

ON EXTREMALITY OF TWO CONNECTED LOCALLY  
EXTREMAL BELTRAMI COEFFICIENTS

GUOWU YAO

Let  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  be two domains in the complex plane with a nonempty intersection. Suppose that  $\mu_j$  are locally extremal Beltrami coefficients in  $\Omega_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) respectively. In 1980, Sheretov posed the problem: Will the coefficient  $\mu$  defined by the condition  $\mu(z) = \mu_j(z)$  for  $z \in \Omega_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , be locally extremal in  $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ ? We give a counterexample to show that  $\mu$  may not be locally extremal and not even be extremal.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a domain in the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  with at least two boundary points and Let  $M(\mathcal{D})$  be the open unit ball of  $L^\infty(\mathcal{D})$ . Every element  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{D})$  can be regarded as an element in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{C})$  by putting  $\mu$  equal to zero in the outside of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Every  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{D})$  induces a global quasiconformal self-mapping  $f$  of the plane which solves the Beltrami equation [1],

$$(1) \quad f_{\bar{z}}(z) = \mu(z)f_z(z),$$

and  $f$  is defined uniquely up to postcomposition by a complex affine map of the plane. Conversely, any quasiconformal mapping  $f$  defined on  $\mathcal{D}$  has a Beltrami coefficient  $\mu(z) = f_{\bar{z}}(z)/f_z(z)$  in  $M(\mathcal{D})$ .

Two Beltrami coefficients  $\mu, \nu \in M(\mathcal{D})$  are equivalent if they induce quasiconformal mappings  $f$  and  $g$  by (1) such that there is a conformal map  $c$  from  $f(\mathcal{D})$  to  $g(\mathcal{D})$  and an isotopy through quasiconformal mappings  $h_t$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , from  $\mathcal{D}$  to  $\mathcal{D}$  which extend continuously to the boundary of  $\mathcal{D}$  such that

1.  $h_0(z)$  is identically equal to  $z$  on  $\mathcal{D}$ ,
2.  $h_1$  is identically to  $g^{-1} \circ c \circ f$ , and
3.  $h_t(p) = g^{-1} \circ c \circ f(p)$  for any  $p \in \partial\mathcal{D}$ .

---

Received 22nd July, 2004

The author was supported by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10401036).

Copyright Clearance Centre, Inc. Serial-fee code: 0004-9727/05 \$A2.00+0.00.

The equivalence relation partitions  $M(\mathcal{D})$  into equivalence classes and the space of equivalence classes is by definition the Teichmüller space  $T(\mathcal{D})$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Given  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{D})$ , we denote by  $[\mu]$  the set of all elements  $\nu \in M(\mathcal{D})$  equivalent to  $\mu$ , and set

$$k_0([\mu]) = \inf\{\|\nu\|_\infty : \nu \in [\mu]\}.$$

We say that  $\mu$  is extremal (in  $[\mu]$ ) if  $\|\mu\|_\infty = k_0([\mu])$ ,  $\mu$  is uniquely extremal if  $\|\nu\|_\infty > k_0([\mu])$  for any other  $\nu \in [\mu]$ ; the alternative is that  $\mu$  is non-uniquely extremal.

We define  $A(\mathcal{D})$  as the Banach space of all holomorphic functions  $\varphi$  on  $\mathcal{D}$  with  $L^1$ -norm

$$\|\varphi\| = \iint_{\mathcal{D}} |\varphi(z)| < \infty.$$

As is well known, a necessary and sufficient condition (Hamilton-Krushkal-Reich-Strebel condition) that a Beltrami coefficient  $\mu$  is extremal in its class in  $T(\mathcal{D})$  is that [4] it has a so-called Hamilton sequence, namely, a sequence  $\{\phi_n \in A(\mathcal{D}) : \|\phi_n\| = 1, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , such that

$$(2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{\mathcal{D}} \mu \phi_n(z) \, dx \, dy = \|\mu\|_\infty.$$

A Beltrami coefficient  $\mu$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  is called to be locally extremal if for any domain  $G \subset \mathcal{D}$  it is extremal in its class in  $T(G)$ ; in other words,

$$\|\mu\|_G := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{z \in G} |\mu| = \sup \left\{ \frac{|\iint_G \mu \phi_n(z) \, dx \, dy|}{\|\phi\|} : \phi \in A(G) \right\}.$$

Obviously, extremality in the whole domain is a prerequisite for a Beltrami coefficient to be locally extremal.

In [6], Sheretov investigated locally extremal Beltrami coefficients and posed the following problem: Let  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  be two domains with  $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose that  $\mu_j$  are locally extremal Beltrami coefficients in  $\Omega_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) respectively. Will the coefficient  $\mu$  defined by the condition  $\mu(z) = \mu_j(z)$  for  $z \in \Omega_j, j = 1, 2$ , be locally extremal in  $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ ?

The main purpose of this paper is to give a negative answer to the above problem in a stronger sense. We shall construct certain counterexample in the next section.

## 2. CONSTRUCTION OF COUNTEREXAMPLE

If  $\mu$  in  $M(\mathcal{D})$  is uniquely extremal in its class  $[\mu]$  in  $T(\mathcal{D})$ , then it is obviously locally extremal. But the converse is not true for which here we include the example constructed in [2, Theorem 2.2] by Reich.

Reich’s example: We denote the parabolic region  $\Omega_0$  by

$$\Omega_0 = \{z = x + iy : x > y^2, x > 0\}.$$

In  $\Omega_0$ , we define  $\mu(z) \equiv k$  where  $k \in (0, 1)$  is a constant. Examining the proof of [2, Theorem 2.2], we find that

$$\sup \left\{ \frac{|\iint_G \mu(z)\phi(z) dx dy|}{\iint_G |\phi| dx dy} : \phi(z) \in A(\Omega_0) \right\} = k$$

for any positive measure subset  $G$  of  $\Omega_0$ . This relation indicates that  $\mu$  is locally extremal in  $\Omega_0$ . But, it is well known that  $\mu$  is not uniquely extremal (see [2, 3]).

In our counterexample to Sheretov’s problem,  $\mu_j, j = 1, 2$ , are uniquely extremal while  $\mu$  may not be locally extremal and not even be extremal in its corresponding class.

EXAMPLE 1. Let  $\Delta$  be the unit disk  $\{z : |z| < 1\}$ . Put

$$\Omega_1 = \left\{ z \in \Delta : \arg z \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \right\}, \quad \Omega_2 = \left\{ z \in \Delta : |\arg z| > \frac{\pi}{4} \right\}.$$

Obviously,  $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 = \Delta^* = \Delta - \{0\}$  and  $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Set  $\mu = k\bar{\varphi}/|\varphi$  on  $\Delta$ , where  $k \in (0, 1)$  is a constant and  $\varphi(z) = 1/z^2$ . Let  $\mu_j (j = 1, 2)$  be the restrictions of  $\mu$  on  $\Omega_j$ , respectively. We claim that  $\mu_j$  are uniquely extremal in their classes in  $T(\Omega_j)$ , respectively.

Suppose the conformal mapping  $z = F(\zeta)$  maps  $\Delta_\zeta = \{|\zeta| < 1\}$  onto  $\Omega_1$ . The question becomes that of determining whether the Beltrami coefficient

$$\tilde{\mu} = k \frac{\overline{\varphi \circ F} \overline{F'(\zeta)^2}}{|\varphi \circ F| |F'(\zeta)|^2}$$

is extremal or uniquely extremal in its class in  $T(\Delta_\zeta)$ . Set

$$\psi(\zeta) = (\varphi \circ F)F'(\zeta)^2.$$

Because the conformal mapping  $F^{-1}$  transfers the second order pole of  $\varphi(z)$  to the second order pole of  $\psi(\zeta)$ , it is not difficult to see that  $\psi(\zeta)$  is holomorphic in  $\Delta_\zeta$  and is meromorphic in  $\overline{\Delta_\zeta}$  except that it has a pole of second order at  $\zeta = F^{-1}(0)$ . Thus, by [5, Theorem 6],  $\tilde{\mu}$  is uniquely extremal in its class in  $T(\Delta_\zeta)$ , and hence  $\mu_1$  is uniquely extremal in its class in  $T(\Omega_1)$ . Similarly,  $\mu_2$  is uniquely extremal in its class in  $T(\Omega_2)$ .

However,  $\mu$  is not even extremal in  $[\mu]$  in  $T(\Delta^*)$ . In fact, noting that  $\{z^n : n = -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  is a base of the Banach space  $A(\Delta^*)$  and

$$\iint_{\Delta^*} \mu(z)\phi(z) dx dy = \iint_{\Delta^*} k \frac{z^2}{|z|^2} z^n dx dy = 0, \quad n = -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

it follows readily that

$$\sup \left\{ \left| \iint_{\Delta^*} \mu(z)\phi(z) dx dy \right| / \|\phi\| : \phi(z) \in A(\Delta^*) \right\} = 0.$$

Thus,  $\mu$  is not extremal in its class in  $T(\Delta^*)$  by the condition of Hamilton sequence. And hence,  $\mu$  is not locally extremal in  $\Delta^*$ .

Notice that in the above example,  $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$  contains two connected components. If the condition  $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \neq \emptyset$  in the original problem replaced by that  $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$  is connected, what situation should be? Up to the present, we can not find such a counterexample.

REMARK 1. After the completion of this paper I have become aware of a paper with related result: Zhong Li et al., An extremal problem of quasiconformal maps, to appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] L.V. Ahlfors and L. Bers, 'Riemann's mapping theorem for variable metrics', *Ann. Math.* **72** (1960), 385–404.
- [2] E. Reich, 'On the uniqueness question for Hahn-Banach extensions from the space of  $L^1$  analytic functions', *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **88** (1983), 305–310.
- [3] E. Reich and K. Strebel, 'On the extremality of certain Teichmüller mappings', *Comment. Math. Helv.* **45** (1970), 353–362.
- [4] E. Reich and K. Strebel, 'Extremal quasiconformal mappings with given boundary values', in *Contributions to Analysis, A Collection of Papers Dedicated to Lipman Bers* (Academic Press, New York, 1974), pp. 375–392.
- [5] G.C. Sethares, 'The extremal property of certain Teichmüller mappings', *Comment. Math. Helv.* **43** (1968), 98–119.
- [6] V.G. Sheretov, 'Locally extremal quasiconformal mappings', *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **21** (1980), 343–345.

Institute of Mathematics  
Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science  
Chinese Academy of Sciences  
Beijing 100080  
People's Republic of China  
e-mail: wallgreat@lycos.com