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Abstract. We work in the setting of weighted pluripotential theory arising from polynomials associated to a convex body $P$ in $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$. We define the logarithmic indicator function on $\mathbb{C}^d$:

$$H_P(z) := \sup_{J \in P} \log |z^J| := \sup_{J \in P} \log \|z_1|^{j_1} \cdots |z_d|^{j_d}|$$

and an associated class of plurisubharmonic (psh) functions:

$$L_P := \{ u \in PSH(\mathbb{C}^d) : u(z) - H_P(z) = 0(1), \ |z| \to \infty \}.$$ 

We first show that $L_P$ is not closed under standard smoothing operations. However, utilizing a continuous regularization due to Ferrier which preserves $L_P$, we prove a general Siciak-Zaharjuta type-result in our $P$-setting: the weighted $P$-extremal function

$$V_{P,K,Q}(z) := \sup\{u(z) : u \in L_P, \ u \leq Q \text{ on } K\}$$

associated to a compact set $K$ and an admissible weight $Q$ on $K$ can be obtained using the subclass of $L_P$ arising from functions of the form $\frac{1}{\deg(p)} \log |p|$ (appropriately normalized).

1. Introduction

A fundamental result in pluripotential theory is that the extremal plurisubharmonic function

$$V_K(z) := \sup\{u(z) : u \in L(\mathbb{C}^d), \ u \leq 0 \text{ on } K\}$$

associated to a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$, where $L(\mathbb{C}^d)$ is the usual Lelong class of all plurisubharmonic (psh) functions $u$ on $\mathbb{C}^d$ with the property that $u(z) - \log |z| = 0(1)$ as $|z| \to \infty$, may be obtained from the subclass of $L(\mathbb{C}^d)$ arising from polynomials:

$$V_K(z) = \max\{0, \sup\{\frac{1}{\deg(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \text{ polynomial}, \ |p||_K \leq 1\}\}.$$ 
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More generally, given an admissible weight function $Q$ on $K$ ($Q$ is lowersemicontinuous and $\{z \in K : Q(z) < \infty\}$ is not pluripolar),

$$V_{K,Q}(z) := \sup\{u(z) : u \in L(C^d), u \leq Q \text{ on } K\}$$

$$= \max[0, \sup\{\frac{1}{\deg(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \text{ polynomial, } ||pe^{-\deg(p)Q}||_K \leq 1\}].$$

We refer to this as a Siciak-Zaharjuta type result. Standard proofs often reduce to a sufficiently regular case by regularization; i.e., convolving with a smooth bump function.

In recent papers, a (weighted) pluripotential theory associated to a convex body $P$ in $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ has been developed. Let $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty)$ and fix a convex body $P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ ($P$ is compact, convex and $P^o \neq \emptyset$). An important example is when $P$ is a non-degenerate convex polytope, i.e., the convex hull of a finite subset of $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ with nonempty interior.

Associated with $P$ we consider the finite-dimensional polynomial spaces

$$\text{Poly}(nP) := \{p(z) = \sum_{J \in nP \cap (\mathbb{Z}^+)^d} c_J z^J : c_J \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ where $z^J = z_1^{j_1} \cdots z_d^{j_d}$ for $J = (j_1, \ldots, j_d)$. For $P = \Sigma$ where

$$\Sigma := \{(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \leq 1\},$$

we have $\text{Poly}(n\Sigma)$ is the usual space of holomorphic polynomials of degree at most $n$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$. For a nonconstant polynomial $p$ we define

$$\deg_P(p) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : p \in \text{Poly}(nP)\}.$$ (1.1)

We define the logarithmic indicator function of $P$ on $\mathbb{C}^d$

$$H_P(z) := \sup_{J \in P} \log |z^J| := \sup_{J \in P} \log(||z_1|^{j_1} \cdots |z_d|^{j_d}||).$$

Note that $H_P(|z_1|, \ldots, |z_d|)$ as in [3], [4], [7], we make the assumption on $P$ that

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

In particular, $0 \in P$. Under this hypothesis, we have

$$H_P(z) \geq \frac{1}{k} \max_{j=1,\ldots,d} \log^+ |z_j|^k$$ (1.3)
where \( \log^+ |z_j| = \max[0, \log |z_j|] \). We use \( H_P \) to define generalizations of the Lelong classes \( L(\mathbb{C}^d) \) and
\[
L^+(\mathbb{C}^d) = \{ u \in L(\mathbb{C}^d) : u(z) \geq \max_{j=1,\ldots,d} \log^+ |z_j| + C_u \}
\]
where \( C_u \) is a constant depending on \( u \). Define
\[
L^+_P = L^+_P(\mathbb{C}^d) := \{ u \in L^+(\mathbb{C}^d) : u(z) \geq H_P(z) + C_u \}.
\]
For \( p \in \text{Poly}(nP) \), \( n \geq 1 \) we have \( \frac{1}{n} \log |p| \in L^+_P \); also each \( u \in L^+_P \) is locally bounded in \( \mathbb{C}^d \). Note \( L_\Sigma = L(\mathbb{C}^d) \) and \( L^+_{\Sigma,+} = L^+(\mathbb{C}^d) \).

Given \( E \subset \mathbb{C}^d \), the \( P \)–extremal function of \( E \) is given by
\[
V_{P,E}^*(z) := \limsup_{\zeta \to z} V_{P,E}(\zeta)
\]
where
\[
V_{P,E}(\zeta) := \sup\{ u(z) : u \in L^+_P(\mathbb{C}^d), u \leq 0 \text{ on } E \}.
\]
Introducing weights, let \( K \subset \mathbb{C}^d \) be closed and let \( w : K \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) be a nonnegative, uppersemicontinuous function with \( \{ z \in K : w(z) > 0 \} \) nonpluripolar. Letting \( Q := -\log w \), if \( K \) is unbounded, we additionally require that
\[
\liminf_{|z| \to \infty, z \in K} [Q(z) - H_P(z)] = +\infty.
\]
Define the weighted \( P \)–extremal function
\[
V_{P,K,Q}^*(z) := \limsup_{\zeta \to z} V_{P,K,Q}(\zeta)
\]
where
\[
V_{P,K,Q}(z) := \sup\{ u(z) : u \in L^+_P(\mathbb{C}^d), u \leq Q \text{ on } K \}.
\]
If \( Q = 0 \) we simply write \( V_{P,K,Q} = V_{P,K} \) as above. For \( P = \Sigma \),
\[
V_{\Sigma,K,Q}(z) = V_{K,Q}(z) := \sup\{ u(z) : u \in L(\mathbb{C}^d), u \leq Q \text{ on } K \}
\]
is the usual weighed extremal function.

A version of a Siciak-Zaharjuta type result has been given in [1] in the case where it is assumed that \( V_{P,K,Q} \) is continuous. Here we give a complete proof of the general version:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d \) be a convex body, \( K \subset \mathbb{C}^d \) closed, and \( w = e^{-Q} \) an admissible weight on \( K \). Then
\[
V_{P,K,Q} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \Phi_n = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \Phi_{n,P,K,Q}
\]
pointwise on $\mathbb{C}^d$ where
\begin{equation}
\Phi_n(z) := \sup\{|p_n(z)| : p_n \in Poly(nP), \max_{\zeta \in K} |p_n(\zeta)e^{-nQ(\zeta)}| \leq 1\}.
\end{equation}

If $V_{P,K,Q}$ is continuous, we have local uniform convergence on $\mathbb{C}^d$.

In the next section, we show that standard convolution does not necessarily preserve the $L_P$ classes. Thus the transition from the Siciak-Zaharjuta type result for $V_{P,K,Q}$ continuous to general $V_{P,K,Q}$ is not immediate. In section 3, we recall the Ferrier regularization procedure from [10] and show that it does preserve the $L_P$ classes. Then in sections 4 and 5 we present a complete proof of Theorem 1.1 together with remarks on regularity of $P-$extremal functions.

2. Approximation by convolution

We fix a standard smoothing kernel
\begin{equation}
\chi(z) = \chi(z_1, \ldots, z_d) = \chi(|z_1|, \ldots, |z_d|)
\end{equation}
with $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and support in the unit polydisk satisfying $\int \chi dV = 1$ where $dV$ is the standard volume form on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Let $\chi_{1/j}(z) = j^{2d}\chi(jz)$.

For which $P$ does $u \in L_P$ imply $u_j := u \ast \chi_{1/j} \in L_P$ for $j$ sufficiently large? To determine this, it clearly suffices to consider $u = H_P$. Thus we write $u_j(z) := (H_P \ast \chi_{1/j})(z)$.

For general $P$ we know that $u_j \geq H_P; u_j \downarrow H_P$ pointwise on $\mathbb{C}^d$ and uniformly on compact sets. Thus if $u_j \in L_P$ then, in fact, $u_j \in L_{P,+}$.

Fix $\delta > 0$ so that
\begin{enumerate}
\item (1) for $j \geq j_0(\delta)$ we have $u_j(z) \leq H_P(z) + \delta$ if $|z_1|, \ldots, |z_d| \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$ and
\item (2) $u_j(z) \leq H_P(z) + C(\delta)$ if $|z_1|, \ldots, |z_d| \geq \delta$ for all $j$ where $C(\delta)$ depends only on $\delta$.
\end{enumerate}

Property (1) follows from the local uniform convergence. For (2),
\begin{equation}
\max_{D(z,1/j)} H_P \leq u_j(z) \leq H_P(|z_1| + 1/j, \ldots, |z_d| + 1/j)
\end{equation}
where $D(z,1/j)$ is the polydisk of polyradius $(1/j, \ldots, 1/j)$ centered at $z$. Then for $|z_k| > \delta$,
\begin{align*}
\log(|z_k| + 1/j) &= \log |z_k| + \log(1 + \frac{1}{j|z_k|}) \\
&\leq \log |z_k| + \log(1 + \frac{1}{j\delta}) \leq \log |z_k| + \log(1 + \frac{1}{\delta})
\end{align*}
and since

\[ H_P(z) = \sup_{(j_1, \ldots, j_d) \in P} \log[|z_1|^{j_1} \cdots |z_d|^{j_d}] = \sup_{(j_1, \ldots, j_d) \in P} \sum_{k=1}^{d} j_k \log |z_k|, \]

for \(|z_1|, \ldots, |z_d| \geq \delta\) we have

\[
\max_{D(z,1/j)} H_P \leq \sup_{(j_1, \ldots, j_d) \in P} \sum_{k=1}^{d} j_k \log(|z_k| + 1/j)
\]

\[
\leq \sup_{(j_1, \ldots, j_d) \in P} \sum_{k=1}^{d} j_k \log |z_k| + \log(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}) \cdot \sup_{(j_1, \ldots, j_d) \in P} \sum_{k=1}^{d} j_k
\]

which gives (2).

For simplicity we work in \(\mathbb{C}^2\) with variables \((z_1, z_2)\). From the above calculations, we see that, given \(\delta > 0\), fixing \(j \geq j_0(\delta)\), to show \(u_j \in L_P\) it suffices to show there is a constant \(A(\delta)\) depending only on \(\delta\) such that for \((z_1, z_2)\) with \(|z_1| < \delta\) and \(|z_2| > 1/\delta\) and for \((z_1, z_2)\) with \(|z_1| > 1/\delta\) and \(|z_2| < \delta\), we have

(2.3) \[ u_j(z_1, z_2) \leq H_P(z_1, z_2) + A(\delta). \]

Proposition 2.1. If there exists \(\delta > 0\) so that \(H_P(z_1, z_2) \geq H_P(\delta, z_2)\) for \(|z_1| < \delta\) and \(|z_2| > 1/\delta\) as well as \(H_P(z_1, z_2) \geq H_P(z_1, \delta)\) for \(|z_2| < \delta\) and \(|z_1| > 1/\delta\) then \(u_j = H_P \ast \chi_{1/j} \in L_P\) for \(j\) sufficiently large.

Proof. We need to prove (2.3); to do this it suffices to show

\[ u_j(z_1, z_2) \leq H_P(\delta, z_2) + A(\delta), \quad |z_1| < \delta \quad \text{and} \quad |z_2| > 1/\delta \quad \text{(A)} \]

and

\[ u_j(z_1, z_2) \leq H_P(z_1, \delta) + A(\delta), \quad |z_1| > 1/\delta \quad \text{and} \quad |z_2| < \delta. \quad \text{(B)} \]

We verify (A); (B) is the same. To verify (A), for such \((z_1, z_2)\), from (2.2), we need the appropriate upper bound on

\[
\sup_{(j_1, j_2) \in P} [j_1 \log(|z_1| + 1/j) + j_2 \log(|z_2| + 1/j)].
\]

Now

\[
j_1 \log(|z_1| + 1/j) + j_2 \log(|z_2| + 1/j) \leq j_1 \log(\delta + 1/j) + j_2 \log(\delta + 1/j) + j_2 \log(1 + \frac{1}{|z_2|j})
\]

\[
\leq j_1 [\log \delta + \log(1 + \frac{1}{\delta j})] + j_2 [\log |z_2| + \log(1 + \frac{1}{|z_2|j})]
\]

\[
\leq j_1 [\log \delta + \log(1 + \frac{1}{\delta j})] + j_2 [\log |z_2| + \log(1 + \frac{\delta}{j})]
\]
Thus
\[ u_j(z_1, z_2) \leq \sup_{(j_1, j_2) \in P} \left[ j_1 \log(|z_1| + 1/|j|) + j_2 \log(|z_2| + 1/|j|) \right] \]
\[ \leq \sup_{(j_1, j_2) \in P} \left( j_1 \left[ \log(\delta) + \log(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}) \right] + j_2 \left[ \log(|z_2|) + \log(1 + \delta) \right] \right) \]
\[ \leq \sup_{(j_1, j_2) \in P} \left[ j_1 \log(\delta) + j_2 \log(|z_2|) \right] + A(\delta) \]
where
\[ A(\delta) = \sup_{(j_1, j_2) \in P} \left[ j_1 \log(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}) + j_2 \log(1 + \delta) \right]. \]

We call a convex body \( P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d \) a lower set if for each \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \), whenever \( (j_1, \ldots, j_d) \in nP \cap (\mathbb{Z}^+)^d \) we have \( (k_1, \ldots, k_d) \in nP \cap (\mathbb{Z}^+)^d \) for all \( k_l \leq j_l, l = 1, \ldots, d \). Clearly \( H_P \) for such \( P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^2 \) satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 2.1.

**Corollary 2.2.** If \( P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^2 \) is a lower set, then \( H_P * \chi_{1/j} \in L_P \) for \( j \) sufficiently large.

Indeed, it appears this condition is necessary for \( H_P * \chi_{1/j} \in L_P \) as the following explicit example indicates.

**Example 2.3.** Let \( P \) be the quadrilateral with vertices \((0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\) and \((1, 2)\). This \( P \) is not a lower set. We show that for \( \epsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small, \( H_P * \chi_{\epsilon} \notin L_P \). Here,
\[ H_P(z_1, z_2) = \max[0, \log |z_1|, \log |z_2|, \log |z_1| + 2 \log |z_2|]. \]
Consider the regions
\[ A := \{(z_1, z_2) : |z_1z_2| < 1, |z_2| > 1\} \]
and
\[ B := \{(z_1, z_2) : |z_1z_2| > 1, |z_2| > 1\}. \]
In \( A \), \( H_P(z_1, z_2) = \log |z_2| \) while in \( B \) we have \( H_P(z_1, z_2) = \log |z_1| + 2 \log |z_2| = \log |z_2| + \log |z_1z_2| \). Fixing \( \epsilon > 0 \), we take any large \( C \). We claim we can find a point \((x_C, y_C)\) at which
\[ H_P * \chi_{\epsilon}(x_C, y_C) - H_P(x_C, y_C) > C. \]
If $0 < |x| < 1/|y| < 1$ then $(x, y) \in A$. For such $(x, y)$, let
\[
D_\varepsilon(x, y) := \{(z_1, z_2) : |z_1 - x|, |z_2 - y| < \varepsilon\}
\]
and
\[
S_\varepsilon(x, y) := \{(z_1, z_2) \in D_\varepsilon(x, y) : |z_1| > \varepsilon/2\}.
\]
We first choose $y_C$ with $|y_C|$ sufficiently large so that for any choice of $x_C$ with $|x_C| < 1/|y_C|$ — so that $Z := (x_C, y_C) \in A$ — we have
\[
|y_C| > \max\left\{\frac{4}{\varepsilon}, \frac{2}{\varepsilon} e^{2C/A_\varepsilon}\right\} + \varepsilon
\]
where $A_\varepsilon := \int_{T_\varepsilon} \chi_\varepsilon dV$ and
\[
T_\varepsilon := \{(z_1, z_2) : \varepsilon/2 \leq |z_1| \leq \varepsilon, |z_2| < \varepsilon\}.
\]
Note then that $|x_C| < \varepsilon/4$ and that $S_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)$ contains the set of points
\[
\{(z_1, z_2) : \varepsilon/2 \leq |z_1| \leq \varepsilon, |z_2 - y_C| < \varepsilon\}
\]
which is a translation of $T_\varepsilon$, centered at $(0, 0)$, to $(0, y_C)$. The choice of $y_C$ insures that $S_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C) \subset B$ and
\[
\text{for } (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in S_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C) \text{ we have } |\zeta_1| > 1 \text{ and } |\zeta_2| \geq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} e^{2C/A_\varepsilon}.
\]
Writing $\zeta := (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$, we have
\[
H_\varepsilon \ast \chi_\varepsilon(Z) - H_\varepsilon(Z) = \int_{D_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)} H_\varepsilon(\zeta) \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta) - H_\varepsilon(Z)
\]
\[
= \int_{D_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)} \left[\log |\zeta_2| + \log^+ |\zeta_1 \zeta_2|\right] \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta) - \log |y_C|
\]
\[
= \int_{D_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)} \log^+ |\zeta_1 \zeta_2| \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta)
\]
since $\zeta \rightarrow \log |\zeta_2|$ is harmonic on $D_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)$ and $\int_{D_\varepsilon} \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta) = 1$. But then
\[
\int_{D_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)} \log^+ |\zeta_1 \zeta_2| \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta) \geq \int_{S_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)} \log |\zeta_1 \zeta_2| \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta)
\]
\[
\geq \int_{S_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)} \log\left[\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2 e^{2C/A_\varepsilon}}\right] \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta)
\]
\[
= \log e^{2C/A_\varepsilon} \int_{S_\varepsilon(x_C, y_C)} \chi_\varepsilon(Z - \zeta) dV(\zeta)
\]
\[ C \geq \frac{2C}{A} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \chi_\epsilon(\zeta) dV(\zeta) = 2C. \]

We will use this standard regularization procedure in the proof of Theorem 1.1 but in our application we only utilize the monotonicity property \( u_j \downarrow u \). In the next section, we discuss an alternate regularization procedure which always preserves \( L_P \) classes and which will be needed to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3. Ferrier approximation

We can do a global approximation of \( u \in L_P \) from above by continuous \( u_t \in L_P \) following the proof of Proposition 1.3 in [12] which itself is an adaptation of [10].

**Proposition 3.1.** Let \( u \in L_P \). For \( t > 0 \), define

\[ u_t(x) := -\log \left[ \inf_{y \in \mathbb{C}^d} \{ e^{-u(y)} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \} \right]. \]

Then for \( t > 0 \) sufficiently small, \( u_t \in L_P \cap C(\mathbb{C}^d) \) and \( u_t \downarrow u \) on \( \mathbb{C}^d \).

**Proof.** The continuity of \( u_t \) follows from continuity of \( \delta_t(x) := e^{-u_t(x)} \) which follows from the estimate

\[ \delta_t(x) - \delta_t(y) = e^{-u_t(x)} - e^{-u_t(y)} \leq \frac{1}{t} |x - y|. \]

Note that \( \delta_t \uparrow \) so \( u_t \downarrow \). Since \( \inf_{y \in \mathbb{C}^d} \{ e^{-u(y)} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \} \leq e^{-u(x)} \), we have \( u_t(x) \geq u(x) \). To show that \( u_t \downarrow u \) on \( \mathbb{C}^d \), fix \( x \in \mathbb{C}^d \). By adding a constant we may assume \( u(x) = 0 \). Given \( \delta > 0 \), we want to show there exists \( t(\delta) > 0 \) such that \( u_t(x) < \delta \) for \( t < t(\delta) \). Thus we want

\[ \inf_{y \in \mathbb{C}^d} \{ e^{-u(y)} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \} > e^{-\delta} \text{ for } t < t(\delta). \]

Since \( e^{-u} \) is lowersemicontinuous and \( e^{-u(x)} = 1 > e^{-\delta} \), we can find \( \epsilon > 0 \) so that

\[ e^{-u(y)} > e^{-\delta} \text{ for } |y - x| < \epsilon. \]

For such \( y \), we have \( e^{-u(y)} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| > e^{-\delta} \) for any \( t > 0 \). Choosing \( t(\delta) > 0 \) so that \( t(\delta) < \epsilon e^\delta \) achieves (3.2).

The proof that \( u_t \) is psh follows [10]; for the reader’s convenience we include this in an appendix. Given this, we are left to show \( u_t \in L_P \)
for $t > 0$ sufficiently small. It clearly suffices to show this for $u = H_P$. Thus, let

$$u_t(x) := -\log[\inf_y \{ e^{-H_P(y)} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \}].$$

For $t > 0$ sufficiently small, we want to show there exists $R >> 1$ and $0 < C < 1$, both depending only on $t$ and $P$, so that for each $x \in \mathbb{C}^d$ with $e^{H_P(x)} > R$ we have

$$e^{-u_t(x)} \geq C e^{-H_P(x)}.$$

Unwinding this last inequality, we require

$$e^{-H_P(y)} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \geq C e^{-H_P(x)} \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{C}^d.$$

This is the same as

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{C e^{H_P(y)} - e^{H_P(x)}}{e^{H_P(x)} e^{H_P(y)}} \leq \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{C}^d.$$ 

Fix $x$ and fix $C$ with $0 < C < 1$. For any $y$ with $e^{H_P(y)} \leq \frac{1}{C} e^{H_P(x)}$, (3.3) is clearly satisfied. If $e^{H_P(y)} \geq \frac{1}{C} e^{H_P(x)}$, since

$$\frac{C e^{H_P(y)} - e^{H_P(x)}}{e^{H_P(x)} e^{H_P(y)}} \leq \frac{C e^{H_P(y)}}{e^{H_P(x)} e^{H_P(y)}} = \frac{C}{e^{H_P(x)}},$$

we would like to have

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{C}{e^{H_P(x)}} \leq \frac{1}{t} |y - x|.$$ 

To estimate $|y - x|$, note that $x$ lies on the set

$$L_x := \{ z : e^{H_P(z)} = e^{H_P(x)} \}$$

while $y$ lies outside the larger level set

$$L_{C,x} := \{ z : e^{H_P(z)} = \frac{1}{C} e^{H_P(x)} \}.$$ 

Thus

$$|y - x| \geq \text{dist}(L_x, L_{C,x})$$

and it suffices, for (3.4), to have

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{C}{e^{H_P(x)}} \leq \frac{1}{t} \text{dist}(L_x, L_{C,x}).$$

Note that $L_x$ depends only on $x$ (and $P$) while $L_{C,x}$ depends only on $C$ and $x$ (and $P$). But for any fixed $C$ with $0 < C < 1$, $\text{dist}(L_x, L_{C,x})$ is bounded below by a positive constant as $H_P(x) \to \infty$ for a convex
body $P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ satisfying (1.2). Thus taking $t > 0$ sufficiently small, (3.5) will hold for all $x$ with $H_P(x)$ sufficiently large. □

**Remark 3.2.** If $u \in L_{P,+}$, there exists $c$ with $u(y) \geq c + H_P(y)$ on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Hence

$$\inf_{y \in \mathbb{C}^d} \{ e^{-u(y)} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \} \leq \inf_{y \in \mathbb{C}^d} \{ e^{-[c+H_P(y)]} + \frac{1}{t} |y - x| \} \leq e^{-[c+H_P(x)]}$$

which gives

$$u_t(x) \geq c + H_P(x).$$

Thus $u_t \in L_{P,+}$

We use Proposition 3.1 in the next sections in proving Theorem 1.1.

### 4. Proof of Main Result

Let $P$ be a convex body in $(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ satisfying (1.3). As in the case $P = \Sigma$, for $K$ unbounded and $Q$ satisfying (1.4), $V_{P,K,Q} = V_{P,K \cap B_R,Q}$ for $B_R := \{ z : |z| \leq R \}$ with $R$ sufficiently large (cf., [3]). Thus in proving Theorem 1.1 we may assume $K$ is compact. Theorem 2.10 in [1] states a Siciak-Zaharjuta theorem for $K,Q$ such that $V_{P,K,Q}$ is continuous (without assuming $Q$ is continuous):

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $K$ be compact and $Q$ be an admissible weight function on $K$ such that $V_{P,K,Q}$ is continuous. Then $V_{P,K,Q} = \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q}$ where

$$\tilde{V}_{P,K,Q}(z) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \left[ \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \log |p(z)| : p \in Poly(NP), \| pe^{-Q}\|_K \leq 1 \right\} \right]$$

with local uniform convergence in $\mathbb{C}^d$.

**Remark 4.2.** The fact that the limit $\tilde{V}_{P,K,Q}(z) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \Phi_n(z)$ exists pointwise follows from the observation that $\Phi_n \cdot \Phi_m \leq \Phi_{n+m}$ (here we are using the notation from [1.5]). Convexity of $P$ is crucial as this property implies that

$$\text{Poly}(nP) \cdot \text{Poly}(mP) \subset \text{Poly}((n + m)P).$$

Note we can also write

$$\tilde{V}_{P,K,Q}(z) = \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\deg(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \text{ polynomial}, \| pe^{-deg(p)Q}\|_K \leq 1 \right\}.$$

where $\deg(p)$ is defined in (1.1) and clearly $V_{P,K,Q} \geq \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q}$. 


The proof of Theorem 4.1 is given in [1], Theorem 2.10 but the proof is omitted from the final version [2]. Here we provide complete details including a proof of the following version of Proposition 2.9 from [2], [1] which is stated but not proved in these references. Below \(dV\) is the standard volume form on \(\mathbb{C}^d\).

**Proposition 4.3.** Let \(P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d\) be a convex polytope and let \(f \in O(\mathbb{C}^d)\) such that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |f(z)|^2 e^{-2NH_P(z)} (1 + |z|^2)^{-\epsilon} dV(z) < \infty
\]

for some \(\epsilon \geq 0\) sufficiently small. Then \(f \in \text{Poly}(NP)\).

**Proof.** Since \(P\) is a convex polytope it is given by

\[
P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \ell_j(x) \leq 0, \ j = 1, \ldots, k\}
\]

where

\[
\ell_j(x) := \langle x, r_j \rangle - \alpha_j.
\]

Here \(r_j = (r_{j1}, \ldots, r_{jd}) \in \mathbb{R}^d\) is the primitive outward normal to the \(j\)-th codimension one face of \(P\); \(\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}\); and \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\) is the standard inner product on \(\mathbb{R}^d\). Recall that the support function \(h_P : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}\) of \(P\) is given by

\[
h_P(x) = \sup_{p \in P} \langle x, p \rangle.
\]

Fix an index \(J \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus NP\). Replacing \(P\) with \(NP\) above, this means that

\[
h_{NP}(r_j) \leq N\alpha_j < \langle J, r_j \rangle
\]

for some \(j\). Define \(\text{Log} : (\mathbb{C}^*)^d \to \mathbb{R}^d\) via

\[
\text{Log}(z) := (\log |z_1|, \ldots, \log |z_d|).
\]

The pre-image of \(r_j \in \mathbb{R}^d\) under \(\text{Log}\) is the complex \(d\)-torus

\[
S_{r_j} := \{|z_1| = e^{r_{j1}}\} \times \cdots \times \{|z_d| = e^{r_{jd}}\}.
\]

We conclude that

\[
NH_P(z) = h_{NP}(r_j) < \langle J, \text{Log}(z) \rangle
\]

for every \(z \in S_{r_j}\). Clearly, the above inequality is true for every positive multiple of \(r_j\) and hence on the set of tori \(S_{tr_j}\) for \(t > 0\).
Write \( f(z) = \sum_{L \in \mathbb{Z}^+} a_L z^L \). By the Cauchy integral formula

\[
a_j = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^d} \int_{S_{tr_j}} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta^{(j+1)}} d\zeta
\]

where \( z^J = z_1^{j_1} \cdots z_d^{j_d} \) and \( I = (1, \ldots, 1) \). We want to show that \( a_J = 0 \) for \( J \in \mathbb{Z}^+_+ \setminus NP \). We write \( d|\zeta| = \prod_i |e^{r_i} d\theta_i | \). Then by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (4.2) we have

\[
|a_J| \leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{S_{tr_j}} \frac{|f(\zeta)|^2 e^{-2NH_P(\zeta)}}{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^\epsilon} d|\zeta| \leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{S_{tr_j}} \frac{|f(\zeta)|^2 e^{-2NH_P(\zeta)}}{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^\epsilon} d|\zeta| \frac{(1 + |\zeta|^2)^\epsilon}{|\zeta^{2l}|} \frac{1}{|\zeta^{2l}|} \frac{1}{d|\zeta|}.
\]

Thus,

\[
\prod_{i=1}^d \exp(tr_i^j) \prod_{i=1}^d \exp(2tr_i^j) |a_J|^2 \leq (2\pi)^{-d} \int_{S_{tr_j}} |f(\zeta)|^2 e^{-2NH_P(\zeta)} (1 + |\zeta|^2)^\epsilon d|\zeta|.
\]

Note that some components \( r_i^j \) of \( r_j \) could be negative and some could be nonnegative; e.g., for \( \Sigma \) we have \( r_j = (0, \ldots, 0, -1, 0, \ldots, 0) = -e_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, d \) and \( r_{d+1} = (1/d, \ldots, 1/d) \). Writing \( \zeta_i = \rho_i e^{i\theta} \) where \( \rho_i := e^{tr_i^j} \), the above inequality becomes

\[
\prod_{i=1}^d \exp(tr_i^j) |a_J|^2 \leq (2\pi)^{-d} \int_{|\zeta_1| = \rho_1} \cdots \int_{|\zeta_d| = \rho_d} |f(\zeta)|^2 e^{-2NH_P(\zeta)} (1 + |\zeta|^2)^\epsilon \prod_i \rho_i d\theta_i.
\]

From (1.2), \( P \) contains a neighborhood of the origin and hence for some \( i \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \) we have \( r_i^j \geq 0 \); i.e., we cannot have all \( r_i^j < 0 \).

Case 1: There is some \( i \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \) for which \( r_i^j > 0 \). Then for each \( i = 1, \ldots, d \), we integrate both sides of (4.3) over

\[
\begin{cases}
1 \leq \rho_i \leq T & \text{if } r_i^j \geq 0 \\
1/T \leq \rho_i \leq 1 & \text{if } r_i^j < 0
\end{cases}
\]

and letting \( T \to \infty \) we see that \( a_J = 0 \).

Case 2: \( r_i^j \leq 0 \) for every \( i = 1, \ldots, d \). Note that since \( r_j \neq 0 \) there is an \( i \) such that \( r_i^j < 0 \). Since \( P \) is a convex polytope this implies that

\[
\int_{C^d} |z^J|^2 e^{-2NH_P(\zeta)} (1 + |z|^2)^\epsilon dV(z) = \infty.
\]
On the other hand, since \( H_P(z_1, \ldots, z_d) = H_P(|z_1|, \ldots, |z_d|) \), the monomials \( a_L z^L \) occurring in \( f \) are orthogonal with respect to the weighted \( L^2 \)-norm in (4.1). Hence for each such \( L \) we have

\[
|a_L|^2 \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |z|^L e^{-2NH_P(z)} (1 + |z|^2)^{-\epsilon} dV(z) \leq \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |f(z)|^2 e^{-2NH_P(z)} (1 + |z|^2)^{-\epsilon} dV(z) < \infty
\]

from which we conclude that \( a_J = 0 \).

\[\boxdot\]

**Remark 4.4.** Clearly if \( P \) is a convex body in \((\mathbb{R}^+)^d\) and \( f \in O(C^d) \) satisfies (4.1) then for any convex polytope \( P' \) containing \( P \), \( f \) satisfies (4.1) with \( P' \) so that \( f \in \text{Poly}(NP') \).

We will use the following version of Hörmander’s \( L^2 \)-estimate ([8, Theorem 6.9] on page 379) for a solution of the \( \overline{\partial} \) equation:

**Theorem 4.5.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d \) be a pseudoconvex open subset and let \( \varphi \) be a psh function on \( \Omega \). For every \( r \in (0, 1) \) and every \( (0, 1) \) form \( g = \sum_{j=1}^d g_j d\overline{z}_j \) with \( g_j \in L^2_{p,q}(\Omega, \text{loc}), \ j = 1, \ldots, d \) such that \( \overline{\partial} g = 0 \) and

\[
\int_{\Omega} |g|^2 e^{-\varphi} (1 + |z|^2) dV(z) < \infty
\]

where \( |g|^2 := \sum_{j=1}^d |g_j|^2 \) there exists \( f \in L^2(\Omega, \text{loc}) \) such that \( \overline{\partial} f = g \) and

\[
\int_{\Omega} |f|^2 e^{-\varphi} (1 + |z|^2)^{-r} dV(z) \leq \frac{4}{r^2} \int_{\Omega} |g|^2 e^{-\varphi} (1 + |z|^2)^{-r} dV(z) < \infty.
\]

Moreover, we can take \( f \) to be smooth if \( g \) and \( \varphi \) are smooth.

Finally we will use the following result, which is Lemma 2.2 in [2].

**Lemma 4.6.** Let \( P \) be a convex body in \((\mathbb{R}^+)^d\) and \( \psi \in L_{P^+}(\mathbb{C}^d) \). Then for every \( p \in P^o \) there exists \( \kappa, C_\psi > 0 \) such that

\[
\psi(z) \geq \kappa \max_{j=1, \ldots, d} \log |z_j| + \log |z^p| - C_\psi \text{ for every } z \in \mathbb{C}^*.
\]

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** From Remark 4.2, given \( z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^d \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \) we want to find \( N \) large and \( p_N \in \text{Poly}(NP) \) with

\[
\frac{1}{N} \log |p_N(z)| \leq Q(z), \quad z \in K
\]
Lemma 4.6 and (4.4) we obtain,

\[ \frac{1}{N} \log |p_N(z_0)| > V_{P,K,Q}(z_0) - \epsilon. \]

**STEP 1:** We write \( V := V_{P,K,Q} \). Since \( V \) is continuous, we can fix \( \delta > 0 \) so that

\[ V(z) > V(z_0) - \epsilon/2 \text{ if } z \in B(z_0, \delta). \]

If \( V \) is not smooth on \( \mathbb{C}^d \) then we approximate \( V \) by smooth psh functions \( V_t := \chi_t * V \geq V \) on \( \mathbb{C}^d \) with \( \chi \) as in \((2.1)\). Since \( V \) is continuous, \( V_t \) converges to \( V \) locally uniformly as \( t \to 0 \).

Let \( \eta \) be a test function with compact support in \( B(z_0, \delta) = \{ z : |z - z_0| < \delta \} \) such that \( \eta \equiv 1 \) on \( B(z_0, \frac{\delta}{2}) \). For a fixed point \( p \in P^o \), we define

\[ \psi_{N,t}(z) := (N - \frac{d}{\kappa})(V_t(z) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}) + \frac{d}{\kappa} \log |z|^p + \frac{d}{\kappa} \max_{j = 1, \ldots, d} \log |z_j - z_{0,j}| \]

where \( \kappa > 0 \) is as in Lemma 4.6 and \( \frac{d}{\kappa} \ll N \). Note that \( \psi_{N,t} \) is psh on \( \mathbb{C}^d \), and smooth away from \( z_0 \). Applying Theorem 4.5 with the weight function \( \psi_{N,t} \), for every \( r \in (0, 1] \) there exists a smooth function \( u_{N,t} \) on \( \mathbb{C}^d \) such that \( \overline{\partial}u_{N,t} = \overline{\partial}\eta \)

\[
\int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |u_{N,t}|^2 e^{-2\psi_{N,t}} (1 + |z|^2)^{-r} dV(z) \leq \frac{4}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |\overline{\partial}\eta|^2 e^{-2\psi_{N,t}} (1 + |z|^2) dV(z).
\]

Note that the \((0, 1)\) form \( \overline{\partial}\eta \) is supported in \( B(z_0, \delta) \setminus B(z_0, \frac{\delta}{2}) \); therefore both integrals are finite. Since \( \psi_{N,t}(z) = d \max_{j = 1, \ldots, d} \log |z_j - z_{0,j}| + O(1) \) as \( z \to z_0 \) we conclude that \( u_{N,t}(z_0) = 0 \). Moreover, since \( V_t \geq V \) by Lemma 4.6 and (4.4) we obtain

\[
\int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |u_{N,t}|^2 e^{-2N(V_t - \frac{\epsilon}{2})} (1 + |z|^2)^{-r} dV(z) \leq C_1 e^{-2N(V(z_0) - \epsilon)}
\]

where \( C_1 > 0 \) does not depend on either \( N \) or \( t \).

Next, we let \( f_{N,t} := \eta - u_{N,t} \). Then \( f_{N,t} \) is a holomorphic function on \( \mathbb{C}^d \) such that \( f_{N,t}(z_0) = 1 \). Furthermore,

\[
\int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |f_{N,t}|^2 e^{-2N(V_t - \frac{\epsilon}{2})} (1 + |z|^2)^{-r} dV(z) \leq C_2 e^{-2N(V(z_0) - \epsilon)}
\]

and these bounds are uniform as \( C_2 > 0 \) is independent of \( N \) and \( t \). We extract a convergent subsequence \( f_{N,t_k} \to f_N \) as \( t_k \to 0 \) where \( f_N \) is a
holomorphic function on $\mathbb{C}^d$ satisfying $f_N(z_0) = 1$ and

$$
\int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |f_N|^2 e^{-2N(V(z) - V(z_0))(1 + |z|^2)^{-r}} dV(z) \leq C_2 e^{-2N(V(z_0) - \epsilon)}.
$$

Finally, using $V \in L_{P,+}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ we see that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{C}^d} |f_N|^2 e^{-2NHP(1 + |z|^2)^{-r}} dV(z) < \infty.
$$

Taking $r > 0$ sufficiently small, Proposition 4.3 implies that $f_N \in Poly(NP)$.

**STEP 2:** We want to modify $f_N \in Poly(NP)$ satisfying (4.5) and $f_N(z_0) = 1$ to get $p_N$. Note $V(z) \leq Q(z)$ on all of $K$. Fix $\rho > 0$ and for $r > 0$ as above chosen sufficiently small, let

$$
C_r := \min_{z \in K_\rho}(1 + |z|^2)^{-r} \text{ where } K_\rho = \{z : dist(z, K) \leq \rho\}.
$$

There exists $\beta = \beta(\rho) > 0$ with $|V(z) - V(y)| < \epsilon$ if $y, z \in K_\rho$ with $|y - z| < \beta$. Without loss of generality we may assume $\beta \leq \rho$ (or else replace $\beta$ by $\min[\beta, \rho]$).

For $z \in K$, applying subaveraging to $|f_N|^2$ on $B(z, \beta) \subset K_\rho$ we have

$$
|f_N(z)|^2 \leq C_\beta \int_{B(z, \beta)} |f_N(y)|^2 dV(y).
$$

Thus, for every $z \in K$

$$
C_r |f_N(z)|^2 e^{-2NQ(z)} \leq C_r |f_N(z)|^2 e^{-2NV(z)} \leq C_\beta \int_{B(z, \beta)} |f_N(y)|^2 e^{-2NV(y)} (1 + |y|^2)^{-r} dV(y) \leq C_\beta \int_{B(z, \beta)} |f_N(y)|^2 e^{-2N(V(y) - \epsilon)} (1 + |y|^2)^{-r} dV(y) \leq C_\beta C_2 e^{-2N(V(z_0) - \epsilon)}
$$

from (4.5). Thus taking $p_N := \sqrt{\frac{C_r}{C_\beta C_2}} e^{N(V(z_0) - \epsilon)} f_N$ we have $p_N \in Poly(NP)$ and

$$
\max_{z \in K} |p_N(z)e^{-NQ(z)}| \leq 1.
$$

Finally,

$$
\frac{1}{N} \log |p_N(z_0)| = V(z_0) - \epsilon + \frac{1}{2N} \log \frac{C_r}{C_\beta C_2}.
$$
Since none of $C_r, C_\beta, C_2$ depend on $N$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \log |p_N(z_0)| > V(z_0) - 2\epsilon$$

for $N$ sufficiently large.

This completes the proof of the pointwise convergence of

$$\frac{1}{N} \log \Phi_N(z) := \sup \{ \frac{1}{N} \log |p(z)| : p \in Poly(NP), ||p e^{-NQ}||_K \leq 1 \}$$

to $V_{P,K,Q}(z)$. The local uniform convergence follows as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 of [6]; this utilizes the observation that $\Phi_N \cdot \Phi_M \leq \Phi_{N+M}$.

\[\square\]

**Remark 4.7.** Let $u \in L_{P,+} \cap C(\mathbb{C}^d)$ with $u \leq Q$ on $K$. The same argument as in Steps 1 and 2 applies to $u$ to show: given $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we can find $N$ large and $p_N \in Poly(NP)$ with

$$\frac{1}{N} \log |p_N(z)| \leq Q(z), \ z \in K$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} \log |p_N(z_0)| > u(z_0) - \epsilon.$$

Note we have not assumed continuity of $Q$ in Theorem 4.1. We proceed to do the general case (Theorem 1.1) using Theorem 4.1; i.e., having proved if $V_{P,K,Q}$ is continuous, then $V_{P,K,Q} = \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q}$, we verify the equality without this assumption. We begin with an elementary observation.

**Lemma 4.8.** For any $K$ compact and $Q$ admissible,

$$V_{P,K,Q}(z) = \sup \{ u(z) : u \in L_{P,+} : u \leq Q \text{ on } K \}.$$

**Proof.** We have $Q$ is bounded below on $K$; say $Q \geq m$ on $K$. Now $K$ is bounded and so $K \subset D_R = \{ z \in \mathbb{C}^d : |z_j| \leq R, j = 1, ..., d \}$ for all $R$ sufficiently large. Then for $u \in L_P$ with $u \leq Q$ on $K$ we have

$$\tilde{u}(z) := \max [u(z), m + H_P(z/R)] \in L_{P,+}$$

with $\tilde{u} \leq Q$ on $K$. \[\square\]

**Proof of Theorem 1.1** First we show: if $Q$ is continuous, then $V_{P,K,Q} = \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q}$. From Lemma 4.8 and Remark 4.7 it suffices to show that if $u \in L_{P,+}$ with $u \leq Q$ on $K$, given $\epsilon > 0$, for $t > 0$ sufficiently small, $u_t$ defined in (3.1) satisfies $u_t \in L_{P,+}$ with $u_t \leq Q + \epsilon$ on $K$. That $u_t \in L_{P,+}$ follows from Proposition 3.1 and Remark 3.2. Since $u_t \downarrow u$
on \( K \), \( u|_K \in C(K) \), \( u \) is usc on \( K \), and \( K \) is compact, by Dini’s theorem, given \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( t_0 \) such that for all \( t < t_0 \) we have \( u_t \leq Q + \epsilon \) on \( K \), as desired.

Finally, to show \( V_{P,K,Q} = \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q} \) in the general case, i.e., where \( Q \) is only lsc and admissible on \( K \), we utilize the argument in [3], Lemma 7.3 (mutatis mutandis) to obtain the following.

**Proposition 4.9.** Let \( K \subset \mathbb{C}^d \) be compact and let \( w_j = e^{-Q_j} \) be admissible weights on \( K \) with \( Q_j \uparrow Q \). Then

\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} V_{P,K,Q_j}(z) = V_{P,K,Q}(z) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^d.
\]

Taking \( Q_j \in C(K) \) with \( Q_j \uparrow Q \), since \( V_{P,K,Q_j} = \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q_j} \leq \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q} \) for all \( j \), we conclude from the proposition that \( V_{P,K,Q} = \tilde{V}_{P,K,Q} \). This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \( \square \)

We finish this section with some remarks on regularity of \( P \)-extremal functions. Recall that a compact set \( K \) is \( L \)-regular if \( V_K = V_{\Sigma,K} \) is continuous on \( K \) (and hence on \( \mathbb{C}^d \)) and \( K \) is locally \( L \)-regular if it is locally \( L \)-regular at each point \( a \in K \); i.e., if for each \( r > 0 \) the function \( V_{K \cap B(a,r)} \) is continuous at \( a \) where \( B(a,r) = \{ z : |z - a| \leq r \} \). For a convex body \( P \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d \) we define the analogous notions of \( PL \)-regular and locally \( PL \)-regular by replacing \( V_K \) by \( V_{P,K} \). For any such \( P \) there exists \( A > 0 \) with \( P \subset A \Sigma \); hence

\[
V_{P,K}(z) \leq A \cdot V_K(z) \quad \text{and} \quad V_{P,K \cap B(a,r)}(z) \leq A \cdot V_{K \cap B(a,r)}(z)
\]

so if \( K \) is \( L \)-regular (resp., locally \( L \)-regular) then \( K \) is \( PL \)-regular (resp., locally \( PL \)-regular). Note for \( P \) satisfying (12) there exist \( 0 < a < b < \infty \) with \( a \Sigma \subset P \subset b \Sigma \) so that \( K \) is locally \( PL \)-regular if and only if \( K \) is locally \( L \)-regular.

**Corollary 4.10.** For \( K \) compact and locally \( L \)-regular and \( Q \) continuous on \( K \), \( V_{P,K,Q} \) is continuous.

**Proof.** From Theorem 1.1 \( V_{P,K,Q} \) is lowersemicontinuous. We show \( V_{P,K,Q}^* \leq Q \) on \( K \) from which it follows that \( V_{P,K,Q}^* \leq V_{P,K,Q} \) and hence equality holds and \( V_{P,K,Q} \) is continuous.

Since \( K \) is locally \( L \)-regular, it is locally \( PL \)-regular. Given \( a \in K \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \), choose \( r > 0 \) small so that \( Q(z) \leq Q(a) + \epsilon \) for \( z \in K \cap B(a,r) \). Then

\[
V_{P,K,Q}(z) \leq V_{P,K \cap B(a,r),Q(a)+\epsilon}(z) = Q(a) + \epsilon + V_{P,K \cap B(a,r)}(z)
\]
for all \( z \in \mathbb{C}^d \). Thus, at \( a \), \( V_{P,K,Q}(a) \leq Q(a) + \epsilon \). Moreover, by continuity of \( V_{P,K \cap \overline{B}(a,r)} \) at \( a \), we have \( V_{P,K \cap \overline{B}(a,r)}(z) \leq \epsilon \) for \( z \in \overline{B}(a,\delta) \), \( \delta > 0 \) sufficiently small. Thus
\[
V^*_{P,K,Q}(a) \leq Q(a) + 2\epsilon
\]
which holds for all \( \epsilon > 0 \).

\[\square\]

**Remark 4.11.** The converse-type result that for a compact set \( K \subset \mathbb{C}^d \), if \( V_{P,K,Q} \) is continuous for every \( Q \) continuous on \( K \) then \( K \) is locally \( PL \)-regular, follows exactly as in [9] Proposition 6.1.

5. Appendix

We provide a version of the lemma from Ferrier [10] appropriate for our purposes to show \( u_t \) in Proposition 3.1 is psh. For \( \lambda > 0 \), we use the distance function \( d^\lambda : \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C} \to [0, \infty) \) defined as \( d^\lambda(z,w) = \lambda|z| + |w| \) (in our application, \( t = 1/\lambda \)).

**Lemma 5.1.** Let \( \delta : \mathbb{C}^d \to [0, \infty) \) be nonnegative. For \( \lambda > 0 \), define
\[
\tilde{\delta}_\lambda(s) := \inf_{s' \in \mathbb{C}^d} [\delta(s') + \lambda|s' - s|].
\]

Let
\[
\Omega_1 := \{(s,t) \in \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C} : |t| < \delta(s)\}.
\]

Then
\[
(5.1) \quad \tilde{\delta}_\lambda(s) = d_\lambda((s,0),(\mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}) \setminus \Omega_1).
\]

Furthermore, if \( \delta \) is lsc, then \( \Omega_1 \) is open. Moreover,
\[
\Omega_1 = \{(s,t) : -\log \delta(s) + \log |t| < 0\}
\]
so that if, in addition, \( -\log \delta \) is psh in \( \mathbb{C}^d \), then \( \Omega_1 \) is pseudoconvex in \( \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C} \).

**Proof.** This is straightforward; first observe
\[
d_\lambda((s,0),(\mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}) \setminus \Omega_1) = \inf \{\lambda|s - s'| + |t| : (s',t) \in (\mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}) \setminus \Omega_1\}
\]
\[
= \inf \{\lambda|s - s'| + |t| : |t| \geq \delta(s')\} = \inf \{\lambda|s - s'| + \delta(s') : s' \in \mathbb{C}^d\} = \tilde{\delta}_\lambda(s).
\]

Next,
\[
\Omega_1 := \{(s,t) \in \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C} : |t| < \delta(s)\}
\]
\[
= \{(s,t) \in \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C} : -\log \delta(s) + \log |t| < 0\}.
\]

\[\square\]
Corollary 5.2. Under the hypotheses of the lemma, if $-\log \delta$ is psh in $\mathbb{C}^d$ then $-\log \hat{\delta}_\lambda$ is psh.

Proof. Since $\Omega_1$ is pseudoconvex in $\mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}$ and $d_\lambda : \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C} \to [0, \infty)$ is a distance function, we have

$$U(s, t) := -\log d((s, t), (\mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}) \setminus \Omega_1)$$

is psh. Thus $U(s, 0) = -\log \hat{\delta}_\lambda(s)$ is psh. \qed
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