

A variational approach to the quaternionic Hessian equation

Hichame Amal¹, Saïd Asserda², Mohamed Barlob³

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce finite energy classes of quaternionic m -plurisubharmonic functions of Cegrell type and define the quaternionic m -Hessian operator on some Cegrell's classes. We use the variational approach to solve the quaternionic m -Hessian equation when the right-hand side is a positive Radon measure.

Keywords. Variational approach. Cegrell's class. Quaternionic m -subharmonic function. Quaternionic m -Hessian equation.

Mathematics Subject Classification 35A15 . 32U15 . 32U40 . 32W20

Introduction

The quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator is defined as the Moore determinant of the quaternionic Hessian of a function u . In [2], Alesker proved that $(\Delta\varphi)^n = fdV$ is solvable when Ω is a strictly pseudoconvex domain, $f \in C(\Omega)$, $f \geq 0$ with continuous boundary data $\varphi \in C(\partial\Omega)$ and the solution is a continuous plurisubharmonic function. For the smooth case, he proved in [2] a result on the existence and the uniqueness of a smooth plurisubharmonic solution of $(\Delta\varphi)^n = fdV$ when Ω is the euclidean ball in \mathbb{H}^n and $f \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, $f > 0$, $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$. Zhu extended this result in [40] when Ω is a bounded strictly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{H}^n provided the existence of a subsolution. In [4], Alesker defined the Baston operator to express the quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator on quaternionic manifolds by using methods of complex geometry. Motivated by this formula Wan and Wang in [37] introduced two first-order differential operators d_0 and d_1 which behaves similarly as ∂ , $\bar{\partial}$ and $\partial\bar{\partial}$ in complex pluripotential theory, and write $\Delta = d_0d_1$. Therefore the quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator $(\Delta u)^n$ has a simpler explicit expression, on this observation, some authors established and developed the quaternionic versions of several results in complex pluripotential theory. Wang and Zhang proved the maximality of locally bounded plurisubharmonic solution to the problem above with smooth boundary when Ω is an open set of \mathbb{H}^n with $f = 0$ and $\varphi \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)$. In [32], Sroka solved the Dirichlet problem when the right hand side f is merely in L^p for any $p > 2$, which is the optimal bound. The Hölder regularity of the solution was proved independently by Boukhari in [9] and by Kolodziej and Sroka in [31], when Ω is strongly pseudoconvex bounded domain in \mathbb{H}^n with smooth boundary when $\varphi \in C^{1,1}(\partial\Omega)$, $0 \leq f \in L^p(\Omega)$ for $p > 2$. In [9], authors study the Dirichlet Problem for the quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator for measures which does not charge pluripolar sets and in [38], D.Wan applied a variational method based on pluripotential theory to solve the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation on hyperconvex domains in \mathbb{H}^n .

The class $QSH_m(\Omega)$ of m -subharmonic functions and the quaternionic m -Hessian operator $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ in a domain Ω of \mathbb{H}^n are introduced independently in [27] and [10] and some facts about related pluripotential are given. In this paper we continue the investigation of the pluripotential theory for complex

¹Department of mathematics, Laboratory LaREAMI, Regional Center of trades of education and training, Kenitra Morocco, hichameamal@hotmail.com

²Ibn tofail university, faculty of sciences, department of mathematics, PO 242 Kenitra Morocco, said.asserda@uit.ac.ma

³Ibn tofail university, faculty of sciences, department of mathematics, PO 242 Kenitra Morocco, mohamed.barlob@uit.ac.ma

Hessian equations on a bounded domains of \mathbb{H}^n . We then considering the following quaternionic m -Hessian equation

$$(\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu, \quad 1 \leq m \leq n, \quad (1)$$

where μ a positive Radon measure and $\beta = \frac{1}{8}\Delta(\|q\|^2)$ is the standart Kähler form in \mathbb{H}^n .

The main goal of the present paper is to use the variational method initiated in [14] for the complex Monge–Ampère equation to solve equation (1). The idea of this method is to discredit the functional whose Hessian equation considered is the Euler-Lagrange equation and to minimize it on a suitable compact set of quaternionic m -sh functions. We then show that this minimum point is the desired solution. In order to solve this equation, we introduce finite energy classes of quaternionic m -subharmonic functions of Cegrell type and extend the domain of definition of quaternionic m -Hessian operator to some Cegrell’s classes, the functions of which are not necessarily bounded.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1, we recall some basic facts about quaternionic m -subharmonic functions and the quaternionic m -Hessian operators. In Section 2, inspired by [19, 20, 29], we introduce and study Cegrell’s classes for the quaternionic m -subharmic functions in a domain in \mathbb{H}^n which is the generalizations of Cegrell’s classes for the complex m -subharmonic functions [29], we prove that integration by parts is allowed and establish some inequalities including the energy estimate for the quaternionic m -Hessian operator on these classes. In Section 3, we develop a variational approach inspired by [29, 38] to solve (1) and prove our main result

Theorem 0.1. *Let μ be a positive Radon measure in Ω , $p \geq 1$. Then, we have $(\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu$ with $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ if and only if $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega) \subset L^p(\Omega, \mu)$.*

1 Preliminaries

The Baston operator Δ is the first operator of 0-Cauchy-Fueter complex on quaternionic manifold:

$$0 \longrightarrow C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{\Delta} C^\infty(\Omega, \wedge^2 \mathbb{C}^{2n}) \xrightarrow{D} C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \wedge^3 \mathbb{C}^{2n}) \longrightarrow \dots$$

Alesker defined the quaternionic Monge–Ampère operator as the n -th power of this operator when the manifold is flat. Motivated by this formula Wan and Wang in [37] introduced two first-order differential operators d_0 and d_1 which behaves similarly as ∂ , $\bar{\partial}$ and $\partial\bar{\partial}$ in complex pluripotential theory, and write $\Delta = d_0 d_1$. Therefore the quaternionic Monge–Ampère operator $(\Delta u)^n$ has a simpler explicit expression, First, we use the well known embedding of the quaternionic algebra \mathbb{H} into $End(\mathbb{C}^2)$ defined by:

$$x_0 + ix_1 + jx_2 + kx_3 \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_0 + ix_1 & -x_2 - ix_3 \\ x_2 - ix_3 & x_0 - ix_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the conjugate embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \tau : \mathbb{H}^n &\cong \mathbb{R}^{4n} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2} \\ (q_0, \dots, q_{n-1}) &\mapsto (z^{j\alpha}) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2} \end{aligned}$$

$q_l = x_{4l} + ix_{4l+1} + jx_{4l+2} + kx_{4l+3}$, $l = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ $\alpha = 0, 1$ with

$$\begin{pmatrix} z^{(2l)0} & z^{(2l)1} \\ z^{(2l+1)0} & z^{(2l+1)1} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} x_{4l} - ix_{4l+1} & -x_{4l+2} + ix_{4l+3} \\ x_{4l+2} + ix_{4l+3} & x_{4l} + ix_{4l+1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Pulling back to the quaternionic space $\mathbb{H}^n \cong \mathbb{R}^{4n}$ by (2), we define on \mathbb{R}^{4n} first-order differential operators $\nabla_{j\alpha}$ as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{(2l)0} & \nabla_{(2l)1} \\ \nabla_{(2l+1)0} & \nabla_{(2l+1)1} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_{4l}} + i\partial_{x_{4l+1}} & -\partial_{x_{4l+2}} - i\partial_{x_{4l+3}} \\ \partial_{x_{4l+2}} - i\partial_{x_{4l+3}} & \partial_{x_{4l}} - i\partial_{x_{4l+1}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

The Baston operator is given by the determinants of (2×2) -submatrices above. Let $\wedge^{2k}\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ be the complex exterior algebra generated by \mathbb{C}^{2n} , $0 \leq k \leq n$. Fix a basis $\{\omega^0, \omega^1, \dots, \omega^{2n-1}\}$ of \mathbb{C}^{2n} . Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^{4n} . We define

$$\begin{aligned} d_0, d_1 : C_0^\infty(\Omega, \wedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n}) &\longrightarrow C_0^\infty(\Omega, \wedge^{p+1} \mathbb{C}^{2n}) \quad \text{by} \\ d_0 F &:= \sum_{k, I} \nabla_{k0} f_I \omega^k \wedge \omega^I \\ d_1 F &:= \sum_{k, I} \nabla_{k1} f_I \omega^k \wedge \omega^I \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Delta F := d_0 d_1 F$$

for $F = \sum_I f_I \omega^I \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \wedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, where $\omega^I := \omega^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega^{i_p}$ for the multi-index $I = (i_1, \dots, i_p)$. The operators d_0 and d_1 depend on the choice of the coordinates x_j 's and the basis $\{\omega^j\}$.

It is known (cf.[37]) that the second operator D in the 0-Cauchy-Fueter complex can be written as $DF := \begin{pmatrix} d_0 F \\ d_1 F \end{pmatrix}$.

Although d_0, d_1 are not exterior differential, their behavior is similar to exterior differential:

Lemma 1.1. $d_0 d_1 = -d_1 d_0$, $d_0^2 = d_1^2 = 0$; for $F \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \wedge^p \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, $G \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \wedge^q \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, we have

$$d_\alpha(F \wedge G) = d_\alpha F \wedge G + (-1)^p F \wedge d_\alpha G, \quad \alpha = 0, 1, \quad d_0 \Delta = d_1 \Delta = 0 \quad (4)$$

We say F is closed if $d_0 F = d_1 F = 0$, ie, $DF = 0$. For $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \in C^2$, $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_k$ is closed, with $k = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, it follows easily from (3) that $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n$ satisfies the following remarkable identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n &= d_0(d_1 u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n) = -d_1(d_0 u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n) \\ &= d_0 d_1(u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n) = \Delta(u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n). \end{aligned}$$

To write down the explicit expression, we define for a function $u \in C^2$,

$$\Delta_{ij} u := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_{i0} \nabla_{j1} u - \nabla_{i1} \nabla_{j0} u).$$

$2\Delta_{ij}$ is the determinant of (2×2) -matrix of i -th and j -th rows of (3). Then we can write

$$\Delta u = \sum_{i, j=0}^{2n-1} \Delta_{ij} u \omega^i \wedge \omega^j, \quad (5)$$

and for $u_1, \dots, u_n \in C^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n &= \sum_{i_1, j_1, \dots} \Delta_{i_1 j_1} u_1 \dots \Delta_{i_n j_n} u_n \omega^{i_1} \wedge \omega^{j_1} \dots \wedge \omega^{i_n} \wedge \omega^{j_n} \\ &= \sum_{i_1, j_1, \dots} \delta_{01 \dots (2n-1)}^{i_1 j_1 \dots i_n j_n} \Delta_{i_1 j_1} u_1 \dots \Delta_{i_n j_n} u_n \Omega_{2n}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\Omega_{2n} = \omega^0 \wedge \omega^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega^{2n-1}$$

and $\delta_{01 \dots (2n-1)}^{i_1 j_1 \dots i_n j_n} :=$ the sign of the permutation from $(i_1, j_1, \dots, i_n, j_n)$ to $(0, 1, \dots, 2n-1)$, if $\{i_1, j_1, \dots, i_n, j_n\} = \{0, 1, \dots, 2n-1\}$; otherwise, $\delta_{01 \dots (2n-1)}^{i_1 j_1 \dots i_n j_n} = 0$. Note that $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n$ is symmetric with respect to the permutation of u_1, \dots, u_n . In particular, when $u_1 = \dots = u_n = u$, $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n$ coincides with $(\Delta u)^n = \wedge^n \Delta u$.

We denote by $\Delta_n(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ the coefficient of the form $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n$, ie, $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n = \Delta_n(u_1, \dots, u_n) \Omega_{2n}$. Then $\Delta_n(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ coincides with the mixed Monge-Ampère operator $\det(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ while $\Delta_n u$ coincides with the quaternionic Monge-Ampère operator $\det(u)$. See [34, Appendix A].

The notions of quaternionic closed positive forms and closed positive currents has been defined and detailed in [34, 37, 39].

Lemma 1.2. (Stokes type formula, [37, Lemma 3.2])

Assume that T is a smooth $(2n-1)$ -form in Ω , and h is a smooth function with $h = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then we have $\int_{\Omega} h d_{\alpha} T = - \int_{\Omega} d_{\alpha} h \wedge T$ $\alpha = 0, 1$.

The theory of Bedford-Taylor [13] in complex analysis can be generalized to the quaternionic case. Let u be a locally bounded psh function and let T be a closed positive $2k$ -current. Define

$$\Delta u \wedge T := \Delta(uT),$$

i.e., $(\Delta u \wedge T)(\eta) := uT(\Delta\eta)$ for test form η . $\Delta u \wedge T$ is also a closed positive current. Inductively, for $u_1, \dots, u_p \in \mathcal{QPSH}(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^{\infty}(\Omega)$, Wan and Wang in [37] showed that

$$\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_p := \Delta(u_1 \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_p)$$

is closed positive $2p$ -current. In particular, for $u_1, \dots, u_n \in \mathcal{QPSH}(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^{\infty}(\Omega)$, $\Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_n = \mu \Omega_{2n}$ for a well-defined positive Radon measure μ .

For any test $(2n-2p)$ -form ψ on Ω , we have $\int_{\Omega} \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_p \wedge \psi = \int_{\Omega} u_1 \Delta u_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_p \wedge \Delta \psi$, where $u_1, \dots, u_p \in \mathcal{QPSH}(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^{\infty}(\Omega)$. Given a bounded plurisubharmonic function u one can define the quaternionic Monge-Ampère measure

$$(\Delta u)^n = \Delta u \wedge \Delta u \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u.$$

This is a nonnegative Borel measure.

1.1 The quaternionic m -subharmonic functions

Let $\beta = \frac{1}{8} \Delta(\|q\|^2)$ denotes the standard Kähler form in \mathbb{H}^n and Let

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_m := \{\alpha \in \wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^2 \mathbb{C}^{2n} \mid \alpha \wedge \beta^{n-1} \geq 0, \alpha^2 \wedge \beta^{n-2} \geq 0, \dots, \alpha^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq 0\},$$

where $\wedge_{\mathbb{R}}^2 \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is the space of all real 2-forms in quaternion analysis.

Definition 1.3. A $(2n-2k)$ -current T ($k \leq m$) is called m -positive if for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \widehat{\Gamma}_m$, we have

$$\alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_k \wedge T \geq 0. \tag{7}$$

Definition 1.4. A real valued function $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is called m -subharmonic if it is subharmonic and, for any $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}$ in $\widehat{\Gamma}_m$

$$\Delta u \wedge \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq 0. \tag{8}$$

The inequality (8) says that $\Delta u \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ is m -positive.

The class of all quaternionic m -subharmonic functions in Ω is denoted by $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$.

Proposition 1.5. [27, proposition 4.3] Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{H}^n .

- 1) If α, β are non-negative numbers and $u, v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, then $\alpha u + \beta v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$; and $\max\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$.
- 2) If Ω is connected and $\{u_j\} \subset \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ is a decreasing sequence, then $u = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u_j \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ or $u \equiv -\infty$.
- 3) If $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ and $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex increasing function, then $\gamma \circ u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$.
- 4) If $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, then the standard regularization $u * \rho_\epsilon \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega_\epsilon)$, where $\Omega_\epsilon := \{z / \text{dis}(z, \partial\Omega) > \epsilon\}$ $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$.
- 5) If $\{u_j\} \subset \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ is locally uniformly bounded from above, then $(\sup_j u_j)^* \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, where v^* denotes the regularization of v .
- 6) Let ω be a non-empty proper open subset of Ω , $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\omega)$ and $\limsup_{q \rightarrow \varsigma} v(q) \leq u(\varsigma)$ for each $\varsigma \in \partial\omega \cap \Omega$, then

$$W := \begin{cases} \max\{u, v\}, & \text{in } \omega \\ u, & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \omega \end{cases} \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega).$$

Lemma 1.6. 1) Let $v^0, \dots, v^k \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$, let $(v^0)_j, \dots, (v^k)_j$ be a decreasing sequences of m -subharmonic functions in Ω such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v_j^t = v^t$ point-wisely in Ω for $t = 0, \dots, k$. Then for $k \leq m \leq n$, the currents $v_j^0 \Delta v_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v_j^k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ converge weakly to $v^0 \Delta v^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v^k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ as j tends to ∞ .

2) Let $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a locally uniformly bounded sequence in $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ that increases to $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ almost every where in Ω and let $v^1, \dots, v^m \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. Then the currents $u_j \Delta v^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ converge to $u \Delta v^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

3) Let $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ that increases to $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ almost everywhere in Ω (with respect to Lebesgue measure). Then the currents $(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ converge weakly to $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. See [10] and [27]. □

Definition 1.7. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$, and let E be an open subset of Ω , the quaternionic m -capacity of E with respect to Ω is defined by:

$$C_m(E) = C_m(E, \Omega) := \sup \left\{ \int_E (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} : u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega), -1 \leq u \leq 0 \right\}. \quad (9)$$

As in the complex case, the following proposition can be proved.

Proposition 1.8. 1) If $E_1 \subseteq E_2$, then $C_m(E_1) \subseteq C_m(E_2)$.

2) If $E \subseteq \Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega_2$, then $C_m(E, \Omega_1) \geq C_m(E, \Omega_2)$.

3) $C_m(\cup_{j=1}^\infty E_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^\infty C_m(E_j)$.

4) If $E_1 \subseteq E_2 \subseteq \dots$ are borel sets in Ω , then $C_m(\cup_j E_j) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} C_m(E_j)$.

Recall also the following lemmas (see [10] and [27]) :

Lemma 1.9. (*Integration by parts*) Suppose that $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{m-1} \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{Loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. If $\lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} u(q) = \lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} v(q)$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T = \int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T.$$

Where $T = \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$.

Lemma 1.10. (*Maximum principle*) For $u, v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$\chi_{\{u>v\}} (\Delta \max\{u, v\})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \chi_{\{u>v\}} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$$

where χ_A is the characteristic function of a set A .

Lemma 1.11. (*Comparison principle*)

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{H}^n , let $u, v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$, if for any $\xi \in \partial\Omega$

$$\liminf_{q \rightarrow \xi} (u(q) - v(q)) \geq 0.$$

Then

$$\int_{\{u<v\}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{u<v\}} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

1.2 The relatively extremal m -subharmonic function

Let $\mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ be the subclass of negative functions in $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$.

Definition 1.12. A set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ is said to be a quaternionic m -hyperconvex if it is open, bounded, connected and if there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ such that $\{q \in \Omega ; \varphi(q) < -c\} \subset\subset \Omega, \forall c > 0$. A such function is called an exhaustion function for Ω .

Definition 1.13. Let be a subset $E \Subset \Omega$. The relatively m -extremal function is defined by

$$u_{m,E,\Omega} = \sup\{u(q) : u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega), u \leq 0, u|_E \leq -1\}, \quad q \in \Omega.$$

Its upper semi-continuous regularization $u_{m,E,\Omega}^* \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$.

Proposition 1.14. The relatively m -extremal function has the following properties:

- 1) If $E_1 \subset E_2 \Subset \Omega$, then $u_{m,E_2,\Omega} \leq u_{m,E_1,\Omega}$,
- 2) If $E \subset \Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$, then $u_{m,E,\Omega_2} \leq u_{m,E,\Omega_1}$,
- 2) If $K_j \searrow K$, with K_j is compact in Ω , then $(\lim u_{m,K_j,\Omega}^*)^* = u_{m,K,\Omega}^*$.

Proof. The first and the second statements are trivial. For the third one, let $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ such that $u \leq 0, u|_K \leq -1$. For each $\epsilon > 0$, define the open set $U_\epsilon := \{u - \epsilon < -1\}$. Since U_ϵ contains all the compacts K_j with $j \gg 1$. If we let $j \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain $(\lim u_{m,K_j,\Omega}^*)^* \geq u - \epsilon, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0$, for each $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega), u \leq 0$ and $u \leq -1$ on K . From which follows the result. \square

Lemma 1.15. Let $0 < r < R$ and note $a = \frac{2n}{m} > 1$. The relatively m -extremal function $u_{m,\overline{B}(r),B(R)}$ is given by

$$u(q) = \max\left(\frac{R^{2-2a} - \|q\|^{2-2a}}{r^{2-2a} - R^{2-2a}}, -1\right)$$

Proof. The function u is continuous in \mathbb{H}^n , $u|_{\overline{B}(r)} = -1$ and $u|_{\partial B(R)} = 0$. Fix $q^0 \in B(R) \setminus \{0\}$ and define

$$v(q) = \frac{R^{2-2a} - \|q\|^{2-2a}}{r^{2-2a} - R^{2-2a}}.$$

Calculating $\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q_l \partial \overline{q}_k}$ at q^0 , we get

$$\frac{\partial^2 v(q^0)}{\partial q_l \partial \overline{q}_k} = \frac{4(a-1)\|q^0\|^{-2a}}{r^{2-2a} - R^{2-2a}} \left(2\delta_{lk} - a \frac{q_k^0 \cdot \overline{q_l^0}}{\|q^0\|^2} \right).$$

Since the eigenvalues of the matrix $A := \left(2\delta_{lk} - a \frac{q_k^0 \cdot \overline{q_l^0}}{\|q^0\|^2} \right)$ are $\lambda = (2, \dots, 2, 2-a)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_p(A) &= S_p(\lambda(A)) = \frac{2(n-1)!}{p!(n-1-p)!} + \frac{(2-a)(n-1)!}{(p-1)!(n-p)!} \\ &= \frac{2(n-1)!}{(p-1)!(n-p)!} \left(\frac{n}{p} - \frac{n}{m} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tilde{S}_p(A) > 0$, $\forall p < m$ and $\tilde{S}_m(A) = 0$. Therefore $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(B(R) \setminus \overline{B}(r))$. By the maximum principle, the result follows. \square

Proposition 1.16. *If Ω is a quaternionic m -hyperconvex and E is relatively compact in Ω , then*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \omega} u_{m,E,\Omega}(q) = 0, \quad \forall \omega \in \partial\Omega.$$

Proof. Let $\rho < 0$ be an exhaustion function of Ω , then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $C\rho < -1$ on E . Thus $C\rho < u_{m,E,\Omega}$. It is clear that $\lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} \rho(q) = 0$. Hence we get the result. \square

Proposition 1.17. *Let Ω be a quaternionic m -hyperconvex and a compact $K \Subset \Omega$ such that $u_{m,K,\Omega}^* \equiv -1$ on K . Then $u_{m,K,\Omega}$ is continuous in Ω .*

Proof. Let $u = u_{m,K,\Omega}$, and ρ be a defining function for Ω such that $\rho < -1$ on K . Then $\rho \leq u$ in Ω . It is enough to prove that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a continuous function v in the defining family for u such that $u - \epsilon \leq v \leq u$ in Ω . Take $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $u - \epsilon < \rho$ in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\alpha$ and $K \subset \Omega_\alpha$, where

$$\Omega_\alpha = \{q \in \Omega; \text{dist}(q, \partial\Omega) > \alpha\}.$$

One can find $\delta > 0$ such that $u * \chi_\delta - \epsilon < \rho$ on $\partial\Omega_\alpha$ and $u * \chi_\delta - \epsilon < -1$ on K . Define

$$v := \begin{cases} \max\{u * \chi_\delta, \rho\}, & \text{in } \Omega_\alpha \\ u, & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_\alpha \end{cases}$$

Then v is a continuous function in the defining family for u , and thus $u - \epsilon \leq v \leq u$ in Ω . \square

Proposition 1.18. *Let a domain $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{H}^n$ and $E \subset \Omega$. Then $u_{m,E,\Omega}^* \equiv 0$ if and only if there exists $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, $v < 0$ such that $E \subset \{v = -\infty\}$.*

Proof. Denote $u = u_{m,E,\Omega}$. If $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, $v < 0$ and $E \subset \{v = -\infty\}$, then $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon v \leq u$ in Ω and hence $u = 0$ almost everywhere in Ω . Thus $u^* = 0$.

Suppose that $u^* = 0$. Then there exists $a \in \Omega$ such that $u(a) = 0$ because of $u^* = u$ almost everywhere. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $v_k \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ such that $v_k < 0$ in Ω , $v_k < -1$ in E and $v_k(a) > -2^{-k}$. Define

$$v(q) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} v_k(q) \quad q \in \Omega.$$

We have $v(a) > -1$, $v < 0$ in Ω , $v = -\infty$ in E . Since v is the limit of a quaternionic m -subharmonic decreasing sequence of its partial sums and $v \neq -\infty$, then $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$. \square

Corollary 1.19. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ and $E = \cup_j E_j$, where $j = 1, 2, \dots$, $E_j \subset \Omega$. If $u_{m,E_j,\Omega}^* \equiv 0$, $\forall j$, then $u_{m,E,\Omega}^* \equiv 0$.*

Proof. From proposition 1.18 there exists $v_j \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ such that $v_j < 0$ and $v_j = -\infty$ in E_j . One can Take a point $a \in \Omega$ such that $v_j(a) > -\infty$, $v_j(a) > -2^{-j}$, $\forall j$, then $v = \sum_j v_j \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ and $v \equiv -\infty$ in E . Applying proposition 1.18, we obtain $u_{m,E,\Omega}^* = 0$. \square

Proposition 1.20. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ be a quaternionic m -hyperconvex and $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact that is union of a family of closed balls. Then $u_{m,K,\Omega}^* = u_{m,K,\Omega}$ is continuous in Ω . In particular, if $K \subset \Omega$ is compact such that $0 < \varepsilon < \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$, then $u_{m,K_\varepsilon,\Omega}$ is continuous, where $K_\varepsilon = \{q \in \Omega / \text{dist}(q, K) \leq \varepsilon\}$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $u = u_{m,K,\Omega}$ is continuous in ∂K . Let $b \in \partial K$. One can choose $a \in K$ and $0 < r < R$ such that $b \in \overline{B}(a, r) \subset K$ and $B(a, R) \subset \Omega$. If $q \in B(a, R)$, then $u(q) \leq u_{m,\overline{B}(a,r),\Omega}(q) \leq u_{m,\overline{B}(a,r),B(a,R)}(q)$. From lemma 1.15 follows $\lim_{q \rightarrow b} u(q) = -1$. To prove the second conclusion note that $K_\varepsilon = \cup_{a \in K} \overline{B}(a, \varepsilon)$. \square

The following result is a consequence of propositions 1.14 and 1.20.

Corollary 1.21. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ be a quaternionic m -hyperconvex and $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact. Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u_{m,K_\varepsilon,\Omega} = u_{m,K,\Omega}$. In particular, $u_{m,K,\Omega}$ is lower semi-continuous.*

Proposition 1.22. *If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ be a quaternionic m -hyperconvex and $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact, then $u_{m,K,\Omega}^*$ is m -maximal in $\Omega \setminus K$.*

Proof. In view of corollary 1.21, proposition 1.20 and lemma 1.6, we may assume that $u = u_{m,K,\Omega}$ is continuous. Fix $B = \overline{B}(a, r) \subset \Omega \setminus K$ and define

$$v := \begin{cases} \varphi, & \text{in } B \\ u, & \text{in } \Omega \setminus B \end{cases}$$

where φ is the unique solution to the following Dirichlet problem (see [10, Theorem 3.1])

$$\begin{cases} \varphi \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(B) \cap C(\overline{B}) \\ (\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0, & \text{in } B \\ \varphi|_{\partial\Omega} = u. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, $v \geq 0$ and $v < -1$ on K . Hence $v \leq u$ in Ω , On the other hand, $\varphi \geq u$ in B . Therefore $u = \varphi$ in B , Since B was chosen arbitrarily, we get the desired result. \square

Theorem 1.23. *Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{H}^n$ be a quaternionic m -hyperconvex and $K \Subset \Omega$ be a compact, then*

$$C_m(K, \Omega) = \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u_{m,K,\Omega}^*)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Moreover, if $u_{m,K,\Omega}^* > -1$ on K , then $C_m(K, \Omega) = 0$.

Proof. Let ρ be an exhaustion function of Ω such that $\rho < -1$ on K . Denote $u := u_{m,K,\Omega}$ and fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega, (0, 1 - \epsilon))$. In view of proposition 1.20 and corollary 1.21, we can find an increasing sequence $(u_j) \in C(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega, [-1, 0])$ that converges to u . We may assume that $u_j \geq \rho$ on Ω . We have

$$K \subset \{u_j < v - 1\} \subset \{\rho < v - 1\} \subset \{\rho < -\epsilon\}.$$

by the comparison principle, we get

$$\int_K (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{u_j < v-1\}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{u_j < v-1\}} (\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

It follows from lemma 1.6 that $(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ converges weakly to $(\Delta u^*)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Hence,

$$\int_K (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{\rho < v-\epsilon\}} (\Delta u^*)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proposition 1.22 implies that

$$\int_K (\Delta u^*)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\{\rho < v-\epsilon\}} (\Delta u^*)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Note that for each $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$C_m(K, \Omega) = (1 - \epsilon)^{-m} \sup\left\{ \int_K (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} / v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega, (0, 1 - \epsilon)) \right\}.$$

For the second statement, one can suppose that $u^* > \epsilon - 1$ on K . Therefore

$$C_m(K, \Omega) \geq \int_K (\Delta u_{m,U_j,\Omega})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_K \left(\Delta \left(\frac{u^*}{1-\epsilon} \right) \right)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = (1 - \epsilon)^{-m} C_m(K, \Omega),$$

which implies that $C_m(K, \Omega) = 0$. □

Definition 1.24. *Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{H}^n , and let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ be a family of functions which is locally bounded from above. Define*

$$u(q) = \sup\{v(q) / v \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

A set of the form $N = \{q \in \Omega / u(q) < u^(q)\}$ and all their subsets are called m -negligible.*

Definition 1.25. *We say that $E \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ is m -polar set, if for each $q \in E$ there exist a neighborhood V of q and $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(V)$ such that $E \cap V \subset \{v = -\infty\}$. If $E \subset \{v = -\infty\}$ with $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\mathbb{H}^n)$, we say that E is globally m -polar.*

Proposition 1.26. *Let Ω be an open in \mathbb{H}^n and $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. Then for each m -polar set $E \subset \Omega$ we have*

$$\int_E u(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0.$$

Proof. We cover E by a family of closed balls $B_j = B(b_j; r_j)$ such that $E_j = E \cap B_j \subset \{v_j = -\infty\}$, where $v_j \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(B_j)$. It is sufficient to prove that

$$\forall j, \int_{E_j} u(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0.$$

Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and prove that

$$\int_{A_r} u(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0,$$

for each $r < r_j$ where $A_r = v_j^{-1}(-\infty) \cap B(b_j, r)$. We may assume that $v_j < 0$, from proposition 1.18 follows $u_{m,K,B(b_j,r)}^* = 0$ where $K \Subset A_r$ is a compact set. Applying Theorem 1.23, we obtain $C_m(K, B(b_j, r)) = 0$ which implies that

$$\int_K u(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0.$$

□

2 Cegrell's classes $\mathcal{E}_m^0, \mathcal{E}_m, \mathcal{F}_m, \mathcal{E}_m^p, \mathcal{F}_m^p$ and approximation of m -sh functions

Throughout this section, we let Ω denote a quaternionic m -hyperconvex domain. We define the Cegrell's classes of quaternionic m -subharmonic functions.

Definition 2.1. • We denote $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ the class of bounded functions that is belong to $\mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ such that $\lim_{q \rightarrow \xi} u(q) = 0, \forall \xi \in \partial\Omega$ and $\int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$.

- Let $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$, we say that u belongs to $\mathcal{E}_m(\Omega)$ (shortly \mathcal{E}_m) if for each $q_0 \in \Omega$, there exists an open neighborhood $U \subset \Omega$ of q_0 and a decreasing sequence $(u_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $u_j \downarrow u$ on U and $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$.
- We denote by $\mathcal{F}_m(\Omega)$ (or \mathcal{F}_m) the class of functions $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ such that there exists a sequence $(u_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreasing to u in Ω and $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$.
- For every $p \geq 1$, $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ denote the class of functions $\psi \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ such that there exists a decreasing sequence $(\psi_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \psi_j(q) = \psi(q)$, and $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-\psi_j)^p (\Delta \psi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$.
If moreover $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (\Delta \psi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$ then, by definition, $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_m^p(\Omega)$.

Theorem 2.2. For any function $\varphi \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$, there is a decreasing sequence $(\varphi_j) \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ satisfying the following properties:

- φ_j is continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$ and $\varphi_j \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Omega$,
- For each j , $\int_{\Omega} (\Delta \varphi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$,

iii) $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \varphi_j(q) = \varphi(q)$, for $q \in \Omega$.

Proof. If B is a closed ball in Ω , then by Proposition 1.20, $u = u_{m,B,\Omega}$ is continuous in $\overline{\Omega}$ and $\text{supp}((\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}) \Subset \Omega$. We can follow the lines in [20, Theorem 2.1]. \square

Lemma 2.3. $C_0^\infty(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}) - \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$.

Proof. Fix $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and choose $0 > \psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$, choose A so large that $\chi + A|q|^2 \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$a < \inf \chi < \sup_{\Omega} (|\chi| + A|q|^2) < b.$$

and define

$$\varphi_1 = \max(\chi + A|q|^2 - b, B\psi), \quad \varphi_2 = \max(A|q|^2 - b, B\psi)$$

where B is so large that $B\psi < a - b$ in $\text{supp}(\psi)$. Then $\chi = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ and $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ by Proposition 1.5. \square

Let $u, v \in C^2(\Omega)$, define

$$\gamma(u, v) := \frac{1}{2}(d_0 u \wedge d_1 v - d_1 u \wedge d_0 v) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=0}^{2n-1} (\nabla_{i0} u \nabla_{j1} v - \nabla_{i1} u \nabla_{j0} v) \omega^i \wedge \omega^j.$$

In particular, $\gamma(u, u) = d_0 u \wedge d_1 u = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=0}^{2n-1} (\nabla_{i0} u \nabla_{j1} u - \nabla_{i1} u \nabla_{j0} u) \omega^i \wedge \omega^j$. Let u, v, w_1, \dots, w_k be a locally bounded quaternionic m -subharmonic functions in Ω , $k+1 \leq m \leq n$. Then the following statements hold.

Proposition 2.4. 1) The mixed product $\gamma(u, v) \wedge \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ is well defined as a $(2n - 2m + 2k + 2)$ -current.

2) Let $u_j, v_j, w_1^j, \dots, w_k^j$ be decreasing sequences in $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ converging respectively to u, v, w_1, \dots, w_k point-wisely as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then the currents $\gamma(u_j, v_j) \wedge \Delta w_1^j \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k^j \wedge \beta^{n-m} \rightarrow \gamma(u, v) \wedge \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ weakly as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

3) The mixed product $\gamma(u, u) \wedge \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ is well defined as a m -positive $(2n - 2m + 2k + 2)$ -current.

4) The Chern–Levine–Nirenberg type estimate also holds for the m -positive current $\gamma(u, u) \wedge \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$.

Proof. (1) From the polarization identity

$$2(d_0 u \wedge d_1 v + d_0 v \wedge d_1 u) = \Delta[(u+v)^2] - \Delta(u^2) - \Delta(v^2) - 2u\Delta v - 2v\Delta u.$$

It follows that

$$4\gamma(u, v) \wedge T = \Delta[(u+v)^2] \wedge T - \Delta(u^2) \wedge T - \Delta(v^2) \wedge T - 2u\Delta v \wedge T - 2v\Delta u \wedge T, \quad (10)$$

where $T := \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. By [10, (14)] each term of the right hand side of (10) is defined inductively as current. Thus the left side of (10) is well defined.

(2) It follows from the first statement and the lemma 1.6. Since u and v are bounded, we can let $u, v \geq 0$ by adding a positive constant. So u^2 and v^2 are also in $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$. Therefore Lemma 1.6 can be applied to u^2, v^2 and $(u+v)^2$.

To prove (3), it suffice to prove the positvity of the current $\gamma(u, u) \wedge \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Let (u_j) be a decreasing sequence in $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$ converging to u as $j \rightarrow \infty$. it follows from [34, Lemma 3.1] that $\gamma(u_j, u_j)$ is a positive 2-form, thus is strongly positive. For any strongly positive test form ψ we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\gamma(u, u) \wedge \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_m \wedge \beta^{n-m}](\psi) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} [\gamma(u_j, u_j) \wedge \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}](\psi) \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} [\Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_k \wedge \beta^{n-m}](\gamma(u_j, u_j) \wedge \psi) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from that the form $\gamma(u_j, u_j) \wedge \psi$ is strongly positive (c.f proposition 3.1 in [37]).

(4) The Chern-Leving-Nirenberg type estimate follows from [10, Lemma 2.8] and (10). □

Lemma 2.5. *Let $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{m-1} \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{Loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} \gamma(u, v) \wedge T \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \gamma(u, u) \wedge T \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\int_{\Omega} \gamma(v, v) \wedge T \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Where $T = \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$.

Proof. This follows from the above statements and [34, Lemma 3.1]. □

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that $u, v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega) \cap L_{Loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. If $\lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} u(q) = 0$, then*

$$\int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T \leq \int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T$$

where $T = \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$.

Moreover, if $\lim_{q \rightarrow \partial\Omega} v(q) = 0$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T = \int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T = \int_{\Omega} -\gamma(u, v) \wedge T$$

Proof. First, let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, by the induction definition [10, (14)] we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \psi \Delta v \wedge T = \int_{\Omega} v \Delta \psi \wedge T.$$

Hence

$$\int_{\Omega} \psi \Delta v \wedge T \leq \int_{\Omega} v \Delta \psi \wedge T \text{ for } \psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega) \cap L_{Loc}^\infty(\Omega)$, and denote $u_\epsilon = \max\{u, -\epsilon\}$. Then $u - u_\epsilon = \min\{0, u + \epsilon\}$ is a compactly supported function decreasing uniformly to u as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, thus

$$\int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} (u - u_\epsilon) \Delta v \wedge T.$$

Using the above statement, we conclude that

$$\int_{\Omega} (u - u_\epsilon)_\delta \Delta v \wedge T = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} (u - u_\epsilon)_\delta \Delta v \wedge T = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} v \Delta (u - u_\epsilon)_\delta \wedge T,$$

where $(u - u_\epsilon)_\delta$ is the standard regularization of $u - u_\epsilon$ such that $(u - u_\epsilon)_\delta \searrow u - u_\epsilon$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Fix an open set $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ such that the set $\{u < -\epsilon\} \Subset \Omega'$, then $\text{Supp}\{\Delta(u - u_\epsilon)_\delta\} \subset \Omega'$ for δ small enough. Note that $(u_\epsilon)_\delta \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$, then by Lemma (1.2) we get $\Delta(u_\epsilon)_\delta \wedge T \geq 0$. It follows from Lemma 1.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (u - u_\epsilon)_\delta \Delta v \wedge T &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega'} v \Delta(u - u_\epsilon)_\delta \wedge T \\ &\geq \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega'} v \Delta u_\delta \wedge T \\ &= \int_{\Omega'} v \Delta u \wedge T. \end{aligned}$$

For an arbitrary Ω , letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain $\int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T \leq \int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T$. To show the second equality, it suffices to prove the second identity for the smooth case and repeat the above argument for the general case. Since T is closed, applying Lemmas (1.1) and (1.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T &= \int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u(d_0 d_1 - d_1 d_0) v \wedge T \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u d_0(d_1 v \wedge T) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u d_1(d_0 v \wedge T) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} d_0 u \wedge d_1 v \wedge T + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} d_1 u \wedge d_0 v \wedge T \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \gamma(u, v) \wedge T. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.7. *Suppose that $h, u_1, u_2, v_1, \dots, v_{m-p-q} \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$, $1 \leq p, q < m$. Let $T = \Delta v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v_{m-p-q} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Then,*

$$\int_{\Omega} -h(\Delta u_1)^p \wedge (\Delta u_2)^q \wedge T \leq \left[\int_{\Omega} -h(\Delta u_1)^{p+q} \wedge T \right]^{\frac{p}{p+q}} \left[\int_{\Omega} -h(\Delta u_2)^{p+q} \wedge T \right]^{\frac{q}{p+q}}$$

Proof. For the case $p = q = 1$, by Proposition 2.6 and lemma 2.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} -h \Delta u_1 \wedge \Delta u_2 \wedge T &= \int_{\Omega} -u_1 \Delta u_2 \wedge \Delta h \wedge T = \int_{\Omega} \gamma(u_1, u_2) \wedge T \\ &\leq \left[\int_{\Omega} \gamma(u_1, u_1) \wedge \Delta h \wedge T \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_{\Omega} \gamma(u_2, u_2) \wedge \Delta h \wedge T \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left[\int_{\Omega} -u_1 \Delta u_1 \wedge \Delta h \wedge T \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_{\Omega} -u_2 \Delta u_2 \wedge \Delta h \wedge T \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left[\int_{\Omega} -h(\Delta u_1)^2 \wedge T \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_{\Omega} -h(\Delta u_2)^2 \wedge T \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By induction, following the lines in [20, Lemma 5.4] we get the desired result. □

Corollary 2.8. *Suppose that $h, u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$. Then,*

$$\int_{\Omega} -h \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \left[\int_{\Omega} -h(\Delta u_1)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}} \dots \left[\int_{\Omega} -h(\Delta u_m)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}}$$

Theorem 2.9. Suppose that $u^p \in \mathcal{E}_m(\Omega)$, $p = 1, \dots, m$ and $(g_j^p)_j \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $g_j^p \downarrow u_p$, $\forall p$. Then, the sequence of measures $\Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ converges weakly to a positive Radon measure which does not depend on the choice of the sequences $(g_j^p)_j$. We then define $\Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ to be this weak limit.

Proof. By lemma 1.9 and proceeding as in the proof of [20, Theorem 4.2] we get the result. \square

Proposition 2.10. Suppose that $u^p \in \mathcal{F}_m(\Omega)$, $p = 1, \dots, m$ and $(g_j^p)_j \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0 \cap C(\Omega)$ such that $g_j^p \downarrow u_p$, $\forall p$, and

$$\sup_{j,p} \int_{\Omega} (\Delta g_j^p)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty.$$

Then, for each $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} h \Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} h \Delta u^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. Clearly we have

$$\sup_j \int_{\Omega} \Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty. \quad (11)$$

Let $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ and for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, we consider the function $h_{\epsilon} = \max\{h, -\epsilon\}$. Then $h - h_{\epsilon}$ is continuous and compactly supported in Ω . Applying Theorem 2.9 we get

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (h - h_{\epsilon}) \Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} (h - h_{\epsilon}) \Delta u^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

From (11) and the fact that $|h_{\epsilon}| < \epsilon$ follow the result. \square

Corollary 2.11. Suppose that $(g_j)_j \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreases to $u \in \mathcal{F}_m(\Omega)$, $j \rightarrow +\infty$, such that

$$\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (\Delta g_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty.$$

Then, for each $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$, the sequence of measures $h(\Delta g_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ converges weakly to $h(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$.

Corollary 2.12. Suppose that $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathcal{F}_m(\Omega)$. Then,

$$\int_{\Omega} \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \left[\int_{\Omega} (\Delta u_1)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}} \dots \left[\int_{\Omega} (\Delta u_m)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}}$$

Proof. It follows from Definition 2.1 and Proposition 2.10 that Corollary 2.12 holds. \square

Theorem 2.13. Let $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{m-1} \in \mathcal{F}_m(\Omega)$ and $T = \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Then

$$\int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T = \int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T.$$

Proof. Let $u_j, v_j, w_1^j, \dots, w_{m-1}^j$ be sequences in $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ decreasing to $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{m-1}$ respectively such that their total masses are uniformly bounded

$$\sup_j \int_{\Omega} \Delta v_j \wedge T_j \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty, \quad \sup_j \int_{\Omega} \Delta u_j \wedge T_j \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty,$$

where $T_j = \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. By Theorem 2.9 we obtain $\Delta u_j \wedge T_j \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ converges weakly to $\Delta u \wedge T \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. For each fixed $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $j > k$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega} v_k \Delta u_k \wedge T_k \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq \int_{\Omega} v_k \Delta u_j \wedge T_j \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq \int_{\Omega} v_j \Delta u_j \wedge T_j \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

We then infer that the sequence of real numbers $\int_{\Omega} v_j \Delta u_j \wedge T \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ decreases to some $a \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Using proposition 2.10 and letting $j \rightarrow +\infty$ we get

$$\int_{\Omega} v_k \Delta u \wedge T \wedge \beta^{n-m},$$

from which we obtain $\int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq a$. For each fixed k we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T \wedge \beta^{n-m} &\leq \int_{\Omega} v_k \Delta u \wedge T \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} v_k \Delta u_j \wedge T_j \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} v_k \Delta u_k \wedge T_k \wedge \beta^{n-m} \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T \wedge \beta^{n-m} = a$, from which the result follows. \square

Definition 2.14. We define the quaternionic p -energy ($p > 0$) of $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ to be

$$E_p(\varphi) := \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi)^p (\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m},$$

if $p = 1$ we denote by $E(\varphi) = E_1(\varphi)$. and the mutual quaternionic p -energy of $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ to be

$$E_p(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m) := \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi_0)^p \Delta \varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta \varphi_m \wedge \beta^{n-m}, \quad p \geq 1.$$

The following Hölder-type inequality plays an important role in the variational approach in the next section.

Theorem 2.15. Let $u, v_1, \dots, v_m \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $p \geq 1$. We have

$$E_p(u, v_1, \dots, v_m) \leq D_p E_p(u)^{\frac{p}{m+p}} E_p(v_1)^{\frac{1}{m+p}} \dots E_p(v_m)^{\frac{1}{m+p}}$$

where $D_1 = 1$, $D_p = p^{\alpha(m,p)/p-1}$ for $p > 1$ and

$$\alpha(m, p) = (p+2) \left(\frac{p+1}{p} \right)^{m-1} - (p+1).$$

Proof. Let $F(u, v, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}) := \int_{\Omega} (-u)^p \Delta v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$, for $p \geq 1$ and $u, v, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$. By using [30, Theorem 4.1] it suffices to prove that

$$F(u, v, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}) \leq C(p) F(u, u, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1})^{\frac{p}{p+1}} F(v, v, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1})^{\frac{1}{p+1}}$$

where $C(p) = 1$ if $p = 1$ and $C(p) = p^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$ if $p > 1$. Set $T = \Delta v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta v_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. If $p = 1$, the above inequality becomes

$$\int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta v \wedge T) \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u) \wedge T \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} (-v)(\Delta v \wedge T) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

which is the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality.

If $p > 1$, by Proposition 2.6 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (-u)^p \Delta v \wedge T &= \int_{\Omega} -\gamma((-u)^p, v) \wedge T \\ &= p \int_{\Omega} (-u)^{p-1} \gamma(u, v) \Delta v \wedge T \\ &= p \int_{\Omega} (-v) \gamma((-u)^{p-1}, u) \Delta v \wedge T + p \int_{\Omega} (-v) (-u)^{p-1} \Delta u \wedge T \\ &= -p(p-1) \int_{\Omega} (-u)^{p-2} \gamma(u, u) \Delta v \wedge T + p \int_{\Omega} (-v) (-u)^{p-1} \Delta u \wedge T \\ &\leq p \int_{\Omega} (-v) (-u)^{p-1} \Delta u \wedge T. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $\gamma(u, u) \Delta v \wedge T$ is a m -positive current by Proposition 2.4. Using Hölder’s inequality we get

$$\int_{\Omega} (-u)^p \Delta v \wedge T \leq p \left(\int_{\Omega} (-u)^p \Delta u \wedge T \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega} (-v)^p \Delta u \wedge T \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Replacing u by v in the above inequality we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (-v)^p \Delta u \wedge T \leq p \left(\int_{\Omega} (-v)^p \Delta v \wedge T \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega} (-u)^p \Delta v \wedge T \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

the result is a consequence of the two last inequalities. □

Definition 2.16. Denote by $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ such that:

- 1) If $u \in \mathcal{K}$, $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$, then $\max\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{K}$.
- 2) If $u \in \mathcal{K}$, $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^{-1}(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^{\infty}(\Omega)$, $\varphi_j \searrow u$, $j \rightarrow +\infty$, then $(\Delta \varphi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ is weakly convergent.

Corollary 2.17. By \mathcal{E} we denote one of the classes $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{E}_m(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{F}_m(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{F}_m^p(\Omega)$, $p > 0$. We have the following properties

- 1) \mathcal{E} is convex and have the property (1) in Definition 2.16.
- 2) if $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_m(\Omega)$, then \mathcal{E} has properties (1) and (2) in Definition 2.16.
- 3) $\mathcal{E}_m(\Omega)$ is the largest class for which the properties of Definition 2.16 hold true.

Corollary 2.18. Let $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $u \leq v$. Then, $E_p(v) \leq AE_p(u)$, where the constant A is independent of u, v . In particular, for $p = 1$ we have $E_1(v) \leq E_1(u)$.

Proof. Applying Theorem 2.15 directly we get the desired result. □

Corollary 2.19. *Let V be an open subset of Ω and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$, $p \geq 1$. Then*

$$\int_V (\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq MC_m(V)^{\frac{p}{p+m}} E_p(\varphi)^{\frac{m}{p+m}},$$

where M is a constant depending only on p and m and $C_m(V)$ is the quaternionic m -capacity of V .

Proof. We can suppose that V is relatively compact in Ω . Denote by $u = u_{m,V,\Omega}^*$ the regularized m -extremal function of V in Ω . Then $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $u = -1$ in V . From Theorem 2.15 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_V (\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} &\leq \int_{\Omega} (-u)^p (\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\ &\leq D_p E_p(u)^{\frac{p}{p+m}} E_p(\varphi)^{\frac{m}{p+m}} \\ &\leq D_p \left(\int_{\Omega} (\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+m}} E_p(\varphi)^{\frac{m}{p+m}} \\ &\leq D_p C_m(V)^{\frac{p}{p+m}} E_p(\varphi)^{\frac{m}{p+m}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.20. *If $u^k \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, $p \geq 1$ and $(g_j^k)_j \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreases to u^k , $j \rightarrow +\infty$ such that*

$$\sup_{j,k} E_p(g_j^k) < +\infty.$$

Then, the sequence of measures $\Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ is weakly convergent to a positive measure and the limit does not depend to the particular sequence. We then define $\Delta u^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ to be this weak limit.

Proof. Let K be a compact subset of Ω . For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $k = 1, \dots, m$ consider

$$h_j^k := \sup\{u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega) / u \leq g_j^k \text{ on } K\}.$$

Then by using a standard balayage argument we see that $\text{supp}((\Delta h_j^k)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}) \subset K$. It follows that h_j^k decreases to $v^k \in \mathcal{F}_m^p(\Omega)$. We have also $v^k = u^k$ on K . Now, fix $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} h \Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$$

is decreasing to a finite number. Thus $\lim_j \int_{\Omega} h \Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ exists for every $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$. From Proposition 2.10 follows the weak convergence of the sequence $\Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. To prove the last statement, it is sufficient to repeat the arguments in the proof of [20, Theorem 4.2]. □

Corollary 2.21. *Let $u^k \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, $p \geq 1$ and $(u_j^k)_j \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreases to u^k , $j \rightarrow +\infty$ such that*

$$\sup_{j,k} E_p(u_j^k) < +\infty.$$

Then,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} h \Delta u_1^j \wedge \dots \wedge u_m^j \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} h \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_m \wedge \beta^{n-m},$$

for each $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$.

Proof. We repeat the same arguments in the proof of Proposition 2.10. \square

Corollary 2.22. *If $u^k \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, $p \geq 1$ and $(g_j^k)_j \subset \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ decreases to u^k , $j \rightarrow +\infty$, Then, the sequence of measures $\Delta g_j^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta g_j^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ is weakly convergent to $\Delta u^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$.*

Proof. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.20. \square

Theorem 2.23. *Let $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{m-1} \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ and $T = \Delta w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta w_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} u \Delta v \wedge T = \int_{\Omega} v \Delta u \wedge T.$$

Proof. Thanks to Theorem 2.20 the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 2.10 can be used here. \square

Proposition 2.24. *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ (or $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)$) such that $u \leq v$ on Ω . Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq \int_{\Omega} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. Let $(u_j), (v_j)$ be two sequences in $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreasing to u, v as in the definition of $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$. Fix $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$. We can suppose that $u_j \leq v_j$, $\forall j$ in Ω . Then integrating by parts we get

$$\int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq \int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

From Theorem 2.20, Proposition 2.10 and letting $j \rightarrow +\infty$ follow

$$\int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq \int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

to get the result it suffices to let h decreases to -1 . \square

Proposition 2.25. 1) *If $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, then $\int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$.*

2) *If (u_j) is a sequence in $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreasing to u , then*

$$\int_{\Omega} (-u_j)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \nearrow \int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. (1) Let (u_j) be a sequence in $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $u_j \searrow u$ and $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty.$$

(2) From Theorem 2.20 follows $(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \rightarrow (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Since $(-u_j) \nearrow (-u)$ and are lower semi-continuous, then we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Then, it is sufficient to show that for each j we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Let $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ such that $u \leq h$. Since integration by part is allowed in $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, then the sequence $\left(\int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \right)_j$ is increasing and by corollary 2.21 its limit is $\int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. \square

Lemma 2.26. ([10, proposition 2.21]) For $u, v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$(\Delta \max\{u, v\})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq \chi_{\{u>v\}}(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} + \chi_{\{u \leq v\}}(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$$

where χ_A is the characteristic function of a set A .

Theorem 2.27. Let $u, u_1, \dots, u_{m-1} \in \mathcal{F}_m(\Omega)$ (or $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$), $v \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ and $T = \Delta u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Then

$$\Delta \max\{u, v\} \wedge T|_{\{u>v\}} = \Delta u \wedge T|_{\{u>v\}}.$$

Proof. First we prove the result in the case where $v \equiv b$ with some constant b . By Theorem 2.2 there exist $(u^j)_j, (u_k^j)_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $u^j \searrow u$ and $u_k^j \searrow u_k$ for each $k = 1, \dots, m-1$. Since $\{u^j > b\}$ is open, then

$$\Delta \max\{u^j, b\} \wedge T^j|_{\{u^j>b\}} = \Delta u^j \wedge T^j|_{\{u^j>b\}}.$$

where $T^j = \Delta u_1^j \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta u_{m-1}^j \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Because of $\{u > b\} \subset \{u^j > b\}$ we obtain that

$$\Delta \max\{u^j, b\} \wedge T^j|_{\{u>b\}} = \Delta u^j \wedge T^j|_{\{u>b\}}.$$

Letting $j \rightarrow +\infty$, by Proposition 2.10 and Theorem 2.20 follow

$$\begin{aligned} \max(u-b, 0) \Delta(\max(u^j, b)) \wedge T^j &\rightarrow \max(u-b, 0) \Delta(\max(u, b)) \wedge T \\ \max(u-b, 0) \Delta u^j \wedge T^j &\rightarrow \max(u-b, 0) \Delta u \wedge T. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\max(u-b, 0) \Delta(\max(u-b, 0)) - \Delta u \wedge T = 0.$$

Which implies that

$$\Delta(\max(u-b, 0)) \wedge T = \Delta u \wedge T \text{ on the set } \{u > b\}.$$

For the general case, we repeat the same arguments in [33, Theorem 4.1]. □

Corollary 2.28. For $p \geq 1$ and $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ we have

$$\chi_{\{u>v\}}(\Delta \max\{u, v\})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \chi_{\{u>v\}}(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

3 The variational approach

3.1 The energy functional

Definition 3.1. 1) For a positive Radon measure μ in Ω , the energy functional $\mathcal{F}_\mu : \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_\mu(u) = \frac{1}{m+1} E(u) + L_\mu(u),$$

where $L_\mu(u) = \int_\Omega u d\mu$ and $E(u)$ is the quaternionic energy of $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$.

2) We say \mathcal{F}_μ is proper if $\mathcal{F}_\mu \rightarrow +\infty$ whenever $E \rightarrow +\infty$.

Definition 3.2. We say that a positive measure μ belong to \mathcal{M}_p if there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega (-u)^p d\mu \leq A E_p(u)^{\frac{p}{m+p}}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$$

The following remark will be proved as the complex case in [19].

Remark 3.3. $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_p$ if and only if $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega) \subset L^p(\Omega, \mu)$.

Proposition 3.4. 1) If $(u_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $\sup_j E(u_j) < +\infty$, then $(\sup_j u_j)^* \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$.

2) If $(u_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $\sup_j E(u_j) < +\infty$, and $u_j \rightarrow u$, then $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$.

3) The functional $E : \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is lower semi-continuous.

4) If $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, then

$$E(u+v)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \leq E(u)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} + E(v)^{\frac{1}{m+1}}.$$

Moreover, if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$, then \mathcal{F}_μ is proper and convex.

5) If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$, $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ and $u_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $u_j \searrow u$, then $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_\mu(u_j) = \mathcal{F}_\mu(u)$.

6) If $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, then

$$\int_{\{u>v\}} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{u>v\}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. 1) Let (φ_j) be a sequence in $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ decreasing to $u = (\sup_j u_j)^*$. Since $u_j \leq \varphi_j$ and $\sup_j E(u_j) < +\infty$ then $\sup_j E(\varphi_j) < +\infty$. Hence $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$.

2) Let (φ_j) be a sequence in $\mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ decreasing to u . Let denote $\psi_j := \max\{u_j, \varphi_j\}$. Then $\psi_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $E(\psi_j) \leq E(u_j)$, which implies that $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$.

3) Suppose that $u, u_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that u_j converges to $u \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $\varphi_j := (\sup_{k \geq j} u_k)^*$ is in $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ and $\varphi_j \downarrow u$. Hence $E(\varphi_j) \uparrow E(u)$. From $E(u_j) \geq E(\varphi_j)$ follows $\liminf_j E(u_j) \geq E(u)$.

4) It follows from Theorem 2.15 that

$$\begin{aligned} E(u+v) &= \int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta(u+v))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} + \int_{\Omega} (-v)(\Delta(u+v))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\ &\leq E(u)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} E(u+v)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} + E(v)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} E(u+v)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $E^{\frac{1}{m+1}}$ is convex since it is homogeneous of degree 1. So, E is also convex. If μ belongs to \mathcal{M}_1 , there exists $A > 0$ such that $\int_{\Omega} (-u)d\mu \leq AE(u)^{\frac{1}{m+1}}$, for every $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$. Then we get $\mathcal{F}_\mu(u) \geq \frac{1}{m+1}E(u) - AE(u)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \rightarrow +\infty$.

5) Let $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ and $u_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $u_j \searrow u$, then by Proposition 2.25 follows $E(u_j) \nearrow E(u)$. Applying the monotone convergence theorem and the fact that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$ we get the result.

6) let $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ and $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$. then we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta \max\{u, v\})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m},$$

since

$$\int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq E(h)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} E(u)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} < +\infty$$

Then, it follows from Corollary 2.28 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\{u>v\}} (-h)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} &= \int_{\{u>v\}} (-h)(\Delta \max\{u, v\})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta \max\{u, v\})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} + \int_{\{u<v\}} (-h)(\Delta \max\{u, v\})^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} + \int_{\{u<v\}} (-h)(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&= \int_{\{u>v\}} (-h)(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $h \searrow -1$ to get the desired result. □

3.2 The projection theorem

Definition 3.5. Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be an upper semi-continuous function. We define the projection of u on $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ by

$$P(u) = \sup\{v \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) : v \leq u\}.$$

Lemma 3.6. Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, suppose that there exists $w \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $w \leq u$. Then $\int_{\{P(u)<u\}} (\Delta P(u))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that w is bounded. From Choquet's lemma, there exists an increasing sequence $(u_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $(\lim_j u_j)^* = P(u)$.

Let $\tilde{q} \in \{P(u) < u\}$. Since u is continuous, there exist $\varepsilon > 0, r > 0$ such that

$$P(u)(q) < u(\tilde{q}) - \varepsilon < u(q), \quad \forall q \in B = B(\tilde{q}, r).$$

For fixed j , by approximating $u_j|_{\partial B}$ from above by a sequence of continuous functions on ∂B and by using [10, Theorem 3.1], we can find a function $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(B)$ such that $\varphi_j = u_j$ on ∂B and $(\Delta \varphi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0$ in B . The comparison principle gives us that $\varphi_j \geq u_j$ in B . The function ψ_j defined by $\psi_j = \varphi_j$ in B and $\psi_j = u_j$ in $\Omega \setminus B$, belongs to $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. For each $q \in \partial B$ we have $\varphi_j(q) = u_j(q) \leq P(u)(q) \leq u(\tilde{q}) - \varepsilon$. It then follows that $\varphi_j \leq u(\tilde{q}) - \varepsilon$ in B since $u(\tilde{q}) - \varepsilon$ is a constant and $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$. Hence, $u_j \leq \psi_j \leq u$ in Ω . This implies that $(\lim \psi_j)^* = P(u)$. It follows from Lemma 1.6 that $(\Delta \psi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \rightarrow (\Delta P(u))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Therefore, $(\Delta P(u))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}(B) \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \inf((\Delta \psi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})(B) = 0$. from which the result follows. □

Lemma 3.7. Let $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ with v is continuous. We define for $t < 0$,

$$h_t = \frac{P(u + tv) - tv - u}{t}.$$

Then, for each $0 \leq k \leq m$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \int_{\Omega} h_t (\Delta u)^k \wedge (\Delta P(u + tv))^{m-k} \wedge \beta^{n-m} = 0.$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \int_{\Omega} \frac{P(u + tv) - u}{t} (\Delta u)^k \wedge (\Delta P(u + tv))^{m-k} \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} v (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. An easy computation shows that h_t is decreasing in t and $0 \leq h_t \leq -v$. For each fixed $s < 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \int_{\Omega} h_t(\Delta u)^k \wedge (\Delta P(u + tv))^{m-k} \wedge \beta^{n-m} &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \int_{\Omega} h_s(\Delta u)^k \wedge (\Delta P(u + tv))^{m-k} \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&= \int_{\Omega} h_s(\Delta u)^k \wedge (\Delta P(u))^{m-k} \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&= \int_{\Omega} h_s(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&= \int_{\{P(u+sv)-sv < u\}} h_s(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&\leq \int_{\{P(u+sv)-sv < u\}} (-v)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $u_k \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ be a decreasing sequence which tends to u such that

$$\int_{\{P(u+sv)-sv < u\}} (-v)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq A \int_{\{P(u_k+sv)-sv < u\}} (-v)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Taking into account Theorem 2.2 and proposition 3.4 we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\{P(u_k+sv)-sv < u\}} h_s(-v)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} &\leq \int_{\{P(u_k+sv)-sv < u\}} (-v)(\Delta(P(u_k + sv) - sv))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&\leq \int_{\{P(u_k+sv)-sv < u_k\}} (-v)(\Delta(P(u_k + sv) - sv))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\
&\leq -sM \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } s \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Where M is a positive constant which depends only on m , $\|v\|$ and $\int_{\Omega} v(\Delta(u + v))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. The second equality follows from the first one. Thus we complete the proof. \square

Theorem 3.8. *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, and v is continuous. Then*

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} E(P(u + tv)) = (m + 1) \int_{\Omega} (-v)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. If $t > 0$, $P(u + tv) = u + tv$. It is easy to see that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0^+} E(P(u + tv)) = (m + 1) \int_{\Omega} (-v)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

For $t < 0$, observing that $P(u + tv)$, $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, we can integrate by parts to have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{t} \left(\int_{\Omega} -P(u + tv)(\Delta P(u + tv))^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} - \int_{\Omega} (-u)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^m \int_{\Omega} \frac{u - P(u + tv)}{t} (\Delta u)^k \wedge (\Delta P(u + tv))^{m-k} \wedge \beta^{n-m}.
\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to apply Lemma 3.7. \square

3.3 The quaternionic Hessian equation

In this section, we introduce the variational method to solve the quaternionic Hessian equation on finite energy classes of Cegrell type

$$(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu,$$

where μ is a positive Radon measure. The idea is to minimize the energy functional on a compact subset of m -sh functions.

Lemma 3.9. *Assume that μ is a positive Radon measure such that \mathcal{F}_μ is proper and lower semi-continuous on $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$. Then, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $\mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi) = \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_\mu(\psi)$.*

Proof. As in the proof of [29, lemma 4.12]. Let $(\varphi_j) \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ be such that

$$\lim_j \mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi_j) = \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_\mu(\psi) \leq 0.$$

From the properness of the functional \mathcal{F}_μ , we obtain $\sup_j E(\varphi_j) < +\infty$. It follows that the sequence (φ_j) forms a compact subset of $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$. Hence there exists a subsequence (φ_{j_k}) converging to φ in $L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$. Since \mathcal{F}_μ is lower semi-continuous we have

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi_{j_k}) \geq \mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi)$$

We then deduce that φ is a minimum point of \mathcal{F}_μ on $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$. □

Theorem 3.10. *Suppose that $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Then*

$$(\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu \iff \mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi) = \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_\mu(\psi).$$

Proof. First assume that $(\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu$ and let $\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$. From Theorem 2.15 and Young's inequality follow

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (-\psi)(\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} &\leq E(\psi)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \cdot E(\varphi)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m+1} E(\psi) + \frac{m}{m+1} E(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{F}_\mu(\psi) \geq \mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi)$. Thus $\mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi) = \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)} \mathcal{F}_\mu(\psi)$.

Now, assume that \mathcal{F}_μ is minimized on $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ at φ . let $\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ and define

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{m+1} E(P(\varphi + t\psi)) + L_\mu(\varphi + t\psi), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Using Theorem 3.8 we get

$$f'(0) = \int_{\Omega} (-\psi)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} + L_\mu(\psi).$$

Since $P(\varphi + t\psi) \leq \varphi + t\psi$ and $P(\varphi + t\psi) \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, then

$$f(t) \geq \mathcal{F}_\mu(P(\varphi + t\psi)) \geq \mathcal{F}_\mu(\varphi) = f(0), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It follows that f attains its minimum at $t = 0$. Thus $f'(0) = 0$. Therefore

$$\int_{\Omega} (\psi)(\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} \psi d\mu.$$

for an arbitrarily test function ψ which implies the result. □

Lemma 3.11. *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Then $u \leq v$ in Ω .*

Proof. By the absurd, suppose that there exists $q_0 \in \Omega$ such that $v(q_0) < u(q_0)$. Let φ an exhaustion function of Ω , such that $\varphi(q_0) < -\epsilon r^2$ for each $q \in B(q_0, r) \cap \Omega$, $r > 0$ for a fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and smaller enough. Define $\psi(q) := \max\{\varphi(q), \epsilon(|q - q_0|^2 - r^2)\}$. Then Ψ is a continuous exhaustion function in Ω such that $(\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \geq \epsilon^m \beta^{n-m}$, near q_0 . Choose $\delta > 0$ so smaller such that $v(q_0) < u(q_0) + \delta \psi(q_0)$, then the Lebesgue measure of the set $\mathcal{U} := \{q \in \Omega : v(q) + \delta \psi(q)\} \cap B(q_0, R)$ is strictly positive for $R > 0$. Then $\int_{\mathcal{U}} (\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} > 0$. From proposition 3.4 (6) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{U}} (\Delta v + \delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} + \delta^m \int_{\mathcal{U}} (\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Let μ be a positive Radon measure in Ω does not charge m -polar sets such that $\mu(\Omega) < +\infty$. Let (u_j) be a sequence in $\mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$ which converges in L_{loc}^1 to $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$. If $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^2 d\mu < +\infty$ then $\int_{\Omega} u_j d\mu \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} u d\mu$.*

Proof. Since $\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^2 d\mu < +\infty$, by Banach-Saks Theorem there exists a sub-sequence (u_j) such that

$\varphi_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N u_j$ converges in $L^2(\mu)$ and μ -almost everywhere to φ . We have also $\varphi_N \rightarrow u$ in L_{loc}^1 . For each

$j \in \mathbb{N}$, Denote by $\psi_j := (\sup_{k \geq j} \varphi_k)^*$. Then ψ_j decreases to u in Ω . Since μ does not charge the m -polar set $\{(\sup_{k \geq j} \varphi_k)^* > \sup_{k \geq j} \varphi_k\}$. Then we conclude that $\psi_j := \sup_{k \geq j} \varphi_k$ μ -almost everywhere. Thus ψ converges to φ μ -almost everywhere and $u = \varphi$ μ -almost everywhere. This yields

$$\lim_j \int_{\Omega} u_j d\mu = \lim_j \int_{\Omega} \varphi_j d\mu = \lim_j \int_{\Omega} u d\mu$$

\square

Theorem 3.13. *Suppose that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Then there exists a unique $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu$.*

Proof. The uniqueness follows from Lemma 3.11. We prove the existence in two steps.

Step 1: If μ has compact support $K \Subset \Omega$, let $h_K = h_{m,K,\Omega}^*$ be the regularized relatively m -extremal function of K with respect to Ω and set

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ \nu > 0 : \text{supp } \nu \subset K, \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi)^2 d\nu \leq CE(\varphi)^{\frac{2}{m+1}}, \text{ for every } \varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) \right\},$$

where C is a fixed constant such that $C > 2E(h_K)^{\frac{m-1}{m+1}}$. For each compact $L \subset K$, we have $h_K \leq h_L$. Then $E(h_L) \leq E(h_K)$. Therefore, for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$, we have by (12)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi)^2 (\Delta h_L)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} &\leq 2 \|h_L\|_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi) \Delta \varphi \wedge (\Delta h_L)^{m-1} \wedge \beta^{n-m} \\ &\leq 2E(\varphi)^{\frac{2}{m+1}} \cdot E(h_L)^{\frac{m-1}{m+1}} \\ &\leq 2E(\varphi)^{\frac{2}{m+1}} \cdot E(h_K)^{\frac{m-1}{m+1}} \\ &< CE(\varphi)^{\frac{2}{m+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $(\Delta h_L)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \in \mathcal{M}$ for every compact $L \subset K$. Put $T = \sup\{\nu(\Omega), \nu \in \mathcal{M}\}$. We have $T < +\infty$. In fact, since Ω is m -hyperconvex, there exists $g \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $g \leq -1$ on $K \Subset \Omega$. For each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $\nu(K) \leq \int_{\Omega} (-g)^2 d\nu \leq CE(g)^{\frac{2}{m+1}}$, from which the result follows.

Fix $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\nu_0(\Omega) > 0$. Set

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ \nu > 0 : \text{supp } \nu \subset K, \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi)^2 d\nu \leq \left(\frac{C}{T} + \frac{C}{\nu_0(\Omega)} \right) E(\varphi)^{\frac{2}{m+1}}, \text{ for every } \varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega) \right\},$$

Then, for each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi)^2 \frac{(T - \nu(\Omega))d\nu_0 + \nu_0(\Omega)d\nu}{T\nu_0(\Omega)} &\leq \frac{T - \nu(\Omega)}{T\nu_0(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi^2) d\nu_0 + \frac{1}{T} \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi^2) d\nu \\ &\leq \left(C \frac{T - \nu(\Omega)}{T\nu_0(\Omega)} + \frac{C}{T} \right) E(\varphi)^{\frac{2}{m+1}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C}{\nu_0(\Omega)} + \frac{C}{T} \right) E(\varphi)^{\frac{2}{m+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

From this we conclude that $\frac{(T - \nu(\Omega))\nu_0 + \nu_0(\Omega)\nu}{T\nu_0(\Omega)} \in \mathcal{N}$, for every $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$. Therefore \mathcal{N} is nonempty convex and weakly compact in the space of probability measures. From a generalized Radon-Nykodim Theorem follows that there exists a positive measure $\nu \in \mathcal{N}$ and a positive function $f \in L^1(\nu)$ such that $\mu = f d\nu + \nu_1$, where ν_1 is orthogonal to \mathcal{N} . Since $(\Delta h_L)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \in \mathcal{N}$ for each $L \Subset K$, each measure orthogonal to \mathcal{N} must be supported in some m -polar set. Since μ does not charge m -polar sets, then we deduce that $\nu_1 \equiv 0$.

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ set $\mu_j = \min(f, j)\nu$. From Lemma 3.12 and Proposition 3.4, we deduce that \mathcal{L}_{μ_j} is continuous on $\mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ and \mathcal{F}_{μ_j} is proper and lower semi-continuous. Therefore, by Lemma 3.9 and Theorem 3.10, there exists $u_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu_j$. It is clear from the comparison principle that (u_j) decreases to a function $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ which solves $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu$.

Step 2: If μ does not have compact support. Let (K_j) be an exhaustive sequence of compact subsets of Ω and let $u_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu_j$ where $\mu_j = \chi_{K_j} d\mu$. We have (u_j) decreases to $u \in \mathcal{QSH}_m^-(\Omega)$. We will prove that $\sup_j E(u_j) < +\infty$. Indeed, since $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$, then

$$E(u_j) = \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)(\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{K_j} (-u_j) d\mu \leq \int_{\Omega} (-u_j) d\mu \leq AE(u_j)^{\frac{1}{m+1}}.$$

This implies that $E(u_j)$ is uniformly bounded, hence $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ and the result follows. \square

Lemma 3.14. *Let μ be a positive Radon measure satisfying $\mu(\Omega) < +\infty$, and $\mu \leq (\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$, where ψ is a bounded function in $\mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega)$. Then there exists a unique function $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu$.*

Proof. Assume that $-1 \leq \psi \leq 0$. Let $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ be the exhaustion function of Ω . Let $h_j = \max\{\psi, jh\}$ and $A_j = \{q \in \Omega : jh < -1\}$. Note that $\chi_{A_j}\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$, Theorem 3.13 implies that for each j , there exists $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta\varphi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \chi_{A_j}\mu$. Thus $0 \geq \varphi_j \geq h_j \geq \psi$ on Ω . By Lemma 3.11, φ_j decreases to some $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and φ satisfies $(\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu$. \square

Proposition 3.15. *If $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$, then*

$$\int_{\{u>v\}} (\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{u>v\}} (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. Let $h \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$. First assume that v is bounded and vanishes on the boundary. Let K_j be an exhaustion sequence of compact subsets of Ω . Using Lemma 3.14, there exists $v_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \chi_{K_j}(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Then, by lemma 3.11 $v_j \downarrow v$. Now, from $\int_{\Omega} (-h)(\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty$ and Corollary 2.28 follow

$$\int_{\{u>v_j\}} (-h)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{u>v_j\}} (-h)(\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\{u>v_j\} \cap K_j} (-h)(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Letting $j \rightarrow +\infty$ we get

$$\int_{\{u>v\}} (-h)(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} \leq \int_{\{u>v\}} (-h)(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

It remains to remove the assumption on v as in the proof of [29, Theorem 5.2]. \square

Proposition 3.16. *Let μ be a positive measure in Ω which does not charge m -polar sets. Then, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq f \in L_{loc}^1((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$ such that $\mu = f((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$.*

Proof. We first assume that μ has compact support. By applying Theorem 3.13 we can find $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^1(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq f \in L^1((\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$ such that $\mu = f((\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$, and $\text{supp}((\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}) \Subset \Omega$. Let $\psi = (-u)^{-1} \in \mathcal{QSH}_m(\Omega) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. Then $(-u)^{-2m}((\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}) \leq (\Delta\psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Since $(\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ has compact support in Ω , we can modify ψ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ such that $\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$. It follows from Lemma 3.14 that

$$(-u)^{-2m}((\Delta u)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}) = (\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega).$$

This implies that $\mu = f(-u)^{2m}((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$.

If μ has compact support. Let (K_j) be an exhaustive sequence of compact subsets of Ω . From previous arguments there exist $u_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $f_j \in L^1((\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$ such that $\chi_{K_j}\mu = f_j((\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$.

Take a sequence of positive numbers (t_j) satisfying $\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} t_j u_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$. The measure μ is absolutely continuous with respect to $(\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Thus $\mu = g((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$ and $g \in L_{loc}^1((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$. \square

Theorem 3.17. *Let μ be a positive Radon measure in Ω such that $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega) \subset L^p(\Omega, \mu)$, $p \geq 1$. Then, there exists a unique $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ such that $\mu = (\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$.*

Proof. The uniqueness follows from Proposition 3.15. Since μ does not charge m -polar sets, by Proposition 3.16 there exist $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq f \in L_{loc}^1((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$ such that $\mu = f((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$. For each j , let $\mu_j = \min(f, j)((\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$. By Lemma 3.14, we can find $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta\varphi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu_j$. Since $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_p$, we have $\sup_j E_p(\varphi_j) < +\infty$. It follows from Proposition 3.15 and definition of $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ that φ_j decreases to some $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ and φ satisfies $(\Delta\varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \mu$. \square

Lemma 3.18. *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ and $p \geq 1$. Then there exist two sequences $(u_j), (v_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreasing to u, v respectively, such that*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^p (\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} (-u)^p (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Proof. Since $u \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$, there exists a sequence $(u_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreasing to u such that

$$\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^p (\Delta u_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty.$$

From Proposition 3.16 and the fact that $(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ does not charge m -polar sets, we can find $\psi \in \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq f \in L_{loc}^1((\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$ such that $(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = f((\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m})$. Then by lemma 3.14, there exists a sequence $(v_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \min(f, j)(\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Thus from the comparison principle follows that (v_j) decreases to some function $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$ such that $(\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = (\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$. Hence, we have $v \equiv \varphi$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^p (\Delta v_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-u_j)^p \min(f, j)(\Delta \psi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} (-u)^p (\Delta v)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 0.1. Assume that $\mu = (\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}$ with $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$. and ψ is an other function in $\mathcal{E}_m^p(\Omega)$. By lemma 3.18 we can find two sequences $(\varphi_j), (\psi_j) \subset \mathcal{E}_m^0(\Omega)$ decreasing to φ, ψ respectively such that

$$\sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-\varphi_j)^p (\Delta \varphi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty \text{ and } \sup_j \int_{\Omega} (-\psi_j)^p (\Delta \psi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} < +\infty.$$

From Theorem 2.15 it follows that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} (-\psi_j)^p (\Delta \varphi_j)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m} = \int_{\Omega} (-\psi)^p (\Delta \varphi)^m \wedge \beta^{n-m}.$$

Then we get $\psi \in L^p(\Omega, \mu)$. It suffices to apply Theorem 3.17 to get the result. □

References

- [1] P. Åhag, U. Cegrell, R. Czyz, : On Dirichlet's principle and problem. Math. Scand. 110(2), 235–250 (2012)
- [2] S. Alesker: Non-commutative linear algebra and plurisubharmonic functions of quaternionic variables. Bull. Sci. Math. 127(1), 1–35 (2003)
- [3] S. Alesker : Quaternionic Monge–Ampère equations. J. Geom. Anal. 13(2), 205–238 (2003)
- [4] S. Alesker : Pluripotential theory on quaternionic manifolds. J. Geom. Phys. 62(5), 1189–1206 (2012)
- [5] S. Alesker : Solvability of the quaternionic Monge–Ampère equation on compact manifolds with a fat hyperKähler metric. Adv. Math. 241, 192–219 (2013)
- [6] S. Alesker, E. Shelukhin : On a uniform estimate for the quaternionic Calabi problem. Isr. J. Math. 197(1), 309–327 (2013)

- [7] S. Alesker, Verbitsky, M.: Plurisubharmonic functions on hypercomplex manifolds and HKT-geometry. *J. Geom. Anal.* 16(3), 375–399 (2006)
- [8] S. Alesker, Verbitsky, M.: Quaternionic Monge–Ampère equation and Calabi problem for HKT-manifolds. *Isr. J. Math.* 176, 109–138 (2010)
- [9] H.Amal, S.Asserda, F.Boukhari : Quaternionic Monge-Ampère measure on pluripolar set. *Set. Acta. Math. Sin.-English Ser.* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10114-024-2227-x>.
- [10] H.Amal, S.Asserda, M.Barloub : The Hessian equation in quaternionic space. *arXiv:2310.16774*.
- [11] E. Bedford : Survey of pluri-potential theory. In: *Several complex variables (Stockholm, 1987/1988)*, volume 38 of *Math. Notes*, pp. 48–97. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ 1(993)
- [12] E. Bedford, B.A. Taylor: The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge–Ampère equation. *Invent. Math.* 37(1), 1–44 (1976)
- [13] E. Bedford, B.A..Taylor : A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions. *Acta Math.* 149(1–2), 1–40 (1982)
- [14] R. Berman, S. Boucksom,,D.W. Nyström : Fekete points and convergence towards equilibrium measures on complex manifolds. *Acta Math.* 207(1), 1–27 (2011)
- [15] R.J. 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)
- [16] F. Boukhari, Hölder continuous solutions to quaternionic Monge–Ampère equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 477 (2019), no. 1, 747–768, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2019.04.060>.
- [17] U. Cegrell : Approximation of plurisubharmonic functions in hyperconvex domains. In: *Complex Analysis and Digital Geometry*, volume 86 of *Acta Univ. Upsaliensis Skr. Uppsala Univ. C Organ. Hist.*, pp. 125–129. Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala (2009)
- [18] U. Cegrell : Sums of continuous plurisubharmonic functions and the complex Monge–Ampère operator in \mathbb{C}^n . *Math. Z.* 193(3), 373–380 (1986)
- [19] U. Cegrell : Pluricomplex energy. *Acta Math.* 180(2), 187–217 (1998)
- [20] U. Cegrell : The general definition of the complex Monge–Ampère operator. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 54(1), 159–179 (2004)
- [21] U. Cegrell : A general Dirichlet problem for the complex Monge–Ampère operator. *Ann. Polon. Math.* 94(2), 131–147 (2008)
- [22] J.P. Demailly : Mesures de Monge–Ampère et caractérisation géométrique des variétés algébriques affines. *Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.)* 19, 124 (1985)
- [23] J.-P. Demailly, H.H. Pham : A sharp lower bound for the log canonical threshold. *Acta Math.* 212(1), 1–9 (2014)
- [24] Q. Kang, W. Wang : On Penrose integral formula and series expansion of k-regular functions on the quaternionic space \mathbb{H}^n . *J. Geom. Phys.* 64, 192–208 (2013)

- [25] C.O. Kiselman, : Sur la définition de l'opérateur de Monge-Ampère complexe. In: Complex Analysis (Toulouse, 1983), volume 1094 of Lecture Notes in Math., pp. 139–150. Springer, Berlin (1984)
- [26] M. Klimek, : Pluripotential theory, volume 6 of London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford Science Publications (1991)
- [27] Liu, S., Wang, W. On Pluripotential Theory Associated to Quaternionic m -Subharmonic Functions. *J Geom Anal* 33, 143 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12220-023-01197-x>
- [28] L. H. Chinh, Equation hessiennes complexes, Doctoral thesis. (2012) Toulouse.
- [29] C.H.Lu : A variational approach to complex Hessian equations in \mathbb{C}^n . *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 431(1), 228–259 (2015)
- [30] L.Persson : A Dirichlet principle for the complex Monge–Ampère operator. *Ark. Mat.* 37(2), 345–356 (1999)
- [31] Kolodziej, S lawomir; Sroka, Marcin. Regularity of solutions to the quaternionic Monge-Ampère equation. *J. Geom. Anal.* 30 (2020), no. 3, 2852–2864.
- [32] M.Sroka,: Weak solutions to the quaternionic Monge–Ampère equation. *Anal. PDE* 13 (2020), no. 6, 1755–1776.
- [33] N.Van Khue,, P.H.Hiep : A comparison principle for the complex Monge–Ampère operator in Cegrell's classes and applications. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 361(10), 5539–5554 (2009)
- [34] D.Wan : The continuity and range of the quaternionic Monge–Ampère operator on quaternionic space. *Math. Z.* 285, 461–478 (2017)
- [35] D. Wan, Q.Kang: Potential theory for quaternionic plurisubharmonic functions. *Mich. Math. J.* 66, 3–20 (2017)
- [36] D.Wan, W.Wang : Viscosity solutions to quaternionic Monge–Ampère equations. *Nonlinear Anal.* 140, 69–81 (2016)
- [37] D.Wan, W.Wang : On quaternionic Monge–Ampère operator, closed positive currents and Lelong–Jensen type formula on quaternionic space. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 141, 267–311 (2017)
- [38] D.Wan: A variational approach to the quaternionic Monge–Ampère, *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* (1923)2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-020-00960-z>. equation
- [39] D. Wan, W. Zhang. Quasicontinuity and maximality of quaternionic plurisubharmonic functions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 424 (2015) 86-103, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2012.10.002>.
- [40] J. Zhu. Dirichlet problem of quaternionic Monge-Ampère equations. *Isr. J. Math.* 214 (2016), 597–619.