A GEOMETRICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF INTRINSIC ULTRA-CONTRACTIVITY FOR PLANAR DOMAINS WITH BOUNDARIES GIVEN BY THE GRAPHS OF FUNCTIONS

by

Rodrigo Bañuelos and Burgess Davis

Department of Mathematics
1395 Mathematical Sciences Bldg.
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1395

Department of Mathematics & Statistics
1399 Mathematical Sciences Bldg.
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1399

Technical Report # 91-57

Department of Statistics
Purdue University

December 1991
A GEOMETRICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF INTRINSIC ULTRA-CONTRACTIVITY FOR PLANAR DOMAINS WITH BOUNDARIES GIVEN BY THE GRAPHS OF FUNCTIONS

by

Rodrigo Bañuelos* and Burgess Davis*
Department of Mathematics
1395 Mathematical Sciences Bldg.
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1395

and
Department of Mathematics & Statistics
1399 Mathematical Sciences Bldg.
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1399

Abstract
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§0. Introduction.

Let $D$ be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, and let $P_t^D(z,w)$, $t > 0, z, w \in D$, be the heat kernel for one half the Dirichlet Laplacian in $D$. We assume that $D$ has a positive eigenfunction $\varphi$ in $L^2(dz)$ with eigenvalue $\lambda$, an assumption which holds for all domains considered in this paper. Since

$$P_t^D(z,w) \leq \frac{1}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} e^{-\frac{|z-w|^2}{2t}},$$

the Markovian semigroup associated with $P_t^D(z,w)$ is ultracontractive. That is, it maps $L^2(D,dz)$ into $L^\infty(D,dz)$ for all $t > 0$. Following Davies and Simon [10] we shall say that $D$ is \textit{intrinsically ultracontractive}, which henceforth we write as IU, if the new Markovian semigroup in $L^2(\varphi^2dz)$ with kernel

$$\tilde{P}_t(z,w) = \frac{e^{\lambda t}P_t^D(z,w)}{\varphi(z)\varphi(w)}$$

is ultracontractive. That is, if it maps $L^2(\varphi^2dz)$ into $L^\infty(\varphi^2dz)$ for all $t > 0$. Davies and Simon [10], (Theorem 3.1), gave several other equivalent formulations of IU including the following: There exist constants $a_t$ and $b_t$ depending only on $t$ such that

$$(0.1) \quad a_t \varphi(z)\varphi(w) \leq P_t^D(z,w) \leq b_t \varphi(z)\varphi(w),$$

for all $t > 0, z, w \in D$. In this paper we shall also say that $D$ is IU for $t > t_0$ if (0.1) holds for all $t > t_0$. IU is closely related to estimates on the expected lifetime of certain conditioned Brownian motions ($h$–processes) in $D$, and naturally, to estimates on eigenfunctions.

In [10], Davies and Simon also introduced a weaker notion of intrinsic contractivity. Following their definition we shall also say that $D$ is \textit{intrinsically supercontractive}, which we shall write as ISC, if the semigroup of $\tilde{P}_t$ maps $L^2(\varphi^2dz)$ into $L^p(\varphi^2dz)$ for any $2 < p < \infty$ and all $t$. As with IU, Simon and Davis [10], (Theorem 3.1), have several equivalent formulations of ISC including the following: Let $Q_t(z) = \sqrt{\tilde{P}_t(z,z)}$. Then $D$ is ISC if and only if

$$(0.2) \quad \|Q_t(z)\|_{L^p(\varphi^2dz)} < \infty \text{ for all } t > 0.$$
for which of these domains the expected lifetimes of all \( h \) processes are bounded. We give a geometrical characterization for ISC, in terms of the Whitney distance, for domains in \( \mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2 \), which satisfy a capacity boundary condition, a class which includes all simply connected planar domains, (see Theorem 5). Theorem 5 leads to a result on IU, (see Theorem 6), for domains in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with the capacity boundary condition which even though not sharp, is likely to be the best that can be done in terms of the quantities used in Theorem 5.

To simplify our presentation, we first state special cases of some of our results when the domain is "above the graph of a function".

Let \( f \) be an uppersemicontinuous function on \((0,1)\), taking values in \([-\infty,0)\) which is not identically \(-\infty\). Define

\[
D_f = \{z = (x,y): 0 < x < 1, f(x) < y < 1\}.
\]

A maximal horizontal line segment, MHLS, of \( D_f \), is a subset of \( D_f \) of the form \( \{(x,y): a < x < b\} \) which is not strictly contained in another set of the same form. We call \( y \) the height of this segment. Let \( \mathcal{A} \) be the collection of all connected subsets of \( D_f \) which are unions of MHLSs, no two of which have the same height. Let \( \mathcal{A}_r \) be those sets in \( \mathcal{A} \) which contain no points with \( y \) coordinate larger than \( r \). If \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^2, |A| \) will denote its area. We have

**Theorem 1.** \( D_f \) is IU if and only if \( \lim_{r \to -\infty} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} |A| = 0 \).

If \( f \) is increasing on \((0, 1)\), Theorem 1 says that \( D_f \) is IU if and only if it has finite area. Davies and Simon [10] prove this under certain additional conditions on \( f \), but even for general increasing \( f \), Theorem 1 is new. When \( f \) is a bounded function, it was proved in B. Davis [13] that \( D_f \) is IU. This result was extended to the case when \( f \) belongs to \( L^p[0,1] \) for \( p > 1 \) by R. Bass and K. Burdzy [7]. Theorem 1 as stated was conjectured in Davis [13] and parts of our proof are modifications of the arguments used there. All our theorems are proved in ways which translate geometric information about a domain into estimates for the \( a_t \) and \( b_t \) of \((0,1)\), and in this sense they give information even for \( C^\infty \) domains. For example, for the domains \( D_f \), it can be shown that given \( \epsilon > 0 \) there are numbers \( c \) and \( C \) which can be explicitly given, such that if \( t > c^{-1} \) and \( \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} |A| < ct \),
then $a_t$ and $b_t$ in (0.1) may be chosen so that $1 \leq b_t/a_t \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ (we note that always $a_t \leq 1 \leq b_t$), while if $\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} |A| > Ct$, it must hold that $b_t/a_t > 1/\varepsilon$.

IU has also been proved for several other types of domains and we refer the reader to Bañuelos [3], where a survey of recent results is given. As is well known by now, if $D$ is IU for $t > t_0$ for some $t_0$ then the expected lifetimes of $h$-processes in $D$ are bounded, (a subject which also has been widely investigated in recent years), but the converse is false. For this connection we refer the reader to R. Bañuelos and B. Davis [6]. Our second result, which is a corollary of the proof of Theorem 1, gives a geometrical characterization for the boundedness of the expected lifetimes in $D_f$.

Let $H(D_f)$ be the collection of all positive superharmonic functions in $D_f$. For $z \in D_f$ and $h \in H(D_f)$, we write $E^h_z(\tau_{D_f})$ for the expected lifetime of the Brownian motion in $D$ starting at $z$ and conditioned by $h$ (the Doob-$h$ process).

**Theorem 2.** $\sup_{z \in D_f, h \in H(D_f)} E^h_z(\tau_{D_f}) < \infty$ if and only if $D_f$ is IU for $t > t_0$ for some $t_0$ and this in turn holds if and only if $\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} |A| < \infty$.

The equivalence of the finiteness of the two suprema appearing in the statement of Theorem 2, for a special class of functions $f$, has been proved by Xu [17], and we use some of his methods. Our main result, Theorem 3, states that if the domain $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i$, where $V_i$ is the image under an analytic map $z \rightarrow a_i z + b_i$, with $a_i, b_i$ constants, $a_i \neq 0$, of a domain $D_{f_i}$, then $D$ is IU if and only if each $D_{f_i}$ is IU, that is, satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1. We also prove an analogous extension of Theorem 2. The formal statements appear at the beginning of Section 4. We note that it is not in general true that a domain, which is the union of two IU domains, is itself IU.

The paper is organized as follows. In §1, we set up some notation and give a new proof of a lemma due to Davies and Simon [11] and Bass and Burdzy [7] which provides the probabilistic connection to IU. In §2, we prove the "only if" part of Theorem 1. In §3, we prove the "if" part of Theorem 1 and explain how the proof of Theorem 1 implies Theorem 2. In §4, we state and prove our results for domains given locally by the graph of a function. In this section we also present the characterization of ISC in terms of the Whitney distance, (Theorem 5), and its consequences for IU, (Theorem 6). We can also
give an analytical (that is, non probabilistic) proof of the special case of Theorem 1 in the case that \( f \) is increasing (see Theorem 6 and the comments at the end of Theorem 6).

Throughout the paper, the letters \( c, C, c', C' \), will be used to denote constants which may change from line to line but which do not depend on the variable points \( x, y, z, w, \) etc. \( C(r), C_1, C_2, \ldots \) are also constants but they will not change. Constants depending only on \( t \), or on \( t, \varepsilon \), and which may also change from line to line, will be denoted by \( a_t, b_t, C_t, C_{t, \varepsilon} \), etc. We will sometimes use \( \wedge \) and \( \vee \) to denote the minimum and maximum respectively.

§1. Notation and Preliminaries.

If \( f \) is negative and uppersemicontinuous, we set \( \Omega_f = \{ z = (x, y) : 0 < x < 1, f(x) < y < 0 \} \). The MHLS for \( \Omega_f \) are defined as were those for \( D_f \). If \( L \) is a MHLS we denote by \( h(L) \) and \( \ell(L) \) its height and length, respectively. If \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) are MHLs we shall say that \( L_1 \) is above \( L_2 \) if \( h(L_1) > h(L_2) \) and the vertical line through any point in \( L_2 \) intersects \( L_1 \). We also let \( T_0 = (0, 1) \times \{0\} \) and \( T_1 = (0, 1) \times \{1\} \). Notice that if \( L \) is a MHLS of \( \Omega_f \) then the union of all MHLS of \( \Omega_f \) below \( L \) is also an \( \Omega_g \), (after scaling and translating), for some \( g \), and furthermore note that each \( D_f \) is also, after translation, an \( \Omega_g \).

Points in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) will be written as \( z = (x, y) \) or \( w = (u, v) \). In Sections 2 and 3, \( D \) will always stand for a domain of the form \( D_f \) and \( \Omega \) will always stand for a domain of the form \( \Omega_f \). We will use \( \Theta \) for the generic domain in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). If \( h \) is a positive superharmonic function in \( \Theta \), we will use \( P^h_\Theta z = P^h_z \) and \( E^h_\Theta z = E^h_z \) to denote the probability and expectation associated with the Doob \( h \)-process in \( \Theta \) started at \( z \). In the case \( h \) is the Green function for \( \Theta, G_\Theta(z, w), \) (which gives Brownian motion conditioned to go from \( z \) to \( w \) in \( \Theta \)), we simply write \( P^w_\Theta z \) and \( E^w_\Theta z \). Similarly, if \( h(z) = K(z, \xi), z \in \Theta, \xi \in \partial \Theta, K \) the Martin kernel, we will write \( P^\xi_\Theta z \) and \( E^\xi_\Theta z \). We refer the reader to Doob [14] for more information on \( h \) processes. We just recall here that if \( \tau_\Theta \) denotes the lifetime of this process in \( \Theta \), then up to time \( \tau_\Theta \) the \( h \) process is a strong Markov process with transition functions

\[
P^h_t(z, w) = \frac{1}{h(z)} P^\Theta_t(z, w) h(w),
\]

where \( P^\Theta_t(z, w) \) is as in the introduction. The following result is due to Cranston and McConnell [8].
Lemma 1.1. There is a constant $C$ such that for any $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$E^h_\tau \Theta \leq C |\Theta|.$$ 

By a square $Q$ we shall always mean a closed square with sides parallel to the coordinate axes. A Whitney decomposition of $\Theta$, denoted by $W(\Theta) = \{Q_j\}$, is a collection of squares in $\Theta$ with disjoint interiors whose union is $\Theta$ and which satisfy $1 \leq d(Q_j, \partial \Theta)/\ell(Q_j) \leq 4\sqrt{2}$ for all $j$. This can be easily seen to imply $\frac{1}{10} \leq \ell(Q_j)/\ell(Q_k) \leq 10$ if $Q_i \cap Q_k \neq \emptyset$. Here $\ell(Q_j)$ is the side length of $Q_j$ and $d(Q_j, \partial \Theta)$ is the Euclidean distance from $Q_j$ to $\partial \Theta$. The Whitney decomposition gives rise to the quasi-hyperbolic distance in the following way. Fix $Q_0, Q_k \in W(\Theta)$. We say that $Q_0 \to Q_1 \to \ldots \to Q_m = Q_k$ is a Whitney chain connecting $Q_0$ to $Q_k$ of length $m$ if $Q_i \in W(\Theta)$ for all $i$ and if $Q_i \cap Q_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$, $0 \leq i < m$. We define the Whitney distance $d_W(Q_0, Q_k)$ to be the length of the shortest Whitney chain connecting $Q_0$ to $Q_k$. If $z_1$ and $z_2 \in \Theta$, we let $\rho_\Theta(z_1, z_2) = d_W(Q_1, Q_2)$ where $z_1 \in Q_1$ and $z_2 \in Q_2$. This is the quasi-hyperbolic distance between $z_1$ and $z_2$. From these definitions it follows by the Harnack inequality that if $h$ is a positive harmonic function in $\Theta$ then

$$h(z_2) \geq ce^{-C\rho_\Theta(z_1, z_2)} h(z_1)$$

where $c$ and $C$ are absolute constants.

If $\Theta$ is a simply connected domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ we let $d_\Theta(z_1, z_2)$ be the hyperbolic distance in $\Theta$. It is well known, (it follows easily from the Koebe distortion theorem and the Schwarz lemma), that $c\rho_\Theta(z_1, z_2) - C \leq d_\Theta(z_1, z_2) \leq c\rho_\Theta(z_1, z_2)$. We recall that if $\Theta$ is simply connected then the curve $\Gamma$ is a hyperbolic geodesic if it is the image of the segment $(-1, 1)$ in the unit disc under a conformal map from the disc to $D$. The hyperbolic geodesic $\Gamma$ splits the boundary of $\Theta$ into two pieces $F_1$ and $F_2$ with the property that if $z \in \Gamma$ then the harmonic measures of $F_1$ and $F_2$ with respect to $z$ are both $1/2$. This follows from the disc case by the conformal invariance of harmonic measure.

The next lemma is from Bañuelos and Carroll [5]. A weaker and somewhat different form of this lemma, which will be enough for our applications in this paper, will also follow from some of the arguments in Xu [17].
Lemma 1.2. Let $\Theta$ be a simply connected planar domain and let $\Gamma$ be a hyperbolic geodesic ending at the Martin boundary point $\xi$. Let $z \in \Gamma$ and let $\gamma$ be the part of $\Gamma$ from $z$ to $\xi$. Then if $Q \in W(\Theta)$ and $z_Q$ denotes the center of $Q$, we have

$$P^\xi_z \{ B_t \in Q \text{ for some } t < \tau_\Theta \} \geq ce^{-C d_\Theta(z_Q, \gamma)}$$

for some constants $c$ and $C$. In particular, if $Q$ intersects the curve $\Gamma$ at some point (or points) between $x$ and $\xi$, the probability in (1.2) is larger than $c$.

Next we need a well known estimate for harmonic measure in simply connected domains. (See Tsuji [16], p. 112 for a proof which even gives information on constants.)

Lemma 1.3. Let $\Theta$ be a simply connected domain. Given $\delta > 0$ and $\rho < 1$ there exists a constant $C(\rho)$ such that for all $x \in \Theta$ with $d(x, \partial \Theta) < \delta C(\rho)$,

$$P_z \{ \tau_\Theta < \tau_{B(x, \delta)} \} > \rho,$$

where $\tau_{B(x, \delta)}$ is the exit time from the ball centered at $x$ and radius $\delta$.

We now present a lemma which provides the probabilistic connection with IU. The lemma was stated without proof in Davies and Simon [11] and independently discovered later and proved by Bass and Burdzy [7]. Here we provide a different proof. Let us assume that $\Theta$ is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2$, for which the Dirichlet Laplacian has discrete spectrum in $L^2(dz)$. Notice that this condition is clearly satisfied for our domains in Theorems 1 and 2 by Theorem 1.6.8 in Davies [9].

Lemma 1.4. Suppose that for each $t > 0$ there exists a compact set $K_t \subset \Theta$, such that for all $z \in \Theta$,

$$P_z \{ \tau_\Theta > t \} \leq a_t P_z \{ \tau_\Theta > t, B_t \in K_t \}$$

where $a_t$ does not depend on $z$. Then $\Theta$ is IU.

Proof: Let $\varphi_0 = \varphi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots$ be the eigenfunctions with corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_0 = \lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots$ and normalized to have $L^2$ norm 1. Since the semigroup of $P^\Theta_t(z, w)$ is ultracontractive, (independent of the domain $\Theta$), we have that for all $z \in \Theta$,

$$e^{-\lambda_n t}||\varphi_n(z)|| = | \int_\Theta P^\Theta_t(z, w)\varphi_n(w)dw | \leq a_t ||\varphi_n||_2 = a_t.$$
Thus we have $|\varphi_n(z)| \leq a_t e^{\lambda_n t}$. On the other hand, since $\varphi$ is strictly positive and continuous, $\varphi(z) \geq C_t$ for all $z \in K_t$. Using our convention that $a_t$ may change from line to line we have,

\[ e^{-\lambda_n t/2} |\varphi_n(z)| = |E_z(\varphi_n(B_{t/2}); \tau_\Theta > t/2)| \]
\[ \leq a_t e^{\lambda_n t/2} P_z \{ \tau_\Theta > t/2 \} \]
\[ \leq a_t e^{\lambda_n t/2} P_z \{ \tau_\Theta > t/2, B_{t/2} \in K_{t/2} \} \]
\[ \leq a_t e^{\lambda_n t/2} E_z(\varphi(B_t); \tau_\Theta > t/2) \]
\[ = a_t e^{\lambda_n t/2} e^{-\lambda t/2} \varphi(z). \]

Thus (1.4) implies that for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$,

(1.6)

\[ |\varphi_n(z)| \leq a_t e^{\lambda_n t} \varphi(z), \]

where $a_t$ depends only on $t$. It is proved in Davies and Simon [10], Theorem 3.1, (and it follows very easily from the expansion of the heat kernel in terms of eigenfunctions), that (1.6) is equivalent to IU.

\[ \square \]

Remark 1. Notice that our proof shows that if (1.4) holds for $t > t_0$ then (1.6) holds for $t > 2t_0$ and this gives IU, (0.1), for $t > Ct_0$, $C$ an absolute constant, (4 will work). We shall use this in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 below.

Remark 2. IU may be defined without reference to eigenfunctions purely in terms of $P_t^\Theta(z, w)$ as in Davis [13]. However, as shown by Davies and Simon [10], [11], IU implies discrete spectrum in $L^2$.

§2. Proof of the “only if” part of Theorem 1.

We start with some lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\Theta$ be a simply connected domain, and let $Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n$ be squares in $\Theta$ with $\ell(Q_j) = \varepsilon$, $d(Q_j, \partial \Theta) \geq \varepsilon/4$ for all $j$ and such that $Q_j$ and $Q_{j+1}$ have a common side for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1$. There exist constants $c$ and $C$ such that for all $z \in Q_1$ and $S_n$ any one of the four sides of $Q_n$,

(2.1)

\[ P_z \{ B_t \in S_n \text{ for some } t < c n \varepsilon^2, t < \tau_\Theta \} > C^n. \]
Proof: Let $\Theta_\varepsilon = \{ z \in \Theta : d(z, \bigcup_{j=1}^n Q_j) < \varepsilon/4 \}$. Let $z_0$ be the center of $Q_n$. Then $P_{z_0}\{\tau_{S_n} < \tau_{\Theta_\varepsilon}\} = C > 0$ and by the Harnack inequality, (1.1),

\[(2.2) \quad P_z\{\tau_{S_n} < \tau_{\Theta_\varepsilon}\} > C^n\]

for all $z \in Q_1$.

Next, by Lemma 1.1 we have

\[E_z(\tau_{S_n}|\tau_{S_n} < \tau_{\Theta_\varepsilon}) \leq c \text{ area } (\Theta_\varepsilon) \leq cn\varepsilon^2.\]

This inequality together with the Chebychev inequality gives that

\[(2.3) \quad P_z\{\tau_{S_n} < 2cn\varepsilon^2|\tau_{S_n} < \tau_{D_\varepsilon}\} \geq 1/2,\]

which together with (2.2) gives

\[P_z\{\tau_{S_n} < 2cn\varepsilon^2, \tau_{S_n} < \tau_{D_\varepsilon}\} > \frac{1}{2}C^n,\]

and (2.1) follows. \qed

Lemma 2.2. Let $L_1$ be either $T_0$ or a MHLS of $\Omega$ and let $L_2$ be a MHLS of $\Omega$. Suppose $L_2$ is below $L_1$, $\ell(L_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell(L_1)$, and $h(L_1) - h(L_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell(L_1)$. Let $\Gamma$ be a hyperbolic geodesic in $\Omega_f$ which has one end point $\xi_0 \in T_0$ and which has a point $z \in L_2$. Then there exists a constant $C_1$ such that $\text{dist}(\bar{z}, \partial \Omega \cup L_1 \cup L_2) \geq C_1\ell(L_1)$ for some $\bar{z} \in \Gamma$, $\bar{z}$ below $L_1$ and above $L_2$.

Proof: Let $L$ be the MHLS midway between $L_1$ and $L_2$. Let $D_3$ be the points of $\Omega$ which are below $L_2$ and let $D_2$ be those that are below $L$ but not below $L_2$ and let $D_1 = \Omega \setminus (D_2 \cup D_3)$. Let $\xi_1 \in \partial \Omega$ be the other end point of $\Gamma$. We shall consider three cases, namely (i) $\xi_1 \in \partial D_1$, (ii) $\xi_1 \in \partial D_2$, and (iii) $\xi_1 \in \partial D_3$. All cases are similar so we just discuss (i).

Let $F_1$ and $F_2$ be the two sets into which the end points of $\Gamma$ divide the boundary of $\Omega$. As explained earlier, $\omega_z(F_1) = \omega_z(F_2) = 1/2$, for any $z \in \Gamma$ where $\omega_z(\cdot)$ is the harmonic measure for $\Omega$ at $z$. If $\xi_1 \in \partial D_1$, then $\partial D_2 \setminus (L \cup L_2)$ is either completely contained in $F_1$.
or completely contained in \( F_2 \). If \( L' \) is the MHLS midway between \( L \) and \( L_2 \), \( \Gamma \) cannot intersect \( L' \) at a point \( \tilde{z} \) with

\[
(2.4) \quad d(\tilde{z}, \partial \Omega) < \min \left( C\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \ell(L_1)/4, \, \ell(L_1)/4 \right)
\]

where \( C\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \) is the constant of Lemma 1.3 corresponding to \( \rho = 1/2 \). If this were to happen then by Lemma 1.3, there would be a subset \( F \subset \partial D_2 \) with \( F \subset F_1 \) or \( F \subset F_2 \) such that \( \omega_z(F) > 1/2 \), which is impossible.

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( L \) be a MHLS of \( \Omega \) such that \( \ell(L) \geq \frac{1}{2} \) and \( h(L) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \). There is a constant \( C_2 \) such that if \( z \) is on or below \( L \), then

\[
(2.5) \quad P_z\{B_{\tau_n} \in \hat{T}_0 | B_{\tau_n} \in T_0\} > C_2,
\]

where \( \hat{T}_0 = \{z \in T_0 : d(z, \partial\Omega \setminus T_0) > C_1\} \) and \( C_1 \) is the constant of Lemma 2.2.

**Proof:** We may and do assume that \( z \in L \), since otherwise we just use the strong Markov property at \( \tau_L \). We may also assume that \( h(L) = -\frac{1}{2} \), since if \( h(L) < -\frac{1}{2} \) we can just replace \( L \) by the MHLS of height \( -\frac{1}{2} \) and use the strong Markov property again. Set \( F = \{z = (x, y) \in \Omega : y > -\frac{1}{2}, \, d(z, \partial \Omega) > C_1\} \). If \( x \in T_0 \) we have by Lemma 1.2 that

\[
P^x_\tau \left\{ B_t \in \bar{Q} \text{ for some } t < \tau_\Omega \right\} > c
\]

where \( \bar{Q} \) is the Whitney cube containing the \( \tilde{z} \in F \) given by Lemma 2.2. By the Harnack inequality, we have

\[
P^x_\tau (\tau_F < \tau_\Omega) > c,
\]

which implies

\[
(2.6) \quad P_z(\tau_F < \tau_\Omega) > c P_z(\tau_{\tau_n} \in T_0).
\]

Next, if \( w \in F \), we can construct squares \( Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n \) with \( w \in Q_1, \, n \) depending on \( C \), but not on \( w, \ell(Q_j) = C \) and \( d(Q_j, \partial \Omega) > C, \, C \) also depending on \( C_1 \) but not on \( w \). Furthermore we can construct this chain in such a way that \( Q_j \) and \( Q_{j+1} \) have a common side, and such that any curve in \( G = \{w : d(w, \cup Q_i) < C\} \) which connects \( w \) to the top side \( S_n \) of \( Q_n \) must intersect \( \hat{T}_0 \). By Lemma 2.1, there is \( c' \) not depending on \( w \) such that

\[
P_w(\tau_{S_n} < \tau_G) > c',
\]
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implying

\[ P_w(\tau_\Omega = \tau_{T_0}) > c'. \]

The lemma now follows from (2.6), (2.7) and the strong Markov property at \( \tau_F \).

In general, if \( L \) is a MHLS of \( \Omega \) we define \( \hat{L} = \{ z \in L : d(z, \partial\Omega \setminus T_0) > C_1 \ell(L) \} \), where \( C_1 \) is the constant of Lemma 2.2 and if \( L \) is a MHLS of \( D \) we define \( \hat{L} \) analogously.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a set of the form \( \bigcup_{\gamma \leq r \leq 0} ((a(r), b(r)) \times \{r\}) \) where \( \gamma \leq -2 \) and \( (a(r_2), b(r_2)) \subseteq (a(r_1), b(r_1)) \subseteq (0, 1) \) if \( \gamma \leq r_2 \leq r_1 \leq 0 \). There exist numbers \( \gamma = a_0 \leq a_1' < a_1 \leq a_2' < \ldots < a_M \) such that

(i) \( -2 \leq a_M \leq 0 \)

(ii) \( a_i - a_i' = \lambda(a_{i-1}') \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda(a_i), \ 1 \leq i \leq M \)

and

(iii) \( a_i - a_{i-1} \leq 2\lambda(a_i), \ 1 \leq i \leq M. \)

**Proof:** With \( a_0 = \gamma \) let \( z_0 = a_0, z_1 = z_0 + \lambda(z_0), \ldots, z_j = z_{j-1} + \lambda(z_{j-1}) \) and let \( N = \inf\{ j : \lambda(z_j) \leq 2\lambda(z_{j-1}) \} \). Set \( a'_1 = z_{N-1} \) and \( a_1 = z_N \). Let \( a_1 \) now play the role of \( a_0 \) and define \( a'_2 \) and \( a_2 \) in the same way. Continuing this way we get \( a_0 \leq a'_1 < a_1 \leq a'_2 < \ldots. \)

Let us now define \( M \). First, we claim that \( a'_1 < -1 \). To see this observe that by definition, \( \lambda(z_{j-1}) < \frac{1}{2} \lambda(z_j) \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq N - 1 \). Also, since \( \lambda(\gamma) \leq 1 \), we must have \( \lambda(z_j) < \frac{1}{2} \) for \( 0 \leq j \leq N - 2 \). Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
a'_1 - a_0 &= (\lambda(z_0) + \ldots + \lambda(z_{N-3})) + \lambda(z_{N-2}) \\
&< (\frac{1}{2} \lambda(z_1) + \ldots + \frac{1}{2} \lambda(z_{N-2})) + \lambda(z_{N-2}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(\lambda(z_1) + \ldots + \lambda(z_{N-3})) + (1 + \frac{1}{2})\lambda(z_{N-2}).
\end{align*}
\]

Continuing this way and using the fact that \( a_0 \leq -2 \) we find that

\[
a'_1 + 2 \leq a'_1 - a_0 < (1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \ldots)\lambda(z_{N-2}) < 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} = 1
\]

and so \( a'_1 < -1 \). Thus \( a_1 < 0 \). We define \( M = \min\{ j : a_j \geq -2 \} \). The properties (i) and (ii) are clear from the definition of \( N \) and \( M \). For (iii), let \( z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_N \) be the \( z_j \)'s
constructed by starting with $z_0 = a_{i-1}$. Then $a_i - a_{i-1} = (\lambda(z_0) + \ldots + \lambda(z_{N-2})) + \lambda(z_{N-1})$ and continuing as in (2.8), (iii) follows.

We now complete the proof of the "only if" part of Theorem 1. Let us first note that if $\lim_{r \to -\infty} \sup_{A \in A_r} |A| > 0$ then one or both of the following hold:

(i) $\sup_{A \in A} |A| = \infty$.

(ii) There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $A_\epsilon \in A$ such that each MHLS contained in $A_\epsilon$ has length smaller than $\epsilon$ and $|A_\epsilon| > \delta$.

Suppose (i) holds. Let $N > 0$ and $A \subset A$ be such that $|A \cap \{y \leq -2\}| > N$. By Lemma 2.4 and scaling so that the top line of $A$ is scaled to have length 1 and assumes the role of $T_0$, we may find disjoint intervals $(d_k, e_k), 1 \leq k \leq n$, such that $(d_k, e_k) \subset \{y: (x, y) \in A\}$ and the MHLS of $A$ of height $e_k$ has length at most twice the length of the MHLS in $A$ of height $d_k$ which equals $e_k - d_k$ and such that if $\Gamma_k = \{(x, y) \in A: d_k < y < e_k\}$ then $\Sigma |\Gamma_k| \geq C \sum |\Gamma_k| \geq C \sum |\Gamma_k| + c$.

Let $z$ be a point below the MHLS in $A$ of height $d_1$. Let $\Gamma$ be a geodesic with one end point at $z = (1/2, 1)$ and which contains $z$. By Lemma 2.2 there exists a Whitney cube $Q_k$ in each $\Gamma_k$ which touches this geodesic and such that $|\Gamma_k| \leq C |Q_k|$. By Lemma 1.2,

$$P_{x}^{t} \{\tau_{Q_k} < \tau_{D}\} > C.$$ 

By Theorem 1.1 in Davis [12] (or Corollary 2.2 in Bañuelos and Carroll [5]),

$$E_{x}^{t} \{\tau_{D}\} \geq C \sum |Q_k| \geq C \sum |\Gamma_k| \geq C \left( |A \cap \{y \leq -2\}| - c \right) \geq CN - c.$$ 

Now, $N$ may be arbitrarily large. Thus if (i) holds, the domain $D$ does not have the expected lifetime property and hence it is not IU; (see Bañuelos and Davis [6]).

Before we deal with case (ii) we make some observations concerning IU. The left equality of (1.5) with $n = 0$ implies that in (0.1) with $D = \Theta$ we may always choose $a_t = a_t$ nondecreasing as $t$ increases and $b_t$ nonincreasing as $t$ increases, if $\Theta$ is IU. From this it follows that there is a $C_t$, depending only on $t$, such that

$$\int_{t}^{2t} P_{s}^{\Theta}(z, w) ds \geq C_t \int_{2t}^{\infty} P_{s}^{\Theta}(z, w) ds.$$

By definition,

$$P_{z}^{t} \{\tau_{\Theta} > t\} = \frac{1}{G_{\Theta}(z, w)} \int_{\Theta} P_{t}^{\Theta}(z, \tilde{z})G_{\Theta}(\tilde{z}, w) d\tilde{z},$$
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for any $z, w \in \Theta$. Differentiating both sides of (2.10) in $t$ and integrating by parts we find that the density of $\tau_\Theta$ under $P^w_z$ is given by $P^w_\Theta(z, w)/G_\Theta(z, w)$. Thus dividing both sides of (2.9) by $G_\Theta(z, w)$ we obtain

$$P^w_z \{ t < \tau_\Theta < 2t \} \geq C_t P^w_z \{ \tau_\Theta > 2t \}$$

for all $z, w \in \Theta$. Since $C_t$ depends only on $t$, we also have that for any $z \in \Theta$ and $\xi \in \partial \Theta$,

$$P^\xi_z \{ t < \tau_\Theta < 2t \} \geq C_t P^\xi_z \{ \tau_\Theta > 2t \}.$$

Let us now assume that (ii) holds. Then as in case (i) for large enough $n$ there exists a hyperbolic geodesic $\Gamma_n$ ending at $\xi_n \in T_1$ and a collection of Whitney cubes $Q^n_1, Q^n_2, \ldots, Q^n_{n'}$ in $A_\frac{1}{n}$ such that $\ell(Q^n_j) < \frac{1}{n}$ for all $j$, $\bigcup_{j=1}^{n'} Q_j > C \delta$, and with $Q^n_j$ touching the geodesic $\Gamma_n$ for every $j$. Let $R_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n'} Q_j$ and let $z_n$ be a point in $D$ such that each of the $Q^n_j$, $1 \leq j \leq n'$, touches that part of $\Gamma_n$ between $z_n$ and $\xi_n$. Let $T_{R_n}$ be the total time $B_t$ spends in $R_n$. That is,

$$T_{R_n} = \int_0^{\tau_D} 1(B_t \in R_n) dt.$$

Then by Lemma 1.2 and Theorem 1.1 in Davis [12] (or Corollary 2.2 in Bañuelos and Carroll [5]),

$$E_{z_n^T} T_{R_n} \geq C|R_n| \geq C \delta.$$

By the argument used to prove (5.1) in Davis [12] there exists $h_n$ which goes to zero as $n$ goes to infinity such that

$$\var (T_{R_n}) \leq h_n|R_n|^2,$$

where by $\var(T_{R_n})$ we mean the variance of $T_{R_n}$ with respect to the measure $P^\xi_{z_n}$. This implies there is a constant $k = k(\delta)$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} P^\xi_{z_n} \{ T_{R_n} > k \} = 1$ and hence

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P^\xi_{z_n} \{ \tau_D > k \} = 1.$$

Then with $t = k/2$, $P^\xi_{z_n} \{ \tau_D > 2t \} \to 1$ and $P^\xi_{z_n} \{ t < \tau_D < 2t \} \to 0$, contradicting (2.12) with $D = \Theta$. Thus the proof of the "only if" part is complete. \qed
§3. Proof of the “if” part of Theorem 1.

Lemma 3.1. Let $z_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \Omega$. There exists a constant $C_3$ such that

$$ E_{z_0} (\tau_\Omega | B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0) \leq C_3 + C_3 |y_0|. $$

Proof: Let $h(z) = P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0 \}$, the harmonic measure of $T_0$ with respect to $\Omega$. Let $u(z) = P_z \{ B_{\tau_S} \in T_0 \}$ where $S$ is the half strip $\{(x, y) : 0 < x < 1, y < 0\}$. Clearly $h(z) \leq u(z)$ for all $z \in \Omega$. Let $v(z) = 1 - u(z)$. Then $v(z)$ is a positive harmonic function in $S$ which vanishes on $T_0$. As is well known, such functions cannot vanish faster than the distance to the boundary. That is, for $y > -C$, where $C$ is small enough,

$$ v(z) \geq c|y| $$

where $z = (x, y)$. From (3.2) we have

$$ u(z) \leq 1 - c|y|, -C < y < 0. $$

Now let $\varepsilon < \min(C, |y_0|)$. Let $L$ be the MHLS above $z_0$ and of height $-\varepsilon$. Let $\tilde{L}$ be the set of those points of $T_0$ directly above $L$ and let $z_\varepsilon = (x_0, y_0 + \varepsilon)$. If we take a path which starts at $z_0$ and terminates at $L$ and which has not exited $\Omega$ and translate it up to start at $z_\varepsilon$, it will terminate at $\tilde{L}$ and hence

$$ P_z \{ \tau_L < \tau_\Omega \} \leq P_{z_\varepsilon} \{ \tau_{\tilde{L}} = \tau_\Omega \} \leq h(z_\varepsilon). $$

From the martingale property of $h(B_t); t < \tau_\Omega$, we obtain

$$ h(z) = E_z (h(B_{\tau_L}); \tau_L < \tau_\Omega). $$

Since $h(z) \leq u(z) \leq (1 - c|y|) = (1 - c\varepsilon), z \in L$,

$$ h(z) \leq (1 - c\varepsilon) P_z \{ \tau_L < \tau_\Omega \}. $$

Thus

$$ h(z_\varepsilon) - h(z) \geq P_z \{ \tau_L < \tau_D \} c\varepsilon \geq c\varepsilon h(z), $$
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and we conclude that

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(z) \geq ch(z), z \in \Omega.$$  

Next we recall that $h$-processes satisfies the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = dB_t + \frac{\nabla h}{h}(X_t)dt$$

and hence (3.7) implies that the vertical component of the drift of the associated $h$-process is larger than or equal to $ct$ everywhere in $\Omega$. Thus if $\eta < y_0$,

$$P_{z_0}^\eta \{B_t \text{ ever gets below the line } y = \eta\} \leq P_0\{w_t + ct \leq \eta - y \text{ for any } t\} \leq e^{2c(y_0 - \eta)},$$

where $w_t$ is standard one dimensional Brownian motion, the second inequality since if $w_t$ is one dimensional Brownian motion, then $-\inf_t \{w_t + ct\}$ has an exponential distribution with parameter $2c$ (this follows from the exponential martingale).

In particular we conclude from above that the probability that our $h$ processes ever hits a Whitney square below $y = \eta$, for $\eta < y_0$, is bounded by $e^{2c(y - y_0)}$. Now

$$E_{z_0}(\tau_\eta | B_{\tau_\eta} \in T_0) \leq C \sum_{Q \in W(D)} |P_Q|Q|$$

where $P_Q = P_{y_0}(\tau_Q < \tau_{T_0}|\tau_\eta = \tau_{T_0})$, which follows from Theorem 1.1 of Davis [12], upon integrating over the points of $T_0$. Together with (3.8), (3.9) proves the lemma.

**Remark.** One can also use Corollary 2.2 in Bañuelos and Carroll [5] to prove Lemma 2.3, by using the fact that hyperbolic distance decreases with increasing domains, and the easily computable distance in $S$.

**Lemma 3.2.** There is a positive constant $C(r), -\infty < r < 0$, which is bounded below on bounded subsets of $(-\infty, 0)$ such that if $z = (x, y) \in \Omega$,

$$P_z\{\tau_\eta > 2|y|\} \leq C(y)P_z\{B_{\tau_\eta} \in T_0, \tau_\eta < 2|y|\}.$$
**Proof:** Let $L_{2y}$ be the horizontal line at level $2y$. Let $\tau_{2y}$ be the hitting time of $L_{2y}$. Set

$$A = \{\tau_{2y} < \tau_\Omega; \tau_{2y} \leq 2|y|\}$$

$$B = \{B_{\tau_n} \in T_0; \tau_\Omega \leq 2|y|\}$$

$$C = \{\tau_\Omega > 2|y|; \tau_{2y} > 2|y|\}.$$  

Notice that if we take a path in $A$ and reflect it about the MHLS $L_y$ containing $z$ after the last time before $2|y|$ it hits $L_y$ we obtain a path in $B$. Since the reflected motion is still Brownian motion, (see the explanation following (3.8) in Davis [13]); we have

(3.11) $$P_z\{A\} \leq P_z\{B\}.$$  

Next we apply the Girsanov argument used in [13]. Under the transformation $B_t + t$ for $0 \leq t \leq 2|y|$, any path from $C$ is transformed into a path in $B$. Thus if we apply (2.9) in [13] with $M = 2|y|$ we have

(3.12) $$P_z\{C\} \leq C(y)P_z\{B\}$$

which together with (3.11) proves the lemma, since $\{\tau_\Omega > 2|y|\} \subset A \cup C$.  

**Lemma 3.3.** Let $L$ be a MHLS of $D = D_f$ which lies below $T_0$. Then if $z \in \hat{L}$ and $w$ is on or below $L$,

(3.13) $$P_w\{\tau_D > t\} \leq C_tP_z\{\tau_D > t\}.$$  

**Proof:** Let $K = [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}] \times [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}]$. Let $\tilde{z}$ be any point directly above $w$. That is, if $w = (u, v)$, then $\tilde{z} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ with $\tilde{x} = u$, $v < \tilde{y}$. By translating the path up we see that

(3.14) $$P_w\{\tau_D > t\} + P_w\{\tau_D \leq t, B_{\tau_D} \in T_1\}$$

$$\leq P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_D > t\} + P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_D \leq t, B_{\tau_D} \in T_1\}.$$  

By the argument used to prove inequality (3.4) in Davis [13] (the reader may read the proof of (3.4) in [13] without reading the rest of that paper; just substitute $K$ and $D$ for
A and \(\Omega\) respectively, note that we never use \(Im x \geq -1/4\), and that to hit \((0, 1) \times \{1\}\) without hitting \(A\) you must hit \(L\) without hitting \(A\) we have

\[
P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_D \leq t, B_{\tau_D} \in T_1\} \leq C_t P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_K < \tau_D, \tau_K < t\},
\]

and we may even take \(C_t = 1\). Since \(\inf_{z \in K} P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_D > t\} = C_t > 0\), the right hand side of (3.15) is less than \(C_t P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_D > t\}\). This together with (3.14) imply that

\[
P_w\{\tau_D > t\} \leq C_t P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_D > t\}.
\]

If we now let \(V\) be the vertical line through \(w\) and \(\tau_{V^+}\) the hitting time of those points in \(V\) above \(L\). The lemma then follows from the strong Markov property provided we show that

\[
P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_{V^+} < \tau_D\} > C
\]

for some constant \(C\) independent of \(z\). To see (3.17) we may assume that \(V^+\) is to the left of \(z\). Let \(\varepsilon = \frac{C_1}{4}\ell(L)\) where \(C_1\) is the constant in the definition of \(\tilde{L}\). Let \(Q_1\) be the square centered at \(z\) and with side length \(\varepsilon\). Let \(Q_2\) be the square of same size as \(Q_1\) and on top of \(Q_1\). That is, the bottom side of \(Q_2\) is the top side of \(Q_1\). Let \(Q_3\) be the square of same size as \(Q_2\) and on the left of \(Q_2\). That is, the left side of \(Q_2\) is the right side of \(Q_3\). Continuing this way we get squares \(Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\) where \(n\) depends only on \(C_1\) and such that \(V^+ \cap Q_n \neq \emptyset\). Our desired inequality (3.17) now follows from the Harnack inequality, applied to the domain consisting of all points within \(\varepsilon/2\) of \(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} Q_i\). Even though this domain is not necessarily contained in \(D\), if a curve in this domain, started at \(z\), hits \(V^+\), it also hits \(V^+\) before leaving \(D\). \(\square\)

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \(L\) be a MHLS of \(\Omega\) such that \(-1 \leq h(L) \leq -\frac{1}{2}\) and \(\ell(L) \geq \frac{1}{2}\). There are constants \(C_4\) and \(C_5\) such that

\[
P_{\tilde{z}}\{B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \tilde{T}_0, \tau_\Omega < C_4\} \geq C_5[P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_\Omega < C_4, B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0\} + P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_\Omega > C_4\}]
\]

for \(z = (x, y)\) on or below \(L\) and \(y \geq -2\).

**Proof:** Let \(d\) be the distance between \(T_0\) and \(L\). By Lemma 3.1,

\[
P_{\tilde{z}}\{\tau_\Omega \geq t | B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0\} \leq \frac{1}{t} E_{\tilde{z}}(\tau_\Omega | B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{t}(C_3 + C_3d) \leq \frac{3C_3}{t}.
\]

17
Together with Lemma 2.3, this implies
\[ P_z \{ \tau_\Omega \geq t, B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0 \} \leq \frac{3C_2}{C_2^t} P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0 \}. \]

Thus
\[ C_2 P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0 \} \leq P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0 \} = P_z \{ \tau_\Omega \geq t, B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0 \} + P_z \{ \tau_\Omega < t, B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0 \} \]
\[ \leq \frac{3C_3}{C_2^t} P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0 \} + P_z \{ \tau_\Omega < t, B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0 \} \]

and if we choose \( t_0 \) large enough depending only on \( C_2 \) and \( C_3 \) we find that
\[ \frac{C_2}{2} P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0 \} \leq P_z \{ \tau_\Omega < t_0, B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0 \}, \]

which together with Lemma 3.2 gives the result with \( C_4 = t_0 \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.5.** Let \( L_1 \) be a MHLS of \( \Omega \) such that \(-1 \leq h(L_1) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \leq \ell(L_1) \leq 1 \). Let \( L_0 \) be a MHLS such that \( h(L_0) \leq h(L_1) \) and \( h(L_0) \geq -2 \). Let \( m \) be a subprobability measure which puts all of its mass on or below \( L_0 \) and such that \( m(\hat{L}_0) \geq \min \left( \frac{C_2}{2}, C_6 \right) m(\Omega) \). Then there is a constant \( C_6 \) such if \( \eta \) is the distribution under \( P_m \) of
\[ B_{C_6 \wedge \tau_\Omega} I(\{ \tau_\Omega > C_6 \} \cup \{ C_6 > \tau_\Omega, B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0 \}), \]

then \( \eta(+T_0) \geq \frac{C_2}{2} \eta(\Omega \cup T_0) \). Here \( C_2 < 1 \) is the constant of Lemma 2.3.

**Proof:** We can and do, without loss of generality, assume \( m \) is a probability measure. Define the function
\[ h(z, t) = P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in T_0, \tau_\Omega < t \} \]
\[ \hat{h}(z, t) = P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in \hat{T}_0, \tau_\Omega < t \}, \]
\[ g(z, t) = P_z \{ \tau_\Omega > t \}, \]
\[ f(z, t) = h(z, t) + g(z, t), \]

and
\[ \omega_z(A) = P_z \{ B_{\tau_\Omega} \in A \}, \quad A \subset \partial \Omega. \]

We first show some properties of these functions. Clearly,
\[ (3.18) \quad h(z, s) \leq h(z, t), \quad s \leq t \]
\begin{align*}
\text{and} \\
(3.19) \quad \omega_z(T_0) \leq f(z, t), \text{ for any } t.
\end{align*}

By Lemma 2.3, Lemma 3.2, and a translation of the path argument similar to that used in the proof of (3.14), we have, respectively,

\begin{align*}
(3.20) \quad \omega_z(\hat{T}_0) \geq C_2 \omega_z(T_0), & \hspace{1em} z \text{ on or below } L_0 \\
(3.21) \quad g(z, 4) \leq Ch(z, 4), & \hspace{1em} z \in L_0
\end{align*}

and

\begin{align*}
(3.22) \quad f(w, t) \leq f(z, t), w \text{ directly below } z \in L_0.
\end{align*}

From (3.21) we obtain

\begin{align*}
(3.23) \quad h(z, 4) \leq f(z, 4) \leq Ch(z, 4), & \hspace{1em} z \in L_0.
\end{align*}

Also, since \( h(z, 4) \leq \omega_z(T_0) \) we have

\begin{align*}
(3.24) \quad \omega_z(T_0) \leq f(z, 4) \leq C\omega_z(T_0), & \hspace{1em} z \in L_0.
\end{align*}

Next, if \( z_0 \in \hat{L}_0 \) and \( z \) is any other point in \( L_0 \) we have, by the strong Markov property, that

\[ \omega_{z_0}(T_0) \geq \inf_{w \in V^+(z)} \omega_w(T_0) P_{z_0} \{ \tau_{V^+} < \tau_\Omega \} \]

where \( V^+(z) \) is the vertical segment connecting \( z \) to \( T_0 \). As in (3.17), we have that \( P_{z_0} \{ \tau_{V^+} < \tau_\Omega \} > C \) and by translating the path again we see that \( \inf_{w \in V^+(z)} \omega_w(T_0) = \omega_z(T_0) \). Thus we have

\begin{align*}
(3.25) \quad \omega_z(T_0) \leq C\omega_{z_0}(T_0), & \hspace{1em} z_0 \in \hat{L}_0, \ z \in L_0.
\end{align*}

This together with (3.22) and (3.24) gives

\begin{align*}
(3.26) \quad f(w, 4) \leq Cf(z, 4), & \hspace{1em} z \in \hat{L}_0, \ w \text{ on or below } L_0.
\end{align*}
From (3.23), (3.26), and the hypotheses of the lemma we obtain,

\begin{align*}
(3.27) \quad E_m(h(B_0, 4)1(B_0 \in \hat{L}_0)) & \geq C E_m(f(B_0, 4)1(B_0 \in \hat{L}_0)) \\
& \geq C \max\{f(z, 4) : z \text{ on or below } L_0\} \\
& \geq C E_m f(B_0, 4) \\
& \geq C E_m g(B_0, 4).
\end{align*}

On the other hand if we apply the Markov property at \( t = 4 \) and use the fact that \( \Omega \) is contained in the half strip \( (0, 1) \times (-\infty, 0) \) we obtain for any \( z = (x, y) \in \Omega \),

\begin{align*}
(3.28) \quad g(z, 4 + j) &= P_z\{\tau_D > 4 + j\} \\
& \leq \sup_{x \in (0, 1)} P_x\{\tau_{(0, 1)} > j\} P_z\{\tau_D > 4\} \\
& \leq C e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}j} g(z, 4),
\end{align*}

where the last inequality follows from the fact that \( \frac{x^2}{2} \) is the lowest eigenvalue for \( (0, 1) \).

From (3.28), (3.27) and (3.18) we see that for \( j \) large enough,

\begin{align*}
(3.29) \quad E_m g(B_0, 4 + j) \leq C e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}j} E_m g(B_0, 4) \\
& \leq C e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}j} E_m(h(B_0, 4)1(B_0 \in \hat{L}_0)) \\
& \leq C e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}j} E_m(h(B_0, 4 + j)1(B_0 \in \hat{L}_0)) \\
& \leq \frac{C_2}{4} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j).
\end{align*}

From now on we consider \( j \) fixed and large enough so that (3.29) holds.

Next, by (3.19), we have

\begin{align*}
(3.30) \quad E_m \omega_{B_0}(T_0) - E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \leq E_m g(B_0, 4 + j)
\end{align*}

which together with (3.20) and (3.29) gives

\begin{align*}
E_m \hat{h}(B_0, 4 = j) \geq E_m \omega_{B_0}(\hat{T}_0) - [E_m \omega_{B_0}(T_0)) - E_m(h(B_0, 4 + j)] \\
& \geq E_m \omega_{B_0}(\hat{T}_0) - E_m g(B_0, 4 + j)
\end{align*}
\[
\geq E_m \omega B_0(\hat{T}_0) - \frac{C_2}{4} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \\
\geq E_m \omega B_0(T_0) - \frac{C_2}{4} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \\
\geq E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) - \frac{C_2}{4} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \\
= \frac{3}{4} C_2 E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \\
= \frac{3}{4} C_2 \left[ \frac{4}{5} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) + \frac{1}{5} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \right] \\
\geq \frac{3}{4} C_2 \left[ \frac{4}{5} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) + \frac{1}{4} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \right] \\
\geq \frac{3}{5} C_2 \left[ E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) + \frac{C_2}{4} E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) \right] \\
\geq \frac{3}{5} C_2 \left[ E_m h(B_0, 4 + j) + E_m g(B_0, 4 + j) \right],
\]

and thus we may take \( C_6 = 4 + j \), since \( \frac{3}{5} > \frac{1}{2} \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.6.** Let \( L \) be a MHLS of \( D \) and let \( z \in D \) be below \( L \) and a distance at least two from \( L \). Let \( \Gamma \) be the vertical line segment connecting \( z \) to \( L \) and let \( \gamma \) be the union of all MHLS of \( D \) which intersect \( \Gamma \). Let \( \gamma = y \), \((z = (x, y))\), and let \( a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_M \) be the numbers corresponding to \( \Gamma \) and \( \gamma \) guaranteed by Lemma 2.4. Let \( L_k \) be the MHLS with \( h(L_k) = a_k \), let \( \psi = \{z \in D : z \text{ below } L_M\} \), and set \( \delta = |\Gamma| \). Then

\[
P_z\{B_{r_\psi} \in \hat{L}, \tau_\psi < C_7 \delta\} \geq \min\left(\frac{C_2}{2}, C_5\right) [P_z\{B_{r_\psi} \in L, \tau_\psi < C_7 \delta\} + P_z\{\tau_\psi > C_7 \delta\}],
\]

where \( C_7 = \max(C_4, C_6) \).

**Proof:** Let \( \Gamma_k = \{(x, y) \in \Gamma : a_{k-1} \leq y \leq a_k\} \) and let \( \lambda_k = C_7|\Gamma_k| \). Let \( v_k = \inf\{t > 0 : B_t \in L_k\} \), \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, M \). We denote by \( \theta \) be the usual shift transformation for Markov Processes. Let \( T_1 = (\lambda_1 \wedge v_1), T_2 = (\lambda_1 \wedge v_2) \circ \theta_{T_1}, \ldots, T_M = (\lambda \wedge v_M) \circ \theta_{T_{M-1}} \). Notice that \( T_1 < T_2 < \ldots < T_M < \sum_{k=1}^M \lambda_k \leq C_7|\Gamma| = C_7 \delta \). Define \( A_k = \{B_{T_k} \in L_k, T_k < \tau_{\psi_k}\} \), \( \hat{A}_k = \{B_{T_k} \in \hat{L}_k, T_k < \tau_{\psi_k}\} \) and \( B_k = \{B_{T_k} \notin L_k, T_k < \tau_{\psi_k}\} \), where \( \psi_k \) is the region below \( L_k \). Notice that each \( \psi_k \) is a region of the shape \( \ell(L_k) \Omega_f \) for some \( f \). By Lemma 2.4 and scaling, we may apply Lemma 3.4 to obtain that

\[
(3.31) \quad P_z\{\hat{A}_1\} \geq C_5 P_z\{A_1 \cup B_1\} \geq \min\left(\frac{C_2}{2}, C_5\right) P_z\{A_1 \cup B_1\}.
\]
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Now, Lemma 3.5 with $m$ the distribution of $B_{T_1}I(T_1 < \tau_\phi)$, and the strong Markov property, give

\begin{equation}
P_z\{\hat{A}_2\} \geq \frac{C_2}{2} P_z\{A_2 \cup B_2\} \geq \min\left(\frac{C_2}{2}, C_5\right) P_z\{A_2 \cup B_2\}.
\end{equation}

Continuing to apply Lemma 3.5, we obtain the analog of (3.32) with $\hat{A}_M$, $A_M$ and $B_M$ in place of $\hat{A}_2$, $A_2$, and $B_2$, which proves the lemma.

We are now ready to complete the proof of the sufficiency part of Theorem 1. We retain the notation of the previous proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\phi = \phi(\varepsilon)$ so negative that the maximal length squared of the horizontal line segments of height $\phi$ is less than $\varepsilon$ and such that $\sup_{A \in A_\phi} |A| < \varepsilon$. The proof of (3.1) in Davis [13] gives a constant $C_{t,\varepsilon}$ depending only on $t$ and $\phi$, hence on $t$ and $\varepsilon$, such that

\begin{equation}
P_z\{B_t \in K; \tau_D > t\} \geq C_{t,\varepsilon} P_z\{\tau_D > t\}
\end{equation}

for any $z$ above the line $y = \phi - 2$. As above, $K = [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}] \times [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}]$. (Notice, however, that the constant given in Davis [13] gets worse and worse as $\phi$ decreases. Later in this paper we give an alternative proof of (3.33)).

Next, suppose $z$ is below the line of height $\phi - 2$. Let $L$ be the $L_M$ in Lemma 3.6 corresponding to $z$.

If $u(w, t) = P_w\{\tau_D > t\}$ then by the parabolic Harnack inequality (see [2]) for all $t < s$ and $w_1, w_2 \in \hat{L}$ we have

\[ u(w_1, t) \leq C \exp\left(c \left(\frac{|w_1 - w_2|^2}{t - s} + \frac{t - s}{R}\right)\right) u(w_2, s) \]

where $R = \min(1, t, d^2)$, $d = \dist(\hat{L}, \partial D)$. Since $d^2 \approx \ell^2(L) \approx |\Gamma| = \delta$, we have for $t > C_7 \delta$,

\[ P_w\{\tau_D > t\} \leq C P_w\{\tau_D > t + C_7 \delta\} \]

for all $w \in \hat{L}$. By this, (3.33) and the strong Markov property applied at time $\tau_L$,

\[ P_z\{B_{t+C_7 \delta} \in K; \tau_D > t + C_7 \delta\} \]

\begin{equation}
\geq C_{t,\varepsilon} \inf_{w \in \hat{L}} P_w\{\tau_D > t\} P_z\{B_{\tau_\phi} \in \hat{L}, \tau_L \leq C_7 \delta\}.
\end{equation}
where the $C_{t,\varepsilon}$ here may be taken to be the minimum of the $C_{s,\varepsilon}$ from (3.33) for $C_7\delta \leq s \leq C_7\delta + t$, assuming, as we may, that we have chosen the constants $C_{s,\varepsilon}$ from (3.33) continuous on compact $s$ intervals. On the other hand, we have

\begin{equation}
P_x\{\tau_D > t + C_7\delta\} = P_x\{\tau_D > t + C_7\delta, \tau_L \leq C_7\delta\}
+ P_x\{\tau_D > t + C_7\delta, \tau_L > C_7\delta\}.
\end{equation}

Again, the strong Markov property and Lemma 3.3 give

\begin{equation}
P_x\{\tau_D > t + C_7\delta, \tau_L > C_7\delta\} \leq C_t \sup_{w \in L} P_w\{\tau_D > t\} P_x\{\tau_L > C_7\delta\}
\leq C_t \inf_{w \in L} P_w\{\tau_D > t\} P_x\{\tau_L > C_7\delta\}
\end{equation}

and in the same way that

\begin{equation}
P_x\{\tau_D > t + C_7\delta, \tau_L \leq C_7\delta\}
\leq C_t \inf_{w \in L} P_w\{\tau_D > t\} P_x\{B_{\tau_0} \in L, \tau_L \leq C_7\delta\}.
\end{equation}

From (3.34)--(3.37) and Lemma 3.6, we obtain,

\[ P_x\{B_{t+C_7\delta} \in K, \tau_D > t + C_7\delta\} \geq C_{t,\varepsilon} P_x\{\tau_D > t + C_7\delta\}. \]

Since $\delta = |\Gamma| \leq \varepsilon$, we have proved IU, by Lemma 1.4 and the remark following its proof, for any $t > C_7\varepsilon$. Since by our assumption on $f$, $\varepsilon$ can be taken arbitrarily small, we have IU for all $t > 0$ and Theorem 1 is completely proved. $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 2.** An easy modification of the proof of Theorem 1 shows that $\alpha \sup_{A \in A} |A| < \infty$, then $D$ is IU for $t > t(\alpha)$ and this gives one direction of Theorem 2. On the other hand, in the proof of Theorem 1 we also showed that if $\sup_{A \in A} |A| = \infty$, (case (i)), then the lifetime estimate does not hold. Thus we also have completely proved Theorem 2.

§4. **Domains with Boundaries Given by Graphs of Functions**

First, we rephrase the definition of §1 of a domain with boundary given by functions. Our definition is from Bass and Burdzy [7]. A domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is said to have boundary
given by a graph of a function if there exist a finite number of orthonormal coordinate systems \( CS_1, CS_2, CS_3, \ldots, CS_n \), real numbers \( r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n \), and uppersemicontinuous functions \( f_k: (0, r_k) \to [-\infty, 0), 1 \leq k \leq n \), such that \( f_k \) is not everywhere \(-\infty\) and if \( D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V_i \) where

\[
V_i = \{(x, y): 0 < x < r_i, \; f_i(x) < y < r_i \text{ in } CS_i \}.
\]

(4.1)

**Theorem 3.** Let the domain \( D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V_i, V_i \) as in (4.1). \( D \) is IU if and only if each \( V_i \) satisfies the obvious analog of the condition of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 4.** Let the domain \( D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V_i, V_i \) as in (4.1). Then

\[
\sup_{x \in \partial D} \mathbb{E}_x^h(\tau_D) < \infty
\]

if and only if each \( V_i \) satisfies the obvious analog of the condition of Theorem 2.

The proof of the necessity is almost a carbon copy of the proof of Theorem 1, and is omitted. The proof of the sufficiency requires new arguments, which we now describe, leaving some of the details to the reader.

We let \( L^k_r, r < 1 \), stand for the intersection of \( V_k \) with the line parallel to the line \( y = 1 \) in \( CS_k \) and a distance \(-r + 1\) below (in \( CS_k \)) this line, and let \( B^k_r \) be that part of \( V_k \) below \( L^k_r \). Clearly, if \( CS_j \) and \( CS_k \) have a different orientation (that is, if the rotations involved to transform to the usual coordinate systems are different) then for small enough \( r \), \( B^k_r \) and \( B^k_r \) are disjoint.

Assume without loss of generality that \( 1 = m_0 \leq m_1 \leq m_2 < \ldots < m_{j_0} = n + 1 \) are such that \( V_i \), \( m_j \leq i < m_{j+1} \) have the same orientation and that \( \bigcup_{k=m_j}^{m_{j+1}-1} V_k = D_j \) is connected, and that \( V_{m_j} \) and \( V_{m_{j+1}-1} \) contain respectively the smallest and largest \( x \) values, in terms of \( CS_{m_j} \) (or equivalently, in terms of any of the \( CS_k \), \( m_j \leq k < m_{j+1} \)). We also insist that the \( j_0 \) sets \( \left( \bigcup_{k=m_j}^{m_{j+1}-1} B^k_r \right), 0 < j < j_0, \) are disjoint for small enough \( r \). We let, for \( 0 \leq \alpha < j_0 \), \( K_{\alpha} = \bigcup_{j=m_{\alpha}}^{m_{\alpha}+1-2} R_j \cup \bigcup_{j=m_{\alpha}}^{m_{\alpha}+1-2} \Delta_j \) where \( R_j = [r_j/4, 3r_j/4] \times [r_j/4, 3r_j/4] \) (in coordinate \( CS_j \)), and \( \Delta_j \) is a curve lying in \( D_{\alpha} \) and connecting \( R_j \) and \( R_{j+1} \). Let
$P^j_t$ denote the line parallel to the 'top' line (in $CS_{m_j}$) of $V_\kappa$, $m_j \leq k < m_{j+1}$, and such that the maximum distance of $P^j_t$ from these $m_{j+1} - m_j$ 'top' lines is $r$. Pick $t_j$ so small that $G_j$, $0 \leq j < j_0$, are disjoint, where $G_j$ is that part of $D_j$ 'below' $P^j_t$. We observe that any curve in $D_j$ which lies between $P^j_{t_j}$ and $P^j_{2t_j}$ and which starts in $P^j_{t_j}$ and ends in $P^j_{2t_j}$, upon reflection about $P^j_{t_j}$, either connects $P_{t_j}$ to $K_j$ before leaving $D_j$, or else, before leaving $D_j$ intersects from below either the line segment parallel to the 'top' of $R_{m_j}$ which connects this 'top' to the 'left' boundary of $D_{m_j}$, or the line segment parallel to the 'top' of $R_{m_j+1-1}$ which connects this 'top' to the 'right' boundary of $D_{m_j+1}$. 

Now let $D^+_j$ be that part of $D_j$ which lies 'above' $P^j_{2t_j}$, and let $D^+ = \bigcup_{j=1}^{j_0} D^+_j$. Then $D^+$ is a (connected) bounded domain, and it is easily shown that $D^+$ is IU, using either results of Bañuelos [4] or Bass–Burdzy [7] to the effect that a domain with boundary given by the graphs of bounded functions is IU. Let $K = \bigcup_{j=1}^{j_0} K_j$.

To prove sufficiency we will show

\begin{equation}
P_z(\tau_K < \tau_D, \tau_K < t) > C_t P_z(\tau_D > t)
\end{equation}

and apply Lemma 1.4, together with the strong Markov property at $\tau_K$ together with the fact that $P_z(\tau_D > t, B_t \in K) > C_t$ if $z \in K$, which holds since $K$ is compact and has positive area.

Let $D'_j$ be those parts of $D_j$ lying above $P_{t_j}$ and let $D' = \bigcup_{j=1}^{j_0} D'_j$. We first prove (4.2) for $z \in D'$. We have

\begin{equation}
P_z(\tau_D > t) = P_z(\tau_D > t) + P_z(\tau_D \leq t, \tau_D > t).
\end{equation}

Now since $D^+$ is IU,

\begin{equation}
P_z(\tau_D > t) \leq C_t P_z(\tau_K \leq t, \tau_K < \tau_D+).
\end{equation}

Thus to complete the proof of (4.2) for $z \in D'$ it suffices to show

\begin{equation}
P_z(\tau_D \leq t, \tau_D > t) \leq C_t P_z(\tau_K < \tau_D, \tau_K < t), \ z \in D',
\end{equation}

which follows, using the fact that $B_{\tau_D+} \in \mathcal{P}_{2t_j}$ on $\{\tau_D+ < \tau_D\}$, from

\begin{equation}
P_z(\tau_{P_{t_j}} < t, \tau_D > t) \leq C_t P_z(\tau_{K_j} < \tau_D, \tau_{K_j} < t), \ z \in D^+, \ 0 \leq j < j_0.
\end{equation}
To prove (4.6), reflect $B_t$ about $P_{t_j}$ after the last time, after hitting $P_{t_j}$, that it hits $P_{t_j}$ before hitting $P_{2t+1} \cup R_0$. We see that the probability that this reflected motion, which is still standard Brownian motion, exhibits the behavior described in connection with the reflection discussion above, is at least the probability that the original motion hit $P_{2t_j}$ before leaving $D^+$. An argument identical to one used in [13] to prove (3.1), now proves (4.6).

Finally, we complete the proof of (4.2). Suppose $z \in V_j$. Since $V_j$ is IU by Theorem 1, we have

$$P_z(\tau_K < t, \tau_K < \tau_D) > P_z(\tau_K < \tau_{V_j}, \tau_K < t/2)$$

$$> C_t P_z(\tau_{V_j} > t/2)$$

$$> C_t P_z(\tau_D > t, \tau_{V_j} > t/2).$$

Thus, to finish the proof of (4.2) it suffices to show

$$P_z(\tau_K < t, \tau_K < \tau_D) > C_t P_z(\tau_D > t, \tau_{V_i} \leq t/2),$$

$$= C_t P_z(\tau_D > t, \tau_{V_i} \leq t/2, B_{r_{V_i}} \in D'), z \in V_j$$

the last equality since that part of the boundary of $V_i$ which is not in $D'$ is also part of the boundary of $D$. Let $\hat{C}_t = \min_{t/2 \leq s \leq t} C_s'$, where $C_s'$ is the constant which works in (4.2) for all $z \in D'$. We can and do choose these constants bounded below on compact time intervals of $(0, \infty)$. We have on $\{B_{r_{V_j}} \in D', \tau_{V_i} \leq t/2\} = F_t,$

$$P_z(\tau_K < t, \tau_K < \tau_D | B_{r_{V_j}}) \geq P_{B_{r_{V_j}}}(\tau_K < t - \tau_{V_j}, \tau_K < \tau_D)$$

$$\geq \hat{C}_t P_{B_{r_{V_j}}}(\tau_D > t - \tau_{V_j}),$$

which, upon integration over $F_t$ gives

$$P_z(\tau_K < t, \tau_K < \tau_D) \geq \hat{C}_t P_z(\tau_D > t, F_t),$$

which is (4.7). \qed

We now present our characterization of intrinsic supercontractivity. First, as we said earlier, IU has been proved for a wide class of domains in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. In particular, in Bañuelos [4] IU is proved for what are called “uniformly H"{o}lder domains.” More precisely, a domain $D$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, is said to be in $UH(\alpha)$ for $0 < \alpha < \infty$ if

$$\rho_D(z) \leq \frac{c}{d_D(z)^\alpha} + C$$
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where $\rho_D(z) = \rho_D(z_0, z)$, $z_0 \in D$ is fixed and $d_D(z)$ is the euclidean distance from $z$ to $\partial D$, and if $D$ satisfies capacity condition

$$\text{Cap}(B(Q, R) \cap D^c) \geq C' R^{d-2}$$

for all $Q \in \partial D$ and all $R > 0$ with a similar definition relative to balls in the plane. Here, Cap denotes the Newtonian capacity. For simply connected planar domains the condition (4.8) is automatically satisfied. In Bañuelos [4], it is proved that if $D \in UH(\alpha)$ for any $0 < \alpha < 2$, then $D$ is IU and that for every $\alpha \geq 2$ there exists $D \in UH(\alpha)$ which is not IU and for which even the weaker result of the expected lifetime does not hold. For $0 < \alpha < 2$, the $UH(\alpha)$ class includes the uniformly twisted $L^p$ domains, $p > d - 1$, of Bass and Burdzy [7]. In the plane they include any domain which is of the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V_i$, $V_i$ as in (4.1) and $f_i \in L^p$ for $p > 1$ for every $i$. The results for $UH(\alpha)$ motivate the following question: Under the assumption (4.8), is $d_D^2(z) \rho_D(z) \to 0$ as $d_D(z) \to 0$, a necessary and sufficient condition for IU? First, if $\theta(x) = \frac{1}{x \log x}$ for $x > e$ and $\theta(x) = 1/e$ for $0 < x \leq e$, the domain $D_\theta = \{(x, y): x > 0, -\theta(x) < y < \theta(x)\}$ is not IU and in fact, even the lifetime estimate does not hold by Theorem 4. On the other hand, it is easy to see that $d_{D_\theta}^2(x, 0) \rho_{D_\theta}(x, 0) \sim \frac{1}{\log x}$ and thus the condition $d_D^2(z) \rho_D(z) \to 0$ as $d_D(z) \to 0$ does not imply IU. In the other direction we do have an affirmative result and even a stronger result.

**Theorem 5.** Under the assumption (4.8) $D$ is ISC if and only if $d_D^2(z) \rho_D(z) \to 0$ as $d_D(z) \to 0$.

We also have the following result for IU. Part (a) is a corollary of Theorem 5, (b) follows from the example $D_\theta$ discussed above. Part (c) follows exactly as the proof of Theorem 1 in Bañuelos [4] with minor changes and part (d) follows from Theorem 1 in Davis [13] or our Theorem 1 above.

**Theorem 6.** (a) Suppose $D$ satisfies (4.8). If $D$ is IU then $d_D^2(z) \rho_D(z) \to 0$ as $d_D^2(z) \to 0$.

(b) There exists a $D$ satisfying (4.8) such that $d_D^2(z) \rho_D(z) \to 0$ but $D$ is not IU.

(c) Suppose $D$ satisfies (4.2) and in addition

$$\rho_D(z) \leq C \frac{\eta(d_D(z))}{d_D^2(z)} + C$$
with $\eta(r) \downarrow 0$ as $r \downarrow 0$ and such that

$$
(4.9) \quad \int_0^1 \frac{\eta(r)}{r} dr < \infty.
$$

Then $D$ is IU.

(d) Let $\{a_n\}$ be any sequence of positive real numbers such that $a_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

There exists a domain $D$ satisfying (4.8) which is IU and with points $z_n \in D$ such that

$$
ca_n \leq d_D^2(z_n)\rho_D(z_n) \leq Ca_n,
$$

where $c$ and $C$ are constants independent of $n$.

Thus under the assumption (4.8), IU implies $d_D^2(z)\rho_D(z) \to 0$ but the converse is false. However, if we assume something about the rate, namely (4.9), we do have IU. In general, however, we cannot conclude anything about the rate at which $d_D^2(z)\rho_D(z) \to 0$ from IU. It is also interesting to note that for $D_\theta$ as above with any $\theta \downarrow 0$ as $r \uparrow \infty$, (4.9) is equivalent to $|D_\theta| < \infty$ which in turn is equivalent to IU by Theorem 1.

**Proof of Theorem 5.** The argument in Bañuelos [4] shows that if $d_D^2(z)\rho_D(z) \to 0$ as $d_D^2(z) \to 0$, then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $g(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$
(4.10) \quad \int_D |u(z)|^2 \log \frac{1}{\varphi(z)} dz \leq \varepsilon \int_D |
abla u(z)|^2 dz + g(\varepsilon) \int_D |u(z)|^2 dz
$$

for all $u \in C_0^\infty(D)$, (the $C^\infty$ functions with compact support in $D$). By (4.10) and Theorem 5.2(d) in Davies and Simon [10], (p. 357), $D$ is intrinsically supercontractive and the sufficient part of Theorem 5 follows. It remains to prove that ISC implies $d^2(z)\rho(z) \to 0$ as $d_D(z) \to 0$.

Assume for the rest of this section that, in addition to (4.8), $D$ satisfies

$$
(4.11) \quad \lim_{|z| \to \infty} d_D(z) = 0.
$$

We note that by Theorem A.4 in Davies and Simon [10], (p. 380), and Theorem 1.6.8 in Davies [9], (p. 39), (4.11) is always satisfied under the assumption of ISC. Under (4.8) and (4.11) we have

**Lemma 4.1.** There is a positive constant $C$ such that

$$
(4.12) \quad \int_D e^{C\rho_D(z)} |\varphi(z)|^2 dz < \infty.
$$
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Proof: We shall apply Theorem 3.1 of Evans, Harris and Kauffman [15]. First we recall that the distance function \( \rho_D \) is equivalent to the quasi-hyperbolic distance defined by

\begin{equation}
\hat{\rho}_D(z) = \int_\gamma \frac{ds}{d_D(w)},
\end{equation}

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable curves joining \( z \) to \( z_0 \) in \( D \). It is easy to show that \( \hat{\rho}_D \) is Lipschitz continuous with

\begin{equation}
|\nabla \hat{\rho}_D(z)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{d_D(z)},
\end{equation}

(see Agmon [1], Theorem 1.4). Thus if we set

\[ w(z) = e^{\hat{\rho}_D(z)} \]

we find that

\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\nabla w(z)}{w(z)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{d_D(z)}.
\end{equation}

By our assumption (4.8), there exists a constant \( C \) such that

\begin{equation}
\int_D \frac{|u(z)|^2}{d_B(z)} dz \leq C \int_D |\nabla u(z)|^2 dz
\end{equation}

for all \( u \in C_0^\infty(D) \); (this is a result of A. Ancona and we refer the reader to Bañuelos [4] for the exact reference to his paper). By our assumption (4.11) \( S_C = \{ z \in D : \frac{1}{d_B(z)} \leq C \} \) is compact in \( D \) for any positive constant \( C \). With this, (4.15) and (4.16) we may apply Theorem 3.1 of [15] to conclude that there is a positive constant \( C \) such that

\[ \int_D e^{C \hat{\rho}_D(z)} |\varphi(z)|^2 dz < \infty \]

and hence our Lemma is proved. \( \Box \)

We are now ready to prove the “only if” part of Theorem 5. Since \( D \) is ISC, \( \tilde{P}_t \) maps \( L^2(\varphi^2 dz) \) into \( L^4(\varphi^2 dz) \) for all \( t > 0 \) and by (0.2),

\[ \int_D Q^t_1(z) \varphi(z) dz = e^{2\lambda t} \int_D \left| \frac{P^D_t(z, z)}{\varphi(z)} \right|^2 dz < C_t < \infty \]
for all $t > 0$. Therefore
\[
\int_D e^{Q_P (z)} P_t^D (z, z) dz \\
\leq \left( \int_D e^{C_P (z)|\varphi(z)|^2} dz \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_D \left| \frac{P_t^D (z, z)}{\varphi(z)} \right|^2 dz \right)^{1/2} \\
\leq C \cdot C_t < \infty
\]
(4.17)

for all $t > 0$.

Next, let $Q_j \in W(D)$, a Whitney cube for $D$. By the properties of the Whitney decomposition there exists a universal constant $C$ such that $CQ_j = \tilde{Q}_j \subset D$ where by $CQ$ we mean the cube concentric with $Q_j$ and $\ell(CQ_j) = C\ell(Q_j)$. Let $P_t^\tilde{Q}_j (z, w)$ be the Dirichlet heat kernel for $\tilde{Q}_j$. Then
\[
P_t^\tilde{Q}_j (z, z) \geq \frac{C'}{\ell(Q_j)^d} \exp \left( -\frac{C't}{\ell^2(Q_j)} \right)
\]
(4.18)

for all $z \in Q_j$. This follows by first proving (4.18) for the unit cube and then scaling. From (4.17), (4.18) and the fact that $P_t^D (z, w) \geq P_t^\tilde{Q}_j (z, w)$ we have that
\[
\sum_{Q_j \in W(D)} \exp \left( \frac{C}{2} \rho_D (z_j) - \frac{C't}{\ell^2(Q_j)} \right) \leq C \sum_{Q_j \in W(D)} \int_{Q_j} e^{Q_P (z)} P_t^\tilde{Q}_j (z, z) dz \\
\leq C \int_D e^{Q_P (z)} P_t^D (z, z) dz \\
< C_t < \infty
\]
(4.19)

for every $t > 0$. Here $z_j$ is the center of $Q_j$. From the convergence of the sum in the left hand side of (4.19) we conclude that $\ell^2(Q_j)\rho_D(z_j) \to 0$ and the result follows from the properties of the Whitney decomposition and the definition of $\rho_D(z)$. □

Remark: Notice that in the above argument we only used that $\tilde{P}_t : L^2(\varphi^2 dz) \to L^4(\varphi^2 dz)$ for all $t > 0$. It is easy to show directly that this implies ISC.
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