ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'É.N.S.

CHRISTER BORELL

Hitting probabilities of killed brownian motion : a study on geometric regularity

Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. 4^e série, tome 17, n° 3 (1984), p. 451-467

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1984_4_17_3_451_0>

© Gauthier-Villars (Éditions scientifiques et médicales Elsevier), 1984, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. » (http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ansens) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.,
4e série, t. 17, 1984, p. 451-467.

HITTING PROBABILITIES OF KILLED BROWNIAN MOTION; A STUDY ON GEOMETRIC REGULARITY

BY CHRISTER BORELL

1. Introduction

Consider a Brownian motion X in n-space with first hitting times $\tau_A = \tau_A(X) = \inf\{t>0;\, X(t)\in A\}$ and let $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the class of all non-empty, open, and convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, if $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A_0, A_1, B_0, B_1 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{R}^n)$:

$$(1.1)\quad \mathbb{P}_{x_\lambda}(\tau_{B_\lambda^c} \geqq \tau_{A_\lambda} < +\infty) \geqq \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(\tau_{B_0^c} \geqq \tau_{A_0} < +\infty) \wedge \mathbb{P}_{x_1}(\tau_{B_1^c} \geqq \tau_{A_1} < +\infty), \qquad 0<\lambda<1,$$

where $\xi_\lambda = (1-\lambda)\xi_0 + \lambda\xi_1$, $\xi = x$, A, B, and $B^c = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B$, respectively (Borell [4]).

In this paper, the basic diffusion process is a Brownian motion Y in $\mathbb{R}^n \cup \{\varphi\}$, which starts in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and behaves as an ordinary Brownian motion up till a certain random point of time when it jumps to φ and remains there. More explicitly, conditioned on X, the event $Y(t)\in\mathbb{R}^n$, has the probability $\exp\left(-\int_0^t V(X(s))\,ds\right)$, where $V:\mathbb{R}^n \to [0, +\infty]$ is such that $V^{-1/2}_{|\operatorname{dom} V}$ is concave and $\operatorname{dom} V = \{V < +\infty\} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Under these assumptions (1.1) still holds with $\tau_\cdot = \tau_\cdot(Y)$ (Theorem 3.1). In fact, the same result remains true if $\mathbb{R}^n$ is replaced by an arbitrary Banach space.

About half the paper deals with various interpretations of Theorem 3.1. Thus, we discuss convexity properties of :

(i) V-harmonic measures (Section 6, Example 7.1);

(ii) V-Newtonian potentials (Theorem 7.1);

(iii) V-equilibrium measures (Example 7.2) and

(iv) logarithmic and Newtonian capacities (examples 7.3-7.5).

In the above list, perhaps the single most interesting point is the following: let $B\in\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $n\geqq 2$, be bounded and suppose $V: B \to [0, +\infty[$ is $-1/2$-concave, that is, $V^{-1/2}: B \to]0, +\infty]$ is concave. Moreover, let g denote the Green function of

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE. — 0012-9593/84/03 451 17/$ 3.70
© Gauthier-Villars

$-1/2\Delta+V$ in B with the Dirichlet boundary condition zero. Then g is quasi-concave if $n=2$, and if $n\geqq 3$ the function $g^{-1/(n-2)}$ is convex. Theorem 7.1 expresses these facts as a Brunn-Minkowski inequality of appropriate potentials of g. For comparison, we here only mention that the 3-dimensional potential $g\mu$, μ being the uniform distribution of a line segment, turns out to have convex equipotential surfaces. The same thing is known to be true for a point mass if $V=0$ (Gabriel [15], [16]). Needless to say, the beautiful works of Gabriel have played a decisive role for this and some other closely related papers of the author ([4], [5]).

Finally, in this section, let us make some remarks on the potential V above.

Again, consider a Y-process in $\mathbb{R}^n$ now with a convex potential V. Moreover, suppose $\operatorname{dom} V\in\mathscr{U}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is bounded. Then, by Brascamp and Lieb ([9], [10]), the transition densities p_t, $t>0$, of Y are log-concave for each fixed $t>0$. From this we expect nice geometrical properties of the corresponding Green function:

$$g=\int_0^\infty p_t\,dt.$$

In fact, our fruitless attempts to understand this puzzling problem have finally led us to $-1/2$-concave potentials. The reader should note that a $-1/2$-concave function is convex. (The log-concavity of the p_t for convex V turns out to be an algebraic consequence of (1.1) but that is another uniformity!) Below we will also see that $-1/2$-concave potentials enter quite naturally in the hyperbolic potential theory of plane convex domains (Example 3.1).

2. Definitions

Throughout, E denotes a separable Banach space and $\mathscr{C}_E([0,+\infty[)$ is the standard Fréchet space of all continuous maps of $[0,+\infty[$ into E. A centered Gaussian random vector X in $C_E([0,+\infty[)$ is called a Brownian motion in E or an E-valued Brownian motion if X possesses stochastically independent increments and if, for every $t>0$, the law of $X_t=[X(\,.\,)](t)$ equals the law of $t^{1/2}X_1$ (*see* Gross [18] (potential theory) and Chow [12] (noise theory)).

Example 2.1. — Suppose S is a compact metric space and let $G=(G(s),\ s\in S)$ be a real-valued, centered Gaussian stochastic process with continuous paths. Then there exists an unique real-valued centered Gaussian process X with time set $S\times[0,+\infty[$ and covariance $[\mathbb{E}(G(s)G(s'))](t\wedge t')$. Moreover, a version of $X=(X(s,t),\ (s,t)\in S\times[0,+\infty[)$ has continuous paths with probability one and, accordingly, induces a Brownian motion in $\mathscr{C}(S)$ (for details, *see* Carmona [11]). □

The above example brings out the most general form of a Banach space-valued Brownian motion.

An E-valued Brownian motion is said to be non-degenerated if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{L}(X_1)=E$. If F is a separable Banach space and $A:E\to F$ is a bounded linear map, then each E-valued Brownian motion X defines an F-valued Brownian motion by the rule $[AX]_t=AX_t$.

In what follows, X is supposed to be a fixed *non-degenerated* Brownian motion in E and, as usual, we let $\mathbb{P}_x = \mathscr{L}(x+X)$ and $\mathbb{E}_x = \int (\ )\, d\mathbb{P}_x$.

Below $\mathscr{U}(E)$ denotes the class of all non-empty, open, and convex subsets of E. Moreover, $\bar{\mathscr{U}}(E) = \{\bar{A};\ A \in \mathscr{U}(E)\}$, $\mathscr{U}_\infty(E) = \{A \in \mathscr{U}(E);\ A \text{ bounded}\}$, and $\bar{\mathscr{U}}_\infty(E)\} = \{\bar{A};\ A \in \mathscr{U}_\infty(E)\}$, respectively. If $A_0,\ A_1 \subseteqq E$, and $0<\lambda<1$, we write $A_\lambda = (1-\lambda)A_0 + \lambda A_1$. The same convention will be used for vectors in E. Given $A_i \in \mathscr{U}(E)$, concave functions $f_i : A_i \to [0, +\infty]$, $i=0, 1$, and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, the so-called λ-supremum convolution :

$$f_0 \,\underline{\lambda}\, f_1 : \quad A_\lambda \to [0, +\infty],$$

of f_0 and f_1 is defined by:

$$(f_0 \,\underline{\lambda}\, f_1)(x_\lambda) = \sup\{(1-\lambda) f_0(x_0) + \lambda f_1(x_1);\ x_0 \in A_0,\ x_1 \in A_1\}.$$

Here $0.(+\infty) = 0$. Of course, $f_0 \,\underline{\lambda}\, f_1$ is concave and by simple means one verifies:

$$f_0 \,\underline{\theta_\lambda}\, f_1 = (f_0 \,\underline{\theta_0}\, f_1) \,\underline{\lambda}\, (f_0 \,\underline{\theta_1}\, f_1), \qquad \theta_0, \theta_1 \in [0, 1]. \tag{2.1}$$

Next suppose $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Using the conventions $0^\alpha = +\infty$ and $(+\infty)^\alpha = 0$, if $\alpha < 0$, a function $f : A \to [0, +\infty]$ $(A \subseteqq E)$ is said to be α-convex (α-concave) if f^α is convex (concave). For this reason, a quasi-concave (log-concave) function is sometimes called $-\infty$-convex (0-convex or 0-concave). The same terminology is used for set functions on vector spaces. For future reference, recall that a Gaussian Radon measure on a locally convex Hausdorff vector space is log-concave (Borell [6]).

3. The main result

Consider the Feynman-Kac semi-group:

$$S_t f = \mathbb{E}.\left(f(X(t)) \exp\left(-\int_0^t V(X(s))\, ds\right)\right), \qquad t>0,$$

where the potential $V : E \to [0, +\infty]$ is Borel measurable. If, in addition, V is convex, the log-concavity of Gaussian measures may be used to show that each S_t preserves log-concavity. Indeed, this property has many nice consequences (Brascamp, Lieb [9], [10], Lions [20]). The reader should note that if $B = \operatorname{dom} V \in \mathscr{U}(E)$, then:

$$S_t f = \mathbb{E}.\left(f(X(t)) \exp\left(-\int_0^t V(X(s))\, ds\right);\ \tau_{B^c} \geqq t\right), \qquad t>0.$$

THEOREM 3.1. — *For* $i=0,1$, *suppose* A_i, $B_i \in \mathcal{U}(E)$, $x_i \in B_i$, *and let* $V_i : B_i \to [0, +\infty[$ *be* $-1/2$*-concave. Set* $V_\lambda = (V_0^{-1/2} \underline{|}\, \lambda \,\underline{|} V_1^{-1/2})^{-2}$ *and:*

$$M(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}_{x_\lambda}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_{A_\lambda}} V_\lambda(X(s))\, ds \right); \tau_{B_\lambda^c} \geqq \tau_{A_\lambda} < +\infty \right), \quad 0<\lambda<1,$$

respectively. Then M *is quasi-concave.*

Interestingly enough, there are several relations between Theorem 3.1 and the Brunn-Minkowski theory of convex bodies but the interplay is not yet fully understood. In particular, one may ask if the log-concavity of Gaussian measures (on all measurable sets!) and Theorem 3.1 have a common source.

For some other geometrical estimates on Feynman-Kac semi-groups, *see* Borell [7] and Ehrhard [14].

Before giving the proof of Theorem 3.1, which is rather lengthy, we should like to discuss an example where $-1/2$-concave potentials arise in a natural way.

First, however, recall that if X is the usual Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^n$, then the expectation:

$$u(x) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_A} V(X(s))\, ds \right); \tau_{B^c} \geqq \tau_A < +\infty \right), \qquad x \in \bar{B},$$

solves the V-equilibrium potential equation:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2}\Delta u - V u = 0 & \text{in } B, \\ u = 1 & \text{on } \bar{A}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B, \end{cases}$$

where, for example, $A, B \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\bar{A} \subseteq B$, and $V : B \to [0, +\infty[$ is continuous (*see* e. g. Dynkin [13], Chap. 13). (Here and elsewhere $\Delta = \partial^2/\partial x_1^2 + \ldots + \partial^2/\partial x_n^2$.)

Example 3.1. — Consider a $B \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C})$, $B \neq \mathbb{C}$, equiped with the hyperbolic metric:

$$ds = \left| \frac{f'(z)}{\operatorname{Im} f(z)} \right| |dz|,$$

f being an arbitrary one-to-one conformal map onto the upper half plane in $\mathbb{C}$. Note that:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left| \frac{f'(z)}{\operatorname{Im} f(z)} \right| = \lim_{\zeta \to z} d(z, \zeta)/|z-\zeta|,$$

where $d(z, \zeta) = \left| (f(z) - f(\zeta))/(f(z) - \overline{f(\zeta)}) \right|$, $z, \zeta \in B$, is a strictly increasing function of the hyperbolic distance in B (*see* e. g. Ahlfors [1], [2]).

The following discussion is based on the fact that the Green function $g(z, \zeta)$ of $-1/2\Delta$ in B with the Dirichlet boundary condition zero is quasi-concave in (z, ζ) (this may be known; for safety's sake the result is proved in Theorem 7.1). Equivalently, if $B(z; r)$ denotes the open d-ball with center $z \in B$ and radius $r>0$, then:

$$(1-\lambda)\, B(z_0; r)+\lambda\, B(z_1; r) \subseteqq B(z_\lambda; r), \qquad 0<\lambda<1.$$

Accordingly, for reals $t \neq 0$ close to zero:

$$\frac{1}{|t|}\left|\frac{f(z_\lambda+th_\lambda)-f(z_\lambda)}{f(z_\lambda+th_\lambda)-\overline{f(z_\lambda)}}\right| \leqq \frac{1}{|t|}\left\{\left|\frac{f(z_0+th_0)-f(z_0)}{f(z_0+th_0)-\overline{f(z_0)}}\right| \vee \left|\frac{f(z_1+th_1)-f(z_1)}{f(z_1+th_1)-\overline{f(z_1)}}\right|\right\},$$

and in the limit as $t \to 0$:

$$\left|\frac{f'(z_\lambda)\,h_\lambda}{\operatorname{Im} f(z_\lambda)}\right| \leqq \left|\frac{f'(z_0)\,h_0}{\operatorname{Im} f(z_0)}\right| \vee \left|\frac{f'(z_1)\,h_1}{\operatorname{Im} f(z_1)}\right|.$$

By choosing:

$$h_\nu = \left|\frac{\operatorname{Im} f(z_\nu)}{f'(z_\nu)}\right|, \quad \nu=0, 1,$$

the resulting inequality states that the function $|(\operatorname{Im} f(z))/f'(z)|$ is concave.

Now recall that the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_B in the hyperbolic B equals:

$$\Delta_B = \left|\frac{\operatorname{Im} f(z)}{f'(z)}\right|^2 \Delta.$$

Consequently, if $A \in \mathscr{U}_\infty(\mathbb{C})$ and $\bar{A} \subseteqq B$, Theorem 3.1 applies to the 1-equilibrium potential equation:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_B u - u = 0 & \text{in } B \setminus \bar{A}, \\ u_{|\bar{A}} = 1, \end{cases}$$

and we conclude that u is quasi-concave. Moreover, if u_z denotes the 1-equilibrium potential of $B(z; r)$, then the map $(z, \zeta) \rightsquigarrow u_z(\zeta)$ is quasi-concave too. □

4. Reduction of Theorem 3.1 to finite dimension

To begin with, we list a series of Lemmas, which are all well-known and easy to prove.

LEMMA 4.1. — *Suppose* F_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *are closed and* $F_n \downarrow F$. *Then* $\mathbb{P}.(\tau_{F_n} \downarrow \tau_F)=1$ *on* $F^r \cup F^c$.

Here $F^r = \{\mathbb{P}.(\tau_F=0)=1\}$ is the set of all regular points for F. Recall that $\mathbb{P}.(\tau_F=0)$ vanishes on $(F^r)^c$ by Blumenthal's zero-one law (*see* e. g. Port and Stone [22]).

LEMMA 4.2. — If $A \in \mathscr{U}(E)$, then $A^r = \bar{A}^r = \bar{A}$. *In addition,* $\tau_A = \tau_{\bar{A}}$ a. s. $\mathbb{P}.$.

The reader should note that the last part of Lemma 4.2 depends on the strong Markov property of X. The next Lemma is a consequence of continuity of paths only.

LEMMA 4.3. — *Let* F_n, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, *be closed and* $F_n\downarrow F$. *If* $B_n\in\mathscr{B}(E)$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, *and* $B_n\downarrow B$, *then:*

$$\{\tau_{B_n^c}\geqq\tau_{F_n}<+\infty\}\downarrow\{\tau_{B^c}\geqq\tau_F<+\infty\},\qquad \text{a. s. } \mathbb{P}_\cdot((\ )\cap\{\tau_{B^c}<+\infty\}),$$

on $F^r\cup F^c$.

Here $\mathscr{B}(E)$ denotes the Borel field in E.

LEMMA 4.4. — *Suppose* $0<\lambda<1$:

(*a*) *If* A_0, $A_1\in\mathscr{U}_\infty(E)$ *and* A_λ *is contained in an open affine half-space* H, *then there exist open affine half-spaces* H_0, H_1, *satisfying* $H\supseteqq H_\lambda$, $H_0\supseteqq A_0$, *and* $H_1\supseteqq A_1$.

(*b*) *Let* $B_i\in\mathscr{U}_\infty(E)$ *and suppose* $f_i: B_i\to[0,+\infty[$, $i=0,1$, *are concave. If* ζ *is a continuous affine function on* E *and* $\zeta_{|B_\lambda}\geqq f_0\underline{|}\lambda\underline{|}f_1$, *then there exist continuous affine functions* ζ_0, ζ_1 *on* E *satisfying* $\zeta\geqq\zeta_0\underline{|}\lambda\underline{|}\zeta_1$, $\zeta_{0\,|\,B_0}\geqq f_0$, *and* $\zeta_{1\,|\,B_1}\geqq f_1$.

LEMMA 4.5:

(*a*) $\bar{A}_0+\bar{A}_1\subseteqq\overline{A_0+A_1}$, A_0, $A_1\subseteqq E$;

(*b*) *If* A_n, $A\in\mathscr{U}(E)$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, *and* $A_n\downarrow A$, *then* $\bar{A}_n\downarrow\bar{A}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1, $\dim E<+\infty\Rightarrow$ *Theorem* 3.1. In view of (2.1) it is enough to establish the following inequality:

$$M(\lambda)\geqq M(0)\wedge M(1),$$

where $0<\lambda<1$ is fixed. Furthermore, we may assume B_0, $B_1\in\mathscr{U}_\infty(E)$.

Let $j=0,1$, or λ and set $f_j=V_j^{-1/2}$. By monotone convergence, there is no loss of generality if we only treat the case when the f_j are finite-valued. Suppose:

$$f_j=\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\zeta_{jn\,|\,B_j}$$

and $\zeta_{\lambda n}\geqq\zeta_{0n}\underline{|}\lambda\underline{|}\zeta_{1n}$, where the ζ_{jn} are finite infimums of continuous affine functions on E. This construction is possible due to Lemma 4.4. By the same Lemma here exist open polyedrons C_{jn}, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $C=A$, B, satisfying:

$$C_{jn}\downarrow C_j\quad\text{as } n\to+\infty$$

and $C_{\lambda n}\supseteqq(1-\lambda)C_{0n}+\lambda C_{1n}$.

We now introduce:

$$f_{jn}=\inf_{0\leqq k\leqq n}\zeta_{jk\,|\,B_{jn}}\cap\{\zeta_{j0}>0,\ldots,\zeta_{jn}>0\}$$

and:

$$M_n(j)=\mathbb{E}_{x_j}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_{A_{jn}}}f_{jn}^{-2}(X(s))\,ds\right);\ \tau_{B_{jn}^c}\geqq\tau_{A_{jn}}<+\infty\right).$$

Granted the validity of Theorem 3.1 in the finite-dimensional case, we have:

$$M_n(\lambda) \geqq M_n(0) \wedge M_n(1)$$

and (4.1) follows from Lemmas 4.1-4.4 and monotone convergence. □

5. Proof of Theorem 3.1, *dim* $E < +\infty$

In the following lemma, the V_j, $j=0, 1$, or λ, are as in Theorem 3.1.

LEMMA 5.1. — *If* $J(r)=r$, $r>0$, *then:*

$$J^3 \otimes V_\lambda \leqq (J^3 \otimes V_0) \lfloor \underline{\lambda} \rfloor (J^3 \otimes V_1),\ 0<\lambda<1.$$

Proof. — By the Hölder inequality the function $(J \otimes 1)^3/(1 \otimes J)^2$ is convex and the result follows at once. □

LEMMA 5.2. — *Suppose* $A, B \in \mathscr{U}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *and* $0 \in \bar{A} \subseteqq B$. *Let* $f : B \to]0, \infty[$ *be* $\mathscr{C}^\infty$ *and concave and set* $V = f^{-2}$. *Then the solution of the Dirichlet problem:*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u - V u = 0 & \text{in } B \setminus \bar{A}, \\ u = 1 & \text{on } \partial A \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B, \qquad u \in \mathscr{C}(\bar{B}), \end{cases}$$

has a non-vanishing gradient in $B \setminus \bar{A}$.

Proof. — The solution u is $\mathscr{C}^\infty$ (*see* e. g. Gilbarg and Trudinger [17], Theorem 6.17).

We first prove that the function $v(x) = x; \nabla u(x)$, $x \in B \setminus \bar{A}$, is non-positive.

To see this, let $\alpha > 1$ satisfy $\alpha \bar{A} \subseteqq B$ and note that:

$$\Delta[u(x/\alpha)] - \alpha^{-2} V(x/\alpha) u(x/\alpha) = 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \alpha \bar{A}.$$

Moreover, as:

$$f(x/\alpha) \geqq \alpha^{-1} f(x) + (1-\alpha^{-1}) f(0) \quad \text{in } B,$$

we have $\alpha f(x/\alpha) \geqq f(x)$, $x \in B$, and hence:

$$\Delta[u(x/\alpha)] - V(x) u(x/\alpha) \leqq 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \alpha \bar{A}.$$

Thus:

$$\Delta[u(x) - u(x/\alpha)] - V(x)[u(x) - u(x/\alpha)] \geqq 0 \quad \text{in } B \setminus \bar{A}$$

and as $(u - u(./\alpha))_{| \partial(B \setminus \alpha \bar{A})} \leqq 0$, the maximum principle ([17], cor. 3.2) gives

$$(u - u(./\alpha))_{| B \setminus \alpha \bar{A}} \leqq 0.$$

But then $v \leqq 0$.

In the next step we show that v is strictly negative.

A computation yields:

$$\Delta v = x; \nabla(\Delta u) + 2\Delta u = x; \nabla(\mathrm{V}u) + 2\mathrm{V}u = (x; \nabla \mathrm{V})u + \mathrm{V}(x; \nabla u) + 2\mathrm{V}u,$$

that is:

$$\Delta v - \mathrm{V}v = (2\mathrm{V} + x; \nabla \mathrm{V})u.$$

But:

$$2\mathrm{V} + x.\nabla \mathrm{V} = \frac{2}{f^3}(f - x; \nabla f) \geqq \frac{2}{f^3} f(0) > 0$$

and so $\Delta v - \mathrm{V}v > 0$. Since $v \leqq 0$, the strong maximum principle ([17], Th. 35) gives $v < 0$ and accordingly $v \neq 0$ in $\mathrm{B} \setminus \bar{\mathrm{A}}$. □

The main points in the proof which follows are due to Gabriel ([15], [16]). The Brunn-Minkowski aspect was added for the first time in [4]. The Gabriel differential method also applies to certain time-dependent [5] and non-linear (Lewis [19]) problems.

Proof of Theorem 3.1, dim $\mathrm{E} < +\infty$. — There is no loss of generality in assuming:

(i) X *is the usual Brownian motion in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqq 1$;

(ii) $0 \in \bar{\mathrm{A}}_0 \cap \bar{\mathrm{A}}_1$, B_0, $\mathrm{B}_1 \in \mathscr{U}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$;

(iii) *the functions* $f_i = \mathrm{V}_i^{-1/2}$ *have concave* $\mathscr{C}^\infty$ *extensions* $\tilde{f}_i : \mathrm{B}_i + \mathrm{B}(0; \delta) \to]0, +\infty[$, $i = 0,1$ ($\delta > 0$ fixed) and from (iii) and Lemma 4.3;

(iv) $\bar{\mathrm{A}}_i \subseteqq \mathrm{B}_i$, $i = 0,1$.

Next let $0 < \lambda < 1$ be fixed. Moreover, suppose:

$\tilde{\mathrm{V}}_\lambda : \mathrm{B}_\lambda \to]0, +\infty[$ is $-1/2$-concave and $\mathscr{C}^\infty$ and $\tilde{\mathrm{V}}_\lambda \leqq \mathrm{V}_\lambda$.

Set:

$$u_i(x) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_{\mathrm{A}_i}} \tilde{\mathrm{V}}_i(\mathrm{X}(s))\, ds\right); \tau_{\mathrm{B}_i^c} \geqq \tau_{\mathrm{A}_i}\right), \qquad x \in \bar{\mathrm{B}}_i, \qquad i = 0,1,$$

and:

$$u_\lambda(x) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_{\mathrm{A}_\lambda}} \tilde{\mathrm{V}}_\lambda(\mathrm{X}(s))\, ds\right); \tau_{\mathrm{B}_\lambda^c} \geqq \tau_{\mathrm{A}_\lambda}\right), \qquad x \in \bar{\mathrm{B}}_\lambda.$$

It now only remains to prove that:

$$u_\lambda(x_\lambda) \geqq u_0(x_0) \wedge u_1(x_1), \qquad x_0 \in \bar{\mathrm{B}}_0, \qquad x_1 \in \bar{\mathrm{B}}_1.$$

Let $u_\lambda^*(x_\lambda) = \sup\{u_0(x_0) \wedge u_1(x_1);\ x_0 \in \bar{\mathrm{B}}_0,\ x_1 \in \bar{\mathrm{B}}_1\}$. If $\neg(u_\lambda^* \leqq u_\lambda)$, then:

$$\sup(u_\lambda^* - u_\lambda) = u_\lambda^*(\hat{x}_\lambda) - u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda) > 0,$$

for a suitable $\hat{x}_\lambda \in \bar{\mathrm{B}}_\lambda$. Suppose $u_\lambda^*(\hat{x}_\lambda) = u_0(\hat{x}_0) \wedge u_1(\hat{x}_1)$, where $\hat{x}_\lambda = (1-\lambda)\hat{x}_0 + \lambda \hat{x}_1$. Certainly, $(\hat{x}_0, \hat{x}_1) \in (\mathrm{B}_0 \times \mathrm{B}_1) \setminus (\bar{\mathrm{A}}_0 \times \bar{\mathrm{A}}_1)$. Also it is easy to see that the relation $\hat{x}_0 \notin \mathrm{A}_0$,

$\hat{x}_1 \in A_1$ is contradictory. Indeed, arbitrarily close to $\hat{x}_0$ there are points where u_0 exceeds $u_0(\hat{x}_0)$, by the maximum principle. Thus, by symmetry, $(\hat{x}_0, \hat{x}_1) \in (B_0 \setminus \bar{A}_0) \times (B_1 \setminus \bar{A}_1)$.

In the following, let $i=0$ or 1 and $j=0,1$, or λ.

Suppose $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $h; \nabla u_i(\hat{x}_i) > 0$ (i fixed). Then, if $s>0$ is small, $u_i(\hat{x}_i + sh) > u_i(\hat{x}_i)$ and, hence, $u_\lambda^*(\hat{x}_\lambda + s\lambda_i h) > u_\lambda^*(\hat{x}_\lambda)$, where $\lambda_i = (2i-1)\lambda + 1 - i$, so that $u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda + s\lambda_i h) \geqq u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda)$. Accordingly, $h; \nabla u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda) \geqq 0$ and it follows that the non-zero vectors $\nabla u_i(\hat{x}_i)$ and $\nabla u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda)$ are parallel. Let $a_j = |\nabla u_j(\hat{x}_j)|$ and $\nu = \nabla u_j(\hat{x}_j)/a_j$.

From now on we assume that $u_\lambda^*(\hat{x}_\lambda) = u_0(\hat{x}_0)$. The case $u_\lambda^*(\hat{x}_\lambda) = u_1(\hat{x}_1)$ may be treated in a similar way.

Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $\kappa = h;\ \nu \neq 0$. For each s close to 0 there exists a unique $r = r(s)$, with $|r|$ minimal, satisfying the equation :

$$u_0(\hat{x}_0 + sh/a_0) - u_0(\hat{x}_0) = u_1(\hat{x}_1 + rh/a_1) - u_1(\hat{x}_1).$$

Writing:

$$\hat{x}_\lambda(s) = (1-\lambda)(\hat{x}_0 + sh/a_0) + \lambda(\hat{x}_1 + r(s)h/a_1) = \hat{x}_\lambda + [(1-\lambda)s/a_0 + \lambda r(s)/a_1]h,$$

we have:

$$u_0(\hat{x}_0 + sh/a_0) - u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda(s)) \leqq u_\lambda^*(\hat{x}_\lambda(s)) - u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda(s)) \leqq u_0(\hat{x}_0) - u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda)$$

and, in particular:

$$D_s^k(u_0(\hat{x}_0 + \mathrm{sh}/a_0) - u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda(s)))\big|_{s=0} = \begin{cases} 0, & k=1 \\ \leqq 0, & k=2. \end{cases}$$

Next suppose:

$$u_j(\hat{x}_j + sh/a_j) = u_j(\hat{x}_j) + \kappa s + b_j s^2 + o(s^2) \quad \text{as } s \to 0.$$

Then:

$$r(s) = s + \kappa^{-1}(b_0 - b_1)s^2 + o(s^2) \quad \text{as } s \to 0$$

and introducing $p = (1-\lambda)/a_0 + \lambda/a_1$ we have:

$$\begin{cases} a_\lambda p = 1, \\ \left(1 - \lambda\frac{a_\lambda}{a_1}\right) b_0 + \lambda\frac{a_\lambda}{a_1} b_1 - b_\lambda \leqq 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus:

$$\sum_{1 \leqq \alpha, \beta \leqq n} \left[\frac{1-\lambda}{a_0^3} D_{\alpha\beta} u_0(\hat{x}_0) + \frac{\lambda}{a_1^3} D_{\alpha\beta} u_1(\hat{x}_1) - \frac{1}{a_\lambda^3} D_{\alpha\beta} u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda) \right] h_\alpha h_\beta \leqq 0$$

and, accordingly:

$$\frac{1-\lambda}{a_0^3} V_0(\hat{x}_0) u_0(\hat{x}_0) + \frac{\lambda}{a_1^3} V_1(\hat{x}_1) u_1(\hat{x}_1) \leqq p^3 \tilde{V}_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda) u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda).$$

Finally, noting that $u_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda) < u_0(\hat{x}_0) \wedge u_1(\hat{x}_1)$ we get:

$$\frac{1-\lambda}{a_0^3} V_0(\hat{x}_0) + \frac{\lambda}{a_1^3} V_1(\hat{x}_1) < p^3 V_\lambda(\hat{x}_\lambda),$$

which contradicts Lemma 5.1. Hence $u_\lambda^* \leqq u_\lambda$. □

6. Quasi-concavity of V-harmonic measures restricted to supporting hyperplanes

We first recall some known properties of quasi-concave measures on Banach spaces. All the results may be found in the author's papers [6] and [8].

A non-negative finite Borel measure μ on E is quasi-concave if:

$$\mu(A_\lambda) \geqq \mu(A_0) \wedge \mu(A_1), \tag{6.1}$$

for all $0<\lambda<1$ and all A_0, $A_1 \in \mathscr{B}(E)$ = the Borel field in E. It turns out that a non-negative finite Borel measure μ on E is quasi-concave if (6.1) holds for all $0<\lambda<1$ and all A_0, $A_1 \in \mathscr{U}(E)$.

Next suppose $0<\lambda<1$ is fixed and suppose μ_0, μ_1, μ_λ are quasi-concave measures on E. If:

$$\mu_\lambda(A_\lambda) \geqq \mu_0(A_0) \wedge \mu_1(A_1), \tag{6.2}$$

for all A_0, $A_1 \in \mathscr{U}(E)$, then (6.2) is true for all A_0, $A_1 \in \mathscr{B}(E)$. Moreover, if $E = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $d\mu_j = f_j dx$, $j = 0, 1, \lambda$, where the $f_j : E \to [0, +\infty]$ are semi-continuous from below, then (6.2) holds for all Borel sets A_0, A_1 in $\mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if:

$$f_\lambda^{-1/n}(x_\lambda) \leqq (1-\lambda) f_0^{-1/n}(x_0) + \lambda f_1^{-1/n}(x_1), \qquad x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The above makes it possible to pass from convex bodies to Borel sets in a very special but still interesting case of Theorem 3.1.

THEOREM 6.1. — *Let* $B \in \mathscr{U}(E)$ *and suppose* F *is a supporting hyperplane* $(0 \in F)$ *of* $\bar{B}$. *If* $V : B \to [0, +\infty[$ *is* $-1/2$*-concave, then the* V*-harmonic measure:*

$$\kappa_x(A) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_{B^c}} V(X(s))\, ds \right); X(\tau_{B^c}) \in A \right), \quad A \in \mathscr{B}(B^c),$$

at $x \in B$ *satisfies:*

$$\kappa_{x_\lambda}(A_\lambda) \geqq \kappa_{x_0}(A_0) \wedge \kappa_{x_1}(A_1), \qquad 0<\lambda<1, \qquad A_0, A_1 \in \mathscr{B}(F).$$

In particular, $\kappa_{x \mid \mathscr{B}(F)}$ *is quasi-concave.*

Proof. — First note that for any closed $A \subseteqq B^c$:

$$\kappa_x(A) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_A} V(X(s))\, ds \right); \tau_{B^c} \geqq \tau_A < +\infty \right),$$

because $x \in B$ is non-regular for B^c. Hence the inequality we shall prove is true for all A_0, $A_1 \in \bar{\mathscr{U}}(F)$ and Theorem 6.1 follows from what we said above. □

Example 6.1. — Let G be a Borel measurable additive subgroup of F, where we abide by the various assumptions in Theorem 6.1. Then $\kappa_x(G)$ or $\kappa_x(F \setminus G) = 0$ from the zero-one law of quasi-concave measures [6]. A direct proof of this fact is rather simple but we do not know any proof independent of the zero-one law of quasi-concave measures. □

Example 6.2. — Let $E = \mathbb{R}^n$ but otherwise assume the same conditions as in Theorem 6.1.

If $\bar{B} \cap F = C$ is $(n-1)$-dimensional, then an appropriate version of the restricted Poisson kernel $(d\kappa_x / d\sigma_{\partial B})(y)$, $(x, y) \in B \times C$, is $-1/(n-1)$-convex. □

Example 6.3. — If C_0, $C_1 \in \bar{\mathscr{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then the original Brunn-Minkowski inequality states that:

$$|C_0 + C_1|^{1/n} \geqq |C_0|^{1/n} + |C_1|^{1/n}. \tag{6.3}$$

To deduce this estimate from (1.1) we let $B_0 = B_1 = \{x_{n+1} > 0\} \subseteqq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $x = x_0 = x_1 = (\alpha, \ldots, \alpha, 1)$, and get:

$$|\alpha|^{n+1} \int_{C_\lambda} \frac{dy}{\|x-y\|^{n+1}} \geqq |\alpha|^{n+1} \left(\int_{C_0} \frac{dy}{\|x-y\|^{n+1}} \wedge \int_{C_0} \frac{dy}{\|x-y\|^{n+1}} \right), \quad 0 < \lambda < 1.$$

As $|\alpha| \to +\infty$, we obtain $|C_\lambda| \geqq |C_0| \wedge |C_1|$ or, due to homogeneity, (6.3). In fact, already Minkowki's ideas entail (6.3) for arbitrary Borel sets but the Gabriel differential method seems to collapse beyond star-shaped bodies. □

7. Quasi-concavity of V-Newtonian potentials of very thin bodies

Consider, for $\dim E \geqq 3$, the Newtonian potential of $A \in \mathscr{B}(E)$:

$$v_\cdot(A) = \mathbb{E}_\cdot \left(\int_0^\infty 1_A(X(t))\, dt \right),$$

that is, the expected amount of time the Brownian motion spends in A. If $x \in E$ is fixed, the measure v_x is not quasi-concave, although, by ([8], Th. 5.1):

$$v_{x_0 + x_1}(A_0 + A_1) \geqq v_{x_0}(A_0) \wedge v_{x_1}(A_1),$$

or, stated otherwise:

$$v_{x_{1/2}}(A_{1/2}) \geqq \frac{1}{4} [v_{x_0}(A_0) \wedge v_{x_1}(A_1)],$$

for all $x_0, x_1 \in E$ and all $A_0, A_1 \in \mathscr{B}(E)$. The convexity behaviour of $v_\cdot(A)$, with $A \in \mathscr{U}(E)$ fixed, is unknown to us.

The main questions we focus on in this section have no direct meaning without restriction on dim E. We therefore assume throughout that $E = \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geqq 2$.

Now suppose $B \in \mathscr{U}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that $V : B \to [0, +\infty[$ is $-1/2$-concave. Moreover, we suppose $B \neq \mathbb{R}^2$ if $n=2$ and $V=0$ so that B becomes a Greenian domain for the operator $-1/2\,\Delta + V$ with the Dirichlet boundary condition zero. Let:

$$v_x(A) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\int^{\tau_{B^c}} 1_A(X(t)) \exp\left(-\int_0^t V(X(s))\,ds \right) dt \right) = \int_A g(x, y)\,dy, \qquad x \in B,$$

be the V-Newtonian potential of $A \in \mathscr{B}(B)$, g being the corresponding Green function. The reader should note that $g : B \times B \to [0, +\infty]$ is continuous (*see* e. g. [13], Chap. 13). In particular, given a k-dimensional affine manifold F in $\mathbb{R}^n$ possessing Lebesgue measure m^F ($m^{\{a\}} = \delta_a$), the V-Newtonian potential of any $A \in \mathscr{B}(F \cap B)$, v*iz*:

$$v_x^F(A) = \int_A g(x, y)\,dm^F(y), \qquad x \in B,$$

becomes well-defined.

THEOREM 7.1. — *If* $\dim F = n-2$, *then:*

$$v_{x_\lambda}^{c_\lambda + F}(A_\lambda) \geqq v_{x_0}^{c_0 + F}(A_0) \wedge v_{x_1}^{c_1 + F}(A_1), \qquad 0 < \lambda < 1,$$

where $A_i \in \mathscr{B}((c_i + F) \cap B)$, $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, *and* $x_i \in B$, $i = 0, 1$, *are arbitrary.*

Before presenting the proof of Theorem 7.1, we recall some basic facts from potential theory.

Suppose $A \in \mathscr{U}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\bar{A} \subseteqq B$. Then there exists a unique non-negative measure μ_A in $\bar{A}$, called the V-equilibrium measure of A, such that:

$$\int g(x, y)\,d\mu_A(y) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_A} V(X(s))\,ds \right);\ \tau_{B^c} \geqq \tau_A < +\infty \right), \qquad x \in B.$$

The total mass $\mu_A(\bar{A}) = \mathscr{C}(A)$ is termed the V-capacity of A and, moreover, writing $g\mu = (\mu(g(x, .)))_{x \in B}$ if μ is a non-negative measure in B:

$$\mathscr{C}(A) = \sup\{\mu(B);\ \operatorname{supp}\mu \subseteqq A,\ g\mu \leqq 1\}$$

(*see* e. g. Blumental, Getoor [3], Chap. 6.4).

Proof of Theorem 7.1. — We shall prove that g is $-1/(n-2)$-convex. By eventually diminishing V and using the Dini theorem, there is no loss of generality in assuming $\sup V = q < +\infty$.

In the following, we sometimes write $g^{B, V}$, $\mathscr{C}^{B, V}$, $\mu_A^{B, V}$ instead of g, $\mathscr{C}$, and μ_A, respectively, and asume, as we may, that X is the standard Brownian motion.

Case $n \geqq 3$. — Letting $\mathscr{C}^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathrm{B}(0:r)) = c_n r^{n-2}$, we claim that:

$$\lim_{r \to 0^+} \frac{\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{B}(y; r))}{c_n r^{n-2}} = 1, \qquad y \in \mathrm{B}. \tag{7.1}$$

To *see* this, let $y \in \mathrm{B}$ be fixed and write $\mathrm{B}_r = \mathrm{B}(y; r)$ for brevity. Then, if $\mathrm{B}_r \subseteqq \bar{\mathrm{B}}_R \subseteqq \mathrm{B}$, certainly:

$$c_n r^{n-2} \leqq \mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{B}_r) \leqq \mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{B}_R, q}(\mathrm{B}_r).$$

We next integrate:

$$g^{\mathrm{B}_R, 0} = g^{\mathrm{B}_R, q} + q g^{\mathrm{B}_R, 0} g^{\mathrm{B}_R, q},$$

with respect to $\mu_{\mathrm{B}_r}^{\mathrm{B}_R, 0} \otimes \mu_{\mathrm{B}_r}^{\mathrm{B}_R, q}$, arriving at:

$$\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{B}_R, q}(\mathrm{B}_r) \leqq \mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{B}_R, 0}(\mathrm{B}_r) + q d_n \mathrm{R}^n,$$

where $d_n = \mathrm{Vol}\, \mathrm{B}(0; 1)$. Moreover, by integrating:

$$g^{\mathrm{B}_R, 0}(x, \xi) = g^{\mathbb{R}^n, 0}(x, \xi) - \mathbb{E}_x g^{\mathbb{R}^n, 0}(\mathrm{X}(\tau_{\mathrm{B}_R^c}), \xi)$$

with respect to $\mu_{\mathrm{B}_r}^{\mathrm{B}_R, 0}(dx) \otimes \mu_{\mathrm{B}_r}^{\mathbb{R}^n, 0}(d\xi)$, we get:

$$\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{B}_R, 0}(\mathrm{B}_r) = c_n r^{n-2} (1 - (r/\mathrm{R})^{n-2})^{-1}.$$

Finally, by choosing $\mathrm{R} = r^{1-1/n}$ in the above estimates (7.1) follows at once.

Writing $g = g^{\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{V}}$ as above we have for all $r_0, r_1 > 0$, $0 < \lambda < 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\varepsilon^{2-n}(g \mu_{\mathrm{B}(y_\lambda; \varepsilon r_\lambda)})(x_\lambda) \geqq \varepsilon^{2-n}[(g \mu_{\mathrm{B}(y_0; \varepsilon r_0)})(x_0) \wedge (g \mu_{\mathrm{B}(y_1; \varepsilon r_1)})(x_1)],$$

by Theorem 3.1, and in the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$:

$$g(x_\lambda, y_\lambda) r_\lambda^{n-2} \geqq g(x_0, y_0) r_0^{n-2} \wedge g(x_1, y_1) r_1^{n-2}.$$

Thus, choosing $r_i = (g(x_i, y_i))^{-1/(n-2)}$, if $x_i \neq y_i$, $i = 0, 1$, the resulting inequality becomes:

$$g^{-1/(n-2)}(x_\lambda, y_\lambda) \leqq (1-\lambda) g^{-1/(n-2)}(x_0, y_0) + \lambda g^{-1/(n-2)}(x_1, y_1),$$

and it follows at once that g is $-1/(n-2)$-convex.

Case $n = 2$. — If Theorem 7.1 is true in $\mathbb{R}^{n_0+1}$, $n_0 \geqq 2$, then we may use the theory of α-convex measures to prove Theorem 7.1 in $\mathbb{R}^{n_0}$. Indeed, set $\tilde{\mathrm{V}}(x, \xi) = \mathrm{V}(x)$, $(x, \xi) \in \mathrm{B} \times \mathbb{R}$ and note that:

$$g(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g^{\mathrm{B} \times \mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathrm{V}}}(x, 0, y, \eta)\, d\eta.$$

If $g^{\mathrm{B} \times \mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathrm{V}}}$ is $-1/(n_0-1)$-convex it follows from ([8], Th. 3.1) that g is $-1/(n_0-2)$-convex. □

In the following two examples we suppose in addition to the above assumptions that ∂B is $\mathscr{C}^\infty$ and that V has a $\mathscr{C}^\infty$ extension to a neighbourhood of $\bar{B}$.

Example 7.1. — For each $y \in \partial B$, let $n_i(y) = n_i^B(y)$ denote the inner unit normal of $\bar{B}$ at y and set:

$$p(x, y) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} g(x, y + \varepsilon n_i(y))/2\varepsilon.$$

If $n_i(y_0) = n_i(y_1)$, then $n_i(y_\lambda) = n_i(y_0)$, $0 < \lambda < 1$, and the $-1/(n-2)$-convexity of g gives:

$$p^{-1/(n-1)}(x_\lambda, y_\lambda) \leqq (1-\lambda) p^{-1/(n-1)}(x_0, y_0) + \lambda p^{-1/(n-1)}(x_1, y_1),$$

employing the same type of argument as in the proof of Theorem 7.1. Noting that $p(x, y)\, d\sigma_{\partial B}(y)$ is the V-harmonic measure at x (use ([17], Th. 6.14) and the Green formula) we have thus complemented Example 6.2. □

Example 7.2. — Let $A \in \mathscr{U}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\bar{A} \subseteqq B$, and assume $\partial A \in \mathscr{C}^\infty$. Moreover, suppose F is a supporting hyperplane of $\bar{A}$ such that $\bar{A} \cap F = C$ is $(n-1)$-dimensional. Then:

$$d\mu_{A \mid \beta(C)} = f\, d\sigma_C,$$

where f is -1-concave.

To see this, we apply the Green formula once more to get:

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial u_A}{\partial n_e}\, d\sigma_{\partial A} = d\mu_A - 1_A V\, dm,$$

where m is Lebesgue measure, $u_A = g\, \mu_A$, and $n_e = -n_i^A$. However, as u_A is quasi-concave $-\partial u_A / \partial n_e$ is -1-concave on C. □

In the planar case, we shall complement Theorem 7.1 in the following way.

THEOREM 7.2. — *Let for* $A \in \bar{\mathscr{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{C})$, $g_A \leqq 0$ *be the Green function of* Δ *in* $\mathbb{C} \setminus A$ *with pole at* ∞ *and with the Dirichlet boundary condition zero. Then:*

$$g_{A_\lambda}(z_\lambda) \geqq g_{A_0}(z_0) \wedge g_{A_1}(z_1), \qquad 0 < \lambda < 1.$$

Proof. — Assuming $0 \in A$, $g = g_A$ possesses the following characteristic properties:

(i) g is harmonic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus A$;

(ii) g is continuous in $\mathbb{C}$ and $g|_A = 0$,

(iii) $g(z) = 1n \dfrac{1}{|z|} - 1n \dfrac{1}{\mathscr{C}_2(A)} + \mathscr{O}\left(\dfrac{1}{|z|}\right)$ as $|z| \to +\infty$.

The constant $\mathscr{C}_2(A)$ is the logarithmic capacity of A [1]. If $B(0; R) \supseteqq A$ and $u_A^{B(0;R)}$ denotes the equilibrium potential of A relative to $B(0; R)$ we thus have:

$$(u_A^{B(0;R)}(z) - 1)\, 1n \frac{R}{\mathscr{C}_2(A)} - g_A(z) = \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{1}{R}\right) \quad \text{as } R \to +\infty$$

and, consequently:

$$g_A(z) = \lim_{R \to +\infty} (u_A^{B(0;R)}(z) - 1) \, 1n \frac{R}{\mathscr{C}_2(A)}.$$

From this representation formula Theorem 7.2 follows at once using Theorem 3.1. □

Example 7.3. — $\mathscr{C}_2$ is concave on $\bar{\mathscr{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{C})$:

$$\mathscr{C}_2(A_0 + A_1) \geqq \mathscr{C}_2(A_0) + \mathscr{C}_2(A_1), \quad A_0, A_1 \in \bar{\mathscr{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{C}). \tag{7.2}$$

Indeed, as:

$$1n\mathscr{C}_2(A) = \lim_{|z| \to +\infty} (g_A(z) + 1n|z|).$$

Theorem 7.2 gives:

$$\mathscr{C}_2(A_\lambda) \geqq \mathscr{C}_2(A_0) \wedge \mathscr{C}_2(A_1),$$

and (7.2) follows by homogeneity. □

The next example is mainly a preparation for Example 7.5.

Example 7.4. — By an excercise in Pólya and Szegö [21], Aufg. [124] :

$$\mathscr{C}_2(A) \leqq \frac{1}{2\pi} \text{length } \partial A, \qquad A \in \bar{\mathscr{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{C}). \tag{7.3}$$

A possible solution reads as follows.

Let H_A be the support function of A:

$$H_A(\xi) = \sup_{x \in A} \langle x, \xi \rangle, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{C},$$

and remember that:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} H_A(e^{i\theta}\xi) \, d\theta/2\pi = \frac{\|\xi\|}{2\pi} \text{length } \partial A, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{7.4}$$

We next approximate the average in the left-hand side by:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p} H_A(e^{i\theta_k}\xi)\lambda_k \qquad (0 < \lambda_k < 1, \lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_p = 1),$$

that is, by the support function of $\sum_{k=1}^{p} \lambda_k e^{-i\theta_k} A$. However,

$$\mathscr{C}_2\left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} \lambda_k e^{-i\theta_k} A\right) \geqq \mathscr{C}_2(A)$$

from Example 7.3 and as the right-hand side of (7.4) is the support function of a ball of radius $1/2\pi$ length ∂A, we have (7.3). □

Example 7.5. — Consider an $A \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with principal radius R_1 and R_2 and mean curvature:

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial A}\left(\frac{1}{R_1}+\frac{1}{R_2}\right)d\sigma(\xi).$$

Then by a Theorem of Szegö [23], Satz III:

$$\mathcal{C}_3(A) \leqq \frac{1}{4\pi}\mathcal{M}(A), \tag{7.5}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_3$ is the Newtonian capacity normalized so that $\mathcal{C}_3(B(0;1))=1$. A very important ingredient in Szegö's proof is the following inequality for mixed volumes due to Minkowski:

$$\mathcal{M}^2(A) \geqq 4\pi \text{ area } \partial A.$$

Noting that $\mathcal{C}_3$ is concave on $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ [4] due to (1.1) we, alternatively, obtain (7.5) as in the previous example. The n-dimensional counterpart of (7.5) is now obvious: if $\mathcal{C}_n$ denotes the Newtonian capacity in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geqq 3$, $\mathcal{C}_n(B(0;1))=1$) and if Z_n is a uniformly distributed random vector on S^{n-1}, then:

$$\mathbb{E}\, H_A(Z_n) \geqq \mathcal{C}_n^{1/(n-2)}(A),\ A \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Certainly, the Szegö line of reasoning leads to the same estimate. □

REFERENCES

[1] L. V. AHLFORS, *Conformal Invariants* (*Topics in Geometric Function Theory*, New York, McGraw Hill, 1973).

[2] L. V. AHLFORS, *Möbius Transformations in Several Dimensions* (*School of Math.*, Univ. of Minnesota 1981).

[3] R. M. BLUMENTHAL, and R. K. GETOOR, *Markov Processes and Potential Theory*, New York, London, Academic Press 1968.

[4] C. BORELL, *Capacitary Inequalities of the Brunn-Minkowski Type* (*Math. Ann.*, 263, 1983, pp. 179-184).

[5] C. BORELL, *Brownian Motion in a Convex Ring and Quasi-Concavity* (*Commun. Math. Phys.*, 86, 1982, pp. 143-147).

[6] C. BORELL, *Convex Measures on Locally Convex Spaces* (*Ark. Mat.*, 12, 1974, pp. 239-252).

[7] C. BORELL, *Convexity of Measures in Certain Convex Cones in Vector Space σ-Algebras* (*Math. Scand.* 53, 1983, pp. 125-144).

[8] C. BORELL, *Convex Set Functions in d-space* (*Period. Math., Hungar*, 6, 1975, pp. 111-136).

[9] H. J. BRASCAMP and E. H. LIEB, *Some Inequalities for Gaussian Measures*, In: *Functional Integral and Its Applications*, Edited by A. M. Arthurs, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1975.

[10] H. J. BRASCAMP and E. H. LIEB, *On Extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler Theorems, Including Inequalities for Log Concave Functions, and with an Application to the Diffusion Equation.*, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer-Verlag, 644, 1978, pp. 96-124).

[11] R. CARMONA, *Tensor Product of Gaussian Measures* (*Lecture Notes in Math.*, 644, 1978, pp. 96-124). Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Springer-Verlag.

[12] P. L. CHOW, *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations in Turbulence Related Problems*, In: *Probabilistic Analysis and Related Topics*, Vol. 1, Edited by A. T. Bharucha-Reid, New York, San Francisco, London, Academic Press, 1978.

[13] E. B. DYNKIN, *Markov processes*, Vol. I-II, Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, Springer-Verlag, 1965.

[14] A. EHRHARD, *Symétrisation dans l'espace de Gauss* (*Math. Scand.* 53, 1983, pp. 281-301).

[15] R. M. GABRIEL, *An Extended Principle of the Maximum for Harmonic Functions in 3-dimensions* (*J. London Math. Soc.*, 30, 1955, pp. 388-401).

[16] R. M. GABRIEL, *A Result Concerning Convex Level Surfaces of 3-dimensional Harmonic Functions* (*J. London Math. Soc.*, 32, 1957, pp. 286-294).

[17] D. GILBARG and N. S. TRUDINGER, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[18] L. GROSS, *Potential Theory on Hilbert Space* (*J. Functional Analysis*, 1, 1967, pp. 123-181).

[19] J. L. LEWIS, *Capacitary Functions in Convex Rings* (*Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 66, 1977, pp. 201-224).

[20] P. L. LIONS, *Two Geometrical Properties of Solutions of Semilinear problems* (*Applicable Analysis*, 12, 1981, pp. 267-272).

[21] G. PÓLYA and G. SZEGÖ, *Aufgaben und Lehrsätze aus der Analysis II*, Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, Springer-Verlag, 1954.

[22] S. C. PORT and C. J. STONE, *Brownian Motion and Classical Potential Theory*, New York, San Francisco, London, Academic Press, 1978.

[23] G. SZEGÖ, *Über Einige Neue Extremaleigenschaften der Kugel. Math. Zeit.*, 33, 1931, pp. 419-425).

(Manuscrit reçu le 9 juin 1983.)

C. BORELL,
Department of Mathematics,
Chalmers University of Technology,
The University of Göteborg,
S-412 96,
Göteborg, Sweden.