arXiv:2012.01593v1 [math.DS] 2 Dec 2020

LOGARITHMIC CAPACITY OF RANDOM G_δ SETS

FERNANDO QUINTINO

Abstract. We study the logarithmic capacity of G_δ subsets of the interval $[0,1]$. Let S be of the form

$$S = \bigcap_m \bigcup_{k \geq m} I_k,$$

where each I_k is an interval in $[0,1]$ with length l_k that decrease to 0. We provide sufficient conditions for S to have full capacity, i.e. $\mathrm{Cap}(S) = \mathrm{Cap}([0,1])$. We consider the case when the intervals decay exponentially and are placed in $[0,1]$ randomly with respect to some given distribution. The random G_δ sets generated by such distribution satisfy our sufficient conditions almost surely and hence, have full capacity almost surely. This study is motivated by the G_δ set of exceptional energies in the parametric version of the Furstenberg theorem on random matrix products. We also study the family of G_δ sets $\{S(\alpha)\}_{\alpha>0}$ that are generated by setting the decreasing speed of the intervals to $l_k = e^{-k^\alpha}$. We observe a sharp transition from full capacity to zero capacity by varying $\alpha > 0$.

1. Introduction

1.1. **The setting.** Finite signed Borel measures on $\mathbb{C}$ form a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$. Given two finite singed measures Borel measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{C}$ we define their *interaction* by

$$I(\nu,\mu) := \iint (-\log|z-w|)\, d\nu(z)\, d\mu(w). \tag{1.1}$$

The interaction is a bilinear form on the vector space of finite singed Borel measures on $\mathbb{C}$ with the following properties:

(1) $I(\nu,\mu) = I(\mu,\nu)$,
(2) $I(\nu,\mu) > 0$, if ν and μ are probability measures and the union of their support has diameter of at most 1,
(3) $I(\nu,\mu+\mu') = I(\nu,\mu) + I(\nu,\mu')$ and $I(\nu,c\mu) = cI(\nu,\mu)$.

Date: November 23, 2021.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 31A15, 31C15. Secondary: 28A12.

Key words and phrases. Logarithmic capacity, phase transition, parametric Furstenberg theorem.

The author was supported in part by NSF grants DMS-1700143 (PI - M. Foreman) and DMS-1855541 (PI - A. Gorodetski).

This bilinear form is a generalization of the *energy* of measure μ, which is defined as $I(\mu) := I(\mu, \mu)$. We can think of the energy of a measure as *self-interacting*. In physics μ is considered as a charge distribution on $\mathbb{C}$ and $I(\mu)$ as the total energy of μ on $\mathbb{C}$ (see [10, pg. 56]).

The *logarithmic capacity* of a subset $E \subset \mathbb{C}$ is then defined by minimizing the energy:

$$\mathrm{Cap}(E) = \exp(-\inf\{I(\mu)\}),$$

where the infimum is taken over the set of Borel probability measures whose support is a compact subset of E (we interpret $e^{-\infty}$ as 0). Capacity gauges how far away a set is from being *polar*. A set E is said to be *polar* if $I(\mu) = \infty$ for every non-trivial measure μ with compact support in E.

Most of the literature on capacity has been devoted to the study of compact sets in $\mathbb{C}$, but non-compact sets has also been studied (see [10], [11, Appendix A]). Moreover, G_δ sets have also been of interest (see [3], [7], [10]). In [2, Section 9], the authors discuss the applications of potential theory to spectral theory.

Our focus will be on the capacity of G_δ's of the form:

$$S = \bigcap_m \bigcup_{k \geq m} I_k, \tag{1.2}$$

where each I_k is an open interval of length l_k with center at $c_k \in (0, 1)$. The sequence $\{l_k\}$ is taken to approach 0 as $k \to \infty$. It is immediate that S is a G_δ subset of $[0, 1]$. Under certain assumptions, we will show that the set S has full capacity on the unit interval:

Definition 1. Let $J \subset \mathbb{C}$. A set $E \subset J$ is said to have *full capacity* on J if

$$\mathrm{Cap}(E) = \mathrm{Cap}(J).$$

The capacity of an interval J is $\mathrm{Cap}(J) = \frac{|J|}{4}$ (see, e.g. [10, pg. 135], [11, Example A.17]).

Our results and methods can be extended to higher dimensions, but we do not elaborate on that here. In this paper, we will be focused on G_δ subsets of an interval of the real line. We are mostly interested in one-dimension because our motivation came from the one-dimensional random G_δ sets of exceptional energies in the parametric version of the Furstenberg theorem (see Section 1.3).

1.2. **Main results.** Our first main result is devoted to the random setting, being a "toy model" for the exceptional energies in the parametric version of the Furstenberg theorem (see Section 1.3). Namely, the set of exceptional parameters in [6] is generated by exponentially small intervals, that are asymptotically distributed with respect to some (dynamically defined) measure. However, their positions are random.

A *random* G_δ set is obtained by viewing the centers $\{c_k\}$ as random variables. As a toy model, it is reasonable to consider first the set generated by random intervals, that are placed independently (with the same "reasonable" distribution of their centers) - instead of some complicated definition coming from the random dynamical systems.

Theorem 1. *Let $\{c_k\}$ be i.i.d. with an absolutely continuous distribution on any interval J with almost everywhere positive and uniformly bounded density function. Take $l_k = e^{-\lambda k}$ for some fixed $\lambda > 0$ and let S be the corresponding G_δ-set* (1.2)*. Then, almost surely S has full capacity on the unit interval:*

$$\mathrm{Cap}(S) = \mathrm{Cap}([0,1]) > 0.$$

Remark 1. Full capacity is a property that is inherited when restricted to subintervals (see [7, Proposition 1.6]): If E is a subset of interval J such that $\mathrm{Cap}(E) = \mathrm{Cap}(J)$, then given any subinterval $J' \subset J$, one has $\mathrm{Cap}(E \cap J') = \mathrm{Cap}(J')$.

Remark 2. In Theorem 1 (and Theorem 3 below), the interval $[0,1]$ may be replaced with any bounded interval J due to the fact that $\mathrm{Cap}(\beta \cdot J) = \beta \cdot \mathrm{Cap}([0,1])$ for some $\beta > 0$. Without loss of generality, we will only be working on the interval $[0,1]$. So, we will take dx to be the restriction to the unit interval: $dx|_{[0,1]}$.

Now, take the centers $\{c_k\}$ from Theorem 1 and let us vary the lengths of the intervals as a function of the parameter $\alpha \in (0,1]$: $l_k = e^{-\lambda k^\alpha}$. It turns out that at $\alpha = 1$ the capacity undergoes a (sharp) phase transition:

Theorem 2 (Random phase transition)**.** *Let $\{c_k\}$ be i.i.d. with an absolutely continuous distribution with density function that is bounded and positive almost everywhere with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Let S be generated by $l_k := e^{-\lambda k^\alpha}$ for $\lambda > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then*

(1) $\mathrm{Cap}(S) = \mathrm{Cap}([0,1]) > 0$ *for* $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ *almost surely,*
(2) $\mathrm{Cap}(S) = 0$ *for* $1 < \alpha$*.*

Remark 3. The phase transition in Theorem 2 (and in Theorem 4 below) is analogous to the one observed in [7] (see Equation (1.7) and Theorem 6 in Section 1.3). It is interesting to note that in the present paper we actually establish the full capacity at the critical point $\alpha = 1$, while for the setting in [7] full capacity at the critical value $\alpha = 2$ was only a conjecture.

Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 follow from our deterministic results. Our first main deterministic result provides sufficient conditions for a G_δ set S, defined by (1.2), to have full capacity on the unit interval:

Theorem 3 (Sufficient conditions for full capacity)**.** *Assume that the intervals $\{I_k\}$ from* (1.2) *have exponentially decreasing lengths $l_k = e^{-\lambda k}$ for*

*some fixed $\lambda > 0$ and satisfy the assumptions **A.1** - **A.3** below. Then the G_δ set S has full capacity on the unit interval:*

$$\mathrm{Cap}(S) = \mathrm{Cap}([0,1]) > 0.$$

The assumptions that are imposed in this theorem, roughly speaking, state that these intervals are sufficiently uniformly placed and sufficiently well-spaced (both in terms of "average" and minimal distances between their centers).

First, we will pack intervals $\{I_k\}$ into groups with the indices from

$$\mathcal{A}_n := \{n, \dots, 2n-1\}, \tag{1.3}$$

and then pack these into larger groups:

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,q(n)} := \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_{2n} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{A}_{2^q n}, \tag{1.4}$$

where $q \in \mathbb{N}$. We will assume the following:

A.1 (distribution) The centers are *distributed* with respect to some density function $\phi(x) \in L^1([0,1],\, dx)$, where $\phi(x) > 0$ a.e.. Namely, for every $f \in C([0,1])$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_n)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}_n} f(c_k) \to \int_0^1 f(x)\phi(x)\, dx \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Also, there exists a sequence $q(n)$ of integer numbers, such that $q(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ and that the following two conditions hold:

A.2 (log-average spacing) For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all n large enough for any $n', n'' \in \{n, 2n, \dots, 2^{q(n)}n\}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''})} \sum (-\log |c_i - c_j|) < \varepsilon,$$

where the sum is over $i \in \mathcal{A}_{n'}, j \in \mathcal{A}_{n''}$ such that $i \neq j$ and $|c_i - c_j| < \delta$.

A.3 (gap control) For every $\varepsilon > 0$, for all large enough n, we have that for every $i, j \in \mathcal{A}_{n,q(n)}$ with $i \neq j$ the following holds:

$$\frac{l_i + l_j}{2|c_i - c_j|} < \varepsilon.$$

Applying Theorem 3, we obtain our next result, a deterministic phase transition for the capacity. Again, take the centers $\{c_k\}$ that assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** are satisfied for the choice of lengths $l_k = e^{-\lambda k}$ for some fixed $\lambda > 0$ and varying the speed at which the lengths of intervals decrease, we observe a sharp phase transition in the deterministic setting:

Theorem 4 (Deterministic phase transition)**.** *Let the centers $\{c_k\}$ be the same centers from Theorem 3. Let S be generated by $l_k := e^{-\lambda k^\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$. Then*

(1) $\mathrm{Cap}(S) = \mathrm{Cap}([0,1]) > 0$ *for* $0 < \alpha \leq 1$,
(2) $\mathrm{Cap}(S) = 0$ *for* $1 < \alpha$.

The next theorem states that both the random theorems (Theorem 1 and Theorem 2) follow from the deterministic theorems (Theorem 12 and Theorem 4):

Theorem 5. *Let* $\{c_k\}$ *be i.i.d. with an absolutely continuous distribution on any interval* J *with almost everywhere positive and uniformly bounded density function. Take* $l_k = e^{-\lambda k}$ *for some fixed* $\lambda > 0$. *Then, almost surely assumptions* ***A.1*****-*****A.3*** *are satisfied.*

1.3. **Motivation and historical background.** In this section, we will discuss the motivation behind our project and the historical background.

Gorodetski and Kleptsyn in [6, Section 1.2] studied the set of exceptional energies in the parametric version of the Furstenberg theorem. Consider

$$T_{n,\omega,a} := A_{\omega_n}(a) \dots A_{\omega_1}(a)$$

where matrices $A_{\omega_k}(a) \in SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ are i.i.d., depending on a parameter a, taking values in some interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$. Furstenberg's theorem implies that for every $a \in J$, for almost every ω, we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|T_{n,\omega,a}\| = \lambda_F(a) > 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Questions on switching the quantifiers in the limit appear naturally in spectral theory, specifically, in Anderson localization proofs.

In [6, Theorem 1.5], the authors proved that almost surely switching the quantifiers leads to the occurrence of a different kind of behavior. Namely, under some technical assumptions, it was shown that for almost every ω, there exists some random *exceptional energies* subset of parameters $S_e(\omega) \subset J$ such that (1.5) does not hold. Additionally, there also exists a smaller set of parameters G_δ-set $S_0(\omega)$ such that for all $a \in S_0(\omega)$, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|T_{n,\omega,a}\| = 0.$$

Both these sets are random G_δ's of the form (1.2).

Additionally, in [6] it was shown that the set $S_e(\omega)$ (and thus $S_0(\omega)$) have zero Hausdorff dimension. Capacity is a finer measurement than the Hausdorff dimension in the sense that any set $E \subset \mathbb{C}$ that has zero capacity must have zero Hausdorff dimension. The question as to what is the capacity of both $S_e(\omega)$ and $S_0(\omega)$ is still open. If one can show that those sets satisfy assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** (and this is what we conjecture), our Theorem 3 will imply that these sets have full capacity, that is $\mathrm{Cap}(S_e(\omega)) = \mathrm{Cap}(S_0(\omega)) = \mathrm{Cap}(J)$, in the same way as we get full capacity in the "toy model" Theorem 2.

The capacity of such G_δ's is also interesting because it showcases a phase transition. That is, a drastic transition from zero capacity to full capacity precisely when the series

$$\sum_k \frac{1}{|\log l_k|} \tag{1.6}$$

transitions from convergent to divergent. As we mentioned above, capacity gauges how far away a set is from being polar. Hence, as we change the speed of intervals so that the series (1.6) transitions from convergent to divergent, S goes from being polar to being as far away as possible from polar, there is no middle ground. This transition was first noticed by Kleptsyn and Quintino (see [7]) in the case when the centers $\{c_k\}$ are equidistributed in the following way: for every n we consider n equally spaced centers:

$$c_{j,n} = \frac{2j+1}{2n} \quad \text{for every} \quad j = 0, \dots, n-1,$$

and with the restriction that the corresponding interval $J_{j,n}$ have the same length r_n for $j = 0, \dots, n-1$. The *uniform G_δ-set* $\widetilde{S}$, corresponding to the sequence r_n, is given by

$$\widetilde{S} := \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} J_{j,n}. \tag{1.7}$$

Any uniform G_δ set $\widetilde{S}$ may be written in the generic setting (1.2) by ordering $J_{j,n}$ and re-labeling. They noticed that there is a "phase transition" in which $\widetilde{S}$ goes from having zero capacity to full capacity:

Theorem 6 (Phase transition [7, Theorem 1.2])**.** *For $r_n = e^{-n^\alpha}$,*

(1) if $\alpha > 2$, then $\mathrm{Cap}(\widetilde{S}) = 0$,
(2) if $\alpha < 2$, then $\mathrm{Cap}(\widetilde{S}) = \mathrm{Cap}([0,1])$.

We refer to $\alpha = 2$ as the critical case because it is precisely when the sum (1.6) transitions from convergent to divergent. Note that there are n intervals of length e^{-n^α} in (1.7), and that is why the critical case is $\alpha = 2$ in Theorem 6 and not $\alpha = 1$. Also, note that full capacity of $\widetilde{S}$ in the critical case in [7] was *conjectured*, but not proved; contrary to this, in the setting of the present paper the analogous statement for the critical $\alpha = 1$ is *established* (see Remark 3).

The zero capacity part in all the theorems above goes back to the works in the first half of twentieth century: a 1918 paper by Lindeberg [8] and 1937 by Erdös and Gillis [5]. They were working on connecting the notion of the *h-volume* of a set with the *logarithmic capacity* of a set. A function h that is defined in some right neighborhood of 0 is called a *measuring function* provided that h is continuous, positive, increasing, concave, and $h(0) = 0$.

The *h-volume* of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$m_h(E) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0+} \inf_{\{(x_j, r_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\} \in \mathcal{I}(E,\varepsilon)} \sum_j h(r_j),$$

where the infimum is taken over the set $\mathcal{I}(E, \varepsilon)$ of covers of E by balls of diameter less than ε:

$$\mathcal{I}(E,\varepsilon) = \left\{ (x_j, r_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \mid \bigcup_j U_{r_j}(x_j) \supset E, \quad \forall j \quad r_j < \varepsilon \right\}.$$

In particular, the function $h_0(x) = \frac{1}{|\log x|}$ provided the following link:

Theorem 7 (Erdös and Gillis [5, p. 187], generalizing Lindeberg [8, p. 27])**.** *If for a set E one has $m_{h_0}(E) < +\infty$, then* $\mathrm{Cap}(E) = 0$.

This was later re-proved by Carleson [1], and noticed in [7, Thm. 1.3] to be a corollary of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Theorem 7 immediately implies (see [7, Corollary 1.4]):

Corollary 8. *Let S be defined by* (1.2)*. If the series $\sum_k \frac{1}{|\log l_k|}$ converges, then the set S is of zero capacity.*

In the same 1937 paper, Erdös and Gillis [5, (C), p. 186] have mentioned a conjecture, going back to Nevanlinna's paper [9], that aimed at generalizing Theorem 7 to other h-volume settings. This conjecture was disproved by Ursell [12]; the re-distribution construction that was used in [7] and that we are using in the present paper can be seen as an extension of his technique.

1.4. **Sketch of the proof and plan of the paper.** In this section, we will give a sketch of the proofs and end with the plan of the paper.

The statement in the phase transition theorems 2 and 4 for $\alpha > 1$ is a result from [7] and does not require assumptions **A.1** - **A.3** (see Theorem 7 above).

Due to monotonocity of capacity, the statement in the phase transition theorems 2 and 4 for $0 < \alpha < 1$ follows by establishing full capacity for $\alpha = 1$. For the deterministic phase transition this is Theorem 3. For the random phase transition the result follows from Theorem 3 by showing that assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** hold almost surely, that is Theorem 5.

In Section 2, we will show that the centers from the random phase transition satisfy assumptions **A.1** - **A.3** for $\alpha = 1$ (Theorem 5). Hence, the random phase transition holds.

Thus, the main task is to show that S has full capacity for $\alpha = 1$ (Theorem 3). The method that we will employ to show full capacity is the *re-distribution technique* under assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** for $\alpha = 1$.

We introduce this technique in Section 3.1. Namely, we will begin with the equilibrium measure ν_J on the interval J, then we will construct a probability measure ν_1 such that the energy $I(\nu_1)$ approximates the energy $I(\nu_J)$

and whose support is a subset of $\operatorname{supp}\nu_J$ and is a finite union of intervals $\{I_k\}$. Then we will construct another probability measure ν_2 such that the energy $I(\nu_2)$ approximates the energy $I(\nu_1)$ and whose support is a subset of $\operatorname{supp}\nu_1$ and is a finite union of intervals $\{I_k\}$. Inductively, repeating this procedure, we get a sequence of probability measures that have their energies that are arbitrarily close to $I(\nu_J)$ and such that their supports create a decreasing sequence of compact subsets. After passing to the weak-limit we obtain a measure supported on S (Proposition 12), thus proving the desired full capacity for the set S (see Section 3.2 for the proof). Proposition 13 states that the above technique is applicable when assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** are satisfied. Hence, Theorem 3 follows from Proposition 12 and Proposition 13.

Finally, in Section 4 we develop the tools to prove Proposition 13. In Section 4.5 we conclude with the proof of Proposition 13.

2. In the random setting **A.1**-**A.3** are a.s. satisfied

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5: we assume that the centers $\{c_k\}$ are i.i.d. random variables and show that if their distributions are nice, then assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** are satisfied.

The distribution immediately follows from the law of large numbers:

Lemma 9. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5, assumption **A.1** is almost surely satisfied.*

Now, take $q(n) = [\log_2(\log n)]$. The uniform gap control can be obtained by a straightforward estimate of the probability of two random centers being close to each other:

Lemma 10. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5, for $q(n) = [\log_2(\log n)]$, assumption **A.3** is almost surely satisfied.*

Proof. Let K be the upper bound for the density of the distribution, and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. For any $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \mathcal{A}_{n,q(n)}$, if

$$\frac{l_i + l_j}{2|c_i - c_j|} < \varepsilon$$

does not hold, it implies that

$$|c_i - c_j| \leq \frac{l_i + l_j}{2\varepsilon} < \frac{1}{\varepsilon} e^{-\lambda n},$$

and the probability of such an event (for any given i and j) does not exceed $\frac{2K}{\varepsilon} e^{-\lambda n}$. As there are less than $2^{q(n)+1} n < 2n^2$ possible indices i and j, the total probability that the condition is violated for a given n does not exceed $4n^4 \cdot \frac{2K}{\varepsilon} e^{-\lambda n}$. The series

$$\sum_n 4n^4 \cdot \frac{2K}{\varepsilon} e^{-\lambda n}$$

converges, and the application of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma concludes the proof. □

Finally, the log-averages of spaces also can be controlled quite directly:

Lemma 11. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5, for $q(n) = [\log_2(\log n)]$, assumption **A.2** is almost surely satisfied.*

Proof. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and set

$$G(X,Y) = (-\log|X-Y|)\mathbb{1}_{(0,\delta)}(|X-Y|),$$

where $\delta > 0$ and $G(X,X) = 0$. We have that

$$\frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''})} \sum_{0<|c_i-c_j|<\delta} (-\log|C_i - C_j|) = \frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''})} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}_{n'}, j\in\mathcal{A}_{n''}} G(C_i, C_j).$$

Suppose the law of large numbers holds for $G(X,Y)$: as $n \to \infty$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''})} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}_{n'}, j\in\mathcal{A}_{n''}} G(C_i, C_j) \to \mathbb{E}\, G(C_1, C_2),$$

where for $n', n'' \in \{n, 2n, \dots, 2^{q(n)}n\}$. Then we may find a δ such that **A.2** holds.

The law of large numbers holds by considering the difference:

$$H(x,y) := G(x,y) - c - \mathbb{E}[G(x,y) - c|y] - \mathbb{E}[G(x,y) - c|x],$$

where $c = \mathbb{E}\, G(x,y)$ and their average

$$\frac{1}{n'n''} S_{n',n''} = \frac{1}{n'n''} \sum_{i\neq j} H(x,y). \tag{2.1}$$

Now, consider the fourth power of $S_{n',n''}$ and take its expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}(S_{n',n''})^4 = \sum \mathbb{E}[H(c_{i_1}, c_{i_2})H(c_{j_1}, c_{j_2})H(c_{k_1}, c_{k_2})H(c_{l_1}, c_{l_2})]. \tag{2.2}$$

The function $H(x,y)$ has the property that $\mathbb{E}[H(x,y)|y] = \mathbb{E}[H(x,y)|x] = 0$. Hence, if a term has an independent random variable, say c_{i_1}, then

$$\mathbb{E}[H(c_{i_1}, c_{i_2})H(c_{j_1}, c_{j_2})H(c_{k_1}, c_{k_2})H(c_{l_1}, c_{l_2})] = 0.$$

On the other hand, when every random variable is depended on another random variable, we can count the non-vanishing terms. There are $(n'n'')$ terms of the form $\mathbb{E}[H(c_{i_1}, c_{i_2})^4]$. There are $(n'n'')^2$ terms of the form

$$\mathbb{E}[H(c_{i_1}, c_{i_2})^2 H(c_{j_1}, c_{j_2})^2].$$

There are at most $(n'n'')(n' + n'')4$ terms of the form

$$\mathbb{E}[H(c_{i_1}, c_{i_2})^2 H(c_{j_1}, x)H(c_{k_1}, y)],$$

where $x, y \in \{c_{i_1}\, c_{i_2}\}$. Lastly, there are at most $n'n''(n' + n'')^2$ terms of the form

$$\mathbb{E}[H(c_{i_1}, c_{i_2})H(c_{i_1}, c_{j_2})H(c_{k_1}, c_{i_2})H(c_{k_1}, c_{j_2})].$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[H(x,y)^4] < \infty$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\, S^4_{n',n''} \leq C' \max\{(n'n'')^2, n'^3 n'', n' n''^3\},$$

where $C' > 0$ is some constant. An application of the Chebyshev inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(|S_{n',n''}| > \varepsilon(n'n'')\right) &\leq \mathbb{E}(S_n)^4/(\varepsilon(n'n''))^4 \\ &\leq \frac{C'}{\varepsilon^4} \max\left\{\frac{1}{(n'n'')^2}, \frac{1}{n'n''^3}, \frac{1}{n'^3 n''}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $n \leq n', n''$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|S_{n',n''}| > \varepsilon(n'n'')\right) \leq \frac{C'}{\varepsilon^4}\frac{1}{n^4}.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n'=n}^{2^{q(n)}n} \sum_{n''=n}^{2^{q(n)}n} \mathbb{P}\left(|S_{n',n''}| > \varepsilon(n'n'')\right) &\leq \frac{C'}{\varepsilon^4} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2q(n)}}{n^2} \\ &\leq \frac{C'}{\varepsilon^4} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\log n)^2}{n^2},\end{aligned}$$

which is finite. By Borel-Cantelli lemma, $|S_{n',n''}| > \varepsilon(n'n'')$ does not occur infinitely often with probability 1. Let ε_k be a sequence of positive numbers that decreases to 0 as $k \to \infty$. For each ε_k, $|S_{n',n''}| > \varepsilon_k(n'n'')$ does not occur infinitely often with probability 1. Since the countable intersection of sets of full measure has full measure, then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq n_0$, for every $n', n'' \in \{n, 2n, \ldots, 2^{q(n)}n\}$, we have $|S_{n',n''}| < \varepsilon(n'n'')$ with probability 1. That is, the average (2.1) goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$.

□

Together, lemmas 9, 10, 11 imply Theorem 5.

3. The re-distribution technique

3.1. **Introducing the technique.** Our main tool for establishing full capacity for a set S (what is needed for the proof of Theorem 3) will be the *re-distrubtion technique* that was introduced in [7]. We will recall the method in this section. The main property that allows it to work will be the following one:

Definition 2. We say that S (in the generic setting (1.2)) is *re-distributable* if the following holds: for every probability measure ν with piecewise continuous density that is supported on a finite collection of intervals in $[0,1]$ and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists another probability measure ν' with piecewise continuous density such that

(1) $I(\nu') < I(\nu) + \varepsilon$,

(2) ν' is supported on $\operatorname{supp}\nu \cap V_n$ for some $n \geq m$,

where V_n is a finite union of I_k's with $k \geq n$.

The following proposition then allows us to establish full capacity:

Proposition 12. *If S is re-distributable, then S has full capacity on the unit interval:*

$$\operatorname{Cap}(S) = \operatorname{Cap}([0,1]).$$

Proposition 13. *Assume **A.1** - **A.3** for interval lengths $l_k = e^{-\lambda k}$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Then the set S is re-distributable.*

Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Proposition 13.

3.2. **Proof of Proposition 12.** In this section, we will prove that S has full capacity when S is re-distributable.

As we have mentioned in Section 1.4, the proof of Proposition 3 is obtained by inductively constructing a sequence of measures with smaller and smaller support. Let us make these arguments formal:

Proof of Proposition 12. The density function for the equilibrium measure for the unit interval is

$$f_{[0,1]}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{x(1-x)}},$$

for $x \in (0,1)$ and 0 otherwise (see e.g. [11, Eq. (A.53)]). Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a continuous density function f such that

$$I(f(x)dx) < I(f_{[0,1]}(x)dx) + \varepsilon.$$

Let $d\nu_0(x) := f(x)\,dx$ with support $[0,1]$. Applying Definition 2 to ν_0, there exists ν_1 with support V_{n_1} and

$$I(\nu_1) < I(\nu_0) + \varepsilon/2^2.$$

Apply Definition 2 to ν_1, there exists ν_2 with support $V_{n_1} \cap V_{n_2}$ and

$$I(\nu_2) < I(\nu_1) + \varepsilon/2^3.$$

and $n_1 < n_2$. By induction and applying Definition 2, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a Borel probability measure ν_m that is supported on

$$C_m := V_{n_1} \cap \cdots \cap V_{n_m}.$$

We consider the telescoping sum:

$$I(\nu_m) - I(\nu_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \big(I(\nu_i) - I(\nu_{i-1})\big) < \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i+1}}.$$

It follows that

$$I(\nu_m) < I(\nu_0) + \varepsilon.$$

As in [7], any weak* limit will work. Assume that ν_∞ is a weak* limit of $\{\nu_m\}$. Passing to a weak* limit can only decrease the energy (see [10, Lemma 3.3.3]):

$$I(\nu_\infty) \leq \liminf_{m\to\infty} I(\nu_m) < I(\nu_0) + \varepsilon < I(f_{[0,1]}(x)\,dx) + 2\varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we have that

$$I(\nu_\infty) \leq I(f_{[0,1]}(x)\,dx).$$

If ν_∞ has compact support contained in S, then we are done. The weak* limit only allows us to conclude that ν_∞ has compact support contained in

$$\bar{C}_\infty := \bigcap_m \mathrm{Cl}(C_m).$$

However, $\bar{C}_\infty$ differs from

$$C_\infty := \bigcap_m C_m \subset S,$$

by at most a countable set P (the collection of boundary points of each C_m). Since $I(\nu_\infty) < \infty$, then $\nu_\infty(P) = 0$ (see [10, Theorem 3.2.3]). By regularity of Borel measures, we may find a Borel probability measure with compact support contained in C_∞ that differs from $I(\nu_\infty)$ as small as we want. Hence,

$$I(f_{[0,1]}(x)\,dx) = \inf\{I(\nu) : \nu \in \mathcal{P}(C_\infty)\}.$$

Since $C_\infty \subset S$, then S has full capacity:

$$\mathrm{Cap}(S) = \mathrm{Cap}([0,1]).$$

□

4. Proving Proposition 13: **A.1**-**A.3** imply re-distribution

4.1. **Properties of assumptions A.1-A.3.** In this section, we will discuss some of the properties of assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** that will be needed in the proofs.

The gap control property (assumption **A.3**) is aimed at controlling the gaps between two distinct intervals in a collection of intervals in a uniform way. Let $I, I' \subset (0,1)$ be two disjoint intervals with centers c, c', then the gap between I and I' is

$$\mathrm{dist}(I, I') = |c - c'| - \frac{1}{2}(|I| + |I'|) > 0. \tag{4.1}$$

We will control the gaps by controlling the ratio of the average of the lengths and the distance between their centers (see **A.3**).

Remark 4. Notice that by letting $\varepsilon < 1$ in **A.3**, we get (4.1). Hence, gap control implies that the intervals in

$$\{I_k : k \in 2n, \dots, 2^{q(n)}n - 1\},$$

are pairwise disjoint. Each measure that we construct in Section 4.2 will be supported on pair-wise disjoint collection:

$$\{I_k : k \in \mathcal{A}_n\} = \{I_n, I_{n+1}, \dots, I_{2n-1}\}.$$

In Section 4.5, we will construct a measure that is an average of measures from Section 4.2. Hence, the average measure will be supported on:

$$\begin{gathered}\{I_n, I_{n+1}, \dots, I_{2n-1}\}\\ \{I_{2n}, I_{2n+1}, \dots, I_{2^2n-1}\}\\ \vdots\\ \{I_{2^{q(n)-1}n}, I_{2^{q(n)-1}n+1}, \dots, I_{2^{q(n)}n-1}\}.\end{gathered}$$

Assumption **A.3** allows the collection of intervals above to be disjoint.

The distribution property (assumption **A.1**) requires the centers to be *distributed* with respect to some function $\phi(x) \in L^1([0,1],\, dx)$, where $\phi(x) > 0$ a.e.:

$$\frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_n)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}_n} f(c_k) \to \int_0^1 f(x)\phi(x)\, dx \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \tag{4.2}$$

for every continuous function $f \in C([0,1])$. This definition is a generalization of equidistributed sequences.

Remark 5. Note that (4.2) will hold for piecewise continuous functions f since we may approximate such functions from above and below by continuous functions in L_1. Equation (4.2) extends to 2-dimensions: Let f be any piecewise continuous function. Then

$$\frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_n \times \mathcal{A}_{n'})} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_n, j \in \mathcal{A}_{n'}} f(c_i)f(c_j) \to \int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x)f(y)\phi(x)\phi(y)\, dxdy, \tag{4.3}$$

as $m \to \infty$ and $n, n' \geq m$.

To show that S is re-distributable (see Definition 2), we will show that the following statement holds:

P.1 For each positive continuous function f on the interval $[0,1]$, there exists a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu^n\}$ so that each μ^n has a

piecewise continuous density with support contained in a finite union of disjoint I_k's with $k \geq n$ and with asymptotic behavior:

$$I(\mu^n) = \frac{I(f(x)\,dx)}{(\int_0^1 f(x)\,dx)^2} + o(1).$$

With the distribution assumption **A.1** and log-average spacing assumption **A.2**, we can see that the centers have the asymptotic behavior that is needed in **P.1**:

Lemma 14. *Under assumptions **A.1** and **A.2**, for every $f \in C([0,1])$, as $n \to \infty$ and $n \leq n', n''$, we have that*

$$\frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''})} \sum_{i \neq j} (-\log|c_i - c_j|) f(c_i) f(c_j) \to I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx), \tag{4.4}$$

where the sum is taken over $(i,j) \in \mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''}$ and $i \neq j$. Moreover,

$$I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx) < \infty.$$

Remark 6. The density function $\phi(x)$ in assumption **A.1** is not to be confused with the continuous density function f in Definition 2 and in **P.1**. Once the centers are distributed with respect to $\phi(x)$, the function $\phi(x)$ is fixed. The continuous density function f in Definition 2 and in **P.1** is arbitrary.

Proof of Lemma 14. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\delta > 0$ satisfy assumption **A.2**. For $s > 0$, define $f_s(x) = -\log x$ for $x \geq s$ and 0 otherwise. Using Fatou's lemma, we get

$$\iint_{|x-y|<\delta} (-\log|x-y|)\phi(x)\phi(y)\,dx\,dy \leq \liminf_{s\to 0^+} \iint_{|x-y|<\delta} f_s(|x-y|)\phi(x)\phi(y)\,dx\,dy.$$

Using assumption **A.1** for $n', n'' \in \{n, 2n, \ldots, 2^{q(n)}n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{s\to 0^+} \iint_{|x-y|<\delta} f_s(|x-y|)\phi(x)\phi(y)\,dx\,dy &= \liminf_{s\to 0^+} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{0<|c_i-c_j|<\delta} \frac{f_s(|c_i-c_j|)}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''})} \\
&\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{0<|c_i-c_j|<\delta} \frac{(-\log|c_i-c_j|)}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'} \times \mathcal{A}_{n''})} \\
&\leq \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last holds by assumption **A.2** for some $\delta > 0$. Hence, for every continuous function f, we have finite energy:

$$I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx) = \iint (-\log|x-y|) f(x)\phi(x) f(y)\phi(y)\,dx\,dy < \infty.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j)}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'}\times\mathcal{A}_{n''})}-\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f_\delta(c_i)f_\delta(c_j)}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'}\times\mathcal{A}_{n''})}$$
$$=\sum_{0<|c_i-c_j|<\delta}\frac{(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j)}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'}\times\mathcal{A}_{n''})}.$$

Let $n\to\inf$, then by assumptions **A.1** and **A.2**, we have

$$\left|\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j)}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'}\times\mathcal{A}_{n''})}-\iint f_\delta(|x-y|)f(x)f(y)\phi(x)\phi(y)\right|$$
$$\leq\varepsilon\cdot(\max|f|)^2.$$

By letting $\delta\to 0$, we have that

$$\left|\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j)}{\#(\mathcal{A}_{n'}\times\mathcal{A}_{n''})}-I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)\right|\leq\varepsilon\cdot\max|f|.$$

Since $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrary, we get (4.4).

□

4.2. **Construction of a single-level re-distribution.** Our first step in constructing the probability measures in **P.1** is to construct a *single-level re-distribution* probability measure. This section is devoted to the construction of such probability measures.

We begin with a "re-distribution" type of measure $f(x)\,dx|_{[0,1]}$ onto a single interval:

$$\mu_k=\frac{f(x)\,dx|_{I_k}}{|I_k|}.$$

We do not call this a re-distribution as in [7] because the measure is not necessarily a probability measure. We consider the average of μ_k's:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}:=\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{A}_n}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n}\mu_k,$$

where $\mathcal{A}_n$ are defined in (1.3) and satisfy the gap control property **A.3**. Recall that gap control implies that for large enough n, our collection of intervals are disjoint (see Remark 4). Notice that each measure $\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ is not necessarily a probability measure. To correct that, let us define

$$V_n=\bigcup_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n}I_k.$$

Then, we consider the *single-level re-distribution* probability measure:

$$\hat{\mu}_n := \frac{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}}{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n)}, \tag{4.5}$$

which is supported on V_n and it's energy is

$$I(\hat{\mu}_n) = \frac{1}{(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n))^2} I(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}).$$

Thus, we are interested in the asymptotic behavior of $\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n)$ and the asymptotic behavior of:

$$I\left(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}\right) = \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} I(\mu_k) + \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2} \sum_{i\neq j} I(\mu_i, \mu_j). \tag{4.6}$$

The first sum is referred to as the *self-interaction* sum because in $I(\mu_k) = I(\mu_k, \mu_k)$ the same measure is interacting with itself. The second sum is referred to as *outer-interaction* sum because we have two measures with disjoint supports interacting with each other in $I(\mu_k, \mu_j)$.

In Section 4.3, we will discuss the asymptotic behavior of the outer-interaction and in Section 4.4 we will work on controlling the asymptotic behavior of the self-interaction sum. In Section 4.5, we will put the two together. We will finish the section with the asymptotic behavior of $\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n)$:

Lemma 15. *If **A.1** and **A.3** hold, then*

$$\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n) = \int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx + o(1).$$

Proof. Since for large n the intervals in

$$\{I_k : k \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$$

are disjoint (see Remark 4), then $\mu_k(V_n) = \frac{1}{|I_k|}\int_{I_k} f(x)\,dx$. Hence,

$$\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} \frac{1}{|I_k|} \int_{I_k} f(x)\,dx.$$

Due to the uniform continuity of f on the interval $[0,1]$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{if} \quad |x - y| < \delta.$$

Since the lengths of the intervals I_k approach 0, then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $k \geq N$ we have

$$|f(x) - f(c_i)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{if} \quad x \in I_k.$$

Therefore, for every $n \geq N$ and every $k \in \mathcal{A}_n$, we have

$$|f(x) - f(c_k)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{if} \quad x \in I_k.$$

It follows that for large enough n, we have

$$\left|\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n) - \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{A}_n}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}_n} f(c_i)\right| < \varepsilon.$$

As the centers are distributed with respect to $\phi(x)$ **A.1**, it follows that

$$\left|\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n) - \left(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx + o(1)\right)\right| < \varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, then the result holds. □

4.3. **Asymptotic behavior of outer-interaction.** In this section, we are interested in the asymptotic behavior of the outer-interaction sum:

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j} I(\mu_i,\mu_j),$$

where the sum is taken over $i,j\in\mathcal{A}_n$ and $i\neq j$. It is the outer-interaction sum that gives the limit point in **P.1**:

Lemma 16. *We have*

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j} I(\mu_i,\mu_j) = I(f(x)\phi(x)dx) + o(1), \tag{4.7}$$

where $i,j\in\mathcal{A}_n$.

To show Lemma 16, we want to estimate $(-\log|x-y|)$ by $(-\log|c-c'|)$ where x and y are in intervals with centers c and c', respectively. The next lemma allows us to do that.

Lemma 17. *Let f be any continuous function on $[0,1]$ and let J,J' be two disjoint intervals in $[0,1]$ with lengths r,r' and centers c,c', respectively. Define*

$$\mu := \frac{1}{r}\,f(x)\,dx|_J \quad \text{and} \quad \mu' := \frac{1}{r'}\,f(x)\,dx|_{J'}\,.$$

Let $\varepsilon>0$. If

$$\frac{r+r'}{2|c-c'|} \le (1-e^{-\varepsilon}), \tag{4.8}$$

then

$$\left|I(\mu,\mu') - (-\log|c-c'|)f(c)f(c')\right| \le (2K(-\log|c-c'|)+K^2)\varepsilon,$$

where $K=\|f\|_\infty$.

Proof. Let us first prove that for $a,b>0$, we have

$$|\log a - \log b| \le \varepsilon,$$

if

$$|a-b| \le b(1-e^{-\varepsilon}).$$

We have that

$$|\log a - \log b| \leq \varepsilon$$

holds if and only if

$$-\varepsilon \leq \log(a/b) \leq \varepsilon,$$

if and only if

$$be^{-\varepsilon} \leq a \leq be^{\varepsilon},$$

if and only if

$$-b(1-e^{-\varepsilon}) \leq a - b \leq b(e^{\varepsilon} - 1).$$

Since $(1-e^{-\varepsilon}) \leq (e^{\varepsilon}-1)$, then

$$|\log a - \log b| \leq \varepsilon$$

holds when

$$|a-b| \leq b(1-e^{-\varepsilon}).$$

For any two disjoint intervals $J, J' \in [0,1]$ with centers c, c' and with lengths r, r' respectively, we have

$$||x-y| - |c-c'|| \leq |(x-c) + (c'-y)| \leq \frac{r+r'}{2}.$$

Since assumption (4.8) is equivalent to

$$\frac{r+r'}{2} \leq |c-c'|(1-e^{-\varepsilon}),$$

then

$$|(-\log|x-y|) - (-\log|c-c'|)| < \varepsilon.$$

Since f is uniformly continuous on $[0,1]$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(a)-f(b)| < \varepsilon$ if $|a-b| < \delta$. If $0 < r, r' < \delta$, we have that $|f(x)-f(c)| < \varepsilon$ and $|f(y)-f(c')| < \varepsilon$. We would like to combine the three inequalities.

Suppose $A, a, B, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_b > 0$ such that

$$|A-a| < \varepsilon_a \quad \text{and} \quad |B-b| < \varepsilon_b.$$

We have that

$$|AB - ab| \leq |AB - Ab| + |Ab - ab| \leq (|A|\varepsilon_b + |b|\varepsilon_a).$$

One application of the above gives

$$|f(x)f(y) - f(c)f(c')| \leq 2K\varepsilon,$$

where $K = \|f\|_{\infty}$. A third application yields

$$|(-\log|x-y|)f(x)f(y) - (-\log|c-c'|)f(c)f(c')| < (2K\varepsilon(-\log|c-c'|) + K^2\varepsilon).$$

Integrating by

$$\frac{1}{r}\,dx|_J \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r'}\,dy|_{J'}$$

finishes the proof. □

Now that we can estimate $(-\log|x-y|)$ by $(-\log|c-c'|)$ where x and y are in intervals with centers c and c', respectively, we are ready to estimate

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j} I(\mu_i,\mu_j),$$

by

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j}(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j).$$

Let us go back to Lemma 16 and prove the asymptotic behavior of the outer-interaction:

Proof of Lemma 16. Let $\epsilon>0$ be given and let $K=\|f\|_\infty$. The gap control **A.3** guarantees that there exists $N\in\mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n\geq N$ and every $i\neq j$, where $i,j\in\mathcal{A}_n$, we have

$$\frac{l_i+l_j}{2|c_i-c_j|}\leq(1-e^{-\varepsilon}),$$

which is the condition (4.8) in Lemma 17. Since l_k decrease to 0 as $k\to\infty$, then for all large enough n we may apply Lemma 17 to get

$$|I(\mu_i,\mu_j)-(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j)|\leq(2K(-\log|c_i-c_j|)+K^2)\varepsilon,$$

for every $n\geq N$ and every $i\neq j$, where $i,j\in\mathcal{A}_n$. Adding this up for $i\neq j$ where $i,j\in\mathcal{A}_n$ and then dividing by $(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2$, gives us:

$$\left|\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j}I(\mu_i,\mu_j)\;-\;\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j}(-\log|c_i-c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j)\right| \leq\frac{2K\varepsilon}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j}(-\log|c_i-c_j|)+K^2\varepsilon.$$

We will apply Lemma 14 twice to the last two sums. We apply the lemma to the last sum by taking $f=1$ in Lemma 14, and then we apply the lemma again for arbitrary f in Lemma 14 to get:

$$\left|\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j}I(\mu_i,\mu_j)-I(f(x)\phi(x)dx)\right| \leq(2KI(\phi(x)dx)+K^2)\varepsilon.$$

Lemma 14 also informs us that the energy of $\phi(x)dx$ is finite, hence $0 < (2KI(\phi(x)dx) + K^2)\varepsilon < \infty$. As $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{i\neq j}(-\log|c_i - c_j|)f(c_i)f(c_j) \to I(f(x)\phi(x)dx).$$

Lemma 16 holds.

□

4.4. **Asymptotic behavior of self-interaction.** In this section, we will to control the self-interaction:

Lemma 18. *If $l_k = e^{-\lambda k}$ where $\lambda > 0$, then*

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} I(\mu_k) = O\left(\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} k + o(1)\right).$$

Proof. By shifting and a change of variables, we get

$$I(\frac{1}{l_k}dx|_{I_i}) = -\log l_k + I(\,dx|_{[0,1]}) = -\log l_k \cdot (1 + o(1)).$$

If $l_k = e^{-\lambda k}$, then adding the above over $k \in \mathcal{A}_n$ gives us our result.

□

If the self-interaction sum vanishes in the limit, then we will be able to finish the proof with a single-level re-distribution. Let us see what the self-interaction tells us:

Lemma 19. *If $\mathcal{A}_n := \{n, \dots, p(n) - 1\}$ where $p(n)$ is an integer-valued function such that $p(n) \geq 2n$, then*

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} k = \frac{p(n) + n - 1}{2(p(n) - n)}.$$

If $p(n) >> n$, then the right-hand side is close to $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Let

$$S = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} k.$$

Then the arithmetic sum becomes

$$S = \frac{(p(n) + n - 1)(\#\mathcal{A}_n)}{2}.$$

Since $\#\mathcal{A}_n = p(n) - n$, then dividing by $(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2$ we get what we want. □

Remark 7. Lemma 19 tells us that no matter how many intervals are included in our single-level of re-distribution, the self-interaction sum will never vanish.

But since we can bound the self-interaction sum uniformly for all n, we will be able to apply a multi-level re-distribution in Section 4.5. That is, we will take the average of measures $\hat{\mu}_n$ to handle the self-interaction sum.

4.5. **The proof of Proposition 13.** In this section, we will use a multi-level re-distribution to show **P.1** holds and prove Proposition 13.

Let us first see where the asymptotic behavior of a single-level re-distribution leads:

Proposition 20 (Single-level re-distribution)**.** *Let $l_k := e^{-\lambda k}$ and $\lambda > 0$. If assumptions **A.1**-**A.3** are satisfied, then*

$$I(\hat{\mu}_n) = \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2}\right) + o(1) = O(1),$$

where each $\hat{\mu}_n$ is the corresponding measure defined in (4.5)*.*

Proof. We have that

$$I(\hat{\mu}_n) = \frac{1}{(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n))^2} I(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}).$$

Breaking down the last, we get

$$I\left(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}\right) = \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} I(\mu_k) + \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2} \sum_{i\neq j} I(\mu_i, \mu_j).$$

Applying Lemma 16 to the outer-interaction sum and Lemma 19 to the self-interaction sum, and lastly, applying Lemma 15 to the normalization $\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n)$ completes the proof.

□

Remark 7 tells us that using a single level re-distribution will not render S to be re-distributable no matter how many intervals are included in $\{I_k : k \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$. We will need to take the average of $q(n)$ single-level re-distribution measures, where $q(n)$ is an integer-valued function such that $q(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Let $\hat{\mu}_n$ be a single-level re-distribution as defined in (4.5). For each n, we consider a *multi-level re-distribution* probability measure:

$$\mu^m := \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{B}_m} \sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}_m} \hat{\mu}_{2^s m},$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_m := \{0, \ldots, q(m) - 1\}.$$

Since each $\hat{\mu}_n$ is supported on

$$V_n := \bigcup_{k\in\mathcal{A}_n} I_k = \bigcup_{k=n}^{2n-1} I_k,$$

then μ^m is supported on

$$V_n, V_{2n}, V_{2^2 n}, \dots, V_{2^{q(n)-1}n}.$$

See Remark 4 for details.

Our convex measure can now be partitioned into a new self-interaction sum and a new outer-interaction sum:

$$I(\mu^m) = \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{B}_m)^2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_m} I(\hat{\mu}_{2^s m}) + \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{B}_m)^2} \sum_{\substack{s,t \in \mathcal{B}_m \\ s \neq t}} I(\hat{\mu}_{2^s m}, \hat{\mu}_{2^t m}).$$

Proposition 20 tells us that

$$I(\hat{\mu}_n) = O(1).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{B}_m)^2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_m} I(\hat{\mu}_{2^s m}) =& \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{B}_m)^2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_m} O(1) \\ \leq& \frac{O(1)}{(\#\mathcal{B}_m)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad m \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

That is, the self-interaction sum vanishes. The outer-interaction sum gives what we aim:

Lemma 21. *Assume **A.1**-**A.3**. As $m \to \infty$ we have that*

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{B}_m)^2} \sum_{s \neq t} I(\hat{\mu}_{2^s m}, \hat{\mu}_{2^t m}) \to \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2},$$

where the sum is over $s \neq t$ and $s, t \in \mathcal{B}_m$.

We will leave the proof of Lemma 21 to the end of the section. Note that the vanishing of the self-interaction sum and Lemma 21 gives us:

Proposition 22. *For every $f \in C([0,1])$, we have that*

$$I(\mu^m) = \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} + o(1).$$

Notice that with Proposition 22 we can show that S is re-distributable when $\phi(x) \equiv 1$. In order to remove $\phi(x)$, we will need to apply Proposition 22 to a continuous approximation of $1/\phi(x)$ and take an appropriate subsequence:

Proposition 23. *Suppose for each continuous function f, there exists a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu^n\}$ so that each μ^n has a piecewise continuous density with support V_n, where V_n is a finite union of disjoint I_k's with $k \geq n$ with asymptotic behavior:*

$$I(\mu^n) = \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)dx)}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} + o(1). \tag{4.9}$$

*Then property **P.1** holds.*

Let us go back to show that S is re-distributable using a multi-level re-distribution before we prove Proposition 23.

Proof of Proposition 13 . Since $\phi(x) > 0$ almost everywhere, then combining Proposition 22 and Proposition 23 shows **P.1** holds.

Given any probability measure ν with piecewise continuous density that is supported on a finite collection of intervals in $[0,1]$ and given any $\varepsilon > 0$, we may apply **P.1** to a continuous L^1 approximation of the density function of ν to show that there exists a probability measure ν' satisfying properties (1) and (2) in Definition 2. Thus, S is re-distributable.

□

Now, let us analyze the asymptotic behavior of the new outer-interaction sum:

Proof of Lemma 21 . The goal is to show that

$$I(\hat{\mu}_n, \hat{\mu}_{n'}) = \frac{I(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}, \mu_{\mathcal{A}_{n'}})}{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n) \cdot \mu_{\mathcal{A}_{n'}}(V_{n'})} \to \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2},$$

as $m \to \infty$ and independently of our choice of $n, n' \in \{2^s m : s \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$. Once we accomplish this, then

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{B}_m)^2} \sum_{s \neq t} I(\hat{\mu}_{2^s m}, \hat{\mu}_{2^t m}) \to \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2},$$

as $m \to \infty$.

Lemma 15 shows that

$$\frac{1}{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}(V_n) \cdot \mu_{\mathcal{A}_{n'}}(V_{n'})} \to \frac{1}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2},$$

as $m \to \infty$ and independently of our choice of $n, n' \in \{2^s m : s \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$.

Let us focus on $I(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}, \mu_{\mathcal{A}_{n'}})$. Given $n \neq n'$ where $n, n' \in \{2^s m : s \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$, we have that

$$I(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}, \mu_{\mathcal{A}_{n'}}) = \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)(\#\mathcal{A}_{n'})} \sum_{i \neq j} I(\mu_i, \mu_j), \tag{4.10}$$

where $(i,j) \in \mathcal{A}_n \times \mathcal{A}_{n'}$. By the gap control assumption **A.3**, we know that for all large enough m and every $i \neq j$, where $i, j \in \{m, \ldots, 2^{q(m)}m - 1\}$, we have

$$\frac{l_i + l_j}{2|c_i - c_j|} \leq (1 - e^{-\varepsilon}),$$

which is the needed condition (4.8) to apply Lemma 17 for all large enough m. Lemma 17 gives us

$$|I(\mu_i, \mu_j) - (-\log|c_i - c_j|) f(c_i) f(c_j)| \leq (2K(-\log|c_i - c_j|) + K^2)\varepsilon,$$

for every $i \neq j$ where $i, j \in \{m, \dots, 2^{q(m)}m - 1\}$ and for all large enough m. Adding this up over $(i,j) \in \mathcal{A}_n \times \mathcal{A}_{n'}$ and then dividing by $(\#\mathcal{A}_n)(\#\mathcal{A}_{n'})$ gives us:

$$\left| \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)(\#\mathcal{A}_{n'})} \sum_{i \neq j} I(\mu_i, \mu_j) - \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)(\#\mathcal{A}_{n'})} \sum_{i \neq j} (-\log|c_i - c_j|) f(c_i) f(c_j) \right| \leq \frac{2K\varepsilon}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)(\#\mathcal{A}_{n'})} \sum_{i \neq j} (-\log|c_i - c_j|) + K^2\varepsilon.$$

We remark that the inequality holds independently of our choice of $n, n' \in \{2^s m : s \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$ for all large enough m. By the distribution assumption **A.1** and the log-average spacing assumption **A.2**, we can apply Lemma 14 twice to the last two sums above. One application yields:

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)(\#\mathcal{A}_{n'})} \sum_{i \neq j} (-\log|c_i - c_j|) f(c_i) f(c_j) \to I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx),$$

as $m \to \infty$ with $n, n' \geq m$. For the second application we take $f = 1$ in Lemma 14 to get

$$\frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{A}_n)^2} \sum_{i \neq j} (-\log|c_i - c_j|) \to I(\phi(x)\,dx) < \infty,$$

as $m \to \infty$ with $n, n' \geq m$. Therefore, for $n, n' \in \{2^s m : s \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$, we have

$$\left| \lim_{m \to \infty} I(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}, \mu_{\mathcal{A}_{n'}}) - I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx) \right| \leq 2K\varepsilon I(\phi(x)\,dx) + K^2\varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary and $I(\phi(x)\,dx) < \infty$, then for $n, n' \in \{2^s m : s \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$, we have

$$\left| \lim_{m \to \infty} I(\mu_{\mathcal{A}_n}, \mu_{\mathcal{A}_{n'}}) - I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx) \right| = 0.$$

Therefore, as $m \to \infty$, then

$$I(\hat{\mu}_n, \hat{\mu}_{n'}) \to \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2},$$

where $n, n' \in \{2^s m : s \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$, which completes the proof.

□

Proof of Proposition 23 . For every continuous function h, set

$$f(x) := \frac{h(x)}{\phi(x)},$$

when $\phi \neq 0$ and 0 otherwise. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a continuous function f' such that

$$\left| \frac{I(f_0(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int_0^1 f_0(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} - \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)}{(\int_0^1 f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} \right| < \varepsilon/2.$$

Applying (4.9) to f_0, gives us that for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N such that for every $n \geq N$ we have

$$\left| \frac{I(f_0(x)\phi(x))}{(\int_0^1 f_0(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} - I(\mu^n) \right| < \varepsilon/2,$$

where each μ^n is a probability measure with a piecewise continuous density with support in V_n, where V_n is a finite unions of disjoint I_k's with $k \geq n$. Since $f(x)\phi(x) = h(x)$ a.e., then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as large as we need such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| I(\mu^n) - \frac{I(h(x)\,dx)}{(\int_0^1 h(x)\,dx)^2} \right| \leq & \left| I(\mu^n) - \frac{I(f_0(x)\phi(x))}{(\int_0^1 f_0(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} \right| \\ & + \left| \frac{I(f_0(x)\phi(x))}{(\int_0^1 f_0(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} - \frac{I(f(x)\phi(x))}{(\int_0^1 f(x)\phi(x)\,dx)^2} \right| \\ < & \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists a subsequence n_k and probability measures μ^{n_k} with piecewise continuous density supported in V_{n_k} such that

$$I(\mu^{n_k}) = \frac{I(h(x)\,dx)}{(\int_0^1 h(x)\,dx)^2} + o(1). \tag{4.11}$$

Each μ^{n_k} is a probability measure with a piecewise continuous density with support contained in V_{n_k}, that is a finite union of disjoint I_j's with $j \geq k$. Hence, these $\{\mu^{n_k}\}$ satisfy **P.1**.

□

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Victor Kleptsyn for numerous discussions and for the idea of the proof of Lemma 11, as well as for reading multiple drafts of this paper and offering many helpful suggestions, and Anton Gorodetski for his remarks.

References

[1] L. Carleson, On the connection between Hausdorff measures and capacity, *Arkiv för Matematik*, **3**:5 (1958), pp. 403–406.

[2] D. Damanik, J. Fillman, Schrödinger Operators with Thin Spectra, *IAMP News Bulletin*, (2020), pp. 3–29.

[3] J. Deny, Sur les infinis d'un potentiel, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **224** (1947), pp. 524–525.
[4] R. Durrett, Probability: theory and examples, Cambridge University Press, 1951.
[5] P. Erdös, J. Gillis, Note on the Transfinite Diameter, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, **12**:3 (1937), pp. 185–192.
[6] A. Gorodetski, V. Kleptsyn, Parametric Furstenberg Theorem on Random Products of $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ matrices, preprint, arXiv:1809.00416.
[7] V. Kleptsyn, F. Quintino, Phase transition of capacity for the uniform G_δ-sets, preprint, arXiv:1910.07653.
[8] J. W. Lindeberg, Sur l'existence des fonctions d'une variable complexe et des fonctions harmoniques bornées, *Ann. Acad. Scient. Fenn.*, **11**:6 (1918).
[9] R. Nevanlinna, Über die Kapazität der Cantorschen Punktmengen, *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, **43** (1936), pp. 435–447.
[10] T. Ransford, Potential Theory in the Complex Plane, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
[11] B. Simon, Equilibrium Measures and Capacities in Spectral Theory, *Inverse Problems and Imaging*, **1**:4 (2007), pp. 713–772.
[12] Ursell, H., Note on the Transfinite Diameter, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, (1938).

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine
Email address: fquintin@uci.edu