

HOROFUNCTION COMPACTIFICATIONS AND LOCAL GROMOV MODEL DOMAINS

VIKRAMJEET SINGH CHANDEL, SUSHIL GORAI, ANWOY MAITRA AND AMAR DEEP SARKAR

ABSTRACT. We explore the *horofunction compactification* of complete hyperbolic domains in complex Euclidean space equipped with the Kobayashi distance. We provide a sufficient condition under which, given a domain Ω as above, the identity map from Ω to itself extends to an embedding of $\overline{\Omega}$ into the horofunction compactification of (Ω, k_Ω) , with k_Ω denoting the Kobayashi distance on Ω . Notably, this condition admits unbounded domains that are *not* Gromov hyperbolic relative to the Kobayashi distance. We also provide a large class of planar hyperbolic domains satisfying the above condition.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ be a Kobayashi hyperbolic domain equipped with the Kobayashi distance k_Ω . In this article, we are concerned with the following question: for what sorts of domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ can one identify the so-called *horofunction compactification* of (Ω, k_Ω) with some appropriate *Euclidean* compactification of Ω ? Answering this question for general Ω is intractable; one can try to give an answer for various special classes of Ω . Arosio et. al [1, Corollary 4.5, Theorem 5.3] proved that for the following three classes of domains the Euclidean compactification, horofunction compactification, and Gromov compactification are the same:

- Bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains with \mathcal{C}^2 -boundary.
- Bounded convex domains in \mathbb{C}^d with \mathcal{C}^∞ smooth boundary of finite type in the sense of D'Angelo.
- Bounded convex domains Ω for which the squeezing function $s_\Omega(z)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \partial\Omega} s_\Omega(z) = 1.$$

Here, the important point is that the above three classes of domains Ω are *Gromov model domains*, i.e., (Ω, k_Ω) is Gromov hyperbolic and the Gromov boundary and the Euclidean boundary are identifiable. Our main motivation in this article is to produce a class of domains that are not Gromov hyperbolic but such that one can still identify the Euclidean boundary with a *part* of the horofunction boundary. In what follows, given Ω as above (not necessarily bounded), we shall denote by $\overline{\Omega}^H$ the horofunction compactification of, and in case (Ω, k_Ω) is Gromov hyperbolic, by $\overline{\Omega}^G$ the Gromov compactification of, (Ω, k_Ω) . The Gromov boundary (in the case of Gromov hyperbolicity) and the horofunction boundary will be denoted by $\partial\overline{\Omega}^G$ and $\partial\overline{\Omega}^H$ respectively. The reader is referred to Section 2 for a quick introduction to these objects.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 32F45, 30C20, 30D40, 53C23; Secondary: 32Q45, 53C22.

Key words and phrases. Kobayashi distance, visibility, end compactification, continuous extension, Gromov hyperbolicity, Gromov compactification, Gromov model domain, horofunction compactification.

The class of domains that we are interested in is as follows:

Definition 1.1. A (possibly unbounded) hyperbolic domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ is said to be a *local Gromov model domain* if, for every $\xi \in \partial\Omega$, there exists a bounded neighbourhood U of ξ such that $U \cap \Omega$ is connected, complete Kobayashi hyperbolic, Gromov hyperbolic relative to its Kobayashi distance, and such that $\text{id}_{U \cap \Omega}$ extends to a homeomorphism from $\overline{U \cap \Omega}^G$ to $\overline{U \cap \Omega}$. In other words, every boundary point $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ has a bounded neighbourhood U such that $U \cap \Omega$ is a *Gromov model domain*, to use the terminology of [7, Definition 1.3].

Remark 1.2. In [7, Corollary 1.7] it is proved that if Ω is a *bounded* local Gromov model domain then it is a Gromov model domain. However, there exist unbounded local Gromov model domains in dimension one that are not Gromov hyperbolic (and hence are not Gromov model domains)—see, for example, [5, Proposition 9.1]. It is also easy to construct unbounded domains in \mathbb{C}^d , $d \geq 2$, with smooth boundary that are local Gromov model domains but not Gromov hyperbolic; such a construction is presented in brief at the beginning of Section 3.

For a bounded Gromov model domain Ω , given $x \in \partial\Omega$ and two geodesic rays γ, σ landing at x (i.e., $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(t) = x = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(t)$), since x represents a point in the Gromov boundary, by definition (see Section 2), γ and σ are asymptotic, i.e.,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} k_\Omega(\gamma(t), \sigma(t)) < \infty.$$

Our first result says that an analogous result holds for local Gromov model domains.

Proposition 1.3. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ is a Kobayashi hyperbolic local Gromov model domain that is hyperbolically embedded in \mathbb{C}^d , and γ, σ are k_Ω -geodesic rays that land at the boundary point $\xi \in \partial\Omega$. Then γ and σ are k_Ω -asymptotic, i.e.,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} k_\Omega(\gamma(t), \sigma(t)) < \infty.$$

Here, Ω is said to be *hyperbolically embedded* in \mathbb{C}^d if for any $p \neq q \in \partial\Omega$,

$$\liminf_{(x, y) \rightarrow (p, q)} k_\Omega(x, y) > 0.$$

This is not how the notion of being hyperbolically embedded is usually defined in the literature, but is easily seen to be equivalent to the standard definition (see, e.g., [16, Definition 1.3]). We use the definition above because it matches exactly with the *boundary separation property* as defined and used in [12] (see [12, Subsection 2.4]), and which, as we just observed, coincides with the notion being discussed. Note that every bounded domain is hyperbolically embedded in \mathbb{C}^d . This follows, for example, from [4, Proposition 3.5] and the fact that the Kobayashi distance is the integrated form of the Kobayashi–Royden metric (see [12, Lemma 2.8] and the following discussion). It is also not difficult to see that Ω is hyperbolically embedded in \mathbb{C}^d if and only if it is *hyperbolic at each boundary point* (for a definition of this latter term, and for the equivalence, see, for instance, [17, Definition 2.1, Proposition 2.2]).

Given a geodesic ray γ in an appropriate distance space (X, d) , there is a well-known construction that associates to γ a point in the horofunction boundary of (X, d) . This is via the Busemann function associated to γ , B_γ ; see Section 2 for more details. A basic question is: given geodesic rays γ and σ , when do B_γ and B_σ determine the same point of the horofunction boundary? A natural condition explored in [1] is the notion of *strong*

asymptoticity (see [1, Definition 3.1]). Two k_Ω -geodesic-rays σ, γ are said to be *strongly asymptotic* if they satisfy

$$\exists T \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} k_\Omega(\gamma(t), \sigma(t + T)) = 0.$$

Arosio et. al. in [1] proved that for a bounded domain Ω satisfying $\lim_{z \rightarrow \partial\Omega} s_\Omega(z) = 1$, where $s_\Omega(z)$ denotes the squeezing function, any two asymptotic geodesic rays that land at the same boundary point are strongly asymptotic. Our second result says that an analogous result also holds for local Gromov model domains.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ is a Kobayashi hyperbolic (not necessarily bounded) local Gromov model domain that is hyperbolically embedded in \mathbb{C}^d . Suppose that Ω admits squeezing functions, and that the squeezing function tends to 1 at the boundary, i.e., $\forall \xi \in \partial\Omega, \lim_{\Omega \ni z \rightarrow \xi} s_\Omega(z) = 1$. Then, for every $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and every two k_Ω -geodesic-rays γ, σ in Ω landing at ξ , γ and σ are strongly asymptotic.*

Before we state the next result, we wish to remind the reader of the so-called *visibility property with respect to the Kobayashi distance*. The notion of visibility has been studied intensively in recent years; see, for example, [4], [3], [8], [10], [7], [21], [17], [2], [18], [15], and [16]. In this short note, we will not recall the definition of this property, but rather refer the reader to [10, Sections 1 & 3] for the definitions and a brief discussion of the various types of visibility.

We are now in a position to state the main result of this paper, which provides a sufficient condition under which the natural map from Ω to $\overline{\Omega}^H$ extends continuously to $\overline{\Omega}$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ be a complete Kobayashi hyperbolic domain that has the geodesic visibility property and satisfies: for every $\xi \in \partial\Omega$, any two geodesic rays γ and σ in (Ω, k_Ω) landing at ξ are strongly asymptotic (with respect to k_Ω). Then the map $\Psi : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}^H$ defined by*

$$\Psi(\xi) := \begin{cases} [k_\Omega(\cdot, \xi)], & \text{if } \xi \in \Omega, \\ [B_\gamma], & \text{if } \xi \in \partial\Omega \text{ and } \gamma \text{ is a geodesic ray in } (\Omega, k_\Omega) \text{ landing at } \xi, \end{cases}$$

is well defined and embeds $\overline{\Omega}$ into $\overline{\Omega}^H$.

The above result is inspired by, and modeled on, [1, Theorem 3.5], but with key differences. While [1, Theorem 3.5] concerns the embedding (indeed, the topological equivalence) of the Gromov compactification of a proper geodesic Gromov hyperbolic space into its horofunction compactification, the theorem above establishes an embedding of the closure of a domain in complex Euclidean space into its horofunction compactification relative to k_Ω . In place of Gromov hyperbolicity, we assume the geodesic visibility property, which is more natural in the present setting.

We would like to present a simple example illustrating the fact that, in the context of the theorem just stated, the natural map from Ω to $\overline{\Omega}^H$ (namely, $x \mapsto [k_\Omega(\cdot, x)]$) *does not*, in general, extend continuously to $\overline{\Omega}$, the Euclidean closure of Ω . Take $\Omega := \mathbb{D} \setminus [0, 1]$, the unit disk with the line segment from 0 to 1 removed. It is not hard to see that, for every $p \in (0, 1]$, $[k_\Omega(\cdot, x)]$ has no limit as $\Omega \ni x \rightarrow p$. This follows from three things: the classical behaviour of a Riemann map from \mathbb{D} to Ω (see, for instance, [19, Proposition 2.5, Theorem 2.6]); the fact that any Riemann map is an isometry for the hyperbolic (equivalently, Kobayashi) distance; and the standard fact that $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^H$ is naturally homeomorphic to $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Finally we present a class of planar hyperbolic domains, introduced recently in [12], to which the above theorem applies. These are local Gromov model domains; in particular, this class contains hyperbolic domains that are not Gromov hyperbolic with respect to the Kobayashi distance, and domains whose boundaries could be very irregular (see [12, Section 6]).

Definition 1.6. A hyperbolic domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ is said to satisfy Condition 1 (or to be a Condition 1 domain) if for any point $p \in \partial\Omega$, there exist an $r > 0$ and a topological embedding $\tau_p : \overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\tau_p(\mathbb{D}) \subset \Omega$ and $D(p, r) \cap \Omega \subset \tau_p(\mathbb{D})$.

In the above, $D(p, r)$ denotes the open disc of radius r centred at p . It is easy to see why Condition 1 domains are local Gromov model domains: take a point $p \in U$, and let τ_p , $r > 0$ be as in the above definition. Note that $\tau_p(\mathbb{D})$ is a Jordan domain; therefore, appealing to the Riemann Mapping Theorem and Carathéodory's Extension Theorem [6, Theorem 4.3], we may assume that τ_p restricted to \mathbb{D} is a biholomorphism onto $\tau_p(\mathbb{D})$ that extends to a homeomorphism from $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ to $\overline{\tau_p(\mathbb{D})}$. Clearly, $\tau_p(\mathbb{D})$ equipped with its Kobayashi distance is a Gromov model domain.

Condition 1 domains were also completely characterized in [12]: these are domains for which the boundary is locally connected and each boundary component is a Jordan curve in the Riemann sphere [12, Proposition 4.15]. They also possess the geodesic visibility property. Regarding their squeezing function, we prove the following result:

Proposition 1.7. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a domain that satisfies Condition 1. Then, for every $p \in \partial\Omega$, $\lim_{z \rightarrow p} s_\Omega(z) = 1$.*

As a consequence of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.4, we get the following result.

Corollary 1.8. *Let Ω be a Condition 1 domain. Then the identity map extends as an embedding from $\overline{\Omega}$ to $\overline{\Omega}^H$.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let us recall the horofunction compactification and the horofunction boundary of a distance space. These notions were introduced by Gromov in 1981 [14] in the setting of CAT(0) spaces. Given a locally compact distance space (X, d) , we endow $C(X; \mathbb{R})$, the space of real-valued continuous functions on X , with the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets. The strategy is to embed X in $C(X; \mathbb{R})$, as follows. Choose and fix a point $p \in X$ and consider the mapping $\psi_p : X \rightarrow C(X; \mathbb{R})$ given by: $\forall x, y \in X$, $\psi_p(x)(y) := d(x, y) - d(x, p)$. Note that, for every $x \in X$, $\psi_p(x)$ is a continuous function on X that vanishes at p ; note also that ψ_p itself is injective. It follows easily from the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem that $\psi_p(X)$ is a relatively compact subset of $C(X; \mathbb{R})$; hence its closure $\overline{\psi_p(X)}$ in $C(X; \mathbb{R})$ is compact. One could define $\overline{\psi_p(X)}$ to be the horofunction compactification of (X, d) , but this would leave open the possibility that this compactification depends on p .

To remove this dependence on p , we proceed as follows. We let A denote the set of constant functions in $C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then A is a closed subspace of $C(X, \mathbb{R})$ and so $C_*(X, \mathbb{R}) := C(X, \mathbb{R})/A$ is defined as a (quotient) topological vector space in its own right. For an arbitrary function $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, we let $[f]$ denote the image of f under the natural projection from $C(X, \mathbb{R})$ onto $C_*(X, \mathbb{R})$. Define $\tau : X \rightarrow C_*(X, \mathbb{R})$ as follows: $\forall x \in X$, $\tau(x) := [d(x, \cdot)]$. Here, $d(x, \cdot) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the distance from x . If, for $p \in X$ arbitrary,

we let $C_p(X, \mathbb{R}) := \{f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}) \mid f(p) = 0\}$, then $C_p(X, \mathbb{R})$ is a closed subspace of $C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Consider the map $H_p : C(X, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C_p(X, \mathbb{R})$ given by $H_p(f) := f - f(p)$; it is clear that H_p is a continuous linear surjection with kernel A . Thus, it establishes an isomorphism of topological vector spaces, say $\check{H}_p : C_*(X, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C_p(X, \mathbb{R})$. Now note that the map ψ_p defined above maps X into $C_p(X, \mathbb{R})$; in fact, as we will note below, in “nice” situations it is an *embedding* of X into $C_p(X, \mathbb{R})$. As mentioned above, $\overline{\psi_p(X)}$ is (a) compact (subset of $C_p(X, \mathbb{R})$, or, equivalently, of $C(X, \mathbb{R})$). It makes sense to consider the map $\check{H}_p^{-1} \circ \psi_p : X \rightarrow C_*(X, \mathbb{R})$; it is (at least) a continuous injective map. The closure of its image is $\overline{\check{H}_p^{-1}(\psi_p(X))} = \check{H}_p^{-1}(\overline{\psi_p(X)})$, which is a compact subset of $C_*(X, \mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, it is easy to check that for *any* $p \in X$, $\check{H}_p^{-1} \circ \psi_p = \tau$. Therefore, for any $p, q \in X$,

$$\overline{\check{H}_p^{-1} \circ \psi_p(X)} = \overline{\check{H}_q^{-1} \circ \psi_q(X)} = \overline{\tau(X)}.$$

We define $\overline{\tau(X)}$ to be the *horofunction compactification* or *horocompactification* of (X, d) , and we denote it by \overline{X}^H . We define $\overline{\tau(X)} \setminus \tau(X)$ to be the *horofunction boundary* or *horoboundary* of (X, d) , and we denote it by $\partial^H X$. By a *horofunction* of (X, d) we mean an element $h \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ such that $[h] \in \partial^H X$. Given an element $\alpha \in \partial^H X$ and given $p \in X$, there exists a unique element $h \in C_p(X, \mathbb{R})$ such that $[h] = \alpha$; this h we denote by α_p . We now state the following fact that is well-known in the literature; see e.g. [22, Proposition 3.0.26].

Result 2.1. *Suppose that (X, d) is a proper, geodesic distance space. Then, for every $p \in X$, ψ_p is an embedding of X into $C(X, \mathbb{R})$.*

Let us now recall the Gromov compactification of a Gromov hyperbolic space. Let (X, d) be a proper, geodesic, Gromov hyperbolic metric space. A *geodesic ray* in X is an isometric embedding $[0, \infty) \rightarrow X$; a *geodesic line* is an isometric embedding $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$; and a *geodesic segment* (sometimes also referred to simply as a *geodesic*) is an isometric embedding $[a, b] \rightarrow X$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$. (It is also pertinent to recall the following definition: if (X, d) is an arbitrary distance space and if $\lambda \geq 1$ and $\kappa \geq 0$ are parameters, then by a (λ, κ) -quasi-geodesic in (X, d) we mean a map $\gamma : I \rightarrow X$, where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval, such that

$$\forall s, t \in I, (1/\lambda)|s - t| - \kappa \leq k_\Omega(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) \leq \lambda|s - t| + \kappa.$$

The *Gromov boundary* $\partial^G X$ is the set of equivalence classes of geodesic rays under the relation of being *asymptotic*, denoted \sim_G , where

$$\gamma \sim_G \sigma \iff \sup_{t \geq 0} d(\gamma(t), \sigma(t)) < \infty.$$

If X is proper, geodesic, and Gromov hyperbolic, the space $\overline{X}^G := X \sqcup \partial^G X$ admits a natural metrizable topology making it a compactification of X . Convergence in this topology is described as follows. A sequence $(x_n) \subset X$ converges to a boundary point $\xi \in \partial^G X$ if there exists $p \in X$ such that, for every sequence of geodesic segments γ_n joining p to x_n , every subsequence of (γ_n) admits a further subsequence converging uniformly on the compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$ to a geodesic ray representing ξ . Similarly, a sequence $(\xi_n) \subset \partial^G X$ converges to $\xi \in \partial^G X$ if there exists $p \in X$ such that, for any choice of geodesic rays γ_n emanating from p and representing ξ_n , every subsequence of (γ_n) has a further subsequence converging uniformly on the compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$ to a ray representing ξ .

We now recall the Busemann function corresponding to a geodesic ray. Suppose that (X, d) is a proper, non-compact (equivalently, unbounded) geodesic distance space and $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow X$ is a geodesic ray in (X, d) . Consider the family

$$\left(d(\cdot, \gamma(t)) - d(\gamma(t), \gamma(0)) \right)_{t \geq 0}$$

of functions on X . Using the fact that γ is a geodesic ray, it is easy to see that this family of functions is pointwise decreasing and locally bounded from below. Therefore, by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem, the family converges, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, to an element $B_\gamma(\cdot, \gamma(0))$ of $C(X, \mathbb{R})$. This element is a horofunction; indeed, returning to the terminology introduced above, $B_\gamma(\cdot, \gamma(0)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\gamma(0)}(\gamma(t))$. In fact, using the observations made at the beginning of this section, it is not difficult to see that for $p \in X$ arbitrary, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi_p(\gamma(t))$ exists as well; we denote it by $B_\gamma(\cdot, p)$. Thus, we have a function $B_\gamma : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$B_\gamma(x, y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(d(x, \gamma(t)) - d(\gamma(t), y) \right);$$

this we call the *Busemann function* corresponding to the geodesic ray γ . Given $x, y \in X$ and $t \in [0, \infty)$ arbitrary, note that $[\psi_x(\gamma(t))] = [\psi_y(\gamma(t))]$; taking the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $[B_\gamma(\cdot, x)] = [B_\gamma(\cdot, y)]$; this common element of $C_*(X, \mathbb{R})$ we denote by $[B_\gamma]$. We now recall the following result alluded to in the Introduction.

Result 2.2 ([1, Proposition 3.3]). *Let (X, d) be a proper geodesic distance space. If two geodesic rays γ, σ in X are strongly asymptotic, then $B_\gamma = B_\sigma$.*

For domains possessing the geodesic visibility property, we have the following result (in what follows, given Ω , a possibly unbounded, complete Kobayashi hyperbolic domain, $\overline{\Omega}^{End}$ denotes the *end compactification* of $\overline{\Omega}$ —see, for instance, [12, Subsection 2.1] for a quick introduction to this):

Result 2.3. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ is a complete Kobayashi hyperbolic domain that has the geodesic visibility property. Then the identity map $\text{id} : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ extends to a continuous surjective map from $\overline{\Omega}^H$ to $\overline{\Omega}^{End}$. Moreover, given $\xi \in \partial \overline{\Omega}^{End}$, let*

$$\mathcal{F}_\xi := \{ \alpha \in C_*(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \mid \exists (x_n) \subset \Omega \text{ such that } x_n \rightarrow \xi \text{ and } \tau(x_n) \rightarrow \alpha \},$$

where τ is as in the definition of horofunction compactification. Then, for every $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \partial \overline{\Omega}^{End}$ with $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$, $\mathcal{F}_{\xi_1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\xi_2} = \emptyset$.

We skip the proof of this result here as it follows from more general results in the recent article [11]. However, in our setting, we present the main idea: an important role is played by the following result.

Result 2.4 ([23, Corollary 4.3]). *Suppose (X, d) is a proper, geodesic distance space. Then, for every $\alpha \in \overline{\tau(X)} \setminus \tau(X)$, and every two sequences (x_n) and (y_n) in X such that $(\tau(x_n))$ and $(\tau(y_n))$ both converge to α , one has $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} (x_n | y_m)_o = \infty$.*

Following the terminology in [4, Definition 6.2], the above result essentially says that \overline{X}^H is a *good compactification*. The continuous extension of the identity map in Definition 2.3 then follows from ideas similar to those in the proof of [4, Theorem 6.5]. Alternatively, one could also appeal to [11, Theorem 1.4]. The second assertion in Definition 2.3 also follows from a similar argument using the visibility property. Alternatively, one could also appeal to [11, Theorem 1.8].

3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS

In this section, we will present the proofs of our main results.

But we begin with the construction referred to in Definition 1.2. Consider a bounded convex domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ with smooth boundary that is of finite type everywhere except at only one point. Note that, by [24, Theorem 1.1], (D, k_D) is not Gromov hyperbolic. Now let the exceptional point be $0_{\mathbb{C}^d}$ and suppose without loss of generality that the complex tangent space to ∂D at $0_{\mathbb{C}^d}$ is $\{z_1 = 0\}$. Consider the biholomorphic map $F : \mathbb{C}^d \setminus \{z_1 = 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d \setminus \{z_1 = 0\}$ given by $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) \mapsto (1/z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d)$. Writing $\Omega := F(D)$, it is clear that Ω is an unbounded domain in \mathbb{C}^d that is not Gromov hyperbolic relative to its Kobayashi distance. Note that F is defined as a biholomorphism in a neighbourhood of $\overline{D} \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{C}^d}\}$ and note also that $\partial\Omega = F(\partial D \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{C}^d}\})$. From these two facts and [24, Theorem 1.3] it follows that Ω is a local Gromov model domain. This concludes the construction; we now turn to the proofs of the results.

Proof of Definition 1.3. Using the fact that Ω is a local Gromov model domain, choose a bounded neighbourhood U of ξ such that $U \cap \Omega$ is connected, complete hyperbolic, Gromov hyperbolic, and such that $\text{id}_{U \cap \Omega}$ extends to a homeomorphism from $\overline{U \cap \Omega}^G$ to $\overline{U \cap \Omega}$. Also choose a neighbourhood W of ξ such that $W \Subset U$. Since γ and σ land at ξ , there exists $T \in [0, \infty)$ such that, for all $t \geq T$, $\gamma(t), \sigma(t) \in W \cap \Omega$. Note that, since $U \cap \Omega$ is a Gromov model domain, in particular, every two points of $\partial\Omega \cap U$ possess the (weak) visibility property with respect to $k_{U \cap \Omega}$ (see, for instance, [25, Theorem 2.6] and [10, Corollary 3.2]). Therefore, we may invoke [21, Theorem 1] to conclude that there exists $C < \infty$ such that

$$\forall z, w \in W \cap \Omega, \quad k_{\Omega}(z, w) \leq k_{U \cap \Omega}(z, w) \leq k_{\Omega}(z, w) + C. \quad (3.1)$$

This readily implies that $\gamma|_{[T, \infty)}$ and $\sigma|_{[T, \infty)}$ are continuous $(1, C)$ -quasi-geodesics with respect to $k_{U \cap \Omega}$. Now consider $\hat{\gamma} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \Omega$ and $\hat{\sigma} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \Omega$ defined by

$$\hat{\gamma}(t) = \gamma(t + T), \quad \hat{\sigma}(t) = \sigma(t + T) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Clearly both $\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\sigma}$ are $(1, C)$ -quasi-geodesic rays in $(U \cap \Omega, k_{U \cap \Omega})$ landing at $\xi \in \partial(U \cap \Omega)$. Since $(U \cap \Omega, k_{U \cap \Omega})$ is a Gromov model domain, appealing to Lemma 5.8 in [1], we get

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} k_{U \cap \Omega}(\hat{\gamma}(t), \hat{\sigma}(t)) < \infty.$$

This together with (3.1) implies that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} k_{\Omega}(\hat{\gamma}(t), \hat{\sigma}(t)) < \infty,$$

from which the desired conclusion follows easily. \square

We now present the proof of Definition 1.4. Our proof closely follows the proof of Theorem 4.3 in [1]. The main point to note is that, under the hypotheses of our theorem, the assumption of boundedness in [1, Theorem 4.3] is redundant. Keeping this in mind, and for the sake of completeness, we first state a lemma, which is essentially a restatement of [1, Lemma 4.4]. To state this lemma we need to make some preliminary remarks, which mirror those made in [1] immediately before the statement of Lemma 4.4.

With Ω an arbitrary domain that admits squeezing functions, suppose we have a sequence $(\gamma_n : [-T_n, T_n] \rightarrow \Omega)_n$ of geodesic segments in (Ω, k_{Ω}) such that $T_n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that there exist a sequence (z_n) in Ω and $C < \infty$ such that, for all n , $k_{\Omega}(z_n, \gamma_n(0)) \leq C$ and such that $s_{\Omega}(z_n) \rightarrow 1$. Write $r_n := s_{\Omega}(z_n)$ and, using the definition of the squeezing

function, choose, for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, an injective holomorphic map $\phi_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^d$ such that $\phi_n(z_n) = 0$ and $B(0; r_n) \subset \Omega_n := \phi_n(\Omega)$. Let $\hat{\gamma}_n := \phi_n \circ \gamma_n$; then $\hat{\gamma}_n$ is a geodesic segment in $(\Omega_n, \mathbf{k}_{\Omega_n})$. Since (Ω_n) expands to \mathbb{B}^d , it is easy to see, by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem, that there exists a subsequence of $(\hat{\gamma}_n)$ that converges uniformly on the compact subsets of \mathbb{R} to a $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbb{B}^d}$ -geodesic-line $\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^d$; we may suppose, without loss of generality, that $(\hat{\gamma}_n)$ itself converges uniformly on the compact subsets of \mathbb{R} to the geodesic line η . The next lemma allows us to calculate $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbb{B}^d}(0, \text{ran } \eta)$ in terms of $\mathbf{k}_{\Omega_n}(0, \text{ran } \hat{\gamma}_n)$.

Lemma 3.1. *In the situation described above,*

$$\mathbf{k}_{\mathbb{B}^d}(0, \text{ran } \eta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{k}_{\Omega_n}(0, \text{ran } \hat{\gamma}_n).$$

We omit the proof because it is the same, word for word, as the proof of Lemma 4.4 in [1].

Proof of Definition 1.4. Assume, to get a contradiction, that the statement is false. Then there exist $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and there exist \mathbf{k}_{Ω} -geodesic-rays γ and σ in Ω landing at ξ that are not strongly asymptotic. By Definition 1.3, γ and σ are \mathbf{k}_{Ω} -asymptotic. From this point one can follow the proof of [1, Theorem 4.3] *verbatim* to obtain the required result. \square

Proof of Definition 1.5. It is easy to see that Ψ is well-defined: if $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and γ, σ are geodesic rays in $(\Omega, \mathbf{k}_{\Omega})$ landing at ξ , then by hypothesis γ and σ are strongly asymptotic, and therefore by Definition 2.2, we conclude that $B_{\gamma} = B_{\sigma}$, whence, a fortiori, $[B_{\gamma}] = [B_{\sigma}]$. This also means that there is a well-defined function $f_{\xi} : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every geodesic ray γ in $(\Omega, \mathbf{k}_{\Omega})$ landing at ξ , and for every two points $z, p \in \Omega$, $f_{\xi}(z, p) = B_{\gamma}(z, p)$.

To show that Ψ is continuous, it is enough to prove that if $(x_n) \subset \Omega$ is such that $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial\Omega$ then $(\Psi(x_n))$ converges to $\Psi(\xi)$. To do this, it suffices to prove that for a fixed but arbitrary $p \in \Omega$, the sequence of functions $(\mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(\cdot, x_n) - \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(x_n, p))$ converges to the function $B_{\gamma}(\cdot, p)$, where γ is *some* geodesic ray in $(\Omega, \mathbf{k}_{\Omega})$ landing at ξ . Observe that for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $y, z \in X$ arbitrary,

$$|(\mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(z, x_n) - \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(x_n, p)) - (\mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(y, x_n) - \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(x_n, p))| \leq \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(z, y),$$

which shows that the sequence of functions considered is uniformly 1-Lipschitz. Since it is also clearly pointwise relatively compact, it follows, by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem, that in order to prove that the sequence $(\mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(\cdot, x_n) - \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(x_n, p))$ converges (in $C(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$) to $f_{\xi}(\cdot, p)$, it suffices to prove that it converges pointwise to the said function, i.e., for every $z \in \Omega$, $\mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(z, x_n) - \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(x_n, p) \rightarrow f_{\xi}(z, p)$. Fix $z \in \Omega$. We only need to prove that every subsequence of $(\mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(z, x_n) - \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(x_n, p))$ has a further subsequence that converges to $f_{\xi}(z, p)$; for notational convenience, we show that $(\mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(z, x_n) - \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(x_n, p))$ has a subsequence that converges to $f_{\xi}(z, p)$. For every n , choose geodesic segments γ_n and σ_n in $(\Omega, \mathbf{k}_{\Omega})$ joining z to x_n and p to x_n , respectively. Since Ω is a complete hyperbolic visibility domain, we may invoke [12, Lemma 2.16] to conclude that (γ_n) and (σ_n) have subsequences that converge uniformly on the compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$ to geodesic rays $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ that emanate from z and p , respectively, and land at ξ . By passing to subsequences successively, we may assume that (γ_n) and (σ_n) themselves converge to $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$, respectively. By hypothesis, $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are strongly asymptotic, i.e., there exists $T \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{k}_{\Omega}(\tilde{\gamma}(t), \tilde{\sigma}(t + T)) = 0.$$

Fix $t \in [0, \infty)$. For all n sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} k_\Omega(z, x_n) &= k_\Omega(z, \gamma_n(t)) + k_\Omega(\gamma_n(t), x_n), \\ k_\Omega(x_n, p) &\leq k_\Omega(x_n, \gamma_n(t)) + k_\Omega(\gamma_n(t), p) \\ k_\Omega(x_n, p) &= k_\Omega(x_n, \sigma_n(t+T)) + k_\Omega(\sigma_n(t+T), p) \\ &\geq k_\Omega(x_n, \gamma_n(t)) + k_\Omega(\gamma_n(t), p) - 2k_\Omega(\gamma_n(t), \sigma_n(t+T)). \end{aligned}$$

From the first and second (in)equalities above,

$$k_\Omega(z, x_n) - k_\Omega(x_n, p) \geq k_\Omega(z, \gamma_n(t)) - k_\Omega(\gamma_n(t), p). \quad (3.2)$$

Similarly, from the first and third inequalities,

$$k_\Omega(z, x_n) - k_\Omega(x_n, p) \leq k_\Omega(z, \gamma_n(t)) - k_\Omega(\gamma_n(t), p) + 2k_\Omega(\gamma_n(t), \sigma_n(t+T)). \quad (3.3)$$

Recalling that t is fixed, take $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.2) to get

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (k_\Omega(z, x_n) - k_\Omega(x_n, p)) \geq k_\Omega(z, \tilde{\gamma}(t)) - k_\Omega(\tilde{\gamma}(t), p). \quad (3.4)$$

Similarly, taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.3) we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (k_\Omega(z, x_n) - k_\Omega(x_n, p)) \leq k_\Omega(z, \tilde{\gamma}(t)) - k_\Omega(\tilde{\gamma}(t), p) + 2k_\Omega(\tilde{\gamma}(t), \tilde{\sigma}(t+T)). \quad (3.5)$$

Now recall that t itself was arbitrary, that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (k_\Omega(z, \tilde{\gamma}(t)) - k_\Omega(\tilde{\gamma}(t), p))$$

exists and equals $f_\xi(z, p)$, and that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} k_\Omega(\tilde{\gamma}(t), \tilde{\sigma}(t+T)) = 0$$

to conclude, from (3.4) and (3.5), that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (k_\Omega(z, x_n) - k_\Omega(x_n, p)) = f_\xi(z, p).$$

By the discussion above, it follows that $(k_\Omega(\cdot, x_n) - k_\Omega(x_n, p))$ converges, in the topology of $C(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, to $f_\xi(\cdot, p)$. This establishes the continuity of Ψ .

That $\Psi : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}^H$ is an embedding, is a consequence of Definition 2.4. Note that, to prove the assertion about the embedding, it suffices to check that if $(x_n) \subset \overline{\Omega}$ and $y \in \overline{\Omega}$ are such that $\Psi(x_n) \rightarrow \Psi(y)$, then $x_n \rightarrow y$. The verification proceeds by considering the possible locations of x_n and y (in the interior or on the boundary) and whether (x_n) is bounded. We illustrate the argument for one representative case: $x_n \in \partial\Omega$ and $y \in \partial\Omega$.

Since (Ω, k_Ω) is complete and has the geodesic visibility property, [12, Theorem 3.3] implies that $\overline{\Omega}^{End}$ is sequentially compact. Hence, some subsequence (x_{k_n}) converges to a point $\xi \in \partial\overline{\Omega}^{End}$; it remains to show that $\xi = y$. Using the first countability of $\overline{\Omega}^{End}$ and the metrizability of $\overline{\tau(\Omega)}$ (where τ is as in Section 2 for (Ω, k_Ω)), one can find a sequence $(x'_n) \subset \Omega$ such that $x'_n \rightarrow \xi$ and $(\Psi(x_{k_n}))$ and $(\Psi(x'_n))$ converge to the same point (hence to $\Psi(y)$). Let $(y_n) \subset \Omega$ be such that $y_n \rightarrow y$. Since $\Psi|_\Omega = \tau$, we have two sequences (x'_n) and (y_n) in Ω with $\tau(x'_n)$ and $\tau(y_n)$ converging to the same element of $\overline{\tau(\Omega)}$. By Definition 2.4,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x'_n | y_n)_o = \infty,$$

where $o \in \Omega$ is a fixed but arbitrary point. If $\xi \neq y$, then by a standard fact for domains with the visibility property (see, e.g., [8, Prop. 2.4], [10, Prop. 3.1], [12, Lem. 2.15]),

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x'_n | y_n)_o < \infty,$$

a contradiction. Thus $\xi = y$, completing this case. The remaining cases can be handled similarly. \square

Now we are ready to prove Definition 1.7.

Proof of Definition 1.7. Given $p \in \partial\Omega$, let γ be the connected component of $\partial\Omega$ containing p , and let K_γ be the connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega$ containing γ (or, equivalently, p). Then we know, by [12, Lemma 4.11], that there exists a neighbourhood V of p in \mathbb{C} such that

$$V = (V \cap \Omega) \cup (V \cap K_\gamma). \quad (3.6)$$

Consider the domain

$$\Omega_\gamma := \mathbb{C}_\infty \setminus \text{cl}_{\mathbb{C}_\infty}(K_\gamma)$$

(as a set, this is equal to $\mathbb{C} \setminus K_\gamma$ when K_γ is unbounded as a subset of \mathbb{C} and is equal to $\mathbb{C}_\infty \setminus K_\gamma$ when K_γ is bounded; the point to be emphasised is that we always regard Ω_γ as being a domain in \mathbb{C}_∞). Then Ω_γ is a simply connected domain in \mathbb{C}_∞ containing Ω whose boundary is precisely $\text{cl}_{\mathbb{C}_\infty}(\gamma)$. Now, by [12, Proposition 4.14], $\text{cl}_{\mathbb{C}_\infty}(\gamma)$ is a Jordan curve. Therefore, if we choose and fix a biholomorphism $\phi_\gamma : \Omega_\gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$, then, by Carathéodory's theorem on the extension of biholomorphisms (see, for instance, [6, Theorem 4.3.1]), ϕ_γ will extend to a homeomorphism, which we will continue to call ϕ_γ , from $\text{cl}_{\mathbb{C}_\infty}(\Omega_\gamma)$ to $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. We may assume, by post-composing with a suitable automorphism of \mathbb{D} , that $\phi_\gamma(p) = 1$. Note that $V \cap \overline{\Omega}$ is a neighbourhood of p in $\overline{\Omega}$; so $W := \phi_\gamma(V \cap \overline{\Omega})$ is a neighbourhood of 1 in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Note that by (3.6),

$$W \cap \mathbb{D} = W \cap \phi_\gamma(\Omega_\gamma) = W \cap \phi_\gamma(\Omega).$$

By the biholomorphic invariance of the squeezing function, writing $\tilde{\Omega} := \phi_\gamma(\Omega)$, we have

$$s_{\tilde{\Omega}} \circ \phi_\gamma = s_\Omega.$$

Therefore, in order to prove that $\lim_{\Omega \ni z \rightarrow p} s_\Omega(z) = 1$, it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{W \cap \mathbb{D} \ni z \rightarrow 1} s_{\tilde{\Omega}}(z) = 1. \quad (3.7)$$

Since W is a neighbourhood of 1 in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, it follows, from the properties of the Poincaré distance, which is the Kobayashi distance on \mathbb{D} , that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 1} k_{\mathbb{D}}(z, \mathbb{D} \setminus W) = \infty.$$

Since $\mathbb{D} \setminus \tilde{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus W$, it also follows that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 1} k_{\mathbb{D}}(z, \mathbb{D} \setminus \tilde{\Omega}) = \infty.$$

Therefore, given $r < 1$, there exists a neighbourhood \widehat{W} of 1 in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that

$$\forall z \in \widehat{W} \cap \mathbb{D}, \quad k_{\mathbb{D}}(z, \mathbb{D} \setminus \tilde{\Omega}) > k_{\mathbb{D}}(0, r) = \tanh^{-1}(r) = (1/2) \log \left(\frac{1+r}{1-r} \right). \quad (3.8)$$

For any $z \in \widehat{W} \cap \mathbb{D}$, we choose an automorphism T_z of \mathbb{D} such that $T_z(z) = 0$. Note that, by the biholomorphic invariance of the Poincaré distance and (3.8),

$$k_{\mathbb{D}}(0, \mathbb{D} \setminus T_z(\tilde{\Omega})) = k_{\mathbb{D}}(z, \mathbb{D} \setminus \tilde{\Omega}) > k_{\mathbb{D}}(0, r) = k_{\mathbb{D}}(0, \mathbb{D} \setminus D(0, r));$$

therefore, $D(0; r) \subset T_z(\tilde{\Omega})$. Hence $s_{\tilde{\Omega}}(z) \geq r$. Since r was arbitrary, this proves (3.7) and with it the proposition. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a domain that satisfies Condition 1. Then the mapping $\Psi : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \overline{(\Omega, k_{\Omega})}^H$ given by*

$$\Psi(\xi) := \begin{cases} [k_{\Omega}(\cdot, \xi)], & \text{if } \xi \in \Omega, \\ [B_{\gamma}], & \text{if } \xi \in \partial\Omega \text{ and } \gamma \text{ is some geodesic ray in } (\Omega, k_{\Omega}) \text{ landing at } \xi, \end{cases}$$

is well-defined and an embedding of $\overline{\Omega}$ in $\overline{(\Omega, k_{\Omega})}^H$.

Proof. First note that, by the discussion following Definition 1.6, Ω is a local Gromov model domain. Therefore, by Definition 1.3, for every $\xi \in \partial\Omega$, and for every two k_{Ω} -geodesic rays γ and σ landing at ξ , γ and σ are k_{Ω} -asymptotic. Using Definition 1.7 and Definition 1.4, we conclude that γ and σ are strongly asymptotic. Therefore we may invoke Definition 1.5 to draw the required conclusion. \square

Acknowledgements: Sushil Gorai is partially supported by a Core Research Grant (CRG/2022/003560) from Science and Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology, Government of India. Anwoy Maitra is partially supported by a New Faculty Initiation Grant (SB24250650MANFIG009155) from the Indian Institute of Technology Madras.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Arosio, M. Fiacchi, S. Gontard and L. Guerini, *The horofunction boundary of a Gromov hyperbolic space*, Math. Ann. **388** (2024), 1163–1204.
- [2] A. Banik, *Visibility domains that are not pseudoconvex*, Bull. Sci. Math. **193** (2024), Paper No. 103452, 11 pp.
- [3] G. Bharali and A. Maitra, *A weak notion of visibility, a family of examples, and Wolff–Denjoy theorems*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **22** (2021), 195–240.
- [4] G. Bharali and A. Zimmer, *Goldilocks domains, a weak notion of visibility, and applications*, Adv. Math. **310** (2017), 377–425.
- [5] G. Bharali and A. Zimmer, *Unbounded visibility domains, the end compactification, and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **376** (2023), no. 8, 5949–5988.
- [6] F. Bracci, M. D. Contreras and S. Díaz-Madrigal, *Continuous semigroups of holomorphic self-maps of the unit disc*, Springer 2020.
- [7] F. Bracci, H. Gaussier, N. Nikolov, and P. J. Thomas, *Local and global visibility and Gromov hyperbolicity of domains with respect to the Kobayashi distance*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **377** (2024), no. 1, 471–493.
- [8] F. Bracci, N. Nikolov and P. J. Thomas, *Visibility of Kobayashi geodesics in convex domains and related properties*, Math. Z., **301**(2), (2022), 2011–2035.
- [9] M. R. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric Spaces of Non-positive Curvature*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **319**, Springer-Verlag Berlin, 1999.
- [10] V. S. Chandel, A. Maitra, and A. D. Sarkar, *Notions of visibility with respect to the Kobayashi distance: comparison and applications*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **203** (2024), no. 2, 475–498.
- [11] V. S. Chandel, N. Mandal, *The metric compactification of a Kobayashi hyperbolic complex manifold and a Denjoy–Wolff Theorem*, arXiv:2507.18156.

- [12] V. S. Chandel, S. Gorai, A. Maitra, and A. D. Sarkar, *Visibility property in one and several variables and its applications*, [arXiv:2406.15298](#).
- [13] M. Gromov, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*. With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes. Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates Progr. Math., **152** Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999. xx+585 pp.
- [14] M. Gromov, Hyperbolic manifolds, groups and actions, Riemann surfaces and related topics: Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference (State Univ. New York, Stony Brook, N.Y., 1978), pp. 183–213, Ann. of Math. Stud., No. 97, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1981
- [15] Rumpa Masanta, *Taut visibility domains are not necessarily Kobayashi complete*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **153** (2025), no. 7, 3077–3081.
- [16] Rumpa Masanta, *Visibility domains relative to the Kobayashi distance in complex manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (2025), DOI: 10.1090/tran/9566
- [17] N. Nikolov, A. Y. Ökten and P. J. Thomas, *Local and global notions of visibility with respect to Kobayashi distance: a comparison*, Ann. Polon. Math. **132** (2024), no. 2, 169–185.
- [18] N. Nikolov, A. Y. Ökten and P. J. Thomas, *Visible C^2 -smooth domains are pseudoconvex*, Bull. Sci. Math. **197** (2024), Paper No. 103525, 8 pp.
- [19] C. Pommerenke, Boundary behaviour of conformal maps, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften **299**, Springer Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 1992.
- [20] H. L. Royden, *Remarks on the Kobayashi metric*, Several Complex Variables, College Park, MD, USA, 1970, Part 2, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **185**.
- [21] A. D. Sarkar, *Localization of the Kobayashi distance for any visibility domain*, J. Geom. Anal. **33** (2023), no. 5, Paper No. 144, 16 pp.
- [22] A.-S. Schilling, Horofunction Compactification of Finite-Dimensional Normed Spaces and of Symmetric Spaces, Diploma Thesis, Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, 2013.
- [23] C. Webster and A. Winchester, *Boundaries of hyperbolic metric spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **221** (2005), no. 1, 147–158.
- [24] A. M. Zimmer, *Gromov hyperbolicity and the Kobayashi metric on convex domains of finite type*, Math. Ann. **365** (2016), 1425–1498.
- [25] A. M. Zimmer, *Characterizing domains by the limit set of their automorphism group*, Adv. Math. **308** (2017), 438–482.

VSC: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR, KANPUR – 208 016, INDIA

Email address: vschandel@iitk.ac.in

SG: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH KOLKATA, MOHANPUR – 741 246, INDIA

Email address: sushil.gorai@iiserkol.ac.in

AM: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY MADRAS, CHENNAI – 600 036, INDIA

Email address: anwoy@iitm.ac.in

ADS: SCHOOL OF BASIC SCIENCES, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BHUBANESWAR, ARGUL – 752 050, INDIA

Email address: amar@iitbbs.ac.in