

## RIEMANN MAPPING THEOREM FOR SIMPLY CONNECTED SETS WITH SMOOTH BOUNDARY

The Riemann mapping theorem states that for any simply connected open set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\Omega \neq \mathbb{C}$ , there is a biholomorphic map  $H : \Omega \rightarrow B_1$ . In this section we prove this theorem for simply connected sets  $\Omega$  with smooth boundaries. The proof follows the original idea of Riemann, which is based on a variational principle. We notice that this proof also provides the up-to-the-boundary regularity of  $H$ , which turns out to be as smooth as  $\partial\Omega$ .

**Idea of the proof.** The Riemann's proof starts from the following observation. Suppose that we have a map

$$H : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{B_1},$$

which is a homeomorphism between  $\overline{\Omega}$  and  $\overline{B_1}$ , and a conformal map between  $\Omega$  and  $B_1$ . Suppose that  $H$  can be written in the form

$$H(z) = zh(z),$$

for some holomorphic function  $h$ . Since

$$|H(z)| = 1 \quad \text{for all } z \in \partial\Omega,$$

we have that

$$|h(z)| = \frac{1}{|z|} \quad \text{for all } z \in \partial\Omega.$$

Assume that  $h$  can be written in the form

$$h = \exp(u + iv),$$

where  $u$  and  $v$  are real-valued functions and that  $L := u + iv$  is holomorphic on  $\Omega$ . Then  $u$  and  $v$  are harmonic on  $\Omega$ . Moreover, since

$$|h(z)| = e^{u(z)},$$

we have that  $u$  should satisfy

$$u(z) = -\ln|z| \quad \text{for all } z \in \partial\Omega.$$

Thus,  $u$  is the solution to

$$\Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = -\ln|z| \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

In order to prove the Riemann mapping theorem, we invert this process. We start from the harmonic extension defined from the above equation, we reconstruct  $H$  and we prove that it is a bijection between  $\overline{\Omega}$  and  $\overline{B_1}$ .

**Teorema 1** (Riemann mapping theorem for smooth sets). *Let  $\Omega$  be a connected bounded open set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  whose boundary  $\partial\Omega$  is:*

- $C^{k,\alpha}$  regular for some  $k \geq 1$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ;
- parametrized by a single closed  $C^{k,\alpha}$  curve  $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $|\sigma'(t)| > 0$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

*Then, there is a map*

$$H : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{B_1}$$

*such that:*

- (i)  $H : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is  $C^{k,\alpha}$  regular for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ;
- (ii)  $H$  is holomorphic on  $\Omega$ ;
- (iii)  $H : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{B_1}$  is a homeomorphism;
- (iv) the inverse  $H^{-1} : \overline{B_1} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$  is  $C^{k,\alpha}$  regular on  $\overline{B_1}$  and holomorphic on  $B_1$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we can suppose that  $0 \in \Omega$ . We proceed in several steps.

**Step 1. Construction of  $H$ .** Let

$$u : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a continuous function solution to

$$\Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u(z) = -\ln|z| \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Since  $\partial\Omega$  is  $C^{k,\alpha}$  and since the boundary datum is smooth, we have that

$$u \in C^{k,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}).$$

Consider the differential form

$$-\partial_y u \, dx + \partial_x u \, dy.$$

This is a closed form since

$$d\left(-\partial_y u \, dx + \partial_x u \, dy\right) = \Delta u \, dx \wedge dy = 0.$$

Then, there is a function  $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (called *harmonic conjugate of  $u$* ) such that

$$dv = -\partial_y u(x, y) \, dx + \partial_x u(x, y) \, dy,$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{cases} \partial_x v = -\partial_y u \\ \partial_y v = \partial_x u \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

For every  $z = (x, y) \in \Omega$ ,  $v(x, y)$  can be computed by integrating the differential form  $-\partial_y u \, dx + \partial_x u \, dy$  over any curve  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$  with

$$\sigma(0) = (0, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(1) = (x, y),$$

precisely:

$$v(x, y) = \int_0^1 \left( \sigma_1'(t) \partial_y u(\sigma_1(t), \sigma_2(t)) + \sigma_2'(t) \partial_x u(\sigma_1(t), \sigma_2(t)) \right) dt,$$

which in particular implies that also the function  $v : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is in  $C^{k, \alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ . Finally, we have constructed maps

$$L : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^2, \quad L(z) = u(z) + iv(z),$$

and

$$h : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^2, \quad h(z) = \exp\left(u(z) + iv(z)\right),$$

which are both of class  $C^{k, \alpha}(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{C})$  and holomorphic in  $\Omega$ . This implies that the map

$$H : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^2, \quad H(z) = zh(z)$$

is of class  $C^{k, \alpha}(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{C})$  holomorphic in  $\Omega$ .

**Step 2.  $H$  has values in  $\bar{B}_1$ .** Precisely, we will show that

$$H(\partial\Omega) \subset \partial B_1 \quad \text{and} \quad H(\Omega) \subset B_1.$$

First we notice that by construction we have

$$|h(z)| = \exp(u(z)) = \exp(-\ln|z|) = \frac{1}{|z|} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

This implies that

$$|H(z)| = 1 \quad \text{for all } z \in \partial\Omega.$$

Now, since the function  $\ln|z|$  is subharmonic in  $\Omega$  and  $u$  is harmonic in  $\Omega$ , we have that

$$u(z) + \ln|z| \text{ is subharmonic in } \Omega \text{ and continuous on } \bar{\Omega}.$$

Since  $u(z) + \ln|z|$  vanishes on  $\partial\Omega$ , the strong maximum principle now yields

$$u(z) + \ln|z| < 0 \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega.$$

This implies that

$$1 > \exp\left(u(z) + \ln|z|\right) = |z| \exp(u(z)) = |z| |h(z)| = |H(z)| \quad \text{for all } z \in \Omega.$$

**Step 3.  $H$  is onto.** We notice that:

- since  $H : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is continuous,  $H(\bar{\Omega})$  is a closed set;
- since  $H : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is holomorphic, the set  $H(\Omega)$  is open.

In particular, in order to prove that

$$H(\bar{\Omega}) = \bar{B}_1,$$

it is sufficient to prove that

$$B_1 \subset H(\bar{\Omega}).$$

Suppose by contradiction that there is a point

$$w \in B_1 \setminus H(\bar{\Omega}).$$

For every  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we set

$$w_t := tw$$

and we define  $t_*$  to be the largest  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $w_{t_*} \in H(\overline{\Omega})$ .

We notice that:

- by assumption  $w \notin H(\overline{\Omega})$ , so we have that  $t_* < 1$ ;
- $H(0) = 0$  so  $t_* > 0$ .

Let  $z_{t_*} \in \overline{\Omega}$  be such that  $H(z_{t_*}) = w_{t_*}$ . Since  $H(\Omega)$  is open, we necessarily have that  $z_{t_*} \in \partial\Omega$ . But this is impossible since  $H(\partial\Omega) \subset \partial B_1$ . This proves that  $H(\overline{\Omega}) = \overline{B}_1$ .

**Step 4.  $H : \Omega \rightarrow B_1$  is injective.** Notice that by construction

$$|h| = e^u \neq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Thus, 0 is the unique zero of the function

$$H : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad H(z) = zh(z),$$

and 0 has multiplicity 1. Thus, for every connected open set  $0 \ni D \Subset \Omega$  whose boundary  $\partial D$  is parametrized by a single closed regular  $C^1$  curve  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with  $\gamma' \neq 0$ , we have that:

$$1 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\partial_z H(z)}{H(z)} dz.$$

Consider the map

$$z_0 \mapsto \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\partial_z H(z)}{H(z) - H(z_0)} dz$$

defined for every  $z_0 \in D$ . Since this map is continuous and has values in  $\mathbb{N}$  we have that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\partial_z H(z)}{H(z) - H(z_0)} dz = 1 \quad \text{for every } z_0 \in D.$$

This shows that  $H$  is injective as map from  $D$  to  $\mathbb{C}$ . Since  $D$  is arbitrary, we get that  $H$  is injective as a map from  $\Omega$  to  $B_1$ .

**Step 5. Behavior of  $H$  at the boundary.** Let

$$g(x, y) = \ln |z| = \frac{1}{2} \ln(x^2 + y^2).$$

We notice that since  $u + g : \overline{\Omega}$  is continuous in  $\overline{\Omega}$ , subharmonic and strictly negative in  $\Omega$  and vanishes on  $\partial\Omega$ , the Hopf maximum principle implies that

$$\nabla(u + g) \neq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

which can be written as

$$\nabla u(x, y) + \frac{(x, y)}{x^2 + y^2} \neq 0 \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in \partial\Omega,$$

or in terms of  $z = x + iy$  as

$$(\partial_x u - i\partial_y u) + \frac{1}{z} \neq 0 \quad \text{for } z \in \partial\Omega.$$

We next notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z L(z) &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x - i\partial_y)(u + iv) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x u + \partial_y v) + i\frac{1}{2}(\partial_x v - \partial_y u) \\ &= \partial_x u - i\partial_y u, \end{aligned}$$

so the above condition yields

$$\partial_z L(z) + \frac{1}{z} \neq 0 \quad \text{for } z \in \partial\Omega.$$

Now, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z H(z) &= h(z) + z\partial_z h(z) \\ &= h(z) \left(1 + \frac{z\partial_z h(z)}{h(z)}\right) \\ &= h(z) \left(1 + z\partial_z L(z)\right), \end{aligned}$$

for every  $z \in \overline{\Omega}$ . This implies that

$$\partial_z H(z) \neq 0 \quad \text{for } z \in \partial\Omega,$$

which gives that the map

$$H : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{B}_1$$

is invertible around any boundary point  $z \in \partial\Omega$ . This proves two things:

- first, since  $H : \Omega \rightarrow B_1$  is injective, then also  $H : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{B}_1$  should be injective;
- second, the inverse map  $H^{-1} : \overline{B}_1 \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$  is  $C^{k,\alpha}$  regular up to the boundary.

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

In the proof of the Riemann mapping theorem we have used the following well-known formula for the number of zeros of a holomorphic function.

**Teorema 2** (Number of zeros of a holomorphic function). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$  be an open set and let  $\Phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a holomorphic function. Let  $D \Subset \Omega$  be a bounded connected open set such that:*

- $\Phi \neq 0$  on  $\partial D$ ;
- the boundary  $\partial D$  of  $D$  is  $C^1$  regular and is parametrized by a positively oriented closed regular  $C^1$  curve  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with  $\gamma' \neq 0$ .

*Then, the number  $N(\Phi, D)$  of zeros (counted with their multiplicity) of  $\Phi$  in  $D$  given by the formula*

$$N(\Phi, D) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\partial_z \Phi(z)}{\Phi(z)} dz.$$

*Proof.* Let  $N := N(\Phi, D)$  and let  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  be the zeros of  $\Phi$  in  $D$  (counted with their multiplicity). Then,  $\Phi$  can be written as

$$\Phi(z) = (z - z_1)(z - z_2) \dots (z - z_N) \Psi(z),$$

where  $\Psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a holomorphic function, which is non-zero in a neighborhood of  $\overline{D}$ . One can easily check that

$$\frac{\partial_z \Phi(z)}{\Phi(z)} = \frac{\partial_z \Psi(z)}{\Psi(z)} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{z - z_j}.$$

Now, since  $\frac{\partial_z \Psi}{\Psi}$  is holomorphic in a neighborhood of  $\overline{D}$ , we have that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\partial_z \Psi(z)}{\Psi(z)} dz = 0,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\partial_z \Phi(z)}{\Phi(z)} dz &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{\partial_z \Psi(z)}{\Psi(z)} dz + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{dz}{z - z_j} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{dz}{z - z_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the claim follows since, by the Cauchy formula, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{dz}{z - z_j} = 1,$$

for every  $z_j \in D$ .  $\square$