

**EXISTENCE OF DIRICHLET INFINITE HARMONIC  
 MEASURES ON THE UNIT DISC**

MITSURU NAKAI

The primary purpose of this paper is to give an affirmative answer to a problem posed by Ohtsuka [13] whether there exists a  $p$ -harmonic measure on the unit disc in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space  $\mathbf{R}^2$  with an infinite  $p$ -Dirichlet integral for the exponent  $1 < p < 2$ .

To clarify the meaning of the problem we start by explaining the background of the problem. We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a strictly monotone elliptic operator on the Euclidean space  $\mathbf{R}^d$  of dimension  $d \geq 2$  with exponent  $p \in (1, d]$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a mapping of  $\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d$  to  $\mathbf{R}^d$  satisfying the following assumption for some constants  $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < \infty$ :

- (1) the function  $h \mapsto \mathcal{A}(x, h)$  is continuous for almost every fixed  $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ , and the function  $x \mapsto \mathcal{A}(x, h)$  is measurable for all fixed  $h \in \mathbf{R}^d$ ;

for almost every  $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$  and for all  $h \in \mathbf{R}^d$

- (2)  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) \cdot h \geq \alpha |h|^p$ ,
- (3)  $|\mathcal{A}(x, h)| \leq \beta |h|^{p-1}$ ,
- (4)  $(\mathcal{A}(x, h_1) - \mathcal{A}(x, h_2)) \cdot (h_1 - h_2) > 0$

whenever  $h_1 \neq h_2$ , and

- (5)  $\mathcal{A}(x, \lambda h) = |\lambda|^{p-2} \lambda \mathcal{A}(x, h)$

for all  $\lambda \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . Here  $|x|$  indicates the length of a vector  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^d)$  in  $\mathbf{R}^d$ . The class of all operators  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\mathbf{R}^d$  satisfying (1)-(5) with exponent  $p \in (1, d]$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ .

---

Received December 16, 1993.

This work was partly supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, No. 06640227, Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

Using an  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$  we consider a quasilinear elliptic equation

$$(6) \quad -\nabla \cdot \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u(x)) = 0$$

on  $\mathbf{R}^d$ . A function  $u$  on an open subset  $U$  of  $\mathbf{R}^d$  is a weak solution of (6) if  $u \in \text{loc } W_p^1(U)$  and

$$\int_U \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u(x)) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) dx = 0$$

for every  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$  where  $W_p^1(U)$  is the Sobolev space on  $U$  consisting of functions  $f \in L_p(U) = L_p(U; \mathbf{R})$  with distributional gradients  $\nabla f \in L_p(U) = L_p(U; \mathbf{R}^d)$  and  $dx = dx^1 \cdots dx^d$ . A weak solution  $u$  of (6) (possibly modified on a set of zero measure  $dx$ ) is actually continuous. We say that a function  $u$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic on  $U$  if  $u$  is a continuous weak solution of (6) on  $U$ . We denote by  $H_{\mathcal{A}}(U)$  the class of all  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic functions on  $U$ . The simplest and the most typical operator  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$  is the  $p$ -Laplacian  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = |h|^{p-2}h$  so that the corresponding elliptic equation is the  $p$ -Laplace equation

$$(7) \quad -\nabla \cdot (|\nabla u(x)|^{p-2} \nabla u(x)) = 0.$$

In this case we use the term  $p$ -harmonic instead of  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic and the notation  $H_p(U)$  in place of  $H_{\mathcal{A}}(U)$ .

The greatest  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic minorant  $u \wedge v$  on  $U$ , if it exists, of two  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic functions  $u$  and  $v$  on  $U$  is the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic function  $u \wedge v$  on  $U$  characterized by the following two conditions: (i)  $u \wedge v \leq u$  and  $u \wedge v \leq v$  on  $U$ ; (ii) if there is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic function  $h$  on  $U$  such that  $h \leq u$  and  $h \leq v$  on  $U$ , then  $h \leq u \wedge v$  on  $U$ . A function  $w$  is said to be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure on  $U$  in the sense of Heins [3] if  $w$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic on  $U$  and satisfies

$$(8) \quad w \wedge (1 - w) = 0$$

on  $U$ . An  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure always satisfies  $0 \leq w \leq 1$  on  $U$ ;  $w \equiv 0$  or  $w \equiv 1$  are  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measures on  $U$ ; when  $U$  is a region, an  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $w$  on  $U$  is nonconstant if and only if  $0 < w < 1$  on  $U$ .

Our main concern in this paper is the  $p$ -Dirichlet integral

$$D_p(w) = D_p(w; B^d) = \int_{B^d} |\nabla w(x)|^p dx \leq \infty$$

of each  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $w$  on the unit ball  $B^d = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^d; |x| < 1\}$  with  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ . We say that  $w$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite (infinite, resp.) if  $D_p(w) < \infty$  ( $D_p(w) = \infty$ , resp.). We have the following result:

**9. THEOREM.** *If  $2 \leq p \leq d$ , then every nonconstant  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure on the unit ball  $B^d$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ .*

We say that a subdivision  $\delta_0 \cup \delta_1$  of  $\partial B^d$  gives rise to an electric condenser  $(B^d; \delta_0, \delta_1)$  surrounded by two electrodes  $\delta_0$  and  $\delta_1$  if the unit potential difference can be produced between  $\delta_0$  and  $\delta_1$  by putting a charge of finite energy on  $\delta_1$  when  $\delta_0$  is grounded. The intuitive meaning of the above result is that  $B^d$  cannot be made to an electric condenser no matter how we decompose the boundary  $\partial B^d$  of  $B^d$  into two parts. The above result in its present final form was obtained and proved in [11]. The result in the special case of  $p = 2$  and the classical Laplace operator  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = h$  was proved in [9] based on a different view point. If  $p = d = 2$  and  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = h$ , then the above result has been known in the frame of the theory of functions and its proof is found in various sources (cf. e.g. [8], [13], etc.). If  $p = 2$  and  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = h$ , then the above result is the one in the linear potential theory. From this view point we remark that (6) can be nonlinear for  $p = 2$  and even for the borderline conformal case  $p = d = 2$  (see Appendix at the end of this paper).

In contrast with the case  $2 \leq p \leq d$ , we have proved the following result in the same paper [11] cited above:

**10. THEOREM.** *If  $1 < p < 2$ , then there exist nonconstant  $p$ -Dirichlet finite  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measures on the unit ball  $B^d$  for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ .*

We turn to the final question in the case  $1 < p < 2$  whether there are  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measures on the unit ball  $B^d$  for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ , which is the main theme of this paper. For a technical reason we restrict ourselves to the case of the dimension  $d = 2$  in the remainder of this paper. We view  $\mathbf{R}^2$  also as the complex plane by identifying the point  $(x^1, x^2)$  in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  with the complex number  $x = x^1 + ix^2$  ( $i = \sqrt{-1}$ ). For simplicity we denote by  $\Delta$  the unit disc in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ :  $\Delta = B^2 = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^2 : |x| < 1\}$ .

Take two sequences  $(a_n) = (a_n : 1 \leq n < N + 1)$  and  $(b_n) = (b_n : 1 \leq n < N + 1)$  of real numbers  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  such that

$$(11) \quad 0 < a_n < b_n < a_{n+1} < b_{n+1} < \pi \quad (1 \leq n < N)$$

so that  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$  are finite sequences of  $N$  terms if  $1 \leq N < \infty$  and infinite sequences if  $N = \infty$ . With these two sequences  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$  we associate the sequence  $(A_n) = (A_n : 1 \leq n < N + 1)$  of *main arcs*  $A_n$  in  $\partial\Delta = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^2 : |x| = 1\}$  given by

$$A_n = \{e^{i\theta} : a_n < \theta < b_n\} \quad (1 \leq n < N + 1)$$

and the sequence  $(B_n) = (B_n : 1 \leq n < N + 1)$  of *subsidiary arcs*  $B_n$  in  $\partial\Delta$  given by

$$B_n = \{e^{i\theta} : b_n < \theta < a_{n+1}\} \quad (1 \leq n < N).$$

Finally we consider the open subset  $A$  in  $\partial\Delta$  associated with sequences  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$  given by

$$A = A((a_n), (b_n)) = \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n.$$

The function  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  on  $\Delta$  given by

$$(12) \quad \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})(x) = \sup\{h(x) : h \in C(\bar{\Delta}) \cap H_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta), h|_{\bar{\Delta}} \leq 1, h|_{(\partial\Delta \setminus A)} \leq 0\}$$

for  $x \in \Delta$  is referred to as the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure of  $A$  with respect to  $\Delta$  for  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^2)$  with  $1 < p \leq 2$ . In this case of an open set  $A$  in  $\partial\Delta$  the definition of  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  in (12) coincides with the one given by Martio ([4], [2, Chap. 11]). We will see later in 44 that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is actually an  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure on  $\Delta$  in the sense of Heins characterized by (8).

If  $1 < p < 2$ ,  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = |h|^{p-2}h$ , and  $N < \infty$ , i.e.  $A$  is the union of a finite number of mutually disjoint open arcs in  $\partial\Delta$ , then we know that the  $p$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  of  $A$  with respect to  $\Delta$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite (Ohtsuka [13], [10]; also see Theorem 14 below). In view of this fact one might feel that every  $p$ -harmonic measure on  $\Delta$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite for every  $1 < p < 2$ . Thus we are naturally led to ask the following question originally raised by Ohtsuka [13, Chap. VIII] in terms of extremal distances in an equivalent to but superfacially different from our present setting:

**13. OHTSUKA'S PROBLEM.** *Does there exist a  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite  $p$ -harmonic measure on  $\Delta$  for each  $1 < p < 2$ ? Or more generally, does there exist a  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure on  $\Delta$  for every  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^2)$  with each  $1 < p < 2$ ?*

The purpose of this paper is to give an affirmative answer to the above problem of Ohtsuka by proving the following result.

**14. MAIN THEOREM.** *If  $N < \infty$  or if  $N = \infty$  and either the sequence  $(|A_n| : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  or  $(|B_n| : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  converges to zero so rapidly as to satisfy the condition*

$$(15) \quad \min\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |A_n|^{2-p}, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |B_n|^{2-p}\right) < \infty,$$

where  $|A_n|$  denotes the length of  $A_n$ , then the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^2)$  with  $1 < p < 2$ . If the sequences  $(|A_n| : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  and  $(|B_n| : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  converge to zero so slowly as to satisfy the condition

$$(16) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \min(|A_n|^{2-p}, |B_n|^{2-p}) = \infty,$$

then the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^2)$  with each  $1 < p < 2$ .

The proof of this theorem will be given later in **51** after a series of preparations starting from **22**. The latter half of the above result takes the following more applicable form.

**17. COROLLARY.** *If the sequences  $(|A_n| : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  and  $(|B_n| : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  satisfy the condition*

$$(18) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |B_n| / |A_n| > 0 \quad (\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |A_n| / |B_n| > 0, \text{ resp.})$$

and also the condition

$$(19) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |A_n|^{2-p} = \infty \quad \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |B_n|^{2-p} = \infty, \text{ resp.}\right),$$

then the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^2)$  with each  $1 < p < 2$ .

*Proof.* Condition (18) assures the existence of a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$|B_n| \geq C |A_n| \quad (|A_n| \geq C |B_n|, \text{ resp.}) \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \min(|A_n|^{2-p}, |B_n|^{2-p}) &\geq \min(|A_n|^{2-p}, C^{2-p} |A_n|^{2-p}) \\ &= \min(1, C^{2-p}) |A_n|^{2-p} \\ (\min(|A_n|^{2-p}, |B_n|^{2-p}) &\geq \min(C^{2-p} |B_n|^{2-p}, |B_n|^{2-p}) \\ &= \min(1, C^{2-p}) |B_n|^{2-p}, \text{ resp.}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence (19) implies (16) and thus Theorem 14 yields the above conclusion.  $\square$

We are now able to give an affirmative answer to Problem 13 as an application of Corollary 17 by giving the following example.

**20. EXAMPLE.** Choose sequences  $(a_n : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  and  $(b_n : 1 \leq n < \infty)$  so as to satisfy the condition

$$(21) \quad a_{n+1} - b_n = b_n - a_n = n^{-1/(2-p)}$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ . Then the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^2)$  with each  $1 < p < 2$ .

*Proof.* Since  $0 < 2 - p < 1$ , the series  $\sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-1/(2-p)} < \infty$  and therefore we can choose sequences  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$  satisfying conditions (11) and (21). Then  $|A_n| = |B_n| = n^{-1/(2-p)}$  for sufficiently large  $n$  and hence (18) and (19) are trivially satisfied. Thus Corollary 17 assures that the corresponding  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite for every  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^2)$  with each  $1 < p < 2$ .  $\square$

## 22. Trace

For simplicity we denote by  $\Gamma = \partial\Delta$  the unit circle  $\{x \in \mathbf{R}^2 : |x| = 1\}$ . The Sobolev space  $W_p^1(G)$  ( $1 < p \leq 2$ ) is a Banach space equipped with the norm

$$\|f; W_p^1(G)\| = \|f; L_p(G)\| + \|\nabla f; L_p(G)\|,$$

where  $G$  is an open set in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . The Sobolev null space  $W_{p,0}^1(G)$  is the closure of  $C_0^\infty(G)$  in  $W_p^1(G)$  with respect to the above norm.

There exists a unique continuous linear operator  $\gamma$  of  $W_p^1(\Delta)$  into  $L_p(\Gamma)$  such that  $\gamma f = f|_\Gamma$  for every  $f$  in  $C(\bar{\Delta}) \cap W_p^1(\Delta)$ . The function  $\gamma f$  defined a.e. on  $\Gamma$  and belonging to  $L_p(\Gamma)$  is referred to as the *trace* on  $\Gamma$  of  $f$  in  $W_p^1(G)$ . It is seen that the expression

$$(23) \quad (\gamma f)(\zeta) = \lim_{r \uparrow 1} f(r\zeta)$$

holds for a.e.  $\zeta$  in  $\Gamma$  (cf. e.g. [6, p.47]).

Concerning the kernel  $\text{Ker } \gamma = \gamma^{-1}(0)$  and the image  $\text{Im } \gamma = \gamma(W_p^1(\Delta))$  of  $\gamma$  we have the following fundamental results. First,  $\text{Ker } \gamma$  characterizes the Sobolev null space (cf. e.g. [7, p.187]):

$$(24) \quad W_{p,0}^1(\Delta) = \text{Ker } \gamma = \{f \in W_p^1(\Delta) : \gamma f = 0\}.$$

Second, we denote  $\text{Im } \gamma = \gamma(W_p^1(\Delta))$  by  $\Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . It is seen that the space  $\Lambda_p(\Gamma)$  forms a Banach space under the norm

$$(25) \quad \|\varphi; \Lambda_p(\Gamma)\| = \|\varphi; L_p(\Gamma)\| + \left( \int \int_{\Gamma \times \Gamma} \frac{|\varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(\eta)|^p}{|\zeta - \eta|^p} ds_\zeta ds_\eta \right)^{1/p}$$

where  $ds$  is the line element on  $\Gamma$ . The theorem of Gagliardo [1] assures the existence of a constant  $C \geq 1$  such that

$$(26) \quad C^{-1} \|\varphi; \Lambda_p(\Gamma)\| \leq \inf_{\gamma f = \varphi} \|f; W_p^1(\Delta)\| \leq C \|\varphi; \Lambda_p(\Gamma)\|$$

for every  $\varphi$  in  $\Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . The quantity  $\|\varphi; \Lambda_p(\Gamma)\|$  will be referred to as the *Gagliardo norm* of  $\varphi$  in this paper.

Hereafter we sometimes use the same letter  $C$  to denote positive constants which may differ from each other from line to line and even in the same line.

**27. Dirichlet problem**

Let  $G$  be a bounded region in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . We will mainly consider the case  $G = \Delta$  but  $G$  is supposed to be a general bounded region for a while. For any  $f$  in  $W_p^1(G)$  there exists a *unique*  $u$  in the space  $H_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \cap W_p^1(G)$  such that  $u - f$  belongs to  $W_{p,0}^1(G)$  (cf. Maz'ya [5]). This fact can be reformulated as the Maz'ya decomposition of  $W_p^1(G)$ :

$$(28) \quad W_p^1(G) = (H_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \cap W_p^1(G)) \oplus W_{p,0}^1(G),$$

i.e. any  $f$  in  $W_p^1(G)$  can be expressed as the sum of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic part  $u$  in  $H_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \cap W_p^1(G)$  and the "potential part"  $g$  in  $W_{p,0}^1(G)$ :  $f = u + g$ . We denote by  $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^G$  the projection operator of  $W_p^1(G)$  to  $H_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \cap W_p^1(G)$  determined by  $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^G f = u$ . We say that  $G$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -regular if

$$(29) \quad \lim_{x \in G, x \rightarrow y} (\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^G f)(x) = f(y)$$

for any  $f$  in  $C(\bar{G}) \cap W_p^1(G)$  and for every  $y$  in  $\partial G$ . If  $G$  is bounded by a finite number of mutually disjoint smooth Jordan curves, then  $G$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -regular (cf. [5]). The disc  $\Delta$  is the most typical example of  $\mathcal{A}$ -regular regions.

We also use the following extremal property of  $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^G$ : the quasi Dirichlet principle is valid in the sense that  $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^G f$  quasiminimizes the  $p$ -Dirichlet integral:

$$(30) \quad \int_G |\nabla (\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^G f)(x)|^p dx \leq (\beta/\alpha)^p \int_G |\nabla f(x)|^p dx.$$

In fact, since  $u = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^G f$  is a weak solution of (6) and  $u - f$  belongs to  $W_{p,0}^1(G)$  in which  $C_0^\infty(G)$  is  $\|\cdot\|; W_p^1(G)$ -dense, we have

$$\int_G \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u(x)) \cdot \nabla(u - f)(x) dx = 0.$$

By (2), (3) and the Hölder inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_G |\nabla u(x)|^p dx &\leq \int_G \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u(x)) \cdot \nabla u(x) dx = \int_G \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u(x)) \cdot \nabla f(x) dx \\ &\leq \left( \int_G |\mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u(x))|^{p/(p-1)} dx \right)^{(p-1)/p} \cdot \left( \int_G |\nabla f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \beta \left( \int_G |\nabla u(x)|^p dx \right)^{(p-1)/p} \cdot \left( \int_G |\nabla f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

by which we can conclude the inequality (30).

We now restrict ourselves to the case  $G = \Delta$ . We use the abbreviation  $\pi = \pi_{\mathcal{A}} = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta$ . We say that an  $f$  in  $W_p^1(G)$  has an essential limit  $\alpha$  at  $\xi$  in  $\Gamma = \partial\Delta$ ,

$$\alpha = \operatorname{ess\,lim}_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} f(x)$$

in notation, if

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|f - \alpha; L_\infty(\Delta(\xi, \varepsilon) \cap \Delta)\| = 0$$

where  $\Delta(\xi, \varepsilon)$  is the disc of radius  $\varepsilon > 0$  centered at  $\xi$ . As a localized version of (29) we have

$$\lim_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} (\pi f)(x) = \operatorname{ess\,lim}_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} f(x)$$

at a point  $\xi$  in  $\Gamma$  for every  $f$  in  $L_\infty(\Delta) \cap W_p^1(\Delta)$  for which the right hand side of the above exists at a  $\xi$  in  $\Gamma$  (cf. [12]). Although the operator  $\pi = \pi_{\mathcal{A}} = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta$  is homogeneous but not linear, we see that  $\pi$  is *monotone* (cf. [11]), i.e.  $f_1 \geq f_2$  a.e. on  $\Delta$  for any  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  in  $W_p^1(\Delta)$ , then  $\pi f_1 \geq \pi f_2$  on  $\Delta$ .

In view of the relation (24) and the uniqueness of the Maz'ya decomposition (28) we can define the operator

$$\tau = \pi \circ \gamma^{-1}: \Lambda_p(\Gamma) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta) \cap W_p^1(\Delta).$$

Clearly the operator  $\tau = \tau_{\mathcal{A}} = \tau_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta$  is *bijective*. Moreover we have the following result.

**31. PROPOSITION.** *The operator  $\tau$  is monotone, i.e. if  $\varphi_1 \geq \varphi_2$  a.e. on  $\Gamma$  for any  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  in  $L_p(\Gamma)$ , then  $\tau\varphi_1 \geq \tau\varphi_2$  everywhere on  $\Delta$ .*

*Proof.* Choose an arbitrary  $g_i$  in  $W_p^1(\Delta)$  with  $\gamma g_i = \varphi_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). We denote by  $F \cup G$  the function given by  $(F \cup G)(x) = \max(F(x), G(x))$  for any two functions  $F$  and  $G$ . Then  $(g_1 - g_2) \cup 0$  belongs to  $W_p^1(\Delta)$  by the lattice property of  $W_p^1(\Delta)$ . By (23) we see that

$$\gamma((g_1 - g_2) \cup 0) = (\gamma(g_1 - g_2)) \cup 0 = (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \cup 0 = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2.$$

If we set  $f_2 = g_2$  and  $f_1 = g_2 + (g_1 - g_2) \cup 0$ , then  $\gamma f_2 = \gamma g_2 = \varphi_2$  and

$$\gamma f_1 = \gamma g_2 + \gamma((g_1 - g_2) \cup 0) = \varphi_2 + (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) = \varphi_1.$$

Then  $\tau\varphi_1 = \pi f_1$ ,  $\tau\varphi_2 = \pi f_2$  and  $f_1 \geq f_2$  on  $\Delta$  imply that  $\tau\varphi_1 \geq \tau\varphi_2$  on  $\Delta$  by the monotonicity of  $\pi$ . □

Beside the defining boundary behavior  $\gamma(\tau\varphi) = \varphi$  of  $\tau\varphi$ , we have the following more precise boundary behavior of  $\tau\varphi$  if an additional condition is imposed upon  $\varphi$ :

**32. LEMMA.** *If  $\varphi \in L_\infty(\Gamma) \cap L_p(\Gamma)$  is continuous at a point  $\xi \in \Gamma$  in the sense that  $\text{ess lim}_{\eta \in \Gamma, \eta \rightarrow \xi} \varphi(\eta) = \varphi(\xi)$ , then  $\tau\varphi$  has a boundary value  $\varphi(\xi)$  at  $\xi$ .*

*Proof.* We only have to show that  $\lim_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} (\tau\varphi)(x) = \varphi(\xi)$ . Since  $\tau(\varphi - \varphi(\xi)) = \tau\varphi - \varphi(\xi)$ , we may suppose  $\varphi(\xi) = \text{ess lim}_{\eta \in \Gamma, \eta \rightarrow \xi} \varphi(\eta) = 0$  to show the above identity. Let  $|\varphi| \leq K$  a.e. on  $\Gamma$  for a positive constant  $K$  and  $\rho(x) = |x - \xi|$  on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Clearly  $\rho$  belongs to the class  $C(\bar{\Delta}) \cap W_p^1(G)$  and  $\tau(\rho|_\Gamma) = \pi\rho$ , or roughly  $\tau\rho = \pi\rho$ . Hence by (29) we have

$$\lim_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} (\tau\rho)(x) = 0.$$

For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|\varphi(\eta)| < \varepsilon$  for a.e.  $\eta$  in  $\Delta(\xi, \delta) \cap \Gamma$ . Since  $(K/\delta)\rho \geq K$  for every  $\eta$  in  $\Gamma \setminus \Delta(\xi, \delta)$ , we see that

$$-\frac{K}{\delta} \rho(\eta) - \varepsilon \leq \varphi(\eta) \leq \frac{K}{\delta} \rho(\eta) + \varepsilon$$

a.e. on  $\Gamma$ . By Proposition 31, we have

$$-\frac{K}{\delta} (\tau\rho)(x) - \varepsilon \leq (\tau\varphi)(x) \leq \frac{K}{\delta} (\tau\rho)(x) + \varepsilon \quad (x \in \Delta).$$

On letting  $x$  in  $\Delta$  tend to  $\xi$ , we see by  $(\tau\rho)(x) \rightarrow 0$  that

$$-\varepsilon \leq \liminf_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} (\tau\varphi)(x) \leq \limsup_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} (\tau\varphi)(x) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we finally conclude the required identity  $\lim_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} (\tau\varphi)(x) = 0$ . □

**33. Estimate of Gagliardo norms**

For two measurable subsets  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\Gamma$  and mostly for open or closed subarcs  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\Gamma$  we consider the set function

$$(34) \quad S(X, Y) = \int \int_{X \times Y} |\xi - \eta|^{-p} ds_\xi ds_\eta$$

where  $ds$  is the arc element on  $\Gamma$ . The following elementary properties of  $S$  are easily checked and will be used without making any further mention of them:  $S$  is symmetric, i.e.  $S(X, Y) = S(Y, X)$ ;  $S$  is rotationally invariant, i.e.  $S(e^{i\theta}X, e^{i\theta}Y) = S(X, Y)$  where  $e^{i\theta}X = \{e^{i\theta}\xi : \xi \in X\}$ ;  $S$  is additive, i.e.  $X = \cup_{j=1}^n X_j$  is a finite disjoint union, then

$$S(\cup_{j=1}^n X_j, Y) = \sum_{j=1}^n S(X_j, Y);$$

$S$  is increasing, i.e. if  $X \subset X'$  and  $Y \subset Y'$ , then  $S(X, Y) \leq S(X', Y')$ .

We denote by  $\Gamma^+$  the upper half circle  $\{e^{i\theta} : 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi\}$ . For a measurable subset  $X$  and mostly for open or closed subarc  $X$  in  $\Gamma$  we set

$$X^\wedge = \{x \in [0, 2\pi) : e^{ix} \in X\}$$

which is a measurable subset of the real line and actually the interval  $[0, 2\pi)$ . We consider the auxiliary set function

$$(35) \quad T(X, Y) = \int \int_{X^\wedge \times Y^\wedge} |x - y|^{-p} dx dy$$

which is comparable to (34) for  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\Gamma^+$ :

$$(36) \quad T(X, Y) \leq S(X, Y) \leq (\pi/2)^p T(X, Y) \quad (X, Y \subset \Gamma^+).$$

To see this relation we observe that

$$S(X, Y) = \int \int_{X \times Y} |\xi - \eta|^{-p} ds_\xi ds_\eta = \int \int_{X^\wedge \times Y^\wedge} |e^{ix} - e^{iy}|^{-p} dx dy.$$

Replacing  $|e^{ix} - e^{iy}|$  in the above by  $|x - y|$  or  $(2/\pi)|x - y|$  based on the following inequalities

$$(2/\pi)|x - y| \leq |e^{ix} - e^{iy}| \leq |x - y| \quad (x, y \in [0, \pi]),$$

we deduce the required inequalities (36).

We choose arbitrary open or closed arcs  $I$  and  $J$  in  $\Gamma^+$  such that  $(\text{int } I) \cap (\text{int } J) = \emptyset$  where  $\text{int } I$  is the interior of  $I$  considered in  $\Gamma$ . We denote by  $|I|$  the length of the arc  $I$ . Let  $\rho = \rho(I, J)$  be the distance between  $I$  and  $J$  considered in the Riemannian metric in  $\Gamma$ . We then deduce the following fundamental relation:

**37. IDENTITY.** *The auxiliary set function  $T(I, J)$  is given by*

$$T(I, J) = C_p \{ (|I| + \rho)^{2-p} + (|J| + \rho)^{2-p} - (|I| + |J| + \rho)^{2-p} - \rho^{2-p} \}$$

( $1 < p < 2$ ) where  $C_p = 1/(p - 1)(2 - p)$ .

*Proof.* Let the closures of intervals  $I^\wedge$  and  $J^\wedge$  be  $[a, b]$  and  $[c, d]$ , respectively. Since  $T(I, J) = T(J, I)$ , we may assume that  $0 \leq a < b \leq c < d \leq \pi$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} T(I, J) &= \int \int_{I^\wedge \times J^\wedge} |x - y|^{-p} dx dy = \int_a^b \left( \int_c^d (y - x)^{-p} dy \right) dx \\ &= (p - 1)^{-1} \int_a^b \{ (c - x)^{1-p} - (d - x)^{1-p} \} dx \\ &= \{ (p - 1)(2 - p) \}^{-1} \cdot \{ (c - a)^{2-p} - (c - b)^{2-p} + (d - b)^{2-p} - (d - a)^{2-p} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $c - a = |I| + \rho$ ,  $d - b = |J| + \rho$ ,  $d - a = |I| + |J| + \rho$  and  $c - b = \rho$ , we deduce the identity 37. □

For an arbitrary open or closed arc  $I$  in  $\Gamma$  we denote by  $I^c$  the complement of  $I$  with respect to  $\Gamma$  so that  $I^c = \Gamma \setminus I$ . Then we have the following relation:

**38. ESTIMATE.**  $S(I, I^c) \leq (2^{p-1} + 3^{p-1}C_p)\pi^p |I|^{2-p} \quad (1 < p < 2).$

*Proof.* Let  $I = \cup_{j=1}^6 I_j$  be the decomposition of  $I$  into 6 arcs  $I_j$  such that  $(\text{int } I_j) \cap (\text{int } I_k) = \emptyset$  and  $|I_j| = |I_k|$  for  $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, 6$  with  $j \neq k$ . Take the arc  $J$  in  $\Gamma^+$  such that the midpoint of  $J$  is  $i = (0, 1)$  and  $|J| = |I_j| = |I|/6$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ . We denote by  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  the two arcs which are components of  $\Gamma^+ \setminus J$  and set  $J_3 = \Gamma^- = \{e^{i\theta} : \pi \leq \theta \leq 2\pi\}$ . We estimate  $S(I, I^c)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(I, I^c) &= S\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^6 I_j, I^c\right) = \sum_{j=1}^6 S(I_j, I^c) \leq \sum_{j=1}^6 S(I_j, I_j^c) \\
 &= 6S(J, J^c) = 6S\left(J, \bigcup_{j=1}^3 J_j\right) = 6 \sum_{j=1}^3 S(J, J_j).
 \end{aligned}$$

By (36) and (37) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(J, J_j) &\leq (\pi/2)^b T(J, J_j) \\
 &= (\pi/2)^b C_p \{|J|^{2-b} + |J_j|^{2-b} - (|J| + |J_j|)^{2-b}\} \\
 &\leq (\pi/2)^b C_p |J|^{2-b} \quad (j = 1, 2)
 \end{aligned}$$

because  $\rho(J, J_j) = 0$ . Since  $J^\wedge \subset [\pi/3, 2\pi/3]$  and  $J_3 = \Gamma^-$ , we see that  $|e^{ix} - e^{iy}| \geq 1$  for  $e^{ix} \in J$  and  $e^{iy} \in J_3$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(J, J_3) &= \int \int_{J^\wedge \times J_3^\wedge} |e^{ix} - e^{iy}|^{-b} dx dy \leq \int \int_{J^\wedge \times J_3^\wedge} dx dy \\
 &= |J| |J_3| = \pi |J| \leq \pi(\pi/3)^{b-1} |J|^{2-b}
 \end{aligned}$$

in view of  $|J| \leq \pi/3$ . Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(I, I^c) &\leq 6\{2(\pi/2)^b C_p |J|^{2-b} + (\pi^b/3^{b-1}) |J|^{2-b}\} \\
 &= 6\pi^b (2^{1-b} C_p + 3^{1-b}) |J|^{2-b} = 6\pi^b (2^{1-b} C_p + 3^{1-b}) (|I|/6)^{2-b} \\
 &= 6^{b-1} (2^{1-b} C_p + 3^{1-b}) \pi^b |I|^{2-b} = (2^{b-1} + 3^{b-1} C_p) \pi^b |I|^{2-b}. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

For any set  $E$  in  $\Gamma$  we denote by  $1_E$  the characteristic function of  $E$  on  $\Gamma$  so that  $1_E(\xi) = 1$  for  $\xi \in E$  and  $1_E(\xi) = 0$  for  $\xi \in \Gamma \setminus E$ . We then have

**39. PROPOSITION.** *For any exponent  $p \in (1, 2)$  there exists a positive constant  $C$  depending only on  $p$  such that*

$$(40) \quad \|1_I; A_p(\Gamma)\| \leq |I|^{1/p} + C |I|^{(2-p)/p}$$

for every open or closed subarc  $I$  of  $\Gamma$ .

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|1_I; A_p(\Gamma)\| &= \|1_I; L_p(\Gamma)\| + \left(\int \int_{\Gamma \times \Gamma} \frac{|1_I(\xi) - 1_I(\eta)|^p}{|\xi - \eta|^p} ds_\xi ds_\eta\right)^{1/p} \\
 &= |I|^{1/p} + (S(I, I^c) + S(I^c, I))^{1/p}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By the estimate 38 we see that

$$\|1_I; A_p(I)\| \leq |I|^{1/p} + \{2(2^{p-1} + 3^{p-1}C_p)\pi^p\}^{1/p} |I|^{(2-p)/p}.$$

Hence it suffices to choose  $C = \{2(2^{p-1} + 3^{p-1}C_p)\}^{1/p}\pi$ . □

**41.  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measures of boundary sets**

In this section we assume that  $1 < p < 2$  and study the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  of the boundary set

$$A = A((a_n), (b_n)) = \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n$$

where  $A_n = \{e^{i\theta} : a_n < \theta < b_n\}$  ( $1 \leq n < N + 1; N \leq \infty$ ) is introduced in (12). Since 0 is a competing function in the definition (12), we see that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \geq 0$  on  $\Delta$ . Since any competing function  $h$  in (12) satisfies  $h \leq 1$  on  $\Delta$ , we see that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \leq 1$  on  $\Delta$ . Thus we have

$$(42) \quad 0 \leq \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})(x) \leq 1 \quad (x \in \Delta).$$

As for the boundary behavior of  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  we have the following relation:

$$(43) \quad \begin{cases} \lim_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})(x) = 1 & (\xi \in A), \\ \lim_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi} \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})(x) = 0 & (\xi \in \Gamma \setminus \bar{A}). \end{cases}$$

In fact, suppose first that  $\xi \in A$ . There is a function  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$  such that  $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$  on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ ,  $\varphi(\xi) = 1$  and  $\varphi = 0$  on  $\Gamma \setminus A$ . Since  $\varphi$  belongs to  $C(\bar{\Delta}) \cap W_p^1(\Delta)$ ,  $h = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta \varphi$  is a competing function in (12) and we have

$$h(x) \leq \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})(x) \leq 1 \quad (x \in \Delta).$$

Thus  $h(x) \rightarrow 1$  ( $x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi$ ) implies the first relation in (43). Next we assume  $\xi \in \Gamma \setminus \bar{A}$ . There is a function  $\psi$  in  $C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$  such that  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$  on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ ,  $\psi(\xi) = 1$  and  $\psi = 0$  on  $\bar{A}$ . Then  $\varphi = 1 - \psi$  belongs to  $C(\bar{\Delta}) \cap W_p^1(\Delta)$  and  $g = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta \varphi$  is in  $C(\bar{\Delta}) \cap H_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta)$  such that  $0 \leq g \leq 1$  on  $\bar{\Delta}$ ,  $g(\xi) = 0$  and  $g = 1$  on  $\bar{A}$ . Let  $h$  be any competing function in (12). Since  $h \leq g$  on  $\Gamma$ , the comparison principle (cf. e.g. [2, p. 183]) implies that  $h \leq g$  on  $\Delta$ . Thus

$$0 \leq \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})(x) \leq g(x) \quad (x \in \Delta).$$

That  $g(x) \rightarrow 0$  ( $x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \xi$ ) implies the second relation in (43).

We are now ready to prove the following result announced in the introductory part. Only here we assume that  $1 < p \leq 2$ .

44. PROPOSITION. *The function  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure in the sense of Heins.*

*Proof.* We denote by  $K$  the closure of the set consisting of points  $e^{ia_n}$  and  $e^{ib_n}$  ( $1 \leq n < N + 1; N \leq \infty$ ). We can find a sequence  $(K_m)_{1 \leq m < \infty}$  of unions  $K_m$  of a finite number of mutually disjoint closed discs such that

$$K_m \supset K_{m+1} \supset K \quad (m = 1, 2, \dots)$$

and

$$\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} K_m = K.$$

Choose an  $R \in (1, \infty)$  such that  $K_1 \subset G := \Delta(0, R)$ . We can find an  $f_m$  in  $C(\bar{G}) \cap W_p^1(G)$  such that  $f_m|_{K_m} = 1$  and  $f_m|_{\partial G} = 0$  for each  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ . Moreover, by the lattice property of  $C(\bar{G}) \cap W_p^1(G)$ , we can assume that  $0 \leq f_{m+1} \leq f_m \leq 1$  on  $\bar{G}$  ( $m = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Since  $G \setminus K_m$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -regular, the function  $w_m$  defined by

$$w_m(x) := \begin{cases} (\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^{G \setminus K_m} f_m)(x) & (x \in G \setminus K_m), \\ f_m(x) & (x \in K_m \cup \partial G) \end{cases}$$

for each  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  belongs to  $C(\bar{G}) \cap H_{\mathcal{A}}(G \setminus K_m) \cap W_p^1(G)$ , and satisfies  $w_m|_{K_m} = 1$  and  $w_m|_{\partial G} = 0$ . The sequence  $(w_m)_{1 \leq m < \infty}$  is decreasing along with  $(f_m)_{1 \leq m < \infty}$ . By the Harnack principle (cf. e.g. [2, p. 113]),  $w = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} w_m$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic on  $G \setminus K$ . Clearly  $w \in C(\bar{G} \setminus K)$  and  $w|_{\partial G} = 0$ .

Consider the  $p$ -capacity  $\text{cap}_p(K_m, G)$  of the condenser  $(K_m, G)$  given by

$$\text{cap}_p(K_m, G) = \inf \int_{G \setminus K_m} |\nabla \varphi(x)|^p dx$$

where the infimum is taken with respect to  $\varphi$  in  $C_0^\infty(G)$  with  $\varphi \geq 1$  on  $K_m$ . The  $p$ -capacity  $\text{cap}_p(K, G)$  is similarly defined. It is a fundamental property of the  $p$ -capacity (cf. e.g. [2, Chap. 2, in particular, p. 28]) that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{cap}_p(K_m, G) = \text{cap}_p(K, G)$$

since  $K_m$  and  $K$  are compact and  $K_m \downarrow K$ . Note that

$$K = \{e^{ia_n}\}_{1 \leq n < N+1} \cup \{e^{ib_n}\}_{1 \leq n < N+1} \cup X$$

where  $X$  consists of only one point  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{ia_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{ib_n}$  if  $N = \infty$  and  $X = \emptyset$  if  $N < \infty$ . By the subadditivity of the  $p$ -capacity and the vanishingness of the  $p$ -capacity for one point we see that

$$\text{cap}_p(K, G) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \{ \text{cap}_p(\{e^{ia_n}\}, G) + \text{cap}_p(\{e^{ib_n}\}, G) \} + \text{cap}_p(X, G) = 0$$

and therefore we conclude that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{cap}_p(K_m, G) = 0.$$

For any competing function  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(G)$  with  $\varphi \geq 1$  on  $K_m$  for the  $p$ -capacity  $\text{cap}_p(K_m, G)$  we set  $\varphi_m = \max(\min(\varphi, 1), 0)$ . Clearly

$$w_m = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^{G \setminus K_m} f_m = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^{G \setminus K_m} \varphi_m.$$

By (30) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G |\nabla w_m(x)|^p dx &= \int_{G \setminus K_m} |\nabla w_m(x)|^p dx \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^p \int_{G \setminus K_m} |\nabla \varphi_m(x)|^p dx \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^p \int_{G \setminus K_m} |\nabla \varphi(x)|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\int_G |\nabla w_m(x)|^p dx \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^p \text{cap}_p(K_m, G) \rightarrow 0 \quad (m \rightarrow \infty)$$

and therefore we can conclude that  $\{\nabla w_m\}_{1 \leq m < \infty}$  converges to zero strongly in  $L_p(G, \mathbf{R}^2)$  and hence converges to zero weakly in  $L_p(G, \mathbf{R}^2)$ . As the locally uniform limit of the decreasing sequence  $\{w_m\}$  with  $0 \leq w_m \leq 1$ , the function  $w$  is bounded and continuous on  $G \setminus K$ . Hence we may view that  $w \in L_p(G, \mathbf{R})$ . Thus, by  $w_m \downarrow w$  a.e. on  $G$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G \nabla w(x) \cdot \Phi(x) dx &= - \int_G w(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) dx \\ &= - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_G w_m(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) dx = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_G \nabla w_m(x) \cdot \Phi(x) dx = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for every  $C^\infty$  vector field  $\Phi$  on  $G$  with compact support. This means that  $\nabla w(x) = 0$  on  $G$  and thus  $w$  is a constant on  $G$ . Hence  $w|_{\partial G} = 0$  implies that

$$(45) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} w_m(x) = 0 \quad (x \in G \setminus K).$$

It is clear that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \geq 0$  and  $1 - \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \geq 0$  on  $\Delta$ . Take any  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic function  $h$  on  $\Delta$  such that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \geq h$  and  $1 - \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \geq h$  on  $\Delta$ . By (43) we see that

$$\limsup_{x \in \Delta, x \rightarrow \eta} h(x) \leq 0 \quad (\eta \in \Gamma \setminus K).$$

It is clear that  $h \leq 1$  and  $w_m \geq 0$  on  $\Delta$ . Hence we see that

$$\limsup_{x \in \Delta \setminus K_m, x \rightarrow \eta} h(x) \leq \limsup_{x \in \Delta \setminus K_m, x \rightarrow \eta} w_m(x) = \lim_{x \in \Delta \setminus K_m, x \rightarrow \eta} w_m(x)$$

for every  $\eta$  in  $\partial(\Delta \setminus K_m)$ . By the comparison principle (cf. e.g. [2, p.183]) we have  $h \leq w_m$  on  $\Delta \setminus K_m$ . On letting  $m \uparrow \infty$ , (45) yields  $h \leq 0$  on  $\Delta$ . This proves the existence of the greatest  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic minorant  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \wedge (1 - \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}))$  of  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  and  $1 - \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  on  $\Delta$  and therefore we have

$$\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \wedge (1 - \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})) = 0$$

which is the defining property of  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure on  $\Delta$  in the sense of Heins. □

We next study the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  when  $N < \infty$  so that  $A$  is the union of a finite number  $N$  of open arcs  $A_n : A = \cup_{n=1}^N A_n$  ( $N < \infty$ ). Let  $X = \cup_{n=1}^N X_n$  and  $Y = \cup_{n=1}^N Y_n$  where  $X_n$  and  $Y_n$  are open arcs in  $\Gamma$  such that  $\bar{X}_n \subset A_n \subset \bar{A}_n \subset Y_n \subset \bar{Y}_n \subset \Gamma^+$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ) and  $\bar{Y}_n \cap \bar{Y}_m = \emptyset$  ( $n \neq m$ ). Such an  $X$  will be referred to as being *admissible* for  $A$ . In view of Proposition 39 we see that

$$\|1_X; A_p(\Gamma)\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \|1_{X_n}; A_p(\Gamma)\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^N (|X_n|^{1/p} + C|X_n|^{(2-p)/p})$$

so that we have

$$(46) \quad \|1_X; A_p(\Gamma)\| \leq C_N \text{ and similarly } \|1_Y; A_p(\Gamma)\|, \|1_A; A_p(\Gamma)\| \leq C_N$$

where  $C_N = N(\pi^{1/p} + C\pi^{(2-p)/p})$  is a constant depending only on  $N$  (and  $p$ ). Therefore we can define  $w_X = \tau 1_X$  and  $w_Y = \tau 1_Y$ . By Lemma 32, (43) and the comparison principle, we deduce

$$(47) \quad w_X(x) \leq \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})(x) \leq w_Y(x) \quad (x \in \Delta).$$

By the comparison principle and the Harnack principle

$$\underline{w}_A = \lim_{X \uparrow A} w_X \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}_A = \lim_{Y \downarrow A} w_Y$$

are well defined and  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic on  $\Delta$ . Similarly, (46) assures the possibility of defining  $w_A = \tau 1_A$ . We will show that

$$(48) \quad \underline{w}_A(x) = \bar{w}_A(x) = w_A(x) \quad (x \in \Delta).$$

This with (47) implies that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) = w_A$  on  $\Delta$ . Thus we can conclude the following result.

**49. PROPOSITION.** *If  $N < \infty$  and  $1 < p < 2$ , then  $1_A \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite on  $\Delta$ , and the trace  $\gamma(\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})) = 1_A$  on  $\Gamma$ .*

*Proof.* We only have to show the relation (48). By (26) and (46) we see that

$$\inf_{\gamma f = 1_X} \|\nabla f; L_p(\Delta)\| \leq \inf_{\gamma f = 1_X} \|f; W_p^1(\Delta)\| \leq C \|1_X; \Lambda_p(\Gamma)\| \leq CC_N.$$

By the quasi Dirichlet principle (30),

$$\|\nabla w_X; L_p(\Delta)\| \leq (\beta/\alpha) \|\nabla f; L_p(\Delta)\|$$

for any  $f$  with  $\gamma f = 1_X$  since  $\pi f = w_X$ . Hence we see that

$$\|\nabla w_X; L_p(\Delta)\| \leq C$$

where we denote by  $C$  the constant  $(\beta/\alpha)CC_N$ . Any bounded set in the reflexive Banach space  $L_p(\Delta) = L_p(\Delta; \mathbf{R}^2)$  is weakly sequentially compact. Therefore we can find a countable sequence  $(X(m))_{1 \leq m < \infty}$  in the set  $\{X\}$  of admissible  $X$  such that  $X(m) \subset X(m + 1)$ ,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} w_{X(m)} = \underline{w}_A$$

locally uniformly on  $\Delta$ , and  $(\nabla w_{X(m)})_{1 \leq m < \infty}$  is weakly convergent in  $L_p(\Delta)$ . Since  $0 \leq \underline{w}_A \leq 1$  on  $\Delta$ ,  $\underline{w}_A$  belongs to  $L_p(\Delta)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta} \underline{w}_A(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) dx &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta} w_{X(m)}(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) dx \\ &= - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta} \nabla w_{X(m)}(x) \cdot \Phi(x) dx = - \int_{\Delta} (\text{weak } \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nabla w_{X(m)}(x)) \cdot \Phi(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

for every  $C^\infty$  vector field  $\Phi$  with compact support in  $\Delta$ . This means that the distributional gradient  $\nabla w_A = \text{weak } \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nabla w_{X(m)} \in L_p(\Delta)$  and therefore  $\underline{w}_A \in W_p^1(\Delta)$ . By (47),  $w_X \leq \underline{w}_A \leq \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  on  $\Delta$  for any admissible  $X$ . By (43) we see that

$$1_X \leq \gamma w_A \leq 1_A$$

a.e. on  $\Gamma$  for any admissible  $X$ . A fortiori we can conclude that  $\gamma w_A = 1_A$  in  $L_p(\Gamma)$ . Hence  $\gamma \underline{w}_A = \gamma w_A = 1_A$  implies that  $\underline{w}_A = w_A = \tau 1_A$ . Similarly we can show that  $\bar{w}_A = w_A = \tau 1_A$ . The proof of (48) and hence that of Proposition 49 is thus complete. □

We turn to the study of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  when  $N = \infty$  so that  $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n$ . We will base our reasoning upon the fact that  $1_{\bigcup_{n=1}^k A_n}$  always belongs to  $\Lambda_p(\Gamma)$  for every  $k < \infty$  as was shown in Proposition 49. However  $1_A = 1_{\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n}$  may or may not belong to  $\Lambda_p(\Gamma)$  in general.

**50. PROPOSITION.** *Suppose  $N = \infty$  and  $1 < p < 2$ . The  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic measure  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite on  $\Delta$  if and only if  $1_A \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$  and in this case the trace  $\gamma(\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})) = 1_A$  on  $\Gamma$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite so that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  belongs to  $W_p^1(\Delta)$ . Then by (43) and (23) we see that  $\gamma(\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})) = 1_A$  on  $\Gamma$  except for the boundary of  $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty (A_n \cup B_n)$  relative to  $\Gamma$  and hence a.e. on  $\Gamma$ . Therefore  $1_A$  belongs to  $\Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ .

Conversely assume that  $1_A \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . Then we can define  $w_A = \tau 1_A$  so that  $D_p(w_A) = \|\nabla w_A; L_p(\Delta)\|^p < \infty$ . Let  $a = \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} a_k$  which belongs to  $(0, \pi]$ . Set

$$r_k = |e^{ia_{k+1}} - e^{ia}| \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots)$$

and choose a function  $\chi_k$  on  $\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, 3) = \overline{\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)}$  such that  $\chi_k$  is continuous on  $\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, 3)$ ,  $p$ -harmonic on  $\Delta(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k)$ ,  $\chi_k|_{\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k)} = 0$  and  $\chi_k|_{\partial\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)} = 1$ . Choose an arbitrary  $\varphi$  in  $C_0^\infty(\Delta(e^{ia}, 3))$  with  $\varphi \geq 1$  on  $\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k)$  and set  $\psi = \max(\min(\varphi, 1), 0)$ . Observe that

$$1 - \chi_k = \pi_p^{\Delta(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k)} \psi$$

on  $\Delta(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k)$  where  $\pi_p = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}$  with  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = |h|^{p-2}h$ . The quasi Dirichlet principle (30) is nothing but the Dirichlet principle in this case of  $\alpha = \beta = 1$  for  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = |h|^{p-2}h$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(1 - \chi_k); L_p(\Delta(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k))\| &\leq \|\nabla\psi; L_p(\Delta(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k))\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla\varphi; L_p(\Delta(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k))\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\text{cap}_p(\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k), \Delta(e^{ia}, 3))$  is the infimum of  $\|\nabla\varphi; L_p(\Delta(e^{ia}, 3))\|^p$  for every  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Delta(e^{ie}, 3))$  with  $\varphi \geq 1$  on  $\bar{\Delta}(e^{ie}, r_k)$ , we see that

$$\|\nabla\chi_k; L_p(\Delta(e^{ia}, 3))\|^p \leq \text{cap}_p(\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k), \Delta(e^{ia}, 3))$$

(and actually we can replace  $\leq$  by  $=$  in the above). Note that  $\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k)$  and  $\{e^{ia}\}$  are compact and  $\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k) \downarrow \{e^{ia}\}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . This assures that

$$\text{cap}_p(\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, r_k), \Delta(e^{ia}, 3)) \downarrow \text{cap}_p(\{e^{ia}\}, \Delta(e^{ia}, 3)) \quad (k \uparrow \infty).$$

Since  $\text{cap}_p(\{e^{ia}\}, \Delta(e^{ia}, 3)) = 0$  (cf. e.g. [2, p. 35]), we see that

$$\lim_{k \uparrow \infty} \int_{\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)} |\nabla\chi_k(x)|^p dx = 0.$$

By the comparison principle and the Harnack principle, we see that  $(\chi_k)_{1 \leq k < \infty}$  is increasing and converges to a  $p$ -harmonic function  $\chi$  locally uniformly on  $\Delta(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \{e^{ia}\}$ . Here  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ ,  $\chi \in C(\bar{\Delta}(e^{ia}, 3) \setminus \{e^{ia}\})$  and  $\chi|_{\partial\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)} = 1$ , and in particular  $\chi \in L_p(\Delta(e^{ia}, 3))$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)} \chi(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)} \chi_k(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) dx \\ &= - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)} \nabla\chi_k(x) \cdot \Phi(x) dx = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for every  $C^\infty$  vector field  $\Phi$  with compact support in  $\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)$ . This proves that  $\nabla\chi = 0$  on  $\Delta(e^{ia}, 3)$ . Thus  $\chi$  is a constant, which must be 1. Therefore we see in particular that  $\chi_k \uparrow 1$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ) locally uniformly on  $\bar{\Delta} \setminus \{e^{ia}\}$  and  $D_p(\chi_k) = \|\nabla\chi_k; L_p(\Delta)\|^p \downarrow 0$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ).

Next we consider the sequence  $(\chi_k w_A)_{1 \leq k < \infty}$  in  $\Delta$ . Clearly we see that  $\chi_k w_A \uparrow w_A$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ) locally uniformly on  $\Delta$ . We also have that  $D_p(\chi_k w_A - w_A) \rightarrow 0$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ). In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} &D_p(\chi_k w_A - w_A)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{\Delta} |\chi_k(x) - 1|^p |\nabla w_A(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} + \left( \int_{\Delta} |w_A(x)|^p |\nabla\chi_k(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{\Delta} |\chi_k(x) - 1|^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} + \left( \int_{\Delta} |\nabla\chi_k(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $d\mu(x) = |\nabla w_A(x)|^p dx$  is a finite measure on  $\Delta$ . The second term of the rightmost side of the above is  $D_p(\chi_k) \downarrow 0$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ). The first term of the rightmost side of the above tends to zero as  $k \uparrow \infty$  by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem since  $\chi_k \uparrow 1$  on  $\Delta$  as  $k \uparrow \infty$ .

We now set

$$u_k = \pi_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta(\chi_k w_A) = \tau_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta((\gamma\chi_k)1_A) \leq w_A$$

on  $\Delta$ . The last inequality comes from the monotoneity of  $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta$  and  $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}^\Delta$ . By the same reason,  $(u_k)_{1 \leq k < \infty}$  is increasing on  $\Delta$ . By the Harnack principle there exists an  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonic function  $u$  on  $\Delta$  such that  $u_k \uparrow u \leq w_A$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ) on  $\Delta$ . By the quasi Dirichlet principle

$$D_p(u_k) \leq (\beta/\alpha)^p D_p(\chi_k w_A) \rightarrow (\beta/\alpha)^p D_p(w_A) \quad (k \uparrow \infty).$$

Hence  $(\nabla u_k)_{1 \leq k < \infty}$  is a bounded sequence in  $L_p(\Delta)$  and we can extract a weakly convergent subsequence  $(\nabla u_{k'})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta} u(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) dx &= \lim_{k' \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta} u_{k'}(x) \nabla \cdot \Phi(x) dx \\ &= - \lim_{k' \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta} \nabla u_{k'}(x) \cdot \Phi(x) dx = - \int_{\Delta} (\text{weak lim}_{k' \rightarrow \infty} \nabla u_{k'}(x)) \cdot \Phi(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

for every  $C^\infty$  vector field  $\Phi$  with compact support in  $\Delta$ , which proves that the distributional  $\nabla u = \text{weak lim}_{k' \uparrow \infty} \nabla u_{k'}$  belongs to  $L_p(\Delta)$ . Hence  $D_p(u) < \infty$  and  $u \in W_p^1(\Delta)$ . Therefore  $\gamma u_k \leq \gamma u \leq \gamma w_A$  or  $(\gamma \chi_k) 1_A \leq \gamma u \leq 1_A$  a.e. on  $\Gamma$ . Since  $\chi_k \uparrow 1$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ) locally uniformly on  $\bar{\Delta} \setminus \{e^{i\alpha}\}$  and thus  $\gamma \chi_k \uparrow 1$  ( $k \uparrow \infty$ ) a.e. on  $\Gamma$ , we see that  $\gamma u = 1_A$  so that  $u = w_A$ , i.e.  $\lim_{k \uparrow \infty} u_k = w_A$  on  $\Delta$ .

Observe that

$$(\gamma \chi_k) 1_{\cup_{n=1}^k A_n} \leq 1_A$$

so that we have  $u_k \leq w_{\cup_{n=1}^k A_n} \leq w_A$  on  $\Delta$ . By Proposition 49 we have

$$\omega(\cup_{n=1}^k A_n, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) = w_{\cup_{n=1}^k A_n}$$

on  $\Delta$ . Hence we have

$$u_k \leq \omega(\cup_{n=1}^k A_n, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) \leq w_A$$

on  $\Delta$  and by letting  $k \uparrow \infty$  we conclude that

$$\lim_{k \uparrow \infty} \omega(\cup_{n=1}^k A_n, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) = w_A$$

on  $\Delta$ . Since  $O_k = \cup_{n=1}^k A_n$  is open in  $\Gamma$ ,  $O_k \subset O_{k+1}$  and

$$O = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty O_k = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n = A$$

is again open, we can show (cf. e.g. [2, p. 29]) that

$$\lim_{k \uparrow \infty} \omega(\bigcup_{n=1}^k A_n, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) = \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} \omega(O_k, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) = \omega(O, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) = \omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}).$$

Thus  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A}) = w_A = \tau 1_A$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite and  $\gamma(\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})) = 1_A \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . □

**51. Proof of Main theorem**

If  $N < \infty$ , then, by Proposition 49,  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite on  $\Delta$ . Hence, hereafter in this proof, we assume that  $N = \infty$  so that  $A = A((a_n), (b_n)) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . Let

$$B_0 = \overline{\Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n \cup B_n)}$$

and set  $B = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n$ .

We now start the essential part of this proof by showing that (15) implies the  $p$ -Dirichlet finiteness of  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  on  $\Delta$ . Suppose first that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |B_n|^{2-p} < \infty$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|1_A; \Lambda_p(\Gamma)\| &= \|1_A; L_p(\Gamma)\| + \left( \int \int_{\Gamma \times \Gamma} \frac{|1_A(\xi) - 1_A(\eta)|^p}{|\xi - \eta|^p} ds_{\xi} ds_{\eta} \right)^{1/p} \\ &= |A|^{1/p} + (2S(A^c, A))^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

By the estimate 38,  $S(B_n, B_n^c) \leq C |B_n|^{2-p}$  where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(A^c, A) &= S(\bar{A}^c, A) = S\left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n, A\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S(B_n, A) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S(B_n, B_n^c) \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |B_n|^{2-p} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we see that  $1_A \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . Next suppose that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |A_n|^{2-p} < \infty$ . In the same fashion as above simply replacing the role of  $A$  and  $(A_n)_1^{\infty}$  by  $B$  and  $(B_n)_0^{\infty}$ , we see that  $1_B \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . Clearly

$$1_A = 1 - 1_{A^c} = 1 - 1_{\bar{B}} = 1 - 1_B$$

a.e. on  $\Gamma$  and thus  $1_A \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . Hence in any case the condition (15) implies that  $1_A \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ . By Proposition 50 we can conclude that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite.

We close this proof by showing that (16) implies that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet infinite. We prove this by contradiction. Suppose, contrary to the

assertion, that  $\omega(A, \Delta; \mathcal{A})$  is  $p$ -Dirichlet finite. By Proposition 50 we must have  $1_A \in A_p(\Gamma)$ . Since  $A_n$  and  $B_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) are in  $\Gamma^+$ , (36) implies that

$$T(A_n, B_n) \leq S(A_n, B_n) \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Therefore we deduce that, for any fixed positive integer  $k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^k T(A_n, B_n) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^k S(A_n, B_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^k \left( \sum_{m=1}^k S(A_n, B_m) \right) \\ &= S\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^k A_n, \bigcup_{m=1}^k B_m\right) \leq 2S\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n, \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} B_m\right) = 2S(A, (\bar{A})^c) \\ &= 2S(A, A^c) = \int \int_{\Gamma \times \Gamma} \frac{|1_A(\xi) - 1_A(\eta)|^p}{|\xi - \eta|^p} ds_\xi ds_\eta \leq \|1_A; A_p(\Gamma)\|^p. \end{aligned}$$

On letting  $k \uparrow \infty$ , we obtain

$$(52) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} T(A_n, B_n) \leq \|1_A; A_p(\Gamma)\|^p.$$

By the identity 37 we have

$$T(A_n, B_n) = C_p(|A_n|^{2-p} + |B_n|^{2-p} - (|A_n| + |B_n|)^{2-p}).$$

Here we used the fact that the Riemannian distance  $\rho = \rho(A_n, B_n) = 0$  considered in  $\Gamma$  since  $\bar{A}_n \cap \bar{B}_n = \{e^{ib_n}\} \neq \emptyset$ .

We pause here to observe the validity of the following simple and elementary inequality for  $1 < p < 2$ :

$$(53) \quad x^{2-p} + y^{2-p} - (x + y)^{2-p} \geq a^{2-p} + b^{2-p} - (a + b)^{2-p} \quad (0 \leq a \leq x, 0 \leq b \leq y).$$

In fact, consider  $f_y(x) = x^{2-p} + y^{2-p} - (x + y)^{2-p}$  as a function of  $x \geq 0$  for an arbitrary fixed  $y \geq 0$ . Since

$$\frac{d}{dx} f_y(x) = (2 - p)\{x^{1-p} - (x + y)^{1-p}\} \geq 0 \quad (x > 0),$$

we see that  $f_y(x)$  is increasing and hence  $f_y(x) \geq f_y(a)$  ( $0 \leq a \leq x$ ). By the symmetry  $f_y(a) = f_a(y)$  we also see that  $f_a(y) \geq f_a(b)$  or  $f_y(a) \geq f_b(a)$ . Thus  $f_y(x) \geq f_b(a)$  ( $0 \leq a \leq x, 0 \leq b \leq y$ ) which proves (53).

On setting  $x = |A_n|$ ,  $y = |B_n|$ , and  $a = b = \min(|A_n|, |B_n|)$  in (53), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|A_n|^{2-p} + |B_n|^{2-p} - (|A_n| + |B_n|)^{2-p} \\ &\geq 2(\min(|A_n|, |B_n|))^{2-p} - (2\min(|A_n|, |B_n|))^{2-p}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the left hand side of the above is  $C_p^{-1}T(A_n, B_n)$ , we have

$$C_p C \cdot \min(|A_n|^{2-p}, |B_n|^{2-p}) \leq T(A_n, B_n)$$

where  $C = 2 - 2^{2-p} \in (0, 1)$ . Hence by (52) and (16)

$$\infty = C_p C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \min(|A_n|^{2-p}, |B_n|^{2-p}) \leq \|1_A; A_p(\Gamma)\| < \infty,$$

which is clearly a contradiction. □

**54. Appendix: Nonlinearity of  $\mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^2)$**

The  $p$ -Laplace operator  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = |h|^{p-2}h$  is a typical example of  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{R}^d)$  which makes the equation (6) nonlinear if  $p \neq 2$ . However it is important to recognize that  $\mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  contains an  $\mathcal{A}$  which produces a genuinely nonlinear equation (6) as was pointed out e.g. by Martio in [4]. Even in the borderline conformal case  $p = d = 2$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -harmonicity in general belongs in essence to the category of nonlinearity. In this appendix we will exhibit such an  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  for every dimension  $d \geq 2$ . The author owes a lot to Professor Masaru Hara in constructing this example.

As a required  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  we only have to take the one of the form  $\mathcal{A}(x, h) = A(h)$  independent of  $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$  such that  $A = A_d : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^d$  ( $d \geq 2$ ) is nonlinear.

Consider a closed surface  $\Sigma$  in  $\mathbf{R}^d$  ( $d \geq 2$ ) which is star-shaped and symmetric with respect to the origin 0 of  $\mathbf{R}^d$  belonging to the region bounded by  $\Sigma$ . In terms of the polar coordinate expression  $x = r\omega$  of  $x \in \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$  with  $r = |x|$  and  $\omega = x/|x| \in \partial B^d$ , since  $\Sigma$  is star-shaped with respect to 0, we have the polar coordinate expression of  $\Sigma$  as follows:

$$\Sigma : r = g(\omega) \quad (\omega \in \partial B^d).$$

By the symmetry of  $\Sigma$  with respect to 0 we see that  $g(-\omega) = g(\omega)$  for every  $\omega \in \partial B^d$ . Since the origin 0 is contained in the interior region bounded by  $\Sigma$ , we have

$$c_\Sigma := \inf\{g(\omega) : \omega \in \partial B^d\} > 0.$$

We then set

$$C_\Sigma := \sup\left(\frac{|g(\omega) - g(\bar{\omega})|}{|\omega - \bar{\omega}|} : \omega, \bar{\omega} \in \partial B^d, \omega \neq \bar{\omega}\right)$$

which lies in  $(0, \infty]$  at the moment. As a candidate of the required  $A$  we now set

$$A(h) = \begin{cases} g(h/|h|)h & (h \neq 0), \\ 0 & (h = 0). \end{cases}$$

Then we have the following

**55. FACT.** *If the condition  $C_\Sigma < \sqrt{2} c_\Sigma$  is satisfied, then  $A$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  ( $d \geq 2$ ) and moreover  $A$  is not linear if and only if  $\Sigma$  is not a sphere with center 0.*

*Proof.* The continuity of  $A(h)$  at  $h \in \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$  follows from that of  $g$ . Since  $|A(h)| \leq (\sup_{\partial B^d} g) |h|$  and  $A(0) = 0$ ,  $A(h)$  is continuous at  $h = 0$ . Thus  $A$  satisfies (1). Observe that

$$A(h) \cdot h = g(h/|h|)h \cdot h \geq c_\Sigma |h|^2 \quad (h \neq 0)$$

which shows the validity of (2) for  $p = 2$  by taking  $\alpha = c_\Sigma$ . Similarly

$$|A(h)| = |g(h/|h|)| |h| \leq (\sup_{\partial B^d} g) |h|^{2-1} \quad (h \neq 0)$$

which assures (3) for  $p = 2$  by taking  $\beta = \sup_{\partial B^d} g$ . In passing we observe that  $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < \infty$ . Next we ascertain that (5) is valid for  $p = 2$ . If  $\lambda > 0$ , then

$$A(\lambda h) = g(\lambda h/|\lambda h|)\lambda h = \lambda A(h) \quad (h \neq 0).$$

If  $\lambda < 0$ , then, by  $\lambda = -|\lambda|$  and  $g(-\omega) = g(\omega)$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} A(\lambda h) &= A(|\lambda|(-h)) = |\lambda|A(-h) = |\lambda|g(-h/|-h|)(-h) \\ &= -|\lambda|g(h/|h|)h = \lambda A(h) \quad (h \neq 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the proof of (4) only is nontrivial. We need to show that

$$(56) \quad (A(h) - A(\bar{h})) \cdot (h - \bar{h}) > 0 \quad (h \neq \bar{h}).$$

When one of  $h$  and  $\bar{h}$  is 0, the other is nonzero and a fortiori (2) and  $A(0) = 0$  trivially imply (56). Thus we assume that both of  $h$  and  $\bar{h}$  are not 0. We can moreover assume that  $|\bar{h}| = 1$  so that we may set  $h = r\omega$  ( $r = |h|$ ,  $\omega \in \partial B^d$ ),  $\bar{h} = \bar{\omega}$  ( $\bar{\omega} \in \partial B^d$ ) and

$$\omega \cdot \bar{\omega} = \cos \theta \quad (\theta \in [0, \pi]).$$

Then  $h \neq \bar{h}$  is equivalent to either  $r \neq 1$  or  $\omega \neq \bar{\omega}$  (or  $\theta \neq 0$ ). Hence (56) is equivalent to

$$(g(\omega)r\omega - g(\bar{\omega})\bar{\omega}) \cdot (r\omega - \bar{\omega}) > 0 \quad (r \neq 1 \text{ or } \omega \neq \bar{\omega}),$$

which can be restated as

$$(57) \quad Q := g(\omega)r^2 - \{(g(\omega) + g(\bar{\omega}))\cos \theta\}r + g(\bar{\omega}) > 0 \quad (r \neq 1 \text{ or } \theta \neq 0).$$

We thus have to prove (57). If  $\theta = 0$ , then  $\omega = \bar{\omega}$  and  $r \neq 1$  so that

$$Q = g(\omega)(r - 1)^2 > 0$$

and (57) is certainly true. If  $\theta \in [\pi/2, \pi]$ , then  $\cos \theta = -|\cos \theta|$  and hence we have

$$Q = g(\omega)r^2 + \{(g(\omega) + g(\bar{\omega}))|\cos \theta|\}r + g(\bar{\omega}) > 0$$

so that (57) is also true in this case. To prove (57) we thus only have to treat the case  $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$ . Viewing  $Q$  as the quadratic form of  $r$ , it is sufficient to show that the discriminant of  $Q$  is negative:

$$\begin{aligned} & (g(\omega) + g(\bar{\omega}))^2 \cos^2 \theta - 4g(\omega)g(\bar{\omega}) \\ &= (g(\omega) - g(\bar{\omega}))^2 - (g(\omega) + g(\bar{\omega}))^2 \sin^2 \theta < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|\omega - \bar{\omega}|^2 = 4\sin^2(\theta/2) > 0$ , the above inequality is equivalent to

$$(58) \quad D := \frac{(g(\omega) - g(\bar{\omega}))^2}{|\omega - \bar{\omega}|^2} - (g(\omega) + g(\bar{\omega}))^2 \cos^2(\theta/2) < 0 \quad (0 < \theta < \pi/2).$$

By virtue of  $C_\Sigma < \sqrt{2}c_\Sigma$  we see that

$$D \leq C_\Sigma^2 - 4c_\Sigma^2 \cos^2(\pi/4) = C_\Sigma^2 - 2c_\Sigma^2 < 0,$$

i.e. (58) is valid. Therefore we have shown that  $A \in \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  if  $C_\Sigma < \sqrt{2}c_\Sigma$ .

Clearly  $A$  is linear if  $g$  is constant on  $\partial B^d$  or equivalently  $\Sigma$  is a sphere with center 0. Conversely assume that  $A$  is linear. Fix an arbitrary  $\omega_0 \in \partial B^d$  and take any  $\omega \in \partial B^d$  different from  $\pm \omega_0$ . Then  $A(\omega) + A(\omega_0) = A(\omega + \omega_0)$  or

$$g(\omega)\omega + g(\omega_0)\omega_0 = g((\omega + \omega_0)/|\omega + \omega_0|)(\omega + \omega_0)$$

and the linear independence of  $\{\omega, \omega_0\}$  implies  $g(\omega) = g(\omega_0) = g((\omega + \omega_0)/|\omega + \omega_0|)$  so that  $g \equiv g(\omega_0)$  on  $\partial B^d$ , i.e.  $\Sigma$  is a sphere with center 0. □

**59. EXAMPLE.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a hyperellipsoid

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{(x^i)^2}{(a^i)^2} = 1 \quad (0 < a^1 \leq a^2 \leq \dots \leq a^d).$$

If  $a^d - a^1$  is positive but enough close to zero, e.g. if

$$(60) \quad a^1 < a^d < \sqrt{d/(d-1)} a^1,$$

then  $\Sigma$  induces a nonlinear  $A \in \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  ( $d \geq 2$ ) as in the proof of Fact 55. On the contrary, if  $a^d - a^1$  is sufficiently large, e.g. if  $a^d > 6a^1$ , then  $A \notin \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  ( $d \geq 2$ ).

*Proof.* Assume (60). We express  $\Sigma$  as  $r = g(\omega)$  ( $\omega \in \partial B^d$ ) by the polar coordinate  $(r, \omega)$  :

$$g(\omega) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} ((a^i)^{-2} - (a^d)^{-2})(\omega^i)^2 + (a^d)^{-2} \right)^{-1/2} (\omega = (\omega^1, \dots, \omega^d)).$$

Then clearly we have

$$c_\Sigma = \inf\{g(\omega) : \omega \in \partial B^d\} = a^1 > 0.$$

We see that

$$|\partial g / \partial \omega^i| = ((a^i)^{-2} - (a^d)^{-2}) |\omega^i| g(\omega)^3 \leq ((a^1)^{-2} - (a^d)^{-2})(a^d)^3$$

( $i = 1, \dots, d - 1$ ). Therefore we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} C_\Sigma &\leq \sqrt{d-1}((a^1)^{-2} - (a^d)^{-2})(a^d)^3 = \sqrt{d-1}((a^d)^2 - (a^1)^2)a^d(a^1)^{-2} \\ &< \sqrt{d-1}((d/(d-1))(a^1)^2 - (a^1)^2)\sqrt{d/(d-1)}a^1(a^1)^{-2} \\ &= (\sqrt{d}/(d-1))a^1 \leq \sqrt{2}a^1 = \sqrt{2}c_\Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

by which Fact 55 implies the first assertion.

We proceed to the proof of the second part. Observe that  $A \in \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  implies (58). Set  $\omega = (1/4, 0, \dots, 0, \sqrt{15}/4)$  and

$$\bar{\omega} = (1/4 + \varepsilon, 0, \dots, 0, \sqrt{15}/4 - (\sqrt{15}/2 - \sqrt{15/4 - 4\varepsilon(1/2 + \varepsilon)})/2)$$

for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$  in (58). On letting  $\bar{\omega} \rightarrow \omega$  or equivalently  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  or  $\theta \rightarrow 0$  in (58) with the above choice of  $\omega$  and  $\bar{\omega}$  we deduce

$$\frac{15}{16} (((a^1)^{-2} - (a^d)^{-2})4^{-1}g(\omega)^3)^2 - 4g(\omega)^2 \leq 0.$$

Since  $1 < \sqrt{15} - 2$  and  $\sqrt{15} + 30 < 36$ , we have  $(a^1)^{-2} < 36(a^d)^{-2}$  or  $a^d < 6a^1$ . Hence we must have  $A \notin \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$  if  $a^d > 6a^1$ . □

REFERENCES

[ 1 ] E. Gagliardo, Caratterizzazione delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in  $n$  variabili, Rend. Sem. Mat. Padova. **27** (1957), 284–305.  
 [ 2 ] J. Heinonen, T. Kilpeläinen and O. Martio, Nonlinear Potential Theory of Degenerate Elliptic Equations, Oxford, 1993.

- [ 3 ] M. Heins, On the Lindelöf principle, *Ann. Math.*, **61** (1955), 440–473.
- [ 4 ] O. Martio, Potential theory and quasiconformal mappings, pp. 55–63 in “Potential Theory” (ed. by M. Kishi), de Gruyter, 1992.
- [ 5 ] V. G. Maz’ya, On the continuity at the boundary point of solutions of quasi-linear elliptic equations, *Vestnik Leningrad Univ. Math.*, **3** (1976), 225–242. English translation of *Vestnik Leningrad Univ.*, **25** (1970), 42–55 (Russian).
- [ 6 ] C. Miranda, *Partial Differential Equations of Elliptic Type*, Springer, 1970.
- [ 7 ] S. Mizohata, *The Theory of Partial Differential Equations*, Cambridge, 1973.
- [ 8 ] M. Nakai, Dirichlet finite harmonic measures on Riemann surfaces, *Complex Variables*, **17** (1991), 123–131.
- [ 9 ] ———, Riemannian manifolds with connected Royden harmonic boundaries, *Duke Math. J.*, **67** (1992), 589–625.
- [10] ———, Existence of Dirichlet finite harmonic measures in nonlinear potential theory, *Complex Variables*, **21** (1993), 107–114.
- [11] ———, Existence of Dirichlet finite harmonic measures on Euclidean balls, *Nagoya Math. J.*, **133** (1994), 85–125.
- [12] ———, Flat cone condition for Dirichlet regularity, *NIT Sem. Rep. Math.*, **103** (1993), 1–12.
- [13] M. Ohtsuka, *Extremal Length and Precise Functions* (In preparation).

*Department of Mathematics*  
*Nagoya Institute of Technology*  
*Gokiso, Showa, Nagoya 466*  
*Japan*