

On the topological boundary of the range of super-Brownian motion—extended version

Jieliang Hong* Leonid Mytnik† Edwin Perkins‡

September 13, 2018

Abstract

We show that if $\partial\mathcal{R}$ is the boundary of the range of super-Brownian motion and \dim denotes Hausdorff dimension, then with probability one, for any open set U , $\partial\mathcal{R} \cap U \neq \emptyset$ implies

$$\dim(U \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) = \begin{cases} 4 - 2\sqrt{2} \approx 1.17 & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \frac{9 - \sqrt{17}}{2} \approx 2.44 & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases}$$

This improves recent results of the last two authors by working with the actual topological boundary, rather than the boundary of the zero set of the local time, and establishing a local result for the dimension.

1 Introduction

We consider a d -dimensional super-Brownian motion (SBM), $(X_t, t \geq 0)$, starting at X_0 under \mathbb{P}_{X_0} with $d \leq 3$. Here $X_0 \in M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of finite measures on \mathbb{R}^d with the weak topology, X is a continuous $M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued strong Markov process, and \mathbb{P}_{X_0} denotes any probability under which X is as above. We write $X_t(\phi)$ for the integral of ϕ with respect to X , and take our branching rate to be one, so that for any non-negative bounded Borel functions ϕ, f on \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0} \left(\exp \left(-X_t(\phi) - \int_0^t X_s(f) ds \right) \right) = \exp(-X_0(V_t(\phi, f))). \quad (1.1)$$

Here $V_t(x) = V_t(\phi, f)(x)$ is the unique solution of the mild form of

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} = \frac{\Delta V_t}{2} - \frac{V_t^2}{2} + f, \quad V_0 = \phi, \quad (1.2)$$

*Department of Mathematics, The University of British Columbia. jlhong@math.ubc.ca

†Faculty of Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion. leonid@ie.technion.ac.il

‡Department of Mathematics, The University of British Columbia. perkins@math.ubc.ca

that is,

$$V_t = P_t(\phi) + \int_0^t P_s \left(f - \frac{V_{t-s}^2}{2} \right) ds.$$

In the above (P_t) is the semigroup of standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. See Chapter II of [17] for the above and further properties. Note that X has an a.s. finite extinction time, and therefore we can define the so-called total occupation time measure of the super-Brownian motion as a finite measure,

$$I(A) = \int_0^\infty X_s(A) ds.$$

$\text{Supp}(\mu)$ will denote the closed support of a measure μ . We define the range, \mathcal{R} , of X to be

$$\mathcal{R} = \text{Supp}(I).$$

A slightly smaller set is often used in the literature (see [2] or Corollary 9 in Ch. IV of [14]) but the definitions agree under \mathbb{P}_{δ_x} or the canonical measures \mathbb{N}_x defined below, and also give the same outcomes for $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$ and $\partial\mathcal{R} \cap \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$. Therefore the two definitions will be equivalent for our purposes. In dimensions $d \leq 3$, the occupation measure I has a density, L^x , which is called (total) local time of X , that is,

$$I(f) = \int_0^\infty X_s(f) ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) L^x dx \text{ for all non-negative measurable } f.$$

Moreover, $x \mapsto L^x$ is lower semicontinuous, is continuous on $\text{Supp}(X_0)^c$, and for $d = 1$ is globally continuous (see Theorems 2 and 3 of [20]). From (1.1) and (1.2) it is easy to derive (see Lemma 2.2 in [16])

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(e^{-\lambda L^x}) = \exp \left(- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V^\lambda(x - x_0) X_0(dx_0) \right), \quad (1.3)$$

where V^λ is the unique solution (see Section 2 of [16] and the references given there) to

$$\frac{\Delta V^\lambda}{2} = \frac{(V^\lambda)^2}{2} - \lambda \delta_0, \quad V^\lambda > 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.4)$$

Thus in dimensions $d \leq 3$ we have

$$\mathcal{R} = \overline{\{x : L^x > 0\}},$$

and \mathcal{R} is a closed set of positive Lebesgue measure. In dimensions $d \geq 4$, \mathcal{R} is a Lebesgue null set of Hausdorff dimension 4 (see Theorem 1.4 of [2]), which explains our restriction to $d \leq 3$ in this work.

Our main goal in this paper is to study properties of $\partial\mathcal{R}$ — the topological boundary of \mathcal{R} , and in particular to determine the local Hausdorff dimension of $\partial\mathcal{R}$ outside the

support of X_0 . The related question of the dimension of the boundary of the set where the local time is positive, that is the dimension of

$$F = \partial\{x : L^x > 0\}, \quad (1.5)$$

was studied in [16]. To describe this latter result we introduce:

$$p = p(d) = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } d = 1 \\ 2\sqrt{2} & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \frac{1+\sqrt{17}}{2} & \text{if } d = 3, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

$d_f = d + 2 - p$, and

$$\alpha = \alpha(d) = \frac{p(d) - 2}{4 - d} = \begin{cases} 1/3 & \text{if } d = 1 \\ \sqrt{2} - 1 & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \frac{\sqrt{17}-3}{2} & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Theorem 1.1 ([16]). *With \mathbb{P}_{δ_0} -probability one,*

$$\dim(F) = d_f = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d = 1 \\ 4 - 2\sqrt{2} \approx 1.17 & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \frac{9-\sqrt{17}}{2} \approx 2.44 & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases}$$

There were also versions of the above in [16] for more general initial conditions X_0 .

I. Benjamini's observation that the boundary of the range exhibited interesting fractal properties in simulations was one motivation for the above. Although F may be a natural object from a stochastic analyst's perspective, the topological boundary of \mathcal{R} , $\partial\mathcal{R}$, is the more natural geometric object and of course was the set Benjamini had in mind. Clearly, $\partial\mathcal{R}$ and F are closely related; it is easy to check that

$$\partial\mathcal{R} \subset F. \quad (1.8)$$

Thus, Theorem 1.1 gives an upper bound on dimension of $\partial\mathcal{R}$. Whether or not $F = \partial\mathcal{R}$ remains open for $d = 2$ or 3 , but Theorem 1.7 in [16] shows that, if $d = 1$, there exist random variables L, R such that

$$F = \partial\mathcal{R} = \{L, R\} \text{ where } L < 0 < R \quad \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0} - \text{a.s.}, \quad (1.9)$$

and so we will usually assume $d = 2$ or 3 . A point x in F will be in $\partial\mathcal{R}$ iff there are open sets U approaching x s.t. $L = 0$ on U . Note that, for example, any isolated zeros of L will be in F but not in $\partial\mathcal{R}$ but we do not even know if such points exist in $d = 2, 3$. It was conjectured in (1.10) of [16] that in $d = 2, 3$,

$$\dim(\partial\mathcal{R}) = \dim(F) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0} - \text{a.s.} \quad (1.10)$$

In this paper we verify this conjecture, and prove the following stronger local version.

Theorem 1.2. \mathbb{P}_{X_0} -a.s. for any open $U \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$

$$U \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \dim(U \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) = d_f.$$

The following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 1.3. $\text{Supp}(X_0)^c \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \dim(\text{Supp}(X_0)^c \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) = d_f \quad \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - a.s.$

The hypothesis in the above Corollary is needed—see Proposition 1.5 of [16] for an example where it fails with positive probability.

Corollary 1.4. \mathbb{P}_{δ_0} -a.s. for any open set U ,

$$U \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \dim(U \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) = d_f.$$

In particular, $\dim(\partial\mathcal{R}) = d_f \quad \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0} - a.s.$

Proof. It is enough to check the claim only for $U \supset \{0\}$, since otherwise it follows immediately from Theorem 1.2. Thus, let U be an open set such that $U \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$ and $U \supset \{0\}$. We claim that $(U \setminus \{0\}) \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$. If not, we have for small enough $r > 0$, $\{|x| < r\} \cap \partial\mathcal{R} = \{0\}$. \mathcal{R} is \mathbb{P}_{δ_0} -a.s. a connected set (e.g., see Theorem 7 in Ch. IV of [14]) of positive Lebesgue measure. There are $r_n \downarrow 0$ s.t. $\partial B_{r_n} \cap \mathcal{R}^c \neq \emptyset$, and by connectedness of $\mathcal{R} \ni 0$ (and $\mathcal{R} \neq \{0\}$), $\partial B_{r_n} \cap \mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$. The connectedness of ∂B_{r_n} now implies that $\partial B_{r_n} \cap \partial\mathcal{R}$ is non-empty for all n , which contradicts our assumption that 0 is isolated in $\partial\mathcal{R}$. Now we may apply Theorem 1.2 with $U \setminus \{0\}$ in place of U to finish. \blacksquare

Note that besides confirming (1.10), the above shows that the dimension result holds locally on any open ball intersecting $\partial\mathcal{R}$.

We also consider X and its local time under the canonical measures \mathbb{N}_x . Recall from Section II.7 of [17] that \mathbb{N}_x is a σ -finite measure on the space of continuous finite length $M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued excursion paths such that

$$X_t = \int \nu_t \Xi(d\nu) \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \quad \text{under } \mathbb{P}_{X_0}, \quad (1.11)$$

where Ξ is a Poisson point process with intensity $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\cdot) = \int \mathbb{N}_{x_0}(\cdot) X_0(dx_0)$. In this way \mathbb{N}_{x_0} governs the “excursions” of X from a single ancestor at x_0 . The existence of local time L under \mathbb{N}_x follows easily from the above, in fact it is even globally continuous (see [10]). It should not be surprising that Corollary 1.4 continues to hold under the canonical measure, in fact, as we shall see, the proof is a bit easier.

Theorem 1.5. \mathbb{N}_0 -a.e. for any open set U ,

$$U \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \dim(U \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) = d_f.$$

We first say a few words about the argument leading to the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [16]. If a small ball B intersects F , then B contains a point x such that L^x is positive but small. Thus, to get the bounds on the Hausdorff dimension of F , it is useful to understand the asymptotics of $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(0 < L^x < \varepsilon)$, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Write $f(t) \sim g(t)$ as $t \downarrow 0$ iff $f(t)/g(t)$ is bounded and bounded away from zero for small positive t , and similarly for $f(t) \sim g(t)$ as $t \uparrow \infty$. It was shown in Theorem 1.3 of [16] that for p as in (1.6) and α given by (1.7),

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(0 < L^x < \varepsilon) \sim |x|^{-p} \varepsilon^\alpha, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0. \quad (1.12)$$

Not very difficult *heuristics* involving regularity properties of local time and a covering argument explains the upper bound on dimension of F : $\dim(F) \leq d_f$ (see the Introduction of [16]). (1.12) was derived in [16] through a Tauberian theorem we now sketch. Let $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ in (1.3) and (1.4) to see that $V^\lambda(x) \uparrow V^\infty(x)$ where

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(L^x = 0) = \exp(-V^\infty(x)). \quad (1.13)$$

One important simplification available for the analysis of F in [16] is that V^∞ is explicitly known (see e.g. (2.17) in [16]):

$$V^\infty(x) = \frac{2(4-d)}{|x|^2}. \quad (1.14)$$

In particular V^∞ solves

$$\frac{\Delta V^\infty}{2} = \frac{(V^\infty)^2}{2} \text{ for } x \neq 0. \quad (1.15)$$

V^∞ sometimes is called the *very singular solution* to (1.15), see, e.g., [1]. Applying a Tauberian theorem one can see that (1.12) can be reduced to verifying

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_0}(e^{-\lambda L^x} \mathbf{1}(L^x > 0)) \sim |x|^{-p} \lambda^{-\alpha}, \quad \text{as } \lambda \uparrow \infty. \quad (1.16)$$

The left-hand side of the above behaves like $d^\lambda(x) := V^\infty(x) - V^\lambda(x)$, and so a substantial part of the argument in [16] was devoted to finding a rate of convergence of V^λ to V^∞ , and showing that it behaves like the right hand side of (1.16).

The upper bound on $\dim(F)$ in [16] also utilized Dynkin's exit measures. We always assume

$$G \text{ is an open set satisfying } d(G^c, \text{supp}(X_0)) > 0 \text{ and a Brownian path} \quad (1.17)$$

starting from any $x \in \partial G$ will exit G immediately.

The exit measure of X from such a G under \mathbb{P}_{X_0} or \mathbb{N}_{X_0} is denoted by X_G (see Chapter V of [14] for a good introduction to exit measures). X_G is a random finite measure supported on ∂G , which intuitively corresponds to the mass started at X_0 which is stopped at the instant it leaves G . The Laplace functional of X_G is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\exp(-X_G(g))) = \exp\left(-\int 1 - \exp(-X_G(g)) d\mathbb{N}_{X_0}\right) = \exp\left(-\int U^g(x) X_0(dx)\right), \quad (1.18)$$

where $g : \partial G \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous and $U^g \geq 0$ is the unique continuous function on \overline{G} which is C^2 on G and solves

$$\Delta U^g = (U^g)^2 \text{ on } G, \quad U^g = g \text{ on } \partial G. \quad (1.19)$$

For this, see Theorem 6 in Chapter V of [14], and the last exercise on p. 86 for uniqueness. Let $G_\varepsilon^{x_0} = \{x : |x - x_0| > \varepsilon\}$ and set $G_\varepsilon = G_\varepsilon(0)$. Similarly $B_\varepsilon(x_0)$ is the open ball centered at x_0 and $B_\varepsilon = B_\varepsilon(0)$. Proposition 3.4 of [16] gives an upper bound on $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(0 < X_{G_\varepsilon}(1) < \varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ for $x \neq 0$. This bound is refined to precise asymptotics in Propositions 4.9 and 4.11 in Section 4 below. Intuitively these asymptotics are related to (1.12) since a small exit measure from G_ε^x suggests small values of the local time inside $B_\varepsilon(x)$.

Consider next the ideas underlying Theorem 1.2, where exit measures play a more central role. To show that a point x is near $\partial\mathcal{R}$, it is not enough to show that the local time at x is small and positive, or that the exit measure from some G_ε^x is small. In addition, there should be balls B near x on which the local time is zero, or equivalently $X_{\overline{B}^c} = 0$. To this end we will study $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(0 < X_{G_\varepsilon^x}(1) \leq K\varepsilon^2, X_{G_{\varepsilon/2}^x}(1) = 0)$ and show (see Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.9)

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(0 < X_{G_\varepsilon^x}(1) \leq K\varepsilon^2, X_{G_{\varepsilon/2}^x}(1) = 0) \sim \varepsilon^{p-2}, \text{ as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0. \quad (1.20)$$

The proof of (1.20) requires asymptotics for solutions to (1.19) with varying boundary conditions, rather than than solutions to (1.4). For $\varepsilon, \lambda > 0$ we let $U^{\lambda, \varepsilon}$ denote the unique continuous function on $\{|x| \geq \varepsilon\}$ such that (cf. (1.19))

$$\Delta U^{\lambda, \varepsilon} = (U^{\lambda, \varepsilon})^2 \text{ for } |x| > \varepsilon, \quad \text{and } U^{\lambda, \varepsilon}(x) = \lambda \text{ for } |x| = \varepsilon. \quad (1.21)$$

Uniqueness of solutions implies the scaling property

$$U^{\lambda, \varepsilon}(x) = \varepsilon^{-2} U^{\lambda \varepsilon^2, 1}(x/\varepsilon) \quad \text{for all } |x| \geq \varepsilon, \quad (1.22)$$

and also shows $U^{\lambda, \varepsilon}$ is radially symmetric, thus allowing us to write $U^{\lambda, \varepsilon}(|x|)$ for the value at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. By (1.18) we have for any finite initial measure satisfying $\text{Supp}(X_0) \subset G_\varepsilon$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\exp(-\lambda X_{G_\varepsilon}(1))) = \exp(-X_0(U^{\lambda, \varepsilon})). \quad (1.23)$$

Let $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ in the above to see that $U^{\lambda, \varepsilon} \uparrow U^{\infty, \varepsilon}$ on G_ε and

$$\mathbb{P}_{X_0}(X_{G_\varepsilon}(1) = 0) = \exp(-X_0(U^{\infty, \varepsilon})). \quad (1.24)$$

Proposition 9(iii) of [14] readily implies (see (3.5) and (3.6) of [16])

$$U^{\infty, \varepsilon} \text{ is } C^2 \text{ and } \Delta U^{\infty, \varepsilon} = (U^{\infty, \varepsilon})^2 \text{ on } G_\varepsilon, \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \varepsilon, |x| > \varepsilon} U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) = +\infty, \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) = 0. \quad (1.25)$$

Clearly a key step in deriving (1.20) are asymptotics for

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(0 < X_{G_\varepsilon^x}(1) \leq K\varepsilon^2) \sim U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) - U^{K^{-1}\varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x) \text{ as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0,$$

where the above equivalence is by a Tauberian theorem. In Section 4.1 we show (see Corollary 4.7)

$$U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) - U^{K^{-1}\varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x) \sim \varepsilon^{p-2}.$$

This and a special Markov property (Propositions 2.2 and 2.3) then give (1.20). To get a lower bound on $\partial\mathcal{R}$, essentially by an inclusion-exclusion argument, in addition to the lower bound in (1.20), we will also need an upper bound on (see Proposition 5.1)

$$P_{\delta_0}(0 < X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_1}}(1) \leq K\varepsilon^2, 0 < X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_2}}(1) \leq K\varepsilon^2). \quad (1.26)$$

Although involved, this argument is similar to the proof of Proposition 6.1 in [16] and so is deferred to the Appendix A.3. The above estimates allow us to show that the lower bound on the dimension of $\partial\mathcal{R}$ holds with positive probability—see Proposition 5.3. To conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2, we will show that the lower bound on local dimension, in fact holds *with probability one*. This will be a consequence of the following proposition:

Proposition 1.6. *Let $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 < r_1 < r_0$, and assume $B_{2r_0}(x_1) \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$. Then \mathbb{P}_{X_0} -a.s.*

$$X_{G_{r_1}^{x_1}}(1) = 0 \text{ and } X_{G_{r_0}^{x_1}}(1) > 0 \text{ imply } \dim(B_{r_0}(x_1) \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f. \quad (1.27)$$

The main ingredient in the proof of Proposition 1.6 is a version under the canonical measure.

Proposition 1.7. *Let $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 < r_1 < r_0$, and assume $B_{2r_0}(x_1) \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$. Then \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e.*

$$\begin{cases} X_{G_{r_1}^{x_1}}(1) = 0 \text{ and } X_{G_{r_0}^{x_1}}(1) > 0 \text{ imply} \\ \dim(B_r(x_1) \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f \text{ for every } r > r_1 \text{ s.t. } X_{G_r^{x_1}}(1) > 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.28)$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, preliminary results on super-Brownian motion, Brownian snakes, exit measures and their special Markov property are presented. In Section 3 we prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.5, assuming Propositions 1.6, 1.7.

In Section 4 left tail asymptotics of exit measures are given. First in Section 4.1 we derive necessary bounds on solutions to the boundary value problems (1.21) and (1.25), and then in Section 4.2 we prove (1.20) (see Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.9). In Section 5, we show that the lower bound on the local dimension of $\partial\mathcal{R}$ holds with positive probability; see Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 5.4.

In Section 6, we show that for any $r_0 > 0$, the process $Z_t = X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t}}}^{x_1}(1)/(r_0 e^{-t})^2$, $t \geq 0$ is a *time homogeneous* continuous state branching process (CSBP), see Proposition 6.2. The absence of negative jumps in Z is important in the proof of Proposition 1.7, but we also believe that Z and its associated measure-valued process are of independent interest; see Remark 6.3. The proof of Propositions 1.6 and 1.7 are concluded in Section 7. For the proof of Proposition 1.6 one shows that for $r < r_0$ sufficiently small there is a single excursion of X (see (1.11)) governed by \mathbb{N}_{X_0} that enters B_r and thus by the monotonicity

of dimension, Proposition 1.6 follows from Proposition 1.7. Proposition 1.7 (with $x_1 = 0$ without loss of generality) is proved by studying the martingale

$$M_r = \mathbb{N}_{x_0}(\dim(B_{r_0} \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f | \mathcal{E}_r) \quad 0 \leq r < r_0, \quad |x_0| > 2r_0,$$

where \mathcal{E}_r is the σ -field generated by the excursions of the Brownian snake in G_{r_0-r} (see Section 2 for a careful definition). In particular we analyze

$$M_r \text{ as } r \uparrow T_0 = \inf\{r : X_{G_{r_0-r}}(1) = 0\} \text{ on } \{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\},$$

where r_0, r_1 are as in Proposition 1.7. The special Markov property and results from Sections 5 and 6 will show $M_r \geq q > 0$, for r close enough to T_0 , and on the above set. The last step is then to show that $\{\dim(B_{r_0} \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f\} \in \mathcal{E}_{T_0-}$ (Lemma 7.3). Then letting $r \uparrow T_0$ shows that on $\{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\}$, $1(\dim(B_{r_0} \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f) \geq q > 0$, as required.

Note that the methods of [16] (see Theorem 1.4 and the ensuing discussion of that work) would have required the stronger hypothesis $\text{Conv}(X_0)^c \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$ in Corollary 1.3, where $\text{Conv}(X_0)$ is the closed convex hull of $\text{Supp}(X_0)$. This is because exit measures from hyperplanes were used in [16], instead of the process of exit measure from the complements of shrinking balls. This refinement also leads to the purely local result on dimension in Theorem 1.2.

Convention on Functions and Constants. Constants whose value is unimportant and may change from line to line are denoted $C, c, c_d, c_1, c_2, \dots$, while constants whose values will be referred to later and appear initially in say, Lemma i.j are denoted $c_{i,j}$, or $\underline{c}_{i,j}$ or $\underline{C}_{i,j}$.

2 Exit Measures and the Special Markov Property

Notation. Let \mathcal{K} be the space of compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the Hausdorff metric, where we add \emptyset as a discrete point. That is let $K^\varepsilon = \{x : d(x, K) \leq \varepsilon\}$ and for K_1, K_2 non-empty compacts, set

$$d(K_1, K_2) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : K_1 \subset K_2^\varepsilon \text{ and } K_2 \subset K_1^\varepsilon\} \wedge 1,$$

and set $d(\emptyset, K) = 1$ for K non-empty compact. (\mathcal{K}, d) is then a complete separable metric space. If U is an open set in \mathbb{R}^d we let $C(U)$ be the space of continuous functions on U with the compact-open topology.

We start with a measurability result requiring a bit of care; a proof is given in the Appendix.

Lemma 2.1. (a) For any $R > 0$, $\psi_a : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ is a Borel map, where $\psi_a(K) = K \cap \overline{B_R}$.
(b) For any $\alpha, R > 0$, $\psi_b : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a universally measurable map, where $\psi_b(K) = 1(\dim((\partial K) \cap B_R) < \alpha)$.

We will use Le Gall's Brownian snake construction of a SBM X , with initial state $X_0 \in M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Set $\mathcal{W} = \cup_{t \geq 0} C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d)$ with the natural metric (see page 54 of [14]), and let $\zeta(w) = t$ be the lifetime of $w \in C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{W}$. The Brownian snake $W = (W_t, t \geq 0)$ is a \mathcal{W} -valued continuous strong Markov process and, abusing notation slightly, let \mathbb{N}_x denote its excursion measure starting from the path at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with lifetime zero. As usual we let $\hat{W}(t) = W_t(\zeta(W_t))$ denote the tip of the snake at time t , and $\sigma(W) > 0$ denote the length of the excursion path. We refer the reader to Ch. IV of [14] for the precise definitions. The construction of super-Brownian motion, $X = X(W)$ under \mathbb{N}_x or \mathbb{P}_{X_0} , may be found in Ch. IV of [14]. The "law" of $X(W)$ under \mathbb{N}_x is the canonical measure of SBM starting at x described in the last Section (and also denoted by \mathbb{N}_x). If $\Xi = \sum_{j \in J} \delta_{W_j}$ is a Poisson point process on \mathcal{W} with intensity $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(dW) = \int \mathbb{N}_x(dW)X_0(dx)$, then by Theorem 4 of Ch. IV of [14] (cf. (1.11))

$$X_t(W) = \sum_{j \in J} X_t(W_j) = \int X_t(W) \Xi(dW) \text{ for } t > 0 \quad (2.1)$$

defines a SBM with initial measure X_0 . We will refer to this as the standard set-up for X under \mathbb{P}_{X_0} .

Recall $\mathcal{R} = \overline{\{x : L^x > 0\}}$ is the range of the SBM X under \mathbb{P}_{X_0} or \mathbb{N}_{X_0} . Under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} we have (see (8) on p. 69 of [14])

$$\mathcal{R} = \{\hat{W}(s) : s \in [0, \sigma]\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Let G be as in (1.17). Then

$$X_G \text{ is a finite random measure supported on } \mathcal{R} \cap \partial G \text{ a.s.} \quad (2.3)$$

Under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} this follows from the definition of X_G on p. 77 of [14] and the ensuing discussion, and (2.2). Although [14] works under \mathbb{N}_x for $x \in G$ the above extends immediately to \mathbb{P}_{X_0} because as in (2.23) of [16],

$$X_G = \sum_{j \in J} X_G(W_j) = \int X_G(W) d\Xi(W), \quad (2.4)$$

where Ξ is a Poisson point process on \mathcal{W} with intensity \mathbb{N}_{X_0} .

Working under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} and following [13], we define

$$S_G(W_u) = \inf\{t \leq \zeta_u : W_u(t) \notin G\} \quad (\inf \emptyset = \infty),$$

$$\eta_s^G(W) = \inf\{t : \int_0^t 1(\zeta_u \leq S_G(W_u)) du > s\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_G = \sigma(W_{\eta_s^G}, s \geq 0) \vee \{\mathbb{N}_{X_0} - \text{null sets}\},$$

where $s \rightarrow W_{\eta_s^G}$ is continuous (see p. 401 of [13]). Write the open set $\{u : S_G(W_u) < \zeta_u\}$ as countable union of disjoint open intervals, $\cup_{i \in I} (a_i, b_i)$. Clearly $S_G(W_u) = S_G^i < \infty$ for all $u \in [a_i, b_i]$ and we may define

$$W_s^i(t) = W_{(a_i+s) \wedge b_i}(S_G^i + t) \text{ for } 0 \leq t \leq \zeta_{(a_i+s) \wedge b_i} - S_G^i.$$

Therefore for $i \in I$, $W^i \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{W})$ are the excursions of W outside G . Proposition 2.3 of [13] implies X_G is \mathcal{E}_G -measurable and Corollary 2.8 of the same reference implies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Conditional on } \mathcal{E}_G, \text{ the point measure } \sum_{i \in I} \delta_{W^i} \text{ is a Poisson point measure} \\ \text{with intensity } \mathbb{N}_{X_G}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

If $d(D^c, \bar{G}) > 0$, then the definition (and existence) of $X_D(W)$ applies equally well to each $X_D(W^i)$ and it is easy to check that

$$X_D(W) = \sum_{i \in I} X_D(W^i). \quad (2.6)$$

If U is an open subset of $\text{Supp}(X_0)^c$, then L_U , the restriction of the local time L^x to U , is in $C(U)$. Here are some simple consequences of (2.5).

Proposition 2.2. (a) Let $G_1 \subset G_2$ be open sets as in (1.17) such that $d(G_2^c, \bar{G}_1) > 0$.

(i) If $\psi_1 : C(\bar{G}_1^c) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is Borel measurable, then

$$\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\psi_1(L_{\bar{G}_1^c}) | \mathcal{E}_{G_1}) = \mathbb{E}_{X_{G_1}}(\psi_1(L_{\bar{G}_1^c})).$$

(ii) If $\psi_2 : M_F(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is Borel measurable then

$$\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\psi_2(X_{G_2}) | \mathcal{E}_{G_1}) = \mathbb{E}_{X_{G_1}}(\psi_2(X_{G_2})).$$

(b) If $0 < R_2 < R_1$, $d(\text{Supp}(X_0), \bar{B}_{R_1}) > 0$, and $\psi_3 : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is Borel measurable, then

$$\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\psi_3(\mathcal{R} \cap \bar{B}_{R_2}) | \mathcal{E}_{G_{R_1}}) = \mathbb{E}_{X_{G_{R_1}}}(\psi_3(\mathcal{R} \cap \bar{B}_{R_2})).$$

Proof. (a) (i) is Proposition 2.6(b) of [16]. (a)(ii) follows in a similar manner from (2.5), (2.6) and (2.4).

(b) Define $S : C(B_{R_1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ by $S(f) = \text{Supp}(f) := \overline{\{x : f(x) > 0\}}$, where the closure is taken in all of \mathbb{R}^d . Then it is easy to see that S is Borel measurable, for example by considering the inverse images of closed balls in \mathcal{K} . In addition the map $K \rightarrow \bar{B}_{R_2} \cap K$ is measurable on \mathcal{K} by Lemma 2.1(a). Now observe that $\mathcal{R} \cap \bar{B}_{R_2} = S(L_{B_{R_1}}) \cap \bar{B}_{R_2}$, and so by the above observations is a measurable function of $L_{B_{R_1}}$. Therefore (b) now follows from (a)(i) with $G_i = G_{R_i}$. \blacksquare

We will need a version of the above under \mathbb{P}_{X_0} as well.

Proposition 2.3. For an open set G and $X_0 \in M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as in (1.17), let Ψ be a bounded measurable function on $C(\bar{G}^c)$ and Φ_i , $i = 0, 1$ be bounded measurable functions on $M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$, respectively. Then

(a) $\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\Phi_0(X_G)\Psi(L)) = \mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\Phi_0(X_G)\mathbb{E}_{X_G}(\Psi(L)))$.

(b) (i) Let D_i be open sets as in (1.17) such that $d(D_i^c, \bar{G}) > 0, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\Phi_0(X_G)\Phi_1(X_{D_1}, \dots, X_{D_n})) = \mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\Phi_0(X_G)\mathbb{E}_{X_G}(\Phi_1(X_{D_1}, \dots, X_{D_n}))).$$

(ii) If $0 < R_2 < R_1$ and $d(\text{Supp}(X_0)^c, \overline{B_{R_1}}) > 0$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\Phi_0(X_{G_{R_1}})1(\mathcal{R} \cap \overline{B_{R_2}} \neq \emptyset)) = \mathbb{E}_{X_0}(\Phi_0(X_{G_{R_1}})\mathbb{P}_{X_{G_{R_1}}}(\mathcal{R} \cap \overline{B_{R_2}} \neq \emptyset)).$$

Proof. (a) is Proposition 2.6(c) of [16]. (b)(i) follows by the same reasoning there, using (2.5), (2.4) (the latter for each D_i , as well as G), and Proposition 2.2(a)(ii), trivially extended to accommodate $(X_{D_1}, \dots, X_{D_n})$ in place of X_{G_2} . (b)(ii) follows from (a), as in the proof of Proposition 2.2(b). \blacksquare

3 Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.5

We will see in this section that (using Theorem 1.1) Theorem 1.2 is a simple consequence of Proposition 1.6, and similarly Theorem 1.5 can be derived from Proposition 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 < r_1 < r_0 \leq 1$ satisfy $B_{2r_0}(x_1) \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$. From (2.3) we have \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - a.s.,

$$\partial G_{r_1}^{x_1} \cap \mathcal{R} = \emptyset \Rightarrow X_{G_{r_1}^{x_1}} = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Proposition 2.3(b)(ii) and translation invariance imply

$$\mathbb{P}_{X_0}(X_{G_{r_0}^{x_1}} = 0, \mathcal{R} \cap B_{r_0/2}(x_1) \neq \emptyset) = \mathbb{E}_{X_0}(1(X_{G_{r_0}^{x_1}} = 0)\mathbb{P}_{X_{G_{r_0}^{x_1}}}(\mathcal{R} \cap B_{r_0/2}(x_1) \neq \emptyset)) = 0.$$

It follows that \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - a.s.,

$$\mathcal{R} \cap B_{r_0/2}(x_1) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow X_{G_{r_0}^{x_1}}(1) > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Fix ω outside a \mathbb{P}_{X_0} -null set so that (1.27) of Proposition 1.6, (3.1), and (3.2) all hold for all $x_1 \in \mathbb{Q}^d$ and all rational numbers $0 < r_1 < r_0 \leq 1$ satisfying $B_{2r_0}(x_1) \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$. Assume U is an open set in $\text{Supp}(X_0)^c$ which intersects $\partial\mathcal{R}$ and choose $x_0 \in U \cap \partial\mathcal{R}$. Pick a rational r_0 in $(0, 1]$ so that

$$B_{3r_0}(x_0) \subset U \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c,$$

then choose $x_1 \in \mathbb{Q}^d \cap B_{r_0/2}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{R}^c$, and finally select a rational $r_1 \in (0, r_0)$ such that

$$B_{2r_1}(x_1) \subset \mathcal{R}^c \text{ and so } \partial G_{r_1}^{x_1} \cap \mathcal{R} = \emptyset. \quad (3.3)$$

Clearly we have

$$B_{2r_0}(x_1) \subset B_{3r_0}(x_0) \subset U \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c, \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$x_0 \in B_{r_0/2}(x_1) \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \text{ and so } B_{r_0/2}(x_1) \cap \mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset. \quad (3.5)$$

Our choice of ω and (3.4) allow us to conclude from (3.3) and (3.5), respectively, that

$$X_{G_{r_1}^{x_1}}(1) = 0 \text{ and } X_{G_{r_0}^{x_1}}(1) > 0, \text{ respectively.}$$

By (3.4) and our choice of ω we may also apply Proposition 1.6 and conclude that

$$\dim(U \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq \dim(B_{r_0}(x_1) \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f,$$

where we have used (3.4) in the first inequality. On the other hand we know from Theorem 1.4(a) of [16] and $\partial\mathcal{R} \subset \partial\{x : L^x > 0\}$ that

$$\dim(U \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \leq \dim(S(X_0)^c \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \leq d_f,$$

and the proof is complete. ■

Proof of Theorem 1.5. The derivation of Theorem 1.5 directly from Proposition 1.7 is very similar to the above proof of Theorem 1.2 from Proposition 1.6 and so is omitted. Note here that the derivation of Proposition 1.6 under \mathbb{N}_0 from Proposition 1.7 with $X_0 = \delta_0$ is almost immediate as both are under \mathbb{N}_0 , and that the proof of Corollary 1.4 then holds under \mathbb{N}_0 . ■

4 Lower Bound on the Exit Measure Probability

Throughout this Section we fix $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$. As noted in the Introduction, the goal of this section, stated below, is a key estimate for the lower bound on the dimension of $\partial\mathcal{R}$. Although we are interested in $d = 2, 3$, we assume $d \leq 3$ throughout this section as the arguments remain valid.

Theorem 4.1. *There are positive constants $R_{4.1}$, $K_1(\varepsilon_0) < K_2(\varepsilon_0) < \infty$ and $c_{4.1}(\varepsilon_0)$ such that, for all $\varepsilon_0 \leq |x| \leq \varepsilon_0^{-1}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(K_1 \leq \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2, X_{G_{\varepsilon/2}(1)} = 0) \geq c_{4.1}(\varepsilon_0)\varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0/R_{4.1}.$$

The next subsection is devoted to proving necessary bounds on solutions to the boundary value problems (1.21), (1.25). These bounds will be used for proving Theorem 4.1 in Section 4.2.

4.1 Bounds on Solutions to some Boundary Value Problems

Recall $U^{\lambda,R}$ and $U^{\infty,R}$ from (1.21) and (1.25), respectively. A simple application of (1.25), (1.15) and the maximum principle implies

$$V^\infty(x) \leq U^{\infty,1}(x) \quad \forall |x| > 1. \quad (4.1)$$

We will need an upper bound on $U^{\infty,1}$ which shows this bound is asymptotically sharp for large $|x|$. We briefly include $d = 1$ in our analysis.

Proposition 4.2. *There exist constants $C_{4,2} > 1$ and $c_{4,2} \geq 0$ such that*

$$U^{\infty,1}(x) \leq V^\infty(x)(1 + c_{4,2}|x|^{2-p}) \quad \forall |x| \geq C_{4,2}.$$

Proof. We will write $u(r)$ for $U^{\infty,1}(r)$ and $v(r)$ for $V^\infty(r)$.

For $t \geq 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} q(t) &= \frac{u(e^{t/4})}{v(e^{t/4})} = \frac{1}{4}u(e^{t/4})e^{t/2}, \text{ in } d = 2, \\ q(t) &= \frac{u(12^{1/3}e^{t/3})}{v(12^{1/3}e^{t/3})} = \frac{12^{2/3}}{2}u(12^{1/3}e^{t/3})e^{2t/3}, \text{ in } d = 3, \\ q(t) &= \frac{u(180^{1/5}e^{t/5})}{v(180^{1/5}e^{t/5})} = \frac{180^{2/5}}{2}u(180^{1/5}e^{t/5})e^{2t/5}, \text{ in } d = 1. \end{aligned}$$

A simple calculation gives

$$\frac{1}{2}q'' - \frac{1}{2}q' + \beta(q - q^2) = 0 \text{ on } (0, \infty), \quad q(0) \in (0, \infty], \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} q(t) = 1,$$

where $\beta = \frac{3}{25}$ in $d = 1$, $\beta = \frac{1}{8}$ in $d = 2$, and $\beta = \frac{1}{9}$ in $d = 3$. Note that the last limit is derived the same way as (3.10) in [16] by taking $U^{\infty,1}$ instead of $U^{\delta_0,1}$, $\tilde{y}(t) = y(t + 2)$ instead of $y(t)$ and $\tilde{z}(t) = z(t + 2)$ instead of $z(t)$ there.

Note that $q(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \geq 0$ by (4.1). Define

$$z = q - 1,$$

then z satisfies the following equation:

$$\frac{1}{2}z'' - \frac{1}{2}z' - \beta z(z + 1) = 0 \text{ on } (0, \infty), \quad z(0) = \infty, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} z(t) = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Let w be the unique solution to

$$\frac{1}{2}w''(t) - \frac{1}{2}w'(t) - \beta w(t) = 0, \quad t > 1, \quad w(1) = z(1), \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w(t) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

By the comparison principle we get

$$w(t) \geq z(t), \quad t \geq 1. \quad (4.4)$$

We leave it for the reader to check that

$$w(t) = z(1)e^{-\lambda}e^{\lambda t}, \quad t \geq 1,$$

with

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + 2\beta} < 0.$$

By the definition of β we have $\lambda = -0.2$ for $d = 1$, $\lambda = 1/2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ for $d = 2$, and $\lambda = 1/2 - \frac{\sqrt{17}}{6}$ for $d = 3$. This and (4.4) imply that for $C = z(1)e^{-\lambda} \geq 0$ we have

$$z(x) \leq Ce^{\lambda x}, \quad x \geq 1,$$

and since $\lambda < 0$ we get that z decreases to zero exponentially fast. Recall the definition of q to get

$$q(x) \leq 1 + Ce^{\lambda x}, \quad x \geq 1.$$

Then in $d = 2$ we have,

$$u(e^{t/4}) \leq v(e^{t/4})(1 + Ce^{\lambda t}), \quad t \geq 1.$$

and so

$$u(s) \leq v(s)(1 + Cs^{4\lambda}) = v(s)(1 + Cs^{2-p}), \quad s \geq e^{1/4}.$$

Similar algebra shows the result in $d = 1, 3$. ■

Recalling (1.14), we may immediately conclude:

Corollary 4.3. *There are constants $C_{4.3}, c_{4.3} > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $|x| \geq C_{4.3}$, we have*

$$U^{\infty,1}(x) \leq V^{\infty}(x) + \frac{c_{4.3}}{|x|^p}. \quad (4.5)$$

In particular, there is some constant $K_{4.3} > 2$ such that

$$U^{\infty,1}(x) \leq 3(4-d)|x|^{-2}, \quad \forall |x| \geq K_{4.3}. \quad (4.6)$$

If $D^\lambda = U^{\infty,1} - U^{\lambda,1} \geq 0$ for $\lambda > 0$, then the Feynmann-Kac formula (as in (3.8) in [16]) easily gives

$$D^\lambda(x) = D^\lambda(R)E_x\left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \left(\frac{U^{\infty,1} + U^{\lambda,1}}{2}\right)(B_s)ds\right)\right), \quad |x| \geq R > 1, \quad (4.7)$$

where B denote a d -dimensional Brownian motion starting at x under P_x and $\tau_R = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |B_t| \leq R\}$ for $|x| \geq R > 1$.

We will frequently use the following lemmas. For $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, let (ρ_t) denote a γ -dimensional Bessel process starting from $r > 0$ under $P_r^{(\gamma)}$, and (\mathcal{F}_t) be the filtration generated by ρ . Define $\tau_R = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \rho_t \leq R\}$ for $R > 0$. The following result is from Lemma 5.3 of [16].

Lemma 4.4. *Assume $0 < 2\gamma \leq \nu^2$ and $q > 2$. Then*

$$\sup_{r \geq 1} E_r^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{\gamma}{\rho_s^q} ds\right) \middle| \tau_1 < \infty\right) \leq c_{4.4}(q, \nu) < \infty.$$

Lemma 4.5. Let $q > 2$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\zeta \in [0, 2(4-d))$, $\nu_\zeta = \sqrt{\nu^2 - \zeta}$ and $p_\zeta = \nu_\zeta + \mu$, where

$$\mu = \begin{cases} -1/2 & \text{if } d = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } d = 2, \text{ and } \nu = \sqrt{\mu^2 + 4(4-d)}, \\ 1/2 & \text{if } d = 3, \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

Then for all $R < |x|$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_x \left(1(\tau_R < \infty) \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{a}{|B_s|^q} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d) - \zeta/2}{|B_s|^2} ds \right) \right) \\ = E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu_\zeta)} \left(\exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \Big|_{\tau_R < \infty} \right) (R/|x|)^{p_\zeta}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. The proof is based on arguments from [16] (see the proof of Lemma 5.4 there) and is deferred to Appendix A.2. ■

Proposition 4.6. There are positive universal constants $C_{4.6}, c_{4.6} > 0$, $K_{4.6} > K_{4.3}$, and $R_{4.6} > 2$ such that

(a)

$$D^\lambda(x) \leq \frac{R^p}{|x|^p} D^\lambda(R), \quad \forall |x| \geq R > 1, \quad \lambda \geq 6.$$

(b)

$$D^\lambda(x) \leq C_{4.6} \frac{R^p}{|x|^p} D^\lambda(R), \quad \forall |x| \geq R \geq \frac{K_{4.6}}{\lambda}, \quad 0 < \lambda < 1.$$

(c)

$$D^\lambda(x) \geq c_{4.6} \frac{R^p}{|x|^p} D^\lambda(R) > 0, \quad \forall |x| \geq R \geq R_{4.6}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

Proof. Recall μ, ν introduced in (4.8) so that for $p = p(d)$ defined as in (1.6), we have

$$p = \mu + \nu. \quad (4.10)$$

(a) For $\lambda \geq 6$, clearly we have $U^{\lambda,1}(1) = \lambda \geq V^\infty(1)$. As

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} U^{\lambda,1}(x) \leq \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} U^{\infty,1}(x) = 0$$

by (1.25), we may apply the maximum principle to get

$$U^{\lambda,1}(x) \geq V^\infty(x) = \frac{2(4-d)}{|x|^2}, \quad \forall |x| > 1. \quad (4.11)$$

Use (4.1) and the above to see that (4.7) becomes

$$D^\lambda(x) \leq D^\lambda(R)E_x\left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d)}{|B_s|^2} ds\right)\right) = D^\lambda(R)(R/|x|)^p,$$

the last by Lemma 4.5.

(b) Assume $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Recall Proposition 3.3(b) in [16]:

$$\forall \delta \in (0, 1), \exists C_\delta > 2, \text{ so that } U^{\lambda,1}(x) \geq (1 - \delta)V^\infty(x) \text{ for all } |x| \geq C_\delta/\lambda. \quad (4.12)$$

For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, let $\zeta = 2(4-d)\delta \in (0, 2(4-d))$. Let μ and ν be as in (4.8). Define $\nu_\zeta = \sqrt{\mu^2 + 4(4-d) - \zeta}$ and $p_\zeta = \nu_\zeta + \mu \rightarrow p > 2$ as $\zeta \downarrow 0$. Choose $\delta \in (0, 1)$ small enough so that $p_\zeta > 2$. Let $K_{4.6} \equiv C_\delta + K_{4.3}$. Now use (4.1), (4.12) and Lemma 4.5 to see that for $|x| \geq R \geq K_{4.6}/\lambda > C_\delta/\lambda$, (4.7) implies

$$D^\lambda(x) \leq D^\lambda(R)E_x\left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d) - (\zeta/2)}{|B_s|^2} ds\right)\right) = D^\lambda(R)(R/|x|)^{p_\zeta},$$

Let $\xi(R) = D^\lambda(R)R^{p_\zeta}/2$. Then the above gives

$$\left(\frac{U^{\lambda,1} + U^{\infty,1}}{2}\right)(x) \geq U^{\infty,1}(x) - \frac{\xi(R)}{|x|^{p_\zeta}} \geq V^\infty(x) - \frac{\xi(R)}{|x|^{p_\zeta}} \text{ for } |x| \geq R.$$

Use this in (4.7) and then Lemma 4.5 to see that for $|x| \geq R$,

$$\begin{aligned} D^\lambda(x) &\leq D^\lambda(R)E_x\left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{\xi(R)}{|B_s|^{p_\zeta}} ds\right) \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d)}{|B_s|^2} ds\right)\right) \\ &= D^\lambda(R)E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{\xi(R)}{\rho_s^{p_\zeta}} ds\right) \Big|_{\tau_R < \infty}\right)(R/|x|)^p. \end{aligned}$$

A scaling argument shows that the above equals

$$D^\lambda(R)(R/|x|)^p E_{|x|/R}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{\xi(R)R^{2-p_\zeta}}{\rho_s^{p_\zeta}} ds\right) \Big|_{\tau_1 < \infty}\right).$$

To apply Lemma 4.4 we note that by (4.6), for $R \geq K_{4.6}/\lambda > K_{4.3}$ we have

$$2\gamma \equiv 2\xi(R)R^{2-p_\zeta} \leq U^{\infty,1}(R)R^2 \leq 3(4-d) < \nu^2.$$

So Lemma 4.4 and the above bound show that

$$D^\lambda(x) \leq D^\lambda(R)(R/|x|)^p c_{4.4}(p_\zeta, \nu). \quad (4.13)$$

(c) Use (4.5) in Corollary 4.3 to see that for $|x| \geq R > C_{4.3}$, we have

$$\frac{U^{\infty,1} + U^{\lambda,1}}{2}(x) \leq U^{\infty,1}(x) \leq \frac{2(4-d)}{|x|^2} + \frac{c_{4.3}}{|x|^p}.$$

So (4.7) and Lemma 4.5 imply

$$\begin{aligned} D^\lambda(x) &\geq D^\lambda(R)E_x\left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{c_{4.3}}{|B_s|^p} ds\right) \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d)}{|B_s|^2} ds\right)\right) \\ &= D^\lambda(R)E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{c_{4.3}}{\rho_s^p} ds\right) \mid \tau_R < \infty\right)(R/|x|)^p, \end{aligned}$$

with $p = \mu + \nu$. A scaling argument shows that the above equals

$$D^\lambda(R)(R/|x|)^p E_{|x|/R}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{c_{4.3}R^{2-p}}{\rho_s^p} ds\right) \mid \tau_1 < \infty\right). \quad (4.14)$$

To apply Lemma 4.4 note that if $R \geq R_{4.6}$ for some constant $R_{4.6} > 2$,

$$2\gamma \equiv 2c_{4.3}R^{2-p} < 2(4-d) < \nu^2.$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \left(E_{|x|/R}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{c_{4.3}R^{2-p}}{2\rho_s^p} ds\right) \exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{c_{4.3}R^{2-p}}{2\rho_s^p} ds\right) \mid \tau_1 < \infty\right)\right)^2 \\ &\leq E_{|x|/R}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{c_{4.3}R^{2-p}}{\rho_s^p} ds\right) \mid \tau_1 < \infty\right) E_{|x|/R}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{c_{4.3}R^{2-p}}{\rho_s^p} ds\right) \mid \tau_1 < \infty\right) \\ &\leq E_{|x|/R}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{c_{4.3}R^{2-p}}{\rho_s^p} ds\right) \mid \tau_1 < \infty\right) c_{4.4}(p, \nu), \end{aligned}$$

the last by Lemma 4.4. Hence

$$\inf_{|x| \geq R} E_{|x|/R}^{(2+2\nu)}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{c_{4.3}R^{2-p}}{\rho_s^p} ds\right) \mid \tau_1 < \infty\right) \geq c_{4.4}(p, \nu)^{-1} > 0,$$

and by (4.14) we are done. ■

By using the scaling relations of $U^{\infty, \varepsilon}$ and $U^{\lambda\varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}$ from (1.22), the following is immediate from the above.

Corollary 4.7. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

(a)

$$U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) - U^{\lambda\varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x) \leq \frac{R^p}{|x|^p} D^\lambda(R) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall |x|/\varepsilon \geq R > 1, \quad \lambda \geq 6.$$

(b)

$$U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) - U^{\lambda\varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x) \leq C_{4.6} \frac{R^p}{|x|^p} D^\lambda(R) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall |x|/\varepsilon \geq R \geq \frac{K_{4.6}}{\lambda}, \quad 0 < \lambda < 1.$$

(c)

$$U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) - U^{\lambda\varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x) \geq c_{4.6} \frac{R^p}{|x|^p} D^\lambda(R) \varepsilon^{p-2} > 0, \quad \forall |x|/\varepsilon \geq R \geq R_{4.6}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

4.2 The left tail of the total exit measure and Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proposition 4.8. *For any $|x| \geq \varepsilon_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/2)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x} \left(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \leq e \frac{2^p}{|x|^p} D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq 6.$$

Proof. Apply Markov's inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_x} \left(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) &\leq e \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} \left(\exp(-\lambda \varepsilon^{-2} X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)) 1(X_{G_\varepsilon}(1) > 0) \right) \\ &= e \left(\exp(-U^{\lambda \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x)) - \exp(-U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x)) \right) \\ &\leq e \left(U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) - U^{\lambda \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

the equality by (1.23) and (1.24). Note we've assumed $|x|/\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_0/\varepsilon > 2$ and $\lambda \geq 6$ so that we can use Corollary 4.7(a) with $R = 2$ to bound the right-hand side of (4.15) by $e(2/|x|)^p D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2}$, as required. \blacksquare

Proposition 4.9. *There is some $c_{4.9}(\varepsilon_0) > 0$ such that for all $|x| \geq \varepsilon_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x} \left(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \leq c_{4.9}(\varepsilon_0) \lambda^{-(p-2)} \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall 0 < \lambda < 1.$$

Proof. For $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$|x|/\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_0/\varepsilon \geq K_{4.6}/\lambda,$$

we apply Markov's inequality as in (4.15) and use Corollary 4.7(b) with $R = K_{4.6}/\lambda$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_x} \left(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) &\leq e \left(U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) - U^{\lambda \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x) \right) \leq e C_{4.6} U^{\infty, 1}(R) (R/|x|)^p \varepsilon^{p-2} \\ &\leq e C_{4.6} (3(4-d)/R^2) (R/\varepsilon_0)^p \varepsilon^{p-2} \leq 9e C_{4.6} \varepsilon_0^{-p} K_{4.6}^{p-2} \lambda^{-(p-2)} \varepsilon^{p-2}, \end{aligned}$$

the second line by (4.6) with $R > K_{4.6} > K_{4.3}$.

For $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\varepsilon_0/\varepsilon \leq K_{4.6}/\lambda,$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x} \left(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \leq 1 \leq (K_{4.6}/\varepsilon_0)^{p-2} \lambda^{-(p-2)} \varepsilon^{p-2}.$$

The result follows by letting $c_{4.9}(\varepsilon_0) = 9e C_{4.6} \varepsilon_0^{-p} K_{4.6}^{p-2} + (K_{4.6}/\varepsilon_0)^{p-2}$. \blacksquare

For $|x| \geq \varepsilon_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, we define

$$F_{\varepsilon,x}(K) \equiv \mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K), \quad \forall K > 0, \quad (4.16)$$

and

$$\hat{F}_{\varepsilon,x}(\lambda) \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}\left(\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2}\right) 1(X_{G_\varepsilon}(1) > 0)\right), \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \quad (4.17)$$

The dependence on ε and x will at times be suppressed.

Lemma 4.10. *There are constants $R_{4.10} > 2$ and $c_{4.10}(\varepsilon_0) > 0$ so that for any $\varepsilon_0 \leq |x| \leq \varepsilon_0^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/R_{4.10})$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}\left(\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2}\right) 1(X_{G_\varepsilon}(1) > 0)\right) \geq c_{4.10}(\varepsilon_0) D^\lambda(R_{4.10}) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall \lambda > 0.$$

Proof. By (1.23) and (1.24), for $\hat{F} = \hat{F}_{\varepsilon,x}$ defined as in (4.17) we have

$$\hat{F}(\lambda) = \exp(-U^{\lambda\varepsilon^{-2},\varepsilon}(x)) - \exp(-U^{\infty,\varepsilon}(x)) \geq (U^{\infty,\varepsilon}(x) - U^{\lambda\varepsilon^{-2},\varepsilon}(x)) \exp(-U^{\infty,\varepsilon}(x)). \quad (4.18)$$

Let $R_{4.10} = K_{4.3} + R_{4.6} > R_{4.6}$. Then for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/R_{4.10})$ we have $|x|/\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_0/\varepsilon > R_{4.10}$. Use Corollary 4.7(c) with $R = R_{4.10}$ to get

$$U^{\infty,\varepsilon}(x) - U^{\lambda\varepsilon^{-2},\varepsilon}(x) \geq c_{4.6} D^\lambda(R_{4.10}) (R_{4.10}/|x|)^p \varepsilon^{p-2} \geq c_{4.6} D^\lambda(R_{4.10}) R_{4.10}^p \varepsilon_0^{-p} \varepsilon^{p-2}.$$

Next since $|x|/\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_0/\varepsilon > R_{4.10} > K_{4.3}$, we may apply (4.6) to get

$$\exp(-U^{\infty,\varepsilon}(x)) = \exp(-\varepsilon^{-2} U^{\infty,1}(x/\varepsilon)) \geq \exp(-\varepsilon^{-2} 3(4-d)(|x|/\varepsilon)^{-2}) \geq \exp(-9\varepsilon_0^{-2}).$$

So the lemma follows from (4.18) and the above inequalities. \blacksquare

Proposition 4.11. *There are positive constants $K_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0)$ and $c_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0)$ such that, for all $\varepsilon_0 \leq |x| \leq \varepsilon_0^{-1}$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0)) \geq c_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0/R_{4.10}.$$

Proof. Recall $F = F_{\varepsilon,x}$ and $\hat{F} = \hat{F}_{\varepsilon,x}$ from (4.16) and (4.17), respectively. We have

$$\hat{F}(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda y} dF(y).$$

Let $\lambda = 1$ and $K > 1$. Use integration by parts and Proposition 4.9 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}(1) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-y} F(y) dy \leq F(K) + \int_K^\infty e^{-y} F(y) dy \leq F(K) + \int_K^\infty e^{-y} c_{4.9}(\varepsilon_0) y^{p-2} \varepsilon^{p-2} dy \\ &\leq F(K) + \frac{1}{2} c_{4.10}(\varepsilon_0) D^1(R_{4.10}) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $K = K(\varepsilon_0) > 1$ is large enough. Lemma 4.10, with $\lambda = 1$ and ε, x as in the Proposition, implies

$$F(K) \geq c_{4.10}(\varepsilon_0)D^1(R_{4.10})\varepsilon^{p-2} - \frac{1}{2}c_{4.10}(\varepsilon_0)D^1(R_{4.10})\varepsilon^{p-2} = \frac{1}{2}c_{4.10}(\varepsilon_0)D^1(R_{4.10})\varepsilon^{p-2}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Pick $\lambda = \lambda(\varepsilon_0) \geq 6$ large enough so that

$$e(2^p/|x|^p)D^\lambda(2) \leq e2^p\varepsilon_0^{-p}D^\lambda(2) \leq \frac{1}{2}c_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0).$$

So for $K_1(\varepsilon_0) \in (0, 1/\lambda(\varepsilon_0))$, Proposition 4.8 gives

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_1) \leq \frac{1}{2}c_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0)\varepsilon^{p-2}.$$

Let $K_2 = K_{4.11}$ in Proposition 4.11 to see that for x, ε as in the Theorem and $R_{4.1} = R_{4.10}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(K_1 \leq \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2) = \mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2) - \mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(0 < \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}c_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0)\varepsilon^{p-2}. \quad (4.19)$$

Use Proposition 2.3(b)(i) with $G = G_\varepsilon$ and $D_1 = G_{\varepsilon/2}$ to see that for x, ε as above,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(K_1 \leq \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2, X_{G_{\varepsilon/2}}(1) = 0) = \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}(1(K_1 \leq \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2)\mathbb{P}_{X_{G_\varepsilon}}(X_{G_{\varepsilon/2}}(1) = 0)) \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}(1(K_1 \leq \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2) \exp(-\int U^{\infty, \varepsilon/2}(y)X_{G_\varepsilon}(dy))) \quad (\text{by (1.24) with } X_0 = X_{G_\varepsilon}) \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}(1(K_1 \leq \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2) \exp(-4\varepsilon^{-2}U^{\infty, 1}(2)X_{G_\varepsilon}(1))) \quad (\text{by (1.22)}) \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}(1(K_1 \leq \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq K_2) \exp(-4K_2U^{\infty, 1}(2))) \geq \frac{1}{2}c_{4.11}(\varepsilon_0)\varepsilon^{p-2} \exp(-4K_2U^{\infty, 1}(2)), \end{aligned}$$

the last by (4.19). So the theorem follows. \blacksquare

5 Preliminaries for the Lower Bound on the Dimension

In this section, we will show that the lower bound on the local dimension of $\partial\mathcal{R}$ holds with positive probability (see Proposition 5.3). The refined version of this result, which is crucial for the later proof of Proposition 1.7, is given in Lemma 5.4. The next result is important for implementing our program: it plays a role analogous to that of Proposition 6.1 in [16].

Proposition 5.1. *There is a $\lambda > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there is some $c_{5.1}(\varepsilon_0) > 0$ so that for all $|x_i| \geq \varepsilon_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_0} \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) \leq c_{5.1} (1 + |x_1 - x_2|^{2-p}) \varepsilon^{2(p-2)}.$$

Given the results in Section 4, the proof then follows that of Proposition 6.1 in [16], and so is deferred to Appendix A.3. The reader should note that the role of λ in [16] is now played by $\lambda \varepsilon^{-2}$, where λ is chosen to be a fixed large constant.

Recall that we are in the case $d = 2$ or 3 . Let $\beta > 0$ and $g_\beta(r) = r^{-\beta}$. For a finite measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d and Borel subset A of \mathbb{R}^d , let

$$\langle \mu \rangle_{g_\beta} = \int \int g_\beta(|x - y|) d\mu(x) d\mu(y),$$

and

$$I(g_\beta)(A) = \inf \{ \langle \mu \rangle_{g_\beta} : \mu \text{ is a probability supported by } A \}.$$

The g_β -capacity of A is $C(g_\beta)(A) = (I(g_\beta)(A))^{-1}$. Set

$$\beta = p - 2 = \begin{cases} 2\sqrt{2} - 2, & \text{if } d = 2, \\ (\sqrt{17} - 3)/2, & \text{if } d = 3, \end{cases}$$

and note $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$. Now we may use Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 5.1 to get the following theorem. Although similar to the omitted proof of Theorem 6.2 in [16], there are some important adjustments, and so this time the argument is included.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume $d = 2$ or 3 . For every $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, there is a $c_{5.2}(\varepsilon_0) > 0$ such that for any Borel set, A , of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \varepsilon_0 \leq |x| \leq \varepsilon_0^{-1}\}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap A \neq \emptyset) \geq c_{5.2}(\varepsilon_0) C(g_\beta)(A).$$

In particular for any Borel subset A of \mathbb{R}^d , $C(g_\beta)(A) > 0$ implies that $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap A \neq \emptyset) > 0$.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$. We approximate $\partial\mathcal{R}$ by

$$\partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon) := \{x : K_1\varepsilon^2 \leq X_{G_\varepsilon^x}(1) \leq K_2\varepsilon^2, X_{G_{\varepsilon/2}^x}(1) = 0\}.$$

where $0 < K_1(\varepsilon_0) < K_2(\varepsilon_0) < \infty$ are as in Theorem 4.1. Then for $\lambda > 0$ as in Proposition 5.1, there is some $\delta = \delta(\lambda, \varepsilon_0) \in (0, e^{-1})$ such that

$$\lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^x}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^x}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \geq \delta, \quad \forall x \in \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon). \quad (5.1)$$

Let Γ be a compact subset of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \varepsilon_0 \leq |x| \leq \varepsilon_0^{-1}\}$ such that (without loss of generality) $C(\Gamma) = C(g_\beta)(\Gamma) > 0$. If $I(\Gamma) = I(g_\beta)(\Gamma)$, we may choose $\{x_i^N : 1 \leq i \leq N\} \subset \Gamma$ so that (suppressing the superscript N) as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (see [21]),

$$I_N \equiv \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} |x_i - x_j|^{-\beta} \rightarrow I(\Gamma) = 1/C(\Gamma). \quad (5.2)$$

Therefore by translation invariance, inclusion-exclusion, Theorem 4.1, (5.1), and Proposition 5.1, for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0/R_{4.1})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(\Gamma \cap \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(x_j \in \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon)) - \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(x_i, x_j \in \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon)) \\ &\geq Nc_{4.1}(\varepsilon_0)\varepsilon^{p-2} - \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \delta^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_0} \left(\prod_{k=i,j} \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_k}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(-\lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_k}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) \\ &\geq Nc_{4.1}\varepsilon^{p-2} - c_{5.1}\delta^{-2}\varepsilon^{2(p-2)} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} (1 + |x_i - x_j|^{2-p}) \\ &\geq c_{4.1}N\varepsilon^{p-2} - C(\varepsilon_0)(N\varepsilon^{p-2})^2 I_N. \end{aligned}$$

Now choose $\varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ such that $N\varepsilon_N^{p-2} = c_{4.1}/(2C(\varepsilon_0)I_N)$. Therefore, for some $c(\varepsilon_0) > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(\Gamma \cap \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon_N) \neq \emptyset) \geq \frac{c_{4.1}}{2C(\varepsilon_0)I_N} \frac{c_{4.1}}{2} \rightarrow c(\varepsilon_0)C(\Gamma), \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(\Gamma \cap \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon_N) \neq \emptyset, \text{ infinitely often}) \geq c(\varepsilon_0)C(\Gamma).$$

Assume now that

$$\omega \in \{\Gamma \cap \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon_N) \neq \emptyset, \text{ infinitely often}\}.$$

So we may choose $\{x_N\} \subset \Gamma$ such that $x_N \in \partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon_N)$, where we have suppressed the further subsequence of ε_N in our notation. The definition of $\partial\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon_N)$ gives $X_{G_{\varepsilon_N}^{x_N}}(1) > 0$ and $X_{G_{\varepsilon_N/2}^{x_N}}(1) = 0$. By Proposition 2.3(b)(ii) and translation invariance, we have \mathbb{P}_{δ_0} -a.s.

$$\mathcal{R} \cap B(x_N, \varepsilon_N/3) = \emptyset. \quad (5.3)$$

By (2.3), $X_{G_{\varepsilon_N}^{x_N}}(1) > 0$ implies

$$\mathcal{R} \cap \partial G_{\varepsilon_N}^{x_N} \text{ is non-empty.} \quad (5.4)$$

Combining (5.3) and (5.4) with an elementary argument in point set topology we can choose $y_N \in \partial\mathcal{R}$ such that $\varepsilon_N/4 \leq |y_N - x_N| \leq \varepsilon_N$. The compactness of Γ implies there is some $x \in \Gamma$ such that $x_{N_k} \rightarrow x$ as $N_k \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore $y_{N_k} \rightarrow x$ and $x \in \partial\mathcal{R}$ since $\partial\mathcal{R}$ is closed, which gives $x \in \Gamma \cap \partial\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$, and so the proof is complete for $A = \Gamma$ compact. Use the inner regularity of capacity to extend the result to any Borel subset of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \varepsilon_0 \leq |x| \leq \varepsilon_0^{-1}\}$. \blacksquare

Proposition 5.3. For each non-empty open set B in \mathbb{R}^d ,

- (a) $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(\dim(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B) \geq d_f) > 0$
(b) $\mathbb{N}_0(\dim(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B) \geq d_f) := p_{5.3}(B) > 0$

Proof. (a) is derived from Theorem 5.2 by taking A to be the range of an appropriate independent Lévy process, exactly as in the proof of Proposition 6.5 of [16]. (b) then follows easily from (a) by making trivial changes to the cluster decomposition proof of Corollary 6.6 in [16]. \blacksquare

To help upgrade the lower bound in part (a) of the above to probability one, we need to extend (a) to more general initial conditions through a scaling argument.

Lemma 5.4. There is a constant $q_{5.4} > 0$ so that if $X'_0 \in M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is supported on $\{|x| = r\}$ and $\delta = X'_0(1)$ satisfies $0 < \delta \leq r^2$, then

$$\mathbb{P}_{X'_0}\left(\dim\left(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B\left(0, r - \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{2}\right)\right) \geq d_f\right) \geq q_{5.4}.$$

Proof. Define $X_0^{(\delta)}(A) = \delta^{-1}X'_0(\sqrt{\delta}A)$, so that $X_0^{(\delta)}$ is supported on $\{|x| = r/\sqrt{\delta}\}$ and has total mass one. By scaling properties of SBM (see, e.g., Ex. II.5.5 in [17]) and scale invariance of Hausdorff dimension, we may conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{X'_0}(\dim(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B(0, r - \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{2}) \geq d_f) & \quad (5.5) \\ = \mathbb{P}_{X_0^{(\delta)}}(\dim(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B(0, \frac{r}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}) \geq d_f). \end{aligned}$$

Now work in our standard set-up for SBM with initial law $X_0^{(\delta)}$ so that (by (2.1)), $X_t = \sum_{j \in J} X_t(W_j) = \int X_t(W) \Xi(dW)$ for all $t > 0$, where Ξ is a Poisson point process with intensity $\mathbb{N}_{X_0^{(\delta)}}$. For $r \geq \sqrt{\delta}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\rho(W_j) &= \inf\{t \geq 0 : |\hat{W}_j(t)| \leq \rho\}, \\ U_\rho(W_j) &= \inf\{t \geq 0 : |\hat{W}_j(t) - \hat{W}_j(0)| \geq \rho\}, \\ \text{and } N_1 &= \sum_{j \in J} 1(\tau_{(r/\sqrt{\delta})-(1/2)}(W_j) < \infty) := \#(I_{r,\delta}). \end{aligned}$$

Here as usual $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Then N_1 is Poisson with mean

$$\begin{aligned} m_{r,\delta} &:= \mathbb{N}_{X_0^{(\delta)}}(\tau_{(r/\sqrt{\delta})-(1/2)} < \infty) \leq \mathbb{N}_{X_0^{(\delta)}}(U_{1/2}(W) < \infty) \\ &= \mathbb{N}_0(U_{1/2}(W) < \infty) := \bar{m} < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where $X_0^{(\delta)}(1) = 1$ and translation invariance are used in the equality, and the finiteness of \bar{m} follows from Theorem 1 of [12]. Let $\mathcal{R}(W_j) = \{\hat{W}_j(t) : t \leq \sigma(W_j)\}$ (recall (2.2)) be the range of the j th excursion, so that

$$\mathcal{R} \cap B\left(0, \frac{r}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}\right) = \cup_{j \in J, \tau_{(r/\sqrt{\delta})-(1/2)}(W_j) < \infty} \left(\mathcal{R}(W_j) \cap B\left(0, \frac{r}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right).$$

We may assume (by additional randomization) that conditional on $I_{r,\delta}$, $\{W_j : j \in I_{r,\delta}\}$ are iid with law $\mathbb{N}_{X_0^{(\delta)}}(W \in \cdot | \tau_{(r/\sqrt{\delta})-(1/2)} < \infty)$. Therefore the right-hand side of (5.5) is at least

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{X_0^{(\delta)}}(N_1 = 1) \mathbb{N}_{X_0^{(\delta)}}\left(\dim\left(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B\left(0, \frac{r}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \geq d_f \mid \tau_{\frac{r}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}} < \infty\right) \\ &= \frac{m_{r,\delta} e^{-m_{r,\delta}}}{m_{r,\delta}} \mathbb{N}_{x_0}\left(\dim\left(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B\left(0, \frac{r}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \geq d_f\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where $x_0 = (\frac{r}{\sqrt{\delta}})e_1$ and e_1 is the first unit basis vector. We also have used the fact that spherical symmetry shows we could have taken any x_0 on the sphere of radius $r/\sqrt{\delta}$. Now again use scaling to see that the right side of (5.7) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-m_{r,\delta}} \mathbb{N}_{x_0}\left(\dim\left(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B\left(0, |x_0| - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \geq d_f\right) \\ &= e^{-m_{r,\delta}} \mathbb{N}_{e_1}(\dim(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B(0, 1 - (2|x_0|)^{-1})) \geq d_f) \\ &\geq e^{-\bar{m}} \mathbb{N}_{e_1}(\dim(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B(0, 1/2)) \geq d_f) \quad (\text{recall that } |x_0| \geq 1) \\ &\geq e^{-\bar{m}} p_{5.3}(B(-e_1, 1/2)) > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where the next to last inequality holds by translation invariance and Proposition 5.3(b), and the first inequality uses (5.6). We have shown that the right-hand side of (5.8) is a lower bound for (5.5), and so have proved the lemma with $q_{5.4} = e^{-\bar{m}} p_{5.3}(B(-e_1, 1/2))$. \blacksquare

6 Exit Measures and Continuous State Branching Processes

To finish the proofs of Propositions 1.6, 1.7 we need to establish some properties of the total exit measure process $X_{G_{r_0-r}}(1), 0 \leq r < r_0$. We will show in Proposition 6.2 that, for any $r_0 > 0$, the ‘‘time changed’’ process $Z_t = X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t}}}(1)/(r_0 e^{-t})^2, t \geq 0$, is a time homogeneous continuous state branching process (CSBP) and thus has no negative jumps.

A non-negative function $\lambda \mapsto u(\lambda)$ on $[0, \infty)$ is completely concave iff for every $y > 0$ $\lambda \rightarrow \exp(-yu(\lambda))$ is the Laplace transform of a probability measure on the half-line. (See (4.1) in [19] for a Lévy-Khintchine representation of such functions). We recall the definition of a continuous state branching process from Section 4 of [19].

Definition A (finite) continuous state branching process (CSBP) Z is a time-homogeneous $[0, \infty)$ -valued Markov process with no fixed time discontinuities (if $t_n \rightarrow t$, then $Z(t_n) \rightarrow Z(t)$ a.s.), and such that there is a family of completely concave functions $\{u(s, \cdot) : s > 0\}$ satisfying

$$E(\exp(-\lambda Z(t_2)) | Z(s), s \leq t_1) = \exp(-Z(t_1)u(t_2 - t_1, \lambda)) \text{ a.s. for all } t_2 > t_1 \geq 0. \quad (6.1)$$

We call the associated family $\{u(t, \cdot) : t > 0\}$ the log Laplace transform of Z .

Recall that $U^{\lambda, R}(x) = U^{\lambda, R}(|x|)$ is the unique continuous map on $\{|x| \geq R\}$ which is C^2 on G_R and satisfies

$$\Delta U = U^2 \text{ on } G_R \text{ and } U = \lambda \text{ on } \partial G_R. \quad (6.2)$$

A simple application of the comparison principle (e.g., Chapter V, Lemma 7 of [14]), using the last part of (1.25), gives

$$U^{\lambda, R}(x) \leq \lambda \quad \forall |x| \geq R. \quad (6.3)$$

Define

$$u(t, \lambda) = e^{2t} U^{\lambda, 1}(e^t) \text{ for } t \geq 0. \quad (6.4)$$

For the remainder of this section we assume that $r_0 > 0$ satisfies

$$B_{2r_0} \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c. \quad (6.5)$$

Notation. For $0 \leq r < r_0$ we define $Y(r) = X_{G_{r_0-r}}$, $\mathcal{E}_r = \mathcal{E}_{G_{r_0-r}} \vee \{\mathbb{N}_{X_0} - \text{null sets}\}$, and for $t \geq 0$ set

$$Z(t) = X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t}}}(1) \frac{e^{2t}}{r_0^2} = Y(r_0(1 - e^{-t}))(1) e^{2t} r_0^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{E}_{r_0(1 - e^{-t})} = \mathcal{E}_{G_{r_0 e^{-t}}}.$$

It is not hard to show that \mathcal{E}_r is non-decreasing in r (the corresponding result for half-spaces is noted prior to (7.2) of [16] and the observation made there applies to balls as well.) By Proposition 2.3 of [13], Y is (\mathcal{E}_r) -adapted and Z is (\mathcal{G}_t) -adapted. Let $\mathcal{E}_r^+ = \mathcal{E}_{r^+}$ denote the associated right-continuous filtration. In addition to \mathbb{N}_{X_0} , we will also work under the probability $Q_{X_0}(\cdot) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\cdot | Y_0(1) > 0)$, where (6.5) ensures that $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(Y_0(1) > 0) < \infty$. Note that

$$\text{for any r.v. } Z \geq 0, \text{ and any } r \geq 0, \quad Q_{X_0}(Z | \mathcal{E}_r) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(Z | \mathcal{E}_r) \quad Q_{X_0} - \text{a.s.} \quad (6.6)$$

because $\{Y_0(1) > 0\} \in \mathcal{E}_0$. When conditioning on \mathcal{E}_r under Q_{X_0} , we are adding the slightly larger class of Q_{X_0} -null sets to \mathcal{E}_r , but will not record this distinction in our notation. Below we will apply the definition of (CSBP) under the σ -finite measure \mathbb{N}_{X_0} as well as Q_{X_0} . We write Q_{x_0} for $Q_{\delta_{x_0}}$ as usual.

Lemma 6.1. (a) *If $0 \leq t_1 < t_2$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, then*

$$(i) \quad Q_{X_0}\left(e^{-\lambda Z_{t_2}} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t_1}\right) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}\left(e^{-\lambda Z_{t_2}} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{t_1}\right) = \exp(-Z_{t_1} u(t_2 - t_1, \lambda)).$$

(ii)

$$Q_{X_0}\left(\left(e^{-\lambda Z_{t_2}} - e^{-\lambda Z_{t_1}}\right)^2\right) = Q_{X_0}\left(\exp(-Z_{t_1} u(t_2 - t_1, 2\lambda)) - 2 \exp(-\lambda Z_{t_1} - Z_{t_1} u(t_2 - t_1, \lambda)) + \exp(-2\lambda Z_{t_1})\right), \quad (6.7)$$

and similarly for \mathbb{N}_{X_0} .

(b) For all $t > 0$, $\lambda \mapsto u(t, \lambda)$ is completely concave.

(c) $(Z_t, t \geq 0)$ is a (time-homogeneous) (\mathcal{G}_t) -Markov process under Q_{X_0} or \mathbb{N}_{X_0} .

Proof. (a) (6.6) shows that for $\lambda \geq 0$, the left-hand side of (i) equals the middle expression, which by Proposition 2.2(a)(ii) and then (1.23) equals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t_1}}}}(\exp(-\lambda e^{2t_2} r_0^{-2} X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t_2}}}(1))) &= \exp\left(-\int U^{\lambda e^{2t_2} r_0^{-2}, r_0 e^{-t_2}}(x) X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t_1}}}(dx)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-U^{\lambda e^{2t_2} r_0^{-2}, r_0 e^{-t_2}}(r_0 e^{-t_1}) X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t_1}}}(1)\right) \\ &= \exp(-u(t_2 - t_1, \lambda) Z_{t_1}), \end{aligned}$$

where scaling (i.e., (1.22)) is used in the last line. This gives (i). It is then easy to derive (ii) by expanding out the square, conditioning on \mathcal{G}_{t_1} and finally using (i).

(b) Let $y_0 > 0$ and $t > 0$. Let m_r be the uniform distribution on $\{|x| = r\}$ and set $W = e^{2t} r_0^{-2} X_{G_{r_0 e^{-t}}}(1)$. Apply (1.23) and then scaling ((1.22)) to see that for all $\lambda \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{y_0 r_0^2 m_{r_0}}(\exp(-\lambda W)) &= \exp(-y_0 r_0^2 U^{\lambda e^{2t} r_0^{-2}, r_0 e^{-t}}(r_0)) \\ &= \exp(-y_0 r_0^2 r_0^{-2} e^{2t} U^{\lambda, 1}(e^t)) \\ &= \exp(-y_0 u(t, \lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

(c) This is immediate from (a)(i), (b) (to define the family of laws $\{P_x : x \geq 0\}$), and a monotone class argument. \blacksquare

Proposition 6.2. (a) Y is an inhomogeneous (\mathcal{E}_r) -Markov process under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} or Q_{X_0} . That is, for $\psi : M_F(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ Borel measurable and $0 \leq r_1 < r_2$,

$$Q_{X_0}(\psi(Y(r_2)) | \mathcal{E}_{r_1}) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\psi(Y(r_2)) | \mathcal{E}_{r_1}) = \mathbb{E}_{Y(r_1)}(\psi(Y(r_2))) \quad a.s.$$

(b) If $0 \leq r_1 < r_2 < r_0$, then the total mass, $Y_r(1)$, of Y_r satisfies

$$\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(Y_{r_2}(1) | \mathcal{E}_{r_1}) = \begin{cases} Y_{r_1}(1) & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \frac{r_0 - r_2}{r_0 - r_1} Y_{r_1}(1) & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

Under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} or Q_{X_0} , $Y_r(1)$ has a cadlag version on $[0, r_0)$ which is an (\mathcal{E}_r^+) -supermartingale (an (\mathcal{E}_r^+) -martingale if $d = 2$), satisfies (6.8) with $\mathcal{E}_{r_1}^+$ in place of \mathcal{E}_{r_1} , and has only non-negative jumps a.e.

(c) Under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} or Q_{X_0} , $Z(t), t \geq 0$ has a cadlag version which is a CSBP with log Laplace transform given by $\{u(t, \cdot) : t > 0\}$ in (6.4).

Proof. (a) This is immediate from Proposition 2.2(a)(ii) and (6.6).

(b,c) Let B denote a d -dimensional Brownian motion starting at x under P_x^B and

$$\tau_r = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |B_t| \leq r\} \quad (\inf \emptyset = \infty).$$

Recalling (6.5), Proposition 3 in Chapter V of [14] shows that for $0 \leq r < r_0$,

$$\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(Y_r(1)) = \int P_x^B(\tau_{r_0-r} < \infty) dX_0(x) = \begin{cases} X_0(1) & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \int \frac{r_0-r}{|x|} dX_0(x) & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases} \quad (6.9)$$

Return now to the probability \mathbb{P}_{X_0} , and use (2.4) and the above to see that

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(Y_r(1)) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(Y_r(1)) = \begin{cases} X_0(1) & \text{if } d = 2 \\ \int \frac{r_0-r}{|x|} dX_0(x) & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

Although we have assumed $B_{2r_0} \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$, both (6.9) and (6.10) will apply if $\text{Supp}(X_0) \subset G_{r_0-r}$. This allows us to apply (6.10), with $X_0 = Y_{r_1}$ and $r = r_2$, and (a) to derive (6.8).

Turning to the second part of (b) and (c) we first work with Z . Let $t_n \uparrow t > 0$ ($t_n < t$) and set $r_n = r_0(1 - e^{-t_n}) \uparrow r_0(1 - e^{-t}) = r \in (0, r_0)$. By (6.8) and supermartingale convergence, $\{Y_{r_n}\}$ converges \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e. to a limit we denote by $Y_{r-}(1)$ for now. (The σ -finiteness of \mathbb{N}_{X_0} is not an issue here, but the reader who prefers probabilities may work with Q_{X_0} and note that on the complementary set, $\{Y_0(1) = 0\}$, $Y_{r_n}(1) = 0$ \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e. by (6.8) with $r_1 = 0$ there. Henceforth we will not make such arguments.) It follows that

$$Z_{t_n} \rightarrow e^{2t} r_0^{-2} Y_{r-}(1) := Z_{t-} \quad \mathbb{N}_{X_0} - \text{a.e.} \quad (6.11)$$

By (6.7),

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_{X_0} \left(\left(e^{-\lambda Z_t} - e^{-\lambda Z_{t_n}} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= Q_{X_0} \left(\exp(-Z_{t_n} u(t - t_n, 2\lambda)) - 2 \exp(-(\lambda + u(t - t_n, \lambda)) Z_{t_n}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \exp(-2\lambda Z_{t_n}) \right) \\ &\rightarrow Q_{X_0} (\exp(-2\lambda Z_{t-}) - 2 \exp(-2\lambda Z_{t-}) + \exp(-2\lambda Z_{t-})) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where Dominated Convergence is used in the above convergence. This and (6.11) show that $Z_{t_n} \rightarrow Z_t$ Q_{X_0} -a.s. The fact, noted above, that $Y_0(1) = 0$ implies $Z_{t_n} = Z_t = 0$ \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e. allows us to upgrade this to

$$Z_{t_n} \rightarrow Z_t \quad \mathbb{N}_{X_0} - \text{a.e.} \quad \text{if } t_n \uparrow t > 0. \quad (6.12)$$

A simpler argument, now using reverse supermartingale convergence, shows that

$$Z_{t_n} \rightarrow Z_t \quad \mathbb{N}_{X_0} - \text{a.e.} \quad \text{if } t_n \downarrow t \geq 0. \quad (6.13)$$

(6.12) and (6.13) imply $Y_r(1)$ is continuous in measure on $[0, r_0]$. Therefore by (6.8) there is a cadlag version of $(Y_r(1), r \in [0, r_0])$ under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} (we do not change the notation) which is an (\mathcal{E}_r^+) -supermartingale (martingale if $d = 2$) satisfying (6.8) with $\mathcal{E}_{r_1}^+$ in place of \mathcal{E}_{r_1} . This gives a cadlag version of Z which satisfies the (\mathcal{G}_{t+}) version of Lemma 6.1(a)(i), and so is (\mathcal{G}_{t+}) -Markov under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} or Q_{X_0} , just as for Lemma 6.1(c). Clearly (6.12) and (6.13) imply that $Z_{t-} = Z_t$ \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e., and so Z has no fixed time discontinuities. It follows from the above and Lemma 6.1(b) that $(Z_t, t \geq 0)$ is a (CSBP) with log Laplace transform $\{u(t, \cdot) : t > 0\}$ under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} or Q_{X_0} . A theorem of Lamperti (see. e.g. p. 1044 of [19]) shows that $(Z_t, t \geq 0)$ has only non-negative jumps a.e. and so the same applies to $(Y_r(1), r \in [0, r_0])$. \blacksquare

Remark 6.3. *Although in this work we only use the above results, we briefly discuss the processes Z and $Y(1)$ in the general context of CSBP's. By Proposition 6.2(c) above and Theorem 4 of [19] there is a Lévy measure $\tilde{\pi}$ on $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $\int \ell^2 \wedge 1 d\tilde{\pi}(\ell) < \infty$ and constants $\tilde{a} \in \mathbb{R}, b \geq 0$, such that if*

$$\Psi(u) = \tilde{a}u - bu^2 + \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-u\ell} - u\ell e^{-\ell}) d\tilde{\pi}(\ell), \quad u \geq 0, \quad (6.14)$$

then $t \mapsto u(t, \lambda)$ is the unique solution of

$$\frac{du(t, \lambda)}{dt} = \Psi(u(t, \lambda)), \quad u(0, \lambda) = \lambda. \quad (6.15)$$

Z is often called a Ψ -CSBP. (6.14) implies Ψ is concave on $[0, \infty)$ and differentiable on $(0, \infty)$. If $\lambda_d = 2(4 - d)$, then a short calculation using (6.4) and (6.2) gives (primes denote derivatives with respect to t)

$$u''(t, \lambda) = (6 - d)u' + u(u - \lambda_d), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (6.16)$$

Differentiating both sides of (6.15) and using (6.16) on the resulting left-hand side, leads to the first order ode for Ψ ,

$$\Psi' \Psi(u(t, \lambda)) = (6 - d)\Psi(u(t, \lambda)) + u(t, \lambda)(u(t, \lambda) - \lambda_d), \quad \Psi(0) = 0.$$

Letting $t \rightarrow 0$ and varying λ we conclude that Ψ is a solution of the ode

$$\Psi' \Psi(u) = (6 - d)\Psi(u) + u(u - \lambda_d), \quad u > 0, \quad \Psi(0) = 0. \quad (6.17)$$

By using this equation to analyze the behaviour of Ψ near ∞ it is easy to see that in (6.14), $b = 0$. The concavity of Ψ implies $\lim_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\Psi(u)}{u} = \lim_{u \downarrow 0} \Psi'(u) \in (-\infty, +\infty]$. If we divide both sides of (6.17) by u and let $u \downarrow 0$ we conclude this limit, $\Psi'(0)$ is in fact finite and satisfies

$$\Psi'(0)^2 = (6 - d)\Psi'(0) - \lambda_d,$$

that is, $\Psi'(0) = 2$ if $d = 2$, and $\Psi'(0) = 1$ or 2 if $d = 3$. It is not hard to see using (6.8) that, in fact, $\Psi'(0) = 1$ if $d = 3$. The fact that this derivative is finite, already implies that $\int_0^\infty \ell d\tilde{\pi}(\ell) < \infty$ and (6.14) can be rewritten as

$$\Psi(u) = a_d u + \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-u\ell} - u\ell) d\pi(\ell), \quad \int_0^\infty \ell \wedge \ell^2 d\pi(\ell) < \infty, \quad (6.18)$$

where now $a_d = \Psi'(0) = 4 - d$, by the above. The ode (6.17) can be used to study the tail behaviour of Ψ , and hence π , via Tauberian theorems. For example it is not hard to show that for some explicit $c_{6.19} > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{3/2} \pi([\varepsilon, \infty)) = c_{6.19}. \quad (6.19)$$

The process of total mass of the exit measure from B_r (as opposed to G_{r_0-r}) is studied in [9] as an inhomogeneous CSBP. The setting there is for general branching mechanisms, but the ideas used above and in defining Z appear to be novel. It would be of interest to study the detailed behaviour of the measure-valued process $r \rightarrow X_{G_{r_0-r}}$.

In [16] we instead worked with the exit measure from half spaces $H_r = \{x : x_1 < r\}$, where the total mass process is a Ψ -CSBP with $\Psi(u) = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} u^{3/2}$ (see [9] and Proposition 4.1 of [16] and c.f. (6.19)). The CSBP analysis there was simpler due to this explicit 3/2-stable Ψ , but half-planes were clumsier and led to less precise results. See the discussion at the end of the Introduction.

7 Proof of Propositions 1.6, 1.7

We use the notation from Section 6. In particular X_0 and $r_0 > 0$ are as in (6.5), $Y_r = X_{G_{r_0-r}}$ for $0 \leq r < r_0$, and $Q_{X_0}(\cdot) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\cdot | Y_0(1) > 0)$.

In what follows we always will work with the cadlag versions of $Y_r(1)$, and hence Z_t , constructed in Proposition 6.2(b) above. We let W denote a generic snake under \mathbb{N}_{X_0} or Q_{X_0} with the associated ‘‘tip process’’ $\hat{W}(t)$ and excursion length σ . Define

$$T_0(W) = \inf\{r \in [0, r_0) : Y_r(1) = 0\} \in [0, r_0], \quad \text{where } \inf \emptyset = r_0,$$

and

$$\hat{T}_0(W) = \inf\{|\hat{W}(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq \sigma\} = \inf\{|x| : x \in \mathcal{R}\}, \quad (7.1)$$

the final equality holding \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e. by (2.2). Clearly we have

$$Q_{X_0}(\cdot) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\cdot | T_0 > 0).$$

Lemma 7.1. *The sets $\{T_0 > 0\}$ and $\{\hat{T}_0 < r_0\}$ coincide \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e., and on this set, $\hat{T}_0 = r_0 - T_0$ \mathbb{N}_{X_0} -a.e.*

Proof. For every rational q in $[0, T_0)$, $X_{G_{r_0-q}}(1) > 0$ implies $\partial G_{r_0-q} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is non-empty (by (2.3)) and so by (2.2) $\hat{T}_0 \leq r_0 - q$. This proves that

$$\hat{T}_0 \leq r_0 - T_0 \quad \mathbb{N}_{X_0}\text{-a.e. on } \{T_0 > 0\}. \quad (7.2)$$

Conversely assume $r_0 > T_0$ and choose rationals q, q' so that $T_0 < q' < q < r_0$. Then $X_{G_{r_0-q'}}(1) = 0$ and the special Markov property (Proposition 2.2(b)) at $R_1 = r_0 - q'$ shows that $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\mathcal{R} \cap B_{r_0-q} \neq \emptyset | \mathcal{E}_{q'}) = 0$ a.e on $\{T_0 < q'\}$. This proves that

$$\hat{T}_0 \geq r_0 - T_0 \quad \mathbb{N}_{X_0}\text{-a.e. on } \{T_0 < r_0\}. \quad (7.3)$$

The above is trivial if $T_0 = r_0$ and so we have shown (by (7.2) and (7.3))

$$\hat{T}_0 = r_0 - T_0 \quad \mathbb{N}_{X_0}\text{-a.e on } \{T_0 > 0\}.$$

Finally, note that (7.2) shows $T_0 > 0$ implies $\hat{T}_0 < r_0$, and (7.3) shows $T_0 = 0$ implies $\hat{T}_0 \geq r_0$, which in turn shows $\hat{T}_0 < r_0$ implies $T_0 > 0$ (all up to \mathbb{N}_{X_0} null sets). This proves the a.e. equality of $\{T_0 > 0\}$ and $\{\hat{T}_0 < r_0\}$, and completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 7.2. (a) For $0 < r < r_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(0 < T_0 \leq r) &= \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(r_0 - r \leq \hat{T}_0 < r_0) \\ &= \mathbb{N}_{X_0}\left(1(X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0) \exp[-X_{G_{r_0}}(1)(r_0 - r)^2 U^{\infty,1}(r_0/(r_0 - r))]\right). \end{aligned}$$

(b) $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(T_0 \in dr) \ll dr$ on $\{0 < r < r_0\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\hat{T}_0 \in dr) \ll dr$ on $\{0 < r < 2r_0\}$.

Proof. (a) Using (1.23) and scaling ((1.22) with $\lambda = \infty$), we have for $0 < r < r_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{X_{G_{r_0}}}(X_{G_{r_0-r}}(1) = 0) &= \exp(-X_{G_{r_0}}(U^{\infty, r_0-r})) \\ &= \exp(-X_{G_{r_0}}(1)(r_0 - r)^{-2} U^{\infty,1}(r_0/(r_0 - r))). \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

The special Markov property (Proposition 2.2(a)(ii)) now implies for $0 < r < r_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(0 < T_0 \leq r) &= \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(1(T_0 > 0) \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(X_{G_{r_0-r}}(1) = 0 | \mathcal{E}_0)) \\ &= \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(1(T_0 > 0) \mathbb{P}_{X_{G_{r_0}}}(X_{G_{r_0-r}}(1) = 0)) \\ &= \mathbb{N}_{X_0}\left(1(X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0) \exp[-X_{G_{r_0}}(1)(r_0 - r)^{-2} U^{\infty,1}(r_0/(r_0 - r))]\right), \end{aligned}$$

where (7.4) has been used in the last line. This, together with Lemma 7.1, gives (a).

(b) The right-hand side of (a) is continuously differentiable in $r \in (0, r_0)$ because $U^{\infty,1}$ is C^2 on G_1 (recall (1.25)). Here we note that it is easy to justify differentiation inside the integral since $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0) < \infty$ (recall (6.5)), $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(X_{G_{r_0}}(1)) < \infty$ (recall (6.9)), and $(U^{\infty,1})'(r)$ is bounded on compacts away from $\{r \leq 1\}$. This gives the first part of (b). Lemma 7.1 now implies the absolute continuity of $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\hat{T}_0 \in dr)$ on $\{0 < r < r_0\}$. But (6.5) allows us to replace r_0 with αr_0 for any $1 < \alpha < 2$ in the above reasoning and so conclude that $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\hat{T}_0 \in dr)$ is absolutely continuous on $\{0 < r < 2r_0\}$. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 1.6 assuming Proposition 1.7. By translation invariance we may assume $x_1 = 0$. Fix r_0, r_1 and X_0 as in our hypotheses. We must show that

$$X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0 \text{ and } X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0 \text{ imply } \dim(B_{r_0} \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - a.s. \quad (7.5)$$

Measurability issues are easily handled using Lemma 2.1 and will henceforth be ignored. We work under \mathbb{P}_{X_0} in the standard set-up and so from (2.4) have for $0 < r \leq r_0$ and $J_0 = \{j \in J : \hat{T}_0(W_j) \leq r_0\}$,

$$X_{G_r} = \sum_{j \in J} X_{G_r}(W_j) = \sum_{j \in J} X_{G_r}(W_j) 1(\hat{T}_0(W_j) \leq r) = \sum_{j \in J_0} X_{G_r}(W_j) 1(\hat{T}_0(W_j) \leq r). \quad (7.6)$$

Here we used the fact that $\hat{T}_0(W_j) > r$ implies $X_{G_r}(W_j) = 0$ (e.g. by (2.3) and (2.2)). Recall from (2.2) that the range of the j th excursion W_j is

$$\mathcal{R}_j := \mathcal{R}(W_j) = \{\hat{W}_j(t) : t \leq \sigma(W_j)\}.$$

It follows easily from (2.1) (see (2.19) in [16]) that for $x \in \overline{B_{r_0}}$,

$$L^x = \sum_{j \in J_0} L^x(W_j),$$

and therefore,

$$\mathcal{R} \cap B_{r_0} = \cup_{j \in J_0} (\mathcal{R}_j \cap B_{r_0}) \text{ and so } 1_{\mathcal{R} \cap B_{r_0}}(x) = 1\left(\sum_{j \in J_0} 1_{\mathcal{R}(W_j) \cap B_{r_0}}(x) > 0\right). \quad (7.7)$$

We will frequently use the elementary topological result

$$B_{r_0} \cap \partial F = B_{r_0} \cap \partial(B_{r_0} \cap F) = B_{r_0} \cap \partial(\overline{B_{r_0}} \cap F) \text{ for any closed set } F. \quad (7.8)$$

It follows easily from Lemma 7.1 that

$$T_0 = r_0 - \wedge_{j \in J_0} \hat{T}_0(W_j) \quad \text{on } \{T_0 > 0\} = \{\wedge_{j \in J_0} \hat{T}_0(W_j) < r_0\} \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - a.s. \quad (7.9)$$

In view of the absolute continuity properties of \hat{T}_0 under \mathbb{N}_0 from Lemma 7.2 we see from the above that if $N_0 = |J_0|$, a Poisson mean $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\hat{T}_0 \leq r_0)$ random variable, then

$$T_0 > 0 \text{ iff } J_0 \neq \emptyset \text{ iff } N_0 > 0 \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - a.s. \quad (7.10)$$

By enlarging our probability space and randomizing the above Poisson points we may assume that there is an iid sequence $\{\widetilde{W}_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$, independent of the Poisson variable $N_0 = |J_0|$ with mean $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\hat{T}_0 \leq r_0)$, and with common law

$$\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\cdot | \hat{T}_0 \leq r_0) = \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\cdot | \hat{T}_0 < r_0), \quad (7.11)$$

(the last equality by Lemma 7.2) and so that

$$\sum_{j \in J_0} \delta_{W_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \delta_{\widetilde{W}_j}. \quad (7.12)$$

Let \widehat{W}_j denote the tip of the j th excursion and define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}^j &= \hat{T}_0(\widehat{W}_j) < r_0 \quad (\text{a.s. by (7.11)}), \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_j &= \mathcal{R}(\widetilde{W}_j) = \{\widehat{W}_j(t) : t \leq \sigma(\widetilde{W}_j)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0$ implies $T_0 < r_0 - r_1$ a.s. and so, in view of (7.9),

$$X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0 \text{ and } Y_0(1) = X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0 \text{ imply } \hat{T}^j \geq r_1 \quad \forall j \leq N_0 \quad \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - \text{a.s.} \quad (7.13)$$

The independence of the \hat{T}^j 's and fact they have no positive atoms by Lemma 7.2 imply

$$\mathbb{P}_{X_0}(\hat{T}^j = \hat{T}^{j'} \text{ for some } 1 \leq j \neq j' \leq N_0, X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0) = 0. \quad (7.14)$$

So on $\{X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0\}$ there is an a.s. unique $\tilde{j} \leq N_0$ s.t. $\hat{T}^{\tilde{j}} = \min\{\hat{T}^j : j \leq N_0\}$. (7.14) and (7.13) imply that (if an empty minimum is r_0) $\mathbb{P}_{X_0} - \text{a.s.}$,

$$\tilde{T} := \min\{\hat{T}^j : j \neq \tilde{j}, j \leq N_0\} > \hat{T}^{\tilde{j}} \geq r_1 \text{ on } \{X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0\} \subset \{N_0 \geq 1\}. \quad (7.15)$$

Hence \tilde{T} is the largest radius $r \leq r_0$ so that a single excursion \widetilde{W}_j enters B_r (it exists on $\{X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0\}$).

By the definition of \tilde{j} and \tilde{T} we have from (7.15) and (7.7),

$$B_{\tilde{T}} \cap \mathcal{R} = B_{\tilde{T}} \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\tilde{j}} \text{ on } \{X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0\} \text{ a.s.}$$

Therefore, using the above and (7.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{X_0}(\dim(B_{r_0} \cap \partial \mathcal{R}) \geq d_f, X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{X_0}(\dim(B_{\tilde{T}} \cap \partial \mathcal{R}) \geq d_f, X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{X_0}(\dim(B_{\tilde{T}} \cap \partial \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\tilde{j}}) \geq d_f, X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{X_0}(\{N_0 \geq 1\} \cap (\cap_{j \leq N_0} \{\dim(B_r \cap \partial \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_j) \geq d_f \quad \forall r > \hat{T}^j \geq r_1\})). \end{aligned} \quad (7.16)$$

In the last line we have used $N_0 \geq 1$ iff $X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0$ (by (7.10)), and on this set, $\hat{T}^j \geq r_1$ for all $j \leq N_0$ implies $T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1$ (by (7.9)) and so $X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0$. We also use the fact (from (7.15)) that if $\{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\}$ then $\tilde{T} > \hat{T}^{\tilde{j}}$. The independence of the \widetilde{W}_j 's and

their joint independence from N_0 together with their common law in (7.11) imply that (7.16) equals

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0}(1(N_0 \geq 1) \prod_{j=1}^{N_0} \mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\dim(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B_r) \geq d_f \forall r > \hat{T}_0 \geq r_1 | \hat{T}_0 < r_0)). \quad (7.17)$$

By Proposition 1.7 and Lemma 7.1 each of the terms in the above product equals $\mathbb{N}_{X_0}(\hat{T}_0 \geq r_1 | \hat{T}_0 < r_0)$ and so (7.17) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{X_0}(1(N_0 \geq 1) 1(\wedge_{j=1}^{N_0} \hat{T}_0(\tilde{W}_j) \geq r_1)) \\ & = \mathbb{P}_{X_0}(0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1) = \mathbb{P}_{X_0}(X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0, X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0). \end{aligned} \quad (7.18)$$

In the first equality we used (7.9) and (7.10). We have proved the left-hand side of (7.16) exceeds the above, and we conclude that

$$X_{G_{r_1}}(1) = 0 \text{ and } X_{G_{r_0}}(1) > 0 \text{ imply } \dim(B_{r_0} \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f \mathbb{P}_{X_0} - \text{a.s.},$$

thus proving (7.5). ■

Recall again that we always work with the cadlag version of $Y_r(1)$ from Proposition 6.2(b) which only has non-negative jumps and is an (\mathcal{E}_r^+) -supermartingale. Define a sequence of (\mathcal{E}_r^+) -stopping times by

$$T_{n-1} = \inf\{r \leq r_0 : Y_r(1) \leq 1/n\} \quad (\inf \emptyset = r_0).$$

Then

$$\text{on } \{0 < T_0\} \text{ (and so } Q_{X_0}\text{-a.s.) } T_{n-1} \uparrow T_0 \text{ and } T_{n-1} < T_0, \quad (7.19)$$

where the last inequality holds since $Y_r(1)$ has no negative jumps. So under Q_{X_0} , T_0 is a predictable stopping time which is announced by $\{T_{n-1}\}$ and so (see (12.9)(ii) in Chapter VI of [18])

$$\mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+ = \vee_n \mathcal{E}_{T_n}^+. \quad (7.20)$$

Let $D_r = \{\dim(B_r \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f\}$ for $0 < r \leq r_0$. We assume \mathcal{E}_r^+ is augmented by Q_{X_0} -null sets throughout this Section.

To finish the proof of Proposition 1.7 we need:

Lemma 7.3. *If $X_0 = \delta_{x_0}$ where $|x_0| \geq 2r_0$, then*

$$D_{r_0} \in \mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+. \quad (7.21)$$

For the proof of Proposition 1.7 below it would suffice to show that $D_{r_0} \cap \{T_0 < r_0\} \in \mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+$, and this latter result should be intuitively obvious, as we now explain. With Lemma 7.1 in mind, we see that $\mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+$ includes information generated by the excursions of W outside of its minimum radius. If this minimum radius is positive (as is the case on $\{T_0 < r_0\}$) it is intuitively clear that this includes all the information generated by W .

Even without intersecting with $\{T_0 < r_0\}$, however, none of the mass that hits the origin will survive for any length of time and so again all of W will have been observed. This last point stems from the fact that points are polar for Brownian motion in more than one dimension and be more formally justified using a mean measure result for the integral of the snake (Proposition 2 in Ch. IV of [14] with $p = 1$). Before giving its proof below, we first show how Lemma 7.3 implies Proposition 1.7.

Proof of Proposition 1.7. Clearly it suffices to fix $x_0 \in \text{Supp}(X_0)$ and prove the result with \mathbb{N}_{x_0} in place of \mathbb{N}_{X_0} . By translation invariance we may assume $x_1 = 0$, and so $|x_0| \geq 2r_0$. Fix $0 < r_1 < r_0$. Assume $0 \leq r < r_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough so that $r + n^{-1} < r_0$. By Lemma 2.1(b) there is a universally measurable map $\psi : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 1(D_{r_0-r-n^{-1}}) &= 1(\dim(\partial(\overline{B}_{r_0-r-n^{-1}} \cap \mathcal{R}) \cap B_{r_0-r-n^{-1}}) \geq d_f) \quad (\text{by (7.8)}) \\ &= \psi(\overline{B}_{r_0-r-n^{-1}} \cap \mathcal{R}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

Recall that conditional expectations with respect to \mathcal{E}_r , under \mathbb{N}_{x_0} and Q_{x_0} , agree Q_{x_0} -a.s., and note that Proposition 2.2(b) can be trivially extended to universally measurable maps. Therefore up to Q_{x_0} -null sets, on $\{4n^{-2} \leq Y_r(1) \leq (r_0 - r)^2\}(\in \mathcal{E}_r)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{x_0}(D_{r_0}|\mathcal{E}_r) &\geq Q_{x_0}(D_{r_0-r-n^{-1}}|\mathcal{E}_r) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{Y_r}(D_{r_0-r-n^{-1}}) \quad (\text{by (7.22) and Proposition 2.2(b)}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{Y_r}\left(\dim\left(\partial\mathcal{R} \cap B_{r_0-r-(\sqrt{Y_r(1)}/2)}\right) \geq d_f\right) \\ &\geq q_{5.4}, \end{aligned}$$

where Lemma 5.4 and the assumed bounds on $Y_r(1)$ are used in the last inequality, and the assumed lower bound on $Y_r(1)$ is used in the next to last inequality. Let $n \rightarrow \infty$ and take limits from above in $r \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ (recall $Y_r(1)$ is cadlag) to conclude that

$$M_r := Q_{x_0}(D_{r_0}|\mathcal{E}_r^+) \geq q_{5.4} \text{ on } \{0 < Y_r(1) < (r_0 - r)^2\} \forall r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, r_0) \text{ } Q_{x_0} \text{ - a.s.} \quad (7.23)$$

Here M_r is a cadlag version of the bounded martingale on the left-hand side. Using right-continuity one can strengthen (7.23) to

$$M_r = Q_{x_0}(D_{r_0}|\mathcal{E}_r^+) \geq q_{5.4} \text{ on } \{0 < Y_r(1) < (r_0 - r)^2\} \forall r \in (0, r_0) \text{ } Q_{x_0} \text{ - a.s.} \quad (7.24)$$

On $\{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\}$ we have from (7.19) and the lack of negative jumps for $Y_r(1)$,

$$\text{for } n \text{ large, } T_{n^{-1}} \in (0, r_0 - r_1) \text{ and } Y_{T_{n^{-1}}}(1) = n^{-1} < (r_0 - T_{1/n})^2 \text{ } Q_{x_0} \text{ - a.s.} \quad (7.25)$$

By Corollary (17.10) in Chapter VI of [18], (7.24), and (7.25), we have Q_{x_0} -a.s. on $\{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\} \in \mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+$,

$$Q_{x_0}(D_{r_0}|\mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(T_{n^{-1}}) \geq q_{5.4}. \quad (7.26)$$

Multiplying the above by $1(\{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\})$, we see from Lemma 7.3 that

$$1(D_{r_0} \cap \{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\}) \geq q_{5.4} 1(\{0 < T_0 \leq r_0 - r_1\}) \quad Q_{x_0} - \text{a.s.},$$

and therefore by Lemma 7.1,

$$r_1 \leq \hat{T}_0 < r_0 \text{ implies } \dim(B_{r_0} \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f \quad Q_{x_0} - \text{a.s.}.$$

This remains true if we replace r_0 by any $r \in (r_1, r_0]$ since we still have $B_{2r} \subset \text{Supp}(X_0)^c$. Therefore we may fix ω outside a Q_{x_0} -null set so that for any $r \in (r_1, r_0] \cap \mathbb{Q}$, $r_1 \leq \hat{T}_0 < r$ implies $\dim(B_r \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f$. By monotonicity of the conclusion in r this means that $\{r_1 \leq \hat{T}_0 < r_0\}$ implies $\dim(B_r \cap \partial\mathcal{R}) \geq d_f$ for all $r > \hat{T}_0$. This gives Proposition 1.7 under Q_{x_0} . The result under \mathbb{N}_{x_0} is now immediate from the definition of Q_{x_0} , and $\{Y_0(1) > 0\} = \{\hat{T}_0 < r_0\}$ \mathbb{N}_{x_0} -a.e. (by Lemma 7.1). \blacksquare

Turning now to Lemma 7.3, we work under Q_{x_0} where $|x_0| \geq 2r_0$. Recall the definitions of η_s^G and \mathcal{E}_G from Section 2. For $0 \leq r < r_0$, introduce

$$A_t^r = \int_0^t 1(\zeta_u \leq S_{G_{r_0-r}}(W_u)) du,$$

so that

$$\eta_s^r := \eta_s^{G_{r_0-r}} = \inf\{t : A_t^r > s\}.$$

Lemma 7.4. (a) Q_{x_0} -a.s. for all $t \geq 0$ we have

$$A_t^r = \int_0^t 1(\inf_{v \leq \zeta_u} |W_u(v)| > r_0 - r) du \quad \forall r \in [0, r_0),$$

and

$$r \mapsto A_t^r \text{ is left-continuous on } [0, r_0).$$

(b) $\lim_{r' \uparrow r} \eta_s^{r'} = \eta_s^r$ for all $r \in (0, r_0)$, $s \geq 0$ Q_{x_0} -a.s.

(c) If T is an (\mathcal{E}_r^+) -stopping time, then $W_{\eta_s^r}$ is \mathcal{E}_T^+ -measurable.

Proof. The proof is a straightforward modification of that of Lemma 7.4 in [16], where shrinking half spaces have now been replaced with shrinking balls. \blacksquare

Proof of Lemma 7.3. By (7.22) (with a different radii) and Lemma 2.1(a) there are Borel maps $\tilde{\psi}$ on \mathcal{K} and ψ on $C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{W})$ such that

$$1_{D_{r_0}} = \tilde{\psi}(\mathcal{R}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\psi}(\{\hat{W}(s) : s \leq N\}) = \psi(W),$$

where we have used (2.2) in the second equality. In the last equality we have also called on the continuity of $W \mapsto \{\hat{W}(s) : s \leq N\}$ from $C([0, \infty), \mathcal{W})$ to \mathcal{K} . Therefore a monotone

class argument shows it suffices to fix $s \geq 0$ and show that if $\phi : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded Borel then

$$\phi(W_s) \text{ is } \mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+ \text{ - measurable.} \quad (7.27)$$

Lemma 7.4(b) implies that $W_{\eta_s^{T_0}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{\eta_s^{T_{n-1}}} Q_{x_0}$ -as. and so by Lemma 7.4(c) and (7.20), $W_{\eta_s^{T_0}}$ is $\mathcal{E}_{T_0-}^+$ -measurable. So to prove (7.27) it suffices to show

$$W_s = W_{\eta_s^{T_0}} Q_{x_0} - \text{a.s.}$$

This, in turn, would follow from $A_t^{T_0} = t$ for all $t \geq 0$ Q_{x_0} -a.s., or equivalently by Lemma 7.4(a),

$$\int_0^\sigma 1(\inf_{v \leq \zeta_u} |W_u(v)| \leq r_0 - T_0) du = 0 \quad Q_{x_0} - \text{a.s.} \quad (7.28)$$

Here we have truncated the integral at σ since $\zeta_u = 0$ and $|W_u(0)| = |x_0| \geq 2r_0$ for $u \geq \sigma$. If $0 \leq u < \zeta_s$ and $s' < s$ is the last time before s that $\zeta_{s'} = u$, then $\inf_{t \in [s', s]} \zeta_t = \zeta_{s'} = u$ and so (e.g., see p. 66 of [14]) $W_s(u) = \hat{W}(s')$ Q_{x_0} -a.s. This and Lemma 7.1 (recall also (7.1)) imply

$$\inf_{u \leq \sigma} \inf_{v \leq \zeta_u} |W_u(v)| = \hat{T}_0 = \inf\{|x| : x \in \mathcal{R}\} = r_0 - T_0 \quad Q_{x_0} - \text{a.s.} \quad (7.29)$$

Therefore (7.28) is equivalent to

$$\int_0^\sigma 1(\inf_{v \leq \zeta_u} |W_u(v)| = \hat{T}_0) du = 0 \quad Q_{x_0} - \text{a.s.} \quad (7.30)$$

The historical process, $(H_t, t \geq 0)$ is an inhomogeneous Markov process under \mathbb{N}_{x_0} taking values in $M_F(C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^d))$ —see [3] or p. 64 of [14] to see how it is easily defined from the snake W . The latter readily implies

$$\int_0^\infty H_t(\phi) dt = \int_0^\sigma \phi(W_u) du \quad \text{for all non-negative Borel } \phi, \quad (7.31)$$

where we have extended W_u to \mathbb{R}_+ in the obvious manner. Recalling (7.1) and letting X be the SBM under \mathbb{N}_{x_0} as usual, we have

$$\mathbb{N}_{x_0} \left(\int_0^\infty 1(\inf_{v \leq \zeta_u} |W_u(v)| = \hat{T}_0) du \right) \quad (7.32)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{N}_{x_0} \left(\int_0^\infty \int 1(\inf_{t' \leq t} |y_{t'}| = \hat{T}_0) H_t(dy) dt \right) \quad (\text{by (7.31)})$$

$$\leq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{N}_{x_0} \left(\int 1 \left(\int_0^\infty X_s(\{x : |x| < \inf_{t' \leq t} |y(t')|\}) ds = 0 \right) H_t(dy) \right) dt, \quad (7.33)$$

where in the last line we use (7.29) and $y(\cdot) = y(\cdot \wedge t) H_t - \text{a.a. } y \quad \forall t \geq 0$ \mathbb{N}_{x_0} -a.e. Below we will let B denote a d -dimensional Brownian motion starting at x_0 under $P_{x_0}^B$,

$m_t = \inf_{t' \leq t} |B_{t'}| = |B_{\tau_t}|$ (for some $\tau_t < t$), and L^x be the local time of the SBM X (at time infinity). Fix $t > 0$ and use the Palm measure formula for H_t (e.g. Proposition 4.1.5 of [3]) to see that (cf. (7.22) in [16])

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{N}_{x_0} \left(\int_0^\infty 1 \left(\int_0^\infty X_s(\{x : |x| < \inf_{t' \leq t} |y(t')|\}) ds = 0 \right) H_t(dy) \right) \\ &= E_{x_0}^B \left(\exp \left(- \int_0^t \int_0^\infty 1 \left(\int_0^\infty X_s(\{x : |x| < m_t\}) ds > 0 \right) d\mathbb{N}_{B_u} du \right) \right) \\ &\leq E_{x_0}^B \left(\exp \left(- \int_0^t \mathbb{N}_{B_u}(L^{B_{\tau_t}} > 0) du \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.34)$$

It follows from (1.13), (1.14) and $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}(L^y = 0) = \exp(-\mathbb{N}_x(L^y > 0))$ (see, e.g., (2.12) in [16]) that

$$\mathbb{N}_x(L^y > 0) = 2(4-d)|x-y|^{-2}.$$

Use this to bound (7.34) by

$$E_{x_0}^B \left(\exp \left(- \int_0^t \frac{2(4-d)}{|B_s - B_{\tau_t}|^2} ds \right) \right).$$

A simple application of Lévy's modulus for B shows the above integral is infinite a.s. and so proves that (7.32) equals zero. This implies (7.30), as required. \blacksquare

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Lemma 2.1

(a) Let $K^{(\varepsilon)} = \{x : d(x, K) < \varepsilon\}$. If $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ and $0 < r \leq 1$ are fixed it suffices to show that $\{K \in \mathcal{K} : d(K \cap \overline{B}_R, K_0) < r\}$ is Borel. If $r_n \uparrow r$, this set is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \{K : K \cap \overline{B}_R \subset K_0^{(r)}\} \cap \{K : K_0 \subset (K \cap \overline{B}_R)^{(r)}\} \\ &= \{K : K \cap \overline{B}_R \subset K_0^{(r)}\} \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \{K : K_0 \subset (K \cap \overline{B}_R)^{r_n}\} \right) := S_1 \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty S_2^n \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is then not hard to show that S_1 is open in \mathcal{K} and S_2^n is closed in \mathcal{K} .

(b) This easily reduces to showing that for any fixed rationals $q \in (0, \alpha)$ and $r \in (0, R)$, the following describes an universally measurable subset of \mathcal{K} 's in \mathcal{K} :

For any natural number N there is a finite number of open balls B^1, \dots, B^M

centered at points in \mathbb{Q}^d and with rational radii $r_1, \dots, r_M > 0$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^M r_i^q < N^{-1}$

so that $\partial K \cap \overline{B}_r \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^M B^i$.

So fixing B_i and r as above, it suffices to show

$$A_1 = \{K \in \mathcal{K} : \partial K \cap \overline{B}_r \subset \cup_{i=1}^M B^i\}^c \text{ is an analytic set in } \mathcal{K},$$

because this implies A_1 , and hence A_1^c , is a universally measurable set in \mathcal{K} . Let $K_0 = \left(\cup_{i=1}^M B^i\right)^c \cap \overline{B}_r \in \mathcal{K}$, $H_0 = \{(x, K) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{K} : x \in K\}$, and for $n \geq 1$, set $H_n = \{(x, K) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{K} : B_{n-1}(x) \not\subset K\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \{K \in \mathcal{K} : K_0 \cap \partial K \neq \emptyset\} \\ &= \{K \in \mathcal{K} : \exists x \in K_0 \text{ s.t. } x \in K \text{ and } \forall n \in \mathbb{N} B_{n-1}(x) \cap K^c \neq \emptyset\} \\ &= \{K \in \mathcal{K} : \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } (x, K) \in (K_0 \times \mathcal{K}) \cap \left(\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} H_n\right)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the well-known fact that the projection of a Borel subset of $K_0 \times \mathcal{K}$ onto \mathcal{K} is an analytic subset of \mathcal{K} (see eg. Theorem 13 in Ch. III of [4] and note the argument goes through with \mathbb{R}^d in place of \mathbb{R}), it then suffices to show each H_n is Borel. H_0 is the countable intersection of the open sets $H_0^M = \{(x, K) : x \in K^{(1/M)}\}$. Moreover it is not hard to see that H_n is open for $n \geq 1$, and we are done. \blacksquare

A.2 Proof of Lemma 4.5

For the proof we will use the following lemma of Marc Yor (see Proposition 2.5 of [16]). Recall that for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, (ρ_t) denotes a γ -dimensional Bessel process starting from $r > 0$ under $P_r^{(\gamma)}$, (\mathcal{F}_t) is the filtration generated by ρ and $\tau_R = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \rho_t \leq R\}$ for $R > 0$.

Lemma A.1. *Let $\lambda \geq 0$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $r > 0$ and $\nu = \sqrt{\lambda^2 + \mu^2}$. If $\Phi_t \geq 0$ is \mathcal{F}_t -adapted, then for all $R < r$, we have*

$$E_r^{(2+2\mu)} \left(\Phi_{t \wedge \tau_R} \exp \left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} \frac{1}{\rho_s^2} ds \right) \right) = r^{\nu-\mu} E_r^{(2+2\nu)} \left((\rho_{t \wedge \tau_R})^{-\nu+\mu} \Phi_{t \wedge \tau_R} \right).$$

Now we are ready to give

Proof of Lemma 4.5 We use Fatou's lemma and then Lemma A.1 to get that for $a \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &E_x \left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{a}{|B_s|^q} ds \right) \exp \left(-\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d) - \zeta/2}{|B_s|^2} ds \right) \right) \\ &\leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} E_{|x|}^{(2+2\mu)} \left(1_{(\tau_R \leq \tau_R \wedge t)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R \wedge t} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \exp \left(-\int_0^{\tau_R \wedge t} \frac{2(4-d) - (\zeta/2)}{\rho_s^2} ds \right) \right) \\ &= |x|^{\nu_\zeta - \mu} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu_\zeta)} \left(1_{(\tau_R \leq \tau_R \wedge t)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R \wedge t} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \rho_{t \wedge \tau_R}^{\mu - \nu_\zeta} \right) \\ &= (R/|x|)^{\mu - \nu_\zeta} E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu_\zeta)} \left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \right) \quad (\text{since } \rho_{t \wedge \tau_R} = R \text{ on } \{\tau_R \leq t\}) \\ &= (R/|x|)^{p_\zeta} E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu_\zeta)} \left(\exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \Big|_{\tau_R < \infty} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in next to the last line we use monotone convergence for $a \geq 0$, and in the last line the hitting probabilities for Bessel processes (e.g. (48.3) and (48.5) in Ch. V of [18]) as well as $p_\zeta = \mu + \nu_\zeta$. Note that for $a < 0$, by bounded convergence, we get equality in the second line above (with $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty}$ replaced by $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}$) and thus proceeding as above we get, by using bounded convergence again in the next to the last line, that (4.9) holds for $a < 0$.

It remains to verify the lower bound in (4.9), for $a \geq 0$. Fix $T > 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_x \left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{a}{|B_s|^q} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d) - \zeta/2}{|B_s|^2} ds \right) \right) \\
& \geq E_{|x|}^{(2+2\mu)} \left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R \wedge T} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^{\tau_R} \frac{2(4-d) - (\zeta/2)}{\rho_s^2} ds \right) \right) \\
& = |x|^{\nu_\zeta - \mu} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu_\zeta)} \left(1_{(\tau_R \leq \tau_R \wedge t)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R \wedge t \wedge T} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) R^{\mu - \nu_\zeta} \right) \\
& = (R/|x|)^{\mu - \nu_\zeta} E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu_\zeta)} \left(1_{(\tau_R < \infty)} \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R \wedge T} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \right) \\
& = (R/|x|)^{p_\zeta} E_{|x|}^{(2+2\nu_\zeta)} \left(\exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_R \wedge T} \frac{a}{\rho_s^q} ds \right) \Big| \tau_R < \infty \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality we used bounded convergence and Lemma A.1, in the second equality bounded convergence again, and in the last equality the hitting probabilities for Bessel processes. Now let $T \rightarrow \infty$, to get the required lower bound, and we are done. ■

A.3 Proof of Proposition 5.1

For $|x_i| \geq \varepsilon_0$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, if $|x_1 - x_2| \leq 5\varepsilon$, then use $xe^{-x} \leq e^{-1}, \forall x \geq 0$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_0} \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) \leq e^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_0} \left(\lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_1}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_1}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right).$$

Recall the definition of $F = F_{\varepsilon, x_1}$ in (4.16). For all $\lambda > 0$, an integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\delta_0} \left(\lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_1}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_1}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) = \int_0^\infty \lambda x e^{-\lambda x} dF(x) \\
& = \int_0^\infty \lambda(\lambda x - 1) e^{-\lambda x} F(x) dx = \int_0^\infty (y - 1) e^{-y} F\left(\frac{y}{\lambda}\right) dy \leq F(2) + \int_{2\lambda}^\infty y e^{-y} F\left(\frac{y}{\lambda}\right) dy \\
& \leq c_{4.9} 2^{p-2} \varepsilon^{p-2} + \int_{2\lambda}^\infty y e^{-y} c_{4.9} \left(\frac{y}{\lambda}\right)^{p-2} \varepsilon^{p-2} dy = C(\varepsilon_0, \lambda) \varepsilon^{p-2},
\end{aligned}$$

the last line by Proposition 4.9. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_0} \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \lambda \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) \leq e^{-1} C(\varepsilon_0, \lambda) \varepsilon^{p-2} \leq e^{-1} 5^{p-2} C(\varepsilon_0, \lambda) |x_1 - x_2|^{2-p} \varepsilon^{2(p-2)},$$

provided $|x_1 - x_2| \leq 5\varepsilon$. As a result,

throughout the rest of this Section we may fix $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $|x_i| \geq \varepsilon_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ with $|x_1 - x_2| > 5\varepsilon$. In this case, we have $B(x_1, 2\varepsilon) \cap B(x_2, 2\varepsilon) = \emptyset$.

Let $\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, $G = G_\varepsilon^{x_1} \cap G_\varepsilon^{x_2}$, and $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in [0, \infty)^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. For $X_0 \in M_F(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $d(\text{Supp}(X_0), G^c) > 0$, the decomposition (2.4) with $G = G_\varepsilon^{x_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0} \left(\exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) = \exp \left(- \int U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) X_0(dx) \right), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon} \geq 0$ is defined as

$$U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) \equiv \mathbb{N}_x \left(1 - \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We use results from Chapter V of [14] to get the following lemma.

Lemma A.2. $U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}$ is a C^2 function on G and solves

$$\Delta U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon} = (U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon})^2 \text{ on } G. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Moreover,

$$U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) \leq (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\varepsilon^{-2}, \quad \forall x \in G.$$

Proof. Let

$$u(x) \equiv U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) = \mathbb{N}_x \left(1 - \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right).$$

Then use $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ to get

$$u(x) \leq \mathbb{N}_x \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \varepsilon^{-2} P_x(\tau_i < \infty) \leq (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

the equality by Proposition V.3 of [14], where (B_t) is d -dimensional Brownian motion starting from x under P_x and $\tau_i = \inf\{t \geq 0 : B_t \notin G_\varepsilon^{x_i}\}$.

Next, for any $x' \in G$, let D be an open ball that contains x' , whose closure is in G . Use (A.1) with $X_0 = \delta_x$ and then Proposition 2.3(b)(i) to see that for $x \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-u(x)} &= \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} \left(\exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) = \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} \left(\mathbb{E}_{X_D} \left(\exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} \left(\exp \left(- \int u(x) X_D(dx) \right) \right) = \exp \left(- \mathbb{N}_x \left(1 - \exp \left(- \int u(y) X_D(dy) \right) \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

the third equality by (A.1) with $X_0 = X_D$, and the last by the decomposition (2.4). Therefore

$$u(x) = \mathbb{N}_x \left(1 - \exp \left(- \int u(y) X_D(dy) \right) \right) \quad \forall x \in D.$$

Note u is bounded in G by (A.4), and hence on ∂D . Use Theorem V.6 of [14] to conclude

$$\Delta u(x) = (u(x))^2, \quad \forall x \in D, \quad \text{and, in particular, for } x = x'.$$

Since x' is arbitrary, it holds for all $x \in G$. ■

Let $X_0 = \delta_x$ in (A.1) for $x \in G$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} \left(\exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) = \exp(-U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x)). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Monotone convergence and the convexity of e^{-ax} for $a, x > 0$ allow us to differentiate the left-hand side of (A.5) with respect to $\lambda_i > 0$ through the expectation and so conclude that for $i = 1, 2$, $U_i^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_i} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x)$ exists and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} \left(\frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) = e^{-U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x)} U_i^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) \quad \text{for } \lambda_i > 0, \lambda_{3-i} \geq 0.$$

Repeat the above to see that $U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x)$ is C^2 in $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ and if $U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda_1 \partial \lambda_2} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x} \left(\frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_1}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_2}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) \\ = e^{-U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x)} \left[U_1^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) U_2^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) - U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) \right], \quad \text{for } \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The next monotonicity result follows just as in the proof of Lemma 9.2 of [16].

Lemma A.3.

- (a) $U_i^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) > 0$ is strictly decreasing in $\vec{\lambda} \in \{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) : \lambda_i > 0, \lambda_{3-i} \geq 0\}$, for $i = 1, 2$.
- (b) $-U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) > 0$ is strictly decreasing in $\vec{\lambda} \in (0, \infty)^2$.

Note that

$$U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) = U^{\lambda_i \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x - x_i), \quad \text{for } \lambda_i > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_{3-i} = 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The above monotonicity results easily give the following, just as for Lemma 9.3 of [16].

Lemma A.4. (a) For all $\lambda_i > 12$ and $\lambda_{3-i} \geq 0$,

$$U_i^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_i} (U^{\lambda_i \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x_i - x) - U^{(\lambda_i/2) \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x_i - x)) \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_i} \frac{2^p}{|x_i - x|^p} D^{\lambda_i/2}(2) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall |x_i - x| \geq 2\varepsilon.$$

(b) For all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 12$,

$$\begin{aligned} -U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) &\leq \frac{4}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \min_{i=1,2} (U^{\lambda_i \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x_i - x) - U^{(\lambda_i/2) \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(x_i - x)) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} 2^p ([D^{\lambda_1/2}(2)|x_1 - x|^{-p}] \wedge [D^{\lambda_2/2}(2)|x_2 - x|^{-p}]) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \quad \forall |x_i - x| \geq 2\varepsilon, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $r_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$ and assume $0 < r_\varepsilon < \min\{|x_i - x| : i = 1, 2\}$. Set $T_{r_\varepsilon}^i = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |B_t - x_i| \leq r_\varepsilon\}$ and $T_{r_\varepsilon} = T_{r_\varepsilon}^1 \wedge T_{r_\varepsilon}^2$, and let (\mathcal{F}_t) denote the right-continuous filtration generated by the Brownian motion B , which starts at x under P_x .

Lemma A.5. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$.

(a) $U_1^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(t \wedge T_{r_\varepsilon})) - \int_0^{t \wedge T_{r_\varepsilon}} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) U_1^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds$ is an (\mathcal{F}_t) -martingale.

(b) For any $t > 0$,

$$U_1^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) = E_x \left(U_1^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(t \wedge T_{r_\varepsilon})) \exp \left(- \int_0^{t \wedge T_{r_\varepsilon}} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) \right).$$

This result follows from Lemmas A.2, A.4 and Itô's Lemma, exactly as for Lemma 9.4 in [16], and so the proof is omitted.

Lemma A.6. For all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} -U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x) &= E_x \left(\int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}} \prod_{i=1}^2 U_i^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(t)) \exp \left(- \int_0^t U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) dt \right) \\ &\quad + E_x \left(\exp \left(- \int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) 1(T_{r_\varepsilon} < \infty) (-U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(T_{r_\varepsilon})) \right) \end{aligned}$$

This follows from Lemmas A.4 and A.5, as in the proof of Lemma 9.5 of [16].

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Recall $r_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$. For the case $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_0/2, \varepsilon_0)$, the result follows immediately by letting $c_{5.1} \geq e^{-2} 2^{2(p-2)} \varepsilon_0^{-2(p-2)}$ and by using $x e^{-x} \leq e^{-1}$, for $x \geq 0$, so we assume

$$r_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0. \tag{A.8}$$

Recall that $T_{r_\varepsilon}^i = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |B_t - x_i| \leq r_\varepsilon\}$ and $T_{r_\varepsilon} = T_{r_\varepsilon}^1 \wedge T_{r_\varepsilon}^2$. Since $|x_i| \geq \varepsilon_0$, we have $T_{r_\varepsilon} > 0$, P_0 -a.s.. We set $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda, \lambda)$, $\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, and $\Delta = |x_1 - x_2|$, where the constant $\lambda > 0$ will be chosen large below.

Apply (A.6) and Lemma A.4(a) to see that for $\lambda > 12$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\delta_0} \left(\lambda^2 \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_1}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_2}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \exp \left(- \lambda \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{X_{G_\varepsilon^{x_i}}(1)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) &= \lambda^2 e^{-U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(x)} \left[U_1^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(0) U_2^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(0) - U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(0) \right] \\ &\leq 2^{2p+2} (D^{\lambda/2}(2))^2 |x_1|^{-p} |x_2|^{-p} \varepsilon^{2(p-2)} - \lambda^2 U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(0) \leq c \varepsilon_0^{-2p} \varepsilon^{2(p-2)} + \lambda^2 (-U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(0)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

To bound the last term, use Lemma A.6 to get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 (-U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(0)) &= \lambda^2 E_0 \left(\int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}} \prod_{i=1}^2 U_i^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(t)) \exp \left(- \int_0^t U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) dt \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 E_0 \left(\exp \left(- \int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) 1(T_{r_\varepsilon} < \infty) (-U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(T_{r_\varepsilon})) \right) \\ &\equiv K_1 + K_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

We first consider K_2 . On $\{T_{r_\varepsilon} < \infty\}$ we may set $x_\varepsilon(\omega) = B(T_{r_\varepsilon})$ and choose $i(\omega)$ so that $|x_i - x_\varepsilon| \geq \Delta/2$. By the definition of T_{r_ε} , $|x_i - x_\varepsilon| \geq r_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$, and so $|x_i - x_\varepsilon| \geq \frac{1}{2}(\Delta \vee r_\varepsilon)$. Lemma A.4(b) and the above imply

$$\lambda^2 (-U_{1,2}^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(T_{r_\varepsilon}))) \leq 4 \cdot 2^p (D^{\lambda/2}(2)) (\Delta \vee r_\varepsilon)^{-p} 2^p \varepsilon^{p-2} \leq c (\Delta \vee r_\varepsilon)^{-p} \varepsilon^{p-2}.$$

This shows that

$$K_2 \leq c (\Delta \vee r_\varepsilon)^{-p} \varepsilon^{p-2} \sum_{i=1}^2 E_0 \left(1(T_{r_\varepsilon}^i < \infty) \exp \left(- \int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}^i} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) \right). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Use (A.7) and Corollary 4.7(a) with $|B(s) - x_i| \geq r_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$ and $R = 2$ to see that

$$\begin{aligned} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) &\geq U^{\lambda \varepsilon^{-2}, \varepsilon}(B(s) - x_i) \geq U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(B(s) - x_i) - 2^p |B(s) - x_i|^{-p} D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2} \\ &\geq V^\infty(B(s) - x_i) - 2^p |B(s) - x_i|^{-p} D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where the last follows by using (4.1) and scaling to see that $U^{\infty, \varepsilon}(x) = \varepsilon^{-2} U^{\infty, 1}(x/\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^{-2} V^\infty(x/\varepsilon) = V^\infty(x)$ for all $|x|/\varepsilon > 1$. Let $\tau_{r_\varepsilon} = \inf\{t : |B_t| \leq r_\varepsilon\}$ and let μ, ν be as in (4.8). Use the above in (A.11) and then use Brownian scaling to see that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &E_0 \left(1(T_{r_\varepsilon}^i < \infty) \exp \left(- \int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}^i} U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) \right) \\ &\leq E_{-x_i} \left(1(\tau_{r_\varepsilon} < \infty) \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_{r_\varepsilon}} \frac{2^p D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2}}{|B(s)|^p} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^{\tau_{r_\varepsilon}} \frac{2(4-d)}{|B(s)|^2} ds \right) \right) \\ &\leq E_{-x_i/r_\varepsilon} \left(1(\tau_1 < \infty) \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{2^p D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2} r_\varepsilon^{2-p}}{|B(s)|^p} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{2(4-d)}{|B(s)|^2} ds \right) \right) \\ &= E_{|x_i|/r_\varepsilon}^{(2+2\nu)} \left(\exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{4D^\lambda(2)}{\rho_s^p} ds \right) \Big| \tau_1 < \infty \right) (|x_i|/r_\varepsilon)^{-p} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where we have used Lemma 4.5 in the last line, and recalled that $p = \nu + \mu$. Choose $\lambda > 12$ large such that

$$2\gamma \equiv 2 \cdot 4D^\lambda(2) \leq 2(4-d) < \nu^2,$$

and then apply Lemma 4.4 to conclude that (A.13) is bounded by

$$c_{4.4}(p, \nu)(|x_i|/r_\varepsilon)^{-p} \leq c_{4.4}(p, \nu)\varepsilon_0^{-p}r_\varepsilon^p.$$

So (A.11) becomes

$$K_2 \leq c(\Delta \vee r_\varepsilon)^{-p}\varepsilon^{p-2}2c_{4.4}(p, \nu)\varepsilon_0^{-p}r_\varepsilon^p \leq c(\varepsilon_0)\Delta^{2-p}\varepsilon^{p-2}r_\varepsilon^{p-2} = 2^{p-2}c(\varepsilon_0)\Delta^{2-p}\varepsilon^{2(p-2)}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

In view of (A.9), (A.10) and (A.14), it remains to prove

$$K_1 \leq C(\varepsilon_0)\Delta^{2-p}\varepsilon^{2(p-2)}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Let $\Delta_i = x_{3-i} - x_i$, so that $|\Delta_i| = \Delta$. Let $T_{r_\varepsilon}^{\prime, i} = \inf\{t : |B_t| \leq r_\varepsilon \text{ or } |B_t - \Delta_i| \leq r_\varepsilon\}$. Lemma A.4(a) and then (A.12) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &\leq \lambda^2 \frac{1}{\lambda^2} (2^{p+1}\varepsilon^{p-2}D^{\lambda/2}(2))^2 E_0 \left(\int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}} \prod_{i=1}^2 |B_t - x_i|^{-p} \exp \left(- \int_0^t U^{\vec{\lambda}, \vec{x}, \varepsilon}(B(s)) ds \right) dt \right) \\ &\leq c\varepsilon^{2(p-2)} \sum_{i=1}^2 E_{-x_i} \left(\int_0^{T_{r_\varepsilon}^{\prime, i}} |B_t|^{-p} |B_t - \Delta_i|^{-p} 1(|B_t| \leq |B_t - \Delta_i|) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \exp \left(\int_0^t \frac{2^p D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2}}{|B(s)|^p} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^t \frac{2(4-d)}{|B(s)|^2} ds \right) dt \right). \quad (\text{A.16}) \end{aligned}$$

On $\{|B_t| \leq |B_t - \Delta_i|\}$, we have

$$\Delta = |\Delta_i| \leq |B_t - \Delta_i| + |B_t| \leq 2|B_t - \Delta_i|,$$

and hence

$$|B_t - \Delta_i|^{-p} \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \vee |B_t| \right)^{-p} \leq 2^p (\Delta^{-p} \wedge |B_t|^{-p}).$$

Use $T_{r_\varepsilon}^{i'} \leq \tau_{r_\varepsilon}$ and Brownian scaling to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &\leq c2^p \varepsilon^{2(p-2)} \sum_{i=1}^2 E_{-x_i} \left(\int_0^{\tau_{r_\varepsilon}} |B_t|^{-p} (|B_t|^{-p} \wedge \Delta^{-p}) \right. \\
&\quad \times \exp \left(\int_0^t \frac{2^p D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2}}{|B(s)|^p} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^t \frac{2(4-d)}{|B(s)|^2} ds \right) dt \Big) \\
&\leq c \varepsilon^{2(p-2)} \sum_{i=1}^2 E_{-x_i/r_\varepsilon} \left(\int_0^{\tau_1} r_\varepsilon^{2-2p} |B_t|^{-p} (|B_t|^{-p} \wedge (\Delta/r_\varepsilon)^{-p}) \right. \\
&\quad \times \exp \left(\int_0^t \frac{2^p D^\lambda(2) \varepsilon^{p-2} r_\varepsilon^{2-p}}{|B(s)|^p} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^t \frac{2(4-d)}{|B(s)|^2} ds \right) dt \Big) \\
&= c \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_0^\infty E_{-x_i/r_\varepsilon} \left(1(t < \tau_1) |B(t \wedge \tau_1)|^{-p} (|B(t \wedge \tau_1)|^{-p} \wedge (\Delta/r_\varepsilon)^{-p}) \right. \\
&\quad \times \exp \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_1} \frac{4D^\lambda(2)}{|B(s)|^p} ds \right) \exp \left(- \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_1} \frac{2(4-d)}{|B(s)|^2} ds \right) \Big) dt
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $\delta = 4D^\lambda(2)$, μ, ν be as in (4.8), and use Lemma 4.5 as in (A.13), to get

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &\leq c \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_0^\infty (|x_i|/r_\varepsilon)^{\nu-\mu} E_{|x_i|/r_\varepsilon}^{(2+2\nu)} \left(1(t < \tau_1) \rho(t \wedge \tau_1)^{-p} (\rho(t \wedge \tau_1)^{-p} \wedge (\Delta/r_\varepsilon)^{-p}) \right. \\
&\quad \times \exp \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_1} \delta \rho_s^{-p} ds \right) \rho(t \wedge \tau_1)^{-\nu+\mu} \Big) dt \\
&= c \varepsilon^{\mu-\nu-2} \sum_{i=1}^2 |x_i|^{\nu-\mu} E_{|x_i|/r_\varepsilon}^{(2+2\nu)} \left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \rho_t^{-p-\nu+\mu} (\rho_t^{-p} \wedge (\Delta/r_\varepsilon)^{-p}) \exp \left(\int_0^t \delta \rho_s^{-p} ds \right) dt \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We interrupt the proof of the proposition for another auxiliary result from [16].

Lemma A.7. *There is some universal constant $c_{A.7} > 0$ such that for any $r > 0$ with $r < (|x_i| \wedge \Delta)$ and $0 < \delta < (p-2)(2-\mu)$, we have*

$$E_{|x_i|/r}^{(2+2\nu)} \left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \rho_t^{-p-\nu+\mu} (\rho_t^{-p} \wedge (\Delta/r)^{-p}) \exp \left(\int_0^t \delta \rho_s^{-p} ds \right) dt \right) \leq c_{A.7} r^{-2+2p+\nu-\mu} |x_i|^{-2\nu} \Delta^{2-p}.$$

Proof. This is included in the proof of Proposition 6.1 of [16] with $r = r_\lambda$. In particular, the above expectation appears in (9.23) of [16] and is bounded by eJ_i in (9.27) of that paper. Following the inequalities in that work, noting we only need consider Case 1 or Case 3 (the latter with $r \leq |x_i| \leq \Delta$) at the end of the proof, we arrive at the above bound. \blacksquare

Returning now to the proof of Proposition 5.1. Pick $\lambda > 12$ large such that $\delta < (p-2)(2-\mu)$. Note we assumed $|x_i| \geq \varepsilon_0 > r_\varepsilon$ by (A.8) and $\Delta = |x_1 - x_2| > 5\varepsilon > r_\varepsilon$ at

the very beginning of this section. So use Lemma A.7 applied with $r = r_\varepsilon$ to see that

$$K_1 \leq c\varepsilon^{\mu-\nu-2} \sum_{i=1}^2 |x_i|^{\nu-\mu} c_{A.7} r_\varepsilon^{-2+2p+\nu-\mu} |x_i|^{-2\nu} \Delta^{2-p} \leq C\varepsilon_0^{-\mu-\nu} \Delta^{2-p} \varepsilon^{2p-4}.$$

This gives (A.15), and so the proof is complete. ■

References

- [1] H. Brezis, L. A. Peletier and D. Terman. A very singular solution of the heat equation with absorption. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 95: 185–209, 1986.
- [2] D. Dawson, I. Iscoe and E. Perkins. Super-Brownian motion: Path properties and hitting probabilities. *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields* 83: 135–205, 1989.
- [3] D. Dawson and E.A. Perkins. Historical processes. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **93** (1991).
- [4] C. Dellacherie and P.A. Meyer. Probabilities et Potential Vol 1. North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1978).
- [5] R. Durrett. Probability: Theory and Examples. *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, New York, (2010).
- [6] R. Durrett. Ten Lectures on Particle Systems. *Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics, no. 1608, Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint Flour 1993*. Springer, Berlin (1995).
- [7] W. Feller. An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications Vol. 2. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics John Wiley and Sons, New York, (1971).
- [8] G. Grimmett and D. Stirzaker. Probability and Random Processes, 3rd Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2001).
- [9] M. Hesse and A. Kyprianou. The mass of super-Brownian motion upon exiting balls and Sheu’s compact support condition. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, **124**:2003–2022, (2014).
- [10] J. Hong. Renormalization of local times of super-Brownian motion. *Math. ArXiv*, 1711.06447, (2017).
- [11] T. Hughes and E. Perkins. On the boundary of the zero set of super-Brownian motion and its local time. *Math. ArXiv*, 1802.03681, (2018).

- [12] I. Iscoe. On the supports of measure-valued critical branching Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, **16** (1):200–221, (1988).
- [13] J.F. Le Gall. The Brownian snake and solutions of $\Delta u = u^2$ in a domain. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, **102**:393–432, (1995).
- [14] J.F. Le Gall. Spatial Branching Processes, Random Snakes and Partial Differential Equations. Lectures in Mathematics, ETH, Zurich. Birkhäuser, Basel (1999).
- [15] T.M. Liggett. Interacting Particle Systems. *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 276*. Springer-Verlag, New York (1985).
- [16] L. Mytnik and E. Perkins. The dimension of the boundary of super-Brownian motion. Math ArXiv no. 1711.03486, to appear in *Prob. Th. Rel Fields*.
- [17] E.A. Perkins. Dawson-Watanabe Superprocesses and Measure-valued Diffusions. *Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics, no. 1781, Ecole d'Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour 1999* Springer, Berlin (2002).
- [18] L.C.G. Rogers and D. Williams. Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1994).
- [19] M.L. Silverstein. A new approach to local times. *J. Math. Mech.*, **17**: 1023–1054, (1968).
- [20] S. Sugitani. Some properties for the measure-valued branching diffusion processes. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **41**:437–462, (1989).
- [21] S.J. Taylor. On the connection between generalized capacities and Hausdorff measures. *Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc.*, **57**:524–531, (1961).