

FULLY NON-LINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS ON COMPACT HYPERKÄHLER MANIFOLDS

GIOVANNI GENTILI AND LUIGI VEZZONI

ABSTRACT. We consider a general class of elliptic equations on hypercomplex manifolds which includes the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation, the quaternionic Hessian equation and the Monge-Ampère equation for quaternionic $(n - 1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions. We prove that under suitable assumptions the solutions to these equations on hyperkähler manifolds satisfy a $C^{2,\alpha}$ a priori estimate.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the present paper we study a general class of elliptic equations on compact hyperhermitian manifolds. The interest in this class of equations moves from a Calabi-Yau-type conjecture on HKT manifolds stated by Alesker and Verbitsky in [3] and from the work of Harvey and Lawson [21, 22] about a general class of Dirichlet problems on special Riemannian manifolds including hyperhermitian manifolds. The conjecture of Alesker and Verbitsky states that is always possible to prescribe the J -anti-invariant part of the Chern-Ricci form on compact HKT manifolds and has strong applications on the geometry of hyperhermitian manifolds. In analogy to the complex case, the conjecture can be analytically reformulated in terms of a Monge-Ampère-type equation (called *quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation*). So far the solvability of such equation is proved only under extra assumptions. In [1] Alesker proved that the equation is always solvable on compact flat hyperkähler manifolds. The result was drastically improved by Dinew and Sroka in [10] who confirmed the conjecture on every compact hyperkähler manifold (for other results related to the study of the equation see [2, 13, 14, 24, 25] and the references therein). Beside the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation, other parabolic and elliptic equations on hyperhermitian manifolds have been considered in the literature. In [4, 5, 30] the parabolic counterpart of the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation was studied, while more general parabolic and elliptic equations are taken into account in [15, 16, 21, 22, 25]. More recently, in [12] a quaternionic analogue of the Monge-Ampère equation for $(n - 1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions [11, 28, 29] is solved on compact hyperkahler manifolds.

A *hypercomplex manifold* is a smooth manifold M equipped with three complex structures (I, J, K) satisfying the quaternionic relations

$$IJ = -JI = K .$$

A Riemannian metric g on M is hyperhermitian if it is compatible with each complex structure. A hyperhermitian metric g induces the fundamental form $\omega(\cdot, \cdot) := g(I\cdot, \cdot)$. Due to the quaternionic relations ω is J -anti-invariant, i.e. $\omega(J\cdot, J\cdot) = -\omega(\cdot, \cdot)$. On the other hand a skew-symmetric 2-form which is compatible with I and is J -anti-invariant induces a hyperhermitian metric canonically. A hypercomplex manifold with a hyperhermitian metric is called a

Date: September 4, 2024.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B45, 53C26, 35J60, 32W50.

This work was supported by GNSAGA of INdAM.

hyperhermitian manifold. The standard model of hyperhermitian manifold is the quaternionic vector space \mathbb{H}^n with the Euclidean metric. Moreover, any hyperkähler manifold is in particular hyperhermitian.

Next we describe the class of equations we consider in the present paper.

Let (M^{4n}, I, J, K, g) be a hyperhermitian manifold of real dimension $4n$. Let also χ be a J -anti-invariant real form in $\Lambda_I^{1,1}M$. For any function $\varphi: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is at least of class C^2 , the form

$$\chi_\varphi := \chi + \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi - \sqrt{-1}J\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi}{2}$$

is a J -anti-invariant real form in $\Lambda_I^{1,1}M$. We denote with g_φ the corresponding symmetric 2-tensor. Composing with g^{-1} we get an endomorphism

$$A_\varphi := g^{-1}g_\varphi: T_I^{1,0}M \rightarrow T_I^{1,0}M$$

which is hyperhermitian with respect to g . We shall study equations of the form

$$(1) \quad F(A_\varphi) = h,$$

where $h: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth datum. By $F(A_\varphi)$ we denote an expression of the type $f(\lambda(A_\varphi))$, where $\lambda(A_\varphi) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ denotes the eigenvalues of A_φ regarded as an $n \times n$ quaternionic matrix and f is a symmetric function satisfying the following conditions:

1. f is defined on a symmetric proper convex open cone Γ in \mathbb{R}^n with vertex at the origin and containing the positive orthant $\Gamma_n := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \lambda_i > 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, n\}$.
2. $f_i := \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i} > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and f is a concave function.
3. $\sup_{\partial\Gamma} f < \inf_M h$, where $\sup_{\partial\Gamma} f = \sup_{\lambda_0 \in \partial\Gamma} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0} f(\lambda)$.
4. For any $\sigma < \sup_\Gamma f$ and $\lambda \in \Gamma$ we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t\lambda) > \sigma$.

Assumption 2. ensures that if φ is Γ -admissible, i.e.

$$\lambda(A_\varphi) \in \Gamma,$$

the equation is elliptic, while 3. guarantees non-degeneracy of the equation and then uniform ellipticity once the second order estimate is obtained.

The same framework has been investigated at length and has a long lasting tradition starting from the influential paper of Caffarelli, Nirenberg and Spruck [7], where the Dirichlet problem on domains of \mathbb{R}^n is considered. The setting we described above is the natural generalization to the quaternionic case of the one considered by Székelyhidi in [26] for studying fully non-linear elliptic equations on complex manifolds. Note that the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation, the quaternionic Hessian equation [15, 21, 22] and the Monge-Ampère equation for quaternionic $(n-1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions [15] belong to this general class of equations.

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1. *Let (M^{4n}, I, J, K, g) be a compact hyperkähler manifold, $\chi \in \Lambda_I^{1,1}M$ a real J -anti-invariant form, and $\underline{\varphi}$ a \mathcal{C} -subsolution of (1). Then there exist $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and a constant $C > 0$, depending only on (M, I, J, K, g) , χ , h and $\underline{\varphi}$, such that any Γ -admissible solution φ to (1) with $\sup_M \varphi = 0$ satisfies the estimate*

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} \leq C.$$

In the statement by \mathcal{C} -subsolution of (1) we mean that $\underline{\varphi} \in C^2(M, \mathbb{R})$ is such that

$$\left(\lambda(A_{\underline{\varphi}}) + \Gamma_n\right) \cap \partial\Gamma^{h(x)} \text{ is bounded for every } x \in M,$$

where for every $\sigma > \sup_{\partial\Gamma} f$, Γ^σ denotes the convex superlevel set $\Gamma^\sigma = \{\lambda \in \Gamma \mid f(\lambda) > \sigma\}$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is obtained as follows:

In section 2 we prove that solutions to (1) satisfy a C^0 -a priori bound. This section is quite general since the hyperkähler assumption does not play a role and the estimate we obtain holds true when the manifold is simply hyperhermitian.

In section 3 we prove that the Laplacian of solutions to (1) satisfies the following estimate

$$\Delta_g \varphi \leq C (\|\nabla \varphi\|_{C^0} + 1)$$

for a positive constant C depending on the data. We use an approach introduced by Chou and Wang [8] to study the Hessian equation (see also Hou, Ma and Wu [23]). Here is where the hyperkähler assumption plays a role. A key observation is that concavity of the equation implies that F satisfies

$$F^{r\bar{s}}(A)A_{r\bar{s}} \leq C \sum_{k=1}^{2n} F^{k\bar{k}}(A)$$

for every hyperhermitian matrix A such that $\lambda(A) \in \partial\Gamma^\sigma$, where the constant C depends on $\sigma \in [\sup_{\partial\Gamma} f, \sup_{\Gamma} f]$. Here $F^{r\bar{s}}$ are the first derivatives of F with respect to the (r, \bar{s}) -th entry. Note that if F_* denotes the differential of F we have

$$F_{*|A}(X) := F^{i\bar{j}}(A)X_{i\bar{j}}$$

and $\sum_{k=1}^{2n} F^{k\bar{k}}(A)$ is the trace of gradient of F once it is regarded as a matrix. Note that our Laplacian estimate is sharper than the one obtained by Székelyhidi [26, Proposition 13], since Székelyhidi's estimate involves $\|\nabla \varphi\|_{C^0}^2$, while the hyperkähler assumption allows us to prove an estimate which involves $\|\nabla \varphi\|_{C^0}$ only.

In section 4 we prove the C^1 -estimate. The fact that our Laplacian estimate involves $\|\nabla \varphi\|_{C^0}$, only, allows us to obtain the C^1 -estimate quite easily. Indeed we can combine an interpolation inequality, Morrey's inequality and elliptic bounds in order to prove the estimate. In particular we do not need to apply any Liouville-type theorem.

In section 5 we obtain the $C^{2,\alpha}$ -estimate by using a general result of Tosatti, Wang, Weinkove and Yang [27] and in section 6 we combine the results of the previous sections in order to prove Theorem 1.

Acknowledgements. The first-named author is grateful to Elia Fusi for many useful discussions.

2. C^0 ESTIMATE

In this section we show that every solution φ of class C^2 to (1) satisfies a C^0 a priori bound. The strategy we adopt is to use the Alexandrov-Bakelman-Pucci (ABP for short) maximum principle in the form of [26, Proposition 10]. Such an idea can be traced back to the work of Błocki [6] for the complex Ampère equation. For a more restrictive class of equations Sroka proves in [25] a sharp C^0 -estimate by adapting a technique of Guo and Phong [18, 19] and of Guo, Phong and Tong [20] to the quaternionic case. The class of equations considered by Sroka is more restrictive than the one taken into account in the present paper, on the other hand Sroka's estimate is sharper than ours.

Lemma 2. *Let (M^{4n}, I, J, K, g) be a compact hyperhermitian manifold. If φ is a solution to (1), then there exist $p, C > 0$, depending only on the background data, such that*

$$\left\| \varphi - \sup_M \varphi \right\|_{L^p} \leq C.$$

Proof. The proof is a standard application of the weak Harnack inequality. We explain the main ideas for convenience of the reader. Take an open cover of M made of coordinate balls $2B_i := B_{2r_i}(x_i)$ such that the balls B_i with half the radius still cover M . Since

$$\Gamma \subseteq \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i > 0 \right\},$$

we have $\text{tr}_\omega \chi_\varphi > 0$ and so, using that ω is J -anti-invariant, we get

$$\Delta_\omega \varphi = \text{tr}_\omega(\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi) = \text{tr}_\omega \left(\frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi - \sqrt{-1} J \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi}{2} \right) = \text{tr}_\omega \chi_\varphi - \text{tr}_\omega \chi \geq -C.$$

Therefore we can apply the weak Harnack inequality [17, Theorem 9.22] to $\psi := \varphi - \sup_M \varphi$ on $2B_i$ deducing

$$(2) \quad \|\psi\|_{L^p(B_i)} \leq C \left(\inf_{B_i} (-\psi) + 1 \right),$$

where $p, C > 0$ depend only on the choice of the cover and the background metric. Since $\psi \leq 0$ we have $\inf_{B_j} (-\psi) = 0$ for at least one index j , and thus $\|\psi\|_{L^p(B_j)} \leq C$. This bound also gives an estimate for $\inf_{B_i} (-\psi)$ on all coordinate balls intersecting B_j . We can then iterate the argument by using (2) and obtain an upper bound on each ball of the cover. \square

Proposition 3. *Let (M^{4n}, I, J, K, g) be a compact hyperhermitian manifold. If $\underline{\varphi}, \varphi$ are a \mathcal{C} -subsolution and a solution to (1) respectively, with $\sup_M \varphi = 0$, then there is a constant $C > 0$, depending only on the background data and the subsolution $\underline{\varphi}$, such that*

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \leq C.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume $\underline{\varphi} = 0$, since we can always modify χ in order to obtain $\underline{\varphi} = 0$. Since we assumed $\sup_M \varphi = 0$, the claim is equivalent to a lower bound for $S = \inf_M \varphi$, hence, we may assume $S \leq -1$.

Since $\underline{\varphi} = 0$ is a \mathcal{C} -subsolution there are $\delta, R > 0$ such that

$$(3) \quad (\lambda (g^{-1} \chi) - \delta \mathbf{1} + \Gamma_n) \cap \partial \Gamma^{h(x)} \subseteq B_R(0), \quad \text{at every } x \in M,$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$. Pick I -holomorphic coordinates (z^1, \dots, z^{2n}) centered at the point where φ attains its minimum S . We may identify such coordinate neighborhood with the open ball of unit radius $B_1 = B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ centered at the origin. Let $v(x) = \varphi(x) + \varepsilon |x|^2$ be defined on B_1 for some small fixed $\varepsilon > 0$. Observe that $\inf_{B_1} v = v(0) = \varphi(0) = S$ and $\inf_{\partial B_1} v \geq v(0) + \varepsilon$. These conditions allow us to apply the ABP method (see [26, Proposition 10]) to obtain

$$(4) \quad C_0 \varepsilon^{4n} \leq \int_P \det(D^2 v),$$

where $C_0 > 0$ is a constant depending on the dimension of M only,

$$P = \left\{ x \in B_1 \mid |Dv(x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, v(y) \geq v(x) + Dv(x) \cdot (y - x) \text{ for all } y \in B_1 \right\},$$

and Dv , D^2v are the gradient and the (real) Hessian of v . Note that $P \subseteq \{x \in B_1 \mid D^2v(x) \geq 0\}$, then, thanks to a calculation by Błocki [6], we have

$$(5) \quad \det(D^2v) \leq 2^{4n} \det(\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}v)^2, \quad \text{at every } x \in P.$$

Applying [25, Lemma 3.1] we also have

$$(6) \quad \det(\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}v) \leq 2^{2n} \det\left(\frac{\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}v + J^t \text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}v J}{2}\right).$$

Furthermore, since convexity implies plurisubharmonicity, we have $\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}v(x) \geq 0$ at any point $x \in P$ and thus also $\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi(x) \geq -\varepsilon \text{Id}$, where Id is the $2n \times 2n$ identity matrix. Choosing ε small enough depending on g and δ , we have

$$(7) \quad \lambda\left(g^{-1}\left(\chi + \frac{\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi + J^t \text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi J}{2}\right)\right) \in \lambda(g^{-1}\chi) - \delta \mathbf{1} + \Gamma_n, \quad \text{at every } x \in P.$$

On the other hand, since φ solves equation (1) we also have

$$(8) \quad \lambda\left(g^{-1}\left(\chi + \frac{\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi + J^t \text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi J}{2}\right)\right) \in \partial\Gamma^{h(x)}, \quad \text{at every } x \in P.$$

Together (3), (7) and (8) imply that $|\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi + J^t \text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}\varphi J| \leq C$ on P and thus also $\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}v + J^t \text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}}v J \leq C$. Consequently, from (4), (5) and (6) we get

$$C_0 \varepsilon^{4n} \leq C \text{Vol}(P)$$

By definition of P we have $v(0) \geq v(x) - Dv(x) \cdot x > v(x) - \varepsilon/2$, i.e. $v(x) < S + \varepsilon/2 < 0$ for all $x \in P$. As a consequence for any $p > 0$

$$\|v\|_{L^p(M)}^p \geq \|v\|_{L^p(P)}^p = \int_P (-v)^p \geq \left|S + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right|^p \text{Vol}(P) \geq C^{-1} C_0 \varepsilon^{4n} \left|S + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right|^p.$$

Applying Lemma 2 we find a $p > 0$ such that $\|v\|_{L^p}$ is bounded, therefore we conclude. \square

3. LAPLACIAN ESTIMATE

In this section we establish the upper bound of the Laplacian of solutions to (1):

Proposition 4. *Let (M^{4n}, I, J, K, g) be a compact hyperkähler manifold. Let $\underline{\varphi}, \varphi$ be a \mathcal{C} -subsolution and a solution to (1) respectively. Then there is a constant $C > 0$, depending only on (M, I, J, K, g) , $\|h\|_{C^2}$, $\|\chi\|_{C^2}$, $\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$ and $\underline{\varphi}$, such that*

$$\Delta_g \varphi \leq C (\|\nabla \varphi\|_{C^0} + 1).$$

In order to prove Proposition 4 we need the following lemma whose proof is completely analogous to the one of [26, Proposition 6]:

Lemma 5. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\sup_{\partial\Gamma} f < a < b < \sup_{\Gamma} f$ and let $\delta, R > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in [a, b]$, every hyperhermitian matrix B satisfying*

$$(\lambda(B) - 2\delta \mathbf{1} + \Gamma_n) \cap \partial\Gamma^\sigma \subseteq B_R(0),$$

and every hyperhermitian matrix A satisfying $\lambda(A) \in \partial\Gamma^\sigma$ and $|\lambda(A)| > R$, we have either

$$F^{j\bar{k}}(A) (B_{j\bar{k}} - A_{j\bar{k}}) > \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{2n} F^{k\bar{k}}(A)$$

or

$$F^{j\bar{j}}(A) > \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{2n} F^{k\bar{k}}(A), \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, 2n.$$

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 4:

Proof of Proposition 4. Consider the quantity

$$Q = 2\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \alpha(|\nabla\varphi|_g^2) + \beta(\varphi)$$

where $\lambda_1: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix A_φ and

$$\alpha, \beta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \alpha(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 - \frac{t}{2N} \right), \quad \beta(t) = -2Dt + \frac{1}{2}t^2,$$

being $N = \|\nabla\varphi\|_{C^0}^2 + 1$ and $D > \|\varphi\|_{C^0}$ a large constant we will determine later. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (4N)^{-1} &\leq \alpha'(|\nabla\varphi|_g^2) \leq (2N)^{-1}, & \alpha'' &= 2(\alpha')^2, \\ -3D &\leq \beta'(\varphi) \leq -D, & \beta'' &\equiv 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $x_0 \in M$ be a maximum point of Q . In order to prove the statement, it is enough to show that

$$(9) \quad \lambda_1(x_0) \leq C (\|\nabla\varphi\|_{C^0}^2 + 1)$$

for a positive constant C . Indeed, since

$$(10) \quad 2\sqrt{\lambda_1(x)} + \alpha(|\nabla\varphi(x)|_g^2) + \beta(\varphi(x)) \leq 2\sqrt{\lambda_1(x_0)} + \alpha(|\nabla\varphi(x_0)|_g^2) + \beta(\varphi(x_0))$$

at every point $x \in M$ and

$$0 \leq \alpha(|\nabla\varphi|_g^2) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log 2,$$

then if (9) is true we can conclude that

$$\lambda_1(x) \leq C' (\|\nabla\varphi\|_{C^0}^2 + 1), \quad \text{for every } x \in M,$$

where C' depends on C , D and $\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$.

The function λ_1 could be non smooth near x_0 . In order to overcome this problem we modify its definition as follows. Consider I -holomorphic coordinates around x_0 such that

- the coordinates are normal with respect to g at x_0 , i.e. $g_{i\bar{j}}(x_0) = \delta_{i\bar{j}}$ and $\partial_r g_{i\bar{j}}(x_0) = 0$;
- J takes its standard form at x_0 ;
- g_φ is diagonal at x_0 ;
- the eigenvalues of A_φ regarded as complex matrix are non-increasing.

Note that in these coordinates since J is parallel with respect to the Levi-Civita connection of g , its first derivatives vanish at x_0 . Moreover, $A_\varphi(x_0)$ takes the following diagonal expression

$$A_\varphi(x_0) = \text{diag}(\lambda_1(x_0), \lambda_1(x_0), \lambda_2(x_0), \lambda_2(x_0), \dots, \lambda_n(x_0), \lambda_n(x_0)).$$

Let

$$\tilde{A} = A_\varphi - B,$$

where B is a constant matrix of the form

$$B = \text{diag}(0, 0, B_{2\bar{2}}, B_{2\bar{2}}, \dots, B_{n\bar{n}}, B_{n\bar{n}})$$

and the components $B_{r\bar{r}}$ satisfy

$$0 < B_{2\bar{2}} < B_{3\bar{3}} < \dots < B_{n\bar{n}} < 2B_{2\bar{2}}.$$

Since the eigenvalues $\{\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n\}$ of \tilde{A} regarded as a quaternionic matrix are distinct at x_0 , they remain distinct in a neighborhood of x_0 and so $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ is a smooth function near x_0 such that $\tilde{\lambda}_1(x_0) = \lambda_1(x_0)$.

We then replace Q with

$$\tilde{Q} = 2\sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_1} + \alpha(|\nabla\varphi|_g^2) + \beta(\varphi)$$

which still achieves a maximum at the point x_0 .

Let

$$L(u) := F^{i\bar{j}}(A_\varphi)u_{i\bar{j}}$$

be the linearized operator of F . And note that $F^{i\bar{j}}(A_\varphi)$ is diagonal at x_0 .

From now on we write $F^{i\bar{j}}$ instead of $F^{i\bar{j}}(A_\varphi)$ in order to simplify the notation. We have

$$\tilde{Q}_k(x_0) = 0$$

and

$$L(\tilde{Q}) = L\left(2\sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_1}\right) + L\left(\alpha(|\nabla\varphi|_g^2)\right) + L(\beta(\varphi)) \leq 0 \quad \text{at } x_0.$$

We aim to show that this last inequality implies (9). Here we handle the three terms of $L(\tilde{Q})$ separately.

We have

$$L\left(2\sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_1}\right) = F^{k\bar{k}}\left(\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,k\bar{k}}}{\sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_1}} - \frac{|\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\bar{k}}|^2}{2\lambda_1\sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_1}}\right) \quad \text{at } x_0,$$

where

$$(11) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{1,k} = \frac{\partial\tilde{\lambda}_1}{\partial\tilde{A}_{i\bar{j}}} \tilde{A}_{ij,k}, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{1,\bar{k}} = \frac{\partial\tilde{\lambda}_1}{\partial\tilde{A}_{i\bar{j}}} \tilde{A}_{i\bar{j},\bar{k}},$$

$$(12) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{1,k\bar{k}} = \frac{\partial^2\tilde{\lambda}_1}{\partial\tilde{A}_{i\bar{j}}\partial\tilde{A}_{a\bar{b}}} \tilde{A}_{ij,k} \tilde{A}_{a\bar{b},\bar{k}} + \frac{\partial\tilde{\lambda}_1}{\partial\tilde{A}_{i\bar{j}}} \tilde{A}_{i\bar{j},k\bar{k}}.$$

The indexes after the comma denote covariant derivatives with respect to the Levi-Civita connection of g . In order to compute the derivatives of $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ with respect to the entries of the matrix \tilde{A} , since J takes the standard form

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & & & & \\ 1 & 0 & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & & 0 & -1 \\ & & & & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

at x_0 , we consider the following basis of hyperhermitian matrices:

$$\{E_{2r-1\ 2s}, E_{2r\ 2s}, E_{2r\ 2r}\}, \quad r < s,$$

where

$$(E_{2r-1\ 2s})_{i\bar{j}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i, j) = (2r-1, 2s), (2s, 2r-1) \\ -1 & \text{if } (i, j) = (2r, 2s-1), (2s-1, 2r) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad r < s$$

and

$$(E_{2r\ 2s})_{i\bar{j}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i, j) = (2r, 2s), (2s, 2r), (2r-1, 2s-1), (2s-1, 2r-1) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad r \leq s.$$

Since \tilde{A} is diagonal at x_0 , for $r < s$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\det(\tilde{A} + tE_{2r-1}2s - \lambda \text{Id}) = \det(\tilde{A} + tE_{2r}2s - \lambda \text{Id}) = \left(\lambda^2 - \lambda(\tilde{\lambda}_r + \tilde{\lambda}_s) + \tilde{\lambda}_r\tilde{\lambda}_s - t^2 \right)^2 \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq r, s}}^n (\tilde{\lambda}_k - \lambda)^2$$

at x_0 , and

$$\det(\tilde{A} + tE_{2r}2r - \lambda \text{Id}) = \left(\tilde{\lambda}_r + t - \lambda \right)^2 \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq r}}^n (\tilde{\lambda}_k - \lambda)^2$$

at x_0 . In particular

$$\lambda_1(\tilde{A} + tE_{p2s}) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\lambda}_1 + t & \text{if } p = 2s = 2, \\ \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_1 + \tilde{\lambda}_s}{2} + \left(\left(\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_s}{2} \right)^2 + t^2 \right)^{1/2} & \text{if } p \in \{1, 2\}, s > 1, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

at x_0 , where $\lambda_1(\tilde{A} + tE_{p2s})$ denotes the first eigenvalue of $\tilde{A} + tE_{p2s}$. It follows that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\lambda}_1}{\partial \tilde{A}_{i\bar{j}}} = \delta_{i\bar{1}}\delta_{1\bar{j}} + \delta_{i\bar{2}}\delta_{2\bar{j}}$$

at x_0 . Similarly, one can compute

$$\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\lambda}_1}{\partial \tilde{A}_{i\bar{j}} \partial \tilde{A}_{a\bar{b}}} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_s} & \text{if } (i, j) = (a, b), i \in \{1, 2\}, j > 2, j = 2s - 1 \text{ or } j = 2s, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

at x_0 . Therefore, taking into account that $B_{i\bar{j}, \bar{k}} = 0$, since B is constant in the chosen neighborhood and the Christoffel symbols of the Levi-Civita connection vanish at x_0 , equations (11) and (12) reduce at x_0 to

$$(13) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{1,k} = g_{1\bar{1},k}^\varphi + g_{2\bar{2},k}^\varphi, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{1,\bar{k}} = g_{1\bar{1},\bar{k}}^\varphi + g_{2\bar{2},\bar{k}}^\varphi,$$

$$(14) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{1,k\bar{k}} = 2 \sum_{s>1} \sum_{p=1}^2 \frac{|g_{2s-1\bar{p},k}^\varphi|^2 + |g_{p2s-1,k}^\varphi|^2 + |g_{2s\bar{p},k}^\varphi|^2 + |g_{p2s,k}^\varphi|^2}{\lambda_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_s} + g_{1\bar{1},k\bar{k}}^\varphi + g_{2\bar{2},k\bar{k}}^\varphi.$$

The next step consists in showing that

$$(15) \quad \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{k\bar{k}} g_{p\bar{p},k\bar{k}}^\varphi \geq \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{k\bar{k}} g_{k\bar{k},p\bar{p}}^\varphi - C\mathcal{F} \quad \text{at } x_0,$$

where

$$\mathcal{F} = \sum_{k=1}^{2n} F^{k\bar{k}}(x_0).$$

Note that, by [26, Lemma 9] we have $\mathcal{F} > \tau > 0$. Taking into account that $\Gamma_{ab}^c(x_0) = 0$, we compute

$$g_{p\bar{p},k\bar{k}}^\varphi = \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi - \overline{\Gamma_{pk}^r} \partial_p g_{k\bar{r}}^\varphi - \partial_{\bar{p}} \Gamma_{pk}^q g_{q\bar{k}}^\varphi - \Gamma_{pk}^q \partial_{\bar{p}} g_{q\bar{k}}^\varphi + \Gamma_{pk}^q \overline{\Gamma_{pk}^r} g_{q\bar{r}}^\varphi = \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi - \partial_{\bar{p}} \Gamma_{pk}^q g_{q\bar{k}}^\varphi$$

at x_0 . Moreover, using that $\Gamma_{pk}^q = -\partial_k J_p^{\bar{s}} J_s^q$ (cf. [5, Proof of Lemma 4.3]) and the fact that the first derivatives of J vanish at x_0 , we deduce

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{p=1}^2 \partial_{\bar{p}} \Gamma_{pk}^q &= -\sum_{p=1}^2 \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p J_k^{\bar{s}} J_s^q = -\sum_{p=1}^2 \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_k J_p^{\bar{s}} J_s^q = -\sum_{p=1}^2 (\partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_k (J_p^{\bar{s}} J_s^q) - J_p^{\bar{s}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_k J_s^q) \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^2 J_p^{\bar{s}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_k J_s^q = \partial_{\bar{1}} \partial_k J_2^q - \partial_{\bar{2}} \partial_k J_1^q = 0 \end{aligned}$$

at x_0 , because $\partial_{\bar{p}} J_p^a = \partial_{\bar{q}} J_p^a$ in any I -holomorphic coordinate system (see [10, Remark 2.13]). So

$$\sum_{p=1}^2 g_{p\bar{p}, k\bar{k}}^\varphi = \sum_{p=1}^2 \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi$$

at x_0 . Since $F^{j\bar{k}}$ satisfies $F^{j\bar{k}} = F^{a\bar{b}} J_a^{\bar{k}} J_b^j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{k\bar{k}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{k\bar{k}} \left(J_k^{\bar{b}} J_k^a \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p \varphi_{a\bar{b}} + \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p J_k^{\bar{b}} J_k^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}} + J_k^{\bar{b}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p J_k^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}} \right) - C\mathcal{F} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{a\bar{a}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p \varphi_{a\bar{a}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{a\bar{a}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p J_k^{\bar{b}} J_k^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{b\bar{b}} J_k^{\bar{b}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p J_k^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}} - C\mathcal{F} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{a\bar{a}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p \varphi_{a\bar{a}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{a\bar{a}} J_k^{\bar{b}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p J_k^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{b\bar{b}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p J_k^{\bar{b}} J_k^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}} - C\mathcal{F} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{a\bar{a}} \partial_{\bar{p}} \partial_p \varphi_{a\bar{a}} - C\mathcal{F} \end{aligned}$$

at x_0 , where we used again (16). In a similar way we have

$$\sum_{p=1}^2 F^{k\bar{k}} \partial_k \partial_k g_{p\bar{p}}^\varphi \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^2 F^{k\bar{k}} \partial_k \partial_k \varphi_{p\bar{p}} + C\mathcal{F}$$

at x_0 , and thus we obtain (15).

Differentiating the equation $F(A_\varphi) = h$ we have

$$(17) \quad h_j = F^{i\bar{k}} g_{i\bar{k}, j}^\varphi = F^{k\bar{k}} g_{k\bar{k}, j}^\varphi,$$

and

$$(18) \quad h_{j\bar{j}} = F^{i\bar{k}, r\bar{s}} g_{i\bar{k}, j}^\varphi g_{r\bar{s}, \bar{j}}^\varphi + F^{k\bar{k}} g_{k\bar{k}, j\bar{j}}^\varphi$$

at x_0 . Using (15) in (14) and applying (18) with $j = 1, 2$ we get

$$F^{k\bar{k}} \tilde{\lambda}_{1, k\bar{k}} \geq -F^{i\bar{k}, r\bar{s}} \sum_{p=1}^2 g_{i\bar{k}, p}^\varphi g_{r\bar{s}, \bar{p}}^\varphi - C\mathcal{F} \geq -C\mathcal{F}$$

at x_0 , where we also used that F is concave. Hence we have

$$(19) \quad L\left(2\sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_1}\right) \geq -\frac{1}{2\lambda_1\sqrt{\lambda_1}} F^{k\bar{k}} \left| \sum_{p=1}^2 g_{p\bar{p}, k}^\varphi \right|^2 - C\mathcal{F} \quad \text{at } x_0.$$

Now we handle the second and the third term of $L(\tilde{Q})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} L(\alpha(|\nabla\varphi|_g^2)) &= F^{k\bar{k}} (\alpha'' \nabla_{\bar{k}} |\nabla\varphi|_g^2 \nabla_k |\nabla\varphi|_g^2 + \alpha' \nabla_{\bar{k}} \nabla_k |\nabla\varphi|_g^2) \\ &= F^{k\bar{k}} \left(\alpha'' \left| \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (\varphi_{jk} \varphi_{\bar{j}} + \varphi_j \varphi_{\bar{j}k}) \right|^2 + \alpha' \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (\varphi_{jk\bar{k}} \varphi_{\bar{j}} + |\varphi_{jk}|^2 + |\varphi_{j\bar{k}}|^2 + \varphi_j \varphi_{\bar{j}k\bar{k}}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

at x_0 . Since

$$\varphi_{jk\bar{k}} = \varphi_{k\bar{k}j} + R_{k\bar{k}j}{}^q \varphi_q, \quad \varphi_{\bar{j}k\bar{k}} = \varphi_{k\bar{k}\bar{j}}$$

and

$$F^{k\bar{k}} g_{k\bar{k},j}^\varphi = F^{k\bar{k}} \left(\chi_{k\bar{k},j} + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{k\bar{k}j} + \frac{1}{2} J_k^{\bar{b}} J_{\bar{k}}^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}j} \right) \leq F^{k\bar{k}} \varphi_{k\bar{k}j} + C\mathcal{F},$$

$$F^{k\bar{k}} g_{k\bar{k},\bar{j}}^\varphi = F^{k\bar{k}} \left(\chi_{k\bar{k},\bar{j}} + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{k\bar{k}\bar{j}} + \frac{1}{2} J_k^{\bar{b}} J_{\bar{k}}^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}\bar{j}} \right) \leq F^{k\bar{k}} \varphi_{k\bar{k}\bar{j}} + C\mathcal{F}$$

at x_0 , using (17) and its conjugate, keeping in mind that $0 < \alpha' < (2N)^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\alpha' F^{k\bar{k}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{2n} (\varphi_{jk\bar{k}} \varphi_{\bar{j}} + \varphi_j \varphi_{\bar{j}k\bar{k}}) \right) \geq -C\mathcal{F}$$

at x_0 . Moreover, using the inequality $|a+b|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}|a|^2 - |b|^2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha' F^{k\bar{k}} \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (|\varphi_{jk}|^2 + |\varphi_{j\bar{k}}|^2) &\geq \frac{1}{4N} F^{k\bar{k}} |\varphi_{k\bar{k}}|^2 = \frac{1}{8N} F^{k\bar{k}} (|\varphi_{k\bar{k}}|^2 + |J_k^{\bar{b}} J_{\bar{k}}^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}}|^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{8N} F^{k\bar{k}} (|2g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi - 2\chi_{k\bar{k}} - J_k^{\bar{b}} J_{\bar{k}}^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}}|^2 + |J_k^{\bar{b}} J_{\bar{k}}^a \varphi_{a\bar{b}}|^2) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4N} F^{k\bar{k}} |g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi|^2 - C\mathcal{F} \end{aligned}$$

at x_0 . Furthermore, since $\tilde{Q}_k(x_0) = 0$ we infer

$$\sum_{p=1}^2 \frac{g_{p\bar{p},k}^\varphi}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} + \alpha' \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (\varphi_{jk} \varphi_{\bar{j}} + \varphi_j \varphi_{\bar{j}k}) + \beta' \varphi_k = 0$$

at x_0 , and using $\alpha'' = 2(\alpha')^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'' F^{k\bar{k}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{2n} (\varphi_{jk} \varphi_{\bar{j}} + \varphi_j \varphi_{\bar{j}k}) \right|^2 &= 2F^{k\bar{k}} \left| \sum_{p=1}^2 \frac{g_{p\bar{p},k}^\varphi}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} + \beta' \varphi_k \right|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{2\varepsilon}{\lambda_1} F^{k\bar{k}} \left| \sum_{p=1}^2 g_{p\bar{p},k}^\varphi \right|^2 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} (\beta')^2 F^{k\bar{k}} |\varphi_k|^2, \end{aligned}$$

at x_0 , where we used the inequality $|a+b|^2 \geq \varepsilon|a|^2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}|b|^2$ for every $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$. Hence

$$(20) \quad L(\alpha(|\nabla\varphi|_g^2)) \geq \frac{2\varepsilon}{\lambda_1} F^{k\bar{k}} \left| \sum_{p=1}^2 g_{p\bar{p},k}^\varphi \right|^2 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} (\beta')^2 F^{k\bar{k}} |\varphi_k|^2 + \frac{1}{4N} F^{k\bar{k}} |g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi|^2 - C\mathcal{F} \quad \text{at } x_0.$$

Moreover,

$$(21) \quad L(\beta(\varphi)) = \beta' F^{k\bar{k}} \varphi_{k\bar{k}} + \beta'' F^{k\bar{k}} \varphi_k \varphi_{\bar{k}} \quad \text{at } x_0.$$

Then (19), (20), (21) and $L(\tilde{Q})(x_0) \leq 0$ imply
(22)

$$\frac{4\varepsilon\sqrt{\lambda_1}-1}{2\lambda_1\sqrt{\lambda_1}}F^{k\bar{k}}\left|\sum_{p=1}^2g_{p\bar{p},\bar{k}}^\varphi\right|^2+\left(\beta''-\frac{2\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}(\beta')^2\right)F^{k\bar{k}}|\varphi_k|^2+\frac{1}{4N}F^{k\bar{k}}|g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi|^2+\beta'F^{k\bar{k}}\varphi_{k\bar{k}}-C\mathcal{F}\leq 0.$$

at x_0 . By choosing

$$\varepsilon < \frac{1}{18D^2+1}$$

and assuming that $\sqrt{\lambda_1}(x_0) \geq \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}$ the first two terms on the right hand side of (22) are non-negative. Hence

$$(23) \quad \frac{1}{4N}F^{k\bar{k}}|g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi|^2+\beta'F^{k\bar{k}}\varphi_{k\bar{k}}-C\mathcal{F}\leq 0 \text{ at } x_0.$$

Again, we assume $\varphi \equiv 0$, otherwise we could replace χ with a suitably chosen form in order to simplify the equation. By definition of \mathcal{C} -subsolution we can find $\delta, R > 0$ such that

$$(\lambda(g^{-1}\chi) - 2\delta\mathbf{1} + \Gamma_n) \cap \partial\Gamma^{h(x)} \subseteq B_R(0), \quad \text{at every } x \in M.$$

Suppose $\lambda_1 > R$ then $|\lambda(A_\varphi)| > R$ and we can then apply Lemma 5 to deduce the existence of a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that either

$$-F^{k\bar{k}}\varphi_{k\bar{k}} > \kappa\mathcal{F},$$

or

$$F^{k\bar{k}} > \kappa\mathcal{F}, \quad \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, 2n.$$

In the first case, choosing D large enough we can guarantee $\beta'F^{k\bar{k}}\varphi_{k\bar{k}} - C\mathcal{F} > 0$ which, together with (23) yields a contradiction. Therefore, we only need to consider the second case. We have

$$\beta'F^{k\bar{k}}\varphi_{k\bar{k}} = \frac{1}{2}\beta'F^{k\bar{k}}(\varphi_{k\bar{k}} + J_k^{\bar{b}}J_{\bar{k}}^a\varphi_{a\bar{b}}) = \beta'F^{k\bar{k}}(g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi - \chi_{k\bar{k}}) \geq -3DF^{k\bar{k}}g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi - C\mathcal{F},$$

and so from (23) we obtain

$$(24) \quad \frac{1}{4N}F^{k\bar{k}}|g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi|^2 - 3DF^{k\bar{k}}g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi - C\mathcal{F} \leq 0.$$

Using $F^{k\bar{k}}|g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi|^2 \geq F^{11}|g_{1\bar{1}}^\varphi|^2 = F^{11}\lambda_1^2 > \kappa\mathcal{F}\lambda_1^2$ in (24), we get

$$(25) \quad \frac{1}{4N}\kappa\mathcal{F}\lambda_1^2 - 3DF^{k\bar{k}}g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi - C\mathcal{F} \leq 0.$$

Since f is concave, for $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ we have

$$f(\lambda) - f(\mathbf{1}) \geq \nabla f(\lambda) \cdot (\lambda - \mathbf{1})$$

which gives, at x_0

$$\begin{aligned} F^{k\bar{k}}g_{k\bar{k}}^\varphi &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(F^{2j-1}\overline{2j-1} + F^{2j}\overline{2j} \right) \lambda_j = 2 \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(\lambda) \lambda_j \leq 2f(\lambda) - 2f(\mathbf{1}) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(\lambda) \\ &= 2h - 2f(\mathbf{1}) + \mathcal{F} \leq C\mathcal{F} \end{aligned}$$

hence, we deduce from (25)

$$\lambda_1^2 \leq CN,$$

which implies the bound. \square

4. GRADIENT ESTIMATE

In this section we use interpolation inequalities to deduce a bound for the gradient of solutions to (1).

Proposition 6. *Let (M^{4n}, I, J, K, g) be a compact hyperhermitian manifold. Assume that every solution φ of (1) satisfies*

$$\Delta_g \varphi \leq C(\|\nabla \varphi\|_{C^0} + 1).$$

Then there is a bound

$$\Delta_g \varphi \leq C',$$

depending only on (M, I, J, K, g) , C and $\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$.

Proof. In view of [17, section 6.8], for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ there exists a constant $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^1} \leq C_\varepsilon \|\varphi\|_{C^0} + \varepsilon \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}}.$$

By choosing $p = \frac{4n}{1-\alpha} > 4n$ applying Morrey's inequality and elliptic L^p -estimates for the Laplacian, we have

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq C_1 \|\varphi\|_{W^{2,p}} \leq C_2 (\|\varphi\|_{L^p} + \|\Delta_g \varphi\|_{L^p}) \leq C_2 (\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + \|\Delta_g \varphi\|_{C^0})$$

for some positive constants C_1, C_2 depending only on α . Therefore, we obtain

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^1} \leq C_\varepsilon \|\varphi\|_{C^0} + \varepsilon C_2 C (\|\varphi\|_{C^1} + 1),$$

which gives the gradient bound, and thus the Laplacian bound we were looking for, when we choose $\varepsilon < (C_2 C)^{-1}$. \square

5. $C^{2,\alpha}$ ESTIMATE

Proposition 7. *Let (M^{4n}, I, J, K, g) be a compact hyperhermitian manifold. If φ is a solution to (1) such that $\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$ and $\Delta_g \varphi$ are bounded from above by a constant $C > 0$, then there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and a constant $C' > 0$, depending only on the background data and C such that*

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} \leq C'.$$

Proof. For any point $x_0 \in M$, take a I -holomorphic coordinate chart (z^1, \dots, z^{2n}) centered at x_0 and assume that the domain of the chart contains $B_1(0)$. Consider also the induced real coordinates (x^1, \dots, x^{4n}) , where $z^k = x^k + \sqrt{-1}x^{2n+k}$, for $k = 1, \dots, 2n$. We take into account the real representation of complex matrices $\iota: \mathbb{C}^{2n, 2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{4n, 4n}$, defined as

$$\iota(H) := \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(H) & \operatorname{Im}(H) \\ -\operatorname{Im}(H) & \operatorname{Re}(H) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The map ι sends the space $\operatorname{Herm}(2n)$ of $2n \times 2n$ Hermitian matrices to the space $\operatorname{Sym}(4n)$ of $4n \times 4n$ real symmetric matrices. We will also need the projections $\mathfrak{p}: \operatorname{Sym}(4n) \rightarrow \operatorname{Im}(\iota)$, $T: \operatorname{Sym}(4n) \times B_1(0) \rightarrow \operatorname{Im}(\iota)$

$$\mathfrak{p}(N) := \frac{1}{2}(N + {}^tINI), \quad T(N, x) = \frac{1}{4}(\mathfrak{p}(N) + \iota(J^t(x))\mathfrak{p}(N)\iota(J(x))).$$

In the chosen coordinates, for a C^2 -regular function $u: B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\iota(\operatorname{Hess}_C u) = \frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{p}(D^2 u).$$

Observe that, whenever $N \in \operatorname{Sym}(4n)$, for every $x \in B_1(0)$, the endomorphism

$$\tilde{N}(x) := g^{-1}(x)(\iota^{-1}(T(N, x))),$$

is hyperhermitian with respect to g . Define the set

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ N \in \text{Sym}(4n) \mid \lambda(\tilde{N}(0)) \in \bar{\Gamma}^\sigma \cap \overline{B_R(0)} \right\},$$

where σ and R are to be chosen. The set \mathcal{E} is compact and by convexity of Γ it is also convex. Note that by continuity of g , and possibly shrinking $B_1(0)$ to a smaller radius $r \in (0, 1)$, it follows that $\lambda(\tilde{N}(x))$ is close to $\lambda(\tilde{N}(0))$. Possibly shrinking $B_1(0)$ again we may assume that if N lies in a sufficiently small neighborhood U of \mathcal{E} , then $\lambda(\tilde{N}(x)) \in \bar{\Gamma}^\sigma \cap \overline{B_{2R}(0)}$ for any $x \in B_1(0)$.

The bound $\Delta_g \varphi \leq C$ implies that σ and R can be chosen so that

$$\iota(\chi(x)) + T(D^2 \varphi(x), x) = \iota \left(\chi(x) + \frac{\text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}} \varphi(x) + J^t(x) \text{Hess}_{\mathbb{C}} \varphi(x) J(x)}{2} \right) \in \mathcal{E},$$

for each $x \in B_1(0)$.

Finally, our assumptions on f ensure that [27, Theorem 1.2] can be applied with

- $F: \text{Sym}(4n) \times B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $F(N, x) = f(\lambda(\tilde{N}(x)))$ for $N \in U$, and extended smoothly to all of $\text{Sym}(4n) \times B_1(0)$;
- $S: B_1(0) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(4n)$ defined as $S(x) = \iota(\chi(x))$;
- $T: \text{Sym}(4n) \times B_1(0) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(4n)$ defined as $T(N, x) = \frac{1}{4}(\text{p}(N) + \iota(J^t(x))\text{p}(N)\iota(J(x)))$.

And since $\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \leq C$ we obtain the desired bound $\|\varphi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} \leq C$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. \square

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

Proof of Theorem 1. Let (M, I, J, K, g) be a compact hyperkähler manifold and let φ be a solution to (1) such that $\sup_M \varphi = 0$. By Proposition 3 there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \leq C_1,$$

with C_1 depending only on background data. We can then apply Proposition 4 to get a bound of the form

$$\Delta_g \varphi \leq C_2 (\|\nabla \varphi\|_{C^0} + 1)$$

where $C_2 > 0$ depends only on the background data. We then deduce a gradient bound from Proposition 6 and thus we have

$$\Delta_g \varphi \leq C_3.$$

The $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate is then implied by Proposition 7 and the result follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. ALESKER. Solvability of the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation on compact manifolds with a flat hyperkähler metric, *Adv. Math.*, **241**, 192–219, 2013.
- [2] S. ALESKER, E. SHELUKHIN. A uniform estimate for general quaternionic Calabi problem (with appendix by Daniel Barlet), *Adv. Math.*, **316**, 1–52, 2017.
- [3] S. ALESKER, M. VERBITSKY, Quaternionic Monge-Ampère equations and Calabi problem for HKT-manifolds, *Israel J. Math.*, **176**, 109–138, 2010.
- [4] L. BEDULLI, G. GENTILI, L. VEZZONI, A parabolic approach to the Calabi-Yau problem in HKT geometry, *Math. Z.* **302**, no. 2, 917–933, 2022.
- [5] L. BEDULLI, G. GENTILI, L. VEZZONI, The parabolic quaternionic Calabi-Yau equation on hyperkähler manifolds, to appear in *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*
- [6] Z. BŁOCKI, On uniform estimate in Calabi-Yau theorem, *Sci. China Ser. A*, **48**, 244–247, 2005.
- [7] 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**, 261–301, 1985.
- [8] K. S. CHOU, X. J. WANG, A variation theory of the Hessian equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **54**, 1029–1064, 2001.

- [9] S. DINEW, S. KOŁODZIEJ, Liouville and Calabi-Yau type theorems for complex Hessian equations, *Amer. J. Math.*, **139**, no. 2, 403–415, 2017.
- [10] S. DINEW, M. SROKA, On the Alesker-Verbitsky conjecture on hyperKähler manifolds, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **33**, no. 4, 875–911, 2023.
- [11] J. FU, Z. WANG, D. WU, Form-type Calabi-Yau equations, *Math. Res. Lett.* **17**, no. 5, 887–903, 2010.
- [12] J. FU, X. XU, D. ZHANG, The Monge-Ampère equation for $(n - 1)$ -quaternionic PSH functions on a hyperKähler manifold, *Math. Z.* **307**, no. 2, Paper No. 29, 25 pp., 2024.
- [13] G. GENTILI, L. VEZZONI, The quaternionic Calabi conjecture on abelian hypercomplex nilmanifolds viewed as tori fibrations, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **2022**, no. 12, 9499–9528, 2022.
- [14] G. GENTILI, L. VEZZONI, A remark on the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation on foliated manifolds, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **151**, no. 3, 1263–1275, 2023.
- [15] G. GENTILI, J. ZHANG, Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact manifolds with a flat hyperkähler metric, *J. Geom. Anal.* **32**, no. 9, Paper No. 229, 38 pp., 2022.
- [16] G. GENTILI, J. ZHANG, Fully non-linear parabolic equations on compact manifolds with a flat hyperkähler metric, to appear in *Israel J. Math.*
- [17] D. GILBARG, N. S. TRUDINGER, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, second ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. **224**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [18] B. GUO, D. H. PHONG, On L^∞ estimates for fully nonlinear partial differential equations, *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **200**, no. 1, 365–398, 2024.
- [19] B. GUO, D. H. PHONG, Auxiliary Monge-Ampère equations in geometric analysis, *ICCM Not.* **11**, no. 1, 98–135, 2023.
- [20] B. GUO, D. H. PHONG, F. TONG, On L^∞ estimates for complex Monge-Ampère equations, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **198**, no. 1, 393–418, 2023.
- [21] F. R. HARVEY, H. B. LAWSON JR., Dirichlet Duality and the Nonlinear Dirichlet Problem, *Comm. Pure App. Math.*, **62**, no. 3, 396–443, 2009.
- [22] F. R. HARVEY, H. B. LAWSON JR., Dirichlet Duality and the Nonlinear Dirichlet Problem on Riemannian Manifolds, *J. Diff. Geom.*, **88**, no. 3, 395–482, 2011.
- [23] Z. HOU, X. MA, D. WU, A second order estimate for complex Hessian equations on a compact Kähler manifold, *Math. Res. Lett.*, **17**, 547–561, 2010.
- [24] M. SROKA, The C^0 estimate for the quaternionic Calabi conjecture, *Adv. Math.*, **370**, 107237, 2020.
- [25] M. SROKA, Sharp uniform bound for the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation on hyperhermitian manifolds, *Calc. Var.* **63**, Paper No. 102, 2024.
- [26] G. SZÉKELYHIDI, Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds, *J. Diff. Geom.*, **109**, no. 2, 337–378, 2018.
- [27] V. TOSATTI, Y. WANG, B. WEINKOVE, X. YANG, $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for nonlinear elliptic equations in complex and almost-complex geometry, *Calc. Var.*, **54**, no. 1, 431–453, 2015.
- [28] V. TOSATTI, B. WEINKOVE, The Monge-Ampère equation for $(n - 1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions on a compact Kähler manifold, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **30**, no. 2, 311–346, 2017.
- [29] V. TOSATTI, B. WEINKOVE, Hermitian metrics, $(n - 1, n - 1)$ forms and Monge-Ampère equations, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **755**, 67–101, 2019.
- [30] J. ZHANG, Parabolic quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation on compact manifolds with a flat hyperKähler metric, *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, **59**, no. 1, pp. 13–33, 2022.

(GIOVANNI GENTILI) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA G. PEANO, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO, VIA CARLO ALBERTO 10, 10123 TORINO, ITALY.

Email address: `giovanni.gentili@unito.it`

(LUIGI VEZZONI) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA G. PEANO, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO, VIA CARLO ALBERTO 10, 10123 TORINO, ITALY.

Email address: `luigi.vezzoni@unito.it`