

FULLY NONLINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS FOR SOME PRESCRIBED CURVATURE PROBLEMS ON HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS

RIRONG YUAN

ABSTRACT. We study fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Hermitian manifolds through blow-up argument and partial uniform ellipticity. We apply our results to draw geometric conclusions on finding conformal Hermitian metrics with prescribed Chern-Ricci curvature functions. By some obstruction from geometric function theory, our assumptions are almost sharp.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (M, ω) be a Hermitian manifold of complex dimension $n \geq 2$ with Kähler form $\omega = \sqrt{-1}g_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_j$. Under the Chern connection ∇ the curvature of ω is locally given by

$$R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}} = -\partial_{\bar{j}}\partial_i g_{k\bar{l}} + g^{p\bar{q}}\partial_i g_{k\bar{q}}\partial_{\bar{j}}g_{p\bar{l}}.$$

The Ricci curvature on Kähler manifolds has been well studied in huge literature, among which [9, 10, 50, 51, 52], to name just a few, starting at least from the milestone work of Aubin [2] and Yau [56] on Calabi's conjectures and Kähler-Einstein metric. Unlike the Kähler metric case, there are different Ricci curvatures for non-Kähler metric

$$R_{i\bar{j}}^{(1)} = g^{k\bar{l}}R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}}, R_{i\bar{j}}^{(2)} = g^{k\bar{l}}R_{k\bar{l}i\bar{j}}, R_{i\bar{j}}^{(3)} = g^{k\bar{l}}R_{i\bar{l}k\bar{j}}, R_{i\bar{j}}^{(4)} = g^{k\bar{l}}R_{k\bar{j}i\bar{l}},$$

where $\{g^{i\bar{j}}\} = \{g_{i\bar{j}}\}^{-1}$. Following [39] we call, for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$,

$$\text{Ric}_{\omega}^{(k)} = \sqrt{-1}R_{i\bar{j}}^{(k)}dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_j$$

the k -th *Chern-Ricci form*. The Chern-scalar curvature is given by $R_{\omega} = \text{tr}(\omega^{-1}\text{Ric}^{(1)})$. The first and second Chern-Ricci curvatures are of particular importance and deeply connected to the complex geometric structure. The Calabi-Yau theorem was extended by Tosatti-Weinkove [53] to non-Kähler case for first Chern-Ricci form. The Hermitian curvature flow related to second Chern-Ricci form was proposed by Streets-Tian [46] as an important analogue of Ricci flow for Hermitian geometry. The third and fourth Chern-Ricci forms were considered by Liu-Yang [39] who studied relations and geometric properties of Ricci curvatures with respect to different (Levi-Civita, Chern and Bismut) connections. In [27] Guan-Qiu-Yuan studied the conformal deformation of the *mixed Chern-Ricci form*, the geometric quantity as a combination of Chern-Ricci forms

$$\text{Ric}_{\omega}^{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)} := \alpha \text{Ric}_{\omega}^{(1)} + \beta \text{Ric}_{\omega}^{(2)} + \gamma (\text{Ric}_{\omega}^{(3)} + \text{Ric}_{\omega}^{(4)}).$$

This paper is devoted to looking for conformal metrics with further conditions on Chern-Ricci curvatures. The special case of deforming to constant Chern-scalar curvature is referred to as Chern-Yamabe problem proposed by [1]. More general prescribed Chern-scalar curvature problem was further studied in [18, 33, 57].

In this paper, as a special case of our results, we obtain some conclusion regarding to the Chern-Yamabe problem for complete noncompact manifolds.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M, ω) be a complete noncompact Hermitian manifold of non-positive Chern-scalar curvature. In addition, we assume $R_\omega \leq -\delta$ in $M \setminus K_0$ for some compact subset K_0 and positive constant δ . Then there exists a unique maximal smooth complete metric $\tilde{\omega} = e^u \omega$ with $R_{\tilde{\omega}} \equiv -1$.*

This is a complex analogue of [4]. In fact, we consider more general problems.

Problem 1.2. In the conformal class of Hermitian metrics, does there exist a *compact* or *complete* metric with prescribed first Chern-Ricci curvature function.

Problem 1.3. In the conformal class of Hermitian metrics, can we find a *compact* or *complete* metric so that it has prescribed mixed Chern-Ricci curvature function.

As suggested by [7], we assume that the curvature function f is a *smooth, symmetric, concave* function defined in $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where Γ is an *open, symmetric, convex* cone with vertex at origin, $\partial\Gamma \neq \emptyset$, and $\Gamma_n := \{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \forall \lambda_i > 0\} \subseteq \Gamma$. Following [7], Γ is of *type 1* if $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \partial\Gamma$; otherwise it is of *type 2*.

In [55], Wu-Zhang studied prescribed Chern-scalar curvature problem for suitable noncompact manifolds and obtained conformal metric, possibly not complete, prescribing nonpositive and nonzero Chern-scalar curvature. In [27], Guan-Qiu-Yuan considered Problem 1.3 in special case and obtained metric with prescribing boundary metric. Definitely not too surprisingly, things become more subtle and the problems are rarely known in the case when the resulting metric is complete.

In this paper we consider the problems above through fully nonlinear equations

$$(1.1) \quad f(\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u))) = \psi e^{\Lambda_0 u},$$

where $\Lambda_0 > 0$ is a constant, χ is a smooth real $(1, 1)$ -form, and $\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ denotes the n -tuple of eigenvalues of $\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u$ with respect to ω . In addition, f is supposed to satisfy the following basic assumptions:

$$(1.2) \quad f > 0 \text{ in } \Gamma, \quad f = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Gamma,$$

$$(1.3) \quad f(t\lambda) = t^\varsigma f(\lambda), \quad \forall \lambda \in \Gamma, \quad t > 0, \quad \text{for some constant } 0 < \varsigma \leq 1.$$

When Γ is of type 1, we additionally assume that

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n + t) = +\infty, \quad \forall \lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma.$$

We emphasize that throughout this paper the following condition is not required

$$(1.5) \quad f_i(\lambda) = f_{\lambda_i}(\lambda) := \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}(\lambda) > 0 \text{ in } \Gamma, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

See Lemmas 3.6, 3.11 and 3.13. This is in contrast with huge literature on second order fully nonlinear equations of elliptic and parabolic type.

As is well known, conditions (1.2)-(1.4) allow the important case: $f = \sigma_k^{1/k}$, $\Gamma = \Gamma_k$, where σ_k is the k -th elementary symmetric function, Γ_k is the k -th Gårding cone. In particular, when $k = n$ the equation (1.1) is the complex Monge-Ampère equation, which is closely related the Kähler-Einstein metrics on closed Kähler manifolds with negative first Chern class; see [2, 56].

Definition 1.4. For the equation (1.1), we say that u is an *admissible* function if

$$\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)) \in \Gamma \text{ in } \bar{M} (= M \cup \partial M).$$

Here M stands for the interior of \bar{M} , ∂M denotes the boundary of M . Similarly, we call u a *pseudo-admissible* function if

$$\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)) \in \bar{\Gamma} := \Gamma \cup \partial\Gamma \text{ in } M.$$

Meanwhile, u is the *maximal* solution to (1.1), if $u \geq w$ for any admissible solution w . Similarly, we have analogous notions of admissible, pseudo-admissible and maximal conformal metrics, respectively.

Definition 1.5. We say that ∂M is Γ_∞ -*admissible* for (1.1) if $(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}) \in \Gamma_\infty$, where $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}$ are the eigenvalues of Levi form $L_{\partial M}$ of boundary with respect to $\omega' = \omega|_{T_{\partial M} \cap J T_{\partial M}}$, and J is the complex structure. Henceforth

$$\Gamma_\infty := \{\lambda' = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) : (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, R) \in \Gamma \text{ for some } R > 0\}.$$

In order to solve (1.1), the first challenge is to derive gradient estimate. The direct proof of gradient estimate was settled for fairly restrictive cases in literature [5, 26, 28, 31, 58, 59, 67], but cases beyond this are mostly open. Blow-up argument offers another approach to prove gradient estimate as shown by [8] for complex Monge-Ampère equation, by [14] for complex k -Hessian equations with the aid of second estimate in [34]; see also [48] for more general equation satisfying

$$(1.6) \quad \text{For any } \sigma < \sup_\Gamma f \text{ and } \lambda \in \Gamma, \text{ we have } \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(t\lambda) > \sigma.$$

In this paper, we employ such a contradiction method to set up gradient estimate. To this end, we derive the quantitative boundary estimate

$$(1.7) \quad \sup_{\partial M} |\partial\bar{\partial}u| \leq C(1 + \sup_M |\partial u|^2)$$

for Dirichlet problem, adapting some idea from prequels [61, 62] (see also the subsequent paper [60]). As usual the local barrier technique in [29, 22] (further refined by [24]) is a key ingredient. There are more related work [6, 44, 12] on Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equation and complex k -Hessian equations, in which their method relies specifically on the structure of the operators, which cannot be adopted to treat general equations.

We obtain existence result, assuming admissible function instead of subsolution.

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose (f, Γ) satisfies (1.2) and (1.4). Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth Γ_∞ -admissible boundary. In addition, we assume that \bar{M} carries a C^2 -smooth admissible function. Then for any $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial M)$ and $0 < \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$, there is a unique admissible solution to (1.1) with $u = \varphi$ on ∂M .*

The case $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is of interest since the boundary is automatically Γ_∞ -admissible, without any geometric condition. Significantly, in this case we employ certain Morse function to construct admissible functions and then solve Dirichlet problem without extra assumption on ∂M , beyond $\partial M \in C^\infty$. This is a fully nonlinear analogue of existence theorem for Poisson's equation and Liouville's equation. See Theorem 6.2. In addition, with the aid of some results on partial uniform ellipticity and singular Yamabe problem, we can derive interior estimates and solve the Dirichlet problem with infinite boundary data; see Section 7 for more results.

Theorem 1.7. *Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary. In addition to (1.2) and $\sup_\Gamma f = +\infty$, we assume $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Then for any $0 < \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$, the equation (1.1) possesses an admissible solution $u \in C^\infty(M)$ with $\lim_{z \rightarrow \partial M} u(z) = +\infty$. Moreover, u is minimal in the sense that $u \leq w$ for any admissible solution w with infinity boundary data.*

Below we give some obstruction to indicate that in Theorem 1.7 the assumption $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ cannot be dropped in general. To do this, we define the integer for Γ

$$(1.8) \quad \kappa_\Gamma := \max \left\{ k : \overbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}^{k\text{-entries}}, \overbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}^{(n-k)\text{-entries}} \in \Gamma \right\}$$

in an attempt to connect admissible function to notion of q -plurisubharmonic function in several complex variables. The constant κ_Γ was introduced by [64, 65] to measure how close the operator f can come to uniform ellipticity (Lemma 3.9).

Remark 1.8 (Obstruction). Let $\Omega_0, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_m$ be smooth bounded domains in \mathbb{C}^n with $\bar{\Omega}_i \subset\subset \Omega_0$ and $\bar{\Omega}_i$ being pairwise disjoint, for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Pick

$$(\Omega, \omega) = (\Omega_0 \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^m \bar{\Omega}_i), \sqrt{-1} \sum dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i).$$

Assume that the following problem (with Γ being of type 1, that is $0 \leq \kappa_\Gamma \leq n-2$)

$$f(\lambda(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)) = \psi e^{\Lambda_0 u} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = +\infty \text{ on } \partial\Omega$$

admits a C^2 -smooth admissible solution. Then u is a κ_Γ -plurisubharmonic exhaustion function for Ω . This yields that Ω is Levi κ_Γ -pseudoconvex by Eastwood-Suria [15] and Suria [47] (see Theorem 3.4 below), which contradicts to the shape of Ω .

Remark 1.9. The role of κ_Γ becomes apparent as it serves as a bridge between two concepts. On one hand, it links the ideas of admissible function and partial uniform ellipticity within the realm of fully nonlinear PDEs. On the other hand, it establishes a connection with the concepts of q -plurisubharmonic function, Levi q -pseudoconvexity, and q -completeness in several complex variables.

Building on Theorem 1.7 we prove that all of geometric and analytic obstructions to solvability of (1.1) on complete noncompact manifolds are embodied in asymptotic condition at infinity: M carries a *pseudo-admissible* function satisfying

$$(1.9) \quad f(\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\underline{v}))) \geq \psi e^{\Lambda_0 \underline{v}} \text{ in } M \setminus K_0, \quad \underline{v} \in C^2(M),$$

where K_0 is a compact subset of M . This is a sufficient and necessary condition.

Theorem 1.10. *Let (M, ω) be a complete noncompact Hermitian manifold. Suppose, in addition to (1.2) and $\sup_{\Gamma} f = +\infty$, that $\Gamma_{\infty} = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Given a prescribed function $0 < \psi \in C^{\infty}(M)$ satisfying (1.9), there is a unique maximal smooth admissible solution u to (1.1) with $u \geq \underline{v} - C_0$ in M for some constant C_0 .*

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we first draw some geometric conclusions related to Problems 1.2 and 1.3. In Section 3 we summarize some useful results. Based on partial uniform ellipticity, in Section 4 we prove that (2.3) can be reduced to a fully nonlinear equation of elliptic or uniformly elliptic type. Furthermore, we construct various type 2 cones, which allows us to study Problem 1.3 and more general equations with Laplacian terms. In Section 5 we construct admissible functions using certain Morse functions. In Section 6 we solve the Dirichlet problem. In Section 7 we solve the Dirichlet problem with infinite boundary value condition. Moreover, we verify the completeness of the obtained metric. Under an appropriate asymptotic condition at infinity, in Section 8 we prove the existence of maximal solution to equations on complete noncompact manifolds. The proofs of a priori estimates are left to Sections 9 and 10. In appendices A and B we give the proofs of Lemmas 3.9, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.5, respectively.

The author is indebted to Professor Yi Liu for answering questions related to the proof of Lemma 3.1. He also would like to thank Ze Zhou for helpful discussion on homogeneity lemma.

2. GEOMETRIC CONCLUSIONS ON PROBLEMS 1.2 AND 1.3

2.1. Geometric conclusions related to Problem 1.2. We draw some results on Problem 1.2 by solving the equation

$$(2.1) \quad f(\lambda(-\tilde{\omega}^{-1} \text{Ric}_{\tilde{\omega}}^{(1)})) = \psi, \quad \lambda(-\tilde{\omega}^{-1} \text{Ric}_{\tilde{\omega}}^{(1)}) \in \Gamma, \quad \tilde{\omega} = e^u \omega.$$

The results are stated as follows.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose (f, Γ) satisfies (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4). Assume that (\bar{M}, ω) is a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth Γ_{∞} -admissible boundary and suppose a C^2 conformal metric $\underline{\omega}$ satisfying $\lambda(-\omega^{-1} \text{Ric}_{\underline{\omega}}^{(1)}) \in \Gamma$. Then for any smooth metric h on ∂M which is conformal to the restriction of ω to ∂M and $0 < \psi \in C^{\infty}(\bar{M})$, there exists a unique smooth metric $\tilde{\omega} = e^u \omega$ satisfying (2.1) and $\tilde{\omega}|_{\partial M} = h$.*

Furthermore, we can construct complete metrics when Γ is of type 2. (The obstruction in Remark 1.8 indicates that such an assumption is generally necessary).

Theorem 2.2. *Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary. In addition to (1.2) and (1.3), we assume $\Gamma_{\infty} = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. For any $0 < \psi \in C^{\infty}(\bar{M})$, the interior M admits a smooth complete metric $\tilde{\omega} = e^u \omega$ satisfying (2.1).*

When (M, ω) is complete and noncompact, we solve (2.1) under the asymptotic condition at infinity: There is a compact set K_0 and a positive constant Λ such that

$$(2.2) \quad f(\lambda(-\omega^{-1} \text{Ric}_{\omega}^{(1)})) \geq \Lambda \psi \text{ in } M \setminus K_0.$$

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose, in addition to (1.2), (1.3) and $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, that (M, ω) is a complete noncompact Hermitian manifold with pseudo-admissible metric subject to (2.2) for some $0 < \psi \in C^\infty(M)$. Then (2.1) is uniquely solvable in the conformal class of maximal smooth complete metrics.*

Proof of Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. When f satisfies (1.3), (2.1) is reduced to

$$f(\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u - n^{-1}\text{Ric}_\omega^{(1)}))) = \psi e^{s(u-\log n)}.$$

Consequently, by Theorems 1.6 and 1.10 we obtain Theorems 2.1 and 2.3, respectively. Combining Theorems 1.7 and 7.2, we get Theorem 2.2. \square

2.2. Geometric conclusions related to Problem 1.3. Below we focus on Problem 1.3 by finding the metric $\tilde{\omega} = e^u \omega$ with

$$(2.3) \quad f(\lambda(-\tilde{\omega}^{-1}\text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle})) = \psi, \quad \beta > 0, \quad \lambda(-\omega^{-1}\text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle}) \in \Gamma.$$

Under the assumption (1.3), the equation (2.3) reads as follows:

$$(2.4) \quad f(\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\Delta u \omega + \beta^{-1}(n\alpha + 2\gamma)\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u - \beta^{-1}\text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle}))) = \psi e^{s(u-\log \beta)},$$

where $\Delta u = \text{tr}(\omega^{-1}\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)$, according to the formula (see e.g. [27])

$$-\text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle} = \beta \Delta u \omega + (n\alpha + 2\gamma)\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u - \text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle}.$$

Given an admissible subsolution, the Dirichlet problem was solved by [27] when

$$(2.5) \quad \beta + n\alpha + 2\gamma > 0, \quad \beta > 0, \quad n\alpha + 2\gamma \neq 0,$$

under which the equation becomes uniformly elliptic. Nevertheless, such uniform ellipticity possibly breaks down in the case

$$(2.6) \quad \beta + n\alpha + 2\gamma = 0, \quad \beta > 0.$$

This includes among others the $(n-1)$ Monge-Ampère equation

$$(2.7) \quad (\Delta u \omega - \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u - \beta^{-1}\text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle})^n = e^{nu+\phi} \omega^n,$$

which is exactly of $(n-1)$ -uniform ellipticity in the sense of Definition 3.8. This poses a challenge, especially when the resulting metric is required to be complete.

Our strategy is based on partial uniform ellipticity. For Γ , as in [66] we define

$$(2.8) \quad (1, \dots, 1, 1 - \varrho_\Gamma) \in \partial\Gamma.$$

It is easy to see $1 \leq \varrho_\Gamma \leq n$. In addition, $\varrho_{\Gamma_k} = \frac{n}{k}$. In particular, $\varrho_\Gamma = 1 \Leftrightarrow \Gamma = \Gamma_n$, and $\varrho_\Gamma = n \Leftrightarrow \Gamma = \Gamma_1$.

In Proposition 4.2 we prove that (2.4) is uniformly elliptic under the assumption

$$(2.9) \quad \varrho_\Gamma \beta + n\alpha + 2\gamma > 0, \quad \beta > 0, \quad n\alpha + 2\gamma \neq 0.$$

This condition is in effect sharp. As a result, we obtain

Theorem 2.4. *Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary. Suppose (1.2) and (1.3) hold. For any (α, β, γ) obeying (2.9) and $0 < \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$, the interior M admits a smooth complete conformal metric $\tilde{\omega}$ satisfying (2.3).*

Notice in the above theorem that we don't impose subsolution assumption and the resulting metric is complete, thereby answering some problems left open by [27]. In addition, we can treat the problem on the complete noncompact manifold with a pseudo-admissible metric satisfying an asymptotic condition.

Theorem 2.5. *Assume (1.2), (1.3), (2.9) hold. Suppose that (M, ω) is a complete noncompact Hermitian manifold with pseudo-admissible metric subject to*

$$(2.10) \quad f(\lambda(-\omega^{-1} \text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle})) \geq \Lambda \psi \text{ in } M \setminus K_0$$

for some $0 < \psi \in C^\infty(M)$ and positive constant Λ . Then there is a unique smooth maximal complete metric satisfying (2.3).

The obstruction presented in Remark 1.8 indicates that in general one could not expect that Theorem 2.4 holds in the limiting case

$$(2.11) \quad \varrho_\Gamma \beta + n\alpha + 2\gamma = 0, \quad \beta > 0.$$

Fortunately, we can solve the Dirichlet problem. For our purpose, we assume

$$(2.12) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(\lambda + t(1, \dots, 1, 1 - \varrho_\Gamma)) = +\infty, \quad \forall \lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma,$$

$$(2.13) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_i \vec{\mathbf{1}} - \varrho_\Gamma(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}, 0) + t(1, \dots, 1, 1 - \varrho_\Gamma) \in \Gamma \text{ in } \partial M, \text{ for } t \gg 1,$$

where and hereafter $\vec{\mathbf{1}} := (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, when $\Gamma = \Gamma_n$ we verify that

- (2.11) reduces to (2.6), and then (2.4) reads an $(n-1)$ -type equation.
- (2.12) allows $f = (\sigma_n / \sigma_k)^{1/(n-k)}$ with $0 \leq k \leq n-2$.
- (2.13) holds if and only if $\kappa_1 + \dots + \kappa_{n-1} > 0$.

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose $\Gamma \neq \Gamma_1$ and (f, Γ) satisfies (1.2), (1.3), (2.12). Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary satisfying (2.13). Given (α, β, γ) obeying (2.11), assume $\lambda(-\omega^{-1} \text{Ric}_\omega^{\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle}) \in \Gamma$ in \bar{M} . Then for any smooth metric h on $\partial \bar{M}$ which is conformal to the restriction of ω to $\partial \bar{M}$, and $0 < \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$, there is a unique smooth metric $\tilde{\omega} = e^u \omega$ satisfying (2.3) and $\tilde{\omega}|_{\partial \bar{M}} = h$.*

Finally, we will complete the proof of Theorems 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6.

Proof of Theorems 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6. We show in Section 4 that (2.4) falls into an equation of the form (1.1). The equation is of uniform ellipticity under assumption (2.9) by Proposition 4.2. Therefore, Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 follows from Theorems 1.7, 7.2 and 1.10. The equation is elliptic when (2.11) holds according to Proposition 4.7 and Lemma 4.6. Together with Lemma 4.8, we can confirm all the assumptions in Theorem 1.6. Thus we obtain Theorem 2.6. \square

Remark 2.7. The Yamabe problem for complete noncompact Riemannian manifolds is not always solvable due to the counterexample of Jin [35]. We reasonably believe that the asymptotic assumptions at infinity in Theorems 1.1, 2.3, 2.5 and 1.10 can not be further dropped in general. (Also note that such asymptotic conditions are necessary for the solvability of the equations, respectively).

3. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, $\sigma(z)$ denotes the distance from z to ∂M , and f satisfies the natural condition $\sup_{\partial\Gamma} f < \sup_{\Gamma} f$, where $\sup_{\partial\Gamma} f = \sup_{\lambda_0 \in \partial\Gamma} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0} f(\lambda)$. In computation we use derivatives with respect to the Chern connection ∇ of ω , and write $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$, $\bar{\partial}_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_i}$, $\nabla_i = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}}$, $\nabla_{\bar{i}} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_i}}$. For a smooth function v ,

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} v_i &:= \partial_i v, \quad v_{\bar{i}} := \bar{\partial}_i v, \quad v_{i\bar{j}} := \partial_i \bar{\partial}_j v, \quad v_{ij} := \partial_j \partial_i v - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_k, \\ v_{i\bar{j}k} &:= \partial_k v_{i\bar{j}} - \Gamma_{ki}^l v_{l\bar{j}}, \dots, \text{ etc,} \end{aligned}$$

where Γ_{ij}^k are the Christoffel symbols defined by $\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} = \Gamma_{ij}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}$.

For simplicity, we denote

$$\psi[u] = \psi(z, u), \quad \lambda(\Omega) = \lambda(\omega^{-1}\Omega) \text{ for real } (1, 1)\text{-form } \Omega.$$

$$\partial\Gamma^\sigma = \{\lambda \in \Gamma : f(\lambda) = \sigma\}, \quad \Gamma^\sigma = \{\lambda \in \Gamma : f(\lambda) > \sigma\}.$$

3.1. Some result on Morse function. The following lemma asserts that any compact manifold with boundary carries some function without any critical points.

Lemma 3.1. *Let \bar{M} be a compact connected manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$ with smooth boundary. Then there is a smooth function v without any critical points.*

Proof. The construction is more or less standard in differential topology. Let X be the double of M . Let w be a smooth Morse function on X with the critical set $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^{m+k}$, among which p_1, \dots, p_m are all the critical points being in \bar{M} . Pick $q_1, \dots, q_m \in X \setminus \bar{M}$ but not the critical point of w . By homogeneity lemma (see [41]), one can find a diffeomorphism $h : X \rightarrow X$, which is smoothly isotopic to the identity, such that $h(p_i) = q_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and moreover $h(p_i) = p_i$ for $m+1 \leq i \leq m+k$. Then $v = w \circ h^{-1}|_{\bar{M}}$ is the desired function. \square

3.2. The criterion of q -pseudoconvexity. First, we recall some related notion.

Definition 3.2. An open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is called Levi q -pseudoconvex if at any $x \in \partial\Omega$ the Levi form L_ρ has at most q -negative eigenvalues on the holomorphic tangent space $T_{x, \partial\Omega} \cap JT_{x, \partial\Omega}$.

Definition 3.3. A C^2 function $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a q -plurisubharmonic function if $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}h$ has at least $n - q$ positive eigenvalues for all z in Ω .

According to some results of Eastwood-Suria [15] and Suria [47], one has

Theorem 3.4 ([15, 47]). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a C^2 -smoothly bounded domain. Then Ω is Levi- q pseudoconvex if and only if it admits a C^2 -smooth q -plurisubharmonic exhaustion function.*

For more results on q -pseudoconvexity, q -complete and q -plurisubharmonic function, please refer to the monograph [43]. Also, we refer to [10, 42] for some results relating Ricci curvature to function-theoretic information.

3.3. A quantitative lemma. The following lemma was proposed by [61]*, which can be viewed as a quantitative version of [7, Lemma 1.2]. For completeness, we present the proof in Appendix B.

Lemma 3.5 ([61, 62]). *Let A be an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & & & & a_1 \\ & d_2 & & & a_2 \\ & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & & d_{n-1} & a_{n-1} \\ \bar{a}_1 & \bar{a}_2 & \cdots & \bar{a}_{n-1} & \mathbf{a} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}$ fixed, and with \mathbf{a} variable. Denote the eigenvalues of A by $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a fixed constant. Suppose that

$$\mathbf{a} \geq \frac{2n-3}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2 + (n-1) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |d_i| + \frac{(n-2)\epsilon}{2n-3}.$$

Then the eigenvalues (possibly with a proper permutation) behave like

$$\begin{aligned} d_\alpha - \epsilon &< \lambda_\alpha < d_\alpha + \epsilon, \quad \forall 1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1, \\ \mathbf{a} &\leq \lambda_n < \mathbf{a} + (n-1)\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

3.4. Useful lemmas regarding to f . The concavity of f yields a useful inequality

$$(3.2) \quad f(\mu) \leq f(\lambda) + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda)(\mu_i - \lambda_i), \quad \forall \lambda, \mu \in \Gamma.$$

The following lemma states that the unbound and concavity imply monotonicity. This was observed in new draft of [62].

Lemma 3.6. *If f satisfies (1.4) in Γ , then (1.5) holds.*

Proof. Suppose $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$. Then $f_1(\lambda) \geq \dots \geq f_n(\lambda)$. In view of the concavity and unbound of f , by setting $t \gg 1$ we know

$$f_n(\lambda) \geq \frac{f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n + t) - f(\lambda)}{t} > 0.$$

□

Next, we present another useful lemma.

Lemma 3.7 ([62, 65]). *If f satisfies (1.6), then $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda)\mu_i > 0$, $\forall \lambda, \mu \in \Gamma$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma = f(\lambda)$ and $Df = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$. By (1.6), $t\mu \in \Gamma^\sigma$ for t large. Since Γ^σ is convex, $Df(\lambda) \cdot (t\mu - \lambda) > 0$. So $Df(\lambda) \cdot \lambda > 0$ (setting $\mu = \lambda$) and so $Df(\lambda) \cdot \mu > 0$.

□

We introduce the following notion in order to explore the structure of fully non-linear equations of elliptic and parabolic type.

*The results in [61] were moved to [62]. More precisely, the paper [62] is essentially extracted from [61], along with the first parts of [arXiv:2001.09238] and [arXiv:2106.14837].

Definition 3.8 (Partial uniform ellipticity). We say that f is of m -uniform ellipticity in Γ , if f satisfies

- (i) $f_i(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n$, $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) > 0$, $\forall \lambda \in \Gamma$.
- (ii) There is a uniform constant ϑ such that for $\lambda \in \Gamma$ with $f_1(\lambda) \geq \dots \geq f_n(\lambda)$,

$$(3.3) \quad f_i(\lambda) \geq \vartheta \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(\lambda) > 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

In particular, n -uniform ellipticity is also called *fully uniform ellipticity*.

Accordingly, we have an analogous notion of partial uniform ellipticity for a second order elliptic equation, if its linearized operator satisfies a similar condition.

In [64, 65][†] the author determined the integer m from (3.3) for generic symmetric concave functions, extending extensively an inequality of [38] for $f = \sigma_k^{1/k}$.

Lemma 3.9 ([64, 65]). *Suppose (1.6) holds. Then for any $\lambda \in \Gamma$ with $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$, we have*

- (1) $f_i(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n$, $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) > 0$.
- (2) $f_i(\lambda) \geq n\vartheta_\Gamma f_1(\lambda) \geq \vartheta_\Gamma \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(\lambda)$, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq 1 + \kappa_\Gamma$.

Here κ_Γ is given in (1.8), and

$$(3.4) \quad \vartheta_\Gamma = \begin{cases} 1/n, & \Gamma = \Gamma_n, \\ \sup_{(-\alpha_1, \dots, -\alpha_{\kappa_\Gamma}, \alpha_{\kappa_\Gamma+1}, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \Gamma, \alpha_i > 0} \frac{\alpha_1/n}{\sum_{i=\kappa_\Gamma+1}^n \alpha_i - \sum_{i=2}^{\kappa_\Gamma} \alpha_i}, & \Gamma \neq \Gamma_n. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the assertion of $(\kappa_\Gamma + 1)$ -uniform ellipticity is sharp.

Remark 3.10. If $\Gamma = \Gamma_1$ then by (3.4) $f_1(\lambda) = f_2(\lambda) = \dots = f_n(\lambda)$ in Γ .

It is notable that f is of uniform ellipticity when Γ is of type 2 and vice versa.

Lemma 3.11 ([64, 65]). *Suppose f satisfies (1.6) in Γ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.
- (2) $\kappa_\Gamma = n - 1$. That is, Γ is of type 2.
- (3) There exists a uniform constant θ such that

$$(3.5) \quad f_i(\lambda) \geq \theta \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(\lambda) > 0 \text{ in } \Gamma, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

When f satisfies (3.5), we verify the unbounded condition.

Lemma 3.12 ([65]). *In the presence of (1.6), (3.5) and $\sup_\Gamma f = +\infty$, f satisfies the unbounded condition (1.4).*

Finally, we verify (1.6) in certain case.

Lemma 3.13 ([65]). *Suppose $\sup_\Gamma f = +\infty$ and (1.2) holds. Then f satisfies (1.6).*

For convenience, in Appendix A we will give the proofs of above lemmas.

[†]The results in [64] were moved to [65].

4. ON THE STRUCTURE OF FULLY NONLINEAR EQUATIONS

In this section we explore the structure of fully nonlinear equations of the type

$$(4.1) \quad f(\lambda(\chi + \Delta u \omega - \varrho \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u)) = \psi[u], \quad \varrho \neq 0,$$

and the relation to

$$(4.2) \quad \tilde{f}(\lambda(\tilde{\chi} + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u)) = \psi[u].$$

4.1. The relation between (4.1) and (4.2). We prove that (4.1) can be transformed into (4.2) and vice versa. Let ϱ_Γ be as defined in (2.8).

4.1.1. *Equation (4.1) has the form (4.2).* Fix (f, Γ) . Given ϱ with $\varrho \leq \varrho_\Gamma$, $\varrho \neq 0$ ($\varrho < n$ if $\Gamma = \Gamma_1$), we can construct $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\Gamma})$ as follows:

$$(4.3) \quad \tilde{\Gamma} = \left\{ (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) : \lambda_i = \frac{1}{\varrho} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j - (n - \varrho) \mu_i \right), (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \Gamma \right\}.$$

Note that for any $\lambda \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ there is a unique $\mu \in \Gamma$ such that $\lambda_i = \frac{1}{\varrho} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j - (n - \varrho) \mu_i \right)$. Define $\tilde{f} : \tilde{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{f}(\lambda) = f(\mu).$$

This shows that (4.1) (with $\varrho \leq \varrho_\Gamma$) has the form (4.2). One can simply verify that \tilde{f} is concave in $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Furthermore, if (f, Γ) satisfies (1.6) then so does $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\Gamma})$.

4.1.2. *Equation (4.2) has the form (4.1).*

Proposition 4.1. Suppose as before, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is an open symmetric convex cone with vertex at origin, and with $\partial \tilde{\Gamma} \neq \emptyset$, $\tilde{\Gamma} \neq \Gamma_1$, $\Gamma_n \subseteq \tilde{\Gamma}$. Pick a constant ϱ with $n - \varrho_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \leq \varrho < n$. Let P be a linear map from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{R}^n which is defined as follows:

$$P(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n - \varrho} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \vec{1} - \varrho \lambda \right).$$

Take $\Gamma := P(\tilde{\Gamma})$. Then Γ is an open, symmetric, convex cone with vertex at origin,

$$\Gamma_n \subseteq \Gamma \subset \Gamma_1, \quad \varrho \leq \varrho_\Gamma.$$

Proof. Since $\tilde{\Gamma} \neq \Gamma_1$, $0 < n - \varrho_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \leq \varrho < n$ and the linear map P is well-defined and invertible. Moreover, Γ is an open, convex, symmetric cone with vertex at origin.

Fix $\lambda \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, we take $\mu = P(\lambda)$. By $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j$, we know $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma_1$. The remaining step is to prove $\Gamma_n \subseteq \Gamma$. Since $n - \varrho_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \leq \varrho$, we know $(1, \dots, 1, 1 - n + \varrho) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, which implies $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$. This means $\Gamma_n \subseteq \Gamma$. Since $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, we get $(1, \dots, 1, 1 - \varrho) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$. Thus $\varrho \leq \varrho_\Gamma$. \square

Consequently, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ has the form (4.3). In other words, for any cone $\tilde{\Gamma}$ (with $\tilde{\Gamma} \neq \Gamma_1$) as in Proposition 4.1, there is an open symmetric convex cone Γ with vertex at origin and a constant ϱ of $0 < n - \varrho_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \leq \varrho \leq \varrho_{\Gamma}$, such that

$$\tilde{\Gamma} = \left\{ (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) : \lambda_i = \frac{1}{\varrho} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j - (n - \varrho)\mu_i \right) \text{ for } (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \Gamma \right\}.$$

As a result, (4.2) can be rewritten in the form (4.1) (with $0 < n - \varrho_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \leq \varrho \leq \varrho_{\Gamma}$).

4.2. **On the structure of $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\Gamma})$.** We can prove by Lemma 3.11 that

Proposition 4.2. Suppose (f, Γ) satisfies (1.6). Then

- If $\varrho < \varrho_{\Gamma}$, $\varrho \neq 0$, then (4.1) is uniformly elliptic at admissible solution u with $\lambda(\chi + \Delta u \omega - \varrho \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u) \in \Gamma$.
- If $\varrho = \varrho_{\Gamma}$ ($\Gamma \neq \Gamma_1$) and (2.12) holds, then (4.1) is elliptic at admissible solutions.

To achieve this we first check that

Lemma 4.3. Given a cone Γ , as in (4.3) we take $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Then

- (1) $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is of type 2 if and only if $\varrho < \varrho_{\Gamma}$, $\varrho \neq 0$.
- (2) $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is of type 1 if $\varrho = \varrho_{\Gamma}$.

Remark 4.4. This was also observed in [66]. A somewhat surprising fact to us is that $(n-1)$ -type fully nonlinear equation is of uniform ellipticity whenever $\Gamma \neq \Gamma_n$. This is in contrast with the $(n-1)$ Monge-Ampère equation, which is in close connections with $(n-1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions in the sense of Harvey-Lawson [32] as well as Form-type Calabi-Yau equation [17] and Gauduchon's conjecture [19] (see also [45, 54]). In recent years, Székelyhidi-Tosatti-Weinkove [49] proved the Gauduchon conjecture for higher dimensions, extending earlier work of Cherrier [11] on complex surfaces. Subsequently, the author [63] solved the Dirichlet problem, in which the equation probably allows degeneracy.

4.2.1. *Uniform ellipticity case.* In practice, Lemma 3.11 and the first part of Lemma 4.3 together give the following key ingredient.

Proposition 4.5. Fix a constant with $\varrho < n$, $\varrho \neq 0$. Given (f, Γ) satisfying (1.6), as in (4.3) and (4.4) we can define $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\Gamma})$. Then the following are equivalent:

- $\varrho < \varrho_{\Gamma}$.
- \tilde{f} is of fully uniform ellipticity in $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Namely,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \lambda_i}(\lambda) \geq \theta \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \lambda_j}(\lambda) > 0 \text{ in } \tilde{\Gamma}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

4.2.2. *Ellipticity case.* Assume $\varrho = \varrho_{\Gamma}$ and $\Gamma \neq \Gamma_1$. Obviously, from the construction of $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\Gamma})$ we have

Lemma 4.6. Given (f, Γ) satisfying (1.6), we assume $\varrho = \varrho_{\Gamma}$ ($\Gamma \neq \Gamma_1$). Let $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\Gamma})$ be as in (4.3) and (4.4). Suppose in addition that f obeys (2.12) in Γ . Then \tilde{f} satisfies the unbounded condition (1.4) in $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

Together with Lemma 3.6 we can conclude that

Proposition 4.7. Suppose $\varrho = \varrho_\Gamma$ ($\Gamma \neq \Gamma_1$) and that (f, Γ) satisfies (1.6) and (2.12). Let $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\Gamma})$ be as in (4.3) and (4.4). Then \tilde{f} satisfies (1.5) in $\tilde{\Gamma}$. That is

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \lambda_i}(\lambda) > 0, \quad \forall \lambda \in \tilde{\Gamma}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

4.3. **Further remarks on Γ_∞ -admissible boundary.** Let $\tilde{\Gamma}$ be as in (4.3). We can check that

Lemma 4.8. ∂M is $\tilde{\Gamma}_\infty$ -admissible (i.e., $(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}) \in \tilde{\Gamma}_\infty$) if and only if

$$(4.5) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_i \vec{1} - \varrho(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}, 0) + t(1, \dots, 1, 1 - \varrho) \in \Gamma \text{ for } t \gg 1.$$

Corollary 4.9. If $\varrho < \varrho_\Gamma$, $\varrho \neq 0$, then any smooth boundary is $\tilde{\Gamma}_\infty$ -admissible. On the other hand, when $\varrho = \varrho_\Gamma$ the condition (4.5) coincides with (2.13).

5. CONSTRUCT ADMISSIBLE FUNCTIONS VIA MORSE FUNCTIONS

Lemma 5.1. Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary. Then there is a smooth admissible function \underline{w} subject to $\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\underline{w}) \in \Gamma$ in \bar{M} , provided that Γ is of type 2, i.e., $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we have a smooth function v with $v \geq 1$ and $\partial v \neq 0$ on \bar{M} . Let $\underline{w} = e^{tv}$. Note that $\lambda(\sqrt{-1}\partial v \wedge \bar{\partial} v) = |\partial v|^2(0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and

$$(5.1) \quad \chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\underline{w} = \chi + te^{tv}(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}v + t\sqrt{-1}\partial v \wedge \bar{\partial} v).$$

Since $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $\lambda(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}v + t\sqrt{-1}\partial v \wedge \bar{\partial} v) \in \Gamma$ for $t \gg 1$. Together with the openness of Γ , \underline{w} is an admissible function when $t \gg 1$. \square

Lemma 5.2. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.10, there exists a C^2 -admissible function \underline{u} satisfying

$$(5.2) \quad f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\underline{u})) \geq \Lambda_1 \psi e^{\Lambda_0 \underline{u}} \text{ in } M$$

for some constant $\Lambda_1 > 0$. Moreover, $\underline{u} \geq \underline{v} - C_1$ for some $C_1 > 0$, where \underline{v} is as in Theorem 1.10.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\underline{v} = 0$ is pseudo-admissible and satisfies (1.9). Let K_0 be the compact subset as in (1.9). From (1.2), the pseudo-admissible assumption and the positivity of ψ , we know $\lambda(\chi) \in \Gamma$ in $M \setminus K_0$.

Pick compact submanifolds M_1, M_2 of complex dimension n and with smooth boundary and with $K_0 \subset\subset M_1 \subset\subset M_2$. Choose a cutoff function satisfying

$$\zeta \in C_0^\infty(M_2), \quad 0 \leq \zeta \leq 1 \text{ and } \zeta|_{M_1} = 1.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we take a smooth function v with $dv \neq 0$ and $v \leq 0$ on \bar{M}_2 . From (5.1), for $t \gg 1$, $\underline{w} = e^{t(v-1)}$ is an admissible function on \bar{M}_2 . Take $\underline{u} = e^{Nh}$, where

$$h = \begin{cases} \zeta v - 1 & \text{if } x \in M_2, \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

When $N \gg 1$, \underline{u} is an admissible function and satisfies (5.2). \square

6. THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM

From Subsection 4.1 we know that (2.4), and so (2.3), falls into equation of the form (1.1). From now on, we consider more general equation than (1.1)

$$(6.1) \quad f(\lambda(\omega^{-1}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u))) = \psi(z, u).$$

Throughout this section, and Sections 7 as well as 9, we suppose that (\bar{M}, ω) is a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary.

In this section we consider the equation (6.1) prescribing boundary value data

$$(6.2) \quad u = \varphi \text{ on } \partial M.$$

Furthermore, we assume that $\psi(z, t)$ is a smooth function on $\bar{M} \times \mathbb{R}$ with

$$(6.3) \quad \inf_{z \in \bar{M}} \psi(z, t) > \sup_{\partial \Gamma} f, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Theorem 6.1. *Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth Γ_∞ -admissible boundary. In addition to (1.4) and (1.6), we assume that $\psi(z, t)$ is a smooth function on $\bar{M} \times \mathbb{R}$ subject to (6.3) and*

$$(6.4) \quad \psi_t(z, t) := \frac{\partial \psi(z, t)}{\partial t} > 0, \quad \forall (z, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R},$$

$$(6.5) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \psi(z, t) = \inf_{\Gamma} f, \quad \forall z \in \bar{M}.$$

Suppose in addition that there is a C^2 admissible function \underline{w} . Then for any $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial M)$, there is a unique smooth admissible function satisfying (6.1) and (6.2).

When $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ or f satisfies (3.5), we will show that the Dirichlet problem is uniquely solvable without assumptions on boundary and existence of admissible function, beyond $\partial M \in C^\infty$. It is a fully nonlinear analogue of existence theory for Poisson's equation and Liouville's equation.

Theorem 6.2. *Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary. Suppose $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $\sup_{\Gamma} f = +\infty$ and that (f, Γ) satisfies (1.6). Assume in addition that $\psi(z, t)$ satisfies (6.3) and $\psi_t(z, t) \geq 0$. Then for any $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial M)$, the Dirichlet problem (6.1) and (6.2) has a unique smooth admissible solution.*

As a special case, we obtain

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $\sup_{\Gamma} f = +\infty$ and that (f, Γ) satisfies (1.2). Then for any smooth positive function ψ in \bar{M} and $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial M)$, the equation (1.1) possesses a unique smooth admissible solution with $u = \varphi$ on ∂M .*

6.1. **Set-up.** According to the Evans-Krylov theorem [16, 36] and Schauder theory, it suffices to establish estimates for complex Hessian up to boundary

$$(6.6) \quad \sup_{\bar{M}} |\partial\bar{\partial}u| \leq C.$$

Let \hat{u} be the solution to

$$(6.7) \quad \Delta\hat{u} + \text{tr}(\omega^{-1}\chi) = 0 \text{ in } M, \quad \hat{u} = \varphi \text{ on } \partial M.$$

The existence and regularity of \hat{u} can be found in standard textbooks; see e.g. [21]. The maximum principle yields

$$(6.8) \quad u \leq \hat{u} \text{ in } M, \quad u = \hat{u} = \varphi \text{ on } \partial M.$$

Key assumption: Near the boundary we assume that there exists a local admissible function \underline{u} satisfying

$$(6.9) \quad u \geq \underline{u} \text{ in } M_\delta, \quad \underline{u} = \varphi \text{ on } \partial M$$

for some $\delta > 0$, where

$$(6.10) \quad M_\delta := \{z \in M : \sigma(z) < \delta\}.$$

Lemma 6.4. Any admissible solution u satisfying (6.9) shall obey

$$(6.11) \quad \sup_M u \leq C, \quad \sup_{\partial M} |\partial u| \leq C.$$

Moreover, if replacing local condition (6.9) by a global version

$$(6.12) \quad u \geq \underline{u} \text{ in } M, \quad \underline{u} = \varphi \text{ on } \partial M,$$

then we have zero order and boundary gradient estimates

$$(6.13) \quad \sup_M |u| + \sup_{\partial M} |\partial u| \leq C.$$

The primary problem is to derive gradient estimate as described in introduction. Our strategy is to establish quantitative boundary estimate of the form (1.7), i.e.,

$$\sup_{\partial M} |\partial\bar{\partial}u| \leq C(1 + \sup_M |\partial u|^2),$$

given a local admissible function near boundary. We leave the proof to Section 9.

Proposition 6.5. Assume (1.4), (1.6) and (6.9) hold. Then for any admissible solution $u \in C^3(M) \cap C^2(\bar{M})$ to the Dirichlet problem (6.1)-(6.2), we have the quantitative boundary estimate (1.7).

On the other hand, following closely the proof of Hou-Ma-Wu [34, Theorem 1.1], or the generalization by Székelyhidi [48, Section 4], one can derive

Proposition 6.6. Suppose, in addition to (1.6) and (1.4), that there is a C^2 -smooth admissible function \underline{w} . Then for any admissible solution $u \in C^4(M) \cap C^2(\bar{M})$ to equation (6.1), there is a uniform constant C such that

$$\sup_M |\partial\bar{\partial}u| \leq C(1 + \sup_M |\partial u|^2 + \sup_{\partial M} |\partial\bar{\partial}u|).$$

The above two propositions together give

$$\sup_M |\partial\bar{\partial}u| \leq C(1 + \sup_M |\partial u|^2).$$

Using the Liouville type theorem of Székelyhidi [48], we can derive gradient estimate and therefore (6.6).

6.2. The Dirichlet problem on manifolds with Γ_∞ -admissible boundary.

6.2.1. C^0 -estimate. By maximum principle, we obtain the following estimate as a complement to (6.8). Since the proof is standard, we omit it here.

Lemma 6.7. *In addition to (1.6), (6.4), (6.5), we assume that there is an admissible function \underline{w} . Let $u \in C^2(\bar{M})$ be an admissible solution to (6.1)-(6.2), then*

$$\inf_M (u - \underline{w}) \geq \min \left\{ \inf_{\partial M} (\varphi - \underline{w}), A_1 - \sup_M \underline{w} \right\},$$

where A_1 is a constant with $\sup_{z \in M} \psi(z, A_1) \leq \inf_M f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\underline{w}))$.

6.2.2. *The construction of local barriers.* As above σ denotes the distance function to ∂M , and $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}$ are the eigenvalues of Levi form $L_{\partial M}$. Under the assumption $(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}) \in \Gamma_\infty$, we may use σ to construct local barriers, thereby confirming (6.9). Fix $k \geq 1$. Similar to the Riemannian case (see e.g. [23]) we take

$$(6.14) \quad w(z) = 2 \log \frac{\delta^2}{\delta^2 + k\sigma(z)}.$$

The straightforward computation gives the following:

$$\partial\bar{\partial}w = \frac{2k}{\delta^2 + k\sigma} \left(\frac{k}{\delta^2 + k\sigma} \partial\sigma \wedge \bar{\partial}\sigma - \partial\bar{\partial}\sigma \right).$$

Note that $|\partial\sigma| = \frac{1}{2}$ on ∂M , and $\frac{k}{\delta^2 + k\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sigma + \delta^2/k} \geq \frac{1}{\sigma + \delta^2}$ on M_δ . Together with Lemma 3.5, we can take $0 < \delta \ll 1$ such that w is smooth in M_δ and

$$\lambda \left(\frac{k\sqrt{-1}}{\delta^2 + k\sigma} \partial\sigma \wedge \bar{\partial}\sigma - \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\sigma \right) \in \Gamma \text{ and } \lambda \left(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi + \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}\partial\bar{\partial}w \right) \in \Gamma \text{ in } M_\delta.$$

Here is the only place to use the Γ_∞ -admissible assumption on the boundary.

By Lemma 3.13, f obeys (1.6). Using lemma 3.7, we can derive $f(\lambda + \mu) \geq f(\lambda)$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Gamma$. Notice $w \leq 0$. Take $0 < \delta_1 \ll 1$, we conclude

$$(6.15) \quad f \left(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(w + \varphi)) \right) \geq f \left(\lambda \left(\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}\partial\bar{\partial}w \right) \right) \geq \psi(z, w + \varphi) \text{ in } M_{\delta_1}.$$

By Lemma 6.7, u has a uniform lower bound, i.e., there is a constant δ_2 such that

$$(6.16) \quad \inf_M (u - \varphi) \geq 2 \log \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_2 + k}.$$

Consequently, the comparison principle yields that

$$(6.17) \quad u \geq w + \varphi = 2 \log \frac{\delta^2}{\delta^2 + k\sigma} + \varphi \text{ on } M_\delta, \delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}.$$

So $\underline{u} = w + \varphi$ is a desired local admissible function satisfying (6.9).

6.3. The Dirichlet problem with type 2 cone. To obtain Theorem 6.2, it suffices to confirm (6.9) and (6.13).

Proposition 6.8. Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary. Suppose $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $\sup_\Gamma f = +\infty$ and that (f, Γ) satisfies (1.6). Assume $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial M)$ and $\psi(z, t)$ is a smooth function satisfying (6.3) and $\psi_t(z, t) \geq 0$. Let $u \in C^2(\bar{M})$ be an admissible solution to the Dirichlet problem (6.1) and (6.2). Then u satisfies (6.9) and (6.13).

Proof. According to Lemma 3.11, f satisfies (3.5). In addition, f satisfies (1.4) by Lemma 3.12. From (6.8) we know u has a upper bound $u \leq \hat{u}$. Together with $\psi_u(z, u) \geq 0$, we know there is a uniform constant C_1 such that

$$\psi(z, u) \leq \psi(z, \hat{u}) \leq C_1, \forall z \in M.$$

As in proof of Lemma 5.1, let $\underline{w} = e^{tv}$. Note $\lambda(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}v \wedge \bar{\partial}v) = |\partial v|^2(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \Gamma$. Then \underline{w} is admissible for $t \gg 1$. Using (5.1) and Lemma for $t \gg 1$ we get

$$f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\underline{w})) > f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)).$$

By the maximum principle, u has a uniform lower bound

$$(6.18) \quad \inf_M(u - \underline{w}) = \inf_{\partial M}(\varphi - \underline{w}).$$

Hence (6.16). As in (6.14) we take $w = 2 \log \frac{\delta^2}{\delta^2 + k\sigma}$. Similar to (6.15), we get

$$f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(w + \varphi))) > C_1 \geq f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)) \text{ in } M_{\delta_1}.$$

Then we get (6.17), hence confirming (6.9). Combining with (6.18) we obtain (6.13). □

7. THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM WITH INFINITE BOUNDARY VALUE CONDITION, AND COMPLETENESS OF CONFORMAL METRICS

When the right-hand side $\psi(z, t)$ satisfies exponential growth in t at infinity, we can solve the Dirichlet problem with infinity boundary data.

Theorem 7.1. Let (\bar{M}, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary. In addition to $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $\sup_\Gamma f = +\infty$, we assume f satisfies (1.6). Let $\psi(z, t)$ be a smooth function satisfying (6.3) and $\psi_t(z, t) \geq 0$. Suppose in addition that

$$(7.1) \quad \psi(z, t) \geq h(z)e^{l(z)t}, \quad \forall z \in \bar{M}, \forall t > T$$

for some $T > 0$ and positive valued continuous functions $h, l \in C^0(\bar{M})$. There is an admissible function $u \in C^\infty(M)$ satisfying (6.1) and $\lim_{z \rightarrow \partial M} u(z) = +\infty$. Moreover, u is minimal in the sense that $u \leq w$ for any admissible solution w with infinity boundary value.

When $\psi(z, t) = \psi(z)e^{\Lambda_0 t}$ we obtain Theorem 1.7. Moreover, we have

Theorem 7.2. *Let u be the minimal solution asserted in Theorem 7.1. Suppose the assumptions in Theorem 1.7 hold. In addition, we assume that f obeys (1.3) and $\psi(z, t) = \psi(z)e^{\varsigma t}$. Here ς is as in (1.3). Then $e^u\omega$ is complete.*

7.1. **Lemmas.** To fix the notation, $\nabla_g^2 u$ denotes the real Hessian of u under Levi-Civita connection of (M, g) (a Riemannian manifold of real dimension $2n$). Let $\Delta_g u = \text{tr}(g^{-1}\nabla_g^2 u)$. It is known that the complex Laplacian differs from standard Laplacian of Levi-Civita connection by a linear first order term; see [19]. That is

Lemma 7.3. *Let (M, ω) be a Hermitian manifold of complex dimension n . Let τ be the torsion 1-form with $d\omega^{n-1} = \omega^{n-1} \wedge \tau$. For any $u \in C^2(M)$, we have*

$$2\Delta u = \Delta_g u - \langle du, \tau \rangle_\omega.$$

The following important result is due to Aviles-McOwen [3], who extended extensively a seminal result of Loewner-Nirenberg [40].

Lemma 7.4 ([3]). *Suppose that (\bar{X}, g) is a compact Riemannian manifold of real dimension $m \geq 3$ with smooth boundary ∂X , $\bar{X} := X \cup \partial X$. Then the interior X admits a complete conformal metric with negative constant scalar curvature.*

From (3.2) we can deduce the following lemma.

Lemma 7.5. *Assume $f(\vec{\mathbf{1}}) < \sup_\Gamma f$ and $A_f = n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\vec{\mathbf{1}}) \right)^{-1}$. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \geq n + A_f \left(f(\lambda) - f(\vec{\mathbf{1}}) \right), \quad \forall \lambda \in \Gamma.$$

7.2. **Proof of Theorems 7.1 and 7.2.** By Lemma 3.11, $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ implies that f satisfies (3.5) in Γ . According to Theorem 6.2, for any integer $k \geq 1$, the following Dirichlet problem has a unique smooth admissible solution

$$(7.2) \quad f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u_{(k)})) = \psi(z, u_{(k)}) \text{ in } M, \quad u_{(k)} = 2 \log k \text{ on } \partial M.$$

The comparison principle (see e.g. [21]) yields that

$$(7.3) \quad u_{(k)} \leq u_{(k+1)} \text{ in } M, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

So $u_{(k)}$ has a common lower bound for all $k \geq 1$. On the other hand, from the assumption (7.1) it follows that there are positive constants γ, Λ and T_1 such that

$$(7.4) \quad \psi(z, t) \geq \gamma e^{\Lambda t}, \quad \forall z \in \bar{M}, \quad \forall t \geq T_1.$$

Below we prove local C^0 bound from above. Applying Lemma 7.4 to Hermitian manifold (M, ω) (note that it is a manifold of real dimension $2n$ with Riemannian metric g), there is $\tilde{u} \in C^\infty(M)$ with

$$(7.5) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_g \tilde{u} + \frac{n-1}{4}|d\tilde{u}|_g^2 - \frac{S_g}{2(2n-1)} = e^{\tilde{u}} \text{ in } M, \quad \lim_{z \rightarrow \partial M} \tilde{u}(z) = +\infty,$$

where S_g is the Riemannian scalar curvature of g . That is, $\tilde{g} = e^{\tilde{u}}g$ is a complete metric with Riemannian scalar curvature $S_{\tilde{g}} = -2(2n-1)$. Together with Lemma 7.3, we may use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to verify the following key lemma.

Lemma 7.6. *Let \tilde{u} be as in (7.5). There exists a uniform constant A such that*

$$(7.6) \quad \Delta \tilde{u} \leq e^{\tilde{u}} + A \text{ in } M, \quad \lim_{z \rightarrow \partial M} \tilde{u}(z) = +\infty.$$

We have the following proposition.

Proposition 7.7. *Let \tilde{u} be as in (7.5). Let Λ, T_1 be as in (7.4). There is a uniform constant C_o depending on $\inf_M \tilde{u}$ and other known data but not on k such that*

$$u_{(k)} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\tilde{u} + C_o}{\Lambda}, T_1 + \frac{\tilde{u} - \inf_M \tilde{u}}{\Lambda} \right\} \text{ in } M, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Proof. Fix k . By Lemma 7.5, we get

$$\Delta u_{(k)} \geq A_f \left(\psi[u_{(k)}] - f(\vec{\mathbf{I}}) \right) + n - \text{tr}(\omega^{-1}\chi).$$

We know that $\Lambda u_{(k)} - \tilde{u}$ attains its maximum at some interior point x_0 , where $\Delta \tilde{u} \geq \Lambda \Delta u_{(k)}$. We assume $u_{(k)}(x_0) \geq T_1$ (otherwise we are done). Then at x_0 we have $\psi[u_{(k)}] \geq \gamma e^{\Lambda u_{(k)}}$ by (7.4), hence

$$(7.7) \quad \Delta u_{(k)} \geq A_f \left(\gamma e^{\Lambda u_{(k)}} - f(\vec{\mathbf{I}}) \right) + n - \text{tr}(\omega^{-1}\chi).$$

Combining (7.7) and (7.6), we have

$$\Lambda A_f \gamma e^{\sup_M (\Lambda u_{(k)} - \tilde{u})} < 1 + \sup_M \left[e^{-\tilde{u}} \left(A + \Lambda A_f f(\vec{\mathbf{I}}) + \Lambda \text{tr}(\omega^{-1}\chi) \right) \right],$$

where A comes from Lemma 7.6. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.1. By (7.3) and Proposition 7.7 the following limit exists

$$(7.8) \quad u(z) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} u_{(k)}(z), \quad \forall z \in M.$$

Using the interior estimates proved in Proposition 10.1, together with Evans-Krylov theorem and Schauder theory, we know $u \in C^\infty(M)$. On the other hand, by the maximum principle, we have $u \leq w$ for any admissible solution w with $w|_{\partial M} = +\infty$. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2. Note that in Theorem 7.2, f satisfies (1.3) and $\psi(z, u) = \psi(z)e^{Su}$. In (6.14) and (7.2), we take $w = 2 \log \frac{\delta^2}{\delta^2 + k\sigma}$, $\varphi = 2 \log k$. That is

$$f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u_{(k)})) = \psi e^{Su_{(k)}} \text{ in } M, \quad u_{(k)} = 2 \log k \text{ on } \partial M.$$

Let u be the limit as we defined in (7.8). Using Lemma 3.7 and $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \Gamma$, we can establish an inequality similar to (6.15). Notice by (7.3) that $u_{(k)}$ has a common lower bound for all $k \geq 1$. Therefore, by comparison principle shows that there is a uniform constant δ such that

$$u_{(k)}(z) \geq 2 \log \frac{k\delta^2}{\delta^2 + k\sigma(z)} \text{ on } M_\delta, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Thus $u \geq -2 \log \sigma - C_0$ for some constant C_0 near boundary, which yields the completeness of the metric $e^u \omega$. \square

8. EQUATIONS ON COMPLETE NONCOMPACT HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS

In this section we solve the equation (6.1) on a complete noncompact Hermitian manifold. Together with Lemma 5.2, we obtain Theorem 1.10.

Theorem 8.1. *Let (M, ω) be a complete noncompact Hermitian manifold. Let $\psi(z, t)$ be a smooth function on $M \times \mathbb{R}$. Assume, in addition to $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $\sup_\Gamma f = +\infty$, that f satisfies (1.6) in Γ . Suppose $\psi(z, t)$ satisfies (6.3), (7.1) and $\psi_t(z, t) \geq 0$. Assume in addition that there is an admissible function $\underline{u} \in C^2(M)$ such that*

$$(8.1) \quad f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\underline{u})) \geq \psi(z, \underline{u}) \text{ in } M \setminus K_0$$

where K_0 is a compact subset of M . Then there is an admissible function $u \in C^\infty(M)$ satisfying (6.1). Moreover, u is the maximal solution and $u \geq \underline{u}$.

Remark 8.2. When (M, ω) is complete noncompact, in assumption (7.1) \bar{M} shall be replaced by M .

Proof. Fix an exhausting sequence $\{M_k\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ by complex submanifolds of complex dimension n with smooth boundary such that $M = \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k$, $\bar{M}_k = M_k \cup \partial M_k$, $\bar{M}_k \subset\subset M_{k+1}$. For any integer $k \geq 1$ we denote $u^{(k)}$ the admissible solution to

$$f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u^{(k)})) = \psi(z, u^{(k)}) \text{ in } M_k, \quad \lim_{z \rightarrow \partial M_k} u^{(k)}(z) = +\infty.$$

Moreover, $u^{(k)} \in C^\infty(M_k)$. The existence and regularity follow from Theorem 7.1.

By the maximum principle, we deduce that

$$u^{(k)} \geq u^{(k+1)} \text{ in } M_k.$$

On the other hand, using the maximum principle again,

$$u^{(k)} \geq \underline{u} \text{ in } M_k.$$

Let's take $u = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} u^{(k)}$. Such a limit exists and $u \geq \underline{u}$. In addition, $u \in C^\infty(M)$ according to Evans-Krylov theorem, Schauder theory, and the interior estimates (Proposition 10.1). Moreover, by the maximum principle, u is the maximal solution. □

9. QUANTITATIVE BOUNDARY ESTIMATE

We establish quantitative boundary estimate (1.7), assuming local admissible function \underline{u} satisfying (6.9) near boundary, instead of existence of subsolution.

Pick $p_0 \in \partial M$ and let M_δ be as in (6.10). We choose local coordinates

$$(9.1) \quad (z_1, \dots, z_n), \quad z_i = x_i + \sqrt{-1}y_i$$

centered at p_0 in a neighborhood which we assume to be contained in M_δ such that at p_0 ($z = 0$), $g_{i\bar{j}}(0) = \delta_{ij}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$ is the interior normal to ∂M . Denote

$$(9.2) \quad \Omega_\delta = \{z \in M : |z| < \delta\}.$$

Throughout this section the Greek letters α, β run from 1 to $n - 1$.

The quantitative boundary estimate consists of the following two propositions.

Proposition 9.1. Assume f satisfies (1.4) and (1.6). Suppose near boundary that there is a local admissible function \underline{u} satisfying (6.9). Then for any admissible solution $u \in C^2(\bar{M})$ to (6.1)-(6.2), there is a uniform positive constant C such that

$$(9.3) \quad \mathfrak{g}_{n\bar{n}}(p_0) \leq C \left(1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} |\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha\bar{n}}(p_0)|^2 \right) \text{ for } p_0 \in \partial M.$$

Proposition 9.2. Suppose near boundary that there is a local admissible function \underline{u} obeying (6.9). Assume (1.6) and (1.4) hold. Then for any admissible solution $u \in C^3(M) \cap C^2(\bar{M})$ to Dirichlet problem (6.1)-(6.2), there is a uniform positive constant C depending on $|u|_{C^0(\bar{M})}$ and other known data under control, such that

$$(9.4) \quad |\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha\bar{n}}(p_0)| \leq C(1 + \sup_M |\partial u|) \text{ for } p_0 \in \partial M.$$

9.1. Preliminaries. Denote $F(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u) := f(\lambda(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u))$. The linearized operator of (6.1) at u , say \mathcal{L} , is locally given by

$$\mathcal{L}v = F^{i\bar{j}} v_{i\bar{j}}$$

where $F^{i\bar{j}} = \frac{\partial F(\mathfrak{g})}{\partial \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}}}$, $\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}} = \chi_{i\bar{j}} + u_{i\bar{j}}$. Moreover, we denote $\lambda = \lambda(\mathfrak{g})$ and

$$\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_{i\bar{j}} = \chi_{i\bar{j}} + \underline{u}_{i\bar{j}}, \quad \underline{\lambda} = \lambda(\underline{\mathfrak{g}}).$$

We have standard identities $F^{i\bar{j}} \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}} = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) \lambda_i$, $F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}} = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda)$.

Let \underline{u} be the local admissible function given by (6.9). Since f satisfies the unbounded condition (1.4), we can check that \underline{u} is a local C -subsolution, introduced by [24] and [48], of (6.1) near boundary. This allows us to apply the following lemma, which is a refinement of [24, Theorem 2.18]. We also refer to [25] for more analogue result.

Lemma 9.3 ([48]). *There exist positive constants R_0, ε such that if $|\lambda| \geq R_0$ then we either have*

$$F^{i\bar{j}}(\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_{i\bar{j}} - \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}}) \geq \varepsilon F^{i\bar{j}} \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}}$$

or

$$F^{i\bar{j}} \geq \varepsilon (F^{p\bar{q}} g_{p\bar{q}}) g^{i\bar{j}}.$$

Let \underline{u} be the local admissible function near boundary as in (6.9). Then

$$(9.5) \quad u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0) = \underline{u}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0) + (u - \underline{u})_{x_n}(0) \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0).$$

Also this gives the bound of second estimates for pure tangential derivatives

$$(9.6) \quad |u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0)| \leq C.$$

9.2. Double normal derivative case. We assume that Γ is of type 1. Then Γ_∞ is a symmetric convex cone as noted in [7]. (For the type 2 case, see Proposition 9.5).

At p_0 ($z = 0$), by (9.5) we have

$$(9.7) \quad \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = (1 - t) \underline{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \{t \underline{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + (u - \underline{u})_{x_n} \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}\}.$$

For simplicity, we denote

$$(9.8) \quad A_t = \sqrt{-1} \left[t \underline{g}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + (u - \underline{u})_{x_n} \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} \right] dz_\alpha \wedge d\bar{z}_\beta.$$

Clearly, from (9.7) $(A_1)_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}$. Let t_0 be the first t as we decrease t from 1 such that

$$(9.9) \quad \lambda_{\omega'}(A_{t_0}) \in \partial\Gamma_\infty.$$

Henceforth, $\lambda_{\omega'}(\chi')$ denotes the eigenvalues of χ' with respect to $\omega' = \sqrt{-1} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} dz_\alpha \wedge d\bar{z}_\beta$. Such t_0 exists, since $\lambda_{\omega'}(A_1) \in \Gamma_\infty$ and $\lambda_{\omega'}(A_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus \Gamma_\infty$ for $t \ll -1$. Furthermore, for a uniform positive constant T_0 under control,

$$(9.10) \quad -T_0 < t_0 < 1.$$

Let

$$(9.11) \quad \underline{\lambda}' = \lambda_{\omega'}(\underline{g}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}).$$

Since \underline{u} is admissible, there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small such that

$$(9.12) \quad \underline{\lambda} - \varepsilon_0 \vec{\mathbf{1}} \in \Gamma.$$

By the unbounded condition (1.4) there is a uniform positive constant R_1 depending on $(1 - t_0)^{-1}$, $\sup_{\partial M} \psi[u]$, ε_0 and $\underline{\lambda}'$ such that

$$(9.13) \quad f\left((1 - t_0)(\underline{\lambda}'_1 - \varepsilon_0/2), \dots, (1 - t_0)(\underline{\lambda}'_{n-1} - \varepsilon_0/2), R_1\right) \geq \psi[u],$$

and $(\underline{\lambda}'_1 - \varepsilon_0, \dots, \underline{\lambda}'_{n-1} - \varepsilon_0, (1 - t_0)^{-1} R_1) \in \Gamma$.

Following the idea from [7] (refined by [37] in complex variables), for such t_0 one can prove that

Lemma 9.4. *There is a uniform positive constant C depending on $|u|_{C^0(M)}$, $|\partial u|_{C^0(\partial M)}$, $\inf_M \psi[u]$, ∂M up to third derivatives and other known data, such that*

$$(1 - t_0)^{-1} \leq C.$$

Below we complete the proof of Proposition 9.1. And we leave the proof of Lemma 9.4 to the end of this subsection.

9.2.1. *Proof of Proposition 9.1.* The proof is based on Lemmas 3.5 and 3.7. Let

$$A(R) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} & g_{\alpha\bar{n}} \\ g_{n\bar{\beta}} & R \end{pmatrix}.$$

By (9.7) we can decompose $A(R)$ into

$$(9.14) \quad A(R) = A'(R) + A''(R)$$

where

$$A'(R) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - t_0)(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \delta_{\alpha\beta}) & g_{\alpha\bar{n}} \\ g_{n\bar{\beta}} & R/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A''(R) = \begin{pmatrix} (A_{t_0})_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \frac{(1-t_0)\varepsilon_0}{4} \delta_{\alpha\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & R/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We denote

$$(9.15) \quad \lambda_{\omega'}(A_{t_0}) := \tilde{\lambda}' = (\tilde{\lambda}'_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}'_{n-1}).$$

One can see that there is a uniform constant $C_0 > 0$ depending on $|t_0|$, $\sup_{\partial M} |\partial u|$ and other known data, such that $|\tilde{\lambda}'| \leq C_0$, that is $\tilde{\lambda}'$ is contained in a compact subset of $\bar{\Gamma}_\infty$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\lambda}' \in K := \{\lambda' \in \bar{\Gamma}_\infty : |\lambda'| \leq C_0\}.$$

Thus there is a uniform positive constant R_2 depending on $((1 - t_0)\varepsilon_0)^{-1}$, K and other known data, such that

$$(9.16) \quad \lambda(A''(R)) \in \Gamma, \quad \forall R > R_2.$$

Let's pick $\epsilon = \frac{(1-t_0)\varepsilon_0}{4}$ in Lemma 3.5, then as in [62] we set

$$R_c = \frac{8(2n-3)}{(1-t_0)\varepsilon_0} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} |g_{\alpha\bar{n}}|^2 + 2(n-1)(1-t_0) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} |\underline{\lambda}'_\alpha| + \frac{n(n-1)(1-t_0)\varepsilon_0}{2} + 2R_1 + 2R_2$$

where ε_0 , R_1 and R_2 are the constants as we fixed in (9.13) and (9.16).

According to Lemma 3.5, the eigenvalues $\lambda(A'(R_c))$ of $A'(R_c)$ shall behave like

$$(9.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_\alpha(A'(R_c)) &\geq (1-t_0)(\underline{\lambda}'_\alpha - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}), \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1, \\ \lambda_n(A'(R_c)) &\geq R_c/2 - (n-1)(1-t_0)\varepsilon_0/4. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\lambda(A'(R_c)) \in \Gamma$. So $\lambda(A(R_c)) \in \Gamma$. Together with (3.2), Lemma 3.7 yields that

$$(9.18) \quad f(\lambda(A(R_c))) \geq f(\lambda(A'(R_c))).$$

From (9.13), (9.17) and (9.18), we deduce $g_{n\bar{n}} \leq R_c$.

Proposition 9.5. When f is of uniform ellipticity, we have a more delicate estimate

$$(9.19) \quad g_{n\bar{n}}(p) \leq C \left(1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} |g_{\alpha\bar{n}}(p)| \right), \quad \forall p \in \partial M.$$

Proof. Fix $p_0 \in \partial M$. We assume $g_{n\bar{n}}(p_0) \geq 1$. From (3.5), $F^{n\bar{n}} \geq \theta F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}}$. Let $C_{\sup \psi[u]}$ be the positive constant with

$$(9.20) \quad f(C_{\sup \psi[u]} \vec{\mathbf{1}}) = \sup_{z \in M} \psi[u](z).$$

The concavity yields $0 \geq F^{i\bar{j}}(g_{i\bar{j}} - C_{\sup \psi[u]} \delta_{ij})$. Together with (9.6), we get (9.19). \square

9.2.2. *Proof of Lemma 9.4.* We follow closely [37]. We assume that Γ is of type 1. Then Γ_∞ is a symmetric convex cone as noted by [7]. (The case of type 2 cone is much more simpler since $\Gamma_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$). The proof presented below is a slight modification of that in [62].

Let \check{u} and \underline{u} be as in (6.7) and (6.9), respectively. Let $\underline{\lambda}'$ and $\tilde{\lambda}'$ be as in (9.11) and (9.15), respectively. For simplicity, we denote

$$\eta = (u - \underline{u})_{x_n}(0).$$

We assume $\eta > 0$ (otherwise we are done). Without loss of generality, we assume

$$t_0 > \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \tilde{\lambda}'_1 \leq \cdots \leq \tilde{\lambda}'_{n-1}.$$

It was proved in [7, Lemma 6.1] that for $\tilde{\lambda}' \in \partial\Gamma_\infty$ there is a supporting plane for Γ_∞ and one can choose μ_j with $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_{n-1} \geq 0$ so that

$$(9.21) \quad \Gamma_\infty \subset \left\{ \lambda' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \lambda'_\alpha > 0 \right\}, \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha = 1, \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \tilde{\lambda}'_\alpha = 0.$$

Note that as in (9.12), $\underline{\lambda} - \varepsilon_0 \mathbf{1} \in \Gamma$. Then $(\underline{\lambda}'_1 - \varepsilon_0, \dots, \underline{\lambda}'_{n-1} - \varepsilon_0) \in \Gamma_\infty$ and so

$$(9.22) \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \underline{\lambda}'_\alpha \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0.$$

According to [7, Lemma 6.2] (without loss of generality, assume $\underline{\lambda}'_1 \leq \cdots \leq \underline{\lambda}'_{n-1}$),

$$(9.23) \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \underline{g}_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \geq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \underline{\lambda}'_\alpha \geq \varepsilon_0.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $(A_{t_0})_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = t_0 \underline{g}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \eta \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}$ is diagonal at p_0 .

From (9.21) one has at the origin

$$(9.24) \quad 0 = t_0 \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \underline{g}_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} + \eta \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} + \eta \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}.$$

Together with (6.11) and $\eta = (u - \underline{u})_{x_n}(0)$, we see at the origin ($z = 0$)

$$(9.25) \quad - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2 \sup_{\partial M} |\nabla(\underline{u} - \underline{u})|} =: a_1 > 0.$$

On $\Omega_\delta = M \cap B_\delta(0)$, we take

$$(9.26) \quad d(z) = \sigma(z) + \tau|z|^2$$

where τ is a positive constant to be determined. Let

$$(9.27) \quad w(z) = \underline{u}(z) + (\eta/t_0)\sigma(z) + l(z)\sigma(z) + Ad(z)^2,$$

where $l(z) = \sum_{i=1}^n (l_i z_i + \bar{l}_i \bar{z}_i)$, $l_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $\bar{l}_i = \overline{l_i}$, to be chosen as in (9.32) below, and A is a positive constant to be determined. Furthermore,

$$(9.28) \quad u(z) - w(z) = -A\tau^2|z|^4 \text{ on } \partial M \cap \bar{\Omega}_\delta.$$

When $A \gg 1$, on $M \cap \partial B_\delta(0)$ we see

$$(9.29) \quad u(z) - w(z) \leq -(2A\tau\delta^2 + \frac{\eta}{t_0} - 2n \sup_i |l_i|\delta)\sigma(z) - A\tau^2\delta^4 \leq -\frac{A\tau^2\delta^4}{2}.$$

Let $T_1(z), \dots, T_{n-1}(z)$ be an orthonormal basis for holomorphic tangent space of level hypersurface $\{w : d(w) = d(z)\}$ at z , so that for each $1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1$, T_α is of C^1 class and $T_\alpha(0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_\alpha}$. Such a basis exists and the holomorphic tangent space can be characterized as $\left\{ \xi = \xi^i \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} : (\sigma_i + \tau \bar{z}_i) \xi^i = 0 \right\}$, see e.g. [13].

By [7, Lemma 6.2], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 9.6. *Let $T_1(z), \dots, T_{n-1}(z)$ be as above, and let $T_n = \frac{\partial d}{|\partial d|}$. For a real $(1, 1)$ -form $\Theta = \sqrt{-1}\Theta_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_j$, we denote by $\lambda(\omega^{-1}\Theta) = (\lambda_1(\Theta), \dots, \lambda_n(\Theta))$ the eigenvalues of Θ with $\lambda_1(\Theta) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(\Theta)$. Then for any $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_n$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \lambda_i(\Theta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \Theta(T_i, J\bar{T}_i).$$

Let μ_1, \dots, μ_{n-1} be as in (9.21), and we set $\mu_n = 0$. Let's denote $T_\alpha = \sum_{k=1}^n T_\alpha^k \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}$. For $\Theta = \sqrt{-1}\Theta_{i\bar{j}}dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_j$, we define

$$\Lambda_\mu(\Theta) := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j \Theta_{i\bar{j}}.$$

Lemma 9.7. *Let w be as in (9.27). There are parameters τ, A, l_i, δ depending only on $|u|_{C^0(M)}, |\nabla u|_{C^0(\partial M)}, |\underline{u}|_{C^2(M)}, \partial M$ up to third derivatives and other known data, such that*

$$\Lambda_\mu(g[w]) \leq 0 \text{ in } \Omega_\delta, \quad u \leq w \text{ on } \partial\Omega_\delta.$$

Proof. By direct computation

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_\mu(g[w]) &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j (\chi_{i\bar{j}} + \underline{u}_{i\bar{j}} + \frac{\eta}{t_0} \sigma_{i\bar{j}}) + 2Ad(z) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j d_{i\bar{j}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j (l(z) \sigma_{i\bar{j}} + l_i \sigma_{i\bar{j}} + \sigma_i l_{\bar{j}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we use $T_\alpha d = 0$ for $1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1$. Next, we will estimate $\Lambda_\mu(g[w])$ in Ω_δ .

- At the origin ($z = 0$), $T_\alpha^i = \delta_{\alpha i}$,

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j (\chi_{i\bar{j}} + \underline{u}_{i\bar{j}} + \frac{\eta}{t_0} \sigma_{i\bar{j}})(0) = \frac{1}{t_0} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha (A_{t_0})_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} = 0.$$

So there are complex constants k_i such that

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j (\chi_{i\bar{j}} + \underline{u}_{i\bar{j}} + \frac{\eta}{t_0} \sigma_{i\bar{j}})(z) = \sum_{i=1}^n (k_i z_i + \bar{k}_i \bar{z}_i) + O(|z|^2).$$

- Note that

$$(9.30) \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j(z) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha T_\alpha^i \bar{T}_\alpha^j(0) + O(|z|) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \delta_{\alpha i} \delta_{\alpha j} + O(|z|),$$

$$(9.31) \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}(z) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}(0) + O(|z|).$$

Combining with (9.25), one can pick δ, τ sufficiently small such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j d_{i\bar{j}} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} (\sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}(z) + \tau) + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} (T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j(z) - T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j(0)) d_{i\bar{j}} \\ &\leq -a_1 + \tau + O(|z|) \leq -\frac{a_1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$2Ad(z) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j d_{i\bar{j}} \leq -\frac{a_1 A}{2} d(z).$$

- From $\sum_{i=1}^n T_{\alpha}^i \sigma_i = -\tau \sum_{i=1}^n T_{\alpha}^i \bar{z}_i$ we have

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j (l_i \sigma_{\bar{j}} + \sigma_i l_{\bar{j}}) = -\tau \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} (\bar{l}_{\alpha} \bar{z}_{\alpha} + l_{\alpha} z_{\alpha}) + O(|z|^2).$$

On the other hand, by (9.30),

$$l(z) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j \sigma_{i\bar{j}} = l(z) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}(0) + O(|z|^2).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &l(z) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j \sigma_{i\bar{j}} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^i \bar{T}_{\alpha}^j (l_i \sigma_{\bar{j}} + \sigma_i l_{\bar{j}}) \\ &= l(z) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} \sigma_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}(0) - \tau \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\alpha} (z_{\alpha} l_{\alpha} + \bar{z}_{\alpha} \bar{l}_{\alpha}) + O(|z|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\mu}(\mathfrak{g}[w]) &\leq \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} 2\Re \left\{ z_{\alpha} \left(k_{\alpha} - \tau \mu_{\alpha} l_{\alpha} + l_{\alpha} \sum_{\beta=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\beta} \sigma_{\beta\bar{\beta}}(0) \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + 2\Re \left\{ z_n \left(k_n + l_n \sum_{\beta=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\beta} \sigma_{\beta\bar{\beta}}(0) \right) \right\} - \frac{Aa_1}{2} d(z) + O(|z|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Let $l_n = -\frac{k_n}{\sum_{\beta=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\beta} \sigma_{\beta\bar{\beta}}(0)}$. For $1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1$, we set

$$(9.32) \quad l_{\alpha} = -\frac{k_{\alpha}}{\sum_{\beta=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\beta} \sigma_{\beta\bar{\beta}}(0) - \tau \mu_{\alpha}}.$$

From $\mu_{\alpha} \geq 0$ and (9.25), we see such l_i (or equivalently the $l(z)$) are all well defined and uniformly bounded. We thus complete the proof if $0 < \tau, \delta \ll 1, A \gg 1$. \square

Completion of the proof of Lemma 9.4. Let w be as in (9.27). From the construction above, we know that there is a uniform positive constant C'_1 such that

$$\|g[w]\|_{C^0(\Omega_\delta)} \leq C'_1.$$

Denote $\lambda[w] = \lambda(g[w])$ and assume $\lambda_1[w] \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n[w]$. Together with Lemma 9.6, Lemma 9.7 implies

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mu_\alpha \lambda_\alpha[w] \leq 0 \text{ in } \Omega_\delta.$$

So by (9.21) $(\lambda_1[w], \dots, \lambda_{n-1}[w]) \notin \Gamma_\infty$. In other words, $\lambda[w] \in X$, where

$$X := (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Gamma) \cap \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\lambda| \leq C'_1\}.$$

Consequently, $X \cap \bar{\Gamma}^{\text{inf}_M \psi[u]} = \emptyset$, where $\bar{\Gamma}^{\text{inf}_M \psi[u]} = \{\lambda \in \Gamma : f(\lambda) \geq \inf_M \psi[u]\}$ is the closure of $\Gamma^{\text{inf}_M \psi[u]}$. Notice that X is a compact subset. So we can deduce that the distance between $\bar{\Gamma}^{\text{inf}_M \psi[u]}$ and X has a uniform positive lower bound. Therefore, there exists a positive constant ϵ_0 such that

$$(9.33) \quad \epsilon_0 \vec{1} + \lambda[w](z) \notin \bar{\Gamma}^{\text{inf}_M \psi[u]}, \quad \forall z \in \Omega_\delta.$$

Near the origin p_0 , under coordinates (9.1) the distance can be expressed as

$$\sigma(z) = x_n + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2n} a_{ij} t_i t_j + O(|t|^3).$$

Thus one can choose a positive constant C' such that $x_n \leq C'|z|^2$ on $\partial M \cap \bar{\Omega}_\delta$. As a result, there is a positive constant C_2 depending only on ∂M and δ so that

$$x_n \leq C_2 |z|^2 \text{ on } \partial \Omega_\delta.$$

From (9.33) we can take $h(z) = w(z) + \epsilon(|z|^2 - \frac{x_n}{C_2})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, such that

$$(9.34) \quad \lambda[h](z) \notin \bar{\Gamma}^{\text{inf}_M \psi[u]}, \quad \forall z \in \Omega_\delta.$$

Moreover, from (9.28)-(9.29) we know $u \leq h$ on $\partial \Omega_\delta$. The maximum principle (e.g. [7, Lemma B]) implies

$$u \leq h \text{ in } \Omega_\delta.$$

Notice $u(0) = \varphi(0)$ and $h(0) = \varphi(0)$, we have $u_{x_n}(0) \leq h_{x_n}(0)$. Thus

$$t_0 \leq \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon/(\eta C_2)}, \text{ i.e., } (1 - t_0)^{-1} \leq 1 + \frac{\eta C_2}{\epsilon}.$$

9.3. Tangential-Normal derivatives case. In establishing Proposition 9.2, we use the subsolution method of [29, 22] (further refined by [24]). In order to derive (9.4), we shall construct more delicate local barriers near boundary. The specific instance of such local barriers was investigated by [6, 8, 44] for complex Monge-Ampère equation, and further by [12] for more general complex k -Hessian equations. The utilization of local barriers for general equations was introduced in [60, 61, 62].

Fix $p_0 \in \partial M$. Under local coordinate (9.1) centered at p_0 ($z = 0$), for convenience

$$t_{2k-1} = x_k, \quad t_{2k} = y_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1; \quad t_{2n-1} = y_n, \quad t_{2n} = x_n.$$

We use notation as in (3.1). By direct calculations, one derives

$$\begin{aligned} (u_{x_k})_{\bar{j}} &= u_{\bar{j}x_k} + \overline{\Gamma_{kj}^l} u_{\bar{l}}, \quad (u_{y_k})_{\bar{j}} = u_{\bar{j}y_k} - \sqrt{-1} \overline{\Gamma_{kj}^l} u_{\bar{l}}, \\ (u_{x_k})_{i\bar{j}} &= u_{i\bar{j}x_k} + \Gamma_{ki}^l u_{l\bar{j}} + \overline{\Gamma_{kj}^l} u_{i\bar{l}}, \quad (u_{y_k})_{i\bar{j}} = u_{i\bar{j}y_k} + \sqrt{-1} \left(\Gamma_{ki}^l u_{l\bar{j}} - \overline{\Gamma_{kj}^l} u_{i\bar{l}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let \underline{u} be the local admissible function satisfying (6.9). We set

$$w = (\underline{u} - u) - t\sigma + N\sigma^2 \text{ in } \Omega_\delta.$$

Here N is a positive constant to be determined, δ and t are small enough such that

$$(9.35) \quad \sigma \text{ is smooth, } \frac{1}{4} \leq |\partial\sigma| \leq 2, \quad |\mathcal{L}\sigma| \leq C_\sigma \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \text{ in } \Omega_\delta,$$

$$(9.36) \quad N\delta - t \leq 0, \quad \max\{|2N\delta - t|, t\} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{16C_\sigma},$$

for some constant $C_\sigma > 0$, where ε is the constant asserted in Lemma 9.3. Clearly,

$$(9.37) \quad w \leq 0 \text{ in } \Omega_\delta,$$

$$(9.38) \quad \mathcal{L}w = F^{i\bar{j}}(\underline{g}_{i\bar{j}} - g_{i\bar{j}}) + 2NF^{i\bar{j}}\sigma_i\sigma_{\bar{j}} + (2N\sigma - t)\mathcal{L}\sigma \text{ in } \Omega_\delta.$$

We define the tangential operator on the boundary

$$\mathcal{T} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha}} - \bar{\eta} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}}, \text{ for each fixed } 1 \leq \alpha < 2n,$$

where $\bar{\eta} = \frac{\sigma_{x_\alpha}}{\sigma_{x_n}}$. One has $\mathcal{T}(u - \varphi) = 0$ on $\partial M \cap \bar{\Omega}_\delta$. By $\bar{\eta}(0) = 0$ one derives $|\bar{\eta}| \leq C|z|$ on $\bar{\Omega}_\delta$. Since $(u - \varphi)|_{\partial M} = 0$ we obtain $\mathcal{T}(u - \varphi)|_{\partial M} = 0$. Together with the boundary gradient estimate contained in (6.11), one has

$$(9.39) \quad |(u - \varphi)_{x_\alpha}| \leq C|z| \text{ on } \partial M \cap \bar{\Omega}_\delta, \quad \forall 1 \leq \alpha < 2n.$$

Denote $b_1 = 1 + \sup_M |\partial u|^2$. Take

$$\Phi = \pm \mathcal{T}(u - \varphi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_1}}(u_{y_n} - \varphi_{y_n})^2 \text{ in } \Omega_\delta.$$

Combining Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can prove

$$(9.40) \quad \mathcal{L}\Phi \geq -C_\Phi \sum_{i=1}^n f_i |\lambda_i| - C_\Phi \sqrt{b_1} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i - C_\Phi \sqrt{b_1} \text{ in } \Omega_\delta.$$

Here we use

$$2|\operatorname{Re}(F^{i\bar{j}}(\bar{\eta})_i(u_{x_n})_{\bar{j}})| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_1}} F^{i\bar{j}}(u_{y_n})_i(u_{y_n})_{\bar{j}} + C \sum_{i=1}^n f_i |\lambda_i| + C \sqrt{b_1} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i.$$

By straightforward computations and [24, Proposition 2.19], we have

$$\mathcal{L} \left(\sum_{\tau < n} |(u - \varphi)_\tau|^2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i \neq r} f_i \lambda_i^2 - C'_1 \sqrt{b_1} \left(\sqrt{b_1} + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i |\lambda_i| \right).$$

From Lemma 3.7 we see $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \lambda_i \geq 0$. Together with (3.2), we can prove that

$$(9.41) \quad 0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \lambda_i \leq C_{\sup \psi[u]} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i,$$

where $C_{\sup \psi[u]}$ is as in (9.20). Combining Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$(9.42) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n f_i |\lambda_i| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4\sqrt{b_1}} \sum_{i \neq r} f_i \lambda_i^2 + \left(C_{\sup_M \psi[u]} + \frac{4\sqrt{b_1}}{\epsilon} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n f_i, \text{ for } \epsilon > 0.$$

On the other hand, there is a uniform positive constant κ_σ depending on σ such that

$$(9.43) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) \geq \kappa_\sigma, \text{ for } f(\lambda) = \sigma.$$

One may construct in Ω_δ the barrier function as follows:

$$\tilde{\Psi} = A_1 \sqrt{b_1} w - A_2 \sqrt{b_1} |z|^2 + A_3 \Phi + \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_1}} \sum_{\tau < n} |(u - \varphi)_\tau|^2.$$

Putting the above inequalities together, we obtain

$$(9.44) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\tilde{\Psi} &\geq A_1 \sqrt{b_1} F^{i\bar{j}}(\underline{g}_{i\bar{j}} - g_{i\bar{j}}) + 2A_1 N \sqrt{b_1} F^{i\bar{j}} \sigma_i \sigma_{\bar{j}} - (C'_1 + A_3 C_\Phi) \sqrt{b_1} \\ &\quad - (A_2 + A_3 C_\Phi + A_1 C_\sigma |2N\sigma - t| + 4(C'_1 + A_3 C_\Phi)^2) \sqrt{b_1} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \\ &\quad - (C'_1 + (C'_1 + A_3 C_\Phi) C_{\sup \psi[u]}) \sum_{i=1}^n f_i. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 9.2 follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 9.8. *There are constants $A_1 \gg A_2 \gg A_3 \gg 1$, $N \gg 1$, $0 < \delta \ll 1$ such that $\tilde{\Psi}(0) = 0$, $\tilde{\Psi}|_{\partial\Omega_\delta} \leq 0$, and*

$$(9.45) \quad \mathcal{L}\tilde{\Psi} \geq 0 \text{ on } \Omega_\delta.$$

Proof. Obviously, $\tilde{\Psi}(0) = 0$. From (9.39) and (9.37), we see $\tilde{\Psi}|_{\partial\Omega_\delta} \leq 0$ if $A_2 \gg A_3 \gg 1$. Let ε and R_0 be the corresponding positive constants in Lemma 9.3. According to Lemma 9.3 the discussion can be divided into three cases.

Case 1: Assume that $|\lambda| \geq R_0$ and

$$F^{i\bar{j}}(\underline{g}_{i\bar{j}} - g_{i\bar{j}}) \geq \varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^n F^{i\bar{i}}.$$

Note (9.36) implies $C_\sigma |2N\sigma - t| \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$. Taking $A_1 \gg 1$ by (9.43) we get (9.45).

Case 2: Suppose that $|\lambda| \geq R_0$ and

$$(9.46) \quad f_i \geq \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^n f_j, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

By (9.35), we have $|\partial\sigma| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ in Ω_δ , then

$$(9.47) \quad A_1 N \sqrt{b_1} F^{i\bar{j}} \sigma_i \sigma_{\bar{j}} \geq \frac{A_1 N \varepsilon \sqrt{b_1}}{16} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \text{ on } \Omega_\delta.$$

This term controls all the bad terms containing $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i$ in (9.44). On the other hand,

$$\mathcal{L}(\underline{u} - u) \geq f(\underline{\lambda}) - \psi(z, u)$$

and the bad term $-(C'_1 + A_3 C_\Phi) \sqrt{b_1}$ from (9.44) can be dominated by combining (9.47) and (9.43). Thus (9.45) holds if $N \gg 1$.

Case 3: Assume $|\lambda| < R_0$. Then an inequality of the form (9.46) holds with a possibly different constant ε . Consequently, this gives back **Case 2**. \square

10. INTERIOR ESTIMATES FOR UNIFORMLY ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

In this section we derive interior estimates for equations of uniform ellipticity.

Proposition 10.1. Let B_r be a geodesic ball in (M, ω) . Suppose (1.6) and (3.5) hold. Then for any admissible solution $u \in C^4(B_r)$ to (6.1) in B_r , we have

$$\sup_{B_{r/2}} (|\partial u|^2 + |\partial\bar{\partial}u|) \leq C$$

where C is a uniform constant depending only on r^{-1} , $|u|_{C^0(B_r)}$, $|\psi|_{C^2(B_r)}$ and geometric quantities on B_r . Moreover, (1.6) can be removed when $\psi_u(z, u) \geq 0$.

Remark 10.2. For the equation (4.1), such interior estimates were established in [27] for $\varrho < 1$ and further extended by [20] to the case $\varrho = 1$ when $f = \sigma_k^{1/k}$, $k < n$. Together with Proposition 4.2, we are able to obtain interior estimates for general equation (4.1) under the assumption $\varrho < \varrho_\Gamma$. This partially answers a question left open by [27]. Moreover, as a contrast, in general one could not expect that such interior estimates hold for the limiting case $\varrho = \varrho_\Gamma$.

10.1. Useful formula. Denote $w = |\partial u|^2$ and $Q = |\partial\bar{\partial}u|^2 + |\partial\partial u|^2$. Under local coordinates $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ around z_0 , with $g_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) = \delta_{ij}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i\bar{j}k} - u_{k\bar{j}i} &= T_{ik}^l u_{l\bar{j}}, \quad w_i = u_{\bar{k}} u_{ki} + u_k u_{i\bar{k}}, \\ u_{1\bar{1}\bar{i}\bar{i}} - u_{\bar{i}\bar{1}\bar{1}} &= R_{\bar{i}\bar{1}\bar{p}} u_{p\bar{1}} - R_{1\bar{1}\bar{p}} u_{p\bar{i}} + 2\Re\{\bar{T}_{1i}^j u_{j\bar{1}}\} + T_{i1}^p \bar{T}_{i1}^q u_{p\bar{q}}, \\ w_{i\bar{j}} &= u_{ki} u_{\bar{k}\bar{j}} + u_{k\bar{j}} u_{i\bar{k}} + u_{\bar{k}} u_{i\bar{j}k} + u_k u_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}} + R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}} u_{\bar{k}} u_l - T_{ik}^l u_{l\bar{j}} u_{\bar{k}} - \bar{T}_{jk}^l u_{i\bar{l}} u_k. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 10.3. We have

$$F^{i\bar{j}} w_i w_{\bar{j}} \leq 2wQ \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}};$$

and there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}(w) \geq \frac{3\theta Q}{4} \sum F^{ii} - Cw \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - C|\nabla_z \psi| \sqrt{w} + 2\psi_u w.$$

10.2. Interior gradient estimate. Let's consider the quantity

$$m_0 = \max_{\bar{M}} \eta |\partial u|^2 e^\phi,$$

where η is as in [30] a smooth function with compact support in $B_r \subset M$ satisfying

$$(10.1) \quad 0 \leq \eta \leq 1, \quad \eta|_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}} \equiv 1, \quad |\partial \eta| \leq \frac{C\sqrt{\eta}}{r}, \quad |\partial \bar{\partial} \eta| \leq \frac{C}{r^2}$$

and we take $\phi = v^{-N}$, where $v = u - \inf_{B_r} u + 2$ and $N \gg 1$ so that

$$(10.2) \quad N(N+1)v^{-N-2} - N^2v^{-2N-2} \geq N^2v^{-N-2}.$$

Suppose that m_0 is attained at an interior point $z_0 \in B_r$. We choose local coordinates (z_1, \dots, z_n) such that $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}$ at z_0 . As above we denote $w = |\partial u|^2$. Without loss of generality, we assume $w(z_0) \geq 1$. From above, $\log \eta + \log w + \phi$ achieves a maximum at z_0 and thus,

$$(10.3) \quad \frac{\eta_i}{\eta} + \frac{w_i}{w} + \phi_i = 0, \quad \frac{\eta_{\bar{i}}}{\eta} + \frac{w_{\bar{i}}}{w} + \phi_{\bar{i}} = 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

$$(10.4) \quad \mathcal{L}(\log \eta + \log w + \phi) \leq 0.$$

Combining (10.3) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we derive

$$(10.5) \quad \frac{1}{w^2} F^{i\bar{j}} w_i w_{\bar{j}} \leq \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon \eta^2} F^{i\bar{j}} \eta_i \eta_{\bar{j}} + (1+\epsilon) F^{i\bar{j}} \phi_i \phi_{\bar{j}}.$$

As a result, combining Lemma 10.3 and let $8\epsilon \leq \theta$, we derive at z_0

$$(10.6) \quad \mathcal{L} \log w \geq \left(\frac{\theta Q}{2w} - C \right) \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - \frac{1}{\epsilon \eta^2} F^{i\bar{j}} \eta_i \eta_{\bar{j}} - F^{i\bar{j}} \phi_i \phi_{\bar{j}} - \frac{C|\nabla_z \psi|}{\sqrt{w}} + 2\psi_u.$$

On the other hand

$$(10.7) \quad \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon \eta^2} F^{i\bar{j}} \eta_i \eta_{\bar{j}} - \frac{1}{\eta} F^{i\bar{j}} \eta_{i\bar{j}} \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon r^2 \eta} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}},$$

$$(10.8) \quad F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \phi_i \phi_{\bar{j}} = N^2 v^{-2N-2} F^{i\bar{j}} u_i u_{\bar{j}},$$

$$(10.9) \quad \mathcal{L} \phi = N(N+1)v^{-N-2} F^{i\bar{j}} u_i u_{\bar{j}} - Nv^{-N-1} F^{i\bar{j}} (g_{i\bar{j}} - \chi_{i\bar{j}}).$$

Plugging (9.41), (10.2), (10.5)-(10.9) into (10.4), we obtain

$$\theta w N^2 v^{-N-2} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} + \frac{\theta Q}{2w} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \leq CNv^{-N-1} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} + \frac{C}{r^2 \eta} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{w}} - 2\psi_u.$$

We can use (9.43) to control the term $-2\psi_u$. As a result, we derive interior gradient estimate. Furthermore, note that

$$\frac{\theta w N^2 v^{-N-2}}{2} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} + \frac{\theta Q}{2w} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \geq \theta N v^{-\frac{N}{2}-1} \sqrt{Q} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}$$

and there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that for any λ with $|\lambda| \geq R_0$

$$(10.10) \quad |\lambda| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) \geq \frac{f(|\lambda| \mathbf{1}) - f(\lambda)}{2} > 0.$$

So one can remove (1.6) when $\psi_u \geq 0$.

10.3. Interior estimate for second derivatives. As in [27] we consider the quantity

$$P := \sup_{z \in M} \max_{\xi \in T_z^{1,0} M} e^{2\phi} g_{p\bar{q}} \xi_p \bar{\xi}_q \sqrt{g^{k\bar{l}} g_{i\bar{l}} g_{k\bar{j}} \xi_i \bar{\xi}_j / |\xi|^3}$$

where ϕ is a function depending on z and $|\partial u|$. This is inspired by [54]. Assume that it is achieved at an interior point $p_0 \in M$ for some $\xi \in T_{p_0}^{1,0} M$. By [46, Lemma 2.9] we may choose local coordinates $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ around p_0 , such that at p_0 , $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}$, and

$$T_{ij}^k = 2\Gamma_{ij}^k, \quad g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij} \lambda_i \text{ and so } F^{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij} f_i.$$

As in [54], the maximum P is achieved for $\xi = \partial_1$ at p_0 . Assume $g_{1\bar{1}} \geq 1$; otherwise we are done.

In what follows the computations are given at p_0 . Similar to the computations in [27] one has

$$(10.11) \quad g_{1\bar{1}i} + g_{1\bar{1}} \phi_i = 0, \quad g_{1\bar{1}\bar{i}} + g_{1\bar{1}} \phi_{\bar{i}} = 0,$$

$$(10.12) \quad 0 \geq \frac{F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} g_{1\bar{1}\bar{i}\bar{i}}}{g_{1\bar{1}}} + F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} (\phi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - \phi_i \phi_{\bar{i}}) + \frac{1}{8g_{1\bar{1}}^2} \sum_{k>1} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} g_{1\bar{k}i} g_{k\bar{1}\bar{i}} - C \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}.$$

Combining the standard formula (10.1), we can derive

$$g_{1\bar{1}\bar{i}\bar{i}} \geq g_{\bar{i}\bar{i}1\bar{1}} + 2\Re e(\bar{T}_{1i}^j g_{1\bar{j}\bar{i}}) - C\sqrt{Q}$$

where $Q = |\partial\bar{\partial}u|^2 + |\partial\partial u|^2$, as defined above. Differentiating the equation (6.1) we obtain

$$F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} g_{\bar{i}\bar{i}l} = \psi_{z_l} + \psi_u u_l,$$

$$F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} g_{\bar{i}\bar{i}1\bar{1}} = \psi_{z_1 \bar{z}_1} + \psi_u u_{1\bar{1}} + 2\Re e(\psi_{z_1 u} u_1) + \psi_{uu} |u_1|^2 - F^{i\bar{j}, l\bar{m}} g_{i\bar{j}1} g_{l\bar{m}\bar{1}}.$$

Putting the above inequalities into (10.12) we get

$$0 \geq g_{1\bar{1}} \mathcal{L}\phi - g_{1\bar{1}} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \phi_i \phi_{\bar{i}} - 2g_{1\bar{1}} \Re e F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \bar{T}_{1i}^1 \phi_i - C\sqrt{Q} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} + \psi_u u_{1\bar{1}}.$$

Let $\phi = \log \eta + \varphi(w)$, where $w = |\partial u|^2$ is as above, η is the cutoff function given by (10.1) and

$$\varphi = \varphi(w) = \left(1 - \frac{w}{2N}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{ where } N = \sup_{\{\eta>0\}} |\partial u|^2.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{L}\phi = \frac{\mathcal{L}\eta}{\eta} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \frac{|\eta_i|^2}{\eta^2} + \varphi' \mathcal{L}w + \varphi'' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_i|^2,$$

$$F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\phi_i|^2 + 2\Re e F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \bar{T}_{1i}^1 \phi_i \leq \frac{4}{3} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\phi_i|^2 + C \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}},$$

$$F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\phi_i|^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\varphi_i|^2 + 3F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \frac{|\eta_i|^2}{\eta^2}.$$

Moreover, one can check $\varphi' = \frac{\varphi^3}{4N}$, $\varphi'' = \frac{3\varphi^5}{16N^2}$ and $1 \leq \varphi \leq \sqrt{2}$. And so

$$\varphi'' - 2\varphi'^2 = \frac{\varphi^5}{16N^2} (3 - 2\varphi) > \frac{\varphi^5}{96N^2}.$$

By Lemma 10.3

$$\mathcal{L}(w) \geq \frac{3\theta Q}{4} \sum F^{ii} - C \left(1 + \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}\right).$$

And (10.1) tells us that

$$0 \leq \eta \leq 1, \quad \eta|_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}} \equiv 1, \quad \frac{F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}|\eta_i|^2}{\eta^2} \leq \frac{C}{r^2\eta}, \quad \frac{\mathcal{L}\eta}{\eta} \leq \frac{C}{r^2\eta} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}.$$

In conclusion we finally obtain

$$0 \geq \frac{9\theta Q}{16N} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - \frac{C}{r^2\eta} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - C \frac{\sqrt{Q}}{g_{1\bar{1}}} \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - \frac{\psi_u \chi_{1\bar{1}}}{g_{1\bar{1}}} + \psi_u.$$

Combining (10.10), we obtain $\eta g_{1\bar{1}} \leq C$.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMAS 3.9, 3.11, 3.12 AND 3.13

Fix $\lambda \in \Gamma$ with $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$. The concavity and symmetry of f yields that

$$(A.1) \quad f_1(\lambda) \geq \dots \geq f_n(\lambda), \quad f_1(\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum f_i(\lambda).$$

When $\Gamma = \Gamma_n$ (if and only if $\kappa_\Gamma = 0$), we obtain Lemma 3.9. When $\Gamma \neq \Gamma_n$, Lemmas 3.9 and 3.11 are consequences of the following two propositions.

Proposition A.1 ([64, 65]). Assume $\Gamma \neq \Gamma_n$ and f satisfies (1.6) in Γ . Let κ_Γ be as in (1.8). Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be positive constants with $(-\alpha_1, \dots, -\alpha_{\kappa_\Gamma}, \alpha_{\kappa_\Gamma+1}, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \Gamma$. In addition, assume $\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_{\kappa_\Gamma}$. Then for any $\lambda \in \Gamma$ with order $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$,

$$(A.2) \quad f_{\kappa_\Gamma+1}(\lambda) \geq \frac{\alpha_1}{\sum_{i=\kappa_\Gamma+1}^n \alpha_i - \sum_{i=2}^{\kappa_\Gamma} \alpha_i} f_1(\lambda).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.7 we conclude that $f_i(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\sum f_i(\lambda) > 0$ and $-\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_\Gamma} \alpha_i f_i(\lambda) + \sum_{i=\kappa_\Gamma+1}^n \alpha_i f_i(\lambda) \geq 0$. This yields $f_{\kappa_\Gamma+1}(\lambda) \geq \frac{\alpha_1}{\sum_{i=\kappa_\Gamma+1}^n \alpha_i} f_1(\lambda)$. Moreover, one can derive (A.2) by iteration. \square

Proposition A.2 ([64, 65]). We assume that f is of $(k+1)$ -uniform ellipticity in the corresponding cone Γ for some $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. Then $\kappa_\Gamma \geq k$.

Proof. Let ϑ be as in (3.3). Let $c_0 > 0$ be some constant with $f(c_0 \vec{\mathbf{1}}) > \sup_{\partial\Gamma} f$.

Take $a = 1 + c_0$ then $f(a \vec{\mathbf{1}}) > f(c_0 \vec{\mathbf{1}})$. For $\epsilon > 0$ and $R > 0$, we denote $\lambda_{\epsilon,R} = (\underbrace{\epsilon, \dots, \epsilon}_k, \underbrace{\epsilon, R, \dots, R}_{n-k})$. We can deduce from (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda_{\epsilon,R}) &\geq f(a \vec{\mathbf{1}}) + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(\lambda_{\epsilon,R}) + R \sum_{i=k+1}^n f_i(\lambda_{\epsilon,R}) - a \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda_{\epsilon,R}) \\ &\geq f(a \vec{\mathbf{1}}) + (R\vartheta - a) \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda_{\epsilon,R}) \quad (\text{using } (k+1)\text{-uniform ellipticity}) \\ &= f(a \vec{\mathbf{1}}) \quad (\text{by setting } R = \frac{a}{\vartheta}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice $R = \frac{a}{\beta}$ depends not on ϵ . Next we prove $\lambda_{\epsilon,R} \rightarrow \lambda_{0,R} = (0, \dots, 0, R, \dots, R) \in \Gamma$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. If $\lambda_{0,R} \in \partial\Gamma$ then $\sup_{\partial\Gamma} f \geq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} f(\lambda_{\epsilon,R}) \geq f(\mathbf{a}\vec{\mathbf{1}})$. A contradiction. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Fix $\lambda \in \Gamma$ with $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$. By Lemma 3.7, we know $f_i(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\sum f_i(\lambda) > 0$, thereby confirming (1).

Next, we will verify (2). When $\Gamma = \Gamma_n$ this is trivial. The remaining case $\Gamma \neq \Gamma_n$ follows immediately from Proposition A.1 and (A.1).

Finally, we will prove that the statement of $(\kappa_\Gamma + 1)$ -uniform ellipticity is sharp. Assume by contradiction that f is of $(k + 1)$ -uniform ellipticity for some $k > \kappa_\Gamma$. Then $\kappa_\Gamma \geq k$ according to Proposition A.2. This is a contradiction. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.11. Obviously (1) \Rightarrow (2). Since Γ is open, (2) \Rightarrow (1). By Lemma 3.9, (2) \Rightarrow (3). By Proposition A.2, $\kappa_\Gamma \geq n - 1$. Thus (3) \Rightarrow (2). \square

Proof of Lemma 3.12. Fix $\lambda \in \Gamma$. For $t > 0$, we denote $\lambda^t = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}\lambda_n + t)$. By Lemma 3.11, $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \Gamma$. Using (3.5), for large t

$$f(\lambda^t) - f\left(\frac{t}{2}(0, \dots, 0, 1)\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda^t)\lambda_i + \frac{t}{2}f_n(\lambda^t) \geq 0.$$

Together with (1.6), we know that f satisfies the unbounded condition (1.4). \square

Proof of Lemma 3.13. Fix $\lambda \in \Gamma$. Note that (1.2) and the concavity imply $f_i(\lambda) \geq 0$. Combining $\sup_\Gamma f = +\infty$, we get $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) > 0$ (otherwise $f(\mu) \leq f(\lambda)$, $\forall \mu \in \Gamma$). Fix $R > 0$. Then $t\lambda - R\vec{\mathbf{1}} \in \Gamma$ for some $t > 0$. By concavity and (1.2), we have

$$f(t\lambda) \geq sf\left(\frac{R}{s}\vec{\mathbf{1}}\right) + (1-s)f\left(\frac{t\lambda - R\vec{\mathbf{1}}}{1-s}\right) > sf\left(\frac{R}{s}\vec{\mathbf{1}}\right), \forall 0 < s < 1.$$

So $f(t\lambda) \geq f(R\vec{\mathbf{1}})$ for $t \gg 1$. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.5

For convenience we give the proof of Lemma 3.5 in this appendix. We start with the case $n = 2$. For $n = 2$, the eigenvalues of A are

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\mathbf{a} + d_1 - \sqrt{(\mathbf{a} - d_1)^2 + 4|a_1|^2}}{2} \text{ and } \lambda_2 = \frac{\mathbf{a} + d_1 + \sqrt{(\mathbf{a} - d_1)^2 + 4|a_1|^2}}{2}.$$

We can assume $a_1 \neq 0$; otherwise we are done. If $\mathbf{a} \geq \frac{|a_1|^2}{\epsilon} + d_1$ then one has

$$0 \leq d_1 - \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 - \mathbf{a} = \frac{2|a_1|^2}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{a} - d_1)^2 + 4|a_1|^2} + (\mathbf{a} - d_1)} < \frac{|a_1|^2}{\mathbf{a} - d_1} \leq \epsilon.$$

The following lemma enables us to count the eigenvalues near the diagonal elements via a deformation argument. It is an essential ingredient in the proof of Lemma 3.5 for general n .

Lemma B.1 ([61, 62]). *Let A be an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & & & a_1 \\ & d_2 & & a_2 \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & d_{n-1} & a_{n-1} \\ \bar{a}_1 & \bar{a}_2 & \cdots & \bar{a}_{n-1} & \mathbf{a} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}$ fixed, and with \mathbf{a} variable. Denote $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ by the eigenvalues of A with the order $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose that the parameter \mathbf{a} in the matrix A satisfies the following quadratic growth condition

$$(B.1) \quad \mathbf{a} \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} [d_i + (n-2)|d_i|] + (n-2)\epsilon.$$

Then for any λ_α ($1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1$) there exists d_{i_α} with index $1 \leq i_\alpha \leq n-1$ such that

$$(B.2) \quad |\lambda_\alpha - d_{i_\alpha}| < \epsilon,$$

$$(B.3) \quad 0 \leq \lambda_n - \mathbf{a} < (n-1)\epsilon + \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} (d_\alpha - d_{i_\alpha}) \right|.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2 > 0$ and $n \geq 3$ (otherwise we are done). Note that in the assumption of the lemma the eigenvalues have the order $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$. It is well known that, for a Hermitian matrix, any diagonal element is less than or equals to the largest eigenvalue. In particular,

$$(B.4) \quad \lambda_n \geq \mathbf{a}.$$

It suffices to prove (B.2), since (B.3) is a consequence of (B.2), (B.4) and

$$(B.5) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = \text{tr}(A) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} d_\alpha + \mathbf{a}.$$

Let's denote $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. We divide the index set I into two subsets by

$$\mathbf{B} = \{\alpha \in I : |\lambda_\alpha - d_i| \geq \epsilon, \forall i \in I\}$$

and $\mathbf{G} = I \setminus \mathbf{B} = \{\alpha \in I : \text{There exists an } i \in I \text{ such that } |\lambda_\alpha - d_i| < \epsilon\}$.

To complete the proof we need to prove $\mathbf{G} = I$ or equivalently $\mathbf{B} = \emptyset$. It is easy to see that for any $\alpha \in \mathbf{G}$, one has

$$(B.6) \quad |\lambda_\alpha| < \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |d_i| + \epsilon.$$

Fix $\alpha \in \mathbf{B}$, we are going to estimate λ_α . The eigenvalue λ_α satisfies

$$(B.7) \quad (\lambda_\alpha - \mathbf{a}) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\lambda_\alpha - d_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (|a_i|^2 \prod_{j \neq i} (\lambda_\alpha - d_j)).$$

By the definition of \mathbf{B} , for $\alpha \in \mathbf{B}$, one then has $|\lambda_\alpha - d_i| \geq \epsilon$ for $i \in I$. We derive

$$(B.8) \quad |\lambda_\alpha - \mathbf{a}| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{|a_i|^2}{\lambda_\alpha - d_i} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{|a_i|^2}{|\lambda_\alpha - d_i|} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2, \text{ if } \alpha \in \mathbf{B}.$$

Hence, for $\alpha \in \mathbf{B}$, we obtain

$$(B.9) \quad \lambda_\alpha \geq \mathbf{a} - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2.$$

We shall use proof by contradiction to prove $\mathbf{B} = \emptyset$. For a set \mathbf{S} , we denote $|\mathbf{S}|$ the cardinality of \mathbf{S} . Assume $\mathbf{B} \neq \emptyset$. Then $|\mathbf{B}| \geq 1$, and so $|\mathbf{G}| = n - 1 - |\mathbf{B}| \leq n - 2$.

In the case $\mathbf{G} = \emptyset$, one knows that

$$(B.10) \quad \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}) \geq \mathbf{a} + (n-1)\left(\mathbf{a} - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2\right) > \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d_i + \mathbf{a} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}).$$

In the case $\mathbf{G} \neq \emptyset$, we compute the trace of the matrix A as follows:

$$(B.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}) &= \lambda_n + \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbf{B}} \lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbf{G}} \lambda_\alpha \\ &\geq \lambda_n + |\mathbf{B}| \left(\mathbf{a} - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2 \right) - |\mathbf{G}| \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |d_i| + \epsilon \right) \\ &> 2\mathbf{a} - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2 - (n-2) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |d_i| + \epsilon \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d_i + \mathbf{a} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (B.1), (B.4), (B.6) and (B.9). Again, it is a contradiction. Thus $\mathbf{B} = \emptyset$ as required. \square

We apply Lemma B.1 to prove Lemma 3.5 via a deformation argument.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Without loss of generality, we assume $n \geq 3$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2 > 0$. Fix $a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}$. Denote $\lambda_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, \lambda_n(\mathbf{a})$ the eigenvalues of A with

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{a}) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(\mathbf{a}).$$

Clearly, the eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\mathbf{a})$ are all continuous functions in \mathbf{a} .

For simplicity, we write $\lambda_i = \lambda_i(\mathbf{a})$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let $I'_\alpha = (d_\alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2n-3}, d_\alpha + \frac{\epsilon}{2n-3})$,

$$P'_0 = \frac{2n-3}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |a_i|^2 + (n-1) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |d_i| + \frac{(n-2)\epsilon}{2n-3}.$$

In what follows we assume $\mathbf{a} \geq P'_0$. The connected components of $\bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} I'_\alpha$ are as in the following:

$$J_1 = \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{j_1} I'_\alpha, J_2 = \bigcup_{\alpha=j_1+1}^{j_2} I'_\alpha \cdots, J_i = \bigcup_{\alpha=j_{i-1}+1}^{j_i} I'_\alpha, \cdots, J_m = \bigcup_{\alpha=j_{m-1}+1}^{n-1} I'_\alpha.$$

Moreover, $J_i \cap J_k = \emptyset$, for $1 \leq i < k \leq m$. Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_k : [P'_0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the function that counts the eigenvalues which lie in J_k . (Note that when the eigenvalues are not distinct, the function $\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_k$ denotes the summation of all the algebraic multiplicities of distinct eigenvalues which lie in J_k). This function measures the number of the eigenvalues which lie in J_k . The crucial ingredient is that Lemma B.1 yields the continuity of $\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_i(\mathbf{a})$ for $\mathbf{a} \geq P'_0$. More explicitly, by Lemma B.1 and $\lambda_n \geq \mathbf{a}$ we conclude that, if \mathbf{a} satisfies the quadratic growth condition (3.2) then

$$\lambda_n \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \overline{I'_k} \right) = \mathbb{R} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m \overline{J_i} \right), \text{ and } \lambda_\alpha \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} I'_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^m J_i \text{ for } 1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1.$$

Hence, $\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_i(\mathbf{a})$ is a continuous function in the variable \mathbf{a} . So it is a constant. Together with the line of the proof of [7, Lemma 1.2] we see that $\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_i(\mathbf{a}) = j_i - j_{i-1}$ for sufficiently large \mathbf{a} . Here we denote $j_0 = 0$ and $j_m = n-1$. The constant of $\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_i$ therefore follows that

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_i(\mathbf{a}) = j_i - j_{i-1}.$$

We thus know that the $(j_i - j_{i-1})$ eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{j_{i-1}+1}, \lambda_{j_{i-1}+2}, \cdots, \lambda_{j_i}$$

lie in the connected component J_i . Thus, for any $j_{i-1} + 1 \leq \gamma \leq j_i$, we have $I'_\gamma \subset J_i$ and λ_γ lies in the connected component J_i . Therefore,

$$|\lambda_\gamma - d_\gamma| < \frac{(2(j_i - j_{i-1}) - 1)\epsilon}{2n - 3} \leq \epsilon.$$

Here we use the fact that d_γ is midpoint of I'_γ and every $J_i \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an open subset.

To be brief, if for fixed index $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ the eigenvalue $\lambda_i(P'_0)$ lies in J_α for some α , then Lemma B.1 implies that, for any $\mathbf{a} > P'_0$, the corresponding eigenvalue $\lambda_i(\mathbf{a})$ lies in the same interval J_α . The computation of $\widetilde{\mathbf{Card}}_k$ can be done by setting $\mathbf{a} \rightarrow +\infty$. □

Acknowledgements. The author is partially supported by Guangzhou Science and Technology Program (Grant No. 202201010451) and Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (Grant No. 2023A1515012121).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Angella, S. Calamai and C. Spotti, *On the Chern-Yamabe problem*, Math. Res. Lett. **24** (2017), 645–677.
- [2] T. Aubin, *Équations du type Monge-Ampère sur les variétés kählériennes compactes*, (French) Bull. Sci. Math. **102** (1978), 63–95.
- [3] P. Aviles and R. McOwen, *Complete conformal metrics with negative scalar curvature in compact Riemannian manifolds*, Duke Math. J. **56** (1988), 395–398.
- [4] P. Aviles and R. McOwen, *Conformal deformation to constant negative scalar curvature on noncompact Riemannian manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **27** (1988), 225–239.
- [5] Z. Błocki, *A gradient estimate in the Calabi-Yau theorem*, Math. Ann. **344** (2009), 317–327.
- [6] S. Boucksom, *Monge-Ampère equations on complex manifolds with boundary*, Complex Monge-Ampère equations and geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics. Lecture Notes in Math. 2038, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012, 257–282.
- [7] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations III: Functions of eigenvalues of the Hessians*, Acta Math. **155** (1985), 261–301.
- [8] X.-X. Chen, *The space of Kähler metrics*, J. Differential Geom. **56** (2000), 189–234.
- [9] X.-X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. I, II, III, J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **28** (2015), 183–197, 199–234, 235–278.
- [10] S.-Y. Cheng and S.-T. Yau, *On the existence of a complete Kähler metric on noncompact complex manifolds and the regularity of Fefferman’s equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **33** (1980), 507–544.
- [11] P. Cherrier, *Équations de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés hermitiennes compactes*, Bull. Sci. Math. **111** (1987), 343–385.
- [12] T. Collins and S. Picard, *The Dirichlet problem for the k -Hessian equation on a complex manifold*, to appear in Amer. J. Math.
- [13] J. P. Demailly, *Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry*. Available at <http://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/demailly/books.html>.
- [14] S. Dinew and S. Kołodziej, *Liouville and Calabi-Yau type theorems for complex Hessian equations*, Amer. J. Math. **139** (2017), 403–415.
- [15] M. G. Eastwood and G. V. Suria, *Cohomologically complete and pseudoconvex domains*, Comment. Math. Helv. **55** (1980), 413–426.
- [16] L. C. Evans, *Classical solutions of fully nonlinear convex, second order elliptic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **35** (1982), 333–363.
- [17] J.-X. Fu, Z.-Z. Wang and D.-M. Wu, *Form-type Calabi-Yau equations*, Math. Res. Lett. **17** (2010), 887–903.
- [18] E. Fusi, *The prescribed Chern scalar curvature problem*, J. Geom. Anal. **32** (2022), no. 6, Paper No. 187, 21 pp.
- [19] P. Gauduchon, *La 1-forme de torsion d’une variété hermitienne compacte*, Math. Ann. **267** (1984), 495–518.
- [20] M. George, B. Guan and C.-H. Qiu, *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Hermitian manifolds for symmetric functions of partial Laplacians*, J. Geom. Anal. **32** (2022), Paper No. 183, 27 pp.
- [21] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, reprint of the 1998 Edition, 2001.
- [22] B. Guan, *The Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equations and regularity of the pluri-complex Green function*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **6** (1998), 687–703.
- [23] B. Guan, *Complete conformal metrics of negative Ricci curvature on compact manifolds with boundary*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2008, Art. ID rnn 105, 25 pp.
- [24] B. Guan, *Second order estimates and regularity for fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds*, Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), 1491–1524.
- [25] B. Guan, *The Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds*, to appear in Adv. Math.

- [26] B. Guan and Q. Li, *Complex Monge-Ampère equations and totally real submanifolds*, Adv. Math. **225** (2010), 1185–1223.
- [27] B. Guan, C.-H. Qiu and R.-R. Yuan, *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations for conformal deformation of Chern-Ricci forms*, Adv. Math. **343** (2019), 538–566.
- [28] B. Guan and W. Sun, *On a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Hermitian manifolds*, Calc. Var. PDE. **54** (2015), 901–916.
- [29] B. Guan and J. Spruck, *Boundary-value problems on \mathbb{S}^n for surfaces of constant Gauss curvature*, Ann. Math. **138** (1993), 601–624.
- [30] P.-F. Guan and G.-F. Wang, *Local estimates for a class of fully nonlinear equations arising from conformal geometry*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2003, 1413–1432.
- [31] A. Hanani, *Equations du type de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés hermitiennes compactes*, J. Funct. Anal. **137** (1996), 49–75.
- [32] F. Harvey and H. Lawson, *Geometric plurisubharmonicity and convexity: an introduction*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012), 2428–2456.
- [33] P. T. Ho, *Results related to the Chern-Yamabe flow*, J. Geom. Anal. **31** (2021), 187–220.
- [34] Z.-L. Hou, X.-N. Ma and D.-M. Wu, *A second order estimate for complex Hessian equations on a compact Kähler manifold*, Math. Res. Lett. **17** (2010), 547–561.
- [35] Z.-R. Jin, *A counterexample to the Yamabe problem for complete noncompact manifolds*. Lecture Notes in Math. 1306, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1988.
- [36] N. V. Krylov, *Boundedly nonhomogeneous elliptic and parabolic equations in a domain*, Izvestia Math. Ser. **47** (1983), 75–108. 2692–2706.
- [37] S.-Y. Li, *On the Dirichlet problems for symmetric function equations of the eigenvalues of the complex Hessian*, Asian J. Math. **8** (2004), 87–106.
- [38] M. Lin and N. Trudinger, *On some inequalities for elementary symmetric functions*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **50** (1994), 317–326.
- [39] K.-F. Liu and X.-K. Yang, *Ricci curvatures on Hermitian manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369** (2017), 5157–5196.
- [40] C. Loewner and L. Nirenberg, *Partial differential equations invariant under conformal or projective transformations*. Contributions to analysis. Academic Press, New York, 1974, 245–272.
- [41] J. W. Milnor, *Topology from the differentiable viewpoint*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997.
- [42] N. Mok and S.-T. Yau, *Completeness of the Kähler-Einstein metric on bounded domains and the characterization of domains of holomorphy by curvature conditions*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 39 American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1983, 41–59.
- [43] T. Ohsawa and T. Pawlaschuk, *Analytic continuation and q -convexity*. SpringerBriefs Math. Springer, Singapore, 2022.
- [44] D. H. Phong and J. Sturm, *The Dirichlet problem for degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **18** (2010), 145–170.
- [45] D. Popovici, *Aeppli cohomology classes associated with Gauduchon metrics on compact complex manifolds*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **143** (2015), 763–800.
- [46] J. Streets and G. Tian, *Hermitian curvature flow*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **13** (2011), 601–634.
- [47] G. V. Suria, *q -pseudoconvex and q -complete domains*, Compositio Math. **53** (1984), 105–111.
- [48] G. Székelyhidi, *Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **109** (2018), 337–378.
- [49] G. Székelyhidi, V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove, *Gauduchon metrics with prescribed volume form*, Acta Math. **219** (2017), 181–211.
- [50] G. Tian, *On Calabi’s conjecture for complex surfaces with positive first Chern class*, Invent. Math. **101** (1990), 101–172.
- [51] G. Tian, *K -stability and Kähler-Einstein metrics*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **68** (2015), 1085–1156.
- [52] G. Tian and S.-T. Yau, *Complete Kähler manifolds with zero Ricci curvature. I*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), 579–609.

- [53] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove, *The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), 1187–1195.
- [54] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove, *Hermitian metrics, $(n - 1, n - 1)$ forms and Monge-Ampère equations*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **755** (2019), 67–101.
- [55] D. Wu and X. Zhang, *Prescribing Chern scalar curvatures on noncompact manifolds*, arXiv:2304.13975.
- [56] S.-T. Yau, *On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation, I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **31** (1978), 339–411.
- [57] W.-K. Yu, *Prescribed Chern scalar curvatures on compact Hermitian manifolds with negative Gauduchon degree*, J. Funct. Anal. **285** (2023), no. 2, Paper No. 109948, 27 pp.
- [58] R.-R. Yuan, *On a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations containing gradient terms on compact Hermitian manifolds*, Canad. J. Math. **70** (2018), 943–960.
- [59] R.-R. Yuan, *On the Dirichlet problem for a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, Calc. Var. PDE. **60** (2021), no. 5, Paper No. 162, 20 pp.
- [60] R.-R. Yuan, *Regularity of fully non-linear elliptic equations on Kähler cones*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **16** (2020), no. 5, 1585–1617.
- [61] R.-R. Yuan, *Regularity of fully non-linear elliptic equations on Hermitian manifolds*, arXiv:2203.03439.
- [62] R.-R. Yuan, *On the regularity of Dirichlet problem for fully non-linear elliptic equations on Hermitian manifolds*, arXiv:2203.04898.
- [63] R.-R. Yuan, *The Dirichlet problem for Monge-Ampère equation for $(n - 1)$ -PSH functions on Hermitian manifolds*, arXiv:2203.07232.
- [64] R.-R. Yuan, *On the partial uniform ellipticity and complete conformal metrics with prescribed curvature functions on manifolds with boundary*, arXiv:2011.08580.
- [65] R.-R. Yuan, *The partial uniform ellipticity and prescribed problems on the conformal classes of complete metrics*, arXiv:2203.13212.
- [66] R.-R. Yuan, *An extension of prescribed problems on the conformal classes of complete metrics*, arXiv:2304.12835.
- [67] X.-W. Zhang, *A priori estimates for complex Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **19** (2010), 3814–3836.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTH CHINA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, GUANGZHOU 510641, CHINA
Email address: yuanrr@scut.edu.cn