

THE REGULARITY OF ENVELOPES

ELEONORA DI NEZZA, STEFANO TRAPANI

In memory of Jean-Pierre Demailly.

ABSTRACT. Let X be a compact complex manifold of complex dimension n and α be a smooth closed real form on X such that its cohomology class $\{\alpha\} \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is big. In this paper we prove that, given a bounded function f with bounded distributional laplacian in X , the α -psh envelope $P(f)$ is also locally bounded with locally bounded distributional laplacian on the ample locus of $\{\alpha\}$.

RÉSUMÉ. Soit X une variété complexe compacte de dimension complexe n et α une $(1,1)$ -forme réelle et fermée sur X telle que sa classe de cohomologie $\{\alpha\} \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ est grosse. Dans ce travail on démontre que, étant donnée une fonction f dont le laplacien, au sens des distributions, est borné, alors l'enveloppe α -psh, $P(f)$, a aussi un laplacien borné sur le lieu ample de $\{\alpha\}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Envelopes of plurisubharmonic functions played an important role in the development of the pluripotential theory on domains of \mathbb{C}^n , see for example [1, 2, 3, 27, 30].

When, relying on the Bedford and Taylor theory in the local case, the foundations of a pluripotential theory on compact Kähler manifolds have been developed [21, 22], *envelopes of quasi-plurisubharmonic functions* started to be intensively studied.

The geometric motivations we can mention are, among others, the study of geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics [10, 14, 6, 25, 12, 15, 11] and the transcendental holomorphic Morse inequalities on projective manifolds [29].

The two basic (and related) questions are about the regularity of envelopes and the behaviour of their Monge-Ampère measures. To fix the setting, let X be a compact complex manifold of complex dimension n , let α be a smooth closed real $(1,1)$ -form and let f be a function on X bounded from above. We are going to refer to f as “barrier function”. Then the prototype of an envelope construction is

$$P_\alpha(f) := (\sup\{\varphi \in \text{PSH}(X, \alpha) : \varphi \leq f\})^*,$$

where $*$ denotes the upper semi-continuous regularization and $\text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ is the space of all α -plurisubharmonic functions, as defined in Section 2.

The function $P_\alpha(f)$ is either a genuine α -plurisubharmonic function or identically $-\infty$. When $f = -\mathbf{1}_T$ is the negative characteristic function of a subset T , then $P_\alpha(f) = f_T^*$ is the so-called relative extremal function of T [21]. When $f = 0$, then $P_\alpha(0) = V_\alpha$ is a distinguished potential with minimal singularities.

We recall that a function on some open set in X is said to be in $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ if it is locally L^∞ and its distributional Laplacian is represented by a locally bounded function. Any $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ function is also $C^{1,\alpha}$ for any $0 < \alpha < 1$. In this paper we prove the following:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32W20, 32U05, 32Q15.

Key words and phrases. Envelopes, Kähler manifolds, big cohomology classes.

Theorem 1.1. *Let α be a real closed $(1,1)$ -form such that $\{\alpha\}$ is a big class. Assume $f \in C^{1,\bar{1}}(X)$. Then $P_\alpha(f)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ on the ample locus of $\{\alpha\}$.*

We actually prove a regularity result for the more general rooftop envelope $P_\alpha(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ (see Theorem 4.2).

The study of such envelopes has led to several works. We start by summarizing them in the case of a smooth barrier function f .

The first result to mention is [5], where the author proves that in the case $\alpha \in c_1(L)$ where L is a big line bundle over X , the envelope $P_\alpha(f)$ is $C^{1,1}$ on the ample locus $\text{Amp}(\{\alpha\})$ of α , and moreover

$$(1.1) \quad \alpha_{P_\alpha(f)}^n = \mathbf{1}_{\{P_\alpha(f)=f\}} \alpha_f^n.$$

Here, given a α -psh function u , $\alpha_u := \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}u$ and α_u^n denotes the non-pluripolar Monge-Ampère measure $(\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}u)^n$ (see [9, Definition 1.1]). Thus the left-hand side of (1.1) is the non-pluripolar product of $P_\alpha(f)$ while α_f^n is the wedge product n times of the form α_f that has bounded coefficients since f is smooth, (observe that f is not α -plurisubharmonic so the non-pluripolar product of α_f does not make sense).

Later people started to work on possible generalisations of the above results in the case of a pseudoeffective class $\{\alpha\}$ that does not necessarily represent the first Chern class of a line bundle. Assuming that $\{\alpha\}$ is big and nef, Berman [7], using PDE methods, proved that the envelope $P_\alpha(f)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ on $\text{Amp}(\{\alpha\})$ and that the identity in (1.1) holds.

The optimal regularity $C^{1,1}$ when $\{\alpha\}$ is a Kähler class was then proved independently by [28] and [13], while the big and nef case was settled in [12]. For a general pseudoeffective class the equality

$$(1.2) \quad \alpha_{P_\alpha(f)}^n = \mathbf{1}_{\{P_\alpha(f)=f\}} \alpha_f^n.$$

is established in [20], without relying on the regularity of $P_\alpha(f)$.

The general case of a big class was treated for the first time by Berman and Demailly. In [4] the authors claim to prove the $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ regularity of $P_\alpha(f)$ on the ample locus of $\{\alpha\}$ when f is smooth. However it became clear later that their arguments had a mistake in their crucial technical Lemma 1.12. In fact, the lower bound in their Lemma 1.12 does not follow from [4, eq. (1.8)] (as they state) since there are some mixed terms to take care of.

The purpose of this paper is then to correct the proof in [4] and generalise their regularity result.

Our proof relies on results in [4] and especially on [17] but it presents two novelties. We proceed in three steps:

- As in [4], we consider the regularization of the envelope through the exponential map. We first derive weaker estimates than the one stated in [4, Lemma 1.12], which allows us to obtain Hölder regularity of the envelope. This is done in Lemma 3.1.
- Such regularity and a version of the Lelong-Jensen inequality, allow us to prove an estimate for the complex hessian of the regularized function (like the one in Lemma 1.12) but with variable coefficients (Lemma 3.5). We can however control the asymptotics of these coefficients near the boundary of the the ample locus of $\{\alpha\}$;
- In the third step, we pass to a modification, and we transport the regularized function on a suitable line bundle. Thanks to a change of coordinates we are able to “kill” the coefficients appearing in the lower bound of the hessian, thus reducing to estimates with constant coefficients. This is the key to use (more or less) the same strategy as in [4] and complete the proof. This is done in Section 4.

Acknowledgements. The second author is partially supported by PRIN *Real and Complex Manifolds: Topology, Geometry and holomorphic dynamics* n.2017JZ2SW5, and by MIUR Excellence Department Projects awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, 2018-2022 CUP E83C18000100006, and 2023-2027. The paper was finalized while the second author was visiting C.M.L.S supported by the CNRS grant PEPS 2021 of the first author. We also thank Vincent Guedj, Ahmed Zeriahi and Sébastien Boucksom for very useful discussions on the subject of this paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let us first assume that (X, ω) is a compact Kähler manifold of complex dimension $n \geq 1$. The Kähler assumption will be then removed at the end of Section 4.

Let α be a smooth closed real $(1, 1)$ form such that the cohomology class $\{\alpha\}$ is big.

The cohomology class $\{\alpha\}$ is said to be big if there exists a positive closed $(1, 1)$ -current $T = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi \in \{\alpha\}$ such that $T \geq \varepsilon_0\omega$, for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. By replacing ω with $\varepsilon_0\omega$ we can assume $T \geq \omega$. Such currents are called Kähler currents.

Let Ω be the set of x in X such that there exists a Kähler current cohomologous to α which is smooth in a neighborhood of x . This is called the ample locus of $\{\alpha\}$ (also denoted by $\text{Amp}\{\alpha\}$ in the literature). If $\{\alpha\}$ is big, Ω is a non-empty open subset such that $\Sigma = X \setminus \Omega$ is a closed analytic set. Moreover, there exists a Kähler current $T = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi$ with analytic singularities which is smooth in Ω (see [8]). Observe that, without loss of generality, we can normalize $\Phi \leq -1$.

The cohomology class of α is Kähler if and only if $\Omega = X$. Also, Φ is a smooth function and we can take $\omega = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi$.

A function $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is called quasi-plurisubharmonic if locally $\varphi = \rho + u$, where ρ is smooth and u is a plurisubharmonic function. We say that φ is α -plurisubharmonic (α -psh for short) if it is quasi-plurisubharmonic and $\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi \geq 0$ in the weak sense of currents on X . We let $\text{PSH}(X, \alpha)$ denote the space of all α -psh functions on X .

Let f be a smooth function on X , we denote by $P(f)$ the α -psh envelope of f , given by

$$P(f) = (\sup\{\varphi \text{ } \alpha\text{-psh} : \varphi \leq f\})^*.$$

Note that we drop the index α for simplicity since no ambiguity can occur.

It can be showed that $P(f)$ is α -psh as well, is bounded by f and hence there is no need to take the upper semicontinuous regularization. Also, clearly $P(f) - f$ is the largest non-positive $(\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}f)$ -psh function, so for simplicity we will assume in the sequel $f \equiv 0$. Observe that by definition $\Phi \leq P(0)$, hence $P(0)$ is locally bounded in Ω .

Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and let z be holomorphic local coordinates with center in x_0 which are ω normal at x_0 . Given a function in Ω , we will make the harmless confusion between the function in Ω restricted to a small coordinate open set (and in this case we use the variable x), and the same function expressed in the local coordinate variable z .

Let φ be any α -psh function, we denote by $\Psi(\varphi)$ the regularised function of φ defined in [4, eq. (1.6)] as

$$\Psi(\varphi)(z, w) = \int_{\zeta \in T_z X} \varphi(\text{exph}_z(w\zeta)) \chi(|\zeta|^2) dV_\omega, \quad (z, w) \in X \times \mathbb{C}$$

where $\text{exph} : TX \rightarrow X$, $T_z X \ni \zeta \rightarrow \text{exph}_z(\zeta)$ is the formal holomorphic part of the Taylor expansion of the exponential map of the Chern connection on TX associated with the metric ω and $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi > 0$ for $t < 1$, $\chi(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 1$ and $\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \chi(|\zeta|^2) d\lambda(\zeta) = 1$.

We simply denote by Ψ the function $\Psi(P(0))$. Observe that $\Psi \leq 0$.

By [17] there exists $K > 0$ large enough such that for $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda(z, w) := \frac{\partial(\Psi(z, e^s) + Ke^{2s})}{\partial s} \Big|_{s=\log|w|} \rightarrow \nu_z(P(0))$$

as w goes to 0 where $\nu_z(P(0))$ is the Lelong number of $P(0)$ at the point z . Moreover, the function λ is continuous, non-negative and increasing with respect to $|w|$ (see [17, page 15]). In particular the function

$$\Psi(z, e^s) + Ke^{2s}$$

is increasing with respect to s .

3. LOWER BOUND FOR THE HESSIAN WITH VARIABLE COEFFICIENTS

Let $\theta = \sum_j \theta_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$ and $\tau = \tau_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ be tangent vectors in the coordinates z and w and let S be a real $(1,1)$ -form in the coordinates z, w and (z, w) (i.e. S can be locally written as $\sum f_{jk} dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_k + g dw \wedge d\bar{w} + \sum (h_i dz_i \wedge d\bar{w} + \bar{h}_i dw \wedge d\bar{z}_i)$).

As in [17] we denote by $S[\theta]^2$, $S[\tau]^2$, $S[\theta, \tau]^2$ the action of the form S on the vectors θ , τ , and $\theta + \tau$ respectively as an hermitian form. For notational convenience we denote by $|dz|^2, |dw|^2$ the forms

$$|dz|^2 := (i/2) \sum_j dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j, \quad |dw|^2 = (i/2) dw \wedge d\bar{w}$$

Observe that if the holomorphic coordinates are normal at 0, then $|dz|_0^2 = \omega|_0$. Note also that $|dz|^2[\theta]^2 = \sum_j |\theta_j|^2 := |\theta|^2$, and $|dw|^2[\tau]^2 = |\tau_1|^2 := |\tau|^2$. Moreover if p, q are smooth non-negative functions in z, w coordinates, then:

$$(3.1) \quad \left(\frac{p^2 |dz|^2}{2} + \frac{q^2 |dw|^2}{2} \right) [\theta, \tau]^2 - pq|\theta||\tau| = \frac{1}{2}(p|\theta| - q|\tau|)^2 \geq 0.$$

Given $\beta \in [0, 1]$ we denote by I_β the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha(z) + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}\Psi(z, w)) [\theta, \tau]^2 \\ & \geq - \left(A\lambda(z, |w|) + K|w|^{1+\beta} \right) |\theta|^2 - K|w|^\beta |\theta||\tau| - K|w|^\beta |\tau|^2 \\ & = \left(- \left(A\lambda(z, |w|) + K|w|^{1+\beta} \right) |dz|^2 - K|w|^\beta |dw|^2 \right) [\theta, \tau]^2 - K|w|^\beta |\theta||\tau| \end{aligned}$$

where $A > 0, K > 2$ and $0 < |w| < \delta_0$.

Lemma 3.1. *The inequality I_0 holds for some positive constants A, K, δ_0 .*

We thank the referee for pointing out that the above lemma was already proved in [24, Lemma 4.1]. However we prefer to give a proof since we make considerations which will be crucial for us in a more general case in the sequel.

Proof. We choose as above canonical local holomorphic coordinates (z, ζ) on the tangent bundle of X centered at some point $(x_0, 0)$ (which is then identified with \mathbb{C}^n), where z varies in an open set U , and the coordinates are ω normal at x_0 . Let $z \in U$ and $B(z, r) := \{z' : |z' - z| < r\}$. Let η be a local potential of α , then $P(0) + \eta$ is psh. Observe that, since Ψ is a linear operator and η is a smooth function

$$(3.2) \quad \Psi(P(0) + \eta) = \Psi(P(0)) + \Psi(\eta) = \Psi(P(0)) + \eta + O(|w|^2).$$

We let $A = \sup_{|\zeta| \leq 1, |\xi| \leq 1} \{ |c_{jklm} \zeta_j \bar{\zeta}_k \xi_l \bar{\xi}_m| \}$, where c_{jklm} are the coefficients of the curvature tensor of ω .

The above estimate comes from the proof of [17, Theorem 4.1] where we choose $u = A\omega$ and $\gamma = 0$. Indeed, it follows from [17, Proposition 3.8] (applied with $N = 2$), the estimates (3.11) and (4.3) in [17] that for $K' \gg 1$ large enough we have the following estimate up to a term $O(|w|^2)$:

$$\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}\Psi(z, w)[\theta, \tau]^2 \geq$$

$$|w|^2 \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} -\chi_1(\zeta) \sum_{j,k,l,m} \frac{\partial^2(P(0) + \eta)}{\partial z_m \partial \bar{z}_l} (\exp_h(z, w\zeta)) \left(c_{jklm} + \frac{1}{|w|^2} \delta_{jm} \cdot \delta_{kl} \right) \tau'_j \bar{\tau}'_k d\lambda(\zeta) - K'(|\theta||\tau| + |\tau|^2)$$

where χ_1 denotes the primitive $\chi_1(t) = \int_{+\infty}^t \chi(u) du$ of χ such that $\chi_1(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 1$ and $\tau' = \theta + \zeta\tau + O(|w|)$.

Since $0 \leq -\chi_1$, we get (always up to a term of the form $O(|w|)$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}\Psi(z, w)[\theta, \tau]^2 \\ & \geq -A \left(\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} -|w|^2 \chi_1(\zeta) \sum_{j,k,l,m} \frac{\partial^2(P(0) + \eta)}{\partial z_m \partial \bar{z}_l} (\exp_h(z, w\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) \right) |\theta|^2 - K''(|\theta||\tau| + |\tau|^2) \\ & \geq -A\lambda_\Omega(z, w)|\theta|^2 - K''(|\theta||\tau| + |\tau|^2) \end{aligned}$$

where the function λ_Ω is defined in [17, page 14]. We stress that the coefficients K', K'' are $O(1)$ thanks to [17, eq. (3.11)].

Now the various “ O -terms” depend on the Taylor expansion of \exp_h up to order $N = 2$, in the given local normal holomorphic coordinates. In particular they depend on the coefficients b_{jklm} and $d_{\alpha km}$ appearing in [17, Proposition 2.9]. On the other hand, thanks to [23, Main Theorem] there exist holomorphic normal coordinates centered at a point x_0 such that, in these coordinates, the coefficients of the Taylor expansion of the exponential map at 0 depend only on the curvature of ω and its subsequent covariant derivatives at x_0 . Since ω is defined on the compact manifold X it follows that these coefficients are uniformly bounded.

Also, thanks to [17, eq. (4.5)] we know that

$$(3.3) \quad |\lambda - \lambda_\Omega| = O(|w|^2).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha(z) + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}\Psi(z, w)) [\theta, \tau]^2 \geq \\ & \left(- \left(A\lambda(z, |w|) + \tilde{K}|w|^2 \right) |dz|^2 - \tilde{K}|dw|^2 - C|w|(|dz|^2 + |dw|^2) \right) [\theta, \tau]^2 - \tilde{K}|\theta||\tau| \end{aligned}$$

where $|w| < \delta_0 \leq 1$.

Let us stress that $-C|w|(|dz|^2 + |dw|^2)[\theta, \tau]^2$ is needed to bound the term $O(|w|)[\theta, \tau]^2$ appearing in [17, Proposition 3.8] applied with $N = 2$. Since $|w| \leq 1$, if we put $K = \tilde{K} + C$ we find I_0 . \square

Remark 3.2. In [18] the authors study the Hölder regularity of solutions of Monge-Ampère equation, in particular in their Theorem D they work in the case of a big class $\{\alpha\}$.

In their proof they make use of the uncorrected [4, Lemma 1.12]. However we point out that the inequality I_0 is enough for their purposes. The interested reader can find all the details in [24, Theorem 4.2] where the authors considered the case when the reference form is an hermitian positive definite form. The same arguments apply when α represents a big class.

For simplicity we make the change of coordinate $(z, w) \rightarrow (z, \delta_0^{-1}w)$, so we will work with $|w| < 1$. Let $\gamma \in [1/2, 1]$, we say that the statement II_γ holds if there exist strictly positive continuous functions $C_1(x), \delta(x)$ in Ω and a positive constant C_2 such that

$$-C_2 \leq \left(\frac{\Psi(x, \delta) - P(0)(x)}{\delta^{2\gamma}} \right) \leq C_1(x)$$

for $0 < \delta < \delta(x)$.

In the above inequality, we used the variable x and not the local coordinate z in order to stress that the inequality is global.

The main strategy to prove regularity of the envelope both in [4] and here, is to prove the inequality II_1 with $C_1(x) < C_1$, $C_1 > 0$ and $\delta(x) > \delta_0 > 0$ where x varies on some relatively

compact open set of the ample locus of the class $\{\alpha\}$. It is proved in [4, page 44] that this uniform inequality is indeed sufficient to obtain $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ regularity of $P(0)$ on the ample locus of $\{\alpha\}$. However, given the central importance of the latter statement, we will give details of the proof in the lemma below:

Lemma 3.3. *Assume*

$$-C_2 \leq \left(\frac{\Psi(x, \delta) - P(0)(x)}{\delta^2} \right) \leq C_1$$

for all $x \in U$, where U is a relatively compact open set of Ω , and with $C_1 > 0, C_2 > 0, 0 < \delta < \delta_0 > 0$ which may depend on U . Then $P(0)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let μ_0 be a finite and positive Borel measure on a relatively compact open set U in \mathbb{R}^N . Let $\mu_0 = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ be the Lebesgue decomposition of μ_0 with respect to the Lebesgue measure m . Then μ_1 and μ_2 are finite and positive. Also μ_1 is absolutely continuous with respect to m whereas μ_2 is the singular part (with respect to m). We define

$$\underline{D}(\mu_0)(x) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_0(B(x, r))}{m(B(x, r))}$$

where $B(x, r)$ is the open ball of center x and radius r . Similarly we define

$$\underline{D}(\mu_1)(x) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_1(B(x, r))}{m(B(x, r))}.$$

These are globally defined functions on U , and they may have non-negative values including $+\infty$. [26, Theorem 7.13] ensures that $\underline{D}(\mu_0)(x) = \underline{D}(\mu_1)(x)$ outside of a set of m -measure zero (i.e. a set of measure zero w.r.t m). Moreover outside of a set of m -measure zero $\underline{D}(\mu_0)(x)$ and $\underline{D}(\mu_1)(x)$ are in fact limits (and not only \liminf). For such x we (respectively) denote by $D\mu_0(x)$ and $D\mu_1(x)$ these limits. Moreover it follows from [26, Theorem 7.8] that

$$\mu_1(E) = \int_E D(\mu_1) dm,$$

for any E Borel subset of U . On the other hand $D(\mu_1) = \underline{D}(\mu_1) = \underline{D}(\mu_0)$ almost everywhere with respect to m , hence

$$\mu_1(E) = \int_E \underline{D}(\mu_0) dm.$$

We claim that if the function $\underline{D}(\mu_0)$ is bounded, then $\mu_0 = \mu_1$, i.e. μ_0 is absolutely continuous with respect to m with bounded density. In fact in [26, Theorem 7.15] it is proved that the set $S_2 = \{x \in U : \underline{D}(\mu_2)(x) = +\infty\}$ as full measure with respect to the singular measure μ_2 , meaning that $\mu_2(U) = \mu_2(S_2)$. Since

$$S_2 \subseteq S_0 = \{x \in U : \underline{D}(\mu_0)(x) = +\infty\} = \{x \in U : D(\mu_0)(x) = +\infty\}$$

it follows that $\mu_2(U) = \mu_2(S_0)$. Note also that since μ_1 is finite and positive, and $\underline{D}(\mu_0)$ is a density of μ_1 (w.r.t m) then the Lebesgue measure of S_0 is zero.

Since by assumption the function $\underline{D}(\mu_0)$ is bounded, the set S_0 is empty. Thus $\mu_2(U) = \mu_2(S_0) = \mu_2(\emptyset) = 0$. Then $\mu_0 = \mu_1$ is absolutely continuous and it has a bounded m -density. This proves the claim.

Now we choose a small open set U in Ω such that $\alpha = i\partial\bar{\partial}\eta$ in U . The function $\varphi := P(0) + \eta$ is then psh on U and so $\mu_0 := \Delta\varphi$ is a finite and positive measure on U . It follows from the assumption

$$-C_2 \leq \left(\frac{\Psi(x, \delta) - P(0)(x)}{\delta^2} \right) \leq C_1$$

and from [4, eq. 1.16] that $\underline{D}(\mu_0)$ is bounded on U . It then follows from the arguments above (with $N = 2n$) that the measure $\Delta\varphi$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and

it has bounded density. This implies that φ , hence $P(0)$, is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ on U . Since U is any relatively compact set in Ω we can then conclude that $P(0) \in C^{1,\bar{1}}(\Omega)$. \square

We also have the following:

Lemma 3.4. *Fix A, K, β real numbers with $A > 0$, $K > 2$, $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Assume the inequality I_β . Then the statement II_γ holds as well with $\gamma = \frac{\beta+1}{2}$. Moreover if $\{\alpha\}$ is a Kähler class, we can choose $C_1(x)$ and $\delta(x)$ to be positive constants.*

Proof. Note that if $\beta \in [0, 1]$ then $\gamma \in [1/2, 1]$. Given K', c positive real numbers, we consider the functions

$$f_\delta(x, w) = \Psi(x, w) + K'|w|^{2\gamma} - K'\delta^{2\gamma} + c \log \delta$$

and

$$\psi_{c,\delta}(x) = \inf_{0 < |w| < \delta} (f_\delta - c \log(|w|)).$$

for $0 < \delta < 1, x \in X$ and $|w| < \delta$. Fix x_0 in Ω and let z be the holomorphic local coordinates centered in x_0 which are ω normal and defined in an open neighborhood of \bar{U} where U is an open neighborhood of x_0 . Simple computations give

$$\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}(f_\delta - c \log |w|) = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}f_\delta = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}\Psi + 2K'\gamma^2|w|^{2(\gamma-1)}|dw|^2.$$

We then use the inequality (3.1) with $p = K|w|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}, q = |w|^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}$, and thanks to I_β , we find:

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}f_\delta \\ & \geq - \left(A\lambda(z, |w|) + (K + K^2/2)|w|^{\beta+1} \right) |dz|^2 + \left(2K'\gamma^2|w|^{2(\gamma-1)} - K - \frac{|w|^{\beta-1}}{2} \right) |dw|^2 \\ & \geq - \left(A\lambda(z, |w|) + K^2|w|^{\beta+1} \right) |dz|^2 + |w|^{2(\gamma-1)} \left(2K'\gamma^2 - K|w|^{2(1-\gamma)} - \frac{1}{2}|w|^{\beta+1-2\gamma} \right) |dw|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used the fact that $-K|w|^\beta|dw|^2 \geq -K|dw|^2$.

We require that

$$(3.4) \quad 2K' > \frac{2K+1}{2\gamma^2},$$

in order to have $2K'\gamma^2 - K - \frac{1}{2} > 0$. Since $\gamma = \frac{\beta+1}{2} \leq 1$, and $0 < |w| \leq \delta$, we find

$$(3.5) \quad \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}f_\delta > - \left(A\lambda(z, |w|) + K^2|w|^{\beta+1} \right) |dz|^2.$$

By definition of λ (see (2.1)) and f_δ we have that

$$\frac{\partial f_\delta(z, e^s)}{\partial s} = \lambda(z, e^s) - 2Ke^{2s} + 2\gamma K'e^{2\gamma s} = \lambda(z, e^s) + 2e^{2\gamma s}(\gamma K' - Ke^{2(1-\gamma)s}).$$

Now we also require that

$$(3.6) \quad K' > \frac{K}{\gamma}$$

and we find that

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{\partial f_\delta(z, e^s)}{\partial s} > \lambda(z, e^s) > 0$$

for $s \leq 0$. For example we could take

$$K' = 2K + 2.$$

Since the function $P(0)$ is finite at x_0 (recall that $x_0 \in \Omega$), by (2.1) we have

$$(3.8) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\partial f_\delta(z, e^s)}{\partial s} = 0.$$

By (3.5) and the fact that $|w| \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}f_\delta > -(A\lambda(z, |w|) + K^2)|dz|^2.$$

By (3.8) the function $s \rightarrow f_\delta(z, e^s) - cs$ is strictly decreasing near $-\infty$, then this function takes a minimum value in the interval $-\infty < s \leq \log \delta$ at some point s_0 . Set $t_0 = e^{s_0}$. If $t_0 = \delta$ then $\frac{\partial f_\delta(z, e^s)}{\partial s} - c \leq 0$ in $(-\infty, \log \delta]$, in particular by (3.7) $\lambda(z, t_0) < c$. If $t_0 < \delta$, then $\frac{\partial f_\delta(z, e^s)}{\partial s} \Big|_{s=s_0} = c$, and again $\lambda(z, t_0) < c$. Let η and σ be local potentials of α and of ω , respectively, in an open neighborhood of \bar{U} . It follows from inequality (3.5) that the function $\eta(z) + C_0\sigma(z) + f_\delta(z, w) - c \log |w|$ is strictly plurisubharmonic in z and w in an open neighborhood of the point (x_0, t_0) in $X \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$, of the form $V \times \{t_0 - \rho < |w| < t_0 + \rho\}$ for some $\rho > 0$ where

$$C_0 := Ac + K^2\delta^{2\gamma}$$

(recall that $2\gamma = \beta + 1$). If we apply the above to every point $x_0 \in \Omega$, by Kiselman's minimum principle and by (3.5), we have that $\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{c,\delta} \geq -C_0\omega$ in Ω . Moreover $\psi_{c,\delta}(x) \leq f_\delta(x, \delta) - c \log(\delta) \leq 0$ since $\Psi \leq 0$, so, since $X \setminus \Omega$ is a closed analytic set, the estimate $\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{c,\delta} \geq -C_0\omega$ extends to all of X .

Let $\mu := \frac{C_0}{C_0+1}$, so that $0 < \mu < 1$, and consider the function $u = (1 - \mu)\psi_{c,\delta}(z) + \mu\Phi(z)$, then we have $u \leq 0$ and $\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}u \geq (-(1 - \mu)C_0 + \mu)\omega = 0$. So, the function u extends to an α -psh non-positive function on X , in particular $u \leq P(0)$. If $x_0 \in \Omega$, then in local ω normal holomorphic coordinates this gives:

$$P(0)(z) \geq (1 - \mu)\psi_{c,\delta}(z) + \mu\Phi(z) \geq \psi_{c,\delta}(z) + \mu\Phi(z)$$

since $\psi_{c,\delta}(z) \leq 0$. In other words:

$$P(0)(z) \geq \Psi(z, t_0) + K't_0^{2\gamma} - K'\delta^{2\gamma} - c \log(t_0/\delta) + \mu\Phi(z).$$

On the other hand by (3.7), the function $t \rightarrow \Psi(z, t) + K't^{2\gamma}$ is increasing and it coincides with $P(0)(z)$ at $t = 0$, so

$$(3.9) \quad P(0)(z) \leq \Psi(z, t_0) + K't_0^{2\gamma} \leq P(0)(z) + K'\delta^{2\gamma} + c \log(t_0/\delta) - \mu\Phi(z).$$

From (3.9) we first derive

$$c \log(t_0/\delta) \geq -(K'\delta^{2\gamma} + \mu|\Phi(z)|)$$

(recall that $\Phi \leq -1$), which is equivalent to

$$(3.10) \quad \delta \exp\left(-\frac{1}{c}(K'\delta^{2\gamma} + \mu|\Phi(z)|)\right) \leq t_0 \leq \delta.$$

Again from (3.9) we derive:

$$0 \leq \Psi(z, t_0) - P(0)(z) + K't_0^{2\gamma} \leq K'\delta^{2\gamma} + c \log(t_0/\delta) + \mu|\Phi(z)| \leq K'\delta^{2\gamma} + \mu|\Phi(z)|.$$

Observe that $\frac{\mu}{C_0} \leq 1$, and if we let $c = \delta^{2\gamma}$, then $\frac{C_0}{c} = A + K^2$, then $\frac{\mu}{c} \leq A + K^2$ and $K' + \frac{\mu}{c}|\Phi(z)| \leq K' + (A + K^2)|\Phi(z)| \leq B|\Phi(z)|$ where $B > 1$ is constant. We set

$$(3.11) \quad R(x) := B|\Phi(x)|.$$

Therefore

$$(3.12) \quad \delta \exp(-R(z)) \leq t_0 \leq \delta.$$

and

$$(3.13) \quad 0 \leq \frac{\Psi(z, t_0) - P(0)(z) + K't_0^{2\gamma}}{\delta^{2\gamma}} \leq R(z).$$

Observe that the functions Ψ and R are defined in all of Ω not only locally. For fixed $x \in \Omega$ and $0 < \delta' < \exp(-R(x))$ we choose $\delta := \exp(R(x))\delta' < 1$. Observe that by (3.12) we have $\delta' \leq t_0$. Since $\Psi(x, t) + K't^{2\gamma}$ is increasing in t we then get

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{\Psi(x, \delta') - P(0)(x) + K'\delta'^{2\gamma}}{\delta'^{2\gamma}} \\ &\leq \frac{\Psi(x, t_0) - P(0)(x) + K't_0^{2\gamma}}{\delta'^{2\gamma}} \\ &= \exp(2\gamma R(x)) \left(\frac{\Psi(x, t_0) - P(0)(x) + K't_0^{2\gamma}}{\delta^{2\gamma}} \right) \\ &\leq R(x) \exp(2\gamma R(x)) = R(x) \exp((\beta + 1)R(x)). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof by posing $c = \delta^{2\gamma}$, $C_2 = K' = 2K + 2$, $C_1(x) = R(x) \exp((\beta + 1)R(x)) - K'$, $\delta(x) = \exp(-R(x))$. Note that the function $R(x)$ goes to $+\infty$ as x approaches the boundary of Ω , while $\delta(x)$ goes to zero. As already mentioned, $\Omega = X$ if $\{\alpha\}$ is a Kähler class, hence in this case we can find a uniform upper bound for the function $R(x)$ and a (uniform) lower bound for $\delta(x)$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *There exists continuous positive functions $K(x) > 2$, and $\delta(x)$ in Ω of the form $K(x) := LR(x)e^{R(x)}$, and $\delta(x) := Se^{-R(x)}$ with $L > 1$ and $0 < S < \frac{1}{2}$ constants, such that:*

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} &(\alpha(z) + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}\Psi(z, w)) [\theta, \tau]^2 \geq \\ &(- (A\lambda(z, |w|) + K(z)|w|^2) |dz|^2 - K(z)|w||dw|^2) [\theta, \tau]^2 - K(z)|w||\theta||\tau| \\ &\text{if } 0 < |w| < \delta(x). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.6. Since for every point $x_0 \in \Omega$, we work in a neighborhood of x_0 where we choose local holomorphic coordinates which are ω normal at x_0 , if we wish to state Lemma 3.5 in a coordinate-free way we just have to replace $|\theta|^2 = |dz|^2[\theta, \tau]^2$ with $\omega[\theta]^2$ and $|\theta|$ with $\sqrt{\omega[\theta]^2}$.

Proof. We choose as above canonical local holomorphic coordinates (z, ζ) on the tangent bundle of X centered at some point $(x_0, 0)$, where z varies in an open set U , and the coordinates are ω normal at x_0 . Note that for any $z \in U$, $\text{exph}_z(0) = z$ and $(d\text{exph}_z)_0 = Id$. Then, since X is compact, there exists a positive constant S such that for any $|\zeta| < |w| < S$ and for any $z \in U$ the norm of determinant of the real Jacobian of $\text{exph}_z(\zeta)$ as a function of ζ is between $1/2$ and 2 and the function exph_z as a function of ζ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant 2 . Let $B(z, r) := \{z' : |z' - z| < r\}$. Let η be a local potential of α , then $P(0) + \eta$ is psh. Now fix $z_0 \in U$. Recall that for any $j, k = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$\frac{1}{|w|^{2n}} \left| \int_{B(0, |w|)} \frac{\partial^2(P(0) + \eta)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) \right| \leq \frac{C_3}{|w|^{2n}} \int_{B(0, |w|)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta) (\text{exph}_{z_0}(\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta),$$

where $d\lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure and C_3 is a positive constant. Here $\Delta := \sum_j \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j}$.

On the other hand, by the uniform bounds on the determinant of the real Jacobian and on the Lipschitz constant on \exp_{z_0} we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{C_3}{|w|^{2n}} \int_{B(0,|w|)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(\exp_{z_0}(\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) \\ & \leq \frac{C'_3}{|w|^{2n}} \int_{B(0,|w|)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(\exp_{z_0}(\zeta)) |\det(\text{Jac}_{\mathbb{R}} \exp_{z_0})| d\lambda(\zeta) \\ & = \frac{C'_3}{|w|^{2n}} \int_{\exp_{z_0}(B(0,|w|))} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(u) d\lambda(u). \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$|\exp_{z_0}(\zeta) - \exp_{z_0}(0)| = |\exp_{z_0}(\zeta) - z_0| \leq 2|\zeta| \leq 2|w| \quad \text{on } |\zeta| < |w|.$$

This means that $\exp_{z_0}(B(0,|w|)) \subseteq B(z_0, 2|w|)$. Therefore

$$\frac{C'_3}{|w|^{2n}} \int_{\exp_{z_0}(B(0,|w|))} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(u) d\lambda(u) \leq \frac{C'_3}{|w|^{2n}} \int_{B(z_0, 2|w|)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(u) d\lambda(u).$$

Given $0 < a < 1, t > 0, \gamma \in [0, 1]$, by (3.2) and by [4, eq. (1.16)] we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Psi(z_0, t) - P(0)(z_0)}{t^{2\gamma}} &= \frac{\Psi(P(0) + \eta)(z_0, t) - P(0)(z_0) - \eta(z_0)}{t^{2\gamma}} - O(t^{2-2\gamma}) \\ &\geq \frac{C_5(a)}{t^{2\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{(at)^{2n-2}} \int_{B(z_0, at)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(u) d\lambda(u) \right) - C_4 t^{2-2\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

for positive constants $C_4, C_5(a)$.

The previous inequality with $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}, 0 < a < 1, t > 0$, gives

$$\frac{\Psi(z_0, t) - P(0)(z_0)}{t} \geq a^2 C_5(a) \left(\frac{1}{(at)^{2n}} \int_{B(z_0, at)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(u) d\lambda(u) \right) t - C_4 t.$$

Since condition I_0 holds, thanks to Lemma 3.4 we can ensure that $II_{1/2}$ holds as well. Thus we have (3.14) with $t = \delta' < \delta(x)$ and $\gamma = 1/2$:

$$0 \leq \frac{\Psi(z_0, t) - P(0)(z_0) + K't}{t} \leq R(z_0) \exp(R(z_0)).$$

Combining the above inequalities we get

$$R(z_0) \exp(R(z_0)) - K' + C_4 t \geq a^2 C_5(a) \left(\frac{1}{(at)^{2n}} \int_{B(z_0, at)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(u) d\lambda(u) \right) t,$$

i.e.

$$0 \leq \left(\frac{1}{(at)^{2n}} \int_{B(z_0, at)} \Delta(P(0) + \eta)(u) d\lambda(u) \right) \leq \frac{R(z_0) \exp(R(z_0)) - K' + (\frac{C_4}{a})at}{(aC_5(a))at}.$$

Taking $a = 1/2, at = 2|w|$, for any $j, k = 1, \dots, n$ we get:

$$\frac{1}{|w|^{2n}} \left| \int_{B(0,|w|)} \frac{\partial^2(P(0) + \eta)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k}(\exp_{z_0}(\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) \right| \leq C_6 |w|^{-1} (R(z_0) \exp(R(z_0)) - K' + 4C_4 |w|).$$

Observe that all the above constants are independent on the choice of the point $z_0 \in U$. Now we consider the global function $M(z) := B'R(z) \exp R(z)$, where $B' > 1$ is a constant such that

$$M(z) > C_6(R(z) \exp(R(z)) - K' + 4C_4).$$

Since $|w| \leq 1$, it then follows that for any j, k

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial^2(P(0) + \eta)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) &= \frac{1}{|w|^{2n}} \int_{B(0,|w|)} \frac{\partial^2(P(0) + \eta)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) \\ &\leq M(z_0)|w|^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality ensures that

$$\int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial^2(P(0) + \eta)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) = O(M(z_0)|w|^{-1}).$$

Moreover, the fact that $\int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial^2 \eta}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) = O(1)$ gives for small $|w|$

$$(3.16) \quad \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial^2 P(0)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) = O(M(z_0)|w|^{-1}).$$

Observe that, a priori, by [17, eq. (3.11)] we only have that the left hand side quantity is $O(|w|^{-2})$.

We now follow the arguments in the proof of [17, Theorem 4.1]. By [17, Proposition 3.8] we have that

$$\partial \bar{\partial}_{(z,w)} \Psi(z, w) [\theta, \tau]^2 \Big|_{z=z_0} = \int_{\zeta \in T_{z_0} X} \partial \bar{\partial}_{(z,w)} P(0) (\tau' \wedge \bar{\tau}' + |w|^2 V)_{\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)} \chi(|\zeta|^2) dV_\omega + O(|w|^{N-1})$$

where N is a positive integer and the vector fields τ' and V are the ones defined at [17, page 8]. We observe that such vector fields depends on N (the multi-indexes α, β are indeed such that $2 \leq |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq N$). In order to obtain the estimates we want, we need to apply [17, Proposition 3.8] with $N = 3$, whereas Demailly applies it with $N = 2$. On the other hand, by the observation in the last lines of the proof of [17, Proposition 3.8] we know that when we increase N by one unit (in this case from 2 to 3) the contribution of the additional terms (which corresponds to the contribution of all multi-indexes α, β with $|\alpha|$ and $|\beta|$ equal to $N + 1 = 3$) in the expansion of $\partial \bar{\partial} \Psi(P(0))_{(z,w)}$ are of the form

$$\left(\int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial^2 P(0)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) \right) O(|w|^3).$$

By (3.16) these terms are of type $O(M(z_0)|w|^2)$.

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.17) \quad \partial \bar{\partial}_{(z,w)} \Psi(z, w) [\theta, \tau]^2 \Big|_{z=z_0} \\ = \int_{\zeta \in T_{z_0} X} \partial \bar{\partial}_{(z,w)} P(0) (\tau' \wedge \bar{\tau}' + |w|^2 V)_{\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)} \chi(|\zeta|^2) dV_\omega + O(M(z_0)|w|^2) + O(|w|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the vector fields τ' and V are the ones defined with $N = 2$.

In the proof of [17, Theorem 4.1] the estimates for $\partial \bar{\partial}_{(z,w)} \Psi(z, w) [\theta, \tau]^2$ are given up to terms $O(|w|)$ (coming from [17, Proposition 3.8] applied with $N = 2$), and up to a term of the form

$$\left(\int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial^2 P(0)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k} (\text{exph}_{z_0}(w\zeta)) d\lambda(\zeta) \right) O(|w|^3).$$

Therefore applying [17, Proposition 3.8] with $N = 3$ and observing that in our case the latter term is $O(M(z_0)|w|^2)$ thanks to (3.16), we can use the arguments in the proof of [17, Theorem 4.1] to estimate $\partial \bar{\partial}_{(z,w)} \Psi(z, w) [\theta, \tau]^2$ adding an error term of the form $O(M(z)|w|^2)$.

Thus [17, eq. (4.3)] and the formula $\tau = \theta + \eta\zeta + O(|w|)$ at the end of page 14 in [17] give that

$$(\alpha(z) + i\partial \bar{\partial}_{(z,w)} \Psi(z, w)) [\theta, \tau]^2 \geq$$

$$- (A\lambda(z, |w|) + C|w|^2) |dz|^2 - CM(z)|w|^2 (|dz|^2 + |dw|^2) [\theta, \tau]^2 - K''(|\theta||\tau| + |\tau|^2)$$

where $C > 0$ and $|w| < \delta_0 \leq 1$. Thanks to [17, eq. (3.11)] and (3.16), the coefficient K'' is of the form $O(M(z))|w|$. Moreover, we observe that the coefficient of $|dz|^2$ is of that form because of (3.3) and we stress again that the term $CM(z)|w|^2 (|dz|^2 + |dw|^2)$ in the lower bound comes from (3.17).

Now, besides the dependence on $M(z_0)$, as we already saw in the proof of Lemma 3.1, the various “ O -terms” are uniformly bounded, thus $O(|w|^2)$ is bounded by $C|w|^2(|\theta|^2 + |\tau|^2)$ for some positive constant C . Finally we collect together all terms multiplying $|\theta|^2$, all terms multiplying $|\eta|^2$, and all terms multiplying $|\theta||\tau|$. The estimate in (3.15) then holds with $0 < |w| < Se^{-R(z)}$ and $K(z) := LM(z)$ for some positive constant L . \square

3.1. The Kähler case. In the Kähler case the lower bound (3.15) holds with constant coefficients. This allows us to reprove regularity in the Kähler case in the spirit of [4].

Corollary 3.7. *If $\{\alpha\}$ is a Kähler class, then the estimates I_1 and II_1 with constant coefficients holds on X . In particular the function $P(0)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ on X .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 we have I_0 . Since the class $\{\alpha\}$ is Kähler, Lemma 3.4 ensures that $II_{1/2}$ holds with constant coefficients (i.e. with $C_1(x), \delta(x)$ constants). Using the arguments in Lemma 3.5 we derive (3.15) where, since $\{\alpha\}$ is Kähler, the function $R(x)$ is uniformly bounded from above by a big positive constant, hence inequality I_1 holds with constant coefficients. Then by Lemma 3.4 we have II_1 . By Lemma 3.3 we conclude that $P(0)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$. \square

The corollary above was also proved in [7] using Monge-Ampère equations and the so-called β -convergence.

4. LOWER BOUND OF THE HESSIAN II: THE TRICK OF THE LINE BUNDLE

The same arguments in Corollary 3.7 can not be used in the big case since the coefficients appearing in the lower bound of the hessian are functions that explodes when approaching the boundary of Ω . The idea is then to work on a high power of a suitable line bundle in order to “kill” such functions after a change of coordinates. After that, the reasoning will be similar to the above.

As mentioned in Section 2, the Kähler current $T = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi$ can be chosen to have analytic singularities along Σ , so there exists a modification $q : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$, (which is a sequence of blow-ups with smooth center) such that $q^*T = \tilde{\omega} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} c_j [D_j]$, where c_j are positive real numbers, $\tilde{\omega}$ is a semipositive smooth real closed $(1, 1)$ -form and $[D_j]$ is the current of integration along an irreducible divisor D_j [19, Theorem 3.4]. Moreover the map q gives a biholomorphism between $q^{-1}(\Omega)$ and Ω . Observe that if φ is a non-positive α -psh function of X , then $\varphi \circ q$ is a non-positive $q^*\alpha$ -psh function on \tilde{X} . Vice-versa if ψ is non-positive $(q^*\alpha)$ -psh on \tilde{X} , then the restriction of ψ to $q^{-1}(\Omega)$ is of the form $\varphi \circ q$ for some non-positive α -psh function φ on Ω . Such function φ can be extended to all of X , since $\Sigma = X \setminus \Omega$ is a closed pluripolar subset, hence $\psi = \varphi \circ q$ in all of X . It follows that the largest non-positive $(q^*\alpha)$ -psh function on \tilde{X} is $P(0) \circ q$. Since q gives a biholomorphism from $q^{-1}(\Omega)$ to Ω , showing that $P(0)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ in Ω is equivalent to show that so is $P(0) \circ q$ in $q^{-1}(\Omega)$. In the sequel we will then assume $X = \tilde{X}$, $q = Id_X$, $\Sigma = \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} D_j$, and $T = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi = \tilde{\omega} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} c_j [D_j]$.

Also, recall that if h is an hermitian metric on an holomorphic line bundle L , and σ is a non-zero holomorphic section of L , then the Poincaré-Lelong formula gives $[D] = \frac{i}{2\pi} (\Theta_h + \partial\bar{\partial} \log |\sigma|_h^2)$, where Θ_h is the curvature of h and D is the zero set of σ . In particular if L_j, σ_j are, respectively, the line bundle and the holomorphic section associated to the divisor D_j and h_j is a smooth hermitian metric on L_j , we have

$$T = \tilde{\omega} + \frac{i}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \left(\Theta_{h_j} + \partial\bar{\partial} \log |\sigma_j|_{h_j}^2 \right) = \alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi.$$

Then $i\partial\bar{\partial}\left(\sum_j \frac{c_j}{2\pi} \log |\sigma_j|_{h_j}^2 - \Phi\right)$ is smooth, hence

$$\Phi = \sum_j \frac{c_j}{2\pi} \log |\sigma_j|_{h_j}^2 + \text{a smooth function on } X.$$

Given $p \in \Sigma$, let $U_p(1)$ and $U_p(2), U_p(3)$ open neighbourhoods of p such that $U_p(2)$ is relatively compact in $U_p(1)$, and $U_p(3)$ is relatively compact in $U_p(2)$. Assume that there exists in $U_p(1)$ holomorphic local coordinates z for X and holomorphic nowhere zero sections of L_j .

Let $\{V'_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ be a finite sub-covering of the covering $\{U_p(2)\}_{p \in \Sigma}$ of Σ , and set $\{V_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ the corresponding sub-covering of $\{U_p(1)\}_{p \in \Sigma}$.

Let $U = \bigcup_{p \in \Sigma} U_p(3)$, and $\tilde{H} = X \setminus U$, then \tilde{H} is compact. Given $q \in \tilde{H}$, let $U_q(1)$ and $U_q(2)$ open neighborhoods of q such that $U_q(2)$ is relatively compact in $U_q(1)$, $\overline{U_q(1)} \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ and assume that in $U_q(1)$ there exists holomorphic local coordinates z and holomorphic nowhere zero sections of L_j . Let $\{V'_i\}_{\ell+1 \leq i \leq r}$ be a finite sub covering of the covering $\{U_q(2)\}_{q \in \tilde{H}}$ of \tilde{H} , and set $\{V_i\}_{\ell+1 \leq i \leq r}$ the corresponding subcovering of $\{U_q(1)\}_{q \in \tilde{H}}$.

Then we obtain $\{V_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ and $\{V'_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ finite open coverings of X , with the following properties:

1. V'_i is relatively compact in V_i , for $1 \leq i \leq r$,
2. $\{V'_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ covers Σ ,
3. $\overline{V_i} \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ for $\ell + 1 \leq i \leq r$,
4. there exist local holomorphic coordinates z on the open set V_i , and nowhere zero holomorphic sections $\eta_{i,j}$ of the line bundle $L_j|_{V_i}$.

Therefore we have

$$(4.1) \quad 0 < a_{i,j} < |\eta_{i,j}|_{h_i}^2 < b_{i,j}.$$

on V'_i for $1 \leq i \leq r$, for some positive constants $a_{i,j}, b_{i,j}$. Let $g_{i,j} := \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\eta_{i,j}^2}$. By rescaling the section σ_j (if necessary) we can assume that $|\sigma_j|_{h_j}^2 < \frac{1}{2}(\min_i a_{i,j})$. Recall that the covering $\{V'_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ is finite. Then by construction it follows that $|g_{i,j}| < 1/2$ on V'_i . Moreover $g_{i,j}$ is holomorphic, it is nowhere zero on $V'_i \setminus D_j$ and $g_{i,j} \equiv 0$ on $V'_i \cap D_j$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $1 \leq j \leq N$.

Also, by definition on V'_i , we can re-write Φ as

$$(4.2) \quad \Phi = \sum_j \frac{c_j}{2\pi} \log |g_{i,j}| + \text{a smooth bounded function on } V'_i.$$

for $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Given a positive integer m to be suitably chosen later, we let

$$L = (L_1 \otimes L_2 \dots \otimes L_N)^{2m},$$

with its holomorphic section $s := (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \dots \otimes \sigma_N)^{2m}$. Let L^* the dual bundle of L . Let $h = (h_1 \otimes h_2 \dots \otimes h_N)^{2m}$ be the corresponding hermitian metric on L , and let h^* be the dual metric on L^* . Let $M(L^*)$ be the total space of the line bundle L^* and $\pi : M(L^*) \rightarrow X$ be the natural projection. Set

$$W := \{\beta \in M(L^*) \setminus \{\text{zero section}\} : 0 < |\beta(s(\pi(\beta)))| < S e^{-R(\pi(\beta))}, \pi(\beta) \in \Omega\},$$

where S is the constant appearing in Lemma 3.5. Let $\tilde{\Psi} : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ give by

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\beta) =: \Psi(\pi(\beta), \beta(s(\pi(\beta)))).$$

The map $\tilde{\Psi}$ is smooth and for all β in $M(L^*) \setminus \{\text{zero section}\}$ we have $\lim_{\xi \in \mathbb{C}, \xi \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\Psi}(\xi\beta) = P(0)(\pi(\beta))$.

On each open set $V'_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ we have a natural trivialization of L^* given by $(z, \xi) \rightarrow (z, \xi \eta^*(z))$, where η^* is the dual section of $\eta := (\eta_{i,1} \otimes \eta_{i,2} \otimes \dots \otimes \eta_{i,N})^{2m}$. Then in local holomorphic coordinates we have

$$\tilde{\Psi}(z, \xi) = \Psi(z, G_i(z)\xi) \quad \text{on } V'_i$$

where $G_i = (g_{i,1} \ g_{i,2} \ \dots \ g_{i,N})^m$.

In the following we aim at computing the complex hessian of $\tilde{\Psi}$ in these coordinates.

Recall that the map $(z, \xi) \rightarrow (z, G_i(z)\xi)$ is holomorphic, hence if (θ, τ) is a tangent vector to a point in V'_i with θ tangent to X , and $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$, then the Levi form of $\tilde{\Psi}$ computed at the point (z, ξ) on the vector (θ, τ) is the Levi form of Ψ computed at the point $(z, G_i(z)\xi)$ on the vector

$$(4.3) \quad \text{Jac}(z, G_i(z)\xi)(\theta, \tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \theta \\ \xi d_z G_i(\theta) + G_i(z)\tau \end{pmatrix}$$

where Jac is the holomorphic Jacobian.

Moreover, since for $1 \leq i \leq r$ the open set V'_i is relatively compact in V_i and both ω and $|dz|^2$ are Kähler forms in V_i , then $\frac{|dz|^2}{M} \leq \omega \leq M|dz|^2$ on each V'_i for some real number $M > 1$. Since the covering is finite we may choose M independent of i .

We then obtain the lower bound for the hessian of Ψ in the coordinates on each V'_i . More precisely, Lemma 3.5, Remark 3.6 and the above observation insures that, up to replacing A with AM , and $K(z)$ with $K(z)M$ (but keeping the same name $A, K(z)$) we have

$$(4.4) \quad (\alpha(z) + \partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,w)}\Psi(z, w)) [\theta, \tau]^2 \geq (- (A\lambda(z, |w|) + K(z)|w|^2) |dz|^2 - K(z)|w||dw|^2) [\theta, \tau]^2 - K(z)|w||\theta||\tau|$$

where $K(z) = LR(z)e^{R(z)}$, $L > 1$, and $0 < |w| < Se^{-R(z)}$.

If $\beta \in W$, let (z, ξ) are the coordinates of β in the open set V'_i , then from (4.4) and (4.3), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha(z) + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,\xi)}\tilde{\Psi}(z, \xi)) [\theta, \tau]^2 \\ & \geq - (A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)||\xi|) + K(z)|G_i(z)|^2|\xi|^2) |\theta|^2 - K(z)|\xi||G_i(z)||\xi d_z G_i(\theta) + G_i(z)\tau|^2 \\ & \quad - K(z)|\xi||G_i(z)||\theta||\xi d_z G_i(\theta) + G_i(z)\tau| \\ & \geq - (A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)||\xi|) + K(z)|G_i(z)|^2|\xi|^2) |\theta|^2 - K(z)|\xi||G_i(z)|(|\xi|^2|d_z G_i(\theta)|^2 + |G_i(z)|^2|\tau|^2 \\ & \quad + 2|\xi||G_i(z)||d_z G_i(\theta)||\tau|) - K(z)|\xi||G_i(z)||\theta||\xi||d_z G_i(\theta)| - K(z)|\xi||G_i(z)||\theta||G_i(z)||\tau| \\ & \geq - (A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)||\xi|) + K_1(z, \xi)) |\xi|^2|\theta|^2 - K_2(z)|\xi||\tau|^2 - K_3(z, \xi)|\xi||\theta||\tau| \\ & \geq - (A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)||\xi|) + K_1(z)) |\xi|^2|\theta|^2 - K_2(z)|\xi||\tau|^2 - K_3(z)|\xi||\theta||\tau|. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} K_1(z, \xi) &:= K(z)(|G_i(z)|^2 + |\xi||G_i(z)||d_z G_i|^2 + |G_i||d_z G_i|) \\ &\leq K(z)(|G_i(z)|^2 + |d_z G_i|^2 + |G_i||d_z G_i|) := K_1(z) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since $|G_i(z)||\xi| \leq 1$ and $|d_z G_i(\theta)| \leq |d_z G_i||\theta|$;

$$K_2(z) := K(z)|G_i(z)|^3$$

and

$$K_3(z, \xi) := K(z)|G_i(z)|(|G_i(z)| + 2|\xi||G_i(z)||d_z G_i|) \leq K(z)|G_i(z)|(|G_i(z)| + 2|d_z G_i|) := K_3(z)$$

where the inequality follows again from the fact that $|G_i(z)||\xi| \leq 1$. Thus

$$(\alpha(z) + i\partial\bar{\partial}_{(z,\xi)}\tilde{\Psi}(z, \xi)) [\theta, \tau]^2 \geq$$

$$- (A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)| |\xi|) + K_1(z) |\xi|^2) |\theta|^2 - K_2(z) |\xi| |\tau|^2 - K_3(z) |\xi| |\theta| |\tau|.$$

We claim that we can choose the positive integer m so large that $K(z)|G_i(z)|$ and $K(z)|d_z G_i|$ go to zero as z approaches the set Σ . This would imply that $K_1(z), K_2(z), K_3(z)$ will also go to zero as z approaches Σ .

Now recall that $K(z) = L(Re^R)(z) \leq Le^{2R}(z)$, $R = B|\Phi|$ ($B > 1$) and by (4.2) $R \leq T_1 \sum_j \log(1/|g_{i,j}|)$. This means that $K(z) \leq \frac{T_2}{(g_{i,1}g_{i,2}\dots g_{i,N})^{T_3}}$, with T_1, T_2, T_3 positive constants. Then choosing $m > T_3 + 1$ we have the claim.

On the other hand the functions $K(z)G_i(z)$, and $K(z)|d_z G_i|$ are bounded also on V'_i for $l+1 \leq i \leq r$ since $\overline{V'_i} \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ for $i \geq l+1$. We can then infer that $K_1(z) \leq H, K_2(z) \leq H|G_i(z)|^2$ and $K_3(z) \leq H|G_i(z)|$ on each V'_i for $1 \leq i \leq r$ with H positive constant. Combining all the above we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (4.5) \quad & i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{\Psi}(z, \xi)[\theta, \tau]^2 \\ & \geq -\alpha[\theta]^2 - (A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + H|\xi|^2) |\theta|^2 - H|G_i(z)|^2 |\xi| |\tau|^2 - H|G_i| |\xi| |\theta| |\tau| \\ & \geq -\alpha[\theta]^2 - \left(A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + \left(H + \frac{1}{2} \right) |\xi|^2 \right) |\theta|^2 - \left(H|G_i(z)|^2 |\xi| + \frac{1}{2} H^2 |G_i(z)|^2 \right) |\tau|^2. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $H|G_i| |\xi| |\theta| |\tau| \leq \frac{1}{2} (|\xi|^2 |\theta|^2 + H^2 |G_i|^2 |\tau|^2)$.

We also claim that there exists a positive constant $k_0 > 1$ such that for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, the quantity $\frac{e^{-k_0 R(z)}}{|G_i(z)|}$ goes to zero when z goes to Σ .

To prove the claim we observe that on V'_i for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we have:

$$-R = B\Phi \leq \frac{B}{2\pi} \left(\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} c_j \right) \sum_j \log |g_{i,j}| + T_4 := T_5 \sum_j \log |g_{i,j}| + T_4$$

with T_4, T_5 positive constants, since by construction $|g_{i,j}| < 1/2$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq j \leq N$. It follows that

$$\frac{e^{-k_0 R}}{|G_i|} \leq e^{k_0 T_4} |g_{i,1} g_{i,2} \dots g_{i,N}|^{k_0 T_5 - m}.$$

It is then sufficient to choose $k_0 > \frac{m}{T_5} + 1$. Hence, we infer $\frac{e^{-k_0 R}}{|G_i|} < T_6$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$, with T_6 positive constant.

We fix δ real number with $0 < \delta < S$ and we let

$$W_\delta := \{\beta \in M(L^*) \setminus \{\text{zero section}\} : 0 < |\beta(s(\pi(\beta)))| < e^{-k_0 R(\pi(\beta))} \delta, \pi(\beta) \in \Omega\}.$$

Note that since $k_0 > 1$, $W_\delta \subseteq W$. Fix $\beta \in W_\delta$, it follows that if (z, ξ) are the local coordinates of β in V'_i we have: $|\xi| < T_6 \delta$.

We consider the function $\tilde{f} : W_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\tilde{f}(\beta) := \tilde{\Psi}(\beta) + \tilde{K}' |\beta(s(\pi(\beta)))|^2$, with \tilde{K}' a (big enough) positive constant. In local coordinates:

$$\tilde{f}(z, \xi) = \tilde{\Psi}(z, \xi) + \tilde{K}' |G_i(z)|^2 |\xi|^2.$$

Using (4.3), we compute the complex Hessian of \tilde{f} (w.r.t. (z, ξ)):

$$(4.6) \quad i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{f}[\theta, \tau]^2 = i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{\Psi}[\theta, \tau]^2 + \tilde{K}' |\xi|^2 |d_z G_i(\theta)|^2 + \tilde{K}' |G_i(z)|^2 |\tau|^2 + 2\tilde{K}' \Re(\overline{G_i(z)} d_z G_i(\theta) \xi \bar{\tau}).$$

Then from (4.5) and (4.6):

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{f}[\theta, \tau]^2 & \geq -\alpha[\theta]^2 - (A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + (H + 1/2)|\xi|^2) |\theta|^2 - (H|G_i(z)|^2 |\xi| + 1/2 H^2 |G_i(z)|^2) |\tau|^2 \\ & \quad + \tilde{K}' |\xi|^2 |d_z G_i(\theta)|^2 + \tilde{K}' |G_i(z)|^2 |\tau|^2 + 2\tilde{K}' \Re(\overline{G_i(z)} d_z G_i(\theta) \xi \bar{\tau}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand since $|d_z G_i(\theta)| \leq |d_z G_i||\theta|$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tilde{K}'|\Re(d_z G_i(\theta)\overline{G_i(z)}\xi\bar{\tau})| &\leq 2\tilde{K}'|G_i(z)||d_z G_i||\theta||\xi||\tau| \\ &\leq \tilde{K}'^2|d_z G_i|^2|\xi|^2|\theta|^2 + |G_i|^2|\tau|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since for $\beta \in W_\delta$ we have $|\xi| < T_6\delta < T_6$, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{f}[\theta, \tau]^2 &\geq -\alpha[\theta]^2 - \left(A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + (H + 1/2 + (\tilde{K}'^2 + K')|d_z G_i|^2)|\xi|^2 \right) |\theta|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\tilde{K}'|G_i(z)|^2 - |G_i(z)|^2 - (H|G_i(z)|^2|\xi| + 1/2H^2|G_i(z)|^2) \right) |\tau|^2 \\ &\geq -\alpha[\theta]^2 - \left(A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + (H + 1/2 + (\tilde{K}'^2 + K')|d_z G_i|^2)|\xi|^2 \right) |\theta|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\tilde{K}'|G_i(z)|^2 - |G_i(z)|^2 - (HT_6|G_i(z)|^2 + 1/2H^2|G_i(z)|^2) \right) |\tau|^2 \\ &= -\alpha[\theta]^2 - \left(A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + (H + 1/2 + (\tilde{K}'^2 + K')|d_z G_i|^2)|\xi|^2 \right) |\theta|^2 \\ &\quad + |G_i(z)|^2 \left(\tilde{K}' - 1 - HT_6 - 1/2H^2 \right) |\tau|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We choose \tilde{K}' such that $\left(\tilde{K}' - 1 - HT_6 - \frac{1}{2}H^2 \right) > 0$ and such that $\tilde{K}' - K > 0$ (where K is the constant appearing in (2.1)). We also choose K^* such that $K^* > H + \frac{1}{2} + (\tilde{K}'^2 + \tilde{K}')|d_z G_i|^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Finally we find:

$$(4.7) \quad i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{f}[\theta, \tau]^2 > -\alpha[\theta]^2 - \left(A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + K^*|\xi|^2 \right) |\theta|^2.$$

Also we recall that ω and $|dz|^2$ are Kähler forms on V_i , hence $\frac{\omega}{|dz|^2}$ is bounded on V_i' . So by multiplying A and K^* by the same big positive constant (but keeping the same name A and K^*) we obtain:

$$(4.8) \quad i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{f}[\theta, \tau]^2 > -\alpha[\theta]^2 - \left(A\lambda(z, |G_i(z)\xi|) + K^*|\xi|^2 \right) \omega[\theta]^2.$$

We now fix $x_0 \in \Omega$ and we look at the restriction of \tilde{f} to the fiber over x_0 of $\pi : W_\delta \rightarrow \Omega$ as a function of $u := \log |\beta(s(x_0))|$. Since $W_\delta \subseteq W$, such restriction h_{x_0} is well defined on $]-\infty, -k_0R(x_0) + \log \delta[$. Then h_{x_0} is strictly increasing with respect to u , since thanks to (2.1), the first derivative of h_{x_0} is $\lambda(x_0, e^u) + 2(\tilde{K}' - K)e^{2u}$. Observe that by construction the function $\tilde{f} : W_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is invariant under the natural S^1 action on $M(L^*) \setminus \{\text{zero section}\}$.

Now fix $c > 0$. Since the Lelong number of $P(0)$ at x_0 is zero we have that

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\partial(h_{x_0}(u) - cu)}{\partial u} = -c.$$

This means that the function $h_{x_0}(u) - cu$ is either decreasing on the whole interval $]-\infty, -k_0R(x_0) + \log \delta[$, and in this case $u_0 = -k_0R(x_0) + \log(\delta)$; or $h_{x_0}(u) - cu$ has a minimum value $u_0 < -k_0R(x_0) + \log \delta$. In both cases $\lambda(x_0, e^{u_0}) \leq c$. (Note that u_0 depends on x_0).

However, since $\tilde{\Psi} \leq 0$ and $e^{-k_0R(x_0)}\delta < \delta$, by definition of \tilde{f} we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{x_0}(u_0) - cu_0 &\leq h_{x_0}(-k_0R(x_0) + \log \delta) - c(-k_0R(x_0) + \log \delta) \\ &\leq \tilde{K}'e^{-2k_0R(x_0)}\delta^2 - c(-k_0R(x_0) + \log \delta) \\ &\leq \tilde{K}'\delta^2 - c(-k_0R(x_0) + \log \delta) \\ &\leq \tilde{K}'\delta^2 + ck_0R(x_0) - c \log \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$(4.9) \quad h_{x_0}(u_0) - cu_0 - \tilde{K}'\delta^2 - c(k_0R(x_0) - \log \delta) \leq 0.$$

Since the function $\beta \rightarrow \beta(s(\pi(\beta)))$, is holomorphic and nowhere zero on W_δ , by formula (4.8) and the fact that $|\xi| \leq T_6\delta$, we see that in coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial\bar{\partial}(\tilde{f} - c\log|\beta(s(\pi(\beta)))|) &= i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{f} > -\alpha - (A\lambda(\pi(\beta), \beta(s(\pi(\beta))) + K^*|\xi|^2)\omega \\ &\geq -\alpha - (A\lambda(\pi(\beta), \beta(s(\pi(\beta))) + K^*T_6^2\delta^2)\omega \end{aligned}$$

Set $K^{**} = K^*T_6^2$ and let η, σ be the local potentials of α and ω respectively. It then follows that the function $\tilde{f} + (Ac + K^{**}\delta^2)\sigma \circ \pi + \eta \circ \pi$ is strictly psh in a neighborhood of a point $\beta_0 \in W_\delta$ such that $\pi(\beta_0) = x_0$ and $\log|\beta_0(s(x_0))| = u_0$.

Since \tilde{f} is invariant under rotations, we can apply Kiselman minimum principle on an invariant neighbourhood of a point β with $\pi(\beta) = x$ to prove that the function $\tilde{\psi} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by

$$\tilde{\psi}(x) := \inf \left\{ \tilde{f}(\beta) - c\log|\beta(s(x))|, \quad \beta \in W_\delta : \pi(\beta) = x \right\}$$

satisfies the inequality

$$(4.10) \quad i\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{\psi} \geq -C_0^*\omega - \alpha$$

in a neighborhood of x_0 , with

$$C_0^* = Ac + K^{**}\delta^2.$$

But x_0 is arbitrary so this inequality holds on all of Ω .

Moreover by (4.9) we find

$$\tilde{\psi}(x) - \tilde{K}'\delta^2 - c(k_0R(x) - \log\delta) \leq 0$$

We can rewrite this inequality as:

$$Q(x) := \tilde{\psi}(x) + ck_0B\Phi(x) + c\log\delta - \tilde{K}'\delta^2 \leq 0.$$

Thanks to (4.10) and the fact that $i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi \geq \omega - \alpha$ we obtain

$$(1 + ck_0B)\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}Q \geq -C_0^*\omega + ck_0B\omega \geq -C_0^*\omega.$$

Now we choose $\tilde{\mu} := \frac{C_0^*}{C_0^* + 1 + ck_0B}$, and we note that $0 < \tilde{\mu} < 1$. Then the function $v := (1 - \tilde{\mu})Q + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)\Phi$ is $(1 + ck_0B)\alpha$ psh and $v \leq 0$.

Then v extends to a non-positive $(1 + ck_0B)\alpha$ psh function on X , so that

$$(4.11) \quad v \leq (1 + ck_0B)P(0) \leq P(0)$$

since $P(0) \leq 0$. In other words, since $Q \leq 0$,

$$P(0) \geq (1 - \tilde{\mu})Q + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)\Phi \geq Q + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)\Phi$$

so

$$(4.12) \quad P(0) \geq \tilde{\psi} + ck_0B\Phi + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)\Phi + c\log\delta - \tilde{K}'\delta^2.$$

Now the function $\tilde{f}(\beta)$ with $\pi(\beta) = x$, depends only on $\|\beta\|_{h^*}$ (where h^* is the dual metric on L^* introduced above). As function of $\|\beta\|_{h^*}$, \tilde{f} is decreasing and it converges to $P(0)(x)$ when β goes to zero along $\pi^{-1}(x)$. Then $P(0)(x) \leq \tilde{f}(\beta_0) = \tilde{\psi}(x) + cu_0$, by definition of u_0 and $\tilde{\psi}$. Combining this with (4.12)

$$P(0) - cu_0 \leq \tilde{\psi} \leq P(0) - ck_0B\Phi - \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)\Phi - c\log\delta + \tilde{K}'\delta^2.$$

Now $\Phi \leq -1$ and $P(0)$ is finite in Ω , then

$$u_0 \geq - \left(k_0B|\Phi| + \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{c}(1 + ck_0B)|\Phi| - \log\delta + \tilde{K}'\frac{\delta^2}{c} \right).$$

If we set $c = \delta^2$ we derive $\frac{\bar{\mu}}{c} \leq A + K^{**}$. We also set $t_0 = e^{u_0}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} t_0 &\geq \exp \left(- \left((A + K^{**})(1 + ck_0B)|\Phi| + k_0B|\Phi| + \tilde{K}' \right) \right) \delta \\ &\geq \exp \left(- \left((A + K^{**})(1 + k_0B)|\Phi| + k_0B|\Phi| + \tilde{K}' \right) \right) \delta \end{aligned}$$

since $c = \delta^2 < 1$.

On the other hand $t_0 \leq \exp(-k_0R(x))\delta \leq \delta$, hence if we set

$$F(x) := \left((A + K^{**})(1 + k_0B)|\Phi(x)| + k_0B|\Phi(x)| + \tilde{K}' \right)$$

we have $F > 0$ and $e^{-F(x)}\delta \leq t_0 \leq \delta$.

Let V be a relatively compact open subset of Ω , and assume $0 < F \leq M$ on V , then

$$(4.13) \quad e^{-M}\delta \leq t_0 \leq \delta$$

on V .

However by (4.12), for $x \in V$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \tilde{\psi}(x) - P(0)(x) + ck_0B\Phi(x) + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)\Phi(x) + c \log \delta - \tilde{K}'\delta^2 \\ &= \tilde{f}(\beta_0) - c \log t_0 - P(0)(x) + ck_0B\Phi(x) + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0T_1)\Phi(x) + c \log \delta - \tilde{K}'\delta^2 \\ &= \Psi(x, t_0) + \tilde{K}'t_0^2 - P(0)(x) - c \log t_0 + ck_0B\Phi(x) + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)\Phi(x) + c \log \delta - \tilde{K}'\delta^2 \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\Psi(x, t_0) + \tilde{K}'t_0^2 - P(0)(x) \leq c \log t_0 + ck_0B|\Phi|(x) + \tilde{\mu}(1 + ck_0B)|\Phi|(x) - c \log \delta + \tilde{K}'\delta^2.$$

Then, since $c = \delta^2 < 1$ and $\frac{\bar{\mu}}{c} \leq A + K^{**}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Psi(x, t_0) + \tilde{K}'t_0^2 - P(0)(x)}{\delta^2} &\leq \log \frac{t_0}{\delta} + k_0B|\Phi|(x) + (A + K^{**})(1 + k_0B)|\Phi|(x) + \tilde{K}' \\ &\leq k_0B|\Phi|(x) + (A + K^{**})(1 + k_0B)|\Phi|(x) + \tilde{K}' \\ &= F(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{\Psi(x, t_0) + \tilde{K}'t_0^2 - P(0)(x)}{\delta^2} \leq M$$

on the relatively compact open subset V on Ω chosen above.

Now recall that the function $t \rightarrow \Psi(x, t) + \tilde{K}'t^2$ is increasing and it is greater or equal to $P(0)$, then if we let $\delta' = e^{-M}\delta \leq t_0$ we get

$$0 \leq \frac{\Psi(x, \delta') + \tilde{K}'\delta'^2 - P(0)(x)}{\delta^2} \leq M$$

or equivalently,

$$0 \leq \frac{\Psi(x, \delta') + \tilde{K}'\delta'^2 - P(0)(x)}{\delta'^2} \leq Me^{2M}$$

for $x \in V$ and $0 < \delta' = e^{-M}\delta < Se^{-M}$ (recall that $\delta < S < 1/2$).

We then infer that for $x \in V$ and for $0 < \delta' < Se^{-M}$

$$-\tilde{K}' \leq \frac{\Psi(x, \delta') - P(0)(x)}{\delta'^2} \leq Me^{2M} - \tilde{K}'$$

Since the relatively compact set V in Ω is arbitrary, combining the above inequality together with Lemma 3.3 we show that $P(0)$ in $C^{1,1}$ in Ω .

Remark 4.1. It is worth observing that the estimate (4.10) is essentially the one given in [4, Lemma 1.12].

Given k (possibly different) $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ functions f_1, \dots, f_k on X , we can consider the rooftop envelope $P(\min_{1 \leq j \leq k} f_j)$, also denoted by $P(f_1, \dots, f_k)$. Note that $P(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ is a genuine α -psh function with minimal singularities. In fact, the functions f_j for $1 \leq j \leq k$ are continuous on X , then there is a positive constant C such that $-C \leq \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} f_j \leq C$, therefore $P(0) - C \leq P(f_1, \dots, f_k) \leq P(0) + C$.

We are now able to derive our main theorem:

Theorem 4.2. *Let X be a compact complex manifold. Assume α is a smooth real closed $(1,1)$ -form such that $\{\alpha\}$ is a big class. Let f_1, \dots, f_k be $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ functions on X . Then the rooftop envelope $P(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ in Ω , the ample locus of $\{\alpha\}$. In particular the coefficients of $i\partial\bar{\partial}P(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ are locally bounded on any local holomorphic coordinate system in Ω .*

Proof. We first assume that (X, ω) is Kähler, that $k = 1$ and that the function f_1 is quasi-psh. As in [4], we observe that in the above computations we do not really need α to be a smooth form. In our arguments we only need that the coefficients of α are bounded on the open sets $V'_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ given above. Observe that since f_1 is quasi-psh and it is $C^{1,\bar{1}}(X)$, then coefficients of $i\partial\bar{\partial}f_1$ are locally bounded. We can then replace the smooth form α by $\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}f_1$.

If $P(f_1)$ is the psh envelope of f_1 with respect to the form α , then $P(f_1) - f_1$ coincides with the envelope $P(0)$ with respect to $\alpha + i\partial\bar{\partial}f_1$. Moreover if $q : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ is the modification as above, the function $f_1 \circ q$ is still $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ and quasi-psh on \tilde{X} . Thus, we infer that $P(f_1)$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ in Ω .

We now take functions f_1, \dots, f_k which are not necessarily quasi-psh and we choose $A > 0$ big enough such that $A\omega > \alpha$. We then consider the rooftop envelope of f_1, \dots, f_k w.r.t. $A\omega$, $P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k)$. Since the functions f_1, \dots, f_k are in $C^{1,\bar{1}}(X)$ and $A\omega$ is a Kähler form it follows from [7] and [16, Theorem 2.5] that $P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ is also $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ on X .

Moreover $P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ is also quasi-psh by definition, hence the arguments above ensure that $P_\alpha(P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k))$ is $C^{1,\bar{1}}$ in Ω .

We claim that $P_\alpha(f_1, \dots, f_k) = P_\alpha(P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k))$.

Indeed, $P_\alpha(P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k)) \leq P_\alpha(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ since $P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k) \leq \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} f_j$. For the reverse inequality we observe that any α -psh function is also $A\omega$ -psh ($A\omega > \alpha$). This implies that $P_\alpha(f_1, \dots, f_k) \leq P_{A\omega}(f_1, \dots, f_k)$. Taking the envelope w.r.t α both sides we get the equality we wanted.

Finally to remove the Kähler assumption: given a compact complex manifold X , we observe (as we did at the beginning of Section 4) that we can choose a Kähler current representing $\{\alpha\}$ which is smooth on Ω . If we resolve its singularities and we make further blow-ups as in [19, Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 3.5] we obtain a compact Kähler manifold \tilde{X} with a birational morphism from \tilde{X} to X which is biholomorphic over Ω . Then (as in Section 4) we can pull-back the form α and the functions $P(0), f_1, \dots, f_k$ in order to reduce to the Kähler case. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Eric Bedford and B. A. Taylor. The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampère equation. *Invent. Math.*, 37(1):1–44, 1976.
- [2] Eric Bedford and B. A. Taylor. A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions. *Acta Math.*, 149(1-2):1–40, 1982.
- [3] Eric Bedford and B. A. Taylor. The complex equilibrium measure of a symmetric convex set in \mathbf{R}^n . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 294(2):705–717, 1986.
- [4] Robert Berman and Jean-Pierre Demailly. Regularity of plurisubharmonic upper envelopes in big cohomology classes. In *Perspectives in analysis, geometry, and topology*, volume 296 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 39–66. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012.
- [5] Robert J. Berman. Bergman kernels and equilibrium measures for line bundles over projective manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 131(5):1485–1524, 2009.
- [6] Robert J. Berman. On the optimal regularity of weak geodesics in the space of metrics on a polarized manifold. In *Analysis meets geometry*, Trends Math., pages 111–120. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.

- [7] Robert J. Berman. From Monge-Ampère equations to envelopes and geodesic rays in the zero temperature limit. *Math. Z.*, 291(1-2):365–394, 2019.
- [8] Sébastien Boucksom. Divisorial Zariski decompositions on compact complex manifolds. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 37(1):45–76, 2004.
- [9] Sébastien Boucksom, Philippe Eyssidieux, Vincent Guedj, and Ahmed Zeriahi. Monge-Ampère equations in big cohomology classes. *Acta Math.*, 205(2):199–262, 2010.
- [10] Xiuxiong Chen. The space of Kähler metrics. *J. Differential Geom.*, 56(2):189–234, 2000.
- [11] Jianchun Chu and Nicolas McCleerey. $C^{1,1}$ regularity of geodesics of singular Kähler metrics. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 104(2):66–96, 2021.
- [12] Jianchun Chu, Valentino Tosatti, and Ben Weinkove. $C^{1,1}$ regularity for degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations and geodesic rays. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 43(2):292–312, 2018.
- [13] Jianchun Chu and Bin Zhou. Optimal regularity of plurisubharmonic envelopes on compact Hermitian manifolds. *Sci. China Math.*, 62(2):371–380, 2019.
- [14] Tamás Darvas. The Mabuchi completion of the space of Kähler potentials. *Amer. J. Math.*, 139(5):1275–1313, 2017.
- [15] Tamás Darvas, Eleonora Di Nezza, and Chinh H. Lu. On the singularity type of full mass currents in big cohomology classes. *Compos. Math.*, 154(2):380–409, 2018.
- [16] Tamás Darvas and Yanir A. Rubinstein. Kiselman’s principle, the Dirichlet problem for the Monge-Ampère equation, and rooftop obstacle problems. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 68(2):773–796, 2016.
- [17] Jean-Pierre Demailly. Regularization of closed positive currents of type $(1, 1)$ by the flow of a Chern connection. In *Contributions to complex analysis and analytic geometry*, Aspects Math., E26, pages 105–126. Friedr. Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1994.
- [18] Jean-Pierre Demailly, Sławomir Dinew, Vincent Guedj, Hoang Hiep Pham, Sławomir Kołodziej, and Ahmed Zeriahi. Hölder continuous solutions to Monge-Ampère equations. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 16(4):619–647, 2014.
- [19] Jean-Pierre Demailly and Mihai Paun. Numerical characterization of the Kähler cone on a compact Kähler manifold. *Annals of Mathematics*, 159(3):1247–1274, 2004.
- [20] Eleonora Di Nezza and Stefano Trapani. Monge-ampère measures on contact sets. *Math. Research Letters*, 2020.
- [21] Vincent Guedj and Ahmed Zeriahi. Intrinsic capacities on compact Kähler manifolds. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 15(4):607–639, 2005.
- [22] Vincent Guedj and Ahmed Zeriahi. The weighted Monge-Ampère energy of quasisubharmonic functions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 250(2):442–482, 2007.
- [23] Tillmann Jentsch and Gregor Weingart. Riemannian and kähler normal coordinates. *Asian journal of mathematics*, 24, 2020.
- [24] Sławomir Kołodziej and Ngoc Cuong Nguyen. Stability and regularity of solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation on hermitian manifolds. *Advances in Mathematics*, 346:264–304, 2019.
- [25] Julius Ross and David Witt Nyström. Envelopes of positive metrics with prescribed singularities. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 26(3):687–728, 2017.
- [26] Walter Rudin. Real and complex analysis. McGraw-Hill, third edition 1987.
- [27] Józef Siciak. Extremal plurisubharmonic functions in \mathbf{C}^n . *Ann. Polon. Math.*, 39:175–211, 1981.
- [28] Valentino Tosatti. Regularity of envelopes in Kähler classes. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 25(1):281–289, 2018.
- [29] David Witt Nyström. Duality between the pseudoeffective and the movable cone on a projective manifold. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 32(3):675–689, 2019. With an appendix by Sébastien Boucksom.
- [30] V. P. Zaharjuta. Extremal plurisubharmonic functions, orthogonal polynomials, and the Bernstein-Walsh theorem for functions of several complex variables. *Ann. Polon. Math.*, 33(1-2):137–148, 1976/77 (Russian).

IMJ-PRG, SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ,
4 PLACE JUSSIEU, 75005, PARIS, FRANCE,
eleonora.dinezza@imj-prg.fr

UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA TORVERGATA,
VIA DELLA RICERCA SCIENTIFICA 1, 00133, ROMA, ITALY,
trapani@mat.uniroma2.it