

Title	A cluster of sets of exceptional times of linear Brownian motion
Author(s)	磯崎, 泰樹
Citation	大阪大学, 2002, 博士論文
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/11094/1093">https://hdl.handle.net/11094/1093</a>
rights	
Note	

*Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

## A CLUSTER OF SETS OF EXCEPTIONAL TIMES OF LINEAR BROWNIAN MOTION

YASUKI ISOZAKI

(Received June 7, 2000)

### 1. Introduction and the main theorems

Aspandiiarov-Le Gall [1] studied the following random closed sets  $K^-$ ,  $K$  and  $K'$ : Let  $(B_t; t \geq 0)$  be a linear standard Brownian motion starting at 0, and let

$$\begin{aligned} K^- &= \left\{ t \in [0, 1]; \int_s^t (B_u - B_t) du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in [0, t). \right\}, \\ K &= \left\{ t \in K^-; \int_t^s (B_u - B_t) du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in (t, 1]. \right\}, \\ K' &= \left\{ t \in K^-; \int_t^s (B_u - B_t) du \geq 0 \text{ for every } s \in (t, 1]. \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

They computed the Hausdorff dimension of  $K^-$ ,  $K$  and  $K'$ .

**Theorem** ([1]). *It holds  $\dim K^- = 3/4$ ,  $\dim K = 1/2$  and  $\dim K' \leq 1/2$  almost surely. The set  $K'$  is possibly empty or  $\dim K' = 1/2$ , both with positive probability. The same statements hold if the weak inequalities in the definition of  $K^-$ ,  $K$  and  $K'$  are replaced by the strict inequalities.*

In this paper, we consider a cluster of random sets having various dimension. For  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $c > 0$ , we define the following functions  $V(\alpha, c)$  increasing on  $\mathbb{R}$ :

$$V(\alpha, c; y) = y^\alpha \quad \text{for } y > 0; \quad V(\alpha, c; 0) = 0; \quad V(\alpha, c; y) = -\frac{|y|^\alpha}{c} \quad \text{for } y < 0.$$

Let  $\alpha, \alpha_+, \alpha_- \geq 0$ ,  $c, c_+, c_- > 0$  and write  $V$  for  $V(\alpha, c)$ ,  $V_\pm$  for  $V(\alpha_\pm, c_\pm)$ . We define the random sets depending on the functions  $V$ ,  $V_+$  and  $V_-$ :

$$(1.1) \quad K^-(V) = \left\{ t \in [0, 1]; \int_s^t V(B_u - B_t) du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in [0, t). \right\},$$

$$(1.2) \quad K(V_-; V_+) = \left\{ t \in K^-(V_-); \int_t^s V_+(B_u - B_t) du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in (t, 1]. \right\},$$

$$(1.3) \quad K'(V_-; V_+) = \left\{ t \in K^-(V_-); \int_t^s V_+(B_u - B_t) du \geq 0 \text{ for every } s \in (t, 1]. \right\}.$$

These sets consist of exceptional times in the sense that  $P[t \in K^-(V)] = 0$  for every  $t \in (0, 1]$  and  $P[t \in K(V_-; V_+)] = P[t \in K'(V_-; V_+)] = 0$  for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 1.** *We define  $\nu = 1/(2 + \alpha)$ ,  $\nu_- = 1/(2 + \alpha_-)$  and  $\nu_+ = 1/(2 + \alpha_+)$ . Let  $\rho, \rho_-, \rho_+ \in (0, 1)$  be the unique solutions of the equations*

$$\begin{aligned} c^\nu \sin \pi \nu (1 - \rho) &= \sin \pi \nu \rho, \\ c_-^{\nu_-} \sin \pi \nu_- (1 - \rho_-) &= \sin \pi \nu_- \rho_-, \\ c_+^{\nu_+} \sin \pi \nu_+ (1 - \rho_+) &= \sin \pi \nu_+ \rho_+ \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

- (a) *For  $V = V(\alpha, c)$ , we have almost surely  $\dim K^-(V) = 1 - \rho/2$ . For  $V_+ = V(\alpha_+, c_+)$  and  $V_- = V(\alpha_-, c_-)$  we have (b) and (c):*  
 (b)  *$\dim K(V_-; V_+) \leq 1 - (\rho_- + \rho_+)/2$  almost surely and*

$$P \left[ \dim K(V_-; V_+) \geq 1 - \frac{\rho_- + \rho_+}{2} \right] > 0.$$

- (c)  *$\dim K'(V_-; V_+) \leq (1 - \rho_- + \rho_+)/2$  almost surely and*

$$P \left[ \dim K'(V_-; V_+) \geq \frac{1 - \rho_- + \rho_+}{2} \right] > 0.$$

The behavior of  $V, V_+$  and  $V_-$  outside any neighborhood of the origin have no influence on the Hausdorff dimension; We could state the theorem in that fashion. The parameters  $\rho, \rho_-, \rho_+ \in (0, 1)$  in the statement of Theorem 1 are continuous and increasing in  $c, c_+, c_-$  and have the range  $(0, 1)$  since  $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \rho = 0$  and  $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \rho = 1$ . In fact, they are equal to the probability of some event related to the parameters in the theorem, see the remark 4 in [4].

Note that for fixed  $\alpha$ , it holds  $\rho = 1/2$  if  $c = 1$ . Hence the statements in the theorem in [1] for  $K^-$  and  $K'$  can be included in Theorem 1 since  $K^- = K^-(V(1, 1))$  and  $K' = K'(V(1, 1); V(1, 1))$ . The implication by Theorem 1 on  $K$ , however, is weaker than [1], since we have not obtained the almost sure estimate from below.

Let  $\alpha, \tilde{\alpha} \geq 0$  and  $c, \tilde{c} > 0$ . If  $V = V(\alpha, c)$  and  $\tilde{V} = V(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{c})$ , then there is no inclusion in general between  $K^-(V)$  and  $K^-(\tilde{V})$ . However it is easy to see, for each  $\alpha$ , that  $K^-(V(\alpha, c)) \subset K^-(V(\alpha, \tilde{c}))$  if  $\tilde{c} < c$ . Hence we obtain a family

$$\{K^-(V(\alpha, c)); c \in (0, 1)\}$$

of decreasing random sets having strictly decreasing dimension.

The estimate in Theorem 1 for  $\dim K^-(V)$  is exhaustive in the following sense: Let  $H$  be the set of times  $t$  when  $B_t$  attains its past-maximum:

$$H := \left\{ t \in [0, 1]; B_t = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} B_s \right\}.$$

It is well known that  $\dim H = 1/2$  a.s. Since  $H \subset K^-(V(\alpha, c)) \subset [0, 1]$ , we have  $1/2 \leq \dim K^-(V) \leq 1$ . The range of  $1 - \rho/2$  is exactly  $(1/2, 1)$  and the trivial case  $K^-(V) = H$  or  $K^-(V) = [0, 1]$  could be included if we allow  $c = \infty$  or  $c = 0$ .

The estimate in Theorem 1 for  $\dim K(V_-; V_+)$  is also exhaustive in the following sense: Let  $\tau$  be the time when the maximum on  $[0, 1]$  of  $B$  is attained:  $B_\tau \geq B_t$  for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ . The inclusion  $\{\tau\} \subset K(V_-; V_+) \subset [0, 1]$  implies  $0 \leq \dim K(V_-; V_+) \leq 1$  and the range of the value  $1 - (\rho_- + \rho_+)/2$  is exactly  $(0, 1)$ . The extreme cases could also be included here.

In the same sense as Aspdiiarov and LeGall [1] noted concerning  $K', K'(V_-; V_+)$  can be interpreted as a weakened notion of the increasing points of Brownian motion and it is not straightforward to exhibit an element of  $K'(V_-; V_+)$ .

If both  $V_-$  and  $V_+$  are  $V(\alpha, c)$  then  $(1 - \rho_- + \rho_+)/2 = 1/2$  irrespective of  $\alpha$  and  $c$ . This motivates the next theorem, which could be a version of settlement of a conjecture at the end of [1]:  $\dim K' = 1/2$  a.s. on the event  $\{B_1 > 0\}$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; V(0) = 0, V \text{ is strictly increasing}\}$ .*

*We define  $\tilde{K}'(V; V)$  for  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  in the same way as (1.3) replacing the weak inequalities by strict inequalities in the definition of  $K'(V; V)$ :*

$$\tilde{K}'(V; V) = \left\{ t \in [0, 1]; \int_s^t V(B_u - B_t) du < 0 \text{ for every } s \in [0, t), \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \int_t^s V(B_u - B_t) du > 0 \text{ for every } s \in (t, 1]. \right\}.$$

*Then we have  $P[\dim \tilde{K}'(V; V) = 1/2] > 0, P[\tilde{K}'(V; V) \subset \{0, 1\}] > 0$  and*

$$P \left[ \dim \tilde{K}'(V; V) = \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \tilde{K}'(V; V) \subset \{0, 1\} \right] = 1.$$

REMARK 1. When the set  $\tilde{K}'(V; V)$  consists of exceptional times, we have the dichotomy that  $\dim \tilde{K}'(V; V) = 1/2$  if it is not empty.

The result of Theorem 2 is stronger than Theorem 1(c) for each strictly increasing functions  $V(\alpha, c)$ , i.e.  $\alpha > 0$ , while Theorem 2 says nothing about  $V(0, c)$ .

Theorem 2 is in fact a corollary of the following Theorem 3 due essentially to Bertoin [3].

Let  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $X = (X(t); t \geq 0)$  be a cadlag path with  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X(t) = +\infty$ . We define, inspired by Bertoin [3],

$$K'_\infty(V, x, X) = \left\{ t \in [0, \infty); \int_s^t V(X_u - x)du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in [0, t), \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \int_t^s V(X_u - x)du \geq 0 \text{ for every } s \in (t, \infty). \right\},$$

$$K'_1(V, x, X) = \left\{ t \in [0, 1]; \int_s^t V(X_u - x)du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in [0, t), \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \int_t^s V(X_u - x)du \geq 0 \text{ for every } s \in (t, 1]. \right\}.$$

It is then easy to see  $\tilde{K}'(V; V) \cup \{0, 1\} = \cup_{\#K'_1(V, x, B)=1} K'_1(V, x, B)$ .

In other words,  $K'_\infty(V, x, X)$  and  $K'_1(V, x, X)$  consist of the locations of the overall minimum of the function  $s \mapsto \int_0^s V(X_u - x)du$  on  $[0, \infty)$  or  $[0, 1]$  respectively and  $\tilde{K}'(V; V)$  is the collections of such  $t$ 's that the function  $s \mapsto \int_0^s V(B_u - B_t)du$  has the unique minimum at  $s = t$ .

The following results are proven in Bertoin [3] in the case where  $V(y) \equiv y = V(1, 1; y)$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $X$  be a Lévy process with no positive jump such that  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X(t) = +\infty$  a.s. Let  $a(x)$  be the rightmost element of  $K'_\infty(V, x, X)$ .*

(a)  *$\{a(x) - a(0); x \geq 0\}$  and the process  $T^X(x) := \inf\{t \geq 0; X_t \geq x\}$  have the same law.*

(b) *For every fixed  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $P^X[\#K'_\infty(V, x, X) = 1] = 1$ .*

(c) *Let  $g(0) = \sup\{t \geq 0; X(t) \leq 0\}$  be the last exit time from  $(-\infty, 0]$ . If  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  satisfies  $V(y) = -V(-y)$ , then  $a(0)$  and  $g(0) - a(0)$  are independent and have the same law.*

(d) *If  $X$  is a Brownian motion with unit drift, then  $\{a(x) - a(0); x \geq 0\}$  has the Lévy measure  $(2\pi)^{-1/2}y^{-3/2}e^{-y/2}dy$  on  $(0, \infty)$ . If, moreover,  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  satisfies  $V(y) = -V(-y)$ , then the density of the common law of  $a(0)$  and  $g(0) - a(0)$  is  $2^{-1/4}\Gamma(1/4)^{-1}y^{-3/4}e^{-y/2}dy$  on  $(0, \infty)$ .*

REMARK 2. The statement (a) and the first sentence in (d) hold for nondecreasing  $V$  satisfying  $V(0) = 0$ . The second sentence in (d) was known to Jean Bertoin(private communication).

This paper is organized as follows: We prove Theorem 1 in Section 2 using Theorem 4, which contains an asymptotic estimate for some fluctuating additive functionals. Theorems 2 and 3 are proven in Section 3. We prove Theorem 4 in Section 4 using a theorem in [4].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. The author would express his gratitude to Professor Shin'ichi Kotani for his careful reading of a draft of this paper and for his helpful comment. Thanks also goes to the anonymous referee for advice on improving the presentation.

**2. Proof of Theorem 1**

The argument here mimics that of Aspandiarov and Le Gall [1] line by line. We first state Theorem 4, an estimate for the distribution of the first hitting time of  $\int_0^t V(B_u)du$ , next define suitable approximations of  $K^-(V)$ ,  $K(V_-; V_+)$  and  $K'(V_-; V_+)$  and obtain some preliminary estimates. From that point on, we only need the straightforward changes.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $\alpha \geq 0$ ,  $c > 0$ ,  $V = V(\alpha, c)$ ,  $\nu = 1/(2 + \alpha)$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  be the solution of  $c^\nu \sin \pi\nu(1 - \rho) = \sin \pi\nu\rho$ . We denote by  $p(t, x, y; V)$  the probability  $P[\forall s \in [0, t], x + \int_0^s V(y + B_u)du \leq 0]$ .*

*For any  $t > 0$ ,  $x < 0$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and there exist constants  $C_0(t, x, y; V) > 0$ ,  $C_1(\alpha, c) > 0$  and  $\tilde{C}(x, y) > 0$  such that it holds*

$$(2.4) \quad \sup_{\sigma > 0} \sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V) = C_0(t, x, y; V),$$

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V) = C_1(\alpha, c) t^{-\rho/2} \tilde{C}(x, y),$$

Moreover it holds

$$(2.6) \quad C_0(t, x, y; V) \leq \text{const } t^{-\rho/2} (|x|^{\nu\rho} \vee |y|^{-\rho}),$$

DEFINITION. Let  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/2]$ ,  $a \in [0, 1 - \varepsilon]$  and  $b \in [\varepsilon, 1]$ . For  $V, V_+, V_- \in \cup_{\alpha \geq 0, c > 0} \{V(\alpha, c)\}$  we define

$$K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V) = \left\{ t \in [a + \varepsilon, 1]; \int_s^t V(B_u - B_t)du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in [a, t - \varepsilon] \right\},$$

$$K_{\varepsilon,b}^+(V) = \left\{ t \in [0, b - \varepsilon]; \int_t^s V(B_u - B_t)du \leq 0 \text{ for every } s \in [t + \varepsilon, b] \right\},$$

$$K_{\varepsilon,b}^*(V) = \left\{ t \in [0, b - \varepsilon]; \int_t^s V(B_u - B_t)du \geq 0 \text{ for every } s \in [t + \varepsilon, b] \right\},$$

$$K_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+) = K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V_-) \cap K_{\varepsilon,b}^+(V_+),$$

$$K'_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+) = K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V_-) \cap K_{\varepsilon,b}^*(V_+).$$

We also define

$$(2.7) \quad K_\varepsilon^-(V) = K_{\varepsilon,0}^-(V), \quad K^-(V) = K_0^-(V),$$

$$(2.8) \quad K_\varepsilon(V_-; V_+) = K_{\varepsilon,0,1}(V_-; V_+), \quad K(V_-; V_+) = K_0(V_-; V_+),$$

$$(2.9) \quad K'_\varepsilon(V_-; V_+) = K'_{\varepsilon,0,1}(V_-; V_+), \quad K'(V_-; V_+) = K'_0(V_-; V_+).$$

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\alpha, \alpha_+, \alpha_- \geq 0$ ,  $c, c_+, c_- > 0$  and let  $\rho, \rho_+, \rho_-$  be defined in the statement of Theorem 1.*

(a) *For any  $V = V(\alpha, c)$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$  and  $t > a$ , it holds*

$$\left(\frac{t-a}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\rho/2} P[t \in K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V)] < \text{const.}$$

*There exists a constant  $C_3(V) > 0$  such that it holds*

$$P[t \in K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V)] \sim C_3(V) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{t-a}\right)^{\rho/2}$$

*as  $\varepsilon \searrow 0$  for every  $t$ .*

(b) *For any  $V_+ = V(\alpha_+, c_+)$ ,  $V_- = V(\alpha_-, c_-)$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$  and  $t \in (a, b)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{t-a}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\rho_-/2} \left(\frac{b-t}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\rho_+/2} P[t \in K_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+)] &< \text{const.}, \\ \left(\frac{t-a}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\rho_-/2} \left(\frac{b-t}{\varepsilon}\right)^{(1-\rho_+)/2} P[t \in K'_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+)] &< \text{const.} \end{aligned}$$

*We denote by  $V_+(-\cdot)$  the function  $y \mapsto V_+(-y)$ . It holds as  $\varepsilon \searrow 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} P[t \in K_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+)] &\sim C_3(V_-)C_3(V_+) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{t-a}\right)^{\rho_-/2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{b-t}\right)^{\rho_+/2}, \\ P[t \in K'_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+)] &\sim C_3(V_-)C_3(V_+(-\cdot)) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{t-a}\right)^{\rho_-/2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{b-t}\right)^{(1-\rho_+)/2} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We only prove (a) since the statement (b) follows by time-reversal  $\tilde{B}_s = B_{1-s}$  and by reflection  $\tilde{B}_s = -B_s$ .

Let  $P_{(x,y)}^V$  be the law of the following two-dimensional diffusion  $(X(t), Y(t))$ :

$$Y(t) = y + B(t), \quad X(t) = x + \int_0^t V(Y(s))ds.$$

By the strong Markov property,

$$P[t \in K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V)] = E_{(0,0)}^V[p(t-a-\varepsilon, X(\varepsilon), Y(\varepsilon); V)]$$

Under  $P_{(0,0)}^V$ , the law of  $(X(\varepsilon), Y(\varepsilon))$  is the same as that of  $(\varepsilon^{1/2\nu}X(1), \varepsilon^{1/2}Y(1))$ . By (2.4) and (2.6), we have for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\varepsilon^{-\rho/2} p(t - a - \varepsilon, \varepsilon^{1/2\nu} X(1), \varepsilon^{1/2} Y(1); V) \\ &< \text{const}(t - a - \varepsilon)^{-\rho/2} (|X(1)|^{-\nu\rho} \vee |Y(1)|^{-\rho}) \\ &< \text{const}(t - a)^{-\rho/2} (|X(1)|^{-\nu\rho} \vee |Y(1)|^{-\rho}). \end{aligned}$$

The quantity  $((t - a)/\varepsilon)^{\rho/2} P[t \in K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V)]$  is hence bounded. This bound also enables us to prove the second sentence of (a) with  $C_3(V) = C_1(\alpha, c) E_{(0,0)}^V[\tilde{C}(X(1), Y(1))]$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *We use the same notations as the previous lemma. It holds for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $0 < s < t < 1$ ,*

$$(2.10) \quad P[\{s, t\} \subset K_{\varepsilon,a}^-(V)] \leq \text{const} \frac{\varepsilon^\rho}{s^{\rho/2}(t-s)^{\rho/2}},$$

$$(2.11) \quad P[\{s, t\} \subset K_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+)] \leq \frac{\text{const} \varepsilon^{\rho_+ + \rho_-}}{s^{\rho_-/2}(t-s)^{(\rho_- + \rho_+)/2}(1-t)^{\rho_+/2}},$$

$$(2.12) \quad P[\{s, t\} \subset K'_{\varepsilon,a,b}(V_-; V_+)] \leq \frac{\text{const} \varepsilon^{\rho_- + (1-\rho_+)}}{s^{\rho_-/2}(t-s)^{(\rho_- + 1 - \rho_+)/2}(1-t)^{(1-\rho_+)/2}}.$$

The constants here depend on  $\alpha, \alpha_+, \alpha_-$  and  $c, c_+, c_-$ .

Proof. This can be done using Lemma 5. See the proof of Proposition 4 in [1].  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}_{a,b}$  be the  $\sigma$ -field  $\sigma(B_u - B_a; u \in [a, b])$  for  $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$ .*

*For any  $\alpha \geq 0, c > 0$  and  $V = V(\alpha, c)$  there exist  $\mathcal{F}_{a,b}$ -measurable random variables  $U_{a,b,-}, U_{a,b,+}$  and  $U_{a,b,*}$  such that*

$$(2.13) \quad P[K^-(V) \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset \mid \mathcal{F}_{a,1}] \leq (b - a)^{\rho/2} U_{a,b,-},$$

$$(2.14) \quad P[K^+(V) \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset \mid \mathcal{F}_{0,b}] \leq (b - a)^{\rho/2} U_{a,b,+},$$

$$(2.15) \quad P[K^*(V) \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset \mid \mathcal{F}_{0,b}] \leq (b - a)^{(1-\rho)/2} U_{a,b,*},$$

and  $E_0[(U_{a,b,-})^2] \leq \text{const} a^{-\rho}, E_0[(U_{a,b,+})^2] \leq \text{const}(1 - b)^{-\rho}, E_0[(U_{a,b,*})^2] \leq \text{const}(1 - b)^{-1+\rho}$ . The constants here depend on  $\alpha$  and  $c$ .

Proof. We prove (2.14) since (2.13), (2.15) and the corresponding moment estimates follow by time-reversal  $\tilde{B}_s = B_{1-s}$  and by reflection  $\tilde{B}_s = -B_s$ .

Let  $\eta_{a,b}$  be the amplitude of  $B_s$  on  $[a, b]$ . Note that  $V$  is increasing. By modifying the argument in the proof of Lemma 7 in [1], we can take

$$U_{a,b,+} = (b - a)^{-\rho/2} p(1 - b, (b - a)V(-\eta_{a,b}), -\eta_{a,b}; V).$$

The bound of the moment follows by (2.6) and by the fact that  $\eta_{a,b}$  has the same law as  $(b - a)^{1/2}\eta_{0,1}$ .  $\square$



Proof of Theorem 1. The upper estimates for the Hausdorff dimension is obtained by the argument in the proof Proposition 6 in [1].

To obtain the lower estimates, we define the normalized Lebesgue measures: For any Borel subset  $F$  of  $[0, 1]$ , let

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{\varepsilon}^{-}(F) &= \varepsilon^{-\rho/2} |F \cap K_{\varepsilon}^{-}(V)|, \\ \mu_{\varepsilon}(F) &= \varepsilon^{-(\rho-\rho_+)/2} |F \cap K_{\varepsilon}(V_-; V_+)|, \\ \mu'_{\varepsilon}(F) &= \varepsilon^{-(\rho-+1-\rho_+)/2} |F \cap K'_{\varepsilon}(V_-; V_+)|.\end{aligned}$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{M}_f$  the Polish space of all finite measures on  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the topology of weak convergence, and by  $C([0, 1])$  the Banach space of all continuous map from  $[0, 1]$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Let  $(\varepsilon_n)$  be a sequence strictly decreasing to 0. We define the random variables  $\zeta^n$  taking values in  $\mathcal{M}_f \times C([0, 1])$  by  $\zeta^n = (\mu_{\varepsilon_n}, (B_t; 0 \leq t \leq 1))$ . We define  $\zeta^{-,n}$  and  $\zeta^{',n}$  in the same way using  $\mu_{\varepsilon_n}^{-}$  and  $\mu'_{\varepsilon_n}$ . The argument in [1] ensures that we may assume the sequence  $(\zeta^n)$  is weakly convergent by extracting a subsequence. Skorohod's representation theorem says that there is a probability space carrying a sequence of random variables  $\overline{\zeta}^n = (\mu^n, (B_t^n; 0 \leq t \leq 1))$  and a random variable  $\overline{\zeta}^{\infty} = (\mu^{\infty}, (B_t^{\infty}; 0 \leq t \leq 1))$  such that  $\overline{\zeta}^n$  and  $\zeta^n$  have the same law and  $\overline{\zeta}^n$  converges to  $\overline{\zeta}^{\infty}$  almost surely.

Let  $K(V_-; V_+; B^{\infty})$  be defined in the same way as  $K(V_-; V_+)$  replacing  $B$  by  $B^{\infty}$ . To prove that  $\mu^{\infty}$  is a.s. supported on  $K(V_-; V_+; B^{\infty})$ , we change the definition of  $G(\eta, \gamma)$  appearing in the proof of Lemma 9 in [1].

$$G(\eta, \gamma) = \left\{ t < 1 - \eta; \sup_{t+\eta < s \leq 1} \int_t^s V_+(B_u^{\infty} - B_t^{\infty}) du > \gamma \right\}.$$

Since  $V_+$  has no discontinuities of the second kind, it is locally bounded and hence we can deduce, from the occupation time formula, that  $G(\eta, \gamma)$  is an open set.

On the other hand,  $\mu^n$  is a.s. supported on

$$\left\{ t \leq 1 - \varepsilon_n; \sup_{t+\varepsilon_n < s \leq 1} \int_t^s V_+(B_u^n - B_t^n) du \leq 0 \right\}.$$

To deduce that  $\mu^{\infty}(G(\eta, \gamma)) = 0$  and  $\mu^{\infty}$  is a.s. supported on  $K(V_-; V_+; B^{\infty})$  by the argument in the proof of Lemma 9 in [1], we need only to prove the following:

$$(2.16) \quad \text{For fixed } s \text{ and } t, \int_t^s V_+(B_u^n - B_t^n) du \rightarrow \int_t^s V_+(B_u^{\infty} - B_t^{\infty}) du \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

To prove (2.16), let  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$  be arbitrary positive numbers and let

$$R^{\infty}(\varepsilon', s) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}; \exists u < s, |x - B_u^{\infty}| < 2\varepsilon'\}.$$

Since  $V_+$  has discontinuity only at the origin (when  $\alpha = 0$ ), there exists  $0 < \delta < \varepsilon'$  such that for any  $x, y \in R^\infty(\varepsilon', s)$  satisfying  $|x - y| < \delta$  and  $|x| > \varepsilon'$ , it holds  $|V_+(x) - V_+(y)| < \varepsilon$ .

We can make  $\int_t^s 1_{\{|B_u^\infty - B_t^\infty| \leq 3\varepsilon'\}} du$  arbitrarily small by taking  $\varepsilon'$  small, and hence  $\int_t^s V_+(B_u^n - B_t^n) 1_{\{|B_u^n - B_t^n| \leq \varepsilon'\}} du$  is also small if  $\|B^n - B^\infty\| < \varepsilon'$ , since  $V_+$  is bounded on  $R^\infty(\varepsilon', s)$ .

For  $u \in [t, s]$  satisfying  $|B_u^\infty - B_t^\infty| > \varepsilon'$ , we have  $|V_+(B_u^n - B_t^n) - V_+(B_u^\infty - B_t^\infty)| < \varepsilon$  if  $\|B^n - B^\infty\| < \delta/2$ , which is satisfied for all large  $n$ .

We have thus proven (2.16).

Using Lemma 5 and the weak convergence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 E[\mu^{-, \infty}([0, 1])] &= \int_0^1 dt t^{-\rho/2} C_3(V) > 0, \\
 E[\mu^\infty([0, 1])] &= \int_0^1 dt t^{-\rho_-/2} C_3(V_-)(1-t)^{-\rho_+/2} C_3(V_+) > 0, \\
 E[\mu'^{\infty}([0, 1])] &= \int_0^1 dt t^{-\rho_-/2} C_3(V_-)(1-t)^{-(1-\rho_+)/2} C_3(V_+(-\cdot)) > 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

The positivity of these values is, through Frostman's lemma, related to the positivity of  $P[\dim K^-(V) \leq 1 - \rho/2]$  and its companions; The a.s. estimate from below follows by the scaling property of Brownian motion as in [1]. □

### 3. Proof of Theorems 3 and 2

In this section,  $V$  is an strictly increasing function with  $V(0) = 0$  and  $a(x)$  is the rightmost element in  $K'_\infty(V, x, X)$ .

**Lemma 8.** (a) *If  $x_0 < x_1$  and there exists a triple  $(t_0, t_1, t_2)$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_0 &\in K'_\infty(V, x_0, X) \setminus K'_\infty(V, x_1, X), \\
 t_1 &\in K'_\infty(V, x_0, X) \cap K'_\infty(V, x_1, X), \\
 t_2 &\in K'_\infty(V, x_1, X) \setminus K'_\infty(V, x_0, X),
 \end{aligned}$$

*then it holds  $t_0 < t_1 < t_2$ .*

(b) *The cardinality of  $K'_\infty(V, x_0, X) \cap K'_\infty(V, x_1, X)$  are 0 or 1 for all  $x_0 < x_1$ . For all but countable  $x$ 's, the cardinality of  $K'_\infty(V, x, X)$ 's are 1.*

(c) *If  $\int_0^t V(X_u - x) du$  is continuous in  $t$  and  $x$ , then  $a(x)$  is right continuous.*

**Proof.** We first note that for  $s < t$ ,  $\int_s^t V(X_u - x) du$  is strictly decreasing in  $x$ .

(a) Assume  $t_1 < t_0$ . We then have  $\int_{t_1}^{t_0} V(X_u - x_0) du = 0$  and  $\int_{t_1}^{t_0} V(X_u - x_1) du > 0$ , which is a contradiction. We can prove  $t_1 < t_2$  by the same argument and time-reversal.

(b) If both  $t_0$  and  $t_1$  with  $t_0 < t_1$  belong to  $K'_\infty(V, x_0, X) \cap K'_\infty(V, x_1, X)$  then we have  $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} V(X_u - x_0)du = 0 = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} V(X_u - x_1)du$ , which provides a contradiction.

By (a) and the first part of (b), we have for any  $x_0 < x_1$ ,  $t_0 \in K'_\infty(V, x_0, X)$  and  $t_1 \in K'_\infty(V, x_1, X)$ ,  $t_1 - t_0 \geq \sum_{x \in (x_0, x_1)} \text{diam } K'_\infty(V, x, X)$ . Hence at most countably many  $x$ 's admit  $\text{diam } K'_\infty(V, x, X) > 0$ .

(c) For any sequence  $t_n \rightarrow t_\infty$  and  $x_n \rightarrow x_\infty$  such that  $t_n \in K'_\infty(V, x_n, X)$ , we prove  $t_\infty \in K'_\infty(V, x_\infty, X)$ . If  $s$  is greater than  $t_\infty$ , then eventually  $s > t_n$ . By the definition of  $t_n \in K'_\infty(V, x_n, X)$ ,

$$0 \leq \int_{t_n}^s V(X_r - x_n)dr \rightarrow \int_{t_\infty}^s V(X_r - x_\infty)dr.$$

If  $s < t_\infty$ ,  $\int_s^{t_\infty} V(X_r - x_\infty)dr \leq 0$  by the same argument and this establishes  $t_\infty \in K'_\infty(V, x_\infty, X)$ .

We have thus proven that  $a(x+) \equiv \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} a(x + \delta)$  is in  $K'_\infty(V, x, X)$ . It follows from (a) that  $a(x+)$  dominates every element in  $K'_\infty(V, x, X)$  and hence  $a(x+) = a(x)$ . □

**Lemma 9.** *If  $X$  is a Lévy process with no positive jumps which satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t = \infty$ , then for any  $x \geq 0$ , the two processes  $(X_t - x; 0 \leq t \leq a(x))$  and  $(X - x) \circ \theta_{a(x)} \equiv (X_{a(x)+t} - x; t \geq 0)$  are independent. Moreover, the law of the latter process does not depend on  $x$ .*

*Proof.* It can be proved by the same argument in Bertoin [3].

We define  $I_s^x = \int_0^s V(X_u - x)du$  and  $m_s^x = \inf_{0 \leq t \leq s} I_t^x$ . Then  $a(x)$  is the last exit time for the process  $(X_t - x, I_t^x - m_t^x)$  from the point  $(0, 0)$ , which is finite almost surely. It can also be proved  $X_{a(x)} = x$ . This enables us to apply the result by Gettoor on the last exit decomposition as in Bertoin [3]. □

*Proof of Theorem 3(a).* To use Lemma 8(c), we first show that  $f(x, t) = \int_0^t V(X_u - x)du$  is jointly continuous in  $t$  and  $x$ . Fix an  $\tau > 0$  and  $\xi > 0$ . The set

$$R(\tau, \xi) = \{X_t - x; 0 \leq t \leq \tau, |x| < \xi\}$$

is bounded and so is its image by  $V(\cdot)$ . This implies  $f(x, t)$  is uniformly continuous in  $t$  on the rectangle  $\{0 \leq t \leq \tau, |x| < \xi\}$ .

Single point sets are not essentially polar for a Lévy process with no positive jump diverging to  $+\infty$ . There exist local times  $L_t(\cdot)$ , the sojourn time density, so that

$$f(x, t) = \int_{R(\tau, \xi)} V(y)L_t(y+x)dy$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq \tau$  and  $|x| < \xi$ . See e.g. Bertoin [2]. Let  $a$  and  $x'$  be two points such that  $|x| < \xi$ ,  $|x'| < \xi$ . By making  $x'$  arbitrarily close to  $x$ , the  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -norm of  $L_t(y+x') -$

$L_t(y+x)$  with respect to  $dy$  can be made arbitrarily small since  $L_t(\cdot)$  is integrable. The boundedness of  $V$  on  $R(\tau, \xi)$  enables us to conclude that  $f(x, t)$  is continuous in  $x$ . Local uniform continuity in  $t$  combined with this implies continuity in two variables.

Hence right continuity of  $a(x)$  follows from Lemma 8(c). Let  $\tilde{a}(y)$  be the rightmost location of the overall minimum of  $\int_0^t V(X_{a(x)+s} - x - y)ds$ . By Lemma 8(a), we have  $a(x + y) = a(x) + \tilde{a}(y)$  for  $x \geq 0$  and  $y > 0$ . The rest can be done just like the proof of Theorem 1 in Bertoin [3].  $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3(b). For any  $0 \leq x < x_1$ , the event  $\{\#K'_\infty(V, x_1, X) \geq 2\}$  is independent of  $(X_t - x; 0 \leq t \leq a(x))$  because it is the event that  $\int_0^s V(X_{a(x)+t} - x_1)dt$  attains its overall minimum at least twice. Hence  $P^X[\#K'_\infty(V, x, X) \geq 2]$  is the same value for all  $x \geq 0$ . If it is positive, then with a positive probability,  $\{x \in [0, \infty); \#K'_\infty(V, x, X) \geq 2\}$  has positive mass with respect to the Lebesgue measure. This contradicts Lemma 8(b).

In the case where  $x < 0$ , we just condition on the event that  $I_t^x$  hits 0. We resort to the strong Markov property at the first time  $X_t = 0$  after  $I_t^x = 0$  and finally use  $P^X[\#K'_\infty(V, 0, X) = 1] = 1$ .  $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3(c). We follow the argument by Bertoin [3]. Independence is proven in Lemma 9. By (b),  $a(0)$  is the unique location of the overall minimum of  $\int_0^t V(X_s)ds$ . We define a new process  $\hat{X}$  by  $\hat{X}_t = -X_{g(0)-t-0}$  for  $0 \leq t \leq g(0)$ ,  $\hat{X}_t = X_t$  for  $t > g(0)$ . It is known that  $\hat{X}$  and  $X$  have the same law. Since  $V$  is an odd function,

$$\hat{I}_t = \int_0^t V(\hat{X}_u)du = \int_{g(0)-t}^{g(0)} V(-X_u)du = I_{g(0)-t} - \int_0^{g(0)} V(X_u)du.$$

The unique location of the minimum of  $\hat{I}_t$  is  $g(0) - a(0)$  and has the same law as that of  $a(0)$ .  $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3(d). This is proven in the same way as the final part of Theorem 1 in [3].  $\square$

Now we restate Theorem 2 as the following Lemma. Note that  $K'(V, B_1/2, B) \subset (0, 1)$  if  $B_1 > 0$  and the following lemma implies  $\dim \tilde{K}'(V; V) = 1/2$  a.s. on the event  $\{B_1 > 0\}$ .

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $a_1(x)$  be the rightmost element in  $K'_1(V, x, B)$ . It holds  $\dim \tilde{K}'(V; V) = 1/2$  a.s. on  $\{\exists x, K'_1(V, x, B) \subset (0, 1)\} = \{\exists x, 0 < a_1(x) < 1\}$ , and  $\tilde{K}'(V; V) \subset \{0, 1\}$  a.s. on  $\{\forall x, K'_1(V, x, B) = \{0\} \text{ or } 1 \in K'_1(V, x, B)\} = \{\forall x, a_1(x) = 0 \text{ or } 1\}$ .*

Proof. We first note that, by the continuity of  $B(t)$ ,  $B(a_1(x)) = x$  if  $0 < a_1(x) < 1$  and hence  $\tilde{K}'(V; V) \cup \{0, 1\} = \{a_1(x); \#K'_1(V, x, B) = 1\}$ . The symmetric difference of  $\tilde{K}'(V; V)$  and  $\{a_1(x); x \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is at most a countable set, which has no effect on the Hausdorff dimension.

We define the event for  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\eta > 0$ ,  $x \in R$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$E(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon) = \{K'_1(V, x, B) \subset (0, 1), B_1 - x - \varepsilon \geq \xi, I_1^{x+\varepsilon} - m_1^{x+\varepsilon} \geq \eta\}.$$

Let  $\tilde{B}$  be the process conditioned on  $E(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon)$ . Since  $P[E(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon)] > 0$ , the law of  $\tilde{B}$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of a standard Brownian motion on  $[0, 1]$ , and hence to the law of a Brownian motion on  $[0, 1]$  with unit drift.

If  $X$  is a Brownian motion on  $[0, \infty)$  with unit drift independent of  $B$ , then

$$P \left[ \forall t \geq 0, \eta + \int_0^t V(X_u + \xi) du > 0 \right] > 0.$$

Let  $\tilde{X}$  be the conditioned process on this event.

Now we define  $Z$  by  $Z_t = \tilde{B}_t$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $Z_t = \tilde{B}_1 + \tilde{X}_{t-1}$  for  $t > 1$ . The law of  $Z$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of a Brownian motion on  $[0, \infty)$  with unit drift. For all  $x' < x + \varepsilon$ , it follows from definition  $K'_1(V, x', \tilde{B}) \equiv K'_\infty(V, x', Z) \subset (0, 1)$  and hence  $0 < a_1(x') = a(x') < 1$ .

By a general theory for subordinators, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\dim\{a(x'); x < x' < x + \varepsilon\} = 1/2$  a.s. on the event  $\{0 < a(x) < a(x + \varepsilon) < 1\}$ . See e.g. Bertoin [2] Theorem III.15. Now we have a.s. on  $E(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} = \dim\{a(x'); x < x' < x + \varepsilon\} = \dim\{a_1(x'); x < x' < x + \varepsilon\}.$$

Let

$$F(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon) := \{a_1(x'); x < x' < x + \varepsilon, E(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon) \text{ occurs}\},$$

a random subset which is nonempty only on the event  $E(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon)$ . Since  $\tilde{K}'(V; V) \setminus \{0, 1\}$  is the same as a countable union of the random subsets of the form  $F(\xi, \eta, x, \varepsilon)$ , the dichotomy that  $\dim(\tilde{K}'(V; V) \setminus \{0, 1\}) = 1/2$  or  $\tilde{K}'(V; V) \setminus \{0, 1\} = \emptyset$  holds.

Finally, if  $K'_1(V, x, B) \neq \{0\}$  and  $1 \notin K'_1(V, x, B)$  for some  $x$ , then there exists an  $x'$  such that  $K'_1(V, x', B) \subset (0, 1)$  by the continuity of  $\int_0^t V(B_s - x') ds$  in  $x'$ .  $\square$

#### 4. Proof of Theorem 4

We quote a theorem in [4] and the proof of Theorem 4 is based on it. We fix  $\alpha \geq 0$   $c > 0$  and write  $V(y)$  for  $V(\alpha, c; y)$ . Throughout this section we set  $\nu = 1/(\alpha + 2)$  and let  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  be the unique solution of  $c^\nu \sin \pi\nu(1 - \rho) = \sin \pi\nu\rho$  and  $\tilde{C}(x, y)$  be

defined for  $x \leq 0, y \in \mathbb{R}$  by

$$(4.17) \quad \tilde{C}(x, y) = \Gamma(\nu)^{-1} |x|^{1-\nu+\nu\rho} \exp \left\{ \frac{-2\nu^2(y^+)^{1/\nu}}{|x|} \right\} \\ \times \int_0^\infty dt e^{-t} \left( |x|t + 2\nu^2 c^{-1} |y^-|^{1/\nu} \right)^{\nu\rho} \left( |x|t + 2\nu^2 (y^+)^{1/\nu} \right)^{-1+\nu-\nu\rho}.$$

Now we have

**Theorem 11** ([4]). *For  $\mu \geq 0, V = V(\alpha, c)$  there exists a constant  $C_4(\alpha, c) > 0$  such that it holds*

$$(4.18) \quad \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\infty dt \mu e^{-\mu t} \sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V) = C_4(\alpha, c) \mu^{\rho/2} \tilde{C}(x, y).$$

Proof of Theorem 4. Since the integrand above,  $\sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V)$ , is decreasing in  $t$ ,

$$\limsup_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V)$$

must be finite for every  $t > 0$  and it is trivial that  $\sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V) < \sigma^{-\rho} < 1$  for large  $\sigma$ . Hence we know the overall supremum is finite, verifying (2.4), and we denote it by  $C_0(t, x, y; V)$ , which is clearly monotone decreasing in  $t$  and inherits the scaling property from  $p(t, x, y, V)$ :

$$C_0(t, x, y; V) = \sigma^{-\rho} C_0(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V) = \sigma^{-\rho} C_0(\sigma^{-2} t, x, y; V).$$

It is sufficient to prove (2.6) when  $x < 0$  and  $y < 0$ . We deduce from the scaling property and the monotonicity that

$$C_0(t, x, y; V) = |x|^{\nu\rho} C_0 \left( t, -1, \frac{y}{|x|^\nu}; V \right) \\ \leq |x|^{\nu\rho} C_0 \left( t, (-1) \wedge \frac{-|y|^{-1/\nu}}{|x|}, (-1) \wedge \frac{y}{|x|^\nu}; V \right) \\ = C_0 \left( t, x \wedge (-|y|^{-1/\nu}), (-|x|^\nu) \wedge y; V \right) \\ = (|x|^{\nu\rho} \vee |y|^\rho) C_0(t, -1, -1; V).$$

Combining this with  $C_0(t, x, y; V) = t^{-\rho/2} C_0(1, x, y; V)$ , we obtain (2.6).

To prove (2.5), we note that the family  $\{\sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V); \sigma > 0\}$  of decreasing functions has an upper bound  $C_0(t, x, y; V)$ , which satisfies

$$\int_0^\infty dt \mu e^{-\mu t} C_0(t, x, y; V) < \text{const} \int_0^\infty dt \mu e^{-\mu t} t^{-\rho/2} < \infty.$$

Given any sequence  $\sigma_n \searrow 0$ , we can choose a subsequence  $\sigma'_n$  such that the functions  $(\sigma'_n)^{-\rho} p(t, (\sigma'_n)^{1/\nu} x, \sigma'_n y; V)$  converge pointwise on a dense subset of  $\{t > 0\}$  and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty dt \mu e^{-\mu t} (\sigma'_n)^{-\rho} p(t, (\sigma'_n)^{1/\nu} x, \sigma'_n y; V) \\ & \rightarrow \int_0^\infty dt \mu e^{-\mu t} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma'_n)^{-\rho} p(t, (\sigma'_n)^{1/\nu} x, \sigma'_n y; V). \end{aligned}$$

By uniqueness of the Laplace transform, we deduce, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \sigma^{-\rho} p(t, \sigma^{1/\nu} x, \sigma y; V) = \frac{C_4(\alpha, c) \tilde{C}(x, y) t^{-\rho/2}}{\Gamma(1 - \rho/2)}. \quad \square$$

---

#### References

- [1] S. Aspdandiarov and J.-F. Le Gall: *Some new classes of exceptional times of linear Brownian motion*, Ann. Probab. **23** (1995), 1605–1626.
- [2] J. Bertoin: *Lévy processes*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [3] J. Bertoin: *The inviscid Burgers equation with Brownian initial velocity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **193** (1998), 397–406.
- [4] Y. Isozaki and S. Kotani: *Asymptotic estimates for the first hitting time of fluctuating additive functionals of Brownian motion*, Séminaire de Probabilités **34**, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1729** (2000), 374–387.

Department of Mathematics  
Graduate School of Science  
Osaka University  
Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan  
e-mail: yasuki@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp