# SOME ESTIMATIONS ON THE SZEGÖ KERNEL FUNCTION 

By Mitsuru Ozawa

Let $B$ be an $n$-ply connected bounded planar domain bounded by $n$ smooth curves $\Gamma_{i}, i=1, \cdots, n$. We shall denote the total of these curves by $\Gamma$. Let $L^{2}(\Gamma)$ be a class of the function $f(z)$ satisfying the following conditions:
(1) $f(z)$ is regular single-valued in $B$,
(2) $\int_{\Gamma} f(z)^{2} d s_{z}$ is finite.
$L^{2}(\Gamma)$ is a Hilbert space with the following inner product

$$
(f, g)=\int_{\Gamma} f(z) \overline{g(z)} d s_{z}, \quad f, g \in L^{2}(\Gamma)
$$

In $L^{2}(\Gamma)$, there is a reproducing kernel function $K\left(z, \overline{z_{0}}\right)$ - the Szegö kernel function-, where the reproducing property means the identity

$$
f\left(z_{0}\right)=\left(f(z), K\left(z, \overline{z_{0}}\right)\right)
$$

valid for any $f(z)$ in $L^{2}(\Gamma)$. It is well known that the Szegö kernel satisfies the following relations:
$K\left(z_{0}, \bar{z}_{0}\right) \geqq 0$ and Hermitian property, that is, $K\left(z, z_{0}\right)=\overline{K\left(z_{0}, \bar{z}\right)}$.
In our present case, the equality sign does not occur in the first relation. These relations, together with the uniqueness of the Szegö kernel, are obtained under the effect of the reproducing property.

Let $L\left(z, z_{0}\right)$ be the so-called adjoint $L$-kernel associated with the Szegö kernel introduced by Garabedian, which satisfies the following conditions:

It is a single-valued analytic regular function except a point $z=z_{0}$ in $B$, having the expansion

$$
L\left(z, z_{0}\right)=\frac{1}{2 \pi\left(z-z_{0}\right)}+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{n}
$$

around $z=z_{0}$, and on the boundary $\Gamma$ of $B$ it satisfies an important boundary relation

$$
L\left(z, z_{0}\right) d z=i \overline{K\left(z, z_{0}\right)} d s
$$

Let $l\left(z, z_{0}\right)$ be $-\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{n}$ in the expansion of $L\left(z, z_{0}\right)$. This is a singlevalued regular function belonging to the class $L^{2}(\Gamma)$ and satisfies the symmetric relation, namely $l\left(z, z_{0}\right)=l\left(z_{0}, z\right)$.

Let $\mathfrak{R}$ be a class of single-valued regular functions satisfying the boundedness condition $f(z) \leqq 1$ in $B$ and $f\left(z_{0}\right)=0$. Then $\operatorname{Max}_{B} \quad f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)$ exists and is equal to $2 \pi K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)$. The extremal function is unique and maps $B$ onto the $n$-times covered unit disc. From this extremal property we have that $K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)$ is the monotone decreasing functional of the increasing basic domain.

For detailed explanations one can refer to the papers due to the following authors, namely Garabedian [1], Garabedian-Schiffer [2], Schifler [6] and Nehari [3], [4].

The first estimation. Let $S$ be the length of $\Gamma$, then there holds an inequality

$$
K\left(z_{0}, \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{z_{0}}\right) \cdot S \geqq 1
$$

It has been once proved by Ono (in Japanese) that $B$ must be a simply connected domain if equality sign occurs.

For completeness we shall prove this by a quite different way. By the boundary relation for $L$ and $K$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Gamma} L\left(z, z_{0}\right)^{2} d s_{z} & =-i \int_{\Gamma} L\left(z, z_{0}\right) K\left(z, \overline{z_{0}}\right) d z \\
& =K\left(z_{0}, z_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, by the Schwarz inequality and the residue theorem, there holds

$$
\begin{aligned}
1=\left|\int_{\Gamma} L\left(z, z_{0}\right) d z\right|^{2} & \leqq \int_{\Gamma}\left|L\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right|^{2} d s_{z} \int_{\Gamma} d s \\
& \leqq K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \cdot S
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $S^{\prime}$ be the length of the outer boundary $\Gamma_{1}$ and $B^{\prime}$ the finite simply connected domain bounded by $\Gamma_{1}$. Then, by the monotoneity of $K\left(z_{0}, z_{0}\right)$ as a domain functional, we have

$$
K_{B}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \leqq K_{B}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)
$$

the subscripts indicating the referred domains. Therefore we have a series of inequalities

$$
\frac{1}{S}=K_{B}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \geqq K_{B}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \geqq \stackrel{1}{S^{\prime}}
$$

This is absurd, unless $B$ coincides with $B^{\prime}$.
Even if $B$ were simply connected, the equality sign does not occur unless the configuration $\left[B, z_{0}\right]$ is suitably restricted. This fact is deduced by a well known fact, that is, $\lim _{z_{0} \rightarrow \Gamma} K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)=+\infty$. Now we shall establish a precise result for occurrance of the equality sign. We may restrict $B$ as a simply connected domain. Let $f(w)$ be a mapping function such that $w<1$ is mapped conformally upon $B$ with $f(0)=z_{0}$. Then $\left(f^{\prime}(w)\right)^{1 / 2}$ is single-valued
when we fix a branch of it. Let $S(r)$ be the length of the image curve of $w=r$. Then

$$
S(r)=\int_{|w|=r} f^{\prime}(w) \quad d w
$$

Writing $\left(f^{\prime}(w)\right)^{1 / 2}$ as $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{n} w^{n}$, the usual caiculation leads to a relation

$$
S(r)=2 \pi \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}^{2} \cdot r^{2 n+1}
$$

By the Jordan smoothness of $\Gamma$, we have

$$
S(1)=\left.2 \pi \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}\right|^{\prime 2}
$$

whence follows that

$$
1 \leqq K\left(z_{0}, \bar{z}_{0}\right) \cdot S(1)=K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \cdot 2 \pi \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}{ }^{2}
$$

Referring to a result due to Garabedian, namely

$$
2 \pi K\left(z_{0}, z_{0}\right)=\frac{1}{\left.a_{0}\right|^{2}}
$$

in our terms, we have

$$
1 \leqq 1+2 \pi K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|a_{n}\right|^{2} .
$$

If the equality sign occurs, then all the $a_{n}$ with exception of $a_{0}$ are equal to zero, and conversely. Thus, if so, $f(w)=f(0)+a_{0}{ }^{2} w$, and hence the inverse function $F\left(z, z_{0}\right)$ of $f(w)$ can be described as

$$
F\left(z, z_{0}\right)=\frac{1}{a_{0}{ }^{2}}\left(z-z_{0}\right) .
$$

This shows that the domain $B$ and the referred point $z_{0}$ must be a disc and its center, respectively, when the equality sign occurs in an inequality

$$
K_{B}\left(z_{0}, \bar{z}_{0}\right) \geqq \frac{1}{S}
$$

The inverse statement of the above fact is evidently true.
The second estimation. We shall prove an inequality

$$
K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \leqq \frac{1}{4 \bar{\pi}^{2}} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{d s_{z}}{\left|z-z_{0}\right|^{2}}
$$

Let $[f, L]$ be a generalized inner product defined by

$$
\int_{\Gamma} f(z) \overline{L\left(z, z_{0}\right)} d s_{z}, \quad f(z) \in L^{2}(\Gamma)
$$

By the boundary relation for $K$ and $L$, we see

$$
[f, L]=-i \int_{\Gamma} f(z) K\left(z, \overline{z_{0}}\right) d z=0 .
$$

This leads to a relation

$$
\left(f(z), l\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right)=-\frac{1}{2 \pi}\left[f(z), \frac{1}{z-z_{0}}\right] .
$$

Putting $f(z)=l(z, w)$ and noting the boundary relation, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(l(z, w), l\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right) & =\frac{1}{4 \pi^{2}} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{d s_{z}}{(z-w) \overline{\left(z-z_{0}\right)}}-\overline{\left(\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{K(z, w)}{z-z_{0}} d z\right)} \\
& =\frac{1}{4 \pi^{2}} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{d s_{z}}{(z-w)\left(z-z_{0}\right)}-K\left(w, \overline{z_{0}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Especially setting $w=z_{0}$, we see

$$
\left.\int_{\Gamma} l\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right|^{2} d s_{z}+K\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)=\frac{1}{4 \pi^{2}} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{d s_{z}}{z-\left.z_{0}\right|^{2}},
$$

which leads to our result.
Next we should examine the cases where the equality sign occurs. If so, $l\left(z, z_{0}\right) \equiv 0$ or $L\left(z, z_{0}\right)=1 / 2 \pi\left(z-z_{0}\right)$. Since $L\left(z, z_{0}\right)^{2} d z$ is an invariant differential, we have

$$
L\left(f(z), f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{2} d f(z)=L\left(z, z_{0}\right)^{2} d z
$$

with a certain conformal mapping function $f(z)$. If $l\left(f(z), f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)$ vanishes identically, then $l\left(z, z_{0}\right)=0$ leads to a differential equation

$$
\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{\left(f(z)-f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{2}}=\frac{1}{\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{2}},
$$

whose solution is given by

$$
f(z)-f\left(z_{0}\right)=\frac{z-z_{0}}{c\left(z-z_{0}\right)+1},
$$

$c$ being a constant. This shows that the mapping funtion reduces to a linear function. On the other hand, the equality sign occurs for any disc and any inner point of this disc. This can be deduced by an easy calculation and is well known. Now putting $f(z)$ the Riemann mapping function from $B$ onto $w<1$, then we can conclude that $B$ must be a disc when $l\left(z, z_{0}\right) \equiv 0$ happens. Here we must assume that the connectivity of $B$ is one in number.

As is well known, $K\left(z, z_{0}\right)^{2}$ has the multivalued indefinite integral unless the connectivity number of $B$ is equal to one, that is, there does not happen a fact that all the periods

$$
\overline{\alpha_{\nu}\left(z_{0}\right)}=4 \pi \int_{\Gamma_{\nu}} K\left(z, \overline{\left.z_{0}\right)^{2}} d z, \quad \nu=1, \cdots, n ; n \nsupseteq 1,\right.
$$

reduce to zero simultaneously. By the boundary relation of $K$ and $L$, we have

$$
-4 \pi \int_{\Gamma_{\nu}} L\left(z, z_{0}\right)^{2} d z=\alpha_{\nu}\left(z_{0}\right)
$$

However, if we assume that an identity

$$
L\left(z, z_{0}\right) \equiv \frac{1}{2 \pi\left(z-z_{0}\right)}
$$

holds, then we have the following fact that all the $\alpha_{\nu}\left(z_{0}\right)$ reduce to zero, since there holds

$$
\int_{\Gamma \nu} \frac{1}{\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{2}}=0 \quad \text { for any } \nu(\nu=1, \cdots, n)
$$

This contradicts our hypothesis that the connectivity number of $B$ is greater than one. Hence we have a result: If the equality sign occurs in our second estimation, then the connectivity number of $B$ is equal to one and moreover $B$ is a disc.

We should mention an interpretation obtained by the second estimation. Let $B$ be an $n$-ply connected domain bounded by $n$ circles $\Gamma_{1} \cdots, \Gamma_{n}$. We shall put $\Gamma_{1}$ the outer boundary and $B_{1}$ the finite simply connected domain bounded by $\Gamma_{1}$ alone. Let $B_{j}$ be an infinite domain bounded by a circle $\Gamma_{j}$. Then we have a subadditivity relation for the Szegö kernel functions of $B_{j}$, $j=1, \cdots, n$, namely

$$
K_{B}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right) \leqq \sum_{j=1}^{n} K_{B_{j}}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right),
$$

because

$$
K_{B_{j}}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)=\frac{1}{4 \pi^{2}} \int_{\Gamma_{J}} \frac{d s_{z}}{\left|z-z_{0}\right|^{2}}
$$

holds for any $B_{j}$.
In the general domain $B$,

$$
\int_{\Gamma}\left|l\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right|^{2} d s_{z}+K_{B}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{\Gamma_{j}}\left|l_{B_{j}}\left(z, z_{0}\right)\right|^{2} d s_{z}+\sum_{j=1}^{n} K_{B_{j}}\left(z_{0}, \bar{z}_{0}\right)
$$

holds.
To investigate the location of the critical points of $K_{B}\left(z_{0}, \overline{z_{0}}\right)$ seems very interesting. Topological or Morse theoretic tools are very useful, however the precise metrical result can not be obtained when we follow only these tools. We now mention a remarkable fact: Let $B$ be a convex domain, then there is only one minimum point of the subharmonic function $K_{B}\left(z_{0}, z_{0}\right)$ continuous in $B$. There are no other critical points of $K_{B}\left(z_{0}, \bar{z}_{0}\right)$. For the proof we need somewhat long but elementary considerations. For an annulus $r<z<1$, there is a critical line $z^{\prime}=\sqrt{r}$. This is not so difficult to show. Details are omitted here.

The above two estimations may be considered as isoperimetric inequalities.

Let $L_{n}^{2}(\Gamma)$ be a subclass of $L^{2}(\Gamma)$ such that $f^{(n)}(t)=1$ and $M_{n}=\inf f^{2}{ }^{2}$ for $f \in L_{n}^{2}(L)$. The existence of an extremal function $F_{n}(z, t)$ and positivity of $M_{n}$ is almost evident. Our problem is to seek the inner relations among these extremal functions.
Let $f(z)$ be an arbitrary function of $L_{n}^{2}(\Gamma)$, then $F_{n}(z, t)+\lambda \varphi(z)$ with $\varphi(z) \equiv f^{(n)}(t) F_{n}(z, t)-f(z)$ belongs to $L_{n}^{2}(\Gamma)$ for any $\lambda$. Thus we have

$$
F_{n}\left\|^{2} \leqq F_{n}+\lambda \varphi\right\|^{2}=F_{n}\left\|^{2}+2 \operatorname{Re} \lambda\left(F_{n}, \varphi\right)+\mid \lambda\right\|^{2}\|\varphi\|^{2} .
$$

The arbitrariness of $\lambda$ leads to a fact that

$$
\left(F_{n}, \varphi\right)=0 \quad \text { or } \quad f^{(n)}(t) F_{n} \|^{2}=\left(f, F_{n}\right) .
$$

Putting

$$
H_{n}(z, \bar{t})=\frac{F_{n}(z, t)}{n!M_{n}},
$$

we have a sort of reproducing property

$$
\underset{n!}{1} f^{(n)}(t)=\left(f(z), H_{n}(z, \bar{t})\right)
$$

$F_{n}$ is uniquely determined by its extremality. This is also almost obvious.
Let $H_{n}(z, \bar{t})=\sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} h_{n \mu}(z-t)^{\mu}$ in local, then $h_{n m t}=\overline{h_{m n}}$, that is, the matrix $\left(h_{m n}\right)$ is hermitian. $\left\{H_{n}\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a complete system in the Hilbert space $L^{2}(\Gamma)$, since $\left(g(z), H_{n}(z, \bar{t})\right)=0$ for any $n$ implies that $g^{(n)}(t)=0$ for any $n$ and hence $g(z) \equiv 0$ on $B$.

Some slightly modified arguments from the ones carried out in a Schiffer's paper [6] lead to some important facts, namely
$H_{n}(z, \bar{t})$ is analytic on $\bar{B}$ and there exists an analytic function $L_{n}(z, t)$ such that $L_{n}(z, t)$ is regular except a point $z=t$ in $B$ where it has a local expansion

$$
L_{n}(z, t)=\frac{(-1)^{n}}{(z=t)^{n+1}}+\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} A_{m}(z-t)^{m}
$$

and satisfies a boundary relation

$$
L_{n}(z, t)=\overline{2 \pi i H_{n}(t, \bar{z}) \frac{d t}{d s}}, \quad t \in \Gamma
$$

We should remark that $L_{0}$ and $L$ used in the earlier part are essentially the same but somewhat different in their normalizations.
From the last boundary relation we can proceed to a mapping problem as Schiffer has done. But we do not go further in this tendency.
$\left\{H_{n}(z, \bar{t})\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent. If it is not so, then there are $x_{n}$, not all zero, such that

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{N} x_{n} H_{n}(z, \bar{t})=0
$$

This leads to a relation

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{N} x_{n} \overline{L_{n}(z, t)} \frac{d z}{d s} \equiv 0 \quad \text { on } \quad \Gamma, \quad \text { or } \quad \sum_{n=0}^{N} x_{n} L_{n}(z, t) \equiv 0 \quad \text { on } \quad \Gamma .
$$

This remains true on the whole $B$. Thus we have

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{x_{n}}{(z-t)^{n+1}}+\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{N} x_{n} A_{m n}(z-t)^{m} \equiv 0
$$

near $t$, whence follows that

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{x_{n}}{(z-t)^{n+1}} \equiv 0
$$

which leads to a fact the all $x_{n}$ reduce to zero, which is absurd.
Without loss of generality we may assume that the origin is contained in $B$. Let $\Phi_{n}(z)$ be $H_{n}(z, \overline{0})$. We may expand $H_{0}(z, \bar{t})$ in terms of these $\Phi_{n}(z)$ as follows:

$$
H_{0}(z, \bar{t})=\sum_{\mu, \nu=0}^{\infty} q_{\mu \nu} \Phi_{\mu}(z) \overline{\Phi_{\nu}(t)}=\sum_{\mu, \nu=0}^{\infty} k_{\mu \nu} z^{\mu} \overline{t^{\nu}}
$$

The last expansion must be considered as a local one about the origin. Then we have

$$
q_{\mu \nu}=\overline{q_{\nu \mu}}
$$

A short calculation leads to the following :

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q_{n m} h_{n \mu}=\delta_{m \mu} \\
k_{\mu \nu}=\sum_{m, n=0}^{\infty} q_{m n} h_{m \mu} \overline{h_{n \nu}}=\overline{h_{\mu \nu}}=h_{\nu \mu}
\end{gathered}
$$

All the necessary and sufficient tools have been prepared now and we can state our result as follows:

Let $f(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{18}$ satisfy $f(z) \leqq 1$, then there holds

$$
\left|\sum_{\nu=0}^{N} x_{\nu} a_{\nu}\right|^{2} \leqq \sum_{\nu, \mu=0}^{N} x_{\nu} \overline{x_{\mu}} k_{\nu \mu}
$$

for any complex numbers $x_{v}$ and for any integer $N$. Conversely if this condition is satisfied for a function $f(z)$ with local expansion $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}$, then $f(z)$ can be continued analytically on the whole domain $B$ and has the bounded norm $f \leqq 1$.

This result is an analogue of our earlier result in [5]. Since the situation is the same, we omit the proof here.
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