

Finite type conditions for real hypersurfaces in \mathbb{C}^n

Wanke Yin

Joint works with Xiaojun Huang etc.

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University

Nice, Dec. 8 th

Finite type conditions for real hypersurfaces in \mathbb{C}^n

Wanke Yin

Joint works with Xiaojun Huang etc.

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University

Nice, Dec. 8 th

In Several Complex Variables and Complex Geometry, a fundamental problem is to solve the Cauchy-Riemann equations.

In Several Complex Variables and Complex Geometry, a fundamental problem is to solve the Cauchy-Riemann equations.

Let D be a domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Study the existence and regularity of

$$\bar{\partial}u = f \quad \text{in } D.$$

Here $0 \leq p \leq n$, $1 \leq q \leq n$, f is a (p, q) form satisfying the solvability condition:

$$\bar{\partial}f = 0 \quad \text{in } D.$$

Theorem

If D is a bounded pseudoconvex domain and $f \in L_2^{(p,q)}(D)$. Then there exists a u with $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq c_q \|f\|_{L^2}$.

Theorem

If D is a bounded pseudoconvex domain and $f \in L_2^{(p,q)}(D)$. Then there exists a u with $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq c_q \|f\|_{L^2}$.

One also wants to know what kind of regularity can u have when f has higher regularities. Kohn obtained the following global regularity theorem

Theorem

If D is a bounded pseudoconvex domain and $f \in L_2^{(p,q)}(D)$. Then there exists a u with $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq c_q \|f\|_{L^2}$.

One also wants to know what kind of regularity can u have when f has higher regularities. Kohn obtained the following global regularity theorem

Theorem (J. Kohn 1973)

Let D be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n ($n \geq 2$) with smooth boundary. For every $f \in C_{(p,q)}^\infty(\overline{D})$, there exists a $u \in C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(\overline{D})$ such that $\bar{\partial}u = f$.

Kohn also raised the following local version regularity problem:

Kohn also raised the following local version regularity problem:

Problem

Let D be a bounded smooth pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Suppose that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$ and $f \in C_{(p,q)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$ for some neighborhood U .

Kohn also raised the following local version regularity problem:

Problem

Let D be a bounded smooth pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Suppose that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$ and $f \in C_{(p,q)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$ for some neighborhood U .

(1). Is there such a u satisfies $u \in Dom(\bar{\partial}) \cap C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$?

Kohn also raised the following local version regularity problem:

Problem

Let D be a bounded smooth pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Suppose that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$ and $f \in C_{(p,q)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$ for some neighborhood U .

- (1). Is there such a u satisfies $u \in Dom(\bar{\partial}) \cap C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$?
- (2). Is the canonical solution u satisfies $u \in Dom(\bar{\partial}) \cap C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$?

Kohn also raised the following local version regularity problem:

Problem

Let D be a bounded smooth pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Suppose that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$ and $f \in C_{(p,q)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$ for some neighborhood U .

- (1). Is there such a u satisfies $u \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}) \cap C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$?
- (2). Is the canonical solution u satisfies $u \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}) \cap C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$?

Kohn, Catlin: In general, the answer is **NEGATIVE**.

Kohn also raised the following local version regularity problem:

Problem

Let D be a bounded smooth pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . Suppose that $\bar{\partial}u = f$ with $\bar{\partial}f = 0$ and $f \in C_{(p,q)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$ for some neighborhood U .

(1). Is there such a u satisfies $u \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}) \cap C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$?

(2). Is the canonical solution u satisfies $u \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}) \cap C_{(p,q-1)}^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$?

Kohn, Catlin: In general, the answer is **NEGATIVE**.

Kohn-Nirenberg: The answer is **POSITIVE** if the domain has subelliptic estimates.

When D is strongly pseudoconvex, we have the subelliptic estimates:

When D is strongly pseudoconvex, we have the subelliptic estimates:
For $f \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}) \cap \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$. Then

$$\|f\|_{\epsilon}^2 \leq \|\partial f\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* f\|^2 + \|f\|^2 \text{ with } \epsilon = \frac{1}{2}.$$

J. Kohn (1972):

When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, we have the following invariants (which we will define these conditions explicitly for the general dimensional case.)

J. Kohn (1972):

When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, we have the following invariants (which we will define these conditions explicitly for the general dimensional case.)

- 1 contact order by regular holomorphic curves $a^{(1)}(M, p)$,

When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, we have the following invariants (which we will define these conditions explicitly for the general dimensional case.)

- 1 contact order by regular holomorphic curves $a^{(1)}(M, p)$,
- 2 iterated Lie brackets $t^{(1)}(M, p)$,

When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, we have the following invariants (which we will define these conditions explicitly for the general dimensional case.)

- 1 contact order by regular holomorphic curves $a^{(1)}(M, p)$,
- 2 iterated Lie brackets $t^{(1)}(M, p)$,
- 3 the degeneracy of the Levi form $c^{(1)}(M, p)$,

When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, we have the following invariants (which we will define these conditions explicitly for the general dimensional case.)

- 1 contact order by regular holomorphic curves $a^{(1)}(M, p)$,
- 2 iterated Lie brackets $t^{(1)}(M, p)$,
- 3 the degeneracy of the Levi form $c^{(1)}(M, p)$,
- 4 contact order by holomorphic curves $\Delta_1(M, p)$.

- **Theorem:** $a^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p) = \Delta_1(M, p)$.

- **Theorem:** $a^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p) = \Delta_1(M, p)$.
- pseudoconvexity is not necessary in the theorem.

- **Theorem:** $a^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p) = \Delta_1(M, p)$.
- pseudoconvexity is not necessary in the theorem.
- When M is pseudoconvex, these invariants = m if and only if

- **Theorem:** $a^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p) = \Delta_1(M, p)$.
- pseudoconvexity is not necessary in the theorem.
- When M is pseudoconvex, these invariants $= m$ if and only if (1) subelliptic estimates holds (for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{m}$ [Rothschild-Stein 1976]), but

- **Theorem:** $a^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p) = \Delta_1(M, p)$.
- pseudoconvexity is not necessary in the theorem.
- When M is pseudoconvex, these invariants $= m$ if and only if
 - (1) subelliptic estimates holds (for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{m}$ [Rothschild-Stein 1976]), but
 - (2) (Greiner 1974) for no large value of ϵ .

Generalization of Kohn's notion of the boundary finite type condition to higher dimensions has been a subject under extensive investigations in the past 40 years in Several Complex Variables.

Generalization of Kohn's notion of the boundary finite type condition to higher dimensions has been a subject under extensive investigations in the past 40 years in Several Complex Variables.

- Kohn's finite type condition through the subelliptic multiplier ideals

Generalization of Kohn's notion of the boundary finite type condition to higher dimensions has been a subject under extensive investigations in the past 40 years in Several Complex Variables.

- Kohn's finite type condition through the subelliptic multiplier ideals
- regular finite type (of Bloom-Graham)

Generalization of Kohn's notion of the boundary finite type condition to higher dimensions has been a subject under extensive investigations in the past 40 years in Several Complex Variables.

- Kohn's finite type condition through the subelliptic multiplier ideals
- regular finite type (of Bloom-Graham)
- Catlin multitype type

Generalization of Kohn's notion of the boundary finite type condition to higher dimensions has been a subject under extensive investigations in the past 40 years in Several Complex Variables.

- Kohn's finite type condition through the subelliptic multiplier ideals
- regular finite type (of Bloom-Graham)
- Catlin multitype type
- D'Angelo finite type

Generalization of Kohn's notion of the boundary finite type condition to higher dimensions has been a subject under extensive investigations in the past 40 years in Several Complex Variables.

- Kohn's finite type condition through the subelliptic multiplier ideals
- regular finite type (of Bloom-Graham)
- Catlin multitype type
- D'Angelo finite type

T. Bloom (1981):

When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. For each integer $1 \leq s \leq n-1$, we can define corresponding integer invariants $a^{(s)}(M, p)$, $t^{(s)}(M, p)$ and $c^{(s)}(M, p)$ as follows.

T. Bloom (1981):

When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. For each integer $1 \leq s \leq n-1$, we can define corresponding integer invariants $a^{(s)}(M, p)$, $t^{(s)}(M, p)$ and $c^{(s)}(M, p)$ as follows.

(i): The s -contact type $a^{(s)}(M, p)$:

$$a^{(s)}(M, p) = \sup_X \{r \mid \exists \text{ an } s\text{-dimensional complex submanifold } X \\ \text{whose order of vanishing of } \rho|_X \text{ at } p \text{ is } r\}.$$

T. Bloom (1981):

(ii) The s -vector field type $t^{(s)}(M, p)$:

T. Bloom (1981):

(ii) The s -vector field type $t^{(s)}(M, p)$:

Let B be an s -dimensional subbundle of $T^{1,0}M$. We let $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$ be the $C^\infty(M)$ -module spanned by the smooth tangential $(1,0)$ vector fields L with $L|_q \in B|_q$ for each $q \in M$, together with the conjugate of these vector fields.

(ii) The s -vector field type $t^{(s)}(M, p)$:

Let B be an s -dimensional subbundle of $T^{1,0}M$. We let $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$ be the $C^\infty(M)$ -module spanned by the smooth tangential $(1, 0)$ vector fields L with $L|_q \in B|_q$ for each $q \in M$, together with the conjugate of these vector fields.

For $\mu \geq 1$, we let $\mathcal{M}_\mu(B)$ denote the $C^\infty(M)$ -module spanned by commutators of length less than or equal to μ of vector fields from $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$. A commutator of length μ of vector fields in $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$ is a vector field of the following form: $[Y_\mu, [Y_{\mu-1}, \dots, [Y_2, Y_1] \dots]]$. Here $Y_j \in \mathcal{M}_1(B)$.

T. Bloom (1981):

Define $t^{(s)}(B, p) = m$ if $\langle F, \partial\rho \rangle(p) = 0$ for any $F \in \mathcal{M}_{m-1}(B)$ but $\langle G, \partial\rho \rangle(p) \neq 0$ for a certain $G \in \mathcal{M}_m(B)$. Then

T. Bloom (1981):

Define $t^{(s)}(B, p) = m$ if $\langle F, \partial\rho \rangle(p) = 0$ for any $F \in \mathcal{M}_{m-1}(B)$ but $\langle G, \partial\rho \rangle(p) \neq 0$ for a certain $G \in \mathcal{M}_m(B)$. Then

$$t^{(s)}(M, p) = \sup_B \{t(B, p) \mid B \text{ is an } s\text{-dimensional subbundle of } T^{1,0}M\}.$$

T. Bloom (1981):

Define $t^{(s)}(B, p) = m$ if $\langle F, \partial\rho \rangle(p) = 0$ for any $F \in \mathcal{M}_{m-1}(B)$ but $\langle G, \partial\rho \rangle(p) \neq 0$ for a certain $G \in \mathcal{M}_m(B)$. Then

$$t^{(s)}(M, p) = \sup_B \{t(B, p) \mid B \text{ is an } s\text{-dimensional subbundle of } T^{1,0}M\}.$$

$t^{(s)}(B, p)$ is the smallest length of the commutators by vector fields in $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$ to recover the complex contact direction in $\mathbb{C}T_pM$. $t^{(s)}(M, p)$ is the largest possible value among all $t^{(s)}(B, p)$'s. Namely, $t^{(s)}(M, p)$ describes the most degenerate s -subbundle of $T^{1,0}M$.

(iii) The s -type of the Levi form $c^{(s)}(M, p)$:

T. Bloom (1981):

(iii) The s -type of the Levi form $c^{(s)}(M, p)$:

Let B be as in (ii). Let $\mathcal{L}_{M,p}$ be a Levi form associated with a defining function ρ near p of M . For $V_B = \{L_1, \dots, L_s\}$, a basis of smooth sections of B near p , we define the trace of $\mathcal{L}_{M,p}$ along V_B by

(iii) The s -type of the Levi form $c^{(s)}(M, p)$:

Let B be as in (ii). Let $\mathcal{L}_{M,p}$ be a Levi form associated with a defining function ρ near p of M . For $V_B = \{L_1, \dots, L_s\}$, a basis of smooth sections of B near p , we define the trace of $\mathcal{L}_{M,p}$ along V_B by

$$\mathrm{tr}_{V_B} \mathcal{L}_{M,p} = \sum_{j=1}^s \langle [L_j, \bar{L}_j], \partial\rho \rangle(p).$$

T. Bloom (1981):

We define $c(V_B, p) = m$ if for any $m - 3$ vector fields F_1, \dots, F_{m-3} of $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$, and any basis of sections of B , it holds that

$$F_1 \cdots F_{m-3}(\mathrm{tr}_{V_B} \mathcal{L}_{M,p})(p) = 0$$

T. Bloom (1981):

We define $c(V_B, p) = m$ if for any $m - 3$ vector fields F_1, \dots, F_{m-3} of $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$, and any basis of sections of B , it holds that

$$F_1 \cdots F_{m-3}(\mathrm{tr}_{V_B} \mathcal{L}_{M,p})(p) = 0$$

and for a certain choice of $m - 2$ vector fields G_1, \dots, G_{m-2} of $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$, and a certain choice of sections of B , we have

$$G_1 \cdots G_{m-2}(\mathrm{tr}_{V_B} \mathcal{L}_{M,p})(p) \neq 0.$$

T. Bloom (1981):

We define $c(V_B, p) = m$ if for any $m - 3$ vector fields F_1, \dots, F_{m-3} of $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$, and any basis of sections of B , it holds that

$$F_1 \cdots F_{m-3}(\mathrm{tr}_{V_B} \mathcal{L}_{M,p})(p) = 0$$

and for a certain choice of $m - 2$ vector fields G_1, \dots, G_{m-2} of $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$, and a certain choice of sections of B , we have

$$G_1 \cdots G_{m-2}(\mathrm{tr}_{V_B} \mathcal{L}_{M,p})(p) \neq 0.$$

Then

$$c^{(s)}(M, p) = \sup_B \{c(V_B, p) : B \text{ is an } s\text{-dimensional subbundle of } T^{1,0}M\}.$$

- The first invariant is more of algebraic, comparatively more easily to compute

- The first invariant is more of algebraic, comparatively more easily to compute
- The second is defined in a way more of differential geometry

- The first invariant is more of algebraic, comparatively more easily to compute
- The second is defined in a way more of differential geometry
- The third invariant is defined by the degeneracy of the Levi form, it is always more easily to be applied.

- **Bloom-Graham (1977):** $a^{(n-1)}(M, p) = t^{(n-1)}(M, p)$.
- **Bloom (1978):** $a^{(n-1)}(M, p) = c^{(n-1)}(M, p)$.

- **Bloom-Graham (1977):** $a^{(n-1)}(M, p) = t^{(n-1)}(M, p)$.
- **Bloom (1978):** $a^{(n-1)}(M, p) = c^{(n-1)}(M, p)$.
- **Bloom (1981):** For any $1 \leq s \leq n - 1$, $a^{(s)}(M, p) \leq t^{(s)}(M, p)$,
 $a^{(s)}(M, p) \leq c^{(s)}(M, p)$.

- **Bloom-Graham (1977):** $a^{(n-1)}(M, p) = t^{(n-1)}(M, p)$.
- **Bloom (1978):** $a^{(n-1)}(M, p) = c^{(n-1)}(M, p)$.
- **Bloom (1981):** For any $1 \leq s \leq n - 1$, $a^{(s)}(M, p) \leq t^{(s)}(M, p)$,
 $a^{(s)}(M, p) \leq c^{(s)}(M, p)$.

For these results, pseudo-convexity is not necessary.

- **Conjecture:** When M is pseudo-convex, for $1 \leq s \leq n-1$, $a^{(s)}(M, p) = t^{(s)}(M, p) = c^{(s)}(M, p)$.

- **Conjecture:** When M is pseudo-convex, for $1 \leq s \leq n-1$, $a^{(s)}(M, p) = t^{(s)}(M, p) = c^{(s)}(M, p)$.
- pseudo-convexity is necessary in this conjecture:

- **Conjecture:** When M is pseudo-convex, for $1 \leq s \leq n-1$, $a^{(s)}(M, p) = t^{(s)}(M, p) = c^{(s)}(M, p)$.
- pseudo-convexity is necessary in this conjecture:

Let $\rho = 2\operatorname{Re}(w) + (z_2 + \bar{z}_2 + |z_1|^2)^2$ and let $M = \{(z_1, z_2, w) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \mid \rho = 0\}$. Let $p = (0, 0, 0)$. Then $a^{(1)}(M, p) = 4$ but $c^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = \infty$.

- **Conjecture:** When M is pseudo-convex, for $1 \leq s \leq n-1$, $a^{(s)}(M, p) = t^{(s)}(M, p) = c^{(s)}(M, p)$.
- pseudo-convexity is necessary in this conjecture:
Let $\rho = 2\operatorname{Re}(w) + (z_2 + \bar{z}_2 + |z_1|^2)^2$ and let $M = \{(z_1, z_2, w) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \mid \rho = 0\}$. Let $p = (0, 0, 0)$. Then $a^{(1)}(M, p) = 4$ but $c^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = \infty$.
- When $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$, $a^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p)$.

Huang-Y. (2021): When M is pseudo-convex,

$$a^{(n-2)}(M, p) = t^{(n-2)}(M, p) = c^{(n-2)}(M, p).$$

In particular, this gives a complete solution for $n = 3$.

Huang-Y. (2021): When M is pseudo-convex,

$$a^{(n-2)}(M, p) = t^{(n-2)}(M, p) = c^{(n-2)}(M, p).$$

In particular, this gives a complete solution for $n = 3$.

Chen-Chen-Y. (2021): Suppose that M is pseudo-convex, the Levi form at p has only one degenerate eigenvalue. Then $a^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p)$.

Huang-Y. (2021): When M is pseudo-convex,

$$a^{(n-2)}(M, p) = t^{(n-2)}(M, p) = c^{(n-2)}(M, p).$$

In particular, this gives a complete solution for $n = 3$.

Chen-Chen-Y. (2021): Suppose that M is pseudo-convex, the Levi form at p has only one degenerate eigenvalue. Then $a^{(1)}(M, p) = t^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p)$.

(In this case, $a^{(1)}(M, p) = c^{(1)}(M, p)$ is due to Abdallah TALHAOUI (1983))

A Conjecture of D'Angelo (1986)

Suppose M is pseudoconvex. Then for any fixed $(1, 0)$ tangent vector field L , we have $t^{(1)}(L, p) = c^{(1)}(L, p)$.

A Conjecture of D'Angelo (1986)

Suppose M is pseudoconvex. Then for any fixed $(1, 0)$ tangent vector field L , we have $t^{(1)}(L, p) = c^{(1)}(L, p)$.

D'Angelo 1986: $t^{(1)}(L, p) = 4$ if and only if $c^{(1)}(L, p) = 4$.

A Conjecture of D'Angelo (1986)

Suppose M is pseudoconvex. Then for any fixed $(1, 0)$ tangent vector field L , we have $t^{(1)}(L, p) = c^{(1)}(L, p)$.

D'Angelo 1986: $t^{(1)}(L, p) = 4$ if and only if $c^{(1)}(L, p) = 4$.

Chen-Y.-Yuan 2020: $t^{(1)}(L, p) = c^{(1)}(L, p)$ if $n = 3$.

A Conjecture of D'Angelo (1986)

Suppose M is pseudoconvex. Then for any fixed $(1, 0)$ tangent vector field L , we have $t^{(1)}(L, p) = c^{(1)}(L, p)$.

D'Angelo 1986: $t^{(1)}(L, p) = 4$ if and only if $c^{(1)}(L, p) = 4$.

Chen-Y.-Yuan 2020: $t^{(1)}(L, p) = c^{(1)}(L, p)$ if $n = 3$.

Chen-Chen-Y. (2021): Suppose that M is pseudo-convex, the Levi form at p has only one degenerate eigenvalue. Then, for any fixed $(1, 0)$ tangent vector field L , we have $t^{(1)}(L, p) = c^{(1)}(L, p)$.

The D'Angelo finite type

The first D'Angelo finite type:

$$\Delta_1(M, 0) = \sup_{z: (\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, z_0)} \frac{\mu(z^*r)}{\mu(z)}$$

The D'Angelo finite type

The first D'Angelo finite type:

$$\Delta_1(M, 0) = \sup_{z: (\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, z_0)} \frac{\mu(z^* r)}{\mu(z)}$$

The general D'Angelo finite type:

$$\Delta_q(M, 0) = \inf_{\phi: (\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, z_0)} \Delta_1(\phi^* M, 0).$$

Here $\phi : (\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, z_0)$ is a linear embedding.

The D'Angelo finite type

The first D'Angelo finite type:

$$\Delta_1(M, 0) = \sup_{z: (\mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, z_0)} \frac{\mu(z^* r)}{\mu(z)}$$

The general D'Angelo finite type:

$$\Delta_q(M, 0) = \inf_{\phi: (\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, z_0)} \Delta_1(\phi^* M, 0).$$

Here $\phi : (\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n, z_0)$ is a linear embedding.

When z is required to be regular, this is exactly the regular finite type.

The Catlin multitype

Let Γ_n denote the set of all n -tuple of numbers $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ with $1 \leq \lambda_i \leq \infty$ such that $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$.

The Catlin multitype

Let Γ_n denote the set of all n -tuple of numbers $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ with $1 \leq \lambda_i \leq \infty$ such that $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$.

Γ_n is called a weight if for each k , either $\lambda_k = +\infty$ or there is a set of nonnegative integers a_1, \dots, a_k with $a_k > 0$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{a_j}{\lambda_j} = 1$

The Catlin multitype

Let Γ_n denote the set of all n -tuple of numbers $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ with $1 \leq \lambda_i \leq \infty$ such that $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$.

Γ_n is called a weight if for each k , either $\lambda_k = +\infty$ or there is a set of nonnegative integers a_1, \dots, a_k with $a_k > 0$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{a_j}{\lambda_j} = 1$

Order of the weights: Let $\Lambda' = (\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_n)$ and $\Lambda'' = (\lambda''_1, \dots, \lambda''_n)$.
 $\Lambda' < \Lambda''$ if for some k , $\lambda'_j = \lambda''_j$ for $j < k$ and $\lambda'_k < \lambda''_k$.

The Catlin multitype

A weight $\Lambda \in \Gamma_n$ is said to be distinguished if there exist holomorphic coordinates (z_1, \dots, z_n) about z_0 with z_0 mapped to the origin such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n D^\alpha \overline{D^\beta} \rho(z_0) = 0 \text{ for } \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\alpha_j + \beta_j}{\lambda_j} < 1.$$

The Catlin multitype

A weight $\Lambda \in \Gamma_n$ is said to be distinguished if there exist holomorphic coordinates (z_1, \dots, z_n) about z_0 with z_0 mapped to the origin such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n D^\alpha \overline{D}^\beta \rho(z_0) = 0 \text{ for } \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\alpha_j + \beta_j}{\lambda_j} < 1.$$

The multitype $\mathcal{M}(z_0)$ is defined to be the smallest $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \Gamma_n$ such that for every distinguished weight Λ , we have $\mathcal{M}(z_0) \geq \Lambda$.

The Catlin multitype

A weight $\Lambda \in \Gamma_n$ is said to be distinguished if there exist holomorphic coordinates (z_1, \dots, z_n) about z_0 with z_0 mapped to the origin such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n D^\alpha \overline{D}^\beta \rho(z_0) = 0 \text{ for } \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\alpha_j + \beta_j}{\lambda_j} < 1.$$

The multitype $\mathcal{M}(z_0)$ is defined to be the smallest $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \Gamma_n$ such that for every distinguished weight Λ , we have $\mathcal{M}(z_0) \geq \Lambda$.

Notice that the Catlin multitype has a equivalent description by means of the degeneracy of the Levi form (in some sense) similar to the definition of $c^{(s)}(M, p)$, which is crucial to Catlin's solution of Kohn's subelliptic estimates problem.

Example: Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ be a real hypersurface defined by

$$r = -2\operatorname{Im}w + |z_1|^4 + |z_1|^2|z_2|^2 + |z_1|^2|z_3|^2 + |z_2^2 - z_3^3|^4.$$

Relation between these invariants

Example: Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ be a real hypersurface defined by

$$r = -2\operatorname{Im}w + |z_1|^4 + |z_1|^2|z_2|^2 + |z_1|^2|z_3|^2 + |z_2^2 - z_3^3|^4.$$

The Caltin multitypes at 0 are 4, 4, 4,

The Bloom regular contact types are 4, 8, 12,

The D'Angelo finite types are 4, 8, $+\infty$.

Relation between these invariants

Yu 1992: When D is convex and $M = \partial D$, then Caltin multi-type = D'Angelo finite type.

Relation between these invariants

Yu 1992: When D is convex and $M = \partial D$, then Caltin multi-type = D'Angelo finite type.

Fu-Isaev-Krantz 1998: When D is a Reinhardt domain and $M = \partial D$, then regular multi-type a^1 = D'Angelo finite type Δ_1 , Caltin multitype and D'Angelo finite type may be different.

Relation between these invariants

Yu 1992: When D is convex and $M = \partial D$, then Caltin multi-type = D'Angelo finite type.

Fu-Isaev-Krantz 1998: When D is a Reinhardt domain and $M = \partial D$, then regular multi-type α^1 = D'Angelo finite type Δ_1 , Caltin multitype and D'Angelo finite type may be different.

It seems to me that the Bloom Conjecture for the boundary of a convex domain is also unknown.

Kohn's finite ideal type

As before, let D be a smooth pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . $x_0 \in M = bD$.

Kohn's finite ideal type

As before, let D be a smooth pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . $x_0 \in M = bD$.

Denote by $I^q(x_0)$ the set of germs of multipliers satisfying the following:

\exists a neighborhood U of x_0 , $f \in C_0^\infty(U \cap \bar{D})$ such that there are $C, \epsilon > 0$ for which

$$\|f\phi\|_\epsilon^2 \leq C(\|\bar{\partial}\phi\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*\phi\|^2)$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^{(p,q)}(U \cap D)$.

J. Kohn inductively defined the ideals $I_k^q(x_0)$ as follows:

$$I_1^q(x_0) = \sqrt[r]{r, \text{coeff.}\{\partial r \wedge \bar{\partial} r \wedge (\partial\bar{\partial}r)^{n-q}\}}.$$

$$I_{k+1}^q(x_0) = \sqrt[r]{I_k^q(x_0), \text{coeff.}\{\partial f_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \partial f_j \wedge \partial r \wedge \bar{\partial} r \wedge (\partial\bar{\partial}r)^{n-q-j}\}}.$$

Here $f_1, \dots, f_j \in I_k^q(x_0)$.

J. Kohn inductively defined the ideals $I_k^q(x_0)$ as follows:

$$I_1^q(x_0) = \sqrt[r]{r, \text{coeff.}\{\partial r \wedge \bar{\partial} r \wedge (\partial\bar{\partial}r)^{n-q}\}}.$$

$$I_{k+1}^q(x_0) = \sqrt[r]{I_k^q(x_0), \text{coeff.}\{\partial f_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \partial f_j \wedge \partial r \wedge \bar{\partial} r \wedge (\partial\bar{\partial}r)^{n-q-j}\}}.$$

Here $f_1, \dots, f_j \in I_k^q(x_0)$.

We say x_0 is of finite ideal type with respect to (p, q) forms if there is a integer k such that $1 \in I_k^q(x_0)$.

Theorem (J. Kohn 1979:)

Let D be a pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n with real analytic boundary. Then $1 \in I_k^q(x_0)$ if and only if $\Delta_q(M, x_0) < \infty$.

Back to the subelliptic estimates

Theorem (J. Kohn 1979:)

Let D be a pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n with real analytic boundary. Then $1 \in I_k^q(x_0)$ if and only if $\Delta_q(M, x_0) < \infty$.

Theorem (D. Catlin 1987:)

Let D be a pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n with smooth boundary. Then subelliptic estimates holds for (p, q) forms if and only if $\Delta_q(M, x_0) < \infty$.

Let the domain is defined by

$r = 2\operatorname{Re}(w) + |f_1(z)|^2 + \cdots + |f_m(z)|^2$, which is of D'Angelo finite type at the boundary point x_0 .

Let the domain is defined by

$r = 2\operatorname{Re}(w) + |f_1(z)|^2 + \cdots + |f_m(z)|^2$, which is of D'Angelo finite type at the boundary point x_0 .

Siu(2010,2017): $1 \in I_\epsilon(x_0)$ with some ϵ bounded by constant depends on the finite type.

Kim-Zaitsev (2021): give a explicit effective bound.

Sketch of the proof for $n = 3$

- Find some special $L \in T^{(1,0)}M'$, with M' another pseudoconvex hypersurface and L with weighted homogeneous coefficients.

Sketch of the proof for $n = 3$

- Find some special $L \in T^{(1,0)}M'$, with M' another pseudoconvex hypersurface and L with weighted homogeneous coefficients.
- By the Nagano theorem, the Lie algebra generated by $Re(L)$, ImL and their Lie brackets gives a unique homogeneous integral submanifold N^0 .

Sketch of the proof for $n = 3$

- Find some special $L \in T^{(1,0)}M'$, with M' another pseudoconvex hypersurface and L with weighted homogeneous coefficients.
- By the Nagano theorem, the Lie algebra generated by $Re(L)$, ImL and their Lie brackets gives a unique homogeneous integral submanifold N^0 .
- The given condition means that the T direction is always transversal to N^0 at any point of N^0 . Hence the dimension of N^0 must be 3 or 4.

Sketch of the proof for $n = 3$

- Find some special $L \in T^{(1,0)}M'$, with M' another pseudoconvex hypersurface and L with weighted homogeneous coefficients.
- By the Nagano theorem, the Lie algebra generated by $Re(L)$, ImL and their Lie brackets gives a unique homogeneous integral submanifold N^0 .
- The given condition means that the T direction is always transversal to N^0 at any point of N^0 . Hence the dimension of N^0 must be 3 or 4.
- Comparing with Bloom's proof of $a^{(1)}(M, 0) = c^{(1)}(M, 0)$, we need to replace two deep theorems by K. Diederich and J. Forneaess (Annals, 1978).

Sketch of the proof

Theorem 1: Let S be a C^2 -submanifold of a pseudoconvex C^4 -hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Let X, Y be C^1 -vector fields on S with values in $T^N S$. Then the vector field $[X, Y]$ also has values in $T^N S$ along S .

For all $p \in S$,

$$T_p^N S = \{X \in T_p S : X = \operatorname{Re} Y, Y \in T_p^{(1,0)} M, \partial \bar{\partial} \rho(Y, \bar{Y})(p) = 0\}.$$

Sketch of the proof

Theorem 2: Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a pseudoconvex C^∞ hypersurface with $0 \in M$ and $S \subset M$ a C^∞ -CR submanifold, $0 \in S$, with the following properties:

Theorem 2: Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a pseudoconvex C^∞ hypersurface with $0 \in M$ and $S \subset M$ a C^∞ -CR submanifold, $0 \in S$, with the following properties:

- $S \subset \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$, $\text{rank } T^{(1,0)} = q$, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} S = 2q + r$ with $q + r = n - 1$.
- $TS = T^N S$
- By taking subsequent brackets of C^∞ vector fields with values in $T^h S$ one generates the whole tangent bundle TS .

Theorem 2: Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a pseudoconvex C^∞ hypersurface with $0 \in M$ and $S \subset M$ a C^∞ -CR submanifold, $0 \in S$, with the following properties:

- $S \subset \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$, $\text{rank } T^{(1,0)} = q$, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} S = 2q + r$ with $q + r = n - 1$.
- $TS = T^N S$
- By taking subsequent brackets of C^∞ vector fields with values in $T^h S$ one generates the whole tangent bundle TS .

Then in any neighborhood of 0 , there is a relatively open set \hat{U} on M such that $\mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$ is tangent to bM of infinite order at all points $z \in \hat{U}$.

Theorem 1': Let N be a real analytic hypersurface in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} with $0 \in N$ with $n \geq 3$. Let $\rho(z, \bar{z})$ be a real analytic plurisubharmonic function with $\rho = O(|z|^2)$ as $z \rightarrow 0$ defined over a neighborhood of \mathbb{C}^{n-1} . Assume that N is of finite type in the sense of Hörmander–Bloom–Graham and $N \subset \{\rho = 0\}$. Then $\rho \equiv 0$.

Sketch of the proof

Theorem 2': Define the weight of z_1 and \bar{z}_1 to be 1, the weight of z_2 and \bar{z}_2 to be $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k > 1$. Let $A = A(z_1, \bar{z}_1)$ be a homogenous polynomial of degree $k - 1$ in (z_1, \bar{z}_1) without holomorphic terms. Suppose that f is a weighted homogeneous polynomial in (z, \bar{z}) of weighted degree $m > k$. Further assume that $\operatorname{Re}(f)$ is plurisubharmonic, contains no non-trivial holomorphic terms and assume that f satisfies the following equation:

$$f_{\bar{z}_1}(z, \bar{z}) + \overline{A(z_1, \bar{z}_1)} f_{\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) = 0. \quad (0.1)$$

Then $\operatorname{Re}(f) \equiv 0$.

The main difficulties

Suppose the hypersurface M is defined by $r = 0$ and a real submanifold N is defined by $\rho_1 = \cdots = \rho_m = 0$.

The main difficulties

Suppose the hypersurface M is defined by $r = 0$ and a real submanifold N is defined by $\rho_1 = \cdots = \rho_m = 0$.

- In Diederich-Fornaess's Theorem, the problem is reduced to :
 N CR manifold and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0) = O(|\rho|^2)$.

The main difficulties

Suppose the hypersurface M is defined by $r = 0$ and a real submanifold N is defined by $\rho_1 = \cdots = \rho_m = 0$.

- In Diederich-Fornaess's Theorem, the problem is reduced to :
 N CR manifold and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0) = O(|\rho|^2)$.
- In Theorem 1', the problem is reduced to
 N CR manifold of finite type and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0) = O(|\rho|)$.

The main difficulties

Suppose the hypersurface M is defined by $r = 0$ and a real submanifold N is defined by $\rho_1 = \cdots = \rho_m = 0$.

- In Diederich-Fornaess's Theorem, the problem is reduced to :
 N CR manifold and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0) = O(|\rho|^2)$.
- In Theorem 1', the problem is reduced to
 N CR manifold of finite type and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0) = O(|\rho|)$.
- In Theorem 2', we need to solve a PDE with the real part plurisubharmonic.

The main difficulties

Suppose the hypersurface M is defined by $r = 0$ and a real submanifold N is defined by $\rho_1 = \cdots = \rho_m = 0$.

- In Diederich-Fornaess's Theorem, the problem is reduced to :
 N CR manifold and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0) = O(|\rho|^2)$.
- In Theorem 1', the problem is reduced to
 N CR manifold of finite type and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0) = O(|\rho|)$.
- In Theorem 2', we need to solve a PDE with the real part plurisubharmonic.
- For higher dimensional case, we have to deal with the case:
 N CR-singular manifold and $r(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}, 0)|_N$ satisfies some PDE but is non-zero.

Thank you!

Thank you for your attention!