TAN-CONCAVITY PROPERTY FOR LAGRANGIAN PHASE OPERATORS AND APPLICATIONS TO THE TANGENT LAGRANGIAN PHASE FLOW

RYOSUKE TAKAHASHI

Abstract. We explore the tan-concavity of the Lagrangian phase operator for the study of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills (dHYM) metrics. This new property compensates for the lack of concavity of the Lagrangian phase operator as long as the metric is almost calibrated. As an application, we introduce the tangent Lagrangian phase flow (TLPF) on the space of almost calibrated $(1, 1)$-forms that fits into the GIT framework for dHYM metrics recently discovered by Collins-Yau. We show that the TLPF starting from any initial data exists for all positive time. Moreover, we also show that the TLPF converges smoothly to a dHYM metric assuming the existence of a $C$-subsolution, which gives a new proof for the existence of dHYM metrics.
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1. Introduction

Let $X$ be a compact $n$-dimensional complex manifold with a fixed Kähler form $\alpha$ and a closed real $(1, 1)$-form $\widehat{\chi}$. For $\phi \in C^\infty(X; \mathbb{R})$, we set $\chi := \widehat{\chi} + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi$ (where

Date: February 18, 2020.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 53C55; Secondary 53C44.
Key words and phrases. deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills metric, parabolic PDE, mirror symmetry.
the forms $\tilde{\chi}, \chi$ are not necessary Kähler). We say that $\phi \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})$ is a deformed Hermitian-Yang Mills (dHYM) metric if it satisfies
\[
\text{Im}(e^{\sqrt{-1}\Theta}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\chi)^n) = 0.
\] (1.1)
We define a topological invariant
\[
Z := \int_X (\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\chi)^n
\]
and assume $Z \neq 0$. Then the constant angle $\hat{\Theta}$ is uniquely determined (mod. $2\pi$) by
\[
Ze^{\sqrt{-1}\hat{\Theta}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.
\]
The equation (1.1) first appeared in the physics literature [MMMS00, and LYZ01] from mathematical side as the mirror object to a special Lagrangian in the setting of semi-flat mirror symmetry. Recently, it has been studied actively (e.g. [CCL20, Che19, CJY17, CY18, HJ20, HY19, JY17, Pin19, SS19]). We define
\[
\theta(\lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i,
\]
where arctan takes values in $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ so the image of $\theta$ lies in $(-n\pi/2, n\pi/2)$. For an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix $A$ with eigenvalues $\lambda[A]$, we set
\[
\Theta(A) := \theta(\lambda[A]).
\]
The function $\Theta$ is smooth by the symmetry of $\theta$. For $\phi \in C^\infty(X; \mathbb{R})$, we set $A[\phi] := \chi_{ij} \alpha^{kj}$. This is a Hermitian endomorphism on $T^{1,0}X$ with respect to $\alpha$. We denote the eigenvalues of $A[\phi]$ by $\lambda[\phi]$. Then according to the argument [JY17], the condition (1.1) is equivalent to
\[
\Theta(A[\phi]) = \hat{\Theta} \pmod{2\pi},
\] (1.2)
where we regard $A[\phi]$ as an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix at each point by taking normal coordinates. We say that $\phi \in C^\infty(X; \mathbb{R})$ is supercritical (resp. hypercritical) if it satisfies $\Theta(A[\phi]) > (n-2)\pi/2$ (resp. $> (n-1)\pi/2$). In particular, since arctan$(\cdot)$ takes values in $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$, the condition $\Theta(A[\phi]) > (n-1)\pi/2$ yields that all coefficients of $\lambda[\phi]$ are positive, and hence $\chi_\phi$ is Kähler. Although the equation (1.2) is elliptic, it has several problems on analysis. Most seriously, the operator $\Theta$ fails to be concave in general. Indeed, a straightforward computation shows that $\Theta(A[\phi])$ is concave if and only if $\phi$ is hypercritical. The concavity of the operator is essential to apply the Evans-Krylov theory [Kry82, Wan12] for $C^2$ estimate.

In this paper, we propose a method to compensate for the lack of concavity of the Lagrangian phase operator. In what follows, we always assume $\hat{\Theta} \in ((n-1)\pi/2, n\pi/2)$. Let us consider the open convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$:
\[
S := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \left| \theta(\lambda) - \hat{\Theta} < \frac{\pi}{2} \right. \right\}.
\]
Then we set
\[
f(\lambda) := \tan(\theta(\lambda) - \hat{\Theta}), \ \lambda \in S.
\]
The following is our main theorem;

**Theorem 1.1.** Assume that \( \hat{\Theta} \in ((n-1)\frac{\pi}{2}, n\frac{\pi}{2}) \), Then the function \( \theta - \hat{\Theta} \) is tan-concave, i.e. the composition \( f = \tan \circ (\theta - \hat{\Theta}) \) is concave on \( S \).

Collins-Picard-Wu [CPW17] showed that the function \(-e^{-A\theta}(\lambda)\) is concave for a large enough constant \( A = A(\delta) \) as long as \( \lambda \) satisfies \( \theta(\lambda) \geq (n-2)\frac{\pi}{2} + \delta \) for some \( \delta > 0 \). In our case, it is not sure that the composition \( f = \tan \circ (\theta - \hat{\Theta}) \) is concave at first glance since neither \( \tan: (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \to \mathbb{R} \) nor \( \theta - \hat{\Theta}: S \to (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \) are concave.

We expect that the tan-concavity property is useful for the study of dHYM metrics or minimal Lagrangian graphs. As a demonstration, we provide a new geometric flow approach to construct dHYM metrics. Associated to the set \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \), we define the space of almost calibrated potential functions (cf. [CCL20]);

\[
\mathcal{H} := \left\{ \phi \in C^\infty(X; \mathbb{R}) \left| |\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}| < \frac{\pi}{2} \right. \right\}.
\]

We remark that the set \( \mathcal{H} \) is strictly contained in the space of potentials with super-critical phase when \( \hat{\Theta} > (n-1)\frac{\pi}{2} \). In later arguments, we always assume that \( \mathcal{H} \) is not empty and \( 0 \in \mathcal{H} \) by replacing a reference form \( \hat{\chi} \). For any \( \phi_0 \in \mathcal{H} \), we define

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \phi_t = \tan(\Theta(A[\phi_t]) - \hat{\Theta}).
\]  

(1.3)

We have \( f_i = \frac{1+f^2}{1+\lambda^2} > 0 \) for all \( i \), which guarantees the ellipticity of the operator in the RHS. So the short time existence follows from general theory. We would like to call (1.3), the tangent Lagrangian phase flow (TLPF). For simplicity, we set \( F(A) := f(\lambda[A]) \) so that the flow equation is given by \( \frac{d}{dt}\phi = F(A[\phi]) \). On the other hand, Jacob-Yau [JY17] introduced the line bundle mean curvature flow (LBMCF)

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \phi_t = \Theta(A[\phi_t]) - \hat{\Theta}.
\]  

(1.4)

as a Kähler analogue of the Lagrangian mean curvature flow for graphs. In a formal level, the TLPF is similar to the LBMCF whenever the Lagrangian phase \( \Theta(A[\phi_t]) \) is very close to \( \hat{\Theta} \). However, it is expected that the limiting behavior of these two flows are quite different. Actually, the TLPF has some special properties that are not seen for the LBMCF (cf. Remark 4.4 and Remark 5.5). A similar observation can be found in the comparison of the Kähler-Ricci flow and the inverse Monge-Ampère flow on Fano manifolds [CHT17]. Also, we will see that the TLPF perfectly fits into the GIT framework recently discovered by Collins-Yau [CY18] in the sense that it defines the gradient flow of the Kempf-Ness functional (cf. Remark 5.1). This GIT framework gives supporting evidence for the equation (1.3) working well.

In the analysis of the flow (1.3), it is crucial to give a proper notion of C-subsolutions whose existence implies a priori estimates to all orders. With the aid of Theorem 1.1 and already known methods, it is standard to show the following;

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( X \) be a compact complex manifold with a Kähler form \( \alpha \), and \( \hat{\chi} \) a closed real \((1,1)\)-form. Assume that \( \hat{\Theta} \in ((n-1)\frac{\pi}{2}, n\frac{\pi}{2}) \). For any \( \phi_0 \in \mathcal{H} \), let \( \phi_t \) be the tangent Lagrangian phase flow starting from \( \phi_0 \). Then
(1) The flow \( \phi_t \) exists for all positive time.
(2) Moreover, if there is a \( C \)-subsolution, then the flow \( \phi_t \) converges to the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills metric \( \phi_\infty \in \mathcal{H} \) in the \( C^\infty \)-topology.

We note that our notion of \( C \)-subsolutions coincides with that defined by Collins-Jacob-Yau [CJY17]. Indeed, the analysis of the TLPF proceeds very closely to general theory of fully non-linear parabolic equations whose RHS is concave [PT17] (based on the elliptic case [Szé18]). The existence result of dHYM metrics has already been obtained in [CJY17] by the method of continuity under the condition \( \hat{\Theta} > (n - 2)^2 \pi^2 \) and the existence of a \( C \)-subsolution \( \phi \) with \( \Theta(A[\phi]) > (n - 2)\pi^2 \), here we remark that for any \( C \)-subsolution \( \phi \), the condition \( \Theta(A[\phi]) > (n - 2)^2 \pi^2 \) holds automatically if \( \hat{\Theta} > (n - 2 + \frac{2}{n})\pi^2 \) (cf. [CJY17, Lemma 3.3]). They also claimed that one can easily obtain the weaker existence result of dHYM metrics by means of the LBMCF, i.e. if \( \hat{\Theta} > (n - 1)^2 \pi^2 \) and there is a \( C \)-subsolution \( \phi \) with \( \Theta(A[\phi]) > (n - 1)\pi^2 \), then the LBMCF starting from \( \phi \) converges smoothly to a dHYM metric (cf. [CJY17, Remark 7.4]). So Theorem 1.2 gives a new proof for the existence of dHYM metrics although we assume a stronger condition \( \hat{\Theta} > (n - 1)^2 \pi^2 \) (since any \( C \)-subsolution \( \phi \) is almost calibrated if \( \hat{\Theta} > (n - 1)\pi^2 \) by Remark 5.2, we can take this \( \phi \) as the initial data of the TLPF for instance). An advantage of Theorem 1.2 is that it has a more natural meaning from geometric/variational point of view. Also we expect that in the absence of the dHYM metrics, the TLPF produces an optimally destabilizing one-parameter subgroups in GIT in analogy with the Harder-Narasimhan filtrations of unstable vector bundles (for instance, see related results [DS16, His19, Xia19] studied in Kähler settings).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we fix some notations by following [CXY17, JY17], and study the basic properties of the space \( \mathcal{H} \) and functionals on it. In Section 3, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1 that is the core of this paper. In Section 4, we prove some monotonicity formulas along the TLPF. Then we prove the long time existence of the flow which is the first part of Theorem 1.2. In Section 5, we recall the notion of \( C \)-subsolutions defined in [CJY17]. Then in accordance with [PT17], we establish the \( C^k \) estimates and the \( C^\infty \)-convergence of the TLPF, which shows the second part of Theorem 1.2.

2. Foundations

2.1. Notations and formulas. Let \( X \) be an \( n \)-dimensional compact complex manifold with a Kähler form \( \alpha \) and \( \hat{\chi} \) a closed real \((1, 1)\)-form. First we fix some notations. For \( \phi \in C^\infty(X; \mathbb{R}) \), we define a Hermitian metric \( \eta \) on \( T^{1,0}X \) by

\[
\eta_{ij} := \alpha_{ij} + \chi_{i\ell}\alpha^{k\ell}\chi_{kj}.
\]

Let

\[
v := \left| \frac{(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\chi_{\phi})^n}{\alpha^n} \right| = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 + \lambda_i^2) \right),
\]
where $\lambda_i$ denotes the eigenvalues of $A[\phi]$. In particular, this implies $v \geq 1$. In terms of $\mathcal{V}$ and $\Theta(A[\phi])$, the $\mathbb{C}$-valued function $(\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_\phi) / \alpha^n$ is expressed as 
\[
\frac{(\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_\phi)^n}{\alpha^n} = ve^{\sqrt{-1} \Theta(A[\phi])}.
\]

Integrating with respect to $\alpha^n$ we get 
\[
e^{-\sqrt{-1} \hat{\Theta}} Z = \int_X v e^{\sqrt{-1} (\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta})} \alpha^n = \int_X v \cos(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \alpha^n + \sqrt{-1} \int_X v \sin(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \alpha^n.
\]

So by the definition of $\hat{\Theta}$ we know that $e^{-\sqrt{-1} \hat{\Theta}} Z$ is real so that 
\[
|Z| = \int_X v \cos(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \alpha^n, \quad \int_X v \sin(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \alpha^n = 0.
\]

According to [CY18, Section 2], we define functionals on the space of almost calibrated potentials $\mathcal{H}$. We define the Calabi-Yau functional $CY_C$ by 
\[
CY_C(\phi) := \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \int_X \phi(\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_\phi)^j \wedge (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_\phi)^{n-j}, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{H}.
\]

This is a $\mathbb{C}$-valued functional. Then the variational formula of $CY_C$ is given by 
\[
\delta CY_C(\delta \phi) = \int_X \delta \phi(\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_\phi)^n.
\]

Also we set 
\[
\mathcal{C}(\phi) := \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1} \hat{\Theta}} CY_C(\phi)), \quad J(\phi) := -\text{Im}(e^{-\sqrt{-1} \hat{\Theta}} CY_C(\phi)).
\]

Then the variational formula of $CY_C$ yields that 
\[
\delta \mathcal{C}(\delta \phi) = \int_X \delta \phi \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1} \hat{\Theta}} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_\phi)^n),
\]
\[
\delta J(\delta \phi) = -\int_X \delta \phi \text{Im}(e^{-\sqrt{-1} \hat{\Theta}} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_\phi)^n).
\]

Also we define the volume functional by 
\[
\mathcal{V}(\phi) := \int_X v_\phi \alpha^n.
\]

The function $\mathcal{V}$ is non-negative. More precisely, we have $\mathcal{V}(\phi) \geq |Z|$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ (cf. [JY17, Proposition 3.2]). The variational formula of $\mathcal{V}$ (cf. [JY17, Proposition 3.4]) is given by 
\[
\delta \mathcal{V}(\delta \phi) = \int_X \langle d\Theta(A[\phi]), d\delta \phi \rangle_{\eta} v_\phi \alpha^n.
\]

These functionals have the following properties;

**Proposition 2.1.** For any $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ we have 
(1) $CY_C(\phi + c) = CY_C(\phi) + cZ$. 
(2) $\mathcal{C}(\phi + c) = \mathcal{C}(\phi) + c|Z|$. 
(3) $J(\phi + c) = J(\phi)$. 

We collect the properties of \( f \) that we will need;

**Proposition 2.2.** Suppose we have real numbers \( \lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n \) which satisfy \( \theta(\lambda) = \sigma \) for \( \sigma \in ((n - 2)\frac{n}{2}, n\frac{n}{2}) \). Then \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \) have the following properties;

1. \( \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_{n-1} > 0 \) and \( \lambda_{n-1} \geq |\lambda_n| \). In particular, \( \lambda \) lies in the set \( \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n | \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i > 0 \} \).

2. The set \( \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n | \theta(\lambda) \geq \sigma \} \) is convex with boundary a smooth, convex hypersurface.

Furthermore, if \( \sigma \geq (n - 1)\frac{n}{2} \), then

3. \( \lambda_n > 0 \).

In addition, if \( \sigma \geq (n - 2)\frac{n}{2} + \beta \), then there exist constants \( \varepsilon(\beta) > 0 \) and \( C(\beta) > 0 \) such that

4. if \( \lambda_n \leq 0 \), then \( \lambda_{n-1} \geq \varepsilon(\beta) \).

5. \( |\lambda_n| < C(\beta) \).

**Proof.** The property (3) is trivial. See [CJYT17, Lemma 3.1] for other statements.

We end up this subsection with showing some properties of \( F \). Let us write \( F^{ij} \) for the derivative of \( F \) with respect to the \( ij \)-entry of \( A \). Then at a diagonal matrix \( A \) we have

\[
F^{ij} = \delta_{ij} f_i, \quad (2.1)
\]

\[
F^{ij,rs} = f_{ir} \delta_{ij} \delta_{rs} + \frac{f_i - f_j}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j} (1 - \delta_{ij}) \delta_{is} \delta_{jr}. \quad (2.2)
\]

The first formula shows that the operator \( F(A[\phi]) \) is elliptic. In the second formula, we note that \( \frac{f_j - f_i}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j} \leq 0 \). In particular, we have \( f_i \leq f_j \) if \( \lambda_i \geq \lambda_j \) (see [Szé18, Section 4] for more details).

2.2. Fundamental estimates on \( \mathcal{H} \). First, by Proposition 2.2 (1), we have the following;

**Lemma 2.3** (Green function estimate). For any \( \phi \in \mathcal{H} \), we have a uniform bound \( \Delta_\alpha \phi \geq -C \) for some uniform constant \( C > 0 \) depending only on \( \alpha \) and \( \tilde{\chi} \). In particular, we have

\[
\sup_X \phi \leq \int_X \phi \alpha^n + C'
\]

for some uniform constant \( C' > 0 \) depending only on \( \alpha \) and \( \tilde{\chi} \).

**Proposition 2.4** (Harnack type inequality). For any \( \phi \in \mathcal{H} \), there exists a constant \( C \) and \( C' \) depending only on \( \alpha, \tilde{\chi}, \tilde{\Theta}, \inf_X \Theta(A[\phi]) \) and \( C(\phi) \) such that

\[
\sup_X \phi \leq -C \inf_X \phi + C'.
\]

**Proof.** For any \( \phi \in \mathcal{H} \), we set \( \tilde{\phi} := \phi - |Z|^{-1} C(\phi) \) so that \( C(\tilde{\phi}) = 0 \). We may assume that \( 0 \in \mathcal{H} \). We connect \( \phi \) with the base point 0 by a segment \( s\tilde{\phi} \) \((s \in [0, 1])\), so we have \( \chi_{s\tilde{\phi}} = s\chi_{\tilde{\phi}} + (1 - s)\tilde{\chi} \). Since \( \tilde{\Theta} > (n - 1)\frac{n}{2} \), we have a trivial upper bound

\[
\Theta(A[s\tilde{\phi}]) - \tilde{\Theta} < n\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{\Theta} < \frac{\pi}{2}.
\]
Moreover, by [CY18, Lemma 3.1 (7)], for all $s \in [0,1]$ we have
\[
\Theta(A[s\tilde{\phi}]) - \hat{\Theta} \geq \min\{\Theta(A[0]), \Theta(A[\tilde{\phi}])\} - \hat{\Theta} \\
\geq \min\{\inf_X \Theta(A[0]), \inf_X \Theta(A[\phi])\} - \hat{\Theta} \\
> -\frac{\pi}{2}
\]
(indeed, the set $H$ is convex when $\hat{\Theta} > (n - 1)\frac{\pi}{2}$ as pointed out in [CY18, Section 2]). Combining with $v_{s\tilde{\phi}} \geq 1$ we have
\[
\text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\hat{\Theta}}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\chi}_{s\tilde{\phi}})^n) = v_{s\tilde{\phi}} \cos(\Theta(A[s\tilde{\phi}]) - \hat{\Theta}) \alpha^n \geq c\alpha^n
\]
for some constant $c > 0$ depending only on $\hat{\chi}, \hat{\Theta}$ and $\inf_X \Theta(A[\phi])$. Thus $\tilde{\nu}_{\tilde{\phi}} := \int_0^1 \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\hat{\Theta}}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\chi}_{s\tilde{\phi}})^n)ds$ defines a positive measure with volume $|Z|$ and a uniform lower bound $c\alpha^n$. On the other hand, the variational formula of $C$ implies that
\[
0 = C(\tilde{\phi}) = \int_0^1 \int_X \tilde{\phi}\text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\hat{\Theta}}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\chi}_{s\tilde{\phi}})^n)ds = \int_X \tilde{\phi}\tilde{\nu}_{\tilde{\phi}}.
\]
In particular, this shows that $\sup_X \tilde{\phi} \geq 0$ and $\inf_X \tilde{\phi} \leq 0$. Keeping this in mind, we compute
\[
\int_X \tilde{\phi}\alpha^n = -\frac{1}{c} \int_X \tilde{\phi}(\nu_{\tilde{\phi}} - c\alpha^n) \leq -\frac{1}{c} \left[ \int_X (\nu_{\tilde{\phi}} - c\alpha^n) \right] \inf_X \tilde{\phi} = -C_1 \inf_X \tilde{\phi},
\]
where we put $C_1 := c^{-1}|Z| - [\alpha]^n$. Combining with the Green function estimate (cf. Lemma 2.3) we have
\[
\sup_X \tilde{\phi} \leq \int_X \tilde{\phi}\alpha^n + C_2 \leq -C_1 \inf_X \tilde{\phi} + C_2.
\]
Putting $\tilde{\phi} = \phi - |Z|^{-1}C(\phi)$ into the above, we obtain the desired formula. \hfill \Box

3. TAN-CONCAVITY

Now we give a proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. From a direct computation, we have
\[
df = (1 + f^2)d\theta, \quad d\theta = \sum_i \frac{d\lambda_i}{1 + \lambda_i^2},
\]
\[
\nabla^2 \theta = -\sum_i \frac{2\lambda_i}{(1 + \lambda_i)^2} d\lambda_i \otimes d\lambda_i,
\]
\[
\nabla^2 f = 2f df \otimes d\theta + (1 + f^2) \nabla^2 \theta
\]
\[
= 2f(1 + f^2)d\theta \otimes d\theta + (1 + f^2) \nabla^2 \theta
\]
\[
= (1 + f^2)(2f d\theta \otimes d\theta + \nabla^2 \theta).
\]
If we set \( T(\lambda) := \tan((n-1)\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta(\lambda)) \), we observe that \( f < -T \) since
\[
-\frac{\pi}{2} < (n-1)\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta < \hat{\Theta} - \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}
\]
from the assumption. Thus
\[
\nabla^2 f \leq (1 + f^2)(-2T d\theta \otimes d\theta + \nabla^2 \theta)
\]
since \( d\theta \otimes d\theta \) is semipositive. In the standard coordinates, the form \((-\frac{1}{2})(-2T d\theta \otimes d\theta + \nabla^2 \theta)\) has the following matrix representation
\[
M := \begin{pmatrix}
T + \delta_{ij}\lambda_i \\
(1 + \lambda^2_i)(1 + \lambda^2_j)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
Then it suffices to show that \( M \geq 0 \), i.e. \( M \) is positive semidefinite. For \( k = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\} \), let \( M_I \) be the principal submatrix of \( M \) associated to \( I \), i.e.
\[
M_I = \begin{pmatrix}
T + \delta_{ij}\lambda_i \\
(1 + \lambda^2_i)(1 + \lambda^2_j)
\end{pmatrix}_{i,j \in I}.
\]
Since \( M \) is symmetric, \( M \geq 0 \) holds if and only if \( \det M_I \geq 0 \) for all \( I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\} \).

Moreover, since the term \( 1/(1+\lambda^2_i) \) appears precisely in the \((i,k)\)-entries or \((k,i)\)-entries of \( M \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, n \), we see that
\[
\prod_{i \in I} (1 + \lambda^2_i)^2 \cdot \det M_I = \det \widetilde{M}_I,
\]
where \( \widetilde{M}_I \) denotes the principal submatrix of the \( n \times n \) symmetric matrix \( \widetilde{M} := (T + \delta_{ij}\lambda_i) \). By the symmetry of \( f \), we may only consider the point \( \lambda \in S \) with \( \lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n \).

A standard induction argument shows that
\[
\det \widetilde{M}_I = \prod_{i \in I} \lambda_i \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i \in I} T}{\lambda_i} \right)
\]
as long as \( \lambda_n \neq 0 \). Set \( x_i := \arctan \lambda_i \), \( y_i := \frac{\pi}{2} - x_i \) \((i = 1, \ldots, n)\). The argument is divided into two cases;

**Case 1** \((\theta(\lambda) \geq (n-1)\frac{\pi}{2})\); In this case, we know that \( T \leq 0 \) and \( \lambda_i > 0 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). So the condition \( \det \widetilde{M}_I \geq 0 \) is equivalent to
\[
1 + \sum_{i \in I} \frac{T}{\lambda_i} \geq 0.
\]
This is clearly true for all \( I \) when \( T = 0 \), so we assume \( T < 0 \), or equivalently \( \theta(\lambda) > (n-1)\frac{\pi}{2} \). Since \( \sum_{i \in I} \frac{T}{\lambda_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T}{\lambda_i} \), we may only consider the case \( I = \{1, \ldots, n\} \). From the assumption, we observe that
\[
0 < \sum_{i=1}^n y_i < \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad 0 < y_1 \leq \ldots \leq y_n < \frac{\pi}{2}.
\]
So combining with the formula
\[
\tan \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right) = \frac{\tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) + \tan y_n}{1 - \tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) \tan y_n},
\]
we know that \(0 < 1 - \tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) \tan y_n < 1\), and hence
\[
\tan \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right) \geq \tan \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \right) + \tan y_n.
\]

Repeating this, we obtain
\[
-\frac{1}{T} = \tan \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tan y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_i}.
\]

**Case 2** \(((n-2)\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta(\lambda) < (n-1)\frac{\pi}{2})\); In this case, we know that \(T > 0\). If \(\lambda_n \geq 0\), we know that \(\tilde{M} \geq 0\) since it is decomposed as
\[
\tilde{M} = T \cdot E_n + \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n),
\]
where \(E_n\) denotes the \(n \times n\) matrix whose all entries are equal to one. Now we assume that \(\lambda_n < 0\). We note that \(\lambda_i > 0\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, n-1\). If \(n \not\in I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_\ell\}\), we have a decomposition \(\tilde{M}_I = T \cdot E_\ell + \text{diag}(\lambda_{i_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{i_\ell})\) with \(\lambda_{i_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{i_\ell} > 0\), so det \(\tilde{M}_I \geq 0\) is clear. If \(n \in I\), we have \(\sum_{i \in I} T_{ii} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{T}{\lambda_i}\). Eventually we may assume \(I = \{1, \ldots, n\}\). Then the condition det \(\tilde{M}_I \geq 0\) is equivalent to
\[
1 + \sum_{i \in I} \frac{T}{\lambda_i} \leq 0.
\]
From the assumption, we have
\[
0 < \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i < \frac{\pi}{2} < \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i < \pi, \quad 0 < y_1 \leq \ldots \leq y_{n-1} < \frac{\pi}{2} < y_n < \pi.
\]
So from the formula
\[
\tan \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right) = \frac{\tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) + \tan y_n}{1 - \tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) \tan y_n},
\]
we know that \(1 < 1 - \tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) \tan y_n, \tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) + \tan y_n < 0\) and hence we obtain
\[
\tan \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right) \geq \tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) + \tan y_n.
\]
Applying the same argument as in Case 1 to the first term, we obtain \(\tan(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \tan y_i\). Thus
\[
-\frac{1}{T} = \tan \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tan y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_i}.
\]
This completes the proof. \(\square\)
4. The Tangent Lagrangian Phase Flow

4.1. Monotonicity formulas. We start with some monotonicity properties of functionals along the TLPF defined in Section 2.

**Proposition 4.1.** Along the TLPF \( \phi_t \) with \( \phi_0 \in \mathcal{H} \) we have

- (1) \( \mathcal{C}(\phi_t) \) is constant.
- (2) \( \mathcal{J}(\phi_t) \) is monotonically decreasing.
- (3) \( \mathcal{V}(\phi_t) \) is monotonically decreasing.

**Proof.** From the variational formula of \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{J} \), we compute

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{C}(\phi_t) = \int_X \frac{d}{dt} \phi \cdot \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_{\phi})^n)
= \int_X \tan(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_{\phi})^n)
= \int_X v \sin(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \alpha^n
= 0,
\]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{J}(\phi_t) = -\int_X \frac{d}{dt} \phi \cdot \text{Im}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_{\phi})^n)
= -\int_X \tan(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \text{Im}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_{\phi})^n)
= -\int_X \tan^2(\Theta(A[\phi]) - \hat{\Theta}) \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_{\phi})^n)
\leq 0
\]

since \( \phi_t \) stays in the set \( \mathcal{H} \) as long as it exists (cf. Lemma 4.5) and hence the form \( \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_{\phi})^n) \) defines a positive measure on \( X \). Also we have

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{V}(\phi_t) = -\int_X \langle d\Theta(A[\phi]), \frac{d}{dt} \phi \rangle v_{\phi} \alpha^n = -\int_X (1 + F^2) |d\Theta(A[\phi])|^2 v_{\phi} \alpha^n \leq 0.
\]

**Remark 4.2.** In [CY18 Section 2], they discovered a GIT/moment map interpretation for dHYM metrics in which the \( \mathcal{J} \)-functional plays a role of the Kempf-Ness functional, and dHYM metrics are characterized as critical points of \( \mathcal{J} \). Also the space \( \mathcal{H} \) has a natural Riemannian structure defined by

\[
\|\delta \phi\|_\phi^2 := \int_X (\delta \phi)^2 \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\Theta} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} \chi_{\phi})^n), \quad \delta \phi \in T_{\phi} \mathcal{H}.
\]

Moreover, the Riemannian manifold \( \mathcal{H} \) is equipped with the Levi-Civita connection, and the sectional curvature is non-positive as shown in the recent work [CCL20]. The \( \mathcal{J} \)-functional is convex along geodesics with respect to this Riemannian structure. From the proof of Proposition 4.1, we know that the TLPF defines the gradient flow of the \( \mathcal{J} \)-functional.
By Lemma 4.5, Proposition 4.1 (1) and Proposition 2.4 we obtain the following;

**Corollary 4.3.** Along the TLPF $\phi_t$, the Harnack type inequality

$$\sup_X \phi_t \leq -C \inf_X \phi_t + C'$$

holds for some uniform constant $C, C' > 0$ depending only on $\alpha$, $\hat{\chi}$, $\hat{\Theta}$ and the initial data $\phi_0 \in H$.

**Remark 4.4.** In the proof of Proposition 2.4, we see the normalization $\bar{\phi} = \phi - |Z|^{-1}\mathcal{C}(\phi)$ is a significant issue. As for the LBMCF (1.4), the $\mathcal{C}(\phi_t)$ is not constant or even monotone. Instead, one can easily show that if $\xi < \inf_X \hat{\Theta}(A[\phi_0]) \leq \sup_X \Theta(A[\phi_0]) < \xi + \frac{\pi}{2}$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, the $\xi$-twisted $\mathcal{C}$-functional

$$\mathcal{C}_\xi(\phi) := \text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\xi C}\mathcal{Y}_C(\phi))$$

is decreasing along the flow by applying Jensen’s inequality to $\tan(x - \xi)$ for $x \in (\xi, \xi + \frac{\pi}{2})$ (see [Tak19, Proposition 2.1]). However, this argument does not apply when $\text{osc}_X \Theta(A[\phi_0]) \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$.

**4.2. Long time existence.** Now let us consider the TLPF $\phi_t$ with $\phi_0 \in H$ for $t \in [0, T)$ (where $T > 0$ is not necessarily the maximal existence time).

**Lemma 4.5** (see [PTT17], Lemma 6). Along the TLPF $\phi_t$ with $\phi_0 \in H$, we have a uniform control

$$\inf_X \Theta(A[\phi_0]) \leq \Theta(A[\phi_t]) \leq \sup_X \Theta(A[\phi_0]).$$

So $\|\frac{d}{dt}\phi\|_{C^0} \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\phi_0$. In particular, the flow stays in $H$ as long as it exists.

**Proof.** A straightforward computation shows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} F(A[\phi_t]) = F^{jm} \partial_j \partial_m \frac{d}{dt} \phi = F^{jm} \partial_j \partial_m (F(A[\phi_t])).$$

So by a maximum principle we have $\inf_X F(A[\phi_0]) \leq F(A[\phi_t]) \leq \sup_X F(A[\phi_0])$, which shows that $\phi_t \in H$ as long as it exists. So by the monotonicity of $\tan$: $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $\inf_X \Theta(A[\phi_0]) \leq \Theta(A[\phi_t]) \leq \sup_X \Theta(A[\phi_0])$ as desired. \(\square\)

Integrating $\frac{d}{dt} \phi$ on $[0, T)$ we obtain the following;

**Corollary 4.6.** Along the TLPF $\phi_t$ with $\phi_0 \in H$, we have $\|\phi_t\|_{C^0} \leq C_T$ for some constant $C_T > 0$ depending only on $\hat{\Theta}$, $\phi_0$ and $T$.

Combining with Proposition 2.2 we have;

**Corollary 4.7.** Along the TLPF $\phi_t$ with $\phi_0 \in H$, there is a uniform constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\phi_0$ such that $|\lambda_n| < C$.

Set

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda[\phi]) := \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda[\phi]).$$

Then Lemma 4.5 also implies;
Corollary 4.8. For the TLPF $\phi_t$ with $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\phi_0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C} < \mathcal{F}(\lambda[\phi_t]) < C.$$ (4.1)

Proof. We compute

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda[\phi_t]) = (1 + f^2) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_i^2}.$$ 

The upper bound of $f$ follows from the assumption $\hat{\Theta} > (n-1)\frac{\pi}{2}$. The lower bound of $f$ is uniformly controlled by $\inf_X \Theta(A[\phi_0])$ by Lemma 4.5. Combining with the uniform control of $|\lambda_n|$ we obtain the desired estimate. □

Set

$$\mathcal{L} := \frac{d}{dt} - F^{kk} \nabla_k \nabla_k.$$ 

Lemma 4.9. Let $\phi_t$ be the TLPF with $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. Then we have

$$|\sqrt{-1} \delta \bar{\delta} \phi_t|_{\alpha} \leq C_T,$$

where the constant $C_T > 0$ depends only on $\alpha$, $\hat{\chi}$, $\hat{\Theta}$, $\phi_0$ and $T$.

Proof. Take $T' < T$ and let $\nabla$ be the Chern connection with respect to $\alpha$. The strategy is applying the maximum principle to the function

$$G := \log \lambda_1 - Dt$$

on $X \times [0, T']$. The constant $D > 0$ is determined in later argument. Assume that the function $G$ attains its maximum on $X \times [0, T']$ at some $(x_0, t_0)$. We want to apply the operator $\mathcal{L}$ to $G$. More precisely, since $\lambda_1$ may not be differentiable ($\lambda_1$ is only continuous on $X$), we use the perturbation technique as in [Szé18, Section 4]. We take a normal coordinates with respect to $\alpha$ centered at $x_0$ to identify $A[\phi(x_0, t_0)]$ as a matrix valued function on it which is diagonal at the origin with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n$, and then adjust $A$ by subtracting a small constant diagonal matrix $B = \text{diag}(B_{ii})$ with $0 = B_{11} < B_{22} < \ldots < B_{nn}$. At the origin the matrix $\tilde{A} := A - B$ has eigenvalues

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_i = \lambda_i - B_{ii} < \tilde{\lambda}_1 \ (i > 1).$$

These are distinct, and define smooth functions near the origin. Set

$$\tilde{G} := \log \tilde{\lambda}_1 - Dt.$$ 

Then we have $\tilde{G}(x, t) \leq G(x, t)$ and $\tilde{G}$ achieves its maximum $\tilde{G}(x_0, t_0) = G(x_0, t_0)$ at $(x_0, t_0)$. It suffices to show that $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ is bounded from above. We may assume $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ at the origin. We compute

$$\mathcal{L} \log \tilde{\lambda}_1 = \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \mathcal{L} \tilde{\lambda}_1 + F^{kk} \frac{\nabla_k \tilde{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_1^2},$$

$$\nabla_k \tilde{\lambda}_1 = \nabla_k \lambda_{11} - \nabla_k B_{11},$$
\[ \nabla_k \nabla_k \tilde{\lambda}_1 = \nabla_k \nabla_k \chi_{11} + \sum_{p>1} \frac{|\nabla_k \chi_{1p}|^2 + |\nabla_k \chi_{p1}|^2}{\lambda_1 - \hat{\lambda}_p} \]
\[+ \nabla_k \nabla_k B^{11} - 2 \text{Re} \sum_{p>1} \frac{\nabla_k \chi_{1p} \nabla_k B^{1\bar{p}} + \nabla_k \chi_{p1} \nabla_k B^{p\bar{1}}}{\lambda_1 - \hat{\lambda}_p} + \tilde{\lambda}_1^{pq,rs} \nabla_k B^{pq} \nabla_k B^{rs} \]

(for instance, see [Sze18, equation (70)]). Evaluating this expression at the origin, and using that \( B \) is constant we have

\[ \nabla_k \tilde{\lambda}_1 = \nabla_k \chi_{11}, \]
\[ \nabla_k \nabla_k \tilde{\lambda}_1 = \nabla_k \nabla_k \chi_{11} + \sum_{p>1} \frac{|\nabla_k \chi_{1p}|^2 + |\nabla_k \chi_{p1}|^2}{\lambda_1 - \hat{\lambda}_p}. \]

On the other hand, the evolution equation of the TLPF implies that

\[ \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\lambda}_1 = \frac{d}{dt} \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \phi = F^{ar{k},s\bar{r}} \nabla_1 \chi_{\bar{k}k} \nabla_1 \chi_{s\bar{r}} + F^{k\bar{k}} \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \chi_{kk}. \]

Thus we compute \( \mathcal{L} \tilde{\lambda}_1 \) as

\[ \mathcal{L} \tilde{\lambda}_1 = F^{k\bar{k}} \left( \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \chi_{kk} - \nabla_k \nabla_k \chi_{11} - \sum_{p>1} \frac{|\nabla_k \chi_{1p}|^2 + |\nabla_k \chi_{p1}|^2}{\lambda_1 - \hat{\lambda}_p} \right) \]
\[+ F^{ar{k},s\bar{r}} \nabla_1 \chi_{\bar{k}k} \nabla_1 \chi_{s\bar{r}}. \]

The first two terms are estimated as

\[ \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \chi_{kk} - \nabla_k \nabla_k \chi_{11} = \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \tilde{\chi}_{kk} - \nabla_k \nabla_k \tilde{\chi}_{11} + \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \phi_{kk} - \nabla_k \nabla_k \phi_{11} \]
\[\leq C_1 + \text{Rm} * \nabla \nabla \phi \]
\[\leq C_2 (\lambda_1 + 1) \]

since \( \nabla \nabla \phi \) is controlled by \( \lambda_1 \), where \( \text{Rm} \) denotes the Riemannian curvature tensor of \( \alpha \), and the constants \( C_1, C_2 \) only depends on \( \alpha \) and \( \tilde{\chi} \). Thus we obtain

\[ \mathcal{L} \log \tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq C_2 (1 + \lambda_1^{-1}) F + \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ar{k},s\bar{r}} \nabla_1 \chi_{\bar{k}k} \nabla_1 \chi_{s\bar{r}} + F^{k\bar{k}} \frac{|\nabla_k \tilde{\lambda}_1|^2}{\lambda_1^2}. \tag{4.2} \]

For the first term of (4.2), we have \( C_2 (1 + \lambda_1^{-1}) F < C_3 \) at the origin by \( \lambda_1 \geq 1 \) and Corollary 4.8. From the concavity of \( f \), the second term is non-positive. The third term is zero at \( (x_0, t_0) \) by \( \nabla \tilde{G} = 0 \). Thus applying the maximum principle to the function \( \tilde{G} \) with \( D := C_3 + 1 \), we conclude that \( t_0 = 0 \) this gives the desired bound. \( \square \)

With the \( C^2 \)-estimate in hand, we obtain a uniform control of the eigenvalues along the flow. In particular, the operator \( F(A[\phi_t]) \) in the RHS of (1.3) is uniformly elliptic and concave. So we apply the Evans-Krylov theory [Kry82, Wan12] to obtain;

**Lemma 4.10.** Let \( \phi_t \) be the TLPF with \( \phi_0 \in \mathcal{H} \). Assume \( \|\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \bar{\phi}\|_{C^0} \leq C_0 \). Then there exist constants \( C > 0 \) and \( \beta \in (0, 1) \) depending only on \( \alpha, \tilde{\chi} \) and \( C_0 \) such that

\[ \|\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \bar{\phi}\|_{C^2(X \times [0,T])} \leq C. \]
The higher order regularity of the flow follows from the Schauder estimates and a standard bootstrapping argument. We omit the detailed proofs. Also, a standard argument using Ascoli-Arzelà theorem shows that;

**Theorem 4.11.** Let $\phi_t$ be the tangent Lagrangian phase flow with $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and assume $\hat{\Theta} \in ((n-1)\frac{\pi}{2}, n\frac{\pi}{2})$. Then the flow $\phi_t$ exists for all positive time.

5. **Convergence of the TLPF under the existence of a $C$-subsolution**

5.1. **$C$-subsolutions.** Let $\Gamma_n$ be the positive orthant of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Collins-Jacob-Yau [CJY17] introduced the notion of $C$-subsolutions;

**Definition 5.1.** A function $\phi \in C^\infty(X; \mathbb{R})$ is called a $C$-subsolution if for any $x \in X$, the set

$$\{\mu \in \Gamma_n | \theta(\lambda[\phi(x)] + \mu) = \hat{\Theta} \}$$

is bounded.

**Remark 5.2.** From [CJY17, Lemma 3.3], any $C$-subsolution $\phi$ must satisfy $\Theta(A[\phi]) > \frac{n}{n-1}(\hat{\Theta} - \frac{\pi}{2})$. In particular, any $C$-subsolution $\phi$ is almost calibrated when $\hat{\Theta} > (n-1)\frac{\pi}{2}$.

In particular, a genuine solution to (1.2) is clearly a $C$-subsolution. In [CJY17], the notion of $C$-subsolutions is used to study the elliptic equation (1.2). In the next subsection, we will see that the same notion is also useful to study the limiting behavior of the TLPF. Set

$$g(\lambda, \tau) := f(\lambda) + \tau, \quad (\lambda, \tau) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}.$$ 

The condition $f_i > 0$ shows that at each point $(x, t)$, the ray $\{(\lambda[\phi(x,t)] + s\mu, s\tau)|s \geq 0\}$ generated by any non-zero element $(\mu, \tau) \in \Gamma_n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ intersects transversely with the level set $\{g = 0\}$ just once. So by the compactness, there is a $\delta > 0$ and $K > 0$ such that at each $(x, t) \in X \times [0, T)$, any element in the set

$$\{(\mu, \tau) \in \Gamma_n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} | f(\lambda[\phi(x,t)] - \delta I + \mu) + \tau - \delta = 0\}$$

satisfies $|\mu| + |\tau| < K$, where $I$ denotes the vector $(1, \ldots, 1)$ of eigenvalues of the identity matrix. In later arguments, we fix this $\delta$ and $K$.

5.2. **Up to $C^k$-estimates.** In the remaining of the paper, we prove Theorem 1.2. Again we note that the proof is almost a word-by-word copy of general theory of fully non-linear parabolic equations [PT17] once we establish Theorem 1.1 and define a proper notion of $C$-subsolutions. However, our function $f$ does not have the structural properties imposed in [PT17, Szé18]. On the contrary, the function $f$ can not be extended to a symmetric cone $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ containing $\mathcal{S}$ since $f(\lambda) \to -\infty$ as $\lambda$ reaches the boundary $\partial \mathcal{S}$. For this reason, we need to check carefully to see if every argument in [PT17] carries over to our case. In later arguments, we explain there is no substantial differences from [PT17] except the gradient estimate (cf. Lemma 5.7).

Now we assume that there is a $C$-subsolution $\phi$ and set $\hat{\chi} = \chi_\phi$. Let $\phi_t$ the TLPF with $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. One can prove the following two lemmas exactly as in [PT17];

**Lemma 5.3** (see [PT17], Lemma 1). There exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\alpha$, $\hat{\chi}$, $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\phi_0$ such that $\|\phi_t\|_{C^0} \leq C$. 
Proof. This lemma is based on the parabolic version of the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci estimates due to [Tso85]. It is straightforward to check that the proof requires only the lower bound $\Delta \phi_t \geq C$ (cf. Lemma 2.3), the ellipticity of the operator and the boundedness of the set (5.1). Unlike the elliptic case, the argument for parabolic case is more subtle, which just provides a uniform lower bound for $\phi_t$ as mentioned in [PT17]. So we apply the Harnack type equality (cf. Corollary 4.3) to get the full estimate of $\phi_t$. □

Lemma 5.4 (see [PT17], Lemma 3). There exists a constant $\rho = \rho(\delta, K) > 0$ (where the constants $\delta$, $K$ are defined in (5.1)) so that if $|\lambda[\phi_t] - \lambda[\phi]| > K$, then either

$$\mathcal{L}\phi_t > \rho \mathcal{F}(\lambda[\phi])$$

or we have for any $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$F_{ii}(A[\phi_i]) > \rho \mathcal{F}(\lambda[\phi_i]).$$

Proof. The proof requires only the ellipticity and convexity of the level set of $g$, that are available in our case. □

Remark 5.5. As for the elliptic operator $\Theta$, Collins-Jacob-Yau [CJY17, Proposition 3.5] proved a similar inequality based on [Szé18, Proposition 6] only by using the convexity of the level set of $\theta$. Indeed as pointed out in [CJY17], the proof of [Szé18, Proposition 6] only requires the ellipticity and the convexity of the level set of $\theta$. However, this argument can not be extended directly to the parabolic case, i.e. the LBMCF case (1.4). Indeed, if we set $h(\lambda, \tau) := \theta(\lambda) + \tau$, then the each level set $h(\lambda, \tau) = c$ defines the graph of the function $\tau = c - \theta(\lambda)$, which is convex if and only if the function $\theta$ itself is concave. This fails as soon as $\theta(\lambda) < (n - 1)\pi/2$.

Lemma 5.6. We have the estimate

$$|\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\phi_t|_\alpha \leq C(1 + \sup_{X \times [0, T]} |\nabla \phi_t|^2)$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends only on $\alpha$, $\hat{\chi}$, $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\phi_0$.

The proof of this lemma also proceeds along the same line as in [PT17, Lemma 2]. However, using the uniform control of $|\lambda_n|$ and the vanishing of the torsion tensor of $\alpha$, we can simplify the argument. We give the proof for the sake of completeness.

Proof of Lemma 5.6. Take $T' < T$ and consider the function

$$G := \log \lambda_1 + \Phi(|\nabla \phi|^2) + \Psi(\phi)$$

on $X \times [0, T']$, where the functions $\Phi$, $\Psi$ are specified by

$$\Phi(s) := -\frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 - \frac{s}{2P}\right), \quad s \in [0, P],$$

$$\Psi(s) := De^{-s}, \quad s \in \left[\inf_{X \times [0, T']} \phi, \sup_{X \times [0, T']} \phi\right].$$
where \( P := \sup_{X \times [0,T']} (|∇ φ|^2 + 1) \), and the large constant \( D > 0 \) is chosen in the course of the proof. Then we note that

\[
\frac{1}{4P} \Phi' < \frac{1}{2P}, \quad \Phi'' = 2(\Phi')^2 > 0.
\]

Assume that \( G \) attains its maximum on \( X \times [0,T'] \) at some \((x_0,t_0)\). Now we use a perturbation technique similar to the one used in Lemma 4.9. We will apply the maximum principle to the function

\[
\tilde{G} := \log \tilde{\lambda} + \Psi(|∇ φ|^2) + \Psi(φ),
\]

where we adopt the same notations as in the proof of Lemma 4.9. Since \(|λ_n|\) is uniformly controlled along the flow, we may assume that at the origin, \( λ \) satisfies:

- \( λ_1 \geq 1 \).
- \( |λ[φ(x_0,t_0)] - λ[φ(x_0)]| > K \).
- \( λ \geq -\kappa \).
- \( \frac{1}{1 + λ^2} \leq \frac{ρ}{1 + λ^2} \).

where the constant \( ρ = ρ(δ,K) > 0 \) is determined in Lemma 5.4 and \( κ = κ(D,∥φ∥_{C^0}) > 0 \) is determined in later arguments (if \( λ \) does not satisfy any of the above four conditions, the desired estimate already holds). We may assume that \( t_0 > 0 \). As for the term of \( \mathcal{L} \tilde{G} \) we already observe in the proof of Lemma 4.9 that

\[
\mathcal{L} \log \tilde{λ}_1 \leq C_1 \mathcal{F} + \frac{1}{λ_1} F^{ik,\bar{s}r} \nabla_1 \chi_{ik} \nabla_1 \chi_{s\bar{r}} + F^{kk} \frac{|∇ k \tilde{λ}_1|^2}{λ_1^2},
\]

where we used the lower bound \( λ_1 \geq 1 \) to obtain the first term. For the second term of \( \mathcal{L} \tilde{G} \) we compute

\[
\mathcal{L}(Φ(∥∇ φ∥^2)) = Φ' \mathcal{L}(∥∇ φ∥^2) - Φ'' F^{qq} |∇ q(∥∇ φ∥^2)|^2
\]

\[
= Φ' (\nabla_j φ \cdot \mathcal{L}(\nabla_j φ) + \nabla_j φ \cdot \mathcal{L}(∇_j φ) - F^{qq} (|∇_q ∇ φ|^2 + |∇_q ∇ φ|^2))
\]

\[
- Φ'' F^{qq} |∇ q(∥∇ φ∥^2)|^2,
\]

It follows that

\[
\nabla_j \frac{d}{dt} φ = F^{kk} \nabla_j k \chi_{kk}.
\]

Using \((4P)^{-1} < Φ' < (2P)^{-1}\) we get

\[
Φ' \cdot ∇^j φ \cdot \mathcal{L}(∇_j φ) \leq C_2 \mathcal{F}
\]

for some constant \( C_2 > 0 \) depending only on \( α \) and \( \widetilde{χ} \). The similar estimate also holds for \( Φ' \cdot ∇^j φ \cdot \mathcal{L}(∇_j φ) \). Thus

\[
\mathcal{L} Φ(∥∇ φ∥^2) \leq C_3 \mathcal{F} - F^{qq} (|∇_q ∇ φ|^2 + |∇_q ∇ φ|^2) - Φ'' F^{qq} |∇ q(∥∇ φ∥^2)|^2.
\]

The estimate for the last term of \( \mathcal{L} \tilde{G} \) is straightforward;

\[
\mathcal{L}(Ψ(φ)) = Ψ' \mathcal{L} φ - Ψ'' F^{kk} |∇_k φ|^2.
\]
Summarizing the above estimates we get
\[
0 \leq \mathcal{L}G \leq F^{kk} \frac{|\nabla_k \tilde{1}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ls, sr} \nabla_1 \chi_{ls} \nabla_1 \chi_{sr} + C_4 F \\
- F^{q \bar{q}} (|\nabla_q \nabla \phi|^2 + |\nabla_q \nabla \phi|^2) - \Phi'' \cdot F^{q \bar{q}} |\nabla_q (|\nabla \phi|^2)|^2 \\
+ \Psi' \mathcal{L} \phi - \Phi'' \cdot F^{kk} |\nabla_k \phi|^2. 
\tag{5.4}
\]

To deal with the first bad term, we will use the second and fifth good terms. Set
\[
I := \{ i | F^i > \kappa^{-1} F^{11} \}.
\]

We note that \(1 \notin I\) since \(\kappa < 1\). Then at the maximum point we have \(\nabla \tilde{G} = 0\), which yields that
\[
\sum_{k \notin I} F^{kk} \frac{|\nabla_k \tilde{1}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} = \sum_{k \notin I} F^{kk} |\nabla_k (|\nabla \phi|^2) + \Psi' |\nabla_k \phi|^2|
\leq 2(\Phi')^2 \sum_{k \notin I} F^{kk} |\nabla_k (|\nabla \phi|^2)|^2 + 2(\Psi')^2 \sum_{k \notin I} F^{kk} |\nabla_k \phi|^2
\leq \Phi'' \sum_{k \notin I} F^{kk} |\nabla_k (|\nabla \phi|^2)|^2 + 2(\Psi')^2 \kappa^{-1} F^{11} \Phi' P.
\]

On the other hand,
\[
2\kappa \sum_{k \in I} F^{kk} \frac{|\nabla_k \tilde{1}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} \leq 2\kappa \Phi'' \sum_{k \in I} F^{kk} |\nabla_k (|\nabla \phi|^2)|^2 + 4\kappa (\Psi')^2 \sum_{k \notin I} F^{kk} |\nabla_k \phi|^2.
\]

Choose \(\kappa = \kappa(D, ||\phi||_{C^0})\) sufficiently small so that \(4\kappa (\Psi')^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \Phi''\). Then
\[
0 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{ls, sr} \nabla_1 \chi_{ls} \nabla_1 \chi_{sr} + (1 - 2\kappa) \sum_{k \in I} F^{kk} \frac{|\nabla_k \tilde{1}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} - F^{q \bar{q}} (|\nabla_q \nabla \phi|^2 + |\nabla_q \nabla \phi|^2) \\
+ \Psi' \mathcal{L} \phi + 2(\Psi')^2 \kappa^{-1} F^{11} \Phi' P + C_4 F. 
\tag{5.5}
\]

We note that \(\nabla_1 \chi_{kl} = \nabla_k \chi_{1l} = \nabla_k \tilde{1}\) since \(d\chi = 0\) and we are working at a point in normal coordinates. By the concavity and symmetry of \(f\) we have
\[
F^{ls, sr} \nabla_1 \chi_{ls} \nabla_1 \chi_{sr} \leq \sum_{k \in I} F^{kk} \frac{|\nabla_k \tilde{1}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} - F^{11} - F^{kk} = \sum_{k \in I} \frac{F^{11} - F^{kk}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_k} |\nabla_k \tilde{1}|^2
\]

since \(\frac{F^{11} - F^{kk}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_k} \leq 0\) (cf. \textbf{Szé18} equation (67))]. We know that
\[
\frac{1 - \kappa}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_k} \geq \frac{1 - 2\kappa}{\lambda_1}.
\]

Indeed,
\[
(1 - \kappa) \lambda_1 - (1 - 2\kappa) (\lambda_1 - \lambda_k) = \kappa \lambda_1 + (1 - 2\kappa) \lambda_k.
\]

This expression is clearly positive when \(\lambda_k \geq 0\). Otherwise, we have \(k = n\), and by using the assumption \(\kappa \lambda_1 \geq -\lambda_n\), we get
\[
\kappa \lambda_1 + (1 - 2\kappa) \lambda_n \geq -2\kappa \lambda_n > 0.
\]
Thus we have
\[ \sum_{k \in I} F^{kk}_{1\bar{1}} - F^{kk}_{1\bar{1}}|\nabla_k \bar{\lambda}_1|^2 \leq - \sum_{k \in I} \frac{(1 - \kappa) F^{kk}_{1\bar{1}}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_k} |\nabla_k \bar{\lambda}_1|^2 \leq - \frac{1 - 2\kappa}{\lambda_1} \sum_{k \in I} F^{kk}_{1\bar{1}} |\nabla_k \bar{\lambda}_1|^2. \]
So the first and second terms of (5.5) are estimated as
\[ \frac{1}{\lambda_1} F^{kk}_{1\bar{1}} \bar{1}_k \nabla_1 \chi_{1\bar{1}} \nabla_1 \bar{\lambda}_1 + (1 - 2\kappa) \sum_{k \in I} F^{kk}_{1\bar{1}} |\nabla_k \bar{\lambda}_1|^2 \leq 0 \]
since \( \lambda_1 \geq 1 \). As for the forth good term of (5.5), we use the following estimate
\[ F^{q\bar{q}}(|\nabla_q \nabla \phi|^2 + |\nabla_q \nabla \phi|^2) \geq F^{11}_{1\bar{1}} |\lambda_1 - \bar{\chi}_{1\bar{1}}|^2 \geq F^{11}_{1\bar{1}} \frac{\lambda^2_1}{2} - C_5 F \]
for some constant \( C_5 \) depending only on \( \alpha \) and \( \bar{\chi} \). Putting all things together we obtain
\[ 0 \leq F^{11}_{1\bar{1}} \left( 2(\Psi')^2 \kappa - \frac{\lambda^2_1}{2} \right) + \Psi' L \phi + C_6 F \]
with \( C_6 := C_4 + C_5 \). Now we invoke Lemma 5.4. From the assumption \( \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2_1} \leq \frac{\rho}{1 + \lambda^2_1} \), we observe that \( \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2_1} < \rho \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2_i} \), or equivalently \( F^{11}_{1\bar{1}} < \rho F \). So we have \( L \phi \geq \rho F \).
Since \( \Psi' < 0 \), the above inequality yields that
\[ 0 \leq F^{11}_{1\bar{1}} \left( 2(\Psi')^2 \kappa - \frac{\lambda^2_1}{2} \right) + (\rho \Psi' + C_6) F. \]
We take \( D > 0 \) sufficiently small so that \( \rho \Psi' + C_6 < 0 \) (this is possible since the constant \( C_5 \) does not depend on \( \kappa \)). Then we have
\[ \frac{\lambda^2_1}{2} \leq 2(\Psi')^2 \kappa - \frac{\lambda^2_1}{2}. \]
This yields the desired bound. \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.7.** There is a constant \( C > 0 \) depending on \( \alpha \), \( \bar{\chi} \), \( \bar{\Theta} \) and \( \phi_0 \) such that
\[ \sup_{X \times [0,T]} |\nabla \phi_t|^2 \alpha \leq C. \]  
(5.6)

In [PT17 Lemma 4], they give the gradient estimate by the blowup argument combined with Székelyhidi’s Liouville theorem for \( \Gamma \)-solutions (cf. [Szé18 Section 5]). This argument does not apply directly to the TLPF. However, in our case, since we have a uniform lower bound for the eigenvalues by Corollary 4.7, the argument is rather simple. We follow closely to the argument [CJY17 Proposition 5.1];

**Proof of Lemma 5.7.** Assume that (5.6) does not hold. Then there exists a sequence \((x_k, t_k) \in X \times [0,T) \) with \( t_k \to T \) such that
\[ C_k := |\nabla \phi(x_k, t_k)|_\alpha = \sup_{X \times [0,t_k]} |\nabla \phi|_\alpha \to \infty \]
as \( k \to \infty \). By passing to a subsequence, we may further assume that \( \{x_k\} \) converges to some point \( x \in X \). From the previous arguments, there is a uniform constant \( C > 0 \) such that
\[ \tilde{\psi} + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \tilde{\psi} \geq -C \alpha \text{ on } X \times [0, T). \]

\[ \sup_{X \times [0,T]} |\phi_t| \leq C. \]

\[ |\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi(x, t_k)|_\alpha \leq C(1 + \sup_{X \times [0,T]} |\nabla \phi|_0^2) \text{ for all } x \in X. \]

For each \( k \), we take a local coordinates \( \{U_k, (z_1, \ldots, z_n)\} \) centered at \( x_k \), identifying with the ball \( B_1(0) \) of radius 1, where \( \alpha = \Id + O(|z|^2) \). By replacing \( C \) by a slightly large number, we may further assume that \( \alpha \) is the Euclidean metric. We define \( \phi_k(z) := \phi(z/C_k, t_k) \) defined on the ball of radius \( C_k \). Then we have the following properties:

- \( \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_k \geq (-C \Id - \tilde{\chi})/C_k^2 \) on \( B_{C_k}(0) \).
- \( \sup_{B_{C_k}(0)} |\phi_k| \leq C. \)
- \( |\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_k|_\alpha \leq 2C \) on \( B_{C_k}(0) \).
- \( |\nabla \phi_k|_\alpha \leq 1 = |\nabla \phi_k(0)|_\alpha \) on \( B_{C_k}(0) \).

The proof can now be completed exactly as in [CJY17, Proposition 5.1]. So for a fixed \( \beta \in (0, 1) \), we know that the sequence \( \phi_k \) converges to \( \phi_\infty : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) in \( C^{1,\beta}_{\text{loc}} \) as \( k \to \infty \). Moreover, the function \( \phi_\infty \) is continuous, uniformly bounded, has \( |\nabla \phi_\infty(0)|_\alpha = 1 \) and satisfies \( \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_\infty \geq 0 \) in the sense of distributions. Such a function must be a constant (cf. [Ron74], which contradicts to \( |\nabla \phi_\infty(0)|_\alpha = 1 \)).

\[ \square \]

### 5.3. Convergence of the flow.

Now we will finish the proof of Theorem 1.2 by showing that;

**Theorem 5.8.** Let \( X \) be a compact complex manifold with a Kähler form \( \alpha \), and \( \tilde{\chi} \) a closed real \( (1, 1) \)-form. Assume that \( \tilde{\Theta} \in ((n-1)\frac{\pi}{2}, n\frac{\pi}{2}) \) and there is a \( C \)-subsolution. Then the tangent Lagrangian phase flow \( \phi_t \) starting from any potential \( \phi_0 \in \mathcal{H} \) converges to the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills metric \( \phi_\infty \in \mathcal{H} \) in the \( C^{\infty} \)-topology.

We can show this by using the argument in [PT17, Lemma 7].

**Proof of Theorem 5.8.** From the previous subsection, Lemma 4.10 and a standard bootstrapping argument we obtain a uniform \( C^k \) control along the flow \( \phi_t \) for any non-negative integer \( k \). To prove the \( C^\infty \)-convergence, we set \( \psi_t := \frac{d}{dt} \phi_t + A \) for some uniform constant \( A > 0 \) such that \( \psi_t > 0 \) for all \( t \in [0, \infty) \) by using Lemma 4.5. Then \( \psi \) satisfies the same heat equation as \( \frac{d}{dt} \phi \);

\[ \frac{d}{dt} \psi = F^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j \psi. \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.7)

Since we already know that the RHS of (5.7) is uniformly elliptic by the \( C^2 \)-estimate, we can apply the differential Harnack inequality on Hermitian manifolds to (5.7), and obtain

\[ \osc_X \frac{d}{dt} \psi(t) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 t} \]

for some constants \( C_1, C_2 > 0 \) (see [Gill11, Section 6, Section 7] for more details). On the other hand, in the proof of Proposition 4.1 we observe that

\[ \int_X \frac{d}{dt} \phi \cdot \Re \left( e^{-\sqrt{-1} \tilde{\Theta}} (\alpha + \sqrt{-1} X \phi)^n \right) = 0, \]
which in particular shows that there exists a point $y = y(t) \in X$ such that $\frac{d}{dt}\phi(y, t) = 0$ since the measure $\text{Re}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\hat{\Theta}}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\chi \phi)^n)$ is positive along the flow. Therefore for any $x \in X$ we have

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \phi(x, t) \right| = \left| \frac{d}{dt} \phi(x, t) - \frac{d}{dt} \phi(y, t) \right| \leq \text{osc}_X \frac{d}{dt} \phi(\cdot, t) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 t},$$

and hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \phi_t + \frac{C_1}{C_2} e^{-C_2 t} \right) = \frac{d}{dt} \phi - C_1 e^{-C_2 t} \leq 0.$$

So the function $\phi_t + \frac{C_1}{C_2} e^{-C_2 t}$ is decreasing in $t$, and uniformly bounded by the $C^0$ estimate. Thus it converges to a function $\phi_\infty$. By the higher order estimates, we know that this convergence is actually in $C^\infty$. The function $\phi_t$ also converges to the same function $\phi_\infty$ in $C^\infty$. The convergence $\frac{d}{dt} \phi \to 0$ yields that the function $\phi_\infty$ must satisfies the equation $F(A[\phi_\infty]) = 0$, so we have $\Theta(A[\phi_\infty]) = \hat{\Theta}$. This completes the proof. \qed

**Remark 5.9.** Using the monotonicity of $C$ and $\mathcal{V}$ (cf. Proposition 4.1) together with the uniqueness result of dHYM metrics [JY17, Theorem 1.1], one can easily obtain an alternative proof of the $C^\infty$ convergence of the TLPF in the same way as in the proof of [Tak19, Theorem 1.1].
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