

Quasiconformal Mappings and the Max Property¹

Yuming Chu² and Gendi Wang

Department of Mathematics, Huzhou University
Huzhou 313000, P. R. China

Abstract

Suppose that D is a Jordan proper subdomain of $\overline{\mathbb{R}^2}$ whose boundary contains at least three points, $D^* = \overline{\mathbb{R}^2} \setminus \overline{D}$, the exterior of D . We say that D has the max property if there exists a family Γ of curves in D and a constant $c > 1$ such that each pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus \{\infty\}$ can be joined by a curve $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and such that

$$|x - y| \leq c \max_{j=1,2} |x_j - y|$$

for each ordered triple of points $x_1, x, x_2 \in \gamma$ and each $y \in \partial D \setminus \{\infty\}$.

In this paper, the author proves the following two results: (1) D is a quasidisk if and only if both D and D^* have the max property; (2) A homeomorphism $f : \overline{\mathbb{R}^2} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}^2}$ with $f(\infty) = \infty$ is a quasiconformal mapping if and only if $f(D)$ has the max property for any $D \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{R}^2}$ with the max property.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 30C62

Keywords: Quasiconformal mapping, Max property, Quasidisk

1 Introduction

We shall assume throughout this paper that D is a Jordan proper subdomain of $\overline{\mathbb{R}^2}$ whose boundary contains at least three points, $D^* = \overline{\mathbb{R}^2} \setminus \overline{D}$, the exterior

¹The research is partly supported by 973 Project of China under Grant No. 2006CB708304, NSF of China under Grant No. 10471039, Foundation of the Educational Committee of Zhejiang Province under Grant No. 20060306 and NSF of Huzhou City under Grant No. 2006YZ12.

²Corresponding author. *E-mail address* : chuyuming@hutczj.cn

of D . For convenience we shall adopt the notation and terminology as in paper [18]. For $x \in R^2$ and $0 < r < \infty$, let $B^2(x, r) = \{z \in R^2 : |z - x| < r\}$, $\overline{B}^2(x, r)$ be the closure of $B^2(x, r)$, $S^1(x, r) = \partial B^2(x, r)$, $B^2(r) = B^2(0, r)$ and $B^2 = B^2(1)$. Suppose that f is a homeomorphism in \overline{R}^2 with $f(\infty) = \infty$, for $x \in R^2$ and $0 < r < \infty$, let $L(x, f, r) = \max_{|y-x|=r} |f(y) - f(x)|$, and $l(x, f, r) = \min_{|y-x|=r} |f(y) - f(x)|$.

Suppose that $c > 1$ is a constant, we say that D has the c -max property if there exists a family Γ of curves in D such that each pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus \{\infty\}$ can be joined by a curve $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and such that for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

$$|x - y| \leq c \max_{j=1,2} |x_j - y| \tag{1.1}$$

for each ordered triple of points $x_1, x, x_2 \in \gamma$ and each $y \in \partial D \setminus \{\infty\}$. And we say that D has the max property if D has the c -max property for some $c > 1$.

The max property is an important concept in analysis and geometry, it was first introduced by F.W.Gehring and K. Hag in their study [5] of uniform and quasiconformal extension domains, in which they proved that a proper domain E of R^n is a uniform domain if and only if E has the max-min property. Later, it has been used extensively in the research of John disks by O.J. Broch^[2], Z. Balogh and A. Volberg^[3], R. Näkki and J. Väisälä^[15], K. Hag and P. Hag^[9], and K. Kim^[11].

D is called a quasidisk if there exists a K -quasiconformal mapping ($K \geq 1$) $f : \overline{R}^2 \rightarrow \overline{R}^2$ such that D is the image of the unit disk B^2 under f .

It is well-known that quasidisks play a very important role in quasiregular mappings^[10], Kleinian groups^[12], complex dynamics^[13,16] and Teichmüller space theory^[1,7,14,19], etc.

The purpose of this paper is to prove the following two results.

Theorem 1.1. *D is a quasidisk if and only if both D and D^* have the max property.*

Theorem 1.2. *A homeomorphism $f : \overline{R}^2 \rightarrow \overline{R}^2$ with $f(\infty) = \infty$ is a quasiconformal mapping if and only if $f(D)$ has the max property for any $D \subseteq \overline{R}^2$ with the max property.*

For the sake of convenience we shall introduce the following important concepts, they will be used to prove our theorem 1.1 and theorem 1.2 in the next sections.

Let $c \geq 1$ be a constant. (1) If for any $x_0 \in R^2$ and $0 < r < +\infty$, each pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in D \cap \overline{B}^2(x_0, r)$ can be joined by a curve in $D \cap \overline{B}^2(x_0, cr)$, then we say that D is a c -inner linearly locally connected domain, denoted by $D \in c - ILC$; (2) If for any $x_0 \in R^2$ and $0 < r < +\infty$, each pair of

finite points $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus B^2(x_0, r)$ can be joined by a curve in $D \setminus B^2(x_0, r/c)$, then we say that D is a c -outer linearly locally connected domain, denoted by $D \in c - OLC$.

D is called a linearly locally connected domain if $D \in c - ILC$ and $D \in c - OLC$ at the same time for some $c \geq 1$.

The following example shows that there exists a domain D which is not $c - ILC$ and $c - OLC$ at the same time for any $c \geq 1$.

Example.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{(x_1, x_2) | x_1^2 + (x_2 - 1)^2 < 1, x_1 < 0, x_2 < 1\}, \\ D_2 &= \{(x_1, x_2) | x_1^2 + (x_2 + 1)^2 < 1, x_1 < 0, x_2 > -1\}, \\ D_3 &= \{(x_1, x_2) | x_1 \geq 0, -1 < x_2 < 1\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$D = (D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3) \setminus \{(0, 0)\}.$$

Then the simple connected domain $D \subseteq R^2$ is not $c - ILC$ and $c - OLC$ at the same time for any $c \geq 1$. In fact,

(I) For $x > 0$, denote A the point $(-x, 0)$, O the point $(0, 0)$, $d(A, \partial D)$ and $d(A, O)$ the Euclidean distance from A to ∂D and O , respectively. Then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(A, O)}{d(A, \partial D)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{x}{\sqrt{1 + x^2} - 1} = +\infty.$$

Hence for any $c \geq 1$, there exists a point $A(-x, 0)$ such that $d(A, O) > 4cd(A, \partial D)$. This concludes that there exist points in $D \cap \overline{B}^2(A, 2d(A, \partial D))$ which can not be joined by curves in $D \cap \overline{B}^2(A, 2cd(A, \partial D))$, thus D is not $c - ILC$.

(II) For any $c \geq 1$, denote B the point $(3c^2, 0)$, $r = 2c^2$. It is obvious that there exist points in $D \setminus B^2(B, r)$ which can not be joined by curves in $D \setminus B^2(B, r/c)$, thus D is not $c - OLC$.

Let $b > 0$ be a constant, D is called a b -cigar domain if each pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus \{\infty\}$ can be joined by a curve $\gamma \subseteq D$ for which

$$\min_{j=1,2} dia(\gamma(x_j, x)) \leq bd(x, \partial D) \quad \text{for all } x \in \gamma, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\gamma(x_j, x)$ is the part of γ between x_j and x , and $d(x, \partial D)$ is the Euclidean distance from x to ∂D , and $dia(\gamma)$ is the Euclidean diameter of γ .

We say that D is a cigar domain if D is a b -cigar domain for some $b > 0$. F.W. Gehring proved the following result in [4].

Theorem A. *The following four conditions are equivalent each other:*

- (1) D is a quasidisk;
 (2) D is a linearly locally connected domain;
 (3) There exists a constant $d > 1$ such that for each pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in \partial D \setminus \{\infty\}$,

$$\min_{j=1,2} \text{dia}(\gamma_j) \leq d|x_1 - x_2|, \quad (1.3)$$

where γ_1, γ_2 are the components of $\partial D \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}$.

- (4) There exists a constant $b > 1$ such that each pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus \{\infty\}$ can be joined by a rectifiable curve β in D for which

$$l(\beta) \leq b|x_1 - x_2|, \quad (1.4)$$

$$\min_{j=1,2} l(\beta(x_j, x)) \leq bd(x, \partial D) \quad (1.5)$$

for each $x \in \beta$. Here $l(\beta)$ denotes the Euclidean length of β .

2 Lemmas

In this section, we shall establish and introduce the following five lemmas which are crucial in the proof of our theorem 1.1 and theorem 1.2.

Lemma 2.1. *If D has the c -max property, then D^* is a $2a_0(2c+1)$ -cigar domain, where a_0 is an absolute constant.*

Proof. For any finite points $z_1, z_2 \in D^*$, let γ be the hyperbolic geodesic which joins z_1 and z_2 in D^* , for any $z \in \gamma \setminus \{z_1, z_2\}$, suppose that $f: B^2 \rightarrow D^*$ is a conformal mapping with $f(0) = z$ and

$$f^{-1}(\gamma) \subseteq R = \{z : z \in R^2, \text{Im}z = 0\},$$

where f^{-1} is the inverse of f . Then there exist

$$x_1 \in \{z : z \in S^1, \text{Im}z > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 \in \{z : z \in S^1, \text{Im}z < 0\}$$

by [17, Corollary 10.3] such that $\alpha_j = f([0, x_j])$ is rectifiable with

$$l(\alpha_j) < a_0 d(z, \partial D^*), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

where a_0 is an absolute constant, and $[0, x_j]$ is the half open segment which joins the origin O and x_j , $j = 1, 2$.

Let $y_j = f(x_j)$, $\alpha = \alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$, then $y_j \in \partial D$ and

$$l(\alpha) \leq l(\alpha_1) + l(\alpha_2) < 2a_0 d(z, \partial D^*).$$

For above $y_1, y_2 \in \partial D^* = \partial D$, there exist a simple curve $\beta \subseteq D$ which joins y_1 and y_2 such that

$$|y - y'| \leq c \max_{j=1,2} |y' - y_j| \quad \text{for all } y \in \beta \quad \text{and } y' \in \partial D \quad (2.1)$$

by D has the c -max property.

If taking $y' = y_1$ in (2.1), then we get

$$|y - y_1| \leq c|y_1 - y_2|$$

for any $y \in \beta$. This and the triangular inequality imply

$$dia(\beta) \leq 2c|y_1 - y_2| \leq 2cl(\alpha). \quad (2.2)$$

If we denote by D_0 the bounded domain with boundary $\alpha \cup \beta$, then one of the points z_1 and z_2 must be in D_0 . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $z_1 \in D_0$, then we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} dia(\gamma(z_1, z)) &\leq dia(D_0) = dia(\partial D_0) \\ &\leq dia(\alpha) + dia(\beta) \\ &\leq l(\alpha) + dia(\beta) \\ &\leq 2a_0(2c + 1)d(z, \partial D^*). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

This yields

$$\min_{j=1,2} dia(\gamma(z_j, z)) \leq 2a_0(2c + 1)d(z, \partial D^*),$$

hence D^* is a $2a_0(2c + 1)$ -cigar domain.

Lemma 2.2. *If D is a c -cigar domain, then $D \in (2c + 2) - OLC$.*

Proof. Take $b = 2c + 2$. If $D \notin b - OLC$, then there exist $y_0 \in R^2$, $0 < r < \infty$ and $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus B^2(y_0, r)$, such that x_1 and x_2 can not be joined by any curve in $D \setminus B^2(y_0, r/b)$.

Since D is a c -cigar domain, there exists an arc $\gamma \subseteq D$ such that γ joining x_1 and x_2 with

$$\min_{j=1,2} dia(\gamma(x_j, x)) \leq cd(x, \partial D) \quad (2.4)$$

for all $x \in \gamma$.

It is obvious that $\gamma \cap S^1(y_0, r/b) \neq \emptyset$. If taking $y \in \gamma \cap S^1(y_0, r/b)$, then (2.4) implies

$$d(y, \partial D) \geq \frac{1}{c} \min_{j=1,2} dia(\gamma(x_j, y)) \geq \frac{1}{c} \min_{j=1,2} |x_j - y| \geq \frac{1}{c} (1 - \frac{1}{b})r. \quad (2.5)$$

But

$$d(y_0, \partial D) \leq \frac{r}{b}. \tag{2.6}$$

The above (2.5), (2.6) and the triangular inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c}(1 - \frac{1}{b})r \leq d(y, \partial D) \leq |y - y_0| + d(y_0, \partial D) \leq \frac{2}{b}r, \\ b \leq 2c + 1, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

(2.7) contradicts with $b = 2c + 2$. Hence $D \in (2c + 2) - OLC$.

Lemma 2.3. *If D^* is a c_0 -cigar domain, then $D \in (16c_0 + 21) - ILC$.*

Proof. Take $\delta = 8c_0 + 10$. For any $u \in R^2$, $s > 0$, and $z_1, z_2 \in D \cap \overline{B}^2(u, s)$, $z_1 \neq z_2$. Denote $z = \frac{1}{2}(z_1 + z_2)$ and $r = |z_1 - z_2|$. Next we first prove that z_1, z_2 must be in the same component of $\overline{B}^2(z, \frac{1}{2}\delta r) \setminus D^*$.

If z_1, z_2 belong to different components of $\overline{B}^2(z, \frac{1}{2}\delta r) \setminus D^*$, then z_1, z_2 must be in the different components of $\overline{B}^2(z, \frac{1}{2}r) \setminus D^*$. Let β be the line segment which joins z_1 and z_2 , then β contains a subcurve $\alpha \subseteq D^*$ such that α divide D^* into D_1 and D_2 , and $dia(D_j) \geq \frac{1}{2}r(\delta - 1)$, $j = 1, 2$. This yields

$$\min_{j=1,2} dia(D_j) \geq \frac{1}{2}r(\delta - 1). \tag{2.8}$$

For any $x \in \alpha$, if $D_1 \not\subseteq B^2(x, (2c_0 + 2)dia(\alpha))$ and $D_2 \not\subseteq B^2(x, (2c_0 + 2)dia(\alpha))$, then take

$$x_j \in D_j \setminus \overline{B}^2(x, (2c_0 + 2)dia(\alpha)), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Since D^* is a c_0 -cigar domain, there exists an arc $\gamma \subseteq D^*$ joining x_1 and x_2 with

$$\min_{j=1,2} dia(\gamma(x_j, w)) \leq c_0d(w, \partial D^*) \tag{2.9}$$

for all $w \in \gamma$.

Take $y \in \gamma \cap S^1(x, dia(\alpha))$, then we can get

$$\begin{cases} |y - x_j| \geq (2c_0 + 1)dia(\alpha), \\ \min_{j=1,2} dia(\gamma(x_j, y)) \leq c_0d(y, \partial D^*), \end{cases} \quad j = 1, 2. \tag{2.10}$$

This implies

$$d(y, \partial D^*) \geq \frac{2c_0 + 1}{c_0}dia(\alpha). \tag{2.11}$$

But

$$d(x, \partial D^*) \leq dia(\alpha). \tag{2.12}$$

(2.11),(2.12) and the triangular inequality yield

$$\frac{2c_0 + 1}{c_0} dia(\alpha) \leq d(y, \partial D^*) \leq |y - x| + d(x, \partial D^*) \leq 2dia(\alpha),$$

so

$$dia(\alpha) \leq 0,$$

this is obviously impossible. Hence $D_1 \subseteq \overline{B}^2(x, (2c_0 + 2)dia(\alpha))$ or $D_2 \subseteq \overline{B}^2(x, (2c_0 + 2)dia(\alpha))$, and we can obtain

$$\min_{j=1,2} dia(D_j) \leq 2(2c_0 + 2)dia(\alpha). \tag{2.13}$$

(2.8), (2.13) and $dia(\alpha) \leq r$ imply

$$\delta \leq 8c_0 + 9,$$

this contradicts with $\delta = 8c_0 + 10$. Hence z_1, z_2 must be in the same component of $\overline{B}^2(z, \frac{1}{2}\delta r) \setminus D^*$, and there exists an arc $\gamma \subseteq D$ joining z_1 and z_2 with

$$dia(\gamma) \leq \delta r = \delta|z_1 - z_2| \leq 2\delta s. \tag{2.14}$$

The above (2.14) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\subseteq D \cap \overline{B}^2(u, s + dia(\gamma)) \subseteq D \cap \overline{B}^2(u, (2\delta + 1)s) \\ &= D \cap \overline{B}^2(u, (16c_0 + 21)s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $D \in (16c_0 + 21) - ILC$, this completes the proof of lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that $f : \overline{R}^2 \rightarrow \overline{R}^2$ is a K -quasiconformal mapping with $f(\infty) = \infty$, for any $x \in R^2$, if $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 < +\infty$, then*

$$\frac{L(x, f, r_2)}{l(x, f, r_1)} \leq c \left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^K, \tag{2.15}$$

where $c = c(K)$ is a constant which depends only on K .

Proof For any $x \in R^2$ and $0 < r < +\infty$, since f is a K -quasiconformal mapping of \overline{R}^2 , according to [18, p79] we have

$$\frac{L(x, f, r)}{l(x, f, r)} \leq c' \tag{2.16}$$

where $c' = c'(K)$ is a constant which depends only on K .

For any $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 < +\infty$, from (2.16) we can get

$$\frac{L(x, f, r_2)}{l(x, f, r_1)} \leq c'^2 \frac{l(x, f, r_2)}{L(x, f, r_1)}. \tag{2.17}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $l(x, f, r_2) > L(x, f, r_1)$. Let Γ be the curve family which joins $S^1(x, r_1)$ and $S^1(x, r_2)$ in $B^2(x, r_2) \setminus \overline{B^2}(x, r_1)$, $M(\Gamma)$ is the module of Γ , Making use of the comparison principle of module and the properties of K -quasiconformal mappings in [18] we can obtain

$$\frac{2\pi}{\log \frac{l(x, f, r_2)}{L(x, f, r_1)}} \geq M(f(\Gamma)) \geq \frac{1}{K} M(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{K} \frac{2\pi}{\log \frac{r_2}{r_1}}. \tag{2.18}$$

Combining (2.17) and (2.18) we get

$$\frac{L(x, f, r_2)}{l(x, f, r_1)} \leq c^2 \left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^K, \tag{2.19}$$

from (2.19) we can obtain (2.15) with $c = c^2$.

Lemma 2.5^[8]. *Let $f : \overline{R^2} \rightarrow \overline{R^2}$ be a homeomorphism with $f(\infty) = \infty$. If there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\left[\text{dia} \left(f \left(B^2(x, r) \right) \right) \right]^2 \leq c \cdot m \left[f \left(B^2(x, r) \right) \right] \tag{2.20}$$

for all $x \in R^2$ and $0 < r < \infty$, then f is a quasiconformal mapping. Here $m \left[f \left(B^2(x, r) \right) \right]$ denotes the 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure of $f \left(B^2(x, r) \right)$.

3 Proofs of theorems

Proof of theorem 1.1. The necessity. In fact the necessity was proved by F.W. Gehring and K. Hag in [5, theorem 2.7], for the sake of readability, we give the proof as follows.

If D is a quasidisk, then from the equivalent condition 4 of theorem A and the corollary 2 in [6] we know that there exists a constant $b > 1$ such that each pair of finite points $x_1, x_2 \in D$ can be joined by the hyperbolic geodesic $\beta \subseteq D$ and β satisfies (1.4) and (1.5).

Next let Γ denote the family of hyperbolic geodesics in D . Then each pair of finite points $x_1, x_2 \in D$ can be joined by a curve $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Fix $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and for any ordered triple of points $x_1, x, x_2 \in \gamma$ and any $y \in \partial D \setminus \{\infty\}$, then $\beta = \gamma(x_1, x_2) \in \Gamma$ and by (1.4) and the triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x - y| &\leq \frac{1}{2} (|x - x_1| + |x_1 - y| + |x - x_2| + |x_2 - y|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (l(\beta) + |x_1 - y| + |x_2 - y|) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{1}{2}(b|x_1 - x_2| + |x_1 - y| + |x_2 - y|) \\ &\leq \frac{b+1}{2}(|x_1 - y| + |x_2 - y|) \\ &\leq (b+1) \max_{j=1,2} |x_j - y|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence D has the c -max property with $c = b+1$ and Γ the family of hyperbolic geodesics in D .

Since D is a quasidisk, hence D^* is also a quasidisk. Making use of the same method as above we can get that D^* has the max property.

The sufficiency. Suppose that both D and D^* have the max property.

(1) Since D^* has the max property, hence D is a cigar domain by lemma 2.1, this and lemma 2.2 imply $D \in OLC$.

(2) since D has the max property, hence D^* is a cigar domain by lemma 2.1, this and lemma 2.3 imply $D \in ILC$.

From the above (1), (2) and the equivalent condition 2 of theorem A we know that D is a quasidisk.

Proof of theorem 1.2. The necessity. Suppose that D has the c -max property. Let $\Gamma \subseteq D$ be the family of curves which satisfies (1.1), $\Gamma' = f(\Gamma)$, then Γ' is a family of curves in D' . For any $x'_1, x'_2 \in D' \setminus \{\infty\}$, denote $x_1 = f^{-1}(x'_1)$ and $x_2 = f^{-1}(x'_2)$, then $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus \{\infty\}$, and x_1, x_2 can be joined by a curve $\gamma \in \Gamma$ for which (1.1) is satisfied. Let $\gamma' = f(\gamma)$, then $\gamma' \in \Gamma'$ and γ' joins x'_1 and x'_2 .

Next for any ordered triple of points $x'_1, x', x'_2 \in \gamma'$ and each $y' \in \partial D' \setminus \{\infty\}$, let $x_1 = f^{-1}(x'_1)$, $x = f^{-1}(x')$, $x_2 = f^{-1}(x'_2)$ and $y = f^{-1}(y')$, then $x_1, x, x_2 \in \gamma$ are the ordered triple of points and $y \in \partial D \setminus \{\infty\}$ for which (1.1) is satisfied.

without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$|x - y| \leq c|x_1 - y|.$$

From this we can get

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq L(y, f, c|x_1 - y|). \tag{3.1}$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that

$$|f(x_1) - f(y)| \geq l(y, f, |x_1 - y|). \tag{3.2}$$

Making use of (3.1), (3.2) and lemma 2.4 we get

$$\frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|f(x_1) - f(y)|} \leq c^* c^K,$$

where c^* is a constant which depends only on K , and hence

$$|x' - y'| \leq c^* c^K \max_{j=1,2} |x'_j - y'_j|,$$

this implies that D' has the $c^* c^K$ -max property.

The sufficiency. For any $x \in R^2$ and $0 < r < \infty$, choose $y \in B^2(x, r)$ such that

$$dia\left(f(B^2(x, r))\right) \leq 3|f(x) - f(y)|. \tag{3.3}$$

Theorem 1.1 implies that $(B^2(x, r))^*$ has the max property. By the assumption of theorem 1.2 we know that $f((B^2(x, r))^*)$ has the max property, hence $f(B^2(x, r))$ is a cigar domain by lemma 2.1. There exists a constant $b > 0$ and a curve $\gamma \subseteq D$ joins $f(x)$ and $f(y)$ such that

$$\min\{dia(\gamma(f(x), z)), dia(\gamma(f(y), z))\} \leq bd(z, \partial(f(B^2(x, r)))) \tag{3.4}$$

for all $z \in \gamma$. If we choose $z_0 \in \gamma$ such that $dia(\gamma(f(x), z_0)) = dia(\gamma(f(y), z_0))$, then (3.3) and (3.4) imply

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_0, \partial(f(B^2(x, r)))) &\geq \frac{dia(\gamma(f(x), z_0))}{b} \\ &\geq \frac{dia(\gamma(f(x), f(y)))}{2b} \\ &\geq \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{2b} \\ &\geq \frac{dia(f(B^2(x, r)))}{6b}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} B^2\left(z_0, \frac{dia(f(B^2(x, r)))}{6b}\right) &\subseteq f(B^2(x, r)), \\ \pi\left(\frac{dia(f(B^2(x, r)))}{6b}\right)^2 &\leq m(f(B^2(x, r))), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left(dia(f(B^2(x, r)))\right)^2 \leq \frac{36b^2}{\pi} m(f(B^2(x, r))). \tag{3.5}$$

From (3.5) and lemma 2.5 we know that f is a quasiconformal mapping.

References

- [1] K. Astala, M. Zinsmeister, Teichmüller space and BMOA, *Math. Ann.*, 289(1991), 613-625.
- [2] O.J. Broch, Quadrilaterals and John disks, *comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, 4(2004), 419-434.
- [3] Z. Balogh, A. Volberg, Geometric localization, uniformly John property and separated semihyperbolic dynamics, *Ark. Mat.*, 34(1996), 21-49.
- [4] F.W. Gehring, *Characteristic Properties of Quasidisks*, Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montréal, Que.(1982).
- [5] F.W. Gehring, K. Hag, Remarks on uniform and quasiconformal extension domains, *complex variables theory Appl.*, 9(1987), 175-188.
- [6] F.W. Gehring, B.G. Osgood, Uniform domains and the quasi-hyperbolic metric, *J. d'Analyse Math.*, 36(1979), 50-74.
- [7] D.H. Hamilton, The closure of Teichmüller space, *J. Analyse Math.*, 55(1990), 40-50.
- [8] X.G. He, Uniform domains and quasiconformal mappings. *Chinese Ann. Math.*, 13(1992), 66-69.
- [9] K. Hag, P. Hag. John disks and the pre-Schwarzian derivative, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 26(2001), 205-224.
- [10] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, Weighted Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities and quasiregular mappings of polynomial type, *Math. Scand.*, 77(1995), 251-271.
- [11] K. Kim, Relations between certain domains in the complex plane and polynomial approximation in the domains, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, 39(2002), 687-704.
- [12] I. Kra, Families of univalent functions and Kleinian groups, *Israel J. Math.*, 60(1987), 89-127.
- [13] C.T. McMullen, Self-similarity of Siegel disks and Hausdorff dimension of Julia sets, *Acta Math.*, 180(1998), 247-292.
- [14] H. Miyachi, Cusps in complex boundaries of one-dimensional Teichmüller space, *Cofrom. Geom. Dyn.*, 7(2003), 103-151.

- [15] R. Näkki, J. Väisälä, John disks, *Exposition. Math.*, 9(1991), 3-43.
- [16] C.L. Petersen, S. Zakeri, On the Julia set of a typical quadratic polynomial with a Siegal disk, *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 159(2004), 1-52.
- [17] Ch. Pommerenke, *Univalent Functions*, Vandenhoeck, Göttingen(1975).
- [18] J. Väisälä, *Lectures on n -Dimensional Quasiconformal Mappings*, Springer-Verlag, New York(1971).
- [19] J.A. Velling, Degeneration of quasicircles: inner and outer radii of Teichmüller spaces, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.*, 18(1993), 191-202.

Received: September 12, 2006