



HAL
open science

Equidistribution towards the bifurcation current I: Multipliers and degree d polynomials

Thomas Gauthier

► **To cite this version:**

Thomas Gauthier. Equidistribution towards the bifurcation current I: Multipliers and degree d polynomials. 2013. hal-00922634v1

HAL Id: hal-00922634

<https://hal.science/hal-00922634v1>

Preprint submitted on 29 Dec 2013 (v1), last revised 16 Apr 2015 (v3)

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.

EQUIDISTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE BIFURCATION CURRENT I: MULTIPLIERS AND DEGREE d POLYNOMIALS

by

Thomas Gauthier

Abstract. — In the moduli space \mathcal{P}_d of degree d polynomials, the set $\text{Per}_n(w)$ of classes $[f]$ for which f admits a cycle of exact period n and multiplier w is known to be an algebraic hypersurface. We prove that, given $w \in \mathbb{C}$, these hypersurfaces equidistribute towards the bifurcation current as n tends to infinity.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Preliminaries.....	3
2. A comparison principle for plurisubharmonic functions.....	6
3. Structure of some slices of the bifurcation currents.....	9
4. The bifurcation measure doesn't charge boundary components.....	15
5. Distribution of $\text{Per}_n(w)$ for any $w \in \mathbb{C}$	19
References.....	22

Introduction

In a holomorphic family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of degree $d \geq 2$ rational maps, the *bifurcation locus* is the closure in the parameter space Λ of the set of discontinuity of $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{J}_\lambda$, where \mathcal{J}_λ is the Julia set of f_λ . The study of the global geography of the parameter space Λ is related to the study of the hypersurfaces

$$\text{Per}_n(w) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda \text{ s.t. } f_\lambda \text{ has a } n\text{-cycle of multiplier } w\} .$$

In their seminal work [MSS], Mañé, Sad and Sullivan prove that the bifurcation locus is nowhere dense in Λ and coincides with the closure of the set of parameters for which f_λ admits a non-persistent neutral cycle (see also [L]). In particular, by Montel's Theorem, this implies that any bifurcation parameter can be approximated by parameters with a super-attracting periodic point, i.e. the bifurcation locus is contained in the closure of the set $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \text{Per}_n(0)$.

Recall that DeMarco proved that the bifurcation locus can be naturally endowed with a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current T_{bif} , called the bifurcation current (see e.g. [DeM]). This current may be defined as $dd^c L$ where L is the continuous plurisubharmonic function sends a parameter λ to the Lyapunov exponent $L(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{P}^1} \log |f'_\lambda| \mu_\lambda$ of f_λ with respect to its maximal entropy measure μ_λ . The current T_{bif} provides an appropriate tool for studying bifurcations from a measure-theoretic viewpoint. We refer the reader to the survey [Du1] or the lecture notes [B] for a report on recent results involving bifurcation currents and further references.

It also appears that the current T_{bif} is very related to the asymptotic distribution of the hypersurfaces $\text{Per}_n(w)$. Indeed, Bassanelli and Berteloot proved that

$$d^{-n}[\text{Per}_n(w)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{\text{bif}}$$

for a given $|w| < 1$ in the weak sense of currents, using the fact that the function L is a global potential of T_{bif} (see [BB2, BB3]).

In the moduli space \mathcal{P}_d of degree d polynomials, i.e. the set of affine conjugacy classes of degree d polynomials, Bassanelli and Berteloot [BB3] prove that this convergence also holds when $|w| = 1$. In the present paper, we prove that this actually holds for any $w \in \mathbb{C}$. Our main result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1. — *Let $d \geq 2$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}$ be any complex number. Then the sequence $d^{-n}[\text{Per}_n(w)]$ converges in the weak sense of currents to the bifurcation current T_{bif} in the moduli space \mathcal{P}_d of degree d polynomials.*

Notice that, when $d = 2$, the moduli space of quadratic polynomials is isomorphic to the quadratic family $(z^2 + c)_{c \in \mathbb{C}}$ and that, in the quadratic family, this result is a particular case of the main Theorem of [BG]. Notice also that for $d \geq 3$, up to a finite branched covering, \mathcal{P}_d is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^{d-1} .

Let us now sketch the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1 developed in [BG] in the quadratic case and then how to adapt it to our situation. It is known that there exists a global potential φ_n of the current $d^{-n}[\text{Per}_n(w)]$ that, up to extraction, converges in L^1_{loc} to a psh function φ and that $\varphi = L$ on hyperbolic components (see [BB3]).

In the quadratic case, the bifurcation locus is the boundary of the Mandelbrot set $M \Subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{C} \setminus M$ is a hyperbolic component, hence $\varphi = L$ outside M . First, we explain why the harmonic measure $2\Delta L$ of the Mandelbrot set doesn't give mass to the boundary of a connected component of the interior of M . Secondly, we establish a comparison lemma for subharmonic function which gives $\varphi = L$ and the proof is complete.

We now explain how to adapt the proof to the situation $d \geq 3$. First, we establish a generalization of the comparison Lemma for plurisubharmonic functions on a domain Ω of a Kähler manifold of dimension k in Section 2. Assume that $u \leq v$ are psh on Ω , v is continuous, and $u = v$ outside a compact subset K of Ω which boundary contains $\text{supp}((dd^c v)^k)$ and that $(dd^c v)^k$ doesn't give mass to the boundary of connected components of the interior of K . Building on the classical domination principle of Bedford and Taylor, we show that, under these assumptions, $u = v$ on Ω .

Our strategy then goes by a finite induction on the number of critical points that don't escape and consists in applying the comparison principle mentioned above to $u = \varphi$ and $v = L$ in adapted local submanifolds of \mathbb{C}^{d-1} . Remark that the shift locus \mathcal{E} is a hyperbolic component, hence $\varphi = L$ on \mathcal{E} , i.e. $\varphi(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$ as soon as no critical point of P_λ escape. Let now $k \leq d - 2$. Assume that $\varphi(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$ if at most $k - 1$ critical points of P_λ don't escape and pick a parameter λ_0 for which exactly k critical points of P_{λ_0} don't escape. In Section 3, following techniques developed in the context of horizontal-like maps (see [DDS, Du2]), we build a subvariety \mathcal{X} of dimension k and a compact subset $K \Subset \mathcal{X}$ in which the positive measure $(dd^c L)^k|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is supported by a ∂K , doesn't give mass to the boundary of connected components of $\overset{\circ}{K}$, and at most $k - 1$ critical points of P_λ escape if $\lambda \in \mathcal{X} \setminus K$. The comparison Theorem then gives $\varphi = L$ on \mathcal{X} , hence $\varphi(\lambda_0) = L(\lambda_0)$.

The last step consists in applying the comparison Theorem in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} for $K = \mathcal{C}_d$ the connectedness locus. To this aim, we need to prove that the bifurcation measure μ_{bif} doesn't give mass to the boundary of components of the interior of \mathcal{C}_d . This is done in Section 4, building on the description of the bifurcation measure given by Dujardin and Favre [DF] and properties of invariant line fields established by McMullen [Mc].

Finally, the proof of Theorem 1 is performed in Section 5.

Acknowledgement We would like to thank Gabriel Vigny for many interesting and helpful discussions. We also would like to thank Vincent Guedj.

1. Preliminaries

1.1. A good parametrization of \mathcal{P}_d , $d \geq 3$

It is now classical that the moduli space of degree d polynomials, i.e. the space of degree d polynomials modulo affine conjugacy, is a complex orbifold of dimension $d - 1$ which is not smooth when $d \geq 3$. Here, we shall use the following parametrization

$$P_{c,a}(z) := \frac{1}{d}z^d + \sum_{j=2}^{d-1} (-1)^{d-j} \sigma_{d-j}(c) \frac{z^j}{j} + a^d,$$

where $\sigma_j(c)$ is the monic symmetric polynomial in (c_1, \dots, c_{d-2}) of degree j . Observe that the critical points of $P_{c,a}$ are exactly c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{d-2} with the convention that $c_0 := 0$, and that the canonical projection $\pi : \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d$ which maps $(c_1, \dots, c_{d-2}, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ to the class of $P_{c,a}$ in \mathcal{P}_d is finite-to-one.

Recall that the *Green function* of $P_{c,a}$ is the subharmonic function defined for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ by

$$g_{c,a}(z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d^{-n} \log \max(1, |P_{c,v}^n(z)|),$$

and that the filled-in Julia set of $P_{c,a}$ is the compact subset of \mathbb{C}

$$\mathcal{K}_{c,a} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid (P_{c,v}^n(z))_{n \geq 1} \text{ is bounded in } \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Remark that $\mathcal{K}_{c,a} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid g_{c,a}(z) = 0\}$. Recall also that the chaotic part of the dynamics is supported by the *Julia set* $\mathcal{J}_{c,a} = \partial \mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ of $P_{c,a}$. The function $(c, a, z) \in \mathbb{C}^d \mapsto g_{c,a}(z)$ is actually a non-negative plurisubharmonic continuous function on \mathbb{C}^d . We set

$$\mathcal{B}_i := \{(c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \mid c_i \in \mathcal{K}_{c,a}\} = \{(c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \mid g_{c,a}(c_i) = 0\}$$

and $\mathcal{C}_d := \{(c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \mid \max_{0 \leq i \leq d-2} (g_{c,a}(c_i)) = 0\} = \bigcap_i \mathcal{B}_i$. It is known that $\mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ is connected if and only if $(c, a) \in \mathcal{C}_d$. Let us finally set

$$H_\infty := \mathbb{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{C}) \setminus \mathbb{C}^{d-1} = \{[c : a : 0] \in \mathbb{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{C})\} \text{ and } H_i := \{[c : a : 0] \in H_\infty : P_{c,a}(c_i) = 0\}.$$

We shall use the following (see [BB3, BH, DF]):

Theorem 1.1 (Bassanelli-Berteloot, Branner-Hubbard, Dujardin-Favre)

1. For any $0 \leq i \leq d - 2$, the cluster set of \mathcal{B}_i in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{C})$ coincides with H_i ,
2. The divisor $\sum_{i=0}^{d-2} H_i$ has simple normal crossings. In particular, if $1 \leq k \leq d - 2$, for any k -tuple $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d - 2$, the cluster set of $\bigcap_{j=1}^k \mathcal{B}_{i_j}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{C})$, which is exactly $\bigcap_{j=1}^k H_{i_j}$, is a pure $(d - 2 - k)$ -dimensional algebraic variety of H_∞ ,
3. The set \mathcal{C}_d is a compact connected subset of \mathbb{C}^{d-1} .

1.2. The bifurcation current

Classically, a parameter $(c_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ is said \mathcal{J} -stable if there exists a neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ such that for any $(c, a) \in U$, there exists a homeomorphism $\psi_{c,a} : \mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_{c, a}$ which conjugates P_{c_0, a_0} to $P_{c, a}$, i.e. such that

$$\psi_{c,a} \circ P_{c_0, a_0}(z) = P_{c, a} \circ \psi_{c, a}(z), \quad z \in \mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0} .$$

The *stability locus* \mathcal{S} of the family $(P_{c, a})_{(c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}}$ is the set of \mathcal{J} -stable parameters and the *bifurcation locus* is its complement $\mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{S}$.

Definition 1.2. — *We say that the critical point c_i is passive at $(c_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ if there exists a neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ of (c_0, a_0) such that the family $\{(c, a) \mapsto P_{c, a}^n(c_i)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is normal on U . Otherwise, we say that c_i is active at (c_0, a_0) .*

It is known that the activity locus of c_i , i.e. the set of $(c_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ such that c_i is active at (c_0, a_0) , coincides exactly with $\partial \mathcal{B}_i$ and that the bifurcation locus is exactly $\bigcup_i \partial \mathcal{B}_i$ (see e.g. [L, MSS, Mc]). We let

$$T_i := dd^c g_{c, a}(c_i) .$$

Recall that the mass of a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current T on \mathbb{C}^{d-1} is given by

$$\|T\| := \int_{\mathbb{C}^{d-1}} T \wedge \omega_{\text{FS}}^{d-2} = \langle T, \omega_{\text{FS}}^{d-2} \rangle ,$$

where ω_{FS} stands for the Fubini-Study form on $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{C})$ normalized so that $\|\omega_{\text{FS}}\| = 1$ and that, if T has finite mass, then it extends naturally as a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current \tilde{T} on $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{C})$ (see [Dem]). We also let $\|T\|_{\Omega} := \langle T, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega} \omega_{\text{FS}}^{d-2} \rangle$ for any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$. One can prove the following (see [DeM, DF]).

Lemma 1.3 (Dujardin-Favre). — *The support of T_i is exactly $\partial \mathcal{B}_i$. Moreover, T_i has mass 1 and $T_i \wedge T_i = 0$.*

On the other hand, the measure $\mu_{c, a} := dd_z^c g_{c, a}(z)$ is the maximal entropy measure of $P_{c, a}$ and the Lyapounov exponent of $P_{c, a}$ with respect to $\mu_{c, a}$ is given by

$$L(c, a) := \int_{\mathbb{C}} \log |P'_{c, a}| \mu_{c, a} .$$

A double integration by part gives

$$L(c, a) = \log d + \sum_{i=0}^{d-2} g_{c, a}(c_i) .$$

In particular, the function $L : \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is plurisubharmonic and continuous and the $(1, 1)$ -current $dd^c L = \sum_i T_i$ is supported by the bifurcation locus.

Definition 1.4. — *The bifurcation current is $T_{\text{bif}} := \sum_i T_i = dd^c L$.*

1.3. The higher bifurcation currents and the bifurcation measure of \mathcal{P}_d

Bassanelli and Berteloot [BB1] introduce the *higher bifurcation currents* and the *bifurcation measure* on \mathbb{C}^{d-1} (and in fact in a much more general context) by setting

$$T_{\text{bif}}^k := (dd^c L)^k \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\text{bif}} := (dd^c L)^{d-1} .$$

Dujardin and Favre [DF] and Dujardin [Du2] study extensively the measure μ_{bif} in the present context. For our purpose, we first shall notice that Lemma 1.3 implies that

$$(1) \quad T_{\text{bif}}^k = k! \sum_{0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d-2} T_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{i_k}$$

is a positive closed (k, k) -current of finite mass. Let us set

$$G(c, a) := \max_{0 \leq i \leq d-2} (g_{c,a}(c_i)) \quad , \quad (c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$$

and, for any k -tuple $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ with $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d-2$ and $k \leq d-2$,

$$G_I(c, a) := \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} (g_{c,a}(c_{i_j})) \quad , \quad (c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} .$$

We shall use the following (see [DF, §6]):

Proposition 1.5. — *Let $1 \leq k \leq d-2$ and let $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ be a k -tuple with $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d-2$. Then $T_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{i_k} = (dd^c G_I)^k$. Moreover, $\mu_{\text{bif}} = (d-1)! \cdot (dd^c G)^{d-1}$.*

One of the crucial points of our proof relies on the following property of the measure μ_{bif} (see [DF, Proposition 7 & Corollary 11]).

Theorem 1.6 (Dujardin-Favre). — *The support of μ_{bif} coincides with the Shilov boundary $\partial_S \mathcal{C}_d \subset \partial \mathcal{C}_d$ of the connectedness locus. Moreover, there exists a Borel set $\mathcal{B} \subset \partial_S \mathcal{C}_d$ of full measure for the bifurcation measure μ_{bif} and such that for all $(c, a) \in \mathcal{B}$,*

- all cycles of $P_{c,a}$ are repelling,
- the orbit of each critical points are dense in $\mathcal{J}_{c,a}$,
- $\mathcal{K}_{c,a} = \mathcal{J}_{c,a}$ is locally connected and $\dim_H(\mathcal{J}_{c,a}) < 2$.

1.4. Horizontal currents and admissible wedge product

Therefore, we also need some known results concerning *horizontal* currents. Let $\Omega \subset \mathcal{X}$ be a connected open set of a complex manifold.

Definition 1.7. — *A closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current T is horizontal in $\Omega \times \mathbb{D}$ if the support of T is an horizontal subset of $\Omega \times \mathbb{D}$, i.e. if there exists a compact set $K \Subset \mathbb{D}$ such that*

$$\text{supp}(T) \subset \Omega \times K .$$

We define similarly vertical currents.

Mimating exactly the proof of [DDS, Lemma 2.3], one gets the following.

Lemma 1.8. — *Let T be horizontal in $\Omega \times \mathbb{D}$. Let, for any $z \in \Omega$, $\mu_z := T \wedge [\{z\} \times \mathbb{D}]$ be the slice of T on the vertical slice $\{z\} \times \mathbb{D}$. Then the function*

$$u(z, w) := \int_{\{z\} \times \mathbb{D}} \log |w - s| d\mu_z(s)$$

is a psh potential of T , i.e. $T = dd^c u$.

Assume now that $\Omega \subset \mathcal{M}$, where \mathcal{M} is a complex manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. Let $(T_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ be a measurable family of positive closed (q, q) -currents in Ω and let ν be a positive measure on \mathcal{A} such that $\alpha \mapsto \|T_\alpha\|_\Omega$ is ν -integrable. The *direct integral* of $(T_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is the current T defined by

$$\langle T, \varphi \rangle := \int_{\mathcal{A}} \langle T_\alpha, \varphi \rangle d\nu(\alpha) ,$$

for any $(d - q - 1, d - q - 1)$ -test form φ . We denote T by $T = \int_{\mathcal{A}} T_\alpha d\nu(\alpha)$.

Recall also that, if $T = dd^c u$ is a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current and S is a closed positive (p, p) -current with $p + 1 \leq n$, we say that the wedge product $T \wedge S$ is *admissible* if $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\sigma_S)$, where σ_S is the trace measure of S . It is classical that we then may define $T \wedge S := dd^c(uS)$. Dujardin [Du2, Lemma 2.8] can be restated as follows:

Lemma 1.9. — *Let $T = \int_{\mathcal{A}} T_\alpha d\nu(\alpha)$ be a $(1, 1)$ -current as above and let S be a closed positive (p, p) -current with $p + 1 \leq n$. Assume that the product $T \wedge S$ is admissible. Then, for ν -almost every α , $T_\alpha \wedge S$ is admissible and*

$$T \wedge S = \int_{\mathcal{A}} (T_\alpha \wedge S) d\nu(\alpha) .$$

2. A comparison principle for plurisubharmonic functions

In the present section, \mathcal{X} is a k -dimensional complex manifold for which there exists a smooth psh function w on \mathcal{X} and a strict analytic subset \mathcal{Z} of \mathcal{X} such that $(dd^c w)^k$ is a non-degenerate volume form on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$. Let also Ω stand for a connected open subset of \mathcal{X} \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth boundary and let $\mathcal{PSH}(\Omega)$ stand for the set of all *p.s.h* functions on Ω . We establish the following comparison theorem for psh functions. It is a generalization in higher dimension of [BG, Lemma 4].

Theorem 2.1 (Comparison). — *Let $\Omega \subset \mathcal{X}$ be a domain as above, $u, v \in \mathcal{PSH}(\Omega)$ and $K \Subset \Omega$ be a compact set. Assume that the following assumptions are satisfied:*

- *v is continuous, $\text{supp}((dd^c v)^k) \subset \partial K$ and $(dd^c v)^k$ has finite mass,*
- *for any connected component U of $\overset{\circ}{K}$, $(dd^c v)^k(\partial U) = 0$,*
- *$u \leq v$ on Ω and $u = v$ on $\Omega \setminus K$.*

Then $u = v$ on Ω .

2.1. Mass comparison for Monge-Ampère measures

We now assume in addition that $\overline{\Omega}$ is a compact subset of \mathcal{X} . We let $\mathcal{PSH}^-(\Omega)$ be the set of non-positive *p.s.h* functions on Ω . We shall need the following lemma. Even though it looks very classical, we give a proof.

Lemma 2.2. — *Let $0 \leq j \leq k$ and $u, v \in \mathcal{PSH}(\Omega)$ be such that $u = v$ on a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$. Let ω be a smooth closed positive $(1, 1)$ -form. Assume that the measures $(dd^c u)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j}$ and $(dd^c v)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j}$ are well-defined and that $(dd^c u)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j}$ has finite mass. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} (dd^c v)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j} = \int_{\Omega} (dd^c u)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j} .$$

Proof. — For $j = 0$, there is nothing to prove. We thus assume $j > 0$. For $r > 0$, we denote by $\Omega_r := \{z \in \Omega / d(z, \partial\Omega) > r\}$. Let $r > 0$ be such that $u = v$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega_r$ and let $\chi_r \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$ have compact support and be such that $0 \leq \chi_r \leq 1$ and $\chi_r = 1$ on $\overline{\Omega_r}$ and $\chi_r = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_{r/2}$. Let u_n be a decreasing sequence of smooth *psh* functions on Ω converging to u and v_n be a decreasing sequence of smooth *psh* functions on Ω converging to v . As $u = v$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$, for n large enough, $u_n = v_n$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_r}$ and integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \chi_r (dd^c v_n)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j} &= - \int_{\Omega} d\chi_r \wedge d^c v_n \wedge (dd^c v_n)^{j-1} \wedge \omega^{k-j} \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} d\chi_r \wedge d^c u_n \wedge (dd^c u_n)^{j-1} \wedge \omega^{k-j} = \int_{\Omega} \chi_r (dd^c u_n)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j}, \end{aligned}$$

since $u_n = v_n$ on a neighborhood of $\text{supp}(d\chi_r)$ for n large enough. Letting n tend to infinity gives :

$$\int_{\Omega} \chi_r (dd^c v)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j} = \int_{\Omega} \chi_r (dd^c u)^j \wedge \omega^{k-j}.$$

For $r' \leq r$, we can choose $\chi_{r'} \geq \chi_r$. As r can be chosen arbitrarily close to 0, the monotonic convergence Theorem gives the wanted result. \square

2.2. Classical comparison principle

We give here a local comparison theorem in the spirit of [BGZ, Corollary 2.3]. It is one of the numerous generalizations of Bedford and Taylor classical comparison Theorem for Monge-Ampère measures (see [BT]). The difference with respect to Benelkourchi, Guedj and Zeriahi's work consists in the boundary condition, which is of different nature. The proof goes essentially the same way.

Theorem 2.3 (Classical comparison principle). — *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{PSH}^-(\Omega)$ be such that $(dd^c u)^k$ and $(dd^c v)^k$ are well-defined finite positive measures. Assume that $v \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ and*

$$\limsup_{\Omega \ni z \rightarrow z_0} (u(z) - v(z)) \geq 0$$

for any $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$. Then

$$\int_{\{u < v\}} (dd^c v)^k \leq \int_{\{u < v\} \cup \{u = -\infty\}} (dd^c u)^k.$$

Proof. — Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $w := \max(u + \epsilon, v)$. The measure $(dd^c w)^k$ is well-defined and $w = u + \epsilon$ on a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$. Lemma 2.2, thus gives

$$\int_{\Omega} (dd^c w)^k = \int_{\Omega} (dd^c u)^k.$$

On the other hand, according to [BGZ, Theorem 2.2], we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{u + \epsilon < v\}} (dd^c v)^k = \mathbf{1}_{\{u + \epsilon < v\}} (dd^c w)^k \text{ et } \mathbf{1}_{\{u + \epsilon > v\}} (dd^c u)^k = \mathbf{1}_{\{u + \epsilon > v\}} (dd^c w)^k.$$

Therefore, since $\{u + \epsilon \leq v\} \subset \{u < v\} \cup \{u = -\infty\}$, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\{u+\epsilon < v\}} (dd^c v)^k &= \int_{\{u+\epsilon < v\}} (dd^c w)^k = \int_{\Omega} (dd^c w)^k - \int_{\{u+\epsilon \geq v\}} (dd^c w)^k \\
&= \int_{\Omega} (dd^c u)^k - \int_{\{u+\epsilon > v\}} (dd^c w)^k - \int_{\{u+\epsilon = v\}} (dd^c w)^k \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} (dd^c u)^k - \int_{\{u+\epsilon > v\}} (dd^c w)^k = \int_{\mathbb{B}} (dd^c u)^k - \int_{\{u+\epsilon > v\}} (dd^c u)^k \\
&\leq \int_{\{u+\epsilon \leq v\}} (dd^c u)^k \leq \int_{\{u < v\} \cup \{u = -\infty\}} (dd^c u)^k.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\mathbf{1}_{\{u+\epsilon < v\}}$ is an increasing sequence which converges pointwise to $\mathbf{1}_{\{u < v\}}$, Lebesgue's monotonic convergence Theorem, we conclude making $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

As in the classical case of locally uniformly bounded psh functions, we get as a consequence of Theorem 2.3 the following local domination principle:

Corollary 2.4 (Classical domination principle). — *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{PSH}^-(\Omega)$ be such that $(dd^c u)^k$ and $(dd^c v)^k$ are finite well-defined positive measures. Assume that $v \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$, that $u \geq v$ $(dd^c u)^k$ -a.e. and that $\limsup_{\Omega \ni z \rightarrow z_0} (u(z) - v(z)) \geq 0$ for all $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$. Then $u \geq v$.*

Proof. — We proceed by contradiction. Assume that the open set $\{u < v\}$ is non-empty. By our assumption on \mathcal{X} , there exists $w \in \mathcal{PSH}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$ such that $(dd^c w)^k$ is a non-degenerate volume form on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$, where \mathcal{Z} is an analytic subset of \mathcal{X} . As $\bar{\Omega}$ is a compact subset of \mathcal{X} , w is bounded on Ω and, up to adding some negative constant to w , we may assume that $w \leq 0$. For $\epsilon > 0$, we set $v_\epsilon := v + \epsilon w$, then $v_\epsilon \leq v$ and $\{u < v_\epsilon\} \subset \{u < v\}$. If ϵ is small enough, the open set $\{u < v_\epsilon\}$ is also non-empty and

$$0 < \epsilon^k \int_{\{u < v_\epsilon\}} (dd^c w)^k \leq \int_{\{u < v_\epsilon\}} (dd^c v_\epsilon)^k \leq \int_{\{u < v_\epsilon\}} (dd^c u)^k \leq \int_{\{u < v\}} (dd^c u)^k = 0,$$

which is the wanted contradiction. \square

2.3. Proof of Theorem 2.1

Let us first prove that $u = v$ on ∂K . Let $z_0 \in \partial K$. As v is continuous,

$$v(z_0) = \limsup_{K \ni z \rightarrow z_0} v(z) \limsup_{K \ni z \rightarrow z_0} u(z) \leq \limsup_{z \rightarrow z_0} u(z) \leq \limsup_{z \rightarrow z_0} v(z) = v(z_0),$$

and thus $u = v$ on ∂K . Let now U be a connected component of $\overset{\circ}{K}$ and let us set

$$w(z) = \begin{cases} u(z) & \text{if } z \in U \\ v(z) & \text{if } z \in \Omega \setminus U. \end{cases}$$

The function w is then psh on $\Omega \setminus \partial U$ and usc on Ω . Moreover, if $z_0 \in \partial U$, w satisfies the submean inequality at z_0 in any non-constant holomorphic disk $\sigma : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ with $\sigma(0) = z_0$. Indeed, if $r > 0$ is small, then

$$w(z_0) = u(z_0) = u \circ \sigma(0) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u \circ \sigma(re^{i\theta}) d\theta \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} w \circ \sigma(re^{i\theta}) d\theta,$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that, by definition of w , we have $u \leq w$. Thus, w is psh on Ω . By [Dem, Prop. 4.1, p. 150], since $w = v$ outside of a compact subset of Ω , the measure $(dd^c w)^k$ is well-defined. According to Lemma 2.2, it comes

$$(dd^c w)^k(\Omega) = (dd^c v)^k(\Omega) .$$

Moreover, by definition of w , one has $(dd^c w)^k = (dd^c v)^k$ on $\Omega \setminus \bar{U}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (dd^c w)^k(\bar{U}) &= (dd^c w)^k(\Omega) - (dd^c w)^k(\Omega \setminus \bar{U}) \\ &= (dd^c v)^k(\Omega) - (dd^c v)^k(\Omega \setminus \bar{U}) \\ &= (dd^c v)^k(\bar{U}) = 0 , \end{aligned}$$

which gives $(dd^c w)^k = (dd^c v)^k$ as measures on Ω . Since $w \geq v$ on $\text{supp}((dd^c v)^k)$, this in particular implies that $w \geq v$, $(dd^c w)^k$ -a.e in Ω .

To conclude, let $W \Subset \Omega$ be an open set with smooth boundary such that $K \Subset W$ and let $M := \sup_W v \in \mathbb{R}$. Set now $w_1 := w - M$ and $v_1 := v - M$. From the above discussion, we have $w_1, v_1 \in \mathcal{PSH}^-(W)$, $(dd^c w_1)^k = (dd^c v_1)^k$ is a finite well-defined positive measure, and $w_1 = v_1$ on $\text{supp}((dd^c w_1)^k)$ and on a neighborhood of ∂W . According to Corollary 2.4, we then have $w_1 \geq v_1$ on U , i.e. $u = w = v$ on U . As this remains valid for any connected component U of $\overset{\circ}{K}$, we have proved that $u = v$ on $\overset{\circ}{K}$, which ends the proof.

3. Structure of some slices of the bifurcation currents

For any $1 \leq q \leq d - 2$, we set

$$\Sigma_{d-q} := \{1, \dots, d - q\}^{\mathbb{N}} .$$

and $\sigma_{d-q} : \Sigma_{d-q} \rightarrow \Sigma_{d-q}$ be the full shift, i.e. $\sigma_{d-q}(\epsilon_0 \epsilon_1 \dots) = \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots$.

When $d_1, \dots, d_{d-q} \geq 1$ satisfy $d = \sum_i d_i$, we also let ν_{d-q} be the probability measure on Σ_{d-q} , which is invariant by σ_{d-q} , and giving mass $(d_{\epsilon_0} \dots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}})/d^n$ to the cylinder of sequences starting with $\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{n-1}$.

Definition 3.1. — *The measure ν_{d-q} is called the $(\frac{d_1}{d}, \dots, \frac{d_{d-q}}{d})$ -measure on Σ_{d-q} .*

Let us remark that by definition, the measure ν_{d-q} doesn't charge points.

For the whole section, we let $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ be a k -tuple with $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d - 2$ and we let I^c be the unique $(d - 1 - k)$ -tuple satisfying $I \cup I^c = \{0, 1, \dots, d - 2\}$. We may write $I^c = (j_1, \dots, j_{d-1-k})$. For any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{d-1-k}$, we let

$$U_{I,\sigma} := \{G_I(c, a) < g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\sigma(1)}})\} \cap \bigcap_{l=1}^{d-k-2} \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\sigma(l)}}) < g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\sigma(l+1)}})\} .$$

We aim here at proving the following.

Theorem 3.2. — *For any $(c, a) \in U_{I,\sigma} \cap \{G_I = 0\}$, there exists an analytic set $\mathcal{X}_0 \subset U_{I,\sigma}$, a complex manifold \mathcal{X} and a finite proper holomorphic map $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_0$ such that:*

1. \mathcal{X} has dimension k and $\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\} \cap \mathcal{X} \Subset \mathcal{X}$,
2. $(dd^c L \circ \pi)^k$ is a finite measure on \mathcal{X} supported by $\partial(\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\} \cap \mathcal{X})$,

3. there exists $q \geq k$ such that, for any $\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}$, there exists k closed positive $(1, 1)$ -current $T_{\epsilon_1, 1}, \dots, T_{\epsilon_k, k}$ on \mathcal{X} with bounded potentials such that $T_{\epsilon_1, 1} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{\epsilon_k, k}$ is admissible for $\nu_{d-q}^{\otimes k}$ -a.e. $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k)$ and

$$(dd^c L \circ \pi)^k = k! \int_{\Sigma_{d-q}^k} T_{\epsilon_1, 1} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{\epsilon_k, k} d\nu_{d-q}^{\otimes k}(\epsilon) .$$

4. for any connected component \mathcal{U} of the interior of $\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\} \cap \mathcal{X}$,
- $$(dd^c L \circ \pi)^k(\partial\mathcal{U}) = 0 .$$

3.1. Preliminaries to Section 3

Let us recall known results and description concerning the bifurcation currents and the Böttcher coordinates at infinity of degree d polynomials (see e.g. [DF, Du2]). Let \mathcal{X} be any complex manifold and let $(P_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \mathcal{X}}$ be any holomorphic family of degree d polynomials. One can define a fibered dynamical system \widehat{P} acting on $\widehat{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{P} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C} \\ (\lambda, z) &\longmapsto (\lambda, P_\lambda(z)) . \end{aligned}$$

The sequence $d^{-n} \log^+ |(\widehat{P})^n|$ converges uniformly locally on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C}$ to the continuous psh function $(\lambda, z) \mapsto g_\lambda(z)$, where g_λ is the Green function of P_λ . Let us set

$$\widehat{T}_\mathcal{X} := dd_{\lambda, z}^c g_\lambda(z)$$

and let $p_1 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $p_2 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the respective natural projections. Assume in addition that $(P_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \mathcal{X}}$ is endowed with $d-1$ marked critical points, i.e. that there exists holomorphic functions $c_1, \dots, c_{d-1} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $C(P_\lambda) = \{c_1(\lambda), \dots, c_{d-1}(\lambda)\}$. In this setting, one can easily see that

$$dd^c (g_\lambda(c_i(\lambda))) = (p_1)_* \left(\widehat{T}_\mathcal{X} \wedge [C_i] \right) ,$$

where $C_i = \{(\lambda, c_i(\lambda))\}$ is the graph of the map $c_i(\lambda)$.

Finally, we shall also use the Böttcher coordinate at ∞ of $P_{c,a}$, i.e. the biholomorphic map $\psi_{c,a} : W_{c,a} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid g_{c,a}(z) > G(c,a)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}(0, e^{G(c,a)})}$ which satisfies $\psi_{c,a}(z) = z - \frac{1}{d-1}(c_1 + \dots + c_{d-2}) + O(z^{-1})$ at infinity and

$$\psi_{c,a} \circ P_{c,a}(z) = (\psi_{c,a}(z))^d, \quad z \in W_{c,a} .$$

One can show that, for $z \in W_{c,a}$, $g_{c,a}(z) = \log |\psi_{c,a}(z)|$ (see e.g. [Mi2]).

3.2. The maximal entropy measure $\mu_{c,a}$ for $(c,a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$

In the present section, we prove that, when exactly k critical points of $P_{c,a}$ don't escape, the maximal entropy measure $\mu_{c,a}$ of $P_{c,a}$ enjoys good decomposition properties with respect to the measure ν_{d-q} for some $q \geq k$. Namely, we prove the following.

Proposition 3.3. — *Let $(c,a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$. Assume that $d-k-1$ critical points (counted with multiplicity) of $P_{c,a}$ escape under iteration. Then, there exists $k \leq q \leq d-2$ such*

that one can decompose $\mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ as a disjoint union of (possibly non-connected) compact sets

$$\mathcal{K}_{c,a} = \bigcup_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}} \mathcal{K}_\epsilon$$

and, for any $\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}$, there exists a probability measure μ_ϵ supported by \mathcal{K}_ϵ such that the maximal entropy measure of $P_{c,a}$ satisfies

$$\mu_{c,a} = \int_{\Sigma_{d-q}} \mu_\epsilon d\nu_{d-q}(\epsilon) .$$

Moreover, for any $\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}$, one has $\mu_{c,a}(\mathcal{K}_\epsilon) = 0$.

Proof. — We follow closely the strategy of the proof of [Du2, Theorem 3.12] and adapt it to our situation. According to [Mi2, Theorem 9.3], the curve $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid g_{c,a}(z) = G(c,a) > 0\}$ contains at least one critical point of $P_{c,a}$. Let us define a topological disk U_0 by setting $U_0 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid g_{c,a}(z) < d \cdot G(c,a)\}$ and $U_1 := P_{c,a}^{-1}(U_0)$.

Lemma 3.4. — For $n \geq 0$, any component of U_n is a topological disk and $U_{n+1} \Subset U_n$.

We postpone the proof at the end of the section. As explained the proof of [Mi2, Theorem 9.5], one can show that U_1 has at least 2 distinct connected components. We thus can disjoint open set V_1, \dots, V_N so that $U_1 = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_N$. Let us set $P_i := P_{c,a}|_{V_i} : V_i \rightarrow U_0$ is a ramified covering map of degree $d_i \geq 1$.

Claim. — Let $q \geq k$ be the number of critical points of $P_{c,a}$ lying in U_1 , counted with multiplicity. Then U_1 has $d - q$ distinct connected components and

$$d = d_1 + \dots + d_{d-q} .$$

Let us continue the proof of Propostion 3.3. For any $\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}$, we set

$$\mathcal{K}_\epsilon := \{z \in U_0 ; P_{c,a}^m(z) \in V_{\epsilon_m}, m \geq 0\} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} P_{\epsilon_0}^{-1}(\dots(P_{\epsilon_n}^{-1}(\overline{U_0}))) .$$

Beware that the set $\mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ has uncountably many connected components and that the compact set \mathcal{K}_ϵ is not necessarily connected. In fact, whenever $C(P_{c,a}) \cap U_1 \not\subset \mathcal{K}_{c,a}$, there must exist non-connected \mathcal{K}_ϵ . On the other hand, one clearly has

$$\mathcal{K}_{c,a} = \bigcup_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}} \mathcal{K}_\epsilon$$

and this decomposition naturally gives a continuous surjective map

$$h_{c,a} : \mathcal{K}_{c,a} \longrightarrow \Sigma_{d-q}$$

satisfying $h_{c,a}(z) = \epsilon$ iff $z \in \mathcal{K}_\epsilon$. The map $h_{c,a}$ semi-conjugates $P_{c,a}$ on $\mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ to σ_{d-q} on Σ_{d-q} , i.e. satisfies $h_{c,a} \circ P_{c,a} = \sigma_{d-q} \circ h_{c,a}$ on $\mathcal{K}_{c,a}$.

Proceeding as in [Du2], one can prove that, for any $z \in U_0 \setminus \mathcal{K}_{c,a}$, one can rewrite $d^{-n}(P_{c,a}^n)^* \delta_z$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d^n} (P_{c,a}^n)^* \delta_z &= \frac{1}{d^n} \sum_{\epsilon_i \in \{1, \dots, d-k-1\}, i \leq n} P_{\epsilon_0}^* \cdots P_{\epsilon_{n-1}}^* \delta_z \\ (2) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \sum_{\epsilon_i \in \{1, \dots, d-k-1\}, i \leq n} \frac{d_{\epsilon_0} \cdots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}}{d^n} \left[\frac{1}{d_{\epsilon_0} \cdots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}} P_{\epsilon_0}^* \cdots P_{\epsilon_{n-1}}^* \delta_z \right] . \end{aligned}$$

When $n \rightarrow \infty$, the following convergence holds independently of z ,

$$\frac{1}{d_{\epsilon_0} \cdots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}} P_{\epsilon_0}^* \cdots P_{\epsilon_{n-1}}^* \delta_z \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\epsilon ,$$

where the measure μ_ϵ is a probability measure supported by $\partial\mathcal{K}_\epsilon$. The measure μ_ϵ is the analogue of the Brolin measure for the sequence $(P_{\epsilon_i})_{i \geq 0}$. In particular, one can prove that $\mu_\epsilon = \Delta g_\epsilon$, where g_ϵ is a locally bounded subharmonic function.

As $d^{-n}(P_{c,a}^n)^* \delta_z$ converges to $\mu_{c,a}$ of $P_{c,a}$, making $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (2), one finds

$$\mu_{c,a} = \int_{\Sigma_{d-q}} \mu_\epsilon d\nu_{d-q}(\epsilon) .$$

Let now $\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}$. By the formula above, as ν_{d-q} doesn't charge points,

$$\mu_{c,a}(\mathcal{K}_\epsilon) = \nu_{d-q}(\{\epsilon\}) = 0 ,$$

which ends the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.4. — One first sees that

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \exists x \in U_0 \text{ s.t. } P_{c,a}(z) = x\} \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid g_{c,a}(P_{c,a}(z)) < d \cdot G(c, a)\} \\ &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid g_{c,a}(z) < G(c, a)\} \Subset \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid g_{c,a}(z) < d \cdot G(c, a)\} = U_0 , \end{aligned}$$

as $g_{c,a}$ is the Green function of the compact set $\mathcal{K}_{c,a}$. Assume that some connected component W of some U_1 is not homeomorphic to a disk. Then $\mathbb{C} \setminus W$ will have a bounded component O which has to map to the unique unbounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus W$. Hence O will contain a pole of $P_{c,a}$, whereas there are no poles of $P_{c,a}$ in \mathbb{C} . \square

Proof of the Claim. — The map $P_{c,a} : \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \overline{U_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \overline{U_0}$ is a branched covering of degree d and, as $\chi(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \overline{U_0}) = 1$ and $\chi(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \overline{U_1}) = 2 - N$. Let $q \geq k$ be such that $d - q - 1$ critical points of $P_{c,a}$ belong to $U_0 \setminus \overline{U_1}$, and as ∞ is a critical points of multiplicity $d - 1$ of $P_{c,a}$, by Riemann-Hurwitz, one has

$$d \cdot 1 = 2 - N + (d - q - 1) + (d - 1) = 2d - q - N .$$

We thus have $N = d - q$.

For any $1 \leq j \leq d - q$, the map $P_i : V_i \rightarrow U_0$ is a branched covering. As V_i is a topological disk, one has $\chi(V_i) = \chi(U_0) = 1$ and the Riemann-Hurwitz formula gives

$$d_i = \deg(P_i) = r_i + 1 ,$$

where r_i is the number of critical points of $P_{c,a}$ contained in V_i , counted with multiplicities. Making the sum over i , we find

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d-q} d_i = \sum_{i=1}^{d-q} (r_i + 1) = d - q + \sum_{i=1}^{d-q} r_i = d ,$$

since $\sum_i r_i$ is the number of critical points contained in U_1 , i.e. $\sum_i r_i = q$. \square

3.3. Proof of Theorem 3.2

We are now in position to prove Theorem 3.2. For the proof, we follow closely the strategy of the proof of [Du2, Theorem 3.12]. Let $(c_0, a_0) \in \{G_I = 0\} \cap U_I$. As $g_{c_0, a_0}(c_{j,0}) > 0$ for any $j \in I^c$, there exists $k_j \geq 1$ such that $g_{c_0, a_0}(P_{c_0, a_0}^{k_j}(c_{j,0})) = d^{k_j} g_{c_0, a_0}(c_{j,0}) > G(c_0, a_0)$. Let us set

$$\mathcal{X}_1 := \bigcap_{j \in I^c} \{(c, a) \in U_{I, \sigma} \mid \psi_{c, a}(P_{c, a}^{k_j}(c_j)) = \psi_{c_0, a_0}(P_{c_0, a_0}^{k_j}(c_{j,0}))\} .$$

Then \mathcal{X}_1 is an analytic variety of dimension at least k . Up to taking an irreducible component of \mathcal{X}_1 , we may assume that it is irreducible. Moreover, it is contained in

$$\mathcal{Y} := \bigcap_{j \in I^c} \{(c, a) \in U_{I, \sigma} \mid g_{c, a}(c_j) = g_{c_0, a_0}(c_{j,0})\} .$$

The boundary of \mathcal{Y} consists in parameters (c, a) for which $G_I(c, a) = g_{c_0, a_0}(c_{j_{\sigma(1)}, 0}) > 0$. In particular, $\partial \mathcal{X}_1$ consists in parameters for which $G_I(c, a) = g_{c, a}(c_{j_{\sigma(1)}}) > 0$, hence

1. $\partial \mathcal{X}_1 \subset \partial U_{I, \sigma}$ and
2. $\{G_I = 0\} \cap \mathcal{X}_1 \Subset \mathcal{X}_1$.

Let now $q \geq k$ be the integer given by Proposition 3.3 at the parameter (c_0, a_0) and let

$$\mathcal{X}_0 := \mathcal{X}_1 \cap \{d \cdot G_I(c, a) < G(c_0, a_0)\} .$$

Let finally $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_0$ be a desingularization of \mathcal{X}_0 . We denote by P_λ the polynomial $P_{c, a}$ if $(c, a) = \pi(\lambda)$. Let also $c_i(\lambda) := c_i \circ \pi(\lambda)$. We also let $\lambda_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $\pi(\lambda_0) = (c_0, a_0)$. Let us remark that \mathcal{X} still satisfies properties 1 and 2 aforementioned and that $(dd^c G_I \circ \pi)^k$ is supported by the compact set $\partial\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\}$. Let $K \Subset \mathcal{X}$ be a compact subset with $\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\} \Subset K$. By the Chern-Levine-Nirenberg inequalities, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|(dd^c G_I \circ \pi)^k\| \leq C \cdot \|G_I \circ \pi\|_{L^\infty(K)}^k < +\infty ,$$

According to (1) and Proposition 1.5, since $\text{supp}(dd^c g_{c, a}(c_j)) \subset \{g_{c, a}(c_j) = 0\}$, one has

$$(dd^c L)^k = k!(dd^c G_I)^k \text{ on } U_{I, \sigma} .$$

It is thus left to prove that $(dd^c G_I \circ \pi)^k$ satisfies the assertions 3 and 4 of the Theorem.

Remark that the labelling $P_\lambda^{-1}(U_0) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_{d-q}$ does not depend on any choice. Moreover, according to the proof of Proposition 3.3, this decomposition persists in \mathcal{X} and depends continuously on the parameter λ . We thus can define

$$\widehat{P}_i : \mathcal{X} \times V_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{X} \times U_0$$

by setting $\widehat{P}_i(\lambda, z) = (\lambda, P_{i, \lambda}(z))$. Let us also set $s(\lambda) := c_{j_{\sigma(1)}}(\lambda)$. Let $R > 0$ be big enough so that $U_{0, \lambda} \subset \mathbb{D}(0, R/2)$ for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}$. Such an R exists by construction of \mathcal{X} (Take for example $R = d^2 G(c_0, a_0)$). As we have seen in section 3.2, for any $\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}$ and any $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}$, the sequence

$$\frac{1}{d_{\epsilon_0} \dots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}} P_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}^* \dots P_{\epsilon_{n-1}, \lambda}^* \delta_{s(\lambda)} = dd_z^c \left(\frac{1}{d_{\epsilon_0} \dots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}} \log |P_{\epsilon_{n-1}, \lambda} \circ \dots \circ P_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}(z) - s(\lambda)| \right)$$

converges to a measure $\mu_{\epsilon, \lambda}$ which has a continuous logarithmic potential $g_{\epsilon, \lambda}$.

Let now Γ_s be the graph of s , $\Gamma_s := \{(\lambda, s(\lambda)); \lambda \in \mathcal{X}\}$. We can write

$$(3) \quad \frac{1}{d^n} (\widehat{P}^*)^n [\Gamma_s] = \frac{1}{d^n} \sum_{\epsilon_i \in \{1, \dots, d-q\}, i \leq n-1} \widehat{P}_{\epsilon_0}^* \cdots \widehat{P}_{\epsilon_n}^* [\Gamma_s].$$

For $n \geq 0$, one also can set

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{T}_{\epsilon, n} &:= \frac{1}{d_{\epsilon_0} \cdots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}} \widehat{P}_{\epsilon_0}^* \cdots \widehat{P}_{\epsilon_{n-1}}^* [\Gamma_z] \\ &= dd_{\lambda, z}^c \left(\frac{1}{d_{\epsilon_0} \cdots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}} \log |P_{\epsilon_{n-1}, \lambda} \circ \cdots \circ P_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}(z) - s(\lambda)| \right) = dd_{\lambda, z}^c u_{\epsilon, n}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$u_{\epsilon, n}(\lambda, z) := \frac{1}{d_{\epsilon_0} \cdots d_{\epsilon_{n-1}}} \log |P_{\epsilon_{n-1}, \lambda} \circ \cdots \circ P_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}(z) - s(\lambda)|.$$

It is obvious that the sequence $(u_{\epsilon, n})_{n \geq 1}$ is locally uniformly bounded from above. According to the proof of Proposition 3.3, for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}$, the functions $u_{\epsilon, n}|_{\{\lambda\} \times \mathbb{D}(0, R)}$ converges in L_{loc}^1 to a subharmonic function $\neq -\infty$. Hence there exists a subsequence (u_{ϵ, n_k}) which converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{D}(0, R))$ to a psh function $u_{\epsilon, \infty}$. Let us remark that $\widehat{T}_{\epsilon, n}$ are all horizontal currents with supports contained in $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{D}(0, R/2)$. making $n \rightarrow \infty$, we see that the current $\widehat{T}_{\epsilon, \infty} := dd^c u_{\epsilon, \infty}$ is horizontal. According to Lemma 1.8, one can write

$$(4) \quad u_{\epsilon, \infty}(\lambda, z) = \int_{\mathbb{D}(0, R)} \log |z - t| d\mu_{\epsilon, \lambda}(t) + h(\lambda, z) = g_{\epsilon, \lambda}(z) + h(\lambda, z),$$

where h is pluriharmonic on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{D}(0, R)$ and $g_{\epsilon, \lambda}(z)$ is the logarithmic potential of $\mu_{\epsilon, \lambda}$.

In particular, the function $(\lambda, z) \mapsto g_{\epsilon, \lambda}(z)$ is psh on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{D}(0, R)$ and the sequence $\widehat{T}_{\epsilon, n}$ converges in the weak sense of currents to $\widehat{T}_{\epsilon} := dd^c g_{\epsilon, \lambda}(z)$.

Let now $p_1 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $p_2 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ stand for the canonical projections. Let $\widehat{T} := dd_{\lambda, z}^c g_{\lambda}(z)$. According to [DF, §3], $\frac{1}{d^n} (\widehat{P}^*)^n [\Gamma_s]$ converges to \widehat{T} as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The decomposition (3) then guarantees that $\widehat{T} = \int_{\Sigma_{d-q}} \widehat{T}_{\epsilon} d\nu_{d-q}(\epsilon)$.

As \widehat{T} has a continuous potential, $\widehat{T} \wedge [\mathcal{C}_{i_j}]$ is admissible. According to Lemma 1.9, $\widehat{T}_{\epsilon} \wedge [\mathcal{C}_{i_j}]$ is admissible for ν_{d-q} -a.e. $\epsilon \in \Sigma_{d-q}$ and one can write

$$\pi^* T_{i_j} = dd^c g_{\lambda}(c_{i_j}(\lambda)) = (p_2)_* \left(\widehat{T} \wedge [\mathcal{C}_{i_j}] \right) = \int_{\Sigma_{d-q}} (p_2)_* \left(\widehat{T}_{\epsilon} \wedge [\mathcal{C}_{i_j}] \right) d\nu_{d-q}(\epsilon).$$

Let us set $T_{\epsilon, j} := (p_2)_* \left(\widehat{T}_{\epsilon} \wedge [\mathcal{C}_{i_j}] \right)$, as soon as this product is admissible and $T_{\epsilon, j} := 0$ otherwise. When $k = 1$, we have justified item 3.

Assume now that $k \geq 2$. For the sake of simplicity, write $\Sigma = \Sigma_{d-q}$ and $\nu = \nu_{d-q}$. Again, as the functions $g_{\lambda}(c_{i_1}(\lambda)), \dots, g_{\lambda}(c_{i_k}(\lambda))$ are continuous, for any $1 \leq m \leq k$, the wedge product $dd^c g_{\lambda}(c_{i_1}(\lambda)) \wedge \cdots \wedge dd^c g_{\lambda}(c_{i_m}(\lambda))$ is admissible. By an easy induction, according to Lemma 1.9 and to Fubini's Theorem, for any $1 \leq m \leq k$ the product $T_{\epsilon, 1} \wedge \cdots \wedge T_{\epsilon, m}$

is admissible for $\nu^{\otimes m}$ -a.e. $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m)$ and,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigwedge_{j=1}^k dd^c g_\lambda(c_{i_j}(\lambda)) &= \int_{\Sigma} \left(T_{\epsilon_1,1} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=2}^k dd^c g_\lambda(c_{i_j}(\lambda)) \right) d\nu(\epsilon) \\
&= \int_{\Sigma} \left(T_{\epsilon_1,1} \wedge \int_{\Sigma} \left(T_{\epsilon_2,2} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=3}^k dd^c g_\lambda(c_{i_j}(\lambda)) \right) d\nu(\epsilon_2) \right) d\nu(\epsilon_1) \\
&= \int_{\Sigma^2} \left(T_{\epsilon_1,1} \wedge T_{\epsilon_2,2} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=3}^k dd^c g_\lambda(c_{i_j}(\lambda)) \right) d\nu(\epsilon_2) d\nu(\epsilon_1) \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&= \int_{\Sigma^k} (T_{\epsilon_1,1} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{\epsilon_k,k}) d\nu(\epsilon_1) \dots d\nu(\epsilon_k) .
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1.5, this yields item 3, letting $T_{\epsilon_1,1} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{\epsilon_k,k} = 0$ if it is not admissible.

Let us now prove item 4. When $\widehat{T}_\epsilon \wedge [\mathcal{C}_{i_j}]$ is admissible, its support is included in

$$\{(\lambda, z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{D}(0, R); z \in \mathcal{K}_{\epsilon, \lambda}\} \cap \mathcal{C}_{i_j} = \{(\lambda, z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{C}; c_{i_j}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{K}_{\epsilon, \lambda}\} .$$

As a consequence, $\text{supp}(T_{\epsilon, j}) \subset \{\lambda \in \mathcal{X}; c_{i_j}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{K}_{\epsilon, \lambda}\}$. Let \mathcal{U} be a connected component of the interior of $\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\}$. Then \mathcal{U} is a stable component, i.e. the sequences $P_\lambda^n(c_{i_j}(\lambda))$ form normal families in \mathcal{U} as families of holomorphic functions of the parameter. Hence there exists $\epsilon_{0,j} \in \Sigma_{d-q}$ and k holomorphically moving points $z_j(\lambda) \in \mathcal{K}_{\epsilon_{0,j}, \lambda}$ such that $c_{i_j}(\lambda) \equiv z_j(\lambda)$ on \mathcal{U} . This implies $c_{i_j}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{K}_{\epsilon_{0,j}, \lambda}$ for any $\lambda \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle (dd^c G_I \circ \pi)^k, \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{U}}} \right\rangle &= \int_{\Sigma^k} \left\langle \bigwedge_{j=1}^k T_{\epsilon_j, j}, \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{U}}} \right\rangle d\nu^{\otimes k}(\epsilon) \\
&\leq \|T_{\epsilon_{0,1},1} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{\epsilon_{0,k},k}\|_{\overline{\mathcal{U}}} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^k \nu(\{\epsilon_{0,j}\}) = 0 ,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

4. The bifurcation measure doesn't charge boundary components

Here, we prove that, as in the quadratic family, given any connected component U of the interior of the connectedness locus \mathcal{C}_d , the bifurcation measure doesn't give mass to the boundary of U . The proof relies uses the continuity of the Julia set at some specific parameters due to Douady [Do], convergence of invariant line fields established by McMullen [Mc], as well as a precise dynamical description of μ_{bif} -a.e. polynomial due to Dujardin and Favre [DF].

Theorem 4.1. — *Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ be a connected component the interior of \mathcal{C}_d . Then*

$$\mu_{\text{bif}}(\partial\mathcal{U}) = 0.$$

4.1. Invariant line field and the Caratheodory topology

For the material of the present section, we refer to [Mc].

Definition 4.2. — *Let $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ be an open set. A measurable line field on a Borel set of positive area $E \subset U$ is a Beltrami coefficient*

$$\nu = \nu(z) \frac{d\bar{z}}{dz}$$

where $\nu(z)$ is a measurable map on U with $|\nu(z)| = 1$ if $z \in E$ and $\nu(z) = 0$ otherwise. Let $V \subset \mathbb{C}$ be another open set. We say that the line field ν is invariant by a holomorphic map $f : U \rightarrow V$, or f -invariant, if $f^*\nu = \nu$ on $U \cap V$.

Let us consider a sequence (V_n, x_n) of pointed topological disks of \mathbb{P}^1 . We say that (V_n, x_n) converges to (V, x) in the Caratheodory topology if

1. $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,
2. for all compact set $K \subset V$, there exists $N \geq 1$ such that $K \subset V_n$ for all $n \geq N$,
3. for any open set $U \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ containing x , if there exists $N \geq 1$ such that $U \subset V_n$ for all $n \geq N$, then $U \subset V$.

If $(U_n, x_n) \rightarrow (U, x)$ and $(V_n, y_n) \rightarrow (V, y)$ in the Caratheodory topology and if $f_n : U_n \rightarrow V_n$ is a sequence of holomorphic maps satisfying $f_n(x_n) = y_n$ which converges uniformly on compact subsets of U to $f : U \rightarrow V$ holomorphic with $f(x) = y$, we say that $f_n : (U_n, x_n) \rightarrow (V_n, y_n)$ converges in the Carathéodory topology to $f : (U, x) \rightarrow (V, y)$.

Recall the following definition (see [Mc, §5.6]).

Definition 4.3. — *We say that a sequence $\nu_n \in L^\infty(V, \mathbb{C})$ converges in measure to $\nu \in L^\infty(V, \mathbb{C})$ on V if for all compact $K \Subset V$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Area}(\{z \in K ; |\nu_n(z) - \nu(z)| > \varepsilon\}) = 0 .$$

According to [W, Proposition 2.37.3], a bounded sequence $\nu_n \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$ admits a subsequence which converges in measure if and only if it is a Cauchy sequence in measure, i.e. for any compact $K \Subset \mathbb{C}$ and for any $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, there exists $n \geq 1$ such that

$$\text{Area}(\{z \in K : |\nu_p(z) - \nu_q(z)| > \delta\}) \leq \epsilon ,$$

for any $p, q \geq n$.

In what follows, we shall use the following result of McMullen (see [Mc, Theorem 5.14]).

Theorem 4.4 (McMullen). — *Let $f_n : (U_n, x_n) \rightarrow (V_n, y_n)$ be a sequence of non-constant holomorphic maps between disks. Assume that f_n converges in the Caratheodory topology to a non-constant holomorphic map $f : (U, x) \rightarrow (V, y)$. Assume in addition that there exists a measurable f_n -invariant line field ν_n which converges in measure to ν on V . Then ν is a measurable f -invariant line field. In particular, $\text{Area}(\text{supp}(\nu)) > 0$.*

4.2. Some pathologic filled-in Julia sets of positive area

In the present section, we aim at proving that, for polynomials belonging to the boundary of queer components where $\mathcal{K}_{c,a} = \mathcal{J}_{c,a}$, the filled-in Julia set has positive area. Precisely, we prove the following.

Theorem 4.5. — *Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ be a connected component of the interior of \mathcal{C}_d . Assume that there exists a parameter $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$, the polynomial $P_{c,a}$ has only repelling cycles and let $(c_0, a_0) \in \partial\mathcal{U}$. Then either $\text{Area}(\mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0}) > 0$ or \mathcal{K}_{c_0, a_0} has non-empty interior.*

Proof. — As there exists $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $P_{c,a}$ has only repelling cycles, one has $\mathcal{J}_{c,a} = \mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ and, as $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}$, this implies that $\mathcal{J}_{c,a} = \mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ for all $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$. In particular, \mathcal{U} is not a hyperbolic component. By [MSS, Theorem E], for any $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists a $P_{c,a}$ -invariant line field $\nu_{c,a}$ which is supported on the Julia set $\mathcal{J}_{c,a}$ of $P_{c,a}$, i.e. $\nu_{c,a} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$ satisfies $P_{c,a}^* \nu_{c,a} = \nu_{c,a}$ and there exists a Borel set $E_{c,a} \subset \mathcal{J}_{c,a}$ of positive area such that $|\nu_{c,a}(z)| = 1$ for all $z \in E_{c,a}$, and $\nu_{c,a}(z) = 0$ for all $z \notin E_{c,a}$.

Let us briefly recall how, in the present case, one can build this invariant line field. Let $(c_1, a_1) \in \mathcal{U}$ be a base point that we have chosen and let $\psi_{c,a}$ stand for the Böttcher coordinate of ∞ of $P_{c,a}$. The family of analytic maps

$$\phi_{c,a}(z) := \psi_{c,a}^{-1} \circ \psi_{c_1, a_1}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{J}_{c_1, a_1},$$

defines a conformal holomorphic motion $\mathcal{U} \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{J}_{c_1, a_1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which satisfies

$$\phi_{c,a} \circ P_{c_1, a_1}(z) = \psi_{c,a}^{-1} \circ \psi_{c_1, a_1}(P_{c_1, a_1}(z)) = \psi_{c,a}^{-1}(\psi_{c_1, a_1}(z)^d) = P_{c,a} \circ \phi_{c,a}(z).$$

By the λ -Lemma, it extends as a quasiconformal holomorphic motion $\phi : \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ such that $\phi_{c,a}$ conjugates P_{c_1, a_1} to $P_{c,a}$ on \mathbb{C} . Let $\mu_{c,a}$ be the Beltrami form on \mathbb{C} satisfying

$$\bar{\partial}\phi_{c,a}^{-1} = \mu_{c,a} \circ \partial\phi_{c,a}^{-1}$$

almost everywhere on \mathbb{C} . Then $\text{supp}(\mu_{c,a}) \subset \mathcal{J}_{c,a}$. If $\text{Area}(\text{supp}(\mu_{c_2, a_2})) = 0$ for some $(c_2, a_2) \in \mathcal{U}$, it would also be the case for all $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$. By the above construction, the maps $\phi_{c,a}$ would be a quasi-conformal homeomorphism which is holomorphic almost everywhere, i.e. $\phi_{c,a} \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$. This contradicts the fact that the family $(P_{c,a})_{(c,a) \in \mathcal{C}^{d-1}}$ is a finite ramified cover of the moduli space \mathcal{P}_d . Hence the Beltrami form defined by

$$\nu_{c,a} := \begin{cases} \frac{\mu_{c,a}(z)}{|\mu_{c,a}(z)|} \cdot \frac{d\bar{z}}{dz} & \text{if } \mu_{c,a}(z) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

defines an invariant line field for $P_{c,a}$.

Let us now proceed by contradiction, assuming that, for some $(c_0, a_0) \in \partial\mathcal{U}$, one has $\mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0} = \mathcal{K}_{c_0, a_0}$ and \mathcal{K}_{c_0, a_0} has Lebesgue measure zero. According to [Do, Corollaire 5.2], the map $(c, a) \mapsto \mathcal{J}_{c,a}$ is continuous at (c_0, a_0) . By [R, Corollary 6.5.2], for any $(c, a) \in \mathcal{C}_d$, the compact set $\mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ contains 0 and

$$\mathcal{K}_{c,a} \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}(0, 4^{d-1}\sqrt{d})}.$$

By Montel's Theorem, the family $(\psi_{c,a}^{-1})_{(c,a) \in \mathcal{U}}$ is a normal family and, for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}(0, 4d)$, one has $\lim_{(c,a) \rightarrow (c_0, a_0)} \psi_{c,a}^{-1}(z) = \psi_{c_0, a_0}^{-1}(z)$, where ψ_{c_0, a_0} is the Böttcher coordinate

at ∞ of P_{c_0, v_0} . In particular, the family $(\psi_{c,a}^{-1})_{(c,a) \in \mathcal{U}}$ converges locally uniformly to ψ_{c_0, v_0}^{-1} on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ as $(c, a) \rightarrow (c_0, v_0)$. Hence, for $R > 0$ big enough, the topological disk

$$\overline{(\psi_{c,a}^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}(0, R)}))}, \infty)$$

converges to the topological disk

$$\overline{(\psi_{c_0, a_0}^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}(0, R)}))}, \infty)$$

in the Caratheodory topology, as $(c, a) \rightarrow (c_0, a_0)$, and for all $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U} \cup \{(c_0, a_0)\}$,

$$\overline{\mathbb{D}(0, 4\sqrt[d-1]{d})} \cap \psi_{c,a}^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}(0, R)}) = \emptyset .$$

If we set

$$U_{c,a} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}; g_{c,a}(z) < \log R\} = \overline{\psi_{c,a}^{-1}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}(0, R)})}$$

and $V_{c,a} := P_{c,a}(U_{c,a}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C}; g_{c,a}(z) < d \log R\}$, the open sets $U_{c,a}$ and $V_{c,a}$ are topological disks and $(U_{c,a}, 0) \rightarrow (U_{c_0, a_0}, 0)$ and $(V_{c,a}, a^d) \rightarrow (V_{c_0, a_0}, a_0^d)$ in the Caratheodory topology as $(c, a) \rightarrow (c_0, a_0)$.

As \mathcal{J}_{c_n, a_n} converges in the Hausdorff topology to \mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0} , one has

$$0 \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Area}(\mathcal{J}_{c_n, a_n}) \leq \text{Area}(\mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0}) = 0 ,$$

which means that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Area}(\mathcal{J}_{c_n, a_n}) = \text{Area}(\mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0}) = 0$.

Let $K \Subset \mathbb{C}$ be a compact subset and $\delta, \epsilon > 0$. As $\text{supp}(\nu_{c_n, a_n}) \subset \mathcal{J}_{c_n, a_n}$, there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $\text{Area}(\text{supp}(\nu_{c_p, a_p})) \leq \epsilon/2$ for all $p \geq n$. Let now $p, q \geq n$. Then

$$\{z \in K : |\nu_{c_p, a_p}(z) - \nu_{c_q, a_q}(z)| > \delta\} \subset \text{supp}(\nu_{c_p, a_p}) \cup \text{supp}(\nu_{c_q, a_q}) ,$$

hence

$$\text{Area}(\{z \in K : |\nu_{c_p, a_p}(z) - \nu_{c_q, a_q}(z)| > \delta\}) \leq \epsilon .$$

The sequence (ν_{c_n, a_n}) is thus a Cauchy sequence in measure and we can find a sequence $\{(c_n, a_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ (maybe extracted from the previous one) which converges to (c_0, a_0) as n tends to ∞ and such that ν_{c_n, a_n} converges in measure to some function $\nu_0 \in L^\infty$.

Finally, since $(U_{c_n, a_n}, 0) \rightarrow (U_{c_0, a_0}, 0)$ and $(V_{c_n, a_n}, a_n^d) \rightarrow (V_{c_0, a_0}, a_0^d)$ converge in the Carathéodory topology and since P_{c_n, a_n} converges uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{C} to P_{c_0, a_0} , we may apply Theorem 4.4 to the sequences (ν_{c_n, a_n}) and

$$P_{c_n, a_n} : (\mathbb{D}(c_{i,n}, R), c_{i,n}) \rightarrow (V_n, P_{c_n, a_n}(c_{i,n})) .$$

The conclusion is that ν_0 is a P_{c_0, a_0} -invariant line field on \mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0} . In particular, \mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0} must have positive area, since it carries an invariant line field, which is a contradiction. \square

4.3. Proof of Theorem 4.1

Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ be a connected component of the interior of \mathcal{C}_d . Then it is a stable component, i.e. $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}$. Assume first that there exists $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $P_{c,a}$ has at least one non-repelling cycle. As $\text{Per}_n(e^{i\theta}) \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ for any $n \geq 1$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, the polynomial $P_{c,a}$ has at least one attracting periodic point $z(c, a)$ and it can be followed holomorphically on \mathcal{U} . Hence it extends as a continuous map $z : \overline{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $z(c, a)$ is periodic for $P_{c,a}$ for all $(c, a) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}$. In particular, for all $(c, a) \in \partial\mathcal{U}$, the polynomial $P_{c,a}$ admits a non-repelling periodic point. In particular, $\mathcal{B} \cap \partial\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ by Theorem 1.6, hence $\mu_{\text{bif}}(\partial\mathcal{U}) = 0$.

Assume now that there exists $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that all the periodic points of $P_{c,a}$ are repelling. Then, according to [MSS, Theorem E], for any $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U}$, $P_{c,a}$ carries an invariant line field on its Julia set, $\mathcal{J}_{c,a} = \mathcal{K}_{c,a}$ and $\text{Area}(\mathcal{J}_{c,a}) > 0$. Let $(c_0, a_0) \in \partial\mathcal{U}$, as $(c, a) \in \mathcal{U} \rightarrow (c_0, a_0)$, either all the cycles of $P_{c,a}$ remain repelling, or at least one becomes non-repelling. One thus has the following dichotomy:

1. all cycles of P_{c_0, a_0} are repelling and thus $\mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0} = \mathcal{K}_{c_0, a_0}$, or
2. there exists one cycle of P_{c_0, a_0} which is non-repelling.

In the first case, according to Theorem 4.5, one has $\text{Area}(\mathcal{J}_{c_0, a_0}) > 0$, hence $(c_0, a_0) \notin \mathcal{B}$. In the second case, according to Theorem 1.6, one has $(c_0, a_0) \notin \mathcal{B}$. We thus have proved that, in any case, $\partial\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$ and thus $\mu_{\text{bif}}(\partial\mathcal{U}) = 0$.

5. Distribution of $\text{Per}_n(w)$ for any $w \in \mathbb{C}$

The present section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1. In a first time, we recall the construction of the hypersurface $\text{Per}_n(w)$ and equidistribution results concerning these hypersurfaces established by Bassanelli and Berteloot [BB3].

5.1. The hypersurfaces $\text{Per}_n(w)$

In what follows, we shall use the following (see [S, Mi1]):

Theorem 5.1 (Milnor, Silverman). — *For any $n \geq 1$, there exists a polynomial $p_n : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\deg_w p_n(c, a, w) \sim d^{-n}/n$ and*

1. *If $w \neq 1$, $p_n(c, a, w) = 0$ if and only if $P_{c,a}$ has a cycle of exact period n and multiplier w ,*
2. *$p_n(c, a, 1) = 0$ if and only if there exists $q \geq 1$ such that $P_{c,a}$ has a cycle of exact period n/q and multiplier η a primitive q -root of unity.*

We will be interested in the study of the hypersurfaces

$$\text{Per}_n(w) := \{(c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \mid p_n(c, a, w) = 0\},$$

for $n \geq 1$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}$. For $w \in \mathbb{C}$, we also shall set $L_{n,w}(c, a) := \log |p_n(c, a, w)|$ and

$$[\text{Per}_n(w)] := dd_{c,a}^c L_{n,w}.$$

Bassanelli and Berteloot [BB2] show the following.

Theorem 5.2 (Bassanelli-Berteloot). — *Let $w \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $|w| \leq 1$. Then $d^{-n}L_{n,w}$ converges to L in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{C}^{d-1})$. In particular, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d^{-n}[\text{Per}_n(w)] = T_{\text{bif}}$.*

More generally, for any $w \in \mathbb{C}$, they prove the following.

Proposition 5.3 (Bassanelli-Berteloot). — *Fix $w \in \mathbb{C}$. Up to extraction, the sequence $(d^{-n}L_{n,w})$ converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{C}^{d-1})$ to a p.s.h function φ which satisfies*

- $\varphi \leq L$ on \mathbb{C}^{d-1} ,
- $\varphi = L$ on hyperbolic components. In particular, $\varphi \neq -\infty$.

5.2. Proof of Theorem 1

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1. Let us first remark that, since the natural projection $\pi : \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d$ defined by $\pi(c, a) = \{P_{c,a}\}$ is finite to 1, it is sufficient to prove that equidistribution holds in the family $(P_{c,a})_{(c,a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}}$.

Let $w \in \mathbb{C}$ be fixed. If $|w| \leq 1$, then Theorem 5.2 gives the wanted result. We may thus assume that $|w| > 1$. By Proposition 5.3, we may also assume that $(d^{-n_k} L_{n_k, w})_{k \geq 0}$ converges in L_{loc}^1 to a psh function φ and that

1. $\varphi \leq L$ on \mathbb{C}^{d-1} ,
2. $\varphi = L$ on hyperbolic components and in particular, $\varphi \not\equiv -\infty$,

Our strategy is to make inductively use of the comparison principle which is established in Section 2 to prove that $\varphi = L$. First, let us define an open set U by setting

$$U := \bigcup_{k=0}^{d-2} U_k, \quad \text{with } U_k := \bigcup_I \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{d-1-k}} U_{I,\tau},$$

where $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ ranges over k -tuples with $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d-2$ and where $U_{I,\tau}$ are the open sets defined in Section 3.

Claim. — U is an open and dense subset of $\mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$.

We may prove that $L = \varphi$ on U . As L and φ are psh and as L is continuous, this yields $L = \varphi$ on $\mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$. Indeed, if $(c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$, there exists $U \ni (c_n, a_n) \rightarrow (c, a)$ and

$$\varphi(c, a) \leq L(c, a) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(c_n, a_n) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(c_n, a_n) \leq \varphi(c, a).$$

For any $(c, a) \in U$, we let $0 \leq k \leq d-2$ be the number of non-escaping critical points of $P_{c,a}$. If $k = 0$, then $(c, a) \in \mathcal{E} := \mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \bigcup_j \mathcal{B}_j$. Since \mathcal{E} is in an hyperbolic component, hence $\varphi(c, a) = L(c, a)$. In particular, $\varphi = L$ on $U \cap \mathcal{E}$.

Assume now that $1 \leq k \leq d-2$ and that $\varphi = L$ on

$$U \setminus \bigcup_{0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{k-1} \leq d-2} \bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{B}_{i_j},$$

i.e. on the locus on U where at most $k-1$ don't escape. Since k critical points of $P_{c,a}$ don't escape, $(c, a) \in \{G_I = 0\} \cap U_{I,\tau}$ for some k -tuple I and some $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{d-1-k}$. Let us remark that $\{G_I > 0\} \cap U_{I,\tau}$ is contained in the aforementioned open set, so that $\varphi = L$ on $\{G_I > 0\} \cap U_{I,\tau}$. According to Theorem 3.2, there exists a k -dimensional manifold \mathcal{X} , an analytic set \mathcal{X}_0 and a finite proper analytic map $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_0$ such that

- \mathcal{X} has dimension k ,
- $\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\} \Subset \mathcal{X}$, in particular $\varphi \circ \pi = L \circ \pi$ on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{G_I \circ \pi = 0\}$,
- $(dd^c L \circ \pi)^k$ is a finite measure on \mathcal{X} supported by $\partial\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\}$,
- for any connected component \mathcal{U} of the interior of $\{G_I \circ \pi = 0\}$,

$$(dd^c L \circ \pi)^k(\partial\mathcal{U}) = 0.$$

To apply the comparison Theorem 2.1, it remains to justify the existence of a smooth form on \mathcal{X} which is Kähler outside an analytic subset of \mathcal{X} . Let $\omega := dd^c \|(c, a)\|^2$ be the standard Kähler form on \mathbb{C}^{d-1} . Then the function $\lambda \mapsto \|\pi(\lambda)\|^2$ is psh and smooth on \mathcal{X} . Moreover, the form

$$\omega_{\mathcal{X}} := dd^c \|\pi(\lambda)\|^2 = \pi^*(\omega|_{\mathcal{X}_0})$$

is Kähler on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$, where \mathcal{Z} is the analytic set of $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}$ where $D_\lambda \pi$ doesn't have maximal rank. By Theorem 2.1, one has $\varphi \circ \pi = L \circ \pi$ on \mathcal{X} . In particular, $\varphi(c, a) = L(c, a)$ and $\varphi = L$ on the open set

$$U \setminus \bigcup_{0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d-2} \bigcap_{j=1}^k \mathcal{B}_{i_j}.$$

By a finite induction, we have $\varphi = L$ on U , hence on $\mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$.

- The final step of the proof goes essentially the same way. According to Theorem 4.1,
- L is continuous and psh on \mathbb{C}^{d-1} and $(dd^c L)^{d-1} = \mu_{\text{bif}}$ is supported on $\partial \mathcal{C}_d$,
 - for any connected component \mathcal{U} of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_d$, $(dd^c L)^{d-1}(\partial \mathcal{U}) = 0$,
 - $\varphi \leq L$ and $\varphi = L$ on $\mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$.

By Theorem 2.1, this yields $\varphi = L$. Since φ is any L_{loc}^1 limit of the sequence $(d^{-n} L_{n,w})$, the sequence $d^{-n} L_{n,w}$ converges in L_{loc}^1 to L , which ends the proof.

Proof of the Claim. — The openness is trivial by continuity of the maps $(c, a) \mapsto g_{c,a}(c_j)$. For $0 \leq k \leq d-2$, $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ with $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq d-2$ and $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{d-k-1}$, we let $V_{k,I,\tau} \subset \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ be the open set

$$V_{k,\tau} := \{G_I < g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(1)}}) \leq \dots \leq g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(d-k-1)}})\},$$

where $\{j_1, \dots, j_{d-k-1}\} = I^c$, so that $\bigcup_{k,I,\tau} V_{k,I,\tau} = \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$ and $U_{I,\tau} \subset V_{k,I,\tau}$. It is sufficient to prove that $U_{I,\tau}$ is dense in $V_{k,I,\tau}$ for any k and any τ to conclude.

Let now $0 \leq k \leq d-2$ and $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{d-1}$ be fixed. Assume by contradiction that $V_{k,I,\tau} \setminus U_{I,\tau}$ contains an open set Ω of $\mathbb{C}^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d$. Then, there exists $1 \leq l \leq d-k-2$ so that the map

$$\phi_l : (c, a) \mapsto g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l+1)}}) - g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}})$$

is constant equal to 0 on Ω . On the other hand, as $\Omega \subset W := \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\} \cap \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l+1)}}) > 0\}$, the functions $g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}})$ and $g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l+1)}})$ are pluriharmonic on W , the function ϕ_l is pluriharmonic on the connected component V of W containing Ω and vanishes on Ω . In particular, $\phi_l \equiv 0$ on V , hence on \bar{V} , by continuity of ϕ_l . This means that the open set V is a connected component of $\{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$.

Lemma 5.4. — *The open set $\{(c, a) \in \mathbb{C}^{d-1}; g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$ is connected.*

To conclude the proof of the Claim, we just have to remark that we have shown that $g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) \equiv g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l+1)}})$ on \mathbb{C}^{d-1} , which is impossible, by Theorem 1.1. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.4. — If $p \in H_\infty \setminus H_{j_{\tau(l)}}$, then \mathbb{C}^{d-1} can be foliated by all the complex lines $(\ell_t)_{t \in A}$ of \mathbb{C}^{d-1} direction p , where A is a $(d-2)$ -dimensional complex plane which is transverse to the foliation. Let now ℓ be such a line. The choice of p guarantees that $\ell \cap \{g_{c,a}(j_{\tau(l)}) = 0\}$ is a compact subset ℓ . In particular, if the set $\ell \cap \{g_{c,a}(j_{\tau(l)}) > 0\}$ is not connected, it admits a bounded connected component U . By the maximum principle

$$\sup_U |P_{c,a}^n(c_{j_{\tau(l)}})| = \sup_{\partial U} |P_{c,a}^n(c_{j_{\tau(l)}})|.$$

Since ∂U is a compact subset of $\{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) = 0\} \cap \ell$, the sequence $\{P_{c,a}^n(c_{j_{\tau(l)}})\}_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly bounded on U , which contradicts the fact that V is a connected component of $\ell \cap \{g_{c,a}(j_{\tau(l)}) > 0\}$.

Now, if $(c, a), (c', a') \in \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$, there exists a ball $B \subset A$ such that $(c, a), (c', a') \in O := \bigcup_{t \in B} \ell_t$. Since \overline{B} is compact in A , there exists $R > 0$ such that the set $\{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) = 0\} \cap O$ is contained in $\mathbb{B}(0, R)$. Let now $t_0, t_1 \in A$ be such that $(c, a) \in \ell_{t_0}$ and $(c', a') \in \ell_{t_1}$ and let $(c_0, a_0) \in \ell_{t_0} \setminus \mathbb{B}(0, R) \cap \ell_{t_0}$ and $(c_1, a_1) \in \ell_{t_1} \setminus \mathbb{B}(0, R) \cap \ell_{t_1}$. As $\ell_{t_0} \cap \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$ is a connected open set $f\ell_{t_0}$, there exists a continuous path $\gamma_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \ell_{t_0} \cap \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$ with $\gamma_0(0) = (c, a)$ and $\gamma_0(1) = (c_0, a_0)$. One can find the same way a continuous path $\gamma_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \ell_{t_1} \cap \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$ with $\gamma_1(0) = (c_1, a_1)$ and $\gamma_1(1) = (c', a')$. Finally, the choice of (c_0, a_0) and (c_1, a_1) easily gives a continuous path $\gamma_3 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$ which satisfies $\gamma_3(0) = (c_0, a_0)$ and $\gamma_3(1) = (c_1, a_1)$. The path $\gamma := \gamma_1 * \gamma_3 * \gamma_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \{g_{c,a}(c_{j_{\tau(l)}}) > 0\}$ is continuous and satisfies $\gamma(0) = (c, a)$ and $\gamma(1) = (c', a')$, which ends the proof. \square

References

- [B] François Berteloot. Bifurcation currents in holomorphic families of rational maps. In *Pluripotential Theory*, volume 2075 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–93. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2013.
- [BB1] Giovanni Bassanelli and François Berteloot. Bifurcation currents in holomorphic dynamics on \mathbb{P}^k . *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 608:201–235, 2007.
- [BB2] Giovanni Bassanelli and François Berteloot. Lyapunov exponents, bifurcation currents and laminations in bifurcation loci. *Math. Ann.*, 345(1):1–23, 2009.
- [BB3] Giovanni Bassanelli and François Berteloot. Distribution of polynomials with cycles of a given multiplier. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 201:23–43, 2011.
- [BG] Xavier Buff and Thomas Gauthier. Quadratic polynomials, multipliers and equidistribution, 2013. preprint.
- [BGZ] Slimane Benelkourchi, Vincent Guedj, and Ahmed Zeriahi. Plurisubharmonic functions with weak singularities. In *Complex analysis and digital geometry*, volume 86 of *Acta Univ. Upsaliensis Skr. Uppsala Univ. C Organ. Hist.*, pages 57–74. Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala, 2009.
- [BH] Bodil Branner and John H. Hubbard. The iteration of cubic polynomials. I. The global topology of parameter space. *Acta Math.*, 160(3-4):143–206, 1988.
- [BT] Eric Bedford and B. A. Taylor. The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampere equation. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 82(1):102–104, 1976.
- [Dem] J.-P. Demailly. Complex analytic and differential geometry, 2011. free accessible book (<http://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/manuscripts/agbook.pdf>).
- [DeM] Laura DeMarco. Dynamics of rational maps: a current on the bifurcation locus. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 8(1-2):57–66, 2001.
- [Do] Adrien Douady. L'ensemble de Julia dépend-il continûment du polynôme? In *Aspects des systèmes dynamiques*, pages 125–166. Ed. Éc. Polytech., Palaiseau, 2009.
- [Du1] Romain Dujardin. Bifurcation currents and equidistribution on parameter space. To appear in *Frontiers in Complex Dynamics: In Celebration of John Milnor's 80th Birthday* Edited by Araceli Bonifant, Misha Lyubich, & Scott Sutherland, Princeton Mathematical Series.
- [Du2] Romain Dujardin. Cubic polynomials: a measurable view on parameter space. In *Complex dynamics : families and friends / edited by Dierk Schleicher*, pages 451–490. A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, Massachusetts, 2009.
- [DDS] Tien Cuong Dinh, Romain Dujardin, and Nessim Sibony. On the dynamics near infinity of some polynomial mappings in \mathbb{C}^2 . *Math. Ann.*, 333(4):703–739, 2005.
- [DF] Romain Dujardin and Charles Favre. Distribution of rational maps with a preperiodic critical point. *Amer. J. Math.*, 130(4):979–1032, 2008.
- [L] M. Yu. Lyubich. Some typical properties of the dynamics of rational mappings. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 38(5(233)):197–198, 1983.

- [Mc] Curtis T. McMullen. *Complex dynamics and renormalization*, volume 135 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1994.
- [Mi1] John Milnor. Geometry and dynamics of quadratic rational maps. *Experiment. Math.*, 2(1):37–83, 1993. With an appendix by the author and Lei Tan.
- [Mi2] John Milnor. *Dynamics in one complex variable*, volume 160 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, third edition, 2006.
- [MSS] R. Mañé, P. Sad, and D. Sullivan. On the dynamics of rational maps. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 16(2):193–217, 1983.
- [R] Thomas Ransford. *Potential theory in the complex plane*, volume 28 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [S] Joseph H. Silverman. *The arithmetic of dynamical systems*, volume 241 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2007.
- [W] Claude Wagschal. *Dérivation, intégration*. Collection Méthodes. Hermann, Paris, 1999.

THOMAS GAUTHIER, LAMFA, Université de Picardie Jules Verne, 33 rue Saint-Leu, 80039 AMIENS
Cedex 1, FRANCE • E-mail : thomas.gauthier@u-picardie.fr