

ON THE EXTERIOR DIRICHLET PROBLEM FOR HESSIAN TYPE FULLY NONLINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

XIAOLIANG LI AND CONG WANG

ABSTRACT. We treat the exterior Dirichlet problem for a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations of the form

$$f(\lambda(D^2u)) = g(x),$$

with prescribed asymptotic behavior at infinity. The equations of this type had been studied extensively by Caffarelli–Nirenberg–Spruck [8], Trudinger [35] and many others, and there had been significant discussions on the solvability of the classical Dirichlet problem via the continuity method, under the assumption that f is a concave function. In this paper, based on the Perron’s method, we establish an exterior existence and uniqueness result for viscosity solutions of the equations by assuming f to satisfy certain structure conditions as in [8, 35], which may embrace the well-known Monge–Ampère equations, Hessian equations and Hessian quotient equations as special cases but do not require the concavity.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The setting of the equations. Given a bounded domain D in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 3$, we consider in this paper the Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear, second-order partial differential equations of the form

$$f(\lambda(D^2u)) = g(x) \tag{1.1}$$

in the exterior domain $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D}$, where $\lambda(D^2u) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ denotes the eigenvalue vector of the Hessian matrix D^2u , f is a smooth symmetric function defined in an open convex symmetric cone $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with vertex at the origin, such that

$$\Gamma^+ := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, n\} \subset \Gamma,$$

and g is a positive function.

General equations of type (1.1) were first treated by Caffarelli, Nirenberg and Spruck [8], who proved the solvability of the classical Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda(D^2u)) = g(x) & \text{in } D, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

under various assumptions on the structure of the function f as well as a geometric condition for ∂D . A typical example of f embraced in [8] is $\sigma_k^{1/k}$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma_k$, where σ_k is the k -th elementary symmetric function

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n} \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_k}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \tag{1.3}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J60, 35J25, 35D40, 35B40.

Key words and phrases. Fully nonlinear elliptic equations, exterior Dirichlet problem, prescribed asymptotic behavior, Perron’s method.

and Γ_k is the Garding cone

$$\Gamma_k = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sigma_j(\lambda) > 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

In particular, when $k = n$, function (1.3) corresponds to the famous Monge–Ampère operator

$$\sigma_n(\lambda(D^2u)) = \det(D^2u).$$

Trudinger [35] then extended the existence results in [8] to problem (1.2) with more general f which allows the important examples of quotients of functions (1.3), the ones that were generally excluded in [8], given by

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_l}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-l}}, \quad 1 \leq l < k \leq n. \quad (1.4)$$

Specifically, the fundamental structure conditions on f in [8, 35] include

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.5)$$

$$f \text{ is a concave function in } \Gamma, \quad (1.6)$$

and

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0} f(\lambda) < \inf_{\Omega} g^1 \quad \text{for every } \lambda_0 \in \partial\Gamma. \quad (1.7)$$

These have become a standard setting for the function f in the study of fully nonlinear equations associated with form (1.1) since the pioneer work [8]. Indeed, under conditions (1.5)–(1.7) (possibly along with other more technical assumptions such as (1.20) and (1.21) below), many significant contributions have been made to a priori estimates and the existence of solutions to problem (1.2) over the past few decades, which has further extended the existence results in [8, 35] from different directions. We refer to [14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 29, 37] and the references therein for the various extensions to degenerate problems, general domains and inhomogeneous terms $g = g(x, u, Du)$, and to Riemannian manifolds.

However, as far as we know, the exterior counterpart of problem (1.2) with the general f and g has not been studied yet.

1.2. The exterior Dirichlet problem. The aim of this paper is to solve the exterior Dirichlet problem for equation (1.1) in a general setting of the functions f and g . Differently from interior problem (1.2), in exterior domains our main concern is the existence and uniqueness of the solutions with prescribed asymptotic behavior at infinity. In this regard, the investigation for some special cases of f including (1.3)–(1.4) has recently received increasing attentions, which was motivated by Liouville-type results for the corresponding equations in unbounded domains.

As is well-known, a classical theorem due to Jörgens [23], Calabi [9] and Pogorelov [32] states that any convex entire solution of the Monge–Ampère equation

$$\det(D^2u) = 1 \quad (1.8)$$

(i.e. (1.1) with $f = \sigma_n$ and $g \equiv 1$) must be a quadratic polynomial; see also [5, 12, 24]. Caffarelli and Li [7] then extended this rigidity result to the setting of exterior domains. They proved that if u is a convex solution of (1.8) outside a

¹Here Ω is the domain where the function g is defined.

bounded convex domain of \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 3$), then there is a $n \times n$ symmetric positive definite matrix A with $\det(A) = 1$, a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left| u(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2} x^T A x + b \cdot x + c \right) \right| = 0 \quad (1.9)$$

with asymptotic order $|x|^{2-n}$. This result was obtained in [7] by showing that asymptotics (1.9) actually holds for convex entire solutions of

$$\det(D^2 u) = g(x), \quad (1.10)$$

where $g \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} g > 0$ and

$$\text{support}(g - 1) \text{ is bounded.} \quad (1.11)$$

Subsequently, Bao, Li and Zhang [4] derived (1.9) for equation (1.10) under a weaker condition than (1.11), which is given by

$$\limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^\beta |g(x) - 1| < \infty \quad (1.12)$$

for some constant $\beta > 2$. More generally, the above Liouville properties were also exploited for certain k -Hessian equations and Hessian quotient equations (corresponding to (1.1) where f takes (1.3) and (1.4) respectively) both on the whole space and on exterior domains; see [2, 11, 26, 28, 33, 38, 39, 40] and the references therein. In particular, the authors of [26, 39, 40] dealt with the special Lagrangian equations, corresponding to (1.1) where f is

$$\frac{1}{\Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i \quad (1.13)$$

and $g \equiv 1$, where $|\Theta| \in (0, \frac{n}{2}\pi)$ is a constant. Whenever $\Theta \geq \frac{n-1}{2}\pi$ ($\frac{n-2}{2}\pi$) if n is odd (even), function (1.13) defined in Γ_n (Γ_{n-1}) is another example of f fulfilling (1.5)–(1.7) (see [8, Sect. 8]).

Accordingly, ones were naturally led to consider whether the exterior Dirichlet problem for these special equations is well-posed when assigning a quadratic polynomial as the specifying condition at infinity. Indeed, by Perron's method, in [7, 4] the authors also established existence and uniqueness theorems for exterior solutions to Monge–Ampère equations (1.8) and (1.10) with (1.12), with prescribed boundary data and asymptotic behavior (1.9). Their results were later improved by Li and Lu [30], who gave the sharp conditions for the solvability of the problems considered in [4, 7]. In the same spirit, the exterior Dirichlet problem for k -Hessian equations and Hessian quotient equations with the constant right-hand side as well as for the special Lagrangian equations also has been studied in [3, 25, 31] in the viscosity sense, under a prescribed quadratic condition at infinity. Moreover, the extension of these studies to the corresponding equations with a general right-hand side g satisfying (1.12) were recently treated in [10, 22].

Concerning such an investigation for equation (1.1) with general f , the first effort is made by Li and Bao [27]. Under structural conditions (1.5) and (1.7) and the assumption that there is a positive number a^* such that

$$f(a^*, \dots, a^*) = 1,$$

they addressed the existence and uniqueness of viscosity solutions to the exterior Dirichlet problem for (1.1) in the case $g \equiv 1$, with prescribed asymptotic behavior

(1.9) in which the matrix A is restricted to be a^*I^2 . Recently, Jiang, Li and Li [21] extended that to the general setting of prescribed quadratic asymptotics where one can assign more matrices A such that $f(\lambda(A)) = 1$ (more precisely, $A \in \mathcal{A}$; see (1.17) below).

1.3. The main result. In the present paper, by applying an adapted Perron's method we shall generalize the existence result in [21] to equation (1.1) with the general right-hand side g , under assumption (1.12). We were able to skip the requirement of concavity condition (1.6) as in [21, 27], since here the construction of the solution does not rely on deriving a priori second-order estimates and using the Evans–Krylov theorem where (1.6) plays a crucial role (see for instance [8, 16, 17, 35]). We would also like to point out that this generalization is not trivial. Indeed, as an essential tool here we are exploiting, the comparison principle for viscosity solutions to (1.1) whenever $g \not\equiv 1$ is not a straightforward adaption of those established when $g \equiv 1$, since the Aleksandrov maximum principle is usually not helpful; see the discussions in [34, 22]. Moreover, due to the abstract form of f and the variance of g , it is a delicate issue to seek appropriate subsolutions and supersolutions of (1.1) for carrying out the Perron process. Especially, we need to present a new technique for the construction of supersolutions in the more general setting (1.1), since we could neither directly pick quadratic polynomials as the desired supersolutions as adopted in [3, 7, 21, 25, 27, 31] for the case $g \equiv 1$, nor merely try to obtain such ones parallel to seeking subsolutions as handled in [4, 10, 22] for those special f from (1.3) and (1.4); see Remark 4.4 for a detailed explanation.

In order to overcome the above difficulties, besides (1.5) and (1.7) we will assume that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i} \geq \nu(f) \quad \text{in } \Gamma, \quad (1.14)$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_{i_0}} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i} \quad \text{in } \Gamma, \quad (1.15)$$

and that for each $\lambda \in \Gamma^+$ there is a number R such that

$$f(\lambda_1 + R, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \geq 1. \quad (1.16)$$

Here $\nu : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a positive increasing function and $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is such that $\lambda_{i_0} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_i$. As we will explain later in Remark 1.4, conditions (1.14)–(1.16) embrace examples (1.3) and actually are the extract or the variant of those required in, for instance, Caffarelli–Nirenberg–Spruck [8] and Trudinger [34, 35]. Nevertheless, these extra assumptions on f are possible to be removed in our proof; see Remark 1.3 below for details. In that case, the result of this paper may also apply to the special equations (1.1) induced by examples (1.4) and (1.13), which is indeed a generalization of those presented in [3, 4, 7, 10, 22, 25, 31].

To state precisely our main result, we introduce some definitions and notations. First, under hypotheses (1.5) and (1.7), we recall the definition of the viscosity solution to equation (1.1) following [6, 13, 36].

² I is the identity matrix.

Definition 1.1. Given an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, a function $u \in \text{USC}(\Omega)$ ($\text{LSC}(\Omega)$)³ is said to be a viscosity subsolution (supersolution) of (1.1) in Ω (or say that u satisfies $f(\lambda(D^2u)) \geq (\leq) g$ in Ω in the viscosity sense), if for any open subset O in Ω , any admissible function⁴ $\psi \in C^2(O)$ and any local maximum (minimum) x_0 of $u - \psi$ in O we have

$$f(\lambda(D^2\psi(x_0))) \geq (\leq) g(x_0).$$

A function $u \in C^0(\Omega)$ is said to be a viscosity solution of (1.1) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \{A : A \text{ is a real } n \times n \text{ symmetric positive definite matrix with } f(\lambda(A)) = 1\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}' = \{A : A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ with } \alpha(A) > 1\}, \quad (1.17)$$

where

$$\alpha(A) := \frac{\lambda(A) \cdot \nabla f(\lambda(A))}{2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_i(A) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}(\lambda(A))}. \quad (1.18)$$

The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let D be a smooth, bounded, strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 3$ and let $\varphi \in C^2(\partial D)$. Let f be as in (1.1) and satisfy (1.5), (1.7) and (1.14)–(1.16). Let $g \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D)$ satisfy (1.12) and $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g > 0$.*

For any $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a constant c_ depending only on n , D , f , g , A , b and $\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial D)}$, such that for every $c > c_*$ there exists a unique viscosity solution $u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D)$ to the problem*

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda(D^2u)) = g(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |u(x) - (\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + b \cdot x + c)| = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.19)$$

In order to compare Theorem 1.2 with related results available in literature, let us make some remarks on the assumption of the function f we are considering.

Remark 1.3. Here conditions (1.5) and (1.7) are fundamental, which ensure equation (1.1) to be elliptic on admissible functions and its viscosity solutions of class C^2 to be admissible, respectively. However, (1.14)–(1.16) are more technical in nature and may be removed. Indeed, condition (1.14) is required in the comparison principle (see Lemma 4.1) and could be removed if $g \equiv 1$ (see [22, Remark A.5]). Conditions (1.15) and (1.16) are used to construct a family of subsolutions and supersolutions to (1.1) in exterior domains, both with quadratic asymptotics at infinity. When $g \geq 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D}$, (1.16) can be removed since in this case we are able to directly let quadratic polynomials $\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + b \cdot x + c$ be the supersolutions needed in the proof. Based on this, when $g \equiv 1$ particularly, Theorem 1.2 was proved in [21]. Concerning (1.15), it would be removed when we are restricted to the case $A = a^*I$ in (1.19), where one is allowed to utilize radial functions to seek desired subsolutions as treated in [27] (see Remark 2.4 below for more details).

³ $\text{USC}(\Omega)$ and $\text{LSC}(\Omega)$ respectively denote the set of upper and lower semicontinuous real valued functions on Ω .

⁴A function ψ being of class C^2 is called admissible if $\lambda(D^2\psi) \in \Gamma$.

Remark 1.4. Related to the type of conditions (1.14)–(1.16), we make a connection with those required in the study of interior problem (1.2). Caffarelli–Nirenberg–Spruck [8] (see also [14, 29]) assumed the following (in addition to (1.5)–(1.7)): for every $C > 0$ and compact set K in Γ there is a number $R = R(C, K)$ such that

$$f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n + R) \geq C \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in K, \quad (1.20)$$

$$f(R\lambda) \geq C \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in K. \quad (1.21)$$

Trudinger [35] later removed (1.20). Recently, Guan [16] further showed that (1.21) may be improved under a priori assumption of existence of a subsolution. Since f is symmetric, condition (1.16) is weaker than (1.20).⁵ Regarding (1.15), as is well-known, it can be derived from concavity condition (1.6).⁶ As for (1.14)⁷, it was first introduced by Trudinger [34] in order to treat the Dirichlet problem for the prescribed curvature equations and it implies (1.21), as explained in Remark 1.5 below.

Remark 1.5. The set \mathcal{A} would not be empty in Theorem 1.2. Indeed, via conditions (1.5) (1.7) and (1.14), for each $\lambda \in \Gamma$, the function $f(t\lambda)$ varies monotonically from $r_0 < 1$ to $+\infty$ as t goes from 0 to $+\infty$. So there is $t_1 = t_1(\lambda) > 0$ such that $f(t_1\lambda) = 1$. In particular, for $\lambda = (1, \dots, 1)$, $t_1 = a^*$ as already mentioned. Clearly, $a^*I \in \mathcal{A}$ since $\alpha(a^*I) = \frac{n}{2} > 1$. Then, by continuity, \mathcal{A} contains a neighborhood of a^*I in \mathcal{A} .

Now we comment the proof of Theorem 1.2. It is based on an adapted Perron’s method (Lemma 4.2) and in spirit of [3, 21, 25, 31] the crucial point consists in utilizing the so-called generalized symmetric functions specified below to seek out a family of appropriate subsolutions and supersolutions of (1.1), both with uniformly quadratic asymptotics at infinity. However, the strategy in [3, 25, 31] heavily relies on the explicit formula of the k -Hessian operators acting on generalized symmetric functions, which is unavailable in our case. Instead, here we first adapt the idea in [21] to construct a family of admissible subsolutions u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} and supersolutions $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ near infinity by solving two second-order implicit ODEs, which are derived from the comparisons of the function f at the eigenvalue vector of generalized symmetric functions and certain related points in the cone Γ . Then in order to deal with the issue near the boundary, we turn to prepare another subsolution \underline{w} given by the supremum of barrier functions over the boundary points and also another a family of fine supersolutions v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} . Finally, by adjusting delicately the parameters ξ_i (η_i , δ and ζ_i) with $i = 1, 2$, we splice u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} ($U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$) and \underline{w} (v_{ζ_1, ζ_2}) well to obtain the desired subsolutions (supersolutions).

1.4. Organization of the paper. In the rest of this paper, we always denote by $\lambda(A) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ the eigenvalue vector of a real $n \times n$ symmetric matrix A with the ascending order, namely, $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$. Besides, following [3], we call u a *generalized symmetric function* with respect to A if it is a function of $s = \frac{1}{2}x^T Ax$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, that is $u(x) = u(\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax)$. If u is a subsolution (supersolution)

⁵Condition (1.16) clearly is satisfied by examples (1.3) and (1.13) but, in general, excludes example (1.4); the same thus holds for (1.20) as well.

⁶See for instance [1, Lemma 2.2], from which (1.15) embraces examples (1.3), (1.4) and (1.13) simultaneously.

⁷By homogeneity, examples (1.3) and (1.4) clearly fulfill (1.14), where the function ν corresponds to numbers k and 1, respectively, but by which example (1.13) is excluded.

of (1.1) and is also a generalized symmetric function, we say that u is a generalized symmetric subsolution (supersolution) of (1.1).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 and Subsection 3.1 we construct a family of generalized symmetric subsolutions and supersolutions of (1.1), respectively, both of which are admissible and asymptotically quadratic near infinity. In Subsection 3.2, we also construct a family of radial supersolutions of (1.1) with fine properties so that they may splice the previously constructed supersolutions. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2. GENERALIZED SYMMETRIC SUBSOLUTIONS

In this section, we shall work with generalized symmetric functions to seek subsolutions of equation (1.1) with $g \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D)$ satisfying (1.12). In spirit of [21], we first exploit a comparison of the function f acting on admissible generalized symmetric functions and certain points in the cone Γ . Then by solving a second-order implicit ODE, we construct a family of admissible subsolutions of (1.1) with uniformly quadratic asymptotics at infinity; see Proposition 2.5 and Corollary 2.9 below.

Throughout the section, we let

$$A = \text{diag}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \text{ with } a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n \quad (2.1)$$

be a diagonal matrix in \mathcal{A} and let $u = u(s)$ be a generalized symmetric function with respect to A and of class C^2 , where $s = \frac{1}{2}x^T Ax = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For simplicity, we denote $a = \lambda(A)$.

We are trying to estimate $f(\lambda(D^2u))$ from below; see Lemma 2.3. For this purpose, let us start with the estimate of $\lambda(D^2u)$. Since

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = a_i \delta_{ij} u' + a_i a_j x_i x_j u'' \quad (2.2)$$

where $u' := \frac{du}{ds}$ and $u'' := \frac{d^2u}{ds^2}$, one can easily see that if $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_n = a^*$, then the eigenvalues of D^2u are

$$a^* u' + 2a^* s u'', a^* u', \dots, a^* u'. \quad (2.3)$$

However, such a precise representation of $\lambda(D^2u)$ is not available for general A . Nevertheless, we can exploit the following inequality.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume $u'(s) > 0$ and $u''(s) \leq 0$. Then*

$$a_i u'(s) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2 u''(s) \leq \lambda_i(D^2u(x)) \leq a_i u'(s), \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. Inequality (2.4) was obtained in [21, Lemma 1], here we present the proof for completeness since the argument will be also used to establish Lemma 3.1 later in Section 3.

Actually, (2.4) was showed in [21] by virtue of the following Wely theorem (see for instance [18, Theorem 4.3.1]):

Theorem 2.2 (Weyl). *Let A_1 and A_2 be real $n \times n$ symmetric matrices. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$\lambda_i(A_1 + A_2) \leq \lambda_{i+j}(A_1) + \lambda_{n-j}(A_2), \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq n - i, \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\lambda_i(A_1 + A_2) \geq \lambda_{i-j+1}(A_1) + \lambda_j(A_2), \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq i. \quad (2.6)$$

To obtain (2.4), by (2.2) we write $D^2u = A_1 + A_2$ where $A_1 = u'A$ and A_2 is the symmetric matrix whose elements are $a_i a_j x_i x_j u''$. Then $\lambda(A_1) = u'a$ and

$$\lambda(A_2) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2 u'', 0, \dots, 0 \right).$$

Thus, (2.4) follows by taking $j = 0$ in (2.5) and $j = 1$ in (2.6). \square

Lemma 2.1 leads us to the following property.

Lemma 2.3. *Let f be as in (1.1) and assume that (1.5) and (1.15) hold. If $u'(s) > 0$ and $u''(s) \leq 0$, then*

$$f(\lambda(D^2u(x))) \geq f(a_1u'(s) + 2a_nsu''(s), a_2u'(s), \dots, a_nu'(s)), \quad (2.7)$$

provided that $\lambda(D^2u(x))$ and $(a_1u'(s) + 2a_nsu''(s), a_2u'(s), \dots, a_nu'(s))$ both belong to Γ .

Proof. By (2.4), we could write

$$\lambda_i(D^2u) = a_iu' + \theta_i \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2 u'', \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\theta_i = \theta_i(s) \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i = 1$. Set

$$\bar{a} = (a_1u' + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2 u'', a_2u', \dots, a_nu').$$

Since $u'' \leq 0$, it is clear that $\bar{a} \in \Gamma$ when $(a_1u' + 2a_nsu'', a_2u', \dots, a_nu') \in \Gamma$. By the mean value theorem, we have

$$f(\lambda(D^2u)) - f(\bar{a}) = (\theta_1 - 1)Uu'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(\bar{a}) + Uu'' \sum_{i=2}^n \theta_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}(\bar{a}), \quad (2.9)$$

where \bar{a} is a point lying in the segment between \bar{a} and $\lambda(D^2u)$, and $U = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2$. Notice from (1.15) that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(\bar{a}) \geq \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}(\bar{a}) > 0, \quad \forall 2 \leq i \leq n.$$

Thus, we get from (2.9) that

$$f(\lambda(D^2u)) \geq f(\bar{a}) \geq f(a_1u' + 2a_nsu'', a_2u', \dots, a_nu'),$$

where the second “ \geq ” is due to assumption (1.5). \square

Remark 2.4. When $A = a^*I$, it is clear from (2.3) that the equality of (2.7) holds without requiring assumption (1.15).

Now, we give a control for the function g in (1.1) by generalized symmetric functions. In view of $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g > 0$ and (1.12), there exist C_0 and $s_0 > 1$ such that for any $s \geq s_0$,

$$0 < \underline{g}(s) := 1 - C_0 s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \leq g(x) \leq \bar{g}(s) := 1 + C_0 s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}}. \quad (2.10)$$

Hence, in order to make u be an admissible subsolution of (1.1), i.e. $f(\lambda(D^2u)) \geq g$, Lemma 2.3 together with (2.10) inspires us to consider the following second-order implicit ODE:

$$f(a_1u' + 2a_nsu'', a_2u', \dots, a_nu') = \bar{g}, \quad s > s_0. \quad (2.11)$$

By performing qualitative analysis, we next study the global existence of solutions to (2.11) and determine their asymptotic behavior at infinity. More precisely, given the initial data

$$u(s_0) = \xi_1 \quad \text{and} \quad u'(s_0) = \xi_2, \quad (2.12)$$

we will show

Proposition 2.5. *Let f be as in (1.1) and assume that (1.5), (1.7), (1.14) and (1.15) hold. Let $\xi_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi_2 > w_0(s_0)$. Problem (2.11)-(2.12) admits a smooth solution u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} defined on $[s_0, +\infty)$, such that $u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(s) > 1$, $u''_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(s) < 0$ for any $s > s_0$ and*

$$u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(s) = s + \xi_1 + \mu(s_0, \xi_2) + \begin{cases} O(s^{1-\min\{\alpha, \frac{\beta}{2}\}}) & \text{if } \alpha \neq \frac{\beta}{2}, \\ O(s^{1-\alpha} \ln s) & \text{if } \alpha = \frac{\beta}{2}, \end{cases}$$

as $s \rightarrow +\infty$, where $\alpha = \alpha(A)$ is defined by (1.18), $\beta > 2$ is as in (2.10) and μ is a function on $[s_0, +\infty) \times (w_0(s_0), +\infty)$.

Here $w_0 = w_0(s)$ is a positive decreasing function defined on $[s_0, +\infty)$, which is determined by

$$f(a_1w_0(s), \dots, a_nw_0(s)) = \bar{g}(s). \quad (2.13)$$

This equality is validated by assumptions (1.5), (1.7) and (1.14), as explained in Remark 1.5. Moreover, the implicit function theorem results in that w_0 is smooth and it holds

$$w_0(s) = 1 + O(s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dw_0}{ds} = -\frac{C_0\beta s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}-1}}{2a \cdot \nabla f(aw_0)} = O(s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}-1}) \quad (2.14)$$

as $s \rightarrow +\infty$.

To prove Proposition 2.5, we need several lemmas.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $s \in [s_0, +\infty)$ and $w \in [w_0(s), +\infty)$. Assume that (1.5), (1.7) and (1.14) hold. Then there exists a function $h = h(s, w)$ such that*

$$(h(s, w), a_2w, \dots, a_nw) \in \Gamma$$

and

$$f(h(s, w), a_2w, \dots, a_nw) = \bar{g}(s). \quad (2.15)$$

Moreover, $h(s, w)$ is smooth and decreasing with respect to s and w .

Proof. Let us first point out the existence of h . Since Γ is symmetric and convex, one has $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_1$. Thus, by (1.7), it holds that

$$f(\varepsilon, a_2w, \dots, a_nw) \leq \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g \leq \bar{g}$$

when ε is small. On the other hand, by (1.5) we have

$$f(a_1w, \dots, a_nw) \geq f(a_1w_0, \dots, a_nw_0) = \bar{g}.$$

Then the function h exists via the mean value theorem. Also, the convexity of Γ implies

$$(h(s, w), a_2w, \dots, a_nw) \in \Gamma.$$

Furthermore, the implicit function theorem yields that h is smooth and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial h}{\partial s} &= -\frac{C_0\beta s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}-1}}{2\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(h(s, w), a_2w, \dots, a_nw)} < 0, \\ \frac{\partial h}{\partial w} &= -\frac{\sum_{i=2}^n a_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}(h(s, w), a_2w, \dots, a_nw)}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(h(s, w), a_2w, \dots, a_nw)} < 0.\end{aligned}\quad (2.16)$$

□

In terms of Lemma 2.6, one can observe that in equation (2.11) if $u' \geq w_0$ for $s > s_0$, then

$$a_1u' + 2a_nsu'' = h(s, u').$$

Recalling (2.12), this means that such u' solves the initial problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dw}{ds} = \frac{h(s, w) - a_1w}{2a_ns}, & s > s_0, \\ w(s_0) = \xi_2. \end{cases}\quad (2.17)$$

As a result, we may try to solve the first-order ODE (2.17) to acquire a solution of problem (2.11)-(2.12). Indeed, by applying the Picard–Lindelöf theorem we have

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\xi_2 > w_0(s_0)$. Problem (2.17) admits a unique smooth solution $w_{\xi_2}(s)$ defined on $[s_0, +\infty)$. Moreover, for any $s \in [s_0, +\infty)$, $w'_{\xi_2}(s) < 0$, $w_{\xi_2}(s) > w_0(s)$ and $w_{\xi_2}(s)$ is strictly increasing with respect to ξ_2 such that*

$$\lim_{\xi_2 \rightarrow +\infty} w_{\xi_2}(s) = +\infty.$$

Proof. Since $\frac{h(s, w) - a_1w}{2a_ns} \in C^\infty((s_0, +\infty) \times (w_0(s), +\infty))$, by the Picard–Lindelöf theorem we know that problem (2.17) admits locally a unique solution w_{ξ_2} such that $w_{\xi_2} > w_0$. We claim that w_{ξ_2} can be extended to the whole interval $[s_0, +\infty)$. Note that $h(s, w_{\xi_2}) < a_1w_{\xi_2}$, which implies that the local solution w_{ξ_2} is decreasing and bounded. Thus, it suffices to show that w_{ξ_2} does not touch w_0 at a finite $s_1 \in (s_0, +\infty)$. Assume for contradiction that $w_{\xi_2}(s_1) = w_0(s_1)$ and $w_{\xi_2} > w_0$ in (s_0, s_1) . Then by (2.13) and (2.15), we get

$$h(s, w_{\xi_2}(s_1)) = h(s, w_0(s_1)) = a_1w_0(s_1).$$

This means $w'_{\xi_2}(s_1^-) = 0$ via (2.17). But from (2.14),

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow s_1^-} \frac{w_{\xi_2}(s_1) - w_{\xi_2}(s)}{s_1 - s} \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow s_1^-} \frac{w_0(s_1) - w_0(s)}{s_1 - s} = w'_0(s_1) < 0.$$

Consequently, we deduce that w_{ξ_2} exists globally and $w_{\xi_2}(s) > w_0(s)$ for $s \in [s_0, +\infty)$.

The proof of the assertion that $\lim_{\xi_2 \rightarrow +\infty} w_{\xi_2}(s) = +\infty$ is similar to that of Lemma 5 in [21]. We thus omit it. □

Furthermore, we exploit the following concerning the asymptotic behavior of solutions to problem (2.17).

Lemma 2.8. *Let α and β be as in Proposition 2.5. Let w_{ξ_2} be the solution of (2.17) given in Lemma 2.7. Then*

$$w_{\xi_2}(s) - 1 = \begin{cases} O(s^{-\min\{\alpha, \frac{\beta}{2}\}}) & \text{if } \alpha \neq \frac{\beta}{2}, \\ O(s^{-\alpha} \ln s) & \text{if } \alpha = \frac{\beta}{2}, \end{cases}\quad (2.18)$$

as $s \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proof. We first show

$$w_{\xi_2}(s) - 1 = O(s^{-\frac{a_1}{2a_n}}) \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.19)$$

Since $w_{\xi_2} > w_0$ for $s \geq s_0$, we note that $h(s, w_{\xi_2}) \leq h(s, w_0) = a_1 w_0$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dw_{\xi_2}}{ds} &= \frac{h(s, w_{\xi_2}) - a_1 w_0 + a_1 w_0 - a_1 w_{\xi_2}}{2a_n s} \\ &\leq \frac{a_1 w_0 - a_1 w_{\xi_2}}{2a_n s}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Thus, by Gronwall's inequality one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\xi_2}(s) &\leq \left(e^{\int_{s_0}^s -\frac{a_1}{2a_n t} dt} \right) \left[\xi_2 + \int_{s_0}^s \left(e^{\int_{s_0}^r \frac{a_1}{2a_n t} dt} \right) \frac{a_1 w_0(r)}{2a_n r} dr \right] \\ &= \xi_2 s_0^{\frac{a_1}{2a_n}} s^{-\frac{a_1}{2a_n}} + s^{-\frac{a_1}{2a_n}} \int_{s_0}^s \frac{a_1}{2a_n} r^{\frac{a_1}{2a_n}-1} w_0(r) dr \\ &\leq \xi_2 s_0^{\frac{a_1}{2a_n}} s^{-\frac{a_1}{2a_n}} + w_0(s) - s^{-\frac{a_1}{2a_n}} \int_{s_0}^s r^{\frac{a_1}{2a_n}} w_0'(r) dr. \end{aligned}$$

Via (2.14), it is easy to see that (2.19) holds.

Next let us improve asymptotic behavior (2.19) to (2.18). Going back to (2.20), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dw_{\xi_2}}{ds} &= \frac{w_{\xi_2} - w_0}{2a_n s} \left[\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}(s, \theta w_{\xi_2} + (1-\theta)w_0) - a_1 \right] \\ &= \frac{w_{\xi_2} - w_0}{2a_n s} \left[\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}(s, \theta w_{\xi_2} + (1-\theta)w_0) - \frac{\partial h}{\partial w}(s, w_0) + \frac{\partial h}{\partial w}(s, w_0) - a_1 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{w_{\xi_2} - w_0}{2a_n s} \left[M_{\partial_w h}(w_{\xi_2} - 1) + \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}(s, w_0) - a_1 \right) \right] \\ &=: \frac{w_{\xi_2} - w_0}{2a_n s} [I(s) + J(s)], \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{\partial_w h}$ is the modulus of continuity of $\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}$. Hence, using Gronwall's inequality again gives

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\xi_2}(s) &\leq F(s) \left[\xi_2 - \int_{s_0}^s \frac{I(r) + J(r)}{2a_n r} F^{-1}(r) w_0(r) dr \right] \\ &= \xi_2 F(s) + F(s) \left[F^{-1}(r) w_0(r) \Big|_{s_0}^s - \int_{s_0}^s F^{-1}(r) w_0'(r) dr \right] \\ &\leq \xi_2 F(s) + w_0(s) - F(s) \int_{s_0}^s F^{-1}(r) w_0'(r) dr \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where $F(s) = e^{\int_{s_0}^s \frac{I(t)+J(t)}{2a_n t} dt}$.

On the one hand, recalling (2.19), we see that

$$I(s) \leq M_{\partial_w h}(C s^{-\frac{a_1}{2a_n}}) \quad (2.22)$$

when s is sufficiently large, where C is some constant. Since $\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}$ is Dini continuous, we have

$$\int_s^{+\infty} \frac{M_{\partial_w h}(t^{-\frac{a_1}{2a_n}})}{2a_n t} dt = \frac{1}{a_1} \int_0^C \frac{M_{\partial_w h}(t)}{t} dt < +\infty$$

where $C = C(s)$ is a constant. Together with (2.22), we deduce that

$$\int_{s_0}^s \frac{I(t)}{2a_n t} dt < +\infty, \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow +\infty.$$

On the other hand, by virtue of (2.16) and (2.14), we infer that

$$J(s) = -\frac{a \cdot \nabla f(a_1 w_0, a_2 w_0, \dots, a_n w_0)}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(a_1 w_0, a_2 w_0, \dots, a_n w_0)} = -2a_n \alpha + O(s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}}), \quad s \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Thus, we get

$$F(s) = O(s^{-\alpha}) \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.23)$$

Now, thanks to (2.23) and (2.14), it follows from (2.21) that (2.18) holds. This completes the proof. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 2.5.

Proof of Proposition 2.5. Let w_{ξ_2} be given in Lemma 2.7. Define

$$u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(s) = \xi_1 + \int_{s_0}^s w_{\xi_2}(t) dt. \quad (2.24)$$

Since $u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(s) = w_{\xi_2}(s) > w_0(s)$ for any $s > s_0$, via Lemma 2.6 it is clear that u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} is a smooth solution of problem (2.11)-(2.12). Moreover, it follows from Lemma 2.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(s) &= \int_{s_0}^s (w_{\xi_2}(t) - 1) dt + s - s_0 + \xi_1 \\ &= \int_{s_0}^{+\infty} (w_{\xi_2}(t) - 1) dt + s - s_0 + \xi_1 - \int_s^{+\infty} (w_{\xi_2}(t) - 1) dt \\ &= s + \xi_1 + \mu(\xi_2) + \begin{cases} O(s^{1-\min\{\alpha, \frac{\beta}{2}\}}) & \text{if } \alpha \neq \frac{\beta}{2}, \\ O(s^{1-\alpha} \ln s) & \text{if } \alpha = \frac{\beta}{2}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

as $s \rightarrow +\infty$, where

$$\mu(s_0, \xi_2) := \int_{s_0}^{+\infty} (w_{\xi_2}(t) - 1) dt - s_0 < +\infty. \quad (2.25)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Finally, to obtain a subsolution of (1.1), let us conclude the following by combining Proposition 2.5 with Lemma 2.3.

Corollary 2.9. *The function u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} given by Proposition 2.5 is an admissible subsolution of equation (1.1) in the domain $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i^2 > s_0\}$.*

Proof. In view of Lemma 2.3 and formulas (2.10) and (2.11), it suffices to show that u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} is admissible, i.e. $\lambda(D^2 u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}) \in \Gamma$. If $\lambda(D^2 u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(x_0)) \notin \Gamma$ for some $x_0 \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i^2 > s_0\}$, then there exists $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$\lambda(D^2 u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(x_0) + \epsilon_0 A) \in \partial \Gamma$$

and

$$\lambda(D^2u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(x_0) + \epsilon A) \in \Gamma \quad \text{for any } \epsilon > \epsilon_0.$$

Note that for $s > s_0$,

$$(u_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon s)' > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (u_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon s)'' < 0.$$

Hence, by applying Lemma 2.3 to the function $u_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon s$ we obtain that, for any $\epsilon > \epsilon_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(\lambda(D^2u_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon A)) \\ &= f(\lambda(D^2(u_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon s))) \\ &\geq f(a_1(u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon) + 2a_n s u''_{\xi_1, \xi_2}, a_2(u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon), \dots, a_n(u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + \epsilon)) \\ &\geq f(a_1 u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + 2a_n s u''_{\xi_1, \xi_2}, a_2 u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2}, \dots, a_n u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2}) = \bar{g}(s). \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the condition (1.7).

Consequently, u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} is admissible and by Lemma 2.3 it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda(D^2u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(x))) &\geq f(a_1 u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2} + 2a_n s u''_{\xi_1, \xi_2}, a_2 u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2}, \dots, a_n u'_{\xi_1, \xi_2}) \\ &= \bar{g}(s) \geq g(x) \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i^2 > s_0\}$. The proof is completed. \square

3. GENERALIZED SYMMETRIC SUPERSOLUTIONS

This section is devoted to the construction of supersolutions of equation (1.1) and contains two parts. We first seek out a family of generalized symmetric supersolutions with uniformly quadratic asymptotics at infinity, by adapting carefully the idea of seeking such type of subsolutions in Section 2; see Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 below. However, the supersolutions obtained in Corollary 3.6 only stand near infinity and might not work near ∂D . Therefore, we were further led to look for another a family of fine supersolutions of (1.1) outside D (see Proposition 3.8), with which one can splice the former to apply Perron's method to prove Theorem 1.2 in the next section.

We will assume throughout the section that $g \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D)$ satisfies (1.12) and $0 < \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g < 1$. Since if $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g \geq 1$, quadratic polynomials $\frac{1}{2}x^T A x + b \cdot x + c$ with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ may serve as the supersolutions of (1.1) outside D fitted well for the application of Perron's method.

3.1. Generalized symmetric supersolutions near infinity. In this subsection, we let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ be of form (2.1) and let $u = u(s)$ be a generalized symmetric function with respect to A and of class C^2 , where $s = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. As in Section 2, we denote $a = \lambda(A)$.

Let us start by estimating $f(\lambda(D^2u))$ from above, with the following inequality.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume $u'(s) > 0$ and $u''(s) \geq 0$. Then*

$$a_i u'(s) \leq \lambda_i(D^2u(x)) \leq a_i u'(s) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2 u''(s), \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Proof. The proof follows exactly as that of Lemma 2.1. Actually, the only difference is that $\lambda(A_2)$ there is now changed to $(0, \dots, 0, \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2 u'')$. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\delta > 0$ and let f be as in (1.1) with (1.5) and (1.15) holding. Assume that $u' > 0$ and $u'' \geq 0$ on $(0, +\infty)$. If*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} u'(s) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} su''(s) = 0,$$

then there exists $\bar{s} = \bar{s}(f, A, \delta, u', u'') > 0$ such that for any $s > \bar{s}$,

$$f(\lambda(D^2u)) \leq f(a_1u' + (2a_n + \delta)su'', a_2u', \dots, a_nu').$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, it is clear that $\lambda(D^2u) \in \Gamma$ and we can write it as in (2.8). Set

$$\bar{a}_\delta = (a_1u' + (2a_n + \delta)su'', a_2u', \dots, a_nu').$$

It is seen that $\bar{a}_\delta \in \Gamma$ as well. Then similar to (2.9), we have

$$f(\lambda(D^2u)) - f(\bar{a}_\delta) = [\theta_1U - (2a_n + \delta)s]u'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(\bar{a}_\delta) + Uu'' \sum_{i=2}^n \theta_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}(\bar{a}_\delta), \quad (3.1)$$

where \tilde{a}_δ is a point lying in the segment between $\lambda(D^2u)$ and \bar{a}_δ , and $U = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 x_j^2$. Since

$$Uu'' = O(su'') \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow +\infty,$$

one obtains

$$\tilde{a}_\delta \rightarrow a \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla f(\tilde{a}_\delta) \rightarrow \nabla f(a) \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow +\infty.$$

That is, for small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists \bar{s} such that

$$|\nabla f(\tilde{a}_\delta) - \nabla f(a)| < \epsilon \quad \text{for } s \geq \bar{s}.$$

Thus, by (3.1) and (1.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & f(\lambda(D^2u)) - f(\bar{a}_\delta) \\ & \leq [U - (2a_n + \delta)s]u'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(a) + [(1 - 2\theta_1)U + (2a_n + \delta)s]u''\epsilon \\ & \leq -\delta su'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(a) + (4a_n + \delta)su''\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Via (1.5), the assertion follows by letting $0 < \epsilon < \frac{\delta}{4a_n + \delta} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(a)$. \square

Now let s_0 be as in (2.10) and further require it to satisfy

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g \leq \underline{g}(s) = 1 - C_0 s^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \leq g(x) \quad \text{for } s \geq s_0. \quad (3.2)$$

In order to find supersolutions of (1.1), Lemma 3.2 suggests us to study the following second-order ODE

$$f(a_1u' + (2a_n + \delta)su'', a_2u', \dots, a_nu') = \underline{g}, \quad s > s_0, \quad (3.3)$$

with the initial data

$$u(s_0) = \eta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad u'(s_0) = \eta_2. \quad (3.4)$$

We will show the global existence of solutions to problem (3.3)-(3.4) and determine their asymptotic behavior at infinity in a way parallel to how we exploited Lemmas 2.6–2.8 to solve problem (2.11)-(2.12) in Section 2.

First, as an analogue of w_0 determined by (2.13), let $W_0 = W_0(s)$ be the positive increasing function defined on $[s_0, +\infty)$ such that

$$f(a_1W_0(s), \dots, a_nW_0(s)) = \underline{g}(s). \quad (3.5)$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $s \in [s_0, +\infty)$ and $w \in (0, W_0(s))$. Assume that (1.5), (1.7) and (1.16) hold. Then there exists a positive smooth function $H = H(s, w)$ such that*

$$f(H(s, w), a_2 w, \dots, a_n w) = \underline{g}(s).$$

Moreover, $H(s, w)$ is increasing with respect to s and decreasing with respect to w .

Proof. Thanks to (1.7) and (1.16), it is clear that $H(s, w)$ exists. Then the smoothness and monotonicity of $H(s, w)$ can be easily obtained via (1.5) and the implicit function theorem. \square

With Lemma 3.3, we may reduce the solvability of problem (3.3)-(3.4) to that of the following initial problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dw}{ds} = \frac{H(s, w) - a_1 w}{(2a_n + \delta)s}, & s > s_0, \\ w(s_0) = \eta_2. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Indeed, through the analysis performed previously for problem (2.17), we have

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $0 < \eta_2 < W_0(s_0)$. Problem (3.6) admits a unique smooth solution $W_{\eta_2, \delta}(s)$ defined on $[s_0, +\infty)$. Moreover, $W'_{\eta_2, \delta} > 0$, $W_{\eta_2, \delta} < W_0$ and*

$$W_{\eta_2, \delta}(s) - 1 = \begin{cases} O(s^{-\min\{\alpha_\delta, \frac{\beta}{2}\}}) & \text{if } \alpha_\delta \neq \frac{\beta}{2}, \\ O(s^{-\alpha_\delta} \ln s) & \text{if } \alpha_\delta = \frac{\beta}{2}, \end{cases}$$

as $s \rightarrow +\infty$, where β is as in (2.10) and

$$\alpha_\delta = \frac{a \cdot \nabla f(a)}{(2a_n + \delta) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_1}(a)}. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. First, similarly as done in the proof of Lemma 2.7 for the solution w_{ξ_2} to (2.17), the local existence and uniqueness of $W_{\eta_2, \delta}$ can be easily obtained by applying the Picard–Lindelöf theorem and then a contradiction argument shows that it is strictly increasing without touching the function W_0 from below, thus following the global existence of $W_{\eta_2, \delta}$. Then, noting that W_0 also behaves as (2.14), it is not difficult to derive the asymptotic property of $W_{\eta_2, \delta}$ from an argument analogous to that in the proof of Lemma 2.8.

For the above reason, we omit the proof. \square

Lemma 3.4 together with Lemma 3.3 leads us to

Proposition 3.5. *Let f be as in (1.1) and assume that (1.5), (1.7), (1.15) and (1.16) hold. Let $\delta > 0$, $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta_2 \in (0, W_0(s_0))$. Problem (3.3)-(3.4) admits a smooth solution $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ defined on $[s_0, +\infty)$, such that $U'_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta} > 0$ and $U''_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta} > 0$. Moreover, if $\alpha_\delta > 1$, then*

$$U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}(s) = s + \eta_1 + \bar{\mu} + \begin{cases} O(s^{1-\min\{\alpha_\delta, \frac{\beta}{2}\}}) & \text{if } \alpha_\delta \neq \frac{\beta}{2}, \\ O(s^{1-\alpha_\delta} \ln s) & \text{if } \alpha_\delta = \frac{\beta}{2}, \end{cases}$$

as $s \rightarrow +\infty$, where α_δ is defined by (3.7), $\beta > 2$ is as in (2.10) and $\bar{\mu}$ depends on η_2 and δ .

Proof. Let $W_{\eta_2, \delta}$ be given by Lemma 3.4. Define

$$U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}(s) = \eta_1 + \int_{s_0}^s W_{\eta_2, \delta}(t) dt. \quad (3.8)$$

Since $0 < U'_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}(s) = W_{\eta_2, \delta}(s) < W_0(s)$ for any $s > s_0$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ is a smooth solution of problem (3.3)-(3.4). Moreover, when $\alpha_\delta > 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}(s) &= \eta_1 + \int_{s_0}^s (W_{\eta_2, \delta}(t) - 1) dt + s - s_0 \\ &= s + \eta_1 + \int_{s_0}^{+\infty} (W_{\eta_2, \delta}(t) - 1) dt - s_0 - \int_s^{+\infty} (W_{\eta_2, \delta}(t) - 1) dt, \end{aligned}$$

thus completing the proof by setting

$$\bar{\mu} = \int_{s_0}^{+\infty} (W_{\eta_2, \delta}(t) - 1) dt - s_0 < +\infty.$$

□

As an immediate consequence of combining Proposition 3.5 with Lemma 3.2, we conclude the following.

Corollary 3.6. *The function $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ given by Proposition 3.5 is an admissible supersolution of equation (1.1) in the domain $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i^2 > \max\{\bar{s}, s_0\}\}$. Here \bar{s} is as in Lemma 3.2 and s_0 is as in (3.2).*

Remark 3.7. Observe from Lemma 3.2 that \bar{s} above depends on η_2 and δ but is independent of η_1 , which will play an essential role in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

3.2. Radial supersolutions outside D . This subsection aims to find another a family of supersolutions of (1.1) outside D from certain radial functions, in order to serve the needs of proving Theorem 1.2 in Section 4. Without loss of generality, we assume that the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^n is contained in D .

Let $\tilde{a} > 0$ be such that

$$f(\tilde{a}, \dots, \tilde{a}) = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g$$

and let $s = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{a}|x|^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In Proposition 3.8 below, we obtain an admissible function $v = v(s)$ solving the following problem

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda(D^2 v)) = f(\tilde{a}v' + 2\tilde{a}sv'', \tilde{a}v', \dots, \tilde{a}v') = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g, & s > \frac{1}{2}\tilde{a}, \\ v(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{a}) = \zeta_1, & v'(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{a}) = \zeta_2. \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

Here $v' := \frac{dv}{ds}$ and $v'' := \frac{d^2v}{ds^2}$. Clearly, such v is a supersolution of equation (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{D}$.

Proposition 3.8. *Let f be as in (1.1) and assume that (1.5), (1.7) and (1.16) hold. Let $\zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta_2 > 1$. Problem (3.9) admits an admissible solution v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} . Moreover, for any $s > \frac{1}{2}\tilde{a}$, $v'_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2}(s) > 1$ and $v''_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2}(s) < 0$.*

Proof. This result can be proved in the same way seeking a smooth solution of problem (2.11)-(2.12) as handled in Section 2 (see Proposition 2.5).

Indeed, as argued for Lemma 2.6, we first observe that for each $w > 0$ there exists a function $\bar{h} = \bar{h}(w)$ such that

$$(\bar{h}(w), \tilde{a}w, \dots, \tilde{a}w) \in \Gamma$$

and

$$f(\bar{h}(w), \tilde{a}w, \dots, \tilde{a}w) = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g.$$

In order to obtain a solution of (3.9), this leads us to study

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dw}{ds} = \frac{\bar{h}(w) - \bar{a}w}{2\bar{a}s}, & s > \frac{1}{2}\bar{a}, \\ w(\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}) = \zeta_2. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

As argued for Lemma 2.7, by applying the Picard–Lindelöf theorem and the theorem of maximal interval of existence for the solution of the initial value problem of ODEs, we easily infer that problem (3.10) admits a unique smooth solution \bar{w}_{ζ_2} defined on $[\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}, +\infty)$, such that for any $s > \frac{1}{2}\bar{a}$,

$$\bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(s) > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}'_{\zeta_2}(s) < 0. \quad (3.11)$$

In addition, \bar{w}_{ζ_2} is strictly increasing with respect to ζ_2 such that

$$\lim_{\zeta_2 \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2} = +\infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Let

$$v_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2}(s) = \zeta_1 + \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}}^s \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt. \quad (3.13)$$

Then v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} is a smooth solution of (3.9) and it is admissible. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 by applying an adapted Perron’s method (see Lemma 4.2 below). The main ingredient of the proof is to demonstrate the existence of a viscosity subsolution \underline{u} of (1.1) with prescribed Dirichlet boundary value and asymptotic behavior at infinity, and that of a viscosity supersolution $\bar{u} \geq \underline{u}$ but agreeing on \underline{u} at infinity. As we will see later, such a subsolution could be obtained by splicing the generalized symmetric subsolution u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} in Corollary 2.9 and the supremum of barrier functions over the boundary points of D (see Lemma 4.3 below). Analogously, such a supersolution is generally constructed by splicing the generalized symmetric supersolution $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ in Corollary 3.6 and the radial supersolution v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} given by Proposition 3.8. However, the above demonstration is not straightforward since we have to adjust the initial data ξ_i , η_i and ζ_i ($i = 1, 2$) delicately, not only to validate the splicing but also to ensure the spliced subsolutions/supersolutions to achieve the desired conditions on ∂D and at infinity.

To begin with, we introduce several lemmas needed in the proof.

Lemma 4.1 (Comparison principle). *Let f be as in (1.1) with (1.5), (1.7) and (1.14) holding. Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n and $g \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\inf_{\Omega} g > 0$. Suppose that $u \in \text{USC}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap B_p(\Omega)$ ⁸ and $v \in \text{LSC}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap B_p(\Omega)$ are viscosity subsolution and viscosity supersolution of (1.1) respectively. If $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Omega$ (and additionally*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} (u - v)(x) = 0$$

provided Ω is unbounded), then $u \leq v$ in Ω .

Proof. See [22, Theorem A.3 and Corollary A.6]. \square

Thanks to Lemma 4.1, Perron’s method as in [13, 19] could be adapted to the following version for equation (1.1).

⁸ $B_p(\Omega)$ denotes the set of functions that are bounded in Ω intersected with any ball of \mathbb{R}^n .

Lemma 4.2 (Perron's method). *Let f, g and Ω be as in Lemma 4.1. Let $\varphi \in C^0(\partial\Omega)$. Suppose that there exist $\underline{u}, \bar{u} \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that*

$$f(\lambda(D^2\underline{u})) \geq g(x) \geq f(\lambda(D^2\bar{u})) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

in the viscosity sense, $\underline{u} \leq \bar{u}$ in Ω and $\underline{u} = \varphi$ on $\partial\Omega$ (and additionally

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} (\underline{u} - \bar{u})(x) = 0$$

provided Ω is unbounded). Then

$$u(x) := \sup\{v(x) \mid v \in \text{USC}(\Omega), f(\lambda(D^2v)) \geq g(x) \text{ in } \Omega \text{ in the viscosity sense, } \underline{u} \leq v \leq \bar{u} \text{ in } \Omega, v = \varphi \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$$

is in $C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ and is a viscosity solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda(D^2u)) = g(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Proof. See [22, Theorem B.1]. □

To process boundary behavior of the solution, we need the following existence result of barrier functions.

Lemma 4.3. *Let D be a bounded strictly convex domain of \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 3$) with $\partial D \in C^2$ and let $\varphi \in C^2(\partial D)$. Let $K > 0$ and let A be an invertible and symmetric matrix. There exists some constant C , depending only on $n, \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial D)}, K$, the upper bound of A , the diameter and the convexity of D , and the C^2 norm of ∂D , such that for every $\xi \in \partial D$, there exists $\bar{x}(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $|\bar{x}(\xi)| \leq C$ and*

$$\omega_\xi < \varphi \quad \text{on } \partial D \setminus \{\xi\},$$

where

$$\omega_\xi(x) = \varphi(\xi) + \frac{K}{2} [(x - \bar{x}(\xi))^T A(x - \bar{x}(\xi)) - (\xi - \bar{x}(\xi))^T A(\xi - \bar{x}(\xi))]$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. See [7, Lemma 5.1] or [3, Lemma 3.1]. □

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first observe that it suffices to prove in the case that the matrix A is of diagonal form (2.1) and the vector b is 0 by an orthogonal transformation and by subtracting a linear function from u ; see for instance [25, Lemma 3.3] for a specific demonstration. We next split the proof into three steps.

For convenience, denote

$$B_r = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| < r\} \quad \text{and} \quad D_r = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{1}{2}x^T Ax < r\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $B_1 \subset D \subset D_{s_0}$, where s_0 is as in (2.10) and (3.2).

Step 1. Construct a viscosity subsolution \underline{u} of (1.1) with $\underline{u} = \varphi$ on ∂D and the asymptotics

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left| \underline{u}(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + c \right) \right| = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

The idea is to find two viscosity subsolutions \underline{w} and $u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2(c)}$ of (1.1), which attain the boundary value and the asymptotics respectively, and then splice them together as in (4.5) below.

Let $K > 0$ be large enough such that the function ω_ξ given by Lemma 4.3 satisfies⁹

$$f(\lambda(D^2\omega_\xi)) = f(K\lambda(A)) \geq \sup_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g.$$

That is, ω_ξ is a smooth subsolution of (1.1). For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D$, let us set

$$\underline{w}(x) = \max\{\omega_\xi(x) : \xi \in \partial D\}.$$

Then \underline{w} is a viscosity subsolution of (1.1) by [13, Lemma 4.2] and $\underline{w} = \varphi$ on ∂D by Lemma 4.3.

For $\xi_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi_2 > w_0(s_0)$, recall from Corollary 2.9 that Proposition 2.5 gives a smooth subsolution u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{s_0}}$ which is defined by (2.24) and satisfies

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left| u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2} x^T A x + \xi_1 + \mu(s_0, \xi_2) \right) \right| = 0.$$

Here $\mu(s_0, \xi_2)$ is given by (2.25). We claim there exists a constant c_* such that for each $c > c_*$ one can choose proper ξ_1 and ξ_2 to fulfill

$$\xi_1 + \mu(s_0, \xi_2) = c, \quad (4.2)$$

which implies that u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} attains (4.1) this moment. Simultaneously, in order to splice such u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} with \underline{w} , we also require the choice of ξ_1 and ξ_2 to fulfill

$$\max_{\partial D_{s_1}} u_{\xi_1, \xi_2} \leq \min_{\partial D_{s_1}} \underline{w} \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{\partial D_{s_2}} u_{\xi_1, \xi_2} \geq \max_{\partial D_{s_2}} \underline{w}, \quad (4.3)$$

where s_1 and s_2 are two fixed numbers such that $s_2 > s_1 > s_0$.

Indeed, recall from (2.24) that

$$u_{\xi_1, \xi_2}(x) = \xi_1 + \int_{s_0}^{\frac{1}{2}x^T A x} w_{\xi_2}(t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D_{s_0},$$

where w_{ξ_2} is given by Lemma 2.7. Let

$$m = \min\{\omega_\xi(x) : \xi \in \partial D, x \in \overline{D_{s_1}} \setminus D\}.$$

Fixing $\xi_1 = m - \int_{s_0}^{s_1} w_{\xi_2}(t) dt =: \xi_1(m)$ yields

$$u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2}(x) = m + \int_{s_1}^{\frac{1}{2}x^T A x} w_{\xi_2}(t) dt.$$

Since $w_{\xi_2} > 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D_{s_0}$,

$$u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2}(x) \leq m \leq \min_{\partial D_{s_1}} \underline{w}$$

whenever $x \in \overline{D_{s_1}} \setminus D_{s_0}$ and $\xi_2 > w_0(s_0)$. Namely, $u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2}$ satisfies the first condition of (4.3). Regarding the second one, it suffices to let ξ_2 be sufficiently large since w_{ξ_2} is strictly increasing with respect to ξ_2 (see Lemma 2.7). Thus, let us assume that $u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2}$ satisfies (4.3) when $\xi_2 > \bar{C} \geq w_0(s_0)$.

Now, by recalling (2.25) we notice that

$$\xi_1(m) + \mu(s_0, \xi_2) = m + \mu(s_1, \xi_2).$$

⁹This can be guaranteed by conditions (1.5) and (1.14), referring to Remark 1.5.

Via Lemma 2.7, we infer that $\mu(s_1, \xi_2)$ is increasing with respect to ξ_2 and satisfies $\lim_{\xi_2 \rightarrow +\infty} \mu(s_1, \xi_2) = +\infty$. Thus, let c_* be a constant such that

$$c_* \geq m + \mu(s_1, \bar{C}). \quad (4.4)$$

Then for each $c > c_*$, there exists a unique $\xi_2(c) > \bar{C}$ such that

$$\xi_1(m) + \mu(s_0, \xi_2(c)) = c,$$

illustrating that $u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2(c)}$ achieves (4.2).

For $c > c_*$, we define

$$\underline{u}(x) = \begin{cases} \underline{w}(x), & x \in D_{s_1} \setminus D, \\ \max\{\underline{w}(x), u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2(c)}(x)\}, & x \in D_{s_2} \setminus D_{s_1}, \\ u_{\xi_1(m), \xi_2(c)}(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D_{s_2}. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

From Definition 1.1 and [13, Lemma 4.2], we deduce that \underline{u} is a viscosity subsolution of (1.1) satisfying (4.1) and $\underline{u} = \underline{w} = \varphi$ on ∂D .

Step 2. Construct a viscosity supersolution \bar{u} of (1.1) to satisfy

$$\underline{u} \leq \bar{u} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{u} - \underline{u})(x) = 0.$$

If $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g = 1$, then we can take $\bar{u} = \frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + c$ directly as the desired supersolution, provided that $c > c^*$ and c^* is selected suitably; see for instance the argument in [21] (or [3, 25, 27, 31]).

While $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D} g < 1$, the construction of \bar{u} would not be straightforward since $\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + c$ fails to be a supersolution of (1.1) in this case. We will deal with that in a way analogous to the construction of \underline{u} . More precisely, we are going to find two supersolutions of (1.1), one of which coincides with \underline{u} at infinity and the other of which surpasses \underline{u} on ∂D , and then splice them together as in (4.11) below.

Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\alpha_\delta > 1$ (see (3.7)) and let $\eta_2 \in (0, W_0(s_0))$ (see (3.5)). For $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, we first recall from Corollary 3.6 that Proposition 3.5 gives a smooth supersolution $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{\hat{s}}}$ which is defined by (3.8) and satisfies

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left| U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + \eta_1 + \bar{\mu} \right) \right| = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Here $\hat{s} := \max\{\bar{s}, s_0\}$ and $\bar{\mu}$ are both independent of η_1 , which implies they are already fixed.

For $\zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta_2 > 1$, we proceed by recalling that Proposition 3.8 establishes another smooth supersolution v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1}$ which is defined by (3.13), that is,

$$v_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2}(x) = \zeta_1 + \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}|x|^2} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt,$$

where \bar{w}_{ζ_2} is strictly increasing with respect to ζ_2 and satisfies (3.11) and (3.12).

To obtain a supersolution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D}$, we splice $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ and v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} together by choosing suitable ζ_1 and ζ_2 such that

$$\max_{\partial B_{r_1}} v_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2} \leq \min_{\partial B_{r_1}} U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{\partial B_{r_2}} v_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2} \geq \max_{\partial B_{r_2}} U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}, \quad (4.7)$$

where r_1 and r_2 are two fixed numbers such that $D_{\hat{s}} \subset B_{r_1} \subset B_{r_2}$. Indeed, let

$$M(\eta_1) = \min\{U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}(x) : x \in \overline{B_{r_1}} \setminus D_{\hat{s}}\}$$

and fix

$$\zeta_1 = M(\eta_1) - \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt =: \bar{\zeta}_1.$$

Then

$$v_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \zeta_2}(x) = M(\eta_1) + \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}|x|^2} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt. \quad (4.8)$$

Clearly, $v_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \zeta_2}$ satisfies the first condition in (4.7) whenever $\zeta_2 > 1$. To tackle the second one, by recalling (3.8) we observe that

$$\max_{\partial B_{r_2}} U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta} = \eta_1 + \max_{\partial B_{r_2}} \int_{s_0}^{\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax} W_{\eta_2, \delta}(t) dt$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\partial B_{r_2}} v_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \zeta_2} &= M(\eta_1) + \min_{\partial B_{r_2}} \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}|x|^2} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt \\ &= \eta_1 + \min \left\{ \int_{s_0}^{\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax} W_{\eta_2, \delta}(t) dt : x \in \overline{B_{r_1}} \setminus D_{\bar{s}} \right\} + \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_2^2} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the monotonicity of \bar{w}_{ζ_2} with respect to ζ_2 , one can infer that if ζ_2 is sufficiently large (fix $\zeta_2 = \bar{\zeta}_2$), then $v_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \bar{\zeta}_2}$ satisfies (4.7) whatever η_1 is.

Now, in addition to (4.4), we ask the constant c_* to fulfill

$$c_* \geq \max_{\partial D} \varphi - \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt + \bar{\mu}. \quad (4.9)$$

Then for $c > c_*$, we let

$$\eta_1(c) = c - \bar{\mu} \quad (4.10)$$

and define

$$\bar{u}(x) = \begin{cases} v_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \bar{\zeta}_2}(x), & x \in B_{r_1} \setminus D, \\ \min\{v_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \bar{\zeta}_2}(x), U_{\eta_1(c), \eta_2, \delta}(x)\}, & x \in B_{r_2} \setminus B_{r_1}, \\ U_{\eta_1(c), \eta_2, \delta}(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_2}. \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

It is seen that \bar{u} is a viscosity supersolution of (1.1) and by (4.6) it holds that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left| \bar{u}(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + c \right) \right| = \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left| U_{\eta_1(c), \eta_2, \delta}(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + c \right) \right| = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Moreover, in view of (4.8) and (3.8), we find that

$$\bar{u} = v_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \bar{\zeta}_2} \geq M(\eta_1(c)) + \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt \geq \eta_1(c) + \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt \quad \text{on } \partial D.$$

Using (4.9) and (4.10) gives

$$\bar{u}(x) \geq c_* - \bar{\mu} + \int_{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}r_1^2}^{\frac{1}{2}\bar{a}} \bar{w}_{\zeta_2}(t) dt \geq \max_{\partial D} \varphi, \quad x \in \partial D. \quad (4.13)$$

In view of (4.12) and (4.13), by applying Lemma 4.1 we thus deduce that

$$\underline{u} \leq \bar{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D.$$

Step 3. Construct a viscosity solution u to problem (1.19).

With \underline{u} and \bar{u} above, we define

$$u(x) = \sup\{v(x) \mid v \in \text{USC}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{D}), f(\lambda(D^2v)) \geq g \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{D} \text{ in the viscosity sense, with } \underline{u} \leq v \leq \bar{u} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{D} \text{ and } v = \varphi \text{ on } \partial D\}.$$

Thanks to (4.1) and (4.12),

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left| u(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2} x^T A x + c \right) \right| = 0.$$

Consequently, by Lemma 4.2, we conclude that $u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D)$ is a viscosity solution to problem (1.19).

Finally, the uniqueness of u follows from Lemma 4.1. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.4. One may note from the proof that the approach to constructing a desired viscosity supersolution of (1.1) in **Step 2** is more subtle than that in **Step 1** for the desired subsolution. Specifically, the latter is to choose proper values of ξ_1 and ξ_2 to splice subsolutions u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} and \underline{u} as one viscosity subsolution with prescribed boundary data and asymptotic behavior at infinity, which is analogous to those presented in other related works, for instance, [3, 25, 31]. In contrast, in the former we had to carefully adjust initial data η_1 , ζ_1 and ζ_2 from two different supersolutions $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ (where η_2 and δ are preset) and v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} in order to splice them validly as one viscosity supersolution, achieving simultaneously the expected condition on ∂D and that at infinity. This differs from those in [4, 10, 22] treating special cases (1.3) and (1.4) of the function f in a direct way without splicing instead.

Indeed, thanks to an explicit formula for $\sigma_k(\lambda(D^2\psi))$ with ψ being generalized symmetric functions [3], the authors of the above literatures could obtain parallel a family of explicit subsolutions and supersolutions of those special equations in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{D}$, in particular the latter of which may directly serve as the one required in **Step 2** after adjusting only one of parameters involved (corresponding to η_1 in $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ we obtained here). However, as abstract counterparts in the general setting (1.1), our seeking u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} in Section 2 and $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ in Subsection 3.1 are not strictly parallel since in the latter we introduced an extra parameter δ (compare Lemma 3.2 with Lemma 2.3). More importantly, unlike u_{ξ_1, ξ_2} , the domain where $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ becomes a supersolution varies with parameters η_2 and δ involved (see Remark 3.7), implying it was generally not working near ∂D . Therefore, we were naturally led to find another supersolution v_{ζ_1, ζ_2} with fine properties so that it would achieve the expected condition on ∂D and also could validate the process of splicing $U_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \delta}$ somewhere near ∂D , as already described above. To the best of our knowledge, this is a new ingredient among the proofs of such exterior problems (see [3, 4, 7, 10, 21, 22, 25, 31] and the references therein).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank professor Jiguang Bao for helpful comments during the preparation of this work. The first author was supported by China Scholarship Council. Part of this work has been done while the first author was visiting the Department of Mathematics “Federigo Enriques” of Università degli Studi di Milano, which is acknowledged for the hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Andrews, Contraction of convex hypersurfaces in Euclidean space, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 2 (1994), 151–171.
- [2] J.G. Bao, J.Y. Chen, B. Guan, M. Ji, Liouville property and regularity of a Hessian quotient equation, *Amer. J. Math.* 125 (2003), 301–316.
- [3] J.G. Bao, H.G. Li, Y.Y. Li, On the exterior Dirichlet problem for Hessian equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 366 (2014), 6183–6200.
- [4] J.G. Bao, H.G. Li, L. Zhang, Monge–Ampère equation on exterior domains, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 52 (2015), 39–63.
- [5] L. Caffarelli, *Topics in PDEs: The Monge–Ampère Equation*, Graduate Course, Courant Institute, New York University, 1995.
- [6] L. Caffarelli, X. Cabré, *Fully Nonlinear Elliptic Equations*, Colloquium Publications, vol. 43, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.
- [7] L. Caffarelli, Y.Y. Li, An extension to a theorem of Jörgens, Calabi, and Pogorelov, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 56 (2003), 549–583.
- [8] 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.
- [9] E. Calabi, Improper affine hyperspheres of convex type and a generalization of a theorem by K. Jörgens, *Michigan Math. J.* 5 (1958), 105–126.
- [10] X. Cao, J.G. Bao, Hessian equations on exterior domain, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 448 (2017), 22–43.
- [11] S.-Y.A. Chang, Y. Yuan, A Liouville problem for sigma-2 equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 28 (2010), 659–664.
- [12] S.Y. Cheng, S.T. Yau, Complete affine hypersurfaces, I. The completeness of affine metrics, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 39 (1986), 839–866.
- [13] M.G. Crandall, H. Ishii, P.L. Lions, User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 27 (1992), 1–67.
- [14] B. Guan, The Dirichlet problem for a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 19 (1994), 399–416.
- [15] B. Guan, The Dirichlet problem for Hessian equations on Riemannian manifolds, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 8 (1999), 45–69.
- [16] B. Guan, Second-order estimates and regularity for fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, *Duke Math. J.* 163 (2014), 1491–1524.
- [17] B. Guan, H. Jiao, Second order estimates for Hessian type fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 54 (2015), 2693–2712.
- [18] R.A. Horn, C.R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [19] H. Ishii, On uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order elliptic PDE’s, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 42 (1989), 15–45.
- [20] N.M. Ivochkina, N. Trudinger, X.-J. Wang, The Dirichlet problem for degenerate Hessian equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 29 (2004), 219–235.
- [21] T.Y. Jiang, H.G. Li, X.L. Li, On the exterior Dirichlet problem for a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60 (2021), Paper No. 17, 20 pp.
- [22] T.Y. Jiang, H.G. Li, X.L. Li, The Dirichlet problem for Hessian quotient equations on exterior domains, [arXiv:2205.07200](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.07200).
- [23] K. Jörgens, Über die Lösungen der Differentialgleichung $rt - s^2 = 1$ (German), *Math. Ann.* 127 (1954), 130–134.
- [24] J. Jost, Y.L. Xin, Some aspects of the global geometry of entire space-like submanifolds, *Results Math.* 40 (2001), 233–245.
- [25] D.S. Li, Z.S. Li, On the exterior Dirichlet problem for Hessian quotient equations, *J. Differential Equations* 264 (2018), 6633–6662.
- [26] D.S. Li, Z.S. Li, Y. Yuan, A Bernstein problem for special Lagrangian equations in exterior domains, *Adv. Math.* 361 (2020), 106927, 29 pp.
- [27] H.G. Li, J.G. Bao, The exterior Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear elliptic equations related to the eigenvalues of the Hessian, *J. Differential Equations* 256 (2014), 2480–2501.
- [28] M. Li, C.Y. Ren, Z.Z. Wang, An interior estimate for convex solutions and a rigidity theorem, *J. Funct. Anal.* 270 (2016), 2691–2714.

- [29] Y.Y. Li, Some existence results for fully nonlinear elliptic equations of Monge–Ampère type, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 43 (1990), 233–271.
- [30] Y.Y. Li, S.Y. Lu, Existence and nonexistence to exterior Dirichlet problem for Monge–Ampère equation, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 57 (2018), Paper No. 161, 17 pp.
- [31] Z.S. Li, On the exterior Dirichlet problem for special Lagrangian equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 372 (2019), 889–924.
- [32] A.V. Pogorelov, On the improper convex affine hyperspheres, *Geom. Dedicata* 1 (1972), 33–46.
- [33] R. Shankar, Y. Yuan, Rigidity for general semiconvex entire solutions to the sigma-2 equation, *arXiv:2108.00093*.
- [34] N.S. Trudinger, The Dirichlet problem for the prescribed curvature equations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 111 (1990), 153–179.
- [35] N.S. Trudinger, On the Dirichlet problem for Hessian equations, *Acta Math.* 175 (1995), 151–164.
- [36] J.I.E. Urbas, On the existence of nonclassical solutions for two class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 39 (1990), 355–382.
- [37] J.I.E. Urbas, “Hessian equations on compact Riemannian manifolds” in *Nonlinear Problems in Mathematical Physics and Related Topics, II*, *Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.)* 2, Kluwer/Plenum, New York, 2002, 367–377.
- [38] C. Wang, J.G. Bao, Liouville property and existence of entire solutions of Hessian equations, *arXiv:2203.02646*.
- [39] M. Warren, Y. Yuan, A Liouville type theorem for special Lagrangian equations with constraints, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 33 (2008), 922–932.
- [40] Y. Yuan, A Bernstein problem for special Lagrangian equations, *Invent. Math.* 150 (2002), 117–125.

(X.L. Li) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, 100875 BEIJING, P.R. CHINA

Email address: rubiklixiaoliang@163.com

(C. Wang) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, 100875 BEIJING, P.R. CHINA

Email address: cwang@mail.bnu.edu.cn