

ON PLURIPOTENTIAL THEORY ASSOCIATED TO QUATERNIONIC m -SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS

SHENGQIU LIU AND WEI WANG

ABSTRACT. Many aspects of pluripotential theory are generalized to quaternionic m -subharmonic functions. We introduce quaternionic version of notions of the m -Hessian operator, m -subharmonic functions, m -Hessian measure, m -capacity, the relative m -extremal function and the m -Lelong number, and show various propositions for them, based on d_0 and d_1 operators, the quaternionic counterpart of ∂ and $\bar{\partial}$, and quaternionic closed positive currents. The definition of quaternionic m -Hessian operator can be extended to locally bounded quaternionic m -subharmonic functions and the corresponding convergence theorem is proved. The comparison principle and the quasicontinuity of quaternionic m -subharmonic functions are established. We also find the fundamental solution of the quaternionic m -Hessian operator.

1. Introduction

Pluripotential theory provides fine properties of plurisubharmonic functions, their Monge-Ampère measure and solutions to the complex Monge-Ampère equation $(dd^c u)^n = f\beta^n$, where β is the fundamental Kähler form on \mathbb{C}^n . Notably the Monge-Ampère operator $(dd^c u)^n$ is well defined for some non-smooth plurisubharmonic functions, e.g. continuous or locally bounded plurisubharmonic functions. This theory is a powerful tool in complex analysis of several variables, and was generalized to m -subharmonic functions, their Hessian measure and the complex m -Hessian equation $(dd^c u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = f\beta^n$. Pluripotential theory for m -subharmonic functions developed rapidly in last two decades, and there are vast literatures (cf. [1, 2, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30] and references therein).

On the quaternionic space, Alesker [3] introduced notions of quaternionic plurisubharmonic functions and quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator, proved a quaternionic version of the Chern-Levine-Nirenberg estimate and extended the quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator to continuous quaternionic plurisubharmonic functions. He also [6] used the Baston operator Δ to express the quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator by using methods of complex geometry. Then Wan-Wang [30] introduced the first-order differential operators d_0 and d_1 acting on the quaternionic version of differential forms and the notion of the closedness of a quaternionic positive current, motivated by 0-Cauchy-Fueter complex in quaternionic analysis [34]. The behavior of d_0, d_1 and $\Delta = d_0 d_1$ is very similar to $\partial, \bar{\partial}$ and $\partial\bar{\partial}$ in several complex variables, and many results in the complex pluripotential theory have been also extended to the quaternionic case (cf. [4, 5, 11, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35] and references therein). Some aspects of quaternionic pluripotential theory has been generalized to the Heisenberg group [35]. The purpose of this paper is to generalize pluripotential theory to quaternionic m -subharmonic functions.

Key words and phrases. The quaternionic m -Hessian operator; quaternionic m -subharmonic function; quaternionic m -Hessian measure; quaternionic m -capacity; the comparison principle; quasicontinuity; the relative m -extremal function.

Supported by National Nature Science Foundation in China (No. 11971425) .

Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Zhejiang 310027, P. R. China, Email: liushengqiu97@163.com, wwang@zju.edu.cn.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, a quaternionic version of Garding inequality is given by applying Garding's theory of hyperbolic polynomials to symmetric function of eigenvalues of a quaternionic hyperhermitian matrix. In Section 3, we briefly recall positive forms, the first-order differential operators d_0 and d_1 and $\Delta = d_0 d_1$ and their various propositions. The quaternionic m -Hessian operator is introduced and can be written as $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$, where β_n is the fundamental form on \mathbb{H}^n . In Section 4, we give the definition of nonsmooth quaternionic m -subharmonic function in terms of positive currents, which coincides with that for smooth ones, and prove basic properties of quaternionic m -subharmonic functions. In Section 5, for continuous quaternionic m -subharmonic functions, the locally uniform estimate, i.e. the Chern-Levine-Nirenberg estimate, the existence of m -Hessian measure and the comparison principle are established. We study the relative m -extremal function and quaternionic m -capacity in Section 6, and establish the quasicontinuity of quaternionic m -subharmonic functions, the extension of quaternionic m -Hessian operator to locally bounded quaternionic m -subharmonic functions and the corresponding convergence theorem (the Bedford-Taylor theory) in Section 7. In Section 8 we find the fundamental solution of the m -Hessian operator and define the m -Lelong number for a quaternionic m -subharmonic function.

We use the Sadullaev-Abdullaev approach [25, 26] to m -subharmonic functions and the complex m -Hessian operator, i.e. based on an integral estimate for $\int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ on a domain Ω . While in the classical approach (e.g. [18]), ones usually only use local estimate by using a cut-off function, e. g. in the proof of the Chern-Levine-Nirenberg estimate. We established such integral estimate by using a Stokes-type formula instead of Stokes formula, since our forms are not differential forms. The advantage of this approach is that we can quite quickly to establish necessary estimates and various results.

2. Hyperbolicity of symmetric functions of eigenvalues of a quaternionic hyperhermitian matrix

2.1. Quaternionic hyperhermitian matrix. An $n \times n$ quaternionic matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is called *hyperhermitian* if $A^* = A$, i.e., $a_{ij} = \bar{a}_{ji}$ for all i, j . Denote by \mathcal{H}^n the space of all quaternionic hyperhermitian $n \times n$ matrices, by $GL_{\mathbb{H}}(n)$ the set of all invertible quaternionic $(n \times n)$ -matrices, and by $U_{\mathbb{H}}(n)$ the set of all unitary quaternionic $(n \times n)$ -matrices, i.e. $U_{\mathbb{H}}(n) = \{M \in GL_{\mathbb{H}}(n), M^* M = M M^* = I_n\}$. Let us recall the definition of the Moore determinant [7] for $M = (M_{ij}) \in \mathcal{H}^n$. Write a permutation σ of $(1, \dots, n)$ as a product of disjoint cycles as

$$\sigma = (n_{11} \dots n_{1l_1})(n_{21} \dots n_{2l_2}) \cdots (n_{r1} \dots n_{rl_r}),$$

where for each i , we have $n_{i1} < n_{ij}$ for all $j > 1$, and $n_{11} > \dots > n_{r1}$. Then

$$(2.1) \quad \det M = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{sgn} \sigma M_{n_{11}n_{12}} \cdots M_{n_{1l_1}n_{11}} M_{n_{21}n_{22}} \cdots M_{n_{rl_r}n_{r1}}.$$

Consider the homogeneous polynomial $\det(s_1 M_1 + \dots + s_n M_n)$ in real variables s_1, \dots, s_n of degree n . The coefficient of the monomial $s_1 \cdots s_n$ divided by $n!$ is called the *mixed determinant* of the hyperhermitian matrices M_1, \dots, M_n , and is denoted by $\det(M_1, \dots, M_n)$.

Proposition 2.1. (1) [3, Claim 1.1.4, 1.1.7] *For a hyperhermitian $(n \times n)$ -matrix M , there exists a unitary U such that $U^* M U$ is diagonal and real.*

(2) [3, Theorem 1.1.9] *for any quaternionic hyperhermitian $(n \times n)$ -matrix M and for any quaternionic $(n \times n)$ -matrix C , we have $\det(C^* M C) = \det(M) \det(C^* C)$.*

(3) [3, P. 11] *The mixed determinant is symmetric with respect to all variables, and linear with respect to each of them. In particular, $\det(A, \dots, A) = \det(A)$.*

2.2. Hyperbolic polynomials. Recall Garding's theory of hyperbolic polynomials [14]. Let P be a homogeneous polynomial of degree m in variables $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We say that P is *hyperbolic at* $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$ if the equation $P(sa + x) = 0$ has m real zeros for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The *completely polarized form* of the polynomial P is given by

$$(2.2) \quad M(x^1, \dots, x^m) = \frac{1}{m!} \prod_k \left(\sum_i x_i^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \right) P(x),$$

where $x^k = (x_1^k, \dots, x_N^k)$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Let $C(P, a)$ be the set of all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $P(sa + x) \neq 0$ when $s \geq 0$. If we factorize it as $P(sa + x) = P(a) \prod_1^m (s + \mu_k(a, x))$, for fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, then $x \in C(P, a)$ is equivalent to require

$$(2.3) \quad h(a, x) := \min_k \mu_k(a, x) > 0.$$

The *linearity* LP of P is defined as the set of all x such that $P(sx + y) = P(y)$ for all s and y . The edge ∂C of $C = C(P, a)$ is the set of all x such that $C + x = C$ (cf. [14, P. 962]).

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose a homogeneous polynomial P on \mathbb{R}^N of degree $m > 1$ is hyperbolic at $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$.*

Then (1) [14, Lemma 1] $Q = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k \frac{\partial P}{\partial x_k}$ is hyperbolic at a .

(2) [14, Theorem 2] The function h defined in (2.3) is positive, homogeneous and concave, i.e. $h(a, sx) = sh(a, x)$ for $s \geq 0$ and $h(a, x + y) \geq h(a, x) + h(a, y)$. In particular, $C = C(P, a)$ is convex. Further, P is hyperbolic at any $b \in C$ and $C(P, b) = C(P, a)$.

(3) [14, Theorem 3] $\partial C = LP$ and x belongs to LP if and only if $\mu_1(a, x) = \dots = \mu_m(a, x) = 0$.

Proposition 2.3. [14, Theorem 5] *Let a homogeneous polynomial P of degree $m > 1$ be hyperbolic at $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $P(a) > 0$ and let M be the completely polarized form of P . If $x^1, \dots, x^m \in C(P, a)$, then*

$$(2.4) \quad M(x^1, \dots, x^m) \geq P(x^1)^{\frac{1}{m}} \dots P(x^m)^{\frac{1}{m}}$$

with equality if and only if x^1, \dots, x^m are pairwise proportional modulo LP .

2.3. The hyperbolicity of symmetric functions of eigenvalues of a quaternionic hyperhermitian matrix. Now we apply the above theory of hyperbolic polynomials to symmetric functions of eigenvalues of a quaternionic hyperhermitian matrix. An element $x = (x_{ij}) \in \mathcal{H}^n$ is 1-1 correspondent to a point $(x_{12}, \dots, x_{(n-1)n}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{nn})$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. So we can identify \mathcal{H}^n with \mathbb{R}^N for $N = 2n^2 - n$.

Proposition 2.4. *$P(x) = \det x$ is hyperbolic at I on \mathcal{H}^n , where I is the identity matrix in \mathcal{H}^n .*

Proof. By definition (2.1) of the Moore determinant, we can write $\det x = Q_1(x) + \mathbf{i}Q_2(x) + \mathbf{j}Q_3(x) + \mathbf{k}Q_4(x)$ for some real polynomials Q_1, \dots, Q_4 of degree n . On the other hand by Proposition 2.1 (1), we have $\det x = \prod_k \lambda_k(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda_k(x)$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$) to be eigenvalues of the hyperhermitian matrix x , which are all real. We see that $\det x = Q_1(x)$. So $P(x) = \det x$ is a real polynomial of degree n . It follows from Proposition 2.1 (2) that there exists a unitary matrix U such that $x = U \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) U^*$, and so

$$(2.5) \quad P(sI + x) = \det(sI + \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)) = \prod_1^n (s + \lambda_k).$$

Therefore $P(sI + x)$ has exactly n real zeros, i.e. $P(x) = \det x$ is hyperbolic at I . \square

For $A \in \mathcal{H}^n$, let $\lambda_1(A) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(A)$ be eigenvalues of A and write $\lambda(A) = (\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A))$ as a vector in \mathbb{R}^n . Set

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{H}_m(A) := S_m(\lambda(A)),$$

where

$$(2.7) \quad S_m(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_m \leq n} \lambda_{j_1} \dots \lambda_{j_m},$$

for $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $m = 1, \dots, n$. The function \mathcal{H}_m is determined by

$$(2.8) \quad \det(sI + A) = \prod_{k=1}^n (s + \lambda_k(A)) = \sum_{m=0}^n \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_m \leq n} \lambda_{j_1}(A) \dots \lambda_{j_m}(A) s^{n-m} = \sum_{m=0}^n \mathcal{H}_m(A) s^{n-m}$$

for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, by definition.

Proposition 2.5. $\mathcal{H}_m(A)$ is a polynomial of order m on \mathcal{H}^n and is hyperbolic at I for $m = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.4, $\det(A) = \mathcal{H}_n$ is hyperbolic at I , i.e. $\det(A + sI)$ has n real zeros. If we take $Q(sI + A) = \frac{d}{ds} \det(sI + A)$, the equation $Q(sI + A) = 0$ has $(n - 1)$ real zeros separating those of the equation $\det(sI + A) = 0$ by Rolle's theorem (cf. [14, Lemma 1]). Thus

$$Q(A) = Q(sI + A)|_{s=0} = \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \det(A + sI) = \mathcal{H}_{n-1}(A)$$

by (2.8), and it is hyperbolic at I . The result follows by repeating this procedure. \square

Set

$$(2.9) \quad \Gamma_m := \{A \in \mathcal{H}^n : \mathcal{H}_m(sI + A) > 0 \text{ for any } s \geq 0\}.$$

By definition, $\mathcal{H}_m(sI + A) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq n} (s + \lambda_{i_1}) \dots (s + \lambda_{i_m}) > 0$ for large s . Then by the continuity of \mathcal{H}_m , we see that $\mathcal{H}_m(sI + A) \neq 0$ for any $s \geq 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}_m(sI + A) > 0$ for any $s \geq 0$, and so $C(\mathcal{H}_m, I) = \Gamma_m$ by definition of the cone $C(\mathcal{H}_m, I)$.

Corollary 2.1. *We have*

$$(2.10) \quad \Gamma_m = \{\mathcal{H}_1(A) > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{\mathcal{H}_m(A) > 0\}.$$

Proof. It follows from (2.6) that

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{H}_m(sI + A) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq n} (s + \lambda_{i_1}) \dots (s + \lambda_{i_m}) = \sum_{p=0}^m \binom{n-p}{m-p} \mathcal{H}_p(A) s^{m-p}.$$

Since \mathcal{H}_m is hyperbolic at I , for given $A \in \Gamma_m$, there exist m positive number μ_1, \dots, μ_m such that

$$\mathcal{H}_m(sI + A) = \binom{n}{m} \prod_{j=1}^m (s + \mu_j) = \binom{n}{m} \sum_{p=0}^m \left(\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_p \leq m} \mu_{i_1} \dots \mu_{i_p} \right) s^{m-p}.$$

So $\mathcal{H}_p(A) = \binom{n}{m} \binom{n-p}{m-p}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_p \leq m} \mu_{i_1} \dots \mu_{i_p} > 0$ for $p = 1, \dots, m$. \square

Corollary 2.2. *If $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \Gamma_m$, then*

$$(2.12) \quad \binom{n}{m} \det(A_1, \dots, A_m, I, \dots, I) \geq \mathcal{H}_m(A_1)^{\frac{1}{m}} \dots \mathcal{H}_m(A_m)^{\frac{1}{m}}.$$

Proof. Apply Proposition 2.3 to $P = \mathcal{H}_m$ to get

$$M(A_1, \dots, A_m) \geq \mathcal{H}_m^{\frac{1}{m}}(A_1) \dots \mathcal{H}_m^{\frac{1}{m}}(A_m),$$

where M is the completely polarized form of \mathcal{H}_m . Recall that the completely polarized form M of a hyperbolic polynomial P is a polynomial uniquely determined by being linear in each argument, invariant under permutations and satisfying $M(x, \dots, x) = P(x)$ [14]. But $\det(A_1, \dots, A_m, I, \dots, I)$ is linear in A_1, \dots, A_m , and invariant under permutations, and $\det(A, \dots, A, I, \dots, I) = \mathcal{H}_m(A) / \binom{n}{m}$ (cf. (3.16)). Therefore,

$$(2.13) \quad M(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \binom{n}{m} \det(A_1, \dots, A_m, I, \dots, I).$$

The result follows. \square

3. THE QUATERNIONIC m -HESSIAN OPERATOR

Alesker introduced the quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator in [3]. For a point $q = (q_0 \dots q_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{H}^n$, write $q_l = x_{4l} + x_{4l+1}\mathbf{i} + x_{4l+2}\mathbf{j} + x_{4l+3}\mathbf{k}$, $l = 0, \dots, n-1$. The *Cauchy-Fueter operator* is

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{q}_l} = \partial_{x_{4l}} + \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_{4l+1}} + \mathbf{j}\partial_{x_{4l+2}} + \mathbf{k}\partial_{x_{4l+3}},$$

and its conjugate $\frac{\partial u}{\partial q_l} = \partial_{x_{4l}} - \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_{4l+1}} - \mathbf{j}\partial_{x_{4l+2}} - \mathbf{k}\partial_{x_{4l+3}}$. For a C^2 function u , the *quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator* on \mathbb{H}^n is defined as the Moore determinant of its quaternionic Hessian

$$(3.2) \quad \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{q}_l \partial q_k} \right),$$

while the *quaternionic m -Hessian operator* $\mathcal{H}_m(u)$ is defined as

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{H}_m(u) := \mathcal{H}_m \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{q}_l \partial q_k} \right).$$

Let us recall that two first-order differential operator d_0 and d_1 , introduced in [31], act on the quaternionic version of differential form. The behavior of d_0 and d_1 and $\Delta = d_0 d_1$ is very similar to $\partial, \bar{\partial}$ and $\partial \bar{\partial}$ in several complex variables. This formulation of the quaternionic m -Hessian operator is fundamental here in the sense that we can use Stokes-type formula, etc.

3.1. Positive forms. Fix a basis $\{\omega^0, \omega^1, \dots, \omega^{2n-1}\}$ of \mathbb{C}^{2n} . Let $\wedge^{2k} \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ be the complex exterior algebra generated by \mathbb{C}^{2n} , $0 \leq k \leq n$. Recall the embedding $\tau : M_{\mathbb{H}}(p, r) \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{C}}(2p, 2r)$ as follows, where $M_{\mathbb{F}}(p, r)$ is the space of all $p \times r$ -matrices over field \mathbb{F} . For a quaternionic $(p \times r)$ -matrice M , write $\mathcal{M} = a + b\mathbf{j}$ for some complex matrices $a, b \in M_{\mathbb{C}}(p, r)$. Then

$$(3.4) \quad \tau(M) := \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ \bar{b} & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}$$

(cf. [33]). We will notations in [33], as the relabelling of those in [31], which have advantages in the proof of some properties of quaternionic linear algebra.

For $M \in M_{\mathbb{C}}(2n, 2n)$, define its \mathbb{C} -linear action on \mathbb{C}^{2n} as [33]: $M.\omega^A = \sum_{B=0}^{2n-1} M_{AB}\omega^B$, and the induced action on $\wedge^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ as $M.(\omega^{A_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega^{A_{2k}}) = M.\omega^{A_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge M.\omega^{A_{2k}}$. For $M \in M_{\mathbb{H}}(n, n)$, defines its induced \mathbb{C} -linear action on \mathbb{C}^{2n} as $M.\omega^A = \tau(M).\omega^A$, and so on $\wedge^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$. Then for $M \in U_{\mathbb{H}}(n)$, $M.\beta_n = \beta_n$ and $M.\Omega_{2n} = \Omega_{2n}$, where

$$(3.5) \quad \beta_n = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \omega^l \wedge \omega^{n+l}, \quad \beta_n^n = \wedge^n \beta_n = n! \Omega_{2n},$$

where $\Omega_{2n} := \omega^0 \wedge \omega^n \cdots \wedge \omega^{n-1} \wedge \omega^{2n-1}$.

There exists a real linear action $\rho(\mathbf{j})$ on \mathbb{C}^{2n} [31]:

$$(3.6) \quad \rho(\mathbf{j}) : \mathbb{C}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2n}, \quad \rho(\mathbf{j})(z\omega^k) = \bar{z}J.\omega^k, \quad \text{where} \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ -I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

An element ω of $\wedge^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is called *real* if $\rho(\mathbf{j})\omega = \omega$. Denote by $\wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ the subspace of all real elements in $\wedge^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$, which is the counterpart of (k, k) -forms in complex analysis.

An element ω of $\wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^{2n}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is called *positive* if $\omega = \kappa\Omega_{2n}$ for some non-negative number κ . An element $\omega \in \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is said to be *elementary strongly positive* if there exist linearly independent right \mathbb{H} -linear mappings $\eta_j : \mathbb{H}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, such that

$$(3.7) \quad \omega = \eta_1^* \tilde{\omega}^0 \wedge \eta_1^* \tilde{\omega}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \eta_k^* \tilde{\omega}^0 \wedge \eta_k^* \tilde{\omega}^1,$$

where $\{\tilde{\omega}^0, \tilde{\omega}^1\}$ is a basis of \mathbb{C}^2 and $\eta_j^* : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is the induced \mathbb{C} -linear pulling back transformation of η_j . An element $\omega \in \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is called *strongly positive* if it belongs to the convex cone $SP^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ in $\wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ generated by elementary strongly positive elements. An $2k$ -element ω is said to be *positive* if for any elementary strongly positive element $\eta \in SP^{2n-2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$, $\omega \wedge \eta$ is positive. By definition, β_n is a strongly positive 2-form, and β_n^n is a positive $2n$ -form.

Proposition 3.1. [33, Theorem 1.1] (1) For a complex skew symmetric matrix $M = (M_{AB}) \in M_{\mathbb{C}}(2n, 2n)$, the 2-form $\omega = \sum_{A,B=0}^{2n-1} M_{AB} \omega^A \wedge \omega^B$ is real if and only if there exists a hyperhermitian $n \times n$ -matrix $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}_{jk})$, such that $M = \tau(\mathcal{M})J$.

(2) When ω is real, there exists a quaternionic unitary matrix $\mathcal{E} \in U_{\mathbb{H}}(n)$ such that

$$\tau(\mathcal{E})^t M \tau(\mathcal{E}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{V} \\ -\mathcal{V} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{V} = \text{diag}(\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1}),$$

for some real numbers ν_0, \dots, ν_{n-1} . Namely, we can normalize ω as $\omega = 2 \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \nu_l \tilde{\omega}^l \wedge \tilde{\omega}^{l+n}$ with $\tilde{\omega}^A = \mathcal{E}^*.\omega^A$. In particular, ω is (strongly) positive if and only if each $\nu_l \geq 0$ (> 0).

Proposition 3.2. [30, Lemma 3.3] For $\eta \in \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ with $\|\eta\| \leq 1$, $\beta_n^k \pm \epsilon\eta$ is positive $2k$ -form for some sufficiently small absolute constant $\epsilon > 0$.

3.2. d_0, d_1 formulation of the quaternionic m -Hessian operator. We express the quaternionic m -Hessian operator in terms of d_1, d_1 . Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{H}^n . Denoted by $\mathcal{D}^p(\Omega)$ the set of all $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ functions valued in $\wedge^p\mathbb{C}^{2n}$. $F \in \mathcal{D}^{2k}(\Omega)$ is called a (strongly) positive form if for any $q \in \Omega$, $F(q)$ is a (strongly) positive element. Define $d_0, d_1 : C^1(\Omega, \wedge^p\mathbb{C}^{2n}) \rightarrow C(\Omega, \wedge^{p+1}\mathbb{C}^{2n})$ by

$$(3.8) \quad d_\alpha F = \sum_I \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \nabla_{A\alpha} f_I \omega^A \wedge \omega^I,$$

for $F = \sum_I f_I \omega^I \in C^1(\Omega, \wedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, where the multi-index $I = (i_1 \dots i_p)$, $\omega^I = \omega^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega^{i_p}$, and the first-order differential operators $\nabla_{A\alpha}$ ($A = 0, \dots, 2n-1$, $\alpha = 0, 1$) are

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{00} & \nabla_{01} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \nabla_{l0} & \nabla_{l1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \nabla_{n0} & \nabla_{n1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \nabla_{(n+l)0} & \nabla_{(n+l)1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_0} + \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_1} & -\partial_{x_2} - \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_3} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \partial_{x_{4l}} + \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_{4l+1}} & -\partial_{x_{4l+2}} - \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_{4l+3}} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \partial_{x_2} - \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_3} & \partial_{x_0} - \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \partial_{x_{4l+2}} - \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_{4l+3}} & \partial_{x_{4l}} - \mathbf{i}\partial_{x_{4l+1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 3.3. [31, Proposition 2.2] (1) $d_0 d_1 = -d_1 d_0$;

(2) $d_0^2 = d_1^2 = 0$;

(3) For $F \in C^1(\Omega, \wedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, $G \in C^1(\Omega, \wedge^q \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, we have

$$d_\alpha(F \wedge G) = d_\alpha F \wedge G + (-1)^p F \wedge d_\alpha G, \quad \alpha = 0, 1.$$

The following nice identity will be frequently used.

Proposition 3.4. [31, Proposition 2.3] For $u_1, \dots, u_n \in C^2$,

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n &= d_0(d_1 u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n) = -d_1(d_0 u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n) \\ &= d_0 d_1(u_1 \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n) = \Delta(u_1 \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\int_\Omega F = \int_\Omega f dV,$$

if $F = f \Omega_{2n} \in L^1(\Omega, \wedge^{2n} \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, where dV is the Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 3.1. [31, Lemma 3.2] (Stokes-type formula) Assume that $T = \sum_A T_A \omega^{\hat{A}}$ is a C^1 $(2n-1)$ -form in Ω , where $\omega^{\hat{A}} = \omega^A \lrcorner \Omega_{2n} := (-1)^{A-1} \omega^0 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega^{A-1} \wedge \omega^{A+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega^{2n-1}$. Then for a C^1 function h , we have

$$(3.11) \quad \int_\Omega h d_\alpha T = - \int_\Omega d_\alpha h \wedge T + \int_{\partial\Omega} \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} h T_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A\alpha} dS, \quad \alpha = 0, 1,$$

where $\mathbf{n} := (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{4n-1})$ is the unit outer normal vector to $\partial\Omega$, dS denotes the surface measure of $\partial\Omega$, and $\tau(\mathbf{n})$ is a complex $(2n) \times 2$ -matrix by definition (3.4) of τ . In particular, if $h = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, (3.11) has no boundary term.

Recall the Baston operator $\Delta u := d_0 d_1 u$ for a real C^2 function u .

Proposition 3.5. [31, Theorem 1.3] Let u_1, \dots, u_n be real C^2 functions on \mathbb{H}^n . Then we have

$$(3.12) \quad \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n = n! \det(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) \Omega_{2n}.$$

where $A_j = \left(\frac{\partial^2 u_j}{\partial \bar{q}_i \partial q_k}(q) \right)$.

Proposition 3.6.

$$(3.13) \quad (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = m!(n-m)! \mathcal{H}_m(u) \Omega_{2n}.$$

Proof. Apply Proposition 3.5 to $u_1 = \dots = u_m = u$ and $u_{m+1} = \dots = u_n = \|q\|^2$ to get

$$(3.14) \quad 8^{n-m}(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = n! \det(A, \dots, A, 8I, \dots, 8I) \Omega_{2n},$$

where $A = \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{q}_l \partial q_k}(q) \right)$, and

$$(3.15) \quad \Delta \|q\|^2 = d_0 d_1 \|q\|^2 = 8\beta_n.$$

By definition, the coefficient of the monomial $s_1 \dots s_n$ of $\det(s_1 A + \dots + s_m A + 8s_{m+1} I + \dots + 8s_n I)$ divided by $n!$ is the $\det(A, \dots, A, 8I, \dots, 8I)$. On the other hand, we can find a quaternionic unitary matrix $\mathcal{U} \in U_{\mathbb{H}}(n)$ such that $\mathcal{U}^* A \mathcal{U} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Now apply Proposition 2.1 to get

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \det \left(\sum_{j=1}^m s_j A + 8 \sum_{j=m+1}^n s_j I \right) &= \det \left(\mathcal{U}^* \left(\sum_{j=1}^m s_j A + 8 \sum_{j=m+1}^n s_j I \right) \mathcal{U} \right) \\ &= \det \left(\sum_{j=1}^m s_j \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) + 8 \sum_{j=m+1}^n s_j I \right) \\ &= \prod_{p=1}^n \left(\lambda_p \sum_{j=1}^m s_j + 8 \sum_{j=m+1}^n s_j \right), \end{aligned}$$

whose coefficient of $s_1 \dots s_n$ is $8^{n-m} m! (n-m)! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq n} \lambda_{i_1} \dots \lambda_{i_m}$. Therefore

$$(3.17) \quad (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = m! (n-m)! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq n} \lambda_{i_1} \dots \lambda_{i_m} \Omega_{2n}.$$

The result follows. \square

We also need the following elementary strong positivity (cf., e.g. [35, Proposition 4.2]).

Proposition 3.7. *For any C^1 real function u , $d_0 u \wedge d_1 u$ is elementary strongly positive if $\text{grad } u \neq 0$.*

4. Quaternionic m -subharmonic functions

4.1. Smooth quaternionic m -subharmonic function. A real C^2 functions u is said to be *quaternionic m -subharmonic* on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ if

$$(4.1) \quad \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{q}_l \partial q_k} \right) (q) \in \bar{\Gamma}_m$$

for any $q \in \Omega$. It follow from Corollary 2.1 and Proposition 3.6 that it is equivalent to require

$$(4.2) \quad (\Delta u)^k \wedge \beta_n^{n-k} \geq 0, \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Proposition 4.1. *If u_1, \dots, u_k are C^2 quaternionic m -subharmonic functions, $1 \leq k \leq m$, then $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq 0$.*

Proof. Since $u_1, \dots, u_m \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega)$, $A_1 = \left(\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial \bar{q}_l \partial q_k} \right), \dots, A_m = \left(\frac{\partial^2 u_m}{\partial \bar{q}_l \partial q_k} \right) \in \bar{\Gamma}_m$. Then we have

$$\binom{n}{m} \det(A_1, \dots, A_m, I, \dots, I) \geq \mathcal{H}_m(A_1)^{\frac{1}{m}} \dots \mathcal{H}_m(A_m)^{\frac{1}{m}} \geq 0$$

by Garding's inequality in Corollary 2.2. Then, by Proposition 3.5, we get

$$\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = n! \det(A_1, \dots, A_m, I, \dots, I) \Omega_{2n} \geq 0.$$

For $k < m$, it is sufficient to prove that

$$(4.3) \quad \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \geq 0.$$

for any elementary strongly positive $2(m-k)$ -element $\omega = \eta_1^* \tilde{\omega}^0 \wedge \eta_1^* \tilde{\omega}^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \eta_{m-k}^* \tilde{\omega}^0 \wedge \eta_{m-k}^* \tilde{\omega}^1$, where $\eta_j : \mathbb{H}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{H}, j = 1, \dots, m-k$, are linearly independent right \mathbb{H} -linear mappings and $\{\tilde{\omega}^0, \tilde{\omega}^1\}$ is a basis of \mathbb{C}^2 . Since $\Delta \|\tilde{q}_0\|^2 = 8\tilde{\omega}^0 \wedge \tilde{\omega}^1$ and $\eta_j^*(\Delta \|\tilde{q}_0\|^2) = \Delta(\|\eta_j(q)\|^2)$. So (4.3) is proved by $\eta_j(q) \in QPSH \subset QSH_m(\Omega)$ and the case $k = m$ in (4.1). \square

4.2. Closed positive currents. To define nonsmooth quaternionic m -subharmonic functions, we need to use currents. An element of the dual space $(\mathcal{D}^{2n-p}(\Omega))'$ is called a p -current. Obviously $2n$ -currents are just distributions on Ω . A $2k$ -current T is said to be *positive* if we have $T(\eta) \geq 0$ for any strongly positive form $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{2n-2k}(\Omega)$. Let ψ be a p -form whose coefficients are locally integrable in Ω . One can associate with ψ the p -current T_ψ defined by $T_\psi(\varphi) = \int_\Omega \psi \wedge \varphi$ for $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{2n-p}(\Omega)$.

Now for a p -current F , we define the $(p+1)$ -current $d_\alpha F$ as

$$(d_\alpha F)(\eta) := -F(d_\alpha \eta), \quad \alpha = 0, 1,$$

for any test form $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{2n-p-1}(\Omega)$. We say a form (or a current) F is *closed* if $d_0 F = d_1 F = 0$.

If a p -current T has a continuous extension to the space of $(2n-p)$ -forms with continuous coefficients, it is called a p -current of *order zero* or *of measure type*. A p -current T is of measure type if and only if for any neighborhood $G \Subset \Omega$, there exists a constant K_G such that $|T(\alpha)| \leq K_G \|\alpha\|_G$, where $\|\alpha\|_G = \sum_I' \max_{q \in G} |\alpha_I(q)|$ for $\alpha = \sum_{|I|=2n-p} \alpha_I \omega^I$. Here the summation \sum' is taken over increasing indices of length $2n-p$.

Denote by $\mathcal{M}^p(\Omega)$ the set of all p -currents of measure type, and it is identified with \wedge^p -valued Radon measures on Ω . A sequence of currents $T_j \in \mathcal{M}^p(\Omega)$ *weakly * converges* to T if $T_j(\alpha) \rightarrow T(\alpha)$ for any $(2n-p)$ -forms with continuous coefficients. A family of currents $T_\kappa \in \mathcal{M}^p(\Omega)$ is *weakly * compact* (or *locally uniformly bounded*) if and only if for any domain $G \Subset \Omega$ there is a constant K_G depending only on G such that

$$(4.4) \quad |T_\kappa(\alpha)| \leq K_G \|\alpha\|_G.$$

4.3. Non-smooth quaternionic m -subharmonic functions. A $[-\infty, \infty)$ -valued upper semicontinuous function $u \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ is called *quaternionic m -subharmonic*, if for any C^4 quaternionic m -subharmonic functions v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} on Ω , the current $\Delta u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ defined by

$$(4.5) \quad \Delta u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}(\omega) = \int_\Omega u \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega, \quad \text{for any } \omega \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

is nonnegative. The set of quaternionic m -subharmonic functions on Ω is denoted by $QSH_m(\Omega)$.

Proposition 4.2. *A function $u \in C^2(\Omega)$ is quaternionic m -subharmonic in the above sense if and only if (4.1) holds for any $q \in \Omega$.*

Proof. For a function $u \in C^4(\Omega)$,

$$(4.6) \quad \int_\Omega u \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega = \int_\Omega \omega \Delta u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$$

by applying Stokes-type formula (3.11) twice, since integrands vanish on the boundary. By continuity, (4.6) is nonnegative for any nonnegative ω if and only if $\Delta u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ is positive at each $q \in \Omega$. So in this case, the definition (4.5) is equivalent to require v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} only to be quadratic QSH_m polynomials.

Sufficiency. By Proposition 4.1, $\Delta u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ in (4.5) is a positive form if the positivity in (4.1) holds for u .

Necessity. We prove it by induction on dimension n of the space and the number m . Suppose that we have proved the result for dimension less than n and $m-1$ on dimension n . Now by rotation if necessary, we can assume that $\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{q}_i \partial q_k}\right)(q_0)$ is diagonalized with eigenvalues $\lambda_1(q_0) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n(q_0)$. Hence $\lambda_n(q_0) \geq 0$ and

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{H}_m(u)(q_0) = \lambda_n(q_0) \sum_{1 \leq j_2 < \cdots < j_m \leq n-1} \lambda_{j_1}(q_0) \cdots \lambda_{j_m-1}(q_0) + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_m \leq n-1} \lambda_{j_1}(q_0) \cdots \lambda_{j_m}(q_0).$$

If we take $\Delta v_{m-1} = \omega^{n-1} \wedge \omega^{2n-1}$, i.e. $v_{m-1} = |q_n|^2$. Then the positivity of $\Delta u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ at point q_0 implies that

$$\Delta' u(q_0) \wedge \Delta' v_1(q_0) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta' v_{m-2}(q_0) \wedge \beta_{n-1}^{n-m}$$

is a positive element on \mathbb{H}^{n-1} , where Δ' is the Baston operator on \mathbb{H}^{n-1} . By the assumption of induction for dimension $n-1$, we see that $\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{q}_i \partial q_k}(q_0)\right)_{1 \leq j, k \leq n-1}$ belongs to $\bar{\Gamma}_{m-1}$. Thus, the second sum in (4.7) is non negative. The first sum in (4.7) is also non negative by the assumption of induction for $m-1$ in dimension n . \square

Proposition 4.3. *Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{H}^n . Then,*

- (1) *The standard approximation $u_\epsilon = u * \chi_\epsilon$ is also a QSH_m function, and satisfies $u_\epsilon \downarrow u$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$.*
- (2) *$QPSH = QSH_n \subset \cdots \subset QSH_1 = SH$.*
- (3) *$au + bv \in QSH_m(\Omega)$ for any $a, b \geq 0$.*
- (4) *If $\gamma(t)$ is a convex increasing function on \mathbb{R} and $u \in QSH_m$, then $\gamma \circ u \in QSH_m$.*
- (5) *The limit of a uniformly converging or decreasing sequence of QSH_m functions is a QSH_m function.*
- (6) *The maximum of a finite number of QSH_m functions is a QSH_m function; for an arbitrary locally uniformly bounded family $\{u_\alpha\} \subset QSH_m$, the regularization $u^*(q)$ of the supremum $u(q) = \sup_\alpha u_\alpha(q)$ is also a QSH_m function.*
- (7) *If D is an open subset of Ω , $u \in QSH_m(\Omega)$, $v \in QSH_m(D)$ and $\limsup_{q \rightarrow q_0} v(q) \leq u(q_0)$ for all $q_0 \in \partial D \cap \Omega$, then the function defined by*

$$(4.8) \quad \phi = \begin{cases} u, & \text{on } \Omega \setminus D, \\ \max\{u, v\}, & \text{on } D, \end{cases}$$

belongs to $QSH_m(\Omega)$.

Proof. Because there is no characterization of m -subharmonicity by the submean value inequality, the proof is different from that for plurisubharmonic functions.

- (1) For any $C^4(\Omega) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$ functions v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} and nonnegative function $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, it is direct to see that if $\epsilon > 0$ small,

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \Delta u_\epsilon(x) \wedge \Delta v_1(x) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1}(x) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega(x) \\ &= \int_{B(0, \epsilon)} \chi_\epsilon(y) dV(y) \int_{\Omega} u(z) \Delta v_1(z+y) \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1}(z+y) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega(z+y) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by (4.5) for u with $\omega(\cdot)$ replaced by $\omega(\cdot + y)$ and v_j replaced by $v_j(\cdot + y)$. Thus u_ϵ is QSH_m .

For $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} \in C^4(\Omega) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$, denote

$$(4.10) \quad \alpha := \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

Then the linear operator \mathcal{A}_α defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha(u) \cdot \Omega_{2n} = \Delta u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$$

is a differential operator of the second order with C^2 coefficients, whose symbol $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_\alpha)(\xi; q)$ at point q and direction $0 \neq \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{4n}$ is given by

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A}_\alpha)(\xi; q) \Omega_{2n} = d_0 |\xi|^2 \wedge d_1 |\xi|^2 \wedge \omega_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq 0$$

where $\omega_j = \Delta v_j(q)$, and $d_0 |\xi|^2 \wedge d_1 |\xi|^2$ is elementary strongly positive by Proposition 3.7. Without loss of generality, we may assume the it is strictly positive, i.e. \mathcal{A}_α is a uniform elliptic operator. Otherwise, we replaced $v_j(q)$ by $v_j(q) + \varepsilon |q|^2$. It is also an operator of divergence form, which can be proved by $\mathcal{A}_\alpha(u) \cdot \Omega_{2n} = d_0 (d_1 u \wedge \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m})$ by Proposition 3.4.

Now the positivity of (4.5) is equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_\alpha u \geq 0$ in the sense of distributions, i.e. u is \mathcal{A}_α -subharmonic. It is well known \mathcal{A}_α -subharmonicity can be characterized as the maximum principle, i.e. for every domain $G \Subset \Omega$, if $v \in C(\overline{G})$ satisfies $\mathcal{A}_\alpha v = 0$ and $u \leq v$ on ∂G , then $u \leq v$ in G .

All other properties can be proved by using this characterization and well known corresponding properties for \mathcal{A}_α -subharmonic functions (cf. e.g. [16]), since \mathcal{A}_α is an elliptic differential operator of the second order with C^2 coefficients and of divergence form.

For example, for $u \in QSH_m(\Omega)$ and $v \in QSH_m(D)$, they are \mathcal{A}_α -subharmonic on Ω and D , respectively. Then the function ϕ in (4.8) is also \mathcal{A}_α -subharmonic on Ω for any $\alpha := \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ with $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} \in C^4(\Omega) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$. Thus (4.6) is nonnegative for any nonnegative ω .

If \mathcal{A}_α is not uniformly elliptic, we use $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$, where α_ε is the α in (4.10) with $v_j(q)$ replaced by $v_j(q) + \varepsilon |q|^2$. Since $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ is uniformly elliptic, $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \phi \geq 0$ in the sense of distributions. Then $\mathcal{A}_\alpha \phi \geq 0$ by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus, ϕ belongs to $QSH_m(\Omega)$ by definition. \square

Remark 4.1. (1) In the definition of QSH_m , we require $v_j \in C^4$ instead of the usual condition $v_j \in C^2$ in order to make \mathcal{A}_α of C^2 coefficients.

(2) In the complex case, the proof of these properties were only sketched in [25], as far as I know, by using integral representation formula of solutions to the operator \mathcal{A}_α . But there is also the degenerate problem there.

A set $E \subset \Omega$ is said to be *quaternionic m -polar* in Ω , if there exists a function $u \in QSH_m(\Omega)$ such that $u \not\equiv -\infty$ and $u|_E \equiv -\infty$.

5. QUATERNIONIC m -HESSIAN MEASURE AND THE COMPARISON PRINCIPLE

5.1. Quaternionic m -Hessian measure. We need the following coarea formula.

Proposition 5.1. [21, Theorem 1.2.4] *For a measurable nonnegative function Φ on an open subset Ω of \mathbb{R}^N and $f \in C^{0,1}(\Omega)$, we have*

$$(5.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} \Phi(x) |\text{grad } f(x)| dV(x) = \int_0^\infty ds \int_{\Omega \cap \{|f|=s\}} \Phi(x) dS(x),$$

where dS is the $(N-1)$ -dimension Hausdorff measure $d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$, which equals to the surface measure if the surface is smooth.

A domain Ω is called *m -hyperconvex* if there exists a continuous function $\varrho \in QSH_m(\Omega)$ such that $\varrho < 0$ in Ω and $\lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} \varrho(q) = 0$, i.e. $\{\varrho(q) < c\}$ is relatively compact in Ω for any $c < 0$. It is called *strongly m -hyperconvex* if $\varrho \in QSH_m(G)$ for some open set $G \ni \Omega$. We need the following key

integral estimate. See Sadullaev-Abdullaev [24, Theorem 16.2] for plurisubharmonic functions and [25] for m -subharmonic functions on a ball.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\Omega = \{\varrho < 0\}$ be a m -hyperconvex domain with $\varrho \in C^2(\Omega)$, $\sigma = \min_{\Omega} \varrho$. For $u_1 \cdots u_k \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$, $k = 0, \dots, m$, and any $\sigma < r < 0$,*

$$(5.2) \quad \int_{\sigma}^r dt \int_{\varrho \leq t} (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k} \wedge \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \leq (M - M') \int_{\varrho \leq r} (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k+1} \wedge \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1},$$

where $M = \max_{\varrho \leq r} \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$, $M' = \min_{\varrho \leq r} \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$. In particular, if $u_k|_{\varrho=r} = 0$, we have

$$(5.3) \quad \int_{\sigma}^r dt \int_{\varrho \leq t} (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k} \wedge \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k = - \int_{\varrho \leq r} u_k (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k+1} \wedge \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}.$$

We first prove the result under the C^2 assumption.

Lemma 5.1. *Theorem 5.1 holds for $u \in QSH_m(B) \cap C^2(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Note that $\mathbf{n} = \text{grad } \varrho / |\text{grad } \varrho|$ and so $\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A\alpha} = \nabla_{A\alpha} \varrho / |\text{grad } \varrho|$. Denote $\Theta := \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}$. Apply Proposition 3.4, Stokes-type formula (3.11) and the coarea formula (5.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sigma}^r dt \int_{\varrho \leq t} (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k} \wedge \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k &= \int_{\sigma}^r dt \int_{\varrho \leq t} d_0 (d_1 u_k \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k} \wedge (\Delta u)^{k-1}) \\ &= \int_{\sigma}^r dt \int_{\varrho=t} \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} (d_1 u_k \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k})_A \frac{\nabla_{A0} \varrho dS}{|\text{grad } \varrho|} \\ &= \int_{\varrho \leq r} \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} (d_1 u_k \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k})_A \nabla_{A0} \varrho dV \\ &= - \int_{\varrho \leq r} d_1 u_k \wedge d_0 \varrho \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k} \\ &= - \int_{\varrho=r} u_k \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} (d_0 \varrho \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k})_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A1} dS \\ &\quad - \int_{\varrho \leq r} u_k \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k+1} := I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

In the forth identity, we have used

$$(5.4) \quad \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \nabla_{A\alpha} \varrho (d_1 u_k \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k})_A \Omega_{2n} = d_{\alpha} \varrho \wedge d_1 u_k \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k},$$

since $d_{\alpha} \varrho = \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \nabla_{A\alpha} \varrho \omega^A$. But

$$- \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A1} (d_0 \varrho \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k})_A \Omega_{2n} = d_0 \varrho \wedge d_1 \varrho \wedge \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k} / |\text{grad } \varrho|$$

is nonnegative by using Proposition 3.7 and 4.1. So we have

$$I_1 \leq -M \int_{\varrho=r} \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} (d_0 \varrho \wedge \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k})_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A1} dS = M \int_{\varrho \leq r} \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k},$$

and

$$I_2 \leq -M' \int_{\varrho \leq r} \Theta \wedge (\Delta \varrho)^{n-k+1}.$$

The estimate follows. If $u_k|_{\varrho=r} = 0$, we get $I_1 = 0$. \square

Applying (5.2) to the ball $B = B(0, 1)$ with $\varrho(q) = |q|^2 - 1$ repeatedly, we get

$$\int_0^1 dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} dt_k \int_{|q|^2 \leq t_k} \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-k} \leq (M - M')^k \int_{|q|^2 \leq 1} \beta_n^n = C(M - M')^k,$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$. On the other hand, for a fixed $0 < r < 1$, the left hand side above can be estimated from below as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 dt_1 \cdots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} dt_k \int_{|q|^2 \leq t_k} \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-k} \\ & \geq \int_r^1 dt_1 \cdots \int_r^{t_{k-1}} dt_k \int_{|q|^2 \leq r} \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-k} = \frac{(1-r)^k}{k!} \int_{|q|^2 \leq r} \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-k}. \end{aligned}$$

So we get

$$\int_{|q|^2 \leq r} \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-k} \leq \frac{Ck!(M - M')^k}{(1-r)^k},$$

which implies the local *Chern-Levine-Nirenberg estimate* for $QSH_m \cap C^2$ functions.

Corollary 5.1. *In the function class $L_M = \{u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega) : |u| \leq M\}$, the integrals $\int_K \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-k}$ are uniformly bounded for any compact subset K , $k = 1, \dots, m$.*

Theorem 5.2. *For $u_1, \dots, u_m \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$, the recurrence relation*

$$(5.5) \quad \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}(\omega) = \int u_k \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega, \quad k = 1, \dots, m,$$

for $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{2m-2k}(\Omega)$, defines a closed positive current.

Moreover, the following weak $*$ convergence of currents of measure type holds for the standard approximations $u_j^t \downarrow u_j$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$) as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(5.6) \quad \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \rightarrow \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

Proof. The closedness follows from definition. For $k = 1$, the left hand side of (5.5) is the Laplace operator. The result holds.

Suppose that the result holds for $k - 1$. Then $\Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ is a closed positive current of measure type. Thus the right hand side of (5.5) is well defined, and defines a linear continuous functional on $\mathcal{D}^{2m-2k}(\Omega)$.

To show the positivity of this current, note that the standard approximations u_j^t locally uniformly converges to u_j . Thus, for a strongly positive form $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{2m-2k}(\Omega)$, by the convergence (5.6) of currents of measure type for $k - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}(\omega) &= \int u_k \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int u_k \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int u_k^s \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega, \end{aligned}$$

which is nonnegative since

$$\int u_k^s \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega = \int \Delta u_k^s \wedge \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \geq 0,$$

by applying Stokes-type formula (3.11) twice. Now write $u_k^t(q) = u_k(q) + \varepsilon_k^t(q)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega &= \int u_k^t \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega \\ &= \int u_k \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega + \int \varepsilon_k^t(q) \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega \\ &\rightarrow \int u_k \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega = \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

by the inductive hypothesis (5.6) for $k-1$ for the limit and $\varepsilon_k^t \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on $\text{supp } \omega$. Thus $\int \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \rightarrow \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}(\omega)$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{2m-2k}(\Omega)$. By Proposition 3.2 and locally uniform boundedness of vector measures in Corollary 5.1, we get

$$\left| \int_K \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \right| \leq C_1 \|\omega\|_{C(\Omega)} \int_K \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-k} \leq CC_1 \|\omega\|_{C(\Omega)}$$

where $K \supset \text{supp } \omega$, $C_1, C > 0$ are absolute constants depending on K . We get the convergence for $(2m-2k)$ -forms ω with continuous coefficients. Thus, (5.5) defines a current of measure type. \square

The measure $\Delta u^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u^k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ in Theorem 5.2 is called the *quaternionic m -Hessian measure*.

Now the estimate in Theorem 5.1 follows from Lemma 5.1 by using Theorem 5.2, and the following proposition also follows from Corollary 5.1 by using Theorem 5.2.

Proposition 5.2. *In the function class $L_M = \{u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega) : |u| \leq M\}$, the families of closed positive currents $\Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ of measure type are locally uniformly bounded.*

Proposition 5.3. *If $u, v \in C(\Omega) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$, then $(\Delta(u+v))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} + (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$.*

Proof. Note that if $u, v \in C^2(\Omega) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$, we have $(\Delta u)^i \wedge (\Delta v)^{m-i} \wedge \beta_n^m$ is positive by Proposition 4.1. So

$$\begin{aligned} (5.7) \quad (\Delta(u+v))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} &= (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} + (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} + \sum_{p=1}^{m-1} \binom{m}{p} (\Delta u)^p \wedge (\Delta v)^{m-p} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \\ &\geq (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} + (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}. \end{aligned}$$

If u, v is only continuous, apply the above inequality to their standard approximation u_ϵ, v_ϵ . Since u_ϵ, v_ϵ are smooth, and $u_\epsilon \downarrow u, u_\epsilon \downarrow v, u_\epsilon + v_\epsilon \downarrow u + v$ locally uniformly. So by Theorem 5.2, we obtain the result by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

It similar to Proposition 5.2 to establish the following proposition. We omit details.

Proposition 5.4. *In the function class $L_M = \{u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega) : |u| \leq M\}$, the families of closed positive currents $d_0 u_1 \wedge d_1 u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ of measure type are locally uniformly bounded.*

5.2. The comparison principle.

Theorem 5.3. *Let Ω be a bounded domain and let $u, v \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$. If $\{u < v\} \Subset \Omega$, then we have*

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{\{u < v\}} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{\{u < v\}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$$

We need the following proposition to prove this theorem.

Proposition 5.5. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary, and let $u, v \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$. If $u = v$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $u \leq v$ in Ω , then*

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{\Omega} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

Proof. We can choose a defining function ϱ of Ω with $|\text{grad}\varrho| = 1$. Then

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} - \int_{\Omega} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} &= \int_{\Omega} \sum_{p=1}^m (\Delta v)^{p-1} \wedge \Delta(u-v) \wedge (\Delta u)^{n-p} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^m \int_{\Omega} d_0 [d_1(u-v) \wedge (\Delta v)^{p-1} \wedge (\Delta u)^{m-p} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}] \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^m \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_{\partial\Omega} [d_1(u-v) \wedge (\Delta v)^{p-1} \wedge (\Delta u)^{m-p} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}]_A \cdot \nabla_{A0} \varrho dS \end{aligned}$$

by using Stokes-type formula (3.1). Note that we have

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} [d_1(u-v) \wedge (\Delta v)^{p-1} \wedge (\Delta u)^{m-p} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}]_A \cdot \nabla_{A0} \varrho(q) \Omega_{2n} \\ &= d_0 \varrho(q) \wedge d_1(u-v)(q) \wedge (\Delta v)^{p-1} \wedge (\Delta u)^{m-p} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}, \end{aligned}$$

as in (5.10). Since $u = v$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $u \leq v$ in Ω , then for a point $q \in \partial\Omega$ with $\text{grad}(u-v)(q) \neq 0$, we can write $u-v = h\varrho$ in a neighborhood of q for some positive smooth function h . Consequently, we have $\text{grad}(u-v)(q) = h(q)\text{grad}\varrho$, and so $\nabla_{A1}(u-v)(q) = h(q)\nabla_{A1}\varrho(q)$ on $\partial\Omega$. Thus,

$$d_0 \varrho(q) \wedge d_1(u-v)(q) = h(q)d_0 \varrho(q) \wedge d_1 \varrho(q) \quad \text{on the boundary,}$$

which is elementary strongly positive by Proposition 3.7. Since $(\Delta v)^{p-1} \wedge (\Delta u)^{m-p} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ is also positive by Proposition 4.1, we find that the right hand of (5.11) is a positive $2n$ -form by definition. So the integrant in the right hand of (5.10) on $\partial\Omega$ is nonnegative if $\text{grad}(v-u)(q) \neq 0$. While if $\text{grad}(v-u)(q) = 0$, the integrant at q in (5.10) vanishes. Therefore the difference in (5.10) is nonnegative. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.3. At first, we assume that $u, v \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega)$. Let $G_\eta := \{u < v - \eta\}$. Then $G := \{u < v\} = \cup_{\eta>0} G_\eta$ and by Sard's theorem, G_η are open sets with smooth boundaries for almost all $\eta > 0$. For such η , we have

$$\int_{G_\eta} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{G_\eta} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$$

by Proposition 5.5. (5.8) follows by taking limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$.

Now if $u, v \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$, consider the standard approximations $u_j \downarrow u$, $v_j \downarrow v$ by smooth QSH_m functions. Denote $G_p := \{q \in G; u < v - 1/p\}$ and $G_{j,k,p} := \{q \in G; u_j < v_k - 1/p\}$.

For any open set $G' \Subset G$ we can choose positive integers p_0 and p_1 such that $G' \Subset G_{p_0} \Subset G_{p_1} \Subset G$. Since u_j, v_j converge locally uniformly in G , there exist k_0 such that $G' \subset G_{j,k,p_0} \subset G_{p_1} \Subset G$ for all $j, k > k_0$. Then

$$\int_{G_{j,k,p_0}} (\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{G_{j,k,p_0}} (\Delta v_k)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$$

for all $j, k > k_0$. Consequently,

$$\int_{G_{p_1}} (\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{G'} (\Delta v_k)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

By convergence of currents of measure type, we get

$$\int_G (\Delta u)^k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{G_{p_1}} (\Delta u)^k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{G'} (\Delta v)^k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

The result follows since the $G' \Subset G$ is arbitrarily chosen. \square

Proposition 5.6. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary, and let $u, v \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$. Suppose that $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ on Ω , and $\underline{\lim}_{q \in \Omega} (u(q) - v(q)) \geq 0$. Then $u \geq v$ in Ω .*

Proof. Assume that $v(q_0) - u(q_0) = \eta > 0$ at some point $q_0 \in \Omega$. Thus the open set $G := \{D : u(q) < v(q) - \eta/4\}$ is not empty. Then

$$G_1 := \{D : u(q) < v(q) - \eta/2 + \varepsilon|q - q_0|^2\} \Subset G,$$

and contains q_0 for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. By applying the comparison principle in Theorem 5.3 and Proposition 5.3, we get

$$\int_{G_1} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{G_1} (\Delta v + \varepsilon \Delta |q - q_0|^2)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \int_{G_1} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} + (8\varepsilon)^m \int_{G_1} \beta_n^n$$

which contradicts to the assumption $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$. \square

We also need the following proposition for several functions.

Corollary 5.2. *Let Ω be a bounded domain and let $u_j, v_j \in C(\Omega) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$. If $u_j = v_j$ outside a compact subset of Ω , then*

$$(5.12) \quad \int_{\Omega} \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

Proof. If the domain has smooth boundary and $u_j, v_j \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}) \cap QSH_m(\Omega)$, this identity is obtained as in (5.10) by applying

$$\Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_m - \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_m = \sum_{p=1}^m \Delta v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_{p-1} \wedge \Delta(u_p - v_p) \wedge \Delta u_{p+1} \wedge \cdots,$$

since there is no boundary term in this case. The general case easily follows from approximation. \square

6. QUATERNIONIC RELATIVE m -EXTREMAL FUNCTION AND QUATERNIONIC m -CAPACITY

For a domain Ω in \mathbb{H}^n and $E \subset \Omega$, let

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{U}(E, \Omega) := \{u \in QSH_m(\Omega), u|_{\Omega} \leq 0, u|_E \leq -1\},$$

and

$$\omega(q, E, \Omega) := \sup\{u(q); u \in \mathcal{U}(E, \Omega)\},$$

whose upper semicontinuous regularization $\omega^*(q, E, \Omega)$ is called a *relative m -extremal function* of the set E in Ω . The \mathcal{P}_m -capacity is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_m(E, \Omega) := - \int_{\Omega} \omega^*(q, E, \Omega) \beta_n^n.$$

The relative extremal function has the following simple properties:

(1) (*monotonicity*) if $E_1 \subseteq E_2$, then $\omega^*(q, E_1, \Omega) \geq \omega^*(q, E_2, \Omega)$; if $E \subseteq D_1 \subset D_2$, then $\omega^*(q, E, D_1) \geq \omega^*(q, E, D_2)$ for $q \in D_1$.

(2) $\omega^*(q, E, \Omega) \equiv 0$ if and only if E is m -polar in Ω . The proof is the same as the complex case [18].

(3) Let $\Omega = \{\varrho < 0\}$ be m -hyperconvex. If $E \Subset \Omega$, then $\omega^*(q, E, \Omega) \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \partial\Omega$.

Note that $M\varrho \in \mathcal{U}(E, \Omega)$ for a suitable $M > 0$ since $E \Subset \Omega$. Then $0 \geq \omega^*(q, E, \Omega) \geq M\varrho$ on Ω . We must have $\omega^*(q, E, \Omega) \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \partial\Omega$.

(4) Let $\Omega = \{\varrho < 0\}$ be a strongly m -hyperconvex. If $E \Subset \Omega$, then the relative m -extremal function $\omega^*(q, E, \Omega)$ admits a quaternionic m -subharmonic extension to a neighborhood of the closure $\bar{\Omega}$.

By $\omega^*(q, E, \Omega) \geq M\varrho$ on Ω as above, the quaternionic m -subharmonic function

$$w(q) = \begin{cases} \omega^*(q, E, \Omega), & q \in \Omega, \\ M\varrho, & q \notin \Omega, \end{cases}$$

gives an extension to a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$.

A point $q_0 \in K$ is called an m -regular point of the compact set $K \Subset \Omega$ if $\omega^*(q_0, K, \Omega) = -1$. A compact set $K \Subset \Omega$ is called m -regular in Ω if each point of K is m -regular. A function $u \in QSH_m(\Omega)$ is called *maximal* if it satisfies the *maximum principle* in the class $QSH_m(\Omega)$, i.e. for any $D \Subset \Omega$, if $v \in QSH_m(D)$ and $\lim_{q \in \partial D} (u(q) - v(q)) \geq 0$, then $u \geq v$ in D .

Since a quaternionic m -subharmonic function is subharmonic by Proposition 4.3 (2), a regular compact set of the classical potential theory is m -regular. In general, an m -regular compact set is always m' -regular if $m' > m$. Therefore, for any compact subset K of an open set U , there exists an m -regular compact set E such that $K \subset E \Subset U$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let K be an m -regular compact subset of an m -hyperconvex domain Ω . Then, (1) relative m -extremal function $\omega^*(q, K, \Omega)$ is maximal in $\Omega \setminus K$; (2) $\omega^*(\cdot, K, \Omega) \in C(\Omega)$; (3)*

$$(6.2) \quad (\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega \setminus K.$$

Proof. (1) Suppose that $\omega^*(\cdot, K, \Omega)$ is not maximal. Then there exists a domain $G \Subset \Omega \setminus K$ and a function $v \in QSH_m(G)$ such that $\lim_{q \in \partial G} (u(q) - v(q)) \geq 0$, but $v(q_0) > \omega^*(q_0, K, \Omega)$ at some point $q_0 \in G$. Since $\omega^*(q, K, \Omega)|_K \equiv -1$, the function

$$w(q) = \begin{cases} \max(v(q), \omega^*(q, K, \Omega)), & \text{if } q \in G, \\ \omega^*(q, K, \Omega), & \text{if } q \notin G, \end{cases}$$

belongs to $w \in \mathcal{U}(K, \Omega)$ by definition (6.1), and so $w \leq \omega^*(\cdot, K, \Omega)$. This contradicts to $w(q_0) = v(q_0) > \omega^*(q_0, K, \Omega)$.

(2) Consider $\Omega_j := \{q \in \Omega; \omega^*(q, K, \Omega) < -1/j\}$ for positive integers j . Then $\Omega_j \subset \Omega_{j+1}$ and $\Omega_j \Subset \Omega$ since Ω is m -hyperconvex. Fixed a j_0 , the relative m -extremal function can be approximated on $\bar{\Omega}_{j_0}$ by smooth QSH_m functions $v_t \downarrow \omega^*(\cdot, E, \Omega)$. Applying Hartogs' Lemma for subharmonic functions twice to this sequence, we see that there exists t_0 such that for $t > t_0$, we have $v_t \leq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}_{j_0}$ and simultaneously, $v_t \leq -1 + 1/j_0$ on K . Then the function

$$\tilde{w}(q) = \begin{cases} \max(v_t(q) - 1/j_0, \omega^*(q, K, \Omega)), & \text{if } q \in \Omega_{j_0}, \\ \omega^*(q, K, \Omega), & \text{if } q \notin \Omega_{j_0}, \end{cases}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{U}(K, \Omega)$, and so

$$\omega^*(q, K, \Omega) - 1/j_0 \leq v_t(q) - 1/j_0 \leq \tilde{w}(q) \leq \omega^*(q, K, \Omega)$$

for $q \in \overline{\Omega}_{j_0}$. Consequently, v_t converges uniformly to $\omega^*(\cdot, K, \Omega)$ on compact subsets of Ω . So it is continuous.

(3) Suppose $(\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ does not vanish on $\Omega \setminus K$. There exists a ball $B(q_0, r)$ where $(\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \not\equiv 0$. Let $v(q)$ be the Bremermann-Perron solution to the generalized Dirichlet problem $(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = 0$ on the ball with continuous boundary value $\omega^*(\cdot, K, \Omega)|_{\partial B(q_0, r)}$. Such a solution exists, and is unique and continuous. The proof is exactly as in the complex case [10]. We omit details. It is maximal by construction, i.e. $v \geq \omega^*(\cdot, K, \Omega)$ on $B(q_0, r)$. But $v \not\equiv \omega^*(q, K, \Omega)$, since $(\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \not\equiv 0$ on $B(q_0, r)$. Therefore, $v(q') > u(q')$ for some $q' \in B(q_0, r)$. But

$$w(q) = \begin{cases} \omega^*(q, E, \Omega), & q \in \Omega \setminus B(q_0, r), \\ \max\{v(q), \omega^*(q, E, \Omega)\}, & q \in B(q_0, r), \end{cases}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{U}(K, \Omega)$. Then $w(q') > u(q')$ contradicts to the maximality of $\omega^*(q, K, \Omega)$ in (1). \square

6.1. Quaternionic m -capacity. See [25, Section 3] for complex m -capacity. Given a compact set K in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$, let

$$(6.3) \quad \mathcal{U}^*(K, \Omega) = \left\{ u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega), u|_K \leq -1, \lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} u(q) \geq 0 \right\}.$$

The *quaternionic m -capacity* of the condenser (K, Ω) is defined as

$$(6.4) \quad C_m(K) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in \mathcal{U}^*(K, \Omega) \right\}$$

and the quaternionic m -capacity of an open set $U \subset \Omega$ is

$$C_m(U) = \sup\{C_m(K); K \subset U\}.$$

The *exterior m -capacity* of a set $E \subset \Omega$ is defined as

$$C_m^*(E) = \sup\{C_m(U); \text{ open } U \supset E\}$$

m -capacity is obviously monotonic by definition.

Proposition 6.2. *Let Ω be a m -hyperconvex domain in \mathbb{H}^n . Then,*

(1) *For any m -regular compact set $K \subset \Omega$,*

$$(6.5) \quad C_m(K) = \int_K (\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

(2) *For any compact subset $K \subset \Omega$, $C_m(K) = \inf\{C_m(E); \Omega \supset E \supset K \text{ and } E \text{ is an } m\text{-regular compact set}\}$. In particular, $C_m^*(K) = C_m(K)$.*

(3) *If K is an m -regular compact subset, then*

$$(6.6) \quad C_m(K) = \sup \left\{ \int_K \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}; u_j \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega), -1 \leq u_j < 0 \right\}.$$

(4) *Suppose that Ω is strongly m -hyperconvex. If $U \subset \Omega$ is an open set, then*

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} C_m(U) &= \sup \left\{ \int_U (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega), -1 \leq u < 0 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \int_U (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\Omega), -1 \leq u < 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

(5) *The exterior capacity is monotonic, i.e. if $E_1 \subseteq E_2$, then $C_m^*(E_1) \subseteq C_m^*(E_2)$, and countably subadditive, i.e. $C_m^*(\cup_j E_j) \leq \sum_j C_m^*(E_j)$.*

(6) If $U_1 \subset U_2 \subset \dots$ are open subsets of Ω , then $C_m\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} U_j, \Omega\right) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} C_m(U_j, \Omega)$.

(7) If $E \subset D \subset \Omega$, then $C_m^*(E, D) \leq C_m^*(E, \Omega)$.

Proof. (1) For $u \in \mathcal{U}^*(K, \Omega)$ and any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, consider the open set

$$O := \{q \in \Omega; u(q) < (1 - \varepsilon)\omega^*(q, K, \Omega) - \varepsilon/2\} \Subset \Omega.$$

Note that $O \supset K$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \varepsilon)^m \int_K (\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} &= (1 - \varepsilon)^m \int_O (\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \\ &\leq \int_O (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \end{aligned}$$

by the comparison principle and (6.2). Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we see that the infimum on the right hand side of (6.4) is attained by the relative m -extremal function $\omega^*(q, K, \Omega)$.

(2) $C_m(K) \leq C_m(E)$ by monotonicity. Conversely, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, choose $u \in \mathcal{U}^*(K, \Omega)$ such that $\int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} < C_m(K) + \varepsilon$. Since $\{q \in \Omega; u(q) < -1 + \varepsilon\}$ is a neighborhood of the compact set K , there exists an m -regular compact set E such that $K \subset E \Subset U$. Consider

$$O := \{q \in \Omega; u(q) < (1 - 2\varepsilon)\omega^*(q, E, \Omega)\}.$$

Then, $E \subset O \Subset \{q \in \Omega; u(q) < -1 + \varepsilon\}$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} C_m(E) &= \int_E (\Delta\omega^*(q, E, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq \int_O (\Delta\omega^*(q, E, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1 - 2\varepsilon)^m} \int_O (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq \frac{1}{(1 - 2\varepsilon)^m} \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq \frac{C_m(K) + \varepsilon}{(1 - 2\varepsilon)^m}, \end{aligned}$$

by using (6.5) for the m -regular compact subset E and the comparison principle. The result follows by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

(3) $C_m(K)$ is less than or equal to the right hand side of (6.6) by using (6.5). On the other hand, for any $u_j \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ with $-1 \leq u_j < 0$, consider

$$v_j(q) := \max \left\{ (1 + \varepsilon)\omega^*(q, K, \Omega), \frac{u_j(q) - \varepsilon/2}{1 + \varepsilon/2} \right\}.$$

Then, $v_j \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ with $-1 \leq v_j < 0$, $\lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} v_j(q) = 0$, and $v_j \equiv (1 + \varepsilon)\omega^*(\cdot, K, \Omega)$ near the boundary. We get

$$(1 + \varepsilon)^m \int_{\Omega} (\Delta\omega^*)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} \Delta v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \geq \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon/2)^m} \int_K \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

by using Corollary 5.2 and $v_j \equiv (u_j - \varepsilon/2)/(1 + \varepsilon/2)$ in a neighborhood of K . Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get the another direction of inequality, since $(\Delta\omega^*)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus K$.

(4) For any $u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ with $-1 \leq u < 0$, we have $C_m(U) \geq C_m(K) \geq \int_K (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ by (3). Then $C_m(U) \geq \int_U (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ since K can be arbitrarily chosen. Thus $C_m(U)$ is larger than or equal to the right hand side of (6.7).

Since Ω is a strongly m -hyperconvex domain, the relative m -extremal function $\omega^*(q, E, \Omega)$ admits a quaternionic m -subharmonic extension to a neighborhood of the closure $\bar{\Omega}$, and so it can be approximated

in a neighborhood U of $\overline{\Omega}$ by $QSH_m \cap C^\infty$ functions $v_j \downarrow \omega^*(q, K, \Omega)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} C_m(K) &= \int_K (\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = \int_\Omega (\Delta\omega^*(q, K, \Omega))^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq \overline{\lim}_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega (\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{j \rightarrow \infty} (1 + \varepsilon)^m \int_\Omega (\Delta w_j)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \end{aligned}$$

if we denote $w_j = (v_j - \varepsilon)/(1 + \varepsilon)$. Here $-1 \leq w_j < 0$ if j is large. So $C_m(K)$ is controlled by the right hand side of (6.7) multiplying $(1 + \varepsilon)^m$. The result follows by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

(5) The monotonicity of $C_m^*(E)$ follows from the monotonicity of $C_m(K)$ for compact sets K . If E_j 's are open sets, then

$$\begin{aligned} C_m(\cup_j E_j) &= \sup \left\{ \int_{\cup_j E_j} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega), -1 \leq u < 0 \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \sum_j \int_{E_j} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega), -1 \leq u < 0 \right\} \leq \sum_j C_m(E_j). \end{aligned}$$

In general, we find an open set $U_j \supset E_j$ such that $C_m(U_j) - C_m^*(E_j) \leq \varepsilon/2^j$. Then

$$\sum_j C_m^*(E_j) \geq \sum_j C_m(U_j) - \varepsilon \geq C_m(\cup_j U_j) - \varepsilon \geq C_m(\cup_j E_j) - \varepsilon.$$

We get the result by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

(6) It is obvious by definition. □

By (4) and (5), we get a useful estimate: for a strongly m -hyperconvex domain Ω , there exists a neighborhood $\Omega' \supset \overline{\Omega}$ such that

$$(6.8) \quad \int_U (\Delta u_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\Delta u_m) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq C_m(U)$$

for any $u_j \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ with $-1 \leq u_j < 0$ on Ω and $|u_j| \leq 1$ on Ω' .

Proposition 6.3. *If $E \subset B(0, r)$, $r < 1$, then*

$$(6.9) \quad C_m^*(E, B) \leq \frac{m! \mathcal{P}_m(E, B)}{(1 - r^2)^m}.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove (6.9) for m -regular compact set E . Apply Theorem 5.1 for $\varrho(q) = |q|^2 - 1$, $\Omega = B$ and $u = \omega = \omega(q, E, B)$ repeatedly to get

$$\int_0^1 dt_1 \cdots \int_0^{t_{m-1}} dt_m \int_{|q|^2 \leq t_m} (\Delta\omega)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq \int_0^1 dt_1 \int_{|q|^2 \leq t_1} \Delta\omega \wedge \beta_n^{n-1} = - \int_B \omega \beta_n^n = \mathcal{P}_m(E, \Omega).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 dt_1 \cdots \int_0^{t_{m-1}} dt_m \int_{|q|^2 \leq t_m} (\Delta\omega)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} &\geq \int_{r^2}^1 dt_1 \cdots \int_{r^2}^{t_{m-1}} dt_m \int_{|q|^2 \leq r^2} (\Delta\omega)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \\ &= \frac{(1 - r^2)^m}{m!} \int_{|q|^2 \leq r^2} (\Delta\omega)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate follows. □

7. THE QUASICONTINUITY OF QUATERNIONIC m -SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS AND THE BEDFORD-TAYLOR THEORY

Lemma 7.1. [32, Corollary 3.1] *If $u, v \in C^2(\Omega)$ and let α be a positive $(2n-2)$ -form. Then*

$$(7.1) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega} d_0 u \wedge d_1 v \wedge \alpha \right|^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} d_0 u \wedge d_1 u \wedge \alpha \cdot \int_{\Omega} d_0 v \wedge d_1 v \wedge \alpha.$$

Theorem 7.1. *Any bounded quaternionic m -subharmonic function is continuous almost everywhere with respect to m -capacity, i.e., given $u \in QSH_m(\Omega)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an open set $U \subset \Omega$ such that $C_m(U, \omega) < \epsilon$ and u is continuous on $\Omega \setminus U$.*

Proof. Firstly, we establish an integral inequality for QSH_m functions on B . Let \mathcal{L} be the class of smooth QSH_m functions u on the ball $B(0, 1 + \delta)$ for $\delta > 0$, such that $|u| \leq 1$. Consider functions $v, u, u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\varphi_0 = v - u \geq 0$ in B and $\varphi_0 = \text{const}$ on the sphere $S = \partial B$. Then if we denote $\Theta := d_1 u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$, we get

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_B \varphi_0 \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} &= \int_B \varphi_0 d_0 \Theta = \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S \varphi_0 \Theta_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0} dS - \int_B d_0 \varphi_0 \wedge \Theta \\ &= \varphi_0 \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S \Theta_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0} dS - \int_B d_0 \varphi_0 \wedge \Theta \\ &= \varphi_0 \int_B d_0 \Theta - \int_B d_0 \varphi_0 \wedge \Theta \\ &\leq C \|\varphi\|_S - \int_B d_0 \varphi_0 \wedge d_1 u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \end{aligned}$$

by using Stokes-type formula (3.11) to functions in \mathcal{L} , where C is an absolute constant independent of $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathcal{L}$ by Corollary 5.1. Applying Lemma 7.1 to $u = \varphi, v = u_1$ and closed positive form $\alpha = \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$, and using Stokes-type formula (3.11) twice, we get

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_B d_0 \varphi_0 \wedge d_1 u_1 \wedge \alpha \right|^2 &\leq \left(\int_B d_0 u_1 \wedge d_1 u_1 \wedge \alpha \right) \left(\int_B d_0 \varphi_0 \wedge d_1 \varphi_0 \wedge \alpha \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\varphi_0 \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S (d_1 \varphi_0 \wedge \alpha)_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0} dS + \int_B \varphi_0 \Delta \varphi_0 \wedge \alpha \right) \\ &= C \left(\varphi_0 \int_B \Delta \varphi_0 \wedge \alpha + \int_B \varphi_0 \Delta \varphi_0 \wedge \alpha \right) \\ &\leq C \left(2C \|\varphi_0\|_S + \int_B 2 \left(\varphi_0 \Delta \left(\frac{u+v}{2} \right) - \varphi_0 \Delta v \right) \wedge \alpha \right) \\ &\leq C \left(2C \|\varphi_0\|_S + 2 \int_B \varphi_0 \Delta \varphi_0^+ \wedge \alpha \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_0^+ = \frac{u+v}{2} \in \mathcal{L}$. The second inequality follows from locally uniform estimate in Proposition 5.4, $\varphi_0|_S = \|\varphi_0\|_S$ and

$$\left| \int_B \Delta \varphi_0 \wedge \alpha \right| \leq \left| \int_B \Delta(u+v) \wedge \alpha \right| \leq 2C,$$

while the last inequality in (7.3) follows from the fact $\varphi_0 \geq 0$ and $\Delta v \wedge \alpha \geq 0$.

Applying this procedure repeatedly, we obtain the inequality

$$(7.4) \quad \int_B \varphi_0 \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \leq \gamma \left(\|\varphi_0\|_S + \int_B \varphi_0 (\Delta \varphi_0^+)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \right)^\kappa,$$

for some absolute constants $\gamma, \kappa > 0$.

Since the capacity is countably subadditive, it suffices to prove the theorem for the unit $B \subset \Omega$ and show that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an open set $U \subset B'$ such $C_m(U \cap B', B) < \epsilon$ and u is continuous in $B' \setminus U$, where $B' = B(0, \frac{1}{2})$. Assume $-1 \leq u \leq 0$. If replace u by $\max\{u(q), v(q)\}$ with $v(q) = 2(|q|^2 - \frac{3}{4})$, then $v(q)|_{\partial B} = \frac{1}{2} > 0 > u(q)$, i.e. $u \equiv v$ in a neighborhood of the sphere $S = \partial B$. Let $u_p \downarrow u$, $v_p \downarrow v$ be the standard approximations. Note that $u_p \equiv v_p$ in a neighborhood of S for $p > p_0$. We can assume the sequence $\int_B u_p (\Delta u_p)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ has a limit by passing to subsequence if necessary, since it is bounded by Proposition 5.2. For a fixed $\sigma > 0$, consider $U_{p,N}(\sigma) := \{q \in B' : u_p(q) - u_{p+N}(q) > \sigma\}$, then we have $U_{p,N}(\sigma) \subset U_{p,N+1}(\sigma)$, and $\bigcup_{N=1}^\infty U_{p,N} = U_p(\sigma) := \{q \in B' : u_p(q) - u(q) > \sigma\}$. Then we have

$$(7.5) \quad C_m \left(\bigcup_{N=1}^\infty U_{p,N}(\sigma) \right) = C_m(U_p(\sigma)) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} C_m(U_{p,N}(\sigma))$$

by Proposition 6.2 (6).

Denote $\varphi_{p,N} := u_p - u_{p+N}$. Since the open set $U_{p,N}(\sigma) \subset B' \Subset B$, it follows from (6.8) that

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{aligned} C_m(U_{p,N}(\sigma)) &= \sup \left\{ \int_{U_{p,N}(\sigma)} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in \mathcal{L} \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{U_{p,N}(\sigma)} \varphi_{p,N} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in \mathcal{L} \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_B \varphi_{p,N} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} : u \in \mathcal{L} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma}{\sigma} \left(\|v_p - v\|_S + \int_B \varphi_{p,N} (\Delta \varphi_{p,N}^+)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \right)^\kappa, \end{aligned}$$

by the estimate (7.4), where $\varphi_{p,N}^+ := (u_p + u_{p+N})/2$. Note that

$$(7.7) \quad (\Delta \varphi_{p,N}^+)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = 2^{-m} (\Delta u_p + \Delta u_{p+N})^m \wedge \beta_n^m = 2^{-m} \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} (\Delta u_p)^k \wedge (\Delta u_{p+N})^{m-k} \wedge \beta_n^m.$$

It is sufficient to prove $\int_B (u_p - u_{p+N}) (\Delta u_p)^k \wedge (\Delta u_{p+N})^{m-k} \wedge \beta_n^m$ tends to 0 uniformly as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and then $p \rightarrow \infty$.

For any closed C^2 smooth $2(n-1)$ -form α , i.e., $d_0 \alpha = 0, d_1 \alpha = 0$, such that $\Delta u_{p+N} \wedge \alpha \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B u_p \Delta u_{p+N} \wedge \alpha &= \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S u_p (d_1 u_{p+N} \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0}} dS + \int_B d_1 u_{p+N} \wedge d_0 u_p \wedge \alpha \\ &= \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S u_p (d_1 u_{p+N} \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0}} dS + \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S u_{p+N} (d_0 u_p \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A1}} dS \\ &\quad + \int_B u_{p+N} \Delta u_p \wedge \alpha \\ &\leq A_{p,N} + \int_B u_p \Delta u_p \wedge \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

by using Stokes-type formula (3.11) and $d_0 d_1 = -d_1 d_0$, where

$$(7.8) \quad A_{p,N} := \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S [v_p(d_1 v_{p+N} \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0}} + v_{p+N}(d_0 v_p \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A1}}] dS,$$

since $u_p = v_p$ in a neighborhood of S for $p > p_0$. Similarly,

$$(7.9) \quad \int_B u_{p+N} \Delta u_p \wedge \alpha = B_{p,N} + \int_B u_p \Delta u_{p+N} \wedge \alpha \geq B_{p,N} + \int_B u_{p+N} \Delta u_{p+N} \wedge \alpha,$$

by $u_p \geq u_{p+N}$ and $\Delta u_p \wedge \alpha \geq 0$, where

$$B_{p,N} := \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S [v_{p+N}(d_1 v_p \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0}} dS + v_p(d_0 v_{p+N} \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A1}}] dS.$$

Repeating this procedure, finally we get

$$(7.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_B (u_p - u_{p+N})(\Delta u_p)^k \wedge (\Delta u_{p+N})^{m-k} \wedge \beta_n^m \\ & \leq \sigma(v, p, N) + \int_B u_p (\Delta u_p)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} - \int_B u_{p+N} (\Delta u_{p+N})^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma(v, p, N)$ is the sum of terms of type $A_{p,N}$ and $B_{p,N}$ above. Because the sequence $\{v_p\}$ converges in the $C^2(\overline{B})$, we have

$$(7.11) \quad \begin{aligned} A_{p,N} & \rightarrow \sum_{A=0}^{2n-1} \int_S [v_p(d_1 v_p \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0}} + v_p(d_0 v_p \wedge \alpha)_{A\tau(\mathbf{n})_{A1}}] dS \\ & = \int_B (d_0 v_p \wedge d_1 v_p + v_p d_0 d_1 v_p) \wedge \alpha + \int_B (d_1 v_p \wedge d_0 v_p + v_p d_1 d_0 v_p) \wedge \alpha = 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, by using Stokes-type formula (3.11) again. Similarly $B_{p,N} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Since the sequence $\int_B u_p (\Delta u_p)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ has a limit as $p \rightarrow \infty$, the right hand side of (7.10) tends to 0. Hence

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} C_m(U_p(\sigma)) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (U_{p,N}(\sigma)) = 0.$$

Now for fixed $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $p_j > 0$ such that if we denote $U_{p_j} := U_{p_j}(1/j)$ for $\sigma = \frac{1}{j}$, we have $C_m(U_{p_j}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2j}$. Since $u_p(q) - u(q) < \frac{1}{j}$ for $p > p_j$ outside the set U_{p_j} , then we see that u_p convergence to u uniformly outside the open set $U = \cup_{j=1}^{\infty} U_{p_j}$. Since $u_p \in C^\infty(B)$, u is continuous outside U , and

$$C_m(U) = C_m\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} U_{p_j}\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C_m(U_{p_j}) \leq \epsilon.$$

The theorem is proved. \square

Proposition 7.1. *Let $u_1, \dots, u_m \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. Then, (1) the recurrence relation*

$$(7.12) \quad \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}(\omega) = \int u_k \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega$$

for $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{2m-2k}(\Omega)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, defines a closed positive $2(n-m+k)$ -current.

(2) The following convergence of closed positive currents (of measure type) holds for the standard approximations $u_i^t \downarrow u_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(7.13) \quad \Delta u_1^t \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \mapsto \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}, \quad k = 1, \dots, m.$$

Proof. Let us prove the theorem by induction on k . The case $k = 1$ is obvious.

Assume that it holds for $k - 1$. Then for a fixed strongly positive form $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{2m-2k}(\Omega)$, we have

$$(7.14) \quad \int u_k^s \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega = \int \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1}^t \wedge \Delta u_k^s \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \geq 0,$$

by Proposition 4.1 for smooth QSH_m , which yields the limits $\int u_k^s \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^m \wedge \Delta \omega \geq 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. If let $s \rightarrow \infty$, we find that $\int u_k \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega \geq 0$. Hence, the current $\Delta u_k \wedge \Delta u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_{k-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ is positive. It is closed by definition.

To prove (2), note that if the convergence

$$(7.15) \quad \mathcal{E} := u_1^t \Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} - u_1 \Delta u_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

is valid for k , then (7.13) is valid for k , since

$$\int \Delta u_1^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega = \int u_1^t \Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \Delta \omega,$$

for $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{2m-2k}(\Omega)$. So it suffices to prove (7.15) for k , provided that (7.13) is valid for $k - 1$.

By the quasicontinuity in Theorem 7.1, for a fixed $\epsilon > 0$, we can find an open $U \subset \Omega$ such that $C_m(U) < \epsilon$ and $u_1 \in C(\Omega \setminus U)$. Let $\tilde{u} \in C(\Omega)$ satisfy $u_1 \equiv \tilde{u}$ on $\Omega \setminus U$ and $\|\tilde{u}\|_\Omega \leq \|u\|_\Omega$. Denote $E_\omega := \text{supp } \omega$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E} \wedge \omega| &\leq \left| \int_{E_\omega} (u_1^t - u_1) \Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_\Omega u_1 (\Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t - \Delta u_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{E_\omega \setminus U} (u_1^t - u_1) \Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \right| + \left| \int_{E_\omega \cap U} (u_1^t - u_1) \Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{E_\omega \cap U} (u_1 - \tilde{u}) (\Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t - \Delta u_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_\Omega \tilde{u} (\Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t - \Delta u_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The integral over the sets $E_\omega \setminus U$ on the right hand side tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$ since $u_1^t \rightarrow u_1$ uniformly in $E_\omega \setminus U$, while the forth integral over Ω tends to zero because

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Delta u_2^t \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k^t \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = \Delta u_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta u_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m},$$

as currents of measure type by the assumption of induction, and \tilde{u} continuous on Ω . The second and third integrals reduces to estimating integrals of the type

$$\int_{E_\omega \cap U} \Delta v_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \Delta v_k \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \wedge \omega,$$

where $v_2, \dots, v_k \in QSH_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$, which are small because the capacity $C_m(U) < \epsilon$ is small.

At last, a positive current is a current of measure type by Proposition 3.4 in [31]. \square

8. THE FUNDAMENTAL SOLUTION OF THE QUATERNIONIC m -HESSIAN OPERATOR AND THE m -LELONG NUMBER

Proposition 8.1. *Let $\kappa_m = \frac{2n}{m} - 1$. Then the function $K_m(q) := \frac{-1}{|q-a|^{2\kappa_m}}$ is QSH_m and is the fundamental solution to the quaternionic m -Hessian operator \mathcal{H}_m , i.e.*

$$(8.1) \quad \mathcal{H}_m(K_m) = C_{m,n} \delta_a$$

where $C_{m,n} = \frac{8^m n! \pi^{2n} \kappa_m^m}{(2n)! m! (n-m)!}$.

Proof. : Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = 0$. Denote $K_{m,\epsilon} := \frac{-1}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m}}$. Then,

$$(8.2) \quad d_1 K_{m,\epsilon} = \frac{\kappa_m d_1 |q|^2}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m+1}},$$

and

$$(8.3) \quad \Delta K_{m,\epsilon} = d_0 \left(\frac{\kappa_m d_1 |q|^2}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m+1}} \right) = -\frac{\kappa_m(\kappa_m+1)}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m+2}} d_0 |q|^2 \wedge d_1 |q|^2 + \frac{8\kappa_m \beta_n}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m+1}} =: A + B.$$

Hence,

$$(8.4) \quad (\Delta K_{m,\epsilon})^p \wedge \beta_n^{n-p} = (pA \wedge B^{p-1} + B^p) \wedge \beta_n^{n-p}, \quad p = 1, \dots, m,$$

by $\omega \wedge \omega = 0$ for any 1-form ω . Now apply

$$(8.5) \quad d_0 |q|^2 \wedge d_1 |q|^2 = 4 \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} |q_l|^2 \omega^l \wedge \omega^{n+l} + \sum_{|j-k| \neq n} a_{jk} \omega^j \wedge \omega^k$$

(cf. [33, (3.12)]) to (8.4) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Delta K_{m,\epsilon})^p \wedge \beta_n^{n-p} \\ &= \left[-\frac{4p\kappa_m(\kappa_m+1)}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m+2}} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} |q_l|^2 \omega^l \wedge \omega^{n+l} \wedge \left(\frac{8\kappa_m \beta_n}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m+1}} \right)^{p-1} + \left(\frac{8\kappa_m \beta_n}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{\kappa_m+1}} \right)^p \right] \wedge \beta_n^{n-p} \\ &= \frac{-4p(\kappa_m+1)\kappa_m^p(n-1)!8^{p-1}|q|^2}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{1+(\kappa_m+1)p}} \Omega_{2n} + \frac{8^p n! \kappa_m^p}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{(\kappa_m+1)p}} \Omega_{2n} \\ &= \frac{4\kappa_m^p(n-1)!8^{p-1}|q|^2}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{1+(\kappa_m+1)p}} (-p(\kappa_m+1) + 2n) \Omega_{2n} + \epsilon \frac{8^p n! \kappa_m^p}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{1+(\kappa_m+1)p}} \Omega_{2n} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by $-p(\kappa_m+1) + 2n = 2n(1 - p/m) \geq 0$. Thus, $K_{m,\epsilon} \in QSH_m$ by definition, and so is $K_m \in QSH_m$ by $K_{m,\epsilon} \downarrow K_m$. In particular,

$$(\Delta K_{m,\epsilon})^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = \epsilon \frac{8^m n! \kappa_m^m}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{2n+1}} \Omega_{2n}.$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$(8.6) \quad (\Delta K_m)^m \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{H}^n \setminus \{0\}.$$

For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{4n})$, by rescaling $q = q' \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we get

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} \frac{\epsilon}{(|q|^2 + \epsilon)^{2n+1}} \varphi(q) dV(q) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} \frac{\varphi(q' \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})}{(\|q'\|^2 + 1)^{2n+1}} dV(q') = \frac{S_{4n}}{4n} \varphi(0),$$

by

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} \frac{1}{(|q|^2 + 1)^{2n+1}} dV(q) &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} S_{4n} \int_0^R \frac{r^{4n-1}}{(1+r^2)^{2n+1}} dr = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} S_{4n} \int_0^{\arctan R} \frac{\tan^{4n-1} \theta}{\sec^{4n} \theta} d\theta \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} S_{4n} \int_0^{\arctan R} \sin^{4n-1} \theta d\sin \theta = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} S_{4n} \int_0^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{1+R^2}}} t^{4n-1} dt \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} S_{4n} \cdot \frac{1}{4n} \cdot \frac{R^{4n}}{(1+R^2)^{2n}} = \frac{S_{4n}}{4n}.
\end{aligned}$$

where $S_{4n} = 4n \frac{\pi^{2n}}{(2n)!}$. Thus (8.1) follows. \square

Proposition 8.2. *Suppose that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{H}^n$ is a domain and $B(a, R) \Subset \Omega$ for some $R > 0$. For $u \in QSH_m(\Omega)$ and $0 < r < R$, denote*

$$(8.7) \quad \sigma(a, r) = \int_{B(a, r)} \Delta u \wedge \beta_n^{n-1}.$$

Then, $\frac{\sigma(a, r)}{r^{\frac{4n(m-1)}{m}}}$ is an increasing function of r for $0 < r < R$, and

$$(8.8) \quad v_a(u) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma(a, r)}{r^{\frac{4n(m-1)}{m}}}$$

exists and is nonnegative. It is called the m -Lelong number of u at a .

Proof. : For $0 < r_1 < r_2 < R$, consider

$$v_a(r_1, r_2) := \int_{r_1 < |q| \leq r_2} \Delta u \wedge (\Delta K_m)^{m-1} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}.$$

Since $K_m \in QSH_m$, the integrand in (8.7) is a nonnegative measure on $B(a, R)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = 0$. Firstly, assume $u \in QSH_m(B(0, R)) \cap C^\infty(B(0, R))$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_a(r_1, r_2) &= \int_{r_1 < |q| \leq r_2} d_0 (d_1 K_m \wedge \Delta u \wedge (\Delta K_m)^{m-2} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}) \\
&= \frac{\kappa_m}{r_2^{2(\kappa_m+1)}} \int_{|q|=r_2} (d_1 |q|^2 \wedge \Delta u \wedge (\Delta K_m)^{m-2} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m})_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0} dS \\
&\quad - \frac{\kappa_m}{r_1^{2(\kappa_m+1)}} \int_{|q|=r_1} (d_1 |q|^2 \wedge \Delta u \wedge (\Delta K_m) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m})_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0} dS \\
&= (8\kappa_m)^{m-1} \left(\frac{\sigma(a, r_2)}{r_2^{\frac{4n(m-1)}{m}}} - \frac{\sigma(a, r_1)}{r_1^{\frac{4n(m-1)}{m}}} \right) > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by using Stokes theorem, (8.2) for $\epsilon = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\kappa_m}{r_2^{2(\kappa_m+1)}} \int_{|q|=r_2} (d_1 |q|^2 \wedge \Delta u \wedge (\Delta K_m)^{m-2} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m})_A \tau(\mathbf{n})_{A0} dS \\
&= \frac{8\kappa_m}{r_2^{2(\kappa_m+1)}} \int_{|q| \leq r_2} \Delta u \wedge (\Delta K_m)^{m-2} \wedge \beta_n^{n-m+1} = \dots = \left(\frac{8\kappa_m}{r_2^{2(\kappa_m+1)}} \right)^{m-1} \int_{|q| \leq r_2} \Delta u \wedge \beta_n^{n-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Now using the convergence of $u * \chi_\epsilon \downarrow u$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Delta(u * \chi_\epsilon) \wedge \beta_n^{n-m} \rightarrow \Delta u \wedge \beta_n^{n-m}$ as currents of measure type, we get the result. \square

The proof given here also simplifies the proof of the existence of the Lelong number for a plurisubharmonic function in [31].

REFERENCES

- [1] ĀHAG, P., CZYŻ, R. AND HED, L., The geometry of m -hyperconvex domains, *J. Geom. Anal.* **28** (2018), 3196-3222.
- [2] ĀHAG, P. AND CZYŻ, R., On a family of quasimetric spaces in generalized potential theory, *J. Geom. Anal.* **32** (2022), paper No. 117.
- [3] ALESKER, S., Non-commutative linear algebra and plurisubharmonic functions of quaternionic variables, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **127** (2003), 1-35.
- [4] S. ALESKER, Quaternionic Monge-Ampère equations, *J. Geom. Anal.* **13** (2003), 205-238.
- [5] S. ALESKER AND M. VERBITSKY, Plurisubharmonic functions on hypercomplex manifolds and HKT-geometry, *J. Geom. Anal.* **16** (2006), 375-399.
- [6] ALESKER, S., Pluripotential theory on quaternionic manifolds, *J. Geom. Phys.* **62** (2012), 1189-1206.
- [7] ASLAKSEN, H., Quaternionic Determinants, *Math. Intell.* **18** (1966), 57-65.
- [8] BENALI, A. AND GHILOUFI, N. Lelong numbers of m -subharmonic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **466** (2018), 1373-1392.
- [9] BEDFORD, E. AND TAYLOR, B., The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Invent. Math.* **37** (1) (1976), 1-44.
- [10] BLOCKI, Z., Weak solutions to the complex Hessian equation, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **55** (2005), 1735-1756.
- [11] BOUKHARI, F., Hölder continuous solutions to quaternionic Monge-Ampère equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **477** (2019), 747-768.
- [12] DINEW, S. AND KOŁODZIEJ, S., A priori estimates for complex Hessian equations, *Anal. PDE* **7** (2014), 227-244.
- [13] ELKHAHRA, F. m -generalized Lelong numbers and capacity associated to a class of m -positive closed currents, *Result Math.* **74** (2019), paper No. 10.
- [14] GARDING, L., An inequality for hyperbolic polynomials, *J. Math. Mech.* (1959), 957-965.
- [15] HAI, L. AND DUNG, T. Subextension of m -subharmonic functions, *Vietnam J. Math.* **48** (2020), 47-57.
- [16] HEINONEN, J., KILPELÄINEN, T. AND MARTIO, O., *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, the Clarendon Press, Oxford, New York, 1993.
- [17] HUNG, V. AND PHU, N., Hessian measures on m -polar sets and applications to the complex Hessian equations, *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* **62** (2017), 1135-1164.
- [18] KLIMEK, M., *Pluripotential Theory*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, New York, 1991.
- [19] LI, S.-Y., On the Dirichlet problems for symmetric function equations of the eigenvalues of the complex Hessian, *Asian J. Math.* **8** (2004), 87-106.
- [20] LU, H.-C., A variational approach to complex Hessian equations in \mathbb{C}^n , *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **431** (2015), 228-259.
- [21] MAZJA, V., *Sobolev spaces*, Translated from the Russian by T. Shaposhnikova, Springer Series in Soviet Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [22] NGUYEN, V., Maximal m -subharmonic functions and the Cegrell class \mathcal{N}_m , *Indag. Math.* **30** (2019), 717-739.
- [23] NGUYEN, V., KARIM, S. AND TRUONG, D., A note on the space of delta m -subharmonic functions, *AIMS Math.* **5** (2020), 2369-2375.
- [24] SADULLAEV, A., Plurisubharmonic measures and capacities on complex manifolds, *Russ. Math. Surv.* **36** (1981), 61-119.
- [25] SADULLAEV, A. AND ABDULLAEV, B., Potential theory in the class of m -subharmonic functions, *Pro. Steklov Inst. Math.* **279** (2012), 155-180.
- [26] SADULLAEV, A. AND ABDULLAEV, B., Capacities and Hessians in the class of m -subharmonic functions, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk* **448** (2013), 515-517.
- [27] WAN, D., Quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator for unbounded plurisubharmonic functions, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* **198** (2019), 381-398.
- [28] WAN, D., A variational approach to the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* **199** (2020), 2125-2150.
- [29] WAN, D. AND KANG, Q., Potential theory for quaternionic plurisubharmonic functions, *Mich. Math. J.* **66** (2017), 3-20.

- [30] WAN, D. AND WANG, W., Complex Hessian operator and Lelong number for unbounded m -subharmonic functions, *Potential anal.* **44** (2016), 53-69.
- [31] WAN, D. AND WANG, W., On quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator, closed positive currents and Lelong-Jensen type formula on the quaternionic space, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **141** (2017), 267-311.
- [32] WAN, D. AND ZHANG, W., Quasicontinuity and maximality of quaternionic plurisubharmonic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **424** (2015), 86-103.
- [33] WANG, W., On the linear algebra in the quaternionic pluripotential theory, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **562** (2019), 223-241.
- [34] WANG, W., The k -Cauchy-Fueter complex, Penrose transformation and Hartogs' phenomenon for quaternionic k -regular functions, *J. Geom. Phys.* **60** (2010), 513-530.
- [35] WANG, W., The quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator and plurisubharmonic functions on the Heisenberg group, *Math. Z.* **298** (2021), 521-549.