

REGULARITY FOR CONVEX VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS OF SPECIAL LAGRANGIAN EQUATION

JINGYI CHEN, RAVI SHANKAR, AND YU YUAN

ABSTRACT. We establish interior regularity for convex viscosity solutions of the special Lagrangian equation. Our result states that all such solutions are real analytic in the interior of the domain.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we establish regularity for convex viscosity solutions of the special Lagrangian equation

$$(1.1) \quad F(D^2u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i - \Theta = 0,$$

where λ_i 's are the eigenvalues of the Hessian D^2u and Θ is constant.

The fully nonlinear equation (1.1) arises from the special Lagrangian geometry [HL]. The “gradient” graph $(x, Du(x))$ of the potential u is a Lagrangian submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. The Lagrangian graph is called special when the phase, which at each point is the argument of the complex number $(1 + \sqrt{-1}\lambda_1) \cdots (1 + \sqrt{-1}\lambda_n)$, is constant Θ , that is, u satisfies equation (1.1). A special Lagrangian graph is a volume minimizing minimal submanifold in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, dx^2 + dy^2)$.

A dual form of (1.1) is the Monge-Ampère equation

$$(1.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \lambda_i - \Phi = 0$$

with Φ being constant, interpreted by Hitchin [Hi] as the potential equation for special Lagrangian submanifolds in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, dx dy)$. Warren [W] demonstrated the “gradient” graph $(x, Du(x))$ is volume maximizing in this

Date: November 14, 2019.

JYC is partially supported by NSERC Discovery Grant (22R80062) and a grant (No. 562829) from the Simons Foundation. RS and YY are partially supported by NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant No. DGE-1762114 and NSF grant DMS-1800495 respectively.

pseudo-Euclidean space. Under a rotation introduced in [Y2], (1.2) becomes

$$(1.3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \frac{1 + \lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_i} - \Phi = 0.$$

Earlier on, Mealy [Me] showed that an equivalent algebraic form of (1.3) is the potential equation for his volume maximizing/special Lagrangian submanifolds in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, dx^2 - dy^2)$.

A fundamental problem for those geometrically as well as analytically significant equations is regularity. Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *Let u be a convex viscosity solution of (1.1) on ball $B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then u is analytic in $B_1(0)$ and we have an effective Hessian bound*

$$|D^2u(0)| \leq C(n) \exp \left[C(n) \operatorname{osc}_{B_1(0)} u \right]^{2n-2},$$

where $C(n)$ is a certain dimensional constant.

One application of the above regularity result is that every entire convex viscosity solution of (1.1) is a quadratic function; the smooth case was done in [Y2]. In parallel, Caffarelli proved the rigidity for entire convex viscosity solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation, while the smooth case is the classic work by Jörgens-Calabi-Pogorelov and also Cheng-Yau. Another consequence is the existence of interior smooth solutions of the second boundary value problem for (1.1) between general convex domains Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$ on \mathbb{R}^n . For uniformly convex domains Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$ with smooth boundaries, this problem was solved by Brendle-Warren [BW]. The extension can be handled as follows: under smooth, uniformly convex approximations of the two general convex domains, a C^0 limit of Brendle-Warren solutions is still a convex viscosity solution of (1.1), and in turn, interior smooth by Theorem 1.1. The boundary behavior of the solutions remains unclear to us. One by-product of our arguments for the above theorem is that, by Lemma 2.1, we can remove the local $C^{1,1}$ assumption on the initial convex potential, for the long time existence of Lagrangian mean curvature flow in [CCY, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3].

Regularity for two dimensional Monge-Ampère type equations including (1.1) with $n = 2$ was achieved by Heinz [H] in the 1950's. Regularity for continuous viscosity solutions of (1.1) with critical and supercritical phases $|\Theta| \geq (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}$ follows from the a priori estimates developed in [WY1,2,3] [CWY] [WdY2]. Singular semiconvex viscosity solutions of (1.1) certainly with subcritical phase $|\Theta| < (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}$ and $n \geq 3$ constructed by Nadirashvili-Vlăduț [NV] and in [WdY1], show that the convexity condition in Theorem 1.1 is necessary. In comparison, there are singular convex viscosity solutions (Pogorelov $C^{1,1-2/n}$, or more singular ones) to the Monge-Ampère equation $\det D^2u = f(x)$. Under a necessary strict convexity assumption on convex viscosity solutions, interior regularity was obtained respectively by Pogorelov [P] for smooth enough right hand side $f(x)$, by

Urbas [U] for Lipschitz $f(x)$ and $C^{1,(1-2/n)^+}$ solutions, and by Caffarelli [C] for Hölder $f(x)$.

There have been attempts for the regularity of convex viscosity solutions of (1.1) since our work [CWY] in 2009 on a priori estimates for smooth convex solutions, as in the critical and supercritical cases. In those latter cases, one can smoothly solve the Dirichlet problem for (now concave [Y3]) equation (1.1) on any interior small ball, with smooth boundary data approximating the continuous viscosity solution on the boundary in C^0 norm. The a priori estimates in [WY1,3] [WdY2] depend only on C^0 norm of the C^0 viscosity solution on the boundary, thus allow one to draw a smooth limit to the C^0 viscosity solution. Hence, the regularity for viscosity solutions follows. We are not able to find smooth convex solutions of (now saddle [Y3]) equation (1.1) of subcritical phase $\Theta < (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}$, with smooth boundary data approximating the convex viscosity solution there in C^0 norm. Even if we solve the Dirichlet problem for a modified concave equation $\hat{F}(D^2u) = \sum_1^n f(\lambda_i) - \Theta = 0$ with $f(\lambda) = \arctan \lambda$ for $\lambda \geq 0$ and λ for $\lambda < 0$, the smooth solutions with the approximated smooth boundary data may not be convex. Unless one proves similar a priori estimates directly for the modified equation, we cannot gain regularity by drawing a smooth limit to the original convex viscosity solution, with the a priori estimates for smooth convex special Lagrangian solutions in [CWY].

Another natural way is to work over a rotated coordinate system introduced in [Y2], so that the slope of the “gradient” graph of the solution drops to the range $[-1, 1]$ from $[0, +\infty]$. As every graphical tangent cone to the minimal Lagrangian graph with such restricted slopes is flat, via the machinery from geometric measure theory, [Y1] gives a $C^{2,\alpha}$ interior bound, hence regularity in rotated coordinates.

The first difficulty is in dealing with the multivalued “gradient” graph over the rotated coordinate system. We relate the above $\frac{\pi}{4}$ -rotation to the conjugated $\frac{\pi}{2}$ -rotation, that is, at potential level, we rewrite the rotated potential in terms of the Legendre transform (convex conjugate) of the old potential (Proposition 2.1, Lemma 2.1. Geometrically, the “singular” multivalued gradient “graph” is a Lipschitz one in the rotated coordinates. This leads to yet another proof for the Alexandrov Theorem: every semiconvex function is second order differentiable almost everywhere.). The second one is showing the rotated potential is still a viscosity solution of (1.1) (with a decreased phase). The preservation of supersolutions is simple because of the order preservation and the respect for uniform convergence of the rotation operation (Proposition 2.2). The preservation of subsolutions under the rotations is no quick matter. Unlike in the supersolution case, we are only able to show the preservation of convex subsolutions, by convex smooth subsolution approximations of the original convex subsolution of (now concave) equation (1.1) (Proposition 2.3). There is one last hurdle in making sure the slope of the “gradient” graph over the $\frac{\pi}{4}$ -rotated coordinate is not 1,

the largest possible. Otherwise the original potential cannot have bounded Hessian. It turns out the maximum eigenvalue of the rotated Hessian is a subsolution of the linearized equation of the now saddle equation (1.1). The strong maximum principle then finishes the job; see Section 3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Smooth functions and solutions. Via the Legendre transform, we directly connect the original potential u for the Lagrangian graph $(x, Du(x))$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{C}^n$, with the α -rotated potential $\bar{u}(\bar{x})$ for the same Lagrangian submanifold $(\bar{x}, D\bar{u}(\bar{x}))$ on \mathbb{C}^n , under (anti-clockwise $\alpha \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$) coordinate rotation $\bar{z} = e^{-i\alpha}z$. As in [Y2, p. 124], assuming semiconvexity $D^2u > -\cot \alpha I$ and denoting $(c, s) = (\cos \alpha, \sin \alpha)$, the two “gradients” are related by

$$\begin{cases} \bar{x} = cx + sDu(x) \\ D\bar{u}(\bar{x}) = -sx + cDu(x) \end{cases} .$$

Writing the original “gradient” $u_x(x) = Du(x)$ in terms of the old independent x and the new variable $\bar{x} = cx + su_x$, and applying the product rule, one has the “gradient” connection

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{u}(\bar{x}) &= \bar{u}_{\bar{x}}d\bar{x} = (-sx + cu_x) d\bar{x} \\ &= \left[-sx + c\frac{\bar{x} - cx}{s} \right] d\bar{x} = \left[\frac{c}{s}\bar{x} - \frac{1}{s}x \right] d\bar{x} \\ &= d \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \frac{c}{s} \bar{x}^2 - \frac{1}{s} \left[\bar{x}x - \left(su(x) + \frac{c}{2}x^2 \right) \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and up to a constant, in formal notation instead of the above “abused” one, the potential connection, as in [CW, p.334-335],

$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{c}{s} |\bar{x}|^2 - \frac{1}{s} \left[\bar{x} \cdot x - \left(su(x) + \frac{c}{2} |x|^2 \right) \right].$$

When $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2}$, the rotated potential $\bar{u}(\bar{x}) = -[\bar{x} \cdot x - u(x)]$ is the negative of the Legendre transform of $u(x)$. Recall the Legendre transform of a strictly convex (not necessarily smooth) function $f(x)$ on B_1 is usually formulated in an extremal form

$$(2.1) \quad f^*(y) = \sup_{x \in B_1} [y \cdot x - f(x)]$$

for $y \in \partial f(B_1)$. We record the following analytic interpretation of the α -rotated potential in terms of the Legendre transform of the original one.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose $u(x)$ is smooth and $D^2u > -\cot \alpha I$ on B_1 . Then the smooth function*

$$(2.2) \quad \bar{u}(\bar{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{c}{s} |\bar{x}|^2 - \frac{1}{s} \left[su(x) + \frac{c}{2} |x|^2 \right]^* (\bar{x})$$

for $\bar{x} \in [cx + sDu(x)](B_1)$, is a potential for the Lagrangian graph $(x, Du(x))$ under the anti-clockwise coordinate rotation $\bar{z} = e^{-i\alpha}z$.

Observe that the canonical angles between each tangent plane of the Lagrangian graph $(x, Du(x))$ and the α -rotated \bar{x} -plane, decrease from the original ones with respect to the x -plane by α

$$\arctan \bar{\lambda}_i (D^2 \bar{u}) = \arctan \lambda_i (D^2 u) - \alpha;$$

consequently we see the α -rotated potential \bar{u} satisfies the equation

$$(2.3) \quad \bar{F} (D^2 \bar{u}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \bar{\lambda}_i (D^2 \bar{u}) - \Theta + n\alpha = 0,$$

given the equation (1.1) for u .

2.2. Convex functions and viscosity solutions. The α -rotation \bar{u} in (2.2) still makes sense if $u(x) + \frac{1}{2} \cot \alpha |x|^2$ is strictly convex (not necessarily smooth). Indeed, we have

Lemma 2.1. *Let $u + \frac{1}{2} (\cot \alpha - \delta) |x|^2$ be convex on $B_1(0)$ for $\delta > 0$. Then the α -rotation \bar{u} in (2.2) is defined on $\bar{\Omega} = \partial \tilde{u} (B_1(0))$ with $\tilde{u} = su + \frac{c}{2} |x|^2$. Moreover, $\bar{\Omega}$ is open and connected.*

Proof. Step 1. The subdifferential $\partial f(a)$ for any convex function $f(x)$ at a is the set of all the gradients of those linear support functions for $f(x)$ at $x = a$. Recall $\partial f(a)$ is bounded, closed, and convex. The convexity of $\partial f(a)$ is because convex combinations of those linear support functions remain linear support ones at $x = a$. The sum rule is valid for subdifferentials of two convex functions; see [R, Theorem 23.8]. For completeness, we include a proof of the (still subtle) sum rule with the other convex function being a quadratic one

$$\partial (v + Q)(x) = \partial v(x) + \partial Q(x).$$

For the sake of simple notation, we only present the proof at $x = 0$. By subtracting linear supporting functions from v and Q at $x = 0$, we assume that $v(0) = 0$, $v \geq 0$, $\vec{0} \in \partial v(0)$, and $Q(x) = 0.5\kappa |x|^2$ with $\kappa > 0$. The inclusion $\partial (v + Q)(0) \supseteq \partial v(0) + \partial Q(0)$ is easy, because the sum of any two linear supporting functions at the same point for two convex functions, is still a linear supporting function for the sum function at that same point. On the other hand, for any $Y \in \partial (v + Q)(0)$, we show $Y \in \partial v(0) + \partial Q(0) = \partial v(0)$. Otherwise, even $(1 - \eta)Y$ for a small $\eta > 0$ is not in the bounded closed convex set $\partial v(0) \ni \vec{0}$. This means non-vanishing linear function $(1 - \eta)Y \cdot x$ would be larger than $v(x)$, along a sequence x_γ going to 0 with $Y \cdot x_\gamma > 0$. In turn

$$(1 - \eta)Y \cdot x_\gamma + 0.5\kappa |x_\gamma|^2 \geq v(x_\gamma) + 0.5\kappa |x_\gamma|^2 \geq Y \cdot x_\gamma.$$

Then $0.5\kappa |x_\gamma|^2 \geq \eta Y \cdot x_\gamma > 0$. Impossible for small x_γ .

Step 2. We first prove $\bar{\Omega}$ contains $\bar{B}_{s\delta}(\partial \tilde{u}(0))$. For any subdifferential $\bar{x}_0 \in \partial \tilde{u}(0)$, by subtracting linear function $\bar{x}_0 \cdot x + \tilde{u}(0)$ from \tilde{u} , we assume $\bar{x}_0 = 0 \in \partial \tilde{u}(0)$ and $\tilde{u}(0) = 0$, then $\tilde{u} \geq 0$ in $B_1(0)$. For any $|\bar{x}_*| < s\delta$, the linear function $L(x) = \bar{x}_* \cdot (x - \frac{1}{s\delta} \bar{x}_*) + \frac{1}{2s\delta} |\bar{x}_*|^2$ touches $Q(x) = \frac{s\delta}{2} |x|^2$

from below at $x = \frac{1}{s\delta}\bar{x}_*$. Because all the directional derivatives of $\tilde{u} - Q$ are nonnegative at 0, and also the directional derivative of $\tilde{v} - Q$ along each ray from 0 is increasing, we have the ordering $\tilde{u}(x) \geq Q(x) \geq L(x)$. We move up the linear function $L(x)$ until it touches the graph of $\tilde{u}(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^1$ the first time at $x = b$. Without loss of generality, we assume that in the first place, \tilde{u} is already extended to an entire $s\delta$ -convex function on \mathbb{R}^n . Note that the point b cannot be outside $B_1(0)$. Otherwise, by the sum rule in Step 1, $\bar{x}_* \in \partial\tilde{u}(b) = \partial v(b) + s\delta \cdot b$ and $0 \in \partial\tilde{u}(0) = \partial v(0) + \partial Q(0) = \partial v(0)$ with $v = \tilde{u} - Q$. Then we have the slope increasing property for \tilde{u} :

$$|\bar{x}_* - 0|^2 = |\partial v(b) + s\delta b|^2 = |\partial v(b)|^2 + |s\delta b|^2 + 2\langle \partial v(b), s\delta b \rangle \geq |s\delta b|^2 \geq |s\delta|^2,$$

where the ‘‘abused’’ notation $\partial v(b)$ means $\bar{x}_* - s\delta b$, and the inequality $\langle \partial v(b), b \rangle \geq 0$ comes from the summation of the following two for convex function v

$$\begin{aligned} v(b) - v(0) &\geq \langle 0, b - 0 \rangle, \\ v(0) - v(b) &\geq \langle \partial v(b), 0 - b \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It contradicts $|\bar{x}_*| < s\delta$. Thus $\bar{\Omega}$ contains $\bar{B}_{s\delta}(\partial\tilde{u}(0))$.

Similarly $\bar{\Omega}$ contains $\bar{B}_{s\delta(1-|a|)}(\partial\tilde{u}(a))$ for all $a \in B_1(0)$, and in turn, as a union of those open sets, $\bar{\Omega}$ is open.

Lastly, the connectedness of the $\bar{\Omega} = \partial\tilde{u}(B_1(0))$ follows from the continuity of the mapping $\partial\tilde{u} : B_1(0) \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ in the sense that, given any $b \in B_1(0)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that the convex, thus connected subdifferential $\partial\tilde{u}(x)$ satisfies

$$\partial\tilde{u}(a) \subset B_\varepsilon(\partial\tilde{u}(b)) \quad \text{for all } |a - b| < \eta;$$

see [R, Corollary 24.5.1]. \square

In order to proceed further, we observe some simple key facts. The Legendre transform (2.1) is order reversing and respects constants: $f \leq g \rightarrow f^* \geq g^*$, and $(f + c)^* = f^* - c$. In particular, if $f - c \leq g \leq f + c$, then $f^* + c \geq g^* \geq f^* - c$, so the transform respects C^0 uniform convergence. Consequently, the α -rotation (2.2) also enjoys these three properties, except now the order is preserved: if $u - c \leq v \leq u + c$, then $\bar{u} - c \leq \bar{v} \leq \bar{u} + c$.

As an immediate application of the uniform respect for the α -rotation, by taking smooth and $\cot \alpha$ -semiconvex approximations of the $\cot \alpha$ -semiconvex function $u(x)$, we see \bar{u} is $C^{1,1}$ from above, and if $u(x)$ is $(\cot \alpha - \delta)$ -semiconvex, also $C^{1,1}$ from below

$$-K(\alpha, \delta) I \leq D^2\bar{u} \leq \cot \alpha I.$$

A quick consequence of the order preservation is the preservation of the supersolutions under the α -rotation.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $u + \frac{1}{2}(\cot \alpha - \delta)|x|^2$ be convex and u be a viscosity supersolution of (1.1) on $B_1(0)$. Then the α -rotation \bar{u} in (2.2) is a*

corresponding viscosity supersolution of (2.3) on open $\bar{\Omega} = \partial\tilde{u}(B_1(0))$ with $\tilde{u} = su + \frac{c}{2}|x|^2$.

Proof. Let \bar{Q} be any quadratic function touching \bar{u} from below locally somewhere on the open set $\bar{\Omega}$, say the origin. Already $D^2\bar{Q} \leq D^2\bar{u} \leq \cot\alpha I$. By subtracting $\varepsilon|\bar{x}|^2$ from \bar{Q} , then taking the limit as ε goes to 0, we assume $D^2\bar{Q} < \cot\alpha I$. This guarantees the existence of its pre-rotated quadratic function Q . From the order preservation of α -rotation, which is also valid for any reverse rotation, we see the pre-rotated quadratic function Q touches u from below somewhere on $B_1(0)$. Because u is a supersolution there, $\sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i(D^2Q) \leq \Theta$, and in turn, $\bar{F}(D^2\bar{Q}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \bar{\lambda}_i(D^2\bar{Q}) - \Theta + n\alpha \leq 0$. \square

The preservation of subsolutions under α -rotation is no quick matter. Let \bar{Q} be a quadratic function touching \bar{u} from above. When one, but not all, of the eigenvalues is largest possible $\cot\alpha$, we are unable to check $\bar{F}(D^2\bar{Q}) \geq 0$. In this scenario, one cannot “lower” \bar{Q} so that all the eigenvalues are strictly less than $\cot\alpha$ and above \bar{u} at the same time. The pre-rotated function Q touching u from above is not a quadratic function anymore. It is a cone in some subspace, and only quadratic in the complementary subspace. One cannot see $F(D^2Q) \geq 0$. In fact, u is not $C^{1,1}$ from above at this touching point; the very definition of viscosity subsolution requires no checking at such points (of no touching by quadratic functions), and in turn, gives no information on Q . Moreover, we are unable to show that the points at such \bar{Q} touching \bar{u} from above have zero measure. Otherwise, the $C^{1,1}$ function \bar{u} is readily a subsolution.

We are only able to show the preservation of convex subsolutions by convex smooth subsolution approximations.

Proposition 2.3. *Let u be a convex viscosity subsolution of (1.1) on $B_{1.2}(0)$. Then the (anti-clockwise $\alpha \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$) α -rotation \bar{u} in (2.2) is a corresponding viscosity subsolution of (2.3) on open and connected $\bar{\Omega} = \partial\tilde{u}(B_1(0))$ with $\tilde{u}(x) = \frac{1}{2}c|x|^2 + su(x)$.*

Proof. Step 1. By Lemma 2.1 with $\delta = c/s$ and the sum rule $\partial\tilde{u} = cx + s\partial u(x)$, we see that α -rotation \bar{u} is indeed defined on the open and connected set $(cx + s\partial u(x))(B_{1.2}(0))$. For convenience, we extend the convex $u(x)$ to an entire convex function on \mathbb{R}^n . Set the standard convolution $u_\varepsilon(x) = u * \rho_\varepsilon(x)$ with $\rho_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-n}\rho(x/\varepsilon)$ and nonnegative $\rho(x) = \rho(|x|) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(x) dx = 1$. Given the C^0 uniform continuity of u , we have $|u_\varepsilon(x) - u(x)| < o(1)$ for all small enough ε .

We claim that the smooth α -rotation \bar{u}_ε is defined at least on $\bar{\Omega}$ for all small enough ε . We verify this by showing that for any $\bar{a} \in \partial\tilde{u}(a)$ with $a \in B_1(0)$, there exists b such that $D\tilde{u}_\varepsilon(b) = \bar{a}$ with $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{2}c|x|^2 + su_\varepsilon(x)$ and $|b - a| \leq o(1)$ as ε goes to 0. Consequently, $\partial\tilde{u}(B_1(0)) \subset D\tilde{u}_\varepsilon(B_{1.1}(0))$ for all small enough ε .

Now for any $\bar{a} \in \partial\tilde{u}(a)$, given the uniform convexity of \tilde{u}_ε , $D^2\tilde{u}_\varepsilon \geq cI$, there exists $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $D\tilde{u}_\varepsilon(b) = \bar{a}$. By subtracting linear function $\bar{a} \cdot x$ from both \tilde{u} and \tilde{u}_ε , we assume $0 \in \partial\tilde{u}(a) \cap \partial\tilde{u}_\varepsilon(b)$. Then coupled with the c -convexity of \tilde{u} and \tilde{u}_ε , we have

$$\tilde{u}(b) - \tilde{u}(a) \geq \frac{c}{2} |b - a|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(a) - \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(b) \geq \frac{c}{2} |a - b|^2.$$

For small enough ε , we always have

$$\tilde{u}(a) - \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(a) \geq -|o(1)| \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_\varepsilon(b) - \tilde{u}(b) \geq -|o(1)|.$$

Adding all the above four inequalities together, we get

$$|b - a|^2 \leq 2|o(1)|/c.$$

for small enough ε . Therefore, we have proved that \bar{u}_ε is defined on $\bar{\Omega} = \partial\tilde{u}(B_1(0)) \subset D\tilde{u}_\varepsilon(B_{1.1}(0))$ for all small enough ε .

Step 2. Note that the equation (1.1) is concave for convex u . By the well-known result in [CC, p. 56], the solid convex average $u * \rho_\varepsilon$ (instead of the hollow spherical one there) is still a subsolution of (1.1) in $B_{1.1}(0)$ for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$. For smooth convex subsolutions u_ε , the corresponding smooth α -rotation \bar{u}_ε is a subsolution of (2.3) on $\bar{\Omega}$ from Step 1 and the end of Section 2.1. The viscosity solutions are stable under C^0 uniform convergence. Hence uniformly convergent limit $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \bar{u}_\varepsilon = \bar{u}$ is a viscosity subsolution of (2.3) on $\bar{\Omega}$. \square

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

By Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.3 with $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\delta = 1$, the $\frac{\pi}{4}$ -rotation \bar{u} is a viscosity solution of (2.3) on open and connected set $\bar{\Omega} = (cx + s\partial u(x))(B_1(0))$ (we may assume u is defined on $B_{1.2}(0)$ by scaling $1.2^2 u(x/1.2)$). By the argument before Proposition 2.2, we have

$$-I \leq D^2\bar{u} \leq I.$$

Step 1. We now claim \bar{u} is smooth by modifying the dimension-3 interior $C^{2,\alpha}$ a priori estimate arguments in [Y1], using the a priori calculation in [Y2], Proposition 2.1. We can repeat the proof of Lemma 2.2 in [Y1] almost verbatim, and blow up the Lipschitz minimal surface $(\bar{x}, D\bar{u}(\bar{x}))$ at any point $\bar{p} \in \bar{\Omega}$ to produce a graphical minimal tangent cone T at $(\bar{p}, D\bar{u}(\bar{p}))$ satisfying the same Hessian bounds. If T is not smooth away from the origin, then by the dimension reduction argument, we produce a graphical minimal cone C smooth away from its vertex at $(\bar{p}, D\bar{u}(\bar{p}))$ which satisfies the same Hessian bounds. Now, invoking the Hessian bounds and Proposition 2.1 in [Y2], we conclude C is flat, hence that T is smooth away from its vertex as in [Y1]. Proposition 2.1 in [Y2] then implies that T is flat. The rest of the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [Y1] now goes through. We conclude $\bar{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, hence that the special Lagrangian submanifold $(\bar{x}, D\bar{u}(\bar{x}))$ for $\bar{x} \in \bar{\Omega}$ is smooth and even analytic, by the classical elliptic theory (cf. Theorem 17.16 in [GT] and [M] p. 203).

Step 2. Next we show the strict inequality $D^2\bar{u} < I$ on the open and connected set $\bar{\Omega}$, which then implies that the original u satisfies $D^2u < +\infty$, and hence is smooth and even analytic on $B_1(0)$.

Instead of invoking Lemma 4.1 in [CCY], we give another simple argument. Otherwise, there exists $\bar{p} \in \bar{\Omega}$ such that $1 = \bar{\lambda}_{\max} = \bar{\lambda}_1 = \dots = \bar{\lambda}_m > \bar{\lambda}_{m+1} \geq \dots \geq \bar{\lambda}_n \geq -1$ at \bar{p} , where $\bar{\lambda}_i$'s are the eigenvalues of $D^2\bar{u}$. We claim that the Lipschitz function $\bar{\lambda}_{\max}$ is subharmonic, or rather the smooth function

$$b_m = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ln \sqrt{1 + \bar{\lambda}_i^2}$$

satisfies $\Delta_{\bar{g}} b_m \geq 0$ near \bar{p} , where $\bar{g} = I + D^2\bar{u}D^2\bar{u}$ is the induced metric of $(\bar{x}, D\bar{u}(\bar{x}))$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. By the formula in [WdY, p. 487] with all the coefficients for h_{ijk}^2 re-arranged as sums of nonnegative terms for $1 \geq \bar{\lambda}_1 \geq \dots \geq \bar{\lambda}_m > \bar{\lambda}_{m+1} \geq \dots \geq \bar{\lambda}_n \geq -1$ near \bar{p} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} m \Delta_{\bar{g}} b_m &= \sum_{\gamma=1}^m \Delta_{\bar{g}} \ln \sqrt{1 + \bar{\lambda}_\gamma^2} \\ &= \sum_{k \leq m} (1 + \bar{\lambda}_k^2) h_{kkk}^2 + \left(\sum_{i < k \leq m} + \sum_{k < i \leq m} \right) (3 + \bar{\lambda}_i^2 + 2\bar{\lambda}_i \bar{\lambda}_k) h_{iik}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \leq m < i} \frac{2\bar{\lambda}_k (1 + \bar{\lambda}_k \bar{\lambda}_i)}{\bar{\lambda}_k - \bar{\lambda}_i} h_{iik}^2 + \sum_{i \leq m < k} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i - \bar{\lambda}_k + \bar{\lambda}_i^2 (2 + \bar{\lambda}_i^2 + \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{\lambda}_k)}{\bar{\lambda}_i - \bar{\lambda}_k} h_{iik}^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{i < j < k \leq m} (3 + \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{\lambda}_j + \bar{\lambda}_j \bar{\lambda}_k + \bar{\lambda}_k \bar{\lambda}_i) h_{ijk}^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{i < j \leq m < k} \left(1 + \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{\lambda}_j + \bar{\lambda}_i \frac{1 + \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{\lambda}_k}{\bar{\lambda}_i - \bar{\lambda}_k} + \bar{\lambda}_j \frac{1 + \bar{\lambda}_j \bar{\lambda}_k}{\bar{\lambda}_j - \bar{\lambda}_k} \right) h_{ijk}^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{i \leq m < j < k} \bar{\lambda}_i \left(\frac{1 + \bar{\lambda}_i \bar{\lambda}_j}{\bar{\lambda}_i - \bar{\lambda}_j} + \frac{1 + \bar{\lambda}_j \bar{\lambda}_k}{\bar{\lambda}_j - \bar{\lambda}_k} \right) h_{ijk}^2 \\ &\geq 0 \quad \text{near } \bar{p}. \end{aligned}$$

By the strong maximum principle $\bar{\lambda}_{\max} \equiv 1$ everywhere on the connected open set $\bar{\Omega} = \partial\tilde{u}(B_1(0))$. Note that the constant rank result in [CGM, p. 1772] does not apply here, as our smooth solution \bar{u} with $-I \leq D^2\bar{u} \leq I$ cannot be turned into a smooth convex solution of (1.1) yet.

But we can always arrange a quadratic function $Q = \frac{1}{2}K|x|^2 + t$ touching the bounded continuous function u from above at an interior point a in $B_1(0)$. By the order preservation of the rotation, $\bar{Q} = \frac{K-1}{2(K+1)}|x|^2 + t$ would touch \bar{u} from above at the corresponding interior point \bar{a} in $\bar{\Omega}$. It follows that $D^2\bar{u}(\bar{a}) \leq \frac{K-1}{(K+1)}I < I$. This contradiction shows that $D^2\bar{u} < I$ on $\bar{\Omega}$.

Step 3. We conclude by noting that now the original special Lagrangian graph $(x, Du(x))$ is smooth and even analytic, and the effective Hessian bound in Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 1.1 in [CWY]. In fact, a sharper bound follows from the a priori estimate Theorem 1.1 in [WdY2],

since all proofs there go through when $\Theta \geq (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}$ is replaced by $\lambda_i \geq 0$. An implicit Hessian bound would also follow from a compactness argument, see e.g. [L].

REFERENCES

- [BW] Brendle, Simon; Warren, Micah *A boundary value problem for minimal Lagrangian graphs*. J. Differential Geom. **84** (2010), no. 2, 267–287.
- [C] Caffarelli, Luis A. *Interior $W^{2,p}$ estimates for solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation*. Ann. of Math. (2) **131** (1990), no. 1, 135–150.
- [CC] Caffarelli, Luis A.; Cabré, Xavier *Fully Nonlinear Elliptic Equations*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, **43**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.
- [CGM] Caffarelli, Luis; Guan, Pengfei; Ma, Xi-Nan *A constant rank theorem for solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **60** (2007), no. 12, 1769–1791.
- [CCY] Chau, Albert; Chen, Jingyi; Yuan, Yu *Lagrangian mean curvature flow for entire Lipschitz graphs II*. Math. Ann. **357** (2013), no. 1, 165–183.
- [CW] Chen, Jingyi; Warren, Micah *On the regularity of Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian submanifolds*. Adv. Math. **343** (2019), 316–352.
- [CWY] Chen, Jingyi; Warren, Micah; Yuan, Yu *A priori estimate for convex solutions to special Lagrangian equations and its application*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62**, no. 4 (2009), 583–595.
- [GT] Gilbarg, David; Trudinger, Neil S *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Reprint of the 1998 edition. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [HL] Harvey, Reese; Lawson, H. Blaine, Jr. *Calibrated geometry*. Acta Math. **148** (1982), 47–157.
- [H] Heinz, Erhard *On elliptic Monge-Ampère equations and Weyl’s embedding problem*. J. Analyse Math. **7** (1959) 1–52.
- [Hi] Hitchin, Nigel J. *The moduli space of special Lagrangian submanifolds*. Dedicated to Ennio De Giorgi. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **25** (1997), no. 3-4, 503–515 (1998).
- [L] Li, Caiyan *A compactness approach to Hessian estimates for special Lagrangian equations with supercritical phase*. Nonlin. Anal. **187** (2019), 434–437.
- [Me] Mealy, Jack G. *Calibrations on semi-Riemannian manifolds*. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Rice University, 1989.
- [M] Morrey, Charles B., Jr. *On the analyticity of the solutions of analytic non-linear elliptic systems of partial differential equations. I. Analyticity in the interior*. Amer. J. Math. **80** (1958) 198–218.
- [NV] Nadirashvili, Nikolai; Vlăduț, Serge *Singular solution to special Lagrangian equations*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **27** (2010), no. 5, 1179–1188.
- [P] Pogorelov, Aleksei Vasil’evich *The Minkowski multidimensional problem*. Translated from the Russian by Vladimir Oliker. Introduction by Louis Nirenberg. Scripta Series in Mathematics. V. H. Winston & Sons, Washington, D.C.; Halsted Press [John Wiley & Sons], New York-Toronto-London, 1978.
- [R] Rockafellar, R. Tyrrell *Convex analysis*. Reprint of the 1970 original. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton Paperbacks. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997.
- [U] Urbas, John I. E. *Regularity of generalized solutions of Monge-Ampère equations*. Math. Z. **197** (1988), no. 3, 365–393.
- [W] Warren, Micah *Calibrations associated to Monge-Ampère equations*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), no. 8, 3947–3962.

- [WY1] Warren, Micah; Yuan, Yu *Hessian estimates for the sigma-2 equation in dimension 3*. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **62** (2009), no. 3, 305–321.
- [WY2] Warren, Micah; Yuan, Yu *Explicit gradient estimates for minimal Lagrangian surfaces of dimension two*. *Math. Z.* **262** (2009), no. 4, 867–879.
- [WY3] Warren, Micah; Yuan, Yu *Hessian and gradient estimates for three dimensional special Lagrangian equations with large phase*. *Amer. J. Math.* **132** (2010), no. 3, 751–770.
- [WdY1] Wang, Dake; Yuan, Yu *Singular solutions to special Lagrangian equations with subcritical phases and minimal surface systems*. *Amer. J. Math.* **135** (2013), no. 5, 1157–1177.
- [WdY2] Wang, Dake and Yuan, Yu *Hessian estimates for special Lagrangian equations with critical and supercritical phases in general dimensions*. *Amer. J. Math.* **136** (2014), 481–499.
- [Y1] Yuan, Yu *A priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear special Lagrangian equations*. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré Analyse Non Linéaire* **18**, no. 2 (2001), 261–270.
- [Y2] Yuan, Yu *A Bernstein problem for special Lagrangian equations*. *Invent. Math.* **150** (2002), 117–125.
- [Y3] Yuan, Yu *Global solutions to special Lagrangian equations*. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **134** (2006), no. 5, 1355–1358.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC V6T 1Z2

E-mail address: `jychen@math.ubc.ca`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BOX 354350, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195

E-mail address: `shankarr@uw.edu`, `yuan@math.washington.edu`