

Hearing Pseudoconvexity in Complex Manifolds

Mei-Chi Shaw

University of Notre Dame

Taipei, 2018
Lakeside Lecture Series

- 1 The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^n
- 2 The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem and Dolbeault cohomology groups
- 3 L^2 Theory for $\bar{\partial}$
- 4 Hearing pseudoconvexity in \mathbb{C}^n
- 5 Dolbeault cohomology on annuli
- 6 Non-closed Range Property for Some smooth bounded Stein Domain

- 1 The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^n
- 2 The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem and Dolbeault cohomology groups
- 3 L^2 Theory for $\bar{\partial}$
- 4 Hearing pseudoconvexity in \mathbb{C}^n
- 5 Dolbeault cohomology on annuli
- 6 Non-closed Range Property for Some smooth bounded Stein Domain

The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C}

Let \mathbb{C} be the complex Euclidian space with coordinate $z = x + iy$. We define the *Cauchy-Riemann operator*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right),$$

A function h is *holomorphic (or analytic)* in a domain D of \mathbb{C} , if h satisfies the homogeneous Cauchy-Riemann equation

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0. \quad (1)$$

Let $h = u + iv$, where u and v are real-valued functions on D . The equation (1) is equivalent to

$$u_x = v_y, \quad u_y = -v_x. \quad (2)$$

The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C}

Let \mathbb{C} be the complex Euclidian space with coordinate $z = x + iy$. We define the *Cauchy-Riemann operator*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right),$$

A function h is *holomorphic* (or *analytic*) in a domain D of \mathbb{C} , if h satisfies the homogeneous Cauchy-Riemann equation

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0. \tag{1}$$

Let $h = u + iv$, where u and v are real-valued functions on D . The equation (1) is equivalent to

$$u_x = v_y, \quad u_y = -v_x. \tag{2}$$

The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C}

Let \mathbb{C} be the complex Euclidian space with coordinate $z = x + iy$. We define the *Cauchy-Riemann operator*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right),$$

A function h is *holomorphic (or analytic)* in a domain D of \mathbb{C} , if h satisfies the homogeneous Cauchy-Riemann equation

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0. \tag{1}$$

Let $h = u + iv$, where u and v are real-valued functions on D . The equation (1) is equivalent to

$$u_x = v_y, \quad u_y = -v_x. \tag{2}$$

The inhomogeneous Cauchy-Riemann equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{z}} = f, \quad (3)$$

where f a given function in D .

Theorem

Let D be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C} and let $f \in C^k(\bar{D})$, for $k \geq 1$. Then the function defined by

$$u(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_D \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta \wedge d\bar{\zeta},$$

is in $C^k(D)$ and satisfies (3). Moreover, if f is only in $C(\bar{D})$, then $u(z)$ defined as before satisfies (3) in the distribution sense.

Proof: This can be derived from the Generalized Cauchy Integral Formula.

The fundamental solution for $\bar{\partial}$

- Observe that the function

$$u(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{z},$$

is a fundamental solution to (1).

- This can be derived by differentiating the fundamental solution for the Laplace operator $\Delta = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y^2}$. Since

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \Delta \log |z| = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z} \partial z} \log |z| = \delta_0,$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac delta function centered at 0.

- $$\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \log |z| = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{1}{z} = \delta_0.$$

- We can solve $\bar{\partial}$ on any domain D in \mathbb{C} using the Mittag-Leffler theorem.

The fundamental solution for $\bar{\partial}$

- Observe that the function

$$u(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{z},$$

is a fundamental solution to (1).

- This can be derived by differentiating the fundamental solution for the Laplace operator $\Delta = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y^2}$. Since

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \Delta \log |z| = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z} \partial z} \log |z| = \delta_0,$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac delta function centered at 0.

- $$\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \log |z| = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{1}{z} = \delta_0.$$

- We can solve $\bar{\partial}$ on any domain D in \mathbb{C} using the Mittag-Leffler theorem.

The fundamental solution for $\bar{\partial}$

- Observe that the function

$$u(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{z},$$

is a fundamental solution to (1).

- This can be derived by differentiating the fundamental solution for the Laplace operator $\Delta = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y^2}$. Since

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \Delta \log |z| = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z} \partial z} \log |z| = \delta_0,$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac delta function centered at 0.

- $$\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \log |z| = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{1}{z} = \delta_0.$$

- We can solve $\bar{\partial}$ on any domain D in \mathbb{C} using the Mittag-Leffler theorem.

The Cauchy-Riemann equations in \mathbb{C}^n

Let \mathbb{C}^n be the n -dimensional complex Euclidian space, $n \geq 2$. We denote coordinates by $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, where $z_j = x_j + iy_j$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. We can define the *Cauchy-Riemann operator*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \right), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

The *Cauchy-Riemann equations* are

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{z}_j} = f_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad n \geq 2. \quad (4)$$

This system is *overdetermined* (one unknown function with n equations). In order for Equation (4) to be solvable, f must satisfy the following *compatibility conditions*

$$\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial \bar{z}_j} = \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial \bar{z}_k}, \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq n. \quad (5)$$

(Non)-Riemann Mapping Theorem

Theorem (Riemann Mapping Theorem)

Let D be a simply connected domain in \mathbb{C} . Then D is either \mathbb{C} or bihomorphic to the unit disc $\Delta = \{|z| < 1\}$.

When $n \geq 2$, there is no such uniformization theorem in \mathbb{C}^n . Let

$$B_n = \{|z|^2 = |z_1|^2 + \cdots + |z_n|^2 < 1\}$$

and

$$\Delta^n = \{|z_1| < 1, \dots, |z_n| < 1\}.$$

Theorem (Poincaré (1907))

The ball B_n and the polydisc Δ^n in \mathbb{C}^n are not equivalent when $n \geq 2$.

Poincaré proves the theorem by comparing the automorphism groups of the two domains.

(Non)-Riemann Mapping Theorem

Theorem (Riemann Mapping Theorem)

Let D be a simply connected domain in \mathbb{C} . Then D is either \mathbb{C} or bihomorphic to the unit disc $\Delta = \{|z| < 1\}$.

When $n \geq 2$, there is no such uniformization theorem in \mathbb{C}^n . Let

$$B_n = \{|z|^2 = |z_1|^2 + \cdots + |z_n|^2 < 1\}$$

and

$$\Delta^n = \{|z_1| < 1, \dots, |z_n| < 1\}.$$

Theorem (Poincaré (1907))

The ball B_n and the polydisc Δ^n in \mathbb{C}^n are not equivalent when $n \geq 2$.

Poincaré proves the theorem by comparing the automorphism groups of the two domains.

(Non)-Riemann Mapping Theorem

Theorem (Riemann Mapping Theorem)

Let D be a simply connected domain in \mathbb{C} . Then D is either \mathbb{C} or bihomorphic to the unit disc $\Delta = \{|z| < 1\}$.

When $n \geq 2$, there is no such uniformization theorem in \mathbb{C}^n . Let

$$B_n = \{|z|^2 = |z_1|^2 + \cdots + |z_n|^2 < 1\}$$

and

$$\Delta^n = \{|z_1| < 1, \dots, |z_n| < 1\}.$$

Theorem (Poincaré (1907))

The ball B_n and the polydisc Δ^n in \mathbb{C}^n are not equivalent when $n \geq 2$.

Poincaré proves the theorem by comparing the automorphism groups of the two domains.

Hartogs' phenomenon

One of the most striking differences between holomorphic functions in one variable and several variables is the so called *Hartogs phenomenon*.

Theorem (Hartogs' phenomenon (1906))

Let D be an open set in \mathbb{C}^n , $n \geq 2$, and let K be a compact subset in D , such that $D \setminus K$ is connected. If $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus K)$, then f can be extended holomorphically to all D .

- This is not true in \mathbb{C} .
- The zero set of a non-trivial holomorphic function in \mathbb{C} is isolated. The zero set of a holomorphic function in \mathbb{C}^n is a variety.
- One can solve $\bar{\partial}$ with compact support in \mathbb{C}^n , but not in \mathbb{C} .

Hartogs' phenomenon

One of the most striking differences between holomorphic functions in one variable and several variables is the so called *Hartogs phenomenon*.

Theorem (Hartogs' phenomenon (1906))

Let D be an open set in \mathbb{C}^n , $n \geq 2$, and let K be a compact subset in D , such that $D \setminus K$ is connected. If $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus K)$, then f can be extended holomorphically to all D .

- This is not true in \mathbb{C} .
- The zero set of a non-trivial holomorphic function in \mathbb{C} is isolated. The zero set of a holomorphic function in \mathbb{C}^n is a variety.
- One can solve $\bar{\partial}$ with compact support in \mathbb{C}^n , but not in \mathbb{C} .

Domain of holomorphy

Definition

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n . D is a domain of holomorphy if for any $p \in \partial D$, there exists a holomorphic function $f \in \mathcal{O}(D)$ such that f is singular at p .

The following domains are domains of holomorphy:

- (1) Any domain in the complex plain \mathbb{C} .
- (2) Product of planar domains in \mathbb{C}^n .
- (3) Convex domains in \mathbb{C}^n .

The Levi Problem

What kind of domains are domains of holomorphy?

Lemma (Levi)

A C^2 bounded domain Ω in \mathbb{C}^n , $n \geq 2$, is a domain of holomorphy only if it is pseudoconvex.

Pseudoconvex Domains

Let Ω be a domain of \mathbb{C}^n with C^2 boundary with a C^2 defining function ρ .

Definition

The domain Ω is (Levi) pseudoconvex if

$$\mathcal{L}|_p(\rho; a) = \partial\bar{\partial}\rho_p(a, \bar{a}) = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k}(p) a_j \bar{a}_k \geq 0, \quad \forall p \in bD,$$

for all vector $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_j} = 0$ ($a \in T_p^{1,0}(b\Omega)$).

$\mathcal{L}_p(\rho; a)$ is called the Levi form of ρ at p . A domain D is called strictly pseudoconvex if the Levi form is positive definite. We call the $\partial\bar{\partial}\rho|_p(a, \bar{a})$ the complex Hessian.

Definition

A function ρ is called (strictly) plurisubharmonic at p if $\mathcal{L}_p(\rho; a) \geq 0$ (> 0) for all vectors $a \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

- 1 The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^n
- 2 The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem and Dolbeault cohomology groups
- 3 L^2 Theory for $\bar{\partial}$
- 4 Hearing pseudoconvexity in \mathbb{C}^n
- 5 Dolbeault cohomology on annuli
- 6 Non-closed Range Property for Some smooth bounded Stein Domain

The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n (or a complex manifold), $n \geq 2$. For the complexified tangent space $\mathbb{C}T\mathbb{C}^n$, there is a natural decomposition:

$$\mathbb{C}T\mathbb{C}^n = T^{1,0}(\mathbb{C}^n) \oplus T^{0,1}(\mathbb{C}^n),$$

$$T^{1,0}(\mathbb{C}^n) = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \right\}, \quad T^{0,1}(\mathbb{C}^n) = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} \right\}.$$

Let f a C^1 function defined on an open subset D of \mathbb{C}^n . We have

$$df = \partial f + \bar{\partial} f = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}_j}.$$

The $\bar{\partial}$ complex

$$d = \partial + \bar{\partial}$$

$$d^2 = 0, \quad \partial^2 = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}^2 = 0.$$

The $\bar{\partial}$ -equation

Given a (p, q) -form g in Ω such that $\bar{\partial}g = 0$, find a $(p, q - 1)$ -form u such that

$$\bar{\partial}u = g.$$

If g is in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$ (or $g \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$), one seeks $u \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega)$ (or $u \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$).

Definition

A (p, q) -form g satisfying $\bar{\partial}g = 0$ is called $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. A (p, q) -form $g = \bar{\partial}u$ for some $(p, q - 1)$ -form u is called $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.

This is analogous to the problem of solving the real de Rham complex

$$du = g$$

for a q -form g with $dg = 0$ on Ω .

The $\bar{\partial}$ -equation

Given a (p, q) -form g in Ω such that $\bar{\partial}g = 0$, find a $(p, q - 1)$ -form u such that

$$\bar{\partial}u = g.$$

If g is in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$ (or $g \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$), one seeks $u \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega)$ (or $u \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$).

Definition

A (p, q) -form g satisfying $\bar{\partial}g = 0$ is called $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. A (p, q) -form $g = \bar{\partial}u$ for some $(p, q - 1)$ -form u is called $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.

This is analogous to the problem of solving the real de Rham complex

$$du = g$$

for a q -form g with $dg = 0$ on Ω .

The $\bar{\partial}$ -equation

Given a (p, q) -form g in Ω such that $\bar{\partial}g = 0$, find a $(p, q - 1)$ -form u such that

$$\bar{\partial}u = g.$$

If g is in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$ (or $g \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$), one seeks $u \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega)$ (or $u \in \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$).

Definition

A (p, q) -form g satisfying $\bar{\partial}g = 0$ is called $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. A (p, q) -form $g = \bar{\partial}u$ for some $(p, q - 1)$ -form u is called $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.

This is analogous to the problem of solving the real de Rham complex

$$du = g$$

for a q -form g with $dg = 0$ on Ω .

de Rham Cohomology

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n (or a differential manifold), $n \geq 2$.

de Rham Cohomology

$$H_{de}^q(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{d : \mathcal{C}_q^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{d : \mathcal{C}_{q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_q^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- Obstruction to solving the d -problem on Ω .
- If the boundary of Ω is sufficiently smooth (C^1 or Lipschitz), $H_{de}^q(\Omega)$ is finite dimensional.
- From the de Rham's Theorem: $H_{de}^q(\Omega) \cong H_{\text{sing}}^q(\Omega)$.
- $H_{de}^q(\Omega)$ is a topological invariant.
- $H_{de}^0(\Omega) = \{\mathbb{R}\}$ and $H^1(\Omega) = \beta_1$, the first Betti number.

de Rham Cohomology

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n (or a differential manifold), $n \geq 2$.

de Rham Cohomology

$$H_{de}^q(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{d : \mathcal{C}_q^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{d : \mathcal{C}_{q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_q^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- Obstruction to solving the d -problem on Ω .
- If the boundary of Ω is sufficiently smooth (C^1 or Lipschitz), $H_{de}^q(\Omega)$ is finite dimensional.
- From the de Rham's Theorem: $H_{de}^q(\Omega) \cong H_{\text{sing}}^q(\Omega)$.
- $H_{de}^q(\Omega)$ is a topological invariant.
- $H_{de}^0(\Omega) = \{\mathbb{R}\}$ and $H^1(\Omega) = \beta_1$, the first Betti number.

de Rham Cohomology

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n (or a differential manifold), $n \geq 2$.

de Rham Cohomology

$$H_{de}^q(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{d : \mathcal{C}_q^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{d : \mathcal{C}_{q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_q^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- Obstruction to solving the d -problem on Ω .
- If the boundary of Ω is sufficiently smooth (C^1 or Lipschitz), $H_{de}^q(\Omega)$ is finite dimensional.
- From the de Rham's Theorem: $H_{de}^q(\Omega) \cong H_{\text{sing}}^q(\Omega)$.
- $H_{de}^q(\Omega)$ is a topological invariant.
- $H_{de}^0(\Omega) = \{\mathbb{R}\}$ and $H^1(\Omega) = \beta_1$, the first Betti number.

Dolbeault Cohomology

$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- Obstruction to solving the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem on Ω .
- $H^{p,0}(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions or forms in Ω .
- if $H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0$, every $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.
- Natural topology arising as quotients of Fréchet topologies on $\ker(\bar{\partial})$ and $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$.
- If the $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed, we also say that one can solve $\bar{\partial}$ (in the functional analysis sense).
- This quotient topology is Hausdorff if and only if $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$

Dolbeault Cohomology

$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- **Obstruction to solving the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem on Ω .**
- $H^{p,0}(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions or forms in Ω .
- if $H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0$, every $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.
- Natural topology arising as quotients of Fréchet topologies on $\ker(\bar{\partial})$ and $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$.
- If the $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed, we also say that one can solve $\bar{\partial}$ (in the functional analysis sense).
- This quotient topology is Hausdorff if and only if $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$

Dolbeault Cohomology

$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- Obstruction to solving the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem on Ω .
- $H^{p,0}(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions or forms in Ω .
- if $H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0$, every $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.
- Natural topology arising as quotients of Fréchet topologies on $\ker(\bar{\partial})$ and $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$.
- If the $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed, we also say that one can solve $\bar{\partial}$ (in the functional analysis sense).
- This quotient topology is Hausdorff if and only if $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$

Dolbeault Cohomology

$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- Obstruction to solving the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem on Ω .
- $H^{p,0}(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions or forms in Ω .
- if $H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0$, every $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.
- Natural topology arising as quotients of Fréchet topologies on $\ker(\bar{\partial})$ and $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$.
- If the $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed, we also say that one can solve $\bar{\partial}$ (in the functional analysis sense).
- This quotient topology is Hausdorff if and only if $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$

Dolbeault Cohomology

$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q+1}^\infty(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{C}_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)\}}$$

- Obstruction to solving the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem on Ω .
- $H^{p,0}(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions or forms in Ω .
- if $H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0$, every $\bar{\partial}$ -closed form is $\bar{\partial}$ -exact.
- Natural topology arising as quotients of Fréchet topologies on $\ker(\bar{\partial})$ and $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$.
- If the $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed, we also say that one can solve $\bar{\partial}$ (in the functional analysis sense).
- This quotient topology is Hausdorff if and only if $\text{range}(\bar{\partial})$ is closed in $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$

Solution to the Levi Problem

Theorem

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n . The following are equivalent:

- Ω is pseudoconvex;
- Ω is a domain of holomorphy;
- For each $0 \leq p \leq n$, $1 \leq q \leq n$, if $f \in C_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$, there is $u \in C_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\bar{\partial}u = f$.
- $H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0$, $0 \leq p \leq n$, $1 \leq q \leq n$.

- Sheaf method: (1950) K. Oka, H. Bremermann and F. Norguet ($n=2$) and (1958) H. Grauert.
- L^2 method: (1962, 63) Kohn on smooth strictly pseudoconvex domains.
- L^2 method: (1965) Hörmander on pseudoconvex domains.
- Integral Kernel: (1970) Henkin-Grauert on smooth strictly pseudoconvex domains.

Solution to the Levi Problem

Theorem

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n . The following are equivalent:

- Ω is pseudoconvex;
 - Ω is a domain of holomorphy;
 - For each $0 \leq p \leq n$, $1 \leq q \leq n$, if $f \in C_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$, there is $u \in C_{p,q-1}^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\bar{\partial}u = f$.
 - $H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0$, $0 \leq p \leq n$, $1 \leq q \leq n$.
-
- Sheaf method: (1950) K. Oka, H. Bremermann and F. Norguet ($n=2$) and (1958) H. Grauert.
 - L^2 method: (1962, 63) Kohn on smooth strictly pseudoconvex domains.
 - L^2 method: (1965) Hörmander on pseudoconvex domains.
 - Integral Kernel: (1970) Henkin-Grauert on smooth strictly pseudoconvex domains.

- 1 The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^n
- 2 The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem and Dolbeault cohomology groups
- 3 L^2 Theory for $\bar{\partial}$
- 4 Hearing pseudoconvexity in \mathbb{C}^n
- 5 Dolbeault cohomology on annuli
- 6 Non-closed Range Property for Some smooth bounded Stein Domain

Two ways to close an unbounded operator in L^2

- (1) The (weak) maximal closure of $\bar{\partial}$:

Realize $\bar{\partial}$ as a closed densely defined (maximal) operator

$$\bar{\partial} : L^2_{p,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q+1}(\Omega).$$

The L^2 -Dolbeault Cohomology is defined by

$$H^p_{L^2,q}(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{\bar{\partial} : L^2_{p,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q+1}(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{\bar{\partial} : L^2_{p,q-1}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q}(\Omega)\}}$$

- (2) The (strong) minimal closure of $\bar{\partial}$: Let $\bar{\partial}_c$ be the (strong) minimal closed L^2 extension of $\bar{\partial}$.

$$\bar{\partial}_c : L^2_{p,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q+1}(\Omega).$$

By this we mean that $f \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}_c)$ if and only if there exists a sequence of compactly supported smooth forms f_ν such that $f_\nu \rightarrow f$ and $\bar{\partial}f_\nu \rightarrow \bar{\partial}f$.

Two ways to close an unbounded operator in L^2

- (1) The (weak) maximal closure of $\bar{\partial}$:

Realize $\bar{\partial}$ as a closed densely defined (maximal) operator

$$\bar{\partial} : L^2_{p,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q+1}(\Omega).$$

The L^2 -Dolbeault Cohomology is defined by

$$H^p_{L^2,q}(\Omega) = \frac{\ker\{\bar{\partial} : L^2_{p,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q+1}(\Omega)\}}{\text{range}\{\bar{\partial} : L^2_{p,q-1}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q}(\Omega)\}}$$

- (2) The (strong) minimal closure of $\bar{\partial}$: Let $\bar{\partial}_c$ be the (strong) minimal closed L^2 extension of $\bar{\partial}$.

$$\bar{\partial}_c : L^2_{p,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{p,q+1}(\Omega).$$

By this we mean that $f \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}_c)$ if and only if there exists a sequence of compactly supported smooth forms f_ν such that $f_\nu \rightarrow f$ and $\bar{\partial}f_\nu \rightarrow \bar{\partial}f$.

The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem

Let $\square_{p,q}$ ($\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian) be the closed **self-adjoint** densely defined (unbounded) operator :

$$\square_{p,q} = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} : L_{p,q}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$$

and let $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega) = \ker \square_{p,q}$, the space of harmonic (p, q) -forms.

Consequences of the closed range property of $\bar{\partial}$

Suppose that the range of $\bar{\partial}$ is a closed subspace in $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$ and $L_{p,q+1}^2(\Omega)$,

- (Hodge Theorem) The space $H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)$.
- The operator $\square_{p,q}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)^\perp$ and its inverse is called the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator $N_{p,q}$.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ problem can be solved with L^2 -estimates: If $g \perp \ker(\bar{\partial}^*)$, then there is u such that $\bar{\partial}u = g$, and $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2}$.

The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem

Let $\square_{p,q}$ ($\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian) be the closed **self-adjoint** densely defined (unbounded) operator :

$$\square_{p,q} = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} : L_{p,q}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$$

and let $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega) = \ker \square_{p,q}$, the space of harmonic (p, q) -forms.

Consequences of the closed range property of $\bar{\partial}$

Suppose that the range of $\bar{\partial}$ is a closed subspace in $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$ and $L_{p,q+1}^2(\Omega)$,

- (Hodge Theorem) The space $H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)$.
- The operator $\square_{p,q}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)^\perp$ and its inverse is called the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator $N_{p,q}$.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ problem can be solved with L^2 -estimates: If $g \perp \ker(\bar{\partial}^*)$, then there is u such that $\bar{\partial}u = g$, and $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2}$.

The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem

Let $\square_{p,q}$ ($\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian) be the closed **self-adjoint** densely defined (unbounded) operator :

$$\square_{p,q} = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} : L_{p,q}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$$

and let $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega) = \ker \square_{p,q}$, the space of harmonic (p, q) -forms.

Consequences of the closed range property of $\bar{\partial}$

Suppose that the range of $\bar{\partial}$ is a closed subspace in $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$ and $L_{p,q+1}^2(\Omega)$,

- (Hodge Theorem) The space $H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)$.
- The operator $\square_{p,q}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)^\perp$ and its inverse is called the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator $N_{p,q}$.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ problem can be solved with L^2 -estimates: If $g \perp \ker(\bar{\partial}^*)$, then there is u such that $\bar{\partial}u = g$, and $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2}$.

The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem

Let $\square_{p,q}$ ($\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian) be the closed **self-adjoint** densely defined (unbounded) operator :

$$\square_{p,q} = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} : L_{p,q}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$$

and let $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega) = \ker \square_{p,q}$, the space of harmonic (p, q) -forms.

Consequences of the closed range property of $\bar{\partial}$

Suppose that the range of $\bar{\partial}$ is a closed subspace in $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$ and $L_{p,q+1}^2(\Omega)$,

- (Hodge Theorem) The space $H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)$.
- The operator $\square_{p,q}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)^\perp$ and its inverse is called the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator $N_{p,q}$.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ problem can be solved with L^2 -estimates: If $g \perp \ker(\bar{\partial}^*)$, then there is u such that $\bar{\partial}u = g$, and $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2}$.

The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem

Let $\square_{p,q}$ ($\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian) be the closed **self-adjoint** densely defined (unbounded) operator :

$$\square_{p,q} = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} : L_{p,q}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$$

and let $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega) = \ker \square_{p,q}$, the space of harmonic (p, q) -forms.

Consequences of the closed range property of $\bar{\partial}$

Suppose that the range of $\bar{\partial}$ is a closed subspace in $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$ and $L_{p,q+1}^2(\Omega)$,

- (Hodge Theorem) The space $H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)$.
- The operator $\square_{p,q}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)^\perp$ and its inverse is called the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator $N_{p,q}$.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ problem can be solved with L^2 -estimates: If $g \perp \ker(\bar{\partial}^*)$, then there is u such that $\bar{\partial}u = g$, and $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2}$.

The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem

Let $\square_{p,q}$ ($\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian) be the closed **self-adjoint** densely defined (unbounded) operator :

$$\square_{p,q} = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} : L_{p,q}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$$

and let $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega) = \ker \square_{p,q}$, the space of harmonic (p, q) -forms.

Consequences of the closed range property of $\bar{\partial}$

Suppose that the range of $\bar{\partial}$ is a closed subspace in $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$ and $L_{p,q+1}^2(\Omega)$,

- (Hodge Theorem) The space $H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)$.
- The operator $\square_{p,q}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega)^\perp$ and its inverse is called the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator $N_{p,q}$.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ problem can be solved with L^2 -estimates: If $g \perp \ker(\bar{\partial}^*)$, then there is u such that $\bar{\partial}u = g$, and $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2}$.

L^2 theory for $\bar{\partial}$ on pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n

Hörmander 1965

If $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is bounded and pseudoconvex, then

$$H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad q \neq 0.$$

Sobolev estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem (Kohn 1963, 1974)

Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n with smooth boundary. Then

$$H_{W^s}^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad s > 0.$$

Boundary Regularity for $\bar{\partial}$

If $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is bounded and pseudoconvex with smooth boundary, then

$$H^{p,q}(\bar{\Omega}) = 0, \quad q \neq 0.$$

L^2 theory for $\bar{\partial}$ on pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n

Hörmander 1965

If $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is bounded and pseudoconvex, then

$$H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad q \neq 0.$$

Sobolev estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem (Kohn 1963, 1974)

Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n with smooth boundary.
Then

$$H_{W^s}^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad s > 0.$$

Boundary Regularity for $\bar{\partial}$

If $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is bounded and pseudoconvex with smooth boundary, then

$$H^{p,q}(\bar{\Omega}) = 0, \quad q \neq 0.$$

L^2 theory for $\bar{\partial}$ on pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n

Hörmander 1965

If $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is bounded and pseudoconvex, then

$$H_{L^2}^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad q \neq 0.$$

Sobolev estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem (Kohn 1963, 1974)

Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n with smooth boundary.
Then

$$H_{W^s}^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad s > 0.$$

Boundary Regularity for $\bar{\partial}$

If $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is bounded and pseudoconvex with smooth boundary, then

$$H^{p,q}(\bar{\Omega}) = 0, \quad q \neq 0.$$

Ideas of the proof

Use the strictly plurisubharmonic weight function $t|z|^2$, $t > 0$, to set up the problem in the weighted L^2 space with respect to weights $L^2(\Omega, e^{-t|z|^2})$.

- In Hörmander's case, we first choose $t > 0$ to obtain the L^2 existence theorem. Set $t = \delta^{-2}$ where δ is the diameter of the **bounded pseudoconvex** domain Ω to obtain the estimates independent of the weights: The *basic estimates* hold:

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|^2 &\leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} (\|\bar{\partial}f\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*f\|^2) \\ &= \frac{e\delta^2}{q} (f, \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*f + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}f) \leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} \|f\| \|\square f\|.\end{aligned}$$

- If $q = n$, this is the Poincaré's inequality: Let Ω be a **bounded** domain.

$$\|f\|^2 \leq 4\delta^2 \|\nabla f\|^2, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

Ideas of the proof

Use the strictly plurisubharmonic weight function $t|z|^2$, $t > 0$, to set up the problem in the weighted L^2 space with respect to weights $L^2(\Omega, e^{-t|z|^2})$.

- In Hörmander's case, we first choose $t > 0$ to obtain the L^2 existence theorem. Set $t = \delta^{-2}$ where δ is the diameter of the **bounded pseudoconvex** domain Ω to obtain the estimates independent of the weights: The *basic estimates* hold:

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|^2 &\leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} (\|\bar{\partial}f\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*f\|^2) \\ &= \frac{e\delta^2}{q} (f, \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*f + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}f) \leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} \|f\| \|\square f\|.\end{aligned}$$

- If $q = n$, this is the Poincaré's inequality: Let Ω be a **bounded** domain.

$$\|f\|^2 \leq 4\delta^2 \|\nabla f\|^2, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

Ideas of the proof

Use the strictly plurisubharmonic weight function $t|z|^2$, $t > 0$, to set up the problem in the weighted L^2 space with respect to weights $L^2(\Omega, e^{-t|z|^2})$.

- In Hörmander's case, we first choose $t > 0$ to obtain the L^2 existence theorem. Set $t = \delta^{-2}$ where δ is the diameter of the **bounded pseudoconvex** domain Ω to obtain the estimates independent of the weights: The *basic estimates* hold:

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|^2 &\leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} (\|\bar{\partial}f\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*f\|^2) \\ &= \frac{e\delta^2}{q} (f, \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*f + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}f) \leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} \|f\| \|\square f\|.\end{aligned}$$

- If $q = n$, this is the Poincaré's inequality: Let Ω be a **bounded** domain.

$$\|f\|^2 \leq 4\delta^2 \|\nabla f\|^2, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

Consequences of the basic estimates

On a pseudoconvex domain Ω , from Hörmander's Basic Estimates:

$$\|f\| \leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} \|\square f\|.$$

- \square is one-to-one and 0 is not an eigenvalue of \square .
- \square has closed range and the range is $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$.
- \square has a bounded inverse \mathcal{N} , the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator \mathcal{N} is not necessarily compact on a pseudoconvex domain!
- \mathcal{N} is compact (subelliptic) if the domain is *strictly* pseudoconvex (Kohn), or finite type (Kohn, Catlin).
- Not much is known for the spectrum of \square when \mathcal{N} is not compact.

Consequences of the basic estimates

On a pseudoconvex domain Ω , from Hörmander's Basic Estimates:

$$\|f\| \leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} \|\square f\|.$$

- \square is one-to-one and 0 is not an eigenvalue of \square .
- \square has closed range and the range is $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$.
- \square has a bounded inverse \mathcal{N} , the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator \mathcal{N} is not necessarily compact on a pseudoconvex domain!
- \mathcal{N} is compact (subelliptic) if the domain is *strictly* pseudoconvex (Kohn), or finite type (Kohn, Catlin).
- Not much is known for the spectrum of \square when \mathcal{N} is not compact.

Consequences of the basic estimates

On a pseudoconvex domain Ω , from Hörmander's Basic Estimates:

$$\|f\| \leq \frac{e\delta^2}{q} \|\square f\|.$$

- \square is one-to-one and 0 is not an eigenvalue of \square .
- \square has closed range and the range is $L_{p,q}^2(\Omega)$.
- \square has a bounded inverse \mathcal{N} , the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator.
- The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator \mathcal{N} is not necessarily compact on a pseudoconvex domain!
- \mathcal{N} is compact (subelliptic) if the domain is *strictly* pseudoconvex (Kohn), or finite type (Kohn, Catlin).
- Not much is known for the spectrum of \square when \mathcal{N} is not compact.

- 1 The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^n
- 2 The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem and Dolbeault cohomology groups
- 3 L^2 Theory for $\bar{\partial}$
- 4 Hearing pseudoconvexity in \mathbb{C}^n**
- 5 Dolbeault cohomology on annuli
- 6 Non-closed Range Property for Some smooth bounded Stein Domain

Can one hear the shape of a drum?

Eigenvalues of the Laplacian

Mark Kac (1966) asks whether the spectrum (eigenvalues) of the Dirichlet Laplacian determines the shape of a planar domain. This question was answered negatively by Gordon, Webb, and Wolpert (1992).

Not all is lost!

Kac (1966), Kac-Singer (1967)

One still can deduce from the spectrum of the domain its area, perimeter and the number of holes.

- The generalization to domains in higher dimension is to study the spectrum of the Laplace-Beltrami operator

$$\Delta_g = dd^* + d^*d.$$

- Δ_g is Fredholm with discrete spectrum if the boundary is sufficiently smooth (e.g., Lipschitz).

Can one hear the shape of a drum?

Eigenvalues of the Laplacian

Mark Kac (1966) asks whether the spectrum (eigenvalues) of the Dirichlet Laplacian determines the shape of a planar domain. This question was answered negatively by Gordon, Webb, and Wolpert (1992).

Not all is lost!

Kac (1966), Kac-Singer (1967)

One still can deduce from the spectrum of the domain its area, perimeter and the number of holes.

- The generalization to domains in higher dimension is to study the spectrum of the Laplace-Beltrami operator

$$\Delta_q = dd^* + d^*d.$$

- Δ_q is Fredholm with discrete spectrum if the boundary is sufficiently smooth (e.g., Lipschitz).

Can one hear the shape of a drum?

Eigenvalues of the Laplacian

Mark Kac (1966) asks whether the spectrum (eigenvalues) of the Dirichlet Laplacian determines the shape of a planar domain. This question was answered negatively by Gordon, Webb, and Wolpert (1992).

Not all is lost!

Kac (1966), Kac-Singer (1967)

One still can deduce from the spectrum of the domain its area, perimeter and the number of holes.

- The generalization to domains in higher dimension is to study the spectrum of the Laplace-Beltrami operator

$$\Delta_g = dd^* + d^*d.$$

- Δ_g is Fredholm with discrete spectrum if the boundary is sufficiently smooth (e.g., Lipschitz).

Hearing pseudoconvexity with \square

We can characterize pseudoconvex domains via L^2 Dolbeault cohomology groups.

Theorem (Hörmander, Laufer)

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n with **connected** Lipschitz boundary. The following are equivalent:

- 1 Ω is pseudoconvex.
- 2 $H_{L^2}^{0,q}(\Omega) = \{0\}$.
- 3 The infimum of the spectrum of $\square_{0,q}$ is positive for all $1 \leq q \leq n - 1$.
- 4 The infimum of the essential spectrum of $\square_{0,q}$ is positive for all $1 \leq q \leq n - 1$.

When $n = 2$, the conditions are equivalent to the following:

- The range of $\square_{0,1}$ is closed.
- $\bar{\partial} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{0,1}^2(\Omega)$ has closed range.

Hearing pseudoconvexity with Kohn's Laplacian

Let $\bar{\partial}_b$ be the (induced) tangential Cauchy-Riemann complex on the boundary of $b\Omega$ and let \square_b be the $\bar{\partial}_b$ -Laplacian (or Kohn's Laplacian):

$$\square_b = \bar{\partial}_b \bar{\partial}_b^* + \bar{\partial}_b^* \bar{\partial}_b.$$

Theorem (Fu 2005)

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n with connected Lipschitz boundary. Suppose that the infimum of the essential spectrum of \square_b is positive for all $1 \leq q \leq n - 1$, then Ω is pseudoconvex.

- The converse is also true for domains with smooth boundary.
- L^2 existence for $\bar{\partial}_b$ is proved by Shaw (1985) for $1 \leq q < n - 1$ and closed range property by Boas-Shaw and Kohn (1986) for $q = n - 1$.
- This is also true if the boundary is Lipschitz with a plurisubharmonic defining function (2003).

Hearing pseudoconvexity with Kohn's Laplacian

Let $\bar{\partial}_b$ be the (induced) tangential Cauchy-Riemann complex on the boundary of $b\Omega$ and let \square_b be the $\bar{\partial}_b$ -Laplacian (or Kohn's Laplacian):

$$\square_b = \bar{\partial}_b \bar{\partial}_b^* + \bar{\partial}_b^* \bar{\partial}_b.$$

Theorem (Fu 2005)

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n with connected Lipschitz boundary. Suppose that the infimum of the essential spectrum of \square_b is positive for all $1 \leq q \leq n - 1$, then Ω is pseudoconvex.

- The converse is also true for domains with smooth boundary.
- L^2 existence for $\bar{\partial}_b$ is proved by Shaw (1985) for $1 \leq q < n - 1$ and closed range property by Boas-Shaw and Kohn (1986) for $q = n - 1$.
- This is also true if the boundary is Lipschitz with a plurisubharmonic defining function (2003).

Hearing pseudoconvexity with Kohn's Laplacian

Let $\bar{\partial}_b$ be the (induced) tangential Cauchy-Riemann complex on the boundary of $b\Omega$ and let \square_b be the $\bar{\partial}_b$ -Laplacian (or Kohn's Laplacian):

$$\square_b = \bar{\partial}_b \bar{\partial}_b^* + \bar{\partial}_b^* \bar{\partial}_b.$$

Theorem (Fu 2005)

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n with connected Lipschitz boundary. Suppose that the infimum of the essential spectrum of \square_b is positive for all $1 \leq q \leq n - 1$, then Ω is pseudoconvex.

- The converse is also true for domains with smooth boundary.
- L^2 existence for $\bar{\partial}_b$ is proved by Shaw (1985) for $1 \leq q < n - 1$ and closed range property by Boas-Shaw and Kohn (1986) for $q = n - 1$.
- This is also true if the boundary is Lipschitz with a plurisubharmonic defining function (2003).

Serre Duality Theorem

A useful tool in complex analysis is the Serre duality. This is the complex version of the Poincaré duality.

Theorem (Serre Duality (1955))

Let Ω be a domain in a complex manifold and let E be a holomorphic vector bundle on $\bar{\Omega}$. Let $\bar{\partial}_E$ has closed range in the Fréchet space $C_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega, E)$ and $C_{p,q+1}^\infty(\Omega, E)$. We have $H^{p,q}(\Omega, E)' \cong H_c^{n-p, n-q}(\Omega, E^)$.*

- The classical Serre duality are duality results of Dolbeault cohomology group $H^{p,q}(\Omega, E)$ for E -valued smooth (p, q) -forms with the Fréchet topology and compactly supported smooth E^* -valued forms with the natural inductive limit topology.
- It is natural to use the L^2 setting for duality results.

Serre Duality Theorem

A useful tool in complex analysis is the Serre duality. This is the complex version of the Poincaré duality.

Theorem (Serre Duality (1955))

Let Ω be a domain in a complex manifold and let E be a holomorphic vector bundle on $\bar{\Omega}$. Let $\bar{\partial}_E$ has closed range in the Fréchet space $C_{p,q}^\infty(\Omega, E)$ and $C_{p,q+1}^\infty(\Omega, E)$. We have $H^{p,q}(\Omega, E)' \cong H_c^{n-p, n-q}(\Omega, E^*)$.

- The classical Serre duality are duality results of Dolbeault cohomology group $H^{p,q}(\Omega, E)$ for E -valued smooth (p, q) -forms with the Fréchet topology and compactly supported smooth E^* -valued forms with the natural inductive limit topology.
- It is natural to use the L^2 setting for duality results.

Theorem (Chakrabarti-S 2012)

Let Ω be a bounded domain in a complex hermitian manifold of dimension n and let E be a holomorphic vector bundle on $\bar{\Omega}$ with a hermitian metric h . Suppose that \square_E has closed range on $L^2_{p,q}(\Omega, E)$. Then \square_{c,E^*} has closed range on $L^2_{n-p,n-q}(\Omega, E^*)$ and $H^p_{L^2}(\Omega, E) \cong H^{n-p,n-q}_{c,L^2}(\Omega, E^*)$.

- Let $\star_E : C^\infty_{p,q}(\Omega, E) \rightarrow C^{n-p,n-q}(\Omega, E^*)$ be the Hodge star operator.

$$\star_E \square_E = \square_{E^*}^c \star_E .$$

- This gives the explicit formula:

$$\star_E \mathcal{H}^{p,q}(\Omega, E) = \mathcal{H}^{n-p,n-q}_{c,L^2}(\Omega, E^*) .$$

- The theorem follows from the L^2 Hodge theorem.

Non-closed range property for $\bar{\partial}$

Laurent-S (2013)

Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{C}^2 such that $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ is connected. Suppose that Ω is not pseudoconvex. Then $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is non-Hausdorff.

Corollary

Either $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega) = 0$ (and Ω is pseudoconvex) or $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is non-Hausdorff.

Similar results also hold for $(0, n - 1)$ -forms in \mathbb{C}^n when $n \geq 3$ or s Stein manifold.

- Laufer (1975) Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n (or a Stein manifold). Then either $H^{0,1}(\Omega) = 0$ or $H^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is infinite dimensional.
- Trapani (1986) obtained similar results in $H^{0,1}(\Omega)$.

Non-closed range property for $\bar{\partial}$

Laurent-S (2013)

Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{C}^2 such that $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ is connected. Suppose that Ω is not pseudoconvex. Then $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is non-Hausdorff.

Corollary

Either $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega) = 0$ (and Ω is pseudoconvex) or $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is non-Hausdorff.

Similar results also hold for $(0, n - 1)$ -forms in \mathbb{C}^n when $n \geq 3$ or s Stein manifold.

- Laufer (1975) Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n (or a Stein manifold). Then either $H^{0,1}(\Omega) = 0$ or $H^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is infinite dimensional.
- Trapani (1986) obtained similar results in $H^{0,1}(\Omega)$.

Hearing pseudoconvexity on domains with holes

We can characterize domains with holes with L^2 Dolbeault cohomology groups. Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n such that $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \tilde{\Omega}$ is connected. Let $D = \cup_1^N D_i$ be the disjoint union of finitely many domains with C^2 boundary and $\bar{D} \subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Let

$$\Omega = \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \bar{D}.$$

Fu-Laurent-Shaw (Math. Zeit. 2017)

The following are equivalent:

- $\tilde{\Omega}$ and D are pseudoconvex.
- $$\begin{cases} H_{L^2}^{0,q}(\Omega) = \{0\}, & 1 \leq q \leq n-2, \\ H_{L^2}^{0,n-1}(\Omega) \text{ is Hausdorff and infinite dimensional.} \end{cases}$$
- 0 is not in the spectrum of $\square_{0,q}$ when $1 \leq q \leq n-2$ and 0 is not a limit point for $\square_{0,n-1}$ but 0 is in the essential spectrum of $\square_{0,n-1}$.

Remark: The number of holes is irrelevant!

Dolbeault cohomology on domains with holes (Trapani 1986)

The following are equivalent: $\Omega = \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \bar{D}$.

- $\begin{cases} H^{0,q}(\Omega) = \{0\}, & 1 \leq q \leq n-2, \\ H^{0,n-1}(\Omega) \text{ is Hausdorff and infinite dimensional.} \end{cases}$
- $\tilde{\Omega}$ is pseudoconvex and \bar{D} is holomorphically convex (**stronger condition**).

Domains without holes

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n with Lipschitz boundary. The following are equivalent:

- Ω is pseudoconvex.
- $H^{0,q}(\Omega) = \{0\}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq n.$
- $H_{L^2}^{0,q}(\Omega) = \{0\}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq n.$

- 1 The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^n
- 2 The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem and Dolbeault cohomology groups
- 3 L^2 Theory for $\bar{\partial}$
- 4 Hearing pseudoconvexity in \mathbb{C}^n
- 5 Dolbeault cohomology on annuli**
- 6 Non-closed Range Property for Some smooth bounded Stein Domain

The $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on an annulus

Annuli between smooth pseudoconvex domains (S. 1985)

- Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be an annulus between two smooth pseudoconvex domains Ω_0 and Ω_1 with

$$\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega_1, \quad \Omega = \Omega_1 \setminus \Omega_0.$$

- If $1 \leq q < n - 1$,

$$H_{\bar{W}^s}^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad s \geq 0.$$

- The proof is based on Kohn-Hörmander's weighted $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann operator with strictly super-harmonic weight function $-t|z|^2$ near the pseudoconcave part of the boundary. The boundary smoothness has been relaxed by using the L^2 Serre duality results (Chakrabarti-S, 2012).
- The hole domain Ω_0 is assumed to have C^2 boundary.
- Hörmander-Kohn (1965) Subelliptic $\frac{1}{2}$ estimates hold for smooth strongly pseudoconvex boundary.

Harmonic spaces for $q = n - 1$ on the annulus

Hörmander 2004

Let $\Omega = B_1 \setminus \overline{B_0}$, where B_1 and B_0 are two concentric balls in \mathbb{C}^n . Then \square has closed range and the harmonic space $H_{L^2}^{p,n-1}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the Bergman space $H_{L^2}(B_0)$. The harmonic space

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,n-1}(\Omega) = \left\{ \sum_j h\left(\frac{z}{|z|^2}\right) \star d\bar{z}_j \mid h \in H_{L^2}(B_0) \right\}.$$

Duality between harmonic and Bergman spaces (2011)

Let $\Omega = \Omega_1 \setminus \overline{\Omega_0} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ where Ω_1 is bounded and pseudoconvex and $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega_1$ is also pseudoconvex but with C^2 smooth boundary, then again closed range holds for $q = n - 1$ and

$$H_{L^2}^{n,n-1}(\Omega) \cong H_{L^2}(\Omega_0).$$

If $b\Omega_0$ is not C^2 , it is not known if $H^{0,n-1}(\Omega)$ is Hausdorff.

Let $T \Subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be the Hartogs triangle

$$T = \{(z, w) \mid |z| < |w| < 1\}.$$

Then T is not Lipschitz at the origin.

- Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^2 such that $\bar{T} \subset \Omega$. Then $H^{0,1}(\Omega \setminus \bar{T})$ is not Hausdorff (Trapani, Laurent-S).
- If we replace H by the bidisc Δ^2 , then $H^{0,1}(\Omega \setminus \overline{\Delta^2})$ is Hausdorff since Δ^2 has a Stein neighborhood basis (Laurent-Leiterer).

Chinese Coin Problem

Let B be a ball of radius two in \mathbb{C}^2 and Δ^2 be the bidisc. Determine if the L^2 cohomology $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(B \setminus \overline{\Delta^2})$ is Hausdorff.

Solution to the Chinese Coin Problem

Let V_1, \dots, V_n be bounded planar domains in \mathbb{C} with Lipschitz boundary and let $V = V_1 \times \dots \times V_n$.

Theorem (Chakrabarti-Laurent-S)

Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n such that $V \Subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Let $\Omega = \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \bar{V}$ be the annulus between $\tilde{\Omega}$ and V . Then $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is Hausdorff and

- $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega) = \{0\}$, if $n \geq 3$.
- $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ is infinite dimensional if $n = 2$.

Corollary

Let V be the product of bounded planar domains with Lipschitz boundary. Then

$$H_{W^1}^{0,n-1}(V) = \{0\}.$$

- 1 The Cauchy-Riemann equation in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^n
- 2 The $\bar{\partial}$ -problem and Dolbeault cohomology groups
- 3 L^2 Theory for $\bar{\partial}$
- 4 Hearing pseudoconvexity in \mathbb{C}^n
- 5 Dolbeault cohomology on annuli
- 6 Non-closed Range Property for Some smooth bounded Stein Domain

Non-closed range property for some Stein domain

Theorem (Chakrabarti-S, 2015 Math. Ann.)

There exists a pseudoconvex domain Ω in a complex manifold such that

- *Ω is Stein with smooth (real-analytic) Levi-flat boundary.*
- *Any continuous bounded plurisubharmonic function on Ω is a constant.*
- *$\bar{\partial}$ does not have closed range in $L^2_{2,1}(\Omega)$.*
- *$H^2_{L^2}(\Omega)$ is non-Hausdorff.*

Let

$$X = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times T$$

be a compact complex manifold of dimension 2 endowed with the product metric where T is the torus.

The domain $\Omega \subset X = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times T$ is defined by

$$\Omega = \{(z, [w]) \in \mathbb{C}P^1 \times T : \operatorname{Re} zw > 0\}.$$

Non-closed range property for some Stein domain

Theorem (Chakrabarti-S, 2015 Math. Ann.)

There exists a pseudoconvex domain Ω in a complex manifold such that

- Ω is Stein with smooth (real-analytic) Levi-flat boundary.
- Any continuous bounded plurisubharmonic function on Ω is a constant.
- $\bar{\partial}$ does not have closed range in $L^2_{2,1}(\Omega)$.
- $H^2_{L^2}(\Omega)$ is non-Hausdorff.

Let

$$X = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times T$$

be a compact complex manifold of dimension 2 endowed with the product metric where T is the torus.

The domain $\Omega \subset X = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times T$ is defined by

$$\Omega = \{(z, [w]) \in \mathbb{C}P^1 \times T : \operatorname{Re}zw > 0\}.$$

Remarks

- Ω is biholomorphic to a punctured plane \mathbb{C}^* and an annulus. Hence Ω is Stein (Ohsawa 1982).

-

$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad q > 0.$$

- We still do not know if $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ or $H_{L^2}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is Hausdorff.
- An earlier example (constructed by Grauert) of a pseudoconvex domain in a two-tori has been shown with non-Hausdorff property by Malgrange (1975). But the domain is not holomorphically convex (not Stein).

Remarks

- Ω is biholomorphic to a punctured plane \mathbb{C}^* and an annulus. Hence Ω is Stein (Ohsawa 1982).

-

$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad q > 0.$$

- We still do not know if $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ or $H_{L^2}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is Hausdorff.
- An earlier example (constructed by Grauert) of a pseudoconvex domain in a two-tori has been shown with non-Hausdorff property by Malgrange (1975). But the domain is not holomorphically convex (not Stein).

Remarks

- Ω is biholomorphic to a punctured plane \mathbb{C}^* and an annulus. Hence Ω is Stein (Ohsawa 1982).



$$H^{p,q}(\Omega) = 0, \quad q > 0.$$

- We still do not know if $H_{L^2}^{0,1}(\Omega)$ or $H_{L^2}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is Hausdorff.
- An earlier example (constructed by Grauert) of a pseudoconvex domain in a two-tori has been shown with non-Hausdorff property by Malgrange (1975). But the domain is not holomorphically convex (not Stein).

Thank You

