

HARMONIC METRICS OF GENERICALLY REGULAR NILPOTENT HIGGS BUNDLES OVER NON-COMPACT SURFACES

SONG DAI AND QIONGLING LI

ABSTRACT. A rank n Higgs bundle (E, θ) is called generically regular nilpotent if $\theta^n = 0$ but $\theta^{n-1} \neq 0$. We show that for a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle, if it admits a harmonic metric, then its graded Higgs bundle admits a unique maximal harmonic metric. The proof relies on a generalization of Kalka-Yang's theorem for prescribed curvature equation over a non-compact hyperbolic surface to a coupled system. As an application, we show that the branched set of a branched minimal disk in \mathbb{H}^3 has to be the critical set of some holomorphic self-map of \mathbb{D} .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (E, θ) be a Higgs bundle over a Riemann surface X . A Hermitian metric h on E is called harmonic if it satisfies the Hitchin equation

$$F(\nabla_h) + [\theta, \theta^{*h}] = 0.$$

For compact Riemann surfaces X , it is well-known from the works of Hitchin [Hit87] and Simpson [Sim88] that (E, θ) admits a harmonic metric if and only if it is polystable of degree 0.

In the case of non-compact X , the criteria for the existence of harmonic metrics are less well understood. For example, when $X = \bar{X} \setminus D$ and (E, θ) is wild on (\bar{X}, D) , results by Simpson [Sim90], Biquard-Boalch [BB04], and Mochizuki [Moc11] indicate that (E, θ) admits a harmonic metric if and only if it can be extended to a polystable good filtered Higgs bundle over \bar{X} . However, even simpler cases, such as when $X = \mathbb{D}$, fall outside the framework of wild Higgs bundles.

Recent work by T. Mochizuki and the second author has addressed more general scenarios beyond the wild Higgs bundle framework. They have developed techniques to establish the existence of harmonic metrics without stability conditions. In [LM23], they showed that for a $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ -Higgs bundle over any non-compact Riemann surface, if the Higgs field is generically regular semisimple, then a harmonic metric compatible with the $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ -structure exists. Furthermore, in [LM24], they proved that if X is hyperbolic, a Higgs bundle in the $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$ -Hitchin section admits a harmonic metric. See also the work of [Fuj24] and [Ma24].

In this paper, we investigate the existence of harmonic metrics for nilpotent Higgs bundles (E, θ) over non-compact Riemann surfaces X . Notably, nilpotent Higgs bundles do not admit harmonic metrics over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{C}^* . Therefore, our focus is on the case where X is Poincaré hyperbolic, meaning that X admits a complete hyperbolic metric g_X . According to [Li22], for any harmonic metric h on a nilpotent

Higgs bundle (E, θ) over X , the norm of θ with respect to h and g_X satisfies

$$\|\theta\|_{h, g_X}^2 \leq \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{12}.$$

Note that any nilpotent Higgs bundle together with a harmonic metric h gives rise to an equivariant minimal immersion of \tilde{X} in the symmetric space $GL(n, \mathbb{C})/U(n)$ with the left $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ -invariant Riemannian metric induced by the trace form on $\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$. The induced Hermitian metric is $|\theta|_h^2$, and thus $\leq \frac{n(n^2-1)}{12} \hat{g}_X$.

We establish the following results:

Theorem 1.1. (Theorem 5.2) *Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle over a hyperbolic Riemann surface X . If a harmonic metric h_0 exists on (E, θ) , then there exists a metric h on the graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta) = (\oplus_{i=1}^n \text{Gr}_i E, \oplus_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Gr}_i \theta)$ such that $\det(h) = \det(h_0)$.*

Theorem 1.2. (Theorem 5.2) *Let (E, θ) be a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ over X of the form:*

$$E = \oplus_{i=1}^n L_i, \quad \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \gamma_1 & 0 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \gamma_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $L_i (i = 1, \dots, n)$ are holomorphic line bundles and $\gamma_i \in H^0(X, \text{Hom}(L_i, L_{i+1}) \otimes K_X)$ is nonzero for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

If there exists a harmonic metric h_0 exists on (E, θ) , then there uniquely exists a maximal harmonic metric h_{\max} on (E, θ) satisfying $\det(h_{\max}) = \det(h_0)$. Furthermore, h_{\max} is diagonal, that is, $h_{\max} = \oplus_{i=1}^n h_{\max}|_{L_i}$.

Theorem 1.3. (Theorem 5.3) *For the base n -Fuchsian Higgs bundle, where*

$$E = \oplus_{i=1}^n K_X^{\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}, \quad \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \gamma_1 & 0 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \gamma_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for } \gamma_i = \sqrt{\frac{i(n-i)}{2}},$$

the Hermitian metric $h_X = \oplus_{i=1}^n \hat{g}_X^{-\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}$ is the maximal harmonic metric among all (not necessarily diagonal) harmonic metrics of unit determinant.

Here, "generically regular nilpotent" means that $\theta^n = 0$ and $\theta^{n-1} \neq 0$. The graded bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ is constructed as follows. Let G_i be the subbundle generated by the subsheaf $\ker \theta^{n-i}$. Then

$$\mathcal{G} = \{E = G_0 \supset G_1 \supset \dots \supset G_n = 0\}$$

is a full decreasing holomorphic filtration of E , and θ maps G_{i-1} to $G_i \otimes K_X$. The filtration \mathcal{G} is called the *canonical filtration* of (E, θ) .

The graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ is constructed as:

$$(E^0 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n G_{i-1}/G_i, \quad \theta^0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Gr}_i \theta),$$

where for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$\text{Gr}_i \theta : G_{i-1}/G_i \rightarrow G_i/G_{i+1} \otimes K_X$$

is induced from θ , and $\text{Gr}_n\theta : G_{n-1} \rightarrow 0$. The graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ is a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ and can be viewed as the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of the \mathbb{C}^* -flow.

We define a partial order on Hermitian metrics as follows:

Definition 1.4. *Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle with the canonical filtration $\mathcal{G} = \{G_k\}$. Two Hermitian metrics h_1 and h_2 on E are said to have h_1 weakly dominating h_2 if $\det(h_1|_{G_k}) \geq \det(h_2|_{G_k})$ for $k = 0, \dots, n-1$.*

A harmonic metric is maximal if it weakly dominates all other harmonic metrics. While a maximal harmonic metric may not always exist, if it does, it is unique.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 proceeds in two steps. First, we show that a solution to the Hitchin equation on a generically regular Higgs bundle induces a supersolution to the equation on $\det G_k$'s induced from Hitchin equation, as detailed in Proposition 3.1. Next, we show that if a supersolution to the equation on $\det G_k$'s exists, then a maximal solution to the equation on $\det G_k$'s also exists. This maximal solution then provides a maximal harmonic metric on $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$. We finish the second step by showing a more general result in partial differential equations, Proposition 1.5 below.

Proposition 1.5. *(Proposition 4.4) Let (X, g_X) be a non-compact hyperbolic Riemann surface. Let $k_i, i = 1, \dots, n-1$, be essentially positive smooth functions on X . Consider the system*

$$(1.1) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - k_i e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

If this system has a subsolution, then it has a maximal solution.

When $n = 2$, Equation (1.1) simplifies to

$$(1.2) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u + 1 - k e^{2u} = 0.$$

This is the prescribed curvature equation, which seeks a function u such that the metric $e^{2u} \cdot g_X$ has curvature $-k$. In the special case where $k \equiv 1$, the maximal solution is $u = 0$, which represents the complete hyperbolic metric g_X . Here, "essentially positive functions" are defined in Definition 4.3. Proposition 1.5 extends the following theorem by Kalka and Yang for a single scalar equation.

Theorem 1.6. *(Kalka-Yang [KY93, Theorem 4]) Let k be an essentially positive smooth function on X . If (1.2) has a subsolution, then it has a maximal solution.*

Theorem 1.1 provides a necessary condition for the existence of harmonic metrics on generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundles: the existence of harmonic metric on its graded Higgs bundle, a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$. For the existence of a harmonic metric on a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ parametrized by $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1})$, we have the following facts in Section 6:

- The existence property is preserved under holomorphic covering map. (Lemma 6.1).
- Over \mathbb{D} , if γ_i 's are bounded, then a harmonic metric exists. (Lemma 6.5).
- Harmonic metrics may not exist on some (E, θ) . (Proposition 6.9).

Additionally, Theorem 1.1 has a geometric application. For $n = 2$, it is related to branched minimal surfaces in \mathbb{H}^3 . The branched points of these surfaces correspond to the critical points of a holomorphic map from \tilde{X} to \mathbb{D} , where \tilde{X} is the universal cover of X .

Theorem 1.7 (Theorem 7.6). *Let $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ be an equivariant branched minimal disk which does not lie in a totally geodesic copy of \mathbb{D} . Then it induces an equivariant holomorphic map $f^0 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ satisfying*

$$0 < \frac{g_f}{g_{f_0}} < 1.$$

Furthermore, the branched points of f coincide with the critical points of f^0 .

Kraus [Kra13] has characterized the set of critical points of a holomorphic function from \mathbb{D} to itself. For further details, see Section 7.2.

Organization: In Section 2, we provide some basic results on generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundles. In Section 3, we show that a harmonic metric on (E, θ) induces a supersolution to the equation on $\det G_k$'s. In Section 4, we prove Proposition 4.4 as a generalization of Kalka-Yang's theorem. In Section 5, we prove the main theorem: Theorem 5.2. In Section 6, we discuss the existence of harmonic metrics on a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$. In Section 7, we further consider the related topics on \mathbb{C}^* -flow and minimal branched disk in \mathbb{H}^3 .

Acknowledgement: Both authors thank the hospitality of Max Planck Institute at Leipzig, where part of the work was completed. S. Dai is supported by NSF of China No.12071338. Q. Li is partially supported by the National Key R&D Program of China No. 2022YFA1006600, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, and Nankai Zhide foundation. Q. Li is also sponsored by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON GENERICALLY REGULAR NILPOTENT HIGGS BUNDLES

Let X be a non-compact hyperbolic Riemann surface with canonical line bundle K_X , and let g_X be the complete hyperbolic Kähler metric on X . Consider a Higgs bundle (E, θ) over X of rank n .

Definition 2.1. *A Higgs bundle (E, θ) is called generically regular nilpotent if $\theta^n = 0$ and $\theta^{n-1} \neq 0$.*

Definition 2.2. *A Higgs bundle (E, θ) is called a complex variation of Hodge structure of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ if it can be expressed as*

$$E = L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus \dots \oplus L_n,$$

where L_i are holomorphic line bundles for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and the Higgs field θ is given by

$$\gamma_i = \theta|_{L_i} : L_i \rightarrow L_{i+1} \otimes K_X \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

where each γ_i is a non-zero holomorphic bundle map, and $\gamma_n = \theta|_{L_n} : L_n \rightarrow 0$. We write $\theta = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i$.

Remark 2.3. *A complex variation of Hodge structure of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ is generically regular nilpotent.*

For a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle (E, θ) , there is a canonical full decreasing holomorphic filtration \mathcal{G} . Let G_i be the subbundle given by the subsheaf $\ker \theta^{n-i}$. Then

$$\mathcal{G} = \{E = G_0 \supset G_1 \supset \dots \supset G_n = 0\}$$

is a full decreasing holomorphic filtration of E , and θ maps G_{i-1} to $G_i \otimes K_X$.

Given \mathcal{G} , we can construct the graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ as follows:

$$(E^0 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n G_{i-1}/G_i, \quad \theta^0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Gr}_i \theta),$$

where for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$\text{Gr}_i \theta : G_{i-1}/G_i \rightarrow G_i/G_{i+1} \otimes K_X$$

is induced from θ , and $\text{Gr}_n \theta : G_{n-1} \rightarrow 0$. Since (E, θ) is generically regular, $\text{Gr}_i \theta$ is not identically zero for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Thus, $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ is a complex variation of Hodge structure of type $(1, \dots, 1)$. Setting $L_i = G_{i-1}/G_i$ and $\gamma_i = \text{Gr}_i \theta$, the graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ can be expressed as

$$(2.1) \quad (E^0, \bar{\partial}_{E^0}) = (L_1, \bar{\partial}_1) \oplus \dots \oplus (L_n, \bar{\partial}_n), \quad \theta^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \gamma_1 & 0 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \gamma_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If (E, θ) is a complex variation of Hodge structure of type $(1, \dots, 1)$, then \mathcal{G} is its canonical decreasing filtration:

$$G_i = \bigoplus_{k \geq i+1} L_k.$$

Thus, $G_{i-1}/G_i \cong L_i$ canonically and

$$\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta) \cong (E, \theta).$$

For a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle (E, θ) with filtration $\mathcal{G} = \{G_i\}$, the graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta) = (E^0, \theta^0)$ has a canonical filtration $\mathcal{G}^0 = \{G_i^0\}$, where $G_i^0 = \bigoplus_{k \geq i+1} G_{k-1}/G_k$. Although G_i and G_i^0 are generally not isomorphic, the determinant line bundles $\det(G_i)$ and $\det(G_i^0)$ are canonically isomorphic for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

We now consider Higgs bundles with Hermitian metrics.

2.1. Smooth decomposition of E . Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle with $G_i = \ker \theta^{n-i}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. Let h be a Hermitian metric on E . Denote L_i as the h -orthogonal complement of G_i in G_{i-1} for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Using h , $L_i \cong G_{i-1}/G_i$ canonically, and thus we have a smooth decomposition

$$(2.2) \quad E = L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus \dots \oplus L_n.$$

With respect to this decomposition, we have the following:

I. The Hermitian metric h is given by

$$(2.3) \quad h = \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & & & & \\ & h_2 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & h_n \end{pmatrix},$$

where h_i is the restriction of h to L_i ;

II. The holomorphic structure on E is defined by the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator

$$(2.4) \quad \bar{\partial}_E = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\partial}_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \beta_{21} & \bar{\partial}_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \beta_{31} & \beta_{32} & \bar{\partial}_3 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{n1} & \beta_{n2} & \cdots & \beta_{n,n-1} & \bar{\partial}_n \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\bar{\partial}_k$ is the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator defining the holomorphic structure on G_{k-1}/G_k , and $\beta_{ij} \in \Omega^{0,1}(X, \text{Hom}(L_j, L_i))$;

III. The Higgs field is of the form

$$(2.5) \quad \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \gamma_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ a_{31} & \gamma_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & \gamma_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\gamma_k : L_k \rightarrow L_{k+1} \otimes K_X$ is the holomorphic map $\text{Gr}_k \theta : G_{k-1}/G_k \rightarrow G_k/G_{k+1} \otimes K_X$, and $a_{ij} \in \Omega^{1,0}(X, \text{Hom}(L_j, L_i))$.

Note that in the expressions above, $\bar{\partial}_k$ and γ_k are determined by the Higgs bundle (E, θ) and are independent of the Hermitian metric h . However, a_{ij} and β_{ij} depend on the Hermitian metric h . The graded Higgs bundle (E^0, θ^0) in (2.1) with diagonal Hermitian metric $h = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$ is the case where all a_{ij} and β_{ij} vanish.

Since $\det(G_k) \cong \det(G_k^0)$, we can consider the induced metric $\det(h|_{G_k})$ on the determinant line bundle $\det(G_k)$ or $\det(G_k^0)$. In general, for a complex vector space (V, h) with a Hermitian metric and a subspace W of V , we have

$$\det W \otimes \det(V/W) \cong \det V.$$

Thus, we formally define

$$\det(h_{V/W}) = \frac{\det(h_V)}{\det(h_W)}.$$

Remark 2.4. *In the formula above, $\det(h_{V/W})$ is defined using the Hermitian metric on the determinant bundles. If we use the Hermitian metric on V , $h_{V/W}$ can be directly defined by using $V/W \cong W^\perp$.*

In our case, with diagonal Hermitian metric $h = \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_n)$, we have $\det(h|_{G_k}) = \prod_{i=k+1}^n h_i$. Thus,

$$(2.6) \quad h_k = \det(h_{L_k}) = \frac{\det(h|_{G_{k-1}})}{\det(h|_{G_k})}.$$

Definition 2.5. *Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle with canonical filtration $\{G_k\}$. Let h_1 and h_2 be two Hermitian metrics on E . We say that h_1 weakly dominates h_2 if*

$$\det(h_1|_{G_k}) \geq \det(h_2|_{G_k})$$

for every $k = 0, \dots, n-1$.

One may extend the definition of weakly dominate between Hermitian metrics on a nilpotent Higgs bundle (E, θ) and its graded Higgs bundle.

Definition 2.6. Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle with canonical filtration $\{G_k\}$. Let (E^0, θ^0) be its graded Higgs bundle with canonical filtration $\{G_k^0\}$. Let h_1 and h_2 be two Hermitian metrics on E , E^0 respectively. We say that h_1 weakly dominates h_2 if

$$\det(h_1|_{G_k}) \geq \det(h_2|_{G_k^0})$$

under the canonical isomorphism $\det(G_k) \cong \det(G_k^0)$ for every $k = 0, \dots, n-1$.

We say that h_1 strictly weakly dominates h_2 if under the canonical isomorphism $\det(G_k) \cong \det(G_k^0)$ for every $k = 0, \dots, n-1$,

$$\det(h_1|_{G_0}) \geq \det(h_2|_{G_0^0})$$

and

$$\det(h_1|_{G_k}) > \det(h_2|_{G_k^0}) \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

3. HARMONIC METRICS AND HITCHIN EQUATION

We now turn our attention to harmonic metrics on a Higgs bundle (E, θ) , which are Hermitian metrics satisfying the Hitchin equation:

$$(3.1) \quad F(\nabla_h) + [\theta, \theta^{*h}] = 0,$$

where ∇_h is the Chern connection uniquely determined by h and the holomorphic structure on E , $F(\nabla_h)$ is the curvature 2-form of ∇_h , and θ^{*h} is the adjoint of θ with respect to h .

Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle, and let h be a harmonic metric on (E, θ) . Let \mathcal{G} be its canonical filtration, and $E = \bigoplus_i L_i$ be the h -orthogonal decomposition as in Section 2.1. We also adopt the other notations from Section 2.1. Let s_i be a local holomorphic frame for L_i , where $i = 1, \dots, n$. Locally, we have

$$(3.2) \quad h_i = h_i(z) s_i^* \otimes \bar{s}_i^*, \quad \gamma_i = \gamma_i(z) s_i^* \otimes s_{i+1} \otimes dz,$$

where $h_i(z)$ and $\gamma_i(z)$ are local functions. Similarly, we obtain the local expression of h and θ as $h(z)$ and $\theta(z)dz$. Then, locally,

$$F(\nabla_h) = \bar{\partial}(h(z)^{-1} \partial h(z)), \quad \theta^{*h} = h(z)^{-1} \theta(z)^* h(z).$$

3.0.1. Background Metric on X and E . Let g_X denote the hyperbolic metric on X , and ω_X the corresponding Kähler form. Locally, we have

$$g_X = g_X(z) |dz|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_X = \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} g_X(z) dz \wedge d\bar{z}.$$

So we have $|\partial/\partial_z|_{g_X}^2 = \frac{1}{2} g_X(z)$ and $|dz|_{g_X}^2 = 2g_X(z)^{-1}$. The induced Hermitian metric on K_X^{-1} is $\hat{g}_X = \frac{1}{2} g_X(z) dz \otimes d\bar{z}$. The rough Laplacian with respect to g_X is locally given by $\Delta_{g_X} = \frac{4}{g_X(z)} \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}}$. Let Λ_{ω_X} denote the contraction with respect to ω_X .

The Gauss curvature of g_X is

$$k_{g_X} = -\frac{2}{g_X} \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log g_X.$$

Then g_X satisfies $\partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log g_X(z) = \frac{1}{2} g_X(z)$.

Since X is non-compact, we can choose a Hermitian metric \tilde{h}_i on L_i such that

$$\sqrt{-1} F(\nabla_{\tilde{h}_i}) = \frac{n+1-2i}{2} \omega_X,$$

and locally,

$$\partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log \tilde{h}_i(z) = -\frac{n+1-2i}{4} g_X(z).$$

Let $\tilde{h} = \text{diag}(\tilde{h}_1, \dots, \tilde{h}_n)$ be a background Hermitian metric on E satisfying $\det(h) = \det(\tilde{h})$. Then there exists an n -tuple of smooth real-valued functions on X , $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$, such that $h_i = e^{w_i} \tilde{h}_i$. Note that $\det(h) = \det(\tilde{h})$ if and only if $\sum_{k=1}^n w_k = 0$.

Denote by $\|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2$ the squared norm of γ_i in terms of \tilde{h} and g_X . Locally,

$$(3.3) \quad \|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 = \frac{2|\gamma_i(z)|^2 \tilde{h}_i(z)^{-1} \tilde{h}_{i+1}(z)}{g_X(z)}.$$

Let $u_i = -\sum_{k=1}^i w_k$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Set $u_0 = 0$ and, by assumption, $u_n = 0$.

We now present the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *1. We have*

$$(3.4) \quad -\sqrt{-1} \Lambda_{\omega_X} F_{\det(E/G_k)} + \|\gamma_k\|_{h, g_X}^2 \leq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Equivalently, in terms of (u_1, \dots, u_n) and the background metric \tilde{h} , we have

$$(3.5) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - 2\|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

2. Suppose (E, θ) is a CVHS and $h = \oplus h|_{L_i}$ is a diagonal harmonic metric. We have

$$(3.6) \quad -\sqrt{-1} \Lambda_{\omega_X} F_{\det(E/G_k)} + \|\gamma_k\|_{h, g_X}^2 = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Equivalently, in terms of (u_1, \dots, u_n) and the background metric \tilde{h} , we have

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - 2\|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

Proof. For a holomorphic θ -invariant subbundle F of E , let F^\perp denote the subbundle of E orthogonal to F with respect to the harmonic metric h . F^\perp can be equipped with the quotient holomorphic structure from E/F . Considering the smooth orthogonal decomposition

$$E = F^\perp \oplus F,$$

we have the expressions for the holomorphic structure $\bar{\partial}_E$ and the Higgs field θ as

$$\bar{\partial}_E = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\partial}_{F^\perp} & 0 \\ \beta & \bar{\partial}_F \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 \\ B & \theta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad h = \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & 0 \\ 0 & h_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\beta \in \Omega^{0,1}(X, \text{Hom}(F^\perp, F))$ and $B \in \Omega^{1,0}(X, \text{Hom}(F^\perp, F))$.

Denote $\bar{\partial}_E^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\partial}_{F^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\partial}_F \end{pmatrix}$.

Under a holomorphic frame (s^\perp, s) with respect to $(\bar{\partial}_{F^\perp}, \bar{\partial}_F)$ (note that s^\perp is not holomorphic with respect to $\bar{\partial}_E$), the connection 1-form of the Chern connection $\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_E, h}$ is given by $\omega + \beta$, where

$$\omega = h^{-1} \partial h - h^{-1} \beta^* h.$$

Here, we use β to also denote $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ (similarly for B).

For a $(1,1)$ -tensor A , such as θ , B , or β , in a local frame, $A^{*h} = h^{-1}A^*h$. Thus, $\beta^{*h} = h_1^{-1}\beta^*h_2$. Calculations show that the Chern connection $\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{E,h}}$ and the adjoint θ^{*h} of the Higgs field θ are

$$\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{E,h}} = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{F^\perp,h_1}} & -\beta^{*h} \\ \beta & \nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{F,h_2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta^{*h} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1^{*h_1} & B^{*h} \\ 0 & \theta_2^{*h_2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Chern curvature is given by

$$F(\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{E,h}}) = d(\omega + \beta) + (\omega + \beta) \wedge (\omega + \beta).$$

Restricting to the $\text{Hom}(F^\perp, F^\perp)$ component, we have

$$F(\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{E,h}})|_{\text{Hom}(F^\perp, F^\perp)} = F(\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{F^\perp,h_1}}) - \beta^{*h} \wedge \beta.$$

Thus, restricting the Hitchin equation to $\text{Hom}(F^\perp, F^\perp)$, we obtain

$$F(\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{F^\perp,h_1}}) - \beta^{*h} \wedge \beta + B^{*h} \wedge B + [\theta_1, \theta_1^{*h_1}] = 0.$$

Taking the trace and noting that $\text{tr}([\theta_1, \theta_1^{*h_1}]) = 0$, we obtain

$$\text{tr}(F(\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{F^\perp,h_1}})) - \text{tr}(\beta^{*h} \wedge \beta) + \text{tr}(B^{*h} \wedge B) = 0.$$

Contracting with the Kähler form ω , we have

$$-\sqrt{-1}\Lambda_{\omega_X} \text{tr}(F(\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{F^\perp,h_1}})) - \sqrt{-1}\Lambda_{\omega_X} \text{tr}(B^{*h} \wedge B) = -\sqrt{-1}\Lambda_{\omega_X} \text{tr}(\beta^{*h} \wedge \beta) \leq 0.$$

Notice that $\text{tr}(F(\nabla_{\bar{\partial}_{F^\perp,h_1}}))$ is the curvature form $F_{\det F^\perp}$ of the determinant line bundle of F^\perp with respect to the induced metric. Therefore, we obtain the following inequality,

$$(3.8) \quad -\sqrt{-1}\Lambda_{\omega_X} F_{\det F^\perp} - \sqrt{-1}\Lambda_{\omega_X} \text{tr}(B^{*h} \wedge B) \leq 0.$$

The equality holds if and only if $\beta = 0$.

Now for each $k = 1, \dots, n-1$, let F be the subbundle $G_k = \bigoplus_{i \geq k+1} L_i$. Then we have $F^\perp = \bigoplus_{i \leq k} L_i$. The associated factor B is given by

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{k+1,1} & a_{k+1,2} & \cdots & a_{k+1,k-1} & \gamma_k \\ a_{k+2,1} & a_{k+2,2} & \cdots & a_{k+2,k-1} & a_{k+2,k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{n,1} & a_{n,2} & \cdots & a_{n,k-1} & a_{n,k} \end{pmatrix},$$

mapping F^\perp to $F \otimes K_X$. Then

$$(3.9) \quad \sqrt{-1}\Lambda_{\omega_X} \text{tr}(B^{*h} \wedge B) \leq -2|\gamma_k|^2 h_k^{-1} h_{k+1} / g_X.$$

The equality holds if and only if all $a_{ij} = 0$.

Since $\det(F^\perp) = \det(E/G_k)$, together with (3.8), (3.9), we obtain (3.4).

Locally, the induced metric on $\det F^\perp$ is given by $\prod_{i=1}^k h_i(z)$. Then locally

$$(3.10) \quad -\sqrt{-1}\Lambda_{\omega_X} F_{\det F^\perp} = \frac{2}{g_X(z)} \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^k h_i(z) \right).$$

Putting (3.4) and (3.10) together, we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^k h_i(z) \right) + |\gamma_k(z)|^2 h_k(z)^{-1} h_{k+1}(z) \leq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Thus, for $k = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$(3.12) \quad \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^i w_k \right) + \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log \left(\prod_{k=1}^i \tilde{h}_k(z) \right) + |\gamma_i(z)|^2 e^{-w_i + w_{i+1}} \tilde{h}_i(z)^{-1} \tilde{h}_{i+1}(z) = 0.$$

Applying the formula $\partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log \tilde{h}_i(z) = -\frac{n+1-2i}{4} g_X(z)$, $u_i = -\sum_{k=1}^i w_k$, and note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^i (n+1-2k) = i(n-i),$$

we obtain (3.5).

When (E, θ) is a CVHS and h is a diagonal harmonic metric, then all a_{ij} vanishes and $\beta = 0$. Thus we obtain the equality in Equation (3.4) and thus the equality in Equation (3.5). \square

3.1. n -Fuchsian case. Suppose $L_i = K_X^{\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}$, then γ_i 's are constants. Recall the induced Hermitian metric on K_X^{-1} is $\hat{g}_X = \frac{1}{2} g_X(z) dz \otimes d\bar{z}$. Consider $\tilde{h}_i = \hat{g}_X^{-\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}$. Locally, let $s_i = dz^{\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}$. Then $\tilde{h}_i(z) = (\frac{1}{2} g_X(z))^{-\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}$. And

$$\partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log \tilde{h}_i = -\frac{n+1-2i}{2} \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} \log g_X(z) = -\frac{n+1-2i}{4} g_X(z).$$

In this case, if \tilde{h}_i is a harmonic metric, i.e., the conformal factor w_i 's are constants, then the graded Higgs bundle can be given by $\gamma_i = \sqrt{\frac{i(n-i)}{2}}$. So $\|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 = \frac{i(n-i)}{2}$.

In this case, for a diagonal harmonic metric h , using \tilde{h} in the above choice, (u_1, \dots, u_n) satisfies

$$(3.13) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - i(n-i)e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

It is obvious that $(0, \dots, 0)$ is a solution to the system and thus $\tilde{h} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \hat{g}_X^{-\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}$ is a harmonic metric. Thus,

$$\|\theta\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{i(n-i)}{2} = \frac{n(n^2-1)}{12}.$$

4. GENERALIZATION OF KALKA-YANG'S THEOREM TO SYSTEM

Consider the system of equations

$$(4.1) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - k_i e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

Definition 4.1. 1. An n -tuple of smooth functions $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$ is called a subsolution of (4.1) if it satisfies

$$\Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - k_i e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} \geq 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

2. An n -tuple of smooth functions $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$ is called a supersolution of (4.1) if it satisfies

$$\Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - k_i e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} \leq 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

Definition 4.2. A solution $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$ of (4.1) is called maximal if, for any subsolution $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{n-1})$ of (4.1), we have $u_i \geq v_i$ for all i . Clearly, the maximal solution is unique.

Definition 4.3. A tuple of smooth nonnegative functions (k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) on X is called *simultaneously essentially positive* if there is an exhaustion of X by smooth bounded domains $\{\Omega_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $k_i > 0$ on $\partial\Omega_j$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots$.

We always assume (X, g_X) is a non-compact complete hyperbolic surface. In this section, we show the following result:

Proposition 4.4. Let (k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) be a tuple of smooth simultaneously essentially positive functions on X . Suppose (4.1) has a subsolution $\underline{u} = (\underline{u}_1, \dots, \underline{u}_{n-1})$, then it has a maximal solution $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$.

Moreover, either $\underline{u}_i < u_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, or $\underline{u}_i \equiv u_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

When $n = 2$, Equation (4.1) simplifies to

$$(4.2) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u + 1 - ke^{2u} = 0.$$

This is the prescribed curvature equation, which seeks a function u such that the metric $e^{2u} \cdot g_X$ has curvature $-k$. In this context, Kalka and Yang proved the following theorem, which Proposition 4.4 generalizes:

Theorem 4.5 (Kalka-Yang [KY93]). Let k be an essentially positive smooth function on X . If (4.2) has a subsolution, then it has a maximal solution.

Note that when $k = 1$, $u = 0$ is obviously a solution to Equation (4.2). In fact, it is the maximal solution, which corresponds to the fact that g_X is the maximal metric among all hyperbolic metric in its conformal class. As a generalization of this fact, we also prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.6. When $k_i = i(n-i)$, $(0, \dots, 0)$ is the maximal solution to (4.1).

We delay the proof of Proposition 4.4 and Proposition 4.6 to the end of this section. We use Kalka-Yang's strategy [KY93] to prove Proposition 4.4.

We will frequently use the following comparison principle:

Lemma 4.7. (*Comparison principle*) Let Ω be a bounded domain in X . Let $\underline{u} = (\underline{u}_1, \dots, \underline{u}_{n-1})$ be a subsolution and $\bar{u} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_{n-1})$ be a supersolution to Equation (4.1) on Ω . Suppose $\bar{u}_i \geq \underline{u}_i$ on $\partial\Omega$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then either $\underline{u}_i < \bar{u}_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, or $\underline{u}_i \equiv \bar{u}_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. Let $u_i = \underline{u}_i - \bar{u}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Then u_i satisfies

$$(4.3) \quad \Delta_{g_X} u_i - c_i(2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}) = 0,$$

where

$$c_i = k_i \int_0^1 e^{t(2\underline{u}_i - \underline{u}_{i-1} - \underline{u}_{i+1}) + (1-t)(2\bar{u}_i - \bar{u}_{i-1} - \bar{u}_{i+1})} dt.$$

We can verify that the above system satisfies the assumptions (a), (b), (c), and (d) in Lemma A.1 (assumption (c) is satisfied using the procedure in Remark A.3). This completes the proof. \square

We will also use the method of super-subsolution for equation systems, which is prepared in the following lemma by Li-Mochizuki.

Lemma 4.8. ([LM20]) *Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Let $\bar{\Omega}$ be a bounded domain of M with smooth boundary. Denote Ω as its interior. Let $F(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a smooth function on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfies $\frac{\partial F_k}{\partial y_j} \leq 0$ for $j \neq k$. Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ be continuous functions on $\partial\Omega$. Consider the system, for $k = 1, \dots, n$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g u_k &= F_k(x, u_1, \dots, u_n) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_k &= f_k \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose \underline{u} and \bar{u} are a subsolution and a supersolution on $\bar{\Omega}$ respectively, satisfying $\underline{u} \leq \bar{u}$ in Ω and $\underline{u} \leq f \leq \bar{u}$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then there exists a smooth solution u to the Dirichlet problem, satisfying $\underline{u} \leq u \leq \bar{u}$.

Remark 4.9. *In [LM20, Proposition 5.2], Li-Mochizuki demonstrated the method of super-subsolution for the non-compact manifolds. In the Step 1 of their proof, they showed the method of super-subsolution for the Dirichlet problem.*

Let $\bar{\Omega}$ be a bounded domain of X with smooth boundary. First, we show the existence of solution to Equation (4.1) when k is a smooth essentially positive function on $\bar{\Omega}$ and positive on $\partial\Omega$.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\bar{\Omega}$ be a bounded domain of X with smooth boundary. Let k_i be smooth functions on $\bar{\Omega}$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Suppose $k_i \geq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $k_i > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Then Equation (4.1) has a smooth solution $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$ on Ω such that $\lim_{x \in \partial\Omega} u_i(x) = +\infty$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.*

Proof. We use the method of super-subsolution to obtain a solution. From the assumption, there is a constant $C_0 > 1$ such that $|k_i| \leq C_0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Then $\underline{u}_i = -\frac{i(n-i)}{2} \ln C_0$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, gives a subsolution. Now we construct a supersolution. Let Ω' be a bounded domain in X such that $\bar{\Omega} \subset \Omega'$. Consider the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{g_X} u &= \mu u \quad \text{on } \Omega', \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega'. \end{aligned}$$

Let λ be the first eigenvalue and φ be the eigenfunction of λ . It is well known that $\lambda > 0$ and φ is smooth and positive on Ω' . Denote $C_1 = \min_{\bar{\Omega}} \varphi > 0$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $u_i^N = NC_1^{-1} \varphi$. Then suppose $N \geq n(n-1)\lambda^{-1}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$\Delta_{g_X} u_i^N + i(n-i) - k_i e^{2u_i^N - u_{i-1}^N - u_{i+1}^N} \leq -\lambda u_i^N + i(n-i) \leq -\lambda N + i(n-i) \leq 0.$$

Then $u_i^N \geq N$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, gives a supersolution. It is clearly $u_i^N > \underline{u}_i$. By the method of super-subsolution, the following boundary value problem, for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - k_i e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega, \\ u_i &= N \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

has a solution $v^N = \{v_1^N, \dots, v_{n-1}^N\}$ such that for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$-\frac{i(n-i)}{2} \ln C_0 \leq v_i^N \leq u_i^N.$$

From the comparison principle Lemma 4.7, we have v^N is unique and increases with respect to N .

Now we show that for each $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, the sequence $\{v_{i_0}^N(x_0)\}_N$ is bounded. Denote $\Omega_\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \epsilon\}$. Since $k_i > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $\partial\Omega$ is compact, we may choose constants $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, such that $k_i > i(n-i)\delta$ on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\epsilon$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. We assume ϵ is smaller than the injective radius.

Note that $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\epsilon$ is again hyperbolic. There is a unique complete kähler metric on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\epsilon$ of constant curvature $-\delta$.

For $x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$, let $d = 2\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$. Then the hyperbolic disk $D_d(x)$ lies in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\epsilon$. Regard $D_d(x)$ as a subset of the Poincaré disk model, $D_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < r\} \subset \mathbb{D}^2$, where $r = \frac{e^d - 1}{e^d + 1}$ is the Euclidean length corresponding to the hyperbolic length d .

Consider the complete metric g_δ of curvature $-\delta$ on D_r . Explicitly, $g_\delta = \frac{4r^2 |dz|^2}{\delta(r^2 - |z|^2)^2}$.

Let $g_\delta = e^{\tilde{w}} g_{\mathbb{D}}$, then $\tilde{w} = \ln \frac{r^2(1-|z|^2)^2}{\delta(r^2-|z|^2)^2}$. Then \tilde{w} satisfies $\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{D}}} \tilde{w} + 2 - 2\delta e^{\tilde{w}} = 0$. Let

$$\tilde{w}_i = -\frac{n+1-2i}{2}\tilde{w} \text{ and } \tilde{u}_i = -\sum_{k=1}^i \tilde{w}_k = \frac{i(n-i)}{2}\tilde{w}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1. \text{ Then } \tilde{u}_i \text{ satisfies}$$

$$(4.5) \quad \Delta_{g_{\mathbb{D}}} \tilde{u}_i + i(n-i) - i(n-i)\delta e^{2\tilde{u}_i - \tilde{u}_{i-1} - \tilde{u}_{i+1}} = 0 \quad \text{on } D_r.$$

Pulling back Equation (4.4) on $D_d(x)$ to D_r , since $k_i > i(n-i)\delta$, we have

$$\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{D}}} v_i^N + i(n-i) - i(n-i)\delta e^{2v_i^N - v_{i-1}^N - v_{i+1}^N} \geq 0 \quad \text{on } D_r.$$

Since \tilde{u}_i 's are $+\infty$ on ∂D_r , from the comparison principle Lemma 4.7, we obtain $v_i^N \leq \tilde{u}_i$. In particular $v_i^N(x) \leq \tilde{u}_i(0) = \frac{i(n-i)}{2}\tilde{w}(0) = \frac{i(n-i)}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta r^2}$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, are bounded with respect to N .

For $x \in \Omega_{\frac{\delta}{4}}$, consider $v_i^{N_0}$ for a fixed $N_0 \geq n(n-1)\lambda^{-1}$. As Equation (4.3) in the proof of Lemma 4.7, $v_i^N - v_i^{N_0}$ satisfies the assumptions (a)(b) in the maximum principle Lemma A.1. So the non-negative maximum of $v_i^N - v_i^{N_0}$ can obtain on the boundary of $\Omega_{\frac{\delta}{4}}$, which is bounded with respect to N from the discussion above. So $v_i^N(x)$ is bounded with respect to N .

Therefore, for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, we have $v_i^N(x)$ is uniformly bounded on Ω_ϵ , and is increasingly convergent to a function $u_i(x)$ on Ω . From the Schauder theory and the bootstrap argument, u_i is a smooth solution to Equation (4.1) on Ω . And it is clearly that u_i approaches to $+\infty$ on $\partial\Omega$. We finish the proof. \square

Furthermore, we can always find the maximal solution under the assumptions in Lemma 4.10 from the following lemma.

Lemma 4.11. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 4.10, Equation (4.1) has a unique smooth maximal solution $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{n-1})$ on Ω such that $\lim_{x \in \partial\Omega} v_i(x) = +\infty$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.*

Proof. We use the notation in the proof of Lemma 4.10. For $\epsilon \geq 0$ small enough, let u_i^ϵ , $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, be a solution of Equation (4.1) on Ω_ϵ obtained from Lemma 4.10. From the construction, for $\epsilon \geq 0$, we have $u_i^\epsilon \geq -\frac{i(n-i)}{2} \ln C_0$. From the comparison principle Lemma 4.7, for fixed $x \in \Omega$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, $u_i^\epsilon(x)$ decreases as ϵ decreases to 0. Set $v_i(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} u_i^\epsilon(x)$. (Notice that $v_i(x)$ may be different from $u_i^0(x)$.) From the Schauder theory and the bootstrap argument, v_i is a smooth solution of Equation (4.1) on Ω . For the boundary value, we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} v_i(x) \geq \lim_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} u_i^0(x) = +\infty.$$

To see v_i is the maximal solution, let v'_i be another subsolution. From the comparison principle Lemma 4.7, we have $v'_i(x) \leq u_i^\epsilon(x)$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega_\epsilon$. Then for fixed $x \in \Omega$, letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$v'_i(x) \leq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} u_i^\epsilon(x) = v_i(x).$$

We finish the proof. □

Now we are in the position to prove Proposition 4.4.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. From the assumption, we may choose a bounded smooth exhaustion $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of X such that $k_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, on $\partial\Omega_j$, $\forall j$. Let $\underline{u} = (\underline{u}_1, \dots, \underline{u}_{n-1})$ be the subsolution. Then restricting to Ω_i \underline{u} is also a subsolution. From Lemma 4.11, there is a maximal solution $u^{(i)}$ on Ω_i with $\lim_{x \in \partial\Omega} u^{(i)}(x) = +\infty$. Then from the comparison principle Lemma 4.7, for each $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $x \in X$, $u_j^{(i)}(x)$ is decreasing with respect to i (i large enough), and $u_j^{(i)}(x) > \underline{u}_j(x)$. Set

$$u_j(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_j^{(i)}(x), \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad \forall x \in X.$$

From the Schauder theory and the bootstrap argument, $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$ is a smooth solution to Equation (4.1) on X .

Now we show that u is the maximal solution. Let v be another subsolution to Equation (4.1). For $x \in X$, suppose $x \in \Omega_i$ for $i \geq i_0$. Since $u^{(i)}$ is the maximal solution on Ω_i , we have $u^{(i)}(x) \geq v(x)$. Then

$$u(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u^{(i)}(x) \geq v(x).$$

We finish the proof of u being maximal.

At last, we show the “moreover” part. We apply Lemma 4.7 to the subsolution \underline{u} and the maximal solution u to each bounded domain Ω . Then we have on Ω , either $\underline{u}_i < u_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, or $\underline{u}_i \equiv u_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Since Ω is arbitrary, we obtain the claim on X . □

Proposition 4.4 shows the existence of the maximal solution. Now we prove Proposition 4.6, i.e. for the base n -Fuchsian case, the solution given by the hyperbolic metric is just the maximal solution.

Proof of Proposition 4.6. By lifting, we only need to show the proposition in the case $X = \mathbb{D}$. Let u be a solution to Equation (3.13). Denote $D_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < r\}$. For $r < 1$, restricting on D_r , u also satisfies Equation (3.13). Fix $z_0 \in \mathbb{D}$. Suppose r approaches to 1 enough such that $z_0 \in D_r$. Consider the complete hyperbolic metric g_r on D_r , $g_r = \frac{4r^2|dz|^2}{(r^2-|z|^2)^2}$. With respect to the background metric g_X , $g_r = e^{\ln \frac{r^2(1-|z|^2)}{(r^2-|z|^2)^2}} g_X$. As in Equation (4.5), $\tilde{u}_i^r = \frac{i(n-i)}{2} \ln \frac{r^2(1-|z|^2)}{(r^2-|z|^2)^2}$ is a solution to Equation (3.13) on D_r . Then by the comparison principle Lemma 4.7,

$$u_i \leq \tilde{u}_i^r.$$

Letting $r \rightarrow 1$, we obtain $u_i \leq 0$. □

5. MAIN THEOREMS AND THE PROOF

Definition 5.1. *On a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle (E, θ) , we say that a harmonic metric h is maximal if it weakly dominates all other harmonic metrics.*

In this section, we show the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle over a hyperbolic Riemann surface X . Suppose there is a harmonic metric h on (E, θ) . Then there uniquely exists a maximal harmonic metric h_{max} on the graded Higgs bundle $Gr_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ satisfying (1) $\det(h_{max}) = \det(h)$, and (2) h_{max} strictly weakly dominates h , unless (E, θ) is a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ and $h = h_{max}$. Furthermore, h_{max} is diagonal, that is, $h_{max} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n h_{max}|_{Gr_i E}$.*

Proof. Write $(E, \bar{\partial}_E, \theta)$ in terms of the smooth decomposition $E = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n L_i$ with respect to h as in Section 2 so that $h = \bigoplus_i h|_{L_i}$ and $G_i = \bigoplus_{k \geq i} L_k$ (smooth direct sum).

Note that $L_i \cong G_i/G_{i+1}$. The graded Higgs bundle of $(E, \bar{\partial}_E, \theta)$ with respect to \mathcal{G} is isomorphic to

$$E_0 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n L_i, \quad \bar{\partial}_{E_0} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \bar{\partial}_{L_i}, \quad \theta_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \gamma_i.$$

The metric h on E induces a natural metric, still denoted by h , on E_0 under the canonical smooth isomorphism $E \cong E_0$. Let \tilde{h} be a background diagonal Hermitian metric on E satisfying $\det(\tilde{h}) = \det(h)$.

Write $h|_{L_i} = e^{u_i} \cdot \tilde{h}|_{L_i}$ and $u_i = -\sum_{k=1}^i w_k$. By Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - 2\|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

Since for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, γ_i is holomorphic and not identically 0, we see that γ_i has isolated zeros. Then the tuple $(\|\gamma_1\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2, \dots, \|\gamma_{n-1}\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2)$ is simultaneously essentially positive in the sense of Definition 4.3. Thus one may apply Proposition 4.4 and obtain there is a maximal solution to

$$\Delta_{g_X} u_i + i(n-i) - 2\|\gamma_i\|_{\tilde{h}, g_X}^2 e^{2u_i - u_{i-1} - u_{i+1}} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad u_0 = u_n = 0.$$

From Proposition 3.1, the maximal solution to the above equation gives a harmonic metric \hat{h} , which is diagonal, on the graded Higgs bundle satisfying $\det(\hat{h}) = \det(\tilde{h}) = \det(h)$.

By the definition of u_i , we obtain \hat{h} strictly weakly dominates h .

On $Gr_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$, given any (not necessarily diagonal) harmonic metric h , we can apply the above argument. And thus obtain the above \hat{h} weakly dominates h . Therefore, \hat{h} is maximal among all harmonic metrics with the same determinant on the graded Higgs bundle.

Thus, \hat{h} is the desired h_{max} in the statement. \square

Theorem 5.3. *The metric $h_X = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \hat{g}_X^{-\frac{n+1-2i}{2}}$ is the maximal harmonic metric on the base n -Fuchsian Higgs bundle.*

Proof. The statement directly follows from Section 3.1 and Proposition 4.6. \square

6. HARMONIC METRICS ON CVHS

Given a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle (E, θ) , Theorem 5.2 establishes that the absence of a harmonic metric on the graded bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$ implies the nonexistence of a harmonic metric on (E, θ) . We discuss the existence of harmonic metrics on a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ (see Definition 2.2).

In this whole section, we always assume (E, θ) is a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$.

Let Σ be a compact Riemann surface of genus at least 2, with $\pi : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a holomorphic covering.

Lemma 6.1. *Given (E, θ) on Σ and its lift $\pi^*(E, \theta)$ to Σ_1 , then (E, θ) admits a harmonic metric if and only if $\pi^*(E, \theta)$ admits a harmonic metric.*

In this case, both (E, θ) and $\pi^(E, \theta)$ admit diagonal harmonic metrics.*

Proof. It is clear that one only needs to show the case that π is a universal covering map.

The “only if” direction is obvious.

We only need to consider the “if” direction. Suppose that a harmonic metric exists on $\pi^*(E, \theta)$. Since $\pi^*(E, \theta)$ is a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$, it possesses a unique maximal solution h as guaranteed by Theorem 5.2. Given that $\pi^*(E, \theta)$ is $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ -invariant, the uniqueness of the maximal harmonic metric implies that h must also be $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ -invariant, so it descends to a harmonic metric on (E, θ) .

The last statement follows from the fact that the maximal harmonic metric is diagonal. \square

Let \mathbb{D} denote the Poincaré disk. A CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ over \mathbb{D} is given by:

$$(E, \theta) = \left(\mathcal{O} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{O}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \gamma_1 & 0 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & \gamma_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} dz \right),$$

where $\gamma_i (i = 1, \dots, n-1)$ are holomorphic functions on \mathbb{D} .

For $n = 2$, a CVHS of type $(1, 1)$ over \mathbb{D} is given by:

$$(E, \theta) = \left(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} dz \right),$$

where γ is a holomorphic function on \mathbb{D} .

Denote the weighted Bergman space by

$$\mathcal{A} = \{f \text{ is a holomorphic function on } \mathbb{D} : \iint_{\mathbb{D}} |f(z)|^2 (1 - |z|^2) d\sigma < \infty\}.$$

Here $d\sigma$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{D} . Denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ the space of holomorphic functions α on \mathbb{D} such that there exists a nonvanishing holomorphic function g on \mathbb{D} so that $g\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 6.2. ([Kra13, Theorem 1.3]) *For $n = 2$, (E, θ) over \mathbb{D} admits a diagonal harmonic metric of unit determinant if and only if $\gamma \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Here we can improve Kraus’ result slightly.

Proposition 6.3. *For $n = 2$, (E, θ) admits a harmonic metric of unit determinant if and only if $\gamma \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 5.2 and Lemma 6.2. \square

As an illustration, we present a holomorphic function on \mathbb{D} that does not belong to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Let Σ be a compact Riemann surface. Consider the Higgs bundle (E, θ) over Σ defined as:

$$E = L \oplus L^{-1}, \quad \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \eta & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta \neq 0,$$

where L is a holomorphic line bundle over Σ and $\eta \in H^0(\Sigma, L^{-2}K_\Sigma)$. The existence of $\eta \neq 0$ implies $\deg(L) \leq g - 1$. After identifying $\pi^*L = \mathcal{O}$, we obtain $\pi^*\eta = \gamma dz$, where γ is a holomorphic function on \mathbb{D} . We then have the following claim.

Proposition 6.4. *$\deg(L) > 0$ if and only if $\gamma \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.*

As a result, there exists $\gamma \notin \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. The Higgs bundle (E, θ) is stable if and only if $\deg L > 0$. By the Hitchin-Kobayashi correspondence for Higgs bundles on a compact Riemann surface, we obtain $\deg L > 0$ if and only if (E, θ) admits a harmonic metric.

By Lemma 6.1, we obtain $\deg L > 0$ if and only if $\pi^*(E, \theta)$ admits a harmonic metric.

By Proposition 6.3, we obtain $\deg L > 0$ if and only if $\gamma \notin \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. \square

Lemma 6.5. ([LM24, Theorem 7.3]) *Suppose $\gamma_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(i = 1, \dots, n - 1)$, (E, θ) admits a diagonal harmonic metric.*

Lemma 6.6. ([LM24, Proposition 7.10]) *Suppose $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \gamma_i^{i(n-i)} = \alpha^{\frac{n(n^2-1)}{6}}$ for a holomorphic function α on \mathbb{D} . If (E, θ) admits a diagonal harmonic metric, then $\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Again, we can slightly improve the above result.

Proposition 6.7. *Suppose $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \gamma_i^{i(n-i)} = \alpha^{\frac{n(n^2-1)}{6}}$ for a holomorphic function α on \mathbb{D} . If (E, θ) admits a harmonic metric, then $\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 5.2 and Lemma 6.6. \square

Proposition 6.8. *Suppose $\gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_{n-1} = \gamma$. Then (E, θ) admits a harmonic metric if and only if $\gamma \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 6.5 and Proposition 6.7. \square

Proposition 6.9. *For each n , there exists a rank n CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ on \mathbb{D} that does not accept a harmonic metric.*

Proof. From Proposition 6.4, there exists $\alpha \notin \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Choose a CVHS (E, θ) of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ parametrized by (α, \dots, α) . It follows from Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 6.8. \square

7. FURTHER DISCUSSION

7.1. \mathbb{C}^* -action. Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle. Consider the \mathbb{C}^* -action, i.e., for $t \in \mathbb{C}^*$, $t \cdot [(E, \theta)] = [(E, t\theta)]$. Here, $[\cdot]$ denotes the gauge equivalence class. Fixing a Hermitian metric h_0 , we can express (E, θ, h_0)

in the form of (2.3), (2.4), and (2.5). Consider the gauge transformation $g_t = \text{diag}(1, t, \dots, t^{n-1})$. Then,

$$g_t \cdot (\bar{\partial}_E, t\theta) = (g_t^{-1} \circ \bar{\partial}_E \circ g_t, g_t^{-1} \circ t\theta \circ g_t).$$

Letting t approach $+\infty$, we obtain the graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta)$, a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$. It does not depend on the initial choice of the metric h_0 .

We can rephrase Theorem 5.2 as follows:

Corollary 7.1. *Let (E, θ) be a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle with the canonical filtration \mathcal{G} . Suppose that there exists a harmonic metric h_0 on (E, θ) . Then there exists a maximal harmonic metric h on $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(E, \theta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_t \cdot (E, t\theta)$ satisfying $\det(h) = \det(h_0)$ and h weakly dominates h_0 with respect to \mathcal{G} .*

This result can be seen as a complement to Li-Mochizuki [LM24, Theorem D] for t approaching 0.

Assumption 7.2. *There exists an increasing full holomorphic filtration $\mathcal{F} = \{F_k\}$ of E such that θ takes F_k to $F_{k+1} \otimes K_X$ such that the induced maps on F_k/F_{k-1} ($k = 1, \dots, n-1$) are non-zero.*

Suppose (E, θ) satisfies Assumption 7.2. Fixing a Hermitian metric h_0 on E , take L_i to be the perpendicular line bundle of F_{i-1} inside F_i with respect to h_0 , with the induced quotient holomorphic structure. We can express E as a smooth direct sum:

$$E = L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus \dots \oplus L_n.$$

With respect to this decomposition, the holomorphic structure $\bar{\partial}_E$ is strictly upper triangular and θ satisfies $\theta_{ij} = 0$ for $i > j + 1$.

Consider the gauge transformation $g_t = \text{diag}(1, t, \dots, t^{n-1})$ with respect to this smooth decomposition. Then,

$$g_t \cdot (\bar{\partial}_E, t\theta) = (g_t^{-1} \circ \bar{\partial}_E \circ g_t, g_t^{-1} \circ t\theta \circ g_t).$$

Letting t approach 0, we obtain the graded Higgs bundle $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}}(E, \theta)$, a CVHS of type $(1, \dots, 1)$. It does not depend on the initial choice of the metric h_0 .

Theorem 7.3. ([LM24, Theorem D]) *Suppose (E, θ) satisfies Assumption 7.2 with a filtration \mathcal{F} . If $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}}(E, \theta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g_t \cdot (\bar{\partial}_E, t\theta)$ admits a diagonal harmonic metric h_0 , then there exists a harmonic metric on (E, θ) which weakly dominates the metric h_0 with respect to \mathcal{F} .*

By Theorem 5.2, we can slightly improve the result as follows.

Proposition 7.4. *Suppose (E, θ) satisfies Assumption 7.2 with a filtration \mathcal{F} . If $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}}(E, \theta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g_t \cdot (\bar{\partial}_E, t\theta)$ admits a harmonic metric h_0 , then there exists a harmonic metric on (E, θ) .*

Next, we have the following statement.

Theorem 7.5. *For a generically regular nilpotent Higgs bundle (E, θ) , we obtain that (E, θ) satisfies Assumption 7.2 with a filtration \mathcal{F} . Moreover, if $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}}(E, \theta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g_t \cdot (\bar{\partial}_E, t\theta)$ admits a diagonal harmonic metric h_0 , then there exists a harmonic metric on (E, θ) which weakly dominates the metric h_0 with respect to \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. Since $\theta^{n-1} \neq 0$, there exists a point $p \in X$ and a vector $v \in E_p$ such that $\theta^{n-1}(v) \neq 0$. Hence $v, \theta(v), \dots, \theta^{n-1}(v)$ span E_p . That is, v is a cyclic vector of E at p . By [LM24, Proposition 4.26], we obtain that (E, θ) satisfies Assumption 7.2 with a filtration \mathcal{F} . \square

7.2. $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -case and minimal surfaces in \mathbb{H}^3 . Let (E, θ) , where $\theta \neq 0$, be an $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundle over a non-compact hyperbolic Riemann surface X . In the context of non-Abelian Hodge theory, a harmonic metric corresponds to a ρ -equivariant harmonic map $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{C})/SU(2) \cong \mathbb{H}^3$, where \tilde{X} is the universal cover of X , and $\rho : \pi_1(X) \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is the holonomy representation of the flat connection $\nabla = \nabla_h + \theta + \theta^{*h}$. The Hopf differential associated with this setup is given by $\text{tr}(\theta^2)$.

Now, assume (E, θ) is nilpotent. In this case, the Hopf differential vanishes, implying that the harmonic map f is conformal and thus corresponds to a branched minimal surface in \mathbb{H}^3 . The branched points of this surface coincides with the zero set of θ , since the pullback metric is $\text{tr}(\theta\theta^{*h})$. Conversely, any equivariant branched minimal disk in \mathbb{H}^3 arises from a nilpotent $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -Higgs bundle (E, θ) equipped with a harmonic metric h . Then (E, θ, h) is of the following form:

$$E = L \oplus L^{-1}, \bar{\partial}_E = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\partial}_L & 0 \\ \beta & \bar{\partial}_{L^{-1}} \end{pmatrix}, \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix}, h = h|_L \oplus (h|_L)^{-1}.$$

The graded Higgs bundle with respect to the canonical filtration is

$$E^0 = L \oplus L^{-1}, \quad \bar{\partial}_{E^0} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\partial}_L & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\partial}_{L^{-1}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

According to Theorem 5.2, (E^0, θ^0) has a diagonal harmonic metric

$$h^0 = h^0|_L \oplus h^0|_{L^{-1}}$$

satisfying $h^0|_{L^{-1}} = (h^0|_L)^{-1}$ and $h^0|_L > h|_L$ unless $(E, \theta) = (E^0, \theta^0)$ and $h^0 = h$. This corresponds to an equivariant harmonic map $f^0 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{R})/SO(2) \cong \mathbb{D}$. The Hopf differential of f^0 also vanishes. From [SY97, Proposition on Page 10], f^0 is either holomorphic or anti-holomorphic. By a reflection, we may assume f^0 is holomorphic. This leads us to the following result.

Theorem 7.6. *Let $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ be an equivariant branched minimal disk which does not lie in a totally geodesic copy of \mathbb{D} . Then it induces an equivariant holomorphic map $f^0 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ satisfying*

$$0 < \frac{g_f}{g_{f^0}} < 1.$$

In particular, the branched points of f coincide with the critical points of f^0 .

Proof. First, $g_f = \text{tr}(\theta\theta^{*h}) = |\gamma|^2(h|_L)^{-2} < |\gamma|^2(h^0|_L)^{-2} = \text{tr}(\theta^0(\theta^0)^{*h^0}) = g_{f^0}$. Secondly, since the critical set of f coincides with the one of f^0 with multiplicity counted, we have $\frac{g_f}{g_{f^0}} > 0$. \square

Note that an equivariant holomorphic map $f^0 : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ automatically extends to an equivariant branched minimal disk in \mathbb{H}^3 by composing with a totally geodesic embedding $i : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$. We can also state the result as follows.

Proposition 7.7. *Let $D = \{z_j\}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{D} . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. *There is an equivariant branched conformal minimal map from $\tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ with branch set D .*
2. *There is an equivariant holomorphic map from $\tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2$ with critical set D .*

Kraus [Kra13] characterized the set of critical points of a holomorphic map from \mathbb{D} to itself.

Theorem 7.8. ([Kra13, Theorem 1.1]) *Let $D = \{z_j\}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{D} . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) *There is a holomorphic map from \mathbb{D} to itself with critical set D .*
- (b) *There is an indestructible Blaschke product with critical set D .*
- (c) *There is a function in the weighted Bergman space \mathcal{A} with zero set D .*
- (d) *There is a holomorphic function in the Nevanlinna class \mathcal{N} with critical set D .*

A Blaschke product B is of the form $B(z) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{z}_j}{|z_j|} \frac{z_j - z}{1 - \bar{z}_j z}$. A Blaschke product B is said to be indestructible if $T \circ B$ is a Blaschke product for every unit disc automorphism T . A holomorphic function f in \mathbb{D} belongs to \mathcal{N} if and only if the integrals

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(re^{it})| dt$$

remains bounded as $r \rightarrow 1$.

APPENDIX A. MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE

The key tool is the maximum principle for systems. The following maximum principle is well-known in the literature, for example [LGMM94]. We include the proof here for the convenience of the readers and later use.

Lemma A.1. (*Maximum Principle*) *Let \bar{M} be a manifold with boundary. Denote M as the interior of \bar{M} . Let u_i be functions on \bar{M} , $1 \leq i \leq n$, which are C^2 on M and C^0 on \bar{M} . Let c_{ij} be C^0 functions on M , $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Suppose c_{ij} satisfy the following assumptions:*

- (a) *cooperative: $c_{ij} \geq 0$, $i \neq j$,*
- (b) *row diagonally dominant: $\sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij} \leq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Let f_i be non-negative C^0 functions on M , X_i be C^0 vector fields on M , and g_i be Riemannian metrics on M , $1 \leq i \leq n$. Suppose u_i satisfy

$$\Delta_{g_i} u_i + \langle X_i, \nabla_{g_i} u_i \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij} u_j = f_i \text{ on } M, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Then

$$\max_{x \in \bar{M}} \max\{u_i(x), 0\} \leq \max_{x \in \partial M} \max\{u_i(x), 0\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Lemma A.2. (*Strong Maximum Principle*) *Under the assumptions in Lemma A.1, suppose c_{ij} further satisfy the following assumption:*

- (c) *fully coupled: the index set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ cannot be split up in two disjoint nonempty sets α, β such that $c_{ij} \equiv 0$ for $i \in \alpha, j \in \beta$.*

Then (a)(b)(c) implies that if for some i_0 , u_{i_0} attains its non-negative maximum

at an interior point, then $u_i \equiv M$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Furthermore, either the following assumption ensures the constant M must be 0.

(d) $\max_{x \in \partial M} u_i \leq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

(e) $(\sum_{j=1}^n c_{1j}, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^n c_{nj}) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$, i.e. there exists $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $x_0 \in M$,

such that $\sum_{j=1}^n c_{i_0j}(x_0) \neq 0$.

Together with the assumptions (a)(b)(c), the following assumption rules out the possibility that u_i can attain its non-negative maximum at interior points.

(f) $(f_1, \dots, f_n) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$, i.e. there exists $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $x_0 \in M$, such that $f_{i_0}(x_0) \neq 0$.

Proof. We prove Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.2 together. We first assume $\max_{x \in \partial M} u_i \leq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, which is the assumption (d). Let M_i be the maximum of u_i on \bar{M} and $M_0 = \max_i M_i$. Let α be the subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i \in \alpha$ if and only if $M_i = M_0$ and M_i is achieved by an interior point. Let β be the complement of α . If α is empty, then any i such that $M_i = M_0$ satisfies M_i is only achieved on ∂M and thus $M_0 \leq 0$. Hence, we finish the proof. Now we suppose α is not empty.

Claim 1: under the assumptions (a)(b), either (1) $M_0 < 0$ or (2) $M_0 = 0$ and $u_i \equiv M_i = M_0 = 0$ for $i \in \alpha$, $c_{ij} \equiv 0$ for $i \in \alpha, j \in \beta$.

Suppose for $i_0 \in \alpha$, M_0 is achieved by an interior point x_0 , i.e.

$$M_0 = u_{i_0}(x_0) = \max_i \max_{x \in M} u_i.$$

Then

$$\Delta_{g_{i_0}} u_{i_0} + \langle X_{i_0}, \nabla_{g_{i_0}} u_{i_0} \rangle + c_{i_0 i_0} (u_{i_0} - M_0) + c_{i_0 i_0} M_0 + \sum_{j \neq i_0}^n c_{i_0 j} u_j \geq 0.$$

Suppose $M_0 \geq 0$. By the definition of M_0 and the assumptions (a)(b), we obtain

$$\Delta_{g_{i_0}} (u_{i_0} - M_0) + \langle X_{i_0}, \nabla_{g_{i_0}} (u_{i_0} - M_0) \rangle + c_{i_0 i_0} (u_{i_0} - M_0) \geq 0.$$

From the assumptions (a)(b), $c_{i_0 i_0} \leq 0$. Then from the strong maximum principle for single equations, we have $u_{i_0} \equiv M_0$, since the maximum of $u_{i_0} - M_0$ is 0 and achieved by the interior point x_0 . Since $u_{i_0} \leq 0$ on the boundary, we have $M_0 \leq 0$, then $M_0 = 0$. Then we have $\sum_{j \neq i_0}^n c_{i_0 j} u_j \geq 0$. Since $u_j \leq M_0 = 0$, from the

assumption (a), we have $c_{i_0 j} u_j = 0$, $j \neq i_0$. For $j \in \beta$, $u_j < 0$ in the interior. Hence for $j \in \beta$, $c_{i_0 j} \equiv 0$. From the discussion above, we obtain $u_i \equiv M_i = 0$ for $i \in \alpha$ and $c_{ij} \equiv 0$ for $i \in \alpha, j \in \beta$. We finish the proof of Claim 1.

Claim 2: Under the assumptions (a)(b)(c), if $M_0 \geq 0$, then $u_i \equiv 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

If $M_0 < 0$, then by the definition of M_0 , all $u_i < 0$. Otherwise from Claim 1, the index set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is split up in two disjoint subsets α, β such that $c_{ij} \equiv 0$ for $i \in \alpha, j \in \beta$. It contradicts to the assumption (c) unless β is empty. If β is empty, then $u_i \equiv 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. We finish the proof of Claim 2.

Now we remove the assumption $\max_{x \in \partial M} u_i \leq 0$. Consider

$$\tilde{u}_i = u_i - \max_{x \in \partial M} \max\{u_i(x), 0\}.$$

Then $\max_{x \in \partial M} \tilde{u}_i \leq 0$. And $\tilde{f}_i = f_i - \max_{x \in \partial M} \max\{u_i(x), 0\} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij} \geq 0$. From Claim 1 above, we have $\tilde{u}_i \leq 0$, which implies

$$\max_{x \in \bar{M}} \max\{u_i(x), 0\} \leq \max_{x \in \partial M} \max\{u_i(x), 0\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Now we consider the strong maximum principle. If for some i_0 , u_{i_0} attains its non-negative maximum at an interior point, then \tilde{u}_{i_0} attains its maximum 0 at this point. From Claim 2 above, $u_i \equiv M_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $M_0 = \max_i M_i$. If $M_0 = 0$, then all u_i 's are identically 0. In this case $f_i = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, which contradicts to the assumption (f). Now suppose $M_0 > 0$. Let α_1 be the subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i \in \alpha_1$ if and only if $M_i = M_0$, and β_1 be the complement of α_1 . Then for $i_0 \in \alpha_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq f_{i_0} &= \sum_{j=1}^n c_{i_0 j} u_j = c_{i_0 i_0} M_{i_0} + \sum_{j \neq i_0} c_{i_0 j} M_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n c_{i_0 j} M_0 + \sum_{j \neq i_0} c_{i_0 j} (M_j - M_0) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_{j=1}^n c_{i_0 j} = 0$ and $c_{i_0 j} (M_j - M_0) = 0$, $j \neq i_0$. And $f_{i_0} = 0$. Then $c_{ij} \equiv 0$ for $i \in \alpha_1, j \in \beta_1$, which contradicts to the assumption (c) unless β_1 is empty. Thus under assumption (a)(b)(c), if for some i_0 , u_{i_0} attains its non-negative maximum at an interior point, then $u_i \equiv M_0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. And note that $M_0 \geq 0$. In this case, $f_i = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, which contradicts with the assumption (f).

If $M_0 > 0$, then $\sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij} = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, which contradicts with the assumption (e). Under the assumption (d), by Claim 1, we have $M_0 \leq 0$. Thus $M_0 = 0$. \square

Remark A.3. *The assumption (c) is easy to check by the following procedure. If $1 \in \alpha$, consider $\beta_1 = \{j : c_{1j} \equiv 0\}$, $\alpha_1 = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \beta_1$. Then $\alpha_1 \cap \beta = \emptyset$. Then $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha$. Denote $\alpha_0 = \{1\}$. If $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha_0$, then $\alpha = \alpha_0$ gives such a partition. If $\alpha_1 \not\subseteq \alpha_0$, consider $\beta_2 = \{j : c_{ij} \equiv 0, i \in \alpha_0 \cup \alpha_1\}$, $\alpha_2 = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \beta_2$. Then $\alpha_2 \subseteq \alpha$. If $\alpha_2 \subseteq \alpha_0 \cup \alpha_1$, then $\alpha = \alpha_0 \cup \alpha_1$ gives such a partition. If $\alpha_2 \not\subseteq \alpha_0 \cup \alpha_1$, consider $\beta_3 = \{j : c_{ij} \equiv 0, i \in \bigcup_{k=0}^2 \alpha_k\}$, $\alpha_3 = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \beta_3$. Repeat this procedure, then either we obtain a partition α, β such that $c_{ij} \equiv 0$ for $i \in \alpha, j \in \beta$ or we show that $1 \notin \alpha$. If $1 \notin \alpha$, repeat the procedure above for $2, 3, \dots, n$. Then we can show whether such a partition exists or not.*

REFERENCES

- [BB04] Olivier Biquard and Philip Boalch, *Wild non-abelian Hodge theory on curves*, Compos. Math. **140** (2004), no. 1, 179–204. MR 2004129
- [Fuj24] Hitoshi Fujioka, *Harmonic metrics for Higgs bundles of rank 3 in the Hitchin section*, arXiv:2403.07258 (2024).
- [Hit87] Nigel Hitchin, *The self-duality equations on a Riemann surface*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **55** (1987), no. 1, 59–126. MR 887284 (89a:32021)
- [Kra13] Daniela Kraus, *Critical sets of bounded analytic functions, zero sets of Bergman spaces and nonpositive curvature*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **106** (2013), no. 4, 931–956. MR 3056297
- [KY93] Morris Kalka and DaGang Yang, *On conformal deformation of nonpositive curvature on noncompact surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **72** (1993), no. 2, 405–430. MR 1248678

- [LGMM94] Julián López-Gómez and Marcela Molina-Meyer, *The maximum principle for cooperative weakly coupled elliptic systems and some applications*, Differential and Integral Equations (1994).
- [Li22] Qiongling Li, *Nilpotent Higgs bundles and the Hodge metric on the Calabi-Yau moduli*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2022), no. 9, 6705–6741.
- [LM20] Qiongling Li and Takuro Mochizuki, *Complete solutions of Toda equations and cyclic Higgs bundles over non-compact surfaces*, arXiv:2010.05401 (2020).
- [LM23] ———, *Harmonic metrics of generically regular semisimple Higgs bundles on non-compact Riemann surfaces*, Tunisian Journal of Mathematics **5** (2023), no. 4, 663–711.
- [LM24] ———, *Higgs bundles in the Hitchin section over non-compact hyperbolic surfaces*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **129** (2024), no. 6, Paper No. e70008. MR 4832713
- [Ma24] Weihan Ma, *Harmonic metrics of $SO_0(n, n)$ -Higgs bundles in the Hitchin section on non-compact hyperbolic surfaces*, arXiv:2408.15278 (2024).
- [Moc11] Takuro Mochizuki, *Wild harmonic bundles and wild pure twistor D -modules*, Astérisque (2011), x+607.
- [Sim88] Carlos T. Simpson, *Constructing variations of Hodge structure using Yang-Mills theory and applications to uniformization*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 4, 867–918. MR 944577
- [Sim90] ———, *Harmonic bundles on noncompact curves*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), no. 3, 713–770. MR 1040197
- [SY97] R. Schoen and S. T. Yau, *Lectures on harmonic maps*, Conference Proceedings and Lecture Notes in Geometry and Topology, vol. II, International Press, Cambridge, MA, 1997. MR 1474501

SONG DAI, CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND KL-AAGDM, TIANJIN UNIVERSITY, NO. 92 WEIJINLU NANKAI DISTRICT, TIANJIN, P.R. CHINA 300072
Email address: `song.dai@tju.edu.cn`

QIONGLING LI, CHERN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND LPMC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, NO. 94 WEIJINLU NANKAI DISTRICT, TIANJIN, P.R.CHINA 300071
Email address: `qiongling.li@nankai.edu.cn`