HAL
open science

Non-tangential, radial and stochastic asymptotic properties of harmonic functions on trees

Frédéric Mouton

To cite this version:

Frédéric Mouton. Non-tangential, radial and stochastic asymptotic properties of harmonic functions on trees. 2009. hal-00475206

HAL Id: hal-00475206

https://hal.science/hal-00475206

Preprint submitted on 21 Apr 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Non-tangential, radial and stochastic asymptotic properties of harmonic functions on trees *†

Frédéric Mouton

April 21, 2010

Abstract

For a harmonic function on a tree with random walk whose transition probabilities are bounded between two constants in $(0, 1/2)$, it is known that the radial and stochastic properties of convergence, boundedness and finiteness of energy are all a.s. equivalent. We prove here that the analogous non-tangential properties are a.e. equivalent to the above ones.

We are interested in the comparison between some non-tangential asymptotic properties of harmonic functions on a tree and the corresponding radial properties, using analogous stochastic ones. We proved in a previous work [6], under a reasonable uniformity hypothesis, the almost sure equivalence between different radial and stochastic properties: convergence, boundedness and finiteness of the energy. The probabilistic-geometric methods, adaptated from those we used in the setting of manifolds of negative curvature [5], were flexible and presumed to extend to the non-tangential case for trees.

A recent article [2] shows by combinatorial methods the equivalence of the three non-tangential corresponding properties in the particular case of homogeneous trees. It seems to be time to show explicitely that our methods give in a swift way the non-tangential results for general trees satisfying the uniformity hypothesis above.

We use our previous results to compare the non-tangential notions with the radial and stochastic ones: we prove on one hand that the stochastic convergence implies the non-tangential convergence in the section 3 and on the other hand that the non-tangential boundedness implies almost surely the finiteness of the non-tangential energy in the section 4. The notations are fixed in the section 1 and our main result is stated in the section 2.

Key-words : harmonic functions — trees — Fatou theorem — random walks.

†*Math. Classif.* : 05C05, 31C20, 31C35, 60J15, 60J50.

1 Setting

Let us briefly fix the notations (for details see [6]). We consider a *tree* (S, A) i.e. a non-oriented, locally finite, connected and simply connected graph with *vertices* in S and *edges* in A. We will use the usual notions of *path*, *distance* and *geodesic path* and note $x \sim y$ iff $(x, y) \in A$.

We also consider a transient random walk $(X_n)_n$ on S such that the transition probability $p(x, y) > 0$ iff $x \sim y$. Denote by P_x the distribution of the walk starting from x and by $p_n(x, y)$ the probability $P_x[X_n = y]$ of reaching y from x in n steps.

The *Green function* $G(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n(x, y)$ is finite by transience. Denote by $H(x, y)$ the probability of reaching y starting from x. If z is on the geodesic path $[x, y]$, the simple connectivity implies

$$H(x, y) = H(x, z)H(z, y) \quad \text{and} \quad G(x, y) = H(x, z)G(z, y). \tag{1}$$

If $U \subset S$, the *Green function of* U, defined on $U \times U$, is the expectation of the number of times the walk starting from x hits y before exiting U.

The *Laplacian* of a function f on S is $\Delta f(x) = E_x[f(X_1)] - f(x)$. The function f is *harmonic* if $\Delta f = 0$.

Let u be a fixed harmonic function. The *stochastic energy* of u is $J^*(u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\Delta u^2\right)(X_k)$ (non-negative terms). The events $\mathcal{L}^{**}$, $\mathcal{N}^{**}$ and $\mathcal{J}^{**}$ are defined respectively by the convergence of $(u(X_n))_n$, its boundedness and the finiteness of the stochastic energy. The Martingale theorem implies $\mathcal{J}^{**} \overset{\sim}{\subset} \mathcal{L}^{**}$ (P_x-almost sure inclusion) [6]. It is known since P. Cartier [3] that geometric and Martin compactifications agree and the random walk converges almost surely to a point of the boundary ∂S. The exit law starting from x is the harmonic measure μ_x and $\mu = (\mu_x)_x$ is a familly of equivalent measures. Conditioning by Doob's method of h-processes gives probabilities P_x^θ (ending at θ). Asymptotic events verify 0–1 law and we define sets $\mathcal{L}^* = \left\{\theta \in \partial S | P_x^\theta(\mathcal{L}^{**}) = 1\right\}$, $\mathcal{N}^* = \left\{\theta \in \partial S | P_x^\theta(\mathcal{N}^{**}) = 1\right\}$, $\mathcal{J}^* = \left\{\theta \in \partial S | P_x^\theta(\mathcal{J}^{**}) = 1\right\}$, which determine stochastic notions of convergence, boundedness and finiteness of the energy at $\theta \in \partial S$. For $\theta \in \mathcal{L}^*$, $\lim u(X_n)$ is P_x^θ-a.s. constant (independent from x) and called the *stochastic limit* at θ.

Fix a base point o. For $\theta \in \partial S$, γ_θ is the geodesic ray from o to θ and for $c \in \mathbf{N}$, $\Gamma_c^\theta = \{y \in S | d(y, \gamma_\theta) \leq c\}$ is a *non-tangential tube*. Let u be a harmonic function. For $c \in \mathbf{N}$, its *c-non-tangential energy* at θ is $J_c^\theta(u) = \sum_{y \in \Gamma_c^\theta} \Delta u^2(y)$ and its *radial energy* at θ is $J^\theta(u) = J_0^\theta(u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta u^2(\gamma_\theta(k))$. There is *radial* convergence, boundedness or finiteness of the energy depending wether $(u(\gamma_\theta(n)))_n$ converges, is bounded or has finite radial energy. There is *non-tangential* convergence of u at θ if for all $c \in \mathbf{N}$, $u(y)$ has a limit when y goes to θ staying in Γ_c^θ. There is *non-tangential* boundedness (resp. finiteness of the energy) if for all $c \in \mathbf{N}$, u is bounded on Γ_c^θ (resp. $J_c^\theta(u) < +\infty$).

2 Main result

We now suppose $(\mathcal{H})$: $\exists \varepsilon > 0, \exists \eta > 0, \forall x \sim y, \varepsilon \leq p(x,y) \leq \frac{1}{2} - \eta$, a discrete analogue of the pinched curvature for manifolds. It also forces at least three neighbors for each vertex, and ensures transience. We proved in [6]:

Theorem 2.1 *For a harmonic function u on a tree with random walk satisfying $(\mathcal{H})$, the notions of radial convergence, radial boundedness, radial finiteness of the energy, stochastic convergence, stochastic boundedness, stochastic finiteness of the energy, are μ-almost equivalent.*

We prove here the following theorem:

Theorem 2.2 *Under the same hypotheses, the notions of non-tangential convergence, non-tangential boundedness and non-tangential finiteness of the energy are μ-almost equivalent to the notions above.*

Considering the trivial implications, it is sufficient to prove that stochastic convergence implies non-tangential convergence and non-tangential boundedness implies almost surely non-tangential finiteness of the energy.

3 Stochastic implies NT convergence

The first implication needs the following lemma due to A. Ancona in a general setting [1], but easily proved here by simple connectivity:

Lemma 3.1 *If $(x_n)_n$ is a sequence converging non-tangentially to $\theta \in \partial S$, the walk hits P_o^θ-a.s. infinitely many x_n.*

Let us see how this lemma helps. Assume that the harmonic function u has a stochastic limit $l \in \mathbf{R}$ at θ but does not converge non-tangentially towards l at θ. There exists $\delta > 0$ and a sequence $(x_n)_n$ converging non-tangentially to θ such that $|u(x_n) - l| \geq \delta$ for all n. As the random walk $(X_k)_k$ hits P_o^θ-a.s. infinitely many x_n by the lemma, one can extract a subsequence $(X_{k_j})_j$ such that $|u(X_{k_j}) - l| \geq \delta$ for all j. Hence, P_o^θ-almost surely, the function u does not converge towards l along $(X_k)_k$ which leads to a contradiction.

Le us now prove the lemma. Recall that the principle of the method of Doob's h-processes is to consider a new Markov chain defined by $p^\theta(x,y) = \frac{K_\theta(y)}{K_\theta(x)} p(x,y)$ where the Martin kernel $K_\theta(x)$ is defined as $\lim_{y \to \theta} \frac{G(x,y)}{G(o,y)}$ (see for example [4]). This formula leads to analogous fomulae for the p_n^θ and the associated functions H^θ and G^θ. Consider for a fixed n the projection y_n of x_n on the geodesic ray γ_θ (see [6]). As the random walk starting from o and conditioned to end at θ hits almost surely y_n due to the tree structure, the strong Markov property gives $H^\theta(o, x_n) = H^\theta(y_n, x_n) = \frac{K_\theta(x_n)}{K_\theta(y_n)} H(y_n, x_n)$. By definition of the Martin kernel, $\frac{K_\theta(x_n)}{K_\theta(y_n)} = \lim_{y \to \theta} \frac{G(x_n,y)}{G(y_n,y)}$ and $G(x_n, y) = H(x_n, y_n) G(y_n, y)$ as soon as $y_n \in [x_n, y]$, so $H^\theta(o, x_n) = H(x_n, y_n) H(y_n, x_n)$. The distance between x_n and

y_n is bounded as $(x_n)_n$ converges non-tangentially to θ, hence the last product is bounded from below by a constant $C > 0$ using $(\mathcal{H})$. By Fatou's lemma, the probability conditioned to end at θ of hitting infinitely many x_n is not smaller than C and the asymptotic 0-1 law ensures that it equals 1, which completes the lemma's proof.

4 NT boundedness implies finite NT energy

Denoting $\mathcal{N}_c = \{\theta \in \partial S | \sup_{\Gamma_c^\theta} |u| < +\infty\}$ and $\mathcal{J}_c = \{\theta \in \partial S | J_c^\theta(u) < +\infty\}$, we will show that for all $c \in \mathbf{N}$, $\mathcal{N}_{c+1} \overset{\sim}{\subset} \mathcal{J}_c$, which will give the wanted result by monotonous intersection. Let us write $\mathcal{N}_{c+1} = \bigcup_{N \in \mathbf{N}} \mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N$, where

$$\mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N = \left\{ \theta \in \partial S \,\middle|\, \sup_{\Gamma_{c+1}^\theta} |u| \leq N \right\}.$$

By countability it is sufficient to prove that for all N, $\mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N \overset{\sim}{\subset} \mathcal{J}_c$. Let us fix $N \in \mathbf{N}$. Denote $\Gamma = \bigcup_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N} \Gamma_c^\theta$ and τ the exit time from Γ. As

$$M_n = u^2(X_n) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Delta u^2(X_k)$$

is a martingale (see [6]), Doob's stopping time theorem for the bounded exit time $\tau \wedge n$ gives $E_o\left[M_{\tau \wedge n}\right] = E_o[M_0] = u^2(o) \geq 0$, hence

$$E_o\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\tau \wedge n - 1} \Delta u^2(X_k)\right] \leq E_o\left[u^2(X_{\tau \wedge n})\right].$$

As $X_{\tau \wedge n}$ is at distance at most 1 from Γ, it lies in a tube Γ_{c+1}^θ where $\theta \in \mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N$ and $|u(X_{\tau \wedge n})| \leq N$. When n goes to ∞, monotonous convergence ($\Delta u^2 \geq 0$) and the desintegration formula (see [6]) give then, for μ-almost all $\theta \in \partial S$,

$$E_o^\theta\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\tau - 1} \Delta u^2(X_k)\right] < +\infty.$$

Let us use a conditioned version of formula 2 from [6], which will be proved later :

Lemma 4.1 *For a function $\varphi \geq 0$ on Γ and τ the exit time of Γ,*

$$E_o^\theta\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\tau - 1} \varphi(X_k)\right] = \sum_{y \in \Gamma} \varphi(y) G_\Gamma(o, y) K_\theta(y).$$

This lemma implies that for μ-almost all $\theta \in \partial S$, $\sum_{y\in\Gamma} \Delta u^2(y) G_\Gamma(o,y) K_\theta(y)$ is finite. In order to get an energy, we will show that $G_\Gamma(o,y)K_\theta(y)$ is bounded from below using the two following lemmas. The first one is due to A. Ancona [1] but has a very simple proof in the present context of trees. The second one enables comparison between G_Γ and G.

Lemma 4.2 $\forall c \in \mathbf{N}, \exists \alpha > 0, \forall \theta \in \partial S, \forall y \in \Gamma_c^\theta, G(o,y)K_\theta(y) \geq \alpha$.

Lemma 4.3 *For $U \subset S$ containing Γ_c^θ and τ the exit time of U,*

$$\lim_{y\in\Gamma_c^\theta, y\to\theta} \frac{G_U(o,y)}{G(o,y)} = P_o^\theta[\tau = +\infty].$$

By lemma 4.2, for μ-almost all $\theta \in \mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N$,

$$\sum_{y\in\Gamma_c^\theta} \Delta u^2(y) \frac{G_\Gamma(o,y)}{G(o,y)} < +\infty.$$

If we show that for μ-almost all $\theta \in \mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N$, $P_o^\theta[\tau = +\infty] > 0$, lemma 4.3 gives $\mathcal{N}_{c+1}^N \overset{\sim}{\subset} \mathcal{J}_c$. The proof of that fact is the same as in the analogous radial proof [6] which completes the theorem's proof.

Let us now prove the lemmas. Concerning lemma 4.1, using Fubini,

$$E_o^\theta\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} \varphi(X_k)\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} E_o^\theta\left[\varphi(X_k)\mathbf{1}_{(k<\tau)}\right].$$

The random variable $\varphi(X_k)\mathbf{1}_{(k<\tau)}$ being measurable with respect to the σ-algebra generated by $(X_i)_{i\leq k}$ (see [6]) and using formula 2 from [6], the expectation above equals

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} E_o\left[\varphi(X_k)\mathbf{1}_{(k<\tau)}K_\theta(X_k)\right] = E_o\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varphi(X_k)\mathbf{1}_{(k<\tau)}K_\theta(X_k)\right]$$

$$= \sum_{y\in\Gamma} \varphi(y) G_\Gamma(o,y) K_\theta(y),$$

which finishes the proof of lemma 4.1.

Let us prove lemma 4.2. Denote $\pi(y)$ the projection of y on γ_θ (see [6]) and remark that for $z \in (\pi(y),\theta)$, $G(o,z) = H(o,\pi(y))G(\pi(y),z)$ and $G(y,z) = H(y,\pi(y))G(\pi(y),z)$ by formula 1. Hence $\frac{G(y,z)}{G(o,z)} = \frac{H(y,\pi(y))}{H(o,\pi(y))}$ does not depend anymore on z and its limit when z goes to θ is then $K_\theta(y) = \frac{H(y,\pi(y))}{H(o,\pi(y))}$. By formula 1,

$$G(o,y)K_\theta(y) = H(y,\pi(y))\frac{G(o,y)}{H(o,\pi(y))} = H(y,\pi(y))H(\pi(y),y)G(y,y).$$

But $G(y,y) \geq p_2(y,y) \geq 3\varepsilon^2$ and $H(y,\pi(y))H(\pi(y),y) \geq \varepsilon^{2c}$ by $(\mathcal{H})$ and $d(y,\pi(y)) \leq c$, which finishes the proof of lemma 4.2.

Let us prove lemma 4.3 :

$$\begin{aligned} G_U(o,y) &= G(o,y) - E_o[G(X_\tau,y)\mathbf{1}_{(\tau<+\infty)}] \\ &= G(o,y)\left(1 - E_o\left[\frac{G(X_\tau,y)}{G(o,y)}\mathbf{1}_{(\tau<+\infty)}\right]\right) \end{aligned}$$

and by definition of Martin's kernel, if we could switch the limit and expectation, by a conditioning formula [6],

$$\lim_{y\in\Gamma_c^\theta, y\to\theta} \frac{G_U(o,y)}{G(o,y)} = 1 - E_o[K_\theta(X_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{(\tau<+\infty)}] = P_o^\theta[\tau = +\infty].$$

We now justify that inversion by Lebesgue's theorem. The idea is to bound, when τ is finite, $\frac{G(X_\tau,y)}{G(o,y)}$ by a multiple of $K_\theta(X_\tau)$. We compare for that purpose $G(X_\tau,y)$ with $K_\theta(X_\tau)$. Denote again by π the projection function on γ_θ. We distinguish two cases

If $\pi(X_\tau) \in [o,\pi(y)]$, $\frac{G(X_\tau,y)}{K_\theta(X\tau)} = \frac{G(\pi(X_\tau),y)}{K_\theta(\pi(X\tau))} = \frac{G(o,y)}{K_\theta(o)} = G(o,y)$, by formula 1 and the remark that this formula also implies by definition of K_θ and by taking the limit that $K_\theta(X_\tau) = H(X_\tau,\pi(X_\tau))K_\theta(\pi(X_\tau))$ and $K_\theta(o) = H(o,\pi(X_\tau))K_\theta(\pi(X_\tau))$.

If $\pi(X_\tau) \notin [o,\pi(y)]$, again $\frac{G(X_\tau,y)}{K_\theta(X\tau)} = \frac{G(\pi(X_\tau),y)}{K_\theta(\pi(X\tau))}$. We also have, by definition and formula 1, $K_\theta(\pi(X_\tau)) = (H(o,\pi(X_\tau)))^{-1}$, hence the quotient above equals $H(o,\pi(X_\tau))G(\pi(X_\tau),y) = H(o,\pi(y))H(\pi(y),\pi(X_\tau))G(\pi(X_\tau),y)$. We know that G is bounded (see [7, 6]) and H is a probability, so it just remains to compare $H(o,\pi(y))$ with $G(o,y)$. But $\frac{H(o,\pi(y))}{G(o,y)} = (G(\pi(y),y))^{-1}$ and $\frac{1}{G}$ is bounded by $\frac{1}{3\varepsilon^2}$.

Merging the two cases gives a constant β such that $\frac{G(X_\tau,y)}{K_\theta(X\tau)} \leq \beta G(o,y)$, which enables to use Lebesgue's theorem and completes the proof of lemma 4.3.

References

[1] A. Ancona. Théorie du potentiel sur les graphes et les variétés. In P.L. Hennequin, editor, *École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XVIII*. Springer Lect. Notes in Math. 1427, Berlin, 1990.

[2] L. Atanasi and M.A. Picardello. The lusin area function and local admissible convergence of harmonic functions on homogeneous trees. *Trans. of A.M.S.*, 360:3327–3343, 2008.

[3] P. Cartier. Fonctions harmoniques sur un arbre. In *Symposia Mathematica*, volume IX, pages 203–270. Academic Press, London and New-York, 1972.

[4] E.B. Dynkin. Boundary theory of markov processes (the discrete case). *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 24:1–42, 1969.

[5] F. Mouton. Comportement asymptotique des fonctions harmoniques en courbure négative. *Comment. Math. Helvetici*, 70:475–505, 1995.

[6] F. Mouton. Comportement asymptotique des fonctions harmoniques sur les arbres. *Séminaire de Probabilités, Université de Strasbourg*, XXXIV:353–373, 2000.

[7] M. A. Picardello and W. Woess. Finite truncations of random walks on trees. In *Symposia Mathematica*, volume XXIX, pages 255–265. Academic Press, London and New-York, 1987.

Frédéric Mouton
Université Grenoble 1
BP 74
38402 Saint-Martin-d'Hères Cedex (France)
`Frederic.Mouton@ujf-grenoble.fr`