

ON HARNACK INEQUALITIES AND SINGULARITIES OF ADMISSIBLE METRICS IN THE YAMABE PROBLEM

NEIL S. TRUDINGER XU-JIA WANG

The Australian National University

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the local behaviour of admissible metrics in the k -Yamabe problem on compact Riemannian manifolds (M, g_0) of dimension $n \geq 3$. For $n/2 < k < n$, we prove a sharp Harnack inequality for admissible metrics when (M, g_0) is not conformally equivalent to the unit sphere S^n and that the set of all such metrics is compact. When (M, g_0) is the unit sphere we prove there is a unique admissible metric with singularity. As a consequence we prove an existence theorem for equations of Yamabe type, thereby recovering a recent result of Gursky and Viaclovski on the solvability of the k -Yamabe problem for $k > n/2$.

1. Introduction

Let (\mathcal{M}, g_0) be a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$ and $[g_0]$ the set of metrics conformal to g_0 . For $g \in [g_0]$ we denote by

$$A_g = \frac{1}{n-2}(\text{Ric}_g - \frac{R_g}{2(n-1)}g) \quad (1.1)$$

the Schouten tensor and by $\lambda(A_g) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ the eigenvalues of A_g with respect to g (so one can also write $\lambda = \lambda(g^{-1}A_g)$), where Ric and R are respectively the Ricci tensor and the scalar curvature. We also denote as usual

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_k} \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_k} \quad (1.2)$$

the k -th elementary symmetric polynomial and

$$\Gamma_k = \{\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid \sigma_j(\lambda) > 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k\} \quad (1.3)$$

the corresponding open, convex cone in \mathbf{R}^n . Denote

$$[g_0]_k = \{g \in [g_0] \mid \lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma_k\}. \quad (1.4)$$

We call a metric in $[g_0]_k$ *k-admissible*. In this paper we prove three main theorems pertaining to the cases $k > \frac{n}{2}$.

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council.

Theorem A. *If (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is not conformally equivalent to the unit sphere S^n and $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$, then $[g_0]_k$ is compact in $C^0(\mathcal{M})$ and satisfies the following Harnack inequality, namely for any $g = \chi g_0 \in [g_0]_k$,*

$$\max_{x, y \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\chi(x)}{\chi(y)} \leq \exp(C|x - y|^{2 - \frac{n}{k}}) \quad (1.5)$$

for some fixed constant C depending only on (\mathcal{M}, g_0) , where $|x - y|$ denotes the geodesic distance in the metric g_0 between x and y .

When the manifold (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is the unit sphere, the compactness is no longer true. In this case (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is conformally equivalent to the Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^n so that without loss of generality, it suffices to study conformal metrics on \mathbf{R}^n . For our investigation we will allow singular metrics. Accordingly we call a metric $g = \chi g_0$ k -admissible if $\chi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, χ is lower semi-continuous, $\not\equiv \infty$ and there exists a sequence of k -admissible metrics $g_m = \chi_m g_0$, $\chi_m \in C^2(\mathcal{M})$, such that $\chi_m \rightarrow \chi$ almost everywhere in \mathcal{M} . If g is k -admissible, then the function $v = \chi^{(n-2)/4}$ is subharmonic with respect to the operator

$$\square := -\Delta_g + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g \quad (1.6)$$

and hence by the weak Harnack inequality [GT], the set $\{\chi = \infty\}$ has measure zero. Our next result classifies the possible singularities of k -admissible metrics on \mathbf{R}^n .

Theorem B. *Let g be k -admissible on \mathbf{R}^n with $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$. Then either*

$$g(x) = \frac{C}{|x - x_0|^4} g_0(x) \quad (1.7)$$

for some point $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and positive constant C , or the conformal factor χ is Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$, where g_0 is the standard metric on \mathbf{R}^n .

Remark. Theorems A and B also hold if the condition $g \in [g_0]_k$ (namely $\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma_k$) is replaced by $\lambda(A_g) \in \Sigma_\delta$ for $\delta < \frac{1}{n-2}$, where the cone

$$\Sigma_\delta = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid \lambda_i > -\delta \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \quad \forall \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \quad (1.8)$$

was introduced in [GV2]. If $\lambda \in \Gamma_k$, then $\lambda \in \Sigma_\delta$ with $\delta = \frac{n-k}{n(k-1)}$ [TW2].

Theorems A and B have various interesting consequences. As an application of Theorem A, we study the problem of prescribing the k -curvature, that is the existence of a conformal metric $g \in [g_0]$ such that

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(A_g)) = f, \quad (1.9)$$

where f is a given positive smooth function on \mathcal{M} . Write $g = v^{4/(n-2)}g_0$. Then equation (1.9) is equivalent to the *conformal k -Hessian equation*

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(V)) = \varphi(x, v), \quad (1.10)$$

where

$$V = -\nabla^2 v + \frac{n}{n-2} \frac{\nabla v \otimes \nabla v}{v} - \frac{1}{n-2} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v} g_0 + \frac{n-2}{2} v A_{g_0}, \quad (1.11)$$

$\lambda(V)$ denotes the eigenvalues of the matrix V , and $\varphi = f v^{k \frac{n+2}{n-2}}$. When $f \equiv 1$, (1.9) is the *k -Yamabe problem*, which has been studied by many authors, see [A1,S, T] for $k = 1$ and [CGY2, GeW, GW2, LL1, STW, GV1] for $k \geq 2$.

When $k \geq 2$, equation (1.10) is a fully nonlinear partial differential equation, which is elliptic if the eigenvalues $\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma_k$. Therefore to study problem (1.9), we always assume $[g_0]_k \neq \emptyset$. Under this assumption, the k -Yamabe problem has been solved in [STW] if $2 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and (1.9) is variational. Equation (1.9) is automatically variational when $k = 2$, but when $k \geq 3$, it is variational when the manifold is locally conformally flat or satisfies some other conditions [STW]. When $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$, the existence of solutions to (1.9) was proved in [GV1] for any smooth, positive functions f ; see also [CGY2] for the solvability when $k = 2$ and $n = 4$, and [GW2, LL1] when the manifold is locally conformally flat. As a consequence of Theorem A, we have the following stronger result.

Theorem C. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g_0) be a compact n -manifold not conformally equivalent to the unit sphere S^n . Suppose $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$ and $[g_0]_k \neq \emptyset$. Then for any smooth, positive function f and any constant $p \neq k$, there exists a positive solution to the equation*

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(V)) = f(x)v^p. \quad (1.12)$$

The solution is unique if $p < k$. When $p = k$, then there exists a unique constant $\theta > 0$ such that

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(V)) = \theta f(x)v^k \quad (1.13)$$

has a solution, which is unique up to a constant multiplication.

We may call the constant θ in (1.13) (with $f \equiv 1$) the *eigenvalue* of the conformal k -Hessian operator in (1.10). As a special case of Theorem C, letting $p = k \frac{n+2}{n-2}$, we obtain the existence of solutions to the k -Yamabe problem (1.9) for $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$, which was first proved in [GV1]. We also include some extensions of Theorem C at the end of Section 4.

As in [STW] we will use conformal transforms of different forms,

$$g = \chi g_0 = v^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_0 = u^{-2} g_0 = e^{-2w} g_0 \quad (1.14)$$

so that

$$u = v^{-2/(n-2)} = e^w. \quad (1.15)$$

We say u , v , or w is *conformally k -admissible*, or simply k -admissible if no confusion arises, if the metric g is k -admissible. In the smooth case, from the matrix V in (1.11), we see that u, w are k -admissible if the eigenvalues of the matrices

$$U = \{u_{ij} - \frac{|Du|^2}{2u}g_0 + uA_{g_0}\}, \quad (1.16)$$

$$W = \{w_{ij} + w_iw_j - \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2g_0 + A_{g_0}\} \quad (1.17)$$

lie in $\bar{\Gamma}_k$, the closure of Γ_k . Note that if g is the metric given by (1.7), then

$$v = \frac{C}{|x - x_0|^{n-2}} \quad (1.18)$$

is the fundamental solution of the Laplace operator.

The conformal k -Hessian equation is closely related to the k -Hessian equation

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(D^2u)) = \varphi \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.19)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a bounded domain. For the k -Hessian equation (1.19), it is proved in [TW2] that when $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$, a k -admissible function (relative to equation (1.19)) is locally Hölder continuous with Hölder exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$. The existence of solutions to (1.19) with right hand side $\varphi = f(x)|u|^p$ for some constant $p > 0$ was studied in [CW] for $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and in [Ch, W] for $k = n$. By the Hölder continuity one can extend the results in [Ch, W] to the cases $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$. The argument in [W] uses a degree theory, which does not require a variational structure. We will employ the same degree argument to prove our Theorem C.

We will first prove Theorem B for radially symmetric, k -admissible functions defined on \mathbf{R}^n , then extend it to general k -admissible functions by the comparison principle. The proof of Theorem B also implies that if w is a k -admissible function on a manifold \mathcal{M} , then either w is Hölder continuous, or

$$w = -2 \log |x - x_0| + C + o(1) \quad (1.20)$$

for some point $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. If the case (1.20) occurs, we show that w must be a smooth function. Hence by Bishop's volume growth formula, it occurs only when the manifold is conformally equivalent to the unit sphere, because when $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$, \mathcal{M} equipped with the metric $g = e^{-2w}g_0$ is a complete manifold with nonnegative Ricci curvature. Theorem C follows from Theorem A and a degree argument.

The above theorems extend to more general symmetric curvature functions. For example the k^{th} elementary symmetric polynomial σ_k in (1.9) can be replaced by the quotient σ_k/σ_l , where $k > l \geq 1$ and $n \geq k > \frac{n}{2}$. In a subsequent paper we will extend these results to more general symmetric curvature functions, as well as to the case $k = \frac{n}{2}$ in Theorem C.

2. Proof of Theorem B

2.1. Radial functions. The proof of Theorem B can be included in that of Theorem A. However we provide a separate proof here. We first consider radially symmetric functions. Let w be a radially symmetric, k -admissible function on $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. For any given point $x \neq 0$, by a rotation of axes we assume $x = (0, \dots, 0, r)$. Regard w as a function of $r = |x|$, $r \in (0, \infty)$. Then the matrix W in (1.17) is diagonal,

$$W = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{r}w' - \frac{1}{2}w'^2, \dots, \frac{1}{r}w' - \frac{1}{2}w'^2, w'' + \frac{1}{2}w'^2\right).$$

Denote $a = w'' + \frac{1}{2}w'^2$ and $b = \frac{1}{r}w' - \frac{1}{2}w'^2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(\lambda(W)) &= b^k C_{n-1}^k + ab^{k-1} C_{n-1}^{k-1} \\ &= C_{n-1}^{k-1} b^{k-1} \left(a + \frac{n-k}{k} b\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Since $\lambda(W) \in \bar{\Gamma}_k$ and $k > \frac{n}{2}$,

$$b = \frac{w'}{r} - \frac{1}{2}w'^2 \geq 0, \tag{2.2}$$

$$a + \frac{n-k}{k}b = \left(w'' + \frac{w'}{r}\right) - (1-\theta)\left(\frac{w'}{r} - \frac{1}{2}w'^2\right) \geq 0, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\theta = \frac{n-k}{k} < 1$. It follows that

$$0 \leq w' \leq \frac{2}{r}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$w'' + \frac{w'}{r} \geq 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Note that (2.5) can also be written as $(rw')' \geq 0$. Therefore we have

Lemma 2.1. *The function rw' is nonnegative, monotone increasing, and $rw' \leq 2$.*

It follows that w must be locally uniformly bounded from above. Next we prove

Lemma 2.2. *The function w is either Hölder continuous in \mathbf{R}^n with exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$, or*

$$w(r) = 2 \log r + C \tag{2.6}$$

for some constant C .

Proof. First we consider the case $k = n$. In this case $a = w'' + \frac{1}{2}w'^2 \geq 0$, namely, $\frac{w''}{w'^2} + \frac{1}{2} \geq 0$. Hence

$$\int_0^r \left(\frac{-1}{w'} + \frac{r}{2}\right)' \geq 0.$$

If w is not Lipschitz continuous, we have $w'(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Hence

$$\frac{-1}{w'} + \frac{r}{2} \geq 0.$$

It follows that $w' \geq \frac{2}{r}$. Hence by Lemma 2.1, $w' \equiv 2/r$ so that $w(r) = 2 \log r + C$.

In the cases $\frac{n}{2} < k < n$, if $rw' \not\equiv 2$, then by Lemma 2.1, $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} rw' = c_0 < 2$. For any $c_1 \in (c_0, 2)$,

$$w'' + \frac{w'}{r} \geq (1 - \theta) \frac{w'}{r} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} rw'\right) \geq (1 - \theta) \left(1 - \frac{c_1}{2}\right) \frac{w'}{r} \quad (2.7)$$

if r is sufficiently small. Hence

$$\frac{w''}{w'} + \frac{\sigma}{r} \geq 0,$$

where $\sigma = 1 - (1 - \theta) \left(1 - \frac{c_1}{2}\right) < 1$. We obtain

$$\log(w' r^\sigma) \Big|_r^{r_0} \geq 0.$$

Hence

$$w' \leq \frac{C}{r^\sigma}. \quad (2.8)$$

Hence w is bounded and continuous.

To show that w is Hölder continuous with Hölder exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$, by Lemma 2.1 it suffices to prove it at $r = 0$. Note that

$$a + \theta b = w'' + \theta \frac{w'}{r} + \frac{1 - \theta}{2} w'^2 \geq 0.$$

Hence

$$\frac{w''}{w'} + \frac{\theta}{r} \geq -\frac{1 - \theta}{2} w'.$$

Taking integration from r to r_0 , we obtain

$$\log(w' r^\theta) \Big|_r^{r_0} \geq C.$$

Hence

$$w' \leq \frac{C}{r^\theta}, \quad (2.9)$$

so that w is Hölder continuous with exponent $1 - \theta = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$. \square

Remark 2.1. The Hölder continuity also follows from [TW2]. Let $u = e^w$ as in (1.15). Then from the matrix U in (1.16) we see that u is k -admissible with respect to the k -Hessian operator $\sigma_k(\lambda(D^2u))$. Hence u is Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$. It follows that for any constant $c > 0$, $w_c = \max(w, -c)$ is also Hölder continuous with exponent $2 - \frac{n}{k}$. In particular, if w_m converges to w a.e., then w_m converges to w uniformly in $\{w > -c\}$ for any $c > 0$.

2.2. Proof of Theorem B. Let w be a k -admissible function. For any $h \in \mathbf{R}$, denote $\Omega_h = \{w < h\}$. Since w is upper semi-continuous, Ω_h is an open set. For any given point 0 , we define a function \tilde{w} of one variable r by

$$\tilde{w}(r) = \inf\{h : \text{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_h) > r\}. \quad (2.10)$$

Let $x_h \in \partial\Omega_h$ such that $|x_h| = r_h := \text{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_h)$. Assume that $\partial\Omega_h$ and w are smooth at x_h . Rotate the axes such that $x_h = (0, \dots, 0, r_h)$. Then the x_n -axis is the outer normal of $\partial\Omega_h$ at x_h . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}(r_h) &= w(x_h), \\ \tilde{w}(r_h + t) &\geq w(x_h + te_n) \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

for t near 0 , where $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}'(r_h) &= w_n(x_h) = |Dw|(x_h), \\ \tilde{w}''(r_h) &\geq w_{nn}(x_h) \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

provided \tilde{w} is twice differentiable point at r_h .

Let $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}$ be the principal curvatures of $\partial\Omega_h$ at x_h . Then

$$w_{ij} = |Dw|\kappa_i\delta_{ij} \quad i, j \leq n-1. \quad (2.13)$$

By our choice of x_h , we have

$$\kappa_i \leq \frac{1}{r}, \quad (2.14)$$

where $r = r_h$. Hence the matrix

$$(w_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \leq \frac{1}{r}|Dw|I. \quad (2.15)$$

At x_h , the matrix W is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \{w_{ij} + w_iw_j - \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2I\} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} w_{11} - \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2, & 0, & \cdots, & w_{1n} \\ 0, & w_{22} - \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2, & \cdots, & w_{2n} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ w_{1n}, & w_{2n}, & \cdots, & w_{nn} + \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$W' = \text{diag}(w_{11} - \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2, \dots, w_{22} - \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2, w_{nn} + \frac{1}{2}|Dw|^2) \quad (2.16)$$

be a diagonal matrix. We claim that the eigenvalues $\lambda(W') \in \bar{\Gamma}_k$. Indeed, recalling that $\sigma_k(\lambda(W))$ is the sum of all principal $k \times k$ minors, we have

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(W)) = \sigma_k(\lambda(W')) - \sum_{i < n} \sigma_{k-2}(\lambda(W_{|in})) w_{;in}^2, \quad (2.17)$$

where $w_{;ij}$ is the entry of the matrix W , and $W_{|ij}$ denotes the matrix obtained by cancelling the i th and j th rows and columns of W . Since $\lambda(W) \in \bar{\Gamma}_k$, we have

$$\sigma_{k-2}(\lambda(W_{|in})) = \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k(\lambda(W))}{\partial w_{;ii} \partial w_{;nn}} > 0. \quad (2.18)$$

Hence $\sigma_k(\lambda(W')) \geq \sigma_k(\lambda(W)) \geq 0$. Similarly we have $\sigma_j(\lambda(W')) \geq \sigma_j(\lambda(W))$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, and so $\lambda(W') \in \bar{\Gamma}_k$.

From (2.15),

$$W' \leq \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{r}\tilde{w}' - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2, \dots, \frac{1}{r}\tilde{w}' - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2, \tilde{w}'' + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2\right). \quad (2.19)$$

Therefore as in §2.1, we see that \tilde{w} satisfies

$$\frac{\tilde{w}'}{r} - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2 \geq 0 \quad (2.20)$$

$$\left(\tilde{w}'' + \frac{\tilde{w}'}{r}\right) - (1 - \theta)\left(\frac{\tilde{w}'}{r} - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2\right) \geq 0 \quad (2.21)$$

if \tilde{w} is twice differentiable at r .

To proceed further we need some remarks.

Remarks 2.2.

(i) If the function \tilde{w} is not smooth, by (2.11) it satisfies (2.20) and (2.21) in the viscosity sense. That is if φ is a smooth function satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi'}{r} - \frac{1}{2}\varphi'^2 &\geq 0, \\ \left(\varphi'' + \frac{\varphi'}{r}\right) - (1 - \theta)\left(\frac{\varphi'}{r} - \frac{1}{2}\varphi'^2\right) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and $\tilde{w}(r_0) = \varphi(r_0)$, $\tilde{w}'(r_0) = \varphi'(r_0)$, then $\tilde{w}(r) \geq \varphi(r)$ near r_0 . If instead $\tilde{w}(r_0) = \varphi(r_0)$, $\tilde{w}(r_1) = \varphi(r_1)$, then $\tilde{w}(r) \leq \varphi(r)$ for $r \in (r_0, r_1)$.

(ii) In the above we assumed that both w and $\partial\Omega_h$ are smooth at x_h . If w is smooth but $\partial\Omega_h$ is not smooth at x_h , it is easy to see that (2.15) still holds and so one also has (2.20) and (2.21). If w is not smooth, by definition it can be approximated by smooth functions. Hence (2.20) and (2.21) always hold.

(iii) Another way to verify (2.20) and (2.21) is to regard \tilde{w} as a function of x , namely $\tilde{w}(x) = \tilde{w}(|x|)$. Then $\tilde{w} - w$ attains a local minimum at x_h . Hence \tilde{w} is k -admissible in the viscosity sense, and so (2.20) and (2.21) hold.

From (2.20) and (2.21), we can prove Theorem B easily. First we consider the case when w is unbounded from below.

Lemma 2.3. *Let w be a k -admissible function which is unbounded from below, then there exists a point $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and a constant C such that*

$$w(x) \equiv -2 \log |x - x_0| + C. \quad (2.22)$$

Proof. If w is unbounded from below, the singular set $S = \bigcap_{\{c < 0\}} \{w < c\}$ is not empty. Choose a point $0 \in S$. By (2.20) and (2.21), and from the argument in §2.1, we must have $\tilde{w}(r) = 2 \log r + C$ for some constant C .

Let $\hat{w} = 2 \log |x| + C$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(\lambda(W_{\hat{w}})) &= 0, \\ \sigma_1(\lambda_1(W_w)) &\geq \sigma_k^{1/k}(\lambda(W_w)) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_{\hat{w}}$ is the matrix corresponding to \hat{w} , given in (1.17). By the relation (1.15), $\sigma_1(\lambda(W))$ is indeed the Laplace operator. Since $\tilde{w} = 2 \log r + C$, we see that $w - \hat{w}$ attains its local maximum at some interior point. By the maximum principle for the Laplace equation, we conclude that $w \equiv \hat{w}$. \square

Next we consider the case when w is bounded from below.

Lemma 2.4. *Let w be a k -admissible function w . Suppose w is bounded from below. Then w is Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$.*

Proof. For any given point x_0 , we may take x_0 as the origin and define \tilde{w} as (2.10). Then to prove that w is Hölder continuous at x_0 with exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$, it suffices to show that \tilde{w} is Hölder continuous with exponent α . But by (2.20), (2.21), the Hölder continuity of \tilde{w} readily follows from the argument in §2.1, see (2.9). \square

The Hölder continuity also follows from Remark 2.1 above.

Note that the function $w = 2 \log |x|$ is k -admissible. By truncating at $w = -K$ (for large K) and capping off, we see that the set of Hölder continuous k -admissible functions is not compact.

2.3. Applications. First we remark that, by the above proof, Theorem B also holds for k -admissible functions defined on a domain. Here we restate the theorem for the function $v = e^{-\frac{n-2}{2}w}$. Note that by Lemma 2.1, a (non-smooth) k -admissible function v must be locally strictly positive when $k > \frac{n}{2}$.

Theorem B'. *Let Ω be a domain in \mathbf{R}^n . Let v be a k -admissible function in Ω with $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$. If v is unbounded from above near some point $x_0 \in \Omega$, then*

$$v(x) = C|x - x_0|^{2-n}. \quad (2.23)$$

Otherwise v is locally Hölder continuous in Ω with exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$.

It was proved in [LL1] that if v is a k -admissible function, so is the function v_ψ in $B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$, where

$$v_\psi = |J_\psi|^{\frac{n-2}{2n}} v \cdot \psi \quad (2.24)$$

$\psi(x) = \frac{x}{|x|^2}$, and J_ψ is the Jacobian of the mapping ψ . From Theorem B we have

Corollary 2.5. *Let v be a k -admissible function defined in $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus B_1(0)$ with $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$. Then either $v \equiv \text{constant}$ or $|x|^{n-2}v(x)$ converges to a positive constant as $x \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. We cannot apply Theorem B' directly, as the function v_ψ has a singular point at 0. Denote $w = \frac{-2}{n-2} \log v_\psi$. If $w(x) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $x \rightarrow 0$, the argument in §2.2 implies that $w = 2 \log |x| + C$ and so $v \equiv \text{constant}$. Otherwise it suffices to show that w is continuous at 0.

Let $w(0) = \overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow 0} w(x)$ so that w is upper semi-continuous. If $a =: \underline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow 0} w(x) < w(0)$, for simplicity let us assume that $a \leq -1$ and $w(0) = 0$. Let $x_m \rightarrow 0$ such that $w(x_m) = -1$. Define the function $\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_{x_m}$ as in (2.10), with center at x_m . We claim that when m is sufficiently large, the point x_h in (2.11) at $h = 0$ cannot be the origin. Indeed, if $x_h = 0$, by the Hölder continuity of \tilde{w} (in the range $-1 < \tilde{w} < 0$) we see that $w(x) \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ when $|x - x_m| \leq \delta|x_m|$ for some $\delta > 0$ independent of m . But note that $v_\psi = e^{-\frac{n-2}{2}w}$ is superharmonic. Applying the mean value theorem to $e^{-\frac{n-2}{2}w}$ we conclude that $\overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow 0} w(x) > 0$. This is a contradiction.

It follows by the argument in §2.2 that $\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_{x_m}$ is uniformly Hölder continuous. Hence if $w(0) = 0$ and $w(x_m) \leq -1$, we have $|x_m| \geq c_0 > 0$ for some c_0 independent of m . This is again a contradiction. Hence w is continuous at 0, and so $|x|^{n-2}v(x)$ converges to a positive constant as $x \rightarrow \infty$. \square

By Theorem B', we have either $v_\psi = 2 \log |x| + C$, or v_ψ is Hölder continuous at 0. Hence the results in Corollary 2.5 follows. Theorem B also implies the non-existence of solutions to the Dirichlet problem in general. Let Ω be a non-round, bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^n containing the origin. Then if $k > \frac{n}{2}$, there is no solution to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(\lambda(V)) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= c \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

in general, where c is any positive constant, and f is a positive smooth function. Indeed, let $\{f_m\}$ be a sequence of smooth, positive functions which converges to zero locally uniformly in $\Omega \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sup v_m \rightarrow \infty$, where v_m is the corresponding solution. Then v_m must converge to the function $v = C|x|^{2-n}$ by Theorem B. Hence Ω must be a ball.

For the existence of solutions to the Dirichlet problem, it was proved in [G] that for any smooth, bounded domain with smooth boundary data, if there exists a sub-solution, then there exists a solution to the Dirichlet problem.

3. Proof of Theorem A

3.1. Hölder continuity. We start with a Hölder continuity property of k -admissible functions.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g_0) be a compact manifold. Suppose $g = u^{-2}g_0 \in [g_0]_k$ and $k > \frac{n}{2}$. Then u is Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha = 2 - \frac{n}{k}$,*

$$\frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^\alpha} \leq C \int_{\mathcal{M}} u, \quad (3.1)$$

where C is independent of u .

Proof. By approximation it suffices to prove (3.1) for smooth functions. For any given point $0 \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists a conformal metric [A2,C,Gu], still denoted by g_0 , such that in the normal coordinates at 0 ,

$$\det(g_0)_{ij} \equiv 1 \quad \text{near } 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Let

$$u_0(x) = |x|^{2 - \frac{n}{k}}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $|x|$ denotes the geodesic distance from 0 . Note that under condition (3.2), the Laplacian Δ on \mathcal{M} is equal to the Euclidean Laplacian when applying to functions of $r = |x|$ alone [LP, SY]. Hence

$$\Delta_{g_0} u_0 = \frac{n(k-1)(2k-n)}{k^2} r^{-\frac{n}{k}}. \quad (3.4)$$

Denote by

$$P[u] = \min \lambda_i + \delta \sum_i \lambda_i, \quad \left(\delta = \frac{n-k}{n(k-1)} \right) \quad (3.5)$$

the Pucci minimal operator [GT], where $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ are the eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix $(\nabla_{ij} u_0)$. Obviously we have

$$\min \lambda_i \leq \partial_r^2 u_0 = -\frac{(2k-n)(n-k)}{k^2} r^{-\frac{n}{k}}. \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore u_0 satisfies

$$P[u_0] \leq 0 \quad \text{in } B_{0,r} \setminus \{0\}.$$

where $B_{y,r}$ denotes the geodesic ball with center y and radius r .

On the other hand, since $\lambda(U) \in \bar{\Gamma}_k$, where U is given in (1.16), we have $\lambda(u_{ij} + uA_{g_0}) \in \bar{\Gamma}_k \subset \bar{\Gamma}_1$. Namely $\Delta u + \text{tr}(A_{g_0})u \geq 0$. By the Harnack inequality it follows

$$\sup u \leq C \int_{\mathcal{M}} u. \quad (3.7)$$

Therefore to prove (3.1) we may assume that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u = 1$ and u is uniformly bounded.

Let $u_a = u + a|x|^2$. Then $\nabla^2 u_a > \nabla^2 u + aI$ near 0, where I is the unit matrix. Since $\lambda(\nabla^2 u + uA_{g_0}) \in \bar{\Gamma}_k$, we have $\lambda(\nabla^2 u_a) \in \Gamma_k$ when a is suitably large. Taking $l = 1$ in the proof of Lemma 4.2 in [TW2], one has

$$\lambda_i + \frac{n-k}{n(k-1)} \sum_i \lambda_i \geq 0, \quad (3.8)$$

namely $P[u_a] \geq 0$ near 0. Hence by applying the comparison principle to the functions u_a and u_0 with respect to the operator P , we conclude the Hölder continuity (3.1). \square

Remark. The estimate (3.1) (with exponent $\alpha < 2 - \frac{n}{k}$) also follows from gradient estimates from our reduction to p -Laplacian subsolution in [TW2]. Since $\lambda(U) \in \Gamma_k$, we have $\lambda(D^2 u + uA_{g_0}) \in \Gamma_k$. By (3.8) it follows that

$$\Delta_p u := \nabla_i(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla_i u) \geq -Cu|\nabla u|^{p-2} \quad (3.9)$$

for $p - 2 = \frac{n(k-1)}{n-k}$ and some constant C . From our argument in [TW2], we obtain $\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla u|^q \leq C$ for any $q < nk/(n-k)$, whence by the Sobolev inequality, we infer (3.1) for $\alpha < 2 - \frac{n}{k}$; (see also [GV2]).

By the relation $u = e^w$, we have the following

Corollary 3.2. *Let w be a k -admissible function. Suppose $w \leq 0$. Then for any $K > 0$, there exists $C = C_K > 0$, independent of w , such that when $w(y) > -K$,*

$$\frac{w(x) - w(y)}{|x - y|^\alpha} \leq C. \quad (3.10)$$

From (3.10), we see that if $w(x) \leq -K - 1$, then $|x - y| \geq C_{K+1}^{1/\alpha}$. Also note that in Corollary 3.2, if we assume that $w \leq 0$ in $B_{y,r}$, then (3.10) holds for $x, y \in B_{y,r/2}$ for some C depending on r .

3.2. Singularity behaviour of k -admissible functions. Suppose w is a k -admissible function. At any given point $0 \in \mathcal{M}$, we choose a conformal normal coordinate such that (3.2) holds. In the conformal metric, the Ricci curvature vanishes at 0 [LP, SY]. Hence

$$|A_{g_0}| \leq Cr \quad \text{near } 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Define \tilde{w} as in (2.10). Then the argument thereafter is still valid, except that (2.14) should be replaced by $\kappa_i \leq \frac{1}{r} + C$. Hence from (2.19), we have

$$(\tilde{b}, \dots, \tilde{b}, \tilde{a}) \in \bar{\Gamma}_k, \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{b} &= \left(\frac{1}{r} + C\right)\tilde{w}' - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2 + Cr, \\ \tilde{a} &= \tilde{w}'' + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2 + Cr.\end{aligned}$$

Hence similarly to (2.2) (2.3), we have $\tilde{b} \geq 0$ and

$$\tilde{a} + \frac{n-k}{k}\tilde{b} = [\tilde{w}'' + \left(\frac{1}{r} + C\right)\tilde{w}' + Cr] - (1-\theta)\left[\left(\frac{1}{r} + C\right)\tilde{w}' - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{w}')^2 + Cr\right] \geq 0.$$

It follows, similarly to (2.4) and (2.5),

$$\tilde{w}' \leq \frac{2}{r} + \frac{Cr}{\tilde{w}'} + C, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\tilde{w}'' + \left(\frac{1}{r} + C\right)\tilde{w}' + Cr \geq 0. \quad (3.14)$$

From (3.13),

$$\tilde{w}' \leq \frac{2}{r} + C$$

for a different C . Therefore by (3.14), we obtain

$$(r\tilde{w}')' + C \geq 0.$$

It follows that $r\tilde{w}' + Cr$ is increasing. By the compactness of \mathcal{M} , a k -admissible function w must be bounded from above.

If $r\tilde{w}' < 2$ near $r = 0$, then similarly to (2.7) (2.8), \tilde{w} is bounded and Hölder continuous.

If $r\tilde{w}' \rightarrow 2$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, then $r\tilde{w}' + Cr \geq 2$, namely $\tilde{w}' \geq \frac{2}{r} - C$. Hence we obtain

$$\frac{2}{r} + C \geq \tilde{w}' \geq \frac{2}{r} - C. \quad (3.15)$$

We obtain

$$\tilde{w}(r) = 2 \log r + C' + O(r). \quad (3.16)$$

By subtracting a constant we assume that $C' = 0$.

Lemma 3.3. *If \tilde{w} satisfies (3.16), then near 0,*

$$w(x) = 2 \log |x| + o(1). \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. We prove (3.17) by a blow-up argument. In a normal coordinate system at 0, let $y = c_m x$ and $w_m(y) = w(x) + 2 \log c_m$, where c_m is any sequence converging to infinity. Let \tilde{w}_m be the corresponding function of w_m . Then by (3.16),

$$\tilde{w}_m(r) = 2 \log r + O(c_m^{-1}). \quad (3.18)$$

Hence $\tilde{w}_m \rightarrow 2 \log r$.

For any fixed $r_0 > 0$ small, let $w_m(y_m) = \tilde{w}_m(r_0)$ ($|y_m| = r_0$). We may assume that $y_m \rightarrow y_0$. By the Hölder continuity (Corollary 3.2), we may also assume that in a neighborhood of y_0 , w_m converges uniformly to w_∞ . Then w_∞ is a k -admissible function defined on \mathbf{R}^n . The comparison principle argument of Lemma 2.3 implies that $w_\infty \equiv 2 \log r$ in a neighborhood of y_0 . The Hölder continuity in Corollary 3.2 implies that if $w_\infty = 2 \log r$ at some point, w_∞ is well-defined nearby. The comparison principle then implies that $w_\infty \equiv 2 \log r$ near the point. Hence $w_\infty \equiv 2 \log r$ in $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and (3.17) is proved. \square

From the proof of Lemma 3.3, we see that w has only isolated singularities. For if there is a sequence of singular points $x_m \in \mathcal{M}$ which converges to a point 0, we may choose $c_m = |x_m|$ in the above argument. Then the limit function w_∞ has at least two singular points 0 and $x^* = \lim x_m/|x_m|$. To see that x^* is a singular point of the limit function w_∞ , we notice that the constant C' is uniformly bounded from above if w is negative in a neighbourhood of 0, which in turn implies that $\lim_{x \rightarrow x^*} w_\infty(x^*) = -\infty$. But the above argument shows that $w_\infty = 2 \log r$. This is a contradiction. Next we show that w has at most one singular point.

Lemma 3.4. *Let w be a k -admissible function. Then the singularity set*

$$S_w = \bigcap_{h < 0} \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid w(x) < h\} \quad (3.19)$$

contains at most one point.

Proof. If S_w is not empty, it consists of finitely many isolated points. Let $g = e^{-2w}g_0$. By Lemma 3.3, $(\mathcal{M} \setminus S_w, g)$ is a complete manifold with finitely many ends. Now fixing a point $y \notin S_w$, we consider the ratio

$$Q(r) = \frac{\text{Vol}(B_{y,r})}{r^n}, \quad (3.20)$$

where $B_{y,r} = B_{y,r}[g]$ is the geodesic ball of (\mathcal{M}, g) . By definition, there is a sequence of smooth k -admissible functions w_m which converges to w locally uniformly. It is easy to verify that for any fixed y and r , $\text{Vol}(B_{y,r}[g_m]) \rightarrow \text{Vol}(B_{y,r}[g])$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, where $g_m = e^{-2w_m}g_0$. From [GVW], the Ricci curvature of (\mathcal{M}, g_m) is positive. Hence by the Bishop Theorem, the ratio $Q_m(r) = \text{Vol}(B_{y,r}[g_m])/r^n$ is decreasing for all m . Sending $m \rightarrow \infty$, we see that Q is non-increasing in r . Hence

$$Q(0) \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} Q(r) \leq \frac{1}{n} \omega_n, \quad (3.21)$$

where ω_n is the area of the unit sphere S^{n-1} .

On the other hand, denote $A_{r_1, r_2} = B_{0, r_2}[g_0] - B_{0, r_1}[g_0]$, where $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ are sufficiently small. We identify A_{r_1, r_2} with the Euclidean annulus $A_{r_1, r_2}^e = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid r_1 <$

$|x| < r_2\}$ by the exponential map. By the asymptotic (3.17), the volume of A_{r_1, r_2} in the metric $g = e^{-2w}g_0$ is a lower order perturbation of that in the metric $g' = e^{-2w'}g_0$, where $w' = 2\log|x|$. But in our normal coordinates at 0, by (3.2) the volume of A_{r_1, r_2} in g' is the same as that of A_{r_1, r_2}^e with the metric $g'_e = e^{-2w'}g_e$, where g_e is the standard Euclidean metric. Hence $\text{Vol}_{g'}A_{r_1, r_2} = \frac{1}{n}\omega_n(r_1^{-n} - r_2^{-n})$. Therefore as $r \rightarrow \infty$, each end of the metric g will contribute to the ratio $Q(r)$ a factor $\frac{1}{n}\omega_n$. Therefore we obtain

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} Q(r) = \frac{m}{n}\omega_n, \quad (3.22)$$

where m is the number of singular points of w . From (3.21) and (3.22) we see that if S_w is not empty, then m must be equal to 1, namely S_w is a single point. \square

3.3. Smoothness of k -admissible functions. In this subsection we prove the following smoothness result.

Lemma 3.5. *Let w be a k -admissible function w with a singular point 0. Then w is C^∞ smooth away from 0.*

Proof. First we prove

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(A_g)) \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (3.23)$$

where $g = e^{-2w}g_0$. It suffices to prove that for any given point $x_0 \neq 0$ and a sufficiently small $r > 0$ ($r < \frac{1}{4}|x_0|$), (3.23) holds in $B_{x_0, r} = B_{x_0, r}[g_0]$.

By definition, there exists a sequence of smooth k -admissible functions which converges to w in $B_{x_0, 2r}$ uniformly. Let φ_m be the solution of the Dirichlet problem [G]

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(\lambda(A_{g_{\varphi_m}})) &= \varepsilon_m \quad \text{in } B_{x_0, r}, \\ \varphi_m &= w_m \quad \text{on } \partial B_{x_0, r}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where $g_{\varphi_m} = e^{-2\varphi_m}g_0$, and ε_m is a small positive constant such that $\sigma_k(\lambda(A_{g_{w_m}})) > \varepsilon_m$ ($g_{w_m} = e^{-2w_m}g_0$). By the comparison principle we have $\varphi_m \geq w_m$ in $B_{x_0, r}$. Let $\hat{w}_m = w_m$ in $\mathcal{M} - B_{x_0, r}$ and $\hat{w}_m = \varphi_m$ in $B_{x_0, r}$. Then \hat{w}_m is k -admissible (see Corollary 3.8 below). Let $\hat{w} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{w}_m$. Then \hat{w} is a k -admissible function with singularity point 0. Define the metric $\hat{g} = e^{-2\hat{w}}g_0$ and the ratio $\hat{Q}(r) = \frac{\text{Vol}(B_{y, r}[\hat{g}])}{r^n}$. Then from the proof of Lemma 3.4, we also have $\hat{Q} \equiv \frac{1}{n}\omega_n$.

To prove (3.23) it suffices to show that $\hat{w} \equiv w$. Noting that $\hat{w} = w$ in $\mathcal{M} - B_{x_0, r}$ and $\hat{w} \geq w$ in $B_{x_0, r}$, we have $B_{y, r}[\hat{g}] \supset B_{y, r}[g]$ for any $r > 0$ and $y \neq 0$. If there exists a point $y \in B_{x_0, r}$ such that $\hat{w} > w$ at y , then there exists a positive constant $\delta > 0$ such that for any $r > 1$,

$$B_{y, r}[\hat{g}] \supset B_{y, r+\delta}[g].$$

But this is impossible as both the ratios $Q(r)$ and $\hat{Q}(r)$ are constant.

By the interior second order derivative estimate in [GW1, STW], we see that w is $C^{1,1}$ smooth. Next we prove that w is C^∞ smooth away from 0. By the regularity of linear

elliptic equations [GT], it suffices to prove that $v = w^{-\frac{n-2}{2}w} \in C^{1,1}$ is a strong solution to the uniformly elliptic equation

$$-\Delta_{g_0} v + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_{g_0} v = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (3.25)$$

where R is the scalar curvature of (\mathcal{M}, g_0) . Namely the scalar curvature of $g = e^{-2w} g_0$ vanishes identically.

Equation (3.25) is not hard to prove, see §7.6 in [GV1]. Here we provide a proof for completeness. Since $w \in C^{1,1}$, it is twice differentiable almost everywhere. Suppose at a point 0, w is twice differentiable and the scalar curvature $R > 0$. Then with respect to normal coordinates of g at 0, we have the expansion

$$\det g_{ij} = 1 - \frac{1}{3} R_{ij} x_i x_j + o(|x|^2), \quad (3.26)$$

see (5.2) in [LP]. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vol}(B_{0,r}[g]) &= \int_{B_{0,r}} \sqrt{\det g_{ij}} \\ &= \int_{B_{0,r}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{6} R_{ij} x_i x_j + o(|x|^2) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \omega_n r^n \left[1 - \frac{R}{6(n+2)} r^2 + o(r^2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

where R_{ij} and R are respectively the Ricci curvature and the scalar curvature in g . This is a contradiction when $R > 0$ at 0, as the ratio Q is a constant. Hence the scalar curvature of g vanishes almost everywhere. \square

3.4. End of proof of Theorem A. From §3.3 and §3.4, we see that if (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is a compact manifold and there exists a k -admissible function w with singularity at some point 0, then w has the asymptotic formula (3.17) and w is smooth away from 0. The manifold $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}$ equipped with the metric $g = e^{-2w} g_0$ is a complete manifold with nonnegative Ricci curvature, and satisfies furthermore the volume growth formula $Q(r) \equiv 1$. Hence $(\mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}, g)$ is isometric to the Euclidean space [Cha]. Hence (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is conformally equivalent to the unit sphere S^n .

To finish the proof of Theorem A, it suffices to prove

Lemma 3.6. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g_0) be a compact manifold. If (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is not conformally equivalent to the unit sphere S^n , then there exists $K > 0$ such that if w is a k -admissible function,*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{M}} w - \inf_{\mathcal{M}} w \leq K, \quad (3.28)$$

$$|w(x) - w(y)| \leq K |x - y|^{2 - \frac{2}{k}}. \quad (3.29)$$

Proof. If (3.28) is not true, there exists a sequence of k -admissible functions w_m such that $\sup_{\mathcal{M}} w_m = 0$ and $\inf_{\mathcal{M}} w_m \rightarrow -\infty$. Suppose that $w_m(0) \rightarrow -\infty$. By the Hölder continuity in §3.1, we may assume that e^{w_m} converges locally uniformly to e^w in $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}$. Obviously $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} w(x) = -\infty$. But from the above discussion, (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is conformally equivalent to the unit sphere S^n , which is ruled out by our assumption. Hence (3.28) holds.

The Hölder continuity (3.29) follows from Lemma 3.1. \square

3.5. Remarks on the set $[g_0]_k$. In this section we prove some properties for k -admissible functions.

Lemma 3.7. *If w_1, w_2 are smooth and k -admissible, then $w = \max(w_1, w_2)$ is k -admissible.*

Proof. It is convenient to consider the function $u = e^w$. By approximation we suppose u_1 and u_2 are smooth and k -admissible functions such that the eigenvalues $\lambda(U)$ lie strictly in the open convex cone Γ_k , where U is the matrix (1.16) with $u = u_1$ and u_2 . Hence when $r > 0$ is sufficiently small, the eigenvalues of the matrix

$$U_r = \left\{ u_{ij} - \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2u_{x,r}} + uA_{g_0} \right\} \quad (3.30)$$

lie in Γ_k for $u = u_1$ and u_2 , where $u_{x_0, r} = \inf_{B_{x_0, r}} u$.

Let $u = \max(u_1, u_2)$. Since u_1, u_2 are smooth function, u is twice differentiable almost everywhere. Let $\rho \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$ be a mollifier. In particular we choose ρ to be a radial, smooth, nonnegative function, supported in the unit ball $B_{0,1}$, with $\int_{B_{0,1}} \rho = 1$. Let

$$u_{[\varepsilon]}(x) = \int_{B_{x, \varepsilon}} \varepsilon^{-n} \rho\left(\frac{|x-y|}{\varepsilon}\right) u(y) \sqrt{\det(g_0)_{ij}} dy \quad (3.31)$$

be the mollification of u , where $B_{x, \varepsilon}$ is the geodesic ball. For each point x , using normal coordinates and the exponential map, we have, by (3.26),

$$\begin{aligned} u_{[\varepsilon]}(x) &= \int_{B_{0,1}} \rho(y) u(x - \varepsilon y) \sqrt{\det(g_0)_{ij}} dy \\ &= \int_{B_{0,1}} \rho(y) u(x - \varepsilon y) \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{6} R_{ij}(x) y_i y_j + O(\varepsilon^3)\right) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

where $B_{0,1}$ is the Euclidean space. If g_0 is a flat metric, we have

$$\nabla u_{[\varepsilon]} = \int_{B_{0,1}} \rho(y) \nabla u(x - \varepsilon y) dy, \quad (3.33)$$

$$\nabla^2 u_{[\varepsilon]} \geq \int_{B_{0,1}} \rho(y) \nabla^2 u(x - \varepsilon y) dy, \quad (3.34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u_{[\varepsilon]}|^2 &= \left[\int_{B_{0,1}} \rho(y) \nabla u(x - \varepsilon y) dy \right]^2 \\ &\leq \int_{B_{0,1}} \rho(y) |\nabla u(x - \varepsilon y)|^2 dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

Hence $u_{[\varepsilon]}$ is k -admissible by (3.30). If g_0 is not flat, by (3.32), an extra term of magnitude $O(\varepsilon^2)$ arises. Letting $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small and noting that the eigenvalues of U (with respect to u_1 and u_2) lie strictly in the open set Γ_k , we conclude again that $u_{[\varepsilon]}$ is k -admissible. \square

Corollary 3.8. *Suppose φ is a smooth k -admissible function on \mathcal{M} with $\sigma_k(\lambda(A_{g_\varphi})) > f$, where $g_\varphi = e^{-2\varphi}g_0 \in [g_0]_k$ and f is a smooth, positive function. Let w be the solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(\lambda(W)) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ w &= \varphi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

where W is given in (1.17), and Ω is a smooth domain on \mathcal{M} . Extend w to \mathcal{M} by letting $w = \varphi$ on $\mathcal{M} - \Omega$. Then w is k -admissible.

It was proved in [G] that (3.36) admits a solution w , smooth up to the boundary. By the comparison principle we have $w > \varphi$ in Ω and $\partial_\nu(\varphi - w) > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, where ν is the unit outward normal. Hence we can extend w to a neighbourhood of Ω such that it is k -admissible. Hence Corollary 3.8 follows from Lemma 3.7.

Corollary 3.9. *Consider the Dirichlet problem (3.36). Suppose the set of sub-solutions W_{sub} is not empty. Let*

$$w(x) = \sup\{\varphi(x) \mid \varphi \in W_{sub}\}. \tag{3.37}$$

If w is bounded from above, then it is a solution to (3.36).

By the interior a priori estimates [GW1, STW], the proof is standard. Note that in Corollary 3.9, we allow Ω to be the whole manifold \mathcal{M} .

4. Proof of Theorem C

We divide the proof into three cases, according to $p < k$, $p = k$, and $p > k$.

Case 1: $p < k$. By (1.15), we can write equation (1.12) as

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(W)) = fe^{aw}, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$a = \frac{1}{2}(n-2)(k-p). \tag{4.2}$$

For any given k -admissible function w , the functions $w + c$ and $w - c$ are respectively a super and a sub solution of (4.1) provided the constant c is sufficiently large. By the a priori estimates in [V2, GW1, STW] and the comparison principle, the solution of (4.1) is uniformly bounded. When $a > 0$, the linearized equation of (4.1) is invertible. Hence by the continuity method, there is a unique smooth solution to (4.1).

Case 2: $p = k$. We prove that for any positive smooth function f , there is a unique constant $\theta > 0$ such that the equation

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(W)) = \theta f \tag{4.3}$$

has a solution. For $a > 0$ small, let w_a be the solution of (4.1). Let $c_a = \inf w_a$. We write (4.1) in the form

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(W_a)) = (f e^{ac_a}) e^{a(w_a - c_a)}, \tag{4.4}$$

where W_a is the matrix (1.17) relative to w_a . Assume $g_0 \in [g_0]_k$ so that $\lambda(A_{g_0}) \in \Gamma_k$. Then at the maximum point of w_a ,

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(A_{g_0})) \geq \sigma_k(\lambda(W_a)) \geq f e^{ac_a}.$$

At the minimum point of w_a ,

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(A_{g_0})) \leq \sigma_k(\lambda(W_a)) = f e^{ac_a}.$$

Hence e^{ac_a} is strictly positive and uniformly bounded as $a \rightarrow 0$. By the a priori estimates [GW1, STW], where the estimates depend only on $\inf(w_a - c_a)$, we see that $w_a - c_a$ is uniformly bounded from above and sub-converges to a solution w_0 of (4.3) with $\theta = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} e^{ac_a}$. By the maximum principle it is easy to see that if w' is another solution, then necessarily $w' = w_0 + \text{const}$; and furthermore (4.3) has no (k -admissible) solution for different θ .

Case 3: $p > k$. In this case we adopt the degree argument from [W], see the proof of Theorem 5.1 there. Alternatively we can also use the degree argument in §3 of [W]. We will study the auxiliary problem

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(V)) = t(\delta_t + f v^p), \tag{4.6}$$

where $t \geq 0$ is a parameter and δ_t is a positive constant depending on t , $\delta_t = \delta_0 \leq 1$ when $t \leq 1$ and $\delta_t = 1$ when $t > 2$, and δ_t is smooth and monotone increasing when $1 \leq t \leq 2$.

Claim 1. For any $t_0 > 0$, the solution of (4.6) is uniformly bounded when $t \geq t_0$. Indeed, if there exists a sequence of solutions (t_j, v_j) of (4.6) such that $t_j \geq t_0$ and $\sup v_j \rightarrow \infty$, we have $m_j = \inf v_j \rightarrow \infty$ by (1.5). The function $v'_j = v_j/m_j$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(\lambda(V')) &\geq t_j f m_j^{p-k} (v'_j)^p \\ &\geq t_j f m_j^{p-k} \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where V' is the matrix (1.11) relative to v' . From (4.7) and the comparison principle we have $\sup v'_j \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $\inf v'_j \rightarrow \infty$ by (1.5), which contradicts to the definition of v'_j .

Define the mapping T_t so that for any $v_1 \in C^2(\mathcal{M})$, $T_t(v_1)$ is the solution of

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(V)) = t(\delta_t + fv_1^p). \quad (4.8)$$

Then a solution of (4.6) is a fixed point of T_t .

Claim 2. There is a solution of (4.6) when $t > 0$ is small. Indeed, for any smooth, positive function φ^* , denote $\Phi = \{\varphi \in C^2(\mathcal{M}) \mid \varphi < \varphi^*\}$. Then when $t > 0$ is small, $T(\Phi)$ is strictly contained in Φ . Hence the degree $\deg(I - T_t, \Phi, 0)$ is well defined for $t \geq 0$ small. Extend T_t to $t = 0$ by letting $T_t(v) = 0$ for all v , so that T_t is also continuous at $t = 0$. Hence

$$\deg(I - T_t, \Phi, 0) = \deg(I - T_0, \Phi, 0) = 1. \quad (4.9)$$

Hence T_t has a fixed point in Φ for $t > 0$ small.

Claim 3. Let $t^* = \sup\{t \mid (4.6) \text{ admits a solution}\}$. Then t^* is finite. Indeed, if $t^* = \infty$, there is a sequence $t_j \rightarrow \infty$ such that (4.6) has a solution v_j . We have obviously $m_j = \inf v_j \rightarrow \infty$, which is a contradiction with Claim 1.

Claim 4. Equation (4.6) has a solution at $t = t^*$. Indeed, let $t_j \nearrow t^*$ and v_j be the corresponding solution of (4.6). By claim 1, v_j is uniformly bounded. Hence v_j sub-converges to a solution v^* of (4.6) with $t = t^*$.

Now we choose $\varphi^* = v^*$ and define Φ as above. For any $v_1 \in \Phi$, let v be the solution of (4.8). Since for any $t \in (0, t^*)$, v^* is a super-solution of (4.6). We have $0 < v < v^*$ by the maximum principle. Hence by (4.9), $\deg(I - T_t, \Phi, 0) = 1$ for $t \in [0, t^*)$.

On the other hand, for any given $t_0 > 0$, since the solution of (4.6) is uniformly bounded for $t \geq t_0$, the degree $\deg(I - T_t, B_R, 0)$ is well defined for $t \in (t_0, t^* + 1]$ for sufficiently large R , where $B_R = \{v \in C^2(\mathcal{M}) \mid v < R\}$. But when $t > t^*$, (4.6) has no solution. Hence $\deg(I - T_t, B_R, 0) = 0$. Hence for any $t \geq t_0$, (4.6) has a solution $v \notin \Phi$ with degree -1 .

Let $v = v_{\delta_0} \notin \Phi$ be a solution of (4.6) at $t = 1$. We have $\sup v > \inf v^* > 0$. Let $\delta_0 \rightarrow 0$. Since the solution is uniformly bounded, it converges to a solution of (1.12). This completes the proof. \square

From the above argument, we have the following extensions.

Theorem 4.1. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g_0) be a compact n -manifold not conformally equivalent to the unit sphere S^n . Suppose $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$ and $[g_0]_k \neq \emptyset$. Suppose there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\varphi(x, t) \geq c_0, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-k} \varphi(x, t) = \infty. \quad (4.11)$$

Then there exists a constant $t^ > 0$ such that the equation*

$$\sigma_k(\lambda(V)) = t\varphi(x, v) \quad (4.12)$$

has at least two solutions for $0 < t < t^$, one solution at $t = t^*$, and no solution for $t > t^*$.*

Theorem 4.2. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g_0) be as in Theorem 4.1, $\frac{n}{2} < k \leq n$. Suppose $\varphi > 0$,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-k} \varphi(x, t) = 0, \quad (4.13)$$

and (4.11) holds. Then there exists a solution to (1.10).

In the above theorems, we can also allow that the right hand side depends on the gradient ∇v . Furthermore, (4.11) and (4.13) can be relaxed to

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-k} \varphi(x, t) > \theta, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-k} \varphi(x, t) < \theta, \quad (4.15)$$

where θ is the eigenvalue of (1.13) (with $f \equiv 1$). See [W] for the Monge-Ampère equation.

We remark that when $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2}$, Theorem C holds for $p < k \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. Indeed, when $p \leq k$, the proof of the Cases 1 and 2 above also applies to the cases $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2}$. When $k < p < k \frac{n+2}{n-2}$, by a blow-up argument and the Liouville theorem [LL1], it is known that the set of solutions to (4.6) is uniformly bounded. Hence by the above degree argument, one also obtain the existence of solutions.

Theorem 4.3. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g_0) be a compact n -manifold with $[g_0]_k \neq \emptyset$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then for any smooth, positive function f and any constant $p \neq k$, $p < k \frac{n+2}{n-2}$, there exists a positive solution to the equation (1.12). The solution is unique if $p < k$. When $p = k$, there exists a unique constant $\theta > 0$ such that (1.13) has a solution. The solution is unique up to a constant multiplication.*

Note that in Theorem 4.3 we allow that (\mathcal{M}, g_0) is the unit sphere.

REFERENCES

- [A1] T. Aubin, Equations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 55 (1976), 269–296.
- [A2] T. Aubin, *Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry*, Springer, 1998.
- [CNS] L.A. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg, and J. Spruck, Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second order elliptic equations III. Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian, *Acta Math.* 155(1985), 261–301.
- [C] J.-G. Cao, The existence of generalized isothermal coordinates for higher-dimensional Riemannian manifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 324(1991), 901–920.
- [CGY1] A. Chang, M. Gursky, P. Yang, An equation of Monge-Ampère type in conformal geometry, and four-manifolds of positive Ricci curvature, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 155(2002), 709–787.
- [CGY2] A. Chang, M. Gursky, P. Yang, An a priori estimate for a fully nonlinear equation on four-manifolds, *J. Anal. Math.* 87 (2002), 151–186.
- [CHY] Alice Chang, Z.-C. Han, P. Yang, Classification of singular radial solutions to the σ_k -Yamabe equation on annular domains, preprint.
- [Cha] I. Chavel, *Riemannian geometry—a modern introduction*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993.
- [Ch] K.S. Chou (K. Tso), On a real Monge-Ampère functional, *Invent. Math.* 101(1990), 425–448.
- [CW] K.S. Chou and X.-J. Wang, A variational theory of the Hessian equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 54 (2001), 1029–1064.

- [GeW] Y. Ge and G. Wang, On a fully nonlinear Yamabe problem, preprint.
- [GT] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Springer, 1983.
- [G] B. Guan, Conformal metrics with prescribed curvature functions on manifolds with boundary, preprint.
- [GW1] P. Guan and G. Wang, Local estimates for a class of fully nonlinear equations arising from conformal geometry, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2003), 1413–1432.
- [GW2] P. Guan and G. Wang, A fully nonlinear conformal flow on locally conformally flat manifolds, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 557 (2003), 219–238.
- [GVW] P. Guan, J. Viaclovsky, and G. Wang, Some properties of the Schouten tensor and applications to conformal geometry, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(2003), 925–933.
- [Gu] M. Günther, Conformal normal coordinates, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 11(1993), 173–184.
- [GV1] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, Prescribing symmetric functions of the eigenvalues of the Ricci tensor, [arXiv:math.DG/0409187](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0409187).
- [GV2] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, Convexity and singularities of curvature equations in conformal geometry, [arXiv:math.DG/0504066](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0504066).
- [LP] J.M. Lee and T.H. Parker, The Yamabe problem, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 17(1987), 37–91.
- [LL1] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 56 (2003), 1416–1464.
- [LL2] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations II, Liouville, Harnack, and Yamabe, preprint.
- [STW] W.M. Sheng, N.S. Trudinger, X.-J. Wang, The Yamabe problem for higher order curvatures, preprint.
- [S] R. Schoen, Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature, *J. Diff. Geom.* 20(1984), 479–495.
- [SY] R. Schoen and S.T. Yau, *Lectures on Differential geometry*. International Press, 1994.
- [T] N.S. Trudinger, On Harnack type inequalities and their application to quasilinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 20(1967), 721–747.
- [TW1] N.S. Trudinger and X-J. Wang, Hessian measures I, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 10 (1997), 225–239.
- [TW2] N.S. Trudinger and X-J. Wang, Hessian measures II, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 150 (1999), 579–604.
- [V1] J. Viaclovsky, Conformal geometry, contact geometry, and the calculus of variations. *Duke Math. J.* 101 (2000), no. 2, 283–316.
- [V2] J. Viaclovsky, Estimates and existence results for some fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 10 (2002), 815–846.
- [W] X.-J. Wang, Existence of multiple solutions to the equations of Monge-Ampère type, *J. Diff. Eqns*, 100(1992), 95–118.

CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY,
CANBERRA ACT 0200, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: neil.trudinger@maths.anu.edu.au wang@maths.anu.edu.au