

REGULARITY FOR OBSTACLE PROBLEMS TO ANISOTROPIC PARABOLIC EQUATIONS

HAMID EL BAHJA

ABSTRACT. Following Dibenedetto’s intrinsic scaling method, we prove local Hölder continuity of weak solutions to obstacle problems related to some anisotropic parabolic equations under the condition for which only Hölder’s continuity of the obstacle is known.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work, we consider the regularity issue for a class of anisotropic parabolic equations of the form

$$(1.1) \quad u_t - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_T,$$

where $\Omega_T \equiv \Omega \times (0, T]$, Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 2$, $T > 0$, with the exponents $p_i \geq 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. The solutions to (1.1) are subject to an obstacle constraint of the form $u \geq \phi$ in Ω_T , with ϕ being Hölder continuous. In recent decades, there has been growing interest in these types of equations because of their interesting feature of anisotropic diffusion with orthotropic structure where the diffusion rates differ according to the direction x_i . Besides its inherent mathematical interest, they emerge for instance, from the mathematical description of the dynamics of fluids with different conductivities in different directions. This is important for modeling diffusion in materials that have a specific structure, such as wood, bone, or composite materials. For example, in bone, the diffusion of minerals is faster along the long axis of the bone than across the short axis. This is because the bone is made up of a network of interconnected canals, and the canals are oriented along the long axis of the bone. For more examples, see [24, 23, 1] and references therein.

In order to state our main result, we need to briefly describe the by-now classical approach to the regularity of solutions to the degenerate parabolic p -Laplace operator as first introduced by Dibenedetto [12, 13]. The latter realized that the poor structure of PDEs with quasi-linear parabolic operators should be taken into account. By including the singularity/degeneracy of the equation in a suitable geometry, we can derive integral inequalities for the "right" cylinders, which suggests that the PDE behaves in a specific way in its own geometry, and then the continuity of the solution at a point follows from showing that the oscillation converges to zero as a sequence of nested cylinders shrinks to the point.

Equation (1.1) with $p_i = p$ is reduced to the standard parabolic p -Laplacian type of equations whose regularity properties are well studied [12, 20, 25, 27]. However, the theory for the obstacle case is not yet complete. Hölder continuity for a class of parabolic quasi-linear obstacle problems is presented in [6, 18, 19] and references therein, and for obstacle problems to porous medium type equations has been treated in the recent papers [7, 21, 10].

When p_i 's are potentially different, the regularity of local solutions to (1.1) has been studied by several authors. We refer, e.g., to [3, 4] for results on local continuity of solutions to (1.1), to [15, 11] for intrinsic parabolic Harnack estimates, and to [9, 2] for higher regularity properties.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35K65, 35B65.

Key words and phrases. Anisotropic parabolic problems, Intrinsic Harnack inequality, Obstacle problems.

Nevertheless, despite the previously mentioned results, the regularity theory for obstacle problems related to elliptic/parabolic anisotropic equations is largely unknown. The latter is precisely the aim of this paper, where we will prove the following local continuity result.

Theorem 1.1. *Under the assumption that*

$$(1.2) \quad 2 < p_i < \bar{p}\left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right), \quad \bar{p} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} < N \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N,$$

and the obstacle $\phi \in C^{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}}(\Omega_T)$ for $\beta \in (0, 1)$, any local weak solution to the obstacle problem related to (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.3 is locally Hölder continuous.

To prove our result, we use a similar strategy to that used in [7, 21] for nonnegative obstacles, which relies on energy estimations for truncations of the solution and on a De Giorgi-type iteration argument. The basic idea is to construct a sequence of cylinders shrinking to a common vertex. Within each of these cylinders, we consider two measure-theoretic alternatives, which we will call the first and second alternatives. In both alternatives, the solution is bounded away from one of its extrema in a quantifiable way pointwise almost everywhere in a smaller cylinder. The derivation of the energy estimates for the obstacle problem is more complicated than for the obstacle-free case because the solution is not differentiable in time. This prevents us from using the solution itself as a comparison map. To overcome this difficulty, we use a mollification argument in time to exploit the weak formulation of the obstacle problem in the sense of Definition 2.3. However, since our equation exhibits degenerate anisotropic scaling behavior, we will work in cylinders that respect the intrinsic geometry of the equation. In particular, for any given $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$, we will use cylinders of the form

$$(1.3) \quad (x_0, t_0) + Q(\theta\rho^{p^+}, \rho) = B_\rho(x_0) \times (t_0 - \theta\rho^{p^+}, t_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R},$$

in which the scaling parameter θ reflects the degeneracy provided by the nature of our equation.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the definition of weak solutions related to our obstacle problem and introduce some fundamental analytic tools. In Section 3, we establish local energy and logarithmic estimates. In Section 4, we use the energy estimates to prove the local boundedness of the weak solutions. Finally, in Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.1.

2. DEFINITIONS AND TECHNICAL TOOLS

In what follows, we recall some definitions and basic properties of the anisotropic Lebesgue-Sobolev spaces. Then, for exponents $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N \geq 1$ we introduce the anisotropic space

$$W^{1,p_i}(\Omega) := \left\{u \in L^{p_i}(\Omega), \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \in L^{p_i}(\Omega)\right\},$$

which is Banach space under the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p_i}(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{L^{p_i}(\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^{p_i}(\Omega)}.$$

Also, $W_0^{1,p_i}(\Omega)$ denotes the closure of $C_0^1(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,p_i}(\Omega)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Next, for a multi-index $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_N)$ we put

$$W^{1,\vec{p}}(\Omega) = \bigcap_{i=1}^N W^{1,p_i}(\Omega), \quad \text{and} \quad L^{\vec{p}}(0, T; W^{1,\vec{p}}(\Omega)) = \bigcap_{i=1}^N L^{p_i}(0, T; W^{1,p_i}(\Omega)),$$

with

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,\vec{p}}(\Omega)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \|u\|_{W^{1,p_i}(\Omega)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{L^{\vec{p}}(0,T;W^{1,\vec{p}}(\Omega))} = \sum_{i=1}^N \|u\|_{L^{p_i}(0,T;W^{1,p_i}(\Omega))}.$$

We state now the Sobolev-Troisi inequality [26]

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded open set and consider $u \in W^{1,p_i}(\Omega)$, $p_i \geq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Set*

$$\frac{1}{\bar{p}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i}, \quad \bar{p}^* = \frac{N\bar{p}}{N - \bar{p}}.$$

If $\bar{p} < N$, there exists a positive constant C depending only on Ω , p_i and N such that

$$(2.1) \quad \|u\|_{\bar{p}^*} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^{p_i}(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{N}}.$$

Next, we state the following anisotropic embedding which can be found in [28].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $u \in C(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(0, T; W_0^{1,\bar{p}}(\Omega))$ and assume that*

$$\frac{2N}{N+2} \leq \bar{p} < N, \quad l = \bar{p} \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right).$$

Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \int_{\Omega_T} |u|^l \, dxdt \leq C \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega} |u|^2 \, dx + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega_T} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} \, dxdt \right)^{\frac{N+\bar{p}}{N}}.$$

To formally define the weak solutions to obstacle problems related to (1.1), we consider the following class of functions

$$K_\phi(\Omega) := \{u \in C(0, T; L^2(\Omega)); u \in L^{\bar{p}}(0, T; W^{1,\bar{p}}(\Omega)), u \geq \phi \text{ a.e. in } \Omega_T\}.$$

Furthermore, the class of admissible comparison functions is defined as follows

$$K'_\phi(\Omega) := \{u \in K_\phi(\Omega), u_t \in L^2(\Omega_T)\}.$$

Now, we have enough tools to give a definition of weak solutions to our obstacle problem. The existence of such solutions is guaranteed by [8, 5].

Definition 2.3. *We define $u \in K_\phi(\Omega_T)$ as a local weak solution to the obstacle problems associated with (1.1) if and only if*

$$(2.3) \quad \langle\langle u_t, \varphi(v - u) \rangle\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\varphi(v - u)) \, dxdt \geq 0$$

holds true for all comparison functions $v \in K'_\phi(\Omega_T)$ and every test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^+)$. The time term above is defined as

$$\langle\langle u_t, \varphi(v - u) \rangle\rangle = \int_{\Omega_T} \left\{ \varphi_t \left[\frac{1}{2} u^2 - uv \right] - \varphi u v_t \right\} \, dxdt$$

To address the potential lack of differentiability in time of weak solutions to obstacle problems related to (1.1), the following time mollification has been proven to be useful

$$(2.4) \quad [u]_h(x, t) := \frac{1}{h} \int_0^t e^{-\frac{s-t}{h}} u(x, s) \, dx,$$

for $u \in L^1(\Omega_T)$ and $h > 0$. We summarize some elementary properties of (2.4), which can be retrieved from [17] in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *For $p \geq 1$, we have*

- If $u \in L^p(\Omega_T)$ then $[u]_h \rightarrow u$ in $L^p(\Omega_T)$ as $h \downarrow 0$ and

$$\partial_t [u]_h = \frac{1}{h}(u - [u]_h) \in L^p(\Omega) \text{ for every } h > 0.$$

- If $\nabla u \in L^p(\Omega_T, \mathbb{R}^N)$ then $\nabla [u]_h = [\nabla u]_h$ and $\nabla [u]_h \rightarrow \nabla u$ in $L^p(\Omega_T, \mathbb{R}^N)$ as $h \downarrow 0$.
- If $u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega_T})$, then $[u]_h \rightarrow u$ uniformly in Ω_T as $h \downarrow 0$.

Finally, we present the following technical lemma which is frequently used in this work

Lemma 2.5. *Let $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers with*

$$X_{i+1} \leq CB^i X_i^{1+\alpha}, \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N},$$

for constants $C, \alpha > 0$ and $B > 1$. Then

$$X_0 \leq C^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} B^{-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}}$$

implies $X_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

3. LOCAL ENERGY AND LOGARITHMIC ESTIMATES

Customarily, we use the symbols $(u - k)_+$ and $(u - k)_-$ to denote the positive and negative parts of these truncated functions, respectively, such that for $k > 0$

$$(u - k)_+ = \max\{u - k, 0\} \text{ and } (u - k)_- = \max\{k - u, 0\}.$$

To make the calculations easier, we will consider cylinders with the vertex at the origin $(0, 0)$. The results for cylinders with a vertex at a different point (x_0, t_0) can be obtained by simply translating the calculations.

Lemma 3.1. *For $Q(s, \rho) \subset \Omega_T$ to denote $(0, 0) + Q(s, \rho)$ as in (1.3), and $\phi \in C^0(\Omega_T)$, let $u \in K_\phi(\Omega_T)$ be a weak local solution of (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.3. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on the data such that the following estimates hold*

(1) *For any $k > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{-s < t < 0} \int_{B_\rho} \xi^\alpha (u - k)_-^2 dx + C \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k)_- \right|^{p_i} dx dt \\ (3.1) \quad & \leq \int_{B_\rho \times \{-s\}} \xi^\alpha (u - k)_-^2 dx + C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} \right| (u - k)_-^2 dx dt \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} (u - k)_-^{p_i} dx dt \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) *For all $k \geq \sup_{Q(s, \rho)} \phi$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{-s < t < 0} \int_{B_\rho} \xi^\alpha (u - k)_+^2 dx + C \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k)_+ \right|^{p_i} dx dt \\ (3.2) \quad & \leq \int_{B_\rho \times \{-s\}} \xi^\alpha (u - k)_+^2 dx + C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} \right| (u - k)_+^2 dx dt \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} (u - k)_+^{p_i} dx dt \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We begin by introducing the following two nonnegative piecewise smooth functions where $\xi \in C_0^\infty(Q(s, \rho), \mathbb{R}^+)$ vanishing on the lateral boundaries $\partial B_\rho \times (-s, 0)$ of $Q(s, \rho)$ and $\psi_\varepsilon \in W_0^{1, \infty}([-s, 0]; [0, 1])$ which satisfies

$$\psi_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } -s \leq t \leq s_1 - \varepsilon, \\ 1 + \frac{t-s_1}{\varepsilon}, & \text{for } s_1 - \varepsilon < t \leq s_1, \\ 1, & \text{for } s_1 < t < s_2, \\ 1 - \frac{t-s_2}{\varepsilon}, & \text{for } s_2 \leq t < s_2 + \varepsilon, \\ 0, & \text{for } s_2 + \varepsilon \leq t \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, by using the time mollification $[\cdot]_h$ defined in (2.4), for $k > 0$, and $h >$, let

$$(3.3) \quad v_h = [u]_h + ([u]_h - k)_- + \|\phi - [\phi]_h\|_{L^\infty(Q(s, \rho))}.$$

By simple computation, from (3.3) we deduce that

$$v_h \geq \phi \text{ a.e. in } Q(s, \rho).$$

Therefore, we can take v_h as an admissible comparison function in the variational inequality (2.3) such that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \partial_t(\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \left(\frac{1}{2} u^2 - uv_h \right) dxdt - \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta u \partial_t v_h dxdt \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha(v_h - u)) dxdt \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where α is a positive constant to be specified later and $(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta$ is a mollification of ψ_ε defined in [[16], section 2.2] with $0 < \delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and $\text{supp}(\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \subset Q(s, \rho)$. Next, in order to simplify the second integral on the left-hand side of (3.4), we use the following assertion which we obtained from Lemma 2.4

$$(3.5) \quad \partial_t v_h = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{h}(u - [u]_h) & \text{if } Q(s, \rho) \cap \{[u]_h > k\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As a result, we get

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta u \partial_t v_h dxdt = \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta (u - [u]_h) \partial_t v_h dxdt \\ & + \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta [u]_h \partial_t v_h dxdt \\ & \geq \int_{Q(s, \rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta [u]_h \frac{\partial}{\partial t} ([u]_h + ([u]_h - k)_-) dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

Afterward, the last term on the right-hand side of (3.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta [u]_h \frac{\partial}{\partial t} ([u]_h + ([u]_h - k)_-) \, dxdt \\
&= - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) [u]_h^2 \, dxdt - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) [u]_h ([u]_h - k)_- \, dxdt \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \frac{\partial [u]_h^2}{\partial t} \, dxdt - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \frac{\partial [u]_h}{\partial t} ([u]_h - k)_- \, dxdt \\
&= - \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) [u]_h^2 \, dxdt - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) [u]_h ([u]_h - k)_- \, dxdt \\
&\quad + \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^{([u]_h - k)_-} \tau \, d\tau \, dxdt \\
&= - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \left(\frac{1}{2} [u]_h^2 + [u]_h ([u]_h - k)_- \right) \, dxdt - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \int_0^{([u]_h - k)_-} \tau \, d\tau \, dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, (3.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.7) \quad \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta u \partial_t v_h \, dxdt &\geq - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \left(\frac{1}{2} [u]_h^2 + [u]_h ([u]_h - k)_- \right) \, dxdt \\
&\quad - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \int_0^{([u]_h - k)_-} \tau \, d\tau \, dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, the first two integrals on the left-hand side of equation (3.4) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.8) \quad \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \left(\frac{1}{2} u^2 - uv_h \right) \, dxdt &- \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta u \partial_t v_h \, dxdt \\
&\leq \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\xi^\alpha(\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta) \int_0^{(u-k)_-} \tau \, d\tau \, dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we are going to simplify the third integral on the left-hand side of (3.4). Therefore, since by Lemma 2.4, we have that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha(v_h - u)) \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha(u - k)_-) \text{ in } L^{p_i}(Q(s, \rho)), \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.9) \quad & \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha(v_h - u)) \, dxdt \\
& \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha(u - k)_-) \, dxdt \\
& \leq \alpha \nu \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \xi^{(\alpha-1) \frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k)_- \right|^{p_i} \, dxdt \\
& \quad + \alpha C(\nu) \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} (u - k)_-^{p_i} \, dxdt - \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k)_- \right|^{p_i} \, dxdt \\
& \leq -C \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k)_- \right|^{p_i} \, dxdt + \alpha C(\nu) \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} (u - k)_-^{p_i} \, dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Young's inequality and the fact that $0 < \xi \leq 1$, choose $\frac{p_i}{p_i-1} \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$ which implies that $\xi^{(\alpha-1)\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} \leq \xi^\alpha$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Therefore, by putting (3.8), and (3.9) into (3.4) we get

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u-k)_- \right|^{p_i} dx dt &\leq \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} ((\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \xi^\alpha) \int_0^{(u-k)_-} \tau d\tau dx dt \\ &+ C \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{Q(s,\rho)} (\psi_\varepsilon)_\delta \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} (u-k)_-^{p_i} dx dt \end{aligned}$$

First passing to the limit $\delta \downarrow 0$, and subsequently $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, and using intermediate value theorem, the previous inequality becomes

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho \times \{t_2\}} \xi^\alpha (u-k)_-^2 dx + C \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_\rho} \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u-k)_- \right|^{p_i} dx dt \\ \leq \int_{B_\rho \times \{t_1\}} \xi^\alpha (u-k)_-^2 dx + C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} \right| (u-k)_-^2 dx dt \right. \\ \left. + \int_{Q(s,\rho)} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} (u-k)_-^{p_i} dx dt \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the defined properties of ψ_ε . Hence, by taking the supremum over all $t_2 \in (-s, 0)$ and passing to the limites $t_1 \downarrow -s$ and $t_2 \uparrow 0$, we get (3.1).

The proof of (3.2) is similar to the one of (3.1) where we took

$$v_h = [u]_h - ([u]_h - k)_+ - \|\phi - [\phi]_h\|_{L^\infty(Q(s,\rho))}$$

as an admissible test function in (2.3) for any fixed $k \geq \sup_{Q(s,\rho)} \phi$, replacing $([u]_h - k)_-$ by $([u]_h - k)_+$ and using the following identity

$$\partial_t [u]_h ([u]_h - k)_+ = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^{([u]_h - k)_+} \tau d\tau.$$

Hence we get the desired result. \square

Now, we will introduce the following logarithmic function

$$(3.12) \quad \Gamma_\pm(u) = \Gamma(H_k^\pm, (u-k)_\pm, c) = \left[\ln \left(\frac{H_k^\pm}{(H_k^\pm - (u-k)_\pm + c)} \right) \right]_+$$

where $H_k^\pm = \text{ess sup}_{Q(s,\rho)} |(u-k)_\pm|$ and $0 < c < H_k^\pm$. Then, we get the following properties

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{cases} \Gamma_\pm(u) = 0, & \text{if } (u-k)_\pm \leq c, \\ 0 \leq \Gamma_\pm(u) \leq \ln \left(\frac{H_k^\pm}{c} \right), & \text{if } (u-k)_\pm \leq H_k^\pm, \\ 0 \leq \Gamma'_\pm(u) \leq \frac{1}{c}, & \text{if } (u-k)_\pm \neq c, \\ (\Gamma_\pm(u))'' = (\Gamma'_\pm(u))^2, & \text{if } (u-k)_\pm \neq c. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, since Γ_\pm^2 is differentiable in $[0, T]$ we have the following

$$(3.14) \quad (\Gamma_\pm^2)' = 2\Gamma_\pm \Gamma'_\pm \text{ and } (\Gamma_\pm^2)'' = 2(1 + \Gamma_\pm) (\Gamma'_\pm)^2 \text{ in } [0, H_k^\pm].$$

Also, by using Theorem 4.1, we may assume that

$$(3.15) \quad H_k^\pm = \text{ess sup}_{Q(s,\rho)} |(u-k)_\pm| < \infty.$$

Lemma 3.2. For $B_{\rho_2} \subset B_{\rho_1}$, and times $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T$, we abbreviate $Q_1 = B_{\rho_1} \times (t_1, t_2)$. For $H_k^\pm = \text{ess sup}_{Q_1} |(u - k)_\pm|$, and $\phi \in C^0(\Omega_T)$, let $u \in K_\phi(\Omega_T)$ be a weak local solution of (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.3. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on the data such that the following estimates hold

(1) for $k \geq \sup_{Q_1} \phi$ we have

$$(3.16) \quad \text{ess sup}_{t \in (t_1, t_2)} \int_{B_{\rho_2}} \Gamma_+^2 dxdt \leq \int_{B_{\rho_2} \times \{t_1\}} \Gamma_+^2 dxdt + C \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^{p_i}} \int_{Q_1} \Gamma_+ (\Gamma'_+)^{2-p_i} dxdt.$$

(2) For any $k > 0$, we have

$$(3.17) \quad \text{ess sup}_{t \in (t_1, t_2)} \int_{B_{\rho_2}} \Gamma_-^2 dxdt \leq \int_{B_{\rho_2} \times \{t_1\}} \Gamma_-^2 dxdt + C \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^{p_i}} \int_{Q_1} \Gamma_- (\Gamma'_-)^{2-p_i} dxdt.$$

Proof. We begin the proof by letting

$$(3.18) \quad v_h = [u]_h - \beta (\Gamma_+^2)'([u]_h) + \|\phi - [\phi]_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)},$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a constant to be specified later. For $k \geq \sup_{Q_1} \phi$, we have that $v_h \geq \phi$. Indeed, if $[u]_h < k$, we get that

$$(3.19) \quad v_h = [u]_h + \|\phi - [\phi]_h\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \geq \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \geq \phi \text{ a.e. in } Q_1.$$

Else, for $0 < \beta \leq \frac{k - \sup_{Q_1} \phi}{\sup_{[0, H_k^+]} (\Gamma_+^2)'}$, we get

$$(3.20) \quad v_h \geq k - \beta (\Gamma_+^2)'([u]_h) \geq k - \beta \sup_{[0, H_k^+]} (\Gamma_+^2)' \geq \sup_{Q_1} \phi \geq \phi \text{ a.e. in } Q_1.$$

Moreover, since $(\Gamma_+^2)'$ is a Lipschitz function and by Lemma 2.4, we can use v_h as an admissible comparison function in (2.3) such that

$$(3.21) \quad \partial_t v_h = \frac{1}{h} (u - [u]_h) \left(1 - \beta (\Gamma_+^2)''([u]_h) \right),$$

where the terms involving $(\Gamma_+^2)''$ is well defined since $\partial_t [u]_h = 0$ in the set $\{([u]_h - k)_+ = C \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Thereafter, we are going to simplify the second integral on the left-hand side of (2.3) such that

$$(3.22) \quad \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon u \partial_t v_h dxdt = \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon (u - [u]_h) \partial_t v_h dxdt + \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon [u]_h \partial_t v_h dxdt,$$

where ψ_ε is defined as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 and $\xi \in C_0^1(B_{\rho_1}, \mathbb{R}^+)$ is a cutoff function with $\xi = 1$ over B_{ρ_2} and $\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \leq \frac{1}{\rho_1 - \rho_2}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then, for $\beta \leq \frac{1}{\sup_{[0, H_k^+]} (\Gamma_+^2)''}$, the first integral on

the right-hand side of (3.22) becomes

$$(3.23) \quad \frac{1}{h} \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon (u - [u]_h) (u - [u]_h) \left(1 - \beta (\Gamma_+^2)''([u]_h) \right) dxdt \geq 0.$$

Next, for the second integral on the right-hand side of (3.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon [u]_h \partial_t v_h \, dxdt &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon \partial_t [u]_h^2 \, dxdt + \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi'_\varepsilon [u]_h \beta (\Gamma_+^2)' ([u]_h) \, dxdt \\
&+ \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon \partial_t [u]_h \beta (\Gamma_+^2)' ([u]_h) \, dxdt \\
(3.24) \quad &= \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi'_\varepsilon \left([u]_h \beta (\Gamma_+^2)' ([u]_h) - \frac{1}{2} [u]_h^2 \right) \, dxdt \\
&- \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi'_\varepsilon \int_0^{([u]_h - k)_+} \beta (\Gamma_+^2)' (s) \, ds dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by putting (3.24) into (3.22), the first term on the left-hand side of (2.3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi'_\varepsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} u^2 - uv_h \right) \, dxdt - \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon u \partial_t v_h \, dxdt \\
(3.25) \quad &\leq \beta \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi'_\varepsilon \Gamma_+^2(u) \, dxdt \\
&\xrightarrow{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \beta \int_{B_{\rho_1} \times \{t_1\}} \Gamma_+^2(u) \, dx - \beta \int_{B_{\rho_2} \times \{t_2\}} \Gamma_+^2(u) \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the remaining terms we let $h \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha (v_h - u)) \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(\xi^\alpha \beta (\Gamma_+^2)' (u) \right) \text{ in } L^{p_i}(\Omega_T), \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \int_{Q_1} \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha (v_h - u)) \\
(3.26) \quad &\leq \alpha \beta \int_{Q_1} \xi^{\alpha-1} \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-1} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right| (\Gamma_+^2)' (u) \, dxdt - \beta \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} (\Gamma_+^2)'' (u) \, dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

where the terms linked to $(\Gamma_+^2)''$ are well defined since $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} = 0$ a.e. in the set $\{(u - k)_+ = C \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Next, by Young's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \beta \int_{Q_1} \xi^{\alpha-1} \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-1} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right| (\Gamma_+^2)' (u) \, dxdt \\
(3.27) \quad &\leq \nu \int_{Q_1} \psi_\varepsilon \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} 2\Gamma_+(\Gamma_+)'(u) \, dxdt + C(\nu) \int_{Q_1} \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} 2\Gamma_+(\Gamma_+)^{2-p_i}(u) \, dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we took α as in (3.9). Therefore, by putting (3.27) into (3.26), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \int_{Q_1} \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi^\alpha (v_h - u)) \\
(3.28) \quad &\leq -C \int_{Q_1} \xi^\alpha \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} 2(\Gamma_+)'(u) \, dxdt + C \int_{Q_1} \psi_\varepsilon \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} 2\Gamma_+(\Gamma_+)^{2-p_i}(u) \, dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.14) and the fact that $2\Gamma_+(\Gamma_+)'(u) - (\Gamma_+^2)''(u) = -2(\Gamma_+)'(u)^2$. Hence, by choosing a suitable ν and combining (3.25), and (3.28) into (2.3) we obtain (3.16).

In order to prove (3.17), we take as a comparison function

$$\begin{aligned}
v_h &= [u]_h + (\Gamma_-^2)'(u) + \|\phi - [\phi]_h\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \\
&\geq \phi + (\Gamma_-^2)'(u) \geq \phi,
\end{aligned}$$

since Γ_- and Γ'_- are nonnegative and then we proceed similarly as in the proof of (3.16) to get the desired result. \square

4. LOCAL BOUNDEDNESS OF SOLUTIONS

Theorem 4.1. *Under the assumption that*

$$(4.1) \quad 2 < p_i < \bar{p}\left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right), \quad \bar{p} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} < N \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N,$$

and the obstacle $\phi \in C^0(\Omega_T)$, any local weak solution to the obstacle problem related to (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.3 is locally bounded.

Proof. Let $0 < \rho < 1$ be small enough such that

$$B_{\rho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{p_i}}} \times (-\rho^{\bar{p}}, 0) \subset \Omega_T.$$

Also, we take ρ_0, ρ_1, s_1 and s_2 such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{p_i}} \leq \rho_2 < \rho_1 \leq \rho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{p_i}}, \text{ and } -\rho^{\bar{p}} \leq -s_1 < -s_2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}\rho^{\bar{p}}.$$

Furthermore, we use a smooth cutoff function $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \xi = 1 \text{ in } Q(s_2, \rho_2), \quad \xi = 0 \text{ on } \partial Q(s_1, \rho_1), \\ \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\rho_1 - \rho_2} \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, N, \text{ and } 0 \leq \xi_t \leq \frac{1}{s_1 - s_2}. \end{cases}$$

Since $\bar{p} < N$ and $p_i \leq l = \bar{p} \left(\frac{N+2}{N}\right)$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, we apply Lemma 2.2 such that

$$(4.2) \quad \left(\int_{Q(s_3, \rho_3) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^l dxdt \right)^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq \text{ess sup}_{t \in (-s_2, 0)} \int_{B_{\rho_2}} (u - k)_+^2 dx \\ + \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \int_{Q(s_2, \rho_2) \cap \{u > k\}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k) \right|^{p_i} dxdt + \frac{1}{(\rho_2 - \rho_3)^{p_i}} \int_{Q(s_2, \rho_2) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^{p_i} dxdt, \right\}$$

for all

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{p_i}} \leq \rho_3 < \rho_2 < \rho_1 \leq \rho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{p_i}}, \text{ and } -\rho^{\bar{p}} \leq -s_1 < -s_2 < -s_3 \leq -\frac{1}{2}\rho^{\bar{p}},$$

where $k > \left(\sup_{Q(s_1, \rho_1)} \phi \right)_+$. Afterward, by combining (4.2) and (3.2) and letting $\rho_2 - \rho_3 = \rho_1 - \rho_2$ and $s_2 - s_3 = s_1 - s_2$, we arrive at

$$(4.3) \quad \left(\int_{Q(s_3, \rho_3) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^l dxdt \right)^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{s_1 - s_2} \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^2 dxdt \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^{p_i}} \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^{p_i} dxdt \right\}.$$

Next, since $\bar{p} > \frac{2N}{N+2}$ which implies that $l > 2$, and by using the assumption that $p_i < l$, we obtain

$$(4.4) \quad (u - k)^{p_i} \leq (u - k)u^{l-1}u^{p_i-l} \leq C(u - k)u^{l-1} = C(u - k)(u - k + k)^{l-1} \\ \leq C \left((u - k)^l + (u - k)k^{l-1} \right) \leq C \left((u - k)^l + k^l \right),$$

over $Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}$ and where we used Young's inequality in the last inequality of (4.4). Therefore, for all $k > \left(\sup_{Q(s_1, \rho_1)} \phi \right)_+$, by using Hölder's inequality and (4.4), (4.3) becomes

$$(4.5) \quad \left(\int_{Q(s_3, \rho_3) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^l dxdt \right)^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{s_1 - s_2} \left(\int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^l dxdt \right)^{\frac{2}{l}} \right. \\ \times |Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}|^{1-\frac{2}{l}} + \frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^{p_i}} \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^l dxdt \\ \left. + k^l |Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}| \right\}.$$

Next, for h such that $k > h > \left(\sup_{Q(s_1, \rho_1)} \phi \right)_+$, we get that

$$(4.6) \quad |Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}| = \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}} \left| \frac{k-h}{k-h} \right|^l dxdt \leq \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}} \left| \frac{u-h}{k-h} \right|^l dxdt \\ \leq \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > h\}} \left| \frac{u-h}{k-h} \right|^l dxdt.$$

Then, (4.5) becomes

$$(4.7) \quad \left(\int_{Q(s_3, \rho_3) \cap \{u > k\}} (u - k)^l dxdt \right)^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{s_1 - s_2} (k-h)^{2-l} \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > k\}} (u-h)^l dxdt \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^{p_i}} \left(1 + \left(\frac{k}{k-h} \right)^l \right) \int_{Q(s_1, \rho_1) \cap \{u > h\}} (u-h)^l dxdt \right\},$$

for all $k > h > \left(\sup_{Q(s_1, \rho_1)} \phi \right)_+$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be determined. Considering the absolute continuity of a

Lebesgue integral, we take $H > \left(\sup_{Q(s_1, \rho_1)} \phi \right)_+$ large enough such that

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{-\rho^{\bar{p}}}^0 \int_{B_{\frac{\bar{p}}{\rho^{\bar{p}_i}}}} (u - H)_+^l dxdt \leq \varepsilon \rho^{N+\bar{p}}.$$

For $m = 0, 1, \dots$, set

$$(4.9) \quad k_m = 2H - \frac{H}{2^m}, \quad \rho_m = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{m+1}} \right) \rho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{p_i}},$$

$$(4.10) \quad s_m = \frac{1}{2} \rho^{\bar{p}} + \frac{1}{2^{m+1}} \rho^{\bar{p}}, \quad \tilde{Q}_m = (B_{\rho_m} \times (-s_m, 0)) \cap \{u > k_m\},$$

and

$$(4.11) \quad J_m = \int_{\tilde{Q}_m} (u - k_m)^l dxdt.$$

Therefore, from (4.7) and by taking the previous notations we arrive at

$$(4.12) \quad J_{m+1}^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq C \left\{ \frac{2^{m+2}}{\rho^{\bar{p}}} \left(\frac{2^{m+1}}{H} \right)^{l-2} J_m + \frac{2^{m+2}}{\rho^{\bar{p}}} \left(1 + 2^{(m+2)l} \right) J_m \right\}.$$

By taking $H > 1$, then (4.12) can be simplified as follows

$$(4.13) \quad J_{m+1}^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq C J_m^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \left(\frac{2^{ml}}{\rho^{\bar{p}}} J_m^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N+\bar{p}}} \right).$$

Next, from (4.8) we have that $J_0 \leq \varepsilon \rho^{N+\bar{p}}$. Thereafter, by induction for suitable $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we want to prove that

$$(4.14) \quad J_m \leq \delta^m \varepsilon \rho^{N+\bar{p}}, \text{ for } m = 0, 1, \dots$$

Indeed, we assume that (4.14) holds. Then, (4.13) becomes

$$(4.15) \quad J_m^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq C J_m^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}} \left(2^{ml} \delta^{\frac{m\bar{p}}{N+\bar{p}}} \varepsilon^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N+\bar{p}}} \right).$$

Since $0 < \rho < 1$ and by letting

$$(4.16) \quad C \varepsilon^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq \delta^{\frac{N}{N+\bar{p}}}, \quad 2^l \delta^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N+\bar{p}}} \leq 1,$$

we get that

$$(4.17) \quad J_{m+1} \leq \delta^{m+1} \varepsilon \rho^{N+\bar{p}}.$$

Therefore, by induction (4.14) holds for all m . Consequently, we get

$$(4.18) \quad 0 = \lim_{m \uparrow \infty} J_m = \int_{\tilde{Q}_\infty} (u - 2H)^l dx dt,$$

where

$$(4.19) \quad \tilde{Q}_\infty = \left(B_{\frac{1}{2}\rho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N+\bar{p}}}} \times \left(-\frac{1}{2}\rho^{\bar{p}}, 0\right) \right) \cap \{u > 2H\},$$

i.e.

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tilde{Q}_\infty} u \leq 2H.$$

This with $u \geq \phi$ gives the local boundedness of u over Ω_T . \square

5. TOWARD HÖLDER CONTINUITY

Let $R \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that $Q(R^2, R) \subset \Omega_T$ where u is locally bounded by virtue of Theorem 4.1. We assume further that $\phi \in C^{0;\beta, \frac{\beta}{2}}(\Omega_T)$ for the exponent $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$[\phi]_{C^{0;\beta, \frac{\beta}{2}}} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{(x,t),(y,s) \in \Omega_T} \frac{|\phi(x,t) - \phi(y,s)|}{|x-y|^\beta + |t-s|^{\frac{\beta}{2}}}.$$

For some $\lambda > 1$, and $\vartheta \in (0, \beta)$ to be precise later, we define

$$(5.1) \quad H(\rho) := \max \left\{ 2^\lambda \rho^\vartheta, 2 \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho^2, \rho)} \phi \right\} \text{ for any } \rho \in [0, R],$$

which is continuous and increasing. Next, since $\phi \in C^{0;\beta, \frac{\beta}{2}}(\Omega_T)$ we get

$$(5.2) \quad \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho^2, \rho)} \phi \leq [\phi]_{C^{0;\beta, \frac{\beta}{2}}} \rho^\beta \text{ for any } \rho \in [0, R].$$

Therefore, u is Hölder continuous if

$$(5.3) \quad \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho^2, \rho)} u \leq H(\rho)$$

holds for any $\rho \in (0, R]$. If else, there exists $\rho_0 \in (0, R]$ such that

$$(5.4) \quad H(\rho_0) \leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} u, \text{ and } \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho^2, \rho)} u \leq C R^{-\beta} H(\rho), \quad \forall \rho \in [\rho_0, R].$$

From these choices let $\omega = \mu^+ - \mu^-$, where μ^+ and μ^- are fixed parameters satisfying

$$(5.5) \quad \mu^+ = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} u, \quad \mu^- = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} u, \quad \text{and } \theta = \left(\frac{\omega}{2^\lambda}\right)^{2-p^+}.$$

Consequently, since

$$(5.6) \quad \theta = \left(\frac{\omega}{2^\lambda}\right)^{2-p^+} < \left(\frac{H(\rho_0)}{2^\lambda}\right)^{2-p^+} < \left(\frac{2^\lambda \rho_0}{2^\lambda}\right)^{2-p^+} = \rho_0^{2-p^+},$$

we get that

$$(5.7) \quad Q(\theta \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0) \subset Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0), \quad \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\theta \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)} u \leq \omega,$$

and,

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Q(\theta \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)} \phi &\leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} \phi = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} \phi + \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} \phi \\ &\leq \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} \phi + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} u = \frac{1}{2} \omega, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote

$$p^+ = \max\{p_i, i = 1, \dots, N\} \text{ and } p^- = \min\{p_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

To begin our approach inside $Q(\theta \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)$ we consider subcylinders of small size constructed as follow

$$(5.9) \quad (0, \tau^*) + Q(\varrho \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0), \quad \varrho = \left(\frac{\omega}{2}\right)^{2-p^+},$$

where

$$(5.10) \quad \left(2^{p^+-2} - 2^{\lambda(p^+-2)}\right) \omega^{2-p^+} \rho_0^{p^+} < \tau^* < 0.$$

Consequently, for $\nu_0 \in (0, 1)$ to be determined in terms of data and ω , either we have

$$(5.11) \quad \left| \left\{ (x, t) \in (0, \tau^*) + Q(\varrho \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0) : u < \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{2} \right\} \right| \leq \nu_0 \left| Q(\varrho \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0) \right|$$

or

$$(5.12) \quad \left| \left\{ (x, t) \in (0, \tau^*) + Q(\varrho \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0) : u \geq \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{2} \right\} \right| \leq (1 - \nu_0) \left| Q(\varrho \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0) \right|.$$

In both alternatives, by taking into account (5.4) and (5.8), we will find that the essential oscillation of u within smaller cylinders, centered at the origin, decreases in a measurable way. Analyzing this alternative leads to the main results of this paper.

5.1. First alternative. This subsection assumes that (5.11) is met. The following lemma determines a number ν_0 such that the solution u is guaranteed to be above a smaller level within a smaller cylinder.

Lemma 5.1. *Given that (5.11) is true, then for any given data, there exists a number ν_0 in the interval $(0, 1)$ such that*

$$(5.13) \quad u > \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{4}, \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, \tau^*) + Q\left(\varrho \left(\frac{\rho_0}{2}\right)^{p^+}, \frac{\rho_0}{2}\right).$$

Proof. We begin by introducing the following decreasing sequences of positive numbers

$$\rho_n = \frac{\rho_0}{2} + \frac{\rho_0}{2^{n+1}}, \quad k_n = \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{4} + \frac{\omega}{2^{n+2}},$$

and

$$Q_n = (0, \tau^*) + Q(\varrho \rho_n^{p^+}, \rho_n), \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Furthermore, we consider a smooth cutoff function $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$ vanishing on $\partial_p Q_n$ and equal to 1 in Q_{n+1} such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right| \leq \frac{2^{(n+1)\frac{p_i^+}{p_i^-}}}{\rho_0^{\frac{p_i^-}{2p_i}}}, \quad \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} \right| \leq \frac{2^{p^+(n+1)}}{\varrho \rho_0^{p^-}}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. With the previous notifications and assumptions, (3.1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess sup}_{\tau^* - \varrho \rho_n^{p^+} < t < \tau^*} \int_{B_{\rho_n}} \xi^\alpha (u - k_n)_-^2 dx + C \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{Q_n} \xi^\alpha \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k_n)_- \right|^{p_i} dx dt \\ (5.14) \quad & \leq C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{2^{np^+}}{\varrho \rho_0^{p^-}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{2^{np^+}}{\rho_0^{\frac{p_i^-}{2}}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p_i} \right\} |A_n| \\ & \leq C \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{2^{np^+}}{\rho_0^{p^-}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p^+} + \frac{2^{np^+}}{\rho_0^{p^-}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p^+} \rho_0^{\frac{p_i^-}{2}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p_i - p^+} \right\} |A_n| \\ & \leq C \frac{2^{np^+}}{\rho_0^{p^-}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p^+} |A_n|, \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$A_n = Q_n \cap \{u < k_n\},$$

and where we used Young's inequality, the fact that $\rho < 1$, and by virtue of (5.4) we may take

$$(5.15) \quad \rho_0^{\frac{p_i^-}{2}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p_i - p^+} < 1 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Next, by the definition of k_n , using Hölder's inequality, anisotropic Sobolev inequality (2.1) and (5.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\omega}{2^{n+3}} \right)^{\bar{p}} |A_{n+1}| = |k_n - k_{n+1}|^{\bar{p}} |A_{n+1}| \leq C \int_{Q_n} (u - k_n)_-^{\bar{p}} \xi^\eta dx dt \\ (5.16) \quad & \leq C \int_{\tau^* - \varrho \rho_n^{p^+}}^{\tau^*} \left(\int_{B_{\rho_n}} \left((u - k_n)_- \xi^{\frac{\eta}{\bar{p}}} \right)^{\bar{p}^*} dx \right)^{\frac{\bar{p}}{\bar{p}^*}} dt |A_n|^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N}} \\ & \leq C \prod_{i=1}^N \left\{ \int_{\tau^* - \varrho \rho_n^{p^+}}^{\tau^*} \int_{B_{\rho_n}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial} (u - k_n)_- \right|^{p_i} \xi^{p_i} dx dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\tau^* - \varrho \rho_n^{p^+}}^{\tau^*} \int_{B_{\rho_n}} (u - k_n)_-^{p_i} \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i} dx dt \right\}^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N p_i}} |A_n|^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N}} \\ & \leq C \frac{2^{np^+}}{\rho_0^{p^-}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p^+} |A_n|^{1 + \frac{\bar{p}}{N}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we choose η such that $1 \leq \frac{\eta}{p}$ which implies $\xi^{\frac{\eta p_i}{p}} \leq \xi^{p_i}$. Next, by direct computation, we get that

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{|Q_n|^{1+\frac{\bar{p}}{N}}}{|Q_{n+1}|} &\leq 2^{N+p^+} \varrho^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N}} \rho_0^{\frac{\bar{p}}{N}(N+p^+)} \\ &\leq C \rho_0^{\bar{p}(1+\frac{1}{N})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by letting $X_n = \frac{|A_n|}{|Q_n|}$, we arrive at the following recursive relation

$$(5.18) \quad X_{n+1} \leq C 4^{np^+} \left(\frac{\omega}{2}\right)^{p^+-\bar{p}} \rho_0^{\bar{p}(1+\frac{2}{N})-p^-} X_n.$$

Therefore, if

$$(5.19) \quad X_0 \leq \left[C \left(\frac{\omega}{2}\right)^{p^+-\bar{p}} \right]^{-\frac{N}{\bar{p}}} 4^{-p^+(\frac{N}{\bar{p}})^2} := \nu_0,$$

which is guaranteed by (5.11). Then, by Lemma 2.5 $X_n \rightarrow 0$, and hence we get the desired result. \square

Now our next goal is to have similar estimations in smaller cylinders. Consequently, let

$$(5.20) \quad -\tilde{\tau} = \tau^* - \varrho \left(\frac{\rho_0}{2}\right),$$

which implies by Lemma 5.1 that

$$(5.21) \quad u(\cdot, -\tilde{\tau}) > \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{4} \text{ a.e. in } B_{\frac{\rho_0}{2}}.$$

As an immediate result, we have the following lemma

Lemma 5.2. *For (5.11) and every $\tilde{\nu} \in (0, 1)$, there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ depending on the data such that*

$$(5.22) \quad \left| \left\{ x \in B_{\frac{\rho_0}{4}} : u < \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{2n_1} \right\} \right| \leq \tilde{\nu} |B_{\frac{\rho_0}{4}}|, \quad \forall t \in (-\tilde{\tau}, 0).$$

Proof. We consider the logarithmic estimate (3.19) over $Q(\tilde{\tau}, \frac{\rho_0}{2})$ for $(u - k)_-$ with

$$\begin{aligned} k &= \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{4}, \quad c = \frac{\omega}{2n+2}, \\ k - u &\leq H_k^- = \text{ess sup}_{Q(\tilde{\tau}, \frac{\rho_0}{2})} |(u - \mu^- - \frac{\omega}{4})_-| \leq \frac{\omega}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming further that $H_k^- > \frac{\omega}{8}$ (else the result is trivial) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_- &\leq n \ln 2 \quad \text{since} \quad \frac{H_k^-}{H_k^- + u - k + c} \leq \frac{\frac{\omega}{4}}{c} = 2^n, \\ 0 &\leq \Gamma'_- \leq \frac{1}{c} \quad \text{for} \quad u \neq -k + c, \\ |\Gamma'_-|^{2-p_i} &\leq \left(\frac{\omega}{2}\right)^{p_i-2} \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ess sup}_{t \in (-\tilde{\tau}, 0)} \int_{B_{\frac{\rho_0}{4}}} \Gamma_-^2(u) \, dx &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^N n 2^{\lambda(p^+-2)} \omega^{p_i-p^+} \rho_0^{p^+-p_i} |B_{\frac{\rho_0}{2}}| \\ &\leq C n 2^{\lambda(p^+-2)} |B_{\frac{\rho_0}{4}}|, \end{aligned}$$

whereby (5.21) we use the fact that

$$(5.24) \quad [\Gamma_-(u)](\cdot, -\tilde{\tau}) = 0 \quad \text{a.e in } B_{\frac{\rho_0}{2}}, \quad \tilde{\tau} \leq \theta \rho_0^{p^+},$$

and, by virtue of (5.4), we took

$$\omega^{p_i - p^+} \rho_0^{p^+ - p_i} < 1.$$

We can obtain a lower bound on the left-hand side of (5.23) by integrating over the smaller set

$$T = \left\{ x \in B_{\frac{\rho_0}{4}}, \quad u < \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{2^{n+2}} \right\} \subset B_{\frac{\rho_0}{2}}, \quad t \in (-\tilde{\tau}, 0).$$

For any such set, we have that

$$[\Gamma_-(u)]^2 \geq [\ln 2^{n-1}]^2 = (n-1)^2 (\ln 2)^2,$$

since

$$(5.25) \quad \frac{H_k^-}{H_k^- + u - k + \frac{\omega}{2^{n+2}}} \geq \frac{\frac{\omega}{4}}{\frac{\omega}{4} + u - k + \frac{\omega}{2^{n+2}}} \geq \frac{\frac{\omega}{4}}{\frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}}} = 2^{n-1}.$$

Therefore, by putting this into (5.23), we arrive at

$$|T| \leq C \frac{n}{(n-1)^2} 2^{\lambda(p^+ - 2)} |B_{\frac{\rho_0}{4}}|.$$

Hence, we get the desired result by taking $n > 1 + 2C \frac{2^{\lambda(p^+ - 2)}}{\bar{\nu}}$ and $n_1 = n + 2$. \square

Using the conclusion of Lemma 5.2, we can show that the set of points in the cylinder $Q(\tilde{\tau}, \frac{\rho_0}{8})$ where u is far from its infimum is arbitrarily small.

Lemma 5.3. *For some positive integer $n_2 > 1$, depending on the data, we have*

$$(5.26) \quad u > \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{2^{n_2+1}} \quad \text{a.e. in } Q(\tilde{\tau}, \frac{\rho_0}{8}).$$

Proof. Let

$$\rho_n = \frac{\rho_0}{8} + \frac{\rho_0}{2^{n+3}}, \quad k_n = \mu^- + \frac{\omega}{2^{n_2+1}} + \frac{\omega}{2^{n_2+1+n}}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

be decreasing sequences. Therefore, for a smooth cutoff function $0 < \xi(x) < 1$ that is equal to 0 in ∂B_{ρ_n} and equal to one in $Q(\tilde{\tau}, \rho_{n+1})$ such that $\left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right| \leq \frac{2^{(n+4) \frac{p^+}{p_i}}}{\rho_0^{\frac{p^-}{2p_i}}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, since

$(u - k_n)_-(x, -\tilde{\tau}) = 0$ in B_{ρ_n} because of (5.21), and using the same method we used to get (5.16), we arrive at

$$(5.27) \quad \left(\frac{\omega}{2^{n_2+2+n}} \right)^{\bar{p}} |A_{n+1}| \leq C \left(\frac{\omega}{2^{n_2}} \right)^{p^+} |A_n|^{1 + \frac{\bar{p}}{N}},$$

where $A_n = Q(\tilde{\tau}, \rho_n) \cap \{u < k_n\}$. Thereafter, we use (5.17) for $\tilde{\tau} \leq \theta \rho_0^{p^+}$, and by letting $X_n = \frac{|A_n|}{|Q(\tilde{\tau}, \rho_0)|}$, we arrive at the following recursive relation

$$(5.28) \quad X_{n+1} \leq C 4^{np^+} \left(\frac{\omega}{2^{n_2}} \right)^{p^+ - \bar{p}} X_n.$$

Hence, if

$$(5.29) \quad X_0 \leq \left[C \left(\frac{\omega}{2^{n_2}} \right)^{p^+ - \bar{p}} \right]^{-\frac{N}{\bar{p}}} 4^{-p^+ \left(\frac{N}{\bar{p}} \right)^2} := \tilde{\nu}$$

which is guaranteed by (5.22) for $n_1 = n_2$. Hence, we get the desired result by using Lemma 2.5. \square

5.2. Second alternative. In this subsection, we assume that (5.12) holds. Then, there exists $\tau_0 \in [\tau^* - \varrho\rho_0^{p^+}, \tau^* - \frac{\nu_0}{2}\varrho\rho_0^{p^+}]$ such that

$$(5.30) \quad \left| \left\{ x \in B_{\rho_0}, u(x, \tau_0) > \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2} \right\} \right| \leq \left(\frac{1 - \nu_0}{1 - \frac{\nu_0}{2}} \right) |B_{\rho_0}|.$$

Indeed, if (5.30) is false then (5.12) doesn't hold.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists a positive integer $n_3 > 1$ depending on the data such that*

$$(5.31) \quad \left| \left\{ x \in B_{\rho_0}, u > \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{n_3}} \right\} \right| \leq \left(1 - \left(\frac{\nu_0}{2} \right)^2 \right) |B_{\rho_0}|,$$

for all $t \in (-\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, 0)$.

Proof. By integrating over the cylinder $B_{\rho_0} \times (\tau_0, \tau^*)$, taking $k = \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(\mu^+ + \mu^-) \geq \sup_{Q(\varrho\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)} \phi$ which is guaranteed by (5.8), using the same estimation method we used to get (5.23) for Γ_+ instead of Γ_- , and since

$$(5.32) \quad u - k \leq H_k^+ := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{B_{\rho_0} \times (\tau_0, \tau^*)} |(u - \mu^+ + \frac{\omega}{2})_+| \leq \frac{\omega}{2},$$

from (3.18) we arrive at

$$(5.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau_0 < t < \tau^*} \int_{B_{(1-\xi)\rho_0} \times \{t\}} \Gamma_+^2 dx dt &\leq n^2 (\ln(2))^2 \left(\frac{1 - \nu_0}{1 - \frac{\nu_0}{2}} \right) |B_{\rho_0}| \\ &+ C \sum_{i=1}^N \xi^{-p_i} n \ln(2) \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{p_i-2} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{2-p^+} \rho_0^{p^+-p_i} |B_{\rho_0}| \\ &\leq n^2 (\ln(2))^2 \left(\frac{1 - \nu_0}{1 - \frac{\nu_0}{2}} \right) |B_{\rho_0}| + C \frac{n}{\xi^{p^+}} |B_{\rho_0}|, \end{aligned}$$

for $\xi \in (0, 1)$ whereby virtue of (5.4) we took

$$\omega^{p_i-p^+} \rho_0^{p^+-p_i} < 1 \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Moreover, by using (5.25) for Γ_+ instead of Γ_- , (5.33) becomes

$$(5.34) \quad \begin{aligned} (n-1)^2 (\ln(2))^2 \left| \left\{ x \in B_{(1-\xi)\rho_0} : u > \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}} \right\} \right| &\leq n^2 (\ln(2))^2 \left(\frac{1 - \nu_0}{1 - \frac{\nu_0}{2}} \right) |B_{\rho_0}| \\ &+ C \frac{n}{\xi^{p^+}} |B_{\rho_0}|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for all $t \in (\tau_0, \tau^*)$, we get

$$(5.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \left\{ x \in B_{\rho_0} : u > \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}} \right\} \right| &\leq \left| \left\{ x \in B_{(1-\xi)\rho_0} : u > \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}} \right\} \right| + N\xi |B_{\rho_0}| \\ &\leq \left\{ \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 - \nu_0}{1 - \frac{\nu_0}{2}} \right) + \frac{C}{n\xi^{p^+}} + N\xi \right\} |B_{\rho_0}| \\ &\leq \left(1 - \left(\frac{\nu_0}{2} \right)^2 \right) |B_{\rho_0}|, \end{aligned}$$

where we took $\left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^2 \leq (1 - \frac{\nu_0}{2})(1 + \nu_0)$ and $\frac{C}{n\xi^{p^+}} \leq \frac{3}{8}\nu_0^2$. Finally, recalling that $\tau_0 \in [\tau^* - \varrho\rho_0^{p^+}, \tau^* - \frac{\nu_0}{2}\varrho\rho_0^{p^+}]$ and choosing λ such that $2^{(\lambda-1)(p^+-2)} \geq 2$, we get (5.31) for all $t \in (-\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, 0)$. \square

Now, we are going to use the result of Lemma 5.4 to get that within the cylinder $Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)$, the set of points where u is close to its supremum has an arbitrarily small measure.

Lemma 5.5. *For $\tilde{\nu}_1 \in (0, 1)$, there exists an integer $\lambda \geq n_3$ depending on the data such that*

$$(5.36) \quad \left| \left\{ (x, t) \in Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0) : u > \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2\lambda} \right\} \right| \leq \tilde{\nu}_1 Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0).$$

Proof. We begin by taking $k = \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^n} \geq \frac{1}{2}(\mu^+ + \mu^-) \geq \text{ess sup}_{Q(\theta\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)} \phi$ for $n_3 \leq n \leq \lambda$. Therefore, we can apply (3.2) for $(u - k)_+$ where we take $0 \leq \xi(x, t) \leq 1$ as a smooth cutoff function satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \xi = 1 \text{ in } Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0), \xi = 0 \text{ on } \partial_p Q(\theta\rho_0^{p^+}, 2\rho_0), \\ \left| \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_i} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\rho_0^{2p_i}} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N, \quad 0 < \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} \leq \frac{2}{\theta\rho_0}, \end{cases}$$

such that for $n \leq \lambda$

$$(5.37) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u - k)_+ \right|^{p_i} dx dt \leq \frac{C}{\rho_0^{p^-}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2^n} \right)^{p^+} |Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)|,$$

where we used the same method and similar assumptions as the ones we used to get (5.14). Now, for $n \leq \lambda$ we define the following sets

$$G_n(t) = \{x \in B_{\rho_0}, u > \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^n}\}, \quad G_n = \int_{-\frac{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}{2}}^0 G_n(t) dt$$

and

$$B_{\rho_0} - G_n(t) = \{x \in B_{\rho_0}, u \leq \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^n}\}.$$

Also, for all $t \in (-\frac{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}{2}, 0)$ we define the following function

$$(5.38) \quad \gamma_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } u < \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^n}, \\ u - (\mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^n}) & \text{for } \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^n} \leq u < \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}}, \\ \frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}} & \text{for } \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}} \leq u. \end{cases}$$

We construct γ_n in a way that γ_n vanishes over the set $B_{\rho_0} - G_n(t)$. Thereafter, for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in G_n(t)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in B_{\rho_0} - G_n(t)$, we construct a polygonal joining x and y with sides parallel to the coordinate axis, say for instant $\pi_N = x$, $\pi_{N-1} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}, y_N), \dots, \pi_0 = y$. As a result, by direct computation, we obtain the following estimation

$$(5.39) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma_n(x, t) &= [\gamma_n(\pi_N, t) - \gamma_n(\pi_{N-1}, t)] + \dots + [\gamma_n(\pi_1, t) - \gamma_n(\pi_0, t)] \\ &= \int_{y_N}^{x_N} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_N} \gamma_n(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}, \zeta, t) d\zeta + \dots + \int_{y_1}^{x_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \gamma_n(\zeta, x_2, \dots, x_N, t) d\zeta \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-\rho_0}^{\rho_0} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \gamma_n(x_1, \dots, \zeta, \dots, x_N, t) \right| d\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

By double integrating the previous inequality in dx over $G_n(t)$ and in dy over $B_{\rho_0} - G_n(t)$, and using Lemma 5.4, we arrive at

$$(5.40) \quad \left(\frac{\nu_0}{2} \right)^2 |B_{\rho_0}| \int_{B_{\rho_0}} \gamma_n dx \leq 2\rho_0 |B_{\rho_0}| \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{B_{\rho_0}} \left| \frac{\partial \gamma_n}{\partial x_i} \right| dx.$$

Consequently, from the definition of $G_n(t)$ and γ_n , (5.40) becomes

$$(5.41) \quad \frac{\omega}{2^{n+1}} |G_{n+1}(t)| \leq \frac{C\rho_0}{\nu_0^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{G_n(t)-G_{n+1}(t)} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} dx.$$

Then, by integrating (5.41) over $t \in (-\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, 0)$ and using (5.37), we obtain

$$(5.42) \quad \begin{aligned} |G_{n+1}| &\leq C \frac{2^{n+1}\rho_0}{\omega\nu_0^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\int_{G_n-G_{n+1}} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p^-} dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p^-}} |G_n - G_{n+1}|^{\frac{p^- - 1}{p^-}} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\nu_0^2} \left(\frac{\omega}{2^n} \right)^{p^+} \frac{2^{n+1}}{\omega} |Q(\frac{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}{2}, \rho_0)|^{\frac{1}{p^-}} |G_n - G_{n+1}|^{\frac{p^- - 1}{p^-}} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\nu_0^2} |Q(\frac{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}{2}, \rho_0)|^{\frac{1}{p^-}} |G_n - G_{n+1}|^{\frac{p^- - 1}{p^-}}. \end{aligned}$$

Where we took n large enough such that $(\frac{\omega}{2^n})^{\frac{p^+}{p^-}} \frac{2^{n+1}}{\omega} < 1$. By raising (5.42) to the power $\frac{p^-}{p^- - 1}$ and summing it up from $n = n_3, n_3 + 1, \dots, \lambda - 1$, we obtain

$$(5.43) \quad \sum_{i=n_3}^{\lambda-1} |G_{n+1}|^{\frac{p^-}{p^- - 1}} \leq C(\nu_0)^{\frac{-2p^-}{p^- - 1}} |Q(\frac{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}{2}, \rho_0)|^{\frac{1}{p^- - 1}} \sum_{i=n_3}^{\lambda-1} |G_n - G_{n+1}| \leq .$$

Next, since $|G_\lambda| \leq |G_{n+1}|$ we get $\sum_{i=n_3}^{\lambda-1} |G_{n+1}|^{\frac{p^-}{p^- - 1}} \geq (\lambda - n_3) |G_\lambda|^{\frac{p^-}{p^- - 1}}$, and note also that $\sum_{i=n_3}^{\lambda-1} |G_n - G_{n+1}| \leq |Q(\frac{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}{2}, \rho_0)|$, we arrive at

$$|A_\lambda| \leq \frac{C}{(\lambda - n_3)^{\frac{p^- - 1}{p^-}}} (\nu_0)^{-2} |Q(\frac{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}{2}, \rho_0)|.$$

Hence, by choosing λ large enough such that $\frac{C}{(\lambda - n_3)^{\frac{p^- - 1}{p^-}}} (\nu_0)^{-2} \leq \tilde{\nu}_1 < 1$, we get the desired result. \square

Lemma 5.6. *For $\tilde{\nu}_1 \in (0, 1)$, the choice of λ can be made so that*

$$u \leq \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{\lambda+1}} \text{ a.e. in } Q(\frac{\theta}{2} \left(\frac{\rho_0}{2}\right)^{p^+}, \frac{\rho_0}{2}).$$

Proof. We begin our proof by taking decreasing sequences

$$\rho_n = \frac{\rho_0}{2} + \frac{\rho_0}{2^{n+1}}, \quad k_n = \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^{\lambda+1}} - \frac{\omega}{2^{\lambda+1+n}}, \quad \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots$$

Therefore, since $k_n \geq \mu^+ - \frac{\omega}{2^\lambda} \geq \frac{1}{2}(\mu^+ + \mu^-) \geq \sup_{Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0)} \phi$ which is guaranteed by (5.8), we can

use (3.2) for $(u - k_n)_+$ where we take $0 \leq \xi_n(x, t) \leq 1$ as a smooth cutoff function that satisfies the following

$$\begin{cases} \xi_n = 1 \text{ in } Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_{n+1}^{p^+}, \rho_{n+1}), \quad \xi_n = 0 \text{ on } \partial_p Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_n^{p^+}, \rho_n), \\ \left| \frac{\partial \xi_n}{\partial x_i} \right| \leq \frac{2^{(n+1)p^+}}{\rho_0^{2p_i}} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N, \quad 0 < \frac{\partial \xi_n}{\partial t} \leq \frac{2^{(n+1)p^+}}{\theta\rho_0^{p^+}}, \end{cases}$$

such that by using the same method we used in (5.16), we arrive at

$$(5.44) \quad \left(\frac{\omega}{2^{\lambda+n+2}}\right)^{\bar{p}} |A_{n+1}| \leq C \frac{2^{np^+}}{\rho_0^{p^-}} \left(\frac{\omega}{2^\lambda}\right)^{p^+} |A_n|^{1+\frac{\bar{p}}{N}},$$

where $A_n = Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_n^{p^+}, \rho_n) \cap \{u > k_n\}$. Thereafter, by taking $X_n = \frac{|A_n|}{Q(\frac{\theta}{2}\rho_n^{p^+}, \rho_n)}$, we get the following recursive relation

$$(5.45) \quad X_{n+1} \leq C 4^{np^+} \left(\frac{\omega}{2^\lambda}\right)^{p^+-\bar{p}} X_n.$$

Hence, the desired result follows from Lemmas 5.5 and 2.5. \square

5.3. The Recursive Argument. Based on our previous findings, we can conclude that the oscillation of u is reduced in both alternatives.

Corollary 5.7. *There exists $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ depending on the data such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess osc } u \leq \sigma\omega. \\ & Q(\varrho(\frac{\rho_0}{8})^{p^+}, \frac{\rho_0}{8}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Lemma 5.3 we get that

$$(5.46) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{ess osc } u \leq \text{ess sup } u = \text{ess sup } u - \text{ess inf } u \\ & Q(\varrho(\frac{\rho_0}{8})^{p^+}, \frac{\rho_0}{8}) \quad Q(\bar{\tau}, \frac{\rho_0}{8}) \quad Q(\bar{\tau}, \frac{\rho_0}{8}) \quad Q(\bar{\tau}, \frac{\rho_0}{8}) \\ & \leq \mu^+ - \mu^- - \frac{\omega}{2^{n_1+1}} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{n_1+1}}\right) \omega = \sigma_1 \omega. \end{aligned}$$

Next, from Lemma 5.6 we get also that

$$(5.47) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{ess osc } u \leq \sigma_2 \omega, \\ & Q(\frac{\theta}{2}(\frac{\rho_0}{2})^{p^+}, \frac{\rho_0}{2}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_2 = (1 - \frac{1}{2^{\lambda+1}})$. Hence, from (5.46) and (5.47) we get the desired result for $\sigma = \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$. \square

Consequently, we obtain the following recursive result

Proposition 5.8. *For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and by letting*

$$\omega_1 = \max\{\sigma\omega, 2 \text{ ess osc } \phi\},$$

$$Q(\theta\rho_0, \rho_0)$$

there exists a positive constant γ depending on the data such that

$$\gamma = \sigma \frac{p^+-2}{p^+} 2^{\frac{(\lambda-1)(2-p^+)}{p^+}-3} < \frac{1}{8},$$

and by constructing the cylinder

$$Q_1 = Q(\theta_1 \rho_1^{p^+}, \rho_1), \quad \theta_1 = \left(\frac{\omega_1}{2^\lambda}\right)^{2-p^+}, \quad \rho_1 = \gamma \rho_0,$$

we have that

$$\text{ess osc }_{Q_1} u \leq \omega_1, \quad \text{and } Q_1 \subset Q(\theta \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0).$$

Proof. By construction, from (5.7) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess osc } u \leq \omega. \\ & Q(\theta \rho_0^{p^+}, \rho_0) \end{aligned}$$

Next, since $\sigma\omega \leq \omega_1$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho \left(\frac{\rho_0}{8} \right)^{p^+} &= \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \right)^{2-p^+} \left(\frac{2^\lambda}{\omega_1} \right)^{2-p^+} \left(\frac{\omega_1}{2^\lambda} \right)^{2-p^+} \frac{\rho_0^{p^+}}{2^{3p^+}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_1} \right)^{2-p^+} 2^{(\lambda-1)(2-p^+)-3p^+} \theta_1 \rho_0^{p^+} \\ &\geq \sigma^{p^+} 2^{2(\lambda-1)(2-p^+)-3p^+} \theta_1 \rho_0^{p^+} \\ &= \rho_1^{p^+} \theta_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by using Corollary 5.7 and the definition of ω_1 , we get that

$$\operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_1} u \leq \sigma\omega \leq \sigma_1.$$

□

5.4. Proof of Theorem 1.1. We begin by defining the following sequences of parameters and sequences such that for $n = 1, 2, \dots$

$$(5.48) \quad \begin{cases} \rho_n = \gamma \rho_{n-1}, \quad \omega_n = \max\{\sigma\omega_{n-1}, 2 \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{n-1}} \phi\}, \quad \theta_n = \left(\frac{\omega_n}{2^\lambda} \right)^{2-p^+}, \\ \gamma = \sigma^{\frac{p^+-2}{p^+}} 2^{\frac{(\lambda-1)(2-p^+)}{p^+}-3} \in (0, 1), \quad Q_n = Q(\theta_n \rho_n^{p^+}, \rho_n), \\ \mu_n^- = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{Q_n} u, \quad \text{and } \mu_n^+ = \mu_n^- + \omega_n. \end{cases}$$

By proposition 5.8, we have that

$$(5.49) \quad Q_n \subset Q_{n-1} \text{ and } \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_n} u \leq \omega_n.$$

Indeed, for $n = 0$ the result is assured by (5.7) for $\omega_0 := \omega$. Next, we assume that (5.49) is true for n and we will prove it for $(n+1)$. Therefore, we have $\mu_n^- = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{Q_n} u$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n^+ &= \mu_n^- + \omega_n \geq \mu_n^- + \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_n} u = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Q_n} u, \\ \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Q_n} \phi &= \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{Q_n} \phi + \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_n} \phi \leq \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{Q_n} u + \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{n-1}} \phi \leq \mu_n^- + \frac{1}{2}\omega_n = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_n^+ + \mu_n^-), \\ \text{and, } \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_n} \phi &\leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{n-1}} \phi \leq \frac{1}{2}\omega_n = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_n^+ - \mu_n^-). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we can apply Proposition 5.8 to obtain that

$$Q_{n+1} \subset Q_n, \text{ and } \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{n+1}} u \leq \omega_{n+1}.$$

Next, we define

$$(5.50) \quad r_n = \min\{1, \theta^{\frac{1}{p^+}}\} \rho_n,$$

so that

$$(5.51) \quad Q_{r_n} = Q(r_n^{p^+}, r_n) \subset Q_n \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where θ is defined in (5.5). Therefore, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(5.52) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{r_n}} u &\leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_n} u \leq \omega_n \leq \sigma^n \omega + 2 \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{n-1}} \phi \\ &\leq \sigma^n \omega + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^j \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{n-1-j}} \phi. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are going to simplify the last term on the right-hand side of (5.52) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.53) \quad \text{ess osc}_{Q_{n-1-j}} \phi &\leq C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(\rho_{n-1-j}^\beta + \left(\theta_{n-1-j} \rho_{n-1-j}^{p^+} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \right) \\
&\leq C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(\rho_{n-1-j}^\beta + \left(\theta_{n-1-j} \rho_{n-1-j}^{p^+} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{p^+}} \right) \\
&\leq C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\omega_{n-1-j}}{2^\lambda} \right)^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) \rho_{n-1-j}^\beta \\
&\leq C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(1 + (\sigma^{n-1-j} \omega)^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) \rho_{n-1-j}^\beta \\
&\leq C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(1 + \omega^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) \sigma^{\frac{\beta(2-p^+)(n-1-j)}{p^+}} \rho_{n-1-j}^\beta \\
&\leq C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(1 + \omega^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) \left(\frac{\delta_0}{8} \right)^{\beta(n-1-j)} \rho_0^\beta,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_0 = 2^{\frac{(\lambda-1)(2-p^+)}{p^+}}$ and we used (5.4) for the second inequality. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.54) \quad \text{ess osc}_{Q_{r_n}} u &\leq \sigma^n \omega + C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(1 + \omega^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^j \left(\frac{\delta_0}{8} \right)^{\beta(n-1-j)} \rho_0^\beta \\
&\leq \sigma^n \omega + C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(1 + \omega^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) n \delta_1^{n-1} \rho_0^\beta \\
&\leq \sigma^n \omega + C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(1 + \omega^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) \sqrt{\delta_1^n} \rho_0^\beta,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_1 = \max\{\sigma, \left(\frac{\delta_0}{8}\right)^\beta\}$ and we use the fact that $n \delta_1^{n-1} \leq C(\delta_1) \sqrt{\delta_1^n}$. Next, we define

$$(5.55) \quad \vartheta = \min\left\{ \frac{\ln(\delta_1)}{2 \ln(\gamma)}, \frac{p^+ \beta}{p^+ + \beta(p^+ - 2)} \right\},$$

and note that $\vartheta \leq \frac{\ln(\sigma)}{\ln(\gamma)}$. Then, (5.54) becomes

$$(5.56) \quad \text{ess osc}_{Q_{r_n}} u \leq \gamma^{n\vartheta} \omega + C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} \gamma^{n\vartheta} \left(1 + \omega^{\beta \frac{2-p^+}{p^+}} \right) \rho_0^\beta.$$

From (5.4), we have

$$(5.57) \quad 2^\lambda \rho_0^\vartheta \leq \omega \leq C[\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}} R^{-\beta} \rho_0^\beta.$$

Also, from the definition of r_n we get

$$(5.58) \quad \gamma^n = \frac{\rho_n}{\rho_0} = \frac{1}{\min\left\{1, \left(\frac{\omega}{2^\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2-p^+}{p^+}}\right\}} \frac{r_n}{\rho_0} \leq C(p^+, \|u\|_{L_{loc}^\infty}) \frac{r_n}{\rho_0}.$$

Then, (5.56) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.59) \quad \text{ess osc}_{Q_{r_n}} u &\leq C(p^+, \|u\|_{L_{loc}^\infty}, [\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}}) \left\{ \frac{R^{-\beta} \rho_0^\beta r_n^\vartheta}{\rho_0^\vartheta} + \frac{r_n^\vartheta}{\rho_0^\vartheta} \rho_0^{\frac{\vartheta\beta(2-p^+)}{p^+} + \beta} R^{-\beta} \right\} \\
&\leq C(p^+, \|u\|_{L_{loc}^\infty}, [\phi]_{0;\beta,\frac{\beta}{2}}) \frac{r_n^\vartheta}{R^\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that

$$(5.60) \quad \vartheta \leq \frac{p^+ \beta}{p^+ + \beta(p^+ - 2)} \leq \beta.$$

Thereafter, we try to show that (5.59) is true for all $r \in (0, R]$. The case where $r \in (0, r_0)$ we choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_{n+1} \leq r \leq r_n$. Then, from (5.59) we arrive at

$$(5.61) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_r} u &\leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_{r_n}} u \leq C \frac{r_n^\vartheta}{R^\beta} \\ &= C \left(\min\{1, \theta^{\frac{1}{p^+}}\} \right)^\vartheta \frac{\rho_n^\vartheta \gamma^\vartheta}{R^\beta \gamma^\vartheta} \\ &= C \left(\min\{1, \theta^{\frac{1}{p^+}}\} \right)^\vartheta \frac{\rho_{n+1}^\vartheta}{R^\beta \gamma^\vartheta} \\ &= C \frac{r_{n+1}^\vartheta}{R^\beta \gamma^\vartheta} \leq C \frac{r^\vartheta}{R^\beta \gamma^\vartheta}. \end{aligned}$$

If $r \in [r_0, \rho_0]$, from (5.4)₂ we get that

$$(5.62) \quad \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_r} u \leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(\rho_0^2, \rho_0)} u \leq C \frac{\rho_0^\beta r^\vartheta}{r_0^\vartheta R^\beta} \leq C \frac{r^\vartheta}{R^\beta}.$$

For the last case, let $r \in [\rho_0, R]$ we estimate

$$(5.63) \quad \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q_r} u \leq \operatorname{ess\,osc}_{Q(r^2, r)} u \leq C \frac{r^\beta}{R^\beta} \leq C \frac{r^\vartheta}{R^\beta},$$

where we used again (5.4)₂. Hence, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of the previous estimates for all $r \in (0, R]$.

DATA AVAILABILITY

No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Antontsev, J.I. Díaz, S. Shmarev, Energy methods for free boundary problems: applications to nonlinear PDEs and fluid mechanics. Progress in nonlinear differential equations and their applications, vol. 48, Birkhäuser, Boston (2002).
- [2] R. Arora, S. Shmarev, Existence and global second-order regularity for anisotropic parabolic equations with variable growth, Journal of Differential Equations, 349, 83-124 (2023).
- [3] H. El Bahja, Local continuity of singular anisotropic parabolic equations with variable Growth, Complex variables and elliptic equations, 66:12, 1998-2027 (2021).
- [4] H. El Bahja, Regularity for anisotropic quasi-linear parabolic equations with variable growth, Electron. J. Differential Equations, Vol. 2019, No. 104, 1-21 (2019).
- [5] H. El Bahja, Obstacle problem of a nonlinear anisotropic parabolic equation. 72, 625-651 (2023).
- [6] V. Bögelein, C. Scheven, Higher integrability in parabolic obstacle problems, Forum Math. 24, 931-972 (2012).
- [7] V. Bögelein, T. Lukkari and C. Scheven, Hölder regularity for degenerate parabolic obstacle problems, Ark. Mat. 55, no. 1, 1-39 (2017).
- [8] V. Bögelein, F. Duzaar, C. Scheven, The obstacle problem for parabolic minimizers. J. Evol. Equ. 17(4), 1273-1310 (2017).
- [9] P. Bousquet, L. Brasco, C. Leone, A. Verde, Gradient estimates for an orthotropic nonlinear diffusion equation, Adv. Calc. Var. (2021).
- [10] Y. Cho and C. Scheven, Hölder Regularity for Singular Parabolic Obstacle Problems of Porous Medium Type, International Mathematics Research Notices, vol. 2020, no. 10, 1671-1717 (2020).
- [11] S. Ciani, S. Mosconi, V. Vespri, Parabolic Harnack Estimates for anisotropic slow diffusion. JAMA 149, 611-642 (2023).
- [12] E. DiBenedetto, Degenerate Parabolic Equations, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1993).

- [13] E. DiBenedetto, A. Friedman, Hölder estimates for nonlinear degenerate parabolic systems, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 357, 1-22 (1985).
- [14] E. DiBenedetto, J. M. Urbano, V. Vespri, Current issues on singular and degenerate evolution equations, *Handbook of Differential Equations, Evolutionary Equations*, 1, 169–286 (2004).
- [15] F.G. Düzgün, S. Mosconi, V. Vespri, Harnack and pointwise estimates for degenerate or singular parabolic equations, *Contemporary Research in Elliptic PDEs and Related Topics*, Springer INdAM Ser., vol. 33, Springer, Cham, 301–368 (2019).
- [16] E. Giusti, *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*, World Scientific Publishing Co., (2003).
- [17] J. Kinnunen, P. Lindqvist, Pointwise behaviour of semicontinuous supersolutions to a quasilinear parabolic equation, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 185, no. 3, 411-435 (2006).
- [18] R. Korte, T. Kuusi, J. Siljander, Obstacle problem for nonlinear parabolic equations, *J. Differential Equations* 246, 3668-3680 (2009).
- [19] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, K. Nyström, Sharp regularity for evolutionary obstacle problems, interpolative geometries and removable sets, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 101, 119-151 (2014).
- [20] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, N.N. Ural'tseva, *Linear and Quasilinear Elliptic Equations*. Academic Press, New York (1968).
- [21] K. Moring, L. Schätzler, On the Hölder regularity for obstacle problems to porous medium type equations. *J. Evol. Equ.* 22, 81 (2022).
- [22] J. Moser, On Harnack's theorem for elliptic differential equations. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 14, 577-591 (1961).
- [23] A. Murr, Water vapour sorption and moisture transport in and across fibre direction of wood. *Cellulose* 29, 4135-4152 (2022).
- [24] K. Piekarski, M. Munro, Transport mechanism operating between blood supply and osteocytes in long bones, *Nature* vol. 269(5623) pp. 80-82 (1977).
- [25] J. Serrin, Local behavior of solutions of quasi-linear equations. *Acta Math.* 111(1), 247-302 (1964).
- [26] M. Troisi; Teoremi di inclusione per spazi di Sobolev non isotropi, *Ricerche di Mat.*, 18, 3-24 (1969).
- [27] N. Trudinger, On Harnack type inequalities and their application to quasilinear elliptic equations. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 20, 721-747 (1967).
- [28] M. Yu, X. Lian, Boundedness of solutions of parabolic equations with anisotropic growth conditions, *Canad. J. Math.* 49, 4, 798-809 (1997).

HAMID EL BAHJA, AIMS, CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.
Email address: hamidsm88@gmail.com