Commun. Korean Math. Soc. 35 (2020), No. 1, pp. 243-250

https://doi.org/10.4134/CKMS.c180516 pISSN: 1225-1763 / eISSN: 2234-3024

HARDY-LITTLEWOOD PROPERTY AND α -QUASIHYPERBOLIC METRIC

KI WON KIM AND JEONG SEOG RYU

ABSTRACT. Hardy and Littlewood found a relation between the smoothness of the radial limit of an analytic function on the unit disk $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and the growth of its derivative. It is reasonable to expect an analytic function to be smooth on the boundary if its derivative grows slowly, and conversely. Gehring and Martio showed this principle for uniform domains in \mathbb{R}^2 . Astala and Gehring proved quasiconformal analogue of this principle for uniform domains in \mathbb{R}^n . We consider α -quasihyperbolic metric, k_D^{α} and we extend it to proper domains in \mathbb{R}^n .

1. Introduction

A proper subdomain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is said to have Hardy-Littlewood property if there is a constant c such that for $0 < \alpha \le 1$, f is in $\operatorname{Lip}_{\alpha}(D)$ with $||f||_{\alpha} \le cm/\alpha$ whenever f is analytic with

$$(1.1) |f'(z)| \le md(z, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1}$$

in D [3].

Hardy and Littlewood first considered analytic functions on the unit disk in \mathbb{C} and showed that the radial limit $F(\theta) = f(e^{i\theta})$ is in $\operatorname{Lip}_{\alpha}$ if and only if (1.1) hold [2, Theorem 5.1], [5, Theorem 40].

Theorem 1.1 (Hardy-Littlewood). Let f(z) be a function analytic in |z| < 1. Then f(z) is continuous in $|z| \le 1$ and $f(e^{i\theta}) \in Lip_{\alpha}$ $(0 < \alpha \le 1)$ if and only if

$$|f'(z)| \le m(1-|z|)^{\alpha-1}.$$

It is reasonable to expect an analytic function to be smooth on the boundary if its derivative grows slowly, and conversely. Gehring and Martio showed this principle for uniform domains in \mathbb{R}^2 which include the quasidisk, the image of disk under a quasiconformal map of the extended complex plane [3, Corollary 2.2].

Received December 10, 2018; Accepted March 15, 2019.

 $^{2010\} Mathematics\ Subject\ Classification.\ Primary\ 30C65.$

 $Key\ words\ and\ phrases.$ Hardy-Littlewood property, quasiconformal mapping, quasihyperbolic metric.

Theorem 1.2. If D is uniform and f is analytic and satisfies

$$|f'(z)| \le md(z, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1}$$

in D, then f is $Lip_{\alpha}(D)$ with

$$||f||_{\alpha} \leq \frac{cm}{\alpha},$$

where c is a constant which depends only on α and the constants for D.

Astala and Ghering introduced the notion of average derivative $a_f(x)$ of quasiconformal map f and proved quasiconformal analogue of Theorem 1.2 for uniform domains in \mathbb{R}^n [1, Theorem 1.9]. They also proved its converse [1, Theorem 3.17].

Theorem 1.3. Suppose that D is a uniform domain in \mathbb{R}^n and that α and m are constants with $0 < \alpha \le 1$ and $m \ge 0$. If f is K-quasiconformal in D with $f(D) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and if

$$(1.2) a_f(x) \le md(x, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1}$$

for $x \in D$, then f has a continuous extension to $\overline{D} \setminus \{\infty\}$ and

$$|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le cm \left(|x_1 - x_2| + d(x_1, \partial D)\right)^{\alpha}$$

for $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{D} \setminus \{\infty\}$, where c is a constant which depends only on K, n, α and the constants for D.

We consider α -quasihyperbolic metric, k_D^{α} and we extend Theorem 1.3 to proper domains in \mathbb{R}^n for $\alpha \leq 1$. If D is not uniform, then there is an f that can not have a continuous extension to $\overline{D} \setminus \{\infty\}$ even though f satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1.3.

Remark 1.4. Let $D=\{z:1<|z|<2\}\setminus\{z|\arg z=\pi\}$, then D is not a uniform domain but an inner uniform domain in $\mathbb C$. The function $f(z)=\log z$ is analytic on D and $a_f(z)=|f'(z)|$ is bounded on D. But f can not have continuous extension to $\overline{D}\setminus\{\infty\}$.

Theorem 1.5. Suppose that D, D' are proper subdomains of \mathbb{R}^n and that $f: D \to D'$ is K-quasiconformal in D. Suppose that α and m are constants with $\alpha \leq 1$ and $m \geq 0$. Then

$$(1.4) a_f(x) \le md(x, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1}$$

for $x \in D$ if and only if

$$(1.5) |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le cm(k_D^{\alpha}(x_1, x_2) + d(x_1, \partial D)^{\alpha})$$

for $x_1, x_2 \in D$, where c is a constant which depends only on K, n, α .

If D is an inner uniform domain, Kim showed that k_D is comparable to j'_D [7, Theorem 2.1] and Langmeyer showed that k^{α}_D is comparable to $d(x_1, \partial D)^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha < 0$ [10, Theorem 6.5]. Theorem 1.5 can be rephrased in the following form.

Theorem 1.6. Suppose that D, D' are proper subdomains of \mathbb{R}^n and that $f: D \to D'$ is K-quasiconformal in D. Suppose that D is an inner uniform domain in \mathbb{R}^n and that α and m are constants with $\alpha \leq 1$ and $m \geq 0$. Then

$$a_f(x) \le md(x, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1}$$

for $x \in D$ if and only if the following inequality holds. For $x_1, x_2 \in D$,

$$(1.6) |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le c m \left(\lambda_D(x_1, x_2) + d(x_1, \partial D)\right)^{\alpha} (0 < \alpha \le 1),$$

$$(1.7) |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le c \, m \, (j_D'(x_1 x_2) + 1) (\alpha = 0),$$

$$(1.8) |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le c \, m \, d(x_1, \partial D)^{\alpha} (\alpha < 0).$$

Here c is a constant which depends only on K, n, α and the constants for D.

2. Preliminaries

We shall assume throughout this paper that D, D' are proper subdomains of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$ and that d(A, B) denotes the euclidean distance from A to B.

We say that D is uniform if there exist constants a and b such that each pair of points x_1 , x_2 in D can be joined by a rectifiable arc $\gamma \subset D$ for which

(2.1)
$$\begin{cases} \ell(\gamma) \le a|x_1 - x_2|, \\ \min \ell(\gamma(x_j, x)) \le bd(x, \partial D) \end{cases}$$

for all $x \in \gamma$. Here $\ell(\gamma)$ denotes the euclidean length of γ , $\gamma(x_j, x)$ the part of γ between x_j and x.

For each $x_1, x_2 \in D$ we set $\lambda_D(x_1, x_2) = \inf \ell(\gamma)$ where infimum is taken over all rectifiable arcs γ joining x_1 and x_2 in D. We call λ_D the inner length metric in D. We say that D is an inner uniform if (2.1) holds when we replace euclidean distance $|x_1 - x_2|$ by $\lambda_D(x_1, x_2)$, i.e., $\ell(\gamma) \leq a\lambda_D(x_1, x_2)$. We also use a metric $j'_D(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log(1 + \frac{\lambda_D(x_1, x_2)}{\min_{j=1,2}d(x_j, \partial D)})$.

For each $x_1, x_2 \in D$ we set

$$k_D^{\alpha}(x_1, x_2) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_{\gamma} d(x, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1} ds,$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable arcs γ joining x_1 and x_2 in D. We call k_D^{α} the α -quasihyperbolic metric in D. When $\alpha=0$, we have $k_D^0=k_D$, the usual quasihyperbolic metric. If $k_D^{\alpha}(x_1,x_2)=\int_{\gamma}d(x,\partial D)^{\alpha-1}ds$, then we call γ the α -quasihyperbolic geodesic. The existence of α -quasihyperbolic geodesic in D is proved in [4, Lemma 1] for $\alpha=0$, in [9, Lemma 2.2] for $\alpha<0$. The same argument in [9, Lemma 2.2] shows the existence for $0<\alpha<1$.

Suppose that $f: D \to D'$ is K-quasiconformal in D with Jacobian J_f . Then $\log J_f$ is integrable over each ball $B \subset D$. Astala and Gehring introduced average derivative a_f in [1]

$$a_f(x) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{n|B_x|} \int_{B_x} \log J_f dm\right),$$

where $B_x = B(x, d(x, \partial D)/2)$ and $|B_x|$ is the *n*-dimensional measure of B_x . Using a_f , they proved following quasiconformal analogue of Koebe distortion theorem [1, Theorem 1.8].

Lemma 2.1. Let $f: D \to D'$ be K-quasiconformal. There exists a positive constant c depending only on n, K, so that for each $x \in D$

$$\frac{1}{c}d(f(x),\partial D') \le a_f(x)d(x,\partial D) \le cd(f(x),\partial D').$$

The following is the basic property of quasiconformal mapping [8, Lemma 2.2]. (See also [12, 18.1].)

Lemma 2.2. Let $f: D \to D'$ be K-quasiconformal. Then for any $0 < \lambda < 1$ there exist positive constants c_1 , c_2 depending only on n, K, λ such that

$$B^n(f(x), c_1d') \subset f(B^n(x, c_2d) \subset B^n(f(x), \lambda d'),$$

where $d = d(x, \partial D)$ and $d' = d(f(x), \partial D')$. Moreover, there is a constants c_3 depending only on n, K such that

$$B^n(f(x), d'/c_3) \subset f(B_x) \subset B^n(f(x), c_3 d'),$$

and

$$d(f(B_x), \partial D') \ge d'/c_3$$
.

Using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, Koskela showed the following [8, Lemma 2.6].

Lemma 2.3. Let $f: D \to D'$ be K-quasiconformal. If $\gamma \subset D$ is a rectifiable curve with $\ell(\gamma) \geq d(\gamma, \partial D)$, then

$$diam(f\gamma) \leq c \int_{\gamma} a_f(x) ds,$$

where c is a constant which depends only on n, K.

A homeomorphism $f:D\to D'$ is called η -quasisymmetric if there is a homeomorphism $\eta:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ so that

$$|x-a| \le t|x-b|$$
 implies $|f(x)-f(a)| \le \eta(t)|f(x)-f(b)|$

for each t > 0 and for each triple x, a, b of points in D. The connection between quasiconformality and quasisymmetry has been studied by many authors in various geometric settings. We will use the following result [6, Theorem 11.14].

Lemma 2.4. A homeomorphism $f: D \to D'$ between domains in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, is K-quasiconformal if and only if there is η such that f is η -quasisymmetric in each ball $B(x, \frac{1}{2}d(x, \partial D))$ for $x \in D$. The statement is quantitative involving K, η , and the dimension n.

We will use the following modified version of [11, Cor. 5.3].

Lemma 2.5. If a homeomorphism $f: D \to D'$ is η' -quasisymmetric in each ball $B_{x,\lambda} = B(x, \lambda d(x, \partial D))$ for $x \in D$ with a constant $0 < \lambda < 1$, then there exists a homeomorphism $\eta: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that

(2.2)
$$\frac{d(f(x), f(y))}{d(f(x), \partial D')} \le \eta \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{d(x, \partial D)}\right)$$

for all $x \in D$ and $y \in B_{x,\lambda}$.

3. Proof of Theorems

Proof of Theorem 1.5

(1.4) \Longrightarrow (1.5). Choose α -quasihyperbolic geodesic $\gamma \subset D$ joining x_1 and x_2 . Case 1: $\ell(\gamma) \geq d(\gamma, \partial D)$

By Lemma 2.3

$$|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le diam(f\gamma) \le c \int_{\gamma} a_f(x) ds$$

$$\le c \int_{\gamma} m d(x, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1} ds = cmk_D^{\alpha}(x_1, x_2).$$

Case 2 : $\ell(\gamma) < d(\gamma, \partial D)$

We follow the similar arguments in the proof of Lemma 2.3. Since $d(\gamma, \partial D) \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x_1, \partial D) + \frac{1}{2}d(x_2, \partial D)$, we get $\gamma \subset B_{x_1} \cup B_{x_2}$. By Lemma 2.2, we get

$$|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le \sum_{i=1,2} diam(f(B_{x_i})) \le c_1 \sum_{i=1,2} d(f(x_i), \partial D').$$

By Lemma 2.1 and (1.4)

$$\sum_{i=1,2} d(f(x_i), \partial D') \le c_2 \sum_{i=1,2} d(x_i, \partial D) a_f(x_i) \le c_2 m \sum_{i=1,2} d(x_i, \partial D)^{\alpha}.$$

Since $|x_1 - x_2| \le \ell(\gamma) < d(\gamma, \partial D) \le \min(d(x_1, \partial D), d(x_2, \partial D)),$

$$d(x_i, \partial D) \le d(x_i, \partial D) + |x_1 - x_2| \le d(x_i, \partial D) + \ell(\gamma) \le 2d(x_i, \partial D)$$

for $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{2}d(x_1, \partial D) \le d(x_2, \partial D) \le 2d(x_1, \partial D)$$

and

$$|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \le c_3 d(x_1, \partial D)^{\alpha}.$$

 $(1.5) \implies (1.4)$. If we consider the inverse of the homeomorphsim f in Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5, then the following holds.

Lemma 3.1. If a homeomorphism $f: D \to D'$ is η' -quasisymmetric in each ball $B_x = B(x, \frac{1}{2}d(x, \partial D))$ for $x \in D$. Then there exists a homeomorphism $\eta: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\frac{d(x,y)}{d(x,\partial D)} \le \eta \left(\frac{d(f(x),f(y))}{d(f(x),\partial D')} \right)$$

for all $x \in D$ and $y \in B_x$.

We will use following technical Lemma.

Lemma 3.2. For any homeomorphism $\eta:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$, there exist constants $a, t_0 < 1/2$ so that $\eta(t_0) \leq 1/2$ and

$$\eta(t_0) = at_0.$$

Proof. We set $b_1 = \min(\eta^{-1}(1/2), 1/2)$, then $\eta(t) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $0 \leq t \leq b_1$. Let $m_1 = \frac{\eta(b_1)}{b_1}$ and let $b_0 = \frac{1}{2}b_1$, $m_0 = \frac{\eta(b_0)}{b_0}$. If $m_1 = m_0$, then choose $a = m_0$ and $t_0 = b_0$. If $m_1 \neq m_0$, then choose a constant $a = \frac{1}{2}(m_1 + m_0)$. Then we can find $t_0 < 1/2$ such that the line l(t) = (t, at) and curve $\beta(t) = (t, \eta(t))$ intersect at $t = t_0$.

Choose y such that $d(f(x), f(y)) = t_0 d(f(x), \partial D')$. By (3.1) and (3.2)

(3.3)
$$\frac{d(x,y)}{d(x,\partial D)} \le \eta(t_0) = k.$$

Choose a line γ joining x and y. Since $\ell(\gamma) = d(x,y) \leq kd(x,\partial D)$ and $(1-k)d(x,\partial D) \leq d(\gamma(s),\partial D)$,

$$(3.4) k_D^{\alpha}(x,y) \le \int_{\gamma} \frac{ds}{d(\gamma(s),\partial D)^{1-\alpha}} \le \frac{k}{(1-k)^{1-\alpha}} d(x,\partial D)^{\alpha}.$$

By (1.5) and (3.4)

$$t_0 d(f(x), \partial D') = d(f(x), f(y))$$

$$\leq m(k_D^{\alpha}(x, y) + d(x, \partial D)^{\alpha})$$

$$\leq m_2 d(x, \partial D)^{\alpha}.$$

By Lemma 2.1

$$a_f(x) \leq c \frac{d(f(x), \partial D')}{d(x, \partial D)} \leq c \frac{m_2}{t_0} d(x, \partial D)^{\alpha - 1}.$$

This completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.6

 $(1.4) \iff (1.6)$. If $x_2 \in B(x_1, d(x_1, \partial D))$, then $d(x_1, x_2) = \lambda_D(x_1, x_2)$. The proof follows if we use $\lambda_D(x_1, x_2)$ instead of $d(x_1, x_2) = |x_1 - x_2|$ in the proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.5.

 $(1.4) \iff (1.7)$. It is easy to see that

$$(3.5) j_D'(x_1x_2) \le k_D(x_1, x_2).$$

Kim showed

$$(3.6) k_D(x_1, x_2) \le bj'_D(x_1 x_2)$$

for an inner uniform domain D [7, Theorem 2.1]. Therefore (1.5) and (1.7) are equivalent if $\alpha = 0$.

 $(1.4) \iff (1.8)$. In the proof of [10, Theorem 6.5], Langmeyer showed

(3.7)
$$k_D^{\alpha}(x_1, x_2) \le c \left(\min_{j=1,2} d(x_j, \partial D) \right)^{\alpha}$$

for $\alpha < 0$. Therefore (1.5) and (1.8) are equivalent if $\alpha < 0$.

References

- K. Astala and F. W. Gehring, Quasiconformal analogues of theorems of Koebe and Hardy-Littlewood, Michigan Math. J. 32 (1985), no. 1, 99-107. https://doi.org/10. 1307/mmj/1029003136
- [2] P. L. Duren, Theory of H^p spaces, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 38, Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [3] F. W. Gehring and O. Martio, Quasidisks and the Hardy-Littlewood property, Complex Variables Theory Appl. 2 (1983), no. 1, 67-78. https://doi.org/10.1080/17476938308814032
- [4] F. W. Gehring and B. G. Osgood, Uniform domains and the quasi-hyperbolic metric, J. Anal. Math. 36 (1979), 50-74. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02798768
- [5] G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, Some properties of fractional integrals. II, Math. Z. 34 (1932), no. 1, 403-439. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01180596
- [6] J. Heinonen, Lectures on Analysis on Metric Spaces, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-0131-8
- [7] K. W. Kim, Inner uniform domains, the quasihyperbolic metric and weak Bloch functions, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 49 (2012), no. 1, 11-24. https://doi.org/10.4134/ BKMS.2012.49.1.011
- [8] P. Koskela, An inverse Sobolev lemma, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 10 (1994), no. 1, 123-141. https://doi.org/10.4171/RMI/147
- [9] N. Langmeyer, The quasihyperbolic metric, growth, and John domains, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1996.
- [10] _____, The quasihyperbolic metric, growth, and John domains, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 23 (1998), no. 1, 205–224.
- [11] E. Soultanis and M. Williams, Distortion of quasiconformal maps in terms of the quasihyperbolic metric, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 402 (2013), no. 2, 623-634. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2013.01.061
- [12] J. Väisälä, Lectures on n-dimensional quasiconformal mappings, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 229, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971. https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0061216

Ki Won Kim

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION

College of Education

SILLA UNIVERSITY

Busan 46958, Korea

 $Email\ address \colon {\tt kwkim@silla.ac.kr}$

JEONG SEOG RYU
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
HONGIK UNIVERSITY
SEOUL 04066, KOREA
Email address: jsryu@hongik.ac.kr