

LIOUVILLE TYPE THEOREMS AND HESSIAN ESTIMATES FOR SPECIAL LAGRANGIAN EQUATIONS

QI DING

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we get a Liouville type theorem for the special Lagrangian equation with a certain 'convexity' condition, where Warren-Yuan first studied the condition in [29]. Based on Warren-Yuan's work, our strategy is to show a global Hessian estimate of solutions via the Neumann-Poincaré inequality on special Lagrangian graphs, and mean value inequality for superharmonic functions on these graphs. Moreover, we derive interior Hessian estimates in terms of the linear exponential dependence on the gradient of the solutions to the equation with this 'convexity' condition or with supercritical phase. Here, the linear exponential dependence is optimal.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let u be a smooth function on an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then $M \triangleq \{(x, Du(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \Omega\}$ is a Lagrangian submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_n(x)$ be the eigenvalues of Hessian matrix $D^2u(x)$ at any point $x \in \Omega$. We call M a *special Lagrangian graph* if u is a solution to the special Lagrangian equation

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i = \Theta, \quad \text{for some constant } \Theta.$$

The equation (1.1) arises in the special Lagrangian geometry by Harvey-Lawson [16]. M is the special Lagrangian graph if and only if M is a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, or the calibrating n -form $Re(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} dz_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n)$ is equal to the induced volume form along M , which is also equivalent to that M is (volume) minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ (see Theorem 2.3, Proposition 2.17 in [16]; or Chapter 5 in [33]).

The classification of global solutions to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n has a long history. In 1998, Fu [13] classified any smooth solution to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^2 , i.e., any such solution is either quadratic for $|\Theta| > 0$ or harmonic for $\Theta = 0$. In particular, (1.1) for $\Theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ is just the Monge-Ampère equation of dimension 2. In high dimensions, Yuan proved that any smooth solution to (1.1) for $|\Theta| > \frac{n-2}{2}\pi$ on \mathbb{R}^n must be quadratic [35]. Compared with Monge-Ampère equation, it is natural to study Liouville theorem for the smooth convex solution u to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n . For $\Theta = k\pi$ with integer k , Borisenko [5] got linearity of the linear growth u . For general n , Jost-Xin [19] showed that u is quadratic provided Hessian D^2u is uniformly bounded. For $n = 3$ and $\Theta = \pi$, Bao-Chen-Guan-Ji [1] proved that every strictly convex u with quadratic growth must be quadratic. Using Lewy rotation brilliantly, Yuan [34] proved that u must be quadratic for each n .

Furthermore, the Liouville theorem may hold true under conditions much weaker than convexity. Let u be a smooth solution to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ of Hessian matrix D^2u . In the same paper [34], Yuan proved the existence of the constant

The author is partially supported by NSFC 11871156 and NSFC 11922106.

$\epsilon' > 0$ depending only on n such that u is quadratic provided $D^2u \geq -\epsilon'$ on \mathbb{R}^n . Further, for $n = 3$ Yuan proved that u is quadratic on \mathbb{R}^3 if D^2u is uniformly bounded from below [34], or $\lambda_i\lambda_j$ is uniformly bounded from below for all i, j [36]. Moreover, Tsui-Wang [25] proved that if $\lambda_i\lambda_j \geq -\frac{3}{2} + \tau$ for all i, j and any fixed constant $\tau > 0$, and $|D^2u|$ is uniformly bounded, then u is quadratic. In [36], Yuan proved that u is quadratic if one of following statement holds: (i) $\lambda_i \geq -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} + \delta$ everywhere for every i, j and any fixed constant $\delta > 0$ (or 'equivalently' $|\lambda_i| \leq \sqrt{3} - \delta'$ for every i and any fixed constant $\delta' > 0$); (ii) $\lambda_i\lambda_j \geq -1 - \delta''$ everywhere for every i, j and any fixed constant $\delta'' > 0$. In [29], Warren-Yuan first introduced a more general 'convexity' condition:

$$(1.2) \quad 3 + (1 - \epsilon)\lambda_i^2(x) + 2\lambda_i(x)\lambda_j(x) \geq 0$$

for all i, j, x and any small fixed $\epsilon > 0$, which appeared naturally in studying subharmonicity of $\log \det(I + D^2u D^2u)$ on the special Lagrangian graph of the graphic function Du . Under the condition (1.2) and $|Du| < \delta(n)|x|$ for large $|x|$ and any fixed constant $\delta(n) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}$, Warren-Yuan showed that u is quadratic [29]. Moreover, they also proved that u is quadratic provided (1.2) holds for $\epsilon = 0$ and Hessian D^2u is uniformly bounded on \mathbb{R}^n .

In this paper, we show a Liouville type theorem under a general 'convexity' condition without any assumption on the growth of Du .

Theorem 1.1. *Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n , where $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_n(x)$ are the eigenvalues of Hessian $D^2u(x)$. If*

$$(1.3) \quad 3 + \lambda_i^2(x) + 2\lambda_i(x)\lambda_j(x) \geq 0$$

holds for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then u must be a quadratic polynomial.

In fact, we have a litter stronger result than the above theorem. More precisely, there exists a constant $\epsilon_n > 0$ depending only on n such that if a smooth solution u to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n satisfies

$$3(1 + \epsilon_n) + (1 + \epsilon_n)\lambda_i^2 + 2\lambda_i(x)\lambda_j \geq 0$$

on \mathbb{R}^n for all i, j , then u is a quadratic polynomial (see Theorem 4.5). Using Warren-Yuan's argument in [29], in order to prove the above theorem it is sufficient to show the following global Hessian estimate.

Theorem 1.2. *For any constant $K \geq 1$, there is a constant $c_{n,K} > 0$ depending only on n, K such that if u is a smooth solution to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ of Hessian D^2u satisfying*

$$(1.4) \quad \lambda_i\lambda_j \geq -K \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and u is not a quadratic polynomial, then Hessian of u satisfies $-c_{n,K} \leq D^2u \leq c_{n,K}$ on \mathbb{R}^n .

The geometric meaning of (1.4) is that determinant of $\text{Hess}_S u$ on any 2-dimensional surface S of \mathbb{R}^n has a lower bound by $-K$, where $\text{Hess}_S u$ is the Hessian of u restricted on S . Without the condition (1.4), D^2u may be unbounded. For instance, those harmonic functions have unbounded Hessian on \mathbb{R}^2 as they are solutions to (1.1) for $n = 2$, $\Theta = 0$. The proof of boundedness of D^2u uses mean value inequality on special Lagrangian graphs for superharmonic functions in terms to Hessian of solutions, which is established due to the Neumann-Poincaré inequality on the graphs. It is worth to point out that Bombieri-Giusti had established the Neumann-Poincaré inequality on area-minimizing hypersurfaces in Euclidean space, and given many applications to area-minimizing hypersurfaces [4].

Now let us review the known results on interior Hessian estimates for the special Lagrangian equation (1.1). In the 1950s, Heinz derived a Hessian bound for (1.1) with $n = 2$ and $\Theta = \pi/2$ (i.e., the Monge-Ampère equation); Pogorelov [23] got Hessian estimates for (1.1) with $n = 2$ and $\Theta > \pi/2$. Bao-Chen [2] got Hessian estimates in terms of certain integrals of the Hessian for solutions to (1.1) with $n = 3$, $\Theta = \pi$. Warren-Yuan obtained Hessian estimates of (1.1) in terms of gradients for solutions to (1.1) in the following cases: i) the solutions satisfies (1.2) with small gradients in [29]; ii) $n = 2$ in [31]; iii) $n = 3$ and $|\Theta| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$ in [30, 32]. For general n , Chen-Warren-Yuan [8] derived a priori interior Hessian estimates for smooth convex solutions to (1.1) (see the very recent work [7] for convex viscosity solutions). In [27], Wang-Yuan obtained a priori interior Hessian estimates for all the solutions to (1.1) with critical and supercritical phases in dimensions ≥ 3 . More precisely, for any $n \geq 3$, there is a constant c_n depending on n such that for any smooth solution on $B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to (1.1) with $|\Theta| \geq (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}$, there holds

$$(1.5) \quad |D^2u(0)| \leq c_n \exp \left(c_n R^{2-2n} \max_{B_R(0)} |Du|^{2n-2} \right),$$

and when $|\Theta| = (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}$, there holds

$$(1.6) \quad |D^2u(0)| \leq c_n \exp \left(c_n R^{4-2n} \max_{B_R(0)} |Du|^{2n-4} \right).$$

From the counter-examples constructed by Nadirashvili-Vlăduț [22] and Wang-Yuan [26], the condition $|\Theta| \geq (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}$ above is necessary.

We use the mean value inequality on special Lagrangian graphs for superharmonic functions to derive a new interior Hessian estimate in terms of the linear exponential dependence on the gradient of the solutions.

Theorem 1.3. *Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on $B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that (1.3) holds on $B_R(0)$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Then there is a constant $C_n > 0$ depending only on n such that*

$$(1.7) \quad |D^2u(0)| \leq C_n \exp \left(C_n \frac{\max_{B_R(0)} |Du - Du(0)|}{R} \right).$$

The Hessian estimate (1.7) is effective for the convex solutions. In [11], Finn obtained gradient estimates in terms of the linear exponential dependence on the solutions of 2-dimensional minimal surfaces equation (see [3] and [28] for high dimensions and high codimensions case). Further, Finn [11] constructed examples of minimal surfaces whose gradient has the linear exponential dependence on the solutions. With Heinz transformation [18], there is a smooth solution ψ to (1.1) with $n = 2$ and $\Theta = \pi/2$ (i.e., the Monge-Ampère equation), whose Hessian has the linear exponential dependence on $D\psi$ (see also the introduction in [27]). Note that $\psi(x_1, x_2) + \sum_{i=3}^n k_i x_i^2$ are the solutions to (1.1) for $n \geq 3$ with constants k_i associated to the phase Θ . Hence, (1.7) is sharp in the sense of the linear exponential dependence.

Moreover, using subharmonic functions obtained by Wang-Yuan [27], our strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.3 is effective for smooth solutions to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) with supercritical phase, i.e., $|\Theta| > (n-2)\pi/2$ (see Theorem 5.2). However, the strategy is ineffective for critical phase, i.e., $|\Theta| = (n-2)\pi/2$, because in this situation Hessian of the solutions may be not uniformly bounded from below for $\Theta = (n-2)\pi/2$, or above for $\Theta = -(n-2)\pi/2$.

2. LEWY ROTATION FOR SPECIAL LAGRANGIAN GRAPHS OVER CONVEX SETS

In this paper, we denote $B_r(x)$ be the ball in \mathbb{R}^n with the radius r and centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Denote $\mathbf{B}_r(\mathbf{x})$ be the ball in \mathbb{R}^{n+n} with the radius r and centered at $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+n}$. Let $B_r = B_r(0)$, $\mathbf{B}_r = \mathbf{B}_r(\mathbf{0})$ for convenience. For any subset E in \mathbb{R}^n and any constant $0 \leq s \leq n$, let $\mathcal{H}^s(E)$ denote the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure of E . Let Π be a projection from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ into \mathbb{R}^n defined by $\Pi(\mathbf{x}) = x$ for any $\mathbf{x} = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on an open convex set Ω of \mathbb{R}^n . Assume

$$(2.1) \quad \inf_{\Omega} D^2u \geq -\Lambda.$$

Then $\hat{u}(x) \triangleq u(x) + \frac{\Lambda}{2}|x|^2$ is convex. For $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega$, from the segment $\overline{x_1x_2} \subset \Omega$ we have

$$(2.2) \quad \langle x_2 - x_1, D\hat{u}(x_2) - D\hat{u}(x_1) \rangle \geq 0,$$

which implies

$$(2.3) \quad \langle x_2 - x_1, Du(x_2) - Du(x_1) \rangle \geq -\Lambda|x_2 - x_1|^2.$$

In [34], Yuan introduced the Lewy rotation as follows, which turns out to be a standard technique nowadays, but still very powerful in studying special Lagrangian equation. Let $F_{\Lambda} : (x, y) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be the Lewy rotation defined by

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \bar{x} = (\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}}(2\Lambda x + y) \\ \bar{y} = (\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}}(-x + 2\Lambda y) \end{cases},$$

which is an isometry from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Let M be a graph over Ω defined by $\{(x, Du(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \Omega\}$. We call M a *special Lagrangian graph*. Restricted on M , one has

$$\bar{x}(x, Du(x)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}}(2\Lambda x + Du(x))$$

and

$$\bar{y}(x, Du(x)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}}(-x + 2\Lambda Du(x)).$$

Combining (2.3) (see also [34]), for any $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega$ we have

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\bar{x}(x_2, Du(x_2)) - \bar{x}(x_1, Du(x_1))|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4\Lambda^2 + 1} \left(4\Lambda^2|x_2 - x_1|^2 + 4\Lambda \langle x_2 - x_1, Du(x_2) - Du(x_1) \rangle + |Du(x_2) - Du(x_1)|^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4\Lambda^2 + 1} \left(2\Lambda^2|x_2 - x_1|^2 + 2\Lambda \langle x_2 - x_1, Du(x_2) - Du(x_1) \rangle + |Du(x_2) - Du(x_1)|^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\Lambda^2}{4\Lambda^2 + 1} |x_2 - x_1|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\bar{x} : \Omega \rightarrow \bar{x}(\Omega)$ is injective and then $F_{\Lambda}(M)$ is a graph over $\bar{x}(\Omega)$.

Let J be the Jacobi of the mapping \bar{x} , i.e.,

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} \partial \bar{x}_i \\ \partial x_j \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}}(2\Lambda I + D^2u(x)),$$

and \widehat{J} be the Jacobi of the mapping \bar{y} , i.e.,

$$\widehat{J} = \left(\frac{\partial \bar{y}_i}{\partial x_j} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}} (-I + 2\Lambda D^2 u(x)).$$

Note that both of J and \widehat{J} are symmetric matrices. With the diagonalization of $D^2 u$, it is easy to show $J^{-1} \widehat{J} = \widehat{J} J^{-1}$. Since

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{\partial \bar{y}_i}{\partial \bar{x}_j} = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial \bar{y}_i}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial x_k}{\partial \bar{x}_j},$$

Then $\left(\frac{\partial \bar{y}_i}{\partial \bar{x}_j} \right) = \widehat{J} J^{-1} = J^{-1} \widehat{J}$, i.e., $\left(\frac{\partial \bar{y}_i}{\partial \bar{x}_j} \right)$ is symmetric. Note that $\bar{x}(\Omega)$ is convex from Lemma 6.1 in the appendix, then it is simply connected. From Frobenius' theorem (see Lemma 7.2.11 in [33] for instance), there is a function \bar{u} on $\bar{x}(\Omega)$ such that

$$(2.7) \quad D\bar{u}(\bar{x})|_{\bar{x}(x, Du(x))} = \bar{y}(x, Du(x)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}} (-x + 2\Lambda Du(x)).$$

From (2.6), we have

$$(2.8) \quad D^2 \bar{u}(\bar{x})|_{\bar{x}(x, Du(x))} = J^{-1} \widehat{J} = (2\Lambda I + D^2 u(x))^{-1} (-I + 2\Lambda D^2 u(x)),$$

which is equivalent to

$$(2.9) \quad D^2 u(x) = (2\Lambda I - D^2 \bar{u}(\bar{x}))^{-1} (I + 2\Lambda D^2 \bar{u}(\bar{x}))|_{\bar{x}(x, Du(x))}.$$

Note that both of $D\bar{u}$ and $D^2 \bar{u}$ are independent of the choice of \bar{u} . From (2.1), for all $(\bar{x}, D\bar{u}(\bar{x})) \in F_\Lambda(M)$ we have

$$(2.10) \quad -\frac{2\Lambda^2 + 1}{\Lambda} \leq D^2 \bar{u}(\bar{x}) \leq 2\Lambda.$$

Using (2.10), we immediately have a volume estimate for special Lagrangian graph M as follows.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that u is a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation on an open convex set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with (2.1), and $M = \{(x, Du(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \Omega\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for each $R > 0$*

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_R) \leq \omega_n (4\Lambda^2 + 5 + \Lambda^{-2})^{\frac{n}{2}} R^n.$$

Proof. Let $F_\Lambda : (x, y) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be the isometric mapping defined before, and \bar{u} be the function defined on $\bar{x}(\Omega)$ as before. In other words, $D\bar{u}$ is the graphic function of $F_\Lambda(M)$. Since $\Pi(F_\Lambda(M)) = \bar{x}(M)$, then from (2.10) we have

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^n(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_R) &= \int_{\Pi(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_R)} \sqrt{\det(I + D^2 \bar{u} D^2 \bar{u})} \\ &\leq \int_{\Pi(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_R)} \left(1 + \frac{(2\Lambda^2 + 1)^2}{\Lambda^2} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \leq (4\Lambda^2 + 5 + \Lambda^{-2})^{\frac{n}{2}} \mathcal{H}^n(B_R). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(2.13) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_R) = \mathcal{H}^n(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_R) \leq \omega_n (4\Lambda^2 + 5 + \Lambda^{-2})^{\frac{n}{2}} R^n.$$

This completes the proof. \square

3. MEAN VALUE INEQUALITY ON SPECIAL LAGRANGIAN GRAPHS

Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and $M = \text{graph}_{D_u} \triangleq \{(x, Du(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \Omega\}$ be a special Lagrangian graph over Ω with $\mathbf{0} \in M$, $\partial M \subset \partial \mathbf{B}_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection of M with the induced metric $(\delta_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^n u_{ik}u_{jk})dx_i dx_j$. Here, $\partial_{ik}u$ denotes the derivative of u with respect to x_i, x_k . Recall Sobolev inequality on minimal submanifolds proved by Michael-Simon [21] (see also [6] by Brendle):

$$(3.1) \quad \left(\int_M |\varphi|^{\frac{n}{n-1}} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \leq c_n \int_M |\nabla \varphi|$$

for any function $\varphi \in W_0^{1,1}(M)$, where $c_n \geq 1$ is a constant depending only on n . For any nonnegative subharmonic functions ψ on M , there holds the mean value inequality ([9][14][21]):

$$(3.2) \quad \psi(0) \leq \frac{1}{\omega_n r^n} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} \psi$$

for any $0 < r < R$. Let $\kappa \geq 1$ be a constant such that

$$(3.3) \quad \det(I + D^2 u D^2 u) \leq \kappa^2 \quad \text{on } \Omega.$$

Then $\partial M \subset \partial \mathbf{B}_R$ implies that Ω contains a ball centered at the origin with the radius R/κ . Since the Neumann-Poincaré inequality holds on \mathbb{R}^n , then for any open set $V \subset B_r$ with rectifiable boundary ∂V and $r > 0$, there holds

$$(3.4) \quad \min \{ \mathcal{H}^n(V), \mathcal{H}^n(B_r \setminus V) \} \leq c_n r \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_r \cap \partial V)$$

up to choose the constant $c_n \geq 1$. For any $\kappa r \leq R$, let U be an open set in $M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\kappa r}$ with rectifiable boundary, then $\Pi(U \cap \partial \mathbf{B}_{\kappa r}) \cap B_r = \emptyset$, and

$$(3.5) \quad \min \{ \mathcal{H}^n(\Pi(U \cap \mathbf{B}_r)), \mathcal{H}^n(\Pi(\mathbf{B}_r \setminus U)) \} \leq c_n r \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_r \cap \partial(\Pi(U))).$$

Combining (3.3) and $B_r \subset \Pi(\mathbf{B}_{\kappa r})$, we get

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \min \{ \mathcal{H}^n(U \cap \mathbf{B}_r), \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_r \setminus U) \} \\ & \leq \min \left\{ \int_{\Pi(U \cap \mathbf{B}_r)} \sqrt{\det(I + D^2 u D^2 u)} dx, \int_{\Pi(\mathbf{B}_r \setminus U)} \sqrt{\det(I + D^2 u D^2 u)} dx \right\} \\ & \leq \kappa \min \{ \mathcal{H}^n(\Pi(U \cap \mathbf{B}_r)), \mathcal{H}^n(\Pi(\mathbf{B}_r \setminus U)) \} \leq c_n \kappa r \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{B}_{\kappa r} \cap \partial U). \end{aligned}$$

By a standard argument (see Lemma 3.5 in [10] for instance), we have a Neumann-Poincaré inequality on exterior balls as follows.

Lemma 3.1.

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} |f - \bar{f}_r| \leq 2c_n \kappa r \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\kappa r}} |\nabla f|$$

for all function $f \in W^{1,1}(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\kappa r})$, where $\bar{f}_r = \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_r)} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} f$.

Let Δ_M denote the Laplacian of M with the induced metric from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Using (3.1)(3.2)(3.7), we can get the mean value inequality for superharmonic functions on M as follows.

Theorem 3.2. *Let M be the special Lagrangian graph defined previously in this section and κ be the constant in (3.3). Suppose that ϕ is a positive function satisfying $\Delta_M \phi \leq \beta \phi$ on M for some constant $\beta > 0$. Then ϕ satisfies mean value inequality as follows:*

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_\rho} \phi^{\delta_n} \leq c_{\kappa, \beta \rho^2} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_\rho) \phi^{\delta_n}(\mathbf{0})$$

for any $\rho \in (0, R/2]$, where $\delta_n \in (0, 1]$ is a constant depending on n , and $c_{\kappa, \beta \rho^2}$ is a positive constant depending only on $n, \kappa, \beta \rho^2$.

The proof uses the famous De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iteration (refer [10]). For self-containment and figuring out the constant $c_{\kappa, \beta \rho^2}$, we shall give the detailed proof of Theorem 3.2 here. If the reader is quite familiar with it, one can skip the proof.

Proof. Let

$$w = \log \phi - \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_r)} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} \log \phi,$$

then $\Delta_M \phi \leq \beta \phi$ implies

$$(3.9) \quad \Delta_M w \leq \beta - |\nabla w|^2.$$

Let η be a Lipschitz function with compact support in $M \cap \mathbf{B}_r$ for any $r \in (0, R]$. From (3.9), for any $q \geq 0$ integrating by parts implies

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \int (|\nabla w|^2 - \beta) \eta^2 |w|^q &\leq - \int \eta^2 |w|^q \Delta_M w = 2 \int \eta |w|^q \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla w + q \int \eta^2 |w|^{q-2} w |\nabla w|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla w|^2 \eta^2 |w|^q + 2 \int |\nabla \eta|^2 |w|^q + q \int \eta^2 |w|^{q-1} |\nabla w|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(3.11) \quad \int \eta^2 |w|^q |\nabla w|^2 \leq 2 \int (2|\nabla \eta|^2 + \beta \eta^2) |w|^q + 2q \int \eta^2 |w|^{q-1} |\nabla w|^2.$$

For any ball $\mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbf{x} \in M$ and $\mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathbf{B}_R$, we choose $\eta_0 = 1$ on $\mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})$, $\eta_0 = \frac{2\epsilon - |\mathbf{x}|}{\epsilon}$ on $\mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}) \setminus \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})$, $\eta_0 = 0$ outside $\mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})$. Then $|\nabla \eta_0| \leq 1/\epsilon$ on $M \cap \mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})$. Choosing $q = 0$ in (3.11), we have

$$(3.12) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})} |\nabla w|^2 \leq 2 \int (2|\nabla \eta_0|^2 + \beta \eta_0^2) \leq (4\epsilon^{-2} + 2\beta) \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Combining the Neumann-Poincaré inequality (3.7) for w , we have

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{\epsilon}{\kappa}}(\mathbf{x})} |w| &\leq 2c_n \kappa \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})} |\nabla w| \\ &\leq 2c_n \epsilon (\mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})))^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})} |\nabla w|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 2c_n \epsilon (2^{-n} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})))^{\frac{1}{2}} ((4\epsilon^{-2} + 2\beta) \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 2^{3 - \frac{n}{2}} (1 + \beta \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} c_n \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{2\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})). \end{aligned}$$

By vitali covering lemma, for any $0 < r < \frac{R}{2}$ and $0 < \epsilon < \min\{1, \frac{R}{8\kappa}\}$, there is a sequence of mutually disjoint balls $B_{r_i}(\mathbf{p}_i) \subset \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}r}$ with $\mathbf{p}_i \in M$, $r_i \leq \epsilon$ so that $M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}r} \subset$

$\bigcup_i B_{(1+\epsilon)r_i}(\mathbf{p}_i)$. Denote $\mathbf{p}_i = (p_i, Du(p_i))$. By the definition of κ in (3.3), we have

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_i \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{2(1+\epsilon)\kappa r_i}(\mathbf{p}_i)) &\leq \sum_i \kappa \mathcal{H}^n(B_{2(1+\epsilon)\kappa r_i}(p_i)) = 2^n(1+\epsilon)^n \omega_n \kappa^{n+1} \sum_i r_i^n \\ &\leq 2^n(1+\epsilon)^n \kappa^{n+1} \sum_i \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_i}(\mathbf{p}_i)) \leq 2^n(1+\epsilon)^n \kappa^{n+1} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}r}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.13) and (3.14), we have

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}r}} |w| &\leq \sum_i \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{(1+\epsilon)r_i}(\mathbf{p}_i)} |w| \\ &\leq \sum_i 2^{3-\frac{n}{2}}(1+\beta((1+\epsilon)\kappa r_i)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} c_n \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{2(1+\epsilon)\kappa r_i}(\mathbf{p}_i)) \\ &\leq 2^{3-\frac{n}{2}}(1+\beta((1+\epsilon)\kappa)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} c_n \times 2^n(1+\epsilon)^n \kappa^{n+1} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}r}). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in the above inequality, there holds

$$(3.16) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}r}} |w| \leq c_n^* \kappa^{n+2} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}r})$$

for some constant c_n^* depending only on n .

Denote $\bar{\beta} = 1 + \beta^{\frac{1}{2}}r$ for convenience. Let $r_j = (1 + 2^{-j-1})r$ for each integer $j \geq 0$. Let η_j be the cut-off function on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\eta_j = 1$ on $\mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}$, $\eta_j = \frac{r_j - |\mathbf{x}|}{r_j - r_{j+1}}$ on $\mathbf{B}_{r_j} \setminus \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}$, $\eta_j = 0$ outside \mathbf{B}_{r_j} . Then $|\nabla \eta_j| \leq 2^{j+2}/r$. From (3.11), for any number $q \geq 1$ and any integer $j \geq 0$ we have

$$(3.17) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |w|^q |\nabla w|^2 \leq 2^{2j+6} \frac{\bar{\beta}^2}{r^2} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^q + 2q \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |w|^{q-1} |\nabla w|^2.$$

Recall Young's inequality:

$$(3.18) \quad 2q|w|^{q-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}|w|^q + 2^{2q-1}(q-1)^{q-1} \quad \text{for } q \geq 1,$$

where we denote $0^0 = 1$ for the case $q = 1$. Combining (3.17) with $q = 0$, we get

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |w|^q |\nabla w|^2 &\leq 2^{2j+6} \frac{\bar{\beta}^2}{r^2} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^q + 2^{2q-1}(q-1)^{q-1} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |\nabla w|^2 \\ &\leq 2^{2j+6} \frac{\bar{\beta}^2}{r^2} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^q + 2^{2q+2j+5} q^{q-1} \frac{\bar{\beta}^2}{r^2} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining Cauchy inequality and (3.18), for $q \geq 1$ and $j \geq 0$ we have

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |w|^q |\nabla w| &\leq \frac{r}{2^{j+5}\bar{\beta}} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |w|^q |\nabla w|^2 + \frac{2^{j+3}\bar{\beta}}{r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |w|^q \\ &\leq 2^{j+2} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^q + 2^{2q+j+1} q^{q-1} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}) + \frac{2^{j+3}\bar{\beta}}{r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^q \\ &\leq 2^{j+4} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \frac{|w|^{q+1} + 2^{2q+2} q^q}{4(q+1)} + 2^{2q+j+1} q^{q-1} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}) \\ &\leq \frac{2^{j+2}\bar{\beta}}{(q+1)r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^{q+1} + 2^{2q+j+5} q^{q-1} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $j \geq 0$ and $0 \leq q < 1$, combining (3.17) with $q = 0$ and Young inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.21) \quad & \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}} |w|^q |\nabla w| \leq \frac{2^{j+1} \bar{\beta}}{r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}} |w|^{2q} + \frac{r}{2^{j+3} \bar{\beta}} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} \eta_j^2 |\nabla w|^2 \\
 & \leq \frac{2^{j+1} \bar{\beta}}{r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}} \left(\frac{2q}{q+1} |w|^{q+1} + \frac{1-q}{q+1} \right) + 2^{j+3} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}) \\
 & \leq \frac{2^{j+2} \bar{\beta}}{(q+1)r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^{q+1} + 2^{j+4} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.20) and (3.21), we get

$$(3.22) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}} |w|^q |\nabla w| \leq \frac{2^{j+2} \bar{\beta}}{(q+1)r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^{q+1} + 2^{2q+j+5} q^{q-1} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{r} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j})$$

for $q \geq 0$ and $j \geq 0$. Combining Sobolev inequality (3.1) and (3.22), for $j \geq 0$ and $q \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.23) \quad & \left(\int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+2}}} |w|^{\frac{(q+1)n}{n-1}} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \leq \left(\int_M (|w|^{q+1} \eta_{j+1})^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \leq c_n \int_M |\nabla(w^{q+1} \eta_{j+1})| \\
 & \leq c_n \left((q+1) \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}} |w|^q |\nabla w| + \frac{2^{j+3}}{r} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}} |w|^{q+1} \right) \\
 & \leq \frac{2^{j+2} c_n \bar{\beta}}{r} \left(\int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^{q+1} + 2^{2q+3} (q+1)^q \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}) + 2 \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_{j+1}}} |w|^{q+1} \right) \\
 & \leq \frac{2^{j+4} c_n \bar{\beta}}{r} \left(\int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |w|^{q+1} + 2^{2q+1} (q+1)^q \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

For any $f \in L^p(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j})$ with $p > 0$, $j \geq 0$, we define $\|f\|_{p,r_j} = \left(\frac{1}{\kappa \omega_n r_0^n} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}} |f|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

Note that $\mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}) \leq \kappa \omega_n r_j^n \leq \kappa \omega_n r_0^n$ by the definition of κ in (3.3). Then

$$(3.24) \quad \|w\|_{\frac{nq}{n-1}, r_{j+2}}^q \leq 2^{j+5} c_n \bar{\beta} (\kappa \omega_n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \left(\|w\|_{q, r_j}^q + 2^{2q} q^q \right)$$

for any $j \geq 0$, $q \geq 1$, which implies

$$(3.25) \quad \|w\|_{\frac{nq}{n-1}, r_{j+2}} \leq \left(2^{j+5} c_n \bar{\beta} (\kappa \omega_n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\|w\|_{q, r_j} + 4q \right).$$

Let $q_j = \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^j$ and $a_j = \|w\|_{q_j, r_{2j}} / q_j$ for $j \geq 0$. Then from (3.25) we have

$$(3.26) \quad \|w\|_{q_{j+1}, r_{2j+2}} \leq (c_n \bar{\beta} \omega_n^{1/n} \kappa^{1/n})^{\frac{1}{q_j}} 2^{\frac{2j+5}{q_j}} \left(\|w\|_{q_j, r_{2j}} + 4q_j \right),$$

and

$$(3.27) \quad a_{j+1} \leq \frac{n-1}{n} (c_n \bar{\beta} \omega_n^{1/n} \kappa^{1/n})^{\frac{1}{q_j}} 2^{\frac{2j+5}{q_j}} (a_j + 4)$$

for every $j \geq 0$. Put $b_j = \frac{n-1}{n} (c_n \bar{\beta} \omega_n^{1/n} \kappa^{1/n})^{\frac{1}{q_j}} 2^{\frac{2j+5}{q_j}}$. Then for each $j \geq 0$ we have

$$(3.28) \quad a_{j+1} \leq a_0 \prod_{i=0}^j b_i + 4 \sum_{i=0}^j \prod_{k=i}^j b_k.$$

There is a positive constant b_* depending only on n such that for all $j \geq i \geq 0$

$$(3.29) \quad \prod_{k=i}^j b_k \leq b_* \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right)^{j-i+1} \bar{\beta}^{\frac{n}{q_i}} \kappa^{\frac{1}{q_i}}.$$

Hence for each $j \geq 1$

$$(3.30) \quad a_{j+1} \leq \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right)^{j+1} b_* \bar{\beta}^n \kappa a_0 + 4b_* \sum_{i=0}^j \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right)^{j-i+1} \bar{\beta}^{\frac{n}{q_i}} \kappa^{\frac{1}{q_i}}$$

and then

$$(3.31) \quad \|w\|_{q_j, r_{2j}} \leq b_* \bar{\beta}^n \kappa a_0 + 4b_* \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^i \bar{\beta}^{\frac{n}{q_i}} \kappa^{\frac{1}{q_i}}.$$

Denote $\bar{\kappa} = \bar{\beta}^n \kappa$, and $i_* = \left\lceil \frac{\log(1+\log \bar{\kappa})}{\log n/(n-1)} \right\rceil$. Then

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \|w\|_{q_j, r_{2j}} &\leq b_* \bar{\kappa} a_0 + 4b_* \sum_{i=0}^{i_*} \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^i \bar{\kappa} + 4b_* \sum_{i=i_*+1}^{j-1} \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^i \bar{\kappa}^{\left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\log(1+\log \bar{\kappa})}{\log n/(n-1)}}} \\ &\leq b_* \bar{\kappa} a_0 + 4(n-1)b_* \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^{i_*+1} \bar{\kappa} + 4(n-1)b_* \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^j \bar{\kappa}^{\frac{1}{1+\log \bar{\kappa}}} \\ &\leq b_* \bar{\kappa} a_0 + 4nb_*(1+\log \bar{\kappa})\bar{\kappa} + 4(n-1)b_* q_j e^{\frac{\log \bar{\kappa}}{1+\log \bar{\kappa}}}. \end{aligned}$$

For each integer $k \geq 1$, there is an integer $j_k \geq 0$ such that $q_{j_k} \leq k \leq q_{j_k+1}$. Note that $\mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}) \leq \kappa \omega_n r_0^n$ by the definition of κ in (3.3). With Hölder inequality, we have

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \|w\|_{k,r} &\leq \|w\|_{k, r_{2j_k+2}} \leq \|w\|_{q_{j_k+1}, r_{2j_k+2}} \leq b_* \bar{\kappa} a_0 + 4nb_*(1+\log \bar{\kappa})\bar{\kappa} + 4e(n-1)b_* q_{j_k+1} \\ &\leq b_* \bar{\kappa} a_0 + 4nb_*(1+\log \bar{\kappa})\bar{\kappa} + 4enb_* k. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$a_0 = \|w\|_{1, r_0} \leq \frac{C_n^* \kappa^{n+2}}{\kappa \omega_n r_0^n} \mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_0}) \leq C_n^* \kappa^{n+1}$$

from (3.16). Then there is a constant $\delta_n \in (0, 1]$ depending only on n such that

$$(3.34) \quad \|w\|_{k,r} \leq \frac{1}{2\delta_n} \left(\bar{\kappa}^2 \kappa^{n-1} + \frac{k}{2e} \right)$$

for all integers $k \geq 0$. Therefore, combining Stirling's formula

$$(3.35) \quad \|w\|_{k,r}^k \leq \delta_n^{-k} \left(\bar{\kappa}^{2k} \kappa^{(n-1)k} + (2e)^{-k} k^k \right) \leq \delta_n^{-k} \left(\bar{\kappa}^{2k} \kappa^{(n-1)k} + 2^{-k} k^{-\frac{1}{2}} k! \right),$$

which implies

$$(3.36) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \|\delta_n w\|_{k,r}^k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{\kappa}^{2k} \kappa^{(n-1)k}}{k!} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq e^{\bar{\kappa}^2 \kappa^{n-1}} + 1.$$

Hence

$$(3.37) \quad \frac{1}{(\bar{\kappa} \omega_n r_0^n)^2} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} e^{\delta_n w} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} e^{-\delta_n w} \leq e^{\bar{\kappa}^2 \kappa^{n-1}} + 1.$$

Namely,

$$(3.38) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} \phi^{\delta_n} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} \phi^{-\delta_n} \leq (\bar{\kappa} \omega_n r_0^n)^2 \left(e^{\bar{\kappa}^2 \kappa^{n-1}} + 1 \right) \leq 2(\bar{\kappa} \omega_n r_0^n)^2 e^{\bar{\kappa}^2 \kappa^{n-1}}.$$

Since $\Delta_M \phi^{-\delta_n} \geq 0$ from $\Delta_M \phi \leq 0$, then from (3.2) we have

$$(3.39) \quad \phi^{-\delta_n}(\mathbf{0}) \leq \frac{1}{\omega_n r^n} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} \phi^{-\delta_n}.$$

Note $r_0 = \frac{3}{2}r$. Then combining (3.38)(3.39) gets

$$(3.40) \quad \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r} \phi^{\delta_n} \leq 2 \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{2n} \omega_n \bar{\kappa}^2 e^{\bar{\kappa}^2 \kappa^{n-1}} r^n \phi^{\delta_n}(\mathbf{0}),$$

where $\bar{\kappa} = \left(1 + \beta^{\frac{1}{2}} r\right)^n \kappa$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. \square

4. A LIOUVILLE TYPE THEOREM FOR SPECIAL LAGRANGIAN EQUATIONS

Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) with the phase Θ on $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Without loss of generality, we assume the constant $\Theta \geq 0$. Let $M = \{(x, Du(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in B_R\}$. Denote $g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \sum_k u_{ik} u_{jk}$, and $v = \sqrt{\det g_{ij}}$. We usually see v as a function on M by identifying $v(x, Du(x)) = v(x)$, which will not cause confusion from the context in general. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of the Hessian D^2u on \mathbb{R}^n . Let Δ_M denote the Laplacian of M , and ∇_M denote the Levi-Civita connection of M . Let $\partial_{ij}u$ denote the derivative of u with respect to x_i, x_j , and $\partial_{ijk}u$ denote the derivative of u with respect to x_i, x_j, x_k . At any considered point p , we assume that D^2u is diagonalized, then

$$(4.1) \quad \Delta_M \log v = \sum_{i,j,k} (1 + \lambda_i \lambda_j) h_{ijk}^2$$

at p , where $h_{ijk} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1+\lambda_i^2)(1+\lambda_j^2)(1+\lambda_k^2)}} \partial_{ijk}u$ (see [29] for instance). Let $\bar{\nabla}$ be Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to its standard metric. Let E_1, \dots, E_{2n} be the orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that E_i is the dual form of dx_i , and E_{n+i} is the dual form of dy_i for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let e_1, \dots, e_n be a local tangent frame in a neighborhood of p defined by

$$e_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |Du_i|^2}} (E_i + \partial_{ik}u E_{n+k}),$$

and ν_1, \dots, ν_n be a local frame normal to M in a neighborhood of p defined by

$$\nu_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |Du_j|^2}} (-\partial_{jk}u E_k + E_{n+j}).$$

Then at the point p ,

$$e_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \lambda_i^2}} (E_i + \lambda_i E_{n+i}), \quad \nu_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \lambda_j^2}} (-\lambda_j E_j + E_{n+j}),$$

and they make up an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Let B_M denote the second fundamental form on M , then at p we have

$$(4.2) \quad \langle B_M(e_i, e_j), \nu_k \rangle = \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} e_j, \nu_k \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 + \lambda_i^2)(1 + \lambda_j^2)(1 + \lambda_k^2)}} \partial_{ijk}u = h_{ijk}.$$

Let $|B_M|^2$ denote the square norm of B_M , i.e.,

$$(4.3) \quad |B_M|^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n |B_M(e_i, e_j)|^2 = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n |\langle B_M(e_i, e_j), \nu_k \rangle|^2 = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n h_{ijk}^2.$$

From (4.1), we have

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_M v^{-\frac{1}{n}} &= \Delta_M e^{-\frac{1}{n} \log v} = -\frac{1}{n} v^{-\frac{1}{n}} \Delta_M \log v + \frac{1}{n^2} v^{-\frac{1}{n}} |\nabla_M \log v|^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} v^{-\frac{1}{n}} \left(\sum_{i,j,k} h_{ijk}^2 + \sum_{k,i \neq j} \lambda_i \lambda_j h_{ijk}^2 + \sum_{i,k} \lambda_i^2 h_{iik}^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_i \lambda_j h_{iik} h_{jjk} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose there is a constant $K \geq 1$ such that $\lambda_i \lambda_j + K \geq 0$ for all i, j . Combining Cauchy inequality, we have

$$(4.5) \quad \Delta_M v^{-\frac{1}{n}} \leq -\frac{1}{n} v^{-\frac{1}{n}} \left(\sum_{i,j,k} h_{ijk}^2 - \sum_{k,i \neq j} K h_{ijk}^2 \right) \leq \frac{K-1}{n} v^{-\frac{1}{n}} \sum_{i,j,k} h_{ijk}^2 = \frac{K-1}{n} v^{-\frac{1}{n}} |B_M|^2.$$

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that μ_1, \dots, μ_n are constants with $\sum_i \arctan \mu_i \geq 0$. If K is a positive constant ≥ 1 such that $\mu_i \mu_j + K \geq 0$ for all i, j , then $\mu_i \geq -\Lambda_K$, where Λ_K is the unique solution to*

$$(4.6) \quad \arctan t = (n-1) \arctan \frac{K}{t} \quad \text{on } (0, \infty).$$

In particular, $\Lambda_K < 2nK/\pi$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_n$ and $\mu_n < 0$, or else we have complete the proof. From $\mu_1 \mu_n + K \geq 0$, we get $\mu_1 \leq -K/\mu_n$. Then

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_i \arctan \mu_i \leq (n-1) \arctan \mu_1 + \arctan \mu_n \\ &\leq (n-1) \arctan \left(-\frac{K}{\mu_n} \right) + \arctan \mu_n = \arctan \mu_n - (n-1) \arctan \left(\frac{K}{\mu_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\arctan t - (n-1) \arctan \left(\frac{K}{t} \right)$ is monotonic increasing on $(0, \infty)$, then the above inequality implies $\mu_i \geq \Lambda_K$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, where Λ_K is the unique solution to (4.6).

Now let us estimate the upper bound of Λ_K . Since $\tan \left(\frac{\pi}{2n} \right) > \frac{\pi}{2n}$, then

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{\pi}{2} - n \arctan \left(\frac{\pi}{2n} \right) > 0.$$

Hence for $K \geq 1$ we have

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \arctan \left(\frac{2nK}{\pi} \right) - (n-1) \arctan \left(\frac{\pi}{2n} \right) &= \frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan \left(\frac{\pi}{2nK} \right) - (n-1) \arctan \left(\frac{\pi}{2n} \right) \\ &> \frac{\pi}{2} - n \arctan \left(\frac{\pi}{2n} \right) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\Lambda_K < 2nK/\pi$. □

We need a dimensional estimate for singular sets of non-smooth special Lagrangian graphs.

Lemma 4.2. *Let u be a $C^{1,1}$ viscosity solution to (1.1) on $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M = \{(x, Du(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in B_R\}$. If there is a constant $K > 0$ such that $-K \leq D^2 u \leq K$ on B_R . Then the singular set of M is a closed set of Hausdorff dimension $\leq n-4$.*

Remark. Here, a point \mathbf{x} in the singular set of M means that any tangent of M at \mathbf{x} is not an n -plane. Such a point is said to be a singular point. If we write $\mathbf{x} = (x, Du(x))$, then the singular point \mathbf{x} of M means that u is not C^2 at x . With the calibration $Re(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n)$ (see Theorem 4.2 in [16]), for $C^{1,1}$ viscosity solution u to (1.1), M is a (volume) minimizing submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, if u is not C^2 at x , then $\mathbf{x} = (x, Du(x))$ is a singular point of M .

Proof. The proof is the combination of Bernstein theorem for 3-dimensional minimal graphs (see Theorem 5.4 in [12] or Theorem 1.3 in [34]) and dimension reduction argument. Let \mathcal{S} denote the singular set of M . From Allard's regularity theorem (see [20] or [24]), \mathcal{S} is a closed set. We suppose that \mathcal{S} has Hausdorff dimension $> n - 4$. Then there is a constant $\beta > n - 4$ so that β -dimensional Hausdorff measure of \mathcal{S} satisfies $\mathcal{H}^\beta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$. Let \mathcal{H}_∞^β be a measure defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^\beta(E) = \omega_\beta 2^{-\beta} \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\text{diam} U_j)^\beta \mid E \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} U_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \right\}$$

for any set E in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\omega_\beta = \frac{\pi^{\beta/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{\beta}{2}+1)}$, and $\Gamma(r) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} t^{r-1} dt$ is the gamma function for $0 < r < \infty$. From Lemma 11.2 in [15], $\mathcal{H}^\beta(E) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\beta(E) = 0$. From the argument of Proposition 11.3 in [15], there is a point $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}$ and a sequence $r_j \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{H}_\infty^\beta(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j}(\mathbf{q})) > 2^{-\beta-1} \omega_\beta r_j^\beta.$$

Up to translation, we assume \mathbf{q} being the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $M_j = \frac{1}{r_j}(M \cap \mathbf{B}_1)$, $\mathcal{S}_j = \frac{1}{r_j}(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathbf{B}_{r_j})$. Then

$$(4.11) \quad \mathcal{H}_\infty^\beta(\mathcal{S}_j \cap \mathbf{B}_1) > 2^{-\beta-1} \omega_\beta.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that M_j converges to a tangent cone M_* in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ in the varifold sense as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Let \mathcal{S}_* be the singular set of M_* . If $y_j \in \mathcal{S}_j$ and $y_j \rightarrow y_* \in M_*$, then it's clear that y_* is a singular point of M_* by Allard's regularity theorem, which implies $\limsup_j \mathcal{S}_j \subset \mathcal{S}_*$. Analog to the proof of Lemma 11.5 in [15], we have $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\beta(\mathcal{S}_* \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) > 2^{-\beta-1} \omega_\beta$, and then

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{H}^\beta(\mathcal{S}_* \cap \mathbf{B}_1) \geq \mathcal{H}_\infty^\beta(\mathcal{S}_* \cap \mathbf{B}_1) > 2^{-\beta-1} \omega_\beta.$$

Let us continue the above procedure. By the dimension reduction argument, there is an n -dimensional minimal cone $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, which is a special Lagrangian graph over \mathbb{R}^n such that for some integer $0 < k \leq 3$, C is a trivial product of \mathbb{R}^{n-k} and a k -dimensional regular minimal cone C_* . From the assumption $-K \leq D^2 u \leq K$ on B_R , C_* can be written as a graph over \mathbb{R}^3 . However, this contradicts to Theorem 5.4 in [12] (see also Theorem 1.3 in [34]). We complete the proof. \square

Let

$$M_\Lambda = F_\Lambda(M) = \{F_\Lambda(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid (x, y) \in M\},$$

which is a rigid motion of M . Let Δ_{M_Λ} denote the Laplacian of M_Λ , and ∇_{M_Λ} denote the Levi-Civita connection of M_Λ .

Lemma 4.3. *Let ϕ be a smooth function on M_Λ , then $\phi_\Lambda \triangleq \phi \circ F_\Lambda$ satisfies*

$$(4.13) \quad \Delta_M \phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \Delta_{M_\Lambda} \phi(F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})), \quad |\nabla_M \phi_\Lambda|(\mathbf{x}) = |\nabla_{M_\Lambda} \phi|(F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}))$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in M$.

Proof. Let (z_1, \dots, z_n) be a local coordinate chart in a neighborhood of the considered point \mathbf{x} in M , such that ∂_{z_i} forms an orthonormal basis at \mathbf{x} . Let $(w_1, \dots, w_n) = F_\Lambda(z_1, \dots, z_n)$, then (w_1, \dots, w_n) is a local coordinate chart in a neighborhood of $F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$ and $\partial_{w_i} = \sum_j \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_j} \partial_{z_j}$. Since F_Λ is an isometric mapping, then at $F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$

$$(4.14) \quad \langle \partial_{w_i}, \partial_{w_j} \rangle = \left\langle \sum_k \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_k} \partial_{z_k}, \sum_l \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial z_l} \partial_{z_l} \right\rangle = \sum_k \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_k} \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial z_k} = \delta_{ij}.$$

Recall that $\bar{\nabla}$ denotes Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to its standard metric. For any function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(M_\Lambda)$,

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla_M \phi_\Lambda, \nabla_M(\varphi \circ F_\Lambda) \rangle \Big|_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_i \bar{\nabla}_{z_i} \phi_\Lambda \Big|_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{\nabla}_{z_i}(\varphi \circ F_\Lambda) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}} \\ & = \sum_i \sum_j \frac{\partial w_j}{\partial z_i} \bar{\nabla}_{w_j} \phi \Big|_{F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})} \sum_k \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial z_i} \bar{\nabla}_{w_k} \varphi \Big|_{F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})} \\ & = \sum_j \bar{\nabla}_{w_j} \phi \Big|_{F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})} \bar{\nabla}_{w_j} \varphi \Big|_{F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})} = \langle \nabla_{M_\Lambda} \phi, \nabla_{M_\Lambda} \varphi \rangle \Big|_{F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have proved $|\nabla_M \phi_\Lambda|(\mathbf{x}) = |\nabla_{M_\Lambda} \phi|(F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}))$. Let $d\mu$ and $d\mu_\Lambda$ denote the volume elements of M and M_Λ , respectively. Integrating by parts infers

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{M_\Lambda} \varphi \Delta_{M_\Lambda} \phi d\mu_\Lambda &= - \int_{M_\Lambda} \langle \nabla_{M_\Lambda} \phi, \nabla_{M_\Lambda} \varphi \rangle d\mu_\Lambda \\ &= - \int_M \langle \nabla_M \phi_\Lambda, \nabla_M(\varphi \circ F_\Lambda) \rangle d\mu = \int_M \varphi \circ F_\Lambda \Delta_M \phi_\Lambda d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\Delta_M \phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \Delta_{M_\Lambda} \phi(F_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}))$. We complete the proof. \square

From Allard's regularity theorem, there is a positive constant $\tau_n > 0$ depending only on n such that if Σ is an n -dimensional special Lagrangian submanifold in $\mathbf{B}_r(\mathbf{q}) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbf{B}_r(\mathbf{q})$ satisfying

$$(4.17) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_r(\mathbf{q}) \cap \Sigma) \leq (1 + \tau_n) \omega_n r^n,$$

then $|B_\Sigma| \leq \frac{1}{r}$ on $\mathbf{B}_{r/2}(\mathbf{q}) \cap \Sigma$, where B_Σ is the second fundamental form of Σ .

For any C^2 function f on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , let $\bar{\lambda}_f(x)$ denote the largest eigenvalue of Hessian $D^2 f(x)$, and $\underline{\lambda}_f(x)$ denote the smallest eigenvalue of Hessian $D^2 f(x)$.

Theorem 4.4. *For any constant $K \geq 1$, there is a constant $c_{n,K} > 0$ depending only on n, K such that if u is a smooth solution to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ of Hessian $D^2 u$ satisfying*

$$(4.18) \quad \lambda_i \lambda_j \geq -K \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and u is not a quadratic polynomial, then Hessian of u satisfies $-c_{n,K} \leq D^2 u \leq c_{n,K}$ on \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. Let us prove it by contradiction. Let K be a positive constant ≥ 1 . Suppose that there is a sequence of smooth solutions u_k to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with the eigenvalues $\lambda_{1,k}, \dots, \lambda_{n,k}$ of Hessian $D^2 u_k$ satisfying

$$(4.19) \quad \lambda_{i,k} \lambda_{j,k} \geq -K \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and $k \geq 1$ such that each u_k is not a quadratic polynomial and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} |D^2 u_k| = \infty$. Then there is a sequence of points $p_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\bar{\lambda}_{u_k}(p_k) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Let Σ_k be the special Lagrangian graph in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with the graphic function Du_k . Since non-quadratic u_k implies that Σ_k is not flat, then any tangent cone of Σ_k at infinity is not flat. Let τ_n be the constant in (4.17). We claim

$$(4.20) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\omega_n r^n} \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_r \cap \Sigma_k) \geq 1 + \tau_n.$$

Assume $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\omega_n r^n} \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_r \cap \Sigma_k) < 1 + \tau_n$. Now let us deduce the contradiction. From monotonicity of ratio $r^{-n} \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_r \cap \Sigma_k)$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_r \cap \Sigma_k) < (1 + \tau_n) \omega_n r^n$$

for all $r > 0$. From Allard's regularity theorem, we get $|B_{\Sigma_k}| \leq \frac{1}{r}$ on $\mathbf{B}_{r/2} \cap \Sigma_k$, where B_{Σ_k} is the second fundamental form of Σ_k . Letting $r \rightarrow \infty$ implies the flatness of Σ_k , which is a contradiction. Hence the claim (4.20) is true. Then there are a sequence of numbers $r_k > 0$ and a number $0 < \tau_* < \tau_n$ such that

$$(4.21) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_{r_k}(\mathbf{p}_k) \cap \Sigma_k) = (1 + \tau_*) \omega_n r_k^n$$

with $\mathbf{p}_k = (p_k, Du(p_k))$. For each k , let

$$M_k = \frac{1}{r_k}(\Sigma_k - \mathbf{p}_k) = \{r_k^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{x} \in \Sigma_k\},$$

which is a special Lagrangian graph through the origin. From (4.21), we have

$$(4.22) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_1 \cap M_k) = (1 + \tau_*) \omega_n.$$

Up to choose the subsequence, without loss of generality, we assume that the phase $\sum_i \arctan \lambda_{i,k}$ is a nonnegative constant for each k . From Lemma 4.1 and the assumption (4.18), we get

$$(4.23) \quad D^2 u_k \geq -2nK/\pi.$$

Let $F_\Lambda : (x, y) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be the isometric mapping from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ into $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ defined as (2.4) with $\Lambda = 2nK/\pi$. From (4.23), for each k there is a smooth solution \bar{u}_k to (1.1) (with another phase different from the one for $D^2 u_k$) on \mathbb{R}^n such that $F_\Lambda(M_k)$ is the graph of $D\bar{u}_k$, i.e.,

$$F_\Lambda(M_k) = \{(\bar{x}, D\bar{u}_k(\bar{x})) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Put $M_{k,\Lambda} = F_\Lambda(M_k)$. From (2.10) and (4.23), we have

$$(4.24) \quad -\frac{2\Lambda^2 + 1}{\Lambda} \leq D^2 \bar{u}_k \leq 2\Lambda \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

According to the compactness theorem, up to choose the subsequence, we can assume that $M_{k,\Lambda}$ converges to a stationary varifold $M_{\infty,\Lambda}$ in the varifold sense. In the meantime, \bar{u}_k converges to a $C^{1,1}$ -function \bar{u}_∞ with

$$(4.25) \quad -\frac{2\Lambda^2 + 1}{\Lambda} \leq D^2 \bar{u}_\infty \leq 2\Lambda \quad \text{i.e. on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

by Arzela-Ascoli theorem. Moreover, $M_{\infty,\Lambda} = \{(x, D\bar{u}_\infty(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ is a special Lagrangian graph with possible singularities, and \bar{u}_∞ is the viscosity solution to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n . From (4.22), we get

$$(4.26) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_1 \cap M_{\infty,\Lambda}) = (1 + \tau_*) \omega_n.$$

Combining Allard's regularity theorem, $|B_{M_{\infty,\Lambda}}| \leq 1$ on $\mathbf{B}_{1/2} \cap M_{\infty,\Lambda}$, where $B_{M_{\infty,\Lambda}}$ is the second fundamental form of $M_{\infty,\Lambda}$. According the isometric mapping F_Λ , M_k converges

to a stationary varifold M_∞ in the varifold sense with $M_{\infty,\Lambda} = F_\Lambda(M_\infty)$, and $|B_{M_\infty}| \leq 1$ on $\mathbf{B}_{1/2} \cap M_\infty$, where B_{M_∞} is the second fundamental form of the regular part of M_∞ .

Denote $\hat{u}_k(x) = r_k^{-2}u_k(r_kx + p_k)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $D\hat{u}_k$ is the graphic function of M_k . Let $v_k = \sqrt{\det(I + D^2\hat{u}_k D^2\hat{u}_k)}$ and $v_{k,\Lambda}(\bar{x}(x, D\hat{u}_k(x))) = v_k(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $B_{M_{k,\Lambda}}$ denote the second fundamental form of $M_{k,\Lambda}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $M_{k,\Lambda}$ converges to $M_{\infty,\Lambda}$ in the varifold sense, then $|B_{M_{k,\Lambda}}| \leq 1$ on $\mathbf{B}_{1/2} \cap M_{k,\Lambda}$ by Allard's regularity theorem. Combining (4.5) and Lemma 4.3, we have

$$(4.27) \quad \Delta_{M_{k,\Lambda}} v_{k,\Lambda}^{-\frac{1}{n}} \leq \frac{K-1}{n} v_{k,\Lambda}^{-\frac{1}{n}} |B_{M_{k,\Lambda}}|^2 \leq \frac{K-1}{n} v_{k,\Lambda}^{-\frac{1}{n}}$$

on $\mathbf{B}_{1/2} \cap M_{k,\Lambda}$. From Theorem 3.2, there are constants $\delta_n \in (0, 1]$ and $\theta_{n,K} > 0$ depending only on n, K such that

$$(4.28) \quad \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^n(M_{k,\Lambda} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4})} \int_{M_{k,\Lambda} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}} v_{k,\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \theta_{n,K} v_{k,\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0),$$

which is equivalent to the following mean value inequality:

$$(4.29) \quad \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^n(M_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4})} \int_{M_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}} v_k^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \theta_{n,K} v_k^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0).$$

Note that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\lambda}_{u_k}(p_k) = \infty$ implies $v_k(0) \rightarrow \infty$. Combining (4.29) and $|B_{M_i}| \leq 1$ on $\mathbf{B}_{1/2} \cap M_i$, we conclude that

$$(4.30) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{M_i \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/8}} v_k = \infty.$$

Let \mathcal{S}_{M_∞} be the singular set of M_∞ , then $\mathcal{S}_{M_{\infty,\Lambda}} = F_\Lambda(\mathcal{S}_{M_\infty})$. Note that \mathcal{S}_{M_∞} is closed in M_∞ . Then for any $\mathbf{x} \in M_\infty \setminus \mathcal{S}_{M_\infty}$, there is a constant $r_{\mathbf{x}} > 0$ such that $M_k \cap B_{r_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathbf{x})$ converges to $M_\infty \cap B_{r_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathbf{x})$ smoothly. Since \mathcal{S}_{M_∞} has codimension 4 at least by Lemma 4.2, then $M_\infty \setminus \mathcal{S}_{M_\infty}$ is connected. Combining (4.30) and the mean value inequality for v_k like (4.29), for any compact set Ω with $\Omega \cap \mathcal{S}_{M_\infty} = \emptyset$, we have

$$(4.31) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{M_k \cap \Omega} v_k = \infty.$$

Then combining (4.31) and the assumption (4.18), we have

$$(4.32) \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{M_k \cap \Omega} \underline{\lambda}_{u_k} \geq 0.$$

From (2.8), we have

$$(4.33) \quad -\frac{1}{2\Lambda} \leq \underline{\lambda}_{\bar{u}_\infty} \leq \bar{\lambda}_{\bar{u}_\infty} = 2\Lambda$$

on the set where \bar{u}_∞ is C^2 .

If $\mathcal{S}_{M_{\infty,\Lambda}}$ is empty, then (4.33) on \mathbb{R}^n implies the flatness of $M_{\infty,\Lambda}$, i.e., \bar{u}_∞ is a quadratic polynomial. However, this violates (4.26). Hence $\mathcal{S}_{M_{\infty,\Lambda}} \neq \emptyset$. By dimensional reduction argument, there is a sequence of manifolds \widehat{M}_i (obtained from $M_{\infty,\Lambda}$ by scaling and translation) such that \widehat{M}_i converges in the varifold sense to a minimal cone C_* , which is a trivial product of a nonflat regular minimal cone C^* and a Euclidean factor \mathbb{R}^{n-l} ($4 \leq l \leq n$). Moreover, C_* is a special Lagrangian graph with the graphic function Dw^* , where w^* is a $C^{1,1}$ viscosity solution to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with

$$(4.34) \quad -\frac{2\Lambda^2 + 1}{\Lambda} \leq D^2w^* \leq 2\Lambda \quad \text{i.e. on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

from (4.25). Note that w^* is not C^2 on the set $\{0^l\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-l} = \{(0, \dots, 0, x_{l+1}, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (x_{l+1}, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-l}\}$. From (4.33), we get

$$(4.35) \quad -\frac{1}{2\Lambda} \leq \underline{\lambda}_{w^*} \leq \bar{\lambda}_{w^*} = 2\Lambda$$

on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0^l\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-l}$. Hence, without loss of generality, for each $j = 1, \dots, n$, $\partial_j w^*$ has the decomposition as follows:

$$\partial_j w^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} w^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \phi_j(x_1, \dots, x_l) + \sum_{k=l+1}^n c_{jk} x_k$$

for some function ϕ_j and a constant matrix (c_{jk}) with $k = l+1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$. By choosing the coordinate system of x_1, \dots, x_n , we can assume

$$\partial_j w^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \phi_j(x_1, \dots, x_l) + c_j x_j$$

for some constant vector (c_1, \dots, c_n) with $c_1 = \dots = c_l = 0$. Outside $\{0^l\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-l}$, for $i = 1, \dots, l$ and $j = l+1, \dots, n$, we have

$$(4.36) \quad \partial_{ij} w^* = \partial_{ji} w^* = 0 = \partial_i \phi_j(x_1, \dots, x_l),$$

which implies $\phi_j(x_1, \dots, x_l) = 0$ on \mathbb{R}^l for $j = l+1, \dots, n$ as C_* contains the origin. We consider a $C^{1,1}$ function Φ^* on \mathbb{R}^n defined by

$$(4.37) \quad \Phi^* = w^* - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=l+1}^n c_j x_j^2.$$

Then for any $j = l+1, \dots, n$ we have $\partial_j \Phi^* = \partial_j w^* - c_j x_j = 0$. In other words, Φ^* is a function depending only on x_1, \dots, x_l . Hence we can define a function Φ on \mathbb{R}^l by $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_l) = \Phi^*(x_1, \dots, x_l, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then

$$C^* \triangleq \{(x, D\Phi(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^l\}$$

is a Lagrangian graph with isolated singularity. Let $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_l$ be the eigenvalues of Hessian $D^2\Phi$. Then $D^2\Phi^*$ has eigenvalues μ_1, \dots, μ_l and c_{l+1}, \dots, c_n , and

$$(4.38) \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \arctan \mu_i + \sum_{i=l+1}^n \arctan c_i = \Theta.$$

From the calibration $Re(e^{-\sqrt{-1}(\Theta - \sum_{i=l+1}^n \arctan c_i)} dz_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_l)$, the Lagrangian graph C^* is minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l$. Note that C^* has only one singularity at the origin. From (4.35), we obtain

$$(4.39) \quad 2\Lambda \geq \mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_l \geq -\frac{1}{2\Lambda}$$

on $\mathbb{R}^l \setminus \{0^l\}$. By the standard argument (see Yuan [34, 36] or Tsui-Wang [25]), we get the flatness of C^* , which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. \square

Combining Warren-Yuan's argument in [29], we have the following Liouville type theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *There exists a constant $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1)$ such that if u is a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with eigenvalues $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_n(x)$ of Hessian $D^2u(x)$ satisfying*

$$(4.40) \quad 3(1 + \epsilon_n) + (1 + \epsilon_n)\lambda_i^2(x) + 2\lambda_i(x)\lambda_j(x) \geq 0$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then u must be a quadratic polynomial.

Proof. Let us prove it by contradiction. Suppose that there is a sequence of smooth solutions u_k to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with eigenvalues $\lambda_{1,k}(x), \dots, \lambda_{n,k}(x)$ of Hessian $D^2u_k(x)$ satisfying

$$(4.41) \quad 3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) \lambda_{i,k}^2(x) + 2\lambda_{i,k}(x)\lambda_{j,k}(x) \geq 0$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n, k \geq 2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that each u_k is not a quadratic polynomial. The inequality (4.41) implies

$$(4.42) \quad \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \lambda_{i,k}(x)\lambda_{j,k}(x) \geq -3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n, k \geq 2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. From Theorem 4.4, D^2u_k is uniformly bounded on \mathbb{R}^n by a constant c_n depending only on n . Let M_k denote the Lagrangian graph with the graphic function Du_k for each k . From Allard' regularity theorem (see also (4.20)), there exists a sequence $r_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(4.43) \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} r_k^{-n} \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_k \cap M_k) > \omega_n.$$

Let $\widehat{M}_k = \frac{1}{r_k} M_k$, and $\hat{u}_k = r_k^{-2} u_k(r_k \cdot)$. Then

$$(4.44) \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{B}_1 \cap \widehat{M}_k) > \omega_n.$$

According to the compactness theorem, up to choose the subsequence, we can assume that \widehat{M}_k converges to a stationary varifold \widehat{M}_∞ in the varifold sense. In the meantime, \hat{u}_k converges to a $C^{1,1}$ -function \hat{u}_∞ with

$$(4.45) \quad -c_n \leq D^2\hat{u}_\infty \leq c_n \quad i.e. \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

by Arzela-Ascoli theorem. Moreover, $\widehat{M}_\infty = \{(x, D\hat{u}_\infty(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ is a special Lagrangian graph with possible singularities, and \hat{u}_∞ is the viscosity solution to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n with

$$(4.46) \quad 3 + \hat{\lambda}_i^2 + 2\hat{\lambda}_i\hat{\lambda}_j \geq 0 \quad i.e. \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ from (4.41), where $\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_n$ are the eigenvalues of $D^2\hat{u}_\infty$. Now we follow the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [29] including Proposition 3.1 in [29], and get the flatness of \widehat{M}_∞ . However, this contradicts to (4.44). We complete the proof. \square

Remark. Obviously if we assume

$$(4.47) \quad \inf_{i,j=1,\dots,n} \lambda_i(x)\lambda_j(x) \geq -\frac{3}{2}(1 + \epsilon_n)$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, or

$$(4.48) \quad -\sqrt{3}(1 + \epsilon_n) \leq D^2u \leq \sqrt{3}(1 + \epsilon_n)$$

on \mathbb{R}^n , then (4.40) holds true. Namely, any smooth solution u to (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n satisfying (4.47) for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ or (4.48) on \mathbb{R}^n must be a quadratic polynomial.

Using the above Liouville type theorem, we can get an interior curvature estimate for special Lagrangian graphs, which is key for Hessian estimates of solutions to special Lagrangian equations in the following section.

Corollary 4.6. *Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on $B_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Du(0) = 0$, and the eigenvalues $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_n(x)$ of Hessian $D^2u(x)$ satisfies (4.40) for all i, j and $x \in B_2$. Let M be the special Lagrangian graph over B_2 with the graphic function Du . Then there is a constant $c_n > 0$ depending only on n such that $|B_M| \leq c_n$ on $M \cap \mathbf{B}_1$, where B_M is the second fundamental form of M .*

Proof. Let us prove it by contradiction. Suppose that there is a sequence of smooth solution u_i to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on $B_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Du_i(0) = 0$ such that the eigenvalues of Hessian D^2u_i satisfies (4.40) for all i, j and $x \in B_2$, and the special Lagrangian graph M_i of the graphic function u_i satisfies

$$(4.49) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |B_{M_i}|(z_i) = \infty$$

for some sequence of points $z_i \in M_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1$. Here, B_{M_i} is the second fundamental form of M_i .

Then there exists a sequence of points $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}}$ such that

$$r_i \triangleq \left(\frac{3}{2} - |\mathbf{q}_i| \right) |B_{M_i}|(\mathbf{q}_i) = \sup_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}} \cap M_i} \left(\frac{3}{2} - |\mathbf{x}| \right) |B_{M_i}|(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \infty$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Denote $\mathbf{q}_i = (q_i, Du_i(q_i))$. Put $\tau_i = \frac{3}{2} - |\mathbf{q}_i|$, and $R_i = 2r_i/\tau_i$. Let

$$\Sigma_i = \{R_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{x} \in M_i\}$$

and B_{Σ_i} be the second fundamental form of Σ_i . Note that $\frac{\tau_i}{2} \leq \frac{3}{2} - |x|$ for all $x \in \mathbf{B}_{\frac{\tau_i}{2}}(\mathbf{q}_i)$. We have

$$(4.50) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{B}_{r_i(0)} \cap \Sigma_i} |B_{\Sigma_i}| = \frac{1}{R_i} \sup_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{\tau_i}{2}}(\mathbf{q}_i) \cap M_i} |B_{M_i}| \leq \frac{1}{R_i} \frac{2}{\tau_i} \sup_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{\tau_i}{2}}(\mathbf{q}_i) \cap M_i} \left(\frac{3}{2} - |\mathbf{x}| \right) |B_{M_i}|(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1,$$

and

$$(4.51) \quad |B_{\Sigma_i}|(0) = \frac{1}{R_i} |B_{M_i}|(\mathbf{q}_i) = \frac{1}{R_i} \frac{1}{\tau_i} \sup_{\mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}} \cap M_i} \left(\frac{3}{2} - |\mathbf{x}| \right) |B_{M_i}|(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let B_{q_i, R_i} be a convex open set defined by $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid R_i^{-1}x + q_i \in B_2\}$ and

$$\hat{u}_i(x) = R_i^2 u_i(R_i^{-1}x + q_i)$$

for all B_{q_i, R_i} , then $D\hat{u}_i$ is the graphic function of Σ_i over B_{q_i, R_i} .

From (4.40), there holds

$$(4.52) \quad 3(1 + \epsilon_n) + (1 + \epsilon_n) \min\{\lambda_i^2(x), \lambda_j^2(x)\} + 2\lambda_i(x)\lambda_j(x) \geq 0,$$

which implies

$$(4.53) \quad 3 \frac{1 + \epsilon_n}{1 - \epsilon_n} + \lambda_i(x)\lambda_j(x) \geq 0.$$

Let F_Λ be the Lewy rotation defined in (2.4) with $\Lambda = \frac{6n(1+\epsilon_n)}{\pi(1-\epsilon_n)}$, then from Lemma 4.1 and (4.53), the function $u_{i, \Lambda} \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+4\Lambda^2}}(\hat{u}_i + \Lambda|x|^2)$ is strictly convex. Then $Du_{i, \Lambda}(B_{q_i, R_i})$ is convex from Lemma 6.1, hence it is simply connected. From the argument in section 2, there is a sequence of smooth solutions \bar{u}_i to (1.1) on convex domains $\Omega_i \triangleq Du_{i, \Lambda}(B_{q_i, R_i}) = \Pi(F_\Lambda(\Sigma_i))$ with $\Omega_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ so that the graph $\{(x, D\bar{u}_i(x)) \mid x \in \Omega_i\} = F_\Lambda(\Sigma_i)$. From (4.50) with $r_i \rightarrow \infty$, up to choose the subsequence $F_\Lambda(\Sigma_i)$ converges to a smooth special Lagrangian graph $\Sigma_{\infty, \Lambda}$ over \mathbb{R}^n with the graphic function \bar{u}_∞ . Hence, Σ_i converges to a smooth special Lagrangian submanifold Σ_∞ with $F_\Lambda(\Sigma_\infty) = \Sigma_{\infty, \Lambda}$.

If there is a point $\mathbf{x}_\infty \in \Sigma_\infty$ such that for any sequence $\mathbf{x}_i \in \Sigma_i$ with $\mathbf{x}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_\infty$, there holds $|D\hat{u}_i|(x_i) \rightarrow \infty$ with $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_i, D\hat{u}_i(x_i))$. From the proof of Theorem 4.4, the mean value inequality for the function $(\det(I + D^2\hat{u}_i D^2\hat{u}_i))^{-\frac{1}{2n}}$ implies that for any sequence $\mathbf{y}_i \in \Sigma_i$ with $\mathbf{y}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{y}_\infty$ and $\limsup_i |\mathbf{y}_i| < \infty$, there holds $|D\hat{u}_i|(y_i) \rightarrow \infty$ with $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_i, D\hat{u}_i(y_i))$. By following the argument of the proof of Theorem 4.4 further, we get

the flatness of Σ_∞ . However, this contradicts to (4.51). The other case is that for any point $\mathbf{x}_\infty \in \Sigma_\infty$ and any sequence $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_i, D\hat{u}_i(x_i)) \in \Sigma_i$ with $\mathbf{x}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_\infty$, there holds $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} |D\hat{u}_i|(x_i) < \infty$. This implies that Σ_∞ is a graph. From Theorem 4.5, we also get the flatness of Σ_∞ , which contradicts to (4.51). We complete the proof. \square

5. HESSIAN ESTIMATES FOR SPECIAL LAGRANGIAN EQUATIONS

In this section, we use superharmonic functions on special Lagrangian graphs to derive Hessian estimates for the solutions to special Lagrangian equations.

Theorem 5.1. *Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the eigenvalues $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_n(x)$ of Hessian $D^2u(x)$ satisfying (4.40) for all i, j and $x \in B_R$. Then there is a constant $C_n > 0$ depending only on n such that*

$$(5.1) \quad |D^2u(0)| \leq C_n \exp\left(C_n \frac{\max_{B_R} |Du - Du(0)|}{R}\right).$$

Proof. By scaling, we only need to show the case of $R = 3$. By considering $u - Du(0) \cdot x$, we can assume $Du(0) = 0$. Let $M_r = \{(x, Du) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in B_r\}$ for $r \in (0, 3]$, and $M = M_3$ for short. We consider the mapping $F_\Lambda : (x, y) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ as (2.4) with $\Lambda = \frac{6n(1+\epsilon_n)}{\pi(1-\epsilon_n)}$. Then

$$(5.2) \quad \bar{x}(M_r) = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}} (2\Lambda x + Du(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in B_r \right\}.$$

From Lemma 4.1 and (4.53), the function $\tilde{u} \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}}(u(x) + \Lambda|x|^2)$ is strictly convex. Then $\bar{x}(M_r) = D\tilde{u}(B_r)$ is convex from Lemma 6.1, hence $\bar{x}(M_r)$ is simply connected. Therefore, $F_\Lambda(M)$ can be written as a graph over $\bar{x}(M)$ with the graphic function $D\bar{u}$ for some solution \bar{u} to (1.1). From (2.10), one has

$$(5.3) \quad -\frac{2\Lambda^2 + 1}{\Lambda} \leq D^2\bar{u} \leq 2\Lambda \quad \text{on } \bar{x}(M).$$

For any $t > 0$, let $(t\mathbb{Z})^n$ denote the lattice in \mathbb{R}^n defined by

$$\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid t^{-1}x_i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for each } i\}.$$

Let $Q = (t_*\mathbb{Z})^n \cap \bar{x}(\overline{M_1})$ with $t_* = \Lambda / \sqrt{\Lambda^2 + n(2\Lambda^2 + 1)^2}$. For any distinct $q_1, q_2 \in Q$ with $|q_1 - q_2| = t_*$, let $\gamma(t) = q_1 + \frac{t}{t_*}(q_2 - q_1)$ be the normalized geodesic connecting q_1 and q_2 . Then combining Cauchy inequality and (5.3), one has

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |D\bar{u}(q_1) - D\bar{u}(q_2)|^2 &= \left| \int_0^{t_*} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} D\bar{u}(\gamma(t)) dt \right|^2 \leq \left| \int_0^{t_*} \langle D^2\bar{u}(\gamma(t)), \dot{\gamma}(t) \rangle dt \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n t_* \int_0^{t_*} |D\partial_i \bar{u}|^2(\gamma(t)) dt \leq n t_*^2 \frac{(2\Lambda^2 + 1)^2}{\Lambda^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of t_* , we have

$$(5.5) \quad |q_1 - q_2|^2 + |D\bar{u}(q_1) - D\bar{u}(q_2)|^2 \leq t_*^2 \left(1 + n \frac{(2\Lambda^2 + 1)^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) = 1.$$

Put

$$(5.6) \quad \mathbf{Q} = \{(q, D\bar{u}(q)) \in F_\Lambda(\overline{M_1}) \mid q \in Q\}.$$

Then from (5.5) we have

$$(5.7) \quad F_\Lambda(M_1) \subset \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{Q}} B_1(\mathbf{q}).$$

Let $L = \max_{B_1} |Du|$, then by the definition of $\bar{x}(M_r)$ in (5.2), $\bar{x}(M_1)$ belongs to a ball B_ρ centered at the origin with radius ρ satisfying

$$(5.8) \quad \rho \leq \frac{2\Lambda + L}{\sqrt{4\Lambda^2 + 1}} \leq 1 + \frac{L}{2\Lambda}.$$

Hence, the number of the discrete set Q satisfies $\sharp Q \leq c_n(1+L)^n$ for some constant $c_n > 0$ depending only on n .

Let $v = \sqrt{\det(I + D^2u D^2u)}$ and $v_\Lambda(\bar{x}(x, Du(x))) = v(x)$ for any $x \in B_3$. Combining (4.5)(4.53) and Lemma 4.3, we have

$$(5.9) \quad \Delta_{F_\Lambda(M)} v_\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{n}} \leq \frac{2 + 4\epsilon_n}{n(1 - \epsilon_n)} v_\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{n}} |B_{F_\Lambda(M)}|^2$$

on $\mathbf{B}_{1/2} \cap F_\Lambda(M)$, where $B_{F_\Lambda(M)}$ is the second fundamental form of $F_\Lambda(M)$. From Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 4.6, there are constants $\delta_n \in (0, 1]$ and $\theta_n > 0$ depending only on n such that

$$(5.10) \quad \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^n(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_r(\mathbf{x}))} \int_{F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_r(\mathbf{x})} v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \theta_n v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(\mathbf{x})$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in F_\Lambda(M)$ with $d(\mathbf{x}, F_\Lambda(\partial M)) < 2r$. So for any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{Q}$ with $|\Pi(\mathbf{q})| = t_*$ we have

$$(5.11) \quad \int_{F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})} v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \int_{F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}}(0)} v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \theta_n v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0) \mathcal{H}^n(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}}(0)).$$

For any ball $B_{\frac{1}{4}}(x), B_{\frac{3}{2}}(x') \subset B_3$, there is a constant $\alpha_n > 0$ depending only on n such that

$$(5.12) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}}(x', Du(x'))) \leq \frac{\alpha_n}{\theta_n} \mathcal{H}^n(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(x, Du(x))).$$

Then

$$(5.13) \quad \int_{F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})} v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \alpha_n v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0) \mathcal{H}^n(F_\Lambda(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})).$$

Hence there is a point $\mathbf{z}_q \in \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})$ such that $v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(\mathbf{z}_q) \leq \alpha_n v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0)$.

Now we claim that for any positive integer $k > 0$ and any point \mathbf{q} with

$$q = \Pi(\mathbf{q}) \in \partial \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i| = kt_* \right\},$$

there is a point $\mathbf{z}_q \in \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})$ such that

$$v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(\mathbf{z}_q) \leq \alpha_n^k v_\Lambda^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0).$$

Suppose the claim holds true for the $k-1$ case. Since $\bar{x}(M_1)$ is convex, then for any point \mathbf{q} with

$$q = \Pi(\mathbf{q}) \in \partial \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i| = kt_* \right\},$$

there is a point \mathbf{q}' with

$$q' = \Pi(\mathbf{q}') \in \partial \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i| = (k-1)t_* \right\}$$

such that $|q - q'| = t_*$. This implies $|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'| \leq 1$ by the definition of t_* . Let $\mathbf{z}_{q'}$ be a point in $\mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})$ with $v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(\mathbf{z}_{q'}) \leq \alpha_n^{k-1} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0)$. Since $B_{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbf{z}_{q'}) \cap \partial M = \emptyset$, then

$$(5.14) \quad \int_{F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \int_{F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbf{z}_{q'})} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \theta_n v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(\mathbf{z}_{q'}) \mathcal{H}^n \left(F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbf{z}_{q'}) \right) \\ \leq \theta_n \alpha_n^{k-1} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0) \mathcal{H}^n \left(F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbf{z}_{q'}) \right),$$

and

$$(5.15) \quad \int_{F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \alpha_n^k v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0) \mathcal{H}^n \left(F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q}) \right).$$

Hence there is a point $\mathbf{z}_q \in \mathbf{B}_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathbf{q})$ such that $v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(\mathbf{z}_q) \leq \alpha_n^k v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0)$. We complete the proof of the claim. Therefore,

$$(5.16) \quad \int_{F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_1(\mathbf{z}_q)} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \alpha_n^{c_n(1+L)} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0) \mathcal{H}^n \left(F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_1(\mathbf{z}_q) \right).$$

Combining (5.7), we have

$$(5.17) \quad \int_{F_{\Lambda}(M_1)} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq \alpha_n^{c_n(1+L)} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0) \sum_{q \in Q} \mathcal{H}^n \left(F_{\Lambda}(M) \cap \mathbf{B}_1(\mathbf{z}_q) \right) \\ \leq c_n (1+L)^n \alpha_n^{c_n(1+L)} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0) = c_n e^{n \log(1+L)} e^{c_n(1+L) \log \alpha_n} v_{\Lambda}^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0).$$

Therefore, we get

$$(5.18) \quad \int_{M_1} v^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq C_n e^{C_n L} v^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0)$$

for some constant $C_n > 0$ depending only on n . Then

$$(5.19) \quad \omega_n = \int_{M_1} v^{-1} \leq \int_{M_1} v^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}} \leq C_n e^{C_n L} v^{-\frac{\delta_n}{n}}(0),$$

which implies

$$(5.20) \quad v(0) \leq \left(\frac{C_n}{\omega_n} \right)^{\frac{n}{\delta_n}} e^{\frac{n C_n}{\delta_n} L}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ of Hessian $D^2 u$. Assume $\Theta > (n-2)\pi/2$. Then

$$(5.21) \quad \Theta = \sum_i \arctan \lambda_i < (n-1) \frac{\pi}{2} + \arctan \lambda_n,$$

which implies

$$(5.22) \quad \arctan(-\lambda_n) < (n-1) \frac{\pi}{2} - \Theta.$$

Monotonicity of the function 'arctan' on $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ infers

$$(5.23) \quad -\lambda_n < \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \left(\Theta - (n-2) \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right) = \cot \left(\Theta - (n-2) \frac{\pi}{2} \right).$$

Namely,

$$(5.24) \quad D^2 u > -\cot \left(\Theta - (n-2) \frac{\pi}{2} \right).$$

Let $\bar{\lambda}_u$ denote the largest eigenvalue of Hessian D^2u , and $\Phi = \sqrt{1 + \bar{\lambda}_u^2}$ on B_R . Let M be the special Lagrangian graph of Du with Laplacian Δ_M . In Proposition 2.1 of [27], Wang-Yuan proved

$$(5.25) \quad \Delta_M \log \Phi \geq \left(1 - \frac{4}{\sqrt{4n+1}+1}\right) |\nabla \log \Phi|^2$$

in the distribution sense. Hence, $\Delta_M \Phi^{-\left(1 - \frac{4}{\sqrt{4n+1}+1}\right)} \leq 0$ in the distribution sense from (5.25). From Theorem 3.2, there are constants $\delta_* \in (0, 1]$ depending on n and $\theta_{n,\Theta} > 0$ depending only on $n, \max\{0, \cot(\Theta - (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2})\}$ such that

$$(5.26) \quad \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^n(M \cap \mathbf{B}_r(z))} \int_{M \cap \mathbf{B}_r(z)} \Phi^{-\delta_*} \leq \theta_{n,\Theta} \Phi^{-\delta_*}(z)$$

for any $z \in M$ and $0 < r < \theta_{n,\Theta}^{-1} d(z, \partial M)$. Analog to the proof of Theorem 5.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 5.2. *Let u be a smooth solution to the special Lagrangian equation (1.1) on $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\Theta| > (n-2)\pi/2$. Then there is a constant $C_{n,\Theta} > 0$ depending only on n, Θ with $C_{n,\Theta} \rightarrow \infty$ as $|\Theta| \rightarrow (n-2)\pi/2$ such that*

$$(5.27) \quad |D^2u(0)| \leq C_{n,\Theta} \exp\left(C_{n,\Theta} \frac{\max_{B_R} |Du - Du(0)|}{R}\right).$$

6. APPENDIX

Let us state a fact concerned on convex functions. For self-containment, we give the proof here.

Lemma 6.1. *Let f be a strictly smooth convex function on an open convex set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with boundary $\partial\Omega \in C^2$. Then $Df(\Omega) \triangleq \{Df(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n | x \in \Omega\}$ is convex.*

Proof. Let $\Omega_\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega | d(x, \partial\Omega) < \epsilon\}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, and Ω_ϵ is also convex (see Lemma 14.17 in [14] for instance). For proving the lemma, it is sufficient to show the convexity of $Df(\Omega_\epsilon)$ for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Hence, for simplicity of notations we may assume that f is strictly smooth convex on $\bar{\Omega}$ in the process of showing the convexity of $Df(\Omega)$. From Newton-Leibniz formula, for any $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega$

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle Df(x_2) - Df(x_1), x_2 - x_1 \rangle &= \int_0^1 \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t} Df(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1)), x_2 - x_1 \right\rangle dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \text{Hess } f|_{x_1+t(x_2-x_1)}(x_2 - x_1, x_2 - x_1) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the mapping $Df : \Omega \rightarrow Df(\Omega)$ is injective from $\text{Hess } f > 0$. Moreover, $Df(\partial\Omega) = \partial(Df(\Omega))$. For any considered point $p \in \partial\Omega$, up to translation and rotation of Ω , we may assume $p = 0$, and $\Omega \subset \{x_n < 0\}$. Then in a neighborhood of the origin, $\partial\Omega$ can be written as a graph over a set in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} with the graphic function ϕ satisfying $\phi(0) = 0$. By considering $f - \langle x, Df(0) \rangle$, we can assume $Df(0) = 0$. Up to an orthonormal transform,

there hold

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &= f(0) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{k_i}{2} x_i^2 + o(|x|^2), \\ Df(x) &= (k_1 x_1, \dots, k_n x_n) + o(|x|), \\ \text{Hess } f(x) &= \text{diag}\{k_1, \dots, k_n\} + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

in a neighborhood of the origin, where k_1, \dots, k_n are positive constants.

Let E_1, \dots, E_n be a standard orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ be a local orthonormal basis of $T(\partial\Omega)$ in a neighborhood of the origin such that $e_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} E_j$ with $a_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$ at the origin. Let $\tilde{\Omega} = Df(\Omega)$ and \tilde{e}_i be a local frame of $T(\partial\tilde{\Omega})$ in a neighborhood of $Df(0)$ defined by $\tilde{e}_i = (Df)_* e_i$. Denote $\tilde{a}_{ij}(x) = a_{ij}(Df(x))$. Then

$$(6.3) \quad \tilde{e}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{a}_{ij} (Df)_* E_j = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \tilde{a}_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} E_k.$$

In particular, $\tilde{e}_i(Df(0)) = k_i e_i(0)$ from (6.2). Let ν_Ω be the unit normal vector of $\partial\Omega$, and ν_Ω^* be the unit normal vector of $Df(\partial\Omega)$. Then $\nu_\Omega^* = \frac{1}{k_n} (Df)_* \nu_\Omega$ at the origin. Let $\nabla^{\partial\Omega}$ and $\nabla^{\partial\tilde{\Omega}}$ be the Levi-Civita connections of $\partial\Omega$ and $Df(\partial\Omega)$, respectively. Then

$$(6.4) \quad \left\langle \nabla_{\tilde{e}_i}^{\partial\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{e}_j, \nu_\Omega^* \right\rangle \Big|_{Df(0)} = \frac{k_i k_j}{k_n} \left\langle \nabla_{e_i}^{\partial\Omega} e_j, \nu_\Omega \right\rangle \Big|_0.$$

Since Ω is convex at the origin, then the matrix $\left(\left\langle \nabla_{e_i}^{\partial\Omega} e_j, \nu_\Omega \right\rangle \Big|_0 \right)_{n \times n}$ is nonnegative. With (6.4), $\left(k_i k_j \left\langle \nabla_{e_i}^{\partial\Omega} e_j, \nu_\Omega \right\rangle \Big|_0 \right)_{n \times n}$ is also nonnegative. Hence, $Df(\partial\Omega)$ is convex at $Df(0)$. So we conclude that $Df(\partial\Omega)$ is convex everywhere. \square

REFERENCES

1. J. Bao, J. Chen, B. Guan, M. Ji, Liouville property and regularity of a Hessian quotient equation, *Amer. J. Math.* **125** (2003), 301-316.
2. J. Bao and J. Chen, Optimal regularity for convex strong solutions of special Lagrangian equations in dimension 3, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **52** (2003), 1231-1249.
3. E. Bombieri, E. De Giorgi and M. Miranda, Una maggiorazione a priori relativa alle ipersuperfici minimali non parametriche, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **32** (1969), 255-267.
4. E. Bombieri, E. Giusti, Harnack's inequality for elliptic differential equations on minimal surfaces, *Invent. Math.* **15** (1972), 24-46.
5. A. A. Borisenko, On a Liouville-type theorem for the equation of special Lagrangian submanifolds, (Russian) *Mat. Zametki* **52** (1992), 22-25; English translation in *Math. Notes* **52** (1992), 1094-1096 (1993).
6. Simon Brendle, The isoperimetric inequality for a minimal submanifold in Euclidean space, arXiv:1907.09446.
7. Jingyi Chen, Ravi Shankar, Yu Yuan, Regularity for convex viscosity solutions of special Lagrangian equation, arXiv:1911.05452.
8. Jingyi Chen, Micah Warren, Yu Yuan, A priori estimate for convex solutions to special Lagrangian equations and its application, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **62** (2009), no. 4, 583-595.
9. T. H. Colding, and W. P. Minicozzi, A course in minimal surfaces, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, Volume **121**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2011.
10. Qi Ding, Liouville type theorems for minimal graphs over manifolds, arXiv:1911.10306
11. Robert Finn, New estimates for equations of minimal surface type, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **14** (1963), 337-375.
12. D. Fischer-Colbrie, Some rigidity theorems for minimal submanifolds of the sphere, *Acta Math.* **145**(1980), 29-46.
13. L. Fu, An analogue of Bernstein's theorem, *Houston J. Math.* **24** (1998), 415-419.

14. D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, (1983).
15. E. Giusti, *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., 1984.
16. F. Reese Harvey, and H. Blaine. Lawson, Jr., *Calibrated geometry*, *Acta Math.* **148**(1982), 47-157.
17. E. Heinz, On elliptic Monge-Ampère equations and Weyl's embedding problem, *J. Analyse Math.* **7** (1959), 1-52.
18. Konrad Jörgens, Über die Lösungen der Differentialgleichung $rt - s^2 = 1$, (German) *Math. Ann.* **127** (1954), 130-134.
19. J. Jost and Y. L. Xin, A Bernstein theorem for special Lagrangian graphs, *Calc. Var. P.D.E.*, **15** (2002), 299-312
20. F.H. Lin, X.P. Yang, *Geometric measure theory: an introduction*, Science Press, Beijing/ New York; International Press, Boston, 2002.
21. James H. Michael and Leon M. Simon, Sobolev and mean-value inequalities on generalized submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n , *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **26** (1973), 361-379.
22. Nadirashvili-Vlăduț, Singular solution to Special Lagrangian Equations, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **27** (2010), no. 5, 1179-1188.
23. Aleksei Vasil'evich Pogorelov, *Monge-Ampère Equations of Elliptic Type*, Translated from the first Russian edition by Leo F. Boron with the assistance of Albert L. Rabenstein and Richard C. Bollinger P. Noordhoff, Ltd., Groningen, 1964.
24. Leon Simon, *Lectures on Geometric Measure Theory*, Proceedings of the center for mathematical analysis Australian national university, Vol. 3, 1983.
25. M.-P. Tsui, M.-T. Wang, A Bernstein type result for special Lagrangian submanifolds, *Math. Res. Lett.* **9** (2002), 529-535.
26. Dake Wang, Yu Yuan, Singular solutions to special Lagrangian equations with subcritical phases and minimal surface systems, *Amer. J. Math.* **135** (2013), no. 5, 1157-1177.
27. Dake Wang, Yu Yuan, Hessian estimates for special Lagrangian equations with critical and supercritical phases in general dimensions, *Amer. J. Math.* **136** (2014), no. 2, 481-499.
28. M.-T. Wang, Interior gradient bounds for solutions to the minimal surface system, *Amer. J. Math.* **126** (2004), no. 4, 921-934.
29. Micah Warren, Yu Yuan, A Liouville type theorem for special Lagrangian equations with constraints, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **33** (2008), no. 4-6, 922-932.
30. Micah Warren, Yu Yuan, Hessian estimates for the sigma-2 equation in dimension three, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **62** (2009), no. 3, 305-321.
31. Micah Warren, Yu Yuan, Explicit gradient estimates for minimal Lagrangian surfaces of dimension two. *Math. Z.* **262** (2009), no. 4, 867-879.
32. Micah Warren, Yu Yuan, Hessian and gradient estimates for three dimensional special Lagrangian equations with large phase, *Amer. J. Math.* **132** (2010), no. 3, 751-770.
33. Y. L. Xin, *Minimal submanifolds and related topics*. World Scientific Publ., 2003.
34. Y. Yuan, A Bernstein problem for special Lagrangian equations, *Invent. Math.* **150** (2002), 117-125.
35. Y. Yuan, Global solutions to special Lagrangian equations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **134** (2006), no. 5, 1355-1358.
36. Y. Yuan, (unpublished) Notes on Special Lagrangian Equations.

SHANGHAI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200438, CHINA

E-mail address: dingqi@fudan.edu.cn