

**$C$ -ROBIN FUNCTIONS AND APPLICATIONS**

NORM LEVENBERG\* AND SIONE MA'U

ABSTRACT. We continue the study in [1] in the setting of pluripotential theory arising from polynomials associated to a convex body  $C$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ . Here we discuss  $C$ -Robin functions and their applications. In the particular case where  $C$  is a simplex in  $(\mathbb{R}^+)^2$  with vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(b, 0)$ ,  $(a, 0)$ ,  $a, b > 0$ , we generalize results of T. Bloom to construct families of polynomials which recover the  $C$ -extremal function  $V_{C,K}$  of a nonpluripolar compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ .

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Rumely formula and transfinite diameter	4
3. Other preliminary results: General	6
4. $C$ -Robin function	8
5. Preliminary results: Triangle case	18
6. The integral formula	26
7. $C$ -transfinite diameter and directional Chebyshev constants	30
8. Polynomials approximating $V_{C,K}$	32
9. Further directions	36
References	37

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32U15, 32U20, 32U40.

*Key words and phrases.* convex body,  $C$ -Robin function.

\*Supported by Simons Foundation grant No. 354549.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As in [1], we fix a convex body  $C \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$  and we define the logarithmic indicator function

$$(1.1) \quad H_C(z) := \sup_{J \in C} \log |z^J| := \sup_{(j_1, \dots, j_d) \in C} \log[|z_1|^{j_1} \cdots |z_d|^{j_d}].$$

We assume throughout that

$$(1.2) \quad \Sigma \subset kC \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

where

$$\Sigma := \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \sum_{j=1}^d x_j \leq 1\}.$$

Then

$$H_C(z) \geq \frac{1}{k} \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \log^+ |z_j| = \frac{1}{k} H_\Sigma(z)$$

where  $\log^+ |z_j| = \max[0, \log |z_j|]$ . We define

$$L_C = L_C(\mathbb{C}^d) := \{u \in PSH(\mathbb{C}^d) : u(z) - H_C(z) = O(1), |z| \rightarrow \infty\},$$

and

$$L_{C,+} = L_{C,+}(\mathbb{C}^d) = \{u \in L_C(\mathbb{C}^d) : u(z) \geq H_C(z) + C_u\}$$

where  $PSH(\mathbb{C}^d)$  denotes the class of plurisubharmonic functions on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . These are generalizations of the classical Lelong classes  $L := L_\Sigma$ ,  $L^+ := L_{\Sigma,+}$  when  $C = \Sigma$ . Let  $\mathbb{C}[z]$  denote the polynomials in  $z$  and

$$(1.3) \quad Poly(nC) := \{p \in \mathbb{C}[z] : p(z) = \sum_{\alpha \in nC} a_\alpha z^\alpha\}.$$

For a nonconstant polynomial  $p$  we define

$$(1.4) \quad \deg_C(p) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : p \in Poly(nC)\}.$$

If  $p \in Poly(nC)$ ,  $n \geq 1$  we have  $\frac{1}{n} \log |p| \in L_C$ ; also each  $u \in L_{C,+}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  is locally bounded in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . For  $C = \Sigma$ , we write  $Poly(nC) = \mathcal{P}_n$ .

The  $C$ -extremal function of a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  is defined as the uppersemicontinuous (usc) regularization  $V_{C,K}^*(z) := \limsup_{\zeta \rightarrow z} V_{C,K}(\zeta)$  of

$$V_{C,K}(z) := \sup\{u(z) : u \in L_C, u \leq 0 \text{ on } K\}.$$

If  $K$  is regular ( $V_K := V_{\Sigma,K}$  is continuous), then  $V_{C,K} = V_{C,K}^*$  is continuous (cf., [9]). In particular, for  $K = T^d = \{(z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{C}^d : |z_j| = 1, j = 1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $V_{C,T^d} = V_{C,T^d}^* = H_C$  (cf., (2.7) in [1]). If  $K$  is not

pluripolar, i.e., for any  $u$  psh with  $u = -\infty$  on  $K$  we have  $u \equiv -\infty$ , the Monge-Ampère measure  $(dd^c V_{C,K}^*)^d$  is a positive measure with support in  $K$  and  $V_{C,K}^* = 0$  quasi-everywhere (q.e.) on  $\text{supp}(dd^c V_{C,K}^*)^d$  (i.e., everywhere except perhaps a pluripolar set).

Much of the recent development of this  $C$ -pluripotential theory can be found in [9], [1] and [2]. One noticeable item lacking from these works is a constructive approach to finding natural concrete families of polynomials associated to  $K, C$  which recover  $V_{C,K}$ . In order to do this, following the approach of Tom Bloom in [4] and [5], we introduce a  $C$ -Robin function  $\rho_u$  for a function  $u \in L_C$ . The “usual” Robin function  $\rho_{\mathbf{u}}$  associated to  $u \in L_{\Sigma}$  is defined as

$$(1.5) \quad \rho_{\mathbf{u}}(z) := \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [u(\lambda z) - \log |\lambda|]$$

and this detects the asymptotic behavior of  $u$ . This definition is natural since the “growth function”  $H_{\Sigma}(z) = \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \log^+ |z_j|$  satisfies  $H_{\Sigma}(\lambda z) = H_{\Sigma}(z) + \log |\lambda|$ . Let  $C$  be the triangle in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(b, 0)$ ,  $(0, a)$  where  $a, b$  are relatively prime positive integers. Then

- (1)  $H_C(z_1, z_2) = \max[\log^+ |z_1|^b, \log^+ |z_2|^a]$  (note  $H_C = 0$  on the closure of the unit polydisk  $P^2 := \{(z_1, z_2) : |z_1|, |z_2| < 1\}$ );
- (2) defining  $\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2) := (\lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2)$ , we have

$$H_C(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = H_C(z_1, z_2) + ab \log |\lambda|$$

for  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus P^2$  and  $|\lambda| \geq 1$ .

Given  $u \in L_C(\mathbb{C}^2)$ , we define the  $C$ -Robin function of  $u$  (Definition 4.2) as

$$\rho_u(z_1, z_2) := \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [u(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) - ab \log |\lambda|]$$

for  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . This agrees with (1.5) when  $a = b = 1$ ; i.e., when  $C = \Sigma \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^2$ . For general convex bodies  $C$ , it is unclear how to define an analogue to recover the asymptotic behavior of  $u \in L_C$ .

The next two sections give some general results in  $C$ -pluripotential theory which will be used further on but are of independent interest. Section 4 begins in earnest with the case where  $C$  is a triangle in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . The key results utilized in our analysis are the use of an integral formula of Bedford and Taylor [3], Theorem 6.1 in section 6, yielding the fundamental Corollary 6.4, and recent results on  $C$ -transfinite diameter in [12] and [13] of the second author in section 7. Our arguments in Sections 5 and 8 follow closely those of Bloom in [4] and [5]. The main

theorem, Theorem 8.3, is stated and proved in section 8; then explicit examples of families of polynomials which recover  $V_{C,K}$  are provided. We mention that the results given here for triangles  $C$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(b, 0)$ ,  $(0, a)$  where  $a, b$  are relatively prime positive integers should generalize to the case of a simplex

$$C = \text{co}\{(0, \dots, 0), (a_1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, (0, \dots, 0, a_d)\}$$

in  $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ ,  $d > 2$  where  $a_1, \dots, a_d$  are pairwise relatively prime (cf., Remark 4.5). Section 9 indicates generalizations to weighted situations.

## 2. RUMELY FORMULA AND TRANSFINITE DIAMETER

We recall the definition of  $C$ -transfinite diameter  $\delta_C(K)$  of a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  where  $C$  satisfies (1.2). Letting  $N_n$  be the dimension of  $\text{Poly}(nC)$  in (1.3), we have

$$\text{Poly}(nC) = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{N_n}\}$$

where  $\{e_j(z) := z^{\alpha(j)} = z_1^{\alpha_1(j)} \dots z_d^{\alpha_d(j)}\}_{j=1, \dots, N_n}$  are the standard basis monomials in  $\text{Poly}(nC)$  in any order. For points  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{N_n} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} VDM(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{N_n}) &:= \det[e_i(\zeta_j)]_{i,j=1, \dots, N_n} \\ &= \det \begin{bmatrix} e_1(\zeta_1) & e_1(\zeta_2) & \dots & e_1(\zeta_{N_n}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ e_{N_n}(\zeta_1) & e_{N_n}(\zeta_2) & \dots & e_{N_n}(\zeta_{N_n}) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and for a compact subset  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  let

$$V_n = V_n(K) := \max_{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{N_n} \in K} |VDM(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{N_n})|.$$

Then

$$\delta_C(K) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n^{1/l_n}$$

is the  $C$ -transfinite diameter of  $K$  where  $l_n := \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \deg_C(e_j)$ . The existence of the limit is not obvious but in this setting it is proved in [1]. We return to this issue in section 7.

Next, for  $u, v \in L_{C,+}$ , we define the mutual energy

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{E}(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} (u - v) \sum_{j=0}^d (dd^c u)^j \wedge (dd^c v)^{d-j}.$$

Here  $dd^c = i\partial\bar{\partial}$  and for locally bounded psh functions, e.g., for  $u, v \in L_{C,+}$ , the complex Monge-Ampère operators  $(dd^c u)^j \wedge (dd^c v)^{d-j}$  are

well-defined as positive measures. We have that  $\mathcal{E}$  satisfies the cocycle property; i.e., for  $u, v, w \in L_{C,+}$ , (cf., [1], Proposition 3.3)

$$\mathcal{E}(u, v) + \mathcal{E}(v, w) + \mathcal{E}(w, u) = 0.$$

Connecting these notions, we recall the following formula from [1].

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  be compact and nonpluripolar. Then*

$$\log \delta_C(K) = \frac{-1}{c} \mathcal{E}(V_{C,K}^*, H_C)$$

where  $c$  is a positive constant depending only on  $d$  and  $C$ .

We will use the global domination principle for general  $L_C$  and  $L_{C,+}$  classes associated to convex bodies satisfying (1.2) (cf., [11]):

**Proposition 2.2.** *For  $C \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$  satisfying (1.2), let  $u \in L_C$  and  $v \in L_{C,+}$  with  $u \leq v$  a.e.  $-(dd^c v)^d$ . Then  $u \leq v$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ .*

We use these ingredients to prove the following.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $E \subset F$  be compact and nonpluripolar. If  $\delta_C(E) = \delta_C(F)$  then  $V_{C,E}^* = V_{C,F}^*$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.1, the hypothesis implies that  $\mathcal{E}(V_{C,E}^*, H_C) = \mathcal{E}(V_{C,F}^*, H_C)$ . Using the cocycle property,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{E}(V_{C,E}^*, H_C) + \mathcal{E}(H_C, V_{C,F}^*) + \mathcal{E}(V_{C,F}^*, V_{C,E}^*) \\ &= \mathcal{E}(V_{C,E}^*, H_C) - \mathcal{E}(V_{C,F}^*, H_C) + \mathcal{E}(V_{C,F}^*, V_{C,E}^*) \\ &= \mathcal{E}(V_{C,F}^*, V_{C,E}^*). \end{aligned}$$

From the definition (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{E}(V_{C,F}^*, V_{C,E}^*) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} (V_{C,F}^* - V_{C,E}^*) \sum_{j=0}^d (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^j \wedge (dd^c V_{C,E}^*)^{d-j} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} (V_{C,F}^* - V_{C,E}^*) (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^d + \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} (V_{C,F}^* - V_{C,E}^*) (dd^c V_{C,E}^*)^d \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} (V_{C,F}^* - V_{C,E}^*) \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^j \wedge (dd^c V_{C,E}^*)^{d-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Now  $E \subset F$  implies  $V_{C,F}^* \leq V_{C,E}^*$ ; i.e.,  $V_{C,F}^* - V_{C,E}^* \leq 0$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . Also,

$$V_{C,F}^* = V_{C,E}^* = 0 \text{ q.e. on } \text{supp}(dd^c V_{C,E}^*)^d$$

and

$$V_{C,F}^* = 0 \text{ q.e. on } \text{supp}(dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^d.$$

Thus we see that

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} (-V_{C,E}^*)(dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^d + \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} (V_{C,F}^* - V_{C,E}^*) \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^j \wedge (dd^c V_{C,E}^*)^{d-j}$$

where each term on the right-hand-side is nonpositive. Hence each term vanishes. In particular,

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} V_{C,E}^* (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^d$$

implies that  $V_{C,E}^* = 0$  q.e. on  $\text{supp}(dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^d$  (and hence a.e.  $-(dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^d$ ).

We finish the proof by using the domination principle (Proposition 2.2): we have  $V_{C,E}^*, V_{C,F}^* \in L_{C,+}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  with

$$V_{C,E}^* = 0 \leq V_{C,F}^* \text{ a.e. } - (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^d$$

and hence  $V_{C,E}^* \leq V_{C,F}^*$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ ; i.e.,  $V_{C,E}^* = V_{C,F}^*$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . □

**Remark 2.4.** For  $C = \Sigma$ , Proposition 2.3 was proved for regular compact sets  $E, F$  in [5] and in general (compact and nonpluripolar sets) in [6]. Both results utilized the ‘‘usual’’ Robin functions (1.5) of  $V_E^*, V_F^*$ .

### 3. OTHER PRELIMINARY RESULTS: GENERAL

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  be compact and nonpluripolar and let  $\mu$  be a positive measure on  $K$  such that one can form orthonormal polynomials  $\{p_\alpha\}$  using Gram-Schmidt on the monomials  $\{z^\alpha\}$ . We use the notion of degree given in (1.4):  $\deg_C(p) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : p \in \text{Poly}(nC)\}$ . We have the Siciak-Zaharjuta type polynomial formula

$$(3.1) \quad V_{C,K}(z) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\deg_C(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \in \mathbb{C}[z], \|p\|_K \leq 1\right\}$$

(cf., [1], Proposition 2.3). It follows that  $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^d : V_{C,K}(z) = 0\} = \widehat{K}$ , the polynomial hull of  $K$ :

$$\widehat{K} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^d : |p(z)| \leq \|p\|_K, \text{ all polynomials } p\}.$$

In this section, we follow the arguments of Zeriahi in [17].

**Proposition 3.1.** *In this setting,*

$$\limsup_{|\alpha| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(p_\alpha)} \log |p_\alpha(z)| \geq V_{C,K}(z), \quad z \notin \widehat{K}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $Q_n := \sum_{\alpha \in nC} c_\alpha p_\alpha \in \text{Poly}(nC)$  with  $\|Q_n\|_K \leq 1$ . Then

$$|c_\alpha| = \left| \int_K Q_n \bar{p}_\alpha d\mu \right| \leq \int_K |\bar{p}_\alpha| d\mu \leq \sqrt{\mu(K)}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz. Hence

$$|Q_n(z)| \leq N_n \sqrt{\mu(K)} \max_{\alpha \in nC} |p_\alpha(z)|$$

where recall  $N_n = \dim(\text{Poly}(nC))$ .

Now fix  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^d \setminus \widehat{K}$  and let  $\alpha_n \in nC$  be the multiindex with  $\deg_C(p_{\alpha_n})$  largest such that

$$|p_{\alpha_n}(z_0)| = \max_{\alpha \in nC} |p_\alpha(z_0)|.$$

We claim that taking any sequence  $\{Q_n\}$  with  $\|Q_n\|_K \leq 1$  for all  $n$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \deg_C(p_{\alpha_n}) = +\infty.$$

For if not, then by the above argument, there exists  $A < +\infty$  such that for any  $n$  and any  $Q_n \in \text{Poly}(nC)$  with  $\|Q_n\|_K \leq 1$ ,

$$|Q_n(z_0)| \leq N_n \sqrt{\mu(K)} \max_{\deg_C(p_\alpha) \leq A} |p_\alpha(z_0)| = N_n M(z_0)$$

where  $M(z_0)$  is independent of  $n$ . But then

$$\begin{aligned} V_{C,K}(z_0) &= \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\deg_C(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \in \mathbb{C}[z], \|p\|_K \leq 1 \right\} \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \log N_n + \frac{1}{n} \log M(z_0) \right] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^d \setminus \widehat{K}$ . We conclude that for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d \setminus \widehat{K}$ , for any  $n$  and any  $Q_n \in \text{Poly}(nC)$  with  $\|Q_n\|_K \leq 1$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(z)| \leq \frac{1}{n} \log N_n + \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{\alpha_n}(z)|$$

where we can assume  $\deg_C(p_{\alpha_n}) \uparrow +\infty$ . Hence, for such  $z$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{C,K}(z) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{\alpha_n}(z)| \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(p_{\alpha_n})} \log |p_{\alpha_n}(z)| \\ &\leq \limsup_{|\alpha| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(p_\alpha)} \log |p_\alpha(z)| \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $\deg_C(p_{\alpha_n}) \leq n$ .

□

Suppose  $\mu$  is any *Bernstein-Markov measure* for  $K$ ; i.e., for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a constant  $c_\epsilon$  so that

$$\|p_n\|_K \leq c_\epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^n \|p_n\|_{L^2(\mu)}, \quad p_n \in \text{Poly}(nC), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

From (1.2),  $\Sigma \subset kC \subset m\Sigma$  for some  $k, m$  and we can replace  $(1 + \epsilon)^n$  by  $(1 + \epsilon)^{\deg_C(p_n)}$ . In particular, for the orthonormal polynomials  $\{p_\alpha\}$ ,

$$\|p_\alpha\|_K \leq c_\epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^{\deg_C(p_\alpha)}.$$

Thus

$$\limsup_{|\alpha| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(p_\alpha)} \log \|p_\alpha\|_K \leq 0$$

and we obtain equality in the previous result:

**Corollary 3.2.** *In this setting, if  $\mu$  is any Bernstein-Markov measure for  $K$ ,*

$$\limsup_{|\alpha| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(p_\alpha)} \log |p_\alpha(z)| = V_{C,K}(z), \quad z \notin \widehat{K}.$$

We remark that Bernstein-Markov measures exist in abundance; cf., [8]. Our goal in subsequent sections is to generalize the results in [4] and [5] of T. Bloom to give more constructive ways of recovering  $V_{C,K}$  from special families of polynomials.

#### 4. $C$ -ROBIN FUNCTION

We begin with the observation that a proof similar to that of Theorem 5.3.1 of [10] yields the following result.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $C, C' \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$  be convex bodies and let  $F : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$  be a proper polynomial mapping satisfying*

$$0 < \liminf_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sup_{J \in C} |[F(z)]^J|}{\sup_{J \in C'} |z^J|} \leq \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sup_{J \in C} |[F(z)]^J|}{\sup_{J' \in C'} |z^{J'}|} < \infty.$$

Then for  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  compact,

$$V_{C,K}(F(z)) = V_{C',F^{-1}(K)}(z).$$

*Proof.* Since  $H_C(z) := \sup_{J \in C} \log |z^J|$ , the hypothesis can be written

$$(4.1) \quad 0 < \liminf_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{H_C(F(z))}}{e^{H_{C'}(z)}} \leq \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{H_C(F(z))}}{e^{H_{C'}(z)}} < \infty.$$

We first show that  $\liminf_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{H_C(F(z))}}{e^{H_{C'}(z)}} > 0$  implies

$$(4.2) \quad V_{C',F^{-1}(K)}(z) \leq V_{C,K}(F(z)).$$



Indeed, starting with  $u \in L_{C'}$  with  $u \leq 0$  on  $F^{-1}(K)$ , take

$$v(z) := \sup u(F^{-1}(z))$$

where the supremum is over all preimages of  $z$ . Then  $v \in PSH(\mathbb{C}^d)$  and  $v \leq 0$  on  $K$ . Note that  $v(F(z)) = u(z)$ . Now  $u \in L_{C'}$  implies

$$\limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [u(z) - H_{C'}(z)] \leq M < \infty.$$

To show  $v \in L_C$ , since  $F$  is proper it suffices to show

$$\limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [v(F(z)) - H_C(F(z))] < \infty.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [v(F(z)) - H_C(F(z))] \\ &= \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [v(F(z)) - H_{C'}(z) + H_{C'}(z) - H_C(F(z))] \\ &\leq \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [u(z) - H_{C'}(z)] - \liminf_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [H_C(F(z)) - H_{C'}(z)] \\ &\leq M - \liminf_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [H_C(F(z)) - H_{C'}(z)] < \infty \end{aligned}$$

from the hypothesized condition in (4.1) so  $v \in L_C$  and (4.2) follows.

Next we show that

$$\limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{H_C(F(z))}}{e^{H_{C'}(z)}} < \infty \text{ implies } V_{C', F^{-1}(K)}(z) \geq V_{C, K}(F(z)).$$

Letting  $u \in L_C$  with  $u \leq 0$  on  $K$ , we have  $u(F(z)) \in PSH(\mathbb{C}^d)$  and  $u(F(z)) \leq 0$  on  $F^{-1}(K)$  and we are left to show  $u(F(z)) \in L_{C'}$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [u(F(z)) - H_{C'}(z)] \\ &= \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [u(F(z)) - H_C(F(z)) + H_C(F(z)) - H_{C'}(z)] \\ &\leq \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [u(F(z)) - H_C(F(z))] + \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} [H_C(F(z)) - H_{C'}(z)] < \infty \end{aligned}$$

from the hypothesized condition in (4.1) and  $u \in L_C$ .

□

We can apply this in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  with  $C' = c\Sigma$  where  $c \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $C$  is an arbitrary convex body in  $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ . Given  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  compact, provided we can find  $F$  satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1, from the relation

$$V_{C,K}(F(z)) = V_{c\Sigma, F^{-1}(K)}(z) = cV_{F^{-1}(K)}(z) \in cL(\mathbb{C}^d)$$

we can form a scaling of the standard Robin function (1.5) for  $V_{F^{-1}(K)}$ , i.e.,  $\rho_{F^{-1}(K)} := \rho_{\Sigma, F^{-1}(K)}$ , and we have

$$c\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}(z) = \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [V_{C,K}(F(\lambda z)) - c \log |\lambda|].$$

This gives a connection between the standard Robin function  $\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}$  and something resembling a possible definition of a  $C$ -Robin function  $\rho_{C,K}$  (the right-hand-side). Given  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ , the set  $F^{-1}(K)$  can be very complicated so that, a priori, this relation has little practical value.

For the rest of this section, and for most of the subsequent sections, we work in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with variables  $z = (z_1, z_2)$  and we let  $C$  be the triangle with vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(b, 0)$ ,  $(0, a)$  where  $a, b$  are relatively prime positive integers. We recall from the introduction:

- (1)  $H_C(z_1, z_2) = \max[\log^+ |z_1|^b, \log^+ |z_2|^a]$  (note  $H_C = 0$  on the closure of the unit polydisk  $P^2 := \{(z_1, z_2) : |z_1|, |z_2| < 1\}$ );
- (2) defining  $\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2) := (\lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2)$ , we have

$$(4.3) \quad H_C(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = H_C(z_1, z_2) + ab \log |\lambda|$$

for  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus P^2$  and  $|\lambda| \geq 1$ .

**Definition 4.2.** Given  $u \in L_C$ , we define the  $C$ -Robin function of  $u$ :

$$\rho_u(z_1, z_2) := \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [u(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) - ab \log |\lambda|]$$

for  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ .

We claim that  $\rho_u \in L_C$ . To see this, we lift the circle action on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ,

$$\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2) := (\lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2),$$

to  $\mathbb{C}^3$  in the following manner:

$$\lambda \circ (t, z_1, z_2) := (\lambda t, \lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2).$$

Given a function  $u \in L_C(\mathbb{C}^2)$ , we can associate a function  $h$  on  $\mathbb{C}^3$  which satisfies

- (1)  $h(1, z_1, z_2) = u(z_1, z_2)$  for all  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ ;
- (2)  $h \in L_{\tilde{C}}(\mathbb{C}^3)$  where  $\tilde{C} = \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0), (0, b, 0), (0, 0, a)\}$ ;

(3)  $h$  is  $ab$ -log-homogeneous:

$$h(\lambda \circ (t, z_1, z_2)) = h(t, z_1, z_2) + ab \log |\lambda|.$$

Indeed, we simply set

$$\begin{aligned} h(t, z_1, z_2) &:= u\left(\frac{z_1}{t^a}, \frac{z_2}{t^b}\right) + ab \log |t| \text{ if } t \neq 0 \text{ and} \\ h(0, z_1, z_2) &:= \limsup_{(t, w_1, w_2) \rightarrow (0, z_1, z_2)} h(t, w_1, w_2) \text{ if } t = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now since  $h$  is psh on  $\mathbb{C}^3$ , we have

$$(4.4) \quad h(0, z_1, z_2) := \limsup_{(t, z_1, z_2) \rightarrow (0, z_1, z_2)} h(t, z_1, z_2) = \rho_u(z_1, z_2).$$

**Proposition 4.3.** *For  $u \in L_C$ , we have  $\rho_u \in L_C$ . In particular,  $\rho_u$  is plurisubharmonic.*

*Proof.* The psh of  $\rho_u$  follows directly from (4.4) since  $h$  is psh on  $\mathbb{C}^3$ . To show  $\rho_u \in L_C$ , note that

$$\rho_u(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = \rho_u(z_1, z_2) + ab \log |\lambda| \text{ for } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

From (4.3)  $H_C$  satisfies the same relation for  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus P^2$  and  $|\lambda| \geq 1$  which gives the result.  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** Since  $\rho_u(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = \rho_u(z_1, z_2) + ab \log |\lambda|$ , in particular,

$$\rho_u(e^{i\theta} \circ (z_1, z_2)) = \rho_u(z_1, z_2).$$

Moreover, any point  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$  is of the form  $(\lambda^a \zeta_1, \lambda^b \zeta_2)$  for some  $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \partial P^2$  and some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Indeed, if  $b \geq a$  then we get all points  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$  with  $|z_2|^a \leq |z_1|^b$  as  $(\lambda^a \zeta_1, \lambda^b \zeta_2)$  for some  $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$  with  $|\zeta_1| = 1$  and  $|\zeta_2| \leq 1$  and we get all points  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$  with  $|z_2|^a \geq |z_1|^b$  as  $(\lambda^a \zeta_1, \lambda^b \zeta_2)$  for some  $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$  with  $|\zeta_1| \leq 1$  and  $|\zeta_2| = 1$ . Thus we recover the values of  $\rho_u$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  from its values on  $\partial P^2$ .

**Remark 4.5.** In the general case where

$$C = \text{co}\{(0, \dots, 0), (a_1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, (0, \dots, 0, a_d)\} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$$

where  $a_1, \dots, a_d$  are pairwise relatively prime, we have

$$H_C(z_1, \dots, z_d) = \max[a_j \log^+ |z_j| : j = 1, \dots, d]$$

and we define

$$\lambda \circ (z_1, \dots, z_d) := (\lambda^{\prod_{j \neq 1} a_j} z_1, \dots, \lambda^{\prod_{j \neq d} a_j} z_d)$$

so that

$$H_C(\lambda \circ (z_1, \dots, z_d)) = H_C(z_1, \dots, z_d) + \left( \prod_{j=1}^d a_j \right) \log |\lambda|$$

for  $(z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{C}^d \setminus P^d$  and  $|\lambda| \geq 1$ . Then given  $u \in L_C$ , we define the  $C$ -Robin function of  $u$  as

$$\rho_u(z_1, \dots, z_d) := \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [u(\lambda \circ (z_1, \dots, z_d)) - \left( \prod_{j=1}^d a_j \right) \log |\lambda|]$$

for  $(z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{C}^d$ .

We recall the Siciak-Zaharjuta formula (3.1) for  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  compact:

$$V_{C,K}(z) = \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\deg_C(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \in \mathbb{C}[z], \|p\|_K \leq 1 \right\}$$

For simplicity in notation, we write  $\rho_{C,K} := \rho_{V_{C,K}^*}$ . The following result will be used in section 8.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be nonpluripolar and satisfy*

$$(4.5) \quad e^{i\theta} \circ K = K.$$

*Then  $K = \{\rho_{C,K} \leq 0\}$  and  $V_{C,K}^* = \rho_{C,K}^+ := \max[\rho_{C,K}, 0]$ .*

*Proof.* We first define a  $C$ -homogeneous extremal function  $H_{C,K}$  associated to a general compact set  $K$ . To this end, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define the collection of  $nC$ -homogeneous polynomials by

$$H_n(C) := \{h_n(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{(j,k): aj+bk=nab} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k : c_{jk} \in \mathbb{C}\} \subset \text{Poly}(nC).$$

Note that for  $h_n \in H_n(C)$ ,

$$h_n(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = \lambda^{nab} \sum_{(j,k): aj+bk=nab} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k = \lambda^{nab} h_n(z_1, z_2)$$

and thus  $u := \frac{1}{n} \log |h_n|$  satisfies

$$(4.6) \quad u(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = u(z_1, z_2) + ab \log |\lambda|.$$

Define

$$(4.7) \quad H_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) := \sup_n \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \log |h_n(z_1, z_2)| : h_n \in H_n(C), \|h_n\|_K \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Then  $H_{C,K}$  satisfies the property in (4.6). Clearly

$$H_{C,K}^+ := \max[H_{C,K}, 0] \leq V_{C,K}$$

and hence  $K \subset \{H_{C,K} \leq 0\}$ .

For a polynomial  $p \in \text{Poly}(nC)$ , we write

$$(4.8) \quad p(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{aj+bk \leq nab} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k = \sum_{l=0}^{nab} \tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2)$$

where  $\tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2) := \sum_{aj+bk=l} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k$  satisfies

$$\tilde{h}_l(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = \lambda^l \tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2).$$

Then for each  $l = 0, 1, \dots, nab$ ,

$$(4.9) \quad \|\tilde{h}_l\|_K \leq \|p\|_K.$$

To prove (4.9), note that

$$p(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) = \sum_{l=0}^{nab} \lambda^l \tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2).$$

Take  $(z_1, z_2) \in K$  at which  $|\tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2)| = \|\tilde{h}_l\|_K$ . Then by the Cauchy estimates for  $\lambda \rightarrow F(\lambda) := p(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2))$  on the unit circle,

$$|\tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2)| = \|\tilde{h}_l\|_K = |F^{(l)}(0)|/l! \leq \max_{|\lambda|=1} |F(\lambda)| \leq \|p\|_K,$$

proving (4.9).

We define

$$\tilde{H}_l := \{\tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2) := \sum_{aj+bk=l} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k, c_{jk} \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

If  $a = b = 1$ ,  $\tilde{H}_l = H_l(C) = H_l(\Sigma)$  are the usual homogeneous polynomials of degree  $l$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . Moreover, if  $\tilde{h}_l \in \tilde{H}_l$ , then  $\tilde{h}_l^{ab} \in H_l(C)$ . Since  $\|\tilde{h}_l\|_K \leq 1$  if and only if  $\|\tilde{h}_l^{ab}\|_K \leq 1$ , this shows

$$(4.10) \quad H_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) = ab \cdot \sup_l \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{l} \log |\tilde{h}_l(z_1, z_2)| : \tilde{h}_l \in \tilde{H}_l, \|\tilde{h}_l\|_K \leq 1 \right\}.$$

We define the  $C$ -homogeneous polynomial hull  $\widehat{K}_C$  of a compact set  $K$  as

$$\widehat{K}_C := \{(z_1, z_2) : |k(z_1, z_2)| \leq \|k\|_K, k \in \cup_l \tilde{H}_l\}.$$

It is clear  $\widehat{K} \subset \widehat{K}_C$  for any compact set  $K$ . We show the reverse inclusion, and hence equality, for  $K$  satisfying (4.5). To this end, let  $a \in \widehat{K}_C$ . For  $p \in \text{Poly}(nC)$ , write  $p = \sum_{l=0}^{nab} \tilde{h}_l$  as in (4.8). Then

$$|p(a)| \leq \sum_{l=0}^{nab} |\tilde{h}_l(a)| \leq \sum_{l=0}^{nab} \|\tilde{h}_l\|_K \leq (nab + 1)\|p\|_K.$$

Thus

$$|p(a)| \leq (nab + 1)\|p\|_K.$$

Apply this to  $p^m \in \text{Poly}(nmC)$ :

$$|p(a)|^m \leq (nmab + 1)\|p\|_K^m \text{ so that } |p(a)|^{1/n} \leq (nmab + 1)^{1/nm}\|p\|_K^{1/n}.$$

Letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $|p(a)| \leq \|p\|_K$  and hence  $a \in \widehat{K}$ .

We use this to show

$$(4.11) \quad \{V_{C,K} = 0\} = \{H_{C,K} \leq 0\}$$

for sets satisfying (4.5). To see this, we observe from (4.10) that the right-hand-side of (4.11) is the  $C$ -homogeneous polynomial hull  $\widehat{K}_C$  of  $K$  while the left-hand-side is the polynomial hull  $\widehat{K}$  of  $K$ . Thus (4.11) follows from the previous paragraph.

Now we claim that  $V_{C,K}^* = H_{C,K}^+$ . We observed that  $H_{C,K}^+ \leq V_{C,K} \leq V_{C,K}^*$ ; for the reverse inequality, we observe that  $H_{C,K}^+$  is in  $L_C$  and since  $H_{C,K}$  satisfies (4.6), we have  $H_{C,K}^+$  is maximal outside  $\widehat{K}$ . From (4.11) we can apply the global domination principle (Proposition 2.2) to conclude that  $H_{C,K}^+ \geq V_{C,K}^*$  and hence  $H_{C,K}^+ = V_{C,K}^*$ .

Using  $H_{C,K}^+ = V_{C,K}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) &:= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [H_{C,K}(\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2)) - ab \log |\lambda|] \\ &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} H_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) = H_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) \end{aligned}$$

for  $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus K$  by the invariance of  $H_{C,K}$  (i.e., it satisfies (4.6)). Thus, from Proposition 4.3 (and the invariance of  $\rho_{C,K}$ ) we have

$$\rho_{C,K}^+ = H_{C,K}^+ = V_{C,K}^*.$$

This shows  $K = \{\rho_{C,K} \leq 0\}$  and  $V_{C,K}^* = \rho_{C,K}^+ := \max[\rho_{C,K}, 0]$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** It follows that for

$$p = \sum_{l=0}^{nab} \tilde{h}_l = h_n + r_n \in Poly(nC)$$

where  $h_n := \tilde{h}_{nab} \in H_n(C)$  and  $r_n = p - h_n = \sum_{aj+bk < nab} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k$ , if  $u := \frac{1}{n} \log |p_n|$  then

$$\rho_u = \frac{1}{n} \log |\tilde{h}_{nab}| = \frac{1}{n} \log |h_n|.$$

We write  $\hat{p}_n := h_n = \tilde{h}_{nab}$ ; thus  $\rho_u = \frac{1}{n} \log |\hat{p}_n|$ .

In the case  $a = b = 1$  where  $C = \Sigma$ , we know from Corollary 4.6 of [7] that  $K$  regular implies  $\rho_K := \rho_{\Sigma, K}$  is continuous. We need to know that for our triangles  $C$  where  $a, b$  are relatively prime positive integers we also have  $\rho_{C, K}$  is continuous. To this end, we begin with the observation that applying Theorem 4.1 in the special case where  $d = 2$  and  $C$  is our triangle with vertices  $(0, 0), (b, 0), (0, a)$ , we can take

$$F(z_1, z_2) = (z_1^a, z_2^b)$$

and  $c = ab$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} ab\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}(z_1, z_2) &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [V_{C, K}(\lambda^a z_1^a, \lambda^b z_2^b) - ab \log |\lambda|] \\ &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [V_{C, K}(\lambda \circ (z_1^a, z_2^b)) - ab \log |\lambda|] \\ &= \rho_{C, K}(z_1^a, z_2^b) = \rho_{C, K}(F(z_1, z_2)). \end{aligned}$$

We use this connection between  $\rho_{C, K}$  and the standard Robin function  $\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}$  to show that  $\rho_{C, K}$  is continuous if  $K$  is regular.

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact and regular. Then  $\rho_{C, K}$  is uniformly continuous on  $\partial P^2$ .*

*Proof.* With  $F(z_1, z_2) = (z_1^a, z_2^b)$  as above, from Theorem 5.3.6 of [10], we have  $F^{-1}(K)$  is regular. Thus, from Corollary 4.6 of [7],  $\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}$  is continuous. Hence  $\rho_{C, K}(z_1^a, z_2^b) = \rho_{C, K}(F(z_1, z_2))$  is continuous. To show  $\zeta \rightarrow \rho_{C, K}(\zeta)$  is continuous at  $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \partial P^2$ , we use the fundamental relationship that

$$ab\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}(z_1, z_2) = \rho_{C, K}(z_1^a, z_2^b).$$

To this end, let  $\zeta^n = (\zeta_1^n, \zeta_2^n) \in \partial P^2$  converge to  $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ . Then

$$\rho_{C, K}(\zeta_1^n, \zeta_2^n) = \rho_{C, K}([\zeta_1^n]^{1/a}]^a, [(\zeta_2^n)^{1/b}]^b)$$

for any  $a$ -th root  $(\zeta_1^n)^{1/a}$  of  $\zeta_1^n$  and any  $b$ -th root  $(\zeta_2^n)^{1/b}$  of  $\zeta_2^n$ . But

$$\rho_{C,K}([( \zeta_1^n )^{1/a}]^a, [(\zeta_2^n)^{1/b}]^b) = ab\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}((\zeta_1^n)^{1/a}, (\zeta_2^n)^{1/b}).$$

By continuity of  $\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{C,K}(\zeta_1^n, \zeta_2^n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ab\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}((\zeta_1^n)^{1/a}, (\zeta_2^n)^{1/b}) \\ &= ab\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}((\zeta_1)^{1/a}, (\zeta_2)^{1/b}) \end{aligned}$$

for the appropriate choice of  $(\zeta_1)^{1/a}$  and  $(\zeta_2)^{1/b}$ . But

$$ab\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}((\zeta_1)^{1/a}, (\zeta_2)^{1/b}) = \rho_{C,K}([( \zeta_1 )^{1/a}]^a, [(\zeta_2)^{1/b}]^b) = \rho_{C,K}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2).$$

Note that this also yields that the value of  $\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}((\zeta_1)^{1/a}, (\zeta_2)^{1/b})$  is independent of the choice of the roots  $(\zeta_1)^{1/a}$  and  $(\zeta_2)^{1/b}$ . This can also be seen from the definitions of  $\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}$  and  $F$ . □

**Remark 4.9.** The relationship

$$ab\rho_{F^{-1}(K)}(z_1, z_2) = \rho_{C,K}(z_1^a, z_2^b)$$

is a special case of a more general result. Let  $u \in L_C$ . Then

$$\tilde{u}(z) := u(F(z_1, z_2)) = u(z_1^a, z_2^b) \in abL = abL_\Sigma \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_u(F(z_1, z_2)) &= \rho_u(z_1^a, z_2^b) = \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [u(\lambda \circ (z_1^a, z_2^b)) - ab \log |\lambda|] \\ &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [u(\lambda^a z_1^a, \lambda^b z_2^b) - ab \log |\lambda|] \\ &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [\tilde{u}(\lambda z) - ab \log |\lambda|]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tilde{u} \in abL$ , this last line is equal to the ‘‘usual’’ Robin function of  $\tilde{u}$  in the sense of (1.5). To be precise, it is equal to  $ab\rho_{\tilde{u}/ab}$  where  $\rho_{\tilde{u}/ab}$  is the standard Robin function (1.5) of  $\tilde{u}/ab \in L$ . This observation will be crucial in section 6.

We need an analogue of formula (18) in [17] in order to verify a calculation in the next section. We follow the arguments in [17]. Recall we may lift the circle action on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  to  $\mathbb{C}^3$  via

$$\lambda \circ (t, z_1, z_2) := (\lambda t, \lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2).$$



This gave a correspondence between  $L_C(\mathbb{C}^2)$  and  $L_{\tilde{C}}(\mathbb{C}^3)$  where  $\tilde{C} = \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0), (0, b, 0), (0, 0, a)\}$ . In analogy with our class

$$H_n(C) := \{h_n(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{(j,k):aj+bk=nab} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k : c_{jk} \in \mathbb{C}\} \subset \text{Poly}(nC)$$

in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ , we can consider

$$H_n(\tilde{C}) := \{h_n(t, z_1, z_2) = \sum_{(i,j,k):i+aj+bk=nab} c_{ijk} t^i z_1^j z_2^k : c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{C}\} \subset \text{Poly}(n\tilde{C})$$

in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ . For  $h_n \in H_n(\tilde{C})$ , we have

$$u_n(t, z_1, z_2) := \frac{1}{n} \log |h_n(t, z_1, z_2)|$$

belongs to  $L_{\tilde{C}}(\mathbb{C}^3)$  and  $u_n$  is  $ab$ -log-homogeneous. That  $u_n \in L_{\tilde{C}}(\mathbb{C}^3)$  is clear; to show the  $ab$ -log-homogeneity, note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(\lambda \circ (t, z_1, z_2)) &= h_n(\lambda t, \lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2) \\ &= \sum_{(i,j,k):i+aj+bk=nab} c_{ijk} (\lambda t)^i (\lambda^a z_1)^j (\lambda^b z_2)^k \\ &= \sum_{(i,j,k):i+aj+bk=nab} c_{ijk} \lambda^{i+aj+bk} t^i z_1^j z_2^k = \lambda^{nab} h_n(t, z_1, z_2) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$u_n(\lambda \circ (t, z_1, z_2)) = u_n(t, z_1, z_2) + ab \log |\lambda|.$$

Moreover, for  $h_n \in H_n(\tilde{C})$ , the polynomial

$$p_n(z_1, z_2) := h_n(1, z_1, z_2) = \sum_{(j,k):aj+bk \leq nab} c_{ijk} z_1^j z_2^k \in \text{Poly}(nC);$$

conversely, if  $p_n(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{(j,k):aj+bk \leq nab} c_{jk} z_1^j z_2^k \in \text{Poly}(nC)$  then

$$h_n(t, z_1, z_2) := t^{nab} \cdot p_n\left(\frac{z_1}{t^a}, \frac{z_2}{t^b}\right) \in H_n(\tilde{C}).$$

Next, given a compact set  $E \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ , we define the  $ab$ -log-homogeneous  $\tilde{C}$ -extremal function

$$H_{\tilde{C},E}(t, z_1, z_2) := \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\deg_{\tilde{C}}(p)} \log |p(t, z_1, z_2)| : p \in \cup_n H_n(\tilde{C}), \|p\|_E \leq 1 \right\}$$

and its usc regularization  $H_{\tilde{C},E}^*$ . Given the one-to-one correspondence between  $Poly(nC)$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  and  $H_n(\tilde{C})$  in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ , we see that for  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  compact,

$$(4.12) \quad V_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) = H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}(1, z_1, z_2) \text{ for all } (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$$

and hence a similar equality holds for the usc regularizations of both sides. Using this, we observe that for  $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \neq (0, 0)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [V_{C,K}^*(\lambda \circ \zeta) - ab \log |\lambda|] \\ &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}^*(1, \lambda^a \zeta_1, \lambda^b \zeta_2) - ab \log |\lambda|] \\ &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}^*(1/\lambda, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) = H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}^*(0, \zeta_1, \zeta_2). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that

$$H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}^*(\lambda \circ (1/\lambda, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)) = H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}^*(1, \lambda^a \zeta_1, \lambda^b \zeta_2).$$

We state this as a proposition:

**Proposition 4.10.** *For  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  compact,*

$$\rho_{C,K}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}^*(0, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \text{ for all } (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \neq (0, 0).$$

**Remark 4.11.** Using the relation (4.12) and following the reasoning in [15], Proposition 2.3, it follows that a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  is regular; i.e.,  $V_{C,K}$  is continuous in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ , if and only if  $H_{\tilde{C},\{1\} \times K}$  is continuous in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ . Thus we get an alternate proof of Proposition 4.8.

## 5. PRELIMINARY RESULTS: TRIANGLE CASE

We continue to let  $C$  be the triangle with vertices at  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(b, 0)$ , and  $(0, a)$  where  $a, b$  are relatively prime positive integers. For  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  compact and  $\zeta := (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \partial P^2$ , we define Chebyshev constants

$$\kappa_n := \kappa_n(K, \zeta) := \inf\{\|p_n\|_K : p_n \in Poly(nC), |\widehat{p}_n(\zeta)| = 1\}.$$

We note that  $\kappa_{n+m} \leq \kappa_n \kappa_m$ : if we take  $t_n, t_m$  achieving  $\kappa_n, \kappa_m$ , then  $t_n t_m \in Poly(n+m)C$  and  $\widehat{t_n t_m} = \widehat{t_n} \widehat{t_m}$  (see Remark 4.7) so that

$$\kappa_{n+m} \leq \|t_n t_m\|_K \leq \kappa_n \kappa_m.$$

Thus  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_n^{1/n}$  exists and we set

$$\kappa(K, \zeta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_n^{1/n} = \inf_n \kappa_n^{1/n}.$$

The following relation between  $\kappa(K, \zeta)$  and  $\rho_{C,K}(\zeta)$  is analogous to Proposition 4.2 of [14].

**Proposition 5.1.** *For  $\zeta \in \partial P^2$ ,*

$$\kappa(K, \zeta) = e^{-\rho_{C,K}(\zeta)}.$$

*Proof.* We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_n(K, \zeta) &= \inf \left\{ \frac{\|p_n\|_K}{|\widehat{p}_n(\zeta)|} : p_n \in \text{Poly}(nC) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{|\widehat{p}_n(\zeta)|} : p_n \in \text{Poly}(nC), \|p_n\|_K \leq 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for any  $p_n \in \text{Poly}(nC)$  with  $\|p_n\|_K \leq 1$ ,  $\kappa_n(K, \zeta) \leq \frac{1}{|\widehat{p}_n(\zeta)|}$ . For such  $p_n$ ,  $\frac{1}{n} \log |p_n(z)| \leq V_{C,K}(z)$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^2$  so that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\widehat{p}_n(\zeta)| \leq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta); \text{ i.e. } \frac{1}{|\widehat{p}_n(\zeta)|^{1/n}} \geq e^{-\rho_{C,K}(\zeta)}$$

for all  $\zeta \in \partial P^2$ . Taking the infimum over all such  $p_n$ ,

$$\kappa_n(K, \zeta)^{1/n} \geq e^{-\rho_{C,K}(\zeta)}$$

for all  $n$ ; taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  gives

$$\kappa(K, \zeta) \geq e^{-\rho_{C,K}(\zeta)}.$$

To prepare for the reverse inequality, we let  $\{b_j\}$  be an orthonormal basis of  $\bigcup_n \text{Poly}(nC)$  in  $L^2(\mu)$  where  $\mu$  is any Bernstein-Markov measure for  $K$ : thus for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a constant  $c_\epsilon$  so that

$$\|p_n\|_K \leq c_\epsilon (1 + \epsilon)^{\deg_C(p_n)} \|p_n\|_{L^2(\mu)}, \quad p_n \in \text{Poly}(nC), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

In particular,

$$\|b_j\|_K \leq c_\epsilon (1 + \epsilon)^{\deg_C(b_j)}$$

and from Corollary 3.2,

$$(5.1) \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(b_j)} \log |b_j(z)| = V_{C,K}(z), \quad z \notin \widehat{K}.$$

We next show that for  $\zeta \in \partial P^2$ ,

$$(5.2) \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(b_j)} \log |\widehat{b}_j(\zeta)| = \rho_{C,K}(\zeta).$$

For one inequality, we use the fact that for a function  $u$  subharmonic on  $\mathbb{C}$  with  $u \in L$ , the function  $r \rightarrow \max_{|t|=r} u(t)$  is a convex function of  $\log r$ . Hence

$$\limsup_{|t| \rightarrow \infty} [u(t) - \log |t|] = \inf_r \left( \max_{|t|=r} u(t) - \log r \right).$$

Thus if  $u \in abL$ ; i.e.,  $u(z) - ab \log |z| = 0(1)$ ,  $|z| \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$(5.3) \quad \limsup_{|t| \rightarrow \infty} [u(t) - ab \log |t|] = \inf_r \left( \max_{|t|=r} u(t) - ab \log r \right).$$

Fix  $\zeta \in \partial P^2$  and letting  $d_j := \deg_C(b_j)$  apply this to the function

$$\lambda \rightarrow \frac{1}{d_j} \log |b_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| = \frac{1}{d_j} \log |b_j(\lambda^a \zeta_1, \lambda^b \zeta_2)|.$$

We obtain (using also Remark 4.7), for any  $r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{b}_j(\zeta)| &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \frac{1}{d_j} \log |b_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log |\lambda| \right] \\ &\leq \max_{|\lambda|=r} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |b_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{b}_j(\zeta)| &\leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left( \max_{|\lambda|=r} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |b_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log r \right) \\ &\leq \max_{|\lambda|=r} \left( \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |b_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log r \right) = \max_{|\lambda|=r} [V_{C,K}(\lambda \circ \zeta) - ab \log r] \end{aligned}$$

where we used Hartogs lemma and (5.1). Thus, letting  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{b}_j(\zeta)| \leq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta).$$

In order to prove the reverse inequality in (5.2), we use Proposition 4.10. With the notation from the previous section, and following the proof of Théorème 2 in [17], let  $h \in H_n(\check{C})$  with  $\|h\|_{1 \times K} \leq 1$ . Then

$$p(z_1, z_2) := h(1, z_1, z_2) \in \text{Poly}(nC)$$

with  $\|p\|_K \leq 1$ . Writing  $p = \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} c_j b_j$  where  $N_n = \dim(\text{Poly}(nC))$  as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we have  $|c_j| \leq 1$  and hence

$$|h(1, z_1, z_2)| = |p(z_1, z_2)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} |b_j(z_1, z_2)|.$$

Then

$$|h(1/\lambda, z_1, z_2)| = |\lambda^{-nab} \cdot p_n(\lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2)| \leq |\lambda^{-nab} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} b_j(\lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2)|.$$

Fixing  $(z_1, z_2) = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$  and letting  $|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$|h(0, \zeta_1, \zeta_2)| \leq \sum_{b_j \in \text{Polyn}C \setminus \text{Poly}(n-1)C} |\widehat{b}_j(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)| \leq (N_n - N_{n-1}) |\widehat{b}_{j_n}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)|$$

where  $N_{n-1} \leq j_n \leq N_n$ . Using Proposition 4.10 we conclude that

$$\rho_{C,K}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(b_j)} \log |\widehat{b}_j(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)|$$

and (5.2) is proved.

We now use (5.2) to prove that  $\kappa(K, \zeta) \leq e^{-\rho_{C,K}(\zeta)}$  for  $\zeta \in \partial P^2$  which will finish the proof of the proposition. Fixing such a  $\zeta$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , take a subsequence  $\{b_{k_j}\}$  with  $d_j := \deg_C(b_{k_j})$  such that

$$\frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{b}_{k_j}(\zeta)| \geq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) - \epsilon, \quad j \geq j_0(\epsilon).$$

Letting

$$p_j(z) := \frac{b_{k_j}(z)}{c_\epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{d_j}},$$

we have  $\|p_j\|_K \leq 1$  and

$$\rho_{C,K}(\zeta) - \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{b}_{k_j}(\zeta)| = \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{p}_j(\zeta)| + \frac{1}{d_j} \log c_\epsilon + \log(1+\epsilon).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon - \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) &\geq \frac{1}{d_j} \log \frac{1}{|\widehat{p}_j(\zeta)|} - \frac{1}{d_j} \log c_\epsilon - \log(1+\epsilon) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{d_j} \log \kappa_{d_j}(K, \zeta) - \frac{1}{d_j} \log c_\epsilon - \log(1+\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\epsilon - \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) \geq \log \kappa(K, \zeta) - \log(1+\epsilon);$$

which holds for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  completes the proof.  $\square$

Using this proposition, and the observation within its proof that

$$\kappa_n(K, \zeta) = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{|\widehat{p}_n(\zeta)|} : p_n \in \text{Poly}(nC), \|p_n\|_K \leq 1 \right\},$$

we obtain a result which will be useful in proving Theorem 5.3.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact and regular. Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a positive integer  $m$  and a finite set of polynomials  $\{W_1, \dots, W_s\} \subset \text{Poly}(mC)$  such that  $\|W_j\|_K = 1$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, s$  and*

$$\frac{1}{m} \log \max_j |\widehat{W}_j(\zeta)| \geq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) - \epsilon \text{ for all } \zeta \in \partial P^2.$$

*Proof.* From Proposition 5.1, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , for each  $\zeta \in \partial P^2$  we can find a polynomial  $p \in \text{Poly}(nC)$  for  $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$  with  $\|p\|_K = 1$  and

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\widehat{p}(\zeta)| \geq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) - \epsilon.$$

By continuity of  $\rho_{K,C}$ , which follows from Proposition 4.8, such an inequality persists in a neighborhood of  $\zeta$ . We take a finite set  $\{p_1, \dots, p_s\}$  of such polynomials with  $p_i \in \text{Poly}(n_i C)$  such that

$$\max_i \frac{1}{n_i} \log |\widehat{p}_i(\zeta)| \geq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) - \epsilon \text{ for all } \zeta \in \partial P^2.$$

Raising the  $p_i$ 's to powers to obtain  $W_i$ 's of the same  $C$ -degree  $m$ , we still have  $\|W_i\|_K = 1$  and

$$\frac{1}{m} \log \max_j |\widehat{W}_j(\zeta)| \geq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) - \epsilon \text{ for all } \zeta \in \partial P^2.$$

□

Given  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  compact, and given  $h_n \in H_n(C)$ , we define

$$\text{Tch}_K h_n := h_n + p_{n-1} \text{ where } p_{n-1} \in \text{Poly}(n-1)C$$

and  $\|\text{Tch}_K h_n\|_K = \inf \{ \|h_n + q_{n-1}\|_K : q_{n-1} \in \text{Poly}(n-1)C \}$ . The polynomial  $\text{Tch}_K h_n$  need not be unique but each such polynomial yields the same value of  $\|\text{Tch}_K h_n\|_K$ . The next result is similar to Theorem 3.2 of [4].

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact, regular and polynomially convex. If  $\{Q_n\}$  is a sequence of polynomials with  $Q_n \in H_n(C)$  satisfying*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(\zeta)| \leq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta), \text{ all } \zeta \in \partial P^2,$$

then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Tch_K Q_n\|_K^{1/n} \leq 1.$$

*Proof.* We follow the proof in [15]. Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we start with polynomials  $\{W_1, \dots, W_s\} \subset Poly(mC)$  such that  $\|W_j\|_K = 1$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, s$  and

$$\frac{1}{m} \log \max_j |\widehat{W}_j(\zeta)| \geq \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) - \epsilon \text{ for all } \zeta \in \partial P^2$$

(and hence on all of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ) from Corollary 5.2. From the hypotheses on  $\{Q_n\}$  and the continuity of  $\rho_{C,K}$  (Proposition 4.8), we apply Hartogs lemma to conclude

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(\zeta)| < \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) + \epsilon, \quad \zeta \in \partial P^2, \quad n \geq n_0(\epsilon).$$

Thus

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(\zeta)| < \frac{1}{m} \log \max_j |\widehat{W}_j(\zeta)| + 2\epsilon, \quad \zeta \in \partial P^2, \quad n \geq n_0(\epsilon).$$

Note that  $Q_n \in H_n(C)$  implies  $Q_n(\lambda \circ \zeta) = \lambda^{nab} Q_n(\zeta)$  so that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(\lambda \circ \zeta)| = \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(\zeta)| + ab \log |\lambda|.$$

Similary  $\widehat{W}_j \in H_m(C)$  implies

$$\frac{1}{m} \log |\widehat{W}_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| = \frac{1}{m} \log |\widehat{W}_j(\zeta)| + ab \log |\lambda|$$

so that (5.4) holds on all of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ .

We fix  $R > 1$  and define

$$G := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |\widehat{W}_j(z)| < R^m, \quad j = 1, \dots, s\}.$$

Since  $\widehat{W}_j(\lambda \circ \zeta) = \lambda^{mab} \widehat{W}_j(\zeta)$ , we have  $e^{i\theta} \circ G = G$ ; since  $\widehat{W}_j(0) = 0$ , we have  $0 \in G$ . We claim  $G$  is bounded. To see this, choose  $r > 0$  so that

$$K \subset rP^2 = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1|, |z_2| \leq r\}.$$

Then  $V_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) \geq H_C(z_1/r, z_2/r)$  and hence

$$\rho_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) \geq H_C(z_1/r, z_2/r), \quad (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus rP^2.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{m} \log \max_j |\widehat{W}_j(z_1, z_2)| \geq \rho_{C,K}(z_1, z_2) - \epsilon \text{ for all } (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2,$$

$G$  is bounded.

Next, choose  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently large so that

$$K \cup G \subset \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1|, |z_2| < \delta R^m\}.$$

Define

$$\Delta := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^s : |z_1|, |z_2| < \delta R^m, |w_j| < \delta R^m, j = 1, \dots, s\}.$$

Given  $\theta > 1$ , we can choose  $p > 0$  sufficiently large so that

$$D := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^s : |z_1|^p + |z_2|^p + |w_1|^p + \dots + |w_s|^p < (\theta^{abm} \delta R^m)^p\},$$

which is complete circled (in the ordinary sense) and strictly pseudoconvex, satisfies

$$\Delta \subset D \subset \theta^{abm} \Delta$$

(note this is just a replacement of an  $l^\infty$ -norm with an  $l^p$ -norm).

We write  $z := (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$  and  $\widehat{W}(z) := (\widehat{W}_1(z), \dots, \widehat{W}_s(z)) \in \mathbb{C}^s$  for simplicity in notation. Let

$$Y := \{(z, \delta \widehat{W}(z)) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^s : z \in \mathbb{C}^2\}.$$

Then  $Y$  is a closed, complex submanifold of  $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^s$ . Appealing to the bounded, holomorphic extension result stated as Theorem 3.1 in [15], there exists a positive constant  $M$  such that for every  $f \in H^\infty(Y \cap D)$  there exists  $F \in H^\infty(D)$  with

$$\|F\|_D \leq M \|f\|_{Y \cap D} \text{ and } F = f \text{ on } Y \cap D.$$

We will apply this to the polynomials  $Q_n(z)$ . First, we observe that if  $\pi : \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$  is the projection  $\pi(z, w) = z$ , then

$$G = \pi(Y \cap \Delta) \subset \pi(Y \cap D) \subset \pi(Y \cap \theta^{abm} \Delta) \subset \theta \circ G.$$

To see the last inclusion – note we use  $\theta \circ G$ , not  $\theta G$  – first note that

$$s = \theta \circ z \iff z = \frac{1}{\theta} \circ s$$

and thus since  $\widehat{W}_j(\frac{1}{\theta} \circ s) = \frac{1}{\theta^{jab}} \widehat{W}_j(s)$ ,

$$\theta \circ G = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |\widehat{W}_j(z)| < (\theta^{ab} R)^m, j = 1, \dots, s\}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(Y \cap \theta^{abm} \Delta) &= \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : (z, w) \in Y \cap \theta^{abm} \Delta\} \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1|, |z_2| < \theta^{abm} \delta R^m, \delta |\widehat{W}_j(z)| < \theta^{abm} \delta R^m, j = 1, \dots, s\}. \end{aligned}$$



Applying the bounded holomorphic extension theorem to  $f(z, w) := Q_n(z)$  for each  $n$ , we get  $F_n(z, w) \in H^\infty(D)$  with

$$Q_n(z) = F_n(z, \delta\widehat{W}(z))$$

for all  $z \in \pi(Y \cap D)$  and

$$\|F_n\|_D \leq M\|Q_n\|_{\pi(Y \cap D)}.$$

Utilizing the set inclusion  $\pi(Y \cap D) \subset \theta \circ G$ , the definition of  $\theta \circ G$  and (5.4) (which recall is valid on all of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ),

$$(5.5) \quad \|F_n\|_D \leq M\|Q_n\|_{\theta \circ G} \leq M(e^{2\epsilon}\theta^{ab}R)^n \text{ for } n \geq n_0(\epsilon).$$

Since  $D$  is complete circled, we can expand  $F_n$  into a series of homogeneous polynomials which converges locally uniformly on all of  $D$ . Rearranging into a multiple power series, we write

$$F_n(z, w) := \sum_{|I|+|J| \geq 0} a_{IJ} z^I w^J, \quad (z, w) \in D.$$

Using  $Q_n(z) = F_n(z, \delta\widehat{W}(z))$  for  $z \in \pi(Y \cap D)$ , we obtain for such  $z$ ,

$$Q_n(z) = \sum' a_{IJ} z^I (\delta\widehat{W}(z))^J$$

where the prime denotes that the sum is taken over multiindices

$$(5.6) \quad I = (i_1, i_2) \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^2, \quad J \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^s, \quad \text{where } ai_1 + bi_2 =: iab \text{ and } i + |J|m = n.$$

This is because  $Q_n \in H_n(C)$  and  $\widehat{W}_j \in H_m(C)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, s$ . Precisely, each  $\widehat{W}_j(z)$  is of the form  $\sum_{a\alpha + b\beta = mab} c_{\alpha\beta} z_1^\alpha z_2^\beta$  so that if  $J = (j_1, \dots, j_s)$ , a typical monomial occurring in  $Q_n(z)$  must be of the form

$$(5.7) \quad z_1^{i_1} z_2^{i_2} (z_1^{\alpha_1} z_2^{\beta_1})^{j_1} \cdots (z_1^{\alpha_s} z_2^{\beta_s})^{j_s}$$

where  $a\alpha_k + b\beta_k = mab$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, s$ ; hence

$$a(\alpha_1 j_1 + \cdots + \alpha_s j_s) + b(\beta_1 j_1 + \cdots + \beta_s j_s) = |J|mab.$$

In order for (5.7) to (possibly) appear in  $Q_n(z)$ , we require (5.6). The positive integers  $i$  in (5.6) are related to the lengths  $|I|$  by  $|I| = i_1 + i_2 \leq ai_1 + bi_2 = iab$ ; and if, say,  $a \leq b$  we have a reverse estimate

$$iab = ai_1 + bi_2 \leq b|I| \text{ so that } |I| \geq ia.$$

However, all we will need to use is the fact that the number of multi-indices occurring in the sum for  $Q_n(z)$  is at most  $N_n = \dim(\text{Poly}(nC))$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_n^{1/n} = 1$ .

Applying the Cauchy estimates on the polydisk  $\Delta \subset D$ , we obtain

$$(5.8) \quad |a_{IJ}| \leq \frac{\|F_n\|_D}{(\delta R^m)^{|I|+|J|}}$$

for  $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$ .

We now define

$$p_n(z) := \sum' a_{IJ} z^I (\delta W(z))^J.$$

From (5.6) and the previously observed fact that

$$\text{if } q_j \in \text{Poly}(n_j C), \quad j = 1, 2 \text{ then } \widehat{q_1 q_2} = \widehat{q_1} \widehat{q_2},$$

we have  $\widehat{p}_n(z) = Q_n(z)$ . Using the estimates (5.5), (5.8), the facts that  $\|W_j\|_K = 1$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, s$  and

$$K \cup G \subset \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1|, |z_2| < \delta R^m\},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tch_K Q_n\|_K &\leq \|p_n\|_K \leq \sum' \frac{M(e^{2\epsilon} \theta^{ab} R)^n}{(\delta R^m)^{|I|+|J|}} \cdot (\delta R^m)^{|I|} \delta^{|J|} \\ &= \sum' M(e^{2\epsilon} \theta^{ab})^n \cdot R^{n-m|J|} \leq \sum' M(e^{2\epsilon} \theta^{ab})^n \cdot R^n \\ &\leq C_n (e^{2\epsilon} \theta^{ab} R)^n, \quad n \geq n_0(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_n$  can be taken as  $M$  times the cardinality of the set of multi-indices in (5.6). Clearly  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n^{1/n} = 1$  so that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Tch_K Q_n\|_K^{1/n} \leq e^{2\epsilon} \theta^{ab} R.$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $R > 1$  and  $\theta > 1$  were arbitrary, the result follows.  $\square$

## 6. THE INTEGRAL FORMULA

In the standard setting of the Robin function  $\rho_{\mathbf{u}}$  associated to  $u \in L(\mathbb{C}^2)$  (cf., 1.5), for  $z = (z_1, z_2) \neq (0, 0)$  we can define

$$\underline{\rho}_{\mathbf{u}}(z) := \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} [u(\lambda z) - \log |\lambda z|] = \rho_{\mathbf{u}}(z) - \log |z|$$

so that  $\underline{\rho}_{\mathbf{u}}(tz) = \underline{\rho}_{\mathbf{u}}(z)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Thus we can consider  $\underline{\rho}_{\mathbf{u}}$  as a function on  $\mathbb{P}^1$  where to  $p = (p_1, p_2) \in \partial P^2$  we associate the point where the complex line  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda p$  hits  $H_{\infty}$ . The integral formula Theorem 5.5 of [3] in this setting is the following.

**Theorem 6.1. (Bedford-Taylor)** *Let  $u, v, w \in L^+(\mathbb{C}^2)$ . Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^2} (udd^c v - vdd^c u) \wedge dd^c w = 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{P}^1} (\underline{\rho}_u - \underline{\rho}_v) \wedge (dd^c \underline{\rho}_w + \Omega)$$

where  $\Omega$  is the standard Kähler form on  $\mathbb{P}^1$ .

We use this to develop an integral formula for  $u, v, w \in L_{C,+}$ . Letting

$$\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = F(z) = F(z_1, z_2) = (z_1^a, z_2^b),$$

we recall that for  $u \in L_C$ , we have

$$(6.1) \quad \tilde{u}(z) := u(F(z_1, z_2)) = u(\zeta) \in abL \text{ and}$$

$$(6.2) \quad \rho_u(\zeta) = \rho_u(F(z_1, z_2)) = ab\rho_{\tilde{u}/ab}(z)$$

where  $\rho_{\tilde{u}/ab}$  is the standard Robin function of  $\tilde{u}/ab \in L$ . It follows from the calculations in Remark 4.9 that if  $u \in L_{C,+}$  then  $\tilde{u} \in abL^+$ . From (6.1), if  $u, v, w \in L_{C,+}$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^2} (udd^c v - vdd^c u) \wedge dd^c w = \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} (\tilde{u}dd^c \tilde{v} - \tilde{v}dd^c \tilde{u}) \wedge dd^c \tilde{w}.$$

We apply Theorem 6.1 to the right-hand-side, multiplying by factors of  $ab$  since  $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{w} \in abL^+$ , to obtain the desired integral formula:

$$(6.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} (udd^c v - vdd^c u) \wedge dd^c w = 2\pi(ab)^3 \int_{\mathbb{P}^1} (\underline{\rho}_{\tilde{u}/ab} - \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{v}/ab}) \wedge (dd^c \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{w}/ab} + \Omega).$$

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $u, v \in L_{C,+}$  with  $u \geq v$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} u(dd^c v)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} v(dd^c u)^2 \\ & + 2\pi(ab)^3 \int_{\mathbb{P}^1} (\underline{\rho}_{\tilde{u}/ab} - \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{v}/ab}) \wedge [(dd^c \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{u}/ab} + \Omega) + (dd^c \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{v}/ab} + \Omega)]. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* From (6.3)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} (udd^c v - vdd^c u) \wedge dd^c(u + v) \\ & = 2\pi(ab)^3 \int_{\mathbb{P}^1} (\underline{\rho}_{\tilde{u}/ab} - \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{v}/ab}) \wedge [(dd^c \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{u}/ab} + \Omega) + (dd^c \underline{\rho}_{\tilde{v}/ab} + \Omega)]. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that

$$u(dd^c v)^2 - v(dd^c u)^2 = (udd^c v - vdd^c u) \wedge dd^c(u + v) + (v - u)dd^c u \wedge dd^c v.$$

Using this and the hypothesis  $u \geq v$  gives the result.  $\square$

We also obtain a generalization of Theorem 6.9 of [3]:

**Corollary 6.3.** *Let  $E, F$  be nonpluripolar compact subsets of  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with  $E \subset F$ . We have  $\rho_{C,E} = \rho_{C,F}$  if and only if  $V_{C,E}^* = V_{C,F}^*$  and  $\widehat{E} = \widehat{F} \setminus P$  where  $P$  is pluripolar.*

*Proof.* The “if” direction is obvious. For “only if” we may assume  $E = \widehat{E}$  and  $F = \widehat{F}$  since  $V_{C,K}^* = V_{C,\widehat{K}}^*$  for  $K$  compact. It suffices to show  $V_{C,E}^* \leq V_{C,F}^*$  as  $E \subset F$  gives the reverse inequality. We have

$$0 \leq \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} V_{C,E}^* (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^2 = \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} [V_{C,E}^* (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^2 - V_{C,F}^* (dd^c V_{C,E}^*)^2]$$

since  $V_{C,F}^* = 0$  q.e. on  $F$  (and hence a.e.  $(dd^c V_{C,E}^*)^2$ ). Applying Corollary 6.2 with  $u = V_{C,E}^*$  and  $v = V_{C,F}^*$ , the right-hand-side of the displayed inequality is nonpositive since  $\rho_{C,E} = \rho_{C,F}$  implies  $\rho_{\tilde{V}_{C,E}^*/\mathbf{ab}} = \rho_{\tilde{V}_{C,F}^*/\mathbf{ab}}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  by (6.2) so that  $\underline{\rho_{\tilde{V}_{C,E}^*/\mathbf{ab}}} = \underline{\rho_{\tilde{V}_{C,F}^*/\mathbf{ab}}}$  on  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Hence  $\int_{\mathbb{C}^2} V_{C,E}^* (dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^2 = 0$ . We conclude that  $V_{C,E}^* = 0$  a.e.  $(dd^c V_{C,F}^*)^2$ . By Proposition 2.2,  $V_{C,E}^* \leq V_{C,F}^*$ . Then  $\widehat{E} = \widehat{F} \setminus P$  follows since  $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : V_{C,E}^* = 0\}$  differs from  $E = \widehat{E}$  by a pluripolar set.  $\square$

Again using Corollary 6.2 and Proposition 2.2, we get an analogue of Lemma 2.1 in [4], which is the key result for all that follows.

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact and nonpluripolar and let  $v \in L_C$  with  $v \leq 0$  on  $K$ . Suppose that  $\rho_v = \rho_{C,K}$  on  $\partial P^2$ . Then  $v = V_{C,K}^*$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \widehat{K}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix a constant  $c$  so that  $H_C(z) < c$  on  $K$  and let

$$w := \max[v, 0, H_C - c].$$

Then  $w \in L_{C,+}$  with  $w = 0$  on  $\widehat{K}$  and since  $H_C - c \leq V_{C,K}$  we have  $\rho_w = \rho_{C,K}$  on  $\partial P^2$ . Then  $\rho_w = \rho_{C,K}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  (see Remark 4.4) and by (6.2),  $\rho_{\tilde{w}/\mathbf{ab}} = \rho_{\tilde{V}_{C,K}^*/\mathbf{ab}}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Thus  $\underline{\rho_{\tilde{w}/\mathbf{ab}}} = \underline{\rho_{\tilde{V}_{C,K}^*/\mathbf{ab}}}$  on  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Since  $w \leq V_{C,K}^*$ , by Corollary 6.2,

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^2} V_{C,K}^* (dd^c w)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} w (dd^c V_{C,K}^*)^2 = 0,$$

the last equality due to  $w = 0$  on  $\text{supp}(dd^c V_{C,K}^*)^2$ . Thus  $V_{C,K}^* = 0$  a.e.- $(dd^c w)^2$  and hence  $V_{C,K}^* \leq w$  a.e.- $(dd^c w)^2$ . By Proposition 2.2,  $V_{C,K}^* \leq w$  on all of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Since  $V_{C,K}^* \geq H_C - c$ ,  $v = V_{C,K}^*$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \widehat{K}$ .  $\square$

As in Theorem 2.1 in [4], we get a sufficient condition for a sequence of polynomials to recover the  $C$ -extremal function of  $K$  outside of  $\widehat{K}$ . This will be used in section 8.

**Theorem 6.5.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact and nonpluripolar. Let  $\{p_j\}$  be a sequence of polynomials,  $p_j \in \text{Poly}(d_j C)$ , with  $\deg_C(p_j) = d_j$  such that*

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|p_j\|_K^{1/d_j} = 1 \text{ and}$$

$$(6.4) \quad \left( \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{p}_j(\zeta)| \right)^* = \rho_{C,K}(\zeta), \quad \zeta \in \partial P^2.$$

Then

$$\left( \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(z)| \right)^* = V_{C,K}^*(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \widehat{K}.$$

**Remark 6.6.** Given an orthonormal basis  $\{b_j\}$  of  $\bigcup_n \text{Poly}(nC)$  in  $L^2(\mu)$  where  $\mu$  is a Bernstein-Markov measure for  $K$ , using

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(b_j)} \log |b_j(z)| = V_{C,K}(z), \quad z \notin \widehat{K}$$

from Corollary 3.2, in the proof of Proposition 5.1 we showed

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\deg_C(b_j)} \log |\widehat{b}_j(\zeta)| = \rho_{C,K}(\zeta) \text{ for } \zeta \in \partial P^2.$$

Theorem 6.5 is a type of reverse implication.

*Proof.* The function

$$v(z) := \left( \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(z)| \right)^*$$

is psh in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Given  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(z)| \leq \epsilon, \quad z \in K, \quad j \geq j_0(\epsilon).$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(z)| \leq V_{C,K}(z) + \epsilon, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^2, \quad j \geq j_0(\epsilon).$$

We conclude that  $v \in L_C$  and  $v \leq V_{C,K}$ . Hence  $\rho_v \leq \rho_{C,K}$ .

From Corollary 6.4, to show  $v = V_{C,K}^*$  outside  $\widehat{K}$  it suffices to show  $\rho_v \geq \rho_{C,K}$  on  $\partial P^2$ . We use the argument from Proposition 5.1. Recall from (5.3) for  $u \in abL(\mathbb{C})$  we have

$$\limsup_{|t| \rightarrow \infty} [u(t) - ab \log |t|] = \inf_r \left( \max_{|t|=r} u(t) - ab \log r \right).$$

Fix  $\zeta \in \partial P^2$  and apply the above to the function

$$\lambda \rightarrow \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| = \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(\lambda^a \zeta_1, \lambda^b \zeta_2)|.$$

We see that for any  $r$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{p}_j(\zeta)| &= \limsup_{|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log |\lambda| \right] \\ &\leq \max_{|\lambda|=r} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{p}_j(\zeta)| &\leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left( \max_{|\lambda|=r} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log r \right) \\ &\leq \max_{|\lambda|=r} \left( \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |p_j(\lambda \circ \zeta)| - ab \log r \right) = \max_{|\lambda|=r} [v(\lambda \circ \zeta) - ab \log r] \end{aligned}$$

where we used Hartogs lemma. Thus, letting  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{p}_j(\zeta)| \leq \rho_v(\zeta).$$

Since  $\rho_v$  is usc,  $(\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_j} \log |\widehat{p}_j(\zeta)|)^* \leq \rho_v(\zeta)$  and using the hypothesis (6.4) finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 7. $C$ -TRANSFINITE DIAMETER AND DIRECTIONAL CHEBYSHEV CONSTANTS

From [13], we have a Zaharjuta-type proof of the existence of the limit

$$(7.1) \quad \delta_C(K) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n^{1/l_n}$$

(see section 2) in the definition of  $C$ -transfinite diameter  $\delta_C(K)$  of a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  where  $C$  satisfies (1.2). In the classical ( $C =$

$\Sigma$ ) case, Zaharjuta [16] verified the existence of the limit in (7.1) by introducing directional Chebyshev constants  $\tau(K, \theta)$  and proving

$$\delta_\Sigma(K) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{|\sigma|} \int_{\sigma^0} \log \tau(K, \theta) dm(\theta)\right)$$

where  $\sigma := \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \sum_{j=1}^d x_j = 1\}$  is the extreme “face” of  $\Sigma$ ;  $\sigma^0 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 < x_i < 1, \sum_{j=1}^d x_j = 1\}$ ; and  $|\sigma|$  is the  $(d-1)$ -dimensional measure of  $\sigma$ .

In [13], a slight difference with the classical setting is that we have

$$(7.2) \quad \delta_C(K) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\text{vol}(C)} \int_C \log \tau(K, \theta) dm(\theta)\right)$$

where the directional Chebyshev constants  $\tau(K, \theta)$  and the integration in the formula are over the entire  $d$ -dimensional convex body  $C$ . Moreover in the definition of  $\tau(K, \theta)$  the standard grevlex ordering  $\prec$  on  $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^d$  (i.e., on the monomials in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ ) was used. This was required to obtain the submultiplicativity of the “monic” polynomial classes

$$(7.3) \quad M_k(\alpha) := \{p \in \text{Poly}(kC) : p(z) = z^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha} c_\beta z^\beta\}$$

and corresponding Chebyshev constants

$$T_k(K, \alpha) := \inf\{\|p\|_K : p \in M_k(\alpha)\}^{1/k}.$$

However, in our triangle setting, following [13] we can also define an ordering  $\prec_C$  on  $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^2$  by  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \prec_C \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$  if

- (1)  $\deg_C(z^\alpha) < \deg_C(z^\beta)$  or
- (2) when  $\deg_C(z^\alpha) = \deg_C(z^\beta)$  we have  $\alpha_2 < \beta_2$ .

Then

- (1) one has submultiplicativity of the corresponding “monic” polynomial classes defined as in (7.3) using  $\prec_C$  (which we denote  $M_k^{\prec_C}(\alpha)$ ) and one gets the formula (7.2) with  $\theta \rightarrow \tau(K, \theta)$  continuous; and
- (2) if  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$  is on the open hypotenuse  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $C$ ; i.e.,  $a\phi_1 + b\phi_2 = ab$  with  $\phi_1\phi_2 > 0$ , and if  $\phi = r\theta$  where  $\theta$  lies on the interior of  $C$  and  $r > 1$ , then  $r \log \tau(K, \theta) = \log \tau(K, \phi)$  (see [12], Lemma 5.4). (Note  $\mathcal{C} = \sigma^0$  if  $C = \Sigma \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^2$ ).

As a consequence, in our triangle case  $C = \text{co}\{(0, 0), (b, 0), (0, a)\}$ ,

$$(7.4) \quad \delta_C(K) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2 + b^2}} \int_C \log \tau(K, \theta) d\theta\right)$$

where the directional Chebyshev constants  $\tau(K, \theta)$  in (7.4) and the integration in the formula are over  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\theta \rightarrow \tau(K, \theta)$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{C}$ . In what follows, we fix our triangle  $C$  and use this  $\prec_C$  ordering to define these directional Chebyshev constants

$$\tau(K, \theta) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, \alpha/k \rightarrow \theta} T_k^C(K, \alpha)$$

for  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$  (in which case the limit exists) where

$$T_k^C(K, \alpha) := \inf\{\|p\|_K : p(z) = z^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \prec_C \alpha} c_\beta z^\beta \in M_k^{\prec_C}(\alpha)\}^{1/k}.$$

Using (7.4) we have a result similar to Proposition 3.1 in [5]:

**Proposition 7.1.** *For  $E \subset F$  compact subsets of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ,*

- (1) *for all  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\tau(E, \theta) \leq \tau(F, \theta)$  and*
- (2)  *$\delta_C(E) = \delta_C(F)$  if and only if  $\tau(E, \theta) = \tau(F, \theta)$  for all  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ .*

## 8. POLYNOMIALS APPROXIMATING $V_{C,K}$

Following [5], given a nonpluripolar compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  and  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ , a sequence of polynomials  $\{Q_n\}$  is  $\theta$ -asymptotically Chebyshev (we write  $\theta aT$ ) for  $K$  if

- (1) for each  $n$  there exists  $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $\alpha_n$  with  $Q_n \in M_{k_n}^{\prec_C}(\alpha_n)$ ;
- (2)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = +\infty$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n}{k_n} = \theta$ ; and
- (3)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Q_n\|_K^{1/k_n} = \tau(K, \theta)$ .

**Proposition 8.1.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact and nonpluripolar and satisfy  $e^{i\theta} \circ K = K$ . Let  $\{Q_n\}$  be  $\theta aT$  for  $K$ . Then  $\{\widehat{Q}_n\}$  is  $\theta aT$  for  $K$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from (4.9) giving  $\|\widehat{Q}_n\|_K \leq \|Q_n\|_K$  for such  $K$ .  $\square$

Given  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  compact and nonpluripolar, define

$$K_\rho := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \rho_{C,K}(z) \leq 0\}.$$

Note that if  $e^{i\theta} \circ K = K$  then Theorem 4.6 shows that  $K = K_\rho$ . Moreover, from Remark 4.4,

$$\rho_{C,K}(e^{i\theta} \circ z) = \rho_{C,K}(z)$$

so that  $e^{i\theta} \circ K_\rho = K_\rho$  and  $V_{C,K_\rho}^* = \rho_{C,K}^+ := \max[0, \rho_{C,K}]$ .



**Theorem 8.2.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact and regular and let  $\{Q_n\}$  be  $\theta aT$  for  $K$  with  $Q_n \in M_{k_n}^{\prec C}(\alpha_n)$ . Then  $\{\widehat{Q}_n\}$  is  $\theta aT$  for  $K_\rho$ . Conversely, if  $\{H_n\}$  is  $\theta aT$  for  $K_\rho$  with  $H_n \in H_{k_n}(C) \cap M_{k_n}^{\prec C}(\alpha_n)$ , then the sequence  $\{Tch_K H_n\}$  is  $\theta aT$  for  $K$ . Moreover,*

$$\tau(K_\rho, \theta) = \tau(K, \theta) \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathcal{C}.$$

*Proof.* Given  $\{Q_n\}$  which are  $\theta aT$  for  $K$  with  $Q_n \in M_{k_n}^{\prec C}(\alpha_n)$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{k_n} \log \frac{|Q_n(z)|}{\|Q_n\|_K} \leq V_{C,K}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^2.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{k_n} \log \frac{|\widehat{Q}_n(z)|}{\|Q_n\|_K} \leq \rho_{C,K}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^2.$$

Hence for  $z \in K_\rho$ ,

$$\frac{1}{k_n} \log |\widehat{Q}_n(z)| \leq \frac{1}{k_n} \log \|Q_n\|_K; \text{ i.e., } \|\widehat{Q}_n\|_{K_\rho} \leq \|Q_n\|_K.$$

Since

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Q_n\|_K^{1/k_n} = \tau(K, \theta),$$

$$(8.1) \quad \tau(K_\rho, \theta) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{Q}_n\|_{K_\rho}^{1/k_n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{Q}_n\|_{K_\rho}^{1/k_n} \leq \tau(K, \theta).$$

On the other hand, considering  $\{H_n\}$  which are  $\theta aT$  for  $K_\rho$  (we can assume  $H_n \in H_{k_n}(C)$  from Proposition 8.1) we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|H_n\|_{K_\rho}^{1/k_n} = \tau(K_\rho, \theta).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_n} \log |H_n(z)| &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_n} \log \frac{|H_n(z)|}{\|H_n\|_{K_\rho}} + \log \tau(K_\rho, \theta) \\ &\leq \log \tau(K_\rho, \theta) + \rho_{C,K}^+(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By rescaling  $K$ ; i.e., replacing  $K$  by  $rK$  for appropriate  $r \geq 1$  if need be, we can assume that

$$K_\rho \subset \{(z_1, z_2) : |z_1|, |z_2| \leq 1\}.$$

In particular,  $\rho_{C,K} \geq 0$  on  $\partial P^2$ . From Theorem 5.3 we conclude that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_n} \log \|Tch_K H_n\|_K \leq \log \tau(K_\rho, \theta).$$

We have  $Tch_K H_n \in M_{k_n}^{<C}(\alpha_n)$  since  $H_n \in H_{k_n}(C) \cap M_{k_n}^{<C}(\alpha_n)$  and hence (8.2)

$$\tau(K, \theta) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Tch_K H_n\|_K^{1/k_n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Tch_K H_n\|_K^{1/k_n} \leq \tau(K_\rho, \theta).$$

Together with (8.1) we conclude that  $\tau(K_\rho, \theta) = \tau(K, \theta)$  and the inequalities in (8.1) and (8.2) are equalities.  $\square$

Finally, we utilize Theorems 8.2 and 6.5 together with Propositions 2.3 and 7.1 to prove our main result.

**Theorem 8.3.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be compact and regular. Let  $\{p_n\}$  be a countable family of polynomials with  $p_n \in Poly(k_n C)$  such that for every  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is a subsequence which is  $\theta aT$  for  $K$ . Then*

$$\left( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_n} \log \frac{|p_n(z)|}{\|p_n\|_K} \right)^* = V_{C,K}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \widehat{K}.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$v(z) := \left( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_n} \log \frac{|p_n(z)|}{\|p_n\|_K} \right)^*.$$

Clearly  $v \leq V_{C,K}$  on all of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Let

$$w(z) := \left( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_n} \log \frac{|\widehat{p}_n(z)|}{\|p_n\|_K} \right)^*.$$

To finish the proof, it suffices, by Theorem 6.5, to show that

$$w(z) = \rho_{C,K}(z), \quad z \in \partial P^2.$$

Clearly  $w \leq \rho_{C,K}$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  since  $v \leq V_{C,K}$ . To show the reverse inequality, we proceed as follows. Let

$$Z := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : w(z) < 0\}.$$

Then  $Z$  is open since  $w$  is usc. We claim that  $\text{int}(K_\rho) \subset Z$ . For if  $z \in \text{int}(K_\rho)$ , we have  $\rho_{C,K}(z) = -a < 0$ . Thus  $w(z) \leq -a < 0$  and  $z \in Z$ . Moreover, both sets  $K_\rho$  and  $Z$  satisfy the invariance property

$$e^{i\theta} \circ K_\rho = K_\rho \text{ and } e^{i\theta} \circ Z = Z$$

(for  $Z$  this follows since  $\widehat{p}_n \in H_{k_n}(C)$ ). Thus to show the equality  $w(z) = \rho_{C,K}(z)$  it suffices to verify the equality

$$\text{int}(K_\rho) = Z.$$

Suppose this is false. Then we take a point  $z_0 \in \partial K_\rho \cap Z$  and a closed ball  $B$  centered at  $z_0$  contained in  $Z$ . Since  $B$  is regular and  $K$  is assumed regular, by Proposition 4.8 together with Lemma 4.1 of [5],  $B \cup K_\rho$  is regular.

Given  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ , by assumption there exists a subsequence  $\mathbb{N}_\theta \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_\theta}$  is  $\theta aT$  for  $K$ . From Theorem 8.2,  $\{\widehat{p}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_\theta}$  is  $\theta aT$  for  $K_\rho$ . Since  $w \leq 0$  on  $B \cup K_\rho$ , for  $z \in B \cup K_\rho$  we have

$$\limsup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_\theta} \frac{1}{k_n} \log |\widehat{p}_n(z)| \leq \limsup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_\theta} \frac{1}{k_n} \log \|p_n\|_K = \log \tau(K, \theta).$$

Using Hartogs lemma, we conclude that

$$\log \tau(B \cup K_\rho, \theta) \leq \limsup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_\theta} \frac{1}{k_n} \log \|\widehat{p}_n\|_{B \cup K_\rho} \leq \log \tau(K, \theta).$$

Hence

$$\tau(B \cup K_\rho, \theta) \leq \tau(K, \theta) = \tau(K_\rho, \theta)$$

for all  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ . Since  $\tau(B \cup K_\rho, \theta) \geq \tau(K_\rho, \theta)$  we see that

$$\tau(B \cup K_\rho, \theta) = \tau(K_\rho, \theta)$$

for all  $\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ . From Propositions 2.3 and 7.1 (and regularity of the sets  $K_\rho, B \cup K_\rho$ ),

$$V_{C, B \cup K_\rho} = V_{C, K_\rho}.$$

But  $V_{C, K_\rho} = \rho_{C, K}^+ = \max[0, \rho_{C, K}]$  thus if  $B \setminus K_\rho \neq \emptyset$ , since  $\rho_{C, K} > 0$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus K_\rho$  and  $V_{C, B \cup K_\rho} = 0$  on  $B \cup K_\rho$ , this is a contradiction.  $\square$

As examples of sequences of polynomials satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 8.3, as in [5] we have

- (1) the family  $\{t_{k, \alpha} \in M_k^{\prec_C}(\alpha)\}_{k, \alpha}$  of Chebyshev polynomials (minimal supremum norm) for  $K$  in these classes;
- (2) for a Bernstein-Markov measure  $\mu$  on  $K$ , the corresponding polynomials  $\{q_{k, \alpha} \in M_k^{\prec_C}(\alpha)\}_{k, \alpha}$  of minimal  $L^2(\mu)$  norm (see Corollary 3.2);
- (3) any sequence  $p_{\alpha(s)} = z^{\alpha(s)} - L_{\alpha(s-1)}(z^{\alpha(s)})$  where  $\{z^{\alpha(s)}\}$  is an enumeration of monomials with the  $\prec_C$  order and  $L_{\alpha(s-1)}(z^{\alpha(s)})$  is the Lagrange interpolating polynomial for the monomial  $z^{\alpha(s)}$  at points  $\{z_{s-1, j}\}_{j=1, \dots, s-1}$  in the  $(s-1)$ -st row in a triangular

array  $\{z_{jk}\}_{j=1,2,\dots; k=1,\dots,j} \subset K$  where the Lebesgue constants  $\Lambda_{\alpha(s)}$  associated to the array grow subexponentially. Here,

$$\Lambda_{\alpha(s)} := \max_{z \in K} \sum_{j=1}^s |l_{sj}(z)|$$

where  $l_{sj} \in \text{Poly}(\deg_C(z^{\alpha(s)})C)$  satisfies  $l_{sj}(z_{sk}) = \delta_{jk}$ ,  $j, k = 1, \dots, s$  and we require

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_{\alpha(s)}^{1/\deg_C(z^{\alpha(s)})} = 1.$$

We refer to Corollary 4.4 of [5] for details.

**Remark 8.4.** Example (3) includes the case of a sequence of  $C$ -Fekete polynomials for  $K$  (cf., p 1562 of [5]). The case of  $C$ -Leja polynomials for  $K$ , defined using  $C$ -Leja points as in [13], also satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 8.3. This can be seen by following the proof of Corollary 4.5 in [5]. The proof that  $C$ -Leja polynomials satisfy the analogue of (4.28) in [5] is given in Theorem 1.1 of [13].

## 9. FURTHER DIRECTIONS

We reiterate that the arguments given in the note for triangles  $C$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with vertices  $(0, 0), (b, 0), (0, a)$  where  $a, b$  are relatively prime positive integers should generalize to the case of a simplex

$$C = \text{co}\{(0, \dots, 0), (a_1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, (0, \dots, 0, a_d)\}$$

in  $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$  with  $a_1, \dots, a_d$  pairwise relatively prime using the definition of the  $C$ -Robin function in Remark 4.5. Indeed, following the arguments on pp. 72-82 of [6] one should also be able to prove *weighted* versions of the  $C$ -Robin results for such simplices  $C$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We indicate the transition from the  $C$ -weighted situation for  $d = 2$  to a  $\tilde{C}$ -homogeneous unweighted situation for  $d = 3$ . As in section 4, we lift the circle action on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ,

$$\lambda \circ (z_1, z_2) := (\lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2),$$

to  $\mathbb{C}^3$  via

$$\lambda \circ (t, z_1, z_2) := (\lambda t, \lambda^a z_1, \lambda^b z_2).$$

Given a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  and an admissible weight function  $w \geq 0$  on  $K$ , i.e.,  $w$  is usc and  $\{z \in K : w(z) > 0\}$  is not pluripolar, we associate the set

$$\tilde{K}_w := \{(t \circ (1, z_1, z_2)) : (z_1, z_2) \in K, |t| = w(z_1, z_2)\}.$$

It follows readily that

$$e^{i\theta} \circ \tilde{K}_w = \tilde{K}_w.$$

Setting  $\tilde{C} = \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0), (0, b, 0), (0, 0, a)\}$ , we can relate a weighted  $C$ -Robin function  $\rho_{\tilde{C}, K}^w$  to the  $\tilde{C}$ -Robin function  $\rho_{\tilde{C}, \tilde{K}_w}$ . Using these weighted ideas, the converse to Proposition 2.3 should follow as in [6].

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bayraktar, T. Bloom, N. Levenberg, Pluripotential theory and convex bodies, *Mat. Sbornik*, **209** (2018), no. 3, 67-101.
- [2] T. Bayraktar, T. Bloom, N. Levenberg and C. H. Lu, Pluripotential Theory and Convex Bodies: Large Deviation Principle, to appear in *Arkiv for Mat.*
- [3] E. Bedford and B. A. Taylor, Plurisubharmonic functions with logarithmic singularities, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble*, **38**, no. 4, 133-171.
- [4] T. Bloom, Some applications of the Robin function to multivariate approximation theory, *J. of Approx. Theory*, **92** (1998), no. 1, 1-21.
- [5] T. Bloom, On families of polynomials which approximate the pluricomplex Green function, *IUMJ*, **50** (2001), no. 4, 1545-1566.
- [6] T. Bloom and N. Levenberg, Weighted pluripotential theory in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , *Amer. J. of Math.*, **125** (2003), 57-103.
- [7] T. Bloom, N. Levenberg and S. Ma'u, Robin functions and extremal functions, *Annales Polonici Math.*, **80** (2003), 55-84.
- [8] T. Bloom, N. Levenberg, F. Piazzon and F. Wielonsky, Bernstein-Markov: a survey, *Dolomites Research Notes on Approximation*, Vol. 8 (special issue) (2015), 75-91.
- [9] L. Bos and N. Levenberg, Bernstein-Walsh theory associated to convex bodies and applications to multivariate approximation theory, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, **18** (2018), 361-388.
- [10] M. Klimek, *Pluripotential Theory*, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- [11] N. Levenberg and M. Perera, A global domination principle for  $P$ -pluripotential theory, *CRM Proc. and Lec. Notes* series, vol. in honor of T. Ransford, to appear.
- [12] S. Ma'u, Newton-Okounkov bodies and transfinite diameter, *Dolomites Research Notes on Approximation*, **10** (2017), 138-160.
- [13] S. Ma'u, Transfinite diameter with generalised polynomial degree, arXiv:1904.08589.
- [14] S. Nivoche, The pluricomplex Green function, capacitative notions, and approximation problems in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , *IUMJ*, **44** (1995), no. 2, 489-510.
- [15] J. Siciak, A remark on Tchebysheff polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , *Univ. Iagellonicae Acta Math.*, **35** (1997), 37-45.
- [16] V. P. Zaharjuta, Transfinite diameter, Chebyshev constants, and capacity for compacta in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , *Math. USSR Sbornik*, **25** (1975), no. 3, 350-364.

- [17] A. Zeriahi, Capacité, constante de Tchebysheff, et polynômes orthogonaux associés à un compact de  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr.*, 2<sup>e</sup> série, **109** (1985), 325-335.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405 USA

*E-mail address:* `nlevenbe@indiana.edu`

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND

*E-mail address:* `s.mau@auckland.ac.nz`