

ON CANONICAL METRICS OF COMPLEX SURFACES WITH SPLIT TANGENT AND RELATED GEOMETRIC PDES

HAO FANG, JOSHUA JORDAN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study bi-Hermitian metrics on complex surfaces with split holomorphic tangent bundle and construct 2 types of metric cones. We introduce a new type of fully non-linear geometric PDE on such surfaces and establish smooth solutions. As a geometric application, we solve the prescribed Bismut Ricci problem. In various settings, we obtain canonical metrics on 2 important classes of complex surfaces: primary Hopf surfaces and Inoue surfaces of type \mathcal{S}_M .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Relevant Background	12
3. Structures of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}'	16
4. Uniformization for Hopf Surfaces	20
5. Split-type PDE and Prescribing Bismut-Ricci	23
6. A Priori Estimates For Fully Nonlinear PDEs	25
7. Continuity Method	36
References	38

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study Hermitian metrics on complex surfaces with split tangent bundles. We begin by introducing a structural condition that is fundamental to our geometric setup.

Definition 1.1. A connected complex manifold (M^n, I) of dimension n with complex structure I is said to have a *split tangent bundle*, or *split tangent*, if

$$T^{1,0}M = T^+ \oplus T^-,$$

where T^+ and T^- are two non-trivial holomorphic sub-bundles.

Date: June 21, 2024.

Complex manifolds with split tangent have been extensively studied in algebraic geometry. In particular, surface examples have been completely classified by Beauville [9], where their universal coverings either have product structures or are Hopf surfaces. Important examples include Inoue surfaces of type \mathcal{S}_M and primary Hopf surfaces, which are two prototypical cases of class VII manifolds in the Enriques-Kodaira classification theory of complex surfaces.

In this paper, we explore metric properties of surfaces with split tangent.

1.1. Notations and setups. We begin by introducing some relevant notation and constructions that will be used in this paper.

First, for a complex manifold (M, I) , with I being a complex structure, an I -compatible Hermitian metric h induces a non-degenerate differential form $\omega = h(I, \cdot) \in \Lambda^{1,1}(M)$, which will be called the *Hermitian form of h* . In a local holomorphic coordinate, $\omega = \sqrt{-1}h_{i\bar{j}}dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^i$, where $(h_{i\bar{j}})$ is a positive Hermitian matrix. Through out this paper, we fix the orientation of M such that an I -compatible Hermitian form ω is positive.

For M a complex manifold with split tangent, we define

$$\Lambda^{\pm p,q}(M) = \Lambda^p(T^{\pm,*}(M)) \wedge \Lambda^q(\overline{T^{\pm,*}(M)})$$

Definition 1.2. For M satisfying Definition 1.1, we define the space of all $(1,1)$ forms of *split type* to be

$$\Lambda^s(M) := \{\eta = \eta^+ + \eta^- \mid \eta^+ \in \Lambda^{+1,1}(M), \eta^- \in \Lambda^{-1,1}(M)\}$$

Furthermore, we refer to a Hermitian metric h as *of split type* if its associated Hermitian form, ω , is of split type. Locally, we may write the components of a split-type fundamental form as $\omega^+ = \sqrt{-1}h_{i\bar{j}}^+v^i \wedge \bar{v}^j$ and $\omega^- = \sqrt{-1}h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}^-w^\alpha \wedge \bar{w}^\beta$, where $\{v^i\}$ and $\{w^\alpha\}$ are bases for $T^{+,*}$ and $T^{-,*}$, respectively. For future use, we define an involution $\iota : \Lambda^s(M) \rightarrow \Lambda^s(M)$ as

$$(1.1) \quad \iota(\eta^+ + \eta^-) = \eta^+ - \eta^-.$$

Second, we impose integrability conditions on the Hermitian form. A Hermitian form ω is Kähler if $d\omega = 0$. The Kähler condition has significant topological and geometrical restrictions. However, important examples of complex surfaces are known to be non-Kähler. In this paper, we first consider the larger class of *pluriclosed* metrics instead. A differential form ω is called *pluriclosed* if

$$\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\omega = 0.$$

Note that we have $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial} = \frac{-1}{2}dId$ as a real operator. A well-known result of Gauduchon [17], stated also as Theorem 2.3, claims that any Hermitian metric on a compact, complex surface is conformal to a pluriclosed metric. Therefore, pluriclosedness is a mild constraint in the surface case.

Third, we introduce a useful operator from bi-complex and generalized Kähler geometry. Since $\partial: C^\infty(M) \rightarrow \Lambda^{1,0}(M) = \Lambda^{+1,0} \oplus \Lambda^{-1,0}$, we apply proper projections to define $\partial_\pm: C^\infty(M) \rightarrow \Lambda^{\pm 1,0}$ such that $\partial = \partial_+ + \partial_-$ [6]. We have a similar decomposition for $\bar{\partial}$.

Definition 1.3. [14, Lemma 7.77] For $u \in C^\infty(M)$, the *box operator* $\square: C^\infty(M) \rightarrow \Lambda^s(M)$ is defined by

$$\square := \sqrt{-1}(\partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ - \partial_- \bar{\partial}_-).$$

Fourth, following Streets [31, c.f. Definition 7.3, 7.4], we introduce a cohomology group in which important geometric quantities live. A direct computation shows that $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial} \circ \square u = 0$, which leads to the following chain map:

$$(1.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow C^\infty(M) \xrightarrow{\square} \Lambda^s(M) \xrightarrow{\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}} \Lambda^{2,2}(M).$$

Definition 1.4. Notation as above. We define the *split type cohomology group*

$$\mathcal{H}(M) = \{\phi \in \Lambda^s(M) \mid \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\phi = 0\} / \{\square u \mid u \in C^\infty(M)\},$$

and its associated *positive cone* $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{H}$ as

$$\mathcal{P}(M) = \{[\phi] \in \mathcal{H} \mid \exists \omega \in [\phi] \text{ s.t. } \omega > 0\}.$$

Fifth, we introduce a space of metric classes following Streets [31]. Whereas, in the Kähler manifold case, any two Kähler metrics within the same Kähler class differ by $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u$, for manifolds with split tangent bundle, it is natural to study metrics of split type differing by $\square u$. More concretely, for a fixed Hermitian metric ω_0 , we are interested in metrics of the following form

$$\omega = \omega_0 + \square u > 0.$$

Therefore, the positive cone \mathcal{P} in Definition 1.4 replaces Kähler cone in Kähler geometry under our setup.

Last, we point out that there exists a dual geometric construction. For a complex surface (M, I) with split tangent, note that \square may also be defined for general differential forms instead of smooth functions. We may then consider \square -closed *Hermitian metrics*. Notice that similar to (1.2), for any $u \in C^\infty(M)$ and letting $\pi: \Lambda^{1,1}(M) \rightarrow \Lambda^s(M)$ be the natural projection,

$$\square(\pi(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u)) = 0.$$

We have the following:

Definition 1.5. Notation as above. We define the *second split type cohomology group*

$\mathcal{H}'(M) = \{\phi \in \Lambda^s(M) \mid \square\phi = 0\} / \{\pi(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u) \mid u \in C^\infty(M)\}$,
and the associated *positive cone* $\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{H}'$

$$\mathcal{P}'(M) = \{[\phi] \in \mathcal{H}' \mid \exists \omega \in [\phi] \text{ s.t. } \omega > 0\}.$$

1.2. Structure of cohomology and a uniformization theorem. Now we state the first result of our paper as follows, generalizing a result of Streets and Ustinovskiy [36, Lemma 5.3]:

Theorem 1.6. *For a complex surface with split tangent, and notation set as above, we have $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$. Also, we have $\dim \mathcal{H}' = 2$.*

The second part of Theorem 1.6 is a direct consequence of its first part, due to the involution constructed in Definition 1.2 (see Lemma 3.3 for details). The first part of Theorem 1.6 indicates that \mathcal{H} , which is the tangent space of \mathcal{P} , is finite dimensional. Similar results are not known in general non-Kähler Hermitian geometry. Theorem 1.6 indicates our set up may be viewed as a proper analogue of Kähler geometry. For the proof of Theorem 1.6, we introduce a simple algebraic criteria for linear dependence within \mathcal{H} . We explore a linear elliptic PDE of split type to prove Theorem 1.6 where the dimension being 2, as well as the pluriclosed condition, plays an important role.

We use Theorem 1.6 to show a surprising uniformization theorem for pluriclosed bi-Hermitian metrics on Hopf surfaces.

Definition 1.7 ([26]). A primary diagonal Hopf surface $H_{a,b}$, where $\alpha = \operatorname{Re} a > 0$, $\beta = \operatorname{Re} b > 0$, is defined as

$$H = H_{a,b} = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus (0, 0)\} / \sim,$$

where $(z, w) \sim (e^a z, e^b w)$ is an equivalence relation.

In [36], Streets-Ustinovskiy constructed a family of Bismut-Ricci soliton metrics, denoted as $\omega_t^{SU} = \omega_t \in \Lambda^s(H_{a,b})$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, which are holomorphically and metrically equivalent to each other. For future use, we define

$$(1.3) \quad \omega'_t = \frac{d}{dt} \omega_t^{SU}.$$

See Section 3 for more details.

Theorem 1.8 (Uniformization for Hopf surfaces). *Notations as above, we have*

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{P}(H_{a,b}) = \{[s\omega_t], s > 0, t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{P}'(H_{a,b}) = \emptyset.$$

Equivalently, for any bi-Hermitian pluriclosed metric ω on $H_{a,b}$, there exists a smooth function $u \in C^\infty(H_{a,b})$ such that $\omega_u = \omega + \square u = s\omega_t^{SU}$, where $s > 0$.

Theorem 1.8 can be compared to the standard uniformization theorem for \mathbb{S}^2 , where any complex metric can be deformed to the standard round metric up to a conformal map. By Theorem 1.8, one may use a conformal factor to move any bi-Hermitian metric on $H_{a,b}$ to a pluriclosed metric, which can then be moved by an additional $\square u$ term to the standard Streets-Ustinovskiy metric. Note that, even for the regular Hopf surface case, where $\alpha = \beta$, Theorem 1.8 is new.

In addition, we also have a complete characterization of the metric cone.

Theorem 1.9. *For $H_{a,b}$, $[\Omega] \in \mathcal{P}$ if and only if for any pluriclosed form $\Omega \in [\Omega]$*

$$\int_H \iota(\omega'_0) \wedge \Omega > 0,$$

where ι is the involution given in (1.1) and ω'_0 is defined in (1.3). See also (4.2) for its explicit form.

Theorem 1.9 gives a satisfactory intersection-theoretic criterion to determine the bi-Hermitian metric cone, as ω'_0 is an explicit differential form.

1.3. Prescribing Bismut Ricci. Next, we discuss the related curvature problem. Note that in the Kähler case, both Kähler metrics and their corresponding Kähler Ricci forms live in $H_{\mathbb{R}}^{1,1}$ of a Kähler manifold. For manifolds with split tangent, when metrics of split type are considered, both metrics and their corresponding Bismut Ricci forms live in the split type cohomology group \mathcal{H} [14, Lemma 7.77, Proposition 8.20]. More precisely, from any metric ω of split type, the (1,1) component of its Bismut Ricci form of first type, denoted as $\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}$, defines a class in $[\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}] \in \mathcal{H}$ which is independent of ω , and may be seen as the projection of $c_1(TM) \in H^2(M)$ into \mathcal{H} . In particular, following a general result of Streets [14, Proposition 8.20], we have

$$(1.6) \quad \text{Ric}_B^{1,1}(\omega) = -\square(\log \det \omega^+ - \log \det \omega^-),$$

where $\det \omega^\pm$ is computed with a local holomorphic coordinate. See Section 2 for more details.

Noting the strong similarity between (1.6) and the well known Kähler-Ricci formula, Streets [33] poses the following Calabi problem as an analogue of the Calabi problem in the Kähler geometry, which was settled by Yau in his celebrated work [45]. In dimension 2, the problem can be stated as

Problem 1.10. Notations as above. For a fixed $[\omega_0] \in \mathcal{P}$, and any $\rho \in [\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}(\omega_0)] \in \mathcal{H}$, find a smooth $\omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0$, such that $\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}(\omega_u) = \rho$.

In this paper, we are able to answer this question in the dimension 2 case.

Theorem 1.11. *If M is a compact, complex surface with split tangent, and notations are as above. For any fixed $[\omega_0] \in \mathcal{P}$, and any $\rho \in [\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}]$, there exists a smooth $\omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0$, such that $\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}(\omega_u) = \rho$.*

We will comment on the PDE approach to prove 1.11 in a more general setting later in the paper.

1.4. Canonical metrics on Inoue Surfaces of type \mathcal{S}_M .

Definition 1.12. For a unimodular matrix $M \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ with eigenvalues $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 1$ and $\beta, \bar{\beta} \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $a = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$, $b = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ be the real and complex eigen-vectors of M with respect to α and β , respectively. We have $\alpha|\beta|^2 = 1$. Define a holomorphic action group G_M on $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$ generated by

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(z, w) &= (\alpha z, \beta w), \\ g_i(z, w) &= (z + a_i, w + b_i), \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned}$$

An Inoue surface of type \mathcal{S}_M , denoted as S is defined as $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}/G_M$.

Let T^+ be the holomorphic line bundle locally generated by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and T^- be the holomorphic line bundle locally generated by $\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$. T^\pm are both flat as the corresponding transition functions may be chosen as constants. It is clear that S satisfies Definition 1.1. We give the following

Definition 1.13. The Tricerri metric on the Inoue surface S as above is defined as

$$(1.7) \quad \omega_{a,b} := a\sqrt{-1} \frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{\Im(z)^2} + b\sqrt{-1} \Im(z) dw \wedge d\bar{w},$$

while $a > 0, b > 0$ and $\Im(z)$ is the imaginary part of z .

When $a = b = 1$, $\omega_{a,b}$ was first constructed by Tricerri [43]. It is direct to check that these metrics are both \square -closed and pluriclosed. As a consequence of Theorem 1.6, these Tricerri metrics can be viewed as representatives of $\mathcal{P}(S)$ and $\mathcal{P}'(S)$ in their respective sense. However, these metrics do not seem to carry curvature properties.

We explore the special geometric properties of S by the following construction

Definition 1.14. For S satisfying Definition 1.12, define a flat holomorphic line bundle

$$(1.8) \quad l = (T^+) \otimes (T^-) \otimes (T^-).$$

Note that any split type Hermitian metric $\omega = \sqrt{-1}(g^+ dz \wedge d\bar{z} + g^- dw \wedge d\bar{w})$ induces a metric g^l on l naturally. In particular, for the local section $\sigma := \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right) \otimes \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\right) \otimes \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\right)$, its g^l norm can be computed as

$$(1.9) \quad |\sigma|_{g^l}^2 = (g^-)^2 g^+.$$

It is now crucial to observe that $|\sigma|_{g^l}^2$ is *globally well-defined* on S since $\alpha|\beta|^2 = 1$.

We raise the following question

Problem 1.15. For the flat line bundle l given in 1.8, find a split type metric $\omega \in [\omega] \in \mathcal{P}'(S)$ such that the Chern connection of its induced metric g^l is flat.

Problem 1.15 may be seen as a Calabi-Yau type problem. While a Calabi-Yau manifold M has a trivial canonical line bundle K , the Calabi-Yau metric in any Kähler class induces a flat metric on K . Problem 1.15 asks for a canonical flat metric on a flat line bundle.

Since the Chern curvature is computed by $-\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log|\sigma|^2$, by (1.9), Problem 1.15 can be restated as: Given a \square -closed metric ω , find $\omega_u = \omega + \pi(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u) > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(1.10) \quad \left(\frac{\omega_u^+}{\omega_0^+}\right) \left(\frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-}\right)^2 = e^\xi,$$

Note that (1.10) is an elliptic Monge-Ampère equation; while the corresponding problem for \mathcal{P} will be hyperbolic. See also (1.4).

Theorem 1.16. *For an Inoue surface S of type \mathcal{S}_M , given as above,*

$$\mathcal{P}(S) = \{[\omega_{a,b}] \in \mathcal{H}(S) \mid a > 0, b > 0.\}$$

$$\mathcal{P}'(S) = \{[\omega_{a,b}] \in \mathcal{H}'(S) \mid a > 0, b > 0.\}$$

- (1) *For any pluriclosed split Hermitian metric ω on S , there exists a smooth $\omega_u = \omega + \square u = \omega_{a,b} \in \mathcal{P}$;*
- (2) *For any \square -closed split Hermitian metric ω on S , there exists a smooth $\omega_u = \omega + \pi(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u) = \omega_{a,b} \in \mathcal{P}'(S)$;*
- (3) *$\omega_{a,b}$ is the unique metric in its \mathcal{P}' class whose induced metric on l is flat.*

Theorem 1.16 shows that Tricceri metrics are indeed canonical metrics on Inoue surfaces in their respective \mathcal{P}' class when we consider the induced metric on l . Since we have a complete classification of \mathcal{P}' for Inoue surfaces, we are not solving the corresponding non-linear PDE. The corresponding problem in \mathcal{P} is clearly hyperbolic, which requires a completely different set of tools to study.

1.5. A new fully non-linear PDE. We now turn to the PDE aspect of our paper. With application to special examples of Hopf surfaces in mind, we concentrate on the surface case. In this paper, on a complex surface M with split tangent, assume that $\omega_0 \in [\omega] \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0$ be another Hermitian metric. Assume that $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$ and $F \in C^\infty(M)$. We consider the following partial differential

equation:

$$(1.11) \quad \left(\frac{\omega_u^+}{\omega_0^+} \right)^\beta = e^{F+\xi} \left(\frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-} \right)^\alpha,$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in C^\infty(M)$ are unknowns.

Equation (1.11) can be viewed as a Monge-Ampère type PDE of split type. When $\alpha = \beta$, it is actually linear. In fact, Theorem 1.11 is a direct consequence of this case. However, when $\alpha \neq \beta$, (1.11) is fully non-linear. There have been many recent works in the real and complex cases of Monge-Ampère PDE of split type. See [30, 31, 32, 33, 37].

It is interesting to point out that while there are PDEs exploring partial components of the Hessian matrix [27, 37], our equation (1.11), gives non-homogeneous weights to different components when $\alpha \neq \beta$. As far as we are aware, this is a new form of geometric Monge-Ampère type equation.

Our main technical result of the paper is the following:

Theorem 1.17. *Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Assume that M is a closed, complex surface with split tangent with notation as above. Given any fixed $[\omega_0] \in \mathcal{P}$, and any smooth function $F \in C^\infty(M)$, there exists a unique pair of smooth $\omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ to solve (1.11).*

We make some remarks regarding the proof of Theorem 1.17. First, it is important to realize that (1.11) is an elliptic PDE when $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$. Second, since the $\beta = 1$ case is essentially linear, its proof is similar in spirit to that of Theorem 1.6. The general case is much more subtle. Though the dimension is low, we have to apply many techniques in fully non-linear PDEs with interesting new components. We have used heavily the fact that $\alpha \neq \beta$. We have to obtain both upper and positive lower bounds of the diagonal terms of the Hessian. Off-diagonal terms of the Hessian have to be estimated separately. In addition, our PDE is not concave, which complicates *a priori* estimates further. See Section 4 for more details.

1.6. New canonical metrics on Hopf surfaces. With Theorem 1.17, we give a new family of *Calabi-Yau type canonical* metrics on Hopf surfaces utilising the special geometric structure of split tangent.

It is known that the corresponding Bismut-Einstein problem can only be solved on Kähler Calabi-Yau surfaces and regular Hopf surfaces $H_{a,b}$ with $\alpha = \beta$ as in Definition 1.7, on which all Bismut-Ricci flat metrics are unique up to diffeomorphism as quotient metrics from the standard product metric on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ (e.g. [14, Theorem 8.26] or [35, Theorem 1.4]). See Section 3 for further discussion. In general, the Streets-Ustinovskiy metric is given as a Bismut-Ricci soliton, which by Theorem 1.8 may be viewed as the canonical metric on Hopf surfaces.

Again, let T^+ be the holomorphic line bundle locally generated by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and T^- be the holomorphic line bundle locally generated by $\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$. T^\pm are both flat bundles over H . H satisfies Definition 1.1.

We consider first the regular Hopf surface where $a = b \in \mathbb{R}$. Due to the equivalence relation, it is easy to see that $l := T^+ \otimes (T^-)^*$ is a trivial line bundle. Furthermore, any Bismut Ricci-flat split metric ω induces a flat metric on l . In fact, Theorem 1.11. shows that the norm of section $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \otimes (\frac{\partial}{\partial w})^*$ with respect to the induced metric is constant. Therefore, l is metrically trivial, too.

We turn to the case where $\alpha \neq \beta$. While the above construction no longer works, we may consider a *virtual* flat line bundle

$$l := (T^+)^\beta \otimes (T^-)^{\ast\alpha}.$$

We note that when $\beta/\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$, $l^{\frac{m}{\alpha}}$ is well defined over H for a properly chosen integer m . Otherwise, l is ill defined. However, the real line bundle $L := l \otimes \bar{l}$ is well defined over H . In other words, if $\sigma := (\frac{\partial}{\partial z})^\beta \otimes (\frac{\partial}{\partial w})^{\ast\alpha}$, then $\sigma \otimes \bar{\sigma}$ may be viewed as a global non-vanishing section of L . For any split type Hermitian metric $\omega = \sqrt{-1}(g^+ dz \wedge d\bar{z} + g^- dw \wedge d\bar{w})$ induces a metric g^L on L naturally. It is direct to see that

$$(1.12) \quad |\sigma \otimes \bar{\sigma}|_{g^L} = \frac{(g^+)^\beta}{(g^-)^\alpha}.$$

As in the Inoue surface case, we observe that $|\sigma \otimes \bar{\sigma}|_{g^L}$ is now a globally defined function as it is compatible with the equivalence relation used to define $H_{a,b}$. Therefore, we may pose the question of finding flat metrics on L , which means that the induced metric has vanishing Chern curvature. We establish the following:

Theorem 1.18. *Notation as above. For any primary Hopf surface $H_{a,b}$, where $\alpha = \Re(a) > 0$, $\beta = \Re(b) > 0$ and any fixed $[\omega_0] \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists a unique $\omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0$, whose induced metric on the trivial real line bundle L is flat.*

Remark 1.19. The corresponding PDE problem is exactly (1.11). Therefore, Theorem 1.18 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.17.

Remark 1.20. Theorem 1.18 asserts the existence of a second kind of canonical pluri-closed representative for a fixed $[\omega] \in \mathcal{P}$. There are various constructions of pluri-closed metrics on general primary Hopf surfaces (e.g. [18, 36]). Our construction is new. It is interesting to compare two kinds of canonical metrics: Streets-Ustinovskiy metrics and the ones coming from Theorem 1.18.

Remark 1.21. Since $\mathcal{P}'(H_{a,b}) = \emptyset$, we do not have a dual problem in this case.

1.7. Remarks on related works. Our work is motivated and influenced by many existing works from various areas. Here we make comments on some of those. Our list is by no means comprehensive. Interested readers are referred to works cited below and references therein.

In the physics literature, the generalized Kähler condition was introduced by Gates-Hull-Roček[16]. Hull-Lindström-Roček-von Unge-Zabzine identified a scalar equation [23] in the commuting case, which is related to pluriclosed flow [33] and the PDE that we study in this paper.

Hitchin in [22] and subsequently, Gualtieri in [20] introduced the notion of generalized complex geometry and generalized Kähler geometry. Streets and Tian introduced the pluriclosed flow as an extension of Kähler-Ricci flow in [34]. Later Street and Tian studied generalized Kähler-Ricci flow on generalized Kähler manifolds [35]. This setting has proved flexible enough for the formulation of several non-Kähler Calabi-Yau conjectures in different regimes. See, for example, [8, Conjecture 1.1], [7, Conjecture 1.2], and [33, Conjecture 3.12]. For further background, readers are encouraged to refer to the book by Garcia-Fernandez and Streets [14, Chapters 7-9]. See also Zheng [47].

Bott-Chern and Aeppli Cohomologies and their analytical implications have been extensively studied in non-Kähler complex geometry. See the note by Schweitzer [28] and the book by Bismut [11] for reference. See also the review by Angella [2]. Our construction of split type cohomologies is first raised in [36].

For various examples of pluriclosed metrics, we mention the earlier works of Gauduchon-Ornea [18] for a construction of special Gauduchon metrics on all primary Hopf surfaces. Additionally, Apostolov and Dloussky have constructed pluriclosed metrics on Hopf surfaces which are compatible with two complex structures in [5]. Tian-Streets [35, Theorem 1.4] have classified all Bismut Ricci flat metrics in dimension 2. Streets and Ustinovskiy discovered metrics, which we refer to as the Streets-Ustinovskiy metrics, on Hopf surfaces and showed that these are compact, steady generalized Kähler Ricci solitons [36]; in the commuting case this is equivalent to being a Bismut Ricci soliton. Ye in [46] has proved that all non-Kähler Bismut Einstein metrics are Bismut Ricci flat. Yang and Zheng [44] have classified all Bismut flat metrics in dimension 2 and 3. We also mention the construction of Tricerri [43] on Inoue surfaces, which plays a crucial role in this paper. For other references regarding Bismut-Ricci problem, see [15, 25, 33].

For commuting-type generalized Kähler manifolds, Apostolov and Gualtieri, [6, Proposition 5] have shown that local deformations are given by scalar functions. Streets has shown in specific cases that the corresponding cohomology group is finite dimensional [36, Lemma 5.3], suggesting a more general theory.

Monge-Ampère equations have been studied extensively in complex geometry, initiated by the celebrated works of Yau [45] on the Calabi conjecture. Many extensions

in Hermitian geometry have been proved by various authors, see [12, 21, 38, 40, 41] and reference therein.

Split-type elliptic PDEs, as a natural extension of Hessian equations, have seen some study in the context of both geometry and PDE. See the works of Streets-Warren [37] and Mooney-Savin[27].

Several recent studies address metrics on Inoue surfaces after the earlier work of Tricerri [43]. See, for example, Shen-Smith [29], Angella-Tosatti [3] and Tosatti-Weinkove [42].

1.8. Future problems. In the following, we raise some future problems.

First, it is a surprising fact that Theorem 1.17 has two distinct proofs for cases $\alpha = \beta$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$. It is geometrically tempting to conjecture that resulting solutions, when properly normalized, have some continuity property with respect to the parameter β/α . However, we have not been able to establish a uniform proof.

It is also our intention to study bi-Hermitian metrics on other families of complex surfaces with split tangent and their properties.

As indicated earlier, a PDE similar to (1.10) may be studied directly, which may be useful to analyze the geometry of specific examples.

It is highly likely that with our existing *a priori* estimates, a Bismut-Ricci flow approach should give an alternative proof of Theorem 1.11, which should carry more geometric consequence than our continuity method approach.

Our results indicate potential constructions in higher dimensions from both the PDE point of view and the geometric point of view. See [14] for background and some interesting problems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we collect some background definitions and results regarding Gauduchon metrics, Chern Laplacians, classifications of surfaces with split tangent and some formulas for Bismut Ricci curvature. In Section 3, we explore the structure of the cohomology groups \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' , establish Theorem 1.6 and study metrics of Inoue surfaces. In Section 4, we study the metric cone of Hopf surfaces in detail and establish a uniformization theorem. In Section 5, we establish the linear version of Theorem 1.17 and give an affirmative answer to Problem 1.10. In Section 5, we establish necessary *a priori* estimates to study the non-linear version of (1.11). In Section 6, we prove the full version of Theorem 1.17 using the continuity method.

1.9. Acknowledgments. Both authors would like to thank Connor Mooney, Jeff Streets, Lihe Wang and Jinyang Wu for discussions. They appreciate valuable comments of Jeff Streets on an earlier draft of this paper. The first named author thanks Bo Guan, Biao Ma, Wei Wei and Fangyang Zheng for discussions. Both authors acknowledge partial support from NSF RTG grant DMS-2038103.

2. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

In this section, we collect some background facts and results that will be used in this paper.

First, for a complex manifold with split tangent, we introduce a bi-Hermitian structure.

Definition 2.1. For a complex manifold (M, I) with split tangent, as given in Definition 1.1. We define a second complex structure $J : TM \rightarrow TM$ such that $J|_{T^\pm} = \pm I$.

It is clear that $J^2 = -\text{Id}$. A direct computation shows that J is also integrable.

Second, we introduce the notions of *Gauduchon and pluriclosed Hermitian metrics*.

Definition 2.2. A Hermitian metric ω on a complex manifold (M^n, I) is called *Gauduchon* if $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\omega^{n-1} = 0$. When $n = 2$, the Gauduchon condition is equivalent to the *pluriclosed condition*. We will use these notions interchangeably.

One reason for considering such metrics is that every conformal class on a compact, complex manifold which contains a Hermitian metric admits a Hermitian metric satisfying the Gauduchon condition [17]. We state this theorem in detail below as we will use it extensively in this work.

Theorem 2.3. [17] *Let M^n be a compact, complex manifold. Then, if ω is an arbitrary Hermitian metric, there is a unique smooth function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, such that*

$$(2.1) \quad \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(e^{(n-1)f}\omega^{n-1}) = 0,$$

$$(2.2) \quad \int_M e^{nf}\omega^n = \int_M \omega^n.$$

We list a couple properties of (2.1) for future use.

Lemma 2.4. (c.f.[17]) *Suppose $\omega > 0$ is Gauduchon. Let $f \in C^\infty(M)$ satisfy $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(f\omega^{n-1}) = 0$, then $f \equiv \text{const}$.*

Proof. Adding a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$, we may assume that $f + C > 0$. We have

$$\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}((f + C)\omega^{n-1}) = 0.$$

Thus by Theorem 2.3, $f + C$ is constant, which leads to our conclusion. \square

We state a technical result for future use.

Lemma 2.5. *With notation as in Theorem 2.3, the solution f of (2.1) depends continuously on the choice of metric ω when $\omega \mapsto f$ is considered as a map $C^3(\Lambda^{1,1}(M)) \rightarrow C^3(M)$.*

Proof. We denote

$$C_0^1(\Lambda^{n,n}) = \{\eta \in C^1(\Lambda^{n,n}) \mid \int_M \eta = 0\}.$$

We consider the following map

$$G : C^3(M) \times C^3(\Lambda^{1,1}) \rightarrow C_0^1(\Lambda^{n,n}) \times \mathbb{R}$$

$$(f, \omega) \mapsto (\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(e^{(n-1)f}\omega^{n-1}), \frac{1}{\int_M \omega^n} \int_M e^{nf}\omega^n - 1).$$

Suppose that $G(f_0, \omega_0) = 0$ for some $(f_0, \omega_0) \in C^3(\Lambda^{1,1}) \times C^3(M)$, then the linearized map is given as follows:

$$\delta G|_{(f_0, \omega_0)}(\delta f, 0) = (\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(\delta f e^{(n-1)f_0}\omega_0^{n-1}), \frac{n}{\int_M \omega_0^n} \int_M \delta f e^{nf_0}\omega_0^n).$$

We claim that $\delta G|_{(f_0, \omega_0)}(*, 0)$ is bijective.

We consider the injectivity first. Note that $\delta G|_{(f_0, \omega_0)}(\delta f, 0) = 0$ is equivalent to the following

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(\delta f e^{(n-1)f_0}\omega_0^{n-1}) = 0, \\ \int_M \delta f e^{nf_0}\omega_0^n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $G(f_0, \omega_0) = 0$, $e^{f_0}\omega_0$ is Gauduchon. Therefore we apply Lemma 2.4 to the first equation of (2.3) to see that δf is constant. Then, by the second equation of (2.3), we have concluded that $\delta f \equiv 0$.

We then consider the surjectivity. Let $ge^{nf_0}\frac{\omega_0^n}{n!} \in C_0^1(\Lambda^{n,n})$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the following linear elliptic equation:

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(\delta f e^{(n-1)f_0}\omega_0^{n-1}) = ge^{nf_0}\frac{\omega_0^n}{n!}, \\ \frac{1}{\int_M \omega_0^n} \int_M \delta f e^{\frac{n-1}{n}f_0}\omega_0^n = r. \end{cases}$$

As the right hand side of the first equation of (2.4) has $ge^{nf_0}\frac{\omega_0^n}{n!} \in C_0^1(\Lambda^{n,n})$, we have $\int_M g(e^{f_0}\omega_0)^n = 0$. Therefore, the first part of (2.4) can be solved by standard elliptic theory. Pick any such solution $\hat{\delta}f$, then we may re-normalize this to

$$\delta f = \hat{\delta}f + \left(r - \frac{1}{\int_M \omega_0^n} \int_M \hat{\delta}f e^{\frac{n-1}{n}f_0}\omega_0^n \right),$$

which satisfies the second equation of (2.4). We have thus established the surjectivity.

Now that we have established the claim that the linearized operator is bijective, we may apply the Implicit Function Theorem for Banach Spaces [19, Theorem 17.6] to show that the implicit function $\omega \mapsto f_\omega$, defined by $G(f_\omega, \omega) = 0$ is continuous. \square

Definition 2.6. Notation as above. We define the *Chern Laplacian* as

$$\Delta_\omega u := \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n}.$$

The Poisson equation for the Chern Laplacian has a well-understood classical solvability theory coming from the Fredholm alternative.

Theorem 2.7. [12, 17] *Let ω be an arbitrary Hermitian metric on M^n with Gauduchon factor e^f . Then, for $v \in C^\infty(M)$, the Chern-Poisson equation,*

$$\Delta_\omega u = v$$

admits a unique smooth solution u if and only if

$$\int_M v e^{(n-1)f} \omega^n = 0.$$

Furthermore, by standard PDE techniques (see [1, Appendix A]), the Chern Laplacian admits a Green's function with a lower bound.

Theorem 2.8. [1, Appendix A] *For any second-order, elliptic operator A on a compact manifold M , there exists a Green's function $G : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

- (1) $\int_M G(x, y) A\phi(y) dV(y) = \phi(x) - \frac{1}{|M|} \int_M \phi dV$ for all $\phi \in C^\infty(M)$,
- (2) $G(x, y)$ is smooth outside the diagonal $\Delta \subset M \times M$,
- (3) $G(x, y) \geq -D_1$ a.e. on $M \times M$ for some constant $D_1 > 0$, and
- (4) For any fixed $x \in M$, $\|G(x, \cdot)\|_{L^1(M)} < D_2$ for a constant $D_2 > 0$.

Next, we state an algebro-geometric result due to Beauville which, in our language, gives a classification of the compact, complex surfaces which admit a non-trivially split tangent bundle. This result indicates many non-trivial examples. In addition, it implies the existence of a global choice of coordinates.

Theorem 2.9. [9, Theorem C] *Let M be a compact complex surface. M has a nontrivial split tangent bundle if and only if one of the following occurs:*

- *The universal covering space of M is a product of two simply-connected Riemann surfaces $S_1 \times S_2$ and the group $\pi_1(M)$ acts diagonally on $S_1 \times S_2$; in this case, the splitting of $T_{\mathbb{C}}M$ lifts to the direct sum decomposition $T_{\mathbb{C}}(U \times V) = T_{\mathbb{C}}U \oplus T_{\mathbb{C}}V$.*
- *M is a Hopf surface, with the universal covering space $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. It has $\pi_1(M) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, for some integer $m \geq 1$; it is generated by diagonal automorphisms $(z, w) \mapsto (e^a z, e^b w)$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Re(a) > 0$, $\Re(b) > 0$ and $(z, w) \mapsto (\lambda z, \mu w)$ where λ and μ are primitive m -th roots of unity.*

A direct consequence is the following:

Lemma 2.10. [31, Lemma 2.3] *If M is a complex surface with split tangent, then locally there exists holomorphic coordinate $(z, w) \in U \times V \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ such that locally $T^+ = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\}$ and $T^- = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\}$.*

Furthermore, we also list a theorem of Apostolov and Gualtieri, which, in our setting, further classifies surfaces with split tangent up to bi-holomorphism.

Theorem 2.11. [6, c.f. Theorem 1] *Any compact, complex surface M with split tangent is biholomorphic to one of the following:*

- (a) *a geometrically ruled complex surface which is the projectivization of a projectively flat holomorphic vector bundle over a compact Riemann surface;*
- (b) *a bi-elliptic complex surface, i.e. a complex surface finitely covered by a complex torus;*
- (c) *a compact complex surface of Kodaira dimension 1 and even first Betti number, which is an elliptic fibration over a compact Riemann surface, whose only singular fibers are multiple smooth elliptic curves;*
- (d) *a compact complex surface of general type, uniformized by the product of two hyperbolic planes $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ and with fundamental group acting diagonally on the factors;*
- (e) *a quotient of a primary Hopf surface by a finite cyclic group action; or*
- (f) *an Inoue surface of type \mathcal{S}_M .*

All of these cases admit pluriclosed metrics of split type.

Remark 2.12. Note that all of these manifolds admit Kähler metrics except (e) and (f).

In the rest of this section we recall the definition of the Bismut connection and curvature of a Hermitian metric. Let (M, I, h) be a Hermitian manifold. Let ω be the corresponding Hermitian form. Let ∇^{LC} be the Levi-Civita connection of the Riemannian metric induced by h . Bismut introduced the following connection which is compatible with h and I , with a totally skew-symmetric torsion form.

Definition 2.13. [10] For a pluriclosed manifold (M, I, h) with notations as above, the *Bismut connection* is defined as

$$\nabla^B = \nabla^{LC} + \frac{1}{2}h^{-1}d^c\omega,$$

where $d^c = \sqrt{-1}(\partial - \bar{\partial})$. The curvature tensor induced by ∇^B and the corresponding Ricci form of the first type are denoted as $R_B \in \Lambda^2 \otimes \Lambda^{1,1}$ and $\text{Ric}_B = \text{tr}_g R^B \in \Lambda^2(T^*M)$, respectively.

Remark 2.14. Note that in general, R_B does not enjoy as many symmetries as in Riemannian and Kählerian cases. Therefore, there are several definitions of Ricci curvatures. In this paper, we consider only the particular type shown above.

Lemma 2.15. *Assume that M is a complex surface with split tangent and use notation as above. Then the $(1, 1)$ part of the Bismut Ricci form, $\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}$, has the following local representation*

$$(2.5) \quad \text{Ric}_B^{1,1} = -\square(\log \det h^+ - \log \det h^-),$$

where locally, $\omega^+ = \sqrt{-1}h_{ij}^+ v^i \wedge \bar{v}^j$ and $\omega^- = \sqrt{-1}h_{\alpha\beta}^- w^\alpha \wedge \bar{w}^\beta$, $\{v^i\}$ and $\{w^\alpha\}$ are basis for T^+ and T^- , respectively.

Proof. Note that by Lemma 2.10, M is generalized Kähler as in [15]. Then (2.5) is essentially Proposition 8.20 of [15], since curvature computation is purely local. It also follows from the following formula (2.5) of Ivanov-Popadopolous[24],

$$\text{Ric}_B = \text{Ric}_C - dd_\omega^* \omega,$$

where Ric_C is the Ricci form of the Chern connection of ω , d_ω^* is the dual operator of d with respect to metric ω . By choosing proper local coordinates and separating components carefully using the Hodge star operator with respect to ω , a long computation leads to (2.5). \square

It is now clear from (2.5) that $[\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}] \in \mathcal{H}$ is invariant of the choice of local coordinate or Hermitian metric.

Remark 2.16. It is interesting to compare our cohomology \mathcal{H} in this specific setting with the usual Bott-Chern cohomology and Aeppli cohomology.

3. STRUCTURES OF \mathcal{H} AND \mathcal{H}'

In this section, we focus on the case where M is a compact, complex surface with split tangent and we study cohomology groups \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' as defined in Definition 1.4. In particular, we show that both of them are finite dimensional for compact, complex surfaces with split tangent. We further consider some representative examples in Theorem 2.9.

First, we define the following

Definition 3.1. For M a complex surface with split tangent, let

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^+(M) := \{[\eta] \in \mathcal{H}(M), \exists \eta \in [\eta], \text{s.t. } \eta^2 > 0\}$$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{H}^-(M) := \{[\eta] \in \mathcal{H}(M), \exists \eta \in [\eta], \text{s.t. } \eta^+ \geq 0, \eta^- \leq 0\} \\ \cup \{[\eta] \in \mathcal{H}(M), \exists \eta \in [\eta], \text{s.t. } \eta^+ \leq 0, \eta^- \geq 0\}.$$

We give the following elementary fact that will be repeated used later.

Lemma 3.2. *Notation as above. Let $-\mathcal{P}(M) = \{[-\eta] \in \mathcal{P}(M)\}$*

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{H}^+(M) = \mathcal{P}(M) \cup -\mathcal{P}(M),$$

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{H}^+(M) \cap \mathcal{H}^-(M) = \emptyset$$

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{P}(M) \cap -\mathcal{P}(M) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Equation (3.3) is straightforward by connectedness of M . See Definition 1.1.

Assume that (3.4) is not true, then there exists $[\eta] \in \mathcal{H}^+(M) \cap \mathcal{H}^-(M)$ which means there exists $\eta \in [\eta]$ such that $\eta = \eta^+ + \eta^-$ where η^+ and η^- have different signs. In addition, there exists a smooth function u such that either $\eta + \square u > 0$ or $\eta + \square u < 0$. Consider the first case where $\eta^+ \geq 0$, $\eta^- \leq 0$, $\eta^+ + \sqrt{-1}\partial_+\bar{\partial}_+u > 0$ and $\eta^- + \sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-u > 0$, which indicates $\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-u > 0$. When considering the point $p \in M$ when u achieves its maximum, $\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-u \leq 0$. We clearly have a contradiction. The other cases are similar and we omit the detail here. We have proved (3.4).

Equation (3.5) is proved similarly. \square

Next, recall the involution ι defined in 1.1.

Lemma 3.3. *Notation as above. We have*

$$\iota(\square u) = \pi(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u).$$

Also, the involution ι induces an isomorphism, between \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' , which will also be denoted as ι .

This is straightforward and we omit the proof here. Additionally, we will briefly note that a complex surface M , viewed as a Hermitian manifold with a metric compatible to I , and the same smooth manifold M , viewed as a Hermitian manifold with a metric compatible to J , have opposite choices of orientation. Since \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' are both defined with respect to I , ι does not induce an isomorphism between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' .

We are ready to introduce an algebraic operation that characterizes linear relations within \mathcal{H} .

Definition 3.4. Define the following global anti-symmetric, bi-linear bracket on pluriclosed differential forms of split type:

$$(3.6) \quad \{\eta, \gamma\} = \int_M \iota(\eta) \wedge \gamma = \int_M \eta_+ \wedge \gamma_- - \eta_- \wedge \gamma_+.$$

It is direct to check that for any pluriclosed split form η and smooth function u ,

$$\{\square u, \eta\} = \int_M \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u \wedge \eta = 0$$

Therefore, this anti-symmetric, bi-linear bracket descends to \mathcal{H} -classes, offering the following criterion to distinguish different classes in \mathcal{H} .

Theorem 3.5. *For a compact, complex surface having split tangent bundle, if $[\omega_1] \in \mathcal{H}$ and $[\omega_2] \in \mathcal{P}$, then $[\omega_1] = c[\omega_2]$ if and only if $\{[\omega_1], [\omega_2]\} = 0$.*

Proof. We use the notation $\omega_u = \omega_1 + \square u$. We consider the equation

$$(3.7) \quad \omega_u^+ \wedge \omega_2^- = \omega_u^- \wedge \omega_2^+.$$

This can be rearranged as a Chern-Poisson equation.

$$(3.8) \quad \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u \wedge \omega_2 = \omega_2^+ \wedge \omega_1^- - \omega_2^- \wedge \omega_1^+$$

Since ω_2 is pluriclosed, hence it is Gauduchon. By Theorem 2.7, (3.8) is solvable if and only if its right-hand side integrates to zero over M , which is equivalent to

$$(3.9) \quad \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} = 0.$$

Therefore, if (3.9) holds, since $\omega_2 > 0$, there exist functions $f_{\pm} > 0$ such that $\omega_u^{\pm} = f_{\pm} \omega_2^{\pm}$. Therefore, (3.7) becomes

$$(3.10) \quad f_+ = f_-.$$

Thus, $\omega_u = f_+ \omega_2$. However, by Lemma 2.4 and the fact that $\omega_2 > 0$ is Gauduchon, f_+ must be constant. We have proved that $\omega_1 + \square u = c \omega_2$.

The other direction of the equivalence relation is straightforward and we omit its proof. \square

Notice, that for a given compact, complex surface with split tangent bundle, Theorem 3.5 indicates that, as in the case of the Calabi-Yau theorem, one can only hope for uniqueness to hold within a cohomology class. To see this, we construct a one parameter family of pluriclosed metrics with the same $\text{Ric}_B^{1,1}(M)$. For a fixed pluriclosed metric ω_0 , let

$$(3.11) \quad \tilde{\omega}_t = \exp(t) \omega_0^+ + \exp(-t) \omega_0^-.$$

By Theorem 2.3, there exists f_t smooth such that

$$(3.12) \quad \omega_t = \exp(f_t) \tilde{\omega}_t$$

is pluriclosed and $\int_M \omega_t^2 = 1$ for all t . It is direct to check that this family of pluriclosed metrics have identical Bismut Ricci curvature (see Equation 2.5). However, we have the following observation: if $t > s$, then by (3.11),

$$(3.13) \quad \{\omega_t, \omega_s\} = \{\exp(f_t) \tilde{\omega}_t, \exp(f_s) \tilde{\omega}_s\} > 0.$$

In other words, Theorem 3.5 implies ω_t and ω_s belong to different classes in the projectivization of \mathcal{H} .

Finally, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.6. Due to Lemma 3.3, it is sufficient to prove the following:

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that M^2 is a compact, complex surface with split tangent bundle, and notation as above, then $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{H} = 2$.*

Proof. We start with any split Hermitian metric ω_0 . As conformal transformations preserve split forms, we can assume without loss of generality that ω_0 is Gauduchon [17]. We claim that $[\omega_0] \in \mathcal{H}$ is non-zero. Otherwise $\omega_0 = \square u$. However, if $p \in M$ were a maximal point of u , it would be the case that $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u(p) \geq 0$, i.e. ω_0 is not be positive at p . This is a contradiction, proving the claim.

Now consider ω_1 as given in (3.12). By (3.13) and Theorem 3.5, the set $\{[\omega_0]_{\mathcal{H}}, [\omega_1]_{\mathcal{H}}\}$ is linearly independent. Therefore, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{H} \geq 2$.

Let ω be a pluriclosed, split $(1,1)$ -form. We claim that $[\omega] \in \text{span}([\omega_1], [\omega_0])$. If $\{\omega, \omega_1\} = 0$, the claim holds due to Theorem 3.5. Otherwise, by possibly adding a negative sign in front of ω , we may assume $\{\omega, \omega_1\} < 0$. We consider for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, the following split-type forms

$$(3.14) \quad \omega_L = a\omega_1 + \omega, \quad \omega_R = b\omega_1 + \omega_0.$$

The claim will follow from Theorem 3.5 if we are able to find a and b for which

$$(3.15) \quad \{\omega_L, \omega_R\} = 0.$$

Note that (3.15) is equivalent to

$$\{\omega_L, \omega_R\} = a\{\omega_1, \omega_0\} + b\{\omega, \omega_1\} + \{\omega, \omega_0\}$$

As $\{\omega, \omega_1\} < 0$, we may choose $b > 0$ sufficiently large such that

$$b\{\omega, \omega_1\} + \{\omega, \omega_0\} < 0.$$

Then, by (3.13) $\{\omega_1, \omega_0\} > 0$, it is possible to choose $a > 0$ by

$$a = -\frac{b\{\omega, \omega_1\} + \{\omega, \omega_0\}}{\{\omega_1, \omega_0\}} > 0.$$

As $b > 0$, $\omega_R > 0$ as well. By Theorem 3.5, there is some $u \in C^\infty(M)$ and some c such that

$$(3.16) \quad \omega_L + \square u = c\omega_R,$$

which by (3.14) is equivalent to

$$\omega = (cb - a)\omega_1 + c\omega_0 + \square \tilde{u},$$

proving the claim. \square

Remark 3.7. In the proof given above, by taking a large enough such that $\omega_L > 0$, we have both $[\omega_L] \in \mathcal{P}$ and $[\omega_R] \in \mathcal{P}$, which indicates that $c > 0$ by Lemma 3.2.

Finally we discuss the consequence of our results in light of the classification result Theorem 2.9 of Beauville. In particular, we compute \mathcal{H} explicitly in the following simple example.

Example 3.8. Let $X = (\Sigma_+ \times \Sigma_-, I)$ be a compact complex surface where Σ_{\pm} are compact, simply-connected Riemann surfaces with complex structures I_{\pm} , a splitting of the tangent bundle induced by the product structure $T^{1,0}X = T^{1,0}\Sigma_+ \oplus T^{1,0}\Sigma_-$, and product complex structure $I = I_+ \oplus I_-$. Then X has split tangent bundle and \mathcal{H} is clearly spanned by the classes of the semi-positive forms $\pi_+^*\omega_+$ and $\pi_-^*\omega_-$ given by the pull-backs through the projection maps π_{\pm} of the Kähler metrics ω_{\pm} .

Example 3.9. Given an Inoue surface of type $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{M}}$, the classes of the following semi-positive invariant forms generate \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' .

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1 &= \sqrt{-1} \frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{\Im(z)^2}, \\ \omega_2 &= \sqrt{-1} \Im(z) dw \wedge d\bar{w}.\end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.16.

Proof of Theorem 1.16. We consider $\mathcal{H}(S)$ first. By Theorem 1.6, for any pluriclosed split metric $\omega > 0$, there exist $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in C^\infty(S)$ such that

$$\omega = a\omega_1 + b\omega_2 + \square u.$$

Notice that by Lemma 3.2, $[a\omega_1 + b\omega_2] \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ if and only if $a > 0$ and $b > 0$. We have finished the proof. A similar argument may prove the statement regarding \mathcal{P}' . Finally, the ellipticity of the corresponding PDE implies the uniqueness of the solution. \square

4. UNIFORMIZATION FOR HOPF SURFACES

Now we move to the primary Hopf surface $H_{a,b}$ introduced in Definition 1.7. $H_{a,b}$ is called standard if $\alpha = \beta$.

Definition 4.1. [36] Given $H_{a,b}$ as above. The Streets-Ustinovskiy metric is defined for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(4.1) \quad \omega_t = \sqrt{-1} (k(\mu - \nu + t) \frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{\alpha^2 |z|^2} + [1 - k(\mu - \nu + t)] \frac{dw \wedge d\bar{w}}{\beta^2 |w|^2}),$$

where $\mu = \frac{\log |z|^2}{\alpha}$, $\nu = \frac{\log |w|^2}{\beta}$, and $k(x) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ is the strictly monotone increasing function satisfying $k(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ and

$$k'(x) = k(1 - k)[(\beta - \alpha)k(x) + \alpha].$$

In [36], Streets-Ustinovskiy show that ω_t are indeed smooth pluriclosed metrics on $H_{a,b}$.

From Definition 4.1, we also compute

$$(4.2) \quad \omega'_t := \frac{d}{dt}\omega_t = \sqrt{-1}k'(\mu - \nu + t)\left(\frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{\alpha^2|z|^2} - \frac{dw \wedge d\bar{w}}{\beta^2|w|^2}\right),$$

which is clearly pluriclosed. For simplicity, we write ω_0 and ω'_0 as ω and ω' , respectively. It is also direct to compute by (2.5)

$$(4.3) \quad \text{Ric}_B^{1,1}(\omega_t) = \sqrt{-1}(\beta - \alpha)k'(x + t)\left(\frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{\alpha^2|z|^2} - \frac{dw \wedge d\bar{w}}{\beta^2|w|^2}\right) = (\beta - \alpha)\omega'_t,$$

which indicates that ω_t is a Bismut-Ricci soliton metric when $\alpha \neq \beta$. This is the motivation of its construction by Streets-Ustinovskiy.

Note that when $\alpha = \beta$, a direct computation shows

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega &= \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{\alpha^2} \frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z} + dw \wedge d\bar{w}}{|z|^2 + |w|^2}, \\ \omega' &= \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{\alpha} \frac{|w|^2 dz \wedge d\bar{z} - |z|^2 dw \wedge d\bar{w}}{(|z|^2 + |w|^2)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where ω is, up to a scaling, the standard product metric on $S^3 \times S^1$, which is Bismut Ricci flat.

We now collect the following computational results:

Lemma 4.2. *For $H_{a,b}$ and forms defined as above, and a positive constant $c = \frac{8\pi^2}{\alpha\beta}$, we have*

$$(4.5) \quad \{\omega_t, \omega\} = ct.$$

$$(4.6) \quad \{\omega_t, \omega'\} = c.$$

Proof. First, we consider a dense open set in $H_{a,b}$ as $\{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid zw \neq 0\} / \sim$, which can be lifted by a bijection to the domain

$$D' = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid \frac{\log |z|^2}{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}, \frac{\log |w|^2}{\beta} \in (0, 2)\}.$$

Clearly $D' = S^1 \times S^1 \times D''$, where $D'' = \{(\mu, \nu) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \nu \in (0, 2)\}$.

Next, we define the following function $f(t) := \{\omega_t, \omega\}$ (recall Definition 3.6), and compute by (4.1) and standard polar coordinate change formula:

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} f(t) &= \int_H [k(\mu - \nu + t) - k(\mu - \nu)] \frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{\alpha^2|z|^2} \wedge \frac{dw \wedge d\bar{w}}{\beta^2|w|^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{\alpha\beta}\right) \int_{D''} [k(\mu - \nu + t) - k(\mu - \nu)] d\mu d\nu \end{aligned}$$

After changing variables from (μ, ν) to $(x := \mu - \nu, \nu)$, (4.7) may be further reduced to

$$(4.8) \quad f(t) = c \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [k(x+t) - k(x)] dx.$$

Now we use (4.7) and properties of k listed in Definition 4.1 to compute

$$(4.9) \quad f'(t) = c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k'(x+t) dx = c,$$

Therefore, considering $f(0) = 0$, integrating (4.9) completes the proof of the first part. The second part is very similar and we omit it here. \square

Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. By Lemma 4.2 and Theorems 1.6 and 3.5, we have

$$\mathcal{H}(H_{a,b}) = \text{span}\{\omega, \omega'\}.$$

In addition, using basic linear algebra and Lemma 4.2, we may show that

$$(4.10) \quad [\omega_t] = [\omega + t\omega'].$$

It is clear now that

$$(4.11) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H_{a,b}) := \{[s\omega_t], s > 0, t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset \mathcal{P}(H_{a,b}),$$

Therefore

$$(4.12) \quad -\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H_{a,b}) \subset -\mathcal{P}(H_{a,b}).$$

From (4.10), (1.5), (4.12), Lemma 3.2, and the fact that $\omega' \in \mathcal{H}^-$, we conclude that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H_{a,b}) \cup -\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H_{a,b}) \cup \mathcal{H}^- = \mathcal{H}.$$

By Lemma 3.2, we conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H_{a,b}) = \mathcal{P}(H_{a,b})$. \square

We may also give the following

Proof of Theorem 1.9. By Theorem 1.8, any $[\Omega] = p[\omega] + q[\omega'] \in \mathcal{P}$ if and only if $p > 0$. Now note that $p = \{[\Omega], [\omega']\} / \{[\omega], [\omega']\}$, we have the conclusion by checking the definition of the bracket operation (3.4) and Lemma 4.2. \square

Remark 4.3. From the proof above it is clear that the form ω'_0 in Theorem 1.9 may be replaced by any ω'_t , or any $\tilde{\omega} \in [\omega']$.

Finally, we make a remark regarding Aeppli cohomology. Readers should refer to [4] for definitions and background knowledge. In general, our split type cohomology will be a larger vector space than $H_A^{1,1}$ due to our construction. In particular, a result of [4] computes the Aeppli cohomology of Hopf surfaces and indicates that the dimension of $H_A^{1,1}$ of a primary Hopf surface is 1. The following lemma demonstrates

the difference between these notions in the special case of a primary Hopf surface, generalizing a result of Streets and Ustinovskiy on standard Hopf surfaces [36, Lemma 5.3]. Using the Aeppli cohomology definition as in [4], we have:

Lemma 4.4. *Notation as above. ω' defined in (4.2) is cohomologous to 0 in Aeppli cohomology.*

Proof. We consider the family of complex diffeomorphisms $\phi_t(z, w) = (e^{\frac{\alpha t}{4}} z, e^{-\frac{\beta t}{4}} w)$, which is generated by a holomorphic vector field $X = \frac{\alpha z}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} - \frac{\beta w}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial w}$. Then, a direct computation shows that $\phi_t^*(\mu - \nu) = \mu - \nu + t$. We can then compute the Lie derivative using the formula

$$(4.13) \quad \mathcal{L}_X \omega = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \phi_t^* \omega.$$

But, notice that $\phi_t^* \omega = \omega_t$, so that (4.13) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_X \omega = \omega'.$$

Letting $\gamma = i_X \omega \in \Lambda^{0,1}$. One has

$$\omega' = \partial \gamma + \bar{\partial} \bar{\gamma}.$$

In other words, $\omega' \in [0] \in H_A^{1,1}$. □

5. SPLIT-TYPE PDE AND PRESCRIBING BISMUT-RICCI

In this section, we prove the linear case of our main PDE result, a classical solvability theorem for the twisted Monge-Ampère equation in dimension 2. Following [38, 40, 41] we define a *solution of the twisted Monge-Ampère equation* to be a pair $(u, \xi) \in C^\infty(M) \times \mathbb{R}$ solving the twisted Monge-Ampère equation, where ξ is a real parameter. In particular, our main theorem of the section is the following special case of Theorem 1.17:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $[\omega_0] \in \mathcal{P}$. For any $F \in C^\infty(M)$, there exists a unique pair $u \in C^\infty(M)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ solving*

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\omega_u^+}{\omega_0^+} = e^{F+\xi} \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-}, \\ \omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0, \\ \min_M u = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We rewrite the equation as

$$\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^- + \sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ u \wedge \omega_0^- = e^{F+\xi} \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^- - e^{F+\xi} \sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- u \wedge \omega_0^+,$$

or

$$(5.2) \quad \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} u \wedge (e^{F+\xi} \omega_0^+ + \omega_0^-) = (e^{F+\xi} - 1) \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-.$$

Let $\tilde{\omega} = e^{F+\xi}\omega_0^+ + \omega_0^-$, (5.2) can be viewed as a Chern-Poisson equation,

$$(5.3) \quad \Delta_{\tilde{\omega}} u = (1 - e^{-F-\xi}).$$

By Theorem 2.3, there is a unique smooth function $f_{F,\xi}$ depending on F and ξ , such that

$$\int_M e^{2f_{F,\xi}} \tilde{\omega}^2 = \int_M \tilde{\omega}^2, \quad \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(e^{f_{F,\xi}}\tilde{\omega}) = 0.$$

Therefore, we can rewrite (5.2) in terms of the pluriclosed metric $\hat{\omega} = e^{f_{F,\xi}}\tilde{\omega}$.

$$(5.4) \quad \Delta_{\hat{\omega}} u = e^{-f_{F,\xi}}(1 - e^{-F-\xi})$$

By Theorem 2.7, (5.4) is solvable if and only if

$$0 = \int_M e^{-f_{F,\xi}}(1 - e^{-F-\xi})\hat{\omega}^2 = \int_M e^{f_{F,\xi}}(1 - e^{-F-\xi})\tilde{\omega}^2 = \int_M e^{f_{F,\xi}}(e^{F+\xi} - 1)\omega_0^2.$$

Note that for any $\xi_1 > -\inf F$,

$$\int_M e^{f_{F,\xi_1}}(e^{F+\xi_1} - 1)\omega_0^2 > 0.$$

Similarly, for any $\xi_2 < -\sup F$, we have

$$\int_M e^{f_{F,\xi_2}}(e^{F+\xi_2} - 1)\omega_0^2 < 0.$$

We then apply Lemma 2.5 and the intermediate value theorem to determine that there exists a $\xi \in (\xi_2, \xi_1)$ such that

$$\int_M e^{f_{F,\xi}}(e^{F+\xi} - 1)\omega_0^2 = 0.$$

Therefore, we have established the existence of a smooth solution for (5.4). The positivity of the resulting ω_u follows immediately from the argument in Remark 3.7.

To see the uniqueness, suppose that (u, ξ_1) and (v, ξ_2) are both solutions to (5.1). Then the following holds

$$(5.5) \quad \frac{\omega_u^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_u^-} = e^{\xi_1 - \xi_2} \frac{\omega_v^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_v^-},$$

which implies that

$$(5.6) \quad \omega_u = e^f(e^{\xi_1}\omega_v^+ + e^{\xi_2}\omega_v^-)$$

for some smooth function f . Since $\omega_u = \omega_v + \square(u - v)$, by Theorem 3.5, we have

$$0 = \{\omega_v, e^f(e^{\xi_1}\omega_v^+ + e^{\xi_2}\omega_v^-)\} = \int_M (e^{\xi_2} - e^{\xi_1})e^f\omega_v^2.$$

Therefore, $\xi_1 = \xi_2$. Since ω_u and ω_v are both pluriclosed, applying Lemma 2.4 to (5.5) indicates that $f \equiv \text{const}$. Therefore, (5.5) indicates that $\omega_v + \square(u - v) = c\omega_v$. The uniqueness now follows immediately if $c = 1$. When $c \neq 1$ we find

$$\omega_v = \square \left(\frac{v - u}{1 - c} \right),$$

which indicates that $[0]_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{P}$, which is absurd. See also the proof of Lemma 3.2. We have thus finished the proof. \square

6. A PRIORI ESTIMATES FOR FULLY NONLINEAR PDES

In this section, we consider the (1.11) in its full generality. We first simplify (1.11) on a compact complex surface with split tangent to the following:

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\omega_u^+}{\omega_0^+} \right)^\beta = e^{F+\xi} \left(\frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-} \right), \\ \omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0. \end{cases} .$$

Writing the equation in this way, we have assumed $\alpha = 1$, but this is without loss of generality as this normalization can always be achieved by taking roots and replacing β by β/α .

Additionally, we will define the space of admissible functions associated to a Hermitian metric on which (6.1) is elliptic.

Definition 6.1. Given a Hermitian metric ω_0 , the set of admissible functions is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_0) := \{u \in C^4(M) \mid \omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0\}.$$

The tangent space is seen to be

$$(6.2) \quad T_{(u,\xi)}\mathcal{A}(\omega) \cong C^4(M).$$

The distinguished case of (6.1) with $\beta = 1$ is linear and has been discussed in the previous section, so we will restrict our attention to the fully nonlinear case wherein $\beta \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. Finally, notice that it suffices to consider the case $\beta \in (0, 1)$, as we may otherwise take roots and achieve similar estimates with T^+ and T^- swapped. We note that the condition $\beta \neq 1$ will be crucial for our estimates.

We set the following notation conventions to make subsequent computations easier. First, we define

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda &:= \omega_u^+ / \omega_0^+, \\ \eta &:= \omega_u^- / \omega_0^-. \end{aligned}$$

With these conventions, (6.1) takes the form

$$(6.4) \quad \lambda^\beta = e^{F+\xi}\eta.$$

In this section, we obtain uniform estimates for this equation which will be later used along a continuity path. For convenience and without loss of generality, we may assume from now on that

$$(6.5) \quad \inf_M u = 0,$$

which is equivalent to $u \geq 0$.

6.1. Estimate for the parameter. One can estimate ξ by a maximum principle argument. This will have the added benefit of allowing us to avoid needing to track the ξ -dependence of the constants in our estimates.

Lemma 6.2. *Notation as above. Suppose $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ solves Equation 6.1 for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then ξ is controlled by the sup-norm of F . In particular,*

$$|\xi| \leq \|F\|_\infty.$$

Proof. At a maximum x of u , one has $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u(x) \leq 0$ which implies $\lambda(x) \leq 1$ and $\eta(x) \geq 1$, turning Equation 6.4 at this point into the inequality

$$1 \geq e^{F(x)+\xi}.$$

Therefore, $\xi + F(x) \leq 0$, i.e. $\xi \leq -\inf F$. Similarly, at a minimum y , $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}u(y) \geq 0$ so that Equation 6.4 implies $\xi + F(y) \geq 0$, i.e. $\xi \geq -\sup F$. \square

6.2. C^0 -estimate. We will begin with a Laplace lower bound estimate.

Lemma 6.3. *Notation as above. There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on F so that for any $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$,*

$$(6.6) \quad \Delta_0 u \geq -(1 - \beta)C^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.2 and (6.4), there exists a positive constant $C = C(F)$ such that that $\eta \leq C\lambda^\beta$. A direct computation using Young's inequality shows that

$$\Delta_0 u = \lambda - \eta \geq \lambda - C\lambda^\beta \geq -(1 - \beta)C^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}}.$$

\square

We then derive the L^1 -estimate for solutions to our equation.

Theorem 6.4. *Notations as above. Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ solving Equation 6.1. Then there is a constant $C = C(\|F\|_{C^2}, \omega_0, \beta) > 0$ so that*

$$\|u\|_{L^1} \leq C.$$

Proof. We will make use of work of Alesker-Shelukhin [1, Appendix A] on the existence of Green's functions for the Chern-Laplacian following Chu-Tosatti-Weinkove [12]. By Theorem 2.8, there is a non-negative Green's function $G(p, q)$ which is smooth on $M \times M$ away from the diagonal. Furthermore,

$$(6.7) \quad \int_M G(p, q) \Delta_0 \phi(q) \frac{\omega_0^2(q)}{2} = \phi(p) - \frac{1}{|M|_0} \int_M \phi \frac{\omega_0^2}{2}, \forall \phi \in C^\infty(M), p \in M.$$

Apply (6.7) to u with $\min_M u = 0$ and evaluating at a minimal point p_0 gives

$$-\frac{1}{|M|_0} \|u\|_1 = \int_M G(p_0, q) (\Delta_0 u(q)) \frac{\omega_0^2(q)}{2}.$$

After a rearrangement and making application of (6.6), we find

$$\|u\|_1 = |M|_0 \int_M G(p_0, q) (-\Delta_0 u(q)) \frac{\omega_0^2(q)}{2} \leq C \int_M G(p_0, q) \frac{\omega_0^2(q)}{2} \leq C.$$

Where the last inequality follows from Theorem 2.8. We have proved the estimate. \square

Theorem 6.5. *Notation as above. Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ solving (6.1). There is a constant $C = C(\|F\|_{C^2}, \omega_0, \beta) > 0$ so that*

$$\sup u \leq C \|u\|_1.$$

This theorem holds true whether the measure in question is $\omega_0^2/2$ or the normalized probability measure $\mu = \omega_0^2/2|M|_0$. Therefore, we have $|u|$ uniformly bounded

Proof. This result follows immediately from Theorem 6.4 and Lemma 3.4 of Tosatti-Weinkove [39], which employs an iteration method for sub-harmonic functions on surfaces with Gauduchon metric. \square

6.3. Estimates on diagonal terms of the Hessian. In this sub-section, we aim to establish the crucial estimate that bounds λ and η from both sides. We will make use of the the following expressions for the linearized operator. For any smooth function ϕ over M , we define

$$(6.8) \quad L\phi = \beta \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_+\bar{\partial}_+\phi}{\omega_u^+} + \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-\phi}{\omega_u^-} = \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_+\bar{\partial}_+\phi}{\omega_0^+} + \frac{1}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-\phi}{\omega_0^-}.$$

We first state some computational results.

Lemma 6.6. *If $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$ solves (6.1) with $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then for any $\delta > 0$, the following inequality holds.*

$$-Lu = \beta \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{e^{F+\xi}}{\lambda^\beta} + (1 - \beta).$$

Proof. Notice that since $\omega_u = \omega + \square u$, by Equation 6.8,

$$(6.9) \quad Lu = \beta \frac{\omega_u^+ - \omega_0^+}{\omega_u^+} + \frac{\omega_0^- - \omega_u^-}{\omega_u^-} = \frac{1}{\eta} - \beta \frac{1}{\lambda} + (\beta - 1).$$

Combining (6.9) and (6.4), we have proved the claim. \square

Lemma 6.7. *If $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ as a pair solves (6.1), then*

$$\begin{aligned} -L \log \lambda &= \frac{1}{\lambda} (|\partial_+ \log \eta|_0^2 + 2\Re(\langle \partial_+ \log \eta, \partial_+ \omega_0^- \rangle_0) - \Delta_0^+ F - \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}) \\ &+ \frac{e^{F+\xi}}{\lambda^\beta} (|\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 + 2\Re(\langle \partial_- \log \lambda, \partial_- \omega_0^+ \rangle_0) + \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}). \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_0^+ F := (\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ F \wedge \omega_0^-) / (\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-)$ and for a section $\mu = \mu_+ + \mu_- \in \Lambda^{1,0}$, the norm is defined as

$$|\mu|_0^2 = \frac{\sqrt{-1} \mu_+ \wedge \bar{\mu}_+ \wedge \omega_0^-}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} + \frac{\sqrt{-1} \mu_- \wedge \bar{\mu}_- \wedge \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}.$$

Proof. Differentiating the logarithm of (6.4), we get

$$(6.10) \quad \bar{\partial}_+ F = \beta \bar{\partial}_+ \log \lambda - \bar{\partial}_+ \log \eta,$$

$$(6.11) \quad \sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ F = \beta \sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \log \lambda - \sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \log \eta.$$

For future use, we also list some direct consequence of the pluriclosed condition. By (6.3), $\omega_u = \lambda \omega_0^+ + \eta \omega_0^-$. Since both ω_0 and ω_u are pluriclosed, we have

$$(6.12) \quad \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \omega_0 = \sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+ + \sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^- = 0;$$

$$\begin{aligned} (6.13) \quad 0 &= \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} (\lambda \omega_0^+ + \eta \omega_0^-) \\ &= \sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \lambda \wedge \omega_0^+ + \sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \eta \wedge \omega_0^- \\ &\quad + 2\Re(\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \lambda \wedge \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+) + 2\Re(\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \eta \wedge \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^-) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{-1} \lambda \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+ + \sqrt{-1} \eta \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^-. \end{aligned}$$

Now we compute $L \log \lambda$ using (6.3) and (6.8).

$$\begin{aligned} L \log \lambda &= \beta \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \log \lambda \wedge \omega_0^-}{\lambda \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} + \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \log \lambda \wedge \omega_0^+}{\eta \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} \\ &= \beta \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \log \lambda \wedge \omega_0^-}{\lambda \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} + \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \lambda \wedge \omega_0^+}{\lambda \eta \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \eta} \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \lambda \wedge \bar{\partial}_- \lambda \wedge \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} \end{aligned}$$

We can then apply (6.12) and (6.13).

$$\begin{aligned}
 L \log \lambda = & \beta \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \log \lambda \wedge \omega^-}{\lambda \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \eta} \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \lambda \wedge \bar{\partial}_- \lambda \wedge \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} \\
 & - \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \eta \wedge \omega_0^- + 2\Re(\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \lambda \wedge \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+) + 2\Re(\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \eta \wedge \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^-)}{\lambda \eta \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} \\
 & - \frac{\sqrt{-1} \lambda \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+ + \sqrt{-1} \eta \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^-}{\lambda \eta \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can use (6.10) and (6.11) to obtain.

$$\begin{aligned}
 L \log \lambda = & \beta \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \log \lambda \wedge \omega_0^-}{\lambda \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} - \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \log \eta \wedge \omega_0^-}{\lambda \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} \\
 & - \frac{1}{\lambda \eta^2} \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \eta \wedge \bar{\partial}_+ \eta \wedge \omega_0^-}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \eta} \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \lambda \wedge \bar{\partial}_- \lambda \wedge \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} \\
 & - \frac{2\Re(\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \lambda \wedge \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+) + 2\Re(\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \eta \wedge \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^-)}{\lambda \eta \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} \\
 & - \frac{\sqrt{-1} \lambda \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+ + \sqrt{-1} \eta \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^-}{\lambda \eta \omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}
 \end{aligned}$$

This can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}
 L \log \lambda = & \frac{1}{\lambda} (\Delta_0^+ F - \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_+ \bar{\partial}_+ \omega_0^-}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} - 2\Re(\langle \partial_+ \log \eta, \partial_+ \omega_0^- \rangle_0) - |\partial_+ \log \eta|_0^2) \\
 & + \frac{1}{\eta} (-\frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} - |\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 - 2\Re(\langle \partial_- \log \lambda, \partial_- \omega_0^+ \rangle_0)).
 \end{aligned}$$

This can be simplified further by using (6.1) and (6.12), finishing the proof. \square

Lemma 6.8. *Notations as above. Consider $\Phi = \log \lambda + \psi(u)$ for some smooth test function ψ . Then at any critical point of Φ , the following holds.*

$$-L\Phi =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{\lambda} [|\partial_+ \log \eta|_0^2 + 2\Re(\langle \partial_+ \log \eta, \partial_+ \omega_0^- \rangle_0) - \beta \frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2} |\partial_+ \log \lambda|_0^2 + \beta \psi' - \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-} - \Delta_0^+ F] \\
 & + \frac{e^{F+\xi}}{\lambda^\beta} [(1 - \frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2}) |\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 + 2\Re(\langle \partial_- \log \lambda, \partial_- \omega_0^+ \rangle_0) - \psi' + \frac{\sqrt{-1} \partial_- \bar{\partial}_- \omega_0^+}{\omega_0^+ \wedge \omega_0^-}]. \\
 & + \psi'(1 - \beta)
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The critical point condition is

$$(6.14) \quad 0 = \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} + \psi' du.$$

We may compute the following, while applying (6.14):

$$(6.15) \quad \begin{aligned} L\psi(u) &= \psi' Lu + \psi'' \left[\frac{\beta}{\lambda} |\partial_+ u|_0^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} |\partial_- u|_0^2 \right] \\ &= \psi' Lu + \frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2} \left[\frac{\beta}{\lambda} |\partial_+ \log \lambda|_0^2 + \frac{e^{F+\xi}}{\lambda^\beta} |\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \left(\frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2} |\partial_+ \log \lambda|_0^2 - \psi' \right) + \frac{e^{F+\xi}}{\lambda^\beta} \left(\frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2} |\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 + \psi' \right) - \psi'(1 - \beta) \end{aligned}$$

We then combine (6.15) and Lemma 6.7 to prove our claim. \square

Finally, we state first part of our C^2 estimate:

Theorem 6.9. *Notation as before. For any $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ solving (6.1) for $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C > 0$ depending only on β , $\|F\|_{C^2}$, and ω_0 s.t.*

$$\omega_u^+ \geq C\omega_0^+.$$

Proof. We use C, C_1 to denote a positive constant that depends only on $\beta, \|F\|_{C^2}$, and ω_0 , which may change from line to line unless otherwise mentioned. We take $\psi(x) = Ax$ in Lemma 6.8, whereas $A > 0$ is a constant to be determined later. By the Cauchy-Schwarz and arithmetic-geometric mean inequalities, we have

$$(6.16) \quad 2\Re(\langle \partial_+ \log \eta, \partial_+ \omega_0^- \rangle_0) \geq -\frac{1}{2} |\partial_+ \log \eta|_0^2 - C,$$

$$(6.17) \quad 2\Re(\langle \partial_- \log \lambda, \partial_- \omega_0^+ \rangle_0) \geq -\frac{1}{2} |\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 - C.$$

Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$, at point $p \in M$ for which $\Phi(p) = \min \Phi$, by Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.8, (6.16) and (6.17), we have:

$$(6.18) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -L\Phi \geq \frac{1}{\lambda} (\beta A - C) - \frac{C}{\lambda^\beta} (A + 1) + A(1 - \beta). \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\lambda} [\beta A - C - \beta C \epsilon (A + 1)] + (1 - \beta)A - C \epsilon^{-\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}} (A + 1) \\ &> \frac{1}{\lambda} [\beta A(1 - \epsilon C) - C - \beta C \epsilon] - C \epsilon^{-\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}} (A + 1), \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from Young's inequality. We first fix $C > 0$, then we pick $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2C}$. (6.2) then leads to

$$(6.19) \quad 0 \geq [C_1 A - C_2] - C_3(A + 1)\lambda(p),$$

where $C_i = C_i(\beta, \|F\|_{C^2}, \omega_0) > 0$. Then, we pick $A = 2C_2/C_1 > 0$ in (6.19) to obtain

$$\lambda(p) \geq C > 0.$$

Finally, by Theorem 6.5, and the choice of p and Φ , we obtain our estimate. \square

Next, we apply Lemma 6.8 with a different test function to obtain the upper bound.

Theorem 6.10. *Supposing $u \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ as a pair is a solution of (6.1) for $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then there exists a constant $C = C(\|F\|_{C^2}, \omega_0, \beta) > 0$ such that*

$$\omega_u^+ \leq C\omega_0^+.$$

Proof. We consider a test function $\Phi = \log \lambda + \psi(u)$ for some smooth test function ψ , which is to be determined later. We also consider point $p \in M$ such that $\Phi(p) = \max \Phi$.

First, we use the Cauchy-Schwarz and Young's inequalities to find that for any $\delta > 0$, the following hold:

$$(6.20) \quad |\partial_+ \log \eta|^2 + 2\Re(\langle \partial_+ \log \eta, \partial_+ \omega_0^- \rangle_0)$$

$$(6.21) \quad \begin{aligned} &= |\partial_+(F - \beta \log \lambda)|_0^2 + 2\Re(\langle \partial_+(F - \beta \log \lambda), \partial_+ \omega_0^- \rangle_0) \\ &\leq \beta^2 |\partial_+ \log \lambda|_0^2 + \beta C |\partial_+(\log \lambda)|_0 + C \\ &\leq (\beta^2 + \delta\beta) |\partial_+ \log \lambda|_0^2 + C(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}); \end{aligned}$$

$$2\Re(\langle \partial_- \log \lambda, \partial_- \omega_0^+ \rangle_0) \leq \delta |\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 + \frac{C}{\delta},$$

We apply Lemma 6.8 and (6.20) to obtain the following estimate at point p :

$$(6.22) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} (\beta^2 + \delta\beta - \frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2}) |\partial_+ \log \lambda|_0^2 + \beta\psi' + C(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}) \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\lambda^\beta} [(1 + \delta - \frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2}) |\partial_- \log \lambda|_0^2 - \psi' + C(1 + \frac{1}{\delta})] \\ &\quad + \psi'(1 - \beta). \end{aligned}$$

We now pick $\psi(x) = \tau x - \log(x + 1)$ where $\tau = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \text{osc}u)^{-1}$. Then by Theorem 6.5 and (6.5), we get

$$(6.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi'(u) &= \tau - \frac{1}{1+u} \in [\tau - 1, -3\tau] \\ \psi''(u) &= \frac{1}{(1+u)^2} \geq 16\tau^2 > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\psi''(u)}{(\psi'(u))^2} = \frac{1}{(\tau(1+u) - 1)^2} \geq \frac{16}{9}.$$

Thus, if $\delta = 1/2$, we have

$$(6.24) \quad \beta^2 + \delta\beta - \frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2} < 1 + \delta - \frac{\psi''}{(\psi')^2} < \frac{3}{2} - \frac{16}{9} < 0.$$

Now we combine (6.22), (6.23) and (6.24) to get bounded C_1, C_2, C_3 , where $C_1 = 3\tau > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$, such that

$$0 \leq C_3\lambda(p)^{-1} + C_1\lambda(p)^{-\beta} - C_2,$$

which, by Young's inequality, leads to

$$0 \leq C_3 + C_1(C_\epsilon + \epsilon\lambda(p)) - C_2\lambda(p),$$

where $C_\epsilon > 0$ depending on ϵ . Now we may choose $\epsilon = \frac{C_2}{2C_1}$ to get

$$(6.25) \quad \lambda(p) \leq C < \infty.$$

Finally, by Theorem 6.5, and the choice of p and Φ , we obtain our estimate. \square

Theorems 6.9 & 6.10 imply that the metric is uniformly equivalent to the background metric.

Corollary 6.11. *As an immediate consequence of Theorems 6.9 & 6.10 with $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and u, b as noted in those theorems,*

$$(6.26) \quad C^{-1}\omega_0 \leq \omega_u \leq C\omega_0.$$

In particular, the linearized operator L defined in (1.18) is uniformly elliptic.

Proof. This is just a direct consequence of Theorems 6.9 & 6.10, Lemma 6.2, and our equation 6.4. \square

6.4. Full C^2 estimate. In this subsection, we estimate the mixed second derivatives. Unlike the situation in the usual Monge-Ampère equations, where there is direct control of off-diagonal terms of Hessian due to the PDE, these mixed derivatives are not appearing in our geometric equations directly.

First, we list some regularity results that may be obtained already.

Proposition 6.12. *Notation as above. For any $p > 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a universal constant C and depends only on $(F, \omega_0, p, \epsilon)$ such that $\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p} \leq C$, $\|\nabla u\|_{C^\epsilon} \leq C$.*

Proof. By Theorems 6.9 & 6.10, we have obtained uniform lower and upper bound of Δu , which implies the Hessian L^p estimate. We can then apply the standard Soblev inequality to obtain the $C^{1,\epsilon}$ estimate of u . \square

In general, a Laplacian bound does not imply a uniform bound of the full Hessian in non-linear PDE theory. Proposition 6.12 is the optimal estimate.

We shall run the C^2 estimate one more time, which will greatly simplified with existing estimates. In order to proceed, we use Lemma 2.10 to work locally in an open neighborhood U of M , where there exists local holomorphic function z and w such that in U , $T^+ = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\}$ and $T^- = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\}$. We also write

$$\omega_0 = \sqrt{-1}(g dz \wedge d\bar{z} + h dw \wedge d\bar{w}).$$

Remark 6.13. Since M is compact, by a covering argument, we may assume g, h, g^{-1}, h^{-1} , and their derivatives are universally bounded.

We continue to express the linearized operator L in (6.4) locally

$$(6.27) \quad L\phi = \beta \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_+\bar{\partial}_+\phi}{\omega_u^+} + \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-\phi}{\omega_u^-} = \frac{\beta}{\lambda g} \phi_{z\bar{z}} + \frac{1}{\eta h} \phi_{w\bar{w}}.$$

By Corollary 6.11, L is uniformly elliptic.

Let $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^4$ be $\Re(z), \Im(z), \Re(w), \Im(w)$, respectively. We use \tilde{g} to denote the standard Euclidean metric in U with coordinates $\{x^i\}$. Let $\delta = \sum a^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ be a local vector field in U , where $a^i \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\sum a_i^2 \leq 1$. For simplicity, for any smooth function f , we write δf as f_δ . It is clear that by our set-up

$$(6.28) \quad |f_\delta|^2 \leq |\tilde{\nabla} f|^2 := \sum \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \right|^2.$$

For future use, we also define

$$(6.29) \quad \tilde{\Delta} u := \sum \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \right)^2 u = \sqrt{-1}(u_{z\bar{z}} + u_{w\bar{w}}).$$

Remark 6.14. It is important to note that in the setting above, we have $f_{\delta z} = f_z \delta$, $f_{\delta w} = f_w \delta, f_{\delta \bar{z}} = f_{\bar{z}} \delta, f_{\delta \bar{w}} = f_{\bar{w}} \delta$.

Lemma 6.15. *For δu , locally we have universal constants C_1 , C_2 and C_3 that is independent of u such that*

$$(6.30) \quad L(u_{\delta\delta}) \geq C_1;$$

$$(6.31) \quad L(C_2\Delta u - u_{\delta\delta}) \geq C_3.$$

Proof. We apply δ to our PDE (6.4) twice to obtain

$$(6.32) \quad \beta \frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda} - \frac{\eta_\delta}{\eta} = F_\delta,$$

$$(6.33) \quad \beta \frac{\lambda_{\delta\delta}}{\lambda} - \frac{\eta_{\delta\delta}}{\eta} - \beta \left(\frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\eta_\delta}{\eta}\right)^2 = F_{\delta\delta},$$

which lead to

$$(6.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta \frac{\delta^2 \lambda}{\lambda} - \frac{\delta^2 \eta}{\eta} &= \delta^2 F + \beta \left(\frac{\delta \lambda}{\lambda}\right)^2 - \left(\beta \frac{\delta \lambda}{\lambda} - \delta F\right)^2. \\ &= F_{\delta\delta} + F_\delta^2 + (\beta - \beta^2) \left(\frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda}\right)^2 + 2\beta \frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda} F_\delta. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using Theorems 6.9 & 6.10 and Remark 6.13, we have

$$(6.35) \quad \beta \frac{\delta^2 \lambda}{\lambda} - \frac{\delta^2 \eta}{\eta} = \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{u_{z\bar{z}}}{g}\right)_{\delta\delta} - \frac{1}{\eta} \left(1 + \frac{u_{w\bar{w}}}{g}\right)_{\delta\delta} = Lu + K_1 \left(\frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda}\right) + K_2 \frac{\eta_\delta}{\eta}$$

where $K_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ are some universally bounded functions. Note that for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$(6.36) \quad \left| \frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda} F_\delta \right| \leq \epsilon |\lambda_\delta|^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} |F_\delta|^2$$

and we use (6.34) and (6.35) to conclude

$$(6.37) \quad C_5 + C_6 \left| \frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda} \right|^2 \leq L(u_{\delta\delta}) \leq C_7 + C_8 \left| \frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda} \right|^2,$$

where C_i are universally bounded. In particular, since $\beta < 1$, we may pick $\epsilon = C_4 > 0$ in (6.36) small enough to ensure that $C_6 > 0$ and $C_8 > 0$. Therefore, we have proved (6.30), the first part of our claim.

To prove the second half of our claim, we consider $\tilde{\Delta}u$. Apply 6.37 to $\delta = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ repeatedly and sum up resulting inequalities, we obtain

$$(6.38) \quad C_9 + C_{10} \left| \frac{\tilde{\nabla} \lambda}{\lambda} \right|^2 \leq L(\tilde{\Delta}u) \leq C_{11} + C_{12} \left| \frac{\tilde{\nabla} \lambda}{\lambda} \right|^2$$

Again, we may have $C_{10} > 0$ and $C_{12} > 0$.

Now notice that by (6.28)

$$(6.39) \quad \left| \frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda} \right|^2 \leq \left| \frac{\tilde{\nabla} \lambda}{\lambda} \right|^2.$$

We can then use (6.37) and (6.38) to get, for any C_2

$$L(C_2 \tilde{\Delta} u - u_{\delta\delta}) \geq C_2 C_{10} \left(\left| \frac{\tilde{\nabla} \lambda}{\lambda} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\tilde{\nabla} \eta}{\eta} \right|^2 \right) - C_8 \left(\left| \frac{\lambda_\delta}{\lambda} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\eta_\delta}{\eta} \right|^2 \right) + C_{11}.$$

Finally, we may pick $C_2 = C_8/C_{10}$ and use can apply (6.39) to get (6.30). \square

Finally, we may establish the full C^2 estimate.

Theorem 6.16. *Notation as above. There exists a universal constant C that depends only on β, F and ω_0 such that we have the following Hessian bound*

$$|\nabla^2 u| \leq C.$$

Proof. We work in the open set U defined as above. For $u_{\delta\delta}$ and $C_2 \tilde{\Delta} u - u_{\delta\delta}$ defined as in Lemma 6.15. By Corollary 6.11, the linearized operator L in (6.27) is linear and uniformly elliptic. Therefore, we may apply Proposition 6.12 and the local maximum principle for subsolutions (Theorem 4.8 part 2 of [19]) to conclude that $u_{\delta\delta} \leq C$ and $C_2 \tilde{\Delta} u - u_{\delta\delta} \leq C$. Also note that by (6.29) and Corollary 6.11, $\tilde{\Delta} u \geq C$. We then conclude that

$$|u_{\delta\delta}| \leq C.$$

Finally, by considering $\delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \right)$, we may get the desired bound for all mixed second derivatives. We have finished the proof. \square

6.5. Higher regularity. Our previous method may be used to consider the higher regularity estimate. However, an alternative is to apply the following Evans-Krylov theorem for twisted type operators due to Collins [13]. See also Streets-Warren [37] for a related result.

Definition 6.17. On a Riemannian manifold, an elliptic operator $\Psi = \Psi_U + \Psi_\cap$ is said to be of *twisted type* if

- (1) Ψ_U is uniformly elliptic and convex, and
- (2) Ψ_\cap is degenerate elliptic and concave.

This definition is not as general as that found in Collins' paper, but will suffice for our purposes.

Lemma 6.18. *Notation as above. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small so that*

$$\Psi = \left(\beta \log \frac{\omega_u^+}{\omega_0^+} - \epsilon \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-} \right) + \left(\epsilon \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-} - \log \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-} \right)$$

is elliptic and, when split as indicated by the parentheses, is of twisted type.

Proof. Letting Ψ_{\cup} and Ψ_{\cap} be defined as follows.

$$\Psi_{\cup} = \beta \log \frac{\omega_u^+}{\omega_0^+} - \epsilon \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-}, \quad \Psi_{\cap} = \epsilon \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-} - \log \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-}$$

Notice that corresponding linearized operators are

$$\delta\Psi_{\cup}(\delta u) = \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_+\bar{\partial}_+\delta u}{\omega_0^+} + \epsilon \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-\delta u}{\omega_0^-}, \quad \delta\Psi_{\cap}(\delta u) = \left(\frac{1}{\eta} - \epsilon\right) \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-\delta u}{\omega_0^-}.$$

By Corollary 6.11, Ψ_{\cup} is uniformly elliptic and $\epsilon > 0$ can be chosen sufficiently small so that Ψ_{\cap} is degenerate elliptic. Then since

$$\delta\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) = -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_+\bar{\partial}_+\delta u}{\omega_0^+}, \quad \delta\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right) = \frac{1}{\eta^2} \frac{\sqrt{-1}\partial_-\bar{\partial}_-\delta u}{\omega_0^-},$$

it is the case that Ψ_{\cup} and Ψ_{\cap} have the appropriate concavity properties. \square

Theorem 6.19. [13, Theorem 3.2] *Suppose that $u \in C^\infty(B_2)$ on $B_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ where $F = F_{\cup} + F_{\cap}$. Let $\mathcal{U} = D^2u(\bar{B}_1)$ and let $\mathcal{V} \supset \mathcal{U}$ be an open and convex set. Suppose that F_{\cup} is uniformly elliptic, convex and C^2 on \mathcal{V} , and F_{\cap} is C^2 on \mathcal{V} . Assume furthermore that F_{\cap} is degenerate elliptic and concave on \mathcal{U} . Then, for every $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ we have an estimate*

$$\|D^2u\|_{C^\gamma(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \Gamma, F, \|D^2u\|_{\infty})$$

where

$$\Gamma = \text{osc}_{B_1}(-F_{\cup}(D^2u))$$

depend only on Λ and $\|D^2u\|_{\infty}$.

This theorem in hand, we are able to bootstrap to obtain estimates for $u \in C^k(M)$ for all k .

7. CONTINUITY METHOD

In this section, we run the continuity method to solve (1.11) when $\beta < 1$ and $\alpha = 1$. As $u \equiv 0$ and $\xi = 0$ is a solution for $F \equiv 0$, we seek to apply the continuity method to the path $F_t = tF$ with $F \in C^\infty(M)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. We consider the following PDE

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\omega_{u_t}^+}{\omega_0^+}\right)^\beta = e^{F_t + \xi_t} \left(\frac{\omega_{u_t}^-}{\omega_0^-}\right) \\ \omega_u = \omega_0 + \square u > 0 \end{cases}.$$

Let

$$(7.2) \quad S = \{t \in [0, 1] \mid \exists (u_t, \xi_t) \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_0) \times \mathbb{R} \text{ solving (7.1)}\}.$$

Since S is non-empty, it is sufficient to show that S is both open and closed in $[0, 1]$.

7.1. Openness. The proof of openness follows a standard Inverse Function Theorem argument.

Theorem 7.1. *On (M^2, I) a compact, complex surface with Hermitian metric ω_0 and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the following map*

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi : \mathcal{A}(\omega_0) \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow C^\gamma(M) \\ (u, \xi) &\mapsto \beta \log \frac{\omega_u^+}{\omega_0^+} - \log \frac{\omega_u^-}{\omega_0^-} - \xi \end{aligned}$$

is locally invertible.

Proof. We compute the linearized operator at a solution (u, ξ) . We use Theorem 2.3 to obtain a Gauduchon factor for $\frac{1}{\beta}\omega_u^+ + \omega_u^-$ and denote it by e^f , such that $\tilde{\omega} = e^f(\frac{1}{\beta}\omega_u^+ + \omega_u^-)$ is pluriclosed. Let $(\delta u, \delta \xi) \in C^4(M) \times \mathbb{R} \cong T_{(u, \xi)}(\mathcal{A}(\omega) \times \mathbb{R})$. Define the tangent map

$$\delta \Psi|_{(u, \xi)}(\delta u, \delta \xi) = e^f \Delta_{\tilde{\omega}} \delta u - \delta \xi.$$

By the Inverse Function Theorem for Banach Spaces [19, Theorem 17.6], it is sufficient to show that $\delta \Psi|_{(u, \xi)} : C^\gamma(M) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T_{\Psi(u, \xi)} C^\gamma(M)$ is an isomorphism.

We start with injectivity. Suppose that $\delta \Psi|_{(u, \xi)}(\delta u, \delta \xi) = 0$. Then, by Theorem 2.7, the Chern-Poisson equation is uniquely solvable if and only if

$$0 = \int_M (\delta \xi) e^{-f} \tilde{\omega}^2,$$

which shows that $\delta \xi = 0$. Therefore, $\Delta_{\tilde{\omega}} \delta u = 0$. By the maximum principle and (7.1), $\delta u = 0$. Thus, the kernel of $\delta \Psi|_{(u, \xi)}$ is trivial.

On the other hand, for any $\delta F \in C^\gamma(M)$, we use Theorem 2.7 to obtain $(\delta u, \delta \xi) \in T_{(u, \xi)} \mathcal{A}(\omega)$ to satisfy the following

$$(7.3) \quad \delta \xi = -\frac{\int_M \delta F e^f \omega_u^2}{\int_M e^f \omega_u^2}, \quad \Delta_{\tilde{\omega}} \delta u = e^{-f} (\delta F + \delta \xi),$$

which implies surjectivity. □

7.2. Closedness. Finally, we prove the closedness of the set S , which completes the proof of Theorem 1.17 in the case $0 < \beta < 1$. The closedness of S is a direct consequence of *a priori* estimates: Theorems 6.4 and 6.5, Corollary 6.11, and Theorem 6.19. Considering Theorem 5.1 which is the case for $\beta = 1$ and using a symmetry argument to treat the $\beta > 1$ case, we have therefore established Theorem 1.17.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Alesker and E. Shelukhin. On a uniform estimate for the quaternionic Calabi problem. *Israel J. of Math.*, 197(1):309 – 327, 2013. doi: 10.1007/s11856-013-0003-1. 2, 2.8, 6.2
- [2] D. Angella. On the Bott-Chern and Aeppli cohomology, 2015. 1.7
- [3] D. Angella and V. Tosatti. Leafwise flat forms on Inoue-Bombieri surfaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235683210>. 1.7
- [4] D. Angella, G. Dloussky, and A. Tomassini. On Bott-Chern cohomology of compact complex surfaces. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (1923 -)*, 195:199–217, 2014. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119171255>. 4
- [5] V. Apostolov and G. Dloussky. Bihermitian metrics on hopf surfaces. *Mathematical Research Letters*, 15, 11 2007. doi: 10.4310/MRL.2008.v15.n5.a1. 1.7
- [6] V. Apostolov and M. Gualtieri. Generalized Kähler manifolds, commuting complex structures, and split tangent bundles. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 271:561 – 575, 2007. 1.1, 1.7, 2.11
- [7] V. Apostolov and J. Streets. The nondegenerate generalized Kähler Calabi–Yau problem. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 2021:1 – 48, 2017. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119150656>. 1.7
- [8] V. Apostolov, X. Fu, J. Streets, and Y. Ustinovskiy. The generalized Kähler Calabi-Yau problem. 2022. 1.7
- [9] A. Beauville. Complex manifolds with split tangent bundle. *arXiv: Algebraic Geometry*, 1998. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:14042574>. 1, 2.9
- [10] J.-M. Bismut. A local index theorem for non-Kähler manifolds. *Math. Ann.*, 284:681 – 699, 1989. 2.13
- [11] J.-M. Bismut. *Hypoelliptic Laplacian and Bott-Chern cohomology: A theorem of Riemann-Roch-Grothendieck in complex geometry*. Birkhauser/Springer, 2013. 1.7
- [12] J. Chu, V. Tosatti, and B. Weinkove. The Monge-Ampère equation for non-integrable almost complex structures. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 21:1949–1984, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.4171/JEMS/878>. 1.7, 2.7, 6.2
- [13] T. Collins. $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for nonlinear elliptic equations of twisted type. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 55(1), 2016. 6.5, 6.19
- [14] M. Garcia-Fernandez and J. Streets. *Generalized Ricci flow*. Am. Math. Soc., 2021. 1.3, 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8
- [15] M. Garcia-Fernandez, J. Jordan, and J. Streets. Non-Kähler Calabi-Yau geometry and pluriclosed flow. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 177:329–367, 2023. ISSN 0021-7824. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2023.07.002>. URL

- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021782423000971>. 1.7, 2
- [16] S. Gates, C. Hull, and M. Roček. Twisted multiplets and new supersymmetric non-linear σ -models. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 31(3):339 – 411, 1978. 1.7
- [17] P. Gauduchon. Le théorème de l'excentricité nulle. *Compt. Rend. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 285:387 – 390, 1977. 1.1, 2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 3
- [18] P. Gauduchon and L. Ornea. Locally conformally Kähler metrics on Hopf surfaces. *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 48(4):1107–1127, 1998. doi: 10.5802/aif.1651. URL <http://www.numdam.org/articles/10.5802/aif.1651/>. 1.20, 1.7
- [19] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Springer, 2001. 2, 6.4, 7.1
- [20] M. Gualtieri. Generalized complex geometry. *Math. Ann.*, 174(1):75 – 123, 2011. 1.7
- [21] B. Guan and Q. Li. Complex Monge-Ampère equations and totally real submanifolds. *Adv. Math.*, 225(3):1185–1223, 2010. ISSN 0001-8708,1090-2082. doi: 10.1016/j.aim.2010.03.019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2010.03.019>. 1.7
- [22] N. Hitchin. Generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds. *Quart. J. Math.*, 54(3):281 – 308, 2003. 1.7
- [23] C. M. Hull, U. Lindström, M. Roček, R. von Unge, and M. Zabzine. Generalized Calabi-Yau metric and generalized Monge-Ampère equation. *J. High Energy Phys.*, 2010:1–23, 2010. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119636765>. 1.7
- [24] S. Ivanov and G. Papadopoulos. Vanishing theorems and string backgrounds. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 18(6):1089–1110, 2001. ISSN 0264-9381. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/18/6/309>. 2
- [25] J. Jordan and J. Streets. On a Calabi-type estimate for pluriclosed flow. *Adv. in Math.*, 366, 2020. 1.7
- [26] K. Kodaira. *On The Structure Of Compact Complex Analytic Surfaces, II*, pages 1471–1510. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1975. ISBN 9781400869879. doi: doi:10.1515/9781400869879-013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400869879-013>. 1.7
- [27] C. Mooney and O. Savin. Regularity results for the equation $u_{11}u_{22} = 1$. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 39(12):6865–6876, 2019. ISSN 1078-0947. doi: 10.3934/dcds.2019235. URL <https://www.aims sciences.org/article/id/30732454-76bd-4748-9b31-1c991c4671e1>. 1.5, 1.7
- [28] M. Schweitzer. Autour de la cohomologie de bott-chern. *arXiv: Algebraic Geometry*, 2007. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:115165822>. 1.7

- [29] X. S. Shen and K. Smith. The continuity equation on Hopf and Inoue surfaces. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252199966>. 1.7
- [30] J. Streets. Pluriclosed flow on generalized Kähler manifolds with split tangent bundle. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 2014. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119612427>. 1.5
- [31] J. Streets. Pluriclosed flow, Born-Infeld geometry, and rigidity results for generalized Kähler manifolds. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 41(2):318–374, 2016. doi: 10.1080/03605302.2015.1116560. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/03605302.2015.1116560>. 1.1, 1.1, 1.5, 2.10
- [32] J. Streets. Pluriclosed flow on manifolds with globally generated bundles. *Complex Manifolds*, 3(1), 2016. 1.5
- [33] J. Streets. Pluriclosed flow on generalized Kähler manifolds with split tangent bundle. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 2018(739):241 – 276, 2018. 1.3, 1.5, 1.7
- [34] J. Streets and G. Tian. A parabolic flow of pluriclosed metrics. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2010(16):3101 – 3133, 2010. 1.7
- [35] J. Streets and G. Tian. Generalized Kähler geometry and the pluriclosed flow. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 858(2):366–376, 2012. ISSN 0550-3213. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.01.008>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0550321312000211>. 1.6, 1.7
- [36] J. Streets and Y. Ustinovskiy. Classification of generalized Kähler-Ricci solitons on complex surfaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 74(9):1896–1914, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.21947>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpa.21947>. 1.2, 1.2, 1.20, 1.7, 4.1, 4, 4
- [37] J. Streets and M. Warren. Evans-Krylov estimates for a nonconvex Monge-Ampère equation. *Math. Ann.*, 365:805 – 834, 2016. 1.5, 1.7, 6.5
- [38] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove. The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 23:1187–1195, 2010. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-2010-00673-X>. 1.7, 5
- [39] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove. Estimates for the Complex Monge-Ampère Equation on Hermitian and Balanced Manifolds. *Asian J. Math.*, 14(1):19 – 40, 2010. 6.2
- [40] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove. The Monge-Ampère equation for $(n - 1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions on a compact Kähler manifold. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 30:311–346, 2017. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/jams/875>. 1.7, 5
- [41] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove. Hermitian metrics, $(n - 1, n - 1)$ -forms, and Monge-Ampère equations. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 755:67–101, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/crelle-2017-0017>. 1.7, 5

- [42] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove. The Chern-Ricci flow. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.*, 33(1):73–107, 2022. 1.7
- [43] F. Tricerri. Some examples of locally conformal Kähler manifolds. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino*, 40(1):81–92, 1982. ISSN 0373-1243. 1.4, 1.7
- [44] Q. Wang, B. Yang, and F. Zheng. On Bismut flat manifolds. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2016. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55359054>. 1.7
- [45] S.-T. Yau. On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation, I. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 31(3):339 – 411, 1978. 1.3, 1.7
- [46] Y. Ye. Bismut Einstein metrics on compact complex manifolds, 2023. 1.7
- [47] F. Zheng. Some recent progress in non-Kähler geometry. *Sci. China Math.*, 62, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11425-019-9528-1>. 1.7