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#### Abstract

Let $f$ be a locally injective analytic map of the unit disc $D$ and let $\{f, z\}$ be its Schwarzian derivative. Suppose $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$. We use the classical connection between Schwarzian derivative and second order linear equations to show that, for a particular class of functions $p$, the image $f(D)$ is a quasidisc. The analysis centers on the differential equation $y^{\prime \prime}+p y=0$ and a finiteness condition of a positive solution $y$. The proofs are based on Sturm comparison theorems. When $p$ in the class is analytic and $x=1$ is a regular singular point of the linear equation, it is possible to obtain precise information about Hölder continuity of $f$ from considerations on the Frobenius solutions at that point. The main result in this paper resolves the complementary case in a general theorem of univalence of Nehari.


## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let $f$ be analytic and locally univalent, and let $\{f, z\}=\left(f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}-(1 / 2)\left(f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ be its Schwarzian derivative. Two main features of the Schwarzian derivative are that all solutions to $\{f, z\}=0$ are given by fractional linear transformations $T(z)=(a z+b) /(c z+d)$ and that $\{T \circ f, z\}=\{f, z\}$. The second property is a consequence of the first and an important addition formula for the Schwarzian derivative of a composition. There is a classical connection between the Schwarzian derivative and second order linear equations: any solution of $\{f, z\}=2 p(z)$ is given by $(a u+b v) /(c u+d v), a d-b c \neq 0$, where $u, v$ are two linearly independent solutions of the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}+p y=0 . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

A well known fact that follows from this is that $f$ is univalent on a given domain if and only if any nontrivial solution of (1.1) vanishes at most once in the domain (see, e.g., [D]). This characterization of univalence was systematically used by Nehari, who derived several sufficient conditions for global injectivity. Briefly, estimates on the size of $|\{f, z\}|$ together with comparison theorems for the solutions of differential equations imply the absence of multiple zeroes of nontrivial solutions of (1.1). In the unit disc $D$, some of the conditions of this type that imply univalence are

$$
\begin{align*}
& |\{f, z\}| \leq \frac{\pi^{2}}{2}  \tag{1.2}\\
& |\{f, z\}| \leq \frac{2}{\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}}  \tag{1.3}\\
& |\{f, z\}| \leq \frac{4}{1-|z|^{2}} \tag{1.4}
\end{align*}
$$

The constants $\pi^{2} / 2,2$ and 4 are sharp in each case. All of these are particular instances of the following general result due to Nehari (Theorem 1 in [ N 2$]$ ):

Let $p(x) \geq 0$ be an even function on $(-1,1)$ such that $\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2} p(x)$ is nonincreasing for $x>0$. Suppose that the solution $y$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}+p y=0, \quad y(0)=1, y^{\prime}(0)=0 \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

does not vanish on $(-1,1)$. If $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$ then $f$ is univalent in the unit disc.
With the choices for $p$ as in (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) the respective solutions of (1.5) are given by $\cos \left(\frac{\pi}{2} x\right), \sqrt{1-x^{2}}$ and $1-x^{2}$. The odd solution of the linear equation is

$$
y(x) \int_{0}^{x} y^{-2}(s) d s
$$

and since the functions involved here are analytic on $(-1,1)$ they extend to the unit disc. Consequently

$$
F(z)=\int_{0}^{z} y^{-2}(\zeta) d \zeta
$$

gives in each case the extremal map with the normalizations $F(0)=0, F^{\prime}(0)=1$ and $F^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$.

By using standard comparison theorems for solutions of differential equations one can go a step further and derive upper and lower bounds for $|f|$ and $\left|f^{\prime}\right|$ when $f$ is normalized as $F$ and $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$ [C-O].

In Nehari's theorem $p$ is assumed to be continuous, and for such $p$ we will continue to denote by $F$ the associated function defined on $(-1,1)$. Nehari also showed under what circumstances the condition $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$ is sharp. It states that if $F(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow 1$ then for any positive function $r(x)$ on $(-1,1)$ the condition

$$
|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)+r(|z|)
$$

is in general not sufficient for univalence (Theorem 2 in [ N 2$]$ ).
In this paper we shall be concerned with the question of what happens when $F(1)<\infty$. Our main result is
THEOREM 1. Let $p(x) \geq 0$ be an even function on $(-1,1)$ with $\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2} p(x)$ nonincreasing for $x>0$. Suppose that the even solution $y$ of (1.1) is positive and is such that

$$
\int_{0}^{1} y^{-2}(x) d x<\infty
$$

If $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$ then $f(D)$ is a quasidisc.
A quasidisc is the image of $D$ under some map which is quasiconformal in the entire plane. Let $\Omega$ be simply-connected with its Poincaré metric $\lambda(z)|d z|$. A combined result of Ahlfors and later Gehring gives a characterization of quasidiscs which is necessary and sufficient: there exists a positive constant $\eta$ such the inequality

$$
|\{\phi, z\}| \leq \eta \lambda^{2}(z)
$$

implies that $\phi$ is univalent in $\Omega$ (see, e.g., [L]).
The function $p$ in Theorem 1 is assumed to be continuous. As previously shown, there are important cases when $p$ is actually analytic and $x=1$ is a regular singular point of (1.1). This allows to simplify the analysis by considering the possible Frobenius solutions at $x=1$. The assumption that $F(1)$ is finite implies that either $y \sim(1-x)^{m}$ as $x \rightarrow 1$, for some $0<m<\frac{1}{2}$, or else that $y(1)>0$. In the latter case, the normalized function $f$ will be Lipschitz continuous on $D$ while in the former case, it is possible to prove Hölder continuity.

I would like to thank C. Epstein for helpful discussions concerning the proof of Lemma 1.. The referee's valuable comments allowed a simplification of the original proof and gave greater clarity to other parts of the exposition.

## 2. PROOFS

The proof of Theorem 1 will be divided in a series of lemmas. In what follows, let $p$ and $y$ satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem. Let $\alpha \in[0,1)$. Most of the analysis ahead depends on the solution $u$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{\alpha}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}} u=0, \quad u(0)=1, u^{\prime}(0)=0 . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

This function is given explicitly by

$$
u(x)=\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1-x^{2}}\left\{\left(\frac{1+x}{1-x}\right)^{\beta}+\left(\frac{1-x}{1+x}\right)^{\beta}\right\}
$$

where $\beta=\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1-\alpha}[\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{p} .492]$. In particular,

$$
u(x) \sim(1-x)^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta} \quad, x \rightarrow 1
$$

and therefore $\int_{0}^{1} u^{-2}(x) d x<\infty$. Let $\mu=\lim _{x \rightarrow 1}\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2} p(x)$. Clearly $\mu \geq 0$ and we claim that $\mu<1$. If not then $p(x) \geq\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-2}$. Let $P(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-2}$ so that the function $q(x)=p(x)-P(x)$ is non-negative. Then $z(x)=\sqrt{1-x^{2}}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime \prime}+P z=0, \quad z(0)=1, z^{\prime}(0)=0 . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (2.2) by $y$, (1.5) by $z$, and subtracting, we get

$$
z^{\prime \prime} y-z y^{\prime \prime}=q y z
$$

We integrate this equation, using the initial condition on $y$ and $z$, to obtain

$$
\left(\frac{z}{y}\right)^{\prime}(x)=\frac{\int_{0}^{x}(u q y)(s) d s}{y(x)^{2}} .
$$

Hence $\left(\frac{z}{y}\right)^{\prime}$ has the same sign as $x$ and therefore $y \leq z$ on $(-1,1)$ since $z(0)=y(0)=1$. It follows that either $y$ vanishes on $(-1,1)$ or else $F(1)=\infty$. This contradiction proves our claim. Choose $\alpha$ such that $\mu<\alpha<1$ and let now

$$
q(x)=p(x)-\frac{\alpha}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}}
$$

LEMMA 1. Let $l=\liminf _{x \rightarrow 1}(1-x)\left(y^{\prime} / y\right)$. Then $-\frac{1}{2}<l \leq 0$.
PROOF: Following an argument almost identical to the one given above, we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}=\frac{u^{\prime}}{u}-\frac{\int_{0}^{x}(u q y)(s) d s}{u(x) y(x)} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $y^{\prime \prime}=-p y \leq 0$ we have $y^{\prime} \leq 0$ on $(0,1)$ because of the initial condition. Hence $l \leq 0$. On the other hand, the limit of $(1-x)\left(u^{\prime} / u\right)$ as $x \rightarrow 1$ can be computed directly and it equals $-\left(\frac{1}{2}-\beta\right)$. This, together with equation (2.3) and the fact that $q(x)<0$ for $x$ sufficiently close to 1 imply the lemma.

By considering the graph of the function $F$ it follows from elementary geometry that

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{1-x}{y^{2}}=0
$$

LEMMA 2. There exists a constant $M$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(1)-F(x) \leq M\left(\frac{1-x}{y^{2}}\right) . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

PROOF: The derivative of the left hand side of $(2.4)$ is $-y^{-2}$ while the derivative of $(1-x) y^{-2}$ is

$$
-y^{-2}\left(1+2(1-x) \frac{y^{\prime}}{y}\right) .
$$

Lemma 1 implies that $1+2(1-x)\left(y^{\prime} / y\right) \geq \sigma>0$ provided $x$ is sufficiently close to 1 . Hence for all such $x$

$$
F(1)-F(x) \leq \frac{1}{\sigma}\left(\frac{1-x}{y^{2}}\right)
$$

and the lemma follows.
Now we state the key result in this chain.

LEMMA 3. There exists a constant $\eta>0$ such that the solution $\varphi$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi^{\prime \prime}+\left(p(x)+\frac{\eta}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}}\right) \varphi=0, \quad \varphi(0)=1, \varphi^{\prime}(0)=0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

does not vanish on $(-1,1)$.
PROOF: Let $c=F(1)$. On the image interval $(-c, c)$ we consider the "Poincaré density"

$$
\lambda(w)=\frac{1}{F^{\prime}(x)\left(1-x^{2}\right)}=\frac{y^{2}}{1-x^{2}}
$$

where $w=F(x)$. We will show that for $\eta>0$ sufficiently small the solution $h$ of

$$
\begin{equation*}
h^{\prime \prime}+\eta \lambda^{2}(w) h=0, \quad h(0)=1, h^{\prime}(0)=0 \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

is positive on $(-c, c)$. By Lemma 2,

$$
\lambda(w)=\frac{y^{2}}{1-x^{2}} \leq \frac{y^{2}}{1-x} \leq \frac{M}{c-w} \leq \frac{2 M c}{c^{2}-w^{2}} .
$$

Thus it suffices to show that the solution of (2.6) with $\lambda^{2}(w)$ replaced by $4 M^{2} c^{2}\left(c^{2}-w^{2}\right)^{-2}$ does not vanish. This will be the case as long as $4 M^{2} \eta \leq 1$. To see this, we rescale. The function $\bar{h}(x)=h(c x)$ solves $\bar{h}^{\prime \prime}+4 M^{2} \eta\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-2} \bar{h}=0$ with even initial conditions. Then $\bar{h}>0$ on ( $-1,1$ ) if and only if $4 M^{2} \eta \leq 1$ [K, p.492]. With $h$ the positive solution of (2.6) we define $\varphi$ by

$$
\varphi(x)=y(x) h(F(x))
$$

A straightforward computation shows that $\varphi$ is the solution of (2.5). This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.

This lemma together with Nehari's first theorem shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\{g, z\}| \leq 2\left(p(|z|)+\frac{\eta}{\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}}\right) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a sufficient condition for univalence. The proof of Theorem 1 is now quite simple. Assume $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$ and let $\lambda(\zeta)|d \zeta|$ be the Poincaré metric on $\Omega=f(D)$. We will show that

$$
|\{\phi, \zeta\}| \leq 2 \eta \lambda^{2}(\zeta)
$$

implies the univalence of the map $\phi$. Let $g(z)=\phi(f(z))$. Then

$$
\{g, z\}=\{\phi, f(z)\} f^{\prime}(z)^{2}+\{f, z\}
$$

and therefore

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}|\{g, z\}| \leq \lambda^{-2}(\zeta)|\{\phi, \zeta\}|+2\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2} p(|z|)
$$

where $\zeta=f(z)$. It follows that $g$ satisfies (2.7), hence $g$ and consequently $\phi$ are univalent. This shows that $\Omega$ is a quasidisc.

## 3. THE ANALYTIC CASE

In this section we shall assume that, in addition, $p$ is analytic and that $x=1$ is a regular singular point of the equation (1.1). The assumptions on the even solution $y$ are as before. Recall that $\mu=\lim _{x \rightarrow 1}\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2} p(x)$. From the analysis of the possible Frobenius solutions at $x=1$ we will prove Hölder or Lipschitz continuity for maps $f$ that satisfy $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$. Because of the invariance of the Schwarzian derivative under Möbius changes one can not expect such a result unless $f$ is properly normalized. The right normalization turns out to be $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$. Let $u$ solve

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{1}{2}\{f, z\} u=0, \quad u(0)=1, u^{\prime}(0)=0
$$

and let

$$
v(z)=u(z) \int_{0}^{z} u^{-2}(\zeta) d \zeta
$$

be the solution with odd initial conditions. If $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$ then

$$
f(z)=f(0)+f^{\prime}(0) \int_{0}^{z} u^{-2}(\zeta) d \zeta
$$

From Lemma 2 in [C-O] it follows that if $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$ then

$$
|u(z)| \geq y(|z|)
$$

and therefore

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right| y^{-2}(|z|)
$$

We distinguish the cases $\mu>0$ and $\mu=0$. Suppose $\mu$ is positive. Then $p(x) \geq \mu\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-2}$ and hence the function $y$ must vanish at $x=1$. The possible orders $m$ of vanishing are given by the roots of the inditial equation

$$
m^{2}-m+\frac{\mu}{4}=0
$$

i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{1}=\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\mu}}{2} \quad, \quad m_{2}=\frac{1-\sqrt{1-\mu}}{2} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $0<m_{2}<\frac{1}{2}<m_{1}<1$. Since $m_{1}-m_{2}$ is not an integer both orders of vanishing can occur [H].
THEOREM 2. Let $f$ satisfy $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|), f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$ and suppose $\mu>0$. If $F(1)$ is finite then $f$ is Hölder continuous on $D$ with Hölder exponent $\sqrt{1-\mu}$.
PROOF: The assumption that $F(1)<\infty$ implies that $y \sim(1-x)^{m_{2}}$ as $x \rightarrow 1$. Therefore

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|=O\left((1-|z|)^{-2 m_{2}}\right) .
$$

A standard technique of integrating along hyperbolic segments (see, e.g., [G-P]) gives

$$
\left|f\left(z_{1}\right)-f\left(z_{2}\right)\right|=O\left(\left|z_{1}-z_{2}\right|^{1-2 m_{2}}\right)
$$

and the theorem follows.
Suppose now $\mu=0$. In this case, the roots of the inditial equation are 1 and 0 . Hence two linearly independent solutions are $y_{1}=(1-x) h_{1}$ and $y_{2}=h_{2}+c y_{1} \log (1-x)$, where $h_{1}, h_{2}$ are analytic and nonvanishing at $x=1[\mathrm{H}$, Theorem 5.3.1].

THEOREM 3. Let $f$ satisfy $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|), f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$ and suppose $\mu=0$. If $F(1)$ is finite then $f$ is Lipschitz continuous on $D$.

PROOF: The finiteness condition and the discussion preceding the theorem imply that in fact $y$ cannot vanish at $x=1$. Hence $\left|f^{\prime}\right|$ is uniformly bounded.

The following situation describes accurately the case $\mu=0$. Let $p(x)=2\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-1}$ and let $p_{t}(x)=t p(x), 0 \leq t<1$. Since the inequality $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p(|z|)$ is sufficient for univalence then $|\{f, z\}| \leq 2 p_{t}(|z|)$ implies that $f(D)$ is a quasidisc ( Theorem 6 in [G-P]). As mentioned in the introduction, the even solution of (1.1) is in this case $y=1-x^{2}$. We claim that the even solution $y_{t}$ of (1.1) with $p$ replaced by $p_{t}$ must be positive at the endpoints. To show this, let

$$
F_{t}(z)=\int_{0}^{z} y_{t}^{-2}(\zeta) d \zeta
$$

This function is odd and has Schwarzian derivative equal to $2 p_{t}(z)$. Therefore $F_{t}(D)$ is a quasidisc and hence $F_{t}(1)<\infty$, otherwise the point at infinity would be a point of selfintersection of $\partial F_{t}(D)$. This in turn would contradict the fact that $\partial F_{t}(D)$ is a Jordan curve. Since $\mu_{t}=t \mu=0$ it follows that $y_{t}$ is a linear combination of the functions $y_{1}, y_{2}$ as in the paragraph preceding the statement of Theorem 3.. Thus $F_{t}(1)<\infty$ forces $y_{t}(1)>0$.

We consider finally examples for any $\mu \in(0,1)$. For $s \in(1,2)$ let

$$
p(x)=s \frac{1-(s-1) x^{2}}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}}
$$

Then $\mu=s(2-s)$ and the even solution of (1.1) is

$$
y=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{\frac{s}{2}} .
$$

(The exponent $\frac{s}{2}$ corresponds to $m_{1}$ in (3.1) and $m_{2}=\frac{2-s}{2}$.) This shows that the function $F$ has $F(1)=\infty$. On the other hand, by the argument given above, changing $p$ to $t p$ has the effect of making $F_{t}(1)$ finite. Consider now equation (3.1) with $\mu$ replaced by $t \mu$. Since $y_{t} \sim(1-x)^{m_{1}}, x \rightarrow 1$, would make $F_{t}(1)$ infinite, we conclude that the order of vanishing of the solution $y_{t}$ must be the other root, $m_{2}$.
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