

A FLOW APPROACH TO THE GENERALIZED LOEWNER-NIRENBERG PROBLEM OF THE σ_k -RICCI EQUATION

ABSTRACT. We introduce a flow approach to the generalized Loewner-Nirenberg problem (1.5) – (1.7) of the σ_k -Ricci equation on a compact manifold (M^n, g) with boundary. We prove that for initial data $u_0 \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ which is a subsolution to the σ_k -Ricci equation (1.5), the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem (3.1)–(3.3) has a unique solution u which converges in $C^4_{loc}(M^\circ)$ to the solution u_∞ of the problem (1.5) – (1.7), as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (M^n, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary of dimension $n \geq 3$. Denote M° to be the interior of M . In [10], we considered the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem of the Yamabe flow which starts from a positive subsolution of the Yamabe equation (1.1) and converges in $C^2_{loc}(M^\circ)$ to the solution to the Loewner-Nirenberg problem

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{4(n-1)}{n-2} \Delta u - R_g u - n(n-1)u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}} = 0, \quad \text{in } M^\circ,$$

$$(1.2) \quad u(p) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \partial M,$$

which is originally studied by Loewner and Nirenberg [15] on Euclidean domains, and later by Aviles and McOwen [2][3] on general compact manifolds with boundary. A signature feature of our flow is that it preserves the solution $u(\cdot, t)$ as a sub-solution to the Yamabe equation for $t > 0$. In this paper, we extend this approach to study the generalized Loewner-Nirenberg problem for the fully nonlinear equation studied in [5] and [7].

Definition 1.1. For $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$, we define the elementary symmetric functions as

$$\sigma_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_k} \lambda_{i_1} \dots \lambda_{i_k},$$

and define the cone

$$\Gamma_k^+ = \{\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sigma_j(\Lambda) > 0, \forall j \leq k\},$$

which is the connected component of the set $\{\sigma_k > 0\}$ containing the positive definite cone on \mathbb{R}^n . We also define $\Gamma_k^- = -\Gamma_k^+$. For a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix A , $\sigma_k(A)$ is defined to be $\sigma_k(\Lambda)$ with $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ the eigenvalues of A .

The σ_k -scalar curvature equation is introduced in [18]. Let (M^n, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold with boundary of dimension $n \geq 3$. Denote Ric_g as the Ricci tensor of g .

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C44; Secondary 35K55, 35R01, 53C21.

[†] Research partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 11701326 and the Young Scholars Program of Shandong University 2018WLJH85.

In [7], for any $k = 1, \dots, n$, the authors studied the Dirichlet boundary value problem of the σ_k equation of $-Ric_g$, in seek of a conformal metric $\bar{g} = e^{2u}g$ such that $Ric_{\bar{g}} \in \Gamma_k^-$ and

$$(1.3) \quad \sigma_k(-Ric_{\bar{g}}) \equiv \sigma_k(-\bar{g}^{-1}Ric_g) = \bar{\beta}_{k,n} \text{ in } M,$$

$$(1.4) \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial M,$$

where $\bar{\beta}_{k,n} = (n-1)^k \binom{n}{k}$, or equivalently, we have the σ_k -Ricci equation

$$(1.5) \quad \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) = \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku}$$

where

$$(1.6) \quad \bar{\nabla}^2 u = -Ric_g + (n-2)\nabla^2 u + \Delta u g + (n-2)(|du|^2 g - du \otimes du).$$

A more interesting result in [7] is that they generalized the Loewner-Nirenberg problem to the σ_k -Ricci equation (1.5) (see also [5]). They proved that there exists a unique solution u_k to (1.5) with the property that

$$(1.7) \quad u_k(p) \rightarrow +\infty$$

uniformly as $p \rightarrow \partial M$; moreover,

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{p \in \partial M} [u_k(p) + \log(r(p))] = 0$$

as $p \rightarrow \partial M$, where $r(p)$ is the distance of p to ∂M . Notice that in [5] Guan gave an alternative approach to similar results, using metrics of negative Ricci curvature in the conformal class constructed in [16] as the background metric. In comparison, the argument in [7] uses a general background conformal metric and concludes the existence of a prescribed σ_n -Ricci curvature metric of negative Ricci curvature. In this paper, we give a flow approach to the generalized Loewner-Nirenberg problem to the σ_k -Ricci equation (1.5) starting from a sub-solution to (1.5), with a background metric of negative Ricci curvature in the conformal class. In particular, we introduce the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem (3.1) – (3.3) of the σ_k -Ricci curvature flow.

In order to get the lower bound control of the blowing up ratio near the boundary, we need to assume that the boundary data ϕ could not go to infinity too slowly as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 1.2. We call a function $\xi(t) \in C^1([0, \infty))$ a low-speed increasing function if, $\xi(t) > 0$ for $t \geq 0$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \xi(t) = \infty$, and there exist two constants $T > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ such that for $t \geq T$,

$$(1.9) \quad \xi'(t) \leq \tau.$$

Here are some examples of low-speed increasing functions: t^α for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $\log(t)$, and finitely many composition of \log functions: $\log \circ \log \circ \dots \circ \log(t)$ for $t > 0$ large, etc.

Theorem 1.3. Assume (M^n, g) ($n \geq 3$) is a compact manifold with boundary of $C^{4,\alpha}$, and (M, g) is either a compact domain in \mathbb{R}^n or with Ricci curvature $Ric_g \leq -\delta_0 g$ for some $\delta_0 \geq (n-1)$. Assume $u_0 \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ is a subsolution to (1.5) satisfying (3.6) at the points $x \in \partial M$ where $v(x) = 0$ for the function v defined in (3.5). Also, assume $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\partial M \times [0, T_0])$ for all $T_0 > 0$, $\phi_t(x, t) \geq 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, +\infty)$ and ϕ satisfies the compatible condition (3.4) with u_0 . Moreover, assume that there exist a low-speed increasing function $\xi(t)$ satisfying (1.9) for some $T > 0$ and $\tau > 0$, and a constant $T_1 > T$ such that $\phi(x, t) \geq \log(\xi(t))$ for $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [T_1, \infty)$. Then there exists a unique solution $u \in C^{4,2}(M \times [0, +\infty))$ to the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem

(3.1)–(3.3) such that $u \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(M \times [0, T])$ for all $T > 0$. Moreover, the solution u converges to a solution u_∞ to the equation (1.5) locally uniformly on M° in C^4 , and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial M} (u_\infty(x) + \log(r(x))) = 0,$$

where $r(x)$ is the distance of x to ∂M .

Notice that our assumption on the boundary data ϕ and the speed that $\phi \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ is pretty general. When u_0 is a solution to (1.5) in a neighborhood of ∂M , then (3.6) holds automatically; while the condition (3.6) disappears when u_0 is a strict sub-solution to (1.5) in a neighborhood of ∂M . For instance, for any sub-solution u_0 to (1.5), $u_0 - C$ is a strict sub-solution for any constant $C > 0$. For the long time existence of the flow, one needs to establish the global a priori estimates on the solution u up to C^2 -norm: both the boundary estimates and the interior estimates, starting from the L^∞ control by the maximum principle and heavily depending on the monotonicity of u and the control of u_t . In particular, $u_t \geq 0$ and hence $u(\cdot, t)$ is a sub-solution to (1.5) for any $t \geq 0$, which together with the uniform interior upper bound control makes the convergence possible and gives a natural lower bound of u . For the convergence of the flow, we have to give the uniform interior C^2 -estimates on u which is independent of $t > 0$. Finally the asymptotic boundary behavior near the boundary as $t \rightarrow \infty$ is established, which implies that the limit function is a solution to the generalized Loewner-Nirenberg problem. Many of the barrier functions in these estimates can be viewed as a parabolic version of those in [7] and [5]. This flow approach works well for the Loewner-Nirenberg problem of more general nonlinear equations in [5].

Corollary 1.4. *Assume (M^n, g) is a compact manifold with boundary of $C^{4,\alpha}$. Then there exists a sub-solution u_0 to (1.5) and a σ_k -Ricci curvature flow $g(t) = e^{2u}g$ starting from $g_0 = e^{2u_0}g$ and satisfying (3.1) and the Cauchy-Dirichlet condition (3.2)–(3.3) with some boundary data ϕ such that $g(t)$ converges to $g_\infty = e^{2u_\infty}g$ locally uniformly in C^4 as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, where u_∞ is the unique generalized Loewner-Nirenberg solution to (1.5) i.e., $u_\infty(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \partial M$. Moreover,*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial M} (u_\infty(x) + \log(r(x))) = 0.$$

Proof. As discussed in Section 2, by [16] there exists a metric in the conformal class $[g]$ of $C^{4,\alpha}$, which is still denoted as g such that $\text{Ric}_g < -(n-1)g$. If M is a Euclidean domain, we can alternatively just choose g to be the Euclidean metric. We then take g as the background metric. Now we choose a sub-solution u_0 to (1.5) such that u_0 satisfies (3.6) on the boundary. For instance, if (M, g) is a sub-domain in Euclidean space, we choose u_0 to be either the global sub-solution constructed in [7] (just take $\eta(s) = s$ for the subsolution \underline{u} in Section 2) for the constants A and p large, or the solution to (1.5) with $u_0 = 0$ on ∂M obtained in [7] or [5]. For general (M, g) , with the background metric g satisfying $\text{Ric}_g < -(n-1)g$, we can either take u_0 to be the solution to (3.1) with $u_0 = 0$ on ∂M obtained in [7] or [5], or use the global sub-solution constructed in Section 2, or $u_0 = v - 1$ where $v \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ is any sub-solution of (1.5) and hence u_0 is a strict sub-solution (with “ $>$ ” instead of “ $=$ ” in (3.1)). Then we construct the boundary data $\phi \in C^{4,2}(\partial M \times [0, \infty))$ satisfying the compatible condition (3.4) at $t = 0$ such that $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\partial M \times [0, T])$ for any $T > 0$, $\phi_t \geq 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, \infty)$ and $\phi(x, t) \geq \xi(t)$ on $\partial M \times [T, \infty)$ for some $T > 0$, where $\xi(t)$ is a low-speed increasing function in Definition 1.2. Now we consider the solution to the Cauchy-Dirichlet boundary value problem (3.1) – (3.3). Therefore, by Theorem 1.3, we have the required conclusion. \square

One can easily adapt this approach to the convergence of a σ_k -Ricci curvature flow to the solution to the Dirichlet boundary value problem of (1.5).

Corollary 1.5. *Assume (M^n, g) is a compact manifold with boundary of $C^{4,\alpha}$. Let $\varphi_0 \in C^{4,\alpha}(\partial M)$. Then there exists a sub-solution u_0 to (1.5) and a σ_k -Ricci curvature flow $g(t) = e^{2u}g$ starting from $g_0 = e^{2u_0}g$ and satisfying (3.1) and some Cauchy-Dirichlet condition such that $g(t)$ converges to $g_\infty = e^{2u_\infty}g$ uniformly in C^4 as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, where u_∞ is the unique solution to (1.5) such that $u_\infty = \varphi_0$ on ∂M .*

Recently, in [4] the authors studied a more general fully nonlinear equations with less restriction on regularity and convexity on the nonlinear structures on smooth domains in Euclidean space and obtained a unique continuous viscosity solution, which is locally Lipschitz in the interior and shares the same blowing up ratio with the solution to the Loewner-Nirenberg problem near the boundary.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we construct a global sub-solution in $C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ to the σ_k -Ricci equation (1.5). In Section 3, we formulate the maximum principle, show the monotonicity of the flow and give the global a priori estimates of the solution for the long time existence of the flow. In Section 4, we first prove the long time existence of the flow based on the a priori estimates in Section 3, and then we give the uniform interior estimates of the solution independent of t , and establish the asymptotic behavior of the solution near the boundary (see Lemma 4.4) and prove Theorem 1.3. Finally we give a proof of Corollary 1.5.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Professor Matthew Gursky for helpful discussion and Professor Jiakun Liu for nice talks on nonlinear equations.

2. A GLOBAL SUBSOLUTION TO (1.5)

We now construct a global subsolution $\underline{u} \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ to the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary value problem (1.4) – (1.5). Recall that in [7], the authors constructed a global subsolution with singularity at the cut locus of the distance function to some point, which serves as a global uniform lower bound of the solution. We modify it to a smooth function in order to avoid complicated argument on the cut locus in our setting. Let (M^n, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary of $C^{4,\alpha}$. We extend the manifold to a new manifold with boundary $M_1 = M \cup (\partial M \times [0, \epsilon_0])$ for some small constant ϵ_0 with $\partial M = \partial M \times \{0\}$ and extend g to a $C^{4,\alpha}$ metric on M_1 . One can construct a conformal metric $h \in [g_1]$ of $C^{4,\alpha}$ with $Ric_h < 0$ on M_1 , which always exists by the proof in [16]. Without loss of generality, we take h as the background metric and still denote h as g in M_1 , with $Ric_g \leq -\delta_0 g$ for some constant $\delta_0 > 0$ in M . In fact by scaling we assume $Ric_g \leq -\delta_0 g$ with $\delta_0 > (n-1)$ large in M .

Notice that there exist two small constants $0 < \epsilon_1 < \delta$ such that $\text{dist}(x, \partial M_1) > 2\epsilon_1 + 4\delta$ for $x \in \partial M$, and also $\epsilon_1 + 2\delta$ is less than the injectivity radius of any point q in the tubular neighborhood of ∂M

$$\Omega = \{x \in M_1 \mid \text{dist}_g(x, \partial M) \leq \epsilon_1 + 2\delta\},$$

with $\text{dist}_g(x, \partial M)$ distance function to ∂M , and moreover for $x \in \Omega$, the distance $\text{dist}_g(x, \partial M)$ is realized by a unique point $x_1 \in \partial M$ through a unique shortest geodesic connecting x and x_1 , which is orthogonal to ∂M at x_1 . For any $x_0 \in \partial M$, we pick up the point $\bar{x} \in M_1 \setminus M$ on the geodesic starting from x_0 along the outer normal vector of ∂M so that $\text{dist}_g(x_0, \bar{x}) = \epsilon_1$. We define the distance function $r(x) = \text{dist}_g(x, \bar{x})$ for $x \in M_1$. In particular, $r(x_0) = \epsilon_1$ and r is

smooth for $r \leq 2\delta + \epsilon_1$. It is clear that $r(x) \geq r(x_0)$ for any $x \in M$ and the equality holds if and only if $x = x_0$.

Now for a fixed $x_0 \in \partial M$ and the corresponding point \bar{x} , we can choose the subsolution in the following way: We let $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ be two large constant to be determined so that

$$N = A[-(\delta + r(x_0))^{-p} + r(x_0)^{-p}]$$

is large, and we define a convex function $\eta \in C^5(\mathbb{R})$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(s) &= \eta(A(2\delta + r(x_0))^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p}) \text{ for } s \leq A[(2\delta + r(x_0))^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p}], \text{ and} \\ \eta(s) &= s, \text{ for } s \geq A[(\delta + r(x_0))^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p}]. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\eta'(s) \geq 0$ and $\eta''(s) \geq 0$, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Now we define

$$\underline{u}(x) = \eta(A(r(x)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p})),$$

and hence $\underline{u} \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$. We **claim** that we can choose uniform large constants $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ independent of $x_0 \in \partial M$ so that \underline{u} is a subsolution. First, we give the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \underline{u}(x) &= -Ap\eta' r^{-p-1} \nabla r, \\ \nabla_i \nabla_j \underline{u}(x) &= A^2 p^2 \eta'' r^{-2p-2} \nabla_i r \nabla_j r + p(p+1)A\eta' r^{-p-2} \nabla_i r \nabla_j r - pA\eta' r^{-p-1} \nabla_i \nabla_j r \\ &= A^2 p^2 \eta'' r^{-2p-2} \nabla_i r \nabla_j r + Apr^{-p-2} \eta' [(p+1) \nabla_i r \nabla_j r - r \nabla_i \nabla_j r], \\ \Delta \underline{u}(x) &= A^2 p^2 \eta'' r^{-2p-2} |\nabla r|^2 + Ap(p+1)\eta' r^{-p-2} |\nabla r|^2 - Ap\eta' r^{-p-1} \Delta r \\ &= A^2 p^2 \eta'' r^{-2p-2} + Apr^{-p-2} \eta' [(p+1) - r\Delta r], \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that for given $\delta > \epsilon_1 > 0$, we can choose $p > 0$ such that, for any $x \in M$ such that $r(x) \leq 2\delta + r(x_0)$, we have that $(p+1) - r\Delta r > 0$, where $p > 0$ is independent of the choice of $x_0 \in \partial M$. In fact, we choose $p > 0$ large so that the matrix

$$[(p+1) - r\Delta r]g_{ij} - (n-2)r\nabla_i \nabla_j r]$$

is positive for $x \in M$ such that $r(x_0) \leq r(x) \leq 2\delta + r(x_0)$. Therefore,

$$(2.1) \quad (n-2)\nabla^2 \underline{u}(x) + \Delta \underline{u}(x)g$$

is always non-negative on M . Since $-Ric > \delta_0 g$ with some constant $\delta_0 > (n-1)$ on M and

$$|d\underline{u}(x)|^2 g - d\underline{u}(x) \otimes d\underline{u}(x)$$

is semi-positive, we have that for $0 \leq s \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\nabla}_s^2 \underline{u}(x) &\equiv sg - (1-s)Ric_g + (n-2)\nabla^2 \underline{u}(x) + \Delta \underline{u}(x) + (n-2)(|d\underline{u}(x)|^2 g - d\underline{u}(x) \otimes d\underline{u}(x)) \\ &\geq (s + (1-s)\delta_0)g \geq g. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of η ,

$$\underline{u}(x) \leq \eta(A((r(x_0) + \delta)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p})) = A((r(x_0) + \delta)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p})$$

for $r(x) \geq \delta + r(x_0)$. Now $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ is chosen to be large so that

$$A((r(x_0) + \delta)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p}) < -\frac{1}{2} \log((n-1)),$$

and hence

$$(2.2) \quad \sigma_n(g^{-1} \bar{\nabla}_s^2 \underline{u}) \geq \sigma_n(\delta_i^j) = 1 > \bar{\beta}_{n,n} e^{2n\underline{u}}$$

for $x \in M$ with $r(x) \geq \delta + r(x_0)$. On the other hand, for $x \in M$ with $r(x) \leq \delta + r(x_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(A(r(x)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p})) &= A(r(x)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p}), \\ \eta'(A(r(x)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p})) &= 1, \\ \eta''(A(r(x)^{-p} - r(x_0)^{-p})) &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

and hence, as discussed in [7], for $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ large,

$$(2.3) \quad \bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u}(x) > (n-1)g,$$

for $x \in M$ with $r(x) \leq \delta + r(x_0)$, where the term (2.1) serves as the main controlling positive term. Since $\underline{u} \leq 0$, we have $\underline{u} \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ is a subsolution to the σ_n equation when $r(x) \leq \delta + r(x_0)$ and

hence a sub-solution on M by (2.2), with $\underline{u} \leq 0$ on ∂M . Let $S_k = \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u}) \binom{n}{k}^{-1}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$.

By Maclaurin's inequality,

$$S_1 \geq S_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \dots \geq S_k^{\frac{1}{k}} \geq \dots \geq S_n^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

which implies that a subsolution to the σ_n equation is a subsolution to the σ_k equation for $1 \leq k \leq n$, while a supersolution of the σ_1 equation such that $\bar{\nabla}^2 u \in \Gamma_k^+$ is a supersolution to the σ_k equation for $1 \leq k \leq n$. In particular, \underline{u} serves as a subsolution to the σ_k equations and a uniform lower bound of the solutions to the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary value problem for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Moreover, by (2.2), (2.3) and the fact $\underline{u} \leq 0$ on ∂M , we have

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u}) > \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2k\underline{u}}$$

on M . Recall that $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ are independent of $x_0 \in \partial M$. This proves the **claim**. Therefore, we have constructed a strict sub-solution $\underline{u} \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ to (1.5) and $\underline{u} \leq 0$ on M .

3. A PRIORI ESTIMATES FOR THE σ_k -RICCI CURVATURE FLOW

On a compact Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) with boundary ∂M of $C^{4,\alpha}$. We denote M° the interior of M . If (M, g) is a bounded domain in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , we choose the natural extension (M_1, g_1) which is a small tubular neighborhood of M in \mathbb{R}^n , and the global subsolution used in [7] has no singularity in M . For general compact Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) with boundary, with the extension (M_1, g_1) in Section 2, we choose g_1 (and hence g on M) to be the conformal metric which has $-Ric_{g_1} \geq \delta_0 g_1$ with $\delta_0 > n-1$.

For $k = 1, \dots, n$, we consider the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem of the σ_k -Ricci curvature flow

$$(3.1) \quad 2ku_t = \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2ku, \text{ on } M \times [0, +\infty),$$

$$(3.2) \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0,$$

$$(3.3) \quad u|_{\partial M} = \phi, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $u_0 \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ is a subsolution to the σ_k -Ricci equation (1.5), $\bar{\nabla}^2 u$ is defined in (1.6), and $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\partial M \times [0, T])$ for all $T > 0$, and moreover, ϕ satisfies $\phi_t \geq 0$ for $t \geq 0$, $\phi(t) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. To guarantee that the solution u to the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem of (3.1) satisfies

$u \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(M \times [0, T_0))$ for some $T_0 > 0$, we need the compatible condition

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} u_0(x) = \phi(x, 0), & \text{for } x \in \partial M, \\ 2k\phi_t(x, 0) = \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0)(x)) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2ku_0(x), & \text{for } x \in \partial M, \\ 2k\phi_{tt}(x, 0) = L_0(v(x)), & \text{for } x \in \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where the function $v \in C^2(M)$ is

$$(3.5) \quad v(x) \equiv \frac{1}{2k}(\log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0)(x)) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2ku_0(x))$$

and L_0 is the linear operator

$$L_0(\varphi) = \frac{\bar{T}_{k-1}^{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0)}[(n-2)\nabla_i \nabla_j \varphi + \Delta \varphi g_{ij} + (n-2)(2g^{km} \nabla_k u_0 \nabla_m \varphi g_{ij} - \nabla_i \varphi \nabla_j u_0 - \nabla_i u_0 \nabla_j \varphi)] - 2k\varphi,$$

for any $\varphi \in C^2(M)$, where \bar{T}_{k-1}^{ij} is the $(k-1)$ -th Newton transformation of $\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0$, which is positive definite. In order to find boundary data $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\partial M \times [0, \infty))$ compatible with u_0 such that $\phi_t \geq 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, \infty)$, we need to assume that for the subsolution $u_0 \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$,

$$(3.6) \quad L_0(v(x)) \geq 0$$

at any point $x \in \partial M$ such that $v(x) = 0$. We remark that sub-solutions u_0 to (1.5) with the condition (3.6) always exist on (M, g) : It is clear that we do not need the condition (3.6) for a sub-solution \underline{u} which is strict on ∂M i.e.,

$$\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u}) > \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2k\underline{u}}$$

for all $x \in \partial M$. For instance, the global subsolution \underline{u} we constructed in Section 2, by (2.4). Another example is $u_0 = \varphi - C$, with φ a sub-solution of (1.5) and $C > 0$ a constant and hence, u_0 is a strict sub-solution of (1.5) on M . Also, if $u_0 \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ is a solution to (1.5), then $v = 0$ on M and hence (3.6) holds automatically. When u_0 is a solution to (1.5) with $u_0 = 0$ on ∂M as obtained in [7] and [5], we can choose the boundary data $\phi = \phi(t) \in C^3$ such that $\phi(0) = \phi'(0) = \phi''(0) = 0$ and $\phi'(t) \geq 0$ for $t \geq 0$. For a given constant $T > 0$, we call a function $u \in C^2(M \times [0, T))$ a *sub-solution* (*super-solution*) of (3.1) if $\bar{\nabla}^2 u \in \Gamma_k^+$ and u satisfies the inequality with " \leq " (" \geq ") instead of " $=$ " in (3.1). Notice that sub-solution and super-solution are defined similarly for (1.5).

We now prove a maximum principle, which serves as a comparison theorem for later use.

Lemma 3.1. *Let u and v be sub- and super- solutions to (3.1), with $u \leq v$ on $\partial M \times [0, T)$ and $M \times \{0\}$, then we have $u \leq v$ on $M \times [0, T)$.*

Proof. The proof is a modification of the maximum principle of σ_k -Ricci equation in [7]. We argue by contradiction. Let $\xi = u - v$. Assume that there exist $0 < t_1 < T$ and $x \in M^\circ$ such that

$$\xi(x, t_1) = \sup_{M \times [0, t_1]} \xi > 0.$$

Then we have at (x, t_1) ,

$$\tilde{u}_t \geq v_t, \quad \nabla \tilde{u} = \nabla v,$$

$$\nabla^2(v - \tilde{u}) \geq 0,$$

and hence

$$\bar{\nabla}^2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{V} = \bar{\nabla}^2 v$$

with $\mathcal{V} = (n-2)\nabla^2(v - \tilde{u}) + \Delta(v - \tilde{u})g \geq 0$, which implies that $\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 \tilde{u}) \leq \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 v)$, and hence

$$2k\tilde{u}_t - \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 \tilde{u})) \geq 2kv_t - \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 v))$$

at (x, t_1) . On the other hand, the function $\tilde{u} = u - \xi(x, t_1)$ is a strict sub-solution to (3.1) on $M \times [0, T)$:

$$2k\tilde{u}_t = 2ku_t \leq \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2ku < \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 \tilde{u})) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2k\tilde{u}.$$

By the definition of sub- and super- solutions, we have at (x, t_1) ,

$$2k\tilde{u}_t - \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 \tilde{u})) < -\log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2k\tilde{u} = -\log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2kv \leq 2kv_t - \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 v)),$$

which is a contradiction. This proves the lemma. \square

Based on the fact that the initial data u_0 is a subsolution of (1.5) and the boundary data ϕ is increasing in t , we have the monotonicity lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $u_0 \in C^3(M)$ is a subsolution to the σ_k -Ricci equation (1.5), and $u \in C^{3,2}(M \times [0, T))$ is a solution to (3.1) for some $T > 0$. Assume that $u(x, t) = \phi(x, t)$ for any $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi \geq 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, T)$. Then $u_t \geq 0$ in $M \times [0, T)$. In particular, u is increasing along $t \geq 0$. Moreover, we have upper bound estimates for u_t on $M \times [0, T)$.*

Proof. Let $v = u_t$. We take derivative of t on both sides of the equation (3.1) to have

$$(3.7) \quad 2kv_t = \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{k-1}^{ij} [(n-2)\nabla_i \nabla_j v + \Delta v g_{ij} + (n-2)(2g^{km} u_k v_m g_{ij} - v_i u_j - u_i v_j)] - 2kv,$$

where \bar{T}_{k-1}^{ij} is the $(k-1)$ -th Newton transformation of $\bar{\nabla}^2 u$, which is positive definite since $\bar{\nabla}^2 u \in \Gamma_k^+$. Recall that u_0 is a subsolution of (1.5), by the equation (3.1) we have that $v(x, 0) \geq 0$ for $x \in M$. Also, $v(x, t) = \phi_t(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T)$. We will use maximum principle to obtain that $v \geq 0$ on $M \times [0, T)$. Otherwise, assume that there exists $x_0 \in M^\circ$ and $t_1 \in (0, T)$ such that

$$v(x_0, t_1) = \inf_{M \times [0, t_1]} v < 0,$$

then at (x_0, t_1) , we have that

$$v_t \leq 0, \quad \nabla v = 0, \quad \nabla^2 v \geq 0, \quad v < 0,$$

and hence

$$v_t \leq 0, \quad \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{k-1}^{ij} [(n-2)\nabla_i \nabla_j v + \Delta v g_{ij} + (n-2)(2g^{km} u_k v_m g_{ij} - v_i u_j - u_i v_j)] - 2kv > 0,$$

at (x_0, t_1) , contradicting with the equation (3.7). Therefore, $v = u_t \geq 0$ on $M \times [0, T)$. In particular, u is a sub-solution to (1.5) for each $t > 0$.

Similarly, assume $v(x_0, t_1) = \sup_{M \times [0, t_1]} v > 0$ for some $(x_0, t_1) \in M^\circ \times (0, T)$. Then at (x_0, t_1) ,

$$v_t \geq 0, \quad \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{k-1}^{ij} [(n-2)\nabla_i \nabla_j v + \Delta v g_{ij} + (n-2)(2g^{km} u_k v_m g_{ij} - v_i u_j - u_i v_j)] - 2kv < 0,$$

contradicting with the equation (3.7). Therefore, combining with (3.1) at $t = 0$, we have

$$v(x, t) = u_t(x, t) \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{2k} \sup_M [\log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0)) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2ku_0], \sup_{\partial M \times [0, t]} \phi_t\right\}$$

for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T]$. By integration, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= u_0(x) + \int_0^t u_t(x, s) ds \\ &\leq u_0(x) + t \max\left\{\frac{1}{2k} \sup_M [\log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0)) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{k,n}) - 2ku_0], \sup_{\partial M \times [0, t]} \phi_t\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T]$; on the other hand, by monotonicity, $u(x, t) \geq u_0(x)$. Hence, we obtain the upper and lower bound estimates for u on $M \times [0, T]$. \square

We then give the boundary C^1 estimates on u .

Lemma 3.3. *Assume (M^n, g) is a compact manifold with boundary of $C^{4, \alpha}$, and (M, g) is either a compact domain in \mathbb{R}^n or with Ricci curvature $Ric_g \leq -\delta_0 g$ for some $\delta_0 \geq (n-1)$. Let $u \in C^4(M \times [0, T_0])$ be a solution to the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem (3.1)–(3.3) for some $T_0 > 0$. Assume $u_0 \in C^{4, \alpha}(M)$ is a subsolution to (1.5) satisfying (3.6) at the points $x \in \partial M$ where $v(x) = 0$. Also, assume $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\partial M \times [0, T_1])$ for all $T_1 > 0$, $\phi_t(x, t) \geq 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, +\infty)$ and ϕ satisfies the compatible condition (3.4) with u_0 . Then we have the boundary gradient estimates of u i.e., there exists a constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ such that*

$$(3.8) \quad |\nabla u(x, t)| \leq C$$

for $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T_0]$.

Proof. By the Dirichlet boundary condition, tangential derivatives of u on $\partial M \times [0, t_0]$ is controlled by the tangential derivatives of the boundary data ϕ and hence, for the boundary gradient estimates of u , we only need to control $|\frac{\partial}{\partial n} u|$ with n the outer normal vector field of ∂M .

Since $\bar{\nabla}^2 u \in \Gamma_k^+$, we will show the lower bound of $\frac{\partial}{\partial n} u$ based on the control of $\sup_{M \times [0, T_0]} |u|$ as Guan's argument in Lemma 5.2 in [5]. Indeed, we have

$$\text{tr}(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) = 2(n-1)[\Delta u + \frac{(n-2)}{2}|\nabla u|^2 - \frac{1}{2(n-1)}R_g] \geq 0,$$

where $R_g \leq 0$ since $Ric_g \leq 0$. Let $v = e^{\frac{n-2}{2}u}$. Then we have

$$[\Delta v - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}R_g v] \geq 0.$$

Let $m = \sup_{M \times [0, T_0]} |u|$, which is bounded by the proof of Lemma 3.2. For any $t > 0$, let $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}(x, t)$ be the solution to the Dirichlet boundary value problem of the linear elliptic equation

$$\Delta \tilde{v} = \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}R_g e^{\frac{n-2}{2}m}, \quad \text{in } M,$$

$$\tilde{v}(x, t) = e^{\frac{n-2}{2}\phi(x, t)}, \quad p \in \partial M.$$

Then by continuity, for any $T > 0$, there exists a uniform constant $C = C(T) > 0$, such that

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in \partial M \times [0,T]} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \tilde{v} \right| \leq C(T) < +\infty.$$

For $t < T_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \tilde{v}(x, t) &\leq \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g v(x, t) \leq \Delta v(x, t), \quad \forall x \in M, \\ \tilde{v}(x, t) &= v(x, t), \quad x \in \partial M. \end{aligned}$$

By maximum principle, $v(x, t) \leq \tilde{v}(x, t)$ in M and since $v(x, t) = \tilde{v}(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T_0]$, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n} v \geq \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \tilde{v} \geq -C$$

for some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, T_0]$, and hence

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n} u \geq \frac{2}{n-2} e^{-\frac{n-2}{2}u} \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \tilde{v} \geq -\frac{2}{n-2} C(T_0) e^{-\frac{n-2}{2} \sup_{M \times [0, T_0]} |u|}$$

for $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T_0]$. This gives a uniform lower bound of $\frac{\partial}{\partial n} u$ on $\partial M \times [0, T_0]$.

Now we give upper bound estimates on $\frac{\partial}{\partial n} u$. Let (M_1, g_1) be either a small tubular neighborhood of (M, g) in \mathbb{R}^n , or an extension of (M, g) as in Section 2 respectively. For any $x_0 \in \partial M$, let $\bar{x} \in M_1 \setminus M$ be as in Section 2 and $r(x)$ be the distance function to \bar{x} in M_1 for $x \in M_1$. Let $\delta_1 > 0$ be a small constant such that $\delta_1 < \delta$ with $\delta > 0$ defined in Section 2. Define the domain $U = \{x \in M, r(x) \leq r(x_0) + \delta_1\}$, with its boundary $\partial U = \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$ where $\Gamma_0 = U \cap \partial M$ and $\Gamma_1 = \{x \in M \mid r(x) = r(x_0) + \delta_1\}$. Since $2\delta + r(x_0)$ is less than the injectivity radius at \bar{x} , $r(x)$ is smooth in U . For given $T > 0$, we extend ϕ to a $C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ function on $U \times [0, T]$ for any $T > 0$ so that $\phi(x, 0) = u_0(x)$ for $x \in U$. Define the function

$$\underline{u}(x, t) = \phi(x, t) + A \left(\frac{1}{r(x)^p} - \frac{1}{r(x_0)^p} \right),$$

on $U \times [0, T]$, with two large constants $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ to be determined. We will choose $A = A(T)$ and $p = p(T)$ large so that \underline{u} is a barrier function that controls the lower bound of u on $U \times [0, T]$. Direct computations lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{u}_t &= \phi_t, \\ \nabla \underline{u} &= \nabla \phi - A p r^{-p-1} \nabla r, \\ \nabla_i \nabla_j \underline{u} &= \nabla_i \nabla_j \phi + A p(p+1) r^{-p-2} \nabla_i r \nabla_j r - A p r^{-p-1} \nabla_i \nabla_j r \\ \Delta \underline{u} &= \Delta \phi + A p(p+1) r^{-p-2} |\nabla r|^2 - A p r^{-p-1} \Delta r = \Delta \phi + A p(p+1) r^{-p-2} - A p r^{-p-1} \Delta r. \end{aligned}$$

By continuity, there exist constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 = C_2(T) > 0$ such that $|\nabla^2 r| + |\Delta r| \leq C_1$ in U and $|\nabla \phi| + |\nabla^2 \phi| + |\Delta \phi| \leq C_2$ in $U \times [0, T]$. We have the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u})_{ij} &= -Ric_{ij}(g) + (n-2)[\nabla_i \nabla_j \phi + A p(p+1) r^{-p-2} \nabla_i r \nabla_j r - A p r^{-p-1} \nabla_i \nabla_j r] \\ &\quad + [\Delta \phi + A p(p+1) r^{-p-2} - A p r^{-p-1} \Delta r] g_{ij} + (n-2)[|\nabla \underline{u}|^2 g_{ij} - \nabla_i \underline{u} \nabla_j \underline{u}]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $-Ric_g \geq 0$ and the matrix $(\nabla_i r \nabla_j r)$ and the last term are semi-positive, we have

$$(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u})_{ij} \geq (n-2)[\nabla_i \nabla_j \phi - A p r^{-p-1} \nabla_i \nabla_j r] + [\Delta \phi - A p r^{-p-1} \Delta r] g_{ij} + A p(p+1) r^{-p-2} g_{ij},$$

and hence for any $N_1 > 0$ and $A > 0$, there exists a constant $p_0 = p_0(T, N_1, A) > 0$, such that for $p > p_0$, we have

$$(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u})_{ij} \geq N_1 g_{ij}$$

on $U \times [0, T]$. Let

$$N_1 \geq \bar{\beta}_{n,n}^{-\frac{1}{n}} e^{2 \sup_{U \times [0, T]} |\phi_t| + 2 \sup_{U \times [0, T]} |\phi|}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\sigma_n(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u})) &\geq \log(N_1^n) \geq 2n\phi_t + \log(\bar{\beta}_{n,n}) + 2n\phi \\ &\geq 2n\underline{u}_t + \log(\bar{\beta}_{n,n}) + 2n\underline{u} \end{aligned}$$

on $U \times [0, T]$. Therefore, \underline{u} is a subsolution of the σ_n -Ricci curvature flow. By Maclaurin's inequality, \underline{u} is a subsolution of the σ_k -Ricci curvature flow for any $1 \leq k \leq n$. By definition, we know that $\underline{u} \leq u$ on $\Gamma_0 \times [0, T_0)$. On $\Gamma_1 \times [0, T_0)$, u and ϕ has uniform upper and lower bounds, and hence we can choose A and p large enough so that $\underline{u} < u$ on $\Gamma_1 \times [0, T_0)$. Also, we have

$$\underline{u}(x, 0) \leq \phi(x, 0) = u_0(x)$$

for $x \in U$. By maximum principle in Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$u \geq \underline{u}$$

in $U \times [0, T_0)$. Since $u(x_0, t) = \phi(x_0, t) = \underline{u}(x_0, t)$, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n} u \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \underline{u}$$

at (x_0, t) for $t \in [0, T_0]$, where n is the unit outer normal vector of ∂M at x_0 . Notice that the constants used here can be chosen uniformly for all $x_0 \in \partial M$ and hence, there exists a unique constant $m_1 = m_1(T_0) > 0$, such that $\frac{\partial}{\partial n} u \leq m_1$ on $\partial M \times [0, T_0)$. Therefore, we have the C^1 estimates of u at points on ∂M i.e., there exists a constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla u(x, t)| \leq C$$

for $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T_0)$. □

Now we give the C^1 estimates of u on $M \times [0, T_0)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (M, g) and $u \in C^4(M \times [0, T_0))$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ such that*

$$|\nabla u(x, t)| \leq C$$

for $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T_0)$.

Proof. The interior gradient estimate is relatively standard, and here we modify the argument in [11] (see also [8]). By Lemma 3.2, there exist two constants $-\infty < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < +\infty$ depending on T_0 such that $\beta_1 \leq u \leq \beta_2$ on $M \times [0, T_0)$. We define a function

$$\xi(x, t) = (1 + \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2})e^{\eta(u)},$$

where

$$\eta(s) = C_1(C_2 + s)^p$$

is a function on $s \in [\beta_1, +\infty)$ with constants $C_2 > -\beta_1$, $C_1 > 0$ and $p > 0$, depending only on T_0 , β_1 and β_2 , to be determined. Suppose that there exists $x_0 \in M^\circ$ and $t_0 \in (0, T_0)$ such that

$$\xi(x_0, t_0) = \sup_{M \times [0, t_0]} \xi.$$

We take geodesic normal coordinates (x^1, \dots, x^n) centered at $x_0 \in M$ such that $\Gamma_{ij}^m(x_0) = 0$, $g_{ij}(x_0) = \delta_{ij}$. Then we have at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$(3.9) \quad \xi_{x_i} = e^{\eta(u)} [u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_a} + (1 + \frac{1}{2} u_{x_a} u_{x_a}) \eta'(u) u_{x_i}] = 0,$$

$$(3.10) \quad \xi_t = e^{\eta(u)} [u_{x_a t} u_{x_a} + (1 + \frac{u_{x_a} u_{x_a}}{2}) \eta'(u) u_t] \geq 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq \xi_{x_i x_j} &= [\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} g^{ab} u_{x_a} u_{x_b} + u_{x_a x_i x_j} u_{x_a} + u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_a x_j} + \eta'(u) u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_a} u_{x_j} + \eta'(u) u_{x_a x_j} u_{x_a} u_{x_i} \\ &\quad + (1 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2) (\eta'(u))^2 u_{x_i} u_{x_j} + (1 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2) \eta''(u) u_{x_i} u_{x_j} + (1 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2) \eta'(u) u_{x_i x_j}] e^{\eta(u)} \\ &= [\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} g^{ab} u_{x_a} u_{x_b} + u_{x_a x_i x_j} u_{x_a} + u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_a x_j} + (1 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2) (\eta''(u) - (\eta'(u))^2) u_{x_i} u_{x_j} \\ &\quad + (1 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2) \eta'(u) u_{x_i x_j}] e^{\eta(u)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last identity is by (3.9). Notice that the tensor

$$\bar{Q}_{ij} \equiv \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} ((n-2)(\bar{T}_{k-1})_{ij} + g^{ab}(\bar{T}_{k-1})_{ab} g_{ij}),$$

is positive definite. Therefore, at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq [\frac{1}{(1 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2)} (\bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x_i x_j x_a} u_{x_a} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{Q}_{ij} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} g^{ab} u_{x_a} u_{x_b} + \bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_a x_j}) \\ (3.11) \quad &\quad + (\eta''(u) - (\eta'(u))^2) \bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x_i} u_{x_j} + \eta'(u) \bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x_i x_j}] e^{\eta(u)}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, at (x_0, t_0) we have

$$\bar{\nabla}^2 u = -Ric_g + (n-2)u_{x_i x_j} + \Delta u \delta_{ij} - (n-2)u_{x_i} u_{x_j} + (n-2)|\nabla u|^2 \delta_{ij},$$

and hence by the identity $\bar{T}_{ij}(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)_{ij} = k\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)$ and the equation (3.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x_i x_j} &= \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [\bar{T}_{ij}(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)_{ij} + \bar{T}_{ij}(Ric_{ij} + (n-2)u_{x_i} u_{x_j} - (n-2)|\nabla u|^2 \delta_{ij})] \\ (3.12) \quad &= \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [k\bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku} + \bar{T}_{ij}(Ric_{ij} + (n-2)u_{x_i} u_{x_j} - (n-2)|\nabla u|^2 \delta_{ij})], \end{aligned}$$

at (x_0, t_0) . Now take derivative of x_i on both sides of (3.1), and we have at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$\begin{aligned} 2ku_{tx_i} &= \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ab} [-\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} Ric_{ab} + (n-2)u_{x_a x_b x_i} - (n-2)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \Gamma_{ab}^m u_{x_m} \\ &\quad + (u_{x_m x_m x_i} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \Gamma_{mm}^c u_{x_c}) g_{ab} + (n-2)(2u_{x_m x_i} u_{x_m} g_{ab} - u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_b} - u_{x_a} u_{x_b x_i})] - 2ku_{x_i}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence at (x_0, t_0) , for $1 \leq a \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_{ij}u_{x_i x_j x_a} &= 2k(u_{tx_a} + u_{x_a}) + \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij}[(n-2)(-2u_{x_m x_a} u_{x_m} g_{ij} + u_{x_i x_a} u_{x_j} + u_{x_i} u_{x_j x_a} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} \Gamma_{ij}^m u_{x_m}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} \Gamma_{mm}^c u_{x_c} g_{ij} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} Ric_{ij}]. \end{aligned}$$

Now contracting this equation with ∇u we have at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_{ij}u_{x_i x_j x_a} u_{x_a} &= 2k(u_{tx_a} u_{x_a} + u_{x_a} u_{x_a}) + \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij}[(n-2)(-2u_{x_m x_a} u_{x_m} u_{x_a} g_{ij} + 2u_{x_i x_a} u_{x_j} u_{x_a} \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} \Gamma_{ij}^m u_{x_m} u_{x_a}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} \Gamma_{mm}^c u_{x_c} u_{x_a} g_{ij} + u_{x_a} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} Ric_{ij}] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij}[(n-2)(2(1 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2)\eta'(u)(u_{x_a} u_{x_a} g_{ij} - u_{x_i} u_{x_j}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} \Gamma_{ij}^m u_{x_m} u_{x_a}) \\ (3.13) \quad &\quad + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} \Gamma_{mm}^c u_{x_c} u_{x_a} g_{ij} + u_{x_a} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} Ric_{ij}] + 2k(u_{x_a} u_{x_a} - (1 + \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2})\eta'(u)u_t), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by (3.9) and (3.10). Substituting (3.12) and (3.13) to (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \frac{1}{(1 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2)} [2k(|\nabla u|^2 - (1 + \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2})\eta'(u)u_t) + \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} Ric_{ij} u_{x_a} + \bar{Q}_{ij}u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_a x_j} + \bar{Q}_{ij}R_{iajb} u_{x_a} u_{x_b}] \\ &\quad + \frac{2(n-2)}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij} (|\nabla u|^2 g_{ij} - u_{x_i} u_{x_j}) \eta'(u) + (\eta'' - (\eta')^2) \bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x_i} u_{x_j} \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta'}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [k\bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku} + \bar{T}_{ij} (Ric_{ij} + (n-2)(u_{x_i} u_{x_j} - |\nabla u|^2 g_{ij}))] \\ &= (n-2) \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (\eta'' - (\eta')^2 - \eta') \bar{T}_{ij} u_{x_i} u_{x_j} + \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (\eta'' - (\eta')^2 + (n-2)\eta') |\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ &\quad + \eta' \frac{k\bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} + \frac{\eta'}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij} Ric_{ij} - 2k\eta' u_t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(1 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2)} [2k|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} Ric_{ij} u_{x_a} + \bar{Q}_{ij}u_{x_a x_i} u_{x_a x_j} + \bar{Q}_{ij}R_{iajb} u_{x_a} u_{x_b}]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that u and u_t are uniformly bounded from above and blow on $M \times [0, T_0)$ by Lemma 3.2, and so is the term

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} = \bar{\beta}_{k,n}^{-1} e^{-2ku_t - 2ku}.$$

Since \bar{T}_{k-1} and \bar{Q}_{k-1} are positively definite, we have at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq (n-2) \frac{e^{2ku}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (\eta'' - (\eta')^2 - \eta') \bar{T}_{ij} u_{x_i} u_{x_j} + \frac{e^{2ku}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (\eta'' - (\eta')^2 + (n-2)\eta') |\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ &\quad - C - C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

with the constant $C > 0$ depending on T_0 , $\sup_{\partial M \times [0, T_0]}(|\phi| + |\phi_t|)$, $\sup_M \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0))$, $\sup_M |u_0|$, $\sup_M (|Ric_g| + |\nabla Ric_g|)$ and $\sup_{\beta_1 \leq s \leq \beta_2} |\eta'(s)|$. By the definition of η , we have $\eta' > 0$, and

$$\eta'' - (\eta')^2 - \eta' = C_1 p (C_2 + s)^{p-2} [(p-1) - C_1 p (C_2 + s)^p - (C_2 + s)].$$

For $\beta_1 \leq s \leq \beta_2$, we choose $C_2 = 1 - \beta_1$, $p > 0$ large and then choose $C_1 > 0$ small so that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'' - (\eta')^2 &\geq C_1 p, \\ \eta'' - (\eta')^2 - \eta' &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and hence at (x_0, t_0)

$$|\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \leq \frac{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)}{C_1 p e^{2ku}} (C + C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}) = \frac{1}{C_1 p} \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t} (C + C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}) \leq \bar{C} (1 + \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}),$$

where the constant $\bar{C} > 0$ depends on T_0 , $\sup_{\partial M \times [0, T_0]}(|\phi| + |\phi'|)$, $\sup_M \log(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u_0))$, $\sup_M |u_0|$, $\sup_M (|Ric_g| + |\nabla Ric_g|)$ and $\sup_{\beta_1 \leq s \leq \beta_2} |\eta'(s)|$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} &= (n - k + 1) \sigma_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) \geq (n - k + 1) \binom{n}{k-1} \left(\binom{n}{k}^{-1} \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) \right)^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \\ (3.14) \quad &= (n - k + 1) \binom{n}{k-1} \left(\binom{n}{k}^{-1} \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku} \right)^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \geq C, \end{aligned}$$

for some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$, where we have used the Maclaurin's inequality and the uniform lower bound of u and $u_t \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$|\nabla u|^2 \leq \bar{C} \left(1 + \frac{1}{C} \right).$$

This combining with the boundary C^1 estimates completes the proof of the gradient estimates of u on $M \times [0, T_0]$. □

Now we consider the C^2 estimates on u at the points on $\partial M \times [0, T_0]$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let (M, g) and $u \in C^4(M \times [0, T_0])$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ such that*

$$|\nabla^2 u| \leq C$$

on $\partial M \times [0, T_0]$.

Proof. We use the indices e_i, e_j to refer to the tangential vector fields on ∂M and n the outer normal vector field. Notice that we have obtained the uniform bounds

$$\sup_{\partial M \times [0, T_0]} (|u| + |\nabla u|) \leq K,$$

for some constant $K > 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, T_0]$. By definition, we immediately have the control on the second order tangential derivatives

$$\sup_{\partial M \times [0, T_0]} |\nabla_i \nabla_j u| \leq C$$

on $\partial M \times [0, T_0]$ with some constant $C > 0$ depending on K and $\sup_{\partial M \times [0, t_0]}(|\phi| + |\nabla \phi| + |\nabla_\tau^2 \phi|)$ where $\nabla_\tau^2 \phi$ means the second order tangential derivatives of ϕ on ∂M . We extend ϕ to a function

in $C^{4,2}(U \times [0, +\infty))$ still denoted as ϕ such that $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(M \times [0, T])$ for any $T > 0$ and $\phi(x, 0) = u_0(x)$ for $x \in M$.

We now estimate the mixed second order derivatives $|\nabla_n \nabla_i u|$ with n the normal vector field on ∂M . Let (M_1, g_1) be the extension of (M, g) as in Section 2. Let $\delta > \epsilon_1 > 0$ be the small constants in Section 2. For any $x_0 \in \partial M$, let \bar{x} be the point with respect to x_0 as defined in Section 2. Define the exponential map $\text{Exp} : \partial M \times [-\epsilon_1 - 2\delta, \epsilon_1 + 2\delta] \rightarrow M_1$ such that $\text{Exp}_q(s)$ is the point along the geodesic starting from $q \in \partial M$ in the normal direction of ∂M of distance $|s|$ to q . Here we take the inner direction to be positive i.e., $\text{Exp}_q(s) \in M^\circ$ when $s > 0$. In particular, $\bar{x} = \text{Exp}_{x_0}(-\epsilon_1)$. Notice that $\text{Exp} : \partial M \times [-\epsilon_1 - 2\delta, \epsilon_1 + 2\delta]$ is a diffeomorphism to its image. In fact we can choose $\epsilon_1 + 2\delta < \epsilon$ where ϵ is strictly less than the lower bound of injectivity radius of each point in the thin $(\epsilon_1 + 2\delta)$ -neighborhood Ω of ∂M . We now use the Femi coordinate in a small neighborhood $V_{x_0} = B_\epsilon(x_0)$ of x_0 in M_1 : Let (x^1, \dots, x^{n-1}) be a geodesic normal coordinate centered at x_0 on $(\partial M, g|_{\partial M})$. We take $(x^1(q), \dots, x^{n-1}(q), x^n)$ as the coordinate of the point $\text{Exp}_q(x^n)$ in V_{x_0} . Define the distance function $r(x) = \text{dist}(x, \bar{x})$ for $x \in M_1$. Denote $U = \{x \in M \mid r(x) \leq \delta + r(x_0)\}$, $\Gamma_0 = U \cap \partial M$ and $\Gamma_1 = \{x \in M \mid r(x) = \delta + r(x_0)\}$. By our choice of the small constant $\epsilon_1 + 2\delta$, we have $\Gamma_0 \subseteq V_{x_0}$ and hence $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ ($i < n$) is a tangential derivative of ∂M on Γ_0 . It is clear that $r(x)$ is smooth on U . The metric has the orthogonal decomposition

$$g = d(x^n)^2 + g_{x^n}$$

in U and we have $\Gamma_{ab}^c(x_0) = 0$ for $a, b, c \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, taking derivative of $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ on both sides of (3.1) we have

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 = & -2ku_{tx_i} - 2ku_{x_i} + \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ab} [-\nabla_i \text{Ric}_{ab} + (n-2)\nabla_i \nabla_a \nabla_b u + \nabla_i \Delta u g_{ab} \\ & + 2(n-2)(\nabla_i \nabla_c u \nabla_c u g_{ab} - \nabla_i \nabla_a u \nabla_b u)]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we commute derivatives to have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i \nabla_a \nabla_b u &= \nabla_a \nabla_b u_{x_i} + \text{Rm} * \nabla u, \\ \nabla_i \Delta u &= \Delta u_{x_i} + \text{Rm} * \nabla u, \end{aligned}$$

where the terms $\text{Rm} * \nabla u$ are contractions of some Riemannian curvature terms and ∇u . Define the linearized operator L acting on φ as

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} L(\varphi) \equiv & \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ab} [(n-2)\nabla_a \nabla_b \varphi + \Delta \varphi g_{ab} + 2(n-2)(\langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla u \rangle g_{ab} - \nabla_a \varphi \nabla_b u)] \\ & - 2k\varphi_t - 2k\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (3.15) we have

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} |L(u_{x_i})| &= \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} |\bar{T}_{ab} (-\nabla_i \text{Ric}_{ab} + (\text{Rm} * \nabla u))| \leq C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} (1 + |\nabla u|) \\ &\leq C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending on $\sup_M |Rm|$, the lower bound of $u_t + u$ and the upper bound of $|\nabla u|$ on $M \times [0, T_0)$, which has been uniformly controlled. Recall that by (3.14), we have

$$\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \geq C$$

for some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$, and hence direct calculation leads to the bound

$$(3.18) \quad |L(\phi_{x_i})| \leq C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + C \leq C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii},$$

on $U \times [0, T_0)$, where $C > 0$ in the inequalities are uniform constants depending on $T_0, k, n, \sup_{M \times [0, T_0)} (|u| + |u_t| + |\nabla u|)$ and $\sup_{U \times [0, T_0]} (|\phi_{x_i}| + |\phi_{tx_i}| + |\nabla \phi_{x_i}| + |\nabla^2 \phi_{x_i}|)$. Define the function $v = u_{x_i} - \phi_{x_i}$ in $U \times [0, T_0)$. Now by (3.17) and (3.18) we have

$$|L(v)| \leq C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii},$$

for some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$. Also, $v = 0$ on Γ_0 .

Now let

$$\xi(x) = \frac{1}{r(x)^p} - \frac{1}{r(x_0)^p}$$

for $x \in U$, where $p > 0$ is a constant depending on T_0 to be determined. Following the calculation in Section 2, we have that for $p = p(T_0) > 0$ large,

$$(n-2)\nabla^2 \xi + \Delta \xi g \geq \frac{p^2}{4} r^{-p-2} g.$$

Since $\xi \leq 0$, $|\nabla u|$ is uniformly bounded from above and $u_t + u$ is uniformly bounded from below, we choose $p = p(T_0) > 0$ large so that

$$\begin{aligned} L(\xi) &\geq \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku}} \left[\frac{p^2}{4} r^{-p-2} - C|\nabla u| |\nabla \xi| \right] \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} - 2k\xi \\ &\geq \frac{1}{C} \left(\frac{p^2}{4} r^{-p-2} - Cpr^{-p-1} \right) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \geq \frac{p^2}{8C} r^{-p-2} \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ &\geq |L(v)| \end{aligned}$$

on $U \times [0, T_0)$ for some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$. Now we take $p > 0$ even larger so that $\xi < -|v|$ on $\Gamma_1 \times [0, T_0)$ and hence, $\xi \leq -|v|$ on $\partial U \times [0, T_0)$. Recall that

$$\xi(x) \leq 0 = v(x, 0)$$

for $x \in M$, we have by maximum principle,

$$\pm v(x, t) \geq \xi(x)$$

for $(x, t) \in U \times [0, T_0)$. Since $v(x_0, t) = \xi(x_0) = 0$, we have for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$|\nabla_n u_{x_i}(x_0, t)| \leq |\nabla_n \phi_{x_i}(x_0, t)| + |\nabla_n v_{x_i}(x_0, t)| \leq |\nabla_n \phi_{x_i}(x_0, t)| + \nabla_n \xi(x_0) \leq C,$$

for any $(x_0, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T_0]$ with some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ independent of the choice of $(x_0, t) \in \partial M \times [0, T_0]$, where ∇_n is the outer normal derivative at $x_0 \in \partial M$. For the second order normal derivative $\nabla_n^2 u$, since $\text{tr}(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) \geq 0$, i.e.

$$2(n-1)\Delta u + (n-2)(n-1)|\nabla u|^2 - R_g \geq 0,$$

by the estimates on the other second order derivatives, $\nabla_n^2 u$ is bounded from below and we still need to derive an upper bound of $\nabla_n^2 u$. Orthogonally decompose the matrix $\bar{\nabla}^2 u$ at $x_0 \in \partial M$ in normal and tangential directions. By the previous estimates we have

$$\bar{\nabla}^2 u = \begin{pmatrix} (n-1)u_{nn} & 0 \\ 0 & u_{nn}g|_{\partial M} \end{pmatrix} + O(1)$$

with the term $|O(1)| \leq C$ for some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ and hence, as the term $u_{nn} \rightarrow +\infty$, we have

$$\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) = (u_{nn})^k (\Lambda_{k,n} + o(1)) \rightarrow +\infty,$$

where $\Lambda_{k,n}$ is a positive constant. On the other hand, recall that

$$0 < \frac{1}{C} \leq \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) = \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku} \leq C,$$

for some uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ on $M \times [0, T_0]$ and hence, we have that there exists a uniform constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ such that $\nabla_n^2 u(x_0) \leq C$. Notice that the constant C here is independent of the choice of $x_0 \in \partial M$. This completes the boundary C^2 estimates of u . \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let (M, g) and $u \in C^4(M \times [0, T_0])$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T_0) > 0$ such that for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T_0]$ we have*

$$|\nabla^2 u(x, t)|_g \leq C.$$

Proof. The proof is a modification of Proposition 3.3 in [11], see also [8]. We have obtained the global C^1 estimates and boundary C^2 estimates on u . Now suppose the maximum of $|\nabla^2 u|_g$ is achieved at a point in the interior.

Denote $S(TM)$ the unit tangent bundle of (M, g) . We define a function $h : S(TM) \times [0, T_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$h(x, e_x, t) = (\nabla^2 u + m|\nabla u|^2 g)(e_x, e_x),$$

for any $x \in M$, $t \in [0, T_0]$ and $e_x \in ST_x M$, with $m > 1$ a constant to be fixed. Suppose there exist $(q, t_1) \in M^\circ \times [0, T_0]$ and a unit tangent vector $e_q \in ST_q M$ such that

$$h(q, e_q, t_1) = \sup_{S(TM) \times [0, t_1]} h.$$

Notice that on $S(TM) \subseteq S(TM_1)$ (here (M_1, g_1) is the extension of (M, g) as in Section 2), we can find a uniform constant $C' > 0$ and a uniform small constant $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in M$ and any $e_x \in T_x M_1$, e_x can be extended to a unit vector field e on $B_{\delta_0}(x) \subseteq M_1^\circ$ such that $\nabla e(x) = 0$ and $|\nabla^2 e|(x) \leq C'$ at this point x . Take the geodesic normal coordinates (x^1, \dots, x^n) at q , and hence we have $\Gamma_{ab}^c(q) = 0$ and $g_{ij}(q) = \delta_{ij}$. By rotating, we assume $\nabla^2 u = u_{x^i x^j}$ is

diagonal at q and $e_q = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}$ at (q, t_1) . Let the unit vector field $e = \sum_i \xi^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ be the extension of e_q on $B_{\delta_0}(q)$ with $\nabla e(q) = 0$ and $|\nabla^2 e|(q) \leq C'$. We have

$$\xi^1(q) = 1, \quad \xi^i(q) = 0, \quad i \geq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \xi^j(q) = 0, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

It is clear that the fact $\bar{\nabla}^2 u \in \Gamma_k^+$ and the uniform bound of $|\nabla u|$ on $M \times [0, T_0)$ imply that there exists a uniform constant $C > -\infty$ such that $\nabla_1^2 u > C$ at (q, t_1) . Now we define a function \tilde{h} in a small neighborhood $U \times [t_1 - \epsilon, t_1 + \epsilon]$ of (q, t_1) such that

$$\tilde{h}(x, t) = (\nabla^2 u + m|\nabla u|^2 g)(e, e) = \xi^i \xi^j (u_{x^i x^j} - \Gamma_{ij}^a u_{x^a}) + m|\nabla u|^2.$$

Since \tilde{h} achieves its maximum in $U \times [t_1 - \epsilon, t_1]$ at (q, t_1) , we have that at (q, t_1) ,

$$(3.19) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{h} = u_{x^1 x^1 t} + 2mu_{x^a} u_{x^a t} \geq 0,$$

$$(3.20) \quad \tilde{h}_{x^i} = u_{x^1 x^1 x^i} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a} + 2mu_{x^a x^i} u_{x^a} = 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq \tilde{h}_{x^i x^j} &= u_{x^1 x^1 x^i x^j} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^j \partial x^i} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a x^j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a x^i} + m \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} g^{ab} u_{x^a} u_{x^b} \\ &\quad + 2mu_{x^a x^i x^j} u_{x^a} + 2mu_{x^a x^i} u_{x^a x^j} + 2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \xi^a u_{x^a x^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality means the Hessian of \tilde{h} is non-positive. Contracting the Hessian of \tilde{h} and the positively definite tensor $\bar{Q}_{ij} \equiv \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)}((n-2)\bar{T}_{ij} + \text{tr}(\bar{T}_{k-1})g_{ij})$ we have at (q, t_1)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq \bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x^1 x^1 x^i x^j} - \bar{Q}_{ij} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^j \partial x^i} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a} - 2\bar{Q}_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a x^i} + m\bar{Q}_{ij} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} g^{ab} u_{x^a} u_{x^b} \\ (3.21) \quad + 2m\bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x^a x^i x^j} u_{x^a} + 2m\bar{Q}_{ij} u_{x^a x^i} u_{x^a x^j} + 2\bar{Q}_{ij} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \xi^a u_{x^a x^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating equation (3.1) with respect to x^a yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2ku_{x^a t} + 2ku_{x^a} &= \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij} [-\nabla_a \text{Ric}_{ij} + (n-2)\nabla_a \nabla_{ij}^2 u + (\Delta u)_{x^a} g_{ij} \\ &\quad + (n-2)(2\nabla_a \nabla_b u \nabla_b u g_{ij} - 2\nabla_a \nabla_i u \nabla_j u)]. \end{aligned}$$

Define the function $F(r_{ij}) = \log(\sigma_k(r_{ij}))$ on Γ_k^+ . Differentiating (3.1) twice, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2k\nabla_1^2 u_t &= \left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial r_{ab} \partial r_{ij}} \right) \nabla_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)_{ab} \nabla_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)_{ij} + \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij} [-\nabla_1^2 \text{Ric}_{ij} + (n-2)\nabla_1^2 \nabla_{ij}^2 u + \nabla_1^2(\Delta u)g_{ij} \\ &\quad + 2(n-2)(\langle \nabla_1^2 \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle + \nabla_1 \nabla_a u \nabla_1 \nabla_a u)g_{ij} - \nabla_1^2 \nabla_i u \nabla_j u - \nabla_1 \nabla_i u \nabla_1 \nabla_j u] - 2k\nabla_1^2 u \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} \bar{T}_{ij} [2(n-2)(\langle \nabla_1^2 \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle + \nabla_1 \nabla_a u \nabla_1 \nabla_a u)g_{ij} - \nabla_1^2 \nabla_i u \nabla_j u - \nabla_1^2 \nabla_i u \nabla_1^2 u \\ &\quad - \nabla_1^2 \text{Ric}_{ij} + (n-2)\nabla_1^2 \nabla_{ij}^2 u + \nabla_1^2(\Delta u)g_{ij}] - 2k\nabla_1^2 u, \end{aligned}$$

since F is concave on Γ_k^+ . In particular, at (q, t_1) we rewrite these two derivatives as

(3.22)

$$\begin{aligned} 2k(u_{x^a t} + u_{x^a}) &= \bar{Q}_{ij}(u_{x^i x^j x^a} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^a} \Gamma_{ij}^b u_{x^b}) + \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [-\nabla_a Ric_{ij} + 2(n-2)(u_{x^a x^b} u_{x^b} g_{ij} - u_{x^i x^a} u_{x^j})], \\ 2ku_{x^1 x^1} &\leq \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [2(n-2)((u_{x^1 x^1 x^a} u_{x^a} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1a}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^a} + u_{x^1 x^a} u_{x^1 x^a}) \delta_{ij} - u_{x^1 x^1 x^i} u_{x^j} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1i}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^j} \\ &\quad - u_{x^1 x^i} u_{x^1 x^j}) - \nabla_1^2 Ric_{ij}] + \bar{Q}_{ij}[u_{x^i x^j x^1 x^1} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (x^1)^2} \Gamma_{ij}^a u_{x^a} - 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{ij}^a u_{x^1 x^a} - 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1i}^a u_{x^a x^j}] - 2ku_{x^1 x^1}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence combining with (3.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \bar{Q}_{ij}(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (x^1)^2} \Gamma_{ij}^a u_{x^a} + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{ij}^a u_{x^a x^1} + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1i}^a u_{x^a x^j} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^j \partial x^i} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a} - 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a x^i}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [2(n-2)((u_{x^1 x^1 x^a} u_{x^a} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1a}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^a} + u_{x^1 x^a} u_{x^1 x^a}) \delta_{ij} - u_{x^1 x^1 x^i} u_{x^j} - u_{x^1 x^i} u_{x^1 x^j} \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1i}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^j}) - \nabla_1^2 Ric_{ij}] + m \bar{Q}_{ij}(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} g^{ab} u_{x^a} u_{x^b} + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^a} \Gamma_{ij}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^a} + 2 u_{x^a x^i} u_{x^a x^j}) \\ &\quad + 2mu_{x^a}(2ku_{x^a t} + 2ku_{x^a} + \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (\nabla_a Ric_{ij} - 2(n-2)(u_{x^a x^b} u_{x^b} g_{ij} - u_{x^a x^i} u_{x^j}))) \\ &\quad + 2k(u_{x^1 x^1 t} + u_{x^1 x^1}) + 2 \bar{Q}_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 \xi^a}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} u_{x^a x^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (3.19) and (3.20) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \bar{Q}_{ij}(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (x^1)^2} \Gamma_{ij}^a u_{x^a} + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{ij}^a u_{x^a x^1} + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1i}^a u_{x^a x^j} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^j \partial x^i} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a} - 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \Gamma_{11}^a u_{x^a x^i}) - 4km u_{x^a} u_{x^a t} \\ &\quad + 2ku_{x^1 x^1} - \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [2(n-2)((\frac{\partial}{\partial x^a} \Gamma_{11}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^a} - 2mu_{x^b x^a} u_{x^b} u_{x^a} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1a}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^a} + u_{x^1 x^a} u_{x^1 x^a}) \delta_{ij} \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \Gamma_{11}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^j} + 2mu_{x^b x^i} u_{x^b} u_{x^j} - u_{x^1 x^i} u_{x^1 x^j} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} \Gamma_{1i}^b u_{x^b} u_{x^j}) - \nabla_1^2 Ric_{ij}] \\ &\quad + m \bar{Q}_{ij}(2R_{iajb} u_{x^a} u_{x^b} + 2u_{x^a x^i} u_{x^a x^j}) + 2 \bar{Q}_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 \xi^a}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} u_{x^a x^1} \\ &\quad + 2mu_{x^a}(2ku_{x^a t} + 2ku_{x^a} + \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (\nabla_a Ric_{ij} - 2(n-2)(u_{x^a x^b} u_{x^b} g_{ij} - u_{x^a x^i} u_{x^j}))) \\ &= \bar{Q}_{ij}((\nabla_1 R_{ai1j} - \nabla_i R_{a1j1}) u_{x^a} - 2R_{a1j1} u_{x^a x^i}) + 2ku_{x^1 x^1} + 2 \bar{Q}_{ij}(\nabla_{ij}^2 \xi^a + R_{ai1j}) u_{x^a x^1} \\ &\quad - \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [2(n-2)((R_{b1a1} u_{x^b} u_{x^a} - 2mu_{x^b x^a} u_{x^b} u_{x^a} + u_{x^1 x^a} u_{x^1 x^a}) \delta_{ij} \\ &\quad - R_{b1i1} u_{x^b} u_{x^j} + 2mu_{x^b x^i} u_{x^b} u_{x^j} - u_{x^1 x^i} u_{x^1 x^j}) - \nabla_1^2 Ric_{ij}] + m \bar{Q}_{ij}(2R_{iajb} u_{x^a} u_{x^b} + 2u_{x^a x^i} u_{x^a x^j}) \\ &\quad + 2mu_{x^a}(2ku_{x^a} + \frac{\bar{T}_{ij}}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (\nabla_a Ric_{ij} - 2(n-2)(u_{x^a x^b} u_{x^b} g_{ij} - u_{x^a x^i} u_{x^j}))). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, we have at (q, t_1) , $u_{x^i x^i} \leq u_{x^1 x^1}$ for $i \geq 2$ and $u_{x^i x^j} = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Recall that there exists a unique $C > -\infty$ on $M \times [0, T_0)$ such that $u_{x^1 x^1} = \nabla_1^2 u > C$ at (q, t_1) and hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -C - Cu_{x^1 x^1} - (1+m)(Cu_{x^1 x^1} + C) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} [(2m - 2(n-2))u_{x^1 x^1}^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ &\quad + 2(n-2)(1+m)u_{x^1 x^i} u_{x^1 x^j} \bar{T}_{ij}] \\ &\geq -C - Cu_{x^1 x^1} - (1+m)(Cu_{x^1 x^1} + C) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + \frac{1}{\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)} (2m - 2(n-2))u_{x^1 x^1}^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a uniform constant on $M \times [0, T_0)$ depending on $k, n, C', (M, g)$ and

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T_0)} (|u| + |u_t| + |\nabla u| + |Rm| + |\nabla Rm| + |\nabla^2 Ric|).$$

Now take m to be a constant strictly larger than $(n-2)$. Recall that $\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u)$ is uniformly bounded from above and below. On the other hand, by (3.14), $\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} > C$ for some uniform constant $C > 0$ on $M \times [0, T_0)$, and hence we obtain that there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ on $M \times [0, T_0)$, such that

$$u_{x^1 x^1} \leq C$$

at (q, t_1) . Therefore, combining with the boundary C^2 estimates, we have that there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ on $M \times [0, T_0)$, such that

$$|\nabla^2 u| \leq C$$

on $M \times [0, T_0)$. □

Remark. Here we give a way to extend the unit vector e_q at $q \in M \subseteq M_1$ in Proposition 3.6 to a unit vector field e in a neighborhood of q with $|\nabla^2 e|(q) \leq C'$ for some $C' > 0$ independent of $q \in M$. Under the normal coordinates (x^1, \dots, x^n) in $B_\delta(q)$ at q , $\Gamma_{ij}^m(0) = 0$ and $g_{ij}(0) = \delta_{ij}$. Let $\tilde{e}(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}$ for $x \in B_\delta(0)$, where $\delta > 0$ is less than the uniform lower bound of the injectivity radius of the points $q \in M$ in (M_1, g_1) . Let $e(x) \equiv \xi^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} = \frac{\tilde{e}(x)}{|\tilde{e}(x)|_g}$ for $x \in B_\delta(q)$. Since

$$\nabla_i \tilde{e}^j \Big|_{x=0} = \frac{\partial \tilde{e}^j}{\partial x^i} = 0$$

at $x = 0$ (at q), we have

$$\nabla_i \xi^j = \partial_i \left(\frac{\tilde{e}^j}{|\tilde{e}|_g} \right) = \frac{\partial_i \tilde{e}^j}{|\tilde{e}|} - \frac{\partial_i \tilde{e}^a \tilde{e}_a \tilde{e}^j}{|\tilde{e}|^3} = 0,$$

at the point q . Therefore, the extension ξ of e_q in $B_\delta(q)$ is a unit vector field with $\nabla_i \xi^j(q) = 0$. It is easy to see that there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ depending on the lower bound of the injectivity radius and upper bound of the norm of the curvature for points in M in (M_1, g_1) , such that $|\nabla^2 \xi(q)| \leq C$, for the extension e of e_q defined above.

4. CONVERGENCE OF THE σ_k -RICCI CURVATURE FLOW

Now we can prove the long time existence of the flow.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume (M^n, g) is a compact manifold with boundary of $C^{4,\alpha}$, and (M, g) is either a compact domain in \mathbb{R}^n or with Ricci curvature $\text{Ric}_g \leq -\delta_0 g$ for some $\delta_0 \geq (n-1)$. Assume $u_0 \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ is a subsolution to (1.5) satisfying (3.6) at the points $x \in \partial M$ where $v(x) = 0$. Also, assume $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\partial M \times [0, T_1])$ for all $T_1 > 0$, $\phi_t(x, t) \geq 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, +\infty)$ and ϕ satisfies the compatible condition (3.4) with u_0 . There exists a unique solution $u \in C^{4,2}(M \times [0, +\infty))$ to the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem (3.1) – (3.3) such that $u \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(M \times [0, T])$ for all $T > 0$, and the equation (3.1) is uniformly parabolic in $t \in [0, T]$ for any $T > 0$.*

Proof. Since u_0 is a subsolution to (1.5), the equation is strictly parabolic at $t = 0$. By the compatibility condition of ϕ and u_0 , the implicit function theorem yields that there exists $T_0 > 0$ such that the flow is parabolic on $M \times [0, T_0)$ and the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem has a unique solution $u \in C^{4,2}(M \times [0, T_0))$ such that $u \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(M \times [0, t_1])$ for any $t_1 \in (0, T_0)$. Recall that

$$\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) = \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku} \geq \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku},$$

with the right hand side increasing by Lemma 3.2. Also, Lemma 3.2 gives the uniform upper and lower bounds of u on $M \times [0, T_0)$. By the a priori estimates in Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 3.6, we have $\bar{\nabla}^2 u \in \Gamma_k^+$ and the equation is uniformly parabolic, and hence Krylov Theorem for fully nonlinear parabolic equations yields uniform $C^{2,\alpha_{T_0}}(M)$ estimates on u with some constant $0 < \alpha_{T_0} < 1$ for $t \in [0, T_0)$, see [9]. In turn the Schauder estimates yield uniform $C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ estimates on u in $M \times [0, T_0)$. Also, these a priori estimates apply to u on $M \times [0, T]$ for any $T > 0$ with the corresponding constants depending on T , and classical parabolic equation theory applies to extend the flow to $M \times [0, +\infty)$ and $u \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(M \times [0, T])$ for all $T > 0$. This completes the proof of the long time existence of the flow. \square

To show the convergence of the flow, we establish the C^1 and C^2 interior estimates on u based on the bound $\sup_{U \times [0, +\infty)} |u|$ for any compact subset $U \subseteq M^\circ$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume $u \in C^{4,2}(M \times [0, +\infty))$ is a solution to the Cauchy-Dirichlet boundary value problem of the equation (1.5) with $u_t \geq 0$. Assume that for any compact subset $U \subseteq M^\circ$, there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(U) > 0$ such that*

$$|u| \leq C_0$$

on $U \times [0, +\infty)$. Also, for some $T > 0$, we assume that there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that

$$|u| + |\nabla u| \leq C(T)$$

on $M \times [0, T]$. Then for a point $q_1 \in M^\circ$, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ depending on $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1)$, $C_0(B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1))$ and $C(T)$ such that

$$|\nabla u| \leq C_1$$

on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)$, where r is the distance of q_1 to ∂M .

Proof. It is a modification of the interior estimates in [5]. For any $T_1 > T$, we consider the function

$$F(x, t) = \mu(x)we^{f(u)}$$

on $B_r(q_1) \times [0, T_1]$, where $w = \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2}$, and $\mu \in C_0^2(B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1))$ is a cut-off function such that

$$(4.1) \quad \mu = 1 \text{ on } B_{\frac{r}{2}}(q_1), \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq 1, \quad |\nabla \mu| \leq b_0 \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\nabla^2 \mu| \leq b_0,$$

for some $b_0 > 0$ as defined in [5], and $f(u)$ is to be determined later. By the assumption of the lemma, if $F(x, t)$ achieves its maximum on $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, T_1]$ at a point $(x_0, t_0) \in B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, T]$, then $F(x, t)$ is uniformly bounded and hence

$$|\nabla u| \leq C$$

on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(q_1) \times [0, T_1]$ with a constant $C > 0$ independent of T_1 . So from now on, we assume that there exists $(x_0, t_0) \in B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times (T, T_1]$ such that

$$F(x_0, t_0) = \sup_{B_r(q_1) \times [0, T_1]} F.$$

We choose the normal coordinate (x^1, \dots, x^n) at x_0 . Then at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{w_t}{w} + f' u_t \geq 0,$$

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\nabla \mu}{\mu} + \frac{\nabla w}{w} + f' \nabla u = 0,$$

$$(4.4) \quad \bar{T}_{ij} \left[\frac{\nabla_i \nabla_j \mu}{\mu} - \frac{\nabla_i \mu \nabla_j \mu}{\mu^2} + \frac{\nabla_i \nabla_j w}{w} - \frac{\nabla_i w \nabla_j w}{w^2} + f' \nabla_i \nabla_j u + f'' \nabla_i u \nabla_j u \right] \leq 0.$$

By (4.3) we have

$$\bar{T}_{ij} \frac{\nabla_i w \nabla_j w}{w^2} \leq 3 \bar{T}_{ij} \frac{\nabla_i \mu \nabla_j \mu}{\mu^2} + \frac{3}{2} (f')^2 \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i u \nabla_j u,$$

and hence plugging this inequality and the definition of w into (4.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{w} \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{im}^2 u \nabla_{jm}^2 u + \bar{T}_{ij} \left(\frac{\nabla_{ij}^2 \mu}{\mu} - 4 \frac{\nabla_i \mu \nabla_j \mu}{\mu^2} \right) + \frac{1}{w} \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j \nabla_m u \nabla_m u \\ & + f' \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ij}^2 u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2} (f')^2) \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i u \nabla_j u \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Dropping the non-negative first term, changing the order of derivatives for the third order derivative term and by our choice of μ , we have at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{w} \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_m \nabla_i \nabla_j u \nabla_m u + f' \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ij}^2 u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2} (f')^2) \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i u \nabla_j u & \leq \left(\frac{C}{\mu} + \frac{C}{2} w^{-1} |\nabla u|^2 \right) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ & = C \left(\frac{1}{\mu} + 1 \right) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

for some uniform constant $C > 0$ depending on b_0 and $\sup |Rm|$ on $B_{\frac{3}{4}}(q_1)$. Similar argument yields

$$\frac{1}{w} \nabla_m \Delta u \nabla_m u + f' \Delta u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2) |\nabla u|^2 \leq C(\frac{1}{\mu} + 1).$$

Combining these two inequalities and the equation (3.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k(u_{x^i t} u_{x_i} + |\nabla u|^2) \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) - \bar{T}_{ab} \nabla_i u (-\nabla_i Ric_{ab} + 2(n-2)(\nabla_{ic}^2 u \nabla_c u g_{ab} - \nabla_{id}^2 u \nabla_b u)) \\ & \leq -w[(n-2)(f' \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ij}^2 u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2) \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i u \nabla_j u) + (f' \Delta u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2) |\nabla u|^2) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ & \quad + w(\frac{C}{\mu} + C) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (4.2), (4.3) and the following identity into this inequality

$$\bar{T}_{ab} \bar{\nabla}_{ab} u = \bar{T}_{ab} (-Ric_{ab} + (n-2) \nabla_{ab}^2 u + \Delta u g_{ab} + (n-2)(|\nabla u|^2 g_{ab} - \nabla_a u \nabla_b u)) = k \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u),$$

we have at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k(-f' u_t w + |\nabla u|^2) \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) - C |\nabla u| \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ & + 2(n-2) w \bar{T}_{ij} [(\frac{\nabla_c \mu \nabla_c u}{\mu} + f' |\nabla u|^2) g_{ij} - (\frac{\nabla_i \mu \nabla_j u}{\mu} + f' \nabla_i u \nabla_j u)] \\ & \leq -w[(n-2)(f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2) \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i u \nabla_j u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2) |\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ & \quad - k w f' \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) + f' w \bar{T}_{ab} (-Ric_{ab} + (n-2)(|\nabla u|^2 g_{ab} - \nabla_a u \nabla_b u)) + w(\frac{C}{\mu} + C) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \end{aligned}$$

If $w \leq 1$ at (x_0, t_0) , then we obtain the uniform upper bound of $|\nabla u|$. So we assume $w > 1$. Multiplying w^{-1} on both sides of the inequality, and by (3.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k(-f' u_t + 2 + \frac{1}{2} f') \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2k(u_t + u)} - C \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + 2(n-2) \bar{T}_{ij} [\frac{\nabla_c \mu \nabla_c u}{\mu} g_{ij} - \frac{\nabla_i \mu \nabla_j u}{\mu}] \\ & + [(n-2)(f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2 - f') \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i u \nabla_j u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2 + (n-2)f') |\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ & \leq (\frac{C}{\mu} + C) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

at (x_0, t_0) , with $C > 0$ depending on $\sup(|Rm| + |\nabla Ric|)$ and b_0 , and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k(-f' u_t + 2 + \frac{1}{2} f') \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2k(u_t + u)} \\ & + [(n-2)(f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2 - f') \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_i u \nabla_j u + (f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2 + (n-2)f' - b_2) |\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ & \leq C(1 + \frac{1}{b_2})(\frac{1}{\mu} + 1) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on n , $\sup(|Rm| + |\nabla Ric|)$ and b_0 , where we have used the Cauchy inequality and the constant $b_2 > 0$ is to be determined. Now we take

$$f(u) = (2 + u - \inf_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)} u)^{-N}$$

for some constant $N > 1$ to be fixed. Therefore,

$$-N2^{-N-1} \leq f' = -N(2 + u - \inf_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)} u)^{-N-1} \leq -N(2 + \text{osc} u)^{-N-1} < 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned} f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2 + 3(n-2)f' &= N[(N+1) - N(2 + u - \inf_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times \mathbb{R}_+} u)^{-N} - 3(n-2)(2 + u - \inf_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times \mathbb{R}_+} u)] \times \\ &\quad (2 + u - \inf_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times \mathbb{R}_+} u)^{-N-2} \\ &\geq N(2 + u - \inf_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)} u)^{-N-2} [(1 - 2^{-N})N + 1 - 3(n-2)(2 + \text{osc} u)] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{osc} u = \sup_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)} (u - \inf_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)} u) \leq 2 \sup_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, \infty)} |u|.$$

Now we take $N > 1$ large so that

$$f'' - \frac{3}{2}(f')^2 + 3(n-2)f' > 0,$$

and take $b_2 = (n-2)N(2 + \text{osc} u)^{-N-1}$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2k}{C}(-f'u_t + 2 + \frac{1}{2}f')\bar{\beta}_{k,n}e^{2k(u_t+u)} + |\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ (4.5) \quad &\leq C(1 + \frac{1}{b_2})(\frac{1}{\mu} + 1) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on n , $\sup |u|$, $\sup(|Rm| + |\nabla Ric|)$ and b_0 . Notice that if $u_t < \frac{1}{2}$, since $u_t \geq 0$, and u and $f'(u)$ are uniformly bounded, we have for some uniform constant $C > 0$,

$$|\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \leq C(1 + \frac{1}{b_2})(\frac{1}{\mu} + 1) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + C.$$

On the other hand, by (3.14),

$$\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \geq (n-k+1) \binom{n}{k-1} \left(\binom{n}{k} \right)^{-1} \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2ku_t + 2ku} \frac{k-1}{k} \geq C$$

for a uniform $C > 0$ depending on $\sup |u|$, and hence we have

$$\mu |\nabla u|^2 \leq C$$

at (x_0, t_0) for some uniform constant $C > 0$ depending on n , $\sup |u|$, $\sup(|Rm| + |\nabla Ric|)$ and b_0 , independent of T_1 . For the case $u_t \geq \frac{1}{2}$ at (x_0, t_0) , the first term in (4.5) is positive and hence

$$|\nabla u|^2 \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \leq C(1 + \frac{1}{b_2})(\frac{1}{\mu} + 1) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii},$$

and again we have

$$\mu|\nabla u|^2 \leq C$$

at (x_0, t_0) for some uniform constant $C > 0$ depending on n , $\sup |u|$, $\sup(|Rm| + |\nabla Ric|)$ and b_0 , independent of T_1 . Therefore, by the arbitrary choice of $T_1 > T$,

$$F(x, t) \leq F(x_0, t_0) \leq 2Ce^{2^{-N}}$$

for $(x, t) \in [0, +\infty)$. In particular,

$$|\nabla u(x, t)| \leq C$$

for $(x, t) \in B_{\frac{r}{2}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)$, for some uniform constant $C > 0$ depending on n , $\sup_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)} |u|$, $\sup(|Rm| + |\nabla Ric|)$, b_0 and $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1)$. Therefore, for any compact subsets U and U_1 such that $U \subseteq U_1^\circ \subseteq U_1 \subseteq M^\circ$, there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ depending on U , $\sup_{U_1 \times [0, +\infty)} |u|$ and $\sup_M(|Rm| + |\nabla Ric|)$ such that

$$|\nabla u(x, t)| \leq C + \sup_{U \times [0, T]} |\nabla u|$$

for $(x, t) \in U \times [0, +\infty)$.

□

Based on the interior C^1 estimates, the interior C^2 estimates are relatively easy modifications of the C^2 estimates in Proposition 3.6.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume $u \in C^{4,2}(M \times [0, +\infty))$ is a solution to the Cauchy-Dirichlet boundary value problem of the equation (1.5) with $u_t \geq 0$. Assume that for any compact subset $U \subseteq M^\circ$, there exists a constant $C_0(U) > 0$ such that*

$$|u| \leq C_0$$

on $U \times [0, +\infty)$. Also, for some $T > 0$, we assume that there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla^2 u| \leq C(T)$$

on $M \times [0, T]$. Then for a point $q_1 \in M^\circ$, there exists a constant $C' > 0$ depending on $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1)$, $C_0(B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1))$ and $\sup_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, \infty)} |\nabla u|$ such that

$$|\nabla^2 u| \leq C'$$

on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(q_1) \times [0, +\infty)$, where r is the distance of q_1 to ∂M .

Proof. For any $T_1 > T$, we consider the function $H : S(TM) \times [0, T_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$H(x, e_x, t) = \mu(x)h(x, e_x, t)$$

for $x \in M$, $e_x \in ST_x M$ and $t \geq 0$, where h is defined in the proof of Proposition 3.6 and $\mu \in C_0^2(B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1))$ satisfies (4.1) for some constant $b_0 > 0$. By continuity, there exists a point $(q, t_0) \in B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, T_1]$ and $e_q \in ST_q M$, such that

$$H(q, e_q, t_0) = \sup_{STM \times [0, T_1]} \mu(x)h(x, e_x, t).$$

If $t_0 \leq T$, then by assumption, $|\nabla^2 u|$ and hence H are well controlled. Therefore, we assume that $t_0 > T$. The same as in Proposition 3.6, we choose the normal coordinates (x^1, \dots, x^n) at q so that $e_q = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}$ and we extend e_q to a unit vector field $e = \xi^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ in the neighborhood of q in the same way. We define the function

$$\tilde{H}(x, t) = H(x, e(x), t) = \mu(x)\tilde{h}(x, t) = \mu(x)(\xi^i \xi^j \nabla_i \nabla_j u + m|\nabla u|^2)$$

in a neighborhood of (q, t_0) , for some constant $m > 1$ to be fixed. Therefore, at (q, t_0) , we have

$$(4.6) \quad \tilde{h}_t = \nabla_1 \nabla_1 u_t + 2m \nabla_a u_t \nabla_a u \geq 0,$$

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\nabla \mu}{\mu} + \frac{\nabla \tilde{h}}{\tilde{h}} &= 0, \\ \bar{T}_{ij} \left[\frac{\nabla_{ij}^2 \mu}{\mu} - \frac{\nabla_i \mu \nabla_j \mu}{\mu^2} + \frac{\nabla_{ij}^2 \tilde{h}}{\tilde{h}} - \frac{\nabla_i \tilde{h} \nabla_j \tilde{h}}{\tilde{h}^2} + \nabla_j \nabla_i \xi^a \nabla_a^2 u \right] &\leq 0, \\ \frac{\Delta \mu}{\mu} - \frac{|\nabla \mu|^2}{\mu^2} + \frac{\Delta \tilde{h}}{\tilde{h}} - \frac{|\nabla \tilde{h}|^2}{\tilde{h}^2} + \Delta \xi^a \nabla_a^2 u &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Direct calculation and changing order of derivatives yield at (q, t_0) ,

$$\nabla_i \tilde{h} = \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \nabla_i u + Rm * \nabla u + 2m \nabla_i \nabla_a u \nabla_a u,$$

$$\nabla_j \nabla_i \tilde{h} = \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \nabla_j \nabla_i u + \nabla Rm * \nabla u + Rm * \nabla^2 u + 2m(\nabla_a \nabla_j \nabla_i u \nabla_a u + \nabla_{ja}^2 u \nabla_{ia}^2 u + Rm * \nabla u * \nabla u),$$

and hence combining these inequalities at the maximum point (q, t_0) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{T}_{ij}[(n-2)\nabla_1 \nabla_1 \nabla_i \nabla_j u + \nabla_1 \nabla_1 \Delta u g_{ij}] \\ &\leq \bar{T}_{ij}[(n-2)\nabla_{ji}^2 \tilde{h} + \Delta \tilde{h} g_{ij}] - 2m[(n-2)\bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_a \nabla_j \nabla_i u \nabla_a u + \nabla_a \Delta u \nabla_a u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ &\quad - 2m[(n-2)\bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ja}^2 u \nabla_{ia}^2 u + \nabla_{ba}^2 u \nabla_{ba}^2 u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] + (C + C|\nabla^2 u|) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ &\leq -\tilde{h} \bar{T}_{ij}[(n-2)\left(\frac{\nabla_{ij}^2 \mu}{\mu} - 2\frac{\nabla_i \mu \nabla_j \mu}{\mu^2}\right) + \left(\frac{\Delta \mu}{\mu} - 2\frac{|\nabla \mu|^2}{\mu^2}\right)g_{ij}] + (C + C|\nabla^2 u|) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ &\quad - 2m[(n-2)\bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{aji} u \nabla_a u + \nabla_a \Delta u \nabla_a u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] - 2m[(n-2)\bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ja}^2 u \nabla_{ia}^2 u + \nabla_{ba}^2 u \nabla_{ba}^2 u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ &\leq -2m[(n-2)\bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{aji} u \nabla_a u + \nabla_a \Delta u \nabla_a u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] - 2m[(n-2)\bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ja}^2 u \nabla_{ia}^2 u + \nabla_{ba}^2 u \nabla_{ba}^2 u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ &\quad + C(1 + (1 + \frac{1}{\mu})|\nabla^2 u|) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

where C depends on $\sup |Rm|$, b_0 , $\sup_{B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, \infty)} |\nabla u|$ and the uniform upper bound of $|\nabla^2 e|(q)$ (see

Proposition 3.6), and hence combining this inequality with the two inequalities (3.22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k(\nabla_{11}^2 u + \nabla_{11}^2 u_t) \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) - 2(n-2) \bar{T}_{ij} [(\nabla_{a11} u \nabla_a u + \nabla_{1a}^2 u \nabla_{1a}^2 u) g_{ij} - \nabla_{i11} u \nabla_j u - \nabla_{1i}^2 u \nabla_{1j}^2 u] \\ & \leq -4km(\nabla_a u_t \nabla_a u + |\nabla u|^2) \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) - 2m[(n-2) \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ja}^2 u \nabla_{ia}^2 u + \nabla_{ba}^2 u \nabla_{ba}^2 u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ & \quad + C(1+m + (1+m + \frac{1}{\mu}) |\nabla^2 u|) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in (4.6) and (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k \nabla_{11}^2 u \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) - 2(n-2) \bar{T}_{ij} [\nabla_{1a}^2 u \nabla_{1a}^2 u g_{ij} - \nabla_{i1}^2 u \nabla_{1j}^2 u] \\ & \leq -4km |\nabla u|^2 \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) - 2m[(n-2) \bar{T}_{ij} \nabla_{ja}^2 u \nabla_{ia}^2 u + \nabla_{ba}^2 u \nabla_{ba}^2 u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}] \\ & \quad + C(1+m + (1+m + \frac{1}{\mu}) |\nabla^2 u|) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla_{1i}^2 u(q, t_0) = 0$ for $i \geq 2$ by the choice of coordinates as in Proposition 3.6, and

$$\nabla_{11}^2 u(q, t_0) \geq \nabla_{ii}^2 u(q, t_0)$$

for $i \geq 2$, and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k(\nabla_{11}^2 u + 2m|\nabla u|^2) \sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 u) + (2m - 2(n-2)) \nabla_{11}^2 u \nabla_{11}^2 u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ & \leq C(1+m + n(1+m + \frac{1}{\mu}) |\nabla_{11}^2 u|) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \end{aligned}$$

We take m large and use the equation (3.1) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & 2k(\nabla_{11}^2 u + 2m|\nabla u|^2) \bar{\beta}_{k,n} e^{2k(u+u_t)} + \nabla_{11}^2 u \nabla_{11}^2 u \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} \\ & \leq C(1 + (1 + \frac{1}{\mu}) |\nabla_{11}^2 u|) \sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

for some uniform $C > 0$ independent of T_1 , and hence if $\nabla_{11}^2 u(q, t_0) > 1$, the first term in this inequality is positive and since $\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}$ is uniformly bounded from below by (3.14), we have

$$\mu \nabla_{11}^2 u(q, t_0) \leq C,$$

for some uniform constant $C > 0$ independent of T_1 , and hence

$$\tilde{H} \leq C$$

in $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, T_1]$ with $C > 0$ independent of T_1 ; while if $\nabla_{11}^2 u(q, t_0) \leq 1$, we trivially have the uniform upper bound of \tilde{H} by its definition and the bound of $|\nabla u|$ on $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, \infty)$. By the arbitrary choice of $T_1 > T$, \tilde{H} has a uniform upper bound on $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1) \times [0, \infty)$. In particular,

$$\nabla_{11}^2 u \leq C,$$

in $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(q_1) \times [0, \infty)$. Since $\bar{\nabla}^2 u \in \Gamma_k^+$, and $|\nabla u|$ is uniformly bounded in $B_{\frac{3r}{4}}(q_1)$, we have that there exists a uniform constant $\alpha > -\infty$ such that

$$\Delta u \geq \alpha,$$

and hence

$$|\nabla^2 u| \leq n^3(C + |\alpha|),$$

on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}(q_1) \times [0, \infty)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now we prove the convergence of the flow and the asymptotic behavior near the boundary as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Long time existence of the solution u has been obtained in Theorem 4.1, and we only need to consider the convergence of u and its asymptotic behavior near the boundary as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

First we establish the uniform upper bound estimates on u on any given compact subset of M° . By the Maclaurin's inequality, u is a subsolution to the σ_1 -Ricci curvature flow (3.1). By the maximum principle for the σ_1 -Ricci curvature flow in Lemma 3.1, to get the upper bound of u , it suffices to find a super-solution to the scalar curvature equation i.e., (1.5) with $k = 1$ satisfying (1.7) near ∂M . Direct application of Lemma 5.2 in [7], where a sequence of super-solutions to the scalar curvature equation on corresponding small geodesic balls blowing up on the boundary was constructed, yields the upper bound of u :

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial M} [u(x, t) + \log(r(x))] \leq 0,$$

uniformly for all $t > 0$; and moreover, for any compact subset $U \subseteq M^\circ$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on U such that $u(x, t) \leq C$ for all $(x, t) \in U \times [0, +\infty)$. Here is an alternative argument: by maximum principle for σ_1 -Ricci curvature flow in Lemma 3.1,

$$u(x, t) \leq u_{LN}(x),$$

for $(x, t) \in M^\circ \times [0, \infty)$, where u_{LN} is the solution to the Loewner-Nirenberg problem of the constant scalar curvature equation on M . Recall that

$$u_{LN}(x) \leq -\log(r(x)) + o(1) \text{ near the boundary,}$$

with $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \partial M$, see in [15][14][1] for instance.

By Lemma 3.2, $u(x, t)$ is increasing along $t > 0$ and hence

$$u_0(x) \leq u(x, t) \leq u_{LN}(x)$$

for $(x, t) \in M^\circ \times [0, +\infty)$. Or just use the super-solution to (1.5) on a small ball centered at x constructed in Lemma 5.2 in [7] instead of u_{LN} . Therefore, $u(x, t)$ converges as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for any $x \in M^\circ$. By Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, we have that for any compact subsets $U \subseteq U_1 \subseteq M^\circ$ with $U \subseteq U_1^\circ$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla u| + |\nabla^2 u| \leq C$$

in $U_1 \times [0, \infty)$ and hence, the equation (3.1) is uniformly parabolic and by (3.1), u_t has a uniform upper bound on $U_1 \times [0, \infty)$. By Krylov's Theorem and the classical Schauder estimates, we

have that there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ depending on U_1 such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{4,2}(U \times [0, \infty))} \leq C,$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad \|u\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(U)} \leq C,$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Since u increases and has uniform upper bound in U , by the Harnack inequality of the linear uniformly parabolic equation (3.7) for u_t , we have

$$v = u_t \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly on U as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, $u(x, t) \rightarrow u_\infty(x)$ uniformly for $x \in U$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. By the uniform bound (4.8) and the interpolation inequality, we have

$$u(x, t) \rightarrow u_\infty(x)$$

in $C^4(U)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By the arbitrary choice of the compact subset $U \subseteq M^\circ$, we have that u_∞ is a solution to (1.5) in M° .

Now we consider the lower bound of u near the boundary. Applying Lemma 4.4 to be proved later, we have that there exist $\delta_1 > 0$ small and $T > 0$ large, such that

$$u(x, t) \geq -\log(r(x) + \epsilon(t)) + w(x)$$

for $x \in M$ with $r(x) \leq \delta_1$ and $t \geq T$, where $w(x) \leq 0$ with $w|_{\partial M} = 0$ and $\epsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. By the upper and lower bound estimates on u near the boundary, we have

$$u_\infty(x) + \log(r(x)) \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly as $x \rightarrow \partial M$. □

We will show the lower bound of the asymptotic behavior of u near the boundary as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for which we need ϕ to increase not too slowly.

Lemma 4.4. *Let (M, g) , u_0 , ϕ , $T_1 > T$ and u be as in Theorem 1.3. Let $r(x)$ be the distance function of $x \in M$ to the boundary ∂M . Then there exist $\delta_1 > 0$ small and $T_2 > T_1$, such that*

$$u(x, t) \geq -\log(r(x) + \epsilon(t)) + w(x)$$

for $x \in M$ with $r(x) \leq \delta_1$ and $t \geq T_2$, where $\epsilon = \xi(t)^{-1}$ and w is a function of C^2 where $r(x) \leq \delta_1$ such that $w(x) \leq 0$ with $w|_{\partial M} = 0$.

Proof. Let $\delta_1 > 0$ be a small constant to be fixed. Define the exponential map $\text{Exp} : \partial M \times [0, \delta_1] \rightarrow M$ such that $\text{Exp}_q(s) \in M$ is the point on the geodesic starting from $q \in \partial M$ in the direction of inner normal vector with distance s to q . δ_1 is chosen small so that Exp is a diffeomorphism to the image. Define

$$U_{\delta_1} = \{\text{Exp}_q(s) \mid (q, s) \in \partial M \times [0, \delta_1]\}.$$

The metric has the orthogonal decomposition

$$g = ds^2 + g_s,$$

with g_s the restriction of g on $\Sigma_s = \{z \in M \mid r(z) = s\}$ for $0 \leq s \leq \delta_1$. Define the function

$$\underline{u}(x, t) = -\log(r(x) + \epsilon(t)) + w(x)$$

for $(x, t) \in U_{\delta_1} \times [T, +\infty)$ where

$$w(x) = A\left(\frac{1}{(r(x) + \delta)^p} - \frac{1}{\delta^p}\right)$$

with constants $A > 0$, $p > 1$ large and $\delta > 0$ small to be determined. By definition, we have

$$(4.9) \quad -\frac{\epsilon'(t)}{\epsilon(t)^2} = \xi'(t) \leq \tau$$

for $t \geq T$. Let $\tilde{r}(x, t) = r(x) + \epsilon(t)$. For any $x_0 \in U_{\delta_1}^\circ$, let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis at x_0 such that $e_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}$. The same calculation as in Lemma 5.1 in [7] yields

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u} = & -Ric_g + (n-2)\nabla^2 w + \Delta w g + (n-2)(w')^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^2} \left[(n-1)g - 2(n-2)\tilde{r}w' \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \tilde{r}((n-2)\nabla^2 r + \Delta r g) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\nabla^2 r$ and Δr are the second fundamental form and the mean curvature of $\Sigma_{r(x_0)}$, which are uniformly bounded by a constant $\gamma \geq 1$ on U_{δ_1} :

$$\gamma g \geq (n-2)\nabla^2 r + \Delta r g \geq -\gamma g.$$

We denote the bracketed term above on the right hand side as Φ . Taking $\delta + \delta_1 < 1$, we have

$$w' = -Ap(r + \delta)^{-p-1} \leq -Ap,$$

and hence,

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{r}^2} \Phi \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^2} \left[(n-1)g + \tilde{r} \begin{pmatrix} -\gamma & & \\ & 2(n-2)Ap - \gamma & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & 2(n-2)Ap - \gamma \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

Now we let $\delta_1 < \frac{1}{20\gamma}$ and choose $T' > 0$ to be large so that $\epsilon(t) < \frac{1}{20\gamma}$ for $t \geq T'$. There exists $K_0 > 0$ such that for $Ap > K_0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \det\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{r}^2} \Phi\right) & \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^{2n}} (n-1)^n \left(1 - \frac{\gamma\tilde{r}}{n-1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{2(n-2)Ap - \gamma}{n-1} \tilde{r}\right)^{n-1} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^{2n}} (n-1)^n (1 + Ap\tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $-Ric_g \geq 0$. For any large constant $\Lambda > 0$, there exists $A_0 > 0$ and $p_0 > 0$ so that for $A > A_0$ and $p \geq p_0$,

$$(n-2)\nabla^2 w + \Delta w g \geq \Lambda g,$$

on U_{δ_1} . Therefore, if we also assume $Ap \geq 8n\tau$, then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\det(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u})) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{n,n}) - 2n\underline{u} &\geq \log(\det(\frac{1}{\tilde{r}^2} \Phi)) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{n,n}) - 2n\underline{u} \\ &\geq \log(\tilde{r}^{-2n}(1 + Ap\tilde{r})) - 2n\underline{u} \\ &\geq \log(1 + Ap\tilde{r}) \geq \log(1 + 8n\tau\tilde{r}), \end{aligned}$$

and hence for $\tilde{r} \leq (8n\tau)^{-1}$ and $t \geq \max\{T, T'\}$, by (4.9) we have

$$(4.10) \quad \log(\det(\bar{\nabla}^2 \underline{u})) - \log(\bar{\beta}_{n,n}) - 2n\underline{u} \geq 4n\tau\tilde{r} \geq -2n\frac{\epsilon'}{\tilde{r}} = 2n\underline{u}_t.$$

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon(t) = 0$, we take $T_2 \geq \max\{T_1, T'\}$ such that $\epsilon(t) \leq (16n\tau)^{-1}$ for $t \geq T_2$ and let

$$\delta_1 < \min\{(16n\tau)^{-1}, (20\gamma)^{-1}\}.$$

We will choose A and p large so that \underline{u} gives a lower bound of u on $U_{\delta_1} \times [T_2, \infty)$. Notice that $\partial U_{\delta_1} = \Sigma_{\delta_1} \cup \partial M$. By assumption we have

$$\underline{u}(x, t) = \log(\xi(t)) \leq \phi(x, t)$$

for $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [T_2, \infty)$. On Σ_{δ_1} , since u is increasing, we have $u(x, t) \geq u_0(x)$. Notice that there exists $A_1 > 0$ such that for $A \geq A_1$ and any $p \geq 1$, we have

$$-\log(\delta_1) + A((\delta_1 + \delta)^{-p} - \delta^{-p}) < \inf_{\Sigma_{\delta_1}} u_0,$$

and hence we have on $\Sigma_{\delta_1} \times [T_2, \infty)$,

$$\underline{u} \leq u.$$

Finally, we consider the control on $U_{\delta_1} \times \{T_2\}$. Since $\underline{u}(\cdot, T_2), u(\cdot, T_2) \in C^1(M)$ and $\underline{u} \leq u = \phi$ on $\partial M \times \{T_2\}$, there exist $A_2 > 0$ and $p_2 > 0$ such that for $A \geq A_2$ and $p \geq p_2$, we have

$$\underline{u} \leq u$$

on $U_{\delta_1} \times \{T_2\}$.

In summary, we assume

$$\begin{aligned} Ap &\geq \max\{K_0, 8n\tau\}, \quad p \geq \max\{1, p_0, p_2\}, \quad A \geq \max\{A_0, A_1, A_2\}, \\ \delta + \delta_1 &< 1, \quad \delta_1 < \min\{(16n\tau)^{-1}, (20\gamma)^{-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\delta_1 > 0$ is small so that Exp is a diffeomorphism. Therefore, \underline{u} is a sub-solution to (3.1) for $k = n$ by (4.10) and hence a sub-solution to (3.1) for $1 \leq k \leq n$ on $U_{\delta_1} \times [T_2, \infty)$, by Maclaurin's inequality; moreover,

$$\underline{u} \leq u, \quad \text{on } (\partial M \bigcup \Sigma_{\delta_1}) \times [T_2, \infty) \bigcup U_{\delta_1} \times \{T_2\}.$$

Therefore, by the maximum principle in Lemma 3.1, we have

$$u(x, t) \geq \underline{u}(x, t) = -\log(r(x) + \epsilon(t)) + A((r(x) + \delta)^{-p} - \delta^{-p})$$

on $U_{\delta_1} \times [T_2, \infty)$.

□

Proof of Corollary 1.5. The equation (1.5) is conformally covariant, and hence it is equivalent to consider the case when the background metric g is the Euclidean metric when (M, g) is a domain in the Euclidean space, while $g \in C^{4,\alpha}$ is chosen to be a metric constructed in [16] (see Section 2 in the present paper) such that $Ric_g < -(n-1)g$ in the conformal class for a general manifold (M, g) . Let $u_0 = \underline{u} + \min\{0, \inf_{\partial M} \varphi_0\}$ with \underline{u} a sub-solution constructed in Section 2 for $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ large, and when (M, g) is a domain in Euclidean space one can just take \underline{u} to be the global sub-solution in [7] (just take the function $\eta(s) = s$ for the sub-solution \underline{u} in Section 2) with $A > 0$ and $p > 0$ large. Then u_0 is a strict sub-solution near the boundary with $u_0 < \varphi_0$ on ∂M and hence, we can construct the boundary data $\phi \in C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{q}{2}}(\partial M \times [0, \infty))$ satisfying the compatible condition (3.4) at $t = 0$ such that $\phi_t \geq 0$ on $\partial M \times [0, \infty)$ and $\phi(x, t) \rightarrow \varphi_0(x)$ uniformly in $C^{4,\alpha'}(\partial M)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for some $0 < \alpha' < 1$.

Consider the Cauchy-Dirichlet boundary value problem (3.1) – (3.3). It is clear that Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 still hold true. Recall that by Maclaurin's inequality u is a sub-solution to the σ_1 -Ricci curvature flow (3.1). On the other hand, for the σ_1 -Ricci equation (1.5), which is the Yamabe equation, classical variational methods yield a unique minimizing solution u_1 to the Dirichlet boundary value problem with $u_1 = \varphi_0$ on ∂M , see [17]. By Lemma 3.1 for the σ_1 -Ricci curvature flow, we have $u(x, t) \leq u_1(x)$ for $(x, t) \in M \times [0, \infty)$ and hence we have a uniform upper bound of u . Also, the a priori C^2 estimates from Lemma 3.3 to Proposition 3.6 hold with uniform bound of $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{C^2(M)}$ independent of $t > 0$. By Theorem 4.1, we have the long time existence of the unique solution u . Things are even better in this case: there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that for any $T > 0$,

$$(4.11) \quad \|u\|_{C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{q}{2}}(M \times [T, T+1])} \leq C,$$

by Krylov's Theorem and the standard Schauder estimates. Remark that here we do not need the locally uniformly interior estimates.

By (4.11), there exists a sequence $t_j \rightarrow \infty$, such that $u(x, t_j) \rightarrow u_\infty(x)$ in $C^4(M)$ for some $u_\infty \in C^{4,\alpha}(M)$ as $t_j \rightarrow \infty$. By monotonicity of u , $u(x, t) \rightarrow u_\infty(x)$ uniformly for $x \in M$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By (4.11) and the interpolation inequality, we have $u(x, t) \rightarrow u_\infty(x)$ uniformly in $C^4(M)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and hence, $u_\infty = \varphi_0$ on ∂M . Since $u_t \geq 0$ satisfies the linear uniformly parabolic equation (3.7), by Harnack inequality, $u_t \rightarrow 0$ locally uniformly in M° as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and hence, u_∞ is a solution to (1.5). This completes the proof of the corollary. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Andersson, P. Chruściel, H. Friedrich, *On the regularity of solutions to the Yamabe equation and the existence of smooth hyperboloidal initial data for Einsteins field equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., 149(1992), 587-612.
- [2] P. Aviles, R. C. McOwen, *Complete conformal metrics with negative scalar curvature in compact Riemannian manifolds*, Duke Math. J. 56(2) (1988) 395-398.
- [3] P. Aviles, R. C. McOwen, *Conformal deformation to constant negative scalar curvature on noncompact Riemannian manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom., 27 (1988), 225-239.
- [4] M. González, Y.Y. Li, L. Nguyen, *Existence and uniqueness to a fully non-linear version of the Loewner-Nirenberg problem*, Commun. Math. Stat. 6 (2018), no.3, 269-288.
- [5] B. Guan, *Complete conformal metrics of negative Ricci curvature on compact manifolds with boundary*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2008, Art. ID rnn 105, 25 pp.

- [6] B. Guan, *Addendum to: Complete conformal metrics of negative Ricci curvature on compact manifolds with boundary*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2009, no. 22, 4354-4355.
- [7] M. Gursky, J. Streets, M. Warren, *Existence of complete conformal metrics of negative Ricci curvature on manifolds with boundary*, Calc. Var. PDE 2011, no. 1-2, 21-43.
- [8] M. Gursky, J. Viaclovsky, *Fully nonlinear equations on Riemannian manifolds with negative curvature*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **52**, 2003, 399-419.
- [9] N. Krylov, *Nonlinear elliptic and Parabolic equations of the second order*, D. Riedel, Publishing Company 1987.
- [10] G. Li, *Two flow approaches to the Loewner-Nirenberg problem on manifolds*, preprint.
- [11] J. Li, W. Sheng, *Deforming metrics with negative curvature by a fully nonlinear flow*, Calc. Var. PDE 2005, 33-50.
- [12] Y.Y. Li, *Some existence results for fully nonlinear elliptic equations of Monge-Ampère type*, Comm. Pur Appl. Math. **43**, 1990, 233-271.
- [13] C. Loewner, L. Nirenberg, *Partial differential equations invariant under conformal or projective transformations*, Contributions to Analysis, Academic Press, New York, 1974, pp. 245-272.
- [14] A. Lazer, P.J. McKenna, *Asymptotic behavior of boundary blow-up problems*, Differential and Integral Equations **7** (1994), pp. 1001-1019.
- [15] C. Loewner, L. Nirenberg, *Partial differential equations invariant under conformal or projective transformations*, Contributions to Analysis, Academic Press, New York, 1974, pp. 245-272.
- [16] J. Lohkamp, *Negative bending of open manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom., **40** (1994), 461-474.
- [17] L. Ma, *The Yamabe problem with Dirichlet data*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **320** (1995), no. 6, 709-712.
- [18] J. A. Viaclovsky, *Conformal geometry, contact geometry, and the calculus of variations*, Duke Math. J., **101** (2000), 283-316.

GANG LI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY, JINAN, SHANDONG PROVINCE, CHINA
 Email address: runxing3@gmail.com