

Local form of $M \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ in terms of ρ . | Let $\theta = i e^* \partial \rho$.

Cartan's Formula. For a 1-form ω ,
 $2d\omega(X, Y) = X\omega(Y) - Y\omega(X) - \omega([X, Y]).$

Thus, applying this to def. of L_p^θ , we get

$$2i L_p^\theta(Z_p, \bar{W}_p) = \theta([Z, \bar{W}]) = \underbrace{\bar{W}\theta(Z) - Z\theta(\bar{W})}_{\text{both} = 0 \text{ since } \theta^\perp = T^{1,0} + T^{0,1}}$$

$$-2d\theta(Z, \bar{W}) = -2d\theta(\bar{Z}, W).$$

If we write $Z = \sum b^j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$, $W = \sum \eta^j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$
 (in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}), then

$$\begin{aligned} d\theta(Z, \bar{W}) &= i d\partial\rho(Z, \bar{W}) = i \partial\bar{\partial}\rho(Z, \bar{W}) \\ &= -i \sum_{j,k} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} b^j \bar{\eta}^k \end{aligned}$$

Prop: In the notation above,

$$L_p^\theta(Z_p, \bar{W}_p) = \frac{1}{2i} \theta([Z, \bar{W}]) = i d\theta(Z, \bar{W}) = \sum_{j,k} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} b^j \bar{\eta}^k.$$

Suppose Z_1, \dots, Z_n is a local frame for $T^{1,0}M$,

$$Z_\alpha = \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \phi_\alpha^k \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then, we can identify the Levi form at $p \in M$ with a Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix

$$g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = \rho_p \left(\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_\alpha \partial \bar{z}_\beta} \right) = \sum_{j,k} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (p) \phi_\alpha^j \overline{\phi_\beta^k}$$

If we write $H_p = \left(\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (p) \right)_{j,k}$ and

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} -\phi_1 \\ \vdots \\ -\phi_n \end{pmatrix} \text{ an } n \times (n+1) \text{ matrix} \quad \leftarrow \begin{matrix} j,k \\ (n+1) \times (n+1) \end{matrix}$$

then the Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix

$$(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) = \phi^\dagger H_p \phi^*$$

represents the Levi form L_p^ρ for $\theta = i e^* \partial \rho$.

Recall M is strictly ψ conv at p if the
 Hessian is definite at p . Replacing ρ
 by $-\rho$ if needed, $\overset{\text{wlog}}{M}$ is s. ψ conv at p
 $\Leftrightarrow (g_{x\bar{p}})$ is positive definite (for some

ρ). If U is small open nbhd of
 $p \in M$, then $U = U_+ \cup U_- \cup U_0$



pos. semidef

Def. M is ψ conv in U if $(g_{x\bar{p}}) \geq 0$.

In this case, U_- is called the
 ψ conv side of M .

Rem. Cf. $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ domain, $M = \partial\Omega$ smooth,
 Ω ψ conv $\Leftrightarrow M$ is ψ conv in U_p , $\forall p \in M$
 and $\Omega \cap U_-$ is ψ conv side of M .

Holomorphic extension of CR functions on $M \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$.

Recall that the notion of a CR function $u: M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ was modeled on restrictions of

holomorphic functions: u is CR \Leftrightarrow

$\bar{\partial}u = 0$, \forall sections X of T^*M . What about the converse? Globally, this is Hartogs:

Hartogs Thm - CR version. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a bounded domain with smooth connected boundary $M = \partial\Omega$. If u is a C^k -CR function on M , then $\exists v \in C^k(\Omega) \cap C^k(\bar{\Omega})$ s.t.

$$u = v|_M.$$

Pf. In the original HT, u already came from some holomorphic function in $\Omega \setminus K \supset K \subset \subset \Omega$. The proof here is similar. First extend u to $u_1 \in C^k(\bar{\Omega})$ s.t. $u_1|_M = u$. This is clearly doable.

Then, improve u_1 to $u_2 \in C^k(\bar{\Omega})$ s.t. $u_2|_M = u$ and $\bar{\partial}u_2 = O(\rho^2)$ ($M = \{\rho=0\}$).

If we can do this, then the $(0,1)$ -form $f = -\bar{\partial} u_2$ in Ω , $f = 0$ in Ω^c is \mathcal{E}' , has compact support and satisfies $\bar{\partial} f = 0$. Proceeding as in the original HT, correcting u_2 by solving $\bar{\partial} v = f$ finishes the proof.

How to find u_2 ? Outline only (See [Hör, § 2.3] for details).

Step 1. $u_1|_M = u$ and $u \in \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow (\Leftrightarrow \text{actually})$

$$\bar{\partial} u_1 \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho = 0 \text{ on } M. \quad \swarrow \text{(0,1)-form}$$

Step 2. Step 1 $\Rightarrow \bar{\partial} u_1 = h_0 \bar{\partial} \rho + h_1 \rho \Rightarrow$

$$\bar{\partial} (u_1 - h_0 \rho) = (h_1 - \bar{\partial} h_0) \rho = h_2 \rho \quad \leftarrow$$

Thus, $0 = \bar{\partial} (h_2 \rho) = (\bar{\partial} h_2) \rho + \bar{\partial} \rho \wedge h_2 \Rightarrow$

$$\bar{\partial} \rho \wedge h_2 = 0 \text{ on } M \Rightarrow$$

$$h_2 = h_3 \bar{\partial} \rho + h_4 \rho \quad \leftarrow$$

\Rightarrow let $u_2 = u_1 - h_0 \rho - h_3 \frac{\rho^2}{2}$. Check $\bar{\partial} u_2 = \alpha(\bar{\partial}^2)$.