

**ON THE CONSTANT SCALAR CURVATURE KÄHLER
METRICS(I)—
APRIORI ESTIMATES**

XIUXIONG CHEN, JINGRUI CHENG

Dedicated to Sir Simon Donaldson for his 60th Birthday

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we derive apriori estimates for constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics on a compact Kähler manifold. We show that higher order derivatives can be estimated in terms of a C^0 bound for the Kähler potential. We also discuss some local versions of these estimates which can be of independent interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the first of a series of three papers in the study of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics (cscK metrics), following a program outlined in [12]. In this paper, we focus on establishing a priori estimates for cscK metrics in compact Kähler manifold without boundary. Our estimates can be easily adapted to extremal Kähler metrics and for simplicity of presentations, we leave such an extension to the interested readers except to note that for extremal Kähler metrics, its scalar curvature is a priori bounded depending on Kähler class. In the subsequent two papers, we will use these estimates (and its generalizations) to study the Calabi-Donaldson theory on the geometry of extremal Kähler metrics, in particular, to establish the celebrated conjecture of Donaldson on geodesic stability as well as the well known properness conjecture relating the existence of cscK metrics with the properness of K energy functional.

In [12], the first named author advocates a new continuity path which links the cscK equation to certain second order elliptic equation, apparently inspired by the success of the classical continuity path for Kähler Einstein (KE) metrics and Donaldson's continuity path for conical KE metrics. In general, a priori estimate is usually the prelude to the success of any continuity path aiming to obtain existence results of cscK metrics since openness is already established in [12].

Let us recall a conjecture made earlier by the first named author (c.f. [17]).

Conjecture 1.1. *Let $(M, [\omega_0])$ be any compact Kähler manifold without boundary. Suppose ω_φ is a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric. If φ is uniformly bounded, then any higher derivative estimate of φ is also uniformly bounded.*

It is worthwhile to give a brief review of the history of this subject and hopefully, this will make it self-evident why this conjecture is interesting. A special case of constant scalar curvature Kähler metric is the well known KE metric which has been the main

Date: May 12, 2020.

focus of Kähler geometry since the inception of the celebrated Calabi conjecture [5] on Kähler Einstein metrics in 1950s. In 1958, E. Calabi published the fundamental C^3 estimate for Monge-Ampère equation [6] which later played a crucial role in Yau's seminal resolution of Calabi conjecture [39] in 1976 when the first Chern class is either negative or zero (In negative case, T. Aubin [1] has an independent proof) . This work of Yau is so influential that generations of experts in Kähler geometry afterwards largely followed the same route: Securing a C^0 estimate first, then move on to obtain C^2 , C^3 estimates etc. In the case of positive first Chern class, G. Tian proved Calabi conjecture in 1989 [36] for Fano surfaces when the automorphism group is reductive. It is well known that there are obstructions to the existence of KE metrics in Fano manifolds; around 1980s, Yau proposed a conjecture which relates the existence of Kähler Einstein metrics to the stability of underlying tangent bundles. This conjecture was settled in 2012 through a series of work CDS [14] [15] [16] and we refer interested readers to this set of papers for further references in the subject of KE metrics. The proof of CDS's work is itself quite involved as it sits at the intersection of several different subjects: algebraic geometry, several complex variables, geometry analysis and metric differential geometry etc.

To move beyond CDS's work on Kähler Einstein metrics, one direction is the study of the existence problem of cscK metrics which satisfy a 4th order PDE. The following is a conjecture which is a refinement of Calabi's original idea that every Kähler class must have its own best, canonical representatives.

Conjecture 1.2 (Yau-Tian-Donaldson). *Let $[\omega_0]$ be an integral class induced by a line bundle $L \rightarrow M$. There exists a cscK metric in $[\omega_0]$ if and only if (L, M) is K-stable.*

One conspicuous and memorable feature of CDS's proof is the heavy use of Cheeger-Colding theory on manifold with Ricci curvature bounded from below. The apriori bound on Ricci curvature for KE metrics make such an application of Cheeger Colding theory seamlessly smooth and effective. However, if we want to attack this general conjecture, there will be a dauntingly high wall to climb since there is no a priori bound on Ricci curvature. Therefore, the entire Cheeger-Colding theory needs to be re-developed if it is at all feasible. On the other hand, there is a second, less visible but perhaps even more significant feature of CDS's proof is: The whole proof is designed for constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics and the use of algebraic criteria and Cheeger Colding theory is to conclude that the a C^0 bound holds for Kähler potential so that we can apply the apriori estimates for complex KE metrics developed by Calabi, Yau and others. Indeed, this is exactly how we make use of Cheeger Colding theory and stability condition in CDS's proof to nail down a C^0 estimate on potential. Unfortunately, such an estimate is missing in this generality for a 4th order fully nonlinear equation. Indeed, as noted by other famous authors in the subject as well, the difficulty permeates the cscK theory are two folds: one cannot use maximal principle from PDE point of view and one cannot have much control of metric from the bound of the scalar curvature.

In this paper, we want to tackle this challenge and we prove

Theorem 1.1. *If (M, ω_0) be a Kähler manifold such that the class $[\omega_0]$ admits a cscK metric $\omega_\varphi := \omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$. Let φ be normalized so that $\sup_M \varphi = 0$, then all derivatives of the Kähler potential φ can be estimated in terms of an upper bound of $\int_M \log \left(\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n}\right) \omega_\varphi^n$.*

As a consequence, we show that

Corollary 1.1. *Let (M, ω_φ) be as in above theorem, then all higher derivatives of φ can be estimated in terms of $\|\varphi\|_0$.*

The implication from Theorem 1.1 to Corollary 1.1 follows from the fact that cscK minimizes K -energy, and a bound for $\|\varphi\|_0$ would imply an upper bound of entropy. This is explained in more detail in section 5.

The cscK metric equation can be re-written as a pair of coupled equations

$$\begin{aligned} \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) &= F + \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}), \\ \Delta_\varphi F &= -\underline{R} + \text{tr}_\varphi \text{Ric}_g. \end{aligned}$$

Here $g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}$ are the components of ω_0 under local coordinates, namely $\omega_0 = \sqrt{-1} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} dz_\alpha \wedge d\bar{z}_\beta$ and Δ_φ denotes the Laplace operator defined by the Kähler form $\omega_\varphi := \omega_0 + \sqrt{-1} \partial\bar{\partial}\varphi > 0$.

With later applications in mind, we consider the following more general form of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (1.1) \quad \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) &= F + \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}), \\ (1.2) \quad \Delta_\varphi F &= -f + \text{tr}_\varphi \eta. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, f is a given smooth function and η is a given smooth real $(1, 1)$ form. In local coordinates, $\eta = \sqrt{-1} \eta_{i\bar{j}} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_j$. The following proposition shows that higher derivative bounds for solutions to (1.1), (1.2) follow from knowing ω_φ is quasi-isometric to ω_0 : (c.f. [12]).

Proposition 1.2. *Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), normalized so that $\sup_M \varphi = 0$. Suppose that for some $C_0 > 0$, $\frac{1}{C_0} \omega_0 \leq \omega_\varphi \leq C_0 \omega_0$, then for any $p < \infty$, there exist a constant $C_{0.5}$, depending only on the background metric (M, ω_0) , $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, p , and C_0 , such that $\|\varphi\|_{W^{4,p}} \leq C_{0.5}$, $\|F\|_{W^{2,p}} \leq C_{0.5}$. Moreover, one can bound all higher derivatives of φ , which will additionally depend on the derivative bounds for f and η .*

The proof of this proposition is really a combination of several standard results in the theory of elliptic equations of second order, which we will explain in more detail in section 4.

The crucial assumption in Proposition 1.2 is that the metric in question is quasi-isometric. The hard challenge is to prove a priori that the metric ω_φ is quasic isometric. However, there is not much room for improvement at least locally, following the well known example of Pogorelov on real Monge-Ampère equation. In [27], W.Y. He adapted the construction of Pogorelov's example to complex setting and obtained a complete solution to

$$\det u_{i\bar{j}} = 1$$

in \mathbb{C}^n which is not C^2 . Thus, for this conjecture to be true, the global nature of compact Kähler manifold must come into play in a crucial way.

Theorem 1.1 can be expanded into a more detailed version. The constants C in the theorem below can change from line to line. More generally, throughout this paper, the ‘‘C’’ without subscript may change from line to line, while if there is subscript, then it is some fixed constant.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose (M, ω_φ) is a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric. Then the following statements are mutually equivalent:*

- (1) *There is a constant such that $\int_M \log \frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} \cdot \omega_\varphi^n < C$;*
- (2) *There is a constant such that $|\varphi| < C$;*
- (3) *There is a constant C such that $|\nabla\varphi| < C$ and $\log \frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} \geq -C$;*
- (4) *There is a constant C such that $\frac{1}{C} < \frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} < C$;*
- (5) *There is a constant C such that $n + \Delta\varphi < C$ and $\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} > \frac{1}{C}$;*
- (6) *All higher derivatives of φ are uniformly bounded.*

Some remarks are in order:

- (1) The strength of statement is roughly in increasing order. The equivalence of (1) and (6) gives Theorem 1.1.
- (2) From (5) to (6), this is exactly Proposition 1.2, since this assumption implies $\frac{1}{C'}\omega_0 \leq \omega_\varphi \leq C'\omega_0$. All other estimates are new.
- (3) Here is the flow line of our proof:

$$(1) \xrightarrow{\text{section 5}} (2) + (4) \text{ and } (3) \xleftrightarrow{\text{section 2}} (4) \xrightarrow{\text{section 3}} (5) \xrightarrow{\text{section 4}} (6).$$

Remark 1.3. *In Theorem 1.1 and the first part of Theorem 1.2, it is sufficient to assume that φ remains bounded under L^1 geodesic distance, due to the fact that cscK metrics are minimizers of K -energy. We will discuss this matter in more detail in our next paper of the series.*

Now we present technical theorems which lead to this main theorem. Indeed, these technical theorems are interesting in its own right and may be used in other applications.

Theorem 1.3. *(Corollary 5.2) Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), then for any $1 < p < \infty$, there exists a constant C , depending only on the background Kähler metric (M, g) , an upper bound of $\int_M e^F F d\text{vol}_g$, and p , such that*

$$(1.3) \quad \|e^F\|_{L^p(d\text{vol}_g)} \leq C, \quad \|\varphi\|_0 \leq C.$$

Theorem 1.4. *(Corollary 5.4) Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), then there exists a constant C , depending only on the background metric (M, g) and an upper bound for $\int_M e^F F d\text{vol}_g$, such that*

$$(1.4) \quad e^F \leq C.$$

Proposition 1.4. *(Proposition 2.1) Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), then there exists a constant C , depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$, such that*

$$(1.5) \quad F \geq -C.$$

Theorem 1.5. *(Theorem 2.2) Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), then there exists a constant C , depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$ and the background metric g , such that*

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{|\nabla\varphi|^2}{e^F} \leq C.$$

We also show that one can estimate the upper bound of F directly in terms of gradient bound of φ . This result is not directly needed for our main result, but can be of independent interest.

Theorem 1.6. (Theorem 2.1) *Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1) and (1.2), then there exists a constant C , depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$, and the background metric g , such that*

$$(1.7) \quad \max_M e^{\frac{F}{n}} \leq C \max_M |\nabla\varphi|^2.$$

For second order estimate, Chen-He[17] establish an a priori bound on $n + \Delta\varphi$ in terms of $|\nabla F|_{L^p}$ ($p > 2n$) via integral estimate, in absence of (1.2). Inspired by this paper [17] and utilizing the additional equation (1.2), we are able to obtain a $W^{2,p}$ estimate for any $p > 0$, using only $\|F\|_0$. Theorem 1.5 is used essentially in this estimate.

Theorem 1.7. (Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.2) *Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), then for any $1 < p < \infty$, there exists a constant $\alpha(p) > 0$, depending only on p , and another constant C , depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$, the background metric g , and p , such that*

$$(1.8) \quad \int_M e^{-\alpha(p)F} (n + \Delta\varphi)^p \leq C.$$

In particular, $\|n + \Delta\varphi\|_{L^p(dvol_g)} \leq C'$, where C' has the same dependence as C in this theorem, but additionally on $\|F\|_0$.

If we can prove an upper bound for F , then the following theorem becomes very interesting.

Theorem 1.8. (Proposition 4.2) *Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2). Then there exists $p_n > 1$, depending only on n , and a constant C , depending on $\|\varphi\|_0$, $\|F\|_0$, $\|n + \Delta\varphi\|_{L^{p_n}(dvol_g)}$, and the background metric g , such that*

$$(1.9) \quad n + \Delta\varphi \leq C.$$

It is interesting to compare this result with second derivative estimates for complex Monge-Ampère equations. In [30], the authors obtained $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for complex Monge-Ampère equation, depending on $C^{1,\beta}$ bound of the solution (with β close enough to 1) and C^α bound of the right hand side. In [27], the authors obtained $W^{3,p}$ bound of solution to complex Monge-Ampère depending only on C^0 bound of the solution and $W^{1,p}$ bound of right hand side for $p > 2n$. In this result, we are not assuming any regularity of the right hand side e^F , but assumes quite strong bound ($W^{2,p}$ for p large) as a price to pay, and the second equation (1.2) needs to be used in an essential way.

Theorem 1.8 is reminiscent to a renowned problem in \mathbb{C}^n which goes back to S. T. Yau, E. Calabi: whether global solution of Calabi Yau metric in \mathbb{C}^n must be Euclidean metric or not? This problem is disproved by a nontrivial construction of Calabi Yau metric in \mathbb{C}^2 by C. LeBrun. Perhaps one need to strengthen the assumption by assuming it is asymptotically Euclidean at ∞ . This is made known to be true by G. Tian in dimension $n = 2$ and conjectured to be true in all dimensions. While we prepare this paper, it is now known through a surprising result of Y. Li in dimension 3 [31] and then Conlon-Rochon [20], G. Székelyhidi [35] in all dimensions that this fails in general. This exciting new development makes statement like Corollary 1.5 below more interesting. This corollary offers a different point of view: If we control asymptotical growth of the underlying metrics, then the rigidity result still hold for scalar flat Kähler metrics (in particular Calabi Yau metrics) in \mathbb{C}^n .

Corollary 1.5. *Let u be a global smooth pluri-subharmonic function such that $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u$ defines a scalar flat metric on \mathbb{C}^n . If for some $p > 3n(n-1)$, we have*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^{2n}} \int_{B_r(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^n} ((\Delta u)^p + (\sum_k \frac{1}{u_{k\bar{k}}})^p) dV < \infty,$$

then the Levi Hessian of u is constant. Here dV denotes the usual Euclidean volume form.

We will prove this corollary in section 6, using a similar argument as Proposition 6.1. We observe that this theorem covers the well-known Calabi Yau metric equation

$$\det u_{i\bar{j}} = 1$$

as a special case. One interesting question is, what is the smallest number p for which this corollary still holds? In section 6, we also show that when $n = 2$, for a solution φ of cscK in a domain of \mathbb{C}^n , if $|\nabla\varphi|$ is locally bounded, then the volume ratio $\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega^n}$ is also bounded from above locally. It is not clear to us if this estimate can be generalized to higher dimensions.

Finally we would like to explain the organization of this paper:

In section 2, we prove Proposition 1.4, Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.6.

In section 3, we prove Theorem 1.7 by iteration, which is a crucial step towards the main result.

In section 4, we use iteration again to improve L^p bound of $n + \Delta\varphi$ for $p < \infty$ to an L^∞ bound of $n + \Delta\varphi$, proving Theorem 1.8. This estimate requires a bound for $\|n + \Delta\varphi\|_{L^p}$ for some $p > p_n$ ¹, depending on $\|F\|_0$. The key ingredient is a calculation for $\Delta_\varphi(|\nabla_\varphi F|^2)$. Combining the results in section 2, 3, 4 as well as Proposition 2.1 gives estimate for all higher derivatives in terms of $\|\varphi\|_0$ and $\|F\|_0$. We also prove Proposition 1.2 in this section.

In Section 2-4, we always assume $|\varphi|$ is a priori bounded. This assumption is removed in Section 5 where we prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. From these two results, we get estimate for $\|F\|_0$ and $\|\varphi\|_0$ depending only on an upper bound of entropy of F defined as $\int_M \log(\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n}) \omega_\varphi^n$. The key ingredient is the use of α -invariant and the construction of a new test function. On the other hand, if we start with a bound for $\|\varphi\|_0$, and use the convexity of K -energy along $C^{1,1}$ geodesics, it is relatively easy to get an upper bound of entropy bound of F , hence all higher estimates follow.

In section 6, we obtain some interior estimates for cscK in a bounded domain of \mathbb{C}^n . Such estimates are not directly needed for our main results but may be of independent interest.

Acknowledgment In the Fall of 1997, Sir Simon invited the first named author to join him in exploring the space of Kähler potentials, and Sir Simon has been remarkably generous about sharing his time and ideas ever since. It is therefore a deep pleasure to dedicate this paper to Sir Simon Donaldson, in celebration of his 60th birthday, and in acknowledgment of the far-reaching influence of his profound mathematical ideas, which have changed the landscape of mathematics so much.

¹Here $p_n \leq (3n-3)(4n+1)$. But this most likely is not sharp.

2. THE VOLUME RATIO $\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega^n}$ AND C^1 BOUND ON KÄHLER POTENTIAL

The main theorem in this section is to prove that the first derivative of φ is pointwisely controlled by volume ratio e^F from above, assuming a bound for $\|\varphi\|_0$. Conversely, the bound for $\|\nabla\varphi\|_0$ can in turn control e^F . However, this control is much weaker since it is of global nature.

First we show that a C^0 bound for φ implies a lower bound for F .

Proposition 2.1. *Let (φ, F) be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), then there exists a positive constant C_2 depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0, \|f\|_0, \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, such that $F \geq -C_2$.*

This proposition first appeared in [28]. However, for the convenience of the reader, we include a proof here.

Proof. This step is relatively easy. Let $p \in M$, we may choose a local normal coordinate in a neighborhood of p , such that

$$(2.1) \quad g_{i\bar{j}}(p) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \nabla g_{i\bar{j}}(p) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{i\bar{j}}(p) = \varphi_{i\bar{i}}(p)\delta_{ij}.$$

In this paper, we will always work under this coordinate unless specified otherwise.

Choose the constant $C_{2.1}$ to be $C_{2.1} = 2 \max_M \max_i |\eta_{i\bar{i}}| + \frac{2\|f\|_0}{n} + 1$. Under this coordinate, we can calculate:

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(F + C_{2.1}\varphi) &= -f + \sum_i \frac{\eta_{i\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + C_{2.1} \sum_i \frac{\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\ &= -f + C_{2.1}n - \sum_i \frac{C_{2.1} - \eta_{i\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \leq -f + C_{2.1}n - \frac{nC_{2.1}}{2} e^{-\frac{F}{n}} \\ &\leq 2C_{2.1}n - \frac{nC_{2.1}}{2} e^{-\frac{F}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the second line above, we used the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \geq \prod_i (1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{-\frac{1}{n}} = e^{-\frac{F}{n}}.$$

Now let p_0 be such that the function $F + C_{2.1}\varphi$ achieves minimum at p_0 , then from (2.2), we see

$$(2.3) \quad 0 \leq 2C_{2.1}n - \frac{nC_{2.1}}{2} e^{-\frac{F}{n}}(p_0).$$

This gives a lower bound for F , depending only on C^0 bound for φ . □

Next we move on to estimate the upper bound of F in terms of $\max_M |\nabla\varphi|$. Here and in the following, we denote $\nabla f \cdot \nabla h = \text{Re}(g^{i\bar{j}} f_i h_{\bar{j}})$, and $\nabla_\varphi \cdot \nabla_\varphi f = \text{Re}(g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}} f_i h_{\bar{j}})$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let (φ, F) be smooth solutions to cscK, then there exists a constant $C_{2.2}$, depending only on $\|\nabla\varphi\|_0, \|f\|_0, \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$ and lower bound of bisectional crvature of the background metric g , such that $F \leq C_{2.2}$.*

Proof. The argument uses maximum principle again. This time we will calculate $\Delta_\varphi(e^{F-\lambda\varphi}(K+|\nabla\varphi|^2))$ where $\lambda, K > 0$ are constants to be determined later. We choose a normal coordinate (equation (2.1)) and do the following calculations. We have

$$(2.4) \quad \Delta_\varphi(e^{F-\lambda\varphi}(K+|\nabla\varphi|^2)) = \Delta_\varphi(e^{F-\lambda\varphi})(K+|\nabla\varphi|^2) + e^{F-\lambda\varphi}\Delta_\varphi(K+|\nabla\varphi|^2) \\ + e^{F-\lambda\varphi} \cdot \frac{(F_i - \lambda\varphi_i)(|\nabla\varphi|^2)_{\bar{i}} + (F_{\bar{i}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}})(|\nabla\varphi|^2)_i}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}}.$$

We can first calculate:

$$(2.5) \quad \Delta_\varphi(e^{F-\lambda\varphi}) = e^{F-\lambda\varphi} \frac{|F_i - \lambda\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + e^{F-\lambda\varphi} \left(\Delta_\varphi F - \frac{\lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} \right) \\ = e^{F-\lambda\varphi} \frac{|F_i - \lambda\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + e^{F-\lambda\varphi} \left(-f - \lambda n + \frac{\lambda + \eta_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} \right).$$

By differentiating equation (1.1) in z_α direction, we obtain

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_i \frac{\varphi_{i\bar{i}\alpha}}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} = F_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i \frac{\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}\alpha}}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} = F_{\bar{\alpha}}.$$

Then we calculate

$$(2.7) \quad \Delta_\varphi(|\nabla\varphi|^2) = \frac{R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\bar{i}\bar{i}}\varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\beta}}}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}\bar{i}} + \varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}\varphi_{\alpha\bar{i}\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} \\ \geq -\frac{C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \varphi_\alpha F_{\bar{\alpha}} + \varphi_{\bar{\alpha}} F_\alpha \\ = -\frac{C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \varphi_\alpha(F_{\bar{\alpha}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}) + \varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}(F_\alpha - \lambda\varphi_\alpha) + 2\lambda|\varphi_\alpha|^2 \\ \geq -\frac{C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} - \varepsilon(n + \Delta\varphi) - \frac{|F_\alpha - \lambda\varphi_\alpha|^2|\varphi_\alpha|^2}{\varepsilon(1 + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}})} + 2\lambda|\varphi_\alpha|^2.$$

Here $C_{2.21}$ depends only on lower bound of bisectional curvature of g .

For the last term in (2.4), we estimate in the following way:

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{|(F_{\bar{i}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}})(|\nabla\varphi|^2)_i|}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} \\ = \frac{|(F_{\bar{i}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}})(\varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}} + \varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}\varphi_{\alpha\bar{i}})|}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} \\ \leq \frac{|(F_{\bar{i}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}})\varphi_i\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}|}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} + \frac{|(F_{\bar{i}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}})\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}\varphi_{\alpha\bar{i}}|}{1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}} \\ \leq \frac{|F_{\bar{i}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}}|^2|\varphi_i|^2}{2\varepsilon(1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}})} + \frac{|F_{\bar{i}} - \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}}|^2|\varphi_\alpha|^2}{2\varepsilon(1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}})} + \frac{\varepsilon\varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^2}{2(1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}})} + \frac{\varepsilon|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{2(1 + \varphi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}})}.$$

The other conjugate term satisfies the same estimate as above. Combining above calculations, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.9) \quad & \frac{\Delta_\varphi(e^{F-\lambda\varphi}(K + |\nabla\varphi|^2))}{e^{F-\lambda\varphi}} \\
 & \geq (K + |\nabla\varphi|^2 - 3\varepsilon^{-1}|\nabla\varphi|^2) \frac{|F_i - \lambda\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\
 & \quad + \frac{(\lambda + \eta_{i\bar{i}})(K + |\nabla\varphi|^2) - C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)\varphi_{i\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} - \varepsilon(n + \Delta\varphi) \\
 & \quad + \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2(1 - \varepsilon)}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + (-\underline{R} - \lambda n)(K + |\nabla\varphi|^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now it's time to choose the constants ε , λ , and K appearing above.

First we choose $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4}$. With this choice, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.10) \quad & \sum_i \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)\varphi_{i\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} - \varepsilon(n + \Delta\varphi) = \frac{3}{4}(n + \Delta\varphi) - \frac{3n}{2} + \frac{3}{4} \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} - \frac{1}{4}(n + \Delta\varphi) \\
 & \geq \frac{1}{2}(n + \Delta\varphi) - \frac{3n}{2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then we choose λ so large that $\lambda - \max_M \max_i |\eta_{i\bar{i}}| > 1$. Finally, we choose K so large that

$$(2.11) \quad K > C_{2.21} \max_M |\nabla\varphi|^2$$

$$(2.12) \quad K > 3\varepsilon^{-1} \max_M |\nabla\varphi|^2 = 12 \max_M |\nabla\varphi|^2.$$

With above choices for λ and K , we have

$$(2.13) \quad (\lambda + \eta_{i\bar{i}})(K + |\nabla\varphi|^2) - C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2 \geq K - C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2 > 0.$$

and also

$$(2.14) \quad K - 3\varepsilon^{-1}|\nabla\varphi|^2 > 0.$$

Hence we conclude from (2.9) that

$$(2.15) \quad \Delta_\varphi(e^{F-\lambda\varphi}(K + |\nabla\varphi|^2)) \geq e^{F-\lambda\varphi} \left(-(\|f\|_0 + \lambda n)(K + \max_M |\nabla\varphi|^2) - C_{2.22} + \frac{1}{4}(n + \Delta\varphi) \right).$$

Denote $v = e^{F-\lambda\varphi}(K + |\nabla\varphi|^2)$, it is enough to show v has an upper bound. we see from (2.15) that there exists constants $C_{2.23} > 0$, $C_{2.24} > 0$, possibly depending on $\max_M |\nabla\varphi|^2$, such that

$$(2.16) \quad \Delta_\varphi(v) \geq v(-C_{2.23} + \frac{1}{C_{2.24}}(n + \Delta\varphi)).$$

Here we notice that $n + \Delta\varphi \geq ne^{\frac{F}{n}}$. Hence we obtain from (2.16) that

$$(2.17) \quad \Delta_\varphi(v) \geq v(-C_{2.23} + \frac{1}{C_{2.24}}e^{\frac{F}{n}}).$$

Let the maximum of v be achieved at point p , then we know $-C_{2.23} + \frac{e^{\frac{F}{n}(p)}}{C_{2.24}} \leq 0$. This gives an upper bound of F at p , hence an upper bound for v , where this bound depends on $\max_M |\nabla\varphi|$. Here we noted that $\|\varphi\|_0$ can be bounded in terms of $\sup_M \|\nabla\varphi\|_0$ as long as $\sup_M \varphi = 0$ and that M is compact. \square

Conversely, we have the following key estimate, which will be needed when we do the $W^{2,p}$ estimates of φ .

Theorem 2.2. *There exists a constant $C_{2,3}$, depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$, lower bound of bisectional curvature, $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, such that*

$$\frac{|\nabla\varphi|^2}{e^F} \leq C_{2,3}.$$

Proof. We will consider $\Delta_\varphi(e^{-(F+\lambda\varphi)+\frac{1}{2}\varphi^2}(|\nabla\varphi|^2+K))$. Here $\lambda > 0$, $K > 0$ are constants to be determined below. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.18) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(e^{-(F+\lambda\varphi)+\frac{1}{2}\varphi^2}(|\nabla\varphi|^2+K)) \\ &= \Delta_\varphi(e^{-(F+\lambda\varphi)+\frac{1}{2}\varphi^2})(|\nabla\varphi|^2+K) + e^{-(F+\lambda\varphi)+\frac{1}{2}\varphi^2} \Delta_\varphi(|\nabla\varphi|^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{2e^{-(F+\lambda\varphi)+\frac{1}{2}\varphi^2}}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \operatorname{Re}((-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i)(|\nabla\varphi|^2)_{\bar{i}}). \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity of notation, set

$$A(F, \varphi) = -(F + \lambda\varphi) + \frac{1}{2}\varphi^2.$$

Similar as before, we may calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} (2.19) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(e^{A(F,\varphi)}) \\ &= e^A \frac{|-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + e^A (-\Delta_\varphi(F + \lambda\varphi) + \varphi\Delta_\varphi\varphi) + e^A \frac{|\varphi_i|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\ &= e^A \frac{|-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + e^A \left(f - \lambda n + n\varphi + \sum_i \frac{\lambda - \eta_{i\bar{i}} - \varphi}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \right) + \frac{e^A |\varphi_i|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the calculation in (2.7):

$$\begin{aligned} (2.20) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(|\nabla\varphi|^2) = \frac{R_{i\bar{i}\alpha\bar{\beta}}\varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\beta}}}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_{i\bar{i}}^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + F_{\bar{\alpha}}\varphi_\alpha + F_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}} \\ & \geq -C_{2,21}|\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_{i\bar{i}}^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\ & \quad + (-2\lambda + 2\varphi)|\nabla\varphi|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}((F_\alpha + \lambda\varphi_\alpha - \varphi\varphi_\alpha)\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}). \end{aligned}$$

Again $C_{2,21}$ depends only on curvature bound of g . Also

$$(|\nabla\varphi|^2)_{\bar{i}} = \varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}} + \varphi_{\bar{i}}\varphi_{i\bar{i}}, \quad (|\nabla\varphi|^2)_i = \varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}\varphi_{\alpha i} + \varphi_i\varphi_{i\bar{i}}.$$

Hence if we plug in (2.19) and (2.20) back to (2.18), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Delta_\varphi(e^A(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K))e^{-A} \\
 & \geq |\nabla_\varphi(F + \lambda\varphi) - \varphi\nabla_\varphi\varphi|^2(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K) + |\nabla_\varphi\varphi|^2(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K) \\
 (2.21) \quad & + (f - \lambda n + n\varphi + \sum_i \frac{\lambda - \eta_{i\bar{i}} - \varphi}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}})(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K) + \frac{-C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2 + |\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\
 & + (-2\lambda + 2\varphi)|\nabla\varphi|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}((F_\alpha + \lambda\varphi_\alpha - \varphi\varphi_\alpha)\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}}) \\
 & \quad + \frac{2\operatorname{Re}((-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i)(\varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}} + \varphi_{\bar{i}}\varphi_{i\bar{i}}))}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We notice the following complete square in the above sum:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.22) \quad & \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}|\varphi_{i\alpha} - (F_i + \lambda\varphi_i - \varphi\varphi_i)\varphi_\alpha|^2 \\
 & = \frac{|\varphi_{i\alpha}|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{2\operatorname{Re}((-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i)\varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}})}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{|-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i|^2|\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We will drop this complete square in the following. Next we observe a crucial cancellation, which is the key point of this argument. We look at the last two terms in (2.21) and observe:

$$(2.23) \quad (F_\alpha + \lambda\varphi_\alpha - \varphi\varphi_\alpha)\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}} + \frac{(-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i)\varphi_{\bar{i}}\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} = \frac{(F_i + \lambda\varphi_i - \varphi\varphi_i)\varphi_{\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.24) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(e^A(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K))e^{-A} \geq K \frac{|-F_i - \lambda\varphi_i + \varphi\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_i|^2(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K)}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\
 & + \sum_i \frac{\lambda - \eta_{i\bar{i}} - \varphi}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K) + (f - \lambda n + n\varphi)(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K) \\
 & - C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{\varphi_{i\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + (-2\lambda + 2\varphi)|\nabla\varphi|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{(F_i + \lambda\varphi_i - \varphi\varphi_i)\varphi_{\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we make the choices of λ , K . We choose $\lambda = 10(\max_M \max_i |\eta_{i\bar{i}}| + \|\varphi\|_0 + C_{2.21} + 1)$ and $K = 10$. With this choice, we now estimate the terms in (2.24), with various constants C_i which depends only on the curvature bound of g and $\|\varphi\|_0$.

$$(2.25) \quad (\underline{R} - \lambda n + n\varphi)(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K) \geq -C_{2.31}(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + 1).$$

$$(2.26) \quad (-2\lambda + 2\varphi)|\nabla\varphi|^2 \geq -C_{2.32}|\nabla\varphi|^2.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.27) \quad & \frac{|(F_i + \lambda\varphi_i - \varphi\varphi_i)\varphi_{\bar{i}}|}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|F_i + \lambda\varphi_i - \varphi\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|F_i + \lambda\varphi_i - \varphi\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.28) \quad \sum_i \frac{\lambda - \eta_{i\bar{i}} - \varphi}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K) - C_{2.21}|\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \geq 10|\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}.$$

$$(2.29) \quad \frac{\varphi_{i\bar{i}}^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \geq 0.$$

Combining all these estimates, we obtain from (2.24) that

$$(2.30) \quad \Delta_\varphi(e^A(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K)) \geq e^A \left(\frac{|\varphi_i|^2 |\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + 9|\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} - C_{2.33}(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + 1) \right).$$

Here $C_{2.33}$ depends only on curvature bound of g and $\|\varphi\|_0$. Using Young's inequality, we have, if $n \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla\varphi|^{\frac{2}{n}} e^{-\frac{F}{n}} &\leq \sum_i \frac{|\varphi_i|^{\frac{2}{n}}}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{1}{n}}} \cdot (1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{-\frac{F}{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \frac{|\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{n-1}{n} \sum_i (1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}} e^{-\frac{F}{n-1}} \\ &\leq (n-1) \left(\frac{|\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_i (1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}} e^{-\frac{F}{n-1}} \right) \\ &\leq (n-1) \left(\frac{|\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} e^{-\frac{F}{n-1}} \right) \\ &\leq (n-1) \left(\frac{|\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $n \geq 2$,

$$\frac{|\varphi_i|^2 |\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + |\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \geq \frac{1}{n-1} |\nabla\varphi|^{2+\frac{2}{n}} e^{-\frac{F}{n}}.$$

Whereas if $n = 1$, $|\nabla\varphi|^{2+\frac{2}{n}} e^{-\frac{F}{n}} = |\nabla\varphi|^4 e^{-F} = \frac{|\varphi_i|^2 |\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}}$. In any case, we have

$$\frac{|\varphi_i|^2 |\nabla\varphi|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + |\nabla\varphi|^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \geq \frac{1}{n} |\nabla\varphi|^{2+\frac{2}{n}} e^{-\frac{F}{n}}.$$

Hence we get from (2.30) that

$$(2.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(e^A(|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K)) &\geq e^{-\lambda\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\varphi^2} \left(e^{-(1+\frac{1}{n})F} |\nabla\varphi|^{2+\frac{2}{n}} - C_{2.33} e^{-F} |\nabla\varphi|^2 - C_{2.33} e^{-F} \right) \\ &= e^{-\lambda\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\varphi^2} \left((e^{-F} |\nabla\varphi|^2)^{1+\frac{1}{n}} - C_{2.33} e^{-F} |\nabla\varphi|^2 - C_{2.33} e^{-F} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that the function $e^{-(F+C\varphi) + \frac{1}{2}\varphi^2} (|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K)$ achieves maximum at p . Then at point p , we have

$$(2.32) \quad 0 \geq (e^{-F} |\nabla\varphi|^2)^{1+\frac{1}{n}} - C_{2.33} e^{-F} |\nabla\varphi|^2 - C_{2.33} e^{-F}.$$

Recall Proposition 2.1 gives an estimate for e^{-F} which depends only on $\|\varphi\|_0$ and the curvature bound of g . Therefore, we get a bound for $e^{-F} |\nabla\varphi|^2(p)$ with the same dependence. Hence we have a bound for $e^{-(F+\lambda\varphi) + \frac{1}{2}\varphi^2} (|\nabla\varphi|^2 + K)(p)$, with the dependence as stated in the theorem.

But this function achieves maximum at p , so we are done. \square

3. THE VOLUME RATIO $\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n}$ AND $W^{2,p}$ BOUND ON KÄHLER POTENTIAL

In this section, we prove

Theorem 3.1. *For any $p > 0$, there exist constants $\alpha(p) > 0$, $C(p) > 0$, so that*

$$(3.1) \quad \int_M e^{-\alpha(p)F} (n + \Delta\varphi)^p d\text{vol}_g \leq C(p).$$

Here $\alpha(p)$ depends only on p (can be explicitly calculated). The constant C_p depends only on p , $\|\varphi\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, $\|f\|_0$, lower bound of the bisectional curvature of g , and the volume of g .

Proof. One starts by calculating:

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}(n+\Delta\varphi)) &= \Delta_\varphi(e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)})(n+\Delta\varphi) + e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}\Delta_\varphi(n+\Delta\varphi) \\ &+ e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}(-\alpha)\frac{(F_i+\lambda\varphi_i)(\Delta\varphi)_{\bar{i}} + (F_{\bar{i}}+\lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}})(\Delta\varphi)_i}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}. \end{aligned}$$

If we choose $\lambda > 2\max_M \max_i |\eta_{i\bar{i}}|$, then

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}) &= \frac{\alpha^2|F_i+\lambda\varphi_i|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)} + \alpha e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}(f-\lambda n + \sum_i \frac{\lambda-\eta_{i\bar{i}}}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}) \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha^2|F_i+\lambda\varphi_i|^2}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)} + \alpha e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}(f-\lambda n) + \frac{\lambda\alpha}{2}e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}\sum_i \frac{1}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the term $\Delta_\varphi(n+\Delta\varphi)$, we choose a normal coordinate (c.f. equation (2.1)) and then follow Yau's calculation [39]. First, note that

$$(3.4) \quad \Delta_\varphi(n+\Delta\varphi) = \frac{1}{1+\varphi_{k\bar{k}}}\left(g^{i\bar{j}}\varphi_{i\bar{j}}\right)_{k\bar{k}} = \frac{R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}}\varphi_{i\bar{i}}}{1+\varphi_{k\bar{k}}} + \frac{\varphi_{k\bar{k}i\bar{i}}}{1+\varphi_{k\bar{k}}}.$$

We wish to represent the 4-th derivative of φ in terms of F . For this we take equation (1.1) and differentiate it twice in $z_i, z_{\bar{i}}$ and then sum over $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We obtain:

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{\varphi_{k\bar{k}i\bar{i}}}{1+\varphi_{k\bar{k}}} - \frac{R_{k\bar{k}i\bar{i}}}{1+\varphi_{k\bar{k}}} - \frac{|\varphi_{k\bar{\beta}i}|^2}{(1+\varphi_{k\bar{k}})(1+\varphi_{\beta\bar{\beta}})} = F_{i\bar{i}} - R_{i\bar{i}}.$$

Hence

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(n+\Delta\varphi) &= \frac{R_{k\bar{k}i\bar{i}}(1+\varphi_{k\bar{k}})}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{p\bar{q}i}|^2}{(1+\varphi_{p\bar{p}})(1+\varphi_{q\bar{q}})} + \Delta F - R(g) \\ &\geq -C_{3.1}(n+\Delta\varphi)\sum_i \frac{1}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{p\bar{q}i}|^2}{(1+\varphi_{p\bar{p}})(1+\varphi_{q\bar{q}})} + \Delta F - R(g). \end{aligned}$$

Here $C_{3.1}$ depends only on curvature bound of g and R is the scalar curvature of the background metric g . Plug in to equation (3.2) and we get

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}(n+\Delta\varphi)) &\geq e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}\left(\frac{\lambda\alpha}{2} - C_{3.1}\right)(n+\Delta\varphi)\sum_i \frac{1}{1+\varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \\ &+ \alpha e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}(f-\lambda n)(n+\Delta\varphi) + e^{-\alpha(F+\lambda\varphi)}(\Delta F - R(g)). \end{aligned}$$

Here we already drop the term:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\alpha^2 |F_i + \lambda\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} (n + \Delta\varphi) + (-\alpha) \frac{(F_i + \lambda\varphi_i)(\Delta\varphi)_{\bar{i}} + (F_{\bar{i}} + \lambda\varphi_{\bar{i}})(\Delta\varphi)_i}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} + \frac{|\varphi_{p\bar{q}i}|^2}{(1 + \varphi_{p\bar{p}})(1 + \varphi_{q\bar{q}})} \\
& \geq \frac{\alpha^2 |F_i + \lambda\varphi_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} (n + \Delta\varphi) - 2\alpha \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{(F_i + \lambda\varphi_i)(\Delta\varphi)_{\bar{i}}}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \right) + \frac{|(\Delta\varphi)_i|^2}{(n + \Delta\varphi)(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})} \\
& = \frac{n + \Delta\varphi}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \left| \alpha(F_i + \lambda\varphi_i) - \frac{(\Delta\varphi)_i}{n + \Delta\varphi} \right|^2 \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

From the first line to second line in the above, we observed that

$$\frac{|(\Delta\varphi)_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} = \frac{|\sum_p \varphi_{p\bar{p}i}|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \leq \frac{|\varphi_{p\bar{p}i}|^2 (n + \Delta\varphi)}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{p\bar{p}})} \leq \frac{|\varphi_{p\bar{q}i}|^2 (n + \Delta\varphi)}{(1 + \varphi_{p\bar{p}})(1 + \varphi_{q\bar{q}})}.$$

Set

$$u = e^{-\alpha(F + \lambda\varphi)} (n + \Delta\varphi)$$

and note that

$$(n + \Delta\varphi) \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \geq e^{-\frac{F}{n-1}} (n + \Delta\varphi)^{1 + \frac{1}{n-1}},$$

then we know from equation (3.7):

(3.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_\varphi u & \geq e^{-(\alpha + \frac{1}{n-1})F - \alpha\lambda\varphi} \left(\frac{\lambda\alpha}{2} - C_{3.1} \right) (n + \Delta\varphi)^{1 + \frac{1}{n-1}} - \alpha e^{-\alpha(F + \lambda\varphi)} (\lambda n - f) (n + \Delta\varphi) \\
& \quad + e^{-\alpha(F + \lambda\varphi)} (\Delta F - R(g)).
\end{aligned}$$

We use the following equality, which holds for any $p \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2p+1} \Delta_\varphi (u^{2p+1}) & = 2pu^{2p-1} |\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 + u^{2p} \Delta_\varphi u \\
& = 2pu^{2p-2} e^{-\alpha(F + \lambda\varphi)} (n + \Delta\varphi) |\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 + u^{2p} \Delta_\varphi u \\
& \geq 2pu^{2p-2} |\nabla u|^2 e^{-\alpha(F + \lambda\varphi)} + u^{2p} \Delta_\varphi u.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrate with respect to $dvol_\varphi = e^F dvol_g$ and plug inequality (3.8) to get:

(3.9)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_M 2pu^{2p-2} |\nabla u|^2 e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha\lambda\varphi} dvol_g \\
& \quad + \int_M e^{-(\alpha - \frac{n-2}{n-1})F - \alpha\lambda\varphi} \left(\frac{\lambda\alpha}{2} - C_{3.1} \right) (n + \Delta\varphi)^{1 + \frac{1}{n-1}} u^{2p} dvol_g \\
& \quad + \int_M e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha\lambda\varphi} u^{2p} \Delta F dvol_g \leq \int_M \alpha e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha\lambda\varphi} (\lambda n - f) (n + \Delta\varphi) u^{2p} dvol_g \\
& \quad + \int_M e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda\alpha\varphi} R(g) u^{2p} dvol_g.
\end{aligned}$$

We need to handle the term involving ΔF , which is done by integrating by parts.

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.10) \quad & \int_M e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha\lambda\varphi} u^{2p} \Delta F dvol_g = \int_M (\alpha - 1) e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha\lambda\varphi} u^{2p} |\nabla F|^2 dvol_g \\
& \quad + \int_M \alpha \lambda e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda\alpha\varphi} u^{2p} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla F dvol_g - \int_M 2pe^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda\alpha\varphi} u^{2p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla F dvol_g.
\end{aligned}$$

Also we can estimate the last term of (3.10)

$$(3.11) \quad u^{2p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla F \leq \frac{1}{2} u^{2p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{2} u^{2p} |\nabla F|^2.$$

Then we estimate the second to last term of (3.10) and obtain:

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \alpha \lambda e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla F \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{2} e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p} |\nabla F|^2 + \frac{\alpha^2 \lambda^2}{2(\alpha - 1)} u^{2p} |\nabla \varphi|^2 e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{2} e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p} |\nabla F|^2 + C_{2.3} \frac{\alpha^2 \lambda^2}{2(\alpha - 1)} u^{2p} e^{(2-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

When estimating $|\nabla \varphi|^2$ above, we used Theorem 2.2, and $C_{2.3}$ is the constant given by that theorem. Plug (3.11), (3.12) back into (3.10), we obtain

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_M e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha \lambda \varphi} u^{2p} \Delta F \, dvol_g \geq \int_M \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{2} - p \right) e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha \lambda \varphi} u^{2p} |\nabla F|^2 \, dvol_g \\ & - \int_M C_{2.3} \frac{\alpha^2 \lambda^2}{2(\alpha - 1)} e^{(2-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p} \, dvol_g - \int_M p e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p-2} |\nabla u|^2 \, dvol_g. \end{aligned}$$

Plug (3.13) back to (3.9), we see

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_M p e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p-2} |\nabla u|^2 \, dvol_g + \int_M \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{2} - p \right) e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha \lambda \varphi} u^{2p} |\nabla F|^2 \, dvol_g \\ & + \int_M e^{-(\alpha - \frac{n-2}{n-1})F - \alpha \lambda \varphi} \left(\frac{\lambda \alpha}{2} - C_{3.1} \right) (n + \Delta \varphi)^{1 + \frac{1}{n-1}} u^{2p} \, dvol_g \\ & \leq \int_M \alpha e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha \lambda \varphi} (\lambda n + \|f\|_0) (n + \Delta \varphi) u^{2p} \, dvol_g + C_{2.3} \frac{\alpha^2 \lambda^2}{2(\alpha - 1)} \int_M e^{(2-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p} \, dvol_g \\ & + \int_M e^{(1-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} R(g) u^{2p} \, dvol_g. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\alpha > 2p + 1$ and $\lambda \alpha \geq 2C_{3.1} + 1$, note that $n + \Delta \varphi \geq n e^{\frac{F}{n}}$ and F has positive lower bound, according to Proposition 2.1, then we find from above:

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_M e^{-(\alpha - \frac{n-2}{n-1})F - \alpha \lambda \varphi} (n + \Delta \varphi)^{1 + \frac{1}{n-1}} u^{2p} \, dvol_g \\ & \leq C_{3.2} \alpha \int_M e^{(1-\alpha)F - \alpha \lambda \varphi} (n + \Delta \varphi) u^{2p} \, dvol_g + C_{3.2} \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha - 1} \int_M e^{(2-\alpha)F - \lambda \alpha \varphi} u^{2p} \, dvol_g. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of u , this means for any $p \geq 0$, $\alpha \geq 2p + 2$:

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_M \exp\left(- (2p + 1)\alpha F + \frac{n-2}{n-1} F - \lambda \alpha (2p + 1)\varphi\right) (n + \Delta \varphi)^{2p+1 + \frac{1}{n-1}} \, dvol_g \\ & \leq C_{3.2} \alpha \int_M \exp\left(- (2p + 1)\alpha F + F - (2p + 1)\alpha \lambda \varphi\right) (n + \Delta \varphi)^{2p+1} \, dvol_g \\ & + C_{3.2} \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha - 1} \int_M \exp\left(- (2p + 1)\alpha F + 2F - (2p + 1)\alpha \lambda \varphi\right) (n + \Delta \varphi)^{2p} \, dvol_g. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for some constant $C_{3.3}$ which depends on $\|\varphi\|_0$, α , and p , we get:

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_M \exp(-(2p+1)\alpha F + \frac{n-2}{n-1}F)(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p+1+\frac{1}{n-1}} dvol_g \\ & \leq C_{3.3} \left(\int_M \exp(-(2p+1)\alpha F + F)(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p+1} dvol_g \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_M \exp(-(2p+1)\alpha F + 2F)(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p} dvol_g \right). \end{aligned}$$

Take $p = 0$, and $\alpha = 2$ in (3.17), one obtains from (3.17) that:

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_M e^{-\frac{n}{n-1}F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{n}{n-1}} dvol_g & \leq C_{3.3} \left(\int_M e^{-F}(n + \Delta\varphi) dvol_g + \int_M dvol_g \right) \\ & \leq C_{3.3} (n \|e^{-F}\|_0 vol(M) + vol(M)). \end{aligned}$$

Since we obtained in Proposition 2.1 a bound for e^{-F} depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$, $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, and curvature bound of g . Hence we get a bound for $\int_M e^{-\frac{n}{n-1}F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{n}{n-1}} dvol_g$.

We now claim that there exists a sequence of pair of positive numbers (p_k, γ_k) where $p_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\int_M e^{-\gamma_k F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p_k+1} dvol_g < \infty$$

for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Now we explain how we choose this sequence of pairs of positive numbers successively: In general, suppose we already choose (p_k, γ_k) such that the preceding inequality holds. Choose α_{k+1} sufficiently large such that

$$\alpha_{k+1} \geq 2p_k + 2, \quad \text{and} \quad -(2p_k + 1)\alpha_{k+1} + 2 \leq -\gamma_k.$$

Set $\alpha = \alpha_{k+1}$, $p = p_k$ in (3.17), we obtain

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_M \exp(-(2p_k+1)\alpha_{k+1}F + \frac{n-2}{n-1}F)(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p_k+1+\frac{1}{n-1}} dvol_g \\ & \leq C_{3.31} \left(\int_M e^{-\gamma_k F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p_k+1} dvol_g + \int_M e^{-\gamma_k F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p_k} dvol_g \right) \\ & \leq C_{3.32} \int_M e^{-\gamma_k F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p_k+1} dvol_g. \end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality above, we again used the fact that $n + \Delta\varphi \geq ne^{\frac{F}{n}}$, and e^F is bounded from below. Set

$$\gamma_{k+1} = (2p_k + 1)\alpha_{k+1} - \frac{n-2}{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{k+1} = p_k + \frac{1}{2(n-1)}.$$

Then

$$\int_M e^{-\gamma_{k+1} F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p_{k+1}+1} dvol_g \leq C \int_M e^{-\gamma_k F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{2p_k+1}.$$

where the constant depends on $\|\varphi\|_0$ and the background metric g . Our claim is then verified.

By induction, we then get a bound for $\int_M e^{-\gamma_p F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^p dvol_g$ for any $p > 0$ and some constant $\gamma_p > 0$. Here γ_p grows like p^2 as $p \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Remark 3.1. *By a more careful inspection of above argument, one sees that it is possible to choose $\gamma_p = \max((p+1)(p+2), np)$, but this is probably not sharp.*

As an immediate consequence, we have the following $W^{2,p}$ estimate of φ in terms of $\|F\|_0$.

Corollary 3.2. *For any $1 < p < \infty$, there exist constants $\tilde{C}(p) > 0$, depending on $\|\varphi\|_0$, $\|F\|_0$, the background metric g , $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$ and p , such that $\|n + \Delta\varphi\|_{L^p} \leq \tilde{C}(p)$.*

4. $C^{1,1}$ BOUND OF THE KÄHLER POTENTIAL IN TERMS OF ITS $W^{2,p}$ BOUND

In this section, we want to prove

Theorem 4.1. *There exists a constant C_4 , depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$, $\|F\|_0$, $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, and the background metric g , such that $n + \Delta\varphi \leq C_4$.*

Note that this theorem is trivial when $n = 1$, since $1 + \Delta\varphi = e^F$ when $n = 1$. Hence we can assume $n \geq 2$ throughout this section. In view of Theorem 2.1, we have the following immediate consequence:

Corollary 4.1. *There exists a constant $C_{4.1}$, depending only on $\|\varphi\|_0$, $\|\nabla\varphi\|_0$, $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$ and the background metric g , such that $n + \Delta\varphi \leq C_{4.1}$.*

With this assumption, we know from Corollary 3.2 that for any $p > 0$, there exists constants C_p , depending on $\|\varphi\|_0$, $\|F\|_0$, and the background metric g , such that

$$(4.1) \quad \|n + \Delta\varphi\|_{L^p(M)} \leq \tilde{C}(p).$$

Hence it suffices to prove the following statement:

Proposition 4.2. *Let (φ, F) be a smooth solution (1.1), (1.2), then there exists $p_n > 0$, depending only on n , such that*

$$(4.2) \quad \max_M |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi + \max_M (n + \Delta\varphi) \leq C_{4.2}.$$

Here C_4 depends only on $\|F\|_0$, $\|n + \Delta\varphi\|_{L^{p_n}(M)}$, and metric g (in the way described in Theorem 4.1).

Remark 4.3. *From the argument below, one can explicitly get an upper bound for*

$$p_n \leq (2n - 2)(4n + 1).$$

This upper bound is probably not sharp.

Proof. Let us first calculate $\Delta_\varphi(|\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2)$ for any smooth function f in M . First we do the calculation under an orthonormal frame g_φ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi |\nabla_\varphi f|^2 &= (f_i f_{\bar{i}})_{,j\bar{j}} \\ &= f_{,ij\bar{j}} f_{\bar{i}} + f_i f_{,\bar{i}j\bar{j}} + |f_{,ij}|_\varphi^2 + |f_{,i\bar{j}}|_\varphi^2 \\ &= f_{,j\bar{i}\bar{j}} f_{\bar{i}} + f_i f_{,j\bar{i}\bar{j}} + |f_{,ij}|_\varphi^2 + |f_{,i\bar{j}}|_\varphi^2 \\ &= (\Delta_\varphi f)_i f_{\bar{i}} + f_i (\Delta_\varphi f)_{\bar{i}} + Ric_{\varphi, i\bar{j}} f_j f_{\bar{i}} + |f_{,ij}|_\varphi^2 + |f_{,i\bar{j}}|_\varphi^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, $f_{,ij\dots}$ denote covariant derivatives under the metric g_φ . Let $B(\lambda) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function, now we calculate $\Delta_\varphi(e^{B(f)} |\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{-B(f)} \cdot \Delta_\varphi(e^{B(f)} |\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2) \\
&= \Delta_\varphi(|\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2) + B'(f_i(|\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2)_{\bar{i}} + f_{\bar{i}}(|\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2)_i) \\
&\quad + ((B'^2 + B'')|\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2 + B'\Delta_\varphi f) |\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2 \\
&= (\Delta_\varphi f)_i f_{\bar{i}} + f_i (\Delta_\varphi f)_{\bar{i}} + Ric_{\varphi, i\bar{j}} f_j f_{\bar{i}} + |f_{,ij}|_\varphi^2 + |f_{,i\bar{j}}|_\varphi^2 \\
(4.3) \quad &+ B'(f_i f_j f_{\bar{j}\bar{i}} + f_i f_{,j\bar{i}} f_{\bar{j}} + f_{\bar{i}} f_j f_{,j\bar{i}} + f_{\bar{i}} f_{,ji} f_{\bar{j}}) \\
&\quad + ((B'^2 + B'')|\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2 + B'\Delta_\varphi f) |\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2 \\
&\geq (\Delta_\varphi f)_i f_{\bar{i}} + f_i (\Delta_\varphi f)_{\bar{i}} + Ric_{\varphi, i\bar{j}} f_j f_{\bar{i}} + |f_{,i\bar{j}}|_\varphi^2 \\
&\quad + B'(f_i f_{,j\bar{i}} f_{\bar{j}} + f_{\bar{i}} f_j f_{,j\bar{i}}) + (B''|\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2 + B'\Delta_\varphi f) |\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In the inequality above, we noticed and dropped the following complete square:

$$B'^2 |\nabla_\varphi f|_\varphi^4 + B' f_i f_j f_{,j\bar{i}} + B' f_{\bar{i}} f_{\bar{j}} f_{,ij} + |f_{,ij}|_\varphi^2 = |f_{,ij} + B' f_i f_j|_\varphi^2.$$

We apply above calculation to F . Notice that

$$Ric_{\varphi, i\bar{j}} = R_{i\bar{j}} - F_{i\bar{j}}.$$

Set $B' = \frac{1}{2}$, and we switch to normal coordinate of g (c.f. (2.1)), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.4) \quad & e^{-\frac{F}{2}} \Delta_\varphi(e^{\frac{F}{2}} |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2) \geq 2 \nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi \Delta_\varphi F + \frac{R_{j\bar{i}} F_i F_{\bar{j}}}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{j\bar{j}})} \\
&\quad + \frac{|F_{i\bar{\alpha}}|^2}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}})} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_\varphi F |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that there will be no more terms like $\frac{F_{j\bar{i}} F_i F_{\bar{j}}}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{j\bar{j}})}$, because the choice $B' \equiv \frac{1}{2}$ makes such terms exactly cancel out. Next we wish to use the equation satisfied by F :

$$\Delta_\varphi F = -f + tr_\varphi \eta.$$

Hence in (4.4), the last term satisfies:

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Delta_\varphi F |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 \geq -\frac{1}{2} (\|f\|_0 + \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0} tr_\varphi g) |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2.$$

Also

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{|R_{j\bar{i}} F_i F_{\bar{j}}|}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{j\bar{j}})} \leq \max_M |Ric(\omega_0)|_{\omega_0} \frac{|F_i F_{\bar{j}}|}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{j\bar{j}})} \leq \max_M |Ric(\omega_0)| |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 tr_\varphi g.$$

Also we observe that

$$(4.7) \quad tr_\varphi g = \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \leq n e^{-F} (n + \Delta_\varphi)^{n-1} \leq C_{4.6} (1 + \Delta_\varphi)^{n-1}.$$

Hence we conclude, after combining (4.4)-(4.7):

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.8) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(e^{\frac{1}{2}F} |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2) \geq 2e^{\frac{1}{2}F} \nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi \Delta_\varphi F - C_{4.7} ((n + \Delta_\varphi)^{n-1} + 1) |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{C_{4.7}} \frac{|F_{i\bar{\alpha}}|^2}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (3.6) and (4.7), we find

$$(4.9) \quad \Delta_\varphi(n + \Delta\varphi) \geq -C_{4.9}(n + \Delta\varphi)^n + \Delta F - C_{4.8}.$$

We combine (4.8), (4.9), and conclude:

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(e^{\frac{1}{2}F}|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 + (n + \Delta\varphi)) &\geq -C_{4.7}((n + \Delta\varphi)^{n-1} + 1)|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 + 2e^{\frac{1}{2}F}\nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi \Delta_\varphi F \\ &+ \frac{1}{C_{4.7}} \frac{|F_{i\bar{\alpha}}|^2}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})(1 + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}})} + \Delta F - C_{4.8} - C_{4.9}(n + \Delta\varphi)^n. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate ΔF , we may calculate:

$$(4.11) \quad |\Delta F| \leq \frac{1}{2C_{4.7}} \frac{|F_{i\bar{i}}|^2}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^2} + \frac{C_{4.7}}{2}(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2C_{4.7}} \frac{|F_{i\bar{i}}|^2}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^2} + \frac{nC_{4.7}}{2}(n + \Delta\varphi)^2.$$

Combining (4.10), (4.11), we conclude that there exists a constant $C_{4.91}$, with the same dependence as said above, such that

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\varphi(e^{\frac{1}{2}F}|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 + (n + \Delta\varphi)) &\geq -C_{4.91}e^{-\frac{1}{2}F}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{n-1}(e^{\frac{1}{2}F}|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 \\ &+ (n + \Delta\varphi)) + 2e^{\frac{1}{2}F}\nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi \Delta_\varphi F - C_{4.91}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$u = e^{\frac{1}{2}F}|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 + (n + \Delta\varphi) + 1,$$

we obtain the key estimate from here:

$$(4.13) \quad \Delta_\varphi u \geq -C_{4.92}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{n-1}u + 2e^{\frac{1}{2}F}\nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi \Delta_\varphi F.$$

Next we plan to do iteration, using (4.13). Notice that for any $p > 0$:

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{1}{2p+1}\Delta_\varphi(u^{2p+1}) = u^{2p}\Delta_\varphi u + 2pu^{2p-1}|\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2.$$

Integrate over M , we obtain:

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_M 2pu^{2p-1}|\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 dvol_\varphi &= \int_M u^{2p}(-\Delta_\varphi u) dvol_\varphi \\ &\leq \int_M C_{4.92}(n + \Delta\varphi)^{n-1}u^{2p+1} dvol_\varphi - 2 \int_M e^{\frac{1}{2}F}\nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi (\Delta_\varphi F)u^{2p} dvol_\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

We need to integrate by parts in the last term above, then we have

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} - \int_M 2e^{\frac{1}{2}F}\nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi (\Delta_\varphi F)u^{2p} dvol_\varphi &= \int_M 4pu^{2p-1}e^{\frac{1}{2}F}\Delta_\varphi F \nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi u dvol_\varphi \\ &+ \int_M 2u^{2p}e^{\frac{1}{2}F}(\Delta_\varphi F)^2 dvol_\varphi + \int_M u^{2p}e^{\frac{1}{2}F}|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 \Delta_\varphi F dvol_\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

We wish to estimate the three terms on the right hand side of (4.16) from above. First,

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_M 4pu^{2p-1}e^{\frac{1}{2}F}\Delta_\varphi F \nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi u dvol_\varphi &\leq \int_M pu^{2p-1}|\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 dvol_\varphi \\ &+ 4 \int_M pu^{2p-1}e^F(\Delta_\varphi F)^2|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 dvol_\varphi \\ &\leq \int_M pu^{2p-1}|\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 dvol_\varphi + 4 \int_M pu^{2p}e^{\frac{1}{2}F}(\Delta_\varphi F)^2 dvol_\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Also it is clear that

$$(4.18) \quad \int_M u^{2p} e^{\frac{1}{2}F} |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 \Delta_\varphi F dvol_\varphi \leq \int_M u^{2p+1} |\Delta_\varphi F| dvol_\varphi.$$

Combining (4.16), (4.17) and (4.18), we see

$$(4.19) \quad - \int_M 2e^{\frac{1}{2}F} \nabla_\varphi F \cdot_\varphi \nabla_\varphi (\Delta_\varphi F) u^{2p} dvol_\varphi \leq \int_M pu^{2p-1} |\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 dvol_\varphi \\ + \int_M (4p+2) u^{2p} e^{\frac{1}{2}F} (\Delta_\varphi F)^2 dvol_\varphi + \int_M u^{2p+1} |\Delta_\varphi F| dvol_\varphi.$$

Combined with (4.15), we obtain

$$(4.20) \quad \int_M pu^{2p-1} |\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 dvol_\varphi \leq \int_M C_{4.93} (n + \Delta\varphi)^{n-1} u^{2p+1} dvol_\varphi \\ + \int_M u^{2p+1} |\Delta_\varphi F| dvol_\varphi + \int_M (4p+2) u^{2p} e^{\frac{1}{2}F} (\Delta_\varphi F)^2 dvol_\varphi.$$

In the above, we can estimate

$$(4.21) \quad |\Delta_\varphi F| \leq |f| + |tr_\varphi \eta| \leq (\|f\|_0 + \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}) (1 + tr_\varphi g) \\ \leq C_{4.935} (1 + ne^{-F} (n + \Delta\varphi)^{n-1}).$$

Recall that $n + \Delta\varphi$ is bounded from below in terms of $\|F\|_0$ and u is bounded below by 1, we obtain from (4.20) that

$$(4.22) \quad \int_M pu^{2p-1} |\nabla_\varphi u|_\varphi^2 dvol_\varphi \leq \int_M C_{4.94} (p+1) (n + \Delta\varphi)^{2n-2} u^{2p+1} dvol_\varphi.$$

Here $C_{4.94}$ depends only on $\|F\|_0$, the background metric (M, g) , $\|f\|_0$, and $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$. Above implies

$$(4.23) \quad \int_M |\nabla_\varphi (u^{p+\frac{1}{2}})|_\varphi^2 dvol_g \leq \frac{C_{4.94} (p + \frac{1}{2})^2 (p+1)}{p} \int_M C_{4.94} (n + \Delta\varphi)^{2n-2} u^{2p+1} dvol_g.$$

Here we used that $dvol_\varphi = e^F dvol_g$ and that F is bounded. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 2$ to be determined, we estimate the right hand side of (4.23):

$$(4.24) \quad \int_M (n + \Delta\varphi)^{2n-2} u^{2p+1} dvol_g \leq \left(\int_M u^{(p+\frac{1}{2})(2+\varepsilon)} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} \left(\int_M (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{(2n-2)(2+\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}}.$$

Denote $v = u^{p+\frac{1}{2}}$, then (4.23) implies

$$(4.25) \quad \int_M |\nabla_\varphi v|_\varphi^2 dvol_g \leq \frac{C_{4.94} (p + \frac{1}{2})^2}{2p} \left(\int_M (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{(2n-2)(2+\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}} \left(\int_M v^{2+\varepsilon} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}}.$$

Next we wish to estimate the left hand side of (4.25) from below:

$$(4.26) \quad |\nabla v|^{2-\varepsilon} \leq \sum_i |v_i|^{2-\varepsilon} = \sum_i \frac{|v_i|^{2-\varepsilon}}{(1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{2}}} \cdot (1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{2}} \\ \leq \left(\sum_i \frac{|v_i|^2}{1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}} \right)^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\sum_i (1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \leq |\nabla_\varphi v|_\varphi^{2-\varepsilon} n^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{2}}.$$

In the last inequality above, we estimated each $1 + \varphi_{i\bar{i}}$ from above by $n + \Delta\varphi$ and there are n terms in \sum_i . Integrate and use Hölder inequality, we get:

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_M |\nabla v|^{2-\varepsilon} dvol_g &\leq n^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \int_M |\nabla_\varphi v|^{2-\varepsilon} (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{2}} dvol_g \\ &\leq n^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\int_M |\nabla_\varphi v|_{\varphi}^2 \right)^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\int_M (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.26) and (4.27), we see:

$$(4.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\int_M |\nabla v|^{2-\varepsilon} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2-\varepsilon}} &\leq n^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}} \left(\int_M (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}} \int_M |\nabla_\varphi v|_{\varphi}^2 dvol_g \\ &\leq C_{4.95} p K_\varepsilon \left(\int_M v^{2+\varepsilon} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$(4.29) \quad K_\varepsilon = n^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}} \cdot \left(\int_M (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}} \cdot \left(\int_M (n + \Delta\varphi)^{\frac{(2n-2)(2+\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}}.$$

Apply the Sobolev embedding with exponent $2 - \varepsilon$, and denote $\theta = \frac{2n(2-\varepsilon)}{2n-2+\varepsilon}$ to be the improved integrability, we get

$$\|v\|_{L^\theta(dvol_g)} \leq C_{sob} (\|\nabla v\|_{L^{2-\varepsilon}(dvol_g)} + \|v\|_{L^{2-\varepsilon}(dvol_g)}).$$

Recall that $v = u^{p+\frac{1}{2}}$, this means:

$$(4.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\int_M u^{(p+\frac{1}{2})\theta} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{\theta}} &\leq C_{sob} \left(\left(\int_M |\nabla(u^{p+\frac{1}{2}})|^{2-\varepsilon} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2-\varepsilon}} + \left(\int_M u^{(p+\frac{1}{2})(2-\varepsilon)} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2-\varepsilon}} \right) \\ &\leq C_{sob} \left(C_{4.95} p K_\varepsilon \left(\int_M u^{(p+\frac{1}{2})(2+\varepsilon)} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} + \left(\int_M u^{(p+\frac{1}{2})(2-\varepsilon)} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2-\varepsilon}} \right) \\ &\leq C_{4.96,\varepsilon} p \left(\int_M u^{(p+\frac{1}{2})(2+\varepsilon)} dvol_g \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C_{4.96,\varepsilon}$ has the same dependence as C_i 's above, but with additional dependence on ε . From the 1st line to 2nd line, we used (4.28). Now choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small so that $\theta > 2 + \varepsilon$, then above estimate indeed improves integrability, namely we need

$$(4.31) \quad \frac{2n(2-\varepsilon)}{2n-2+\varepsilon} > 2 + \varepsilon.$$

We fix ε and (4.30) gives for $p \geq \frac{1}{2}$:

$$(4.32) \quad \|u\|_{L^{(p+\frac{1}{2})\theta}} \leq (C_{4.97} p)^{\frac{1}{2p+1}} \|u\|_{L^{(p+\frac{1}{2})(2+\varepsilon)}}.$$

Denote $\chi = \frac{\theta}{2+\varepsilon} > 1$, and choose $p + \frac{1}{2} = \chi^i$, for $i \geq 0$. Then we obtain:

$$(4.33) \quad \|u\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)\chi^{i+1}}} \leq (C_{4.97} \chi^i)^{\frac{1}{2\chi^i}} \|u\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)\chi^i}}.$$

It follows that

$$(4.34) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{4.97}^{\sum_{i \geq 0} \frac{1}{2\chi^i}} \cdot \chi^{\sum_{i \geq 0} \frac{i}{2\chi^i}} \|u\|_{L^{2+\varepsilon}} \leq C_{4.97}^{\sum_{i \geq 0} \frac{1}{2\chi^i}} \cdot \chi^{\sum_{i \geq 0} \frac{i}{2\chi^i}} \|u\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2+\varepsilon}} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}}.$$

From above we get estimate of $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$ in terms of $\|u\|_{L^1}$. But recall $u = e^{\frac{1}{2}F} |\nabla_\varphi F|^2 + (n + \Delta\varphi) + 1$, so L^1 estimate is available.

Indeed, it is clear that $n + \Delta\varphi \in L^1$. To see $e^{\frac{1}{2}F} |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 \in L^1$, we just need to show $|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 \in L^1$ since F is now assumed to be bounded. Then we can calculate:

$$(4.35) \quad \Delta_\varphi(F^2) = 2|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 + 2F\Delta_\varphi F = 2|\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 + 2F(-f + \text{tr}_\varphi \eta).$$

Integrate with respect to $d\text{vol}_\varphi = e^F d\text{vol}_g$, we see

$$(4.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_M e^F |\nabla_\varphi F|_\varphi^2 d\text{vol}_g &= \int_M e^F F(f - \text{tr}_\varphi \eta) d\text{vol}_g \\ &\leq C_{4.98} \int_M (1 + \text{tr}_\varphi g \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}) d\text{vol}_\varphi \leq C_{4.99} \text{vol}(M). \end{aligned}$$

Here $C_{4.98}, C_{4.99}$ may depend on $\|F\|_0$. To see the range of p_n asserted in the Remark 4.3, we notice the choice of $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2n}$ verifies the requirement in (4.31). With this choice, the highest power of $n + \Delta\varphi$ appearing in (4.29) is exactly $(2n - 2)(4n + 1)$. Once we have control over K_ε , the rest of the proof goes through. \square

Now we give a proof of Proposition 1.2 for completeness

Proof. The proof of this corollary is essentially the combination of several classical elliptic estimates, as we explain below. The assumption that $\frac{1}{C_0}\omega_0 \leq \omega_\varphi \leq C_0\omega_0$ implies (1.2) is now uniformly elliptic with bounded right hand side. Moreover, we see that (1.2) can be put in the divergence form:

$$(4.37) \quad \text{Re}(\partial_i(\det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})g_{\varphi}^{i\bar{j}}F_{\bar{j}})) = (-f + \text{tr}_\varphi \eta) \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} + \varphi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}).$$

From this we immediately know $\|F\|_{\alpha'} \leq C_{0.1}$, where α' and $C_{0.1}$ has the said dependence. Then we go back to (1.1), we can then conclude from Evans-Krylov theorem that $\|\varphi\|_{2,\alpha''} \leq C_{0.2}$ for any $\alpha'' < \alpha'$ (see [19], [38] for details on extension of Evans-Krylov to complex setting). Then we go back to (4.37) and see that the coefficients on the left hand side is in $C^{\alpha''}$, while the right hand side is bounded. Hence we may conclude $\|F\|_{1,\alpha''} \leq C_{0.3}$, from [25], Theorem 8.32.

Then from (1.1), by differentiating both sides of the equation, we see that the first derivatives of φ solves a linear elliptic equation with $C^{\alpha''}$ coefficient and right hand side, hence Schauder estimate applies and we conclude $\varphi \in C^{3,\alpha''}$ ([25], Theorem 6.2). But then we go back to (4.37) one more time, the coefficients are in C^α for any $0 < \alpha < 1$ with bounded right hand side, hence we conclude $F \in C^{1,\alpha}$ for any $0 < \alpha < 1$. Now the equation solved by the first derivatives of φ will have coefficients and right hand side in C^α for any $0 < \alpha < 1$. Therefore $\varphi \in C^{3,\alpha}$ for any $0 < \alpha < 1$.

The second equation (1.2) now has $C^{1,\alpha}$ coefficient with bounded right hand side, then the classical L^p estimate gives $F \in W^{2,p}$ for any finite p ([25], Theorem 9.11). Then differentiating the first equation (1.1) twice, we get a linear elliptic equation in terms of second derivatives of φ , which has C^α coefficients and L^p right hand side (we already have $F \in W^{2,p}$), it follows that $\varphi \in W^{4,p}$. \square

5. ENTROPY BOUND OF THE VOLUME RATIO AND C^0 BOUND OF KÄHLER POTENTIAL

The main goal of this section is to show the C^0 bound of φ implies a bound for $\int_M e^F F d\text{vol}_g$ and vice versa:

Theorem 5.1. *Let (φ, F) be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2), then $\|\varphi\|_0$ and $\|F\|_0$ can be bounded in terms of an upper bound for $\int_M F e^F dvol_g$. Conversely, if ω_φ is a cscK metric, then a bound for $\|\varphi\|_0$ implies an upper bound for $\int_M e^F F dvol_g$.*

The most difficult part of above theorem is to show that an upper bound for $\int_M e^F F dvol_g$ implies a bound on $\|\varphi\|_0$ and $\|F\|_0$, which is the main focus of this section. That $\|\varphi\|_0$ implies a bound for $\int_M e^F F dvol_g$ when ω_φ is a cscK metric essentially follows from the fact that cscK are minimizers of K -energy. In particular, having a bound on $\|\varphi\|_0$ is enough to control $\|F\|_0$, hence estimates up to $C^{1,1}$, thanks to the results obtained in previous sections.

Actually we will see that in order to bound $\|\varphi\|_0, \|F\|_0$, it is enough to have a bound for $\int_M e^F \Phi(F) dvol_g$, where $\Phi(F) > 0$ is coercive in F in the sense that

- (1) $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} e^t \cdot \Phi(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(t) = \infty$
- (2) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi(t)}{t} < \infty$.

We want to show that, under these conditions, an upper bound for $\int_M e^F \Phi(F) dvol_g$ will imply a bound for $\int_M e^{qF} dvol_g$ for any $q < \infty$. This bound can then imply a bound for $\|\varphi\|_0$, due to the deep result by Kolodziej, [29], but an elementary argument which only uses Alexandrov maximum principle (Lemma 5.5) and avoids pluripotential theory is also possible. This argument is due to Blocki (c.f. [3]). From Corollary 5.4, we obtain a bound for $\|e^F\|_0$. We have also shown in Proposition 2.1 that a C^0 bound of φ will imply a lower bound for F . Hence a bound for $\|F\|_0$ can be obtained this way. Then estimates in previous sections can be applied to obtain higher derivatives bound.

Define

$$(5.1) \quad P(M, g) = \left\{ \phi \in C^2(M, \mathbb{R}) : g_{i\bar{j}} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} \geq 0, \sup_M \phi = 0 \right\}.$$

The following result of Tian is well-known, whose proof may be found in [36], Proposition 2.1:

Proposition 5.1. *There exists two positive constant α, C_5 , depending only on (M, g) , such that*

$$(5.2) \quad \int_M e^{-\alpha \phi} dvol_g \leq C_5, \text{ for any } \phi \in P(M, g).$$

Here $\alpha = \alpha(M, [\omega])$ is the so called α -invariant. To start, we normalize φ so that $\sup_M \varphi = 0$. We also need to consider the auxiliary Kähler potential $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, which solves the following problem:

$$(5.3) \quad \det(g_{i\bar{j}} + \psi_{i\bar{j}}) = \frac{e^F \Phi(F) \det(g_{i\bar{j}})}{\int_M e^F \Phi(F) dvol_g},$$

$$(5.4) \quad \sup_M \psi = 0.$$

The existence of such ψ follows from Yau's celebrated theorem on Calabi's volume conjecture (c.f. [39], Theorem 2). Because of Proposition 5.1, we know that

$$\int_M e^{-\alpha \varphi} dvol_g \leq C_5, \quad \int_M e^{-\alpha \psi} dvol_g \leq C_5.$$

We will show that the following estimate holds:

Theorem 5.2. *Given any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exists a constant $C_{5.1}$, depending on ε , the background metric g , $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, the choice of Φ , and the upper bound of $\int_M e^F \Phi(F) dvol_g$, such that*

$$(5.5) \quad F + \varepsilon\psi - 2(1 + \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0})\varphi \leq C_{5.1}.$$

Corollary 5.2. *For any $0 < q < \infty$, there exists a constant $C_{5.2}$, with the same dependence as $C_{5.1}$ above but additionally on q , such that*

$$(5.6) \quad \int_M e^{qF} dvol_g \leq C_{5.2}, \quad \|\varphi\|_0 \leq C_{5.2}, \quad \|\psi\|_0 \leq C_{5.2}.$$

We will show this important corollary first.

Proof. First we derive the estimate for $\int_M e^{qF} dvol_g$ with $q > 1$.

From Theorem 5.2, we know

$$(5.7) \quad -\alpha\psi \geq \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon} (F - 2(1 + \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0})\varphi - C_{5.1}).$$

hence

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} C_5 &\geq \int_M e^{-\alpha\psi} dvol_g \geq \int_M \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon} (F - 2(1 + \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0})\varphi - C_{5.1})\right) dvol_g \\ &\geq \int_M \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon} (F - C_{5.1})\right) dvol_g. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because we normalized φ so that $\varphi \leq 0$. Choose $\varepsilon = \frac{\alpha}{q}$, then we immediately get the desired estimate for $\int_M e^{qF} dvol_g$. The claimed estimate for φ immediately follows from the estimate for $\|e^F\|_{L^q}$ ($q > 2$), given in the lemma below. The bound for ψ follows in a similar way, using (5.3). \square

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\phi \in P(M, g)$ be such that $e^F = \frac{\omega_\phi^n}{\omega_0^n}$ with $e^F \in L^{2+s}(M, \omega_0)$, for some $s > 0$. Then $\|\phi\|_0 \leq C_{5.21}$, with $C_{5.21}$ depending only on the metric ω_0 , $s > 0$ and $\|e^F\|_{L^{2+s}(M, \omega_0)}$.*

Note that this is a weaker result compared to the deep theorem of Kolodziej [29], which shows $e^F \in L^{1+s}(M, \omega_0)$ is already sufficient. However, the weaker result as stated above can be proved in an elementary way using Alexandrov maximum principle, discovered by Blocki [3], [4].

Combining Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.2, we immediately conclude:

Corollary 5.4. *There exists a constant $C_{5.2}$, depending only on the background metric g , the upper bound of $\int_M e^F F dvol_g$, such that*

$$F \leq C_{5.2}.$$

Proof. Choose $\Phi(t) = \sqrt{t^2 + 1}$ and observe that $\int_M e^F \sqrt{F^2 + 1} dvol_g$ is controlled in terms of an upper bound of $\int_M e^F F dvol_g$. Then the result follows from Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.2. \square

Now let's prove Theorem 5.2.

Proof. (of Theorem 5.2) Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ be given and fixed. Let d_0 be chosen so that for any $p \in M$, the geodesic ball $B_{d_0}(p)$ is contained in a single coordinate neighborhood, and under this coordinate, $\frac{1}{2}\delta_{i\bar{j}} \leq g_{i\bar{j}} \leq 2\delta_{i\bar{j}}$. For any $p \in M$, let $\eta_p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a cut-off function such that $\eta_p(p) = 1$, $\eta_p \equiv 1 - \theta$ outside the ball $B_{\frac{d_0}{2}}(p)$, with the estimate $|\nabla\eta_p|^2 \leq \frac{4\theta^2}{d_0^2}$, $|\nabla^2\eta_p| \leq \frac{4\theta}{d_0^2}$. Here $0 < \theta < 1$ is to be determined later. Let $0 < \delta < 1$, $\lambda > 0$ be constants to be determined. Assume the function $e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}$ achieves maximum at $p_0 \in M$. We now compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.9) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\eta_{p_0}) \\
 &= \Delta_\varphi(e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)})\eta_{p_0} + e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\Delta_\varphi(\eta_{p_0}) + e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}2\delta\nabla_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi) \cdot \nabla_\varphi\eta_{p_0} \\
 &= e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\eta_{p_0}(\delta^2|\nabla_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)|_\varphi^2 + \delta\Delta_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)) \\
 &\quad + e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\Delta_\varphi(\eta_{p_0}) + e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}2\delta\nabla_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi) \cdot \nabla_\varphi\eta_{p_0}.
 \end{aligned}$$

First we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.10) \quad & e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\Delta_\varphi\eta_{p_0} \geq -e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}|\nabla^2\eta_{p_0}|tr_\varphi g \\
 & \geq -e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\frac{4\theta}{d_0^2(1-\theta)}\eta_{p_0}tr_\varphi g.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.11) \quad & 2\delta\nabla_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi) \cdot \nabla_\varphi\eta_{p_0} \geq -\delta^2\eta_{p_0}|\nabla_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)|_\varphi^2 - \frac{|\nabla_\varphi\eta_{p_0}|_\varphi^2}{\eta_{p_0}} \\
 & \geq -\delta^2\eta_{p_0}|\nabla_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)|_\varphi^2 - \frac{|\nabla\eta_{p_0}|^2tr_\varphi g}{\eta_{p_0}} \\
 & \geq -\delta^2\eta_{p_0}|\nabla_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)|_\varphi^2 - \frac{4\theta^2tr_\varphi g}{d_0^2(1-\theta)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.12) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi) = -(f+\lambda n) + tr_\varphi\eta + \lambda tr_\varphi g + \varepsilon\Delta_\varphi\psi \\
 & \geq (-f - \lambda n + \varepsilon n A_\Phi^{-\frac{1}{n}}\Phi^{\frac{1}{n}}(F)) + (\lambda - \varepsilon - \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0})tr_\varphi g.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here $A_\Phi = \int_M e^F \Phi(F) dvol_g$. In the above calculation, we noticed that, using (5.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_\varphi\psi &= g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}(g_{i\bar{j}} + \psi_{i\bar{j}}) - tr_\varphi g \geq n(\det(g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}})\det(g_{i\bar{j}} + \psi_{i\bar{j}}))^{\frac{1}{n}} - tr_\varphi g \\
 &= n(e^{-F}e^F\Phi(F)A_\Phi^{-1})^{\frac{1}{n}} - tr_\varphi g.
 \end{aligned}$$

Plug (5.10), (5.11), (5.12) back into (5.9), we see

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.13) \quad & \Delta_\varphi(e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\eta_{p_0}) \geq \delta\eta_{p_0}e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}(f - \lambda n + \varepsilon n A_\Phi^{-\frac{1}{n}}\Phi^{\frac{1}{n}}(F)) \\
 & + e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\left(\delta\eta_{p_0}(\lambda - \varepsilon - \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}) - \frac{4\theta}{d_0^2(1-\theta)}\eta_{p_0} - \frac{4\theta^2}{d_0^2(1-\theta)}\right)tr_\varphi g.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose various constants δ , λ and θ appearing above.

Since $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, first we choose $\lambda = 2(1 + \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0})$. Then we fix λ , and choose δ to be $2n\delta\lambda = \alpha$. We need to make sure the coefficient in front of $tr_\varphi g$ to be positive.

This can be achieved by choosing θ to be sufficiently small. Indeed, with above choice of δ and λ , we may calculate:

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \delta\eta_{p_0}(\lambda - \varepsilon - \max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}) - \frac{4\theta\eta_{p_0}}{d_0^2(1-\theta)} - \frac{4\theta^2}{d_0^2(1-\theta)^2} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta(1-\theta)\lambda - \frac{4\theta\eta_{p_0}}{d_0^2(1-\theta)} - \frac{4\theta^2}{d_0^2(1-\theta)^2} \geq \frac{(1-\theta)\alpha}{4n} - \frac{4\theta}{d_0^2(1-\theta)} - \frac{4\theta^2}{d_0^2(1-\theta)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence if we choose θ small enough, above ≥ 0 . After we made all the choices of δ , λ , θ , we obtain from (5.13) that

$$(5.15) \quad \Delta_\varphi(e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}\eta_{p_0}) \geq \delta\eta_{p_0}e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}(f - \lambda n + \varepsilon n A_\Phi^{-\frac{1}{n}}\Phi^{\frac{1}{n}}(F)).$$

Denote $u = e^{\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)}$. Now we are ready to apply Alexandroff estimate in $B_{d_0}(p_0)$:

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{B_{d_0}(p_0)} u\eta_{p_0} \leq \sup_{\partial B_{d_0}(p_0)} u\eta_{p_0} \\ & + C_n d_0 \left(\int_{B_{d_0}(p_0)} \frac{u^{2n}((f - \lambda n + \varepsilon n A_\Phi^{-\frac{1}{n}}\Phi^{\frac{1}{n}}(F)))^{-2n}}{e^{-2F}} d\text{vol}_g \right)^{\frac{1}{2n}}. \end{aligned}$$

We want to claim the integral appearing on the right hand side is bounded. Indeed, the function been integrated is nonzero only if

$$f - \lambda n + \varepsilon n A_\Phi^{-\frac{1}{n}}\Phi^{\frac{1}{n}}(F) < 0.$$

By the coercivity of Φ , this will imply an upper bound for F , say $F \leq C_{5.3}$, where the constant $C_{5.3}$ depends on ε , the choice of Φ , the integral bound A_Φ , and the background metric g . With this observation, we see

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{d_0}(p_0)} \frac{u^{2n}((f - \lambda n + \varepsilon n A_\Phi^{-\frac{1}{n}}\Phi^{\frac{1}{n}}(F)))^{-2n}}{e^{-2F}} d\text{vol}_g \\ & \leq \int_{B_{d_0}(p_0) \cap \{F \leq C_{5.3}\}} e^{2n\delta(F+\varepsilon\psi-\lambda\varphi)} e^{2F} (|f| + \lambda n)^{2n} d\text{vol}_g \\ & \leq (\|f\|_0 + \lambda n)^{2n} e^{(2n\delta+2)C_{5.3}} \int_{B_{d_0}(p_0)} e^{2n\delta\varepsilon\psi-2n\delta\lambda\varphi} d\text{vol}_g. \end{aligned}$$

But recall $\psi \leq 0$, and $2n\delta\lambda = \alpha$, we know

$$(5.18) \quad \int_{B_{d_0}(p_0)} e^{2n\delta\varepsilon\psi-2n\delta\lambda\varphi} d\text{vol}_g \leq \int_{B_{d_0}(p_0)} e^{-\alpha\varphi} d\text{vol}_g \leq C_{5.4}.$$

Denote $I = (\|f\|_0 + \lambda n)^{2n} e^{(2n\delta+2)C_{5.3}} \int_{B_{d_0}(p_0)} e^{-\alpha\varphi} d\text{vol}_g$. Now we go back to (5.16) and obtain:

$$(5.19) \quad u(p_0) = \sup_M u \leq (1-\theta) \sup_M u + C_n d_0 I^{\frac{1}{2n}}.$$

Here we recall that $\eta_{p_0} \equiv 1 - \theta$ on $\partial B_{d_0}(p_0)$. This implies $\sup_M u \leq \frac{C_n d_0 I^{\frac{1}{2n}}}{\theta}$. \square

Lemma 5.5. Alexandroff maximum principle (c.f. [25], Lemma 9.3)

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain. Suppose $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$. Denote $M = \sup_{\Omega} u - \sup_{\partial\Omega} u$. Define

$$(5.20) \quad \Gamma^-(u, \Omega) = \{x \in \Omega : u(y) \leq u(x) + \nabla u(x) \cdot (y - x), \\ \text{for any } y \in \Omega \text{ and } |\nabla u(x)| \leq \frac{M}{3 \text{diam}\Omega}\}.$$

Then for some dimensional constant $C_d > 0$:

$$M \leq C_d \left(\int_{\Gamma^-(u, \Omega)} \det(-D^2 u) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{d}}.$$

In particular, suppose u satisfies $a_{ij} \partial_{ij} u \geq f$. Here a_{ij} satisfies the ellipticity condition $a_{ij} \xi_i \xi_j \geq 0$. Define $D^* = (\det a_{ij})^{\frac{1}{d}}$. Then the following estimate holds:

$$(5.21) \quad M \leq C'_d \text{diam}\Omega \left\| \frac{f^-}{D^*} \right\|_{L^d(\Omega)}.$$

Here C'_d is another dimensional constant.

Remark 5.6. In this section (Proof of Theorem 5.2 and Lemma 5.3), we apply this estimate with $d = 2n$ to the operator Δ_{φ} . After rewriting Δ_{φ} in terms of real coefficients, one can find $D^* = (\det(g_{\varphi})_{i\bar{j}})^{-\frac{1}{n}} = e^{-\frac{F}{n}} (\det g_{i\bar{j}})^{-\frac{1}{n}}$.

Finally, we want to give a proof to Theorem 5.1.

Proof. It is well known that in a given Kähler class, cscK metrics is global minimizer of the K-energy functional, by the main result of [2]. In particular, it follows that the K energy functional of φ is a priori bounded from above. Recall the decomposition formula for K energy functional E , proved in [10]:

$$(5.22) \quad K(\varphi) = \int_M \log \frac{\omega_{\varphi}^n \omega_{\varphi}^n}{\omega_0^n n!} + J_{-Ric}(\varphi).$$

In the above, J_{-Ric} is defined in terms of its derivative, namely

$$\frac{dJ_{-Ric}}{dt} = \int_M \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} (-tr_{\varphi} Ric + \underline{R}) \frac{\omega_{\varphi}^n}{n!}.$$

It is well known in the literature that J_{-Ric} can be bounded in terms of C^0 norm of the potential function φ . A bound for $\int_M e^F |F| dvol_g$ follows from here.

Now we prove the second part of the theorem. First Corollary 5.4 gives a bound for F from above and Corollary 5.2 gives a bound for $\|\varphi\|_0$. Proposition 2.1 gives a bound for F from below. \square

For future reference, we record the following theorem, which follows from combining Proposition 1.2, Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 5.3. Let φ be a smooth solution to (1.1), (1.2) normalized to be $\sup_M \varphi = 0$, then for any $p < \infty$, there exist a constant $C_{0.5}$, depending only on the background metric (M, g) , $\|f\|_0$, $\max_M |\eta|_{\omega_0}$, p , and the upper bound of $\int_M e^F F dvol_g$ such that $\|\varphi\|_{W^{4,p}} \leq C_{0.5}$, $\|F\|_{W^{2,p}} \leq C_{0.5}$.

6. SOME LOCAL ESTIMATES

In this section, we show some localized version of our previous estimates. Suppose we have a solution φ to (1.1), (1.2) in the unit ball $B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. First we can find a potential ρ to the background metric g , namely

$$\omega_0 = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\rho, \text{ in } B_1(0).$$

Denote $\phi = \varphi + \rho$, $G = F + \log \det g_{i\bar{j}}$, then the equation (1.1), (1.2) can be rewritten as:

$$(6.1) \quad \det \phi_{i\bar{j}} = e^G,$$

$$(6.2) \quad \Delta_\phi G = -f + \text{tr}_\phi \eta.$$

In the above, $\Delta_\phi = \phi^{i\bar{j}}\partial_{i\bar{j}}$. f is a bounded function on B_1 , η is a bounded (1,1) form on B_1 . In the following, we show that if $\Delta\phi \in L^p(B_1(0))$, and $\sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}} \in L^p(B_1(0))$ for p sufficiently large depending only on dimension n , then we have $\frac{1}{C} \leq \phi_{i\bar{j}} \leq C$, for some constant C . More precisely,

Proposition 6.1. *Let ϕ be a smooth pluri-subharmonic solution to (6.1), (6.2) in $B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, such that $\Delta\phi \in L^p(B_1(0))$ and $\sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}} \in L^p(B_1(0))$ for some $p > 3n(n-1)$. Then there exists a constant C_6 , depending only on p , $\|\Delta\phi\|_{L^p(B_1(0))}$, $\|\sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}}\|_{L^p(B_1(0))}$, such that $\frac{1}{C_6} \leq \phi_{i\bar{j}} \leq C_6$, $|\nabla G| \leq C_6$ in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)$.*

By the same argument in (1.2), we have the following corollary:

Corollary 6.2. *Under the assumption of Proposition 6.1, for any $0 < \theta < 1$, we have $\|D^k \phi\|_{0, B_\theta} \leq C(k)$, for any $k \geq 2$. Here $C(k)$ has the same dependence as described in Proposition 6.1 besides dependence on θ and on $\|\phi\|_{0, B_1}$.*

Now we prove Proposition 6.1, using Lemma 6.3 stated and proved later.

Proof. (of Proposition 6.1) First we want to get boundedness of G , using the second equation. We can write the second equation as

$$(6.3) \quad \det(\phi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})\phi^{i\bar{j}}\partial_{i\bar{j}}G = e^G(-f + \text{tr}_\phi \eta).$$

which is equivalent to:

$$(6.4) \quad \text{Re}(\partial_i(\det(\phi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})\phi^{i\bar{j}}\partial_{\bar{j}}G)) = e^G(-f + \text{tr}_\phi \eta).$$

Denote $a_{i\bar{j}} = \det(\phi_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})\phi^{i\bar{j}}$, which is a hermitian matrix, then for some constant $c_n > 0$, we have

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{1}{c_n(\sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}})^{n-1}}I \leq a_{i\bar{j}} \leq c_n(\Delta\phi)^{n-1}I.$$

The left hand side of (6.4) is a real elliptic operator in divergence form, which satisfies an ellipticity condition same as (6.5). We wish to apply Lemma 6.3 to the equation (6.4). Using (6.5), we can take $\lambda = (\Delta\phi + \sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}})^{n-1}$, and $f = e^G G$. In order to apply Lemma 6.3, we need to show $(\Delta\phi)^{n-1}, (\sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}})^{n-1} \in L^p(B_1)$, and $e^G G \in L^{p/2}(B_1)$ for some $p > 3n$. The desired integrability for $\Delta\phi$ and $\sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}}$ is clear from assumption, while for $e^G G$, since $e^G \leq (\Delta\phi)^n$, we just need to make sure $(\Delta\phi)^n \in L^{p'}$ for some $p' > \frac{3n}{2}$. This is again clear from our assumption on $\Delta\phi$. So we can apply Lemma 6.3 to conclude G

is bounded(with the said dependence) on any interior ball of B_1 . In the following we assume G is bounded on B_1 without loss of generality.

The estimate for $\Delta\phi$ is really similar to our calculation in section 4, so we will be suitably brief here.

Choose any point p and we can do a unitary coordinate transform so that $\phi_{i\bar{j}}(p) = \phi_{i\bar{i}}(p)\delta_{ij}$. We can compute

$$(6.6) \quad \Delta_\phi(|\nabla_\phi G|^2) = \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}\phi_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}}|\phi_{i\alpha} - \sum_p \frac{\phi_{i\alpha\bar{p}}G_p}{\phi_{p\bar{p}}}|^2 + \frac{|G_{p\bar{i}}|^2}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}\phi_{p\bar{p}}} - \frac{G_{q\bar{p}}G_pG_{\bar{q}}}{\phi_{p\bar{p}}\phi_{q\bar{q}}}.$$

Here $|\nabla_\phi G|^2 = \phi^{p\bar{q}}G_pG_{\bar{q}}$.

$$(6.7) \quad \Delta_\phi(e^{\frac{1}{2}G}|\nabla_\phi G|^2) = \Delta_\phi(e^{\frac{1}{2}G})|\nabla_\phi G|^2 + e^{\frac{1}{2}G}\Delta_\phi(|\nabla_\phi G|^2) + \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}G}\frac{G_i(|\nabla_\phi G|^2)_{\bar{i}} + G_{\bar{i}}(|\nabla_\phi G|^2)_i}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}}.$$

One can also compute

$$(6.8) \quad \frac{G_i(|\nabla_\phi G|^2)_{\bar{i}}}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}} = \frac{G_iG_p}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}\phi_{p\bar{p}}}(G_{p\bar{i}} - \sum_t \frac{\phi_{t\bar{p}i}G_{\bar{t}}}{\phi_{t\bar{t}}}) + \frac{G_{p\bar{i}}G_{\bar{p}}G_i}{\phi_{p\bar{p}}\phi_{i\bar{i}}}.$$

Combining (6.6), (6.7), (6.8), we obtain

$$(6.9) \quad \Delta_\phi(e^{\frac{1}{2}G}|\nabla_\phi G|^2)e^{-\frac{1}{2}G} = \frac{1}{2}(f - tr_\phi\eta)|\nabla_\phi G|^2 + \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}\phi_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}}|G_{i\alpha} - \sum_p \frac{\phi_{i\alpha\bar{p}}G_p}{\phi_{p\bar{p}}}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\phi_i\phi_\alpha|^2 + \frac{|G_{p\bar{i}}|^2}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}\phi_{p\bar{p}}}.$$

Also we can compute

$$(6.10) \quad \Delta_\phi(\Delta\phi) = \frac{|\phi_{i\bar{j}p}|^2}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}\phi_{j\bar{j}}} + \Delta G.$$

Hence

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\phi(e^{\frac{1}{2}G}|\nabla_\phi G|^2 + \Delta\phi) &\geq \frac{1}{2}(f - tr_\phi\eta)e^{\frac{1}{2}G}|\nabla_\phi G|^2 + \frac{|G_{p\bar{i}}|^2e^{\frac{1}{2}G}}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}\phi_{p\bar{p}}} + \Delta G \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(f - tr_\phi\eta)e^{\frac{1}{2}G}|\nabla_\phi G|^2 + \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}G}G_{i\bar{i}}^2}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}^2} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{G_{i\bar{i}}^2e^{\frac{1}{2}G}}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}^2} - \frac{1}{2}(\Delta\phi)^2e^{-\frac{1}{2}G}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality above, we noticed

$$\Delta G = \sum_i G_{i\bar{i}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\frac{G_{i\bar{i}}^2e^{\frac{1}{2}G}}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}^2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \phi_{i\bar{i}}^2e^{-\frac{1}{2}G} \leq \frac{1}{2}\frac{G_{i\bar{i}}^2e^{\frac{1}{2}G}}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}^2} + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta\phi)^2e^{-\frac{1}{2}G}.$$

Denote $u = e^{\frac{1}{2}G}|\nabla_\phi G|^2 + \Delta\phi$, then we know

$$(6.12) \quad \Delta_\phi(u) \geq -\left(-\frac{1}{2}f - tr_\phi\eta + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\phi e^{-\frac{1}{2}G}\right)u.$$

Denote $f_0 = -\frac{1}{2}f - tr_\phi\eta + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\phi e^{-\frac{1}{2}G}$. Recall that we now already know G is bounded. Our assumption implies $f_0 \in L^p$ for some $p > 3n$. Hence we may invoke Lemma 6.3 to get the desired result. \square

As a direct consequence of above argument, we can now prove Corollary 1.5.

Proof. (of Corollary 1.5) Define $F = \log \det u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}$, first we show that F is a constant. By the assumption, we can take a sequence of $r_s \rightarrow \infty$, and a constant M_0 , such that

$$(6.13) \quad \sup_{s \geq 1} \frac{1}{r_s^{2n}} \int_{B_{r_s}(0)} ((\Delta u)^p + (\sum_k \frac{1}{u_{k\bar{k}}})^p) dV \leq M_0.$$

Define $u_s(z) = \frac{1}{r_s^2} u(r_s z)$. Let $\Delta_s := u_s^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{i\bar{j}}$, the Laplace operator in \mathbb{C}^n defined by the metric $\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_s$. Also we denote $F_s := \log \det \partial_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} u_s$, then $F_s(z) = F(r_s z)$. Hence $\Delta_s F_s = 0$ in $B_1(0)$, and (6.13) implies

$$(6.14) \quad \sup_{s \geq 1} \int_{B_1} ((\Delta u_s)^p + (\sum_k \frac{1}{(u_s)_{k\bar{k}}})^p) dV \leq M_0.$$

Proposition 6.1 shows that there exists a positive constant C_7 , independent of s , such that $\frac{1}{C_7} \leq (u_s)_{i\bar{j}} \leq C_7$ and $|\nabla F_s| \leq C_7$ in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)$. Rescaling back, we find that $|\nabla F| \leq \frac{C_7}{r_s}$ in $B_{\frac{1}{2}r_s}(0)$. Sending $s \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\nabla F \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{C}^n . Namely we have $\det \partial_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} u_s = c$ for some $c > 0$ on B_1 . Then we may use Evans-Krylov theorem to conclude for some $\alpha > 0$

$$\sup_k [\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_s]_{\alpha, B_{\frac{1}{4}}} \leq M_1.$$

In terms of u , this implies

$$r_s^\alpha \frac{|u_{i\bar{j}}(z_1) - u_{i\bar{j}}(z_2)|}{|z_1 - z_2|^\alpha} \leq M_1, \text{ for any } z_1, z_2 \in B_{\frac{r_s}{4}}(0).$$

Letting $s \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $u_{i\bar{j}}(z_1) = u_{i\bar{j}}(z_2)$, for any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. This implies the Levi Hessian of u is constant. \square

The following is a technical lemma which we used in the proof of Proposition 6.1. The way to prove it is the standard Moser's iteration and may have existed in literature but we were not able to find the exactly reference, so we include a proof here.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose $u \geq 0$ satisfies in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$:*

$$\partial_i (a^{ij} \partial_j u) \geq f_0 u + g.$$

Here $\frac{1}{\lambda(x)} \leq a^{ij}(x) \leq \lambda(x)$, with $\lambda(x) \in L^p(B_1)$, $f_0, g \in L^{p/2}(B_1)$ for some $p > \frac{3d}{2}$, then there exists a constant C , depending on p , $\|\lambda\|_{L^p(B_1)}$, $\|f_0\|_{L^{p/2}(B_1)}$, $\|g\|_{L^{p/2}(B_1)}$, such that

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} u \leq C(\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)} + 1).$$

Proof. The proof follows the same argument as the uniformly elliptic case. From the inequality we know that for any $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$, with $\zeta \geq 0$, the following holds:

$$(6.15) \quad \int_{B_1} a^{ij} \partial_j u \partial_i \zeta dx \leq \int_{B_1} f_0 u \zeta + g \zeta dx.$$

Now let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$, define $\bar{u} = u + 1$. Take $\zeta = \eta^2 \bar{u}^\beta$, for some $\beta > 0$. We plug in this ζ and obtain

$$(6.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} \beta a_{ij} \partial_i \bar{u} \partial_j \bar{u} \bar{u}^{\beta-1} \eta^2 &\leq \int -a_{ij} \partial_j u \partial_i \eta \bar{u}^\beta 2\eta + |f_0| \bar{u}^{\beta+1} \eta^2 + |g| \bar{u}^\beta \eta^2 \\ &\leq \int_{B_1} \frac{\beta}{2} a_{ij} \partial_i \bar{u} \partial_j \bar{u} \bar{u}^{\beta-1} \eta^2 + \frac{4}{\beta} a_{ij} \partial_i \eta \partial_j \eta \bar{u}^{\beta+1} + (|f_0| + |g|) \bar{u}^{\beta+1} \eta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Use the ellipticity condition to get:

$$(6.17) \quad \int_{B_1} \frac{\beta}{\lambda} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \bar{u}^{\beta-1} \eta^2 \leq \int_{B_1} \left(\frac{4\lambda}{\beta} |\nabla \eta|^2 + |f_0| \eta^2 + |g| \eta^2 \right) \bar{u}^{\beta+1}.$$

This is equivalent to:

$$(6.18) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}})|^2 \eta^2 \frac{1}{\lambda} \leq \frac{(\beta+1)^2}{\beta^2} \int_{B_1} \lambda |\nabla \eta|^2 \bar{u}^{\beta+1} + \frac{(\beta+1)^2}{4\beta} \int_{B_1} (|f_0| + |g|) \bar{u}^{\beta+1} \eta^2.$$

Next observe

$$|\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta)|^2 \leq 2|\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}})|^2 \eta^2 + 2\bar{u}^{\beta+1} |\nabla \eta|^2.$$

Hence it follows from (6.18) that if $\beta \geq 1$,

$$(6.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} |\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta)|^2 \frac{1}{\lambda} &\leq \int_{B_1} \left(\frac{2\lambda(\beta+1)^2}{\beta^2} + \frac{2}{\lambda} \right) \bar{u}^{\beta+1} |\nabla \eta|^2 + \frac{(\beta+1)^2}{2\beta} \int_{B_1} (|f_0| + |g|) \bar{u}^{\beta+1} \eta^2 \\ &\leq \int_{B_1} 10\lambda \bar{u}^{\beta+1} |\nabla \eta|^2 + 2\beta \int_{B_1} (|f_0| + |g|) \bar{u}^{\beta+1} \eta^2. \end{aligned}$$

We would like to get rid of the λ in the above estimate. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined, then we have, using Hölder inequality with exponent $\frac{2}{2-\varepsilon}$ and $\frac{2}{\varepsilon}$:

$$(6.20) \quad \|\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta)\|_{L^{2-\varepsilon}}^2 \leq \|\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}-1}} \int_{B_1} \frac{1}{\lambda} |\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta)|^2.$$

On the other hand, we estimate the right hand side by Hölder's inequality:

$$(6.21) \quad \int_{B_1} \lambda \bar{u}^{\beta+1} |\nabla \eta|^2 \leq \|\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}-1}} \|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} |\nabla \eta|\|_{L^{\frac{2}{1-\varepsilon}}}^2,$$

$$(6.22) \quad \int_{B_1} (|f_0| + |g|) \bar{u}^{\beta+1} \eta^2 \leq (\|f_0\|_{L^{p/2}} + \|g\|_{L^{p/2}}) \|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}}^2.$$

Therefore,

$$(6.23) \quad \|\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta)\|_{L^{2-\varepsilon}}^2 \leq \|\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}-1}}^{\frac{2-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} \left(10\|\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}-1}} \|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} |\nabla \eta|\|_{L^{\frac{2}{1-\varepsilon}}}^2 + 2\beta(\|f_0\|_{L^{p/2}} + \|g\|_{L^{p/2}}) \|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}}^2 \right).$$

Now we choose $\varepsilon = \frac{2}{p+1}$, then $\frac{2}{\varepsilon} - 1 = p$. With this choice, we have $\frac{2-\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} < \frac{2p}{p-2}$ in the above, then we find for some constant $C_{6.1}$, depending on $\|\lambda\|_{L^p}$, $\|f_0\|_{L^{p/2}}$, $\|g\|_{L^{p/2}}$, such that

$$(6.24) \quad \|\nabla(\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta)\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}}^2 \leq C_{6.1} \left(\|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} |\nabla \eta|\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}}^2 + \beta \|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \eta\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}}^2 \right).$$

Fix $\frac{1}{2} \leq r < R \leq 1$, Denote $r_i = r + 2^{-i}(R-r)$, for $i \geq 0$. Note that $r_0 = R$, and $r_i \rightarrow r$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. We choose the cut-off function η so that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta \equiv 1$ on $B_{r_{i+1}}$, $\text{supp } \eta \subset B_{r_i}$, and $|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{2}{r_i - r_{i+1}} = \frac{2^{i+2}}{R-r}$. Denote θ to be such that $\frac{1}{\theta} = \frac{p+1}{2p} - \frac{1}{d}$. Since $p > \frac{3d}{2}$, it follows that $\theta > \frac{2p}{p-2}$. Then apply the Sobolev inequality to get

$$(6.25) \quad \|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}\|_{L^\theta(B_{r_{i+1}})} \leq \frac{C_{6.2} \sqrt{\beta} 2^{i+2}}{R-r} \|\bar{u}^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(B_{r_i})}.$$

This is equivalent to:

$$(6.26) \quad \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{\theta(\beta+1)}{2}}(B_{r_{i+1}})} \leq \frac{C_{6.2}^{\frac{2}{\beta+1}} \beta^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} 2^{\frac{2(i+2)}{\beta+1}}}{(R-r)^{\frac{2}{\beta+1}}} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}, \frac{\beta+1}{2}}(B_{r_i})}.$$

Now denote $\theta = \chi \cdot \frac{2p}{p-2}$ for some $\chi > 1$, and choose β to be $\frac{\beta+1}{2} = \chi^i$, then we obtain from (6.26):

$$(6.27) \quad \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{2p\chi^{i+1}}{p-2}}(B_{r_{i+1}})} \leq \left(\frac{2C_{6.2}}{R-r}\right)^{\frac{1}{\chi^i}} \chi^{\frac{i}{\chi^i}} 2^{\frac{i+2}{\chi^i}} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{2p\chi^i}{p-2}}(B_{r_i})}, \text{ for } i \geq 0.$$

Iterating this inequality we obtain for any $\frac{1}{2} \leq r < R \leq 1$, and for some constant $C_{6.3}$ independent of r, R ,

$$(6.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} &\leq \frac{C_{6.3}}{(R-r)^{\sum_{i \geq 0} \chi^{-i}}} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(B_R)} = \frac{C_{6.3}}{(R-r)^{\frac{\chi}{\chi-1}}} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(B_R)} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{6.3}}{(R-r)^{\frac{\chi}{\chi-1}}} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{p-2}{2p}}(B_R)} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^{\frac{p+2}{2p}}(B_R)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} + \frac{2^{\frac{p+2}{p-2}} C_{6.3}^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}}{(R-r)^{\frac{2\chi p}{(\chi-1)(p-2)}}} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^1(B_R)}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired conclusion now follows from the following lemma applied to $f(r) = \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)}$, which is a special case of Lemma 4.3 in [26]. \square

Lemma 6.4. *Let $f : [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nonnegative, monotone increasing, such that there exists $M > 0, \alpha > 0$, such that for any $\frac{1}{2} \leq r < R \leq 1$, it holds*

$$f(r) \leq \frac{1}{2} f(R) + \frac{M}{(R-r)^\alpha}.$$

Then for some $C_\alpha > 0$ depending only on α , we have

$$f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \leq C_\alpha M.$$

Next we show that when $n = 2$, for the solution to (6.1) and (6.2), $|\nabla\phi|$ locally bounded implies G is locally bounded from above. More precisely,

Proposition 6.5. *Let ϕ be a smooth solution to (6.1), (6.2) in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $|\nabla\phi|$ is bounded. Then for some constant $C_{6.4}$, we have*

$$(6.29) \quad e^G \leq C_{6.4} \text{ in } B_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Here $C_{6.4}$ depends only on $\|\nabla\phi\|_0, \sup_{B_1} |\eta|, \|f\|_0$.

Proof. Let $0 < \delta < 1, K > 1, \lambda > 0$ to be determined. We will compute $\Delta_\phi(e^{\delta(G+\lambda|z|^2)}(|\nabla\phi|^2 + K))$. As before, for any point $p \in B_1$ we are considering, we can always do a unitary coordinate transform which makes $\phi_{i\bar{j}}(p) = \phi_{i\bar{i}}(p)\delta_{ij}$.

Under this coordinate, we can compute:

$$(6.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_\phi(e^{\delta(G+\lambda|z|^2)}(|\nabla\phi|^2 + K)) &= e^{\delta(G+\lambda|z|^2)} (\delta^2 |\nabla_\phi(G + \lambda|z|^2)|_\phi^2 + \delta f + \lambda \delta \sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}} + \delta \text{tr}_\phi \eta) \\ &\times (|\nabla\phi|^2 + K) + e^{\delta(G-\lambda\phi)} \Delta_\phi(|\nabla\phi|^2) + e^{\delta(G+\lambda|z|^2)} \delta \frac{((G + \lambda|z|^2))_i (|\nabla\phi|^2)_{\bar{i}} + (G + \lambda|z|^2)_{\bar{i}} (|\nabla\phi|^2)_i}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}}. \end{aligned}$$

One repeats the calculation in Theorem 2.1, we can find, with suitably chosen λ , K , and $\delta = \frac{1}{8}$, one can get:

$$(6.31) \quad \Delta_\phi(e^{\delta G}(|\nabla\phi|^2 + K)) \geq \frac{1}{2}e^{\delta G}\Delta\phi - e^{\delta G}C_{6.5}.$$

Here C_9 depends only on $\|f\|_0$, $\sup_{B_1}|\eta|$, $\|\nabla\phi\|_0$. In our setting here, we need to do careful cut-off. Define $\eta(z) = (1 - |z|^2)^{-1}$ for $z \in B_1$. We show that $|\Delta_\phi\eta| \leq C_{6.6}\eta^3 \sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\phi\eta &= \phi^{i\bar{j}}\partial_{i\bar{j}}(\eta) = \phi^{i\bar{j}}\left((1 - |z|^2)^{-2}\delta_{ij} + 2(1 - |z|^2)^{-3}\bar{z}_i z_j\right) \\ &= \phi^{i\bar{j}}\eta^3((1 - |z|^2)\delta_{ij} + 2\bar{z}_i z_j). \end{aligned}$$

From this the claim follows easily. Denote $v = e^{\delta G}(|\nabla\phi|^2 + K)$. Suppose the function $v - \eta$ achieves maximum at $p \in B_1$. There are two possibilities:

Suppose $v(p) - \eta(p) \leq 0$, then we immediately conclude that

$$v(z) \leq \eta(z) \leq \frac{4}{3}, \text{ for any } z \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then we are done.

Suppose otherwise $v(p) - \eta(p) \geq 0$, then we know at p :

$$(6.32) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \Delta_\phi(v - \eta)(p) \geq \frac{1}{2}e^{\delta G}\Delta\phi - e^{\delta G}C_{6.5} - C_{6.6}\eta^3 \sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}e^{\delta G}\Delta\phi - C_{6.6}v^3e^{-G}\Delta\phi - e^{\delta G}C_{6.5} \geq \frac{1}{2}e^{\delta G}\Delta\phi - C_{6.7}e^{-(1-3\delta)G}\Delta\phi - e^{\delta G}C_{6.5}. \end{aligned}$$

In the third inequality above, we used that $\sum_i \frac{1}{\phi_{i\bar{i}}} = e^{-G}\Delta\phi$, which is true only in dimension 2. Also we used that at p , $\eta \leq v$.

Suppose at p , we have $\frac{1}{4}e^{\delta G} \leq C_{6.7}e^{-(1-3\delta)G}$, this immediately gives a bound for e^G , hence v at p . Then we are done.

Suppose otherwise, then we have at p

$$(6.33) \quad 0 \geq e^{\delta G}\frac{1}{4}\Delta\phi - e^{\delta G}C_{6.5} \geq e^{\delta G}\left(\frac{1}{4}e^{\frac{G}{2}} - C_{6.5}\right).$$

Then we also get an estimate for e^G at p . So we are done as well. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Aubin. Equations du type Monge-Ampère sur les variétés kahleriennes compactes. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A 283(1976) 119.
- [2] R.J. Berman, B. Berndtsson: Convexity of the K-energy on the space of Kähler metrics. J. Amer. Math. Soc, 30(2017), no 4, 1165-1196.
- [3] Z. Blocki: On uniform estimate in Calabi-Yau theorem. Sci. China ser. A. vol 48, 244-247, 2005.
- [4] Z. Blocki: On uniform estimate in Calabi-Yau theorem, II. Sci. China Mathematics. vol 54, 1375-1377, 2011.
- [5] E. Calabi. On Kähler manifolds with vanishing canonical class. Algebraic Geometry and Topology, A symposium in honor of S. Lefschetz, 1955, 78-89.
- [6] E. Calabi. Improper affine hyperspheres of convex type and a generalization of a theorem by K. Jörgens. *Michigan Math. J.*, vol 5, issue 2, 105-126, 1958.

- [7] E. Calabi: Extremal Kähler metrics. In *Seminar on Differential Geometry*, volume 16 of 102, pages 259–290. Ann. of Math. Studies, University Press, 1982.
- [8] E. Calabi. Extremal Kähler metrics, II. In *Differential geometry and Complex analysis*, pages 96–114. Springer, 1985.
- [9] X.-X. Chen. Space of Kähler metrics. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 56(2):189–234, 2000.
- [10] X.-X. Chen. On the lower bound of the Mabuchi energy and its application. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 2000, no. 12, 607–623.
- [11] X.-X. Chen. *Space of Kähler metric (III)—Lower bound of the Calabi energy*. Invent. Math. 175 (2009), no. 3, 453–503.
- [12] X.-X. Chen. On the existence of constant scalar curvature Kähler metric: a new perspective Annales Mathématiques du Québec, 42(2018), 169–189.
- [13] X.-X. Chen, L. Li and M. Paun: Approximation of weak geodesics and subharmonicity of Mabuchi energy. arXiv:1409.7896.
- [14] X.-X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun. *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. I: Approximation of metrics with cone singularities..* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 28 (2015), pp. 183–197 (I).
- [15] X.-X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun. *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. II: Limits with cone angle less than 2π .* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 28 (2015), pp. 199–234.
- [16] X.-X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun. *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. III: Limits as cone angle approaches 2π and completion of the main proof.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 28 (2015), pp. 235–278.
- [17] X.X. Chen and W-Y. He. The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Kähler manifolds. Math. Ann. 354 (2012), no. 4, 1583–1600
- [18] X.-X. Chen, M. Paun and Y. Zeng. On deformation of extremal metrics, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.01290>.
- [19] X.-X. Chen and Y. Wang. $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate for Monge-Ampère equations with Hölder continuous right hand side. Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry, 49(2016), no. 2, 195(10).
- [20] R. J. Conlon, F. Rochon. New examples of complete Calabi Yau metrics on $\mathbb{C}^n (n \geq 3)$. Arxiv 1705.08788.
- [21] T. Darvas. Envelopes and Geodesics in Spaces of Kähler Potentials. Preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.7318>.
- [22] T. Darvas. The Mabuchi Geometry of Finite Energy Classes. Preprint, Adv in Math, 285(2015), no. 5, 182–219.
- [23] R. Dervan. Uniform Stability of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics. Preprint, IMRN 2016, no. 15, 4728–4783.
- [24] S. K. Donaldson. Symmetric spaces, Kähler geometry and Hamiltonian dynamics. *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 196*, pages 13–33, 1999. Northern California Symplectic Geometry Seminar.
- [25] David Gilbarg and Neil. S. Trudinger. Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Springer, Classics in Mathematics, vol 224.
- [26] Q. Han and F.H. Lin. Elliptic partial differential equations, second edition, American Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [27] W.Y., He. On the regularity of the complex Monge-Ampère equations. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140 (2012), no. 5, 1719–1727.
- [28] W.Y. He and Y. Zeng Constant scalar curvature equation and the regularity of its weak solution. arXiv:1705.01236.
- [29] Slawomir, Kolodziej. The complex Monge-Ampère equation. Acta Mathematica. 180(1998), no. 1, 69–117.
- [30] C. Li, J. Li and X. Zhang. A $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate of the complex Monge-Ampère equation. arXiv: 1705.08634.
- [31] Y. Li. A new complete Calabi-Yau metric in \mathbb{C}^n . arXiv:1705.07026.
- [32] A. V. Pogorelov. The Drichelet problem for the multidimensional analogue of the Monge-Ampère equation (Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 201 (1971), 790–793.
- [33] J. Ross, R. Thomas. An obstruction to the existence of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics. J. Differential Geom. 72(2006) no. 3, 429–466.
- [34] G. Székelyhidi. Fully nonlinear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds. arXiv: 1501.02762.
- [35] G. Székelyhidi. Degenerations of \mathbb{C}^n and Calabi-Yau metrics; arXiv:1706.00357

- [36] G. Tian. On Kähler-Einstein metrics on certain Kähler manifolds with $C_1(M) > 0$. *Invent. Math.* 89(1987), 225-246.
- [37] G. Tian. Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature. *Invent. Math.* 130 (1997), no. 1, 1–37.
- [38] Y. Wang. A remark on $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity of the complex Monge-Ampère Equation, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.0902>.
- [39] S.-T. Yau. On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation, I^* . *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 31:339–441, 1978.

Xiuxiong Chen

University of Science and Technology of China and Stony Brook University

Jingrui Cheng

University of Wisconsin at Madison.