

A SIMPLE PROOF OF CURVATURE ESTIMATE FOR CONVEX SOLUTION OF k -HESSIAN EQUATION

JIANCHUN CHU

ABSTRACT. Guan-Ren-Wang [12] established the curvature estimate of convex hypersurface satisfying the Weingarten curvature equation $\sigma_k(\kappa(X)) = f(X, \nu(X))$. In this note, we give a simple proof of this result.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed hypersurface. We consider the following curvature equation in a general form:

$$(1.1) \quad \sigma_k(\kappa(X)) = f(X, \nu(X)) \quad \text{for } X \in M,$$

where $\kappa(X)$ and $\nu(X)$ are principal curvatures and unit outer normal vector at $X \in M$, and σ_k denotes the k -th elementary symmetric function

$$\sigma_k(\kappa) = \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k} \kappa_{i_1} \kappa_{i_2} \cdots \kappa_{i_k}.$$

For $1 \leq k \leq n$, $\sigma_k(\kappa)$ are the Weingarten curvatures of M . In particular, $\sigma_1(\kappa)$, $\sigma_2(\kappa)$ and $\sigma_n(\kappa)$ are the mean curvature, scalar curvature and Gauss curvature, respectively.

The curvature equation (1.1) plays a significant role in geometry. Many important geometric problem can be transformed into (1.1) with a special form of f , including the Minkowski problem ([15, 16, 17, 6]), the problem of prescribing general Weingarten curvature on outer normals by Alexandrov ([1, 9]), the problem of prescribing curvature measures in convex geometry [2, 16, 11, 10]) and the prescribing curvature problem considered in [3, 22, 5].

The curvature equation (1.1) has been studied extensively. When $k = 1$, equation (1.1) is quasi-linear, so the curvature estimate follows from the classical theory of quasi-linear PDEs. When $k = n$, equation (1.1) is of Monge-Ampère type. The desired estimate was established by Caffarelli-Nirenberg-Spruck [4].

When $1 < k < n$, if f is independent of ν , Caffarelli-Nirenberg-Spruck [5] established the curvature estimate; if f depends only on ν , the curvature estimate was proved by Guan-Guan [9]. In [13, 14], Ivochkina studied the Dirichlet problem of equation (1.1) on domains in \mathbb{R}^n and obtained the curvature estimate under some additional assumptions on the dependence

of f on ν . For the prescribing curvature measures problem, Guan-Lin-Ma [11] and Guan-Li-Li [10] proved the curvature estimate for $f(X, \nu) = \langle X, \nu \rangle f(X)$.

For general right-hand side $f(X, \nu)$, establishing the curvature estimate for equation (1.1) is very important and interesting in both geometry and PDEs. In [12], Guan-Ren-Wang solved the case $k = 2$ (in [21], Spruck-Xiao gave a simplified proof). In [18, 19], Ren-Wang solved the cases $k = n - 1$ and $k = n - 2$. The other cases $2 < k < n - 2$ are still open. For general k , Guan-Ren-Wang [12] established the following curvature estimate for convex hypersurface:

Theorem 1.1. *[Guan-Ren-Wang, [12, Theorem 1.1]] Let M be a closed convex hypersurface satisfying curvature equation (1.1) for some positive function $f \in C^2(\Gamma)$, where Γ is an open neighborhood of the unit normal bundle of M in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{S}^n$. There exists a constant C depending only n, k , $\|M\|_{C^1}$, $\inf f$ and $\|f\|_{C^2}$ such that*

$$\max_{X \in M, i=1,2,\dots,n} \kappa_i(X) \leq C.$$

In this note, we give a simple proof of Theorem 1.1. Compared to [12], we take a different approach. To establish the curvature estimate, the main difficulty is how to deal with the third order terms. We apply the maximum principle to a quantity involving the largest principal curvature κ_1 , instead of the symmetric function of κ . This gives us more “good” third order terms, and so simplifies the argument.

2. PRELIMINARIES

For any point $X_0 \in M$, let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a local orthonormal frame near X_0 such that

$$h_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \kappa_i, \quad \kappa_1 \geq \kappa_2 \geq \dots \geq \kappa_n \text{ at } X_0.$$

We use the following notations:

$$\sigma_k^{ij} = \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial h_{ij}}, \quad \sigma_k^{ij,pq} = \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial h_{ij} \partial h_{pq}}.$$

Then at X_0 , we have (see e.g. [8, 20])

$$\sigma_k^{ij} = \sigma_{k-1}(\kappa|i) \delta_{ij}$$

and

$$\sigma_k^{ij,pq} = \begin{cases} \sigma_{k-2}(\kappa|ip) & \text{if } i = j, p = q, i \neq p; \\ -\sigma_{k-2}(\kappa|ip) & \text{if } i = q, p = j, i \neq p; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma_s(\kappa|i_1 \dots i_r)$ denotes s -th elementary symmetric function with $\kappa_{i_1} = \kappa_{i_2} = \dots = \kappa_{i_r} = 0$.

Here we list some well-known formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Guass formula : } X_{ij} &= -h_{ij}\nu, \\ \text{Weingarten equation : } \nu_i &= h_{ij}e_j, \\ \text{Codazzi formula : } h_{ijp} &= h_{ipj}, \\ \text{Guass equation : } R_{ijpq} &= h_{ip}h_{jq} - h_{iq}h_{jp}, \end{aligned}$$

where R_{ijpq} is the curvature tensor of M . We also have

$$(2.1) \quad h_{pqij} = h_{ijpq} + (h_{mq}h_{pj} - h_{mj}h_{pq})h_{mi} + (h_{mq}h_{ij} - h_{mj}h_{iq})h_{mp}.$$

3. SIMPLE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we give a simple proof of Theorem 1.1.

Simple proof of Theorem 1.1. Since M is convex, after shifting the origin of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , we assume that M is star-shaped with respect to the new origin. Thus the support function $u(X) = \langle X, \nu(X) \rangle$ is always positive. By assumptions, there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq u \leq C \quad \text{for } X \in M.$$

Let κ_1 be the largest principal curvature. Since M is convex, to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to prove κ_1 is uniformly bounded from above. Without loss of generality, we assume that the set $\Omega = \{\kappa_1 > 0\}$ is not empty. On Ω , we consider the following quantity

$$Q = \log \kappa_1 - Au,$$

where $A > 1$ is a constant to be determined later. Note that Q is continuous on Ω , and goes to $-\infty$ on $\partial\Omega$. Hence Q achieves a maximum at a point X_0 with $\kappa_1(X_0) > 0$. However, the function Q may be not smooth at X_0 when the eigenspace of κ_1 has dimension strictly larger than 1, i.e., $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2$ at X_0 . To deal with this case, we apply the standard perturbation argument. Let g be the first fundamental form of M and D be the corresponding Levi-Civita connection. We choose a local orthonormal frame $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ near X_0 such that

$$D_{e_i}e_j = 0, \quad h_{ij} = \delta_{ij}\kappa_i, \quad \kappa_1 \geq \kappa_2 \geq \cdots \geq \kappa_n \quad \text{at } X_0.$$

We now apply a perturbation argument. Near X_0 , we define a new tensor B by

$$B(V_1, V_2) = g(V_1, V_2) - g(V_1, e_1)g(V_2, e_1),$$

for tangent vectors V_1 and V_2 . Let $B_{ij} = B(e_i, e_j)$. It is clear that

$$B_{ij} = \delta_{ij}B_{ii}, \quad B_{11} = 0, \quad B_{ii} = 1 \quad \text{for } i > 1.$$

We define the matrix by $\tilde{h}_{ij} = h_{ij} - B_{ij}$, and denote its eigenvalues by $\tilde{\kappa}_1 \geq \tilde{\kappa}_2 \geq \cdots \geq \tilde{\kappa}_n$. It then follows that $\kappa_1 \geq \tilde{\kappa}_1$ near X_0 and

$$\tilde{\kappa}_i = \begin{cases} \kappa_1 & \text{if } i = 1, \\ \kappa_i - 1 & \text{if } i > 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{at } X_0.$$

Thus $\tilde{\kappa}_1 > \tilde{\kappa}_2$ at X_0 , which implies that $\tilde{\kappa}_1$ is smooth at X_0 . We consider the perturbed quantity \tilde{Q} defined by

$$\tilde{Q} = \log \tilde{\kappa}_1 - Au,$$

which still achieves a local maximum at X_0 . From now on, all the calculations will be carried out at X_0 . For any $1 \leq i \leq n$, since $\tilde{\kappa}_1 = \kappa_1$ at X_0 , we have

$$(3.1) \quad 0 = \tilde{Q}_i = \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{1,i}}{\tilde{\kappa}_1} - Au_i = \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{1,i}}{\kappa_1} - Au_i$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad 0 \geq \sigma_k^{ii} \tilde{Q}_{ii} = \sigma_k^{ii} (\log \tilde{\kappa}_1)_{ii} - A \sigma_k^{ii} u_{ii}.$$

In the following lemma, we estimate each term in (3.2) and obtain an inequality.

Lemma 3.1. *At X_0 , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{11,pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1 (\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} - \frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} h_{pp1} h_{qq1}}{\kappa_1} \\ & + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1 (\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} - \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} + \left(\frac{A}{C} - C \right) \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 - CA. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, let us recall the first and second derivatives of $\tilde{\kappa}_1$ at X_0 (see e.g. [20]):

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\kappa}_1^{pq} &:= \frac{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_1}{\partial \tilde{h}_{pq}} = \delta_{1p} \delta_{1q}, \\ \tilde{\kappa}_1^{pq,rs} &:= \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\kappa}_1}{\partial \tilde{h}_{pq} \partial \tilde{h}_{rs}} = (1 - \delta_{1p}) \frac{\delta_{1q} \delta_{1r} \delta_{ps}}{\tilde{\kappa}_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p} + (1 - \delta_{1r}) \frac{\delta_{1s} \delta_{1p} \delta_{qr}}{\tilde{\kappa}_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_r}. \end{aligned}$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\kappa}_{1,i} &= \tilde{\kappa}_1^{pq} \tilde{h}_{pqi} = \tilde{h}_{11i}, \\ \tilde{\kappa}_{1,ii} &= \tilde{\kappa}_1^{pq} \tilde{h}_{pqii} + \tilde{\kappa}_1^{pq,rs} \tilde{h}_{pqi} \tilde{h}_{rsi} = \tilde{h}_{11ii} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\tilde{h}_{1pi}^2}{\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\tilde{\kappa}_1 = \kappa_1$ at X_0 . Using the definition of tensor B and $(D_{e_i} e_j)(X_0) = 0$, we see that

$$B_{ij,p} = 0, \quad B_{11,ii} = 0 \quad \text{at } X_0.$$

Combining this with $\tilde{h}_{ij} = h_{ij} - B_{ij}$, we obtain

$$\tilde{h}_{ijp} = h_{ijp}, \quad \tilde{h}_{11ii} = h_{11ii} \quad \text{at } X_0.$$

It then follows that

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{\kappa}_{1,i} = h_{11i}, \quad \tilde{\kappa}_{1,ii} = h_{11ii} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{h_{1pi}^2}{\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p}.$$

For the term $\sigma_k^{ii}(\log \tilde{\kappa}_1)_{ii}$ in (3.2), using (3.3) and $\tilde{\kappa}_1 = \kappa_1$ at X_0 , we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_k^{ii}(\log \tilde{\kappa}_1)_{ii} &= \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} \tilde{\kappa}_{1,ii}}{\tilde{\kappa}_1} - \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} \tilde{\kappa}_{1,i}^2}{\tilde{\kappa}_1^2} \\
 &= \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} h_{11ii}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} h_{1pi}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} - \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} h_{11i}^2}{\kappa_1^2}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.4}$$

By (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_k^{ii} h_{11ii} &= \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii11} + \sigma_k^{ii} (h_{i1}^2 - h_{ii} h_{11}) h_{ii} + \sigma_k^{ii} (h_{11} h_{ii} - h_{i1}^2) h_{11} \\
 &= \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii11} - \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 h_{11} + \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii} h_{11}^2 \\
 &= \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii11} - \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 h_{11} + k f h_{11}^2.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.5}$$

where we used

$$\sum_i \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii} = \sum_i \kappa_i \sigma_{k-1}(\kappa|i) = k \sigma_k(\kappa) = k f.
 \tag{3.6}$$

On the other hand, differentiating (1.1) twice, we obtain

$$\sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii11} \geq -\sigma_k^{ij,pq} h_{ij1} h_{pq1} + \sum_p h_{p11} (d_\nu f)(e_p) - C h_{11}^2 - C.$$

Combining this with (3.5),

$$\sigma_k^{ii} h_{11ii} \geq -\sigma_k^{ij,pq} h_{ij1} h_{pq1} + \sum_p h_{p11} (d_\nu f)(e_p) - \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 h_{11} - C h_{11}^2 - C.$$

Substituting this into (3.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_k^{ii}(\log \tilde{\kappa}_1)_{ii} &\geq -\frac{\sigma_k^{ij,pq} h_{ij1} h_{pq1}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} h_{1pi}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} - \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \sum_p h_{p11} (d_\nu f)(e_p) - \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 - C h_{11} - C,
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.7}$$

assuming without loss of generality that $\kappa_1 \geq 1$.

By Guass formula, Weingarten equation and Codazzi formula, we see that

$$u_{ii} = \sum_p h_{iip} \langle e_p, X \rangle - u h_{ii}^2 + h_{ii}.$$

For the term $-A \sigma_k^{ii} u_{ii}$ in (3.2), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 -A \sigma_k^{ii} u_{ii} &= -A \sum_p \sigma_k^{ii} h_{iip} \langle e_p, X \rangle + A u \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 - A \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii} \\
 &\geq -A \sum_p \sigma_k^{ii} h_{iip} \langle e_p, X \rangle + \frac{A \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2}{C} - A k f,
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.8}$$

where we used $u \geq \frac{1}{C}$ and (3.6). Differentiating (1.1), we obtain

$$\sigma_k^{ii} h_{iip} = h_{pp}(d_\nu f)(e_p) + (d_X f)(e_p).$$

Substituting this into (3.8), we have

$$(3.9) \quad -A\sigma_k^{ii} u_{ii} \geq -A \sum_p h_{pp}(d_\nu f)(e_p) \langle e_p, X \rangle + \frac{A\sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2}{C} - CA.$$

Combining (3.2), (3.7) and (3.9), we obtain

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq F^{ii} \tilde{Q}_{ii} \\ &\geq -\frac{\sigma_k^{ij,pq} h_{ij1} h_{pq1}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} h_{1pi}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} - \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \sum_p h_{p11}(d_\nu f)(e_p) - A \sum_p h_{pp}(d_\nu f)(e_p) \langle e_p, X \rangle \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{A}{C} - 1 \right) \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 - Ch_{11} - CA. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.1), (3.3) and $u_p = h_{pp} \langle e_p, X \rangle$, for $1 \leq p \leq n$, we have

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{h_{11p}}{\kappa_1} - Ah_{pp} \langle e_p, X \rangle = 0.$$

Combining this with Codazzi formula, it is clear that

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \sum_p h_{p11}(d_\nu f)(e_p) - A \sum_p h_{pp}(d_\nu f)(e_p) \langle e_p, X \rangle = 0.$$

By [7, Lemma 3.1], we have

$$(3.13) \quad \kappa_1 = h_{11} \leq C\sigma_k^{11} h_{11}^2.$$

Substituting (3.12) and (3.13) into (3.10),

$$0 \geq -\frac{\sigma_k^{ij,pq} h_{ij1} h_{pq1}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} h_{1pi}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} - \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} + \left(\frac{A}{C} - C \right) \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 - CA.$$

Combining this with

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{\sigma_k^{ij,pq} h_{ij1} h_{pq1}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} h_{1pi}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} \\ &\geq -\frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} h_{pp1} h_{qq1}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{11,pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{1p1}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{1pp}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} \end{aligned}$$

and Codazzi formula, we obtain Lemma 3.1. \square

Lemma 3.2. *At X_0 , we have*

$$\sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \leq 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{11,pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)},$$

assuming without loss of generality that $\kappa_1 \geq 1$.

Proof. We define

$$I = \{p \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\} \mid \kappa_i = \kappa_1\}.$$

For $p \in I$, we have $\sigma_k^{pp} = \sigma_k^{11}$ and $\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p = 1$. Thus,

$$(3.14) \quad \sum_{p \in I} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \sum_{p \in I} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1} \leq \sum_{p \in I} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)}.$$

For $p \notin I$, since $\tilde{\kappa}_p = \kappa_p - 1$ and $\kappa_p > 0$, then

$$\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p = \kappa_1 - \kappa_p + 1 \leq \kappa_1 + 1 \leq 2\kappa_1,$$

which implies

$$(3.15) \quad \sum_{p \notin I} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \leq 2 \sum_{p \notin I} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)}.$$

On the other hand, using $0 < \kappa_p < \kappa_1$, we have

$$\frac{\sigma_k^{pp} - \sigma_k^{11}}{\kappa_1^2} \leq \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} - \sigma_k^{11}}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \kappa_p)} = \frac{\sigma_k^{11,pp}}{\kappa_1}.$$

It then follows that

$$(3.16) \quad \sum_{p \notin I} \frac{(\sigma_k^{pp} - \sigma_k^{11}) h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \leq \sum_{p \notin I} \frac{\sigma_k^{11,pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1}.$$

Combining (3.15) and (3.16), we obtain

$$(3.17) \quad \sum_{p \notin I} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \leq 2 \sum_{p \notin I} \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} + \sum_{p \notin I} \frac{\sigma_k^{11,pp} h_{11p}^2}{\kappa_1}.$$

Then Lemma 3.2 follows from (3.14) and (3.17). \square

The rest of the proof is very similar to [12, Theorem 1.1]. For the reader's convenience, we give all the details here.

Lemma 3.3. *For $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $1 \leq l \leq k-1$, there exists a uniform constant δ' depending on ε and δ such that if $\kappa_l \geq \delta \kappa_1$ and $\kappa_{l+1} \leq \delta' \kappa_1$, then*

$$(1 - 2\varepsilon) \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \leq - \frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} h_{pp1} h_{qq1}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} + C \kappa_1,$$

for some uniform constant C .

Proof. Using [12, (2.4)] (see also [10, Lemma 3.2]), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq}h_{pp1}h_{qq1}}{\kappa_1} + \frac{\left(\sum_p \sigma_k^{pp}h_{pp1}\right)^2}{\kappa_1\sigma_k} \\
& \geq \frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1\sigma_l^2} \left[\left(\sum_p \sigma_l^{pp}h_{pp1}\right)^2 - \sigma_l\sigma_l^{pp,qq}h_{pp1}h_{qq1} \right] \\
& \geq \frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1\sigma_l^2} \left[\sum_p (\sigma_l^{pp}h_{pp1})^2 + \sum_{p \neq q} (\sigma_l^{pp}\sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l\sigma_l^{pp,qq})h_{pp1}h_{qq1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Differentiating (1.1), we have

$$\sum_p \sigma_k^{pp}h_{pp1} = h_{11}(d_\nu f)(e_1) + (d_X f)(e_1),$$

which implies

$$\frac{\left(\sum_p \sigma_k^{pp}h_{pp1}\right)^2}{\kappa_1\sigma_k} = \frac{\left(h_{11}(d_\nu f)(e_1) + (d_X f)(e_1)\right)^2}{\kappa_1 f} \leq C\kappa_1,$$

assuming without loss of generality that $\kappa_1 \geq 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq}h_{pp1}h_{qq1}}{\kappa_1} + C\kappa_1 \\
(3.18) \quad & \geq \frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1\sigma_l^2} \left[\sum_p (\sigma_l^{pp}h_{pp1})^2 + \sum_{p \neq q} (\sigma_l^{pp}\sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l\sigma_l^{pp,qq})h_{pp1}h_{qq1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We claim

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{p \neq q} (\sigma_l^{pp}\sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l\sigma_l^{pp,qq})h_{pp1}h_{qq1} \\
(3.19) \quad & \geq -\varepsilon \sum_{p \leq l} (\sigma_l^{pp}h_{pp1})^2 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sum_{p > l} (\sigma_l^{pp}h_{pp1})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

When $l = 1$, we have $\sigma_1^{pp,qq} = 0$. Then the claim (3.19) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. When $l > 1$, we split the left-handed side of

(3.19) into three terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{p \neq q} (\sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l \sigma_l^{pp,qq}) h_{pp1} h_{qq1} \\
&= \sum_{p \neq q; p, q \leq l} (\sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l \sigma_l^{pp,qq}) h_{pp1} h_{qq1} \\
(3.20) \quad &+ 2 \sum_{p \leq l; q > l} (\sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l \sigma_l^{pp,qq}) h_{pp1} h_{qq1} \\
&+ \sum_{p \neq q; p, q > l} (\sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l \sigma_l^{pp,qq}) h_{pp1} h_{qq1} \\
&=: T_1 + T_2 + T_3.
\end{aligned}$$

By direct calculation and Newton's inequality, for $p \neq q$, we obtain (see [12, (4.22)])

$$(3.21) \quad \sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l \sigma_l^{pp,qq} = \sigma_{l-1}^2(\kappa|pq) - \sigma_l(\kappa|pq) \sigma_{l-2}(\kappa|pq) \geq 0.$$

Thus, for the term T_1 in (3.20), we have

$$T_1 \geq - \sum_{p \neq q; p, q \leq l} \sigma_{l-1}^2(\kappa|pq) |h_{pp1} h_{qq1}|.$$

For $p \neq q$ and $p, q \leq l$, since $\kappa_p, \kappa_q \geq \kappa_l \geq \delta \kappa_1$, $\kappa_{l+1} \leq \delta' \kappa_1$ and $\kappa_i > 0$ for all i , then

$$\sigma_{l-1}(\kappa|pq) \leq \frac{C \kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_{l+1}}{\kappa_p \kappa_q} \leq \frac{C \kappa_{l+1}}{\kappa_q} \cdot \frac{\kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_l}{\kappa_p} \leq \frac{C \delta' \sigma_l^{pp}}{\delta}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\sigma_{l-1}(\kappa|pq) \leq \frac{C \delta' \sigma_l^{qq}}{\delta}.$$

Choosing δ' sufficiently small,

$$\sigma_{l-1}^2(\kappa|pq) \leq \left(\frac{C \delta'}{\delta} \right)^2 \sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} \leq \frac{\varepsilon \sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq}}{2}.$$

It then follows that

$$(3.22) \quad T_1 \geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{p \neq q; p, q \leq l} |\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1}| \cdot |\sigma_l^{qq} h_{qq1}| \geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{p \leq l} (\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1})^2.$$

For the terms T_2 and T_3 in (3.20), using (3.21) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.23) \quad T_2 + T_3 &\geq -2 \sum_{p \leq l; q > l} \sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} |h_{pp1} h_{qq1}| - \sum_{p \neq q; p, q > l} \sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} |h_{pp1} h_{qq1}| \\
&\geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{p \leq l} (\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1})^2 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sum_{p > l} (\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.22) and (3.23) into (3.20), we obtain the claim (3.19).

Combining (3.18) and (3.19),

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\sigma_k (\sigma_l^{11})^2 h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1 \sigma_l^2} &\leq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1 \sigma_l^2} \sum_{p \leq l} (\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1})^2 \\
 (3.24) \quad &\leq - \frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} h_{pp1} h_{qq1}}{\kappa_1} + \frac{C \sigma_k}{\varepsilon \kappa_1 \sigma_l^2} \sum_{p > l} (\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1})^2 + C \kappa_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\kappa_i > 0$ for all i and $\kappa_{l+1} \leq \delta' \kappa_1$, we have

$$\frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1 \sigma_k^{11}} = \frac{\kappa_1 \sigma_k^{11} + \sigma_k (\kappa|1)}{\kappa_1 \sigma_k^{11}} \geq 1$$

and

$$\frac{\kappa_1 \sigma_l^{11}}{\sigma_l} = 1 - \frac{\sigma_l (\kappa|1)}{\sigma_l} \geq 1 - \frac{C \kappa_2 \cdots \kappa_{l+1}}{\kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_l} = 1 - \frac{C \kappa_{l+1}}{\kappa_1} \geq 1 - C \delta'.$$

Thus, at the expense of decreasing δ' , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\sigma_k (\sigma_l^{11})^2 h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1 \sigma_l^2} &= (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\sigma_k^{11}}{\kappa_1^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1 \sigma_k^{11}} \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa_1 \sigma_l^{11}}{\sigma_l} \right)^2 h_{111}^2 \\
 (3.25) \quad &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) (1 - C \delta')^2 \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon) \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1^2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using $\kappa_l \geq \delta \kappa_1$ and $\kappa_i > 0$ for all i , for $p > l$, we have

$$\frac{\sigma_l^{pp}}{\sigma_l} \leq \frac{C \kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_{l-1}}{\kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_l} \leq \frac{C}{\kappa_l} \leq \frac{C}{\delta \kappa_1}.$$

This implies

$$(3.26) \quad \frac{C \sigma_k}{\varepsilon \kappa_1 \sigma_l^2} \sum_{p > l} (\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1})^2 = \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sum_{p > l} \left(\frac{\sigma_l^{pp}}{\sigma_l} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{\sigma_k h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon \delta^2} \sum_{p > l} \frac{\sigma_k h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1^3}.$$

Since $\kappa_{l+1} \leq \delta' \kappa_1$ and $\kappa_i > 0$ for all i , then for $l < p \leq k$,

$$\frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1} \leq \frac{\delta' \sigma_k}{\kappa_p} \leq \frac{C \delta' \kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_k}{\kappa_p} \leq C \delta' \sigma_k^{pp}.$$

For $p > k$,

$$\frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1} \leq \frac{\delta' \sigma_k}{\kappa_k} \leq C \kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_{k-1} \leq C \delta' \sigma_k^{pp}.$$

So $\frac{\sigma_k}{\kappa_1} \leq C \delta' \sigma_k^{pp}$ for $p > l$. It then follows that

$$(3.27) \quad \frac{C}{\varepsilon \delta^2} \sum_{p > l} \frac{\sigma_k h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1^3} \leq \frac{C \delta'}{\varepsilon \delta^2} \sum_{p > l} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1^2}.$$

Combining (3.26) and (3.27), and using $\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_i \leq \kappa_1 + 1$ for $i > 1$, at the expense of decreasing δ' , we see that

$$(3.28) \quad \frac{C \sigma_k}{\varepsilon \kappa_1 \sigma_l^2} \sum_{p > l} (\sigma_l^{pp} h_{pp1})^2 \leq \sum_{p > l} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \leq 2 \sum_{p > 1} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1 (\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)},$$

assuming without loss of generality that $\kappa_1 \geq 1$. Substituting (3.25) and (3.28) into (3.24), we obtain

$$(1 - 2\varepsilon) \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1^2} \leq -\frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} h_{pp1} h_{qq1}}{\kappa_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp} h_{pp1}^2}{\kappa_1(\kappa_1 - \tilde{\kappa}_p)} + C\kappa_1,$$

as required. \square

Lemma 3.4. *For $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $1 \leq l \leq k-1$, there exists a uniform constant δ' and C depending on δ such that if $\kappa_l \geq \delta\kappa_1$ and $\kappa_{l+1} \leq \delta'\kappa_1$, then $\kappa_1 \leq C$.*

Proof. Combining Lemma 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, we obtain

$$0 \geq -2\varepsilon \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1^2} + \left(\frac{A}{C} - C \right) \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 - C\kappa_1 - CA.$$

Using (3.11), we have

$$-2\varepsilon \frac{\sigma_k^{11} h_{111}^2}{\kappa_1^2} = -2\varepsilon A^2 \sigma_k^{11} h_{11}^2 \langle e_1, X \rangle^2 \geq -C\varepsilon A^2 \sigma_k^{11} h_{11}^2.$$

It then follows that

$$0 \geq \left(\frac{A}{C} - C - C\varepsilon A^2 \right) \sigma_k^{ii} h_{ii}^2 - C\kappa_1 - CA.$$

Using (3.13), we have

$$0 \geq \left(\frac{A}{C_0} - C_0 - C_0\varepsilon A^2 \right) \kappa_1 - C_0 A,$$

for some uniform constant C_0 . Choosing $A = 2C_0^2 + C_0$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{A^2}$, we obtain $\kappa_1 \leq C$, as required. \square

We now complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. Set $\delta_1 = \frac{1}{3}$. By Lemma 3.4, there exists δ_2 such that if $\kappa_2 \leq \delta_2\kappa_1$, then $\kappa_1 \leq C$. If $\kappa_2 > \delta_2\kappa_1$, using Lemma 3.4 again, there exists δ_3 such that if $\kappa_3 \leq \delta_3\kappa_1$, then $\kappa_1 \leq C$. Repeating the above argument, we obtain $\kappa_1 \leq C$ or $\kappa_k > \delta_k\kappa_1$. In the latter case, since $\kappa_1 \geq \kappa_2 \geq \dots \geq \kappa_k > \delta_k\kappa_1$ and $\kappa_i > 0$ for all i , then

$$\delta_k^k \kappa_1^k < \kappa_1 \dots \kappa_k \leq \sigma_k = f \leq C,$$

which implies $\kappa_1 \leq C$, as required. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Aleksandrov, A. D. *Uniqueness theorems for surfaces in the large. I, (Russian)* Vestnik Leningrad. Univ. **11** (1956), no. 19, 5–17.
- [2] Alexandroff, A. *Existence and uniqueness of a convex surface with a given integral curvature*, C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.) **35** (1942). 131–134.
- [3] Bakelman, I. Ja., Kantor, B. E. *Existence of a hypersurface homeomorphic to the sphere in Euclidean space with a given mean curvature, (Russian)* Geometry and topology, No. 1 (Russian), pp. 310. Leningrad. Gos. Ped. Inst. im. Gercena, Leningrad, 1974.

- [4] Caffarelli, L., Nirenberg, L., Spruck, J. *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. I. Monge-Ampère equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **37** (1984), no. 3, 369–402.
- [5] Caffarelli, L., Nirenberg, L., Spruck, J. *Nonlinear second order elliptic equations. IV. Starshaped compact Weingarten hypersurfaces*, Current topics in partial differential equations, 126, Kinokuniya, Tokyo, 1986.
- [6] Cheng, S. Y., Yau, S.-T. *On the regularity of the solution of the n -dimensional Minkowski problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **29** (1976), no. 5, 495–516.
- [7] Chou, K.-S., Wang, X.-J. *A variational theory of the Hessian equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **54** (2001), no. 9, 1029–1064.
- [8] Gerhardt, C. *Closed Weingarten hypersurfaces in Riemannian manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **43** (1996), no. 3, 612–641.
- [9] Guan, B., Guan, P. *Convex hypersurfaces of prescribed curvatures*, Ann. of Math. (2) **156** (2002), no. 2, 655–673.
- [10] Guan, P., Li, J., Li, Y. Y. *Hypersurfaces of prescribed curvature measure*, Duke Math. J. **161** (2012), no. 10, 1927–1942.
- [11] Guan, P., Lin, C., Ma, X.-N. *The existence of convex body with prescribed curvature measures*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2009, no. 11, 1947–1975.
- [12] Guan, P., Ren, C., Wang, Z. *Global C^2 -estimates for convex solutions of curvature equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **68** (2015), no. 8, 1287–1325.
- [13] Ivochkina, N. M. *Solution of the Dirichlet problem for equations of m th order curvature*, Mat. Sb. **180** (1989), no. 7, 867–887, 991; translation in Math. USSR-Sb. **67** (1990), no. 2, 317–339.
- [14] Ivochkina, N. M. *The Dirichlet problem for the curvature equation of order m* , Algebra i Analiz **2** (1990), no. 3, 192–217; translation in Leningrad Math. J. **2** (1991), no. 3, 631–654.
- [15] Nirenberg, L. *The Weyl and Minkowski problems in differential geometry in the large*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **6** (1953), 337–394.
- [16] Pogorelov, A. V. *On existence of a convex surface with a given sum of the principal radii of curvature*, (Russian) Uspekhi Mat. Nauk. **8** (1953), 127–130.
- [17] Pogorelov, A. V. *The Minkowski multidimensional problem*, Scripta Series in Mathematics. V. H. Winston & Sons, Washington, D. C.; Halsted Press [John Wiley & Sons], New York-Toronto-London, 1978.
- [18] Ren, C., Wang, Z. *On the curvature estimates for Hessian equations*, Amer. J. Math. **141** (2019), no. 5, 1281–1315.
- [19] Ren, C., Wang, Z. *The global curvature estimate for the $n - 2$ Hessian equation*, preprint, arXiv: 2002.08702.
- [20] Spruck, J. *Geometric aspects of the theory of fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, Global theory of minimal surfaces, 283–309, Clay Math. Proc., **2**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [21] Spruck, J., Xiao, L. *A note on star-shaped compact hypersurfaces with prescribed scalar curvature in space forms*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **33** (2017), no. 2, 547–554.
- [22] Treibergs, A. E., Wei, S. W. *Embedded hyperspheres with prescribed mean curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **18** (1983), no. 3, 513–521.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, 2033 SHERIDAN ROAD,
EVANSTON, IL 60208

E-mail address: jianchun@math.northwestern.edu