

# EXPLOSION BY KILLING AND MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE IN SYMMETRIC MARKOV PROCESSES

MASAYOSHI TAKEDA

ABSTRACT. Keller and Lenz [10] define a concept of *stochastic completeness at infinity* (SCI) for a regular symmetric Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ . We show that (SCI) can be characterized probabilistically by using the predictable part  $\zeta^p$  of the life time  $\zeta$  of the symmetric Markov process  $X = (\mathbf{P}_x, X_t)$  generated by  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ , that is, (SCI) is equivalent to  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) = 0$ . We define a concept, *explosion by killing* (EK), by  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1$ . Here  $\zeta^i$  is the totally inaccessible part of  $\zeta$ . We see that (EK) is equivalent to (SCI) and  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ . Let  $X^{\text{res}}$  be the *resurrected process* generated by the *resurrected form*, a regular Dirichlet form constructed by removing the killing part from  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ . Extending work of Masamune and Schmidt ([15]), we show that (EK) is also equivalent to the ordinary conservation property of time changed process of  $X^{\text{res}}$  by  $A_t^k$ , where the  $A_t^k$  is the positive continuous additive functional in the Revuz correspondence to the killing measure  $k$  in the Beurling-Deny formula (Theorem 2.10).

We consider the maximum principle for Schrödinger-type operator  $\mathcal{L}^\mu = \mathcal{L} - \mu$ . Here  $\mathcal{L}$  is the self-adjoint operator associated with  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $\mu$  is a Green-tight Kato measure. Let  $\lambda(\mu)$  be the principal eigenvalue of the trace of  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  relative to  $\mu$ . We prove that if (EK) holds, then  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$  implies a Liouville property that every bounded solution to  $\mathcal{L}^\mu u = 0$  is zero quasi-everywhere and that the *refined maximum principle* in the sense of Berestycki-Nirenberg-Varadhan [2] holds for  $\mathcal{L}^\mu$  if and only if  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$  (Theorem 4.9).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In [23], [25], we prove the maximum principle for Schrödinger forms, and in Kim and Kuwae [14], they extend our results to more general Schrödinger forms with distributions as potential. Our aim in this paper is to extend results in [23], [25] to more general class of subsolutions.

Let  $E$  be a locally compact separable metric space and  $m$  a positive Radon measure on  $E$  with full topological support. Let  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  be a transient, regular and symmetric Dirichlet form on  $L^2(E; m)$  and  $X = (\mathbf{P}_x, X_t, \zeta)$  the  $m$ -symmetric Hunt process generated by  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ . Here  $\zeta$  is the life time of  $X$ ,  $\zeta = \inf\{t > 0 \mid X_t \notin E\}$ . We, in addition, assume that  $X$  is irreducible and strong Feller. We take a point  $\Delta$  not in  $E$  as a cemetery. Any function  $u$  on

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60J46, 60G07, 31C25.

*Key words and phrases.* Conservativeness, Maximum Principle, Dirichlet form, Schrödinger form, symmetric Hunt process.

The author was supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No.18H01121(B)), Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

$E$  is always extended to a function on  $E_\Delta (= E \cup \{\Delta\})$  by setting  $u(\Delta) = 0$ . When  $E$  is not compact, we write  $E_\infty$  for the one point comactification of  $E$ .

Let  $\mu$  be a non-trivial measure in the Green-tight Kato class  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$  with respect to  $X$  (For the definition of  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ , see Definition 4.1 below.) For  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ , we define a Schrödinger form  $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{F}^\mu (= \mathcal{F}))$  on  $L^2(E; m)$  by

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(u, v) = \mathcal{E}(u, v) - \int_E \tilde{u}\tilde{v}d\mu, \quad u, v \in \mathcal{F}^\mu.$$

Here  $\tilde{u}$  represents a quasi-continuous version of  $u \in \mathcal{F}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$  the set of functions locally in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Each function  $u$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$  admits a quasi-continuous version  $\tilde{u}$ . In the sequel, we suppose that  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$  is already modified and write  $u$  for  $\tilde{u}$  simply.

Define a measure on  $E$  by

$$(1.1) \quad \mu_{\langle u \rangle}^j(B) = \iint_{B \times E} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(dx, dy), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(E),$$

where  $J$  is the jumping measure in the Beurling-Deny formula for  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  ([9, Theorem 3.2.1]) and  $\mathcal{B}(E)$  is the set of Borel subsets of  $E$ . Following [8], [12], we introduce a subspace  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$  of  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ :

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \mid \mu_{\langle u \rangle}^j \text{ is a Radon measure on } E \right\}.$$

We then see that a bounded function in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$  and that for  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$ ,  $\mathcal{E}(u, \varphi)$  is well-defined ([8, Theorem 3.5]). Here  $C_0(E)$  is the set of continuous functions on  $E$  with compact support.

Define  $\mathcal{L}^\mu$  as the self-adjoint operator associated with the closed symmetric form  $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{F}^\mu)$ ,  $(-\mathcal{L}^\mu u, v)_m = \mathcal{E}^\mu(u, v)$ . A function  $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$  is called a *solution (subsolution, supersolution)* to  $\mathcal{L}^\mu u = 0$  if

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(h, \varphi) = 0 \quad (\leq 0, \geq 0) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E).$$

Here  $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$  is the set of locally bounded  $m$ -measurable functions on  $E$  and for a function space  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_+$  ( $\mathcal{A}_-$ ) represents the totality of non-negative (non-positive) functions in  $\mathcal{A}$ . We write  $\mathbf{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$  ( $\mathbf{S}^{\mu, \text{sup}}$ ) for the space of subsolutions (supersolutions) and define the function spaces:

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}} = \{h \in \mathbf{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}} \mid \|h^+\|_\infty < \infty\}.$$

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sup}} = \{h \in \mathbf{S}^{\mu, \text{sup}} \mid \|h^-\|_\infty > -\infty\}.$$

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}} \cap \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sup}}$$

From now on, we will mainly discuss the space  $\mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$  because  $-h \in \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$  for  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sup}}$ .

We set

$$(1.5) \quad \mathbb{S} = \left\{ \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset E \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_{x_n}(e^{-\zeta}) = 1 \right\}$$

and introduce a subspace of  $\mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$  by

$$\mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}} = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}} \cap C(E) \mid \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0 \text{ for all } \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathbb{S} \right\}.$$

Following Berestycki, Nirenberg and Varadhan [2], we define the *refined maximum principle*:

**(RMP)** If  $h \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ , then  $h(x) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in E$ .

We then obtain the following main theorem:

**Theorem 1.1.** For  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  define

$$(1.6) \quad \lambda(\mu) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{F}, \int_E u^2 d\mu = 1 \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{E}(u) = \mathcal{E}(u, u)$ . Then

$$\lambda(\mu) > 1 \iff \text{(RMP)}.$$

$\lambda(\mu)$  is identified with the principal eigenvalue of the trace of  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  relative to  $\mu$ , in other words, the principal eigenvalue of the time changed process,  $X_{\tau_t}$ ,  $\tau_t = \inf\{s > 0 \mid A_s^\mu > t\}$ , where  $A_t^\mu$  is the positive continuous additive functional (PCAF in abbreviation) of  $X$  in the Revuz correspondence to the measure  $\mu$  (cf. [9, Section 6.2]). In the sequel, for a symmetric form  $a(u, v)$  we simply write  $a(u)$  for  $a(u, u)$ .

The differences between Theorem 1.1 and the corresponding theorems in [23], [25] are as follows: In this paper we will deal with general Dirichlet forms with non-local part, while in [23, Theorem 3.2], [25, Remark 4.3] Dirichlet forms are supposed to be strongly local. Moreover, when general Dirichlet forms with non-local part are dealt with, each  $h \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}}$  is supposed to be in  $\mathcal{F}_e \cap C(E) \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap C(E)$  ([25, Theorem 4.1]). Here,  $\mathcal{F}_e$  is the *extended Dirichlet space* of  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ .

Let  $\gamma(\mu)$  be the principal eigenvalue of the Schrödinger operator  $-\mathcal{L}^\mu$ :

$$(1.7) \quad \gamma(\mu) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}^\mu(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{F}^\mu, \int_E u^2 dm = 1 \right\}.$$

If, in addition, the basic measure  $m$  belongs to  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ , then it holds that  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$  if and only if  $\gamma(\mu) > 0$  (Theorem 4.12). It is shown in [2] that for an elliptic (not necessarily symmetric) operator in a bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , **(RMP)** holds if and only if the generalized principal eigenvalue, an extension of  $\gamma(\mu)$  defined through the so-called *Donsker-Varadhan I-function*, is positive.

We here note that the semi-group of the self-adjoint operator  $\mathcal{L}^\mu$ ,  $T_t^\mu := \exp(t\mathcal{L}^\mu)$ , is expressed by the Feynman-Kac semi-group: For  $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E) \cap L^2(E; m)$

$$T_t^\mu f(x) = p_t^\mu f(x) := \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_t^\mu} f(X_t) \right) \quad m\text{-a.e. } x,$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_b(E)$  is the space of bounded Borel functions on  $E$ . Then the key to the proof of Theorem 1.1 is as follows: For showing the direction ( $\implies$ ), the first crucial fact is that if  $h$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ , then

$$(1.8) \quad h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_{\sigma_n}^\mu} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \quad \text{q.e. } x.$$

Here  $h^+ = h \vee 0$  and  $\{\sigma_n\}$  is a certain sequence of stopping times such that  $\sigma_n \uparrow \zeta$ . “q.e.” is an abbreviation of “*quasi-everywhere*” (cf. [9, Section 2.1]). The proof of (1.8) is given by an application of the Kuwae’s generalized Fukushima

decomposition to the *resurrected Hunt process*  $X^{\text{res}} = (\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}, X_t, \zeta)$  generated by the *resurrected form*  $(\mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{res}})$ . Here the resurrected form  $(\mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{res}})$  is a regular Dirichlet form constructed by removing the killing part from  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  ([4, Theorem 5.2.17]). The life time  $\zeta$  of  $X$  is written as  $\zeta = \zeta^p \wedge \zeta^i$  on  $\{\zeta < \infty\}$ , where  $\zeta^p$  and  $\zeta^i$  are the *predictable* part and the *totally inaccessible* part of  $\zeta$ . It holds true that  $X_{\zeta^-} = \infty$  on  $\{\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty\}$  and  $X_{\zeta^-} \in E$  on  $\{\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty\}$ . The killing measure  $k$  in the Beurling-Deny formula of  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  is identified with the Revuz measure corresponding to the PCAF  $(1_{\{X_{\zeta^-} \neq \infty, \zeta \leq t\}})^p$ , the dual predictable projection of  $1_{\{X_{\zeta^-} \neq \infty, \zeta \leq t\}}$  (cf. [9, Theorem 5.3.1]). Hence the life time of  $X^{\text{res}}$  turns out to be a predictable stopping time because  $(\mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{res}})$  has no killing part. In other words, the removal of the killing part from the Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  is equivalent to that of the totally inaccessible part from the life time  $\zeta$ . The original process  $X$  is the subprocess of  $X^{\text{res}}$  generated by the multiplicative functional  $\exp(-A_t^k)$ , where  $A_t^k$  is the PCAF of  $X^{\text{res}}$  corresponding to the killing measure  $k$  ([4, Theorem 5.2.17]). These facts enable us to imitate the argument in the case of strongly local Dirichlet forms.

The second crucial fact for the direction  $(\implies)$  is that the condition  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$  is equivalent with the gaugeability ([3]):

$$(1.9) \quad \lambda(\mu) > 1 \iff \sup_{x \in E} \mathbf{E} \left( e^{A_\zeta^\mu} \right) < \infty.$$

Owing to the gaugeability, the reverse Fatou lemma is applicable to the equation (1.8) and

$$(1.10) \quad h(x) \leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_{\sigma_n}^\mu} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \leq \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_\zeta^\mu} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \quad \text{q.e. } x.$$

We will show in Lemma 3.4 that for  $x \in E$

$$\{X_{\sigma_n}\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathbb{S} \quad \mathbf{P}_x\text{-a.s. on } \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \{\sigma_n < \zeta\}.$$

Hence noting that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(X_{\sigma_n}) \leq 0 \iff \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) = 0,$$

we see the right hand side of (1.10) equals 0.

For the proof of the opposite direction  $(\impliedby)$ , we apply the fact that for  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  the extended Dirichlet space  $\mathcal{F}_e$  is compactly embedded in  $L^2(E; \mu)$ , which leads us to that there exists a strictly positive function  $h \in \mathcal{F}_e \cap C(E)$  attaining the infimum of (1.6). Moreover, if  $\lambda(\mu) \leq 1$ , then the function  $h$  satisfies  $p_t^\mu h \geq h$  (Lemma 4.8) and for any  $\{x_n\} \in \mathbb{S}$ ,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0$  (Theorem 4.9). Consequently, the opposite direction is derived and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

As remarked above, the original process  $X$  is regarded as a subprocess of  $X^{\text{res}}$  by  $\exp(-A_t^k)$ . As a result, we obtain the following equations:

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad & \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) \\ \text{(ii)} \quad & \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1 - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} \right) \\ \text{(iii)} \quad & \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\infty^k}; \zeta = \infty \right) \end{aligned}$$

(Corollary 2.9), consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1.12) \quad & 1 = \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) \\
 & = \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) \\
 & = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) + \left( 1 - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} \right) \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\infty^k}; \zeta = \infty \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Keller and Lenz [10, Definition 1.1] define the *stochastic completeness at infinity* (SCI for short) of Dirichlet forms  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  on graphs (or the corresponding symmetric Markov process  $X$ ). In [11, Section 7.9], they give a probabilistic interpretation of this concept, that is, a probabilistic characterization of stochastic completeness at infinity is equivalent to that

$$(1.13) \quad \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) = 0.$$

Masamune and Schmidt [15] call this property the *generalized conservation property* and extend Khasminskii's criterion for the generalized conservation property. Moreover, they prove the equivalence with the ordinary conservation property of time changed processes ([15, Theorem 3.5]). We see from (1.11)(i) that (SCI) is also expressed as

$$(1.14) \quad (\mathbf{SCI}) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) = 0,$$

which make the image of (SCI) concrete probabilistically. As a result of (1.13), we see that if  $X^{\text{res}}$  is conservative,  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ , then  $X$  has (SCI). If  $X$  itself is conservative,  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ , then the killing part disappears and  $X^{\text{res}}$  is identified with  $X$ , consequently  $X$  has (SCI).

We see that the next equivalences hold:

$$(1.15) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1 \iff \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} \right) = 0 \iff \mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}} \left( A_\zeta^k = \infty \right) = 1.$$

When we denote by  $X^{\text{res},k}$  the time changed process of  $X^{\text{res}}$  by  $A_t^k$ ,  $A_\zeta^k$  is regarded as the life time of  $X^{\text{res},k}$  by [19, (65.2)], and thus  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(A_\zeta^k = \infty) = 1$  implies the conservativeness of  $X^{\text{res},k}$ .

Here we define the *explosion by killing* ((EK) for short) by

$$(1.16) \quad (\mathbf{EK}) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1.$$

(EK) is equivalent to (SCI) and  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = 1$ . We can conclude from the discussion above that (EK) of  $X$  is equivalent to the conservativeness of the time changed process of  $X^{\text{res}}$  by  $A_t^k$ . Moreover, we prove in Theorem 2.18 and Remark 4.10 that (EK) is also equivalent to the following Liouville type theorem: A function  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \cap \mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}}$ , then  $h(x) = 0$  for q.e.  $x$ . Here  $\mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} = \mathcal{S}^{0,\text{sub}}$  ( $\mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}} = \mathcal{S}^{0,\text{sup}}$ ).

For  $\lambda \geq 0$  define  $\mathcal{L}^{(\lambda)}$  as the self-adjoint operator associated with the closed symmetric form  $(\mathcal{E}_\lambda := \mathcal{E} + \lambda(\cdot, \cdot)_m, \mathcal{F})$ ,  $(-\mathcal{L}^{(\lambda)}u, v)_m = \mathcal{E}_\lambda(u, v)$ . We can extend the spaces,  $\mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$  and  $\mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}}$  or the concepts, (SCP) and (EK) to those associated with  $(\mathcal{E}_\lambda, \mathcal{F})$ , and denote these by  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sub}}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sup}}$  or  $(\text{SCP}_\lambda)$  and  $(\text{EK}_\lambda)$ . Noting that for  $\lambda > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) = 0 & \iff \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k - \lambda \zeta}; \zeta < \infty \right) = 0 \\
 & \iff \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k - \lambda \zeta} \right) = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

we see that (SCP) is equivalent to  $(\text{SCP}_\lambda)$  or  $(\text{EK}_\lambda)$  for each  $\lambda > 0$ , and thus  $h \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sub}} \cap \mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sup}}$  equals 0 q.e. if (SCP) holds.

Let  $X^D = (\mathbf{P}_x^D, X_t, \zeta)$  be the absorbing symmetric  $\alpha$ -stable process ( $0 < \alpha < 2$ ) on a bounded Lipschitz open set  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then  $\mathbf{P}_x^D(\zeta < \infty) = 1$  and  $\mathbf{P}_x^{D, \text{res}}(\zeta = \infty) = 1$  for  $\alpha \leq 1$  ([1, Theorem 1.1]). Note that in [1] the resurrected process  $X^{D, \text{res}}$  of  $X^D$  is called a *censored stable process*. Hence we see that if  $\alpha \leq 1$ , then the Liouville property with respect to  $X^D$  holds (Example 2.24).

Finally, we would like to make a comment on the strong maximum principle. In our point of view the strong maximum principle to the operator  $\mathcal{L}(= \mathcal{L}^0)$ : If  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \cap C(E)$ , then  $h$  is constant  $M = \sup_{x \in E} h(x)$  or  $h(x) < M$  for all  $x \in E$ , follows from the irreducibility of the Markov process  $X$  generated by the regular Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  (Theorem 3.1). More precisely, if a symmetric Markov process  $\mathbf{P}_x$  satisfying the absolute continuity condition (AC) (for definition, see Section 2) is irreducible, then for any Borel set  $G$  of positive capacity

$$\mathbf{P}_x(\sigma_G < \zeta) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in E,$$

where  $\sigma_G = \inf\{t > 0 \mid X_t \in G\}$ .

## 2. SUBSOLUTIONS AND SUPERSOLUTIONS

Let  $E$  be a locally compact separable metric space and  $m$  a positive Radon measure on  $E$  with full topological support. Let  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  be a regular symmetric Dirichlet form on  $L^2(E; m)$ . We denote by  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$  if for any relatively compact open set  $D$  there exists a function  $v \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $u = v$   $m$ -a.e. on  $D$ . Let  $X = (\Omega, \{\mathbf{P}_x\}_{x \in E}, \{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \zeta)$  be the symmetric Hunt process generated by  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ , where  $\zeta$  is the lifetime of  $X$ . Denote by  $\{p_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{R_\alpha\}_{\alpha \geq 0}$  the semi-group and resolvent of  $X$ : For a bounded Borel function  $f$  on  $E$

$$p_t f(x) = \mathbf{E}_x(f(X_t); t < \zeta), \quad R_\alpha f(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} p_t f(x) dt.$$

Through this paper we assume that  $X$  satisfies next two conditions:

**Irreducibility (I).** If a Borel set  $A$  is  $\{p_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -invariant, i.e.,  $p_t(1_A f)(x) = 1_A p_t f(x)$   $m$ -a.e. for any  $f \in L^2(E; m) \cap \mathcal{B}_b(E)$  and  $t > 0$ , then  $A$  satisfies either  $m(A) = 0$  or  $m(E \setminus A) = 0$ .

**Strong Feller Property (SF).** For each  $t > 0$ ,  $p_t(\mathcal{B}_b(E)) \subset C_b(E)$ , where  $C_b(E)$  is the space of bounded continuous functions on  $E$ .

We remark that (SF) implies the following condition ([9, Theorem 4.2.4]).

**Absolute Continuity Condition (AC).** The transition probability and resolvent of  $X$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $m$ ; for each  $t > 0$ ,  $\alpha > 0$  and  $x \in E$

$$p_t f(x) = \int_E p(t, x, y) f(y) m(dy), \quad R_\alpha f(x) = \int_E r_\alpha(x, y) f(y) m(dy).$$

We introduce a subspace  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$  of  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$  by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \mid \mu_{\langle u \rangle}^j \text{ is a Radon measure on } E \right\},$$

where  $\mu_{\langle u \rangle}^j$  is a positive measure defined in (1.1). Denoting by  $\mathcal{L}$  the self-adjoint operator associated with the Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ ,  $(-\mathcal{L}u, v)_m = \mathcal{E}(u, v)$ , we call a function  $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$  a *solution (subsolution, supersolution)* to  $\mathcal{L}u = 0$  if

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) = 0 \quad (\leq 0, \geq 0) \text{ for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E).$$

For  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$ ,  $\mathcal{E}(u, \varphi)$  is well-defined, in other words,

$$\left| \iint_{E \times E} (u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))J(dx, dy) \right| < \infty,$$

which is shown by the same argument on the jumping part  $\mathcal{E}^j$  in the proof of Lemma 2.3 below.

We write  $\mathbf{S}$  ( $\mathbf{S}^{\text{sub}}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}^{\text{sup}}$ ) for the space of solutions (subsolutions, supersolutions) and introduce the function spaces:

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} = \{h \in \mathbf{S}^{\text{sub}} \mid \|h^+\|_\infty < \infty\},$$

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}} = \{h \in \mathbf{S}^{\text{sup}} \mid \|h^-\|_\infty > -\infty\}.$$

We further introduce the function spaces as follows:

$$(2.5) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sub}} = \{h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty \mid \|h^+\|_\infty < \infty, p_t h \geq h \text{ q.e.}\},$$

$$(2.6) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sup}} = \{h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty \mid \|h^-\|_\infty > -\infty, p_t h \leq h \text{ q.e.}\}.$$

By using the argument in the proof of [16, Theorem 5.1], we have the next lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$ . Let  $K = \text{supp}[\varphi]$  and  $G$  a relatively compact open set containing  $K$ . Let  $\{\psi_n\}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$  such that  $0 \leq \psi_n \leq 1$ ,  $\psi_n = 1$  on  $G$ ,  $\psi_n \uparrow 1$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(h\psi_n, \varphi) = \mathcal{E}(h, \varphi).$$

*Proof.* On account of  $h\psi_n = h$  on  $G$ , we see from Beurling-Deny formula [9, Theorem 3.2.1] that  $\mathcal{E}(h\psi_n, \varphi)$  is equal to

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_E d\mu_{\langle h, \varphi \rangle}^c + \iint_{K \times K} (h(x) - h(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))J(dx, dy) \\ & + 2 \iint_{K \times (K^c \cap G)} (h(x) - h(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))J(dx, dy) \\ & + 2 \iint_{K \times G^c} (h(x) - h(y)\psi_n(y))\varphi(x) J(dx, dy) + \int_E h\varphi d\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $J(K \times G^c) < \infty$  and for  $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$

$$\int_E \varphi(x) d\mu_{\langle h \rangle}^j(x) < \infty,$$

we see

$$\begin{aligned} & |(h(x) - h(y)\psi_n(y))\varphi(x)| \\ & \leq |h(x) - h(x)\psi_n(y)|\varphi(x) + |h(x) - h(y)|\psi_n(y)\varphi(x) \\ & \leq |h(x)|\varphi(x)1_{G^c}(y) + |h(x) - h(y)|\varphi(x) \in L^1(K \times G^c; J). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the dominated convergence theorem, the fourth term of (2.7) tends to

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \iint_{K \times G^c} (h(x) - h(y))\varphi(x)J(dx, dy) \\ & = 2 \iint_{K \times G^c} (h(x) - h(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))J(dx, dy) \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence

$$\mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(h\psi_n, \varphi).$$

□

**Lemma 2.2.** *It holds that*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\text{sub}} \subset \mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_+^{\text{sup}} \subset \mathcal{S}_+^{\text{sup}}.$$

*Proof.* We only prove that  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\text{sub}} \subset \mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}}$ .

Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$  and write  $K$  for the support of  $\varphi$ . Take a relatively compact open set  $G$  and a sequence  $\{\psi_n\} \subset \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$  as in Lemma 2.1. Then for  $h \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\text{sub}}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}(h\psi_n, \varphi) \leq 0$ . Indeed, since  $h\psi_n \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $p_t(h\psi_n) \geq p_t h \geq h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(h\psi_n, \varphi) &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (h\psi_n - p_t(h\psi_n), \varphi)_m \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \left( (h, \varphi)_m - (p_t h, \varphi)_m \right) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\cdot, \cdot)_m$  is the inner product of  $L^2(E; m)$ . By Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(h\psi_n, \varphi) \leq 0.$$

□

**Lemma 2.3.** *For  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$ , there exists a smooth positive Radon measure  $\nu_h$  such that*

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) = - \int_E \varphi d\nu_h, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E).$$

*Proof.* Denote  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$  and define a function  $I$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  by

$$(2.9) \quad I(\varphi) = -\mathcal{E}(h, \varphi), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{C}.$$

We confirm in [21, Lemma 4.7] that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *Stone vector lattice* and  $I(\varphi)$  is a *pre-integral* (For these definitions, see [7, p.143]). We then know from Stone-Daniell theorem [7, Theorem 4.5.2] that there exists a positive Borel measure  $\nu_h$  such that

$$I(\varphi) = \int_E \varphi d\nu_h, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{C}.$$



We see by the relation (2.8) that  $\nu_h$  is Radon. Moreover, we see by the same argument as in [21, Lemma 4.7], [16, Lemma 4.1] that the measure  $\nu_h$  is smooth. Indeed, let  $K$  be a compact set with  $\text{Cap}(K) = 0$ . Take relatively compact open sets  $G$  and  $D$  such that  $K \subset G \subset \bar{G} \subset D \subset E$ . Let  $\{\varphi_n\}$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(G)$  such that  $\varphi_n \geq 1$  on  $K$ , and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\varphi_n) = 0$ . The existence of such a sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$  follows from [9, Lemma 2.2.7, Theorem 4.4.3]. Take  $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(D)$  such that  $\psi \leq 1$  and  $\psi = 1$  on  $G$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}^c, \mathcal{E}^j, \mathcal{E}^k$  be the strongly local part, jumping part, killing part of  $\mathcal{E}$  in the Beurling-Deny formula.

We see from the local property of  $\mathcal{E}^c$  and  $\mathcal{E}^k$  that

$$|\mathcal{E}^c(h, \varphi_n)| \leq \mathcal{E}^c(h\psi)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^c(\varphi_n)^{1/2}, \quad |\mathcal{E}^k(h, \varphi_n)| \leq \mathcal{E}^k(h\psi)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^k(\varphi_n)^{1/2}.$$

The jumping part  $\mathcal{E}^j(h, \varphi_n)$  equals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^j(h, \varphi_n) &= \iint_{E \times E} (h(x) - h(y))(\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_n(y))J(dx, dy) \\ &= \iint_{G \times G} (h(x) - h(y))(\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_n(y))J(dx, dy) \\ &\quad + 2 \iint_{G \times G^c} (h(x) - h(y))(\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_n(y))J(dx, dy). \end{aligned}$$

The first term of the right hand side equals

$$\iint_{G \times G} (h(x)\psi(x) - h(y)\psi(y))(\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_n(y))J(dx, dy) \leq \mathcal{E}^j(h\psi)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^j(\varphi_n)^{1/2}$$

and the second term is less than  $2\mu_{\langle h \rangle}^j(G)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^j(\varphi_n)^{1/2}$ . Hence noting  $h\psi \in \mathcal{F}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_h(K) &\leq \int_E \varphi_n d\nu_h = -\mathcal{E}(h, \varphi_n) = -(\mathcal{E}^c(h, \varphi_n) + \mathcal{E}^j(h, \varphi_n) + \mathcal{E}^k(h, \varphi_n)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}^c(h\psi)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^c(\varphi_n)^{1/2} + \mathcal{E}^j(h\psi)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^j(\varphi_n)^{1/2} + 2\mu_{\langle h \rangle}^j(G)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^j(\varphi_n)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{E}^k(h\psi)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^k(\varphi_n)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left( \mathcal{E}(h\psi)^{1/2} + 2\mu_{\langle h \rangle}^j(G)^{1/2} \right) \mathcal{E}(\varphi_n)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the measure  $\nu_h$  is smooth.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$  and  $h^M = h - M$ ,  $M := \|h^+\|_\infty$ . Noting that the constant function  $M$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^{\dagger} \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$  and that

$$\mathcal{E}(h^M, \varphi) = \mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) - M\mathcal{E}(1, \varphi) = \mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) - M \int_E \varphi dk \leq 0,$$

we see that  $h^M \in \mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}}$ . Since

$$\mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) = - \int_E \varphi (d\nu_{h^M} - Mdk),$$

$\nu_h$  equals  $\nu_{h^M} - Mk$ .  $\nu_h$  looks signed, but it's actually positive.

Let  $\{K_n\}$  be a sequence of increasing compact sets such that  $K_1 \subset \overset{\circ}{K}_2 \subset \cdots \subset K_n \subset \overset{\circ}{K}_{n+1} \subset \cdots$  and  $K_n \uparrow E$ , where  $\overset{\circ}{K}$  is the interior of  $K$ . Denote by  $\tau_n$  the first exit time from  $K_n$ ,

$$(2.10) \quad \tau_n = \inf\{t > 0 \mid X_t \notin K_n\}.$$

The next lemma is an extension of [25, Lemma 3.18, Lemma 3.19], where a function in  $\mathcal{F}_e$  is treated.

**Lemma 2.5.** *For  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$  there exists a sequence  $\{\sigma_n\}$  of stopping times such that  $\sigma_n < \zeta$ ,  $\sigma_n \uparrow \zeta$  and*

$$(2.11) \quad h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \text{ q.e. } x.$$

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{res}})$  be the *resurrected Dirichlet form* defined in [4, (5.2.25)], which is a regular Dirichlet form on  $L^2(E; m)$ . We see from [4, Theorem 5.2.17] that  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{res}} \supset \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{res}} \cap L^2(E; k) = \mathcal{F}$ . As a result, we know that  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{res}} \cap C_0(E) = \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}^{\text{res}\dagger})_{\text{loc}} \supset \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$  and that for  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$

$$\mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}(h, \varphi) = - \int_X \varphi(hdk + d\nu_h), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{res}} \cap C_0(E).$$

Since  $k$  is a smooth Radon measure, so is  $hk$ .

Let  $X^{\text{res}} = (\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}, X_t, \zeta)$  be the *resurrected process* of  $X$ , that is, the Hunt process generated by  $(\mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{res}})$  (cf. [4, Theorem 5.2.17]). We then see from [16, Corollary 3.3] that

$$h(X_t) = h(X_0) + M_t^{[h]} + \int_0^t h(X_s) dA_s^k + A_t^{\nu_h}, \quad t < \zeta, \quad \mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}\text{-a.s. q.e. } x,$$

where  $M_t^{[h]} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^{[0, \zeta[}$  is the martingale part of the Fukushima decomposition, i.e., there exist a sequence  $\{S_n\}$  of stopping times with  $S_n \uparrow \zeta$  and a sequence  $\{M_t^n\}$  of square integrable martingale AFs such that

$$(2.12) \quad M_{t \wedge S_n}^{[h]} 1_{\{t \wedge S_n < \zeta\}} = M_{t \wedge S_n}^n 1_{\{t \wedge S_n < \zeta\}}$$

([12, Theorem 4.2]).

Note that  $X_\zeta = X_{\zeta-} (= \infty)$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}$ -a.s. on  $\{\zeta < \infty\}$  because  $(\mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}, \mathcal{F}^{\text{res}})$  has no killing part ([9, Theorem 5.3.1]). Consequently,  $\tau_n < \zeta$ ,  $\tau_n \uparrow \zeta$  on  $\{\zeta < \infty\}$ . Define  $\sigma_n = S_n \wedge \tau_n$ . Then  $\sigma_n < \zeta$  and  $\sigma_n \uparrow \zeta$ . We see from Itô's formula that

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) &= h(X_0) - \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} h(X_s) dA_s^k + \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} dM_s^{[h]} \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} h(X_s) dA_s^k + \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^{\nu_h} \\ &= h(X_0) + \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} dM_s^{[h]} + \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^{\nu_h}, \quad \mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}\text{-a.s. q.e. } x. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that  $\int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} dM_s^{[h]}$  is a square integrable martingale by (2.12) and  $\int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^{\nu_h} \geq 0$ , we have this lemma by taking expectation of both sides of (2.13).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.** *It holds that*

$$\mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\text{sub}}, \quad \mathcal{S}_+^{\text{sup}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_+^{\text{sup}}.$$

*Proof.* We will only prove that  $\mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\text{sub}}$ .

On account of  $h \leq 0$ , we see from Fatou's lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t) \right) &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t); t < \zeta \right) \\ &= -\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} (-h)(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right); t < \zeta \right) \\ (2.14) \quad &\geq -\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} (-h)(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \right) \\ &\geq -\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( -\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \right) \quad \text{q.e. } x, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t) \right) = p_t h(x) \quad \text{q.e. } x.$$

by (2.11). Applying [4, Theorem 5.2.17] again, we see that the left hand side of (2.14) is equal to  $\mathbf{E}_x(h(X_t)) = p_t h(x)$ .  $\square$

By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.6, we have

**Theorem 2.7.** *It holds that*

$$\mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\text{sub}}, \quad \mathcal{S}_+^{\text{sup}} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_+^{\text{sup}}.$$

Let  $\{\tau_n\}$  be a sequence of stopping times defined in (2.10). We define

$$(2.15) \quad \Omega^p = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\tau_n < \zeta < \infty\},$$

$$(2.16) \quad \Omega^i = (\Omega^p)^c = (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\tau_n = \zeta < \infty\}) \cup \{\zeta = \infty\}.$$

Let  $\zeta^p$  (resp.  $\zeta^i$ ) be the predictable (resp. totally inaccessible) part of  $\zeta$ , that is,

$$(2.17) \quad \zeta^p = \begin{cases} \zeta, & \omega \in \Omega^p, \\ \infty, & \omega \in \Omega^i, \end{cases} \quad \zeta^i = \begin{cases} \zeta, & \omega \in \Omega^i, \\ \infty, & \omega \in \Omega^p. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\zeta$  is written as  $\zeta = \zeta^p \wedge \zeta^i$ . For the decomposition of the predictable part and the totally inaccessible part, refer [18, Lemma (13.4)]. Note that predictability is equivalent to accessibility in case when  $X$  is a Hunt process ([18, Theorem 15.1]).

**Lemma 2.8.** *For  $u \in C(E_\infty)$*

$$(2.18) \quad \mathbf{E}_x(u(X_{\zeta^-}); \zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} u(X_{\zeta^-}); \zeta < \infty \right).$$

Here  $C(E_\infty)$  is the set of continuous functions on the one-point compactification  $E_\infty$  of  $E$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{\tau_n\}$  be a sequence of stopping times in (2.10). By [19, (62.13)],

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}_x(u(X_{\tau_n})1_{\{\tau_n < \zeta < \infty\}}) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \int_0^{\tau_n} u(X_{\tau_n}(k_t))1_{\{\tau_n(k_t) < \zeta(k_t) < \infty\}} \left( -de^{-A_t^k} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + e^{-A_{\tau_n}^k} u(X_{\tau_n})1_{\{\tau_n < \zeta < \infty\}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $k_t$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq \infty$  is the killing operators (For definition, see [19, Definition (11.3)]). Since

$$\tau_n(k_t) < \zeta(k_t) \iff \tau_n \wedge t < \zeta \wedge t \iff \tau_n < t,$$

by [19, Proposition (11.11)], the right hand side equals

$$\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\tau_n}^k} u(X_{\tau_n})1_{\{\tau_n < \zeta < \infty\}} \right).$$

Note that  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta < \infty) = 1$  implies  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = 1$ . Hence on account of  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\tau_n < \zeta < \infty) = 1$ , we have

$$\mathbf{E}_x(u(X_{\tau_n}); \tau_n < \zeta < \infty) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\tau_n}^k} u(X_{\tau_n}); \zeta < \infty \right),$$

which implies (2.18) by letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.9.** (i)  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\zeta}^k}; \zeta < \infty \right)$ .

(ii)  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1 - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\zeta}^k} \right)$ .

(iii)  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\infty}^k}; \zeta = \infty \right)$ .

*Proof.* The claim (i) follows from Lemma 2.8 by taking  $u \equiv 1$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \int_0^{\zeta} 1_{\{\zeta(k_t) = \infty\}} \left( -de^{-A_t^k} \right) + e^{-A_{\zeta}^k} 1_{\{\zeta = \infty\}} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\infty}^k}; \zeta = \infty \right) \end{aligned}$$

by  $\zeta(k_t) = \zeta \wedge t$ , the claim (iii) follows. Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\zeta}^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\infty}^k}; \zeta = \infty \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\zeta}^k} \right), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) &= 1 - (\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty)) \\ &= 1 - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\zeta}^k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) \\ &= \mathbf{P}_x(\Omega^p) + \mathbf{P}_x(\Omega^i \cap \{\zeta < \infty\}) + \mathbf{P}_x(\Omega^i \cap \{\zeta = \infty\}) \\ &= \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) + \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty), \end{aligned}$$

according to Corollary 2.9

(2.19)

$$\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) + \left( 1 - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} \right) \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\infty^k}; \zeta = \infty \right) = 1.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^t 1_E(X_s) e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^k &= \int_0^t 1_E(X_s) d(e^{-A_s^k}) \\ &= e^{-A_t^k} 1_E(X_t) - 1 - \int_0^t e^{-A_s^k} d(1_E(X_s)) \\ &= e^{-A_t^k} 1_E(X_t) - 1 + e^{-A_\zeta^k} 1_{\{\zeta \leq t\}}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

(2.20)

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} 1_E(X_t) \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \int_0^t 1_E(X_s) e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^k \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k}; t < \zeta \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \int_0^{\zeta \wedge t} e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^k \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Keller and Lenz [10] define the *stochastic completeness at infinity* ((SCI) in abbreviation) of  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  (or the corresponding symmetric Markov process  $X$ ) by

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k}; t < \zeta \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \int_0^{\zeta \wedge t} e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^k \right) \\ (2.21) \quad &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} 1_E(X_t) \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( \int_0^t 1_E(X_s) e^{-A_s^k} dA_s^k \right), \quad t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if  $dk = V dm$ , then  $A_t^k = \int_0^t V(X_s) ds$  and the equation (2.21) is written as

$$1 = p_t 1 + \int_0^t p_s V ds, \quad t > 0.$$

By (2.20), the equality (2.21) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t \right) = 0, \quad t > 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(2.22) \quad \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) = 0$$

because

$$\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t \right) \uparrow \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, by the irreducibility of  $X^{\text{res}}$ , it satisfies i)  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta < \infty) = 0$  for all  $x \in E$  or ii)  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta < \infty) > 0$  for all  $x \in E$ . For the case i), (2.22) holds and for the case ii), (2.22) is equivalent to

$$(2.23) \quad e^{-A_\zeta^k} = 0 \quad \mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}\text{-a.s. on } \{\zeta < \infty\} \iff \mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(A_\zeta^k = \infty | \zeta < \infty) = 1.$$

Therefore, we see that (SCI) is equivalent to that i)  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta = \infty) = 1$  or  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(A_\zeta^k = \infty | \zeta < \infty) = 1$  ([11, Theorem 7.33]). Here we would like to

emphasis that using the concepts of predictable part and totally inaccessible part of the life time, we can make the image of (SCI) concrete probablistically, that is,

$$(2.24) \quad (\text{SCI}) \iff \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty) = 0.$$

Masamune and Schmidt [15] call this property the *generalized conservation property* ((GCP) for short) and extend Khasminskii's criterion for the generalized conservation property and prove the equivalence with the ordinary conservation property of time changed processes. We see that if  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ , that is,  $X^{\text{res}}$  is conservative, then  $X$  has (SCI). In particular, if  $X$  is conservative,  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ , then the killing part disappear and  $X^{\text{res}}$  is identified with  $X$ , consequently,  $X$  has the SCI.

As stated in (2.23), if  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = 1$ , then (SCI) is equivalent to

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1 &\iff \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(e^{-A_\zeta^k}\right) = 0 \\ &\iff \mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(A_\zeta^k = \infty) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $X^{\text{res},k}$  be the time changed process of  $X^{\text{res}}$  by  $A_t^k$ . Note that  $A_\zeta^k$  is nothing but the life time of  $X^{\text{res},k}$  ([19, (65.2)]). We then see that if  $X^{\text{res},k}$  is conservative,  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res},k}(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ , then  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(A_\zeta^k = \infty) = 1$ . On account of the equivalence above, we define a concept on stochastic incompleteness, *explosion by killing* ((EK) for short) by

$$(2.26) \quad (\text{EK}) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1.$$

(EK) implies that the Hunt process  $X$  explodes by jumping from inside of  $E$  to the cemetery point  $\Delta$  almost surely. We then have

**Theorem 2.10.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) = 0$  and (SCI).
- (ii) (EK)
- (iii)  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(e^{A_\zeta^k}\right) = 0$ .
- (iv)  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(A_\zeta^k = \infty) = 1$ .
- (v) *The time changed process of  $X^{\text{res}}$  by  $A_t^k$  is conservative.*

**Remark 2.11.** Since  $X$  is the subprocess of  $X^{\text{res}}$  by  $\exp(-A_t^k)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}_x(\tau_n < \zeta \leq t) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(\int_0^\zeta 1_{\{\tau_n(k_s) < \zeta(k_s) \leq t\}}\left(-de^{-A_s^k}\right)\right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t\right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(\int_{\tau_n}^\zeta\left(-de^{-A_s^k}\right)\right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t\right). \end{aligned}$$

The left and right hand side tend to  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p \leq t)$  and  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t\right)$  respectively by letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and thus

$$(2.27) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p \leq t) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}\left(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t\right).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i \leq t) &= 1 - \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta > t) - \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p \leq t) \\ &= 1 - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k}; \zeta > t \right) - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta \leq t \right), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(2.28) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i \leq t) = 1 - \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\zeta \wedge t}^k} \right).$$

Corollary 2.9 is regarded as identities obtained by limiting equations (2.27) and (2.28) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 2.12.** For  $\lambda > 0$ , denote by  $(\text{SCI}_\lambda)$ (resp.  $(\text{EK}_\lambda)$ ) the stochastic completeness at infinity (resp. explosion by killing) of  $(\mathcal{E}_\lambda (= \mathcal{E} + \lambda(\cdot, \cdot)), \mathcal{F})$ . Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{SCI}) \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) = 0 &\iff (\text{SCI}_\lambda) \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k - \lambda \zeta}; \zeta < \infty \right) = 0 \\ &\iff (\text{EK}_\lambda) \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k - \lambda \zeta} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (SCI) is equivalent to  $(\text{SCI}_\lambda)$  and  $(\text{EK}_\lambda)$  for any  $\lambda > 0$ .

**Lemma 2.13.** For  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &\leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t); t < \zeta \right) \\ &+ \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}); t \geq \zeta \right) - \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} h^-(X_{\sigma_n}); t \geq \zeta \right) \text{ q.e.} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* On account of (2.11) we have for  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$

$$h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \text{ q.e.}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h^+(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}); t < \zeta \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}); t \geq \zeta \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h^-(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}); t < \zeta \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} h^-(X_{\sigma_n}); t \geq \zeta \right) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t); t < \zeta \right) + \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}); t \geq \zeta \right) \\ &\quad - \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} h^-(X_{\sigma_n}); t \geq \zeta \right) \end{aligned}$$

the proof is completed.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.14.** Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \cap C(E_\infty)$ . Then

$$(2.29) \quad h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t); t < \zeta \right) + h(\infty) \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; t \geq \zeta \right) \text{ q.e.}$$

**Lemma 2.15.** If  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ , then for  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$

$$h(x) \leq p_t h(x) \text{ q.e.}$$

In particular,  $\mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{sub}}$ .

*Proof.* If  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ , the expectations on  $\{t \geq \zeta\}$  in the proof of Lemma 2.13 disappear. Hence

$$h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t) \right) = p_t h(x) \quad \text{q.e.}$$

□

**Proposition 2.16.** *Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \cap C(E_\infty)$ . If  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = 1$ , then*

$$(2.30) \quad h(x) \leq h(\infty) \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) (= h(\infty) \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^p < \infty)) \quad \text{q.e.}$$

*Proof.* The right hand side of (2.29) tends to the right hand side of (2.30) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} h(X_t); t < \zeta \right) &\leq \|h^+\|_\infty \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\infty^k}; \zeta = \infty \right) \\ &= \|h^+\|_\infty \mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \infty) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; t \geq \zeta \right) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right).$$

□

**Proposition 2.17.** *If  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1$ , then every  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$  is non-positive for q.e.  $x$ .*

*Proof.* We see from Lemma 2.13 that

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &\leq \|h^+\|_\infty \left( \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k}; t < \zeta \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; t \geq \zeta \right) \right) \\ &\rightarrow \|h^+\|_\infty \left( \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\infty^k}; \zeta = \infty \right) + \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty \right) \right), \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The equation in parentheses equals 0 by Corollary 2.9 and the assumption in this proposition. □

Put

$$(2.31) \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \cap \mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}}.$$

Applying Proposition 2.17, we have a next Liouville property:

**Theorem 2.18.** *If  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1$ , then every function in  $\mathcal{S}$  is zero q.e.  $x$ .*

**Lemma 2.19.** *The function  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty)$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\infty^k}; \zeta = \infty)$  and  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\zeta^k})$  belong to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$ .*

*Proof.* Put  $g(x) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty)$ . By the Markov property

$$\begin{aligned} p_t g(x) &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k - A_{\zeta(\theta_t)}^k(\theta_t)}; t < \zeta, \zeta(\theta_t) < \infty \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k}; t < \zeta < \infty \right) \leq g, \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $g$  is  $p_t$ -excessive. Let  $\varphi$  be a strictly positive function in  $L^2(E; m) \cap C(E)$  and define  $g_n = g \wedge nR_1\varphi$ . Then  $g_n \in L^2(E; m)$ ,  $g_n \leq nR_1\varphi (\in \mathcal{F})$  and  $e^{-t}p_t g_n \leq g_n$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , and thus  $g_n \in \mathcal{F}$  by [9, Lemma 2.3.2]. Since  $O_n := \{R_1\varphi > 1/n\}$  are open sets satisfying  $O_n \uparrow E$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $g = g_n$  on  $O_n$ ,  $g$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ . On account of the boundedness of  $g$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$ .



By the same argument above, we can show that the other functions belong to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.20.** *The functions  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty)$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\infty^k}; \zeta = \infty)$  and  $\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\zeta^k})$  belong to  $\mathcal{S}$ .*

*Proof.* Put  $g(x) = \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(e^{-A_\zeta^k}; \zeta < \infty)$ . Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$  and  $\{\psi_n\} \subset \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$  the sequence defined in Lemma 2.1. Since

$$\begin{aligned} p_t(g\psi_n)(x) &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k} \mathbf{E}_{X_t}^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} 1_{\{\zeta < \infty\}} \right) \psi_n(X_t) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_t^k - A_{\zeta(\theta_t)}^k(\theta_t)} 1_{\{t < \zeta, \zeta(\theta_t) < \infty\}} \psi_n(X_t) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} 1_{\{\zeta < \infty\}} \psi_n(X_t) \right), \\ (g\psi_n - p_t(g\psi_n), \varphi)_m &= (g - p_t(g\psi_n), \varphi)_m \\ &= \left( \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_\zeta^k} 1_{\{\zeta < \infty\}} (1 - \psi_n(X_t)) \right), \varphi \right)_m. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq (g\psi_n - p_t(g\psi_n), \varphi)_m &\leq (\mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}}(1 - \psi_n(X_t)), \varphi)_m \\ &\leq (1 - p_t^{\text{res}}\psi_n, \varphi)_m \\ &= (\psi_n - p_t^{\text{res}}\psi_n, \varphi)_m, \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $0 \leq \mathcal{E}(g\psi_n, \varphi) \leq \mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}(\psi_n, \varphi)$ . Noting that  $1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger$ , we see from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}(\psi_n, \varphi) = \mathcal{E}^{\text{res}}(1, \varphi) = 0$$

and so  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(g\psi_n, \varphi) = 0$ . Using Lemma 2.1 again, we have  $\mathcal{E}(g, \varphi) = 0$ .

By the same argument above, we can show that the other functions also belong to  $\mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

Theorem 2.18 and Lemma 2.20 lead to

**Corollary 2.21.** *The next statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1$ .
- (ii) If  $h \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $h = 0$ , q.e.

*Proof.* The implication from (i) to (ii) follows from Theorem 2.18. On account of Lemma 2.20, It follow from (ii) that  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1$  q.e. Noting that  $g(x) := \mathbf{E}_x(e^{-A_\zeta^k})$  is an excessive function,  $p_t g(x) \leq g(x)$  and  $p_t g(x) \uparrow g(x)$ , we see that  $g$  is finely continuous and conclude that  $g(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in E$  and so  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1 - g(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in E$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.22.** For  $\lambda > 0$ , denote by  $X^{(\lambda)} = (\mathbf{P}_x^{(\lambda)}, X_t, \zeta)$  be the  $\lambda$ -killing process of  $X$ , that is the Hunt process generated by  $(\mathcal{E}_\lambda, \mathcal{F})$ . By Remark 2.12, (SCI) of  $X$  is equivalent to  $(\text{SCI})_\lambda$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_x^{(\lambda)}(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) = 1$ . Hence we see from Corollary 2.21 that (SCI) of  $X$  is equivalent to that if  $h \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda := \mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sub}} \cap \mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sup}}$ , then  $h = 0$ , q.e., where  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sub}}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda^{\text{sup}}$  are the space of subsolutions and supersolutions associated with  $(\mathcal{E}_\lambda, \mathcal{F})$ .

**Example 2.23.** For a non-negative function  $k$  in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  define

$$\mathcal{E}(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla u, \nabla v) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2 k(x) dx, \quad u \in \mathbb{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C_0(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Here  $\mathbb{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is the Sobolev space of order 1. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the closure of the form above and denote by  $\mathbf{P}_x$  the process generated by  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ . Then  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}$  is the Brownian motion  $(\mathbf{P}_x^B, X_t)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbf{P}_x$  is the killed process of  $\mathbf{P}_x^B$  by the multiplicative functional  $\exp(-\int_0^t k(X_s) ds)$ . Since the Brownian motion is conservative,  $\mathbf{P}_x$  satisfies (SCI), and  $\mathbf{P}_x$  satisfies the (EK) if and only if

$$\mathbf{P}_x^B \left( \int_0^\infty k(X_t) dt = \infty \right) = 1, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let  $h$  be a bounded, twice continuously differentiable function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $-(1/2)\Delta h(x) + k(x)h(x) = 0$ , in particular,  $-(1/2)\Delta h(x) + \lambda h(x) = 0$  ( $\lambda > 0$ ), then  $h(x) \equiv 0$  by Corollary 2.21.

If

$$\mathbf{P}_x^B \left( \int_0^\infty k(X_t) dt < \infty \right) > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

then  $P_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) > 0$  and  $P_x(\zeta = \zeta^i < \infty) + P_x(\zeta = \infty) = 1$ .

**Example 2.24.** Let  $\bar{E}$  be a compactification of  $E$ . Suppose that a subsolution  $h$  is continuous on  $\bar{E}$  and  $\sup_{x \in E} h(x) (= \max_{x \in \bar{E}} h(x)) \geq 0$ . If  $\mathbf{P}_x^{\text{res}}(\tau_E < \infty) = 1$ , the argument similar to that of Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.16 leads that

$$h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x(h(X_{\tau_E-}); \tau_E = \tau_E^p < \infty),$$

where  $\tau_E$  is the first exit time from  $E$ ;  $\tau_E = \inf\{t > 0 \mid X_t \notin E\}$ . Since  $h(X_{\tau_E-}) \in \partial E := \bar{E} \setminus E$  on  $\{\tau_E = \tau_E^p < \infty\}$ , the maximum of  $h$  on  $\bar{E}$  attains at a point in  $\partial E$ :

$$h(x) \leq \sup_{x \in \partial E} h(x), \quad x \in E.$$

Consider the absorbing symmetric  $\alpha$ -stable process  $X^D = (\mathbf{P}_x^D, X_t, \tau_D)$  on a bounded Lipschitz open set  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  (cf. [1]). Write for  $(\mathcal{E}^D, \mathcal{F}^D)$  the Dirichlet form generated by  $X^D$ . Then its killing measure  $k^D$  is

$$k^D(dx) = k^D(x)dx, \quad k^D(x) = C \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus D} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}} dy \right),$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending on  $d$  and  $\alpha$ . It is shown in [1, Theorem 1.1] that  $\mathbf{P}_x^{D, \text{res}}(\tau_D < \infty) = 1$  if and only if  $\alpha > 1$ . Note that in [1] they call the resurrected process  $\mathbf{P}_x^{D, \text{res}}$  a *censored stable process* and prove that the two processes are identical ([1, Theorem 2.1]). Let  $h$  be a function in  $\mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$  associated with  $(\mathcal{E}^D, \mathcal{F}^D)$ . We see that for  $\alpha \leq 1$  the resurrected process is recurrent because of its conservativeness and the finiteness of the Lebesgue measure of  $D$ . More strongly, it is Harris recurrent by Absolute Continuity Condition (AC) ([9, Lemma 4.8.1]). Hence, it follows from [17, Chapter X, Proposition (3.11)] that for  $\alpha \leq 1$

$$\mathbf{P}_x^{D, \text{res}} \left( \int_0^\infty k^D(X_t) dt = \infty \right) = 1,$$

and so  $h(x) \leq 0$ . If  $\alpha > 1$  and  $h$  continuous on the closure  $\bar{D}$  of  $D$ , then

$$h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{D, \text{res}} \left( e^{-A^k_{\tau_D}} h(X_{\tau_D-}) \right).$$

### 3. STRONG MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE

Let  $h$  be a nontrivial subsolution in  $\mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}}$  and put  $G = \{x \in E \mid h(x) < 0\}$ . Then  $G$  is a quasi-open set and so its capacity is positive,  $\text{Cap}(G) > 0$ . Thus by the irreducibility (I) and the absolute continuity (AC) of  $X$ ,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\sigma_G < \zeta) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in E,$$

where  $\sigma_G = \inf\{t > 0 \mid X_t \in G\}$  ([9, Theorem 4.7.1]). As a result,

$$\mathbf{P}_x \left( \int_0^\zeta (h1_G)(X_t) dt < 0 \right) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in E,$$

and thus by Theorem 2.7

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-t} h(x) dt \leq \int_0^\infty e^{-t} p_t h(x) dt \leq \int_0^\infty e^{-t} p_t (h1_G)(x) dt \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x \left( \int_0^\zeta (h1_G)(X_t) dt \right) < 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in E. \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that  $X$  satisfies (I) and (SF).*

(i) *Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \cap C(E)$  and  $M = \sup_{x \in E} h(x) \geq 0$ . Then  $h \equiv M$  or  $h(x) < M$  for all  $x \in E$ .*

(ii) *Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sup}} \cap C(E)$  and  $m = \inf_{x \in E} h(x) \leq 0$ . Then  $h \equiv m$  or  $h(x) > m$  for all  $x \in E$ .*

*Proof.* We will only prove (i). Since  $\mathcal{E}(h - M, \varphi) = \mathcal{E}(h, \varphi) - M\mathcal{E}(1, \varphi) \leq 0$  for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$ ,  $h - M$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_-^{\text{sub}}$  and so in  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\text{sub}}$  by Theorem 2.7. Therefore, we see from the argument above that  $h(x) - M \leq p_t(h - M)(x) < 0$ , and thus  $h(x) < M$  for all  $x \in E$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** Theorem 3.1 (i) says that if  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}}$ , then  $\sup_{E \setminus K} h(x) = \sup_E h(x)$  for any compact set  $K$ .

We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S} &= \left\{ \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset E \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_{x_n}(e^{-\zeta}) = 1 \right\}, \\ \tilde{\mathbb{S}} &= \left\{ \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset E \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_{x_n}(\zeta > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \forall \epsilon > 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.3.** ([23, Lemma 3.1]) *It holds that*

$$\mathbb{S} = \tilde{\mathbb{S}}.$$

We introduce

$$\mathcal{S}_0^{\text{sub}} = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{sub}} \cap C(E) \mid \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0, \quad \forall \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{S} \right\}.$$

Note that a function in  $\mathcal{S}_0^{\text{sub}}$  is supposed to be continuous. Imitating the definition in [2], we define the *refined maximum principle* for  $\mathcal{L}$  as follows:

**(RMP)** If  $h \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\text{sub}}$ , then  $h(x) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in E$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = 1$ . For  $x \in E$ , there exists an increasing sequence  $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  of stopping times such that*

$$(3.2) \quad \{X_{\sigma_n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{S} \quad \mathbf{P}_x\text{-a.s. on } \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\sigma_n < \zeta\}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{K_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  be an increasing sequence of compact sets with  $\cup_{l=1}^{\infty} K_l = E$  and  $\tau_l$  the first exit time  $K_l$ . By the strong Markov property and  $\{\tau_l < \zeta\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau_l \wedge \zeta} = \mathcal{F}_{\tau_l}$  ([6, p.415(f)]),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_x \left( \left( 1 - \mathbf{E}_{X_{\tau_l}}(e^{-\zeta}) \right); \tau_l < \zeta \right) &= \mathbf{E}_x \left( \mathbf{E}_x \left( \left( 1 - e^{-\zeta(\theta_{\tau_l})} \right) 1_{\{\tau_l < \zeta\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\tau_l} \right) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x \left( \left( 1 - e^{-(\zeta - \tau_l)} \right); \tau_l < \zeta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tau_l \uparrow \zeta$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ , the right hand side above tends to 0, and thus  $\{\mathbf{E}_{X_{\tau_l}}(e^{-\zeta})\}$  converges to 1 in  $L^1(\mathbf{P}_x; \Omega^p)$ . Hence there exists a subsequence  $\{\sigma_n\}$  of  $\{\tau_l\}$ ,  $\{X_{\sigma_n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{S}$   $\mathbf{P}_x$ -a.s. on  $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\sigma_n < \zeta\}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.5.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = 1$ . If  $X$  satisfies (I) and (SF), then (RMP) holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\text{sub}}$  and  $\{\sigma_n\}$  a sequence of stopping times defined in Lemma 2.5. We can suppose that

$$\{X_{\sigma_n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{S} \quad \mathbf{P}_x\text{-a.s. on } \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\sigma_n < \zeta\}.$$

Then by (2.11)

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} h(x) &\leq \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k} h^+(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x \left( h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and so by the definition of  $\mathcal{S}_0^{\text{sub}}$

$$h(x) \leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left( h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \leq \mathbf{E}_x \left( \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) = 0.$$

$\square$

#### 4. MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR SCHRÖDINGER FORMS

Under (AC), there exists a non-negative, jointly measurable  $\alpha$ -resolvent kernel  $r_\alpha(x, y)$ :

$$R_\alpha f(x) = \int_E r_\alpha(x, y) f(y) m(dy), \quad x \in E, \quad f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E).$$

Moreover,  $r_\alpha(x, y)$  is  $\alpha$ -excessive in  $x$  and in  $y$  ([9, Lemma 4.2.4]). We simply write  $r(x, y)$  for  $r_0(x, y)$ . For a measure  $\mu$ , we define the  $\alpha$ -potential of  $\mu$  by

$$R_\alpha\mu(x) = \int_E r_\alpha(x, y)\mu(dy).$$

We write  $R\mu$  for  $R_0\mu$ .

We call a Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $E$  *smooth in the strict sense* if there exists a sequence  $\{E_n\}$  of Borel sets such that for each  $n$ ,  $1_{E_n} \cdot \mu \in \mathcal{S}_{00}$  where  $\mathcal{S}_{00}$  is the set of finite, positive Radon measure of finite energy with bounded 1-potential,  $\sup_{x \in E} R_1\mu(x) < \infty$  ([9, Theorem 2.2.4]), and

$$\mathbf{P}_x(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n \geq \zeta) = 1, \quad \forall x \in E,$$

where  $\sigma_n = \inf\{t > 0 \mid X_t \in E \setminus E_n\}$ . In particular, a Radon measure  $\mu$  with  $\sup_{x \in E} R_1\mu(x) < \infty$  is smooth in the strict sense. We denote by  $\mathcal{S}$  the set of smooth measures in the strict sense.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$ .

(1)  $\mu$  is said to be in the *Kato class* of  $X$  ( $\mathcal{K}$  in abbreviation) if

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} R_\alpha\mu(x) = 0.$$

$\mu$  is said to be in the *local Kato class* ( $\mathcal{K}_{\text{loc}}$  in abbreviation) if for any compact set  $K$ ,  $1_K \cdot \mu$  belongs to  $\mathcal{K}$ .

(2) Suppose that  $X$  is transient. A measure  $\mu$  is said to be in the class  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$  if for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a compact set  $K = K(\epsilon)$

$$\sup_{x \in E} R(1_{K^c}\mu)(x) < \epsilon.$$

$\mu$  in  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$  is called *Green-tight*.

In this section, we assume that  $X$  is transient in addition to (I) and (SF). For a measure in  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  define the Schrödinger form  $\mathcal{E}^\mu$  by

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(u) = \mathcal{E}(u) - \int_E \tilde{u}^2 d\mu, \quad u \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Here  $\tilde{u}$  is a quasi-continuous version of  $u$ . In the sequel, we always assume that every function  $u \in \mathcal{F}$  is represented by its quasi-continuous version. We see that for  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$  ( $\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{F}$ ) is a lower bounded closed symmetric form ([20, Theorem 3.1]). We denote by  $\mathcal{L}^\mu$  the self-adjoint operator associated with a Schrödinger form ( $\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{F}$ ),

$$(-\mathcal{L}^\mu u, v)_m$$

It is known that for  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$  the right hand side is a lower bounded closed symmetric form and the semigroup  $\{p_t^\mu\}$  generated by  $\mathcal{L}^\mu$  is written as a Feynman-Kac semigroup

$$p_t^\mu f(x) = \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_t^\mu} f(X_t) \right),$$

where  $A_t^\mu$  is the PCAF in the Revuz correspondence to  $\mu$ .  $p_t^\mu$  has also the strong Feller property ([5]). A function  $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$  is called a *solution* (*subsolution*, *supersolution*) to  $\mathcal{L}^\mu u = 0$  if

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(h, \varphi) = 0 \quad (\leq 0, \geq 0) \text{ for any } \varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E).$$

We write  $\mathbf{S}^\mu$  ( $\mathbf{S}^{\mu,\text{sub}}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}^{\mu,\text{sup}}$ ) for the space of solutions (subsolutions, supersolutions) and introduce the function spaces:

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{S}^{\mu,\text{sub}} = \{h \in \mathbf{S}^{\mu,\text{sub}} \mid \|h^+\|_\infty < \infty\},$$

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{S}^{\mu,\text{sup}} = \{h \in \mathbf{S}^{\mu,\text{sup}} \mid \|h^-\|_\infty > -\infty\},$$

$$(4.3) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\mu,\text{sub}} = \{h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty \mid \|h^+\|_\infty < \infty, p_t^\mu h \geq h \text{ q.e.}\},$$

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\mu,\text{sup}} = \{h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty \mid \|h^-\|_\infty > -\infty, p_t^\mu h \leq h \text{ q.e.}\}.$$

Applying Itô's formula to  $e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k + A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^\mu} h(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n})$ , we have the next inequality similarly to (2.11):

$$(4.5) \quad h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k + A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^\mu} h(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \text{ q.e. } x.$$

Using the equation (4.5), we can extend results in Section 2 and Section 3 to  $\mathcal{S}^{\mu,\text{sub}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\mu,\text{sub}}$  ( $\mathcal{S}^{\mu,\text{sup}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\mu,\text{sup}}$ ). In particular, we have the next theorem.

**Theorem 4.2.** *It holds that*

$$\mathcal{S}_-^{\mu,\text{sub}} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\mu,\text{sub}}, \quad \mathcal{S}_+^{\mu,\text{sup}} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_+^{\mu,\text{sup}}.$$

Let  $g^\mu(x)$  be the so-called *gauge function*:

$$(4.6) \quad g^\mu(x) = \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_\zeta^\mu} \right).$$

Define

$$(4.7) \quad \lambda(\mu) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{F}, \int_E u^2 d\mu = 1 \right\}.$$

We then know in [3, Theorem 5.1] that for  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$

$$(4.8) \quad \lambda(\mu) > 1 \iff \sup_{x \in E} g^\mu(x) < \infty.$$

**Lemma 4.3.** ([21, Lemma 5.2]) *If  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ , then the function  $g^\mu$  is  $p_t^\mu$ -excessive, i.e.,  $p_t^\mu g^\mu(x) \uparrow g^\mu(x)$  as  $t \downarrow 0$ .*

**Lemma 4.4.** ([21, Lemma 5.4]) *If  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ , then  $g^\mu$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap C(E)$ .*

We introduce the function space of strictly positive  $p_t^\mu$ -excessive functions by

$$(4.9) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{++}^{\text{sup}}(\mu) = \{h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap C(E) \mid h > 0, p_t^\mu h \leq h\}.$$

We see that for  $h \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{++}^{\text{sup}}(\mu)$  the bilinear form  $(\mathcal{E}^{\mu,h}, \mathcal{F}^{\mu,h})$  on  $L^2(E; h^2 m)$  defined by

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}^{\mu,h}(u) = \mathcal{E}^\mu(hu) \\ \mathcal{F}^{\mu,h} = \{u \in L^2(E; h^2 m) \mid hu \in \mathcal{F}\} \end{cases}$$

is a regular Dirichlet form on  $L^2(E; h^2 m)$ . This fact can be proved in the manner of [9, Theorem 6.3.2]. As a result, if  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{++}^{\text{sup}}(\mu)$  is not empty, then  $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, \mathcal{F})$  is positive semi-definite,

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(u) = \mathcal{E}^{\mu,h}(u/h) \geq 0,$$

consequently,  $\gamma(\mu)$  in (4.7) is non-negative. Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 tell us that if  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ , then the gauge function  $g^\mu$  belongs to  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{++}^{\text{sup}}(\mu)$ . Hence, we have

**Lemma 4.5.** *For  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$*

$$(4.11) \quad \lambda(\mu) > 1 \implies \gamma(\mu) \geq 0.$$

Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ . Since for  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+^{\mu, g^\mu} \cap C_0(E)$ ,  $g^\mu \varphi$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$  by Lemma 4.4, the function  $h/g^\mu$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mu, g^\mu}(h/g^\mu, \varphi) = \mathcal{E}^\mu(h, g^\mu \varphi) \leq 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+^{\mu, g^\mu} \cap C_0(E),$$

that is,  $h/g^\mu$  is a subsolution of  $\mathcal{E}^{\mu, g^\mu}$ . Therefore, noting that  $1 \leq g^\mu \leq M < \infty$ , we see from Theorem 3.1 (i) that

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in E} h(x) = 0 &\iff \sup_{x \in E} \frac{h}{g^\mu}(x) = 0 \\ &\iff \frac{h}{g^\mu}(x) \equiv 0 \text{ or } \frac{h}{g^\mu}(x) < 0 \text{ for all } x \in E \\ &\iff h(x) \equiv 0 \text{ or } h(x) < 0 \text{ for all } x \in E. \end{aligned}$$

The equation (4.12) can be shown without the condition  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ . Indeed, we have

**Theorem 4.6.** *Suppose that  $X$  satisfies (I) and (SF).*

(i) *Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}_-^{\mu, \text{sub}} \cap C(E)$  such that  $\sup_{x \in E} h(x) = 0$ . Then  $h \equiv 0$  or  $h(x) < 0$  for all  $x \in E$ .*

(ii) *Let  $h \in \mathcal{S}_+^{\mu, \text{sup}} \cap C(E)$  such that  $\inf_{x \in E} h(x) = 0$ . Then  $h \equiv 0$  or  $h(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in E$ .*

*Proof.* We will give only the proof of (i). By the same argument as that stated in the previous paragraph of Theorem 3.1 we can prove it. Suppose that there exists  $x_0 \in E$  such that  $h(x_0) < 0$ . Then  $G = \{x \in E \mid h(x) < 0\}$  is an open set. Thus by the irreducibility (I) and the absolute continuity (AC) of  $X$ ,

$$(4.13) \quad \mathbf{P}_x(\sigma_G < \zeta) > 0, \quad x \in E,$$

where  $\sigma_G = \inf\{t > 0 \mid X_t \in G\}$  ([9, Theorem 4.7.1]). As a result,

$$\mathbf{P}_x \left( \int_0^\zeta 1_G(X_t) dt > 0 \right) > 0, \quad x \in E,$$

Let

$$\mathcal{O}(\omega) = \{t \in [0, \infty) \mid h(X_t(\omega)) < 0\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{P}_x \left( \int_0^\infty e^{-t} e^{A_t^\mu} h(X_t) dt \leq \int_{\mathcal{O}(\omega)} e^{-t} e^{A_t^\mu} h(X_t) dt < 0 \right) > 0,$$

and thus

$$\mathbf{E}_x \left( \int_0^\infty e^{-t} e^{A_t^\mu} h(X_t) dt \right) < 0, \quad x \in E.$$

Noting that  $p_t^\mu h(x) \geq h(x)$  for  $h \in \mathcal{S}_-^{\mu, \text{sub}}$  by the argument similar to that in Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-t} h(x) dt \leq \int_0^\infty e^{-t} p_t^\mu h(x) dt \\ &= \mathbf{E}_x \left( \int_0^\infty e^{-t} e^{A_t^\mu} h(X_t) dt \right) < 0, \quad x \in E. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 4.7.** ([25, Lemma 3.16]) *For  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  with  $\lambda(\mu) = 1$ , there exists a positive function  $h \in \mathcal{F}_e \cap C_b(E)$  ( $\subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}^\dagger \cap C(E)$ ) such that*

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(h, \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Moreover,  $h$  is  $p_t^\mu$ -invariant,  $h = p_t^\mu h$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *For  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  with  $\lambda(\mu) \leq 1$ , there exists a positive function  $h \in \mathcal{F}_e \cap C_b(E)$  such that  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$  and  $h \leq p_t^\mu h$ .*

*Proof.* Noting that by the definition of  $\lambda(\mu)$

$$\lambda(\lambda(\mu)\mu) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{F}, \lambda(\mu) \int_E u^2 d\mu = 1 \right\} = 1,$$

we see from Lemma 4.7 above that there exists a positive function  $h \in \mathcal{F}_e \cap C_b(E)$  such that

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda(\mu)\mu}(h, \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E).$$

Since  $\lambda(\mu)\mu \leq \mu$  and the function  $h$  is  $p_t^{\lambda(\mu)\mu}$ -invariant, we have

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(h, \varphi) \leq \mathcal{E}^{\lambda(\mu)\mu}(h, \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{F}_+ \cap C_0(E)$$

and

$$h = p_t^{\lambda(\mu)\mu} h \leq p_t^\mu h.$$

□

We introduce

$$\mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}} = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}} \cap C(E) \mid \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0, \quad \forall \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathbb{S} \right\}.$$

We define the refined maximum principle for  $\mathcal{L}^\mu$  similarly to  $\mathcal{L}$ :

**(RMP)** If  $h \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ , then  $h(x) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in E$ .

**Theorem 4.9.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = 1$ . Then for  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$*

$$\lambda(\mu) > 1 \iff \text{(RMP)}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$  and  $h \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ . Let  $\{\sigma_n\}$  be a sequence of stopping times such that

$$\{X_{\sigma_n}\} \in \mathbb{S} \quad \mathbf{P}_x\text{-a.s. on } \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \{\sigma_n < \zeta\}.$$



Then on account of (4.8) we can apply the reverse Fatou lemma to (4.5) and have

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &\leq \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^k + A_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^\mu} h^+(X_{t \wedge \sigma_n}) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_x^{\text{res}} \left( e^{-A_{\sigma_n}^k} e^{A_{\sigma_n}^\mu} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) = \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_{\sigma_n}^\mu} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \quad \text{q.e.} \end{aligned}$$

Applying the reverse Fatou lemma again, we obtain

$$h(x) \leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_{\sigma_n}^\mu} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) \leq \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_\zeta^\mu} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^+(X_{\sigma_n}) \right) = 0 \quad \text{q.e.}$$

which implies  $h(x) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in E$ .

Suppose  $\lambda(\mu) \leq 1$  and let  $h$  be the function in Lemma 4.8. By Hölder inequality

$$h(x) \leq \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{A_t^\mu} h(X_t) \right) \leq \|h^+\|_\infty \left( \sup_{x \in E} \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{pA_t^\mu} \right) \right)^{1/p} \mathbf{P}_x(t < \zeta)^{1/q},$$

and  $\sup_{x \in E} \mathbf{E}_x \left( e^{pA_t^\mu} \right) < \infty$  because of  $p\mu \in \mathcal{K}$ . Hence for any  $\{x_n\} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ ,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0$  and so  $h$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}_0^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ ; however, since  $h(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in E$ , (RMP) does not hold.  $\square$

**Remark 4.10.** By the equation (4.5) and the gaugeability,  $\sup_{x \in E} g^\mu(x) < \infty$ , every result in Section 2 and Section 3, Accordingly, Lemma 2.15, Corollary 2.17, Theorem 2.18 especially can be extended to  $\mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sup}}$  ( $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\mu, \text{sub}}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\mu, \text{sup}}$ ) under the condition  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ .

**Lemma 4.11.** For  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  define

$$(4.14) \quad \Lambda(\theta) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u) \mid \int_E u^2 d(\mu + \theta m) = 1 \right\}, \quad \theta \geq 0.$$

If the basic measure  $m$  also belongs to  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ , then  $\Lambda(\theta)$  is continuous.

*Proof.* We know from [24, Theorem 4.8] that for  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  the extended Dirichlet space  $(\mathcal{F}_e, \mathcal{E})$  is compactly embedded in  $L^2(E; \nu)$ . Hence, for  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \geq 0$  there exist functions  $u_1, u_2$  in  $\mathcal{F}_e$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(\theta_1) &= \mathcal{E}(u_1), \quad \int_E u_1^2 d(\mu + \theta_1 m) = 1, \\ \Lambda(\theta_2) &= \mathcal{E}(u_2), \quad \int_E u_2^2 d(\mu + \theta_2 m) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &= \int_E u_1^2 d(\mu + \theta_2 m) = 1 + (\theta_2 - \theta_1) \int_E u_1^2 dm, \\ k_2 &= \int_E u_2^2 d(\mu + \theta_1 m) = 1 + (\theta_1 - \theta_2) \int_E u_2^2 dm, \end{aligned}$$

and  $v_1 = u_1/\sqrt{k_1}$ ,  $v_2 = u_2/\sqrt{k_2}$ . We then have

$$\Lambda(\theta_1) \leq \mathcal{E}(v_2) = \frac{1}{k_2} \Lambda(\theta_2), \quad \Lambda(\theta_2) \leq \mathcal{E}(v_1) = \frac{1}{k_1} \Lambda(\theta_1),$$

and thus

$$k_1 \Lambda(\theta_2) \leq \Lambda(\theta_1) \leq \frac{1}{k_2} \Lambda(\theta_2).$$

Therefore, noting that  $\lim_{\theta_2 \rightarrow \theta_1} k_1 = 1$  and  $\lim_{\theta_2 \rightarrow \theta_1} k_2 = 1$ , we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{\theta_2 \rightarrow \theta_1} \Lambda(\theta_2) \leq \Lambda(\theta_1) \leq \underline{\lim}_{\theta_2 \rightarrow \theta_1} \Lambda(\theta_2),$$

which implies the continuity of  $\Lambda(\theta)$ .  $\square$

Write  $\gamma(\mu)$  for the principal eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}^\mu$ :

$$(4.15) \quad \gamma(\mu) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}^\mu(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{F}, \int_E u^2 dm = 1 \right\}.$$

**Theorem 4.12.** *If  $m$  and  $\mu$  are in  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ , then*

$$(4.16) \quad \lambda(\mu) > 1 \iff \gamma(\mu) > 0.$$

*Proof.* If  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ , there exists  $\theta_0 > 0$  such that

$$\inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u) \mid \int_E u^2 d(\mu + \theta_0 m) = 1 \right\} = 1.$$

Indeed, denote by  $u_\theta \in \mathcal{F}_e$  the function attaining the infimum in (4.14), and put  $k = \int_E u_0^2 dm$ ,  $v_\theta = u_0 / \sqrt{1 + k\theta}$ . Note that

$$\int_E v_\theta^2 d(\mu + \theta m) = \frac{1}{1 + k\theta} \left( \int_E u_0^2 d\mu + \theta \int_E u_0^2 dm \right) = 1.$$

Then since

$$\Lambda(\theta) = \mathcal{E}(u_\theta) \leq \mathcal{E}(v_\theta) = \frac{1}{1 + k\theta} \mathcal{E}(u_0) = \frac{1}{1 + k\theta} \Lambda(0),$$

we have  $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(\theta) = 0$ . If  $\Lambda(0) = \lambda(\mu) > 1$ , then there exists  $\theta_0$  such that  $\Lambda(\theta_0) = 1$  by Lemma 4.11.

For  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$  define

$$G(t) = \frac{\mathcal{E}(u_{\theta_0} + t\varphi)}{\int_E (u_{\theta_0} + t\varphi)^2 d(\mu + \theta_0 m)}.$$

Then  $G'(0) = 0$  and thus

$$\mathcal{E}(u_{\theta_0}, \varphi) - \int_E u_{\theta_0} \varphi d(\mu + \theta_0 m) = 0 \iff \mathcal{E}^\mu(u_{\theta_0}, \varphi) = \theta_0 \int_E u_{\theta_0} \varphi dm.$$

Hence  $\theta_0$  equals  $\gamma(\mu)$ , the principal eigenvalue of the Schrödinger operator  $-\mathcal{L}^\mu$ , and  $v_0 = u_{\theta_0} / \|u_{\theta_0}\|_m$  is the normalized principal eigenfunction. Hence

$$\gamma(\mu) = \mathcal{E}(v_0) - \int_E v_0^2 d\mu \geq (\lambda(\mu) - 1) \int_E v_0^2 d\mu > 0.$$

Suppose  $\gamma(\mu) > 0$  and let  $u_0$  be the function attaining  $\lambda(\mu)$ . Then

$$\mathcal{E}(u_0) - \int_E u_0^2 d\mu - \gamma(\mu) \int_E u_0^2 dm \geq 0,$$

and thus

$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{\mathcal{E}(u_0)}{\int_E u_0^2 d\mu} \geq 1 + \gamma(\mu) \frac{\int_E u_0^2 dm}{\int_E u_0^2 d\mu} > 1.$$

$\square$

**Remark 4.13.** We suppose that the basic measure  $m$  is finite and, in addition, that the operator norm  $\|p_t\|_{1,\infty}$  of the semi-group  $p_t$  is bounded by  $C(t)(< \infty)$  such that  $\int_\delta^\infty C(t)dt < \infty$  for any  $\delta > 0$ . Here  $\|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}$  is the operator norm from  $L^1(E; m)$  to  $L^\infty(E; m)$ . Then for a compact set  $K$

$$\begin{aligned} R1_{E \setminus K}(x) &= \int_0^\delta p_t 1_{E \setminus K}(x) dt + \int_\delta^\infty p_t 1_{E \setminus K}(x) dt \\ &= \delta + \left( \int_\delta^\infty C(t) dt \right) m(E \setminus K). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any  $\epsilon$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  and a compact set  $K$  such that the right hand side above is less than  $\epsilon$ , which implies  $m \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ . In particular, for a uniformly elliptic self-adjoint operator  $\mathcal{L}$  of form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( a_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right)$$

in a bounded domain  $D \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ , the Lebesgue measure is in  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ . In this case, for  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ ,  $\gamma(\mu) > 0$  is equivalent with  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ .

In general,  $\gamma(\mu) > 0$  implies  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ ; however, the converse does not always hold (cf. [23, Remark 3.1]).

We set

$$\mathbb{S}' = \{ \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset E \mid \text{For any compact set } K, \exists N \text{ s.t. } x_n \notin K \forall n > N \}$$

and put

$$(4.17) \quad \partial^M h = \inf_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \sup_{E \setminus K} h(x),$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the totality of compact sets of  $E$ .

**Theorem 4.14.** *Suppose that  $X$  satisfies (I), (SF) and let  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  with  $\lambda(\mu) > 1$ . Then for  $h \in \mathcal{S}^{\mu, \text{sub}} \cap C(E)$*

$$\partial^M h \leq 0 \iff \sup_{x \in E} h(x) \leq 0.$$

*In particular, if  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0$  for any  $\{x_n\} \in \mathbb{S}$ , then  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0$  for any  $\{x_n\} \in \mathbb{S}'$ .*

*Proof.* It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^M h \leq 0 &\iff \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0 \text{ for any } \{x_n\} \in \mathbb{S}' \\ &\implies \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \leq 0 \text{ for any } \{x_n\} \in \mathbb{S} \\ &\implies \sup_{x \in E} h(x) \leq 0 \implies \partial^M h \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Remark 4.15.** Let  $\mu = \mu^+ - \mu^-$  be a signed measure. We treat  $\mathcal{E}^{\mu^+} = \mathcal{E} + \int_E u^2 d\mu^+$  and  $\mu^-$  instead of  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mu$  in the argument above, in other words, consider  $k + \mu^+$  the killing measure. Suppose that  $(\mathcal{E}^{\mu^+}, \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E))$  is closable and denote by  $(\mathcal{E}^{\mu^+}, \mathcal{F}^{\mu^+})$  the closure. If the Hunt process  $X^{\mu^+}$

generated by the regular Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{E}^{\mu^+}, \mathcal{F}^{\mu^+})$  satisfies (I) and (SF) and  $\mu^- \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  satisfies

$$(4.18) \quad \lambda(\mu) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}^{\mu^+}(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E), \int_E u^2 d\mu^- = 1 \right\} > 1,$$

then the results above can be extended in this case.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Bogdan, K., Burdzy, K., Chen, Z.-Q.: Censored stable processes, *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **127**, (2003), no. 1, 89-152.
- [2] Berestycki, H., Nirenberg, L., Varadhan, S. R. S.: The principal eigenvalue and maximum principle for second-order elliptic operators in general domains, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **47**, (1994), 47-92.
- [3] Chen, Z.-Q.: Gaugeability and conditional gaugeability, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **354** (2002), 4639-4679.
- [4] Chen Z.-Q. and Fukushima, M.: Symmetric Markov Processes, Time Change, and Boundary Theory, London Mathematical Society Monographs Series, **35**. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [5] Chung K.L.: Doubly-Feller process with multiplicative functional, Seminar on Stochastic Processes, (1986), 63-78.
- [6] Doob, J. L.: Classical potential theory and its probabilistic counterpart, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., **262**, Springer-Verlag, (1984).
- [7] Dudley, R. M.: Real Analysis and Probability, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 74, Cambridge University Press, (2002).
- [8] Frank, R. L., Lenz, D., Wingert, D.: Intrinsic metrics for non-local symmetric Dirichlet forms and applications to spectral theory, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **266**, (2014), 4765-4808.
- [9] Fukushima, M., Oshima, Y. and Takeda, M.: Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes, Walter de Gruyter, 2nd ed. (2011).
- [10] Keller, M., Lenz, D.: Dirichlet forms and stochastic completeness of graphs and subgraphs. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **666** (2012), 189-223.
- [11] Keller, M., Lenz, D., Wojciechowski, R. K.: Graphs and discrete Dirichlet spaces, *Grundlehren Math.*, **358** (2021).
- [12] Kuwae, K.: *Stochastic calculus over symmetric Markov processes without time reversal*, *Ann. Probab.*, **38** (2010), 1532-1569.
- [13] Kuwae, K.: *Errata to: "Stochastic calculus over symmetric Markov processes without time reversal"*, *Ann. Probab.*, **40** (2012), 2705-2706.
- [14] Kim, D., Kuwae, K.: Generalized Schrödinger forms with applications to maximum principles, *Osaka J. Math.*, **58** (2021), 731-753.
- [15] Masamune, J., Schmidt, M.: A generalized conservation property for the heat semigroup on weighted manifolds, *Math. Ann.*, **377** (2020), 1673-1710.
- [16] Miura, Y.: Superharmonic functions of Schrödinger operators and Hardy inequality, *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **71** (2019), 689-708.
- [17] Revuz, D., Yor, M.: Continuous martingales and Brownian motion, Grundlehren Math., **293** Springer (1999).
- [18] Rogers, L. C. G., Williams, D.: Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. Vol. 2, Cambridge University Press (2000).
- [19] Sharpe, M.: General theory of Markov processes, *Pure Appl. Math.*, **133** Academic Press (1988).
- [20] Stollmann, P. and Voigt, J.: Perturbation of Dirichlet forms by measures, *Potential Anal.*, **5**, (1996), 109-138.
- [21] Takeda, M.: Criticality and subcriticality of generalized Schrödinger forms, *Illinois J. Math.*, **58** (2014), 251-277.
- [22] Takeda, M.: Symmetric Markov processes with tightness property. *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, **229** (2018), 489-499.
- [23] Takeda, M.: The bottom of the spectrum of time-changed processes and the maximum principle of Schrödinger operators, *J. Theoret. Prob.* **31** (2018), 741-756.

- [24] Takeda, M.: Compactness of symmetric Markov semigroups and boundedness of eigenfunctions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **372**, (2019), 3905-3920.
- [25] Takeda, M.: Maximum principles for generalized Schrödinger equations, *Illinois J. Math.* **64**, (2020), 119-139.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KANSAI UNIVERSITY, YAMATECHO, SUITA, 564-8680,  
JAPAN

*Email address:* `mtakeda@kansai-u.ac.jp`