

# RANDOM SUMS OF WEIGHTED ORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS IN $\mathbb{C}^d$

T. BLOOM, D. DAUVERGNE AND N. LEVENBERG\*

ABSTRACT. We consider random polynomials of the form  $G_n(z) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} \xi_\alpha^{(n)} p_{n,\alpha}(z)$  where  $\{\xi_\alpha^{(n)}\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  are i.i.d. (complex) random variables and  $\{p_{n,\alpha}\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  form a basis for  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , the holomorphic polynomials of degree at most  $n$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . In particular, this includes the setting where  $\{p_{n,\alpha}\}$  are orthonormal in a space  $L^2(e^{-2nQ}\tau)$ , where  $\tau$  is a compactly supported Bernstein-Markov measure and  $Q$  is a continuous weight function. Under an optimal moment condition on the random variables  $\{\xi_\alpha^{(n)}\}$ , in dimension  $d = 1$  we prove convergence in probability of the zero measure to the weighted equilibrium measure, and in dimension  $d \geq 2$  we prove convergence of zero currents.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider random polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ ,  $d \geq 1$ , of degree at most  $n$  of the form

$$(1.1) \quad G_n(z) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} \xi_\alpha^{(n)} p_{n,\alpha}(z)$$

where  $\{\xi_\alpha^{(n)}\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  is an array of i.i.d. (complex) random variables and the set  $\{p_{n,\alpha}\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  forms a basis for  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , the holomorphic polynomials of degree at most  $n$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . Here

$$p_{n,\alpha}(z) = a_{n,\alpha} z^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha} c_{n,\beta} z^\beta =: a_{n,\alpha} \tilde{p}_{n,\alpha}(z)$$

where  $z^\alpha := z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_d^{\alpha_d}$  and  $\prec$  denotes an ordering on the set  $\mathbb{N}^d = \{0, 1, \dots\}^d$  of multi-indices  $\alpha$  which satisfies  $\alpha \prec \beta$  whenever  $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_d < |\beta|$ , and if  $\alpha \prec \beta$ , then  $\alpha + e_j \prec \beta + e_j$  for any coordinate vector  $e_j := (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ . For example, if  $\alpha \prec \beta$  for  $|\alpha| < |\beta|$  and  $\prec$  is the standard lexicographic order on each of the sets  $\{\alpha : |\alpha| = n\}$ ,

---

\*Supported in part by Simons grant.

then  $\prec$  is a valid ordering. We will sometimes write  $\{p_{n,\alpha}\}_{|\alpha|\leq n} = \{p_{n,j}\}_{j=1,\dots,m_n}$  where  $m_n := \binom{d+n}{d} = \dim(\mathcal{P}_n)$ .

The random variables  $\xi_\alpha^{(n)}$  are defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ , and we will sometimes write  $G_n(z, \omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ . We always assume that the random variables are non-degenerate, i.e., the law of  $\xi_\alpha^{(n)}$  is not supported on a single point. We are interested in studying the distribution of the zero set of  $G_n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We extend some of the results in [1], [2], [9] and [3] on asymptotics of normalized zero measures and currents associated to  $G_n$ . All our proofs and theorems will apply to random polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  for arbitrary  $d \geq 1$ , however we introduce the problems first in dimension one, where the problems are more classical and the results have a simpler interpretation in terms of classical potential theory.

**1.1. Dimension one.** The simplest example of the form (1.1) is the Kac ensemble in  $d = 1$ , given by

$$H_n(z) = \sum_{j=0}^n \xi_j z^j.$$

In the case when the  $\xi_j$  are i.i.d. complex Gaussian random variables of mean 0 and variance 1, Hammersley [13] showed that the zeros of  $H_n$  concentrate on the unit circle. As one might expect, the asymptotic distribution of the zeros only depends on the  $\xi_j$  through a moment condition. To this end, Ibragimov and Zaporozhets [14] showed that the condition

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbb{E}(\log(1 + |\xi_0|)) < \infty$$

is both necessary and sufficient for almost sure weak-\* convergence of the *zero measure*  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i}$ , where  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  are the zeros of  $H_n$ , to normalized arclength measure  $\frac{1}{2\pi} d\theta$  on the unit circle.

If instead we are interested only in convergence in probability of the zero measure, then the correct necessary and sufficient condition is a slightly weakened version of (1.2):

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbb{P}(\log(1 + |\xi_0|) > t) = o(t^{-1}).$$

The necessity and sufficiency of this condition was shown in [5].

A useful way to think about these results is through the lens of orthogonal polynomials and potential theory. From this point of view, we can think of  $\{z^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  as orthonormal polynomials in the space

$L^2(\tau)$ ,  $\tau = \frac{1}{2\pi}d\theta$ , and view these convergence results as saying that the zero measure of a random sum of orthonormal polynomials converges under condition (1.3) to the equilibrium measure  $\mu_K$  on the support  $K$  of  $\tau$ , i.e. the unique probability measure supported on  $K$  minimizing the logarithmic energy

$$I(\mu) := \int \int \log \frac{1}{|z-t|} d\mu(z) d\mu(t).$$

In other words, we can approximate the equilibrium measure by the zero measure of a *random* sum of orthonormal polynomials. With this in mind, a natural generalization of the Kac ensemble is to take the polynomial basis  $p_{n,\alpha}$  in (1.1) to be given by a more general collection of orthonormal polynomials. More precisely, in this work we allow  $\{p_{n,j} : j = 0, \dots, n\}$  to be

- (1) orthonormal polynomials in  $L^2(e^{-2nQ}\tau)$  for  $\mathcal{P}_n$  where  $p_{n,j}$  has degree  $j$ . Here  $\tau$  is a probability measure supported on a regular compact set  $K$ , and  $Q : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous real-valued weight function (external field). We impose the mild regularity assumption that  $\tau$  is a *weighted Bernstein-Markov measure* for  $K, Q$ , or more generally
- (2) an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(e^{-2nQ}\tau_n)$  for  $\mathcal{P}_n$  associated to a sequence of *asymptotically weighted Bernstein-Markov measures*  $\tau_n$  for  $K, Q$ .

See Section 2 for precise definitions. The weight  $e^{-2nQ}$  is chosen so that in the limit, we expect the zero measure  $\mu_n$  of the random sum (1.1) to converge to the weighted equilibrium measure  $\mu_{K,Q}$ , i.e. the probability measure minimizing the weighted energy

$$I(\mu) + 2 \int Q d\mu$$

among all probability measures supported on  $K$ . In the unweighted case  $Q \equiv 0$ , [5] showed that under assumption (1) above and condition (1.3) on the random variables,  $\mu_n$  converges in probability to the equilibrium measure in the weak\* topology.

The behaviour of the  $G_n$  when  $Q \not\equiv 0$  is quite different. For example, when  $Q \equiv 0$  the equilibrium measure  $\mu$  is always supported on the outer boundary of the set  $K$ , whereas general weighted equilibrium measures can be quite arbitrary (e.g., see [18, Section IV]). Moreover, when  $Q \equiv 0$ , the array  $\{p_{n,i} : i \leq n\}$  is simply a sequence  $p_{n,i} = p_i$

of orthonormal polynomials, a point which is crucial to the proofs in [5, 11].

In the case of a non-zero external field, [3] showed that  $\mu_n$  converges weakly to  $\mu$  under assumption (1.3) whenever the distribution of the  $\xi_j$  has no atoms. Our main theorem in dimension one removes this condition.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\{\xi_i^{(n)}, i \leq n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be an array of i.i.d. random variables satisfying (1.3); let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  be compact and regular; and let  $Q$  be a continuous, real-valued function on  $K$ . Let  $\{p_{n,i}\}_{i \leq n}$  be a basis for  $\mathcal{P}_n$  as in (1) or (2). For random polynomials  $G_n$  as in (1.1) with zero set  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  we have*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \rightarrow \mu_{K,Q}$$

*in probability in the weak\* topology on measures on  $\mathbb{C}$ .*

**Remark 1.2.** Theorem 1.1 is the strongest possible result. Indeed the method introduced in [11] for showing necessity of the condition (1.3) in the unweighted case  $Q \equiv 0$  also works in the weighted case with a few minor modifications. For brevity we do not pursue this direction here.

**1.2. Dimension  $d \geq 2$ .** In dimensions  $d \geq 2$ , we view the zero set of  $G_n$  as a  $(1, 1)$ -current (see [16]):

$$Z_{G_n} := dd^c \left( \frac{1}{\deg(G_n)} \log |G_n| \right)$$

where  $dd^c = \frac{i}{\pi} \partial \bar{\partial}$ . When paired with a test form  $\phi$  (i.e., a smooth  $(n-1, n-1)$ -form with compact support),  $\langle Z_{G_n}, \phi \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$ . We endow the space of  $(1, 1)$ -currents with the weak\* topology and call  $Z_{G_n}$  the **zero current** of  $G_n$ . In dimension 1,  $dd^c = \frac{1}{2\pi} \Delta$ , where  $\Delta$  is the Laplace operator, and this definition gives back the zero measure. The operator  $dd^c$  is continuous on  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{C})$ , so it is natural to study convergence of the functions  $\frac{1}{\deg(G_n)} \log |G_n|$  there as  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  is a more concrete space than the space of all  $(1, 1)$ -currents. In particular, it is metrizable, which allows us to consider convergence in probability on this space and then pass results down to the (non-metrizable) space of  $(1, 1)$ -currents.

As in the one-variable case, we consider orthonormal polynomial bases of the form (1) or (2) above (with  $\{p_{n,j} : j = 1, \dots, m_n\}$ ), but

we require that the compact set  $K$  be locally regular, rather than regular. In dimension 1, these notions coincide. The correct multivariate analogue of condition (1.3) is

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbb{P}(\log(1 + |\xi_\alpha^{(n)}|) > t) = o(t^{-d}).$$

Indeed, [5] showed that for polynomial bases of the form (1) above with  $Q \equiv 0$ , if  $G_n$  is built from i.i.d. random variables satisfying (1.4), then the functions  $\frac{1}{\deg(G_n)} \log |G_n|$  converge in probability. As in the one-variable setting, [3] extended this to all ensembles satisfying (1) or (2) with the additional assumption that the distribution of the  $\xi_\alpha^{(n)}$  has no atoms, and we remove this condition in the present work.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\{\xi_\alpha^{(n)}\}$  be an array of i.i.d. random variables satisfying (1.4); let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  be compact and locally regular; and let  $Q$  be a continuous, real-valued function on  $K$ . Let  $\{p_{n,\alpha}\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  be a basis for  $\mathcal{P}_n$  as in (1) or (2). For random polynomials  $G_n$  as in (1.1),*

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n| \rightarrow V_{K,Q} \text{ in } L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{C}^d)$$

*in probability.*

We will give the definitions of all notions in Theorem 1.3 in the next section. Note that despite the similarity to the main result of [3], the potential for distributions with atoms requires a completely different method of proof.

The next corollary translates Theorem 1.3 to a statement about convergence of zero measures. Note that both of the types of convergence we state below are equivalent to convergence in probability in metrizable spaces.

**Corollary 1.4.** *In the setting of Theorem 1.3, the zero currents  $Z_{G_n}$  converge to  $dd^c V_{K,Q}$  in either of the following senses:*

- *For any sequence  $Y \subset \mathbb{N}$  there is a further subsequence  $Y' \subset Y$  such that  $Z_{G_n} \rightarrow dd^c V_{K,Q}$  weak\*-almost surely along  $Y'$ .*
- *For any weak\*-open set  $O$  containing  $dd^c V_{K,Q}$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_{G_n} \in O) = 1.$$

In the next section, we provide the necessary (weighted) potential- and pluripotential-theoretic background, including a key result on the leading coefficients  $a_{n,\alpha}$  of  $p_{n,\alpha}$  (Proposition 2.2). Section 3 outlines the

general strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.3, reducing it to verifying the crucial Proposition 3.2. The proof of this result is completely different to its analogue in [3]; the key step is Theorem 3.3. Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.4 are also deduced from Theorem 1.3 in this section. The details of the actual proof of Theorem 3.3 are given in section 4.

## 2. WEIGHTED (PLURI-)POTENTIAL THEORY PRELIMINARIES

We begin with some general definitions, valid in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  for any  $d \geq 1$ . For  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  compact, let  $V_K^*(z) := \limsup_{\zeta \rightarrow z} V_K(\zeta)$  where

$$\begin{aligned} V_K(z) &:= \sup\{u(z) : u \in L(\mathbb{C}^d) \text{ and } u \leq 0 \text{ on } K\} \\ &= \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\deg(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \in \bigcup \mathcal{P}_n, \|p\|_K := \sup_{\zeta \in K} |p(\zeta)| \leq 1\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $L(\mathbb{C}^d)$  is the set of all plurisubharmonic functions on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  of logarithmic growth:  $u \in L(\mathbb{C}^d)$  if  $u$  is plurisubharmonic in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  and  $u(z) \leq \log |z| + O(1)$  as  $|z| \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that  $V_K = V_{\widehat{K}}$  where

$$(2.1) \quad \widehat{K} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^d : |p(z)| \leq \|p\|_K \text{ for all polynomials } p\}.$$

It is known that either  $V_K^* \equiv +\infty$  ( $K$  is pluripolar) or  $V_K^* \in L(\mathbb{C}^d)$ ; in this paper, we always assume the latter holds. The compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  is *regular* at  $a \in K$  if  $V_K$  is continuous at  $a$ ; and  $K$  is regular if it is continuous on  $K$ , i.e., if  $V_K = V_K^*$ . We call a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  *locally regular* if for any  $z_0 \in K$ ,  $V_{K \cap \overline{B(z_0, r)}}$  is continuous at  $z_0$  for  $r > 0$  where  $B(z_0, r) := \{z : |z - z_0| < r\}$ ; this is an a priori stronger notion than regularity but these notions coincide if  $d = 1$ . Let  $Q$  be a continuous, real-valued function on  $K$  and let  $w := e^{-Q}$ . The weighted extremal function for  $K, Q$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} V_{K, Q}(z) &:= \sup\{u(z) : u \in L(\mathbb{C}^d), u \leq Q \text{ on } K\} \\ &= \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\deg(p)} \log |p(z)| : p \in \bigcup_n \mathcal{P}_n, \|pe^{-\deg(p) \cdot Q}\|_K \leq 1\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is known that for  $K$  locally regular and  $Q$  continuous,  $V_{K, Q}$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  (cf., [17]).

To explain the allowable bases  $\{p_{n, j}\}_{j=1, \dots, m_n}$  in Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, given a positive measure  $\tau$  on  $K$ , we say that  $(K, Q, \tau)$  satisfies a weighted Bernstein-Markov property if

$$(2.2) \quad \|w^n p_n\|_K \leq M_n \|w^n p_n\|_{L^2(\tau)} \text{ for all } p_n \in \mathcal{P}_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$$

where  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n^{1/n} = 1$ . For such triples, letting  $\{p_{n,j}\}_{j=1,\dots,m_n}$  be an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(e^{-2nQ}\tau)$  for  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , define

$$(2.3) \quad B_n(z) := \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} |p_{n,j}(z)|^2.$$

It is well-known that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2n} \log B_n(z) = V_{K,Q} \text{ locally uniformly on } \mathbb{C}^d$$

and this is the key deterministic property of our bases  $\{p_{n,j}\}$  that we will need. More generally, let  $\{\mu_n\}$  be a sequence of probability measures on  $K$  with the following property: if  $M_n$  is the smallest constant such that

$$\|qe^{-nQ}\|_K \leq M_n \|q\|_{L^2(e^{-2nQ}\mu_n)} = M_n \|qe^{-nQ}\|_{L^2(\mu_n)} \text{ for all } q \in \mathcal{P}_n,$$

then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n^{1/n} = 1$ . We say that  $\{\mu_n\}$  are *asymptotically weighted Bernstein-Markov* for  $K, Q$  (simply asymptotically Bernstein-Markov if  $Q \equiv 0$ ). In [3, Proposition 2.8] the following was proved (it was stated slightly differently there):

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  be a locally regular compact set and  $Q$  a continuous, real-valued function on  $K$ . Let  $\{\mu_n\}$  be an asymptotically weighted Bernstein-Markov sequence for  $K, Q$  and let  $\{p_{n,j}\}_{j=1,\dots,m_n}$  be an orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{P}_n$  in  $L^2(e^{-2nQ}\mu_n)$ . Then for  $B_n$  as in (2.3),*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2n} \log B_n = V_{K,Q} \text{ locally uniformly on } \mathbb{C}^d.$$

Now let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  be compact and locally regular. For  $Q$  continuous on  $K$ , we have  $w = e^{-Q} > 0$  on  $K$ . Fix  $\tau$  a finite measure on  $K$  such that  $(K, Q, \tau)$  is weighted Bernstein-Markov. Let

$$\mathcal{P}(\alpha) = \mathcal{P}_d(\alpha) := \{z^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha} c_\beta z^\beta : c_\beta \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Recall that our ordering  $\prec$  on multiindices satisfies  $\beta \prec \alpha$  whenever  $|\beta| < |\alpha|$ . We write

$$(2.4) \quad p_{n,\alpha}(z) = a_{n,\alpha} z^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha} c_{n,\beta} z^\beta =: a_{n,\alpha} \tilde{p}_{n,\alpha}(z)$$

where  $\{p_{n,\alpha}\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  is an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(e^{-2nQ}\tau)$  for  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . Then

$$\tilde{p}_{n,\alpha}(z) = z^\alpha + \dots \in \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$$

and  $\|w^n p_{n,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\tau)} = 1$  implies  $\|w^n \tilde{p}_{n,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\tau)} = \frac{1}{|a_{n,\alpha}|}$ , which is minimal among polynomials  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$ .

We need some control over these leading coefficients  $a_{n,\alpha}$ . For multi-indices  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$  with  $|\alpha| \leq n$ , let

$$(2.5) \quad T(n, \alpha) := \inf\{\|w^n p\|_{L^2(\tau)} : p \in \mathcal{P}(\alpha)\}.$$

Since  $T(n, \alpha) = \frac{1}{|a_{n,\alpha}|}$  an equivalent issue is to control the numbers  $T(n, \alpha)$ .

To proceed, following [8], taking  $K, w = e^{-Q}$  and  $\tau$  as above, we let

$$Z = Z(K, w) := \{(t, z) = (t, t\lambda) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^d : \lambda \in K, |t| = w(\lambda)\}$$

(note  $\lambda = z/t \in \mathbb{C}^d$ ) and

$$Z(D) := \{(t, z) = (t, t\lambda) : \lambda \in K, |t| \leq w(\lambda)\}.$$

Then  $Z(D)$  is a complete circular set ( $\zeta Z(D) \subset Z(D)$  for  $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|\zeta| \leq 1$ ). Since  $V_{K,Q}$  is continuous, from Theorem 2.1 in [8],  $Z(D)$  is regular. Define a measure  $\nu$  by the integration formula

$$\int \phi d\nu = \int \left( \int \phi(t, t\lambda) dm_\lambda(t) \right) d\tau(\lambda)$$

for measurable  $\phi : \mathbb{C}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Here  $m_\lambda$  is normalized arclength measure on the circle  $|t| = w(\lambda)$  (see (3.3) of [8]). The probability measure  $\nu$  satisfies the Bernstein-Markov property on  $Z(D)$  in dimension  $d + 1$  (see [8, Theorem 3.1] and surrounding discussion).

Given a polynomial  $G_n(z)$  of degree at most  $n$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ , we can form the homogeneous polynomial

$$P_n(t, z) = t^n G_n(z/t)$$

of degree  $n$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{d+1}$ . Then

$$\|w^n G_n\|_K = \|P_n\|_{Z(D)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|w^n G_n\|_{L^2(\tau)} = \|P_n\|_{L^2(\nu)}.$$

Next, applying Gram-Schmidt in  $L^2(w^{2n}\tau)$  to the monomials  $\{z^\alpha\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  with the ordering  $\prec$ , we thus obtain orthonormal polynomials  $\{p_{n,\alpha}\}_{|\alpha| \leq n}$  as in (2.4). Now, define

$$P_{n,\alpha}(t, z) := t^n p_{n,\alpha}(z/t).$$

These are homogeneous polynomials of degree  $n$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{d+1}$  which are orthonormal in  $L^2(\nu)$ . By extending the ordering  $\prec$  to multi-indices in



the variables  $(t, z_1, \dots, z_d)$  so that  $t$  comes before all the  $z$  variables, i.e.,

$$(n - |\beta|, \beta) \prec (n - |\alpha|, \alpha) \text{ if } \beta \prec \alpha,$$

we have a similar expression to (2.4) for  $P_{n,\alpha}$ :

$$P_{n,\alpha}(t, z) = a_{n,\alpha} t^{n-|\alpha|} z^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha} c_\beta t^{n-|\beta|} z^\beta.$$

Since  $\|w^n p_{n,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\tau)} = \|P_{n,\alpha}\|_{L^2(\nu)}$ , we similarly have

$$T(n, \alpha) = \inf\{\|P\|_{L^2(\nu)} : P \in \mathcal{P}(n, \alpha)\} = \frac{1}{|a_{n,\alpha}|}$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}(n, \alpha) = \mathcal{P}_{d+1}(n, \alpha) := \left\{ t^{n-|\alpha|} z^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha} a_\beta t^{n-|\beta|} z^\beta : a_\beta \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$$

are the ‘‘monic’’ homogeneous polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}^{d+1}$  corresponding to the class  $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . Thus, in order to control the leading coefficients  $a_{n,\alpha}$  of  $p_{n,\alpha}$  it suffices to work with the measure  $\nu$  and the (same) leading coefficients  $a_{n,\alpha}$  of  $P_{n,\alpha}$ .

Let  $\Sigma_d := \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \sum_{j=1}^d x_j = 1\}$  be the standard simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let

$$\Sigma_d^0 := \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 < x_i < 1, \sum_{j=1}^d x_j = 1\}.$$

Given a compact set  $F \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\theta \in \Sigma_d$ , Zaharjuta [19] defined directional Chebyshev constants  $\tau(F, \theta)$  via

$$\tau(F, \theta) := \limsup_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow \theta} \tau_\alpha(F)$$

where

$$\tau_\alpha(F) := \inf\{\|p\|_F : p \in \mathcal{P}_d(\alpha)\}^{1/|\alpha|}.$$

He showed that for  $\theta \in \Sigma_d^0$ , the limit

$$\tau(F, \theta) = \lim_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow \theta} \tau_\alpha(F)$$

exists and  $\theta \rightarrow \tau(F, \theta)$  is continuous on  $\Sigma_d^0$ . For  $\theta \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma^0$ , the limit need not exist (see Remark 1 in [19]). However, it was recently shown in [10] that for  $F$  regular, the limit does, indeed, exist for  $\theta \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma^0$ ,

and, moreover, in this case,  $\theta \rightarrow \tau(F, \theta)$  is continuous on *all* of  $\Sigma_d$ . This fact will be crucial.

We write  $\alpha(i) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  for the  $i$ -th multi-index in our ordering  $\prec$  on  $\mathbb{N}^d$ . By [10] and the Bernstein-Markov property of  $\nu$  on  $Z(D)$ , we know that for all  $\tilde{\theta} = (\theta_0, \theta) \in \Sigma_{d+1}$ , where  $\theta_0 \in [0, 1]$ , the limits in the directional Chebyshev constants for  $Z(D) \subset \mathbb{C}^{d+1}$  exist and are given by

$$(2.6) \quad \tau(Z(D), \tilde{\theta}) = \lim_{(n-|\alpha|, \alpha)/n \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}} T(n, \alpha)^{1/n} = \lim_{(n-|\alpha|, \alpha)/n \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}} \frac{1}{|a_{n, \alpha}|^{1/n}}.$$

Here given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$  so that  $\alpha/|\alpha| = \theta \in \Sigma_d$ , we have  $(n - |\alpha|, \alpha) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$  and  $(n - |\alpha|, \alpha)/n = \tilde{\theta} \in \Sigma_{d+1}$ ; and for  $Z(D)$  circled ( $(t, z) \in Z(D)$  implies  $e^{i\theta}(t, z) \in Z(D)$ ) we only need consider these homogeneous Chebyshev constants  $T(n, \alpha)$  to construct the directional Chebyshev constants for  $Z(D)$  (cf., [15]).

We will need the following simple consequence of (2.6).

**Proposition 2.2.** *For any sequences  $\{k_n\}, \{i_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  with  $k_n, i_n \leq m_n$  and*

$$\|\alpha(i_n) - \alpha(k_n)\|_2 = o(n),$$

*we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|a_{n, \alpha(i_n)}|}{|a_{n, \alpha(k_n)}|} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Suppose not. Then we can find a subsequence  $Y \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|a_{n, \alpha(i_n)}|}{|a_{n, \alpha(k_n)}|} \right| > \epsilon$$

for all  $n \in Y$ . Now, since  $\Sigma_{d+1}$  is compact, we can find a further subsequence  $Y' \subset Y$  such that  $(n - |\alpha(i_n)|, \alpha(i_n))/n \in \Sigma_{d+1}$  converges to a point  $\tilde{\theta} \in \Sigma_{d+1}$  along  $Y'$ . Since  $\|\alpha(i_n) - \alpha(k_n)\|_2 = o(n)$ , we similarly have that  $(n - |\alpha(k_n)|, \alpha(k_n))/n \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}$ . Therefore applying (2.6) we have that

$$\lim_{n \in Y'} \frac{1}{n} \log |a_{n, \alpha(i_n)}| = \lim_{n \in Y'} \frac{1}{n} \log |a_{n, \alpha(k_n)}| = -\log \tau(Z(D), \tilde{\theta}),$$

which contradicts the previous display.  $\square$

We will only need this result for  $i_n$  and  $k_n$  where

$$\alpha(i_n) = \alpha(k_n) \pm (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0).$$

**Remark 2.3.** In the univariate case, given  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  corresponding to  $\alpha(j) = j$ , the point  $(n - j, j)/n$  is a point on the simplex  $\Sigma_2$ . Using the notation in this setting, Proposition 2.2 reads:

**Proposition 2.4.** *For any sequence  $\{k_n\}$  with  $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k_n = o(n)$ , and any sequence  $\{i_n\}$  with  $i_n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i_n \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left( \frac{|a_{n, i_n}|}{|a_{n, i_n + k_n}|} \right) = 0.$$

The proof of Proposition 2.4 only requires a special case of the  $\mathbb{C}^2$  version of the main result in [10]. We provide a self-contained proof of this case in the appendix.

**Remark 2.5.** In the case of a sequence  $\{\tau_n\}$  of asymptotically Bernstein-Markov measures for  $K, Q$ , the corresponding sequence  $\{\nu_n\}$  is asymptotically Bernstein-Markov on  $Z(D)$ . The  $T(n, \alpha)$  in (2.5) are computed using  $\tau_n$ ; from the asymptotic Bernstein-Markov property of  $\{\nu_n\}$  and [10], equation (2.6) is still valid.

### 3. STRATEGY OF PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

The following multidimensional version of Theorem 4.1 of [5] or [6], which occurs as Proposition 3.5 in [3], is the guiding light for the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\{G_n(z, \omega)\}$  be a sequence of random polynomials of the form (1.1) such that for some continuous function  $V \in L(\mathbb{C}^d)$ ,*

- (1) *almost surely,  $\{\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n|\}$  is locally uniformly bounded above on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ ;*
- (2) *almost surely,  $[\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |G_n(z, \omega)|]^* \leq V(z)$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ ; and*
- (3) *there is a countable dense set of points  $\{w_r\}$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |G_n(w_r, \omega)| = V(w_r), \quad r = 1, 2, \dots$$

*almost surely.*

*Then almost surely,  $\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n| \rightarrow V$  in  $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ .*

To show that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n| \rightarrow V_K \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{C}^d)$$

in probability, it suffices to show that for any sequence  $Y \subset \mathbb{N}$  there is a further subsequence  $Y_1 \subset Y$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, n \in Y_1} \frac{1}{n} \log |G_n| = V_K \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{C}^d)$$

almost surely. The first two properties in Proposition 3.1 of the full sequence  $\{\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n|\}$  follow as in [3] under the hypothesis that  $\frac{1}{2n} \log B_n \rightarrow V_{K,Q}$  locally uniformly on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ ; this condition holds for bases satisfying (1) or (2) in the introduction by Proposition 2.1. Thus we concentrate on the third property for a subsequence.

From the previous observations, to apply Proposition 3.1 in this setting it suffices to prove the following.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Under the hypothesis (1.4), there exists a countable dense set  $\{z_j\} \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  such that for any subsequence  $Y \subset \mathbb{N}$  there exists a further subsequence  $Y_0 \subset Y$  such that*

$$(3.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, n \in Y_0} \frac{1}{n} \log |G_n(z_j)| = V_{K,Q}(z_j)$$

almost surely for every  $z_j$ .

Proposition 3.2 follows from the next result.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define*

$$J_n(z, \epsilon) := \#\{\alpha : |\alpha| \leq n \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha}(z)| \geq V_{K,Q}(z) - \epsilon\}.$$

*Then there exists a set  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  of Lebesgue measure 0 such that for any  $z \in M^c$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_n(z, \epsilon) = \infty.$$

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is the main novel idea in the present paper and is contained in the next section. Assuming Theorem 3.3, we can proceed similarly to [5] to prove Proposition 3.2. The key step deduces (3.1) from the Kolmogorov-Rogozin inequality and (3.2). This lemma explains how the condition (1.4) enters into the main theorem.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\{z_{n,\alpha} : |\alpha| \leq n, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be an array of complex numbers and for  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  define*

$$K_n(M) = \#\{\alpha : |\alpha| \leq n \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \log |z_{n,\alpha}| \geq M\}.$$

Suppose there exists  $m_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_n(M) = \infty, \quad M < m_0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_n(M) = 0, \quad M > m_0.$$

Let  $\{\xi_{n,\alpha} : |\alpha| \leq n, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be an array of i.i.d. non-degenerate complex random variables satisfying (1.4). Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} \xi_{n,\alpha} z_{n,\alpha} \right| = m_0$$

in probability.

The proof is a slight variant of the first part of the proof of Theorem 5.2 in [5].

*Proof.* We first show that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , that

$$(3.4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n} \log \left| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} \xi_{n,\alpha} z_{n,\alpha} \right| > m_0 + \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

We have the bound

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \left| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} \xi_{n,\alpha} z_{n,\alpha} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \left( \max_{|\alpha| \leq n} |\xi_{n,\alpha}| \right) + \frac{1}{n} \log \left( \max_{|\alpha| \leq n} |z_{n,\alpha}| \right) + \frac{d \log n}{n}.$$

The second term on the right-hand side above is at most  $m_0 + \epsilon/2$  for large enough  $n$  since  $K_n(m_0 + \epsilon/2) = 0$  for large enough  $n$ , and the third term tends to 0 with  $n$ . To bound the first term, observe that by a union bound and condition (1.4),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\log |\xi_{n,\alpha}| > n\epsilon/4 \text{ for some } |\alpha| \leq n) \\ & \leq \binom{n+d}{d} \mathbb{P}(\log |\xi_{n,0}| > n\epsilon/4) = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the first term in the previous display is at most  $\epsilon/4$  with probability tending to 1 with  $n$ . This yields (3.4).

To complete the proof, we show that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$(3.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n} \log \left| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} \xi_{n,\alpha} z_{n,\alpha} \right| < m_0 - \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

To prove (3.5), recall that for a complex random variable  $X$  and  $r > 0$ , its concentration function is

$$\mathcal{Q}(X; r) := \sup_{c \in \mathbb{C}} \mathbb{P}(|X - c| < r).$$

Using the concentration, we can bound the probability in (3.5) above by

$$\mathcal{Q}\left(\sum_{|\alpha|\leq n} \xi_{n,\alpha} z_{n,\alpha} ; e^{n(m_0-\epsilon)}\right),$$

which by the Kolmogorov-Rogozin inequality for sums of independent random variables (see [12], Corollary 1) is bounded above by

$$(3.6) \quad C\left(\sum_{|\alpha|\leq n} [1 - \mathcal{Q}(\xi_{n,\alpha} z_{n,\alpha} ; e^{n(m_0-\epsilon)})]\right)^{-1/2},$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant. Now, if  $|z_{n,\alpha}| > e^{n(m_0-\epsilon/2)}$ , then

$$\mathcal{Q}(\xi_{n,\alpha} z_{n,\alpha} ; e^{n(m_0-\epsilon)}) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\xi_{n,\alpha} e^{n(m_0-\epsilon/2)} ; e^{n(m_0-\epsilon)}) = \mathcal{Q}(\xi_{n,\alpha} ; e^{-n\epsilon/2}).$$

Since the  $\xi_{n,\alpha}$  are non-degenerate, for large enough  $n$ , the right-hand side is bounded above by  $1 - \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . Therefore for such  $n$ , (3.6) is bounded above by

$$C[K_n(m_0 - \epsilon/2)\delta]^{-1/2},$$

which tends to 0 with  $n$  since  $K_n(m_0 - \epsilon/2) \rightarrow \infty$ . This proves (3.5), completing the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.2.* It suffices to find a dense set  $M^c \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  such that for any  $z \in M^c$  we have

$$(3.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |G_n(z)| = V_{K,Q}(z) \quad \text{in probability.}$$

Then, given a countable dense subset  $\{z_j\} \subset M^c$ , given any subsequence  $Y$  we can use a diagonalization argument to pass to a further subsequence  $Y_0$  on which (3.7) holds almost surely, as required.

Take  $M$  as in Theorem 3.3, so that for  $z \in M^c$  we have

$$(3.8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_n(z, \epsilon) = \infty$$

for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . We apply Lemma 3.4 with  $z_{n,\alpha} = p_{n,\alpha}(z)$ . With notation as in that lemma, (3.8) implies that  $K_n(V_{K,Q}(z) - \epsilon) \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . Moreover for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $K_n(V_{K,Q}(z) + \epsilon) = 0$  for all large enough  $n$  by Proposition 2.1. Applying Lemma 3.4 yields (3.7).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.4.* By Proposition 3.2 and the discussion after Proposition 3.1, we can find a countable dense set  $\{z_j\} \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  such that given any subsequence  $Y \subset \mathbb{N}$  we can find a

further subsequence  $Y' \subset Y$  such that conditions (1)-(3) in Proposition 3.1 hold almost surely along  $Y'$  with  $V = V_{K,Q}$ , and hence  $\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n| \rightarrow V_{K,Q}$  in  $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  almost surely along this subsequence. Hence  $\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n| \rightarrow V_{K,Q}$  in probability over  $\mathbb{N}$ , proving Theorem 1.3. Moreover, the first bullet point in Corollary 1.4 then follows from the weak\*-continuity of the operator  $dd^c$  in  $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ .

For the second bullet in Corollary 1.4, letting  $O$  be any weak\*-open set of  $(1, 1)$ -currents, containing  $dd^c V_{K,Q}$ , continuity of  $dd^c$  implies that  $(dd^c)^{-1}O$  is an open set in  $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  containing  $V_{K,Q}$ . Applying Theorem 1.3 gives that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\frac{1}{n} \log |G_n| \in (dd^c)^{-1}O) = 1,$$

yielding the second bullet. Finally, Theorem 1.1 is the special case when our  $(1, 1)$ -currents can be identified with measures with the (now metrizable) weak\* topology. Metrizability ensures that we can recast either of the equivalent bullet points in Corollary 1.4 as convergence in probability.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3

We will give the proof of Theorem 3.3 under condition (1); i.e., where  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  is compact and locally regular;  $w = e^{-Q}$  is continuous on  $K$ ; and  $\tau$  is a finite measure on  $K$  such that  $(K, Q, \tau)$  satisfies a weighted Bernstein-Markov property (2.2). The proof in the case where we take a sequence  $\{\mu_n\}$  of asymptotically weighted Bernstein-Markov measures for  $K, Q$  is the same, mutatis mutandis.

Theorem 3.3 naturally splits into two cases, depending on the value of  $V_{K,Q}$  at  $z$ . If  $V_{K,Q}(z)$  attains its minimal value  $\inf Q$ , then the polynomials for which  $\frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha}(z)|$  is close to  $V_{K,Q}(z)$  have low degree. In this case, we can show that  $J_n(z, \epsilon)$  is large by directly showing that when  $|\alpha| \ll n$ , the function  $\frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha}(z)|$  is essentially flat and close to  $\inf Q$  outside of a set of small measure.

On the other hand, at points where  $V_{K,Q}(z) > \inf Q$ , the polynomials used in the approximation of  $V_{K,Q}(z)$  will have large degree. Large degree orthonormal polynomials for arbitrary  $K, Q$  are harder to control explicitly; our construction simply shows the existence of a collection of polynomials that ensure  $J_n(z, \epsilon)$  is large. The rough idea is to use the orthogonality condition, as well as Proposition 2.2, to bootstrap the existence of a single  $\alpha$ ,  $|\alpha| \leq n$  with  $\frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha}(z)|$  close to  $V_{K,Q}(z)$

– guaranteed by Proposition 2.1 – to a collection of other  $\beta$ ,  $|\beta| \leq n$  with  $\frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\beta}(z)|$  close to  $V_{K,Q}(z)$ .

To understand why we need to introduce two cases, it may be useful to keep in mind the simplest case of the sequence of single-variable monomials  $1, z, z^2, \dots$ , which are the orthonormal polynomials for normalized arclength measure on the unit circle  $K$  in the unweighted case  $Q = 0$ . When  $0 < |z| \leq 1$ , we have

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log |z^{k_n}| \rightarrow V_{K,Q}(z) = \max(\log |z|, 0)$$

for any sequence  $k_n = o(n)$ , whereas when  $|z| \geq 1$ , the convergence in (4.1) holds whenever  $k_n = n - o(n)$ . The point  $z = 0$  is the unique point where  $J_n(z, \epsilon) \not\rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ ; this is the set  $M$  in Theorem 3.3.

We first deal with the case where  $V_{K,Q}(z) = \inf Q$ . For this, we require a multivariate version of Cartan's estimate on the Lebesgue measure of the set where a polynomial can be small. We will use this estimate to show that for low degree polynomials,  $\frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha}(z)|$  is essentially flat. The following lemma is Corollary 4.2 of [4].

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $B$  be a closed ball. There exists  $C = C(d)$  such that for any polynomial  $p$  of degree  $n$  with  $\|p\|_B = 1$  we have*

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(\{z \in B : |p(z)| \leq \epsilon^n\})}{\mathcal{L}(B)} \leq C\epsilon^2$$

for  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ . Here  $\mathcal{L}$  denotes Lebesgue measure.

**Remark 4.2.** In the univariate case, we have the stronger classical Cartan's lemma: for a monic polynomial  $p$  of degree  $n$  and any  $h > 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}(\{z : |p(z)| \leq h^n\}) \leq ch^2.$$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\alpha_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$  be any sequence with  $|\alpha_n| = o(n/\log n)$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)| = \inf Q$$

for (Lebesgue) almost every  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)| \leq \inf Q$$

for every  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ .



*Proof.* Fix a closed ball  $B \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ . We first claim that

$$(4.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)|}{\|p_{n,\alpha_n}\|_B} = 0$$

for almost every  $z \in B$ . Indeed, for any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ , by Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\mathcal{L} \left\{ z \in B : \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)|}{\|p_{n,\alpha_n}\|_B} \leq -\epsilon \right\} \leq \mathcal{L}(B) \cdot C e^{-2\epsilon n/|\alpha_n|}$$

where the constant  $C$  is as in this lemma. Since  $|\alpha_n| = o(n/\log n)$ , the right-hand side is summable in  $n$  for all fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ . Therefore by the Borel-Cantelli lemma,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)|}{\|p_{n,\alpha_n}\|_B} \geq -\epsilon$$

for almost every  $z \in B$ . Since  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, (4.2) follows.

Now, for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ , from the definition of  $V_{K,Q}$  we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)|}{\|p_{n,\alpha_n} e^{-nQ}\|_K} \leq V_{K,Q}(z).$$

Noting that  $\frac{1}{n} \log \|p_{n,\alpha_n} w^n\|_K \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by the weighted Bernstein Markov property (2.2), we therefore have

$$(4.3) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)| \leq V_{K,Q}(z)$$

for every  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ . On the other hand, letting  $B$  be any closed ball containing  $K$ , we have

$$\|p_{n,\alpha_n}\|_B \geq \|p_{n,\alpha_n}\|_K \geq e^{n \inf Q} \|p_{n,\alpha_n} e^{-nQ}\|_K = e^{n(\inf Q + o(1))},$$

where the final bound again uses the weighted Bernstein-Markov property (2.2), thus

$$(4.4) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|p_{n,\alpha_n}\|_B \geq \inf Q.$$

Now, since  $Q$  is continuous and  $V_{K,Q} \leq Q$  on  $K$ , the only way (4.2), (4.3), and (4.4) can simultaneously hold is if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha_n}(z)| = \inf Q = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|p_{n,\alpha_n}\|_B$$

for almost every  $z \in B$ . This first equality gives the first claim in the lemma, and the second equality gives the second claim.  $\square$

We can now quickly prove the  $V_{K,Q}(z) = \inf Q$  case of Theorem 3.3.

**Corollary 4.4.** *There exists a set  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^d$  of Lebesgue measure 0 such that for any  $z \in M^c$  with  $V_{K,Q}(z) = \inf Q$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_n(z, \epsilon) = \infty.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha(0), \alpha(1), \dots$  be the sequence of multi-indices in  $\mathbb{N}^d$ , listed according to the total order  $\prec$ . For every  $k$ , let  $M_k$  be the set of points  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$  where

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n, \alpha(k)}(z)| \neq \inf Q,$$

and set  $M = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k$ . The Lebesgue measure of each  $M_k$  is 0 by Lemma 4.3, and so the Lebesgue measure of  $M$  is also 0. Moreover, the set  $M$  satisfies the other condition of the corollary by construction.  $\square$

The remaining case of Theorem 3.3 follows from the next lemma.

**Lemma 4.5.** *For any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $V_{K,Q}(z) > \inf Q$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_n(z, \epsilon) = \infty.$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.3 given Lemma 4.5.* The constant function  $\inf Q$  belongs to  $L(\mathbb{C}^d)$ ; thus  $V_{K,Q} \geq \inf Q$  in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . Taking  $M$  as in Corollary 4.4, the theorem follows by combining Corollary 4.4 with Lemma 4.5.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.5.* Fix  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $V_{K,Q}(z) > \inf Q$ . To prove the lemma, it is enough to show that for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(4.5) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_n(z, \epsilon) \geq k \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0.$$

We prove (4.5) by induction on  $k$ . For the base case when  $k = 1$ , observe that

$$\max_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq n} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n, \alpha}(z)| \geq \frac{1}{2n} \log \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq n} |p_{n, \alpha}(z)|^2 - \frac{1}{2n} \log \binom{n+d}{d}.$$

The first term on the right hand side converges to  $V_{K,Q}(z)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by Proposition 2.1 and the second term on the right-hand side above converges to 0. Moreover, using the same argument as in (4.3)

$$V_{K,Q}(z) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \max_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq n} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n, \alpha}(z)| \right),$$

and so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \max_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq n} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha}(z)| \right) = V_{K,Q}(z).$$

Thus for any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $J_n(z, \epsilon) \geq 1$  for all large enough  $n$ .

Now suppose that (4.5) holds for  $k \geq 1$ . We prove it for  $k + 1$ . Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough so that  $V_{K,Q}(z) - \epsilon > \inf Q$ . By the inductive hypothesis, for all large enough  $n$  we can find indices  $\alpha_i = \alpha_i(z, n)$  with  $|\alpha_i| \leq n$  and

$$\alpha_k \prec \alpha_{k-1} \prec \cdots \prec \alpha_1$$

such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  we have

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha_i}(z)| \geq V_{K,Q}(z) - \epsilon/2 > \inf Q.$$

As long as  $n$  was chosen large enough, Lemma 4.3 and the second inequality in (4.6) ensure that  $\alpha_k = (\alpha_{k,1}, \dots, \alpha_{k,d}) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ . Therefore we can find  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $\alpha_{k,j} \geq 1$ . Let  $e_j = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$  be the  $j$ th coordinate vector, set  $\alpha_k^- = \alpha_k^-(z, n) := \alpha_k - e_j$ , and define a polynomial

$$q_{n,\alpha_k}(z) := z_j p_{n,\alpha_k^-}(z).$$

We write  $\beta \preceq \alpha$  if  $\beta \prec \alpha$  or  $\beta = \alpha$ . From our hypothesis on  $\prec$  that  $\alpha \prec \beta \implies \alpha + e_j \prec \beta + e_j$ , we can expand  $q_{n,\alpha_k}$  as a linear combination of  $p_{n,\beta}$  with  $\beta \preceq \alpha_k$ :

$$q_{n,\alpha_k} := \sum_{\beta \preceq \alpha_k} \lambda_\beta p_{n,\beta}.$$

Then

$$\sqrt{\sum_{\beta \preceq \alpha_k} |\lambda_\beta|^2} = \|q_{n,\alpha_k}\|_{L^2(w^{2n\tau})} \leq [\max_{z \in K} |z_j|] \cdot \|p_{n,\alpha_k^-}\|_{L^2(w^{2n\tau})} = \max_{z \in K} |z_j|$$

and so each  $|\lambda_\beta|$  is bounded above by the constant  $c_K := \max_{z \in K} |z_j|$ . Next,

$$\lambda_{\alpha_k} p_{n,\alpha_k} = q_{n,\alpha_k} - \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha_k} \lambda_\beta p_{n,\beta}$$

and so applying the triangle inequality at  $z$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_{\alpha_k} p_{n,\alpha_k}(z)| &\leq |q_{n,\alpha_k}(z)| + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha_k} |\lambda_\beta| \cdot |p_{n,\beta}(z)| \\ &\leq (|z_j| + |\lambda_{\alpha_k^-}|) |p_{n,\alpha_k^-}(z)| + \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha_k, \beta \neq \alpha_k^-} |\lambda_\beta| \cdot |p_{n,\beta}(z)|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by the above inequality, letting  $c_{K,z} := c_K + |z_j|$  we have

$$|\lambda_{\alpha_k} p_{n,\alpha_k}(z)| \leq c_{K,z} \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha_k} |p_{n,\beta}(z)|.$$

Next, observe that the leading coefficient of  $q_{n,\alpha_k}$ , i.e., the coefficient of  $z^{\alpha_k}$ , is equal to  $\lambda_{\alpha_k}$  times the leading coefficient  $a_{n,\alpha_k}$  of  $p_{n,\alpha_k}$ . Moreover, it is also the leading coefficient  $a_{n,\alpha_k^-}$  of  $z_j p_{n,\alpha_k^-}$ . Thus

$$\lambda_{\alpha_k} = \frac{a_{n,\alpha_k^-}}{a_{n,\alpha_k}}$$

and our estimate above on  $|\lambda_{\alpha_k} p_{n,\alpha_k}(z)|$  becomes

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{|a_{n,\alpha_k^-}|}{|a_{n,\alpha_k}|} |p_{n,\alpha_k}(z)| &\leq c_{K,z} \sum_{\beta \prec \alpha_k} |p_{n,\beta}(z)| \\ &\leq c_{K,z} \binom{n+d}{d} \max_{\beta \prec \alpha_k} |p_{n,\beta}(z)|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking logs and then combining (4.7) with (4.6) gives

$$\max_{\beta \prec \alpha_k} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\beta}(z)| \geq V_{K,Q}(z) - \epsilon/2 - \frac{1}{n} \log \binom{n+d}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|a_{n,\alpha_k^-}(z,n)|}{|a_{n,\alpha_k}(z,n)|}.$$

By Proposition 2.2, the final term above tends to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore for all large enough  $n$ , there exists  $\alpha_{k+1} \prec \alpha_k$  such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |p_{n,\alpha_{k+1}}(z)| \geq V_{K,Q}(z) - \epsilon,$$

and so  $J_n(z, \epsilon) \geq k+1$ . Since  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, this completes the inductive step in (4.5).  $\square$

## 5. APPENDIX

We give a self-contained proof of a special  $\mathbb{C}^2$  case of the main result in [10] which is all that is needed for the proof of Proposition 2.4 and hence the univariate version of Theorem 1.3 and hence Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 5.1.** *For  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  compact, regular, and complete circular, if  $\theta \in \Sigma_2 \setminus \Sigma_2^0 = \{(0,1), (1,0)\}$ ,*

$$\tau(K, \theta) = \lim_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow \theta} \tau_\alpha(K);$$

*i.e., the limit exists. Moreover,  $\theta \rightarrow \tau(K, \theta)$  is continuous on  $\Sigma_2$ .*

We begin with some general facts from [19] for an arbitrary compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ . From [19], it is known that for  $\theta_d \in \Sigma_d^0$ , the limit

$$\tau(K, \theta) := \lim_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow \theta} \tau_\alpha(K)$$

exists and  $\theta \rightarrow \tau(K, \theta)$  is continuous on  $\Sigma_d^0$  where we recall that  $\tau_\alpha(K) := \inf\{\|p\|_K : p \in \mathcal{P}_d(\alpha)\}^{1/|\alpha|}$ . Moreover, recall that for circled (and hence complete circular) sets we only need consider homogeneous polynomials in  $\mathcal{P}_d(\alpha)$ . For  $\theta \in \Sigma_d \setminus \Sigma_d^0$ , we define

$$(5.1) \quad \tau(K, \theta) := \limsup_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow \theta} \tau_\alpha(K)$$

and Lemma 3 in [19] shows that for  $\theta \in \Sigma_d \setminus \Sigma_d^0$  one has

$$(5.2) \quad \tau_-(K, \theta) := \liminf_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow \theta} \tau_\alpha(K) = \liminf_{\theta' \rightarrow \theta, \theta' \in \Sigma_d^0} \tau(K, \theta').$$

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Let  $K \subset \mathbb{C}^2$  be regular. We write  $\Sigma := \Sigma_2$  and  $\Sigma^0 := \Sigma_2^0$ . Here we order the monomials as usual:

$$1, z, w, \dots, z^n, z^{n-1}w, \dots, w^n, \dots$$

and we write  $\alpha = (a, b)$ . We first take  $(0, 1) \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma^0$  and we want to show

$$\lim_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow (0,1)} \tau_\alpha(K)$$

exists. The first observation is that

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(0,n)}(K) \text{ exists and equals } \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow (0,1), \theta \in \Sigma^0} \tau(K, \theta).$$

This was shown by the first author in [7] (see Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 3.2). This uses an ‘‘internal ellipsoid’’ argument which we will also use below in the case  $(1, 0) \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma^0$ .

Thus we need to consider all sequences with  $\theta_j := \frac{\alpha_j}{|\alpha_j|} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  and show  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{\alpha_j}(K)$  exists and equals  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(0,n)}(K)$ . Given such a sequence, we can write

$$\theta_j = (\epsilon_j, 1 - \epsilon_j) \text{ and } \alpha_j = n_j \theta_j$$

where  $n_j = |\alpha_j|$ . Note that  $n_j \epsilon_j$  is an integer. Let

$$p_{0, n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}(z, w) := w^{n_j(1-\epsilon_j)} \pm \dots$$

be the Chebyshev polynomial among polynomials of this type; i.e.,  $\|p_{0,n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}\|_K^{1/n_j(1-\epsilon_j)} = \tau_{(0,n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K)$ . Then

$$q_{n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}(z, w) := z^{n_j\epsilon_j} \cdot p_{0,n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}(z, w) = w^{n_j(1-\epsilon_j)} z^{n_j\epsilon_j} + \dots$$

is a competitor for the Chebyshev polynomial in this class, i.e.,

$$\|q_{n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}\|_K^{1/n_j} \geq \tau_{(n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K).$$

Thus

$$\tau_{(n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K) \leq \|q_{n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}\|_K^{1/n_j} \leq \tau_{(0,n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K)^{1-\epsilon_j} \cdot \max_{(z,w) \in K} |z|^{\epsilon_j}.$$

Since we can assume  $\max_{(z,w) \in K} |z| > 0$  ( $K$  is not pluripolar),

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K) \leq \limsup_{n_j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(0,n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(0,n)}(K).$$

On the other hand, using (5.3) and (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K) &\geq \liminf_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow (0,1)} \tau_\alpha(K) \\ &= \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow (0,1), \theta \in \Sigma^0} \tau(K, \theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(0,n)}(K) \end{aligned}$$

so that, in fact,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j))}(K) \text{ exists and equals } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(0,n)}(K)$$

for any sequence  $\{\alpha_j = n_j\theta_j = (n_j\epsilon_j, n_j(1-\epsilon_j))\}$  with  $|\alpha_j| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\theta_j := \frac{\alpha_j}{|\alpha_j|} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ .

The above argument did not require  $K$  to be complete circular. But to get the analogous result at the other boundary point,  $(1, 0)$ , we will assume that  $K$  is complete circular; and since  $\|p\|_K = \|p\|_{\widehat{K}}$  for any polynomial  $p$  we may assume  $K = \widehat{K}$  (recall (2.1)). Thus the intersection of  $K$  with any complex line through the origin is a closed disk centered at the origin in this line, and each disk has positive radius since  $K$  is not pluripolar.

First, to compute  $\tau_{(n,0)}(K)$ , we minimize sup norms on  $K$  over the *single* homogeneous polynomial  $z^n$ : thus  $\tau_{(n,0)}(K) = \max_{(z,w) \in K} |z|$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n,0)}(K) = \max_{(z,w) \in K} |z|$$

(which is positive since  $K$  is not pluripolar). Take any sequence  $\alpha_j$  with  $|\alpha_j| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\theta_j := \frac{\alpha_j}{|\alpha_j|} \rightarrow (1, 0)$ . Clearly we can write

$$\theta_j = (1 - \epsilon_j, \epsilon_j) \text{ and } \alpha_j = n_j\theta_j$$

(where  $n_j = |\alpha_j|$ ). We consider  $\tau_{(n_j(1-\epsilon_j), n_j\epsilon_j)}(K)$  where we minimize sup norms on  $K$  over the homogeneous polynomials of the form

$$z^{n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}w^{n_j\epsilon_j} + \dots + a_n z^n = z^{n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}(w^{n_j\epsilon_j} + \dots + a_n z^{n_j\epsilon_j});$$

i.e., the competitors for  $\tau_{(n_j(1-\epsilon_j), n_j\epsilon_j)}(K)$  are precisely  $z^{n_j(1-\epsilon_j)}$  times the competitors for  $\tau_{(0, n_j\epsilon_j)}(K)$ . Hence

$$\tau_{(n_j(1-\epsilon_j), n_j\epsilon_j)}(K)^{n_j} \leq \tau_{(0, n_j\epsilon_j)}(K)^{n_j\epsilon_j} \cdot \left[ \max_{(z, w) \in K} |z|^{n_j(1-\epsilon_j)} \right]$$

showing that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n_j(1-\epsilon_j), n_j\epsilon_j)}(K) &\leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \max_{(z, w) \in K} |z|^{1-\epsilon_j} \cdot \tau_{(0, n_j\epsilon_j)}(K)^{\epsilon_j} \\ &= \max_{(z, w) \in K} |z| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n, 0)}(K). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have shown that

$$(5.4) \quad \limsup_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow (1, 0)} \tau_\alpha(K) \leq \max_{(z, w) \in K} |z| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n, 0)}(K).$$

For a reverse inequality (with  $\liminf$ ), we use the hypothesis that  $K$  is complete circular. Suppose first that for  $K_0 := K \cap \{w = 0\} = \{(z, 0) \in K\}$  we have

$$\max\{|z| : (z, 0) \in K_0\} = \max_{(z, w) \in K} |z| =: R.$$

Recall  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n, 0)}(K) = \max_{(z, w) \in K} |z| = R$ . We can use interior approximation by an ellipsoid to get the lower bound for the  $(1, 0)$  Chebyshev constant of  $K$ . To be precise, for  $r < R$ , the closed disk

$$\{(z, 0) : |z| \leq r\}$$

is contained in the interior of  $K$  and hence for some constant  $A = A(r)$  the ellipsoid

$$E = E(A, r) := \{(z, w) : |z|^2/r^2 + |w|^2/A^2 \leq 1\}$$

is contained in the interior of  $K$  (cf., the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [7]). Thus for all  $\theta \in \Sigma^0$  we have

$$\tau(K, \theta) \geq \tau(E, \theta).$$

Explicit calculation (cf., Example 3.1 in [7]) gives that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow (1, 0), \theta \in \Sigma^0} \tau(E, \theta) = r.$$

Hence

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow (1,0), \theta \in \Sigma^0} \tau(K, \theta) \geq r$$

for all  $r < R$  and hence

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow (1,0), \theta \in \Sigma^0} \tau(K, \theta) \geq R = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n,0)}(K).$$

By rescaling, we may assume  $R = 1$ . Now suppose that

$$R = 1 = \max\{|z| : (z, 0) \in K_0\} < \max_{(z,w) \in K} |z| =: |c|.$$

Let the right-hand-side be attained at the point  $(c, d) \in K$ . Consider the change of coordinates  $(z', w') := (z, w - (d/c)z)$  and let  $K'$  be the image of  $K$ . The Chebyshev constants of  $K$  and  $K'$  are the same as this transformation preserves the classes of polynomials used to define the directional Chebyshev constants. But now for  $K'_0 := K' \cap \{w = 0\} = \{(z, 0) \in K'\}$  we have

$$|c| = \max\{|z| : (z, 0) \in K'_0\} = \max_{(z,w) \in K'} |z|$$

and we are back in the first case. Thus we have shown that

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow (1,0), \theta \in \Sigma^0} \tau(K, \theta) \geq R = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n,0)}(K).$$

From (5.2),  $\liminf_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow (1,0)} \tau_\alpha(K) = \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow (1,0), \theta \in \Sigma^0} \tau(K, \theta)$  so that

$$\liminf_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow (1,0)} \tau_\alpha(K) \geq R.$$

On the other hand, (5.4) gave us

$$R = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n,0)}(K) \geq \limsup_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow (1,0)} \tau_\alpha(K).$$

Putting these inequalities together gives us that

$$\lim_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rightarrow (1,0)} \tau_\alpha(K)$$

exists and equals  $R = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{(n,0)}(K)$ .

The continuity of  $\theta \rightarrow \tau(K, \theta)$  on  $\Sigma$  follows immediately from the theorem and the continuity of this function on  $\Sigma^0$ .  $\square$



## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bayraktar, Equidistribution of zeros of random holomorphic sections, *Indiana U. Math. J.*, **65**, (2016), no. 5, 1759-1793.
- [2] T. Bayraktar, Zero distribution of random sparse polynomials, *Mich. Math. J.*, **66**, (2017), no. 2, 389-419.
- [3] T. Bayraktar, T. Bloom and N. Levenberg, Random Polynomials in Several Complex Variables, *Journal, D'Analyse Math.*, (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11854-023-0316-x>.
- [4] S. Benelkourchi, B. Jennane and A. Zeriah, Polya's inequalities, global uniform integrability and the size of plurisubharmonic lemniscates, *Ark. Mat.* **43** (2005), no. 1, 85-112.
- [5] T. Bloom and D. Dauvergne, Asymptotic zero distribution of random orthogonal polynomials, arXiv:1901.07614v1.
- [6] T. Bloom and D. Dauvergne, Asymptotic zero distribution of random orthogonal polynomials, *Ann. Probab.*, **47**, (2019), no. 5, 3202-3230.
- [7] T. Bloom, On families of polynomials which approximate the pluricomplex Green function, *Indiana U. Math. J.*, **50**, (2001), no. 4, 1545-1566.
- [8] T. Bloom, Weighted polynomials and weighted pluripotential theory, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **361**, (2009), no. 4, 2163-2179.
- [9] T. Bloom and N. Levenberg, Random polynomials and pluripotential-theoretic extremal functions, *Potential Analysis*, **42** (2015) no. 2, 311-334.
- [10] T. Bloom and N. Levenberg, Directional Chebyshev constants on the boundary, arXiv:2408.07619.
- [11] D. Dauvergne, A necessary and sufficient condition for convergence of the zeros of random polynomials, *Advances in Mathematics*, **384** (2021), 1-33.
- [12] C. Esseen, On the Kolmogorov-Rogozin inequality for the concentration function, *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, **5** (1996), no.3, 210-216.
- [13] J. Hammersley, The zeros of a random polynomial. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, (1954) 89-111.
- [14] I. Ibragimov and D. Zaporozhets, On distribution of zeros of random polynomials in complex plane. In *Prokhorov and Contemporary Probability Theory: In Honor of Yuri V. Prokhorov. Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, **33** (2013) 303-323. Springer, Heidelberg.
- [15] M. Jędrzejowski, The homogeneous transfinite diameter of a compact subset of  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , *Ann. Polon. Math.*, **55**, (1991), 191-205.
- [16] M. Klimek, *Pluripotential theory*, Oxford University Press (1991).
- [17] Nguyen Quang Dieu, Regularity of certain sets in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , *Ann. Polon. Math.*, **82** (2003), no. 3, 219-232.
- [18] E. Saff and V. Totik, *Logarithmic potentials with external fields*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [19] V. P. Zaharjuta, Transfinite diameter, Chebyshev constants, and capacity for compacta in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , *Math. USSR Sbornik*, **25** (1975), no. 3, 350-364.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ONTARIO M5S 2E4 CANADA  
*Email address:* bloom@math.toronto.edu

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ONTARIO M5S 2E4 CANADA  
*Email address:* duncan.dauvergne@utoronto.ca

INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405 USA  
*Email address:* nlevenbe@iu.edu