

# The equivalence of two definitions of quasiconformal mappings.

Autor(en): **Bers, Lipman**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici**

Band (Jahr): **37 (1962-1963)**

PDF erstellt am: **23.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-28614>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

# The equivalence of two definitions of quasiconformal mappings<sup>1)</sup>

by LIPMAN BERS

We give here a new proof to the known fact (cf. MORI [7], BERS [3], YÛJÔBÔ [12], PFLUGER [11]) that the so-called analytic and geometric definitions of quasiconformality are equivalent. The proof uses a minimum of real variable techniques; no mention is made of absolute continuity in the sense of TONELLI. We rely instead on the theory of BELTRAMI's equations as exposed in AHLFORS-BERS [2] and on a theorem of BEURLING-AHLFORS [5].

Let  $z \rightarrow w(z) = u(x, y) + iv(x, y)$  be an orientation preserving homeomorphism of a plane domain  $D$  onto another. If the partial derivatives of  $w$ , in the sense of distribution theory, are locally square integrable functions, we denote by  $K_a(D, w)$  the smallest constant  $K \geq 1$  such that the inequality

$$\left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} \right|^2 \leq \left( K + \frac{1}{K} \right) \frac{\partial(u, v)}{\partial(x, y)} \quad (1)$$

holds a.e. in  $D$ . If there is no such number, or if  $w$  does not have locally square integrable generalized derivatives, we set  $K_a(D, w) = \infty$ . If

$$K_a(D, w) < \infty,$$

$w$  is said to be  $K$ -quasiconformal according to the *analytic definition* [4, 6, 9].

A *topological rectangle*  $R$  is a conformal image of a closed rectangle

$$0 \leq \xi \leq m, \quad 0 \leq \eta \leq 1,$$

the images of the vertices being distinguished. We write  $m = \text{mod } R$ . For  $R \subset D$ ,  $w(R)$  is also a topological rectangle, in view of RIEMANN's mapping theorem. We set

$$K_g(D, w) = \sup \left( \frac{\text{mod } w(R)}{\text{mod } R} \right), \quad R \subset D. \quad (2)$$

It is immediate that  $K_g(D, w) = K_g(w(D), w^{-1})$ . Mappings with

$$K_g(D, w) < \infty$$

are called  $K$ -quasiconformal according to the *geometric definition* [1, 8, 10].

---

<sup>1)</sup> Work supported by Contract Number DA-30-069-ORD-2153 (Army Research Office).

**Theorem.**  $K_a(D, w) = K_g(D, w)$ .

The proof requires several lemmas. The crux of the argument is contained in Lemma 8 below.

If  $K_a(D, w) \leq K < \infty$ , then  $w(z)$  satisfies a BELTRAMI equation

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \bar{z}} = \mu(z) \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} \quad (3)$$

with a measurable coefficient  $\mu(z)$  satisfying

$$|\mu(z)| \leq \frac{K - 1}{K + 1}. \quad (4)$$

Indeed, inequality (1) may be written as

$$\left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial \bar{z}} \right| \leq \frac{K - 1}{K + 1} \left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} \right|.$$

Thus the theory exposed in [2] is applicable. In particular

$$K_a(D, \varphi \circ w \circ \psi) = K_a(\psi(D), w)$$

if  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are conformal.

Now let  $D$  and  $w(D)$  be JORDAN domains,  $z_0$  a point in  $D$  and  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  conformal mappings of  $D$  and  $w(D)$  onto the unit disc with

$$\varphi(z_0) = \psi(w(z_0)) = 0.$$

Then  $W = \psi \circ w \circ \varphi^{-1}$  is a self-mapping of the unit disc with  $W(0) = 0$ . If  $K(D, w) \leq K < \infty$ ,  $W$  is a solution of a BELTRAMI equation with a coefficient satisfying (4). Using [2] we obtain

**Lemma 1.** *If  $K_a(D, w) < \infty$ ,  $D$  and  $w(D)$  are JORDAN domains and  $z_0 \in D$ , then  $w$  has a uniform modulus of continuity depending only on  $K_a(D, w)$ ,  $D$ ,  $w(D)$ ,  $z_0$  and  $w(z_0)$ .*

Let  $R$  be a topological rectangle,  $\mu(z)$ ,  $z \in R$ , a measurable function satisfying (4) for some  $K \geq 1$ ,  $w$  and  $w_1$  two homeomorphisms of  $D$  satisfying (3). Then  $w \circ w_1^{-1}$  is a conformal mapping so that  $\text{mod } w(R) = \text{mod } w_1(R)$ . Hence we may define:  $\text{mod } (R, \mu) = \text{mod } w(R)$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $R$  be a topological rectangle and  $\{\mu_j(z)\}$  a sequence of measurable functions in  $R$  such that  $|\mu_j(z)| \leq k < 1$  and  $\mu_j(z) \rightarrow \mu(z)$  a.e. Then  $\text{mod } (R, \mu_j) \rightarrow \text{mod } (R, \mu)$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $R$  is the unit disc made into a topological rectangle by choosing four "vertices"  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4$  on the boundary. Let  $W^{\mu_j}$  be the homeomorphism of  $|z| \leq 1$  onto itself with  $W^{\mu_j}(0) = 0$ ,  $W^{\mu_j}(1) = 1$

and  $\partial W^{\mu_j}/\partial \bar{z} = \mu_j(z) \partial W^{\mu_j}/\partial z$  and let  $W^\mu$  be defined similarly. By [2], p. 399,  $W^{\mu_j} \rightarrow W^\mu$  uniformly in the closed unit disc. Since  $\text{mod}(R, \mu_j) = \text{mod } W^{\mu_j}(R)$  is a continuous function of the cross-ratio of the points  $W^{\mu_j}(\zeta_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , and similarly for  $\text{mod}(R, \mu)$ , the conclusion follows.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $R$  be a topological rectangle,  $\mu(z)$ ,  $z \in R$ , a measurable function satisfying (4). Then  $\text{mod}(R, \mu) \leq K \text{mod } R$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\mu(z)$  is smooth, every homeomorphic solution of (3) is smooth and has a positive jacobian (cf. [2], p. 391). In this case the desired inequality follows by GRÖTZSCH's classical argument [7]. The general case is reduced to this special one by Lemma 2, since it is easy to find a sequence of smooth  $\mu_j$  satisfying (4) and converging a. e. to  $\mu$ .

**Lemma 4.**  $K_g(D, w) \leq K_a(D, w)$ .

This is an immediate corollary of Lemma 3.

**Lemma 5.** *If  $K_a(D, w) < \infty$ , then  $K_g(D, w) = K_a(D, w)$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $K_a(D, w) = K$  and assume that  $1 < K < \infty$ . (Otherwise there is nothing to prove.) In view of Lemma 4 it suffices to show that for every  $\delta$ ,  $0 < \delta < K - 1$ , there exists a sequence of squares  $Q_j \subset D$  with

$$\lim \text{mod } w(Q_j) \geq K - \delta. \quad (5)$$

Set  $\mu(z) = (\partial w/\partial \bar{z})/(\partial w/\partial z)$  for  $\partial w/\partial z \neq 0$ ,  $\mu(z) = 0$  for  $\partial w/\partial z = 0$ ; then  $w$  satisfies (4) and  $\text{ess. sup } |\mu(z)| = (K - 1)/(K + 1)$ . Let  $\Delta$  denote the annulus

$$\frac{K - \delta - 1}{K + \delta + 1} \leq |\mu| \leq \frac{K - 1}{K + 1}$$

in the  $\mu$ -plane; then  $\mu^{-1}(\Delta) \subset D$  has positive measure. Let  $\epsilon_j \downarrow 0$  be a given sequence. We can find a sequence of measurable sets  $\Delta_j$  such that

$$\Delta_{j+1} \subset \Delta_j \subset \Delta, \quad \text{diam } \Delta_j \leq \epsilon_j, \quad \text{mes } \mu^{-1}(\Delta_j) > 0.$$

Indeed, if  $\Delta$  is subdivided into finitely many measurable sets of diameter not exceeding  $\epsilon_1$ , at least one of them, say  $\Delta_1$  must be such that  $\text{mes } \mu^{-1}(\Delta) > 0$ . If  $\Delta_1$  is subdivided into finitely many measurable sets of diameter not exceeding  $\epsilon_2$ , at least one of them, say  $\Delta_2$ , is such that  $\text{mes } \mu^{-1}(\Delta_2) > 0$ , etc. Let  $\mu_0 = |\mu_0| e^{i\alpha}$  be the intersection of the closures of the  $\Delta_j$ . For each  $j$  let  $z_j \in D$  be a point at which the set  $\mu^{-1}(\Delta_j)$  has metric density one; such points exist by LEBESGUE's theorem. Each  $z_j$  is the center of a square  $Q_j$  with one side parallel to the ray  $z = r e^{i\alpha/2}$ ,  $0 < r < \infty$ , and such that

$$Q_j \subset D, \quad \text{mes } Q_j = m_j^2 < \epsilon_j, \quad \text{mes } [Q_j \cap \mu^{-1}(\Delta_j)] \geq (1 - \epsilon_j) m_j^2.$$

Hence

$$\text{mes} \{z \mid z \in Q_j, \mid \mu(z) - \mu_0 \mid > \epsilon_j\} \leq \epsilon_j m_j^2.$$

Let  $Q$  be the square obtained from  $Q_j$  by the mapping  $z \rightarrow (z - z_j)/m_j$ . For  $z \in Q$  set  $\mu_j(z) = \mu(z_j + m_j z)$ . Then  $\mu_j(z) \rightarrow \mu_0$  in measure. Selecting if need be a subsequence we may assume that  $\mu_j(z) \rightarrow \mu_0$  a. e. in  $Q$ . By Lemma 2

$$\text{mod} (Q, \mu_j) \rightarrow \text{mod} (Q, \mu_0) = \frac{1 + \mid \mu_0 \mid}{1 - \mid \mu_0 \mid} \geq K - \delta.$$

Noting that  $\text{mod} w(Q_j) = \text{mod} (Q, \mu_j)$  we obtain (5).

**Lemma 6.** *If  $w_j \rightarrow w$  uniformly in  $D$  and  $K_a(D, w_j) \leq K < \infty$ , then  $K_a(D, w) \leq K$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $w = u + iv$ ,  $w_j = u_j + iv_j$ . Let  $D_0$  be a relatively compact subdomain of  $D$ . It suffices to show that  $K_a(D_0, w) \leq K$ . By [2] Theorem 5, and the hypothesis

$$\int \int_{D_0} \frac{\partial(u_j, v_j)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy = \text{mes} w_j(D_0) = O(1).$$

Since (1) holds for each  $w_j$ ,

$$\int \int_{D_0} \left( \left| \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial y} \right|^2 \right) dx dy = O(1).$$

This shows that the partial derivatives of  $w_j$  are square-integrable functions in  $D_0$  and that we may assume, selecting if need be a subsequence, that

$$\frac{\partial w_j}{\partial x} \rightarrow \frac{\partial w}{\partial x}, \quad \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial y} \rightarrow \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} \quad \text{weakly in } L_2(D_0). \tag{6}$$

Next, let  $\omega$  be a smooth function with compact support in  $D_0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int \int_{D_0} \omega \frac{\partial(u_j, v_j)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy &= \int \int_{D_0} v_j \frac{\partial(\omega, u_j)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy, \\ \int \int_{D_0} \omega \frac{\partial(u, v)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy &= \int \int_{D_0} v \frac{\partial(\omega, u)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

If  $w$  and  $w_j$  are smooth, this follows by integration by parts. In the general case one approximates  $w$  (or  $w_j$ ) together with its first derivatives, in the mean, by smooth functions. If  $\omega$  is also non-negative, then

$$\int \int_{D_0} \omega \left( \left| \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial y} \right|^2 \right) dx dy \leq \left( K + \frac{1}{K} \right) \int \int_{D_0} \omega \frac{\partial(u_j, v_j)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy. \tag{8}$$

But by (6)

$$\iint_{D_0} \omega \left( \left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} \right|^2 \right) dx dy \leq \liminf \iint_{D_0} \omega \left( \left| \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial y} \right|^2 \right) dx dy$$

and by (6) and (7)

$$\lim \iint_{D_0} \omega \frac{\partial(u_j, v_j)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy = \iint_{D_0} \omega \frac{\partial(u, v)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy,$$

so that by (8)

$$\iint_{D_0} \omega \left( \left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} \right|^2 \right) dx dy \leq \left( K + \frac{1}{K} \right) \iint_{D_0} \omega \frac{\partial(u, v)}{\partial(x, y)} dx dy.$$

A simple limiting argument shows that this holds also if  $\omega$  is the characteristic function of a rectangle in  $D_0$ . This implies that (1) holds a.e.

We note now a corollary of the BEURLING-AHLFORS theorem [5].

**Lemma 7.** *For every  $K \geq 1$  there exists a number  $K^*$  with the following property. Let  $K_g(D, w) \leq K < \infty$  and let  $D_0$  be a relatively compact JORDAN subdomain of  $D$ . Then there exists a homeomorphism  $\Omega$  of the closure of  $D_0$  onto that of  $w(D_0)$  with  $K_a(D, \Omega) \leq K^*$  and  $w(z) = \Omega(z)$  on the boundary  $\dot{D}_0$  of  $D_0$ .*

*Proof.* Choose a point  $\hat{z}$  on  $\dot{D}_0$  and set  $\hat{Z} = w(\hat{z})$ . Let  $z \rightarrow \varphi(z)$  and  $Z \rightarrow \psi(Z)$  be conformal homeomorphisms, of  $D_0$  and  $w(D_0)$ , respectively, onto the half-plane  $U = \{ \zeta \mid \text{Im } \zeta > 0 \}$  with  $\varphi(\hat{z}) = \psi(\hat{Z}) = \infty$ . Set

$$\gamma(\xi) = \psi \circ w \circ \varphi^{-1}(\xi), \quad -\infty < \xi < +\infty.$$

For a real  $\xi$  and an  $h > 0$  make  $D_0$  into a topological rectangle  $R_{\xi, h}$  by choosing as "vertices" the points  $\varphi^{-1}(\xi - h)$ ,  $\varphi^{-1}(\xi)$ ,  $\varphi^{-1}(\xi + h)$  and  $\hat{z}$ . Then  $\text{mod } R_{\xi, h} = 1$ . The "vertices" of  $w(R_{\xi, h})$  are the points

$$\psi^{-1}(\gamma(\xi - h)), \psi^{-1}(\gamma(\xi)), \psi^{-1}(\gamma(\xi + h))$$

and  $\hat{Z}$ , and  $\text{mod } w(R_{\xi, h})$  is a continuous function of the ratio

$$(\gamma(\xi + h) - \gamma(\xi)) / (\gamma(\xi) - \gamma(\xi - h)).$$

Since  $K^{-1} \leq \text{mod } w(R_{\xi, h}) \leq K$ , there exists a  $\varrho > 0$  depending only on  $K$  such that

$$0 < \frac{1}{\varrho} \leq \frac{\gamma(\xi + h) - \gamma(\xi)}{\gamma(\xi) - \gamma(\xi - h)} \leq \varrho. \tag{9}$$

According to [5], condition (9) implies that

$$\zeta = \xi + i\eta \rightarrow F(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 [(1 + i)\gamma(\xi + \tau\eta) + (1 - i)\gamma(\xi - \tau\eta)] d\tau$$

is a homeomorphism of the closed upper half-plane onto itself with  $F(\xi) = g(\xi)$  and  $K_a(U, F) = K^* < \infty$ , where  $K^*$  depends only on  $K$ . Set  $\Omega = \psi^{-1} \circ F \circ \varphi$ ; this mapping has the required properties.

**Lemma 8.** *If  $K_g(D, w) < \infty$ , then  $K_a(D, w) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $K_g(D, w) = K$ . We show that for every square  $Q \subset D$ ,

$$K_a(Q, w) \leq K^*,$$

the number in Lemma 7. For every integer  $j > 0$  subdivide  $Q$  into  $4^j$  congruent squares. Lemma 7 implies that there exists a homeomorphism  $w_j$  of  $Q$  such that  $K_a(q, w_j) \leq K^*$  for each of the  $4^j$  small squares  $q$  and  $w_j = w$  on the boundary of each small square. Hence  $w_j$  is a homeomorphism of  $Q$  onto  $w(Q)$  and  $K_a(Q, w_j) \leq K^*$ . By Lemma 1 the  $w_j$  are equicontinuous and, by construction,  $w_j \rightarrow w$  on a dense set. Hence  $w_j \rightarrow w$  uniformly and, by Lemma 6,  $K_a(Q, w) \leq K^*$ .

Combining Lemmas 5 and 8 we obtain the theorem.

Now set

$$K_1(D, w) = \inf \text{mod } w(R) \quad \text{for all } R \subset D \text{ and } \text{mod } R = 1$$

where  $R$  is a topological rectangle.

The argument used in proving Lemma 5 shows that  $K_1(D, w) = K_a(D, w)$  whenever  $K_a(D, w) < \infty$ . The argument used in proving Lemmas 7 and 8 shows that  $K_a(D, w)$  is finite whenever  $K_1(D, w)$  is. Thus

$$K_1(D, w) = K_a(D, w).$$

The geometric definition can be given a local form by setting (cf. PFLUGER [9]).

$$K^*(D, w) = \sup_{z_0 \in D} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} K_g(S_r(z_0), w)$$

$S_r(z_0)$  being the disc  $|z - z_0| < r$ . We have that

$$K^*(D, w) = K_g(D, w);$$

the proof is immediate via the equivalence theorem.

## REFERENCES

- [1] AHLFORS, L.: *On quasiconformal mappings*. J. d'Analyse Math. 3 (1954) pp. 1–58 and 207–208.
- [2] AHLFORS, L. and BERS, L.: *RIEMANN'S mapping theorem for variable metrics*. Ann. of Math. 72 (1960) pp. 385–404.
- [3] BERS, L.: *On a theorem of MORI and the definition of quasiconformality*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 84 (1956) pp. 78–84.
- [4] BERS, L. and NIRENBERG, L.: *On a representation theorem for linear elliptic systems with discontinuous coefficients and its applications*. Conv. Internat. sulle Equazioni Derivate e Parziali, Edizioni Cremonese (1954) pp. 111–149.
- [5] BEURLING, A. and AHLFORS, L.: *The boundary-correspondence under quasiconformal mappings*. Acta Math. 96 (1956) pp. 125–142.
- [6] CACCIOPPOLI, R.: *Fondamenti per una teoria generale delle funzioni pseudo-analitiche di una variabile complessa*. Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei, Rendic. 13 (1952) pp. 197–204 and 321–329.
- [7] GRÖTZSCH, H.: *Über die Verzerrung bei schlichten nichtkonformen Abbildungen und über eine damit zusammenhängende Erweiterung des PICARDSchen Satzes*. Ber. Verh. Sächs. Akad. Wiss. Leipzig. Math.-Nat. Kl. 80 (1928).
- [8] MORI, A.: *On quasiconformality and pseudo-analyticity*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 84 (1956) pp. 56–77.
- [9] MORREY, C.B.: *On the solution of quasilinear elliptic partial differential equations*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 43 (1938) pp. 126–166.
- [10] PFLUGER, A.: *Quasikonforme Abbildungen und logarithmische Kapazität*. Ann. Inst. Fourier (1951) pp. 69–80.
- [11] PFLUGER, A.: *Über die Äquivalenz der geometrischen und der analytischen Definition quasikonformer Abbildungen*. Comment. Math. Helv. 33 (1959) pp. 23–33.
- [12] YŪJÔBÔ, Z.: *On absolutely continuous functions of two or more variables in the TONELLI sense and quasiconformal mappings in the A. MORI sense*. Comm. Math. Univ. St. Paul 4 (1955) pp. 67–92.

(Received March 14, 1962)