

A Liouville theorem for solutions of degenerate Monge-Ampère equations

Tianling Jin and Jingang Xiong

Abstract

In this paper, we give a new proof of a celebrated theorem of Jörgens which states that every classical convex solution of

$$\det \nabla^2 u(x) = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2$$

has to be a second order polynomial. Our arguments do not use complex analysis, and can be applied to establish such Liouville type theorems for solutions of a class of degenerate Monge-Ampère equations. We prove that every convex generalized (or Alexandrov) solution of

$$\det \nabla^2 u(x_1, x_2) = |x_1|^\alpha \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\alpha > -1$, has to be

$$u(x_1, x_2) = \frac{a}{(\alpha + 2)(\alpha + 1)} |x_1|^{2+\alpha} + \frac{ab^2}{2} x_1^2 + bx_1 x_2 + \frac{1}{2a} x_2^2 + \ell(x_1, x_2)$$

for some constants $a > 0$, b and a linear function $\ell(x_1, x_2)$.

This work is motivated by the Weyl problem with nonnegative Gauss curvature.

1 Introduction

A celebrated theorem of Jörgens states that every entire classical convex solution of

$$\det \nabla^2 u(x) = 1 \tag{1}$$

in \mathbb{R}^2 has to be a second order polynomial. This theorem was first proved by Jörgens [20] using complex analysis methods. An elementary and simpler proof, which also uses complex analysis, was later given by Nitsche [23], where Bernstein theorem for two dimensional minimal surfaces is established as a corollary. Jörgens' theorem was extended to smooth convex solutions in higher dimensions by Calabi [8] for dimension ≤ 5 and by Pogorelov [26] for all dimensions.

Another proof was given by Cheng and Yau [9] along the lines of affine geometry. Note that each local generalized solution of (1) in dimension two is smooth, but this is false in dimension ≥ 3 . Caffarelli [4] established the Jörgens-Calabi-Pogorelov theorem for generalized solutions (or viscosity solutions). Trudinger-Wang [27] proved that the only convex open subset Ω of \mathbb{R}^n which admits a convex C^2 solution of (1) in Ω with $\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} u(x) = \infty$ is $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. Caffarelli-Li [6] established the asymptotical behaviors of viscosity solutions of (1) outside of a bounded convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 2$ (the case $n = 2$ was studied before in Ferrer-Martínez-Milán [12, 13] using complex analysis), from which the Jörgens-Calabi-Pogorelov theorem follows.

In this paper, we provide a new proof of this Jörgens' theorem. Our arguments do not use complex analysis. This allows us to establish such Liouville type theorems for solutions of a class of degenerate Monge-Ampère equations. More precisely, we classify entire convex solutions of the degenerate Monge-Ampère equations

$$\det \nabla^2 u(x_1, x_2) = |x_1|^\alpha \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha > -1$. The equation (2) appears, for instance, as a blowup limiting equation of

$$\det \nabla^2 u(x_1, x_2) = (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{\alpha/2} \quad (3)$$

in Daskalopoulos-Savin [10] in the study of the Weyl problem with nonnegative Gauss curvature.

In 1916, Weyl [28] posed the following problem: Given a Riemannian metric g on the 2-dimensional sphere \mathbb{S}^2 whose Gauss curvature is positive everywhere, does there exist a global C^2 isometric embedding $X : (\mathbb{S}^2, g) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^3, ds^2)$, where ds^2 is the standard flat metric on \mathbb{R}^3 ?

Lewy [21] solved the problem in the case that g is real analytic. In 1953, Nirenberg [22] gave a solution to this problem under the regularity assumption that g has continuous fourth order derivatives. The result was later extended to the case that g has continuous third order derivatives by Heinz [17]. An entirely different approach was taken independently by Alexandrov and Pogorelov; see [1, 24, 25].

There are also work (see [19, 14, 18, 10]) which study the problem with nonnegative Gauss curvature. Guan-Li [14] showed that for any C^4 metric on \mathbb{S}^2 with nonnegative Gauss curvature, there always exists a global $C^{1,1}$ isometric embedding into (\mathbb{R}^3, ds^2) ; see also Hong-Zuily [18] for a different approach to this $C^{1,1}$ embedding result. Guan and Li asked there that whether the $C^{1,1}$ isometric embeddings can be improved to be $C^{2,\gamma}$ or even $C^{2,1}$. The problem can be reduced to regularity properties of solutions of a Monge-Ampère equation that becomes degenerate at the points where the Gauss curvature vanishes. If the Gauss curvature of g only has one nondegenerate zero, the regularity of the isometric embedding amounts to studying the regularity of solutions of (3) near the origin for $\alpha = 2$, and it has been proved in Daskalopoulos-Savin [10] that the solutions of (3) are $C^{2,\gamma}$ near the origin for $\alpha > 0$.

A comprehensive introduction to the Weyl problem and related ones can be found in the monograph Han-Hong [16].

The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let u be a convex generalized (or Alexandrov) solution of (2) with $\alpha > -1$. Then there exist some constants $a > 0$, b and a linear function $\ell(x_1, x_2)$ such that*

$$u(x_1, x_2) = \frac{a}{(\alpha + 2)(\alpha + 1)} |x_1|^{2+\alpha} + \frac{ab^2}{2} x_1^2 + bx_1x_2 + \frac{1}{2a} x_2^2 + \ell(x_1, x_2).$$

Recall that every generalized solution of (1) in an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 is strictly convex (and thus, smooth). However, this is not the case for generalized (or even classical) solutions of $\det \nabla^2 u = |x_1|^\alpha$ when $\alpha > 0$; see Example 4.3. And it follows from [3] that the generalized solutions of such equations with homogenous boundary condition are strictly convex.

The paper is organized as follows. To illustrate our method, in Section 2 we first present another proof of Jörgens' theorem, which only makes use of a few properties of harmonic functions. Those properties also hold in general for solutions of elliptic or even certain degenerate elliptic equations, such as a Grushin type equation shown in Section 3 that the partial Legendre transform of u satisfies. In Section 4, we show that entire solutions of (2) are strictly convex and prove Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgements: Both authors thank Professor YanYan Li for valuable suggestions and constant encouragement. The second author was supported in part by the First Class Postdoctoral Science Foundation of China (No. 2012M520002).

2 A new proof of Jörgens' theorem

Proof of Theorem 1.1 when $\alpha = 0$. First of all, we know that u is smooth. Define $T : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$T(x_1, x_2) = (x_1, \nabla_{x_2} u(x)) =: (p_1, p_2). \quad (4)$$

Clearly, T is injective. Recall that the partial Legendre transform $u^*(p)$ is defined as

$$u^*(p) = x_2 \nabla_{x_2} u(x) - u(x).$$

Then

- u^* is concave w.r.t. p_1 and convex w.r.t. p_2 ;
- $(u^*)^* = u$;
- $\Delta u^* = 0$ in $T(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Step 1: Prove the theorem under the assumption $T(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{R}^2$.

For simplicity, we will denote $\nabla_{x_i} u(x)$, $\nabla_{p_i} u^*(p)$ as $u_i(x)$, $u_i^*(p)$ respectively throughout the paper if there is no possibility of confusion. Since u^* is convex w.r.t. p_2 , we have

$$u_{22}^* \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta u_{22}^* = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2.$$

It follows from Liouville theorem for entire nonnegative harmonic functions that $u_{22}^* = a \geq 0$ for some constant a . By the equation of u^* , we have $u_{11}^* = -a$. Hence,

$$u^* = (-p_1^2 + p_2^2)a/2 + bp_1p_2 + \ell(p_1, p_2)$$

for some constant b and linear function ℓ . Since $u = (u^*)^*$, $a > 0$ and we are done.

Step 2: Prove $T(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{R}^2$.

We prove it by contradiction. Suppose that there exists \bar{x}_1 such that

$$\lim_{x_2 \rightarrow +\infty} u_2(\bar{x}_1, x_2) := \beta < +\infty.$$

Claim: for any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{x_2 \rightarrow +\infty} u_2(x_1, x_2) = \beta.$$

Indeed, by the convexity of u , for $t > 0$

$$u(\bar{x}_1, 0) + t\beta \geq u(\bar{x}_1, t) \geq u(x_1, x_2) + u_1(x)(\bar{x}_1 - x_1) + u_2(x)(t - x_2),$$

namely,

$$u_2(x)(1 - x_2/t) \leq \beta + \frac{1}{t}\{u(\bar{x}_1, 0) - u(x_1, x_2) - u_1(x)(\bar{x}_1 - x_1)\}.$$

Sending $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have $u_2(x_1, x_2) \leq \beta$. Hence, $\lim_{x_2 \rightarrow +\infty} u_2(x_1, x_2) \leq \beta$. Repeating this argument with x_1 and \bar{x}_1 exchanged, we would see that $\lim_{x_2 \rightarrow +\infty} u_2(x_1, x_2) \geq \beta$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\beta = 1$. Therefore,

$$T(\mathbb{R}^2) = (-\infty, +\infty) \times (\beta_0, 1)$$

for some $-\infty \leq \beta_0 < 1$. Since T is one-to-one and $u_2^*(p_1, p_2) = x_2$, we have

$$\lim_{p_2 \rightarrow 1^-} u_2^*(p_1, p_2) = +\infty,$$

i.e., for any $C > 2$, there exists ε (may depend on \bar{p}_1 which is arbitrarily fixed) such that $u_2^*(\bar{p}_1, p_2) \geq C$ for every $p_2 \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. By continuity of u_2^* , $u_2^*(p_1, 1 - \varepsilon) \geq C - 1$ for $p_1 \in (\bar{p}_1 - \delta, \bar{p}_1 + \delta)$ for some small δ . Since u_2^* is monotone increasing in p_2 , we have $u_2^*(p_1, p_2) \geq C - 1$ in $(\bar{p}_1 - \delta, \bar{p}_1 + \delta) \times (1 - \varepsilon, 1)$. This shows that

$$\lim_{(p_1, p_2) \rightarrow (\bar{p}_1, 1)} u_2^*(p_1, p_2) = +\infty$$

for any $\bar{p}_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, and in particular, u_2^* is positive near the point $(2, 1)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that u_2^* is positive in $[1, 3] \times [0, 1)$. For any $C > 0$ large, we let

$$v(p_1, p_2) := u_2^*(p_1, p_2) - Cp_2(p_1 - 1)(3 - p_1) - \frac{C}{3}p_2^3 + \frac{C}{3}.$$

Since $\Delta u_2^* = 0$, it follows that $\Delta v = 0$. By the maximum principle, $v \geq 0$ in $[1, 3] \times [0, 1)$. In particular, $v(2, \bar{p}_2) \geq 0$ where $\bar{p}_2 \in (0, 1)$ is chosen such that

$$\bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_2^3/3 - 1/3 = 1/2.$$

Hence, $u_2^*(2, \bar{p}_2) \geq C/2$ for all $C > 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

3 Homogenous Grushin type equations

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n with C^2 boundary $\partial\Omega$ such that $\Omega \cap \{x|x_1 = 0\} \neq \emptyset$. Consider

$$Lu := u_{x_1x_1} + |x_1|^\alpha u_{x_2x_2} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha > -1$. We will see later that the partial Legendre transform of solutions of (2) satisfies (5). Also, (5) appears in [7] in extension formulations for fractional Laplacian operators.

Definition 3.1. *We say a function u is a strong solution of (5) if $u \in C^1(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega \setminus \{x_1 = 0\})$ and satisfies*

$$Lu = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \{x_1 = 0\}.$$

In this following, we will see that our definition of strong solution coincides with the classical strong solutions. Indeed, $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}$ for any $1 \leq p < -\frac{1}{\alpha}$ if $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$, and u is $C^{2,\delta}$ if $\alpha \geq 0$. We have to be careful if we want to study continuous viscosity solutions of (5) which may not have uniqueness property, see Remark 4.3 in [7]. However, L^p -viscosity solutions of certain elliptic equations with coefficients deteriorating along some lower dimensional manifolds would be such strong solutions, see, e.g., [29]. The following proposition is in the same spirit of Lemma 4.2 in [7]. For regularity properties of solutions of a more general class of quasilinear degenerate elliptic equations we refer to [11].

Proposition 3.2. *For any $g \in C(\partial\Omega)$, there exists a unique strong solution u of (5) with $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ and $u = g$ on $\partial\Omega$. Furthermore, we have*

$$\max_{\bar{\Omega}} u \leq \max_{\partial\Omega} g, \quad \min_{\bar{\Omega}} u \geq \min_{\partial\Omega} g, \quad (6)$$

and, for any $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{l=0}^k \|\nabla_{x_2}^l u\|_{C^1(\Omega')} \leq C \|g\|_{C^0(\partial\Omega)}, \quad (7)$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \alpha, k, \text{dist}(\Omega', \partial\Omega)$.

Proof. Uniqueness. Clearly, the uniqueness would follow from (6). The proof of uniqueness in Lemma 4.2 in [7] can be applied to obtain (6) and we include it for completeness. Let u be a strong solution of (5) with $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $u = g$ on $\partial\Omega$. Let $v = u - \max_{\partial\Omega} g + \varepsilon|x_1|$, where ε is small. Suppose v has an interior maximum point \bar{x} in Ω . Then $\bar{x}_1 = 0$, since otherwise v satisfies an elliptic equation near \bar{x} which does not allow an interior maximum point. On the other hand, if $\bar{x}_1 = 0$, then \bar{x} can not be a maximum point of v since $\partial_+ v(\bar{x}) > \partial_- v(\bar{x})$. Therefore, the maximum of v is achieved on $\partial\Omega$, i.e. $u - \max_{\partial\Omega} g + \varepsilon|x_1| \leq \varepsilon \text{diam}(\Omega)$. Sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $\max_{\overline{\Omega}} u \leq \max_{\partial\Omega} g$. Similarly, we can show that $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} u \geq \min_{\partial\Omega} g$.

Existence. For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, let $0 < \eta_\varepsilon(x_1) \in C^\infty(-\infty, \infty)$ such that

$$\eta_\varepsilon(x_1) = |x_1|^\alpha \quad \text{for } |x_1| > 2\varepsilon; \quad \eta_\varepsilon(x_1) = \varepsilon^\alpha \quad \text{for } |x_1| \leq \varepsilon.$$

By the standard linear elliptic equation theory, there exists a unique solution $u^\varepsilon \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ of

$$L_\varepsilon u^\varepsilon := u_{x_1 x_1}^\varepsilon + \eta_\varepsilon u_{x_2 x_2}^\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (8)$$

and $u^\varepsilon = g$ on Ω . By the maximum principle, we have $\sup_\Omega |u^\varepsilon| \leq \sup_{\partial\Omega} |g|$. We will establish proper uniform norms of u^ε and obtain the desired solution by sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Our proof of this part is different from [7] which uses Caffarelli-Gutiérrez's Harnack inequality [5] to obtain uniform interior Hölder norms of those approximating solutions. Instead, we establish an interior bound of $u_{x_2}^\varepsilon$ first, as in Daskalopoulos-Savin [10]. In view of the standard uniformly elliptic equation theory, we only need to concern about the area near $\{x_1 = 0\}$. Suppose that $0 \in \Omega$ and $B_\tau \subset \Omega$ for some small $\tau > 0$. We shall show that $\|u_{x_2}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_{\tau/2})} \leq C$ for some C independent of ε .

We claim that there exists a large universal constant β such that

$$L_\varepsilon(\beta(u^\varepsilon)^2 + (\varphi u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (9)$$

where φ is some cutoff function in B_τ satisfying $\varphi = 1$ in $B_{\tau/2}$, $\varphi = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus B_\tau$, and $\varphi_{x_1} = 0$ for all $|x_1| \leq \tau/4$.

Indeed, a simple computation yields

$$L_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)^2 = 2((u_{x_1}^\varepsilon)^2 + \eta_\varepsilon(u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L_\varepsilon(\varphi u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2 &= L_\varepsilon \varphi^2 (u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2 + \varphi^2 L_\varepsilon (u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2 + 2(\varphi^2)_{x_1} ((u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2)_{x_1} + 2\eta_\varepsilon (\varphi^2)_{x_2} ((u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2)_{x_2} \\ &= L_\varepsilon \varphi^2 (u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2 + 2\varphi^2 ((u_{x_2 x_1}^\varepsilon)^2 + \eta_\varepsilon (u_{x_2 x_2}^\varepsilon)^2) + 8(\varphi_{x_1} u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)(\varphi u_{x_2 x_1}^\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + 8\eta_\varepsilon (\varphi_{x_2} u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)(\varphi u_{x_2 x_2}^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} L_\varepsilon(\beta(u^\varepsilon)^2 + (\varphi u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2) &\geq 2\beta\eta_\varepsilon (u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2 + 2\varphi^2 ((u_{x_2 x_1}^\varepsilon)^2 + \eta_\varepsilon (u_{x_2 x_2}^\varepsilon)^2) \\ &\quad + L_\varepsilon \varphi^2 (u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)^2 + 8(\varphi_{x_1} u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)(\varphi u_{x_2 x_1}^\varepsilon) + 8\eta_\varepsilon (\varphi_{x_2} u_{x_2}^\varepsilon)(\varphi u_{x_2 x_2}^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy inequality and the facts

$$L_\varepsilon(\varphi^2) \geq -C_1\eta_\varepsilon, \quad |\varphi_{x_1}u_{x_2}^\varepsilon| \leq C_1\eta_\varepsilon|u_{x_2}^\varepsilon|,$$

the claim follows for large β independent of ε .

By (9) and the maximum principle, we have

$$\sup_{B_{\tau/2}} |u_{x_2}^\varepsilon| \leq \beta^{1/2} \sup_{\Omega} |u^\varepsilon|.$$

Since $Lu_{x_2}^\varepsilon = 0$, the same arguments can be applied inductively to show that $\partial^k u^\varepsilon / \partial x_2^k$ are bounded in the interior of Ω for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Since $|u_{x_2x_2}^\varepsilon| \leq C$ for some C independent of ε and $u_{x_1x_1}^\varepsilon + \eta_\varepsilon u_{x_2x_2}^\varepsilon = 0$, we have

$$|u_{x_1}^\varepsilon| \leq C \int_{-1}^1 \eta_\varepsilon(x_1) dx_1 + C,$$

where we used the fact that $u_{x_1}^\varepsilon$ is bounded uniformly for $B_{3\tau/4} \cap \{x \mid |x_1| \geq \tau/4\}$. Since $\alpha > -1$, the integral $\int_{-1}^1 \eta_\varepsilon(x_1) dx_1$ can be bounded independent of ε . The same arguments would show that $u_{x_1x_2}^\varepsilon$ and $u_{x_1x_2x_2}^\varepsilon$ are bounded as well.

For $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$ and any point $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \in B_{\tau/4}$, by the Taylor's formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} & u^\varepsilon(x_1, \bar{x}_2) \\ &= u^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + u_{x_1}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_1 - \bar{x}_1) + (x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2 \int_0^1 (1 - \lambda) u_{x_1x_1}^\varepsilon(\xi_\lambda, \bar{x}_2) d\lambda \\ &= u^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + u_{x_1}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_1 - \bar{x}_1) - (x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2 \int_0^1 (1 - \lambda) u_{x_2x_2}^\varepsilon(\xi_\lambda, \bar{x}_2) \eta(\xi_\lambda) d\lambda \\ &= u^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + u_{x_1}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_1 - \bar{x}_1) - u_{x_2x_2}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2 \int_0^1 (1 - \lambda) \eta(\xi_\lambda) d\lambda \\ &\quad + O(|x_1 - \bar{x}_1|^3 \int_0^1 \eta(\xi_\lambda) d\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_\lambda = \bar{x}_1 + \lambda(x_1 - \bar{x}_1)$. One should note that $\int_0^1 \eta(\xi_\lambda) d\lambda \leq C|x_1 - \bar{x}_1|^\alpha$ for some constant $C > 0$ independent of ε . Making use of Taylor's formula again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(x_1, x_2) &= u^\varepsilon(x_1, \bar{x}_2) + u_{x_2}^\varepsilon(x_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_2 - \bar{x}_2) + \frac{1}{2} u_{x_2x_2}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_2 - \bar{x}_2)^2 \\ &\quad + O(|x_2 - \bar{x}_2|^3 + |(x_1 - \bar{x}_1)(x_2 - \bar{x}_2)^2|), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$u_{x_2}^\varepsilon(x_1, \bar{x}_2) = u_{x_2}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + u_{x_1x_2}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_1 - \bar{x}_1) + O(|x_1 - \bar{x}_1|^{2+\alpha}).$$

Therefore,

$$|u^\varepsilon(x_1, x_2) - u^\varepsilon(x_1, \bar{x}_2) - u_{x_1}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_1 - \bar{x}_1) - u_{x_2}^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)(x_2 - \bar{x}_2)| \leq C|x - \bar{x}|^{2+\alpha}.$$

By the arbitrary choice of \bar{x} , we conclude that

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,1+\alpha}(B_{\tau/4})} \leq C. \quad (10)$$

The same argument is also applicable to $\alpha \geq 0$, and one can conclude that

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{C^{2,\delta}(B_{\tau/4})} \leq C \quad (11)$$

for some $\delta > 0$ depending only on α .

By passing to a subsequence, we obtain a strong solution u of (5) and u satisfies (7). \square

Remark 3.3. *From the proof of Proposition 3.2, we see that:*

- If $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$, $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1+\alpha}(\Omega)$;
- If $\alpha \geq 0$, $u \in C_{loc}^{2,\delta}(\Omega)$ for some $\delta > 0$ depending only on α .

Let

$$\phi(x_1, x_2) = |x_1|^{2+\alpha} + x_2^2 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (12)$$

Then

$$\nabla^2 \phi = \begin{pmatrix} (2+\alpha)(1+\alpha)|x_1|^\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$(\nabla^2 \phi)^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{(2+\alpha)(1+\alpha)}|x_1|^{\alpha/2} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, $\det \nabla^2 \phi = c(\alpha)|x_1|^\alpha$, where $c(\alpha) = 2(\alpha+2)(\alpha+1) > 0$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t > 0$, denote

$$S(x, t) = S_\phi(x, t) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 | \phi(y) < \ell(y) + t\},$$

where $\ell(y)$ is the support plane of ϕ at $(x, \phi(x))$. It is direct to verify

Condition μ_∞ [5]: *For any given $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all sections S and all small subsets $E \subset S$,*

$$\frac{|E|}{|S|} < \delta_2 \quad \text{implies} \quad \frac{\int_E |x_1|^\alpha dx}{\int_S |x_1|^\alpha dx} < \delta_1. \quad (13)$$

Let

$$A(x_1, x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} |x_1|^{-\alpha} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly,

$$B := (\nabla^2 \phi)^{1/2} A (\nabla^2 \phi)^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} (2 + \alpha)(1 + \alpha) & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is positive definite if $\alpha > -1$. Therefore, we can apply Caffarelli-Gutiérrez's Harnack inequality [5] to obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $u \geq 0$ be a strong solution of*

$$Lu = 0 \quad \text{in } S(x_0, 2),$$

where x_0 is an arbitrary point in \mathbb{R}^2 . Then there exists a positive constant β depending only on α such that

$$\sup_{S(x_0, 1)} u \leq \beta \inf_{S(x_0, 1)} u.$$

Corollary 3.5. *Let u be a strong solution of*

$$Lu = 0 \quad \text{in } S(0, 2).$$

Then there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ depending only on α such that

$$\|u\|_{C^\gamma(S(0, 1))} \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(S(0, 2))}.$$

Theorem 3.6. *Let u be a nonnegative strong solution of*

$$Lu = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{14}$$

Then u is a constant in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Proof. Consider the scaling $u_r = \frac{1}{r} u(r^{1/(2+\alpha)} x_1, r^{1/2} x_2)$ for $r > 0$. Then u_r also satisfies (14). By Proposition 3.4, we have

$$\sup_{S(0, 2)} u_r \leq \beta u_r(0).$$

It follows from Corollary 3.5 that

$$[u_r]_{C^\gamma(S(0, 1))} \leq C \beta u_r(0).$$

For any two distinct points x, y in \mathbb{R}^2 , we have, for sufficiently large r ,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| &= r |u_r(r^{-1/(2+\alpha)} x_1, r^{-1/2} x_2) - u_r(r^{-1/(2+\alpha)} y_1, r^{-1/2} y_2)| \\ &\leq r [u_r]_{C^\gamma(S(0, 1))} |r^{-2/(2+\alpha)} (x_1 - y_1)^2 + r^{-1} (x_2 - y_2)^2|^{\gamma/2} \\ &\leq C \beta u(0) |r^{-2/(2+\alpha)} (x_1 - y_1)^2 + r^{-1} (x_2 - y_2)^2|^{\gamma/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Sending $r \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $u(x) = u(y)$. The proof is completed. \square

4 Regularity for solutions of degenerate Monge-Ampère equations

Define the measure μ_α in \mathbb{R}^2 as $d\mu_\alpha = |x_1|^\alpha dx_1 dx_2$ for $\alpha > -1$. For any bounded open convex set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, it is clear that the measure μ_α has the *doubling property* in Ω , i.e., there exists a constant $c_\alpha > 0$, depending only on α and Ω , such that for any $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \in \Omega$ and any ellipsoids $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ centered at origin with $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + E \in \Omega$ there holds

$$\mu_\alpha((\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + E) \geq c_\alpha \mu_\alpha(((\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + 2E) \cap \Omega). \quad (15)$$

Consequently, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Ω be an open convex set in \mathbb{R}^2 , and u be the generalized solution of*

$$\det \nabla^2 u(x) = |x_1|^\alpha \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

with $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then u is strictly convex in Ω , $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\delta}(\Omega)$ for some $\delta > 0$ depending only on α . Furthermore, the partial Legendre transform u^* of u is a strong solution of

$$Lu^* = 0 \quad \text{in } T(\Omega),$$

where the map T is given in (4).

Proof. The strict convexity and the $C^{1,\delta}$ regularity was proved in [2, 3]. Hence, T is continuous and one-to-one, and thus, $T(\Omega)$ is open. Let $u_k \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ be the solution of

$$\det \nabla^2 u_k = \eta_{1/k}(x_1) \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (16)$$

with $u_k = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, where $\eta_{1/k}(x_1)$ is the same as the one in the proof of Proposition 3.2 with $\varepsilon = 1/k$. Let

$$T_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_1, \partial_2 u_k(x)),$$

and u_k^* be the partial Legendre transform of u_k . Then u_k^* satisfies (8). Clearly, up to a subsequence, $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $C_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k(x) = T(x)$ for any $x \in \Omega$, and for any $y \in T(\Omega)$ there exists λ sufficiently small such that $B_\lambda(y) \subset T(\Omega) \cap T_k(\Omega)$ for every large k . By the same argument used in proof of Proposition 3.2, we can conclude that $u^* \in C^1(T(\Omega)) \cap C^2(T(\Omega) \setminus \{x_1 = 0\})$ and satisfies $Lu^* = 0$ in $T(\Omega) \setminus \{x_1 = 0\}$. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let u be a generalized solution of (2). Then u is strictly convex.*

Proof. By the two dimensional Monge-Ampère equation theory, if u is a generalized solution of

$$\det \nabla^2 u \geq c_0 > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where Ω is an open set in \mathbb{R}^2 , then u is locally strictly convex in Ω . Hence, we only need to consider the situation $\alpha > 0$. After subtracting a supporting plane of u at origin, we may assume that

$$u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \quad \text{and } u(0) = 0.$$

Claim: There exists a sufficiently large $R > 0$ such that

$$\min_{\partial B_R} u > 0. \tag{17}$$

Indeed, if not, namely, $\min_{\partial B_R} u = 0$ for all sufficiently large $R > 0$. The strict convexity of u away from $\{x_1 = 0\}$ implies $u(Re_2) = 0$ or $u(-Re_2) = 0$, where $e_2 = (0, 1)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $u(Re_2) = 0$. Let

$$M = \max_{\partial B_1} u > 0,$$

and Δ be the triangle generated by the segment $\{(x_1, 0) \mid |x_1| \leq 1\}$ and the point Re_2 . By the convexity of u , we have

$$M \geq u \quad \text{in } \Delta.$$

It is clear that the ellipsoid

$$E = \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1^2 + \frac{1}{R^2}(x_2 - R/4)^2 = \frac{1}{16}\}$$

sits in Δ . Let

$$u_R(y_1, y_2) = \frac{1}{R}u(y_1, R(y_2 + 1/4)).$$

We have

$$\det \nabla^2 u_R(y_1, y_2) = |y_1|^\alpha \quad \text{in } B_{1/4},$$

and $u_R \leq \frac{M}{R}$ in $B_{1/4}$. Choosing a small constant $\tau > 0$, depending only on α , such that

$$S_\phi(0, \tau) \subset B_{1/4},$$

where ϕ is given in (12). By the comparison principle (see, e.g., [15]),

$$0 \leq u_R \leq \sqrt{c(\alpha)^{-1}}(\phi - \tau) + \max_{\partial S(0, \tau)} u_R \quad \text{in } S_\phi(0, \tau),$$

where $c(\alpha) = 2(\alpha + 2)(\alpha + 1)$. In particular,

$$0 \leq -\sqrt{c(\alpha)^{-1}}\tau + \max_{\partial S(0, \tau)} u_R \leq -\sqrt{c(\alpha)^{-1}}\tau + M/R.$$

That is

$$R \leq \frac{\sqrt{c(\alpha)}M}{\tau},$$

which contradicts to the assumption that R can be arbitrarily large.

Thus, (17) holds and we can conclude Theorem 4.2 from Theorem 4.1. \square

One might ask if every solution of

$$\det \nabla^2 u = |x_1|^\alpha \quad \text{in } B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$$

is strictly convex, where $\alpha > 0$. The following example shows that this is not the case.

Example 4.3. *It is clear that for every $\alpha > 0$ there always exists a positive convex smooth solution w of the ODE*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\alpha(\alpha+2)}{4}w(t)w(t)'' - \frac{(\alpha+2)^2}{4}(w'(t))^2 = 1, \\ w(0) = 1, \\ w'(0) = 1, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

near $t = 0$. Then $u = |x_1|^{\frac{\alpha+2}{2}}w(x_2)$ is a generalized solutions of $\det \nabla^2 u = |x_1|^\alpha$ in a small open set in \mathbb{R}^2 . But u is not strictly convex (is smooth for certain α , though). By proper scaling and translation we can make the equation holds in B_1 .

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let u be a generalized solution of (2). It follows from Theorem 4.2 that u is strictly convex, and hence u is smooth away from $\{x_1 = 0\}$. By Theorem 4.1, we know that $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and the partial Legendre transform u^* of u is a strong solution of

$$Lu^* = u_{11}^* + |p_1|^\alpha u_{22}^* = 0 \quad \text{in } T(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad (19)$$

where $u_{ii}^* = u_{p_i p_i}^*$ and $T(x_1, x_2) = (x_1, u_{x_2}(x_1, x_2)) = (p_1, p_2)$. Moreover, T is continuous and one-to-one.

Given Theorem 3.6 and Proposition 3.4, the rest of the proof is similar to that in Section 2 for $\alpha = 0$.

Step 1: Prove the theorem under the assumption: $T(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{R}^2$.

Since u^* is convex with respect to p_2 , we have that $u_{22}^* \geq 0$. Note that $Lu_{22}^* = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . By Theorem 3.6, $u_{22}^* \equiv a$ for some nonnegative constant a . By the equation $Lu^* = 0$, we have $u_{11}^* = -a|p_1|^\alpha$. Hence, $u_{121}^* \equiv u_{122}^* \equiv 0$ in $\{p_1 > 0\}$. Consequently, $u_{12}^* \equiv b$ in $\{p_1 > 0\}$ for some constant b . It follows from calculus that

$$u^* = -\frac{a}{(\alpha+1)(\alpha+2)}|p_1|^{2+\alpha} + \frac{a}{2}p_2^2 + bp_1p_2 + \ell(p_1, p_2) \quad (20)$$

for some linear function ℓ in $\{p_1 > 0\}$. The same argument applies to $\{p_1 < 0\}$. Since $u^*, u_2^* \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, (20) holds for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Since $u = (u^*)^*$, $a > 0$ and we are done.

Step 2: Prove: $T(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{R}^2$.

We prove it by contradiction. Suppose that there exists \bar{x}_1 such that $\lim_{x_2 \rightarrow \infty} u_2(\bar{x}_1, x_2) := \beta_2 < \infty$. Then, as in Section 2, $\lim_{x_2 \rightarrow \infty} u_2(x_1, x_2) = \beta$ for every $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, and we may assume

$\beta = 1$. Therefore, $T(\mathbb{R}^2) = (-\infty, \infty) \times (\beta_0, 1)$ for some $-\infty \leq \beta_0 < 1$. Since T is one-to-one and $u_2^*(p_1, p_2) = x_2$, we have $\lim_{p_2 \rightarrow 1^-} u_2^*(p_1, p_2) = \infty$. The same argument in Section 2 shows that

$$\lim_{(p_1, p_2) \rightarrow (\bar{p}_1, 1)} u_2^*(p_1, p_2) = +\infty$$

for any $\bar{p}_1 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Case 1: $\alpha \geq 0$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that u_2^* is positive in $[1, 3] \times [0, 1)$. For any $C > 0$ large, we let

$$v(p_1, p_2) := u_2^*(p_1, p_2) - Cp_2(p_1 - 1)(3 - p_1) - \frac{C}{3}p_2^3 + \frac{C}{3}.$$

It is direct to check that $Lv < 0$ in $[1, 3] \times [0, 1)$. By the maximum principle, $v \geq 0$ in $[1, 3] \times [0, 1)$. In particular, $v(2, \bar{p}_2) \geq 0$ where $\bar{p}_2 \in (0, 1)$ is chosen such that

$$\bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_2^3/3 - 1/3 = 1/2.$$

Hence, $u_2^*(2, \bar{p}_2) \geq C/2$ for all $C > 0$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2: $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that u_2^* is positive in $[1/2, 1] \times [0, 1)$. For any $C > 0$ large, we let

$$v(p_1, p_2) := u_2^*(p_1, p_2) - Cp_2(p_1 - 1/2)(1 - p_1) - \frac{C}{3}p_2^3 + \frac{C}{3}.$$

It is direct to check that $Lv < 0$ in $[1, 3] \times [0, 1)$. By the maximum principle, $v \geq 0$ in $[1/2, 1] \times [0, 1)$. In particular, $v(3/4, \bar{p}_2) \geq 0$ where $\bar{p}_2 \in (0, 1)$ is chosen such that

$$\bar{p}_2/16 + \bar{p}_2^3/3 - 1/3 = 1/32.$$

Hence, $u_2^*(3/4, \bar{p}_2) \geq C/32$ for all $C > 0$, which is a contradiction.

The proof is completed. □

References

- [1] Alexandrov, A.D.: *Intrinsic Geometry of Convex Surfaces*, OGIz, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948.
- [2] Caffarelli, L.: *A localization property of viscosity solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation and their strict convexity*, Ann. of Math. (2) **131** (1990), no. 1, 129–134.
- [3] Caffarelli, L.: *Some regularity properties of solutions of Monge Ampère equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44** (1991), no. 8-9, 965–969.

- [4] Caffarelli, L.: “Topics in PDEs: The Monge-Ampère equation.” Graduate course. Courant Institute, New York University, 1995.
- [5] Caffarelli, L.; Gutiérrez, C.: *Properties of the solutions of the linearized Monge-Ampère equation*, Amer. J. Math. **119** (1997), no. 2, 423–465.
- [6] Caffarelli, L.; Li, Y.Y.: *An extension to a theorem of Jörgens, Calabi, and Pogorelov*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **56** (2003), 549–583.
- [7] Caffarelli, L.; Silvestre, L.: *An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian*, Comm. Partial. Diff. Equ., **32** (2007), 1245–1260.
- [8] Calabi, E.: *Improper affine hyperspheres of convex type and a generalization of a theorem by K. Jörgens*, Michigan Math. J. **5** (1958), 105–126.
- [9] Cheng, S. Y.; Yau, S. T.: *Complete affine hypersurfaces. I. The completeness of affine metrics*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), no. 6, 839–866.
- [10] Daskalopoulos, P.; Savin, O.: *On Monge-Ampère equations with homogeneous right-hand sides*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62** (2009), no. 5, 639–676.
- [11] Guan, P.: *Regularity of a class of quasilinear degenerate elliptic equations*, Adv. Math. **132** (1997), no. 1, 24–45.
- [12] Ferrer, L.; Martínez, A.; Milán, F.: *An extension of a theorem by K. Jörgens and a maximum principle at infinity for parabolic affine spheres*, Math. Z. **230** (1999), 471–486.
- [13] Ferrer, L.; Martínez, A.; Milán, F.: *The space of parabolic affine spheres with fixed compact boundary*, Monatsh. Math. **130** (2000), no. 1, 19–27.
- [14] Guan, P.; Li, Y.Y.: *The Weyl problem with nonnegative Gauss curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **39** (1994), no. 2, 331–342.
- [15] Gutiérrez, C. E.: *The Monge-Ampère equation. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*, 44. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2001.
- [16] Han, Q.; Hong, J.-X.: “Isometric embedding of Riemannian manifolds in Euclidean spaces.” American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.
- [17] Heinz, E.: *On Weyl’s embedding problem*, J. Math. Mech. **11** (1962), 421–454.
- [18] Hong, J.; Zuily, C.: *Isometric embedding of the 2-sphere with nonnegative curvature in \mathbb{R}^3* , Math. Z. **219** (1995), no. 3, 323–334.
- [19] Iaiia, J.A.: *Isometric embeddings of surfaces with nonnegative curvature in \mathbb{R}^3* , Duke Math. J. **67** (1992), 423–459.
- [20] Jörgens, K.: *Über die Lösungen der Differentialgleichung $rt - s^2 = 1$* , Math. Ann. **127**, (1954), 130–134.
- [21] Lewy, H.: *On the existence of a closed convex surface realizing a given Riemannian metric*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **24** (1938), 104–106.
- [22] Nirenberg, L.: *The Weyl and Minkowski problems in differential geometry in the large*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **6** (1953), 337–394.
- [23] Nitsche, J. C. C.: *Elementary proof of Bernstein’s theorem on minimal surfaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **66** (1957), 543–544.
- [24] Pogorelov, A. V.: *On convex surfaces with a regular metric*, Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) **67** (1949), 791–794.
- [25] Pogorelov, A. V.: *On the regularity of convex surfaces with regular metric*, Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) **66** (1949), 1051–1053.
- [26] Pogorelov, A. V.: *On the improper convex affine hyperspheres*, Geometriae Dedicata **1** (1972), no. 1, 33–46.

- [27] Trudinger, N. S.; Wang, X.-J.: *The Bernstein problem for affine maximal hypersurfaces*, Invent. Math. **140** (2000), 399–422.
- [28] Weyl, H.: *ber die Bestimmung einergeschlossen konvexen Flche durch ihr Linienelement*, Vierteljahrsschrift Naturforsch. Gesellschaft **61** (1916), 40–72.
- [29] Xiong, J.: *$C^{1,1}$ estimates for elliptic equations with partial and piecewise continuous coefficients*, Methods and Applications of Analysis, **18** (2011), 373–390.

T. Jin

Department of Mathematics, The University of Chicago
5734 S. University Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

Email: tj@math.uchicago.edu

J. Xiong

Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University
Beijing 100871, China

Email: jxiong@math.pku.edu.cn