

MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATIONS ON COMPACT HESSIAN MANIFOLDS

V. GUEDJ AND T. D. TÔ

ABSTRACT. We consider degenerate Monge-Ampère equations on compact Hessian manifolds. We establish compactness properties of the set of normalized quasi-convex functions and show local and global comparison principles for twisted Monge-Ampère operators. We then use the Perron method to solve Monge-Ampère equations whose RHS involves an arbitrary probability measure, generalizing works of Cheng-Yau, Delanoë, Caffarelli-Viaclovsky and Hultgren-Önnheim. The intrinsic approach we develop should be useful in deriving similar results on mildly singular Hessian varieties, in line with the Strominger-Yau-Zaslow conjecture.

INTRODUCTION

An affine manifold (M, ∇) is a manifold possessing a flat affine connection ∇ . Equivalently we may define an affine manifold as a manifold possessing a topological atlas (U_i, x^i) such that the transition functions $x^i \circ (x^j)^{-1}$ are affine maps.

A Hessian manifold (M, ∇, g) is an affine manifold with a Riemannian metric g which can be locally expressed as $g = \nabla d\phi$, where ϕ is a (locally defined) smooth convex function. Flat Riemannian manifolds provide examples of Hessian manifolds, many more can be found in [Sh07].

Compact Hessian manifolds (with mild singularities) are an import class of affine manifolds, which play a central role in the study of maximal degenerations of polarized Calabi-Yau varieties (X_t, g_t) . Indeed the Strominger-Yau-Zaslow conjecture [SYZ, GW00, LYZ05, KS06] predicts that (suitably rescaled) the metric spaces (X_t, g_t) converge in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense to a singular Hessian manifold M with the limiting metric satisfying a real Monge-Ampère equation on the smooth locus of M .

Real Monge-Ampère equations on Hessian manifolds with smooth data have been studied by Cheng-Yau [CY82], Delanoë [De89] and Caffarelli-Viaclovsky [CV01] (see also [PT20] for a parabolic approach). Given $0 < f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(M)$, they have shown that the equation

$$\det(g + \nabla du) = cf(x) \det g$$

admits a unique solution (u, c) , where c is a positive constant and $u \in \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(M)$ is a normalized g -convex function, i.e. $u + \phi$ is convex in an affine chart where $g = \nabla d\phi$. They have similarly shown the existence of a unique g -convex function u such that

$$\det(g + \nabla du) = f(x)e^u \det g.$$

Date: January 10, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J96, 53C25, 58J05.

Key words and phrases. Monge-Ampère equations, Hessian manifolds.

The purpose of this note is to extend these results to the case where the right hand side measure $\mu = f \det g \, dx$ can be arbitrarily degenerate. A similar study has been done by Hultgren-Önnheim in [HO19], by using the fact that $M = \Omega/\Gamma$ is the quotient of a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n by a subgroup of affine transformations, and by developping a variational approach. We develop here a more intrinsic approach, which one should be able to use when M has mild singularities, in line with the SYZ conjecture; it provides results of a different nature when M is not special.

Recall that, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, a **s -density** on M is a section of a line bundle whose transition functions are $\left| \det \frac{\partial x_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta} \right|^{-s}$, where $x_\alpha = (x_\alpha^1, \dots, x_\alpha^n)$ are local affine coordinates. A 1-density is thus a generalization of the notion of a *volume form*. If ψ is a smooth function, then

$$\det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x_\beta^i \partial x_\beta^j} \right) = \left| \det \frac{\partial x_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta} \right|^2 \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x_\alpha^i \partial x_\alpha^j} \right).$$

Thus $\det(g_{ij} + u_{ij})$ is a 2-density and

$$M_{\rho,g}[u] := \rho \det(g_{ij} + u_{ij}) dx^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n$$

is a globally well-defined measure on M whenever ρ is a (-1) -density and u is a \mathcal{C}^2 g -convex function. This is the Monge-Ampère measure of u with respect to ρ .

Using that any g -convex function can be uniformly approximated by smooth g -convex functions, we extend the definition of $M_{\rho,g}[u]$ to the set $\mathcal{K}(M, g)$ of all g -convex functions. Our first main result is then the following:

Theorem A. *Let μ be a probability measure on M and ρ a (-1) -density. There exists a unique g -convex function $u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ such that*

$$M_{\rho,g}[u] = e^u \mu.$$

The proof uses the Perron method, once an appropriate comparison principle (Theorem 2.14) has been established. One can solve similarly various degenerate equations of the type $M_{\rho,g}[u] = e^{F(u,x)} \mu$, under minimal assumptions on F . We only consider here the case $F(u, x) = \varepsilon u$, where $\varepsilon > 0$. Letting ε decrease to zero we show convergence of the corresponding solutions u_ε , establishing our second main result:

Theorem B. *Let μ be a probability measure on M and ρ a (-1) -density. There exists a unique constant $c > 0$ and a g -convex function $u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ such that*

$$M_{\rho,g}[u] = c\mu.$$

These results allows one to prove that any g -convex function is the uniform limit of smooth strictly g -convex functions, a result that can also be proved directly (see Proposition 1.10) by using convolutions and gluing techniques, the same way Demailly approximates quasi-plurisubharmonic functions in [Dem92].

We study topological properties of subsets of g -convex functions in section 1 (see Lemmata 1.8 and 1.9), define the twisted Monge-Ampère operator $M_{\rho,g}$ in section 2 and establish there the comparison principle (Theorem 2.14). We then prove Theorem A and Theorem B in section 3.

Acknowledgements. *We thank Jakob Hultgren for useful discussions. The authors are partially supported by the ANR under the "PIA" program ANR-11-LABX-0040 (research project HERMETIC), and by the CNRS through the IEA project PLUTOCHÉ.*

1. QUASI-CONVEX FUNCTIONS ON HESSIAN MANIFOLDS

1.1. Hessian manifolds.

Definition 1.1. An *affine manifold* is a differentiable manifold M equipped with a flat, torsion-free connection ∇ .

It is known that a manifold M is affine if and only if M admits an affine atlas (U_i, x^i) , i.e. a topological atlas such that transition functions $x^i \circ (x^j)^{-1}$ are in the affine group $\text{Aff}(n, \mathbb{R}) = \{\Phi : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto Ax + b \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$.

An affine manifold (M, ∇) is called *special* if it admits a volume form which is covariant constant with respect to the connection ∇ . Alternatively M is special if and only if it admits an affine atlas with transition functions in $SL(n, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}$.

The notion of convex function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on an affine manifold M is well defined, requiring that u is convex in "affine coordinates". However the only global convex functions are the constants if M is compact, as follows from the maximum principle. We are therefore going to consider the softer notion of quasi-convex functions, by allowing for a negative but smooth contribution from the Hessian of u . We shall measure the latter by comparing it with a Hessian metric:

Definition 1.2. A Riemannian metric g on an affine manifold (M, ∇) is called a *Hessian metric* if g can be locally expressed by $g = \nabla d\phi$. In this case (M, ∇, g) is called a *Hessian manifold*.

If (U_i, x^i) is an affine atlas the metric g is Hessian if $g = \nabla d\phi_i$ in U_i , where $\phi_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth strictly convex functions such that $\phi_i - \phi_j$ is affine in $U_i \cap U_j$.

By analogy with the concept of Kähler class, one makes the following:

Definition 1.3. Two Hessian metrics $g = \nabla d\phi_i$ and $\tilde{g} = \nabla d\tilde{\phi}_i$ are in the same class if $\tilde{\phi}_i - \phi_i = \tilde{\phi}_j - \phi_j = u$ is independent of i, j , hence defines a global function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Such a function u is then called g -convex:

Definition 1.4. A g -convex function on M is a continuous function $u \in \mathcal{C}^0(M, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\phi_i + u$ is convex in any open set U_i of M , where $g = \nabla d\phi_i$ in U_i .

The definition does not depend on the choice of local potentials for g : if $g = \nabla d\tilde{\phi}_i$, then $\tilde{\phi}_i - \phi_i$ is affine hence $u + \phi_i$ is convex if and only if so is $u + \tilde{\phi}_i$.

Example 1.5. Assume M is compact. If $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, it follows from the compactness of M that εu is g -convex for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, where $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ depends on the \mathcal{C}^2 -norm of u . We provide in Example 2.11 examples of non smooth g -convex functions.

Definition 1.6. We let $\mathcal{K}(M, g)$ denote the set of all g -convex functions.

In the sequel we endow $\mathcal{K}(M, g)$ with the \mathcal{C}^0 -topology. Basic operations on convex functions extend to g -convex ones:

- if u, v are g -convex then so are $\max(u, v)$ and $\log[e^u + e^v]$;
- a normalized sum of g -convex functions is g -convex;
- a uniform limit of g -convex functions is g -convex.

Here is recipe to cook up extra g -convex functions from known ones:

Lemma 1.7. *If u is g -convex and χ is convex with $0 \leq \chi' \leq 1$ then $\chi \circ u$ is g -convex.*

Proof. The assertion follows from an elementary computation which we provide for the convenience of the reader. If (x_1, \dots, x_n) denote local affine coordinates in some chart U , where $g = \nabla d\phi$ with $\phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ convex, we know that

$$\text{Hess}(u + \phi) := \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right)$$

and $\text{Hess}(\phi)$ are both non-negative. The function $v = \chi \circ u$ satisfies

$$\text{Hess}(v + \phi) = \chi'' \circ u \cdot \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \right) + \chi' \circ u \cdot \text{Hess}(u + \phi) + (1 - \chi' \circ u) \cdot \text{Hess}(\phi).$$

Since the matrix $\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \right)$ is non-negative, the positivity of $\text{Hess}(v + \phi)$ follows from that of $\text{Hess}(\phi)$, $\text{Hess}(u + \phi)$ and the normalization $\chi'' \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \chi' \leq 1$.

One can interpret this computation in the sense of distributions, or alternatively use convolutions in affine charts and proceed by approximation (see Proposition 1.10). \square

1.2. Compactness properties of g -convex functions. Let (M, ∇, g) be a compact Hessian manifold. In the sequel, fixing a Hessian class $\{g\}$, we seek for g -convex functions that solve certain (degenerate) Monge-Ampère equations.

We shall use the Perron method and proceed by approximation, this requires to establish good topological properties of families of g -convex functions. Sup-normalized g -convex functions enjoy strong compactness properties:

Lemma 1.8. *The set*

$$\mathcal{K}_0(M, g) := \{u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g), \sup_M u = 0\}$$

is compact. There exists $C_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ and all $x \in X$,

$$-C_0 \leq u(x) \leq 0.$$

This result has been established by Hultgren-Önnheim in [HO19, Proposition 3.4] by using properties of the universal cover of M and the fact that convex functions admit a Taylor expansion at order two at almost every point. We provide here a different and direct approach, that only relies on submean value inequalities.

Proof. The closedness of $\mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ is clear, as convexity and sup-normalization are both preserved under uniform convergence. We show herebelow that functions in $\mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ are uniformly bounded and use this information to establish, in Lemma 1.9, that they are uniformly Lipschitz. It follows therefore from Arzela-Ascoli theorem that $\mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ is compact in $\mathcal{C}^0(M, \mathbb{R})$.

Fix $u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ and fix two coverings $\{U_\alpha\}, \{U'_\alpha\}$ of M by open sets such that

- there exists affine coordinates (x_i^α) in U'_α ;
- g admits a smooth convex potential ρ_α in U'_α ;
- U_α is relatively compact in U'_α , hence ρ_α is uniformly bounded in U_α .

Pick $B(a, R)$ an affine ball in U_α and ℓ an affine line passing through a . It intersects $\partial B(a, R)$ in two points b^+, b^- . The function $v_\alpha = u + \rho_\alpha$ is convex in U'_α hence

$$v_\alpha(x) \leq \frac{1}{2R} \int_{b^-}^{b^+} v_\alpha(t) dt$$

Using spherical coordinates and letting ℓ vary, we obtain

$$v_\alpha(x) \leq \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(B(x, R))} \int_{B(x, R)} v_\alpha dV.$$

Using that ρ_α is uniformly bounded in U_α , we infer that for all $B(x, R) \subset U_\alpha$,

$$u(x) \leq \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(B(x, R))} \int_{B(x, R)} u dV + C_\alpha, \quad (1.1)$$

for some uniform constant $C_\alpha > 0$ (independent of u, x, R). This uniform lower bound is the key to more general uniform L^1 and L^∞ -bounds.

We first establish a uniform L^1 -bound, i.e. we claim there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$

$$-C_1 \leq \int_M u dV \leq 0.$$

Reasoning by contradiction, we assume there exists $u_k \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ such that $\int_M u_k dV \rightarrow -\infty$. Extracting and relabelling, we can assume that $\sup_M u_k = u_k(x_k) = 0$ with $x_k \rightarrow a \in U_\alpha$, for some α . We denote by G the set of those $x \in M$ such that there exists a neighborhood W of x and a constant C_W such that $\int_W u_k dV \geq -C_W$ for all k . The set G is open by definition. It is non empty as it contains the point a : indeed

$$0 = u_k(x_k) \leq \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(B(x_k, R))} \int_{B(x_k, R)} u_k dV + C_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(B(a, 2R))} \int_{B(a, R/2)} u_k dV + C_\alpha,$$

as follows from (1.1), the inclusions $B(a, R/2) \subset B(x_k, R) \subset B(a, 2R)$ and $u_k \leq 0$.

We finally claim that G is closed reaching a contradiction since then $G = M$ by connectedness. Indeed assume that $(a_j) \in G^\mathbb{N}$ converges to $b \in M$. Fix α such that $b \in U_\alpha$ and $R > 0$ small enough so that $B(b, R) \subset U_\alpha$. For j_0 large enough $a_{j_0} \in B(b, R/2)$ and we can find a neighborhood W of a_{j_0} such that $\int_W u_k dV \geq -C_W$; in particular $k \mapsto \sup_{B(b, R/2)} u_k$ remains bounded. It follows therefore from (1.1) again that $k \mapsto \int_{B(b, R/2)} u_k dV$ is bounded, hence $b \in G$, as claimed.

We now establish a uniform L^∞ -bound. It is a consequence of the previous L^1 -bound together with the following observation: there exists $A, B > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$,

$$A \frac{\int_M u dV}{\text{vol}(M)} - B \leq \inf_M u.$$

The latter can be obtained as follows: fix $u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ and b such that $u(b) = \inf_M u$. We fix α and $r > 0$ (independent of u) such that $b \in U_\alpha$ and $B(b, 4r) \subset U_\alpha$. Fix $a \in U_\alpha$

with $d(a, b) = r$ and $c \in B(a, r/2)$. The affine line joining b to c meets $\partial B(c, d(c, b))$ in a second point b' . It follows from the convexity of $v_\alpha = u + \rho_\alpha$ that

$$v_\alpha(c) \leq \frac{v_\alpha(b) + v_\alpha(b')}{2} \leq \frac{v_\alpha(b)}{2} + C_\alpha.$$

Integrating over $c \in B(a, r/2)$ and using that ρ_α is uniformly bounded yields the conclusion. \square

We now observe that normalized g -convex functions are uniformly Lipschitz:

Lemma 1.9. *There exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ and all $x, x' \in X$,*

$$|u(x) - u(x')| \leq C_1 d_g(x, x').$$

Here d_g denotes the Riemannian distance induced on M by g . We refer the reader to [HO19, Proposition 3.5] for a related result.

Proof. We use the same notations as in the proof of the previous lemma. The result is a simple consequence of the uniform bound if x, x' do not belong to the same chart U_α , so it suffices to treat this case.

Observing that

$$|u(x) - u(x')| \leq |[u + \rho_\alpha](x) - [u + \rho_\alpha](x')| + |\rho_\alpha(x) - \rho_\alpha(x')|,$$

we are reduced to establishing an appropriate result for (euclidean) convex functions. The latter follows from the following property: if $v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function in a ball $B(x_0, 2r)$ such that $m \leq v \leq M$, then for all $x, x' \in B(x_0, \delta)$,

$$|v(x) - v(x')| \leq \frac{M - m}{\delta} \|x - x'\|.$$

The proof of this fact is left to the reader. \square

1.3. Regularization of g -convex functions. We fix here again (M, ∇, g) a compact Hessian manifold of dimension n .

Proposition 1.10. *Let $u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$, there is a sequence $u_j \in \mathcal{K}(M, g) \cap C^\infty(M)$ such that u_j uniformly converges to u as $j \rightarrow \infty$.*

The proposition and its proof are inspired by Demailly's regularization theorem [Dem92] (see also [BK07]) for quasi-plurisubharmonic functions in complex geometry: we use convolutions in local charts, affine transitions and gluing techniques to construct global smooth g -convex approximants.

We first recall the standard regularization by convolution. Let $\rho(x) := \tilde{\rho}(|x|) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a radial function with $\tilde{\rho} \geq 0, \rho(r) = 0, \forall r \geq 1, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho d\lambda(x) = 1$, where $d\lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^n . Set $\rho_\delta = \delta^{-n} \rho(x/\delta)$ and consider

$$u_\delta(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(x - \delta w) \rho(w) d\lambda(w),$$

for $x \in \Omega' \Subset \Omega$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \text{dist}(\Omega', \partial\Omega)$. If $u \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$, then $u_\delta \in C^\infty(\Omega')$ and

$$\|u_\delta - u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega')} \leq \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)} \delta^\alpha.$$

In particular when u is convex we can take $\alpha = 1$.

We let $\max_\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the regularization of the max function,

$$\max_\epsilon(t_1, \dots, t_N) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \max(t_1 + s_1, \dots, t_N + s_N) \epsilon^{-N} \prod_{i=1}^N \gamma(s_i/\epsilon) ds_1 \dots ds_N, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\gamma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+)$ has compact support in $[-1, 1]$ and is such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma(s) ds = 1$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}} s \gamma(s) ds = 0$. It follows from the definition that \max_ϵ is non-decreasing in all variables, smooth and convex on \mathbb{R}^N .

The following lemma is left to the reader:

Lemma 1.11. *Let $A : U \rightarrow U'$ be an affine map between two open subsets U, U' of \mathbb{R}^n , and let u be a convex function on U . Then for any set $V \Subset U$ we can find a constant $\delta_V > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_V)$ the function $u^A := (u \circ A^{-1})_\delta \circ A$ is convex and well defined in a neighborhood of \overline{V} and there is a constant $C_V > 0$ such that*

$$\|u_\delta^A - u\|_{L^\infty(V)} \leq C_V \|u\|_{C^{0,1}\delta}.$$

Proof of Proposition 1.10. Let $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ be a finite cover with local affine charts of M and choose another finite cover with local affine charts $(V_i)_{i \in I}$ of M such that $V_i \Subset U_i$. For each $i \in I$ we can find a convex function ϕ_i in a neighborhood W_i of $\overline{U_i}$ such that $g = D^2\phi_i$ on W_i . Then the function $v_i := \phi_i + u$ is convex on U_i .

For any pair $(j, k) \in I^2$ such that $U_j \cap U_k \neq \emptyset$, we have two regularizations $v_{j,\epsilon}$ and $v_{k,\epsilon}$ of the restriction $v_j|_{U_j \cap U_k}$ using convolutions on local charts U_j and U_k respectively. Let A be the affine change of coordinates on $U_j \cap U_k$ from U_j to U_k . Then we have on $U_j \cap U_k$

$$v_{j,\epsilon} - v_{k,\epsilon} = v_{j,\epsilon} - v_{j,\epsilon}^A + (v_j - v_k)_\epsilon,$$

where $(v_j - v_k)_\epsilon$ is the regularization of $u_j - u_k$ using convolution on U_k . Using Lemma 1.11 and the fact that $v_j - v_k = \phi_j - \phi_k \in C^\infty$, we obtain

$$\|v_{j,\epsilon} - v_{k,\epsilon} - (\phi_j - \phi_k)\|_{L^\infty} \leq B\epsilon \quad \text{on } U_j \cap U_k.$$

Fix $C_1 \gg 1$. We define for each $i \in I$ a smooth function η_i on U_i such that $\eta_i = 0$ on V_i and $\eta_i = -C_1$ away from a compact subset of U_i . Suppose that $D^2\eta_j \geq -C_2g$ for some $C_2 > 0$. We define the function

$$w_j^\epsilon = v_{j,\epsilon} - \phi_j + B\epsilon\eta_j \quad \text{on } U_j.$$

Then $\varphi_\epsilon(x) = \max_\epsilon \{w_j^\epsilon(x) : x \in U_j\}$ is smooth and $(1 + C_2B\epsilon)g$ -convex. We infer that $u_\epsilon := \varphi_\epsilon/(1 + C_2B\epsilon) \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ uniformly converges to u as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

2. MONGE-AMPÈRE OPERATORS ON COMPACT HESSIAN MANIFOLDS

2.1. Definition of Monge-Ampère operators.

2.1.1. *Alexandrov definition.* Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n and $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function.

Definition 2.1. The subdifferential of u is the set-valued function $\partial u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ defined by

$$\partial u(x_0) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n, u(x) \geq u(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0), \forall x \in \Omega\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Given $E \subset \Omega$, we define $\partial u(E) = \cup_{x \in E} \partial u(x)$.

It follows from a theorem of Alexandrov that

$$\mathcal{S} := \{E \subset \Omega \mid \partial u(E) \text{ is Lebesgue measurable}\}$$

is a σ -algebra (cf. [Gut01, Chapter 1]). This motivates the following:

Definition 2.2 (Alexandrov). The Monge Ampère measure, Mu , of a convex function on Ω is defined by

$$\text{Mu}(E) = |\partial u(E)| \quad (2.2)$$

for any Borel set $E \subset \Omega$.

Here $|B|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of the Borel set B . For smooth convex functions one can check that this definition yields

$$\text{Mu}(E) = \int_E \det D^2 u(x) dx$$

(see [Gut01, Example 1.1.4]).

Example 2.3. The convex function $u : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto |x - a| \in \mathbb{R}$ is smooth off the point a and affine along lines through a , thus $\det D^2 u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{a\}$. On the other hand $\partial u(a) = B(0, 1)$, therefore $\text{Mu} = \delta_a$ is the Dirac mass at the point a .

We shall use the following basic results:

Lemma 2.4. [Gut01, Lemma 1.4.1] Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set and $u, v \in C(\bar{\Omega})$. If $u = v$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $u \leq v$ in Ω , then $\text{M}[v](\Omega) \leq \text{M}[u](\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.5. [Gut01, Lemma 1.4.7] If u and v are convex functions in Ω , then

$$\text{M}[u + v](E) \geq \text{M}[u](E) + \text{M}[v](E) \quad (2.3)$$

for any Borel set $E \subset \Omega$.

2.1.2. *The Rauch-Taylor point of view.* In [RT77] the authors introduce an alternative definition of the Monge-Ampère measure: for a smooth $u \in \mathcal{K}(\Omega)$ they observe that

$$\mathcal{M}u := du_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge du_n = \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right) dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n,$$

setting $u_j := \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}$. The mass of the Monge-Ampère measure $du_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge du_n$ is controlled by a Chern-Levine-Nirenberg inequality:

Lemma 2.6. *Let Ω be a subset in \mathbb{R}^n and fix $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega_2 \Subset \Omega$ relatively compact open subsets. Let u be a \mathcal{C}^2 convex function and $T = \phi dx^{k+1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n$ for some positive continuous function ϕ . There exists a constant $C = C_{\Omega_1, \Omega_2} > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega_1} du_1 \wedge \dots \wedge du_k \wedge T \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(E)}^k \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)},$$

where $E = (\Omega_2 \setminus \Omega_1) \cap \text{Supp}(\phi)$ and u_j denotes $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x^j}$.

We provide a proof for the reader's convenience.

Proof. The argument is similar to the (complex) Chern-Levine-Nirenberg inequality (see [GZ17, Theorem 3.9]). By induction it suffices to prove the inequality for $k = 1$.

Let χ be a non-negative smooth function on Ω such that $\chi = 1$ in Ω_1 . Since u is a \mathcal{C}^2 convex function, we have

$$du_1 \wedge \dots \wedge du_k \wedge dx^{k+1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n = \det[(u_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}] dx^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n \geq 0.$$

For $T = \phi dx^2 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n$ we thus get

$$\int_{\Omega_1} du_1 \wedge T \leq \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)} \int_{\Omega_2} \chi du_1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n.$$

Using Stokes theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_2} \chi du_1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n &= - \int_{\Omega_2} u_1 d\chi \wedge dx^2 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n \\ &= \int_{\Omega_2} u d\chi_1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n \\ &= \int_{\Omega_2 \setminus \Omega_1} u d\chi_1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing $C > 0$ such that $(\chi_{ij}) \leq CI_n$, we infer $\int_{\Omega_1} du_1 \wedge T \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(E)} \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}$. \square

If u_j are smooth convex functions uniformly converging to u , the measures $\mathcal{M}u_j$ have uniformly bounded masses thanks to Lemma 2.6 and one can show that they converge towards a measure $\mathcal{M}u$ independent of the approximants. Thus $\mathcal{M}u$ is well-defined for arbitrary convex functions and one can check that the two definitions are equivalent:

Proposition 2.7. *If u is convex in Ω then $\text{Mu} = \mathcal{M}u$.*

We refer the reader to [RT77, Proposition 3.3] for a proof.

2.1.3. The compact case. Let (M, ∇, g) be a compact Hessian manifold of dimension n .

Recall that, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, a **s -density** on M is a section of a line bundle whose transition functions are $\left| \det \frac{\partial x_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta} \right|^{-s}$, where $x_\alpha = (x_\alpha^1, \dots, x_\alpha^n)$ are local coordinates in some open set U_α of M . A 1-density is thus a generalization of the notion of a *volume form*.

Observe that if $x_\alpha = (x_\alpha^1, \dots, x_\alpha^n)$ are affine local coordinates with respect to ∇ and ψ is a smooth function, then

$$\det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x_\beta^i \partial x_\beta^j} \right) = \left| \det \frac{\partial x_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta} \right|^2 \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x_\alpha^i \partial x_\alpha^j} \right).$$

Thus $\det(g_{ij} + u_{ij})$ is a 2-density and $\det(g_{ij} + u_{ij})dx^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n$ is not a well-defined measure on M . To obtain a good definition we use a (-1)-density:

Definition 2.8. Let ρ be an (-1)-density of M and assume that u is a \mathcal{C}^2 g -convex function. We define the (relative) Monge-Ampère measure of u with respect to ρ by

$$M_{\rho,g}[u] := \rho \det(g + u_{ij})dx^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n.$$

Observe that $\rho_\beta \det\left(g + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_\beta^i \partial x_\beta^j}\right) = \rho_\alpha \left| \det \frac{\partial x_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta} \right| \det\left(g + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_\alpha^i \partial x_\alpha^j}\right)$, thus the measure $M_{\rho,g}[u]$ does not depend on the choice of affine coordinates, it is a globally well defined Radon measure on M . We simply denote this measure by $M_g[u]$ when $\rho = \det(g)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

If $u_j \in \mathcal{K}(M, g) \cap \mathcal{C}^2(M)$ uniformly converges to u , it follows from Lemma 2.6 that the measures $M_{\rho,g}[u_j]$ have uniformly bounded masses $\int_M M_{\rho,g}[u_j] \leq C_1$. We can extend the definition of the Monge-Ampère measure to arbitrary g -convex functions by approximation, following the method of Rauch-Taylor [RT77]:

Proposition 2.9. Assume $u_j, v_j \in \mathcal{K}(M, g) \cap \mathcal{C}^2(M)$ are such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u_j = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v_j = u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$, $M_{\rho,g}[u_j] \rightarrow \mu$ and $M_{\rho,g}[v_j] \rightarrow \nu$ in the topology of weak convergence of measures. Then $\mu = \nu$.

Using Proposition 1.10 we can thus set:

Definition 2.10. If u is an arbitrary g -convex function, we define

$$M_{\rho,g}[u] = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} M_{\rho,g}[u_j],$$

where u_j is any sequence of smooth g -convex functions converging to u .

Example 2.11. Let x be affine coordinates near $a \in M$ and χ a test function such that $\chi \equiv 1$ near a with compact support in this chart. Then $u : x \in M \mapsto \chi(x)|x - a| \in \mathbb{R}$ is smooth in $M \setminus \{a\}$ and convex near a , so εu is g -convex if $0 < \varepsilon$ is small enough.

The Monge-Ampère measure $M_{\rho,g}[\varepsilon u]$ satisfies $M_{\rho,g}[\varepsilon u] \geq C\varepsilon^n \delta_a = e^{u(a)+n \log \varepsilon + \log C} \delta_a$, so the g -convex function $v = \varepsilon u + n \log \varepsilon + \log C$ satisfies $M_{\rho,g}[v] \geq e^v \delta_a$: one says that v is a subsolution to the equation $M_{\rho,g}[w] = e^w \delta_a$. Taking finite convex combination of such functions and shifting by an additive constant, one can construct similarly g -convex subsolutions to the equation $M_{\rho,g}[w] = e^w \mu$, where $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^p c_i \delta_{a_i}$.

It follows from Stokes theorem that the Monge-Ampère measures $M_{\rho,g}(u)$ all have the same total mass if the manifold M is special. This is no longer the case on an arbitrary Hessian manifold, but we nevertheless have uniform bounds :

Lemma 2.12. There exist constants $0 < a \leq b < +\infty$ such that

$$0 < a \leq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{K}(M,g)} \int_M M_{\rho,g}(u) \leq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{K}(M,g)} \int_M M_{\rho,g}(u) \leq b.$$

Proof. Since $M_{\rho,g}(u) = M_{\rho,g}(u - \sup_M u)$, we can consider the infimum and the supremum over the set $\mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ which is a compact subset of $\mathcal{C}^0(M, \mathbb{R})$ (see Lemma 1.9).

Since the map $u \mapsto m(u) = \int_M M_{\rho,g}(u)$ is continuous and takes finite values, it suffices to check that $m(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$. This is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.14 below: if $M_{\rho,g}(u) = 0$ then for any constant function $A \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$, one gets

$$0 = e^{-u} M_{\rho,g}(u) \leq e^{-A} M_{\rho,g}(A),$$

hence $u \geq A$, which leads to a contradiction as soon as $A > \sup_M u$. \square

2.2. Comparison principles. We first establish a local comparison principle.

Lemma 2.13. *Let u, v be two convex functions on Ω such that*

$$e^{-u} M[u] \geq e^{-v} M[v]. \quad (2.4)$$

and $u - v$ achieves a local strict maximum at $x_0 \in \Omega$. Then $u(x_0) \leq v(x_0)$.

Proof. It follows from the hypothesis that there is $D \subset \Omega$ such that $\sup_{\partial D}(u - v) = b$ and $\sup_D(u - v) = u(x_0) - v(x_0) = a$ with $a > b$. Assume by contradiction that $a > 0$. Shrinking D we can assume that $b \geq 0$. Define

$$u_\delta = u + \delta \|x - x_0\|^2 - \frac{a + b}{2},$$

with $\delta > 0$ satisfying $\delta(\text{diam}(D))^2 < (a - b)/2 \leq (a + b)/2$. Therefore we have $u_\delta \leq u$ in D . The open set $B = \{x \in D : u_\delta > v\}$ is non empty as it contains x_0 . For any $x \in \partial D$ we have $u_\delta(x) < v(x)$, therefore $\partial B = \{x \in D : u_\delta = v\}$.

It follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$M[v](B) \geq M[u_\delta](B) \geq M[u](B) + (2\delta)^n |B|. \quad (2.5)$$

On the other hand, using inequality (2.4) and the fact that $v \leq u_\delta \leq u$ in B , we get

$$M[v](B) \leq (e^{v-u} M[u])(B) \leq M[u](B).$$

Using (2.5) we infer $|B| = 0$, a contradiction. \square

We now prove a global comparison principle:

Theorem 2.14. *Let (M, g, ∇) be a compact Hessian manifold and u and v be two g -convex functions such that*

$$e^{-u} M_{\rho,g}[u] \geq e^{-v} M_{\rho,g}[v] \quad (2.6)$$

in the sense of measures. Then $u \leq v$.

Proof. Let h be a smooth strictly g -convex function such that $g + \nabla dh \geq \epsilon g$ and $h \leq u$. For any $0 < \delta < 1$, we consider $u_\delta = (1 - \delta)u + \delta h + n \log(1 - \delta)$. Our goal is show that $u_\delta \leq v$ for all $0 < \delta < 1$.

Suppose that $\max_M(u_\delta - v) = u_\delta(x_\delta) - v(x_\delta)$. We take a neighborhood D of x_δ and consider $\tilde{u}_\delta = \phi + u_\delta$, $\tilde{v} = \phi + v$ where $g = \nabla d\phi$ in D . Define

$$\tilde{u}_\alpha = \tilde{u}_\delta - \alpha \|x - x_\delta\|^2 = (1 - \delta)(\phi + u) + \delta(\phi + h) - \alpha \|x - x_\delta\|^2 + n \log(1 - \delta)$$

with $\alpha > 0$ such that $\delta(\phi + h) - \alpha\|x - x_\delta\|^2$ is convex (we use here the fact that h is strictly g -convex). Then $\tilde{u}_\alpha - \tilde{v}$ achieves a strict maximum at x_δ on D . Moreover in D we also have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\tilde{u}_\alpha} M[\tilde{u}_\alpha] &\geq e^{-\tilde{u}_\alpha} (1 - \delta)^n M[u + \phi] \\ &\geq e^{-u - \phi} M[u + \phi] \\ &\geq e^{-v - \phi} M[v + \phi] = e^{-\tilde{v}} M[\tilde{v}], \end{aligned}$$

where we use (2.6) for the third inequality. Applying Lemma 2.13 to \tilde{u}_α and \tilde{v} we get $\tilde{u}_\alpha(x_\delta) - \tilde{v}(x_\delta) \leq 0$. Letting $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $u_\delta \leq v$ on M . Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we get $u \leq v$ on M as required. \square

The maximum of two g -convex functions is also g -convex. The following inequality allows one to bound from below the corresponding Monge-Ampère measure:

Lemma 2.15. *Let u, v be two g -convex functions then*

$$M_{\rho,g}[\max(u, v)] \geq 1_{\{u \geq v\}} M_{\rho,g}[u] + 1_{\{u < v\}} M_{\rho,g}[v].$$

Proof. The set $\Omega := \{u < v\}$ is an open set of M since u and v are continuous, hence

$$1_{\{u < v\}} M_{\rho,g}[\max(u, v)] = 1_{\{u < v\}} M_{\rho,g}[v].$$

We infer that $M_{\rho,g}[\max(u, v)] \geq 1_{\{u > v\}} M_{\rho,g}[u] + 1_{\{u < v\}} M_{\rho,g}[v]$. Thus we are done if $\mu(\{u = v\}) = 0$ with $\mu = M_{\rho,g}[u]$.

We claim that $\mu(\{u = v + \epsilon\}) = 0$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R} \setminus S_\mu$ where S_μ is at most countable. Assuming this we can find a sequence ϵ_j which converge to 0 such that $\mu(\{u = v + \epsilon_j\}) = 0$. Replacing v by $v + \epsilon_j$ the argument yields

$$M_{\rho,g}[\max(u, v + \epsilon_j)] \geq 1_{\{u \geq v + \epsilon_j\}} M_{\rho,g}[u] + 1_{\{u < v + \epsilon_j\}} M_{\rho,g}[v],$$

we obtain the desired inequality by letting $\epsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ and using Proposition 2.9.

We now verify that the set $\{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(\{u = v + \epsilon\}) > 0\}$ is at most countable. Observe that the function $f : t \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mu(\{u < v + t\}) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is increasing and left continuous since $\mu = M_{\rho,g}[u]$ is a Borel measure. Moreover

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \epsilon^+} f(t) = \mu(\{u \leq v + \epsilon\}),$$

hence f is continuous at ϵ unless $\mu(\{u = v + \epsilon\}) > 0$. Therefore S_μ is the set of discontinuity of f , hence S_μ is at most countable. \square

3. RESOLUTION OF MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATIONS

Let (M, ∇, g) be a compact Hessian manifold of dimension n . In this section we prove Theorem A and Theorem B from the introduction.

3.1. Perron method.

Theorem 3.1. *Let μ be a probability measure on M and ρ a (-1) -density. There exists a unique g -convex function $u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ such that*

$$M_{\rho, g}[u] = e^u \mu.$$

Moreover if μ_j are probability measures that weakly converge to a probability measure μ , then the unique solutions $u_j \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ to $M_{\rho, g}[u_j] = e^{u_j} \mu_j$ uniformly converge to the unique solution $u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ of $M_{\rho, g}[u] = e^u \mu$.

Proof. We are going to apply the Perron method, showing that the envelope of subsolutions is the unique solution to this equation.

Step 1. We start by treating the case when $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^p c_i \delta_{a_i}$ is a sum of Dirac masses, where $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $c_1, \dots, c_p > 0$ are positive reals such that $\sum_{i=1}^p c_i = 1$, and a_1, \dots, a_p are distinct points in X . We let \mathcal{F} denote the family of subsolutions, i.e.

$$\mathcal{F} = \{u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g), M_{\rho, g}[u] \geq e^u \mu\}.$$

Here are basic properties of \mathcal{F} :

- it follows from Example 2.11 that \mathcal{F} is not empty, we pick $u_0 \in \mathcal{F}$;
- we claim that \mathcal{F} is uniformly bounded from above. Indeed fix $u \in \mathcal{F}$ and set $v = u - \sup_M u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$. It follows from Lemma 1.8 that $-C_0 \leq v(x)$ for all $x \in M$, hence in particular $\sup_M u \leq u(a_1) + C_0$. Lemma 2.12 now yields

$$b \geq \int_M M_{\rho, g}[u] \geq \sum_{i=1}^p c_i e^{u(a_i)} \geq c_1 e^{u(a_1)}$$

since u is a subsolution, hence $\sup_M u \leq \log(b/c_1) + C_0$.

- \mathcal{F} is closed and stable under maximum: if $u, v \in \mathcal{F}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\rho, g}[\max(u, v)] &\geq 1_{\{u \geq v\}} M_{\rho, g}[u] + 1_{\{u < v\}} M_{\rho, g}[v] \\ &\geq 1_{\{u \geq v\}} e^u \mu + 1_{\{u < v\}} e^v \mu \\ &= 1_{\{u \geq v\}} e^{\max(u, v)} \mu + 1_{\{u < v\}} e^{\max(u, v)} \mu = e^{\max(u, v)} \mu, \end{aligned}$$

as follows from Lemma 2.15.

It follows therefore from Lemma 1.9 and Arzela-Ascoli theorem that

$$\mathcal{F}_{u_0} = \{u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g), M_{\rho, g}[u] \geq e^u \mu \text{ and } u \geq u_0\}.$$

is a compact subset of $\mathcal{K}(M, g)$. Thus the envelope of subsolutions $U = \sup_{\mathcal{F}} u = \sup_{\mathcal{F}_{u_0}} u$ is a g -convex function which is still a subsolution.

We finally conclude that U is actually a solution of the equation through a balayage process. We pick a small euclidean ball B in some affine chart such that ∂B does not contain any point a_j , and we solve the local Dirichlet problem $M_{\rho, g}(v) = e^v \mu$ in B with U as boundary data. The local solution exists by (a slight generalization of) [Gut01, Theorem 1.6.2] and glue with U in $M \setminus B$ to provide yet another subsolution. It thus coincides with U , hence U solves the equation in any such ball B , hence in the whole of M . The uniqueness follows from the comparison principle (Theorem 2.14).

Step 2. We now proceed by approximation in order to treat the general case. Let $\mu_p = \sum_{i=1}^p c_{i,p} \delta_{a_{i,p}}$ be finite combination of Dirac masses that weakly approximate $\mu = \lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_p$. It follows from previous step that there exists a unique g -convex function $u_p \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ such that $M_{\rho,g}[u_p] = e^{u_p} \mu_p$.

We claim that $\sup_M u_p$ is uniformly bounded. We set $v_p = u_p - \sup_M u_p \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ and recall from Lemma 2.12 that the Monge-Ampère mass of $M_{\rho,g}(u_p) = M_{\rho,g}(v_p)$ is uniformly bounded from above and below, away from zero. We infer

$$a \leq \int_M M_{\rho,g}(u_p) = \int_M e^{u_p} d\mu_p \leq e^{\sup_M u_p} \implies \log a \leq \sup_M u_p.$$

Using that $v_p \geq -C_0$ (see Lemma 1.8), we also obtain

$$e^{\sup_M u_p} e^{-C_0} \leq \int_M e^{u_p} d\mu_p = \int_M M_{\rho,g}(u_p) \leq b \implies \sup_M u_p \leq C_0 + \log b.$$

Lemma 1.8 ensures that u_p is uniformly bounded on M , while Lemma 1.9 ensures that the u_p 's are uniformly Lipschitz, hence relatively compact for the \mathcal{C}^0 -topology. We can thus extract a convergent subsequence $u_{p_j} \rightarrow u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$. Since $M_{\rho,g}$ is continuous for the \mathcal{C}^0 -topology, we infer

$$M_{\rho,g}[u] = e^u \mu.$$

The uniqueness follows again from the comparison principle (Theorem 2.14).

Step 3. We finally prove the stability property. Let μ_j be probability measures that weakly converge to a probability measure μ . Let $u_j \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ be the unique solutions to $M_{\rho,g}[u_j] = e^{u_j} \mu_j$ and let $u \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ the unique solution of $M_{\rho,g}[u] = e^u \mu$.

The same reasoning as above shows that $\sup_M u_j$ is uniformly bounded, hence (u_j) is relatively compact. A subsequence u_{j_k} thus uniformly converge to some function $v \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$. Now $M_{\rho,g}[u_{j_k}] \rightarrow M_{\rho,g}[v]$ and $e^{u_{j_k}} \mu_{j_k} \rightarrow e^v \mu$, so $v = u$ by uniqueness \square

3.2. The flat equation. As the proof of Theorem 3.1 shows, a similar result holds for more general equations of the form $M_{\rho,g}[u] = F(x, u)\mu$, with appropriate assumptions on the function F . A straightforward generalization that we shall need is that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a unique g -convex function $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ such that

$$M_{\rho,g}[u_\varepsilon] = e^{\varepsilon u_\varepsilon} \mu.$$

We now use such perturbations to solve another degenerate Monge-Ampère equation:

Theorem 3.2. *Let μ be a probability measure on M and ρ a (-1) -density. There exist a unique constant $c > 0$ and a g -convex function $u \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$ such that*

$$M_{\rho,g}[u] = c\mu.$$

When M is special the preservation of Monge-Ampère masses ensures that the constant c is determined by

$$\int_M M_{\rho,g}(0) = c.$$

The uniqueness of c is slightly more involved in the general case.

Proof. Existence of (c, u) . We first show the existence of the solution. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{K}(M, g)$ be the unique g -convex function such that

$$M_{\rho, g}[u_\varepsilon] = e^{\varepsilon u_\varepsilon} \mu.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.12 that

$$a \leq \int_M M_{\rho, g}[u_\varepsilon] = \int_M e^{\varepsilon u_\varepsilon} \mu \leq e^{\varepsilon \sup_M u_\varepsilon},$$

hence $\varepsilon \mapsto \varepsilon \sup_M u_\varepsilon$ is uniformly bounded below.

Lemma 2.12 again yields a bound from above on $\int_M e^{\varepsilon u_\varepsilon} d\mu \leq b$. It follows therefore from the concavity of the logarithm that

$$\int_M \varepsilon u_\varepsilon d\mu \leq \log b.$$

Since $\varepsilon u_\varepsilon$ is g -convex for all $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, Lemma 1.8 ensures that $\int_M \varepsilon u_\varepsilon d\mu$ and $\varepsilon \sup_M u_\varepsilon$ are uniformly comparable, hence $\varepsilon \mapsto \varepsilon \sup_M u_\varepsilon$ is uniformly bounded as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$.

The family $v_\varepsilon = \varepsilon u_\varepsilon$ is thus relatively compact in $\mathcal{K}(M, g)$ by Lemma 1.9, so we can extract a sequence v_{ε_j} which uniformly converges to a g -convex function v . Since v_{ε_j} is actually $\varepsilon_j g$ -convex, the function v is $0g$ -convex hence $v \equiv c$ is constant by the maximum principle.

The family $\varepsilon \mapsto w_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon - \sup_M u_\varepsilon$ is relatively compact by Lemmata 1.8 and 1.9, so we can extract $w_{\varepsilon_{j_k}} \rightarrow u$ in $\mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$. Since $M_{\rho, g}$ is continuous for the uniform topology, we conclude that

$$M_{\rho, g}[u] = \lim_k M_{\rho, g}[w_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}] = \lim_k e^{\varepsilon_{j_k} u_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}} \mu = c\mu.$$

Uniqueness of c . Suppose that u, v are two g -convex functions satisfying $M_{\rho, g}[u] = c_1\mu$ and $M_{\rho, g}[v] = c_2\mu$. We now show that $c_1 = c_2$. Assume by contradiction that $c_1 > c_2$, so there is $\delta > 0$ such that $(1 - \delta)^n c_1 > c_2$. Set $u_\delta = (1 - \delta)u$ and pick $x_\delta \in M$ such that

$$\max_M (u_\delta - v) = u_\delta(x_\delta) - v(x_\delta) =: A.$$

Let D be a small neighborhood of x_δ such that $d_g(x_\delta, \partial D) \geq d/3$ where $d = \text{diam}(D)$. Let ϕ be a potential of g in D , i.e $g = \nabla d\phi$. Set $\hat{u}_\delta = \phi + u_\delta$, $\hat{u} = \phi + u$, $\hat{v} = \phi + v$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_{\delta, \epsilon} &= \hat{u}_\delta - \epsilon \|x - x_\delta\|^2 - (A - \epsilon d^2/10) \\ &= \phi + (1 - \delta)u - \epsilon \|x - x_\delta\|^2 - (A - \epsilon d^2/10), \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ is so small so that $\nabla d(\delta\phi - \epsilon \|x - x_\delta\|^2) \geq (\delta/2)g$. Observe that

$$\max_{\bar{D}} (\hat{u}_{\delta, \epsilon} - \hat{v}) = \hat{u}_{\delta, \epsilon}(x_\delta) - \hat{v}(x_\delta) = \epsilon d^2/10 > 0$$

and

$$\sup_{\partial D} (\hat{u}_{\delta, \epsilon} - \hat{v}) \leq A - \epsilon d^2/9 - (A - \epsilon d^2/10) < 0.$$

Thus the set $B := \{x \in \bar{D} \mid \hat{u}_{\delta, \epsilon} > \hat{v}\}$ is open, non empty (as it contains x_δ) and $B \cap \partial D = \emptyset$. We infer $\partial B = \{x \in D \mid \hat{u}_{\delta, \epsilon} = \hat{v}\}$ and Lemma 2.4 ensures that

$$M[\hat{v}](B) \geq M[\hat{u}_{\delta, \epsilon}](B) \geq (1 - \delta)^n M[\hat{u}](B) + (\delta/2)^n M[\phi](B),$$

since $\nabla d(\hat{u}_{\delta,\epsilon}) \geq (1 - \delta)^n \nabla d\hat{u} + (\delta/2)g$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} c_2\mu(B) &\geq (1 - \delta)^n c_1\mu(B) + (\delta/2)^n M_{\rho,g}[0](B) \\ &\geq c_2\mu(B) + (\delta/2)^n M_{\rho,g}[0](B). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $M_{\rho,g}[0](B) = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $c_1 = c_2$ as claimed. \square

Remark 3.3. *The uniqueness of u is more delicate. It is obtained in [CV01] when the solutions are C^2 -smooth by using a classical maximum principle; this requires μ to be absolutely continuous with respect to some volume form, with Hölder density.*

We make the observation that uniqueness holds in the most degenerate case when $\mu = \delta_p$ is a Dirac mass at a single point $p \in M$: if $M_{\rho,g}(u) = M_{\rho,g}(v) = c\delta_p$ with $u, v \in \mathcal{K}_0(M, g)$, then $M_{\rho,g}(\tilde{u}) = e^{\tilde{u}}\delta_p$ and $M_{\rho,g}(\tilde{v}) = e^{\tilde{v}}\delta_p$ with $\tilde{u} = u - u(p) + \log c$, $\tilde{v} = v - v(p) + \log c$, so $\tilde{u} = \tilde{v}$ by uniqueness in Theorem 3.1, which yields $u = v$.

3.3. Regularization of g -convex functions. Let (M, g) be a compact Hessian manifold and ρ a (-1) -density. Given a g -convex function u on M , we set $\mu_u := e^{-u}M_{\rho,g}[u]$ so that u is the unique g -convex solution of $M_{\rho,g}[u] = e^u\mu_u$. Using convolutions we approximate μ_u by smooth volume forms $\mu_\varepsilon = \mu \star \chi_\varepsilon + \varepsilon dV_M$ and invoke a result of Cheng-Yau [CY82] to obtain a smooth strictly g -convex function u_ε on M such that

$$M_{\rho,g}[u_\varepsilon] = e^{u_\varepsilon}\mu_\varepsilon.$$

It follows from the stability property (Theorem 3.1) that u_ε uniformly converges to u as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, so any g -convex function u is the uniform limit of smooth strictly g -convex functions. This provides an alternative proof of the global regularization of g -convex functions (compare with Proposition 1.10).

REFERENCES

- [BK07] Blocki, Z., Kolodziej, K. *On regularization of plurisubharmonic functions on manifolds*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 135 (2007), no. 7, 2089-2093.
- [CV01] Caffarelli, L.A., Viaclovsky, J.A. *On the regularity of solutions to Monge-Ampère equations on hessian manifolds*. Commun. Partial Differ. Equ. 26(11-12), 2339-2351 (2001)
- [CY82] Cheng, S.-Y., Yau, S.-T. *On the real Monge-Ampère equation and affine flat structures*. Proc. of the 1980 Beijing Symposium on Differential Geometry and Differential Equations, (1982), 339-370
- [De89] Delanoë, P. *Remarques sur les variétés localement hessiennes*. Osaka J. Math. 26, 65-69 (1989)
- [Dem92] Demailly, J.-P. *Regularization of closed positive currents and intersection theory*. J. Algebraic Geom. 1 (1992), no. 3, 361-409.
- [GW00] Gross, M., Wilson, P. M. H. *Large complex structure limits of K3 surfaces*. J. Differential Geom. 55 (2000), no. 3, 475-546.
- [GZ17] Guedj, V., Zeriahi, A., *Degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations*, EMS Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 26, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2017.
- [Gut01] Gutiérrez, C.: *The Monge-Ampère equation*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 44. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2001. xii+127 pp.
- [HO19] Hultgren, J., Önnheim, M. *An optimal transport approach to Monge-Ampère equations on compact Hessian manifolds*. J. Geom. Anal. 29 (2019), no. 3, 1953-1990.
- [KS06] Kontsevich, M., Soibelman, Y. *Affine structures and non-Archimedean analytic spaces*. The unity of mathematics, 321-385, Progr. Math., 244, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA (2006).
- [LYZ05] Loftin, J., Yau, S.-T., Zaslow, E. *Affine manifolds, SYZ geometry and the "Y" vertex*. J. Differential Geom. 71 (2005), no. 1, 129-158.

- [PT20] S.Puechmorel, T.D.Tô. *Convergence of the Hesse-Koszul flow on compact Hessian manifolds*. Preprint arXiv:2001.02940
- [RT77] Rauch, J., Taylor, B. A. *The Dirichlet problem for the multidimensional Monge-Ampère equation*. Rocky Mountain J. Math. 7 (1977), no. 2, 345-364.
- [Sh07] Shima, H. *The Geometry of Hessian Structures*, vol. 1. World Scientific, Singapore (2007)
- [SYZ] Strominger,A.; Yau,S.-T. Zaslow,E; *Mirror symmetry is T-duality*. Nucl.Phys. B (1996),243-259

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE TOULOUSE, UNIVERSITÉ DE TOULOUSE, 118 ROUTE DE NARBONNE, 31400 TOULOUSE, FRANCE,

Email address: vincent.guedj@math.univ-toulouse.fr

URL: <https://www.math.univ-toulouse.fr/~guedj/>

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU-PARIS RIVE GAUCHE, SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ, 4 PLACE JUSSIEU, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE

Email address: tat-dat.to@imj-prg.fr

URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/totatdatmath/home>