

ANNALES DE LA FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES DE TOULOUSE Mathématiques

XIUXIONG CHEN, LONG LI AND MIHAI PĂUNI

Approximation of weak geodesics and subharmonicity of Mabuchi energy

Tome XXV, n° 5 (2016), p. 935-957.

http://afst.cedram.org/item?id=AFST_2016_6_25_5_935_0

© Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, 2016, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux articles de la revue « Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse Mathématiques » (<http://afst.cedram.org/>), implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://afst.cedram.org/legal/>). Toute reproduction en tout ou partie de cet article sous quelque forme que ce soit pour tout usage autre que l'utilisation à fin strictement personnelle du copiste est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

cedram

Article mis en ligne dans le cadre du
Centre de diffusion des revues académiques de mathématiques
<http://www.cedram.org/>

Approximation of weak geodesics and subharmonicity of Mabuchi energy

XIUXIONG CHEN⁽¹⁾, LONG LI⁽²⁾, MIHAI PĂUNI⁽³⁾

RÉSUMÉ. – Dans cet article nous obtenons des résultats concernant l’approximation des géodésiques qui connectent deux métriques kähleriennes dans la même classe de cohomologie. Comme corollaire, nous obtenons une preuve de la convexité de la fonctionnelle de Mabuchi le long des géodésiques. C’est un théorème obtenu récemment par Berman-Berndtsson, et nos arguments représentent une version “globale” de leur démonstration originale.

ABSTRACT. – In this paper we are interested in the approximation of weak geodesics connecting two Kähler metrics in the same cohomology class. As a consequence, we derive the convexity of the Mabuchi energy along geodesics. This important result was obtained recently by Berman-Berndtsson, and our approach can be seen as a “global version” of their original proof.

1. Introduction

In a recent paper [4], R. Berman and B. Berndtsson established the convexity of the Mabuchi energy functional \mathcal{M} along the so-called *weak geodesics*, answering (affirmatively) to a conjecture proposed by the first named author of this article. Given two Kähler metrics in the same cohomology class, it is well-known (cf. [16], [10]) that in general one cannot find a

*Reçu le 28/01/2015, accepté le 09/10/2015

¹Department of Mathematics, Stony Brook University, NY, USA.
xiu@math.sunysb.edu

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1, Canada.
lilong@math.mcmaster.ca

³Korea Institute for Advanced Study, School of Mathematics, 85 Hoegiro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130-722, Korea.
paun@kias.re.kr

Article proposé par Vincent Guedj.

smooth geodesic connecting them: this is a major source of difficulties while dealing e.g. with the aforementioned convexity question.

In this article we explore in a systematic way two techniques of approximation of weak geodesics. The first and most natural one is given by the ε -geodesics, obtained in [7]. The second one consists in using a fiberwise approximation of weak geodesics via a family of well-chosen Monge-Ampère equations. A corollary of the second technique is an alternative proof of the result in [4]. Roughly speaking, our proof can be seen as a “global version” of the local Bergman kernel arguments, so morally we follow the original ideas of [4]; nevertheless, we feel that our approach might be useful in other contexts. For example, the method we are using here allows us to establish the convexity of \mathcal{M} more *directly* than in the original article, where the first step is to show convexity of \mathcal{M} in the sense of distributions.

We equally infer that the Mabuchi functional is *continuous* up to the boundary when evaluated on a weak geodesic. The proof of this second statement is based on semi-continuity properties of the entropy functional.

Another theorem we will establish here is the almost-convexity of the regularized Mabuchi energy along the ε -geodesics cf. [7]. Actually, our hope is that this latter result could be also used in order to provide a proof of the convexity of \mathcal{M} along weak geodesics. We refer to the comments at the end of this note for further support concerning this belief.

This article is organized as follows. We start by recalling the important result of Xiuxiong Chen in [7] concerning the existence of $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ solutions of the MA equation describing the geodesic between two Kähler metrics. After a preliminary discussion about the strategy of the proof, the convexity and the continuity of \mathcal{M} are obtained in section 4 via the approximation procedure mentioned above. Finally, the convexity of \mathcal{M} along ε -geodesics and some other results/expectations are treated in section 5.

Acknowledgement. — *It is our privilege to thank the referee for her/his insightful comments and constructive criticism about this article.*

2. Geodesics

Let X be a compact Kähler manifold; we denote by \mathcal{K} its Kähler cone. Let $\{\omega\} \in \mathcal{K}$ be a Kähler class of X ; the notation above means that the representative ω is non-singular and positive definite. Let $\omega_0, \omega_1 \in \{\omega\}$ be two positive definite representatives of the same cohomology class. A *weak*

geodesic between ω_0 and ω_1 is a semi-positive definite (1,1)-current

$$\mathcal{G} := \omega + dd^c \varphi \tag{2.1}$$

on the product $X \times \Sigma$ of the manifold X with the annulus $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$, such that the following requirements are satisfied.

- (a) The function φ is $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ on $X \times \Sigma$; in particular, the coefficients of \mathcal{G} are bounded.
- (b) We have $\mathcal{G}^{n+1} = 0$.
- (c) The current \mathcal{G} is rotationally invariant, and it equals ω_0 and ω_1 on the boundary of Σ , respectively.

The existence of \mathcal{G} with the properties stated above was first established in [7]. The results obtained by Z. Blocki in [5], [6], are equally crucial in this circle of ideas.

3. What is to be proved

Let u be a smooth function on X , such that $\omega_u := \omega + dd^c u$ is a Kähler metric. The *energy* functional is given by the expression

$$\mathcal{E}(u) := \sum_{j=0}^n \int_X u \omega_u^{n-j} \wedge \omega^j. \tag{3.1}$$

Given a (1,1)-form α , one introduces the following version of the energy functional

$$\mathcal{E}^\alpha(u) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_X u \omega_u^{n-j-1} \wedge \omega^j \wedge \alpha. \tag{3.2}$$

For a smooth path $\omega_t := \omega + dd^c u_t$ of Kähler metrics depending on the parameter $t \in \Sigma$, one rapidly computes

$$dd^c \mathcal{E}(t) = \int_X \Omega^{n+1}, \quad dd^c \mathcal{E}^\alpha(t) = \int_X \Omega^n \wedge \alpha, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\Omega := \omega + dd^c u$ is a (1,1)-form on $X \times \Sigma$, and the integration is understood as the push-forward of an $(n+1, n+1)$ form to Σ (we use the same notation for ω and its inverse image on $X \times \Sigma$). An important observation (cf. [8], [4] and the references therein) is that the equalities (3.3) still hold true *in the sense of distributions* if the path (u_t) is only assumed to be continuous.

The *Mabuchi functional* \mathcal{M} along \mathcal{G} is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{M}(t) = \frac{S}{n+1} \mathcal{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Ric}_\omega}(\varphi_t) + \int_X \log \frac{\mathcal{G}_t^n}{\omega^n} \mathcal{G}_t^n \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_t := \omega + dd^c \varphi_t$ is the restriction of \mathcal{G} to the slice $X \times \{t\} \subset X \times \Sigma$, and S is the average of the scalar curvature of (X, ω) . Unlike the original definition of \mathcal{M} , the expression (3.4) first introduced in [8], has a meaning even if the regularity of φ is only $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$. We recall further that the convexity of \mathcal{M} along weak geodesics was conjectured in [8].

Ideally, the convexity of \mathcal{M} would follow provided that one is able to produce the following objects.

Let $(\Theta_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0} \subset \{\omega\}$ be a family of closed positive (1,1) currents on $X \times \Sigma$, such that for each positive ε we have:

- (a) The potential ϕ_ε of each Θ_ε is of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$.
- (b) The logarithm of the fiberwise determinant of Θ_ε is of class \mathcal{C}^1 .
- (c) The determinant of $\Theta_\varepsilon|_{X \times \{t\}}$ converges a.e. to $\mathcal{G}^n|_{X \times \{t\}}$.

As explained in [4], it is enough to show that we can find $(\Theta_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ as above, such that moreover we have

$$dd^c \log \frac{\Theta_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n} \wedge \mathcal{G}^n \geq \text{Ricci}_\omega \wedge \mathcal{G}^n \quad (3.5)$$

where the quantity $\log \frac{\Theta_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n}$ denotes (slightly abusively) a function on $X \times \Sigma$. Indeed, given the relations (3.3), the inequality (3.5) implies the convexity in the sense of distributions of the following functional

$$\mathcal{M}(\varepsilon, t) := \frac{S}{n+1} \mathcal{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Ric}_\omega}(\varphi_t) + \int_X \log \frac{\Theta_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n} \mathcal{G}_t^n. \quad (3.6)$$

By the condition (b) the functional $\mathcal{M}(\varepsilon, t)$ is continuous; therefore its convexity in weak sense implies convexity in usual sense. The condition (c) would imply the same property for \mathcal{M} , by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

An excellent candidate for the family Θ_ε would be the approximation of \mathcal{G} contained in the proof of X.X. Chen, i.e. the ε -geodesics. Indeed, the properties (a) and (b) are direct consequences of [7], and the inequality (3.5) can be checked to hold true on the set $\Lambda_{A,\varepsilon}$ where Θ_ε is uniformly bounded from below by $\exp(-A)\omega$ via a direct computation (this would be enough to conclude, by letting $A \rightarrow \infty$ at the end). However, it does not seem to be so easy to establish the crucial property (c) (we refer the the paper [9], section 6, in order to have a glimpse at the difficulties/consequences of such a statement).

In order to overcome this issue, we will consider in the next paragraph a different approximation of \mathcal{G} , obtained by solving a family of MA equations.

A version of the convexity of \mathcal{M} along the ε -geodesics will be treated in the last part of our note.

4. Fiberwise approximation of \mathcal{G}

In order to construct the family of currents $(\Theta_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ with the properties stated in the previous section we will need the following result.

THEOREM 4.1. ([17]). — *Let $p : X \rightarrow Y$ be a holomorphic submersion. We consider a semi-positive class $\{\beta\} \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$, such that the adjoint class $c_1(K_{X_y}) + \{\beta\}|_{X_y}$ is Kähler for any $y \in Y$. Then the relative adjoint class*

$$c_1(K_{X/Y}) + \{\beta\}$$

contains a closed positive current Ξ , whose restriction to each fiber X_y is a positive definite form.

We specialize here to the case of the trivial submersion $X \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$, so the relative canonical bundle equals the inverse image of K_X .

As a consequence of the previous result we infer the next statement; we recall that \mathcal{G} denotes the (weak) geodesic between the two metrics ω_0 and ω_1 .

THEOREM 4.2. — *For each $t \in \Sigma$ and for each $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, we consider the equation*

$$(\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{G} + dd^c\phi_{t,\varepsilon})^n = \varepsilon^{-n} \exp(\phi_{t,\varepsilon})\omega^n; \quad (4.1)$$

on $X \times \{t\}$. It has a unique $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(X \times \{t\})$ -solution $\phi_{t,\varepsilon}$; the resulting function ϕ_ε on $X \times \Sigma$ is continuous on the interior points of $X \times \Sigma$, and moreover we have

$$\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{G} + dd^c\phi_\varepsilon \geq 0 \quad (4.2)$$

on the product manifold $X \times \Sigma$.

Proof. — We proceed in a very standard manner, namely by an approximation argument. Let (\mathcal{G}_δ) be a family of (1,1)-forms on the open set

$$X \times \Sigma' \subset X \times \Sigma$$

obtained by considering the convolution of the potential φ with a convolution kernel K_δ , cf. e.g. [11]. Here Σ' stands for a compact subset of the

annulus Σ . The resulting (1,1)-forms are approximating our weak geodesic \mathcal{G} , as follows.

- (i) The forms \mathcal{G}_δ are non-singular, and we have

$$\mathcal{G}_\delta \geq -C\delta(\omega + \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t})$$

on $X \times \Sigma'$.

- (ii) The coefficients of \mathcal{G}_δ are uniformly bounded, and they converge in L^p norm to the coefficients of \mathcal{G} , so that if we write

$$\mathcal{G}_\delta := \omega + dd^c\varphi_\delta$$

then we have

$$|dd^c\varphi_\delta - dd^c\varphi|_{L^p(X \times \{t\})} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, uniformly with respect to $t \in \Sigma'$ and for any p .

- (iii) We have

$$\sup_{t \in \Sigma'} \|\varphi_\delta - \varphi\|_{C^1(X \times \{t\})} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

The properties (ii) and (iii) of the approximation family (\mathcal{G}_δ) hold true thanks to the explicit construction of (\mathcal{G}_δ) by using the convolution of the potential of \mathcal{G} with a regularizing kernel ([11]), combined with the fact that the potential of \mathcal{G} is $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$.

For each $\eta := (\varepsilon, \delta)$ such that ε and δ are positive and small enough we define the semi-positive form

$$\beta_\eta := \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{G}_\delta + C\delta(\omega + \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t})). \quad (4.3)$$

The class $c_1(K_X) + \{\beta_\eta\}|_{X \times \{t\}}$ is clearly Kähler; by the classical result of S.-T. Yau we infer that there exists a function $\phi_{t,\eta}$ such that we have

$$\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \beta_\eta|_{X \times \{t\}} + dd^c\phi_{t,\eta} > 0 \quad (4.4)$$

together with

$$(\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \beta_\eta + dd^c\phi_{t,\eta})^n = \varepsilon^{-n} \exp(\phi_{t,\eta})\omega^n \quad (4.5)$$

on the fiber $X \times \{t\}$.

According to the proof of Theorem 4.1, we infer that

$$\Xi_\eta := \Theta_\omega(K_X) + \beta_\eta + dd^c\phi_\eta \geq 0, \quad (4.6)$$

as a smooth form on $X \times \Sigma'$ —actually, this is the only reason why we need to consider the regularization of \mathcal{G} with respect to the parameter “ t ” as well. Actually that this is *exactly* how the current Ξ in Theorem 4.1 is constructed, so (4.6) is a direct consequence of this result.

We show next that the family ϕ_η is equicontinuous *for each ε fixed*; prior to this, we introduce a few notations.

Let $\tau_\eta := \varepsilon\phi_\eta + \varphi_\delta$; it is a smooth function defined on $X \times \Sigma'$. Then for each $t_0, t_1 \in \Sigma'$ we have

$$\left(\Psi_{t_0, \eta} + dd^c(\tau_\eta(t_1) - \tau_\eta(t_0))\right)^n = e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\tau_\eta(t_1) - \tau_\eta(t_0) - \varphi_\delta(t_1) + \varphi_\delta(t_0))} \Psi_{t_0, \eta}^n \quad (4.7)$$

where $\Psi_{t, \eta} := \varepsilon \Xi_\eta|_{X \times \{t\}}$.

The maximum principle, combined with the property (iii) above (concerning the uniformity properties of the sequence φ_δ on $X \times \Sigma'$) shows that we have

$$\sup_{x \in X} |\phi_\eta(t_0, x) - \phi_\eta(t_1, x)| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}|t_0 - t_1|. \quad (4.8)$$

The same kind of arguments (i.e. the maximum principle applied on fibers $X \times \{t\}$) shows that in fact we have

$$|\phi_\eta(t_0, x_0) - \phi_\eta(t_1, x_1)| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}(|t_0 - t_1| + \text{dist}(x_0, x_1)) \quad (4.9)$$

where C is a constant independent of $\eta = (\varepsilon, \delta)$. This proves the claimed equicontinuity.

As a consequence, the limit $\phi_\varepsilon := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \phi_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ is continuous on the interior of $X \times \Sigma$, and we have

$$\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{G} + dd^c \phi_\varepsilon \geq 0, \quad (4.10)$$

which finishes the proof of Theorem 4.2, except for the $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(X \times \{t\})$ -regularity of the solution $\phi_{t, \varepsilon}$; this will be treated next. \square

In our next statement we will use another type of regularization of the geodesic \mathcal{G} , borrowed from [3]. We define $\mathcal{G}'_\delta := \omega + dd^c \varphi_\delta$ on $X \times \Sigma$, such that for each $t \in \Sigma$, the function φ_δ is the regularization of $\varphi|_{X \times \{t\}}$ by a global convolution kernel. The properties of the resulting form which will be relevant for us are as follows.

- (1) The forms \mathcal{G}'_δ are non-singular when restricted to each fiber $X \times \{t\}$, and moreover there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that we have

$$|dd^c \varphi_\delta| \leq C$$

for any $\delta > 0$. We equally have

$$\mathcal{G}'_\delta \geq -C\delta(\omega + \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge \bar{d}\bar{t})$$

on $X \times \Sigma$.

- (2) The coefficients of \mathcal{G}'_δ are uniformly bounded, and they converge in L^p norm to the coefficients of \mathcal{G} , so that if we write

$$\mathcal{G}'_\delta := \omega + dd^c \varphi_\delta$$

then we have

$$|dd^c \varphi_\delta - dd^c \varphi|_{L^p(X \times \{t\})} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, uniformly with respect to $t \in \Sigma$ and for any p .

- (3) We have

$$\lim \|\varphi_\delta - \varphi\|_{C^0(X \times \Sigma)} = 0$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

We consider the Monge-Ampère equation

$$(\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \beta'_\eta + dd^c \phi_{t,\eta})^n = \varepsilon^{-n} \exp(\phi_{t,\eta}) \omega^n \quad (4.11)$$

on the fiber $X \times \{t\}$, where

$$\beta'_\eta := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{G}'_\delta + C\delta(\omega + \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t})). \quad (4.12)$$

The regularity/uniformity properties of the functions $(\phi_{t,\eta})_\eta$ are stated in the following result.

THEOREM 4.3. — *The following assertions hold true.*

- (a) *For each fixed ε , the family ϕ_η obtained by piecing together the fiber-wise solutions $\phi_{t,\eta}$ is equicontinuous.*
 (b) *There exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of η such that*

$$\sup_X \phi_{\varepsilon,\delta} \leq C, \quad -\varepsilon \inf_X \phi_{\varepsilon,\delta} \leq C, \quad |\varepsilon dd^c \phi_{\varepsilon,\delta}| \leq C.$$

on the fiber $X \times \{t\}$.

- (c) *Therefore for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we can extract a limit*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \phi_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \phi_\varepsilon,$$

strongly in C^0 , where the restriction of ϕ_ε to $X \times \{t\}$ is the unique $C^{1,1}$ solution of the degenerate Monge-Ampère equation

$$(\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{G} + dd^c \phi_{t,\varepsilon})^n = \varepsilon^{-n} \exp(\phi_{t,\varepsilon}) \omega^n \quad (4.13)$$

on the fiber $X \times \{t\}$.

- (d) *The measures*

$$\exp(\phi_{t,\varepsilon}) \omega^n$$

are converging to $\mathcal{G}|_{X \times \{t\}}^n$ weakly in L^p for any p , as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. — Except maybe for the point (d), the arguments of the proof rely on basic results in MA theory, so we will be very sketchy.

The point (a) was basically discussed during the proof of Theorem 4.2. In addition, we remark that by the same procedure we obtain the equicontinuity of (ϕ_η) on $X \times \Sigma$ up to the boundary of $X \times \Sigma$: this is a consequence of the property (2) of \mathcal{G}'_δ .

Concerning the point (b), the upper bound of the potentials is a consequence of the maximum principle since we can rewrite the equation (4.11) as

$$(\varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \mathcal{G}_\delta + dd^c(\varepsilon\phi_{t,\eta}))^n = \exp(\phi_{t,\eta})\omega^n, \quad (4.14)$$

then take $\phi_{t,\eta}(p) = \max_X \phi_{t,\eta}$, which implies $dd^c\phi_{t,\eta}(p) \leq 0$. But notice that the form $\varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \mathcal{G}_\delta$ is strictly positive at the point p thanks to the inequality (4.4), hence

$$\phi_{t,\eta} \leq \phi_{t,\eta}(p) \leq \log \frac{(\varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X) + \mathcal{G}_\delta)^n}{\omega^n}(p) \leq C.$$

On the other hand, the lower bound is obtained by considering

$$(\omega + \varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X) + dd^c\tau_{t,\eta})^n = e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\tau_{t,\eta} - \varphi_\delta)}\omega^n \quad (4.15)$$

where $\tau_{t,\eta} = \varepsilon\phi_{t,\eta} + \varphi_\delta$, so by choosing $\tau_{t,\eta}(q) = \min_X \tau_{t,\eta}$, the minimum principle says

$$\varepsilon\phi_{t,\eta} + \varphi_\delta \geq \varepsilon \log \frac{(\omega + \varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X))^n}{\omega^n}(q) + \varphi_\delta(q) \geq -\varepsilon C + \varphi_\delta(q),$$

hence $\varepsilon\phi_{t,\eta} \geq -C$ for some uniform constant C . Now the bound of $dd^c\tau_{t,\eta}$ follows from the usual Laplacian estimate for the Monge-Ampère equations, cf. [5]. For fixed η , let $\omega_\varepsilon = \omega + \varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X)$, and notice that it is a smooth non-degenerate approximation of ω , then we can write $\Delta\tau = g_\varepsilon^{j\bar{k}}\tau_{j\bar{k}}$, and set

$$\alpha := \log(n + \Delta\tau) - A\tau,$$

where $A > 0$ is some constant determined later. Consider the point p where the maximum of α is attained, and take $u = G_\varepsilon + \tau$, where the function G_ε is the local potential of ω_ε in a normal coordinate ball of p , then the standard maximum principle argument implies at the point p

$$0 \geq \frac{1}{\Delta u} \left\{ -B\Delta u \sum_p \frac{1}{u_{p\bar{p}}} + \Delta\phi_{t,\eta} - S \right\} + A \sum_p \frac{1}{u_{p\bar{p}}} - nA, \quad (4.16)$$

where $-B < 0$ is the lower bound of bisectonal curvature, and S is the upper bound of scalar curvature of (X, ω_ε) . Now take $A = B$, then we have

$$nB\Delta u + S \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\Delta(\tau - \varphi_\delta),$$

hence

$$n + \Delta\varphi_\delta + S\varepsilon \geq (1 - \varepsilon nB)\Delta u,$$

and finally

$$\Delta u(p) \leq \frac{C}{1 - \varepsilon nB} < 2C$$

for some uniform constant C , when $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2nB}$. Then suppose there is some uniform constant C' such that $\text{osc}(\tau) < C'$, we infer

$$\Delta u \leq 2Ce^{2BC'}$$

The statement (c) is a consequence of the elliptic regularity results, cf. [12]. Moreover, since the solution $\phi_{t,\varepsilon}$ belongs to the space $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ we infer that the equality (4.13) holds almost everywhere on $X \times \{t\}$ (in the sense of L^∞ functions).

In order to establish the point (d), we rewrite the equation (4.13) as follows

$$(\omega + \varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X) + dd^c\tau_\varepsilon)^n = e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\tau_\varepsilon - \varphi)}\omega^n \quad (4.17)$$

where we recall that $\mathcal{G} = \omega + dd^c\varphi$. In the relation (4.17), we denote $\tau_\varepsilon := \varepsilon\phi_\varepsilon + \varphi$, so we will be done if we can prove that

$$\varepsilon\phi_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In any case, thanks to the estimates (b), there exists some function $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ such that we have

$$\varepsilon\phi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \rho \quad (4.18)$$

strongly in $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}$ for any $\alpha < 1$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, so that the limit τ extracted from τ_ε verifies the inequality

$$\tau \leq \varphi \quad (4.19)$$

as it is clear from the second part of estimate (b).

In particular, the convergence statement in (4.18) implies that we have

$$(\omega + \varepsilon\Theta_\omega(K_X) + dd^c\tau_\varepsilon)^n \rightarrow (\omega + dd^c\tau)^n \quad (4.20)$$

in weak sense in L^p for any p (this is due to the fact that all currents in the concern have uniformly bounded coefficients).

Let $\Omega_\delta := \{\tau < \varphi - \delta\}$; it is an open subset of X , and we claim that $\mathcal{G}^n|_{\Omega_\delta} = 0$, for each $\delta > 0$. Indeed, by the comparison principle [15], [14] we have

$$\int_{\Omega_\delta} \mathcal{G}^n \leq \int_{\Omega_\delta} (\omega + dd^c\tau)^n. \quad (4.21)$$

However, as we can see from equation (4.17), we have $\int_{\Omega_\delta} (\omega + dd^c \tau)^n = 0$, simply because on the set Ω_δ we have the inequality $\frac{\tau_\varepsilon - \varphi}{\varepsilon} < -\frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon}$ as soon as ε is small enough – remark that this is a consequence of the uniform convergence in (4.18) – so our claim is proved.

But then it follows that $\mathcal{G}^n|_{\overline{\Omega}} = 0$, where $\overline{\Omega}$ is the closure of the open set $\{\tau < \varphi\} \subset X$. Indeed, the set $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega$ has measure zero, and the coefficients of \mathcal{G} are bounded. We infer that we have

$$\mathcal{G}^n = (\omega + dd^c \tau)^n \tag{4.22}$$

since the complement of $\overline{\Omega}$ is an open set where τ coincides with φ .

We invoke next the uniqueness result in [15] concerning the solutions of MA equations whose right hand side member has a density in L^p , for $p > 1$, so that $\rho = 0$ and the point (d) of our lemma follows. \square

Remark 4.4. — The fiberwise convergence (d) was proved in [1] in a slightly different setting; the main argument in that article relies on the variational approach developed in [2]. However, we have chosen to give a direct proof here, for the sake of variation.

4.1. Convexity

Let $t_0, t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$ be three arbitrary points. By the property (d) combined with a result due to Banach-Saks one can find a sequence $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \exp(\phi_{t_p, \varepsilon_j}) \rightarrow \frac{\mathcal{G}^n}{\omega^n} |_{X \times \{t_p\}}$$

in $L^2(X \times \{t_p\})$, for each $p = 0, 1, 2$. The sequence (ε_k) depends on the triple (t_p) , but fortunately this does not matter for the rest of the proof.

For each $t \in \Sigma$, let $\omega_{t,k} \in \{\omega\}$ be the Kähler metric such that

$$\omega_{t,k}^n = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \exp(\phi_{t, \varepsilon_j}) \omega^n. \tag{4.23}$$

Let \mathcal{M}_k be the Mabuchi functional evaluated on the weak geodesic \mathcal{G} , with the entropy term modified by using $\log \omega_{t,k}^n$ instead of $\log \mathcal{G}^n$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}_k(t) = \frac{S}{n+1} \mathcal{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Ric}_\omega}(\varphi_t) + \int_X \log \frac{\omega_{t,k}^n}{\omega^n} \mathcal{G}^n \tag{4.24}$$

Then we have the following statement.

LEMMA 4.5. — *For each $k \geq 1$ the functional \mathcal{M}_k is a continuous convex function on $[0, 1]$.*

Proof. — Our first observation is that the functional \mathcal{M}_k is continuous. Indeed, this is the case given the regularity we have already established in Theorem 4.3 for each ϕ_k , combined with the stability theorem due to S. Kolodziej, cf. [15]; we do not give further details here.

It is therefore enough to show that \mathcal{M}_k is convex in weak sense; this boils down to the inequality

$$dd^c \log \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \exp(\phi_{\varepsilon_j}) \right) \wedge \mathcal{G}^n \geq \text{Ricci}_\omega \wedge \mathcal{G}^n. \quad (4.25)$$

This is immediately seen to be true, as follows. We have

$$dd^c \log \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \exp(\phi_{\varepsilon_j}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\exp(\phi_{\varepsilon_j})}{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\phi_{\varepsilon_i})} dd^c \phi_{\varepsilon_j} \quad (4.26)$$

by a direct computation, and moreover Theorem 4.2 shows that we have

$$- \text{Ricci}_\omega + \varepsilon_j^{-1} \mathcal{G} + dd^c \phi_{\varepsilon_j} \geq 0. \quad (4.27)$$

By using this inequality in (4.26), we obtain

$$dd^c \log \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \exp(\phi_{\varepsilon_j}) \wedge \mathcal{G}^n \geq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\exp(\phi_{\varepsilon_j})}{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\phi_{\varepsilon_i})} \text{Ricci}_\omega \wedge \mathcal{G}^n \quad (4.28)$$

which proves the lemma. \square

COROLLARY 4.6. — *The Mabuchi functional \mathcal{M} is a convex function on the interval $[0, 1]$.*

Proof. — We intend to use the convexity of \mathcal{M}_k (cf. preceding lemma) together with a limit argument. To this end, we first consider the following “truncated version” of \mathcal{M}_k .

$$\mathcal{M}_{k,A}(t) := \frac{S}{n+1} \mathcal{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Ric}_\omega}(\rho_{\varepsilon,t}) + \int_X \max \left(\log \frac{\omega_{t,k}^n}{\omega^n}, \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n} \right) \mathcal{G}^n \quad (4.29)$$

where A is a constant, and $h_A = e^{-A} dV$ is a continuous volume element, such that its associated curvature is greater than $-C\mathcal{G}$.

The inequality (4.25) combined with the choice of h_A show that

$$dd^c \log \max \left(\frac{\omega_{t,k}^n}{\omega^n}, \frac{h_A}{\omega^n} \right) \wedge \mathcal{G}^n \geq \text{Ricci}_\omega \wedge \mathcal{G}^n \quad (4.30)$$

for any k, A . In conclusion, the functional $\mathcal{M}_{k,A}$ is convex (and continuous).

Let $t_p \in [0, 1]$ be three arbitrary points; we can apply the convexity inequality for each $\mathcal{M}_{k,A}$ corresponding to the points $(t_p)_{p=0,1,2}$ and we first let $k \rightarrow \infty$, and then we let $A \rightarrow \infty$. The first limit equals

$$\mathcal{M}_A(t) := \frac{S}{n+1} \mathcal{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Ric}_\omega}(\varphi_t) + \int_X \max \left(\log \frac{\mathcal{G}^n}{\omega^n}, \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n} \right) \mathcal{G}^n \quad (4.31)$$

by dominated convergence. The limit $A \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.31) is precisely \mathcal{M} , so the convexity of Mabuchi functional follows. \square

Remark 4.7. — The preceding truncation procedure is taken from [4]. It might be possible to prove directly that \mathcal{M}_k converges to \mathcal{M} , by using the fact that the sequence of functions

$$\log \frac{\omega_{t,k}^n}{\omega^n} \quad (4.32)$$

is *almost subharmonic* with respect to \mathcal{G} , cf. (4.25), and uniformly bounded from above. This should imply the convergence statement mentioned above (by analogy to the case of psh functions).

Remark 4.8. — Actually one can choose the volume element h_A above as follows. We recall that φ is the ω -potential of the geodesic \mathcal{G} . Let $C \gg 0$ be a large constant, such that $C\omega \geq \text{Ricci}_\omega$. We define

$$h_A := e^{-C\varphi - A} \omega^n$$

and then we have the following relation $dd^c \log h_A \geq -C\mathcal{G}$ as well as $dd^c \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n} \geq -C\mathcal{G}$.

4.2. Continuity at the boundary

Given that \mathcal{M} is a convex function, it is automatically continuous on the open interval $]0, 1[$. In this subsection we will show that the continuity property holds up to the boundary.

To this end we recall next a few well-known facts concerning the entropy functional H , defined as

$$H(\varphi) := \int_X f_\varphi \log f_\varphi d\mu,$$

where

$$f_\varphi = \frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega^n}$$

is an L^∞ function provided that the potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}$, and the probability measure $d\mu$ equals ω^n .

The following semi-continuity property of H is well-known, cf. [9], [2] and the references therein.

LEMMA 4.9. — *Let φ_i, φ and f_i, f be as above, and suppose f, f_i are uniformly bounded non-negative functions, such that $f_i \rightarrow f$ weakly in L^1 , then*

$$\liminf_i \int_X (f_i \log f_i - f \log f) d\mu \geq 0.$$

In the same spirit, we state next a version of the previous lemma, which will be very useful later on. The set-up is as follows: χ is a continuous function, and $h_A = \exp(\chi - A)$. We consider the following truncated version of the entropy functional

$$H_A(\varphi) := \int_X f_i \log \max(f_i, h_A) d\mu.$$

Our claim is as follows.

LEMMA 4.10. — *The truncated entropy functional has the following weak semi-continuity type property*

$$\liminf_i H_A(\varphi_i) - H_A(\varphi) \geq -\delta(A)$$

for some uniform constant $\delta(A) > 0$ such that $\delta(A) \rightarrow 0$ as A tends to ∞ . The sequence (f_i) is assumed to verify the hypothesis of the preceding lemma.

We will not detail here the arguments for the proof of Lemma 4.10, because they are completely similar to the classical case, cf. Lemma 4.9.

The Mabuchi functional can be written as

$$\mathcal{M}(\varphi) = E(\varphi) + H(\varphi) \tag{4.33}$$

where E is the energy part of the Mabuchi functional, and H is the entropy part. As a consequence of our previous results, we establish here the following statement.

THEOREM 4.11. — *The Mabuchi functional $\mathcal{M}(\varphi(t))$ is a continuous convex function on $[0, 1]$.*

Proof. — The proof results immediately from our previous considerations. Indeed, since \mathcal{M} is a convex function, we automatically have

$$\mathcal{M}(0) \geq \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}(t) \quad (4.34)$$

On the other hand, the semi-continuity properties of the entropy functional in Lemma 4.9 show that in fact we have

$$\mathcal{M}(0) \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}(t) \quad (4.35)$$

and the proof of Theorem 4.11 is completed. Indeed, the *energy* part of the Mabuchi functional is continuous, given the regularity of the potential of \mathcal{G} . \square

5. Almost convexity along ε -geodesics

In [7], the geodesic \mathcal{G} is obtained by the continuity method, and as a by-product of the proof, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ one has a smooth, positive (1,1)-form

$$\omega_\varepsilon := \omega + dd^c \rho_\varepsilon \quad (5.1)$$

on $X \times \Sigma$ such that the next identity holds

$$\omega_\varepsilon^{n+1} = \varepsilon \sqrt{-1} dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega^n. \quad (5.2)$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon,A} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the regularization of the Mabuchi functional evaluated on ω_ε . By definition, this equals

$$\mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon,A}(t) = \frac{S}{n+1} \mathcal{E}(\varphi_t) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Ric}\omega}(\rho_{\varepsilon,t}) + \int_X \max\left(\log \frac{\omega_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n}, \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n}\right) \omega_\varepsilon^n \quad (5.3)$$

where h_A is a volume element on X whose associated curvature is greater than $-C\mathcal{G}$ for some positive constant C .

Then Hessian of $\mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon,A}$ reads as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Sigma \mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon,A} dd^c \tau &= \int_{X \times \Sigma} \tau (\omega_\varepsilon^{n+1} - \text{Ric}(\omega) \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n) \\ &+ \int_{X \times \Sigma} \log \max\left(\frac{\omega_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n}, \frac{h_A}{\omega^n}\right) \omega_\varepsilon^n \wedge dd^c \tau \\ &= \varepsilon - \int_{X \times \Sigma} \text{Ric}(\omega) \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n + \int_{X \times \Sigma} \tau dd^c \log \max\left(\frac{\omega_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n}, \frac{h_A}{\omega^n}\right) \omega_\varepsilon^n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where τ is any test function on Σ .

The main result of this second part of our article is the following.

THEOREM 5.1. — *For each positive constant $A \gg 0$, the function*

$$\mathcal{M}_A := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon, A} \tag{5.5}$$

is convex.

Proof. — It would be enough to prove that for any $A \gg 0$ there exists a constant C_A such that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X \times \Sigma} \tau dd^c \max \left(\log \frac{\omega_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n}, \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n} \right) \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n &\geq \int_{X \times \Sigma} \tau \operatorname{Ricci}_\omega \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n \\ &- \varepsilon C_A \int_\Sigma \tau \sqrt{-1} dt \wedge d\bar{t} \\ &- C_A \int_{X \times \Sigma} \tau \mathcal{G} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

for any positive test function τ on Σ . Indeed, if we could establish (5.6), the convexity of \mathcal{M}_A would follow by (5.4) given that $\omega_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ so that we have

$$\int_{X \times \Sigma} \tau \mathcal{G} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n \rightarrow \int_{X \times \Sigma} \tau \mathcal{G}^{n+1} = 0$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The inequality (5.6) will be shown to hold true in the next paragraph by a direct computation.

To this end, we recall the following technical statement, which will justify some of the calculations below.

LEMMA 5.2. — *Let u and v be two smooth functions on a complex manifold Z , and let ω be a Kähler metric on Z . We assume that v is subharmonic with respect to ω , and that we equally have $\Delta_\omega(u) \geq 0$ on the set $u > v - 1$. Then the ω -Laplacian of the function $\max(u, v)$ is positive.*

Indeed this follows from the fact that a smooth function is subharmonic if and only if it satisfies the mean value inequality (in this context, the usual Lebesgue measure is replaced with the harmonic measure on balls); we refer to [13] and the references therein for a complete account of these facts. In the next section we will have to deal with functions whose Laplacian is greater than $-C$. Then we have a similar statement, since locally we can construct functions with strictly positive Laplacian (e.g. the potential of the metric ω).

5.1. The computation

In order to simplify the notations, we define the function $f_\varepsilon : X \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the equality

$$\frac{\omega_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n} \Big|_{X \times \{t\}} = e^{f_\varepsilon(t, \cdot)}. \quad (5.7)$$

We introduce the set

$$\Omega_{\varepsilon, A} := \left\{ (z, t) \in X \times \Sigma \text{ such that } f_\varepsilon(t, z) > \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n}(t, z) \right\} \quad (5.8)$$

so that we have

$$\max \left(\log \frac{\omega_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n}, \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n} \right) = f_\varepsilon(t, z) \quad (5.9)$$

on $\Omega_{\varepsilon, A}$. This reveals the importance of considering the functional $\mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon, A}$: on the set $\Omega_{\varepsilon, A}$ the distortion function f_ε is bounded from below *by a quantity which is independent of ε* . This simple remark will play a crucial role in the next considerations.

We will proceed next to the evaluation of the top form

$$d\nu_\varepsilon := (dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega) \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n \quad (5.10)$$

pointwise on the set $\Omega_{\varepsilon, A}$ – this will be sufficient for us, by Lemma 5.2 together with the choice of h_A .

We fix now a few notations: locally near a point $(z, t) \in X \times \Sigma$ we write the metric ω_ε as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\varepsilon &= \sqrt{-1}g_{t\bar{t}}dt \wedge \bar{d}\bar{t} + \sqrt{-1}g_{t\bar{\alpha}}dt \wedge dz^{\bar{\alpha}} + \sqrt{-1}g_{\alpha\bar{t}}dz^\alpha \wedge \bar{d}\bar{t} \\ &+ \sqrt{-1}g_{\gamma\bar{\alpha}}dz^\gamma \wedge dz^{\bar{\alpha}} \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

where the coefficients g in the expression above depend on ε as well.

The equation (5.7) satisfied by ω_ε can be written in local coordinates as

$$\begin{aligned} c(\varphi_\varepsilon) &:= g_{t\bar{t}} - g^{\gamma\bar{\alpha}}g_{\gamma\bar{t}}g_{t\bar{\alpha}} \\ &= \varepsilon e^{-f_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Let

$$v := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - g^{\gamma\bar{\alpha}}g_{t\bar{\alpha}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z^\gamma} \quad (5.13)$$

be the gradient of the t derivative of φ_ε .

Remark 5.3. — We will give here a few explanations about the computations to follow. The (1,1)–form

$$\Theta_\varepsilon := dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega \tag{5.14}$$

represents the curvature of the relative canonical bundle $K_{X \times \Sigma / \Sigma}$ endowed with the determinant of the metric ω_ε . Then we have the formula

$$\Theta_\varepsilon(v, \bar{v}) = |\bar{\partial}v|^2 + \Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon} c(\varphi_\varepsilon) \tag{5.15}$$

(which will be established at the end of this paragraph) showing that modulo the Laplacian of the the term $c(\varphi_\varepsilon)$, the form Θ_ε is positive in the direction v . In order to analyze the quantity we have to deal with in (5.10), we will write the metric ω_ε as the sum of two positive forms, cf. (5.17) below, such that the vector v belongs to the kernel ρ_ε plus an “error” term. The point is that the integral

$$\int_X \frac{\Theta_\varepsilon \wedge \rho_\varepsilon^n}{\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t}} \tag{5.16}$$

is positive, by (5.15).

Given this, we rewrite locally the metric ω_ε as follows

$$\omega_\varepsilon = c(\varphi_\varepsilon)\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} + \rho_\varepsilon \tag{5.17}$$

where ρ_ε has the same expression as ω_ε , except that we replace $g_{t\bar{t}}$ with $g^{\gamma\bar{\alpha}}g_{\gamma\bar{t}}g_{t\bar{\alpha}}$. We note that although ρ_ε may not be closed, it is positive definite on each slice $X \times \{t\}$ and it satisfies

$$\rho_\varepsilon^{n+1} = 0. \tag{5.18}$$

We have the equality

$$\omega_\varepsilon^n = \rho_\varepsilon^n + nc(\varphi_\varepsilon)\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \rho_\varepsilon^{n-1} \tag{5.19}$$

which is the same as

$$\omega_\varepsilon^n = \rho_\varepsilon^n + nc(\varphi_\varepsilon)\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^{n-1} \tag{5.20}$$

by the definition of the form ρ_ε .

- The “error” factor

$$nc(\varphi_\varepsilon)(dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega) \wedge \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^{n-1} \tag{5.21}$$

is analyzed as follows.

We observe that we have

$$nc(\varphi_\varepsilon)dd^c f_\varepsilon \wedge \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^{n-1} = c(\varphi_\varepsilon)\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(f_\varepsilon)\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n \tag{5.22}$$

and by the equality (5.12) we have

$$nc(\varphi_\varepsilon)dd^c f_\varepsilon \wedge \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^{n-1} = \varepsilon\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(f_\varepsilon)\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n. \quad (5.23)$$

The other term in the equality (5.21) is bounded in L^1 norm by εC_A , given that on the set $\Omega_{\varepsilon,A} \cap X \times \{t\}$ the eigenvalues of ω_ε are bounded from below (and above) by a constant independent of ε , so that the trace of Ricci_ω with respect to ω_ε is bounded by some constant C_A .

Therefore, we have

$$nc(\varphi_\varepsilon) \frac{(dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega) \wedge \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^{n-1}}{\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_0^n} \geq \varepsilon\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(f_\varepsilon) - \varepsilon C_A \quad (5.24)$$

This can be rewritten in the following way

$$nc(\varphi_\varepsilon)(dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega) \wedge \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^{n-1} \geq \Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(f_\varepsilon)\omega_\varepsilon^{n+1} - C_A\omega_\varepsilon^{n+1}. \quad (5.25)$$

- The evaluation of the main term

$$(dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega) \wedge \rho_\varepsilon^n \quad (5.26)$$

goes as follows.

$$(dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega) \wedge \rho_\varepsilon^n = (dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega)(v, \bar{v})\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \rho_\varepsilon^n. \quad (5.27)$$

Indeed, this is a matter of linear algebra: we have

$$\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2^n = \frac{\beta_1(v, \bar{v})}{\lambda(v, \bar{v})} \lambda \wedge \beta_2^n$$

on a vector space of dimension $n+1$, where λ, β_j are $(1,1)$ -forms, such that v is in the kernel of β_2 , and such that $\lambda(v, \bar{v}) \neq 0$.

A straightforward calculation which we will detail in a moment shows that we have

$$(dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega)(v, \bar{v}) \geq \varepsilon\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(e^{-f_\varepsilon}). \quad (5.28)$$

Since we have $\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(e^{-f_\varepsilon}) \geq -e^{-f_\varepsilon}\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(f_\varepsilon)$, the inequality (5.28) combined with (5.25) finishes the proof. Indeed, we first remark that we have

$$\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \rho_\varepsilon^n = \sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n;$$

by (5.28) we obtain

$$(dd^c f_\varepsilon - \text{Ricci}_\omega)(v, \bar{v}) \geq -\varepsilon\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(f_\varepsilon)\sqrt{-1}dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n \quad (5.29)$$

and we observe that the right hand side of (5.29) is nothing but

$$-\Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(f_\varepsilon)\omega_\varepsilon^{n+1}.$$

Thus, we infer the inequality

$$dd^c \max \left(\log \frac{\omega_\varepsilon^n}{\omega^n}, \log \frac{h_A}{\omega^n} \right) \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n \geq -C_A (\omega_\varepsilon^{n+1} + \mathcal{G} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n) \quad (5.30)$$

globally on $X \times \Sigma$. We remark that the term $\mathcal{G} \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^n$ appears in (5.30) thanks to the curvature properties of h_A , cf. Remark 4.8.

We prove next the inequality (5.28); before that, we remark that the following approach is quite standard in the theory of the homogeneous Monge-Ampère equations, cf. [7], [8], [9]... Also, the inequality (5.28) is very similar to the positivity of the curvature along the leaves of the foliation (which does not exist in our case...), cf. [9].

The next computations are done with respect to a geodesic coordinate system at (X, z) ; we have

$$\bar{\partial} \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) = g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \bar{t}} d\bar{t} + g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \bar{\gamma}} dz^{\bar{\gamma}} \quad (5.31)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\bar{\partial} \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) &= (g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \bar{t}} + g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, t\bar{t}}) dt \wedge d\bar{t} \\ &+ g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \gamma\bar{t}} dz^\gamma \wedge d\bar{t} + g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, t\bar{\gamma}} dt \wedge dz^{\bar{\gamma}} \\ &+ g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \gamma\bar{\tau}} dz^\gamma \wedge dz^{\bar{\tau}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

Since the metric ω_ε is locally given by the Hessian of a function, the following commutation relations

$$g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, t\bar{t}} = g_{t\bar{t}, \alpha\bar{\beta}} \quad (5.33)$$

hold true on X . Given that

$$g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}_{,t} = -g^{\alpha\bar{\gamma}} g^{\delta\bar{\beta}} g_{\delta\bar{\gamma}, t} \quad (5.34)$$

the equality (5.32) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\bar{\partial} \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) &= (g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{t\bar{t}, \alpha\bar{\beta}} - g^{\alpha\bar{\gamma}} g^{\delta\bar{\beta}} g_{\delta\bar{\gamma}, \bar{t}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, t}) dt \wedge d\bar{t} \\ &+ g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \gamma\bar{t}} dz^\gamma \wedge d\bar{t} + g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, t\bar{\gamma}} dt \wedge dz^{\bar{\gamma}} \\ &+ g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \gamma\bar{\tau}} dz^\gamma \wedge dz^{\bar{\tau}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

We evaluate this in the v -direction, and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial\bar{\partial} \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})(v, \bar{v}) &= g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{t\bar{t}, \alpha\bar{\beta}} - g^{\alpha\bar{\gamma}} g^{\delta\bar{\beta}} g_{\gamma\bar{\delta}, \bar{t}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, t} \\
 &- g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \gamma\bar{t}} g^{\gamma\bar{\mu}} g_{t\bar{\mu}} - g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, t\bar{\gamma}} g^{\mu\bar{\gamma}} g_{\mu\bar{t}} \quad (5.36) \\
 &+ g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}, \gamma\bar{\tau}} g^{\gamma\bar{\mu}} g^{\rho\bar{\tau}} g_{t\bar{\mu}} g_{\rho\bar{t}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The equation satisfied by the metric ω_ε reads as

$$g_{t\bar{t}} - g^{p\bar{q}} g_{p\bar{t}} g_{t\bar{q}} = \varepsilon e^{-f_\varepsilon} \quad (5.37)$$

so that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{t\bar{t}, \alpha\bar{\beta}} - \varepsilon \Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(e^{-f_\varepsilon}) &= g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g^{\rho\bar{q}}_{, \alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{p\bar{t}} g_{t\bar{q}} \\
 &+ g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g^{\rho\bar{q}} g_{p\bar{t}, \alpha\bar{\beta}} g_{t\bar{q}} + g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g^{\rho\bar{q}} g_{p\bar{t}} g_{t\bar{q}, \alpha\bar{\beta}} \quad (5.38) \\
 &+ g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g^{\rho\bar{q}} g_{p\bar{t}, \alpha} g_{t\bar{q}, \bar{\beta}} + g^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} g^{\rho\bar{q}} g_{p\bar{t}, \bar{\beta}} g_{t\bar{q}, \alpha}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By combining (5.38) with (5.36) we obtain

$$\partial\bar{\partial} \log \det(g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}})(v, \bar{v}) = |\bar{\partial}v|^2 + \varepsilon \Delta_{\omega_\varepsilon}(e^{-f_\varepsilon}) \quad (5.39)$$

and the inequality (5.28) follows. \square

5.2. Further results and comments

It is very likely that the convexity of \mathcal{M} in the sense of distributions can be derived by the techniques we have developed in the previous section, i.e. using ε -geodesics. One of the motivations to do so is that the resulting proof would be more “self-contained”.

However, we encounter a rather severe difficulty: we ignore whether the fiberwise sequence of volume elements

$$\omega_\varepsilon^n$$

corresponding to the ε -geodesics is converging almost everywhere to the volume element of the geodesic \mathcal{G} .

Nevertheless, we strongly believe that this holds true, based on the following considerations. On the set $\Omega_{\varepsilon, A}$ we have

$$C(A)\omega < \omega_\varepsilon < C\omega \quad (5.40)$$

where $C(A)$ is a constant depending on A , but uniform with respect to ε , and C is a fixed constant, independent of ε, A . Indeed, this is a consequence

of the results in [7]. The relation (5.40) is a uniform *Laplacian estimate* for the metrics $\omega_\varepsilon|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}$. Hence, via Evans-Krylov theory one might hope that it is possible to obtain a higher regularity estimate for the family $(\varphi_\varepsilon|_{\Omega_{\varepsilon,A}})_{\varepsilon>0}$. The problem is that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the set $\Omega_{\varepsilon,A}$ converges eventually towards a set which is only measurable, and it is a-priori unclear how to implement Evans-Krylov theory in this setting.

However, we show here that the continuity of \mathcal{M} at the endpoints 0 and 1 can be also obtained as a consequence of the results we have established in the previous section (i.e. without knowing a-priori the convexity of \mathcal{M}).

THEOREM 5.4. — *The Mabuchi functional $\mathcal{M}(t)$ is continuous at the boundary points 0 and 1.*

Proof. — We identify in what follows τ and its real part $t = \text{Re}(\tau)$, since all the functionals involved in the proof only depends on the real part of τ . Also, we will only prove the continuity at 0.

A first observation is that we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}(t) \geq \mathcal{M}(0) \tag{5.41}$$

thanks to the entropy property recalled in Lemma 4.9.

Next, we observe that the lim sup of a sequence of convex functions which are locally bounded from above is still convex (unlike subharmonic functions). Hence if we define

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon,A} := \mathcal{M}_A,$$

then \mathcal{M}_A is a convex function on $[0, 1]$ by theorem (5.1). And by construction we have $\mathcal{M}_A(0) = \mathcal{M}(0)$ for any value of the regularization parameter A .

Now for every point $\tau \in (0, 1)$, we have $\mathcal{M}_A(\tau) \geq \mathcal{M}(\tau) - \delta(A)$, since

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} H_A(\varphi_\varepsilon) \geq H_A(\varphi) - \delta(A),$$

by Lemma 4.10.

We define a new functional

$$\limsup_{A \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{M}_A := \widetilde{\mathcal{M}},$$

and then $t \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ is a convex function on $[0, 1]$ which still verifies the equality $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(0) = \mathcal{M}(0)$.

Then we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(0) \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ by convexity, as well as the inequality $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau) \geq \mathcal{M}(\tau)$ for each $\tau \in (0, 1)$, thanks to the considerations above. We

therefore infer that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}(t) \leq \mathcal{M}(0) \quad (5.42)$$

and Theorem 5.4 is proved. \square

Bibliography

- [1] BERMAN (R.). — A thermodynamical formalism for Monge-Ampere equations, Moser-Trudinger inequalities and Kahler-Einstein metrics, arXiv:1011.3976.
- [2] BERMAN (R.), BOUCKSOM (S.), GUEDJ (V.), ZERIAHI (A.). — A variational approach to complex Monge-Ampère equations, Publications mathématiques de l’IHES, 117(1), p. 179-245 (2013).
- [3] BERMAN (R.), DEMAILLY (J.-P.). — Regularity of plurisubharmonic upper envelopes in big cohomology classes, Proceedings of the Symposium ”Perspectives in Analysis, Geometry and Topology” in honor of Oleg Viro (Stockholm University, May 2008), Progress in Math. 296, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York (2012).
- [4] BERMAN (R.), BERNDTSSON (B.). — Convexity of the K-energy on the space of Kähler metrics, arXiv:1405.0401
- [5] BLOCKI (Z.). — A gradient estimate in the Calabi-Yau theorem, Math. Ann., 344(2), p. 317-327 (2009).
- [6] BLOCKI (Z.). — On geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics, Proceedings of the “Conference in Geometry” dedicated to Shing-Tung Yau (Warsaw, April 2009), in “Advances in Geometric Analysis”, ed. S. Janeczko, J. Li, D. Phong, Advanced Lectures in Mathematics 21, International Press, p. 3-20 (2012).
- [7] CHEN (X.-X.). — Space of Kähler metrics. Journal of Differential Geometry, 56(2), p. 189-234 (2000).
- [8] CHEN (X.-X.). — On the lower bound of the Mabuchi energy and its application, Internat. Math. Res. Notices 2000, no. 12, p. 607-623.
- [9] CHEN (X.-X.), TIAN (G.). — Geometry of Kähler metrics and foliations by holomorphic discs, Publications Mathématiques de l’IHES, Vol 107, p. 1-107 (2008).
- [10] DARVAS (T.), LEMPERS (L.). — Weak geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics, Math. Res. Lett. 19, no. 5, p. 1127-1135 (2012).
- [11] DEMAILLY (J.-P.). — Regularization of closed positive currents of type (1,1) by the flow of a Chern connection, Actes du Colloque en l’honneur de P. Dolbeault (Juin 1992), édité par H. Skoda et J.M. Trépreau, Aspects of Mathematics, Vol. E 26, Vieweg, p. 105-126 (1994).
- [12] GILBARG (D.), TRUDINGER (N.). — Elliptic Partial Differential Equation of Second Order, Springer.
- [13] GREENE (R. E.), WU (H.). — C^∞ approximations of convex, subharmonic, and plurisubharmonic functions, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. (4) 12, no. 1 p. 47-84 (1979).
- [14] GUEDJ (V.), ZERIAHI (A.). — The weighted Monge-Ampère energy of quasipsh functions, J. Funct. An. 250, p. 442-482 (2007).
- [15] KOŁODZIEJ (S.). — Hölder continuity of solutions to the complex Monge-Ampère equation with the right-hand side in L^p : the case of compact Kähler manifolds, Math. Ann. 342, no. 2, p. 379-386 (2008).
- [16] LEMPERS (L.), VIVAS (L.). — Geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics, Duke Math. J. 162, no. 7, p. 1369-1381 (2013).
- [17] PÄUN (M.). — Relative adjoint transcendental classes and Albanese maps of compact Kaehler manifolds with nef Ricci curvature, arXiv:1209.2195