

Characterization for a class of pseudoconvex domains whose boundaries having positive constant pseudo scalar curvature

Song-Ying Li

October 1, 2007

1 Introduction and Main Results

Let (M, θ) be a strictly pseudoconvex pseudo-Hermitian compact hypersurface in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} in the sense of Webster [34] with a pseudo-Hermitian real one-form θ on M . Let R_θ be the Webster pseudo scalar curvature for M with respect to θ . By the solution of the CR Yamabe problem given by Jerison and Lee [18], Gamara and Yacoub [10] and Gamara [9] (for $n = 1$), there is a pseudo-Hermitian real one-form θ so that (M, θ) has constant Webster pseudo scalar curvature R_θ . Let ρ be a defining function for M . Then $\theta = \frac{1}{2i}(\partial\rho - \bar{\partial}\rho)$ is a pseudo-Hermitian one-form for M , and any Hermitian one-form can be constructed in this way by using defining function of M . When $M = S^{2n+1}$, the unit sphere in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} , if $\rho(z) = |z|^2 - 1$, then $R_\theta = n(n+1)$ on M . The main purpose of the paper is to give some characterizations on ρ so that the pseudo scalar curvature R_θ is a positive constant on M if and only if M is CR-equivalent to the sphere S^{2n+1} .

Let D be a smoothly bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Let u be a strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion function for D ($u = +\infty$ on ∂D). Let $\rho(z) = -e^{-u(z)}$. Then the Fefferman's functional $J(\rho)$ of ρ is defined as:

$$(1.1) \quad J(\rho) = -\det \begin{bmatrix} \rho & \bar{\partial}\rho \\ (\bar{\partial}\rho)^* & H(\rho) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $H(\rho)$ is the complex Hessian matrix of ρ , $\bar{\partial}\rho = (\partial_{\bar{1}}\rho, \dots, \partial_{\bar{n}}\rho)$ is a $1 \times n$ matrix and $(\bar{\partial}\rho)^*$ is its adjoint matrix.

Let $f(z)$ be a positive function on D . It was known (see, for examples, [7], [25]) that

$$(1.2) \quad J(\rho) = f(z) > 0 \text{ in } D; \quad \rho = 0 \text{ on } \partial D$$

if and only if

$$(1.3) \quad \det H(u)(z) = f(z)e^{(n+1)u} \text{ in } D; \quad u = +\infty \text{ on } \partial D.$$

When $f(z) \in C^\infty(\overline{D})$ is positive for all $z \in \overline{D}$, the existence and uniqueness of a strictly plurisubharmonic solution of (1.3) were given by Cheng and Yau in [7]. In particular, when $f(z) \equiv 1$, they proved that the plurisubharmonic solution u of (1.3) defines a complete Kähler-Einstein metric on D : $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$.

When D is strictly pseudoconvex, uniqueness and a formal approximation solution ρ of (1.2) with $u = -\log(-\rho)$ being plurisubharmonic in D were given by Fefferman [8] earlier; the existence of such a solution was proved by Cheng and Yau [7] with $\rho \in C^{n+3/2}(\overline{D})$. Lee and Melrose [22] gave an asymptotic expansion solution for ρ . In particular, they proved that $\rho \in C^{n+2-\epsilon}(\overline{D})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. In general ρ fails to be in $C^{n+2}(\overline{D})$.

Using the notation of $J(\rho)$, the following formula for the Webster pseudo Ricci curvature of (M, θ) was given by Li and Luk in [28]:

$$(1.4) \quad \text{Ric}_z(w, \bar{v}) = - \sum_{j,k=1}^{n+1} \frac{\partial^2 \log J(\rho)(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} w_j \bar{v}_k + (n+1) \frac{\det H(\rho)(z)}{J(\rho)(z)} w_j \bar{v}_k$$

for $v, w \in H_z(M)$, holomorphic tangent space of M at z .

Assume that $\phi : D \rightarrow B_{n+1}$ is a biholomorphic mapping, and if $\rho(z) = |\phi(z)|^2 - 1$, then $\det H(\rho) = J(\rho) = |\det \phi'(z)|^2$ on D and $\log J(\rho)$ is pluriharmonic in D . By (1.4), we have $R_\theta = n(n+1)$ on ∂D .

The main purpose of the current paper is to prove the converse is also true, we state it as the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1 *Let $\rho \in C^3(\overline{D})$ be a defining function for D so that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in D . Let $M = \partial D$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2i}(\partial\rho - \bar{\partial}\rho)$. Assume $\log J(\rho)$ is harmonic in the Kähler metric $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, we have the following two statements hold:*

(a) If $R_\theta \equiv c > 0$, constant on ∂D , then D is biholomorphic to the unit ball B_{n+1} in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} .

(b) Webster pseudo scalar curvature

$$(1.5) \quad R_\theta = n(n+1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \quad \text{on } \partial D.$$

Notice that if $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is the potential function for the Kähler-Einstein metric for D , then $J(\rho) = 1$ on D . By Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 3.1 in [24], we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2 *Let D be a smoothly bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} . Assume that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is the potential function for the Kähler-Einstein metric for D (defined by (1.3) with $f \equiv 1$) and $\theta = \frac{1}{2i}(\partial\rho - \bar{\partial}\rho)$ on $M = \partial D$. If $R_\theta \equiv c > 0$, constant on ∂D , then there is a biholomorphic map $\phi : D \rightarrow B_{n+1}$ so that $\det \phi'(z)$ is a constant on D .*

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we provide several main lemmas. In Section 3, we will prove part (b) of Theorem 1.1. Finally, the proofs of Part(a) of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 are given in Section 4.

2 Main Lemmas

Let $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) < 0\}$ with C^2 defining function ρ . Let $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ be plurisubharmonic in D . Then the relation between $J(\rho)$ and $\det H(u)$ is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $u \in C^2(D)$ and let $\rho(z) = -e^{-u}$. Then*

$$(2.1) \quad \det H(u) = J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}.$$

Proof. By viewing $\bar{\partial}u$ as an 1 by n matrix and $(\bar{\partial}u)^*$ is its adjoint matrix, one has that

$$(2.2) \quad \bar{\partial}\rho = -\rho\bar{\partial}u, \quad H(\rho)(z) = -\rho(z)H(u) + \rho(z)(\bar{\partial}u)^*\bar{\partial}u.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
J(\rho) &= -\det \begin{bmatrix} \rho & -\rho\bar{\partial}u \\ -\rho(\bar{\partial}u)^* & -\rho H(u) + \rho(\bar{\partial}u)^*\bar{\partial}u \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -(\rho)^{n+1} \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\bar{\partial}u \\ -(\bar{\partial}u)^* & -H(u) + (\bar{\partial}u)^*\bar{\partial}u \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -(\rho)^{n+1} \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\bar{\partial}u \\ 0 & -H(u) + (\bar{\partial}u)^*\bar{\partial}u - (\bar{\partial}u)^*\bar{\partial}u \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -(\rho)^{n+1} \det(-H(u)) \\
&= e^{-(n+1)u} \det H(u).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (2.1) holds and the lemma is proved. \square

Let $[u^{i\bar{j}}]^t = H(u)^{-1}$. We will use the following notations:

$$(2.3) \quad u_{i\bar{j}} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}, \quad u_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial z_i}, \quad u_{\bar{j}} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{z}_j}$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad |\partial u|_u^2 := u^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i u \partial_{\bar{j}} u, \quad T(z) := |\partial u|_u^2 + e^{-u}.$$

Then if $\rho(z) = -e^{-u(z)}$ with u being strictly plurisubharmonic in D , then by Lemma 2.2 in [24],

$$(2.5) \quad \det H(\rho) = e^{-nu} \det H(u) (1 - |\partial u|_u^2) = J(\rho) e^u (1 - |\partial u|_u^2).$$

Thus

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} - 1 = e^u (1 - T(z)).$$

Then the following lemma was included in the proof of Part(b) of Theorem 2.4 in [24], given in pages 468–470.

Lemma 2.2 *Let D be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Let $u \in C^4(D)$ be strictly plurisubharmonic in D , and let $\rho(z) = -e^{-u}$. If $-\log J(\rho)$ is subharmonic in the metric $u_{i\bar{j}} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, then*

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n u^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{i\bar{j}} \left(-\frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \right) (z) \geq 0, \quad z \in D.$$

The following result essentially is corollary of the main theorem of Burns [3] in our notation:

Corollary 2.3 *Let $\rho \in C^3(\overline{D})$ be a defining function for D so that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in D . Let $M = \partial D$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2i}(\partial\rho - \bar{\partial}\rho)$. If $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho)$ is a positive constant on the boundary ∂D of D , then D is biholomorphic to the unit ball B_{n+1} in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} .*

Proof. Since $u = -\log(-\rho)$ is plurisubharmonic in D , by (2.1), we have $J(\rho) > 0$ on D . Notice that $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho)$ is a positive constant on D , we have ρ is strictly plurisubharmonic in D . Let $z_0 \in D$ be such that

$$(2.8) \quad m = -\min\{\rho(z) : z \in \overline{D}\} = -\rho(z_0),$$

Then

$$(2.9) \quad J(\rho)(z_0) = m \det H(\rho)(z_0).$$

Let

$$(2.10) \quad \tau(z) = \rho(z) + m.$$

Then $\tau : D \rightarrow [0, m)$ is smooth, onto and strictly plurisubharmonic. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} J[\tau] &= -\det H(\tau)[\tau - |\partial\tau|_\tau^2] \\ &= -m \det H(\rho) - \det H(\rho)(\rho - |\partial\rho|_\rho^2) \\ &= -m \det H(\rho) + J(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv \text{constant on } D \iff J(\tau) \equiv 0 \text{ on } D.$$

Notice that

$$(2.12) \quad J(\tau) = -\tau^{n+1} \det H(\log \tau)$$

Thus

$$(2.13) \quad J(\tau) = 0 \iff \det H(\log \tau) = 0 \text{ on } D \setminus \tau^{-1}(0).$$

Combining the above relations and the main theorem of Burns in [3], the proof of Corollary 2.3 is complete. \square

Next result is the main theorem of this section.

THEOREM 2.4 *Let $\rho \in C^3(\overline{D})$ be a defining function for D so that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in D . If $-\log J(\rho)$ is subharmonic in Kähler metric $u_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, and if there is a positive constant c so that*

$$(2.14) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv c \quad \text{on } \partial D,$$

then

$$(2.15) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv c \quad \text{on } D.$$

Proof. Since $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv c > 0$ on ∂D , replacing ρ by $c\rho$ if it is necessary, without loss of generality, we may assume that $c = 1$. We can write

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} := 1 + A(z)\rho(z), \quad z \in D.$$

Since $-\log J(\rho)$ is subharmonic in the metric $u_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, by Lemma 2.2, we have that $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho)$ attains its minimum over \overline{D} at some point in ∂D . Thus (2.16) holds with $A(z) \leq 0$ in D . By (2.6), one has

$$(2.17) \quad 1 - T(z) = \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} e^{-u} - e^{-u} = (1 + A(z)\rho)(-\rho) + \rho.$$

Thus, by (2.16)

$$(2.18) \quad T(z) = 1 - \rho(z) + (1 + A\rho)\rho = 1 + A(z)\rho(z)^2.$$

We claim that $T(z) \equiv 1$ on D (i.e. $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv 1$ on D .)

By Lemma 2.2, if there is $z_0 \in D$ so that $\det H(\rho)(z_0)/J(\rho)(z_0) = 1$, then $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv 1$ on D (i.e. $A \equiv 0$). Otherwise, we have $A(z) < 0$ on D , we will prove there is a contradiction.

Let $C = \max\{-A(z) : z \in \overline{D}\} \in (0, \infty)$. Then $C \in (0, \infty)$, and by (2.18), we have

$$(2.19) \quad 0 < (1 - T) \leq C\rho(z)^2 = Ce^{-2u}, \quad \text{on } D.$$

By (2.18) again, one has $T(z) := |\partial u|_u^2 + e^{-u} < 1$ on D . Since $e^{-u} = 0$ on ∂D and $e^{-u} > 0$ in D , one can easily see that

$$(2.20) \quad b := \max\{e^{-u(z)} : z \in D\} < 1, \quad z \in D.$$

By (2.19), we have

$$(2.21) \quad (1 - T)^{-3/4} \geq C^{-3/4} e^{\frac{3u}{2}}, \quad \frac{1}{1 - e^{u(z)}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - b}.$$

Note: This is key place we use the condition $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) = 1$ on ∂D .

For any fixed positive integer m satisfying

$$(2.22) \quad m \geq C^{3/4} \frac{(n+1)^2}{(1-b)^2},$$

It is easy to see that

$$(2.23) \quad m(1 - T)^{-3/4} - \frac{(1+n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} - \frac{(1+n)^2 |\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2} e^u \geq 0, \quad z \in D.$$

Let

$$(2.24) \quad \mathcal{L}_n := u^{i\bar{j}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} - n \operatorname{Re} (u^{i\bar{j}} u_i \partial_{\bar{j}})$$

and

$$(2.25) \quad \mathcal{L}_{m,n} = \mathcal{L}_n + m(1 - T)^{-3/4} \operatorname{Re} (\partial_i T u^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}}).$$

For any $z_0 \in D$, we will show $\mathcal{L}_{m,n} T(z_0) \geq 0$. By a holomorphic change of coordinates, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$(2.26) \quad u_{i\bar{j}k}(z_0) = 0, \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n.$$

It was proved by author in [24] that: if $T(z) \leq 1$ on D and if u is the strictly plurisubharmonic solution for the Monge-Ampère equation:

$$(2.27) \quad \det H(u) = J e^{(n+1)u} \text{ in } D; \quad u = \infty \text{ on } \partial D$$

with $-\log J$ is subharmonic in the metric $u_{i\bar{j}} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, then

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} u^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{i\bar{j}} T(z_0) &= u^{i\bar{j}} (u^{k\bar{\ell}} u_k u_{\bar{\ell}} + e^{-u}) \\ &\geq n(1 - T) - |\partial u|_u^2 (1 - e^{-u}) + u^{i\bar{j}} u^{k\bar{\ell}} u_{ik} u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note: This is (2.24) in [24] while (2.21) in [24] becomes inequality with our

assumption $u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_{i\bar{j}}\log J(\rho)(z_0) \leq 0$.

By (2.26), one has that $\partial_k u^{i\bar{j}}(z_0) = 0$. Thus, for $1 \leq j \leq n$, one has

$$(2.29) \quad \partial_{\bar{j}}T(z_0) = u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_k u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}} + u_{\bar{j}}(1 - e^{-u}), \quad \partial_i T(z_0) = u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{ik} u_{\bar{j}} + u_i(1 - e^u).$$

Thus

$$(2.30) \quad u^{i\bar{j}}u_i \partial_{\bar{j}}T(z_0) = u^{i\bar{j}}u_i u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_k u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}} + |\partial u|_u^2(1 - e^{-u})$$

and

$$(2.31) \quad u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_{i\bar{j}}T(z_0) \geq n(1 - T) - u^{i\bar{j}}u_i \partial_{\bar{j}}T + u^{i\bar{j}}u_i u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_k u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}} + u^{i\bar{j}}u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{ik} u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}}.$$

Thus

$$(2.32) \quad \mathcal{L}_n T \geq n(1 - T) - \operatorname{Re}(1 + n)u^{i\bar{j}}u_i \partial_{\bar{j}}T + \operatorname{Re} u^{i\bar{j}}u_i u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_k u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}} + u^{i\bar{j}}u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{ik} u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}}$$

By (2.29), one has

$$(2.33) \quad u_i(z_0) = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-u}}[\partial_i T(z_0) - u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{\bar{\ell}}u_{ik}(z_0)].$$

Thus

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{aligned} & - (1 + n)\operatorname{Re} u^{i\bar{j}}u_i \partial_{\bar{j}}T \\ &= \frac{1 + n}{1 - e^{-u}}[-u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i T \partial_{\bar{j}}T + u^{i\bar{j}}u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{\bar{\ell}}u_{ik} \partial_{\bar{j}}T] \\ &\geq -\left[\frac{(1 + n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} + \frac{(1 + n)^2|\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2}e^u\right]u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i T \partial_{\bar{j}}T - e^{-u}u^{i\bar{j}}u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{ik} u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2.35) \quad \operatorname{Re} u^{i\bar{j}}u_i u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_k u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}}(z_0) \geq -|\partial u|_u^2 u^{i\bar{j}}u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{ik} u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}}(z_0).$$

Combining (2.32), (2.34) and (2.35), one has

$$(2.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n T(z_0) &\geq n(1 - T) + (1 - |\partial u|^2 - e^{-u})u^{i\bar{j}}u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{ik} u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}} \\ &\quad - \left[\frac{(1 + n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} + \frac{(1 + n)^2|\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2}e^u\right]u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i T \partial_{\bar{j}}T. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.37) \quad \mathcal{L}_{m,n}T(z_0) &\geq n(1-T) + (1-T)u^{i\bar{j}}u^{k\bar{\ell}}u_{ik}u_{\bar{j}\bar{\ell}} \\
&\quad + [m(1-T)^{-3/4} - \frac{(1+n)}{(1-e^{-u})} - \frac{(1+n)^2|\partial u|^2}{4(1-e^{-u})^2}e^u]u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i T\partial_{\bar{j}}T \\
&\geq [m(1-T)^{-3/4} - \frac{(1+n)}{(1-e^{-u})} - \frac{(1+n)^2|\partial u|^2}{4(1-e^{-u})^2}e^u]u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i T\partial_{\bar{j}}T \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\det H(u) = J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i [J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}u^{i\bar{j}}] = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.38) \quad \operatorname{Re} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \partial_i [e^{-nu}e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}}J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_{\bar{j}}T] \\
= e^{(n+1-n)u}e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}}[\mathcal{L}_n T(z_0) + m(1-T)^{-3/4}u^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i T\partial_{\bar{j}}T] \\
= e^u e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}} \mathcal{L}_{m,n}T.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(2.39) \quad u^{i\bar{j}} = (-\rho)(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial \rho|_\rho^2 - \rho}), \quad \rho^i = \rho^{i\bar{\ell}} \rho_{\bar{\ell}}$$

we have

$$(2.40) \quad e^u \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i u^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} T = -\frac{\rho \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial \rho|_\rho^2 - \rho} \partial_{\bar{j}} T = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D.$$

Let $|\partial \rho|_0^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n |\partial_j \rho(z)|^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \operatorname{Re} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\rho_i}{|\partial \rho|_0} e^{-nu} e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}} J(\rho) e^{(n+1)u} u^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} T d\sigma(z) \\
&= \operatorname{Re} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \partial_i (e^{-nu} e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}} J(\rho) e^{(n+1)u} u^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} T) dv \\
&= \int_{\Omega} e^u e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}} \mathcal{L}_{m,n}T(z) dv(z)
\end{aligned}$$

(2.37) shows that the integrand in the last integral is non-negative on D . Thus, the above identity implies that

$$(2.41) \quad e^u e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}} \mathcal{L}_{m,n} T(z) = 0, \quad z \in D.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}_{m,n} T(z) \equiv 0, \quad \text{in } D.$$

Maximum principle (for both T and $-T$) implies that

$$\max\{T(z) : z \in \bar{\Omega}\} = \max\{T(z) : z \in \partial D\} = 1$$

and

$$\min\{T(z) : z \in \bar{\Omega}\} = \min\{T(z) : z \in \partial D\} = 1.$$

Therefore

$$T(z) \equiv 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv 1 \quad \text{in } D.$$

This contradicts to $A(z) < 0$ on D (i.e. $T(z) < 1$ on D). Therefore, our claim $T(z) \equiv 1$ is proved, and so

$$(2.42) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv 1 \quad \text{in } D.$$

Therefore, the proof of Theorem 2.4 is complete. \square

3 Proof of Part (b) of Theorem 1.1

First let us recall some notions and a formula for the Webster pseudo Ricci curvature and pseudo scalar curvature proved in [28]. Let M be a real hypersurface in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} with a defining function $\rho \in C^3(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})$. Let $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} : \rho(z) < 0\}$ and let U be a neighborhood of M . Assume that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in $D \cap U$. From now on, we always use ρ to denote a defining function for M and $\theta = \frac{1}{2i}(\partial\rho - \bar{\partial}\rho)$ is the pseudo-Hermitian form for M associated to the defining function ρ . We define a second order differential operator $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}$ associated to ρ for $1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n$ as follows:

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{D}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta} - \frac{\rho_\alpha}{\rho_{n+1}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_{n+1} \partial \bar{z}_\beta} - \frac{\rho_{\bar{\beta}}}{\rho_{n+1}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_{n+1}} + \frac{\rho_\alpha \rho_{\bar{\beta}}}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_{n+1} \partial \bar{z}_{n+1}}.$$

The following explicit formula for the Webster pseudo Ricci curvature and pseudo scalar curvature in terms of defining function ρ for (M, θ) was proved in [28]:

THEOREM 3.1 *Let $M = \partial D$ be a strictly pseudoconvex hypersurface in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} . Let $\rho \in C^3(\overline{D} \cap U) \cap C^\infty(D \cap U)$ be a defining function for M with that $J(\rho) > 0$ on $\overline{D} \cap U$ and $u(z) = -\log(-\rho)$ is plurisubharmonic in $D \cap U$. Let $\theta = (\partial\rho - \bar{\partial}\rho)/(2i)$. Then for $v, w \in H(M) = T_{1,0}(M)$, we have:*

$$(3.2) \quad \text{Ric}(w, \bar{v}) = -L_{\log J(\rho)}(w, \bar{v}) + (n+1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} L_\rho(w, \bar{v}).$$

where $L_g(w, \bar{v}) = \sum_{k,j=1}^n g_{k\bar{j}}(z) w_k \bar{v}_j$ is the Levi form associated to g .

In a local coordinates, at those $z \in M_1 = \{z \in M : \rho_{n+1}(z) \neq 0\}$, we have the Webster pseudo scalar curvature

$$(3.3) \quad R_\theta(z) = - \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^n h^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \mathcal{D}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \log J(\rho) + n(n+1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)},$$

where the pseudo-Hermitian metric $h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = \mathcal{D}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(\rho)$ and $[h^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}] = ([h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}]^t)^{-1}$.

Proposition 3.2 *With the notation above, $h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = \mathcal{D}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(\rho)$, we have*

$$(3.4) \quad h^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(z) = \rho^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - \frac{\rho^\alpha \rho^{\bar{\beta}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}, \quad z \in M_1, \quad 1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n.$$

Proof. Since, for $1 \leq i, k \leq n$ with $h_{k\bar{j}} = \mathcal{D}_{k\bar{j}}(\rho)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) h_{k\bar{j}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) \left(\rho_{k\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho_{\bar{j}}}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{k\bar{n}+1} + \frac{\rho_k \rho_{\bar{j}}}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \rho_{n+1\bar{n}+1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{i\bar{j}} \left(\rho_{k\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho_{\bar{j}}}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{k\bar{n}+1} + \frac{\rho_k \rho_{\bar{j}}}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \rho_{n+1\bar{n}+1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} (\rho_{k\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho_{\bar{j}}}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{kn+1} + \frac{\rho_k \rho_{\bar{j}}}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \rho_{n+1\overline{n+1}}) \\
= & \delta_{ik} - \rho^{i\overline{n+1}} \rho_{k\overline{n+1}} + \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho^{i\overline{n+1}} \rho_{n+1\overline{n+1}} - \frac{\rho^i}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{k\overline{n+1}} + \rho^{i\overline{n+1}} \rho_{k\overline{n+1}} \\
& + \frac{\rho^i \rho_k}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \rho_{n+1\overline{n+1}} - \rho^{i\overline{n+1}} \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1\overline{n+1}} \\
& - \frac{\rho^i \rho_k}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} + \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\overline{n+1}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \rho_{k\overline{n+1}} + \frac{\rho^i \rho_{n+1}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\overline{n+1}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1\overline{n+1}} \\
& + \frac{\rho^i}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{k\overline{n+1}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\overline{n+1}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \rho_{k\overline{n+1}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho_k}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \rho_{n+1\overline{n+1}} + \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\overline{n+1}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1\overline{n+1}} \\
= & \delta_{ik}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (3.4) holds, and the proof of the proposition is complete. \square

Let Δ_u be the Beltrami-Laplacian with respect to the metric $u_{i\bar{j}} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$. Then

$$(3.5) \quad \Delta_u = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} u^{i\bar{j}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}$$

Since $u = -\log(-\rho)$ we have (see [7], [24]) that

$$(3.6) \quad u_{i\bar{j}} = \frac{\rho_{i\bar{j}}}{-\rho} + \frac{\rho_i \rho_{\bar{j}}}{\rho^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad u^{i\bar{j}} = (-\rho) \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{-\rho + |\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right).$$

Then

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta_u = (-\rho) \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{-\rho + |\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}.$$

Thus if f is harmonic in the metric $u_{i\bar{j}} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, then that

$$(3.8) \quad \Delta_u f = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{-\rho + |\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} = 0.$$

Proposition 3.3 *With the notation above, for any $f \in C^2(D)$, we have*

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) f_{i\bar{j}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) \mathcal{D}_{i\bar{j}}(f).$$

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}) f_{i\bar{j}} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}) \mathcal{D}_{i\bar{j}}(f) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}) (\frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{n+1\bar{j}} + \frac{\rho_{\bar{j}}}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{i\bar{n}+1} - \frac{\rho_i \rho_{\bar{j}}}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} f_{n+1\bar{n}+1}) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\rho^{\bar{j}}}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{n+1\bar{j}} - \sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{n+1\bar{j}} f_{n+1\bar{j}} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\rho^i}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{i\bar{n}+1} - \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{i\bar{n}+1} f_{i\bar{n}+1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n (-\frac{\rho_i \rho^i}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} + \rho^{i\bar{n}+1} \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{n+1}}) f_{n+1\bar{n}+1} \\
&\quad - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i \rho_i}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\rho^{\bar{j}}}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{n+1\bar{j}} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \rho^j \rho_{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\rho^i}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{i\bar{n}+1} \\
&\quad + \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i \rho_i)(\sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{\bar{j}} \rho_{\bar{j}})}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2 |\rho_{n+1}|^2} f_{n+1\bar{n}+1} \\
&= (1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i \rho_i}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\rho^{\bar{j}}}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{n+1\bar{j}} - \sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{n+1\bar{j}} f_{n+1\bar{j}} \\
&\quad + (1 - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{\bar{j}} \rho_{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\rho^i}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{i\bar{n}+1} - \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{i\bar{n}+1} f_{i\bar{n}+1} \\
&\quad + (-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i \rho^i}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} + \frac{\rho^{n+1}}{\rho_{n+1}} - \rho^{n+1\bar{n}+1} + \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i \rho_i)(\sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{\bar{j}} \rho_{\bar{j}})}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2 |\rho_{n+1}|^2}) f_{n+1\bar{n}+1} \\
&= -\sum_{j=1}^n [\rho^{n+1\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^{n+1} \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}] f_{n+1\bar{j}} - \sum_{i=1}^n [\rho^{i\bar{n}+1} - \frac{\rho^{n+1} \rho^i}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}] f_{i\bar{n}+1} \\
&\quad - [\rho^{n+1\bar{n}+1} - \frac{\rho^{n+1} \rho^{n+1}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}] f_{n+1\bar{n}+1}
\end{aligned}$$

Moving the right side to the left hand side, we have

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} (\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}) f_{i\bar{j}} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2}) \mathcal{D}_{i\bar{j}}(f) = 0.$$

Therefore, the proof of (3.9) is complete, and so is the proof of the proposition. \square

Proof of Part (b) of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Let $f(z) = \log J(\rho)(z)$ be harmonic in the metric $u_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$. By (3.8), and then by (3.9), we have for all $z \in M = \partial D$

$$(3.11) \quad 0 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(\rho^{i\bar{j}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^{\bar{j}}}{|\partial\rho|_\rho^2} \right) \mathcal{D}_{i\bar{j}}(f)(z).$$

By (3.4) and $f = \log J(\rho)$, we have

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^n h^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \mathcal{D}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(\log J(\rho)) = 0, \quad z \in M_1.$$

Applying the formula (3.3) for the Webster pseudo scalar curvature R_θ , we have that $R_\theta = n(n+1) \det H(\rho)/J(\rho)$, i.e., (1.5) holds, and the proof of Part(b) of Theorem 1.1 is complete. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2

We have proved Part (b) of Theorem 1.1. Now we prove Part (a) of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Part (a) of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Since $\log J(\rho)$ is harmonic in the metric $u_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$ in D . Since the pseudo scalar curvature is constant c , by Part(b) of Theorem 1.1, we have

$$(4.1) \quad c = R_\theta = n(n+1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \quad \text{on } \partial D.$$

Therefore

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} = \frac{c}{n(n+1)} > 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D.$$

This with $-\log J(\rho)$ being harmonic in the metric $u_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, we have that all conditions of Theorem 2.4 hold. By Theorem 2.4, we have

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} = \frac{c}{n(n+1)} > 0 \quad \text{on } D.$$

By Corollary 2.3, we have that D is biholomorphic to B_{n+1} , and the proof of Part (a) of Theorem 1.1 is complete. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.2

Proof. Since u is the potential function for D , we have $J(\rho) \equiv 1$. Hence $\log J(\rho) = 0$ is harmonic in $u_{i\bar{j}} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$. By Part (b) of Theorem 1.1, we have $R_\theta = c$ on ∂D , and then by Part (a) of Theorem 1.1 that D is biholomorphic to B_{n+1} . Moreover, $\det H(\rho) \equiv c$ on D . Let $\rho^0 = c\rho$. $\det H(\rho^0)/J(\rho^0) \equiv 1$ on D . Then by (2.8) and (2.9), there is $z_0 \in D$ with

$$(4.4) \quad \rho^0(z_0) = \min\{\rho^0(z) : z \in D\} = -\frac{\det H(\rho)(z_0)}{J(\rho^0)(z_0)} = -1.$$

By (2.6), we have $T(z) \equiv 1$ on D . By (2.5) in [24], we have

$$\det H(\log(1 + \rho^0))(z) = 0, \quad \text{for all } z \in D \text{ with } \rho^0(z) > -1.$$

Applying Part (ii) of Theorem 1.2 in [24], there is a constant Jacobian biholomorphic mapping $\phi : D \rightarrow B_{n+1}$. The proof of Corollary 1.2 is complete. \square

References

- [1] S. M. Baouendi, P. Ebenfelt and L. P. Rothschild, Real Submanifolds in Complex Space and their Mappings, Math Series 47, *Princeton University Press*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.
- [2] R. Beals, C. Fefferman and R. Grossman, Strictly pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n , *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, (N.S.) 8 (1983), 125–322.
- [3] D. Burns, Curvatures of Monge-Ampère foliations and parabolic manifolds, *Ann. Math.* 115 (1982), 349–373.
- [4] D. Jr. Burns and S. Shnider, Spherical hypersurfaces in complex manifolds, *Invent. Math.*, 33 (1976), 223–246.
- [5] L. Caffarelli, J. J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations, II: complex Monge-Ampère, and uniformly elliptic equations, *Comm. on Pure and Appl. Math.* (1985), 209–252.

- [6] S. S. Chern and S. Ji, On the Riemann mapping theorem, *Ann. of Math.*, 144(1996), 421–439.
- [7] S. Y. Cheng and S. T. Yau, On the existence of a complex Kähler metric on non-compact complex manifolds and the regularity of Fefferman’s equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 33 (1980) 507–544.
- [8] C. Fefferman, Monge-Ampère equations, the Bergman kernel, and geometry of pseudoconvex domains, *Ann. of Math.* 103(1976), 395–416.
- [9] Najoua Gamara, The CR Yamabe conjecture the case $n = 1$, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 3(2001), 105–137.
- [10] Najoua Gamara and Ridha Yacoub, CR Yamabe conjecture–The conformally Flat case, *Pacific Jour. of Math.*, 201 (2001), 121–175.
- [11] C. R. Graham, Scalar boundary invariants and the Bergman type kernel, *Complex Analysis, II* (College Park, Maryland, 1985–85), Lecture Notes in Math. 1276, Springer, Berlin, 1987, 108–135.
- [12] B. Guan, The Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equations and Regularity of the Green’s function, *Comm. in Analysis and Geometry*, 6(1998), 687–703.
- [13] B. Guan and P. Guan, Convex Hypersurfaces of Prescribed Curvature, *Ann. of Math.*, 156(2002), 655–674.
- [14] P. Guan, Extremal Function associated to Intrinsic Norm, *Ann. of Math.*, 156(2002), 197–211.
- [15] Xiaojun Huang, On some problems in several complex variables and CR geometry. First International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians (Beijing, 1998), 383–396,
- [16] Xiaojun Huang and Shanyu Ji, Global holomorphic extension of a local map and a Riemann mapping theorem for algebraic domains, *Math. Res. Lett.*, 5 (1998), no. 1-2, 247–260

- [17] Xiaojun Huang, Shanyu Ji and Stephen S.T. Yau, An example of a real analytic strongly pseudoconvex hypersurface which is not holomorphically equivalent to any algebraic hypersurface, *Ark. Mat.*, 39 (2001), 75–93.
- [18] D. Jerison and J. Lee, The Yamabe Problem on CR manifolds , *Jour. Differential Geometry*, 25(1987), 167–197.
- [19] D. Jerison and J. M. Lee, Extremal for the Sobolev inequality on the Heisenberg group and the CR Yamabe problem. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 1 (1988), no. 1, 1–13..
- [20] S. G. Krantz and S.-Y. Li, On the Existence of Smooth Plurisubharmonic Solutions for Certain Degenerate Monge-Ampère Equations, *Complex variables*, 41(2000), 207–219.
- [21] John M. Lee, The Fefferman metric and pseudo-Hermitian invariants, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 296 (1986), no. 1, 411–429.
- [22] J. Lee and Melrose, J. Lee and R. Melrose, Boundary behavior of the complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Acta Math.* (1982), 159–192.
- [23] L. Lempert, Solving the degenerate Monge-Ampère equation with one concentrated singularity, *Math. Ann.*, 263 (1983), 515–532.
- [24] S.-Y. Li, Characterization for Balls with Potential Function of Kähler-Einstein Metrics for domains in \mathbb{C}^n , *Comm. in Analysis and Geometry*, 13(2005), 461–478.
- [25] S.-Y. Li, On the existence and regularity of Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equations on weakly pseudoconvex domains, *Calculus of Variations & PDEs*, 20 (2004), 119–132.
- [26] S.-Y. Li, The Neumann Problem for Complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Indiana University J. of Mathematics*, 44(1995), 1099–1122.
- [27] S.-Y. Li, On the Dirichlet Problem for Symmetric Function Equations of Eigenvalues of Complex Hessian, *Asian J. Math.*, 8(2004), 87–106.

- [28] S.-Y. Li and H-S Luk, An explicit formula for the Webster pseudo Ricci curvature on real hypersurfaces and its application for characterizing balls in \mathbb{C}^n , *Comm. in Anal and Geom.*, 14(2006), 673-701.
- [29] S.-Y. Li and H-S Luk, An explicit formula for the Webster Torsion on real hypersurfaces and its application to the torsion-free hypersurfaces in \mathbb{C}^n , *Science in China*, 49(2006), 1662–1682.
- [30] N. Mok and S. T. Yau, Completeness of the Kähler-Einstein metric on bounded domains and the characterization of domains of holomorphy by curvature conditions. *The mathematical heritage of Henri Poincaré* Part 1 (Bloomington, Ind., 1980), 41–59, Proc. Symposia. Pure Math., 39, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1983.
- [31] Wilhelm Stoll, The characterization of strictly parabolic manifolds, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (4) 7 (1980), no. 1, 87–154.
- [32] N. Tanaka, A Differential geometric study on strongly pseudoconvex manifolds, *Kinokuniya Company Ltd.*, Tokyo, 1975.
- [33] S. M. Webster, On the pseudo-conformal geometry of a Kähler manifold. *Math. Z.*, 157 (1977), no. 3, 265–270.
- [34] S. M. Webster, Pseudo-hermitian geometry on a real hypersurface, *J. Diff. Geom.*, 13 (1973), 25–41.

Mailing Address:

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine,
 CA 92697–3875, USA.
 E-mail: sli@math.uci.edu