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#### Abstract

We establish a convergence speed estimate for hole probabilities of zeros of random holomorphic sections on compact Riemann surfaces.
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## 1. Introduction

Distribution of zeros of random polynomials is a classical subject with rich literature, initiated by the works of Waring [48], Bloch-Pólya [7], and henceforth developed intensively by the works of Littlewood-Offord, Hammersley, Kac, Erdös-Turán, see [5, 9, 38] for a review and references therein.

In this article, we study the distribution of zeros of random sections of holomorphic line bundles on compact Riemann surfaces. More precisely, based on the celebrated work [51] of Zelditch (see also [45, [50]) and a recent advance [12], we establish a convergence speed estimate of the hole probabilities. Some inspiration also takes from the approach of [31] on hole probabilities of Gaussian entire functions.

Here is our setting. Let $X$ be a compact Riemann surface, equipped with a Kähler form $\omega_{0}$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a positive holomorphic line bundle on $X$, i.e., having degree $\operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})>0$. Fix a Hermitian metric $\mathfrak{h}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ with strictly positive curvature form $c_{1}(\mathcal{L}, \mathfrak{h})$. We will regard the normalized $(1,1)$-form $\omega:=c_{1}(\mathcal{L}, \mathfrak{h}) / \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})$ as a probability measure on $X$, since $\int_{X} \omega=1$.

For every positive integer $n$, the $n$-th power $\mathcal{L}^{n}:=\mathcal{L}^{\otimes n}$ of the line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ inherits a natural metric $\mathfrak{h}_{n}$ induced by $\mathfrak{h}$, i.e., $\left\|s^{\otimes n}(x)\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n}}:=\|s(x)\|_{\mathfrak{h}}^{n}$ for local sections $s$ of $\mathcal{L}$ around a point $x \in X$. Let $(\cdot, \cdot)_{n}$ denote the pointwise Hermitian inner product corresponding to
the Hermitian metric $\mathfrak{h}_{n}$. On the space $H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ of global holomorphic sections of $\mathcal{L}^{n}$, we can define a global Hermitian inner product

$$
\left\langle s_{1}, s_{2}\right\rangle_{n}:=\int_{X}\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)_{n} \omega_{0} \quad \text { for } \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \in H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)
$$

By the Riemann-Roch theorem, the global sections of $\mathcal{L}^{n}$ are abundant for $n \gg 1$, that is, $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{C}} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)=n \cdot \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})-g+1 \gg 1$. On the projectivized space $\mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$, we consider the Fubini-Study volume form $V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}$ induced by $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle_{n}$.

The zero set $Z_{s}$ of a section $s$ in $H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right) \backslash\{0\}$, or of an element $[s]$ in $\mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$, contains $n \cdot \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})$ points counting with multiplicities. Denote by $\left[Z_{s}\right]$ the sum of Dirac masses at the points in $Z_{s}$. The Poincaré-Lelong formula states that

$$
\left[Z_{s}\right]=\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \log \|s\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n}}+n \cdot \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L}) \omega .
$$

Here, $\mathrm{d}^{\mathrm{c}}:=\frac{i}{2 \pi}(\bar{\partial}-\partial)$ and $\mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}=\frac{i}{\pi} \partial \bar{\partial}$. The empirical probability measure of $Z_{s}$ is given by the unit mass normalization

$$
\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket:=(n \cdot \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L}))^{-1}\left[Z_{s}\right] .
$$

The distribution of $\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket$ for $s \in H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right) \backslash\{0\}$ with respect to the complex Gaussian measure on $H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ associated with $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle_{n}$ is equal to the distribution of $\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket$ for $[s] \in$ $\mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ with respect to $V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}$ (cf. [42, Section 2]).

The study of the zero distribution of random holomorphic sections has rich literature, cf. [2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 26, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44]. Notably, specialized in complex dimension one, a celebrated theorem of Shiffman and Zelditch [40] implies that, under the distribution $V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}$, the zeros of sections in $\mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ are equidistributed with respect to $\omega$, i.e., for any smooth test function $\phi$ on $X$, there holds

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)}\left\langle\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket, \phi\right\rangle \mathrm{d} V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}(s)=\int_{X} \phi \omega .
$$

Our goal is to study the hole probabilities of this distribution, in the vein of [12, 45, 50 , [51]. Precisely, for an open subset $D$ in $X$ with $\bar{D} \neq X$, for every large $n$, we consider the hole event

$$
H_{n, D}:=\left\{[s] \in \mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right), Z_{s} \cap D=\varnothing\right\}
$$

about holomorphic sections of $\mathcal{L}^{n}$ non-vanishing on $D$.
To state our main result, we need to employ a key functional $\mathcal{I}_{\omega, D}$ introduced in [12], whose initial model was proposed by Zeitouni-Zelditch [50] (see also [18, 19, 31, 51]). Let $\mathcal{M}(X \backslash D)$ be the set of probability measures supported on $X \backslash D$. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{I}_{\omega, D}(\mu):=-\int_{X} U_{\mu} \omega-\int_{X} U_{\mu} \mathrm{d} \mu=-\int_{X} U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu+2 \max U_{\mu}^{\prime}, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X \backslash D) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, the function $U_{\mu}$ (resp. $U_{\mu}^{\prime}$ ) is the $\omega$-potential of type M (resp. type I) of $\mu$, see Section 2.2. When $D$ is non-empty, $\mathcal{I}_{\omega, D}$ is strictly positive. We abbreviate $\mathcal{I}_{D}:=\mathcal{I}_{\omega, D}$ for convenience, as $\omega$ is fixed throughout this article. One merit of $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ is that it admits a unique minimizer $\nu_{D} \in \mathcal{M}(X \backslash D)$, which coincides with the limit of the conditional expectations $\mathbf{E}\left(\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket \mid H_{n, D}\right)$ of the empirical probability measures $\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket$ of the hole events $[s] \in H_{n, D}$ as $n$ tends to infinity. A surprising phenomenon is that the support of $\nu_{D}$ avoids
an open "forbidden set" other than $D$ (cf. [12]). Such phenomenon first appeared in the setting of Gaussian entire functions [19, 31].

An open set $E$ in $X$ is said to have smooth boundary $\partial E$, if for every $x \in \partial E$, there is some neighborhood $B$ of $x$ and a smooth diffeomorphism $\psi: E \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$, where $\mathbb{D}$ is the unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$, such that

$$
\psi(E \cap B)=\mathbb{D} \cap\{\operatorname{Im}(z)>0\}, \quad \text { and } \quad \psi(\partial E \cap B)=\mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{R} .
$$

For technical convenience, from now on, we assume that the hole $D$ has smooth boundary and that $\partial D$ consists of only finitely many components. Our main result is about the exponential decay of hole probabilities $\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right)$.
Theorem 1.1. There exist a $C_{D}>0$ independent of $n$, and a $C>0$ independent of $n, D$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\min \mathcal{I}_{D}-C_{D} \frac{\log n}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n^{2}} \log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \leq-\min \mathcal{I}_{D}+C \frac{\log n}{n} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all sufficiently large $n$.
Here, we assume $n \gg 1$ to ensure that $\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \neq 0$, since when $X \neq \mathbb{P}^{1}$ the hole event $H_{n, D}$ can possibly be empty for certain small $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$. Note that (1.2) is a strengthen on the convergence speed of the following hole probability result

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^{2}} \log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right)=-\min \mathcal{I}_{D} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

established in [12, Lemma 7.2]. As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, in dimension one we can recover an estimate established by Shiffman-Zelditch-Zrebiec [45] on the exponential decay $\exp \left(-c_{D} n^{t+1}\right)$ of the hole probabilities with respect to a fixed open domain $D$ in a projective manifold of any dimension $t \geq 1$. For the case that $\mathbb{P}^{t}, t \geq 1$, equipped with the Fubini-Study metric, some good asymptotic formulas of the hole probabilities of polydiscs were established by Zrebiec [53] and Zhu [52]. Nevertheless, even in the simplest case that $(X, \mathcal{L}, \omega)=\left(\mathbb{P}^{1}, \mathscr{O}(1), \omega_{\mathrm{FS}}\right)$, the convergence speed estimate $O(\log n / n)$ in Theorem 1.1 is new (cf. [52, 53]).

Our second result concerns asymptotic behavior of the hole probabilities for discs with varying radii. Fix a radius $r_{0}>0$ such that $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x, r_{0}\right) \neq X$ for any $x \in X$.
Theorem 1.2. There exist constants $C>c>0$ independent of $x, r$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
-C r^{4} \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^{2}} \log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, \mathbb{B}(x, r)}\right) \leq-c r^{4}, \quad \forall x \in X, \quad \forall 0<r \leq r_{0} \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Previously, such hole probabilities with a parameter $r$ on the hole size were not known for zeros of random holomorphic sections, except in some very special cases for which tour de force calculation is possible, see [52, 53] for such exceptions in dimension one and higher. The estimate (1.4) is inspired by several classical works in recent decades. In the setting of Gaussian entire functions $F(z):=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} / \sqrt{n!}$ with the i.i.d. standard complex Gaussian coefficients $a_{j}$, Sodin-Tsirelson [47] established that the hole probability with respect to a disc of radius $r$ decays as $\exp \left(-c r^{4}\right)$ when $r$ tends to infinity. An optimal constant $c$ was obtained by Nishry [29]. Recently, Buckley-Nishry-Peled-Sodin [10] studied the hole probabilities for zeros of hyperbolic Gaussian Taylor series with finite radii of convergence. See also [8, $9,18,19,20,23,24,30,31,33,41]$.

Now we discuss the insight and ideas in the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, First, let us explain more about the functional $\mathcal{I}_{D}$, since it is a crucial ingredient in our approach. Such a type of functional was first proposed by Zeitouni-Zelditch [50] and Zelditch [51] to study large deviations of random zeros of line bundle sections on compact Riemann surfaces. Later, Ghosh-Nishry [18, 19] modified it a bit to study the hole event problem for Gaussian entire functions on $\mathbb{C}$. Recently, Dinh, Ghosh and the first named author [12] finalized the functional $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ to the current version, which is near but different to ZeitouniZelditch's, and used it to solve the equidistribution problem of hole events, and obtained the exponential decay (1.3) of the hole probabilities as a by-product. The proofs in this article heavily rely on the structure theorem of the equilibrium measure obtained in [12].

We shall emphasize that (1.2) is a strengthen of (1.3). For instance, the lower bound of (1.2) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \geq e^{-C_{D} n \log n} \cdot e^{-\min \mathcal{I}_{D} \cdot n^{2}}, \quad \forall n \gg 1, \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

while (1.3) only means that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \geq e^{-\epsilon_{n} n^{2}} \cdot e^{-\min \mathcal{I}_{D} \cdot n^{2}}, \quad \forall n \gg 1 \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some sequence $\left\{\epsilon_{n}\right\}_{n \gg 1}$ of positive numbers tending to zero.
The proofs of both (1.5) and (1.6) boil down to the following two considerations:
$(\bigcirc)$ to construct holomorphic sections $s \in H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ whose zeros avoid the hole $D$;
$(\diamond)$ to show that such $[s]$ constitute a subset of $\mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ with "large" volume.
As a matter of fact, (1.5) is much more difficult to prove than (1.6). The method of [12] fails to generate enough $[s] \in H_{n, D}$ for (1.5) concerning $(\diamond)$.

In general, constructing "desired" holomorphic sections is widely known to be a notoriously difficult task, and it lies in the heart of several prominent problems in algebraic and complex geometry (cf. [46]). Let us keep a broader scope in mind that, most of the time, one appeals to three kinds of classical tools:
(1) methods motivated by electrostatic potentials;
(2) differential geometric methods involving positive curvature;
(3) $L^{2}$-methods of solving $\bar{\partial}$-equations.

Note that (2) and (3) work in any dimension, while (1) is useful only in dimension one.
Our approach is a reminiscence of (1). The starting point is Zelditch's density formula (2.12) (cf. [51, Theorem 2]), whose proof relies on certain bosonization formula [1] and ingenious calculation involving theta functions. In fact, the functional $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ is obtained by exploring the key exponent in the formula (2.12). Therefore, $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ serves as a rate function of a large deviation principle (LDP) for the empirical measures $\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket$ of zeros of random holomorphic sections $[s] \in H_{n, D}$, and such an idea goes back to Dinh, Ghosh and the first author [12].

The insight is that zeros of a random section in the hole event $H_{n, D}$ shall repel each other, like electrons. The zero sets $Z_{s}$ of most $[s] \in H_{n, D}$ would produce empirical measures $\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket$ very close to the minimizer $\nu_{D}$ of the functional $\mathcal{I}_{D}$. This is due to the equidistribution result from [12, Theorem 2].

In practice, the upper bound in Theorem 1.1 is relatively easy to obtain, by means of Zelditch's density formula (2.12). The formidable difficulty lies in the the lower bound, i.e. (1.5). Our key strategies concerning $(\bigcirc)$ and $(\diamond)$ consist of two steps.
( $\boldsymbol{\oplus}$ ) First, to seek some $[s] \in H_{n, D}$ such that a certain necessary modification of $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ takes value "extremely close" to $\mathcal{I}_{D}\left(\nu_{D}\right)$ on the empirical measure $\llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket$. Here "necessary" is due to the trouble that $\mathcal{I}_{D}(\mu)=+\infty$ for any probability measure $\mu$ charging positive mass at some point.
(\&) Next, to show that, by "arbitrary" mild perturbations $Z_{s^{\prime}} \subset X \backslash D$ (but still subject to the Abel-Jacobi equation (2.5)) of the zero set $Z_{s}$ of $s$, we can recover lots of $\left[s^{\prime}\right] \in H_{n, D}$ which constitute "large" volume.
The reason for requiring the "extremely closeness" in $(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is to ensure that after mild perturbations $\llbracket Z_{s^{\prime}} \rrbracket$ still take the modified-functional values "very close" to $\mathcal{I}_{D}\left(\nu_{D}\right)$ so that such $\left[s^{\prime}\right] \in H_{n, D}$ could possibly constitute "large" volume according to Zelditch's density formula (2.12).

When $g=0$, such a blueprint can be realized directly, see Remark 8.3 below. However, when $g \geq 1$, one basic difficulty appears as follows, as pointed out by Zelditch [51]. Say $n>g$ and $\operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})=1$ for simplicity. Note that the zero number of every $[s] \in \mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ is presicely $n$, which is strictly larger than the dimension $n-g$ of $\mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$. Write the zeros of $s$ in any order as $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{n-g}, q_{1}, \ldots, q_{g}$. For a generic $s$, by Abel's theorem, the last $g$ zeros $q_{1}, \ldots, q_{g}$ are uniquely determined by the first $n-g$ zeros $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{n-g}$. However, even if all the $p_{j}$ 's are outside the hole $D$, it is not certain whether $q_{j}$ 's are in $X \backslash D$ or not, i.e., there seems no direct way to parameterize $H_{n, D}$.

Let us highlight three major new ingredients along with the structure of this article.

- We adapt the Fekete points theory on compact Riemann surfaces (Section 4), inspired by Nishry-Wennman [31], so that ( $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ ) can be achieved for every large $n$ (Section5).
- We show the Hölder regularity of $\nu_{D}$ (Section(3) to guarantee that the zeros of any section $s$ obtained in ( $\boldsymbol{\oplus}$ ) are "sufficiently separated" with each other.
- We introduce a new perturbation method (Section (6) to accomplish (Section 7), in which the key engine is Lemma6.1.

In the next Section2, we will present some useful background. The proof of Theorem 1.1 will be reached in Section 8, and Theorem 1.2 in Section 9 ,

Lastly, we shall emphasize that our approach for Theorem 1.1 is not suitable in higher dimension, because it is based on the Abel-Jacobi theory. The hole probabilities in higher dimensional varieties remain a challenging research direction.

Notations: The symbols $\lesssim$ and $\gtrsim$ stand for inequalities up to positive multiplicative constants, which may depend on $X, \omega_{0}, \omega, D$ but not on any other parameter. The notation $O(f)$, where $f$ is some given positive function, means some term taking values less than $C \cdot f$ for some positive constant $C$ which may depend on $D$. We denote by $\mathbb{D}(x, r) \subset \mathbb{C}$ the open disc centered at $x \in \mathbb{C}$ with radius $r>0$. We abbreviate $\mathbb{D}(0, r)$ as $\mathbb{D}_{r}$, and $\mathbb{D}_{1}$ as $\mathbb{D}$. In a Riemann surface or a complex manifold, $\mathbb{B}(x, r)$ stands for the open ball centered at $x$ having radius $r$ with respect to some given metric.

## 2. Preliminaries

2.1. Abel-Jacobi theory. On a compact Riemann surface $X$, a divisor is a finite formal linear combination $\mathcal{D}:=\sum a_{j} x_{j}$ with $a_{j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x_{j} \in X$. If $a_{j} \geq 0$ for all $j$, then we call
$\mathcal{D}$ an effective divisor. The degree $\operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{D})$ of $\mathcal{D}$ means the total sum $\sum a_{j}$. For a nonzero meromorphic function $f$ on $X$ (resp. a nontrivial holomorphic section $s$ of $\mathcal{L}$ ), we write $(f):=(f)_{0}-(f)_{\infty}$ (resp. $\left.(s)\right)$ the divisor defined by the zeros $(f)_{0}$ and the poles $(f)_{\infty}$ of $f$ (resp. zeros of $s$ ) respectively. Such a divisor $\mathcal{D}=(f)$ is called a principal divisor, and it always has degree 0 . A divisor $\mathcal{D}$ on $X$ can be associated with a line bundle $\mathscr{O}(\mathcal{D})$.

Take a canonical basis $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{g}, \beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{g}$ of $H_{1}(X, \mathbb{Z})$ with the intersection numbers $\alpha_{i} \cdot \beta_{j}=\delta_{i j}$ and $\alpha_{j_{1}} \cdot \alpha_{j_{2}}=\beta_{j_{1}} \cdot \beta_{j_{2}}=0$ for $j_{1} \neq j_{2}$. Let $\left\{\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{g}\right\}$ be a basis for the complex vector space of holomorphic differential 1-forms on $X$. Denote by $\Phi=\left(\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{g}\right)^{\top}$ a column vector of length $g$. The $g \times 2 g$ matrix

$$
\Omega:=\left(\int_{\alpha_{1}} \Phi, \ldots, \int_{\alpha_{g}} \Phi, \int_{\beta_{1}} \Phi, \ldots, \int_{\beta_{g}} \Phi\right) .
$$

is called a period matrix. The $2 g$ columns of $\Omega$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$, hence generate a lattice $\Lambda$ in $\mathbb{C}^{g}$ (cf. [21, 22]). Define the Jacobian variety of $X$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Jac}(X):=\mathbb{C}^{g} / \Lambda \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a $g$-dimensional complex torus. Fix a base point $p_{\star} \in X$. The Abel-Jacobi map $\mathcal{A}: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Jac}(X)$ associated with $p_{\star}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{A}(x):=\left(\int_{p_{*}}^{x} \phi_{1}, \ldots, \int_{p_{*}}^{x} \phi_{g}\right) \quad(\bmod \Lambda), \quad \forall x \in X \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last vector is independent of the choices of path from $p_{\star}$ to $x$ after taking the modulo.
Let $X^{(m)}$ be the $m$-th symmetric product of $X$. Points in $X^{(m)}$ one-to-one correspond to effective divisors $p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}$ of degree $m$, where points $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m} \in X$ are not necessarily distinct. It is well known that $X^{(m)}$ inherits a complex structure from $X^{n}$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi_{m}: X^{m} \rightarrow X^{(m)}, \quad\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}\right) \mapsto p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

be the canonical projection. Let $\mathscr{R}_{m}:=\left\{\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}\right): p_{j}=p_{\ell}\right.$ for some $\left.j \neq \ell\right\}$ be the ramification subvariety. Near a point $p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \notin \pi_{m}\left(\mathscr{R}_{m}\right)$, the holomorphic coordinates of $X^{(m)}$ are given by the local coordinates of $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m} \in X$.

For every $t \geq 1$, define a holomorphic map $\mathcal{A}_{t}: X^{(t)} \rightarrow \operatorname{Jac}(X)$ by

$$
\mathcal{A}_{t}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{t}\right):=\sum_{j=1}^{t} \mathcal{A}\left(p_{j}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{t}\left(\int_{p_{\star}}^{p_{j}} \phi_{1}, \ldots, \int_{p_{\star}}^{p_{j}} \phi_{g}\right) \quad(\bmod \Lambda) .
$$

Then $\mathcal{A}_{1}=\mathcal{A}$ is injective, and $\mathcal{A}_{g}$ is surjective by the Jacobi inversion theorem. Moreover, Riemann showed that $\mathcal{A}_{g}$ is birational, i.e., there exist two subvarieties $\mathscr{W} \subsetneq X^{(g)}$ and $W_{g}^{1}=\mathcal{A}_{t}(\mathscr{W}) \subsetneq \operatorname{Jac}(X)$, both of codimension 2 , such that the restriction

$$
\mathcal{A}_{g}: X^{(g)} \backslash \mathscr{W} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Jac}(X) \backslash W_{g}^{1}
$$

is biholomorphic. The subvariety $\mathscr{W}$ consists of critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{g}$, and $W_{g}^{1}$ is called the Wirtinger subvariety. Both of them depend on $p_{\star}$. For $q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g} \in \mathscr{W}$, one has $\operatorname{dim} H^{0}\left(X, \mathscr{O}\left(q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}\right)\right) \geq 2$ (cf. [21, 22]). When $g=1, \mathscr{W}$ is empty.

Abel's theorem states that $\mathcal{A}_{t}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{t}\right)=\mathcal{A}_{t}\left(p_{1}^{\prime}+\cdots+p_{t}^{\prime}\right)$ if and only if $p_{1}+\cdots+$ $p_{t}-p_{1}^{\prime}-\cdots-p_{t}^{\prime}$ is a principal divisor. In particular, there is a holomorphic section $s \in$ $H^{0}\left(X, \mathscr{O}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{t}\right)\right)$ with $(s)=p_{1}^{\prime}+\cdots+p_{t}^{\prime}$.

By the Riemann-Roch theorem, any line bundle on $X$ of degree $\geq g$ has a nontrivial global section $s$, hence is linearly equivalent to $\mathscr{O}(\mathcal{D})$ for the effective divisor $\mathcal{D}=(s)$. For large $n$ such that $m:=n \cdot \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})-g>0$, for any $p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \in X^{(m)}$, we can apply this observation to the line bundle $\mathcal{L}^{n} \otimes \mathscr{O}\left(-\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}\right)\right)$ of degree $g$ to see that there exists some $q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g} \in X^{(g)}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{O}\left(q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}\right) \simeq \mathcal{L}^{n} \otimes \mathscr{O}\left(-\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}\right)\right) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equivalently, if $\mathcal{L}^{n} \simeq \mathscr{O}\left(w_{1}+\cdots+w_{n \cdot \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})}\right)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{A}_{m}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}\right)+\mathcal{A}_{g}\left(q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}\right)=\mathcal{A}_{n}\left(w_{1}+\cdots+w_{n \cdot \operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})}\right)=: \mathcal{A}_{n}\left(\mathcal{L}^{n}\right) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the choice of $q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}$ is unique if $\operatorname{dim} H^{0}\left(X, \mathscr{O}\left(q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}\right)\right)=1$, or equivalently, $\mathcal{A}_{n}\left(\mathcal{L}^{n}\right)-\mathcal{A}_{m}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}\right) \notin W_{g}^{1}$.

In this article, we will just assume $\operatorname{deg}(\mathcal{L})=1$, because of the following well-known fact, which is a corollary of the Jacobi inversion theorem.
Lemma 2.1 (cf. [12]-Lemma 6.4). If $\mathcal{L}^{\prime}$ is positive line bundle on $X$ of degree $d>1$, then there exists a positive line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ of degree 1 such that $\mathcal{L}^{d} \simeq \mathcal{L}^{\prime}$.
2.2. Quasi-potentials. A function $\phi$ on $X$ with values in $\mathbb{R} \cup\{-\infty\}$ is quasi-subharmonic if locally it is the difference of a subharmonic function and a smooth one. If $\phi$ is quasisubharmonic, then there exists a constant $c \geq 0$ such that $\mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \phi \geq-c \omega$ in the sense of currents. When $c=1, \phi$ is called an $\omega$-subharmonic function, and $\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \phi+\omega$ is a probability measure on $X$ by Stoke's formula.

For any probability measure $\mu$ on $X$, we can write $\mu=\omega+\mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} U_{\mu}$, where $U_{\mu}$ is the unique quasi-subharmonic function such that $\max U_{\mu}=0$. We call $U_{\mu}$ the $\omega$-potential of type $M$ of $\mu$ ( $M$ stands for "maximum"). There is an alternative way to normalize the potential $U_{\mu}^{\prime}$ by requiring that $\int_{X} U_{\nu}^{\prime} \omega=0$. We call $U_{\mu}^{\prime}$ the $\omega$-potential of type I of $\mu$ (I stands for "integration"). To construct $\omega$-potentials, we use the theory of Green functions.

Lemma 2.2 (cf. [25]-Theorem 2.2, [12]-Lemma 2.1). There exists a Green function $G(x, y)$ of $(X, \omega)$ defined on $X \times X$, smooth outside the diagonal, such that for every $x \in X$, one has

$$
\int_{X} G(x, \cdot) \omega=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} G(x, \cdot)=\delta_{x}-\omega
$$

Moreover, the function $\varrho(x, y):=G(x, y)-\log \operatorname{dist}(x, y)$ is Lipschitz in two variables $x, y$.
For a probability measure $\mu$ on $X$, the aforementioned $\omega$-potentials are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{\mu}^{\prime}(x):=\int_{X} G(x, \cdot) \mathrm{d} \mu \quad \text { and } \quad U_{\mu}:=U_{\mu}^{\prime}-\max U_{\mu}^{\prime} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, one can define the $\omega$-potential $U_{\nu}^{\prime}$ for any positive measure or sign measure $\mu$ on $X$ by the above formula, which will be used in the study of Fekete points. For any two positive measures or sign measures $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}$ on $X$, it is clear that $U_{\mu_{1}+\mu_{2}}^{\prime}=U_{\mu_{1}}^{\prime}+U_{\mu_{2}}^{\prime}$. Moreover, one can show by Stoke's formula that (cf. [12, Lemma 2.3])

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{X} U_{\mu_{1}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu_{2}=\int_{X} U_{\mu_{2}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu_{1}, \quad \text { and } \quad \int_{X} U_{\mu_{1}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu_{1} \leq 0 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

There is another geometric description for the $\omega$-potentials. For every $p \in X$, the holomorphic line bundle $\mathscr{O}(p)$ associated with the one-point divisor $p$ has a canonical
section $1_{\mathscr{O}(p)}$. By the Poincaré-Lelong formula and by the $\partial \bar{\partial}$-lemma, we can find a smooth Hermitian metric $\mathfrak{h}_{p}$ for every $p$ such that the curvature form is $\omega$ and such that the aforementioned potential reads as

$$
U_{\delta_{p}}(z)=\log \left\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}(p)}(z)\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{p}}+C_{\mathfrak{h}_{p}}
$$

where $C_{\mathfrak{h}_{p}}$ is a normalized constant subject to the law $\max U_{\delta_{p}}=0$.
For every point $\mathbf{p}:=p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \in X^{(m)}, m \geq 1$, we denote by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{\mathbf{p}}:=\left(\delta_{p_{1}}+\cdots+\delta_{p_{m}}\right) / m \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

the empirical probability measure of $\mathbf{p}$. Similarly, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}(z)=\frac{1}{m} \log \left\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}(\mathbf{p})}(z)\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{p}}}+C_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{p}}} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}(\mathbf{p})}:=\otimes_{j=1}^{m} \mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(p_{j}\right)}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{p}}:=\otimes_{j=1}^{m} \mathfrak{h}_{p_{j}}$, and $C_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbf{p}}}$ is a normalized constant subject to the law $\max U_{\delta_{\mathrm{p}}}=0$.
2.3. Density of zeros. From now on, we fix a positive line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on a compact Riemann surface $X$ with degree 1 . Let $n>g$ be an integer. Set $m:=n-g$. Define the exceptional subvariety

$$
\mathbf{H}_{m}:=\left\{p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \in X^{(m)}: \mathcal{A}_{n}\left(\mathcal{L}^{n}\right)-\mathcal{A}_{m}\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}\right) \in W_{g}^{1}\right\}
$$

of $X^{(m)}$ with codimension 2. Outside $\mathbf{H}_{m}$, we have a holomorphic map

$$
\mathcal{B}_{m}: X^{(m)} \backslash \mathbf{H}_{m} \longrightarrow X^{(g)}
$$

given by $\mathcal{B}_{m}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}\right):=q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}$ in (2.4) or (2.5). The image of $\mathcal{B}_{m}$ is $X^{(g)} \backslash \mathscr{W}$. Consequently, we obtain a holomorphic map

$$
\mathscr{A}_{m}: X^{(m)} \backslash \mathbf{H}_{m} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)
$$

defined by

$$
\mathscr{A}_{m}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}\right):=[s],
$$

where $s \in H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$ satisfies $(s)=p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}+\mathcal{B}_{m}\left(p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}\right)$. The map $\mathscr{A}_{m}$ is generically $\binom{n}{m}$ to one. For a measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$, if we set

$$
A_{\mathbb{P}}:=\left\{[s] \in \mathbb{P} H^{0}\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{n}\right): \llbracket Z_{s} \rrbracket \in A\right\},
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(A_{\mathbb{P}}\right)=\int_{A_{\mathbb{P}}} \mathrm{d} V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}=\binom{n}{m}^{-1} \int_{\mathscr{A}_{m}^{-1}\left(A_{\mathbb{P}}\right)} \mathscr{A}_{m}^{*}\left(V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}\right) \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Write $\mathbf{q}:=\mathcal{B}_{m}(\mathbf{p})=q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g} \in X^{(g)}$. We define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p}):=\frac{1}{m^{2}} \sum_{j_{1} \neq j_{2}} G\left(p_{j_{1}}, p_{j_{2}}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p}):=\log \left\|e^{U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}+m^{-1} g U_{\delta_{\mathbf{q}}}^{\prime}}\right\|_{L^{2 m}\left(\omega_{0}\right)} \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, $G$ is the Green function of $(X, \omega)$, and $U_{\delta_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\prime}, U_{\delta_{\mathrm{q}}}^{\prime}$ are the $\omega$-potentials of type I.
Zelditch [51, Theorem 2] established the following explicit formula for $\mathscr{A}_{m}^{*}\left(V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}\right)$ (see also [12, Section 4]).

Proposition 2.3. For all $n \geq 2 g$ and $m=n-g$, on $X^{(m)} \backslash \mathbf{H}_{m}$, the positive measures $\mathscr{A}_{m}^{*}\left(V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}\right)$ are of the shape

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{n} \exp \left[m^{2}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\frac{2(m+1)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p})\right)\right] \kappa_{n}(\mathbf{p}) . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, $\left\{C_{n}\right\}$ are some normalized positive constants, and $\kappa_{n}$ are positive continuous $(m, m)$ forms on $X^{(m)} \backslash \mathbf{H}_{m}$ given by

$$
\kappa_{n}(\mathbf{p}):=\Upsilon(\mathbf{p}) \xi(\mathbf{q}) \prod_{j=1}^{m} \prod_{l=1}^{g} \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, q_{l}\right)^{2} i \mathrm{~d} z_{1} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge i \mathrm{~d} z_{m} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}_{m}
$$

where $e^{-O(m)} \leq \Upsilon(\mathbf{p}) \leq e^{O(m)}$, and $\xi(\mathbf{q})$ is some strictly positive smooth function on $X^{(g)}$ independent of $n$.

Let us explain the above formula. If $\mathbf{p} \notin \pi_{m}\left(\mathscr{R}_{m}\right) \cup \mathbf{H}_{m}$ (see (2.3)), we can use the uniformizing coordinates $z_{j}$ about $p_{j}$ for $j=1, \ldots, m$ to construct coordinates $\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{m}\right)$ for $\mathbf{p} \in X^{(m)}$. For $\mathbf{p} \in \pi_{m}\left(\mathscr{R}_{m}\right) \backslash \mathbf{H}_{m}$, observing that $\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})=-\infty$, we set $\mathscr{A}_{m}\left(V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}\right)$ to be 0 on $\pi_{m}\left(\mathscr{R}_{m}\right) \backslash \mathbf{H}_{m}$.

The following lemma says hole probability does not quite involve with the choice of $\omega_{0}$.
Lemma 2.4 ([12]-Lemma 4.2). One has

$$
\sup _{\mathbf{p} \in X^{(m)}}\left|\mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}\right|=O\left(\frac{\log m}{m}\right) \quad \text { as } \quad m \rightarrow \infty
$$

and $U_{\delta_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\prime} \leq C$ for some constant $C$ independent of $m$ and $\mathbf{p}$.
To apply Zelditch's density formula (2.12) to study hole probabilities, we need to compute its integration over the set $\mathscr{A}_{m}^{-1}\left(H_{n, D}\right)$. Thus, we put $\mathcal{R}_{m, D}:=\mathscr{A}_{m}^{-1}\left(H_{n, D}\right)$, which can be rephrased as

$$
\mathcal{R}_{m, D}=\left\{\mathbf{p} \in(X \backslash D)^{(m)} \backslash \mathbf{H}_{m}: \mathbf{q}=\mathcal{B}_{m}(\mathbf{p}) \in(X \backslash D)^{(g)}\right\} .
$$

We also define the following separating subset of $\mathcal{R}_{m, D}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{S}_{m, D}:=\left\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{m, D}: \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j_{1}}, p_{j_{2}}\right) \geq m^{-4} \text { for all } 1 \leq j_{1} \neq j_{2} \leq m\right.  \tag{2.13}\\
&\left.\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, q_{l}\right) \geq 1 / m \text { for all } 1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq l \leq g\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

where, $\mathbf{p}:=p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}$ and $\mathbf{q}:=q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}$. This $\mathcal{S}_{m, D}$ will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.1,

## 3. Regularity of the equilibrium measures

From [12, Theorem 1], we know that the minimizer of $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ is $\nu_{D}:=\left.\omega\right|_{S_{D}}+\nu_{\partial D}$, where $S_{D}:=\left\{U_{\nu_{D}}=0\right\} \backslash \bar{D}$ and $\nu_{\partial D}$ is a non-vanishing positive measure on $\partial D$. Moreover, if $\nu_{D}$ has mass on some component of $\partial D$, then $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{D}\right)$ contains this component and $U_{\nu_{D}}$ is strictly negative on this component of $\partial D$.

In this section, our goal is to prove the following regularity of $\nu_{\partial D}$, which is used for studying the Fekete points in the next section.

Proposition 3.1. For any arc $A$ on $\partial D$, one has $\nu_{\partial D}(A) \leq c_{D} \cdot \operatorname{length}(A)$ for some $c_{D}>0$ independent of $A$.

Recall the following result from [12, Proposition 3.1].

Proposition 3.2. Let $h$ be a continuous function on $\bar{D}$ and harmonic on $D$. Assume that $h+U_{\nu_{D}} \leq 0$ on $\bar{D}$, then

$$
\int_{\partial D} h \mathrm{~d} \nu_{D} \leq 0
$$

Suppose that Proposition 3.1 fails, by the following lemma we will construct a harmonic function $h$ such that $h+U_{\nu_{D}} \leq 0$ on $\bar{D}$ while $\int_{\partial D} h \mathrm{~d} \nu_{D}>0$, which is absurd.
Lemma 3.3. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $\partial \mathbb{D}$ and $z$ be a point in $\partial \mathbb{D}$. Suppose that there exists a sequence $\left\{r_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ of positive radii shrinking to 0 such that $\mu\left(\mathbb{D}\left(z, r_{j}\right)\right) / r_{j}$ tends to infinity. Then there exist a positive sequence $\left\{\beta_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ tending to infinity and a sequence of functions $\left\{F_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ which are harmonic on $\mathbb{D}$ and continuous on $\partial \mathbb{D}$, such that $\beta_{j} r_{j}$ tends to 0 and such that for $j$ large enough, $F_{j}<0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \backslash \mathbb{D}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$ while $\int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} F_{j} \mathrm{~d} \mu>0$.

Proof. Denote $\alpha_{j}:=\mu\left(\mathbb{D}\left(z, r_{j}\right)\right)$. Take a sequence $\beta_{j}:=1 / \sqrt{\alpha_{j} r_{j}}$ so that $\beta_{j} \alpha_{j}$ tends to infinity while $\beta_{j} r_{j}$ tends to zero. Let $g_{j}$ be a smooth cut-off function on $\partial \mathbb{D}$ such that

$$
g_{j}=1 \text { on } \partial \mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{D}\left(z, r_{j}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad g_{j}=0 \text { on } \partial \mathbb{D} \backslash \mathbb{D}\left(z, 2 r_{j}\right) .
$$

Set $f_{j}:=g_{j}-\alpha_{j} / 2$. Let $F_{j}$ be the harmonic extensions of $f_{j}$ to $\mathbb{D}$. It is clear that

$$
\int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} F_{j} \mathrm{~d} \mu=\int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} g_{j} \mathrm{~d} \mu-\alpha_{j} / 2 \geq \int_{\partial \mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{D}\left(z, r_{j}\right)} 1 \mathrm{~d} \mu-\alpha_{j} / 2=\alpha_{j}-\alpha_{j} / 2>0
$$

for large $j$ (in fact, for every $j$, after a moment of reflection).
Now we check that $F_{j}<0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \backslash \mathbb{D}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$ for large $j$. Since $\left\{\beta_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ tends to infinity, all but finite $\beta_{j} \geq 4$. In this case, $F_{j}=-\alpha_{j} / 2<0$ on $\partial \mathbb{D} \backslash \mathbb{D}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$. By the maximum principle, we only need to show that $F_{j}<0$ on $\partial \mathbb{D}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right) \cap \mathbb{D}$. The remaining argument is a standard application of the Poisson formula.

For every $w \in \partial \mathbb{D}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right) \cap \mathbb{D}$, read

$$
F_{j}(w)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} f_{j}\left(e^{i \theta}\right) \frac{1-|w|^{2}}{\left|e^{i \theta}-w\right|^{2}} \mathrm{~d} \theta=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} g_{j}\left(e^{i \theta}\right) \frac{1-|w|^{2}}{\left|e^{i \theta}-w\right|^{2}} \mathrm{~d} \theta-\alpha_{j} / 2
$$

The support of $g_{j}$ is in $\partial \mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{D}\left(z, 2 r_{j}\right)$, whose arc length is $(4+o(1)) r_{j} \leq 5 r_{j}$ for large $j$. Observe that $1-|w|^{2} \leq 2(1-|w|)=2(|z|-|w|) \leq 2|z-w| \leq 2 \beta_{j} r_{j}$. Moreover, for every $e^{i \theta}$ in $\partial \mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{D}\left(z, 2 r_{j}\right)$, we have $\left|e^{i \theta}-w\right| \geq|w-z|-\left|e^{i \theta}-z\right| \geq \beta_{j} r_{j}-2 r_{j} \geq \beta_{j} r_{j} / 2$. Thus we can conclude that

$$
F_{j}(w) \leq \frac{1}{2 \pi} \cdot 5 r_{j} \cdot \frac{2 \beta_{j} r_{j}}{\left(\beta_{j} r_{j} / 2\right)^{2}}-\alpha_{j} / 2=\frac{20}{\pi \beta_{j}}-\alpha_{j} / 2<0
$$

for large $j$.
We have a similar result for the hole $D$.
Lemma 3.4. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $\partial D$ and $z$ be a point in $\partial D$. Suppose that there exists a sequence $\left\{r_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ of positive radii shrinking to 0 such that $\mu\left(\mathbb{B}\left(z, r_{j}\right)\right) / r_{j}$ tends to infinity. Then there exist a positive sequence $\left\{\beta_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ tending to infinity and a sequence of functions $\left\{F_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ which are harmonic on $D$ and continuous on $\partial D$, such that $\beta_{j} r_{j}$ tends to 0 and such that for $j$ large enough, $F_{j}<0$ on $\bar{D} \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$ while $\int_{\partial D} F_{j} \mathrm{~d} \mu>0$.

Proof. If $D$ is simply connected, by the Riemann mapping theorem, we can find a biholomorphism $\phi: D \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$. By our assumption on the regularity of $\partial D$, the Kellogg theorem (cf. [34, p. 49]) guarantees that $\phi$ (resp. $\phi^{-1}$ ) can be continuously extended to the boundary and is Lipschitz on $\bar{D}$ (resp. $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ ). Thus we can apply Lemma 3.3 to conclude.

In general, when $D$ is not simply connected, take a small $\gamma>0$ such that $\mathbb{B}(z, \gamma)$ intersects only one connected component of $D$. Reducing $\gamma$ if necessary, we can draw a simply connected subset $D^{\prime} \subset D$ with smooth boundary such that $D \cap \mathbb{B}(z, \gamma) \subset D^{\prime}$.

Denote $\alpha_{j}:=\mu\left(\mathbb{B}\left(z, r_{j}\right)\right)$. Take $\beta_{j}:=1 / \sqrt{\alpha_{j} r_{j}}$, so that $\beta_{j} \alpha_{j}$ tends to infinity, while $\beta_{j} r_{j}$ tends to zero. Let $g_{j}$ be a smooth cut-off function on $\partial D$ such that

$$
g_{j}=1 \text { on } \partial D \cap \mathbb{B}\left(z, r_{j}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad g_{j}=0 \text { on } \partial D \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(z, 2 r_{j}\right) .
$$

Set $f_{j}:=g_{j}-\alpha_{j} / 2$. Let $F_{j}, G_{j}$ be the harmonic extensions of $f_{j}, g_{j}$ respectively to $D$, whose existence is guaranteed by [49, Theorem I.12] since $\partial D$ contains finitely many components. It is clear that

$$
\int_{\partial D} F_{j} \mathrm{~d} \mu=\int_{\partial D} g_{j} \mathrm{~d} \mu-\alpha_{j} / 2 \geq \alpha_{j}-\alpha_{j} / 2>0
$$

for every $j$.
Now we prove that $F_{j}<0$ on $\bar{D} \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$ for large $j$ by means of the maximum principle and the auxiliary simply connected subdomain $D^{\prime} \subset D$. By throwing some finite $j$ if necessary, we can assume that all $\beta_{j} r_{j}<\gamma$, hence $\partial \mathbb{B}\left(z_{j}, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right) \cap D$ coincides with $\partial \mathbb{B}\left(z_{j}, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right) \cap D^{\prime}$ by our choice of $D^{\prime}$.

Now we consider the restricted function of $G_{j}$ on $\partial D^{\prime}$, denoted by $h_{j}$. The key observation is that the support of $h_{j}$ is contained in the union of $\partial D^{\prime} \cap \mathbb{B}\left(z, 2 r_{j}\right)$ and $\partial D^{\prime} \backslash \partial D$, while these two segments keep relatively large distance compared with $\beta_{j} r_{j}$. This feature provides the opportunity for manipulating the Poisson formula on $D^{\prime}$ in the same spirit as using Katutani's formula on $D$.

By the Riemann mapping theorem and Kellogg's theorem, we can find a biholomorphism $\phi: D^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that both $\phi$ and $\phi^{-1}$ can be continuously extended to the boundaries and are K-Lipschitz with some positive constant K. Since $G_{j}$ solves the Dirichlet problem on $D^{\prime}$ with the boundary data $h_{j}$, by the Poisson formula, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{j}(w)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} h_{j} \circ \phi^{-1}\left(e^{i \theta}\right) \frac{1-|\phi(w)|^{2}}{\left|e^{i \theta}-\phi(w)\right|^{2}} \mathrm{~d} \theta \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $w$ in $\partial \mathbb{B}\left(z_{j}, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right) \cap D^{\prime}$. We only need to integral against two kinds of $\theta$, either $\phi^{-1}\left(e^{i \theta}\right) \in \partial D^{\prime} \cap \mathbb{B}\left(z, 2 r_{j}\right)$ or $\phi^{-1}\left(e^{i \theta}\right) \in \partial D^{\prime} \backslash \partial D$, since $h_{j} \circ \phi^{-1}\left(e^{i \theta}\right)$ vanishes otherwise. The first kind of integration contributes $O\left(\beta_{j}^{-1}\right)$ by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, using the fact that $\phi$ is Lipschitz. For the second kind of $\theta$ with $\phi^{-1}\left(e^{i \theta}\right) \in$ $\partial D^{\prime} \backslash \partial D$, noting that the distance between $\partial D^{\prime} \cap \mathbb{B}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$ and $\partial D^{\prime} \backslash \partial D$ is larger than a fixed positive number while $\beta_{j} r_{j}$ tends to zero, we can show that

$$
\frac{1-|\phi(w)|^{2}}{\left|e^{i \theta}-\phi(w)\right|^{2}}=O\left(\beta_{j} r_{j}\right)
$$

Indeed, $1-|\phi(w)|^{2} \leq 2(|\phi(z)|-|\phi(w)|) \leq 2|\phi(z)-\phi(w)| \leq 2 \mathrm{~K} \beta_{j} r_{j}$, while $\left|e^{i \theta}-\phi(w)\right|^{2} \geq \mathrm{K}^{-2} \operatorname{dist}\left(\phi^{-1}\left(e^{i \theta}\right), w\right)^{2}$, since both $\phi$ and $\phi^{-1}$ are K-Lipschitz. Thus the second kind of integration contributes $O\left(\beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$ because $0 \leq h_{j} \leq 1$ by the maximum
principle. Summarizing, for every $w$ in $\partial \mathbb{B}\left(z_{j}, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right) \cap D^{\prime}$, we have $G_{j}(w)=O\left(\beta_{j}^{-1}\right)+O\left(\beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$. Thus we can bound $F_{j}(w)=G_{j}(w)-\alpha_{j} / 2$ from above by

$$
O\left(\beta_{j}^{-1}\right)+O\left(\beta_{j} r_{j}\right)-\alpha_{j} / 2=\left(O\left(\beta_{j}^{-1}\right)-\alpha_{j} / 4\right)+\left(O\left(\beta_{j} r_{j}\right)-\alpha_{j} / 4\right) .
$$

Both brackets $(\cdots)$ are negative for large $j$ by our choice of $\beta_{j}$. Hence we conclude the proof by the maximum principle.

Proof of Proposition 3.1 Assume on the contrary that such $c_{D}$ does not exist. Then by Vitali's covering (e.g. [27, Chapter 2]), we can find some point $z \in \partial D$ with a sequence $\left\{r_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ of positive radii tending to zero such that $\nu_{\partial D}\left(\mathbb{B}\left(z, r_{j}\right)\right) / r_{j} \rightarrow \infty$. By considering the probability measure $c \nu_{\partial D}$ for a suitable $c$ and applying Lemma 3.3, we can find a positive sequence $\left\{\beta_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ tending to zero and a sequence of functions $F_{j}$, which are harmonic on $D$ and continuous on $\partial D$, such that $\beta_{j} r_{j}$ tends to zero, $F_{j}<0$ on $\bar{D} \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(z, \beta_{j} r_{j}\right)$, and that $\int_{\partial D} F_{j} \mathrm{~d} \nu_{\partial D}>0$ for all $j$.

On the other hand, recall that $U_{\nu_{D}}$ is strictly negative on the component of $\partial D$ having positive $\nu_{\partial D}$ measure. In particular, $U_{\nu_{D}}(z)<0$. By the upper semi-continuity of $U_{\nu_{D}}$, when $\beta_{j} r_{j}$ is small enough, for some small positive constant $\delta$, the function $\delta F_{j}$ satisfies that

$$
\delta F_{j}+U_{\nu_{D}} \leq 0 \text { on } \bar{D} \text { and } \int_{\partial D} \delta F_{j} \mathrm{~d} \nu_{D}>0 .
$$

This contradicts to Proposition 3.2.
Now we can state the regularity result for $U_{\nu_{D}}$. The proof is standard, which is a consequence of Proposition 3.1. We provide it here for the convenience of the readers.
Proposition 3.5. The quasi-potential $U_{\nu_{D}}$ is $1 / 3$-Hölder.
Proof. Recall the decomposition $\nu_{D}=\left.\omega\right|_{S_{D}}+\nu_{\partial D}$ and $U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}=U_{\omega \mid S_{D}}^{\prime}+U_{\nu_{\partial D}}^{\prime}$. It is enough to show that $U_{\nu_{\partial D}}^{\prime}$ is Hölder. Using (2.7), we have

$$
U_{\nu_{\partial D}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\nu_{\partial D}}^{\prime}(w)=\int U_{\nu_{\partial D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d}\left(\delta_{z}-\delta_{w}\right)=\int\left(U_{\delta_{z}}^{\prime}-U_{\delta_{w}}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{d} \nu_{\partial D}
$$

By (2.6), we obtain that

$$
U_{\delta_{z}}^{\prime}(y)-U_{\delta_{w}}^{\prime}(y)=\varrho(z, y)-\varrho(w, y)+\log \operatorname{dist}(z, y)-\log \operatorname{dist}(w, y)
$$

where $\varrho$ is Lipschitz. Hence we only need to estimate the integration

$$
\int(\log \operatorname{dist}(z, y)-\log \operatorname{dist}(w, y)) \mathrm{d} \nu_{\partial D}(y)
$$

Fix a small $a>0$ to be determined. We only need to consider the case that $\operatorname{dist}(z, w) \leq a$. Let us separate the integration in two parts as

$$
\left(\int_{\operatorname{dist}(z, y)>2 a}+\int_{\operatorname{dist}(z, y) \leq 2 a}\right)(\log \operatorname{dist}(z, y)-\log \operatorname{dist}(w, y)) \mathrm{d} \nu_{\partial D}(y) .
$$

If $\operatorname{dist}(z, y)>2 a$, then $\operatorname{dist}(w, y)>a$. Using Proposition 3.1 and mean value theorem, we can obtain that

$$
\left|\int_{\operatorname{dist}(z, y)>2 a}(\log \operatorname{dist}(z, y)-\log \operatorname{dist}(w, y)) \mathrm{d} \nu_{\partial D}(y)\right|
$$

$$
\leq c_{D}^{\prime} \int_{\operatorname{dist}(z, y)>2 a} \operatorname{dist}(z, w) \cdot \operatorname{dist}(w, y)^{-1} \operatorname{dLeb}(\partial D) \leq c_{D}^{\prime} a^{-1} \cdot \operatorname{dist}(z, w)
$$

where $\operatorname{Leb}(\partial D)$ is the probability measure on $\partial D$ proportional to arc length.
If $\operatorname{dist}(z, y) \leq 2 a$, then $\operatorname{dist}(w, y) \leq 3 a$. Using Proposition 3.1 again, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{\operatorname{dist}(z, y) \leq 2 a}(\log \operatorname{dist}(z, y)-\log \operatorname{dist}(w, y)) \mathrm{d} \nu_{\partial D}(y)\right| \\
& \leq c_{D}^{\prime \prime}\left|\int_{\operatorname{dist}(z, y) \leq 2 a} \log \operatorname{dist}(z, y) \operatorname{dLeb}(\partial D)\right|+c_{D}^{\prime \prime}\left|\int_{\operatorname{dist}(w, y) \leq 3 a} \log \operatorname{dist}(w, y) \operatorname{dLeb}(\partial D)\right|,
\end{aligned}
$$

which is $O\left(c_{D}^{\prime \prime} a|\log a|\right)$. Thus, by taking $a:=\sqrt{\operatorname{dist}(z, w)}$, we finish the proof.
Remark 3.6. Actually we can show that $U_{\nu_{D}}$ is Lipschitz. Nevertheless, any $\gamma$-Hölder continuity of $U_{\nu_{D}}$ for some $\gamma>0$ suffices for our purpose. Our boundary assumption on $\partial D$ is also not optimal; as long as $\partial D$ is $\mathscr{C}^{1+\epsilon}$ and does not contain cusps, $U_{\nu_{D}}$ is $\gamma$-Hölder continuous for some $\gamma>0$. To keep this article in an economical length, we prefer not to go further in this direction.

## 4. Fekete points of the hole events

For proving Theorem 1.1, we need to investigate the minimum value of the functional $-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}$ defined on $(X \backslash D)^{(m)}$. To this aim, we adapt the theory of logarithmic potentials with external fields (cf. [36, Chapter I]) to compact Riemann surfaces.

For a closed subset $E$, its $\omega$-capacity is defined as

$$
\operatorname{cap}_{\omega}(E):=\sup _{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(E)} \exp \left[\int_{X} U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu\right],
$$

where $U_{\nu}^{\prime}$ is the $\omega$-potential of type I of $\nu$, see (2.6). If a property holds outside a capacity zero set, then we say that it holds quasi-everywhere. It is a fact that if the $\omega$-capacity of $E$ is zero, then the $\omega^{\prime}$-capacity of $E$ is again zero for any other smooth positive (1,1)-form $\omega^{\prime}$ on $X$ giving unit area. Another fact is that a capacity zero set is a polar set.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $X$ such that $\int_{X} U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu$ is finite. If $\operatorname{cap}_{\omega}(E)=0$, then $\mu(E)=0$.

Proof. Assume that $\mu(E)>0$ on the contrary. Then we can take a probability measure $\mu_{E}:=\left.c \mu\right|_{E}$ for some appropriate $c>0$. Note that $\int_{X} U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu>-\infty$ implies that $\int_{X} U_{\mu_{E}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu_{E}>-\infty$. Thus we have $\operatorname{cap}_{\omega}(E) \geq \exp \left[\int_{X} U_{\mu_{E}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu_{E}\right]>0$, which is absurd.

Let $Q$ be a real continuous function on $X$. Define the functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{J}^{Q}(\mu):=-\int_{X} U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu+2 \int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \mu \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $\mu$ in $\mathcal{M}(X \backslash D)$. Here $Q$ is called an external field. We have the following analog of [36, Theorem I.1.3].

Theorem 4.2. The functional $\mathcal{J}^{Q}$ admits a unique minimizer $\nu_{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(X \backslash D)$ with continuous $\omega$-potential $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ of type I. Moreover, one has
(1) $-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q \geq \min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ on $X \backslash D$;
(2) $-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q=\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ on $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$.

Proof. The existence of $\nu_{Q}$ follows from the continuity of $Q$. The uniqueness is based on a well-known fact that $\mu \mapsto-\int_{X} U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu$ is strictly convex whenever it is finite, see e.g. [50, Proposition 12]. Now we verify the remaining two statements.

We first show that (1) holds on $X \backslash D$ quasi-everywhere. Suppose, on the contrary, that $E:=\left\{-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q<\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}\right\} \backslash D$ has positive capacity. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{a}:=\left\{-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q \leq \min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}-a\right\} \backslash D \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

also has positive capacity for some small $a>0$. Hence we can find some probability measure $\sigma$ supported on $E_{a}$ such that $\int_{X} U_{\sigma}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma$ is finite. On the other hand, note that

$$
\int_{X}\left(-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q\right) \mathrm{d} \nu_{Q}=-\int_{X} U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{Q}+\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}=\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}
$$

Since $-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q$ is lower semicontinuous, there exists a closed ball $B \subset X \backslash D$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q>\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}-a / 2 \quad \text { on } B, \quad \text { and } \quad \nu_{Q}(B)>0 \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Set $c:=\nu_{Q}(B)>0$. Consider the probability measure $\sigma_{\varepsilon}:=\nu_{Q}+\varepsilon\left(c \sigma-\left.\nu_{Q}\right|_{B}\right)$ on $X$ for small $\varepsilon>0$ to be determined. Using (2.7), we can rewrite $\mathcal{J}^{Q}\left(\sigma_{\varepsilon}\right)$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{J}^{Q}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)-2 \int_{X} U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d}\left(\varepsilon c \sigma-\left.\varepsilon \nu_{Q}\right|_{B}\right)+2 \int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d}\left(\varepsilon c \sigma-\left.\varepsilon \nu_{Q}\right|_{B}\right)+O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right) \\
= & \mathcal{J}^{Q}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)+2 \int_{X}\left(-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q\right) \mathrm{d}(\varepsilon c \sigma)-2 \int_{X}\left(-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+Q\right) \mathrm{d}\left(\left.\varepsilon \nu_{Q}\right|_{B}\right)+O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right) \\
\leq & \mathcal{J}^{Q}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)-2 \cdot a \cdot \varepsilon c+2 \cdot a / 2 \cdot \varepsilon c+O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right) \quad \text { [use (4.2), (4.3)] } \\
= & \mathcal{J}^{Q}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)-c a \varepsilon+O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, for $\varepsilon$ small enough, $\mathcal{J}^{Q}\left(\nu_{\varepsilon}\right)<\mathcal{J}^{Q}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. This is impossible, because $\nu_{Q}$ is the minimizer of $\mathcal{J}^{Q}$.

Next, we prove (2). Since $\int_{X} U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{Q}$ is finite, the set $E$ of capacity zero must have $\nu_{Q^{-}}$ measure 0 by Lemma 4.1. Hence (1) holds $\nu_{Q}$-almost everywhere. Moreover, $\int_{X}\left(-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+\right.$ $Q) \mathrm{d} \nu_{Q}=\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ imples that (2) holds $\nu_{Q}$-almost everywhere on $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. The lower semi-continuity of $-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ implies (2) holds everywhere on $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$.

Lastly, we come back to prove (1). From (2), we see that $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ is continuous as a function on $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. By a classical result [49, p. 54, Theorem III.2], $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ is continuous on the whole $X$. Hence (1) holds everywhere on $X \backslash D$.
Theorem 4.3. One has

$$
U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}=\sup _{\phi}\{\phi \text { is } \omega \text {-subharmonic : } \phi \leq Q \text { on } X \backslash D\}^{*}
$$

Here $*$ means the upper semicontinuous regularization.
Proof. By Theorem4.2, $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ itself is an $\omega$-subharmonic function which is bounded from above by $Q$ on $X \backslash D$. Hence the direction " $\leq$ " is done.

Denote the function on the right hand side by $V$, which is $\omega$-subharmonic as well. For the probability measure $\nu:=\operatorname{dd}^{c} V+\omega$, we have $\operatorname{dd}^{c}\left(V-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}\right)=\nu-\nu_{Q}$. Thus $V-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$
is subharmonic on $X \backslash \operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. By Theorem 4.2, $Q=U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ on $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$ while $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ is continuous, hence $V=U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ on $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. By the maximum principle, $V-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime} \leq \min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ on $X \backslash \operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. This shows " $\geq$ ".

For each $m>1$ and $\mathbf{p} \in(X \backslash D)^{(m)}$, define (see (2.8), (2.11))

$$
\mathcal{K}_{m}^{Q}(\mathbf{p}):=-\frac{m}{m-1} \mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \delta_{\mathbf{p}}
$$

Let $\mathbf{f}_{m}=\sum_{j=1}^{m} f_{m, j}$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{K}_{m}^{Q}$. It may not be unique and we just fix one. We call $\mathscr{F}_{m}:=\left\{f_{m, 1}, \ldots, f_{m, m}\right\}$ an $m$-th Fekete set and call $f_{m, j}$ Fekete points. Obviously, all the points in $\mathscr{F}_{m} \subset X \backslash D$ are pairwise distinct.
Theorem 4.4. One has $-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}(x)+Q(x)=\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ for every $x$ in $\mathscr{F}_{m}$.
Proof. By Theorem 4.2, we only need to show that $-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}(x)+Q(x) \leq \min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}$ every $x$ in $\mathscr{F}_{m}$. Without loss of generality, we take $x=f_{m, 1}$. Define the function

$$
F(z):=\mathcal{K}_{m}^{Q}\left(z+f_{m, 2}+\cdots+f_{m, m}\right)
$$

for $z \in X \backslash D$, which attends a minimum value at $z=f_{m, 1}$. Write $\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}:=f_{m, 2}+\cdots+f_{m, m}$. By the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{m}$, the new function (see (2.6))

$$
\widetilde{F}(z):=-\frac{m}{m-1} \frac{2}{m^{2}} \sum_{j \geq 2} G\left(z, f_{m, j}\right)+\frac{2}{m} Q(z)=\frac{2}{m}\left(-U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}(z)+Q(z)\right)
$$

must attend its minimum on $X \backslash D$ at $z=f_{m, 1}$. In other words,

$$
\begin{equation*}
-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)+Q\left(f_{m, 1}\right) \leq-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}(z)+Q(z), \quad \forall z \in X \backslash D . \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we consider the auxiliary function $\phi(z):=U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\delta_{f^{\prime}}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)+Q\left(f_{m, 1}\right)$ on $X$. Clearly, it is $\omega$-subharmonic and bounded from above by $Q$ on $X \backslash D$. By Theorem4.3,

$$
\phi(z) \leq U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}(z)+\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} Q \mathrm{~d} \nu_{Q}, \quad \forall z \in X .
$$

Taking $z=f_{m, 1}$, we obtain the desired inequality.
Using the theorems above, one can show that $\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}$ converges to $\nu_{Q}$ weakly. Since we do not need this in this article, we left the proof to the readers. Now we show that any two Fekete points cannot be too close.

Proposition 4.5. If $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ is $\gamma$-Hölder for some $0<\gamma \leq 1$, then there exists a constant $c_{Q}>0$ independent of $m$ such that

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, j_{1}}, f_{m, j_{2}}\right) \geq c_{Q} m^{-1 / \gamma}, \quad \text { if } \quad j_{1} \neq j_{2}
$$

Some arguments in the proof are inspired by [31, Proposition A.2], though technically much more involved. One new difficulty is to find appropriate local holomorphic coordinate charts on $X$ to apply the Schwarz lemma. Another new difficulty is to deal with the local weight functions of certain holomorphic line bundles. The next two lemmas will be useful for handling the mentioned two difficulties respectively.

Lemma 4.6. Let $g: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a holomorphic function. Let $x, y$ be two points in $\mathbb{D}$. Assume that $g(y)=0,|g(x)|=a$, and that $\sup _{U}|g|<b$ for some constant $a, b>0$, where $U \subset \mathbb{D}$ is a simply connected region containing $x$. Then $|x-y| \geqslant \frac{a}{a+b} \cdot \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial U)$.

Proof. Assume on the contrary that $|x-y|<\frac{a}{a+b} \cdot \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial U)$. Then $y \in U$, and

$$
\operatorname{dist}(y, \partial U) \geqslant \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial U)-|x-y| \geqslant \frac{b}{a+b} \cdot \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial U)>\frac{b}{a} \cdot|x-y|
$$

Hence the disc $D^{\prime}:=\mathbb{D}\left(y, \frac{b}{a} \cdot|x-y|\right)$ centered at $y$ with the radius $\frac{b}{a} \cdot|x-y|$ is contained in $U$. By the maximum principle, $\sup _{D^{\prime}}|g| \leqslant \sup _{U}|g|<b$. Thus by the Schwarz lemma, noting that $g(y)=0$, we obtain that

$$
|g(x)|=|g(y+(x-y))| \leqslant \frac{|x-y|}{\frac{b}{a} \cdot|x-y|} \cdot \sup _{D^{\prime}}|g|<\frac{a}{b} \cdot b=a,
$$

which is absurd.
Lemma 4.7. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a holomorphic line bundle on $X$, and let $U \subset X$ be a simply connected region. Let $\mathfrak{h}_{1}, \mathfrak{h}_{2}$ be two smooth metrics of $\mathcal{L}$ over $U$, giving the same curvature. Then for any holomorphic section $s_{1} \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{L})$ of $\mathcal{L}$ on $U$, one can find a holomorphic section $s_{2} \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{L})$ with $\left\|s_{2}\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{2}}=\left\|s_{1}\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{1}}$ on $U$.
Proof. We can define the ratio $\mathfrak{h}_{2} / \mathfrak{h}_{1}$ at every point of $U$, and check that it is a positive smooth function on $U$. Since the curvature of $\mathfrak{h}_{1}$ and $\mathfrak{h}_{2}$ coincide, $\log \left(\mathfrak{h}_{2} / \mathfrak{h}_{1}\right)$ is a harmonic function on $U$. As $U$ is simply connected, we can write $\log \left(\mathfrak{h}_{2} / \mathfrak{h}_{1}\right)=\operatorname{Re}(u)$ as the real part of a holomorphic funtion $u \in \mathscr{O}(U)$. Hence $s_{2}:=e^{u} \cdot s_{1}$ suffices.

Proof of Proposition 4.5 Step 1. By symmetry, we only need to show the existence of $c_{Q}>0$ and $M_{Q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$such that $\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, 2}\right) \geq c_{Q} m^{-1 / \gamma}$ for all $m \geq M_{Q}$.

Write $\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}:=f_{m, 2}+\cdots+f_{m, m}$. For $z \in \operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$, by Theorems 4.2, 4.4 and (4.4), we have

$$
U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right) \leq Q(z)-Q\left(f_{m, 1}\right)=U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right) .
$$

Consequently, $U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}(z) \leq U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)$ for $z \in \operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. Since $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ is harmonic outside $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right), U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime \prime}$ is subharmonic on $X \backslash \operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{Q}\right)$. By the maximum principle,

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right) \leq U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right) \quad \text { for all } \quad z \in X \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}$ is $\gamma$-Hölder continuous with some constant $A:=\left\|U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}_{\gamma}}$, if $\operatorname{dist}\left(z, f_{m, 1}\right) \leq$ $(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma}$, the right-hand-side of (4.5) is $\leq A \cdot(m-1)^{-1}$. Hence (2.9) implies that

$$
\log \left\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}\right)}(z)\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{m}^{\prime}}-\log \left\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}\right)}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{f}_{m}^{\prime}}} \leq A \cdot(m-1)^{-1}
$$

or equivalently (let $\mathfrak{h}_{j}$ be the metric of $\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\prod_{j=2}^{m}\left\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)}\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{j}}(z)}{\prod_{j=2}^{m}\left\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)}\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{j}}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)} \leq e^{A}, \quad \forall z \in \mathbf{B}_{m}:=\mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, 1},(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma}\right) \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Step 2. The idea is to show that $f_{m, 2}$ can not be too close to $f_{m, 1}$ by exploring (4.6). First, we make some technical preparations which will be essential later.

For every point $y \in X$, we take a local holomorphic chart $g_{y}: \mathbb{D}_{2} \rightarrow V_{y}$ with $g_{y}(0)=y$. Since $\left\{g_{y}(\mathbb{D})\right\}_{y \in X}$ covers $X$, by compactness, we can take finitely many points $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{M}$ such that $X$ is covered by the union of $W_{j}:=g_{y_{j}}(\mathbb{D})$ for $j=1, \ldots, M$.

Since each $g_{y_{j}}: \mathbb{D}_{2} \rightarrow V_{y_{j}}$ is a biholomorphism, by compactness, both the restrictions $g_{y_{j}} \mid \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\left.g_{y_{j}}^{-1}\right|_{\overline{W_{j}}}$ are $\mathrm{K}_{j}$-Lipschitz for some large $\mathrm{K}_{j}>0$ with respect to the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{D}$ and the given distance on $X$. Set $\mathrm{K}:=\max \left\{\mathrm{K}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~K}_{M}\right\}$.

For each $j=1,2, \ldots, m$, we fix a smooth weight function $\rho_{j}$ on $V_{y_{j}}$ satisfying the equation $\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \rho_{j}=\omega$. By compactness, we can take some large constant $\mathrm{K}^{\prime}>0$ such that all $\rho_{j}$ are $\mathrm{K}^{\prime}$-Lipschitz on $W_{j}$ for $j=1,2, \ldots, M$.
Step 3. By compactness argument, there exists some uniform radius $r>0$ such that for any $z \in X$, the small disc $\mathbb{B}(z, r)$ is contained entirely in one of $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{M}$. Take a large integer $M_{Q}$ so that $(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma}<r$ for all $m \geq M_{Q}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{B}_{m} \subset W_{1}$.

Since $W_{1}$ is open, any holomorphic line bundle on $W_{1}$ is holomorphically trivial (cf. [17, p. 229]). In particular, for each line bundle $\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right), j=2, \ldots, m$, we can fix a nowhere vanishing section $e_{j} \in \Gamma\left(W_{1}, \mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right)$ and use it to trivialize $\left.\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right|_{W_{1}}$ by identifying every holomorphic section $s \in \Gamma\left(W_{1}, \mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right)$ with the holomorphic function $s / e_{j} \in \mathscr{O}\left(W_{1}\right)$. In accordance with this trivialization, the metric $\left.\mathfrak{h}_{j}\right|_{W_{1}}$ of $\left.\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right|_{W_{1}}$ defines a smooth weight function $\varphi_{j}$ on $W_{1}$ by the law

$$
\|s\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{j}}(z)=\left|s / e_{j}\right|(z) \cdot e^{-\varphi_{j}(z)}, \quad \forall z \in W_{1} .
$$

Since the curvature of $\mathfrak{h}_{j}$ is $\omega$, we have $\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \varphi_{j}=\omega$.
In this way, each canonical section $\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)} \in \Gamma\left(W_{1}, \mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right)$ for $j=2, \ldots, m$ has norm

$$
\left\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)}\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{j}}(z)=\left|h_{j}(z)\right| \cdot e^{-\varphi_{j}(z)}, \quad \forall z \in W_{1}
$$

where $h_{j}:=\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)} / e_{j}$ is some holomorphic functions. Hence we can read (4.6) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\prod_{j=2}^{m}\left|h_{j}(z)\right| \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{m} e^{-\varphi_{j}(z)}}{\prod_{j=2}^{m}\left|h_{j}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)\right| \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{m} e^{-\varphi_{j}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)}} \leq e^{A}, \quad \forall z \in \mathbf{B}_{m} \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Step 4. For some technical reason to be seen later, we would like to have some uniform Lipschitz bound of each $\varphi_{j}$ on $W_{1}$. One way to achieve this is by using some singularity decomposition result (see Lemma (2.2)) of the Green kernel $G(x, y)$ near the diagonal $\{x=y\} \subset X \times X$ and by choosing appropriate $e_{j}, \varphi_{j}$.

Nevertheless, here we present an alternative method. To apply Lemma (4.7), for every $j=2, \ldots, m$, we define another metric $\mathfrak{h}_{j}^{\prime}$ of the line bundle $\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)$ on $W_{1}$, by evaluating any holomorphic section $s \in \Gamma\left(W_{1}, \mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right)$ with the norm $\|s\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{j}^{\prime}}(z)=\left|s / e_{j}\right|(z) \cdot e^{-\rho_{1}(z)}$ at each point $z \in W_{1}$. Since dd ${ }^{\mathrm{c}} \rho_{1}=\omega$, the curvature of $\mathfrak{h}_{j}^{\prime}$ coincide with that of $\mathfrak{h}_{j}$ on $W_{1}$. By Lemma (4.7), we can find some holomorphic section $\mathbf{1}_{j}^{\prime} \in \Gamma\left(W_{1}, \mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right)$ with the norm equality $\left\|\mathbf{1}_{\overparen{O}\left(f_{m, j}\right)}\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{j}}=\left\|\mathbf{1}_{j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{j}^{\prime}}$ on $W_{1}$. Equivalent, we have

$$
\left|h_{j}(z)\right| \cdot e^{-\varphi_{j}(z)}=\left|\widehat{h_{j}}(z)\right| \cdot e^{-\rho_{1}(z)}, \quad \forall z \in W_{1}
$$

where $\widehat{h_{j}}:=\mathbf{1}_{j}^{\prime} / e_{j} \in \mathscr{O}\left(W_{1}\right)$ is the representative holomorphic function of $\mathbf{1}_{j}^{\prime}$ in the local trivialization. Thus we can rewrite (4.7) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\prod_{j=2} \widehat{h}_{j}(z)}{\prod_{j=2} \widehat{h}_{j}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)} \cdot e^{\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left[\rho_{1}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-\rho_{1}(z)\right]} \leq e^{A}, \quad \forall z \in \mathbf{B}_{m} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that by our preparation, the weight function $\rho_{1}$ is $\mathrm{K}^{\prime}$-Lipschitz on $W_{1}$, which contains $\mathbf{B}_{m}$. Hence we have

$$
\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left|\rho_{1}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-\rho_{1}(z)\right| \leq(m-1) \cdot \mathrm{K}^{\prime} \cdot(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma} \leq \mathrm{K}^{\prime}, \quad \forall z \in \mathbf{B}_{m}
$$

By the above two estimates, the holomorphic function

$$
H:=\prod_{j=2}^{m} \frac{\widehat{h}_{j}}{\widehat{h}_{j}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)},
$$

which is well-defined on $W_{1}$, has absolute norm $\leq e^{A+\mathrm{K}^{\prime}}$ on $\mathbf{B}_{m}$.
Step 5. Assume on the contrary that $\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, 2}\right)<\lambda \cdot(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma}$ for some sufficiently small $\lambda$. It is clear that $f_{m, 2} \in \mathbf{B}_{m}, H\left(f_{m, 1}\right)=1$, and that $H\left(f_{m, 2}\right)=0$ because the canonical section $\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{O}\left(f_{m, 2}\right)}$ vanishes at $f_{m, 2}$ by definition.

Now we are in a position to apply Lemma 4.6 upon

$$
g:=H \circ g_{y_{1}}, x:=g_{y_{1}}^{-1}\left(f_{m, 1}\right), y:=g_{y_{1}}^{-1}\left(f_{m, 2}\right), a=1, b:=e^{A+K^{\prime}}, U:=g_{y_{1}}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{B}_{m}\right)
$$

Since $g_{y_{1}}$ is K-Lipschitz by our preparation,

$$
(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma}=\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, \partial \mathbf{B}_{m}\right)=\operatorname{dist}\left(g_{y_{1}}(x), g_{y_{1}}(\partial U)\right) \leq \mathrm{K} \cdot \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial U)
$$

Thus Lemma 4.6 guarantees that

$$
|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{1+e^{A+\mathrm{K}^{\prime}}} \cdot \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial U) \geq \frac{1}{1+e^{A+\mathrm{K}^{\prime}}} \cdot \mathbf{K}^{-1} \cdot(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma}
$$

On the other hand, $g_{y_{1}}^{-1}$ is also K-Lipschitz. Hence

$$
|x-y|=\left|g_{y_{1}}^{-1}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-g_{y_{1}}^{-1}\left(f_{m, 2}\right)\right| \leq \mathrm{K} \cdot \operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, 2}\right)
$$

Summarizing the above two inequalities, we obtain

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, 2}\right) \geq \frac{1}{1+e^{A+B}} \cdot \mathbf{K}^{-2} \cdot(m-1)^{-1 / \gamma}
$$

Therefore, if $\lambda<\frac{\mathrm{K}^{-2}}{1+e^{A+K^{\prime}}}$, we get a contradiction. Hence $c_{Q}=\frac{\mathrm{K}^{-2}}{1+e^{A+K^{\prime}}}$ suffices.

## 5. Functional values with Fekete points

This goal of this section is to find a $\mathbf{p} \in(X \backslash D)^{(m)}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime} \leq \min \mathcal{I}_{D}+O(\log m / m) \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The minimizer of $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ is $\nu_{D}$. While we do not know much about $-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}$. We will make use of the two functionals $\mathcal{J}^{Q}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{m}^{Q}$ defined in Section 4. These functionals are linked according through the following result.

Proposition 5.1. For $Q:=U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}$, one has $\nu_{Q}=\nu_{D}$.
Proof. Since $\operatorname{supp}\left(\nu_{D}\right) \subset X \backslash D$, integrating the first inequality in Theorem 4.2 against $\nu$, we get

$$
-\int U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}+\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D} \geq \min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{Q}
$$

Using (2.7), we obtain $\min \mathcal{J}^{Q} \leq \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}$.

On the other hand, $Q$ itself is an $\omega$-subharmonic function and is bounded from above by $Q$ on $X \backslash D$. By Theorem4.3, we have

$$
U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \leq U_{\nu_{Q}}^{\prime}+\min \mathcal{J}^{Q}-\int_{X} U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{Q} .
$$

Integrating this inequality against $\nu_{D}$, we get $\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D} \leq \min \mathcal{J}^{Q}$. By the uniqueness of the minimizer of the functional $\mathcal{J}^{Q}$ (see Theorem4.2), we conclude that $\nu_{Q}=\nu_{D}$.

The functional $\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})$ can be viewed as a discrete version of $\int U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu$. Thus, the functionals $-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}, \mathcal{K}_{m}^{Q}(\mathbf{p})$ are discrete versions of $\mathcal{I}_{D}(\mu), \mathcal{J}^{Q}(\mu)$ respectively. The advantage of introducing $\mathcal{J}^{Q}$ is that under the setting of complex plane $\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{J}^{Q}$ was well-studied, see e.g. [36]. Thus, using Proposition 5.1, we will find a p satisfying (5.1), from the Fekete points of $\mathcal{K}_{m}^{Q}(\mathbf{p})$.

From now on, we fix the external field $Q:=U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}$, which is $1 / 3$-Hölder continuous by Proposition 3.5. Hence Proposition 4.5 guarantees that distinct Fekete points $f_{m, 1}, \ldots, f_{m, m}$ are separated for every large $m \gg 1$, with a distance estimate $\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, j_{1}}, f_{m, j_{2}}\right) \geq c_{Q} m^{-3}$ for $j_{1} \neq j_{2}$ (we still use $c_{Q}$ for convenience in this section, which is depending on $D$ ).

The following probability measure $\eta$ will be used two times later.
Lemma 5.2. Let $E$ be a subset of $X$ (not necessary open) with with finitely many connected components, whose boundary $\bar{E} \backslash \operatorname{int}(E)$ consists of disjoint smooth curves. Then there exists a probability measure $\eta$ supported on $\bar{E}$, such that $U_{\eta}^{\prime}$ is constant on $\bar{E}$ and attends its minimum on $\bar{E}$.

Proof. Consider

$$
\Psi:=\sup _{\phi}\{\phi \text { is } \omega \text {-subharmonic : } \phi \leq 0 \text { on } E\}^{*} .
$$

Let $\eta:=\operatorname{dd}^{c} \Psi+\omega$. The remaining proof goes the same as [50, Theorem 21]. This $\eta$ is also the minimizer of the functional

$$
\mu \mapsto-\int_{X} U_{\mu}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \mu \quad \text { for } \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{E}) .
$$

The assumptions on the boundary of $E$ is to ensure the continuity of $U_{\eta}^{\prime}$.
Let $\sigma_{m, j}$ be the probability measure on $\partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, j}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$ induced by arc lengths. Define the probability measure

$$
\sigma_{m}:=\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sigma_{m, j} .
$$

We will use $\sigma_{m}$ to approximate $\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}$, because $\int U_{\delta_{f_{m}}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}=-\infty$, while $\int U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m}>-\infty$.
Lemma 5.3. There exists some constant $C_{D}>0$, such that for all sufficiently large $m \gg 1$, for any $w \in \partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, j}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$, one has

$$
\left|U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}^{\prime}(w)\right| \leq C_{D} \log m / m
$$

Proof. We may assume $w \in \partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, 1}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$. The argument is by straightforward computation, using (2.6) and Lemma 2.2, $\left|U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}^{\prime}(w)\right|$ is bounded by

$$
\left|\int \log \operatorname{dist}(w, x) \mathrm{d}\left(\sigma_{m}-\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)(x)\right|+\left|\int \varrho(w, x) \mathrm{d}\left(\sigma_{m}-\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)(x)\right|
$$

Since $\varrho$ is Lipschitz, the second term is $O\left(m^{-5}\right)$. By definition, the first term is bounded by

$$
\frac{1}{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \int\left|\log \operatorname{dist}(w, x)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, \ell}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, \ell}(x)
$$

When $\ell \neq 1$, recall the support of $\sigma_{m, \ell}$ is $\partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, \ell}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$ and $\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, \ell}\right)>c_{Q} m^{-3} / 2$. By the monotonicity of the $\log$ function, for $x \in \operatorname{supp}\left(\sigma_{m, \ell}\right)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\log \operatorname{dist}(w, x)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, \ell}\right)\right| \leq \\
& \quad \max \left(\log \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, \ell}\right)}{\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, \ell}\right)-c_{Q} m^{-5}}, \log \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, \ell}\right)+c_{Q} m^{-5}}{\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, \ell}\right)}\right)=\frac{O(1)}{m^{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It remains to estimate the first term with $\ell=1$. Since $\sigma_{m, 1}$ is the probability measure on $\mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, 1}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$ induced by arc length, we have
$\int\left|\log \operatorname{dist}(w, x)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, 1}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, 1}(x) \leq \int|\log \operatorname{dist}(w, x)| \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, 1}(x)+\left|\log \left(c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)\right|$, which is $O(\log m)$ by the singular integration formula

$$
\int \log |w-z| \operatorname{dLeb}_{\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)}(z)=\log \left(c_{Q} m^{-5}\right) \quad \text { for } \quad z \in \partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)
$$

where $\operatorname{Leb}_{\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)}$ is the Lebesgue probability measure on $\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$. The proof of the lemma is finished.

Lemma 5.4. There exists a constant $C_{D}>0$ independent of $m$ such that

$$
\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} \geq-C_{D} \frac{\log m}{m}
$$

for all sufficiently large $m \gg 1$.
Proof. By integrating (4.5) against $\nu_{D}=\nu_{Q}$, and by using (2.7), we obtain

$$
\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right) \leq \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} \geq U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)+\varepsilon_{m, D} \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\varepsilon_{m, D}:=\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}=\frac{1}{m(m-1)} \cdot \sum_{j=2}^{m} U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, j}\right)-\frac{1}{m} \cdot U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)
$$

clearly satisfies that $\left|\varepsilon_{m, D}\right| \leq 2 \cdot m^{-1} \cdot \max \left|U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\right|=O\left(m^{-1}\right)$. It remains to show that $U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right) \geq-C_{D} \log m / m$.

Let $w \in X$ be a point near $f_{m, 1}$ with $\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, 1}\right)=c_{Q} m^{-5}$. Using (2.6) and Lemma 2.2, we can bound $\left|U_{\delta_{f_{m}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}}^{\prime}(w)\right|$ from above by the sum of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{m}\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, 1}\right)\right|+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left|\frac{1}{m} \log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, j}\right)-\frac{1}{m-1} \log \operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, j}\right)\right| \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{m}\left|\varrho\left(w, f_{m, 1}\right)\right|+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left|\frac{1}{m} \varrho\left(w, f_{m, j}\right)-\frac{1}{m-1} \varrho\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, j}\right)\right| \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\varrho$ is Lipschitz, (5.4) is $O\left(m^{-1}\right)$. By the monotonicity of the log function,
$\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, j}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, j}\right)\right| \leq$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left(\log \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, j}\right)}{\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, j}\right)-c_{Q} m^{-5}}, \log \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, j}\right)+c_{Q} m^{-5}}{\operatorname{dist}\left(w, f_{m, j}\right)}\right)=\frac{O(1)}{m^{2}} \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

because $\operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, 1}, f_{m, j}\right) \geq c_{Q} m^{-3}$ by Proposition 4.5. Hence (5.3) is $O(\log m / m)$. Summarizing, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}}^{\prime}(w)\right|=O(\log m / m) \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, the $1 / 3$-Hölder continuity of $U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}$ yields

$$
\left|U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}(w)\right|=O\left(m^{-5 / 3}\right)<1 / m
$$

for large $m \gg 1$. Thus we conclude that

$$
U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right)-U_{\delta_{\boldsymbol{f}_{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, 1}\right) \geq U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\delta_{\boldsymbol{f}_{m}}}^{\prime}(w)-O(\log m / m)
$$

by the above two estimates. Hence (5.2) and Lemma 5.3 implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} \geq U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime}(w)-O(\log m / m) \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

By repeating the same argument, or by symmetry, it is clear that (5.7) holds for any $w \in$ $\partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, j}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right), j=1, \ldots, m$.

Now take the probability measure $\eta$ in Lemma 5.2 for $E:=\cup_{j=1}^{m} \partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, j}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$. Integrating (5.7) against $\eta$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} & \geq \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \eta-\int U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \eta-O(\log m / m) \\
\text { [use (2.7)] } & =\int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m}-O(\log m / m)
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 5.2, $U_{\eta}^{\prime}$ equals constantly to its minimum on $E$. Hence $\int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D} \geq \int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m}$, and the proof is done.
Lemma 5.5. There exists a constant $C_{D}>0$ such that, for all sufficiently large $m$, one has

$$
\left|\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{f_{m}}\right| \leq \frac{C_{D}}{m}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)-\int U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m} \leq C_{D} \frac{\log m}{m}
$$

Proof. Since $U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}$ is $1 / 3$-Hölder continuous with the constant $A:=\left\|U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^{1 / 3}}$, we have

$$
\left|\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left|\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, j}-U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\left(f_{m, j}\right)\right| \leq A\left(\frac{c_{Q}}{2 m^{5}}\right)^{1 / 3}
$$

which implies the first inequality.

For the second one, we use Lemma 2.2 to rewrite (see (2.11))

$$
\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)=\frac{1}{m^{2}} \sum_{j \neq k}\left(\log \operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, j}, f_{m, k}\right)+\varrho\left(f_{m, j}, f_{m, k}\right)\right)
$$

and

$$
\int U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m}=\frac{1}{m^{2}} \sum_{j, k} \iint(\log \operatorname{dist}(x, y)+\varrho(x, y)) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, j}(x) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, k}(y)
$$

Denote by $\operatorname{Leb}_{\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, m^{-5}\right)}$ the probability Lebesgue measure on $\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, m^{-5}\right)$. For every $j$, we can estimate that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\iint(\log \operatorname{dist}(x, y)+\varrho(x, y)) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, j}(x) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, j}(y)\right| \\
& \leq O(1) \iint|\log | x-y| | \operatorname{dLeb}_{\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, m^{-5}\right)}(x) \operatorname{deb}_{\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, m^{-5}\right)}(y)+\max \varrho \\
& =O(\log m)+\max \varrho+O(1),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality is based on the fact that the singular integration

$$
\iint \log |x-y| \operatorname{dLeb}_{\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, m^{-5}\right)}(x) \operatorname{dLeb}_{\partial \mathbb{D}\left(0, m^{-5}\right)}(y)=\log \left(m^{-5}\right) .
$$

Therefore, to gain the desired estimate $\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)-\int U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m} \leq C_{D} \log m / m$, we only need to show, for each pair $j \neq k$, that

$$
\left(\log \operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, j}, f_{m, k}\right)+\varrho\left(f_{m, j}, f_{m, k}\right)\right)-\iint(\log \operatorname{dist}(x, y)+\varrho(x, y)) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, j}(x) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, k}(y)
$$

is $O(\log m / m)$. First, observe that the difference involving $\varrho$ is $O\left(m^{-5}\right)$, because $\varrho$ is Lipschitz while $\sigma_{m, j}, \sigma_{m, k}$ are supported on the small circles around $f_{m, j}$ and $f_{m, k}$ respectively. For the remaining terms, by the monotonicity of the log function, we can show that

$$
\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, j}, f_{m, k}\right)-\iint \log \operatorname{dist}(x, y) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, j}(x) \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m, k}(y)\right|=O\left(m^{-2}\right)
$$

because for any $x \in \partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, j}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right), y \in \partial \mathbb{B}\left(f_{m, k}, c_{Q} m^{-5}\right)$, we have

$$
\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(f_{m, j}, f_{m, k}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}(x, y)\right|=O\left(m^{-2}\right)
$$

by the same reasoning as (5.5).
Summarizing all the estimates above, we conclude the proof.
The following is the main result of this section, giving (5.1).
Proposition 5.6. There exists a constant $C_{D}>0$, such that

$$
-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right) \leq-\int_{X} U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}+C_{D} \frac{\log m}{m}
$$

and

$$
\max U_{\delta_{\mathrm{f}_{m}}}^{\prime} \leq \max U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}+C_{D} \frac{\log m}{m}
$$

for all sufficiently large $m$.

Proof. By symmetry, the inequality (4.4) remains true after replacing $\left(f_{m, 1}, \mathbf{f}_{m}^{\prime}\right)$ by $\left(f_{m, k}, \sum_{j \neq k} f_{m, j}\right)$ for every $k=1,2, \cdots, m$. Summing up all these $m$ inequalities, we obtain that (see (2.6))

$$
-\frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{j \neq k} G\left(f_{m, j}, f_{m, k}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{m} Q\left(f_{j}\right) \leq-\sum_{j=1}^{m} G\left(z, f_{m, j}\right)+m Q(z)
$$

for all $z \in X \backslash D$, where $Q=U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}$. Multiplying both sides by $(m-1) / m^{2}$, we receive

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)+\frac{m-1}{m} \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} \leq-\frac{m-1}{m} U_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}}^{\prime}(z)+\frac{m-1}{m} U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}(z) . \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrating (5.8) against the probability measure $\eta$ in Lemma 5.2 for $E:=X \backslash D$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)+\frac{m-1}{m} \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} & \leq-\frac{m-1}{m} \int U_{\delta_{f_{m}}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \eta+\int \frac{m-1}{m} U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \eta \\
{[\text { use (2.7)] }} & =-\frac{m-1}{m} \int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}+\frac{m-1}{m} \int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 5.2, $U_{\eta}^{\prime}$ is constant on $X \backslash D$. Hence $-\int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}+\int U_{\eta}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}=0$. Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right) \leq-\frac{m-1}{m} \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} . \tag{5.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\sigma_{m}$ be the probability measure in Lemma [5.5, By Stokes' formula, we have

$$
\int\left(U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime}-U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{d}\left(\sigma_{m}-\nu_{D}\right) \leq 0
$$

Equivalently,

$$
-\int U_{\sigma_{m}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m} \geq \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-2 \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \sigma_{m}
$$

This combining with Lemma 5.5 gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{f}_{m}\right)+\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}+O\left(\frac{\log m}{m}\right) \geq \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}-O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking (5.9) into account, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}} \leq-\frac{1}{m} \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}+C_{D}^{\prime} \frac{\log m}{m} \tag{5.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}$ is uniformly bounded, we conclude the first assertion.
For the second one, it is enough to show that $U_{\delta_{f_{m}}}^{\prime}(z) \leq U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}(z)+C_{D} \log m / m$ for all $z \in X$. Plugging (5.10) in the left-hand-side of (5.8), we obtain that for all $z \in X \backslash D$,

$$
-\frac{1}{m} \int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}+\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \nu_{D}-\int U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime} \mathrm{d} \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{m}}-O\left(\frac{\log m}{m}\right) \leq \frac{m-1}{m}\left(U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}(z)-U_{\delta_{f_{m}}}^{\prime}(z)\right) .
$$

By Lemma 5.4 and the boundedness of $U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}$, we deduce that

$$
U_{\delta_{\mathrm{f}_{m}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}(z) \leq U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}(z)+C_{D} \log m / m, \quad \forall z \in X \backslash D
$$

Noting that $U_{\nu_{D}}^{\prime}-U_{\delta_{f_{m}}}^{\prime}$ is harmonic on $D$, by the maximal principle, the above inequality holds for any $z \in D$ as well. Thus we conclude the proof.

## 6. Constructing holomorphic sections by Fekete points

We have obtained a set of Fekete points $\mathscr{F}_{m}:=\left\{f_{m, 1}, \ldots, f_{m, m}\right\} \subset X \backslash D$. When $X=\mathbb{P}^{1}$, $\mathscr{F}_{m}$ can be realized directly as the zero set of a degree $m$ homogeneous polynomial in the hole event. However, in the higher genus case, there might not exist $q_{1}, \ldots, q_{g}$ in $X \backslash D$ such that (2.5) holds for $p_{j}=f_{m, j}$, due to the restriction of the Abel-Jacobi equation (2.5). In other words, this $m$-th Fekete set may not be the zero set of one section in $H_{n, D}$. For this concern, we will construct a valid section $s_{n}$ in the hole event $H_{n, D}$ whose zero set $Z_{s_{n}}$ deviates from $\mathscr{F}_{m}$ only mildly. The following lemma is instrumental in our approach.
Lemma 6.1. Let $\mathbb{B}(y, R) \subset X$ be the disc centered at $y \in X$ having radius $R>0$ with respect to $\omega_{0}$. Then there exist small constants $0<\zeta, \beta_{1}, \beta_{2}, \beta_{3} \ll 1$ and a large integer $k \gg 1$, such that, for any $\mathbf{Z} \in \operatorname{Jac}(X)$, for any $m \geq 1$ points $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m} \in X$, one can find $\mathbf{P}^{[j]}=P_{1}^{[j]}+\cdots+P_{g}^{[j]} \in X^{(g)}(1 \leq j \leq k)$ and $\mathbf{Q}=Q_{1}+\cdots+Q_{g} \in X^{(g)}$ satisfying the following conditions

$$
P_{\ell}^{[j]}, Q_{\ell} \in \mathbb{H}_{y, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}}^{R, \zeta}:=\mathbb{B}(y, R) \backslash \cup_{j=1}^{m} \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, \zeta / \sqrt{m}\right) \quad \text { for all } \ell, j,
$$

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{A}_{g}\left(\mathbf{P}^{[j]}\right)+\mathcal{A}_{g}(\mathbf{Q})=\mathbf{Z}  \tag{6.1}\\
\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathbf{Q}, \pi_{g}\left(\mathscr{R}_{g}\right) \cup \mathscr{W}\right) \geq \beta_{1},  \tag{6.2}\\
\operatorname{dist}\left(P_{\ell_{1}}^{\left[j_{1}\right]}, P_{\ell_{2}}^{\left[j_{2}\right]}\right) \geq \beta_{2} \quad \text { for all }\left(j_{1}, \ell_{1}\right) \neq\left(j_{2}, \ell_{2}\right),  \tag{6.3}\\
\operatorname{dist}\left(P_{\ell_{1}}^{[j]}, Q_{\ell_{2}}\right) \geq \beta_{3} \quad \text { for all } j, \ell_{1}, \ell_{2} \tag{6.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

The proof is quite involved, and will be separated into 7 Steps with respect to the thinking process. For clarifying the independence of some uniform positive constants on $\mathbf{Z}, m, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}$, we will write $\mathrm{K}_{1}, \mathrm{~K}_{2}, \mathrm{~K}_{3}, \ldots$ instead of merely $O(1)$.

Proof. Step 1. By demanding $\zeta \ll 1$ to be sufficiently small, we can ensure that the union of any $m$ closed discs $\cup_{j=1}^{m} \overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(p_{j}, \zeta / \sqrt{m}\right)$ does not cover the open annulus $\mathbb{B}(y, R) \backslash \overline{\mathbb{B}}(y, 2 R / 3)$ (we can assume that it is nonempty by shrinking $R$ if necessary) by area comparison

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{Area}_{\omega_{0}}\left(\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(p_{j}, \zeta / \sqrt{m}\right)\right) & \leq m \cdot \mathrm{~K}_{1} \cdot(\zeta / \sqrt{m})^{2} \\
& =\mathrm{K}_{1} \cdot \zeta^{2}<\operatorname{Area}_{\omega_{0}}(\mathbb{B}(y, R) \backslash \overline{\mathbb{B}}(y, 2 R / 3)) \tag{6.5}
\end{align*}
$$

The existence of a uniform constant $\mathrm{K}_{1}>0$ is guaranteed by the compactness of $X$. Thus we can choose $g$ points $Q_{\ell}$ in the nonempty open set

$$
(\mathbb{B}(y, R) \backslash \overline{\mathbb{B}}(y, 2 R / 3)) \backslash \cup_{j=1}^{m} \overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(p_{j}, \zeta / \sqrt{m}\right)
$$

for $\ell=1, \ldots, g$, such that $\mathbf{Q}:=Q_{1}+\cdots+Q_{g} \notin \pi_{g}\left(\mathscr{R}_{g}\right) \cup \mathscr{W}$, since $\pi_{g}\left(\mathscr{R}_{g}\right) \cup \mathscr{W}$ is a proper subvariety of $X^{(g)}$. However, at the moment it is still not clear why we can choose $\beta_{1}>0$ independent of $\mathbf{Z}, m, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}$ such that the requirement (6.2) holds.
Step 2. To this aim, we improve the above reasoning as follows. First, we pick $g$ points $Q_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, Q_{g}^{\prime}$ in $\mathbb{B}(y, R) \backslash \overline{\mathbb{B}}(y, 2 R / 3)$ such that $\mathbf{Q}^{\prime}:=Q_{1}^{\prime}+\cdots+Q_{g}^{\prime} \notin \pi_{g}\left(\mathscr{R}_{g}\right) \cup \mathscr{W}$. Next,
by continuity argument, we can choose a sufficiently small positive constant $\mathrm{K}_{2} \ll 1$ such that $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(Q_{\ell}^{\prime}, \mathrm{K}_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{B}(y, R) \backslash \overline{\mathbb{B}}(y, 2 R / 3)$ for $\ell=1, \ldots, g$ and such that $Q_{1}+\cdots+Q_{g} \notin$ $\pi_{g}\left(\mathscr{R}_{g}\right) \cup \mathscr{W}$ whenever $Q_{1}, \ldots, Q_{g}$ are mild perturbations of $Q_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, Q_{g}^{\prime}$ respectively within distance $\mathrm{K}_{2}$, i.e., $\operatorname{dist}\left(Q_{\ell}, Q_{\ell}^{\prime}\right) \leq \mathrm{K}_{2}$ for $\ell=1, \ldots, g$. By compactness, for all such $Q_{1}, \ldots, Q_{g}$ we have (6.2) for some uniform constant $\beta_{1}>0$. Lastly, we only need to make sure that $\cup_{j=1}^{m} \overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(p_{j}, \zeta / \sqrt{m}\right)$ does not cover any of $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(Q_{\ell}, \mathrm{K}_{2}\right)$ for $\ell=1, \ldots, g$. This can be achieved by modifying (6.5) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{K}_{1} \cdot \zeta^{2}<\operatorname{Area}_{\omega_{0}}\left(\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(Q_{\ell}^{\prime}, \mathrm{K}_{2}\right)\right) \quad \text { for every } \quad \ell=1, \ldots, g \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus (6.2) is obtained.
Step 3. We will choose all the remaining points $P_{\bullet}^{[\bullet]}$ in $\mathbb{B}(y, R / 2)$ so that (6.4) automatically holds for sufficiently small $\beta_{3} \ll 1$. Now the only remaining obstacles are (6.1) and (6.3).

Fix a local holomorphic coordinate chart $\varphi: \mathbb{D} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B}(y, R / 2)$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\mathrm{d} \varphi\|>\mathrm{K}_{3}>0 \tag{6.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

with respect to $\omega_{0}$ and the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{D}$. Recall the construction (2.1) of the Jacobian variety defined by the holomorphic 1-forms $\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{g}$. Read

$$
\varphi^{*} \phi_{1}(z)=\omega_{1}(z) \mathrm{d} z, \quad \ldots, \quad \varphi^{*} \phi_{g}(z)=\omega_{g}(z) \mathrm{d} z
$$

in the local chart, where $z$ is the standard coordinate of the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$. By the common knowledge of Riemann surfaces (e.g. [28, p. 87]), the equation $\operatorname{det}\left(\omega_{\ell}\left(z_{j}\right)\right)_{1 \leq \ell, j \leq g}=0$ defines a proper subvariety of $\mathbb{D}^{g}$ with coordinates $\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{g}\right)$. Fix a point $\left(z_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, z_{g}^{\prime}\right) \in$ $\mathbb{D}^{g}$ outside this subvariety, i.e., $\operatorname{det}\left(\omega_{\ell}\left(z_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right)_{1 \leq \ell, j \leq g} \neq 0$. Therefore the fixed matrix $M:=$ $\left(\omega_{\ell}\left(z_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right)_{1 \leq \ell, j \leq g}$ is invertible, and the $g$ fixed points $z_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, z_{g}^{\prime}$ are pairwise distinct.
Step 4. Fix a small positive constant

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta:=\min \left\{\left|z_{\ell_{1}}^{\prime}-z_{\ell_{2}}^{\prime}\right| / 3,1-\left|z_{\ell}^{\prime}\right|: 1 \leq \ell_{1}<\ell_{2} \leq g, \ell=1, \ldots, g\right\}>0 \tag{6.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is obviously independent of $\mathbf{Z}, m, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}$. Define a holomorphic map (see (2.2))

$$
F: \mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g} \rightarrow \operatorname{Jac}(X), \quad\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{g}\right) \mapsto \mathcal{A}\left(\varphi\left(z_{1}^{\prime}+z_{1}\right)\right)+\cdots+\mathcal{A}\left(\varphi\left(z_{g}^{\prime}+z_{g}\right)\right)
$$

Then the the differential $\mathrm{d} F$ of $F$ at the origin $(0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{D}^{g}$ has the Jacobian matrix $M$. Select another system $\left(\widetilde{\phi}_{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{\phi}_{g}\right):=\left(\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{g}\right) \cdot M^{-1}$ of $\mathbb{C}$-linearly independent holomorphic 1-forms on $X$. The $\operatorname{Jacobian}$ variety $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X)$ associated with $\left(\widetilde{\phi}_{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{\phi}_{g}\right)$ is clearly $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X):=\mathbb{C}^{g} / \Lambda \cdot M^{-1}$ by (2.1), and the corresponding Abel-Jacobi map $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}: X \rightarrow$ $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X)$ defined as

$$
\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(x):=\left(\int_{p_{\star}}^{x} \widetilde{\phi}_{1}, \ldots, \int_{p_{\star}}^{x} \widetilde{\phi}_{g}\right) \quad\left(\bmod \Lambda \cdot M^{-1}\right), \quad \forall x \in X
$$

satisfies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}=\mathcal{A} \cdot M^{-1}$, where in abuse of notation we also denote $M^{-1}$ as the isomorphism from $\operatorname{Jac}(X)=\mathbb{C}^{g} / \Lambda$ to $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X)=\mathbb{C}^{g} / \Lambda \cdot M^{-1}$. Define another holomorphic map

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{F}: \mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g} \rightarrow \widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X), \quad\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{g}\right) \mapsto \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\left(\varphi\left(z_{1}^{\prime}+z_{1}\right)\right)+\cdots+\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\left(\varphi\left(z_{g}^{\prime}+z_{g}\right)\right) \tag{6.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is clear that $\widetilde{F}=F \cdot M^{-1}$. Once we identify both the tangent spaces of $\mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g}$ and $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X)$ at the origins as $\mathbb{C}^{g}$, the differential $\mathrm{d} \widetilde{F}: \mathbb{C}^{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{g}$ of $\widetilde{F}$ at $(0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g}$ is nothing but the identity map.

Step 5. We plan to choose

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\ell}^{[j]}:=\varphi\left(z_{\ell}^{\prime}+z_{\ell}^{[j]}\right) \quad \text { for some } \quad z_{\ell}^{[j]} \in \mathbb{D}_{\delta} \quad \text { for all } j, \ell \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\widetilde{G}:=\widetilde{F}-\widetilde{F}(0, \ldots, 0)$ be the translation of $\widetilde{F}$ so that $\widetilde{G}$ maps the origin of $\mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g}$ to that of $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X)$. First of all, we transform the equation (6.1) equivalently to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{k} G\left(z_{1}^{[j]}, \ldots, z_{g}^{[j]}\right)=\left(\mathbf{Z}-\mathcal{A}_{g}(\mathbf{Q})\right) \cdot M^{-1}-k \widetilde{F}(0, \ldots, 0)=:[\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}] \in \widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X) \tag{6.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}} \in \mathbb{C}^{g}$ in a fundamental domain of $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X)=\mathbb{C}^{g} / \Lambda \cdot M^{-1}$. Note that the Euclidean norm of $\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ is uniformly bounded from above by some finite constant $\mathrm{K}_{4}$.
Step 6. The upshot is that the differential $\mathrm{d} \widetilde{G}: \mathbb{C}^{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{g}$ at the origin of $\mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g}$ is the identity map. By the inverse function theorem, we can define the inverse $\widetilde{G}^{-1}$ of $\widetilde{G}$ on a small neighborhood $U$ of the origin of $\widetilde{\operatorname{Jac}}(X)$. The key idea is to show, by means of volume comparison, that for some large integer $k$ and for sufficiently small $0<\zeta \ll 1$, we can choose certain $k$ points $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]} \in \mathbb{C}^{g}$ near the origin for $j=1, \ldots, k$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]}=0$, and such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(z_{1}^{[j]}, \ldots, z_{g}^{[j]}\right):=\widetilde{G}^{-1}\left(\left[k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}+\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]}\right]\right) \tag{6.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

meets the requirement (6.3).
Now we fulfill some technical details. For convenience of notation, we regard $U$ as an open neighborhood of the origin of $\mathbb{C}^{g}$. It is clear that the differential $\mathrm{d} \widetilde{G}^{-1}: \mathbb{C}^{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{g}$ at the origin is the identity map. Hence we can fix a sufficiently small constant $\epsilon>0$, such that for every $\mathbf{w}$ in the polydisc $\mathbb{D}_{\epsilon}^{g} \subset U$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{G}^{-1}(\mathbf{w})=\mathbf{w}+O\left(\|\mathbf{w}\|^{2}\right) \tag{6.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the error term $O\left(\|\mathbf{w}\|^{2}\right)$ has Euclidean norm $\leq \mathrm{K}_{5} \cdot\|\mathbf{w}\|^{2}$.
Denote the finite square lattice

$$
\mathcal{W}_{t, \rho}:=\{a \rho+b \rho \cdot i \in \mathbb{C}: a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \cap[1, t]\}
$$

for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}, \rho>0$ to be determined. Let $\mathfrak{I}: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{g}$ be the diagonal map, sending $z$ to $(z, z, \ldots, z)$. We will take $k=2 t^{2}$, and take the aforementioned points $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]} \in \mathbb{C}^{g}$ for $j=1, \ldots, t^{2}$ as mild perturbations of the $t^{2}$ points in $\mathfrak{I}\left(\mathcal{W}_{t, \rho}\right)$, and for $j=1+t^{2}, \ldots, 2 t^{2}$ as mild perturbations of the $t^{2}$ points in $-\mathfrak{I}\left(\mathcal{W}_{t, \rho}\right)$. Here, perturbations mean that the differences are within $\mathbb{D}_{\rho / 3}^{g}$. In practice, we will take

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\left[j+t^{2}\right]}=-\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]} \quad \text { for } \quad j=1, \ldots, t^{2} \tag{6.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

First of all, we need to ensure that all possible $\left\{k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}+\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]}\right\}_{j=1}^{k}$ chosen in this way are contained in $\mathbb{D}_{\epsilon}^{g}$. For this goal, we require that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}\right\|=\left\|2^{-1} \cdot t^{-2} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}\right\| \leq \epsilon / 100 \quad \text { and } \quad t \cdot \rho \leq \epsilon / 2 \tag{6.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, we verify (6.14) for each $j$. The only risk is that one of $g$ coordinates of $\widetilde{G}^{-1}\left(k^{-1}\right.$. $\left.\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}+\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}{ }^{[j]}\right)$ or of $\widetilde{G}^{-1}\left(k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}+\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\left[j+t^{2}\right]}\right)=\widetilde{G}^{-1}\left(k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]}\right)$ lies in $\varphi^{-1}\left(\cup_{j=1}^{m} \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, \zeta / \sqrt{m}\right)\right)=: \mathscr{B}$. Note that such "bad" choices of $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]}$ are contained either in

$$
\bigcup_{j=0}^{g}\left(\widetilde{G}\left(\mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{j} \times \mathscr{B} \times \mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g-1-j}\right)-k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}\right) \quad \text { or in } \quad \bigcup_{j=0}^{g}\left(k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}-\widetilde{G}\left(\mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{j} \times \mathscr{B} \times \mathbb{D}_{\delta}^{g-1-j}\right)\right)
$$

whose total Euclidean volume is $\leq \mathrm{K}_{6} \cdot \zeta^{2}$ (see (6.7)). Since all possible choices of $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]}$ has the Euclidean volume equal to that of $\mathbb{D}_{\rho / 3}^{g}$, as long as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{K}_{6} \cdot \zeta^{2}<\operatorname{Vol}\left(\mathbb{D}_{\rho / 3}^{g}\right)=\mathrm{K}_{7} \cdot \rho^{2 g}, \tag{6.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

we can take $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{[j]}$ not "bad". Thus (6.1) is satisfied because of (6.11), (6.12) and (6.14).
Step 7. In the end, we check the requirement (6.3). By the definition (6.12), for any $\ell=1, \ldots, g$, for any two distinct $j_{1}, j_{2} \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$, using (6.13) we can obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|z_{\ell}^{\left[j_{1}\right]}-z_{\ell}^{\left[j_{2}\right]}\right| \geq(\rho-\rho / 3-\rho / 3)-2 \cdot \mathrm{~K}_{5} \cdot g \epsilon^{2}=\rho / 3-2 g \mathrm{~K}_{5} \cdot \epsilon^{2} . \tag{6.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $g \epsilon^{2}$ stands for an upper bound for both $\left\|k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}+\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\left[j_{1}\right]}\right\|^{2}$ and $\left\|k^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}+\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\left[j_{2}\right]}\right\|^{2}$.
Note that under the restriction (6.15) we can still make

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho / 3-2 g \mathbf{K}_{5} \cdot \epsilon^{2} \geq \rho / 6 \tag{6.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, (6.15) is a consequence of

$$
\begin{equation*}
2^{-1} \cdot t^{-2} \cdot \mathrm{~K}_{4} \leq \epsilon / 100, \quad t \cdot \rho \leq \epsilon / 2 \tag{6.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

By shrinking $\epsilon>0$ if necessary, we can check that by selecting

$$
t:=\left[\sqrt{50 \mathrm{~K}_{4} / \epsilon}\right]+1, \quad \rho:=12 g \mathrm{~K}_{5} \epsilon^{2}>0
$$

both the requirements (6.18) and (6.19) are satisfied. Thus (6.17) implies that

$$
\left|z_{\ell}^{\left[j_{1}\right]}-z_{\ell}^{\left[j_{2}\right]}\right| \geq \rho / 6>0, \quad \text { hence } \quad \operatorname{dist}\left(P_{\ell}^{\left[j_{1}\right]}, P_{\ell}^{\left[j_{2}\right]}\right) \geq \mathrm{K}_{8} \cdot \rho / 6>0
$$

On the other hand, for any $1 \leq j_{1}, j_{2} \leq k$, for any two distinct $\ell_{1}, \ell_{2} \in\{1, \ldots, g\}$, by the construction (6.8) and (6.10), we have

$$
\left|\left(z_{\ell_{1}}^{\prime}+z_{\ell_{1}}^{\left[j_{1}\right]}\right)-\left(z_{\ell_{2}}^{\prime}+z_{\ell_{2}}^{\left[j_{2}\right]}\right)\right| \geq \delta, \quad \text { hence } \quad \operatorname{dist}\left(P_{\ell_{1}}^{\left[j_{1}\right]}, P_{\ell_{2}}^{\left[j_{2}\right]}\right) \geq \mathrm{K}_{8} \cdot \delta>0
$$

Summarizing, we can take $\beta_{2}:=\min \left\{\mathrm{K}_{8} \cdot \rho / 6, \mathrm{~K}_{8} \cdot \delta\right\}$, and demand $\zeta>0$ to obey (6.6) and (6.16), so that all the requirements are satisfied.

Using Lemma 6.1, we can construct a valid section in $H_{n, D}$, whose zeros are mostly coming from the $m$-th Fekete set.

Proposition 6.2. For every $n$ large enough, one can find a holomorphic section $s_{n} \in H_{n, D}$ with zero set $Z_{s_{n}}=\left\{p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}, q_{1}, \ldots, q_{g}\right\}$, such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
p_{j}=f_{m, j} \quad \text { for all } j \leq m-k_{D} g  \tag{6.20}\\
\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j_{1}}, p_{j_{2}}\right) \geq c_{D} m^{-3} \quad \text { for all } j_{1} \neq j_{2} \tag{6.21}
\end{gather*}
$$

$$
\begin{gather*}
\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, q_{l}\right) \geq c_{D} / \sqrt{m} \text { for all } j, l,  \tag{6.22}\\
\quad \operatorname{dist}\left(q_{l}, D\right) \geq c_{D} \quad \text { for all } l
\end{gather*}
$$

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}, \pi_{g}\left(\mathscr{R}_{g}\right) \cup \mathscr{W}\right) \geq c_{D}
$$

where $k_{D} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}, c_{D}>0$ are independent of $n$.

Proof. We apply Lemma 6.1 upon an open disc $\mathbb{B}(y, R) \Subset X \backslash \bar{D}$ to get a $k_{D}:=k \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$. Now we start with the data

$$
p_{j}:=f_{m, j} \quad \text { for } \quad j \leq m-k g, \quad \mathbf{Z}:=\mathcal{A}_{n}\left(\mathcal{L}^{n}\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{m-k g} \mathcal{A}\left(f_{m, j}\right),
$$

to obtain the remaining $k g+g$ points

$$
p_{m-k g+1}+\cdots+p_{m}:=\mathbf{P}^{[1]}+\cdots+\mathbf{P}^{[k]} \text { and } q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}:=\mathbf{Q} .
$$

These $n$ points are the zeros of some holomorphic section $s_{n}$ because of equation (6.1). The desired distance inequalities come from the definition of $\mathbb{H}_{y, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}}^{R, \zeta}$ and $(\sqrt{6.2}),(\sqrt{6.3})$, (6.4).

The zeros of $s_{n}$ also gives an element in $\mathcal{S}_{m, D}$ (see (2.13)) for all $m$ large enough. The last inequality of the corollary implies that $p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \notin \mathbf{H}_{m}$, i.e., $q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}$ is unique.

## 7. Difference between the two functionals

In this section, our goal is to approximate the minimum of the functional $\mathcal{I}_{D}$ closely by $-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\prime}$, and show that such $\mathbf{p} \in X^{(m)}$ can constitute "large enough" volume.

Proposition 7.1. There exist constants $m_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}, C_{D}>0$, such that for every large integer $m \geq m_{0}$, one can find an open subset $\Omega_{m, D} \subset \mathcal{S}_{m, D} \subset X^{(m)}$ (see (2.13)) with volume $\operatorname{Vol}\left(\Omega_{m, D}\right) \geq m^{-11 m}$ and that

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+\frac{2(m+1)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \min \mathcal{I}_{D}+C_{D} \frac{\log m}{m}, \quad \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Omega_{m, D} \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

First, we need the following two lemmas, which guarantees the stability of the functional values $-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}$ under mild perturbations of $\mathbf{p}:=p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \in \mathcal{S}_{m, D}$.
Lemma 7.2. For every sufficiently large $m$, for any $\mathbf{p}^{\prime}:=p_{1}^{\prime}+\cdots+p_{m}^{\prime}$ with $p_{j}^{\prime} \in \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-5}\right)$, one has

$$
\left|\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)\right|=O\left(m^{-1}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad\left|\max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}-\max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}\right|=O\left(m^{-1}\right)
$$

Proof. By (2.11) and Lemma 2.2, $\left|\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)\right|$ is bounded from above by

$$
\frac{1}{m^{2}} \sum_{j \neq \ell}\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, p_{\ell}^{\prime}\right)\right|+\frac{1}{m^{2}} \sum_{j \neq \ell}\left|\varrho\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)-\varrho\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, p_{\ell}^{\prime}\right)\right|
$$

Since $\varrho$ is Lipschitz, the second term is $O\left(m^{-5}\right)$. For the first one, using the monotonicity of the $\log$ function, every term $|\cdots|$ is less than

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left(\log \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)}{\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)-2 m^{-5}}, \log \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)+2 m^{-5}}{\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)}\right)=O\left(m^{-1}\right) \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

because $\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right) \geq m^{-4}$ for $j \neq \ell$ by (2.13). Hence their summation ( $m(m-1$ ) terms), divided by $m^{2}$, is also $O\left(m^{-1}\right)$. Thus the first assertion is proved.

For the second assertion, we only need to show the following three estimates:
(i) $\left|U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\delta \mathbf{p}^{\prime}}^{\prime}(w)\right|=O\left(m^{-1}\right)$, if $\operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}\right) \geq m^{-6}$ and $\operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}^{\prime}\right) \geq m^{-6}$;
(ii) $\max _{X \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-6}\right)} U_{\delta_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\prime} \geq \sup _{\mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-6}\right)} U_{\delta_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\prime}-O\left(m^{-1}\right)$;
(iii) $\max _{X \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, m^{-6}\right)} U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}^{\prime}}}^{\prime} \geq \sup _{\mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, m^{-6}\right)} U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{\prime}-O\left(m^{-1}\right)$.

By (2.6) and Lemma 2.2, the left-hand-side of (i) is bounded from above by

$$
\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right|+\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left|\varrho\left(w, p_{j}\right)-\varrho\left(w, p_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right|
$$

The remaining argument goes the same as the first assertion above.
Now we prove (ii) by showing that

$$
\max _{\partial \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-6}\right)} U_{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\prime} \geq \sup _{\mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-6}\right)} U_{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\prime}-O(\log m / m)
$$

Take any $w \in \partial \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-6}\right), y \in \mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-6}\right)$ for e.g. $j=1$. By (2.6), we have

$$
U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}(y)=\frac{1}{m}\left(G\left(w, p_{1}\right)-G\left(y, p_{1}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{m} \sum_{\ell=2}^{m}\left(G\left(w, p_{\ell}\right)-G\left(y, p_{\ell}\right)\right)
$$

Using Lemma 2.2 again, we can estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{m}\left(G\left(w, p_{1}\right)-G\left(y, p_{1}\right)\right) & =\frac{1}{m}\left(\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{1}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(y, p_{1}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{m}\left(\varrho\left(w, p_{1}\right)-\varrho\left(y, p_{1}\right)\right) \\
& \geq 0-O(1) \operatorname{dist}(w, y) / m \geq-O\left(m^{-7}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

By similar computations, and using the fact that

$$
\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{\ell}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(y, p_{\ell}\right)\right| \leq \log \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{1}, p_{\ell}\right)+m^{-6}}{\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{1}, p_{\ell}\right)-m^{-6}}=O\left(m^{-2}\right), \quad \forall \ell=2, \ldots, m
$$

we can show that

$$
\sum_{\ell=2}^{m}\left|G\left(w, p_{\ell}\right)-G\left(y, p_{\ell}\right)\right|=O\left(m^{-1}\right)
$$

Hence we conclude (ii). The proof of (iii) is likewise.
Lemma 7.3. For every sufficiently large integer $m \gg 1$, for any $\mathbf{p}^{\prime}:=p_{1}^{\prime}+\cdots+p_{m}^{\prime} \in X^{(m)}$ with $\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j_{1}}^{\prime}, p_{j_{2}}^{\prime}\right) \geq c_{D} m^{-3}$ for $j_{1} \neq j_{2}$, and with $p_{j}^{\prime}=p_{j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m-k_{D} g$, one has

$$
\left|\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)\right|=O(\log m / m) \quad \text { and } \quad\left|\max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}-\max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}\right|=O(\log m / m)
$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{p}^{\prime}$ only differ in the choice of $k_{D} g$ points, by (2.11) and Lemma 2.2, we can bound $\left|\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)\right|$ from above by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{m^{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{\ell=m-k_{D} g+1, \ell \neq j}}^{m}\left(\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, p_{\ell}^{\prime}\right)\right|+\left|\varrho\left(p_{j}, p_{\ell}\right)-\varrho\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, p_{\ell}^{\prime}\right)\right|\right) \tag{7.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the assumptions, each $\log \operatorname{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is $O(\log m)$. Using the boundedness of $\varrho$, it is clear that (7.3) is $O\left(k_{D} \log m / m\right)$. This proves the first assertion.

For the second one, using (ii) and (iii) in the preceding proof, we only need to show that, if $w \in X$ satisfies $\operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}\right), \operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}^{\prime}\right) \geq m^{-6}$ for all $j=1, \ldots, m$, then

$$
\left|U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}(w)\right|=O(\log m / m)
$$

Applying (2.6) and Lemma 2.2 again, we can bound $\left|U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}(w)-U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}^{\prime}}}^{\prime}(w)\right|$ from above by

$$
\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=m-k_{D} g+1}^{m}\left|\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}\right)-\log \operatorname{dist}\left(w, p_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right|+\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=m-k_{D} g+1}^{m}\left|\varrho\left(w, p_{j}\right)-\varrho\left(w, p_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right|
$$

The remaining estimate goes the same as (7.3).
Now we are ready to prove Proposition 7.1. The idea is to fix a set $\left\{f_{m, 1}, \ldots, f_{m, m}\right\}$ of Fekete points for every large $m$, and then to apply Proposition 6.2 to show that certain mild perturbations $\mathbf{p} \in X^{(m)}$ of $f_{m, 1}+\cdots+f_{m, m}$, which correspond to zero sets of some sections in $H_{n, D}$, constitute "large" volume, and that their functional values $-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\prime}$ are close to $\min \mathcal{I}_{D}$.
Proof of Proposition 7.1 Take an $m$-th Fekete set $\left\{f_{m, 1}, \ldots, f_{m, m}\right\}$ for every $m \geq 1$. Applying Proposition 6.2 with the same notation, we obtain a holomorphic section $s_{n} \in H_{n, D}$ whose zero set reads in two separated parts as $\mathbf{p}:=p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m}$ and $\mathbf{q}:=q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}$. Define

$$
\Omega_{m, D}:=\otimes_{j=1}^{m}\left(\mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-5}\right) \backslash D\right) \subset X^{(m)} .
$$

Since $D$ has smooth boundary and one half of the unit disc has Euclidean area $\pi / 2>1$, the volume of $\mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-5}\right) \backslash D$ is $>m^{-10}$ for sufficiently large $m$, no matter where is $p_{j}$ in the compact complement $X \backslash D$. Thus the volume of $\Omega_{m, D}$ is $>m^{-11 m}$ for $m \gg 1$.

Now we check that $\Omega_{m, D} \subset \mathcal{S}_{m, D}$. Take any point $\mathbf{p}^{\prime}:=p_{1}^{\prime}+\cdots+p_{m}^{\prime} \in \Omega_{m, D}$, i.e., $p_{j}^{\prime} \in$ $\mathbb{B}\left(p_{j}, m^{-5}\right)$. Let $\mathbf{q}^{\prime}=q_{1}^{\prime} \cdots+q_{g}^{\prime}$ be a solution to the Abel-Jacobi equation $\mathcal{A}_{m}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{A}_{g}\left(\mathbf{q}^{\prime}\right)=$ $\mathcal{A}_{n}\left(\mathcal{L}^{n}\right)$. We need to show that $\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j_{1}}^{\prime}, p_{j_{2}}^{\prime}\right) \geq m^{-4}$ for all $j_{1} \neq j_{2}$, $\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, q_{l}^{\prime}\right) \geq 1 / m$ for all $j, l$, and $q_{l}^{\prime} \in X \backslash D$ for all $l$. The first inequality follows from (6.21) directly when $m \gg 1$. For the second and third assertions, since $\mathcal{A}_{1}$ is holomorphic, for a fixed Euclidean distance in $\operatorname{Jac}(X)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{A}_{m}(\mathbf{p}), \mathcal{A}_{m}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)\right) & =\operatorname{dist}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{A}_{1}\left(p_{j}\right), \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{A}_{1}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{A}_{1}\left(p_{j}\right), \mathcal{A}_{1}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} O(1) \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, p_{j}^{\prime}\right)=O\left(m^{-4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently, $\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{A}_{g}(\mathbf{q}), \mathcal{A}_{g}\left(\mathbf{q}^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq O\left(m^{-4}\right)$. Recalling that $\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathbf{q}, \pi_{g}\left(\mathscr{R}_{g}\right) \cup \mathscr{W}\right)$ is bounded below by a constant from (6.24), by the inverse function theorem and the compactness argument, $\mathcal{A}_{g}$ is an isomorphism in a small ball centered at q with some uniform radius. For sufficiently large $m, \mathcal{A}_{g}\left(\mathbf{q}^{\prime}\right)$ is in the image of such a ball under $\mathcal{A}_{g}$. Thus $\mathbf{q}^{\prime}$ is unique, and we can read $\mathbf{q}^{\prime}$ as $q_{1}^{\prime}+\cdots+q_{g}^{\prime}$ in a suitable order so that $\operatorname{dist}\left(q_{l}, q_{l}^{\prime}\right) \leq O\left(m^{-4}\right)$. Whence $\operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}^{\prime}, q_{l}^{\prime}\right) \geq 1 / m$ by (6.22) and $q_{l}^{\prime} \in X \backslash D$ by (6.23).

It remains to verify (7.1). Now we apply Lemma 7.3 upon the two points $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{m}:=$ $f_{m, 1}+\cdots+f_{m, m}$, which clearly meet the criterion by (6.20). Taking also Proposition 5.6 into consideration, we see that

$$
-\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime} \leq \min \mathcal{I}_{D}+O(\log m / m)
$$

This combining with Lemma 7.2 yields

$$
-\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)+2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}^{\prime}}}^{\prime} \leq \min \mathcal{I}_{D}+O(\log m / m), \quad \forall \mathbf{p}^{\prime} \in \Omega_{m, D}
$$

Thus we can conclude the proof by Lemma 2.4 .

## 8. Decay of the hole probabilities

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.1 in the difficult case $g \geq 1$ (see Remark 8.3 below for the easy case $g=0$ ).

Let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $X$. Define

$$
\mathcal{E}_{\Delta}(\mu):=\int_{(X \times X) \backslash \Delta} G(x, y) \mathrm{d} \mu(x) \mathrm{d} \mu(y) .
$$

Observe that $\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\Delta}\left(\delta_{\mathbf{p}}\right)$ for every $\mathbf{p}=p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \in X^{(m)}$. The equality holds if and only if $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}$ are pairwise distinct.

Lemma 8.1. For any open set $D$ (can be empty) in $X$, one has

$$
\inf _{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X \backslash D)}\left(-\mathcal{E}_{\Delta}(\mu)+2 \max U_{\mu}^{\prime}\right)=\min \mathcal{I}_{D}=\mathcal{I}_{D}\left(\nu_{D}\right) .
$$

Proof. Recall (2.6) that

$$
\mathcal{I}_{D}(\mu)=-\int_{X \times X} G(x, y) \mathrm{d} \mu(x) \mathrm{d} \mu(y)+2 \max U_{\mu}^{\prime}
$$

Noting that $G(x, y)=-\infty$ on the diagonal $\Delta:=\{x=y\}$ of $X \times X$, it is clearly that $\nu_{D} \times \nu_{D}$ charges no mass on $\Delta$, for otherwise $\mathcal{I}_{D}\left(\nu_{D}\right)=+\infty$ ! Hence we conclude the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.1] By (2.10) and Proposition 2.3, we can compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) & =\binom{n}{m}^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{R}_{m, D}} \mathscr{A}_{m}^{*}\left(V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}\right) \\
& =\binom{n}{m}^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{m, D}} C_{n} \exp \left[m^{2}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\frac{2(m+1)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p})\right)\right] \kappa_{n}(\mathbf{p})
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking logarithm, we receive that
(8.1) $\log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \leq \log C_{n}+m^{2} \sup _{\mathbf{p} \in(X \backslash D)^{(m)}}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\frac{2(m+1)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p})\right)+\log \int_{X^{(m)}} \kappa_{n}$.

By Lemma 2.4, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p}) \geq \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}-O(\log m / m)$. Together with the uniformly boundedness of $\max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}$ for all $\mathbf{p}$, we conclude that

$$
\sup _{\mathbf{p} \in(X \backslash D)^{(m)}}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\frac{2(m+1)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p})\right) \leq O(\log m / m)+\sup _{\mathbf{p} \in(X \backslash D)^{(m)}}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-2 \max U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}\right)
$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\Delta}\left(\delta_{\mathbf{p}}\right)$, the last term is bounded from above by

$$
\sup _{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X \backslash D)}\left(\mathcal{E}_{\Delta}(\mu)-2 \max U_{\mu}^{\prime}\right)=-\min \mathcal{I}_{D}
$$

due to Lemma 8.1,
Now we estimate the integration of $\kappa_{n}$. Using Proposition [2.3, we get
(8.2) $\log \int_{X^{(m)}} \kappa_{n} \lesssim \log \int_{X^{(m)}} e^{O(m)} \operatorname{diam}(X)^{2 m g} i \mathrm{~d} z_{1} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge i \mathrm{~d} z_{m} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}_{m} \lesssim m \log m$.

Therefore, we conclude by Lemma 8.2 below that

$$
\log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \leq-m^{2} \min \mathcal{I}_{D}+C m \log m
$$

Notice that $C$ can be chosen independent of $D$.
For the lower bound, we apply Proposition 7.1 to get $\Omega_{m, D}$, so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) & =\binom{n}{m}^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{R}_{m, D}} \mathscr{A}_{m}^{*}\left(V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}\right) \geq\binom{ n}{m}^{-1} \int_{\Omega_{m, D}} \mathscr{A}_{m}^{*}\left(V_{n}^{\mathrm{FS}}\right) \\
& =\binom{n}{m}^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_{m, D}} C_{n} \exp \left[m^{2}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\frac{2(m+1)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p})\right)\right] \kappa_{n}(\mathbf{p}) .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows from (7.1) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \geq-\log \binom{n}{m}+\log C_{n}-m^{2} \min \mathcal{I}_{D}-C_{D} m \log m+\log \int_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_{m, D}} \kappa_{n} \tag{8.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

It remains to estimate the integration of $\kappa_{n}$. Since $\Omega_{m, D} \subset \mathcal{S}_{m, D}$ (see (2.13)), for any point $\mathbf{p}=p_{1}+\cdots+p_{m} \in \mathcal{S}_{m, D}$ and $\mathbf{q}:=\mathcal{B}_{m}(\mathbf{p})=q_{1}+\cdots+q_{g}$, we have

$$
\prod_{j=1}^{m} \prod_{l=1}^{g} \operatorname{dist}\left(p_{j}, q_{l}\right)^{2} \geq \prod_{j=1}^{m} \prod_{l=1}^{g} \frac{1}{m^{2}}=m^{-2 m g}
$$

Thus, applying Proposition 2.3 and reminding that $\operatorname{Vol}\left(\Omega_{m, D}\right) \geq m^{-11 m}$ from Proposition 7.1, the logarithm of the integration of $\kappa_{n}$ is no less than

$$
O(m)+\log \int_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_{m, D}} m^{-2 m g} i \mathrm{~d} z_{1} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge i \mathrm{~d} z_{m} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}_{m} \geq-O(m \log m)
$$

Therefore, we deduce from Lemma 8.2 below that

$$
\log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, D}\right) \geq-m^{2} \min \mathcal{I}_{D}-C_{D}^{\prime} m \log m
$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1,
Some useful estimate of $C_{n}$ might be known in literature. For the sake of completeness, we provide a proof here.
Lemma 8.2. There exists a constant $c>0$ independent of $n$ and $D$ such that

$$
-c n \log n \leq \log C_{n} \leq c n \log n .
$$

Proof. Note that $\mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, \varnothing}\right)=1$ and $\min \mathcal{I}_{\varnothing}=0$. Repeating the argument in the proof of Theorem 1.1 above for $D=\varnothing$, we can deduce from (8.1) that

$$
\log C_{n} \geq m^{2} \min \mathcal{I}_{\varnothing}-c_{1} m \log m=-c_{1} m \log m
$$

for some $c_{1}$ independent of $n$.
On the other hand, using the method of Fekete points upon the case $D=\varnothing$, we receive $\Omega_{m, \varnothing} \subset \mathcal{S}_{m, \varnothing}$. Repeating the same reasoning as (8.3), we can obtain that

$$
\log \mathbf{P}_{n}\left(H_{n, \varnothing}\right) \geq-\log \binom{n}{m}+\log C_{n}-m^{2} \min \mathcal{I}_{\varnothing}-c_{2} m \log m+\log \int_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_{m, \varnothing}} \kappa_{n}
$$

for some $c_{2}$ independent of $n$. This combining with (8.2) yields

$$
\log C_{n} \leq m^{2} \min \mathcal{I}_{\varnothing}+c_{3} m \log m=c_{3} m \log m
$$

Hence we finish the proof.

Remark 8.3. For the proof of the case $g=0$, i.e., $X=\mathbb{P}^{1}$, we can repeat the same strategy, by using a density formula of the zeros, cf. [50, Proposition 3]. The proof is much simpler because there is no q any more and we only need to deal with the functional $\mathcal{E}_{m}(\mathbf{p})-\frac{2(m+1)}{m} \mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p})$ with $m=n$, where $\mathcal{F}_{m}$ is given by $\mathcal{F}_{m}(\mathbf{p}):=\log \left\|e^{U_{\delta_{\mathbf{p}}}^{\prime}}\right\|_{L^{2 m}\left(\omega_{0}\right)}$.

## 9. Asymptotic behavior of the hole probabilities

To prove Theorem 1.2, it is enough to show the inequality for a fixed $x_{0}$ and all small $r$. The theorem will follow by a standard compactness argument.

Fix a point $x_{0} \in X$. For a radius $r>0$, we denote $\mathcal{I}_{r}:=\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)}$ and $\nu_{r}:=\nu_{\mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)}$ for abbreviation. This section is devoted to prove the following proposition, which implies Theorem 1.2 by Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 9.1. There exist constants $C>c>0$ independent of $r$ such that

$$
c r^{4} \leq \min \mathcal{I}_{r} \leq C r^{4} \quad \text { for every } \quad 0<r \ll 1
$$

We decompose the proof into several lemmas below.
Lemma 9.2. For any probability measure $\mu$ supported on $X \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)$, one has $\mathcal{I}_{r}(\mu) \geq c r^{4}$ for some $c>0$ independent of $r$ and $\mu$.
Proof 1. Take a local coordinate function $\phi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\phi\left(x_{0}\right)=0$, where $V$ contains $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, r_{0}\right)$ for some small $r_{0}>0$. By compactness, we can find a sufficiently small $\epsilon_{0}>0$ such that both $\omega_{0}$ and $\omega$ are greater than $\epsilon_{0}^{2} \cdot \phi^{*} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2}$ on $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, r_{0}\right)$, where $z$ is the coordinate of $\mathbb{C}$. For any probability measure $\mu$ supported on $X \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)$ with $r<r_{0}$, the $\omega$-potential $U_{\mu}$ of $\mu$ satisfies the equation $\operatorname{dd}^{c} U_{\mu}=-\omega$ on $\mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)$. Note that for any $r \in\left[0, r_{0}\right]$, the range $\phi(\overline{\mathbb{B}}(x, r))$ contains $\overline{\mathbb{D}}\left(0, \epsilon_{1} \cdot r\right) \subset \mathbb{C}$ for some $\epsilon_{1}=$ const $\cdot \epsilon_{0}$. We can check that $\widehat{U}_{\mu}:=U_{\mu} \circ \phi^{-1}: \overline{\mathbb{D}}\left(0, \epsilon_{1} \cdot r_{0}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$ is strictly supharmonic

$$
-\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \widehat{U}_{\mu}=-\left(\phi^{-1}\right)^{*} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} U_{\mu}=\left(\phi^{-1}\right)^{*} \omega \geq\left(\phi^{-1}\right)^{*}\left(\epsilon_{0}^{2} \cdot \phi^{*} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2}\right)=\epsilon_{0}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2} .
$$

Using Jensen's formula (cf. e.g. [32, 35]), for any $0<t \leq \epsilon_{1} \cdot r_{0}$, we have

$$
\widehat{U}_{\mu}(0)-\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{|z|=t} \widehat{U}_{\mu} \mathrm{d} \theta=-2 \int_{x=0}^{t} \frac{\mathrm{~d} x}{x} \int_{\mathbb{D}_{x}} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \widehat{U}_{\mu} \geq 2 \int_{x=0}^{t} \frac{\mathrm{~d} x}{x} \int_{\mathbb{D}_{x}} \epsilon_{0}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2} .
$$

Discarding the first term $\widehat{U}_{\mu}(0) \leq 0$, we obtain that

$$
-\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{|z|=t} \widehat{U}_{\mu} \mathrm{d} \theta \geq 2 \int_{x=0}^{t} \frac{\mathrm{~d} x}{x} \int_{\mathbb{D}_{x}} \epsilon_{0}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2}=\text { const } \cdot \epsilon_{0}^{2} \cdot t^{2}
$$

for any $0<t \leq \epsilon_{1} \cdot r_{0}$. Thus we conclude that

$$
-\int_{\mathbb{D}_{r}} \widehat{U}_{\mu} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2}=- \text { const } \cdot \int_{t=0}^{r} t \mathrm{~d} t \int_{|z|=t} \widehat{U}_{\mu} \mathrm{d} \theta \geq- \text { const } \cdot \epsilon_{0}^{2} \cdot r^{4}
$$

for any $0<r \leq \epsilon_{1} \cdot r_{0}$. Since $U_{\mu} \leq 0$, we can bound $\mathcal{I}_{r}(\mu) \geq-\int_{\mathbb{B}(x, r)} U_{\mu} \cdot \omega$ from below by

$$
-\int_{\phi(\mathbb{B}(x, r))} U_{\mu} \circ \phi^{-1} \cdot\left(\phi^{-1}\right)^{*} \omega \geq-\int_{\mathbb{D}\left(0, \epsilon_{1} \cdot r\right)} \widehat{U}_{\mu} \cdot \epsilon_{0}^{2} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2} \geq \text { const } \cdot \epsilon_{0}^{4} \cdot r^{4}
$$

for any $r \in\left(0, r_{0}\right)$.

Proof 2. In the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{r}, U_{\mu}$ is non-positive. It suffices to show that $\int_{X} U_{\mu} \omega \geq c r^{4}$. The problem is local, we can work on $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$. More precisely, we will show that for any $\omega_{\mathbb{D}}$-subharmonic function $U_{r}$ with $U_{r} \leq 0$ on $\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathrm{dd}^{c} U_{r}=-\omega_{\mathbb{D}}$ on $\mathbb{D}_{r}$, one has $-\int_{\mathbb{D}_{r}} U_{r} \omega_{\mathbb{D}} \geq c r^{4}$, where $\omega_{\mathbb{D}}:=f(z) i \mathrm{~d} z \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}$ is some fixed Kähler form on $\mathbb{D}$.

Suppose for contradiction, there exists a sequence ( $U_{j}, r_{j}$ ) with $\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} U_{j}=-\omega_{\mathbb{D}}, U_{j} \leq 0$ and $\lim _{j \rightarrow \infty} r_{j}=0$, such that

$$
\lim _{j \rightarrow \infty} r^{-4} \int_{\mathbb{D}\left(0, r_{j}\right)} U_{j} \omega_{\mathbb{D}}=0
$$

Consider the dilation map $\tau_{r}: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(0, r), z \mapsto r z$. Define

$$
\Phi_{j}:=-r_{j}^{-2} \tau_{r_{j}}^{*} U_{j}
$$

Then on $\mathbb{D}$, for $j$ large, we have $\Phi_{j} \geq 0$ and

$$
\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \Phi_{j}=r_{j}^{-2} \tau_{r_{j}}^{*}\left(-\mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} U_{j}\right)=r^{-2} \tau_{r_{j}}^{*} \omega_{\mathbb{D}}=f\left(r_{j} z\right) i \mathrm{~d} z \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z} \gtrsim i \mathrm{~d} z \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}
$$

On the other hand,

$$
\int_{\mathbb{D}} \Phi_{j} i \mathrm{~d} z \wedge \mathrm{~d} \bar{z} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{D}} \Phi_{j} r^{-2} \tau_{r_{j}}^{*} \omega_{\mathbb{D}}=\int_{\mathbb{D}} r^{-2}\left(\tau_{r_{j}}\right)_{*}\left(\Phi_{j}\right) \omega_{\mathbb{D}}=-r^{-4} \int_{\mathbb{D}\left(0, r_{j}\right)} U_{j} \omega_{\mathbb{D}}
$$

This says the $L^{1}$-norm of $\Phi_{j}$ converges to 0 . It is not possible because $d^{\mathrm{c}} \Phi_{j}$ does not converge to 0 . So we get a contradiction.

To prove the upper bound, we construct a local quasi-subharmonic function first.
Lemma 9.3. Let $\omega_{\mathbb{D}}$ be a Kähler form on $\mathbb{D}$. There exist an integer $\ell>2$ and a constant $\alpha>0$, such that for every small $0<r \ll 1$, there exists a continuous $\omega_{\mathbb{D}}$-subharmonic function $\Phi_{r}$

Proof. Take two positive constants $\beta_{1}, \beta_{2}>0$ such that $\beta_{1} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2} \leq \omega_{\mathbb{D}} \leq \beta_{2} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2}$ on $\mathbb{D}_{1 / 2}$. Let $\ell$ be a large positive integer to be determined. Define an auxiliary function

$$
\Phi_{r}(z):=-\beta_{1}(|z|-\ell r)^{2}
$$

on $\mathbb{D}_{\ell r} \backslash \mathbb{D}_{r}$, where $r \in(0,1 /(2 \ell)]$. Direct computation shows that

$$
\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \Phi_{r}=-\beta_{1} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2}+2 \beta_{1} \ell r \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z| \geq-\beta_{1} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2} \geq-\omega_{\mathbb{D}}
$$

on $\mathbb{D}_{\ell r} \backslash \mathbb{D}_{r} \subset \mathbb{D}_{1 / 2}$. Next, we trivially extend $\Phi_{r}=0$ outside $\mathbb{D}_{\ell r}$, and we extend $\Phi_{r}$ inside $\mathbb{D}_{r}$ as the unique solution to the elliptic equation $\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \Phi_{r}=-\omega_{\mathbb{D}}$ with the boundary condition $\left.\Phi_{r}\right|_{\partial \mathbb{D}_{r}}=-\beta_{1}(\ell-1)^{2} r^{2}$.

Now we show that $\Phi_{r} \leq 0$ on $\mathbb{D}_{r}$. To do this, we introduce a comparison function $\Psi_{r}$ which solves the equation $\mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \Psi_{r}=-\beta_{2} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2}$ with the same boundary condition that $\left.\Psi_{r}\right|_{\partial \mathbb{D}_{r}}=-\beta_{1}(\ell-1)^{2} r^{2}$. Noting that $\mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}\left(\Phi_{r}-\Psi_{r}\right)=-\omega_{\mathbb{D}}+\beta_{2} \mathrm{dd}^{\mathrm{c}}|z|^{2} \geq 0$ with the vanishing boundary values $\left.\left(\Phi_{r}-\Psi_{r}\right)\right|_{\partial \mathbb{D}_{r}}=0$, by the maximal principle, $\Phi_{r}-\Psi_{r} \leq 0$ on $\mathbb{D}_{r}$. Thus we only need to check that $\Psi_{r} \leq 0$. Indeed, it is easy to see that

$$
\Psi(z)=-\beta_{1}(\ell-1)^{2} r^{2}+\beta_{2} \cdot\left(r^{2}-|z|^{2}\right) \leq\left(-\beta_{1}(\ell-1)^{2}+\beta_{2}\right) \cdot r^{2} \leq 0
$$

for $z \in \mathbb{D}_{r}$ as long as $\ell \geq \sqrt{\beta_{2} / \beta_{1}}+1$. It is clear that $\Phi_{r}$ is a continuous $\omega_{\mathbb{D}}$-subharmonic function and satisfies all the desired properties with $\alpha=-\beta_{1}(\ell-1)^{2}$.
Lemma 9.4. For every small $0<r \ll 1$, there exists a probability measure $\mu$ supported outside $\mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)$ such that $\mathcal{I}_{r}(\mu) \leq C r^{4}$ for some $C>0$ independent of $r$.

Proof. Using Lemma 9.3, we can find an $\omega$-subharmonic function $\Phi_{r}$ on $X$ such that $\Phi_{r}=0$ on $X \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)$, $-\alpha r^{2} \leq \Phi_{r} \leq 0$ on $\mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)$ and $d^{c} \Phi_{r}=-\omega$ on $\mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)$, where $\ell, \alpha$ are independent of $r$. Let $\mu:=\operatorname{dd}^{\mathrm{c}} \Phi_{r}+\omega$. Obviously, $\operatorname{supp}(\mu) \subset X \backslash \mathbb{B}\left(x_{0}, r\right)$. Observe that $\Phi_{r}$ is actually the $\omega$-potential of type M of $\mu$. Furthermore, since $\mu=\omega$ outside $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)$, the mass of $\mu$ on $\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)$ is equal to $\omega\left(\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)\right)$. Hence

$$
\mathcal{I}_{r}(\mu)=-\int_{\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)} \Phi_{r} \mathrm{~d} \mu-\int_{\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)} \Phi_{r} \omega \leq \alpha r^{2} \cdot \int_{\overline{\mathbb{B}}\left(x_{0}, \ell r\right)}(\mathrm{d} \mu+\omega) \lesssim r^{4} .
$$

This ends the proof.
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