ARCHIVUM MATHEMATICUM (BRNO)
Tomus 53 (2017), 255–265

INFINITESIMAL CR AUTOMORPHISMS FOR A CLASS OF POLYNOMIAL MODELS

Martin Kolář and Francine Meylan

Abstract. In this paper we study infinitesimal CR automorphisms of Levi degenerate hypersurfaces. We illustrate the recent general results of [18], [17], [15], on a class of concrete examples, polynomial models in $\mathbb{C}^3$ of the form $\mathsf{Im}\ w = \mathsf{Re}\,(P(z)\overline{Q(z)})$, where P and Q are weighted homogeneous holomorphic polynomials in $z = (z_1, z_2)$. We classify such models according to their Lie algebra of infinitesimal CR automorphisms. We also give the first example of a non monomial model which admits a nonlinear rigid automorphism.

1. Introduction

The study of possible complexity of automorphisms of CR manifolds has a long history. The classical case of Levi nondegenerate hypersurfaces was studied by Poincaré, Cartan, Tanaka, Chern and Moser, Vitushkin and many others. Most results on symmetries in this class are negative, indicating that interesting symmetries are very rare. In particular, Beloshapka and Kruzhilin showed that if the hypersurface is not locally spherical, then its symmetries are linear in Chern-Moser normal coordinates.

Similar results were obtained for finite type hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^2$. In particular, all such hypersurfaces which admit a nonlinear symmetry are biholomophically equivalent to the model $Im\, w = |z|^k$.

Several recent results indicate that the situation is more interesting for finite type hypersurfaces in higher dimensions, and also for infinite type hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^2$ (see e.g. [14], [18]).

On the one hand, the simple example of a finite type hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$

$$\mathsf{Im}\ w = \mathsf{Re}\ z_1 \bar{z}_2^l \tag{1.1}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: primary 32V35; secondary 32V40.

Key words and phrases: Levi degenerate hypersurfaces, finite multitype, polynomial models, infinitesimal CR automorphisms.

The first author was supported by the GACR grant GA17-19437S. The second author was supported by Swiss NSF Grant 2100-063464.00/1.

Received April 29, 2017. Editor M. Čadek.

DOI: 10.5817/AM2017-5-255

which admits an infinitesimal automorphism of the form

$$Y = iz_2^l \partial_{z_1}\,,$$

where l is an arbitrary integer, shows that infinitesimal automorphisms may have coefficients of arbitrary degree. On the other hand, as shown by the results of [18], the weighted degree of such coefficients is controlled by the Catlin multitype of the manifold. Note that when $l = 1$, we recover a Levi nondegenerate hyperquadric: in this case, the real dimension of the Lie algebra of the infinitesimal CR automorphisms is known to be 15.

Let P and Q be weighted homogeneous holomorphic polynomials in $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, and let M given by

$$M = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : \mathsf{Im}\, w = P\overline{Q} + Q\overline{P}\} \tag{1.2}$$

be holomorphically non degenerate hypersurface. We will consider the following problem, generalizing in a natural way the above example:

- *Characterize in terms of P and Q the Lie algebra of infinitesimal CR automorphisms of M.*

Note that in dimensions higher than three the hypersurface given by (1.2) is necessarily holomorphically degenerate.

As a main result of this paper, we completely classify such models in terms of P and Q according to their Lie algebra $\mathrm{aut}(M, 0)$ of infinitesimal CR automorphisms at 0 (see Theorems 4.1 and 4.2).

As a special case of (1.2) one obtains monomial hypersurfaces. We will call a model of the form (1.2) monomial, if there exist coordinates in which both P and Q are monomials (see Section 3 for the precise definition). The model (1.1) is an example of such a hypersurface. In fact, all the previously known examples of hypersurfaces which admit a nonlinear rigid infinitesimal CR automorphism are based on monomials ([2], [17]).

In Section 4 we will also construct the first example of a non monomial model which admits a nonlinear rigid automorphism (see Theorem 4.3).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a self contained summary of the results obtained in [18], [17], [15]. Some of them (but not all) will be used in Section 4 to prove the main results of the paper. Section 3 contains several auxilliary results, which for each particular graded component of $\mathrm{aut}(M, 0)$ characterize manifolds for which this component is nonzero. In case of rotations, i.e. the $\mathfrak{g}_0$ part, containing infinitesimal CR automorphisms of weight 0, such description is provided separately for real, imaginary and nilpotent rotations. Section 4 contains the statements and proofs of the main results of the paper.

2. Preliminaries and previous results

Recall that a hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is of finite Catlin multitype (m_1, m_2) at $p \in M$ if there exist local holomorphic coordinates centered at p such that M is given by

$$\mathsf{Im}\, w = P_C(z, \bar{z}) + o_{\Lambda_M}(1)\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where P_C is a weighted homogeneous polynomial of weighted degree one with respect to the weights $\Lambda_M = (\mu_1, \mu_2) = (\frac{1}{m_1}, \frac{1}{m_2})$ and $o_{\Lambda_M}(1)$ denotes terms of weighted degree bigger than one. Moreover, by the definition of multitype, Λ_M is the lexicographically smallest weight with this property. The algebraic hypersurface M_H, defined by

$$\mathsf{Im}\, w = P_C(z, \bar{z})\,, \tag{2.2}$$

is called the model hypersurface, or shortly model.

Recall that the model M_H is holomorphically nondegenerate at $p \in M_H$ if there is no germ at p of a holomorphic vector field X (complex) tangent to M_H. We refer the reader to [15] for more details.

We now summarize the main results from [18], [17], [15]. Some of them will be used in Section 4 to prove the main results of this paper.

Let us consider a holomorphically nondegenerate model given by (2.2).

It was proved in [18], that the Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{aut}(M_H, 0)$ of M_H admits a weighted decomposition, which we write in the form

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2} \mathfrak{g}_{-\mu_j} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_c \oplus \mathfrak{g}_n \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1\,, \tag{2.3}$$

where the vector fields in $\mathfrak{g}_c$ commute with $W = \partial_w$ and the nonzero vector fields in $\mathfrak{g}_n$ do not commute with W. Their weights in both cases lie in the interval $(0, 1)$. Note that by a result of [18], vector fields in $\mathfrak{g}_j$ with $j < 0$ are regular and vector fields in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ are linear.

The following theorem, which deals with $\mathfrak{g}_n$, was obtained in [15].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $P_C(z, \bar{z})$ be a weighted homogeneous polynomial of degree 1 with respect to the multitype weights, such that the hypersurface*

$$M_H := \{\mathsf{Im}\, w = P_C(z, \bar{z})\}\,, \quad (z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}\,, \tag{2.4}$$

is holomorphically nondegenerate. Let $\mathfrak{g}_n$ in (2.3) satisfy

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_n > 0\,. \tag{2.5}$$

Then M_H is biholomorphically equivalent to

$$\mathsf{Im}\ w = \mathsf{Re}\, z_1 \bar{z}_2^l \tag{2.6}$$

or

$$\mathsf{Im}\ w = |z_1|^2 \pm |z_2|^{2l}\,. \tag{2.7}$$

The next result deals with the component $\mathfrak{g}_c$ ([17]).

Definition 2.2. Let Y be a weighted homogeneous vector field. A pair of finite sequences of holomorphic weighted homogeneous polynomials $\{U^1, \dots, U^n\}$ and

$\{V^1, \dots, V^n\}$ is called a symmetric pair of Y-chains if

$$Y(U^n) = 0\,, \quad Y(U^j) = c_j U^{j+1}\,, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1\,, \tag{2.8}$$

$$Y(V^n) = 0\,, \quad Y(V^j) = d_j V^{j+1}\,, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1\,, \tag{2.9}$$

where c_j, d_j are non zero complex constants, which satisfy

$$c_j = -\bar{d}_{n-j}\,. \tag{2.10}$$

If the two sequences are identical we say that $\{U^1, \dots, U^n\}$ is a symmetric Y-chain.

The following theorem shows that in general the elements of $\mathfrak{g}_c$ arise from symmetric pairs of chains.

Theorem 2.3. *Let M_H be a holomorphically nondegenerate hypersurface given by* (2.4)*, which admits a nontrivial $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_c$. Then P_C can be decomposed in the following way*

$$P_C = \sum_{j=1}^{M} T_j\,, \tag{2.11}$$

where each T_j is given by

$$T_j = \mathsf{Re}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{N_j} U_j^k \overline{V_j^{N_j-k+1}}\Big)\,, \tag{2.12}$$

where $\{U_j^1, \dots, U_j^{N_j}\}$ and $\{V_j^1, \dots, V_j^{N_j}\}$ are a symmetric pair of Y-chains.

Conversely, if Y and P_C satisfy (2.8)–(2.12)*, then $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_c$.*

Note that Y is uniquely and explicitly determined by P (see [17]). Hence for a given hypersurface this result also provides a constructive tool to determine $\mathfrak{g}_c$, and shows that

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_c \leq 1\,. \tag{2.13}$$

The description of the remaining component $\mathfrak{g}_1$ was obtained in Theorem 4.7 of [18].

Definition 2.4. We say that P_C is balanced if it can be written as

$$P_C(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{|\alpha|_\Lambda = |\bar{\alpha}|_\Lambda = 1} A_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}} z^\alpha \bar{z}^{\bar{\alpha}}\,, \tag{2.14}$$

for some nonzero pair of real numbers $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, where

$$|\alpha|_\Lambda := \lambda_1 \alpha_1 + \lambda_2 \alpha_2\,.$$

The associated hypersurface M_H is called a balanced hypersurface.

Note that P_C is balanced if and only if the linear vector field

$$Y = \lambda_1 z_1 \partial_{z_1} + \lambda_2 z_2 \partial_{z_2}$$

is a complex reproducing field in the terminology of [18], i.e., $Y(P_C) = P_C$.

Theorem 2.5. *The component* $\mathfrak{g}_1$ *satisfies*

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_1 = 1 \tag{2.15}$$

if and only if in suitable multitype coordinates M_H *is a balanced hypersurface. Otherwise,* $\dim \mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$*.*

3. Auxiliary lemmata

In this section we prove some necessary lemmata, needed to obtain the main results. We will assume throughout the section that M is holomorphically nondegenerate.

Definition 3.1. The model of the form (1.2) is called monomial, if there exist multitype coordinates in which both P and Q are monomials.

Lemma 3.2. *Let* M *be given by* (1.2)*. If* M *is monomial, then it is a balanced hypersurface.*

Proof. Let $P\bar{Q} = z_1^{\alpha_1} z_2^{\alpha_2} \bar{z}_1^{\beta_1} \bar{z}_2^{\beta_2}$. Then

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_j z_j \partial_{z_j}$$

is a complex reproducing field provided that λ_1, λ_2 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1\alpha_1 + \lambda_2\alpha_2 &= 1\,, \\ \lambda_1\beta_1 + \lambda_2\beta_2 &= 1\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

which gives a unique solution, since M is holomorphically nondegenerate and hence (α_1, α_2) and (β_1, β_2) are linearly independent. □

In the sequel we will use the following terminology. We will say $X \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ is a real (respectively imaginary) rotation if it is diagonal in normal form with purely real (respectively imaginary) coefficients. We will say that $X \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ is a nilpotent rotation if the diagonal terms vanish in normal form. Note that by a result of [18], the diagonal part and the nilpotent part of a rotation are also rotations, therefore it is enough to study diagonal and nilpotent rotations.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* M *be a Levi degenerate model given by* (1.2)*. If* P *and* Q *are monomials, then* $X \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ *is diagonal in normal form if and only if it is diagonal in the given coordinates.*

Proof. The proof is immediate, applying a rotation in general form to a holomorphically nondegenerate monomial model. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let* M *be given by* (1.2)*. Then* M *admits an imaginary rotation if and only if* M *is a balanced hypersurface. Moreover,* X *is an imaginary rotation if and only if* ciX*, for some* $c \in \mathbb{R}$*, is a complex reproducing field.*

Proof. Let M be balanced and R be the associated complex reproducing field given by

$$R = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_j z_j \partial_{z_j} .$$

Then M admits an imaginary rotation

$$X = iR = i \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_j z_j \partial_{z_j} .$$

Conversely, let M admit an imaginary rotation given in normal form by

$$X = i \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_j z_j \partial_{z_j}$$

with λ_j real. If P and Q are monomials in such coordinates, then M is balanced by Lemma 3.2.

If P and Q are not both monomials, let us consider an arbitrary monomial $z_1^{\alpha_1} z_2^{\alpha_2} \bar{z}_1^{\beta_1} \bar{z}_2^{\beta_2}$ in the expansion of $P\bar{Q}$. We obtain

$$\lambda_1(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) + \lambda_2(\alpha_2 - \beta_2) = 0 .$$

Take another monomial in the expansion of $\operatorname{Re} P\bar{Q}$, which we write in the form

$$z_1^{\alpha_1 - \gamma} z_2^{\alpha_1 + \gamma \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}} \bar{z}_1^{\beta_1} \bar{z}_2^{\beta_2} .$$

We obtain

$$\lambda_1(\alpha_1 - \gamma - \beta_1) + \lambda_2(\alpha_2 + \gamma \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2} - \beta_2) = 0 .$$

Hence

$$\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2} = 0 ,$$

which implies that $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} = \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}$. It follows that ciX, for suitable $c \in \mathbb{R}$, is a complex reproducing field. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Let M be given by* (1.2). *M admits a real rotation if and only if M is monomial.*

Proof. Let

$$X = \lambda_1 z_1 \partial_{z_1} + \lambda_2 z_2 \partial_{z_2} \tag{3.2}$$

be a real rotation. For any monomial $z_1^{\alpha_1} z_2^{\alpha_2} \bar{z}_1^{\beta_1} \bar{z}_2^{\beta_2}$ in the expansion of $P\bar{Q}$ we have

$$\lambda_1(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) + \lambda_2(\alpha_2 + \beta_2) = 0 . \tag{3.3}$$

Since

$$\mu_1(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) + \mu_2(\alpha_2 + \beta_2) = 1 , \tag{3.4}$$

and (λ_1, λ_2) and (μ_1, μ_2) are linearly independent, we obtain a unique solution for $\alpha_1 + \beta_1$ and $\alpha_2 + \beta_2$. Hence the total degrees in z_1 and z_2 in $P\bar{Q}$ are constant, and both P and Q have to be monomials. The converse follows immediately from (3.3). $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *Let M be given by* (1.2)*. If M admits a tubular symmetry, then it is biholomorphically equivalent to*

$$\mathsf{Im}\, w = \mathsf{Re}\, z_1 \overline{z_2}^l \,, \tag{3.5}$$

or

$$\mathsf{Im}\, w = \mathsf{Re}\, z_1 z_2^l \overline{z_2^l} \,. \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, the real dimension of the tubular symmetries for (3.6) *is one.*

Proof. After a change of multitype coordinates (possibly introducing pluriharmonic terms), we can assume that $X = \partial_{z_1}$ is a tubular symmetry. We have

$$P_{z_1}\overline{Q} + \overline{P}Q_{z_1} + \overline{P_{z_1}}Q + P\overline{Q_{z_1}} + H_{z_1} + \overline{H_{z_1}} = 0 \,,$$

where H is a holomorphic polynomial. $H = 0$ leads to (3.6) by assuming that the maximum degree in z_1 is realized in P. $H \neq 0$ leads to (3.5). It is immediate to verify by direct computation that (3.6) does not admit any other tubular symmetry. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let M be given by* (1.2)*. If M admits a nilpotent rotation, then it is biholomorphically equivalent to*

$$\mathsf{Im}\, w = \mathsf{Re}\, i z_1^{k+1} \overline{z_1^k z_2} \,. \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, the real dimension of the nilpotent rotations is one.

Proof. After a linear change of coordinates, we can assume that $X = z_1 \partial_{z_2}$ is a nilpotent rotation, i.e. $\mathsf{Re}\, X(P\overline{Q} + \overline{P}Q) = 0$. We have

$$z_1 P_{z_2}\overline{Q} + \overline{P} z_1 Q_{z_2} + \overline{z_1 P_{z_2}} Q + P\overline{z_1 Q_{z_2}} = 0 \,.$$

Without any loss of generality, let the maximum degree in z_2 be realized in P. It follows that either $X(Q) = 0$ or $P_{z_2} = cQ_{z_2}$. This leads to (3.7). We verify by direct computation that (3.7) does not admit any other rotation which is not diagonal in the given coordinates. □

Let us remark that the model given by (1.2) is closely related to the hyperquadric H of mixed signature $\mathsf{Im}\, w' = \mathsf{Re}\, z_1' \bar{z}_2'$. In order to formulate the next result, let us consider the mapping between the two hypersurfaces,

$$f_{PQ} : \mathbb{C}^3 \to \mathbb{C}^3$$

given by

$$z_1' = P(z_1, z_2) \,, \quad z_2' = Q(z_1, z_2) \,, \quad w' = w \,,$$

and let us denote by $J(P, Q)$ the Jacobian of this mapping, i.e. the determinant of the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{z_1} P & \partial_{z_2} P \\ \partial_{z_1} Q & \partial_{z_2} Q \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.8}$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let M be given by* (1.2)*. Then M admits a generalized rotation if and only if $J(P, Q)$ divides (in the space of homogeneous polynomials) QQ_{z_j}, $j = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Let X be a generalized rotation. Let first the weighted degree of P be the same as the weighted degree of Q. Applying X to $\mathsf{Im}\, w - P\overline{Q} - Q\overline{P}$, we obtain

$$X(P)\overline{Q} + X(Q)\overline{P} = 0\,, \tag{3.9}$$

which implies that

$$Q = \alpha P\,. \tag{3.10}$$

But this is impossible since M is holomorphically non degenerate. Suppose now that the weighted degree of P is strictly less than the weighted degree of Q. Applying X to $\mathsf{Im}\, w - P\overline{Q} - Q\overline{P}$, we obtain

$$X(Q) = 0 \qquad X(P) = icQ\,, \tag{3.11}$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Putting

$$X = a_1\partial_{z_1} + a_2\partial_{z_2}\,, \tag{3.12}$$

where a_1, a_2 are holomorphic functions, we get, using (3.11)

$$a_1 Q_{z_1} + a_2 Q_{z_2} = 0\,. \tag{3.13}$$

It implies that

$$X = h(z_1, z_2)(Q_{z_2}, -Q_{z_1})$$

for some meromorphic function h. Using the second equation $X(P) = icQ$, we obtain

$$h(z_1, z_2)J(P, Q) = icQ(z_1, z_2)\,.$$

Hence

$$X = ic\frac{Q}{J(P, Q)}(Q_{z_2}, -Q_{z_1})\,,$$

which leads to the claim. The converse is immediate. This achieves the proof of the lemma. □

4. The main results

In this section we will prove the following two main theorems. Since we know that $\dim \mathfrak{g}_c$ is either 0 or 1, we consider the two cases separately.

Theorem 4.1. *Let M be a Levi degenerate model given by* (1.2). *Suppose that* $\dim \mathfrak{g}_c = 1$. *Then the possible dimensions of* $\mathfrak{g} = \operatorname{aut}(M, 0)$ *are* $\{10, 7, 6, 3\}$. *Moreover,*

- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 10$ *if and only if M is biholomorphically equivalent to* (1.1),
- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 7$ *if and only if M is biholomorphically equivalent to* (3.6),
- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 6$ *if and only if M is monomial and not equivalent to* (1.1) *or* (3.6),
- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 3$ *if and only if M is not monomial.*

Let us note that verifying whether $\dim \mathfrak{g}_c = 1$ using Lemma 3.8 is immediate for monomial models.

Theorem 4.2. *Let M be a Levi degenerate model given by* (1.2). *Suppose that* $\dim \mathfrak{g}_c = 0$. *Then the possible dimensions of* $\mathfrak{g} = \operatorname{aut}(M, 0)$ *are* $\{6, 5, 4, 2\}$. *Moreover,*

- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 6$ *if and only if M is biholomorphically equivalent to* (3.7),

- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 5$ *if and only if* M *is monomial and not biholomorphically equivalent to* (3.7),
- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 4$ *if and only if* M *is balanced and not monomial,*
- $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 2$ *for all the other models.*

The following example shows that nonmomial models admitting a generalized rotation indeed exist.

Theorem 4.3. *There exists a non-monomial model* M *such that* $\dim \mathfrak{g}_c > 0$.

Proof. Take

$$\begin{aligned} P(z_1, z_2) &= i z_1^2 z_2^3 (z_1 - z_2) \\ Q(z_1, z_2) &= 3 z_1^3 z_2^5 (z_1 - z_2) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$X = z_1 z_2^2 (5z_1 - 6z_2)\partial_{z_1} - z_2^3(4z_1 - 3z_2)\partial_{z_2}\,. \tag{4.2}$$

It is easy to check that $X(P) = iQ$ and $X(Q) = 0$, and therefore X is a generalized rotation for M given by $\mathsf{Im}\, w = \mathsf{Re}\, P\bar{Q}$. Clearly, this hypersurface is not monomial, since P and Q vanish along three complex lines. □

In order to prove the two main theorems, we will need the following result.

Theorem 4.4. *Let* M *be a Levi degenerate model given by* (1.2). *Then* $1 \le \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 \le 4$. *Moreover,*

- $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 4$ *if and only if* M *biholomorphically equivalent to* (3.7),
- $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 3$ *if and only if* M *is monomial and not equivalent to* (3.7),
- $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 2$ *if and only if* M *is balanced and not monomial.*

Proof. First we note that the real dimension of imaginary rotations is at most one, since otherwise there will be two complex reproducing fields, contradicting holomorphic degeneracy, using Lemma 3.4. Recall that the real dimension of real rotations is also at most one, because of the existence of the Euler field. By Lemma 3.7, the only model which admits a nilpotent rotation is (3.7), which is monomial, hence it also admits a real and imaginary rotation. It follows that $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 4$ for (3.7). It remains to consider diagonalizable rotations. By Lemma 3.2, admitting a real rotation is equivalent to being monomial, and by Lemma 3.4, admitting an imaginary rotation is equivalent to being balanced. It follows, using Lemma 3.4, that for monomial models, with the exception of (3.7), we have $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 3$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.5, M admits only an imaginary roation, i.e. $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 2$, if and only if M is balanced and not monomial. That finishes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. First note that $\dim \mathfrak{g}_n = 0$, except for M given by (1.1), by Theorem 2.1. Also, as proved in [16], if M is biholomorphically equivalent to (1.1), then $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 10$. Let us further assume that M is not biholomorphic to (1.1), hence $\dim \mathfrak{g}_n = 0$. If $\dim \mathfrak{g}_t \neq 0$, then by Lemma 3.6, M is biholomorphically equivalent to (3.6), which is a monomial model and therefore balanced. Hence by Lemma 3.8, $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 3$. Further, in this case $\dim \mathfrak{g}_1 = 1$ and $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 7$. If $\dim \mathfrak{g}_t = 0$ and M is monomial, then again $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 3$ and $\dim \mathfrak{g}_1 = 1$. Hence $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 6$. Next, assume that M is not monomial. Observe that if a nonmonomial model has $\dim \mathfrak{g}_c > 0$, then it is not balanced. Indeed, looking at the proof of Lemma 3.4, we observe that the reproducing field is the (z_1, z_2) part of the Euler field. Therefore, the commutator of an element of $\mathfrak{g}_c$ and $\mathfrak{g}_1$ can not vanish, and is of weighted degree bigger than one, which gives a contradiction with (2.3).

It follows that if M is not monomial, then under the assumptions of the Theorem, $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 3$. That finishes the proof. $\square$

The proof of Theorem 4.2 is completely analogous.

It would be interesting to find an explicit list of hypersurfaces given by (1.2) admitting nontrivial $\mathfrak{g}_c$.

References

[1] Baouendi, M.S., Ebenfelt, P., Rothschild, L.P., *Local geometric properties of real submanifolds in complex space*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **37** (3) (2000), 309–336.

[2] Bedford, E., Pinchuk, S.I., *Convex domains with noncompact groups of automorphisms*, Mat. Sb. **185** (1994), 3–26.

[3] Bloom, T., Graham, I., *On "type" conditions for generic real submanifolds of C^n*, Invent. Math. **40** (3) (1977), 217–243.

[4] Cartan, E., *Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de deux variables complexes, I*, Ann. Math. Pura Appl. **11** (1932), 17–90.

[5] Cartan, E., *Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de deux variables complexes, II*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **1** (1932), 333–354.

[6] Catlin, D., *Boundary invariants of pseudoconvex domains*, Ann. of Math. (2) **120** (1984), 529–586.

[7] Chern, S. S., Moser, J., *Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds*, Acta Math. **133** (1974), 219–271.

[8] D'Angelo, J., *Orders od contact, real hypersurfaces and applications*, Ann. of Math. (2) **115** (1982), 615–637.

[9] Kim, S.Y., Zaitsev, D., *Equivalence and embedding problems for CR-structures of any codimension*, Topology **44** (2005), 557–584.

[10] Kohn, J.J., *Boundary behaviour of $\bar\partial$ on weakly pseudoconvex manifolds of dimension two*, J. Differential Geom. **6** (1972), 523–542.

[11] Kolář, M., *Normal forms for hypersurfaces of finite type in $\mathbb{C}^2$*, Math. Res. Lett. **12** (2005), 523–542.

[12] Kolář, M., *The Catlin multitype and biholomorphic equivalence of models*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **18** (2010), 3530–3548.

[13] Kolář, M., Kossovskiy, I., Zaitsev, D., *Normal forms in Cauchy-Riemann geometry*, Analysis and geometry in several complex variables, vol. 681, Contemp. Math., 2017, pp. 153–177.

[14] Kolář, M., Lamel, B., *Ruled hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^2$*, J. Geom. Anal. **25** (2015), 1240–1281.

[15] Kolář, M., Meylan, F., *Nonlinear CR automorphisms of Levi degenerate hypersurfaces and a new gap phenomenon*, `arXiv:1703.07123` [CV].

[16] Kolář, M., Meylan, F., *Chern-Moser operators and weighted jet determination problems*, Geometric analysis of several complex variables and related topics, vol. 550, Contemp. Math., 2011, pp. 75–88.

[17] Kolář, M., Meylan, F., *Higher order symmetries of real hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (2016), 4807–4818.

[18] Kolář, M., Meylan, F., Zaitsev, D., *Chern-Moser operators and polynomial models in CR geometry*, Adv. Math. **263** (2014), 321–356.

[19] Poincaré, H., *Les fonctions analytique de deux variables et la représentation conforme*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **23** (1907), 185–220.

[20] Vitushkin, A.G., *Real analytic hypersurfaces in complex manifolds*, Russian Math. Surveys **40** (1985), 1–35.

[21] Webster, S.M., *On the Moser normal form at a non-umbilic point*, Math. Ann. **233** (1978), 97–102.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
Masaryk University,
Kotlářská 2, 611 37 Brno, Czech Republic
E-mail: `mkolar@math.muni.cz`

Department of Mathematics,
University of Fribourg,
Chemin du Musée 23,
CH 1700 Fribourg
E-mail: `francine.meylan@unifr.ch`