

On the theory of pseudo-balayage on a locally compact space and its applications

Natalia Zorii

In memory of Bent Fuglede (1925-2023)

Abstract. Under suitable requirements on a kernel on a locally compact space, we develop a theory of inner (outer) pseudo-balayage of quite general signed Radon measures (not necessarily of finite energy) onto quite general sets (not necessarily closed). Such investigations were initiated in Fuglede's work (Anal. Math., 2016), which was, however, mainly concerned with the outer pseudo-balayage of positive measures of finite energy, whereas treatment of signed measures of infinite energy requires essentially new methods and approaches. To illustrate this, it is enough to note that in the particular case of kernels satisfying the balayage principle, the pseudo-balayage of positive measures coincides with their balayage, whereas for signed measures, these two concepts are drastically different. The theory thereby established enables us to provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the solvability of the inner Gauss variational problem, a point of interest for a number of recent researches in constructive function theory. This study covers many interesting kernels in classical and modern potential theory, which looks promising for further applications.

1. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL CONVENTIONS

This paper deals with the theory of potentials on a locally compact (Hausdorff) space X with respect to a kernel κ , a *kernel* being thought of as a symmetric, lower semicontinuous (l.s.c.) function $\kappa : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. In more details, under suitable requirements on X and κ , we establish a theory of *inner* pseudo-balayage $\widehat{\omega}^A$ of quite a general *signed* Radon measure ω (not necessarily of finite energy) to quite a general set A (not necessarily closed), where $\widehat{\omega}^A$ is introduced as the solution to the problem of minimizing the Gauss functional

$$\int \kappa(x, y) d(\mu \otimes \mu)(x, y) - 2 \int \kappa(x, y) d(\mu \otimes \omega)(x, y),$$

μ ranging over the class of all positive measures of finite energy concentrated on the set A . As a by-product, we provide a generalization of Fuglede's theory [15] of *outer* pseudo-balayage $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$, which was mainly dealing with *positive* ω of *finite* energy.

Though we are particularly concerned with kernels that do *not* meet *the principle of balayage* (see [18, p. 365], [19, p. 144]), this work is even of interest for classical kernels (e.g. Newtonian or Green), for then, the inner balayage ω^A of a *signed* measure ω is drastically different from its inner pseudo-balayage $\widehat{\omega}^A$, the former being usually defined by linearity, and hence being likewise signed. (For the theory of inner balayage on a locally compact space, we refer to the author's recent papers [22]–[24], [29].)

The concept of inner pseudo-balayage is further shown to be a powerful tool in the well-known inner Gauss variational problem, see Section 6 for the results obtained.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 31C15.

Key words: Radon measures on a locally compact space; energy, consistency, and maximum principles; inner and outer pseudo-balayage; minimum energy problems with external fields.

1.1. General conventions. In what follows, a locally compact space X is assumed to be second-countable. Then it is σ -compact (that is, representable as a countable union of compact sets [3, Section I.9, Definition 5]), see [4, Section IX.2, Corollary to Proposition 16]; and hence the concept of negligibility coincides with that of local negligibility [5, Section IV.5, Corollary 3 to Proposition 5]. (For the theory of measures and integration on a locally compact space we refer to Bourbaki [5] or Edwards [12], see also Fuglede [13] for a brief survey.)

We denote by \mathfrak{M} the linear space of all (real-valued Radon) measures μ on X , equipped with the *vague* topology of pointwise convergence on the class $C_0(X)$ of all continuous functions $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of compact support, and by \mathfrak{M}^+ the cone of all positive $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$, where μ is *positive* if and only if $\mu(\varphi) \geq 0$ for all positive $\varphi \in C_0(X)$. The space X being second-countable, each $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$ has a countable base of vague neighborhoods [24, Lemma 4.4], and hence any vaguely bounded subset of \mathfrak{M} has a *sequence* that is vaguely convergent in \mathfrak{M} (cf. [5, Section III.1, Proposition 15]).

Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathfrak{M}$, the *mutual energy* and the *potential* are introduced by

$$I(\mu, \nu) := \int \kappa(x, y) d(\mu \otimes \nu)(x, y),$$

$$U^\mu(x) := \int \kappa(x, y) d\mu(y), \quad x \in X,$$

respectively, provided the value on the right is well defined as a finite number or $\pm\infty$. For $\mu = \nu$, the mutual energy $I(\mu, \nu)$ defines the *energy* $I(\mu, \mu) =: I(\mu)$ of $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$.

Throughout this paper, a kernel κ is assumed to satisfy the *energy principle*, or equivalently to be *strictly positive definite*, which means that $I(\mu) \geq 0$ for all (signed) $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$, and moreover that $I(\mu) = 0$ only for $\mu = 0$. Then all (signed) measures of finite energy form a pre-Hilbert space \mathcal{E} with the inner product $\langle \mu, \nu \rangle := I(\mu, \nu)$ and the energy norm $\|\mu\| := \sqrt{I(\mu)}$, cf. [13, Lemma 3.1.2]. The topology on \mathcal{E} introduced by means of this norm is said to be *strong*.

Another permanent requirement on κ is that it satisfies the *consistency principle*, which means that the cone $\mathcal{E}^+ := \mathcal{E} \cap \mathfrak{M}^+$ is *complete* in the induced strong topology, and that the strong topology on \mathcal{E}^+ is *finer* than the vague topology on \mathcal{E}^+ ; such a kernel is said to be *perfect* (Fuglede [13]). Thus any strong Cauchy sequence (net) $(\mu_j) \subset \mathcal{E}^+$ converges *both strongly and vaguely* to the same unique measure $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}^+$, the strong topology on \mathcal{E} as well as the vague topology on \mathfrak{M} being Hausdorff.

We shall sometimes also need the *domination* and *Ugaheri maximum principles*, where the former means that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ and $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}^+$ with $U^\mu \leq U^\nu$ μ -a.e., the same inequality holds on all of X ; whereas the latter means that there is $H \in [1, \infty)$, depending on X and κ only, such that for each $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ with $U^\mu \leq c_\mu$ μ -a.e., where $c_\mu \in (0, \infty)$, it holds that $U^\mu \leq Hc_\mu$ on all of X . When the constant H is specified, we speak of *H-Ugaheri's maximum principle*, and when $H = 1$, *H-Ugaheri's maximum principle* is referred to as *Frostman's maximum principle*. See [19, Section 1.2].

Example 1.1. The α -Riesz kernel $|x - y|^{\alpha-n}$ of order $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, $\alpha < n$, on \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$ (thus in particular the Newtonian kernel $|x - y|^{2-n}$ on \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 3$), is perfect, and it satisfies the domination and Frostman maximum principles [18, Theorems 1.10, 1.15, 1.18, 1.27, 1.29]. The same holds true for the associated α -Green kernel on an arbitrary open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$ [16, Theorems 4.6, 4.9, 4.11]. The (2-)Green kernel on a planar Greenian set is likewise strictly positive definite [9, Section I.XIII.7] and perfect [11], and it fulfills the domination and Frostman maximum principles (see [1, Theorem 5.1.11] or [9, Section I.V.10]). The restriction

of the logarithmic kernel $-\log|x-y|$ to a closed disc in \mathbb{R}^2 of radius < 1 satisfies the energy and Frostman maximum principles [18, Theorems 1.6, 1.16], and hence it is perfect [13, Theorem 3.4.2]. The α -Riesz kernels of order $2 < \alpha < n$ on \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, are likewise perfect, and satisfy H -Ugaheri's maximum principle with $H := 2^{n-\alpha}$ [18, Theorems 1.5, 1.15, 1.18]. The Deny kernels, defined with the aid of Fourier transformation (see (A) in [7, Section 1], cf. [18, Section VI.1.2]), are perfect as well.

For any $A \subset X$, we denote by \mathfrak{C}_A the upward directed set of all compact subsets K of A , where $K_1 \leq K_2$ if and only if $K_1 \subset K_2$. If a net $(x_K)_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A} \subset Y$ converges to $x_0 \in Y$, Y being a topological space, then we shall indicate this fact by writing

$$x_K \rightarrow x_0 \text{ in } Y \text{ as } K \uparrow A.$$

Given $A \subset X$, let $\mathfrak{M}^+(A)$ denote the set of all $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}^+$ concentrated on A , which means that $A^c := X \setminus A$ is μ -negligible, or equivalently that A is μ -measurable and $\mu = \mu|_A$, $\mu|_A$ being the trace of μ to A , cf. [5, Section V.5.7]. (If a set A is closed, then $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}^+(A)$ if and only if $S(\mu) \subset A$, where $S(\mu)$ denotes the support of μ .)

Also define $\mathcal{E}^+(A) := \mathcal{E} \cap \mathfrak{M}^+(A)$. As seen from [13, Lemma 2.3.1],¹

$$c_*(A) = 0 \iff \mathcal{E}^+(A) = \{0\} \iff \mathcal{E}^+(K) = \{0\} \text{ for every } K \in \mathfrak{C}_A. \quad (1.1)$$

In what follows, let a set $A \subset X$ be fixed. To avoid trivialities, suppose that

$$c_*(A) > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

While approximating A by $K \in \mathfrak{C}_A$, we may therefore only consider K with $c(K) > 0$.

Yet another permanent condition imposed on a set A is that the class $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ is *closed* in the induced strong topology.² Being, therefore, a strongly closed subcone of the strongly complete cone \mathcal{E}^+ , the cone $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ is likewise *strongly complete*.

Also fix $\omega \in \mathfrak{M}$, $\omega \neq 0$. Unless $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, assume that (a)–(c) are fulfilled, where:

- (a) ω^+ is bounded, i.e. $\omega^+(X) < \infty$.³
- (b) U^{ω^+} is upper semicontinuous (u.s.c.) on every $K \in \mathfrak{C}_A$, and moreover

$$M_A := \sup_{x \in A} U^{|\omega|}(x) < \infty. \quad (1.3)$$

- (c) κ satisfies H -Ugaheri's maximum principle.

The above-mentioned assumptions on a locally compact space X , a kernel κ , a set A , and a measure ω will usually not be repeated henceforth. (We emphasize that, in case $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, the only requirement imposed on κ is its perfectness.)

2. INNER AND OUTER PSEUDO-BALAYAGE

It is often convenient to treat the above measure $\omega \in \mathfrak{M}$ as a charge creating the *external field*

$$f := -U^\omega.$$

¹For the *inner* and *outer* capacities of $A \subset X$, denoted by $c_*(A)$ and $c^*(A)$, respectively, we refer to [13, Section 2.3]. If A is capacitable (e.g. open or compact), we write $c(A) := c_*(A) = c^*(A)$.

²As shown in [28, Theorem 2.13], this occurs, for instance, if A is *quasiclosed* (*quasicompact*), that is, if A can be approximated in outer capacity by closed (compact) sets (Fuglede [14, Definition 2.1]).

³ ω^+ and ω^- denote respectively the positive and negative parts of ω in the Hahn–Jordan decomposition, see [5, Section III.1, Theorem 2]. We also write $|\omega| := \omega^+ + \omega^-$.

If $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, then f is well defined and finite q.e. (hence, n.e.) on X , see [13, Corollary to Lemma 3.2.3],⁴ while otherwise $|f|$ is well defined and bounded on A , cf. (1.3).

We denote by $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ the class of all $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$ such that the external field f is μ -integrable, i.e. $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu)$ (see [5, Sections IV.3, IV.4]), and define

$$\widehat{w}_f(A) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)} I_f(\mu), \quad (2.1)$$

where $I_f(\mu)$ is the so-called *Gauss functional*,⁵ introduced by means of

$$I_f(\mu) := \|\mu\|^2 + 2 \int f d\mu = \|\mu\|^2 - 2 \int U^\omega d\mu \in (-\infty, \infty). \quad (2.2)$$

Then

$$-\infty \leq \widehat{w}_f(A) \leq 0, \quad (2.3)$$

the upper estimate being caused by the fact that $0 \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$, while $I_f(0) = 0$.

Observe that in the case $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, we actually have

$$\mathcal{E}_f^+(A) = \mathcal{E}^+(A), \quad (2.4)$$

which is clear from the Cauchy–Schwarz (Bunyakovski) inequality, applied to $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$, while otherwise $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ includes all *bounded* $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$, the latter being obvious from (1.3) by making use of [5, Section IV.3, Corollary 2 to Theorem 4]. The same corollary from [5] also implies that $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ is a *convex cone*.

Theorem 2.1. *There is one and the same measure $\widehat{w}^A \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$, called the inner pseudo-balayage of ω onto A , that satisfies any one of the following three assertions.*

(i) \widehat{w}^A is the unique solution to problem (2.1), that is, $\widehat{w}^A \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ and

$$I_f(\widehat{w}^A) = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)} I_f(\mu) = \widehat{w}_f(A) \in (-\infty, 0]. \quad (2.5)$$

(ii) \widehat{w}^A is the only measure in $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ having the two properties

$$\int U^{\widehat{w}^A - \omega} d\mu \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A), \quad (2.6)$$

$$\int U^{\widehat{w}^A - \omega} d\widehat{w}^A = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

(iii) \widehat{w}^A is the only measure in $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ having the two properties⁶

$$U^{\widehat{w}^A} \geq U^\omega \quad \text{n.e. on } A, \quad (2.8)$$

$$U^{\widehat{w}^A} = U^\omega \quad \widehat{w}^A\text{-a.e.} \quad (2.9)$$

Remark 2.2. Assume for a moment that the kernel κ satisfies the domination principle. If moreover ω is *positive*, then, by virtue of (2.8) and (2.9),

$$U^{\widehat{w}^A} = U^\omega \quad \text{n.e. on } A, \quad (2.10)$$

$$U^{\widehat{w}^A} \leq U^\omega \quad \text{on } X,$$

⁴An assertion $\mathcal{A}(x)$ involving a variable point $x \in X$ is said to hold *quasi-everywhere* (q.e.) on a set $Q \subset X$ if the set N of all $x \in Q$ where $\mathcal{A}(x)$ fails, is of outer capacity zero. Replacing here $c^*(N) = 0$ by $c_*(N) = 0$, we arrive at the concept of *nearly everywhere* (n.e.) on Q . See [13, p. 153].

⁵For the terminology used here, see e.g. [18, 19]. In constructive function theory, $I_f(\mu)$ is often referred to as *the f -weighted energy*, see e.g. [2, 20].

⁶In view of (2.8), $U^{\widehat{w}^A} \geq U^\omega$ \widehat{w}^A -a.e. (Lemma 3.1); hence, (2.9) can be replaced by the apparently weaker relation $U^{\widehat{w}^A} \leq U^\omega$ \widehat{w}^A -a.e. Similarly, (2.7) can be replaced by $\int U^{\widehat{w}^A - \omega} d\widehat{w}^A \leq 0$.

so that $\widehat{\omega}^A$ serves as the inner balayage ω^A of ω onto A . In other words, for positive ω , the concept of inner pseudo-balayage, introduced by means of Theorem 2.1, represents a natural extension of the concept of inner balayage to kernels that do not satisfy the domination principle. However, *this is no longer so if ω is signed*, for the inner balayage of a signed measure is usually defined by linearity:

$$\omega^A = (\omega^+)^A - (\omega^-)^A,$$

and hence it must likewise be signed. Thus, for kernels κ satisfying the domination principle and signed measures ω , the theory of inner pseudo-balayage provides an alternative approach to inner balayage that is *not* equivalent to the classical one. For further illustrations of this non-equivalence, see Remarks 2.3 and 2.4 below.

Remark 2.3. It is obvious from Theorem 2.1 that for any $q \in (0, \infty)$,

$$q\widehat{\omega}^A = \widehat{q\omega}^A.$$

However, this fails to hold whenever $q \in (-\infty, 0)$. In fact, if $\omega = -\omega^- \neq 0$, then

$$\widehat{\omega}^A = \widehat{(-\omega^-)}^A = 0,$$

because $\widehat{w}_f(A) = 0 = I_f(0)$, the former equality being clear from $0 \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ and

$$I_f(\mu) = \|\mu\|^2 + 2 \int U^{\omega^-} d\mu \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A).$$

Remark 2.4. In general, equality does not prevail in (2.8) (as it does for the inner balayage, cf. (2.10)), which is seen by taking $\omega = -\omega^- \neq 0$, cf. Remark 2.3.

Theorem 2.5. *If A is Borel, then Theorem 2.1 remains valid with "n.e. on A " replaced by "q.e. on A ". The measure $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$, thereby uniquely determined, is said to be the outer pseudo-balayage of ω onto A . Actually,*

$$\widehat{\omega}^{*A} = \widehat{\omega}^A. \tag{2.11}$$

Remark 2.6. It follows that for Borel A , Remarks 2.2–2.4 remain valid with $\widehat{\omega}^A$ and "n.e. on A " replaced by $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$ and "q.e. on A ", respectively.

Remark 2.7. If A is quasiclosed and $\omega \in \mathcal{E}^+$, then the existence of the outer pseudo-balayage $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$ was established by Fuglede [15, Theorem 4.10]. The methods exploited in the present work are substantially different from those in [15], which enabled us to generalize Fuglede's result to *signed* ω of *infinite* energy (Theorem 2.5) as well as to develop the theory of inner pseudo-balayage $\widehat{\omega}^A$ (Theorem 2.1). Besides, we also study the strong and vague continuity of $\widehat{\omega}^A$ and $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$ under approximation of A by monotone families of sets (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2), and analyze how the inner (outer) pseudo-balayage varies the total mass of ω (Theorem 5.1).

3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2.1 AND 2.5

We quote for future reference some known facts, useful in the sequel. For any $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}^+$, let $\nu^*(E)$, resp. $\nu_*(E)$, stand for the *outer*, resp. *inner*, measure of $E \subset X$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $E \subset X$, any $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(E)$, and any universally measurable $U \subset X$ such that $c_*(E \cap U) = 0$, we have $\mu^*(E \cap U) = 0$.*

Proof. Being the intersection of universally measurable U and μ -measurable E , the set $E \cap U$ is μ -measurable. Since the space X is σ -compact, it is therefore enough to show that $\mu_*(E \cap U) = 0$, which is however obvious from (1.1). \square

Lemma 3.2. For any $E \subset X$ and any universally measurable $U_j \subset X$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$c_*\left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} E \cap U_j\right) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} c_*(E \cap U_j).$$

Proof. Since a strictly positive definite kernel is pseudo-positive, cf. [13, p. 150], the lemma follows directly from Fuglede [13] (see Lemma 2.3.5 and the remark after it). For the Newtonian kernel on \mathbb{R}^n , this goes back to Cartan [6, p. 253]. \square

Lemma 3.3. If a sequence $(\nu_j) \subset \mathcal{E}$ converges strongly to ν_0 , then there exists a subsequence (ν_{j_k}) whose potentials converge to U^{ν_0} pointwise n.e. on X .

Proof. See Fuglede [13], the remark attached to Lemma 3.2.4. \square

Theorem 3.4 (Principle of positivity of mass). Assume that the domination and Frostman maximum principles both hold. For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$, then

$$U^\mu \leq U^\nu \quad \text{n.e. on } X \implies \mu(X) \leq \nu(X).$$

Proof. See Zorii [23, Theorem 2.1], cf. Deny [8]. (Compare with [25, Theorem 1.2], providing quite a surprising version of Deny's principle of positivity of mass for the α -Riesz kernels $|x - y|^{\alpha-n}$ of order $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $\alpha < n$, on \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$.) \square

3.1. Proof of Theorem 2.1. We first note that the uniqueness of the solution $\widehat{\omega}^A$ to problem (2.1) within $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ can easily be verified by means of standard arguments, based on the convexity of the cone $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$, the parallelogram identity in the pre-Hilbert space \mathcal{E} , and the energy principle (cf. [21, Proof of Lemma 6]).

Fixing $\nu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$, we further show that (2.8) and (2.9) hold true for ν in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$ if and only if so do (2.6) and (2.7) — again, of course, for ν in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$. It is enough to verify the "if" part of this claim, because for every $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$, $U^{\widehat{\omega}^A - \omega}$ is μ -equivalent to a positive μ -integrable function that is defined on all of X (see Lemma 3.1 above and [5, Section IV.3, Corollary 2 to Theorem 4]).

Assuming, therefore, that (2.6) and (2.7) are fulfilled, suppose to the contrary that (2.8) fails. But then there exists compact $K \subset A$ such that $U^\nu < U^\omega$ on K while $c(K) > 0$, hence $\int U^{\nu-\omega} d\tau < 0$ for any $\tau \in \mathcal{E}^+(K)$, $\tau \neq 0$,⁷ which however contradicts (2.6) for $\mu := \tau$. Thus (2.8) does indeed hold, and so, by Lemma 3.1,

$$U^\nu \geq U^\omega \quad \nu\text{-a.e.} \tag{3.1}$$

Now, assuming to the contrary that (2.9) (with ν in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$) fails, we infer from (3.1) that there is compact $Q \subset A$ such that $\nu(Q) > 0$ while $U^\nu > U^\omega$ on Q . This together with (3.1) implies, again by use of the assertions from [5] mentioned in footnote 7, that $\int U^{\nu-\omega} d\nu > 0$, which is however impossible because of (2.7).

The equivalence thereby verified enables us to prove the statement on the uniqueness in each of (ii) and (iii). Indeed, applying (2.6) and (2.7) to each of ν, ν' , we get, by making use of [5, Section IV.4, Corollary 2 to Theorem 1],

$$\langle \nu, \nu' \rangle \geq \int U^\omega d\nu' = \|\nu'\|^2, \quad \langle \nu', \nu \rangle \geq \int U^\omega d\nu = \|\nu\|^2,$$

and therefore

$$0 \leq \|\nu - \nu'\|^2 = (\|\nu\|^2 - \langle \nu', \nu \rangle) + (\|\nu'\|^2 - \langle \nu, \nu' \rangle) \leq 0,$$

⁷Here we have used [5, Chapter IV] (see Proposition 10 in Section 1 and Theorem 1 in Section 2). Also note that such a measure τ does indeed exist because of our convention (1.2), cf. (1.1), and that $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\tau)$, τ being bounded and of finite energy.

whence $\nu = \nu'$, by virtue of the energy principle.

Consider first the case where $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$; then the Gauss functional has the form

$$I_f(\mu) = \|\omega - \mu\|^2 - \|\omega\|^2 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(A), \quad (3.2)$$

whence (2.4). Thus the question on the existence of the solution $\widehat{\omega}^A$ to problem (2.1) is reduced to that on the existence of the orthogonal projection of ω onto $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$, i.e.

$$\widehat{\omega}^A \in \mathcal{E}^+(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\omega - \widehat{\omega}^A\| = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)} \|\omega - \mu\|.$$

The class $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ being convex and strongly complete (Section 1.1), applying [12] (Theorem 1.12.3 and Proposition 1.12.4(2)) shows that this orthogonal projection does exist, and it is uniquely characterized within $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ by both (2.6) and (2.7). (Here we have utilized the fact that $0 \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$ and that $\mathcal{E}^+(A) + \mathcal{E}^+(A) \subset \mathcal{E}^+(A)$.) In view of the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) proved above, this implies the theorem.

It thus remains to analyze the case where (a)–(c) are fulfilled. We begin by showing that the solution $\widehat{\omega}^A$ to problem (2.1) exists if and only if there is the (unique) measure $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$ satisfying (ii) (equivalently, (iii)), and then necessarily

$$\mu_0 = \widehat{\omega}^A. \quad (3.3)$$

Assume first that this $\widehat{\omega}^A$ exists. To verify (2.8), suppose to the contrary that there is compact $K \subset A$ with $c(K) > 0$, such that $U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} < U^\omega$ on K . A straightforward verification then shows that for any $\tau \in \mathcal{E}^+(K)$, $\tau \neq 0$, and any $t \in (0, \infty)$,⁸

$$I_f(\widehat{\omega}^A + t\tau) - I_f(\widehat{\omega}^A) = 2t \int (U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} - U^\omega) d\tau + t^2 \|\tau\|^2, \quad (3.4)$$

and moreover, similarly as in the third paragraph of this proof,

$$\int (U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} - U^\omega) d\tau < 0.$$

Thus, the value on the right in (3.4) (hence, also that on the left) must be < 0 when $t > 0$ is small enough, which is however impossible because of $\widehat{\omega}^A + t\tau \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$.

Having thus established (2.8), in view of Lemma 3.1 we obtain

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} \geq U^\omega \quad \widehat{\omega}^A\text{-a.e.} \quad (3.5)$$

Suppose now that (2.9) fails; then, in consequence of (3.5), there is a compact set $Q \subset A$ with $\widehat{\omega}^A(Q) > 0$, such that $U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} > U^\omega$ on Q . Denoting $v := \widehat{\omega}^A|_Q$, we have $\widehat{\omega}^A - tv \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$, hence

$$I_f(\widehat{\omega}^A - tv) - I_f(\widehat{\omega}^A) = -2t \int (U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} - U^\omega) dv + t^2 \|v\|^2, \quad (3.6)$$

which is however again impossible when t is sufficiently small.

For the "if" part of the above claim, assume that (ii) holds true for some (unique) $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$. To show that then necessarily $\mu_0 = \widehat{\omega}^A$, we only need to verify that

$$I_f(\mu) - I_f(\mu_0) \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } \mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A). \quad (3.7)$$

⁸In (3.4) (as well as in (3.6), (3.8), and (3.9)), we use [5, Section IV.4, Corollary 2 to Theorem 1]. To this end, we observe that $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\tau)$, τ being of compact support, and hence bounded.

But obviously

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(\mu) - I_f(\mu_0) &= \|\mu - \mu_0 + \mu_0\|^2 - 2 \int U^\omega d\mu - \|\mu_0\|^2 + 2 \int U^\omega d\mu_0 \\ &= \|\mu - \mu_0\|^2 + 2 \int U^{\mu_0 - \omega} d(\mu - \mu_0), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

and applying (2.6) and (2.7), both with μ_0 in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$, gives (3.7).

To complete the proof of the theorem, it thus remains to establish the existence of the solution $\widehat{\omega}^A$ to problem (2.1). To this end, assume first that $A := K$ is *compact*. As $c(K) > 0$, we may restrict ourselves to *nonzero* $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(K)$, cf. (1.1). For each of those μ , there are $t \in (0, \infty)$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{E}^+(K)$ with $\tau(K) = 1$ such that $\mu = t\tau$. The potential $U^{|\omega|}$ being bounded on K according to (b),

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(\mu) &= t^2 \|\tau\|^2 - 2t \int U^\omega d\tau \geq t^2 \|\tau\|^2 - 2t \int U^{\omega^+} d\tau \\ &\geq t^2 c(K)^{-1} - 2t M_K = t^2 (c(K)^{-1} - 2M_K t^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

$M_K \in (0, \infty)$ being introduced by (1.3) (with $A := K$). Thus, by virtue of (3.9), $I_f(\mu) > 0$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(K)$ having the property

$$\mu(K) > 2M_K c(K) =: L_K \in (0, \infty).$$

On the other hand, $\widehat{w}_f(K) \leq 0$, cf. (2.3). In view of the above, $\widehat{w}_f(K)$ would therefore be the same if $\mathcal{E}_f^+(K)$ in (2.1) were replaced by

$$\mathcal{E}_{L_K}^+(K) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(K) : \mu(K) \leq L_K\} \quad (\subset \mathcal{E}_f^+(K)). \quad (3.10)$$

That is,

$$\widehat{w}_f(K) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{E}_{L_K}^+(K)} I_f(\mu) =: \widehat{w}_{f, L_K}(K), \quad (3.11)$$

and hence

$$-\infty < -2M_K L_K \leq \widehat{w}_f(K) \leq 0.$$

Choose a (minimizing) sequence $(\mu_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_{L_K}^+(K)$ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} I_f(\mu_j) = \widehat{w}_{f, L_K}(K).$$

Being vaguely bounded in consequence of (3.10), (μ_j) is vaguely relatively compact [5, Section III.1, Proposition 15], and so there is a subsequence (μ_{j_k}) converging vaguely to some $\mu_0 \in \mathfrak{M}^+(K)$. (Here we have used the facts that the vague topology on \mathfrak{M} is first-countable, see Section 1.1, and that $\mathfrak{M}^+(K)$ is vaguely closed [5, Section III.2, Proposition 6].) The energy $I(\cdot)$ being vaguely l.s.c. on \mathfrak{M}^+ [13, Lemma 2.2.1(e)],

$$\|\mu_0\|^2 \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu_{j_k}\|^2,$$

and so $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(K)$. Furthermore, by [5, Section IV.4, Corollary 3 to Proposition 5],

$$\int U^\omega d\mu_0 \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int U^\omega d\mu_{j_k} \in (-\infty, \infty),$$

U^ω being bounded and u.s.c. on the (compact) set K , see (b). This altogether gives

$$\widehat{w}_f(K) \leq I_f(\mu_0) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_f(\mu_{j_k}) = \widehat{w}_{f, L_K}(K),$$

which combined with (3.11) shows that μ_0 serves as the solution $\widehat{\omega}^K$ to problem (2.1). Moreover, the same $\widehat{\omega}^K$ solves the minimum f -weighted problem (3.11) because

$$\widehat{\omega}^K(X) = \mu_0(X) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{j_k}(X) \leq L_K,$$

the mapping $\nu \mapsto \nu(X)$ being vaguely l.s.c. on \mathfrak{M}^+ [5, Section IV.1, Proposition 4].

We next aim to show that a constant L_K , satisfying (3.11), can be chosen to be independent of $K \in \mathfrak{C}_A$. To this end, we first conclude from (2.9) with $A := K$ that

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^K} \leq U^\omega \quad \text{on } \mathfrak{S} := S(\widehat{\omega}^K),$$

U^ω being u.s.c. on K by virtue of (b), whereas $U^{\widehat{\omega}^A}$ being l.s.c. on X . This combined with (2.8) gives $U^{\widehat{\omega}^K} = U^\omega$ n.e. on \mathfrak{S} , hence $\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}}$ -a.e. (Lemma 3.1), where $\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}} \in \mathcal{E}^+(\mathfrak{S})$ denotes the capacity measure on \mathfrak{S} .⁹ Since $U^{\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}}} \geq 1$ n.e. on \mathfrak{S} , hence $\widehat{\omega}^K$ -a.e., applying Lebesgue–Fubini’s theorem [5, Section V.8, Theorem 1] yields

$$\widehat{\omega}^K(X) \leq \int U^{\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}}} d\widehat{\omega}^K = \int U^{\widehat{\omega}^K} d\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}} = \int U^\omega d\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}} = \int U^{\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}}} d\omega \leq \int U^{\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}}} d\omega^+.$$

As $U^{\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}}} \leq 1$ on $S(\gamma_{\mathfrak{S}})$, we therefore get, by H -Ugaheri’s maximum principle (see (c)),

$$\widehat{\omega}^K(X) \leq H\omega^+(X) =: L \in (0, \infty) \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathfrak{C}_A, \quad (3.12)$$

$\omega^+(X)$ being finite according to (a). Thus,

$$\widehat{\omega}^K \in \mathcal{E}_L^+(K) \subset \mathcal{E}_f^+(K),$$

$\mathcal{E}_L^+(K)$ being introduced by (3.10) with L in place of L_K . This implies

$$\widehat{w}_{f,L}(K) \leq I_f(\widehat{\omega}^K) = \widehat{w}_f(K) \leq \widehat{w}_{f,L}(K),$$

and so $\widehat{\omega}^K$ also solves the problem of minimizing $I_f(\mu)$, where μ ranges over $\mathcal{E}_L^+(K)$.

It is also worth emphasizing that

$$\widehat{w}_f(K) = \widehat{w}_{f,L}(K) \in [-2M_A L, 0] \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathfrak{C}_A, \quad (3.13)$$

the constants $M_A, L \in (0, \infty)$ being introduced by (1.3) and (3.12), respectively.

To prove the existence of the solution $\widehat{\omega}^A$ to problem (2.1) for noncompact A , we first note that the net $(\widehat{w}_{f,L}(K))_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$ decreases, and moreover, by virtue of (3.13),

$$\infty < \lim_{K \uparrow A} \widehat{w}_{f,L}(K) \leq 0. \quad (3.14)$$

For any compact $K, K' \subset A$ such that $K \subset K'$,

$$(\widehat{\omega}^K + \widehat{\omega}^{K'})/2 \in \mathcal{E}_L^+(K'),$$

whence

$$\|\widehat{\omega}^K + \widehat{\omega}^{K'}\|^2 - 4 \int U^\omega d(\widehat{\omega}^K + \widehat{\omega}^{K'}) \geq 4\widehat{w}_{f,L}(K') = 4I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{K'}),$$

which yields, by applying the parallelogram identity to $\widehat{\omega}^K, \widehat{\omega}^{K'} \in \mathcal{E}^+$,

$$\|\widehat{\omega}^K - \widehat{\omega}^{K'}\|^2 \leq 2I_f(\widehat{\omega}^K) - 2I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{K'}). \quad (3.15)$$

Noting from (3.14) that the net $(I_f(\widehat{\omega}^K))_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$, being equal to $(\widehat{w}_{f,L}(K))_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$, is Cauchy in \mathbb{R} , we infer from (3.15) that the net $(\widehat{\omega}^K)_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$ is strong Cauchy in $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$. As $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ is strongly complete (Section 1.1), there exists $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$ such that

$$\widehat{\omega}^K \rightarrow \zeta \quad \text{strongly (hence vaguely) in } \mathcal{E}^+(A) \text{ as } K \uparrow A. \quad (3.16)$$

Moreover, $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_L^+(A)$, since $\mu \mapsto \mu(X)$ is vaguely l.s.c. on \mathfrak{M}^+ ; and so the ζ -measurable set A is actually ζ -integrable [5, Section IV.5, Corollary 1 to Theorem 5].

⁹See Fuglede [13, Theorem 2.5] for the concept of capacity measure, its existence, uniqueness, and properties. (Note that for any compact $Q \subset X$, $c(Q) < \infty$ by the energy principle, and hence $\gamma_Q \in \mathcal{E}^+(Q)$ does indeed exist.)

We claim that the same ζ serves as the solution $\widehat{\omega}^A$ to problem (2.1). As shown above, cf. (3.3), this will follow if we prove both (2.8) and (2.9) for ζ in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$.

Clearly, (2.8) only needs to be verified for any given compact subset K_0 of A . The strong topology on \mathcal{E}^+ being first-countable, in view of (3.16) there is a subsequence $(\widehat{\omega}^{K_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the net $(\widehat{\omega}^K)_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$ such that $K_j \supset K_0$ for all j ,¹⁰ and

$$\widehat{\omega}^{K_j} \rightarrow \zeta \quad \text{strongly (hence vaguely) in } \mathcal{E}^+(A) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.17)$$

Passing if necessary to a subsequence and changing notations, we derive from (3.17), by exploiting Lemma 3.3, that

$$U^\zeta = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} U^{\widehat{\omega}^{K_j}} \quad \text{n.e. on } X. \quad (3.18)$$

Applying now (2.8) to each of $\widehat{\omega}^{K_j}$, and then letting $j \rightarrow \infty$, we infer from (3.18) that (2.8) (for ζ in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$) does indeed hold n.e. on K_0 ,¹¹ whence n.e. on A .

It remains to prove (2.9) for ζ in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$. The set A being ζ -integrable, there is a countable union A' of pairwise disjoint compact subsets of A such that $A \setminus A'$ is ζ -negligible, cf. [5, Section IV.4, Corollary 2 to Theorem 4]. Thus, by virtue of [5, Section IV.4, Proposition 9], it is enough to verify the equality

$$U^\zeta = U^\omega \quad \zeta\text{-a.e. on } K, \quad (3.19)$$

where K is any given compact subset of A . As in footnote 10, there is no loss of generality in assuming $K \subset K_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets K_j being the same as above.

It is clear from (2.9) applied to each of those K_j that

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^{K_j}} \leq U^\omega \quad \text{on } S(\widehat{\omega}^{K_j}), \quad (3.20)$$

U^ω being u.s.c. on K_j by (b), while $U^{\widehat{\omega}^{K_j}}$ being l.s.c. on X . Since $(\widehat{\omega}^{K_j})$ converges to ζ vaguely, see (3.17), for every $x \in S(\zeta) \cap K$ there exist a subsequence (K_{j_k}) of (K_j) and points $x_{j_k} \in S(\widehat{\omega}^{K_{j_k}})$ such that $x_{j_k} \rightarrow x$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, by (3.20),

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^{K_{j_k}}}(x_{j_k}) \leq U^\omega(x_{j_k}) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Letting here $k \rightarrow \infty$, by the upper semicontinuity of U^ω on the compact subsets of A and the lower semicontinuity of the mapping $(x, \mu) \mapsto U^\mu(x)$ on $X \times \mathfrak{M}^+$, \mathfrak{M}^+ being equipped with the vague topology [13, Lemma 2.2.1(b)], we obtain

$$U^\zeta(x) \leq U^\omega(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in S(\zeta) \cap K,$$

which combined with (2.8) gives (3.19), whence (2.9) (for ζ in place of $\widehat{\omega}^A$).

This implies that

$$\zeta = \widehat{\omega}^A, \quad (3.21)$$

thereby completing the proof of the whole theorem.

Remark 3.5. If (a)–(c) are fulfilled, then

$$\widehat{\omega}^A(X) \leq H\omega^+(X),$$

which is seen from (3.12), (3.16), and (3.21) by use of the vague lower semicontinuity of the mapping $\nu \mapsto \nu(X)$ on \mathfrak{M}^+ .

¹⁰If this does not hold, we replace \mathfrak{C}_A by its subset $\mathfrak{C}'_A := \{K \cup K_0 : K \in \mathfrak{C}_A\}$ with the partial order relation inherited from \mathfrak{C}_A , and then apply to \mathfrak{C}'_A the same arguments as just above.

¹¹Here we have utilized the countable subadditivity of inner capacity on universally measurable sets (see Fuglede [13, Lemma 2.3.5], cf. also Lemma 3.2 above).

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.5. A locally compact space is second-countable if and only if it is metrizable and σ -compact (Bourbaki [4, Section IX.2, Corollary to Proposition 16]). Being thus metrizable, the space X is normal and even perfectly normal,¹² and hence Fuglede's theories of outer capacities, outer capacity measures, and capacitability are applicable (see [13, Sections 4.3–4.5]). Utilizing [13, Theorem 4.5], we therefore arrive at the following conclusion.

Theorem 3.6. *Any Borel subset of a second-countable, locally compact Hausdorff space X , endowed with a perfect kernel κ , is capacitable.*

If A is Borel, then so is the exceptional set E appearing in Theorem 2.1(iii). Applying Theorem 3.6 therefore gives $c^*(E) = c_*(E) = 0$, and Theorem 2.5 follows.

4. CONVERGENCE OF PSEUDO-BALAYAGE FOR MONOTONE FAMILIES OF SETS

Theorem 4.1. $\widehat{\omega}^K \rightarrow \widehat{\omega}^A$ strongly and vaguely in $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ as $K \uparrow A$. If A is Borel, then the same remains valid with $\widehat{\omega}^K$ and $\widehat{\omega}^A$ replaced by $\widehat{\omega}^{*K}$ and $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$, respectively.

Proof. On account of Theorem 2.5, the latter claim is reduced to the former.

If $\omega \in \mathfrak{M}$ meets (a)–(c), then in turn, the former claim follows by substituting (3.21) into (3.16). It is thus left to consider the case of ω of finite energy; then $\widehat{\omega}^K$, resp. $\widehat{\omega}^A$, is the orthogonal projection of ω onto the (convex, strongly complete) cone $\mathcal{E}^+(K)$, resp. $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$. A slight modification of the proof of (3.15) shows that

$$\|\widehat{\omega}^K - \widehat{\omega}^{K'}\|^2 \leq 2I_f(\widehat{\omega}^K) - 2I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{K'}) \quad \text{whenever } K \subset K' \quad (K, K' \in \mathfrak{C}_A).$$

Since the net $(\widehat{w}_f(K))_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$ decreases and, in view of (2.3) and (3.2), is bounded:

$$-\|\omega\|^2 \leq \widehat{w}_f(K) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathfrak{C}_A,$$

we conclude from the above that the net $(\widehat{\omega}^K)_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A} \subset \mathcal{E}^+(A)$ is strong Cauchy, and hence converges strongly and vaguely to some (unique) $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$. This implies

$$\widehat{w}_f(A) \leq I_f(\mu_0) = \lim_{K \uparrow A} I_f(\widehat{\omega}^K) = \lim_{K \uparrow A} \widehat{w}_f(K),$$

the former equality being derived from the strong convergence of $(\widehat{\omega}^K)$ to μ_0 by use of (3.2). To verify that the same μ_0 actually equals $\widehat{\omega}^A$, it thus remains to show that

$$\lim_{K \uparrow A} \widehat{w}_f(K) \leq \widehat{w}_f(A). \quad (4.1)$$

But for every $\mu \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$,

$$I_f(\mu) = \lim_{K \uparrow A} I_f(\mu|_K) \geq \lim_{K \uparrow A} \widehat{w}_f(K),$$

where the equality follows by applying [13, Lemma 1.2.2] to each of the positive, l.s.c., μ -integrable functions κ , U^{ω^+} , and U^{ω^-} , the set A being μ -measurable. Letting now μ range over $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ we obtain (4.1), thereby completing the proof of the theorem. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Consider a decreasing sequence (A_j) of quasiclosed sets with the intersection A of nonzero inner capacity, and a measure $\omega \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that either $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$ or (a)–(c) are fulfilled with A_1 in place of A . Then*

$$\widehat{\omega}^{A_j} \rightarrow \widehat{\omega}^A \quad \text{strongly and vaguely in } \mathcal{E}^+ \text{ as } K \uparrow A. \quad (4.2)$$

¹²By Urysohn's theorem [4, Section IX.4, Theorem 1], a Hausdorff topological space Y is said to be *normal* if for any two disjoint closed subsets F_1, F_2 of Y , there exist disjoint open sets D_1, D_2 such that $F_i \subset D_i$ ($i = 1, 2$). Further, a normal space Y is said to be *perfectly normal* (see Bourbaki [4, Exercise 7 to Section IX.4]) if each closed subset of Y is a countable intersection of open sets.

If moreover the sets A_j , $j \in \mathbb{N}$, are Borel, then (4.2) remains valid with $\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}$ and $\widehat{\omega}^A$ replaced by $\widehat{\omega}^{*A_j}$ and $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$, respectively.

Proof. The existence of $\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\widehat{\omega}^A$ is ensured by Theorem 2.1, a countable intersection of quasiclosed sets being likewise quasiclosed (Fuglede [14, Lemma 2.3]).¹³

Clearly, $\widehat{w}_f(A_j)$ increases as $j \rightarrow \infty$, and does not exceed $\widehat{w}_f(A)$, cf. (2.1). Together with (2.5), this gives

$$-\infty < \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}) \leq 0,$$

and hence the sequence $(I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}))$ is Cauchy in \mathbb{R} . As $\widehat{\omega}^{A_{j+1}} \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A_{j+1}) \subset \mathcal{E}_f^+(A_j)$, while $\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}$ minimizes $I_f(\mu)$ over $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A_j)$, we conclude, by utilizing the convexity of the class $\mathcal{E}_f^+(A_j)$ and the parallelogram identity applied to $\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}$ and $\widehat{\omega}^{A_{j+1}}$, that

$$\|\widehat{\omega}^{A_{j+1}} - \widehat{\omega}^{A_j}\|^2 \leq 2I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{A_{j+1}}) - 2I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}),$$

and hence the sequence $(\widehat{\omega}^{A_j})_{j \geq k}$ is strong Cauchy in $\mathcal{E}^+(A_k)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The cone $\mathcal{E}^+(A_k)$ being strongly closed, hence strongly complete (Section 1.1), there exists a measure μ_0 which belongs to $\mathcal{E}^+(A_k)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that

$$\widehat{\omega}^{A_j} \rightarrow \mu_0 \quad \text{strongly (hence, vaguely) in } \mathcal{E}^+. \quad (4.3)$$

We assert that

$$\mu_0 = \widehat{\omega}^A, \quad (4.4)$$

which substituted into (4.3) would have implied (4.2).

Being the (countable) union of μ_0 -negligible $(A_k)^c$, the set A^c is likewise μ_0 -negligible [5, Section IV.2, Proposition 4], and therefore

$$\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}^+(A). \quad (4.5)$$

Assume first that $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$. Then applying (2.4), (2.5), (3.2), (4.3), and (4.5) gives

$$\widehat{w}_f(A) \leq I_f(\mu_0) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} I_f(\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{w}_f(A_j) \leq \widehat{w}_f(A),$$

whence (4.4), according to Theorem 2.1(i).

It thus remains to consider the case of ω satisfying (a)–(c) with A_1 in place of A . In view of (2.8) applied to $\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}$, $U^{\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}} \geq U^\omega$ n.e. on A_j , hence n.e. on the (smaller) set A , which yields, by exploiting (4.3) and Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3,

$$U^{\mu_0} \geq U^\omega \quad \text{n.e. on } A. \quad (4.6)$$

On account of Theorem 2.1(iii), this together with (4.5) implies that (4.4) will be established once we verify the equality

$$U^{\mu_0} = U^\omega \quad \mu_0\text{-a.e.} \quad (4.7)$$

By virtue of (a) and Remark 3.5,

$$\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}(X) \leq H\omega^+(X) < \infty \quad \text{for all } j.$$

Since $\widehat{\omega}^{A_j} \rightarrow \mu_0$ vaguely, while $\nu \mapsto \nu(X)$ is vaguely l.s.c. on \mathfrak{M}^+ , the measure μ_0 is bounded. Hence, A is μ_0 -integrable [5, Section IV.5, Corollary 1 to Theorem 5], the μ_0 -measurability of A being clear from (4.5). In view of [5, Section IV.4, Corollary 2 to Theorem 4], there exists, therefore, $A' \subset A$, a countable union of pairwise disjoint compact sets, such that $A \setminus A'$ is μ_0 -negligible. This implies, by use of [5, Section IV.4, Proposition 9], that (4.7) only needs to be verified on any given compact $K \subset A$.

¹³Recall that for quasiclosed $A \subset X$, $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ is strongly closed (Zorii [28, Theorem 2.13]).

Applying (2.9) to each of the sets A_j , we obtain

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}} \leq U^\omega \quad \text{on } S(\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}) \cap K, \quad (4.8)$$

U^ω being u.s.c. on the compact subsets of A_1 , while $U^{\widehat{\omega}^{A_j}}$ being l.s.c. on X . As $(\widehat{\omega}^{A_j})$ converges to μ_0 vaguely, for every $x \in S(\mu_0) \cap K$ there exist a subsequence (A_{j_k}) of (A_j) and points $x_{j_k} \in S(\widehat{\omega}^{A_{j_k}}) \cap K$ such that $x_{j_k} \rightarrow x$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, by (4.8),

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^{A_{j_k}}}(x_{j_k}) \leq U^\omega(x_{j_k}) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Letting here $k \rightarrow \infty$, in view of the upper semicontinuity of U^ω on K and the lower semicontinuity of the mapping $(x, \mu) \mapsto U^\mu(x)$ on $X \times \mathfrak{M}^+$, \mathfrak{M}^+ being equipped with the vague topology [13, Lemma 2.2.1(b)], we get

$$U^{\mu_0}(x) \leq U^\omega(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in S(\mu_0) \cap K,$$

which combined with (4.6) gives (4.7), whence (4.2).

Substituting (2.11) into (4.2) we obtain the latter claim of the theorem, thereby completing the whole proof. \square

5. ON THE VARIATION OF $\omega(X)$ UNDER THE PSEUDO-BALAYAGE

Theorem 5.1. *The following assertions (i₁)–(iii₁) hold true.*

(i₁) *If $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, assume moreover that U^{ω^+} is u.s.c. on every $K \in \mathfrak{C}_A$, and that H-Ugaheri's maximum principle holds. Then in either of the cases in question,*

$$\widehat{\omega}^A(X) \leq H\omega^+(X). \quad (5.1)$$

*If moreover A is Borel, then the same remains valid with $\widehat{\omega}^A$ replaced by $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$.*

(ii₁) *Assume the domination and Frostman maximum principles both hold. Then*

$$\widehat{\omega}^A(X) \leq \omega^+(X). \quad (5.2)$$

*If moreover A is Borel, then the same remains valid with $\widehat{\omega}^A$ replaced by $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$.*

(iii₁) *Assume the domination and Frostman maximum principles both hold, $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, and ω^+ is concentrated on A . Then*

$$\omega^+(X) \leq \widehat{\omega}^A(X) + \omega^-(X), \quad (5.3)$$

so that $\omega(X) \leq \widehat{\omega}^A(X)$ whenever either of the measures ω^+ or ω^- is bounded.

*If moreover A is Borel, then the same remains valid with $\widehat{\omega}^A$ replaced by $\widehat{\omega}^{*A}$.*

Proof. Assuming first that the requirements of (i₁) are met, we observe that then, the proof of (3.12), given above for $\omega \in \mathfrak{M}$ satisfying (a)–(c), holds true for $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$ as well. Hence, in either of the cases in question,

$$\widehat{\omega}^K(X) \leq H\omega^+(X) \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathfrak{C}_A,$$

which immediately leads to (5.1), since the net $(\widehat{\omega}^K)_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$ converges vaguely to $\widehat{\omega}^A$ (Theorem 4.1), whereas the mapping $\mu \mapsto \mu(X)$ is vaguely l.s.c. on \mathfrak{M}^+ . The remaining claim for Borel A follows by substituting (2.11) into (5.1).

In the rest of the proof, we require that the domination and Frostman maximum principles both hold. As seen from (i₁), (5.2) only needs to be verified when $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$. Noting that, by virtue of (2.9),

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} = U^\omega \leq U^{\omega^+} \quad \widehat{\omega}^A\text{-a.e.},$$

we then get $U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} \leq U^{\omega^+}$ on all of X (the domination principle), whence (5.2), by virtue of Deny's principle of positivity of mass in the form stated in Theorem 3.4.

To verify (5.3), assume moreover that $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$ and that ω^+ is concentrated on A . Since, according to (2.8), $U^{\widehat{\omega}^A} \geq U^\omega$ n.e. on A , it holds true that

$$U^{\widehat{\omega}^A + \omega^-} \geq U^{\omega^+} \quad \text{n.e. on } A,$$

hence ω^+ -a.e. (Lemma 3.1) as $\omega^+ \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$. Therefore, by the domination principle, $U^{\widehat{\omega}^A + \omega^-} \geq U^{\omega^+}$ on all of X , and applying Theorem 3.4 once again we obtain (5.3).

Finally, substituting (2.11) into (5.2), resp. (5.3), completes the proof of (ii₁), resp. (iii₁), whence the theorem. \square

6. PSEUDO-BALAYAGE IN THE INNER GAUSS VARIATIONAL PROBLEM

The aim of the rest of this study is to show that the concept of inner pseudo-balayage, introduced by means of Theorem 2.1, serves as a powerful tool in the inner Gauss variational problem, the problem on the existence of $\lambda_{A,f} \in \check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$ with

$$I_f(\lambda_{A,f}) = \inf_{\mu \in \check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)} I_f(\mu) =: w_f(A). \quad (6.1)$$

Here $I_f(\mu)$ is the energy of μ evaluated in the presence of the external field $f = -U^\omega$, see (2.2), referred to as the Gauss functional or the f -weighted energy, while

$$\check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A) : \mu(X) = 1\}.$$

For the bibliography on this problem, see [2, 10, 19, 20, 26, 28] and references therein.

Since f is μ -integrable for each μ from the (nonempty) class $\check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$, we have

$$-\infty < \widehat{w}_f(A) \leq w_f(A) < \infty, \quad (6.2)$$

the first inequality being clear from (2.5). Thus $w_f(A)$ is *finite*, which enables us to prove, by use of the convexity of the class $\check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$ and the pre-Hilbert structure on the space \mathcal{E} , that the solution $\lambda_{A,f}$ to problem (6.1) is *unique* (cf. [21, Lemma 6]).

As for the existence of $\lambda_{A,f}$, it does indeed exist when $A := K$ is compact while f is l.s.c. on K , for then the class $\check{\mathfrak{M}}^+(K) := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}^+(K) : \mu(X) = 1\}$ is vaguely compact, cf. [5, Section III.1.9, Corollary 3], while $I_f(\mu)$ is vaguely l.s.c. on $\mathfrak{M}^+(K)$, cf. [5, Section IV.1, Proposition 4]. (For more details about this particular case, see the pioneering paper by Ohtsuka [19, Theorem 2.6].) But if any of these two assumptions is not fulfilled, then the above arguments, based on the vague topology only, fail down, and the problem becomes "rather difficult" (Ohtsuka [19, p. 219]).

Our analysis of the inner Gauss variational problem for A and $f = -U^\omega$, indicated in Section 1.1 above, is based on the concept of the inner pseudo-balayage $\widehat{\omega}^A$, introduced in the present study, and is mainly performed with the aid of the approach originated in our recent work [28]. However, [28] was only concerned with external fields created by *positive* measures of *finite* energy, and exactly this circumstance made it possible to exploit efficiently the two topologies — strong and vague, whereas the treatment of the problem for *signed* ω whose energy might be *infinite*, needs the involvement of more delicate arguments. Because of this obstacle, we shall sometimes have to impose on the objects in question some additional requirements.

Let ∞_X stand for the Alexandroff point of X [3, Section I.9.8]. To simplify the analysis of the problem, in addition to the permanent requirements on X , κ , A , and ω , formulated in Section 1.1, we assume in the sequel that (d)–(f) hold true, where:

- (d) $\kappa(x, y)$ is continuous for $x \neq y$.
- (e) When $y \rightarrow \infty_X$, $\kappa(\cdot, y) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on compact subsets of X .
- (f) ω is compactly supported in \overline{A}^c , where $\overline{A} := \text{Cl}_X A$.

Then necessary and sufficient conditions for the solvability of problem (6.1) can be given in the following, rather simple, form.

Theorem 6.1. *For the solution $\lambda_{A,f}$ to exist, it is necessary and sufficient that*

$$c_*(A) < \infty \quad \text{or} \quad \widehat{\omega}^A(X) \geq 1.$$

Corollary 6.2. *$\lambda_{A,f}$ does exist whenever A is quasicompact.*

Proof. This is obvious from Theorem 6.1 because a quasicompact set, being approximated in outer capacity by compact sets, is of finite outer (hence inner) capacity. \square

Corollary 6.3. *If $c_*(A) = \infty$ and $\omega = -\omega^-$, then problem (6.1) is unsolvable.*

Proof. Since then $\widehat{\omega}^A = 0$ (Remark 2.3), this follows directly from Theorem 6.1. \square

Corollary 6.4. *If $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, assume that H -Ugaheri's maximum principle holds. In either of the cases in question, problem (6.1) is then unsolvable whenever*

$$c_*(A) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^+(X) < 1/H.$$

Proof. This follows by combining Theorem 6.1 with Theorem 5.1(i₁). \square

Remark 6.5. It is clear from the additional assumptions (d)–(f) that both U^{ω^+} and U^{ω^-} are bounded and continuous on \overline{A} . Furthermore, by virtue of (e) and (f),

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty_X} U^{\omega^\pm}(x) = 0. \quad (6.3)$$

Remark 6.6. As follows from (d)–(f) (cf. also Remark 6.5), the permanent requirements (a) and (b) (Section 1.1) do hold automatically, and can be omitted.

Remark 6.7. All the permanent requirements on κ do hold, in particular, for the Riesz kernel $|x - y|^{\alpha-n}$ of an arbitrary order $\alpha \in (0, n)$ on \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, as well as for the classical 2-Green kernel $g_D(x, y)$ on a bounded Greenian set D in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$.

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.1

7.1. Preparatory results. Theorem 7.1, providing a well known criterion for the existence of the solution $\lambda_{A,f}$ to problem (6.1), was discovered by the author long ago (see [21]). Nevertheless, it is still of great importance, serving as a tool in various researches on this topic (see this study and, in particular, [10], [26]–[29]).

Theorem 7.1. *For $\mu \in \check{\mathcal{E}}^+(A)$ to be the (unique) solution $\lambda_{A,f}$ to problem (6.1), it is necessary and sufficient that*

$$U_f^\mu \geq \int U_f^\mu d\mu \quad \text{n.e. on } A, \quad (7.1)$$

or equivalently

$$U_f^\mu = \int U_f^\mu d\mu \quad \mu\text{-a.e. on } X, \quad (7.2)$$

where $U_f^\mu := U^\mu + f$ is said to be the f -weighted potential of μ .¹⁴ The (finite) constant

$$c_{A,f} := \int U_f^{\lambda_{A,f}} d\lambda_{A,f} \quad (7.3)$$

is referred to as the inner f -weighted equilibrium constant for the set A .

¹⁴For f in question, U_f^ν , where $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$, is finite n.e. on A , which is obvious from Lemma 3.2 and the fact that U^ν is finite q.e. (hence, n.e.) on X , cf. [13, Corollary to Lemma 3.2.3].

Proof. See [21], Theorems 1, 2 and Proposition 1 therein. \square

A net $(\mu_s) \subset \check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$ is said to be *minimizing* if

$$\lim_s I_f(\mu_s) = w_f(A); \quad (7.4)$$

let $\mathbb{M}_f(A)$ stand for the (nonempty) set of all those (μ_s) .

Lemma 7.2. *There is the unique $\xi_{A,f} \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$ such that for every $(\mu_s) \in \mathbb{M}_f(A)$,*

$$\mu_s \rightarrow \xi_{A,f} \quad \text{strongly and vaguely in } \mathcal{E}^+(A); \quad (7.5)$$

this $\xi_{A,f}$ is said to be the extremal measure in problem (6.1).

Proof. In a manner similar to that in [28, Proof of Lemma 4.1], one can see that for any $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ and $(\nu_t)_{t \in T}$ from $\mathbb{M}_f(A)$,

$$\lim_{(s,t) \in S \times T} \|\mu_s - \nu_t\| = 0, \quad (7.6)$$

$S \times T$ being the product of the directed sets S and T [17, p. 68]. Taking the two nets in (7.6) to be equal, we deduce that every $(\nu_t)_{t \in T} \in \mathbb{M}_f(A)$ is strong Cauchy. The cone $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ being strongly closed, hence strongly complete (Section 1.1), $(\nu_t)_{t \in T}$ must converge strongly to some (unique) $\xi_{A,f} \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$. The same $\xi_{A,f}$ also serves as the strong limit of any other $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_f(A)$, which is obvious from (7.6). The strong topology on \mathcal{E}^+ being finer than the vague topology on \mathcal{E}^+ according to the perfectness of the kernel κ , $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ must converge to $\xi_{A,f}$ also vaguely. \square

Lemma 7.3. *For the extremal measure $\xi_{A,f}$, we have*

$$I_f(\xi_{A,f}) = w_f(A), \quad (7.7)$$

$$\xi_{A,f}(X) \leq 1, \quad (7.8)$$

whence

$$\xi_{A,f} \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A).$$

Proof. Fix $(\mu_s) \in \mathbb{M}_f(A)$; then $\mu_s \rightarrow \xi := \xi_{A,f}$ strongly and vaguely, which gives

$$\lim_s \|\mu_s\| = \|\xi\| \quad (7.9)$$

as well as (7.8), the mapping $\nu \mapsto \nu(X)$ being vaguely l.s.c. on \mathfrak{M}^+ . In view of (2.2), (7.4), and (7.9), the remaining claim (7.7) is reduced to showing that

$$\lim_s \int U^\omega d\mu_s = \int U^\omega d\xi. \quad (7.10)$$

In fact, if $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, then (7.10) is obvious because of the relations

$$0 \leq \lim_s |\langle \omega, \mu_s - \xi \rangle| \leq \|\omega\| \cdot \lim_s \|\mu_s - \xi\| = 0,$$

which are derived from (7.5) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, applied to ω and $\mu_s - \xi$, elements of the pre-Hilbert space \mathcal{E} ; while otherwise, (7.10) follows by making use of (d)–(f). Indeed, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_0 \subset \overline{A}$ such that $U^{\omega^\pm}(x) < \varepsilon$ for all $x \notin K_0$ (cf. (6.3)), and therefore, on account of (7.8),¹⁵

$$\left| \int U^\omega(x) 1_{K_0^c}(x) d(\mu_s - \xi)(x) \right| < 4\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } s \geq s_0. \quad (7.11)$$

¹⁵In (7.11) as well as in (7.12), we have utilized [5, Section IV.4], see Proposition 2 and Corollary 2 to Theorem 1 therein.

As U^{ω^+} , resp. U^{ω^-} , is continuous on \overline{A} , the Tietze-Urysohn extension theorem [12, Theorem 0.2.13] implies that there exist positive $\varphi^+, \varphi^- \in C_0(X)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^\pm(x) &= U^{\omega^\pm}(x) \quad \text{if } x \in K_0, \\ \varphi^\pm(x) &\leq \varepsilon \quad \text{otherwise,}\end{aligned}$$

which indicates, in turn, that for all s large enough,

$$\left| \int U^\omega(x) 1_{K_0}(x) d(\mu_s - \xi)(x) \right| = \left| \int (\varphi - \varphi|_{K_0^c}) d(\mu_s - \xi) \right| < 5\varepsilon, \quad (7.12)$$

where $\varphi := \varphi^+ - \varphi^- \in C_0(X)$. (Here we have used the fact that $\mu_s \rightarrow \xi$ vaguely; see also footnote 15.) This combined with (7.11) gives (7.10), whence the lemma. \square

Corollary 7.4. *Problem (6.1) is solvable if and only if equality prevails in (7.8), i.e.*

$$\xi_{A,f}(X) = 1, \quad (7.13)$$

and in the affirmative case,

$$\xi_{A,f} = \lambda_{A,f}. \quad (7.14)$$

Proof. Indeed, if (7.13) holds, then $\xi_{A,f}$ belongs to $\check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$, which together with (7.7) shows that $\xi_{A,f}$ serves as $\lambda_{A,f}$. Further, if $\lambda_{A,f}$ exists, then the trivial net $(\lambda_{A,f})$ obviously belongs to $\mathbb{M}_f(A)$, and hence converges strongly to $\xi_{A,f}$ (Lemma 7.2) as well as to $\lambda_{A,f}$. This implies (7.14), the strong topology on $\mathcal{E}^+(A)$ being Hausdorff. \square

Corollary 7.5. *If $A := K$ is compact, then $\lambda_{K,f}$ does exist. Hence,*

$$U_f^{\lambda_{K,f}} \geq c_{K,f} \quad \text{n.e. on } K, \quad (7.15)$$

$$U_f^{\lambda_{K,f}} = c_{K,f} \quad \lambda_{K,f}\text{-a.e.}, \quad (7.16)$$

where

$$c_{K,f} := \int U_f^{\lambda_{K,f}} d\lambda_{K,f}. \quad (7.17)$$

Proof. The existence of $\lambda_{K,f}$ is obvious from Corollary 7.4 in view of the vague compactness of the class $\check{\mathcal{M}}^+(K)$, see [5, Section III.1.9, Corollary 3], while (7.15)–(7.17) follow directly from Theorem 7.1, see (7.1)–(7.3). \square

Corollary 7.6. *The minimizers $\lambda_{K,f}$, $K \in \mathfrak{C}_A$, form a minimizing net:*

$$(\lambda_{K,f})_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A} \in \mathbb{M}_f(A),$$

whence

$$\lambda_{K,f} \rightarrow \xi_{A,f} \quad \text{strongly and vaguely in } \mathcal{E}^+(A) \text{ as } K \uparrow A. \quad (7.18)$$

Proof. As seen from Lemmas 7.2, 7.3 and Corollary 7.5, we only need to verify that

$$\lim_{K \uparrow A} w_f(K) = w_f(A). \quad (7.19)$$

But the net $(w_f(K))_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$ obviously decreases and has $w_f(A)$ as a lower bound; hence, (7.19) will follow once we show that for any given $\mu \in \check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$,

$$I_f(\mu) \geq \lim_{K \uparrow A} w_f(K). \quad (7.20)$$

Noting that $\mu(K) \uparrow 1$ as $K \uparrow A$, and applying [13, Lemma 1.2.2] to each of the (positive, l.s.c., μ -integrable) functions κ , U^{ω^+} , and U^{ω^-} , we get

$$I_f(\mu) = \lim_{K \uparrow A} I_f(\mu|_K) = \lim_{K \uparrow A} I_f(\nu_K) \geq \lim_{K \uparrow A} w_f(K),$$

where $\nu_K := \mu|_K / \mu(K) \in \check{\mathcal{E}}^+(K)$ ($K \in \mathfrak{C}_A$ being large enough). This proves (7.20), whence the corollary. \square

Lemma 7.7. *For the extremal measure $\xi := \xi_{A,f} \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$, we have*

$$U_f^\xi \geq C_\xi \quad \text{n.e. on } A, \quad (7.21)$$

$$U_f^\xi = C_\xi \quad \xi\text{-a.e. on } X, \quad (7.22)$$

where

$$C_\xi := \int U_f^\xi d\xi \in (-\infty, \infty). \quad (7.23)$$

Proof. Applying (7.9) and (7.10) to $(\lambda_{K,f})_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A} \in \mathbb{M}_f(A)$, cf. Corollary 7.6, gives

$$\lim_{K \uparrow A} c_{K,f} = C_\xi, \quad (7.24)$$

$c_{K,f}$ and C_ξ being introduced by means of (7.17) and (7.23), respectively.

Fix $K_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_A$. The strong topology on \mathcal{E}^+ being first-countable, one can choose a subsequence $(\lambda_{K_j,f})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the net $(\lambda_{K,f})_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_A}$ such that

$$\lambda_{K_j,f} \rightarrow \xi \quad \text{strongly (hence vaguely) in } \mathcal{E}^+(A) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.25)$$

There is certainly no loss of generality in assuming that

$$K_0 \subset K_j \quad \text{for all } j,$$

for if not, we replace K_j by $K'_j := K_j \cup K_0$; then, by the monotonicity of $(w_f(K))$, the sequence $(\lambda_{K'_j,f})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ remains minimizing, and hence also converges strongly to ξ .

Due to the arbitrary choice of $K_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_A$, (7.21) will follow once we show that

$$U_f^\xi \geq C_\xi \quad \text{n.e. on } K_0. \quad (7.26)$$

Passing if necessary to a subsequence and changing notations, we infer from (7.25), by making use of Lemma 3.3, that

$$U^\xi = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} U^{\lambda_{K_j,f}} \quad \text{n.e. on } X. \quad (7.27)$$

Now, applying (7.15) to each of K_j , $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and then letting $j \rightarrow \infty$, in view of (7.24) and (7.27) we obtain (7.26). (Here we have utilized the countable subadditivity of inner capacity on universally measurable sets [13, Lemma 2.3.5].)

Since f is continuous on \bar{A} (Remark 6.5), $U_f^{\lambda_{K,f}}$, where $K \in \mathfrak{C}_A$, is l.s.c. on \bar{A} , which in view of (7.16) implies that

$$U_f^{\lambda_{K,f}} \leq c_{K,f} \quad \text{on } S(\lambda_{K,f}). \quad (7.28)$$

Since $(\lambda_{K_j,f})$ converges to ξ vaguely, cf. (7.25), for every $x \in S(\xi)$ there exist a subsequence (K_{j_k}) of the sequence (K_j) and points $x_{j_k} \in S(\lambda_{K_{j_k},f})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that x_{j_k} approach x as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, according to (7.28),

$$U_f^{\lambda_{K_{j_k},f}}(x_{j_k}) \leq c_{K_{j_k},f} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Letting here $k \rightarrow \infty$ and utilizing (7.24), the continuity of f on \bar{A} , and the lower semicontinuity of the mapping $(x, \mu) \mapsto U^\mu(x)$ on $X \times \mathfrak{M}^+$, \mathfrak{M}^+ being equipped with the vague topology [13, Lemma 2.2.1(b)], we arrive at the inequality

$$U_f^\xi \leq C_\xi \quad \text{on } S(\xi),$$

which together with (7.21) gives

$$U_f^\xi = C_\xi \quad \text{n.e. on } S(\xi) \cap A.$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 therefore results in (7.22), ξ being a positive measure of finite energy, concentrated on both A (Lemma 7.2) and $S(\xi)$, and hence on $S(\xi) \cap A$. \square

7.2. Proof of Theorem 6.1. Let first $c_*(A) < \infty$. According to Corollary 7.4, problem (6.1) is solvable whenever the extremal measure $\xi := \xi_{A,f}$, uniquely determined by means of Lemma 7.2, belongs to the class $\check{\mathcal{E}}^+(A)$. But this does indeed hold by virtue of Theorem 7.8, ξ being the strong limit of a minimizing net $(\mu_s) \subset \check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$.

Theorem 7.8. *If $c_*(A) < \infty$, $\check{\mathcal{E}}^+(A)$ is strongly closed, hence strongly complete.*

Proof. The strong topology being first-countable, consider a sequence $(\mu_j) \subset \check{\mathcal{E}}^+(A)$ converging strongly (hence vaguely) to $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$; then (μ_j) is strongly bounded:

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mu_j\| < \infty. \quad (7.29)$$

The mapping $\mu \mapsto \mu(X)$ being vaguely l.s.c. on \mathfrak{M}^+ ,

$$\mu_0(X) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(X) = 1. \quad (7.30)$$

The theorem will therefore follow once we show that equality prevails in (7.30), i.e.

$$\mu_0(X) = 1. \quad (7.31)$$

Since $\mu_j \rightarrow \mu_0$ vaguely, applying [5, Section IV.4.4, Corollary 3] gives

$$\int 1_K d\mu_0 \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int 1_K d\mu_j \quad \text{for every compact } K \subset X, \quad (7.32)$$

the indicator function 1_K of K being bounded, of compact support, and u.s.c. on X . On the other hand,

$$\mu_0(X) = \lim_{K \uparrow X} \mu_0(K) = \lim_{K \uparrow X} \int 1_K d\mu_0,$$

which together with (7.30) and (7.32) results in

$$1 \geq \mu_0(X) \geq \limsup_{(j,K) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathfrak{C}_X} \int 1_K d\mu_j = 1 - \liminf_{(j,K) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathfrak{C}_X} \int 1_{A \setminus K} d\mu_j,$$

the equality being implied by the fact that every μ_j is a positive measure of unit total mass concentrated on A . (Here and throughout, \mathfrak{C}_X denotes the upward directed set of all compact subsets K of X .) The proof of (7.31) is thus reduced to that of

$$\liminf_{(j,K) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathfrak{C}_X} \int 1_{A \setminus K} d\mu_j = 0. \quad (7.33)$$

By virtue of [23, Theorem 6.1] (cf. Fuglede [13, Theorem 4.1]) applied to $A \setminus K$, $K \in \mathfrak{C}_X$ being arbitrarily chosen, there exists the (unique) inner capacity measure $\gamma_{A \setminus K}$, minimizing the energy $\|\nu\|^2$ over the (convex) set $\Gamma_{A \setminus K}$ of all $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ with the property $U^\nu \geq 1$ n.e. on A . For any $K' \in \mathfrak{C}_X$ such that $K \subset K'$, we have $\Gamma_{A \setminus K} \subset \Gamma_{A \setminus K'}$, and utilizing [13, Lemma 4.1.1] with $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{E}$ and $\Gamma := \Gamma_{A \setminus K'}$ gives

$$\|\gamma_{A \setminus K} - \gamma_{A \setminus K'}\|^2 \leq \|\gamma_{A \setminus K}\|^2 - \|\gamma_{A \setminus K'}\|^2. \quad (7.34)$$

Since $\|\gamma_{A \setminus K}\|^2 = c_*(A \setminus K)$ [23, Theorem 6.1], $\|\gamma_{A \setminus K}\|^2$ decreases as $K \uparrow X$, which together with (7.34) implies that the net $(\gamma_{A \setminus K})_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_X} \subset \mathcal{E}^+$ is Cauchy in the strong topology on \mathcal{E}^+ . Noting that $(\gamma_{A \setminus K})_{K \in \mathfrak{C}_X}$ converges vaguely to zero,¹⁶ we get

$$\gamma_{A \setminus K} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } \mathcal{E}^+ \text{ as } K \uparrow X, \quad (7.35)$$

the kernel κ being perfect.

Using [23, Theorem 6.1] once again, we also see that

$$U^{\gamma_{A \setminus K}} \geq 1_{A \setminus K} \quad \text{n.e. on } A \setminus K, \quad (7.36)$$

hence μ_j -a.e. for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.¹⁷ Integrating (7.36) with respect to μ_j we therefore obtain, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\int 1_{A \setminus K} d\mu_j \leq \int U^{\gamma_{A \setminus K}} d\mu_j \leq \|\gamma_{A \setminus K}\| \cdot \|\mu_j\| \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathfrak{C}_X \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

which combined with (7.29) and (7.35) yields (7.33), whence the theorem. \square

Assume now that $\widehat{w}^A(X) = 1$. Noting from Theorem 2.1 that $\widehat{w}^A \in \mathcal{E}_f^+(A)$, we conclude that then, actually, $\widehat{w}^A \in \check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$, and therefore $I_f(\widehat{w}^A) \geq w_f(A)$. But

$$I_f(\widehat{w}^A) = \widehat{w}_f(A) \leq w_f(A),$$

the former and the latter relations being valid by virtue of (2.5) and (6.2), respectively. Putting this all together, we see that the solution $\lambda_{A,f}$ to problem (6.1) does indeed exist, and moreover $\lambda_{A,f} = \widehat{w}^A$.

We next aim to show that problem (6.1) is unsolvable provided that

$$c_*(A) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{w}^A(X) < 1. \quad (7.37)$$

The space X being σ -compact, whereas $c_*(A) = \infty$, there exist a sequence (U_j) of relatively compact open subsets of X which cover X , such that $\overline{U_j} \subset U_{j+1}$ for each j [3, Section I.9, Proposition 15], and a sequence (K_j) of compact sets $K_j \subset A \cap U_{j+1}$ such that $K_j \cap \overline{U_j} = \emptyset$ and $c(K_j) \geq j$ for each j . If $\lambda_j := \gamma_{K_j}/c(K_j) \in \check{\mathcal{E}}^+(K_j)$ denotes the normalized capacitary measure on K_j , then

$$\|\lambda_j\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty, \quad (7.38)$$

$$\lambda_j \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{vaguely in } \mathcal{E}^+ \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty, \quad (7.39)$$

where the latter is obvious from the fact that for any compact $Q \subset X$, $S(\lambda_j) \cap Q = \emptyset$ for all j large enough. Noting that $\widehat{w}^A(X) < 1$, cf. (7.37), define

$$\mu_j := \widehat{w}^A + q\lambda_j, \quad \text{where } q := 1 - \widehat{w}^A(X) \in (0, 1]. \quad (7.40)$$

As $\widehat{w}^A, \lambda_j \in \mathcal{E}^+(A)$, we have $\mu_j \in \check{\mathcal{E}}^+(A)$; hence, $\mu_j \in \check{\mathcal{E}}_f^+(A)$ for all j , and so

$$w_f(A) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} I_f(\mu_j). \quad (7.41)$$

On the other hand, we see by means of a straightforward verification that

$$I_f(\mu_j) \leq \widehat{w}_f(A) + q^2 \|\lambda_j\|^2 + 2q \langle \widehat{w}^A, \lambda_j \rangle + 2q \int U^{\omega^-} d\lambda_j,$$

¹⁶Indeed, for any given $\varphi \in C_0(X)$, there exists a relatively compact open set $G \subset X$ such that $\varphi(x) = 0$ for all $x \notin \overline{G}$. Hence, $\gamma_{A \setminus K}(\varphi) = 0$ for all $K \in \mathfrak{C}_X$ with $K \ni \overline{G}$, and the claim follows.

¹⁷This follows from Lemma 3.1 applied to $\mu_j|_{A \setminus K}$, $A \setminus K$ along with A being μ_j -measurable.

and applying (6.2), (6.3), and (7.38) therefore gives, by use of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} I_f(\mu_j) \leq w_f(A).$$

Combined with (7.41), this shows that the sequence (μ_j) is, actually, minimizing, and hence converges strongly and vaguely to the extremal measure ξ (Lemma 7.2). On account of (7.39) and (7.40), this yields $\xi = \widehat{\omega}^A$, whence $\xi(X) < 1$ (cf. (7.37)), which according to Corollary 7.4 substantiates the unsolvability of problem (6.1).

It remains to verify the solvability of problem (6.1) in the case where

$$\widehat{\omega}^A(X) > 1. \quad (7.42)$$

We first show that

$$C_\xi \neq 0, \quad (7.43)$$

where C_ξ is given by (7.23). Indeed, assuming to the contrary that $C_\xi = 0$, we infer from Lemma 7.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} U^\xi &\geq U^\omega \quad \text{n.e. on } A, \\ U^\xi &= U^\omega \quad \xi\text{-a.e. on } X. \end{aligned}$$

But according to Theorem 2.1(iii), then necessarily

$$\xi = \widehat{\omega}^A,$$

which is however impossible, since $\xi(X) \leq 1$ while $\widehat{\omega}^A(X) > 1$ by virtue of (7.8) and (7.42), respectively. The contradiction thus obtained proves (7.43).

Now, integrating (7.22) with respect to ξ , we get

$$\int U_f^\xi d\xi = C_\xi \cdot \xi(X),$$

which in view of (7.23) and (7.43) gives $\xi(X) = 1$. According to Corollary 7.4, this implies the solvability of problem (6.1), thereby completing the proof of the theorem.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported in part by a grant from the Simons Foundation (1030291, N.V.Z.).

9. A DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

This manuscript has no associated data.

10. FUNDING AND COMPETING INTERESTS

The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

- [1] Armitage, D.H., Gardiner, S.J.: *Classical Potential Theory*. Springer, Berlin (2001)
- [2] Borodachov, S.V., Hardin, D.P., Saff, E.B.: *Discrete Energy on Rectifiable Sets*. Springer, Berlin (2019)
- [3] Bourbaki, N.: *General Topology. Chapters 1–4*. Springer, Berlin (1989)
- [4] Bourbaki, N.: *General Topology. Chapters 5–10*. Springer, Berlin (1989)
- [5] Bourbaki, N.: *Integration. Chapters 1–6*. Springer, Berlin (2004)

- [6] Cartan, H.: Théorie générale du balayage en potentiel newtonien. *Ann. Univ. Fourier Grenoble* **22**, 221–280 (1946)
- [7] Deny, J.: Sur la définition de l'énergie en théorie du potentiel. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **2**, 83–99 (1950)
- [8] Deny, J.: Méthodes Hilbertiennes en Théorie du Potentiel. In: *Potential Theory. C.I.M.E. Summer Schools* **49**, 121–201. Springer, Berlin (2010)
- [9] Doob, J.L.: *Classical Potential Theory and Its Probabilistic Counterpart*. Springer, Berlin (1984)
- [10] Dragnev, P.D., Orive, R., Saff, E.B., Wielonsky F.: Riesz energy problems with external fields and related theory. *Constr. Approx.* **57**, 1–43 (2023)
- [11] Edwards, R.E.: Cartan's balayage theory for hyperbolic Riemann surfaces. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **8**, 263–272 (1958)
- [12] Edwards, R.E.: *Functional Analysis. Theory and Applications*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York (1965)
- [13] Fuglede, B.: On the theory of potentials in locally compact spaces. *Acta Math.* **103**, 139–215 (1960)
- [14] Fuglede, B.: The quasi topology associated with a countably subadditive set function. *Ann. Inst. Fourier Grenoble* **21**, 123–169 (1971)
- [15] Fuglede, B.: Symmetric function kernels and sweeping of measures. *Anal. Math.* **42**, 225–259 (2016)
- [16] Fuglede, B., Zorii, N.: Green kernels associated with Riesz kernels. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **43**, 121–145 (2018)
- [17] Kelley, J.L.: *General Topology*. Princeton, New York (1957)
- [18] Landkof, N.S.: *Foundations of Modern Potential Theory*. Springer, Berlin (1972)
- [19] Ohtsuka, M.: On potentials in locally compact spaces. *J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-I* **25**, 135–352 (1961)
- [20] Saff, E.B., Totik, V.: *Logarithmic Potentials with External Fields*. Springer, Berlin (1997)
- [21] Zorii, N.V.: Equilibrium potentials with external fields. *Ukrainian Math. J.* **55**, 1423–1444 (2003)
- [22] Zorii, N.: Balayage of measures on a locally compact space. *Anal. Math.* **48**, 249–277 (2022)
- [23] Zorii, N.: On the theory of capacities on locally compact spaces and its interaction with the theory of balayage. *Potential Anal.* **59**, 1345–1379 (2023)
- [24] Zorii, N.: On the theory of balayage on locally compact spaces. *Potential Anal.* **59**, 1727–1744 (2023)
- [25] Zorii, N.: On the role of the point at infinity in Deny's principle of positivity of mass for Riesz potentials. *Anal. Math. Phys.* **13**, 38 (2023)
- [26] Zorii, N.: Minimum Riesz energy problems with external fields. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **526**, 127235 (2023)
- [27] Zorii, N.: Inner Riesz pseudo-balayage and its applications to minimum energy problems with external fields. *Potential Anal.* **60**, 1271–1300 (2024)
- [28] Zorii, N.: Minimum energy problems with external fields on locally compact spaces. *Constr. Approx.* **59**, 385–417 (2024)
- [29] Zorii, N.: On the theory of balayage on locally compact spaces and its applications. *arXiv:2401.11043* (2024)