



INSTITUT DE FRANCE
Académie des sciences

Comptes Rendus

Mathématique

Muzhi Jin and Yuan Yuan

On the canonical solution of $\bar{\partial}$ on polydisks

Volume 358, issue 5 (2020), p. 523-528

Published online: 14 September 2020

<https://doi.org/10.5802/crmath.51>

 This article is licensed under the
CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION 4.0 INTERNATIONAL LICENSE.
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Les Comptes Rendus. Mathématique sont membres du
Centre Mersenne pour l'édition scientifique ouverte
www.centre-mersenne.org
e-ISSN : 1778-3569



Complex Analysis, Partial Differential Equations / *Analyse complexe, Équations aux dérivées partielles*

On the canonical solution of $\bar{\partial}$ on polydisks

Muzhi Jin^a and Yuan Yuan^{*, a}

^a Department of Mathematics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA.
E-mails: mujin@syr.edu, yyuan05@syr.edu.

Abstract. We observe that the recent result of Chen–McNeal [6] implies that the canonical solution operator satisfies Sobolev estimates with a loss of $n-2$ derivatives on the polydisk Δ^n and particularly is exact regular on Δ^2 .

Manuscript received 3rd October 2019, revised 4th March 2020 and 16th April 2020, accepted 13th April 2020.

1. Introduction

This note is motivated by the following $\bar{\partial}$ question on the bidisk Δ^2 raised in [12].

Question 1. For any $f \in W_{(0,1)}^{1,2}(\Delta^2)$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$, can one find a solution $u \in W^{1,2}(\Delta^2)$ such that $\bar{\partial}u = f$?

The solution of this question will lead to the closed range property of $\bar{\partial}$ on the high dimensional annuli domain. Although Question 1 is already answered in the affirmative by Chakrabarti–Laurent–Shaw in [3] by the powerful L^2 -Čech cohomology theory, this note provides the canonical solution with Sobolev estimates.

Recently, Chen–McNeal defined a $\bar{\partial}$ solution operator T on product domains in [6, 7] using Cauchy transform and derived L^p estimates. We give a brief statement of Chen–McNeal’s results and readers are referred to [6] (also [7]) for details. Let $D = D_1 \times \cdots \times D_n$ be a product of piecewise C^1 smooth bounded domains in \mathbb{C} . Write

$$\emptyset \neq J = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\} \quad \text{with} \quad 1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_l \leq n.$$

For $f = \sum_j f_j d\bar{z}_j \in C_{(0,1)}^\infty(D)$, denote $f_J^c = \frac{\partial^{l-1} f_{j_l}}{\partial \bar{z}_{j_2} \cdots \partial \bar{z}_{j_1}}$ with other variables z_j fixed for all $j \notin J$. For those $(0, 1)$ -forms f on D such that $f_J^c \in L^1(D)$ for $\emptyset \neq J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, Chen–McNeal solution operator

$$Tf = \sum_{\emptyset \neq J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \mathcal{E}^J(f_J^c)$$

* Corresponding author.

is introduced in [6], where \mathcal{C}^J is the multi-Cauchy transform is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}^J(u) = -\frac{1}{\pi^l} \int_{D_{j_1} \times \dots \times D_{j_l}} \frac{u(z)}{(z_{j_1} - w_{j_1}) \cdots (z_{j_l} - w_{j_l})} dA(z_{j_1}) \cdots dA(z_{j_l}),$$

for $u \in L^1(D)$ [6]. In particular, if $f \in W_{(0,1)}^{n-1,1}(D)$, Tf can be defined and the following L^p estimates is a special case of the result proved by Chen–McNeal (cf. [6, Corollary 2.17]). Note that when $n = 2$, the result is proved in [7].

Theorem 2 (Chen–McNeal). *Let $p > 1$ and $f \in W_{(0,1)}^{n-1,p}(D) \cap \text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$. Then $u = Tf$ solves $\bar{\partial}u = f$ and satisfies*

$$\|Tf\|_{0,p} \lesssim \|f\|_{n-1,p}.$$

We apply L^p estimate of T by Chen–McNeal to the polydisk Δ^n in \mathbb{C}^n . Let $K = T - \mathcal{B} \circ T$, where \mathcal{B} is the classical Bergman projection on Δ^n . We observe that Theorem 2 easily implies the following Theorem 3.

Theorem 3. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, $k \geq n - 1$. For $f \in W_{(0,1)}^{k,p}(\Delta^n)$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$, $u = Kf$ solves the $\bar{\partial}$ equation $\bar{\partial}u = f$ and satisfies the Sobolev estimates*

$$\|Kf\|_{k+2-n,p} \lesssim \|f\|_{k,p}.$$

When $p = 2$, K is the canonical solution operator. Namely, for $f \in L^2_{(0,1)}(\Delta^n)$, $u = Kf$ provides a solution to $\bar{\partial}u = f$ with minimal L^2 norm. A direct consequence for $n = p = 2$ answers Shaw’s question.

Corollary 4. *The canonical solution operator K on Δ^2 is exact regular. Namely, given $k \geq 0$, for any $f \in W_{(0,1)}^{k,2}(\Delta^2)$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$,*

$$\|Kf\|_{k,2} \lesssim \|f\|_{k,2}. \tag{1}$$

Remark 5. As pointed out by the referee, it follows from [4, Theorem 1.2] that the canonical solution operator on Δ^2 maps $W_{(0,1)}^{2k,2}(\Delta^2)$ to $W^{k,2}(\Delta^2)$ continuously for any $k \geq 0$.

Remark 6. By the non-compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator on Δ^2 (cf. [9]) and thus the non-compactness of the canonical solution operator K (cf. [14, Proposition 4.2]), the Sobolev estimates in Corollary 4 is optimal in the sense that given any $\epsilon > 0$, there does not exist a constant $C_\epsilon > 0$, such that $\|Kf\|_{\epsilon,2} \leq C_\epsilon \|f\|_{0,2}$ for all $f \in L^2_{(0,1)}(\Delta^2) \cap \text{Ker}(\bar{\partial})$ on Δ^2 . Nevertheless, it would be interesting to know if the Sobolev estimates in Theorem 3 is optimal.

2. Proof of Theorem 3

The proof of Theorem 3 is a combination of Sobolev estimates of three operators: Beurling transform, Bergman projection and Chen–McNeal solution operator in [6, 7].

2.1. Cauchy transform on the planar domain

Let U be bounded domain in \mathbb{C} and $B(w, R)$ be the ball centered at w with radius R . For $f \in C^\infty_c(U)$, recall that Cauchy transformation on U is

$$(\mathcal{C}f)(w) := -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_U \frac{f(z)}{z - w} dA(z),$$

and the Beurling transform (or Hilbert transform) on U is

$$(\mathcal{H}f)(w) := -\frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{U \setminus B(w, \epsilon)} \frac{f(z)}{(z - w)^2} dA(z).$$

Theorem 7. *Let U be bounded domain in \mathbb{C} and $f \in L^p(U)$. Then*

(1) $\mathcal{C} : L^p(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$ is bounded for any $p > 1$ and

$$\frac{\partial(\mathcal{C} f)}{\partial \bar{w}} = f$$

holds in the distribution sense.

(2) $\mathcal{H} : L^p(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$ is bounded for any $p > 1$ and

$$\mathcal{H} f = \frac{\partial(\mathcal{C} f)}{\partial w}$$

holds in the distribution sense.

This result is well known in complex analysis (cf. [1, 10]; a stronger result of Part (1) is also given in [6]).

It immediately follows from Theorem 7 that \mathcal{C} is bounded from $L^p(U)$ to $W^{1,p}(U)$ for any $1 < p < \infty$. However, it is not that clear for general Sobolev spaces.

Corollary 8. *Let U be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} . For $p > 1, k \in \mathbb{N}$, if \mathcal{H} is bounded from $W^{k,p}(U)$ to $W^{k,p}(U)$, then $\mathcal{C} : W^{k,p}(U) \rightarrow W^{k+1,p}(U)$ is bounded.*

Proof. The case of $k = 0$ follows from Theorem 7. Consider $k \geq 1$. Let $D^\alpha = \frac{\partial^{k+1}}{\partial w^a \partial \bar{w}^b}$ be a (mixed) partial derivative in w and \bar{w} of order $k + 1$. For any $f \in W^{k,p}(U)$, if $b \geq 1$, then

$$D^\alpha(\mathcal{C} f) = \frac{\partial^k}{\partial w^a \partial \bar{w}^{b-1}} f$$

and the thus

$$\|D^\alpha(\mathcal{C} f)\|_{0,p} \leq \|f\|_{k,p}.$$

Otherwise,

$$\frac{\partial^{k+1}}{\partial w^{k+1}}(\mathcal{C} f) = \frac{\partial^k}{\partial w^k} \mathcal{H} f$$

and thus

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^{k+1}}{\partial w^{k+1}}(\mathcal{C} f) \right\|_{0,p} \leq \|\mathcal{H} f\|_{k,p} \lesssim \|f\|_{k,p} \text{ by the assumption on } \mathcal{H}.$$

□

The proof illustrates the idea in the proof of the main Theorem 3. As one can see, the Sobolev regularity of \mathcal{H} plays a crucial role and it still remains open that what is the minimal boundary condition on the planar domain to assert the boundedness of \mathcal{H} from $W^{k,p}(U)$ to $W^{k,p}(U)$ for all $p > 1, k \in \mathbb{N}$ (cf. [11] and references therein for the recent study on this subject). The following result is proved in [11, Example 1.4].

Theorem 9. \mathcal{H} is bounded from $W^{k,p}(\Delta)$ to $W^{k,p}(\Delta)$ on the unit disk Δ for all $p > 1, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.2. Bergman projection

The following result is well known and the key of the proof is a holomorphic integration by parts. The proof is implicitly contained in [2, 5, 13] and it also follows from combining Fubini theorem with [8, Theorem 2.12].

Proposition 10. *The Bergman projection $\mathcal{B} : W^{k,p}(\Delta^n) \rightarrow W^{k,p}(\Delta^n)$ is bounded for any $p > 1, k \geq 0$.*

Proof. In [8], Edholm and McNeal proved the one-dimensional case. Namely, for any $f \in W^{k,p}(\Delta)$,

$$\int_{\Delta} \left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial w^k} \int_{\Delta} \frac{1}{(1-w\bar{z})^2} f(z) dA(z) \right|^p dA(w) \lesssim \sum_{l=0}^k \sum_{a+b=l} \int_{\Delta} \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial w^a \partial \bar{w}^b} f(w) \right|^p dA(w). \tag{2}$$

For the higher dimensional case, let α be a multi-index with $|\alpha| \leq k$. For $f \in W^{k,p}(\Delta^n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Delta^n} \left| \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial w^\alpha} ((\mathcal{B}f)(w)) \right|^p dV(w) \\ &= \int_{\Delta^n} \left| \frac{\partial^{\alpha_1}}{\partial w_1^{\alpha_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n}}{\partial w_n^{\alpha_n}} \int_{\Delta^n} \frac{1}{(1-w_1\bar{z}_1)^2 \cdots (1-w_n\bar{z}_n)^2} f(z) dV(z) \right|^p dV(w) \\ &= \int_{\Delta^n} \left| \frac{\partial^{\alpha_1}}{\partial w_1^{\alpha_1}} \int_{\Delta} \frac{1}{(1-w_1\bar{z}_1)^2} \frac{\partial^{\alpha_2}}{\partial w_2^{\alpha_2}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n}}{\partial w_n^{\alpha_n}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \int_{\Delta^{n-1}} \frac{1}{(1-w_2\bar{z}_2)^2 \cdots (1-w_n\bar{z}_n)^2} f(z) dV(z_2, \dots, z_n) dA(z_1) \right|^p dV(w) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{l=0}^{\alpha_1} \sum_{a+b=l} \int_{\Delta^n} \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial w_1^a \partial \bar{w}_1^b} \frac{\partial^{\alpha_2}}{\partial w_2^{\alpha_2}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n}}{\partial w_n^{\alpha_n}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \int_{\Delta^{n-1}} \frac{1}{(1-w_2\bar{z}_2)^2 \cdots (1-w_n\bar{z}_n)^2} f(w_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) dV(z_2, \dots, z_n) \right|^p dV(w). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the Fubini Theorem and (2) applied to the integration in z_1 and w_1 . Repeating this process for z_2, \dots, z_n , we have the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Delta^n} \left| \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial w^\alpha} ((\mathcal{B}f)(w)) \right|^p dV(w) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{l_1=0}^{\alpha_1} \cdots \sum_{l_n=0}^{\alpha_n} \sum_{a_1+b_1=l_1} \cdots \sum_{a_n+b_n=l_n} \int_{\Delta^n} \left| \frac{\partial^{l_1}}{\partial w_1^{a_1} \partial \bar{w}_1^{b_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{l_n}}{\partial w_n^{a_n} \partial \bar{w}_n^{b_n}} f(w_1, \dots, w_n) \right|^p dV(w). \end{aligned}$$

The proposition 10 is thus proved. □

2.3. Consequence of Chen–McNeal solution operator

Theorem 11. For any $p > 1, k \geq n - 1$ and any $f \in W_{(0,1)}^{k,p}(\Delta^n)$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$, Tf satisfies $\bar{\partial}Tf = f$ with Sobolev estimates

$$\|Tf\|_{k+2-n,p} \lesssim \|f\|_{k,p}.$$

Proof. By the density it suffices to prove the a priori estimate. Assume $f \in C^\infty(\overline{\Delta^n})$. For any $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we use D_j^k to denote $\frac{\partial^k}{\partial w_j^a \partial \bar{w}_j^b}$ for any a, b with $a + b = k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|D_j^k T f\|_{0,p} \\
 &= \left\| \sum_{1 \leq |J| \leq n} D_j^k \mathcal{E}^J (f_J^{J^c}) \right\|_{0,p} \leq \sum_{1 \leq |J| \leq n} \|D_j^k \mathcal{E}^J (f_J^{J^c})\|_{0,p} \\
 &= \sum_{j \notin J} \|\mathcal{E}^J (D_j^k f_J^{J^c})\|_{0,p} + \sum_{j \in J} \|D_j^k \mathcal{E}^j \mathcal{E}^{J \setminus \{j\}} (f_J^{J^c})\|_{0,p} \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{j \notin J} \|\mathcal{E}^J (D_j^k f_J^{J^c})\|_{0,p} + \sum_{j \in J} \|D_j^{k-1} \mathcal{E}^{J \setminus \{j\}} (f_J^{J^c})\|_{0,p} + \sum_{j \in J} \left\| \frac{\partial^{k-1}}{\partial w_j^{k-1}} \mathcal{E}^j \mathcal{E}^{J \setminus \{j\}} (f_J^{J^c}) \right\|_{0,p} \tag{3} \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{j \notin J} \|\mathcal{E}^J (D_j^k f_J^{J^c})\|_{0,p} + \sum_{a+b \leq k-1} \sum_{j \in J} \left\| \frac{\partial^{a+b}}{\partial w_j^a \partial \bar{w}_j^b} \mathcal{E}^{J \setminus \{j\}} (f_J^{J^c}) \right\|_{0,p} \\
 &= \sum_{j \notin J} \|\mathcal{E}^J (D_j^k f_J^{J^c})\|_{0,p} + \sum_{a+b \leq k-1} \sum_{j \in J} \left\| \mathcal{E}^{J \setminus \{j\}} \left(\frac{\partial^{a+b}}{\partial w_j^a \partial \bar{w}_j^b} f_J^{J^c} \right) \right\|_{0,p} \\
 &\lesssim \|f\|_{n+k-2,p} + \|f\|_{n+k-2,p},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the fifth line follows from applying Theorem 9 and the Fubini theorem repeatedly, and the seventh line follow from applying Theorem 7, the Fubini theorem repeatedly, and the definition of $f_J^{J^c}$. The case of the general differential operator follows from the similar argument. □

Now Theorem 3 is a simple corollary of Proposition 10 and Theorem 11.

Proof of Theorem 3.

$$\|Kf\|_{k+2-n,p} \leq \|Tf\|_{k+2-n,p} + \|\mathcal{B}(Tf)\|_{k+2-n,p} \lesssim \|Tf\|_{k+2-n,p} \lesssim \|f\|_{k,p}.$$
□

Proof of Corollary 4. When $k = 0$, (1) follows from the standard L^2 theory. When k is a positive integer, (1) follows from Theorem 3. For general $k \geq 0$, (1) follows from interpolation. □

Acknowledgement

Both authors would like to thank the referee for helpful comments. We also thank Yuan Zhang for pointing out the mistake in the earlier version, Aleksis Koski for informing us the reference [11], Leonid Kovalev for helpful discussions and Jeffery McNeal for useful comments. The second author is supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-1412384, Simons Foundation grant #429722 and CUSE grant program at Syracuse University.

References

- [1] L. V. Ahlfors, *Lectures on quasiconformal mappings*, 2nd enlarged and revised ed., University Lecture Series, vol. 38, American Mathematical Society, 2006, with supplemental chapters by C. J. Earle, I. Kra, M. Shishikura and J. H. Hubbard.
- [2] H. P. Boas, "Holomorphic reproducing kernels in Reinhardt domains", *Pac. J. Math.* **112** (1984), no. 2, p. 273-292.
- [3] D. Chakrabarti, C. Laurent-Thiébaut, M.-C. Shaw, "On the L^2 -Dolbeault cohomology of annuli", *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **67** (2018), no. 2, p. 831-857.

- [4] D. Chakrabarti, M.-C. Shaw, "The Cauchy–Riemann equations on product domains", *Math. Ann.* **349** (2011), no. 4, p. 977-998.
- [5] L. Chen, "Weighted Sobolev regularity of the Bergman projection on the Hartogs triangle", *Pac. J. Math.* **288** (2017), no. 2, p. 307-318.
- [6] L. Chen, J. D. McNeal, "Product domains, Multi-Cauchy transforms, and the $\bar{\partial}$ equation", *Adv. Math.* **360** (2020), article ID 106930 (42 pages).
- [7] ———, "A solution operator for $\bar{\partial}$ on the Hartogs triangle and L^p estimates", *Math. Ann.* **376** (2020), no. 1-2, p. 407-430.
- [8] L. D. Edholm, J. D. McNeal, "Sobolev mapping of some holomorphic projections", *J. Geom. Anal.* **30** (2020), no. 2, p. 1293-1311.
- [9] S. Fu, E. J. Straube, "Compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on convex domains", *J. Funct. Anal.* **159** (1998), no. 2, p. 629-641.
- [10] O. Lehto, K. I. Virtanen, *Quasiconformal mappings in the plane. Translated from the German by K. W. Lucas*, 2nd ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 126, Springer, 1973.
- [11] M. Prats, X. Tolsa, "A T(P) theorem for Sobolev spaces on domains", *J. Funct. Anal.* **268** (2015), no. 10, p. 2946-2989.
- [12] M.-C. Shaw, "The Hartogs triangle in complex analysis", in *Geometry and topology of submanifolds and currents*, Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 646, American Mathematical Society, 2015, p. 105-115.
- [13] E. J. Straube, "Exact regularity of Bergman, Szegő and Sobolev space projections in nonpseudoconvex domains", *Math. Z.* **192** (1986), no. 1, p. 117-128.
- [14] ———, *Lectures on the L^2 -Sobolev theory of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*, ESI Lectures in Mathematics and Physics, vol. 7, European Mathematical Society, 2010.