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## Introduction.

Let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Kähler manifold with $C^{\infty}$ Kähler metric $G$, let $D$ be an open subset of $M$, and let $d_{\partial D}$ be the boundary distance function of $D$ induced by the metric $G$.

When $D$ is pseudoconvex (in the usual sense) in $M$, the plurisubharmonicity of the function $-\log d_{\partial D}$ is closely related to the holomorphic bisectional curvature of $M$. Takeuchi [26] first showed that, if $D$ is a pseudoconvex open subset of the complex projective space $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$ and if $d_{\partial D}$ is the boundary distance function of $D$ with respect to the Fubini-Study metric on $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$, the function $-\log d_{\partial D}$ is strongly plurisubharmonic on $D$. After the works of Takeuchi [27], Elencwajg [6], Suzuki [24] and others, Greene-Wu [11] differential-geometrically gave an estimate from below for 'the modulus of plurisubharmonicity' of the function $-\log d_{\partial D}$, and showed that a relatively compact, pseudoconvex open subset $D$ of $M$ is 1-complete (and hence Stein) if $M$ has positive holomorphic bisectional curvature.

In this paper, we shall extend the result to the case where $D$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$ and show that $D$ is $q$-convex or $q$-complete (with corners) in several cases.

An open subset $D$ of $M$ is said to be pseudoconvex of order $n-q, 1 \leqq q \leqq n$, in $M$ if, roughly speaking, the complement $M \backslash D$ has the same continuity as an analytic set of pure dimension $n-q$. Pseudoconvex open subsets in the usual sense are pseudoconvex of order $n-1$. If $D \subset M$ is weakly $q$-convex, then $D$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$. However, when $2 \leqq q \leqq n-1$, the converse is not valid even if $D \subset C^{n}$ (see Diederich-Fornaess [4] and Matsumoto [13]). By Fujita [8], an open subset $D$ of $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$, if and only if $D$ has an exhaustion function which is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$. Therefore, by the approximation theorem of Bungart [3], an open subset $D$ of $M$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$, if and only if $D$ is locally $q$-complete with corners in $M$ in the sense of Peternell [16] (for the precise, see $\S \S 1$ and 2 ).

The main results of this paper are as follows.
At first, let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Kähler manifold with positive holomorphic bisectional curvature and let $D$ be a relatively compact, pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Then the function $-\log d_{\partial D}$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ whole on $D$ and particularly $q$-convex on the open subset of $D$ (if it exists) where $d_{\partial D}$ is of class $C^{2}$ (see Corollary 6.5). Therefore, by the approximation theorems of Bungart and Diederich-Fornaess, the set $D$ is $q$-complete with corners and hence $\tilde{q}$-complete, where $\tilde{q}=n-[n / q]+1$ and [] denotes the Gauss symbol (see Theorem 6.6). Moreover, if the boundary $\partial D$ is also a real submanifold of class $C^{2}$ in $M$, then $D$ is $q$-convex (see Theorem 6.2).

Secondly, let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Stein manifold and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Let $d_{\partial D}$ be a boundary distance function of $D$ induced by a complete Kähler metric on $M$. Then there exists a 1 -convex function $h$ on $M$ such that the function $-\log d_{\partial D}+h$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$ (see Proposition 7.2). Therefore, the set $D$ is $q$-complete with corners and hence $\tilde{q}$-complete (see Theorem 7.3). Moreover, if the boundary $\partial D$ is also a real submanifold of class $C^{2}$ in $M$, then $D$ is $q$-complete (see Theorem 7.6).

The above results are extensions (and different proofs) of that of Barth [2] and that of Suria [23] (or Eastwood-Suria [5]), respectively.
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## 1. Pseudoconvex functions of general order and $q$-convex functions with corners.

Throughout this paper, let $D$ be a paracompact complex manifold of pure dimension $n$ and $q$ an integer with $1 \leqq q \leqq n$. After § 4 we consider only the case where $D$ is an open subset of another connected Kähler manifold $M$, but we do not require $D$ to be Kählerian in the first three sections.

A function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is said to be $q$-convex (resp. weakly $q$-convex), if $\varphi$ is of class $C^{2}$ on $D$ and if its Levi form $\partial \bar{\partial} \varphi$ has at least $n-q+1$ positive (resp. nonnegative) eigenvalues on the holomorphic tangent space $T_{P}(D)$ for each $P \in D$ (see Andreotti-Grauert [1]). As extensions of the notion of weakly $q$-convex functions or (upper semi-continuous) plurisubharmonic functions, Hunt-Murray [12] and Fujita [8] introduced that of ( $q-1$ )-plurisubharmonic functions and that of pseudoconvex functions of order $n-q$, respectively. Further, Fujita [9] proved that they are equivalent. For the original definitions and fundamental properties of them, see Fujita [8], Hunt-Murray [12] and Slodkowski [21], [22].

In this paper we shall give the definition as follows.
Definition 1.1. An upper semi-continuous function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ is said to be pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P \in D$ if, for each weakly $(n-q+1)$-convex function $f$ defined near $P$, one can find a neighborhood $U(f)$ of $P$, so that

$$
(\varphi+f)(P) \leqq \max \{(\varphi+f)(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta\}
$$

for every domain $\Delta$ with $P \in \Delta$ and $\Delta \Subset U(f)$. A function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ is said to be pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$, if $\varphi$ is upper semi-continuous on $D$ and if $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at each $P \in D$.

Using the criterion of ( $q-1$ )-plurisubharmonicity due to Slodkowski ([21], Proposition 1.1, (iii)), we can immediately prove that $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$ in the sense of Definition 1.1, if and only if $\varphi$ is $(q-1)$-plurisubharmonic on $D$ in the sense of Hunt-Murray [12]. Therefore, $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$ in the sense of Definition 1.1 , if and only if so is $\varphi$ in the sense of Fujita [8].

Plurisubharmonic functions in the usual sense are pseudoconvex functions of order $n-1$.

If $f$ is weakly $(n-q+1)$-convex and if $h$ is weakly 1 -convex, then $f+h$ is weakly ( $n-q+1$ )-convex. Using this fact, we can easily verify that if $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$ and if $h$ is weakly 1 -convex near $P$, then $\varphi+h$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$.

Lemma 1.2. An upper semi-continuous function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P \in D$, if there exists an $(n-q+1)$-dimensional complex submanifold $L$ defined near $P$ and containing $P$ such that the restriction $\left.\varphi\right|_{L}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P \in L$ (and particularly plurisubharmonic near $P \in L$ ).

Proof. Let $f$ be a weakly $(n-q+1)$-convex function defined near $P \in D$. Then $\left.f\right|_{L}$ is also weakly $(n-q+1)$-convex near $P \in L$. If $\left.\varphi\right|_{L}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P \in L$, we can by definition find a neighborhood $U^{\prime}=U^{\prime}\left(\left.f\right|_{L}\right)$ $(\subset L)$ of $P \in L$, so that

$$
\left(\left.\varphi\right|_{L}+\left.f\right|_{L}\right)(P) \leqq \max \left\{\left(\left.\varphi\right|_{L}+\left.f\right|_{L}\right)(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta^{\prime}\right\}
$$

for every domain $\Delta^{\prime}$ with $P \in \Delta^{\prime}$ and $\Delta^{\prime} \Subset U^{\prime}$. Choose a neighborhood $U=U(f)$ $(\subset D)$ of $P \in D$ so that $U \cap L \subset U^{\prime}$. Let $\Delta$ be a domain with $P \in \Delta$ and $\Delta \Subset U$, and denote by $\Delta^{\prime}$ the connected component of $\Delta \cap L$ containing $P$. Then $P \in \Delta^{\prime}$ and $\Delta^{\prime} \Subset U^{\prime}$. Moreover, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\varphi+f)(P) & \leqq \max \left\{\left(\left.\varphi\right|_{L}+\left.f\right|_{L}\right)(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta^{\prime}\right\} \\
& \leqq \max \{(\varphi+f)(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P \in D$.
A $C^{2}$ function $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$, if and only if $\varphi$ is weakly $q$-convex on $D$ (see Fujita [8], Proposition 8). It is well-known that every (upper semi-continuous) plurisubharmonic function defined on an open subset of $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$ can be approximated by 1-convex functions. However, pseudoconvex functions of order $n-q$ cannot be approximated by $q$-convex functions in general. We shall next recall the approximation theorems of DiederichFornaess and Bungart.

Definition 1.3 (Diederich-Fornaess [4]). A function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is said to be $q$-convex with corners on $D$ if, for each $P \in D$, there exist a neighborhood $U$ of $P$ and (strongly) $q$-convex functions $\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}, \cdots, \varphi_{t(P)}$ on $U$ such that $\left.\varphi\right|_{U}=$ $\max \left\{\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}, \cdots, \varphi_{t(P)}\right\}$.

Definition 1.4 (cf. Bungart [3]). A function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ is said to be strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$ (or strictly ( $q-1$ )-plurisubharmonic on $D$ in the sense of Bungart [3]) if, for each $P \in D$, there exist a neighborhood $U$ of $P$ and a (strongly) 1-convex function $h$ on $U$ such that $\varphi-h$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $U$.

It is clear that every $q$-convex function with corners is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$. Conversely, if $\varphi$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ and if $\varphi$ is piecewise $C^{2}$, that is, $\varphi$ is locally a maximum of a finite number of $C^{2}$ functions, then $\varphi$ is $q$-convex with corners (see Matsumoto [13], p. 73).

Diederich-Fornaess showed the following approximation theorem.
Theorem 1.5 ([4], Theorem 1). Let $D$ be an $n$-dimensional paracompact complex manifold and $\varphi$ a $q$-convex function with corners on $D$. Then, for any continuous function $\varepsilon>0$ on $D$, there exists $a \tilde{q}$-convex function $\psi$ on $D$ such that $|\varphi-\psi|<\varepsilon$ on $D$, where $\tilde{q}=n-[n / q]+1$ and [] denotes the Gauss symbol.

Diederich-Fornaess ([4], Theorem 2) further showed that the number $\tilde{q}$ in Theorem 1.5 is best possible for any pair $(n, q)$. Note that $\tilde{q}>q$ when $2 \leqq q \leqq n-1$.

On the other hand, Bungart showed the following approximation theorem.
Theorem 1.6 ([3], Theorem 5.3). Let $D$ be an $n$-dimensional paracompact complex manifold and $\varphi$ a continuous strongly pseudoconvex function of order $n-q$ on $D$. Then, for any continuous function $\varepsilon>0$ on $D$, there exists a $q$-convex function $\psi$ with corners on $D$ such that $|\varphi-\psi|<\varepsilon$ on $D$.

Remark 1.7. Bungart [3] asserted Theorem 1.6 only when $D \subset \boldsymbol{C}^{n}$. In view of his proof, the theorem remains valid when $D$ is a paracompact complex manifold.

Remark 1.8. By the definition in this paper, a $q$-convex function with corners is piecewise $C^{2}$. Since every $C^{2}$ function can be locally approximated by $C^{\infty}$ functions with respect to (Whitney) $C^{2}$ topology, every $q$-convex function with corners defined on a paracompact complex manifold can be globally approximated by such piecewise $C^{\infty}$ functions. Therefore, we can choose the $q$-convex function $\psi$ with corners in Theorem 1.6 so that it is also piecewise $C^{\infty}$.

## 2. Pseudoconvex domains of general order and $q$-convex domains with corners.

Let $D$ be a complex manifold and $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ an upper semi-continuous function. Then $\varphi$ is said to be an exhaustion function of $D$ if $\{P \in D: \varphi(P)<A\} \Subset D$ for every $A \in \boldsymbol{R}$.

A complex manifold $D$ is said to be $q$-convex (resp. $q$-convex with corners) if $D$ has a continuous exhaustion function which is $q$-convex (resp. $q$-convex with corners) outside some compact subset of $D$. Further, $D$ is said to be $q$-complete (resp. $q$-complete with corners) if $D$ has an exhaustion function which is $q$-convex (resp. $q$-convex with corners) whole on $D$ (see Andreotti-Grauert [1] and Diederich-Fornaess [4]).

It is clear that $D$ is $q$-convex (resp. $q$-complete) with corners if $D$ is $q$-convex (resp. $q$-complete). When $2 \leqq q \leqq n-1$, the converse is not valid even if $D \subset \boldsymbol{C}^{n}$ (see Diederich-Fornaess [4] and Matsumoto [13]). By the Diederich-Fornaess approximation theorem (Theorem 1.5), an $n$-dimensional complex manifold $D$ is $\tilde{q}$-convex (resp. $\tilde{q}$-complete) if $D$ is $q$-convex (resp. $q$-complete) with corners, where $\tilde{q}=n-[n / q]+1$. Moreover, by the Bungart approximation theorem (Theorem 1.6), $D$ is $q$-complete with corners, if and only if $D$ has an exhaustion function which is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$.

In what follows, let $M$ be a connected, paracompact complex manifold of dimension $n$.

An open subset $D$ of $M$ is said to be pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$, if the complement $M \backslash D$ satisfies 'the Hartogs continuity principle of dimension $n-q$ ' (see Tadokoro [25] for the precise definition; and see also Riemenschneider [18] and Fujita [8]).

The pseudoconvexity of order $n-q$ of an open subset $D$ in $M$ is a local property of the boundary $\partial D(\subset M)$ of $D$. More precisely, $D$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$ if, for each $Q \in \partial D$, there exists a neighborhood $V(\subset M)$ of $Q$ such that $D \cap V$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $V$.

When $M=\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$, Fujita showed the following.
Theorem 2.1 ([8], Théorème 2). For an open subset $D$ of $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$, the following conditions are equivalent:
(a) $D$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$.
(b) $D$ has an exhaustion function which is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$.
(c) $-\log d_{\partial D}(z)$ is $p$ seudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$, where $d_{\partial D}(z)=\inf \{\|z-w\|$ : $w \in \partial D\}$ is the Euclidean boundary distance of $D$ at $z \in D$.

Using Theorem 2.1 and the Bungart approximation theorem Theorem 1.6, we can easily prove the following.

Proposition 2.2. An open subset $D$ of $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$, if and only if $D$ is $q$-complete with corners. Therefore, an open subset $D$ of an n-dimensional complex manifold $M$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$, if and only if $D$ is locally $q$-complete with corners in $M$ in the sense of Peternell [16].

Now we shall give some examples of pseudoconvex open subsets of order $n-q$.

Example 2.3. Let $D$ be an open subset of an $n$-dimensional complex manifold $M$ and suppose that the boundary $\partial D$ is a real hypersurface of class $C^{2}$ in $M$, that is, there exist, for each $Q \in \partial D$, a neighborhood $V$ of $Q$ and a $C^{2}$ function $\rho: V \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ such that $d \rho(Q) \neq 0$ and $D \cap V=\{P \in V: \rho(P)<0\}$. Then $D$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$, if and only if the Levi form $\partial \bar{\partial} \rho$ has at least $n-q$ non-negative eigenvalues on $T_{Q}^{\prime}(\partial D)$ for each $Q \in \partial D$ and for each defining function $\rho$ of $D$ near $Q$, where $T_{Q}^{\prime}(\partial D)\left(\subset T_{Q}(\partial D)\right)$ is the holomorphic tangent space of the real hypersurface $\partial D$ at $Q$. (Eastwood-Suria [5] and Suria [23] called such a subset $D$ a ( $q-1$ )-pseudoconvex open subset with $C^{2}$ boundary.)

Example 2.4. Let $S$ be an analytic subset of an $n$-dimensional complex manifold $M$ and denote by $k$ the minimum of dimensions of irreducible components of $S$. Then the complement $M \backslash S$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$ if and only if $k \geqq n-q$. Moreover, an open subset $D$ of $M$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$ if, for each $Q \in \partial D$, there exists a purely ( $n-q$ )-dimensional analytic subset $S$ defined near $Q$ such that $Q \in S$ and $S \subset M \backslash D$.

In this paper, we introduce the following condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$.
Definition 2.5. We say that an open subset $D$ of an $n$-dimensional complex manifold $M$ satisfies the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $M$, if
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ For each $Q \in \partial D$, there exists an $(n-q)$-dimensional complex submanifold defined near $Q$ such that $Q \in S$ and $S \subset M \backslash D$.
For the sake of simplicity, we agree that $M$ itself and the empty set satisfy the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $M$.

Every open subset with the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $M$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ in $M$. If $S$ is a complex submanifold of $M$ and if each connected component of $S$ has at least dimension $n-q$, the complement $M \backslash S$ obviously satisfies the
condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $M$.
Lemma 2.6. Let $\varphi$ be a q-convex function with corners defined on a complex manifold $D$ and suppose that $\varphi$ is also piecewise $C^{\infty}$. Then there exists a subset A of Lebesgue measure zero in $\boldsymbol{R}$ such that the set $\{P \in D: \varphi(P)<A\}$ satisfies the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $D$ for every $A \in \boldsymbol{R} \backslash \Lambda$.

Proof. Let $U$ be an open subset of $D$ and $\psi: U \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ a $q$-convex function of class $C^{\infty}$. For each $A \in \boldsymbol{R}$, define the set $U_{A}$ by $U_{A}=\{P \in U: \psi(P)<A\}$. If the value $A$ of $\psi$ is not critical and if the boundary $\partial U_{A}(\subset U)$ of $U_{A}$ is not empty, then $\partial U_{A}$ is a real hypersurface of class $C^{\infty}$ in $U$ and so $U_{A}$ satisfies the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $U$. On the other hand, the Sard theorem asserts that the set of the critical values of $\psi$ is of Lebesgue measure zero in $\boldsymbol{R}$, if $\psi: U \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is of class $C^{\infty}$ (at least of class $C^{2 n}$ ). The lemma follows from the two facts.

Using Lemma 2.6 we can easily prove the following.
Lemma 2.7. If a complex manifold $D$ is $q$-convex with corners, there exists a sequence $\left\{D_{\nu}\right\}_{\nu \in N}$ of open subsets with the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $D$ such that $D_{\nu} \Subset D_{\nu+1} \Subset D$ for each $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$ and $\bigvee_{\nu=1}^{\infty} D_{\nu}=D$.

## 3. The definition and some properties of the operator $W_{q}$.

Throughout $\S 3$, let $M$ be a connected, paracompact complex manifold of dimension $n$ and $G$ a (fixed) Hermitian metric on $M$. Let $D$ be an open subset of $M$ and $q$ an integer with $1 \leqq q \leqq n$.

Given a continuous function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ and a point $P \in D$, the quantity $W[\varphi](P)$ introduced by Takeuchi [26], [27] is very useful to study plurisubharmonic functions defined on Kähler manifolds (see also Elencwaig [6], Suzuki [24] and Greene-Wu [11]). Roughly speaking, the quantity $W[\varphi](P)$ means 'the modulus of plurisubharmonicity' of $\varphi$ at $P$. In this section, we shall introduce the quantity $W_{q}[\varphi](P)$ meaning 'the modulus of pseudoconvexity of order $n-q$, of $\varphi$ at $P$ and give some properties of the operator $W_{q}$ (see Remark 3.5 below for the relation between the operators $W$ and $W_{q}$ ).

Definition 3.1. A local coordinate system $\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ around $P \in M$ is said to be normal at $P$ (with respect to $G$ ), if

$$
z_{i}(P)=0, \quad G\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{i}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{j}}\right)(P)=\delta_{i j} \quad \text { for } 1 \leqq i, j \leqq n
$$

Every point $P$ of $M$ has a normal coordinate system at $P$. If local coordinate systems $\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ and $\left(w_{1}, \cdots, w_{n}\right)$ are both normal at $P$, the transformation matrix $\left(\partial z_{i} / \partial w_{j}\right)$ is unitary at $P$. Therefore, if a function $\varphi$ defined
near $P$ is of class $C^{2}$, all the eigenvalues of the Hermitian matrix $\left(\partial^{2} \varphi / \partial z_{i} \partial \bar{z}_{j}\right)(P)$ coincide those of $\left(\partial^{2} \varphi / \partial w_{i} \partial \bar{w}_{j}\right)(P)$. We shall only call them eigenvalues of the Levi form $\partial \bar{\partial} \varphi$ at $P$.

Definition 3.2. Let $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ be upper semi-continuous and $P \in D$. Let $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ be a normal coordinate system at $P$. We define the quantity $W_{q}[\varphi](P)$ as the supremum of $\alpha \in \boldsymbol{R}$ such that $\varphi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$, where $\|z\|^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|z_{i}\right|^{2}$. If no such $\alpha \in \boldsymbol{R}$ exists, we put $W_{q}[\varphi](P)=-\infty$.

The following lemma implies that the quantity $W_{q}[\varphi](P)$ is well-defined, that is, it is independent of the choice of a normal coordinate system at $P$.

Lemma 3.3. Let $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ be upper semi-continuous and $P \in D$. Suppose that $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ and $w=\left(w_{1}, \cdots, w_{n}\right)$ are both normal coordinate systems at $P$. If $\varphi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$, so is $\varphi-\beta\|w\|^{2}$ for every $\beta<\alpha$.

Proof. We put $h=\alpha\|z\|^{2}-\beta\|w\|^{2}$. Then $h$ is 1 -convex near $P$ because all the eigenvalues of $\partial \bar{\partial} h$ are equal to $\alpha-\beta(>0)$ at $P$. Therefore, $\varphi-\beta\|w\|^{2}=$ $\varphi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}+h$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$ if so is $\varphi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}$.

In particular, Lemma 3.3 implies that $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$ if $W_{q}[\varphi](P)>0$.

Using Lemma 3.3, we can immediately prove the following.
Lemma 3.4. Let $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ be upper semi-continuous, $P \in D$, and $\alpha \in \boldsymbol{R}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
(a) $W_{q}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha$.
(b) There exists a normal coordinate system $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ at $P$ such that $\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$ for every $\beta<\alpha$.
(c) $\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$ for every normal coordinate system $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ at $P$ and for every $\beta<\alpha$.

Let $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ be of class $C^{2}$ and $P \in D$. Denote all the eigenvalues of $\partial \bar{\partial} \varphi$ at $P$ by $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \cdots, \alpha_{n}$, where $\alpha_{1} \geqq \alpha_{2} \geqq \cdots \geqq \alpha_{n}$. Then we have $W_{q}[\varphi](P)=\alpha_{n-q+1}$. Moreover, $W_{q}[\varphi]: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is continuous if $\varphi$ is of class $C^{2}$. When $\varphi$ is not of class $C^{2}$, the function $W_{q}[\varphi]$ is not continuous in general.

REMARK 3.5. If $W$ denotes the operator introduced by Takeuchi, then $W[\varphi] \equiv 4 W_{1}[\varphi]$ for every $C^{2}$ function $\varphi$ (see Takeuchi [27], p. 335). The author does not know whether the operators $W$ and $4 W_{1}$ exactly coincide or not.

A $C^{2}$ function $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is $q$-convex (resp. weakly $q$-convex) on $D$ if and only if $W_{q}[\varphi]>0$ (resp. $W_{q}[\varphi] \geqq 0$ ) on $D$. Moreover, we obtain the following.

Proposition 3.6. Let $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ be an upper semi-continuous function. Then
(a) $\varphi$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$ if and only if $W_{q}[\varphi] \geqq 0$ on $D$.
(b) $\varphi$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$ if and only if, for each $P \in D$, there exist a neighborhood $U$ of $P$ and a constant $\varepsilon>0$ such that $W_{q}[\varphi] \geqq \varepsilon$ on $U$.

Proof. The proof of (b) is easy. The necessity of (a) is obvious. To prove the sufficiency of (a), suppose that $W_{q}[\varphi] \geqq 0$ on $D$ and $(U, z), z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$, is any coordinate neighborhood of $D$. For each $\nu \in N$, define the function $\varphi_{\nu}$ on $U$ by $\varphi_{\nu}=\varphi+(1 / \nu)\|z\|^{2}$. Then $W_{q}\left[\varphi_{\nu}\right]>0$ on $U$. This implies that each $\varphi_{\nu}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at each point of $U$ and hence on $U$. Therefore, by Fujita ([8], Proposition 7), the limit $\varphi$ of the decreasing sequence $\left\{\varphi_{\nu}\right\}_{\nu \in N}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $U$, which proves the sufficiency of (a).

Proposition 3.7. Let $\varphi_{\nu}: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}, \nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$, be upper semi-continuous and let $\alpha: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ be continuous. Suppose that $W_{q}\left[\varphi_{\nu}\right] \geqq \alpha$ on $D$ for all $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$. If the sequence $\left\{\varphi_{\nu}\right\}_{\nu \in N}$ is decreasing or uniformly convergent on $D$, then $W_{q}[\varphi] \geqq \alpha$ on $D$, where $\varphi=\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\nu}$.

Proof. Let $P$ be a point of $D$ and $\beta$ a real number with $\beta<\alpha(P)$. Let $(U, z), z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$, be a normal coordinate neighborhood at $P$. Choose a neighborhood $V(\subset U)$ of $P$ so that $W_{1}\left[\beta\|z\|^{2}\right]<\alpha$ on $V$. Then, for each $\nu \in N$, we have $W_{q}\left[\varphi_{\nu}-\beta\|z\|^{2}\right]>0$ on $V$ and so $\varphi_{\nu}-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $V$. Since the sequence $\left\{\varphi_{\nu}-\beta\|z\|^{2}\right\}_{\nu \in N}$ is decreasing or uniformly convergent on $V$, it follows by Fujita ([8], Proposition 7) that the limit $\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ is also pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $V$. Therefore, we have $W_{q}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha(P)$ for every $P \in D$.

The following criterion will be used frequently in this paper.
Lemma 3.8. Let $\varphi$ and $\psi$ be upper semi-continuous functions from $D$ to $\boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ and $P$ a point of $D$. If $\varphi(P)=\psi(P)$ and $\varphi \geqq \psi$ on $D$, then $W_{q}[\varphi](P)$ $\geqq W_{q}[\psi](P)$.

Proof. Let $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ be a normal coordinate system at $P$ and $\alpha$ a real number with $\alpha<W_{q}[\psi](P)$. Then $\psi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$. Hence, for each weakly $(n-q+1)$-convex function $f$ defined near $P$, one can find a neighborhood $U(f)$ of $P$, so that

$$
\left(\psi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}+f\right)(P) \leqq \max \left\{\left(\psi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}+f\right)(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta\right\}
$$

for every domain $\Delta$ with $P \in \Delta$ and $\Delta \Subset U(f)$. If $\varphi(P)=\psi(P)$ and $\varphi \geqq \psi$ on $D$, the above inequality replaced $\psi$ with $\varphi$ remains valid. Therefore, $\varphi-\alpha\|z\|^{2}$ is also
pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P$ for every $\alpha<W_{q}[\psi](P)$ and hence we obtain $W_{q}[\varphi](P) \geqq W_{q}[\psi](P)$.

Next, let $L$ be a $t$-dimensional complex submanifold of $D(\subset M), 1 \leqq t \leqq n$. Then $L$ has the $C^{\infty}$ Hermitian metric $\left.G\right|_{L}$ induced by the metric $G$ on $M$. In exactly the same way as the definition of the operators $W_{q}, 1 \leqq q \leqq n$, on $M$ with respect to the metric $G$ on $M$, we can define the operators on $L$ with respect to the metric $\left.G\right|_{L}$ on $L$. We shall denote them by $W_{q}^{(L)}, 1 \leqq q \leqq t$. The results about $W_{q}=W_{q}^{(M)}$ are naturally valid for $W_{q}^{(L)}$.

Lemma 3.9. Let $L$ be a t-dimensional complex submanifold of $D$. Let $\varphi: L \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ be upper semi-continuous, $P \in L$, and $\alpha \in \boldsymbol{R}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
(a) $W_{q}^{(L)}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha$.
(b) There exists a normal coordinate system $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ at $P \in D$ such that $\varphi-\left.\beta\left(\|z\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}$ is pseudoconvex of order $t-q$ at $P \in L$ for every $\beta<\alpha$.
(c) $\varphi-\left.\beta\left(\|z\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}$ is pseudoconvex of order $t-q$ at $P \in L$ for every normal coordinate system $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ at $P \in D$ and for every $\beta<\alpha$.

Proof. If $w=\left(w_{1}, \cdots, w_{n}\right)$ is a normal coordinate system of $D$ at $P \in D$ with respect to the metric $G$ on $D$ and if $L$ is written by $w_{t+1}=w_{t+2}=\cdots=w_{n}$ $=0$ near $P$, then $w^{\prime}=\left(w_{1}, \cdots, w_{t}\right)$ is a normal coordinate system of $L$ at $P \in L$ with respect to the metric $\left.G\right|_{L}$ on $L$. Hence it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $W_{q}^{(L)}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha$ if and only if $\varphi-\left.\beta\left(\|w\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}=\varphi-\beta\left\|w^{\prime}\right\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $t-q$ at $P \in L$ for every $\beta<\alpha$. This implies that $(\mathrm{c}) \Rightarrow(\mathrm{a}) \Rightarrow(\mathrm{b})$.

To prove (b) $\Rightarrow(\mathbf{c})$, suppose that $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ and $w=\left(w_{1}, \cdots, w_{n}\right)$ are both normal coordinate systems of $D$ at $P \in D$. Let $\beta$ and $\gamma$ be real numbers with $\beta<\gamma<\alpha$. Then the function $h:=\gamma\|w\|^{2}-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ is 1 -convex near $P \in D$ and so the restriction $\left.h\right|_{L}$ is also 1-convex near $P \in L$. Therefore, if $\varphi-\left.\gamma\left(\|w\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}$ is pseudoconvex of order $t-q$ at $P \in L$, so is $\varphi-\left.\beta\left(\|z\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}=\varphi-\left.\gamma\left(\|w\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}+\left.h\right|_{L}$. This implies that (b) $\Rightarrow(\mathrm{c})$.

Lemma 3.10. Let $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ be upper semi-continuous and $P \in D$. Then $W_{q}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha$, if there exists an $(n-q+1)$-dimensional complex submanifold $L$ defined near $P$ such that $P \in L$ and $W_{1}^{(L)}\left[\left.\varphi\right|_{L}\right](P) \geqq \alpha$.

Proof. Let $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ be a normal coordinate system of $D$ at $P \in D$ and $\beta$ a real number with $\beta<\alpha$. Since $W_{1}^{(L)}\left[\left.\varphi\right|_{L}\right](P) \geqq \alpha$, it follows from Lemma 3.9 that $\left.\left(\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}=\left.\varphi\right|_{L}-\left.\beta\left(\|z\|^{2}\right)\right|_{L}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ $(=(n-q+1)-1)$ at $P \in L$. Hence, by Lemma 1.2, $\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ at $P \in D$ for every $\beta<\alpha$. This means that $W_{q}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha$.

Lemma 3.11. Let $\varphi: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ be upper semi-continuous and $P \in D$. Then $W_{1}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha$ if, for every 1-dimensional $C$-linear subspace $E_{P}$ of $T_{P}(D)$, there
exists a 1-dimensional complex submanifold $E$ of $D$ defined near $P$ such that $P \in E, T_{P}(E)=E_{P}$ and $W_{1}^{(E)}\left[\left.\varphi\right|_{E}\right](P) \geqq \alpha$.

Proof. Let $z=\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ be a normal coordinate system of $D$ at $P \in D$ and $\beta$ a real number with $\beta<\alpha$. To prove the pseudoconvexity of order $n-1$ of $\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ at $P \in D$, let $f$ be a weakly $n$-convex function defined near $P \in D$ and $\gamma$ a real number with $\beta<\gamma<\alpha$. Since the function $h:=f+(\gamma-\beta)\|z\|^{2}$ is strongly $n$-convex near $P \in D$, there exists a 1 -dimensional $C$-linear subspace $E_{P}$ of $T_{P}(D)$ such that $\partial \bar{\partial} h$ has a positive eigenvalue on $E_{P}$. By the assumption of the lemma, choose a 1 -dimensional complex submanifold $E$ of $D$ defined near $P$ such that $P \in E, \quad T_{P}(E)=E_{P}$ and $W_{1}^{(E)}\left[\left.\varphi\right|_{E}\right](P) \geqq \alpha$. Then $\left.h\right|_{E}$ is 1-convex near $P \in E$ and $\left.\varphi\right|_{E}-\left.\gamma\left(\|z\|^{2}\right)\right|_{E}$ is pseudoconvex of order $0(=1-1)$ at $P \in E$. Hence we can find a neighborhood $U^{\prime}=U^{\prime}\left(\left.h\right|_{E}\right)(\subset E)$ of $P \in E$, so that

$$
\left(\varphi-\gamma\|z\|^{2}+h\right)(P) \leqq \max \left\{\left.\left(\varphi-\gamma\|z\|^{2}+h\right)\right|_{E}(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta^{\prime}\right\}
$$

for every domain $\Delta^{\prime}$ with $P \in \Delta^{\prime}$ and $\Delta^{\prime} \Subset U^{\prime}$. Choose a neighborhood $U=U(f)$ $(\subset D)$ of $P \in D$ so that $U \cap E \subset U^{\prime}$. Let $\Delta$ be a domain with $P \in \Delta$ and $\Delta \Subset U$, and denote by $\Delta^{\prime}$ the connected component of $\Delta \cap E$ containing $P$. Then $P \in \Delta^{\prime}$ and $\Delta^{\prime} \Subset U^{\prime}$. Moreover, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}+f\right)(P) & \leqq \max \left\{\left.\left(\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}+f\right)\right|_{E}(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta^{\prime}\right\} \\
& \leqq \max \left\{\left(\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}+f\right)(Q): Q \in \partial \Delta\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, $\varphi-\beta\|z\|^{2}$ is pseudoconvex of order $n-1$ at $P \in D$ for every $\beta<\alpha$ and hence $W_{1}[\varphi](P) \geqq \alpha$.

## 4. Distance functions to complex submanifolds.

After $\S 4$, let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional connected Kähler manifold with $C^{\infty}$ Kähler metric $G$. Then $M$ can be also regarded as a $2 n$-dimensional Riemannian manifold with the $C^{\infty}$ Hermitian metric $g \equiv \operatorname{Re} G$. We denote by $J$ the complex structure tensor field of $M$, and denote by $\nabla$ and $R$ the covariant derivation and the curvature tensor field (of covariant degree 4) with respect to the Riemannian connection of $M$, respectively.

If $\sigma$ and $\tau$ are holomorphic planes, i.e., $J$-invariant planes in the (real) tangent space $T_{P}(M)$ at $P \in M$, the holomorphic bisectional curvature $H(\sigma, \tau)$ of them is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(\sigma, \tau) & :=R(X, J X, Y, J Y) \\
& =R(X, Y, X, Y)+R(J X, Y, J X, Y),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $X$ and $Y$ are unit vectors in $\sigma$ and $\tau$, respectively (see Goldberg-Kobayashi [10]).

For two points $P$ and $Q$ of $M$, denote by $d(P, Q)$ the distance between $P$ and $Q$ induced by the metric $g(\equiv \operatorname{Re} G)$. Given a subset $E$ of $M$, we define the distance function $d_{E}: M \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ to $E$ by

$$
d_{E}(P)=d(P, E)=\inf \{d(P, Q): Q \in E\} \quad \text { for } P \in M
$$

When $D$ is a pseudoconvex open subset (in the usual sense) in $M$, the plurisubharmonicity of the function $-\log d_{M \backslash D}$ was differential-geometrically studied by Takeuchi [27], Elencwajg [6], Suzuki [24] and Greene-Wu [11]. In this section we shall prove the following fundamental lemma. The proof is based on that of Greene-Wu ([11], Theorem 1).

Lemma 4.1. Let $M$ be an n-dimensional Kähler manifold, $D$ an open subset of $M$, and $P$ a point of $D$. Suppose that there exists (at least one) $Q \in \partial D$ such that
(i) $\quad d_{\partial D}(P)=d(P, Q)$,
(ii) The points $P$ and $Q$ can be joined by a geodesic $\xi$ in $M$,
(iii) There exists an ( $n-q$-dimensional complex submanifold defined near $Q$ such that $Q \in S$ and $S \subset M \backslash D$.
Then we have the estimate

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right](P) \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta}{3}, \Theta\right\},
$$

where $\Theta$ is the minimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures of $M$ on the geodesic $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ in (ii).

Proof. If $S$ is an ( $n-q$ )-dimensional complex submanifold defined near $Q \in \partial D$, and if $Q \in S$ and $S \subset M \backslash D$, we have $d_{S} \geqq d_{M \backslash D}=d_{\partial D}$ on $D$ and hence $-\log d_{\partial D} \geqq-\log d_{S}$ on $D$. Moreover, since $d_{S}(P)=d(P, Q)=d_{\partial D}(P)$, we have $-\log d_{\partial D}(P)=-\log d_{S}(P)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.8, we first see

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right](P) \geqq W_{q}\left[-\log d_{S}\right](P)
$$

Let $\xi=\xi(t), t \in[0, l]$, be a geodesic in $M$ from $P \in D$ to $Q \in \partial D$, where $\xi(0)=P, \xi(l)=Q, l=d_{\partial D}(P)=d(P, Q)$, and the parameter $t$ is canonical. Let $N_{t}$, $t \in[0, l]$, be the unit tangent vector field of $\xi=\xi(t)$. Then the vector $N_{l}$ is orthogonal to the (real) tangent space $T_{Q}(S)$ at $Q=\xi(l) \in S$. Let $F_{P}$ be the parallel translate of $T_{Q}(S)$ along $\xi$ back to $P=\xi(0)$. Since $T_{Q}(S)$ is $J$-invariant and of real dimension $2(n-q)$, so is $F_{P}$. Moreover, $F_{P}$ is orthogonal to both $N_{0}$ and $J N_{0}$. We denote by $L_{P}$ the $J$-invariant $\boldsymbol{R}$-linear subspace of real dimension $2(n-q+1)$ in $T_{P}(M)$ which is generated by $N_{0}, J N_{0}$ and the elements of $F_{P}$.

Since the metric $G$ on the complex manifold $M$ is now Kählerian, we can
choose a local coordinate system $\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ around $P$, so that $\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ is normal at $P$ (in the sense of Definition 3.1) and moreover satisfies $\left(\partial G_{i j} / \partial z_{k}\right)(P)$ $=0$ for $1 \leqq i, j, k \leqq n$, where $G_{i j}=G\left(\partial / \partial z_{i}, \partial / \partial z_{j}\right)$. Let $L$ be the $(n-q+1)$ dimensional complex submanifold defined near $P$ such that $P \in L, T_{P}(L)=L_{P}$ and $L$ is linear with respect to $\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$. Making a unitary transformation of $\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ if necessary, we may assume that $L$ is given by $z_{n-q+2}=z_{n-q+3}$ $=\cdots=z_{n}=0$ near $P$.

We put $\alpha=\min \{\Theta / 3, \Theta\} / 4$. To prove $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{S}\right](P) \geqq \alpha$, it is sufficient by Lemma 3.10 to show that $W_{1}^{(L)}\left[\left.\left(-\log d_{S}\right)\right|_{L}\right](P) \geqq \alpha$ for the $L$ chosen above. Moreover, it is sufficient by Lemma 3.11 to show that $W_{1}^{(E)}\left[\left.\left(-\log d_{S}\right)\right|_{E}\right](P) \geqq \alpha$ for every 1-dimensional complex submanifold $E$ of $L$ defined near $P$ such that $P \in E$ and $E$ is linear with respect to ( $z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}$ ).

Making a unitary transformation of ( $z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n-q+1}$ ) if necessary, we may without loss of generality assume that $E$ is given by $z_{2}=z_{3}=\cdots=z_{n}=0$ near $P$. For the sake of simplicity, we write $z$ instead of $z_{1}$, and put $z=x+\sqrt{-1} y$, $x, y \in \boldsymbol{R}$. Since the vector $(\partial / \partial z)_{P}$ is unit with respect to the metric $G$, the vectors $V_{0}=(\partial / \partial x)_{P}$ and $J V_{0}=(\partial / \partial y)_{P}$ are unit with respect to the metric $g$ $(\equiv \operatorname{Re} G)$. Since $T_{P}(E)$ is a $J$-invariant $\boldsymbol{R}$-linear subspace of $L_{P}=T_{P}(L)$, we can, by making a rotation of $z_{1}$-plane if necessary, write $V_{0}=\alpha N_{0}+\beta X_{0}$ for some $\alpha, \beta$ and $X_{0}$, where $X_{0} \in F_{P}$ is unit and $\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2}=1$.

Let $X_{t}, t \in[0, l]$, be the parallel translate of $X_{0}$ along $\xi$ to $\xi(t)$. Then the unit vectors $X_{t}, J X_{t}, N_{t}$ and $J N_{t}$ are mutually orthogonal at $\xi(t)$ for each $t \in[0, l]$. We now define the vector field $V$ along $\xi$ by

$$
V_{t}=\left(\frac{l-t}{l}\right) \alpha N_{t}+\beta X_{t} \quad \text { for } t \in[0, l],
$$

and put $U_{\varepsilon}=\{(x, y) \in E:|x|<\varepsilon,|y|<\varepsilon\}$ for $\varepsilon>0$. Then, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$, we can take a $C^{\infty}$ mapping $k:[0, l] \times U_{s} \rightarrow M$ such that
(i) $k(t ; 0,0) \equiv \hat{\xi}(t)$,
(ii) $\quad k_{*}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)_{(t ; 0,0)} \equiv V(t), \quad k_{*}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)_{(t ; 0,0)} \equiv J V(t)$,
(iii) $k(0 ; x, y) \equiv x+\sqrt{-1} y \in E, \quad k(l ; x, y) \in S^{\prime}$,
for $t \in[0, l]$ and $(x, y) \in U_{\varepsilon}$, where $S^{\prime}$ is some 1 -dimensional complex submanifold of $S$ defined near $Q$ and containing $Q$, and $k_{*}$ denotes the differential of the mapping $k$.

For $(x, y) \in U_{\varepsilon}$, we define the function $h: U_{s} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ by

$$
h(x, y)=\int_{0}^{t} \sqrt{g\left(k_{*}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right), k_{*}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)\right)_{(t ; x, y)}} d t
$$

i. e., the length of the curve $k_{(x, y)}=k_{(x, y)}(t):=k(t ; x, y) \in M, t \in[0, l]$. Since
$h(P)=h(0,0)=l=d_{S}(P)$, we have $(-\log h)(P)=\left.\left(-\log d_{S}\right)\right|_{E}(P)$. Moreover, it follows from the condition (iii) of the mapping $k$ that $h \geqq\left. d_{S}\right|_{E}$ on $U_{\varepsilon}$ and hence $-\log h \leqq\left.\left(-\log d_{S}\right)\right|_{E}$ on $U_{\varepsilon}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.8, we have

$$
W_{1}^{(E)}\left[\left.\left(-\log d_{S}\right)\right|_{E}\right](P) \geqq W_{1}^{(E)}[-\log h](P) .
$$

Since the function $-\log h$ is of class $C^{\infty}$ on $U_{\varepsilon}(\subset E)$ and the local coordinate $z=x+\sqrt{-1} y$ of $E$ is normal at $P \in E$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
W_{1}^{(E)}[-\log h](P) & =\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial z \partial \bar{z}}(-\log h)(P)  \tag{1}\\
& =\frac{1}{l^{2}}\left|\frac{\partial h}{\partial z}(P)\right|^{2}-\frac{1}{l}\left(\frac{\partial^{2} h}{\partial z \bar{\partial} \bar{z}}\right)(P) \\
& =\frac{1}{4 l^{2}}\left\{\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(P)\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(P)\right)^{2}\right\}-\frac{1}{4 l}\left\{\frac{\partial^{2} h}{\partial x^{2}}(P)+\frac{\partial^{2} h}{\partial y^{2}}(P)\right\} .
\end{align*}
$$

We shall now apply to (1) the variation formulas in Riemannian geometry. The first variation formula gives

$$
\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(P)=\left.g\left(V_{t}, N_{t}\right)\right|_{t=0} ^{t=l}=-\alpha, \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(P)=\left.g\left(J V_{t}, N_{t}\right)\right|_{t=0} ^{t=t}=0
$$

and hence we first obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(P)\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(P)\right)^{2}=\alpha^{2} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, the second variation formula gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^{2} h}{\partial x^{2}}(P)=\left.g\left(\left(\nabla_{V} V\right)_{(t ; 0,0)}, N_{t}\right)\right|_{t=0} ^{t=l} \\
& \quad+\int_{0}^{l}\left[-R\left(V_{t}, N_{t}, V_{t}, N_{t}\right)+g\left(\left(\nabla_{N} V\right)_{t},\left(\nabla_{N} V\right)_{t}\right)-\left\{\frac{d}{d t} g\left(V_{t}, N_{t}\right)\right\}^{2}\right] d t \\
& \frac{\partial^{2} h}{\partial y^{2}}(P)=\left.g\left(\left(\nabla_{J V} J V\right)_{(t ; 0,0)}, N_{t}\right)\right|_{t=0} ^{t=l} \\
& \quad+\int_{0}^{l}\left[-R\left(J V_{t}, N_{t}, J V_{t}, N_{t}\right)+g\left(\left(\nabla_{N} J V\right)_{t},\left(\nabla_{N} J V\right)_{t}\right)-\left\{\frac{d}{d t} g\left(J V_{t}, N_{t}\right)\right\}^{2}\right] d t,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have put

$$
V_{(t ; x, y)}=k_{*}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)_{(t ; x, y)}, \quad J V_{(t ; x, y)}=k_{*}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)_{(t ; x, y)}
$$

Now, by the condition (iii) of the mapping $k$, the vector fields

$$
V_{(0 ; x, y)} \equiv\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)_{(x, y)}, \quad J V_{(0 ; x, y)} \equiv\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)_{(x, y)}
$$

are restrictions to $U_{\varepsilon}(\subset E)$ of the coordinate vector fields with respect to the normal coordinate system $\left(z_{1}, \cdots, z_{n}\right)$ of $M$ at $P \in M$. Hence we have

$$
\left(\nabla_{V} V\right)_{(0 ; 0,0)}=\left(\nabla_{J V} J V\right)_{(0 ; 0,0)}=0 .
$$

Moreover, since $V_{(l ; x, y)}$ and $J V_{(l ; x, y)}$ are vector fields on the complex submanifold $S^{\prime}$, and since the vector $N_{l}$ is orthogonal to $S^{\prime}(\subset S)$ at $Q$, we have

$$
g\left(\left(\nabla_{V} V\right)_{(l ; 0,0)}, N_{l}\right)+g\left(\left(\nabla_{J V} J V\right)_{(l ; 0,0)}, N_{l}\right)=g\left(J[J V, V]_{(l ; 0,0)}, N_{l}\right)=0
$$

(see Frankel [7], p. 171). Therefore, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial^{2} h}{\partial x^{2}}(P)+\frac{\partial^{2} h}{\partial y^{2}}(P)=\frac{\alpha^{2}}{l}-\int_{0}^{l} R\left(V_{t}, J V_{t}, N_{t}, J N_{t}\right) d t \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

exactly as in the proof of Greene-Wu ([11], pp. 177-178). Substituting (2) and (3) for (1), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{1}^{(E)}[-\log h](P)=\frac{1}{4 l} \int_{0}^{l} R\left(V_{t}, J V_{t}, N_{t}, J N_{t}\right) d t \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\Theta$ is the minimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures of $M$ on the geodesic $\xi=\xi(t), t \in[0, l]$, then

$$
R\left(V_{t}, J V_{t}, N_{t}, J N_{t}\right) \geqq \Theta\left\{\left(\frac{l-t}{l}\right)^{2} \alpha^{2}+\beta^{2}\right\} \quad \text { for } t \in[0, l]
$$

Hence, by (4), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{1}^{(E)}[-\log h](P) & \geqq \frac{\Theta}{4 l} \int_{0}^{l}\left\{\left(\frac{l-t}{l}\right)^{2} \alpha^{2}+\beta^{2}\right\} d t \\
& =\frac{\Theta}{4}\left(\frac{\alpha^{2}}{3}+\beta^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Noting that $\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2}=1$ and hence $1 / 3 \leqq\left(\alpha^{2} / 3\right)+\beta^{2} \leqq 1$, we finally obtain

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right](P) \geqq W_{1}^{(E)}[-\log h](P) \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta}{3}, \Theta\right\}
$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.

## 5. Boundary distance functions of pseudoconvex domains of general order.

Let $M$ be a Kähler manifold and $D$ an open subset of $M$. For $P \in M$ and $r>0$, we use the notation

$$
B(P, r)=\{Q \in M: d(P, Q)<r\}
$$

Then $B\left(P, d_{\partial D}(P)\right) \subset D$ for every $P \in D$. We further denote by $\Theta(P), P \in D$, the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D}(P)\right)$. It is easy to see that the function $\Theta: D \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is continuous, if $D \cap B(P, r) \Subset M$ for every $P \in D$ and for every $r>0$. Note that the condition is satisfied, either if $M$ is complete or if $D \Subset M$.

As an application of Lemma 4.1, we shall first prove the following local result on boundary distance functions of pseudoconvex open subsets of general order.

Proposition 5.1. Let $M$ be an n-dimensional Kähler manifold and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Then there exists an open subset $\Delta$ of $M$ such that $\partial D \subset \Delta$ and

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right] \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta}{3}, \Theta\right\} \quad \text { on } D \cap \Delta \text {, }
$$

where $\Theta=\Theta(P), P \in D$, is the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D}(P)\right)$.

Proof. We put $\alpha=\min \{\Theta / 3, \Theta\} / 4$. To prove the proposition, it is sufficient to show that each $Q \in \partial D$ has a neighborhood $V$ such that $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right]$ $\geqq \alpha$ on $D \cap V$.

Let $V^{*}$ be a Stein neighborhood of $Q \in \partial D$ which is relatively compact in some coordinate neighborhood of $M$. Then the set $D^{*}:=D \cap V^{*}$ is biholomorphic to a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $\boldsymbol{C}^{n}$. Hence, by Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 2.7, we can take a sequence $\left\{D_{\nu}^{*}\right\}_{\nu \in N}$ of open subsets with the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $D^{*}$ such that $D_{\nu}^{*} \Subset D_{\nu+1}^{*} \Subset D^{*}$ for each $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$ and $\cup_{\nu=1}^{\infty} D_{\nu}^{*}=D^{*}$. Then, for each $P \in D_{\nu}^{*}$, there exists (at least one) $Q \in \partial D_{\nu}^{*}$ which satisfies the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) of Lemma 4.1. Hence, by Lemma 4.1, we have

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\left.\partial D_{\nu}^{*}\right]} \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta^{*}}{3}, \Theta^{*}\right\} \quad \text { on } D_{\nu}^{*}\right.
$$

for each $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$, where $\Theta^{*}=\Theta^{*}(P), P \in D^{*}$, is the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D *}(P)\right)$. Note here that, because $D^{*} \Subset M, \Theta^{*}$ and hence $\alpha^{*}:=\min \left\{\Theta^{*} / 3, \Theta^{*}\right\} / 4$ are continuous functions from $D^{*}$ to $\boldsymbol{R}$. On the other hand, for each $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$, the sequence $\left\{-\log d_{\partial D_{\mu}^{*}}\right\}_{\mu \geq \nu}$ decreases on $D_{\nu}^{*}$ and converges to $-\log d_{\partial D *}$. Therefore, it follows from Proposition 3.7 that $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D^{*}}\right] \geqq \alpha^{*}$ on $D_{\nu}^{*}$ for each $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$ and hence $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D^{*}}\right] \geqq \alpha^{*} \geqq \alpha$ on $D^{*}$.

Now choose $r>0$ so that $B(Q, 2 r) \Subset V^{*}$, and put $V=B(Q, r)$. Then we have $d_{\partial D}=d_{\partial D *}$ on $D \cap V\left(\subset D^{*}\right)$, which implies that $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right] \geqq \alpha$ on $D \cap V$ for this $V$.

We shall later show that the estimate in Proposition 5.1 holds not only near $\partial D$ but also whole on $D$ in some cases (see Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 7.1). In this section we give the following global estimate for $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right]$ under the assumption stated below.

Lemma 5.2. Let $M$ be an n-dimensional Kähler manifold and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$ such that $D \cap B(P, r) \Subset M$ for every
$P \in D$ and for every $r>0$. Suppose that there exists an open subset $\Delta$ of $M$ with $\partial D \subset \Delta$, and that one can for each $r>0$ find a positive number $C^{(r)}$ and a $q$-convex function $\psi^{(r)}$ with corners on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$ satisfying $\left|-\log d_{\partial D}-\psi^{(r)}\right|<C^{(r)}$ on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$, where $D^{(r)}=D \cap B(O, r)$ and $O \in \partial D$ is fixed. Then we have the estimate

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right] \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta}{3}, \Theta\right\} \quad \text { whole on } D \text {, }
$$

where $\Theta=\Theta(P), P \in D$, is the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D}(P)\right)$.

Proof. We may assume that each $\psi^{(r)}$ is piecewise $C^{\infty}$. Then, by Lemma 2.6, there exists a subset $\Lambda^{(r)}$ of Lebesgue measure zero in $\boldsymbol{R}$ such that the set $\left\{P \in D^{(r)} \cap \Delta: \psi^{(r)}(P)<A\right\}$ satisfies the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$ for every $A \in \boldsymbol{R} \backslash \Lambda^{(r)}$. On the other hand, by assumption, $D^{(r)} \Subset M$ and hence $D^{(r)} \backslash \Delta \subseteq D$ for each $r>0$. We can thus choose $A_{0}^{(r)}>0$, so that

$$
D^{(r)} \backslash \Delta \subset\left\{P \in D^{(r)}:-\log d_{\partial D}(P)+C^{(r)}<A_{0}^{(r)}\right\} .
$$

For $A>0$ and $r>0$, we define the set $D_{A}^{(r)}$ by

$$
D_{A}^{(r)}=\left(D^{(r)} \backslash \Delta\right) \cup\left\{P \in D^{(r)} \cap \Delta: \psi^{(r)}(P)<A\right\} .
$$

Since $\psi^{(r)}>-\log d_{\partial D}-C^{(r)}$ on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$, we have $D_{A}^{(r)} \Subset D$ for every $A>0$. Moreover, since $\psi^{(r)}<-\log d_{\partial D}+C^{(r)}$ on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$, the set $D_{A}^{(r)}$ satisfies the condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{q}\right)$ in $D^{(r)}$ if $A>A_{0}^{(r)}$ and $A \in \boldsymbol{R} \backslash \Lambda^{(r)}$.

For each $P \in D_{A}^{(r)}$, let $Q \in \partial D_{A}^{(2 r)}$ be a point such that $d_{\partial D_{A}^{(2 r)}}(P)=d(P, Q)$. Then the point $Q$ is necessarily an interior point of $D^{(2 r)}$ because $d_{\partial D_{A}^{(2 r)}}(P)<$ $d(O, P)<r$. Hence, if $A>A_{0}^{(2 r)}$ and $A \in \boldsymbol{R} \backslash \Lambda^{(2 r)}$, the point $Q$ belongs to $D^{(2 r)} \cap \Delta$ and satisfies $\psi^{(2 r)}(Q)=A$, and fulfills the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) of Lemma 4.1 with respect to the set $D_{A}^{(2 r)}$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D_{A}^{(2 r)}}\right] \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta^{(2 r)}}{3}, \Theta^{(2 r)}\right\} \quad \text { on } D_{A}^{(r)}
$$

for every $A$ with $A>A_{0}^{(2 r)}$ and $A \in \boldsymbol{R} \backslash \Lambda^{(2 r)}$, where $\Theta^{(r)}=\Theta^{(r)}(P), P \in D^{(r)}$, is the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D^{(r)}}(P)\right)$. Note here that $\Theta^{(r)}: D^{(r)} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is continuous because $D^{(r)} \subseteq M$. Furthermore, $-\log d_{\partial D_{B}^{(2 r)}}$, where $B>A$, decreases on $D_{A}^{(r)}$ and converges to $-\log d_{\partial D}$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, using Proposition 3.7, we can conclude that

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right] \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta^{(2 r)}}{3}, \Theta^{(2 r)}\right\} \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta}{3}, \Theta\right\}
$$

on $D^{(r)}$ for every $r>0$, which proves the lemma.

## 6. Pseudoconvex domains of general order in Kähler manifolds of positive holomorphic bisectional curvature.

In §6, we consider the case where a Kähler manifold $M$ has positive or non-negative holomorphic bisectional curvature.

The following is the direct result of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 3.6.
Corollary 6.1. Let $M$ be an n-dimensional Kähler manifold with nonnegative (resp. positive) holomorphic bisectional curvature and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Then there exists an open subset $\Delta$ of $M$ such that $\partial D \subset \Delta$ and the function $-\log d_{\partial D}$ is pseudoconvex (resp. strongly pseudoconvex) of order $n-q$ on $D \cap \Delta$.

If the boundary $\partial D$ of an open subset $D$ of $M$ is a real submanifold of class $C^{2}$ in $M$ (whose irreducible components may have different dimensions from each other), there exists an open subset $\Gamma$ of $M$ such that $\partial D \subset \Gamma$ and the boundary distance function $d_{\partial D}$ is of class $C^{2}$ on $D \cap \Gamma$ (see Matsumoto [14]). Using this fact and Proposition 6.1, we first obtain the following result on the $q$-convexity of domains.

Theorem 6.2. Let $M$ be an n-dimensional Kähler manifold with non-negative (resp. positive) holomorphic bisectional curvature and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Moreover, suppose that $D \Subset M$ and the boundary $\partial D$ is a real submanifold of class $C^{2}$ in $M$. Then $D$ is weakly (resp. strongly) $q$-convex.

Remark 6.3. The $n$-dimensional complex projective space $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$ has positive holomorphic bisectional curvature with respect to the Fubini-Study metric on $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$. Theorem 6.2 is an extension of the Barth theorem ([2], Satz 3) asserting that the complement $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C}) \backslash S$ is strongly $q$-convex, if $S$ is a complex submanifold (and hence an algebraic submanifold) of $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$ and if each connected component of $S$ has at least dimension $n-q$ (cf. Example 2.4). When $M=P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$, Theorem 6.2 is the result of Schwarz ([20], Theorem 6.4) and Matsumoto ([15], Corollary of Theorem 2). As another extension of the Barth theorem, Schneider [19] has also showed the $q$-convexity of $M \backslash S$ under the assumption that $M$ and $S$ are compact and $S$ has positive normal bundle in $M$.

In what follows, we consider only the case where $M$ has positive holomorphic bisectional curvature. Then we can extend Proposition 5.1 to the following global result.

Proposition 6.4. Let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Kähler manifold with positive holomorphic bisectional curvature and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Moreover, suppose either that $M$ is complete or that $D \Subset M$.

Then we have the estimate

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right] \geqq \frac{\Theta}{12} \quad \text { whole on } D \text {, }
$$

where $\Theta=\Theta(P), P \in D$, is the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D}(P)\right)$.

Proof. By Corollary 6.1, there exists an open subset $\Delta$ of $M$ such that $\partial D \subset \Delta$ and $-\log d_{\partial D}$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D \cap \Delta$. Hence, by the Bungart approximation theorem Theorem 1.6), we can find a $q$-convex function $\psi$ with corners on $D \cap \Delta$ such that $\left|-\log d_{\partial D}-\psi\right|<1$ on $D \cap \Delta$. The proposition thus follows from Lemma 5.2 .

COROLLARY 6.5. Uuder the same assumption as in Proposition 6.4, the function $-\log d_{\partial D}$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ whole on $D$.

Using the approximation theorems of Bungart and Diederich-Fornaess, we obtain from Corollary 6.5 the following theorem and its corollary on the $q$-completeness (with corners) of domains.

Theorem 6.6. Let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Kähler manifold with positive holomorphic bisectional curvature and let $D$ be a relatively compact, pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Then $D$ is $q$-complete with corners.

Corollary 6.7. Under the same assumption as in Theorem 6.6, $D$ is $\tilde{q}$-complete, where $\tilde{q}=n-[n / q]+1$.

When $M=P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$, Theorem 6.6 is particularly stated as follows (see Proposition 2.2).

Corollary 6.8. Let $D$ be an open subset of $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$. If $D$ is locally $q$-complete with corners in $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$ (in the sense of Peternell [16]), then $D$ is globally $q$-complete with corners and hence globally $\tilde{q}$-complete, where $\tilde{q}=$ $n-[n / q]+1$. In particular, if $S$ is an algebraic subset of $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C})$ and if each irreducible component of $S$ has at least dimension $n-q$, then $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C}) \backslash S$ is globally $q$-complete with corners and hence globally $\tilde{q}$-complete.

Remark 6.9. In Corollary 6.8, the case where $S$ is non-singular has been showed by Schwarz ([20], Theorem 6.5). When $S$ is non-singular, the set $P^{n}(\boldsymbol{C}) \backslash S$ is further $\min \{2 q-1, \tilde{q}\}$-complete (see Peternell [17]).

## 7. Pseudoconvex domains of general order in Stein manifolds.

Finally in §7, we consider the case where a Kähler manifold $M$ admits a (strongly) 1-convex function. Then we can extend Proposition 5.1 to the following global result.

Proposition 7.1. Let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Kähler manifold and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Suppose that there exists an open subset $\Delta$ of $M$ such that $\partial D \subset \Delta$ and $\Delta$ admits a 1-convex function. Moreover, suppose either that $M$ is complete or that $D \Subset M$. Then we have the estimate

$$
W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right] \geqq \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{\frac{\Theta}{3}, \Theta\right\} \quad \text { whole on } D \text {, }
$$

where $\Theta=\Theta(P), P \in D$, is the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D}(P)\right.$ ).

Proof. Shrinking $\Delta$ if necessary, we may assume that there exists a 1 -convex function $h$ which is defined on an open subset including $\bar{\Delta}$. Moreover, we may by Proposition 5.1 assume that the estimate in Proposition 7.1 holds on $D \cap \Delta$.

Let $O$ be a fixed point of $\partial D$ and put $D^{(r)}=D \cap B(O, r)$ for $r>0$. Then, by the assumption of the proposition, $D^{(r)} \Subset M$ for each $r>0$. We put

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha^{(r)}=\frac{1}{4} \inf \left\{\frac{\Theta}{3}(P), \Theta(P): P \in D^{(r)} \cap \Delta\right\}, \\
& \beta^{(r)}=\inf \left\{W_{1}[h](P): P \in D^{(r)} \cap \Delta\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $\alpha^{(r)} \in \boldsymbol{R}$ and $\beta^{(r)}>0$. If we choose $A^{(r)}>0$ so that $\alpha^{(r)}+A^{(r)} \beta^{(r)}>1$, we have $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}+A^{(r)} h\right]>1$ on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$. By Proposition 3.6, the function $-\log d_{\partial D}+A^{(r)} h$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$. Hence, by the Bungart approximation theorem (Theorem 1.6), we can find a $q$-convex function $\psi^{(r)}$ with corners on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$ such that

$$
\left|-\log d_{\partial D}+A^{(r)} h-\psi^{(r)}\right|<1 \quad \text { on } D^{(r)} \cap \Delta .
$$

If we choose $C^{(r)}>0$ so that $C^{(r)}>1+A^{(r)}|h|$ on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$, then $\left|-\log d_{\partial D}-\psi^{(r)}\right|$ $<C^{(r)}$ on $D^{(r)} \cap \Delta$. The proposition thus follows from Lemma 5.2.

In what follows, let $M$ be a Stein manifold. Then $M$ admits a complete Kähler metric.

Proposition 7.2. Let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Stein manifold and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Let $d_{\partial D}$ be a boundary distance function of $D$ induced by a complete Kähler metric on $M$. Then there exists a 1-convex function $h$ on $M$ such that the function $-\log d_{\partial D}+h$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$.

Proof. Let $f$ be a 1 -convex exhaustion function of $M$. For each $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$, define the set $D_{\nu}$ by $D_{\nu}=\{P \in D: f(P)<\nu\}$ and denote by $\alpha_{\nu}$ the infimum of the function $\{\Theta / 3, \Theta\} / 4$ on $D_{\nu}$, where $\Theta=\Theta(P), P \in D$, is the infimum of the holomorphic bisectional curvatures on $B\left(P, d_{\partial D}(P)\right)$. Then, by Proposition 7.1,
we have $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}\right] \geqq \alpha_{\nu}$ on $D_{\nu}$. Let $\beta_{\nu}$ be the infimum of the function $W_{1}[f]$ on $D_{\nu}$. Then $\beta_{\nu}>0$ because $D_{\nu} \Subset M$.

Take a sequence $\left\{C_{\nu}\right\}_{\nu \in N}$ such that $0<C_{\nu}<C_{\nu+1}$ and $\alpha_{\nu}+C_{\nu} \beta_{\nu}>1$ for $\nu \in N$. Choose a $C^{2}$ function $u: \boldsymbol{R} \rightarrow(1,+\infty)$ such that $u^{\prime}>C_{1}>0, u^{\prime \prime}>0$ and $u^{\prime}(\nu) \geqq C_{\nu+1}$ for $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$, and put $h=u \circ f$. Then $h$ is 1 -convex on $M$. On the other hand, since $W_{1}[h] \geqq C_{\nu} \beta_{\nu}$ on $D_{\nu} \backslash D_{\nu-1}$, we have $W_{q}\left[-\log d_{\partial D}+h\right]>1$ on $D_{\nu} \backslash D_{\nu-1}$ for each $\nu \in \boldsymbol{N}$ and hence on $D$. Therefore, $-\log d_{\partial D}+h$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$.

Using the approximation theorems of Bungart and Diederich-Fornaess, we obtain from Proposition 7.2 the following theorem and its corollary.

Theorem 7.3. Let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Stein manifold and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Then $D$ is $q$-complete with corners.

Corollary 7.4. Under the same assumption as in Theorem 7.3, D is $\tilde{q}$ complete, where $\tilde{q}=n-[n / q]+1$.

Remark 7.5. Using the Bungart approximation theorem, we can also obtain Theorem 7.3 directly from the result of Peternell ([16], Theorem 2) or that of Matsumoto ([13], Theorem 1).

If the boundary $\partial D$ of an open subset $D$ of $M$ is a real submanifold of class $C^{2}$ in $M$ (whose irreducible components may have different dimensions from each other), we further obtain the following.

Theorem 7.6. Let $M$ be an $n$-dimensional Stein manifold and let $D$ be a pseudoconvex open subset of order $n-q$ in $M$. Moreover, suppose that the boundary $\partial D$ is a real submanifold of class $C^{2}$ in $M$. Then $D$ is $q$-complete.

Proof. By Proposition 7.2, we can find a 1-convex function $h$ on $M$ such that $\varphi=-\log d_{\partial D}+h$ is strongly pseudoconvex of order $n-q$ on $D$, where $d_{\partial D}$ is a boundary distance function of $D$ induced by a complete Kähler metric on $M$. Let $\Delta$ be an open subset of $M$ such that $\partial D \subset \Delta$ and $d_{\partial D}$ is of class $C^{2}$ on $D \cap \Delta$. Then $\varphi$ is (strongly) $q$-convex on $D \cap \Delta$.

Choose a 1-convex exhaustion function $f$ of $M$ so that $f>\varphi$ on $D \backslash \Delta$ and put $\Phi=\max \{\varphi, f\}$ on $D$. Since $\Phi \equiv f$ on $D \backslash \Delta$ and since $\varphi$ is $q$-convex on $D \cap \Delta$, we can, by the Diederich-Fornaess approximation theorem (cf. [4], §5), find a $q$-convex function $\Psi$ (without corners) on $D$ such that $|\Phi-\Psi|<1$ on $D$. Then the function $\Psi$ is further an exhaustion function of $D$, which proves the theorem.

Remark 7.7. When $\partial D$ is a real hypersurface of class $C^{2}$ in $M$, Theorem 7.6 has been showed by Suria [23] and Eastwood-Suria [5] (cf. Example 2.3).

Theorem 7.6 is an extension of the result. Schwarz ([20], Corollary 6.3) has also proved Theorem 7.6 in another way.
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