HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Martin boundary points of cones generated by spherical John regions
Author(s)	Hirata, Kentaro
Citation	Hokkaido University Preprint Series in Mathematics, 727, 1-11
Issue Date	2005
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/83877
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/69535
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	re727.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

MARTIN BOUNDARY POINTS OF CONES GENERATED BY SPHERICAL JOHN REGIONS

KENTARO HIRATA

Abstract. We study Martin boundary points of cones generated by spherical John regions. In particular, we show that such a cone has a unique (minimal) Martin boundary point at the vertex, and also at infinity. We also study a relation between ordinary thinness and minimal thinness, and the boundary behavior of positive superharmonic functions.

1. Introduction

We work in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, where $n \geq 3$. Let Ω be a subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and G_Ω stands for the Green function for Ω. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ be fixed, and let ξ be a boundary point of Ω. Suppose now that $\{y_j\}$ is a sequence in Ω converging to ξ. Then, for each bounded open set ω such that $x_0 \in \omega$ and $\overline{\omega} \subset \Omega$, there is j_0 such that $\{G_\Omega(\cdot, y_j)/G_\Omega(x_0, y_j)\}_{j=j_0}^\infty$ is a uniformly bounded sequence of positive harmonic functions in ω. Therefore some subsequence of $\{G_\Omega(\cdot, y_j)/G_\Omega(x_0, y_j)\}_j$ converges to a positive harmonic function in Ω. All limit functions obtained in this way are called *Martin kernels at* ξ or *Martin boundary points at* ξ. Note that the number of Martin boundary points at ξ depends on geometry of Ω near ξ, so it is not necessarily unique. We say that a positive harmonic function h is *minimal* if every positive harmonic function less than or equal to h coincides with a constant multiple of h. If a Martin kernel is minimal, then we call it a minimal Martin kernel or a minimal Martin boundary point. There are many investigations for minimal Martin boundary points of several domains. For instance, every Euclidean boundary point of Lipschitz domains [13], NTA domains [14] or uniform domains [2], has a unique Martin boundary point and it is minimal. See also [5] and [4] for other domains. For Denjoy domains [8] (cf. [11], [18]), Lipschitz-Denjoy domains [9] (cf. [6]), sectorial domains [10] and quasi-sectorial domains [17], the authors gave criterions for the number of minimal Martin boundary points at a fixed Euclidean boundary point. In [4], Aikawa, Lundh and the author investigated the number of minimal Martin boundary points at each Euclidean boundary point of a John domain. An open subset Ω of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a John domain with John constant C_J and John center X_0 if each point x in Ω can be connected to X_0 by a rectifiable curve γ in Ω such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) \geq C_J \ell(\gamma(x, z)) \quad \text{for all } z \in \gamma, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\ell(\gamma(x, z))$ denotes the length of the subarc $\gamma(x, z)$ of γ connecting x to z, and $\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$ stands for the distance from z to the Euclidean boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω. A

Key words and phrases. Martin boundary points, cone, quasi-hyperbolic metric, John domain, ordinary thinness, minimal thinness, boundary behavior

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 31C35. Secondary 31B05, 31B25.

John domain is a very general domain including domains stated above and domains with fractal boundaries. Each Euclidean boundary point of a John domain may have many minimal Martin boundary points, but its number is finite.

Theorem A. *Let Ω be a John domain with John constant C_J. The following statements hold:*

(i) *The number of minimal Martin boundary points at every point of $\partial\Omega$ is bounded by a constant depending only on C_J.*

(ii) *If $C_J > \sqrt{3}/2$, then there are at most two minimal Martin boundary points at every point of $\partial\Omega$.*

The bound $C_J > \sqrt{3}/2$ in (ii) is sharp (cf. [4, Remark 1.1]). However, the number of minimal Martin boundary points at a given Euclidean boundary point can not be determined in terms of the John constant C_J. Our interesting object in this situation is to give domains with complicated boundaries of which a Euclidean boundary point has a unique (minimal) Martin boundary point.

In this note, we will consider a cone generated by a (relatively) open subset of the unit sphere with a John property, and will study Martin boundary points at the vertex and at infinity. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, let $B(x, r)$ and $S(x, r)$ denote the open ball and the sphere of center x and radius r, respectively. When $x = 0$, we write $B(r)$ and $S(r)$ for them to abbreviate the notation. Let $x_0 \in S(1)$. We say that a connected (relatively) open subset V of $S(1)$ is a John region of center x_0 if there exists a positive constant c_J with the following property: for each $x \in V$ there is a rectifiable curve γ in V connecting x to x_0 such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, S(1) \setminus V) \geq c_J \ell(\gamma(x, z)) \quad \text{for all } z \in \gamma. \tag{1.2}$$

Throughout the note, we call Γ a cone (with vertex at the origin) generated by a John base V of center x_0 if V is a John region in $S(1)$ of center x_0 and

$$\Gamma = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{x}{|x|} \in V \right\}.$$

Our result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Γ be a cone generated by a John base V of center x_0. Then there exists a unique Martin kernel $K_\Gamma(\cdot, 0)$ at the origin and it is minimal. Also, there exists a unique Martin kernel $K_\Gamma(\cdot, \infty)$ at infinity and it is minimal. Furthermore, there exist a positive continuous function f on V and $p \geq n-2$ such that for $x \in \Gamma$,*

$$K_\Gamma(x, 0) = |x|^{-p} f(x/|x|) \quad \text{and} \quad K_\Gamma(x, \infty) = |x|^{2-n+p} f(x/|x|). \tag{1.3}$$

Theorem 1.1 is the extension of Kuran's result [15, Theorem 1]. He considered an NTA cone, i.e. a cone Γ such that $\Gamma \cap B(1)$ is an NTA domain in the sense of Jerison and Kenig [14]. In order to show the existence of a unique Martin boundary point at the origin, he could apply the results in [14], the boundary Harnack principle and the uniqueness theorem, to a bounded NTA domain $\Gamma \cap B(1)$. It is noteworthy that cones generated by John bases do not satisfy, in general, the boundary Harnack principle at every boundary point except for the origin. We will show the boundary Harnack principle at the origin, using ideas from our previous paper [4].

The rest of the note is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will give a proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 3, we will show the equivalence of the ordinary thinness

and the mininal thinness of a set contained in a subcone of Γ, and will show that there is no positive superharmonic function u in a domain, which contains Γ, such that $|x|^p u(x) \to +\infty$ as $x \to 0$ along a subcone of Γ, where p is the homogeneous degree of $K_\Gamma(\cdot, 0)$ in Theorem 1.1.

Throughout the note, we use the symbol C to denote an absolute positive constant whose value is unimportant and may change from line to line. If necessary, we use $C_1, C_2, \cdots$ to specify them.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We start by recalling the Harnack inequality involving the quasi-hyperbolic metric. Let x and y be points in a subdomain Ω of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The quasi-hyperbolic metric on Ω is defined by

$$k_\Omega(x, y) = \inf_\gamma \int_\gamma \frac{ds(z)}{\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)},$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable curves γ in Ω connecting x to y and ds stands for the line element on γ. We say that a finite sequence of balls $\{B(x_j, 2^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(x_j, \partial\Omega))\}_{j=1}^N$ in Ω is a Harnack chain between x and y if $x_1 = x$, $x_N = y$ and $x_{j+1} \in B(x_j, 2^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(x_j, \partial\Omega))$ for $j = 1, \cdots, N-1$. The number N is called the length of the Harnack chain. We observe that the shortest length of the Harnack chain between x and y is comparable to $k_\Omega(x, y) + 1$. Therefore the Harnack inequality yields the following.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a constant $C > 1$ depending only on the dimension n such that if $x, y \in \Omega$, then*

$$\exp(-C(k_\Omega(x, y) + 1)) \le \frac{h(x)}{h(y)} \le \exp(C(k_\Omega(x, y) + 1))$$

for every positive harmonic function h in Ω.

We next recall the notion, a system of local reference points of order N, which played important roles in our previous work [4] concerning minimal Martin boundary points of a John domain.

Definition 2.2. Let N be a positive integer and $0 < \eta < 1$. We say that $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ has *a system of local reference points of order N with factor η* if there exist $r_\xi > 0$ and $C_\xi > 1$ with the following property: for each positive $r < r_\xi$ there are N points $y_1 = y_1(r), \cdots, y_N = y_N(r) \in \Omega \cap S(\xi, r)$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(y_j, \partial\Omega) \ge C_\xi^{-1} r$ for $j = 1, \cdots, N$ and

$$\min_{j=1,\cdots,N} \{k_{\Omega\cap B(\xi,\eta^{-3}r)}(x, y_j)\} \le C_\xi \log \frac{r}{\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)} + C_\xi \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega \cap B(\xi, \eta r).$$

We should note that this notion controls the boundary behavior of positive harmonic functions. Indeed, by Lemma 2.1, there exist constants $C > 1$ and $\alpha > 1$ such that if h is a positive harmonic function in $\Omega \cap B(\xi, \eta^{-3}r)$, then we have for $x \in \Omega \cap B(\xi, \eta r)$,

$$h(x) \le C \left(\frac{r}{\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}\right)^\alpha \sum_{j=1}^N h(y_j).$$

That is, if $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ has a system of local reference points of order N, then the behavior of positive harmonic functions near ξ is controlled at N points $y_1, \cdots, y_N$ in $\Omega \cap S(\xi, r)$. Furthermore, if Ω is a John domain, then the above inequality and a geometrical property would lead the Carleson type estimate:

$$h(x) \le C \sum_{j=1}^{N} h(y_j) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega \cap B(\xi, \eta^2 r), \tag{2.1}$$

whenever h is a positive and bounded harmonic function in $\Omega \cap B(\xi, \eta^{-3} r)$ vanishing on $\partial\Omega \cap B(\xi, \eta^{-3} r)$ except for a polar set.

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we need to show (2.1) with $N = 1$. To do this, we need to show that each point in $\Gamma \cap B(1)$ can be connected to x_0 by a curve satisfying (1.1), and that the origin has a system of local reference points of order 1.

Lemma 2.3. *Let Γ be a cone generated by a John base V of center x_0. Then each $x \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B(1)}$ can be connected to x_0 by a rectifiable curve γ in $\Gamma \cap \overline{B(1)}$ such that*

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Gamma) \ge C_1 \ell(\gamma(x, z)) \quad \textit{for all } z \in \gamma, \tag{2.2}$$

where C_1 is a positive constant depending only on Γ.

Proof. Let $x \in \Gamma \cap B(1)$. Then, by the definition of V, there is a rectifiable curve γ' in V connecting $x/|x|$ to x_0 and satisfying (1.2). Let γ'_x be the image of γ' under the dilation mapping $x/|x|$ to x. Then γ'_x is the curve in $\Gamma \cap S(|x|) \subset \Gamma \cap B(1)$ connecting x to $|x|x_0$ and satisfies that for $z \in \gamma'_x$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Gamma) &= |x| \operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, \partial\Gamma) \\ &\ge |x| \frac{c_J}{2} \ell(\gamma'(x/|x|, z/|x|)) = \frac{c_J}{2} \ell(\gamma'_x(x, z)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Indeed, the above inequality can be shown as follows: If $\operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, \partial\Gamma) = \operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, 0) = 1$, then we have by (1.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, \partial\Gamma) = \frac{\ell(\gamma'(x/|x|, z/|x|))}{\ell(\gamma'(x/|x|, z/|x|))} &\ge \frac{\ell(\gamma'(x/|x|, z/|x|))}{c_J^{-1} \operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, S(1) \setminus V)} \\ &\ge \frac{c_J}{2} \ell(\gamma'(x/|x|, z/|x|)). \end{aligned}$$

If $\operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, \partial\Gamma) \ne \operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, 0)$, then there is a point $y \in \partial\Gamma \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, \partial\Gamma) = |z/|x| - y|$. Then the angle $\angle y0z$ must be less than $\pi/2$. Therefore we have by (1.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, \partial\Gamma) = |z/|x| - y/|y|| \cos(2^{-1} \angle y0z) &\ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \operatorname{dist}(z/|x|, S(1) \setminus V) \\ &\ge \frac{c_J}{\sqrt{2}} \ell(\gamma'(x/|x|, z/|x|)). \end{aligned}$$

See Figure 1.

Let $\gamma = \gamma'_x \cup [|x|x_0, x_0]$, where $[|x|x_0, x_0]$ denotes the line segment between $|x|x_0$ and x_0. To complete the lemma, it suffices to show (2.2) for $z \in [|x|x_0, x_0]$. Let $w \in [|x|x_0, x_0]$. Since $\operatorname{dist}(|x|x_0, \partial\Gamma) \le |x| \le |w|$, it follows from (2.3) with $z = |x|x_0$



FIGURE 1

that

$$\ell(\gamma(x,w)) = \ell(\gamma'_x) + ||x|x_0 - w| \le \frac{2}{c_J}\operatorname{dist}(|x|x_0, \partial\Gamma) + |w|$$
$$\le \left(\frac{2}{c_J}+1\right)|w| = \left(\frac{2}{c_J}+1\right)\frac{\operatorname{dist}(w,\partial\Gamma)}{\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Gamma)}.$$

Hence the lemma holds with $C_1 = (2c_J^{-1}+1)^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Gamma)$. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let Γ be a cone generated by a John base V of center x_0. Then there exists a positive constant C_2 depending only on Γ such that*

$$k_{\Gamma\cap B(2r)}(x, rx_0) \le C_2 \log\frac{r}{\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Gamma)} + C_2 \quad \text{for } x \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B(r)},$$

whenever $r > 0$. In other words, the origin has a system of local reference points of order 1.

Proof. Let $r > 0$. We note that the conclusion in Lemma 2.3 is invariant under dilation since Γ is the cone. Therefore we see that for each $x \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B(r)}$ there is a curve γ in $\Gamma \cap \overline{B(r)}$ connecting x to rx_0 such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial(\Gamma \cap B(2r))) = \operatorname{dist}(z,\partial\Gamma) \ge C_1\ell(\gamma(x,z)) \quad \text{for all } z \in \gamma.$$

Since $\ell(\gamma) \le C_1^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(rx_0,\partial\Gamma) = C_1^{-1}r\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Gamma)$, we have

$$k_{\Gamma\cap B(2r)}(x,rx_0) \le \int_\gamma \frac{ds(z)}{\operatorname{dist}(z,\partial\Gamma)} \le 1 + \frac{1}{C_1}\int_{2^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Gamma)}^{\ell(\gamma)} \frac{dt}{t}$$
$$\le C_2 \log\frac{r}{\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Gamma)} + C_2,$$

where a constant C_2 depends only on C_1 and $\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Gamma)$. Thus the lemma follows. □

In the sequel, we suppose that Γ is a cone generated by a John base of center x_0. Note from Lemma 2.3 that the shape of $\Gamma \cap B(1)$ is John, and from Lemma 2.4 that the origin has a system of local reference points of order 1. By repeating similar arguments as in [4, Lemmas 5.1 and 6.1] (cf. [3, Sections 4 and 5]), we can obtain Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7 below. We say that a property holds quasi-everywhere if it holds apart from a polar set.

Lemma 2.5 (Carleson type estimate)**.** *Let $r > 0$. Suppose that h is a positive harmonic function in $\Gamma \cap B(2r)$ vanishing quasi-everywhere on $\partial\Gamma \cap B(2r)$. If h is bounded in $\Gamma \cap B(2r)$, then*

$$h(x) \le Ch(rx_0) \quad \text{for } x \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B(2^{-1}r)},$$

where a constant C is independent of x, h and r.

Remark 2.6. Lemma 2.5 would be proved for sufficiently small r, say $0 < r \le r_0$. But, considering $h(\frac{r}{r_0}\cdot)$, we can obtain it for all $r > 0$.

Let $\omega(x, E, D)$ denote the harmonic measure of a Borel set E for an open set D evaluated at x.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $r > 0$. If h is a positive and bounded harmonic function in $\Gamma \cap B(2r)$ vanishing quasi-everywhere on $\partial\Gamma \cap B(2r)$, then*

$$\omega(x, \Gamma \cap S(2^{-1}r), \Gamma \cap B(2^{-1}r)) \le C\frac{h(x)}{h(rx_0)} \quad \text{for } x \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B(3^{-1}r)},$$

where a constant C is independent of x, h and r.

As a consequence of these lemmas, we can obtain the following Boundary Harnack principle at the origin. For two positive functions f_1 and f_2, we write $f_1 \approx f_2$ if there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that $C^{-1}f_1 \le f_2 \le Cf_1$. The constant C is called the constant of comparison.

Lemma 2.8 (Boundary Harnack principle)**.** *Let $r > 0$. If h_1 and h_2 are positive and bounded harmonic functions in $\Gamma \cap B(2r)$ vanishing quasi-everywhere on $\partial\Gamma \cap B(2r)$, then*

$$\frac{h_1(y)}{h_2(y)} \approx \frac{h_1(y')}{h_2(y')} \quad \text{for } y, y' \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B(3^{-1}r)},$$

where the constant of comparison is independent of y, y', h_1, h_2 and r.

We note again that this Boundary Harnack principle holds only at the origin, that is, it does not hold at other boundary points in general. So we can not apply the arguments in [2, Lemma 4 and Proof of Theorem 3] in order to prove the existence of a unique Martin boundary point at the origin. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *Let Ω be a subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \ge 2$, and let $\xi \in \partial\Omega$. Suppose that h is a positive harmonic function in Ω such that h vanishes quasi-everywhere on $\partial\Omega \setminus \{\xi\}$ and $\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x) = 0$ when Ω is unbounded. If h is bounded in $\Omega \setminus B(\xi, r)$ for each $r > 0$, then the measure associated with h in the Martin representation is concentrating on minimal Martin boundary points at ξ.*

Proof. Let Δ and Δ_1 denote the Martin boundary and the minimal Martin boundary of Ω, respectively, and K_Ω stand for the Martin kernel of Ω. By the Martin representation, there is a unique measure μ_h on Δ such that $\mu_h(\Delta \setminus \Delta_1) = 0$ and

$$h(x) = \int_\Delta K_\Omega(x, y)d\mu_h(y) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega.$$

We now write $\Delta(\xi)$ for the set of all Martin boundary points at ξ. Let E be a compact subset of $\Delta \setminus \Delta(\xi)$, and let $\{E_j\}$ be a decreasing sequence of compact

neighborhoods of E in the Martin compactification of Ω such that $\bigcap_j E_j = E$ and $(E_1 \cap \Omega) \cap B(\xi, r_1) = \emptyset$ for some $r_1 > 0$. Then, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have by [7, Corollary 9.1.4]

$$\widehat{R}_h^{E_j \cap \Omega}(x) = \int_{\Delta_1} \widehat{R}_{K_\Omega(\cdot, y)}^{E_j \cap \Omega}(x) d\mu_h(y) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega,$$

where $\widehat{R}_u^F$ denotes the regularized reduced function of a positive superharmonic function u relative to F in Ω. By assumption on h, we see that $\lim_{j\to\infty} \widehat{R}_h^{E_j \cap \Omega}$ is a bounded harmonic function in Ω vanishing quasi-everywhere on $\partial\Omega$. The maximum principle gives $\lim_{j\to\infty} \widehat{R}_h^{E_j \cap \Omega} \equiv 0$. Thus we have by the monotone convergence

$$0 = \lim_{j\to\infty} \widehat{R}_h^{E_j \cap \Omega}(x_0) = \int_{\Delta_1} \lim_{j\to\infty} \widehat{R}_{K_\Omega(\cdot, y)}^{E_j \cap \Omega}(x_0) d\mu_h(y). \tag{2.4}$$

If $y \in E \cap \Delta_1$, then $E_j \cap \Omega$ is not minimally thin at y for each j (cf. [7, Lemma 9.1.5]). Therefore we have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \widehat{R}_{K_\Omega(\cdot, y)}^{E_j \cap \Omega}(x_0) = K_\Omega(x_0, y) = 1 \quad \text{for } y \in E \cap \Delta_1.$$

Hence this, together with (2.4), concludes $\mu_h(E) = 0$, and so $\mu_h(\Delta \setminus (\Delta(\xi) \cap \Delta_1)) = 0$. Thus the lemma follows. □

Let us give a proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We first show that the origin has at most one minimal Martin boundary point. Let ξ and η be minimal Martin boundary points at the origin. Then, by definition, there are sequences $\{y_j\}$ and $\{y_j'\}$ in Γ converging to the origin such that $G_\Gamma(\cdot, y_j)/G_\Gamma(x_0, y_j) \to K_\Gamma(\cdot, \xi)$ and $G_\Gamma(\cdot, y_j')/G_\Gamma(x_0, y_j') \to K_\Gamma(\cdot, \eta)$ as $j \to \infty$. Here $K_\Gamma(\cdot, \xi)$ denotes the Martin kernel corresponding to ξ. Let $r > 0$ and let $x \in \Gamma \setminus B(3r)$. We apply Lemma 2.8 to $h_1 = G_\Gamma(x, \cdot)$ and $h_2 = G_\Gamma(x_0, \cdot)$, and let $j \to \infty$. Then we have $K_\Gamma(x, \xi) \approx K_\Gamma(x, \eta)$. Since the constant of comparison is independent of r, it follows that $K_\Gamma(\cdot, \xi) \approx K_\Gamma(\cdot, \eta)$ on whole of Γ. By minimality and $K_\Gamma(x_0, \xi) = 1 = K_\Gamma(x_0, \eta)$, we obtain $K_\Gamma(\cdot, \xi) \equiv K_\Gamma(\cdot, \eta)$, and hence $\xi = \eta$. To complete the first statement of the theorem, it is enough to show that Martin boundary points at the origin are minimal. But this follows from Lemma 2.9. Indeed, if ζ is a Martin boundary point at the origin and $0 < r < 3^{-1}$, then Lemma 2.8 yields that

$$K_\Gamma(x, \zeta) \approx \frac{G_\Gamma(x, 3^{-1} r x_0)}{G_\Gamma(x_0, 3^{-1} r x_0)} \quad \text{for } x \in \Gamma \setminus \overline{B(3r)}.$$

Hence $K_\Gamma(\cdot, \zeta)$ satisfies the assumptions in Lemma 2.9, and so ζ is minimal. Also, by the Kelvin transfomation with respect to $S(1)$, we observe that there is a unique Martin boundary point at infinity and it is minimal. The last statement of the theorem can be obtained by the similar way as in [15, p. 472]. □

3. Further results

As a consequence of investigations in the previous section, we will show the equivalence of the ordinary thinness and the minimal thinness of a set contained in a subcone of Γ. We recall their definitions. Let E be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a limit point of E. We say that E is thin at ξ (in the ordinary sense) if there exists

a positive superharmonic function u in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $u(\xi) < +\infty$ and $u(x) \to +\infty$ as $x \to \xi$ along E. The original definition of minimal thinness by Naïm is based on the regularized reduced function of the Martin kernel. We define minimal thinness by the following equivalent condition (cf. [7, Theorem 9.2.7]). Let ξ be a minimal Martin boundary point of a domain Ω and let E be a subset of Ω, where ξ is a Martin topology limit point of E. We say that E is minimally thin at ξ with respect to Ω if there exists a Green potential $G_\Omega\mu$ in Ω such that $\int K_\Omega(x,\xi)d\mu(x) < +\infty$ and $G_\Omega\mu(y)/G_\Omega(x_0,y) \to +\infty$ as $y \to \xi$ along E in the Martin topology. For a subset U of $S(1)$, we write $\Gamma(U) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x/|x| \in U\}$. Note from Theorem 1.1 that a unique minimal Martin boundary point at 0 may be identified with the Euclidean boundary point 0.

Theorem 3.1. *Let Γ be a cone generated by a John base V of center x_0. Let U be a subset of $S(1)$ such that $\overline{U} \subset V$, and suppose that E is a subset of $\Gamma(U)$. Then E is thin at 0 if and only if E is minimally thin at 0 with respect to Γ.*

This was first proved in the half-space by Lelong-Ferrand [16], and was extended by Aikawa [1] to a Lipschitz domain. The proof of Theorem 3.1 will be based on our previous work [12] in a uniform domain.

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ be a cone generated by a John base V of center x_0, and let U be a subset of $S(1)$ such that $\overline{U} \subset V$. The following statements hold:*

(i) *For $x \in \Gamma(U) \cap B(6^{-1})$,*

$$G_\Gamma(x,x_0)K_\Gamma(x,0) \approx |x|^{2-n}, \tag{3.1}$$

where the constant of comparison is independent of x.

(ii) *For $x \in \Gamma(U) \cap B(6^{-1})$ and $y \in \Gamma(U) \cap B(3|x|)$,*

$$\frac{G_\Gamma(x,x_0)G_\Gamma(x,y)}{G_\Gamma(x_0,y)} \approx |x-y|^{2-n}, \tag{3.2}$$

where the constant of comparison is independent of x and y;

(iii) *For $x \in \Gamma \cap B(6^{-1})$ and $y \in \Gamma(U) \cap (B(2^{-1}) \setminus B(3|x|))$,*

$$\frac{G_\Gamma(x,x_0)G_\Gamma(x,y)}{G_\Gamma(x_0,y)} \le C|x-y|^{2-n}, \tag{3.3}$$

where a constant C is independent of x and y.

To apply Lemma 2.1 to the Green function, we need the following: If $z \in \Omega$, then

$$k_{\Omega\setminus\{z\}}(x,y) \le 3k_\Omega(x,y) + \pi \quad \text{for } x,y \in \Omega \setminus B(z, 2^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(z,\partial\Omega)). \tag{3.4}$$

The proof of this inequality may be found in [4, Lemma 7.2].

Proof of Lemma 3.2. (i) We observe from the Harnack inequality that

$$K_\Gamma(6^{-1}x_0,\infty) \approx 1 \quad \text{and} \quad G_\Gamma(6^{-1}x_0,x_0) \approx \operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Gamma)^{2-n}.$$

By Lemma 2.8 and (1.3), we have for $x \in \Gamma \cap B(6^{-1})$,

$$G_\Gamma(x,x_0) \approx \frac{G_\Gamma(x,x_0)}{G_\Gamma(6^{-1}x_0,x_0)} \approx \frac{K_\Gamma(x,\infty)}{K_\Gamma(6^{-1}x_0,\infty)} \approx K_\Gamma(x,\infty) = \frac{|x|^{2-n}}{K_\Gamma(x,0)} f(x/|x|)^2.$$

Since f is a positive continuous function on V and $\overline{U} \subset V$, we obtain (3.1) for $x \in \Gamma(U) \cap B(6^{-1})$.

(ii) Let $x \in \Gamma(U) \cap B(6^{-1})$ and $y \in \Gamma(U) \cap B(3|x|)$. We will consider three cases.
Case 1: $|y| \le 6^{-1}|x|$. By Lemma 2.8 and (3.1), we have

$$G_\Gamma(x, x_0)\frac{G_\Gamma(x, y)}{G_\Gamma(x_0, y)} \approx G_\Gamma(x, x_0)K_\Gamma(x, 0) \approx |x|^{2-n}.$$

Since $|x| \approx |x - y|$, we obtain (3.2) in this case.
Case 2: $|y| \ge 6^{-1}|x|$ and $|y-x| \ge 2^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Gamma)$. Since $\operatorname{dist}(y, \partial\Gamma) \ge |y| \operatorname{dist}(\overline{U}, \partial\Gamma)$ and $\operatorname{dist}(6^{-1}|x|x_0, \partial\Gamma) = 6^{-1}|x| \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Gamma) \ge 18^{-1}|y| \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Gamma)$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} k_{\Gamma\cap B(1)}(6^{-1}|x|x_0, y) &\le k_{\Gamma\cap B(1)}(6^{-1}|x|x_0, |y|x_0) + k_{\Gamma\cap B(1)}(y, |y|x_0) \\ &\le C_2 \log \frac{|y|}{\operatorname{dist}(6^{-1}|x|x_0, \partial\Gamma)} + C_2 \log \frac{|y|}{\operatorname{dist}(y, \partial\Gamma)} + 2C_2 \\ &\le C. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore Lemma 2.1, together with (3.4), gives

$$G_\Gamma(x, y) \approx G_\Gamma(x, 6^{-1}|x|x_0) \quad \text{and} \quad G_\Gamma(x_0, y) \approx G_\Gamma(x_0, 6^{-1}|x|x_0).$$

Since $|x - 6^{-1}|x|x_0| \approx |x - y|$, we obtain from Case 1 that

$$\frac{G_\Gamma(x, x_0)G_\Gamma(x, y)}{G_\Gamma(x_0, y)} \approx \frac{G_\Gamma(x, x_0)G_\Gamma(x, 6^{-1}|x|x_0)}{G_\Gamma(x_0, 6^{-1}|x|x_0)} \approx |x - y|^{2-n}.$$

Case 3: $|y-x| \le 2^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Gamma)$. By the Harnack inequality, $G_\Gamma(x, x_0) \approx G_\Gamma(y, x_0)$. Since $G_\Gamma(x, y) \approx |x - y|^{2-n}$ in this case, we obtain (3.2).

(iii) Let $x \in \Gamma \cap B(6^{-1})$ and $y \in \Gamma(U) \cap (B(2^{-1}) \setminus B(3|x|))$. By Lemma 2.5, we have $G_\Gamma(x, x_0) \le CG_\Gamma(|y|x_0, x_0)$. It follows from Lemma 2.4 and $\operatorname{dist}(y, \partial\Gamma) \ge |y| \operatorname{dist}(\overline{U}, \partial\Gamma)$ that $k_{\Gamma\cap B(1)}(y, |y|x_0) \le C$, and so Lemma 2.1 gives $G_\Gamma(|y|x_0, x_0) \approx G_\Gamma(y, x_0)$. Hence we obtain

$$\frac{G_\Gamma(x, x_0)G_\Gamma(x, y)}{G_\Gamma(x_0, y)} \le CG_\Gamma(x, y) \le C|x - y|^{2-n}.$$

The proof of the lemma is complete. □

Theorem 3.1 will be proved similarly as in [12], using Lemma 3.2. In the sequel, we write $\widehat{R}_1^E$ for the regularized reduced function of the constant function 1 relative to E in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We may assume, without loss of generality, that 0 is a limit point of E and $E \subset B(6^{-1})$. We first assume that E is thin at 0. In view of Wiener's criterion (cf. [7, Theorem 7.7.2]), there exists a sequence $\{a_j\}$ of positive numbers such that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} a_j = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \widehat{R}_1^{E_j}(0) < +\infty,$$

where $E_j = \{x \in E : 2^{-j-1} \le |x| \le 2^{-j}\}$. Let μ_j be the Riesz measure associated with the Newtonian potential $\widehat{R}_1^{E_j}$, and let $d\nu_j(x) = G_\Gamma(x, x_0)d\mu_j(x)$. Since μ_j is supported on $\overline{E}_j$, it follows from (3.2) that

$$1 = \widehat{R}_1^{E_j}(y) \le C\frac{G_\Gamma\nu_j(y)}{G_\Gamma(x_0, y)} \quad \text{for quasi-every } y \in E_j.$$

Then $u(y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j G_\Gamma \nu_j(y)$ is a Green potential in Γ such that $u(y)/G_\Gamma(x_0, y) \to +\infty$ as $y \to 0$ along $E \setminus F$, where F is a polar set. We also have by (3.1)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \int K_\Gamma(x, 0) d\nu_j(x) \le C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \widehat{R}_1^{E_j}(0) < +\infty.$$

Hence $E \setminus F$ is minimally thin at 0 with respect to Γ, and so is E.

We next assume that E is minimally thin at 0 with respect to Γ. Then there is a Green potential $G_\Gamma \mu$ in Γ such that $\int K_\Gamma(x, 0) d\mu(x) < +\infty$ and $G_\Gamma \mu(y)/G_\Gamma(x_0, y) \to +\infty$ as $y \to 0$ along E. We may assume that μ is supported on $\Gamma(U) \cap B(6^{-1})$, replacing $G_\Gamma \mu$ by its regularized reduced function. Let $d\nu(x) = G_\Gamma(x, x_0)^{-1} d\mu(x)$. Then we have by (3.2) and (3.3)

$$\frac{G_\Gamma \mu(y)}{G_\Gamma(x_0, y)} \le C \int |x - y|^{2-n} d\nu(x) \quad \text{for } y \in E,$$

and so $\int |x - y|^{2-n} d\nu(x) \to +\infty$ as $y \to 0$ along E. Also, we have by (3.1)

$$\int |x|^{2-n} d\nu(x) \le C \int K_\Gamma(x, 0) d\mu(x) < +\infty.$$

Hence E is thin at 0. The proof is complete. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let Γ be a cone generated by a John base V of center x_0, and suppose that E is a non-polar subset of $S(1)$ such that $\overline{E} \subset V$. Then $\Gamma(E)$ is not minimally thin at 0 with respect to Γ.*

Proof. Let $r > 0$ and denote $rE = \{rx : x \in E\}$. Then we observe that $\widehat{R}_1^E(x) = \widehat{R}_1^{rE}(rx)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore we have

$$\widehat{R}_1^{rE}(0) = \widehat{R}_1^E(0) = \mu(\overline{E}) > 0 \quad \text{for all } r > 0,$$

where μ is the Riesz measure associated with $\widehat{R}_1^E$. This shows that $\Gamma(E)$ is not thin at 0. Hence it follows from Theorem 3.1 that $\Gamma(E)$ is not minimally thin at 0 with respect to Γ. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let Γ be a cone generated by a John base V, and suppose that Ω is a domain such that $\Gamma \cap B(1) \subset \Omega$ and $0 \in \partial\Omega$. If E is a non-polar subset of $S(1)$ such that $\overline{E} \subset V$, then there is no positive superharmonic function u in Ω such that*

$$\lim_{x \to 0, x \in \Gamma(E)} |x|^p u(x) = +\infty, \tag{3.5}$$

where $p > 0$ is the homogeneous degree of $K_\Gamma(\cdot, 0)$ in Theorem 1.1.

Proof. Let u be a positive superharmonic function in Ω. By [7, Theorem 9.3.3], $u/K_\Gamma(\cdot, 0)$ has a finite minimal fine limit l at 0 with respect to Γ. That is, there exists a subset F of Γ, minimally thin at 0, such that $u(x)/K_\Gamma(x, 0) \to l$ as $x \to 0$ along $\Gamma \setminus F$. Then there must exist a sequence $\{x_j\}$ in $\Gamma(E) \setminus F$ converging to 0, because otherwise implies that there is $r_0 > 0$ such that $\Gamma(E) \cap B(r_0) \subset F$, which contradicts Corollary 3.3. Therefore $u(x_j)/K_\Gamma(x_j, 0)$ has limit l as $j \to \infty$, and hence there is no positive superharmonic function in Ω satisfying (3.5). □

References

[1] H. Aikawa, *On the minimal thinness in a Lipschitz domain*, Analysis **5** (1985), no. 4, 347–382.

[2] ———, *Boundary Harnack principle and Martin boundary for a uniform domain*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **53** (2001), no. 1, 119–145.

[3] H. Aikawa, K. Hirata and T. Lundh, *Martin boundary for union of convex sets*, Sūrikaisekikenkyūsho Kōkyūroku No. 1293 (2002), 1–14.

[4] ———, *Martin boundary points of a John domain and unions of convex sets*, preprint.

[5] A. Ancona, *Une propriété de la compactification de Martin d'un domaine euclidien*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **29** (1979), no. 4, ix, 71–90.

[6] ———, *Sur la frontière de Martin des domaines de Denjoy*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. **15** (1990), no. 2, 259–271.

[7] D. H. Armitage and S. J. Gardiner, *Classical potential theory*, Springer-Verlag London Ltd., London, 2001.

[8] M. Benedicks, *Positive harmonic functions vanishing on the boundary of certain domains in* $\mathbf{R}^n$, Ark. Mat. **18** (1980), no. 1, 53–72.

[9] N. Chevallier, *Frontière de Martin d'un domaine de* $\mathbf{R}^n$ *dont le bord est inclus dans une hypersurface lipschitzienne*, Ark. Mat. **27** (1989), no. 1, 29–48.

[10] M. C. Cranston and T. S. Salisbury, *Martin boundaries of sectorial domains*, Ark. Mat. **31** (1993), no. 1, 27–49.

[11] S. J. Gardiner, *Minimal harmonic functions on Denjoy domains*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **107** (1989), no. 4, 963–970.

[12] K. Hirata, *Comparison estimates for the Green function and the Martin kernel*, preprint.

[13] R. A. Hunt and R. L. Wheeden, *Positive harmonic functions on Lipschitz domains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **147** (1970), 507–527.

[14] D. S. Jerison and C. E. Kenig, *Boundary behavior of harmonic functions in nontangentially accessible domains*, Adv. in Math. **46** (1982), no. 1, 80–147.

[15] Ü. Kuran, *On NTA-conical domains*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **40** (1989), no. 3, 467–475.

[16] J. Lelong-Ferrand, *Étude au voisinage de la frontière des fonctions subharmoniques positives dans un demi-espace*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3) **66** (1949), 125–159.

[17] A. Lömker, *Martin boundaries of quasi-sectorial domains*, Potential Anal. **13** (2000), no. 1, 11–67.

[18] S. Segawa, *Martin boundaries of Denjoy domains*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **103** (1988), no. 1, 177–183.

Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan
E-mail address: hirata@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp