

THE EIGENVALUE PROBLEM FOR THE COMPLEX MONGE-AMPÈRE OPERATOR

PAPA BADIANE AND AHMED ZERIAHI

A tribute to Professor Jean-Pierre Demailly

ABSTRACT. We prove the existence of the first eigenvalue and an associated eigenfunction with Dirichlet condition for the complex Monge-Ampère operator on a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n . We show that the eigenfunction is plurisubharmonic, smooth with bounded Laplacian in Ω and boundary values 0. Moreover it is unique up to a positive multiplicative constant.

To this end, we follow the strategy used by P.L. Lions in the real case. However, we have to prove a new theorem on the existence of solutions for some special complex degenerate Monge-Ampère equations. This requires establishing new a priori estimates of the gradient and Laplacian of such solutions using methods and results of L. Caffarelli, J.J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck [9] and B. Guan [21].

Finally we provide a Pluripotential variational approach to the problem and using our new existence theorem, we prove a Rayleigh quotient type formula for the first eigenvalue of the complex Monge-Ampère operator.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain of \mathbb{C}^n with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and $0 < f \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

Our goal is to solve the eigenvalue problem with Dirichlet boundary condition for a twisted complex Monge-Ampère operator.

The problem consists in finding a couple (λ, u) , with $\lambda > 0$ and $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = (-\lambda u)^n f^n \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ \|u\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1, \end{cases}$$

Date: June 7, 2023.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32U05, 32W20, 35J66, 35J96.

Key words and phrases. Plurisubharmonic function, Complex Monge-Ampère operator, Dirichlet Problem, Subsolution, Eigenvalue Problem, Energy Functional.

The authors were supported by the Direction Europe de la Recherche et Coopération Internationale (DERCI) of CNRS, through the project EMAC .

where $\omega := dd^c|z|^2$ is the standard Kähler form on \mathbb{C}^n . Here we use the standard differential operators $d = \partial + \bar{\partial}$ and $d^c := (i/2)(\bar{\partial} - \partial)$ so that $dd^c = i\partial\bar{\partial}$.

P. L. Lions solved the existence problem of the first eigenvalue with Dirichlet boundary condition for the real Monge-Ampère operator on a smooth bounded strongly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^N (see [29]). He claimed that using the results of L. Caffarelli, J.J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck [9], all his results extend without changes to the case of the complex Monge-Ampère operator.

We were not able to directly apply the results of [9] as claimed by Lions to solve the problem in the complex case. Indeed we have to deal with complex Monge-Ampère equations with a right hand side of the type $\psi_\varepsilon(z, u) := (\varepsilon - \lambda u)^n f(z)^n$ with $\varepsilon > 0$. Since these functions are decreasing in u and $\psi_\varepsilon(z, 0) \equiv \varepsilon f(z)^n$ is completely degenerate at the boundary as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, the existence results of [9] and [21] do not apply directly in this case.

Instead, we will establish a new existence theorem for degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations of this type (see Theorem 3.1) based on the fundamental theorem of [9] and new Laplacian a priori estimates for the inverse Monge-Ampère operator.

Let us state our first main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain with smooth boundary and $0 < f \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ be a smooth positive function in $\bar{\Omega}$.*

Then there exists a real number $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(\Omega, f) > 0$ and a function $u_1 \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\|u_1\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1$ such that the pair (λ_1, u_1) is the unique solution to the eigenvalue problem (1.1).

The number λ_1 will be called the first eigenvalue of the complex Monge-Ampère operator with respect to the volume form $d\nu_f := f^n \omega^n$ and u_1 will be called its associated normalized eigenfunction.

Here $C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ denotes the space of all function $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ such that its Laplacian Δu in the sense of distributions is a bounded function $\Delta u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ i.e.

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})} := \|u\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} + \|\nabla u\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < +\infty.$$

By the Calderon-Zygmund theory a function $u \in C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies $u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ and then by Sobolev spaces theory (Morrey's Lemma), it follows that $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ (see [20]).

We do not know if the eigenfunction u_1 in our theorem satisfies $u_1 \in C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega})$.

On the other hand we develop a general variational approach to the problem of the existence of a first eigenvalue for more general twisted Monge-Ampère operators. Using this approach and our new existence theorem we

are able to prove a Rayley quotient type formula for the eigenvalue. This is our second main result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain with smooth boundary and $0 < f \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ be a smooth positive function in $\bar{\Omega}$. Let (λ_1, u_1) be the normalized solution of the eigenvalue problem (1.1). Then*

$$\lambda_1^n = \frac{\int_{\Omega} (-u_1)(dd^c u_1)^n}{\int_{\Omega} (-u_1)^{n+1} d\nu_f} = \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} (-\phi)(dd^c \phi)^n}{\int_{\Omega} (-\phi)^{n+1} d\nu_f}; \phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega), \phi \neq 0 \right\},$$

where $d\nu_f = f^n \omega^n$.

Here $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega) \subset PSH(\Omega)$ is the convex positive cone of negative plurisubharmonic functions in Ω with finite Monge-Ampère energy (see Section 5 for the precise definition).

Let us mention that N.D. Koutev and I.P. Ramadanov considered the eigenvalue problem for a twisted complex Monge-Ampère operator in bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains with a homogenous non degenerate strictly positive right hand side which do not contain the case considered here (see [27, 28]). On the other hand a Rayley quotient type formula for the eigenvalue of the real Monge-Ampère operator was proved by K. Tso in [32] with a different approach.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some known results which will be useful for the proofs of the main theorems.

In Section 3, we prove a priori estimates as well as a new existence result for some degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations which will be used later. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1. As an application, we show that the eigenvalue λ_1 plays the role of a bifurcation parameter for a family of operators of complex Monge-Ampère type with respect to the maximum principle as in the case of linear second order elliptic operators. In section 5 we develop a variational approach to the eigenvalue problem and prove Theorem 1.2 using our new existence theorem.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let us first recall some results in Pluripotential Theory that will be used in the sequel. The general reference for this material is [24].

2.1. The complex Monge-Ampère operator. Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain. Recall that by E. Bedford and B.A. Taylor [3, 4], the complex Monge-Ampère operator is well defined on the class of locally bounded plurisubharmonic functions on Ω . For such a function $v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$, $(dd^c v)^n$ is a positive current of bidegree (n, n) on Ω , which will be identified to a Radon measure on Ω . By the classical representation theorem of F. Riesz, this Radon measure extends (uniquely) to a positive Borel measure on Ω (with locally finite mass), called the complex Monge-Ampère measure

of v and still denoted by $(dd^c v)^n$. Recall that when $v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ we have

$$(dd^c v)^n = \det(v_{j\bar{k}})\omega^n.$$

Moreover the complex Monge-Ampère operator is continuous under (local) uniform convergence and monotone convergence of sequences in $PSH(\Omega) \cap L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)$ and satisfies the following comparison principle.

Proposition 2.1. [3] . *Let $u, v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that for $\zeta \in \partial\Omega$ $\liminf_{z \rightarrow \zeta} (u - v) \geq 0$ and $(dd^c u)^n \leq (dd^c v)^n$ in the sense of currents on Ω . Then $u \geq v$ in Ω .*

Following [4] we define the Monge-Ampère capacity as follows : for any Borel set $B \subset \Omega$, set

$$\text{Cap}_\Omega(B) := \sup \left\{ \int_B (dd^c v)^n ; v \in PSH(\Omega), -1 \leq v \leq 0 \right\}.$$

This capacity plays an important role in Pluripotential Theory (see [4]). Let $D > 0$ be the diameter of Ω and $R := D/2$ and $B(a, R)$ a ball containing Ω . Then using the test function $v(z) := (R^{-2}|z - a|^2 - 1)$ in the definition of the capacity, we easily see that for any Borel set $B \subset \Omega$,

$$(2.1) \quad \text{Vol}(B) \leq R^{2n} \text{Cap}_\Omega(B),$$

where $\text{Vol}(B) := \int_B dV = \int_B (dd^c |z|^2)^n$ is up to a numerical multiplicative constant the volume of B in \mathbb{C}^n .

2.2. The CKNS theorem. Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a strongly pseudoconvex domain with C^2 boundary i.e. Ω admits a defining function $\rho \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ which is strictly plurisubharmonic in a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$ and satisfies $\|\nabla \rho\| > 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. We consider the following Dirichlet problem for the complex Monge-Ampère operator:

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = \psi(\cdot, u)\omega^n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \varphi & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\omega = dd^c |z|^2$, $\psi : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varphi : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions.

We will need the following fundamental theorem due to L. Caffarelli, J.J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck (see [9]).

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain with smooth boundary. Let $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ and $\psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$ such that $\partial_t \psi(z, t) \geq 0$ and $\psi > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Then the Dirichlet problem (2.2) admits a unique solution $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

2.3. The subsolution theorem of B. Guan. Let us recall that under the condition $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial u} \geq 0$, Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg-Spruck used the continuity method and a priori estimates to prove the existence of a unique solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.2).

In the general case, the continuity method do not apply. However under the strong assumption that ψ admits a positive lower bound, B. Guan ([21]) was able to extend the CKNS result to a more general situation using a priori estimates and the more involved method of topological degree as in the real case (see [11]).

Let us state the theorem of B. Guan [21, Theorem 1.1]) which we will use only in our application (see Theorem 4.2).

Theorem 2.3. [21] *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$. Assume that $\psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$, $\psi > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$, and the problem (2.2) admits a strictly plurisubharmonic subsolution $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$.*

Then the problem (2.2) admits a smooth solution $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $u \geq \underline{u}$ in Ω .

This theorem cannot be applied to prove Theorem 1.1 because in this case, the right hand side $(-\lambda u)^n$ degenerates at the boundary as $u = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. We will prove a new theorem which deals with this case (see Theorem 3.1).

2.4. The eigenvalue problem for linear elliptic operators. To prove Theorem 1.1, we need to recall few results from the theory of linear elliptic operators of second order. The link to the complex Monge-Ampère operator is provided by Gaveau's formula [19] in linear algebra : if b is a positive Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix, we have

$$(2.3) \quad (\det b)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \frac{1}{n} \inf \{ \text{tr}(a \cdot b) : a \in \mathcal{H}_n \},$$

where \mathcal{H}_n be the set of Hermitian positive $n \times n$ matrices with $\det a \geq 1$.

This formula makes it possible to reduce the equation (1.1) to a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) type equation.

Let $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ be the set of positive Hermitian $n \times n$ matrices $a = \{a_{j\bar{k}}\}_{1 \leq j, k \leq n}$ with continuous coefficients in Ω and bounded in Ω such that $\det a \geq 1$.

To each matrix $a = \{a_{j\bar{k}}\}_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$, we associate the second-order linear differential operator

$$(2.4) \quad L_a = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j, k=1}^n a_{j\bar{k}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k}.$$

The operator L_a is elliptic and then satisfies the maximum principle. Moreover Gaveau's formula implies that if $u \in C^2(\Omega)$, we have pointwise in Ω ,

$$(2.5) \quad (\det a_{j\bar{k}})^{\frac{1}{n}} = \inf \left\{ L_a u ; a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega) \right\}.$$

Following the idea of Lions in the real case [29], we will show the existence of an eigenvalue of the complex Monge-Ampère operator using the first eigenvalues of the linear operators L_a which define it.

We will need the following classical result (see [18, p. 335-340]):

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a unique pair $(\gamma_1, \phi_1) = (\gamma_1(a), \phi_1(a))$ satisfying $\gamma_1 > 0$, $\phi_1 \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$, $\phi_1 > 0$ and $\|\phi_1\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1$ such that (γ_1, ϕ_1) is a solution of the Dirichlet problem*

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{cases} L_a \phi_1 = -\gamma_1 \phi_1 f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \phi_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ \phi_1 < 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

The number $\gamma_1(a) = \gamma_1(L_a, \Omega)$ is called the first eigenvalue of the operator $-L_a$ and ϕ_1 is an associated eigenfunction.

We will use the following results to prove uniqueness in Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.5. [7] *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ and $\gamma_1 := \gamma_1(a)$. Then*

1. γ_1 is given by the following formula :

$$(2.7) \quad \gamma_1(a) = \gamma_1(L_a, \Omega) = \sup\{\gamma \geq 0 : \exists \phi < 0, L_a \phi + \gamma \phi f \geq 0\},$$

where $\phi \in C^2(\Omega)$ and $\phi = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$.

2. If $\phi \in C^2(\Omega)$ is bounded from above in Ω , $\limsup_{z \rightarrow \zeta} \phi(z) \leq 0$ for all $\zeta \in \partial\Omega$ and satisfies $L_a \phi + \gamma_1 \phi f \geq 0$ in Ω , then there exists a constant $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi = \theta \phi_1$.

All these results are stated in [7] in the case $f \equiv 1$ in Ω , but they are still valid for a general positive density $f > 0$ (see [31]).

To apply this result in our context, we will need the following observation.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $u, v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$. Then there exist a matrix $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ such that*

$$[\det(u_{j\bar{k}})]^{\frac{1}{n}} - [\det(v_{j\bar{k}})]^{\frac{1}{n}} = L_a(u - v).$$

Proof. Recall that the function $x \mapsto \det x$ is a C^1 -function on the space \mathcal{M}_n of square matrices of order n and its differential is given for $x \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and $\xi \in T_x \mathcal{M}_n \simeq \mathcal{M}_n$, by the formula

$$(2.8) \quad D_\xi(\det)(x) = D(\det)(x) \cdot \xi = \text{tr}(\tilde{x}^\tau \xi),$$

where \tilde{x} be the comatrix of x and \tilde{x}^τ its transpose.

Set $g(t) := [\det(tu_{j\bar{k}} + (1-t)v_{j\bar{k}})]^{\frac{1}{n}}$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Then g is differentiable in $[0, 1]$ and therefore

$$[\det(u_{j\bar{k}})]^{\frac{1}{n}} - [\det(v_{j\bar{k}})]^{\frac{1}{n}} = g(1) - g(0) = \int_0^1 g'(t) dt.$$

Applying the formula (2.8) of the differential of \det at the point $x(t) := t(u_{j\bar{k}}) + (1-t)(v_{j\bar{k}})$ with $\xi := (u_{j\bar{k}}) - (v_{j\bar{k}})$, we obtain

$$g'(t) := \frac{1}{n} [\det(x(t))]^{\frac{1}{n}-1} \text{tr}(\tilde{x}(t)^\tau \xi).$$

It follows by setting $w := u - v$ that

$$[\det(u_{j\bar{k}})]^{\frac{1}{n}} - [\det(v_{j\bar{k}})]^{\frac{1}{n}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{j\bar{k}} w_{j\bar{k}} = L_a w,$$

where

$$a_{j\bar{k}} := \int_0^1 [\det(x(t))]^{\frac{1}{n}-1} \tilde{x}_{j\bar{k}}(t) dt.$$

It remains to show that $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$.

Indeed, $\det^{\frac{1}{n}}$ is a concave function on the convex set \mathcal{H}_n of positive Hermitian $n \times n$ matrices (this results follows from Gaveau's formula). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\det a)^{\frac{1}{n}} &\geq \int_0^1 \left[\det \left([\det x(t)]^{\frac{1}{n}-1} \tilde{x}(t) \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} dt \\ &= \int_0^1 [\det x(t)]^{\frac{1}{n}-1} [\det \tilde{x}(t)]^{\frac{1}{n}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to calculate $\det \tilde{x}(t)$. This is done by remembering the formula for the inverse of a matrix $x \in \mathcal{H}_n$: $x^{-1} = \frac{1}{\det x} \tilde{x}^\tau$ and therefore $\det \tilde{x} = (\det x)^{n-1}$. Thus $\det a \geq 1$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$. \square

3. A NEW EXISTENCE THEOREM

To prove the main results stated in the introduction, we need to prove a new theorem on the existence of a solution to some special degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations.

Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and $\psi : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a smooth function on $\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$, $\psi \geq 0$.

Consider the Dirichlet problem for the complex Monge-Ampère operator:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = \psi(\cdot, u) \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $u \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) := PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ is the unknown function.

As we already said, the solvability of this problem when $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n , was established by L. Caffarelli, J.J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck [9] under the assumption that $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial u} \geq 0$ and some conditions on the way ψ degenerates near the boundary. Later this result was extended by B. Guan [21] and B. Guan and Q. Li [22] to a more general situation in the non degenerate case on a general domain, assuming the existence of a strictly plurisubharmonic subsolution.

However these results do not apply in our case. Using ideas from [9], we are able to prove a new existence theorem for such equations under the

assumption of the existence of a subsolution and a supersolution by a fixed point method.

We say that $\underline{u} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is a subsolution of (3.1) if it satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c \underline{u})^n \geq \psi(z, \underline{u})\omega^n & \text{on } \Omega, \\ \underline{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Moreover the subsolution \underline{u} is said to be a *strict subsolution* if

$$(3.3) \quad (dd^c \underline{u})^n \geq (\psi(z, \underline{u}) + \epsilon_0)\omega^n, \quad \text{on } \Omega.$$

Also we say that $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is a supersolution of (3.1), if it satisfies

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c \bar{u})^n \leq \psi(z, \bar{u})\omega^n & \text{on } \Omega, \\ \bar{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The differential inequality here is understood in the sense of currents on Ω .

Here is our new result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain with smooth boundary, $0 \leq \psi^{\frac{1}{n}} \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$ and $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial u} \leq 0$ in $\Omega \times]-\infty, 0]$.*

Assume the following conditions:

(1) *If $\psi > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0]$, the problem (3.1) admits a subsolution $\underline{u} \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$;*

(2) *If $\psi \geq 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0]$ and $\psi > 0$ in $\Omega \times]-\infty, 0[$, the Dirichlet problem (3.1) admits a strict subsolution $\underline{u} \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$;*

(3) *the Dirichlet problem (3.1) admits a supersolution $\bar{u} \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\underline{u} \leq \bar{u} < 0$ on Ω .*

Then the Dirichlet problem (3.1) admits a solution $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\underline{u} \leq u \leq \bar{u}$ on $\bar{\Omega}$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 will be given below. The idea of the proof is as follows. When $\psi > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0]$, by Theorem 2.2, for any $v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, the following Dirichlet problem

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = \psi(\cdot, v)\omega^n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution $u = T(v) \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

The solution of the Dirichlet problem (3.1) is a fixed point for the inverse Monge-Ampère operator T . We will use an iterative method to find a fixed point of T . We then need to establish a priori estimates to control the iteration process. This will be done in the next three subsections.

3.1. A priori estimates. In this subsection, we assume the following conditions.

- (1) Ω is a smooth bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^n , ρ a smooth defining function of Ω such that $dd^c \rho \geq \omega = dd^c |z|^2$;
- (2) $\psi > 0$ and smooth on $\bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0]$;

3.2. Gradient estimate. Fix a function $\phi \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\phi < 0$ in Ω .

Proposition 3.2. *Let $v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $v \leq \phi$ in Ω . Let $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^3(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be a smooth solution to the Dirichlet problem (3.5).*

Then we have the following estimate

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \sup_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla v|^2}{2} + C_1,$$

where C_1 depends on $L := \|\nabla \rho\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}$, $C_0 := \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} (|u| + |\rho|)$, $M_0 := \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |v|$, $K_1 := \|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega} \times [-M_0, 0])}$ and $m_0 := \min_{\bar{\Omega}_0 \times [-M_0, -A_0]} \psi^{1/n} > 0$, where $A_0 > 0$ and $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega$ depend only on C_0 and the $C^0(\bar{\Omega}_0)$ -norm of w .

Proof. We set $\beta = |\nabla u|^2 = \sum_p |u_p|^2$, where u_p stands for the partial derivative of u in the direction z_p .

We consider the function

$$G(z) := \log \beta(z) + \frac{u^2}{2} + B\rho$$

defined and continuous on $\bar{\Omega}$. Here B is a positive constant to be specified later. The maximum of G over $\bar{\Omega}$ is attained at some z_0 that can be assumed to be in the interior (otherwise we are done).

If $\beta(z_0) \leq 1$, then for any $z \in \Omega$, $G(z_0) \leq C_0^2$, hence $G(z) \leq C_0^2$, which yields the upper bound $\beta(z) \leq e^{C_0^2 + BC_0}$ on Ω .

We can thus assume that $\beta(z_0) \geq 1$. From now, our computations will be done at $z_0 \in \Omega$, and we can assume that the matrix $(u_{i\bar{j}})$ is diagonal. By the maximum principle we have, for any $1 \leq p, q \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= G_p = \frac{\beta_p}{\beta} + uu_p + B\rho_p, \\ (3.6) \quad 0 &= G_{\bar{q}} = \frac{\beta_{\bar{q}}}{\beta} + uu_{\bar{q}} + B\rho_{\bar{q}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} G_{p\bar{p}} = \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \left(\frac{\beta_{p\bar{p}}}{\beta} - \frac{|\beta_p|^2}{\beta^2} + B + |u_p|^2 + uu_{p\bar{p}} \right) \\ (3.7) \quad &= \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \left(\frac{\beta_{p\bar{p}}}{\beta} - |uu_p + B\rho_p|^2 + B + |u_p|^2 \right) + nu. \end{aligned}$$

We next compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \beta_{p\bar{p}} &= \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \sum_{j=1}^n (u_j u_{\bar{j}})_{p\bar{p}} = \sum_{p=1, j=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} (2\operatorname{Re}(u_{\bar{j}} u_{jp\bar{p}}) + |u_{jp}|^2 + |u_{j\bar{p}}|^2) \\ (3.8) \quad &= \sum_{1 \leq p, j \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} (2\operatorname{Re}(u_{\bar{j}} u_{jp\bar{p}}) + |u_{jp}|^2) + \sum u_{p\bar{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $g(z) := \log \psi(z, v(z))$ for $z \in \Omega$.

Differentiating the Monge-Ampère equation

$$\log \det(u_{i\bar{j}}) = \log \psi(\cdot, v) = g,$$

we obtain

$$\sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} u_{p\bar{p}j} = g_j,$$

Thus, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \beta_{p\bar{p}} &= \sum u_{p\bar{p}} + \sum_{1 \leq p, j \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |u_{jp}|^2 + 2Re \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} g_j u_{\bar{j}} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{1 \leq p, j \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |u_{jp}|^2 - 2|\nabla g| \sqrt{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

We next estimate the first term on the right-hand side. We have, by the maximum principle, see (3.6),

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} u_{jp} u_{\bar{j}} + u_p u_{p\bar{p}} = -\beta(uu_p + B\rho_p),$$

thus Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$|\beta(uu_p + B\rho_p) + u_p u_{p\bar{p}}|^2 \leq \beta \sum_j |u_{jp}|^2,$$

therefore,

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{j,p} \frac{u^{p\bar{p}} |u_{jp}|^2}{\beta} &\geq \beta^{-2} \sum_p u^{p\bar{p}} |\beta(uu_p + B\rho_p) + u_p u_{p\bar{p}}|^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |uu_p + B\rho_p|^2 - 2\beta^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} |uu_p + B\rho_p| |u_p| \\ &\geq \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |uu_p + B\rho_p|^2 - 2C_0 - 2BL\beta^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $L = \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla \rho|$. From (3.9) and (3.10) and $\beta(z_0) \geq 1$, we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \beta^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} \beta_{p\bar{p}} \geq \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |uu_p + B\rho_p|^2 - 2\beta^{-1/2} |\nabla g| - A_1,$$

where $A_1 := 2C_0 + 2BL$.

Observe that $g(z) = \log \psi(z, v(z)) = n \log \psi^{1/n}(z, v(z))$, hence

$$\nabla g = n \left[\nabla \psi^{1/n}(\cdot, v) + (\psi^{1/n})_t(\cdot, v) \nabla v \right] \psi^{-1/n}(\cdot, v).$$

and $|\nabla g| \leq nK_1 (1 + |\nabla v|) \psi^{-1/n}(\cdot, v)$, where K_1 is an upper bound of the C^1 -norm of $\psi^{1/n}$ on $\bar{\Omega} \times [-M_0, 0]$.

Observe that, by the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} \geq n\psi(\cdot, v)^{-1/n}.$$

This together with (3.7) give

(3.12)

$$0 \geq (B - 2K_1) \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} - 2nK_1\beta^{-1/2} |\nabla v| \psi^{-1/n}(\cdot, v) - A_2 + \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |u_p|^2,$$

where $A_2 := A_1 + nC_0$.

We choose $B = 1 + 2K_1(1 + e^{C_0^2+1})$, and consider two cases.

Case 1: $\rho(z_0) \geq -B^{-1}$. Set

$$B_1 := e^{-C_0^2-2} \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} (1 + |\nabla v|^2).$$

If $\beta(z_0) \leq \max(B_1, 1)$ then

$$G(z) \leq G(z_0) \leq \max(\log B_1, 0) + \frac{C_0^2}{2} \leq \max(\log(1 + \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla v|^2) - 2, C_0^2),$$

hence for any $z \in \Omega$,

$$\log \beta(z) \leq G(z) - \frac{u(z)^2}{2} - B\rho \leq \max(\log(1 + \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla v|^2) - 1, C_0^2 + 1),$$

and the desired estimate follows.

Recall that $\Pi_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} = \psi^{-1}(\cdot, v)$.

If $\beta(z_0) \geq \max(B_1, 1)$, then by the arithmetic-geometric inequality, we have

$$2nK_1\beta^{-1/2} |\nabla v| \psi^{-1/n}(\cdot, v) \leq 2nK_1 e^{C_0^2+1} \psi^{-1/n}(\cdot, v) \leq (B - 2K_1 - 1) \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}}.$$

From (3.12), it follows that

$$(3.13) \quad 0 \geq \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} - A_2 + \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |u_p|^2.$$

Hence $\sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} \leq A_2$.

Now recall the following elementary inequality for $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$,

$$(3.14) \quad \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j \leq n (\Pi_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j) \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j^{-1} \right)^{n-1}.$$

Applying this inequality with $\lambda_j = u_{j\bar{j}}$, we deduce that $\sum_{p=1}^n u_{p\bar{p}} \leq A_3 := nA_2^{n-1}K_1$. Since $0 \leq u_{p\bar{p}}$, it follows that $u_{p\bar{p}} \leq A_3$, hence $u^{p\bar{p}} \geq A_3^{-1}$. Putting this into (3.13) we obtain $\beta \leq A_4 := A_2A_3$ as desired.

Case 2: $\rho(z_0) \leq -B^{-1}$. Observe that $\Omega_0 := \{z \in \Omega; \rho(z_0) < -B^{-1}\} \Subset \Omega$, $z_0 \in \bar{\Omega}_0$. By continuity of ϕ and the fact that $\phi < 0$ on Ω , it follows $\phi(z_0) \leq -A_0 := \max_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \phi < 0$. Hence $v(z_0) \leq \phi(z_0) \leq -A_0 < 0$.

Since $z_0 \in \bar{\Omega}_0$, $-M_0 \leq v(z_0) \leq -A_0$ and $\psi > 0$ in $\Omega \times]-M_0, 0[$, it follows that

$$\psi^{1/n}(z_0, v(z_0)) \geq m_0 := \min_{\bar{\Omega}_0 \times [-M_0, -A_0]} \psi^{1/n}(z, t) > 0.$$

If $\beta(z_0) \leq e^{-C_0^2 - BC_0} \sup |\nabla v|^2$ then we have for any $z \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \beta(z) &= G(z) - \frac{u^2(z)}{2} - B\rho(z) \leq G(z_0) - \frac{u^2(z)}{2} - B\rho(z) \\ &\leq \log \beta(z_0) + \frac{u^2(z_0)}{2} + B\rho(z_0) - B\rho(z) \\ &\leq -C_0^2/2 - 1 - B(C_0 + \rho(z)) + \log \sup |\nabla v|^2 \\ &\leq -1 + \log \sup |\nabla v|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the required estimate.

If $\beta(z_0) \geq e^{-C_0^2 - BC_0} \sup |\nabla v|^2$, we have

$$\beta^{-1/2}(z_0) |\nabla v(z_0)| \psi^{-1/n}(z_0, v(z_0)) \leq m_0^{-1} e^{C_0^2/2 + BC_0/2} =: A_5,$$

and then from (3.12), it follows that

$$0 \geq (B - 2K_1) \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} - A_6 + \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} |u_p|^2 \geq \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} - A_6 + \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} |u_p|^2,$$

since $B - 2K_1 \geq 1$, where $A_6 := A_2 + 2nK_1A_5$. This yields the desired estimate in the same way as before. \square

We can improve the previous a priori estimate for a fixed point of the operator T .

Corollary 3.3. *Let $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^3(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be a solution to the complex Monge-Ampère equation*

$$(dd^c u)^n = \psi(\cdot, u) \omega^n$$

such that $u \leq 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.

Then we have the following estimate

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \sup_{\partial\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u|^2 + C_1,$$

where C_1 depends on $L := \|\rho\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$, $C_0 := \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} (|u| + |\rho|)$ and $K_1 := \|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega} \times [-C_0, 0])}$.

The issue here is that the constant C_1 does not depend on a lower bound of ψ .

Proof. We use the same notations as in the previous proof. When $v = u$ in we have $\beta = |\nabla v|^2$ and then the inequality (3.12) becomes

$$(3.15) \quad 0 \geq (B - 2K_1) \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} - 2nK_1 \psi^{-1/n}(\cdot, u) - A_2 + \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |u_p|^2.$$

From this inequality and the fact that $\sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \geq n\psi^{-1/n}(\cdot, u)$, we deduce that

$$0 \geq \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} - A_2 + \sum_{1 \leq p \leq n} u^{p\bar{p}} |u_p|^2,$$

if we choose $B = 4K_1 + 1$. The conclusion follows then in the same way. \square

3.3. Laplacian estimate. Fix a function $v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ be a smooth solution to the complex Monge-Ampère equation (3.5).*

Then the following estimate holds

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}} \Delta u \leq \sup_{\partial\Omega} \Delta u + \frac{1 + \|\nabla v\|^2 + \sup_{\Omega} \Delta v}{2} + C_2,$$

where C_2 depends on $r := \sup_{\Omega} |z|$, $C_0 := \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |u|$, $M_0 := \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |v|$, $C_1 = \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} (|\nabla u|)$ and $K_2 := \|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times [-M_0, 0])}$.

Proof. We consider the function $H(z) = \log(\Delta u) + b\|z\|^2$ defined and smooth on $\bar{\Omega}$. Assume that H attains its maximum over $\bar{\Omega}$ at some $z_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$. If $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$ then the estimate follows immediately.

We now assume $z_0 \in \Omega$ and do our computations at z_0 . We can also assume that $u_{i\bar{j}}(z_0)$ is diagonal. Then, by the maximum principle we have, for any $1 \leq p, q \leq n$,

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial z_p} = H_p = \frac{(\Delta u)_p}{\Delta u} + b\bar{z}_p \\ 0 &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial \bar{z}_q} = H_{\bar{q}} = \frac{(\Delta u)_{\bar{q}}}{\Delta u} + bz_q, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} H_{p\bar{p}} = \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \left(\frac{(\Delta u)_{p\bar{p}}}{\Delta u} - \frac{|(\Delta u)_p|^2}{(\Delta u)^2} + b \right) \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^n u^{p\bar{p}} \left(\frac{(\Delta u)_{p\bar{p}}}{\Delta u} - b^2 r^2 + b \right). \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating the Monge-Ampère equation $(\det(u_{i\bar{j}}))^{1/n} = \psi(\cdot, v)^{1/n} = g(\cdot, v)$ twice we obtain, using summation convention,

$$n^{-1} g u^{p\bar{q}} u_{p\bar{q}j} = g_j + g_v v_j,$$

$$n^{-2} g u^{k\bar{l}} u_{k\bar{l}j} u^{p\bar{q}} u_{p\bar{q}j} + n^{-1} g (u^{p\bar{q}})_{\bar{j}} u_{p\bar{q}j} + n^{-1} g u^{p\bar{q}} u_{p\bar{q}j\bar{j}} = 2\operatorname{Re}(g_v v_j) + g_v v_{j\bar{j}} + g_{vv} |v_j|^2 + g_{j\bar{j}}.$$

If D is any partial derivative then $Du^{k\bar{q}} = -u^{p\bar{q}} u^{k\bar{l}} Du_{p\bar{l}}$, hence, at z_0 (using that $u_{i\bar{j}}$ is diagonal)

$$Du^{k\bar{q}} = -u^{q\bar{q}} u^{k\bar{k}} Du_{q\bar{k}}.$$

Using again that $(u_{i\bar{j}})$ is diagonal we obtain

$$n^{-2}gu^{p\bar{p}}u^{q\bar{q}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}}u_{q\bar{q}j}-n^{-1}gu^{p\bar{p}}u^{q\bar{q}}|u_{p\bar{q}j}|^2+n^{-1}gu^{p\bar{p}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}\bar{j}}=2\operatorname{Re}(g_{v_j}v_{\bar{j}})+g_vv_{j\bar{j}}+g_{j\bar{j}},$$

which is the same as

$$n^{-1}g\left|\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}}\right|^2-g\sum_{p,q=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}u^{q\bar{q}}|u_{p\bar{q}j}|^2+g\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}\bar{j}}=n(2\operatorname{Re}(g_{v_j}v_{\bar{j}})+g_vv_{j\bar{j}}+g_{vv}|v_j|^2+g_{j\bar{j}}).$$

Observe that, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$n^{-1}\left|\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}}\right|^2-\sum_{p,q=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}u^{q\bar{q}}|u_{p\bar{q}j}|^2\leq n^{-1}\left|\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}}\right|^2-\sum_{p=1}^n|u^{p\bar{p}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}}|^2\leq 0.$$

We then get

$$g\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}u_{p\bar{p}\bar{j}\bar{j}}\geq -A_1(1+\|\nabla v\|^2+\Delta v),$$

where $A_1 > 0$ depends only on $\|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega}\times[-C_0,0])}$.

Plugging this into (3.17) we obtain at the point z_0 ,

$$0\geq(b-b^2r^2)\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}-\frac{A_1(1+\|\nabla v\|^2+\Delta v)}{g\Delta u},$$

where $\|\nabla v\| := \|\nabla v\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}$.

Choosing b small enough (depending on r) we get at the point z_0 ,

$$0\geq\frac{b}{2}\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}-\frac{A_1(1+\|\nabla v\|^2+\Delta v)}{g\Delta u}.$$

If $\Delta u(z_0)\leq e^{-br^2-1}(1+\|\nabla v\|^2+\Delta v(z_0))$, then

$$H(z_0)\leq\log(1+\|\nabla v\|^2+\Delta v(z_0))-1,$$

hence for any $z\in\Omega$,

$$\log\Delta u(z)\leq H(z)\leq H(z_0)\leq\log(1+\|\nabla v\|^2+\sup_{\Omega}\Delta v)-1,$$

and the desired estimate follows.

Assume now that $\Delta u(z_0)\geq e^{-br^2-1}(1+\|\nabla v\|^2+\Delta v(z_0))$. We then get at z_0 the inequality

$$(3.18)\quad\sum_{p=1}^nu^{p\bar{p}}\leq A_1g^{-1}.$$

Applying the inequality (3.14) with $\lambda_j := u_{j\bar{j}}$, we deduce from (3.18) that

$$\Delta u(z_0)\leq A_1g^ng^{-(n-1)}\leq A_2,$$

where $A_2 := A_1\sup_{\Omega\times[-C_0,0]}\psi^{1/n}$. Hence for any $z\in\Omega$, we have

$$\Delta u(z)\leq H(z)\leq H(z_0)\leq\Delta(z_0)+b|z_0|^2\leq A_2+br^2.$$

This completes the proof. \square

3.4. Boundary second order estimates.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that $\underline{u} \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ is a strictly plurisubharmonic function on $\bar{\Omega}$, $w \in SH(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\underline{u} \leq w < 0$ in Ω and $\underline{u} = w = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. Let $v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $v \leq w$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. Then any solution $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ of (3.5) such that $\underline{u} \leq u \leq w$ in Ω satisfies the following a priori estimate*

$$(3.19) \quad \sup_{\partial\Omega} \|D^2u\| \leq C_3,$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is a constant depending on an upper bound $C_0 := \max_{\bar{\Omega}} |\underline{u}|$, $\|\underline{u}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|w\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|v\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$ and $\|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times [-C_0, 0])}$.

Proof. Since $\underline{u} \leq u \leq w$, we have

$$(3.20) \quad \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |u| \leq C_0,$$

and

$$(3.21) \quad \sup_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla u| \leq C_1,$$

where C_0, C_1 depending on the C^1 -norms of v and w on $\partial\Omega$.

Then Proposition 3.2, yields a uniform C^1 -estimate of u in $\bar{\Omega}$:

$$(3.22) \quad \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u| \leq C'_1,$$

where $C'_1 > 0$ is a uniform constant depending on $\|\underline{u}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|w\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega} \times [-M, 0])}$ and $\|v\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$.

The C^2 -estimate on the boundary are done in three steps as usual.

The estimates for tangential-tangential and tangential-normal second order derivatives follow from [21] (see also [9]). Indeed these estimates do not depend on a lower bound for ψ , and the last ones require strict plurisubharmonicity of \underline{u} and a uniform bound on $|\nabla \underline{u}|$ and $|\nabla u|$ near $\partial\Omega$.

However the estimate for the normal-normal second order derivative obtained in [21] depend heavily on a positive lower bound on ψ in $\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$, while the ones obtained in [9] do not require a lower bound on ψ but use the fact that ψ is increasing in the second variable.

In order to overcome this difficulty we use the fact that $\partial\Omega$ is strongly pseudoconvex and adapt the arguments in [9] to our case.

We fix a point $P \in \partial\Omega$ and let ρ be a strongly plurisubharmonic defining function for Ω . We can assume that $P = 0$ is the origin and choose local coordinates $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $z_j = x_j + iy_j$, ($1 \leq j \leq n$) around the origin such that $\rho_{z_\alpha}(0) = 0$ for $\alpha < n$, $\rho_{y_n}(0) = 0$, $\rho_{x_n}(0) = -1$ so that the x_n -axis is the interior normal direction to $\partial\Omega$ at 0. For convenience we set

$$t_{2k-1} = x_k, \quad t_{2k} = y_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \quad t_{2n-1} = y_n, \quad t_{2n} = x_n.$$

Since $d\rho$ does not vanish near the boundary, and $u = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$, we may represent u as

$$(3.23) \quad u = h\rho,$$

where h is a smooth function near the boundary.

We will use the classical notations

$$u_{t_\alpha} := \frac{\partial u}{\partial t_\alpha}, \quad u_{t_\alpha t_\beta} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t_\alpha \partial t_\beta}, \quad u_{j\bar{k}} := \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k}.$$

Since $\rho = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, by (3.23), we see that $u_{x_n}(0) = -h(0)$, and then

$$(3.24) \quad u_{t_\alpha t_\beta}(0) = -u_{x_n}(0)\rho_{t_\alpha t_\beta}(0), \quad \alpha, \beta < 2n.$$

Therefore there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$(3.25) \quad |u_{t_\alpha t_\beta}(0)| \leq C_2, \quad \alpha, \beta \leq 2n - 1,$$

where $C_2 > 0$ depends only on C^1 -bound of \underline{u} at the boundary, the constant C'_1 in (3.22) and an upper bound of the Levi-form of ρ on $\partial\Omega$.

To establish the estimates

$$u_{t_\alpha x_n} \leq C_2, \quad \alpha \leq 2n - 1,$$

we proceed as in the proof of [9, Lemma 3.1] (see also [21], p. 692-693). Observe that here the constant C_2 depends on a lower bound of $dd^c \underline{u}$ (\underline{u} is strictly plurisubharmonic on $\bar{\Omega}$) and the C^1 -norm of $\psi(\cdot, v)$ but not on a lower bound on ψ .

It remains to establish the estimate

$$(3.26) \quad |u_{x_n x_n}(0)| \leq C_3,$$

for a uniform constant $C_3 > 0$ which does not depend on a lower bound on ψ .

We will use an idea from [9] (see p. 221) based on the Hopf Lemma with appropriate modifications. By (3.25) we have already the estimates

$$(3.27) \quad |u_{p\bar{q}}(0)| \leq C_2, \quad p \leq n - 1, q \leq n,$$

where $C > 0$ is a uniform constant which depends only on a C^1 -bound of u at the boundary and the geometry of $\partial\Omega$. Therefore it suffices to prove that

$$(3.28) \quad 0 \leq u_{n\bar{n}}(0) = u_{x_n x_n} + u_{y_n y_n}(0) \leq C.$$

Indeed, expanding $\det(u_{j\bar{k}})_{1 \leq j, k \leq n}$, we obtain

$$(3.29) \quad \det(u_{j\bar{k}}(0)) = au_{n\bar{n}}(0) + b,$$

where

$$a := \det(u_{p\bar{q}}(0))|_{\{1 \leq p, q \leq n-1\}}$$

and b is bounded in view of (3.27).

Since $\det(u_{j\bar{k}})$ is bounded above, we only have to derive an a priori positive lower bound for a , which is equivalent to the inequality

$$(3.30) \quad \{u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0)\}_{\alpha,\beta < n} \geq c_0 I_{n-1},$$

with a uniform constant $c_0 > 0$ which does not depend on a lower bound of ψ . Indeed, from (3.24), we deduce that

$$(3.31) \quad u_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0) = -u_{x_n}(0)\rho_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0), \quad \alpha, \beta \leq n-1.$$

Since $u \leq w < 0$ in Ω and $w = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$, we have by Hopf Lemma (see [18, Lemma 6.2])

$$(3.32) \quad u_{x_n}(0) \leq w_{x_n}(0) =: -\delta_0 < 0.$$

Since $\partial\Omega$ is strongly pseudoconvex, together with (3.32) and (3.31) we have (3.30). The conclusion follows. \square

3.4.1. *Global a priori estimates.* Here we deduce from the previous analysis global a priori estimates for solutions to the equation

$$(3.33) \quad (dd^c u)^n = \psi(\cdot, u)\omega^n.$$

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\psi : \bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a smooth positive function such that $\psi^{1/n} \in C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$. Let $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ be a strictly plurisubharmonic function and $w \in SH(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\underline{u} \leq w < 0$ in Ω and $\underline{u} = w = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$.*

Then if $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ is a solution to the equation (3.33) such that $\underline{u} \leq u \leq w$ in Ω , we have the following a priori estimates.

$$(3.34) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C_1,$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\|\underline{u}\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|w\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$ and $\|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega} \times [-M_0, 0])}$ ($M_0 := \|u\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}$),
and

$$(3.35) \quad \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_2,$$

where $C_2 > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\|\underline{u}\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|w\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$ and $\|\psi^{1/n}\|_{C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times [-M_0, 0])}$.

Proof. Since $\underline{u} \leq u \leq w \leq 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, we have

$$(3.36) \quad \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |u| \leq C_0 := \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\underline{u}|,$$

and

$$(3.37) \quad \sup_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla u| \leq C_1 := \max\{\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla \underline{u}|, \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}\}.$$

Then Corollary 3.3 yields a uniform C^1 -estimate of u in $\bar{\Omega}$:

$$(3.38) \quad \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u| \leq C'_1,$$

where $C'_1 > 0$ is a uniform constant.

Then we can apply Proposition 3.5 to obtain a uniform estimate of Δu on $\partial\Omega$. To conclude it's enough to apply Proposition 3.4. \square

3.5. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Recall that we want to solve the following Dirichlet problem.

$$(3.39) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = \psi(\cdot, u) \omega^n & \text{on } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

This is a fixed point problem, so we will use an iterative method to solve it and proceed in two steps.

Step 1. We assume that $\psi > 0$ in $[\bar{\Omega} \times] - \infty, 0]$. Applying Theorem 2.2, we will construct inductively a sequence (u_j) in $PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $u_0 := \underline{u}$ and for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_{j+1} = T(u_j)$ is the unique solution to the following problem

$$(3.40) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u_{j+1})^n = \psi(\cdot, u_j) \omega^n & \text{on } \Omega \\ u_{j+1} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Now the main observation is that the sequence $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing and satisfies $\underline{u} \leq u_j \leq u_{j+1} \leq \bar{u}$ in Ω . This follows from the comparison principle Proposition 2.1 and the fact that ψ is non increasing.

Indeed for $j = 0$ we set $u_0 := \underline{u}$. Assume that for a fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have constructed functions $(u_k)_{1 \leq k \leq j}$ in $PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ such that for $1 \leq k \leq j$, we have

$$(dd^c u_k)^n = \psi(\cdot, u_{k-1}) \omega^n, \text{ on } \Omega \text{ and } u_k = 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega,$$

on Ω and $\underline{u} \leq u_{k-1} \leq u_k \leq \bar{u}$ on Ω .

By Theorem 2.2, the Dirichlet problem (3.40) admits a unique solution $u_{j+1} \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

Since $\underline{u} \leq u_{j-1} \leq u_j \leq \bar{u}$ in Ω and ψ is non increasing in the last variable, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (dd^c \bar{u})^n \leq \psi(\cdot, \bar{u}) \omega^n &\leq \psi(\cdot, u_j) \omega^n = (dd^c u_{j+1})^n \\ &\leq \psi(\cdot, u_{j-1}) \omega^n = (dd^c u_j)^n \\ &\leq \psi(\cdot, \underline{u}) \omega^n \leq (dd^c \underline{u})^n, \text{ on } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the comparison principle that $\bar{u} \geq u_{j+1} \geq u_j \geq \underline{u}$ in Ω . This achieves the construction.

Since the sequence (u_j) is increasing, it converges a.e. to a function $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\underline{u} \leq u \leq \bar{u}$ in Ω .

Setting $K_j := \sup_{\bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u_j|^2$, we see by Proposition 3.2 that

$$K_{j+1} \leq C_1 + 2^{-1} K_j,$$

for any j with a uniform constant C_1 independent of j . Thus $K_j \leq 2C_1 + K_0$, for all j , hence the sequence $(\|\nabla u_j\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})})$ is bounded by a constant which does not depend on j . It follows from Ascoli-Arzelà theorem that actually $u_j \rightarrow u$ uniformly on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$.

Moreover, passing to the limit in the weak sense in (3.40), we see that u is a weak solution to the Dirichlet problem (3.39).

On the other hand, the inequalities $\underline{u} \leq u_j \leq \bar{u}$ on $\bar{\Omega}$, yields

$$\sup_j \left(\|u_j\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} + \|\nabla u_j\|_{C^0(\partial\Omega)} \right) < +\infty$$

By Proposition 3.2, it follows that $\sup_j \|\nabla u_j\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} < +\infty$. It follows from the Laplacian estimate on the boundary (here we need the bound for the gradient) that the sequence $(\|\Delta u_{j+1}\|_{C^0(\partial\Omega)})$ is bounded. Hence there exists a uniform constant $C' > 0$ such that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\nabla u_j\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} + \|\Delta u_{j+1}\|_{C^0(\partial\Omega)} \leq C'.$$

Applying Proposition 3.4 with $u = u_{j+1}$ and $v = u_j$, we see that the constants $L_j := \|\Delta u_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ satisfy the inequality $L_{j+1} \leq C_2 + 2^{-1}L_j$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $L_j \leq 2C_2 + L_0$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Therefore there exists a uniform constant $C'' > 0$ such that

$$(3.41) \quad \|u_j\|_{C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C''.$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where C'' depends only on C' , the uniform barriers \underline{u} and \bar{u} of the u_j 's and an upper bound of ψ on $\bar{\Omega} \times [-M_0, 0]$ as well as a lower bound of ψ on $\Omega_0 \times [-M_0, -A_0]$, the later depending only on Ω and \bar{u} and an upper bound of ψ on $\bar{\Omega} \times [-M_0, 0]$ where M_0 is a uniform bound of the u_j 's (see Proposition 3.2).

Taking the limit in (3.41) we obtain $\|u\|_{C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C$. Hence $u \in C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$.

Step 2 : Assume now that $\psi \geq 0$, $\psi > 0$ in $\Omega \times]-\infty, 0[$ and \underline{u} is a strict subsolution to the Dirichlet problem (3.5) in the sense that it satisfies the inequality (3.3) for soem constant ϵ_0 . For a fixed $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, set $\psi_\epsilon := \psi + \epsilon^n$. Then consider the Dirichlet problem

$$(3.42) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = \psi_\epsilon(\cdot, u) \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = \phi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Since $\psi_\epsilon \geq \epsilon^n > 0$, we want to apply the first step to solve this problem. To this end we need to construct a subsolution \underline{u}_ϵ and a supersolution \bar{u}_ϵ to the problem (3.42) such that $\underline{u}_\epsilon \leq \bar{u}_\epsilon$ in Ω .

Indeed, observe that $\bar{u}_\epsilon := \bar{u}$ is clearly a supersolution since $\psi \leq \psi_\epsilon$. By strong pseudoconvexity, the domain Ω admits a smooth strictly plurisubharmonic defining function ρ such that $dd^c \rho \geq \omega$ in Ω . For for $0 < \epsilon < 1$, the function $\underline{u}_\epsilon := \underline{u} + \epsilon \rho$ is plurisubharmonic on Ω and $\underline{u} + \rho \leq \underline{u}_\epsilon \leq \underline{u}$ in Ω . Moreover if we set

$$M := \|\rho\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} \cdot \|\partial_t \psi\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega} \times I)},$$

where $I := [-C_0, 0]$ and $C_0 := \|\underline{u} + \rho\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (dd^c \underline{u}_\epsilon)^n &\geq (dd^c \underline{u})^n + \epsilon^n (dd^c \rho)^n \geq (\psi(\cdot, \underline{u}) + \epsilon_0 + \epsilon^n) \omega^n \\ &\geq (\psi(\cdot, \underline{u}_\epsilon) - M\epsilon + \epsilon_0 + \epsilon^n) \omega^n \geq (\psi(\cdot, \underline{u}_\epsilon) + \epsilon^n) \omega^n, \end{aligned}$$

if we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ so small that $M\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Hence for $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 := \min\{1, \varepsilon_0/M\}$, the function $\underline{u}_\varepsilon$ is a subsolution to the Dirichlet problem (3.42) such that $\underline{u}_\varepsilon \leq \underline{u} \leq \bar{u}$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.

From the first case, it follows that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, the Dirichlet problem (3.42) admits a solution $u_\varepsilon \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\underline{u} + \rho \leq \underline{u} + \varepsilon\rho \leq u_\varepsilon \leq \bar{u}$ in Ω .

Using Ascoli-Arzelà theorem we can extract a subsequence (u_{ε_j}) which converges uniformly on $\bar{\Omega}$ to a function $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$. Hence $(dd^c u)^n = \psi(\cdot, u)\omega^n$ in the weak sense on Ω and $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ i.e. u is a weak solution to the Dirichlet problem (3.39).

Observe that we have for any $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$, $\underline{u}_1 := \underline{u} + \rho \leq u_\varepsilon \leq \bar{u} < 0$ on Ω .

We claim that there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$ such that

$$(3.43) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

Indeed fix $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. We know from the first step that by construction u_ε is the limit of a sequence $(u_\varepsilon^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying the equation

$$(dd^c u_\varepsilon^{j+1})^n = (\psi(\cdot, u_\varepsilon^j) + \varepsilon^n)\omega^n,$$

on Ω and $\underline{u}_\varepsilon \leq u_\varepsilon^j \leq \bar{u}$ on Ω for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $\underline{u}_1 := \underline{u} + \rho \leq u_\varepsilon^j \leq \bar{u}$ on Ω for any $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$ and any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from the estimates (3.41) in the first step that

$$(3.44) \quad \|u_\varepsilon^j\|_{C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ does not depend on ε, j . Passing to the limit in (3.41) as $j \rightarrow +\infty$ for fixed $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$, we obtain the required estimate (3.43), which proves our claim.

By Ascoli-Arzelà theorem there exists a sequence $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ such that $u_j := u_{\varepsilon_j} \rightarrow u$ uniformly on $\bar{\Omega}$, where $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\underline{u} \leq u \leq \bar{u} < 0$ on Ω .

Moreover passing to the limit in (3.43) as $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the required estimate

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

which proves that $u \in C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$.

To prove that $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, we will use the complex analogue of Evans-Krylov type argument.

Recall that for each $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$, $u_\varepsilon \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ is a solution to the following Monge-Ampère equation

$$(dd^c u_\varepsilon)^n = g_\varepsilon \omega^n \text{ on } \Omega, \text{ where } g_\varepsilon(z) := \psi(z, u_\varepsilon(z)) + \varepsilon^n.$$

Observe that the right hand side g_ε of this equation is locally uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant independent of ε .

Indeed we have $g_\varepsilon(z) \geq \psi(z, u_\varepsilon(z)) \geq \psi(z, \bar{u}(z)) > 0$ in Ω since ψ is non increasing and $u_\varepsilon \leq \bar{u} < 0$ in Ω . Moreover $g_\varepsilon^{1/n} \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\|g_\varepsilon^{1/n}\|_{C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})}$ is uniformly bounded by a constant independent of $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$.

We can then apply the complex Evans-Krylov local argument provided in [33] (see also [17] and [24, Theorem 14.9]). Then for any subdomain $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ and any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, there exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$,

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega')} \leq C',$$

where C' does not depend on $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$. It follows that $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega')$.

To conclude that $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, we will use the Schauder theory as explained in [24, Section 14.3.2]. More precisely the operator

$$F(u) := \det(u_{j\bar{k}})$$

is locally uniformly elliptic on the class of smooth strictly plurisubharmonic functions u on Ω .

Fix an open set $\Omega'' \Subset \Omega$ and take a subdomain Ω' such that $\Omega'' \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega$. Recall that $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega')$ is a solution to the following equation on Ω'

$$F(u) = g := \psi(\cdot, u).$$

Since $g \in C^\alpha(\Omega')$, for a fixed $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $|\zeta| = 1$, the difference quotients

$$u^h(z) := \frac{u(z + h\zeta) - u(z)}{h},$$

are defined in a neighborhood V of $\bar{\Omega}''$ for $|h| > 0$ small enough, and satisfies a uniformly elliptic second order linear equation $L^h u^h = g^h$ in V with Hölder continuous coefficients and Hölder continuous right hand side (see [24, Section 14.3.2], [20, Corollary 6.3]). By the interior Schauder a priori estimates in [20, Corollary 6.3], it follows that $u^h \in C^{2,\alpha}(V)$ with a uniform control on its $C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega'')$ -norm (independent of h and ζ). Hence $u \in C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega'')$ for any $\Omega'' \Subset \Omega$. By iterating this argument we conclude that $u \in C^k(\Omega'')$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\Omega'' \Subset \Omega$. Hence $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$.

4. THE EXISTENCE OF THE FIRST EIGENVALUE

We will now give the proof of Theorem 1.1, deduce some properties of the first eigenvalue and give an application.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1. We follow the strategy of Lions [29].

Recall that for $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$, the first eigenvalues of the operator $-L_a$ is given by the formula

$$(4.1) \quad \gamma_1(a) := \sup\{\gamma \geq 0 : \exists u \in C^2(\Omega), \quad u < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad L_a u \geq -\gamma u f\}.$$

Proof. We define the following number

$$(4.2) \quad \lambda_1 := \inf\{\gamma_1(a) : a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)\}.$$

Following Lions, we consider the Dirichlet problem

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = (1 - \lambda u)^n f^n \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \equiv 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter.

Then we introduce the following real number :

$$(4.4) \quad \mu_1 := \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 : \exists u \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega), \text{ solution of (4.3)}\},$$

where

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega) := \{u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega}); u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}.$$

By Theorem 2.2 there exists $u_0 \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ solution to the problem (4.3) with $\lambda = 0$ i.e. $(dd^c u_0)^n = f^n \omega^n$. Hence μ_1 is well defined and $0 \leq \mu_1 \leq +\infty$.

Observe that since the right hand side $\psi(z, u) := (1 - \lambda u)^n f(z)^n \geq f^n(z)$ in $\bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0]$, the function u_0 is a supersolution to the Dirichlet problem (4.3) for any $\lambda > 0$.

The proof will be done in several steps.

Step 1 : We show that $\mu_1 \leq \lambda_1$.

Indeed if $\lambda \geq 0$ is such that u_λ is a solution to the problem (4.3), by the formula (2.5) for any $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ we have

$$L_a u \geq (1 - \lambda u_\lambda) f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u_\lambda < 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u_\lambda = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Then $\lambda \leq \gamma_1(a)$. Therefore he have $0 \leq \mu_1 \leq \lambda_1 < \infty$.

Step 2 : We prove that $\mu_1 \geq \|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1}$.

Indeed, if $\lambda < \|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1}$, we set $C = (1 - \lambda \|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})})^{-1}$. Then $\underline{u} = C u_0 \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$ and

$$(dd^c \underline{u})^n = (dd^c C u_0)^n = C^n (dd^c u_0)^n = C^n f^n \omega^n.$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} C f - (1 - \lambda \underline{u}) f &= \lambda C f (\|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} + u_0) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c \underline{u})^n \geq (1 - \lambda \underline{u})^n f^n \omega^n & \text{on } \Omega, \\ \underline{u} \equiv 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In other words \underline{u} is a subsolution of the problem (4.3). Since $(1 - \lambda \underline{u})^n f^n \omega^n \geq f^n \omega^n = (dd^c u_0)^n$ in Ω , it follows that u_0 is a supersolution of the problem (4.3) such that $\underline{u} \leq u_0$ in Ω . Since the right hand side of the equation (4.3) is positive, we can apply Theorem 3.1 to conclude that for $0 < \lambda < \|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1}$ there exists $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ solution of (4.3) such that $\underline{u}_1 \leq u_\lambda \leq u_0$

in Ω . This proves that any $\lambda < \|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1}$, satisfies the inequality $\lambda \leq \mu_1$. Therefore we have shown that

$$(4.7) \quad \|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1} \leq \mu_1 \leq \lambda_1.$$

Step 3 : We prove that for any $0 < \lambda < \mu_1$, the problem (4.3) admits a solution u_λ .

Indeed, if $0 < \lambda < \mu_1$, there exists $\lambda < \lambda' < \mu_1$ and $u_{\lambda'} \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$ such that

$$(dd^c u_{\lambda'})^n = (1 - \lambda' u_{\lambda'})^n f^n \omega^n \geq (1 - \lambda u_{\lambda'})^n f^n \omega^n.$$

Therefore $u_{\lambda'}$ is a subsolution to the problem (4.3). Since we already know that u_0 is a supersolution, applying again Theorem 3.1 yields the existence of a solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$.

Step 4 : We show that $\|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \mu_1$.

Assume the converse is true i.e. there exists $M > 0$ such that for some subsequence (λ_j) in $]0, \mu_1[$, converging to μ_1 we have, $\|u_{\lambda_j}\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} \leq M < +\infty$. Then

$$-M \leq u_{\lambda_j} \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

and for any $\lambda = \lambda_j$, we have

$$(dd^c u_\lambda)^n = (1 - \lambda u_\lambda)^n f^n \omega^n \leq (1 + \mu_1 M)^n f^n \omega^n.$$

Observe that $\underline{u} := (1 + \mu_1 M) u_0$ solves the following problem

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c \underline{u})^n = (1 + \mu_1 M)^n f^n \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \underline{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and then by the comparison principle $\underline{u} \leq u_\lambda$ on $\bar{\Omega}$.

On the other hand, since

$$(dd^c u_\lambda)^n = (1 - \lambda u_\lambda)^n f^n \omega^n \geq f^n \omega^n,$$

and $w := u_0$ solves the problem

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c w)^n = f^n \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and we have $u_\lambda \leq w$ on $\bar{\Omega}$.

Thus $\underline{u} \leq u_\lambda \leq w < 0$ on Ω . Since \underline{u} is strictly plurisubharmonic on Ω , it follows from Proposition 3.6, that there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\lambda = \lambda_j$

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

By the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (Step 2) based on the complex analogue of Evans-Krylov theory we conclude that, up to extracting a subsequence we can assume that $\{u_{\lambda_j}\}$ converges in the $C^2(\bar{\Omega}')$ -norm for any $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ to a function $u_{\mu_1} \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$ solution of (4.3) when $\lambda \rightarrow \mu_1$.

As in the second step, we see that for $\delta < \|u_{\mu_1}\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1}$, $C := (1 - \delta \|u_{\mu_1}\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})})^{-1}$ and $\underline{u} := C u_{\mu_1} \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$, and we have

$$(dd^c \underline{u})^n = C^n (dd^c u_{\mu_1})^n = C^n (1 - \mu_1 u_{\mu_1})^n f^n \omega^n,$$

and

$$C(1 - \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}) - (1 - (\delta + \mu_1)C u_{\mu_1}) = C\delta(\|u_{\mu_1}\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} + u_{\mu_1}) \geq 0.$$

Therefore

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c \underline{u})^n \geq (1 - (\delta + \mu_1)\underline{u})^n f^n \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \underline{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

In other words \underline{u} is a subsolution to the problem (4.3). Again since u_0 is a supersolution, it follows from Theorem 3.1 that there exist a solution u_λ of (4.3) for $\mu_1 \leq \lambda < \mu_1 + \delta$ and this contradicts the definition of μ_1 . Hence , $\|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \mu_1$.

Step 5 : We show that the normalized family defined for $\lambda < \mu_1$ by the following formula :

$$v_\lambda := \frac{u_\lambda}{\|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}},$$

converges to a function $\varphi_1 \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ such that (μ_1, φ_1) is a solution to the eigenvalue problem (1.1).

Indeed, for $\lambda < \mu_1$, we have

$$(dd^c v_\lambda)^n = \|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-n} (1 - \lambda u_\lambda)^n f^n \omega^n = (\|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1} - \lambda v_\lambda)^n f^n \omega^n \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Hence v_λ solves the following problem :

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c v_\lambda)^n = (\|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1} - \lambda v_\lambda)^n f^n \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega \\ v_\lambda = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega \\ \|v_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1. \end{cases}$$

Using the function u_0 defined before, we claim that there exists $C > 0$ and $0 < \mu_2 < \mu_1$ such that for $\mu_2 < \lambda < \mu_1$, we have

$$C u_0 \leq v_\lambda \leq 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

Indeed by the fourth step, there exists $0 < \mu_2 < \mu_1$ such that for $\mu_2 < \lambda < \mu_1$ we have $\|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} > 1$. Since $v_\lambda < 0$ in Ω and $\|v_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1$, it follows that for $\mu_2 < \lambda < \mu_1$,

$$(\|u_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1} - \lambda v_\lambda) \leq 1 + \mu_1.$$

Choosing $C = 1 + \mu_1$, we have for $\mu_2 < \lambda < \mu_1$,

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c v_\lambda)^n \leq C^n f^n \omega^n \leq (dd^c(Cu_0))^n & \text{in } \Omega \\ v_\lambda = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

By comparison principle, we deduce that $Cu_0 \leq v_\lambda < 0$ in Ω for $\mu_2 < \lambda < \mu_1$. This proves the claim.

Therefore we have a uniform bound on $\|\nabla v_\lambda\|_{C^0(\partial\Omega)}$ independent of $\lambda \in]\mu_2, \mu_1[$. Since $\|v_\lambda\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1$, it follows from Corollary 3.3 that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for any $\lambda \in]\mu_2, \mu_1[$,

$$\|v_\lambda\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C_1$$

By Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, there exists a subsequence (λ_j) in $]\mu_2, \mu_1[$ such that $\lambda_j \rightarrow \mu_1$ and the subsequence (v_{λ_j}) converges uniformly on $\bar{\Omega}$ to some $\varphi_1 \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ which is a weak solution of the following problem :

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c \varphi_1)^n = (-\mu_1 \varphi_1)^n f^n \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega \\ \varphi_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ \|\varphi_1\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1. \end{cases}$$

To prove that $\varphi_1 \in C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega})$, we will apply Proposition 3.6. This requires the existence of a uniform super-barrier for all v_λ 's. This will be constructed using φ_1 .

Indeed since $v_{\lambda_j} \rightarrow \varphi_1$ uniformly in $\bar{\Omega}$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, it follows that

$$-v_{\lambda_j} \geq -\varphi_1 - \frac{1}{3}$$

pointwise in $\bar{\Omega}$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. Since $\|\varphi_1\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 1$, there exists $z_0 \in \Omega$ such that $-\varphi_1(z_0) = 1$. Hence, there exists a ball $B = B(z_0, r) \Subset \Omega$ such that $-\varphi_1 \geq \frac{2}{3}$ in \bar{B} . Therefore

$$-v_{\lambda_j} \geq \frac{1}{3}$$

in \bar{B} for any j large enough. It follows that

$$(dd^c v_{\lambda_j})^n \geq 3^{-n} \lambda_j^n f^n \omega^n \geq 3^{-n} \mu_2^n f^n \omega^n$$

in \bar{B} and therefore

$$\Delta v_{\lambda_j} \geq \frac{\mu_2}{3} f$$

in \bar{B} .

Now let us solve the following classical Dirichlet problem for the Laplace operator

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta w = \frac{\mu_2}{3} f \theta_B & \text{in } \Omega \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $0 \leq \theta_B \leq 1$ is a smooth function in $\bar{\Omega}$ with $\text{Supp}(\theta_B) \subset B$ and $\theta_B \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of z_0 . Then we obtain a smooth subharmonic function w such that

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta w \leq \Delta v_{\lambda_j} & \text{in } \Omega \\ w = v_{\lambda_j} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Therefore $Cu_0 \leq v_{\lambda_j} \leq w < 0$ in Ω for j large enough.

By Proposition 3.6, there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that for j large enough, we have

$$(4.16) \quad \|v_{\lambda_j}\|_{C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

Recall that v_{λ_j} is a solution to the following Monge-Ampère equation

$$(dd^c v_{\lambda_j})^n = g_j, \text{ in } \Omega, \text{ where } g_j := (\|u_{\lambda_j}\|^{-1} - \lambda_j v_{\lambda_j})^n f^n.$$

Observe that the right hand side g_j of this equation is locally uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant independent of j , since $g_j \geq (-\mu_1 v_{\lambda_j})^n f^n$ and $v_{\lambda_j} \rightarrow \varphi_1$ uniformly on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $\varphi_1 < 0$ on Ω .

Moreover $g_j^{1/n} = (\|u_{\lambda_j}\|^{-1} - \lambda_j v_{\lambda_j})f \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\|g_j^{1/n}\|_{C^{0,1}(\Omega)}$ is uniformly bounded by a constant independent of j .

We can again apply the complex Evans-Krylov local argument and Schauder theory as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (Step 2) to conclude that $\varphi_1 \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ and the pair (μ_1, φ_1) is a solution of (1.1) with $\mu_1 \leq \lambda_1$.

Step 6 : We prove that $\mu_1 \geq \lambda_1$.

Indeed by Lemma 2.6, there exists $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ such that

$$L_{\bar{a}}\varphi_1 = \left[\det((\varphi_1)_{j\bar{k}}) \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} = -\mu_1 \varphi_1 f.$$

Therefore φ_1 is an eigenfunction of $-L_{\bar{a}}$ associated to the eigenvalue μ_1 and this implies that $\mu_1 \geq \gamma_1(\bar{a}) \geq \lambda_1$. Since we already know that $\mu_1 \leq \lambda_1$, we deduce that

$$\mu_1 = \lambda_1.$$

Step 7 : The last step is to prove that (μ_1, φ_1) is unique. Let (μ, φ) be another solution of (1.1). Again by Lemma 2.6, there exists $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ such that $L_{\bar{a}}\varphi = -\mu \varphi f$, which implies that $\mu \geq \lambda_1$.

We claim that there exists $t > 0$, such that $0 \leq t(-\varphi) \leq -\varphi_1$ on $\bar{\Omega}$. Indeed, by Hopf's Lemma ([18, Lemma 6.4.2, p. 347]) we have $D_\nu \varphi_1 < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ (ν being the inner unit normal vector field on $\partial\Omega$). Hence there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\varphi_1(x) \leq -c_0 d(x, \partial\Omega) \text{ on } \Omega.$$

On the other hand, let ρ be a smooth defining function for Ω ; in particular $|\nabla\rho| > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Since $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, it follows that $\varphi = h\rho$ on a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$, where h is a smooth function near $\partial\Omega$. Hence there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that $0 \leq -\varphi \leq c_1(-\rho)$ on $\bar{\Omega}$. Now its enough to observe that $d(x, \partial\Omega)$ is equivalent to $-\rho(x)$ on $\bar{\Omega}$. In particular there exist a constant $c'_0 > 0$ such that $-\rho(x) \leq c'_0 d(x, \partial\Omega)$ on $\bar{\Omega}$. Summarizing we obtain

$$-\varphi \leq c_1(-\rho) \leq c_1 c'_0 d(\cdot, \partial\Omega) \leq c_1 c'_0 c_0^{-1}(-\varphi_1), \text{ on } \Omega,$$

which proves the claim.

Now let $t_0 = \max\{t > 0 : 0 \leq t(-\varphi) \leq -\varphi_1 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega}\}$. Applying Lemma 2.6 in our case with $(\mu, t_0\varphi)$ and (λ_1, φ_1) , we find $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ such that

$$L_a(t_0\varphi - \varphi_1) + \mu t_0 \varphi f - \lambda_1 \varphi_1 f = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} L_a(t_0\varphi - \varphi_1) &= \lambda_1 \varphi_1 f - \mu t_0 \varphi f \\ &= -\lambda_1 f(t_0\varphi - \varphi_1) + (\lambda_1 - \mu) f t_0 \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda_1 \leq \mu$ and $\varphi < 0$, we obtain $L_a(t_0\varphi - \varphi_1) \geq -\lambda_1 f(t_0\varphi - \varphi_1)$. From the fact that $\lambda_1 \leq \gamma_1(a)$ and $\phi := t_0\varphi - \varphi_1 \geq 0$, we deduce that $L_a(\phi) \geq -\gamma_1(a)\phi f$. Since ϕ is bounded and $\phi = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$, by Proposition 2.5, there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi = \theta\phi_1$ where ϕ_1 is the positive eigenfunction of the operator $-L_a$.

Thus either $\theta = 0$ and we conclude, or $\theta > 0$ and using Hopf's Lemma again ([18, Lemma 6.4.2, p. 347]), we see that there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\theta\phi_1 \geq \varepsilon(-\varphi)$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, i.e. $t_0\varphi - \varphi_1 \geq \varepsilon(-\varphi)$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. But, this yields

$$(-\varphi_1) \geq (t_0 + \varepsilon)(-\varphi) \text{ in } \bar{\Omega}$$

contradicting the definition of t_0 . This shows that $\varphi_1 = t_0\varphi$ and thus $\mu = \lambda_1$. This proves Theorem 1.1. \square

Let us make some interesting remarks which follow from the previous proof.

Remark 4.1. 1. The previous proof gives a lower bound for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(f, \Omega)$. Indeed let $u_0 \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ be the solution to the equation (4.3) with $\lambda = 0$ i.e. $(dd^c u_0)^n = f^n \omega^n$ in Ω and $u_0 = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. Then by (4.7), we have

$$\lambda_1 \geq \|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}^{-1}.$$

In particular if $\Omega := B(a, R) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is an euclidean ball of radius $R > 0$ then the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(B(a, R)) = \lambda_1(B(a, R), 1)$ satisfies the following estimate :

$$(4.17) \quad \lambda_1(B(a, R)) \geq R^{-2}.$$

Indeed the function $u_0(z) := |z - a|^2 - R^2$ satisfies the required estimates with $f = 1$ in $B(a, R)$ and $\|u_0\|_{C^0(\bar{B}(a, R))} = R^2$.

2. Let $F : \Omega' \rightarrow \Omega$ be a biholomorphic map between bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n which extends smoothly to the boundary. Then we have

$$\lambda_1(\tilde{f}, \Omega') = \lambda_1(f, \Omega),$$

where $\tilde{f} := |J_F|^{2/n} f \circ F$ and J_F is the Jacobian of F in Ω' . Indeed, let (λ_1, φ_1) the solution to the eigenvalue problem (1.1) so that $(dd^c \varphi_1)^n = (-\lambda_1 \varphi_1)^n f^n \omega^n$ in Ω . Then

$$F^*((dd^c \varphi_1)^n) = (-\lambda_1 \varphi_1 \circ F)^n (f \circ F)^n F^*(\omega^n).$$

Since $F^*(\omega^n) = |J_F|^2 \omega^n$, if we let $\tilde{\varphi}_1 := \varphi_1 \circ F$ and $\tilde{f} := (f \circ F)|J_F|^{2/n}$, it follows that

$$(dd^c \tilde{\varphi}_1)^n = (-\lambda_1 \tilde{\varphi}_1)^n \tilde{f}^n \omega^n,$$

which proves our claim.

4.2. An application. We are going to give a further property of the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(\Omega, 1)$. We will consider a smooth function $H \in C^{1,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$ satisfying the following condition :

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{cases} H(z, t) > 0 & \text{for all } (z, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0] \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} \geq -\lambda_0 & \text{on } \bar{\Omega} \times]-\infty, 0], \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is a uniform constant.

Let λ_1 be the first eigenvalue of the complex Monge-Ampère operator with $f = 1$. Recall that λ_1 is the supremum of all $\lambda > 0$ such that there exists $u_\lambda \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying the equation $(dd^c u_\lambda)^n = (1 - \lambda u)^n \omega^n$ with $u_\lambda = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$.

We want to solve the following Dirichlet problem.

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = H^n(z, u) \omega^n & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $u \in PSH(\Omega)$ is the unknown function.

It's well known that this problem admits a unique smooth solution if $\partial_t H \geq 0$ in $\Omega \times]-\infty, 0]$ by [9].

Following Lions [29], we will prove the following more general result.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that H satisfies the assumptions (4.18) with a constant $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1$. Then the Dirichlet problem (4.19) admits a unique solution $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.*

Proof. To show the existence part, we just need to build a subsolution and apply Theorem 2.3.

Let $C \geq \|H(\cdot, 0)\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} > 0$. Since $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1$, we can choose $\lambda \in]\lambda_0, \lambda_1[$ and set $v := Cu_\lambda$, where u_λ is a solution to the problem (4.3). Then we have in Ω ,

$$\begin{aligned} [\det(v_{j\bar{k}})]^{1/n} &= C(1 - \lambda u_\lambda) \\ &\geq \|H(\cdot, 0)\|_{C^0(\Omega)} + \lambda_0(-Cu_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand for $s < 0$ and $z \in \Omega$, we have

$$H(z, 0) - H(z, s) = \int_s^0 \partial_t H(z, t) dt \geq -\lambda_0(-s) = \lambda_0 s.$$

Applying this inequality for $s = Cu_\lambda(z)$ we obtain for $z \in \Omega$,

$$C + \lambda_0(-Cu_\lambda) \geq H(z, 0) + \lambda_0(-Cu_\lambda(z)) \geq H(z, Cu_\lambda(z)),$$

Hence Cu_λ is a subsolution to the problem (4.19). By Theorem 2.3, it follows that the problem (4.19) admits a solution $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.

Now we will prove the uniqueness. If u, v are two solutions to the problem (4.19), by Lemma 2.6, one may find $a \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ such that

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{cases} L_a(u - v) = H(\cdot, u) - H(\cdot, v) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u - v = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega \\ u - v \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega}). \end{cases}$$

We have for $z \in \Omega$,

$$H(z, u(z)) - H(z, v(z)) := c(z)(u(z) - v(z)),$$

where

$$c(z) := \int_0^1 \frac{\partial H}{\partial s}(z, v(z) + s(u(z) - v(z))) ds.$$

Let $w := u - v$, then (4.20) becomes

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{cases} (L_a - c)w = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ w \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega}). \end{cases}$$

Let $\phi_1 > 0$ be an eigenfunction of $-L_a$ with eigenvalue $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(a)$, i.e. $L_a\phi_1 = -\gamma_1\phi_1$ and $\phi_1|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$.

Since $\frac{\partial H}{\partial t}(z, t) \geq -\lambda_0$, it follows that $c \geq -\lambda_0 > -\gamma_1$. Hence $\phi_1 > 0$ in Ω and

$$\begin{aligned} (L_a - c)\phi_1 &= L_a\phi_1 - c\phi_1 \\ &= -(\gamma_1 + c)\phi_1 \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the operator $L_a - c$ satisfies the maximum principle (see [7], property (ii) page 48). Hence the problem (4.21) has a unique solution, which implies that $w = 0$ in Ω i.e. $u = v$ in Ω . \square

5. A VARIATIONAL FORMULA FOR λ_1

For the proof of Theorem 1.2, we need to develop a variational approach to the eigenvalue problem using Pluripotential Theory.

5.1. The finite energy class. We assume here that $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is hyperconvex i.e. it admits a continuous negative plurisubharmonic exhaustion. Let us define an important convex class of singular plurisubharmonic functions in Ω suitable for the variational approach. As we explained in section 2.1, the complex Monge-Ampère operator $(dd^c \cdot)^n$ is well defined on the class of locally bounded plurisubharmonic functions in Ω .

Following Urban Cegrell [12], we define the class $\mathcal{E}^0(\Omega)$ as the set of bounded plurisubharmonic functions ϕ on Ω with boundary values 0 such that $\int_{\Omega} (dd^c \phi)^n < +\infty$. Then we define $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ as the set of plurisubharmonic functions u in Ω such that there exists a decreasing sequence $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the

class $\mathcal{E}^0(\Omega)$ satisfying $u = \lim_j u_j$ in Ω and $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)(dd^c u_j)^n < +\infty$. It is easy to see from the definition that $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ is a convex cone in $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$.

It turns out that the complex Monge-Ampère operator extends to the class $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ and is continuous under monotone limits in $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$. Moreover if $u \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$, then $\int_{\Omega} (-u)(dd^c u)^n < +\infty$ (see [12]).

5.2. The Monge-Ampère energy functional. The Monge-Ampère energy functional is defined on the space $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ as follows : for $\phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$,

$$(5.1) \quad E(\phi) := \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Omega} (-\phi)(dd^c \phi)^n.$$

It was proved in [8] in the compact setting that E is lower semi-continuous and $-E$ is a primitive of the complex Monge-Ampère operator (see also [30], [1] for domains). More precisely, we have.

Lemma 5.1. *1) For any smooth path $t \mapsto \phi_t$ in $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ defined in some interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt} E(\phi_t) = \int_{\Omega} (-\dot{\phi}_t)(dd^c \phi_t)^n, \quad t \in I.$$

In particular if $u, v \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ and $u \leq v$, then $0 \leq E(v) \leq E(u)$.

Moreover we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} E(\phi_t) &= \int_{\Omega} (-\ddot{\phi}_t)(dd^c \phi_t)^n \\ &+ n \int_{\Omega} d\dot{\phi}_t \wedge d^c \dot{\phi}_t \wedge (dd^c \phi_t)^{n-1}, \quad t \in I \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any $u, v \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$, the function $t \mapsto E((1-t)u + tv)$ is a convex function in $[0, 1]$.

2) The functional $E : \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is lower semi-continuous on $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ for the $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ -topology.

The following estimates for the capacity of sublevel sets of functions in $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ will be useful (see [15]). There exists a constant $D_0 > 0$ such that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ and any $s > 0$, we have

$$(5.3) \quad \text{Cap}_{\Omega}(\{\phi \leq -s\}) \leq \frac{D_0}{s^{n+1}} E(\phi).$$

5.3. A non linear Sobolev-Poincaré type inequality. We will need the following result.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $dV_g := g\omega^n$ be a positive volume form on $\bar{\Omega}$ with density $0 \leq g \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$. Then there exists a constant $A = A(n, \|g\|_p) > 0$ such that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$, we have*

$$(5.4) \quad \int_{\Omega} (-\phi)^{n+1} dV_g \leq A E(\phi).$$

Moreover for any sequence (u_j) in $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ converging to u in $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ such that $M := \sup_j E(u_j) < +\infty$, we have

$$(5.5) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^{n+1} dV_g = \int_{\Omega} (-u)^{n+1} dV_g.$$

Observe that for $n = 1$, $E(\phi) = (1/2) \int_{\Omega} (-\phi) dd^c \phi = (1/2) \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2$. Hence the inequality (5.4) in this case is the Poincaré inequality for functions in $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega) \subset W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

Proof. To prove the inequality (5.4), we will need the following estimate due to Z. Blocki. For any $u, v \in \mathcal{E}^0(\Omega)$ we have

$$(5.6) \quad \int_{\Omega} (-u)^{n+1} (dd^c v)^n \leq (n+1)! \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^n \int_{\Omega} (-u) (dd^c u)^n,$$

This can be proved using integration by parts n times (see [5]).

By a well know result of Kołodziej [26], there exists $\phi_0 \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\phi_0 = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$ and $(dd^c \phi_0)^n = g dV$ in the sense of currents on Ω .

To prove the estimate (5.4), it is enough to assume that $\phi \in \mathcal{E}^0(\Omega)$. Then since we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (-\phi)^{n+1} dV_g = \int_{\Omega} (-\phi)^{n+1} (dd^c \phi_0)^n,$$

it follows from (5.6) that

$$\int_{\Omega} (-\phi)^{n+1} dV_g \leq (n+1)! \|\phi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^n \int_{\Omega} (-\phi) (dd^c \phi)^n,$$

which proves the required estimate with $A := (n+1)(n+1)! \|\phi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^n$.

Let us prove the second property. Taking a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that $u_j \rightarrow u$ a.e. in Ω .

Assume first that (u_j) is uniformly bounded in Ω . Then since the sequence $(-u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}^{n+1}$ converges to $(-u)^{n+1}$ a.e. in Ω it follows from the Lebesgue convergence theorem that

$$(5.7) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^{n+1} g dV = \int_{\Omega} (-u)^{n+1} g dV.$$

We now consider the general case. For fixed $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $u^{(k)} := \sup\{u, -k\}$ and $u_j^{(k)} := \sup\{u_j, -k\}$.

Set for $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $h_j := (-u_j)^{n+1}$, $h_j^{(k)} = (-u_j^{(k)})^{n+1}$, $h := (-u)^{n+1}$ and $h^{(k)} := (-u^{(k)})^{n+1}$. These are Borel functions in $L^1(\Omega, dV_g)$ and we have the following obvious inequalities :

$$(5.8) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega} (h_j - h) dV_g \right| \leq \int_{\Omega} (h_j^{(k)} - h_j) dV_g + \left| \int_{\Omega} h_j^{(k)} - h^{(k)} dV_g \right| + \int_{\Omega} (h^{(k)} - h) dV_g.$$

For fixed k , the sequence $(u_j^{(k)})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a uniformly bounded sequence of plurisubharmonic functions in Ω . Then applying the first step, we see that

for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the second term in (5.8) converges to 0 as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, while the third term converges to 0 by the monotone convergence theorem. It remain to show that the first term converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, uniformly in j . Indeed, for $j, k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ we have the following obvious estimates

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{\Omega} |h_j - h_j^{(k)}| dV_g \leq 2 \int_{\{h_j \geq k^{n+1}\}} h_j dV_g.$$

We claim that the sequence $k \mapsto \int_{\{h_j \geq k^{n+1}\}} h_j dV_g$ converges to 0 uniformly in j as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Indeed for fixed j, k , we have

$$(5.10) \quad \int_{\{h_j \geq k^{n+1}\}} h_j dV_g = \int_{\{u_j \leq -k\}} (-u_j)^{n+1} g dV$$

On the other hand, given a Borel subset $B \subset \Omega$, by Kolodziej's theorem [26] there exists $\phi_B \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\phi_B = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$ and $(dd^c \phi_B)^n = \mathbf{1}_B g dV$ in the sense of currents on Ω . Moreover there exists a uniform constant $C_0 > 0$ such that $\|\phi_B\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^n \leq C_0 \|\mathbf{1}_B g\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$.

Therefore as before, Blocki's inequality (5.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B (-u_j)^{n+1} g dV &= \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^{n+1} (dd^c \phi_B)^n \leq (n+1)! \|\phi_B\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^n \int_{\Omega} (-u_j) (dd^c u_j)^n \\ &\leq (n+1)! C_0 M \|\mathbf{1}_B g\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now since $g^p \in L^1(\Omega)$, by absolute continuity, it follows that $\|\mathbf{1}_B g\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p = \int_B g^p dV \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{Vol}(B) \rightarrow 0$.

This implies that $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_B (-u_j)^{n+1} g dV \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{Vol}(B) \rightarrow 0$. We want to apply this result to the Borel sets $B := \{u_j \leq -k\}$. To estimate their volumes, we first observe that their Monge-Ampère capacity can be controlled using the inequalities (5.3) i.e. for any $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\text{Cap}_{\Omega}(\{u_j \leq -k\}) \leq \frac{D_0}{k^{n+1}} E(u_j) \leq \frac{D_0 M}{k^{n+1}}.$$

Using the inequality (2.1), we conclude that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Vol}(\{u_j \leq -k\}) \leq \frac{M D_0 R^{2n}}{k^{n+1}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

This proves the claim and completes the proof of the Lemma. \square

5.4. A Rayleigh quotient type formula. We first use a variational approach to prove the following result of independent interest.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a hyperconvex domain and $dV_g := g\omega^n$ be a positive volume form on $\bar{\Omega}$ with density $0 \leq g \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$ such that $\int_{\Omega} dV_g > 0$. We define the real number*

$$(5.11) \quad \eta_1^n := \inf \left\{ \frac{E(\phi)}{I_g(\phi)}; \phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega), w \neq 0 \right\},$$

where $I_g(\phi) := \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Omega} (-\phi)^{n+1} dV_g$.

Then there exists a function $w \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$(5.12) \quad \eta_1^n = \frac{E(w)}{I_g(w)}.$$

Moreover (η_1, w) is a (weak) solution to the eigenvalue problem

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c w)^n = (-\eta_1 w)^n g \omega^n & \text{on } \Omega \\ w = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega \\ w < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By assumption, Ω admits a continuous negative plurisubharmonic exhaustion ρ . Then $\rho \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ and any $w \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ such that $w < 0$ satisfies $\int_{\Omega} (-w)^{n+1} dV_g > 0$. Indeed, since $\int_{\Omega} dV_g > 0$ there exists a compact set $K \Subset \Omega$ such that $V_g(K) := \int_K dV_g > 0$. Therefore $\int_{\Omega} (-w)^{n+1} dV_g \geq (-\max_K w)^{n+1} V_g(K) > 0$. Hence η_1 is a well defined non negative real number and by homogeneity, we have

$$(5.14) \quad \eta_1^n = \inf\{E(w); w \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega), I_g(w) = 1\}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 5.2, there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that for any $w \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$

$$\int_{\Omega} (-w)^{n+1} dV_g \leq A E(w).$$

In particular we conclude that $\eta_1^n \geq A^{-1} > 0$.

On the other hand, by definition there exists a minimizing sequence $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ such that $I_g(w_j) = 1$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} E(w_j) = \eta_1^n.$$

By construction it follows that the sequence $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^{n+1}(\Omega, dV_g)$. Extracting a subsequence if necessary we can assume that (w_j) converges weakly to $w \in PSH(\Omega)$ and a.e. in Ω , hence in $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. By semi-continuity of the energy functional, it follows that $w \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ and $E(w) \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} E(w_j) = \eta_1^n$.

Since $\sup_j E(w_j) =: C < +\infty$, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that

$$(5.15) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-w_j)^{n+1} dV_g = \int_{\Omega} (-w)^{n+1} dV_g.$$

Hence $I_g(w) = 1$ and $w \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ is an extremal function for the eigenvalue problem i.e.

$$\eta_1^n = \frac{E(w)}{I_g(w)}.$$

To prove that (η_1, w) is a solution to the eigenvalue problem, consider the following functional defined for $\phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$, by the formula

$$F_g(\phi) := E(\phi) - \eta_1^n I_g(\phi),$$

and observe that when ϕ is smooth then

$$F'_g(\phi) = -(dd^c \phi)^n + \eta_1^n (-\phi)^n dV_g,$$

This means that the eigenvalue equation is the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional F_g on $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$.

As observed before, for any $\phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ with $\phi \not\equiv 0$, we have $I_g(\phi) > 0$ and then

$$F_g(\phi) := I_g(\phi) \left(\frac{E(\phi)}{I_g(\phi)} - \eta_1^n \right) \geq 0,$$

by definition of η_1 . Since $F_g(w) = 0$, this means that the functional F_g achieves its minimum on $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ at w . Therefore w is a kind of "critical point" of the functional F_g . To prove this claim, we will use a tricky argument which goes back to [8].

Fix a "test function" $\psi \in \mathcal{E}^0(\Omega)$ and consider the path $\phi_t = w + t\psi$ which belongs to $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ when $0 \leq t \leq 1$ by convexity. When $t < 0$, this is no longer the case, and so we consider its plurisubharmonic envelope $\tilde{\phi}_t := P(\phi_t)$ i.e. the largest plurisubharmonic function below ϕ_t in Ω . Then since $w \leq \phi_t$ when $t < 0$, it follows that $w \leq P(\phi_t)$ when $t < 0$ hence $\tilde{\phi}_t \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ for any $t \in [-1, +1]$ (see [12]).

Now consider the one variable function defined for $t \in [-1, +1]$ by

$$h(t) := E \circ P(\phi_t) - \eta_1^n I_g(\phi_t).$$

We claim that the function h is derivable $[-1, +1]$, non negative and attains its minimum at $t = 0$. Indeed observe first that $h(0) = 0$. Moreover since for any $t \in [-1, 1]$, $\tilde{\phi}_t \leq \phi_t < 0$ in Ω , it follows that $I_g(\phi_t) \leq I_g(\tilde{\phi}_t)$ and then

$$h(t) \geq E(\tilde{\phi}_t) - \eta_1^n I_g(\tilde{\phi}_t) = F_g(\tilde{\phi}_t) \geq 0,$$

for any $t \in [-1, 1]$, which proves our claim. An important property of the operator P is that for any smooth curve $t \mapsto \varphi_t$ in $L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, we have :

$$\frac{d}{dt}(E \circ P)(\varphi_t) = \int_{\Omega} (-\dot{\varphi}_t)(dd^c P(\varphi_t))^n,$$

for any t (see [8], [30]).

Therefore h is derivable in $[-1, +1]$ and by Lemma 5.1, we have for any $t \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} h'(t) &= \frac{d}{dt} E(\tilde{\phi}_t) - \eta_1^n \frac{d}{dt} I_g(\phi_t) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (-\dot{\phi}_t)(dd^c \tilde{\phi}_t)^n + \eta_1^n \int_{\Omega} \dot{\phi}_t (-\phi_t)^n dV_g. \end{aligned}$$

Since h achieves its minimum at 0, it follows that $h'(0) = 0$, which implies the following identity:

$$\int_{\Omega} \psi (dd^c w)^n = \eta_1^n \int_{\Omega} \psi (-w)^n dV_g.$$

for any $\psi \in \mathcal{E}^0(\Omega)$. Since any smooth test function χ in Ω can be written as $\chi = \psi_1 - \psi_2$, where $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{E}^0(\Omega)$, it follows that

$$(dd^c w)^n = \eta_1^n (-w)^n dV_g.$$

in the sense of currents on Ω . \square

5.5. Proof of Theorem 1.2. It is an immediate consequence of the following result.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $dv_f := f^n \omega^n$ be a smooth positive volume form on $\bar{\Omega}$ and (λ_1, φ_1) the smooth normalized solution of the eigenvalue problem (1.1) and let (η_1, w_1) be a weak solution to the problem (5.13) for $g = f^n$.*

Then $\lambda_1 = \eta_1$ and $\varphi_1 = \theta w_1$ for some constant $\theta > 0$. In particular

$$(5.16) \quad \lambda_1^n = \frac{\int_{\Omega} (-\varphi_1)(dd^c \varphi_1)^n}{\int_{\Omega} (-\varphi_1)^{n+1} dv_f} = \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} (-\phi)(dd^c \phi)^n}{\int_{\Omega} (-\phi)^{n+1} dv_f}; \phi \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega), \phi \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Proof. Since (λ_1, φ_1) is the solution of the eigenvalue problem (1.1) given by Theorem 1.1, it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} (-\varphi_1)(dd^c \varphi_1)^n = \lambda_1^n \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi_1)^{n+1} f^n \omega^n.$$

By the formula (5.12) we see that $\lambda_1 \geq \eta_1$.

We first prove that $\eta_1 = \lambda_1$. We argue by contradiction. Assume that $\eta_1 < \lambda_1 = \mu_1$. From step 3 of the proof of Theorem 1.1, it follows that there exists $u_{\eta_1} \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ such that

$$(dd^c u_{\eta_1})^n = (1 - \eta_1 u_{\eta_1})^n f^n \omega^n, \quad u_{\eta_1} = 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega.$$

Moreover w_1 is a weak (super)-solution to the problem (5.13). We want to compare u_{η_1} and w_1 by applying the comparison principle.

We first claim that w_1 is bounded in Ω and $w_1 = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. Indeed by Lemma 5.2, we have $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega) \subset L^{n+1}(\Omega)$, hence $w_1 \in L^{n+1}(\Omega)$. Set $p := \frac{n+1}{n} > 1$. Since f is bounded in Ω , it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} [(-\eta_1 w_1)^n f^n]^p \omega^n \leq \int_{\Omega} (-\eta_1 w_1)^{n+1} f^{n+1} \leq \|\eta_1 f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{n+1} \int_{\Omega} (-w_1)^{n+1} \omega^n < \infty.$$

This means that the density $g := (-\eta_1 w_1)^n f^n \in L^p(\Omega)$ with $p > 1$. By a theorem of Kolodziej [25, Theorem 3], there exists a unique function $v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $(dd^c v)^n = (-\eta_1 w_1)^n f^n \omega^n$ on Ω and $v = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. Moreover we also have $v \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$. This means that we have two weak solutions $v, w_1 \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ of the complex Monge-Ampère equation $(dd^c \phi)^n = (-\eta_1 w_1)^n f^n \omega^n$. By the uniqueness theorem of Cegrell [12, Theorem 6.2], it follows that $w_1 = v \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ and $w_1 = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. This proves our claim.

Now we have $(dd^c w_1)^n = (-\eta_1 w_1)^n f^n \omega^n \leq t^n f^n \omega^n$ on Ω , where $t := \eta_1 M$. Moreover we also have $(dd^c u_{\eta_1})^n \geq f^n \omega^n$ on Ω and then $(dd^c w_1)^n \leq (dd^c t u_{\eta_1})^n$ on Ω . Since $t u_{\eta_1} = 0 = w_1$ in $\partial\Omega$, it follows from the comparison principle that $\underline{u} := t u_{\eta_1} \leq w_1$ in Ω .

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (dd^c \underline{u})^n &= t^n (1 - \eta_1 u_{\eta_1})^n f^n \omega^n \\ &\geq t^n (1 + (-\eta_1 u_{\eta_1})^n) f^n \omega^n \\ &= ((-\eta_1 \underline{u})^n + t^n) f^n \omega^n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence \underline{u} is a smooth strict subsolution to the problem (5.13) and w_1 is a continuous supersolution to the problem (5.13) such that $\underline{u} \leq w_1$ in Ω . It follows from Theorem 3.1 that there exists a solution $\varphi \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\bar{1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ to the problem (5.13) such that $\underline{u} \leq \varphi \leq w_1$ in Ω . Therefore if $\theta := \|\varphi\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})}$, then $(\eta_1, \theta\varphi)$ is another smooth solution to the eigenvalue problem (1.1). By the uniqueness property in Theorem 1.1, it follows that $\eta_1 = \lambda_1$. This contradiction leads to the conclusion $\eta_1 = \lambda_1$. Now the fact that for some positive constant $\theta > 0$ follows from the uniqueness property in Proposition 5.5 below. \square

Proposition 5.5. *Let (λ_1, φ_1) be the normalized smooth solution to the eigenvalue problem (1.1). Assume that $u \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to the following problem*

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = (-\lambda_1 u)^n f^n \omega^n & \text{on } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a positive constant $\theta > 0$ such that $u = \theta\varphi_1$.

The main idea of the proof of this result is due to Chinh H. Lu.

Proof. First observe that $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. Indeed as in the last proof, we see that the density $g := (-\lambda_1 u)^n f^n \in L^{1+1/n}(\Omega)$. Therefore by [13] (see also [23]), there exists $\phi \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $(dd^c \phi)^n = g\omega^n$ in Ω and $\phi = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. By the uniqueness theorem of Cegrell for solutions in $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ we conclude that $u = \phi \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$ (see [12, Theorem 6.2]).

By the mixed Monge-Ampère inequalities ([26], [16]), we have

$$dd^c u \wedge (dd^c \varphi_1)^{n-1} \geq (-\lambda_1 u f)(-\lambda_1 \varphi_1 f)^{n-1} \omega^n = (-\lambda_1 u) G \omega^n,$$

weakly on Ω , where $G := (-\lambda_1 \varphi_1)^{n-1} f^n$ is a smooth function in $\bar{\Omega}$.

Let us consider the following linear elliptic second order operator

$$L\phi := dd^c \phi \wedge (dd^c \varphi_1)^{n-1} / \omega^n.$$

Then $L\varphi_1 = (-\lambda_1 \varphi_1)G$, and

$$(5.18) \quad Lu \geq -\lambda_1 uG,$$

weakly on Ω .

Since $-\lambda_1 uG \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$, it follows from Schauder theory that the following Dirichlet problem

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{cases} Lv = -\lambda_1 uG & \text{on } \Omega \\ v = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

admits a solution $v \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$.

Indeed the operator L is elliptic on Ω and then it satisfies the maximum principle [20, Theorem 3.5]. Moreover the operator L is locally uniformly elliptic and its coefficients are locally Hölder continuous on Ω . Therefore we

can apply the observation of [20, Section 6.6]. To be more precise we can apply the Perron method to solve the Dirichlet problem (5.19) as explained after the statement of [20, Theorem 6.11]. Indeed observe that u is a subsolution to this problem, hence the upper envelope v of all subsolutions to the Dirichlet problem (5.19) is well defined and is a bounded subsolution such that $u \leq v \leq 0$ in Ω . To show that $v \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$ is a solution to the Dirichlet problem (5.19), one can use the classical balayage process using the same arguments as in the proof of [20, Theorem 2.12], thanks to the compactness result provided by the interior Schauder estimates of [20, Corollary 6.3].

By (5.18), we have $Lu \geq -\lambda_1 uG = Lv$, hence $u \leq v \leq 0$ in Ω and then $Lv \geq -\lambda_1 vG$ on Ω .

Now applying Proposition 2.5, we deduce that there exists $\theta > 0$ such that $v = \theta\varphi_1$. Hence $Lv = -\lambda_1 vG$ in Ω and $v = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. By (5.19), we deduce that $u = v$, hence $u = \theta\varphi_1$. \square

5.6. The monotonicity property of $\lambda_1(\Omega)$. Let $\Omega' \Subset \Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be two bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains and $0 < f \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$. Then we have the following comparison theorem

Theorem 5.6. *Let $f' := f_{\Omega'}$ be the restriction of f to Ω' . Then we have*

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, f) \leq \lambda_1(\Omega', f').$$

Proof. We denote by $E_\Omega(u) := \frac{1}{n+1} \int_\Omega (-u)(dd^c u)^n$ for $u \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ and $I_{\Omega, f} := \frac{1}{n+1} \int_\Omega (-u)^{n+1} f^n dV$.

By Theorem 5.4 there exists $w' \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega')$ such that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega', f_{\Omega'}) = \frac{E_{\Omega'}(w')}{I_{\Omega', f'}(w')}.$$

By the subextension Theorem from [10], it follows that there exists $w \in \mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$ such that $w \leq w'$ in Ω' and $E_\Omega(w) \leq E_{\Omega'}(w')$. Since $w \leq w'$ in Ω' , it follows that $I_{\Omega', f'}(w') \leq I_{\Omega, f}(w)$, hence

$$\frac{E_{\Omega'}(w')}{I_{\Omega', f'}(w')} \geq \frac{E_\Omega(w)}{I_{\Omega, f}(w)}.$$

By Theorem 5.4 we conclude that $\lambda_1(\Omega', f') \geq \lambda_1(\Omega, f)$. \square

From (4.17) we deduce the following lower bound for the first eigenvalue.

Corollary 5.7. *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain and $R := \text{diam}(\Omega)/2$. Then the eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega) = \lambda_1(\Omega, 1)$ satisfies the following estimate :*

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \geq R^{-2}.$$

Dedication : This work is dedicated to Professor Jean-Pierre Demailly for his profound contributions to Complex Analysis and Pluripotential Theory with deep applications to Kähler Geometry and complex Algebraic Geometry.

Acknowledgements : This article was completed when the first author was visiting the Institute of Mathematics of Toulouse during spring 2023. He would like to thank this institution for welcoming him and providing him with excellent research conditions. He also would like to thank especially his coadvisor Salomon Sambou for his strong support and many useful discussion and suggestions during the elaboration of the first part of this work.

The second author would like to thank Salomon Sambou and Daouda Niang Diatta for useful mathematical discussions and also for their support and their kind hospitality during his visits to the University Assane Seck of Ziguinchor.

The authors would like to thank Vincent Guedj and Chinh H. Lu for interesting discussions and useful suggestions about this work. They are indebted to Chinh Hoang Lu for his careful reading of the first version of this work, pointing out an error and helping them to correct it.

Finally, the authors are grateful to the reviewer for his careful reading of the previous version of the paper and for many suggestions that permit to correct some statements and improve significantly the presentation of its final version.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Åhag, U. Cegrell, R. Czyz : *On Dirichlet's principle and problem*. Math. Scand. 110 (2), 235-250 (2012).
- [2] P. Åhag, U. Cegrell, S. Kolodziej, H.H. Pham, A. Zeriahi: *Partial Energy and Integrability Exponents*, Adv. Math. 222 (2009), no. 6, 2036–2058.
- [3] E. Bedford and B. A. Taylor : *The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampère equation*. Invent. Math., 37 (1), 1-44 (1976).
- [4] E. Bedford and B. A. Taylor : *A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions*. Acta Math. 149 , no. 1 (2), 1-40 (1982).
- [5] Z. Błocki : *Estimates for the complex Monge-Ampère operator*. Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences 41, 151-157 (1993).
- [6] Z. Błocki, *A gradient estimate in the Calabi-Yau theorem*, Math. Ann. 344 (2009), no. 2, 317–327.
- [7] H. Berestycki, L. Nirenberg, S.R.S. Varadhan : *The first eigenvalue and maximum principle for second order elliptic differential operators in general domains*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 47 (1), 47-92 (1994).
- [8] R. Berman, S. Boucksom, V. Guedj, A. Zeriahi : *A variational approach to complex Monge-Ampère equations*. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. 117, 179-245 (2013).
- [9] L. Caffarelli, J. J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg, J. Spruck : *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. II. Complex Monge-Ampère, and uniformly elliptic, equations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 38 (2), 209-252 (1985).
- [10] U. Cegrell, S. Kolodziej, A. Zeriahi : *Maximal subextensions of plurisubharmonic functions*. Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. 20 (6), 101–122 (2011).
- [11] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg, J. Spruck : *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. I. Monge-Ampère*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 37, 369-402 (1984).
- [12] U. Cegrell : *Pluricomplex energy*. Acta Math. 180 (2), 187-217 (1998).

- [13] M. Charabati : *Hölder regularity for solutions to complex Monge-Ampère equations*. Ann. Polon. Math. 113 (2), 109-127 (2015).
- [15] U. Cegrell, S. Kolodziej, A. Zeriahi : *Subextension of plurisubharmonic functions with weak singularities*. Math. Zeit. 250, 7-22 (2005).
- [16] S. Dinew : *An inequality for mixed Monge-Ampère measures*. Math. Z. 262, 1-15 (2009).
- [17] S. Dinew, X. Zhang, X.W. Zhang : *The $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate of complex Monge-Ampère equation*. IUMJ, 60-5 (2011), 1713-1722.
- [18] L. C. Evans : *Partial Differential Equations*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 19, Second edition, American Mathematical Society (2010).
- [19] B. Gaveau : *Méthode de contrôle optimal en analyse complexe, I*. J. Funct. Anal. 25, 391-411 (1977).
- [20] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger : *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order (2nd edn.)*. Grundlehr. der Math. Wiss., Springer, Berlin (1998).
- [21] B. Guan : *The Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equations and Regularity of the Pluricomplex Green Function*. Comm. Anal. Geom., 6 (4), 687-703 (1998).
- [22] B. Guan and Q. Li : *Complex Monge-Ampère equations and totally real submanifolds*. Adv. Math. 225, 1185-1223 (2010).
- [23] V. Guedj, S. Koldziej and A. Zeriahi : *Hölder continuous solutions to Monge-Ampère equations*. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 40 (6), 1070-1080 (2008).
- [24] V. Guedj and A. Zeriahi : *Degenerate Complex Monge-Ampère Equations*. EMS Tracts in Mathematics 26 (2017).
- [25] S. Kolodziej : *Some sufficient conditions for solvability of the Dirichlet problem for the complex Monge-Ampère operator*. Ann. Pol. Math. 65 (1), p. 11-21 (1996).
- [26] S. Kolodziej : *Equicontinuity of families of plurisubharmonic functions with bounds on their Monge-Ampère masses*. Math. Z. 240 (4), 835-847 (2002).
- [27] N.D. Koutev, I. P. Ramadanov : *Valeurs propres radiales de l'opérateur de Monge-Ampère complexe*. Bull. Sc. Math. 113 (2), 195-212 (1989).
- [28] N.D. Koutev, I. P. Ramadanov : *An eigenvalue problem for the complex Monge-Ampère operator in pseudoconvex domains*. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré. 7 (5), 493-503 (1990).
- [29] P. L. Lions : *Two remarks on the Monge-Ampère equations*. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. 142 (4), 263-275 (1986).
- [30] C. H. Lu : *A variational approach to complex Hessian equations in \mathbb{C}^n* . J. Math. Anal. Appl. 431 (1), 228-259 (2015).
- [31] R. Nussbaum, Y. Pinchover : *On variational principles for the generalized principal eigenvalue of second order elliptic operators and applications*. Journal d'Analyse Mathématique. 59, 161-177 (1992).
- [32] K. Tso : *On a real Monge-Ampère functional*. Invent. Math. 101, 425-448 (1990).
- [33] Y. Wang : *On the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity of the complex Monge-Ampère equation*. Math. Research Letter 19, 939-946 (2012).

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET APPLICATIONS; UNIVERSITÉ ASSANE SECK DE ZIGUINCHOR BP 523.

Email address: p.badiane4963@zig.univ.sn

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE TOULOUSE; UMR 5219, UNIVERSITÉ DE TOULOUSE; CNRS, UPS, 118 ROUTE DE NARBONNE, F-31062 TOULOUSE CEDEX 9, FRANCE

Email address: ahmed.zeriahi@math.univ-toulouse.fr