

PRESCRIBING CAPACITARY CURVATURE MEASURES ON PLANAR CONVEX DOMAINS

J. XIAO

ABSTRACT. For $p \in (1, 2]$ and a bounded, convex, nonempty, open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ let $\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot)$ be the p -capacitary curvature measure (generated by the closure $\bar{\Omega}$ of Ω) on the unit circle \mathbb{S}^1 . This paper shows that such a problem of prescribing μ_p on a planar convex domain: “Given a finite, nonnegative, Borel measure μ on \mathbb{S}^1 , find a bounded, convex, nonempty, open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = d\mu(\cdot)$ ” is solvable if and only if μ has centroid at the origin and its support $\text{supp}(\mu)$ does not comprise any pair of antipodal points. And, the solution is unique up to translation. Moreover, if $d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = \psi(\cdot) d\ell(\cdot)$ with $\psi \in C^{k,\alpha}$ and $d\ell$ being the standard arc-length element on \mathbb{S}^1 , then $\partial\Omega$ is of $C^{k+2,\alpha}$.

1. STATEMENT OF THEOREM 1.1

Continuing from [34] and [22, 23, 14, 35], we prove

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(p, k, \alpha) \in (1, 2] \times \mathbb{N} \times (0, 1)$ and μ be a finite nonnegative Borel measure on the unit circle \mathbb{S}^1 of \mathbb{R}^2 .*

- (i) *Existence - there is a bounded, convex, nonempty, open subset Ω of \mathbb{R}^2 such that $d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = d\mu(\cdot)$ if and only if μ has centroid at the origin and its support $\text{supp}(\mu)$ does not comprise any pair of antipodal points.*
- (ii) *Uniqueness - the domain Ω in (i) is unique up to translation.*
- (iii) *Regularity - if $d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = \psi(\cdot) d\ell(\cdot)$, $d\ell$ is the standard arc-length element on \mathbb{S}^1 , and $0 < \psi \in C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^1)$, i.e., its k -th derivative $\psi^{(k)}$ is α -Hölder continuous on \mathbb{S}^1 , then the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω is of $C^{k+2,\alpha}$.*

In the above and below, $\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot)$ is the p -capacitary curvature measure on \mathbb{S}^1 - more precisely - if u is the p -equilibrium potential $u_{\bar{\Omega}}$ of $\bar{\Omega}$ - the closure of Ω (cf. [25, 15, 13]), i.e., the unique solution $u = u_{\bar{\Omega}}$ to the boundary value problem (for a model partial differential equation in geometric potential

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C45, 53C42, 52B60, 35Q35, 31B15.
This project was in part supported by NSERC of Canada.

theory over \mathbb{R}^2 ; see e.g. [1, 2, 3]):

$$(eq_{1 < p < 2}) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta_p u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{\Omega}; \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega; \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u(x) = 1, \end{cases}$$

or

$$(eq_{p=2}) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta_{p=2} u = \operatorname{div}(\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{\Omega}; \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega; \\ 0 < \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{u(x)}{\log |x|} \right) \leq \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{u(x)}{\log |x|} \right) < \infty, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, E) = \int_{g^{-1}(E)} |\nabla u|^p d\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_{g^{-1}(E)} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1 \quad \forall \text{ Borel } E \subset \mathbb{S}^1,$$

where $d\mathcal{H}^1$ is the standard 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\partial\Omega$, $g^{-1} : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ is the inverse of the Gauss map $g : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ (which is defined as the outer unit normal vector at $\partial\Omega$), and the non-tangential limit of $\nabla u = \nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}$ at each point of $\partial\Omega$ exists \mathcal{H}^1 -almost everywhere with $|\nabla u| = |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}| \in L^p(\partial\Omega, d\mathcal{H}^1)$ (cf. [26, 27, 16]), and hence

$$d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = g_*(|\nabla u|^p d\mathcal{H}^1)(\cdot) = g_*(|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1)(\cdot) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^1.$$

Here it should be pointed out that not only the if-part of Theorem 1.1(i) implies [14, Theorem 1.2] under $1 < p < 2 = n$ and [23, Corollary 6.6] under $p = 2 = n$ due to the fact that $\operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ comprising no any pair of antipodal points amounts to μ being unsupported on any equator (the intersection of \mathbb{S}^1 with any line passing through the origin) but also Theorems 1.1(ii)&(iii) under $p \in (1, 2)$ have been established in [14, Theorems 1.2&1.4]. Our essential contribution to this direction is an establishment of Theorem 1.1(i) and the case $p = 2$ of Theorems 1.1(ii)&(iii).

Needless to say, Theorem 1.1 is not unimportant in that it is nonlinear-potential-theoretic generalization of the classical Minkowski problem in \mathbb{R}^2 concerning the existence, uniqueness and regularity of a planar convex domain with the prescribed curve measure

$$d\mu_{cm} = g_*(d\mathcal{H}^1) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^1$$

defined by

$$\mu_{cm}(E) = \int_{g^{-1}(E)} d\mathcal{H}^1 = \mathcal{H}^1(g^{-1}(E)) \quad \forall \text{ Borel } E \subset \mathbb{S}^1.$$

See e.g. [12, 21, 33, 24] and their references for an extensive discussion on this subject.

2. PREPARATIONAL MATERIAL

Two-fold preparation for validating Theorem 1.1 is presented through this intermediate section.

On the one hand, it is necessary to recall three fundamental properties on the variational $1 < p < 2$ capacity $\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega})$ and the logarithmic capacity (or conformal radius or transfinite diameter) $2\text{cap}(\bar{\Omega})$ of a compact, convex, nonempty set $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (cf. [25, 15, 13, 23, 32]) determined by:

$$\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}) = \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \begin{cases} 2\pi \left(\frac{2-p}{p-1}\right)^{p-1} |x|^{2-p} (1 - u_{\bar{\Omega}}(x))^{p-1} & \text{as } p \in (1, 2); \\ \exp(\log|x| - u_{\bar{\Omega}}(x)) & \text{as } p = 2, \end{cases}$$

where $d\mathcal{H}^2$ stands for the two-dimensional Hausdorff measure on \mathbb{R}^2 and $u_{\bar{\Omega}}$ is the solution of either (eq_{1<p<2}) or (eq_{p=2}).

Firstly, according to [14, Lemma 2.16(a)] for $p \in (1, 2)$ and [23, (6.3)] for $p = 2$, we have:

$$(\star) \quad \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}) = \begin{cases} \int_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|^{p-1} d\mathcal{H}^1 & \text{as } p \in (1, 2); \\ \exp\left(2\pi \int_{\partial\Omega} (\log|\cdot|) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}(\cdot)| d\mathcal{H}^1(\cdot)\right) & \text{as } p = 2. \end{cases}$$

Secondly, upon writing $A(\Omega)$ and $\text{diam}(\Omega)$ for the 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure of Ω and the diameter of Ω , we have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}) = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega)$$

(cf. (\star) or [29, 20]) and the following isocapacitary/isodiametric inequalities (cf. [34, 4, 32] and their relevant references):

$$(\star\star) \quad \left(\frac{A(\bar{\Omega})}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega})}{2\pi \left(\frac{p-1}{2-p}\right)^{1-p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}} \leq 2^{-1} \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}) & \text{as } p \in (1, 2); \\ 2^{-1} \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}) \leq 2\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}) \leq \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}) & \text{as } p = 2. \end{cases}$$

Thirdly, if $h_{\bar{\Omega}}(x) = \sup_{y \in \bar{\Omega}} x \cdot y$ stands for the support function of $\bar{\Omega}$, then (\star) can be formulated in the following way (cf. [14, Theorem 1.1] for $p \in (1, 2)$ and [35, Theorem 3.1] for $p = 2$):

$$(\star\star\star) \quad \int_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}(x)|^p x \cdot \mathbf{g}(x) d\mathcal{H}^1(x) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2-p}{p-1}\right) \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}) & \text{as } p \in (1, 2); \\ 2\pi & \text{as } p = 2. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, three key lemmas and their arguments are needed.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p \in (1, 2]$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded, convex, open set with non-empty interior. If $u_{\bar{\Omega}}$ is the p -equilibrium potential of Ω and there is an origin-centered open disk $\mathbb{D}(o, r)$ with radius $r > 0$ such that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{D}(o, r)$, then there exists a constant $c > 0$ depending only on r such that $|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}| \geq c$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega$ with respect to $d\mathcal{H}^1$.*

Proof. This follows directly from the case $n = 2$ of both [14, Lemma 2.18] (for $p \in (1, 2)$) and [35, Theorem 3.2] (for $p = 2$). \square

Lemma 2.2. *For $p \in (1, 2]$ and integer $m \geq 3$, a family $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{S}^1$, and any point $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with all nonnegative components $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m$ let*

$$\begin{cases} \Omega(\mathbf{p}) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \cdot \zeta_j \leq \mathbf{p}_j \ \forall j = 1, \dots, m\}; \\ \mathbf{M} = \{\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \text{pcap}(\Omega(\mathbf{p})) \geq 1 \ \& \ \mathbf{p}_j \geq 0 \ \forall j = 1, \dots, m\}. \end{cases}$$

Given a sequence of m positive numbers $\{c_j\}_{j=1}^m$, set $\Sigma(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{j=1}^m c_j \mathbf{p}_j$. If $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ obeys the following three conditions:

- (i) *for any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ there is $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $|\theta \cdot \zeta_j| > 0$;*
- (ii) *$|\zeta_j + \zeta_k| > 0 \ \forall j, k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$;*
- (iii) *$\sum_{j=1}^m c_j \zeta_j = 0$.*

Then there exists a point $\mathbf{p}^ \in \mathbf{M}$ such that:*

- (iv) *$\inf_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{M}} \Sigma(\mathbf{p}) = \Sigma(\mathbf{p}^*) > 0$;*
- (v) *$\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ is a polygon with $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^m$ and $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ as the only edges and outer unit normal vectors respectively;*
- (vi) *the p -equilibrium potential $u_{\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)}$ of $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ obeys*

$$c_{1 \leq j \leq m} = \tau_p^{-1} \Sigma(\mathbf{p}^*) \int_{F_j} |\nabla u_{\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1$$

with

$$\tau_p = \begin{cases} (2-p)(p-1)^{-1} & \text{as } p \in (1, 2); \\ 2\pi & \text{as } p = 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. First of all, the argument for [22, Theorem 5.4] is modified to reveal that $\Omega(\mathbf{p})$ is closed and bounded thanks to (i) which derives

$$|x| \leq \sup_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1} \mathbf{p}_j |\theta \cdot \zeta_j|^{-1} \quad \forall x \in \Omega(\mathbf{p}).$$

Next, since $\{c_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is fixed and

$$\begin{cases} \Sigma(\mathbf{p}) \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^m c_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{p}_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}; \\ \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{M}} \Sigma(\mathbf{p}) < \infty, \end{cases}$$

each minimizing sequence for $\inf_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{M}} \Sigma(\mathbf{p})$ is bounded, and consequently, we can select a subsequence from the minimizing sequence that converges to \mathbf{p}^* . Now from the continuity of $\text{pcap}(\cdot)$ under the Hausdorff distance $d_H(\cdot, \cdot)$ it follows that $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathbf{M}$ is a minimizer. Of course,

$$\begin{cases} \text{pcap}(\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)) = 1; \\ \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{M}} \Sigma(\mathbf{p}) = \Sigma(\mathbf{p}^*) \quad \forall p \in (1, 2]. \end{cases}$$

If $\Sigma(\mathbf{p}^*) = 0$, then \mathbf{p}^* is the origin, and hence condition (i) implies that $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ consists only of the origin, thereby yielding a contradiction

$$1 = \text{pcap}(\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)) = 0.$$

So, (iv) holds.

Furthermore, if the interior $(\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*))^\circ$ of $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ is empty, then (ii) can be used to deduce that $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ is contained in a compact convex set K with the Hausdorff dimension $\dim_H(K) \leq 1$.

- If $\dim_H(K) = 0$ then $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ comprises one point and hence

$$0 = \text{pcap}(\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)) = 1,$$

a contradiction.

- If $\dim_H(K) = 1$ then $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ reduces to a segment and hence there exists $\zeta_j + \zeta_k = 0$ for some $j, k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ which is against the hypothesis (ii).

Thus, $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ has a non-empty interior, and consequently (v) holds.

Finally, in order to check (vi), observe that \mathbf{p}^* is not unique. Given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$. If $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{M}$ then an application of (iii) implies that

$$\mathbf{q} = \{\mathbf{p}_j + x_0 \cdot \zeta_j\}_{j=1}^m$$

enjoys

$$\begin{cases} \Omega(\mathbf{q}) = x_0 + \Omega(\mathbf{p}); \\ \Sigma(\mathbf{q}) = \Sigma(\mathbf{p}). \end{cases}$$

Due to the fact that $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ has non-empty interior, the origin may be translated to the interior of $\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)$ so that each component \mathbf{p}_j^* is positive. Let \mathbf{P} be the collection of those vectors $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m)$ with

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_j \geq 0; \\ \Sigma(t\mathbf{p} + (1-t)\mathbf{p}^*) = \Sigma(\mathbf{p}^*) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}; \\ t\Omega(\mathbf{p}) + (1-t)\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*) \subseteq \Omega(t\mathbf{p} + (1-t)\mathbf{p}^*) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1], \end{cases}$$

plus [14, Theorem 5.2] (for $p \in (1, 2)$) and [23, (6.4)'] or [35, Theorem 4.4] (for $p = 2$), ensures a constant $w_j > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m (\mathbf{p}_j - \mathbf{p}_j^*) w_j = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-1} (\text{pcap}(t\Omega(\mathbf{p}) + (1-t)\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*)) - \text{pcap}(\Omega(\mathbf{p}^*))) \leq 0.$$

Whenever \mathbf{p} is close to $\mathbf{p}^* = (\mathbf{p}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m^*)$, the support function $h_{\Omega(\mathbf{p})}$ of $\Omega(\mathbf{p})$ enjoys

$$h_{\Omega(\mathbf{p})}(\zeta_j) = \mathbf{p}_j \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

Recall $p_j^* > 0$. So

$$\sum_{j=1}^m (p_j - p_j^*) w_j = 0.$$

This last equation gives

$$w_j = \tau_p(\Sigma(p^*))^{-1} c_j \quad \forall \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$

thereby completing the proof. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let $p \in (1, 2]$ and μ be a finite, nonnegative, Borel measure comprising a finite sum of point masses on \mathbb{S}^1 such that:*

- (i) μ is not supported on any equator of \mathbb{S}^1 , i.e., $\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |\theta \cdot \xi| d\mu(\xi) > 0$;
- (ii) $\text{supp}(\mu)$ contains no any pair of antipodal points, i.e., if $\mu(\{\eta\}) > 0$ then $\mu(\{-\eta\}) = 0$;
- (iii) $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \theta \cdot \xi d\mu(\xi) = 0 \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$.

Then there exists a bounded, convex, nonempty, open polygon $O \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $d\mu_p(\bar{O}, \cdot) = d\mu(\cdot)$.

Proof. As in demonstrating [22, Lemma 5.7], we put

$$d\mu = \sum_{j=1}^m c_j \delta_{\xi_j}$$

where $c_1, \dots, c_m > 0$ are constants. Note that conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 2.2 amount to (i), (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 2.3, respectively. So, an application of Lemma 2.2 yields a bounded, convex, closed polygon P containing the origin and a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{g}_*(|\nabla u_P|^p d\mathcal{H}^1) = cd\mu.$$

Note that if rP is the r -dilation of P then

$$\mathbf{g}_*(|\nabla u_{rP}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1) = r^{1-p} \mathbf{g}_*(|\nabla u_P|^p d\mathcal{H}^1).$$

Thus, the desired result follows from choosing $r = c^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$ and $\bar{O} = rP$. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

(i) *Existence.* This comprises two parts.

The if-part. Suppose that μ has centroid at the origin and $\text{supp}(\mu)$ does not comprise any pair of antipodal points. Of course, the first supposed condition is just

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \theta \cdot \eta d\mu(\eta) = 0 \quad \forall \quad \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1.$$

However, the second one implies that μ is not supported on any equator (the intersection of the unit circle \mathbb{S}^1 with any line through the origin) $\{\theta, -\theta\}$ of \mathbb{S}^1 where $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ - otherwise

$$\text{supp}(\mu) = \{\theta_0, -\theta_0\} \text{ for some } \theta_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1.$$

Conversely, if μ is unsupported on any equator then $\text{supp}(\mu)$ does not consist of any pair of antipodal points in \mathbb{S}^1 - otherwise there is $\theta_1 \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{\theta_1, -\theta_1\}$, i.e., μ is supported on an equator of \mathbb{S}^1 . Consequently,

$$0 < \kappa \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |\theta \cdot \xi| d\mu(\xi).$$

Using the above analysis, we may take a sequence $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of finite, non-negative, Borel measures that are finite sums of point masses, not only converging to μ in the weak sense, but also satisfying (i)-(ii)-(iii) of Lemma 2.3. According to Lemma 2.3, for each j there is a bounded, convex, closed set (polygon) $\bar{\Omega}_j \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ containing the origin such that the pull-back measure

$$d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}_j, \cdot) = \mathbf{g}_*(|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_j}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1)(\cdot)$$

is equal to $d\mu_j(\cdot)$. On the one hand, by Lemma 2.1 and $(\star\star)$ there is a constant $\kappa_1 > 0$ independent of j such that

$$\kappa_1 \leq \begin{cases} \left(\left(\frac{p-1}{2-p} \right)^{p-1} ((2\pi)^{-1} \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_j)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}} & (\text{for } 1 < p < 2) \\ \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_j) & (\text{for } p = 2) \end{cases} \leq \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}_j).$$

On the other hand, $\bar{\Omega}_j$ contains a segment S_j such that its length is equal to $\text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}_j)$. Due to the translation-invariance of $\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_j)$ it may be assumed that S_j is the segment connecting $-2^{-1} \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}_j)\theta_j$ and $2^{-1} \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}_j)\theta_j$ where $\theta_j \in \mathbb{S}^1$. If j is big enough, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{\bar{\Omega}_j} d\mu_j &\geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{S_j} d\mu_j \\ &\geq 2^{-1} \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}_j) \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |\theta_j \cdot \xi| d\mu_j(\xi) \\ &\geq 2^{-1} \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}_j) \kappa, \end{aligned}$$

and hence there is another constant $\kappa_2 > 0$ independent of j such that $\kappa_2 \geq \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega}_j)$. Hence, an application of the Blaschke selection principle (see e.g. [31, Theorem 1.8.6]) derives that $\{\bar{\Omega}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ has a subsequence, still denoted by $\{\bar{\Omega}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, which converges to a bounded, compact, convex set $\bar{\Omega}_\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_\infty) > 0$. In the sequel, we verify that the interior $(\bar{\Omega}_\infty)^\circ$ of $\bar{\Omega}_\infty$ is not empty. For this, assume $(\bar{\Omega}_\infty)^\circ = \emptyset$. Then the Hausdorff dimension $\dim_H(\bar{\Omega}_\infty)$ of $\bar{\Omega}_\infty$ is strictly less than 2. If $\dim_H(\bar{\Omega}_\infty) = 0$ then the convexity of $\bar{\Omega}_\infty$ ensures that $\bar{\Omega}_\infty$ is a single point and hence $\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_\infty) = 0$,

contradicting $\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_\infty) > 0$. This illustrates $\dim_H(\bar{\Omega}_\infty) = 1$. Consequently, there exists a constant $\kappa_3 > 0$ and a point $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that the pull-back measure $\mathbf{g}_*(d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega_\infty})$ of $\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega_\infty}$ to \mathbb{S}^1 via the Gauss map \mathbf{g} is equal to $\kappa_3(\delta_\xi + \delta_{-\xi})$. Upon using Lemma 2.1 we obtain a positive constant κ_4 (independent of j but dependent of p and the radius of an appropriate o -centered ball containing all $\bar{\Omega}_j$) such that $|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_j}|^p \geq \kappa_4$ holds almost everywhere on $\partial\bar{\Omega}_j$. Suppose that $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^1)$ (the class of all continuous functions on \mathbb{S}^1) is positive and its support is contained in a small neighbourhood $N(\xi) \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ of $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ only. Now, we use Fatou's lemma to derive

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{N(\xi)} f d\mu &= \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} f d\mu_j \\ &\geq \kappa_4 \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} f \mathbf{g}_*(d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_j}) \\ &\geq \kappa_4 \int_{N(\xi)} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{g}_*(d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_j}) \\ &= \kappa_4 \int_{N(\xi)} f \mathbf{g}_*(d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega_\infty}) \\ &= \kappa_4 f(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Radon-Nikodym's differentiation of μ with respect to the Dirac measure concentrated at ξ (cf. [17, page 42, Theorem 3]) implies that μ must have a positive mass at ξ , and similarly, $\mu(\{-\xi\}) > 0$. Thus

$$\text{supp}(\mu) \supset \{\xi, -\xi\}.$$

Meanwhile, if

$$\xi_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1 \setminus \{\xi, -\xi\},$$

then an application of the fact that the polygon $\bar{\Omega}_j$ (whose Gauss map is denoted by $\mathbf{g}_j : \partial\bar{\Omega}_j \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$) approaches Ω (which has only two outer unit normal vectors $\pm\xi$) ensures that ξ_0 is not in the set of all outer unit normal vectors of $\bar{\Omega}_j$, thereby yielding

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}(\{\xi_0\})) = 0 \quad \text{as } j > N$$

for a sufficiently large N . According to [26, Theorems 1&3], there is $q > p$ such that $|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_j}|^q$ is integrable on $\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}(\{\xi_0\})$ with respect to $d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_j}$. This existence, the Hölder inequality, the weak convergence of μ_j , and Fatou's

lemma, imply

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq \mu(\{\xi_0\}) \\
 &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(\{\xi_0\}) \\
 &= \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}(\{\xi_0\})} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_j}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega_j} \\
 &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}(\{\xi_0\})} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_j}|^q d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega_j} \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left(\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}(\{\xi_0\})) \right)^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\mu(\{\xi_0\}) = 0$. So,

$$\text{supp}(\mu) = \{\xi, -\xi\},$$

which contradicts the second supposed condition. In other words, $(\bar{\Omega}_\infty)^\circ \neq \emptyset$. This, along with

$$d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}_j, \cdot) = d\mu_j(\cdot)$$

and the weak convergence of $\mu_j \rightarrow \mu$, derives

$$d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}_\infty, \cdot) = d\mu(\cdot),$$

as desired.

The only-if part. Suppose that $d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = d\mu(\cdot)$ holds for a bounded, convex, nonempty, open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Note first that $\text{pcap}(\cdot)$ is translation invariant. So

$$\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega} + \{x_0\}) = \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}) \quad \forall \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

However, the translation $\bar{\Omega} \mapsto \bar{\Omega} + \{x_0\}$ changes $x \cdot \mathbf{g}$ to $x \cdot \mathbf{g} + x_0 \cdot x$. Thus, an application of $(\star \star \star)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\int_{\partial(\bar{\Omega} + \{x_0\})} (x \cdot \mathbf{g}(x)) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega} + \{x_0\}}(x)|^p d\mathcal{H}^1(x) \\
 &= \int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}} (x_0 \cdot \mathbf{g}(x)) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}(x)|^p d\mathcal{H}^1(x) + \int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}} (x \cdot \mathbf{g}(x)) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}(x)|^p d\mathcal{H}^1(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}} (x_0 \cdot \mathbf{g}(x)) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}(x)|^p d\mathcal{H}^1(x) = 0.$$

This in turn implies the following linear constraint on μ :

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \theta \cdot \eta d\mu(\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \theta \cdot \eta d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \theta) = 0 \quad \forall \quad \eta \in \mathbb{S}^1.$$

Next, let us validate that $\text{supp}(\mu)$ does not comprise any pair of antipodal points. If this is not true, then there is $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that

$$\text{supp}(\mu) = \{\theta_0, -\theta_0\}.$$

However, the following considerations (partially motivated by [6, Lemma 4.1] handling the necessary part of a planar L_p -Minkowski problem from [30]) will show that this last identification cannot be valid.

Case $o \in \Omega$. This, together with Lemma 2.1, ensures

$$\{\theta_0, -\theta_0\} = \text{supp}(\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot)) = \text{supp}(\mathbf{g}_*(d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega})).$$

However, $\bar{\Omega}$ is not degenerate, so $\text{supp}(\mathbf{g}_*(d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega}))$ cannot be $\{\theta_0, -\theta_0\}$ - a contradiction occurs.

Case $o \in \partial\Omega$. Denote by Λ the exterior normal cone at o such that

$$\Lambda \cap \mathbb{S}^1 = \{\eta \in \mathbb{S}^1 : h_\Omega(\eta) = 0\}.$$

Since $\text{supp}(\mu)$ coincides with $\text{supp}(\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot))$, it follows that $h_\Omega(\theta_0)$ and $h_\Omega(-\theta_0)$ are positive. This in turn implies that $\pm\theta_0$ are not in Λ . Without loss of generality we may assume that $\Lambda \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ is a subset of the following semi-circle

$$\mathbb{T}(-\theta_0, o) = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \zeta \cdot \theta_0 < 0\}.$$

Accordingly, if

$$\eta \in \mathbb{T}(\theta_0, o) = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \zeta \cdot \theta_0 > 0\},$$

then $h_{\bar{\Omega}}(\eta) > 0$. Also because of

$$\mathbf{g}_*(d\mathcal{H}^1|_{\partial\Omega})(\mathbb{T}(\theta_0, o)) > 0$$

and Lemma 2.1 (with a positive constant c depending only on p and r - the radius of a suitable ball $\mathbb{D}(o, r) \supset \Omega$), we utilize

$$\text{supp}(\mu) = \{\theta_0, -\theta_0\}$$

to obtain the following contradictory computation:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mu(\mathbb{T}(\theta_0, o)) \\ &= \mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{T}(\theta_0, o)) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{g}^{-1}(\mathbb{T}(\theta_0, o))} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1 \\ &\geq c^p \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbf{g}^{-1}(\mathbb{T}(\theta_0, o))) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *Uniqueness.* Suppose that Ω_0, Ω_1 are two solutions of the equation $d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = d\mu(\cdot)$. Then

$$g_*(|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1) = g_*(|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_1}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1).$$

To reach the conclusion that Ω_0 and Ω_1 are the same up to a translate, we define

$$[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto f_p(t) = \begin{cases} (\text{pcap}((1-t)\bar{\Omega}_0 + t\bar{\Omega}_1))^{\frac{1}{2-p}} & \text{as } p \in (1, 2); \\ \text{pcap}((1-t)\bar{\Omega}_0 + t\bar{\Omega}_1) & \text{as } p = 2, \end{cases}$$

and handle the following two cases.

Case $p \in (1, 2)$. In a manner (cf. [11]) slightly different from proving [14, Theorem 1.2] (under $n = 2 > p > 1$), we use the chain rule, [14, Theorem 1.1] (under $n = 2$) and $(\star \star \star)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} f'_p(0) &= \frac{(f_p(0))^{p-1}}{\left(\frac{2-p}{p-1}\right)} \int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_0} (h_{\bar{\Omega}_1}(\mathbf{g}) - h_{\bar{\Omega}_0}(\mathbf{g})) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1 \\ &= \frac{(f_p(0))^{p-1}}{\left(\frac{2-p}{p-1}\right)} \left(\int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_0} h_{\bar{\Omega}_1}(\mathbf{g}) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1 - \int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_0} h_{\bar{\Omega}_0}(\mathbf{g}) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1 \right) \\ &= \frac{(f_p(0))^{p-1}}{\left(\frac{2-p}{p-1}\right)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{\bar{\Omega}_1} \mathbf{g}_* (|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \mathbf{g}_* (|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1) \right) \\ &= \frac{(f_p(0))^{p-1}}{\left(\frac{2-p}{p-1}\right)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{\bar{\Omega}_1} \mathbf{g}_* (|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_1}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \mathbf{g}_* (|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^p d\mathcal{H}^1) \right) \\ &= (f_p(0))^{p-1} \left((f_p(1))^{2-p} - (f_p(0))^{2-p} \right). \end{aligned}$$

According to [15, Theorem 1], f_p is concave, and so

$$f_p(1) - f_p(0) \leq f'_p(0) = (f_p(0))^{p-1} \left((f_p(1))^{2-p} - (f_p(0))^{2-p} \right).$$

This, along with exchanging $\bar{\Omega}_0$ and $\bar{\Omega}_1$, implies

$$\text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_1) = f_p(1) \leq f_p(0) = \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_0) \leq f_p(1) = \text{pcap}(\bar{\Omega}_1),$$

thereby producing $f'_p(0) = 0$ and f_p being a constant thanks to the concavity of f_p . Since $\bar{\Omega}_0$ and $\bar{\Omega}_1$ have the same p -capacity, an application of the equality in [15, Theorem 1] yields that Ω_0 is a translate of Ω_1 .

Case $p = 2$. Referring to the argument for [35, Theorem 5.1] under $n = 2$, we employ [35, Theorems 4.4 & 3.1] to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
f_2'(0) &= (2\pi)^{-1} f_2(0) \int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_0} (h_{\bar{\Omega}_1}(\mathbf{g}) - h_{\bar{\Omega}_0}(\mathbf{g})) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^1 \\
&= (2\pi)^{-1} f_2(0) \left(\int_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_0} h_{\bar{\Omega}_1}(\mathbf{g}) |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^1 - 2\pi \right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-1} f_2(0) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{\bar{\Omega}_1} \mathbf{g}_* (|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_0}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^1) - 2\pi \right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-1} f_2(0) \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_{\bar{\Omega}_1} \mathbf{g}_* (|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}_1}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^1) - 2\pi \right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-1} f_2(0) (2\pi - 2\pi) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $t \mapsto f_2(t)$ is concave on $[0, 1]$ (cf. [5, 13]). So f_2 is a constant function on $[0, 1]$, in particular, we have

$$2\text{cap}(\bar{\Omega}_1) = f_2(1) = f_2(t) = f_2(0) = 2\text{cap}(\bar{\Omega}_0).$$

As a consequence, the equation

$$f_2(t) = f_2(0) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]$$

and [13, Theorem 3.1] ensure that Ω_0 and Ω_1 are the same up to translation and dilation. But,

$$2\text{cap}(\bar{\Omega}_0) = 2\text{cap}(\bar{\Omega}_1)$$

forces that Ω_1 is only a translate of Ω_0 .

(iii) *Regularity*. [14, Theorem 1.4] covers the case $1 < p < 2 = n$. The argument for [14, Theorem 1.4] or for the regularity part of [22, Theorem 0.7] (cf. [22, Theorem 7.1] and [20]) under $n = 2$ can be modified to verify the case $p = 2$. For reader's convenience, an outline of this verification under $p \in (1, 2]$ is presented below.

Firstly, we observe that Lemmas 7.2-7.3-7.4 in [14] are still valid for the $(1, 2] \ni p$ -equilibrium potential $u_{\bar{\Omega}}$.

Secondly, [22, Lemma 6.16] can be used to produce two constants $c > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ (depending on the Lipschitz constant of Ω) such that (cf. [14, Lemma 7.5] for $p \in (1, 2)$ and [22, Theorem 6.5] for $p = 2$)

$$\int_{H \cap \partial\Omega} (\delta(\cdot, H \cap \partial\Omega))^{1-\epsilon} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}(\cdot)|^p d\mathcal{H}^1(\cdot) \leq c \mathcal{H}^1(H \cap \partial\Omega) \inf_{H \cap \partial\Omega} |\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|^p$$

holds for any half-plane $H \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $H \cap \mathbb{D}(o, r_{int}) = \emptyset$, where r_{int} is the inner radius of Ω , and $\delta(x, H \cap \partial\Omega)$ is a normalized distance from x to $H \cap \partial\Omega$.

Thirdly, from [14, Lemma 7.7] it follows that if

$$d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = \psi(\cdot) d\ell(\cdot)$$

is valid for some integrable function ψ being greater than a positive constant c on \mathbb{S}^1 , and if ϕ stands for the convex and Lipschitz function defined on a bounded open interval $O \subset \mathbb{R}^1$ whose graph

$$G = \{(s, \phi(s)) : s \in O\}$$

is a portion of the convex curve $\partial\Omega$, then ϕ enjoys the following $(1, 2] \ni p$ -Monge-Ampère equation in Alexandrov's sense (cf. [19, p.6]):

$$\begin{aligned} \phi''(s) &= \det(\nabla^2 \phi(s)) \\ &= (1 + |\nabla \phi(s)|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} |(\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}})(s, \phi(s))|^p (\psi(\xi))^{-1} \\ &= \left(1 + (\phi'(s))^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} |(\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}})(s, \phi(s))|^p (\psi(\xi))^{-1} \\ &\equiv \Phi_p(\bar{\Omega}, s), \end{aligned}$$

where

◦

$$\frac{d}{ds} u_{\bar{\Omega}}(s, \phi(s)) = (1, \phi'(s)) \cdot (\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}})(s, \phi(s))$$

is utilized to explain the action of $\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}$ at $(s, \phi(s)) \in G$;

◦

$$s \mapsto \phi''(s) \left(1 + (\phi'(s))^2\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} |(\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}})(s, \phi(s))|^{-p}$$

is regarded as the p -equilibrium-potential-curvature on $G \subset \partial\Omega$;

◦

$$\xi = (\phi'(s), -1) \left(1 + (\phi'(s))^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

is written for the outer unit normal vector at $(s, \phi(s)) \in G$.

Fourthly, an application of the secondly-part and the thirdly-part above and [22, Theorem 7.1] derives that if ψ is bounded above and below by two positive constants then Caffarelli's methodology developed in [10] can be adapted to establish that $\partial\Omega$ is of $C^{1,\epsilon}$ for the above-found $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Now, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ let the positive function ψ in

$$d\mu_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot) = \psi(\cdot) d\ell(\cdot)$$

belong to $C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^1)$. Since $\partial\Omega$ is of $C^{1,\epsilon}$, a barrier argument, plus [28], yields that $|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|$ is not only bounded above and below by two positive constants (and so is ϕ'' on O), but also $|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|$ is of $C^{0,\epsilon}$ up to $\partial\Omega$. From the thirdly-part above it follows that $\Phi_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot)$ is of C^{0,ϵ_1} for some $\epsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$. This, along with $\phi''(\cdot) = \Phi_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot)$, gives that ϕ is of C^{2,ϵ_1} . As a consequence, we see that $|\nabla u_{\bar{\Omega}}|$ is of C^{1,ϵ_2} up to $\partial\Omega$ for some $\epsilon_2 \in (0, 1)$, and thereby finding that $\Phi_p(\bar{\Omega}, \cdot)$ is of $C^{0,\alpha}$. Accordingly, $\partial\Omega$ being of $C^{2,\alpha}$ follows from Caffarelli's

three papers [7, 8, 9]. Continuing this initial process, we can reach the desired higher order regularity.

Acknowledgement. The author is grateful to Han Hong and Ning Zhang for several discussions on the only-if-part of Theorem 1.1(i).

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Adamowicz, *On p -harmonic mappings in the plane*. Nonlinear Anal. 71(2009)502-511.
- [2] T. Adamowicz, *The geometry of planar p -harmonic mappings: convexity, level curves and the isoperimetric inequality*. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. 14(2015) 263-292.
- [3] G. Aronsson, *Aspects of p -harmonic functions in the plane*. Summer School in Potential Theory (Joensuu, 1990), 9-34, Joensuun Yliop. Luonnont. Julk., 26, Univ. Joensuu, Joensuu, 1992.
- [4] R. W. Barnard, K. Pearce and A.Y. Solynin, *An isoperimetric inequality for logarithmic capacity*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 27(2002)419-436.
- [5] C. Borell, *Hitting probability of killed Brownian motion: A study on geometric regularity*. Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Supér. Paris 17(1984)451-467.
- [6] K. J. Böröczky and H. T. Trinh, *The planar L_p -Minkowski problem for $0 < p < 1$* . Adv. in Appl. Math. 87(2017)58-81.
- [7] L. Caffarelli, *Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully non-linear equations*. Ann. Math. 131(1989)189-213.
- [8] L. Caffarelli, *A localization property of viscosity solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation and their strict convexity*. Ann. of Math. 131(1990)129-134.
- [9] L. Caffarelli, *Interior $W^{2,p}$ estimates for solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation*. Ann. Math. 131(1990)135-150.
- [10] L. Caffarelli, *Some regularity properties of solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 44(1991)965-969.
- [11] L. Caffarelli, D. Jerison and E. H. Lieb, *On the case of equality in the Brunn-Minkowski inequality for capacity*. Adv. Math. 117(1996)193-207.
- [12] S.-Y. Cheng and S.-T. Yau, *On the regularity of the solution of the n -dimensional Minkowski problem*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 29(1976)495-561.
- [13] A. Colesanti and P. Cuoghi, *The Brunn-Minkowski inequality for the n -dimensional logarithmic capacity*. Potential Anal. 22(2005)289-304.
- [14] A. Colesanti, K. Nyström, P. Salani, J. Xiao, D. Yang and G. Zhang, *The Hadamard variational formula and the Minkowski problem for p -capacity*. Adv. Math. 285(2015)1511-1588.
- [15] A. Colesanti and P. Salani, *The Brunn-Minkowski inequality for p -capacity of convex bodies*. Math. Ann. 327(2003)459-479.
- [16] B.E.J. Dahlberg, *Estimates of harmonic measure*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 65(1977)275-288.
- [17] L.C. Evans and R.F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*. CRC Press, 1992.
- [18] R.J. Gardner and D. Hartenstine, *Capacities, surface area, and radial sums*. Adv. Math. 221(2009)601-626.
- [19] C.E. Gutiérrez, *The Monge-Ampère Equation*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications, Vol. 44, Birkhäuser, 2001.

- [20] C.E. Gutiérrez and D. Hartenstine, *Regularity of weak solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 355(2003)2477-2500.
- [21] D. Jerison, *Prescribing harmonic measure on convex domains*. Invent. Math. 105(1991)375-400.
- [22] D. Jerison, *A Minkowski problem for electrostatic capacity*. Acta Math. 176(1996)1-47.
- [23] D. Jerison, *The direct method in the calculus of variations for convex bodies*. Adv. Math. 122(1996)262-279.
- [24] D. A. Klain, *The Minkowski problem for polytopes*. Adv. Math. 185(2004)270-288.
- [25] J. L. Lewis, *Capacitary functions in convex rings*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 66(1977)201-224.
- [26] J. L. Lewis and K. Nyström, *Boundary behaviour for p -harmonic functions in Lipschitz and starlike Lipschitz ring domains*. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. 40(2007)765-813.
- [27] J. L. Lewis and K. Nyström, *Regularity and free boundary regularity for the p -Laplacian in Lipschitz and C^1 -domains*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 33(2008)523-548.
- [28] G. M. Lieberman, *Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*. Nonlinear Anal. 12(1988)1203-1219.
- [29] M. Ludwig, J. Xiao and G. Zhang, *Sharp convex Lorentz-Sobolev inequalities*. Math. Ann. 350(2011)169-197.
- [30] E. Lutwak, *The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. I. mixed volumes and the Minkowski problem*. J. Differential Geom. 38(1993)131-150.
- [31] R. Schneider, *Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993.
- [32] A. Y. Solynin and V. A. Zalgaller, *An isoperimetric inequality for logarithmic capacity of polygons*. Ann. Math. 159(2004)277-303.
- [33] V. Umanskiy, *On solvability of two-dimensional L_p -Minkowski problem*. Adv. Math. 180(2003)176-186.
- [34] J. Xiao, *On the variational p -capacity problem in the plane*. Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 14(2015)959-968.
- [35] J. Xiao, *Exploiting log-capacity in convex geometry*. Asian J. Math. 22(2018)955-980.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND,
 ST. JOHN'S, NL A1C 5S7, CANADA
E-mail address: jxiao@math.mun.ca