

ON THE AUTOMORPHISM GROUP OF SOME SPECIAL $S^1.O(n, R)$ -INVARIANT DOMAINS IN \mathbb{C}^n

NABIL OURIMI¹

ABSTRACT. In this note, we develop a new method to determine the automorphism group of some special $S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant domains in \mathbb{C}^n with singular boundary, that can be interesting for more general convex domains in \mathbb{C}^n . In particular, it can be applied in the case of the minimal ball introduced in [4] as a solution of the problem of the minimal norm in \mathbb{C}^n .

1. INTRODUCTION AND RESULTS

The Riemann conformal mapping theorem asserts that a simply connected domain in \mathbb{C} , different from \mathbb{C} , is biholomorphically equivalent to the open unit disc. The situation is quite different in several complex variables : a small perturbation of the unit ball \mathbb{B}^n in \mathbb{C}^n can be nonequivalent to \mathbb{B}^n , even if it is simply connected. This shows that a domain is not completely described by its topological properties. The structure of the automorphism group depends in an essential way of the structure of the boundary of the domain. A fundamental result showing this fact is due to Wong-Rosay ([11], [13]), stating that a strongly pseudoconvex bounded domain in \mathbb{C}^n with a noncompact automorphism group is biholomorphic to the unit ball. However, the automorphism group of a strongly pseudoconvex domain may have various structure. For example, Bedford-Dadok [2] proved that every compact Lie group can be the automorphism group of a strongly pseudoconvex domain.

¹Supported by College of Science (KSU) Research Center project No. Math/2007/15
Mathematics Subject Classification. 32H40, 32H35.

Key words: Automorphism group, minimal ball, Lie ball.

For a survey of results and a rich bibliography on the subject we refer the reader to [6].

Let N_p be the function defined by :

$$N_p(z) = \left\{ \left(\frac{|z|^2 - |z^2|}{2} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + \left(\frac{|z|^2 + |z^2|}{2} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p < \infty$$

and

$$N_\infty(z) = \left(\frac{|z|^2 + |z^2|}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where $z^2 = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} z_j^2$. We consider the domain

$$B_p = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : N_p(z) < 1\}$$

and we denote by $Aut(B_p)$ its automorphism group. According to M. Baran [1] the function N_p is a norm in \mathbb{C}^n and its dual norm defined by $N_p^*(z) = \sup\{|z.w|, N_p(w) \leq 1\}$ is equal to N_q with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. This family contains the minimal ball introduced by M.K. Hahn and P. Pflug [4] for $p = \infty$, the Lie ball for $p = 1$ and the Euclidean ball for $p = 2$. The automorphism groups of these domains have been studied by several authors. K.T. Kim [8] proved that $Aut(B_\infty) = S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$ with scaling method. W. Zwolnek [14] gives an alternative proof of this result by using some geodesics in B_∞ and M. Baran [1] determined the automorphism groups of B_p for $p > 2$. See also [10] for related result (where the authors use a different approach to study the automorphism of invariant bounded domains by a compact linear group). Note that $Aut(B_p) \subset S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$.

Our aim in this note is to present a new method of proof to study the automorphism group of B_p that can be useful for more general convex domains. In particular, we determine the automorphism group of B_p for all $p > 1$. The main result is the following

Theorem. For $1 < p \leq \infty$ and $p \neq 2$, $Aut(B_p) = S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$.

For the case of the Lie ball and the Euclidean ball, their automorphism groups are well known, see for example [5] for the Lie ball and [12] for the Euclidean ball.

The proof is based on two results. The first one is the Kaup-Upmeyer theorem [7] giving the structure of the orbit :

In every complex Banach space E with open unit ball $D \subset E$ there is a closed \mathbb{C} -linear subspace $V \subset E$ such that $V \cap D$ is the orbit of the origin $0 \in E$ under the action of the automorphism group of D .

The second result is the local version of Wong-Rosay's theorem proved by S. Pinchuk [9] :

The unit ball is a model for the class of C^2 -strongly pseudoconvex domains at an accumulation point.

2. STRUCTURE OF B_p

In this section we present some properties of the boundary of B_p . Set

$$\mathbb{H} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : z^2 = 0\} \text{ and } \mathbb{K} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z|^2 = |z^2|\} = S^1 \cdot \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proposition 2.1. (a) For $1 \leq p < \infty$ the function $N_p \in C^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathbb{K})$ and $N_\infty \in C^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathbb{H})$.

(b) For $1 < p < \infty$, $N_p \in C^1(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\})$.

(c) For $2 \leq p < \infty$, $N_p \in C^2(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\})$.

Proof. (a) Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. For $z \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathbb{K}$, the function N_p can be written as :

$$N_p(z) = 2^{\frac{1-q}{p}} |z| \left(1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{q(q-1)\dots(q-2k+1)}{(2k)!} \left(\frac{|z^2|}{|z|^2} \right)^{2k} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

with $q = \frac{p}{2}$. Hence, clearly N_p belongs to $C^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathbb{K})$.

Moreover, it is easy to verify that for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{\mathbb{H} \cup \mathbb{K}\}$:

$$\frac{\partial N_p}{\partial z_j}(z) = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \left(\frac{|z|^2 - |z^2|}{2} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \left(\bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) + \left(\frac{|z|^2 + |z^2|}{2} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \left(\bar{z}_j + \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \right\}.$$

and for $z \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}$:

$$\frac{\partial N_p}{\partial z_j}(z) = 2^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\bar{z}_j}{|z|}.$$

For the case $p = \infty$ the computation is similar.

(b) Let $1 < p < \infty$. In view of (a), it suffices to prove that $N_p \in C^1(\mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\})$.

We have $\frac{\partial N_p}{\partial z_j}(w) - \frac{1}{4|z|} \left(\bar{z}_j + \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \rightarrow 0$ as $w \rightarrow z \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$, then $N_p \in C^1(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\})$ and $\frac{\partial N_p}{\partial z_j}(z) = \frac{1}{4|z|} \left(\bar{z}_j + \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$.

(c) Let now $2 \leq p < \infty$. We denote by $u(z) = |z|^2 + |z^2|$, $v(z) = |z|^2 - |z^2|$ and $q = \frac{p}{2}$. Thus, we have $N_p = \left(\frac{u^q + v^q}{2^q} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

Since the function $u^q \in C^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\})$, it suffices to verify that $v^q \in C^2(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\})$. A simple computation gives :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 v^q}{\partial z_k \partial z_j}(z) &= q(q-1)(|z|^2 - |z^2|)^{q-2} \left(\bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \left(\bar{z}_k - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_k}{|z^2|} \right) \\ &\quad + q(|z|^2 - |z^2|)^{q-1} \left(\frac{z_j \cdot z_k (\bar{z}^2)^2}{|z^2|^3} - \delta_j^k \frac{\bar{z}^2}{|z^2|} \right) \\ \frac{\partial^2 v^q}{\partial \bar{z}_k \partial z_j}(z) &= q(q-1)(|z|^2 - |z^2|)^{q-2} \left(\bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \left(z_k - \frac{z^2 \bar{z}_k}{|z^2|} \right) \\ &\quad + q(|z|^2 - |z^2|)^{q-1} \left(\delta_j^k - \frac{z_j \cdot \bar{z}_k}{|z^2|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_{j,k} \left(\bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \left(z_k - \frac{z^2 \bar{z}_k}{|z^2|} \right) = \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \right|^2 \leq 2(|z|^2 - |z^2|)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{and } \left| \sum_{j,k} \left(\bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \left(\bar{z}_k - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_k}{|z^2|} \right) \right| &= \left| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right)^2 \right| \leq \\ & \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\bar{z}_j - \frac{\bar{z}^2 z_j}{|z^2|} \right) \right|^2 \leq 2(|z|^2 - |z^2|), \end{aligned}$$

it follows that N_p is C^2 -smooth for $2 \leq p < \infty$. □

Remark. Note that if $p \in 2\mathbb{N}$, the function N_p is smooth every where except the origin.

For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we denote by $\partial\mathbb{H}_p = \mathbb{H} \cap \partial B_p$ and $\partial\mathbb{K}_p = \partial\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K} \cap \partial B_p$. Next, we give a description of the boundary of B_p .

Proposition 2.2. (a) *The set of strongly pseudoconvex boundary points of B_p is equal to $\partial B_p \setminus \partial\mathbb{K}$ for $1 < p < 2$ and is equal to $\partial B_\infty \setminus \partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$ for $p = \infty$.*

(b) *For $2 \leq p < \infty$, B_p is a strongly pseudoconvex domain.*

(c) *For $p = 1$, there is no strongly pseudoconvex boundary point.*

Proof. (a) Let $u(z) = |z|^2 + |z^2|$, $v(z) = |z|^2 - |z^2|$, $q = \frac{p}{2}$, $k = \frac{z^2}{|z^2|}$, $\lambda = \frac{u}{v}$ and $\rho_q(z) = u(z)^q + v(z)^q$. Then we have $N_p = \left(\frac{\rho_q}{2^q} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

Let $z \in \partial B_p \setminus \{\partial\mathbb{H}_p \cup \partial\mathbb{K}\}$. The complex Hessian of ρ_q at (z, ξ) is given by the formula :

$$L(\rho_q)(z, \xi) = q(q-1) \left\{ [v(z)]^{q-2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial v(z)}{\partial z_j} \xi_j \right|^2 + [u(z)]^{q-2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial u(z)}{\partial z_j} \xi_j \right|^2 \right\} +$$

$$+q \{ [v(z)]^{q-1} + |u(z)|^{q-1} \} |\xi|^2 + q|z^2|^{-1} \{ [u(z)]^{q-1} - [v(z)]^{q-1} \} | \langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle |^2$$

where $\langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle = \sum_j \xi_j z_j$.

The complex tangent space to ∂B_p at z is defined by :

$$T_z^c(\partial B_p) = \{ \xi \in \mathbb{C}^n : \langle \xi | u(z)^{q-1}(z + k\bar{z}) + v(z)^{q-1}(z - k\bar{z}) \rangle = 0 \}.$$

An element ξ belongs to $T_z^c(\partial B_p)$ if and only if it satisfies the equation:

$$\langle \xi | z \rangle = \bar{k} \frac{1 - \lambda^{q-1}}{1 + \lambda^{q-1}} \langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle.$$

On the complex tangent space, we have :

$$\sum_j \frac{\partial u}{\partial z_j}(z) \xi_j = \frac{2\bar{k}}{1 + \lambda^{q-1}} \langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle$$

$$\sum_j \frac{\partial v}{\partial z_j}(z) \xi_j = \frac{-2\bar{k}\lambda^{q-1}}{1 + \lambda^{q-1}} \langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle.$$

After simplification, the Levi-form of ρ_q at (z, ξ) is defined by the formula :

$$L(\rho_q)(z, \xi) = qv^{q-1}(1 + \lambda^{q-1})|\xi|^2 +$$

$$+2qv^{q-2} \left[\frac{\lambda^{q-1} - 1}{\lambda - 1} + 2(q-1) \frac{\lambda^{2q-2} + \lambda^{q-2}}{(1 + \lambda^{q-1})^2} \right] | \langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle |^2.$$

As $\sigma = \frac{\lambda^{q-1} - 1}{\lambda - 1} + 2(q-1) \frac{\lambda^{2q-2} + \lambda^{q-2}}{(1 + \lambda^{q-1})^2}$ is negative, we have :

$$\inf_{(\xi \in T_z^c(\partial B_p), |\xi|=1)} L(\rho_q)(z, \xi) = qv^{q-1} \left[(1 + \lambda^{q-1}) + \frac{2\sigma}{v} \max_{\xi \in T_z^c(\partial B_p)} \frac{|\langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right].$$

We compute $\max_{\xi \in T_z^c(\partial B_p)} \frac{|\langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle|^2}{|\xi|^2}$. This quantity is the square of the norm of the projection of \bar{z} on $T_z^c(\partial B_p)$. Since $T_z^c(\partial B_p)$ is the orthogonal of the vector $(\lambda^{q-1} + 1)z + k(\lambda^{q-1} - 1)\bar{z}$, a simple computation gives that

$$\max_{\xi \in T_z^c(\partial B_p)} \frac{|\langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle|^2}{|\xi|^2} = -\lambda \frac{(\lambda^{q-1} + 1)^2}{2(\lambda^{2q-1} + 1)} v.$$

It follows that :

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{(\xi \in T_z^c(\partial B_p), |\xi|=1)} L(\rho_q)(z, \xi) \\ &= qv^{q-1}(1 + \lambda^{q-1}) \left[1 + \frac{\lambda(\lambda^{q-1} + 1)}{\lambda^{2q-1} + 1} \left(\frac{\lambda^{q-1} - 1}{\lambda - 1} + 2(q-1) \frac{\lambda^{2q-2} + \lambda^{q-2}}{(1 + \lambda^{q-1})^2} \right) \right] \\ &= qv^{q-1} \frac{(\lambda^q + 1)(\lambda^{q-1} - 1)}{\lambda^{2q-1} + 1} \left[\frac{(2q-1)\lambda^{q-1}}{1 + \lambda^{q-1}} + \frac{\lambda^{2q-1} - 1}{(1 + \lambda^{q-1})(\lambda - 1)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $L(\rho_q)(z, \xi)$ is bounded below by a strictly positive expression for any $q > \frac{1}{2}$. For $q = \frac{1}{2}$ this expression is zero, then B_1 has no strict pseudoconvexity point (in (c) we will give another proof).

Let now z be a point of $\partial \mathbb{H}_p$. The complex tangent space at z is defined by :

$$T_z^c(\partial B_p) = \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{C}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n z_j \bar{\xi}_j = 0 \right\}$$

and the Levi-form of ρ_q at (z, ξ) is given by:

$$L(\rho_q)(z, \xi) = \frac{p}{2} \frac{p}{p/2} |z|^{p-4} \{ (p-1)|z \circ \xi|^2 + |z|^2 |\xi|^2 - |z \circ \xi|^2 \}.$$

By using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we conclude that the points of $\partial\mathbb{H}_p$ are strongly pseudoconvex for $1 < p < \infty$.

For $p = \infty$, a simple computation of the Levi-form shows that $\partial B_\infty \setminus \partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$ is strongly pseudoconvex.

(b) In view of (a), to show that the boundary of B_p is strongly pseudoconvex for $2 \leq p < \infty$, it suffices to prove it for points in $\partial\mathbb{K}$. The complex tangent space at a point z of $\partial\mathbb{K}$ is given by :

$$T_z^c(\partial B_p) = \{\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n : \langle \xi | z + k\bar{z} \rangle = 0\}.$$

Then ξ belongs to $T_z^c(\partial B_p)$ if and only if $\langle \xi | z \rangle = -\bar{k} \langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle$. After simplification the Levi-form of ρ_q at a point (z, ξ) of $\partial\mathbb{K} \times T_z^c(\partial B_p)$ is given by the formula :

$$L(\rho_q)(z, \xi) = q|z|^{p-2}(|\xi|^2 + \frac{|\langle \xi | \bar{z} \rangle|^2}{|z|^2})$$

which is strictly positive for $\xi \neq 0$. This finishes the proof of (b).

(c) The Lie ball is a homogeneous domain [5] which is not biholomorphic to Euclidean ball of \mathbb{C}^n . Then in view of the Wong-Rosay theorem it follows that its boundary contains no strict pseudoconvexity points. \square

By using the structure of the boundary of B_p , we deduce the following :

Proposition 2.3. *For $p \neq q$, the domains B_p and B_q are biholomorphically inequivalent. In particular B_p is not biholomorphic to the Euclidean ball of \mathbb{C}^n for $p \neq 2$.*

Since $\mathbb{K} = S^1 \cdot \mathbb{R}^n$, obviously we have the following

Lemma 2.1. *If $V \subset \mathbb{K}$ is a real-subspace of dimension m , then there exists a real number α such that $e^{-i\alpha}V$ is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^m .*

Proof of proposition 2.3. Assume that B_p and B_q are biholomorphic. Since B_p and B_q are bounded, circular, convex domains, according to [3], there exists a linear automorphism L transforming B_p into B_q . We consider several cases:

- Assume that $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $q = 2$. As in [1], we consider the points

$$z_0 = 2^{-\frac{1}{p}}(e_1 + ie_2), \quad z_1 = 2^{-\frac{1}{p}}(e_1 - ie_2)$$

where $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $e_2 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. It is clear that z_0 and z_1 lie in ∂B_p . A simple computation shows that $2 = |L(z_0)|^2 + |L(z_1)|^2 = 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{2}{p}}(|L(e_1)|^2 + |L(e_2)|^2) = 4 \cdot 2^{-\frac{2}{p}}$. Hence, $p = 2$.

- Assume that p and q are real numbers in $[1, \infty \setminus \{2\}]$. According to [1], the conjugate balls $B_p^* = \{N_p^* < 1\}$ and $B_q^* = \{N_q^* < 1\}$ are linearly equivalent. Then, without loss of generality we may assume that $p \notin 2\mathbb{N}$. If $q \in 2\mathbb{N}$, the result is obvious. Hence we may assume that p and q are not in $2\mathbb{N}$. Since the boundary of B_p and B_q are smooth only outside $\partial\mathbb{K}$, we obtain $L(\partial\mathbb{K}) = \partial\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{K}$. By linearity $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a vector space of dimension n include in \mathbb{K} . According to lemma 2.1, there exists a real number α such that $L(\mathbb{R}^n) = e^{i\alpha}\mathbb{R}^n$. The mapping $h = e^{-i\alpha}L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ verifies $\|h(x)\| = \|x\|$ for all x in \mathbb{R}^n ; then $h \in O(n, \mathbb{R})$ and $L \in S^1 \cdot O(n, \mathbb{R})$. But $S^1 \cdot O(n, \mathbb{R}) \subset \text{Aut}(B_p)$, therefore $B_p = B_q$ and $p = q$.

- Assume that $q = \infty$ and p is real in $[1, \infty \setminus \{2\}]$. (Note that in view of the regularity of the boundary, it is clear the B_2 and B_∞ are not biholomorphic.) Since the boundary of B_∞ is smooth only outside $\partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$ and the boundary of B_p is smooth only outside $\partial\mathbb{K}$, we have $L(\partial\mathbb{K}) = \partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$ and hence $L(\mathbb{K}) = \mathbb{H}$. This is impossible; since \mathbb{K} is a smooth manifold and \mathbb{H} is a manifold with singularity at 0. \square

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

Suppose that $p \neq \{1, 2\}$. First we will show that 0 is a fixed point of any automorphism of B_p . We denote by $\text{Orb}(0)$ the orbit of 0 under the action of $\text{Aut}(B_p)$. According to [7], there exists a complex vector subspace V such that $\text{Orb}(0) = V \cap B_p$. For $2 < p < \infty$, B_p is strongly pseudoconvex and not biholomorphic to the unit ball. Then by the Wong-Rosay theorem, $V = \{0\}$.

Now, let $p \in]1, 2[\cup \{\infty\}$. Assume that $V \neq \{0\}$ and let $z \in V \setminus \{0\}$. The point $z/N_p(z)$ belongs to $V \cap \partial B_p$. Since B_p is strongly pseudoconvex only outside $\partial \mathbb{K}$ for $1 < p < 2$ and only outside $\partial \mathbb{H}_\infty$ for $p = \infty$, then again the Wong-Rosay theorem implies that $z/N_p(z) \in \partial \mathbb{K}$ for $1 < p < 2$ and $z/N_\infty(z) \in \partial \mathbb{H}_\infty$. Thus $V \subset \mathbb{K}$ for $1 < p < 2$ and $V \subset \mathbb{H}$ for $p = \infty$.

Let $z_o = a + ib \in \text{Orb}(0) \setminus \{0\}$. Consider the dimension of the orbit of z_o under the action of $S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$, denoted by E .

• Case 1 : $z_o \in \mathbb{H}$ (i.e., $|a| = |b|$ and $\langle a|b \rangle = 0$). The orbit E of z_o under the action of $S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$ is a manifold of dimension $2n - 3$. Indeed, E is homeomorphic to $S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})/G_{z_o}$, where $G_{z_o} = \{f \in S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R}) : f(z_o) = z_o\}$. Let α be a real number and M be an orthogonal real matrix in $O(n, \mathbb{R})$. The equation $e^{i\alpha} M.z_o = z_o$ is equivalent to the system defined by :

$$\begin{cases} Ma = & a \cos \alpha + b \sin \alpha \\ Mb = & - a \sin \alpha + b \cos \alpha \end{cases}$$

Let $B = \left(\frac{a}{|a|}, \frac{b}{|a|}, \dots \right)$ be an orthogonal basis in \mathbb{C}^n . The matrix of M in the basis B has the form $\begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}$ where $A = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & \sin \alpha \\ -\sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix}$ and $C \in O(n - 2, \mathbb{R})$. Then the group G_{z_o} can be identified to $S^1.O(n - 2, \mathbb{R})$ and consequently

$$\dim E = 1 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} - \left[1 + \frac{(n-2)(n-3)}{2} \right] = 2n - 3.$$

Thus the orbit of z_o under the action $S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$ is a manifold of dimension $2n - 3$.

• Case 2 : $z_o \in \mathbb{K}$. In this case G_{z_o} has two connected components. These components can be identified to $O(n - 1, \mathbb{R})$. Consequently

$$\dim E = 1 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} - \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2} = n.$$

Thus the orbit of z_o under the action $S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$ is a manifold of dimension n .

We need the following lemma whose proof is deferred until the end of this section.

Lemma 3.1. *Every complex vector subspace contained in \mathbb{H} has dimension less or equal to $n/2$ and every complex vector subspace contained in \mathbb{K} is either trivial or a complex line.*

By considering dimension of the orbit we obtain :

- If $z_o \in \mathbb{K}$, then $\dim E \leq 2$, i.e. $n \leq 2$. In the case $n = 2$, the consideration of the dimension shows that the orbit of z_o under the action of $S^1.O(2, \mathbb{R})$ coincides with the $\text{Orb}(0)$. Therefore there exist $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g \in O(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that $e^{i\alpha}g(z_o) = 0$; it is a contradiction with the fact that $z_o \neq 0$.
- If $z_o \in \mathbb{H}$ then $\dim E \leq [\frac{n}{2}]$. More precisely : $2n - 3 \leq [\frac{n}{2}]$, i.e. : $n \leq 2$. For $n = 2$, $\mathbb{H} = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : z - iw = 0\} \cup \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : z + iw = 0\}$. As V is a vector space include in \mathbb{H} , then it is equal to one of these complex lines. It follows that the orbit of z_o under the action of $S^1.O(2, \mathbb{R})$ coincides with $\text{Orb}(0)$. This is impossible as it was shown in the previous case. Thus, $\text{Orb}(0) = \{0\}$.

Now, by the classical Cartan's theorem, we deduce that any automorphism of B_p is \mathbb{C} -linear. To finish the proof of the theorem, we use the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *Any \mathbb{C} -linear automorphism preserving B_p $1 < p \leq \infty$, $p \neq 2$ belongs to $S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. Since the boundary of B_p is not smooth on $\partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$ for $p = \infty$ and not smooth on $\partial\mathbb{K}$ for $1 < p < \infty$ ($p \neq 2$), the automorphisms of B_p preserve $\partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$ for $p = \infty$ and $\partial\mathbb{K}$ for $1 < p < \infty$ ($p \neq 2$). Let g be a \mathbb{C} -linear automorphism. If $g(\partial\mathbb{K}) = \partial\mathbb{K}$, then $g(\mathbb{K}) = \mathbb{K}$. In this case, as $g(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a vector space of dimension n included in \mathbb{K} , according to lemma 1, there exists a real α such that $g(\mathbb{R}^n) = e^{i\alpha}\mathbb{R}^n$. The mapping h defined by $h = e^{-i\alpha}g$ verifies $\|h(x)\| = \|x\|$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $h \in O(n, \mathbb{R})$ and $g \in S^1.O(n, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

For the case $g(\partial\mathbb{H}_\infty) = \partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$, let $(e_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^n . For $j \neq k$ the vectors $e_j + ie_k$ and $e_j - ie_k \in \partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$, since g preserves $\partial\mathbb{H}_\infty$, we have:

$$\|g(e_j + ie_k)\|^2 = \|g(e_j - ie_k)\|^2 = 2 \text{ and } g(e_j + ie_k)^2 = g(e_j - ie_k)^2 = 0, \text{ i.e. :}$$

$$\|g(e_j)\|^2 + \|g(e_k)\|^2 = 2, \operatorname{Re} \langle ig(e_k)|g(e_j) \rangle = 0$$

and

$$g(e_j)^2 = g(e_k)^2 \text{ and } \langle g(e_j)|\overline{g(e_k)} \rangle = 0.$$

Since e_j and e_k are in the boundary of B_∞ , $g(e_j)$ and $g(e_k)$ belong also to ∂B_∞ , i.e. : $\|g(e_j)\|^2 + \|g(e_j)^2\| = 2$ and $\|g(e_k)\|^2 + \|(g(e_k)^2)\| = 2$.

Then $\|g(e_j)\| \geq 1$ and $\|g(e_k)\| \geq 1$; thus

$$(3.1) \quad \|g(e_j)\| = \|g(e_k)\| = |g(e_j)^2| = |g(e_k)^2| = 1$$

$$(3.2) \quad \operatorname{Im} \langle g(e_k)|g(e_j) \rangle = 0$$

$$(3.3) \quad g(e_j)^2 = g(e_k)^2$$

$$(3.4) \quad \langle g(e_j)|\overline{g(e_k)} \rangle = 0$$

The equation (3.1) shows that $g(e_j)$ and $g(e_k)$ belong to \mathbb{K} , then there exist then real numbers α_j and α_k such that the vectors $e^{-i\alpha_j}g(e_j)$ and $e^{-i\alpha_k}g(e_k)$ belong to \mathbb{R}^n . From (3.3), we have $e^{2i\alpha_j} = e^{2i\alpha_k}$ and we can assume then the existence of a real α and a family $(b_j)_j$ of vectors of \mathbb{R}^n such that $g(e_j) = e^{i\alpha}b_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The equation (3.4) involves that $\langle b_j|b_k \rangle = 0$. Thus the family $(b_j)_j$ is an orthogonal family and the mapping $e^{-i\alpha}g$ belongs to $O(n, \mathbb{R})$. \square

We conclude this paper with the proof of lemma 3.1. Let F be a complex subspace of \mathbb{H} and let (e_1, \dots, e_m) be a basis of F . Then $(e_i + e_j) \circ (e_i + e_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, i.e., $e_i \circ e_j = 0$. It follows that the family $(e_1, \dots, e_m, \bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_m)$ is

independent in \mathbb{C}^n (\bar{e}_j denotes the conjugate of the vector e_j). Then necessary $2m \leq n$. Now, let F be a complex vector subspace of \mathbb{K} and $x, y \in F$. Since $\mathbb{K} = S^1 \cdot \mathbb{R}^n$, there exist $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in S^1$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x = \lambda_1 a$ and $y = \lambda_2 b$. Since F is a complex vector space, it follows that $a + ib \in F$. Then $a + ib = \lambda_3 c$ for a certain $\lambda_3 \in S^1$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus x and y are dependent and so the complex dimension of F is ≤ 1 .

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Baran, *Conjugate norms in \mathbb{C}^n and related geometrical problems*, Dissertationes Mathematicae, CCCLXXVII (1998), 1-67.
- [2] E. Bedford and J. Dadok, *Bounded domains with prescribed group of automorphisms*, Comment-Math-Helv. **62** No.4 (1987), 561-572.
- [3] R. Braun, W. Kaup, H. Upmeyer, *On the automorphisms of circular and Reinhardt domains in complex banach spaces*, Manuscript Math. **25** (1978), 97-133.
- [4] K.T. Hahn and P. Pflug, *On minimal complex norm in \mathbb{C}^n that extends the real complex norm*, Monath.f.math. **105** (1988), 107-112.
- [5] L.K. Hua, *Harmonic Analysis of Functions of several complex variables in Classical Domains*, American Math. Soc, Providence, RI, (1963).
- [6] A. V. Isaev, S. G. Krantz, *Domains with Non-Compact Automorphism Group*, Advances in Mathematics **146** (1999) 1-38.
- [7] W. Kaup, H. Upmeyer, *Banach spaces with biholomorphically equivalent unit balls are isomorphic*, Proc. A.M.S, **58** (1976), 129-133.
- [8] K.T. Kim, *Automorphism groups of certain domains in \mathbb{C}^n with singular boundary*, Pacific J.math. **151** (1991), 54-64.
- [9] S. Pinchuk, *The scaling method and holomorphic mappings in several complex variables and complex geometry*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **52** Part. 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1991), 151-161.
- [10] K. Oeljeklaus and E.H. Youssfi, *Proper holomorphic mappings and related automorphism groups*, J.Gem. Anal. **7** (1997), 623-636
- [11] J.P. Rosay, *Sur une caracterisation de la boule parmi les domaines de \mathbb{C}^n par son groupe d'automorphismes*, Ann.Inst. Fourier, Grenoble **29** (1979), 91-97.
- [12] W. Rudin, *Function theory of the unit Ball of \mathbb{C}^n* , Grundlehren der mathematischen wissenschaften **241**, springer-verlag New York Heidelberg Berlin (1980).
- [13] B. Wong, *Characterization of the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n by its automorphism group*, Invent. Math.**41** (1977), 253-257.
- [14] W. Zwonek, *Automorphism Group of some special domain in \mathbb{C}^n* , Universitatis Iagelonicae Acta Mathematica, Fasciculus XXXIII (1996).

Department of Mathematics, College of Science, King Saud University.

P.O. Box 2455, Riyadh 11451, Saudia Arabia.

E-mail: ourimi@ksu.edu.sa

Date received October 6, 2007