

STRICTLY LOCALLY CONVEX RADIAL GRAPHS OF PRESCRIBED CURVATURE AND BOUNDARY IN SPACE FORMS

ZHENAN SUI

ABSTRACT. We obtain C^2 a priori estimates for solutions of the nonlinear second-order elliptic equation related to the geometric problem of finding a strictly locally convex hypersurface with prescribed curvature and boundary in a space form. Under the assumption of a strictly locally convex subsolution, we establish existence results by using degree theory arguments.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we stay in $(n+1)$ dimensional space form $N^{n+1}(K)$ ($n \geq 2$) with constant sectional curvature $K = 0, 1$ or -1 , which can be modeled as follows. In Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , fix the origin 0 and let \mathbb{S}^n denote the unit sphere centered at 0 . Choose the spherical coordinates (z, ρ) in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} with $z \in \mathbb{S}^n$. Define the new metric on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} by

$$\bar{g} = d\rho^2 + \phi^2(\rho) \sigma$$

where σ is the standard metric on \mathbb{S}^n induced from \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Then $(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \bar{g})$ is a model of $N^{n+1}(K)$ for $K = 0$ if we choose $\phi(\rho) = \rho$ where $\rho \in [0, \infty)$, for $K = 1$ if $\phi(\rho) = \sin(\rho)$ where $\rho \in [0, \pi/2)$, and for $K = -1$ if $\phi(\rho) = \sinh(\rho)$ where $\rho \in [0, \infty)$, which correspond to the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , the upper hemisphere \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1} and the hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^{n+1} respectively. Let $V = \phi(\rho) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}$ be the conformal Killing field in $N^{n+1}(K)$. It is well known that V is the position vector field in Euclidean space.

Given a disjoint collection $\Gamma = \{\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_m\}$ of closed smooth embedded $(n-1)$ dimensional submanifolds, a smooth symmetric function f of n variables and a smooth positive function ψ defined on $N^{n+1}(K)$, it is a fundamental question in differential geometry to seek a strictly locally convex hypersurface Σ with the prescribed curvature

$$(1.1) \quad f(\kappa[\Sigma]) = \psi(V)$$

and boundary

$$(1.2) \quad \partial\Sigma = \Gamma$$

where $\kappa[\Sigma] = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n)$ denotes the principal curvatures of Σ at V with respect to the outward unit normal ν . We call a hypersurface Σ strictly locally convex if all its principal curvatures $\kappa_i > 0$ everywhere in Σ .

Equation (1.1) arises in various geometric problems. If we do not impose boundary condition (1.2) and consider closed hypersurfaces, there is a vast literature in this direction. When requiring the convexity of the hypersurfaces, the Gauss curvature case was studied by Oliker [22] while the most current breakthrough is

due to Guan-Ren-Wang [17], where the authors studied convex hypersurfaces with prescribed Weingarten curvature in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} for general ψ depending on both V and ν . For starshaped compact hypersurfaces, we refer the readers to [2] for the introductory material, and see Jin-Li [18] for Weingarten curvature in hyperbolic space, [2, 21] for Weingarten curvature in elliptic space, Spruck-Xiao [25] for scalar curvature in space forms for general ψ , Chen-Li-Wang [6] for Weingarten curvature in warped product spaces for general ψ .

For the Dirichlet problem, important examples include the classical Plateau problem concerning the mean curvature as well as the corresponding problem for Gauss curvature (see [3, 13, 11, 12, 14]). The Dirichlet problem in the general setting (1.1)–(1.2) was first studied by Caffarelli-Nirenberg-Spruck [5] for vertical graphs over strictly convex domains in \mathbb{R}^n with constant boundary data. Since then, there have been significant progresses, among which, we mention Guan-Spruck [15] and Trudinger-Wang [30] for general locally convex hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} which may not be graphs, Su [26] for strictly locally convex radial graphs in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} and Cruz [7] for starshaped radial graphs with prescribed Weingarten curvature in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .

As in [15], the curvature function f is assumed to be defined on the open symmetric convex cone $\Gamma_n^+ \equiv \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \lambda_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ satisfying the fundamental structure conditions

$$(1.3) \quad f_i(\lambda) \equiv \frac{\partial f(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_n^+, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

$$(1.4) \quad f \text{ is concave in } \Gamma_n^+$$

$$(1.5) \quad f > 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_n^+, \quad f = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Gamma_n^+$$

In addition, f is assumed to satisfy the technical conditions

$$(1.6) \quad \sum f_i(\lambda) \lambda_i \geq \sigma_0 \quad \text{on } \{\lambda \in \Gamma_n^+ \mid \psi_0 \leq f(\lambda) \leq \psi_1\}$$

for any $\psi_1 > \psi_0 > 0$, where σ_0 is a positive constant depending only on ψ_0 and ψ_1 , and for any $C > 0$ and any compact set $E \subset \Gamma_n^+$ there exists $R = R(E, C) > 0$ such that

$$(1.7) \quad f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n + R) \geq C \quad \forall \lambda \in E$$

Examples satisfying (1.3)–(1.7) include a large family $f = \sum f_l$ where

$$f_l = S_n^{\frac{1}{nN_l}} \prod_{i=1}^{N_l-1} \left(c_i + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_{i,k} S_{n,k}^{\frac{1}{n-k}} \right)^{\frac{1}{N_l}}$$

where $c_i, c_{i,k} \geq 0$ are constants, $c_i + \sum_k c_{i,k} > 0$ for each i , S_k is the k th elementary symmetric function, $S_0 = 1$ and $S_{k,l} = S_k/S_l$ ($0 \leq l < k \leq n$). However, the pure curvature quotient $S_{n,k}^{1/(n-k)}$ does not satisfy (1.7).

In this paper, we are interested in strictly locally convex hypersurfaces embedded in $N^{n+1}(K)$ which can be represented as radial graphs over a domain in \mathbb{S}^n . Assuming Γ to be the boundary of a smooth positive radial graph φ in $N^{n+1}(K)$ defined on a smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n$, we thus have $\Gamma = \{(z, \varphi(z)) \mid z \in \partial\Omega\}$ and look for a smooth strictly locally convex radial graph $\Sigma = \{(z, \rho(z)) \mid z \in \Omega\}$ satisfying the Dirichlet problem

$$(1.8) \quad f(\kappa[\rho]) = \psi(z, \rho) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$(1.9) \quad \rho = \varphi \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega$$

where $\kappa[\rho]$ denotes the principal curvatures of the graph of ρ and we use the same ψ for the smooth positive function on the right hand side. For C^0 estimates, we assume that

$$(1.10) \quad \Omega \text{ does not contain any hemisphere.}$$

We obtain the following C^2 estimates:

Theorem 1.11. *Under assumption (1.3)–(1.7) and (1.10), suppose Γ can span a C^2 positive radial graph $\bar{\rho}$ in $N^{n+1}(K)$ which is strictly locally convex in a neighborhood of Γ . Then for any C^4 strictly locally convex radial graph ρ satisfying (1.8)–(1.9) with $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ in Ω , we have*

$$\|\rho\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C$$

where C depends only on Ω , $\|\psi\|_{C^2}$, $\|\bar{\rho}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|\varphi\|_{C^4(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\inf \psi$, $\inf_{\partial\Omega} \bar{\rho}$ and the convexity of $\bar{\rho}$.

We remark that for C^2 estimates, it is necessary in Theorem 1.11 to assume $\bar{\rho}$ to be strictly locally convex near its boundary. To establish existence results, as in [13, 11, 12, 14, 15, 26], we further require that $\bar{\rho}$ is a strictly locally convex subsolution. Since there are topological obstructions to the existence of strictly locally convex hypersurfaces spanning a given Γ (see [23]), the existence of a subsolution allows the arbitrary geometry of Γ . Using Theorem 1.11, we can prove the following existence results.

Theorem 1.12. *Under assumption (1.3)–(1.7) and (1.10), assume in addition that there exists a smooth strictly locally convex radial graph $\bar{\rho}$ satisfying*

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{aligned} f(\kappa[\bar{\rho}]) &\geq \psi(z, \bar{\rho}) && \text{in } \Omega \\ \bar{\rho} &= \varphi && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists a smooth strictly locally convex radial graph $\Sigma = \{(z, \rho(z)) \mid z \in \Omega\}$ in space form $N^{n+1}(K)$ satisfying the Dirichlet problem (1.8)–(1.9) with $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ and uniformly bounded principal curvatures

$$0 < K_0^{-1} \leq \kappa_i \leq K_0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma.$$

where K_0 is a uniform positive constant depending only on Ω , $\|\psi\|_{C^2}$, $\|\bar{\rho}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|\varphi\|_{C^4(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\inf \psi$, $\inf_{\partial\Omega} \bar{\rho}$ and the convexity of $\bar{\rho}$.

In Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , Theorem 1.12 was proved in [13] for constant Gauss curvature assuming the existence of a strictly locally convex strict subsolution and was extended in [11] for general ψ depending also on the gradient term. These existence results are established via the theory of Monge-Ampère type equations on \mathbb{S}^n . The linearized operators may have nontrivial kernels, which call for extra efforts for the proof of existence since one can not directly use continuity method. In [13], the authors established the existence results for equations with $\partial\psi/\partial u \leq 0$ by monotone iteration approach. In [11] the author rederived C^2 estimates for a wider class of equations which allows the application of degree theory to the proof of existence for general ψ (the proof also need the existence result in [13]). In [12], Guan obtained the existence results for Monge-Ampère equations with general ψ over smooth bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^n by assuming the existence of a subsolution (improving the results in [3] where the authors assumed the strict convexity of

the domain) and stated that the strict subsolution assumption in [13, 11] can be weakened to a subsolution. More recently, Su [26] proved Theorem 1.12 in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} assuming the existence of a strict subsolution, where the author reformulated (1.8) in a form with invertible linearized operator and thus continuity method and degree theory can be directly applied without extra C^2 estimates.

The novelty of this paper lies in: first, it provides a unified approach for C^2 estimates by transformation (see (2.9)). Second, for proving existence by degree theory, it generalizes Su's idea (see [26]) to \mathbb{H}^{n+1} and weakens the strict subsolution assumption. Besides, it creates a new continuity process starting from \mathbb{R}^{n+1} to \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1} and hence the existence in \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1} is proved.

This paper is organized as follows: in section 2, we reformulate equation (1.8) in two different ways: one is used for deriving C^2 boundary estimates in section 3 and the other is for proving existence in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} and \mathbb{H}^{n+1} in section 5. Section 4 is devoted to global C^2 estimates. Section 6 is for existence in \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1} .

2. STRICTLY LOCALLY CONVEX RADIAL GRAPHS IN SPACE FORMS AND REFORMULATIONS OF EQUATION (1.8)

Throughout this paper, we are interested in hypersurface $\Sigma \subset N^{n+1}(K)$ that can be represented as a smooth radial graph over a smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n$, i.e.

$$\Sigma = \{(z, \rho(z)) \mid z \in \Omega\}$$

We note that the range for $\rho = \rho(z)$ is $(0, \rho_U^K)$ where

$$(2.1) \quad \rho_U^K = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } K = 0 \text{ or } -1 \\ \frac{\pi}{2}, & \text{if } K = 1 \end{cases}$$

Following the notations in [25], we introduce the following geometric quantities on Σ . Let ∇' denote the covariant derivatives with respect to some local orthonormal frame e_1, \dots, e_n on \mathbb{S}^n (while ∇ will be reserved for the covariant derivatives with respect to some local orthonormal frame E_1, \dots, E_n on Σ). The induced metric, its inverse, unit outer normal, and second fundamental form on Σ are given respectively by

$$(2.2) \quad g_{ij} = \phi^2 \delta_{ij} + \rho_i \rho_j$$

$$(2.3) \quad g^{ij} = \frac{1}{\phi^2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{\rho_i \rho_j}{\phi^2 + |\nabla' \rho|^2} \right)$$

$$(2.4) \quad \nu = \frac{-\nabla' \rho + \phi^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}}{\sqrt{\phi^4 + \phi^2 |\nabla' \rho|^2}}$$

$$(2.5) \quad h_{ij} = \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + |\nabla' \rho|^2}} \left(-\nabla'_{ij} \rho + \frac{2\phi'}{\phi} \rho_i \rho_j + \phi \phi' \delta_{ij} \right)$$

where $\rho_i = \rho_{e_i} = \nabla'_{e_i} \rho = \nabla'_i \rho$, $\rho_{ij} = \nabla'_{e_j} \nabla'_{e_i} \rho = \nabla'_{e_j e_i} \rho = \nabla'_{ji} \rho = \nabla'_{ij} \rho$, and higher order covariant derivatives are interpreted in this manner. We thus have $\nabla' \rho = \rho_k e_k$ (while in Section 4, ρ_i may denote $\nabla_{E_i} \rho$, which is the covariant derivative with respect to E_1, \dots, E_n).

The principal curvatures $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n$ of the radial graph ρ are the eigenvalues of the real symmetric matrix $\{a_{ij}\}$:

$$a_{ij} = \gamma^{ik} h_{kl} \gamma^{lj}$$

with $\{\gamma^{ik}\}$ and its inverse $\{\gamma_{ik}\}$ given respectively by

$$(2.6) \quad \gamma^{ik} = \frac{1}{\phi} \left(\delta_{ik} - \frac{\rho_i \rho_k}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + |\nabla' \rho|^2} (\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 + |\nabla' \rho|^2})} \right)$$

$$(2.7) \quad \gamma_{ik} = \phi \delta_{ik} + \frac{\rho_i \rho_k}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 + |\nabla' \rho|^2}}$$

Note that $\{\gamma_{ik}\}$ is the square root of the metric, i.e., $\gamma_{ik} \gamma_{kj} = g_{ij}$.

Definition 2.8. A hypersurface Σ is strictly locally convex if its principal curvatures are all positive, i.e. $\kappa_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ everywhere on Σ ; or, equivalently, the symmetric matrix $\{a_{ij}\}$ (or $\{h_{ij}\}$) is positive definite everywhere in Ω .

A C^2 function ρ is strictly locally convex if the hypersurface Σ represented by ρ is strictly locally convex.

For simplicity, throughout this paper $a_{ij} > 0$ (or ≥ 0) means that the symmetric matrix $\{a_{ij}\}$ is positive definite (or positive semi-definite); and $a_{ij} \geq b_{ij}$ means that the symmetric matrices $\{a_{ij}\}$ and $\{b_{ij}\}$ satisfy $a_{ij} - b_{ij} \geq 0$. Now we will transform ρ into other variables for deriving a priori estimates and proving the existence.

2.1. Reformulation for deriving a priori estimates.

We do the following transformation

$$(2.9) \quad \rho = \zeta(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{u}, & \text{if } K = 0 \\ \operatorname{arccot} u, & \text{if } K = 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{u+1}{u-1} \right), & \text{if } K = -1 \end{cases}$$

In view of (2.1), the range for u is (u_L^K, ∞) with

$$(2.10) \quad u_L^K = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } K = 0 \text{ or } 1 \\ 1, & \text{if } K = -1 \end{cases}$$

Then the formula (2.2), (2.3), (2.6), (2.7) and (2.5) can be expressed as

$$(2.11) \quad g_{ij} = \phi^2 \delta_{ij} + \zeta'^2(u) u_i u_j$$

$$(2.12) \quad g^{ij} = \frac{1}{\phi^2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{\zeta'^2(u) u_i u_j}{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2} \right)$$

$$(2.13) \quad \gamma^{ik} = \frac{1}{\phi} \left(\delta_{ik} - \frac{\zeta'^2(u) u_i u_k}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2} (\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2})} \right)$$

$$(2.14) \quad \gamma_{ik} = \phi \delta_{ik} + \frac{\zeta'^2(u) u_i u_k}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2}}$$

$$(2.15) \quad h_{ij} = \frac{-\zeta'(u)\phi}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} (\nabla'_{ij} u + u \delta_{ij})$$

Hence

$$(2.16) \quad a_{ij} = \frac{-\zeta'(u)\phi}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} \gamma^{ik} (\nabla'_{kl} u + u \delta_{kl}) \gamma^{lj}$$

It is easy to see that Σ (or u) is strictly locally convex if and only if

$$(2.17) \quad \nabla'_{ij} u + u \delta_{ij} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

Under transformation (2.9), the Dirichlet problem (1.8)-(1.9) is equivalent to

$$(2.18) \quad f(\kappa[u]) = \psi(z, u) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$(2.19) \quad u = \varphi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

Here we still use ψ for the function on the right hand side, and φ for the boundary value. Denote $\kappa[u] = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n) = \lambda(A[u])$ where $\lambda(A)$ denotes the eigenvalues of A and $A[u] = \{a_{ij}\}$ with a_{ij} given by (2.16). Define the function F by $F(A) = f(\lambda(A))$ and the function G by

$$G(r, p, u) = F(A(r, p, u))$$

where $A(r, p, u)$ is obtained from $A[u]$ with $(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u)$ replaced by (r, p, u) . Therefore equation (2.18) can be rewritten in the following form

$$(2.20) \quad G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u) = \psi(z, u) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} F^{ij}(A) &= \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{ij}}(A), \quad F^{ij,kl}(A) = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial a_{ij} \partial a_{kl}}(A) \\ G^{ij}(r, p, u) &= \frac{\partial G}{\partial r_{ij}}(r, p, u), \quad G^i(r, p, u) = \frac{\partial G}{\partial p_i}(r, p, u), \quad G_u(r, p, u) = \frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(r, p, u) \\ \psi_u(z, u) &= \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial u}(z, u) \end{aligned}$$

As mentioned in [15], the function F possesses the following properties. First, the matrix $\{F^{ij}(A)\}$ is symmetric with eigenvalues f_1, \dots, f_n . By (1.3), $F^{ij}(A) > 0$ whenever $\lambda(A) \in \Gamma_n^+$, and by (1.4) we know that F is a concave function of A , i.e., the symmetric matrix $F^{ij,kl}(A) \leq 0$ whenever $\lambda(A) \in \Gamma_n^+$. The function G satisfies similar structure conditions as F . In fact, from (2.16) we have

$$(2.21) \quad G^{ij} = \frac{\partial G}{\partial u_{ij}} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{kl}} \frac{\partial a_{kl}}{\partial u_{ij}} = \frac{-\phi \zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2}} F^{kl} \gamma^{ik} \gamma^{jl}$$

Thus the symmetric matrix $G^{ij} > 0$ if and only if $F^{ij} > 0$, which in particular implies that equation (2.20) is elliptic for strictly locally convex solutions. Also by (2.16) we can calculate

$$\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial u_{ij} \partial u_{kl}} = \frac{\partial a_{pq}}{\partial u_{ij}} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial a_{pq} \partial a_{rs}} \frac{\partial a_{rs}}{\partial u_{kl}}$$

which implies that G is concave with respect to $\{u_{ij}\}$ for strictly locally convex u .

We next compute G^s and G_u , which will be needed in section 3.

Lemma 2.22. Denote $w = \sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u)|\nabla' u|^2}$. Then

$$(2.23) \quad G^s = -\frac{2\zeta'^2(w\gamma^{is}u_q + \phi\gamma^{qs}u_i)}{w(\phi + w)}F^{ij}a_{qj} - \frac{\zeta'^2u_s}{w^2}F^{ij}a_{ij}$$

$$(2.24) \quad G_u = -2\left(\phi\phi'\zeta'g^{iq} + \frac{\zeta'\zeta''u_iu_q}{w^2}\right)F^{ij}a_{qj} + \left(\frac{\phi'\zeta'}{\phi} - \frac{\phi\phi'\zeta'}{w^2} + \frac{\phi^2\zeta''}{\zeta'w^2}\right)F^{ij}a_{ij} - \frac{\phi\zeta'}{w}F^{ij}g^{ij}$$

Proof. We first prove (2.23). Note that

$$(2.25) \quad G^s = \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{ij}} \frac{\partial a_{ij}}{\partial u_s} = F^{ij} \left(2 \frac{\partial \gamma^{ik}}{\partial u_s} h_{kl} \gamma^{lj} + \gamma^{ik} \frac{\partial h_{kl}}{\partial u_s} \gamma^{lj} \right)$$

where

$$(2.26) \quad \frac{\partial \gamma^{ik}}{\partial u_s} = -\gamma^{ip} \frac{\partial \gamma_{pq}}{\partial u_s} \gamma^{qk}$$

Direct calculations from (2.14) and (2.13) yield

$$(2.27) \quad \frac{\partial \gamma_{pq}}{\partial u_s} = \frac{\zeta'^2(u)(\delta_{ps}u_q + \delta_{qs}u_p)}{\phi + w} - \frac{\zeta'^4(u)u_pu_qu_s}{(\phi + w)^2w} = \frac{\zeta'^2(u)(\delta_{ps}u_q + \phi u_p\gamma^{qs})}{\phi + w}$$

and

$$(2.28) \quad \gamma^{ip}u_p = \frac{u_i}{w}$$

Besides, from (2.15) and (2.16) we have

$$(2.29) \quad \gamma^{ik} \frac{\partial h_{kl}}{\partial u_s} \gamma^{lj} = -\frac{\zeta'^2(u)u_s}{w^2}a_{ij}$$

Taking (2.26)–(2.29) into (2.25), the formula (2.23) is proved.

The formula (2.24) can be proved similarly. In fact,

$$(2.30) \quad G_u = \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{ij}} \frac{\partial a_{ij}}{\partial u} = F^{ij} \left(2 \frac{\partial \gamma^{ik}}{\partial u} h_{kl} \gamma^{lj} + \gamma^{ik} \frac{\partial h_{kl}}{\partial u} \gamma^{lj} \right)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial \gamma^{ik}}{\partial u} = -\gamma^{ip} \frac{\partial \gamma_{pq}}{\partial u} \gamma^{qk}$$

From (2.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \gamma_{ik}}{\partial u} &= \phi'\zeta'\delta_{ik} + \frac{2\zeta'\zeta''u_iu_k}{\phi + w} - \frac{\zeta'^2(u)u_iu_k}{(\phi + w)^2} \left(\phi'\zeta'(u) + \frac{\phi\phi'\zeta' + \zeta'\zeta''|\nabla'u|^2}{w} \right) \\ &= \phi'\zeta'\delta_{ik} + \frac{\zeta'u_iu_k}{\phi + w} \left(2\zeta'' - \frac{\zeta'}{\phi + w} \left(\phi'\zeta' + \frac{\phi\phi'\zeta' + \zeta'\zeta''|\nabla'u|^2}{w} \right) \right) \\ &= \phi'\zeta'\delta_{ik} + \frac{\zeta'u_iu_k}{\phi + w} \left(2\zeta'' - \frac{\zeta'^2\zeta''|\nabla'u|^2}{(\phi + w)w} - \frac{\phi'\zeta'^2}{w} \right) \\ &= \phi'\zeta'\delta_{ik} + \frac{\zeta'u_iu_k}{\phi + w} \left(\frac{w + \phi}{w}\zeta'' - \frac{\phi'\zeta'^2}{w} \right) \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.13), the above formula becomes

$$(2.31) \quad \frac{\partial \gamma_{ik}}{\partial u} = \phi\phi'\zeta'\gamma^{ik} + \frac{\zeta'\zeta''u_iu_k}{w}$$

Direct calculation from (2.15) yields

$$(2.32) \quad \frac{\partial h_{ij}}{\partial u} = \left(-\frac{\phi' \zeta'^2}{w} + \frac{\phi^2 \phi' \zeta'^2}{w^3} - \frac{\phi^3 \zeta''}{w^3}\right)(\nabla'_{ij} u + u \delta_{ij}) - \frac{\phi \zeta'}{w} \delta_{ij}$$

Inserting (2.31) and (2.32) into (2.30) and in view of (2.16) and (2.28) we obtain (2.24). \square

Corollary 2.33. *Suppose that we have the C^1 bounds for strictly locally convex solutions u of (2.18):*

$$u_L^K < C_0^{-1} \leq u \leq C_0, \quad |\nabla' u| \leq C_1 \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}$$

Then

$$|G^s| \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad |G_u| \leq C(1 + \sum G^{ii})$$

Proof. Note that $\{F^{ij}(A)\}$ and A can be diagonalized simultaneously by an orthonormal transformation. Consequently, the eigenvalues of the matrix $\{F^{ij}(A)\}A$, which is not necessarily symmetric, are given by

$$\lambda(\{F^{ij}(A)\}A) = (f_1 \kappa_1, \dots, f_n \kappa_n)$$

In particular we have

$$F^{ij} a_{ij} = \sum f_i \kappa_i$$

In addition, for a bounded matrix $B = \{b_{ij}\}$, i.e. $|b_{ij}| \leq C$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ we have

$$|b_{ik} F^{ij} a_{kj}| \leq C \sum f_i \kappa_i$$

Thus from (2.23) and (2.24) we have

$$|G^s| \leq C \sum f_i \kappa_i \quad \text{and} \quad |G_u| \leq C(\sum f_i \kappa_i + \sum f_i)$$

Finally, by the concavity of f and $f(0) = 0$ we can derive that $\sum f_i \kappa_i \leq \psi \leq C$. Also, in view of (2.21) we have $\sum f_i \leq C \sum G^{ii}$. Hence the corollary is proved. \square

2.2. Reformulation for proving existence.

For the proof of the existence in Section 5, we do the following transformation.

$$(2.34) \quad u = \eta(v) = \begin{cases} e^v, & \text{if } K = 0 \\ \sinh v, & \text{if } K = 1 \\ \cosh v, & \text{if } K = -1 \end{cases}$$

In view of (2.10), the range for v is (v_L^K, ∞) with

$$(2.35) \quad v_L^K = \begin{cases} -\infty, & \text{if } K = 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } K = 1 \text{ or } -1 \end{cases}$$

The formula (2.13) and (2.15) can consequently be transformed into

$$(2.36) \quad \gamma^{ik} = \eta'(v) \left(\delta_{ik} - \frac{v_i v_k}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla' v|^2} (1 + \sqrt{1 + |\nabla' v|^2})} \right)$$

$$(2.37) \quad h_{ij} = \frac{1}{\eta'^2(v) \sqrt{1 + |\nabla' v|^2}} \left(\eta'(v) \nabla'_{ij} v + \eta(v) v_i v_j + \eta(v) \delta_{ij} \right)$$

Denoting

$$w = \sqrt{1 + |\nabla' v|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\gamma}^{ik} = \delta_{ik} - \frac{v_i v_k}{w(1+w)}$$

we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} (2.38) \quad a_{ij} &= \frac{1}{w} \tilde{\gamma}^{ik} \left(\eta'(v) \nabla'_{kl} v + \eta(v) v_k v_l + \eta(v) \delta_{kl} \right) \tilde{\gamma}^{lj} \\ &= \frac{1}{w} \left(\eta(v) \delta_{ij} + \eta'(v) \tilde{\gamma}^{ik} \nabla'_{kl} v \tilde{\gamma}^{lj} \right) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that Σ (or v) is strictly locally convex if and only if

$$(2.39) \quad \eta(v) \delta_{ij} + \eta'(v) \tilde{\gamma}^{ik} \nabla'_{kl} v \tilde{\gamma}^{lj} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

Under transformation (2.34), we now reformulate (2.18)–(2.19) in terms of v ,

$$(2.40) \quad f(\kappa[v]) = \psi(z, v) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$(2.41) \quad v = \varphi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

Here we still use ψ for the right function and φ for the boundary value. At this time, $\kappa[v] = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n) = \lambda(A[v])$ and $A[v] = \{a_{ij}\}$ with a_{ij} given by (2.38). Replacing $(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v)$ in $A[v]$ by (r, p, v) we can define $A(r, p, v)$. Then we can define \mathcal{G} by $\mathcal{G}(r, p, v) = F(A(r, p, v))$. Thus, equation (2.40) can be rewritten as

$$(2.42) \quad \mathcal{G}(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v) = \psi(z, v) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{G}^{ij}(r, p, v) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial r_{ij}}(r, p, v), \quad \mathcal{G}^i(r, p, v) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial p_i}(r, p, v), \quad \mathcal{G}_v(r, p, v) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial v}(r, p, v)$$

By (2.38), we notice that equation (2.42) is elliptic for strictly locally convex v , and \mathcal{G} is concave with respect to $\nabla'^2 v$ for strictly locally convex v .

3. SECOND ORDER BOUNDARY ESTIMATES

In this section, we derive the C^2 a priori estimates for strictly locally convex solutions u to the Dirichlet problem (2.20)–(2.19) with $u \geq \underline{u}$ in Ω

$$(3.1) \quad \|u\|_{C^2(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C$$

which, together with $u \geq C_0^{-1} > u_L^K$, implies an upper bound for all the principal curvatures by (2.16). By assumption (1.5), the principal curvatures admit a uniform positive lower bound, i.e.,

$$(3.2) \quad 0 < K_0^{-1} \leq \kappa_i \leq K_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

which implies the uniform ellipticity of the linearized operator. Then $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates can be established by Evans-Krylov theory [8, 19]

$$(3.3) \quad \|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C$$

and higher-order regularity follows from classical Schauder theory.

The following C^1 estimates have been established in [13] which was originally stated for \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , but it also works in space forms.

Lemma 3.4. *Under assumption (1.10), for any strictly locally convex function u with $u \geq \underline{u}$ in Ω and $u = \underline{u}$ on $\partial\Omega$ we have*

$$(3.5) \quad u_L^K < C_0^{-1} \leq u \leq C_0, \quad |\nabla' u| \leq C_1 \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}$$

where C_0 depends only on Ω , $\sup_{\partial\Omega} \underline{u}$ and $\inf_{\Omega} \underline{u}$; C_1 depends in addition on $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla' \underline{u}|$.

In next section, we will derive global curvature estimates, which is equivalent to the global estimates for $|\nabla'^2 u|$ on $\overline{\Omega}$ from its bound on $\partial\Omega$. Therefore in this section we focus on the boundary estimates:

$$(3.6) \quad |\nabla'^2 u| \leq C \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

Consider any fixed point $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$. Choose a local orthonormal frame field e_1, \dots, e_n around z_0 on Ω , which is obtained by parallel translation of a local orthonormal frame field on $\partial\Omega$ and the interior, unit, normal vector field to $\partial\Omega$, along the geodesics perpendicular to $\partial\Omega$ on Ω . Assume that e_n is the parallel translation of the unit normal field on $\partial\Omega$.

Since $u = \varphi$ on $\partial\Omega$,

$$\nabla'_{\alpha\beta}(u - \varphi) = -\nabla'_n(u - \varphi) \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^n, \quad \alpha, \beta < n \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

where Γ_{ij}^k are the Christoffel symbols of ∇' with respect to the frame e_1, \dots, e_n on \mathbb{S}^n . We thus obtain

$$(3.7) \quad |\nabla'_{\alpha\beta} u(z_0)| \leq C, \quad \alpha, \beta < n$$

Let $\rho(z)$ and $d(z)$ denote the distances from $z \in \overline{\Omega}$ to z_0 and $\partial\Omega$ on \mathbb{S}^n , respectively. Set

$$\Omega_\delta = \{z \in \Omega : \rho(z) < \delta\}$$

Choose $\delta_0 > 0$ sufficiently small such that ρ and d are smooth in Ω_{δ_0} , on which, we have

$$|\nabla' d| = 1, \quad -C I \leq \nabla'^2 d \leq C I, \quad |\nabla' \rho| = 1, \quad I \leq \nabla'^2 \rho^2 \leq 3I$$

where C depends only on δ_0 and the geometric quantities of $\partial\Omega$, and

$$\nabla'^2 \underline{u} + \underline{u} I \geq 4c_0 I$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$ in view of the strict local convexity of \underline{u} and (2.17).

We will need the following barrier function

$$\Psi = Av + B\rho^2$$

with

$$v = u - \underline{u} + \epsilon d - \frac{N}{2} d^2$$

and the linearized operator associated with equation (2.20)

$$(3.8) \quad L = G^{ij} \nabla'_{ij} + G^i \nabla'_i$$

to estimate the mixed tangential normal and pure normal second derivatives at z_0 . By direct calculation and Corollary 2.33 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.9) \quad Lv &= (G^{ij} \nabla'_{ij} + G^i \nabla'_i)(u - \underline{u} + \epsilon d - \frac{N}{2} d^2) \\
 &= G^{ij} \nabla'_{ij} (u - \underline{u} - \frac{N}{2} d^2) + \epsilon G^{ij} \nabla'_{ij} d + G^i \nabla'_i (u - \underline{u} + \epsilon d - \frac{N}{2} d^2) \\
 &\leq G^{ij} \left(\nabla'_{ij} u - \left(\nabla'_{ij} (\underline{u} + \frac{N}{2} d^2) - 2c_0 \delta_{ij} \right) \right) \\
 &\quad - 2c_0 \sum G^{ii} + C\epsilon \sum G^{ii} + C(1 + \epsilon + N\delta)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u)$ is concave with respect to $\nabla'^2 u$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.10) \quad &G^{ij} \left(\nabla'_{ij} u - \left(\nabla'_{ij} (\underline{u} + \frac{N}{2} d^2) - 2c_0 \delta_{ij} \right) \right) \\
 &\leq G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u) - G\left(\nabla'^2 (\underline{u} + \frac{N}{2} d^2) - 2c_0 I, \nabla' u, u\right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\nabla'^2 (\underline{u} + \frac{N}{2} d^2) - 2c_0 I + uI \\
 &= \nabla'^2 \underline{u} + \underline{u} I + Nd \nabla'^2 d + N \nabla' d \otimes \nabla' d - 2c_0 I + (u - \underline{u}) I \\
 &\geq 2c_0 I - CN\delta I + N \nabla' d \otimes \nabla' d := \mathcal{H}
 \end{aligned}$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.11) \quad &G\left(\nabla'^2 (\underline{u} + \frac{N}{2} d^2) - 2c_0 I, \nabla' u, u\right) \\
 &= F\left(\frac{-\phi \zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} g^{-1/2} (\nabla'^2 (\underline{u} + \frac{N}{2} d^2) - 2c_0 I + uI) g^{-1/2}\right) \\
 &\geq F\left(\frac{-\phi \zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} g^{-1/2} \mathcal{H} g^{-1/2}\right) \\
 &= F\left(\frac{-\phi \zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} \mathcal{H}^{1/2} g^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{1/2}\right) \\
 &\geq F\left(\frac{-\phi \zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} \mathcal{H}^{1/2} \frac{1}{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2} I \mathcal{H}^{1/2}\right) \\
 &= F\left(\frac{-\phi \zeta'(u)}{(\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2)^{3/2}} \mathcal{H}\right) \geq F(\tilde{c} \mathcal{H})
 \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{c} is a positive constant depending only on C_0 and C_1 .

Combining (3.9)–(3.11) we have

$$(3.12) \quad Lv \leq -F(\tilde{c} \mathcal{H}) + (C\epsilon - 2c_0) \sum G^{ii} + C(1 + \epsilon + N\delta)$$

where $\mathcal{H} = \text{diag}(2c_0 - CN\delta, \dots, 2c_0 - CN\delta, 2c_0 - CN\delta + N)$. By (1.7), we can choose N sufficiently large and ϵ, δ sufficiently small with δ depending on N such that

$$C\epsilon \leq c_0, \quad CN\delta \leq c_0, \quad -F(\tilde{c} \mathcal{H}) + C + 2c_0 \leq -1,$$

Therefore, (3.12) becomes

$$(3.13) \quad Lv \leq -c_0 \sum G^{ii} - 1$$

We then choose $\delta \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{N}$ such that

$$v \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\delta$$

A direct consequence of (3.13) is

$$(3.14) \quad L\Psi = ALv + BL(\rho^2) \leq A(-c_0 \sum G^{ii} - 1) + BC(1 + \sum G^{ii}) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\delta$$

which will be used later. Besides, we also need to estimate $L(\nabla'_k u)$. For this, we first apply the formula

$$\nabla'_{ij}(\nabla'_k u) = \nabla'_k \nabla'_{ij} u + \Gamma_{ik}^l \nabla'_{jl} u + \Gamma_{jk}^l \nabla'_{il} u + \nabla'_k \Gamma_{ij}^l u_l$$

to obtain

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} L(\nabla'_k u) &= G^{ij} \nabla'_{ij}(\nabla'_k u) + G^i \nabla'_i(\nabla'_k u) \\ &= (G^{ij} \nabla'_k \nabla'_{ij} u + G^i \nabla'_{ki} u) + G^{ij} \Gamma_{ik}^l \nabla'_{jl} u + G^{ij} \Gamma_{jk}^l \nabla'_{il} u \\ &\quad + G^{ij} \nabla'_k \Gamma_{ij}^l u_l + G^i \Gamma_{ik}^l u_l \end{aligned}$$

By (2.21) and (2.16) we have

$$G^{ij} \Gamma_{ik}^l (\nabla'_{jl} u + u \delta_{jl}) = F^{st} \gamma^{is} \gamma^{jt} \Gamma_{ik}^l \cdot \gamma_{jp} a_{pq} \gamma_{ql} = (\gamma^{is} \Gamma_{ik}^l \gamma_{ql}) F^{st} a_{tq}$$

The term $G^{ij} \Gamma_{jk}^l \nabla'_{il} u$ can be computed similarly. Taking the covariant derivative of (2.20) and applying Corollary 2.33 we have

$$|G^{ij} \nabla'_k \nabla'_{ij} u + G^i \nabla'_{ki} u| \leq C + |(\psi_u - G_u) u_k| \leq C(1 + \sum G^{ii})$$

From all these above, (3.15) can be estimated as

$$(3.16) \quad |L(\nabla'_k u)| \leq C(1 + \sum G^{ii})$$

For fixed $\alpha < n$, choose B sufficiently large such that

$$\Psi \pm \nabla'_\alpha(u - \varphi) \geq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega_\delta$$

From (3.14) and (3.16)

$$L(\Psi \pm \nabla'_\alpha(u - \varphi)) \leq A(-c_0 \sum G^{ii} - 1) + BC(1 + \sum G^{ii})$$

Then choose A sufficiently large such that

$$L(\Psi \pm \nabla'_\alpha(u - \varphi)) \leq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\delta$$

Applying the maximum principle we have

$$\Psi \pm \nabla'_\alpha(u - \varphi) \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\delta$$

which implies

$$(3.17) \quad |\nabla'_{\alpha n} u(z_0)| \leq C$$

It remains to estimate the double normal derivative $\nabla'_{nn} u$ on $\partial\Omega$. By the strict local convexity of u , we only need to give an upper bound

$$\nabla'_{nn} u \leq C \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega$$

The following proof is inspired by an idea of Trudinger [29]. First we prove that

$$(3.18) \quad M := \min_{z \in \partial\Omega} \min_{\xi \in T_z(\partial\Omega), |\xi|=1} (\nabla'_{\xi\xi} u + u) \geq c_1$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Assume that M is achieved at $z_1 \in \partial\Omega$ in the direction of ξ_1 . Let e_1, \dots, e_n be the local orthonormal frame field around z_1 on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ such that $e_1(z_1) = \xi_1$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \nabla'_{\xi_1 \xi_1} u(z_1) + u(z_1) = \nabla'_{11} u(z_1) + u(z_1) \\ &= (\nabla'_{11} \underline{u}(z_1) + \underline{u}(z_1)) - (u - \underline{u})_n(z_1) \Gamma_{11}^n(z_1) \end{aligned}$$

Assume $(u - \underline{u})_n(z_1) \Gamma_{11}^n(z_1) > \frac{1}{2}(\nabla'_{11} \underline{u}(z_1) + \underline{u}(z_1))$, for, otherwise we are done. Since the function Γ_{11}^n is continuous and $0 < (u - \underline{u})_n(z_1) \leq C$,

$$\Gamma_{11}^n(z) \geq \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{11}^n(z_1) \geq c_2 > 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega_\delta = \{z \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}_{\mathbb{S}^n}(z_1, z) < \delta\}$$

for some small $\delta > 0$. Now consider

$$\Phi = \frac{\nabla'_{11} \varphi + \varphi - M}{\Gamma_{11}^n} - (u - \varphi)_n$$

Since $\nabla'_{11}(u - \varphi) = -(u - \varphi)_n \Gamma_{11}^n$ on $\partial\Omega$,

$$\nabla'_{11} \varphi + \varphi - (u - \varphi)_n \Gamma_{11}^n = \nabla'_{11} u + u \geq M$$

Thus, $\Phi \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega \cap \Omega_\delta$. Also, by (3.16)

$$(3.19) \quad L(\Phi) = L\left(\frac{\nabla'_{11} \varphi + \varphi - M}{\Gamma_{11}^n} + \varphi_n\right) - Lu_n \leq C(1 + \sum G^{ii})$$

Now choose B sufficiently large such that $\Psi + \Phi \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega_\delta$. By (3.14) and (3.19) we then choose A sufficiently large such that $L(\Psi + \Phi) \leq 0$ in Ω_δ . Since $(\Psi + \Phi)(z_1) = 0$, we have $(\Psi + \Phi)_n(z_1) \geq 0$ and consequently

$$u_{nn}(z_1) \leq C.$$

Together with (3.7) and (3.17), a bound $|\nabla'^2 u(z_1)| \leq C$ can be obtained and hence a bound for all principle curvatures at z_1 by (2.16). Therefore, the principle curvatures at z_1 admit a uniform positive lower bound by (1.5), which in turn yields a positive lower bound for the eigenvalues of $\nabla'^2 u(z_1) + u(z_1)I$. Hence (3.18) is proved.

By (3.18) and Lemma 1.2 in [4] there exists a constant $R > 0$ depending on the estimates (3.7) and (3.17) such that if $u_{nn}(z_0) \geq R$ and $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$, then the eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ of $\nabla'^2 u(z_0) + u(z_0)I$ satisfy

$$\frac{c_1}{2} \leq \lambda_\alpha \leq C, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad \lambda_n \geq \frac{R}{2}$$

Consequently

$$\nabla'^2 u(z_0) + u(z_0)I \geq X^{-1} \Lambda X$$

where X is an orthogonal matrix and $\Lambda = \text{diag}\left(\frac{c_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{c_1}{2}, \frac{R}{2}\right)$. Hence at z_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u)(z_0) \\
&= F\left(\frac{-\phi\zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} g^{-1/2} (\nabla'^2 u(z_0) + u(z_0)I) g^{-1/2}\right) \\
&\geq F\left(\frac{-\phi\zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} g^{-1/2} X^{-1} \Lambda X g^{-1/2}\right) \\
&= F\left(\frac{-\phi\zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} \Lambda^{1/2} X g^{-1} X^{-1} \Lambda^{1/2}\right) \\
&\geq F\left(\frac{-\phi\zeta'(u)}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} \Lambda^{1/2} X \frac{1}{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2} I X^{-1} \Lambda^{1/2}\right) \\
&= F\left(\frac{-\phi\zeta'(u)}{(\phi^2 + \zeta'^2 |\nabla' u|^2)^{3/2}} \Lambda\right) \geq F(\tilde{c} \Lambda)
\end{aligned}$$

By (1.7) we can choose R sufficiently large such that $F(\tilde{c} \Lambda) > \sup_{\bar{\Omega} \times [C_0^{-1}, C_0]} \psi$. It follows that

$$G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u)(z_0) > \psi(z_0, u(z_0))$$

which is a contradiction to equation (2.20). Hence $\nabla'_{nn} u \leq R$ on $\partial\Omega$ and (3.6) is proved.

4. GLOBAL CURVATURE ESTIMATES

The ideas for deriving global C^2 a priori estimates for starshaped compact or convex hypersurfaces can be found in [18, 25, 17] (see also [5] for vertical graphs). For strictly locally convex hypersurfaces, we synthesize the ideas in [18, 25] to estimate from above for the largest principal curvature $\kappa_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \kappa_i$ of Σ , which, together with (3.5), (3.6) and (2.5) implies an estimate for $\|\rho\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})}$.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume (1.3), (1.4) and (1.6). Let $\Sigma = \{(z, \rho(z)) \mid z \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n\} \subset N^{n+1}(K)$ be a strictly locally convex C^4 hypersurface satisfying equation (1.1) for some positive C^2 function ψ defined on $N^{n+1}(K)$. Suppose in addition that*

$$0 < C_0^{-1} \leq \rho(z) \leq C_0 < \rho_U^K \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla' \rho| \leq C_1 \quad \text{on} \quad \bar{\Omega}$$

where C_0 and C_1 are uniform positive constants. Then there exists a constant C depending only on C_0 , C_1 , $\|\psi\|_{C^2}$ and $\inf \psi$ such that

$$\max_{\substack{z \in \Omega \\ i=1, \dots, n}} \kappa_i(z) \leq C \left(1 + \max_{\substack{z \in \partial\Omega \\ i=1, \dots, n}} \kappa_i(z)\right)$$

Proof. Since $\kappa_i > 0$ for all i on Σ , it suffices to estimate from above for the largest principal curvature κ_{\max} of Σ . To construct a test function, we will make use of the following ingredients:

$$\Phi(\rho) = \int_0^\rho \phi(r) dr$$

and the support function

$$\tau = \bar{g}(V, \nu) = \langle V, \nu \rangle$$

Note that τ has a positive lower bound

$$\tau = \left\langle \phi(\rho) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}, \frac{-\nabla' \rho + \phi^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}}{\sqrt{\phi^4 + \phi^2 |\nabla' \rho|^2}} \right\rangle \geq 2a > 0$$

Now define the test function

$$\Theta = \ln \kappa_{\max} - \ln(\tau - a) + \beta \Phi$$

Assume Θ achieves its maximum value at $\mathbf{x}_0 = (z_0, \rho(z_0)) \in \Sigma$. Choose a local orthonormal frame E_1, \dots, E_n around \mathbf{x}_0 on Σ such that $h_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \kappa_i \delta_{ij}$, where $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n$ are the principal curvatures of Σ at \mathbf{x}_0 . We may assume $\kappa_1 = \kappa_{\max}(\mathbf{x}_0) \geq 1$. Then, at \mathbf{x}_0 ,

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{h_{11i}}{h_{11}} - \frac{\tau_i}{\tau - a} + \beta \Phi_i = 0$$

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{h_{11ii}}{h_{11}} - \frac{h_{11i}^2}{h_{11}^2} - \frac{\tau_{ii}}{\tau - a} + \left(\frac{\tau_i}{\tau - a} \right)^2 + \beta \Phi_{ii} \leq 0$$

By Codazzi equation and Gauss equation we have

$$(4.4) \quad \nabla_l h_{ij} = \nabla_j h_{il}$$

and

$$(4.5) \quad h_{iill} = h_{lil} + \kappa_l \kappa_i^2 - \kappa_l^2 \kappa_i + K(\kappa_i - \kappa_l)$$

In the rest of this section all computations are evaluated at \mathbf{x}_0 . Under the local orthonormal frame E_1, \dots, E_n , equation (1.1) appears as

$$(4.6) \quad F(h) = f(\lambda(h)) = \psi(V) \quad \text{where } h = \{h_{ij}\}$$

Covariantly differentiate (4.6) twice we have

$$(4.7) \quad F^{ii} h_{iil} = \phi' d_V \psi(E_l)$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad F^{ii} h_{ii11} + F^{ij,kl} h_{ij1} h_{kl1} \geq -C \kappa_1$$

Here we have used the property of the conformal Killing field V ,

$$\nabla_{E_l} V = \phi' E_l$$

Combining (4.3), (4.5) and (4.8) we have

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{\kappa_1} F^{ij,kl} h_{ij1} h_{kl1} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1^2} \sum f_i h_{11i}^2 - \sum f_i \kappa_i^2 + \left(\kappa_1 - \frac{K}{\kappa_1} \right) \sum f_i \kappa_i \\ & + K \sum f_i - C - \frac{1}{\tau - a} \sum F^{ii} \tau_{ii} + \frac{1}{(\tau - a)^2} \sum f_i \tau_i^2 + \beta \sum F^{ii} \Phi_{ii} \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Now we partition $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into two parts,

$$I = \{j : f_j \leq 2f_1\}, \quad J = \{j : f_j > 2f_1\}$$

By (4.2), for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{\kappa_1^2} \sum_{i \in I} f_i h_{11i}^2 \leq C(1 + \epsilon^{-1}) \beta^2 f_1 \sum \Phi_i^2 + \frac{(1 + \epsilon)}{(\tau - a)^2} \sum f_i \tau_i^2$$

Taking (4.10), (4.7) and the following equations (see Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.6 in [16] for the proof)

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_i &= \phi(\rho) \rho_i, & \Phi_{ii} &= \phi' - \tau \kappa_i \\ \tau_i &= \phi(\rho) \rho_i \kappa_i \\ \tau_{ii} &= \phi(\rho) \sum_m \rho_m h_{im} + \phi'(\rho) \kappa_i - \tau \kappa_i^2\end{aligned}$$

into (4.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned}(4.11) \quad & -\frac{1}{\kappa_1} F^{ij,kl} h_{ij1} h_{kl1} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1^2} \sum_{i \in J} f_i h_{11i}^2 \\ & + \left(\frac{a}{\tau - a} - \frac{C\epsilon}{(\tau - a)^2} \right) \sum f_i \kappa_i^2 - C\beta^2(1 + \epsilon^{-1}) f_1 \\ & + \left(\kappa_1 - \frac{K}{\kappa_1} - \tau\beta - \frac{\phi'}{\tau - a} \right) \sum f_i \kappa_i + (\beta\phi' + K) \sum f_i - C - \frac{C}{a} \leq 0\end{aligned}$$

Using an inequality due to Andrews [1] and Gerhardt [9] and applying (4.4)

$$-\frac{1}{\kappa_1} F^{ij,kl} h_{ij1} h_{kl1} \geq \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{f_i - f_j}{\kappa_j - \kappa_i} h_{ij1}^2 \geq \frac{2}{\kappa_1} \sum_{i \geq 2} \frac{f_i - f_1}{\kappa_1 - \kappa_i} h_{11i}^2 \geq \frac{1}{\kappa_1^2} \sum_{i \in J} f_i h_{11i}^2$$

where the fractions are interpreted as limits whenever the denominators are zero. Inserting it into (4.11), applying assumption (1.6), choosing $\epsilon = a^2/(2C)$ and $\beta = u_L^K$ we obtain

$$\frac{a^2}{2(\tau - a)^2} \sum f_i \kappa_i^2 - C\beta^2(1 + \frac{1}{a^2}) f_1 + \left(\kappa_1 - 1 - \tau\beta - \frac{\phi'}{\tau - a} \right) \sigma_0 - C - \frac{C}{a} \leq 0$$

Since $\sum f_i \kappa_i^2 \geq f_1 \kappa_1^2$, a uniform upper bound for κ_1 follows easily from the above inequality. Consequently, we obtain a uniform upper bound for κ_{\max} on Σ . \square

5. EXISTENCE IN \mathbb{R}^{n+1} AND \mathbb{H}^{n+1}

In this section, we will use classical continuity method and degree theory developed by Y. Y. Li [20] to prove the existence of solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.42)–(2.41). Under the transformation $\bar{\rho} = \zeta(\underline{u})$ and $\underline{u} = \eta(\underline{v})$, the subsolution condition (1.13) can be expressed as

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}(\nabla'^2 \underline{v}, \nabla' \underline{v}, \underline{v}) \geq \psi(z, \underline{v}) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \underline{v} = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

Assume that \underline{v} is not a solution of (2.42), for otherwise we are done. We consider the following two auxiliary equations.

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v) = (t\epsilon + (1-t)\frac{\psi(z)}{\xi(\underline{v})}) \xi(v) & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = \underline{v} & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

and

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v) = t\psi(z, v) + (1-t)\epsilon \xi(v) & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = \underline{v} & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

where $t \in [0, 1]$, $\underline{\psi}(z) = \mathcal{G}(\nabla'^2 \underline{v}, \nabla' \underline{v}, \underline{v})(z)$, ϵ is a small positive constant such that

$$(5.4) \quad \underline{\psi}(z) > \epsilon \xi(\underline{v}) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

and $\xi(v) = e^{2v}$ if $K = 0$ while $\xi(v) = \sinh v$ if $K = -1$. The existence results in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} was given in [26] where the author assumed the existence of a strict subsolution. In this section, we will consider the case when $K = 0$ or $K = -1$ with the subsolution assumption.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\psi(z)$ be a positive function defined on Ω . For $z \in \Omega$ and a strictly locally convex function v near z , if*

$$\mathcal{G}(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v)(z) = F(a_{ij}[v])(z) = f(\kappa[v])(z) = \psi(z) \xi(v)(z)$$

then

$$\mathcal{G}_v(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v)(z) - \psi(z) \xi'(v)(z) < 0$$

Proof. The proof can be found in [27]. \square

Lemma 5.6. *For any fixed $t \in [0, 1]$, if \underline{V} and v are strictly locally convex subsolution and solution to (5.2), then $v \geq \underline{V}$. Thus the Dirichlet problem (5.2) has at most one strictly locally convex solution.*

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma 3.40 in [28]. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let v be a strictly locally convex solution of (5.3). If $v \geq \underline{v}$ in Ω , then $v > \underline{v}$ in Ω and $\mathbf{n}(v - \underline{v}) > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, where \mathbf{n} is the interior unit normal to $\partial\Omega$.*

Proof. By (5.1) and (5.4) we know that \underline{v} is a strict subsolution of (5.3) when $t \in [0, 1)$, while it is a subsolution but not a solution of (5.3) when $t = 1$. It is relatively easy to prove the conclusion when $t \in [0, 1)$, following the ideas in [26]. For the case $t = 1$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{G}(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v) = \psi(z, v) & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = \underline{v} & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

we will make use of the maximum principle which was originally discovered in [24], while more precisely stated for our purposes in [10] (see section 1.3, p. 212). Because the maximum principle and Hopf lemma there are designed for domains in Euclidean spaces, we need to rewrite the above equation in a local coordinate system of \mathbb{S}^n . For convenience, we first transform the above equation back under the transformation (2.34) into a form as (2.20):

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{cases} G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u) = \psi(z, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = \underline{u} & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

Recall that $G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u) = F(A[u])$ where $A[u] = \{\gamma^{ik} h_{kl} \gamma^{lj}\}$. Since at this time we do not use local orthonormal frame on \mathbb{S}^n , but rather a local coordinate system of \mathbb{S}^n , γ^{ik} and h_{kl} will appear differently (comparing with (2.13) and (2.15)). Also, condition (5.1) (i.e. (1.13)) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} G(\nabla'^2 \underline{u}, \nabla' \underline{u}, \underline{u}) \geq \psi(z, \underline{u}) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \underline{u} = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

Note that \underline{u} is not a solution of (5.8).

(i) We first show that if a strictly locally convex solution u of (5.8) satisfies $u \geq \underline{u}$ in Ω , then $u > \underline{u}$ in Ω . Let $N \notin \Omega$ be the north pole of \mathbb{S}^n . Take the radial projection of $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \{N\}$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{-1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be the image of Ω . We thus have a coordinate system (x_1, \dots, x_n) on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{-1\} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$. The metric on \mathbb{S}^n , its inverse, and the Christoffel symbols are given respectively by

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{16}{\mu^2} \delta_{ij}, \quad \mu = 4 + \sum x_i^2, \quad \sigma^{ij} = \frac{\mu^2}{16} \delta_{ij}$$

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k = -\frac{2}{\mu} (\delta_{ik} x_j + \delta_{jk} x_i - \delta_{ij} x_k)$$

Consequently, the metric on Σ , its inverse and the second fundamental form on Σ are given respectively by (c.f. [25])

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ij} &= \phi^2 \sigma_{ij} + \zeta'^2(u) u_i u_j \\ g^{ij} &= \frac{1}{\phi^2} \left(\sigma^{ij} - \frac{\zeta'^2(u) u^i u^j}{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2} \right), \quad u^i = \sigma^{ik} u_k \\ h_{ij} &= \frac{-\zeta'(u) \phi}{\sqrt{\phi^2 + \zeta'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2}} (\nabla'_{ij} u + u \sigma_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

The entries of the symmetric matrices $\{\gamma_{ik}\}$ and $\{\gamma^{ik}\}$ depend only on x_1, \dots, x_n , u and the first derivatives of u .

Now, setting $\tilde{u} = \mu u$ and by straightforward calculation we have

$$(5.9) \quad \nabla'_{ij} u + u \sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\mu} \tilde{u}_{ij} + \frac{2\delta_{ij}}{\mu^2} (\tilde{u} - \sum_k x_k \tilde{u}_k)$$

and (5.8) can be transformed into the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{G}(D^2 \tilde{u}, D\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}, x_1, \dots, x_n) = F\left(A\left[\frac{\tilde{u}}{\mu}\right]\right) = \tilde{\psi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, \tilde{u}) & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega} \\ \tilde{u} = \mu \underline{u} & \text{on } \partial \tilde{\Omega} \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{u}_i = \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial x_i}$, $D\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)$, $\tilde{u}_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{u}}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ and $D^2 \tilde{u} = \{\tilde{u}_{ij}\}$.

In view of (5.9) and (2.21) we know that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{G}}{\partial \tilde{u}_{ij}} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{kl}} \frac{\partial a_{kl}}{\partial \tilde{u}_{ij}} = \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{\partial G}{\partial u_{ij}}$$

Also, the function $\underline{\tilde{u}} = \mu \underline{u}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{G}(D^2 \underline{\tilde{u}}, D\underline{\tilde{u}}, \underline{\tilde{u}}, x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq \tilde{\psi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, \underline{\tilde{u}}) & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega} \\ \underline{\tilde{u}} = \mu \underline{u} & \text{on } \partial \tilde{\Omega} \end{cases}$$

Hence we can apply the Maximum Principle (see p. 212 of [10]) to conclude that $\tilde{u} > \underline{\tilde{u}}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$, which immediately yields $u > \underline{u}$ in Ω .

(ii) To prove $\mathbf{n}(u - \underline{u}) > 0$ on $\partial \Omega$, we pick an arbitrary point $z_0 \in \partial \Omega$ and assume z_0 to be the north pole of $\mathbb{S}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. We introduce a local coordinate system about z_0 by taking the radial projection of the upper hemisphere onto the tangent hyperplane of \mathbb{S}^n at z_0 and identifying this hyperplane to \mathbb{R}^n . Denote the coordinates by (y_1, \dots, y_n) and assume that the positive y_n -axis is the interior

normal direction to $\partial\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ at z_0 . In this coordinate system, the metric on \mathbb{S}^n , its inverse, and the Christoffel symbols are given respectively by (see [22, 13])

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{ij} &= \frac{1}{\mu^2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{y_i y_j}{\mu^2} \right), \quad \mu = \sqrt{1 + \sum y_i^2} \\ \sigma^{ij} &= \mu^2 (\delta_{ij} + y_i y_j) \\ \Gamma_{ij}^k &= -\frac{\delta_{ik} y_j + \delta_{jk} y_i}{\mu^2}\end{aligned}$$

The metric g_{ij} , its inverse g^{ij} and the second fundamental form h_{ij} on Σ have the form as above. The entries of the symmetric matrices $\{\gamma_{ik}\}$ and $\{\gamma^{ik}\}$ depend only on y_1, \dots, y_n, u and the first derivatives of u .

Now set $\tilde{u} = \mu u$. By straightforward calculation we have

$$(5.10) \quad \nabla'_{ij} u + u \sigma_{ij} = \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_{ij}$$

and equation (5.8) can be transformed into an equation defined in an open neighborhood of 0 on \mathbb{R}^n , which is the radial projection of a neighborhood of z_0 on \mathbb{S}^n :

$$\tilde{G}(D^2 \tilde{u}, D\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}, y_1, \dots, y_n) = F\left(A\left[\frac{\tilde{u}}{\mu}\right]\right) = \tilde{\psi}(y_1, \dots, y_n, \tilde{u})$$

where $\tilde{u}_i = \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial y_i}$, $D\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)$, $\tilde{u}_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{u}}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}$ and $D^2 \tilde{u} = \{\tilde{u}_{ij}\}$. In view of (5.10) and (2.21) we know that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{G}}{\partial \tilde{u}_{ij}} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_{kl}} \frac{\partial a_{kl}}{\partial \tilde{u}_{ij}} = \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{\partial G}{\partial u_{ij}}$$

Applying Lemma H (see p. 212 of [10]) we find that $(\tilde{u} - \underline{\tilde{u}})_n(0) > 0$ and equivalently $\mathbf{n}(u - \underline{u})(z_0) > 0$. \square

Theorem 5.11. *For any $t \in [0, 1]$, the Dirichlet problem (5.2) has a unique strictly locally convex solution.*

Proof. The proof is the same as in [27]. \square

Theorem 5.12. *For any $t \in [0, 1]$, the Dirichlet problem (5.3) has a strictly locally convex solution. In particular, (2.42)–(2.41) has a strictly locally convex solution.*

Proof. The proof is the same with [27] except slight modifications. \square

6. EXISTENCE IN \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1}

For any $\epsilon > 0$, we want to prove the existence of a strictly locally convex solution to the Dirichlet problem when $K = 1$,

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} G[u] := G(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u) = \psi(z, u) - \epsilon & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

Then a strictly locally convex solution to (2.20)–(2.19) follows from the uniform (ϵ -independent) C^2 estimates (established in Section 3 and 4) and approximation.

As we have seen from last section, there does not exist an auxiliary equation in \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1} with an invertible linearized operator. Hence we want to build a continuity process starting from an auxiliary equation in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .

For this, we first consider a continuous version of (2.16). For $t \in [0, 1]$, denote

$$a_{ij}^t = \frac{-(\zeta^t)' \phi^t}{\sqrt{(\phi^t)^2 + (\zeta^t)'^2 |\nabla' u|^2}} (\gamma^t)^{ik} (\nabla'_{kl} u + u \delta_{kl}) (\gamma^t)^{lj}$$

where

$$(\gamma^t)^{ik} = \frac{1}{\phi^t} \left(\delta_{ik} - \frac{(\zeta^t)'^2(u) u_i u_k}{\sqrt{(\phi^t)^2 + (\zeta^t)'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2} (\phi^t + \sqrt{(\phi^t)^2 + (\zeta^t)'^2(u) |\nabla' u|^2})} \right)$$

and

$$\phi^t(\rho) = \frac{\sin(t\rho)}{t}, \quad \zeta^t(u) = \frac{1}{t} \operatorname{arccot} \frac{u}{t}$$

Note that these geometric quantities on Σ correspond to the background metric

$$\bar{g}^t = d\rho^2 + (\phi^t)^2(\rho) \sigma$$

which provides a deformation process from \mathbb{R}^{n+1} ($t = 0$) to \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1} ($t = 1$). Define

$$G^t[u] = G^t(\nabla'^2 u, \nabla' u, u) = F(a_{ij}^t)$$

Hence $G^1 = G$. The following property is true by direct calculation.

Proposition 6.2. *$G^t[u]$ is increasing with respect to t .*

Proof.

$$a_{ij}^t = \left(1 + \frac{|\nabla' u|^2}{u^2 + t^2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\gamma}^{ik} (\nabla'_{kl} u + u \delta_{kl}) \tilde{\gamma}^{lj}$$

where

$$\tilde{\gamma}^{ik} = \delta_{ik} - \frac{u_i u_k}{\sqrt{u^2 + t^2 + |\nabla' u|^2} (\sqrt{u^2 + t^2} + \sqrt{u^2 + t^2 + |\nabla' u|^2})}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G^t[u] &= \left(1 + \frac{|\nabla' u|^2}{u^2 + t^2} \right)^{-3/2} F^{ij} \cdot \\ &\quad \left(\frac{t |\nabla' u|^2}{(u^2 + t^2)^2} \tilde{\gamma}^{ik} + 2 \left(1 + \frac{|\nabla' u|^2}{u^2 + t^2} \right) \frac{\partial \tilde{\gamma}^{ik}}{\partial t} \right) (\nabla'_{kl} u + u \delta_{kl}) \tilde{\gamma}^{lj} \end{aligned}$$

The inverse $(\tilde{\gamma}_{ik})$ of $(\tilde{\gamma}^{ik})$ is given by

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{ik} = \delta_{ik} + \frac{u_i u_k}{u^2 + t^2 + \sqrt{(u^2 + t^2)^2 + (u^2 + t^2) |\nabla' u|^2}}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{\gamma}^{ik}}{\partial t} &= -\tilde{\gamma}^{ip} \frac{\partial \tilde{\gamma}_{pq}}{\partial t} \tilde{\gamma}^{qk} \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{\gamma}_{pq}}{\partial t} &= -\frac{u_p u_q t}{(u^2 + t^2)^{3/2} \sqrt{u^2 + t^2 + |\nabla' u|^2}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\gamma}^{ik} u_k = \frac{\sqrt{u^2 + t^2}}{\sqrt{u^2 + t^2 + |\nabla' u|^2}} u_i$$

therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G^t[u] &= \frac{t}{\sqrt{u^2 + t^2} (u^2 + t^2 + |\nabla' u|^2)^{3/2}} F^{ij} \\ &\quad \left(|\nabla' u|^2 \delta_{iq} + 2u_i u_q \right) \tilde{\gamma}^{qk} \left(\nabla'_{kl} u + u \delta_{kl} \right) \tilde{\gamma}^{lj} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Recall that we have assumed a strictly locally convex subsolution.

$$\begin{cases} G[\underline{u}] \geq \psi(z, \underline{u}) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \underline{u} = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

Choose ϵ small such that

$$\epsilon < \min\left\{ \min_{\bar{\Omega}} G^0[\underline{u}], \min_{\bar{\Omega}} \psi(z, \underline{u}) \right\}$$

By continuity, for $t \in [1 - \delta_1, 1]$ where δ_1 is a sufficiently small positive constant depending on ϵ , we have

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{cases} G^t[\underline{u}] > \psi(z, \underline{u}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} & \text{in } \Omega \\ \underline{u} = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

Denote $\mathcal{G}^t[v] := G^t(\nabla'^2 v, \nabla' v, v) =: G^t[e^v]$. Consider the continuity process,

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}^t[v] = (1 - T(t)) \delta_2 e^{2v} + T(t) (\psi(z, e^v) - \epsilon) & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = \ln \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

where δ_2 is a small positive constant such that

$$\delta_2 \max_{\bar{\Omega}} \underline{u}^2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and $T(t)$ is a smooth strictly increasing function with $T(0) = 0$, $T(1) = 1$ satisfying

$$\min_{\bar{\Omega}} G^0[\underline{u}] > 2 T(1 - \delta_1) \max_{\bar{\Omega}} \psi(z, \underline{u})$$

Proposition 6.5. $\underline{v} = \ln \underline{u}$ is a strict subsolution of (6.4) for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. For $t \in [1 - \delta_1, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^t[\underline{v}] &= G^t[\underline{u}] > \psi(z, \underline{u}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} > \delta_2 \underline{u}^2 + (\psi(z, \underline{u}) - \epsilon) \\ &\geq (1 - T(t)) \delta_2 e^{2\underline{v}} + T(t) (\psi(z, e^{\underline{v}}) - \epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

For $t \in [0, 1 - \delta_1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^t[\underline{v}] &= G^t[\underline{u}] \geq G^0[\underline{u}] > \frac{\epsilon}{2} + T(1 - \delta_1) \psi(z, \underline{u}) \\ &\geq (1 - T(t)) \delta_2 \underline{u}^2 + T(t) (\psi(z, \underline{u}) - \epsilon) \\ &= (1 - T(t)) \delta_2 e^{2\underline{v}} + T(t) (\psi(z, e^{\underline{v}}) - \epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we can obtain the existence results in \mathbb{S}_+^{n+1} .

Theorem 6.6. For any $t \in [0, 1]$, the Dirichlet problem (6.4) has a strictly locally convex solution. In particular, (6.1) has a strictly locally convex solution when $K = 1$.

Proof. The $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for strictly locally convex solutions v of (6.4) with $v \geq \underline{v}$ is equivalent to the $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for strictly locally convex solutions to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} G^t[u] = (1 - T(t)) \delta_2 u^2 + T(t) (\psi(z, u) - \epsilon) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

This can be established by changing ϕ and ζ into ϕ^t and ζ^t in the previous proof. Then $C^{4,\alpha}$ estimates follows by classical Schauder theory. Thus we have the t -independent uniform estimates,

$$(6.7) \quad \|v\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} < C_4 \quad \text{and} \quad C_2^{-1} I < \{v_{ij} + v_i v_j + \delta_{ij}\} < C_2 I \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}$$

Consider the subspace of $C^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ given by

$$C_0^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) := \{w \in C^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \mid w = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$$

and the bounded open subset

$$\mathcal{O} := \left\{ w \in C_0^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \left| \begin{array}{l} w > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \nabla'_{\mathbf{n}} w > 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \\ C_2^{-1} I < \{(\underline{v} + w)_{ij} + (\underline{v} + w)_i (\underline{v} + w)_j + \delta_{ij}\} < C_2 I \text{ in } \overline{\Omega} \\ \|w\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} < C_4 + \|\underline{v}\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

Construct a map $\mathcal{M}_t(w) : \mathcal{O} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$,

$$\mathcal{M}_t(w) = \mathcal{G}^t[\underline{v} + w] - (1 - T(t)) \delta_2 e^{2(\underline{v} + w)} - T(t) (\psi(z, e^{\underline{v} + w}) - \epsilon)$$

At $t = 0$, by Theorem 5.11 for the case $K = 0$, there is a unique solution v^0 to (6.4). By Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.7 we have $w^0 := v^0 - \underline{v} > 0$ in Ω and $\nabla'_{\mathbf{n}} w^0 > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, w^0 satisfies (6.7) and thus $w^0 \in \mathcal{O}$. Also, Lemma 5.7 and (6.7) implies that $\mathcal{M}_t(w) = 0$ has no solution on $\partial\mathcal{O}$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$. Besides, \mathcal{M}_t is uniformly elliptic on \mathcal{O} independent of t . Therefore, $\deg(\mathcal{M}_t, \mathcal{O}, 0)$, the degree of \mathcal{M}_t on \mathcal{O} at 0, is well defined and independent of t . Hence it suffices to compute $\deg(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{O}, 0)$.

Note that $\mathcal{M}_0(w) = 0$ has a unique solution $w^0 \in \mathcal{O}$. The Fréchet derivative of \mathcal{M}_0 with respect to w at w^0 is a linear elliptic operator from $C_0^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ to $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$,

$$(6.8) \quad \mathcal{M}_{0,w}|_{w^0}(h) = (\mathcal{G}^0)^{ij} [v^0] \nabla'_{ij} h + (\mathcal{G}^0)^i [v^0] \nabla'_i h + ((\mathcal{G}^0)_v [v^0] - 2 \delta_2 e^{2v^0}) h$$

By Lemma 5.5

$$(\mathcal{G}^0)_v [v^0] - 2 \delta_2 e^{2v^0} < 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

Thus $\mathcal{M}_{0,w}|_{w^0}$ is invertible. Applying the degree theory in [20],

$$\deg(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{O}, 0) = \deg(\mathcal{M}_{0,w}|_{w^0}, B_1, 0) = \pm 1 \neq 0$$

where B_1 is the unit ball in $C_0^{4,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$. Thus

$$\deg(\mathcal{M}_t, \mathcal{O}, 0) \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1]$$

and this theorem is proved. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Andrews, *Contraction of convex hypersurfaces in Euclidean space*, Calc. Var. PDE **2** (1994), 151–171.
- [2] J. L. M. Barbosa, J. H. S. Lira and V. I. Oliker, *A priori estimates for starshaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed m th curvature function in space forms*, Nonlinear Problems of Mathematical Physics and Related Topics I, (2002), 35–52.
- [3] L. A. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations I. Monge-Ampère equations*, Comm. Pure Applied Math., **37** (1984), 369–402.
- [4] L. A. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations, III: Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian*, Acta Math., **155**:3-4 (1985), 261–301.
- [5] L. A. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, *Nonlinear second-order elliptic equations V. The Dirichlet problem for Weingarten hypersurfaces*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **41** (1988), 41–70.
- [6] D. G. Chen, H. Z. Li and Z. Z. Wang, *Starshaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed Weingarten curvature in warped product manifolds*, Calc. Var. Partial. Dif., **57** (2018): 42.
- [7] F. F. Cruz, *Radial graphs of constant curvature and prescribed boundary*, Calc. Var. Partial. Dif., **56** (2017): 83.
- [8] L. C. Evans, *Classical solutions of fully nonlinear, convex, second order elliptic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **35** (1982), 333–363.
- [9] C. Gerhardt, *Closed Weingarten hypersurfaces in Riemannian manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **43** (1996), 612–641.
- [10] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni and L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle*, Comm. Math. Phys., **68** (1979), 209–243.
- [11] B. Guan, *On the existence and regularity of hypersurfaces of prescribed Gauss curvature with boundary*, Indiana U. Math. J., **44** (44) (1995), 221–241.
- [12] B. Guan, *The Dirichlet problem for Monge-Ampère equations in non-convex domains and spacelike hypersurfaces of constant Gauss curvature*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **350** (1998), 4955–4971.
- [13] B. Guan and J. Spruck, *Boundary-value problems on S^n for surfaces of constant Gauss curvature*, Ann. of Math., **138** (1993), 601–624.
- [14] B. Guan and J. Spruck, *The existence of hypersurfaces of constant Gauss curvature with prescribed boundary*, J. Differential Geom., **62** (2002), 259–287.
- [15] B. Guan and J. Spruck, *Locally convex hypersurfaces of constant curvature with boundary*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **57** (2004), 1311–1331.
- [16] P. F. Guan and J. F. Li, *A mean curvature type flow in space forms*, Int. Math. Res. Notices, 2015(13).
- [17] P. F. Guan, C. Y. Ren and Z. Z. Wang, *Global C^2 -estimates for convex solutions of curvature equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **68**(8) (2015), 1287–1325.
- [18] Q. N. Jin and Y. Y. Li, *Starshaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed k th mean curvature in hyperbolic space*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems **15** (2005), 367–377.
- [19] N. V. Krylov, *Boundedly nonhomogeneous elliptic and parabolic equations in a domain*, Izvestiya Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk, Seriya Matematicheskaya **47** (1983), 75–108.
- [20] Y. Y. Li, *Degree theory for second order nonlinear elliptic operators and its applications*, Commun. Part. Diff. Eq., **14**(11) (1989), 1541–1578.
- [21] Y. Y. Li and V. I. Oliker, *Starshaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed m -th mean curvature in elliptic space*, J. Partial Differential Equations, **15** (2002), 68–80.
- [22] V. I. Oliker, *Hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} with prescribed Gaussian curvature and related equations of Monge-Ampère type*, Comm. P.D.E. **9** (1984), 807–838.
- [23] H. Rosenberg, *Hypersurfaces of constant curvature in space forms*, Bull. Sci. Math., **117** (1993), 211–239.
- [24] J. Serrin, *A symmetry problem in potential theory*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., **43** (1971), 304–318.
- [25] J. Spruck and L. Xiao, *A note on starshaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed scalar curvature in space forms*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., **33** (2017), No. 2, 547–554.
- [26] C. Y. Su, *Starshaped locally convex hypersurfaces with prescribed curvature and boundary*, J. Geom. Anal., **26**(3) (2016), 1730–1753.

- [27] Z. Sui, *Strictly locally convex hypersurfaces with prescribed Gauss curvature and boundary in space forms*, arXiv:1805.08107.
- [28] Z. Sui, *Convex hypersurfaces of prescribed curvature and boundary in hyperbolic space*, arXiv:1812.09554.
- [29] N. S. Trudinger, *On the Dirichlet problem for Hessian equations*, Acta Math., **175** (1995), 151–164.
- [30] N. S. Trudinger and X. J. Wang, *On locally convex hypersurfaces with boundary*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **551** (2002), 11–32.