov hyperbolicity and the Kobayashi metric on strictly pseudoconvex domains*, Comment. Math. Helv. **75**, no. 3 (2000), 504–533.
- [3] M. S. Baouendi, P. Ebenfelt, L. P. Rothschild, *Real Submanifolds in Complex Space and their Mappings*, Princeton University Press (1999).
- [4] D. Barrett, *Behavior of the Bergman projection on the Diederich-Fornæss worm*, Acta mathematica **168** (1992) 1–10.
- [5] D. Barrett, *The Bergman projection on sectorial domains*, Contemp. Math. **212** (1998), 1–24.
- [6] E. Bedford, J.E.Fornæss, *A construction of peak functions on weakly pseudoconvex domains*, Ann. of Math. **107**, no. 3 (1978), 555–568.
- [7] M. Bridson, A. Haefliger, *Metric Spaces of Nonpositive Curvature*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences] **319**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1999).
- [8] G. Dall’Ara, S. Mongodi, *The core of the Levi distribution*, arXiv:2109.04763
- [9] G. Dall’Ara, S. Mongodi, *Remarks on the Levi core*, in preparation.
- [10] K. Diederich and J. E. Fornæss, *Pseudoconvex domains: An example with nontrivial Nebenhülle*, Math. Ann. **225** (1977), 275–292.
- [11] F. Docquier, H. Grauert, *Levisches Problem und Rungescher Satz für Teilgebiete Steinscher Mannigfaltigkeiten*, Math. Ann. **140** (1960), 94–123.
- [12] M. Fiacchi, *Gromov hyperbolicity of pseudoconvex finite type domains in \mathbb{C}^2* , Math. Ann. **382**, no. 1 (2022), 37–68.
- [13] H. Gaussier, *Tautness and complete hyperbolicity of domains in \mathbb{C}^n* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **197**, no. 1 (1999), 105–116.
- [14] H. Gaussier, H. Seshadri, *On the Gromov hyperbolicity of convex domains in \mathbb{C}^n* . Comput. Methods Funct. Theory **18** (2018), 617–641.
- [15] S. Kobayashi, *Hyperbolic Complex Spaces*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences] **318**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1998).
- [16] S. Krantz, M. Peloso, *Analysis and geometry on Worm domains*, J. Geom. Anal. **18** (2008), 478–510.
- [17] A. Noell, *Peak points for pseudoconvex domains: a survey*, J. Geom. Anal. **18**, no.4 (2008), 1058–1087.
- [18] A. Zimmer, *Gromov hyperbolicity and the Kobayashi metric on convex domains of finite type*, Math. Ann. **365**, no. 3-4 (2016), 1425–1498.
- [19] A. Zimmer, *Gromov hyperbolicity, the Kobayashi metric, and \mathbb{C} -convex sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369**, no. 12 (2017), 8437–8456.