

# THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM FOR MIXED HESSIAN EQUATIONS ON HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS

QIANG TU AND NI XIANG\*

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper we study the Dirichlet problem for a class of Hessian type equation with its structure as a combination of elementary symmetric functions on Hermitian manifolds. Under some conditions with the initial data on manifolds and admissible subsolutions, we derive a priori estimates for this complex mixed Hessian equation and solvability of the corresponding Dirichlet problem.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a closed Hermitian manifold of complex dimension  $n \geq 2$  with smooth boundary  $\partial M$  and  $\bar{M} = M \cup \partial M$ , fix a real smooth closed  $(1, 1)$ -form  $\chi_0$  on  $M$ . For any  $C^2$  function  $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we can obtain a new real  $(1, 1)$ -form

$$\chi_u = \chi_0 + \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} u.$$

We consider the following Dirichlet problem of Hessian type equation on  $(M, \omega)$

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \chi_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \alpha_l(z) \chi_u^l \wedge \omega^{n-l}, & \text{in } M, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where  $1 < k \leq n$ ,  $\alpha_l(z)$  and  $\varphi$  are real smooth functions on  $M$  and  $\partial M$ , respectively. Note that this is a class of fully nonlinear equation with its structure as a combination of elementary symmetric functions on Hermitian manifolds. In order to keep the ellipticity of equation (1.1), we require the eigenvalues of  $(1, 1)$ -form  $\chi_u$  with respect to  $\omega$  belong to the Gårding's cone  $\Gamma_{k-1}$ . Hence we introduce the following definition.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32W50, 53C55.

*Key words and phrases.* Complex Hessian equations; Dirichlet problem; Hermitian manifold.

This research was supported by funds from Natural Science Foundation of Hubei Province, China, No. 2020CFB246 and the National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 11971157, 12101206.

\* Corresponding author.

**Definition 1.1.** A function  $u \in C^2(M)$  is called  $k$ -admissible if  $\chi_u \in \Gamma_k(M)$  for any  $z \in M$ , where  $\Gamma_k(M)$  is the Gårding cone

$$\Gamma_k(M) = \{\chi \in \mathcal{A}^{1,1}(M) : \sigma_i(\lambda[\chi]) > 0, \forall 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

The equation in (1.1)

$$(1.2) \quad \chi_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \alpha_l(z) \chi_u^l \wedge \omega^{n-l}$$

includes some of the most partial differential equations in complex geometry and analysis. When  $k = n$  and  $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_{n-1} = 0$ , the equation becomes the complex Monge-Ampère equation  $\chi_u^n = \alpha_0 \omega^n$ , which was solved by Yau [41] on closed Kähler manifolds in the resolution of the Calabi conjecture. Then Tosatti-Weinkove [40, 39] have solved the analogous problem for the equation on closed Hermitian manifolds. The corresponding Dirichlet problems on manifolds were studied by Cherrier-Hanani [9] and Guan-Li [16, 17, 18].

In fact, the Hessian equation  $\chi_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \alpha_0 \omega^n$  and the Hessian quotient equation  $\chi_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \alpha_l(z) \chi_u^l \wedge \omega^{n-l}$  are also the special case of (1.2). For equation  $\chi_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \alpha_0 \omega^n$ , Hou-Ma-Wu [22] established the second order estimates for the equation without boundary on Kähler manifold, and then Dinew-Kolodziej [12] solved the equation by combining the Liouville theorem and Hou-Ma-Wu's results. Zhang [42] and Székelyhidi [30] have solved the equation without boundary on Hermitian manifolds. The corresponding Dirichlet problem on manifolds has also attracted the interest of many researchers, such as Gu-Nguyen [15] were able to obtain continuous solutions to the equation with boundary on Hermitian manifolds, and Collins-Picard [11] solved the problem under the existence of a subsolution. For  $(k, l)$ -Hessian quotient equation  $\chi_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \alpha_l(z) \chi_u^l \wedge \omega^{n-l}$ , the  $(n, n-1)$ -Hessian quotient equation have appeared in a problem proposed by Donaldson in the setting of moment maps and was solved by Song-Weinkove [32]. Then  $(n, l)$ -Hessian quotient equation was considered by Fang-Lai-Ma [13] on Kähler manifold, and by Guan-Li [17], Guan-Sun [20] on Hermitian manifolds. The general  $(k, l)$ -Hessian quotient equation with  $k < n$  without boundary on Hermitian manifolds was studied by Székelyhidi [30] for constants  $\alpha_l$  and by Sun [34] for functions  $\alpha_l$ . The corresponding Dirichlet problem on Hermitian manifolds was studied by Feng-Ge-Zheng [14], since they can only obtain the gradient estimates in some special cases, the existence of solution can be solved in these kinds of special cases.

When  $k = n$  and  $\alpha_l \in \mathbb{R}$ , equation (1.2) was raised as a conjecture by Chen [8] in the study of Mabuchi energy. The conjecture was solved by Collins-Székelyhidi [10] for some special constant  $\alpha_l$ . Later, Phong-Tô [29] generalized Collins-Székelyhidi's result for nonnegative constants  $\alpha_l$ . Moreover, a generalized equation of Chen's problem was studied by Sun [35, 36] and Pingali [26, 27, 28].

The initial motivation of our work is the following: As an important example for the applications of the general notion of fully nonlinear elliptic equations, Krylov [24] studied the Dirichlet problem of the equation

$$(1.3) \quad \sigma_k(D^2u) = \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \alpha_l(x) \sigma_l(D^2u)$$

in a  $(k-1)$ -convex domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\alpha_l > 0$  ( $0 \leq l \leq k-1$ ). Recently, Guan-Zhang [21] observed that equation (1.3) can be rewritten as the following equation

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_{k-1}}(D^2u) - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \alpha_l(x) \frac{\sigma_l}{\sigma_{k-1}}(D^2u) = -\alpha_{k-1}.$$

Actually, the equation is elliptic and concave in  $\Gamma_{k-1}$ . Then they obtained a priori  $C^2$  estimate of the  $(k-1)$ -admissible solution of equation (1.4) without sign requirement for  $\alpha_{k-1}$  and solved the Dirichlet problem for the corresponding equation. Later the corresponding Neumann problem and prescribed curvature equations were also discussed in [4, 5, 45, 7]. Recently, Zhang [43] considered the Dirichlet problem for (1.3) on complex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , which can be seen as the extension of Guan-Zhang's result. Chen [6] and Zhou [44] provide a sufficient and necessary condition for the solvability of the mixed hessian equation on Kähler manifold without boundary. A natural problem is raised whether we can consider the Dirichlet problem for equation (1.3) on complex manifolds. The following is our main result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a closed Hermitian manifold of complex dimension  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\chi_0 \in \Gamma_{k-1}(M)$  be a  $(1, 1)$ -form,  $\alpha_{k-1}(z), \varphi(z), \alpha_l$  be smooth functions and  $\alpha_l(z) > 0$  for  $l = 0, 1, \dots, k-2$ . Suppose there exists an  $(k-1)$ -admissible subsolution  $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar{M})$  such that*

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} \chi_{\underline{u}}^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \geq \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \alpha_l(z) \chi_{\underline{u}}^l \wedge \omega^{n-l}, & \text{in } M, \\ \underline{u} = \varphi & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

*Then there exists a unique  $(k-1)$ -admissible solution  $u \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$  of Dirichlet problem (1.1). Moreover, we have*

$$\|u\|_{C^2(\bar{M})} \leq C,$$

*where the constant  $C$  depends on  $M, \omega, \chi_0, \varphi, \|\underline{u}\|_{C^2}, \inf_{\bar{M}} \alpha_l$  with  $0 \leq l \leq k-2$  and  $\|\alpha_l\|_{C^2}$  with  $0 \leq l \leq k-1$ .*

Note that, equation (1.1) can be seen a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations and there is no sign requirement of the coefficient function  $\alpha_{k-1}$ . Using some notations on Hermitian manifolds, equation (1.1) can be rewritten as a combination of elementary symmetric functions on Hermitian manifolds, which is similar to equation (1.4). Therefore, we will construct barrier functions to obtain a prior estimates for equation (1.1) and solve the

Dirichlet problem. However, compared with the classical method, we apply a blow-up argument and Liouville-type theorem due to Dinew-Kolodziej [12] to obtain the gradient estimate. For this purpose, we follow a technique of Hou-Ma-Wu [22] (also see [11]) to derive a second derivative bound of the form

$$\sup_{\bar{M}} |\partial \bar{\partial} u| \leq C(1 + \sup_M |\nabla u|^2).$$

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we start with some preliminaries. In Section 3 we prove  $C^0$  estimates and second order derivative interior estimates. Boundary second order derivative estimates are given in Section 4 and 5. In Section 6, we use a blow-up argument and Liouville-type theorem to obtain gradient estimates and Theorem 1.1 is proved by the standard continuity method.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we give some basic properties of elementary symmetric functions, which could be found in [25, 33], and establish some key lemmas. Throughout this paper, repeated indices will be summed unless otherwise stated.

**2.1. Basic properties of elementary symmetric functions.** For  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the  $k$ -th elementary symmetric function is defined by

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} \lambda_{i_1} \lambda_{i_2} \cdots \lambda_{i_k}.$$

We also set  $\sigma_0 = 1$  and denote by  $\sigma_k(\lambda|i)$  the  $k$ -th symmetric function with  $\lambda_i = 0$ . The generalized Newton-MacLaurin inequality and some well-known result (See [1]) are as follows, which will be used later.

**Proposition 2.1.** *For  $\lambda \in \Gamma_k := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sigma_i(\lambda) > 0, \forall 1 \leq i \leq k\}$  and  $n \geq k > l \geq 0, r > s \geq 0, k \geq r, l \geq s$ , we have*

$$(2.1) \quad \left[ \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda)/C_n^k}{\sigma_l(\lambda)/C_n^l} \right]^{\frac{1}{k-l}} \leq \left[ \frac{\sigma_r(\lambda)/C_n^r}{\sigma_s(\lambda)/C_n^s} \right]^{\frac{1}{r-s}}.$$

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $A = (a_{ij})$  be a Hermitian matrix,  $\lambda(A) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  be the eigenvalues of  $A$  and  $F = F(A) = f(\lambda(A))$  be a symmetric function of  $\lambda(A)$ . Then for any Hermitian matrix  $B = (b_{ij})$ , we have*

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial a_{ij} \partial a_{st}} b_{ij} b_{st} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda_p \partial \lambda_q} b_{pp} b_{qq} + 2 \sum_{p < q} \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_p} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_q}}{\lambda_p - \lambda_q} b_{pq}^2.$$

*In addition, if  $f$  is concave and  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ , then we have*

$$(2.3) \quad f_1 \geq f_2 \geq \dots \geq f_n,$$

*where  $f_i = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}$ .*

**Proposition 2.3.** Let  $W = W_{ij}$  be an  $n \times n$  symmetric matrix and  $\lambda(W) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$  be the eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix  $W$ . Suppose that  $W = W_{ij}$  is diagonal and  $\lambda_i = W_{ii}$ , then we have

$$(2.1.5) \quad \frac{\partial \lambda_i}{\partial W_{ii}} = 1, \quad \frac{\partial \lambda_k}{\partial W_{ij}} = 0 \quad \text{otherwise},$$

$$(2.1.6) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \lambda_i}{\partial W_{ij} \partial W_{ji}} = \frac{1}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j} \quad \text{for } i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i \neq \lambda_j.$$

$$(2.1.7) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \lambda_i}{\partial W_{kl} \partial W_{pq}} = 0 \quad \text{otherwise}.$$

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $\lambda(z) \in C^0(M, \mathbf{R}^n) \cap \Gamma_{k-1}$  satisfy

$$(2.4) \quad f(\lambda(z), z) := \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda(z))}{\sigma_{k-1}(\lambda(z))} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_l(\lambda(z))}{\sigma_{k-1}(\lambda(z))} = \beta(z),$$

where  $\beta_l, \beta$  are smooth function with  $\beta_l \geq 0$ , then

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) \mu_i \geq f(\mu) + (k-1) \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l \frac{\sigma_l(\lambda)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\lambda)}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is concave in  $\Gamma_{k-1}$ , we have

$$f(\mu) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) (\mu_i - \lambda_i) + f(\lambda),$$

which implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\lambda) \mu_i \geq f(\mu) + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (k-l) \beta_l \frac{\sigma_l(\lambda)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\lambda)}.$$

So, the proof is completed.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $\lambda(z) \in C^0(M, \mathbf{R}^n) \cap \Gamma_{k-1}$  satisfy (2.4) and  $\beta_l, \beta$  be smooth function with  $\beta_l \geq 0$ . Assume  $\mu \in C^0(M, \mathbf{R}^n) \cap \Gamma_{k-1}$  satisfy

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{\sigma_{k-1}(\mu|i)}{\sigma_{k-2}(\mu|i)} - \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_{l-1}(\mu|i)}{\sigma_{k-2}(\mu|i)} > \beta(z) \quad \forall z \in M.$$

Then there exist constants  $N, \theta > 0$  depending on  $\|\mu\|_{C^0(M)}$ ,  $\|\beta\|_{C^0(M)}$  and  $\|\beta_l\|_{C^0(M)}$  such that if

$$\lambda_{\max}(z) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\lambda_i(z)\} \geq N$$

we have at  $z$

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_i f_i(\lambda) (\mu_i - \lambda_i) \geq \theta + \theta \sum_i f_i(\lambda)$$

or

$$(2.8) \quad f_{\max} \lambda_{\max} \geq \theta,$$

where  $f_{\max} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_{\max}}$ .

*Proof.* The proof can be seen in [6, Lemma 2.7].  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{A}^{1,1}(M)$  be the space of real smooth  $(1,1)$ -forms on the Hermitian manifold  $(M, \omega)$ . For any  $\chi \in \mathcal{A}^{1,1}(M)$ , we write in a local coordinate chart  $(z^1, \dots, z^n)$

$$\omega = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} g_{i\bar{j}} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^j$$

and

$$\chi = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \chi_{i\bar{j}} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^j.$$

In particular, in a local normal coordinate system  $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{i\bar{j}}$ , the matrix  $(\chi_{i\bar{j}})$  is a Hermitian matrix. We denote  $\lambda(\chi_{i\bar{j}})$  by the eigenvalues of the matrix  $(\chi_{i\bar{j}})$ . We define  $\sigma_k(\chi)$  with respect to  $\omega$  as

$$\sigma_k(\chi) = \sigma_k(\lambda(\chi_{i\bar{j}})),$$

and the Gårding's cone on  $M$  is defined by

$$\Gamma_k(M) = \{\chi \in \mathcal{A}^{1,1}(M) : \sigma_i(\chi) > 0, \forall 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

In fact, the definition of  $\sigma_k(\chi)$  is independent of the choice of local normal coordinate system, and it can be defined without the use of local normal coordinate by

$$\sigma_k(\chi) = C_n^k \frac{\chi^k \wedge \omega^{n-k}}{\omega^n},$$

where  $C_n^k = \frac{n!}{(n-k)!k!}$ .

Using the above notation, we can rewrite equation (1.1) as the following local form:

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma_k(\chi_u)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi_u)} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_l(\chi_u)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi_u)} = \beta(z), & \text{in } M, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where  $\beta_l(z) = \frac{C_n^k}{C_n^l} \alpha_l(z)$  for  $0 \leq l \leq k-2$  and  $\beta(z) = \frac{C_n^k}{C_n^{k-1}} \alpha_{k-1}(z)$ .

According to an important observation by Guan-Zhang in [21], we know that

**Proposition 2.4.** *If  $u \in C^2(M)$  with  $\chi_u \in \Gamma_{k-1}(M)$  and  $\beta_l(z) \geq 0$  for  $0 \leq l \leq k-2$ , then the operator*

$$(2.10) \quad G(\chi_u) = \frac{\sigma_k(\chi_u)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi_u)} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_l(\chi_u)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi_u)}$$

*is elliptic and concave.*

For the convenience of notations, we will denote

$$G(\chi) := \frac{\sigma_k(\chi)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi)} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_l(\chi)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi)},$$

$$G_k(\chi) := \frac{\sigma_k(\chi)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi)}, \quad G_l(\chi) := -\frac{\sigma_l(\chi)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi)},$$

and

$$G^{i\bar{j}} := \frac{\partial G}{\partial \chi_{i\bar{j}}}, G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} := \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \chi_{i\bar{j}} \partial \chi_{r\bar{s}}}, G_l^{i\bar{j}} := \frac{\partial G_l}{\partial \chi_{i\bar{j}}}, G_l^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} := \frac{\partial^2 G_l}{\partial \chi_{i\bar{j}} \partial \chi_{r\bar{s}}}$$

for any  $1 \leq i, j, r, s \leq n$  and  $0 \leq l \leq k-2$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $u \in C^2(M)$  with  $\chi_u \in \Gamma_{k-1}(M)$  satisfy*

$$G(\chi_u) = \beta, \quad \text{in } M,$$

*where  $\beta_l > 0$  for  $0 \leq l \leq k-2$ . Then*

$$(2.11) \quad 0 < \frac{\sigma_l}{\sigma_{k-1}}(\lambda(\chi_u)) \leq C(n, k, \inf_M \beta_l, \sup_M |\beta|), \quad 0 \leq l \leq k-2;$$

$$(2.12) \quad -\sup_M |\beta| < \frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_{k-1}}(\lambda(\chi_u)) \leq C(n, k, \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \sup_M |\beta_l|);$$

$$(2.13) \quad \frac{n-k+1}{k} \leq \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \leq n-k-1 + \frac{(n-k+2)\sigma_{k-2}}{\sigma_{k-1}}(\lambda(\chi_u)) \beta;$$

$$(2.14) \quad \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \lambda_i(\chi_u) = \beta + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (k-l) \beta_l \frac{\sigma_l}{\sigma_{k-1}}(\lambda(\chi_u)).$$

*Proof.* The proofs of Lemma are quite similar to that given for [6, Lemma 2.8, 2.9] and so they are omitted.  $\square$

### 3. $C^0$ ESTIMATES AND SECOND ORDER INTERIOR ESTIMATES

#### 3.1. $C^0$ estimates.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $u \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$  be an  $(k-1)$ -admissible solution for equation (1.1). Under the assumptions mentioned in Theorem 1.1, then there exists a positive constant  $C$  depending only on  $(M, \omega), \chi_0, \alpha_l, \varphi$  and the subsolution  $\underline{u}$  such that*

$$\sup_{\bar{M}} |u| \leq C.$$

*Proof.* On the one hand, we know that the subsolution  $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar{M})$  satisfies  $G(\chi_{\underline{u}}) - G(\chi_u) \geq 0$  in  $M$  and  $\underline{u} - u = 0$  on  $\partial M$ . By the ellipticity of  $G$  and the maximum principle,

$$\underline{u}(z) \leq u(z), \quad \forall z \in \bar{M}.$$

On the other hand, let  $v$  be a function satisfying

$$\omega^{i\bar{k}}((\chi_0)_{\bar{k}i} + \partial_i \partial_{\bar{k}} v) = 0 \quad \text{in } M; \quad v = \varphi \quad \text{on } \partial M.$$

Note that  $\chi_u \in \Gamma_k(M) \subset \Gamma_1(M)$ . By the comparison principle,

$$u(z) \leq v(z), \quad \forall z \in \bar{M}.$$

□

According to the proof of Theorem 3.1, we know that  $u - v$  and  $\underline{u} - u$  attain their maximums on the boundary. Combining with the Hopf lemma, we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad \sup_{z \in \partial M} |\nabla u| \leq C,$$

where  $C$  depends on  $(M, \omega)$ ,  $\chi_0$ ,  $\alpha_l$  and  $\underline{u}$ .

**3.2. Notations and some lemmas.** In local complex coordinates  $(z^1, \dots, z^n)$ , the subscripts of a function  $u$  always denote the covariant derivatives of  $u$  with respect to  $\omega$  in the directions of the local frame  $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n}$ . Namely,

$$u_i = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}} u, \quad u_{i\bar{j}} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^j}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}} u, \quad u_{i\bar{j}k} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^j}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}} u.$$

But, the covariant derivatives of a  $(1,1)$ -form  $\chi$  with respect to  $\omega$  will be denoted by indices with semicolons, e.g.,

$$\chi_{i\bar{j};k} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}} \chi\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^j}\right), \quad \chi_{i\bar{j};k\bar{l}} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^l}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}} \chi\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^j}\right).$$

We recall the following commutation formula on Hermitian manifolds  $(M, \omega)$  [22, 16, 17].

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $u \in C^4(M)$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i\bar{j}k} - u_{k\bar{j}i} &= T_{ik}^l u_{l\bar{j}}, \\ u_{i\bar{j}k} - u_{i\bar{k}j} &= \overline{T_{jk}^l} u_{i\bar{l}}, \\ u_{i\bar{j}k} &= u_{ik\bar{j}} - R_{k\bar{j}i\bar{m}} g^{\bar{m}l} u_l, \end{aligned}$$

$$u_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}} - u_{k\bar{l}i\bar{j}} = g^{p\bar{q}}(R_{k\bar{l}i\bar{q}} u_{p\bar{j}} - R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{q}} u_{p\bar{l}}) + T_{ik}^p u_{p\bar{j}\bar{l}} + \overline{T_{jl}^q} u_{i\bar{q}k} - T_{ik}^p \overline{T_{jl}^q} u_{p\bar{q}},$$

where  $R$  is the curvature tensor of  $(M, \omega)$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $u \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$  be an  $(k-1)$ -admissible solution for equation (1.1). Under the assumptions mentioned in Theorem 1.1, then there exists a positive constant  $C$  depending only on  $(M, \omega)$ ,  $\chi_0$ ,  $\alpha_l$ ,  $\varphi$  and the subsolution  $\underline{u}$  such that*

$$\sup_M |\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u| \leq C \left( K + \sup_{\partial M} |\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u| \right),$$

where  $K := 1 + \sup_M |\nabla u|^2$ , and  $C$  depending on  $(M, \omega)$ ,  $\chi_0$ ,  $\alpha_l$ ,  $\varphi$  and the subsolution  $\underline{u}$ .

**3.3. The proof of Theorem 3.2.** In order to study the second order interior estimate of (2.9) (or (1.1)), it is sufficient to consider the following equation

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma_k(\tilde{\chi}_u)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\tilde{\chi}_u)} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_l(\tilde{\chi}_u)}{\sigma_{k-1}(\tilde{\chi}_u)} = \beta(z), & \text{in } \bar{M}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{\chi}_u := \tilde{\chi}_0 + u$  and  $\tilde{\chi}_0 = \chi_0 + \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} u$ . It is clear that 0 is an admissible subsolution to (3.2). Without causing confusion, we denote  $\tilde{\chi}_u$  by  $\chi$  and  $\tilde{\chi}_0$  by  $\chi_0$ .

Following the work of Hou-Ma-Wu [22], we define a function  $W$  on  $M$  as

$$W(z) = \log \lambda_1(z) + \varphi(|\nabla u|^2) + \psi(u),$$

where  $\lambda_1 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix  $A = \omega^{i\bar{l}} \chi_{i\bar{l}}$  at each point with  $\omega$ . Since  $\lambda_1$  is not a smooth function, we will perturb  $A$  slightly as in [31, 30]. There are also other methods to deal with this issue: one is to use a viscosity type argument as in [37], another is to replace  $\lambda_1$  by a carefully chosen quadratic function of  $\chi_{i\bar{j}}$  as in [38].

The function  $W$  must achieve its maximum at the interior point  $z_0 \in M$ . Around  $z_0$ , we choose a normal chart such that  $A$  is diagonal with eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n.$$

We perturb  $A$  by a diagonal matrix  $B$  with  $B_{11} = 0$ , small  $0 < B_{22} < \dots < B_{nn}$  and  $B_{nn} < 2B_{22}$ . Thus, the new matrix  $\tilde{A} = A - B$  has eigenvalues at  $z_0$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_i = \lambda_1 - B_{ii} \quad \text{for } i > 1.$$

Then, we can calculate the first and second derivatives of  $\tilde{\lambda}_1$  at  $z_0$  from Proposition 2.3

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{1;i} &= \tilde{\lambda}_1^{pq} (\tilde{A}_{pq})_i = \chi_{1\bar{1};i} - (B_{11})_i, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_{1;i\bar{i}} &= \tilde{\lambda}_1^{pq,rs} (\tilde{A}_{pq})_i (\tilde{A}_{rs})_{\bar{i}} + \tilde{\lambda}_1^{pq} (\tilde{A}_{pq})_{i\bar{i}} \\ &= \chi_{1\bar{1};i\bar{i}} + \sum_{p>1} \frac{|\chi_{p\bar{1};i}|^2 + |\chi_{1\bar{p};i}|^2}{\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p} \\ &\quad + (B_{11})_{i\bar{i}} - 2\operatorname{Re} \sum_{p>1} \frac{\chi_{p\bar{1};i} (B_{1\bar{p}})_{\bar{i}} + \chi_{1\bar{p};i} (B_{p\bar{1}})_{\bar{i}}}{\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p} \\ &\quad + \tilde{\lambda}_1^{pq,rs} (B_{pq})_i (B_{rs})_{\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sum_i \lambda_i > 0$ , we can choose  $B$  sufficient small such that  $\sum_i \tilde{\lambda}_i > 0$ . Thus,  $|\tilde{\lambda}_i| < (n-1)\lambda_1$ , which gives

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_i} > \frac{1}{n\lambda_1}.$$

We can absorb the term  $\chi_{p\bar{1};i}(B_{1\bar{p}})_{\bar{i}}$  using

$$|\chi_{p\bar{1};i}(B_{1\bar{p}})_{\bar{i}}| \leq \frac{1}{4}|\chi_{p\bar{1};i}|^2 + C.$$

Moreover, for  $p > 1$  there is

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p} < \frac{1}{B_{22}}.$$

It follows that

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{1;\bar{i}\bar{i}} \geq \chi_{1\bar{1};\bar{i}\bar{i}} + \frac{1}{2n\lambda_1} \sum_{p>1} (|\chi_{p\bar{1};i}|^2 + |\chi_{1\bar{p};i}|^2) - C,$$

where  $C$  depends on  $|B|_{C^2(M)}$ .

From Lemma 3.1, we have

$$u_{1\bar{1}\bar{i}\bar{i}} = u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}1\bar{1}} - 2\text{Re}(u_{i\bar{p}1}\overline{T_{i1}^p}) + \partial\bar{\partial}u * R + \partial\bar{\partial}u * T * T.$$

where  $*$  denotes a contraction. Then, we get

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{1;\bar{i}\bar{i}} &\geq u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}1\bar{1}} + \frac{1}{3n\lambda_1} \sum_{p>1} (|u_{p\bar{1}i}|^2 + |u_{1\bar{p}i}|^2) \\ &\quad - 2\text{Re}(u_{i\bar{p}1}\overline{T_{i1}^p}) - C\lambda_1 - C. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $u_{i\bar{p}1} = u_{1\bar{p}i} + T_{ip}^q u_{q\bar{p}}$  and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{p>1} |\text{Re}(u_{i\bar{p}1}\overline{T_{i1}^p})| &\leq 2 \sum_{p>1} |\text{Re}(u_{1\bar{p}i}\overline{T_{i1}^p})| + C\lambda_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3n\lambda_1} \sum_{p>1} (|u_{p\bar{1}i}|^2 + |u_{1\bar{p}i}|^2) + C\lambda_1. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.5) into (3.4), we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{1;\bar{i}\bar{i}} &\geq u_{\bar{i}\bar{i}1\bar{1}} - 2\text{Re}(u_{i\bar{1}1}\overline{T_{i1}^1}) - C\lambda_1 \\ &\geq \chi_{\bar{i}\bar{i}1\bar{1}} - 2\text{Re}(\chi_{1\bar{1};i}\overline{T_{i1}^1}) - C\lambda_1, \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $u_{i\bar{1}1} = u_{1\bar{1}i} + T_{i1}^p u_{p\bar{1}}$  and choose  $\lambda_1$  large enough ( $\lambda_1 \gg 1$ ) to absorb a constant into  $C\lambda_1$ .

Differentiating the equation (3.2) twice, we have

$$(3.7) \quad \nabla_p \beta = G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_p \beta_l) G_l,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta &= G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{p}} + G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p\bar{p}} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \left( (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \beta_l) G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} + (\nabla_p \beta_l) G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};\bar{p}} \right) \\
(3.8) \quad &+ \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta_l) G_l.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the operator  $\left( \frac{\sigma_{k-1}}{\sigma_l} \right)^{\frac{1}{k-l-1}}$  and the operator  $\frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_{k-1}}$  is concave in  $\Gamma_{k-1}$ , we have

$$(3.9) \quad G_l^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{p}} \leq \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k-l-1} \right) G_l^{-1} G_l^{i\bar{j}} G_l^{r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{p}}$$

and

$$(3.10) \quad G_k^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{p}} \leq 0.$$

Combining with (3.7), (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta - (1 - \delta^2) G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{p}} \\
\leq &\sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \delta^2 \beta_l G_l^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{p}} + G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p\bar{p}} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \left( (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \beta_l) G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} + (\nabla_p \beta_l) G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};\bar{p}} \right) \\
&+ \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta_l) G_l \\
\leq &\delta^2 \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k-l-1} \right) G_l^{-1} |G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p}|^2 + G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p\bar{p}} \\
&+ \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \left( (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \beta_l) G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} + (\nabla_p \beta_l) G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};\bar{p}} \right) + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta_l) G_l \\
= &\frac{\delta^2 (k-l)}{k-1-l} \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l G_l^{-1} \left| G_l^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{k-l-1}} \frac{\nabla_p \beta_l}{\delta^2 \beta_l} G_l \right|^2 \\
&- \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \frac{k-l-1}{k-l} \frac{|\nabla_p \beta_l|^2}{\delta^2 \beta_l} G_l + G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p\bar{p}} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta_l) G_l.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p\bar{p}} &\geq \nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta - (1 - \delta^2) G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};p} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{p}} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{\bar{p}} \nabla_p \beta_l) G_l \\
(3.11) \quad &+ \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \frac{k-l-1}{k-l} \frac{|\nabla_p \beta_l|^2}{\delta^2 \beta_l} G_l,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
G^{i\bar{i}}(\log \tilde{\lambda}_1)_{i\bar{i}} &= G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1;i\bar{i}}}{\lambda_1} - G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{|\tilde{\lambda}_{1;i}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} G^{i\bar{i}} \chi_{i\bar{i};1\bar{1}} - \frac{2}{\lambda_1} G^{i\bar{i}} \operatorname{Re}(\chi_{1\bar{1};i} \overline{T_{i1}^1}) - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{1\bar{1};i} - B_{1\bar{1};i}|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \nabla_{\bar{1}} \nabla_1 \beta - \frac{1 - \delta^2}{\lambda_1} G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};1} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{1}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{\bar{1}} \nabla_1 \beta_l) G_l \\
(3.12) \quad &+ \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \frac{k-l-1}{k-l} \frac{|\nabla_1 \beta_l|^2}{\delta^2 \beta_l} G_l - (1 + \delta^4) G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{|\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \\
&\geq -\frac{1 - \delta^2}{\lambda_1} G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};1} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{1}} - (1 + \delta^4) G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{|\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\lambda_1^2} - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} - C.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we begin to prove Theorem 3.2. We redefine the auxiliary function

$$W(z) = \log \tilde{\lambda}_1 + \varphi(|\nabla u|^2) + \psi(u),$$

where

$$\varphi(s) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \left( 1 - \frac{s}{2K} \right) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq K-1$$

and

$$\psi(t) = -A \log \left( 1 + \frac{t}{2L} \right) \quad \text{for } -L+1 \leq t \leq 0.$$

Here, we set

$$K =: \sup_M |\nabla u|^2 + 1, \quad L =: \sup_M |u| + 1, \quad A =: 2L\Lambda,$$

and  $\Lambda$  is a large constant that which will be chosen later. Clearly,  $\varphi$  satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2K} \geq \varphi' \geq \frac{1}{4K}, \quad \varphi'' = 2(\varphi')^2 > 0,$$

and  $\psi$  satisfies

$$2\Lambda \geq -\psi' \geq \Lambda, \quad \psi'' \geq \frac{2\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} (\psi')^2 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2A+1}.$$

The function  $W$  must achieve its maximum at the interior point  $z \in M$ .

Thus, we arrive at  $z$

$$(3.13) \quad W_i = \frac{\chi_{1\bar{1};i}}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}} + \varphi' \nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2) + \psi' u_i = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.14) \quad W_{i\bar{i}} &= (\log \tilde{\lambda}_1)_{i\bar{i}} + \varphi'' |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + \varphi' \nabla_{\bar{i}} \nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2) \\
&+ \psi'' |u_i|^2 + \psi' u_{i\bar{i}} \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (3.14) by  $G^{i\bar{i}}$  and summing it over index  $i$ , we can know from (3.12)

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \geq & -\frac{1-\delta^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}} G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};1} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{1}} - (1+\delta^4) G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{|\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} - C \\ & + \varphi'' G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i(|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + \varphi' G^{i\bar{i}} \nabla_{\bar{i}} \nabla_i(|\nabla u|^2) + \psi'' G^{i\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 + \psi' G^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we need the following calculation

$$\nabla_i(|\nabla u|^2) = \sum_p (u_p u_{\bar{p}i} + u_{\bar{p}} u_{pi})$$

and

$$\nabla_{\bar{i}} \nabla_i(|\nabla u|^2) = \sum_p (u_{pi} \bar{u}_{\bar{p}i} + u_{\bar{p}i} u_{pi} + u_p u_{\bar{p}i\bar{i}} + u_{\bar{p}} u_{pi\bar{i}}).$$

Note that

$$u_{\bar{p}i\bar{i}} = u_{i\bar{p}i} = u_{i\bar{i}\bar{p}} + \overline{T_{pi}^q} u_{i\bar{q}} = \chi_{i\bar{i};\bar{p}} - (\chi_0)_{i\bar{i};\bar{p}} + \overline{T_{pi}^i} \chi_{i\bar{i}} - \overline{T_{pi}^q} (\chi_0)_{i\bar{q}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} u_{p\bar{i}\bar{i}} &= u_{p\bar{i}i} + R_{i\bar{i}p\bar{q}} g^{\bar{q}m} u_m \\ &= u_{i\bar{i}p} + R_{i\bar{i}p\bar{q}} g^{\bar{q}m} u_m + T_{pi}^q u_{q\bar{i}} \\ &= \chi_{i\bar{i};p} - (\chi_0)_{i\bar{i};p} + R_{i\bar{i}p\bar{q}} g^{\bar{q}m} u_m + T_{pi}^i \chi_{i\bar{i}} - T_{pi}^q (\chi_0)_{q\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G^{i\bar{i}} u_{\bar{p}i\bar{i}} u_p &\geq G^{i\bar{i}} \chi_{i\bar{i};\bar{p}} u_p + G^{i\bar{i}} \overline{T_{pi}^i} \chi_{i\bar{i}} u_p - C_\epsilon K \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \\ &\geq (\beta)_{\bar{p}} u_p - \frac{\epsilon}{2} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 - C_\epsilon K \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$G^{i\bar{i}} u_{pi\bar{i}} u_{\bar{p}} \geq (\beta)_p u_{\bar{p}} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 - C_\epsilon K \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}.$$

Thus,

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} G^{i\bar{i}} \nabla_{\bar{i}} \nabla_i(|\nabla u|^2) &\geq \sum_p G^{i\bar{i}} (|u_{pi}|^2 + |u_{\bar{p}i}|^2) + 2 \sum_p \operatorname{Re}\{(\beta)_p u_{\bar{p}}\} \\ &\quad - \epsilon G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 - C_\epsilon K \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_p G^{i\bar{i}} |u_{\bar{p}i}|^2 &\geq G^{i\bar{i}} |u_{i\bar{i}}|^2 \geq G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}} - (\chi_0)_{i\bar{i}}|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}, \end{aligned}$$

we can use half of the term  $\sum_p G^{i\bar{i}} |u_{\bar{p}i}|^2$  to absorb the negative term  $-\epsilon G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2$  if we chose  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{8}$ . From now on we can replace  $C_\epsilon$  with  $C$  since  $\epsilon$  is fixed. It follows from (3.16)

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} G^{i\bar{i}} \nabla_{\bar{i}} \nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2) &\geq \frac{1}{8} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_p G^{i\bar{i}} (|u_{pi}|^2 + |u_{\bar{p}i}|^2) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_p \operatorname{Re}\{(\beta)_p u_{\bar{p}}\} - CK \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the inequality (3.18) into (3.15), it yields

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -\frac{1-\delta^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}} G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};1} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{1}} - (1+\delta^4) G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{|\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} + \psi'' G^{i\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 + \psi' G^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}} \\ &\quad + \varphi'' G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + \frac{\varphi'}{8} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 + \frac{\varphi'}{2} \sum_p G^{i\bar{i}} (|u_{pi}|^2 + |u_{\bar{p}i}|^2) \\ &\quad + 2\varphi' \sum_p \operatorname{Re}\{(\beta)_p u_{\bar{p}}\} - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} - C. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we divide our proof into two cases separately, depending on whether  $\chi_{n\bar{n}} < -\delta \chi_{1\bar{1}}$  or not, for a small  $\delta$  to be chosen later.

**Case 1.**  $\chi_{n\bar{n}} < -\delta \chi_{1\bar{1}}$ . In this case, it follows that  $\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\delta^2} \chi_{n\bar{n}}^2$ . So, we only need to bound  $\chi_{n\bar{n}}^2$ . Clearly, we can obtain if we throw some positive terms in (3.19)

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -(1+\delta^4) G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{|\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} + \psi' G^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}} + \varphi'' G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + \frac{\varphi'}{8} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\varphi' \sum_p \operatorname{Re}\{(\beta)_p u_{\bar{p}}\} - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} - C. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.5), we obtain

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} -\psi' \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}} &= -\psi' \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \left[ \chi_{i\bar{i}} - ((\chi_0)_{i\bar{i}} - \tau) - \tau \right] \\ &= -\psi' \left[ \beta + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (l-k) \beta_l G_l - \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} (\chi_{0i\bar{i}} - \tau) - \tau \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \right] \\ &\leq C\Lambda - \tau\Lambda \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.21) into (3.20) and choosing  $\Lambda$  large enough,

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} &\varphi'' G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + \frac{\varphi'}{8} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{i}}|^2 \\ &\leq (1+\delta^4) G^{i\bar{i}} \frac{|\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} - 2\varphi' \sum_p \operatorname{Re}\{(\beta)_p u_{\bar{p}}\} + C(1+\Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we get from (3.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 + \delta^4) \sum_i \frac{G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} &= (1 + \delta^4) \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} |\varphi' \nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2) + \psi' u_i|^2 \\
&\leq 2(\varphi')^2 \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + \frac{8(1 + \delta^4)}{1 - \delta^4} \Lambda^2 K \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \\
(3.23) \quad &\leq 2(\varphi')^2 \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + 16\Lambda^2 K \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we choose  $\delta \leq 3^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ . In fact,

$$(3.24) \quad \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \chi_{i\bar{i}}^2 \geq G^{n\bar{n}} \chi_{n\bar{n}}^2 \geq \frac{1}{n} \chi_{n\bar{n}}^2 \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}.$$

Substituting (3.23) and (3.24) into (3.22), we get

$$\frac{1}{32nK} \chi_{n\bar{n}}^2 \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} \leq 16\Lambda^2 K \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} + C(1 + \Lambda).$$

Combining with (2.13), it is easy to derive that

$$\chi_{1\bar{1}} \leq CK.$$

**Case 2.**  $\chi_{n\bar{n}} \geq -\delta \chi_{1\bar{1}}$ . Define

$$I = \left\{ i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : G^{i\bar{i}} > \delta^{-1} G^{1\bar{1}} \right\}.$$

It follows from (2.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{1}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}} G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};1} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{1}} &\geq \frac{1 - \delta}{1 + \delta} \frac{1}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{i\bar{1};1}|^2 \\
(3.25) \quad &\geq \frac{1 - \delta}{1 + \delta} \frac{1}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} \left( |\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}\{\chi_{1\bar{1};i} \overline{e'_i}\} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $e'_i = T_{i\bar{1}}^p u_{p\bar{1}} + (\chi_0)_{i\bar{1};1} - (\chi_0)_{1\bar{1};i}$ .

Note that  $\varphi'' = 2(\varphi')^2$ , using (3.13), we get

$$(3.26) \quad \varphi'' \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 \geq 2 \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} \left( \delta \left| \frac{\chi_{1\bar{1};i}}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}} \right|^2 - \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} |\psi' u_i|^2 \right).$$

Choosing  $\delta \leq \min\{\frac{1}{2A+1}, 3^{-\frac{1}{4}}\}$  and hence  $\psi'' \geq \frac{2\delta}{1-\delta}(\psi')^2$ . Combining (3.25) with (3.26),

$$\begin{aligned}
& -(1+\delta^4) \sum_{i \in I} \frac{G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} - \frac{1-\delta^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}} G^{i\bar{j}, r\bar{s}} \chi_{i\bar{j};1} \chi_{r\bar{s};\bar{1}} \\
& + \varphi'' \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 + \psi'' \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} |u_i|^2 \\
\geq & \frac{\delta^2}{2} \sum_{i \in I} \frac{G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} + 2(1-\delta)^2 \frac{1}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} \operatorname{Re}\{\chi_{1\bar{1};i} \bar{e}_i\} \\
\geq & \frac{\delta^2}{4} \sum_{i \in I} \frac{G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} - C_\delta \frac{1}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}} \lambda_i^2 \\
(3.27) \quad \geq & \frac{\delta^2}{4} \sum_{i \in I} \frac{G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} - C \sum_{i \in I} G^{i\bar{i}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we choose  $\chi_{1\bar{1}}$  large enough to get the last inequality.

For the terms without an index in  $I$ , by (3.23) and the fact  $1 \notin I$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.28) \quad & -(1+\delta^4) \sum_{i \notin I} \frac{G^{i\bar{i}} |\chi_{1\bar{1};i}|^2}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2} + \varphi'' \sum_{i \notin I} G^{i\bar{i}} |\nabla_i (|\nabla u|^2)|^2 \\
\geq & -\frac{16n\Lambda^2 K}{\delta} G^{1\bar{1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.27) and (3.28) into (3.19),

$$(3.29) \quad C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} + C + \frac{16n\Lambda^2 K}{\delta} G^{1\bar{1}} \geq \frac{1}{8K} G^{i\bar{i}} \chi_{i\bar{i}}^2 + \psi' G^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}}.$$

Note that  $\mu := \lambda(\chi_0 + \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} \underline{u})$  satisfies the condition (2.6) since (1.5). Without loss of generality we assume that  $\chi_{1\bar{1}} \geq N$ . From Lemma 2.2, we will divide the following argument into two case:

**Case 2.1:**

$$\sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}} \leq -\theta - \theta \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}.$$

It implies that

$$\psi' \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}} \geq \Lambda \theta (1 + \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}).$$

Combining with (3.29), we have

$$(3.30) \quad C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} + C + \frac{16n\Lambda^2 K}{\delta} G^{1\bar{1}} \geq \frac{1}{8K} G^{i\bar{i}} \chi_{i\bar{i}}^2 + \Lambda \theta (1 + \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}).$$

We can choose  $\Lambda$  large enough, then (3.30) gives

$$\frac{1}{8K}G^{1\bar{1}}\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{8K}G^{i\bar{i}}\chi_{i\bar{i}}^2 \leq \frac{16n\Lambda^2K}{\delta}G^{1\bar{1}}.$$

So

$$|\chi_{1\bar{1}}| \leq 8\Lambda K \sqrt{\frac{2n}{\delta}}.$$

**Case 2.2:**

$$(3.31) \quad G^{1\bar{1}}\chi_{1\bar{1}} \geq \theta.$$

From (3.21), we can absorb the last term of (3.29) into  $\tau\Lambda \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}$ ,

$$C(1+\Lambda) + C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} + \frac{16n\Lambda^2K}{\delta}G^{1\bar{1}} \geq \frac{1}{8K}G^{1\bar{1}}\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2 + \tau\Lambda \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}.$$

Choosing  $\Lambda$  large enough, it follows that

$$(3.32) \quad C(1+\Lambda) + \frac{16n\Lambda^2K}{\delta}G^{1\bar{1}} \geq \frac{1}{8K}G^{1\bar{1}}\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2.$$

Using (3.31), we choose  $\chi_{1\bar{1}}$  large enough such that

$$\frac{1}{16K}G^{1\bar{1}}\chi_{1\bar{1}}^2 \geq \frac{\theta}{16K}\chi_{1\bar{1}} \geq C(1+\Lambda).$$

Taking the above inequality into (3.32), we arrive

$$\chi_{1\bar{1}} \leq 16\sqrt{\frac{n}{\delta}}\Lambda K.$$

So, we complete the proof.

#### 4. BOUNDARY MIXED TANGENTIAL-NORMAL ESTIMATES

The goal of this section is to prove an estimate for the boundary mixed tangential-normal derivatives. For  $p \in \partial M$ , we choose a coordinate  $z = (z^1, \dots, z^n)$  such that  $p$  corresponds to the origin and  $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}$ . We denote  $z^i = x^i + \sqrt{-1}y^i$  and

$$t^1 = y^1, t^2 = y^2, \dots, t^n = y^n, t^{n+1} = x^1, \dots, t^{2n-1} = x^{n-1}.$$

Let  $\rho$  be the distance function to 0, i.e.,

$$\rho(z) =: \text{dist}_{g_0}(z, 0), \quad x \in M$$

and set

$$M_\delta = \{z \in M : \rho(z) < \delta\} \quad \text{for } \delta > 0.$$

Let  $d$  be the distance function to the boundary  $\partial M$  with respect to the background metric  $g$

$$d(z) =: \text{dist}_{g_0}(z, \partial M), \quad z \in M.$$

Since  $\partial M$  is smooth and  $|\nabla d| = 1$  on  $\partial M$ , we can choose  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small so that  $d$  is smooth,

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq |\nabla d| \leq 2 \quad \text{in } M_\delta$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad C_2 \leq |\nabla^2 d| \leq C_1 \quad \text{in } M_\delta,$$

where the constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are independent of  $\delta$ .

Suppose near the origin, the boundary  $\partial M$  is represented by

$$\rho(z) = 0$$

and  $d\rho \neq 0$  on  $\partial M$ . Then, there exists a function  $\zeta(t)$  such that

$$\rho(t, \zeta(t)) = 0.$$

Differentiating the boundary condition  $(u - \underline{u})(t, \zeta(t)) = 0$ , we derive the relation on  $\partial M \cap \overline{M}_\delta$

$$(4.3) \quad \partial_{t^\alpha}(u - \underline{u}) = -\partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})\partial_{t^\alpha}\zeta$$

for any  $\alpha = 1, \dots, 2n-1$ . Moreover, differentiating the boundary condition again gives

$$(4.4) \quad \partial_{t^\alpha}\partial_{t^\gamma}(u - \underline{u})(0) = -\partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(0)\partial_{t^\alpha}\partial_{t^\gamma}\zeta(0),$$

which implies that

$$(4.5) \quad |\partial_{t^\alpha}\partial_{t^\gamma}u(0)| \leq C$$

for any  $\alpha, \gamma = 1, \dots, 2n-1$ .

To derive the boundary tangential-normal estimates, we use the following locally defined auxiliary function in  $M_\delta$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi = & A\sqrt{K}v + B\sqrt{K}|z|^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{p=1}^n \left[ \partial_{y^p}(u - \underline{u}) \right]^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} |\nabla_a(u - \underline{u})|^2 \\ & + T_\alpha(u - \underline{u}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $A, B \gg 1$  are constants to be determined. Here,

$$v = u - \underline{u} + td - \frac{N}{2}d^2,$$

introduced by Guan in [19], and  $t$  and  $N$  will be determined later.

**Lemma 4.1.** *There exist uniform positive constants  $t, \delta, \varepsilon$  small enough and  $N \gg 1$  such that  $v$  satisfies*

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} G^{i\bar{j}}v_{i\bar{j}} \leq -\frac{\varepsilon}{4} \left( 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} \right), & \text{in } M_\delta, \\ v \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial M_\delta, \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* The proof is quite similar to that given for [43, Lemma 2.4] and so they are omitted.  $\square$

4.1. **Estimates of tangential derivatives  $T_\alpha(u - \underline{u})$ .** For  $\alpha \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2n-1\}$ , we define the real vector fields

$$T_\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial t^\alpha} - \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^n},$$

which are clearly tangential vector on  $\partial M$ . Then, we have

**Lemma 4.2.**

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} T_\alpha(u - \underline{u}) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^n}(u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^n}(u - \underline{u}) \\ &+ C \sum_{i=1}^n (1 + G^{i\bar{i}} |\lambda_i|) + C(1 + \sqrt{K}) \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We start with the following computation

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} &G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} T_\alpha(u - \underline{u}) \\ &= G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{t^\alpha}(u - \underline{u}) - \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u}) \\ &- 2\operatorname{Re} \left[ G^{i\bar{j}} \left( \partial_i \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \right) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u}) \right] - G^{i\bar{j}} \left( \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \right) \partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u}). \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating the equation (2.9) once, we have

$$(4.9) \quad G^{i\bar{j}} \nabla_{t^\alpha} \nabla_i \nabla_{\bar{j}} u + G^{i\bar{j}} \nabla_{t^\alpha} (\chi_0)_{\bar{j}i} = \nabla_{t^\alpha} \beta - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{t^\alpha} \beta_l) G_l.$$

Note that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\alpha} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-1}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial z^\alpha} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^\alpha} \right) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \alpha \leq n,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t^\alpha} = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{\alpha-n}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^{\alpha-n}} \right) \quad \text{for } n+1 \leq \alpha \leq 2n-1.$$

Then, we can convert covariant derivatives to partial derivatives for  $n+1 \leq \alpha \leq 2n-1$

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla_{t^\alpha} \nabla_i \nabla_{\bar{j}} u &= \nabla_\alpha \nabla_i \nabla_{\bar{j}} u + \nabla_{\bar{\alpha}} \nabla_i \nabla_{\bar{j}} u \\ &= \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{t^\alpha} u - \Gamma_{\alpha i}^r u_{\bar{j}r} - \overline{\Gamma_{\alpha j}^r} u_{\bar{r}i}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (4.10) into (4.9) gives

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{t^\alpha} u &= -G^{i\bar{j}} \nabla_{t^\alpha} (\chi_0)_{\bar{j}i} + \nabla_{t^\alpha} \beta - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (\nabla_{t^\alpha} \beta_l) G_l \\ &+ G^{i\bar{j}} \Gamma_{\alpha i}^r u_{\bar{j}r} + G^{i\bar{j}} \overline{\Gamma_{\alpha j}^r} u_{\bar{r}i}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for  $n+1 \leq \alpha \leq 2n-1$

$$(4.12) \quad \left| G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{t^\alpha} u \right| \leq C G^{i\bar{i}} (1 + |\lambda_i|) + C(|\nabla \beta| + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} |\nabla \beta_l|).$$

Similarly, we can get the estimate (4.12) for  $1 \leq \alpha \leq n$ . Thus, the estimate (4.12) holds for all  $1 \leq \alpha \leq 2n-1$ . Moreover, we also have a similar estimate

$$(4.13) \quad |G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{x^n} u| \leq C G^{i\bar{i}} (1 + |\lambda_i|) + C(|\nabla \beta| + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} |\nabla \beta_l|).$$

Plugging (4.12) and (4.13) into (4.8), it yields

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} T_\alpha(u - \underline{u}) &\leq -2\operatorname{Re} \left[ G^{i\bar{j}} \left( \partial_i \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \right) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{x^n} (u - \underline{u}) \right] + \sqrt{K} \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} \\ &\quad + C G^{i\bar{i}} (1 + |\lambda_i|) + C. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side of (4.14) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} G^{i\bar{j}} \left( \partial_i \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \right) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{x^n} (u - \underline{u}) &= 2G^{i\bar{j}} \left( \partial_i \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \right) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_n (u - \underline{u}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{-1} G^{i\bar{j}} \left( \partial_i \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \right) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^n} (u - \underline{u}), \end{aligned}$$

it follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} |G^{i\bar{j}} \left( \partial_i \frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}} \right) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{x^n} (u - \underline{u})| &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^n} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^n} (u - \underline{u}) \\ &\quad + C \left( \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} |\lambda_i| + 1 \right) + C(1 + \sqrt{K}) \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.14) and (4.15) gives (4.7).  $\square$

**4.2. Estimates of  $K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{p=1}^n \left[ \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \right]^2$ .** Differentiating the boundary condition  $(u - \underline{u})(t, \zeta(t)) = 0$ , we have

$$\partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) = -\partial_{x^n} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{y^p} \zeta, \quad \text{on } \partial M \cap \overline{M_\delta}.$$

Note that  $|\partial_{y^p} \zeta| \leq C|t|$  in view of  $\partial_{y^p} \zeta(0) = \partial_{y^p} \rho(0) = 0$ , hence

$$(\partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}))^2 \leq C|z|^2 \quad \text{on } \partial M \cap \overline{M_\delta}.$$

Combining with (4.12), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.16) \quad & \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \left[ \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \right]^2 \\
&= \frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \\
&\geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) - C |G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} u| - C \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} \\
&\geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) - C G^{i\bar{i}} (1 + |\lambda_i|) - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} - C.
\end{aligned}$$

**4.3. Estimates of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} |\nabla_a (u - \underline{u})|^2$ .** For each  $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ , we define local sections of  $T^{1,0}M$  around the origin

$$E_a(0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z^a} - \left[ \frac{\partial z^a \rho}{\partial z^n \rho} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq a \leq n-1.$$

Clearly, those are tangential to  $\partial M$ . Using the metric  $\omega$ , we perform the Gram-Schmidt process to obtain a local orthonormal frame  $\{e_a\}_{a=1}^{n-1}$  of  $T^{1,0}M$ . Thus,  $\{e_a\}_{a=1}^{n-1}$  are tangential to  $\partial M$ ,  $\omega(e_a, \bar{e}_b) = \delta_{ab}$  and

$$e_a(0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z^a}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq a \leq n-1.$$

Furthermore, let

$$e_n = \frac{E_n}{|E_n|_\omega}, \quad E_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} - \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} \omega(\partial_n, \bar{e}_a) e_a.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.17) \quad & \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} |\nabla_a (u - \underline{u})|^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \nabla_a (u - \underline{u}) \overline{\nabla_a (u - \underline{u})} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \left[ e_a^p \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}} \partial_p (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}) \right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} e_a^p \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_p (u - \underline{u}) \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}} \partial_{\bar{q}} \partial_i (u - \underline{u}) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} e_a^p \partial_i \partial_p (u - \underline{u}) \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}} \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}) \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} \operatorname{Re} \left( G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} (e_a^p \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}}) \partial_p \partial_i (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}) \right) \\
&\quad - C G^{i\bar{i}} (1 + |\lambda_i|) - C (1 + \sqrt{K}) \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} - C.
\end{aligned}$$

We deal with the first term on the right side of the inequality (4.17) by

$$\begin{aligned}
G^{i\bar{j}} e_a^p \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_p (u - \underline{u}) \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}) &= G^{i\bar{j}} (\chi - \chi_{\underline{u}})_{\bar{j}a} (\chi - \chi_{\underline{u}})_{\bar{a}i} \\
(4.18) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\geq \frac{1}{2} G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{\bar{j}a} \chi_{\bar{a}i} - C \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we can rewrite the third term on the right side of the inequality (4.17) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} (e_a^p \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}}) \partial_p \partial_i (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}) &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} (e_a^p \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}}) \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_i (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}) \\
(4.19) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\quad - \sqrt{-1} \frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} (e_a^p \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}}) \partial_{y^p} \partial_i (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the relation  $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^p} - \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^p}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{2}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{p,q} \left| G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_{\bar{j}} (e_a^p \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}}) \partial_{y^p} \partial_i (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{q}} (u - \underline{u}) \right| \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{p,q} \left[ G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i (\bar{e}_a^p e_a^{\bar{q}}) \partial_{\bar{j}} (e_a^p \bar{e}_a^{\bar{q}}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_i G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) + C \sqrt{K} \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (4.18) and (4.19) into (4.17), dropping the second term on the right side of the inequality (4.17), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} |\nabla_a (u - \underline{u})|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{\bar{j}a} \chi_{\bar{a}i} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \\
(4.20) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\quad - C \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} (1 + |\lambda_i|) - C(1 + \sqrt{K}) \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} - C.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Lemma 2.7 in [14], there exists an index  $r$  such that

$$G^{i\bar{j}} \chi_{\bar{j}a} \chi_{\bar{a}i} \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq r} G^{i\bar{i}} \lambda_i^2.$$

Going back to (4.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} |\nabla_a (u - \underline{u})|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}} \sum_{i \neq r} G^{i\bar{i}} \lambda_i^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{p=1}^n G^{i\bar{j}} \partial_i \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \partial_{\bar{j}} \partial_{y^p} (u - \underline{u}) \\
(4.21) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\quad - C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} |\lambda_i| - C(1 + \sqrt{K}) \sum_{i=1}^n G^{i\bar{i}} - C.
\end{aligned}$$

**4.4. Mixed tangential-normal estimates.** Combining with (4.6), (4.7), (4.16) and (4.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
G^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i\partial_{\bar{j}}\Psi &\leq -\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}G^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i\partial_{y^p}(u-\underline{u})\partial_{\bar{j}}\partial_{y^p}(u-\underline{u}) - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}}\sum_{i\neq r}G^{i\bar{i}}\lambda_i^2 \\
&\quad -\frac{\varepsilon}{4}A\sqrt{K}\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^nG^{i\bar{i}}\right) + B\sqrt{K}\sum_{i=1}^nG^{i\bar{i}} \\
&\quad +C(1+\sum_iG^{i\bar{i}}|\lambda_i|) + C(1+\sqrt{K})\sum_{p=1}^nG^{p\bar{p}} \\
&\leq -\frac{\varepsilon}{4}A\sqrt{K}\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^nG^{i\bar{i}}\right) + B\sqrt{K}\sum_{i=1}^nG^{i\bar{i}} + C(1+\sqrt{K})\sum_{i=1}^nG^{i\bar{i}} + C \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}}\sum_{i\neq r}G^{i\bar{i}}\lambda_i^2 + CG^{i\bar{i}}|\lambda_i|.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}A \geq B + 2C + A_0$  with  $A_0$  large enough, we have

$$(4.22) \quad G^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i\partial_{\bar{j}}\Psi \leq -A_0\sqrt{K}\sum_{i=1}^nG^{i\bar{i}} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{K}}\sum_{i\neq r}G^{i\bar{i}}\lambda_i^2 + C\sum_iG^{i\bar{i}}|\lambda_i|.$$

By [19, Corollary 2.8], for any  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , we have

$$(4.23) \quad \sum_iG^{i\bar{i}}|\lambda_i| \leq \varepsilon_0\sum_{i\neq r}G^{i\bar{i}}\lambda_i^2 + C_1(1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_0})\sum_iG^{i\bar{i}}.$$

Choosing  $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{4C\sqrt{K}}$  and substituting the above inequality into (4.22), choosing  $A_0$  sufficiently large results in

$$G^{i\bar{j}}\partial_i\partial_{\bar{j}}\Psi \leq 0.$$

Lastly, we consider the boundary value for  $\Psi$  which consists of two pieces. First, on  $\partial M \cap M_\delta$ , if we take  $B$  large enough, we have

$$(4.24) \quad \Psi \geq A\sqrt{K}v + B\sqrt{K}|z|^2 - C|z|^2 \geq 0.$$

Secondly, on  $\partial M_\delta \cap M$ , if we take  $B$  large enough, we have

$$(4.25) \quad \Psi \geq A\sqrt{K}v + B\sqrt{K}\delta^2 - C\sqrt{K} \geq 0,$$

combining (4.24) and (4.25) gives

$$\Psi \geq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial M_\delta.$$

Then, applying the maximum principle, we get

$$\Psi \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad M_\delta.$$

Note that  $\Psi(0) = 0$ , it yields

$$\partial_{x^n}\Psi(0) \geq 0.$$

It follows that

$$0 \leq A\sqrt{K}\partial_{x^n}v(0) - (\partial_{x^n}\frac{\rho_{t^\alpha}}{\rho_{x^n}})(0)\partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(0) + \partial_{x^n}\partial_{t^\alpha}(u - \underline{u}).$$

Since  $|\partial_{x^n}v| \leq C$  on  $\partial M$ , we conclude

$$\partial_{x^n}\partial_{t^\alpha}u(0) \geq -C\sqrt{K}.$$

We can apply the same argument to the function

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi} : &= A\sqrt{K}v + B\sqrt{K}|z|^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \partial_{y^i}(u - \underline{u}) \right]^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |\nabla_i(u - \underline{u})|^2 \\ (4.26) \quad &- T_\alpha(u - \underline{u}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\partial_{x^n}\partial_{t^\alpha}u(0) \leq C\sqrt{K}.$$

Thus,

$$|\chi_{\alpha'\bar{n}}|(0) \leq C\sqrt{K} \quad \forall \alpha' \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}.$$

## 5. BOUNDARY DOUBLE NORMAL ESTIMATE

For  $p \in \partial M$ , we choose coordinates  $z = (z^1, \dots, z^n)$  such that  $z(p) = 0$  and  $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}$ . We denote  $z^i = x^i + \sqrt{-1}y^i$  and rotate the coordinates such that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^n}$  is the unit inner normal vector at  $p$ . Then, we perform an orthogonal change of coordinates in the tangential directions to arrange that

$$\chi_{i\bar{j}} = (\chi_0)_{i\bar{j}} + u_{i\bar{j}} = \lambda'_i \delta_{ij} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n-1.$$

Since  $\chi \in \Gamma_{k-1}(M)$ , we have

$$\chi_{n\bar{n}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda'_i \geq 0,$$

which implies

$$\chi_{n\bar{n}} \geq -C.$$

Thus, it remains to estimate  $\chi_{n\bar{n}}$  from above. We give the following lemma before starting the estimate.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $A = (a_{i\bar{j}})$  be a  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrix and  $A' = (a'_{i\bar{j}})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1}$  be the  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  Hermitian matrix. Suppose that  $\lambda_1(A) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(A)$  are the eigenvalues of  $A$  and  $\lambda'_1(A') \leq \dots \leq \lambda'_{n-1}(A')$  are the eigenvalues of  $A'$ . Then we have*

$$(5.1) \quad \lambda_j(A) \leq \lambda'_j(A') \leq \lambda_{j+1}(A), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1,$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} \lambda_j(A) = \lambda'_j(A') + o(1), & 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \\ a_{n\bar{n}} \leq \lambda_n(A) \leq a_{n\bar{n}} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{a_{n\bar{n}}}\right) \right). \end{cases}$$

as  $|a_{n\bar{n}}| \rightarrow +\infty$ .

*Proof.* (5.1) can be obtained by the Cauchy's interlace inequality (see for example [23]) and (5.2) is follows from [3, Lemma 1.2]  $\square$

We set

$$\Gamma_\infty := \{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \mid ((\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma_{k-1} \text{ for some } \lambda_n)\},$$

and

$$f(\lambda(z)) := \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda(z))}{\sigma_{k-1}(\lambda(z))} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_l(\lambda(z))}{\sigma_{k-1}(\lambda(z))}$$

for any continuous function  $\lambda$ . For any  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  Hermitian matrix  $E$  with  $\lambda'(E) \in \Gamma_\infty$ , we define

$$\tilde{G}(E) = f_\infty(\lambda'(E)) := \lim_{\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty} f(\lambda'_1(E), \dots, \lambda'_{n-1}(E), \lambda_n).$$

**The upper bound estimate of  $\chi_{n\bar{n}}$ .** For simplicity, we denote by  $\lambda = \lambda(\chi_u(z))$  and  $\lambda' = \lambda(\chi'_u(z))$ , where  $\chi'_u(z) = ((\chi_u)_{i\bar{j}})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1}$ . The proof is divided into two claims:

**Claim 1:**

$$(5.3) \quad P_\infty := \min_{z \in \partial M} \left( \tilde{G}(\chi'_u(z)) - \beta(z) \right) > c_0$$

for some uniform constant  $c_0$ .

We assume that  $P_\infty = \tilde{G}(\chi'_u(z_0)) - \beta(z_0)$  at point  $z_0 \in \partial M$ . Since  $\lambda(\chi_u) \in \Gamma_{k-1}$  and  $\sigma_k(\lambda) = \lambda_n \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda \mid i) + \sigma_k(\lambda \mid i)$ , then

$$\tilde{G}(\chi'_u(z)) = \frac{\sigma_{k-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}}(\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_{n-1}) - \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_{l-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}}(\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_{n-1}).$$

Denote  $\tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}} := \frac{\partial \tilde{G}}{\partial (\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}}(\chi'_u(z_0))$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$ . By the concavity of  $G$  and  $\tilde{G}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}((\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z) - (\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z_0)) \\ &= \left( \frac{\sigma_{k-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}} \right)^{i\bar{j}}|_{z_0} ((\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z) - (\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z_0)) + \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \beta_l(z_0) \left( -\frac{\sigma_{l-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}} \right)^{i\bar{j}} ((\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z) - (\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z_0)) \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma_{k-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}}(\chi'_u(z)) - \frac{\sigma_{k-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}}(\chi'_u(z_0)) + \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \beta_l(z_0) \left( -\frac{\sigma_{l-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}}(\chi'_u(z)) + \frac{\sigma_{l-1}}{\sigma_{k-2}}(\chi'_u(z_0)) \right) \\ &\geq \tilde{G}(\chi'_u(z)) - \tilde{G}(\chi'_u(z_0)) - C \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} |\beta_l|_{C^1} |z - z_0|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}(\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z) - \beta(z) - \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}(\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) + \beta(z_0) \\
& \geq \tilde{G}(\chi'_u(z)) - \beta(z) - c_0 - C \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} |\beta_l|_{C^1} |z - z_0| \\
(5.4) \quad & \geq -C \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} |\beta_l|_{C^1} |z - z_0|.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$(5.5) \quad c_\infty := \min_{z \in \partial M} \left( \tilde{G}(\chi'_u(z)) - G(\chi_u(z)) \right) > 0.$$

Using (4.4), we have

$$(\chi_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) = (\chi_{\underline{u}})_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) - \partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(z_0) \zeta_{i\bar{j}}(z_0)$$

for any  $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.6) \quad \partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(z_0) \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \zeta_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}(z_0) &= \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}((\chi'_{\underline{u}})_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) - (\chi'_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z_0)) \\
&\geq \tilde{G}(\chi_{\underline{u}}(z_0)) - \tilde{G}(\chi_u(z_0)) \\
&= \tilde{G}(\chi_{\underline{u}}(z_0)) - \beta(z_0) - c_0 \\
&\geq \tilde{G}(\chi_{\underline{u}}(z_0)) - G(\chi_{\underline{u}}(z_0)) - c_0 \\
&\geq c_\infty - c_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if  $\partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(z_0) \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \zeta_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}(z_0) \leq \frac{c_\infty}{2}$ , then  $c_0 \geq \frac{c_\infty}{2}$  and we are done.

Suppose now that

$$\partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(z_0) \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \zeta_{i\bar{j}}(z_0) \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}(z_0) \geq \frac{c_\infty}{2}.$$

Let  $\eta(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \zeta_{i\bar{j}}(z) \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}}(z)$ . Note that

$$\eta(z_0) \geq \frac{c_\infty}{2\partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(z_0)} \geq 2\epsilon_1 c_\infty$$

for some uniform  $\epsilon_1 > 0$  since (3.1). We may assume that

$$\eta \geq \epsilon_1 c_\infty \quad \text{on } \bar{M}_\delta(z_0)$$

by requiring  $\delta$  small, where  $M_\delta(z_0) := \{z \in M \mid \text{dist}_{g_0}(z, z_0) < \delta\}$ . We consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(z) = & -\partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(z) + \frac{1}{\eta(z)} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \tilde{G}_0^{i\bar{j}} ((\chi'_{\underline{u}})_{i\bar{j}}(z) - (\chi'_{\underline{u}})_{i\bar{j}}(z_0)) - \frac{\beta(z) - \beta(z_0)}{\eta(z)} \\ & + \frac{C}{\eta(z)} \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} |\beta_l|_{C^1} |z - z_0|. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce from (5.4) and the fact  $(\chi_u)_{i\bar{j}}(z) = (\chi_{\underline{u}})_{i\bar{j}}(z) - \partial_{x^n}(u - \underline{u})(z)\zeta_{i\bar{j}}(z)$  on  $\partial M \cap \bar{M}_\delta(z_0)$  that

$$\Phi(z_0) = 0, \quad \Phi(z) \geq 0 \quad \forall z \in \partial M \cap \bar{M}_\delta(z_0),$$

while by (4.7) and (4.13),

$$G^{i\bar{j}}\Phi_{i\bar{j}} \leq C\sqrt{K}(1 + \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}}) + C \sum_i G^{i\bar{i}} |\lambda_i(\chi_u)|^2.$$

Consider the function  $\tilde{\Psi}$  defined in (4.26), it follows from (4.6), (4.7), (4.16), (4.21) and (4.22) that

$$\begin{cases} G^{i\bar{j}}(\Phi + \tilde{\Psi})_{i\bar{j}} \leq 0, & \text{in } M_\delta(z_0), \\ \Phi + \tilde{\Psi} \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial M_\delta(z_0). \end{cases}$$

The maximum principle yields that  $\Phi + \tilde{\Psi} \geq 0$  in  $\partial M_\delta(z_0)$ , and then  $\partial_{x_n}\Phi(z_0) = -\phi_\nu(z_0) \geq \tilde{\Psi}_\nu(z_0)$ . This, together with the definition of  $\Phi$ , yields that

$$\partial_{x^n}\partial_{x^n}u(z_0) \leq CK.$$

Since

$$u_{\bar{n}n} = \frac{1}{4}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^n} + \sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^n})(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^n} - \sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^n})u,$$

it follows that  $\lambda(\chi_u)(z_0)$  is contained in a compact subset of  $\Gamma$ . Therefore

$$P_\infty \geq f(\lambda'(\chi'_u)(z_0), R) - \beta(z_0) > 0$$

for  $R$  sufficiently large since  $f_i > 0$ , which yields (5.3).

**Claim 2:** There holds

$$(5.7) \quad \chi_{n\bar{n}}(z) \leq CK \quad z \in \partial M$$

for some constant  $C$ .

Let  $z \in \partial M$ , we suppose that  $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$  and  $\lambda'_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda'_{n-1}$ . From the boundary tangential-tangential and tangential-normal estimates, it follows that  $\lambda'(\chi'_u)$  lies in a compact set  $L \subset \Gamma_\infty$ . Combining with (5.3), we know that there exist uniform positive constant  $c_0$  and  $R_0$  depending on the range of  $\lambda'(\chi'_u)$  such that for any  $R > R_0$

$$f(\lambda', R) > \sup_M \beta + c_0,$$

which implies

$$(5.8) \quad f(\tilde{\lambda}, R) > \sup_M \beta + \frac{c_0}{2}$$

for any  $\tilde{\lambda} \in U_L$  and  $R > R_0$ , where  $U_L$  is the neighborhood of  $L$ .

Assuming that there exists a constant  $R_1 > R_0$  such that  $\chi_{n\bar{n}}(z) \geq R_1$ . According to (5.1) and (5.2), it is easy to see that

$$\lambda_n \geq \chi_{n\bar{n}}(z) \geq R_0, \quad \lambda_j \in U_L, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1.$$

Combining with (5.8), we know that  $G(\chi_u(z)) = f(\lambda) > \beta(z) + \frac{c_0}{2}$ . This contradicts with the equation (2.9), and hence (5.7) holds.  $\square$

Combining this with the second order interior estimate, i.e., Theorem 3.2, we have

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $u \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$  be an  $(k-1)$ -admissible solution for equation (1.1). Under the assumptions mentioned in Theorem 1.1, then there exists a positive constant  $C$  depending only on  $(M, \omega), \chi_0, \alpha_l, \varphi$  and the subsolution  $\underline{u}$  such that*

$$\sup_{\bar{M}} |\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u| \leq CK,$$

where  $K := 1 + \sup_M |\nabla u|^2$ .

## 6. GRADIENT ESTIMATES

In this section, we combine the second derivative estimate with a blow-up argument and Liouville type theorem due to Dinew-Kolodziej [12] to obtain gradient estimates.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $u \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$  be an  $(k-1)$ -admissible solution for equation (1.1). Under the assumptions mentioned in Theorem 1.1, then there exists a positive constant  $C$  depending only on  $(M, \omega), \chi_0, \alpha_l, \varphi$  and the subsolution  $\underline{u}$  such that*

$$\sup_M |\nabla u| \leq C.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists a sequence of function  $u_m \in C^4(\bar{M})$  to the equation (1.1) such that

$$N_m = \sup_M |\nabla u_m| \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Hence

$$(6.1) \quad \chi_{u_m}^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \alpha_l(z) \chi_{u_m}^l \wedge \omega^{n-l}, \quad u = \varphi \text{ on } \partial M.$$

For any  $m$ , we assume that  $|\nabla u_m|$  attains its maximum value at  $z_m \in M$ . Then, after passing a subsequence we may assume that  $z_m \rightarrow z'$  for some point  $z' \in \bar{M}$ . By Theorem 5.1 we have

$$(6.2) \quad \sup_M |\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u_m| \leq C(1 + N_m^2),$$

where the constant inderpends of  $m$ . we divide our proof into two cases separately.

**Case 1:**  $z' \in \overset{\circ}{M}$ .

Choosing a small coordinate ball centered at  $z'$ , which we identify with an open set in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with coordinates  $(z^1, \dots, z^n)$ , and such that  $\omega(0) = \omega_0 = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \delta_{ij} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^j$ . We can assume that all  $z_m$  are within this coordinate ball. Let  $R > 0$ , we define

$$v_m(z) := u_m\left(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m\right), \quad \forall z \in B_R(0),$$

which is well-defined for any  $m$  such that  $N_m$  is large enough. Clearly,

$$|\nabla v_m(0)| = 1, \quad |v_m|_{C^2(B_R(0))} \leq C.$$

Let  $R \rightarrow +\infty$  and taking a diagonal subsequence again, we can assume that  $v_m \rightarrow v$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{1, \frac{\gamma}{2}}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  with  $\nabla v(0) = 1$ . Then we have from (6.1)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \chi_0\left(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m\right) + N_m^2 \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} v_m \right]^k \wedge \left[ \omega\left(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m\right) \right]^{n-k} \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \alpha_l \left(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m\right) \left[ \chi_0\left(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m\right) + N_m^2 \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} v_m \right]^l \wedge \left[ \omega\left(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m\right) \right]^{n-l}. \end{aligned}$$

We can take a limit of the equation and obtian

$$(\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} v)^k \wedge \omega_0^{n-k} = 0,$$

which is in the pluripotential sense. Moreover, we have for any  $1 \leq l \leq k-1$  by a similar reasoning

$$(\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} v)^l \wedge \omega_0^{n-l} \geq 0.$$

Combining with the result of Blocki [2], we know that  $v$  is a maximal  $k$ -subharmonic function in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . Then the Liouville thereom in [12] implies that  $v$  is a constant, which contradicts the fact  $\nabla v(0) = 1$ .

**Case 2:**  $z' \in \partial M$ .

Let  $\Omega \subset M$  be a coordinate chart centered at  $z'$ . Then there exists a smooth function  $\rho : B_{2s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\partial M \cap \Omega = \{\rho = 0\}, \quad M \cap \Omega \subset \{\rho \leq 0\}.$$

Where  $B_{2s} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2n}$  is the ball of radius  $2s$  at  $0 = z'$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume  $z_m \in \Omega$  with  $|z_m| < s$  in local coordinates and

$$r_m := \text{dist}(z_m, \partial M \cap \Omega) = |z_m - y_m|$$

for a unique point  $y_m \in \partial M \cap \Omega$ . Clearly,  $y_m \rightarrow z$  as  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ . Set

$$v_m(z) := u_m\left(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m\right), \quad z \in \Omega_m,$$

where  $\Omega_m := \{z \in \Omega \mid \frac{z}{N_m} + z_m \in B_{2s} \cap \{\rho \leq 0\}\}$ . Therefore

$$|\nabla v_m(0)| = 1, \quad |u_m|_{C^2(\Omega_m)} \leq C.$$

Let  $\rho_m := \rho(\frac{z}{N_m} + z_m)$ , then  $B_{sN_m} \cap \{\rho_m \leq 0\} \subset \Omega_i$  since  $|z_m| < s$ . By the standard elliptic theory, we know that

$$(6.3) \quad |v_m|_{C^{2,\gamma}\left(B_{\frac{sN_m}{2}} \cap \{\rho_m \leq 0\}\right)} \leq C.$$

Then we divide the proof into the following two sub-cases

**Case 2.1**

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} N_m r_m = +\infty.$$

After passing to a subsequence  $v_m$  converges in  $C^{2,\gamma}$  on compact sets to  $v \in C^{2,\gamma}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  since  $N_m r_m \rightarrow \infty$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar to Case 1, we know that  $v$  is a constant, which contradicts the fact  $\nabla v(0) = 1$ .

**Case 2.2**

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} N_m r_m = L \in [0, \infty).$$

The proof for Case 2.2 is quite similar to that given for Case 2b in [11, Proposition 6.1 ], and so they are omitted.  $\square$

Last we apply the standard continuity method to solve the Dirichlet problem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** For any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we consider the equation

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{cases} G(\chi_{u_t}) = t\beta + (1-t)G(\chi_{\underline{u}}), & \text{in } \bar{M}, \\ u_t = \varphi & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where

$$G(\chi_{u_t}) = \frac{\sigma_k(\chi_{u_t})}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi_{u_t})} - \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \beta_l(z) \frac{\sigma_l(\chi_{u_t})}{\sigma_{k-1}(\chi_{u_t})}.$$

Set

$$\mathbf{S} = \{t \in [0, 1] \mid \text{there exists } u_t \in C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{M}) \text{ with } \lambda(\chi_{u_t}) \in \Gamma_{k-1} \text{ solving (6.4)}\}.$$

Clearly the set  $\mathbf{S}$  is non-empty since  $\underline{u}$  solve the equation (6.4) for  $t = 0$ . On the one hand, by the generalized Newton-MacLaurin inequality, we have

$$\sigma_{k-1}(\chi_{u_t}) \geq C,$$

which implies that the equation (6.4) is uniformly elliptic. Therefore  $\mathbf{S}$  is an open set by the implicit function theorem.

On the other hand, let  $u_{t_i}$  be the solution of (6.4) for  $t_i \in [0, 1]$  with  $t_i \rightarrow t_0$ . From (3.1), theorem 3.1 , 5.1 and 6.1, we know that

$$|u_{t_i}|_{C^2(M)} \leq C$$

for some uniformly constants. Then, higher-order estimates follow from the Evan-Krylov theorem and the Schauder estimate, i.e.,

$$|u_{t_i}|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M)} \leq C.$$

We can take convergent subsequence to a limiting function  $\tilde{u} \in C^{4,\alpha}$  which solves the equation (6.4) for  $t_0$ . Hence  $\mathbf{S}$  is also closed and we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. Andrews, Contraction of convex hypersurfaces in Euclidean space, *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 2 (1994), 151-171.
- [2] Z. Blocki, Weak solutions to the complex Hessian equation, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 55 (2005), no. 5, 1735-1756.
- [3] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg, J. Spruck, Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second order elliptic equations III, Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian, *Acta Math.*, 155 (1985), 261-301.
- [4] C. Q. Chen, L. Chen, X. Q. Mei, N. Xiang, The Classical Neumann Problem for a class of mixed Hessian equations, To appear in *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 2021.
- [5] C. Q. Chen, L. Chen, X. Q. Mei, N. Xiang, The Neumann problem for a class of mixed complex Hessian equations, Preprint, 2019.
- [6] L. Chen, Hessian equations of Krylov type on Kähler manifolds, Preprint, arXiv:2107.12035, 2021.
- [7] L. Chen, A. G. Shang, Q. Tu, A class of prescribed Weingarten curvature equations in Euclidean space, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 46 (2021), no. 7, 1326-1343.
- [8] X. X. Chen, On the lower bound of the Mabuchi energy and its application, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 12 (2000), 607-623.
- [9] P. Cherrier, A. Hanani, Le probleme de Dirichlet pour des equations de Monge-Ampere en metrique hermitienne, *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 123 (1999), 577-597.
- [10] T. Collins, G. Székelyhidi, Convergence of the  $J$ -flow on toric manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.*, 107 (2017), no. 1, 47-81.
- [11] T. Collins, S. Picard, The Dirichlet Problem for the  $k$ -Hessian Equation on a complex manifold, Preprint, arXiv:1909.00447, 2019.
- [12] S. Dinew, S. Kolodziej, Liouville and Calabi-Yau type theorems for complex Hessian equations, *Amer. J. Math.*, 139(2017), 403-415.
- [13] H. Fang, M. J. Lai, X. N. Ma, On a class of fully nonlinear flows in Kähler geometry, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 653 (2011), 189-220.
- [14] K. Feng, H. B. Ge, T. Zheng, The Dirichlet problem of fully nonlinear equations on Hermitian manifolds, Preprint, arXiv:1905.02412v4, 2020.
- [15] D. Gu, N.C. Nguyen, The Dirichlet problem for a complex Hessian equation on compact Hermitian manifolds with boundary, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di scienze*, 18 (2018), 1189-1248.
- [16] B. Guan, Q. Li, Complex Monge-Ampère equations and totally real submanifolds, *Adv. Math.*, 225 (2010), no. 3, 1185-1223.
- [17] B. Guan, Q. Li, A Monge-Ampère type fully nonlinear equation on Hermitian manifolds, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 17 (2012), 1991-1999.
- [18] B. Guan, Q. Li, The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampère type equation on Hermitian manifolds, *Adv. Math.*, 246 (2013), 351-367.
- [19] B. Guan, Second order estimates and regularity for fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, *Duke Math. J.*, 163 (2014), 1491-1524.
- [20] B. Guan, W. Sun, On a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Hermitian manifolds, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 54 (2015), no. 1, 901-916.
- [21] P. F. Guan, X. W. Zhang, A class of curvature type equations. *Pure and Applied Math Quarterly*, 17 (2021), No. 3, 865-907.
- [22] Z. Hou, X.N. Ma, D. M. Wu, A second order estimate for complex Hessian equations on a compact Kähler manifold, *Math. Res. Lett.*, 17 (2010), no. 3, 547-561.

- [23] S. Hwang, Cauchy's interlace theorem for eigenvalues of Hermitian matrices, *American Mathematical Monthly*, 111 (2004), 157–159.
- [24] N. V. Krylov, On the general notion of fully nonlinear second order elliptic equation, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 347 (1995), 857-895.
- [25] G. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, World Scientific, 1996.
- [26] Vamsi P. Pingali, A fully nonlinear generalized Monge-Ampère PDE on a torus, *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, 211 (2014), pp.
- [27] Vamsi P. Pingali, A generalised Monge-Ampère equation, *J. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 27 (2014), no. 4, 333-346.
- [28] Vamsi P. Pingali, A priori estimates for a generalized Monge-Ampère PDE on some compact Kähler manifolds, *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.*, 61 (2016), no. 8, 1037-1051.
- [29] D. H. Phong, D. T. Tô, Fully non-linear parabolic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds, *Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup.*, 54 (2021), no.3, 793-829.
- [30] G. Székelyhidi, Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds, *J. Differ. Geom.*, 109 (2018), 337-378.
- [31] G. Székelyhidi, V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, Gauduchon metrics with prescribed volume form, *Acta Math.*, 219 (2017), no. 1, 181-211.
- [32] J. Song, B. Weinkove, On the convergence and singularities of the  $J$ -flow with applications to the Mabuchi energy, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61 (2008), 210-229.
- [33] J. Spruck, Geometric aspects of the theory of fully nonlinear elliptic equations, *Clay Mathematics Proceedings*, 2 (2005), 283-309.
- [34] W. Sun, On a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on closed Hermitian manifolds II:  $L^\infty$  estimate, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 70 (2017), 172-199.
- [35] W. Sun, Generalized complex Monge-Ampère type equations on closed Hermitian manifolds, Preprint, arXiv:1412.8192.
- [36] W. Sun, Parabolic Flow for Generalized complex Monge-Ampère type equations, Preprint, arXiv:1501.04255.
- [37] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, The complex Monge-Ampère equation with a gradient term, *Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly*, 17 (2021), 1005-1024.
- [38] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, Hermitian metrics,  $(n-1, n-1)$  forms and Monge-Ampère equations, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 755 (2019), 67-101.
- [39] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, Estimates for the complex Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian and balanced manifolds, *Asian J. Math.*, 14 (2010), 19-40.
- [40] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact hermitian manifolds, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 23 (2010), 1187-1195.
- [41] S.T. Yau, On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation I, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 31 (1978), 339-411.
- [42] D. K. Zhang, Hessian equations on closed Hermitian manifolds, *Pac. J. Math.*, 291 (2017), 485-510.
- [43] Q. Zhang, Regularity of the Dirichlet Problem for the Non-degenerate Complex Quotient Equations, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 23 (2021), 17673-17694.
- [44] J. D. Zhou, A class fo the non-degenerate complex quotient equations on compact Kähler manifolds, *Comm. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 20 (2021), 2361-2377.
- [45] J. D. Zhou, The interior gradient estimate for a class of mixed Hessian curvature equations, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* 59 (2022), 53-69.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HUBEI KEY LABORATORY OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, HUBEI UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430062, P.R. CHINA  
*Email address:* qiangtu@hubu.edu.cn

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HUBEI KEY LABORATORY OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, HUBEI UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430062, P.R. CHINA  
*Email address:* nixiang@hubu.edu.cn