

## SOME APPLICATIONS OF EXTREMAL LENGTH TO ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS

BO-HYUN CHUNG

ABSTRACT. We consider some applications of extremal length to the boundary behavior of analytic functions and derive theorems in connection with the conformal mappings. It shows us the usefulness of the method of extremal length. And we present some geometric applications of extremal length. The method of extremal length lead to simple proofs of theorems.

### 0. Introduction

The method of extremal length is a useful tool in a wide variety of areas. Especially, it has been successfully applied to conformal mappings and analytic functions of a complex variable. Extremal length was introduced as a conformally invariant measure of curve families. This development appeared in Ahlfors and Beurling [3].

The purpose of this paper is to apply the extremal length of a curve family in the complex plane to the boundary behavior of analytic functions of a complex variable. And we consider some geometric applications of extremal length. This method lead to simple proofs of theorems.

Throughout this paper,  $\mathbb{C}$  denote the finite complex plane,  $D$  is a domain (open and connected set) in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $g$  is an arbitrary function defined on  $D$  (Def. 2.1),  $\partial D$  is a boundary of  $D$ , and  $cl(D)$  is a closure of  $D$ .

The subject of this paper was suggested by professor Un Haing Choi, to whom we are deeply grateful for all his advice.

### 1. Extremal length

Let  $\Gamma$  be a family whose elements  $\gamma$  are locally rectifiable curves (sim-

---

Received December 2, 2004.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30C, 30C62, 30D40.

Key words and phrases: extremal length, boundary behavior.

ply, curves or arcs) in  $D$ , and let  $\rho(z)$  be a non-negative Borel measurable function defined on  $\mathbb{C}$ . Every curve  $\gamma$  has a well-defined

$$(1) \quad L(\gamma, \rho) = \int_{\gamma} \rho(z) |dz|, \quad z = x + iy$$

which may be infinite, and  $D$  has a

$$(2) \quad A(D, \rho) = \iint_D [\rho(z)]^2 dx dy \neq 0, \infty.$$

In order to define an invariant which depends on the whole set  $\Gamma$ , we introduce

$$(3) \quad L(\Gamma, \rho) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} L(\gamma, \rho),$$

where we agree that  $L(\Gamma, \rho) = \infty$  in case  $\Gamma$  is empty.

To obtain a quantity that does not change when the weight function  $\rho$  is multiplied by a constant, we form the homogeneous expression  $[L(\Gamma, \rho)]^2/A(D, \rho)$ .

DEFINITION 1.1. ([1]) The *extremal length* of  $\Gamma$  in  $D$  is defined by

$$(4) \quad \lambda(\Gamma) = \lambda_D(\Gamma) = \sup_{\rho} [L(\Gamma, \rho)]^2/A(D, \rho),$$

where  $\rho$  is subject to the condition  $0 < A(D, \rho) < \infty$ , obviously  $0 \leq \lambda(\Gamma) \leq \infty$ .

REMARK 1.2. (i)  $\lambda_D(\Gamma)$  depends only on  $\Gamma$  and not on  $D$ . Accordingly, we shall simplify the notation to  $\lambda(\Gamma)$  [1].

(ii) Since almost every curve in  $\mathbb{C}$  is rectifiable, the non-rectifiable curves of a family  $\Gamma$  have no influence on the extremal length of  $\Gamma$ . Accordingly, we shall simplify the terminology to curve or arc [14].

There are two special cases in which the extremal length is very easy to determine explicitly.

PROPOSITION 1.3. (a) ([2]) Let  $B$  be a rectangle of sides  $a$  and  $b$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be the family of arcs in  $B$  which join the sides of length  $b$ . Then

$$\lambda(\Gamma) = a/b.$$

(b) ([7]) Let  $\Delta$  be the annulus  $\Delta = \{z \mid a < |z| < b\}$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be the family of arcs in  $\Delta$  which join the two contours. Then

$$\lambda(\Gamma) = (1/2\pi) \log(b/a).$$

In fact, for any  $\rho(z)$ , we have

$$\int_a^b \rho dr \geq L(\Gamma, \rho), \quad \iint_{\Delta} \rho dr d\theta \geq 2\pi L(\Gamma, \rho).$$

Then, by the Schwarz inequality ([8]),

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi^2 [L(\Gamma, \rho)]^2 &\leq \left[ \iint_{\Delta} \rho dr d\theta \right]^2 \\ &\leq \left[ \iint_{\Delta} \rho^2 (1/r) dr d\theta \right] \left[ \iint_{\Delta} r dr d\theta \right] \\ &= [2\pi \log(b/a)] \left[ \iint_{\Delta} \rho^2 r dr d\theta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This proves  $\lambda(\Gamma) \leq (1/2\pi) \log(b/a)$ .

Equality for  $\rho = 1/r$ , we have

$$L(\Gamma, 1/r) = \log(b/a), \quad A(\Delta, 1/r) = 2\pi \log(b/a).$$

Thus  $\lambda(\Gamma) \geq (1/2\pi) \log(b/a)$ .

The conformal invariance of extremal length is an immediate consequence of the definition.

**PROPOSITION 1.4.** ([12], Conformal invariance) *Let  $z^* = f(z)$  be a 1-1 conformal mapping on  $D$  upon a domain  $D^*$  and  $\Gamma$  a family of curves on  $D$ . Then*

$$\lambda(\Gamma) = \lambda[f(\Gamma)].$$

**PROPOSITION 1.5.** ([1], Comparison principle) *For two curve families  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ , if every  $\gamma_2 \in \Gamma_2$  contains a  $\gamma_1 \in \Gamma_1$ , then*

$$\lambda(\Gamma_1) \leq \lambda(\Gamma_2).$$

Indeed, both extremal lengths can be evaluated with respect to the same  $D$ . For any  $\rho$  in  $D$  it is clear that  $L(\Gamma_2, \rho) \geq L(\Gamma_1, \rho)$ . These minimum lengths are compared with the same  $A(D, \rho)$ .

REMARK 1.6. (i) Briefly, the set  $\Gamma_2$  of fewer or longer curves has the larger extremal length [1].

PROPOSITION 1.7. ([12]) Suppose that there exist disjoint open sets  $G_n$  containing the curves in  $\Gamma_n$ . If  $\cup_n \Gamma_n \subset \Gamma$ , then

$$\sum_n 1/\lambda(\Gamma_n) \leq 1/\lambda(\Gamma).$$

## 2. Some boundary behavior of conformal mappings

DEFINITION 2.1. ([10]) By an *arbitrary function*  $g$ , we mean a (single-valued) function whose domain is a subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  and whose range is on the Riemann sphere  $\Omega$ .

DEFINITION 2.2. ([5]) Let  $\Lambda$  be a curve at  $z_0 \in cl(D)$ . Then the *cluster set* of  $g$  at  $z_0$  along  $\Lambda$ , denoted by  $C_\Lambda(g, z_0)$ , is defined to be the set of all points  $\omega \in \Omega$  with the property that, for some sequence of points  $\{z_n\}$  on  $\Lambda$  converging to  $z_0$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(z_n) = \omega.$$

A value  $\omega$  is called a *cluster value* of  $g$  at  $z_0$  along  $\Lambda$ . It follows readily that  $C_\Lambda(g, z_0)$  is a nonempty closed subset of  $\Omega$ .

We consider some applications of extremal length to conformal mappings. A purely function-theoretic proof of the following theorem is difficult. The use of extremal length, however, makes the proof trivial.

THEOREM 2.3. Let  $D$  be a Jordan domain in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\partial D$  its boundary. Let  $z_0, z_1$  be two distinct points of  $\partial D$ , and denote by  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  the two curves between  $z_0$  and  $z_1$ , where  $C_1, C_2 \subset \partial D$ . Let  $f(z)$  be a 1-1 conformal mapping defined on  $D$  satisfying

$$\iint_D |f'(z)|^2 dx dy < \infty.$$

If  $f(z)$  has the cluster values  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  ( $\omega_1, \omega_2 \neq \infty$ ) for some sequence of points  $\{z_n\}$  on  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  converging to  $z_0$  respectively, then

$$\omega_1 = \omega_2.$$

In our discussion we will need the followings.

DEFINITION 2.4. ([1]) A non-negative Borel measurable function  $\rho(z)$  will be called *allowable* if it satisfies the condition (2).

DEFINITION 2.5. ([1]) Let  $D$  be a simply connected domain in  $\mathbb{C}$ . A *crosscut* of  $D$  is a Jordan curve  $\gamma$  in  $D$  which in both directions tends to a boundary point.

LEMMA 2.6. ([13]) Let  $R$  be a ring domain in  $\mathbb{C}$  and let  $R_0$  and  $R_1$  denote the bounded component and unbounded component of  $R^c$  the complement of  $R$ , respectively. Let  $\partial R_0$  and  $\partial R_1$  denote the two components of the boundary of  $R$ , and let  $\Gamma_R$  be the family of all curves in  $R$  connecting  $\partial R_0$  and  $\partial R_1$ . Then

$$\lambda(\Gamma_R) = \infty$$

if and only if  $R_0$  consists of a single point.

LEMMA 2.7. ([4, ch.4]) Let  $R$ ,  $R_0$ ,  $R_1$  and  $\Gamma_R$  be as in Lemma 2.6. We say that the closed curve  $\gamma$  in  $R$  separates  $R_0$  and  $R_1$  if  $\gamma$  has non-zero winding number about the points of  $R_0$ . Let  $\Gamma_S$  be the family of all closed curves in  $R$  which separate  $R_0$  and  $R_1$ . Then

$$\lambda(\Gamma_R) \cdot \lambda(\Gamma_S) = 1.$$

We say that  $\lambda(\Gamma_S)$  is the *conjugate extremal length* of  $\lambda(\Gamma_R)$ .

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3. Let  $\Gamma$  be the family of all crosscuts  $\gamma$  in  $R_D$  connecting points of  $C_1$  and points of  $C_2$ , where

$$R_D = \{z \mid 0 < |z - z_0| < r_0\} \cap D.$$

Here  $r_0$  is a sufficiently small positive real number. Then

$$|\omega_1 - \omega_2| \leq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{\gamma} |f'(z)| |dz|.$$

There remains to show that

$$(5) \quad \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{\gamma} |f'(z)| |dz| = 0.$$

Since

$$R = \{z \mid 0 < |z - z_0| < r_0\}$$

is a ring domain, by Lemma 2.6, we see that

$$\lambda(\Gamma_R) = \infty,$$

where  $\Gamma_R$  is as in Lemma 2.6.

Suppose now that we are considering  $\Gamma_S$ , the family of all simple closed curves in  $R$  separating  $z_0$  from  $\{z \mid |z - z_0| = r_0\}$ . Then  $\lambda(\Gamma_S)$  is the conjugate extremal length of  $\lambda(\Gamma_R)$ . Hence by Lemma 2.6,

$$\lambda(\Gamma_S) = 0.$$

And clearly,

$$\Gamma < \Gamma_S.$$

Thus by the comparison principle of extremal length (Proposition 1.5), we see that

$$(6) \quad \lambda(\Gamma) = 0.$$

On the other hand, if we choose the allowable function  $\rho(z) = |f'(z)|$  on  $D$ , then

$$(7) \quad \iint_D [\rho(z)]^2 dx dy < \infty.$$

Hence by (6), (7), we have (5).

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

### 3. Geometric applications of extremal length

There are a number of purely geometric applications of extremal length. The simplest example concerns the ring domain.

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $R, \partial R_0$  and  $\partial R_1$  be as in Lemma 2.6. Let  $a$  be the length of the shortest arc in  $D$  connecting  $\partial R_0$  and  $\partial R_1$ . Let  $b$  be the length of the Jordan curve,  $\partial R_0$ . Then*

$$a \cdot b < S.$$

where  $S$  is the area of  $R$ .

PROOF. The purely geometric proof of this theorem is difficult. The use of extremal length, however, makes the proof trivial.

Let  $\Gamma_R$  and  $\Gamma_S$  be as in Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7 respectively. Then by Lemma 2.7,

$$\lambda(\Gamma_R) \cdot \lambda(\Gamma_S) = 1.$$

On the other hand, if we choose the non-negative Borel measurable function  $\rho = 1$ , then  $\lambda(\Gamma_R)$  and  $\lambda(\Gamma_S)$  has the following lower bounds respectively. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} (a^2/S) \cdot (b^2/S) &= [\{L(\Gamma_R, 1)\}^2 / A(D, 1)] \cdot [\{L(\Gamma_S, 1)\}^2 / A(D, 1)] \\ &\leq \lambda(\Gamma_R) \cdot \lambda(\Gamma_S) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows at once.  $\square$

THEOREM 3.2. Suppose that we have a set of  $n$  disjoint general quadrilaterals  $Q_k$ , for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , contained in the annulus  $\Delta = \{z \mid r < |z| < R\}$ , ( $0 < r < R$ ,  $R \neq \infty$ ) and bounded by Jordan curves, each of which has an arc, in common with each of the circles  $\{z \mid |z| = r\}$  and  $\{z \mid |z| = R\}$  (the  $Q_k$  can be regarded as strips extending from the inner to the outer circle). If these domains  $Q_k$  are mapped onto rectangles  $B_k$  with sides equal respectively to  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  in such a way that the arcs referred to are mapped into sides of lengths  $a_k$ , then

$$(8) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n a_k/b_k \leq 2\pi/\log(R/r),$$

where the equality holds only if the  $Q_k$  are domains of the form  $\{z \mid r < |z| < R, \phi_k < \arg z < \phi_{k+1}\}$  completely filling the annulus.

PROOF. The method of extremal length considered leads to a simple proof of the inequality (8).

We can map an arbitrary general quadrilateral conformally onto a rectangle ([9, p.15]). Let  $w = f_k(z)$  be 1-1 conformal mappings on  $Q_k$  upon  $B_k$  respectively. Let  $\Gamma$  be the family of arcs in  $\Delta$  which join the two boundary circles, and let  $\Gamma_k$  be the family of arcs in  $Q_k$  which join the two sides of  $Q_k \subset \partial\Delta$ . Then by the conformal invariance of extremal length (Proposition 1.5) and Proposition 1.3(a),

$$(9) \quad \lambda(\Gamma_k) = \lambda[f_k(\Gamma_k)] = b_k/a_k.$$

By the hypothesis, there exist disjoint open sets  $Q_k (k = 1, 2, \dots, n)$  containing  $\Gamma_k$  and  $\cup_k \Gamma_k \subset \Gamma$ . Hence by Proposition 1.7,

$$(10) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n 1/\lambda(\Gamma_k) \leq 1/\lambda(\Gamma).$$

Therefore by Proposition 1.3(b), (9) and (10), we obtain (8).

The proof is complete.  $\square$

Now, we will prove alternatively the well-known result by making use of extremal length. In particular, this method shortens the length of the proof significantly as we shall see by comparing the following proof with that of Theorem 14.22 in [11].

**THEOREM 3.3.** ([11]) *Let  $\Delta(r, R) = \{z \mid r < |z| < R\}$ , ( $0 < r < R, R \neq \infty$ ). Then  $\Delta_1(r_1, R_1)$  and  $\Delta_2(r_2, R_2)$  are conformally equivalent if and only if*

$$(11) \quad R_1/r_1 = R_2/r_2.$$

**PROOF.** (Method of extremal length) Since the proof of sufficient condition is trivial, we discuss the proof of necessary condition. Let  $\Gamma_\Delta$  be the family of arcs in  $\Delta(r, R)$  which join the two contours. Then by Proposition 1.3(b),

$$(12) \quad \lambda(\Gamma_\Delta) = (1/2\pi) \log(R/r).$$

Suppose that  $\Delta_1(r_1, R_1)$  and  $\Delta_2(r_2, R_2)$  are conformally equivalent and let  $f$  be a 1-1 conformal mapping on  $\Delta_1(r_1, R_1)$  upon  $\Delta_2(r_2, R_2)$ . Then by the conformal invariance of extremal length,

$$(13) \quad \lambda(\Gamma_{\Delta_1}) = \lambda[f(\Gamma_{\Delta_1})] = \lambda(\Gamma_{\Delta_2}).$$

Hence by (12), (13), we obtain (11).

The proof is now complete.  $\square$

## References

- [1] L. V. Ahlfors, *Conformal Invariants. Topics in Geometric Function Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973.



- [2] ———, *Lectures on Quasiconformal Mappings*, Van Nostrand, 1987.
- [3] L. V. Ahlfors and A. Beurling, *Conformal invariants and function-theoretic null-sets*, Acta. Math. **83** (1950), 101–129.
- [4] L. V. Ahlfors and L. Sario, *Riemann Surfaces*, Princeton Math. Ser. 26 (1960).
- [5] E. F. Collingwood and A. J. Lohwater, *The Theory of Cluster Sets*, Cambridge Univ. Press, London and New York, 1966.
- [6] H. Grötzsch, *Über einige extremal probleme der konformer abbildung*, Ber. Verh. Sachs. Akad. Wiss., Leipzig. **80** (1928), 367–376.
- [7] K. Haliste, *Estimates of harmonic measure*, Ark. Mat. **6** (1965), 1–31.
- [8] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood and G. Polya, *Inequalities*, Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1934.
- [9] Lehto and K. I. Virtanen, *Quasiconformal Mappings in the Plane*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973.
- [10] J. E. Mcmillan, *Arbitrary functions defined on plane sets*, Michigan Math. J., **14** (1967), 445–447.
- [11] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, New Delhi, 1974.
- [12] L. Sario and K. Oikawa, *Capacity Functions*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1969.
- [13] J. Väisälä, *Lectures on  $n$ -Dimensional Quasiconformal Mappings*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.
- [14] ———, *On quasiconformal mappings in space*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. AI. **298** (1961), 1–35.

Mathematics Section  
College of Science and Technology  
Hong-Ik University  
Chochiwon 339-701, Korea  
*E-mail*: bohyun@hongik.ac.kr