

POGORELOV TYPE ESTIMATES FOR SEMI-CONVEX SOLUTIONS OF HESSIAN EQUATIONS AND RELATED RIGIDITY THEOREMS

QIANG TU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish Pogorelov type C^2 estimates for semi-convex admissible solutions to the Dirichlet problem of k -Hessian equation with general right hand side. Under some sufficient conditions, we apply such estimates to obtain rigidity theorems for semi-convex admissible solutions of k -Hessian equation, which can be seen as a improvement of Li-Ren-Wang and Chu-Dinew's rigidity theorem for k -Hessian equation. When $2k > n$, we also obtain Pogorelov type C^2 estimates for admissible solutions to the Dirichlet problem of k -Hessian equation based on a concavity inequality, which is inspired by the Ren-Wang's work on the global curvature estimates for the $n - 1$ and $n - 2$ curvature equation.

Keywords: Pogorelov type estimates, Semi-convex solutions, Hessian equations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and $n \geq 3$. In this paper we considered the following Dirichlet problem of Hessian equations

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \sigma_k(\nabla^2 u) = \psi(x, u, \nabla u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma_k(\nabla^2 u)$ denote by $\sigma_k(\lambda(\nabla^2 u))$ (see (2.1)) with $\lambda(\nabla^2 u)$ being the eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 u$. Moreover, $u \in C^2(\Omega)$ is k -convex (admissible) if $\lambda(\nabla^2 u)$ belongs to the Garding's cone Γ_k (see (2.2)).

As we all know, the classic k -Hessian equation

$$(1.2) \quad \sigma_k(\nabla^2 u) = \psi(x, u, \nabla u)$$

is an important research content in the field of fully nonlinear partial differential equations and geometric analysis, which is associated with many important geometric problems, such as Minkowski problem, prescribing curvature problem and so on, see [10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 42]. The a prior estimates, especially the C^2 estimates, for k -Hessian equation (1.2) is a longstanding problem,

which has attracted much attentions. For the relative work, we refer the readers to [7, 3, 4, 9, 20, 23, 24, 37, 38, 39, 40].

In the sequel we study Pogorelov type C^2 estimates, which is a type of interior C^2 estimates with boundary information, for the Dirichlet problem (1.1). The initial motivation of our work is the following: Pogorelov estimates for Monge-Ampère equations were studied at first by Pogorelov [14, 27]. Then, Chou-Wang extended Pogorelov type estimates to the case of k -Hessian equations [9, 40]. More precisely, when the right hand side function $\psi = \psi(x, u)$, Chou-Wang proved that there exist a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$(1.3) \quad \sup_{\Omega} (-u)^{1+\epsilon} |\nabla^2 u| \leq C$$

for any k -convex solution u to the Hessian equations (1.1). It's worth pointing out that the small constant ϵ should not be zero in Chou-Wang's proof. Later, Li-Ren-Wang [25] developed new techniques to drop the small ϵ and established Pogorelov type estimates for $(k+1)$ -convex solutions to the Hessian equations (1.1) with ψ depending on x, u and the gradient term ∇u . Then Liu-Ren [22] established Pogorelov type C^2 estimates for k -convex solutions to the Dirichlet problem of Sum Hessian equations under some conditions. Chen-Tu-Xiang [8] obtained Pogorelov type estimates for η -convex solutions to a class of Hessian quotient equations.

From analysis point of view, a natural problem is whether we can weak the convexity assumption in [25] and established Pogorelov type C^2 estimates to the Hessian equations (1.1). In this paper, we establish Pogorelov type C^2 estimates under semi-convex assumption or a concavity conjecture.

Definition 1.1. A function $u \in C^2(\Omega)$ is called semi-convex if there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\lambda_i(\nabla^2 u)(x) \geq -K, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

We get the following main theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $2 \leq k \leq n$ and $\psi \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\psi > 0$. Assume $u \in C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is a semi-convex solution to the Dirichlet problem of Hessian equation (1.1) with $\lambda(\nabla^2 u) \in \Gamma_k$. Then there exist a constant $\beta > 0$ such that*

$$(-u)^\beta |\nabla^2 u|(x) \leq C, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

where C, β depends on $n, k, \sup_{\Omega} |u|, \sup_{\Omega} |\nabla u|, |\psi|_{C^2}, \inf_{\Omega} \psi$ and the domain Ω .

Remark 1.3. Compared to [25], we weaken the convexity assumption and give a simple proof of Pogorelov type C^2 estimates. However, due to technical difficulties, we cannot make the constant β equal to 1. Our method is inspired by the Chu [10] and Lu [26]'s work on curvature estimates for the prescribing curvature problem. We construct a test function involving the largest eigenvalues $\lambda_{\max}$ of the Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 u$, instead of the symmetric function of λ to deal with the third order terms.

One may ask whether Theorem 1.2 is still true if we remove the semi-convex assumption. Then we will restrict our attention to this problem. Our idea goes back as far as Ren-Wang's work [28, 29, 30] on the global curvature estimates for the $n - 1$ and $n - 2$ curvature equation. More precisely, they established the global curvature estimate for the following prescribing curvature equation

$$\sigma_k(\kappa(X)) = f(X, \nu(X)), \quad \forall X \in M,$$

where $2k > n$, $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a closed hypersurface, $\kappa(X)$ and $\nu(X)$ are principal curvatures and unit outer normal vector at $X \in M$, respectively. Note that, their results based on a concavity conjecture, and the conjecture holds when $k \geq n - 2$.

Inspired by this, we propose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.4. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \Gamma_k$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and $n < 2k$. Assume that there exist constants N_0, N_1 such that $N_0 \leq \sigma_k(\lambda) \leq N_1$. There exists constants K and B such that if $\lambda_1 > B$, the following inequality holds*

$$(1.4) \quad \lambda_1 \left(K \left(\sum_j \sigma_k^{jj}(\lambda) \xi_j \right)^2 - \sigma_k^{pp,qq}(\lambda) \xi_p \xi_q \right) - \sigma_k^{11}(\lambda) \xi_1^2 + \sum_{j \neq 1} a_j \xi_j^2 \geq 0,$$

for any $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Here a_j is defined by

$$a_j = \sigma_k^{jj}(\lambda) + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_j) \sigma_k^{11,jj}(\lambda).$$

The following theorem is our Pogorelov type C^2 estimates for k -convex solutions of Hessian equation (1.1).

Theorem 1.5. *Let $2 \leq k \leq n$, $2k > n$ and $\psi \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\psi > 0$. Assume $u \in C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is a solution to Hessian equation (1.1) with $\lambda(\nabla^2 u) \in \Gamma_k$ and Conjecture 1.4 holds, then there exist a constant $\beta > 0$ such that*

$$(-u)^\beta |\nabla^2 u|(x) \leq C, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

where C, β depends on $n, k, \sup_\Omega |u|, \sup_\Omega |\nabla u|, |\psi|_{C^2}, \inf_\Omega \psi$ and the domain Ω .

Remark 1.6. It should be observed that the concavity conjecture 1.4 is weaker than the one proposed by Ren-Wang in [30]. Compared to [30], our proof is more straightforward and simpler since our idea is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

We notice that the conjecture 1.4 holds for $k = n - 1$ and $k = n - 2$, which have proved by Ren-Wang in [28, 29, 30]. Hence, we have the following results.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $k = n - 1$ or $n - 2$ and $\psi \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\psi > 0$. Assume $u \in C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is a solution to the Dirichlet problem of Hessian equation (1.1) with $\lambda(\nabla^2 u) \in \Gamma_k$. Then there exist a constant $\beta > 0$ such that*

$$(-u)^\beta |\nabla^2 u|(x) \leq C, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

where C, β depends on $n, k, \sup_\Omega |u|, \sup_\Omega |\nabla u|, |\psi|_{C^2}, \inf_\Omega \psi$ and the domain Ω .

As an application of the above results, rigidity theorems can be considered for k -Hessian equations. In [5], Chang-Yuan proposed a problem that:

Problem 1.8. Are the entire solutions of the following k -Hessian equations

$$(1.5) \quad \sigma_k(\nabla^2 u(x)) = 1 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with lower bound only quadratic polynomials?

Recall that the classical Liouville theorem for Laplace equations and Jörgens-Calabi-Pogorelov theorem for Monge-Ampère equations gave a positive answer to the Problem 1.8 in case $k = 1$ and $k = n$, respectively. For $k = 2$, Chang-Yuan [5] have proved that, if u satisfies an almost convexity condition, i.e.,

$$\nabla^2 u \geq \left(\delta - \sqrt{\frac{2n}{n-1}} \right) \quad \forall \delta > 0,$$

then the entire solution of the equation (1.5) only are quadratic polynomials. Chen-Xiang [6] showed that all super quadratic entire solutions to equation (1.5) with $\sigma_1(\nabla^2 u) > 0$ and $\sigma_3(\nabla^2 u) \geq -K$ are also quadratic polynomials. Then Shankar-Yuan [31] have proved that every entire semi-convex solution of equation (1.5) in three dimensions is a quadratic polynomial. For general k , Bao-Chen-Guan-Ji [2] proved that strictly entire convex solutions of equation (1.5) satisfying a quadratic growth are quadratic polynomials. Li-Ren-Wang [25] relaxed the condition of strictly convex solutions in [2] to $(k + 1)$ -convex solutions. It was guessed in [5] and [41] that the semi-convex assumption is the necessary condition for the Problem 1.8. We will

restrict our attention to prove the rigidity theorem for equation (1.5) under semi-convex assumption. The following is our result.

Theorem 1.9. *The entire and semi-convex solutions in k -convex cone of the equation (1.5) defined in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy the following conditions:*

(i) *Quadratic growth condition: there exist constants c, b and sufficiently large R such that*

$$(1.6) \quad u(x) \geq c|x|^2 - b \quad \text{for } |x| \geq R.$$

(ii) *Almost $(k+1)$ -convexity condition: there exist constants $M' < \frac{1}{k-1}$, $M > 0$ such that*

$$(1.7) \quad \left(\frac{\partial \sigma_{k+1}(\nabla^2 u)}{\partial u_{ij}} \right)_{ij} \geq -M' I \quad \text{if } \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 u) \geq M.$$

Then u are quadratic polynomials.

As an application, we obtain the following corollaries:

Corollary 1.10. *The entire and k -convex solutions of the equation (1.5) defined in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy Quadratic growth condition and the following conditions: there is a constant A such that*

$$(1.8) \quad \sigma_{k+1}(\nabla^2 u(x)) \geq -A, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then u are quadratic polynomials.

Remark 1.11. There is another way to prove Corollary 1.10 by Chu-Dinew using a purely geometric condition in [12]. But we emphasize that our method is different from [12]. Chu-Dinew used the condition CNS (see Definition 3.2 in [12]) to establish gradient estimates and pogorelov type estimates respectively, then combined with the standard blow-up method to obtain Corollary 1.10. In this article, we only need to establish pogorelov type estimates, since our estimates do not depend on the gradient. Furthermore, semi-convex assumption and almost $(k+1)$ -convexity condition we stated seem to be weaker than condition CNS, since condition CNS can derive semi-convex assumption and the almost $(k+1)$ -convexity condition.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we start with some preliminaries. The proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.5 are respectively given in section 3 and section 4. In the last section, the rigidity theorems of the equations (1.5) under semi-convex assumption are established.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we recall the definition of elementary symmetric function for $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma_k(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} \lambda_{i_1} \lambda_{i_2} \dots \lambda_{i_k}.$$

We also set $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_k = 0$ for $k > n$ or $k < 0$. Recall that the Garding's cone is defined as

$$(2.2) \quad \Gamma_k = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sigma_i(\lambda) > 0, \forall 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

We denote $\sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|i) = \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial \lambda_i}$. Then, we list some properties of σ_k which will be used later.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$, then we have*

(1)

$$\Gamma_1 \supset \Gamma_2 \supset \dots \supset \Gamma_n.$$

(2)

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) = \sigma_k(\lambda|i) + \lambda_i \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

(3)

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|i) = (n - k + 1) \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda).$$

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial \lambda_i} \geq [C_n^k]^{\frac{1}{k}} \text{ for } \lambda \in \Gamma_k.$$

$$(5) \quad \sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}} \text{ is concave in } \Gamma_k.$$

Proof. All the above properties are well known. For example, see Chapter XV in [24] or [21] for proofs of (1), (2) and (3); see Lemma 2.2.19 in [15] for the proof of (4); see [4] and [24] for the proof of (5). $\square$

Proposition 2.2. *For $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma_k$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$.*

(i)

$$0 < \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|1) \leq \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|2) \leq \dots \leq \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|n).$$

(ii) *If $\lambda_i \leq 0$, then we have*

$$-\lambda_i \leq \frac{n-k}{k} \lambda_1.$$

(iii) For any $1 \leq l < k$, we have

$$\sigma_l(\lambda) \geq C(n, l) \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_l.$$

(iv) There exists a constant depending only on n and k such that

$$\lambda_1 \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|1) \geq C \sigma_k(\lambda).$$

(v)

$$\sum_i \lambda_i^2 \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|i) \geq \frac{k}{n} \sigma_1(\lambda) \sigma_k(\lambda).$$

(vi) The number of possible negative entries of λ is at most $n - k$ and

$$\lambda_k + \lambda_{k+1} + \cdots + \lambda_n > 0, \quad |\lambda_i| \leq n \lambda_k \text{ for any } i > k.$$

(vii)

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) \leq C_n^k \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k.$$

Proof. See [26, Lemma 2.2] for (i)-(v); see [29] for (vi); see Chapter XV in [24] for (vii). $\square$

The generalized Newton-MacLaurin inequality is as follows, which will be used all the time.

Proposition 2.3. For $\lambda \in \Gamma_m$ and $m > l \geq 0$, $r > s \geq 0$, $m \geq r$, $l \geq s$, we have

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

Proof. See [37]. $\square$

Next, we list the following well-known results.

Lemma 2.4. If $W = (w_{ij})$ is a symmetric real matrix, $\lambda_i = \lambda_i(W)$ is one of the eigenvalues ($i = 1, \dots, n$) and $F = F(W) = f(\lambda(W))$ is a symmetric function of $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, then for any real symmetric matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, we have the following formulas:

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial w_{ij} \partial w_{st}} a_{ij} a_{st} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda_p \partial \lambda_q} a_{pp} a_{qq} + 2 \sum_{p < q} \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_p} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_q}}{\lambda_p - \lambda_q} a_{pq}^2.$$

Moreover, if f is concave and $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$, we have

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(\lambda) \leq \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_2}(\lambda) \leq \cdots \leq \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_n}(\lambda).$$

Proof. See Lemma 3.2 in [13] or [1] for the proof of (2.3) and Lemma 2.2 in [1] for the proof (2.4). $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *Let $W = W_{ij}$ be an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix and $\lambda(W) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ be the eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix W . Suppose that $W = W_{ij}$ is diagonal and $\lambda_i = W_{ii}$, then we have*

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{\partial \lambda_i}{\partial W_{ii}} = 1, \quad \frac{\partial \lambda_k}{\partial W_{ij}} = 0 \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \lambda_i}{\partial W_{ij} \partial W_{ji}} = \frac{1}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j} \quad \text{for } i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i \neq \lambda_j.$$

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \lambda_i}{\partial W_{kl} \partial W_{pq}} = 0 \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

We now state some important inequalities by Guan-Ren-Wang in [19, Lemma 7] and Ren-Wang [30, Lemma 13], which are crucial to our estimates.

Lemma 2.6. *Assume that $k > l$, $W = (w_{ij})$ is a Codazzi tensor which is in Γ_k . Denote $\alpha = \frac{1}{k-l}$. Then for $h = 1, \dots, n$ and any $\delta > 0$, we have the following inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{p \neq q} \sigma_k^{pp,qq}(W) w_{pph} w_{qqh} + \left(1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}\right) \frac{(\sigma_k(W))_h^2}{\sigma_k(W)} \\ & \geq \sigma_k(W) (\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha) \left(\frac{(\sigma_l(W))_h}{\sigma_l(W)} \right)^2 - \frac{\sigma_k(W)}{\sigma_l(W)} \sigma_l^{pp,qq}(W) w_{pph} w_{qqh}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma_k$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and $n < 2k$. Assume that $\sigma_k(\lambda) \geq N_0 > 0$. Then for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $i \neq j$, if $\lambda_i > \lambda_1 - \frac{\sqrt{\Delta_1}}{n}$, we have*

$$\frac{2\lambda_i (1 - e^{\lambda_j - \lambda_i})}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j} \sigma_k^{jj}(\lambda) \geq \sigma_k^{jj}(\lambda) + (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) \sigma_k^{ii,jj}(\lambda),$$

when λ_1 is sufficiently large.

We need following lemma which is a slight improvement of Lemma 3.1 in [26].

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma_k$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$, $1 \leq l < k$ and $W = (w_{ij})$ be a Codazzi tensor which is in Γ_k . For any $\epsilon, \delta, \delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant*

$\delta' > 0$ depending only on $\epsilon, \delta, \delta_0, n, k$ and l such that if $\lambda_l \geq \delta\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_{l+1} \leq \delta'\lambda_1$, then we have

$$-\sum_{p \neq q} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} w_{pph} w_{qqh}}{\sigma_k} + (1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}) \frac{(\sum_i \sigma_k^{ii} w_{iih})^2}{\sigma_k^2} \geq (1 + \alpha - \delta\alpha - \epsilon) \frac{w_{11h}^2}{\lambda_1^2} - \delta_0 \sum_{i>l} \frac{\sigma_k^{ii} w_{iih}^2}{\lambda_1 \sigma_k}$$

for any $h = 1, \dots, n$, where $\alpha = \frac{1}{k-l}$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\sum_{p \neq q} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} w_{pph} w_{qqh}}{\sigma_k} + (1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}) \frac{(\sum_i \sigma_k^{ii} w_{iih})^2}{\sigma_k^2} \\ & \geq (\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha) \left(\frac{\sum_i \sigma_l^{ii} w_{iih}}{\sigma_l} \right)^2 - \sum_{p \neq q} \frac{\sigma_l^{pp,qq}(W) w_{pph} w_{qqh}}{\sigma_l(W)} \\ (2.8) \quad & \geq \frac{1}{\sigma_l^2} \left((\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha) \sum_i (\sigma_l^{ii} w_{iih})^2 + \sum_{p \neq q} (\sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l \sigma_l^{pp,qq}) w_{pph} w_{qqh} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.2) in [26, Lemma 3.1], we claim that

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{p \neq q} (\sigma_l^{pp} \sigma_l^{qq} - \sigma_l \sigma_l^{pp,qq}) w_{pph} w_{qqh} \geq -\frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{i \leq l} (\sigma_l^{ii} w_{iih})^2 - \frac{C}{\epsilon} \sum_{i>l} (\sigma_l^{ii} w_{iih})^2.$$

By (2.8) and (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\sum_{p \neq q} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} w_{pph} w_{qqh}}{\sigma_k} + (1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}) \frac{(\sum_i \sigma_k^{ii} w_{iih})^2}{\sigma_k^2} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{\sigma_l^2} \left((\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \sum_{i \leq l} (\sigma_l^{ii} w_{iih})^2 - \frac{C}{\epsilon} \sum_{i>l} (\sigma_l^{ii} w_{iih})^2 \right) \\ (2.10) \quad & \geq (\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \left(\frac{\sigma_l^{11}}{\sigma_l} w_{11h} \right)^2 - \frac{C}{\epsilon} \sum_{i>l} \left(\frac{\sigma_l^{ii}}{\sigma_l} w_{iih} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Together with Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\lambda_1 \sigma_l^{11} = \sigma_l - \sigma_l(\lambda|1) \geq \left(1 - \frac{C\delta'}{\delta} \right) \sigma_l,$$

and hence

$$(\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \left(\frac{\sigma_l^{11}}{\sigma_l} \right)^2 \geq (\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \left(\frac{1 - \frac{C\delta'}{\delta}}{\lambda_1} \right)^2 \geq \frac{\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha - \epsilon}{\lambda_1^2}$$

by choosing δ' sufficiently small.

For $i > l$, from the assumption of the lemma, it is easily seen that

$$-\frac{C}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\sigma_l^{ii}}{\sigma_l} \right)^2 \geq -\frac{C}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{l-1}}{\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_l} \right)^2 \geq -\frac{C}{\epsilon \delta^2} \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2}.$$

Consequently,

$$-\sum_{p \neq q} \frac{\sigma_k^{pp,qq} w_{pph} w_{qqh}}{\sigma_k} + (1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}) \frac{(\sum_i \sigma_k^{ii} w_{iih})^2}{\sigma_k^2} \geq (\alpha + 1 - \delta\alpha - \epsilon) \frac{w_{11h}^2}{\lambda_1^2} - \frac{C}{\epsilon \delta^2} \sum_{i>l} \frac{w_{iih}^2}{\lambda_1^2}.$$

To prove the lemma, we only need to show the following inequality

$$\sigma_k^{ii} \geq \frac{C}{\epsilon \delta^2 \delta_0} \frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_1}$$

for any $i > l$, which is already proved in the proof the Lemma 3.1 in [26]. Hence we complete the proof. $\square$

Finally, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that the function $f(x) = x - (1 - \epsilon)(1 - e^{-x})(x + \delta) > 0$ for any $x \in (0, +\infty)$.*

Proof. It is clearly see that

$$f'(x) = \epsilon + (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \delta)e^{-x} - (1 - \epsilon)xe^{-x}.$$

We shall have established the lemma if we show that $f(z) > 0$ for any point $z \in S := \{z \in (0, +\infty) \mid e^z = \frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon}z - \frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon}(1 - \delta)\}$. In fact for any $z \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= e^{-z}(1 - \epsilon) \left(z^2 - (1 - \delta)z + z - \delta \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\epsilon}(z - 1 + \delta) + \delta \right) \\ &= e^{-z}(1 - \epsilon) \left(z^2 - \frac{\delta(1 - \epsilon) - \delta\epsilon}{\epsilon}z + (1 - \delta)\delta \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\epsilon} + \delta \right) \\ &= e^{-z}(1 - \epsilon) \left(\left(z - \frac{\delta - 2\delta\epsilon}{2\epsilon} \right)^2 + \frac{-(\delta - 2\delta\epsilon)^2 + 4(1 - \delta)\delta(1 - \epsilon)\epsilon + 4\epsilon^2\delta}{4\epsilon^2} \right) \\ &= e^{-z}(1 - \epsilon) \left(\left(z - \frac{\delta - 2\delta\epsilon}{2\epsilon} \right)^2 + \frac{\delta(4\epsilon - \delta)}{4\epsilon^2} \right) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

if we choose $\delta < 4\epsilon$.

$\square$

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we will use the idea in [11, 7] to give the proof of Theorem 1.2. For convenience, we introduce the following notations

$$F(\nabla^2 u) = \sigma_k(\nabla^2 u), \quad F^{ij} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_{ij}}, \quad F^{ij,rs} = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_{ij} \partial u_{rs}}.$$

We assume $u \in C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is a semi-convex solution of the Hessian equation (1.1) with $\lambda(\nabla^2 u) \in \Gamma_k$. Note that we can assume $u < 0$ in Ω by the maximum principle. We consider the following test function,

$$\tilde{P}(x) = \ln \lambda_{\max}(x) + \beta \ln(-u) + \frac{a}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{A}{2} |x|^2,$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(x)$ is the biggest eigenvalue of the Hessian matrix u_{ij} , β, a and A are constants which will be determined later. Suppose $\tilde{P}$ attains its maximum value in Ω at x_0 . Rotating the coordinates, we diagonal the matrix $\nabla^2 u = (u_{ij})$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\lambda_1(x_0)$ has multiplicity m , then

$$u_{ij} = u_{ii} \delta_{ij}, \quad \lambda_i = u_{ii}, \quad \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \dots = \lambda_m \geq \lambda_{m+1} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \quad \text{at } x_0.$$

Then, by (2.4) we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad 0 < F^{11} = F^{22} = \dots = F^{mm} \leq F^{m+1,m+1} \leq \dots \leq F^{nn} \quad \text{at } x_0.$$

We now apply a perturbation argument. Let B be a matrix satisfying the follow conditons:

$$B_{ij} = \delta_{ij}(1 - \delta_{1i}), \quad B_{ij,p} = B_{11,ii} = 0, \quad \text{at } x_0.$$

Define the matrix by $\tilde{u}_{ij} = u_{ij} - B_{ij}$ and denote its eigenvalues by $\tilde{\lambda} = (\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n)$. It follows that $\lambda_1 \geq \tilde{\lambda}_1$ near x_0 and

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

at x_0 . Thus $\tilde{\lambda}_1 > \tilde{\lambda}_2$ at x_0 , which implies that $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ is smooth at x_0 . We consider the pertrubed quantity P defined by

$$P(x) = \ln \tilde{\lambda}_1 + \beta \ln(-u) + \frac{a}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{A}{2} |x|^2,$$

which also attains a local maximum at x_0 . Note that in the following estimates the letter “ C ” denotes a generic constant which is allowed to depend only on the known data of the problem, i.e. $n, k, \sup_{\Omega} |u|, \sup_{\Omega} |\nabla u|, |\psi|_{C^2}, \inf \psi$ and which may change from line to line.

Differentiating P at x_0 twice, we get

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,i}}{\tilde{\lambda}_1} + \frac{\beta u_i}{u} + a u_i u_{ii} + A x_i = 0,$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{\beta u_{ii}}{u} - \frac{\beta u_i^2}{u^2} + \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,ii}}{\tilde{\lambda}_1} - \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,i}^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_1^2} + a \sum_{j=1}^n u_j u_{jii} + a u_{ii}^2 + A \leq 0.$$

According to Lemma 2.5, we have at x_0

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,i}}{\tilde{\lambda}_1} = \frac{u_{11i}}{\lambda_1}, \quad \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,ii}}{\tilde{\lambda}_1} = \frac{u_{11ii}}{\lambda_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{u_{1pi}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)}.$$

Thus, at x_0

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq F^{ii} P_{ii} \\ &\geq \frac{k\beta\psi}{u} - \frac{\beta F^{ii} u_i^2}{u^2} + \frac{F^{ii} u_{11ii}}{\lambda_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{ii} u_{1pi}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} - \frac{F^{ii} u_{11i}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\ &\quad + a \sum_{j=1}^n u_j F^{ii} u_{ij} + a F^{ii} u_{ii}^2 + A \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} \\ &\geq \frac{F^{ii} u_{11ii}}{\lambda_1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{ii} u_{1pi}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + a \sum_{j=1}^n u_j F^{ii} u_{ij} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{ii} u_{11i}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\ (3.5) \quad &+ a F^{ii} u_{ii}^2 - \frac{4a^2}{\beta} F^{ii} u_i^2 u_{ii}^2 + A \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - \frac{4A^2}{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} x_i^2 + \frac{k\beta\psi}{u}. \end{aligned}$$

Rewrite equation (1.1) as

$$(3.6) \quad F(\nabla^2 u) = \psi,$$

differentiating equation (3.6) once gives

$$(3.7) \quad F^{ii} u_{ij} = \psi_j = \psi_{x_j} + \psi_z u_j + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial u_j} u_{jj} \leq C(1 + \lambda_1).$$

Differentiating equation (3.6) twice gives

$$(3.8) \quad F^{ij,rs} u_{ij1} u_{rs1} + F^{ii} u_{ii11} = \psi_{11}.$$

Now we estimate ψ_{11}

$$\psi_{11} \geq -C(1 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_1^2) + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial u_i} u_{11i}.$$

Then, applying the concavity of F (see Proposition 2.1 (5)), it follows at x_0

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{F^{ii}u_{ii11}}{\lambda_1} &\geq -\frac{1}{\lambda_1}F^{ij,rs}u_{ij1}u_{rs1} - C(1 + \lambda_1) + \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial u_i}\frac{u_{11i}}{\lambda_1} \\
 &= -\frac{1}{\lambda_1}\sum_{p \neq q}F^{pp,qq}u_{pp1}u_{qq1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1}\sum_{p \neq q}F^{pp,qq}u_{pq1}^2 - C(1 + \lambda_1) + \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial u_i}\frac{u_{11i}}{\lambda_1} \\
 &\geq -\frac{1}{\lambda_1}\sum_{p \neq q}F^{pp,qq}u_{pp1}u_{qq1} + \frac{2}{\lambda_1}\sum_{i > m}F^{11,ii}u_{11i}^2 - C(1 + \lambda_1) + \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial u_i}\frac{u_{11i}}{\lambda_1} \\
 (3.9) \quad &= -\frac{1}{\lambda_1}\sum_{p \neq q}F^{pp,qq}u_{pp1}u_{qq1} + \sum_{i > m}\frac{2(F^{ii} - F^{11})u_{11i}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_i)\lambda_1} - C(1 + \lambda_1) + \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial u_i}\frac{u_{11i}}{\lambda_1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.7) and (3.2), we have,

$$(3.10) \quad \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial u_i}\frac{u_{11i}}{\lambda_1} + a \sum_{j=1}^n u_j F^{ii}u_{ij} \geq -C(A + a + \frac{\beta}{-u}).$$

Plugging (3.7), (3.9) and (3.10) into (3.5), assuming $u_{11}(x_0) \geq 1$, we have at x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\geq -\frac{1}{\lambda_1}\sum_{p \neq q}F^{pp,qq}u_{pp1}u_{qq1} + 2\sum_i\sum_{p > 1}\frac{F^{ii}u_{1pi}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + \sum_{i > m}\frac{2(F^{ii} - F^{11})u_{11i}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_i)\lambda_1} \\
 &\quad - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta})\frac{F^{ii}u_{11i}^2}{\lambda_1^2} + (a - 4\frac{a^2C}{\beta})F^{ii}\lambda_i^2 + (A - 4\frac{A^2C}{\beta})\sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} \\
 &\quad - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + A + \lambda_1) \\
 &\geq -\frac{1}{\lambda_1}\sum_{p \neq q}F^{pp,qq}u_{pp1}u_{qq1} + 2\sum_{p > 1}\frac{F^{pp}u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + 2\sum_{p > 1}\frac{F^{11}u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i > m}\frac{2(F^{ii} - F^{11})u_{11i}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_i)\lambda_1} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta})\frac{F^{ii}u_{11i}^2}{\lambda_1^2} + (a - \frac{4a^2C}{\beta})F^{ii}\lambda_i^2 \\
 (3.11) \quad &+ (A - 4\frac{A^2C}{\beta})\sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + A + \lambda_1),
 \end{aligned}$$

since

$$2\sum_i\sum_{p > 1}\frac{F^{ii}u_{1pi}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} \geq 2\sum_{p > 1}\frac{F^{pp}u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + 2\sum_{p > 1}\frac{F^{11}u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)}.$$

Recall that $\lambda_i \geq -K$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\lambda_1 \geq K + 1$. Thus $\lambda_1 + \tilde{\lambda}_p \geq 0$ and we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *At x_0 , we have*

$$2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{11} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + \sum_{p>m} \frac{2(F^{pp} - F^{11})u_{11p}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p)\lambda_1} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \geq 0,$$

assuming without loss of generality that $\lambda_1 > \frac{\beta+2}{\beta-2}(K+1)$ and $\beta > 2$.

Proof. By direct calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{11} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + \sum_{p>m} \frac{2(F^{pp} - F^{11})u_{11p}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p)\lambda_1} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\ & \geq \sum_{p>m} \frac{2F^{11} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1} \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_p - \lambda_p}{(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p)} + \sum_{p>m} \frac{F^{pp} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1} \frac{(1 - \frac{2}{\beta})\lambda_1 + (1 + \frac{2}{\beta})\lambda_p}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p)\lambda_1} \\ & \geq F^{11} \sum_{p>m} \frac{u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{(1 - \frac{2}{\beta})\lambda_1 + (1 + \frac{2}{\beta})\lambda_p}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p)\lambda_1} - \frac{2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + 1)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p)} \right) \\ & = (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) F^{11} \sum_{p>m} \frac{u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \frac{\frac{\beta-2}{\beta+2}\lambda_1 + \lambda_p - 1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + 1} \\ & \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Using (3.11) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & \geq -\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{a}{2} F^{ii} \lambda_i^2 \\ (3.12) \quad & + \frac{A}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + A + \lambda_1), \end{aligned}$$

if we choose $\beta > \max\{4, 8AC, 8aC\}$ and $\lambda_1 > \frac{\beta+2}{\beta-2}(K+1)$.

Denote $\alpha = \frac{1}{k-l}$. The rest of the proof is very similar to [26, Theorem 4.1]. For the reader's convenience, we give all the details here.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\epsilon_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, if we choose $\delta \in (0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{4})$, $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{\epsilon_0 \alpha}{4})$, $\delta_0 = \frac{2k}{n+k}$, $\beta > \max\{\frac{8}{\alpha \epsilon_0}, 4, 8AC, 8aC\}$ and $m \leq l < k$, there exist constants δ' depending only on $\epsilon, \delta, \delta_0, n, k$ and l such that if $\lambda_l \geq \delta \lambda_1$ and $\lambda_{l+1} \leq \delta' \lambda_1$, then*

$$(-u)^\beta \lambda_1 \leq C,$$

where C depends on $\epsilon, \delta, \delta_0, n, k, l, |u|_{C^1}, \inf \psi$ and $|\psi|_{C^2}$.

Proof. We will now use Lemma 2.8 to take care of the term $-(1 + \frac{2}{\beta})\frac{F^{11}u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} \\
& \geq -(1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}) \frac{(\sum_p F^{pp} u_{pp1})^2}{\sigma_k \lambda_1} + (1 + \alpha - \delta\alpha - \epsilon) \frac{F u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} - \delta_0 \sum_{p>l} \frac{F^{pp} u_{pp1}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\
& \quad + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} \\
& \geq -C \frac{1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}}{\psi} \lambda_1 + (1 + \alpha - \delta\alpha - \epsilon) \frac{F u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} + \sum_{p>l} \frac{F^{pp} u_{pp1}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \frac{(2 - \delta_0)\lambda_1 + \delta_0 \lambda_p - \delta_0}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + 1} \\
& \geq -C \frac{1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}}{\psi} \lambda_1 + (1 + \alpha - \delta\alpha - \epsilon) \frac{F u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} + \sum_{p>l} \frac{F^{pp} u_{pp1}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \frac{(2 - 2\delta_0)\lambda_1 + \delta_0(-\frac{n-k}{k}\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + 1} \\
& \geq -C \frac{1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\delta}}{\psi} \lambda_1 + (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda|1) u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Plugging (3.13) into (3.12), we have

$$(3.14) \quad 0 \geq \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda|1) u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} + \frac{a}{2} F^{ii} \lambda_i^2 + \frac{A}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + A + \lambda_1).$$

By Proposition 2.2 and the fact that $\lambda_i \geq -K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_k(\lambda|1) & \geq -C \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_k \cdot K - C \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_{k-2} |\lambda_{n-2}| |\lambda_{n-1}| |\lambda_n| \\
& \quad - C \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_{k-4} |\lambda_{n-4}| |\lambda_{n-3}| |\lambda_{n-2}| |\lambda_{n-1}| |\lambda_n| - \cdots \\
& \geq -C \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_k \cdot K.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining with the critical equation (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.15) \quad \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda|1) u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} & = \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda|1)}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{-\beta u_1}{u} - a u_1 \lambda_1 - A x_1 \right)^2 \\
& \geq -CK \frac{\lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_k}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{\beta^2}{u^2} + a^2 \lambda_1^2 + A^2 \right) \\
& = -CK \frac{\lambda_2 \lambda_3 \cdots \lambda_k}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{\beta^2}{u^2} + A^2 \right) - CK a^2 \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_k.
\end{aligned}$$

We assume that $-u\lambda_1 \geq \max\{\beta, A \max|u|\}$ and $a > 1$, then

$$(3.16) \quad \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda|1)u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} \geq -3CKa^2\lambda_1\lambda_2\cdots\lambda_k.$$

Combining with (3.14) and (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -3CKa^2\lambda_1\lambda_2\cdots\lambda_k + \frac{a}{2}F^{ii}\lambda_i^2 + \frac{A}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - C(a + A + \frac{\beta}{-u} + \lambda_1) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{A(n-k+1)}{2} - 3CKa^2\lambda_k\right)\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1} + \frac{ak}{2n}\sigma_1\sigma_k - C(a + A + 2\lambda_1) \\ (3.17) &\geq \left(\frac{A(n-k+1)}{2} - 3CKa^2\lambda_k\right)\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1} + \frac{ak}{2n}C\lambda_1 - 2C\lambda_1 - C(a + A). \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose a and A sufficiently large such that

$$a > \max\left\{\frac{12C^2K^2}{n-k+1}, \frac{2(1+2C)n}{Ck}\right\}, \quad A = a^3.$$

If $\lambda_k \geq \frac{(n-k+1)a}{6CK}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k &\geq \lambda_1\cdots\lambda_k - C\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}\cdot K \\ &\geq \lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}(\lambda_k - CK) \\ (3.18) \quad &\geq \lambda_1(\lambda_k)^{k-2}CK, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $(-u)^\beta\lambda_1 \leq C$.

If $\lambda_k \leq \frac{(n-k+1)a}{6CK}$, then $\frac{A(n-k)}{2} - 3CKa^2\lambda_k > 0$ and (3.17) becomes

$$0 \geq \frac{ak}{2n}C\lambda_1 - 2C\lambda_1 - C(a + A) \geq \lambda_1 - C(a + A).$$

Then we have $(-u)^\beta\lambda_1 \leq C$. □

We now complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. Set $\delta_1 = \frac{1}{3}$. By Lemma 3.2, there exists constant δ_2 such that if $\lambda_2 \leq \delta_2\lambda_1$, then $(-u)^\beta\lambda_1 \leq C$. If $\lambda_2 > \delta_2\lambda_1$, using Lemma 3.2 again, there exists δ_3 such that if $\lambda_3 \leq \delta_3\lambda_1$, then $(-u)^\beta\lambda_1 \leq C$. Repeating the above argument, we obtain $(-u)^\beta\lambda_1 \leq C$ or $\lambda_k > \delta_k\lambda_1$. In the latter case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k &\geq \lambda_1\cdots\lambda_k - C\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}\cdot K \\ &\geq \lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}(\delta_k\lambda_1 - CK) \\ (3.19) \quad &\geq C\delta_2\delta_3\cdots\delta_k(\lambda_1)^k, \end{aligned}$$

by assuming λ_1 sufficiently large. It follows that

$$(-u)^\beta \lambda_1 \leq C,$$

and the theorem is now proved.

4. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.5. We consider the following test function

$$P(x) = \ln \tilde{\lambda}_1 + \beta \ln(-u) + \frac{a}{2} |\nabla u|^2,$$

where β, a are large constants to be determined later, $\tilde{\lambda} = (\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n)$ are eigenvalues of the matrix $u_{ij} - B_{ij}$. Suppose P attains its maximum value in Ω at x_0 . Here B is a matrix satisfying the following conditions:

$$B_{ij} = \delta \delta_{ij} (1 - \delta_{1i}), \quad B_{ij,p} = B_{11,ii} = 0, \quad \text{at } x_0,$$

$\delta < 1$ is a sufficiently small constant to be determined later. It follows that $\lambda_1 \geq \tilde{\lambda}_1$ near x_0 and

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_i = \lambda_i - \delta \quad \text{for } i > 1,$$

at x_0 . We may assume λ_1 has multiplicity m . Analysis similar to that in the proof of Theorem 1.2 show that at x_0

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & -\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{11} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1 (\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + \sum_{i>m} \frac{2(F^{ii} - F^{11}) u_{11i}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_i) \lambda_1} \\ & - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{ii} u_{11i}^2}{\lambda_1^2} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1 (\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + (a - \frac{2a^2 C}{\beta}) F^{ii} \lambda_i^2 \\ (4.1) \quad & - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + \lambda_1). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $k > \frac{n}{2}$, assuming that $\lambda_1 \geq B := \frac{\delta}{1 + \frac{\beta-2}{\beta+2} - \frac{n}{k}}$ and $\beta > \frac{4k}{2k-n}$, then we have at x_0*

$$2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{11} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1 (\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + \sum_{p>m} \frac{2(F^{pp} - F^{11}) u_{11p}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p) \lambda_1} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \geq 0.$$

Proof. In the same manner as in Lemma 3.1, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{11} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} + \sum_{p>m} \frac{2(F^{pp} - F^{11}) u_{11p}^2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p) \lambda_1} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\ & \geq (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) F^{11} \sum_{p>m} \frac{u_{11p}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \frac{\frac{\beta-2}{\beta+2} \lambda_1 + \lambda_p - \delta}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + \delta}. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand,

$$\frac{\frac{\beta-2}{\beta+2} \lambda_1 + \lambda_p - \delta}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + \delta} \geq 0, \quad \text{if } \lambda_p \geq 0.$$

When $\lambda_p < 0$, then

$$\frac{\frac{\beta-2}{\beta+2} \lambda_1 + \lambda_p - \delta}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + \delta} = -1 + \frac{1 + \frac{\beta-2}{\beta+2}}{1 - \frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_1} + \frac{\delta}{\lambda_1}} \geq -1 + \frac{1 + \frac{\beta-2}{\beta+2}}{1 - \frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_1} + \frac{B}{\delta}} \geq 0,$$

the last inequality comes from Proposition 2.2. □

Using (4.1) and Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & \geq -\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\ (4.2) \quad & + (a - \frac{2a^2 C}{\beta}) F^{ii} \lambda_i^2 - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + \lambda_1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} = F^{11} \left(\frac{-\beta u_1}{u} - a u_1 \lambda_1 \right)^2 \leq C F^{11} \frac{\beta^2}{u^2} + C a^2 \sum_i F^{ii} \lambda_i^2,$$

Let $\epsilon = \min\{\frac{1}{16Ca}, \frac{1}{2}\}$ and $\beta \geq \max\{\frac{4k}{2k-n}, 32Ca\}$, then we have

$$(4.3) \quad \left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \epsilon\right) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \leq C \epsilon F^{11} \frac{\beta^2}{u^2} + \frac{a}{8} \sum_i F^{ii} \lambda_i^2 \leq \frac{a}{4} \sum_i F^{ii} \lambda_i^2,$$

by assuming $u^2 \lambda_1^2 \geq \frac{\beta^2}{a^2}$. By concavity of $\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}$,

$$(4.4) \quad -\epsilon \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} \geq -\epsilon \frac{k-1}{k} \frac{(\psi_1)^2}{F \lambda_1} \geq -C \lambda_1.$$

We assume that $\lambda_1 \geq \max\{B, 1\}$ and $u^2\lambda_1^2 \geq \frac{\beta^2}{a^2}$. From Conjecture 1.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -\frac{1-\epsilon}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\
 \geq & -\frac{K(1-\epsilon)}{\lambda_1} \left(\sum_j \sigma_k^{jj}(\lambda) u_{jj1} \right)^2 - \frac{1-\epsilon}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{j \neq 1} a_j u_{jj1}^2 - (\epsilon + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\
 & + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} \\
 \geq & -CK(1 + \lambda_1) - (\epsilon + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} + \sum_{1 < p \leq m} \frac{2F^{11} u_{1pp}^2}{\delta \lambda_1} + \sum_{p>m} \frac{2F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} \\
 (4.5) \quad & -\frac{1-\epsilon}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{1 < p \leq m} a_p u_{pp1}^2 - \frac{1-\epsilon}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{p>m} a_p u_{pp1}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.7 implies that $a_p = F^{11} + 2\lambda_1 \sigma_k^{11,pp} \leq 2\lambda_1 F^{pp}$ for $1 < p \leq m$. Hence

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{1 < p \leq m} \frac{2F^{11} u_{1pp}^2}{\delta \lambda_1} - \frac{1-\epsilon}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{1 < p \leq m} a_p u_{pp1}^2 \geq \sum_{1 < p \leq m} \frac{2\epsilon u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1} F^{11} \geq 0.$$

For $p > m$, according to Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\frac{2\lambda_1 (1 - e^{\lambda_p - \lambda_1})}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p} F^{pp} \geq F^{pp} + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_p) F^{11,pp} = a_p.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.7) \quad & \sum_{p>m} \frac{2F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} - \frac{1-\epsilon}{\lambda_1^2} \sum_{p>m} a_p u_{pp1}^2 \\
 = & \sum_{p>m} \frac{2F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{1}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + \delta)} - \frac{(1-\epsilon)(1 - e^{\lambda_p - \lambda_1})}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_p} \right) \\
 = & \sum_{p>m} \frac{2F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + \delta)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p)} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_p - (1-\epsilon)(1 - e^{\lambda_p - \lambda_1})(\lambda_1 - \lambda_p + \delta)) \\
 > & 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality comes from Lemma 2.9 by choosing $\delta = \epsilon$.

Plugging (4.3)-(4.7) into (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq -CK(\lambda_1 + 1) + \frac{a}{4}F^{ii}\lambda_i^2 - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + \lambda_1) \\
&\geq \frac{ak}{4n}\sigma_1\sigma_k - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + \lambda_1) \\
&\geq \frac{a}{8C}\lambda_1 - C(a + \frac{\beta}{-u} + \lambda_1).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(-u)^\beta\lambda_1 \leq C$ by choosing a large enough. Then the theorem is now proved.

5. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.9

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.9. At first we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $u \in C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ be a semi-convex solution to the Dirichlet problem of the following Hessian equation*

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} \sigma_k(\nabla^2 u) = 1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with $\lambda(\nabla^2 u) \in \Gamma_k$ and $n \geq k \geq 2$. Assume that there exists constants $M' < \frac{1}{k-1}$, $M > 0$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \left(\frac{\partial \sigma_{k+1}(\nabla^2 u)}{\partial u_{ij}} \right)_{ij} \geq -M'I, \quad \text{if } \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 u) \geq M.$$

Then

$$(-u)^\beta |\nabla^2 u|(x) \leq C, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

for sufficiently large $\beta > 0$. Here C and β depends only on n, k, M', M, K and the domain Ω .

Proof. It is obvious that there exist constants a and b depending only on the diameter of the domain Ω such that

$$\frac{a}{2}x^2 - b \leq u \leq 0.$$

Hence, in the following proof, the constant β, C can contains $\sup_\Omega |u|$. Of course, there exists a constant K such that $\nabla^2 u + KI \geq 0$ since u is semi-convex function.

We consider the perturbed quantity $\tilde{P}$ defined by

$$\tilde{P}(x) = \ln \tilde{\lambda}_1 + \beta \ln(-u) + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2,$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ is defined as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. β is a constant which will be determined later. Suppose $\tilde{P}$ attains its maximum value in Ω at x_0 . Rotating the coordinates, we diagonal the matrix $\nabla^2 u = (u_{ij})$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\lambda_1(x_0)$ has multiplicity m . Differentiating P at x_0 twice, we have

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,i}}{\tilde{\lambda}_1} + \frac{\beta u_i}{u} + x_i = 0,$$

and

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{\beta u_{ii}}{u} - \frac{\beta u_i^2}{u^2} + \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,ii}}{\tilde{\lambda}_1} - \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,i}^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_1^2} + 1 \leq 0.$$

Analysis similar to that in the proof of Theorem 1.2 show that

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \geq & -\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} + \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - C + \frac{\beta k}{u} - \frac{2F^{ii} x_i^2}{\beta} \\ & + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \end{aligned}$$

if we choose $\beta > 2$ and $\lambda_1 \geq \frac{\beta+2}{\beta-2}(1+K)$.

Denote $\alpha = \frac{1}{k-l}$ and $\epsilon_0 = \frac{1}{k-1} - M'$. Now we divide two sub-cases to continue.

Case 1: There exist $m \leq l < k$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{4})$, $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{\epsilon_0 \alpha}{4})$, $\delta_0 = \frac{2k}{n+k}$, $\beta > \frac{4k}{(2k-3)\epsilon_0}$ such that $\lambda_l \geq \delta \lambda_1$ and $\lambda_{l+1} \leq \delta' \lambda_1$, where δ' depending only on $\epsilon, \delta, \delta_0, n, k$ and l .

Referring to the calculation in (3.13), we obtain

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{p \neq q} F^{pp,qq} u_{pp1} u_{qq1} + 2 \sum_{p>1} \frac{F^{pp} u_{1pp}^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_p)} - (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F^{11} u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\ \geq & (\alpha - \delta \alpha - \epsilon - \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{F u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} + (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \frac{\sigma_k(\lambda|1) u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\lambda_1 \geq \max\{M, \frac{\beta+2}{\beta-2}(1+K)\}$ and plugging (5.6) into (5.5), we have

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \geq & \left((\alpha - \delta \alpha - \epsilon - \frac{2}{\beta}) F + (1 + \frac{2}{\beta}) \sigma_k(\lambda|1) \right) \frac{u_{111}^2}{\lambda_1^3} + \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - C + \frac{\beta k}{u} \\ & - \frac{2F^{ii} x_i^2}{\beta} \\ \geq & (1 - \frac{2C}{\beta}) \sum_{i=1}^n F^{ii} - C + \frac{\beta k}{u}, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality comes from (5.2). We take $\beta = 4C$, then, we have

$$C \geq \frac{\beta k}{u} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \sigma_k^{\frac{k-2}{k-1}} > \frac{\beta k}{u} + \frac{C_0}{2} \lambda_1^{\frac{1}{k-1}}.$$

Hence we obtain the Lemma.

Case 2: For any $2 \leq l \leq k$, there exists $\delta_l > 0$ such that $\lambda_l \geq \delta_l \lambda_1$.

In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \sigma_k &\geq \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_k - C \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{k-1} K \\ &\geq \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{k-1} (\delta_k \lambda_1 - CK) \\ &\geq C \delta_2 \delta_3 \cdots \delta_k \lambda_1^k, \end{aligned}$$

by assuming λ_1 sufficiently large. It follows that $\lambda_1 \leq C$.

Hence, we have proved Lemma 5.1. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let $u \in C^2(\Omega)$ be a k -convex solution to the Hessian equation*

$$(5.8) \quad \sigma_k(\nabla^2 u) = 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Assume that there exists a uniform constant A such that

$$(5.9) \quad \sigma_{k+1}(\nabla^2 u(x)) \geq -A, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Then u is semi-convex and satisfies the almost $(k+1)$ -convexity condition (5.2). The statement still holds if the k -convex solution u satisfies the condition CNS which introduced by Chu-Dineu in [12].

Proof. From proposition 3.6 in [12], it suffices to show that the condition CNS implies semi-convexity and almost $(k+1)$ -convexity condition (5.2) for u .

Assume that u satisfies the condition CNS and fix $x \in \Omega$, then there is a uniform constant $R > 0$ such that for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ the vector

$$(\lambda_1(\nabla^2 u(x)), \dots, \lambda_{i-1}(\nabla^2 u(x)), R, \lambda_{i+1}(\nabla^2 u(x)), \dots, \lambda_n(\nabla^2 u(x))) \in \Gamma_k.$$

Denote $\lambda_i := \lambda_i(\nabla^2 u(x))$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, assume that $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$. Hence $(R, \lambda') \in \Gamma_k$ for $\lambda' = (\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)$. It follows from Proposition 2.2(ii) that

$$|\lambda_n| \leq \frac{n-k}{n} R,$$

which implies that $\nabla^2 u + \frac{n-k}{n} R I \geq 0$. Thus u is semi-convex.

Let M' be a constant with $M' < \frac{1}{k-1}$, denote $M := \frac{1+M'}{M'}R$. If $\lambda_1 \geq M$, then

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) = \sigma_k(R, \lambda') + \int_R^{\lambda_1} \frac{\sigma_k}{\partial \lambda_1}(s, \lambda') ds \geq \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|1)(\lambda_1 - R) \geq \frac{1}{1+M'} \lambda_1 \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|1).$$

Hence

$$\sigma_k(\lambda|1) = \sigma_k(\lambda) - \lambda_1 \sigma_{k-1}(\lambda|1) \geq -M',$$

which implies condition (5.2) and thus finishes the proof. $\square$

Comining with Lemma 5.1 and 5.2, we have

Theorem 5.3. *Let $u \in C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ be a k -convex solution to the Dirichlet problem (5.1) Assume that there exists a uniform constant A such that $\sigma_{k+1}(\nabla^2 u) \geq -A$ in Ω . Then*

$$(-u)^\beta |\nabla^2 u|(x) \leq C, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

for sufficiently large $\beta > 0$. Here C and β depends only on n, k, A and the domain Ω .

Remark 5.4. We emphasize that this interior C^2 estimate does not depend on the gradient of u .

Proof of Theorem 1.9. The proof here is similar to [39, 25, 22]. So, only a sketch will be given below.

Suppose u is an entire solution of the equation (1.5). For arbitrary positive constant $R > 1$. Define

$$\Omega_R := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u(Ry) \leq R^2\}, \quad v(y) = \frac{u(Ry) - R^2}{R^2}.$$

We consider the following Dirichlet problem

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{cases} \sigma_k(\nabla^2 v) = 1 & \text{in } \Omega_R, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_R. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.1, it follows that

$$(-v)^\beta |\nabla^2 v| \leq C,$$

where C and β depend only on n, k and the domain Ω_R . Now using the quadratic growth condition appears in Theorem 1.9, we can assert that

$$c|Ry|^2 - b \leq u(Ry) \leq R^2.$$

Namely

$$|y|^2 \leq \frac{1+b}{c}.$$

Hence, Ω_R is bounded and the constant C and β become two absolute constants. Consider the domain

$$\Omega'_R = \{y \mid u(Ry) \leq \frac{R^2}{2}\} \subset \Omega_R.$$

It is easily seen that

$$v \leq -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \Delta v \leq 2^\beta C \quad \text{in } \Omega'_R.$$

Note that $\nabla_y^2 v = \nabla_x^2 u$. Thus

$$\nabla u \leq C \quad \text{in } \Omega'_R = \{x \mid u(x) \leq \frac{R^2}{2}\},$$

where C is absolute constant. Since R is arbitrary, we have the above inequality in whole $\mathbb{R}^n$. Using Evan-Krylov theory, we have

$$|D^2 u|_{C^\alpha(B_R)} \leq C \frac{|D^2 u|_{C^0(B_R)}}{R^\alpha} \leq \frac{C}{R^\alpha} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Hence we obtain Theorem 1.9. □

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Andrews, Contraction of convex hypersurfaces in Euclidean space, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 2 (1994), 151-171.
- [2] J. Bao, J. Chen, B. Guan, M. Ji, Liouville property and regularity of a Hessian quotient equation, *Amer. J. Math.*, 125 (2003), 3013-16.
- [3] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg, J. Spruck, Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second order elliptic equations I, Monge-Ampère equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 37 (1984), 369-402.
- [4] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg, J. Spruck, The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second order elliptic equations, III: Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian, *Acta Math.*, 155 (1985), 261-301.
- [5] S.Y.A. Chang, Y. Yuan, A Liouville problem for sigma-2 equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 28 (2010), 6596-64.
- [6] L. Chen, N. Xiang, Rigidity theorems for the entire solutions of 2-Hessian equation, *J. Differential Equations*, 267 (2019), no. 9, 5202-5219.
- [7] X.J. Chen, Q. Tu, N. Xiang, A class of Hessian quotient equations in Euclidean space, *J. Differential Equations*, 269 (2020), 11172-11194.
- [8] L. Chen, Q. Tu, N. Xiang, Pogorelov type estimates for a class of Hessian quotient equations, *J. Differential Equations* 282 (2021), 272-284.
- [9] K.S. Chou, X.J. Wang, A variational theory of the Hessian equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 54 (2001), 1029-1064.
- [10] J.C. Chu, A simple proof of curvature estimate for convex solution of k -Hessian equation, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 149.08 (2021): 3541-3552.
- [11] J.C. Chu, H.M. Jiao, Curvature estimates for a class of Hessian type equations, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 60 (2021), 90.

- [12] J.C. Chu, S. Dinew, Liouville theorem for a class of Hessian equations, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2306.13825, 2023.
- [13] S.Z. Gao, H.Z. Li, H. Ma, Uniqueness of closed self-similar solutions to σ_k^α -curvature flow, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., 5 (2018), No.45, 26.
- [14] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of the Second Order, second edition, Springer, 1998.
- [15] C. Gerhardt, Curvature problems, Series in Geometry and Topology, International Press of Boston Inc., Sommerville, 2006.
- [16] M.J. Gursky, J.A. Viaclovsky, Fully nonlinear equations on Riemannian manifolds with negative curvature, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 52 (2003), no. 2, 399-419.
- [17] P.F. Guan, J. Li, Y.Y. Li, Hypersurfaces of prescribed curvature measure, Duke Math. J., 161 (2012), 1927-1942.
- [18] P.F. Guan, C.S. Lin, X. Ma, The existence of convex body with prescribed curvature measures, Int. Math. Res. Not., (2009), 1947-1975.
- [19] P.F. Guan, C.Y. Ren, Z.Z. Wang, Global C^2 Estimates for Convex Solutions of Curvature Equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 68 (2015), no. 8, 1287-1325.
- [20] F. Han, X.N. Ma, D.M. Wu, A constant rank theorem for Hermitian k -convex solutions of complex Laplace equations, Methods Appl. Anal., 16 (2009), no. 2, 263-289.
- [21] G. Huisken, C. Sinestrari, Convexity estimates for mean curvature flow and singularities of mean convex surfaces, Acta Math., 183 (1999), no. 1, 45-70.
- [22] Y. Liu, C.Y. Ren, Pogorelov type C^2 estimates for Sum Hessian equations and a rigidity theorem, J. Funct. Anal., 284 (2023), no. 1, 109726.
- [23] S.Y. Li, On the Dirichlet problems for symmetric function equations of the eigenvalues of the complex Hessian, Asian J. Math., 8 (2004), no. 1, 87-106.
- [24] G. Lieberman, Second order parabolic differential equations, World Scientific, 1996.
- [25] M. Li, C.Y. Ren, Z.Z. Wang, An interior estimate for convex solutions and a rigidity theorem, J. Funct. Anal., 270 (2016), no. 7, 2691-2714.
- [26] S.Y. Lu, Curvature estimates for semi-convex solutions of Hessian equations in hyperbolic space, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12409 (2023).
- [27] A.V. Pogorelov, The Minkowski Multidimensional Problem, John Wiley, 1978.
- [28] C.Y. Ren, Z.Z. Wang, On the curvature estimates for Hessian equations, Amer. J. Math., 141 (2019), no. 5, 1281-1315.
- [29] C.Y. Ren, Z.Z. Wang, The global curvature estimate for the $n - 2$ Hessian equation, (2020), arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08702.
- [30] C.Y. Ren, Z.Z. Wang, Notes on the curvature estimates for Hessian equations, (2020), arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.14234.
- [31] R. Shankar, Y. Yuan, Rigidity for general semiconvex entire solutions to the sigma-2 equation, Duke Math. J., 171 (2022), no.15, 3201-3214.
- [32] W.M. Sheng, Y. Zhang, A class of fully nonlinear equations arising from conformal geometry, Math. Z., 255 (2007), no. 1, 17-34.
- [33] G. Székelyhidi, V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, Gauduchon metrics with prescribed volume form, Acta Math., 219 (2017), no. 1, 181-211.
- [34] G. Székelyhidi, Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds, J. Differential Geom., 109 (2018), no. 2, 337-378.

- [35] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, The Monge-Ampère equation for $(n - 1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions on a compact Kähler manifold, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 30 (2017), no. 2, 311-346.
- [36] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, Hermitian metrics, $(n - 1, n - 1)$ forms and Monge-Ampère equations, J. Reine Angew. Math., 755 (2019), 67-101.
- [37] J. Spruck, Geometric aspects of the theory of fully nonlinear elliptic equations, Clay Mathematics Proceedings, 2 (2005), 283-309.
- [38] N.S. Trudinger, On the Dirichlet problem for Hessian equations, Acta Math., 175 (1995), 151-164.
- [39] N.S. Trudinger, X.J. Wang, The Monge-Ampère equation and its geometric applications, in: Hand-book of Geometric Analysis, vol. I, International Press, 2008, pp.467-524.
- [40] X.J. Wang, k Hessian equation, in: Geometric Analysis and PDEs, in: Lecture Notes in Math., (2009), 177-252.
- [41] M. Warren, Nonpolynomial entire solutions to k equations, Commun. Partial Differ. Equ., 41 (2016), 848-853.
- [42] H. Wu, Manifolds of partially positive curvature, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 36 (1987), no. 3, 525-548.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HUBEI KEY LABORATORY OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, HUBEI UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430062, P.R. CHINA

Email address: qiangtu@hubu.edu.cn