

THE OBLIQUE BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM FOR MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATIONS

Huaiyu Jian

Department of Mathematical sciences, Tsinghua University
Beijing 100084, China

Xushan Tu

Department of Mathematical sciences, Tsinghua University
Beijing 100084, China

ABSTRACT. We study the good shape property of boundary sections of convex viscosity solutions to the oblique boundary value problem for Monge-Ampère equations. In the two-dimensional case, we prove the global Schauder estimate, $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ estimate and $W^{2,p}$ estimate for the solutions. When the space dimension $n \geq 3$, we show that these estimates still hold if the solution is bounded from above by a quadratic function in the tangent direction. We also obtain an existence result for the viscous convex solutions of Monge-Ampère equations with Robin oblique boundary conditions.

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J60, 35J96, 35J25.

Running head: Oblique problem for Monge-Ampère equation

The Oblique Boundary Value Problem for Monge-Ampère Equations

Huaiyu Jian and Xushan Tu

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. Preliminaries	7
3. Results for Viscosity solution	13
3.1. Qualitative Strict Convexity Lemma	13
3.2. Global Lipschitz Regularity for Viscosity solution	16
3.3. Existence and Compactness	23
4. Good Shape Lemma and Normalization Family	28
4.1. Normalization Family	29
4.2. Proof of Good Shape Lemma	33
5. Universal Strict Convexity Under the Global Assumption	37
6. Engulfing Lemma and Global estimate	45
7. Universal Strict Convexity Under the Pointwise Assumption	54
7.1. Degenerate Model	54
7.2. The Pointwise Strict Convexity	58
8. Convergence	63
9. Stationary Theorem and $C^{2,\alpha}$ Estimate	68
9.1. Stationary Theorem	68
9.2. $C^{2,\alpha}$ Estimate-Proof of Theorem 1.4	74
10. Examples	77
References	83

1. INTRODUCTION

The oblique problem for the Monge-Ampère Equation

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2u = f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ D_\beta u = \phi(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

was studied by Lions, Trudinger and Urbas[12]. Assuming Ω is a bounded uniformly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n and $\beta = \nu$, the unit inward normal on $\partial\Omega$, they obtained the global $C^{3,\alpha}$ estimates in the case when f, ϕ and $\partial\Omega$ are sufficiently smooth, and proved the existence and uniqueness of convex solutions to (1.1) in the space $C^{3,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ ($0 < \alpha < 1$). Their results were extended to the oblique derivative boundary value problem by Urbas[17] and by Wang[21], to the Hessian equations by Ma and Qiu[14], and to the augmented Monge-Ampère Equation by Jiang and Trudinger[10].

In two-dimensional case ($n = 2$), Urbas[16] improved the smooth assumptions on f, ϕ and $\partial\Omega$. He proved that the solution belongs to $C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ if Ω is $C^{2,1}$ uniformly convex, $f \in C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega})$, $\phi \in C^{1,1}(\partial\Omega)$ and $\beta \in C^{2,1}(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a C^1 perturbation of inner vector field.

When the f in (1.1) is less regular, i.e. $f \in C^\alpha(\Omega)$, the interior $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity for (Aleksandrov) generalized solution (which is equivalent to convex-viscosity solution) was obtained by Caffarelli[2], which was extended to the case $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ by Jian and Wang[11]. The boundary Schauder estimate for the Dirichlet problem was proved by Trudinger and Wang in [19] and by Savin in [18]. The global regularity for the natural boundary value problem was proved recently by Chen, Liu and Wang in [5].

In this paper, we study the global regularity for generalized solution to the problem (1.1). We assume that β is oblique (point inward), which means

$$(1.2) \quad \{x_0 + t\beta(x_0) \mid t > 0\} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset, \quad \forall x_0 \in \partial\Omega.$$

By a compactness argument, this is equivalent to saying that if $\beta \in C^0$ and Ω is convex, there exist universal constants $a, \eta > 0$ (depend on β, Ω) such that

$$(1.3) \quad a \leq \|\beta\| \leq a^{-1} \text{ and } \{x_0 + t(\beta(x_0) + B_\eta(0)) \mid t \in (0, a)\} \subset \Omega, \quad \forall x_0 \in \partial\Omega$$

and the second relation of (1.3) can be replaced by $\beta \cdot \nu \geq \eta > 0$ if Ω is C^1 , where a depends on $\|\beta\|_{C^0}, \|\partial\Omega\|_{C^1}$.

Throughout this paper, we always assume that the known data satisfy

(A₁): *The constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Ω is a bounded convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n , $u \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ is a convex solution to problem (1.1) (see Definition 1.1 below), $0 < \lambda \leq f(x) \leq \Lambda$ in Ω for some positive constants λ, Λ , and $\beta \in Lip(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a vector field and satisfies (1.3) for some positive constants a, η .*

When $n \geq 3$, global Schauder estimate for problem (1.1) does not hold, as pointed out in [21] (also see Example 10.1 below). Hence, to obtain the global Schauder estimate, we need to assume u is quadratic growth on boundary. This is to say that there is a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for every $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, there exists a sub-differential $p_{x_0} \in \partial u(x_0)$ (see (2.1) below for its definition) such that

$$(1.4) \quad u(x) - u(x_0) - p_{x_0} \cdot (x - x_0) \leq C_0|x - x_0|^2, \quad \forall x \in \partial\Omega.$$

And it can be replaced by (see Lemma 3.6)

$$(1.5) \quad u(x) - u(x_0) - \nabla u(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) \leq C_0|x - x_0|^2, \quad \forall x \in \partial\Omega.$$

If the known data satisfy the assumption (\mathbf{A}_4) below, we make a weaker assumption for given point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$:

$$(1.6) \quad u(x) - u(x_0) - p_{x_0} \cdot (x - x_0) \leq C_0|x - x_0|^2 + \varepsilon, \quad \forall x \in \partial\Omega$$

for some sufficiently small universal constant $\varepsilon > 0$.

An evident example satisfying the quadratic growth conditions is that $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{1,1}$ and u admits a linear function as its upper barrier at every boundary point. And we can verify (1.4) at the maximum point of u .

We use the standard concept for generalized solutions and viscosity solutions to the first equation of (1.1). See the book [8] for example. But boundary value condition in (1.1) will be understood in the following viscous sense.

Use $USC(E)$ (or $LSC(E)$) to denote the family of all upper (or lower) semi-continuous functions on E and assume $u \in USC(\bar{\Omega})$ ($LSC(\bar{\Omega})$). Whenever we write that

$$D_\beta u \geq (\leq) \phi \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

we mean that u is a viscosity subsolution (or supersolution) on boundary. This is to say that for any convex $\varphi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $u - \varphi$ has a local maximum (or minimum) at $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, then

$$D_\beta \varphi(x_0) \geq (\text{or } \leq) \phi(x_0).$$

If $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ is both viscosity subsolution and viscosity supersolution on boundary, we call it a viscosity solution to $D_\beta u = \phi$.

Definition 1.1. Through the whole article, the solution to the first equation of (1.1) is understood as the generalized solution (or the Aleksandrov solution), the solution to the second equation of (1.1) is understood as the viscosity solution.

Caffarelli[1] indicated that the generalized solution to the first equation of (1.1) is a viscosity subsolution (or supersolution) to the following equation

$$(1.7) \quad \det D^2 u(x_0) \geq \underline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) (\leq \overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)),$$

and the generalized solution and viscosity solution to the first equation of (1.1) are equivalent if $f \in C(\Omega)$, which is proved in detail in [8]. This fact will be used.

The main results of this paper are the following Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4. In addition to (\mathbf{A}_1) , we will need extra assumptions (\mathbf{A}_2) , (\mathbf{A}_3) and (\mathbf{A}_4) for our regularity theory.

(\mathbf{A}_2) : $\phi \in Lip(\partial\Omega)$, and u satisfies (1.4) if $n \geq 3$.

(\mathbf{A}_3) : $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\alpha}$, $\phi \in Lip(\partial\Omega)$, $Osc_{\bar{\Omega}} f + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\beta) + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\phi) \leq \delta$, and u satisfies (1.4) if $n \geq 3$.

(\mathbf{A}_4) : $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\alpha}$, $f \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$, $\phi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, $\beta \in C^{1,\alpha}(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Furthermore, when $n \geq 3$, u is required to satisfy (1.6) for some $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$.

Here, we have used the oscillation notation $Osc_E f := \sup_{x,y \in E} |f(x) - f(y)|$.

Theorem 1.2. *Under the assumption (\mathbf{A}_2) , there exists a universal constant $\epsilon = \epsilon(C_0, \lambda, \Lambda, \eta, n, \|\phi\|_{Lip}, \|\beta\|_{Lip}, \Omega) > 0$ such that $u \in C^{1,\epsilon}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap W^{2,1+\epsilon}(\bar{\Omega})$, and the solution to (1.1) is unique up to constant.*

Theorem 1.3. *Under the assumption (\mathbf{A}_3) , then $u \in C^{1,1-\epsilon}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap W^{2,p}(\bar{\Omega})$ for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $p > 0$, both of which depend on δ . Moreover, ϵ can be arbitrarily small and p can be arbitrarily large if δ in (\mathbf{A}_3) is sufficiently small.*

More importantly, we have the following Schauder regularity.

Theorem 1.4. *Under the assumption (\mathbf{A}_4) , there exist positive constants ε_0 and $\rho = \rho(\varepsilon_0)$ such that if $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, then $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_\rho(x_0) \cap \bar{\Omega})$.*

Besides, by constructing lower barriers, we are able to prove several theorems on existence and compactness (see Section 3.3 for the details). In particular, using the Perron's method, we will prove an existence theorem for the oblique Robin's problem:

$$(1.8) \quad \det D^2 u = f(x) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad D_\beta u = \phi(x) + \gamma(x)u \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Theorem 1.5. *Assume that $\gamma \geq \gamma_0 > 0$ and $\phi \in C(\bar{\Omega})$. If $n = 2$ or Ω is a strict convex domain, then there exists a solution u to problem (1.8) and $u \in Lip(\bar{\Omega})$.*

Obviously, our estimates are sharp in two-dimensional case, which can be viewed as the extension of the Schauder ($W^{2,p}$ and $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$) regularity for Neumann problem of Poisson equations. However, when $n \geq 3$, we require that (1.4) holds at every

boundary point. This is because there is no strict convexity of the boundary and the lack of smoothness of the boundary data, and the $n - 1$ directions on the tangent plane cannot be effectively distinguished. The quadratic growth condition is crucial to ensure that u is strict convex in tangent direction, see Section 3.1. In Section 10, we will show

Remark 1.6. *The pointwise assumption (1.6) is optimal in the following sense: for any small $\delta > 0$, there exists solution $u \in C^{1,\delta}(\overline{B_{\rho(\delta)}^+(0)})$ to the following problem*

$$\det D^2u = 1 \text{ in } B_{\rho}^+(0), \quad D_n u = 0 \text{ in } B_{\rho}(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Moreover, u is strict convex in interior and satisfies

$$u(x) - u(x_0) - \nabla u(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) \leq C_0 |x - x_0|^{2-C\delta}, \quad \forall x, x_0 \in B_{\rho}(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

But $u \notin C^{1,\delta+\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Define the section $S_h^u(x_0)$ of u with height h and based point x_0 by

$$S_h^u(x_0) := \{x \in \bar{\Omega} \mid u(x) < u(x_0) + \nabla u(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) + h\}.$$

We will study the geometry of the height section $S_h^u(x_0)$ and the Neumann boundary

$$G_h^u(x_0) := S_h^u(x_0) \cap \partial\Omega$$

for $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. We will show that for $h > 0$ is small, $S_h^u(x_0)$ shrinks to x_0 uniformly as $h \rightarrow 0$ and has good shape characteristics in the following sense.

Definition 1.7. (*Good Shape*). Denote by $\mathcal{P}^{x_0} = \mathcal{P}^{x_0,\beta}$ the projection mapping along the direction $\beta(x_0)$ to the tangent plane H_p at $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. We say a section $S_h^u(x_0)$ is of good shape if $S_h^u(x_0)$ satisfies the following two property: $S_h^u(x_0)$ has finite density at x_0 , i.e.,

$$c \leq \frac{\text{Vol}(S_h^u(x_0))}{h^{\frac{n}{2}}} \leq c^{-1},$$

for some positive universal constant (see Section 2), and

$$c\mathcal{P}^{x_0} S_h^u(x_0) \subset \mathcal{P}^{x_0} G_h^u(x_0) \cap (x_0 - \mathcal{P}^{x_0}(G_h^u(x_0) - x_0)).$$

In Section 4, we will show that this definition is invariant under convergence as $h \rightarrow 0$ and a linear diagonal transform \mathcal{D} which keeps β and the tangent plane invariant. This property enable us to study the normalization $(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{\Omega}_h)$ of u at boundary points. In Section 5, We will use the good shape to construct a universal strictly convexity module of u to obtain the uniform $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimate at boundary.

In Section 6, by studying the maximum height section for interior point near boundary, we will extend the classical engulfing properties to the boundary, and prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

In Section 7, we will introduce a degenerate model to study the pointwise strict convexity for the solution to problem (1.1) under the weaker hypothesis (1.6).

In section 8, we discuss the blow-up limit, prove that the normalized Neumann boundary \tilde{G}_h tends to be flat and the blow-up limit is a solution to the Neumann problem of the Monge-Ampère equation in half space. Due to the Liouville Theorem 1.8 below obtained by us in [9], the limit solution is a quadratic polynomial. Re-scaling back, we will obtain a quadratic function perturbation estimate for the normalized solutions (see Theorem 8.1).

Theorem 1.8. ([9]). *Let $u \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ be a viscosity convex solution to problem*

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 u = 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = ax_1 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^n. \end{cases}$$

If $n = 2$, or when $n \geq 3$ either $a = 0$ or u satisfies

$$\lim_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}, z \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u(0, z, 0)}{|z|^2} < \infty,$$

then u must be a quadratic polynomial.

In Section 9, we will introduce the energy $\mathcal{E}_t(u)$, which describe the difference between the normalization function and the quadratic polynomial. We will prove Stationary Theorem 9.2 which describes the decay rate of this energy. Then, the $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate automatically follows from the stationary theorem.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In addition to those mentioned in Section 1, we need the following notations and related conventions.

For positive constants depending only on $C_0, \lambda, \Lambda, \alpha, \eta, a, n, \|\phi\|_{Lip}, \|\beta\|_{Lip}, \text{diam}(\Omega), \|\partial\Omega\|_{C^{1,\alpha}}$, we write them as c and C for simplicity.

We always abbreviate the nonnegative non-decreasing (or strictly increasing) functions on $t \in [0, \infty]$ as $\sigma_i(t)$ (or $\sigma_i^+(t)$) : $[0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. When they are continuous functions depending only on the constants c, C above and $\sigma_i(0)$ (or $\sigma_i^+(0)$) = 0 holds, we will omit the subscript and write them as σ (or σ^+).

A point in \mathbb{R}^n is written as

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n) = (x', x_n),$$

and if $n \geq 3$, it will also be written as $x = (x_1, x'', x_n)$. Define $\mathcal{P}x = x'$, the projection mapping along the x_n -axis to the hyperplane $x_n = 0$, and set

$$\mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > 0\}.$$

Denote by \mathcal{I} [or \mathcal{I}' , \mathcal{I}''] the identity matrix of size n [or $n-1$, $n-2$] and $B_r(x)$ [or $B'_r(x')$, $B''_r(x'')$] the ball of radius r centered at x in \mathbb{R}^n [or \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , \mathbb{R}^{n-2}].

The set addition is in the Minkowski sense, this is $E + F = \{x + y \mid x \in E, y \in F\}$.

The $\det D^2u$ can be understood as the general Monge-Ampère measure of convex functions, which yields the generalized solution to the equation $\det D^2u = f$. It is well known that the generalized solution is equivalent to the viscosity solution in the domain where f is continuous. And unless we talk about the comparison principle and convergence, the property (1.7) is sufficient for our proof. Note that if $n = 2$, or if $n \geq 3$ and u satisfies (1.5), the finite positive Monge-Ampère measure implies u is strictly convex in Ω and $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$. See [1, 3] or the books [7, 8, 20]).

The sub-differential of u at point x_0 is defined as follows

$$(2.1) \quad \partial u(x_0) := \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid l := u(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0) \text{ is a support plane of } u \text{ at } x_0\}.$$

And we use $\nabla u(y)$ to represent any element of $\partial u(y)$ for $y \in \Omega$.

Given point $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ and oblique vector $\gamma(x)$, define

$$(2.2) \quad D_\gamma^+ u(x) := \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{p \in \partial u(x + t\gamma(x))} p \cdot \gamma \in [-\infty, +\infty].$$

For $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$D_\gamma^+ u(x) = \sup_{p \in \partial u(x)} p \cdot \gamma = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_\gamma^+ u(x + t\gamma(x)),$$

and simplify it as $D_\gamma u(x)$. Obviously, $D_\gamma u$ is upper semi-continuous function in Ω when γ is continuous. Letting u be a convex viscosity solution of the second equation of problem (1.1), we will verify in Section 3.2 that the second equation of problem (1.1) means that

$$D_\beta^+ u(x) = \sup_{p_x \in \partial u(x)} p_x \cdot \beta = \phi(x) \text{ for } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

And then, for the points $x \in \partial\Omega$, we will define $\nabla u(x)$ as a fixed element $p_x \in \partial u(x)$ which attains the above supreme (see (3.11)). This definition is not unique and depends on the oblique vector field β .

Locally, we consider the boundary point $x_0 = 0 \in \partial\Omega$,

$$(2.3) \quad \Omega \cap B_c(0) := \{x = (x', x_n) \mid x_n > g(x'), x' \in B'_c(0)\},$$

and the part of boundary $\partial\Omega$ near $x_0 = 0$ is described by a local Lipschitz (or $C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}$ if $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\alpha}$) function as

$$(2.4) \quad G := \{x = (x', x_n) \mid x_n = g(x'), x' \in B'_c(0)\}.$$

Here, g is a convex function satisfying

$$(2.5) \quad 0 \leq g(x') \leq C|x'|, \quad \forall x' \in B'_c(0).$$

We will use the following notation,

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{G}x = \begin{cases} (x', x_n) & \text{if } x_n \geq g(x'), \\ (x', g(x')) & \text{if } x_n \leq g(x'). \end{cases}$$

For simplicity, the point $(x', g(x'))$ is written as $\mathcal{G}x' = \mathcal{G}(x', 0) = (x', g(x'))$. We will need to study the following local problem.

Definition 2.1 (Local Problem). *The convex domain Ω is given by (2.3)- (2.5), and u is a non-negative viscosity convex solution to the following problem:*

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ D_nu = \phi & \text{on } G(0), \\ u = 1 & \text{on } S_1^u(0) \setminus G(0), \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda \leq f \leq \Lambda$, $u(0) = \phi(0) = 0$, $\|u\|_{Lip(B_c(0) \cap \Omega)} + \|\phi\|_{Lip(B_c(0) \cap \Omega)} \leq C$ and

$$B_1(0) \cap \bar{\Omega} \subset S_1^u(0) \subset CB_1(0).$$

Definition 2.2 (Standard Problem). *The local problem of u is called a standard problem if f is a constant and ϕ is a linear function.*

In Section 3.2, we will study a perturbation Neumann problem of the local problem with the second equation replaced by $D_nu = \phi^0$, where $\phi^0(x') := D_n^+u(\mathcal{G}x')$ satisfying $|\phi^0| \leq C|x'|$ around 0.

We will also need the following definition and preliminary lemmas.

Definition 2.3. *We say that a closed set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is quasi-symmetric about the point x up to the constant κ , if*

$$(2.8) \quad t(x - E) \subset E - x, \quad \forall t \in [0, c\kappa].$$

When κ is universal, we say that $E \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is quasi-symmetric about x .

This definition was known to be balanced with respect to point x in [4].

Lemma 2.4. *Given convex set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that the line $l(t) := x + te_n$ intersects E at the points p, q . Then*

$$(2.9) \quad |p_n - q_n| \cdot \text{Vol}_{n-1} \mathcal{P}E \leq C \text{Vol} E.$$

In addition, if $\mathcal{P}E$ is quasi-symmetric about $\mathcal{P}q$ up to the constant κ , then we have an inverse inequality

$$(2.10) \quad |p_n - q_n| \cdot \text{Vol}_{n-1} \mathcal{P}E \geq c\kappa \text{Vol} E.$$

Proof. This is Lemma 2.4 in [9], where the proof was given. \square

Lemma 2.5. *If $X(x') : B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is a Lipschitz map and $t \in [0, \frac{1}{4}\|f\|_{Lip}^{-1}]$, then the mapping*

$$x' \rightarrow F_t(x') := x' + tX(x')$$

is bi-Lipschitz and surjective in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)$. Moreover,

$$\max\{\|F_t\|_{Lip(\overline{B_{1/2}})}, \|F_t^{-1}\|_{Lip(\overline{B_{1/2}})}\} \leq \frac{4}{3}.$$

Proof. Since $\|F_t - x'\| \leq t\|X\|_{Lip} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, we find that F_t is injective. For any $q' \in B_{1/2}'$

$$q' \notin \cup_{t \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]} F_t(\partial B_1(0)),$$

thus the brouwer degree $\deg(F_t, B_1(0), q') = \deg(x', B_1(0), q') = 1$, which implies that F_t is surjective onto $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)$. This completes our proof. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Given a convex domain Ω satisfyin (2.3)-(2.5). Let $u \in C(\bar{\Omega} \cap \bar{B}_c^+(0))$ be a convex function, satisfying*

$$(2.11) \quad |u(x) - u(0)| \leq \sigma_1(|x|) \text{ and } D_n^+ u(\mathcal{G}x') \geq -\sigma_0(|x'|).$$

Then

$$(2.12) \quad |\nabla u(y)| \leq C \left(\inf_{|y| \leq t \leq c} \frac{2\sigma_1(Ct)}{t} + \sigma_0(|y'|) \right) \text{ in } \bar{\Omega} \cap \bar{B}_c^+(0).$$

Proof. Suppose that $y \in \Omega \cap \bar{B}_c^+(0)$ and $p \in \partial u(y)$. The convexity implies that for

$$p_n \geq -\sigma_0(|y'|).$$

Assuming that $|p'| > 0$. The assumption (2.5) indicates that g is locally uniformly Lipschitz. Then, (2.3) means that for $a \geq 0$, the point $z := y + a|y|(\frac{cp'}{|p'|}, 1) \in \bar{\Omega}$. We have

$$a|y|(p_n + c|p'|) = p \cdot (z - y) \leq u(z) - u(y) \leq 2\sigma_1((1 + Ca)|y|).$$

These two inequalities mean

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C \left(\frac{2\sigma_1((1 + ca)|x|)}{|x|} + \sigma_0(|x'|) \right) \text{ in } \Omega \cap \bar{B}_c^+(0),$$

which implies (2.12) if we let $t = (1 + Ca)|y|$ and recall that σ_1 is non-decreasing. Here, we may ignore the estimation for $y \in \partial\Omega$, because $\nabla u(y)$ in this paper will be selected by taking the limit $\nabla u(y + te_n)$ from inner direction (See Lemma 3.6). \square

Similar to Lemma 2.6, we can prove

Lemma 2.7. *Write $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $x = (x^1, \dots, x^k)$, $x^j \in \mathbb{R}^{a_j}$, $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i = n$. Let $u \in C(B_r(0))$ be a convex function, satisfying*

$$u(x) \leq u(0) + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(|x^i|).$$

Then

$$|\nabla_i u(0)| \leq C \inf_{0 \leq t \leq cr} \frac{2\sigma_i(Ct)}{t}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

In particular, locally bounded convex functions are locally Lipschitz.

The following John's Lemma is well-known.

Lemma 2.8 (John's Lemma). *If Ω is a bounded convex set with non-empty interior in \mathbb{R}^n and E is the ellipsoid of the smallest volume containing Ω , then after an affine transformation \mathcal{T} ,*

$$B_{c(n)} \subset \mathcal{T}(\Omega) \subset B_{C(n)} := \mathcal{T}(E).$$

We will use the following two comparison principles.

Lemma 2.9. *If Ω is a bounded convex set, $u \in USC(\bar{\Omega})$ and $v \in LSC(\bar{\Omega})$ are convex functions in on Ω satisfying*

$$\det D^2 u \geq \det D^2 v \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Then,

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}} \{u - v\} = \sup_{\partial\Omega} \{u - v\}.$$

Proof. See Theorem 2.10 in [7]. \square

Lemma 2.10. *Supposed that Ω is a bounded convex domain and u is a convex function, satisfying*

$$\det D^2 u > \lambda \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Then

$$(2.13) \quad \text{Vol}(\Omega) \leq C(\lambda) \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

In particular,

$$(2.14) \quad \text{Vol}(S_h) \leq Ch^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Proof. (2.14) was proved in Corollary 3.2.5 in [8], and (2.13) can be proved as its proof. \square

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose that Ω is a convex domain such that $B_c(0) \subset \Omega \subset B_C(0)$ and $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ is a convex function in Ω . If*

$$\lambda \leq \det D^2u \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

then

$$u(x) \geq -C \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Proof. This is the Aleksandrov's maximum principal. See Theorem 1.4.2 in [8]. \square

The following Lemmas 2.12 are the famous interior $C^{1,\alpha}$, $C^{2,\alpha}$ and $W^{2,p}$ estimates by Caffarelli[1, 2, 3] and. Also see related chapters in [7, 8].

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose that Ω is a convex domain such that $B_c(0) \subset \Omega \subset B_C(0)$ and u is a convex function in Ω , satisfying*

$$\det D^2u = f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \inf_{\Omega} u = u(0) = -1.$$

(i) *If $\lambda \leq f \leq \Lambda$, then there is a positive constant $\gamma = \gamma(\lambda, n, \Lambda)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(S_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C.$$

(ii) *For any $p > 1$, there is $\delta_1(p) > 0$ such that if $|f - 1| \leq \delta_1(p)$ in S_1 , then*

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}(S_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C.$$

(iii) *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_2(\epsilon) > 0$ such that if $|f - 1| \leq \delta_2(\epsilon)$ in S_1 , then*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,1-\epsilon}(S_{1/2}(0))} \leq C.$$

(iv) *Suppose that $\lambda \leq f \leq \Lambda$, if $\|f\|_{C^\alpha(S_1)} \leq C$, then*

$$\|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(S_{1/2}(0))} \leq C.$$

The following three lemmas can be found also in [1, 3].

Lemma 2.13. *Suppose that $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a convex domain and $u \in C(\Omega)$ is a convex function, satisfying*

$$\lambda \leq \det D^2u \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Then u is strict convex and C^1 inside Ω .

Lemma 2.14. *Suppose that $n \geq 3$, $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex domain and $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ is a convex function, satisfying*

$$\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = \phi \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

If $\phi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$ for some $\alpha > 1 - \frac{2}{n}$. Then u is strict convex and C^1 inside Ω .

Lemma 2.15. *Let $u \in C(\Omega)$ be a convex solution to*

$$0 < \lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda,$$

For $x \in \Omega$ and $p \in \partial u(x)$, define $\Sigma := \{y \mid u(y) = u(x) + p \cdot (y - x)\}$. Then, either $\Sigma = \{x\}$ or Σ has no extremal point inside Ω .

3. RESULTS FOR VISCOSITY SOLUTION

3.1. Qualitative Strict Convexity Lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Given positive constants r, k, K, M , convex domain*

$$\Omega := \{x = (x, x_n) \mid x_n > g(x'), x' \in B'_r(0)\} \cap B_r(0),$$

and part of its boundary $G := \{x = (x', x_n) \mid x_n = g(x'), x' \in B'_r(0)\}$. Suppose g is a convex function satisfying

$$0 \leq g(x') \leq M|x'|, \quad \forall x' \in B'_r(0),$$

and $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$, $u \geq 0$ and u is a convex-viscosity solution to

$$0 < \lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Then we have a $\bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma}(r, k, K, M, \lambda, \Lambda, n) > 0$ such that if $u(0) \leq \bar{\sigma}$ and

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{\text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{P}\check{S}_h(0) \cap (-\mathcal{P}\check{S}_h(0)) \cap B'_r(0))}{h^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \geq k \text{ for } h \geq \bar{\sigma},$$

then $\sup_{B_r^+} u \geq K$. Here, $\check{S}_h(0) := \{x \in \Omega \mid u(x) \leq h\}$.

Proof. For simplicity, we only need to consider the case $r = 1$. Assume by way of contradiction that $\sup_{B_1^+} u \leq K$. We now assume $h \geq 2\bar{\sigma}$ (to be determined) and set $a_h = \sup\{t \mid te_n \in \check{S}_h(0)\}$. By the assumption for u , we see that $u \geq 0$ in Ω and

$$u(te_n) \leq tu(e_n) + (1-t)u(0) \leq Ct + \bar{\sigma}.$$

Thus, $a_h \geq ch$.

By Lemma 2.4 and (2.13)

$$\text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{P}\check{S}_h(0) \cap (-\mathcal{P}\check{S}_h(0))a_h) \leq \text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{P}\check{S}_h(0))a_h \leq c\text{Vol}(\check{S}_h(0)) \leq Ch^{\frac{n}{2}},$$

which together with (3.1) implies $a_h \leq Ch$. Therefore,

$$ch \leq a_h \leq Ch.$$

Hence, setting $b(t) = \frac{u(te_n)}{t}$, by the convexity we obtain

$$(3.2) \quad c \leq b(t) \leq C, \quad \forall t \geq C\bar{\sigma},$$

and b is a monotonically decreasing function. We claim that *there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ depending on $k, K, \lambda, \Lambda, n$ such that*

$$(3.3) \quad b(t/2) \leq (1 - \delta)b(t), \quad \forall t \geq C\delta^{-1}\bar{\sigma}.$$

On the contrary to (3.3) suppose that there are positive constants $t_0 \geq C\delta^{-1}\bar{\sigma}$ such that $b(t_0/2) \geq (1 - \delta)b(t_0)$. For simplicity, assume that

$$(3.4) \quad b(t_0) = 1 \text{ and } b(t_0/2) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Denote

$$E := \{x + x', x_n\} \in \check{S}_{\delta t_0}(0) : x' \text{ in } \mathcal{P}\check{S}_{\delta t_0}(0) \cap (-\mathcal{P}\check{S}_{\delta t_0}(0))\}.$$

We conclude that

$$(3.5) \quad 0 \leq \sup\{x_n | x = (x, x_n) \in E\} < \frac{t_0}{4}.$$

Otherwise, we would have $q^+ = (q', q_n^+) \in E$ such that $q_n^+ \geq \frac{t_0}{4} \geq M\delta t_0$ for some large M . Choose point $q^- = (-q', q_n^-) \in E$ such the line passing q^+ and q^- will intersect the x_n -axis at point $r = (0, r_n)$. We have

$$r_n = \frac{q_n^+ + q_n^-}{2} \geq \frac{M\delta t_0}{2} \geq C\bar{\sigma}.$$

However, by convexity,

$$u(r_n e_n) \leq \frac{u(q^+) + u(q^-)}{2} \leq \delta t_0 \leq \frac{2r_n}{M},$$

which contradicts (3.2) because M is large. In this way, we have proved (3.5).

Now, we consider $v(x) = u(x) - x_n$. Denote

$$p = e_1, \quad \Gamma_1^+ := \{p + s(z - p) | s \in (0, 1), z \in \mathcal{P}E\},$$

$$q = \frac{t_0 e_1}{2}, \quad \Gamma_2^- := \{q - s(z - q) | s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 2), z \in \mathcal{P}E\},$$

and $F = \Gamma_1^+ \cap \Gamma_2^-$. Then

$$-\delta t_0 \leq v(p), v(q) \leq 0, \text{ and } v \leq u \leq \delta t_0 \text{ in } E.$$

By (3.5), we can rewrite point $x \in F$ as

$$x = p + s_a(a - p) = q - s_b(b - q),$$

for points $a, b \in \mathcal{P}E$, $s_a \in (0, 1)$ and $s_b \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. By convexity

$$v(x) \leq s_a v(a) + (1 - s_a)v(p) \leq \delta t_0$$

and

$$v(x) \geq (1 + s_b)v(q) - s_b v(b) \geq -(1 + s_b)\delta t_0 - s_b \delta t_0 \geq -4\delta t_0.$$

Thus,

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(F)} \leq C\delta t_0.$$

Recall Lemma 2.10, we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \text{Vol}(F) \leq C(\delta t_0)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

However, $\mathcal{P}E$ is a symmetric set and $\text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{P}E) \geq k(\delta t_0)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$ by (3.1). Since F contains the cone

$$\Gamma_{1,c}^+ := \left\{ x = t_0 e_1 + s(z - t_0 e_1) \mid s \in \left(0, \frac{1}{4}\right), z \in \mathcal{P}E \right\},$$

we have

$$\text{Vol}(F) \geq ct_0 \text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{P}E) \geq ck\delta^{-1}(\delta t_0)^{\frac{n}{2}},$$

which contradicts (3.6) if δ is small enough. In this way, we have proved (3.3).

By iteration, (3.3) implies

$$b(t) \leq Ct^{|\log_2(1-\delta)|} \text{ for } t \geq C\delta^{-1}\bar{\sigma},$$

which contradict with (3.2) when $\bar{\sigma}$ is small. This proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Given positive constants r, K, M, M_2 , and the convex domain Ω , part of its boundary G , convex functions g and u are the same as in Lemma 3.1. If*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq K,$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad u(\mathcal{G}(0, x'')) = u(0, x'', g(0, x'')) \leq \varepsilon + M_2|x''|^2 \text{ on } G,$$

then we have $\bar{\sigma} > 0$, depending on r, K, M_1, M_2, λ and Λ, n , such that

$$u(x) \geq \bar{\sigma}(|x_1| + |x_n|) - \varepsilon \text{ in } B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \cap \Omega.$$

Proof. We only consider a local problem near origin. Given point $p = (p_1, p'', p_n) \in B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0) \cap \Omega$ such that $u(p)$ is small, and assume that $p_1 \geq 0$. Let $\rho = p_1 + p_n$. The half ball $B = B_{cM^{-1}\rho}^+(\frac{\rho}{2})$ is in Ω . Consider the slide transform

$$\mathcal{A}x = x - \frac{x_1 + x_n}{p_1 + p_n}(0, p'', 0)$$

and the function

$$v(x) = u(\mathcal{A}^{-1}x).$$

Let $r_0 = cM_1^{-1}\rho r$, and $\tilde{g}(x') = g((\mathcal{A}^{-1}x)')$. Then

$$\tilde{G} := \{x : x_n = \tilde{g}(x'), ; x' \in B'_{r_0}(0)\},$$

a part of $\mathcal{A}G$ near 0, is locally bounded and therefore locally Lipschitz, where $\|\tilde{g}\|_{Lip(B'_{r_0}(0))} \leq Cr_0^{-1}$. And (3.7) means

$$(3.8) \quad v(\tilde{G}(0, x'')) \leq \varepsilon + \frac{CM_2}{\rho^2}|x''|^2 \text{ on } \tilde{G}.$$

Also,

$$0 \leq v \leq K \text{ and } \lambda \leq \det D^2v \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \tilde{\Omega} := \mathcal{A}\Omega.$$

Let $\tilde{p} = \mathcal{A}p = (p_1, 0, p_n)$, $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon + v(\tilde{p})$. Consider the convex set $E := B_{\rho r_0}(\frac{\tilde{p}}{2}) \cap \{x | x_1 p_n \leq x_n p_1\}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$, the boundary $H = \{x | x_n p_1 = x_1 p_n\}$, its normal $\nu = \frac{(p_n, 0, -p_1)}{|\tilde{p}|}$, and the projection mapping \mathcal{P}^ν along $-\nu$ to H .

Note that $H \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ is below \tilde{G} . Given point $z \in H \cap B_{\rho^2 r_0^2}(\frac{\tilde{p}}{2})$, we can find $q = (0, q'', q_n) \in \tilde{G}$ and constants $t, s > 0$ such that $z + s\nu = t\tilde{p} + (1-t)q$. Since ρ is small, we have $t \leq \frac{3}{4}$, then $|q''| \leq C|z''|$, $|q| \leq Cr_0^{-1}|q''| \leq \rho^2 r_0 \ll \rho r_0$ and $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$. By convexity and the quadratic growth condition (3.8) at origin, we obtain

$$v(z) \leq \max\{v(p), v(q)\} \leq \varepsilon_0 + \frac{CM_2}{\rho^2}|z''|^2.$$

Since

$$s \leq \text{dist}(z + s\nu, H) \leq C \text{dist}(q, H) \ll \rho r_0,$$

we have $z + s\nu \in B_{\rho r_0}(\frac{\tilde{p}}{2})$. Let $\check{S}_h = \{x | v(x) \leq h\} \cap B_{\rho r_0}(\frac{\tilde{p}}{2})$. In summary, we have proved that

$$\frac{\text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{P}^\nu \check{S}_h \cap (-\mathcal{P}^\nu \check{S}_h) \cap E)}{h^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \geq c(M_1, M_2, \rho, r) \text{ for } h \geq 2\varepsilon_0,$$

If ε_0 small, this and the fact that $0 \leq v \leq K$ will contradict with Lemma 3.1. Thus ε_0 has a universal lower barrier, which proves the Lemma. \square

3.2. Global Lipschitz Regularity for Viscosity solution.

Recall the definition of viscosity solution to $D_\beta u = \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$. Note that a bounded convex function must be continuous.

Lemma 3.3 (Comparison principle for mixed problem). *Suppose Ω is a bounded convex set, G_1, G_2 are closed sets without interior intersection such that $\partial\Omega = G_1 \cup G_2$,*

β is an oblique vector field on $\partial\Omega \setminus G_1$. Let $u \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \cap USC(\bar{\Omega})$, $v \in LSC(\bar{\Omega})$ be two convex function satisfying

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2v \leq \det D^2u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u < v & \text{on } G_1, \\ D_\beta v < D_\beta u & \text{on } G_2. \end{cases}$$

If either u or v is in $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$, then $u < v$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.

Proof. On the contrary to the conclusion, assume that $w = u - v$ takes nonnegative maximum value m . According to Lemma 2.9 and the assumption, we have $w(x_0) = m$ for some point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \setminus G_1$. This contradicts the definition of viscosity solution. \square

Taking any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, we may assume $x_0 = 0$ by a translation. Suppose that $\beta(0) = \beta' + \beta_n e_n$ is oblique at origin, where $\beta' = \mathcal{P}\beta$ and $\beta_n > 0$. We make a sliding transformation \mathcal{B} at the boundary point $x_0 = 0$ along $x_n = 0$:

$$\mathcal{B}x = \beta_n x + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i x_n e_i.$$

Let

$$v(y) = u(\mathcal{B}y), f^\mathcal{B}(y) = (\beta_n)^{2n} f(\mathcal{B}y), \phi^\mathcal{B}(y) = \phi(\mathcal{B}y), \Omega_\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{-1}\Omega,$$

we see that the problem (1.1) is transformed into

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2v = f^\mathcal{B} & \text{in } \Omega_\mathcal{B}, \\ D_{\mathcal{B}^{-1}\beta(\mathcal{B}(x))}v = \phi^\mathcal{B} & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\mathcal{B}. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding g in (2.3) still belongs to Lipschitz (See Lemma 2.7) (or $C^{1,\alpha}$ if $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\alpha}$) around $x_0 = 0$, and the oblique condition in (1.3) is invariant under any linear transformation (possibly differing by a constant). Furthermore, this discussion can be used to show that the oblique at a boundary point p implies the oblique in a small neighborhood of p . Using finite cover lemma we can derive (1.3) from (1.2).

In summary, we can always transform our problem into a local problem around 0 (see Definition 2.1), and assume that

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & x_0 = 0, \text{ (2.3) -(2.6) holds, } u(0) = 0, \beta(0) = e_n; \\ & \mathcal{P}^{x_0} = \mathcal{P}, g = g(x'), \beta(x) = \beta(x') \text{ and } \phi(x) = \phi(x'); \end{aligned}$$

The regularity of g, β and ϕ is the same as the original.

Here, by virtue of (2.3), locally we always regard ϕ and β as functions depending only on variable x' , and we can always consider function $u - u(x_0)$ instead of $u(x)$.

Next, we need to show that ∇u is bounded on the boundary. For this purpose, we will need the following covering lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that the oblique vector field $\beta \in \text{Lip}(\partial\bar{\Omega})$, then the set*

$$\Omega_\beta := \{y + t\beta(y) \mid y \in \partial\Omega, t \geq 0\}$$

covers the set $\{x \in \bar{\Omega} \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq t_0\}$ for some small universal $t_0 > 0$.

Proof. We assume that $\beta(0) = e_n$ and consider the point $q \in \Omega$ satisfies $|q| < t_0$. Write the points in the neighborhood of 0 as $\mathcal{G}y' + te_n, t > 0$.

Let $X = B'_c(0) \times (0, 1)$, consider the mapping $\phi : \bar{X} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$

$$\phi(x', s; t) = \mathcal{G}x' + (te_n + (1-t)\beta(x'))s.$$

Obviously, $q \notin \phi(\partial X \times [0, 1])$ if t_0 is enough small. Since

$$\text{deg}(\phi(\cdot; 1), X, q) = \text{deg}(\phi(\cdot; 0), X, q) = 1,$$

we see that q is in Ω_β . The proof is then completed by a piecewise cover. \square

Next, we give an alternative expression for the viscosity solution through the Dini differential. Please note that the viscosity boundary value is not necessarily unique.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ is convex function defined on convex domain Ω . For every boundary point x_0 , and oblique vector γ , the following equations holds in viscosity sense pointwise*

$$D_\gamma u(x_0) = D_\gamma^+ u(x_0),$$

where $D_\gamma^+ u$ is defined by (2.2).

Proof. Observing that $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ is convex and x_0 is a boundary point, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(x_0 + t\gamma(x_0)) - u(x_0)}{t} = \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_\gamma u(x_0 + t\gamma(x_0)) = D_\gamma^+ u(x_0).$$

Suppose that $v \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ touches u from above (below) at boundary point x_0 , then

$$D_\gamma v(x_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{v(x_0 + t\gamma(x_0)) - v(x_0)}{t} \geq (\leq) \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(x_0 + t\gamma(x_0)) - u(x_0)}{t} = D_\gamma^+ u.$$

\square

Recall the assumption (\mathbf{A}_1) and the constants a and η in (1.3).

Lemma 3.6. *Given point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, and convex function $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$. Denote $x_t := x_0 + t\beta$ and assume that*

$$D_\beta^+ u(x_0) \geq -C_1.$$

Then

$$|p_t| \leq C(a, \eta)(\text{Osc}_\Omega u + C_1) \text{ for } t \in (0, ca], \forall p_t \in \partial u(x_t).$$

Moreover, we can find a $p(x_0) \in \partial u(x_0)$, which will be denoted by $\nabla u(x_0)$ (depends on β), such that

$$(3.11) \quad p(x_0) \cdot \beta(x_0) = D_\beta^+ u(x_0).$$

Proof. As we have said before (3.10), we may assume that $x_0 = 0$ and (3.10) holds. Thus, $u(0) = 0$ and $\beta(0) = e_n$. By the convexity we have

$$D_n^+ u(0) = \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow 0^+} p_t \cdot e_n = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} p_t \cdot e_n.$$

Take $\sigma_0(0) = C, \sigma_0(t) = +\infty$ for $t > 0$, and $\sigma_1 \equiv Osc_\Omega u$. Lemma 2.6 implies that p_t is universal bounded and

$$|p_t| \leq C(a, \eta)(Osc_\Omega u + C_1), \quad \forall p_t \in \partial u(x_t).$$

Denote the support function of u at point x_t by l_t . Then $\{l_t : t \rightarrow 0^+\}$ is precompact and contains a subsequence that converges to the support function $l_0 = p_0 \cdot x$ of u at 0, thus $p_0 \in \partial u(0)$. And $p_0 \cdot e_n = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} p_t \cdot e_n = D_\beta^+ u(0)$. \square

The next Lemma shows that the bounded convex subsolution is actually Lipschitz.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $u \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \cap USC(\bar{\Omega})$ be a convex, subsolution to problem (1.1). Assume that $\phi \in USC(\partial\Omega)$. Then $D_\beta^+ u \geq \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$, $u \in Lip(\bar{\Omega})$ and*

$$(3.12) \quad \|u\|_{Lip(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C(a, \eta)(Osc_\Omega u + \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}).$$

Proof. Take $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, assume $x_0 = 0$ and (3.10) holds. Thus, $u(0) = 0$ and $\beta(0) = e_n$. Denote $x_t := te_n$ and $p_t \in \partial u(x, t)$. By convexity, $p_s \cdot e_n \leq p_t \cdot e_n \leq C$ and

$$u(x_s) < u(0) - p_s \cdot (0 - x_s) \leq sp_t \cdot e_n \text{ for } s \in [0, t].$$

Note that $D_\beta^+ u(0) \geq \phi(0)$ is equivalent to

$$(3.13) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_n u(x_t) \geq \phi(0).$$

Let $A = \phi(0)$, on the contrary to (3.13) we assume that there would be small positive constants τ ($\tau \leq a$) and ϵ such that $D_n^+ u(x_\tau) \leq A - \epsilon$, then we have

$$(3.14) \quad u(x_t) \leq u(0) + (A - \epsilon)t \text{ for } t \in [0, \tau].$$

Take the positive constants $c = \frac{1}{8(1+\|\beta\|_{Lip})}$ and $r = r(\epsilon, \tau, u) \leq \min\{\epsilon, a\eta, \frac{1}{8}c\eta^3\epsilon\tau\}$ small enough so that

$$A - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\phi(x) \leq A + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon, \quad u(x) \leq \frac{1}{8}c\eta^3\epsilon\tau \text{ in } B_{2\eta^{-1}r}(0) \cap \Omega$$

and

$$u(x) \leq u(x_\tau) + \frac{1}{8}c\eta^3\epsilon\tau \text{ in } B_{2r}(x_\tau) \cap \Omega.$$

Consider the tubular domain

$$\Gamma = (B'_r(0) \times [0, \tau]) \cap \Omega$$

and the convex function

$$v(x) = \frac{c\eta\epsilon}{r^2}|x'|^2 + (A - \epsilon)x_n.$$

Denote $G_1 := \overline{\partial\Gamma} \setminus \partial\Omega$, $G_2 := \partial\Gamma \cap \partial\Omega$. Obviously, $G_2 \subset (B'_r(0) \times [0, t_0]) \cap \partial\Omega$ and $\partial G_1 \in B_{2\eta^{-1}r}(0) \setminus B_r(0)$. By calculation,

$$v > u \text{ on } \partial G_1 \cup B'_r(x_\tau).$$

Note that v is linear along the e_n direction and u is a convex function, therefore $v > u$ on G_1 . We have

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2v = 0 \leq \det D^2u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u < v & \text{on } G_1, \\ D_\beta v < D_\beta u & \text{on } G_2. \end{cases}$$

Here, for point $z \in G_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\beta(z)}v(z) &\leq \phi(0) - \epsilon + \left(\frac{2c\eta\epsilon}{r} + 1\right)|\beta(z) - \beta(0)| \\ &\leq \phi(z) - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon + \left(\frac{2c\eta\epsilon}{r} + 1\right)\|\beta\|_{Lip}r < \phi(z) = D_{\beta(z)}u(z). \end{aligned}$$

However, $v(0) = 0 = u(0)$, which contradicts Lemma 3.3. This is to say that (3.13) holds.

Using the same argument as the proof of Lemma 3.6, we have

$$|\nabla u(x_0 + t\beta(x_0))| \leq C(a, \eta)(Osc_\Omega u + \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}), \quad \forall x_0 \in \partial\Omega \text{ and } t \in (0, ca].$$

Recalling Lemma 3.4 and the fact that 0 can be replaced by arbitrary boundary points,

we conclude that u is uniformly Lipschitz in the neighborhood of boundary $\partial\Omega$.

Now, define

$$u^*(x) = \overline{\lim}_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y).$$

Then $u^* \in USC(\bar{\Omega})$. Since $u \in USC(\bar{\Omega})$ is convex, $u^* \leq u$ on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $u = u^*$ in Ω . If $u^* < u$ at some boundary point x_0 , say $x_0 = 0$, then (3.14) still holds, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $u = u^* \in Lip(\bar{\Omega})$, (3.12) holds. \square

Theorem 3.8. *Let $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ be a convex solution to problem (1.1). Suppose that $\phi \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Then*

$$\sup_\Omega u - \inf_\Omega u \leq C(a, \eta) \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)},$$

and

$$\|u\|_{Lip(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C(a, \eta)(1 + \text{diam}(\Omega))\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Given point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, the equation $D_\beta u(x_0) \leq \phi(x_0)$ corresponding to the supersolution implies

$$\sup_{p \in \partial u(x_0)} \{p \cdot \beta\} \leq \phi(x_0).$$

Assume that u takes its maximum value at the boundary point $x_0 = 0$ and (3.10) holds. According to the above equation and Lemma 3.6, we write

$$\nabla u(0) = \phi(0)e_n + be$$

for $e \in S^{n-1}$, $b \geq 0$. Then

$$bt + \phi(0)g(te_n) \leq u(\mathcal{G}(te)) - u(0) \leq 0.$$

This gives

$$b \leq C(a, \eta)\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}.$$

Hence, by the convexity and the maximum $u(0)$, we see that

$$\inf_{\Omega} u \geq u(0) + \nabla u(0) \cdot x \geq \sup_{\Omega} u - C(a, \eta)\text{diam}(\Omega)\|\phi\|_{L^\infty},$$

which is the first inequality of Lemma 3.8. Its second inequality follows from Lemma 3.7. \square

We can now improve the comparison principle, although it will not be used in this paper.

Corollary 3.9 (Comparison principle for mixed problem). *Suppose Ω , G_1, G_2 , $\partial\Omega = G_1 \cup G_2$ and β are as the same as in Lemma 3.3. Let $u \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \cap USC(\bar{\Omega})$, $v \in LSC(\bar{\Omega})$ be two convex function satisfying (3.9). If either $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ or $D_\beta u \geq -C$, but $\beta \in Lip_{loc}(\partial\Omega \setminus G_1)$, then $u < v$ on $\bar{\Omega}$.*

Proof. On the contrary to the conclusion, we can assume that $w = u - v$ takes the maximum value $m \geq 0$ at point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \setminus G_1$. Recalling the Lemma 3.6, in each case we can find a support plane of u at x_0 . Then $v - [u(x_0) + \nabla u(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) - m]$ takes the minimum at x_0 , which contradicts the definition of supersolution. \square

At this moment, by subtracting a linear function with universally bounded gradients $\alpha = \nabla u(0)$ such that $\alpha \cdot \beta = \phi(0)$, we can replace ϕ by $\phi - \beta \nabla u(0)$. For simplicity, we will always write $S_h^u(0)$ and $G_h^u(0)$ as S_h and G_h respectively, and assume that

$$(3.15) \quad u(0) = 0, \quad \nabla u(0) = 0, \quad u \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \phi(0) = 0.$$

The regularity of ϕ now actually depends on η, β, Ω .

Suppose that (3.10) and (3.15) holds. In Lemma 3.10, we will prove that, locally, the second equation of (1.1) yields (3.17). And for $x \in G$, we rewrite the elements in $\partial u(x)$ that satisfy (3.11) as $\nabla u(x)$. In Sections 4 and 5, unless otherwise stated, we always consider the following local problem:

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ D_n u = \phi^0 & \text{on } G := \partial\Omega \cap B_c(0), \end{cases}$$

where $\phi^0(x') := D_n^+ u(\mathcal{G}x')$ satisfying $|\phi^0| \leq C|x'|$ around 0.

For this purpose, we need to estimate the following quantity.

$$\phi^0(x') = D_n^+ u(\mathcal{G}x') = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_n u(\mathcal{G}x' + te_n).$$

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose u is a solution to problem (1.1), $x_0 = 0 \in \partial\Omega$, (3.15) holds, and $c > 0$ is small. Then the following inequality hold in viscosity sense*

$$(3.17) \quad \|D_n u(x) - \phi(x')\| \leq C\|u\|_{Lip}|\beta - e_n| \leq C|x'| \text{ on } \partial\Omega \cap B_c(0).$$

Proof. Given a point $q = (q', g(q')) \in \partial\Omega \cap B_c(0)$, recalling the Lemma 3.5, we only need to estimate $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_n u(q + te_n)$. On one hand, by Lemma 3.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_n u(q + te_n) &\geq \nabla u(q) \cdot e_n \\ &\geq \nabla u(q) \cdot \beta(q') - C|\beta(q') - e_n| |\nabla u(x)| \\ &\geq \phi(q') - C|q'| \|u\|_{Lip}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 3.8 and assumption (\mathbf{A}_1) .

On the other hand, recalling lemma 3.4 we can write

$$q + te_n = q_s + s\beta(q'_s)$$

for point $q_s \in \partial\Omega$ and constant $s := s(t) \geq 0$. Hence,

$$D_n u(q + te_n) \leq D_{\beta(q'_s)} u(q_s + s\beta(q'_s)) + C|\beta(q'_s) - e_n| |\nabla u(q_s + s\beta(q'_s))|.$$

Consider the family of functions generated by

$$\phi(y, t) := D_{\beta(y')} u(y + t\beta(y')), \quad y \in \partial\Omega.$$

For each fixed t , we have $\phi(y, t) \in USC(\partial\Omega)$. According to Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8, as $t \rightarrow 0$, $\phi(y, t)$ converges decreasingly to the continuous function $\phi := D_\beta u(y)$. Thus, this convergence is uniformly, and there exists a module $\sigma_1(t)$ (with $\sigma_1(0) = 0$) such that

$$(3.18) \quad \phi(y, t) \leq \phi(y) + \sigma_1(t).$$

Observing that $|\beta(x') - e_n| \leq C|x'|$, we can further assume that

$$s \leq Ct, \quad \|s\beta(q'_s)\| \leq \frac{1}{2}|q'_s|, \quad |q'_s - q| \leq Ct|q'|.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.19) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_n u(q + te_n) &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} (D_{\beta(q'_s)} u(q_s + s\beta(q'_s)) + C|\beta(q'_s) - e_n| \cdot |\nabla u(q_s + s\beta(q'_s))|) \\ &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} (\phi(q'_s) + \sigma_1(s) + C|\beta(q'_s) - e_n| \cdot |\nabla u(q_s + s\beta(q'_s))|) \\ &= \phi(q') + C|\beta(q') - e_n| \cdot \|u\|_{Lip} \\ &\leq \phi(q') + C|q'|, \end{aligned}$$

and (3.17) follows. □

It is easy from (3.17) to obtain

Corollary 3.11. *Under the same assumptions of Lemma 3.10, we have*

$$(3.20) \quad u(x + te_n) \geq u(x) - Ct|x'|, \quad \text{if } x \in \partial\Omega \cap B_c(0).$$

Lemma 3.12. *We can modify (1.6) to*

$$u(x) - u(x_0) - \nabla u(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) \leq [C_0 + (C_0\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}]|x - x_0|^2 + \varepsilon + (C_0\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall x \in \partial\Omega.$$

In particular, (1.4) implies that (1.5) holds.

Proof. Suppose $x_0 = 0$ and (3.15) holds. Take a $p_{x_0} \in \partial u(x_0)$ such that (1.4) is satisfied. Write $p_{x_0} = be + de_n$ for some $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \geq 0$. Obviously, $d \leq 0$ due to Lemma 3.6, and by (1.6) we have

$$0 \leq u(\mathcal{G}(-te)) \leq -bt + C_0t^2 + \varepsilon \text{ for any small } t.$$

This gives $b \leq (C_0\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and

$$u(x) \leq C_0|x|^2 + b|x| + \varepsilon \leq [C_0 + (C_0\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}]|x - x_0|^2 + \varepsilon + (C_0\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

3.3. Existence and Compactness.

In this subsection, we construct lower barrier to prove several theorems on compactness and existence. First, we use Perron's method to prove Theorem 1.5, the existence for Robin's problem (1.8).

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Recalling (\mathbf{A}_1) and the assumption of Theorem 1.5, we have $\gamma \geq \gamma_0 > 0$. Choose the appropriate positive constants K_1 and K_2 such that $u^+(x) = K_1$ is a natural supersolution and

$$u^-(x) = -K_2 + \Lambda|x - y|^2$$

is a subsolution to problem (1.8). Consider the non-empty set

$$V := \{v \in USC(\bar{\Omega}) \mid v \text{ is a subsolution to problem (1.8), } u^- \leq v \leq u^+\}.$$

Each function u_0 in V is uniformly bounded, then $D_\beta u_0 \geq -C$, and hence u_0 is uniformly Lipschitz according to Lemma 3.7. Let

$$u(x) = \sup_{v \in V} v(x).$$

Then u is still bounded and Lipschitz on $\bar{\Omega}$. The classical interior discussion shows that $\det D^2 u = f$ in Ω . See, for example, Section 9 in [6].

Given a boundary point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, the support plane of $v_k \in V$ at x_0 will converge to a support plane of u , then Lemma 3.6 ensures that u is a subsolution of the second equation of problem (1.1).

Next, we show that u is a supersolution at x_0 . Suppose $x_0 = 0$, (3.10) holds, $u \geq 0$ and $D_n u(0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} D_n u(x_0 + te_n) = 0$ (see (3.15)). We want to prove $D_n u(0) \leq \phi(0)$. On the contrary, suppose that $\phi(0) \leq -3\epsilon$ for a small $\epsilon > 0$. Then $u^+(0) > u(0)$. Otherwise the support function $l = 0$ will touch u^+ at 0 from below, which contradicts the fact that $D_n u^+(0) \leq \phi(0) < 0$. Note that $u^+ - u \in LSC(\bar{\Omega})$, we can take $\tau, r > 0$ such that $r \ll \epsilon$ such that

$$u^+ - u \geq \tau > 0 \text{ in } B_r(0) \cap \Omega,$$

and

$$\phi(x) + \gamma u \leq \phi(0) + \epsilon \leq -2\epsilon \text{ in } B_r(0) \cap \partial\Omega.$$

Choose a small constant $h > 0$ (to be fixed later). According to Lemma 2.10,

$$\text{Vol } S_h(0) \leq Ch^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Note that

$$t_h := \sup\{t \mid te_n \in S_h(0)\} = \frac{h}{\varepsilon_h}$$

for some $\varepsilon_h \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Lemma 2.4 means that

$$\text{Vol}_{n-1} \mathcal{P}S_h(0) \leq \frac{\text{Vol } S_h(0)}{t_h} \leq \varepsilon_h h^{\frac{n-2}{2}}.$$

By John's Lemma 2.8, there exist point $x_h \in \mathcal{P}S_h(0)$ and affine transformation \mathcal{T} on \mathbb{R}^{n-1} such that

$$\mathcal{P}S_h(0) - x_h \subset \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |\mathcal{T}x'|^2 \leq c\} \text{ and } \det \mathcal{T} \leq C(\text{Vol}_{n-1} \mathcal{P}S_h(0))^{-1}.$$

Note that $u \in Lip(\bar{\Omega})$ and $u(0) = 0$ ensures $cB'_h(0) \subset \mathcal{P}S_h(0)$ and

$$(3.21) \quad cB'_h(0) \subset \mathcal{P}S_h(0) \quad \text{and} \quad h\|\mathcal{T}\| \leq c,$$

and the point $0 \in \mathcal{P}S_h(0)$ gives

$$\mathcal{P}S_h(0) \subset \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |\mathcal{T}x'|^2 \leq 1\}.$$

Let $v = u + \epsilon x_n$, $a_n(h) = \epsilon^{-1}h$, and $E_h = (\{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |\mathcal{T}x'|^2 \leq 1\} \times [0, a_n(h)]) \cap \bar{\Omega}$.

Then

$$(3.22) \quad S_h^v(0) \subset \{u \leq h\} \cap \{x_n \leq a_n(h)\} \subset E_h.$$

If $n = 2$, Lemma 3.2 (or Lemma 4.1) implies that

$$S_h^v(0) \subset S_h^u(0) \rightarrow \{0\} \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

If Ω is strict convex, we still have

$$S_h^v(0) \subset \{x_n \leq \epsilon^{-1}h\} \rightarrow \{0\} \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, under the assumption of Theorem 1.5, we can choose $0 < h \ll \tau$ such that

$$S_h^v(0) \subset B_r(0).$$

Consider function

$$P^h(x) = \frac{h}{4} + \frac{h}{2n} \left[|\mathcal{T}x'|^2 + \left(\frac{x_n}{a_n(h)} \right)^2 \right] - \epsilon x_n.$$

Then

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 P^h > 2\Lambda & \text{in } E_h, \\ D_\beta P^h > \phi & \text{on } \partial E_h \cap G, \\ P^h(x) < u & \text{on } \partial E_h \setminus G, \\ P^h(0) > u(0). \end{cases}$$

In fact, by a direct calculation, we have

$$P^h(x) < h - \epsilon x_n \leq v - \epsilon x_n = u \text{ on } \partial E_h \setminus G,$$

$$\det D^2 P^h \geq C[a_n(h)]^{-2} |\det D'\mathcal{T}|^2 h^n \geq \frac{C\epsilon^2}{\epsilon_h^2} \gg 2\Lambda \text{ in } E_h,$$

and

$$D_\beta P^h \geq \beta' \cdot D' \frac{h|\mathcal{T}x'|^2}{2n} - C|\beta_n - 1| - \epsilon \text{ on } \partial E_h \cap G.$$

Writing $\mathcal{T}x' = \text{diag}\{a_i^{-1}x_i\}$ in a suitable orthogonal coordinate and using (3.21) we obtain

$$D_\beta P^h \geq -C\|\beta - e_n\| - \epsilon > -2\epsilon \geq \phi.$$

In conclusion, the function $w = \max\{P^h, u\}\chi_{E_h} + u\chi_{E_h^c}$ satisfies $w \leq u^+$ and $w \in V$. However, $w(0) > u(0)$, which contradicts the definition of u . \square

The following compactness theorem follows directly from the construction of the lower barrier.

Theorem 3.13. *Let $u_k : \Omega_k \rightarrow R$ be convex solution to*

$$\det D^2 u_k = f_k \text{ in } \Omega_k, \quad D_{\beta_k} u_k = \phi_k \text{ on } \partial\Omega_k.$$

where β_k satisfying oblique assumption (1.3) on $\partial\Omega_k$ uniformly and $\|\beta_k\|_{Lip} \leq C$. Assume that convex domains Ω_k converges to a bounded domain Ω in the sense of Hausdorff distance, $\beta_k, \phi_k \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ locally uniformly converges to $\beta, \phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ respectively, and $\lambda \leq f_k \leq \Lambda$ locally uniformly converges to f . If $n = 2$ or Ω is a strict convex domain, then up to constant, $\{u_k\}$ contains a subsequence which uniformly converges to a solution u to

$$\det D^2 u = f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad D_{\beta} u = \phi \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Proof. Since u_k is uniformly Lipschitz up to a constant by Theorem 3.8, it is easy to verify that u_k converges uniformly to a solution u of the problem

$$\det D^2 u = f, \quad \lambda \leq f \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \text{and } D_{\beta} u \geq \phi \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

We claim that $D_{\beta} u(p) \leq \phi(p)$ for any $p \in \partial\Omega$. Otherwise, in a suitable coordinate, we assume $p = 0$ and can construct an open set F_h and a function Q_h satisfying (3.23), then $Q_h + c_k$ will touch u_k from below at a point $x_k \in F_h$ when k is large enough, which will contradict the fact that u_k is viscosity supersolution and ϕ_k converge to ϕ . \square

Next, we study the local problem (3.16). The mixed problem does not have a general existence result, because it is difficult to find barriers for points near the Dirichlet boundary in this case. We need to make some additional assumptions, one of which is the following strict convexity assumption:

$$(3.24) \quad c|x|^{\frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} - \delta \leq u(x) \leq C|x|^{1+\bar{\alpha}} + \delta$$

for some small universal constant $\delta > 0$.

Lemma 3.14. *Suppose that $u^- \in USC(\bar{\Omega})$ is a subsolution to problem (3.16), and $u^+ \in LSC(\bar{\Omega})$ is a supersolution to problem (3.16). Assume that $u^- \leq u^+$ and both satisfy (3.24). If $\phi \in C(B'_c(0))$ is concave, then there exists a solution $u \in Lip(\bar{\Omega})$ which solves the first equation of problem (3.16), and u is a solution to the second equation of (3.16) in $B_\rho(0) \cap \partial\Omega$ for some small universal constant $\rho > 0$.*

Proof. We follow the proof of Theorem 1.5. Consider the non-empty set

$$V := \{v \in USC(\bar{\Omega}) \mid v \text{ is a subsolution to problem (3.16) and } u^- \leq v \leq u^+\}.$$

The function

$$u(x) = \sup_{v \in V} v(x) \in Lip(\bar{B}_c(0) \cap \bar{\Omega}),$$

is a convex viscosity solution to the first equation of problem (3.16), and u is a subsolution to the second equation of problem (3.16).

Next, we show that u is a supersolution at boundary point $x_0 \in B_\rho(0) \cap G$, where

$$G = \{(x, g(x')) : x' \in B'_c(0)\}.$$

Denote $E := \{u(x) = u(x_0) + \nabla u(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)\} \cap \bar{\Omega}$. (3.24) means that $E \subset\subset B_c(0)$. Note that E can not have extremal point in interior, thus

$$\mathcal{P}E = \mathcal{P}(E \cap G), \text{ and } \partial E \cap (\partial(\mathcal{P}E) \times \mathbb{R}) = \partial E \cap G.$$

Recalling that $D_n u \in USC(\bar{\Omega})$, $D_n u \geq \phi$ on G and ϕ is concave, we can choose $p \in E \cap G$ such that p' is the extremal point of $\mathcal{P}E$ and satisfies

$$D_n u(p) \geq \phi(p) + 3\epsilon.$$

By considering the transformation $\mathcal{A}x = (x - p) - D'g(p') \cdot x'e_n$, without loss of generality, we assume that $p = 0$, (3.10) holds, and

$$\mathcal{P}E \subset \{x_1 \leq 0\}.$$

Similarly, $u(0) < u^+(0)$. We have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} S_h(0) = E := S_0(0)$$

in Hausdorff sense.

Let $a_1(h) := \sup\{t \mid \mathcal{G}(te_1) \in S_h(0)\}$. Recalling the set E_h and the function P^h defined in the proof of Theorem 1.5, we consider the set

$$F_h = E_h \cap \{-16a_1(h) \leq x_1 \leq a_1(h)\}$$

and the function

$$Q^h(x) = P^h(x) + \frac{hx_1}{8a_1(h)}.$$

We have $F_h \rightarrow \{0\}$ as $h \rightarrow 0$,

$$Q^h(x) \leq P^h(x) + \frac{h}{8} < u \text{ on } (\partial E_h \setminus G) \cap \{x_1 \geq -8a_1(h)\}$$

and

$$Q^h(x) \leq P^h(x) - 2h < -h < u \text{ on } (\partial F_h \setminus G) \cap \{x_1 = -8a_1(h)\}.$$

Similarly to (3.23), by choosing a sufficiently small h , we have

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 Q^h > 2\Lambda & \text{in } F_h, \\ D_n Q^h > \phi + \frac{\epsilon}{2} & \text{on } \partial F_h \cap G, \\ Q^h(x) < u - \frac{h}{8} & \text{on } \partial F_h \setminus G, \\ Q^h(0) > u(0). \end{cases}$$

Hence, the function $w = \max\{Q^h, u\}\chi_{F_h} + u\chi_{F_h^c}$ will satisfy $w \leq u^+$, so $w \in V$. However $w(0) > u(0)$, which contradicts the definition of u . \square

Similar to Theorem 3.13, we have the following compactness theorem for mixed problem.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $u_k (k = 1, 2, \dots)$ be convex viscosity solution to the local problems 2.1,*

$$\det D^2 u_k = f_k \text{ in } \Omega_k \cap B_c(0), \quad D_{\beta_k} u_k = \phi_k \text{ on } \partial \Omega_k \cap B_c(0)$$

where $\Omega_k = \{x_n \geq g_k(x')\}$, $\lambda \leq f_k \leq \Lambda$ and $\phi_k \in L^\infty(B_c(0))$ uniform converges to a concave function $\phi \in C(B_c(0))$. If all the u_k satisfy the strict convex assumption (3.24) for C, c and δ (independent of k), then there exists subsequence u_k that locally uniformly converges to a solution to

$$\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \Omega \cap B_\rho(0), \quad D_n u = \phi \text{ on } \partial \Omega \cap B_\rho(0).$$

where $\rho > 0$ is a small universal constant.

Remark 3.16. *In the case $n = 2$, due to the naturalness of the strict convexity Lemma 4.1, we can remove the strict convexity assumption (3.24) and the concave assumption on ϕ in the statement of Lemmas 3.14 and 3.15.*

4. GOOD SHAPE LEMMA AND NORMALIZATION FAMILY

From now on, we assume **(A₂)** and focus on the local problem (3.16) with the local condition (3.15). In addition, by Lemma 3.12 we see that (1.6) becomes

$$(4.1) \quad u(x) \leq C|x'|^2 + C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall x \in \partial \Omega.$$

Note that Lemma 3.2 is trivial when $n = 2$ and (3.7) follows from (1.6) when $n \geq 3$. Then Lemma 3.2 implies the following

Lemma 4.1 (Contraction Lemma). *Under the assumption $n = 2$ or (1.6) if $n \geq 3$, there exists a uniform module $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\sigma(h) \rightarrow 0$ when $h \rightarrow 0$ such that*

$$(4.2) \quad \text{diam } S_h(x_0) \leq \sigma(h + \epsilon).$$

The purpose of this section is to introduce the Normalization Family as in Definition 4.7. For this purpose, we need to state the Good Shape Lemma, whose proof will be given in Section 4.2.

Theorem 4.2 (Good Shape Lemma). *There exists a small universal constant $h_0 > 0$ such that the following holds for $h \leq h_0$:*

$$(4.3) \quad c\mathcal{P}S_h(0) \subset \mathcal{P}G_h(0) \subset \mathcal{P}S_h(0),$$

$$(4.4) \quad ch^{n/2} \leq \text{Vol}(S_h(0)) \leq Ch^{n/2},$$

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{P}G_h(0) \subset -C\mathcal{P}G_h(0).$$

By virtue of (3.10) and (3.15), this theorem shows that for every constant $h \leq h_0$ and boundary point $p \in \partial\Omega$, the boundary section $S_h(p)$ at point p is determined by the intersection $S_h(p) \cap \{p + t\beta(p) \mid t > 0\}$ and the projection $\mathcal{P}^p G_h(p)$ along the direction $\beta(p)$, and that the projection $\mathcal{P}^p G_h(p)$ is quasi-symmetric about p .

The right side of (4.4) is the results of Lemma 2.10. The remaining will be proved by Lemmas 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10.

4.1. Normalization Family.

In this subsection, we suppose that (4.3) holds. It follows that

Corollary 4.3. *Given a point $p \in \Omega$ near 0, and constant $\kappa \in [0, 1]$. Assuming $u(p) = a$, by the convexity we have*

$$u(\kappa p) \leq \kappa u(p) + (1 - \kappa)u(0) = \kappa a.$$

Moreover, by (4.3) we can find a $c > 0$ such that

$$q := q_\kappa = \mathcal{G}(c\mathcal{P}\kappa p) \in \partial\Omega, \quad \mathcal{P}q = c\mathcal{P}\kappa p \quad \text{and} \quad u(q) \leq \kappa a.$$

The following discussions will be used frequently, for example, in Sections 4.2 and 5.1.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose $S \subset \Omega$ is a convex set, $0 \in S$, and $\mathcal{P}S \subset C\mathcal{P}(S \cap G)$. Let $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, p be the centroid of S , and $a = u(p)$. Applying Corollary 4.3, we can find the point $q_\kappa \in S \cap G$ such that $u(q_\kappa) \leq \kappa a$. Note that $0 \in \mathcal{P}S$ and $\mathcal{P}S$ is quasi-symmetric about $\mathcal{P}p$. Thus, $\mathcal{P}S$ is quasi-symmetric about $\mathcal{P}q_\kappa$ up to the constant κ . Letting*

$$d_n := \sup\{t \mid q_\kappa + te_n \in S\},$$

then

$$d_n \geq \|u\|_{Lip}^{-1}(\|u\|_{L^\infty(S)} - u(q_\kappa)) \geq c\|u\|_{L^\infty(S)},$$

and Lemma 2.4 implies that

$$c\kappa \text{Vol } S \leq d_n \text{Vol}_{n-1} \mathcal{P}S \leq C \text{Vol } S.$$

According to John's Lemma 2.8, we can assume that under some suitable coordinates, there exists a diagonal transformation $\mathcal{D}' = \text{diag}\{d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}\}$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{D}'B'_c(0) \subset \mathcal{P}(S - q_\kappa) \subset C\mathcal{D}'B'_C(0).$$

Suppose now $\kappa \in (0, 1)$. Denote the support function of g at q_κ by l , i.e. $l(x') = \nabla g(q_\kappa) \cdot (x' - q'_\kappa) + g(q'_\kappa)$. Let $Lx = x_n - l(x')$, then $L(q) = 0$ and $Lx \geq 0$. We obtain

$$(4.7) \quad 0 \leq Lx \leq C\kappa^{-1}d_n \text{ for } x \in S.$$

In fact, for each point $Q_1 = q + (s', s_n) \in S$, the quasi-symmetric property means that $Q_2 = q - (c\kappa s', t_n)$ will belong to S for some s' and t_n . Thus, $Q_3 = \frac{c\kappa Q_1 + Q_2}{1 + c\kappa}$ is in S , and

$$d_n \geq L(Q_3) = \frac{c\kappa L(Q_2) + L(Q_1)}{1 + c\kappa} \geq \max \frac{c\kappa}{1 + c\kappa} \{L(Q_2), L(Q_1)\},$$

and (4.7) is proved.

Now given a small $h > 0$, denote $S = \overline{S_h(0)}$ and take $\kappa = 1$. There exists point $q : q_\kappa$ (one can choose $\mathcal{G}q'$, where q' is the centroid of $PG_h(0)$) and a diagonal transformation $\mathcal{D} = \text{diag}\{\mathcal{D}', d_n\}$ such that (4.6) holds and

$$(4.8) \quad d_n \det \mathcal{D}' \sim \text{Vol } S.$$

Then, we can make a preliminary definition of the Normalization Family, which depends only on the matrix \mathcal{D} and the point q . We mention here that the properties (4.3)-(4.5) are invariant under our normalization. A more precise definition will be given in the Definition 4.7 below.

Definition 4.5. The normalization $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$ of (u, Ω) is given by

$$(4.9) \quad \tilde{u}(x) := \frac{u(\mathcal{D}x)}{h}, \quad x \in \tilde{\Omega} := \mathcal{D}^{-1}\Omega.$$

We will use $\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\phi}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \tilde{S}_t, \tilde{G}_t$ for $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$ as the corresponding quantities we have defined for (u, Ω) . Then, \tilde{u} is the solution to the following normalized local problem

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 \tilde{u} = \tilde{f} & \text{in } \tilde{S}_1, \\ D_n \tilde{u} = \tilde{\phi}^0 & \text{on } \tilde{G}_1, \\ \tilde{u} = 1 & \text{on } \partial \tilde{S}_1 \setminus \tilde{G}_1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(4.11) \quad \tilde{f}(x) = \frac{(\det \mathcal{D})^2}{h^n} f(\mathcal{D}x), \quad \tilde{\phi}^0(x') = \frac{d_n \phi^0(\mathcal{D}'x')}{h} \text{ and } |\tilde{\phi}^0(x)| \leq \frac{C d_n |\mathcal{D}'x'|}{h},$$

and the oblique assumption $e_n \cdot \nu > 0$ remains unchanged. Furthermore (4.6) implies

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{D}'\mathcal{P}q' + B'_c(0) \subset \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1(0) \subset \mathcal{D}'\mathcal{P}q' + B'_C(0) \subset 2B'_C(0).$$

Next, we are going to estimate the normalized quantities (1.5) implies that $B'_{ch^{\frac{1}{2}}}(0) \subset \mathcal{P}G_h(0)$, and we can assume that

$$d := d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \cdots \geq d_{n-1} \geq ch^{1/2} \text{ when } n \geq 3.$$

Then (4.8) is

$$d_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} d_i \sim d_n \det \mathcal{D}' \sim \text{Vol } S_h(0) \leq Ch^{\frac{n}{2}},$$

which means

$$\tilde{f} \leq \frac{|\text{Vol } S_h(0)|^2}{h^n} \Lambda \leq C,$$

$$d_n \leq Ch^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Cd_{n-1} \text{ when } n \geq 3$$

and

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{cases} dd_n \leq Ch \leq C & \text{if } n = 2, \\ dd_n \leq C \frac{\text{Vol } S_h(0)}{\prod_{i=2}^{n-2} d_i} \leq C \frac{\text{Vol } S_h(0) h^{\frac{3}{2}}}{h^{\frac{n}{2}} d_2} \leq Ch \leq C & \text{if } n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, it follows from Proposition 4.4 that

$$d_n \geq c \|u\|_{L^\infty(S_h)} \geq ch.$$

Given a point $x \in S_h$, then

$$|x_i| \leq Cd_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n-1$$

and

$$|D_n u| = |\phi^0(x')| \leq C|x'| \text{ on } G_h.$$

Therefore, (4.11) and (4.13) mean that on \tilde{G}_1 ,

$$(4.14) \quad |\tilde{\phi}^0(x')| \leq C \frac{d_n |D'x'|}{h} \leq C \frac{dd_n |x'|}{h} \leq \begin{cases} C \frac{\text{Vol } S_h(0)}{h^{\frac{n}{2}}} |x'| & n = 2, \\ C \frac{\text{Vol } S_h(0) h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{h^{\frac{n}{2}} d_2} |x'| & n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

In particular,

$$|\tilde{\phi}^0(x')| \leq C \frac{\text{Vol } S_h(0)}{h^{\frac{n}{2}}} |x'| \leq C|x'|.$$

We should point out that at this moment, the normalized Neumann boundary \tilde{G}_t is not necessarily locally bounded as $t \rightarrow 0$. We need to choose a suitable based point for the sections and study the behavior of the following (4.15)-(4.17).

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, $E \subset \overline{\tilde{S}_1(0)}$ is a convex set, $0 \in E$, $z \in E$, $\mathcal{P}E$ is quasi-symmetric about $\mathcal{P}z$ for some $z \in E$, and $\mathcal{P}E \subset C\mathcal{P}(E \cap \tilde{G}_1)$. Applying the discussion in Proposition 4.4 for \tilde{u}, E, \tilde{G} and z instead of u, S, G and p , we can find $q := q_E \in E \cap \tilde{G}_1$ such that the projection $\mathcal{P}E$ is quasi-symmetric about $\mathcal{P}q$ up to the constant κ and $\tilde{u}(q) \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}$. Let \tilde{l} be the support function of \tilde{g} at q . Consider the linear transformation*

$$Ax := (x - q) - \tilde{l}(x')e_n = (x' - q', \tilde{L}(x_n))$$

and the function

$$(4.15) \quad w(y) = \tilde{u}(A^{-1}y).$$

According to (4.7), we have

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{A}E \subset \mathcal{P}(E - q) \times [0, C\kappa^{-1}].$$

By (4.10), w is a solution to following problem

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2w \sim \frac{|\text{Vol } S_h(0)|^2}{h^n} & \text{in } \mathcal{A}E, \\ D_n w = \tilde{\phi}^0(y' + q') & \text{on } \mathcal{A}(E \cap \tilde{G}_1), \\ w \leq 1 & \text{in } \mathcal{A}E. \end{cases}$$

Next, we suppose that Good Shape Lemma 4.2 holds at 0 and introduce the Normalization Family. Lemma 4.2 implies that $PS_h(0)$ is quasi-symmetric about 0 when $h \leq h_0$. Repeat the arguments from proposition (4.4) to Definition 4.5. Hence, for each $h \leq h_0$, we can find diagonal transformations $\mathcal{D}_h := \mathcal{D}_h^u = \text{diag}\{d_1(h), \dots, d_n(h)\}$ that satisfy

$$\det \mathcal{D}_h = h^{\frac{n}{2}} \text{ and } \mathcal{D}_h(B_c(0) \cap \Omega \subset S_h(0)) \subset C\mathcal{D}_h(B_C(0) \cap \Omega).$$

Definition 4.7 (Normalization Family). *Choose $q = 0$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_h$. The normalization $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega}) := T_h(u, \Omega)$ of (u, Ω) is given by (4.9) (see Definition 4.5) and satisfies*

$$B_c(0) \cap \tilde{\Omega} \subset \tilde{S}_1(0) \subset B_C(0) \cap \tilde{\Omega}$$

and (4.10)-(4.12) with $\tilde{f}(x) = f(\mathcal{D}x)$. The boundary function \tilde{g} will be uniform bounded and then uniformly Lipschitz near 0, and $\tilde{\Omega}$ will satisfy (2.3)-(2.5). Lemmas 2.6 and 3.7 show that \tilde{u} is also locally uniformly Lipschitz around 0.

Although the selection of T_h is not uniquely determined, and the coordinates appearing in the definition of the transformation T_h depend on h and u , the following universal relation holds for $s \leq 1$

$$(4.18) \quad c\mathcal{D}_{sh} \leq \mathcal{D}_h \leq Cs^{-1}\mathcal{D}_{sh}.$$

Considering $\mathcal{D}_s^{\tilde{u}_h} = \mathcal{D}_{sh} \mathcal{D}_h^{-1}$, $(\tilde{u}_{sh}, \tilde{\Omega}_{sh})$ will be regarded as the normalization $T_s^{\tilde{u}_h}(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{\Omega}_h)$ of $(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{\Omega}_h)$ at height s . We are only interested in the relationship between sections, but need not to care the choices of D_h , since they can be different only up to a universal factor.

4.2. Proof of Good Shape Lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *There exists $h_0 > 0$ such that if $h < h_0$, then*

$$(4.19) \quad \mathcal{P}S_h(0) \subset C\mathcal{P}G_h(0).$$

Proof. Suppose that $h \leq h_0 \leq \sigma(c_0)$ is small, where σ is the same as in Lemma 4.1. In contrast to (4.19), there would exist unit vector $e, e \perp e_n$ such that

$$\frac{\sup\{s \mid se \in \mathcal{P}S_h(0)\}}{\sup\{s \mid te \in \mathcal{P}G_h(0), \forall t \in (0, s)\}} = K$$

holds for some sufficiently large $K \gg (cc_0)^{-1} > 1$.

For simplicity, assume that $e = e_1$ and that the two maximums in the above equality are achieved by points $y = (y_1, 0, y_n) \in \overline{S_h(0)}$ and $z = (z_1, 0, z_n) \in \overline{G_h(0)}$. Thus, $y_1 = \sup\{s \mid se_1 \in \mathcal{P}S_h(0)\}$ and $z_1 = \sup\{s \mid se_1 \in \mathcal{P}G_h(0), \forall t \in (0, s)\}$. It is clear that $u(z) = u(y) = h$, $y_1 = Kz_1$, and $0 < y_n \leq c_0$ is small according to Lemma 4.1.

In addition, z is below the line connecting y and 0 , defining

$$H := \frac{y_n}{K} - z_n,$$

then $H \leq CK^{-1}$. Recall that $S_h(0)$ is a convex set, and Lemma 2.10 gives

$$H \cdot \text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{P}S_h(0)) \leq C \text{Vol} S_h(0) \leq Ch^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

By the quadratic growth condition (1.5), the $n - 1$ dimension volume of $\mathcal{P}S_h(0)$ is at least $cy_1 \cdot h^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$. Thus,

$$Hy_1 \leq Ch,$$

which is

$$KH z_1 \leq Ch.$$

The sets $l_y := \{sy, s \in (0, 1)\}$ and $l_z := \{z + te_n, t \in [0, \infty)\}$ intersect at point

$$p = z + He_n = K^{-1}y.$$

By convexity

$$u(p) \leq K^{-1}u(y) + (1 - K^{-1})u(0) = K^{-1}h.$$

However, Corollary 3.11 implies that

$$u(p) \geq u(z) - CHz_1 = h - CHz_1 \geq (1 - CK^{-1})h.$$

This two inequalities imply that $K \leq C + 1$ is bounded, which contradicts the fact that K is large. \square

Lemma 4.9. *There exists $h_0 > 0$ such that if $h < h_0$, then*

$$\text{Vol}(S_h(0)) \geq ch^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 we may choose $h_0 > 0$ such that $\text{diam } S_{h_0} \leq \sigma(h_0)$. Suppose $h < h_0$ and let $\epsilon = \frac{\text{Vol}(S_h(0))}{h^{\frac{n}{2}}}$. On the contrary to the result of Lemma 4.9, the ϵ would be small enough. Repeat the previous discussion of the normalization family. In Proposition 4.6, we take $\kappa = 1$, $E = \tilde{S}_1(0)$ and z to be the centroid of E . Then, (4.8) (or (4.13)) implies $dd_n \leq C\epsilon h$ and $d_n \leq C\epsilon h^{\frac{1}{2}}$. And (4.14) means $|\tilde{\phi}^0| \leq C\epsilon$. By (4.15), we now have the following equation for w

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2 w \sim \epsilon^2 & \text{in } \mathcal{A}\tilde{S}_1(0), \\ |D_n w| \leq C\epsilon & \text{on } \mathcal{A}\tilde{G}_1, \\ w = 1 & \text{on } \mathcal{A}(\partial\tilde{S}_1 \setminus \tilde{G}_1), \end{cases}$$

and $w(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\mathcal{A}\tilde{S}_1(0) \subset B_C^+(0)$.

Consider the convex function

$$v(y) = w(0) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i^2}{8nC^2} + \frac{y_n}{4C}.$$

We claim that for a large C , v is a subsolution to w in the following sense

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 w < \det D^2 v & \text{in } \mathcal{A}\tilde{S}_1(0), \\ D_n w < D_n v & \text{on } \mathcal{A}\tilde{G}_1, \\ v < w = 1 & \text{on } \mathcal{A}(\partial\tilde{S}_1 \setminus \tilde{G}_1). \end{cases}$$

In fact, by calculation we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{in } \mathcal{A}\tilde{S}_1(0), \det D^2 v \geq c > C\epsilon^2 \geq \det D^2 w; \\ & \text{on } \mathcal{A}\tilde{G}_1, D_n v \geq c > C\epsilon \geq D_n w; \\ & \text{on } \mathcal{A}(\partial\tilde{S}_1 \setminus \tilde{G}_1), v < w(0) + \frac{1}{2} \leq 1 = w. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, according to Lemma 3.3, $v < w$, which contradicts the fact that $v(0) = w(0)$. Hence, we conclude that $\text{Vol}(S_h(0)) \geq ch^{\frac{n}{2}}$. \square

Lemma 4.10. *There exists $h_0 > 0$ such that if $h < h_0$, then*

$$(4.21) \quad \mathcal{P}G_h(0) \subset -C\mathcal{P}G_h(0),$$

which means that $\mathcal{P}G_h(0)$ is quasi-symmetric about 0.

Proof. Let K be a large universal constant, $\delta = \frac{1}{K^3}$ and $\kappa = K^{-\frac{1}{n+1}}$. Suppose $h \leq h_0$, where h_0 is so small that $\text{diam}S_{h_0}(0) \leq \delta$.

Repeat the previous discussion for the normalization family. By way of contradiction, assume that (4.21) does not hold when $C = C\delta^{-1}$. By (4.3) (Lemma 4.8) we have

$$\text{dist}(0, \partial\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1) \sim \text{dist}(0, \partial\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1) \leq \delta.$$

This implies that $d \geq c\delta^{-1}h^{\frac{1}{2}}$. On \tilde{G}_1 , by (4.13) and Lemma 4.9 we can change (4.14) to

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\phi}^0(x')| &\leq C \frac{d_n |D'x'|}{h} \leq C d_n \frac{d_1 |x_1| + (n-2)d_2}{h} \\ (4.22) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq C \left(\frac{h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{d_2} |x_1| + \frac{h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{d} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{h^{\frac{1}{2}} |x_1|}{d_2} + \delta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we describe the Neumann boundary values more precisely. Take the point $r = \tilde{G}r'$ satisfies $\text{dist}(0, r') = \text{dist}(0, \partial\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1)$, assuming $r_1 \geq 0$. There are two cases: $d_2 \leq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$ or $d_2 \geq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Case 1: $d_2 \leq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then,

$$B''_{cK^{-1}}(0) \subset \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1(0) \subset B'_C(0).$$

By convexity,

$$\sup\{t | te_1 \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1\} \leq CK\delta \leq \frac{C}{K^2}.$$

Hence (4.22) is turned to

$$|\tilde{\phi}^0(x')| \leq \frac{C}{K} \text{ if } x_1 \geq -\frac{1}{K}.$$

Case 2: $d_2 \geq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$. (4.22) is converted to

$$|\tilde{\phi}^0(x')| \leq \frac{C}{K^2}.$$

In this case, we consider a new orthogonal coordinate with zero as the origin and $e_1 = r'/|r'|$ as the axis, so that the normal and tangent planes remain unchanged. This coordinate is still labeled (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) .

In both cases, let $E = \{-\frac{1}{K} \leq x_1 \leq \frac{C}{K^2}\}$ and z be the centroid of E . Repeating Proposition 4.6, we obtain the transformation \mathcal{A} and the function w defined in (4.15), satisfying

$$w(0) \leq \kappa, \text{ and } \mathcal{A}E \subset [-CK^{-1}, CK^{-1}] \times B''_C(0) \times [0, C\kappa^{-1}].$$

Letting $a = \frac{1}{K} - p_\kappa \cdot e_1$, we have $\mathcal{A}\{x_1 \geq -K^{-1}\} = \{x_1 \geq -a\}$. Note that $|p_\kappa \cdot e_1| \leq C\kappa K^{-1}$, so that

$$a \in [cK^{-1}, CK^{-1}].$$

Let $F = \mathcal{A}E$ and $\partial F = F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_3$, where

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} F_1 &= \partial F \cap \mathcal{A}\tilde{G}_1(0) \cap \{y_1 > -a\}, \\ F_2 &= \partial F \cap \{y_1 = -a\}, \\ F_3 &= \partial F \setminus (F_1 \cup F_2). \end{aligned}$$

Now, w is a solution to the following problem

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 w \sim c & \text{in } F, \\ |D_n w| \leq CK^{-1} & \text{on } F_1, \\ D_{-y} w \leq \kappa & \text{on } F_2, \\ w = 1 & \text{on } F_3. \end{cases}$$

Here, since $-y \cdot p \leq w(0) - w(y) \leq w(0) \leq \kappa$ holds for any $p \in \partial w(y)$ and y on F_2 , the third equation of (4.24) holds in viscosity sense. Moreover, e_n and $-y$ still generate an oblique fields even in the corner $F_1 \cap F_2$. Let

$$Q(x) = \frac{1}{4n} \left(\frac{x^2}{2} + 2x \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

and consider the convex function

$$v(y) = w(0) + \left[Q\left(\frac{y_1}{a}\right) + \kappa \left(Q\left(\frac{\kappa y_n}{C}\right) + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} Q\left(\frac{y_i}{C}\right) \right) \right].$$

We claim that

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 w < \det D^2 v & \text{in } F, \\ D_n w < D_n v & \text{on } F_1, \\ D_{-y} w < D_{-y} v & \text{on } F_2, \\ v < w & \text{on } F_3. \end{cases}$$

Then by Lemma 3.3, we have $v < w$, which contradicts $v(0) = w(0)$. This completes our proof.

Finally, we need to verify (4.25). In fact, by a direct calculation we have:

$$\text{in } F, \det D^2 v \geq cK^2 \kappa^{n+1} \geq cK > \det D^2 w;$$

$$\text{on } F_3, v \leq v(0) + \frac{3n}{4n} = w(0) + \frac{3}{4} \leq \kappa + \frac{3}{4} < 1 = w;$$

$$\text{on } F_2, D_{-y} v \geq D_{-y_1} Q\left(\frac{y_1}{a}\right) - C\kappa \geq c - C\kappa > \kappa \geq D_{-y} w(0);$$

$$\text{on } F_1, D_n v \geq c\kappa^2 > \frac{c}{K} \geq D_n w. \quad \square$$

5. UNIVERSAL STRICT CONVEXITY UNDER THE GLOBAL ASSUMPTION

As in Section 4, in addition to (\mathbf{A}_1) we assume that (\mathbf{A}_2) holds throughout this section. We will prove that the normalization family $(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{\Omega}_h)$ is uniformly strictly convex. This property will imply that the Neumann problem for the normalization family $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{S}_1(0))$ is precompact.

Our main theorem is the following universal strict convexity theorem.

Theorem 5.1 (Universal Strict Convexity). *Suppose (1.5) holds, there exists small positive constants $h_0, \delta_0 > 0$ and θ_0 such that if $h < h_0$, then the following holds:*

$$(5.1) \quad (1 + \delta_0)\theta_0 S_h(0) \cap \Omega \subset S_{\theta_0 h}(0),$$

$$(5.2) \quad (1 + \delta_0)S_{\theta_0 h}(0) \cap \Omega \subset S_h(0),$$

$$(5.3) \quad S_{\theta_0 h}(x) \subset cS_h(0) \text{ if } x \in S_{\theta_0 h}(0).$$

We call (5.1) *the upper strict convexity lemma*, (5.2) *the lower strict convexity lemma*. Note that (5.3) is a directly corollary of (5.1) and (5.2). Here is a simple proof when $n = 2$

Proof of Theorem 5.1 in the case of $n = 2$. Since problem (4.10) may be viewed as a local problem (3.16), applying Lemma 4.1 to the normalization problem $(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{S}_1^h)$, we obtain that $\text{diam } \tilde{S}_t^h(x_0) \leq \sigma(t)$, which is exactly (5.2). Then, (5.1) follows from (5.2) and the good shape lemma 4.2. \square

Before proving the case $n \geq 3$ of Theorem 5.1, we give its equivalent statement and related inferences.

Proposition 5.2. *Both (5.1) and (5.2) are scale-invariant properties. By iteration, (5.1) is equivalent to*

$$(5.4) \quad \tilde{u}(x) \leq C|x|^{1+\bar{\alpha}},$$

while (5.2) is equivalent to

$$(5.5) \quad \tilde{u}(x) \geq c|x|^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\alpha}},$$

where $\bar{\alpha} = \min\{-\log_{\theta_0}(1 + \delta_0), c\gamma\} > 0$, and $\gamma = \gamma(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$ is given in the Lemma 2.12. Recalling Lemma 2.6, the estimates (5.4) and (5.5) will imply that

$$(5.6) \quad |\nabla \tilde{u}(x)| \leq C|x|^{\bar{\alpha}} \text{ in } \tilde{S}_1(0).$$

Proposition 5.3. *Assume that (5.1) and (5.2) hold. Note that $\tilde{S}_1(0) \subset B_C(0)$, and that (5.2) implies $\tilde{S}_{\eta^k}^{\eta^{-k}R}(0) \subset B_{c^k}(0)$, so that (5.3) holds for small universal constant $\theta_0 > 0$.*

We remark that when Θ is a local estimate or property that is invariant under the normalization transformation and the linear transformation that preserves the tangent plan, then (5.3) implies that if Θ holds locally (in the neighborhood of 0) for $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$, it will hold globally for (\tilde{u}, \tilde{S}_1) .

In particular, we have got that \tilde{u} and \tilde{g} are uniformly Lipschitz in $B_C(0)$ and $B'_C(0)$, respectively, and (5.6) imply that \tilde{u} is locally uniformly $C^{1,\bar{\alpha}}$ on $\tilde{G}(0)$. Thus, $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$ solves the local problem as (2.7).

To go on, we need to study the stability of the quasi-symmetric property in Lemma 4.10 under small perturbations of the projection mapping.

Given a point p near 0, and any vector $\beta(p)$ satisfying $|\beta(p) - e_n|$ is small. Consider the projection of G along β to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , given by

$$\mathcal{P}^{\beta(p)}\mathcal{G}x' := x' - \frac{\beta'(p)}{\beta_n(p)}g(x').$$

Since g is Lipschitz and $|\beta'|$ is small, according to Lemma 2.5, the map $\mathcal{P}^{\beta(p)}$ is a locally bi-Lipschitz surjective. Note that the projection along β to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} and the projection along β to the tangent plane at p are different up to one universal invertible linear transformation, so the quasi-symmetric property is invariant. Exchange p and 0 in Lemma 4.10, we obtain

Lemma 5.4. *There exists $h_0 > 0$ such that if $h < h_0$, then for any point $p \in G_{h_0}(0)$, $\mathcal{P}^{\beta(p)}(G_h(p))$ is quasi-symmetric about p' .*

The universal strict convexity theorem is a coordinate free property. According to good shape Theorem 4.2, the boundary section is determined by its intersection with the oblique direction and the projection of the Neumann boundary along the oblique direction. Since the oblique direction has been transformed into the normal direction, we have

$$c\left(\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1(0) + (\tilde{S}_1(0) \cap \{te_n : t \geq 0\})\right) \subset \tilde{S}_1(0) \subset C\left(\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1(0) + (\tilde{S}_1(0) \cap \{te_n : t \geq 0\})\right).$$

Using an iterative method we have

Proposition 5.5. *The proof of Theorem 5.1 is equivalent to the proof along the normal direction $\tilde{S}_1(0) \cap \{te_n : t \geq 0\}$ and tangent direction $\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1(0)$ respectively.*

Now we are in the position to complete the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1 in the case of $n \geq 3$. As we have said, it is enough to prove (5.1) and (5.2) restricted to the tangent plan $\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1(0)$ and the normal direction $\tilde{S}_1(0) \cap \{te_n : t \geq 0\}$.

(i) **The Upper Strict Convexity Lemma (5.1)**

Let $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ be a small constant. Assume that $h_0 > 0$ is so small that

$$\text{diam } S_{h_0}(0) \leq \delta^2.$$

Let $\delta_0 = \delta$ and $\theta_0 = c\delta^2$, and we will prove (5.1) for $h < h_0$.

(i₁) **Tangent plane**

The projection $\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_t$ is quasi-symmetric about 0, similar to the convex set $\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0)$. The desired result follows if we have

$$a\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1(0) \cap \{te : t \geq 0\} \subset (1 - \delta)\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_a(0) \cap \{te : t \geq 0\}$$

for $a = \delta^2$. Otherwise, we can find an $e \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that the above relations fails. We may assume $\sup\{t : te \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1(0)\} = 1$. Hence

$$w(\epsilon_1 e) \geq (1 - \delta) > (1 - \delta)\epsilon_1$$

for some $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \delta^2)$ and $w(x') = \tilde{u}(\tilde{G}x')$. Then, by the convexity we can find the constant $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1)$ and the point $q = \tilde{G}(\epsilon_2 e)$ so that

$$(5.7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{w((\epsilon_2 - t)e) - w(\epsilon_2 e)}{t} \leq \frac{w(0) - w(\epsilon_1 e)}{\epsilon_1} \leq \delta - 1 < -\frac{1}{1 + 2\delta}.$$

Recall that \tilde{g} is locally Lipschitz, we can assume that g is differentiable at this point along the direction e . For any point $y = (y', \tilde{g}(y')) \in \tilde{G}$, the convexity yields

$$(y' - q', \tilde{g}(y') - \tilde{g}(q')) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}(q) \leq \tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(q) = w(y') - w(q').$$

Hence (5.7) implies

$$\nabla_e \tilde{u}(q) + D_{-e} \tilde{g}(q') |D_n \tilde{u}(q)| \geq \frac{1}{1 + 2\delta}.$$

By (4.14), $|D_n \tilde{u}(q)| \leq C|q'| \leq C\delta^2$, so

$$(5.8) \quad \nabla_e \tilde{u}(q) \geq \frac{1}{1 + 2\delta} - C\delta^2 \geq \frac{1}{1 + 3\delta}$$

if δ is small enough.

Choose t such that $\tilde{S}_t(q)$ be the minimum height section containing the point $p = \tilde{G}e$. Then $p \in \partial \tilde{S}_t^p(q) \cap \tilde{G}_1$ and

$$\nabla \tilde{u}(q) \cdot (p - q) = \tilde{u}(p) - \tilde{u}(q) - t \leq 1 - t.$$

As (5.7)-(5.8), we have

$$\nabla \tilde{u}(q) \cdot (p - q) \geq (1 - \epsilon_2) \nabla_e \tilde{u}(q) - C |\nabla_n \tilde{u}(q)| \geq \frac{1}{1 + 3\delta} (1 - \epsilon_2) - C\epsilon_2,$$

so that

$$t \leq C(\epsilon_2 + \delta) \leq C\delta.$$

Taking constant $s = 4C(\epsilon_2 + \delta)$ and point $r = \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(-se)$, and using (5.8) and the fact $|D_n \tilde{u}(q)| \leq C|q|$, we have

$$\tilde{u}(r) - \tilde{u}(q) - \nabla \tilde{u}(-(s + q' \cdot e)e, (r_n - q_n)e_n) - t \geq \frac{s}{1 + 2\delta} - C|q| - t > 0.$$

This implies that $r \notin \tilde{S}_t(q)$ and therefore the projection of $\tilde{G}_t(q) \cap \Omega$ on the tangent plane of q is not quasi-symmetrical about q in direction e . This contradicts the Corollary 5.4.

(i₂) **Normal direction**

Let $k = \frac{1}{2C}$. It is enough to prove

$$2k\delta \tilde{S}_1(0) \cap \{te_n : t \geq 0\} \subset \tilde{S}_{k\delta}(0) \cap \{te_n : t \leq \delta\}.$$

Otherwise, we have

$$\tilde{u}(te_n) \geq kt \text{ for } t \geq \delta.$$

According to Lemma 2.4 and Good Shape Lemma 4.2,

$$\frac{\text{Vol}_{n-1} \left(\mathcal{P} \tilde{S}_t(0) \cap \mathcal{P}(-\tilde{S}_t(0)) \cap B'_c(0) \right)}{t^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \geq ck \text{ for } t \geq c\delta.$$

However, $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$. Lemma 3.1 implies $\delta \geq \sigma(k)$, which is a contradiction.

(ii) **The Proof of Lower Strict Convexity Lemma (5.2)**

Let $\kappa > 0$ be a small constant. Denote by

$$(5.9) \quad K = \kappa^{-n-1}, \quad \delta = K^{-\frac{(n+7)(1+\bar{\alpha})}{\bar{\alpha}}}, \quad \delta_0 = \delta^2, \quad \theta_0 = \delta^{2n+6}.$$

Assume that h_0 is small such that

$$\text{diam } S_{h_0}(0) \leq \delta^2,$$

and we will prove (5.2) for $h < h_0$.

Proposition 5.3 implies that $u \in C^{1,\bar{\alpha}}(\partial\Omega)$. The second equation of (3.16) becomes

$$D_n u = \phi \in \text{Lip}(B'_c(0)),$$

while the second equation of (4.10) is

$$(5.10) \quad D_n \tilde{u} = \tilde{\phi} \text{ and } |D_i \tilde{\phi}| \leq C \frac{d_n(h) d_i(h)}{h} \text{ on } \tilde{G} \cap B_C(0).$$

Then we have

$$(5.11) \quad \tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}y') \geq (y_n - \tilde{g}(y'))D_n\tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}y') \geq -C|\tilde{\phi}(y')| \text{ in } \tilde{S}_1(0),$$

and (1.5) at the origin implies

$$(5.12) \quad \tilde{u}(x) \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{d_i(h)^2}{h} x_i^2 \text{ on } \tilde{G}.$$

(ii₁) **Tangent plane** Denote

$$\tilde{G}_h^*(0) := \{(x', \tilde{g}(x')) : tx' \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_h(0), t \in (0, 1)\}.$$

By iteration method and good shape lemma, it is sufficient to prove

$$\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_{\theta_0}^*(0) \subset (1 - \delta_0)\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1^*(0).$$

Otherwise, there were a point $q \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_{\theta_0}^*(0) \setminus (1 - \delta_0)\partial\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1^*(0)$ such that

$$(5.13) \quad \tilde{u}(q) \leq \theta_0.$$

We will derive a contradiction by three cases.

Case 1. $d_2(h) \geq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

In this case, by(5.10) and (4.13) we have

$$(5.14) \quad |D_n\tilde{u}| \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{d_n(h)d_i(h)}{h} \leq C \frac{dd_n}{h} \leq C \frac{h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{d_2} \leq CK^{-1} \text{ on } \tilde{G}_1(0).$$

If $y \in \tilde{S}_1(0)$, it follows from (5.11) and (5.14) that

$$\tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(ty')) \leq \tilde{u}(ty) + CK^{-1} \leq t\tilde{u}(y) + CK^{-1} \leq t + CK^{-1}, \forall t \in (0, 1).$$

Therefore, we can improve (4.19) in Lemma 4.8 to

$$(5.15) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1(0) \subset (1 + CK^{-1})\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1^*(0).$$

Note that $\delta_0 < K^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1$ is a convex set, so there exists point $p \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1$ such that

$$\text{dist}(q', p') = \text{dist}(q', \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1) \leq CK^{-1}.$$

Consider the convex set

$$E = \{y \mid -CK^{-1} \leq (y - q)' \cdot \hat{e} \leq CK^{-1}\} \cap \tilde{S}_1,$$

where $\hat{e} := (p' - q')'/|p' - q'|$. Let z be the centroid of E . Even though $\tilde{u}(q)$ is not the origin, we can still consider the point $q_\kappa = \mathcal{G}((1 - \kappa)q' + \kappa z')$, then E is quasi-symmetric about q_κ up to constant κ . We have

$$\tilde{u}((1 - \kappa)q + \kappa z) \leq (1 - \kappa)\tilde{u}(q) + \kappa\tilde{u}(z) \leq 2\kappa,$$

thus, by Corollary 3.11 we have

$$\tilde{u}(q_k) \leq \tilde{u}((1 - \kappa)q + \kappa\bar{z}) + C|D_n \tilde{u}(q_k)| \leq C\kappa.$$

Consider a new orthogonal coordinate with q_k as the origin and (\hat{e}, e_n) as the axis, keeping the normal and tangent planes unchanged. This coordinate is still labeled as (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) . Repeating the discussion in Propositions 4.4, 4.6 and the proof of Lemma 4.10, we see that the convex set

$$F := \mathcal{A}E \subset [-a, a] \times B_C''(0) \times [0, C\kappa^{-1}], \quad \partial F = F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_3$$

satisfying (4.23), and the convex function w defined in (4.15) now satisfies the same equation as in (4.24) and $w(0) \leq 2\kappa$. Using the same supersolution v as in the proof of Lemma (4.10) we obtain a contradiction.

Case 2. $d_1(h) \leq \delta^{-2}h^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

In this case, (5.12) becomes

$$\tilde{u}(x) \leq C\delta^{-2}|x'|^2 \text{ on } \tilde{G}.$$

Thus,

$$(5.16) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0) \supset B'_{c\delta t^{\frac{1}{2}}}(0).$$

However, (5.1) implies (5.4), so $\sup\{s | se_n \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0)\} \geq ct^{\frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}$. Then

$$\text{Vol}_{n-1} \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0) \leq Ct^{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}.$$

This and (5.16) imply that

$$\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0) \subset B'_{c\delta^{-n+2t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}}}(0),$$

i.e.

$$\tilde{u}(x) \geq c\delta^{n-2}|x'|^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha}}},$$

which contradicts (5.13).

Case 3. $d_1(h) \geq \delta^{-2}h^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq d_2(h)$.

In this case, it follows from (5.12) that

$$\tilde{u}(0, x'', x_n) \leq CK^{-1}|x''|^2 \text{ on } \tilde{G}.$$

Similar to the discussion in Case 2, we obtain

$$\tilde{u}(x) \geq CK^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}|x_1|^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha}}}.$$

Taking $p_t \in \tilde{S}_t(0)$ to be the point satisfying

$$p_t \cdot e_1 \geq c \sup\{x \cdot e_1 | x \in \tilde{S}_t(0)\}$$

and recalling (5.4), we have

$$(5.17) \quad ct \leq p_t \cdot e_1 \leq C(K^{\frac{n-2}{2}}t)^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}, \forall t \in (0, 1).$$

Write $\mu = K^{-6}$ and $\epsilon = K^{-1}$. To proceed the proof we consider two sub-cases.

Case 3.1. $\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \not\subseteq B''_{c\epsilon}(0)$.

Then there exists a point $q := \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(te) \in \tilde{G}$ for some unit vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ such that $t \geq \epsilon$ and

$$u(q) = \mu.$$

By (5.13) and good shape Lemma 4.2, the intersection set of $\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0)$ and the subplane $H =: \{x = ae_1 + be \mid a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ contains the convex set

$$E := \{x = ae_1 + be \mid |a| \leq c\epsilon\mu, |b| \leq c\epsilon\}.$$

Re-scaling back, this means that the intersection of $\mathcal{P}S_{\mu h}(0)$ and the subplane H contains a ball centered at 0 with radius

$$r \geq c \min\{\epsilon\mu d_1(h), \epsilon h^{\frac{1}{2}}\}.$$

The condition of Case 3 gives

$$\frac{r}{(\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq c \min\{\epsilon\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta^{-2}, \epsilon\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\} \geq cK^2 \gg K,$$

and then Case 1 applies to the transformation $\mathcal{D}_{\mu h}$. Note that the proof in Case 1 also holds for $\theta_1 = \delta^n$, and thus we have

$$\mathcal{P}G_{\theta h}^*(0) \subset \mathcal{P}G_{\theta_1\mu h}^*(0) \subset (1 - \delta_0)\mathcal{P}G_{\mu h}^*(0) \subset (1 - \delta_0)\mathcal{P}G_h^*(0),$$

which contradicts (5.13).

Case 3.2. $\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset B''_{c\epsilon}(0)$.

Recalling the definition of p_t , the quasi-symmetric property implies that

$$\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \subset \{sp_\mu + z'' \mid |s| \leq C, z'' \in B''_{C\epsilon}(0)\}.$$

Note that $p_\mu \cdot e_1 \geq c\mu$ by (5.17), this gives

$$(5.18) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \subset \{|x_1| \geq c\mu(|x''| - C\epsilon)\}.$$

Furthermore, (5.17) also means that

$$(5.19) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0) \subset \{|x'| \mid |x_1| \leq C(K^{\frac{n-2}{2}}t)^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}\}.$$

By(5.18) and (5.19), taking $t = \theta_0 \leq \delta^2 \leq \mu$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_{\theta_0}(0) &\subset \{|x_1| \geq c\mu(|x''| - C\epsilon)\} \cap \{|x'| |x_1| \leq CK^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\theta_0^{1+\bar{\alpha}}\} \\ &\subset \{|x| \leq C\epsilon + C\mu^{-1}(K^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\theta_0)^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}\} \\ &\subset \{|x| \leq C\epsilon + C\mu^{-1}K^{-10}\} \\ &\subset \{|x| \leq CK^{-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (5.13) when K is large.

(ii₂) **Normal direction**

We want to prove

$$\tilde{S}_{\theta_0}(0) \cap \{te_n : t \geq 0\} \subset (1 - \delta_0)\tilde{S}_1(0).$$

Otherwise, we have a $\hat{q} \in \tilde{S}_{\theta_0}(0) \setminus (1 - \delta_0)\tilde{S}_1(0)$ such that $\hat{q} \cdot e_n > 1 - \delta_0$ and $u(\hat{q}) \leq \theta_0$. Letting $q = (1 - \delta_0)e_n$, by the convexity we have

$$\tilde{u}(q) \leq \theta_0.$$

Assume that $\tilde{u}(e_n) = 1$ without loss of generality. Using the iterative method, the same argument as in (ii₁) gives (5.5) restricted on the tangent plan, which is

$$\tilde{u}(x) \geq |x'|^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\alpha}}.$$

Recalling that $x_n = \tilde{g}(x')| \leq C|x'|$ on $B'_C(0)$ and that $\tilde{S}_1 \subset B_C(0)$, one has

$$\tilde{u}(x) \geq 4\theta(x_n - \frac{1}{2}) \text{ on } \partial\tilde{S}_1.$$

Let $S = \{x \in \tilde{S}_1 | \tilde{u}(x) \leq 3\theta_0(x_n - \frac{1}{2})\}$ and $w(x) = \tilde{u}(x) - 3\theta_0(x_n - \frac{1}{2})$. Clearly,

$$(5.20) \quad \{te_n | t \geq \frac{1}{2}\} \subset S \cap \{te_n\} \subset \{te_n | t \leq 1\},$$

and we have

$$w = 0 \text{ on } \partial S \text{ and } \inf_S w \sim w(q) \sim -\theta_0.$$

Let p be the centroid of S . By John's Lemma 2.8, we can assume that

$$\mathcal{D}B_c(0) \subset S - p \subset \mathcal{D}B_C(0).$$

Consider the normalization v of w given by

$$v(y) = \frac{w(\mathcal{D}y + p)}{\theta}.$$

Then (5.20) implies that

$$\text{dist}(\mathcal{D}q, \partial\mathcal{D}S) \leq C\delta_0.$$

However, Lemma 2.11 gives us

$$-1 \sim v(\mathcal{D}q) \geq -(\text{dist}(\mathcal{D}q, \partial\mathcal{D}S))^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

This is a contradiction when δ_0 is small. \square

6. ENGULFING LEMMA AND GLOBAL ESTIMATE

In this section, assuming that the universal strict convexity Theorem 5.1 holds at every boundary point, we are going to prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. It should be pointed out that the discussions and results in this Section apply not only to every normalization $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$ but also to any convex function satisfying certain universal strict convexity Theorem 5.1 on the whole boundary.

Definition 6.1. *Given a point $q \in B_\rho(0) \cap \Omega$, the maximum height of q is defined by*

$$(6.1) \quad h_q := \sup\{a \mid S_t(q) \subset\subset \Omega, \forall t < a\},$$

and $x_q \in \partial S_{h_q}(q) \cap \partial\Omega$ is defined as the contact point.

We first prove that x_q is close to the origin when ρ is small. By (3.10) and (5.6) we have

$$0 = u(0) \geq u(q) + \nabla u(q) \cdot (0 - q) + h_q \geq h_q - C|q|^{1+\bar{\alpha}},$$

i.e.

$$h_q \leq C|q|^{1+\bar{\alpha}}.$$

Then

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{h_q}(q) &= \{x \mid u(x) \leq u(q) + \nabla u(q) \cdot (x - q) + h_q\} \\ &\subset \{x \mid u(x) \leq C(|q|^{\bar{\alpha}}|x| + |q|^{1+\bar{\alpha}})\} \\ &\subset \{x \mid u(x) \leq C|\rho|^{\bar{\alpha}}\} \\ &\subset S_{C|\rho|^{\bar{\alpha}}}(0) \\ &\subset C\rho^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}^2}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} B_1(0) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \rho \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used (5.5) in the last step.

Thus, for each point q near the boundary, we only need to consider this case where the contact point x_q is 0, and the distance between q and 0 is still small. The boundary $C^{1,\bar{\alpha}}$ regularity of u and the convexity of $\partial\Omega$ imply

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that $q \in \Omega$ near 0 and $x_q = 0$. Then $\nabla u(q)$ is parallel to $\nu(0) = e_n$, and we will write*

$$(6.3) \quad \nabla u(q) = a_q e_n.$$

Proof. Consider the sliding transformation \mathcal{A}_q along $x_n = 0$ at the boundary point $x_0 = 0$:

$$\mathcal{A}_q x = x + \frac{x_n}{q_n} q'$$

and the function $v_q(y) := u(\mathcal{A}_q y)$. Write

$$\nabla v_q(q_n e_n) = a_q e_n + b_q e_q,$$

where $e_q \in S^{n-1}$ and $b_q \geq 0$. Obviously, $v(\mathcal{A}_q^{-1} q) = a_q q_n \geq 0$, thus $a_q \geq 0$. Recall that q is in the interior and the cone $\{ty \mid y \in B_{r_q}(q), t \in [0, 1]\}$ is in Ω , where $r_q = \text{dist}(q, \partial\Omega)$. This means that $\partial\mathcal{A}_q^{-1}\Omega$ is still a local Lipschitz graph over \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , so we can write the boundary points along the direction e_q as the Lipschitz functions

$$p_t = c(t)e_n + te_q, \quad c(t) \leq C(r_q, q)t.$$

This implies that

$$b_q t \leq a_q c(t) + b_q d(t) \leq v_q(p_t) = u(\mathcal{A}_q p_t) \leq C[(C(r_q, q) + q_n^{-1})t]^{1+\bar{\alpha}}.$$

Let $t \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that

$$b_q = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\nabla u(q) = \mathcal{A}_q^{-1} \nabla v_q(q_n e_n) = a_q e_n = a_q \nu(0).$$

□

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that $q \in \Omega$ near 0 and $x_q = 0$. Then*

$$(6.4) \quad cu(q) \leq h_q \leq Cu(q),$$

$$(6.5) \quad 2S_{h_q}(q) \subset S_{Ch_q}(0) \subset C^2 S_{ch_q}(q),$$

and

$$(6.6) \quad u(x) \geq 2[u(q) + \nabla u(q) \cdot (x - q)] \text{ outside } S_{Ch_q}(0).$$

Proof. Let K be a universal constant, take $h = Ku(q)$ and consider the normalization $(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{\Omega}_h)$, and denote $p = \mathcal{D}_h^{-1} q$. Similar to (6.1) and (6.3), we define \tilde{h}_p and \tilde{a}_p for \tilde{u}_h at point p . Then

$$\tilde{h}_p = \frac{h_q}{h}, \quad \tilde{a}_p = \frac{d_n(h)a_q}{h}.$$

Note that $p \in \tilde{S}_{K^{-1}}(0) \subset CB_{K^{-\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}}(0)$. If K is large enough, we repeat the discussion (6.2) to obtain

$$\tilde{h}_p \leq \rho \text{ and } \tilde{S}_{\tilde{h}_p}(p) \subset B_\rho(0)$$

for some small universal ρ . In particular, we have obtained the right hand side of (6.4).

It follows from (5.4) and (5.6) that

$$\tilde{u}(x) - 2[\tilde{u}(p) + \nabla\tilde{u}(p) \cdot (x - p)] - \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2} - C\rho^{\bar{\alpha}} \geq 0 \text{ on } \partial\tilde{S}_1(0),$$

and

$$\inf_{\tilde{S}_1(0)} [\tilde{u}(x) - 2\tilde{u}(p) - 2\nabla\tilde{u}(p) \cdot (x - p) - \frac{1}{2}] \leq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{u}(x) - 2[\tilde{u}(p) + \nabla\tilde{u}(p) \cdot (x - p)] \cdot (x - p) \geq \frac{1}{2} \geq 0 \text{ outside } \tilde{S}_1(0),$$

which implies (6.6).

Next, we will prove that

$$\tilde{h}_p \geq c_1 = c_1(K),$$

which can yields (6.5) and the left hand side of (6.4).

By definition,

$$\tilde{S}_{\tilde{h}_p}(p) = \{x \mid \tilde{u}(x) \leq \tilde{a}_p x_n\},$$

and

$$\tilde{u}(x) \geq \tilde{a}_p x_n - \tilde{h}_p \text{ in } \tilde{\Omega}.$$

Recalling (5.4), we have

$$t\tilde{a}_p \leq \tilde{u}(te_n) + \tilde{h}_p \leq C|t|^{1+\bar{\alpha}} + \tilde{h}_p, \quad \forall t \in (0, 1),$$

which give us

$$a_p \leq C\tilde{h}_p^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}.$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{S}_{\tilde{h}_p}(p) \subset \{\tilde{u}(x) \leq C\tilde{h}_p^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} x_n\} \cap \tilde{S}_1(0) \subset \{\tilde{u}(x) \leq C\tilde{h}_p^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}\}.$$

In particular

$$\tilde{h}_p \geq cu(p)^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha}}} \geq cK^{-\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha}}}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 2.8 and Theorem 4.2 we have

$$\tilde{S}_{\tilde{h}_p}(p) \supset cB_{\text{Vol}\tilde{S}_{\tilde{h}_p}(p)}(0) \supset cB_{\tilde{h}_p^{\frac{n}{2}}}(0) \supset B_{c_2}(0).$$

Re-scaling back, we have completed the proof. \square

Similarly, we have

Corollary 6.4. *Suppose that $q \in \Omega$ near 0 and $x_q = 0$. If $h \geq Kh_q$, then*

$$(6.7) \quad S_{ch}(0) \subset S_h(q) \subset S_{Ch}(0).$$

Proof. Consider the normalization $(\tilde{u}_{Kh_q}, \tilde{\Omega}_{Kh_q})$ at the point 0. (6.4) implies that the point q is mapped to the point $p \in \tilde{S}_{K^{-1}}$. Then, (6.7) follows from (5.4) and (5.5). \square

By John's Lemma 2.8 and the classical interior estimate, for each point $q \in \Omega$ and constant $h \leq h_q$, there is a linear transformation $\mathcal{D}_{h,q}$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}_{h,q}B_c(0) \subset S_h(q) - q \subset \mathcal{D}_{h,q}B_C(0).$$

And by (6.5)

$$\mathcal{D}_{h_q,q} \sim \mathcal{D}_{Ch_q,x_q} \sim \mathcal{D}_{h_q,x_q}.$$

Then, we can replace the sections that touches the boundary by the related boundary sections as follows.

Definition 6.5 (Modified Sections). *If $q \in \Omega$, we will replace $S_h(q)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{h,q}$ with*

$$\check{S}_h(q) \text{ and } \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q} = \begin{cases} S_h(x_q) \text{ and } \mathcal{D}_{h,x_q} & \text{if } h \geq Ch_q, \\ S_h(q) \text{ and } \mathcal{D}_{h,q} & \text{if } h \leq ch_q, \\ S_{Ch_q}(x_q) \text{ and } \mathcal{D}_{Ch_q,x_q} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and call them modified sections and modified matrices, respectively.

Lemma 6.6. *The modified matrix still satisfies the John's Lemma 2.8 in the following sense*

$$(6.8) \quad (\check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}B_c(0) + q) \cap \bar{\Omega} \subset S_h(q) \subset (\check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}B_C(0) + q) \cap \bar{\Omega}$$

Proof. Assume that $x_q = 0$. When $ch_q \leq h \leq Kh_q$, we have

$$S_{ch_q}(q) - q \subset S_{Ch_q}(q) - q \subset CK(S_{ch_q}(q) - q)$$

and

$$S_{ch_q}(0) \subset S_{Ch_q}(0) \subset CS_{ch_q}(q).$$

By (6.5) and the above two relations we see that the families of sections $S_{sh_q}(q)$ and $S_{h_q}(0)$ for $s \in (c, C)$ are essentially the same.

It remains to consider the case $h \geq Kh_q$. For the right-hand side, (6.7) means that

$$S_h(q) \subset S_{Ch}(0) \subset CS_h(0) \cap \bar{\Omega} \subset \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}B_C(0) \cap \bar{\Omega}.$$

Then

$$S_h(q) \subset (\check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}B_{2C}(0) + q) \cap \bar{\Omega}.$$

For the left-hand side, (6.5) and good shape Lemma 4.2 imply

$$q \in \frac{1}{2}S_{Ch_q}(0) \subset \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h_q,q}B_C(0) \cap \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}B_c(0) \cap \bar{\Omega} \subset \frac{1}{2}S_h(0).$$

If we take c to be small universal and K to be large universal, then

$$(\check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}B_c(0) + q) \cap \bar{\Omega} \subset (\check{\mathcal{D}}_{h_q,q}B_C(0) + \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}B_c(0)) \cap \bar{\Omega} \subset S_{ch}(0) \subset S_h(q).$$

□

Corollary 6.7. *The modified sections are still universal strict convex in the following sense*

$$(6.9) \quad \check{\mathcal{D}}_{th,q} \geq ct^{\frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}.$$

If we consider the modified normalization (v, E) of u at q

$$v(y) = \frac{u^q(q + \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}y)}{t}, \quad E = \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h,q}^{-1}(\bar{\Omega} - q),$$

where $u^q(x) := u(x) - u(q) - \nabla u(q)(x - q)$. then $v \in Lip(B_c(0) \cap E)$ and

$$(6.10) \quad c|y|^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha}}} \leq v(y) - v(0) - \nabla v(0) \cdot y \leq C|y|^{1+\bar{\alpha}} \text{ in } B_c(0) \cap E.$$

Proof. Suppose that $q \in \Omega$ near 0 and $x_q = 0$. When $h \leq ch_q$, the classical interior $C^{1,\gamma}$ strict convexity result (see (i) in Lemma 2.12) implies that for $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathcal{D}_{th,q} \geq ct^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} \mathcal{D}_{h,q} \geq ct^{\frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} \mathcal{D}_{h,q}.$$

When $th \geq ch_q$, we have

$$\check{\mathcal{D}}_{th,q} = \mathcal{D}_{\max\{th, Ch_q\}},$$

and (6.9) follows universal strict convexity Theorem 5.1 (Proposition 5.2).

Note that $\check{D}_{s,q}$ increases with respect to s except for the jumps on the interval $[ch_q, Ch_q]$, which are universally bounded. Thus, the above two inequalities imply that (6.9), while (6.10) comes from (6.8) and (6.9).

Similarly, when $h \leq ch_q$, $v \in Lip(B_c(0) \cap E)$ comes from the classical global Lipschitz regularity; while when $h \geq ch_q$, it comes from the boundary regularity result in the Remark 5.3. \square

Next, we introduce a variant of the classical engulfing property of the internal section (see [8]).

Lemma 6.8 (Engulfing property). *With the above modified sections, there is a small universal constant $\delta > 0$ such that if $h_1 < 2h_2$ and $\check{S}_{\delta h_1}(p) \cap \check{S}_{\delta h_2}(q) \neq \emptyset$, then*

$$(6.11) \quad \check{S}_{\delta h_1}(p) \subset \check{S}_{h_2}(q).$$

Proof. Assume that $u(q) = 0, \nabla u(q) = 0$ and consider the normalization v of u at q

$$v(y) = \frac{u^q(q + \check{\mathcal{D}}_{h_2,q}y)}{t}.$$

By (6.10) we have

$$c|y|^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha}}} \leq v(y) \leq C|y|^{1+\bar{\alpha}}, \quad y \in B_c(0).$$

Consider the convex set $E = q + \check{D}_{h_2, q} \check{S}_{\delta h_1}(p)$, then $v|_E$ can be approximated by a linear function with the difference bounded by 2δ , and there exists a point $z_0 \in E \cap S_\delta^v(0) \neq \emptyset$. When $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we see that z_0 tends to 0 by the lower bound for v .

Suppose that on the contrary to (6.11), we have

$$z \in E \cap \partial B_c(0) \neq \emptyset.$$

The lower bound for v implies that $v(z) \geq c$. When δ is small enough, this together with the upper bound for v implies that on the line connecting z and z_0 , v can not be approximated by any linear function with the difference bounded by 2δ . This is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 6.8 implies the following variant of the classical Vitali Covering Lemma.

Lemma 6.9 (Vitali covering). *Let E be a measurable set in $\bar{\Omega}$. Suppose that for each point $q \in E$ we associate a corresponding modified section $\check{S}_h(q)$. Then we can find modified sections $\check{S}_{h_i}(x_i), i = 1, 2 \dots$, such that*

$$E \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \check{S}_{h_i}(x_i) \text{ and } \check{S}_{\delta h_i}(x_i) \cap \check{S}_{\delta h_j}(x_j), \forall i \neq j.$$

Proof. The proof follows as in the standard case. We choose $\check{S}_{h_1}(x_1)$ so that h_1 as large as possible. Let us suppose that $\check{S}_{h_i}(x_i), i = 1, 2 \dots k$ have already been chosen. We select $\check{S}_{h_{k+1}}(x_{k+1})$ from the family of modified sections S_k such that $\check{S}_{\delta h_{k+1}}(x_{k+1})$ are disjoint with $\check{S}_{\delta h_i}(x_i), i = 1, 2 \dots k$, and $h_{k+1} \geq \frac{1}{2}\{h | \check{S}_h(x) \in S_k\}$. We claim that

$$E \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \check{S}_{h_i}(x_i).$$

We only need to consider the case the sections is infinite and show that for any given $\check{S}_h(q)$ in the covering family, $\check{S}_{\delta h}(q) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \check{S}_{h_i}(x_i)$. This is because as $h > 2 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k \rightarrow 0$, we take the first k such that $2h_{k+1} < h$. If $\check{S}_h(q)$ is not in the sequence of modified section, then $\check{S}_{\delta h}(q)$ intersects $\check{S}_{h_j}(x_j)$ for some $j \leq k$ and $h_j \geq \frac{1}{2}h$. Then (6.11) implies that $\check{S}_h(q) \subset \check{S}_{h_j}(x_j)$, which proves the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof will be completed by two parts.

Part 1: Global $C^{1, \epsilon}$ estimate. Suppose $p, q \in \Omega$ are points near the boundary. Let $\epsilon = \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1 + \bar{\alpha}}$. Assume that $p \in \check{S}_t(q) \setminus \check{S}_{ct}(q)$. Since u is global Lipschitz, we have

$$\|\check{D}_{h, q}\| \leq Ch, \text{ and } t \leq C|p - q|.$$

Consider the normalization of u^q at q

$$v(y) = \frac{u^q(q + \check{D}_{Ct, q}y)}{Ct}.$$

In Corollary 6.7, we have prove that v is locally Lipschitz, and thus

$$\|Dv(\check{\mathcal{D}}_{Ct,q}^{-1}p) - Dv(\check{\mathcal{D}}_{Ct,q}^{-1}q)\| \leq C.$$

Re-scale back, this is

$$\|Du(p) - Du(q)\| \leq Ct\|\check{\mathcal{D}}_{Ct,q}^{-1}\| \leq ct^{1-\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} \leq c|p - q|^\epsilon.$$

Part 2: Global $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ estimate. We follow the standard argument in [15]. Suppose that $q \in \bar{\Omega}$. We say that *the modified section $S_h(x_0)$ has normalized size A , if $A := \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{D}^{-1}\|^2$ for some matrix \mathcal{D} that satisfies properties (6.8) .*

For $s \gg 1$, denote the measurable sets

$$D_s := \{x \in \bar{\Omega} \mid \|D^2u(x)\| \geq s\}.$$

This is well-defined since $u \in W_{loc}^{2,1+\epsilon}$, and the set D_s is measurable for almost every $s > 0$. Consider the characteristic function $\chi = \chi_{D_s}$ of D_s , and the set

$$E_s := \{x \in \Omega \mid \overline{\lim}_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{D}_{h_x}^{-1}\|^2 \geq s\}.$$

Given point $p \in \Omega \setminus E_s$, then for small $r > 0$

$$B_{c(s^{-1}r)^{\frac{1}{2}}}(0) + p \subset S_r(p) \subset B_{C(sr)^{\frac{1}{2}}}(0) + p,$$

and $S_r(p)$ will eventually become an interior section. Consider the normalization \tilde{u} for $S_r(p)$. Lemma 2.12 implies that $\tilde{u} \in W_{loc}^{2,1}(\frac{1}{2}B_c(0))$ and

$$\{y \in B_c(0) \mid \|D^2\tilde{u}\| \leq C\} \geq c.$$

Re-scaling back, we obtain

$$\{x \in S_r(p) \mid \|D^2u\| \leq Cs\} \geq cr^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(B_{rs}(p) \cap \{x \in \tilde{\Omega} : \|D^2u(x)\| \leq Cs\})}{(rs)^n} \geq cs^{-\frac{n}{2}},$$

then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}(B_r(p) \cap \{x \in \tilde{\Omega} : \|D^2u(x)\| \leq Cs\})}{r^n} \geq cs^{-\frac{n}{2}} > 0.$$

However, according to the fundamental theorem of Lebesgue,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\omega_{n-1}r^n} \int_{B_r(x)} \chi_{D_{Cs}}(y) dy = \chi_{D_{Cs}}$$

holds for almost every x , where ω_{n-1} is the volume of unit ball S^{n-1} . Therefore,

$$|E_s^c \setminus D_{cs}^c| = 0, \text{ hence } |D_s \setminus E_{cs}| = 0.$$

Let $F_k = E_{cM^{k+1}}$, where $M \gg C_0$ is large. For each $q \in F_{k+1}$ we consider a modified section such that $\check{S}_h(q)$ of normalized size A with $A \in [C_0M^k, \leq CC_0M^k]$. This is

possible because the normalized size of $\check{D}_{h,q}$ can be chosen to be continuous, except for jumps on the interval $[ch_q, Ch_q]$ that are universally bounded. And those sizes start between universal constants and have a subsequence converging to a constant smaller than $c^2 M^{k+1}$.

Now we use Lemma 6.9 to choose the vitali covering for F_{k+1} with these modified sections $\check{S}_{h_i}(x_i), i = 1, 2 \dots$. We claim that

$$(6.12) \quad \int_{\check{S}_{h_i}(x_i)} \|D^2 u\| dx \leq CC_0^2 M^k |\{M^k \leq \|D^2 u\| \leq CC_0^2 M^k\} \cap \check{S}_{\delta h_i}(x_i)|.$$

In fact, denote $h = h_i$ and consider the normalization $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$. Whether x_i is in interior or on boundary, by convexity and Lipschitz of \tilde{u} (see Corollary 6.7), we have

$$\int_{\tilde{S}_1(0)} \|D^2 \tilde{u}\| dx \leq C \int_{\tilde{S}_1(0)} \Delta \tilde{u} dx \leq C \int_{\partial \tilde{S}_1(0)} D_\nu \tilde{u} \leq C_1.$$

This implies that the set $\{\|D^2 \tilde{u}\| \leq c^{-1} \delta^{-\frac{n}{2}} C_1\} \cap \tilde{S}_\delta(0)$ has at least measure $\frac{c}{c(n)}$. Thus, taking a $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\{C_0^{-1} \leq \|D^2 \tilde{u}\| \leq C_0\} \cap \tilde{S}_\delta(0)| \geq C_0^{-1},$$

we have

$$\int_{\tilde{S}_1(0)} \|D^2 \tilde{u}\| dx \leq C_0 |\{C_0^{-1} \leq \|D^2 \tilde{u}\| \leq C_0\} \cap \tilde{S}_\delta(0)|.$$

Re-scaling back, we get (6.12).

Then if $M \geq CC_0^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D_{M^{k+1}}} \|D^2 u\| dx &\leq \int_{F_{k+1}} \|D^2 u\| dx \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} CC_0^2 M^k |\{M^k \leq \|D^2 u\| \leq CC_0^2 M^k\} \cap \check{S}_{\delta h_i}(x_i)| \\ &\leq C \int_{D_{M^k} \setminus D_{M^{k+1}}} \|D^2 u\| dx. \end{aligned}$$

This is,

$$\int_{D_{M^{k+1}}} \|D^2 u\| dx \leq (1 - \tau) \int_{D_k} \|D^2 u\| dx,$$

where $\tau = 1/(1 + C)$. It follows that

$$\int_{\|D^2 u(x)\| \geq t} \|D^2 u\| dx \leq Ct^{-2\epsilon}$$

for $\epsilon = -\frac{1}{2} \log_M(1 - \tau)$. This implies $u \in W^{2,1+\epsilon}(\bar{\Omega})$.

Now we are turning to the proof of Theorem 1.3, which is exactly the following Lemma 6.10. First, Note that under the assumption of Theorem 1.3, one can improve (4.18) to

$$(6.13) \quad Cs^{\frac{1+C\epsilon}{2}} \leq \mathcal{D}_s^{\tilde{u}_h} = \mathcal{D}_{sh} \mathcal{D}_h^{-1} \leq Cs^{\frac{1-C\epsilon}{2}}.$$

See Remark 8.2 for the details. \square

Lemma 6.10 (Proof of Theorem 1.3). *Let u be a convex function satisfying the universal strict convexity Theorem 5.1 and (6.13) for each boundary point. Assume that $\epsilon \in (0, 1), p > 1$ and $\det D^2u = f$ in Ω . If $|f - 1| \leq \delta = \delta(p)$ (or $\delta(\epsilon)$), then $u \in C^{1,1-10C\epsilon}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap W^{2,p}(\bar{\Omega})$.*

We will prove the lemma by two parts.

Part 1: Global $C^{1,1-10C\epsilon}$ estimate. Let c and ϵ be small constants. By Proposition 5.3, we only need to prove that $\tilde{u} \in C^{1,1-10C\epsilon}(\tilde{S}_{c\theta^2})$.

Given a point $q \in \tilde{S}_{c\theta^2} \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ near 0. As in (6.1) and (6.3), we assume that

$$\nabla \tilde{u}(q) = a_q e_n, \quad h_q = a_q q_n - \tilde{u}(q), \quad S(q) := S_{h_q}(q) = \{x | \tilde{u}(x) \leq a_q x_n\}.$$

Checking the proof of Lemma 6.3 and replacing $\bar{\alpha}$ by $1 - C\epsilon$, we have the the following (6.14)-(6.16):

$$(6.14) \quad a_q \leq Ch_q^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} \leq Ch_q^{\frac{1-2C\epsilon}{2}},$$

$$(6.15) \quad q_n \geq h_q a_q^{-1} \geq ch_q^{\frac{1+2C\epsilon}{2}},$$

$$(6.16) \quad S(q) \subset \{|x| \leq Ch_q^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}^2}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}\} \subset \{|x| \leq Ch_q^{\frac{1-3C\epsilon}{2}}\},$$

where we have used (5.5) for (6.16).

We claim that $q_n - \tilde{g}(q') \geq \frac{q_n}{2}$. Otherwise (8.5)(in Section 8), (6.15) and (6.16) imply

$$q_n \leq 2\tilde{g}(q') \leq c|q|^{1+\alpha} \leq Ch_q^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(1-3C\epsilon)}{2}} \leq Cq_n^{(1+\alpha)(1-6C\epsilon)}.$$

If $\epsilon \ll \alpha$, this implies $|q_n| \geq c$, which contradicts our assumption that q is near 0.

In summary, for any $p \in \tilde{S}_1$ we can find a height section $S_{r_p}(p)$ satisfying

$$(6.17) \quad cB_{r_p}^{\frac{1+C\epsilon}{2}}(p) \subset S_{r_p}(p) \subset CB_{r_p}^{\frac{1-C\epsilon}{2}}(p)$$

and

$$(6.18) \quad c \operatorname{dist}(p, \partial\tilde{\Omega})^{1+3C\epsilon} \leq r_p^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \operatorname{dist}(p, \partial\tilde{\Omega})^{1-2C\epsilon}.$$

We now estimate $|\nabla\tilde{u}(p) - \nabla\tilde{u}(q)|$ in $\tilde{S}_{c\theta^2}(0)$. Suppose $\text{dist}(q, \tilde{G}) \leq \text{dist}(p, \tilde{G})$, there are two cases. When $\text{dist}(p, q) \geq \frac{1}{2}r_p \frac{1+C\epsilon}{2}$, it follows that

$$|\nabla\tilde{u}(p) - \nabla\tilde{u}(q)| \leq 2C \text{dist}(p, \tilde{G})^{1-C\epsilon} \leq Cr_p \frac{1-4C\epsilon}{2} \leq C \text{dist}(p, q)^{1-8C\epsilon}.$$

And when $\text{dist}(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2}r_p \frac{1+C\epsilon}{2}$, we have $q \in \frac{1}{2}S_{r_p}(p)$. Recalling that $Os_{c\bar{\Omega}}f$ is small, the interior $C^{1,1-\epsilon}$ estimate (Lemma 2.12) gives

$$|\nabla\tilde{u}(p) - \nabla\tilde{u}(q)| \leq C \frac{r_p}{r_p \frac{1+C\epsilon}{2}} \left(\frac{\text{dist}(p, q)}{r_p \frac{1+C\epsilon}{2}} \right)^{1-\epsilon} \leq C \text{dist}(p, q)^{1-10C\epsilon}.$$

□

Part 2: Global $W^{2,p}$ estimate. For any $p > 1$ choose a small $\epsilon > 0$ such that $8(p+8)n\epsilon \leq 1$. Recall (7.26) and (6.18). Re-scaling back, the interior $W^{2,p}$ estimate in Lemma 2.12 gives

$$\int_{S_{\frac{r_p}{2}}(y)} \|D^2u\|^p \leq Cr_p \frac{1-C\epsilon}{2} n \left[\frac{r_p}{r_p \frac{1+C\epsilon}{2}} \right]^{2p} \leq Cd(y, \partial\Omega)^{n-2C\epsilon}.$$

Letting $E_k = \{x | 2^{-k} \leq \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq 2^{-k+1}\}$, we can use balls of radius $c2^{-k(1+10\epsilon)}$ centered at E_k to cover E_k . Using a basic covering lemma, the number of covering balls can be controlled to be less than $N_k = C2^{(1+10\epsilon)nk-k}$. Hence

$$\int_{E_k} \|D^2u\|^p \leq CN_k 2^{-(n-2C\epsilon)k} \leq C2^{-k(1-C\epsilon)}.$$

Therefore, when $\epsilon = \epsilon(p)$ is small, we obtain

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

This proves the theorem. □

7. UNIVERSAL STRICT CONVEXITY UNDER THE POINTWISE ASSUMPTION

In this section, assuming that (\mathbf{A}_1) and (\mathbf{A}_4) holds, when $n \geq 3$ we show that Theorem 5.1 is still valid for section with base point x_0 and height $h > [\sigma^*(\epsilon)]$, where ϵ and x_0 are the same as in (\mathbf{A}_4) and σ^* is a universal continuous module to be determined.

7.1. Degenerate Model.

In order to study the high-dimensional case, we need to understand the fact $D_n u = 0$ first. This leads us to study the following degenerate problem. The notations used in this subsection are independent.

Theorem 7.1. *Assume that E is a convex domain that is symmetric about the plane \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , $0 < \lambda \leq f \leq \Lambda$ and $f(x', x_n) = f(x', -x_n)$ in E , g is a nonnegative function such that $S := \{x \in E : x_n \geq g(x'), x \in \mathcal{P}E\}$ is a closed convex subset, satisfying*

$$(7.1) \quad \mathcal{P}E = \mathcal{P}S.$$

Suppose that u is a convex solution to the following problem

$$(7.2) \quad \det D^2u = f\chi_{\pm S} \text{ in } E, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial E,$$

where χ is the characteristic function and $\pm S = S \cup \{(x, -x_n) : x \in S\}$. Then, $D_n u = 0$ on $G := \partial S \setminus \partial E$, u satisfies the universal strict convex Theorem 5.1 on G , and $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\gamma}(E)$ for small constant $\gamma = \gamma(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$.

Proof. According to John's Lemma 2.8, we can always assume that $B_{c(n)}(0) \subset E \subset B_{C(n)}(0)$. Let u_0 be a solution to problem

$$\det D^2u_0 = \Lambda \text{ in } E, \quad u_0 = 0 \text{ on } \partial E.$$

By comparison principle and Lemma 2.11,

$$(7.3) \quad u(x) \geq u_0(x) \geq -C(n, \Lambda) \text{dist}(x, \partial E)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Consider the map

$$\mathcal{G}x = \begin{cases} (x, |x_n|) & x \in \pm S, \\ (x', g(x')) & x \in E \setminus \pm S. \end{cases}$$

With the notation $Ru(x) = u(x' - x_n)$, we find that Ru is still a solution to the problem (7.2), so $u(x) = u(x', -x_n)$, and $u(x) \leq u(\mathcal{G}x)$ by convexity. For any points $p, q \in E$, the point $\mathcal{G}(\frac{p+q}{2})$ is contained in the simplex generated by the vertices $\pm \mathcal{G}p, \pm \mathcal{G}q$. This is

$$\mathcal{G}\left(\frac{p+q}{2}\right) = c\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}p + \mathcal{G}q}{2}\right) + (1-c)\left(\frac{-\mathcal{G}p - \mathcal{G}q}{2}\right)$$

for some $c \in [0, 1]$. Thus,

$$u\left(\mathcal{G}\left(\frac{p+q}{2}\right)\right) \leq \frac{u(\mathcal{G}p) + u(\mathcal{G}q)}{2},$$

so the function

$$\hat{u}(x) := u(\mathcal{G}x) \geq u(x)$$

is still convex. Furthermore,

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2\hat{u} \geq f\chi_{\pm S} = \det D^2u & \text{in } E, \\ \hat{u} = 0 = u & \text{on } \partial E. \end{cases}$$

By comparison principle $\hat{u} \leq u$. Therefore, $u(x) = u(\mathcal{G}x)$, i.e. $D_n u = 0$ on $E \setminus \bar{S}$, which means that all information of u is contained in \bar{S} .

For any boundary point $p = (p', g(p')) \in G$, by convexity we may take a $\nabla u(p) \in \partial u(p)$ such that $\nabla u(p) \cdot e_n \geq 0$. Define

$$S_h(p) := \{x \in E : u(x) \leq u(p) + \nabla u(p) \cdot (x - p) + h\}.$$

We claim that $S_h(p)$ is of good shape at p if $S_h(p) \cap S$ is strictly contained in E . More precisely, we have constants c, C which depend only on n, λ, Λ , such that

$$(7.4) \quad \mathcal{P}(S_h(p) \cap G) = \mathcal{P}(S_h(p) \cap S) = \mathcal{P}S_h(p),$$

$$(7.5) \quad ch^{\frac{n}{2}} \leq \text{Vol}(S_h(p) \cap S) \leq Ch^{\frac{n}{2}},$$

and

$$(7.6) \quad \mathcal{P}G_h(p) \subset -C\mathcal{P}G_h(p),$$

where $G_h(p) := S_h(p) \cap G$.

(7.4) follows from the fact $u = \hat{u}$, while the right hand side of (7.5) comes from Lemma 2.10. Next, we are going to the left hand side of (7.5).

The section $S_h(p)$ is strictly contained in E for some $h > 0$. Let z' be the centroid of $\mathcal{P}S_h(p)$, we can consider the point $z = \mathcal{G}(z', 0)$, the linear function $l_z(x) = x_n - g(z') - \nabla' g(z') \cdot (x' - z')$. Under the sliding transformation $\mathcal{A}_z x = (x', l_z(x))$, a further reflection transformation about R^{n-1} is done to obtain a new function

$$(7.7) \quad u_z(y) = u(\mathcal{A}_z^{-1}(y, |y_n|)), \quad y \in E_z := \pm \mathcal{A}_z(\{x \mid l_z(x) \geq 0\}).$$

Thus, without loss of generality, we can always assume that 0 is the centroid of $S_h(q)$ with $q = \mathcal{A}_z(p)$, $g(0)$ and $g \geq 0$. By the first part and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\text{Vol } S_h(q) \leq C(n) \text{Vol}(S_h(q) \cap \mathcal{A}_z(S)) \leq Ch^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Hence, John's Lemma 2.8 gives a diagonal transform $\mathcal{D} = \text{diag}(\mathcal{D}', d_n)$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}B_{c(n)}(0) \subset S_h(q) \subset \mathcal{D}B_{C(n)}(0).$$

Assume $\nabla u(p) = 0$ for simplicity and consider the normalization function

$$v(x) = \frac{u(\mathcal{D}x) - u(q) - h}{h}, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}^{-1}S_h(q).$$

Then, $-1 \leq v \leq 0$ and

$$\det D^2 v = a f \circ \mathcal{D}, \quad \text{where } a = \frac{|\det \mathcal{D}|^2}{h^n} \leq C.$$

The classical A-B-P estimate[8] gives

$$1 = -\inf v \leq C \left(\int |\det D^2 v| \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq Ca,$$

which proves the left-hand side of (7.5). Note that $v(\mathcal{D}^{-1}q) = -1$, and (7.3) for v implies

$$\text{dist}(\mathcal{D}^{-1}q, \partial\mathcal{D}^{-1}S_h(q)) \geq c,$$

Re-scaling back, we obtain the desired (7.6).

It remains to prove $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\gamma}(E)$. Take any $p \in G$ we may assume $p = 0$ without loss of generality. So it is sufficient to prove these conclusions near 0.

Consider the function $w(x') = u(x', 0)$, $x' \in \mathcal{P}E$. If $y' \in \partial w(x')$, then $y := (y', 0) \in \partial u(x)$ for the point $x = \mathcal{G}(x', 0) \in G$, and if in addition $S_h^w(x') \subset\subset \mathcal{P}E$, then

$$S_h^w(x') = \mathcal{P}S_h^u(x)$$

is quasi-symmetric about x' . Thus, w is strictly convex away from the boundary $\partial\mathcal{P}E$. More precisely, denoting by $h_{x'}^w$ the supreme of all the h satisfying $S_h^w(x') \subset\subset \mathcal{P}E$, by the compactness arguments as Theorem 1 in [?] we have

$$(7.8) \quad h_{x'} \geq \|w\|_{L^\infty} \sigma^+(\text{dist}(x', \partial\mathcal{P}E)).$$

If $\text{Vol} S = 0$ we conclude that $u = 0$, which completes the proof. If $\text{Vol} S \neq 0$, by Lemma 3.3 and the A-B-P estimate, we have

$$c \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C.$$

(6.5) then shows that for $x \in G$,

$$h_x^u \geq \sigma^+(\text{dist}(\mathcal{P}x, \partial\mathcal{P}E)),$$

and the good shape lemma (7.4)-(7.6) shows that the shape of $S_{h_0}^u(0)$ is controllable. Hence for $h \leq h_0$, (5.2) (the upper strict lemma) holds for every $S_h(x)$. Note that each normalization of $(u, S_h(0))$ still satisfies a problem similar to (7.2), which gives (5.1) (the lower strict lemma), while (5.3) is a direct consequence of (5.1) and (5.2), as pointed in Proposition 5.3. Hence, on the boundary G , u satisfies the universal strict lemma and therefore pointwise $C^{1,\gamma}$ on G . Repeating the related discussions in the proof of Lemma 6.10, we conclude that $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\gamma}(E)$ for some $\gamma = \gamma(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$. Hence $D_n u = 0$ on G since we have proved $D_n u = 0$ in $E \setminus \bar{S}$. \square

Remark 7.2. *In addition to the assumption of Theorem 7.1, suppose $D_n f = 0$, then $D_{nn} u \in L_{loc}^\infty(E)$.*

Proof. For any given interior point x , if there exists $h > 0$ such that the interior section $S_h(x) \subset\subset S$ and its corresponding normalized transformation $\mathcal{D} = \text{diag}\{\mathcal{D}', d_n\}$ ($\mathcal{D}B_{C(n)}(0) \subset S_h(x) \subset \mathcal{D}B_{C(n)}(0)$) satisfies the following conditions

$$(7.9) \quad d_n \geq ah^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some $a > 0$, then the classical Pogorelov computation gives $D_{nn} u(x) \leq \frac{C}{a^2}$.

Recall that our discussion in Section 6 implies that for every point p near $G \cap B_\rho(0)$, the normalized transformation of the section $S_{h_p}(p)$ is compared to the normalized transformation of some boundary section $S_{h_p}(x_p)$. By Lemma 8.3 below, we find that $S_{h_p}(x_p)$ satisfies (7.9), which completes the proof. \square

7.2. The Pointwise Strict Convexity. Now we return to problem (3.16). Assuming that (\mathbf{A}_4) holds, where $n \geq 3$, x_0 in (1.6) is the origin, and

$$\nabla' \phi(0') = a e_1, \text{ where } a \in [-C, C].$$

Fixed $h \in [\sigma^*(\varepsilon), h_0]$, to prove (5.1) (the upper strict convexity lemma) in the tangent direction, the almost C^1 smoothness of β and ϕ is necessary. Locally, (1.6) and the Neumann boundary value imply

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C \max\{|x'|, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \text{ on } G,$$

and similar to Lemma 3.10, we obtain

$$(7.10) \quad \phi^0(x') = \phi(x') + O(\max\{|x'|^2, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}|x'|\}) = a x_1 + O(\max\{|x'|^{1+\alpha}, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}|x'|\}).$$

Since our discussion in Sections 4 is quantitative, there exists a universal module $\sigma^*(\varepsilon) \gg \varepsilon$ such that if (1.4) is replaced by hypothesis (1.6)((4.1)), the good shape Lemma 4.2 still holds for the boundary section $S_h(0)$ with $h \in [\sigma^*(\varepsilon), h_0]$.

Next, take a point $y_h \in \mathcal{P}S_h(0)$ satisfying

$$|y_h \cdot e_1| = \sup\{x \cdot e_1 \mid x \in \mathcal{P}S_h(0)\},$$

and consider slide transformation

$$\mathcal{A}_h x = x + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \frac{y_h \cdot e_i}{y_h \cdot e_1} x_i e_i.$$

Applying John's Lemma 2.8 to $\mathcal{A}_h^{-1} \mathcal{P}S_h(0)$, we can find a new coordinates $\{e_i\}$ which keeps the e_1, e_n direction invariant such that

$$\mathcal{D}_h B_{c(n)}(0) \subset \mathcal{A}_h^{-1} S_h(0) \subset \mathcal{D}_h B_{C(n)}(0)$$

for some diagonal matrix $\mathcal{D}_h := \text{diag}(d_1(h), \dots, d_n(h))$. Moreover, we can require that $\prod_{i=1}^n d_i(h) = \det \mathcal{D}_h = \text{Vol}(S_h)$. The assumption (1.6) means that for $h \geq 2\varepsilon$,

$$(7.11) \quad d_n \text{diam } \mathcal{P}S_h(0) \leq h.$$

Note that the sliding transformation \mathcal{A} does not change the tangent plane \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , and assuming $d_2 \geq d_3 \geq \dots \geq d_{n-1} \geq ch^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have

$$(7.12) \quad d_1 d_2 d_n \leq h^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

We now introduce the slide normalization.

Definition 7.3. Let $\mathcal{T}_h = \mathcal{A}_h \circ \mathcal{D}_h = \text{diag}\{\mathcal{T}'_h, d_n(h)\}$, the slide normalization $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$ of (u, Ω) is defined by

$$(7.13) \quad \tilde{u}_h(x) := \frac{u(\mathcal{T}_h x)}{h}, \quad x \in \tilde{\Omega}_h := \mathcal{T}_h^{-1}\Omega.$$

For simplicity, we omit the index h . Then \tilde{u} is a solution to the local problem

$$(7.14) \quad \begin{cases} \det D^2 \tilde{u} = \tilde{f} & \text{in } \tilde{S}_1, \\ D_n \tilde{u} = \tilde{\phi}^0 & \text{on } \tilde{G}_1, \\ \tilde{u} = 1 & \text{on } \partial \tilde{S}_1 \setminus \tilde{G}_1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \frac{(\det \mathcal{D})^2}{h^n} f(\mathcal{T}x), \quad \tilde{\phi}^0(x') = \frac{d_n \phi^0(\mathcal{T}'x')}{h}.$$

Then $d_n |\mathcal{T}'_h| \leq Ch$. On \tilde{G}_1 , by calculation, (7.10) gives

$$(7.15) \quad \tilde{\phi}(x')^0 = \frac{ad_1 d_n x_1}{h} + O\left(\frac{d_n \max\{|T'x'|^{1+\alpha}, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} |T'x'|\}}{h}\right) = \frac{ad_1 d_n x_1}{h} + O(\sigma(h)^\alpha),$$

and

$$\left| \frac{ad_1 d_n x_1}{h} \right| \leq \frac{h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{d_2} \leq C.$$

The quadratic growth assumption (4.1) is turned to

$$(7.16) \quad \tilde{u}_s(\mathcal{G}(0, x'')) \leq C \left(\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \frac{d_i^2}{s} x_i^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{s} \right).$$

Similar to Theorem 5.1, we have

Theorem 7.4. Suppose that (\mathbf{A}_4) holds, where $n \geq 3$, $x_0 = 0$, and u solves problem (3.16). Then there exists h_0 such that (5.1) and (5.2) holds for $h \in [2\delta^{-4}\sigma^*(\varepsilon), h_0]$.

Proof. Let κ be a small constant. Denote by

$$K = \kappa^{-n-1}, \delta = K^{-\frac{2(n+7)(1+\bar{\alpha})}{\bar{\alpha}}}, \delta_0 = \delta^4, \theta_0 = \theta = \delta^{2n+6}.$$

Assume that h_0 is small such that

$$\text{diam } S_{h_0}(0) \leq \delta^4.$$

We want to prove (5.1)-(5.2) for the θ_0, δ_0 and $h \in [\delta^{-4}\sigma^*(\varepsilon), h_0]$, which is equivalent to prove them in the tangent and normal directions by the good shape Lemma (7.4)-(7.6).

For simplicity, in this subsection we consider only the case: point $x \in \tilde{S}_1(0) \setminus \tilde{S}_{2\delta^4}(0)$, constants $t, s \geq 2\delta^4$ (or $2\delta^4 h$), and ignore the small constants related to ε , since the ε in (1.6) can be sufficiently small.

Using the same arguments as (i_2) in Section 5.1, one can easily prove (5.1) in the normal direction. To prove it in the tangent direction and (5.2), we consider two cases.

Case 1. Assume that there exists $s \in [\delta^2 h, h]$ such that $d_2(s) \geq Ks^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

For simplicity, assuming that $s = h$ and $d_2(h) \geq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$. In this case, (7.15) becomes

$$|\tilde{\phi}^0| \leq \left| \frac{Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}}{d_2} \right| + C\sigma(h)^\alpha \leq K^{-1}.$$

Similar to Case 1 in Section 5.1, as (5.15) we obtain

$$(7.17) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1(0) \subset (1 + CK^{-1})\mathcal{P}\tilde{G}_1(0).$$

Let v be the solution to the problem (7.2) with $f = \tilde{f}$, $S = \tilde{S}_1$, and

$$E = \{-g^+(x') \leq x_n \leq g^+(x') \mid x' \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1\},$$

where g is the same as in (2.3)-(2.4). Note that, (7.3) and (7.15) imply that on $\partial\tilde{S}_1 \setminus \partial\tilde{G}_1$

$$v(x) \geq -C(n, \Lambda) \text{dist}(x, \partial E)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq -CK^{-\frac{1}{n}} \geq -\kappa.$$

Then, the functions

$$w^\pm(x) := \frac{1 + v(x)}{1 \mp \kappa} \pm 2\kappa(2C - x_n)$$

will be supersolution (subsolution) of the problem (7.14) of \tilde{u} . Therefore,

$$\|\tilde{u} - (v + 1)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\kappa.$$

Note that v satisfies 5.1 and Theorem 7.1, $D_n v(0) = 0$ and $\tilde{u}(0) = 0$, we have

$$\min\{\tilde{u}(\mathcal{G}x'), \tilde{u}(\mathcal{G}(-x'))\} \leq \min\{v(\mathcal{G}x'), v(\mathcal{G}(-x'))\} - v(0) + C\kappa \leq C|x'|^{1+\gamma} + C\kappa.$$

and

$$\max\{\tilde{u}(\mathcal{G}x'), \tilde{u}(\mathcal{G}(-x'))\} \geq \max\{v(\mathcal{G}x'), v(\mathcal{G}(-x'))\} - v(0) - C\kappa \geq c|x'|^{\frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma}} - C\kappa.$$

Recalling (7.6), this gives

$$c|x'|^{\frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma}} - C\kappa \leq \tilde{u}(\mathcal{G}x') \leq |x'|^{1+\gamma} + C\kappa,$$

which completes the proof.

Case 2. Assume that $d_2(s) \leq Ks^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $s \in [\delta^2 h, h]$.

Note that $d_2(s) \geq \dots \geq d_{n-1}(s) \geq cs^{\frac{1}{2}}$, therefore

$$(7.18) \quad cs^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{D}_s'' \leq CKs^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{I} \text{ for } s \in [\delta^2 h, h].$$

Moreover, as (5.12) we have

$$(7.19) \quad C \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} K^{-2} x_i^2 \leq \tilde{u}(\mathcal{G}(0, x'')) \leq C \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} K^2 x_i^2 \text{ for } |x''| \geq CK\delta.$$

Since (5.1) holds in the normal direction, given $t \geq \delta^2 \geq \sigma^*(\varepsilon/h)$ we still have

$$\tilde{u}(te_n) \leq Ct^{1+\bar{\alpha}},$$

i.e.

$$d_n(th) \geq ct^{\frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} d_n(h).$$

(7.18) also shows

$$\prod_{i=2}^{n-1} d_i(th) \geq K^{\frac{2-n}{2}} t^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^{n-1} d_i(h).$$

Recall that (4.4), so

$$d_1(th) \leq CK^{\frac{n-2}{2}} t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}} d_1(h),$$

which implies that

$$(7.20) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t \subset \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1 \cap \{|x_1| \leq CK^{\frac{n-2}{2}} t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}\}.$$

Choosing a point $p_t \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$ such that $p_t \cdot e_1 \geq c \frac{d_1(th)}{d_1(h)}$, then we have

$$(7.21) \quad ct \leq p_t \cdot e_1 \leq CK^{\frac{n-2}{2}} t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}.$$

Next, we make the following observations. Given the points $P \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$, $Q \notin \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$. The quasi-symmetric property of $\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$ implies $\pm cP \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$ and $\pm cQ \notin \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$. By (7.19),

$$ct^{\frac{1}{2}} B_1''(0) \subset \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} B_1''(0).$$

Consider the cones

$$\Gamma_1^\pm(P) := \{\mp cP + s(x \pm cP) \mid s \geq 0, x \in ct^{\frac{1}{2}} B_1''(0)\}$$

and

$$\Gamma_2^\pm(Q) := \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus \{\pm cQ - s(x \mp cQ) \mid s \geq 0, x \in Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} B_1''(0)\}.$$

Raying from the points $\pm cP \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$ through the ball $Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} B_1''(0)$, we find that $\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t \cap \{\pm x_n \geq 0\}$ is contained in the cone $\Gamma_1^\pm(P)$, thus

$$(7.22) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t \subset \Gamma_1(P) := \Gamma_1^+(P) \cap \Gamma_1^-(P).$$

Similarly, Raying from the points $\pm cQ \notin \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$ through the ball $ct^{\frac{1}{2}} B_1''(0)$, we find

$$(7.23) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t \subset \Gamma_2(Q) := \Gamma_2^+(Q) \cap \Gamma_2^-(Q).$$

Step 1. Denote $\mu = t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}$. By (7.21) and (7.21) we have

$$(7.24) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \subset \Gamma_1(p_t) \subset \{|x_1| \geq c(\mu/K)^{\frac{1}{2}} (|x''| - CK^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}})\}.$$

Since $\mu \geq t$, (7.24) and (7.20) mean that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0) &\subset \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \cap \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0) \\
&\subset \{|x_1| \geq c(\mu/K)^{\frac{1}{2}}(|x''| - CK^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}})\} \cap \{|x'| |x_1| \leq CK^{\frac{n-2}{2}}t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}\} \\
&\subset \{|x'| \leq CK^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + CK^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}\} \\
&\subset \{|x'| \leq CK^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \\
&\subset CK^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1 = CK^{\frac{n-1}{2}}t^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}}\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $t \geq \sigma^*(\varepsilon/h)$ be universally small, which completes the proof of (5.2) in the tangent direction. Then, the same argument of (ii₂) in Section 5 applies to proving (5.2) in the normal direction.

Step 2. By iteration, (5.2) means

$$\tilde{u}(x) \geq c|x|^{\frac{1+\bar{\alpha}}{\alpha}} \text{ on } \tilde{S}_1 \setminus \tilde{S}_{\varepsilon/h}.$$

Similarly, assuming $t \geq \delta^2 \geq \sigma^*(\varepsilon/h)$, by (7.19) we still have

$$d_n(th) \leq ct^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}d_n(h),$$

and then by (7.18) and (7.19),

$$d_1(th) \geq CK^{\frac{2-n}{2}}t^{\frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}d_1(h).$$

In particular,

$$(7.25) \quad p_t \cdot e_1 \geq c \frac{d_1(th)}{d_1(h)} \geq cK^{\frac{2-n}{2}}t^{\frac{1}{1+\bar{\alpha}}}.$$

Denote

$$b_1(t) = \sup\{\mu | \mu e_1 \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t(0)\}.$$

Let $M := K$ be a large universal constant, and we claim that

$$(7.26) \quad b_1(t) \geq Mt, \quad \forall t \in [\sigma(\frac{\varepsilon}{h}), \delta_0]$$

for some universal module σ . This statement implies $\tilde{u}(te_1) \leq Kt$, which, together with (7.19), completes the proof of the upper strict convexity lemma (5.1) in the tangent direction.

Finally, we need to prove (7.26). Suppose by contradiction (7.26) fails, then $b(t_0) \leq Mt_0$ for some $t_0 \leq \delta_0$. Since $\frac{b(t)}{t}$ is decreasing by the convexity and has a positive lower bound by the Lipschitz, we have $ct \leq b_1(t) \leq Mt$ for all $t \geq \delta_0$. Then

$$\mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \subset \Gamma_2(Me_1) \subset \{|x_1| \leq CMK^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}|x''| + CM\mu\}.$$

Recalling that (7.24), we obtain

$$(7.27) \quad \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_\mu(0) \subset \{c(\mu/K)^{\frac{1}{2}}|x''| - C\mu \leq |x_1| \leq CMK^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}|x''| + CM\mu\}.$$

Take constants $N = CMK^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $r = \frac{1}{2N^4}$, $t = \delta^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $s = rt \geq \delta^2$. Given the point $y \in \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_s \subset \mathcal{P}\tilde{S}_t$, we have

$$c(t/K)^{\frac{1}{2}}|y''| - Ct \leq |y_1| \leq CMK^{\frac{1}{2}}s^{\frac{1}{2}}|y''| + CMs,$$

which implies

$$|y''| \leq CM \frac{t+s}{(t/K)^{\frac{1}{2}} - CMK^{\frac{1}{2}}s^{\frac{1}{2}}} = CMK^{\frac{1}{2}}t^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1+r}{1 - CMKr^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

and

$$|y_1| \leq CMK^{\frac{1}{2}}s^{\frac{1}{2}}|y''| + CMs \leq Nt(r + Nr^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1+r}{1 - N^2r^{\frac{1}{2}}}).$$

Letting $y = p_s$ and recalling that(7.25), we get

$$cK^{\frac{2-n}{2}}(rt)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} \leq p_s \cdot e_1 \leq Nt(r + Nr^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1+r}{1 - N^2r^{\frac{1}{2}}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\delta^{\frac{3}{2}} = t \geq \left[c^{-1}NK^{\frac{n-2}{2}}r^{-\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}(r + Nr^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1+r}{1 - N^2r^{\frac{1}{2}}}) \right]^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha}} \geq [C(M, K)]^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha}} \geq \delta,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Remark 7.5. *Using the above arguments we see that if $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\alpha}$ and $Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}f + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\phi) + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\beta)$ is a sufficiently small, the result of Theorem 7.4 still holds.*

8. CONVERGENCE

From now on, we will use the normalization family Definition 4.7 when we assume **(A₃)** for $W^{2,p}$ -estimate, and use slide normalization family when we assume **(A₄)** for $C^{2,\alpha}$ -estimate. For simplicity, we will replace the slide normalization family by the the normalization family, since they are different just up to a bounded transformation.

The main idea in this section is as follows. As $h \rightarrow 0$, there always exists a subsequence of (slide) normalization family $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$ that locally uniformly converge to a solutions $(\hat{u}, \hat{\Omega})$ to some standard problem in Definition2.2. Here, we have to enlarge the section to ensure the convergence in $B_R(0)$ for arbitrarily large R . For simplicity, we always omit the subscript when consider the limit problem. Suppose that $\hat{u} \in C_{loc}^1(\Omega \cup G_1)$ and is strictly convex in interior, then \hat{u} is smooth in interior, and $v = D_n u - ax_1$ is continuous in $\Omega \cup G_1$ solving the linearized problem:

$$(8.1) \quad \begin{cases} U^{ij}D_{ij}v = 0 & \text{in } S_1(0), \\ v \leq C & \text{on } \partial S_1(0), \\ v = 0 & \text{on } G_1(0), \end{cases}$$

Where U^{ij} is the cofactor of the Hessian D^2u . Since for large constants C_1 and C_2 ,

$$w^+(x) := C_1[\hat{u} - \frac{n}{2}x_n D_n \hat{u} + C_2 n x_n]$$

is a natural upper barrier to problem (8.1), we have

$$v(te_n) \leq Ct \text{ and } \hat{u}(te_n) \leq Ct^2.$$

Thus, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}f + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\phi) + h \leq \delta_0$, then

$$(8.2) \quad \tilde{u}(te_n) \leq Ct^2 + \sigma(\delta_0) \text{ for } h \leq h_0.$$

This will ensure that the Neumann boundary converges locally uniformly to the plane \mathbb{R}^{n-1} and the limit \hat{u} always satisfy the assumptions in Liouville Theorem 1.8, so \hat{u} is a quadratic function. Recall that

$$cB_1^+(0) \subset \hat{S}_1(0) \subset CB_1^+(0) \text{ and } \det D_n \hat{u} = f(0),$$

which push us to prove the following

Theorem 8.1. *For any small constant $\epsilon > 0$, we can find constant $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}f + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\phi) + h \leq \delta_0$, then there exists a quadratic function P_h satisfying*

$$(8.3) \quad P_h(0) = \nabla' P_h(0) = 0, \det D^2 P_h = f(0),$$

and

$$(8.4) \quad \|D_n P_h - D_n \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{G}_1)} + \|\tilde{u} - P_h\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{S}_1)} \leq \epsilon,$$

where \tilde{u} is the same as in Definitions 4.7 or 7.3.

Remark 8.2. *By iteration, Lemma 8.1 yields (6.13) and hence \tilde{u} is $C^{1,1-C\epsilon}$ on \tilde{G} as we have shown in Lemma 6.10.*

Proof of Theorem 8.1 in the case $n = 2$. In this case, the graph of \tilde{u} do not contain lines. On the Neumann boundary, the good shape lemma (Theorem 4.2, or (7.4)-(7.6)) and universal strict convexity of \tilde{u} (Theorem 5.1 or Theorem 7.4) holds for every boundary section, $\tilde{u} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\tilde{\Omega} \cup \tilde{G})$ and is universal strictly convex in interior. We can improve 3.17 to

$$|D_2 u(x) - \phi(x_1)| \leq C\|u\|_{Lip}|\beta - e_2| \leq C|x_1|^{1+\alpha} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \cap B_c(0).$$

Suppose that $\delta_0 := Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}f + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\phi) + h \rightarrow 0$, then we have

$$\det D^2 \tilde{u} = \tilde{f} = f(0) + \sigma(\delta_0) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad D_2 \tilde{u} = \tilde{\phi}^0 = ax_1 + \sigma(\delta_0) \text{ on } \partial\Omega \cap B_c(0).$$

Recall that $\tilde{u} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\tilde{\Omega} \cup \tilde{G})$ and is universal strict convexity, the compactness of the Neumann boundary value (Theorem 1.2) keeps and the limit family solves the

standard problem in Definition 2.2 in the classical sense. Then the above discussion gives (8.2). Through iteration, this means that

$$d_2(h) \geq ch^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}},$$

and then

$$d_1(h) \leq Ch^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}}.$$

In conclude,

$$(8.5) \quad |\tilde{g}(x_1)| \leq \frac{d_1(h)^{1+\alpha}}{d_2(h)} |x_1|^{1+\alpha} \rightarrow 0.$$

This means that the Neumann boundary converges locally uniformly to the line \mathbb{R} , and the proof is complete by the virtue of Theorem 1.8. \square

For higher dimensional case ($n \geq 3$), we use the same idea as the case $n \geq 2$, which is similar to dealing with the normalization family under the global assumption (1.5). However, we need to consider the slide normalization family under the pointwise assumption (1.6), in this situation there is not necessarily a priori $C^1(\Omega \cup G)$ estimate or strict convexity for u , so some extra technique is required.

Due to the universal strict convexity Theorem 7.4, where the restriction that $h \in [2\delta^{-4}\sigma^*(\varepsilon), h_0]$ may be not ignored (since the ε in (1.6) may be sufficiently small), there exists a universal small constant $\varrho > 0$ such that

$$(8.6) \quad \tilde{S}_{\frac{1}{2}}(0) \subset \frac{1}{8\varrho} \tilde{S}_{\varrho}(0).$$

This property is invariant under uniformly convergence.

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose that u solves the local problem (2.7), where $\phi = l$ is a linear function and $D_n f = 0$. If u satisfies (8.6) at 0, then near origin we have*

$$u(te_n) \leq Ct^2.$$

Proof. Take a sequence of smooth functions f_ϵ satisfying $D_n f_\epsilon = 0$ and a sequence of smooth functions w_ϵ on $\partial S_1(0)$ such that

$$\|f_\epsilon - f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|w_\epsilon - u\|_{L^\infty(\partial S_1(0))} < c\epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Then there are classical solutions to the problem

$$\det D^2 u_\epsilon = f_\epsilon \text{ in } S_1(0), \quad u_\epsilon = w_\epsilon \text{ on } \partial S_1(0).$$

By comparison principle, $\|u_\epsilon - u\|_{L^\infty(S_1(0))} \leq \epsilon$. Let

$$G^\epsilon = G_{\frac{1}{2}}(0) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} e_n, \quad S^\epsilon = (S_{\frac{1}{2}}(0) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} e_n) \setminus G^\epsilon.$$

Given a point $q \in S^\epsilon$, by convexity

$$D_n u_\epsilon(q) \leq \inf_{0 < t \leq c} \frac{u_\epsilon(q + te_n) - u_\epsilon(q)}{t} \leq C.$$

According to (3.18), there exist σ_1 (depending on u) with $\sigma_1(0) = 0$ such that

$$0 \leq D_n u(\mathcal{G}x' + te_n) - D_n u(\mathcal{G}x') \leq \sigma_1(t).$$

Given $p \in G^\epsilon$, it follows that

$$D_n u_\epsilon(p) \leq \frac{u(p + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}e_n) - u(p) + 2\epsilon}{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq l(p') + \sigma_1(2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$D_n u_\epsilon(p) \geq \frac{u(p - \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}e_n) - u(p) - 2\epsilon}{\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq l(p') - \sigma_1(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) - \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

And Lemma 2.6 implies that locally $\|\nabla u_\epsilon\| \leq C$.

Denote $\bar{u}_\epsilon(x) = u_\epsilon(x) - u_\epsilon(y_\epsilon) - \nabla u(y_\epsilon) \cdot (x - y_\epsilon)$. We claim that

$$\bar{u}_\epsilon \geq c > 0 \text{ on } \partial S^\epsilon \setminus G^\epsilon.$$

Denote $L := u_\epsilon(y_\epsilon) + \nabla u(y_\epsilon) \cdot (x - y_\epsilon) - \varrho - 2\epsilon$. Since ϵ is small enough, then

$$L(0) \geq -\varrho - c_1 \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon \text{ and } L|_{S_\epsilon(0)} \leq 0.$$

Recalling (8.6), we find that

$$L + \varrho \leq \frac{1}{4} \text{ on } \partial S_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus G_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This is to say $u - L - \varrho \geq \frac{1}{4}$ on $\partial S_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus G_{\frac{1}{2}}$, and

$$\bar{u}_\epsilon = u_\epsilon - L - \varrho - 2\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{8} \text{ on } \partial S^\epsilon \setminus G^\epsilon.$$

According to Lemmas 2.12 and 2.14, u_ϵ is a strict convex, smooth function in interior. Then $v_\epsilon = D_n u_\epsilon - l(x)$ is a bounded solution of the problem

$$(8.7) \quad \begin{cases} U_\epsilon^{ij} D_{ij} v_\epsilon = 0 & \text{in } S^\epsilon, \\ v_\epsilon \leq C & \text{on } \partial S^\epsilon, \\ v_\epsilon \leq \sigma(2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{on } G^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

Consider the upper barrier

$$w_\epsilon^+ := C_1 [\bar{u}_\epsilon - \frac{n}{2}(x_n - \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) D_n u_\epsilon + nC(x_n - \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})] + \sigma(2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where C_1 is large enough. Note that $w_\epsilon^+ \geq \sigma(2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$w_\epsilon^+ \geq C_1 [\frac{1}{8} + \frac{nC}{2}(x_n - s_\epsilon)] \geq C \text{ on } \partial S^\epsilon \setminus G^\epsilon$$

and

$$U_\epsilon^{ij} D_{ij} w_\epsilon^+ = U_\epsilon^{ij} D_{ij} [u_\epsilon - \frac{n}{2} x_n D_n u_\epsilon] = n f_\epsilon - n f_\epsilon = 0.$$

Therefore, w_ϵ^+ is a supersolution of the problem (8.7), which implies

$$D_n u_\epsilon(t e_n) \leq w_\epsilon^+(t e_n) \leq C t + C[\sigma(2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}].$$

Thus,

$$u(t e_n) \leq u_\epsilon(t e_n) + 2\epsilon \leq C t^2 + C[\sigma(2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}] + 2\epsilon,$$

which completes our proof by taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.1 in the case $n \geq 3$. Suppose that $\delta_0 := Osc_{\bar{\Omega}} f + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\phi) + h \rightarrow 0$. Recalling Theorem 7.4, the compactness Lemma 3.15 shows that the limit functions solve the standard problem in Definition 2.2. Apply Lemma 8.3, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $Osc_{\bar{\Omega}} f + Osc_{\bar{\Omega}}(D\phi) + h \leq \delta_0$, then

$$\tilde{u}(t e_n) \leq C t^2 + \sigma(\delta_0) \text{ for } h \leq h_0.$$

Through iteration, this means that

$$d_n(h) \geq c h^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}},$$

thus we obtain

$$\mathcal{T}'_h \leq C h^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}} \mathcal{I}'.$$

In conclusion,

$$|\tilde{g}(x')| \leq \frac{1}{d_n(h)} |\mathcal{T}'_h x'|^{1+\alpha} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0^+,$$

hence the Neumann boundary locally converges to the plane \mathbb{R}^{n-1} uniformly.

By Definition 7.3, we see that on the Neumann boundary \tilde{G} ,

$$D_n \tilde{u} = \frac{a d_n(h) d_1(h)}{h} x_1 + o(\sigma(\delta_0)),$$

and

$$(8.8) \quad \tilde{u}(x) \leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{d_i(h)^2}{h} x_i^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{h} \right) \leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{d_i(h)^2}{h} x_i^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/4}} \right)$$

because of $h \geq \min\{\sigma^*(\varepsilon), \varepsilon^{1/4}\}$. Therefore, letting $\delta_0 \rightarrow 0$ (then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $h \rightarrow 0$), for any sequence of slide normalization family, we can assume that one of the following cases holds up to a subsequence:

If $\frac{d_2(h)}{h^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow \infty$, then $D_n \tilde{u} \rightarrow 0$.

If $\frac{d_2(h)}{h^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq K$ for some constant K , then we get

$$D_n \tilde{u} \rightarrow \frac{a d_n(h) d_1(h) D_1}{h} x_1 \text{ and } \lim \tilde{u}(0, x'', 0) \leq C K |x''|^2.$$

Therefore, the limit function of the normalization solutions always satisfy the assumptions in Liouville Theorem 1.8, and the proof is complete. \square

9. STATIONARY THEOREM AND $C^{2,\alpha}$ ESTIMATE

In this section, we show a stationary theorem which states that if \tilde{u}_h is well approximated by some quadratic function Q_h in $\tilde{S}_1^{\tilde{u}_h}$ and the known data in its normalized local problem (7.14) are small perturbations of constant and linear function, then $\tilde{u}_{\mu h}$ has a better approximation in the smaller $\tilde{S}_1^{\tilde{u}_{\mu h}}$. Applying this theorem and using a perturbation method, we will prove Theorem 1.4.

9.1. Stationary Theorem.

Assuming only the pointwise assumption (1.6) holds, we notice that in higher dimensional case, the Neumann boundary value $\tilde{\phi}^0(0)$ in Definition 7.3 may become larger during the iterations, and the normalized section can lose control without the $C^{1,\alpha}$ smooth assumption on coefficients. Therefore, we take a large constant K to be fixed later, and consider the following modified local problem:

$$(9.1) \quad \begin{cases} |\det D^2u - 1| \leq \delta\epsilon & \text{in } S_1(0), \\ |D_nu - ax_1| \leq \delta\epsilon & \text{on } G_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Here, we assume $|a| \leq K$, $u(0) = 0$, $u \geq 0$, $\|u\|_{Lip} \leq CK$,

$$B_{K^{-1}}^+(0) \cap \Omega \subset S_1(0) \subset B_K(0),$$

and the defining function of G_1 satisfies $\|g\|_{L^\infty} \leq \delta\epsilon$.

Denote

$$F^{u,0} := \{l + Q \mid l \text{ is a linear function, } Q(x) \text{ is a quadratic function, } D^2Q > 0, \\ l(0) = D_nl(0) = 0, \det D^2Q = 1 \text{ and } \nabla' D_nQ(0) = ae_1\}.$$

Definition 9.1. Consider the following distance function

$$\text{dist}_t(u, v) := \frac{\|u - v\|_{L^\infty(S_t^u(0) \cup S_t^v(0))}}{t}.$$

The energy of u at 0 with height t is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_t(u) := \inf_{P \in F^{u,0}} \text{dist}_t(u, P).$$

Obviously,

$$\mathcal{E}_1(\tilde{u}_t) = \mathcal{E}_t(u) \leq t^{-1}\mathcal{E}_1(u).$$

Our main theorem is the following stationary theorem.

Theorem 9.2. *Given any small constant $\mu > 0$, we can find positive constants $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\mu, K)$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\mu, K)$ such that if $\delta \leq \delta_0$, u is a convex function of the problem (9.1), satisfying $\mathcal{E}_1(u) = \text{dist}_1(u, P)$ for some $P = l + Q \in F^{u,0}$, and $\mathcal{E}_1(u) = \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then $|Dl| \leq CK\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and*

$$(9.2) \quad \mathcal{E}_\mu(u) \leq \text{dist}_\mu(u, P^0) \leq C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{E}_1(u)$$

and

$$(9.3) \quad |D^2Q^0 - D^2Q| \leq C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{E}_1(u)$$

for some $P^0 = l^0 + Q^0 \in F^{u,0}$.

Proof. By assumption, $c\mathcal{I} \leq D^2Q \leq C\mathcal{I}$. Let

$$(b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}) := (D_{12}Q, \dots, D_{1n-1}Q)(D_{x''}^2Q)^{-1}.$$

First by the sliding transformation $\mathcal{B}x := x - 2 \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} b_i x_1 e_i$, then by a rotation transform in x'' , we can always find a new coordinate such that Q takes the form of

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[\sqrt{C_1 + a^2(x_1^2 + x_n^2)} + 2ax_1x_n + C_2 \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_i^2 \right].$$

For simplicity, we assume that

$$Q := \frac{1}{2} \left[\sqrt{1 + a^2(x_1^2 + x_n^2)} + 2ax_1x_n + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_i^2 \right].$$

Take a point $x \in G_1$ satisfying $-l(x') = |Dl||x'|$ and $|x'| \sim |x| = \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |Dl||x'| &= -l(x') \leq u(x) - l(x) \\ &\leq |Q(x)| + |u - (l + Q)|_{L^\infty(E)} \\ &\leq C|x|^2 + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $|Dl| \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Step 1. Let $\theta = \delta\epsilon$, we show that u can be approximate by solution to the standard problem in Definition 2.2. In fact, there exists subsolution $u^0 := (1 + C\theta)(u + C^2\theta x_n) - 2C^3\theta$ and supersolution $u^1 := (1 - C\theta)(u - C^2\theta x_n) + 2C^3\theta$. Apply Lemma 3.14, we can obtain a convex function ϖ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2\varpi = 1 & \text{in } S_1^u(0), \\ D_n\varpi = ax_1 & \text{on } G_{\frac{7}{8}}^u(0), \\ u^0 \leq \varpi \leq u^1 & \text{in } S_1^u(0). \end{cases}$$

In particular,

$$\|u - \varpi\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\theta.$$

Step 2. Consider functions

$$\varpi_0 := \varpi - P \text{ and } v := \frac{\varpi_0}{\epsilon}.$$

and the operator

$$Lw := \sqrt{1 + a^2}(w_{11} + w_{nn}) + aw_{1n} + \Delta''w.$$

we will show that if $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$, the corresponding (v, D_nv) will have a subsequence that converges uniformly to a solution (w, D_nw) of the following problem

$$(9.4) \quad Lw = 0 \text{ in } B_c(0), \quad w(0) = 0, \quad D_nw = 0 \text{ on } \{x_n = 0\}.$$

In the following discussion, we can ignore l by considering $\varpi - l$.

Step 2.1. We first consider the convergence on compact subsets

$$E = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_n \geq C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \cap S_{\frac{1}{2}}^Q(0).$$

For point $y \in E$ such that $\text{dist}(y, \partial G_1) \gg C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, choose a constant $\rho = c \text{dist}(y, \partial G_1)$ such that the ball $B_{C\rho}(y) \subset E$. Then

$$B_{c\rho}(y) \subset S_{\rho^2}^Q(y) \subset B_{C\rho}(y).$$

Note that

$$(9.5) \quad 0 = \det D^2\varpi - \det D^2Q = \text{Tr}(AD^2(\varpi - Q)) = \epsilon \text{Tr}(AD^2v).$$

Here

$$A := [A_{ij}]_{n \times n} = \int_0^1 \text{cof}((1-t)D^2Q + tD^2\varpi) dt$$

and $\text{cof}M$ is the cofactor matrix of M .

Recall $|\varpi - Q| \leq \epsilon$. As $\epsilon \leq c\rho^2$, $B_{2c\rho}(y) \subset S_{\rho^2/2}^{\varpi}(y) \subset B_{C\rho}(y)$. It follows that

$$\|\varpi\|_{C^k(B_{c\rho}(y))} \leq C\rho^{2-k} \text{ and } c\mathcal{I} \leq D^2\varpi \leq C\mathcal{I} \text{ in } B_{c\rho}(y).$$

Thus, the operator $L_A f := A_{ij}f_{ij}$ is uniform elliptic with smooth coefficients. According to (9.5), we get

$$(9.6) \quad \|v\|_{C^k(B_{c\rho}(y))} \leq C\rho^{-k},$$

which implies

$$|D^2\varpi - D^2Q| \leq C\epsilon\rho^{-2} \text{ and } |A - D^2Q| \leq C\epsilon\rho^{-2}.$$

Letting $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$, we see by the last inequality and (9.5)-(9.6) that (v, D_nv) converges (w, D_nw) such that $Lw = 0$ in $B_{c\rho}(y)$.

Step 2.2. We show that $|D_nv| \leq C$ in $G_c^{\varpi}(0)$. As the proof of Lemma 8.3, using a family of Dirichlet problem to construct a smooth approximation of w , we may

assume that ϖ is smooth. Let κ, K be positive universal constant with κ small but K large. Consider the functions

$$V(x) = \kappa(1 + |x'|)^2 + K|x_n|^2, \quad W = (V - \varpi)|D_nv|^2,$$

and define the operator

$$L^0 w := \varpi^{ij} D_{ij} w$$

where ϖ^{ij} is the cofactor of $D^2 \varpi$. Denote

$$E_1 := \{\varpi \leq V\} \cap \{x_n \leq \kappa\}.$$

Since $L^0 D_n v = 0$, we have in E ,

$$\begin{aligned} L^0 W &= |D_n v|^2 L^0(V - \varpi) + (V - \varpi) L^0 |D_n v|^2 \\ &= |D_n v|^2 (L^0 V - n) + 2(V - \varpi) \varpi^{ij} D_i(D_n v) D_j(D_n v) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By maximum principle

$$\sup_{E_1} W = \sup_{\partial E_1} W.$$

Recalling (9.6), we find that $|D_n v| \leq C$ on $E_1 \cap \{x_n = \kappa\}$ if $\epsilon \ll \kappa^2$. Thus,

$$|D_n v| \leq C \text{ in } S_c(0).$$

Step 2.3. Next, we give the uniform control of $(v, D_n v)$ near $\{x_n = 0\}$. We will show

$$(9.7) \quad |D_n v(x)| \leq C(x_n + \delta) \text{ in } S_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(0),$$

and

$$(9.8) \quad \text{Osc}_{B_r(x)}(v) \leq C \max\{r^{\frac{2}{3}}, \epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \delta_0\} \text{ for } x \in G_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}.$$

For simplicity, we assume that $c = 1$. It follows from the above discussion that $\omega = D_n v$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \varpi^{ij} D_{ij} \omega = 0 & \text{in } S_1(0), \\ |\omega| \leq C & \text{on } \partial S_1(0) \setminus G_1(0), \\ |\omega| \leq C \frac{x_n}{\epsilon} \leq C \frac{\|g\|_{L^\infty}}{\epsilon} \leq C\delta & \text{on } G_1(0). \end{cases}$$

With C_1, C_2 large enough, the function

$$\omega^+(x) = C_1[\varpi(x) - \frac{n}{2} x_n D_n \varpi + C_2 x_n + C\delta].$$

satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \varpi^{ij} D_{ij} \omega^+ = 0 & \text{in } S_1(0), \\ \omega^+ \geq C & \text{on } \partial S_1(0) \setminus G_1(0), \\ \omega^+ \geq C\delta & \text{on } G_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Thus, $\pm\omega^+$ will be the upper (lower) barrier of w at 0, and we get

$$|D_n v(te_n)| \leq C(t + \delta).$$

By considering the function $u_{x_0} = [u(x) - \varpi(x_0) - \nabla\varpi(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)]$ and transformation $\mathcal{A}x = (x - x_0) - D'g(x_0) \cdot x'e_n$, the similar discussion applies to other boundary points on $G_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}$. Therefore,

$$|D_n v(x)| \leq C(|\mathcal{A}x \cdot e_n| + \delta) \leq C(x_n + \delta),$$

and (9.7) is proved.

by (9.7) we have

$$(9.9) \quad |v(x', g(x')) - v(x', x_n)| \leq C(x_n^2 + \delta x_n).$$

In order to prove (9.8), we only need to estimate $|\varpi(p) - \varpi(q)|$ for $p = (p_1, g(p_1))$ and $q = (q_1, g(q_1))$ in $G_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(0)$. Denote

$$r = |p' - q'| \text{ and } \rho = C \max\{r^{\frac{1}{3}}, \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$$

and take points $y = (p', \rho)$ and $z = (q', \rho)$. Since $\rho \geq C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, (9.6) means

$$|v(y) - v(z)| \leq Cr\rho^{-1},$$

which, together with (9.9), implies

$$|v(p) - v(q)| \leq C(\rho^2 + \delta\rho + r\rho^{-1}) \leq C \max\{r^{\frac{2}{3}}, \epsilon, \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \delta\}.$$

This gives (9.8).

Combining the above with (9.7) we conclude that as $\epsilon_0, \delta_0 \rightarrow 0$, $(v, D_n v)$ will have a subsequence converging uniformly to a solution $(w, D_n w)$ of problem (9.4).

Step 3. It follows from (9.4) and the classical theory that the function $w \in C_{loc}^3$. Note that $w(0) = D'D_n w(0) = 0$, there exist linear function

$$l_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i x_i$$

and quadratic function

$$R(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1} a_{ij} x_i x_j + \frac{b_n}{2} x_n^2,$$

satisfying

$$(9.10) \quad |w(x) - l_1(x) - R(x)| \leq C|x|^3 \text{ and } |D_n w(x) - b_n x_n| \leq C|x|^2.$$

Here, a_i, a_{ij}, b_n are bounded by universal constant, and

$$\sqrt{1 + a^2}(a_{11} + a_{nn}) + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} a_{ii} = 0.$$

As $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$, (9.10) and the result of Step 2 means

$$|v(x) - l_1(x) - R(x)| \leq \sigma + C|x|^3 \text{ and } |D_n v(x) - b_n x_n| \leq \sigma + C|x|^2,$$

where $\sigma = \sigma(\epsilon_0) \rightarrow 0$. Suppose $\sigma^{\frac{2}{3}} + \epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{3}} + \delta_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mu$, then

$$(9.11) \quad |\varpi - [Q + \epsilon(l_1 + R)]| \leq C\epsilon\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} \text{ in } S_\mu^Q,$$

and

$$(9.12) \quad |D_n \varpi - (D_n Q + \epsilon D_n R)| \leq C\epsilon\mu \text{ in } S_\mu^Q.$$

Step 4. Observing $1 = \det D^2 \varpi = \det(D^2 Q + \epsilon D^2 v)$, we see that the function

$$k(t) := \det [D^2 Q + \epsilon D^2 R + tI]$$

satisfies

$$|k(0) - 1| \leq |\sqrt{1 + a^2}(a_{11} + a_{nn}) + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} a_{ii}| \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) \leq C\epsilon^2 \text{ and } c \leq k'(t) \sim C.$$

The equation $k(t) = 1$ is solvable, the solution t_0 satisfies

$$(9.13) \quad |t_0| \leq C\epsilon^2.$$

Take

$$l^0 = \epsilon l_1, \quad Q^0(x) = Q(x) + \epsilon R(x) + \frac{t_0}{2}|x|^2, \quad P^0 = l^0 + Q^0.$$

Then Q^0 satisfies (9.3) and

$$\det D^2 P^0 = 1, \quad D_n P^0 = a x_1 \text{ on } \{x_n = 0\},$$

therefore, $P^0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$. Combing (9.11), (9.12) and (9.13) we obtain

$$|\varpi(x) - P^0(x)| \leq C t_0 \mu + C \epsilon \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq C \epsilon \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} \text{ in } S_\mu,$$

which, together with the result of Step 1, implies

$$|u(x) - P^0(x)| \leq C \epsilon \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} + C \delta \epsilon \leq C \epsilon \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} \text{ in } S_\mu.$$

Now noticing that $S_{\mu/2}(0) \cup S_{\mu/2}^{P^0}(0) \subset S_\mu$ and replacing μ with $\mu/2$, we finish the proof. □

9.2. $C^{2,\alpha}$ Estimate-Proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof. Recall Theorem 8.1. Denote $\Omega_\rho := \omega \cap B_\rho(x_0)$. By the assumption we have

$$Osc_{\Omega_\rho} f + Osc_{\Omega_\rho}(D\beta) + Osc_{\Omega_\rho}(D\phi) + \varepsilon \leq \sigma \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \rho \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, by iteration we can choose a small h_0 such that $16CKh_0^{\frac{\alpha}{8}} \leq \delta_0\epsilon_0$, and

$$(9.14) \quad \mathcal{E}_{h_0}(u) \leq \epsilon_0, \quad ch_0^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}} \mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{T}_{h_0} \leq Ch_0^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}} \mathcal{I},$$

where $\epsilon < \min\{\frac{\alpha}{8}, c\}$ which is a small universal constant.

Let $\mu \leq (4C)^{\frac{2}{\alpha-1}}$, $K = \max\{\prod_{j=0}^{\infty}(1 + 4C^2\mu^{\frac{j\alpha}{4}}), e^{4C}\}$. Choose $\epsilon_0(\mu, K), \delta_0(\mu, K)$ as in Theorem 9.2. Note that for sufficiently small $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$\log C + \sum_{j=0}^k \log(1 + 4CK^2\epsilon_0\mu^{\frac{k\alpha}{4}-2}) \leq 2C + \epsilon_0 C(\mu)K^3 \leq \log K,$$

we can assume that $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small such that the sequence

$$C_0 = C, \quad C_k = (1 + 4CK^2\epsilon_0\mu^{\frac{k\alpha}{4}-2})C_{k-1}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

is bounded by K .

Step 1. Assuming

$$f_{h_0}(0) = 1, \quad D\phi_{h_0}(0) = ae_1.$$

Let $h_k = h_0\mu^k$, $\epsilon_k := \epsilon_0\mu^{\frac{k\alpha}{4}}$ and C_k is defined as above. We will prove by induction

Claim. There exists a sequence of constants a_k , transformations

$$\mathcal{M}_k = \text{diag}\{\mathcal{M}'_k, M_{k,nn}\}, \quad \det \mathcal{M}_k = 1,$$

and linear functions $l_k = b_k x_1$ with a_k, b_k satisfying

$$|b_{k-1}| \leq C(K)\epsilon_{k-1}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |a_k - a_{k-1}| \leq CC_{k-1}\epsilon_{k-1} \text{ and } |\mathcal{M}_k \mathcal{M}_{k-1}^{-1} - \mathcal{I}| \leq C_k \epsilon_{k-1},$$

such that at height h_k , the normalization solution (u_k, Ω_k) of (u, Ω) (see Definition 4.7) given by

$$u_k(x) := \frac{u(\mathcal{T}_k x)}{h_k}, \quad x \in \Omega_k := \mathcal{T}_k^{-1}(\Omega), \quad \mathcal{T}_k := \mathcal{T}_{h_0} \mu^{\frac{k\alpha}{2}} \mathcal{M}_k, \quad f_k(x) := f(\mathcal{T}_k x),$$

satisfying

$$(9.15) \quad C^{-1}h_k^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}} \mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{T}_k \leq Ch_k^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}} \mathcal{I},$$

$$(9.16) \quad C_k^{-1}B_1(0) \cap \Omega_k \subset S_1^{u_k}(0) \subset C_k B_1(0).$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{h_k}(u) \leq \text{dist}_1(u_k, P_k) \leq \epsilon_k$$

for $P_k = l_k + Q_k \in F^{u,0}$, where

$$Q_k(x) := \frac{1}{2} \left[\sqrt{1 + a_k^2(x_1^2 + x_n^2)} + 2a_k x_1 x_n + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_i^2 \right].$$

The Claim in the case $k = 0$ is obvious by taking $\mathcal{M}_0 = h_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}_0$ (see (9.14) or Theorem 8.1). In addition, Lemma 4.1 and (4.4) provide a universal bound for \mathcal{M}_0 .

Assuming that the Claim in the case of k holds, we will prove it for the case $k + 1$ by applying Theorem 9.2 to u_k . For this purpose, we want to check for the ϵ_k whether u_k satisfies the energy conditions in Theorem 9.2.

At first, we show the following estimation at height h_k

$$(9.17) \quad \left| \phi_k^0(x') - \frac{d_n \phi(\mathcal{T}_k x')}{h_k} \right| \leq Ch^{\frac{1-3\epsilon}{2}} \text{ on } G_1^{u_k}.$$

Note that u_k still satisfies the equation

$$D_{\beta_k} u = \phi_k \text{ on } G^{u_k}$$

in the viscosity sense, where

$$\phi_k = \frac{d_n(h_k) \phi(\mathcal{T}_{h_k} x')}{h_k} \text{ and } \beta_k = d_n(h_k) T_{h_k}^{-1} \beta(\mathcal{T}_{h_k} x') \text{ with } d_n(h_k) = |T_{h_k} e_n|.$$

Note that $u_k \in Lip(B_C(0))$, and $g_k \in Lip(B'_C(0))$ on $G^{u_k} \cap B_C(0)$, we have

$$\max\{|\beta_k(x) - e_n|, \|\beta_k\|_{L^\infty(B'_C(0))}\} \leq Cd_n(h_k) h_k^{-\epsilon} \max\{|x'|, C\} \leq Ch_k^{\frac{1-3\epsilon}{2}} \max\{|x'|, C\}.$$

Therefore β_k is still locally uniformly oblique. By (3.17) we have

$$\left\| \phi_k^0(x') - \frac{d_n(h_k) \phi_k(\mathcal{T}_k x')}{h_k} \right\| \leq C |\beta_k - e_n| \cdot \|u_k\|_{Lip(B_C(0))} \leq Ch_k^{\frac{1-3\epsilon}{2}} |x'| \text{ on } G_1^{u_k},$$

Which is (9.17) exactly.

Note that the fact $\delta_0 \epsilon_k \geq 4CK h_k^{\frac{3\alpha}{8}}$ and the induction hypothesis (9.15) gives

$$(9.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f_k - 1\|_{L^\infty} &\leq Ch_k^{\frac{3\alpha}{8}} \leq \delta_0 \epsilon_k, \\ |D_n \phi_k^0 - a_k x_1| &\leq Ch_k^{\frac{3\alpha}{8}} \leq \delta_0 \epsilon_k, \\ |u_k - P_k| &\leq \epsilon_k \text{ in } \Omega_k \cap S_1^{P_k}. \end{aligned}$$

The Neumann boundary $G^{u_k} \subset \partial\Omega_k \cap B_K$ by (9.16). It follows from (9.15) again that

$$(9.19) \quad |g_k| \leq Ch_k^{\frac{3\alpha}{8}} \leq \delta_0 \epsilon_k.$$

and

Applying the Theorem 9.2 to u_k , we obtain a quadratic function $\bar{P}_{k+1} = \bar{l}_{k+1} + \bar{Q}_{k+1} \in F^{u,0}$ satisfies

$$\text{dist}_\mu(u_k, \bar{P}_{k+1}) \leq C \epsilon_k \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq \epsilon_{k+1} \mu,$$

$$|b_k| \leq C\epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } |D^2Q_k - D^2\bar{Q}_{k+1}| \leq C\epsilon_k.$$

Then there exists a_{k+1} and positive matrix $\mathcal{B}_{k+1} = \text{diag}\{\mathcal{B}'_k, B_{k,nn}\}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{B}_{k+1}^T D^2Q_k \mathcal{B}_{k+1} = D^2Q_{k+1}$$

and we can assume that

$$|a_{k+1} - a_k| \leq CC_k\epsilon_k \text{ and } |\mathcal{B}_{k+1} - \mathcal{I}| \leq CC_k\epsilon_k.$$

In particular, $|a_{k+1}| \leq C_{k+1}$. Take $\mathcal{M}_{k+1} = \mathcal{M}_k \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$, $\mathcal{T}_{k+1} = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{T}_k \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$. With

$$u_{k+1}(x) = \frac{u(\mathcal{T}_{k+1}x)}{h_{k+1}}, \quad S_1^{u_{k+1}}(0) = \mathcal{T}_{k+1}^{-1} S_{h_{k+1}}(0), \quad h_{k+1} = \mu^{(k+1)\alpha},$$

we have

$$(1 - CK^2\mu^{-1}\epsilon_k)C_k^{-1}B_1(0) \cap \Omega_{k+1} \subset S_1^{u_{k+1}}(0) \subset (1 + CK^2\mu^{-1}\epsilon_k)C_k B_1(0).$$

This is

$$C_{k+1}^{-1}B_1(0) \cap \Omega_{k+1} \subset S_1^{u_{k+1}}(0) \subset C_{k+1}B_1(0).$$

The remaining conclusion for the case $k+1$ can be verified by direct calculations.

Step 2. It follows that $|a_k| \leq C_k$, $|\mathcal{M}_k| \leq C_k$, which implies they converge geometrically to a_∞ and \mathcal{M}_∞ respectively, and

$$|a_k - a_\infty| \leq C_k\epsilon_k \leq Kh_k^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} \text{ and } |\mathcal{M}_\infty \mathcal{M}_k^{-1} - \mathcal{I}| \leq C_k\epsilon_k \leq Kh_k^{\frac{\alpha}{4}}.$$

Replace each \mathcal{M}_k by \mathcal{M}_∞ and Q_k by Q_∞ (the coefficient a_k of Q_k by a_∞ , we see that the Claim still holds with a large universal constant. This is

$$|u(x) - h_k^{\frac{1}{2}} l_k(\mathcal{M}_\infty^{-1}x) - Q_\infty(\mathcal{M}_\infty^{-1}x)| \leq C_1 K^2 h_k^{1+\frac{\alpha}{4}} \text{ in } B_{ch_k^{\frac{1}{4}}}(0).$$

Here, C_1 depends on the initial transformation \mathcal{T}_0 . Recall that $|Dl_k| \leq C\epsilon_{k-1}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we obtain

$$|u(x) - Q_\infty(\mathcal{M}_\infty^{-1}x)| \leq C_1 K^2 h_k^{1+\frac{\alpha}{4}} \text{ in } B_{ch_k^{\frac{1}{2}}}(0),$$

which means

$$(9.20) \quad |u(x) - Q_\infty(\mathcal{M}_\infty^{-1}x)| \leq C_1 K^2 |x|^{2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Thus, we have proved the pointwise $C^{1,1}$ regularity of u at 0. Therefore, we can normalize the section at any height such that the corresponding Neumann boundary value $a_h x_1$ is bounded and the normalization transformation \mathcal{T}_h satisfying

$$c_1 h^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{T}_h \leq C_1 h^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{I}.$$

Then (9.18)-(9.19) can be modified to be

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_h - 1\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C_1 h^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \\ |D_n \phi_h - a_h x_1| &\leq C_1 h^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|g_h| \leq C \frac{d_1^{1+\alpha}(h)}{d_2(h)} \leq C_1 h^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Repeat Step 1 with $h_k = h_0 \mu^k$, $\epsilon_k := \epsilon_0 \mu^{\frac{k\alpha}{2}}$. Then, (9.20) is converted to

$$|u(x) - Q_\infty(\mathcal{M}_\infty^{-1}x)| \leq C_1 |x|^{2+\alpha}.$$

This gives a pointwise $C^{2,\alpha}$ module of u at 0.

Note that the above discussion is valid for every point $x_0 \in G_{\frac{h_0}{2}}(0)$. Hence we find that u is $C^{2,\alpha}$ on the boundary $G_{\frac{h_0}{2}}(0)$. Therefore, assuming that $\theta > 0$ is small enough, given the point $q \in \partial\Omega$ and point $p = q + \theta\nu(q) \in \Omega$ are close to the origin. The height section $S_{c_1\theta^2}^{Q_q}(p)$ is contained in Ω with

$$B_{c\theta^2}(p) \subset S_{c_1\theta^2}^{Q_q}(p) \subset B_{C\theta^2}(p)$$

And in the convex domain, we have

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2 u(x) = 1 & \text{in } S_{c_1\theta^2}^{Q_q}(p), \\ |u - Q_q(x)| \leq C|\theta|^{2+\alpha} & \text{on } \partial S_{c_1\theta^2}^{Q_q}(p). \end{cases}$$

The interior $C^{2,\alpha}$ theory then gives $\|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(B_{c\theta^2}(p))} \leq C$ and therefore $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega \cap B_\rho(0))$ for some small universal ρ .

When $n = 2$, the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regulatory is valid at every boundary point, then we can prove that there is a positive lower bound on the maximum height of the point far away from the boundary, which gives the global $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate. \square

10. EXAMPLES

In this Section, we will construct Example 10.3 to show Remark 1.6. We first introduce the classical counterexample.

Example 10.1 (Pogorelov's Counterexample). *The classical Pogorelov's example is the convex function u defined on $B_\rho(0)$,*

$$u(x) = (1 + x_n^2)|x'|^{2-\frac{2}{n}}, \quad n \geq 3.$$

And $\det D^2u$ is a smooth and even analytic function. Obviously, u is not C^2 smooth, and $u \in C^2(B_\rho(0) \setminus \{|x'| = 0\})$. Consider the smooth vector fields β near point $\{\pm \rho e_n\}$,

$$\beta(x', x_n) = (-x'x_n, (1 - \frac{1}{n})(1 + x_n^2)).$$

Extend β to be a smooth point-inner vector fields defined on $\partial B_\rho(0)$. Then u is a solution of the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2u = f & \text{in } B_\rho(0) \\ D_\beta u = \phi & \text{on } \partial B_\rho(0) \end{cases}$$

where f, β and ϕ are all smooth.

Next, we copy a singular homogeneous function from [9].

Example 10.2 (Singular Homogeneous Function). Suppose $n \geq 3$, constants $1 < a, b < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$ is small such that

$$\frac{1}{a} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n-2}\delta, \quad 1 - \delta = \frac{1}{b}.$$

Consider domains

$$E_1 := \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |x''|^a \geq |x_1|^b\}, \quad E_2 := \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |x_1|^b \geq |x''|^a\}.$$

the function

$$(10.1) \quad W_{a,b}(x') = \begin{cases} |x''|^a + |x''|^{a-\frac{2a}{b}}|x_1|^2, & x \in E_1, \\ \frac{2b+a-ab}{b}|x_1|^b + \frac{ab-a}{b}|x_1|^{b-\frac{2b}{a}}|x''|^2, & x \in E_2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(10.2) \quad W(x) = (1 + x_n^2)W_{a,b}(x').$$

Let $\rho = \rho(\delta) > 0$ be small. In $\{|x_n| \leq \rho\}$, we will show that W is a convex function and

$$(10.3) \quad c(\delta) \leq \det D^2W \leq C(\delta), \quad D_n W^+(x', 0) = 0.$$

Moreover, for any constant $R > 0$, the symmetric solution W_R^+ to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \det D^2W^+ = c(\delta) & \text{in } B'_R(0) \times [-\rho, \rho], \\ W^+ = W & \text{on } \partial(B'_R(0) \times [-\rho, \rho]) \end{cases}$$

satisfies

$$(10.4) \quad W(x', 0) \leq W^+(x', t) \leq (1 + \rho^2)W(x', 0)$$

Proof. See Example 4.3 and Remark 4.4 in [9] for the details. □

At that moment, we can introduce the following example

Example 10.3. Consider the function u defined in $B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}^+(0)$ given by

$$u(y_1, y'', y_n) = W^+(y_n, y'', y_1).$$

Then u is a solution to problem

$$(10.5) \quad \det D^2 u = c \text{ in } B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}^+(0), \quad D_n u = 0 \text{ on } B'_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(0).$$

Moreover, $u \in C_{loc}^{1, \alpha-1}(B'_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(0))$.

Before verifying Example 10.3, we introduce some properties of the singular function $W_{a,b}(x')$ on the plane \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . Denote

$$v(x') = W_{a,b}(x'), \quad \check{v}(x') = (1 + \rho^2)W_{a,b}(x').$$

Given $t > 0$, consider the sections

$$F_t = S_t^v(0), \quad \check{F}_t = S_t^{\check{v}}(0)$$

and the diagonal transformation

$$\mathcal{D}_t = \text{diag}\{t^{1/b}, t^{1/a}\mathcal{I}''\}.$$

For simplicity, we only consider the case $t = 1$ in the following lemmas since v is a homogeneous function and these lemmas are invariant under the normalization

$$\tilde{v}(x) := \frac{v(\mathcal{D}_t x)}{t} = v(x).$$

Lemma 10.4. Given linear function $L(x')$, suppose that $L(x') \leq \check{v}$. Consider the section

$$S_L = \{x' \mid v \leq L(x')\}.$$

There exists universal constants c, C such that if $S_L \cap \partial F_t \neq \emptyset$, then

$$S_L \subset \check{F}_{Ct} \setminus F_{ct}.$$

Proof. Suppose that

$$p \in S_L \cap \partial F_1 \neq \emptyset.$$

Then $|p| \leq C$, the upper barrier relation $L(x') \leq \check{v}$ and $L(x') \geq 0$ implies that $\|DL\| = \|DL(p)\| \leq C$ (see Lemma 2.7). While the function v is super-linearity at infinite, thus

$$S_L \subset B'_C(0) \subset \check{F}_{C_1}$$

for some universal constant C_1 . This also implies the opposite relation when $c_1 C_1$ is small enough. Otherwise, if $S_L \cap F_{c_1} \neq \emptyset$, then $S_L \subset \check{F}_{c_1 C_1} \subset F_{\frac{1}{2}}$, which contradicts the assumption $S_L \cap \partial F_1 \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 10.5. *Given points p' , denote $t = v(p')$. There exists universal constants c, C such that if $s \in [0, c]$ then*

$$cs^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{D}_t B'_1(0) \subset S_{st}^{\check{v}}(p') - p' \subset Cs^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{D}_t B'_1(0)$$

and thus

$$(10.6) \quad \text{Vol}_{n-1} S_{st}^{\check{v}}(p') \geq cs^{\frac{n-1}{2}} t^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $t = 1$. The strict convexity of v implies that for some small universal constant c ,

$$S_c(p') \cap B'_c(0) = \emptyset,$$

and

$$S_c(0) \subset B'_C(0).$$

Thus,

$$c \leq D^2 v \leq C \text{ on } S_c(0)$$

and the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 10.6. *Suppose that function $L(x')$ is a linear function such that $L(x') \leq \check{v}$. There exists universal constants C such that if the section $S_L = \{x' \mid v \leq L(x')\}$ satisfies $S_L \cap \partial F_t \neq \emptyset$, then $\|t^{-1}\mathcal{D}_t \cdot DL\| \leq C$, and*

$$(10.7) \quad \check{v}(x') - L(x') \leq C(v(x' - q') + t), \quad \forall q' \in \check{F}_{Ct} \setminus F_{ct}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $t = 1$. Then $\|DL\| \leq C$ and $p' \in B'_C(0)$. Note that v is a homogeneous function which is super-linearity at infinite. Thus, for C_1 large enough,

$$C|x'| \leq C_1 v(x' - q') + C_1,$$

and

$$\check{v}(x') \leq C_1 v(x' - q') + C_1.$$

These two inequalities imply our lemma. \square

Now we are in the position to verify *Example 10.3*, which will be completed by three Steps.

Step 1. Denote $w(x) = W_R^+(x)$ and $E = B'_R(0) \times (-\rho, \rho)$, we claim that

$$w \in C^1(E) \cap C_{loc}^2(E \setminus \{te_n\}),$$

and

$$D_1 w(0, x'', x_n) = 0 \text{ and } D_n w(x_1, x'', 0) = 0.$$

Consider the set Γ formed by the intersection of the image of w and the lines l . Let x_0 be a endpoint of l . The classical interior strict convex lemma states that the endpoints of Γ is not inside E , therefore x_0 is on the boundary. Assume by way of

contradiction that $x'_0 \neq 0$, then w is C^2 at point x_0 for some $\epsilon < \frac{2}{n}$, the Pogorelov strict convex lemma implies that x_0 cannot be the extremal point Γ . Therefore, Γ is contained in the axis e_n . Thus, $w \in C^2(E \setminus \{|x'| = 0\})$. Note that (2.7) and (10.4) imply w is pointwise $C^{1,b-1}$ on axis e_n , the claim is completed.

Step 2. Given point $q = (q', q_n) \in E \cap B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(0)$. Suppose that $q' \neq 0$. Denote $t = v(q')$. Let $S_{h_q}^w(q) = \{x \in E \mid w(x) \leq w(q) + \nabla w(q) \cdot (x - q) + h_q\}$ be the maximum section(see (6.1)) at p , and $L(x) = w(x) \leq w(q) + \nabla w(q) \cdot (x - q) + h_q$. We aim to prove that $h_q \sim t$, where $t = v(q') \sim w(q)$.

We claim $h_q \leq Ct$ by proving that

$$(10.8) \quad \mathcal{P}S_{h_q}^w(q) \subset \check{F}_{Ct} \setminus F_{ct}.$$

For each $r \in [-\rho, \rho]$, consider the function

$$v_r(x') = w(x', r) \text{ and } L_r(x') = L(x', r),$$

and the sections

$$\begin{aligned} H_r &= \{x' \mid v_r(x') \leq L_r(x)\}, \\ G_r &= \{x' \mid v(x') \leq L_r(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (10.4)

$$H_r \subset G_r.$$

Since q is near axis e_n , the maximum section touches ∂E at point $p \in \{|x_n| = \rho\}$. For simplicity, we assume that $q_n \geq 0$. By symmetry

$$D_n w(q) \geq D_n w(q', 0) = 0.$$

Therefore, for any constants $r_2 \leq r_1 \leq \rho$,

$$L_{r_2}(x') \leq L_{r_1}(x') \leq \check{v}(x'),$$

and

$$G_{r_2} \subset G_{r_1}.$$

Thus, we can assume that $p_n = \rho$. Then

$$q' \subset G_{q_n} \subset G_{p_n}.$$

Recall Lemma 10.4, we obtain

$$G_r \subset \check{F}_{Ct} \setminus F_{ct}.$$

This is (10.8).

Next, we show that $h_q \geq ct$. Let $s \geq 0$. By (2.14),

$$\text{Vol } S_{h_q+st}^w(q) \leq C(h_q + st)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Recall (10.8),

$$u(p) \geq ct.$$

Note that L_ρ is the support function of \check{v} at point p . Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 10.5 mean

$$\text{Vol } S_{h_q+st}^w(q) \geq c\rho \text{Vol}_{n-1}\{S_{h_q+st}^w(q) \cap \{x_n = \rho\}\} \geq c\rho s^{\frac{n-1}{2}} t^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Thus,

$$C(h_q + st)^{\frac{n}{2}} \geq c\rho s^{\frac{n-1}{2}} t^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

i.e.

$$\frac{h_q}{t} \geq \sup_s \{c(\rho)s^{\frac{n-1}{n}} - s\} \geq c.$$

Step 3. We prove that w satisfies

$$(10.9) \quad w(x) - w(q) - \nabla w(x) \cdot (x - q) \leq C(|x_1|^b + |x''|^a + x_n^2)$$

for any $q \in B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(0)$.

The case that q is on axis e_n follows from (10.4). We then assume that $q' \neq 0$.

If $x \in S_{h_q}^w(q)$. Note that $S_{h_q}^w(q)$ is interior section, the first equation of problem (10.5) means that

$$\text{Vol } S_{h_q}^w(q) \sim h_q^{\frac{n}{2}} \sim t^{\frac{n}{2}},$$

and

$$\text{Vol}(\check{F}_{C^2t} \setminus F_{C^2t} \times [-\rho, \rho]) \leq Ct^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Note that $S_{h_q}^w(q)$ is quasi-symmetric about q . Therefore, according to Lemma 2.4,

$$S_{s_0t}^w(q) - q \sim \mathcal{D}_t B'_1(0) \times [-\rho, \rho].$$

for $s_0 = \frac{h_q}{t} \sim c$. Then the classical interior $C^{1,1}$ regularity results implies if $s \in [0, s_0]$, then

$$(10.10) \quad cs^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}_t B'_1(0) \times [-cs^{\frac{1}{2}}, cs^{\frac{1}{2}}] \subset S_{st}^w(q) - q \subset Cs^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}_t B'_1(0) \times [-Cs^{\frac{1}{2}}, Cs^{\frac{1}{2}}].$$

And (10.10) implies that (10.9).

If $x \notin S_{h_q}^w(q)$. Then

$$v(x' - q') \geq ct \text{ outside } S_{h_q}^w(q).$$

Recall (10.8), we have $\|D_n L\| \leq Ct$. By (10.7),

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) - w(q) - \nabla w(x) \cdot (x - q) &\leq \check{v}(x') - L_{q_n}(x') + Ct \\ &\leq C(v(x' - q') + t) \\ &\leq Cv(x' - q'). \end{aligned}$$

This is (10.9).

In particular, by virtue of Lemma 2.7 and (10.9), we see that w is $C^{1,1-a}$ on the plane $x_1 = 0$, thus we finish the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] Caffarelli L., A localization property of viscosity solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation and their strict convexity, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 131 (1990), 129-134.
- [2] Caffarelli L., Interior $W^{2,p}$ estimates for solutions of Monge-Ampère equation, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 131 (1990), 135-150.
- [3] Caffarelli L., Some regularity properties of solutions of Monge-Ampère equation, *Commun. pure Appl. Math.* 44 (1991), 965-969.
- [4] Caffarelli L., Boundary regularity of maps with convex potentials, II, *Ann. of Math.* (3) 144 (1996), 453-496.
- [5] Chen S.B., Liu J.K., and Wang X. J., Global regularity for the Monge-Ampère equation with natural boundary condition, to appear in *Ann. of Math.*
- [6] Grandall M. G., viscous solutions: Primer, in "Viscosity Solutions and Applications", 1-43, Lecture Notes in Math., 160, Fond. CIME/CIME Found. Subser., Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [7] Figalli A., The Monge-Ampère equation and its Applications, European Math Soc Publ House, CH-8092 Zurich, Switzerland, 2017.
- [8] Gutiérrez C.E., The Monge-Ampère equation, Birkhauser, Boston, Second Edition, 2016.
- [9] Jian H.Y., Tu X.S., A Liouville theorem for the Neumann problem of Monge-Ampère equations, arXiv:2107.03599, 1-49.
- [10] Jiang F.D., Trudinger N.S., Xiang N., On the Neumann problem for Monge-Ampère type equations, *Canad. J. Math.* 68 (2016), 1334-1361.
- [11] Jian H.Y., Wang X.-J., Continuity estimates for the Monge-Ampère equation, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 39 (2007), 608-626.
- [12] Lions P.L., Trudinger N.S., Urbas J., The Neumann problem for equations of Monge-Ampère type, *Commun. pure Appl. Math.* (4) 39 (1986), 539-563.
- [13] Li D. S., Zhang K., Regularity for fully nonlinear elliptic equations with oblique boundary conditions, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 228 (2018), 923-967.
- [14] Ma X., Qiu G., The Neumann problem for Hessian equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 366 (2019), 1-28.
- [15] Philippis G D, Figalli A, Savin O. A note on interior $W^{2,1+\varepsilon}$ estimates for the Monge-Ampère equation. *Mathematische Annalen*, (1) 357 (2012), 11-22.
- [16] Urbas J., Nonlinear oblique boundary value problems for Hessian equations in two dimensions, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 12 (1995), 507-575.
- [17] Urbas J., The oblique derivative problem for equations of Monge-Ampère type in two dimensions, *Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University* 12 (1987), 171-195.
- [18] Savin O., pointwise $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates at the boundary for the Monge-Ampère equation, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* (1) 26 (2013), 63-99.
- [19] Trudinger, N.S., Wang, X.-J., Boundary regularity for the Monge-Ampère and affine maximal surface equations, *Ann. Math.* (2) 167 (2008), 993-1028.

- [20] Trudinger N.S., Wang X.-J., The Monge-Ampère equation and its geometric Applications, Handbook of geometric analysis. No. 1, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), vol. 7, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2008, 467-524.
- [21] Wang X.-J., Oblique derivative problems for the equations of Monge-Ampère type, *Chin. J. Contemp. Math.* 13 (1991), 13-22.

HUAIYU JIAN: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100084, CHINA.

XUSHAN TU: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100084, CHINA.

Email address: `hjia@tsinghua.edu.cn`; `txs17@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn`