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1 Introduction and Main Results

Let \((M, \theta)\) be a strictly pseudoconvex pseudo-Hermitian compact hypersurface in \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\) in the sense of Webster [34] with a pseudo-Hermitian real one-form \(\theta\) on \(M\). Let \(R_\theta\) be the Webster pseudo scalar curvature for \(M\) with respect to \(\theta\). By the solution of the CR Yamabe problem given by Jerison and Lee [18], Gamara and Yacoub [10] and Gamara [9] (for \(n = 1\)), there is a pseudo-Hermitian real one-form \(\theta\) so that \((M, \theta)\) has constant Webster pseudo scalar curvature \(R_\theta\). Let \(\rho\) be a defining function for \(M\). Then \(\theta = \frac{1}{2} (\partial \rho - \overline{\partial} \rho)\) is a pseudo-Hermitian one-form for \(M\), and any Hermitian one-form can be constructed in this way by using defining function of \(M\). When \(M = S^{2n+1}\), the unit sphere in \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\), if \(\rho(z) = |z|^2 - 1\), then \(R_\theta = n(n + 1)\) on \(M\). The main purpose of the paper is to give some characterizations on \(\rho\) so that the pseudo scalar curvature \(R_\theta\) is a positive constant on \(M\) if and only if \(M\) is CR-equivalent to the sphere \(S^{2n+1}\).

Let \(D\) be a smoothly bounded pseudoconvex domain in \(\mathbb{C}^n\). Let \(u\) be a strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion function for \(D\) \((u = +\infty\) on \(\partial D\)). Let \(\rho(z) = -e^{-u(z)}\). Then the Fefferman’s functional \(J(\rho)\) of \(\rho\) is defined as:

\[
(1.1) \quad J(\rho) = -\det \left[ \rho \overline{\partial} \rho \quad \overline{\partial} \rho \right]
\]

where \(H(\rho)\) is the complex Hessian matrix of \(\rho\), \(\overline{\partial} \rho = (\partial_\tau \rho, \cdots, \partial_\pi \rho)\) is a \(1 \times n\) matrix and \((\overline{\partial} \rho)^*\) is its adjoint matrix.
Let \( f(z) \) be a positive function on \( D \). It was known (see, for examples, [7], [25]) that

\[
J(\rho) = f(z) > 0 \text{ in } D; \quad \rho = 0 \text{ on } \partial D
\]

if and only if

\[
det H(u)(z) = f(z)e^{(n+1)u} \text{ in } D; \quad u = +\infty \text{ on } \partial D.
\]

When \( f(z) \in C^\infty(\overline{D}) \) is positive for all \( z \in \overline{D} \), the existence and uniqueness of a strictly plurisubharmonic solution of (1.3) were given by Cheng and Yau in [7]. In particular, when \( f(z) \equiv 1 \), they proved that the plurisubharmonic solution \( u \) defines a complete Kähler-Einstein metric on \( D \):

\[
\partial^2 u / \partial z_i \partial \overline{z}_j dz_i \otimes d\overline{z}_j.
\]

When \( D \) is strictly pseudoconvex, uniqueness and a formal approximation solution \( \rho \) of (1.2) with \( u = -\log(-\rho) \) being plurisubharmonic in \( D \) were given by Fefferman [8] earlier; the existence of such a solution was proved by Cheng and Yau [7] with \( \rho \in C^{n+3/2}(\overline{D}) \). Lee and Melrose [22] gave an asymptotic expansion solution for \( \rho \). In particular, they proved that \( \rho \in C^{n+2-\epsilon}(\overline{D}) \) for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). In general \( \rho \) fails to be in \( C^{n+2}(\overline{D}) \).

Using the notation of \( J(\rho) \), the following formula for the Webster pseudo Ricci curvature of \((M, \theta)\) was given by Li and Luk in [28]:

\[
\text{Ric}_z(w, v) = -\sum_{j,k=1}^{n+1} \frac{\partial^2 \log J(\rho)(z)}{\partial z_j \partial \overline{z}_k} w_j \overline{v}_k + (n + 1) \frac{\det H(\rho)(z)}{J(\rho)(z)} w_j \overline{v}_k
\]

for \( v, w \in H_z(M) \), holomorphic tangent space of \( M \) at \( z \).

Assume that \( \phi : D \to B_{n+1} \) is a biholomorphic mapping, and if \( \rho(z) = |\phi(z)|^2 - 1 \), then \( \det H(\rho) = J(\rho) = |\det \phi'(z)|^2 \) on \( D \) and \( \log J(\rho) \) is pluriharmonic in \( D \). By (1.4), we have \( R_\theta = n(n + 1) \) on \( \partial D \).

The main purpose of the current paper is to prove the converse is also true, we state it as the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1.1** Let \( \rho \in C^3(\overline{D}) \) be a defining function for \( D \) so that \( u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z)) \) is strictly plurisubharmonic in \( D \). Let \( M = \partial D \) and \( \theta = \frac{1}{2i}(\partial \rho - \overline{\partial} \rho) \). Assume \( \log J(\rho) \) is harmonic in the Kähler metric \( \partial^2 u / \partial z_i \partial \overline{z}_j dz_i \otimes d\overline{z}_j \), we have the following two statements hold:
(a) If $R_\theta \equiv c > 0$, constant on $\partial D$, then $D$ is biholomorphic to the unit ball $B_{n+1}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$.

(b) Webster pseudo scalar curvature

\begin{equation}
R_\theta = n(n+1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \quad \text{on} \quad \partial D.
\end{equation}

Notice that if $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is the potential function for the Kähler-Einstein metric for $D$, then $J(\rho) = 1$ on $D$. By Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 3.1 in [24], we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.2** Let $D$ be a smoothly bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Assume that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is the potential function for the Kähler-Einstein metric for $D$ (defined by (1.3) with $f \equiv 1$) and $\theta = \frac{1}{2i}(\partial \rho - \overline{\partial} \rho)$ on $M = \partial D$. If $R_\theta \equiv c > 0$, constant on $\partial D$, then there is a biholomorphic map $\phi : D \to B_{n+1}$ so that $\det \phi'(z)$ is a constant on $D$.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we provide several main lemmas. In Section 3, we will prove part (b) of Theorem 1.1. Finally, the proofs of Part(a) of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 are given in Section 4.

### 2 Main Lemmas

Let $D = \{ z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) < 0 \}$ with $C^2$ defining function $\rho$. Let $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ be plurisubharmonic in $D$. Then the relation between $J(\rho)$ and $\det H(u)$ is given by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1** Let $u \in C^2(D)$ and let $\rho(z) = -e^{-u}$. Then

\begin{equation}
\det H(u) = J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}.
\end{equation}

**Proof.** By viewing $\bar{\partial}u$ as an $1$ by $n$ matrix and $(\bar{\partial}u)^*$ is its adjoint matrix, one has that

\begin{equation}
\bar{\partial} \rho = -\rho \bar{\partial} u, \quad H(\rho)(z) = -\rho(z)H(u) + \rho(z)(\bar{\partial}u)^* \bar{\partial} u.
\end{equation}
Thus

\[
J(\rho) = - \det \left[ \begin{array}{cc} -\rho u & -\rho \bar{u} \\
-\rho (\partial u)^* & -\rho H(u) + \rho (\partial u)^* \bar{u} \end{array} \right]
\]

\[
= -(\rho)^{n+1} \det \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & -\bar{u} \\
0 & H(u) + (\partial u)^* \bar{u} \end{array} \right]
\]

\[
= -(\rho)^{n+1} \det(-H(u))
\]

\[
= e^{-(n+1)u} \det H(u).
\]

Therefore, (2.1) holds and the lemma is proved.

Let \([u^\rho]^t = H(u)^{-1}\). We will use the following notations:

\[
(2.3) \quad u_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}, \quad u_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial z_i}, \quad u_j = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{z}_j}
\]

and

\[
(2.4) \quad |\partial u|^2_u := u_{ij} \partial_i u \partial_j u, \quad T(z) := |\partial u|^2_u + e^{-u}.
\]

Then if \(\rho(z) = -e^{-u(z)}\) with \(u\) being strictly plurisubharmonic in \(D\), then by Lemma 2.2 in [24],

\[
(2.5) \quad \det H(\rho) = e^{-nu} \det H(u)(1 - |\partial u|^2_u) = J(\rho) e^u (1 - |\partial u|^2_u).
\]

Thus

\[
(2.6) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} - 1 = e^u (1 - T(z)).
\]

Then the following lemma was included in the proof of Part(b) of Theorem 2.4 in [24], given in pages 468–470.

**Lemma 2.2** Let \(D\) be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in \(\mathbb{C}^n\). Let \(u \in C^4(D)\) be strictly plurisubharmonic in \(D\), and let \(\rho(z) = -e^{-u}\). If \(-\log J(\rho)\) is subharmonic in the metric \(u_{ij} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j\), then

\[
(2.7) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n u_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j (-\frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)})(z) \geq 0, \quad z \in D.
\]
The following result essentially is corollary of the main theorem of Burns [3] in our notation:

**Corollary 2.3** Let $\rho \in C^3(D)$ be a defining function for $D$ so that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in $D$. Let $M = \partial D$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2\pi}(\partial \rho - \bar{\partial} \rho)$. If $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho)$ is a positive constant on the boundary $\partial D$ of $D$, then $D$ is biholomorphic to the unit ball $B_{n+1}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$.

**Proof.** Since $u = -\log(-\rho)$ is plurisubharmonic in $D$, by (2.1), we have $J(\rho) > 0$ on $D$. Notice that $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho)$ is a positive constant on $D$, we have $\rho$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in $D$. Let $z_0 \in D$ be such that

$$(2.8) \quad m = -\min\{\rho(z) : z \in \overline{D}\} = -\rho(z_0),$$

Then

$$(2.9) \quad J(\rho)(z_0) = m \det H(\rho)(z_0).$$

Let

$$(2.10) \quad \tau(z) = \rho(z) + m.$$  

Then $\tau : D \rightarrow [0, m)$ is smooth, onto and strictly plurisubharmonic. Moreover,

$$J[\tau] = -\det H(\tau)[\tau - |\partial \tau|^2]$$

$$= -m \det H(\rho) - \det H(\rho)(\rho - |\partial \rho|^2)$$

$$= -m \det H(\rho) + J(\rho).$$

Therefore,

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv \text{constant on } D \iff J(\tau) \equiv 0 \text{ on } D.$$

Notice that

$$(2.12) \quad J(\tau) = -\tau^{n+1} \det H(\log \tau)$$

Thus

$$(2.13) \quad J(\tau) = 0 \iff \det H(\log \tau) = 0 \quad D \setminus \tau^{-1}(0).$$

Combining the above relations and the main theorem of Burns in [3], the proof of Corollary 2.3 is complete. \(\square\)

Next result is the main theorem of this section.
THEOREM 2.4 Let $\rho \in C^3(D)$ be a defining function for $D$ so that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in $D$. If $-\log J(\rho)$ is subharmonic in Kähler metric $u_{ij}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, and if there is a positive constant $c$ so that

$$\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv c \quad \text{on} \quad \partial D,$$

then

$$\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv c \quad \text{on} \quad D.$$

**Proof.** Since $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv c > 0$ on $\partial D$, replacing $\rho$ by $c\rho$ if it is necessary, without loss of generality, we may assume that $c = 1$. We can write

$$\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) := 1 + A(z)\rho(z), \quad z \in D.$$

Since $-\log J(\rho)$ is subharmonic in the metric $u_{ij}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$, by Lemma 2.2, we have that $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho)$ attains its minimum over $\partial D$ at some point in $\partial D$. Thus (2.16) holds with $A(z) \leq 0$ in $D$. By (2.6), one has

$$1 - T(z) = \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} e^{-u} - e^{-u} = (1 + A(z)\rho)(-\rho) + \rho.$$

Thus, by (2.16)

$$T(z) = 1 - \rho(z) + (1 + A\rho)\rho = 1 + A(z)\rho(z)^2.$$

We claim that $T(z) \equiv 1$ on $D$ (i.e. $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv 1$ on $D$.)

By Lemma 2.2, if there is $z_0 \in D$ so that $\det H(\rho)(z_0)/J(\rho)(z_0) = 1$, then $\det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \equiv 1$ on $D$ (i.e. $A \equiv 0$). Otherwise, we have $A(z) < 0$ on $D$, we will prove there is a contradiction.

Let $C = \max\{-A(z) : z \in \overline{D}\} \in (0, \infty)$. Then $C \in (0, \infty)$, and by (2.18), we have

$$0 < (1 - T) \leq C\rho(z)^2 = Ce^{-2u}, \quad \text{on} \quad D.$$

By (2.18) again, one has $T(z) := |\partial u|^2 + e^{-u} < 1$ on $D$. Since $e^{-u} = 0$ on $\partial D$ and $e^{-u} > 0$ in $D$, one can easily see that

$$b := \max\{e^{-u(z)} : z \in D\} < 1, \quad z \in D.$$
By (2.19), we have

\[(2.21) \quad (1 - T)^{-3/4} \geq C^{-3/4} e^{\frac{3u}{2}}, \quad \frac{1}{1 - e^{u(z)}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - b}. \]

**Note:** This is key place we use the condition \( \det H(\rho)/J(\rho) = 1 \) on \( \partial D \).

For any fixed positive integer \( m \) satisfying

\[(2.22) \quad m \geq C^{3/4} \frac{(n + 1)^2}{(1 - b)^2}, \]

It is easy to see that

\[(2.23) \quad m(1 - T)^{-3/4} - \frac{(1 + n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} - \frac{(1 + n)^2 |\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2} e^u \geq 0, \quad z \in D. \]

Let

\[ L_n := u^\partial \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \overline{z}_j} - n \text{Re} (u^\partial u_i \partial \overline{z}_j) \]

and

\[ L_{m,n} = L_n + m(1 - T)^{-3/4} \text{Re} (\partial_i T u^\partial \partial_j). \]

For any \( z_0 \in D \), we will show \( L_{m,n} T(z_0) \geq 0 \). By a holomorphic change of coordinates, without loss of generality, we may assume that

\[(2.26) \quad u^\partial_k(z_0) = 0, \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n. \]

It was proved by author in [24] that: if \( T(z) \leq 1 \) on \( D \) and if \( u \) is the strictly plurisubharmonic solution for the Monge-Ampère equation:

\[(2.27) \quad \det H(u) = J e^{(n+1)u} \text{ in } D; \quad u = \infty \text{ on } \partial D \]

with \( -\log J \) is subharmonic in the metric \( u^\partial d z_i \otimes d \overline{z}_j \), then

\[ u^\partial \partial_j T(z_0) = u^\partial (u^{k\overline{\tau}} u_k u_\overline{\tau} + e^{-u}) \]

\[ \geq n(1 - T) - |\partial u|^2_u (1 - e^{-u}) + u^\partial u^{k\overline{\tau}} u_k u_\overline{\tau}. \]

**Note:** This is (2.24) in [24] while (2.21) in [24] becomes inequality with our
assumption $u^j \partial_j \log J(\rho)(z_0) \leq 0$.

By (2.26), one has that $\partial_k u^j(z_0) = 0$. Thus, for $1 \leq j \leq n$, one has

\begin{equation}
(2.29) \quad \partial_j T(z_0) = u^k u_k u_j - u^j (1 - e^{-u}), \quad \partial_i T(z_0) = u^k u_{ik} u_j + u_i (1 - e^{-u}).
\end{equation}

Thus

\begin{equation}
(2.30) \quad u^j \partial_i T(z_0) = u^j u_i u^k u_k u_j + |\partial u|^2 (1 - e^{-u})
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
(2.31) \quad u^j \partial_j T(z_0) \geq n(1 - T) - u^j u_i \partial_j T + u^j u_i u^k u_k u_j + u^j u^k u_{ik} u_j.
\end{equation}

Thus

\begin{equation}
(2.32) \quad L_n T \geq n(1 - T) - \text{Re} (1 + n) u^j u_i \partial_j T + \text{Re} u^j u_i u^k u_k u_j + u^j u^k u_{ik} u_j.
\end{equation}

By (2.29), one has

\begin{equation}
(2.33) \quad u_i(z_0) = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-u}} [\partial_i T(z_0) - u^k u_{ik} u_j(z_0)].
\end{equation}

Thus

\begin{equation}
(2.34) \quad -(1 + n) \text{Re} u^j u_i \partial_j T
= \frac{1 + n}{1 - e^{-u}} [-u^i \partial_i T \partial_j T + u^j u^k u_k u_{ik} \partial_j T]
\geq -\left[ \frac{(1 + n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} + \frac{(1 + n)^2 |\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2} e^u |u^j \partial_i T \partial_j T - e^{-u} u^i u^k u_{ik} u_j \right]
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
(2.35) \quad \text{Re} u^j u_i u^k u_{ik} u_j(z_0) \geq -|\partial u|^2 u^j u^k u_{ik} u_j(z_0).
\end{equation}

Combining (2.32), (2.34) and (2.35), one has

\begin{equation}
(2.36) \quad L_n T(z_0) \geq n(1 - T) + (1 - |\partial u|^2 - e^{-u}) u^j u^k u_{ik} u_j
- \left[ \frac{(1 + n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} + \frac{(1 + n)^2 |\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2} e^u |u^j \partial_i T \partial_j T.\right]
\end{equation}
\[
\mathcal{L}_{m,n}T(z_0) \geq n(1 - T) + (1 - T)u^{\vec{k}}u_k u^{\vec{\tau}}u_\tau \\
+ [m(1 - T)^{-3/4} - \frac{(1 + n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} - \frac{(1 + n)^2|\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2}e^{u^*}]u^{\vec{\tau}}\partial_\tau T\partial_\tau T \\
\geq [m(1 - T)^{-3/4} - \frac{(1 + n)}{(1 - e^{-u})} - \frac{(1 + n)^2|\partial u|^2}{4(1 - e^{-u})^2}e^{u^*}]u^{\vec{\tau}}\partial_\tau T\partial_\tau T \\
\geq 0.
\]

Since \(\det H(u) = J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}\), we have \(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \partial_i [J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}u^{\vec{\tau}}] = 0\) for all \(1 \leq j \leq n\). Thus

\[
\mathcal{L}_{m,n}T(z_0) = e^u e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}}L_{m,n}T.
\]

Let \(|\partial \rho|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\partial_j \rho(z)|^2\). Then

\[
0 = \text{Re} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \partial_i [e^{-nu} e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}}J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}u^{\vec{\tau}}\partial_\tau T] \\
= \text{Re} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \partial_i [e^{-nu} e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}}J(\rho)e^{(n+1)u}u^{\vec{\tau}}\partial_\tau T] dv(z) \\
= \int_{\Omega} e^u e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}}L_{m,n}T(z) dv(z)
\]
(2.37) shows that the integrand in the last integral is non-negative on $D$. Thus, the above identity implies that

$$e^u e^{-4m(1-T)^{1/4}} L_{m,n} T(z) = 0, \quad z \in D.$$  

Therefore,

$$L_{m,n} T(z) \equiv 0, \quad \text{in } D.$$ 

Maximum principle (for both $T$ and $-T$) implies that

$$\max\{T(z) : z \in \Omega\} = \max\{T(z) : z \in \partial D\} = 1$$

and

$$\min\{T(z) : z \in \Omega\} = \min\{T(z) : z \in \partial D\} = 1.$$ 

Therefore

$$T(z) \equiv 1, \quad \text{and } \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv 1 \quad \text{in } D.$$ 

This contradicts to $A(z) < 0$ on $D$ (i.e. $T(z) < 1$ on $D$). Therefore, our claim $T(z) \equiv 1$ is proved, and so

$$\frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \equiv 1 \quad \text{in } D.$$ 

Therefore, the proof of Theorem 2.4 is complete.  

3 Proof of Part (b) of Theorem 1.1

First let us recall some notions and a formula for the Webster pseudo Ricci curvature and pseudo scalar curvature proved in [28]. Let $M$ be a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ with a defining function $\rho \in C^3(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})$. Let $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} : \rho(z) < 0\}$ and let $U$ be a neighborhood of $M$. Assume that $u(z) = -\log(-\rho(z))$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in $D \cap U$. From now on, we always use $\rho$ to denote a defining function for $M$ and $\theta = \frac{i}{2} (\partial \rho - \overline{\partial} \rho)$ is the pseudo-Hermitian form for $M$ associated to the defining function $\rho$. We define a second order differential operator $D_{\alpha\beta}$ associated to $\rho$ for $1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n$ as follows:

$$D_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_\alpha \overline{\partial} z_\beta} - \frac{\rho_\alpha}{\rho_{n+1}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_{n+1} \overline{\partial} z_\beta} - \frac{\rho_{\overline{\beta}}}{\rho_{n+1}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_\alpha \overline{\partial} z_{n+1}} + \frac{\rho_\alpha \rho_{\overline{\beta}}}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_{n+1} \overline{\partial} z_{n+1}}.$$
The following explicit formula for the Webster pseudo Ricci curvature and pseudo scalar curvature in terms of defining function $\rho$ for $(M, \theta)$ was proved in [28]:

**THEOREM 3.1** Let $M = \partial D$ be a strictly pseudoconvex hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Let $\rho \in C^3(\overline{D} \cap U) \cap C^\infty(D \cap U)$ be a defining function for $M$ with that $J(\rho) > 0$ on $\overline{D} \cap U$ and $u(z) = -\log(-\rho)$ is plurisubharmonic in $D \cap U$. Let $\theta = (\partial\rho - \overline{\partial}\rho)/(2i)$. Then for $v, w \in H(M) = T_{1,0}(M)$, we have:

$$ (3.2) \quad \text{Ric}(w, v) = -L \log J(\rho)(w, v) + (n + 1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} L_{\rho}(w, v). $$

where $L_g(w, v) = \sum_{k,j=1}^{n} g_{k\overline{j}}(z) w_k \overline{v_j}$ is the Levi form associated to $g$.

In a local coordinates, at those $z \in M_1 = \{z \in M : \rho_n+1(z) \neq 0\}$, we have the Webster pseudo scalar curvature

$$ (3.3) \quad R_{\theta}(z) = -\sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^{n} h^{a\overline{b}} \mathcal{D}_{a\overline{b}} \log J(\rho) + n(n + 1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)}, $$

where the pseudo-Hermitian metric $h^{a\overline{b}} = \mathcal{D}_{a\overline{b}}(\rho)$ and $[h^{a\overline{b}}] = ([h_{a\overline{b}}])^{-1}$.

**Proposition 3.2** With the notation above, $h^{a\overline{b}} = \mathcal{D}_{a\overline{b}}(\rho)$, we have

$$ (3.4) \quad h^{a\overline{b}}(z) = \rho^{a\overline{b}} - \rho^{a} \overline{\rho^{b}} \frac{|\partial \rho|^2}{|\rho|^2}, \quad z \in M_1, \ 1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq n. $$

**Proof.** Since, for $1 \leq i, k \leq n$ with $h_{kj} = \mathcal{D}_{kj}(\rho)$

$$ \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\rho^j - \rho^j \frac{\rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2}) h_{kj} $$

$$ = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\rho^j - \rho^j \frac{\rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2})(\rho_{kj} - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1 j} - \frac{\rho_{kj}}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{kn+1} + \frac{\rho_{k}}{\rho_{n+1}^2} \rho_{n+1 n+1}) $$

$$ = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^j (\rho_{kj} - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1 j} - \frac{\rho_{kj}}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{kn+1} + \frac{\rho_{k}}{\rho_{n+1}^2} \rho_{n+1 n+1}) $$
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\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2} (\rho_k^j - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1}^j - \frac{\rho_j}{\rho_{n+1}^n} \rho_{k+n+1}^j + \frac{\rho_k \rho_j}{|\rho_{n+1}^n|^2} \rho_{k+n+1}^j 
\]
\[
= \delta_{ik} - \rho^m \rho_{k+n+1} + \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{n+1}} \rho_{n+1} \rho_{n+1}^{m+1} - \frac{\rho^i}{\rho_{n+1}^m} \rho_{k+n+1}^m + \rho^m \rho_{k+n+1}^m
\]
\[
+ \frac{\rho^i \rho_k}{|\rho_{n+1}|^2} \rho_{n+1}^{m+1} - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{n+1}}{|\partial \rho|^2} \rho_{k+n+1} - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{n+1}^m}{|\partial \rho|^2} \rho_{n+1}^m - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{n+1}^{m+1}}{|\partial \rho|^2} \rho_{n+1}^{m+1} \rho_{k+n+1}^m
\]
\[
+ \frac{\rho^i \rho_{n+1}^m}{\rho_{n+1}} - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{n+1}}{|\partial \rho|^2} \rho_{n+1}^m - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{n+1}^{m+1}}{|\partial \rho|^2} \rho_{n+1}^{m+1} \rho_{k+n+1}^m
\]
\[
= \delta_{ik}.
\]
Therefore, (3.4) holds, and the proof of the proposition is complete. \( \Box \)

Let \( \Delta_u \) be the Beltrami-Laplacian with respect to the metric \( u_{ij} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j \).

Then

\[
\Delta_u = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} u_{ij} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}
\]

Since \( u = -\log(-\rho) \) we have (see [7], [24]) that

\[
u_{\bar{z}} = \frac{\rho_{\bar{z}}^i}{\rho^2} + \frac{\rho^i \rho_{\bar{z}}^j}{\rho^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\bar{z}} = (-\rho) \left( \rho_{\bar{z}}^i - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{\bar{z}}^j}{\rho + |\partial \rho|^2} \right).
\]

Then

\[
\Delta_u = (-\rho) \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left( \rho_{\bar{z}}^i - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{\bar{z}}^j}{\rho + |\partial \rho|^2} \right) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}.
\]

Thus if \( f \) is harmonic in the metric \( u_{ij} dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j \), then that

\[
\Delta_u f = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left( \rho_{\bar{z}}^i - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{\bar{z}}^j}{\rho + |\partial \rho|^2} \right) \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} = 0.
\]

Proposition 3.3 With the notation above, for any \( f \in C^2(D) \), we have

\[
\sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left( \rho_{\bar{z}}^i - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{\bar{z}}^j}{|\partial \rho|^2} \right) f_{ij} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \left( \rho_{\bar{z}}^i - \frac{\rho^i \rho_{\bar{z}}^j}{|\partial \rho|^2} \right) D_{ij}(f).
\]
Proof. Since

\[ \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} (\rho^i \rho^j - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2}) f_{ij} - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} (\rho^i \rho^j - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2}) D_{ij}(f) \]

\[ = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} (\rho^i \rho^j - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2}) (\rho_i \rho_{n+1} f_{n+1} - \frac{\rho_j}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{n+1} + \frac{\rho_i \rho^j}{\rho_{n+1}^2} f_{n+1} - \frac{\rho_i \rho^j}{\rho_{n+1}^2} f_{n+1} n_{n+1}) \]

\[ = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\rho^i}{\rho_{n+1}} f_{n+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^{i+j} f_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^i \rho_{n+1} f_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^{i+n+1} f_{n+1} \]

\[ + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-\frac{\rho_i \rho^i}{|\partial \rho|^2}) + \rho^n \frac{|\partial \rho|^2}{|\rho|^2} f_{n+1} n_{n+1} \]

\[ - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^j \rho_{n+1} f_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^i \rho_{n+1} f_{n+1} \]

\[ + (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^i \rho_{n+1})(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^j \rho_{n+1}) f_{n+1} n_{n+1} \]

\[ = (1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^j \rho_{n+1}) \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^{i+j} f_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^{i+n+1} f_{n+1} \]

\[ + (1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^j \rho_{n+1}) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^i \rho_{n+1} f_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^{i+n+1} f_{n+1} \]

\[ + (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^i \rho_{n+1})(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^j \rho_{n+1}) f_{n+1} n_{n+1} \]

\[ = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho^{n+1} - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2} f_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^{i+n+1} - \frac{\rho^{i+n+1} \rho^i}{|\partial \rho|^2} f_{n+1} n_{n+1} \]

\[ - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho^{i+n+1} - \frac{\rho^{i+n+1} \rho^i}{|\partial \rho|^2} f_{n+1} n_{n+1} \]

Moving the right side to the left hand side, we have

\[ \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} (\rho^i \rho^j - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2}) f_{ij} - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} (\rho^i \rho^j - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\partial \rho|^2}) D_{ij}(f) = 0. \]

Therefore, the proof of (3.9) is complete, and so is the proof of the proposition.  

\[ \square \]
Proof of Part (b) of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Let \( f(z) = \log J(\rho)(z) \) be harmonic in the metric \( u_{ij}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j \). By (3.8), and then by (3.9), we have for all \( z \in M = \partial D \)

\[
0 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1} \left( \rho^i \rho^j - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\rho|^2} \right) \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \left( \rho^i \rho^j - \frac{\rho^i \rho^j}{|\rho|^2} \right) D_{ij}(f)(z).
\]

By (3.4) and \( f = \log J(\rho) \), we have

\[
\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{n} h^{\alpha \beta} D_{\alpha \beta}(\log J(\rho)) = 0, \quad z \in M_1.
\]

Applying the formula (3.3) for the Webster pseudo scalar curvature \( R_\theta \), we have that \( R_\theta = n(n+1) \det H(\rho)/J(\rho) \), i.e., (1.5) holds, and the proof of Part(b) of Theorem 1.1 is complete. \( \square \)

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2

We have proved Part (b) of Theorem 1.1. Now we prove Part (a) of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Part (a) of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Since \( \log J(\rho) \) is harmonic in the metric \( u_{ij}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j \) in \( D \). Since the pseudo scalar curvature is constant \( c \), by Part(b) of Theorem 1.1, we have

\[
c = R_\theta = n(n+1) \frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} \quad \text{on} \; \partial D.
\]

Therefore

\[
\frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} = \frac{c}{n(n+1)} > 0 \quad \text{on} \; \partial D.
\]

This with \( -\log J(\rho) \) being harmonic in the metric \( u_{ij}dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j \), we have that all conditions of Theorem 2.4 hold. By Theorem 2.4, we have

\[
\frac{\det H(\rho)}{J(\rho)} = \frac{c}{n(n+1)} > 0 \quad \text{on} \; D.
\]
By Corollary 2.3, we have that $D$ is biholomorphic to $B_{n+1}$, and the proof of Part (a) of Theorem 1.1 is complete. \[\square\]

**Proof of Corollary 1.2**

**Proof.** Since $u$ is the potential function for $D$, we have $J(\rho) \equiv 1$. Hence $\log J(\rho) = 0$ is harmonic in $u_i dz_i \otimes d\bar{z}_j$. By Part (b) of Theorem 1.1, we have $R_\theta = c$ on $\partial D$, and then by Part (a) of Theorem 1.1 that $D$ is biholomorphic to $B_{n+1}$. Moreover, $\det H(\rho) \equiv c$ on $D$. Let $\rho^0 = c \rho$. $\det H(\rho^0)/J(\rho^0) \equiv 1$ on $D$. Then by (2.8) and (2.9), there is $z_0 \in D$ with

\begin{equation}
(4.4) \quad \rho^0(z_0) = \min\{\rho^0(z) : z \in D\} = -\frac{\det H(\rho)(z_0)}{J(\rho^0)(z_0)} = -1.
\end{equation}

By (2.6), we have $T(z) \equiv 1$ on $D$. By (2.5) in [24], we have

$\det H(\log(1 + \rho^0))(z) = 0$, for all $z \in D$ with $\rho^0(z) > -1$.

Applying Part (ii) of Theorem 1.2 in [24], there is a constant Jacobian biholomorphic mapping $\phi : D \rightarrow B_{n+1}$. The proof of Corollary 1.2 is complete. \[\square\]
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