# Convexity of the class of currents with finite relative energy

Duc-Viet Vu, University of Cologne, Mathematics Division, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Weyertal 86-90, 50931 Köln, Germany E-mail: vuviet@math.uni-koeln.de

#### Abstract

We prove the convexity of the class of currents with finite relative energy. A key ingredient is an integration by parts formula for relative non-pluripolar products which is of independent interest.

### 1 Introduction

Let X be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n. Let T be a closed positive current of bi-degree (p, p) on X. Let  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  be closed positive (1, 1)-currents on X. The T-relative non-pluripolar product  $\langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_m \dot{\land} T \rangle$ of  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  was introduced in [14]. The last product is a closed positive current of bi-degree (p + m, p + m). When T is a constant function equal to 1 (*i.e,* T is the current of integration along X), the current  $\langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_m \dot{\land} T \rangle$  $T_m \dot{\land} T \rangle$  coincides with the usual non-pluripolar product of  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  given in [2, 4, 11].

For every closed positive currents S on X, we denote by  $\{S\}$  its cohomology class. For two cohomology (q, q)-classes  $\alpha, \beta$  on X, we write  $\alpha \leq \beta$  if  $\beta - \alpha$  can be represented by a closed positive (q, q)-current.

<sup>2020</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 32U15.

*Key words and phrases*: relative non-pluripolar product, relative energy, full mass intersection.

Recall that by [14, Theorem 1.1] (also [4, 15, 6]), if  $T'_j$  is a closed positive (1, 1)-current on X which is cohomologous to  $T_j$  and less singular than  $T_j$  for  $1 \le j \le m$ , then we have

(1.1) 
$$\{\langle T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \dot{\wedge} T \rangle\} \leq \{\langle T'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T'_m \dot{\wedge} T \rangle\}.$$

The last inequality allows us to define the notion of *T*-relative full mass intersection, see [14, 4]. We say that  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  are of *T*-relative full mass intersection if

$$\{\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle\} = \{\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} T_{j,\min} \dot{\wedge} T \rangle\},\$$

where  $T_{j,\min}$  is a current with minimal singularities in the class  $\{T_j\}$  for  $1 \le j \le m$ .

Let  $\alpha$  be a pseudoeffective (1,1)-class. Denote by  $\mathcal{E}_m(\alpha,T)$  the set of currents  $P \in \alpha$  such that  $P, \ldots, P$  (*m* times *P*) are of *T*-relative full mass intersection.

Recall that  $\mathcal{W}^-$  is the set of convex increasing functions  $\chi$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\chi(-\infty) = -\infty$ . Let  $\chi \in \mathcal{W}^-$ . We can define  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m}(\alpha, T)$  to be the subclass of  $\mathcal{E}_m(\alpha, T)$  consisting of P such that P has finite (T-relative)  $\chi$ -energy. When  $T \equiv 1$  and m = n, the class  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m}(\alpha, T)$  generalizes the usual class of currents with finite energy in [4, 11], see also [5] for the local setting. We refer to Section 3 for details. For the moment, we note here that

$$\mathcal{E}_m(\alpha, T) = \bigcup_{\chi \in \mathcal{W}^-} \mathcal{E}_{\chi, m}(\alpha, T).$$

Here is our main result.

**Theorem 1.1.** The sets  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m}(\alpha,T)$  and  $\mathcal{E}_m(\alpha,T)$  are convex.

The last result was proved in [14, Theorem 1.3] in the case where  $\alpha$  is Kähler. When m = n and  $T \equiv 1$ , the convexity  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m}(\alpha, T)$  was conjectured in [4]. It was later answered affirmatively in [7, Corollary 2.12] in this setting. The proof in [7] doesn't extend directly to our setting because it uses, in a crucial way, Monge-Ampère equations in big classes.

We will see that Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of a more general result (Theorem 3.4) which is in turn deduced from a monotonicity property of joint energy of currents, see Theorem 3.1 below. To prove these results, we use ideas from the proof of [14, Theorem 1.3] and prove an integration by parts formula for relative non-pluripolar products (Theorem 2.7) which is of independent interest. *We emphasize that the last formula* 

was applied to the study of complex Monge-Ampère equations. It plays a key role in the proof of main results in [10], see Theorem 1.3 there.

Moreover it was also explained in [10] that by using the integration by parts formula obtained in this work and the variational method ([3, 6]), one can solve the Monge-Ampère equation in the prescribed singularity setting without the small unbounded locus assumption. Hence this gives another proof of a main result in [8]. We refer to [10, Theorem 3.8] for details.

In the next section, we will present the above-mentioned integration by parts formula for relative non-pluripolar products. This formula strengthens (and generalizes) recent ones obtained in [12, 16] (see Corollary 2.8 and the paragraph following it). Our main result will be proved in Section 3.

### 2 Integration by parts

We first recall some basic facts about relative non-pluripolar products. This notion was introduced in [14] as a generalization of the usual nonpluripolar products given in [2, 4, 11].

Let X be a compact Kähler manifold. Let  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  be closed positive (1, 1)-currents on X. Let T be a closed positive current of bi-degree (p, p) on X. By [14], the T-relative non-pluripolar product  $\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^m T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  is defined in a way similar to that of the usual non-pluripolar product. The product  $\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^m T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  is a well-defined closed positive current of bi-degree (m + p, m + p); and  $\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^m T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  is symmetric with respect to  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  and is homogeneous.

For every closed positive (1,1)-current P, we denote by  $I_P$  the set of  $x \in X$  so that local potentials of P are equal to  $-\infty$  at x. Note that  $I_P$  is a locally complete pluripolar set. The following is deduced from [14, Proposition 3.5].

**Proposition 2.1.** (*i*) Given a locally complete pluripolar set A such that T has no mass on A, then  $\langle \bigwedge_{i=1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  also has no mass on A.

(*ii*) Let  $T'_1$  be a closed positive (1, 1)-current on X and  $T_j, T$  as above. Assume that T has no mass on  $I_{T_1} \cup I_{T'_1}$ . Then we have

(2.1) 
$$\langle (T_1 + T'_1) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=2}^m T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \langle T_1 \wedge \bigwedge_{j=2}^m T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle + \langle T'_1 \wedge \bigwedge_{j=2}^m T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$$

(*iii*) Let  $1 \leq l \leq m$  be an integer. Then for  $R := \langle \bigwedge_{j=l+1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$ , there holds  $\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{l} T_j \dot{\wedge} R \rangle$ .

(iv) The equality

$$\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T' \rangle$$

holds, where  $T' := \mathbf{1}_{X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} I_{T_j}} T$ .

We also need the following result.

**Theorem 2.2.** ([14, Theorem 2.6, Remark 2.7]) Let  $u_j$  be a locally bounded plurisubharmonic (psh) function on an open subset U of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  for  $1 \le j \le m$ . Let  $(u_{jk})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of locally bounded psh functions increasing to  $u_j$ almost everywhere as  $k \to \infty$ . Let T be a closed positive current on U. Then, the convergence

$$(2.2) u_{1k} dd^c u_{2k} \wedge \dots \wedge dd^c u_{mk} \wedge T \to u_1 dd^c u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^c u_m \wedge T$$

as  $k \to \infty$  holds provided that T has no mass on  $A_j := \{x \in U : u_j(x) \neq \lim_{k\to\infty} u_{jk}(x)\}$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq m$  and the set  $A_j$  is locally complete pluripolar for every j.

Recall that a *dsh* function on X is the difference of two quasiplurisubharmonic (quasi-psh for short) functions on X (see [9]). These functions are well-defined outside pluripolar sets. Let v be a dsh function on X. Write  $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ , where  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  are quasi-psh function. Hence v(x) is well-defined for  $x \in X \setminus A$ , where  $A := \{\varphi_1 = -\infty\} \cup \{\varphi_2 = -\infty\}$ . The function v is said to be *bounded* in X if there exists a constant C such that  $|v(x)| \leq C$  for every  $x \in X \setminus A$ .

We say that v is *T*-admissible (or admissible with respect to *T*) if there exist quasi-psh functions  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  on *X* such that  $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$  and *T* has no mass on  $\{\varphi_j = -\infty\}$  for j = 1, 2. In particular, if *T* has no mass on pluripolar sets, then every dsh function is *T*-admissible. Assume now that v is *T*-admissible. The following is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.1 (i).

**Lemma 2.3.** If v is T-admissible, then v is also admissible with respect to  $\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$ .

Recall that if  $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$  for some bounded quasi-psh functions  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$ on X (note X is compact), the current  $dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T$  is, by definition, equal to

(2.3) 
$$\frac{1}{2}dd^{c}(\varphi_{1}-\varphi_{2})^{2}\wedge T-(\varphi_{1}-\varphi_{2})dd^{c}(\varphi_{1}-\varphi_{2})\wedge T.$$

We notice that in the above formula the function  $(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2$  is locally the difference of two bounded psh functions. More precisely, we can assume  $\varphi_j$  is  $\omega$ -psh function for j = 1, 2, where  $\omega$  is a Kähler form on X, and consider an open local chart U such that  $\omega = dd^c \phi$  for some smooth psh function  $\phi$  on U. By adding to  $\phi$  a big constant, we can even assume that  $\varphi_j + \phi \ge 0$  on U for j = 1, 2. Thus  $(\varphi_j + \phi)^2$  and  $(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + 2\phi)^2$  are psh on U for j = 1, 2, and

(2.4) 
$$(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 = (2(\varphi_1 + \phi)^2 + 2(\varphi_2 + \phi)^2) - (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + 2\phi)^2$$

which is the difference of two bounded psh functions on U.

Consider another dsh function w which is equal to the difference of two locally bounded psh functions and T is of bi-degree (n - 1, n - 1), we have

(2.5)  
$$2dv \wedge d^c w \wedge T = d(v+w) \wedge d^c(v+w) \wedge T - dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T - dw \wedge d^c w \wedge T.$$

However, in general, even when v is bounded, v might not be the difference of two bounded quasi-psh functions. Hence, the current " $dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T$ " is not well-defined in the above sense. We will introduce below the current  $\langle dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T \rangle$  in the spirit of non-pluripolar products. Before going into details, we need the following auxiliary estimate.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $\omega$  be a Kähler form on X. Let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  be bounded  $\omega$ -psh functions on X and  $v := \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ . Let T be a closed positive current of bidimension (1, 1) on X. Then, there exists a constant C independent of  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  such that

(2.6) 
$$\int_X dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T \le C \|v\|_{L^{\infty}}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{split} I &:= \int_X dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T = -\int_X v dd^c v \wedge T \\ &= -\int_X v (dd^c \varphi_1 - dd^c \varphi_2) \wedge T \\ &= -\int_X v (dd^c \varphi_1 + \omega) \wedge T + \int_X v (dd^c \varphi_2 + \omega) \wedge T \\ &\leq \|v\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_X (dd^c \varphi_j + \omega) \wedge T \\ &= 2\|v\|_{L^\infty} \int_X T \wedge \omega \end{split}$$

by Stokes' theorem. The desired estimate follows. The proof is finished.  $\hfill \Box$ 

Assume now that v is T-admissible. Let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  be quasi-psh functions such that  $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$  and T has no mass on  $\{\varphi_j = -\infty\}$  for j = 1, 2. Let  $\varphi_{j,k} := \max\{\varphi_j, -k\}$  for every j = 1, 2 and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Put  $v_k := \varphi_{1,k} - \varphi_{2,k}$ . Since  $v_k$  is the difference of two bounded quasi-psh functions, using (2.3), we obtain

$$Q_k := dv_k \wedge d^c v_k \wedge T = dd^c v_k^2 \wedge T - v_k dd^c v_k \wedge T.$$

Let  $\omega$  be a Kähler form so that  $\varphi_j$  is  $\omega$ -psh for j = 1, 2. Let U be a local chart on X such that  $\omega = dd^c \phi$  on U for some psh function  $\phi$  such that  $\varphi_{j,k} + \phi \ge 0$  on U for j = 1, 2 (we fix k). By (2.4) applied to  $\varphi_{j,k} + \phi$ , we have

$$Q_k = 2dd^c(\varphi_{1,k} + \phi)^2 \wedge T + 2dd^c(\varphi_{2,k} + \phi)^2 \wedge T - dd^c(\varphi_{1,k} + \varphi_{2,k} + 2\phi)^2 \wedge T - (v_k dd^c \varphi_{1,k} \wedge T - v_k dd^c \varphi_{2,k} \wedge T)$$

on U. By the plurifine locality with respect to T ([14, Theorem 2.9]) applied to each term in the right-hand side of the last equality, we have

(2.7) 
$$\mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{2}\{\varphi_{j}>-k\}}Q_{k} = \mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{2}\{\varphi_{j}>-k\}}Q_{k'}$$

for every  $k' \ge k$ .

We say that  $\langle dv \wedge d^c v \dot{\Lambda} T \rangle$  is well-defined if the mass of  $\mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^2 \{\varphi_j > -k\}} Q_k$ on X is bounded uniformly in k. In this case, using (2.7) implies that there exists a positive current Q on X such that for every bounded Borel form  $\Phi$  on X, we have

$$\langle Q, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle \mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{2} \{\varphi_j > -k\}} Q_k, \Phi \rangle$$

We define  $\langle dv \wedge d^c v \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  to be the current Q. This agrees with the classical definition if v is the difference of two bounded quasi-psh functions. This definition is independent of the choice of  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  by Lemma 2.5 below. If w is another T-admissible dsh function and T is of bi-dimension (1,1) such that the currents  $\langle dv \wedge d^c v \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$ ,  $\langle dw \wedge d^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$ , and  $\langle d(v+w) \wedge d^c(v+w) \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  are all well-defined, we define  $\langle dv \wedge d^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  using (2.5) formally.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2$  be quasi-psh functions on X such that  $v = \varphi'_1 - \varphi'_2$ and T has no mass on  $\{\varphi'_j = -\infty\}$  for j = 1, 2. Let  $\varphi'_{j,k}, Q'_k$  be the function and current associated to  $\varphi'_j$  defined similarly as  $\varphi_{j,k}$  and  $Q_k$  respectively. Then if  $\mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^2 \{\varphi_j > -k\}} Q_k$  is of mass bounded uniformly on k then so is

$$\mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{2}\{\varphi_{j}^{\prime}>-k\}}Q_{k}^{\prime}, \text{ and}$$

$$(2.8) \qquad \qquad Q = \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle \mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{2}\{\varphi_{j}^{\prime}>-k\}}Q_{k}^{\prime}, \Phi \rangle$$

for every bounded Borel form  $\Phi$  on X.

*Proof.* Since  $v = \varphi'_1 - \varphi'_2$ , we get

$$\varphi_1 + \varphi_2' = \varphi_1' + \varphi_2.$$

Put  $v'_k := \varphi'_{1,k} - \varphi'_{2,k}$ ,  $A'_k := \bigcap_{j=1}^2 \{\varphi'_j > -k\}$ , and  $A_k := \bigcap_{j=1}^2 \{\varphi_j > -k\}$ . We have  $Q'_k = dv'_k \wedge d^c v'_k \wedge T$ , and  $v_k = v'_k$  on  $A_k \cap A'_k$  which is open in the plurifine topology. We claim that

(2.9) 
$$\mathbf{1}_{A_k \cap A'_k} Q'_k = \mathbf{1}_{A_k \cap A'_k} Q_k.$$

This is a sort of plurifine locality statement and can be essentially deduced from the plurifine locality for bounded psh functions (here we have  $v_k = v'_k$  on  $A_k \cap A'_k$  but  $v_k, v'_k$  are only dsh). We give details for readers' convenience. Before doing so, we will show that the desired assertion is a direct consequence of (2.9). First observe that  $\mathbf{1}_{A'_k}Q'_k$  has no mass on the pluripolar set  $\{\varphi_j = -\infty\}$  for j = 1, 2 by Proposition 2.1 (*i*) and the fact that *T* has no mass on  $\{\varphi_j = -\infty\}$ . It follows that

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{1}_{A'_k}Q'_k &= \lim_{s \to \infty} \mathbf{1}_{A'_k \cap A_s}Q'_k \\ &= \lim_{s \to \infty} \mathbf{1}_{A'_k \cap A_s}Q'_s \\ &\leq \lim_{s \to \infty} \mathbf{1}_{A'_s \cap A_s}Q'_s \\ &= \lim_{s \to \infty} \mathbf{1}_{A'_s \cap A_s}Q_s \leq \lim_{s \to \infty} \mathbf{1}_{A_s}Q_s = Q \end{split}$$

where we used (2.7) applied to  $Q'_k$  in the second equality and (2.9) in the third equality. By exchanging the role of  $Q'_k$  and  $Q_k$ , we also obtain that

$$\mathbf{1}_{A_k}Q_k \leq R_k$$

for every limit current R of  $(\mathbf{1}_{A'_k}Q'_k)_k$  as  $k \to \infty$ . Hence (2.8) follows.

We go back to the proof of (2.9). Write

$$dv_k \wedge d^c v_k \wedge T = dv_k \wedge d^c (v_k - v'_k) \wedge T + d(v_k - v'_k) \wedge d^c v'_k \wedge T + dv'_k \wedge d^c v'_k \wedge T.$$

Denote by  $R_1, R_2$  the first and second currents in the right-hand side of the last equality. In order to obtain (2.9), it suffices to check that  $R_j = 0$ 

on  $A_k \cap A'_k$  for j = 1, 2. Observe

$$R_{1} = dv_{k} \wedge d^{c}(\varphi_{1,k} + \varphi_{2,k}' - \varphi_{1,k}' - \varphi_{2,k}) \wedge T$$
  
=  $\left[ d\varphi_{1,k} \wedge d^{c}(\varphi_{1,k} + \varphi_{2,k}') \wedge T - d\varphi_{1,k} \wedge d^{c}(\varphi_{1,k}' + \varphi_{2,k}) \wedge T \right] - \left[ d\varphi_{2,k} \wedge d^{c}(\varphi_{1,k}' + \varphi_{2,k}) \wedge T - d\varphi_{2,k} \wedge d^{c}(\varphi_{1,k}' + \varphi_{2,k}) \wedge T \right].$ 

Each term in the right-hand side of the above equality is equal to 0 on  $A_k \cap A'_k$  thanks to the plurifine locality and the fact that

$$\varphi_{1,k} + \varphi'_{2,k} = \varphi_1 + \varphi'_2 = \varphi'_1 + \varphi_2 = \varphi'_{1,k} + \varphi_{2,k}$$

on  $A_k \cap A'_k$ . Hence  $R_1 = 0$  on  $A_k \cap A'_k$ . Similarly we get  $R_2 = 0$  on  $A_k \cap A'_k$ . This finishes the proof.

**Lemma 2.6.** Assume that v is bounded. Then, the current  $\langle dv \wedge d^c v \dot{\Lambda} T \rangle$  is well-defined.

*Proof.* Let the notation be as in the proof of Lemma 2.4. Let  $\omega$  be a Kähler form on X such that  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  are  $\omega$ -psh. Note that  $\varphi_{jk}$  is also  $\omega$ -psh for every j, k. Observe that since v is bounded, there exists a constant C such that  $\varphi_2 - C \leq \varphi_1 \leq \varphi_2 + C$ . Thus, there exists a constant C so that

$$\|v_k\|_{L^{\infty}} \le C$$

for every k. Using this and Lemma 2.4, one gets

$$\|Q_k\| \lesssim \|v_k\|_{L^{\infty}} \le C$$

for some constant C independent of k. Hence, the desired assertion follows. This finishes the proof.

Let  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  be closed positive (1, 1)-currents on X and  $R := \langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_m \dot{\land} T \rangle$ . We define

$$\langle dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m \dot{\wedge} T \rangle := \langle dv \wedge d^c v \dot{\wedge} R \rangle$$

When  $T \equiv 1$ , we write the left-hand side of the last equality simply as  $\langle dv \wedge d^c v \wedge T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \rangle$ .

The current  $\langle dv \wedge d^c w \wedge T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$  is defined similarly if p + m = n - 1, where T is of bi-degree (p, p). We put

$$\langle dd^c v \dot{\wedge} T \rangle := \langle dd^c \varphi_1 \dot{\wedge} T \rangle - \langle dd^c \varphi_2 \dot{\wedge} T \rangle.$$

Define

$$\langle dd^c v \wedge T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \dot{\wedge} T \rangle := \langle dd^c v \dot{\wedge} R \rangle.$$

By Proposition 2.1 (*iii*), this definition agrees with the *T*-relative nonpluripolar product of  $dd^cv, T_1, \ldots, T_m$  if v is quasi-psh. When  $T \equiv 1$ , we write  $\langle dd^cv \wedge T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \rangle$  for  $\langle dd^cv \wedge T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$ . In this case the product  $\langle dd^cv \wedge T_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge T_m \rangle$  is the one defined in the paragraph right after Theorem 1.2 in [12].

By admissibility and Proposition 2.1 (ii), we can check that if v, w are dsh functions which are admissible with respect to T, then

$$\langle dd^c(v+w)\dot{\wedge}T\rangle = \langle dd^cv\dot{\wedge}T\rangle + \langle dd^cw\dot{\wedge}T\rangle.$$

Here is an integration by parts formula for relative non-pluripolar products.

**Theorem 2.7.** Let T be a closed positive current of bi-degree (n - 1, n - 1) on X. Let v, w be bounded T-admissible dsh functions on X. Then, we have

(2.10) 
$$\int_X w \langle dd^c v \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \int_X v \langle dd^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = - \int_X \langle dw \wedge d^c v \dot{\wedge} T \rangle.$$

The last result was proved in [4, Theorem 1.14] if v, w can be written as the differences of psh functions which are locally bounded outside a *closed* locally complete pluripolar set; see also [1, 13].

*Proof.* We use ideas from the proof of [14, Proposition 4.2]. Let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4$ be negative quasi-psh functions on X such that  $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$  and  $w = \varphi_3 - \varphi_4$ and T has no mass on  $\bigcup_{j=1}^4 \{\varphi_j = -\infty\}$ . Let  $\omega$  be a Kähler form on X such that  $\varphi_j$  is  $\omega$ -psh for every  $1 \le j \le 4$ . Put

$$\psi := \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3 + \varphi_4, \quad \psi_k := k^{-1} \max\{\psi, -k\} + 1.$$

and  $\varphi_{jk} := \max{\{\varphi_j, -k\}}$  for  $1 \le j \le 4$ . Observe that  $0 \le \psi_k \le 1$ . Let  $x \in X$  such that  $\psi_k(x) > 0$ . We have

$$\varphi_1(x) + \varphi_2(x) + \varphi_3(x) + \varphi_4(x) = \psi(x) > -k.$$

This combined with the property that  $\varphi_j \leq 0$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq 4$  yields that  $\varphi_j(x) > -k$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq 4$ . We infer that

(2.11) 
$$\{\psi_k \neq 0\} \subset \bigcap_{j=1}^4 \{\varphi_j > -k\}.$$

Put  $v_k := \varphi_{1k} - \varphi_{2k}$  and  $w_k := \varphi_{3k} - \varphi_{4k}$ . Since v and w are bounded, the functions  $v_k, w_k$  are bounded uniformly in k.

Let  $A := \bigcup_{j=1}^{4} \{ \varphi_j = -\infty \}$ . By admissibility and Proposition 2.1 (*i*), we see that

(2.12) 
$$\mathbf{1}_A \langle (dd^c \varphi_j + \omega) \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = 0.$$

Using (2.12), we can consider w as a bounded function with respect to the trace measure of  $\langle (dd^c \varphi_j + \omega) \dot{\Lambda} T \rangle$ . Using (2.11), we have

$$w\psi_k dd^c \varphi_{jk} \wedge T = w \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_j > -k\}} \psi_k \langle dd^c \varphi_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle$$
  
=  $w \langle dd^c \varphi_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle + w (\mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_j > -k\}} \psi_k - 1) \langle dd^c \varphi_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle.$ 

The second term in the right-hand side of the last equality converges weakly to 0 as  $k \to \infty$  by the fact that  $\psi_k \to 1$  pointwise outside A as  $k \to \infty$  and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Hence

$$w\langle dd^c\varphi_j\dot{\wedge}T\rangle = \lim_{k\to\infty} w\psi_k dd^c\varphi_{jk}\wedge T$$

Applying the last equality to j = 1, 2, and using  $v = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ , we obtain

(2.13) 
$$w\langle dd^c v \wedge T \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} w \psi_k dd^c v_k \wedge T = \lim_{k \to \infty} w_k \psi_k dd^c v_k \wedge T.$$

Here in the second equality we used the fact that  $w = w_k$  on  $\{\varphi_3 > -k\} \cap \{\varphi_4 > -k\}$  which contains  $\{\psi_k \neq 0\}$ . We also have an analogous formula by exchanging the roles of v, w. Thus,

(2.14) 
$$w\langle dd^c v \dot{\wedge} T \rangle - v\langle dd^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \psi_k (w_k dd^c v_k - v_k dd^c w_k) \wedge T.$$

By integration by parts for bounded psh functions, we have

(2.15) 
$$\int_{X} \psi_{k}(w_{k}dd^{c}v_{k} - v_{k}dd^{c}w_{k}) \wedge T = -\int_{X} w_{k}d\psi_{k} \wedge d^{c}v_{k} \wedge T + \int_{X} v_{k}d\psi_{k} \wedge d^{c}w_{k} \wedge T$$

Denote by  $I_1, I_2$  the first and second term in the right-hand side of the last equality. We will check that  $I_j \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for j = 1, 2. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the boundedness of  $v_k, w_k$  and Lemma 2.4, we infer

$$|I_1| \leq \left(\int_X d\psi_k \wedge d^c \psi_k \wedge T\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \left(\int_X |w_k|^2 dv_k \wedge d^c v_k \wedge T\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\lesssim \left(\int_X d\psi_k \wedge d^c \psi_k \wedge T\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Recall that  $\{\lim_{k\to\infty} \psi_k < 1\}$  is equal to the complete pluripolar set  $\{\psi = -\infty\}$ . Using this, Theorem 2.2 and the fact that *T* has no mass on  $\{\psi = -\infty\}$ , we get

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} d\psi_k \wedge d^c \psi_k \wedge T = \lim_{k \to \infty} (dd^c \psi_k^2 - \psi_k dd^c \psi_k) \wedge T = 0$$

Thus we obtain

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} I_1 = 0$$

By similarity, we also get  $I_2 \to 0$  as  $k \to \infty$ . Combining this with (2.15) and (2.13) gives the first desired equality of (2.10). We prove the second one similarly as follows. Put u := v + w, and

$$u_k := \max\{\varphi_1 + \varphi_3, -k\} - \max\{\varphi_2 + \varphi_4, -k\}.$$

By (2.11) observe that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\psi_k > 0\}} \max\{\varphi_1 + \varphi_3, -2k\} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\psi_k > 0\}}(\varphi_{1k} + \varphi_{3k})$$

and a similar equality for  $\varphi_2,\varphi_4$  also holds. Thus, by plurifine locality, we get

$$2\langle dv \wedge d^{c}w\dot{\wedge}T \rangle = \langle du \wedge d^{c}u\dot{\wedge}T \rangle - \langle dv \wedge d^{c}v\dot{\wedge}T \rangle - \langle dw \wedge d^{c}w\dot{\wedge}T \rangle$$
  
$$= \lim_{k \to \infty} \psi_{k} (\langle du_{2k} \wedge d^{c}u_{2k}\dot{\wedge}T \rangle - \langle dv_{k} \wedge d^{c}v_{k}\dot{\wedge}T \rangle - \langle dw_{k} \wedge d^{c}w_{k}\dot{\wedge}T \rangle)$$
  
$$= \lim_{k \to \infty} \psi_{k} (\langle d(v_{k} + w_{k}) \wedge d^{c}(v_{k} + w_{k})\dot{\wedge}T \rangle - \langle dv_{k} \wedge d^{c}v_{k}\dot{\wedge}T \rangle - \langle dw_{k} \wedge d^{c}w_{k}\dot{\wedge}T \rangle).$$

Consequently

$$\langle dv \wedge d^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \psi_k \langle dv_k \wedge d^c w_k \dot{\wedge} T \rangle.$$

It follows that

$$\int_X v \langle dd^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle + \langle dv \wedge d^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_X \psi_k (v_k dd^c w_k + dv_k \wedge d^c w_k) \wedge T$$
$$= -\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_X v_k d\psi_k \wedge d^c w_k \wedge T$$

which is equal to 0 by analogous arguments as in the proof of (2.16). This finishes the proof.  $\hfill \Box$ 

**Corollary 2.8.** Let v, w be bounded dsh functions on X. Then, for every closed smooth form  $\Phi$  of right bi-degree, we have

$$(2.17) \quad \int_X w \langle dd^c v \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^m T_j \rangle \wedge \Phi = \int_X v \langle dd^c w \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^m T_j \rangle \wedge \Phi = -\int_X \langle dv \wedge d^c w \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^m T_j \rangle \wedge \Phi.$$

*Proof.* By writing  $\Phi$  as the difference of two closed positive forms, we can assume that  $\Phi$  is positive. The desired formula is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.7 applied to  $T := \langle T_1 \land \cdots \land T_m \rangle \land \Phi$ .

We recall that the first inequality of (2.17) was proved in [12, Theorem 1.2] and [16] when m = n and the cohomology classes of  $T_j$ 's are big. One should notice a crucial point that the integration by parts formulae obtained in [12, 16] contain no term involving  $dv \wedge d^c w$ . Such a term is essential in applications, especially, in the pluricomplex energy theory. The following result is more general than Theorem 2.7. We will need it later.

**Theorem 2.9.** Let T a closed positive current of bi-degree (n - 1, n - 1) on X. Let v, w be bounded T-admissible dsh functions on X. Let  $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\mathscr{C}^3$  function. Then we have

(2.18)

$$\int_X \chi(w) \langle dd^c v \dot{\wedge} T \rangle = \int_X v \chi''(w) \langle dw \wedge d^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle + \int_X v \chi'(w) \langle dd^c w \dot{\wedge} T \rangle.$$

A quick heuristic reason explaining why (2.18) should hold is because  $dd^c\chi(w) = \chi''(w)dw \wedge d^cw + \chi'(w)dd^cw$  if w is a bounded quasi-psh function.

*Proof.* We first note that [14, Lemma 5.7] still holds for dsh functions which are the differences of two bounded quasi-psh functions. Now, to obtain the desired equality, we just follow the proof of Theorem 2.7 verbatim with  $\chi(w)$  in place of w. The only thing we need to clarify is the computation concerning  $dd^c\chi(w_k) \wedge T$ . To this end, it suffices to use [14, Lemma 5.7] because  $w_k$  is the difference of two bounded quasi-psh functions. This finishes the proof.

# **3** Currents with finite relative energy

Let *X* be a compact Kähler manifold. Let  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m$  be pseudoeffective (1, 1)-classes of *X* and *T* a closed positive current on *X*. Let  $P_j$  be a closed

positive (1, 1)-current in the class  $\alpha_j$  for  $1 \le j \le m$ . Put  $\mathbf{P} := (P_1, \ldots, P_m)$ . We define  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(T)$  to be the set of *m*-tuple  $(T_1, \ldots, T_m)$  of closed positive (1, 1)-currents such that  $T_j \in \alpha_j$  and  $T_j$  is more singular than  $P_j$  and

$$\{\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} T_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle\} = \{\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} P_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle\}$$

Notice that for every current  $P'_j$  in  $\alpha_j$  such that  $P'_j$  has the same singularities as  $P_j$  for  $1 \le j \le m$ , by the monotonicity of relative non-pluripolar products (see (1.1)), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(T) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}'}(T).$$

Hence, when  $P_j$  has minimal singularities in  $\alpha_j$  for  $1 \le j \le m$ , we recover the class  $\mathcal{E}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m, T)$  of currents of full mass intersection introduced in [14, 4] because we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(T) = \mathcal{E}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, T)$$

in this case.

Let  $\chi \in \mathcal{W}^-$ . Write  $P_j = dd^c \varphi_j + \theta_j$ , where  $\theta_j$  is a smooth form and  $\varphi_j$  is a negative  $\theta_j$ -psh function. Let  $(T_1, \ldots, T_m) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(T)$ . Let  $u_j$  be a negative  $\theta_j$ -psh function so that  $T_j = dd^c u_j + \theta_j$  and  $u_j \leq \varphi_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . For a negative Borel function  $\xi$ , we put

(3.1) 
$$E_{\xi,\mathbf{P}}(T_1,\ldots,T_m;T) := \sum_J \int_X -\xi \langle \bigwedge_{j\in J} T_j \wedge \bigwedge_{j\notin J} P_j \dot{\wedge} T \rangle,$$

where the sum is taken over every subset J of  $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ . The  $(T, \mathbf{P})$ relative joint  $\chi$ -energy of  $T_1, \ldots, T_m$  is, by definition,  $E_{\xi,\mathbf{P}}(T_1, \ldots, T_m; T)$ ,
where

$$\xi := \chi \big( (u_1 - \varphi_1) + \dots + (u_m - \varphi_m) \big).$$

The last energy depends on the choice of  $u_j$ ,  $\varphi_j$  but its finiteness does not. That notion generalizes those in [4, 11, 14], see also [5] for the local setting.

For every closed positive (1, 1)-current P, let  $I_P$  be the set of  $x \in X$  so that the potentials of P are equal to  $-\infty$  at x. Note that  $I_P$  is a complete pluripolar set. By Proposition 2.1 (*iv*), the right-hand side of (3.1) remains unchanged if we replace T by  $\mathbf{1}_{X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^m I_{P_j}} T$ . Hence, in practice, we can assume T has no mass on  $\bigcup_{j=1}^m I_{P_j}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,\mathbf{P}}(T)$  the subset of  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(T)$  containing every  $(T_1, \ldots, T_m)$  such that their  $(T, \mathbf{P})$ -relative joint  $\chi$ -energy is finite. Here is a monotonicity for the class  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,\mathbf{P}}(T)$  when  $P_j = P$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . This generalizes [14, Theorem 5.8].

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $P = dd^c \varphi + \theta$  be a closed positive (1, 1)-current and  $\mathbf{P} := (P, \ldots, P)$  (*m* times *P*). Let  $\chi \in \mathcal{W}^-$  with  $|\chi(0)| \leq 1$ . Let  $(T_1, \ldots, T_m) \in \mathcal{E}_{\chi,\mathbf{P}}(T)$  and  $(T'_1, \ldots, T'_m) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(T)$  such that  $T_j = dd^c u_j + \theta$ ,  $T'_j = dd^c u'_j + \theta$  such that  $u_j, u'_j$  are  $\theta$ -psh and  $u_j \leq u'_j \leq \varphi$ . Put

$$\xi := \chi \big( (u_1 - \varphi) + \dots + (u_m - \varphi) \big),$$

Then we have

$$E_{\xi}(T'_1,\ldots,T'_m;T) \le c_1 E_{\xi}(T_1,\ldots,T_m;T) + c_2$$

for some constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  independent of  $\chi$ . In particular,  $(T'_1, \ldots, T'_m) \in \mathcal{E}_{\chi, \mathbf{P}}(T)$ .

*Proof.* As mentioned above, we can assume that T has no mass on  $I_P = \{\varphi = -\infty\}$ . Note here that  $\{\varphi = -\infty\} \subset \{u_i = -\infty\}$ . Put

$$u_{jk} := \max\{u_j, \varphi - k\} - \varphi$$

which is a bounded dsh function and

$$T_{jk} := dd^c u_{jk} + P.$$

Observe that  $u_{jk}$ 's are admissible with respect to T. Define  $u'_{jk}, T'_{jk}$  similarly. Put

$$v := \sum_{j=1}^{m} (u_j - \varphi_j), \quad v_k := \max\{v, -k\}, \quad \xi_k = \chi(v_k).$$

Note that  $\xi = \chi(v)$ . With these notations and a suitable integration by parts ready in our hands (Theorem 2.9) replacing [14, Lemma 5.7]), the proof goes exactly as in the proof of [14, Theorem 5.8]. The only minor modifications are: the Kähler form  $\omega$  is substituted by P and the wedge products appearing in the proof of [14, Theorem 5.8] need to be replaced by T-relative non-pluripolar products. This finishes the proof.

The following is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 3.2.** Let P,  $\mathbf{P}$  be as in Theorem 3.1. Let P' be a current in  $\{P\}$  which is of the same singularity type as P. Then, for  $\mathbf{P}' = (P', \ldots, P')$  (*m* times P'), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\chi,\mathbf{P}'}(T) = \mathcal{E}_{\chi,\mathbf{P}}(T)$$

For every closed positive (1, 1)-current P, we define the class  $\mathcal{E}_{m,P}(T)$ (resp.  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m,P}(T)$ ) to be the set of currents  $T_1 \in \{P\}$  such that  $(T_1, \ldots, T_1)$ belongs to  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(T)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,\mathbf{P}}(T)$ ), where  $\mathbf{P} = (P, \ldots, P)$  (*m* times P). The last space was introduced in [6] when T is the constant function equal to 1. As in the case of the usual class of currents of full mass intersection ([11, Proposition 2.2]), notice that

$$\mathcal{E}_{m,P}(T) = \bigcup_{\chi \in \mathcal{W}^-} \mathcal{E}_{\chi,m,P}(T).$$

Let  $\alpha$  be a pseudoeffective (1,1)-class. By Corollary 3.2, we see that the notion of the weighted class  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m,P}(T)$  makes sense if we replace P by its equivalent class (in terms of singularity type) of (1,1)-currents. Hence, we can define  $\mathcal{E}_m(\alpha,T)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m}(\alpha,T)$ ) to be the set  $\mathcal{E}_{m,P}(T)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m,P}(T)$ ), where P is a current with minimal singularities in  $\alpha$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** Let U be an open subset in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . Let T be a closed positive current on U and  $u_j, u'_j$  bounded psh functions on U for  $1 \le j \le m$ , where  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $v_j, v'_j$  be psh functions on U for  $1 \le j \le q$ . Assume that  $u_j = u'_j$  on  $W := \bigcap_{j=1}^q \{v_j > v'_j\}$  for  $1 \le j \le m$ . Then we have

$$(3.2) \mathbf{1}_W dd^c u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^c u_m \wedge T = \mathbf{1}_W dd^c u_1' \wedge \dots \wedge dd^c u_m' \wedge T.$$

*Proof.* If  $v_j$ ,  $v'_j$  are all bounded, then the desired assertion is Theorem 2.9 in [14]. In general, observe that

$$\{v_j > v'_j\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{v_{jk} > v'_{jk}\},\$$

where  $v_{jk} := \max\{v_j, -k\}$  and similarly for  $v'_{jk}$ . Let  $W_k := \bigcap_{j=1}^q \{v_{jk} > v'_{jk}\}$ . We have  $W = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty W_k$  and  $u_j = u'_j$  on  $W_k$ . Applying [14, Theorem 2.9] to  $u_j, u'_j, W_k$  gives

$$\mathbf{1}_{W_k} dd^c u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^c u_m \wedge T = \mathbf{1}_{W_k} dd^c u_1' \wedge \dots \wedge dd^c u_m' \wedge T$$

for every k. Hence, the desired assertion follows. This finishes the proof.  $\Box$ 

Now, using Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 instead of [14, Theorem 5.8] and [14, Theorem 2.9] respectively, and following arguments in the proof of [14, Theorems 5.9 and 5.1], we immediately obtain the following result.

**Theorem 3.4.** For  $\chi \in W^-$ , the sets  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m,P}(T)$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{m,P}(T)$  are convex.

Finally, we would like to make the following comment.

**Remark 3.5.** Let  $\mathcal{W}_M^+$  be the class of weights introduced in [11, Page 462]. Using arguments from the proof of [11, Lemma 3.5] and that of Theorem 3.4, we can prove the convexity of  $\mathcal{E}_{\chi,m,P}(T)$  for  $\chi \in \mathcal{W}_M^+$ .

#### Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank referees for their remarks improving the presentation of the paper.

# References

- [1] E. BEDFORD AND B. A. TAYLOR, *A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions*, Acta Math., 149 (1982), pp. 1–40.
- [2] —, Fine topology, Šilov boundary, and (dd<sup>c</sup>)<sup>n</sup>, J. Funct. Anal., 72 (1987), pp. 225–251.
- [3] R. J. BERMAN, S. BOUCKSOM, V. GUEDJ, AND A. ZERIAHI, A variational approach to complex Monge-Ampère equations, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci., 117 (2013), pp. 179–245.
- [4] S. BOUCKSOM, P. EYSSIDIEUX, V. GUEDJ, AND A. ZERIAHI, Monge-Ampère equations in big cohomology classes, Acta Math., 205 (2010), pp. 199–262.
- [5] U. CEGRELL, *Pluricomplex energy*, Acta Math., 180 (1998), pp. 187–217.
- [6] T. DARVAS, E. DI NEZZA, AND C. H. LU, Monotonicity of nonpluripolar products and complex Monge-Ampère equations with prescribed singularity, Anal. PDE, 11 (2018), pp. 2049–2087.
- [7] —, On the singularity type of full mass currents in big cohomology classes, Compos. Math., 154 (2018), pp. 380–409.
- [8] T. DARVAS, E. DI NEZZA, AND C. H. LU, Log-concavity of volume and complex Monge-Ampère equations with prescribed singularity, Math. Ann., 379 (2021), pp. 95–132.

- [9] T.-C. DINH AND N. SIBONY, Distribution des valeurs de transformations méromorphes et applications, Comment. Math. Helv., 81 (2006), pp. 221–258.
- [10] D. T. DO AND D.-V. VU, Complex Monge-Ampère equations with solutions in finite energy classes. arXiv:2010.08619, 2020. to appear in Math. Res. Lett.
- [11] V. GUEDJ AND A. ZERIAHI, *The weighted Monge-Ampère energy* of quasiplurisubharmonic functions, J. Funct. Anal., 250 (2007), pp. 442–482.
- [12] C. H. LU, Comparison of Monge-Ampère capacities, Ann. Polon. Math., 126 (2021), pp. 31–53.
- [13] N. SIBONY, Quelques problèmes de prolongement de courants en analyse complexe, Duke Math. J., 52 (1985), pp. 157–197.
- [14] D.-V. VU, *Relative non-pluripolar product of currents*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom., 60 (2021), pp. 269–311.
- [15] D. WITT NYSTRÖM, Monotonicity of non-pluripolar Monge-Ampère masses, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 68 (2019), pp. 579–591.
- [16] M. XIA, Integration by parts formula for non-pluripolar products. arXiv:1907.06359, 2019.