

Polynomials with exponents in compact convex sets and associated weighted extremal functions - Generalized product property

Bergur Snorrason

Abstract

A famous result of Siciak is how the Siciak-Zakharyuta functions, sometimes called global extremal functions or pluricomplex Green functions with a pole at infinity, of two sets relate to the Siciak-Zakharyuta function of their cartesian product. In this paper Siciak's result is generalized to the setting of Siciak-Zakharyuta functions with growth given by a compact convex set, along with discussing why this generalization does not work in the weighted setting.

Subject Classification (2020): Primary 32U35. Secondary 32A08, 32U15.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ denote the Lelong class in \mathbb{C}^n , consisting of all $u \in \mathcal{PSH}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ such that $u(z) \leq \log^+ |z| + c_u$, for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and some constant c_u . For every compact $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ we define the Siciak-Zakharyuta function of K by

$$V_K = \sup\{u; u \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^n), u|_K \leq 0\}.$$

Siciak proved in [9] a product formula for these functions. Namely, if $K_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$, and $n = n_1 + \dots + n_\ell$, then

$$V_K(z) = \max\{V_{K_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}(z_\ell)\}, \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_\ell) \in \mathbb{C}^n, z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j}.$$

See Klimek [3], Theorem 5.1.8.

Bos and Levenberg in [1] continued the study of pluripotential theory related to convex sets by, among other results, generalizing Siciak's product formula. To state the result we define, for $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ compact convex and containing 0, the *logarithmic supporting function* by

$$H_S(z) = \varphi_S(\text{Log}(z))$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^{*n}$, where $\varphi_S(\xi) = \sup_{x \in S} \langle x, \xi \rangle$ is the supporting function of S and $\text{Log}(z) = (\log |z_1|, \dots, \log |z_n|)$. We then extend the definition of H_S to \mathbb{C}^n by

$$H_S(z) = \overline{\lim}_{\mathbb{C}^{*n} \ni w \rightarrow z} H_S(w).$$

This allows us to define the Lelong class $\mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ with respect to S consisting of $u \in \mathcal{PSH}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ such that $u(z) \leq H_S(z) + c_u$ for some constant c_u . We also define $\mathcal{L}_+^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ as the family of those functions $u \in \mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ such that $H_S - c_u \leq u \leq H_S + c_u$. For every compact $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ and function q on K we can then define the weighted Siciak-Zakharyuta function of K , S , and q by

$$V_{K,q}^S = \sup\{u; u \in \mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n), u|_K \leq q\}.$$

In the case where $q = 0$ we omit it in the subscript. The superscript is omitted when S is the standard simplex in \mathbb{R}^n , that is $S = \Sigma = \text{ch}\{0, e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, where e_1, \dots, e_n is the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n and ch denotes the closed convex hull. This is justified since $V_{K,0}^\Sigma = V_K$. The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1 *Let $K_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be compact and non-pluripolar for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$, $n = n_1 + \dots + n_\ell$, $T \subset \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ be compact convex, $S_j \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_j}$ be compact convex containing 0, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be given by*

$$S = \bigcup_{x \in T} (x_1 S_1) \times \dots \times (x_\ell S_\ell).$$

Then

$$V_K^S(z) = \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)), \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_n), z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j}.$$

Taking $T = \text{ch}\{e_1, \dots, e_\ell\}$ and $S_j = \Sigma_j$, where Σ_j is the standard simplex in \mathbb{R}^{n_j} , we get $S = \Sigma_n$ so this generalizes Siciak's original result, since in this case $\varphi_T(\xi) = \max\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell\}$. This result also generalizes Theorem 1.1 in Nguyen and Long [8]. They prove the following.

Corollary 1.2 *Let $K_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ and $K_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ be compact and non-pluripolar, $K = K_1 \times K_2$, $S_1 \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_1}$ and $S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_2}$ be compact convex and containing a neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{R}_+^{n_1}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+^{n_2}$, respectively, and $S = \text{ch}((S_1 \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0\} \times S_2))$. Then*

$$V_K^S(z) = \max\{V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), V_{K_2}^{S_2}(z_2)\}.$$

In [8] it is not assumed that S_1 and S_2 contain a neighborhood of their respective origins, but their proof requires it, see Proposition 2.2 herein.

Another corollary of Theorem 1.1 is Proposition 2.4 in Bos and Levenberg [1]. To state this result we recall the definition of a lower set. A compact convex $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, with $0 \in S$, is said to be a *lower set* if for all $s \in S$ the box $[0, s_1] \times \dots \times [0, s_n]$ is contained in S . Theorem 5.8 in [6] gives several equivalent characterizations for this property. One of these is that S is a lower set if and only if $\varphi_S(\xi) = \varphi_S(\xi^+)$, where $\xi^+ = (\xi_1^+, \dots, \xi_n^+)$ and $\xi_j^+ = \max\{0, \xi_j\}$, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We refer to the smallest lower set containing S as the *lower hull* of S denoted by \hat{S}_ℓ , and note that S is a lower set if and only if $S = \hat{S}_\ell$. The supporting function of \hat{S}_ℓ is therefore given by $\varphi_{\hat{S}_\ell}(\xi) = \varphi_S(\xi^+)$. If we assume $\ell = n$ and $S_j = [0, 1]$ in Theorem 1.1 we have that

$$\varphi_S(\xi) = \varphi_T(\varphi_{[0,1]}(\xi_1), \dots, \varphi_{[0,1]}(\xi_n)) = \varphi_T(\xi_1^+, \dots, \xi_n^+) = \varphi_{\hat{T}_\ell}(\xi)$$

since $\varphi_{[a,b]}(\xi) = \max\{a\xi, b\xi\}$. So $S = \hat{T}_\ell$, since supporting functions uniquely determine their sets. This is clarified further in Section 2. So setting $\ell = n$ and $S_j = [0, 1]$ leads to the following, which is a generalization of Proposition 2.4 in [1].

Corollary 1.3 *Let $K_1, \dots, K_n \subset \mathbb{C}$ be compact and non-polar, $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_n$, and $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ convex compact and containing 0. Then*

$$V_K^{\hat{S}_\ell}(z) = \varphi_S(V_{K_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_n}(z_n)).$$

In [1] this is proven in the setting where S is a lower set. Then the formula becomes

$$(1.1) \quad V_K^S(z) = \varphi_S(V_{K_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_n}(z_n)).$$

Levenberg and Perera [4] claim to prove that the formula also holds if we only assume that $a\Sigma \subset S$ for some $a > 0$, where Σ is the standard simplex in \mathbb{R}^n . Subsequently Nguyen and Long [8] claimed it holds under the relaxed condition that S is a convex body, that is when the interior of S is not empty. These results can not hold. Both make the erroneous assumption that the right hand side of (1.1) is in $\mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$, but Theorem 1.1 tells us that it is in $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{S}_\ell}(\mathbb{C}^n)$. We can also show that these result are wrong by an explicit counterexample.

Let $K_1 = K_2 = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $K = K_1 \times K_2 = \overline{\mathbb{D}}^2$. By Proposition 4.3 in [6], we have that $V_K^S = H_S$, for every $0 \in S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ compact and convex. If we set $S = \text{ch}\{(0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1), (0, a)\}$ then $\varphi_S(\xi) = \max\{\xi_1^+, (\xi_1 + \xi_2)^+, a\xi_2^+\}$, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and thus

$$H_S(z) = \max\{\log^+ |z_1|, (\log |z_1| + \log |z_2|)^+, a \log^+ |z_2|\},$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^2$. But

$$\varphi_S(V_{\overline{\mathbb{D}}}(z_1), V_{\overline{\mathbb{D}}}(z_2)) = \max\{\log^+ |z_1|, \log^+ |z_1| + \log^+ |z_2|, a \log^+ |z_2|\},$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^2$, and, for $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\zeta| > 1$,

$$V_K^S(\zeta^{-1}, \zeta) = H_S(\zeta^{-1}, \zeta) = a \log |\zeta| < \log |\zeta| = \varphi_S(V_{\overline{\mathbb{D}}}(\zeta), V_{\overline{\mathbb{D}}}(\zeta^{-1})),$$

when $a < 1$.

We get more corollaries when we have an explicit formula for φ_T . One immediate example is taking $T = \{(1, 1)\}$, since then $\varphi_T(\xi) = \xi_1 + \xi_2$ and $S = S_1 \times S_2$.

Corollary 1.4 *Let $K_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ and $K_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ be compact and non-pluripolar, and $S_1 \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_1}$ and $S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_2}$ be compact convex and containing 0. Then*

$$V_{K_1 \times K_2}^{S_1 \times S_2}(z) = V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1) + V_{K_2}^{S_2}(z_2).$$

It is well known that $\varphi_T(\xi) = \|\xi^+\|_q$ if $T = B \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, where B is the unit ball with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_p$ and $p, q \geq 1$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1$, see the discussion of equations (2.2.12) in [2].

Corollary 1.5 *Let n_1, \dots, n_ℓ be natural numbers, $n = n_1 + \dots + n_\ell$, $K_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be compact and non-pluripolar for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$, $S_j \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_j}$ be compact convex and containing 0, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be given by*

$$S = \bigcup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^\ell \\ \|x\|_p \leq 1}} (x_1 S_1) \times \dots \times (x_\ell S_\ell).$$

Then

$$V_K^S(z)^q = \|(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))\|_q^q = V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1)^q + \dots + V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)^q.$$

Note that $B \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is a lower set so the previous result becomes particularly explicit when $\ell = n$.

Corollary 1.6 *Let $p, q > 1$ with $1/p + 1/q = 1$, $K_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ be compact and non-pluripolar for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_n$, $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is given by $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n; \|x\|_p \leq 1\}$. Then*

$$V_K^S(z)^q = V_{K_1}(z_1)^q + \dots + V_{K_n}(z_n)^q.$$

A natural question is if it is possible to generalize Theorem 1.1 to the weighted case. The answer turns out to be negative, as is shown in Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. As a follow up, we will look into when the sublevel sets of V_K^S are not convex, even if K is convex.

For general results on weighted Siciak-Zakharyuta functions and their properties see [6] and the references therein. See also [5] and [7].

Acknowledgment

The results of this paper are a part of a research project, *Holomorphic Approximations and Pluripotential Theory*, with project grant no. 207236-051 supported by the Icelandic Research Fund. I would like to thank the Fund for its support and the Mathematics Division, Science Institute, University of Iceland, for hosting the project. I thank my supervisors Ragnar Sigurðsson and Benedikt Steinar Magnússon for their guidance and careful reading the paper.

2 Background

This section is an overview of required fundamental results from [6]. We will use the notation $\mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{*n} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. We fix a compact convex $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ such that $0 \in S$. Recall that we define the logarithmic supporting function of S by

$$H_S(z) = \begin{cases} \varphi_S(\text{Log}(z)), & z \in \mathbb{C}^{*n} \\ \overline{\lim}_{\mathbb{C}^{*n} \ni w \rightarrow z} H_S(w), & z \notin \mathbb{C}^{*n} \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi_S(\xi) = \sup_{x \in S} \langle x, \xi \rangle$ and $\text{Log}(z) = (\log |z_1|, \dots, \log |z_n|)$. We then define the Lelong class $\mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ with respect to S as those $u \in \mathcal{PSH}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ such that $u \leq H_S + c_u$, for some constant c_u . For a function q on a compact $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ we define the Siciak-Zakharyuta function of K , q , and S by

$$V_{K,q}^S = \sup\{u; u \in \mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n), u|_K \leq q\}.$$

The function q is referred to as a *weight* and is said to be *admissible* if it is lower semicontinuous and the set $\{z \in K; q(z) < +\infty\}$ is non-pluripolar. Let now $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be compact and q an admissible weight on K . By Proposition 5.4 in [6] we have that $V_{K,q}^S$ is lower semicontinuous on \mathbb{C}^{*n} and if furthermore $V_{K,q}^{S*} \leq q$ on K then $V_{K,q}^{S*} = V_{K,q}^S \in \mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$, and consequently, $V_{K,q}^S$ is continuous on \mathbb{C}^{*n} . The assumption that $V_{K,q}^{S*} \leq q$ is not restrictive, since $V_{K+\varepsilon\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n,q'}^{S*} \leq q'$, where q' is a continuous (and

thus admissible) weight on $K + \varepsilon \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n$, and $V_{K_j, q_j}^S \nearrow V_{K, q}^S$ if $K_j \searrow K$ and $q_j \nearrow q$. See Lemma 5.2, and Propositions 5.3 and 4.8 in [6]. The Siciak-Zakharyuta functions are also continuous under decreasing sequences in S under some conditions. Namely, if $T_j \searrow S$, such that $V_{K, q}^{T_j^*} \leq q$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then $V_{K, q}^{T_j} \searrow V_{K, q}^S$. See Proposition 4.8 in [6].

Fundamental to this study is that we can explicitly determine some Siciak-Zakharyuta functions. By Proposition 4.3 in [6] we know that $V_K^S = H_S$ if

$$\mathbb{T}^n \subset K \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n; H_S(z) = 0\},$$

where \mathbb{T} is the unit circle in \mathbb{C} . An example of such a K is $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n$.

Lemma 2.2 in Nguyen and Long [8] contains a comparison result that can be used, in certain cases, to characterize the Siciak-Zakharyuta functions in terms of maximality. For the convenience of the reader we include it here, along with their proof.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{PSH}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ such that:*

- (i) $u \leq v$ on K ,
- (ii) $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} v(z) = +\infty$,
- (iii) $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^n} u(z) - v(z) < +\infty$,
- (iv) v is maximal on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus K$,
- (v) v is bounded from below on K ,

then $u \leq v$ on \mathbb{C}^n .

Proof: By (v) we may assume that $v \geq 0$ on K . We now fix $\lambda > 1$ and note that, by (iii), there exists a constant C such that $u \leq v + C$. By (ii) and the upper semicontinuity of v we can take $R > 0$ such that $v(z) > C(\lambda - 1)^{-1}$, for $z \in U_R = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n; |z| \geq R\}$. We then get

$$u(z) \leq v(z) + C = \lambda v(z) + (1 - \lambda)v(z) + C \leq \lambda v(z)$$

for $z \in U_R$. By the positivity of v on K and (i) we have that $u \leq \lambda v$ on $K \cup U_R$. Note that, by (iv), v is maximal on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus (K \cup U_R)$ so $u \leq \lambda v$ on \mathbb{C}^n . This holds for all $\lambda > 1$ so we conclude that $u \leq v$. \square

Proposition 2.2 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be compact and convex with $0 \in S$ such that S contains a neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{R}_+^n , $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ compact, q an admissible weight on K , and $v \in \mathcal{L}_+^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$. If $V_{K, q}^{S*} \leq v \leq q$ on K and v is maximal on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus K$ then $v = V_{K, q}^{S*}$ on \mathbb{C}^n .*

Proof: Since $v \in \mathcal{L}_+^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and $v \leq q$ on K it is clear that $v \leq V_{K, q}^{S*}$. By assumption S contains a neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{R}_+^n , that is there exists $a > 0$ such that $a\Sigma \subset S$, so

$$v(z) \geq H_S(z) + C \geq a \log^+ \|z\|_\infty + C,$$

so $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} v(z) = +\infty$ and v is bounded below on K . So v and $u = V_{K,q}^{S*}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.1 and thus $V_{K,q}^{S*} \leq v$. \square

In [8] Nguyen and Long do not include the assumption that S contains a neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{R}_+^n . So the proof of their Theorem 1.1 is incomplete.

Central to the proof of our main result is the Siciak-Zakharyuta theorem. The version we require can be found in [5], as Theorem 1.1, and is restated here for the convenience of the reader. The Siciak-Zakharyuta theorem relates $V_{K,q}^S$ to an extremal function given by polynomials. This function, the Siciak extremal function, is defined by

$$\Phi_{K,q}^S(z) = \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{|p(z)|^{1/m}; p \in \mathcal{P}_m^S(\mathbb{C}^n), pe^{-mq}|_K \leq 1\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_m^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ consists of all polynomials p of the form $p(z) = \sum_{\alpha \in (mS) \cap \mathbb{N}^n} c_\alpha z^\alpha$.

Theorem 2.3 ([5], Theorem 1.1) *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be compact convex and containing 0, $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be compact, and q an admissible weight on K . Then*

$$V_{K,q}^S(z) = \log \Phi_{K,q}^S(z),$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^{*n}$, if and only if $S = \overline{S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n}$.

Let us now turn our attention to the generalization of the product property. Recall that if $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact and convex then its supporting function $\varphi_A(\xi) = \sup_{x \in A} \langle x, \xi \rangle$ is positively homogeneous and convex, that is $\varphi_A(t\xi) = t\varphi_A(\xi)$ and $\varphi_A(\xi + \eta) \leq \varphi_A(\xi) + \varphi_A(\eta)$, for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\eta, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, if $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is positively homogeneous and convex then it is the supporting function of precisely one compact convex set. See Theorem 2.2.8 in [2]. Let $0 \in S_j \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ be compact convex for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $T \subset \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ compact convex. Note that we do not assume that $0 \in T$. By this assumption φ_T is increasing in each variable, so if $u_j \in \mathcal{L}^{S_j}(\mathbb{C}^{n_j})$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, then

$$u(z) = \varphi_T(u_1(z_1), \dots, u_\ell(z_\ell)) \leq \varphi_T(H_{S_1}(z_1), \dots, H_{S_\ell}(z_\ell)) + \varphi_T(c),$$

for $c \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$. The convexity of φ_T implies that $u \in \mathcal{PSH}(\mathbb{C}^n)$. This leads us to define $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\varphi(\xi) = \varphi_T(\varphi_{S_1}(\xi_1), \dots, \varphi_{S_\ell}(\xi_\ell)),$$

where $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Note that φ is positively homogeneous and convex so it is the supporting function of some compact convex $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We have thus shown that $u \in \mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and, since $\varphi_T(0) = 0$,

$$(2.1) \quad \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)) \leq V_K^S(z),$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$.

To determine an explicit formula for S we set

$$\tilde{S}_j = \{0_1\} \times \dots \times \{0_{j-1}\} \times S_j \times \{0_{j+1}\} \times \dots \times \{0_\ell\},$$

where 0_j is the origin of \mathbb{R}^{n_j} . For $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\varphi_{\tilde{S}_j}(\xi) = \varphi_{S_j}(\xi_j)$, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, so $\varphi_S = \varphi_T(\varphi_{\tilde{S}_1}, \dots, \varphi_{\tilde{S}_\ell})$. For compact convex sets A and B and $a > 0$,

we have that $a\varphi_A + \varphi_B = \varphi_{aA+B}$, and if $(A_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$, $I \neq \emptyset$, is a family of compact sets, $A = \text{ch} \cup_{\alpha \in I} A_\alpha$, and

$$\varphi(\xi) = \sup_{\alpha \in I} \varphi_{A_\alpha}(\xi)$$

is bounded for every ξ , then φ is the supporting function of A . We therefore have

$$\varphi_S(\xi) = \sup_{x \in T} (x_1 \varphi_{\tilde{S}_1}(\xi) + \cdots + x_\ell \varphi_{\tilde{S}_\ell}(\xi)) = \sup_{x \in T} (\varphi_{x_1 \tilde{S}_1 + \cdots + x_\ell \tilde{S}_\ell}(\xi))$$

so $S = \text{ch} \cup_{x \in T} (x_1 \tilde{S}_1 + \cdots + x_\ell \tilde{S}_\ell)$. Actually, the union is convex:

Lemma 2.4 *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ and $B_1, \dots, B_\ell \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be convex sets. Then*

$$C = \bigcup_{a \in A} a_1 B_1 + \cdots + a_\ell B_\ell$$

is a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n . If A, B_1, \dots, B_ℓ are compact, then C is compact.

Proof: Let $c_1 = x_1 w_1 + \cdots + x_\ell w_\ell, c_2 = y_1 z_1 + \cdots + y_\ell z_\ell \in C$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell), y = (y_1, \dots, y_\ell) \in A$ and $w_j, z_j \in B_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Then

$$(1-t)c_1 + tc_2 = (1-t)x_1 w_1 + ty_1 z_1 + \cdots + (1-t)x_\ell w_\ell + ty_\ell z_\ell.$$

Since B_j is convex we have $(1-t)x_j w_j + ty_j z_j \in ((1-t)x_j + ty_j)B_j$, so for $a = (1-t)x + ty$ we have $(1-t)c_1 + tc_2 \in a_1 B_1 + \cdots + a_\ell B_\ell \subset C$. The last statement follows by a simple sequence argument. \square

Finally note that $\varphi_S = \varphi_T(\varphi_{S_1}, \dots, \varphi_{S_\ell}) \geq 0$. It is well known that the supporting function of a compact convex set is positive if and only if the set contains the origin.

So, in conclusion, $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is compact and convex, contains 0, is given by

$$(2.2) \quad S = \bigcup_{x \in T} x_1 \tilde{S}_1 + \cdots + x_\ell \tilde{S}_\ell = \bigcup_{x \in T} (x_1 S_1) \times \cdots \times (x_\ell S_\ell),$$

has the supporting function

$$(2.3) \quad \varphi_S(\xi) = \varphi_T(\varphi_{S_1}(\xi_1), \dots, \varphi_{S_\ell}(\xi_\ell)), \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell), \xi_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j},$$

and the logarithmic supporting function

$$H_S(z) = \varphi_T(H_{S_1}(z_1), \dots, H_{S_\ell}(z_\ell)), \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_\ell), z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j}.$$

3 Proof of the main result

We will prove Theorem 1.1 by applying the Siciak-Zakharyuta theorem along with a product variant of the Bernstein-Walsh inequality. Recall that the Bernstein-Walsh inequality states that

$$|f(z)| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(K)} e^{mV_K^S(z)},$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $0 \in S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ compact and convex, $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ non-pluripolar compact, and $f \in \mathcal{P}_m^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$. This is a consequence of Theorem 3.6 in [6], namely that f , holomorphic on \mathbb{C}^n , is in $\mathcal{P}_m^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ if and only if $\log |f|^{1/m} \in \mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$.

The proof of the product variant of the Bernstein-Walsh inequality follows Klimek's proof of Theorem 5.1.8 in [3] and Siciak's proof of Proposition 5.9 in [9], in a similar way as the proof of Bos and Levenberg [1].

Proposition 3.1 *Let $K_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be compact and non-pluripolar for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$, $n = n_1 + \dots + n_\ell$, $T \subset \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ be compact convex, $S_j \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_j}$ be compact convex and containing 0, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be given by (2.2), and $f \in \mathcal{P}_m^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$. Then*

$$|f(z)| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(K)} e^{m\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

Proof: We will assume that $\overline{S_j \cap \mathbb{Q}^{n_j}} \neq \{0\}$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. If this were not the case then $f(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, would not depend on $z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$. We fix an $r > 0$ and let $G_j = K_j + r\mathbb{D}^{n_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $\Omega_r = G_1 \times \dots \times G_\ell$.

We now need to define an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{P}^{S_j}(\mathbb{C}^{n_j})$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, as subspaces of $L^2(G_j)$. To do this we define $\rho_j: \mathbb{R}_+ S_j \cap \mathbb{N}^{n_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\rho_j(\alpha_j) = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}; \alpha_j \in tS_j\}$$

and let $\kappa_j: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ S_j \cap \mathbb{N}^{n_j}$ be a bijection such that $\rho_j(\kappa_j(k)) \leq \rho_j(\kappa_j(k+1))$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We then set $e_k = z^{\kappa_j(k)}$, apply the Gram-Schmidt process to $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to get $(\hat{e}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and define $p_{j,\alpha_j} = \hat{e}_{\kappa_j^{-1}(\alpha_j)}$, for all $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_+ S_j \cap \mathbb{N}^{n_j}$. This construction implies that if $z_j^{\alpha_j} = \sum_k c_{j,k} p_{j,\beta_k}(z_j)$ then $p_{j,\beta_k} \in \mathcal{P}_1^{\rho_j(\alpha_j)S_j}(\mathbb{C}^{n_j})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_{j,k} \neq 0$ and $z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$.

Now we define $p_\alpha = p_{1,\alpha_1} \dots p_{\ell,\alpha_\ell}$ for $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n$, where $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{N}^{n_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. We now need to show that $\{p_\alpha; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n\}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{P}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$. First we show that $p_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n$, and then we show that the span of $\{p_\alpha; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n\}$ is $\mathcal{P}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) \in mS \cap \mathbb{N}^n$, where $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. By the definition of S there exists $x \in T$ such that $\alpha_j \in mx_j S_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. By construction $p_{j,\alpha_j} \in \mathcal{P}_m^{x_j S_j}(\mathbb{C}^{n_j})$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, so for some $C > 0$, and all $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} |p_\alpha(z)| &= |p_{1,\alpha_1}(z_1)| \dots |p_{\ell,\alpha_\ell}(z_\ell)| \leq C e^{mH_{x_1 S_1}(z_1)} \dots e^{mH_{x_\ell S_\ell}(z_\ell)} \\ &= C e^{m(x_1 H_{S_1}(z_1) + \dots + x_\ell H_{S_\ell}(z_\ell))} \leq C e^{m\varphi_T(H_{S_1}(z_1), \dots, H_{S_\ell}(z_\ell))} = C e^{mH_S(z)}, \end{aligned}$$

so we infer $p_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_m^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$.

To show that $\{p_\alpha; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n\}$ spans $\mathcal{P}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ it is sufficient to show that z^α belongs to the span for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n$. We let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) \in mS \cap \mathbb{N}^n$, where $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_j}$. Then there exists $x \in T$ such that $\alpha_j \in mx_j S_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. For $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ we let $\beta_{j,k} \in \mathbb{R}_+ S_j \cap \mathbb{N}^{n_j}$ such that

$$z_j^{\alpha_j} = \sum_{k=1}^{d_j} c_{j,k} p_{j,\beta_{j,k}}(z_j),$$

where $c_{j,k} \in \mathbb{C}^*$, for $k = 1, \dots, d_j$. By construction of the bases we have, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, that $\beta_{j,k} \in mx_j S_j$ for $k = 1, \dots, d_j$. This then implies that $(\beta_{1,k_1}, \dots, \beta_{j,k_j}) \in mS$ for $k_j = 1, \dots, d_j$ and $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and thus that $p_{1,\beta_{1,k_1}} \dots p_{\ell,\beta_{\ell,k_\ell}} \in \{p_\alpha; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n\}$. We also have that

$$z^\alpha = \sum_{k_1=1}^{d_1} \dots \sum_{k_\ell=1}^{d_\ell} c'_{k_1, \dots, k_\ell} p_{1,\beta_{1,k_1}}(z_1) \dots p_{\ell,\beta_{\ell,k_\ell}}(z_\ell),$$

where $c'_{k_1, \dots, k_\ell} = c_{1,k_1} \dots c_{\ell,k_\ell}$. So $\{p_\alpha; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n\}$ spans $\mathcal{P}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$. We note as well that $\{p_\alpha; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ S \cap \mathbb{N}^n\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{P}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ as a subspace of $L^2(\Omega_r)$.

We can now write

$$(3.1) \quad f(z) = \sum_{\alpha \in mS \cap \mathbb{N}^n} c_\alpha p_\alpha(z),$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where $c_\alpha = \langle f, p_\alpha \rangle$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $|c_\alpha| \leq C_r \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_r)}$, where $C_r = \text{Vol}(\Omega_r)^{1/2}$. Let us now fix $z = (z_1, \dots, z_\ell) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where $z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. If $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, where $\alpha_j \in mx_j S_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $x \in T$, we get, by the submean value property (in each variable), that

$$|p_{j,\alpha_j}(a_j)|^2 \leq (\pi r^2)^{-n_j} \int_{r\mathbb{D}^{n_j} + a_j} |p_{j,\alpha_j}(\zeta)|^2 d\lambda(\zeta) \leq (\pi r^2)^{-n_j},$$

for $a_j \in K_j$ and $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. By the Bernstein-Walsh inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |p_\alpha(z)| &\leq (\pi r^2)^{-n/2} e^{mV_{K_1}^{x_1 S_1}(z_1)} \dots e^{mV_{K_\ell}^{x_\ell S_\ell}(z_\ell)} = \pi^{-n/2} r^{-n} e^{m(x_1 V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1) + \dots + x_\ell V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))} \\ &\leq \pi^{-n/2} r^{-n} e^{m\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $mS \subset m\sigma_S \Sigma \subset [0, m\sigma_S]^n$, the number of terms in the sum in equation (3.1) is no greater than $(m\sigma_S + 1)^n$ where $\sigma_S = \varphi_S(1, \dots, 1)$. So

$$(3.2) \quad |f(z)| \leq C_r \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_r)} \pi^{-n/2} r^{-n} e^{m\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))} (m\sigma_S + 1)^n.$$

Applying the above inequality on $f^t \in \mathcal{P}_{mt}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$, for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$|f(z)|^t \leq C_r \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_r)}^t \pi^{-n/2} r^{-n} e^{mt\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))} (mt\sigma_S + 1)^n.$$

Taking the t -th root improves the estimate in (3.2) to

$$|f(z)| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_r)} e^{m\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))} (C_r \pi^{-n/2} r^{-n} (mt\sigma_S + 1)^n)^{1/t}.$$

We can now take the limit as t goes to infinity and then as r goes to zero to get

$$|f(z)| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(K)} e^{m\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))}.$$

□

Theorem 1.1 now follows from the Siciak-Zakharyuta Theorem 2.3, along with some regularization arguments discussed in the introduction, which we will now restate. Take $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ non-pluripolar and $0 \in S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ compact and convex. Setting $K_\varepsilon = K + \varepsilon \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n$ we have that $V_{K_\varepsilon}^{S*} \leq 0$ on K and $V_{K_\varepsilon}^S \nearrow V_K^S$ when $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, see Propositions 4.8 and 5.3 in [6]. If $T_j \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is a decreasing sequence of convex compact sets containing 0 then $V_K^{T_j} \searrow V_K^S$, when $j \rightarrow \infty$, if $V_K^{T_{k^*}} \leq 0$ on K , for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, see Proposition 4.8 in [6].

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Recall that, by (2.1), we have, for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)) \leq V_K^S(z),$$

so the goal is to prove the inverse inequality. To do this we use Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 3.1. For Theorem 2.3 to apply we assume some regularity on S and $V_K^S, V_{K_1}^{S_1}, \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}$. These assumptions are then relaxed using regularization arguments.

To start off we assume that $S = \overline{S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n}$ and $V_K^S, V_{K_1}^{S_1}, \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}$ are all plurisubharmonic. The second assumption implies that $\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}, \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell})$ is plurisubharmonic. Theorem 2.3 implies that for $z \in \mathbb{C}^{*n}$

$$V_K^S(z) = \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{\log |f(z)|^{1/m}; f \in \mathcal{P}_m^S(\mathbb{C}^n), f|_K \leq 1\},$$

which, with Proposition 3.1, yields, for $z \in \mathbb{C}^{*n}$,

$$V_K^S(z) \leq \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)).$$

By assumption V_K^S and $\varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))$ are plurisubharmonic, so

$$\begin{aligned} V_K^S(z) &= \overline{\lim}_{\mathbb{C}^{*n} \ni w \rightarrow z} V_K^S(w) \leq \overline{\lim}_{\mathbb{C}^{*n} \ni w \rightarrow z} \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(w_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(w_\ell)) \\ &= \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)), \end{aligned}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, since $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \mathbb{C}^{*n}$ is pluripolar. Equality then follows from (2.1).

We now drop the assumptions on S and instead assume that $T \cap \mathbb{R}^{*\ell} \neq \emptyset$. Let $K_{j,\varepsilon} = K_j + \varepsilon \overline{\mathbb{D}}^{n_j}$, $K_\varepsilon = K + \varepsilon \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n = K_{1,\varepsilon} \times \dots \times K_{\ell,\varepsilon}$, $S_{j,k} = \text{ch}\{(1/k)\Sigma_j \cup S_j\}$, for $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, and

$$S'_k = \bigcup_{x \in T} (x_1 S_{1,k}) \times \dots \times (x_\ell S_{\ell,k}) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

If $x \in T \cap \mathbb{R}^{*\ell}$ then $(x_1 S_{1,k}) \times \dots \times (x_\ell S_{\ell,k}) \subset S'_k$. Since $x_1 S_{1,k}, \dots, x_\ell S_{\ell,k}$ are all convex bodies, S'_k is also a convex body. Consequently, $\overline{S'_k \cap \mathbb{Q}^n} = S'_k$ and

$$V_{K_\varepsilon}^{S'_k}(z) = \varphi_T(V_{K_{1,\varepsilon}}^{S_{1,k}}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_{\ell,\varepsilon}}^{S_{\ell,k}}(z_\ell)).$$

So, by the continuity of φ_T , we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{K_\varepsilon}^S(z) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} V_{K_\varepsilon}^{S'_k}(z) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_T(V_{K_{1,\varepsilon}}^{S_{1,k}}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_{\ell,\varepsilon}}^{S_{\ell,k}}(z_\ell)) \\ &= \varphi_T(V_{K_{1,\varepsilon}}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_{\ell,\varepsilon}}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V_K^S(z) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} V_{K_\varepsilon}^S(z) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi_T(V_{K_{1,\varepsilon}}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_{\ell,\varepsilon}}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)) \\ &= \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

Lastly we assume $T \cap \mathbb{R}^{*\ell} = \emptyset$ and $T \neq \{0\}$. If $T = \{0\}$ then $V_K^S = 0$ and $\varphi_T = 0$ so there is nothing to prove. By rearranging the coordinates, we can assume

that $T = A \times \{0\}$, where $A \subset \mathbb{R}_+^k$ satisfies that $A \cap \mathbb{R}^{*k} \neq \emptyset$ and $k < \ell$. Note that $\varphi_T(\xi) = \varphi_A(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$, so $\varphi_S(\xi) = \varphi_{A'}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\nu)$, where $\nu = n_1 + \dots + n_k$ and

$$A' = \bigcup_{x \in A} (x_1 S_1) \times \dots \times (x_k S_k).$$

We then get, by the Liouville theorem for subharmonic functions, that functions in $\mathcal{L}^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ only depend on their first ν variables. So

$$V_K^S(z) = V_{\tilde{K}}^{A'}(z) = \varphi_A(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_k}^{S_k}(z_k)) = \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)),$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where $\tilde{K} = K_1 \times \dots \times K_k$. □

4 The weighted case

We would like to prove a version of Theorem 1.1 which includes weights. One approach is to try to find the correct representation of q such that

$$V_{K,q}^S(z) = \varphi_T(V_{K_1,q_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell,q_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))$$

holds. A natural first guess is to take $q = \varphi_T(q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$. The following results will show that this choice of q is not correct. We will then show that no choice of q will work in the generality of Theorem 1.1, since $\varphi_T(V_{K_1,q_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell,q_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))$ may fail to be maximal outside of K , which is a necessary condition for $V_{K,q}^S$, for any choice of an admissible weight q . See [6], Theorem 6.1.

Proposition 4.1 *Let n_1, \dots, n_ℓ be natural numbers, $K_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be compact and non-pluripolar for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $T \subset \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ be compact convex and containing more than one point, and $\{0\} \neq S_j \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_j}$ be compact convex and containing 0, for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, such that $V_{K_j}^{S_j^*} = 0$, on K_j , for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Then there exist admissible weights q_1, \dots, q_ℓ on K_1, \dots, K_ℓ respectively, such that, for some $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$,*

$$V_{K,q}^S(z) > \varphi_T(V_{K_1,q_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell,q_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)),$$

where $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$, $q = \varphi_T(q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$, and S is given by equation (2.2). Furthermore, if T is a convex body then the previous statement holds for all constant weights $q_j < 0$, $j = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Proof: Recall that if $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ with $|\eta| = 1$ then $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^\ell; \langle x, \eta \rangle = \varphi_T(\eta)\}$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^\ell; \langle x, \eta \rangle = -\varphi_T(-\eta)\}$ are supporting hyperplanes of S with outward normals η and $-\eta$, respectively. The distance between these parallel hyperplanes is $\varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta)$, since $0 = \varphi_T(0) \leq \varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta)$. So $\text{diam } T \geq \varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta)$, where $\text{diam } T$ denotes the diameter of T . If $L \subset T$ is a line segment parallel to η_L , with $|\eta_L| = 1$, then $\varphi_T(\eta_L) + \varphi_T(-\eta_L) \geq \varphi_L(\eta_L) + \varphi_L(-\eta_L) = \text{diam } L$. We can take L such that $\text{diam } L = \text{diam } T$, so

$$\text{diam } T = \sup_{|\eta|=1} (\varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta)).$$

Consequently, since T contains more than one point, we can find $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ such that $\varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta) > 0$.

Since $V_{K_j}^{S_j^*} = 0$ on K_j , Proposition 5.4 in [6] implies that $V_{K_j}^{S_j}$ is continuous on \mathbb{C}^{n_j} and consequently $V_{K_j}^{S_j}(\mathbb{C}^{n_j}) = \mathbb{R}_+$.

Now let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ such that $\varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta) > 0$, $z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be such that $V_{K_j}^{S_j}(z_j) = \eta_j$, and $q_j(w) = -\eta_j$, for $w \in K_j$ and $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Then $V_{K_j, q_j}^{S_j}(z_j) = 0$ and

$$\varphi_T(V_{K_1, q_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell, q_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)) = 0.$$

But, we have by Theorem 1.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{K, q}^S(z) &= V_K^S(z) + \varphi_T(q_1, \dots, q_\ell) = \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)) + \varphi_T(-\eta) \\ &= \varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

So $V_{K, q}^S(z) > \varphi_T(V_{K_1, q_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell, q_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))$.

Now assume that T is a convex body. Then T contains a Euclidean ball with radius r and thus

$$\varphi_T(\eta) + \varphi_T(-\eta) \geq 2r|\eta|,$$

for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$. So we set $\eta_j = -q_j$ and proceed as previously in the proof. \square

Note that all the weights in the previous theorem are negative. Counterexamples with positive weights can, however, be inferred. Take $T = \Sigma$. Then $\varphi_T(\xi) = \max\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell\}$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that $V_{K, q}^S + a = V_{K, q+a}^S$ and

$$\varphi_T(V_{K_1, q_1}^{S_1}, \dots, V_{K_\ell, q_\ell}^{S_\ell}) + a = \varphi_T(V_{K_1, q_1+a}^{S_1}, \dots, V_{K_\ell, q_\ell+a}^{S_\ell}).$$

Now we turn to the question of whether there is any way to choose q to attain an equality. Recall that, for compact $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, compact convex $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ such that $0 \in S$ and $a\Sigma \subset S$ for some $a > 0$, and admissible weight q on K , Proposition 2.2 states that the only function $v \in \mathcal{L}_+^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$ that is maximal on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus K$ and agrees with $V_{K, q}^{S^*}$ on K , is $V_{K, q}^{S^*}$ itself. This enables us to show that $\varphi_S(V_{K_1, q_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell, q_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell))$ is not generally maximal outside of $K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$.

Proposition 4.2 *Let n_1, \dots, n_ℓ be natural numbers, $K_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be compact and non-pluripolar for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $T \subset \mathbb{R}_+^\ell$ be compact convex body, $S_j \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n_j}$ be compact convex and containing 0 with $a\Sigma_j \subset S_j$ for some a , for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, such that $V_{K_j}^{S_j^*} = 0$ on K_j , for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, and $q_j < 0$ is a constant weight K_j , for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Then*

$$V(z) = \varphi_T(V_{K_1, q_1}^{S_1}(z_1), \dots, V_{K_\ell, q_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell)) = \varphi_T(V_{K_1}^{S_1}(z_1) + q_1, \dots, V_{K_\ell}^{S_\ell}(z_\ell) + q_\ell)$$

is not maximal on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus K$.

Proof: Let $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_\ell$ and S be given by (2.2). We have that $V_{K_j, q_j}^{S_j} \in \mathcal{L}_+^{S_j}(\mathbb{C}^{n_j})$, see Proposition 4.5 in [6], so there exists a constant c such that $H_{S_j} - c \leq V_{K_j, q_j}^{S_j}$. Since $\varphi_T(\xi) \leq \varphi_T(\xi - \eta) + \varphi_T(\eta)$ holds for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$H_S - \varphi_T(c, \dots, c) \leq \varphi_T(H_{S_1} - c, \dots, H_{S_\ell} - c) \leq V.$$

So $V|_K = \varphi_T(q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$ and $V \in \mathcal{L}_+^S(\mathbb{C}^n)$. If V were maximal outside of K then, by Proposition 2.2, we would have $V = V_{K, q}^S$ where $q = \varphi_T(q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$, contradicting Proposition 4.1. So V is not maximal outside of K . \square

5 Convexity of sublevel sets

Theorem 1.3 in [8] states that for $t > 0$, convex body $0 \in S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, and compact convex $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, the sublevel set $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^n; V_K^S(z) < t\}$ is convex. This can not hold in the stated generality, as discussed in Example 9.3 of [6]. The error in the proof in [8] is in the first equality on page 516, where $\max\{a, b\} + \max\{c, d\} = \max\{a + c, b + d\}$ is used. This identity does not hold generally. To describe for which sets S the result can not hold we define, for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^{*n}$, the *simplex given by x* as

$$\Sigma_x = \text{ch}\{0, x_1 e_1, \dots, x_n e_n\} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}_+^n; \xi_1/x_1 + \dots + \xi_n/x_n \leq 1\},$$

where e_1, \dots, e_n is the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^n .

Proposition 5.1 *Let $S \neq \{0\}$ be a compact convex subset of \mathbb{R}_+^n containing 0 that is not a simplex. Then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that the sublevel set*

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C}^n; H_S(z) \leq t\}$$

is not convex for all $t > t_0$.

Proof: Assume first that S contains a neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{R}_+^n and define $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ by $x_j = \max\{t \in \mathbb{R}; t e_j \in S\} > 0$. By assumption there is an $s \in S$ such that $s \notin \Sigma_x$, and consequently $s_1/x_1 + \dots + s_n/x_n > 1$. For $a > 1$ we have by Proposition 3.3 in [6] that $H_S(a^{1/x_j} e_j) = \log a$, for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$\begin{aligned} H_S(a^{1/x_1}/n, \dots, a^{1/x_n}/n) &\geq s_1 \log(a^{1/x_1}/n) + \dots + s_n \log(a^{1/x_n}/n) \\ &= (s_1/x_1 + \dots + s_n/x_n) \log a - (s_1 + \dots + s_n) \log n. \end{aligned}$$

Setting

$$t_0 = \frac{(s_1 + \dots + s_n) \log n}{s_1/x_1 + \dots + s_n/x_n - 1} > 0,$$

$t > t_0$, and $a = e^t$, we have that $\log a > t_0$ and consequently

$$H_S(a^{1/x_1}/n, \dots, a^{1/x_n}/n) > \log a = H_S(a^{1/x_j} e_j)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Since $t = \log a$ we have that $a^{1/x_1} e_j, \dots, a^{1/x_n} e_n$ are all in the sublevel set $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^n; H_S(z) \leq t\}$, but their average is not. So the sublevel set is not convex.

Now assume S does not contain a neighborhood of 0. Then, by possibly rearranging the variables, we may assume that $H_S(\zeta, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$ for $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $S \neq \{0\}$ we may assume that there is an $s \in S$ such that $s_1 > 0$, since otherwise we could write $S = \{0\} \times T$ reducing the problem to a lower dimension. Let us now fix $t > 0$ and note that

$$H_S(\zeta/2, 1/2, \dots, 1/2) \geq s_1 \log |\zeta| - (s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_n) \log 2,$$

for $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, so we can choose $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $H_S(\tau/2, 1/2, \dots, 1/2) > t$. We have that $H_S(\tau, 0, \dots, 0) = H_S(0, 1, \dots, 1) = 0$, so both $(\tau, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $H_S(0, 1, \dots, 1)$ are in the sublevel set $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^n; H_S(z) \leq t\}$ but their average is not. So the sublevel set is not convex. \square

References

- [1] L. BOS AND N. LEVENBERG, *Bernstein-Walsh theory associated to convex bodies and applications to multivariate approximation theory*, Comput. Methods Funct. Theory, 18 (2018), pp. 361–388.
- [2] L. HÖRMANDER, *Notions of convexity*, vol. 127 of Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.
- [3] M. KLIMEK, *Pluripotential theory*, vol. 6 of London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1991.
- [4] N. LEVENBERG AND M. PERERA, *A global domination principle for P -pluripotential theory*, in Complex analysis and spectral theory, vol. 743 of Contemp. Math., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2020, pp. 11–19.
- [5] B. S. MAGNÚSSON, Á. E. SIGURÐARDÓTTIR, AND R. SIGURÐSSON, *Polynomials with exponents in compact convex sets and associated weighted extremal functions - The Siciak-Zakharyuta theorem*, arXiv:2305.08260v3, (2023).
- [6] B. S. MAGNÚSSON, Á. E. SIGURÐARDÓTTIR, R. SIGURÐSSON, AND B. SNORRASON, *Polynomials with exponents in compact convex sets and associated weighted extremal functions - Fundamental results*, arXiv:2305.04779v3, (2023).
- [7] B. S. MAGNÚSSON, R. SIGURÐSSON, AND B. SNORRASON, *Polynomials with exponents in compact convex sets and associated weighted extremal functions - The Bernstein-Walsh-Siciak theorem*, Manuscript, (2023).
- [8] Q. D. NGUYEN AND T. V. LONG, *Product property of P -extremal functions*, Math. Scand., 127 (2021), pp. 509–520.
- [9] J. SICIAC, *Extremal plurisubharmonic functions in \mathbf{C}^n* , Ann. Polon. Math., 39 (1981), pp. 175–211.

Science Institute
University of Iceland
IS-107 Reykjavík
ICELAND
bergur@hi.is.