

A DEFORMED HERMITIAN YANG-MILLS FLOW

JIXIANG FU, SHING-TUNG YAU, AND DEKAI ZHANG

ABSTRACT. We study a new deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills flow on a compact Kähler manifold. We first show the existence of the longtime solution of the flow. We then show that under the Collins-Jacob-Yau's condition on the subsolution, the longtime solution converges to the solution of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation, which was solved by Collins-Jacob-Yau [5] by the continuity method. Moreover, as an application of the flow, we show that on a compact Kähler surface, if there exists a semi-subsolution of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation, then the flow converges smoothly to a singular solution to the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation away from a finite number of curves of negative self-intersection. Such a solution can be viewed as a boundary point of the moduli space of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills solutions for a given Kähler metric.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n and χ be a real closed $(1, 1)$ form. Motivated by mirror symmetry [24], Jacob-Yau [22] initiated to study the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills (dHYM) equation:

$$(1.1) \quad \operatorname{Re}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n = \cot \theta_0 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n,$$

where θ_0 is the argument of the complex number $\int_M (\chi + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n$ and $\chi_u = \chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u$ for a *real* smooth function u on M .

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ be the eigenvalues of χ_u with respect to ω , and if necessary we denote λ by $\lambda(\chi_u)$ and λ_i by $\lambda_i(\chi_u)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then by Jacob-Yau [22] the dHYM equation has an equivalent form

$$(1.2) \quad \theta_\omega(\chi_u) := \sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{arccot} \lambda_i = \theta_0.$$

It is called supercritical if $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ and hypercritical if $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$.

1.1. Previous results. The dHYM equation has been extensively studied by many mathematicians ([2], [3], [5], [4], [6], [7], [16], [17], [18], [20], [22], [25], [26], [28]).

We first introduce the related results in the elliptic case. When $n = 2$, Jacob-Yau [22] solved the equation by translating it into the complex Monge-Ampère equation which was solved by Yau [36]. When $n \geq 3$, Collins-Jacob-Yau [5] solved the dHYM equation for

the supercritical case by assuming the existence of a subsolution \underline{u} and an extra condition on \underline{u} . For convenience, for a smooth function v on M we define

$$A_0(v) := \max_M \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i \neq j} \operatorname{arccot} \lambda_i(\chi_v)$$

and

$$B_0(v) = \max_M \theta_\omega(\chi_v).$$

A smooth function \underline{u} on M is called a *subsolution* of dHYM equation (1.2) if \underline{u} satisfies the inequality

$$(1.3) \quad A_0(\underline{u}) < \theta_0.$$

The extra condition on \underline{u} is

$$(1.4) \quad B_0(\underline{u}) < \pi.$$

To be precise, Collins, Jacob and Yau proved the following

Theorem 1.1 (Collins-Jacob-Yau [5]). *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form on M with $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. Suppose there exists a subsolution \underline{u} of dHYM equation (1.2) in the sense of (1.3) and \underline{u} also satisfies inequality (1.4). Then there exists a unique smooth solution of dHYM equation (1.2).*

Without condition (1.4) Pingali [28] then solved the equation for $n = 3$ and Lin [26] solved it for $n = 3, 4$. On the other hand, Lin [25] generalized Collins-Jacob-Yau's result to the Hermitian case (M, ω) with $\partial\bar{\partial}\omega = \partial\bar{\partial}\omega^2 = 0$; Huang-Zhang-Zhang [20] also considered the solution on a compact almost Hermitian manifold for the hypercritical case.

For the parabolic flow method, there are also several results. More precisely, Jacob-Yau [22] and Collins-Jacob-Yau [5] solved the line bundle mean curvature flow (LBMCF)

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} u_t = \theta_0 - \theta_\omega(\chi_u) \\ u(0) = u_0 \end{cases}$$

under the assumptions:

- (1) $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$;
- (2) the existence of a subsolution \underline{u} in the sense of (1.3); and
- (3) $\theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}) \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$.

Takahashi [32] proved the existence and convergence of the tangent Lagrangian phase flow (TLPF)

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} u_t = \tan(\theta_0 - \theta_\omega(\chi_u)) \\ u(0) = u_0 \end{cases}$$

under the same assumptions (1) and (2) of flow (1.5) and the assumption:

$$(3') \quad \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}) - \theta_0 \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}).$$

Another important problem raised by Collins-Jacob-Yau [5] is to find a sufficient and necessary geometric condition on the existence of a solution of the dHYM equation. There are some important progresses made by Chen [2] and Chu-Lee-Takahashi [4].

1.2. Our results. Motivated by the concavity of $\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u)$ by Chen [2], we consider a dHYM flow:

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} u_t = \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) - \cot \theta_0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x). \end{cases}$$

Assume u_0 satisfies

$$(1.8) \quad B_0(u_0) < \pi.$$

This condition is the same as (1.4) if $u_0 = \underline{u}$.

We first prove an existence theorem of the longtime solution of flow (1.7).

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form with $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. If u_0 satisfies inequality (1.8), then dHYM flow (1.7) has a unique smooth longtime solution u .*

Next we consider the convergence of longtime solution of flow (1.7). Now we need to assume the dHYM equation has a subsolution \underline{u} which also satisfies inequality (1.4). The first main result of this paper is

Theorem 1.3. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form with $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. Suppose dHYM equation (1.2) has a subsolution \underline{u} in the sense of (1.3) which also satisfies (1.4). If u_0 satisfies (1.8), then the longtime solution $u(x, t)$ of dHYM flow (1.7) converges to a smooth solution u^∞ to the dHYM equation:*

$$\theta_\omega(\chi_{u^\infty}) = \theta_0.$$

The extra condition (1.4) in our result is the same as the one in Theorem 1.1 which is therefore reproved. Our proof here looks like simpler than the one in [5]. On the other hand, compared with the results in [22] and [32], we only need $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. Moreover, condition (3) of flow (1.5) or (3') of flow (1.6) is stronger than condition (1.4).

In addition to the concavity of $\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u)$, our flow has two advantages: The first one is the imaginary part of the Calabi-Yau functional (see the definition in Section 2) is constant along the flow, which is the key to do the C^0 estimate; The second one is a subsolution \underline{u} of equation (1.2) satisfying (1.4) is also a subsolution of flow (1.7), which allows us to use Lemma 3 in Phong-Tô [27] to do higher order estimates. If we can establish the similar lemma without extra condition (1.4) of \underline{u} , we then can relax condition (1.4).

The second motivation of this paper is to look for applications of flow (1.7). A smooth function \underline{u} is called a *semi-subsolution* of the dHYM equation if

$$(1.9) \quad A_0(\underline{u}) \leq \theta_0.$$

In the 2-dimensional case, this condition is equivalent to

$$(1.10) \quad \chi_{\underline{u}} \geq \cot \theta_0 \omega.$$

Now we restrict ourselves to this case.

Assume there exists a semi-subsolution \underline{u} of the dHYM equation and replace $\chi_{\underline{u}}$ by χ , i.e., assume that $\underline{u} = 0$ is a semi-subsolution. For any $B_1 \in (0, \pi)$, define the set

$$(1.11) \quad \mathcal{H}_{B_1} = \{v \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}) : \theta_\omega(\chi_v) \in (0, B_1)\}.$$

Then if $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$, the set \mathcal{H}_{B_1} for any $B_1 \in (2\theta_0, \pi)$ is non-empty, for example, $0 \in \mathcal{H}_{B_1}$; if $\theta_0 \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$, we can prove that the set \mathcal{H}_{B_1} for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$ is also non-empty, see Lemma 5.2.

We take a function in \mathcal{H}_{B_1} for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$ as u_0 in flow (1.7). We can state the second main theorem of the paper.

Theorem 1.4. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler surface and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form. Assume $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ and $\chi \geq \cot \theta_0 \omega$. Then there exist a finite number of curves E_i of negative self-intersection on M such that the solution $u(x, t)$ of dHYM flow (1.7) converges to a bounded function u^∞ in $C_{loc}^\infty(M \setminus \cup_i E_i)$ as t tends to ∞ with the following properties.*

- (1) $\chi + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u^\infty - \cot B_1 \omega$ is a Kähler current which is smooth on $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$;
- (2) u^∞ satisfies the dHYM equation on $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$

$$(1.12) \quad \operatorname{Re}(\chi_{u^\infty} + \sqrt{-1} \omega)^2 = \cot \theta_0 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_{u^\infty} + \sqrt{-1} \omega)^2;$$

- (3) $\chi_{u(x,t)}$ converges to χ_{u^∞} and u^∞ satisfies (1.12) on M in the sense of currents.

We note that by assuming $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ and $B_1 \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, Takahashi [33] proved the same convergence result of the LBMCF. A similar result of the J-flow was studied in Fang-Lai-Song-Weinkove[12]. As done by [12, 33], we need the singular solution of the degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation (5.4) by Eyssidieux-Guedj-Zeriahi [10], which will be used in the C^0 estimate. We establish a similar lemma, i.e., Lemma 5.7 as Lemma 3 in [27] by the semi-subsolution condition to do the gradient estimate and the second order estimate. As to the convergence of u_t , the key point is that along the dHYM flow the real part of the Calabi-Yau functional is uniformly bounded. In this way we can prove Theorem 1.4.

As an application of Theorem 1.4, we have the lower bound of the \mathcal{J} -functional on certain spaces, see the definition in Section 2.

Corollary 1.5. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler surface and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form. Assume that $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ and $\chi \geq \cot \theta_0 \omega$. The \mathcal{J} -functional is bounded from below in \mathcal{H}_{B_1} for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$.*

If $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$, Takahashi proved that \mathcal{J} is bounded from below in $\mathcal{H}_{\frac{\pi}{2}}$.

We have mentioned that for 2 dimensional case, along the dHYM flow the real part of the Calabi-Yau functional is uniformly bounded. We believe that the same conclusion for

the higher dimension also holds. Hence the real part of the Calabi-Yau functional plays the similar role as the Donaldson functional defined on the space of Hermitian metrics on a holomorphic vector bundle. We expect that we can use our flow to study the moduli space of solutions of the dHYM equation on a compact Kähler manifold (M, ω) .

The rest of this paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminary results on the linearized operator on the dHYM flow, the concavity of $\cot \theta(\lambda)$, the parabolic subsolution, and the Calabi-Yau functional. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.3, including the C^0 estimate, the gradient estimate and the second order estimate. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5.

Notations: In this paper a closed real $(1, 1)$ form χ is fixed. We will use the constant C in the generic sense which is dependent on $\omega, \chi, \underline{u}, u_0$ and n . If necessary, we will use C_i as a specific constant.

Notations of covariant derivatives are used. For example, $u_{i\bar{j}k}$ represents the third order covariant derivative of function u , $\alpha_{i\bar{j},k}$ represents the covariant derivative of $(1,1)$ form α .

We use Einstein summation convention if there is no confusion.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

2.1. The linearized operator. Note

$$(2.1) \quad \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) = \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n}{\operatorname{Im}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n}.$$

We manipulate the linearized operator \mathcal{P} of dHYM flow (1.7) in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *The operator \mathcal{P} has the form:*

$$\mathcal{P}(v) = v_t - \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u)(wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{j}}v_{i\bar{j}},$$

where $g = (g_{i\bar{j}})_{n \times n}$, $w = (w_{i\bar{j}})_{n \times n}$ for $w_{i\bar{j}} = \chi_{i\bar{j}} + u_{i\bar{j}}$, and $D^{i\bar{j}} := (D^{-1})_{i\bar{j}}$ for an invertible Hermitian symmetric matrix D .

Proof. We only need to deal with the variation of $\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u)$. Indeed, let $u(s)$ be a variation of the function u and $\frac{du(s)}{ds}|_{s=0} = v$. Let $A(s) := g^{-1}w(s) + \sqrt{-1}I$ with $w(s)$ being the local matrix of $\chi_{u(s)}$. Then

$$(2.2) \quad A(s)^{-1} = (g^{-1}w(s) - \sqrt{-1}I)((g^{-1}w(s))^2 + I)^{-1}.$$

For simplicity, we write A instead of $A(s)$. By (2.1) we have

$$\delta(\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u)) = \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\delta \det A)}{\operatorname{Im}(\det A)} - \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\det A)\operatorname{Im}(\delta \det A)}{(\operatorname{Im}(\det A))^2}.$$

Since $\delta(\det A) = (\det A)\delta(\log \det A)$, if we write $\det A = a_1 + \sqrt{-1}a_2$ and $\delta(\log \det A) = b_1 + \sqrt{-1}b_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u)) &= \frac{a_1 b_1 - a_2 b_2}{a_2} - \frac{a_1(a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1)}{a_2^2} \\ &= \frac{-a_1^2 - a_2^2}{a_2^2} b_2 = -\csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) b_2.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (2.2) we have

$$b_2 = \operatorname{Im} \delta(\log \det A) = -\operatorname{tr}((wg^{-1}w + g)^{-1} \delta w(s)|_{s=0}) = -(wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{j}} v_{i\bar{j}}.$$

Hence

$$(2.3) \quad \delta(\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u)) = \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) (wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{j}} v_{i\bar{j}}.$$

□

We denote

$$(2.4) \quad F^{i\bar{j}} := \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) (wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{j}}$$

and hence

$$\mathcal{P}(v) = v_t - F^{i\bar{j}} v_{i\bar{j}}.$$

The following lemma is useful in the gradient and second order estimates.

Lemma 2.2. *Let u be a solution of dHYM flow (1.7). Then*

$$(2.5) \quad u_{tp} - F^{i\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p} = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(2.6) \quad u_{tp\bar{p}} - F^{i\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p\bar{p}} &= -F^{i\bar{l}} (wg^{-1}w + g)^{k\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p} (w_{k\bar{m},\bar{p}} g^{r\bar{m}} w_{r\bar{l}} + w_{k\bar{m}} g^{r\bar{m}} w_{r\bar{l},\bar{p}}) \\ &\quad + 2 \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) F^{i\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p} (wg^{-1}w + g)^{k\bar{l}} w_{k\bar{l},\bar{p}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Similar as the proof of (2.3), differentiating equation (1.7) leads to (2.5) directly:

$$u_{tp} = \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) (wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p} = F^{i\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p}.$$

Differentiating the equation twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(2.7) \quad u_{tp\bar{p}} &= \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) (wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p\bar{p}} + (\csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u))_{\bar{p}} (wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p} \\ &\quad - \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) (wg^{-1}w + g)^{i\bar{l}} (wg^{-1}w + g)^{k\bar{j}} w_{i\bar{j},p} (wg^{-1}w + g)_{k\bar{l},\bar{p}},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(\csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u))_{\bar{p}} = 2 \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) (\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u))_{\bar{p}} = 2 \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) F^{k\bar{l}} w_{k\bar{l},\bar{p}}$$

and

$$(wg^{-1}w + g)_{k\bar{l},\bar{p}} = (w_{k\bar{m}} g^{r\bar{m}} w_{r\bar{l}} + g_{k\bar{l}})_{\bar{p}} = w_{k\bar{m},\bar{p}} g^{r\bar{m}} w_{r\bar{l}} + w_{k\bar{m}} g^{r\bar{m}} w_{r\bar{l},\bar{p}}.$$

Hence identity (2.6) follows. \square

2.2. The concavity of $\cot \theta(\lambda)$ in Γ_τ for $\tau \in (0, \pi)$. Here

$$(2.8) \quad \theta(\lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{arccot} \lambda_i \quad \text{for } \lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

and

$$\Gamma_\tau := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \theta(\lambda) < \tau\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{for } \tau \in (0, \pi).$$

We have the following useful facts.

Lemma 2.3 (Yuan [37], Wang-Yuan [35]). *If $\theta(\lambda) \leq \tau \in (0, \pi)$ for $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$, then the following inequalities holds.*

- (1) $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1} \geq \cot \frac{\tau}{2} > 0$, and $\lambda_{n-1} \geq |\lambda_n|$;
- (2) $\lambda_1 + (n-1)\lambda_n \geq 0$.

Moreover, Γ_τ is convex for any $\tau \in (0, \pi)$.

Lemma 2.4 (Chen [2]). *For any $\tau \in (0, \pi)$, the function $\cot \theta(\lambda)$ on Γ_τ is concave.*

Proof. For completeness, we give an elementary proof here. When $n = 1$, $\cot \theta(\lambda) = \lambda_1$ is obviously concave. We now assume $n \geq 2$. By definition (2.8) we have

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \cot \theta(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i \partial \lambda_j} &= - \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_j} \left(\csc^2 \theta(\lambda) \frac{\partial \theta(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_j} \left(\frac{\csc^2 \theta(\lambda)}{1 + \lambda_i^2} \right) \\ &= -2 \csc^2 \theta(\lambda) \left(\frac{\lambda_i \delta_{ij}}{(1 + \lambda_i^2)^2} - \frac{\cot \theta(\lambda)}{(1 + \lambda_i^2)(1 + \lambda_j^2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the function $\cot \theta(\lambda)$ on Γ_τ is concave if and only if the matrix

$$\Lambda = (\lambda_i \delta_{ij} - \cot \theta(\lambda))_{n \times n}$$

is positive definite. Without loss of generality, we assume $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$. Since $\theta(\lambda) \in (0, \pi)$, by Lemma 2.3 (1), we have $\lambda_{n-1} > 0$.

By the definition of $\theta(\lambda)$, for any $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, we have $\sum_{l=1}^k \operatorname{arccot} \lambda_{j_l} < \theta(\lambda)$. Hence

$$(2.10) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left(\prod_{l=1}^k (\lambda_{j_l} + \sqrt{-1}) \right) - \cot \theta(\lambda) \operatorname{Im} \left(\prod_{l=1}^k (\lambda_{j_l} + \sqrt{-1}) \right) > 0.$$

Let $\sigma_i(\lambda_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_k})$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ be the i -th elementary symmetric polynomial of $\lambda_{j_1}, \lambda_{j_2}, \dots, \lambda_{j_k}$. Then (2.10) can be written as

$$(2.11) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{[k/2]} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-2i}(\lambda_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_k}) - \cot \theta(\lambda) \sum_{i=0}^{[(k-1)/2]} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-1-2i}(\lambda_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_k}) > 0.$$

Denote by D_k the k -th leading principal minor of the matrix Λ . We need to prove $D_k > 0$ for any $1 \leq k \leq n$. When $k = 1$, $D_1 = \lambda_1 - \cot \theta(\lambda) > 0$. When $2 \leq k \leq n$, by direct computation, we have

$$D_k = \sigma_k(\lambda_{12\dots k}) - \cot \theta(\lambda) \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda_{12\dots k}).$$

Hence by (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_k &> - \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-2i}(\lambda_{12\dots k}) + \cot \theta(\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-1-2i}(\lambda_{12\dots k}) \\ &=: E_{k-2}(\lambda_{12\dots k}) \end{aligned}$$

We prove $E_{k-2}(\lambda_{12\dots k}) > 0$ for any $2 \leq k \leq n$.

We use the well-known formula

$$(2.12) \quad \sigma_i(\lambda_{12\dots k}) = \sigma_i(\lambda_{2\dots k}) + \lambda_1 \sigma_{i-1}(\lambda_{2\dots k})$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ to deduce that

$$(2.13) \quad E_{k-2}(\lambda_{12\dots k}) = F_{k-2}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) + \lambda_1 E_{k-3}(\lambda_{2\dots k}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k-2}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) &= - \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-2i}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) + \cot \theta(\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-1-2i}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (k-2)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^j \sigma_{k-2-2j}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) - \cot \theta(\lambda) \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (k-3)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^j \sigma_{k-3-2j}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E_{k-3}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) &= - \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-2i-1}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) + \cot \theta(\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^i \sigma_{k-2-2i}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (k-2)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^j \sigma_{k-3-2j}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) - \cot \theta(\lambda) \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (k-3)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^j \sigma_{k-4-2j}(\lambda_{2\dots k}). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.12) we compute directly to get

$$F_{k-2}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) = \operatorname{Re} \left(\prod_{j=3}^k (\lambda_j + \sqrt{-1}) \right) - \cot \theta(\lambda) \operatorname{Im} \left(\prod_{j=3}^k (\lambda_j + \sqrt{-1}) \right) + \lambda_2 F_{k-3}(\lambda_{3\dots k}).$$

Hence

$$F_{k-2}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) > \lambda_2 F_{k-3}(\lambda_{3\dots k}).$$

From this we deduce that

$$F_{k-2}(\lambda_{2\dots k}) > \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_{k-2} F_1(\lambda_{(k-1)k}) = \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_{k-2} (\lambda_{k-1} + \lambda_k - \cot \theta(\lambda)) > 0.$$

Combined with (2.13), we have

$$E_{k-2}(\lambda_{12\dots k}) > \lambda_1 E_{k-3}(\lambda_{2\dots k}).$$

Hence for any $2 \leq k \leq n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{k-2}(\lambda_{12\dots k}) &> \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{k-3} E_1(\lambda_{(k-2)(k-1)k}) \\ &= \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{k-3} (\lambda_{k-2} + \lambda_{k-1} + \lambda_k - \cot \theta(\lambda)) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we finish the proof of the lemma. \square

2.3. Parabolic subsolution. B. Guan [14] introduced the definition of a subsolution of fully non-linear equations. G. Székelyhidi [31] gave a weaker version of a subsolution and Collins-Jacob-Yau [5] used it to the dHYM equation which is equivalent to (1.3). These two notions are equivalent for the type 1 cones by the appendix in [15]. On the other hand, Phong-Tô [27] modified the definition in [14] and [31] to the parabolic case. We use their definition to the parabolic dHYM equation.

Definition 2.5. A smooth function $\underline{u}(x, t)$ on $M \times [0, T)$ is called a subsolution of parabolic dHYM equation (1.7) if there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T)$, the subset of \mathbb{R}^{n+1}

$$\begin{aligned} S_\delta(x, t) := \{(\mu, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid &\cot \theta(\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}(x, t)}) + \mu) - \underline{u}_t(x, t) + \tau = \cot \theta_0, \\ &\mu_i > -\delta \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \tau > -\delta\} \end{aligned}$$

is uniformly bounded, i.e., it is contained in the ball $B_K^{n+1}(0)$ in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} with radius K , a uniform constant.

We have the following observation.

Lemma 2.6. If \underline{u} is a subsolution of dHYM equation (1.1) with $B_0(\underline{u}) < \pi$, then the function $\underline{u}(x, t) = \underline{u}(x)$ on $M \times [0, \infty)$ is also a subsolution of parabolic dHYM equation (1.7).

Proof. We want to find a constant δ in Definition 2.5. If such a δ exists, we let $(\mu, \tau) \in S_\delta(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in M \times [0, \infty)$. Since $\mu_i > -\delta$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, by the definition of $B_0(\underline{u})$ in (1.4) we have

$$0 < \theta(\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)}) + \mu) \leq \theta_\omega(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)}) + n\delta \leq B_0(\underline{u}) + n\delta.$$

Hence if $0 < \delta \leq \frac{\pi - B_0(\underline{u})}{2n}$, then

$$0 < \theta(\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)}) + \mu) < \frac{\pi + B_0(\underline{u})}{2} < \pi,$$

and by the definition of $S_\delta(x, t)$, τ is bounded from above:

$$\tau = \cot \theta_0 - \cot \theta(\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)}) + \mu) \leq \cot \theta_0 - \cot \left(\frac{\pi + B_0(\underline{u})}{2} \right).$$

Since also $\mu_i > -\delta$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, by subsolution condition (1.3) we have

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \operatorname{arccot}(\lambda_i(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)}) + \mu_i) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} \operatorname{arccot} \lambda_i(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)}) + (n-1)\delta \leq A_0(\underline{u}) + (n-1)\delta.$$

If $0 < \delta \leq \frac{\theta_0 - A_0(\underline{u})}{2(n+1)}$, then

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \operatorname{arccot}(\lambda_i(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)}) + \mu_i) \leq \frac{\theta_0 + A_0(\underline{u})}{2}.$$

Since $\tau > -\delta$, by the definition of $S_\delta(x, t)$ we have for each j

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{arccot}(\lambda_j(\chi_{\underline{u}}) + \mu_j) &= \operatorname{arccot}(\cot \theta_0 - \tau) - \sum_{i \neq j} \operatorname{arccot}(\lambda_i(\chi_{\underline{u}}) + \mu_i) \\ &\geq \operatorname{arccot}(\cot \theta_0 + \delta) - \sum_{i \neq j} \operatorname{arccot}(\lambda_i(\chi_{\underline{u}}) + \mu_i) \\ &\geq \theta_0 - \delta - \frac{\theta_0 + A_0(\underline{u})}{2} \geq \frac{n(\theta_0 - A_0(\underline{u}))}{2(n+1)} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\mu_j \leq \max_M |\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}(x)})| + \cot\left(\frac{n(\theta_0 - A_0(\underline{u}))}{2(n+1)}\right).$$

Therefore, if we choose $\delta = \min\{\frac{\pi - B_0(\underline{u})}{2n}, \frac{\theta_0 - A_0(\underline{u})}{2(n+2)}\}$, then for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, \infty)$ and $(\mu, \tau) \in S_\delta(x, t)$, we have

$$|\mu| + |\tau| \leq K := 2n \left(\delta + \max_M |\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}})| + \cot \theta_0 - \cot\left(\frac{\pi + B_0(\underline{u})}{2}\right) + \cot\left(\frac{n(\theta_0 - A_0(\underline{u}))}{2(n+1)}\right) \right).$$

□

2.4. The Calabi-Yau Functional. Recall the definition of the Calabi-Yau functional by Collins-Yau [8]: for any $v \in C^2(M, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(v) := \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \int_M v(\chi_v + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^i \wedge (\chi + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^{n-i}.$$

The \mathcal{J} -functional is defined by

$$\mathcal{J}(v) := \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta_0} \operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(v)).$$

Let $v(s) \in C^{2,1}(M \times [0, T], \mathbb{R})$ be a variation of the function v , i.e., $v(0) = v$. The integration by parts gives

$$(2.14) \quad \frac{d}{ds} \operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(v(s)) = \int_M \frac{\partial v(s)}{\partial s} (\chi_{v(s)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n,$$

$$(2.15) \quad \frac{d}{ds} \mathcal{J}(v(s)) = \int_M \frac{\partial v(s)}{\partial s} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta_0} (\chi_{v(s)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n).$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let $u(x, t)$ be a solution of dHYM flow (1.7). Then*

$$(2.16) \quad \text{Im}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u(\cdot, t))) = \text{Im}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u_0)),$$

$$(2.17) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \text{Re}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u(\cdot, t))) = \int_M \left(\frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} \right)^2 \text{Im}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n,$$

$$(2.18) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{J}(u(\cdot, t)) \leq 0.$$

Proof. Denote by $u(t) := u(x, t)$ for simplicity. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \text{Im}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u(t))) \\ &= \int_M \frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} \text{Im}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \\ &= \int_M \left(\frac{\text{Re}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n}{\text{Im}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n} - \cot \theta_0 \right) \text{Im}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \\ &= \int_M \text{Re}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n - \cot \theta_0 \int_M \text{Im}(\chi + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where each equality is successively by (2.14), (1.7) and (2.1), Stokes' theorem, and the definition of θ_0 . Hence (2.16) holds as $u(0) = u_0$.

Then we can also prove (2.17).

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \text{Re}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u(t))) \\ &= \int_M \frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} \text{Re}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \\ &= \int_M \frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} \cot \theta_{\omega}(\chi_{u(t)}) \text{Im}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \\ &= \int_M \frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} + \cot \theta_0 \right) \text{Im}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \\ &= \int_M \left(\frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} \right)^2 \text{Im}(\chi_{u(t)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (2.16) .

Locally

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial u(t)}{\partial t} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta_0}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + \lambda_i^2) (\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_{u(t)}) - \cot \theta_0) \sin(\theta_\omega(\chi_{u(t)}) - \theta_0) \omega^n \\
&= - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + \lambda_i^2) \frac{\sin^2(\theta_\omega(\chi_{u(t)}) - \theta_0)}{\sin \theta_\omega(\chi_{u(t)}) \sin \theta_0} \omega^n \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\theta_\omega(\chi_{u(t)}) \in (0, \pi)$ by (3.2). Hence \mathcal{J} is decreasing and (2.18) follows. \square

Next we prove that along the dHYM flow the real part of the Calabi-Yau functional can be controlled by $|u|_{L^\infty}$ without the subsolution condition.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $u(x, t)$ be a solution of dHYM flow (1.7) with the initial data satisfying (1.8). Then there exists a uniform constant C such that*

$$(2.19) \quad \operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u)) \leq C|u|_{L^\infty}.$$

Proof. By the definition of the Calabi-Yau functional, we only need to prove that for any $0 \leq k, l \leq n$ with $0 \leq k + l \leq n$

$$(2.20) \quad \left| \int_M u \chi_u^k \wedge \chi^l \wedge \omega^{n-k-l} \right| \leq C|u|_{L^\infty}.$$

We prove the above estimates by inductive argument on k . When $k = 0$, it obviously holds. Now assume inequality (2.20) holds for $k \leq m$ with $0 \leq k + l \leq n$. We prove inequality (2.20) holds for $k = m + 1$. Indeed, since along the flow by (3.2) $\chi_u \geq -\cot B_0(u_0)\omega$, there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that $\chi_u + C_0\omega > 0$ and $\chi + C_0\omega > 0$. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M u \chi_u^{m+1} \wedge \chi^l \wedge \omega^{n-m-l-1} &= \int_M u (\chi_u + C_0\omega)^{m+1} \wedge (\chi + C_0\omega)^l \wedge \omega^{n-m-l-1} \\
&\quad - \sum_{p=0}^m \sum_{q=0}^l C_{pq} \int_M u \chi_u^p \wedge \chi^q \wedge \omega^{n-p-q}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constants C_{pq} . Now

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_M u (\chi_u + C_0\omega)^{m+1} \wedge (\chi + C_0\omega)^l \wedge \omega^{n-m-l-1} \right| \\
&\leq |u|_{L^\infty} \left| \int_M (\chi_u + C_0\omega)^{m+1} \wedge (\chi + C_0\omega)^l \wedge \omega^{n-m-l-1} \right| \\
&= |u|_{L^\infty} \left| \int_M (\chi + C_0\omega)^{m+l+1} \wedge \omega^{n-m-l-1} \right| \\
(2.21) \quad &\leq C_1 |u|_{L^\infty}
\end{aligned}$$

and then by inductive assumption, inequality (2.20) follows. \square

3. THE EXISTENCE OF THE LONGTIME SOLUTION AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2, i.e. the following

Theorem 3.1. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form with $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. If u_0 satisfies inequality (1.8), then dHYM flow (1.7) has a unique smooth longtime solution u .*

We assume that u is the solution of dHYM flow (1.7) in $M \times [0, T)$, where T is the maximal existence time. By showing the uniform a priori estimates in the following subsections, we can prove $T = \infty$.

3.1. The u_t estimate.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $u(x, t)$ be a solution of dHYM flow (1.7) with the initial data satisfying (1.8). For any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T)$,*

$$(3.1) \quad \min_M u_t|_{t=0} \leq u_t(x, t) \leq \max_M u_t|_{t=0};$$

in particular,

$$(3.2) \quad 0 < \min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0(x)}) \leq \theta_\omega(\chi_{u(x,t)}) \leq B_0(u_0) < \pi.$$

Proof. The u_t satisfies the equation:

$$(u_t)_t = F^{i\bar{j}}(u_t)_{i\bar{j}}.$$

By the maximum principle, u_t attains its maximum and minimum on the initial time, i.e., inequality (3.1) holds, i.e.,

$$\min_M \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}) \leq u_t(x, t) + \cot \theta_0 \leq \max_M \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}),$$

or

$$\min_M \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}) \leq \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_{u(x,t)}) \leq \max_M \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}).$$

Thus we obtain

$$0 < \min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}) \leq \theta_\omega(\chi_{u(x,t)}) \leq \max_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}) = B_0(u_0).$$

\square

We have a useful corollary of the above lemma.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\lambda_n(x, t)$ be the smallest eigenvalue of χ_u with respect to the metric ω at (x, t) . Then*

$$\max_{M \times [0, T)} |\lambda_n| \leq A_1 \quad \text{for } A_1 := |\cot B_0(u_0)| + \left| \cot \left(\frac{\min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})}{n} \right) \right|.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$0 < \frac{\min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})}{n} \leq \frac{\theta_\omega(\chi_u)}{n} \leq \operatorname{arccot} \lambda_n \leq B_0(u_0) < \pi.$$

Hence we have

$$\cot B_0(u_0) \leq \lambda_n \leq \cot\left(\frac{\min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})}{n}\right).$$

□

3.2. The complex Hessian estimate. For any $T_0 < T$, we have proved u_t is uniformly bounded and thus $|u| \leq CT_0 + |u_0|_{C^0}$ in $M \times [0, T_0]$. We next prove the complex Hessian estimate.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $u(x, t)$ be a solution of dHYM flow (1.7) with the initial data satisfying (1.8). There exists a uniform constant C such that*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T_0]} |\partial \bar{\partial} u|_\omega \leq Ce^{CT_0}.$$

Proof. Denote $w_{i\bar{j}} := \chi_{i\bar{j}} + u_{i\bar{j}}$ as before. Denote $S(T^{1,0}M) := \bigcup_{x \in M} \{\xi \in T_x^{1,0}M \mid |\xi|_\omega = 1\}$. Consider on $S(T^{1,0}M) \times [0, T_0]$ the auxiliary function

$$\tilde{Q}(x, t, \xi(x)) = \log(w_{i\bar{j}} \xi^i \bar{\xi}^j) - K_0 t,$$

where K_0 is a uniformly large constant to be chosen later.

Suppose the function \tilde{Q} attains its maximum at (x_0, t_0) along the direction $\xi_0 = \xi(x_0)$. We will prove that $t_0 = 0$ and thus the estimate follows. If $t_0 > 0$, we choose holomorphic coordinates near x_0 such that

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{i\bar{j}}(x_0) &= \delta_{i\bar{j}}, \quad \partial_k g_{i\bar{j}}(x_0) = 0, \text{ and} \\ w_{i\bar{j}}(x_0, t_0) &= \lambda_i \delta_{i\bar{j}} \text{ with } \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \end{aligned}$$

which forces $\xi_0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}$. We extend ξ_0 near x_0 as $\tilde{\xi}_0(x) = (g_{1\bar{1}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}$. Then the function $Q(x, t) = \tilde{Q}(x, t, \tilde{\xi}_0(x))$ on $M \times [0, T_0]$ attains its maximum at (x_0, t_0) .

By the maximum principle, we have at (x_0, t_0)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq Q_t &= \frac{u_{t1\bar{1}}}{w_{1\bar{1}}} - K_0, \\ 0 = Q_i &= \frac{w_{1\bar{1},i}}{w_{1\bar{1}}}, \\ 0 \leq -Q_{\bar{i}} &= -\frac{w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}}}{w_{1\bar{1}}} + \frac{|w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2}{w_{1\bar{1}}^2} = -\frac{w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}}}{w_{1\bar{1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \leq Q_t - F^{\bar{i}} Q_{\bar{i}} = \lambda_1^{-1} (u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}} w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}}) - K_0.$$

Since $d\chi = 0$, by covariant derivative formulae, we have

$$(3.5) \quad w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}\bar{i}} = w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},1\bar{1}} + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_i)R_{1\bar{1}\bar{i}\bar{i}}.$$

On the other hand, by (2.6), we have

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},1\bar{1}} &= -F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}(1 + \lambda_j^2)^{-1}(\lambda_i + \lambda_j)|w_{i\bar{j},1}|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u)(1 + \lambda_i^2)^{-1}w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},1}(1 + \lambda_j^2)^{-1}w_{j\bar{j},\bar{1}} \\ &= - \sum_{i \neq j} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}(1 + \lambda_j^2)^{-1}(\lambda_i + \lambda_j)|w_{i\bar{j},1}|^2 - 2F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}\lambda_i(1 + \lambda_i^2)^{-1}|w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},1}|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u)(1 + \lambda_i^2)^{-1}(1 + \lambda_j^2)^{-1}w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},1}w_{j\bar{j},\bar{1}}. \end{aligned}$$

However since $\cot \theta(\lambda)$ is concave, by (2.9)

$$(3.7) \quad u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},1\bar{1}} \leq - \sum_{i \neq j} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}(1 + \lambda_j^2)^{-1}(\lambda_i + \lambda_j)|w_{i\bar{j},1}|^2 \leq 0,$$

since $\lambda_i + \lambda_j > 0$ for any $i \neq j$.

Inserting (3.5) and (3.7) into (3.4), we have

$$(3.8) \quad 0 \leq Q_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}Q_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \leq 2|Rm|_{C^0} \sum_{i=1}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - K_0.$$

Noting that $\sin \theta_\omega(\chi_u) \geq \min \{\sin B_0(u_0), \sin(\min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}))\}$, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have

$$F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} = \frac{1}{\sin^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u)(1 + \lambda_i^2)} \leq \frac{1}{\min \{\sin^2 B_0(u_0), \sin^2(\min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}))\}} := A_2.$$

Inserting the above into (3.8) and choosing $K_0 = 2nA_2|Rm|_{C^0} + 1$, we have

$$(3.9) \quad 0 \leq Q_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}Q_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \leq 2nA_2|Rm|_{C^0} - K_0 = -1,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $t_0 = 0$ and then for any $t \in [0, T_0]$, it holds

$$w_{i\bar{j}}\xi^i\bar{\xi}^j(x, t)e^{-K_0t} \leq w_{1\bar{1}}(x, 0) = u(0)_{1\bar{1}} + \chi_{1\bar{1}} \leq C.$$

□

3.3. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since we have proved the u_t estimate, the C^0 estimate and the complex Hessian estimate, by the concavity of the flow (1.7), we can apply the Evans-Krylov theory to get the higher order estimates of the solution.

If the maximal existence time $T < \infty$, then u is uniformly C^k -bounded (for any $k \geq 0$) in $M \times [0, T]$ and then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that the flow exists on $M \times [0, T + \epsilon_0]$, which is a contradiction since T is the maximal existence time. Thus $T = \infty$.

4. CONVERGENCE OF LONGTIME SOLUTION AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3, i.e., the following

Theorem 4.1. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension n and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form with $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. Suppose dHYM equation (1.2) has a subsolution \underline{u} in the sense of (1.3) which also satisfies (1.4). If u_0 satisfies (1.8), then the longtime solution $u(x, t)$ of dHYM flow (1.7) converges to a smooth solution u^∞ to the dHYM equation:*

$$\theta_\omega(\chi_{u^\infty}) = \theta_0.$$

4.1. The C^0 estimate. We first prove a Harnack type inequality along the dHYM flow.

Lemma 4.2. *Let u be the solution of the dHYM flow on $M \times [0, \infty)$. Then for any $T_0 < \infty$ we have the following Harnack type inequality:*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T_0]} u(x, t) \leq C \left(- \inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u(x, t) - u_0(x)) + 1 \right).$$

Proof. For any $t \in [0, T_0]$, we have $\theta_\omega(\chi_{u(t)}) \leq B_0(u_0) < \pi$ by Lemma 3.2. Then by the convexity of $\Gamma_{\omega, B_0(u_0)} := \{\alpha \in \Lambda^{1,1}(M, \mathbb{R}) \mid \theta_\omega(\alpha) < B_0(u_0)\}$ in Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\theta_\omega(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0}) \leq B_0(u_0) < \eta_0 < \pi,$$

where $\eta_0 = B_0(u_0)/6 + 5\pi/6$ for convenience. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text{Im}(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n}{\omega^n} \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^n (1 + \lambda_k^2(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0}))^{\frac{1}{2}} \sin \theta_\omega(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0}) \\ &\geq \begin{cases} \sin \eta_0, & \text{if } \theta_\omega(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0}) \geq \frac{\pi}{6} \\ \sqrt{1 + \lambda_1^2 \sin \arccot \lambda_1} = 1, & \text{if } \theta_\omega(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0}) < \frac{\pi}{6} \end{cases} \\ (4.1) \quad & \geq 2c_0 := \sin \eta_0. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.7, the imaginary part of the Calabi-Yau functional is constant along the flow. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \text{Im}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u(t))) - \text{Im}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u_0)) \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds} \text{Im}(\text{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(su(t) + (1-s)u_0)) ds \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_M (u(t) - u_0) \text{Im}(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n ds \\ (4.2) \quad &= \int_M (u(t) - u_0) \left(\int_0^1 \text{Im}(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M (u - u_0) \omega^n &= \int_M (u - u_0) \omega^n - \frac{1}{c_0} \int_M (u - u_0) \left(\int_0^1 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n ds \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{c_0} \int_M \underbrace{-(u - u_0) \left(-c_0 \omega^n + \int_0^1 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n ds \right)}_{\text{This term is nonnegative by (4.1)}} \\
&\leq \frac{-\inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u - u_0)}{c_0} \int_M \left(-c_0 \omega^n + \int_0^1 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n ds \right) \\
&= \frac{-\inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u - u_0)}{c_0} \left(-c_0 \int_M \omega^n + \int_0^1 \operatorname{Im} \int_M (\chi_{su(t)+(1-s)u_0} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n ds \right) \\
&= \frac{-\inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u - u_0)}{c_0} \left(-c_0 \int_M \omega^n + \operatorname{Im} \int_M (\chi + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \right) \\
&\leq c_0^{-1} \operatorname{Im} \int_M (\chi + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \left(-\inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u - u_0) \right) \\
&= C \left(-\inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u - u_0) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $C = c_0^{-1} \operatorname{Im} \int_M (\chi + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n$. Therefore we have

$$(4.3) \quad \int_M u(x, t) \omega^n \leq C \left(-\inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u(x, t) - u_0(x)) + 1 \right).$$

On the other hand, let $G(x, z)$ be Green's function of the metric ω on M . Then for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T_0]$,

$$u(x, t) = \left(\int_M \omega^n \right)^{-1} \int_M u(z, t) \omega^n - \int_{z \in M} \Delta_\omega u(z, t) G(x, z) \omega^n.$$

Since $\Delta_\omega u > -\operatorname{tr}_\omega \chi > -C_0$ and $G(x, y)$ is bounded from below, there exists a uniform constant C such that

$$(4.4) \quad u(x, t) \leq \left(\int_M \omega^n \right)^{-1} \int_M u(z, t) \omega^n + C.$$

Combing (4.3) with (4.4), we obtain the desired estimate. \square

Now we can prove the C^0 estimate similar as Phong-Tô [27].

Proposition 4.3. *Along the dHYM flow, there exists a uniform constant M_0 independent of T such that*

$$|u|_{C^0(M \times [0, \infty))} \leq M_0.$$

Proof. Combining (4.2) with (4.1) implies for any $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\sup_{x \in M} (u(x, t) - u_0(x)) \geq 0.$$

Combing the above inequality with the concavity of the equation, we can apply Lemma 1 by Phong-Tô [27]: there exists a uniform constant C_1 such that

$$\inf_{M \times [0, T_0]} (u - \underline{u}) \geq -C_1 \quad \text{for any } T_0 > 0.$$

Then combining this estimate with the Harnack type inequality in Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T_0]} u \leq C.$$

Since T_0 is arbitrary, the result follows. \square

4.2. The gradient estimate. We can use the following lemma by Phong-Tô which plays an important role in the gradient and second order estimates. In fact, it follows from the concavity of the function $\cot \theta(\chi_u)$.

Lemma 4.4. [27] *Let δ and K be two constants in Definition 2.5. There exists a constant κ_0 depending only on δ , K , \underline{u} , (M, ω) , and χ such that if*

$$1 + \lambda_1^2 > \max \left\{ (K + \max_M |\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}})| + 1)^2, \kappa_0^{-1} (1 + A_1^2) \right\},$$

then

$$(4.5) \quad u_t - \sum F^{i\bar{j}} (u_{i\bar{j}} - \underline{u}_{i\bar{j}}) \geq \kappa_0 \sum F^{i\bar{i}}.$$

We prove the gradient estimate following the argument in the elliptic case by Collins-Yau [8].

Proposition 4.5. *Let u be the solution of dHYM flow (1.7). There exists a uniform constant M_1 such that*

$$\max_{M \times [0, \infty)} |\nabla u|_\omega \leq M_1.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $\underline{u} = 0$; otherwise we write $\chi_u = \chi_{\underline{u}} + i\partial\bar{\partial}(u - \underline{u})$ and replace χ by $\chi_{\underline{u}}$ and u by $u - \underline{u}$.

We consider the function

$$\tilde{G} = |\nabla u|^2 \exp \psi(u)$$

where

$$\psi(u) = -D_0 u + (u + M_0 + 1)^{-1}$$

where M_0 is from Proposition 4.3 and D_0 is a constant to be determined later.

For any fixed time $T_0 < \infty$, assume the function \tilde{G} on $M \times [0, T_0]$ attains its maximum at (x_0, t_0) . If $t_0 = 0$, we have the desired estimate directly. Hence we assume $t_0 > 0$.

The function $G := \log \tilde{G} = \log |\nabla u|^2 + \psi(u)$ also attains its maximum at (x_0, t_0) . By the maximum principle, we have $\mathcal{P}G(x_0, t_0) \geq 0$.

Take the holomorphic coordinates (3.3) near x_0 . By (2.4)

$$F^{i\bar{j}}(x_0, t_0) = \frac{\csc^2 \theta(\lambda)}{1 + \lambda_i^2} \delta_{ij}.$$

We take the manipulation at (x_0, t_0) :

$$\begin{aligned} G_t &= \frac{u_{kt}u_{\bar{k}} + u_k u_{\bar{k}t}}{|\nabla u|^2} + \psi' u_t, \\ G_i &= \frac{u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} + u_k u_{\bar{k}i}}{|\nabla u|^2} + \psi' u_i = 0, \\ G_{i\bar{j}} &= \frac{u_{ki\bar{j}}u_{\bar{k}} + u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}\bar{j}} + u_{k\bar{j}}u_{\bar{k}i} + u_k u_{\bar{k}i\bar{j}}}{|\nabla u|^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{(u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} + u_k u_{\bar{k}i})(u_{i\bar{j}}u_{\bar{l}} + u_l u_{\bar{i}\bar{j}})}{|\nabla u|^4} + \psi' u_{i\bar{j}} + \psi'' u_i u_{\bar{j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \mathcal{P}G &= G_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} G_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \\ (4.6) \quad &= \frac{(u_{kt} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{k\bar{i}\bar{i}})u_{\bar{k}} + (u_{\bar{k}t} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{k}\bar{i}\bar{i}})u_k}{|\nabla u|^2} \text{ (denoted by (I))} \\ &\quad - \frac{F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}(u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}\bar{i}} + u_{\bar{k}i}u_{\bar{k}i})|\nabla u|^2 - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}|\nabla_i|\nabla u|^2|^2}{|\nabla u|^4} \text{ (denoted by (II))} \\ &\quad + \psi'(u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) - \psi'' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate term (I). By covariant derivatives formula and (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &\leq \frac{(u_{tk} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}k})u_{\bar{k}} + (u_{\bar{k}t} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}\bar{k}})u_k + 2F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |Rm||\nabla u|^2}{|\nabla u|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{(u_{tk} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},k})u_{\bar{k}} + (u_{\bar{k}t} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{\bar{i}\bar{i},\bar{k}})u_k + F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} (|\nabla \chi| + 2|Rm||\nabla u|)|\nabla u|}{|\nabla u|^2} \\ &= \frac{F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} (|\nabla \chi| + 2|Rm||\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \leq C_2. \end{aligned}$$

We then deal with term (II). Since $G_i = 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_i |\nabla u|^2|^2 &= \left| \sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} + \sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \right|^2 + \left| \sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} \right|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(\sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \sum u_{\bar{k}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right) \\ &= \left| \sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \right|^2 + \left| \sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} \right|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(- \left(\sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} + |\nabla u|^2 \psi' u_i \right) \sum u_{\bar{k}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right) \\ &= \left| \sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \right|^2 - \left| \sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} \right|^2 - 2|\nabla u|^2 \psi' \operatorname{Re} \left(u_i \sum u_{\bar{k}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{II}) &= -|\nabla u|^{-2} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \left(\sum |u_{ki}|^2 + \sum |u_{k\bar{i}}|^2 \right) + |\nabla u|^{-4} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \left| \sum u_{ki} u_{k\bar{i}} \right|^2 \\
&\quad - |\nabla u|^{-4} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \left| \sum u_k u_{k\bar{i}} \right|^2 - 2|\nabla u|^{-2} \psi' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \operatorname{Re} \left(u_i \sum u_{k\bar{i}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right) \\
&\leq -2|\nabla u|^{-2} \psi' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \operatorname{Re} \left(u_i \sum u_{k\bar{i}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\left| \sum u_{ki} u_{k\bar{i}} \right|^2 \leq \sum |u_{ki}|^2 |\nabla u|^2.$$

Since $u_{k\bar{i}} = w_{k\bar{i}} - \chi_{k\bar{i}} = \lambda_i \delta_{ki} - \chi_{k\bar{i}}$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{II}) &\leq -2|\nabla u|^{-2} \psi' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 \lambda_i + 2|\nabla u|^{-2} \psi' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \operatorname{Re} \left(u_i \sum u_{k\bar{i}} \chi_{k\bar{i}} \right) \\
&\leq 2|\psi'| |\nabla u|^{-1} \left(\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \lambda_i^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2|\chi| |\psi'| |\nabla u|^{-1} \left(\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly $\max\{\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}, \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \lambda_i^2\} \leq n \max_M \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})$ by (3.2). If we take

$$(4.7) \quad C_3 := 4n \max_M \csc \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0}) (1 + \max_M |\chi|),$$

then

$$(\text{II}) \leq C_3 |\psi'| |\nabla u|^{-1} \left(\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Inserting the estimates of (I) and (II) into (5.23), we obtain

$$(4.8) \quad 0 \leq \mathcal{P}G \leq -\psi'(-u_i + F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) - \psi'' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 + C_3 |\psi'| |\nabla u|^{-1} (F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_2.$$

We use the argument of Collins-Yau [8] and consider the two cases. Let ϵ_0 be a positive constant satisfying

$$(4.9) \quad \epsilon_0 < \min \left\{ (K + \max_M |\lambda(\chi_u)| + 1)^{-1}, \kappa_0^{1/2} (1 + A_1^2)^{-1/2}, \frac{1}{2} C_3^{-1} \kappa_0 (1 + A_1^2)^{-1} \right\}.$$

Case 1: $\sum_{i=1}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 \geq \epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2$. By the definition of ψ , $D_0 \leq -\psi' \leq D_0 + 1$ and $\psi'' = 2(u - \inf_M u + 1)^{-3}$. Hence, by (4.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq -\frac{2\epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2}{(u + M_0 + 1)^3} + (D_0 + 1) \left(|u_i| + \frac{\csc^2 \theta(\lambda)}{1 + \lambda_i^2} |\lambda_i - \chi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}| \right) + C_3 (D_0 + 1) \csc \theta(\lambda) + C_2 \\
&\leq -\frac{2\epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2}{(u + M_0 + 1)^3} + C(D_0 + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad |\nabla u|^2 \leq C(D_0 + 1) \epsilon_0^{-2} (u + M_0 + 1)^3.$$

Case 2: $\sum_{i=1}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}|u_i|^2 \leq \epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2$. In this case, since $\psi'' > 0$, inequality (4.8) implies

$$(4.11) \quad 0 \leq -\psi'(-u_t + F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) + C_3(-\psi')\epsilon_0 + C_2.$$

On the other hand, since $F^{1\bar{1}} \leq F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}$, we have

$$\epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2 \geq F^{1\bar{1}} |\nabla u|^2 = \csc^2 \theta(\lambda) \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{1 + \lambda_1^2}.$$

Hence we get

$$1 + \lambda_1^2 \geq \epsilon_0^{-2} \csc^2 \theta(\lambda) \geq \epsilon_0^{-2} > \max \left\{ (K + \max_M |\lambda(\chi_{\underline{u}})| + 1)^2, \kappa_0^{-1}(1 + A_1^2) \right\}.$$

Now we apply the key Lemma 4.4 to get

$$u_t - F^{i\bar{j}}u_{i\bar{j}} \geq \kappa_0 \sum_{i=1}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}.$$

Combined with (4.11), we get

$$(4.12) \quad 0 \leq \psi' \kappa_0 \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} + C_3(-\psi')\epsilon_0 + C_2.$$

Since $\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} > F^{n\bar{n}} = \frac{\csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_{\underline{u}})}{1 + \lambda_n^2} \geq (1 + A_1^2)^{-1}$ by Corollary 3.3, and $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2} C_3^{-1} \kappa_0 (1 + A_1^2)^{-1}$ by (4.9), the sum of one half of the first term and the second term in (4.12) is non-positive. Hence if we choose $D_0 > 2\kappa_0^{-1} C_2 (1 + A_1^2)$, we obtain the following contradiction.

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{2} \psi' \kappa_0 \sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} + C_2 \leq -\frac{D_0}{2} \kappa_0 (1 + A_1^2)^{-1} + C_2 < 0.$$

Therefore if we choose ϵ_0 satisfying (4.9) and $D_0 = 2\kappa_0^{-1} C_2 (1 + A_1^2) + 1$, we really obtain the desired estimate (4.10). \square

4.3. Second order estimates. In the elliptic case, Collins-Jacob-Yau [5] used an auxiliary function containing the gradient term which modifies the one in Hou-Ma-Wu [19]. Here our auxiliary function does not contain the gradient term.

Proposition 4.6. *There exists a uniform constant M_2 such that*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, \infty)} |\partial \bar{\partial} u|_\omega \leq M_2.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\underline{u} = 0$. Denote $w_{i\bar{j}} := \chi_{i\bar{j}} + u_{i\bar{j}}$ as before. For any fixed $T_0 < \infty$, we consider the auxiliary function on $S(T^{1,0}M) \times [0, T_0]$:

$$\tilde{H}(x, t, \xi(x)) = \log(w_{i\bar{j}} \xi^i \bar{\xi}^j) + \psi(u)$$

where $\psi(u) = -D_1 u + u^2/2$ with D_1 to be determined later. Recall M_0 is the uniform bound of $|u|$ in Lemma 4.3. Hence we have

$$(4.13) \quad -D_1 - M_0 \leq \psi' \leq -D_1 + M_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi'' = 1.$$

Suppose the function \tilde{H} attains its maximum at (x_0, t_0) along the direction $\xi_0 = \xi(x_0)$. If $t_0 = 0$, the estimate clearly holds. Hence we assume $t_0 > 0$. Take holomorphic coordinates (3.3) near x_0 which forces $\xi_0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}$. Extend ξ_0 near x_0 as $\tilde{\xi}_0(x) = (g_{1\bar{1}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}$. Then the function $H(x, t) = \tilde{H}(x, t, \tilde{\xi}_0(x))$ on $M \times [0, T_0]$ attains its maximum at (x_0, t_0) .

By the maximum principle, we have at (x_0, t_0)

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 \leq H_t &= \frac{u_{t1\bar{1}}}{w_{1\bar{1}}} + \psi' u_t, \\
 0 = H_i &= \frac{w_{1\bar{1},i}}{w_{1\bar{1}}} + \psi' u_i, \\
 0 \leq -H_{\bar{i}} &= -\frac{w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}}}{w_{1\bar{1}}} + \frac{|w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2}{w_{1\bar{1}}^2} - \psi' u_{\bar{i}} - |u_i|^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 \leq H_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} H_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} &= \lambda_1^{-1} (u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}}) + \lambda_1^{-2} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2 \quad (\text{denoted by (I)}) \\
 &\quad - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 + \psi' (u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

We begin to deal with term (I). By (3.5), we have

$$u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}} = u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{\bar{i},1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_i) R_{1\bar{1}\bar{i}\bar{i}}. \tag{4.16}$$

On the other hand, by (3.6) and by (2.9) since $\cot \theta(\lambda)$ is concave, we have

$$u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{\bar{i},1\bar{1}} \leq - \sum_{i \neq j} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} (1 + \lambda_j^2)^{-1} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) |w_{i\bar{j},1}|^2. \tag{4.17}$$

Since $\lambda_i + \lambda_j > 0$ for any $i \neq j$, the above inequality implies

$$u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{\bar{i},1\bar{1}} \leq - \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_i}{1 + \lambda_1^2} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_{i\bar{1},1}|^2 = - \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_i}{1 + \lambda_1^2} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2. \tag{4.18}$$

Using (4.16), (4.18) and (4.14), we can estimate (I) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(I)} &\leq -\lambda_1^{-1} \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_i}{1 + \lambda_1^2} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2 + \lambda_1^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2 + C_4 \\
 &= \lambda_1^{-2} \sum_{i=2}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2 \frac{1 - \lambda_1 \lambda_i}{1 + \lambda_1^2} + \lambda_1^{-2} F^{1\bar{1}} |w_{1\bar{1},1}|^2 + C_4 \\
 &= \psi'^2 \sum_{i=2}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 \frac{1 - \lambda_1 \lambda_i}{1 + \lambda_1^2} + \psi'^2 F^{1\bar{1}} |u_1|^2 + C_4.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.3, we have $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1} \geq \cot(B_0(u_0)/2)$, and without loss of generality we assume $\lambda_1 > 1/\cot(B_0(u_0)/2)$. Hence for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, $1 - \lambda_1 \lambda_i < 0$. For $i = n$, since

$|\lambda_n| \leq A_1$, we have

$$\frac{1 - \lambda_1 \lambda_n}{1 + \lambda_1^2} \leq \frac{1 + A_1}{\lambda_1}.$$

Hence

$$(4.19) \quad (\text{I}) \leq \psi'^2 F^{1\bar{1}} |\nabla u|^2 + \psi'^2 (1 + A_1) \lambda_1^{-1} F^{n\bar{n}} |u_n|^2 + C_4.$$

Inserting (4.19) into (4.15), we have

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (-1 + (1 + A_1) \psi'^2 \lambda_1^{-1}) F^{n\bar{n}} |u_n|^2 + \psi'^2 F^{1\bar{1}} |\nabla u|^2 + \psi' (u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) + C_4 \\ &\leq (-1 + (1 + A_1) (D_1 + M_0)^2 \lambda_1^{-1}) F^{n\bar{n}} |u_n|^2 \\ &\quad + (D_1 + M_0)^2 M_1^2 \csc^2 \theta(\lambda) (1 + \lambda_1^2)^{-1} + \psi' (u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) + C_4. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is negative if we assume

$$(4.21) \quad \lambda_1 > 2(1 + A_1)(D_1 + M_0)^2.$$

We further assume

$$(4.22) \quad 1 + \lambda_1^2 > \max \left\{ (K + \max_M |\chi_{\underline{u}}| + 1)^2, \kappa_0^{-1} (1 + A_1^2) \right\}.$$

Then by Lemma 4.4, we have

$$u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \geq \kappa_0 \sum_{i=1}^n F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \geq \kappa_0 \frac{\csc \theta(\lambda)}{1 + \lambda_n^2} \geq \kappa_0 \frac{\csc \theta(\lambda)}{1 + A_1^2}.$$

Hence if $D_1 > M_0$, (4.20) becomes

$$0 \leq (D_1 + M_0)^2 M_1^2 \csc^2 \theta(\lambda) (1 + \lambda_1^2)^{-1} - (D_1 - M_0) \csc^2 \theta(\lambda) \kappa_0 (1 + A_1^2)^{-1} + C_4$$

or

$$((D_1 - M_0) \kappa_0 (1 + A_1^2)^{-1} - C_4) (1 + \lambda_1^2) \leq (D_1 + M_0)^2 M_1^2.$$

We choose

$$D_1 = (1 + C_4) \kappa_0^{-1} (1 + A_1^2) + M_0.$$

Then we have

$$(4.23) \quad \lambda_1 \leq (D_1 + M_0) M_1.$$

Combining (4.21), (4.22) and (4.23), we have $\lambda_1 < C$ and then can obtain the desired C^2 estimate. \square

4.4. Proof of Theorem 4.1. The proof is the similar as the one in Phong-Tô [27]. We sketch it for completeness. We have proved the uniform a priori estimates up to the second order. By the concavity of $\theta_\omega(\chi_u)$, we have the uniform $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates and then the higher estimates hold.

Since u_t is uniformly bounded, there exists a constant C such that $v(x, t) := u_t(x, t) + C > 0$. Since v satisfies $v_t = (u_t)_t = F^{i\bar{j}}(u_t)_{i\bar{j}} = F^{i\bar{j}}v_{i\bar{j}}$ and $F^{i\bar{j}}$ is uniformly elliptic, we can apply the differential Harnack inequality (Cao [1] and Gill [13]) to get the following estimates

$$(4.24) \quad \max_M u_t(\cdot, t) - \min_M u_t(\cdot, t) = \max_M v(\cdot, t) - \min_M v(\cdot, t) \leq Ce^{-C^{-1}t},$$

where C is a uniform constant.

By Lamma 2.7 and inequality (4.1) we know that for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, there exists a point $x_0(t)$ such that $u_t(x_0(t), t) = 0$. Therefore, for any $(x, t) \in M \times (0, \infty)$, by (4.24), we have

$$|u_t(x, t)| = |u_t(x, t) - u_t(x_0(t), t)| \leq Ce^{-C^{-1}t}$$

and thus $u(x, t)$ converges exponentially to a function u^∞ . By the uniform C^k estimates of $u(x, t)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $u(x, t)$ converges to u^∞ in C^∞ and u^∞ satisfies

$$\theta_\omega(\chi_{u^\infty}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{arccot} \lambda_i(\chi_{u^\infty}) = \theta_0.$$

5. THE CONVERGENCE RESULT ON KÄHLER SURFACE WITH THE SEMI-SUBSOLUTION CONDITION

In this section, we consider the compact Kähler surface case when χ satisfies the semi-subsolution condition i.e. $\chi - \cot \theta_0 \omega \geq 0$. We prove Theorem 1.4, i.e.,

Theorem 5.1. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler surface and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form. Assume $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ and $\chi \geq \cot \theta_0 \omega$. Then there exist a finite number of curves E_i of negative self-intersection on M such that the solution $u(x, t)$ of dHYM flow (1.7) converges to a bounded function u^∞ in $C_{loc}^\infty(M \setminus \cup_i E_i)$ as t tends to ∞ with the following properties.*

- (1) $\chi + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u^\infty - \cot B_1 \omega$ is a Kähler current which is smooth on $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$;
- (2) u^∞ satisfies the dHYM equation on $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$

$$(5.1) \quad \operatorname{Re}(\chi_{u^\infty} + \sqrt{-1} \omega)^2 = \cot \theta_0 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_{u^\infty} + \sqrt{-1} \omega)^2;$$

- (3) $\chi_{u(x, t)}$ converges to χ_{u^∞} and u^∞ satisfies (5.1) on M in the sense of currents.

Here u_0 is a function in \mathcal{H}_{B_1} for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$. If $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$, we have $0 \in \mathcal{H}_{B_1}$ for any $B_1 \in (2\theta_0, \pi)$. If $\theta_0 \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$, we first show that the semi-subsolution condition implies the non-empty of \mathcal{H}_{B_1} for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler surface. Assume $\chi \geq \cot \theta_0 \omega$ and $\theta_0 \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$. Then for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$, there exists a smooth function u such that $u \in \mathcal{H}_{B_1}$.*

Proof. Let $\chi_\epsilon := \chi - \epsilon\omega$ with $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Define $\theta_0(\epsilon)$ as the principal argument of $\int_M (\chi_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2$. Then by definition,

$$\cot \theta_0(\epsilon) = \frac{\int_M \operatorname{Re}(\chi_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2}{\int_M \operatorname{Im}(\chi_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2}.$$

Since $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small we have $\theta_0(\epsilon) \in (0, \pi)$ and thus $\operatorname{Im} \int_M (\chi_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2 = 2 \int_M \chi_\epsilon \wedge \omega > 0$. By direct manipulation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \cot \theta_0(\epsilon) &= \frac{\int_M (\chi^2 - \omega^2 + \epsilon^2 \omega^2 - 2\epsilon \chi \wedge \omega)}{2 \int_M (\chi \wedge \omega - \epsilon \omega^2)} \\ &= \cot \theta_0 - \epsilon + \epsilon \left(\cot \theta_0 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \frac{\int_M \omega^2}{\int_M (\chi \wedge \omega - \epsilon \omega^2)} \\ &< \cot \theta_0 - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This shows $\chi_\epsilon \geq \cot \theta_0 \omega - \epsilon \omega > \cot \theta_0(\epsilon) \omega$. Hence by Jacob-Yau [22] there exists a smooth function u_ϵ solving

$$\operatorname{Re}(\chi_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \omega)^2 = \cot \theta_0(\epsilon) \operatorname{Im}(\chi_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \omega)^2.$$

Thus for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$, we have

$$\theta_\omega(\chi_{u_\epsilon}) < \theta_\omega(\chi_\epsilon + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_\epsilon) = \theta_0(\epsilon) < B_1$$

when ϵ is sufficiently small since $\theta_0(\epsilon)$ tends to θ_0 as ϵ goes to 0. \square

We will use the following proposition proved by Song-Weinkove [29].

Proposition 5.3 (Song-Weinkove [29]). *Let M be a Kähler surface with a Kähler class $\beta \in H^{1,1}(M, \mathbb{R})$. If $\alpha \in H^{1,1}(M, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\alpha^2 > 0$ and $\alpha \cdot \beta > 0$, then either α is Kähler or there exists a positive integer m , curves of negative self-intersection E_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$ and positive numbers a_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that*

$$\alpha - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i [E_i]$$

is a Kähler class.

Since $2 \cot \theta_0 [\chi] \cdot [\omega] = [\chi]^2 - [\omega]^2$, if we let $\tilde{\chi} = \chi - \cot \theta_0 \omega$, then we have

$$(5.2) \quad [\tilde{\chi}]^2 = [\chi]^2 - 2 \cot \theta_0 [\chi] \cdot [\omega] + \cot^2 \theta_0 [\omega]^2 = (1 + \cot^2 \theta_0) [\omega]^2 > 0.$$

Since $\tilde{\chi} \geq 0$, we also have

$$[\tilde{\chi}] \cdot [\omega] > 0,$$

otherwise $\tilde{\chi} \equiv 0$ which contradicts with (5.2). Hence we can apply Proposition 5.3 to get that there exists a finite number $m \geq 0$, curves of negative self-intesection E_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$ and positive numbers a_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $[\tilde{\chi}] - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i [E_i]$ is a Kähler class.

Let h_i be the hermitian metric on $[E_i]$ and s_i be a holomorphic section of $[E_i]$ which vanishes along E_i to order 1. Define

$$S := \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \log |s_i|_{h_i}^2,$$

then

$$(5.3) \quad \tilde{\chi} + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} S > 0.$$

Similar as the argument in Section 2 in [12] which is based on [10], [34] and [38], we get the following result.

Lemma 5.4. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler surface. Assume $\tilde{\chi} := \chi - \cot \theta_0 \omega \geq 0$ and $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. Then there exists a unique (up to adding a constant) bounded $\tilde{\chi}$ -PSH function v on M and $v \in C_{loc}^\infty(M \setminus \cup_i E_i)$ satisfying*

$$(5.4) \quad (\tilde{\chi} + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} v)^2 = \csc^2 \theta_0 \omega^2,$$

in the sense of currents.

5.1. The uniform C^0 -estimate. We have proved the uniform u_t estimate and thus along the flow we have $\theta_\omega(\chi_u) \in (\min_M \theta_\omega(\chi_{u(0)}), B_1)$.

Proposition 5.5. *Assume the same conditions hold as in Theorem 1.4. Then there exists a uniform constant M_0 such that for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, \infty)$*

$$(5.5) \quad |u(x, t)| \leq M_0.$$

Proof. For any T_0 , we will prove $\sup_{M \times [0, T_0]} |u(x, t)| \leq M_0$. We use similar auxiliary functions by Fang-Lai-Song-Weinkove [12] for the J-flow and Takahashi [33] for the LBMCF.

We first prove the upper bound of u using the solution v in Lemma 5.4. Consider

$$w_\varepsilon(x, t) := u - (1 + \varepsilon)v + \varepsilon S - C_0 \varepsilon t,$$

where C_0 is a large constant to be determined later. Since $w_\varepsilon(x, t)$ is upper semi-continuous on $M \times [0, T_0]$ with $w_\varepsilon = -\infty$ in $\cup_i E_i$, w_ε attains its maximum on $M \times [0, T_0]$ at (x_0, t_0) with $x_0 \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. Our goal is to show $t_0 = 0$.

At (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} w_\varepsilon = \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u - (1 + \varepsilon) \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} v + \varepsilon \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} S \\ &= \tilde{\chi}_u - (1 + \varepsilon) \tilde{\chi}_v + \varepsilon (\tilde{\chi} + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} S) \\ (5.6) \quad &\geq \tilde{\chi}_u - (1 + \varepsilon) \tilde{\chi}_v, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use inequality (5.3). Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ be the eigenvalues of $\chi_u(x_0, t_0)$ and $\tilde{\chi}_u(x_0, t_0)$ with respect to the metric ω respectively. Then $\lambda_i = \mu_i + \cot \theta_0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$. By direct manipulation, we have

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dw_\varepsilon}{dt}(x_0, t_0) &= \frac{du}{dt}(x_0, t_0) - C_0\varepsilon = \cot \theta(\chi_u(x_0, t_0)) - \cot \theta_0 - C_0\varepsilon \\ &= \frac{\lambda_1\lambda_2 - 1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} - \cot \theta_0 - C_0\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.8) \quad = \frac{\mu_1\mu_2 - \csc^2 \theta_0}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} - C_0\varepsilon.$$

Case 1: $\mu_1 \geq 0$ and $\mu_2 \geq 0$. By (5.6) and (5.4), we have

$$(5.9) \quad \mu_1\mu_2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{\tilde{\chi}_v^2}{\omega^2} = (1 + \varepsilon) \csc^2 \theta_0.$$

Inserting (5.9) into (5.8), we obtain

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dw_\varepsilon}{dt}(x_0, t_0) &\leq \frac{\csc^2 \theta_0}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \varepsilon - C_0\varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{\csc^2 \theta_0}{\cot \frac{B_1}{2} - \cot B_1} \varepsilon - C_0\varepsilon \\ &= -\varepsilon < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq \cot \frac{B_1}{2} - \cot B_1 > 0$ and choose $C_0 = \frac{\csc^2 \theta_0}{\cot \frac{B_1}{2} - \cot B_1} + 1$.

Case 2: $\mu_1 \geq 0$ and $\mu_2 \leq 0$. By (5.8), $\frac{dw_\varepsilon}{dt}(x_0, t_0) < -C_0\varepsilon < 0$.

Case 3: $\mu_1 \leq 0$ and $\mu_2 \leq 0$. Then $\lambda_1 = \mu_1 + \cot \theta_0 \leq \cot \theta_0$ and we get $\cot \theta(\chi_u(x_0, t_0)) = \lambda_1 - \frac{1+\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2} < \cot \theta_0$. Thus by (5.7), we have $\frac{dw_\varepsilon}{dt}(x_0, t_0) = \frac{du}{dt}(x_0, t_0) - C_0\varepsilon < 0$.

From the above three cases, we conclude $\frac{dw_\varepsilon}{dt}(x_0, t_0) < 0$ and thus $t_0 = 0$. Thus for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(x, t) \in (M \setminus \cup_i E_i) \times [0, T_0]$, we have

$$u(x, t) \leq u_0(x_0) - (1 + \varepsilon)v(x_0) + \varepsilon S(x_0) + (1 + \varepsilon)v(x) - \varepsilon S(x) + C_0\varepsilon t.$$

Fix $(x, t) \in (M \setminus \cup_i E_i) \times [0, T_0]$ and let ε tend to 0, since S is upper bounded, we have $u(x, t) \leq \max u_0 + 2 \max |v|$, which also holds for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, T_0]$ by continuity of $u(x, t)$. Since T_0 is arbitrary, $u \leq \max u_0 + 2 \max |v|$ in $M \times [0, \infty]$.

Next we prove the lower bound of u . Consider

$$\tilde{w}_\varepsilon := u - (1 - \varepsilon)v - \varepsilon S + C_0\varepsilon t,$$

where C_0 is a constant as above. Since $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(x, t)$ is lower semi-continuous with $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon = +\infty$ in $\cup_i E_i$, \tilde{w}_ε attains its minimum in $M \times [0, T_0]$ at (x_1, t_1) with $x_1 \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i$.

At (x_1, t_1) , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{w}_\varepsilon = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u - (1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}v - \varepsilon\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}S \\
 &= \tilde{\chi}_u - (1-\varepsilon)\tilde{\chi}_v - \varepsilon(\tilde{\chi} + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}S) \\
 &\leq \tilde{\chi}_u - (1-\varepsilon)\tilde{\chi}_v.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{5.11}$$

This implies

$$\mu_1\mu_2 \geq (1-\varepsilon)\frac{\tilde{\chi}_v^2}{\omega^2} = (1-\varepsilon)\csc^2\theta_0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d\tilde{w}_\varepsilon}{dt}(x_1, t_1) &= \frac{\mu_1\mu_2 - \csc^2\theta_0}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} + C_0\varepsilon \\
 &\geq -\frac{\csc^2\theta_0}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}\varepsilon + C_0\varepsilon > 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus \tilde{w}_ε attains its minimum at $t_1 = 0$ and the lower bound of u follows. \square

Combining the above uniform estimate and Proposition 2.8 yields

Corollary 5.6. *Along the dHYM flow, there exists a uniform constant C such that*

$$\operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u)) \leq C. \tag{5.12}$$

5.2. C^k -estimate in compact set $K \subset M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. Since $\chi - \cot\theta_0\omega_0$ is only nonnegative, we could not apply Lemma 4.4 directly. But we can prove a similar type inequality as in Lemma 4.4. In fact, we consider $\tilde{u} = u - S$. Since $\chi - \cot\theta_0\omega \geq 0$ and all E_i , $1 \leq i \leq m$ are negative self-intersection, we have $\chi - \cot\theta_0\omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}S > 0$, and thus there exists a small constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\chi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}S \geq (\cot\theta_0 + \delta)\omega. \tag{5.13}$$

We can prove the following useful inequality which is the key for us to prove the gradient estimate and the complex Hessian estimate.

Lemma 5.7. *Assume the same conditions hold as in Theorem 5.1. There exist uniform constants $K_0 > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$ such that if $|\lambda(\chi_u)| > K_0$, then*

$$u_t - F^{i\bar{j}}(u_{i\bar{j}} - S_{i\bar{j}}) \geq c_0.$$

Proof. Choose the normal coordinates at (x, t) as before. By (5.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_t - F^{i\bar{j}}(u_{i\bar{j}} - S_{i\bar{j}}) &= \cot\theta_\omega(\chi_u) - \cot\theta_0 - F^{\bar{i}\bar{j}}(w_{\bar{i}\bar{j}} - \chi_{\bar{i}\bar{j}} - S_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}) \\
 &\geq \cot\theta_\omega(\chi_u) - \cot\theta_0 - F^{\bar{i}\bar{j}}w_{\bar{i}\bar{j}} + (\delta + \cot\theta_0) \sum_{i=1}^2 F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{5.14}$$

By (3.3), we have $|\lambda_2| \leq A_1$. Recall that $\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) = \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 - 1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}$ and $\csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) = 1 + \cot^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u) = \frac{(1 + \lambda_1^2)(1 + \lambda_2^2)}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2}$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} &= \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 - 1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} - \frac{(1 + \lambda_1^2) \lambda_2}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2} - \frac{(1 + \lambda_2^2) \lambda_1}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2} \\ &= \frac{-2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \geq -C \lambda_1^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

For the other terms in (5.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\cot \theta_0 + (\delta + \cot \theta_0) \sum_{i=1}^2 F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} &\geq \cot \theta_0 \left(\frac{\csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_u)}{1 + \lambda_2^2} - 1 \right) + \delta \sum_{i=1}^2 F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - C \lambda_1^{-1} \\ &= \cot \theta_0 \left(\frac{1 + \lambda_1^2}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2} - 1 \right) + \delta \sum_{i=1}^2 F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - C \lambda_1^{-1} \\ &\geq -C \lambda_1^{-1} + \delta \sum_{i=1}^2 F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \\ &\geq -C \lambda_1^{-1} + \delta \frac{(1 + \lambda_1^2)}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2} \\ &\geq \frac{\delta}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

where we assume $\lambda_1 \geq K_0$ and choose K_0 sufficiently large.

Inserting (5.15) and (5.16) into (5.14), we obtain

$$u_t - F^{i\bar{j}}(u_{i\bar{j}} - S_{i\bar{j}}) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} - C \lambda_1^{-1} \geq \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

□

The following lemma is useful for us to prove the gradient estimate and the complex Hessian estimate.

Lemma 5.8. *There exist uniform positive constants $\Lambda_0 := \min_i \{a_i^{-1}\}$ and Λ_1 such that for any $x \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i$, it holds*

$$e^{\Lambda_0 S(x)} \left(|S(x)|^3 + |\nabla S|^2(x) \right) \leq \Lambda_1. \quad (5.17)$$

Proof. Since $S = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \log |s_i|_{h_i}^2$, there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla S|^2 \leq C \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^m |s_i|^{-2} \right). \quad (5.18)$$

Then we have (5.17). □

Proposition 5.9. *There exist uniform constants D_0 and M_1 such that for any $(x, t) \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i \times [0, \infty)$*

$$(5.19) \quad |\nabla u|_\omega(x, t) \leq M_1 \prod_i |s_i|_{h_i}^{-D_0 a_i}(x).$$

Proof. Since S is upper semi-continuous, there exists a uniform constant S_0 such that $\sup_M S \leq S_0$. We consider the function

$$G = \log |\nabla u|^2 + \psi(\tilde{u}),$$

where $\tilde{u} = u - S$ and

$$\psi(\tilde{u}) = -D_0 \tilde{u} + (\tilde{u} + S_0 + M_0 + 1)^{-1},$$

where $D_0 > \Lambda_0 := \min_i \{a_i^{-1}\}$ is a uniform constant to be determined later.

Since S is upper semi-continuous, we know that G is also upper semi-continuous. Suppose that $\max_{M \times [0, T_0]} G(x, t) = G(x_0, t_0)$. Since $S = -\infty$ on $\cup_i E_i$, we have $G(x, t) = -\infty$ on $\cup_i E_i$ and then $x_0 \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i$.

If $t_0 = 0$, we have for any $(x, t) \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i \times [0, T_0]$

$$(5.20) \quad e^{G(x, t)} \leq e^{G(x_0, 0)} \leq |\nabla u_0|^2 e^{D_0 S_0 + D_0 M_0 + S_0 + M_0 + 1} \leq M_{1,0},$$

where we used $S \leq S_0$ and $M_{1,0} := \max_M |\nabla u_0|^2 e^{(D_0+1)(S_0+M_0)+1}$. This gives the estimate (5.9).

In the following, we always assume $t_0 > 0$.

If $|\nabla u|(x_0, t_0) \leq 2|\nabla S|(x_0, t_0)$, by Lemma 5.8, we get the desired estimate as follows

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} e^{G(x_0, t_0)} &\leq C |\nabla u|^2(x_0, t_0) e^{D_0 S(x_0)} \\ &\leq 4C |\nabla S|^2(x_0, t_0) e^{D_0 S(x_0, t_0)} \leq M_{1,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in the following proof, we always assume $|\nabla u|(x_0, t_0) \geq 2|\nabla S|(x_0, t_0)$ and then we have

$$(5.22) \quad \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|(x_0, t_0) \leq |\nabla \tilde{u}|(x_0, t_0) \leq 2 |\nabla u|(x_0, t_0).$$

Taking the manipulation at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_t &= \frac{u_{kt} \bar{u}_{\bar{k}} + u_k \bar{u}_{\bar{k}t}}{|\nabla u|^2} + \psi' u_t, \\ G_i &= \frac{u_{ki} \bar{u}_{\bar{k}} + u_k \bar{u}_{\bar{k}i}}{|\nabla u|^2} + \psi' \tilde{u}_i = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.23) \quad 0 \leq \mathcal{P}G &= G_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} G_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \\
 &= \frac{(u_{kt} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{k\bar{i}\bar{i}})u_{\bar{k}} + (u_{\bar{k}t} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{k}\bar{i}\bar{i}})u_k}{|\nabla u|^2} \text{ (denoted by (I))} \\
 &\quad - \frac{F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}(u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}\bar{i}} + u_{k\bar{i}}u_{\bar{k}i})|\nabla u|^2 - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}}|\nabla_i|\nabla u|^2|^2}{|\nabla u|^4} \text{ (denoted by (II))} \\
 &\quad + \psi'(u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \tilde{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) - \psi'' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\tilde{u}_i|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

By the same estimate as that in Proposition 4.5, we have

$$(I) \leq C.$$

We then deal with term (II). Since $G_i = 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\nabla_i|\nabla u|^2|^2 &= \left| \sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \right|^2 + \left| \sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} \right|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(\sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \sum u_{\bar{k}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right) \\
 &= \left| \sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \right|^2 + \left| \sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} \right|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(- \left(\sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} + |\nabla u|^2 \psi' \tilde{u}_i \right) \sum u_{\bar{k}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right) \\
 &= \left| \sum u_{ki}u_{\bar{k}} \right|^2 - \left| \sum u_k u_{\bar{k}i} \right|^2 - 2|\nabla u|^2 \psi' \operatorname{Re} \left(\tilde{u}_i \sum u_{\bar{k}} u_{k\bar{i}} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(II) \leq -2|\nabla u|^{-2} \psi' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{u}_i \sum u_{\bar{k}} u_{k\bar{i}}),$$

Similar as the estimate in Proposition 4.5, we have

$$(II) \leq C|\psi'| |\nabla u|^{-1} \left(\sum F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\tilde{u}_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Inserting the estimates of (I) and (II) into (5.23), we obtain

$$(5.24) \quad 0 \leq \mathcal{P}G \leq -\psi'(-u_t + F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) - \psi'' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\tilde{u}_i|^2 + C|\psi'| |\nabla u|^{-1} (F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\tilde{u}_i|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C.$$

We divide two cases to do the estimate. Let $\epsilon_0 = \min\{\frac{1}{2}K_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{c_0}{2C \min_M |\sin \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})|}\}$ where K_0 is the uniform constant in Lemma 5.7 and C is the constant in (5.24).

Case 1: $\sum_{i=1}^2 F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\tilde{u}_i|^2 \geq \epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2$. Since $D_0 \leq -\psi' \leq D_0 + 1$ and $\psi'' = 2(\tilde{u} + S_0 + M_0 + 1)^{-3}$, by (5.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq -\frac{2\epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2}{(\tilde{u} + S_0 + M_0 + 1)^3} + (D_0 + 1)(|u_t|_{C^0} + \max_M \csc^2 \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})) \\
 &\quad + (D_0 + 1) \max_M |\csc \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})| |\nabla \tilde{u}| |\nabla u|^{-1} + C.
 \end{aligned}$$

From the above inequality, by (5.22), we have

$$(5.25) \quad |\nabla u|^2 \leq C_1(2M_0 + S_0 + 1 - S)^3.$$

By Lemma 5.8, we obtain

$$(5.26) \quad G(x_0, t_0) = |\nabla u|^2(x_0, t_0) e^{\psi(\tilde{u}(x_0, t_0))} \leq C_1(2M_0 + S_0 + 1 + |S|(x_0, t_0))^3 e^{D_0 S} \leq M_{1,2}.$$

Case 2: $\sum_{i=1}^2 F^{i\bar{i}} |\tilde{u}_i|^2 \leq \epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2$. In this case, since $\psi'' > 0$, by inequality (5.24), we have

$$(5.27) \quad 0 \leq -\psi'(-u_t + F^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}}) + C \max_M |\csc \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})| (-\psi') \epsilon_0 + C.$$

On the other hand, since $F^{1\bar{1}} \leq F^{2\bar{2}}$, we have

$$\epsilon_0^2 |\nabla u|^2 \geq F^{1\bar{1}} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 = \frac{1 + \lambda_2^2}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4\lambda_1^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2.$$

From this inequality and (5.22), we get

$$\lambda_1 \geq \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_0^{-1} = K_0.$$

Then we can apply our Lemma 5.7 to get

$$-u_t + F^{i\bar{j}}(u_{i\bar{j}} - S_{i\bar{j}}) \leq -c_0.$$

Inserting the above inequality into (5.27), we get

$$(5.28) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \psi' c_0 + \epsilon_0 C \max_M |\csc \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})| (-\psi') + C \\ &\leq D_0 \left(-c_0 + \epsilon_0 C \max_M |\csc \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})| \right) + C. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon_0 C \max_M |\csc \theta_\omega(\chi_{u_0})| \leq \frac{c_0}{2}$, if we choose $D_0 = 2c_0^{-1}(C+1)$, we get the following contradiction

$$(5.29) \quad 0 \leq -D_0 \frac{c_0}{2} + C = 1.$$

Thus this case can not occur.

In conclusion, for any $(x, t) \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i$, we have $G(x, t) \leq G(x_0, t_0) \leq M_{1,0} + M_{1,1} + M_{1,2}$ and then we obtain the desired estimate

$$(5.30) \quad |Du|^2(x, t) \leq M_1^2 e^{D_0 S(x)} = M_1 \prod_i |s_i|_{h_i}^{-2D_0 a_i}(x).$$

□

Proposition 5.10. *There exist uniform constant D_1 and M_2 such that for any $(x, t) \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i \times [0, \infty)$*

$$(5.31) \quad |\partial \bar{\partial} u|_\omega(x, t) \leq M_2 \prod_i |s_i|_{h_i}^{-2D_1 a_i}(x, t).$$

Proof. We consider

$$\tilde{H}(x, t, \xi(x)) = \log(w_{i\bar{j}} \xi^i \bar{\xi}^j) + \psi(\tilde{u})$$

where $\psi(\tilde{u}) = -D_1 \tilde{u} + (\tilde{u} + M_0 + S_0 + 1)^{-1}$ and $\tilde{u} = u - S$. Recall M_0 is the uniform bound of $|u|$ in Lemma 4.3 and S_0 is the upper bound of S . Hence we have

$$(5.32) \quad D_1 \leq -\psi' \leq D_1 + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi'' = 2(\tilde{u} + M_0 + S_0 + 1)^{-3}.$$

For any $T_0 \in (0, \infty)$, suppose the function \tilde{H} which is upper semi-continuous attains its maximum on $M \times [0, T_0]$ at (x_0, t_0) along the direction $\xi_0 = \xi(x_0)$. Since $\tilde{H} = -\infty$ on $\cup_i E_i$, we have $x_0 \in M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. If $t_0 = 0$, the estimate holds since S is upper bounded. Hence in the following we assume $t_0 > 0$.

Take holomorphic coordinates near x_0 such that (3.3) holds. Then the function $H(x, t) = \tilde{H}(x, t, \xi_0(x))$ attains its maximum on $M \times [0, T_0]$ at (x_0, t_0) .

At (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$(5.33) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \leq H_t &= \frac{u_{t1\bar{1}}}{w_{1\bar{1}}} + \psi' u_t, \\ 0 = H_i &= \frac{w_{1\bar{1},i}}{w_{1\bar{1}}} + \psi' \tilde{u}_i, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(5.34) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \leq H_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} H_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} &= \lambda_1^{-1} (u_{t1\bar{1}} - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} w_{1\bar{1},\bar{i}\bar{i}}) + \lambda_1^{-2} F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |w_{1\bar{1},i}|^2 \quad (\text{denoted by (I)}) \\ &\quad - \psi'' F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} |\tilde{u}_i|^2 + \psi' (u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \tilde{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}). \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument as that in section 4, (I) has the following estimate

$$(5.35) \quad (\text{I}) \leq \psi'^2 F^{1\bar{1}} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 + \psi'^2 (1 + A_1) \lambda_1^{-1} F^{2\bar{2}} |\tilde{u}_2|^2 + C.$$

Inserting (5.35) into (5.34), by (5.32), we have

$$(5.36) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \leq & (-\psi'' + (1 + A_1) \psi'^2 \lambda_1^{-1}) F^{2\bar{2}} |\tilde{u}_2|^2 + \psi'^2 F^{1\bar{1}} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 + \psi' (u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \tilde{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) + C \\ & \leq (-2(-S + 2M_0 + S_0 + 1)^{-3} + (1 + A_1)(D_1 + 1)^2 \lambda_1^{-1}) F^{2\bar{2}} |\tilde{u}_2|^2 \\ & \quad + (D_1 + 1)^2 |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 \frac{1 + \lambda_2^2}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2} + \psi' (u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \tilde{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) + C. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is negative if we assume

$$(5.37) \quad \lambda_1 > (1 + A_1)(D_1 + 1)^2 (-S + 2M_0 + S_0 + 1)^3,$$

We further assume

$$(5.38) \quad \lambda_1 > 2K_0.$$

Then by Lemma 5.7 and (5.32), we have

$$\psi' (u_t - F^{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \tilde{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) \leq -c_0 D_1.$$

Hence (5.36) becomes

$$0 \leq (D_1 + 1)^2 |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 \frac{1 + A_1^2}{(\lambda_1 - A_1)^2} - c_0 D_1 + C$$

or

$$(c_0 D_1 - C)(\lambda_1 - A_1)^2 \leq (D_1 + 1)^2 (1 + A_1^2) |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2.$$

We choose D_1

$$(5.39) \quad D_1 > c_0^{-1}(C + 1).$$

Then we have

$$(5.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &\leq (D_1 + 1)(1 + A_1^2) |\nabla \tilde{u}| + A_1 \\ &\leq (D_1 + 1)(1 + A_1^2) (|\nabla u| + |\nabla S|) + A_1 \\ &\leq (D_1 + 1)(1 + A_1^2) (M_1 \prod_i |s_i|_{h_i}^{-M_1} + |\nabla S|) + A_1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use (5.9).

By (5.37), (5.38) and (5.40), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &\leq 2K_0 + (1 + A_1)(D_1 + 1)^2 (-S + 2M_0 + S_0 + 1)^3 \\ &\quad + (D_1 + 1)(1 + A_1^2) (M_1 \prod_i |s_i|_{h_i}^{-M_1} + |\nabla S|) + A_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have at (x_0, t_0) ,

$$\lambda_1 e^{\psi(\tilde{u})} \leq C \lambda_1 e^{D_1 S} (M_1 \prod_i |s_i|_{h_i}^{-M_1} + |\nabla S| + (-S + 2M_0 + S_0 + 1)^3) + C.$$

If we choose $D_1 > (M_1 + 1) \min_i \{a_i^{-1}\}$, the above inequality has an uniform upper bound and thus we obtain the estimate (5.10). \square

Proposition 5.11. *For any compact set $K \subset M \setminus \cup_i E_i$ and positive integer k , there exists a uniform constant $C_{k,K}$ such that*

$$(5.41) \quad |u|_{C^k(K)} \leq C_{k,K}.$$

Proof. By the complex Hessian estimate in Proposition 5.10, the dHYM flow is uniformly parabolic. Since $\cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u)$ is concave, by the Evans-Krylov theory [9, 23], we obtain the higher order estimates in K . \square

As an application of Proposition 5.11, we first show

Proposition 5.12. *For any compact set $K \subset M \setminus \cup_i E_i$, $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ uniformly converges to 0 in K as t tends to ∞ .*

Proof. We first prove that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ pointwisely converges to 0 in $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. Since

$$(5.42) \quad \operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u(t))) - \operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u(0))) = \int_0^t \int_M \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} \right)^2 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_{u(s)} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2 ds,$$

by Corollary 5.6 we have

$$\int_0^\infty \int_M \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^2 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2 dt \leq C.$$

Since along the flow $\operatorname{Im}(\chi_u + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2 \geq c_0 \omega^2 > 0$, the above inequality gives

$$(5.43) \quad \int_0^\infty \int_M \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^2 \omega^2 dt \leq c_0^{-1} C.$$

If there exists $x_0 \in K$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x_0, t) \neq 0$, then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\{t_i\}$ which tends to ∞ such that

$$(5.44) \quad \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x_0, t_i) \right| \geq \epsilon_0.$$

Let U be a small neighborhood of x such that $U \subset M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. Then by Proposition 5.11, $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ and its time and space derivative are uniformly bounded in $U \times [0, \infty)$ and thus by (5.44), there exist a small neighborhood $V \subset U$ of x_0 and a uniform constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right| \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \text{ for any } (x, t) \in V \times [t_i, t_i + \delta].$$

This implies

$$\int_0^\infty \int_M \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^2 \omega^2 dt \geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{t_i}^{t_i+\delta} \int_V \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^2 \omega^2 dt \geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta \frac{\epsilon_0^2}{4} \operatorname{vol}_\omega(V) = \infty,$$

which contradicts with (5.43). Hence $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ point-wisely converges to 0 in $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$.

Let $K \subset \cup_{j=1}^N B_r(x_j) \subset M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. We can apply the differential Harnack inequality for $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ in every $B_r(x_j)$ to prove that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ converges in any compact subset K uniformly to 0. \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 5.1. Similarly as the proof by Fang-Lai-Song-Weinkove [12] and Takahashi [33], we have

Lemma 5.13. *Let $\{u_i\}$ be a sequence of smooth functions satisfying $\chi_{u_i} - \cot B_1 \omega > 0$ and $|u_i|_{C^0} \leq C$ for $C > 0$. Let u^∞ be a bounded $(\chi - \cot B_1 \omega)$ -PSH function on M . Let Y be a proper subvariety of M . Assume that u_i converges to u^∞ in $C_{loc}^\infty(M \setminus Y)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u^\infty)$ and $\mathcal{J}(u^\infty)$ are well-defined. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u_i)) &= \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u^\infty)), \\ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u_i)) &= \operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{CY}_{\mathbb{C}}(u^\infty)), \\ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}(u_i) &= \mathcal{J}(u^\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By the C^0 estimate proved in Proposition 5.5, there exists a sequence $\{t_i\}$ such that $u(\cdot, t_i)$ converges to a function $u^\infty \in L^\infty(M)$. By the C^k estimates in Proposition 5.11, by passing a subsequence (for convenience we still denote by t_i), $u(\cdot, t_i)$ smoothly converges to u^∞ in any compact subset of $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$ and thus $u^\infty \in C^\infty(M \setminus \cup_i E_i)$. Since $\chi_u > \cot B_1 \omega$, then $\chi_{u^\infty} - \cot B_1 \omega$ is a Kähler current and is smooth in $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. By Lemma 5.13 and Lemma 2.7, we have $\text{Im}(\text{CY}_\mathbb{C}(u^\infty)) = \text{Im}(\text{CY}_\mathbb{C}(u_0))$.

By Proposition 5.12, u^∞ satisfies (5.1) in $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$ and then $\theta_\omega(\chi_{u^\infty}) = \theta_0$ on $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. We can define $\chi_{u^\infty}^2$ and $\chi_{u^\infty} \wedge \omega$ as finite measures on M such that they do not charge pluripolar subsets. Thus $(\chi_{u^\infty} + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^2$ is well-defined and u^∞ satisfies the equation (5.1) on M in the sense of currents. Moreover, u^∞ is $\tilde{\chi}$ -PSH on M and satisfies the equation (5.4) in the sense of currents.

Finally, by the $C_{loc}^\infty(M \setminus \cup_i E_i)$ uniform estimate of $u(t)$ and the uniqueness of the equation (5.4), similar as the argument in [12], we have $u(t)$ converges smoothly to u^∞ on $M \setminus \cup_i E_i$. \square

5.4. \mathcal{J} functional. As an application of our dHYM flow, we prove the lower bound of the \mathcal{J} -functional in the following set.

$$\mathcal{H}_{B_1} = \{w \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}) : \theta_\omega(\chi_w) \in (0, B_1)\}.$$

Corollary 5.14. *Let (M, ω) be a compact Kähler surface and χ a closed real $(1, 1)$ form. Assume that $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ and $\chi \geq \cot \theta_0 \omega$, the \mathcal{J} -functional is bounded from below in \mathcal{H}_{B_1} for any $B_1 \in (\theta_0, \pi)$.*

Proof. For $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{B_1}$, let $u(t)$ be the solution of the dHYM flow $u_t = \cot \theta_\omega(\chi_u) - \cot \theta_0$ with $u(0) = u_0$. By Theorem 5.1, $u(t)$ converges to a bounded function u^∞ solving (5.4). Since \mathcal{J} is decreasing along the flow, we have

$$\mathcal{J}(u_0) \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}(u(t)) = \mathcal{J}(u^\infty).$$

Let v be a weak solution of (5.4) in Lemma 5.4. By the uniqueness, there exists a constant c_0 such that $u^\infty = v + c_0$. Since $\mathcal{J}(u^\infty) = \mathcal{J}(v)$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}(u_0) \geq \mathcal{J}(v).$$

\square

Acknowledgements: Zhang would like to thank Prof. Xinan Ma for constant help and encouragement. Fu is supported by NSFC grant No. 12141104 and 11871016. Zhang is supported by NSFC grant No. 11901102.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cao, H. D.: Deformation of Kähler metrics to Kähler-Einstein metrics on compact Kähler manifolds. Invent. Math. 81 (1985), no. 2, 359-372.
- [2] Chen, G.: The J-equation and the supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation. Invent. Math. 225 (2021), no. 2, 529-602.

- [3] Chu, J., Collins, T., Lee, M.: The space of almost calibrated $(1, 1)$ forms on a compact Kähler manifold. *Geom. Topol.* 25 (2021), no. 5, 2573-2619.
- [4] Chu, J., Lee, M., Takahashi, R.: A Nakai-Moishezon type criterion for supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation. *arxiv*: 2105.10725.
- [5] Collins, T., Jacob, A., Yau, S.-T.: $(1, 1)$ forms with specified Lagrangian phase: a priori estimates and algebraic obstructions. *Camb. J. Math.* 8 (2020), no. 2, 407-452.
- [6] Collins, T., Picard, S., Wu, X.: Concavity of the Lagrangian phase operator and applications. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 56 (2017), no. 4, Paper No. 89, 22 pp.
- [7] Collins, T., Xie, D., Yau, S. -T.: The deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation in geometry and physics. *Geometry and physics. Vol. I*, 6990, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2018.
- [8] Collins, T., Yau, S. -T.: Moment Maps, Nonlinear PDE and Stability in Mirror Symmetry, I: Geodesics. *Ann. PDE* 7 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 11, 73 pp.
- [9] Evans, L.: Classical solutions of fully nonlinear, convex, second-order elliptic equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 35 (1982), no. 3, 333-363.
- [10] Eyssidieux, P., Guedj, V., Zeriahi, A.: Singular Kähler-Einstein metrics. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 22 (2009), no. 3, 607-639.
- [11] Fang, H., Lai, M., Ma, X.: On a class of fully nonlinear flows in Kähler geometry. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 653 (2011), 189-220.
- [12] Fang, H., Lai, M., Song, J., Weinkove, B.: The J-flow on Kähler surfaces: a boundary case. *Anal. PDE* 7 (2014), no. 1, 215-226.
- [13] Gill, M.: Convergence of the parabolic complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 19 (2011), no. 2, 277-303.
- [14] Guan, B.: Second-order estimates and regularity for fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, *Duke Math. J.* 163 (2014), no. 8, 1491-1524.
- [15] Guan, B.: The Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds. [arXiv:1403.2133](#)
- [16] Han, X., Jin, X.: A Rigidity Theorem for the deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 13, 16 pp.
- [17] Han, X., Jin, X.: Stability of line bundle mean curvature flow, *arXiv*: 2001.07406.
- [18] Han, X., Yamamoto, H.: An ε -regularity theorem for line bundle mean curvature flow. [arXiv:1904.02391](#).
- [19] Hou, Z., Ma, X., Wu, D.: A second order estimate for complex Hessian equations on a compact Kähler manifold. *Math. Res. Lett.* 17 (2010), no. 3, 547-561.
- [20] Huang, L., Zhang, J., Zhang, X., The deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation on almost Hermitian manifolds. *Sci. China Math.* 65 (2022), no. 1, 127-152.
- [21] Jacob, A., Sheu, N.: The deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation on the blowup of \mathbb{P}^n . *arXiv*: 2009.00651.
- [22] Jacob, A., Yau, S. T.: A special Lagrangian type equation for holomorphic line bundles. *Math. Ann.* 369 (2017), no. 1-2, 869-898.
- [23] Krylov, N. : Boundedly inhomogeneous elliptic and parabolic equations in a domain. (Russian) *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* 47 (1983), no. 1, 75-108.
- [24] Leung, N., Yau, S. T., Zaslow, E.: From special Lagrangian to Hermitian-Yang-Mills via Fourier-Mukai transform. 209-225, *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.*, 23, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001.
- [25] Lin, C.: The deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation on compact Hermitian manifolds. *arXiv*: 2012.00487.
- [26] Lin, C.: The deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation, the positivstellensatz, and the solvability. [arXiv:2201.01438](#).

- [27] Phong, D. H., Tô, D.: Fully non-linear parabolic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* (4) 54 (2021), no. 3, 793-829.
- [28] Pingali, P.: The deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation on three-folds. *Anal. PDE* 15 (2022), no. 4, 921-935.
- [29] Song, J., Weinkove, B., On the convergence and singularities of the J-flow with applications to the Mabuchi energy. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 61 (2008), no. 2, 210-229.
- [30] Strominger, A., Yau, S. T., Zaslow, E.: Mirror symmetry is T-duality. *Nuclear Phys. B.* 479 (1996), 243-259.
- [31] Székelyhidi, G.: Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.* 109 (2018), no. 2, 337-378.
- [32] Takahashi, R.: Tan-concavity property for Lagrangian phase operators and applications to the tangent Lagrangian phase flow. *Internat. J. Math.* 31 (2020), no. 14, 2050116, 26 pp.
- [33] Takahashi, R.: Collapsing of the line bundle mean curvature flow on Kähler surfaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 27, 18 pp.
- [34] Tsuji, H.: Existence and degeneration of Kähler-Einstein metrics on minimal algebraic varieties of general type. *Math. Ann.* 281 (1988), no. 1, 123-133.
- [35] Wang, D., Yuan, Y.: Hessian estimates for special Lagrangian equations with critical and supercritical phases in general dimensions. *Amer. J. Math.* 136 (2014), no. 2, 481-499.
- [36] Yau, S. T.: On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation, I. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 31 (1978), no. 3, 339-411.
- [37] Yuan, Y.: Global solutions to special Lagrangian equations, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 134 (2006), no. 5, 1355-1358.
- [38] Zhang, Z.: On degenerate Monge-Ampère equations over closed Kähler manifolds. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2006, 18 pp.

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

Email address: majxfu@fudan.edu.cn

YAU MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES CENTER, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100084, CHINA

Email address: syau@tsinghua.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200444, CHINA

Email address: dkzhang@shu.edu.cn