LECTURES ON PLURIPOTENTIAL THEORY ON COMPACT HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS

SŁAWOMIR DINEW

Abstract. The note is an extended version of lectures pluripotential theory in the setting of compact Hermitian manifolds given by the author in July 2018 at Cetraro.

Introduction

Let (X, J) be a compact complex and connected manifold with J denoting the fixed (integrable) almost complex structure. Unless otherwise stated by n we shall always denote the complex dimension of X. We begin with the basic fact in complex geometry which follows easily from patching local data in coordinate charts:

Theorem 0.1. *(X, J) admits a Hermitian metric.*

If g is such a Hermitian metric then in local coordinates we write

$$g = (g)_{j\bar{k}} := \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} g_{j\bar{k}} dz_j \otimes d\bar{z}_k,$$

where the coefficients $g_{j\bar{k}}$ are smooth local complex valued functions, such that pointwise $g_{j\bar{k}}(z)$ is a positive definite Hermitian symmetric matrix.

The very existence of such a metric has profound implications on the geometry and analysis of X. For example there is a natural **volume form** given locally by $det(g_{j\bar{k}})dV$. (Note that the formula differs from its Riemmanian counterpart as there is no square root over the determinant!)

Exercise 0.2. *Show that this locally defined volume form is global in the sense that it does not depend on the choice of the coordinate chart.*

Just as in the Riemmanian geometry the metric allows one to compute length, to measure angles etc.

The construction based on gluing local data implies in fact that Hermitian metrics exist in abundance. Hence a very natural question appears:

Question 0.3. *Are there Hermitian metrics that are better than the others?*

While the question is far too vague it raises various problems connected to geometry and analysis.

One of the classical "good" Hermitian metrics are the Kähler ones.

Definition 0.4. *Let (X, J) be a Hermitian manifold equipped with the Hermitian form ω. If $d\omega = 0$ the metric is called Kähler. A complex manifold X is called a Kähler manifold if it admits a Kähler metric.*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 32W20. Secondary: 32U15, 32Q15.

There are many resons why kählerness is a natural condition both geometrically and analytically: its Levi-Civita connection coincides with the *Chern connection*, one has $\nabla J = 0$, we have the so-called Kähler identities relating the canonical operators, the $i\partial\bar{\partial}$-lemma holds and so on. Analytically kählerness means that (in a suitable coordinates) the metric is Euclidean up to terms of order 2. Also locally there exist *potentials* for the $(1,1)$-Kähler form associated to the metric.

Note that each Kähler metric defines a de Rham cohomology class in $H^{1,1}(X,\mathbb{R})$. The $i\partial\bar{\partial}$-lemma (see [Dem]) which holds on Kähler manifolds allows the following relation between two *cohomologous* Kähler metrics:

Theorem 0.5. *Let X be a Kähler manifold. If ω_1, ω_2 are two Kähler metrics then there exists a smooth real valued function φ such that*

$$\omega_2 = \omega_1 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi.$$

The theorem says that the only way to perturb a Kähler metric within its cohomology class (and to remain Kähler!) is by adding $i\partial\bar{\partial}$ of a smooth function.

Of course such a perturbation by any function defines a closed $(1,1)$- form and it will be Kähler form if it is additionally positive definite.

Definition 0.6. *A smooth real valued function φ is called admissible (or smooth strictly ω-plurisubharmonic) if*

$$\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi > 0.$$

We shall call these functions ω-psh and we shall often use the notation ω_φ for $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$.

Returning to the general Hermitian setting a question arises: how to perturb a given Hermitian metric hoping to get metrics of better properties? Since there are no obvious cohomological constraints in general the answer pretty much depends on one's backgound: people form conformal geometry may for example wish to perturb the Hermitian form ω by a multiplicative factor e^ρ with ρ being some smooth function.

People coming from Kähler geometry may in turn hope that $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$ for a suitably chosen function φ might still be a good choice even though there is no cohomology class to be preserved.

In the lectures we shall pursue this second approach (which does not mean that the first one is not worth a try too!). Relying on the existent theory in the Kähler setting we shall investigate what remains true in the general Hermitian setting, what are the new phenomena to cope with and so on.

Pluripotential theory in the setting of compact Kähler manifolds has proven to be a very effective tool in the study of degeneration of metrics in geometrically motivated problems (see [Kol98, Kol03, EGZ09, KT08], which is by far incomplete list of the literature on the subject). Usually in such a setting *singular* Kähler metrics do appear as limits of smooth ones. Then pluripotential theory provides a natural background for defining the *singular* volume forms associated to such metrics. More importantly it provides useful information on the behavior of the Kähler potentials exactly along the singularity locus, which is hard to achieve by standard PDE techniques. On the other hand the theory does not rely on strong geometric assumptions, as most of the results are either local in nature or are modelled on local ones. It is therefore natural to expect that at least some of the methods and applications carry through in the more general Hermitian setting.

Of course there is inevitably some price to pay. Computations on general Hermitian manifolds are messier. We lack many important tools from the Kähler setting. Arguably the most important difference for us however will be the lack of invariance of the total volume $\int_X (\omega+dd^c u)^n$ for an admissible function u (which is easily seen after two applications of Stokes theorem). As one will soon verify this leads to troublesome additional terms involving $d\omega$ and/or $d\omega \wedge d^c\omega$ and controlling these in a suitable sense is the main technical difficulty in the whole theory.

The interest towards Hermitian versions of the complex Monge-Ampère equation has grown rapidly in the recent years. The first steps were laid down by the French school most notably by Cherrier [Che87] and Delanoë [De81]. In these papers the Authors followed Aubin and Yau's arguments ([Y78]) to get existence of smooth solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation in the case of smooth data. The Authors were successful only in particular cases (that is under geometric assumptions on the background metric). The main problem to overcome were the a priori esimates needed to establish the closedness part in the continuity method. Then there seems to be no activity on the subject for quite some time up until the renewed interest and important breakthroughs by Guan-Li [GL10] and especially Tosatti-Weinkove [TW10a, TW10b]. Guan and Li were able to solve the equation assuming geometric conditions different than these from [Che87] and [De81], while the missing uniform estimate was finally established without any assumptions in [TW10b]. Parallel to these recent advances foundations of the corresponding pluripotential theory were laid down (see [DK12],[BL11] and [KN1, KN2, KN3]). The theory is still in an infant state, and the techniques are technical modifications of their Kählerian counterparts.

In order to motivate the construction of such a theory we shal list a couple of arguments relying on (kählerian) pluripotential reasonings and try to investigate what happens in the Hermitian realm. One of our first discoveries is that there is a condition strictly more general than kählerness that yields almost the same pluripotential theory. It was studied by Guan and Li ([GL10]). The Authors assumed that $dd^c\omega = 0$ and $dd^c(\omega^2) = 0$. The following properties of metrics satisfying such a condition follow from a simple direct computations but will be crucial in the sequel:

Observation 0.7. *Let (X, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold of complex dimension $n \geq 2$. If the form ω satisfies $dd^c\omega = 0,\ dd^c(\omega^2) = 0$ then*

(1) $d\omega \wedge d^c\omega = 0$;
(2) $dd^c(\omega^k) = 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \cdots, n-1\}$.

Under this condition almost every pluripotential argument from the Kähler setting carries through verbatim. It should be emphasized that in Hermitian geometry there are many other conditions imitating kählerness. These are motivated by various geometric considerations. Some of these conditions have consequences that are relevant to pluripotential theory.

The notes are organized as follows. We start with some basic notation and motivate the theory by listing some applications of Kähler pluripotential theory. Later we define some of the "close-to-Kähler" conditions which can be found in the literature. Each of these has also its drawbacks, and it serves as yet another evidence how strong and natural the Kählerian condition is. In the next section we describe some explicit examples of Hermitian manifolds and "canonical" metrics on them. This list is of course only a glimpse into the vast world of Hermitian geometry. The existence of suitable adapted coordinates (due to [GL10]) is shown in Section 4. Such a coordinate system will turn out to be very useful in the proof of higher order a priori estimates for the Dirichlet problem. The main pluripotential tools are discussed afterwards. In particular we show following [DK12] that "most" pluripotential Kählerian notions have their Hermitian counterparts. It is shown that the complex Monge-Ampère operator is well denfined on bounded ω-plurisubharmonic functions and it shares the convergence properties known from the Kähler case. Special attention is being paid to the most important tool in the whole theory- the comparison principle. As explained it differs considerably from the one known in the Kähler setting unless the form ω satisfies some restrictive additional conditions. In the next section the solution of the Dirichlet problem is presented in detail. For the openness part we follow [TW10a], while for the $\mathcal{C}^2$ estimates we borrow the main idea from [GL10]. The uniform estimate is taken from [DK12]. Then we solve the Monge-Ampère equation with right hand side being an L^p function with $p > 1$ following [KN1]. In the penultimate section we sketch the parabolic version of the theory- the Chern-Ricci flow. As already mentioned we shall discuss here some examples showing significant difference from the Kähler case. Finally we list some open problems which hopefully can be attacked in the recent future.

These are expanded lecture notes of the course that I taught during a C.I.M.E workshop "Complex non-Kähler geometry" in Cetraro 9-13.07.2018. The lectures are based on the manuscript [D16] and more recent developments. It is a great pleasure to thank the organizers of this event for the invitation.

1. Notation

Throughout the paper X will denote a compact, complex and connected manifold. Unless otherwise specified n will always be the complex dimension of X.

Given a Hermitian metric g on X we identify it with the positive definite (**not necessarily closed!**) $(1,1)$ form ω defined by

$$\forall X, Y \in T_zX \quad \omega(z)(X,Y) := g(z)(JX,Y). \tag{1}$$

This form is often called the Kähler form of g in the literature, but we shall not use this terminology in order to avoid confusion with the Kähler condition.

As usual d will denote the exterior differentiation operator, while ∂ and $\bar{\partial}$ will be the $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ part of it under the standard splitting. In some arguments involving integration by parts it is more convenient to use the operator $d^c := i(\bar{\partial} - \partial)$, so that $dd^c = 2i\partial\bar{\partial}$. These will be used interchangeably. We shall also make use of the standard notation ω_u standing for $\omega + dd^c u$.

δ_{ij} will denote the Kronecker delta symbol. We shall make use of Einstein summation convention unless otherwise stated.

Throughout the note we shall use the common practice of denoting constants independent of the relevant quantities by C. In particular these constants may vary line-to-line. If special distinction between the constants is needed in some arguments these will be further distinguished by $\tilde{C}$, $\bar{C}, C_i$ and so on.

A special constant that controls the geometry of (X, ω) (see below for details) is denoted by B- it is the infimum over all positive numbers b satisfying

$$-b\omega^2 \leq ni\partial\bar{\partial}\omega \leq b\omega^2 \text{ and} \\ -b\omega^3 \leq n^2 i\partial\omega \wedge \bar{\partial}\omega \leq b\omega^3. \tag{2}$$

It should be emphasized that this constant measures how far our metric is from satisfying a special condition studied by Guan and Li ([GL10]). Of course if ω is Kähler then $B = 0$.

2. Why pluripotential theory?

In this section we shall briefly list some applications of the pluripotential theory on Hermitian manifolds. As the theory is still developing it is expected that this list will grow rapidly in the near future.

To begin with we recall that a basic example of a local plurisubharmonic function is $log(||F(z)||)$ with F being a local holomorphic mapping. Thus the theory is tightly linked to complex analysis. More globally let L be a holomorphic line bundle over (X, ω) with σ a (holomorphic) section (for analysts: it will be a collection of nowhere vanishing holomorphic functions $g_{\alpha\beta}$ defined on the interscetions coordinate charts $U_{\alpha\beta} := U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$ which satisfy the relations $g_{\alpha\alpha} = Id$ and $g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\beta\gamma}g_{\gamma\alpha} = Id$). If $||\cdot||$ is a smooth norm on the space of sections (collections of holomorphic functions f_α on U_α such that on intersections $f_\alpha = g_{\alpha\beta}f_\beta$), then

$$u(z) := log||\sigma(z)||$$

is a global function which is smooth except on the divisor $\{\sigma = 0\}$ and $i\partial\bar{\partial}log||\sigma|| \geq -C\omega$, for some constant C dependent only on the choice of the norm on $X \setminus \{\sigma = 0\}$. It can be proven that this inequality extends past $\{\sigma = 0\}$ in the distributional sense- u is *quasiplurisubharmonic.*

This simple observation has important consequences: pluripotential theory might be useful for constructing analytic objects on the manifold as $-\infty$-values of suitably constructed functions. Unfortunately for a general ω-psh function u its $-\infty$ locus is much more complicated and hard to deal with as we shall see in the next section.

Reversing a bit the discussion above a natural question is whether one can construct ω-psh functions with *prescribed* singularities. One way of doing so is by solving suitable Monge-Ampère equations. Such an approach was initiated in the paper [TW12], which was motivated by the fundamental paper [Dem93]. Precisely the Authors' goal was to construct ω-plurisubharmonic functions with prescribed logarithmic singularities at a collection of isolated points. Such singular quasiplurisubharmonic functions can be applied as weights in various Ohsawa-Takegoshi type L^2 extension problems or $\bar{\partial}$ problems.

The construction based on J. P. Demailly's idea in [Dem93] is by solving a family of Monge-Ampère equations with right hand sides converging to Dirac delta measures. More specifically in the Kähler case a family of Monge-Ampère equations

$$\begin{cases} \phi_\epsilon \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X), sup_X \phi_\epsilon = 0 \\ \omega + dd^c\phi_\epsilon > 0 \\ (\omega + dd^c\phi_\epsilon)^n = \chi_\epsilon \omega^n \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

is considered, where for each $\epsilon > 0$ χ_ϵ is a smooth strictly positive function with suitably normalized total integral. Moreover it is required that χ_ϵ converge weakly to a combination $\sum c_j\delta_j$ of weighted Dirac delta measures as ϵ tends to zero. Then the weak limit of the solutions (which exist by the Calabi-Yau theorem [Y78]) is the required function.

In the Hermitian setting such a technique requires a modification of the approximating equations:

$$\begin{cases} \phi_\epsilon \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X), sup_X \phi_\epsilon = 0 \\ \omega + dd^c\phi_\epsilon > 0 \\ (\omega + dd^c\phi_\epsilon)^n = e^{c_\epsilon}\chi_\epsilon \omega^n, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where c_ϵ is some constant (the equations are then solvable by [TW10b]). Successful repetition of the argument relies crucially on controlling total volumes, that is on the uniform control of the constants c_ϵ. This is why the results in [TW12] are complete only in dimension 2 and 3.

It is worth pointing out that construction of ω-psh functions with non-isolated analytic singularities is substantially harder, partially due to a lack of reasonable Monge-Ampère theory for such functions.

The Monge-Ampère equation is also related to the *Ricci curvature* in the Kähler setting through the following construction:

Given a Kähler metric ω_0 and a representative α of the first Chern class on a manifold X the Calabi problem boils down to finding a metric ω cohomologous to ω_0, such that $Ric(\omega) = \alpha$. By the dd^c lemma any such ω can be written as $\omega_0 + dd^c\phi$ for some smooth potential ϕ. Furthermore $Ric(\omega_0) = \alpha + dd^c h$, where the Ricci potential h is a function uniquely defined modulo an additive constant (which can be fixed if we assume the normalization $\int_X e^h\omega_0^n = \int_X \omega^n$). Recall that in the Kähler setting one has $Ric(\omega) = -dd^c log((\omega)^n)$ with ω^n denoting n-th wedge product of ω (modulo the identification of the coefficient of the volume form with the volume form itself). Hence $Ric(\omega) = \alpha$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} Ric(\omega_0 + dd^c\phi) = Ric(\omega_0) - dd^c h \Leftrightarrow -dd^c log\frac{(\omega_0 + dd^c\phi)^n}{(\omega_0)^n} &= -dd^c h \\ \Leftrightarrow (\omega_0 + dd^c\phi)^n = e^{h+c}\omega_0^n \end{aligned}$$

for some constant c. Exploiting the kählerness of ω_0 and integration by parts one easily sees that under our normalization $c = 0$ and we end up with the standard Monge-Ampère equation

$$(\omega_0 + dd^c\phi)^n = e^h\omega_0^n \tag{5}$$

with prescribed right hand side.

This equation for smooth h and ω_0 was solved in the celebrated paper of Yau [Y78]. In modern Kähler geometry it is of crucial importance to understand the behavior ot the potential ϕ (or the form $\omega_0 + dd^c\phi$ itself) if we drop the smoothness assumptions on h and/or the strict positivity of ω_0. Such a situation occurs if we work on *mildly singular* Kähler varieties (see for example [EGZ09]) or when one tries to understand the limiting behavior of the Kähler-Ricci flow (see [KT08] and references therein). It is exactly the setting where pluripotential theory can be applied an indeed in such settings the uniform estimate for the potential ϕ (a starting point for the regularity analysis) is usually obtained in this way (compare [EGZ09, KT08]).

Returning to the Hermitian background the picture described above has to be modified. The obvious obstacles are that a Hermitian metric ω_0 need not define a cohomology class and the dd^c lemma may fail. On the bright side the first Chern class can still be reasonably defined in the *Bott-Chern* cohomology that is the cohomology given by

$$H^{p,q}_{BC} = \frac{ker\{d : C_{p,q}(X) \to C_{p,q+1}(X) \oplus C_{p+1,q}(X)\}}{Im\{dd^c C_{p-1,q-1}(X)\}}, \tag{6}$$

where $C_{p,q}(X)$ denotes the space of smooth (p,q)-forms.

Given a Hermitian metric ω_0 its *first Chern form* can be defined analogously to the Kähler setting by

$$Ric^{BC}(\omega_0) := -dd^c log(\omega_0^n).$$

It turns out that the first Ricci forms represent the first Bott-Chern cohomology class $c_1^{BC}(X)$ in the Bott-Chern cohomology. Hence a natural question arises whether any form α in $c_1^{BC}(X)$ is representable as the Ricci form of some metric $\omega_0 + dd^c\phi$. A computation analgous to the one above shows that such a ϕ has to satisfy the equation

$$(\omega_0 + dd^c\phi)^n = e^{h+c}\omega_0^n, \tag{7}$$

with a function h as above and some constant $c > 0$. Contrary to the Kähler case, however, the constant need not be equal to zero and thus the Hermitian Monge-Ampère equation has one more degree of freedom. As we shall see later this adds some technical difficulties into the solution of the equation.

The discussion above resulted in the fact that solutions to Hermitian Monge-Ampère equation prescribe the Ricci form in the Bott-Chern cohomology. Thus weakening of the smoothness assumptions on f and/or strict positivity of ω_0 is helpful in situations analogous to the ones in the Kähler setting above.

Arguably one of the most exciting problems in Hermitian geometry is the classification of slass VII surfaces. To this end the conjectural picture, reduces the problem to finding rational curves on such a surface. This is an extremely hard geometric problem. Esentially the only working tool in some special cases is a deep gauge theoretic argument of Teleman [T10].

It thus worth mentioning that another approach to construction of rational curves exploting some *singularity magnifying* Monge-Ampère equations has been proposed by Y. T. Siu ([Siu09]).

It is thus quite intriguing to investigate the relationships between Monge-Ampère equations and the existence of rational curves.

3. A couple of inspiring examples

3.1. **Local theory.** As we have already mentioned the functions $log(||F(z)||)$ are plurisubharmonic for holomorphic mappings. Thus obviously analytic sets are locally contained in a $-\infty$-locus of some plurisubharmonic functions.

Is this the general picture? Let us begin with the following example:

Example 3.1. *Let Ω be the disk centered at zero with radius $1/2$ in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be the set of all complex numbers in $\Omega \setminus \{0\}$ with both coefficients being rational (ordered in some fashion). Consider a sequence of real positive numbers b_n decreasing sufficiently rapidly to 0 such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n log|a_n| > -\infty$. Consider the function*

$$u(z) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n log|z - a_n|.$$

Obviously $u_m := \sum_{n=1}^{m} b_n log|z - a_n|$ are subharmonic and decrease towards u. Hence u is also subharmonic, $u(0) > -\infty$, yet $\{u = -\infty\}$ contains a dense subset of Ω!

Our next example taken from [Dem] is, in a sense, even more surprising- it shows that even if a plurisubharmonic function is nowhere equal to $-\infty$ it still may fail to be locally bounded from below:

Example 3.2. *The function*

$$v(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} log(|z - 1/k| + e^{-k^3})$$

is everywhere finite but is not locally bounded from below at zero.

Exercise 3.3. *Is it possible, using a countable collection of such v's for every rational complex number to get a dense set of points such that a plurisubharmonic function is everywhere finite but unbounded from below near any point from the dense set?*

These examples lead to the following definitions:

Definition 3.4. *A set E is said to be pluripolar if it is locally contained in a $-\infty$ locus of a plurisubharmonic function. Given any plurisubharmonic function the set $\{u = -\infty\}$ is called the pole set of u.*

Exercise 3.5. *A pluripolar set is contained in a pole set of some function but need not be* **equal** *to a pole set. Construct an example in $\mathbb{C}^2$ of a pluripolar set which is not a pole set.*

Definition 3.6. *Given a plurisubharmonic function u the unbounded locus set of u is the set of points z, such that u is not bounded from below in every neighborhood of u.*

In pluripotential theory there are different tools for measuring the pointwise singularities of plurisubharmonic functions. Among the basic ones (see [Dem]) is the *Lelong number*:

Definition 3.7 (Lelong number)**.** *Let u be a plurisubharmonic function defined in a neighbourhood of a point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then the limit $lim_{r\to 0^+}$ of the quantity*

$$\int_{|z-z_0|\leq r} dd^c u \wedge (dd^c log|z-z_0|)^{n-1} = \frac{1}{r^{2n-2}} \int_{|z-z_0|\leq r} dd^c u \wedge \beta^{n-1}$$

is called a Lelong number of the function u at z_0.

Note that unless u is unbounded near z_0 the Lelong number vanishes. This is however not a sufficient condition as the plurisubharmonic function $-log(-log|z|)$ near zero shows. Intuitively speaking the Lelong number measures whether u has *logarithmic* singularity at z_0- these are the heaviest singularities that plurisubharmonic functions could have.

The equality (whose proof can be found in [Dem]) in particular implies that the quantity $\frac{1}{r^{2n-2}} \int_{|z-z_0|\leq r} dd^c u \wedge \beta^{n-1}$ (which is up to a universal multiplicative constant equal to $\frac{1}{r^{2n-2}} \int_{|z-z_0|\leq r} \Delta u$) is increasing with r. This implies that the set

$$E_c(u) := \{z | u \text{ has a Lelong number at least } c \text{ at } z\}$$

is small for any $c > 0$. More precisely for any $\varepsilon > 0$ it has zero $2n-2+\varepsilon$ Hausdorff measure.

It turns out however that more is true: a deep theorem of Siu [Siu] states that the set $E_c(u)$ are always analytic for $c > 0$:

Theorem 3.8 (Siu)**.** *Let u be a plurisubharmonic function in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Then for any $c > 0$ the set $E_c(u)$ is an analytic subset of Ω.*

This result is one instance of appearance of analytic objects in pluripotential theory.

3.2. **Kähler versus Hermitian.** Below we discuss an example where general Hermitian pluripotential theory behaes differently to its kählerian counterpart.

A broad field where pluripotential theory applies is the study of *singular metrics* i.e. in the case where the background $(1,1)$ form fails to be a metric. One such instance occurs if some of the eigenvalues are zero i.e. we deal simply with semipositive forms.

Suppose ω_j is a sequence of smooth Kähler forms converging smoothly to a limiting smooth semipositive form ω. The local example to keep in mind is

$$\omega_j = idz_1 \wedge d\bar{z}_1 + \frac{i}{j} dz_2 \wedge d\bar{z}_2.$$

Geometrically these metrics *shrink* the z_2 direction, so the limiting space can be identified with the $\mathbb{C}$ with the z_2-factor collapsed (this is a very easy example of Gromov-Hausdorff convergence).

Recall that the Frobenius theorem (under mild additional assumptions) implies that the *kernel* of ω is an integrable distribution i.e. we get a foliation by holomorphic leaves. As a result we end up with a limiting space that has some sort of complex structure.

In the Hermitian case obviously there is no Frobenius type theorem for the limitng form. Can we thus extract a sort of complex structure in the limit? The following example shows that the answer is no in general:

Example 3.9 ([TW14]). *Consider the standard Hopf surface X i.e. $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ modulo the action of the group generated by the contraction $(z_1, z_2) \to (\frac{1}{2}z_1, \frac{1}{2}z_2)$ equipped with the family of metrics*

$$\omega(t) = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} \frac{1}{|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2}((1-2t)\delta_{jk} + 2t\frac{\bar{z}_j z_k}{|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2})idz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_k.$$

for $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. As t converges to $\frac{1}{2}$ the metrics converge to the nonnegative form

$$\omega(1/2) = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} \frac{\bar{z}_j z_k}{(|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2)^2} idz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_k.$$

It is easy to see that the kernel distribution of $\omega(1/2)$ are the vectors $X = \sum_j X^j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$ satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \bar{z}_j X_j = 0$ i.e. the complex tangent directions of the spheres in $\mathbb{C}^2$ centered at zero.

Exercise 3.10. *If the distribution were integrable tha would mean that the boundary of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{C}^2$ would contain locally a holomorphic curve. Show that this is impossible.*

More careful analysis shows that $\omega(t)$ collapses the spheres centered at zero. It can be shown that the limiting space is in fact the radial direction modulo the group action i.e. a circle! For obvious reasons then the limitng space cannot have any sort of complex structure!

4. Kähler type conditions

Given a fixed Hermitian manifold X it is natural to search for the "best" metric that X admits. The reason is at least twofold: nice metrics usually significantly simplify computations and more importantly it is sometimes possible to deduce geometric or topological information from the existence of these.

Unlike the Kähler case there is a large number of mutually different "Kähler type" conditions. Below we list the most common ones:

Definition 4.1. *(Balanced metric) Let (X, ω) be a n-dimensional Hermitian manifold. The form ω is said to be balanced if it satisfies*

$$d(\omega^{n-1}) = 0.$$

Of course this definition differs from the Kähler condition only if $n \geq 3$. The motivation behind such a condition partially comes from string theory (see [AB95, FIUV09, FLY12] and the references therein). There are various constructions of explicit examples of non-Kähler, balanced manifolds in the literature. For example using *conifold transitions* Fu, Li and Yau in [FLY12] proved that such a metric exists on the connected sum $\sharp_k S^3 \times S^3$ of k copies of the product of two three dimensional spheres. Another example is the *Iwasawa manifold* which will be given in the next section.

Balanced metrics impose some geometric restrictions on the underlying manifold (for example it follows from the Stokes theorem that no smooth 1-codimensional complex subvariety can be homologous to zero) and hence not every manifold can be endowed with such a metric.

From potential theoretic point of view the most important property of such metrics is that the Laplacian of any admissible (or even merely smooth) function u on X integrates to zero. Namely if we choose the canonical Laplacian associated to the Chern connection on X then we get

$$\int_X \Delta_\omega u \omega^n = n\int_X i\partial\bar{\partial}u\wedge\omega^{n-1} = -n\int_X \bar{\partial}u\wedge\partial(\omega^{n-1}) = 0.$$

An interesting exercise, left to the Reader, is to check that in the intermediate cases between the balanced and Kähler conditions we do not get anything besides Kählerness:

Exercise 4.2. *Suppose* $1 < k < n-1$. *If* ω *is a form such that*

$$d(\omega^{n-k}) = 0,$$

then $d\omega = 0$ *i.e.* ω *is Kähler.*

A second family that we consider are the so-called Gauduchon metrics [Ga].

Definition 4.3. *(Gauduchon metric) Let* (X,ω) *be a* n*-dimensional Hermitian manifold. The form* ω *is said to be Gauduchon if it satisfies*

$$dd^c(\omega^{n-1}) = 0.$$

Unlike balanced ones, these exist on **any** compact Hermitian manifold. Moreover a theorem of Gauduchon [Ga] states that given any Hermitian form ω there exists a conformal factor e^{ϕ_ω} such that the new form $e^{\phi_\omega}\omega$ is Gauduchon. Gauduchon metrics are useful in many geometric contexts, for example the notion of a degree of a line bundle over a Gauduchon manifold is well defined via the formula

$$deg_\omega(L) = \int c_1(L)\wedge\omega^{n-1},$$

where $c_1(L)$ is the first Chern class of L. This is the starting point for a *stability theory* for vector bundles in the Hermitian setting (see [LT95]).

Yet another difference is that after the exchange of the power $n-1$ to a lesser power we do get nontrivial new conditions. This is in fact how Astheno-Kähler metrics are defined.

Definition 4.4. *(Astheno-Kähler metric) Let* (X,ω) *be a* n*-dimensional Hermitian manifold* ($n \geq 2$)*. The form* ω *is said to be Astheno-Kähler if it satisfies*

$$dd^c(\omega^{n-2}) = 0.$$

This condition was used by Jost and Yau [JY93] in their study of harmonic maps from Hermitian manifolds to general Riemmanian manifolds.

Unlike the Gauduchon metrics Astheno-Kähler metrics impose some constraints on the underlying manifold. It can be shown that any holomorphic

1 form on such a manifold must be closed. Explicit examples of Astheno-Kähler but non-Kähler manifolds can be found in dimension 3 where they coincide with the *pluriclosed* metrics to be defined below. Another type of examples are the so-called *Calabi-Eckmann* manifolds. These are topologically products $S^{2n-1} \times S^{2m-1},\ (m > 1,\ n > 1)$ of odd dimensional spheres. Any such manifold admits families of complex structures which can be constructed using Sasakian geometry. In [Mi09] it was shown that a special choice of such a complex structure yields an Astheno-Kähler manifold. Since $H^2(S^{2n-1} \times S^{2m-1}) = 0$ such manifolds are never Kähler.

Much more information regarding Astheno-Kähler geometry can be found in [FT].

Finally the important notion of the aforementioned *pluriclosed* metrics is defined as follows:

Definition 4.5. *(pluriclosed metric) Let (X, ω) be a n-dimensional Hermitian manifold. The form ω is said to be pluriclosed if it satisfies*

$$dd^c\omega = 0.$$

The pluriclosed metrics are also known as SKT (strong Kähler with torsion) in the literature ([FPS04]). Of course in dimension 2 this notion coincides with the Gauduchon condition, hence any complex surface admits pluriclosed metrics. In complex dimension 3 some nontrivial examples of non-Kähler *nilmanifolds* admitting pluriclosed metrics were constructed by Fino, Parton and Salamon in [FPS04].

As is easily verified, Gauduchon metrics also have the property that the Laplacian of a smooth function integrates to zero. This is not the case for Astheno-Kähler and pluriclosed metrics in general.

A strengthened version of the Gauduchon condition was considered by Popovici in [Pop13]:

Definition 4.6. *(strongly Gauduchon metric) If (X, ω) is n-dimensional Hermitian manifold, the form ω is said to be strongly Gauduchon if $\partial(\omega^{n-1})$ is $\bar{\partial}$ exact.*

Of course strongly Gauduchon implies Gauduchon and these notions coincide if the $\partial\bar{\partial}$-lemma holds on X (see [Pop13]) but in general the inclusion is strict. Note also that any balanced metric is strongly Gauduchon.

The strongly Gauduchon condition was introduced by Popovici in [Pop13] in connection with studies of deformation limits of projective or Kähler manifolds. We refer to [Pop13] for the geometric conditions imposed by this structure. In particular a necessary and sufficient condition of existence of such a metric on a manifold X is the nonexistence of a positive d-exact $(1, 1)$ current on X.

None of the conditions above actually guarantee the invariance of the total volume of the perturbed metric. More precisely the value $\int_X (\omega + dd^c u)^n$ does depend on u and this is the main source of troubles in pluripotential theory. Still a condition weaker that being Käher can be imposed so that the total volume remains invariant. This condition has been investigated by Guan and Li [GL10]:

Definition 4.7. *A metric satisfies the condition imposed by Guan and Li if $dd^c\omega = 0$ and $dd^c(\omega^2) = 0$.*

Observe that this is weaker than Kähler yet by twofold application of Stokes' theorem it can be shown that the total volume remains invariant. Let us also stress once again that the constant B introduced in the previous section measures how far our metric is from satisfying the above condition.

Remark 4.8. *Recently Chiose* [Chi] *has shown that Guan and Li condition is equivalent to the constancy of the total volume $\int_X \omega^n$ for all ω differing by a dd^c of a quasiplurisubharmonic function.*

Remark 4.9. *Non Kähler metrics satisfying the above property do exist. A trivial example, taken from* [TW10a] *is simply the product of a compact complex curve equipped with a Kähler metric and a non-Kähler complex surface equipped with a Gauduchon metric.*

We refer the interested reader to the article [Pop14b], for more explicit examples and interactions between the notions above.

5. Explicit examples of non-Kähler hermitian manifolds

We begin this section by defining the most classical examples of non-Kähler manifolds- the Hopf manifolds. These were historically the first ones and were discovered by Hopf in 1948 [Ho48].

Definition 5.1. *(Hopf manifold) Let t be any nonzero complex number satisfying $|t| \neq 1$. Then it induces a $\mathbb{Z}$ action on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$ by scaling i.e.*

$$(k, w) \to t^k w,$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}, w \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$. The action is discrete and properly discontinuous, hence the quotient manifold $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}/_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a smooth manifold.

Remark 5.2. *In the literature more general definitions are being considered. In particular some Authors define Hopf manifolds as above but with the $\mathbb{Z}$ action induced by any contracting-to-zero biholomorphic mapping of $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$ into itself.*

It can be proved that the Hopf manifolds are all diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^{2n-1} \times \mathbb{S}^1$, hence the first Betti numbers are odd- in particular these are never Kähler. Another obstruction is that $H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$ vanishes which also shows that X cannot be Kähler. In fact it can be proven that Hopf manifolds do not admit even balanced metrics.

On the bright side a Gauduchon metric is explicitly computable in the simplest case. Indeed, suppose that $n = 2$, then the metric

$$\omega = \frac{idz \wedge d\bar{z} + idw \wedge d\bar{w}}{|z|^2 + |w|^2}$$

is clearly invariant under the group action, hence descends onto the quotient manifold. Moreover it is easy to check that $dd^c\omega = 0$, so this metric is pluriclosed (or Gauduchon).

In the two dimensional case Hopf manifolds do belong to the special class of the so-called class VII surfaces, named after the original Kodaira classification list [Kod64, Kod66, Kod68a, Kod68b]. These are characterized by the two conditions that the first Betti number $b_1(X)$ is equal to 1, while the Kodaira dimension $\kappa(X)$ is minus infinity. Class VII minimal surfaces are the only remaining class of two dimensional manifolds that is not fully classified yet. More precisely the classification was obtained by the works of Kato, Nakamura and most notably Teleman [Ka78], [Na84], [T10] in the cases when the second Betti number $b_2(X)$ is small. Classifiaction is complete in the case $b_2(X) \leq 2$ (see [T10]). In the remaining cases a theorem of Dloussky-Oeljeklaus-Toma [DOT03] yields a classification provided one can find $b_2(X)$ rational curves (possibly singular) on X. Conjecturally this is always the case and indeed this holds in the classified cases $b_2(X) \leq 2$. Hence the classification problem boils down to the construction of rational curves.

Let us now present one of the simplest examples of a class VII manifold, called Inoue surface [In74] (in this case $b_2(X) = 0$).

Definition 5.3. *(Inoue surface) Let M be a 3×3 integer valued matrix with determinant equal to 1. Suppose that it has a positive eigenvalue α and two complex eigenvalues β and $\bar{\beta}$. Let also (a_1, a_2, a_3) and (b_1, b_2, b_3) be eigenvectors corresponding to α and β respectively. The Inoue surface is defined as the quotient $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{H}$ being the upper half plane by a group G generated by the following four automorphisms:*

$$g_0(w, z) := (\alpha w, \beta z),$$
$$g_i(w, z) = (w + \alpha_i, z + \beta_i) \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Remark 5.4. *It can be proven that the action is discrete and properly discontinuous, hence the quotient is a smooth manifold. An important property of G in this construction is that it is not an Abelian group but is a solvable one. There are two other classess of surfaces defined by Inoue, also being quotients of $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$ by a solvable group.*

On Inoue surfaces one can also find an explicit pluriclosed/Gauduchon metric:

Definition 5.5. *(Tricerri metric) Let $\omega(z, w) := \frac{idw \wedge d\bar{w}}{Im^2(w)} + Im(w) idz \wedge d\bar{z}$. This metric is invariant under the action of G and hence descends to the Inoue surface. It can be computed that $dd^c\omega = 0$.*

Our last example is known as Iwasawa threefold. It is not Kähler for it admits a non closed holomorphic 1-form:

Definition 5.6. *(Iwasawa manifold) Let*

$$M := \{A \in GL_3(\mathbb{C}) |\ A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & z_1 & z_3 \\ 0 & 1 & z_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad z_i \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, 2, 3\}.$$

The Iwasawa threefold is defined as quotient of M by the lattice of such matrices with coefficients being Gaussian integers acting on M by a left multiplication.

It is easily observed that dz_1, dz_2 and $dz_3 - z_1 dz_2$ are invariant holomorphic one forms on M. As $d(dz_3 - z_1 dz_2) = -dz_1 \wedge dz_2$ is also invariant, it descends to a non zero two form. Thus $dz_3 - z_1dz_2$ is a non closed holomorphic one form on M. It can be shown that

$$idz_1 \wedge d\bar{z}_1 + idz_2 \wedge d\bar{z}_2 + i(dz_3 - z_1dz_2) \wedge \overline{(dz_3 - z_1dz_2)}$$

descends to a balanced (hence strongly Gauduchon) metric on the Iwasawa threefold.

6. Canonical coordinates

In the Kähler setting many local computations are significantly simplified by the use of canonical coordinates. More specifically such coordinates not only diagonalize the metric at a given point (which we assume to be the center of the associated coordinate chart) but also yield vanishing of all third order derivative terms while the fourth order terms are the coefficients of the curvature tensor.

Of course in the general Hermitian setting one cannot expect vanishing of all third order terms. Yet getting more information than pointwise diagonalization is crucial in some laborious computations. Hence a question appears whether some milder "interpolating" conditions on third order terms are achievable. As observed by Guan and Li [GL10] this is indeed possible:

Theorem 6.1 (Guan-Li)**.** *Given a Hermitian manifold (X, ω) and a point $p \in X$ it is possible to choose coordinates near p, such that $g_{i\bar{j}}(p) = \delta_{ij}$ and for any pair i, k one has $\frac{\partial g_{i\bar{i}}}{\partial z_k}(p) = 0$.*

Proof. Choose first local coordinates z_i around p (identified with 0 in the coordinate chart), such that at this point the metric is diagonalized. Then rechoose coordinates by adding some quadratic terms:

$$w_r = z_r + \sum_{m \neq r} \frac{\partial g_{r\bar{r}}}{\partial z_m} z_m z_r + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial g_{r\bar{r}}}{\partial z_r} z_r^2.$$

Observe that

$$\frac{\partial z_r}{\partial w_i} = \delta_{ri} \quad \text{at } p; \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 z_r}{\partial w_i \partial w_k} = -\sum_{m \neq r} \frac{\partial g_{r\bar{r}}}{\partial z_m} \left(\frac{\partial z_m}{\partial w_i} \frac{\partial z_r}{\partial w_k} + \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial w_k} \frac{\partial z_r}{\partial w_i}\right) - \frac{\partial g_{r\bar{r}}}{\partial z_r} \frac{\partial z_r}{\partial w_i} \frac{\partial z_r}{\partial w_k}. \tag{9}$$

Computing now $\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} := g(\frac{\partial}{\partial w_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}_j})$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}}{\partial w_k} &= \sum_{r,s=1}^{n} g_{r\bar{s}} \frac{\partial^2 z_r}{\partial w_i \partial w_k} \frac{\partial \bar{z}_s}{\partial \bar{w}_j} \\ &+ \sum_{r,s,p=1}^{n} \frac{\partial g_{r\bar{s}}}{\partial z_p} \frac{\partial z_p}{\partial w_k} \frac{\partial z_r}{\partial w_i} \frac{\partial \bar{z}_s}{\partial \bar{w}_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging now (8) and (9) into the formula above we get

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}}{\partial w_k} = \sum_{r=1}^{n} \left(-\sum_{m \neq r} -\frac{\partial g_{r\bar{r}}}{\partial z_m} (\delta_{mi}\delta_{rk} + \delta_{mk}\delta_{ri})\delta_{ri} - \frac{\partial g_{r\bar{r}}}{\partial z_r} \delta_{ri}\delta_{rk}\right)$$

$$+\sum_{r,s,p=1}^{n}\frac{\partial g_{r\bar{s}}}{\partial z_p}\delta_{pk}\delta_{ri}\delta_{si}=0.$$

□

7. Basic notions of pluripotential theory: currents and capacities

In this section we shall define all the basic tools in the Hermitian pluripotential theory. A good reference for classical plurisubharmonic functions is [Hö]. The pluripotential theory in the local setting was developed by Bedford and Taylor in [BT82]. For Kählerian counterparts of the discussed notions we refer to [Kol03, GZ05].

7.1. **Some linear algebra.** Given a $(1,1)$-form $\alpha=\alpha_{jk}idz_j\wedge d\bar{z}_k$ it is easy to see that α is *real* $(\alpha=\overline{\alpha})$ iff the coefficients pointwise form a Hermitian matrix. Hence the following definition is natural:

Definition 7.1. *Let ω be a real $(1,1)$ form. Then ω is said to be positive if the coefficients $\omega_{j\bar{k}}$ form pointwise a nonnegative Hermitian matrix.*

Exercise 7.2. *Let μ be any smooth $(1,0)$-form. Show that $i\mu\wedge\overline{\mu}$ is positive. Show that any constant coefficient positive $(1,1)$-form in $\mathbb{C}^n$ can be written as a sum of at most n forms of the type $i\mu\wedge\overline{\mu}$.*

By duality any $(n-1,n-1)$ real form is representable by a $n\times n$ matrix of its coefficients and once again one can define positivity through the positivity of the Hermitian matrix.

In intermediate degrees the coefficient matrix is substantially larger. One may still use its positivity properties for a definition:

Definition 7.3. *Let τ be a (p,p)-form in $\mathbb{C}^n$, where $1<p<n-1$. We say that τ is strictly positive if the coefficient matrix is pointwise a nonnegatie Hermitian matrix.*

Way subtler notion of positivity (which is however more useful!) can be given through an action on simple positive forms:

Definition 7.4. *A (p,p) form is said to be simple positive if it can be written as $\Pi_{j=1}^{p}(i\mu_j\wedge\overline{\mu}_j)$ for some $(1,0)$- forms μ_j. A $(n-p,n-p)$ form γ is said to be positive if for any simple positive (p,p)-form η one has $\gamma\wedge\eta\geq 0$.*

Exercise 7.5. *Inspect the differences between positivity and strict positivity in the first nontrivial case i.e. when $p=2$ and $n=4$.*

7.2. **Currents.** Below we recall the notion of a *current* which generalizes in a sense the notion of an analytic subvariety. First we define the space of test forms.

Definition 7.6. *Let $\mathcal{D}_{p,q}(\Omega)$ denote the space of smooth (p,q)-forms with compact support in Ω equipped with the Schwartz topology (i.e. a sequence α_j converges to α if the coefficients converge in $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}$ and the union of the supports of α_j is compact. Elements of $\mathcal{D}_{p,q}(\Omega)$ are called test forms.*

Exercise 7.7. *Let $\chi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ be any smooth function with compact support. Consider the forms $\alpha_j(z) := \chi(z + j)idz \wedge d\bar{z}$. Do α_j converge to 0 in the Schwartz topology?*

Given the space of test forms we define its dual- the space of currents:

Definition 7.8. *A current of bidegree $(n-p, n-q)$ (or of bidimension (p, q)) is a continuous linear functional on the space $\mathcal{D}_{p,q}(\Omega)$.*

Currents have all the standard properties of linear functionals: they can be added, multiplied by a scalar etc. A special feature of currents is that they can be *differentiated*. Formally if D denotes any partial derivative then

$$DT(\alpha) := \varepsilon T(D\alpha)$$

with $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$ depending on the bidegree so that the sign is consistent with the standard Stokes formula.

Exercise 7.9. *Determine the sign of ε in terms of p and q.*

Exercise 7.10. *Let the Dirac delta measure δ_z act on a $(1, 1)$ form $f(z)idz\wedge d\bar{z}$ in $\mathbb{C}$ by*

$$\delta_z(f) = f(z).$$

Determine whether the following operators are currents of dimension $(1, 1)$

$$a) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_j;$$

$$b) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^j}{\partial^j z_j}\delta_j;$$

$$c) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^j}{\partial^j z_j}\delta_0.$$

A current T which is equal to its conjugate $\overline{T}$ is called *real* (this is only possible if $p = q$). A very special role in pluripotential theory is played by *positive currents*:

Definition 7.11. *A real current T of bidimension (p, p) is said to be positive if for any simple positive test form γ one has*

$$T(\gamma) \geq 0.$$

Exercise 7.12. *Determine which of the currents from the previous exercise are positive.*

A crucial fact that shall be used repeatedly is that positive currents have *coefficients* that are particularly nice:

Theorem 7.13 (Riesz theorem)**.** *Let T be a current of bidimension (p, p). It can be written uniquely as*

$$T = {\sum_{|J|=n-p, |K|=n-p}}' T_{JK} dz_{j_1} \wedge \cdots dz_{j_{n-p}} \wedge d\bar{z}_{k_1} \wedge \cdots d\bar{z}_{k_{n-p}},$$

where $'$ denotes summation over increasing multiindices and T_{JK} are distributions (currents of bidimension $(0,0)$. If T is positive then T_{JK} are complex valued measures.

Exercise 7.14. *Riesz theorem states that A distribution satisfying $T(\varphi) \geq 0$ for any nonnegative test function φ has to be a (positive) measure. Deduce from this that a positive $(1,1)$-current has (complex valued) measures $\mu_{j\bar{k}}$ as coefficients. Furthermore $\mu_{j\bar{j}}$ is a real measure, whereas $\mu_{j\bar{k}}(A) = \bar{\mu}_{k\bar{j}}(A)$ for any Borel set A.*

7.3. **Plurisubharmonic functions.** We begin this Section by recalling the definition of the basic object of study: the ω-plurisubharmonic functions:

Definition 7.15. *The ω plurisubharmonic functions are the elements of the function class*

$$PSH_\omega(X) := \{u \in L^1(X,\omega) : dd^c u \geq -\omega,\ u \in \mathcal{C}^\uparrow(X)\},$$

where $\mathcal{C}^\uparrow(X)$ denotes the space of upper semicontinuous functions and the inequality is understood in the weak sense of currents.

We call the functions that belong to $PSH_\omega(X)$ either ω-plurisubharmonic or ω-psh for short. We shall often use the handy notation $\omega_u := \omega + dd^c u$.

Note that the definition coincides with the usual one in the Kähler setting. In particular ω-psh functions are locally standard plurisubharmonic functions plus some smooth function. Thus in local coordinates in a chart $\Omega_1 \leq \omega \leq \Omega_2$ for some (local) Kähler forms $\Omega_1,\ \Omega_2$. In particular local properties of ω-psh functions are the same as in the Kähler setting.

7.4. **The Monge-Ampère measure.** By construction $\omega + dd^c u$ is a positive $(1,1)$-current i.e. a differential form with distributional coefficients. This raises a serious problem in defining $\omega + dd^c u \wedge \omega + dd^c u$- we would have to multiply distributions to get the coefficients!

We will follow Bedford and Taylor's idea ([BT82, BT76]) to construct this product. First, by Riesz theorem a positive current has *measure* coefficients i.e each of the distributional coefficients is a complex valued measure.

The crucial observation in Bedford-Taylor theory is that for a locally bounded u the current $u(\omega + dd^c u)$ also has measure coefficients. Note that this may still be the case for *some* unbounded functions but in general there is no reason why the product of an integrable function and a measure may still be a measure.

To proceed we would like to take dd^c of the latter current. We need to do it carefully to get a $(2,2)$ current with measure coefficients again. To this end we argue locally.

In a coordinate chart there is a Kähler form $\Omega > \omega$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} dd^c[u(\omega + dd^c u)] + \omega \wedge [\omega + dd^c u] - \omega \wedge dd^c \omega - du \wedge d^c \omega \\ + d^c u \wedge d\omega = dd^c[u[(\Omega + dd^c u) - (\Omega - \omega)]] \\ + \omega \wedge [\omega + dd^c u] - \omega \wedge dd^c \omega - du \wedge d^c \omega + d^c u \wedge d\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Each of the terms on the right hand side is a well defined $(2,2)$ current. The question that remains is whether they all add up to a *positive* current.

We argue locally. We may assume, shrinking the chart if necessary, that $\Omega = dd^c\rho$ for some smooth local plurisubharmonic function. $\rho + u$ is then plurisubharmonic and locally approximable by smooth plurisubharmonic functions $(\rho + u)_j$ (local convolutions with a smoothing kernel would do the job).

Then

$$dd^c[u_j[(\Omega + dd^c u_j) - (\Omega - \omega)]] + \omega \wedge [\omega + dd^c u_j] - \omega \wedge dd^c\omega$$
$$-du_j \wedge d^c\omega + d^c u_j \wedge d\omega$$

converges as a current to

$$dd^c[u[(\Omega + dd^c u) - (\Omega - \omega)]] + \omega \wedge [\omega + dd^c u] - \omega \wedge dd^c\omega$$
$$-du \wedge d^c\omega + d^c u \wedge d\omega.$$

Indeed all the terms besides the first one are linear in u_j. For the first one we use the Bedford-Taylor convergence theorem.

It remains to recall that

$$dd^c[u_j[(\Omega + dd^c u_j) - (\Omega - \omega)]] + \omega \wedge [\omega + dd^c u_j] - \omega \wedge dd^c\omega$$
$$-du \wedge d^c\omega + d^c u \wedge d\omega$$
$$= (\omega + dd^c u_j) \wedge (\omega + dd^c u_j),$$

hence it is a positive $(2,2)$-form.

Next we repeat the argument by multiplying by u the resulting $(2,2)$ current and we coudl thus define $(\omega + dd^c u)^3$ etc.

To get the convergence write

$$dd^c u_j + \omega = dd^c u_j + \Omega - T, \quad T = (\Omega - \omega).$$

Then by the Newton expansion

$$(dd^c u_j + \omega)^k = (dd^c u_j + \Omega)^k - k(dd^c u_j + \Omega)^{k-1} \wedge T + ... \pm T^k. \tag{10}$$

By the convergence theorem for psh functions [BT76] all the terms on the right converge as currents, and the sum of their limits is

$$(dd^c u + \Omega)^n - n(dd^c u + \Omega)^{n-1} \wedge T + ... \pm T^n = (dd^c u + \omega)^n.$$

This allows the use of some local results from pluripotential theory developed by Bedford and Taylor in [BT82]. In particular the Monge-Ampère operator

$$\omega_u^n := \omega_u \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_u$$

is well defined for bounded ω-psh functions.

Furthermore, if $u_j \in PSH(\omega) \cap L^\infty$ is either uniformly convergent or monotonely convergent (in decreasing or increasing manner) almost everywhere to u, then

$$(dd^c u_j + \omega)^n \to (dd^c u + \omega)^n$$

in the sense of currents.

We note that *all* functions u in $PSH_\omega(X)$, normalized by the condition $sup_X u = 0$ are uniformly integrable. This follows from classical results in potential theory (see [Kol98]). Since such results are important in the Hermitian setting (compare [Xia]) we give here a short argument following quite closely the one in [GZ05], where the Authors treat the Kähler case.

Proposition 7.16. *Let $u \in PSH_\omega(X)$ be a function satisfying $sup_X u = 0$. Then there exists a constant C dependent only on X, ω such that*

$$\int_X |u|\omega^n \leq C.$$

Proof. Consider a double covering of X by coordinate balls $B_s^1 \subset\subset B_s^2 \subset X$, $s = 1, \cdots, N$. In each B_s^2 there exists a strictly plurisubharmonic potential ρ_s satisfying the following properties:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_s|_{\partial B_s^2} = 0 \\ inf_{B_s^2}\rho_s \geq -C \\ dd^c\rho_s = \omega_{2,s} \geq \omega, \end{cases}$$

where C is a constant dependent only on the covering and ω. Note that plurisubharmonicity coupled with the first condition above yields the inequality $\rho_s \leq 0$ on B_s^2.

Suppose now that there exists a sequence $u_j \in PSH_\omega(X), sup_X u_j = 0$ satisfying $lim_{j\to\infty} \int_X |u_j|\omega^n = \infty$. After choosing subsequence (which for the sake of brevity we still denote by u_j) we may assume that

$$\int_X |u_j|\omega^n \geq 2^j \tag{11}$$

and moreover a sequence of points x_j where u_j attains maximum is contained in some fixed ball B_s^1.

Note that $\rho_s + u_j$ is an ordinary plurisubharmonic function in B_s^2 and by the sub mean value property one has

$$\rho_s(x_j) = \rho_s(x_j) + u_j(x_j) \leq C\int_{B_s^2} \rho_s(z) + u_j(z)dV \leq C\int_{B_s^2} u_j(z)dV + C, \tag{12}$$

where dV is the Lebesgue measure in the local coordinate chart, while C denotes constants dependent only on B_s^1 and B_s^2. Thus (12) implies that for some constant C one has

$$\int_{B_s^2} |u_j(z)|dV \leq C. \tag{13}$$

Consider the function $v := \sum_{j=1}^\infty \frac{u_j}{2^j}$. By classical potential theory this is again a ω-psh function or constantly $-\infty$. By (13), however, the integral of v over B_s^2 is finite, thus it is a true ω-psh function. By the same reasoning we easily obtain that $v \in L^1(B_t^1)$ for any $t \in 1, \cdots, N$ and hence $v \in L^1(X)$. This contradicts (11), and thus the existence of a uniform bound is established. □

Recall that the Monge-Ampère capacity associated to (X, ω) is the function defined on Borel sets by

$$Cap_\omega(E) := \sup\{\int_E (\omega + dd^c u)^n \,/\, u \in PSH(X, \omega) \text{ and } 0 \leq u \leq 1\}.$$

(an elementary induction ([DK12]) shows that the introducted quantity is finite.)

We refer the reader to [Kol03, GZ05] for the basic properties of this capacity in the Kähler setting. In the Hermitian case one can repeat much of the Kählerian picture. Below we list some basic properties of cap_ω that will be useful later on:

Proposition 7.17.

i) If $E_1 \subset E_2 \subset X$ *then* $cap_\omega(E_1) \leq cap_\omega(E_2)$,

ii) If U *is open then* $cap_\omega(U) = sup\{cap_\omega(K)|\ K - compact,\ K \subset U\}$,

iii) If $U_j \nearrow U,\ U_j - open$ *then* $cap_\omega(U) = lim_{j\to\infty} cap_\omega(U_j)$.

Proof. The first property follows from the very definition of cap_ω. To prove the second fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and a competitor u for the supremum, such that

$$cap_\omega(U) \leq \int_U \omega_u^n + \varepsilon.$$

Since ω_u^n is a regular Borel measure by inner regularity there is a compact set $K \subset U$ satisfying

$$\int_U \omega_u^n \leq \int_K \omega_u^n + \varepsilon \leq cap_\omega(K) + \varepsilon.$$

Coupling the above facts and letting ε converge to zero we end up with $cap_\omega(U) \leq sup\{cap_\omega(K)|\ K - compact,\ K \subset U\}$, and the reverse inequality follows from the first property.

Finally the third one can be proved as follows. Fix once more $\varepsilon > 0$ and a compact set $K \subset U$, such that

$$cap_\omega(U) \leq cap_\omega(K) + \varepsilon.$$

Observe that for j large enough $K \subset U_j$ and hence $cap_\omega(K) \leq cap_\omega(U_j) \leq lim_{j\to\infty} cap_\omega(U_j)$, and hence

$$cap_\omega(U) \leq lim_{j\to\infty} cap_\omega(U_j),$$

while the reverse inequality is obvious. □

For ω-Kähler the patched local Bedford-Taylor capacity was studied in [Kol03]. That is for a fixed double covering $B_s^1 \subset\subset B_s^2 \subset X$, we define the capacity cap'_ω on a Borel set E by

$$cap'_\omega(E) := \sum_{s=1}^n cap(E \cap B_s^1, B_s^2),$$

with $cap(E \cap B_s^1, B_s^2)$ denoting the classical Bedford-Taylor capacity [BT82]. It was shown in [Kol03] that cap_ω and cap'_ω are equicontinuous in the Kähler case. Observe that the latter can also be defined on non-Kähler manifolds. Following the proof in [Kol03] it can be proven that cap_ω and cap'_ω are equicontinuous also in the Hermitian case (except that in each strictly pseudoconvex domain V_s one considers two local Kähler forms $\omega_{1,s}$ and $\omega_{2,s}$ satisfying $\omega_{1,s} \leq \omega \leq \omega_{2,s}$ and works with the potentials of those metrics.)

Coupling this fact with the argument from [Kol03] (Lemma 4.3) one obtains the following corollary:

Corollary 7.18. *Let $p > 1$ and f be a non negative function belonging to $L^p(\omega^n)$. Then for some absolute constant C dependent only on (X, ω) and any compact $K \subset X$ one has*

$$\int_K f\omega^n \leq C(p,X)||f||_p cap_\omega(K) exp(-C cap_\omega^{-1/n}(K))$$
$$\leq C(p,X)||f||_p cap_\omega(K)^2,$$

with $C(p,X)$ a constant dependent on p and (X,ω).

Note that the second inequality is a simple consequence of the elementary inequality:

Observation 7.19. *Given any two positive constants C_0, C_1, there is a positive constant C_2, such that for all $x \in [0, C_0]$ $exp(-C_1/x^{1/n}) \leq C_2 x$.*

As yet another consequence of psh-like property of ω-psh functions one gets the capacity estimate of sublevel sets of those functions.

Proposition 7.20. *Let $u \in PSH_\omega(X), sup_X u = 0$. Then there exists an independent constant C such that for any $s > 1$ $cap_\omega(\{u < -t\}) \leq \frac{C}{t}$.*

Proof. We shall use the double covering introduced in Proposition 7.16. Fix a function $v \in PSH_\omega(X), 0 \leq v \leq 1$. Then we obtain

$$\int_{\{u<-t\}} \omega_v^n \leq \frac{1}{t}\int_X -u\omega_v^n \leq \frac{1}{t}(\sum_{s=1}^N \int_{B_s^1} -u(\omega_{2,s} + dd^c v)^n)$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{t}(\sum_{s=1}^N \int_{B_s^1} -(u+\rho_s)(dd^c(\rho_s + v))^n).$$

Now by the generalized L^1 Chern-Levine-Nirenberg inequalities (see, for example [Dem], Proposition 3.11) applied to each pair $B_s^1 \subset\subset B_s^2$ one obtains that the last quantity can be estimated by

$$\frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^N C_{B_s^1,B_s^2}||u+\rho_s||_{L^1(B_s^2)}||\rho_s + v||_{L^\infty(B_s^2)}$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{t} max_s\{C_{B_s^1,B_s^2}\}(CN\int_X -u\omega^n + C)(C+1)^n,$$

where constants $C_{B_s^1,B_s^2}$ depend on the covering, while C - only on (X,ω). By Proposition 7.16 this quantity is uniformly bounded and the statement follows. □

We finish this Section with a lemma which shall be used throughout the note. It follows from the proof of the comparison principle by Bedford and Taylor in [BT76].

Lemma 7.21. *Let u, v be bounded $PSH_\omega(X)$ functions and T a (positive but non necessarily closed) current of the form $\omega_{u_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_{u_{n-1}}$ for bounded functions u_i belonging to $PSH_\omega(X)$. Then*

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} dd^c(u-v)\wedge T \geq \int_{\{u<v\}} d^c(u-v)\wedge dT.$$

Proof. Suppose first that u, v and the boundary of the set $\{u < v\}$ are smooth. If ρ is a smooth defining function of $\{u < v\}$, then $u - v = \alpha\rho$ for some positive function α on the closure of $\{u < v\}$.

Given any smooth positive $(n-1, n-1)$ form θ we thus get the equality

$$\int_{\partial\{u<v\}} d^c(u-v)\wedge\theta = \int_{\partial\{u<v\}} \alpha d^c\rho\wedge\theta.$$

On the other hand if σ denotes the surface area element on $\partial\{u < v\}$ induced by ω then $\sigma = \frac{*d\rho}{||d\rho||}$, where $*$ stands for the Hodge star operator with respect to ω.

Now if $d^c\rho\wedge\theta = fd\sigma$ for some function f we end up with the equality

$$\alpha d\rho\wedge d^c\rho\wedge\theta = \alpha f d\rho\wedge\frac{*d\rho}{||d\rho||}.$$

But $d\rho\wedge d^c\rho\wedge\theta \geq 0$, which yields that $\alpha f \geq 0$ and thus

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} (dd^c(u-v)\wedge\theta - d^c(u-v)\wedge d\theta) = \int_{\partial\{u<v\}} d^c(u-v)\wedge\theta$$

$$= \int_{\partial\{u<v\}} \alpha f d\sigma \geq 0.$$

The case of a current T of the given form is done by approximation of each u_j by a decreasing sequence of smooth ω-psh functions.

Finally if either u, v or $\partial\{u < v\}$ is not smooth we consider approximating sequence of smooth ω-psh functions u^j, v^j. By the Sard theorem for almost every t the sets $\{u^j < v^j + t\}$ have smooth boundary. Thus we can apply the argument above to the pair $(u^j, v^j + t)$ and then let t to zero. Finally we let $j \to \infty$ and the desired inequality follows. ☐

8. Comparison principle in Hermitian setting

Comparison principle is the most efficient tool in pluripotential theory. Let us recall that in the Kähler setting it says that for any $u,\ v \in PSH_\omega(X)\cap L^\infty(X)$ we have

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^n \leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u^n.$$

Such an inequality is in general impossible on Hermitian manifolds due to the following proposition:

Proposition 8.1. *A necessary condition for the comparison principle to hold is that*

$$\forall u \in PSH_\omega(X)\cap L^\infty(X) \quad \int_X (\omega + dd^c u)^n = \int_X \omega^n.$$

Proof. Note that for any bounded ω-psh function u we can find a constant C such that $u - C < 0 < u + C$. Then applying the comparison principle to the pairs $(u - C, 0)$ and $(0, u + C)$ (the integration takes place over the whole of X) one gets that $\int_X \omega_u^n = \int_X \omega^n$, whence the result. ☐

Thus unless ω is of special type we have to allow some additional error terms into the inequality. The next theorem shows that such a result indeed holds. Below we present a weaker form of a comparison principle with "error terms" which will be useful in obtaining a priori estimates:

Theorem 8.2. *(*[DK12]*) Let ω be a Hermitian metric on a complex compact manifold X and let $u, v \in PSH_\omega(X) \cap L^\infty(X)$. Then there exists a polynomial P_n of degree $n-1$ and zeroth degree coefficient equal to 0, such that*

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^n \leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u^n + P_n(BM) \sum_{k=0}^{n} \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k},$$

where B is defined by (2) and $M = sup_{\{u<v\}}(v-u)$. The coefficients of the polynomial are nonnegative and depend only on the dimension of X.

This claim says that provided the product of B and the supremum of $v-u$ is small enough the error terms are small. Of course these error terms are bounded anyway and can be incorporated in the coefficients of the polynomial P_n but here it is empahsized that P_n is independent of the functions u and v and also that the error terms involve lower order Hessians of ω_u. In general it is impossible to control these pointwise but it will turn ou later that these can be cotrolled by ω_u^n in the integral sense over specific subdomains.

Proof. Note that

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^n = \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega \wedge \omega_v^{n-1} + \int_{\{u<v\}} dd^c v \wedge \omega_v^{n-1}$$
$$\leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega \wedge \omega_v^{n-1} + \int_{\{u<v\}} dd^c u \wedge \omega_v^{n-1} + \int_{\{u<v\}} d^c(v-u) \wedge d(\omega_v^{n-1}),$$

where we have used Lemma 7.21. Again by (2) we have

$$dd^c(\omega_v^{n-1}) \leq B[\omega^2 \wedge \omega_v^{n-2} + \omega^3 \wedge \omega_v^{n-3}].$$

Thus by Stokes theorem

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^n \leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u \wedge \omega_v^{n-1} - \int_{\{u<v\}} d(v-u) \wedge d^c(\omega_v^{n-1})$$
$$\leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u \wedge \omega_v^{n-1} + \int_{\{u<v\}} (v-u) \wedge dd^c(\omega_v^{n-1})$$
$$\leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u \wedge \omega_v^{n-1} + sup_{\{u<v\}}(v-u) B \int_{\{u<v\}} (\omega^2 \wedge \omega_v^{n-2} + \omega^3 \wedge \omega_v^{n-3}).$$

Repeating the above procedure of replacing ω_v by ω and ω_u in the end one obtains the statement. □

In the computations above it is easy to see that the term $\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u^{n-1} \wedge \omega$ will never appear on the right hand side but we shall not use this fact. Also for small n the polynomials P_n are explicitly computable: in particular one can take $P_2(x) = 2x, P_3(x) = 2x^2 + 4x$. In general we can use the following (very) crude count: In the process we exchange a term $\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^k \wedge \omega_u^l \wedge \omega^{k-l}$ for the term $\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^{k-1} \wedge \omega_u^{l+1} \wedge \omega^{k-l}$ and $\int_{\{u<v\}} (v-u) dd^c(\omega_v^{k-1} \wedge \omega_u^l \wedge \omega^{k-l})$.

The latter term splits into six pieces and each of them contains ω_v with power no higher than $k-1$. Of course there are special cases when some of these terms coincide or do not appear, but the upshot is that there will be at most 7^n terms in the very end. Thus one can take P_n as $P_n(x) = 7^n(x+x^2+\cdots+x^{n-1})$.

Below we shall state a technical refined version of the above theorem. It works only for *special* sublevel domains but has the advantage that all the lower order Hessian terms are incorporated into the ω_u^n-term at the cost of enlarging the constant 1 in front of it. This inequality was proven by Cuong and Kolodziej in [KN1]:

Theorem 8.3. *(Comparison principle-refined version) Let X, ω, u and v be as above. Take $0<\varepsilon<1$ and let $m(\varepsilon) = inf_X(u-(1-\varepsilon)v)$. Then for any small constant $0<s<\frac{\varepsilon^3}{16B}$*

$$\int_{\{u<(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s\}} \omega_{(1-\varepsilon)v}^n \leq (1+n^2 14^n \frac{sB}{\varepsilon^n}) \int_{\{u<(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s\}} \omega_u^n$$

for some universal constant C dependent only on X, n and ω.

Observe that this comparison principle works only for sublevel sets very close to the empty set $\{u<(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)\}$. The bonus is that we control not only ω_v^n but also the (integrals of) lower order Hessians of ω_v.

Proof. Denote by $a_k = \int_{\{u<(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s\}} \omega_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k}$. Observe that from the assumptions made on s the BM term from the first version of the comparison principle is small here, hence $P_n(Bs) \leq n7^n Bs$ (since $x^k \leq x$ for $k \geq 1, x \in (0,1)$). Then it is enough to get rid of the lower order Hessians of ω_u.

Note that $\varepsilon\omega \leq \omega_{(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s}$ and hence

$$\varepsilon a_k \leq \int_{\{u<(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s\}} \omega_u^k \wedge \omega_{(1-\varepsilon)v} \wedge \omega^{n-k-1}.$$

Swapping now $(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s$ with u as in the previous proof we get

$$\varepsilon a_k \leq a_{k+1} + sB(a_k + a_{k-1} + a_{k-2}) \tag{14}$$

(with the understanding that $a_{-1} = a_{-2} = 0$). Now we shall prove inductively that $a_k \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} a_{k+1}$. Indeed for $k=0,1$ this follows from inequality (14) and the assumption that $sB \leq \frac{\varepsilon^3}{16}$. Suppose now that the inequality is true for $k-2$ and $k-1$ then (14) results in

$$\varepsilon a_k \leq a_{k+1} + \frac{\varepsilon^3}{16}(a_k + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} a_k + \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} a_k) \leq a_{k+1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} a_k,$$

which proves the claim.

Our inductive argument gives us the inequality $a_k \leq \frac{2^n}{\varepsilon^n} a_n$, so the integrals of lower order Hessians can be estimated by $\int_{\{u<(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s\}} \omega_u^n$ and the result follows. □

Observe that when $B=0$ (in particular when ω is Kähler) the theorem above gives us the standard comparison principle.

Finally we state two "partial" comparison principles. The first one is for the Laplacian operator with respect to a Gauduchon metric:

Proposition 8.4. *Let ω be a Gauduchon metric and let $\phi,\ \psi \in PSH_\omega(X)\cap L^\infty(X)$. Then*

$$\int_{\{\phi<\psi\}} \omega_\psi \wedge \omega^{n-1} \leq \int_{\{\phi<\psi\}} \omega_\phi \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

Since the total integral of the Laplacian is independent of the potential in the Gauduchon case the proof copies the argument from the Kähler setting (see for example [Kol03]). The second one involves mixed Hessian operators. Just like in Proposition 8.1 the necessary condition for the inequality

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k}$$

to hold for any pair $u,\ v$ of bounded ω-psh functions is the constancy of the total masses $\int_X \omega_v^k \wedge \omega^{n-k}$. Observe that this is the case if ω satisfies the Guan-Li condition. It turns out that this necessary condition is also a sufficient one.

Proposition 8.5. *Let ω be a metric satisfyig the condition $\int_X \omega_v^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \int_X \omega^n$ for any bounded ω-psh function v. Then for any two bounded ω-psh functions u and v the inequality*

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_v^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \leq \int_{\{u<v\}} \omega_u^k \wedge \omega^{n-k}$$

holds.

Proof. Recall that the locality of the Monge-Ampère operator (which is independent of the underlying metric) [BT82] (see also [GZ07] [EGZ09]) yields $(\omega + dd^c \max(u,v))^n|_{\{u>v\}} = (\omega + dd^c u)^n|_{\{u>v\}}$. In fact the same argument can be applied to Hessian terms. In particular one also obtains

$$(\omega + dd^c \max(u,v))^k \wedge \omega^{n-k}|_{\{u>v\}} = (\omega + dd^c u)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k}|_{\{u>v\}}.$$

Repeating the argument from [GZ07] we obtain for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\{u-\epsilon<v\}} (\omega + dd^c v)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \int_{\{u-\epsilon<v\}} (\omega + dd^c \max(u,v))^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \\
&= \int_X (\omega + dd^c \max(u,v))^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} - \int_{\{u-\epsilon\geq v\}} (\omega + dd^c \max(u,v))^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \\
&\leq \int_X (\omega + dd^c u)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} - \int_{\{u-\epsilon>v\}} (\omega + dd^c u)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} \\
&= \int_{\{u-\epsilon\leq v\}} (\omega + dd^c u)^k \wedge \omega^{n-k},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the invariance of the total volume and the positivity of the measure in passing from the second line to the last one.

Letting $\epsilon \searrow 0$ and using monotone convergence one obtains the claimed result. $\square$

9. The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds

In this section we shall discuss in detail the solvability of the Dirichlet problem for the complex Monge-Ampère equation in the Hermitian setting. Our goal will be the following theorem:

Theorem 9.1. *Let (X, ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold of complex dimension n. Let also f be any smooth strictly positive function on X. Then the following problem*

$$(15) \qquad \begin{cases} u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X), \quad \omega + dd^c u > 0, \\ sup_X u = 0, \\ c \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (\omega + dd^c u)^n = e^c f \omega^n, \quad f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X), \quad f > 0. \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution (u, c). Furthermore there exist constants C_k, $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$ dependent only on X, ω and f, such that the C^k-th norm of the function u is bounded by C_k.

Note that we do not assume compatibility conditions on f (i.e. we do not assume that $\int_X f\omega^n = \int_X \omega^n$) but instead we introduce an additional constant c in the equation.

In the case when ω is Kähler the solvability of this equation was proved by Yau in his seminal paper [Y78]. The Hermitian case was studied by Cherrier [Che87], and later by Guan-Li, Tosatti-Weinkove [GL10, TW10a] up until the final resolution by Tosatti and Weinkove in [TW10b].

The method of proof will follow the classical continuity method approach. More precisely we consider the family of problems

$$(16) \qquad (*)_t \qquad \begin{cases} u \in PSH_\omega(X), \\ sup_X u = 0, \\ (\omega + dd^c u_t)^n = e^{c_t}(1 - t + tf)\omega^n \quad f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X), f > 0, \end{cases}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$. Clearly the problem $(*)_0$ is solvable and it is enough to prove that the set

$$A := \{T \in [0, 1] | \ (*)_t \text{ is solvable for every } t \leq T\}$$

is open and closed in $[0, 1]$.

To this end we shall first prove uniqueness of the constant c and uniqueness of the solution u. Then we pass to the openness. The hard part (as usual) is the closedness which is achieved by establishing a priori estimates for the solutions.

9.1. Uniqueness.

In [TW10b] the authors proved that if u, v are smooth ω-psh functions and their Monge-Ampère measures satisfy $\omega_u^n = e^{c_1} f\omega^n$, $\omega_v^n = e^{c_2} f\omega^n$ for some smooth function f and some constants c_1 and c_2 then in fact $c_1 = c_2$ and u and v differ by a constant. This is the counterpart of the uniqueness of potentials in the Calabi conjecture from the Kähler case.

The equality $u = v$ is easy. Indeed, suppose that we already knew that $c_1 = c_2$. Then we have

$$0 = e^{c_1} f\omega^n - e^{c_1} f\omega^n = \omega_u^n - \omega_v^n = dd^c(u - v) \wedge (\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \omega_u^k \wedge \omega_v^{n-1-k}).$$

This can be treated as a linear strictly elliptic equation with respect to $u-v$ for the coefficients of the form $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \omega_u^k \wedge \omega_v^{n-1-k}$ pointwise give strictly positive definite matrix. But then the strong maximum principle yields that $u - v$ must be a constant.

Now we show that $c_1 = c_2$. The proof is taken from [DK12] and is in the spirit of pluripotential theory. Suppose, to the contrary, that

$$\omega_u^n = e^{c_1} f\omega^n,\ \omega_v^n = e^{c_2} f\omega^n$$

for some smooth u, v. We can without loss of generality assume that $c_2 > c_1$.

Consider the Hermitian metric $\omega + dd^c u$. Since by the assumptions above it is smooth and strictly positive one finds a unique Gauduchon function ϕ_u, such that

$$inf_X \phi_u = 0,\ dd^c(e^{(n-1)\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)^{n-1}) = 0.$$

Then one can apply the comparison principle for the Laplacian with respect to the Gauduchon metric (Proposition 8.4) $e^{\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)$ which yields

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} e^{(n-1)\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)^{n-1} \wedge \omega_v \leq \int_{\{u<v\}} e^{(n-1)\phi_u}\omega_u^n.$$

Exchanging now v with $v + C$ (which does not affect the reasoning above) for big enough C one obtains

$$\int_X e^{(n-1)\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)^{n-1} \wedge \omega_v \leq \int_X e^{(n-1)\phi_u}\omega_u^n.$$

Note that the left hand side can be estimated from below using (pointwise) the AM-GM inequality:

$$\int_X e^{(n-1)\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)^{n-1} \wedge \omega_v \geq \int_X e^{(n-1)\phi_u + \frac{(c_2-c_1)}{n}}\omega_u^n.$$

Coupling the above estimates one obtains

$$1 < e^{\frac{(c_2-c_1)}{n}} \leq 1,$$

a contradiction.

9.2. **Continuity method: openness.** The openness part boils down to showing that if $(*)_T$ is solvable then the problem $(*)_t$ is also solvable for t close enough to T. This is achieved by applying the implicit function theorem between well chosen Banach spaces and linearization of the equation. Here the linearized operator is essentially the Laplacian, and we shall prove that this operator is bijective in our stteing. The details are taken from [TW10a].

First of all we need the following classical fact:

Proposition 9.2. *Let ω be a Gauduchon metric on X and let Δ_ω be the Laplacian operator with respect to ω. Then, given any $f \in L^2(X,\omega)$ there is a unique $W^{2,2}$ function u which solves the problem*

$$\Delta_\omega u = f, \quad \int_X v\omega^n = 0$$

if and only if $\int_X f\omega^n = 0$. Furthermore if $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$, then $u \in \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(X)$.

Proof. Uniqueness of normalized solutions follows from the ellipticity of Δ_ω. The formal computation

$$\int_X < \Delta_\omega u, g > \omega^n = \int_X g dd^c u \wedge \omega^{n-1} = \int_X u dd^c (g\omega^{n-1}$$
$$= \int_X (u dd^c g \wedge \omega^{n-1} + u dg \wedge d^c(\omega^{n-1}) - u d^c g \wedge d(\omega^{n-1}))$$
$$= \int_X < u, \Delta_\omega^* g > \omega^n$$

shows that the adjoint operator Δ_ω^* is second order elliptic and moreover it contains no zero order term (note that we use the Gauduchon condition here!) thus it contains only constant functions in its kernel. On the other hand, again by classical elliptic theory the image of Δ_ω in L^2 is perpendicular to the kernel of Δ_ω^* which proves the first assertion. The second assertion is a consequence of the classical Schauder theory of linear elliptic equations. □

Suppose now that at time T we have a smooth solution u to the problem $(*)_T$ (we skip the indice T for the ease of notation). Let ϕ_u denotes the Gauduchon function associated to ω_u. We normalize it by adding a constant if needed so that $\int_X e^{(n-1)\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)^n = 1$. We also fix a small positive constant $\alpha < 1$ (dependent on X, ω and n- the dependence will be important in the later stages when we prove higher order a priori estimates).

Consider the two Banach manifolds

$$B_1 := \{w \in \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(X) | \int_X w e^{(n-1)\phi_u} \omega_u^n = 0\}$$

and

$$B_2 := \{h \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(X) | \int_X e^{h+(n-1)\phi_u} \omega_u^n = 1\}.$$

Consider the mapping $\mathcal{T}: B_1 \to B_2$ given by

$$\mathcal{T}(v) := log(\frac{(\omega + dd^c u + dd^c v)^n}{(\omega + dd^c u)^n}) - log(\int_X e^{(n-1)\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u + dd^c v)^n).$$

Observe that $\mathcal{T}(0) = 0$ and that any function v sufficiently close to 0 in $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}$ norm is $\omega + dd^c u$- plurisubharmonic.

By the implicit function theorem the equation $\mathcal{T}(v) = h$ is solvable for any $h \in B_2$ sufficiently close in $\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ norm to zero if the Frechet derivative

$$(D\mathcal{T}) : T_0 B_1 = B_1 \to T_0 B_2 = \{g \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) | \int_X g e^{(n-1)\phi_u} \omega_u^n = 0\}$$

is an invertible linear mapping.

But a computation shows that

$$(D\mathcal{T})(\eta) = \Delta_{\omega+dd^c u}\eta - n\int_X e^{(n-1)\phi_u}\omega_u^{n-1}\wedge dd^c\eta.$$

Note that the last summand is zero beacuse $e^{\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)$ is Gauduchon. The question is thus whether $\Delta_{\omega+dd^c u} : B_1 \to T_0B_2$ is a continuous bijective mapping.

By Proposition 9.2 (recall that $e^{\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)$ is Gauduchon metric!) the equation

$$\Delta_{e^{\phi_u}(\omega+dd^c u)}(\eta) = \tau$$

is solvable if and only if $\int_X \tau e^{n\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)^n = 0$ and the solution is unique up to an additive constant. Note that $\Delta_{e^{\phi_u}(\omega+dd^c u)}(\eta) = e^{-\phi_u}\Delta_{(\omega+dd^c u)}(\eta)$ thus $(D\mathcal{T})(\eta) = \tau$ is solvable if and only if $\int_X \tau e^{(n-1)\phi_u}(\omega + dd^c u)^n = 0$ i.e. exactly if τ belongs to T_0B_2. This proves the surjectivity of $(D\mathcal{T})$ and injectivity follows from the normalization condition. Finally continuity of $(D\mathcal{T})$ follows from the Schauder $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}$ a priori estimates for the Laplace equation.

9.3. **Continuity method: closedness- higher order estimates.** Before starting the proofs of a priori estimates let us stress that third and higher order ones follow from standard Schauder elliptic theory as long as $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}$ estimates are proven for some small positive $\alpha < 1$. Thus we are left with proving estimates up to order $2 + \alpha$.

By the complex version of the Evans-Krylov theory (see [TWWY14] for a nice overview) there is a constant

$$C = C(X, \omega, n, ||\Delta u||_{\mathcal{C}^0}, ||u||_{\mathcal{C}^0}, ||f||_{\mathcal{C}^1})$$

and $0 < \alpha < 1$ dependent on the same quantities, such that if u solves the equation (15) then

$$||u||_{\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}} \le C.$$

Thus what remains is to prove uniform bound for the Laplacian of u, and of u itself.

9.4. **Continuity method: closedness- second order estimate.** The aim of this subsection is to prove the following estimate:

Theorem 9.3. [GL10] *If u is a solution to Equation 15 then there exists a constant $C = C(X, \omega, n, ||\Delta f||_{\mathcal{C}^0}, ||u||_{\mathcal{C}^0})$, such that*

$$0 \le n + \Delta u \le C,$$

where the Laplacian is the ordinary Chern Laplacian with respect to the metric ω.

Once we have second order estimates the gradient estimate follows by interpolation. Our proof will differ slightly from the one in [GL10] but, of course, the main idea remains the same.

Proof. Consider the function $A(u) := log(n + \Delta u) + h(u)$, where h is an additonal uniformly bounded strictly decreasing function that we shall choose later on. If we can prove that at the point z where A attains maximum we have that $n+\Delta u$ is bounded then we are done since at any other point x we have

$$log(n+\Delta u)(x) \leq A(z) - h(u(x)) \leq C.$$

Thus let us fix a point of maximum of A and identify it with zero in a local chart. We shall use ordinary partial derivatives in this chart- in particular $g_{i\bar{j},k}$ will denote $\frac{\partial g_{i\bar{j}}}{\partial z_k}$ and so on. Let us also denote by g' the metric $g_{i\bar{j}} + u_{i\bar{j}}$, while $g^{k\bar{l}}, g'^{k\bar{l}}$ will denote the inverse transposed matrices of g and g' respectively.

In order to simplify the computations let us assume that we have chosen coordinates diagonalizing the metric $g_{i\bar{j}}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}$ and then rechoose the canonical coordinates so that additionally $g_{i\bar{i},k}(0) = 0$ for any i, k. Observe that the Hessian of u is still diagonal at zero. Moreover we can safely assume that $\Delta u(0) \geq 1$, say, for otherwise we are done.

Applyting logarithm to both sides of Equation 15 and differentiating twice at z we get

$$g'^{p\bar{r}}(g_{p\bar{r},k} + u_{p\bar{r}k}) = log(f)_k + g^{p\bar{r}} g_{p\bar{r},k}; \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -g'^{p\bar{s}} g'^{h\bar{r}}(g_{h\bar{s},\bar{l}} + u_{h\bar{s}\bar{l}})(g_{p\bar{r},\bar{k}} + u_{p\bar{r}\bar{k}}) + g'^{p\bar{r}}(g_{p\bar{r},k\bar{l}} + u_{p\bar{r}k\bar{l}}) \\ = log(f)_{k\bar{l}} - g^{p\bar{s}} g^{h\bar{r}} g_{h\bar{s},\bar{l}} g_{p\bar{r},k} + g^{p\bar{r}} g_{p\bar{r},k\bar{l}}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Taking trace in the second equation we obtain

$$-g'^{p\bar{p}} g'^{r\bar{r}} |g_{r\bar{p},k} + u_{r\bar{p}k}|^2 + g'^{r\bar{r}}(g_{r\bar{r},k\bar{k}} + u_{r\bar{r}k\bar{k}}) = \Delta log(f) - |g_{p\bar{r},k}|^2 + g_{r\bar{r},k\bar{k}}. \tag{19}$$

Let us now investigate the function A at the point of maximum. From the vanishing of the first derivative of A we get the equalities

$$0 = \frac{g^{i\bar{j}}_{,k} u_{i\bar{j}} + g^{i\bar{j}} u_{i\bar{j}k}}{\Delta u + n} + h' u_k = \frac{u_{i\bar{i}k}}{\Delta u + n} + h' u_k. \tag{20}$$

(The first term in the first summand vanishes because we have chosen the special coordinates!) Taking now the trace of the Hessian of A at the point z with respect to g' we obtain the inequality

$$0 \geq g'^{k\bar{k}} A_{k\bar{k}} = g'^{k\bar{k}} [\frac{(g^{i\bar{j}} u_{i\bar{j}})_{k\bar{k}}}{\Delta u + n} - \frac{|\sum_i u_{i\bar{i}k}|^2}{(\Delta u + n)^2} + h' u_{k\bar{k}} + h'' |u_k|^2]. \tag{21}$$

From Equation (20) the second term can be exchanged by $-(h')^2 g'^{k\bar{k}} |u_k|^2$, while the third one reads $h'(n - \sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}})$. In order to estimate the first term we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (g^{i\bar{j}} u_{i\bar{j}})_{k\bar{k}} = g^{i\bar{i}}_{,k\bar{k}} u_{i\bar{i}} + u_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} \\ + 2Re(g^{i\bar{j}}_{k} u_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}}). \end{aligned}$$

The fourth order term, after taking trace with $g'^{k\bar{k}}$ can be exchanged using Equation (19).

Note that, exploiting the diagonality of g at z one has

$$g^{i\bar{j}}_{,k} = -g^{i\bar{s}} g^{l\bar{j}} g_{l\bar{s},k} = -g_{j\bar{i},k}.$$

Altogether the first term then reads

$$g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{(g^{i\bar{j}}u_{i\bar{j}})_{,k\bar{k}}}{\Delta u+n}=g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{g^{i\bar{i}}_{k\bar{k}}u_{i\bar{i}}}{\Delta u+n}$$
$$-g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{2Re(g_{j\bar{i},k}u_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}})}{\Delta u+n}-g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{g_{k\bar{k},i\bar{i}}-\Delta logf}{\Delta u+n}$$
$$-\frac{|g_{r\bar{k},i}|^2}{\Delta u+n}+\frac{g'^{r\bar{r}}g'^{k\bar{k}}|g_{r\bar{k},i}+u_{r\bar{k}i}|^2}{\Delta u+n}.$$

Note that the first summand above is controlled from below by $-C\sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}}$ with the constant C bependent on the sup norm of all second order derivatives of g. The same goes for all the terms in the third and fourth summand (the dependence of C on the relevant quantities is clear- note also that in a sense these terms are even "better" due to the Laplacian in the denominator).

Summing up our computations up to now inequality (21) results in

$$0\geq[-h'-C]\sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}}-C+[h''-(h')^2]\sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}}|u_k|^2$$
$$+\frac{g'^{r\bar{r}}g'^{k\bar{k}}|g_{r\bar{k},i}+u_{r\bar{k}i}|^2}{\Delta u+n}-g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{2Re(g_{j\bar{i},k}u_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}})}{\Delta u+n}.$$

The last summand can be rewritten as follows:

$$g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{2Re(g_{j\bar{i},k}u_{i\bar{j}\bar{k}})}{\Delta u+n}$$
$$=g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{2Re(g_{j\bar{i},k}u_{i\bar{k}\bar{j}})}{\Delta u+n}$$
$$=g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{2Re(g_{j\bar{i},k}(g_{i\bar{k},\bar{j}}+u_{i\bar{k}\bar{j}}-g_{i\bar{k},\bar{j}}))}{\Delta u+n}=$$
$$g'^{k\bar{k}}\sum_{i\neq j}\sqrt{g'^{i\bar{i}}g'_{i\bar{i}}}\frac{2Re(g_{j\bar{i},k}g'_{i\bar{k},\bar{j}})}{\Delta u+n}-g'^{k\bar{k}}\frac{2Re(g_{j\bar{i},k}g_{i\bar{k},\bar{j}})}{\Delta u+n}.$$

(We sum only over indices $i\neq j$ for in the special coordinates $g_{i\bar{i},k}=0$). Applying Schwarz inequality the latter is bounded above by

$$g'^{k\bar{k}}\sum_{i\neq j}g'^{i\bar{i}}\frac{|g'_{i\bar{k},\bar{j}}|^2}{\Delta u+n}+g'^{k\bar{k}}\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{g'_{i\bar{i}}|g_{j\bar{i},k}|^2}{n+\Delta u}$$
$$+C\sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}}\leq\sum_{i\neq j}g'^{k\bar{k}}g'^{i\bar{i}}\frac{|g'_{i\bar{k},\bar{j}}|^2}{\Delta u+n}+C\sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}},$$

where we have also used the elementary inequality $g'_{i\bar{i}}\leq\Delta u+n$.

Thus our main inequality reduces to

$$0\geq[-h'-C]\sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}}-C+[h''-(h')^2]\sum_k g'^{k\bar{k}}|u_k|^2+\frac{g'^{r\bar{r}}g'^{k\bar{k}}|g'_{r\bar{k},k}|^2}{\Delta u+n}$$

The last term can be handled as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{g^{'r\bar{r}}g^{'k\bar{k}}|g^{'}_{r\bar{k},k}|^2}{\Delta u+n}\\
&=g^{'r\bar{r}}\frac{[(\sum_k g^{'k\bar{k}}|g^{'}_{r\bar{k},k}|^2)(\sum_k g^{'}_{k\bar{k}})]}{(\Delta u+n)^2}\\
&\geq g^{'r\bar{r}}\frac{|\sum_k(u_{r\bar{k}k}+g_{r\bar{k},k})|^2}{(\Delta u+n)^2}\\
&=g^{'r\bar{r}}|h'u_r+\frac{\sum_k g_{r\bar{k},k}}{\Delta u+n}|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have made use of Equation (20).

Expanding the squares and applying Schwarz inequality once more we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{g^{'r\bar{r}}g^{'k\bar{k}}|g^{'}_{r\bar{k},k}|^2}{\Delta u+n}\\
&\geq g^{'r\bar{r}}((h')^2+h')|u_r|^2-|h'|g^{'r\bar{r}}\frac{|\sum_k g_{r\bar{k},k}|^2}{(\Delta u+n)^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and the last summand is estimated by $C\sum_r g^{'r\bar{r}}$.

Summing up our main inequality now reads

$$0\geq[-h'-C]\sum_k g^{'k\bar{k}}-C+[h''-h']\sum_k g^{'k\bar{k}}|u_k|^2.$$

So if we choose the function $h(t)=Ce^{-t}$ for a sufficiently large constant C, and assuming a bound on $osc_X u$ we end up with

$$0\geq C\sum_k g^{'k\bar{k}}-C,$$

which shows that $g^{'k\bar{k}}$ are upper bounded and hence $g^{'}_{k\bar{k}}$ are also lower bounded. From the equation we immediately get that $g^{'}_{k\bar{k}}$ are upper bounded at the point z which establishes the desired estimate. $\square$

9.5. **Continuity method: closedness- uniform estimate.** The last and historically the hardest step is to establish the uniform $\mathcal{C}^0$ estimate. The uniform estimate was proven by Cherrier, Guan-Li and Tosatti-Weinkove ([Che87, GL10, TW10a]) under various additional assumptions on the metric ω. The general result with no assumptions on ω was first accomplished by Tosatti and Weinkove in [TW10b]. There the Authors used a version of Moser iteration to obtain the following bound:

$$Vol(\{u<inf_X u+\varepsilon\})\geq\delta, \tag{22}$$

for some fixed constants ε and δ. Roughly speaking such an estimate tells us that there is some control from below on the volume of "small" sublevel sets. This coupled with suitable Sobolev inequality completes the proof, see [TW10b] for details.

Below we prove the uniform estimate using techniques from pluripotential theory taken from [DK12]. For different approaches we refer also to [BL11]. More specifically we shall prove the following result

Theorem 9.4. *Let u be a solution to the equation 15. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ dependent on $||f||_p, p, X, \omega, n$, such that $\inf_X u \geq -C$.*

In the proof we shall prove and exploit a similar bound to (22) but we shall use the capacity instead of the volume. Thus our goal is the inequality

$$cap_\omega(\{u < inf_X u + \varepsilon\}) \geq \delta.$$

Indeed suppose that such an inequality is already proven. Then exploiting Proposition 7.20 we immediately get a uniform bound of $inf_X u$ and we are done.

Let us first establish an additional capacity inequality which is modelled on an analogous argument from the Kähler setting:

Proposition 9.5. *(*[DK12],[KN1]*)Let u be a ω-psh solution of the equation $\omega_u^n = f\omega^n$, where $f \in L^p(X,\omega)$ for some $p > 1$ and v be any bounded continuous ω-psh function satisfying $-C_0 \leq v \leq 0$. Take a constant $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and let $0 < t << \varepsilon,\ 0 < s << \varepsilon$ be two sufficiently small constants. Then there is a constant $C = C(n, X, \omega, p, \varepsilon, C_0)$, such that*

$$t^n cap_\omega(\{u < (1-\varepsilon)v + inf_X[u - (1-\varepsilon)v] + s\})$$
$$\leq C||f||_{L^p} cap_\omega(\{u < (1-\varepsilon)v + inf_X[u - (1-\varepsilon)v] + s + t\})^2.$$

Proof. For notational simplicity we denote by $m(\varepsilon)$ the quantity $inf_X[u - (1-\varepsilon)v]$ and by $U(s,\varepsilon)$ the set $\{u < (1-\varepsilon)v + m(\varepsilon) + s\}$. Throughout the proof we shall assume s and t are small enough, so that all technical requrements for the application of Theorem 8.3 are satisfied.

Pick any ω-psh function w such that $0 \leq w \leq 1$. As w is a competitor for the supremum in the definition of the capacity we need to bound from above the quantity $t^n \int_{\{u<(1-\varepsilon)v+m(\varepsilon)+s\}} \omega_w^n$.

To this end observe that the following inequality holds:

$$m(\varepsilon) - (C_0+1)t \leq inf_X[u - (1-\varepsilon)((1-t)v + tw)] \leq m(\varepsilon)$$

Thus we get the following string of set inclusions

$$U(s,\varepsilon) = \{u < (1-\varepsilon)v + m(\varepsilon) + s\} \subset \{u < (1-\varepsilon)((1-t)v + tw) + m(\varepsilon) + s\}$$
$$\subset \{u < (1-\varepsilon)((1-t)v+tw) + inf_X[u-(1-\varepsilon)((1-t)v+tw)] + s + (C_0+1)t\} = V$$
$$\subset \{u < (1-\varepsilon)v + m(\varepsilon) + s + 2(C_0+1)t\} = U(s + 2(C_0+1)t, \varepsilon).$$

Note that $(1-t)v + tw$ is a ω-psh function, and the set V is defined so that Theorem 8.3 can be applied for the pair $(u, (1-t)v + tw)$ provided s and t are sufficiently small. Thus

$$((1-\varepsilon)t)^n \int_{U(s,\varepsilon)} \omega_w^n \leq ((1-\varepsilon)t)^n \int_V \omega_w^n$$
$$\leq \int_V \omega^n_{(1-\varepsilon)((1-t)v+tw)} \leq C \int_V \omega_u^n \leq C \int_{U(s+2(C_0+1)t,\varepsilon)} \omega_u^n,$$

where we have made use of Theorem 8.3 in the penultimate inequality. Note that the constant C depends on ε but is independent of u and v.

Continuing the string of inequalities we get

$$C \int_{U(s+2(C_0+1)t,\varepsilon)} \omega_u^n \leq C||f||_{L^p} cap_\omega(U(s + 2(C_0+1)t, \varepsilon))^2,$$

where the last inequality follows from Corollary 7.18. Thus our claim follows after we exchange t with $2(C_0+1)t$. □

Remark 9.6. *Observe that we haven't made use of the continuity of v. This assumption will be used later to guarantee openness of the sets $U(s,\varepsilon)$.*

Let us now explain how the above estimate implies that $cap_\omega(\{u < inf_X u+\varepsilon\}) \geq \delta$ for some ε and δ. In fact we shall prove the following more genral statement:

Proposition 9.7. *There exists a small constant s_0, such that for any $s < s_0$ one has $s \leq ||f||_{L^p}^{1/n} C cap_\omega(U(s,\varepsilon))^{\frac{1}{n}}$, for a constant C dependent on n, ϵ, X, C_0, p and ω.*

In particular we get our desired bound by plugging $v=0$ and taking any fixed positive $\varepsilon<1$.

Proof. Suppose s_0 is chosen so small that Proposition 9.5 applies for any $s,t \leq s_0$. Define inductively s_i to be the supremum of all numbers between 0 and s_{i-1} such that

$$2cap_\omega(U(s,\varepsilon)) < cap_\omega(U(s_{i-1},\varepsilon))\}.$$

Then s_i is clearly a decreasing sequence and any s_i is well defined for the sets shrink to the empty set as s decreases to zero. Observe also that $U(s,\varepsilon)$ are open sets and from the continuity of the capacity for increasing open sets (recall Proposition 7.17) we get $2cap_\omega(U(s_{i+1},\varepsilon)) \leq cap_\omega(U(s_i,\varepsilon))$, while by definition $lim_{s\to s_i^+} 2cap_\omega(U(s,\varepsilon)) \geq cap_\omega(U(s_{i-1},\varepsilon))$.

Take now an s, such that $s_i \leq s < s_{i-1}$. Then from Proposition 9.5 we get

$$(s_{i-1}-s)^n cap_\omega(U(s,\varepsilon)) \leq C cap_\omega(U(s_{i-1},\varepsilon))^2.$$

Observe that since $s \geq s_i$ we have $2cap_\omega(U(s,\varepsilon)) \geq cap_\omega(U(s_{i-1},\varepsilon))$.

Coupling these inequalities we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(s_{i-1}-s)^n &\leq 4C cap_\omega(U(s,\varepsilon))\\ &\leq 4C(\frac{1}{2})^{i-1} cap_\omega(U(s_0,\varepsilon)),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from iteration.

If we now let s to s_i, then take n-th roots and finally sum up the inequalities over i we will obtain

$$s_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(s_i - s_{i+1}) \leq (4C)^{1/n} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(\frac{1}{2})^{j\frac{1}{n}} cap_\omega(U(s_0,\varepsilon))^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

which is the claimed result. □

10. Weak solutions for degenerate right hand side

In this section we shall discuss the solvability of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} u \in PSH_\omega(X), sup_X u = 0 \\ (\omega+dd^c u)^n = e^c f \omega^n \quad f \in L^p(X,\omega),\ p>1,\ f \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

Of course the hope is to use the smooth solvability to approximate the singular right hand sides by smooth functions f_j in a suitable way, and then to extract a convergent subsequence of solutions u_j. This approach leads to a problem, namely the behavior of the constants c_j in such an approximation procedure. The technical heart of the matter if we want to extract convergent subsequences is to show that these c_j's are bounded from above and below **independently** of the supremum norms of f_j. This was proven in [KN1]:

Theorem 10.1. *Let $X, \omega, f \neq 0$ and p be as above. Let also f_j be a sequence of smooth strictly positive functions convergent in L^p norm to f. Then the corresponding sequence of contants c_j associated to the problems*

$$(*)_i \begin{cases} u_i \in PSH_\omega(X), \\ sup_X u_i = 0, \\ (\omega + dd^c u_i)^n = e^{c_i} f_i \omega^n \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

is uniformly bounded from above and below.

Proof. Let us first give a lower bound for c_j's. For the sake of brevity we drop the index j in what follows. Recall that from the proof of Proposition 9.5 applied to $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, say, and $v = 0$ one has

$$t^n cap_\omega(\{u < inf_X u + s\}) \leq C cap_\omega(\{u < inf_X u + s + t\})^2$$

for all t, s smaller than a fixed constant ε_0. Taking $t = s$ and estimating the capacity on the right hand side by an uniform constant, which is legitimate since $cap_\omega(\{u < inf_X u + s + t\}) \leq cap_\omega(X)$, one gets the inequality

$$cap_\omega(\{u < inf_X u + s\}) \leq \frac{C}{s^n}.$$

On the other side from Proposition 9.7 one has

$$s \leq (\tilde{C} e^c ||f||_{L^p})^{1/n} cap_\omega(\{u < inf_X u + s_0\})^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Coupling these one obtains

$$s^2 \leq \bar{C} e^{c/n} ||f||_{L^p}^{1/n},$$

for all $s \leq \varepsilon_0$. But then obviously c cannot decrease to minus infinity, hence we get a lower bound.

The upper bound is established as follows: since f_j converge to f in L^p, convergence also holds for $f_j^{1/n}$ towards $f^{1/n}$ in L^1 (we have to use the compactness of X here). Thus for j large enough

$$\int_X f_j^{1/n} \omega^n > \frac{\int_X f^{1/n} \omega^n}{2} > 0.$$

But from the AM-GM inequality one has $(\omega + dd^c u_j) \wedge \omega^{n-1} \geq (e^{c_j} f_j)^{1/n} \omega^n$ thus

$$e^{c_j/n} \leq \frac{2}{\int_X f^{1/n} \omega^n} \int_X (\omega + dd^c u_j) \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

if we multiply ω^{n-1} in the last integral by the Gauduchon function $e^{(n-1)\phi}$ (which is uniformly bounded) we get

$$e^{c_j/n} \leq \frac{2}{\int_X f^{1/n}\omega^n} e^{-(n-1)inf\phi} \int_X (\omega + dd^c u_j) \wedge e^{(n-1)\phi}\omega^{n-1}$$
$$= \frac{2}{\int_X f^{1/n}\omega^n} e^{-(n-1)inf\phi} \int_X e^{(n-1)\phi}\omega^n$$

by Stokes theorem. □

Now we are ready for the proof of the existence theorem:

Theorem 10.2. *The Dirichlet problem 23 admits a continuous solution.*

Proof. It is enough to show that the sequence of solutions u_j of the problems (24) admits a Cauchy subsequence in the uniform topology. Indeed then one can extract a continuous limit. The Monge-Ampère operator is continuous with respect to uniform convergence, thus the limiting function solves the equation.

First of all we can assume that (after passing to a subsequence) the sequence of the constants c_j is convergent to some c. Let us still denote this subsequence by c_j.

Note that the family u_j is normalized by $sup_X u_j = 0$, hence it forms a relatively compact subset in the L^1 topology. Thus we can assume that the u_j converge in L^1 to a ω-psh function u (take another subsequence if necessary).

Observe now that in the sequence of Dirichlet problems (24), right hand sides are uniformly bounded in L^p for the chosen subsequence. By theorem 9.4 we get that the sequence u_j is then uniformly bounded. Let then $C_0 > 0$ be a constant such that $u_j \geq -C_0$ for every j.

We shall argue by contradiction. To this end consider the quantities $S_{kj} := inf_X(u_k - u_j) \leq 0$. Since $sup_X(u_k - u_j) = -inf_X(u_j - u_k)$, it is enough to prove that the numbers S_{kj} converge to zero as k and j tend to infinity.

Suppose that this is not the case and let $1 > \varepsilon > 0$ be a constant such that $S_{kj} \leq -(C_0 + 3)\varepsilon$ for arbitrarily large $j \neq k$ (we can further decrease ε if needed). Then if $m_{kj}(\varepsilon)$ as usual denotes the infimum over X of the quantity $u_k - (1-\varepsilon)u_j$ we obtain the inequality $m_{kj}(\varepsilon) \leq S_{kj}$.

As in the proof of Proposition 9.5 suppose that $s, t << \varepsilon$. Then we have a set inclusion

$$\{u_k < (1-\varepsilon)u_j + m_{kj}(\varepsilon) + s + t\} \subset \{u_k < u_j + S_{kj} + \varepsilon C_0 + s + t\},$$

and the last set is in turn contained in

$$\{u_k < u_j - \varepsilon\} \subset \{|u_k - u_j| \geq \varepsilon\}$$

by our assumption on the constants S_{kj}.

From the proof of Proposition 9.5 we then know that for all t and s smaller than a (fixed) ε

$$t^n cap_\omega(\{u_k < (1-\varepsilon)u_j + m_{kj}(\varepsilon) + s\}) \leq C\int_{\{u_k<(1-\varepsilon)u_j+m_{kj}(\varepsilon)+s+t\}} \omega_{u_k}^n$$
$$\leq C\int_{|u_k-u_j|\geq\varepsilon}\omega_{u_k}^n = C\int_{|u_k-u_j|\geq\varepsilon} e^{c_k} f_k\omega^n$$
$$\leq C||e^{c_k}f_k||_{L^p}(Vol(|u_k-u_j|\geq\varepsilon))^{p/(p-1)}.$$

The latter quantity converges to zero as $j,k\to\infty$, as u_k converge to u in L^1. But arguing analogously to the proof of Proposition 9.7 the capacity term on the left hand side cannot converge to zero when t and s are fixed, a contradiction. □

Acknowledgment. The Author was partially supported by NCN grant 2013/08/A/ST1/00312.

References

[AB95] L. ALESSANDRINI and G. BASSANELLI: Modifications of compact balanced manifolds, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **320** (1995), 1517-1522.

[BT76] E. BEDFORD and B. A. TAYLOR: The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampère equation. Invent. Math. **37** (1976), no. 1, 1-44.

[BT82] E. BEDFORD and B. A. TAYLOR: A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions, Acta Math. **149** (1982), no. 1-2,1-40.

[BL11] Z. BLOCKI: On the uniform estimate in the Calabi-Yau theorem, II. Sci. China Math. **54** (2011), no. 7, 1375-1377.

[BDPP13] S. BOUCKSOM, J. P. DEMAILLY, M. PAUN and T. PETERNELL: The pseudo-effective cone of a compact Kähler manifold and varieties of negative Kodaira dimension, J. Alg. Geom. **22** (2013), 201-248.

[Che87] P. CHERRIER: Équations de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés hermitiennes compactes. (French) [Monge-Ampére equations on compact Hermitian manifolds] Bull. Sci. Math. (2) **111** (1987), no. 4, 343-385.

[CLN69] S.S.CHERN, H.I.LEVINE and L.NIRENBERG: Intrinsic norms on a complex manifold (1969). Global Analysis (Papers in Honor of K. Kodaira) pp. 119-139 Univ. Tokyo Press, Tokyo

[Chi] I. CHIOSE: On the invariance of the total Monge-Ampere volume of Hermitian metrics, preprint arXiv:1609.05945.

[Dem85] J. P. DEMAILLY: Champs magnetiques et inegalities de Morse pour la $\bar{\partial}$-cohomologie, Ann. Inst. Fourier **35** (1985), 189-229.

[Dem93] J. P. DEMAILLY: A numerical criterion for very ample line bundles. J. Differential Geom. **37** (1993), no. 2, 323-374.

[Dem11] J. P. DEMAILLY: Holomorphic Morse inequalities and the Green-Griffiths-Lang conjecture, Pure and Appl. Math. Quarterly **7** (2011), 1165-1208.

[Dem] J.P. DEMAILLY: Complex Analytic and Differential geometry, self published e-book.

[De81] P. DELANOË: Équations du type de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés riemanniennes compactes. II. (French) [Monge-Ampère equations on compact Riemannian manifolds. II] J. Funct. Anal. **41** (1981), no. 3, 341-353.

[D16] S. DINEW: Pluripotential theory on compact Hermitian manifolds. Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) 25 (2016), no. 1, 91-139.

[DK12] S. DINEW and S. KOLODZIEJ: Pluripotential estimates on compact Hermitian Manifolds, Advances in geometric analysis, (2012), 69-86, Adv. Lect. Math. (21).

[DOT03] G. DLOUSSKY, K. OELJEKLAUS and M. TOMA: Class VII_0 surfaces with b_2 curves, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **55** (2003) 283-309.

[EGZ09] P. EYSSIDIEUX, V. GUEDJ and A. ZERIAHI: Singular Kähler-Einstein metrics. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (2009), 607-639.

[FIUV09] M. FERNANDEZ, S. IVANOV, L. UGARTE and R. VILLACAMPA: Non Kaehler heterotic string compactifications with non-zero fluxes and constant dilation, Comm. Math. Phys. **288** (2009), 677-697.

[FPS04] A. FINO, M. PARTON and S. SALAMON: Families of strong KT structures in six dimensions. Comment. Math. Helv. **79** (2004), 317-340.

[FLY12] Y. Fu, J. LI and S. T. YAU: Balanced metrics on non-Kähler Claabi-Yau threefolds. J. Diff. Geom. **90** (2012), 81-130.

[FT] A. FINO, G. TOMASSINI: On Astheno-Kähler metrics, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **83** (2011), no. 2, 290-308.

[Ga] P. GAUDUCHON: Le théorème de l'excentricitè nulle. (French) C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **285** (1977), 387-390.

[GL10] B. GUAN and Q. LI: Complex Monge-Ampère equations and totally real submanifolds. Adv. Math. **225** (2010), 1185-1223.

[GZ05] V. GUEDJ and A. ZERIAHI: Intrinsic capacities on compact Kähler manifolds. J. Geom. Anal. **15** (2005), no. 4, 607-639.

[GZ07] V. GUEDJ and A. ZERIAHI: The weighted Monge-Ampère energy of quasi-plurisubharmonic functions. J. Funct. Anal. **250** (2007), no. 2, 442-482.

[Ho48] H. HOPF: Zur Topologie der komplexen Mannigfaltigkeiten, Studies and Essays Presented to R. Courant on his 60th Birthday, January 8, 1948, Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, pp. 167-185.

[Hö] L. HÖRMANDER: Notions of convexity. Progress in Mathematics, 127. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, (1994) viii+414 pp.

[In74] M. INOUE: On surfaces of Class VII_0. Invent. Math. **24** (1974), 269-310.

[JY93] J. JOST and S. T. Yau: A non linear elliptic system for maps from Hermitian to Riemannian manifolds and rigidity theorems in Hermitian geoemtry. Acta Math. **170** (1993), 221-254.

[Ka78] M. KATO: Compact complex manifolds containing "global" spherical shells. I, Proceedings of the International Symposium on Algebraic Geometry (Kyoto Univ., Kyoto, 1977), Tokyo: Kinokuniya Book Store, pp. 45-84..

[Kod64] K. KODAIRA: On the structure of compact complex analytic surfaces. I, Amer. J. Math. **86** (1964) 751-798.

[Kod66] K. KODAIRA: On the structure of compact complex analytic surfaces. II, Amer. J. Math. **88** (1966) 682-721.

[Kod68a] K. KODAIRA: On the structure of compact complex analytic surfaces. III, Amer. J. Math. **90** (1968) 55-83.

[Kod68b] K. KODAIRA: On the structure of complex analytic surfaces. IV, Amer. J. of Math. **90** (1968) 1048-1066.

[Kol98] S. KOLODZIEJ: The complex Monge-Ampère equation. Acta Math. **180** (1998), no. 1, 69-117.

[Kol03] S. KOLODZIEJ: The Monge-Ampère equation on compact Kähler manifolds. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **52** (2003), no.3, 667-686.

[KN1] N. C. NGUYEN and S. KOLODZIEJ: Weak solutions to the complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds, Contemp. Math. **644** (2015), 141-158.

[KN2] N. C. NGUYEN and S. KOLODZIEJ: Stability and regularity of solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian manifolds, preprint arXiv 1501.05749.

[KN3] N. C. NGUYEN and S. KOLODZIEJ: Hölder continuous solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds, preprint arXiv 1708.06516.

[KT08] S.KOLODZIEJ, G.TIAN: A uniform L^∞ estimate for complex Monge-Ampère equations. Math. Ann. **342** (2008), no. 4, 773–787.

[LT95] M. LÜBKE, A. TELEMAN: The Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence, World Scientific publishing Co. (1995).

[Mi09] K. Mitsuo: Astheno-Kähler structures on Calabi-Eckman manifolds. Colloq. Math. **155** (2009), 33-39.

[Mo79] S. MORI: Projective manifolds with ample tangent bundles. Ann. of Math. (2) **110** (1979), no. 3, 593-606.

[Na84] I. NAKAMURA: On surfaces of class VII_0 with curves, Invent. Math. **78** (3) (1984), 393-443.

[Pop13] D. POPOVICI: Deformation limits of projective manifolds: Hodge numbers and strongly Gauduchon metrics. Invent. Math. **194** (2013), no. 3, 515-534.

[Pop14a] D. POPOVICI: An Observation Relative to a Paper by J. Xiao, preprint arXiv:1405.2518, to appear in Math. Ann. as *Sufficient bigness criterion for differences of two nef classes.*

[Pop14b] D. POPOVICI: Deformation openness and closedness of various classes of compact complex manifolds; examples, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **13** (2014), no. 2, 255-305.

[Siu] Y. T. SIU: Analyticity of sets associated to Lelong numbers and the extension of closed positive currents. Invent. Math. 27 (1974), 53-156.

[Siu09] Y. T. SIU: Dynamic multiplier ideal sheaves and the construction of rational curves in Fano manifolds, preprint arXiv:0902.2809.

[T10] A. TELEMAN: Instantons and curves on class VII surfaces. Ann. of Math. (2) **172** (2010), no. 3, 1749-1804.

[TW10a] V. TOSATTI and B. WEINKOVE: Estimates for the complex Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian and balanced manifolds. Asian J. Math. **14** (2010), no. 1, 19-40.

[TW10b] V. TOSATTI and B. WEINKOVE: The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 4, 1187-1195.

[TW12] V. TOSATTI and B. WEINKOVE: Plurisubharmonic functions and nef classes on complex manifolds. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140** (2012), no. 11, 4003-4010.

[TW14] V. TOSATTI and B. WEINKOVE: The Chern-Ricci flow on complex surfaces. Compos. Math. **149** (2013), no. 12, 2101-2138.

[TWWY14] V. TOSATTI, Y. WANG, B. WEINKOVE and X. YANG: $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for nonlinear elliptic equations in complex and almost complex geometry, Calc. Var. PDE **54** (2015), 431-453.

[TZ06] G. TIAN and Z. ZHANG: On the Kähler-Ricci flow on projective manifolds of general type. Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B **27** (2006), no. 2, 179-192.

[Y78] S. T. YAU: On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation. I. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **31** (1978), no. 3, 339–411.

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, 30-409 Kraków, ul. Lojasiewicza 6, Poland / slawomir.dinew@im.uj.edu.pl