

# On the existence of radial graphs with constant scalar curvature

Flávio França Cruz, URCA - Brazil

Supported by FUNCAP



Geometric aspects on capillary problems and related topics  
Granada, Spain

- ▶ Cruz, F., Radial Graphs of Constant Curvature and Prescribed Boundary. *arXiv*: 1508.06881 (2015).

## Question

Under what conditions a closed  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional embedded submanifold  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  spans a compact hypersurface of constant (extrinsic) curvature?

# The geometric setting

# The geometric setting

- ▶ Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n$  be a bounded smooth domain.

# The geometric setting

- ▶ Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n$  be a bounded smooth domain.
- ▶ The radial graph of a positive function  $\rho \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$  is the hypersurface

$$\Sigma = \{X(x) = \rho(x)x : x \in \bar{\Omega}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

# The geometric setting

- ▶ Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^n$  be a bounded smooth domain.
- ▶ The radial graph of a positive function  $\rho \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$  is the hypersurface

$$\Sigma = \{X(x) = \rho(x)x : x \in \bar{\Omega}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

- ▶ Let  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  a l.o.f.f. on  $\mathbb{S}^n$ . The components of the metric and the second fundamental form of  $\Sigma$  are given by

$$g_{ij} = \rho^2 \delta_{ij} + \nabla_i \rho \nabla_j \rho$$

and

$$h_{ij} = \frac{1}{(\rho^2 + |\nabla \rho|^2)^{1/2}} (\rho^2 \delta_{ij} + 2\nabla_i \rho \nabla_j \rho - \rho \nabla_{ij} \rho).$$

## Some previous results

**Theorem (Serrin '69)** Assume  $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^n$  and  $H \leq 0$  satisfies

$$H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq -\frac{n}{n-1}H\phi(x) \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

Then there exists a unique solution of (P).



## Some previous results

**Theorem (Serrin '69)** Assume  $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^n$  and  $H \leq 0$  satisfies

$$H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq -\frac{n}{n-1}H\phi(x) \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

Then there exists a unique solution of (P).

**Remark. (López '03)** If  $\phi \equiv 1$  then the above inequality can be replaced by

$$H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq -H \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

## Some previous results

**Theorem (Serrin '69)** Assume  $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^n$  and  $H \leq 0$  satisfies

$$H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq -\frac{n}{n-1}H\phi(x) \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

Then there exists a unique solution of (P).

**Remark. (López '03)** If  $\phi \equiv 1$  then the above inequality can be replaced by

$$H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq -H \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

**Theorem (Guan - Spruck '93)** Assume that  $\Omega$  does not contain any hemisphere and there exists a strictly locally convex (s.l.c.) radial graph  $\bar{\Sigma}$  with  $\partial\bar{\Sigma} = \text{graph}(\phi)$ . If

$$0 < K < K(\bar{\Sigma}) = \inf_{p \in \bar{\Sigma}} K(p),$$

then there exists a s.l.c. radial graph  $\Sigma$  of constant Gauss curvature  $K$  with boundary  $\partial\Sigma = \text{graph}(\phi)$ .

## Some previous results

**Theorem (CNS-V '88)** Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded strictly convex domain. Suppose that there exists an admissible (vertical) graph  $\bar{\Sigma}$  with  $\partial\bar{\Sigma} = \partial\Omega$ . If

$$0 < R < R(\bar{\Sigma}) = \inf_{p \in \bar{\Sigma}} R(p),$$

then there exists an admissible graph  $\Sigma$  of constant scalar curvature  $R$  with boundary  $\partial\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ .

## Some previous results

**Theorem (CNS-V '88)** Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded strictly convex domain. Suppose that there exists an admissible (vertical) graph  $\bar{\Sigma}$  with  $\partial\bar{\Sigma} = \partial\Omega$ . If

$$0 < R < R(\bar{\Sigma}) = \inf_{p \in \bar{\Sigma}} R(p),$$

then there exists an admissible graph  $\Sigma$  of constant scalar curvature  $R$  with boundary  $\partial\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ .

**Remark. (Trudinger - Ivochkina '94)** The above result also holds for mean convex domains and non constant boundary data.

## Some previous results

**Theorem (CNS-V '88)** Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded strictly convex domain. Suppose that there exists an admissible (vertical) graph  $\bar{\Sigma}$  with  $\partial\bar{\Sigma} = \partial\Omega$ . If

$$0 < R < R(\bar{\Sigma}) = \inf_{p \in \bar{\Sigma}} R(p),$$

then there exists an admissible graph  $\Sigma$  of constant scalar curvature  $R$  with boundary  $\partial\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ .

**Remark. (Trudinger - Ivochkina '94)** The above result also holds for mean convex domains and non constant boundary data.

**Theorem (— '15)** Assume that  $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^n$  is a mean convex domain. Then, for  $0 < R < n(n-1)$ , there exists a radial graph  $\Sigma$  of constant scalar curvature  $R$  and boundary  $\partial\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ .

# Curvature Functions

# Curvature Functions

Let  $\Gamma$  be an open, convex, symmetric cone  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with vertex at the origin and containing the positive cone

$$\Gamma^+ = \{\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{each component } \kappa_i > 0\}.$$

# Curvature Functions

Let  $\Gamma$  be an open, convex, symmetric cone  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with vertex at the origin and containing the positive cone

$$\Gamma^+ = \{\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{each component } \kappa_i > 0\}.$$

We say that  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  is a *curvature function* if it satisfies

**Symmetry:**  $f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = f(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(n)})$ , for all  $\sigma$ ;

**Ellipticity:**  $f_i = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i} > 0$ ;

**Concavity:**  $f$  is a concave function;

**Homogeneity:**  $f(t\lambda) = tf(\lambda)$ ,  $t > 0$ ;

**Compatibility:**  $\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \partial\Gamma} f(\lambda) = 0$ ;



# Technical assumptions

- ▶ For every constant  $C > 0$  and every compact set  $E$  in  $\Gamma$  there is a constant  $R = R(C, E) > 0$  such that

$$f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n + R) \geq C, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in E, \quad (1)$$

- ▶ For all  $\lambda \in \Gamma_{\mu, \nu} = \{\lambda \in \Gamma : \mu < f(\lambda) < \nu\}$  it holds

$$\sum f_i(\lambda) \lambda_i^2 \leq C_0 (\lambda_j \chi_{\{\lambda_j > 0\}} + \sum_{k \neq j} f_k(\lambda) \lambda_k^2). \quad (2)$$

# Main Theorem

## Theorem

Let  $\Omega$  be a smooth bounded domain such that  $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^n$  and  $H_{\partial\Omega} \geq 0$ , and let  $\psi$  be a smooth positive function defined on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Assume  $f$  satisfy (1)-(2) and there exists a smooth admissible<sup>1</sup> radial graph  $\bar{\Sigma}$ :

$\bar{X}(x) = \bar{\rho}(x)x$  over  $\bar{\Omega}$  that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} f(\kappa_{\bar{\Sigma}}[\bar{X}]) &> \psi(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \bar{\rho} &= \psi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

and is locally strictly convex (up to the boundary) in a neighbourhood of  $\partial\Omega$ . Then there exists a smooth radial graph  $\Sigma : X(x) = \rho(x)x$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} f(\kappa_{\Sigma}[X]) &= \psi(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \rho &= \psi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup> $\Sigma$  is admissible if  $\kappa_{\Sigma}([X]) \in \Gamma$  for all  $X \in \Sigma$ .

# Existence

Consider the auxiliary functions

$$\Psi^t(\rho x) = \left( \frac{\bar{\rho}(x)}{\rho} \right)^3 (t\psi(x) + (1-t)\underline{\psi}(x)), \quad t \in [0, 1]$$

and

$$\Phi^s(\rho x) = s\psi(x) + (1-s) \left( \frac{\bar{\rho}(x)}{\rho} \right)^3 \psi(x), \quad s \in [0, 1]$$

defined in the solid cylinder  $\Delta = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \frac{X}{\|X\|} \in \bar{\Omega}\}$ .

# Existence

Consider the auxiliary functions

$$\Psi^t(\rho x) = \left( \frac{\bar{\rho}(x)}{\rho} \right)^3 (t\psi(x) + (1-t)\underline{\psi}(x)), \quad t \in [0, 1]$$

and

$$\Phi^s(\rho x) = s\psi(x) + (1-s) \left( \frac{\bar{\rho}(x)}{\rho} \right)^3 \psi(x), \quad s \in [0, 1]$$

defined in the solid cylinder  $\Delta = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \frac{X}{\|X\|} \in \bar{\Omega}\}$ .

**Remark.**

- ▶  $\Phi^1(\rho x) = \psi(x)$
- ▶  $\Psi^1 = \Phi^0$
- ▶  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}(\rho \Psi^t(\rho x)) \leq 0$
- ▶  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}(\rho \Phi^s(\rho x)) \leq 0$  if  $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ .

# Existence

Consider the auxiliary equations

$$\begin{aligned} H(\nabla^2 v, \nabla v, v) &= \Psi^t(X) && \text{in } \Omega \\ v &= -\ln \phi && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (EqA)_t \quad (3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(\nabla^2 v, \nabla v, v) &= \Phi^s(X) && \text{in } \Omega \\ v &= -\ln \phi && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (EqB)_s \quad (4)$$

# Existence

Consider the auxiliary equations

$$\begin{aligned} H(\nabla^2 v, \nabla v, v) &= \Psi^t(X) && \text{in } \Omega \\ v &= -\ln \phi && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (EqA)_t \quad (3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(\nabla^2 v, \nabla v, v) &= \Phi^s(X) && \text{in } \Omega \\ v &= -\ln \phi && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (EqB)_s \quad (4)$$

**Remark.**

- ▶  $\underline{v} = -\ln \bar{\rho}$  is a solution of  $(EqA)_0$
- ▶  $\underline{v} = -\ln \bar{\rho}$  is a strictly subsolution of  $(EqA)_t$  for each  $t > 0$
- ▶  $\frac{\partial}{\partial v}(H - \Psi^t) \leq 0$
- ▶  $(EqA)_1 = (EqB)_0$ .

# A priori estimates

## Theorem

Let  $v \geq \underline{v}$  be an admissible solution of

$$\begin{aligned} f(\kappa_\Sigma[X]) &= \Upsilon(X) \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ v &= \varphi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}(\rho\Upsilon) \leq 0$ . Then we have the estimate

$$\|v\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C$$

where  $C$  depends on  $\inf_{\Omega} \underline{v}$ ,  $\|\underline{v}\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})}$ ,  $\|\Upsilon\|_{C^2(\Delta_L)}$ , the convexity of  $\bar{\Sigma}$  in a neighbourhood of  $\partial\Omega$  and other known data.

# Existence

It follows from the a priori estimates that

- ▶ There exists a unique solution  $v^0$  of  $(EqB)_0$ .
- ▶ If  $v^s$  is a solution of  $(EqB)_s$  and  $v^s \geq \underline{v}$  then

$$\|v^s\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} < C_1.$$



# Existence

It follows from the a priori estimates that

- ▶ There exists a unique solution  $v^0$  of  $(EqB)_0$ .
- ▶ If  $v^s$  is a solution of  $(EqB)_s$  and  $v^s \geq \underline{v}$  then

$$\|v^s\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} < C_1.$$

Consider the open set

$$\mathcal{O} = \{w \in C_0^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}) : w > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \nabla_n w > 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \\ w + \underline{v} \text{ is admissible and } \|w\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C_1 + \|\underline{v}\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})}\}.$$

and the map

$$M_s[w] = H(\nabla^2(w + \underline{v}), \nabla(w + \underline{v}), w + \underline{v}) - \Phi^s(w + \underline{v}), \quad w \in \mathcal{O}.$$

# Existence

It follows from the a priori estimates that

- ▶ There exists a unique solution  $v^0$  of  $(EqB)_0$ .
- ▶ If  $v^s$  is a solution of  $(EqB)_s$  and  $v^s \geq \underline{v}$  then

$$\|v^s\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} < C_1.$$

Consider the open set

$$\mathcal{O} = \{w \in C_0^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}) : w > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \nabla_n w > 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \\ w + \underline{v} \text{ is admissible and } \|w\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C_1 + \|\underline{v}\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})}\}.$$

and the map

$$M_s[w] = H(\nabla^2(w + \underline{v}), \nabla(w + \underline{v}), w + \underline{v}) - \Phi^s(w + \underline{v}), \quad w \in \mathcal{O}.$$

We have

- ▶  $w^0 = v^0 - \underline{v}$  is the unique solution of  $M_0[w] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}$
- ▶ There is no solution of  $M_s[w] = 0$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}$
- ▶ The Fréchet derivative of  $M_0$  at  $w^0$  is invertible.

# Existence

Then, by the degree theory developed by Yan Yan Li<sup>2</sup>, we can see that the degree of  $M_s$  on  $\mathcal{O}$  at 0  $\deg(M_s, \mathcal{O}, 0)$  is well defined and independent of  $s$ . Moreover,

$$\deg(M_0, \mathcal{O}, 0) = \pm 1 \neq 0$$

and we conclude that

$$\deg(M_s, \mathcal{O}, 0) \neq 0 \text{ for all } s \in [0, 1].$$

Let  $w^1$  be a solution of  $M_1[w] = 0$ . Then the function  $v^1 = w^1 + \underline{v}$  is the desired solution.

---

<sup>2</sup>Li, Y.Y., Degree theory for second order nonlinear elliptic operators and its applications. *Comm. in PDE's*. 14(11)(1989).

## Height and Gradient Bounds

Let  $\underline{\rho}$  be the solution of the minimal surface equation in  $\Omega$  that satisfies  $\underline{\rho} = \phi$  on  $\partial\Omega$ .

Then

$$\underline{\rho} \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho} \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

and

$$\underline{\rho} = \rho = \bar{\rho} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

This yields the height and boundary gradient estimates.

## Height and Gradient Bounds

Let  $\underline{\rho}$  be the solution of the minimal surface equation in  $\Omega$  that satisfies  $\underline{\rho} = \phi$  on  $\partial\Omega$ .

Then

$$\underline{\rho} \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho} \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

and

$$\underline{\rho} = \rho = \bar{\rho} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

This yields the height and boundary gradient estimates.

Under the condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (\rho \Upsilon(\rho x)) \leq 0,$$

the interior gradient estimate follows as in the paper  
*Caffarelli, L., Nirenberg L. and Spruck, J., The Dirichlet Problem for Nonlinear Second-Order Elliptic Equations IV: Starshaped compact Weingarten hypersurfaces (1985).*

## Height and Gradient Bounds

Let  $\underline{\rho}$  be the solution of the minimal surface equation in  $\Omega$  that satisfies  $\underline{\rho} = \phi$  on  $\partial\Omega$ .

Then

$$\underline{\rho} \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho} \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

and

$$\underline{\rho} = \rho = \bar{\rho} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

This yields the height and boundary gradient estimates.

Under the condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (\rho \Upsilon(\rho x)) \leq 0,$$

the interior gradient estimate follows as in the paper

*Caffarelli, L., Nirenberg L. and Spruck, J., The Dirichlet Problem for Nonlinear Second-Order Elliptic Equations IV: Starshaped compact Weingarten hypersurfaces (1985).*

**Remark.** Once established the second derivative boundary estimates, the interior ones follow as above.

# The Barrier Method

Set

$$u = 1/\rho \text{ and } \varphi = 1/\phi.$$

The mixed second derivative boundary estimates are obtained applying the barrier method to the function  $\nabla_\alpha u$ . We will make use of the following version of the Maximum Principle.

## Theorem (Maximum Principle)

Let  $v, w \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $u$  an admissible function on  $\Omega$ . Assume that

$$G^{ij}\nabla_{ij}w \leq C_0(1 + |\nabla w|) \quad \text{in } U$$

$$G^{ij}\nabla_{ij}v \geq C_0(1 + |\nabla v|) \quad \text{in } U,$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant and  $U \subset \Omega$ . If  $v \leq w$  on  $\partial U$ , then  $v \leq w$  in  $\bar{U}$ .

# The Barrier Method

Set

$$u = 1/\rho \text{ and } \varphi = 1/\phi.$$

The mixed second derivative boundary estimates are obtained applying the barrier method to the function  $\nabla_\alpha u$ . We will make use of the following version of the Maximum Principle.

## Theorem (Maximum Principle)

Let  $v, w \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $u$  an admissible function on  $\Omega$ . Assume that

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} w \leq C_0(1 + |\nabla w|) \quad \text{in } U$$

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} v \geq C_0(1 + |\nabla v|) \quad \text{in } U,$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant and  $U \subset \Omega$ . If  $v \leq w$  on  $\partial U$ , then  $v \leq w$  in  $\bar{U}$ .

Rmk:

$$u = 1/\rho \quad \Rightarrow \quad G(\nabla^2 u, \nabla u, u) = \Upsilon$$

$$G^{ij} = \frac{\partial G}{\partial \nabla_{ij} u}$$



## Lemma (Fundamental Inequality)

For some positive constants  $K$  and  $M$  sufficiently large depending on  $\|u\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$ ,  $\|\Upsilon\|_{C^1(\Delta_L)}$  and other known data, the function

$$\Phi = \nabla_k(u - \varphi) - \frac{K}{2} \sum_{l < n} (\nabla_l(u - \varphi))^2$$

satisfies

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} \Phi \leq M(1 + |\nabla \Phi| + G^{ij} \delta_{ij} + G^{ij} \nabla_i \Phi \nabla_j \Phi) \quad \text{in } \Omega_\delta.$$

## Lemma (Fundamental Inequality)

For some positive constants  $K$  and  $M$  sufficiently large depending on  $\|u\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})}$ ,  $\|\Upsilon\|_{C^1(\Delta_L)}$  and other known data, the function

$$\Phi = \nabla_k(u - \varphi) - \frac{K}{2} \sum_{l < n} (\nabla_l(u - \varphi))^2$$

satisfies

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} \Phi \leq M(1 + |\nabla \Phi| + G^{ij} \delta_{ij} + G^{ij} \nabla_i \Phi \nabla_j \Phi) \quad \text{in } \Omega_\delta.$$

We choose

$$w = 1 - e^{-a_0 \Phi} + b_0(u - \underline{u})$$

to get

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} w \leq C_0(1 + |\nabla w|).$$

# Barrier Function

## Lemma

*There exist some uniform positive constants  $t, \delta, \varepsilon$  sufficiently small and  $N$  sufficiently large depending on  $\inf_{\bar{\Omega}} \underline{u}, \|\underline{u}\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})}, \sup_{\Delta_L} \Upsilon$ , the convexity of  $\underline{u}$  in a neighbourhood of  $\partial\Omega$  and other known data, such that the function*

$$\Theta = u - \underline{u} + td - Nd^2, \quad d = \text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\Omega)$$

*satisfies*

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} \Theta \leq -(1 + |\nabla \Theta| + G^{ij} \delta_{ij}) \quad \text{in } \Omega_\delta$$

*and*

$$\Theta \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_\delta.$$

# Barrier Function

## Lemma

*There exist some uniform positive constants  $t, \delta, \varepsilon$  sufficiently small and  $N$  sufficiently large depending on  $\inf_{\bar{\Omega}} \underline{u}, \|\underline{u}\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})}, \sup_{\Delta_L} \Upsilon$ , the convexity of  $\underline{u}$  in a neighbourhood of  $\partial\Omega$  and other known data, such that the function*

$$\Theta = u - \underline{u} + td - Nd^2, \quad d = \text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\Omega)$$

*satisfies*

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} \Theta \leq -(1 + |\nabla \Theta| + G^{ij} \delta_{ij}) \quad \text{in } \Omega_\delta$$

*and*

$$\Theta \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_\delta.$$

We choose

$$v = -c_0 \text{dist}(\cdot, x_0)^2 - d_0 \Theta$$

to get

$$G^{ij} \nabla_{ij} v \geq C_0(1 + |\nabla v|)$$

and  $v \leq w$  on  $\partial\Omega_\delta$ .

# Double Normal Estimate

## Double Normal Estimate

Let  $\kappa'$  the roots of  $\det(h_{\alpha\beta} - tg_{\alpha\beta}) = 0$ . It follows from the previous estimates that the principal curvatures  $\kappa_i$  behave like

$$\kappa_\alpha = \kappa'_\alpha + o(1), \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1,$$

$$\kappa_n = \frac{h_{nn}}{g_{nn}} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{h_{nn}}\right) \right),$$

as  $|h_{nn}| \rightarrow \infty$ .

## Double Normal Estimate

Let  $\kappa'$  the roots of  $\det(h_{\alpha\beta} - tg_{\alpha\beta}) = 0$ . It follows from the previous estimates that the principal curvatures  $\kappa_i$  behave like

$$\kappa_\alpha = \kappa'_\alpha + o(1), \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1,$$

$$\kappa_n = \frac{h_{nn}}{g_{nn}} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{h_{nn}}\right) \right),$$

as  $|h_{nn}| \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\Gamma'$  be the projection of  $\Gamma$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Thus, there exists a uniform positive constant  $N_0 > 0$  satisfying

$$\kappa' \in \Gamma' \quad \text{if} \quad \nabla_{nn}u \geq N_0. \quad (*)$$

## Double Normal Estimate

Let  $\kappa'$  the roots of  $\det(h_{\alpha\beta} - tg_{\alpha\beta}) = 0$ . It follows from the previous estimates that the principal curvatures  $\kappa_i$  behave like

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_\alpha &= \kappa'_\alpha + o(1), \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1, \\ \kappa_n &= \frac{h_{nn}}{g_{nn}} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{h_{nn}}\right) \right),\end{aligned}$$

as  $|h_{nn}| \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\Gamma'$  be the projection of  $\Gamma$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Thus, there exists a uniform positive constant  $N_0 > 0$  satisfying

$$\kappa' \in \Gamma' \quad \text{if} \quad \nabla_{nn}u \geq N_0. \quad (*)$$

### Lemma








Let  $N_0 > 0$  be the constant defined in (\*) and suppose that  $\nabla_{nn}u \geq N_0$ . Then there exists a uniform constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that

$$d(x) = \text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\Gamma') \geq c_0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Therefore an upper bound for  $\kappa_n$  follows from the previous established estimates and the assumption that  $f$  is of unbounded type.



# References

-  Caffarelli, L., Nirenberg L. and Spruck, J., The Dirichlet Problem for Nonlinear Second-Order Elliptic Equations IV: Starshaped compact Weingarten hypersurfaces, *Current Topics in P.D.E.*, Tokyo, 1986.
-  Caffarelli, L., Nirenberg, L. and Spruck, J., Nonlinear Second-Order Elliptic Equations V. The Dirichlet Problem for Weingarten Hypersurfaces. *Comm. Pure Applied Math.*, 41(1988), 47–70.
-  Guan, B. and Spruck, J., Boundary Value Problem on  $S^n$  for Surfaces of Constant Gauss Curvature. *Ann. of Math.*, 138(1993), 601–624.
-  Lopez, R., *Constant Mean Curvature Surfaces with Boundary*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 2010.
-  Serrin, J., The Problem of Dirichlet for Quasilinear Elliptic Differential Equations with Many Variables. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A.*, 264(1969), 413–496.
-  Su, C., Starshaped Locally Convex Hypersurfaces with Prescribed Curvature and Boundary. *arXiv: 1310.4730* (2013).
-  Trudinger, N., On the Dirichlet Problem for Hessian Equations. *Acta Math.*, 175(1995), 151–164.

**Thank you!**