

OPTIMAL REGULARITY AND THE FREE BOUNDARY IN THE PARABOLIC SIGNORINI PROBLEM

DONATELLA DANIELLI, NICOLA GAROFALO, ARSHAK PETROSYAN, AND TUNG TO

ABSTRACT. We give a comprehensive treatment of the parabolic Signorini problem based on a generalization of Almgren's monotonicity of the frequency. This includes the proof of the optimal regularity of solutions, classification of free boundary points, the regularity of the regular set and the structure of the singular set.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Overview of the main results	4
1.2. Related problems	6
1.3. Structure of the paper	6
2. Notation and preliminaries	7
2.1. Notation	8
2.2. Parabolic functional classes	10
3. Known existence and regularity results	11
4. Classes of solutions	14
5. Estimates in Gaussian spaces	17
6. The generalized frequency function	18
7. Existence and homogeneity of blowups	30
8. Homogeneous global solutions	38
9. Optimal regularity of solutions	44
10. Classification of free boundary points	49
11. Free boundary: Regular set	54
12. Free boundary: Singular set	63
13. Weiss and Monneau type monotonicity formulas	68
14. Structure of the singular set	72
Appendix A. Estimates in Gaussian spaces: Proofs	79
Appendix B. Parabolic Whitney's extension theorem	85
References	89

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35R35, 35K85.

Key words and phrases. free boundary problem, parabolic Signorini problem, evolutionary variational inequality, Almgren's frequency formula, Caffarelli's monotonicity formula, Weiss's monotonicity formula, Monneau's monotonicity formula, optimal regularity, regularity of free boundary, singular set.

D.D. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1101246.

N.G. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1001317.

A.P. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1101139.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, with a sufficiently regular boundary $\partial\Omega$, let \mathcal{M} be a relatively open subset of $\partial\Omega$ (in its relative topology), and set $\mathcal{S} = \partial\Omega \setminus \mathcal{M}$. We consider the solution of the problem

$$(1.1) \quad \Delta v - \partial_t v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_T := \Omega \times (0, T],$$

$$(1.2) \quad v \geq \varphi, \quad \partial_\nu v \geq 0, \quad (v - \varphi)\partial_\nu v = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{M}_T := \mathcal{M} \times (0, T],$$

$$(1.3) \quad v = g \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_T := \mathcal{S} \times (0, T],$$

$$(1.4) \quad v(\cdot, 0) = \varphi_0 \quad \text{on } \Omega_0 := \Omega \times \{0\},$$

where ∂_ν is the outer normal derivative on $\partial\Omega$, and $\varphi : \mathcal{M}_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_0 : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $g : \mathcal{S}_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are prescribed functions satisfying the compatibility conditions: $\varphi_0 \geq \varphi$ on $\mathcal{M} \times \{0\}$, $g \geq \varphi$ on $\partial\mathcal{S} \times (0, T]$, and $g = \varphi$ on $\mathcal{S} \times \{0\}$, see Fig. 1. The condition (1.2) is known as the *Signorini boundary condition* and the problem (1.1)–(1.4) as the (*parabolic*) *Signorini problem* for the heat equation. The function φ is called the *thin obstacle*, since v is restricted to stay above φ on \mathcal{M}_T . Classical examples where Signorini-type boundary conditions appear are the problems with unilateral constraints in elastostatics (including the original Signorini problem [Sig59, Fic63]), problems with semipermeable membranes in fluid mechanics (including the phenomenon of osmosis and osmotic pressure in biochemistry), and the problems on the temperature control on the boundary in thermics. We refer to the book of Duvaut and Lions [DL76], where many such applications are discussed and the mathematical models are derived.

Another historical importance of the parabolic Signorini problem is that it serves as one of the prototypical examples of evolutionary *variational inequalities*, going back to the foundational paper by Lions and Stampacchia [LS67], where the existence and uniqueness of certain weak solutions were established. In this paper, we work with a stronger notion of solution. Thus, we say that a function $v \in W_2^{1,0}(\Omega_T)$ solves (1.1)–(1.4) if

$$\int_{\Omega_T} \nabla v \nabla (w - v) + \partial_t v (w - v) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } w \in \mathfrak{K},$$

$$v \in \mathfrak{K}, \quad \partial_t v \in L_2(\Omega_T), \quad v(\cdot, 0) = \varphi_0,$$

where $\mathfrak{K} = \{w \in W_2^{1,0}(\Omega_T) \mid w \geq \varphi \text{ on } \mathcal{M}_T, w = g \text{ on } \mathcal{S}_T\}$. The reader should see Section 2.2 for the definitions of the relevant parabolic functional classes. The existence and uniqueness of such v , under some natural assumptions on φ , φ_0 , and g can be found in [Bré72, DL76, AU88, AU96]. See also Section 3 for more details.

Two major questions arise in the study of the problem (1.1)–(1.4):

- the regularity properties of v ;
- the structure and regularity of the *free boundary*

$$\Gamma(v) = \partial_{\mathcal{M}_T} \{(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}_T \mid v(x, t) > \varphi(x, t)\},$$

where $\partial_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ indicates the boundary in the relative topology of \mathcal{M}_T .

Concerning the regularity of v , it has long been known that the spatial derivatives $\partial_{x_i} v$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are α -Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $\Omega_T \cup \mathcal{M}_T$, for some unspecified $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. In the time-independent case, such regularity was first proved by Richardson [Ric78] in dimension $n = 2$, and by Caffarelli [Caf79] for




FIGURE 1. The parabolic Signorini problem

$n \geq 3$. In the parabolic case, this was first proved by Athanasopoulos [Ath82], and subsequently by Uraltseva [Ura85] (see also [AU88]), under certain regularity assumptions on the boundary data, which were further relaxed by Arkhipova and Uraltseva [AU96].

We note that the Hölder continuity of $\partial_{x_i} v$ is the best regularity one should expect for the solution of (1.1)–(1.4). This can be seen from the example

$$v = \operatorname{Re}(x_1 + ix_n)^{3/2}, \quad x_n \geq 0,$$

which is a harmonic function in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and satisfies the Signorini boundary conditions on $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$, with thin obstacle $\varphi \equiv 0$. This example also suggests that the optimal Hölder exponent for $\partial_{x_i} v$ should be $1/2$, at least when \mathcal{M} is flat (contained in a hyperplane). Indeed, in the time-independent case, such optimal $C^{1,1/2}$ regularity was proved in dimension $n = 2$ in the cited paper by Richardson [Ric78]. The case of arbitrary space dimension (still time-independent), however, had to wait for the breakthrough work of Athanasopoulos and Caffarelli [AC04]. Very recently, the proof of the optimal regularity for the original Signorini problem in elastostatics was announced by Andersson [And12].

One of the main objectives of this paper is to establish, in the parabolic Signorini problem, and for a flat thin manifold \mathcal{M} , that $\nabla v \in H_{\text{loc}}^{1/2,1/4}(\Omega_T \cup \mathcal{M}_T)$, or more precisely that $v \in H_{\text{loc}}^{3/2,3/4}(\Omega_T \cup \mathcal{M}_T)$, see Theorem 9.1 below. Our approach is inspired by the works of Athanasopoulos, Caffarelli, and Salsa [ACS08] and Caffarelli, Salsa, and Silvestre [CSS08] on the time-independent problem. In such papers a generalization of the celebrated Almgren's frequency formula established in [Alm00] was used, not only to give an alternative proof of the optimal $C^{1,1/2}$ regularity of solutions, but also to study the so-called *regular set* $\mathcal{R}(v)$ of the free boundary $\Gamma(v)$. This approach was subsequently refined in [GP09] by the second and third named authors with the objective of classifying the free boundary points according to their separation rate from the thin obstacle φ . In [GP09] the authors also introduced generalizations of Weiss's and Monneau's monotonicity formulas, originally developed in [Wei99a] and [Mon03], respectively, for the classical obstacle problem. Such generalized Weiss's and Monneau's monotonicity formulas allowed to prove a structural theorem on the so-called *singular set* $\Sigma(v)$ of the free boundary, see

[GP09]. For an exposition of these results in the case when the thin obstacle $\varphi \equiv 0$ we also refer to the book by the third named author, Shahgholian, and Uraltseva [PSU12, Chapter 9].

In closing we mention that, as far as we are aware of, the only result presently available concerning the free boundary in the parabolic setting is that of Athanassopoulos [Ath84], under assumptions on the boundary data that guarantee boundedness and nonnegativity of $\partial_t v$. In that paper it is shown that the free boundary is locally given as a graph

$$t = h(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}),$$

for a Lipschitz continuous function h .

1.1. Overview of the main results. In this paper we extend all the above mentioned results from the elliptic to the parabolic case. We focus on the situation when the principal part of the diffusion operator is the Laplacian and that the thin manifold \mathcal{M} is flat and contained in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$.

One of our central results is a generalization of Almgren's frequency formula [Alm00], see Theorem 6.3 below. As it is well known, the parabolic counterpart of Almgren's formula was established by Poon [Poo96], for functions which are caloric in an infinite strip $S_\rho = \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\rho^2, 0]$. In Section 6, we establish a truncated version of that formula for the solutions of the parabolic Signorini problem, similar to the ones in [CSS08] and [GP09]. The time dependent case presents, however, substantial novel challenges with respect to the elliptic setting. These are mainly due to the lack of regularity of the solution in the t -variable, a fact which makes the justification of differentiation formulas and the control of error terms quite difficult. To overcome these obstructions, we have introduced (Steklov-type) averaged versions of the quantities involved in our main monotonicity formulas. This basic idea has enabled us to successfully control the error terms.

Similarly to what was done in [GP09], we then undertake a systematic classification of the free boundary points based on the limit at the point in question of the generalized frequency function. When the thin obstacle φ is in the class $H^{\ell, \ell/2}$, $\ell \geq 2$, this classification translates into assigning to each free boundary point in $\Gamma(v)$ (or more generally to every point on the *extended free boundary* $\Gamma_*(v)$, see Section 4) a certain *frequency* $\kappa \leq \ell$, see Sections 7 and 10. At the points for which $\kappa < \ell$, the separation rate of the solution v from the thin obstacle can be “detected”, in a sense that it will exceed the truncation term in the generalized frequency formula. At those points we are then able to consider the so-called blowups, which will be parabolically κ -homogeneous solutions of the Signorini problem, see Section 7.

Next, we show that, similarly to what happens in the elliptic case, the smallest possible value of the frequency at a free boundary point is $\kappa = 3/2$, see Section 8. We emphasize that our proof of this fact does not rely on the semiconvexity estimates, as in the elliptic case (see [AC04] or [CSS08]). Rather, we use the monotonicity formula of Caffarelli [Caf93] to reduce the problem to the spatial dimension $n = 2$, and then study the eigenvalues of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator in domains with slits (see Fig. 2 in Section 8). The elliptic version of this argument has appeared earlier in the book [PSU12, Chapter 9]. The bound $\kappa \geq 3/2$ ultimately implies the optimal $H_{\text{loc}}^{3/2, 3/4}$ regularity of solutions, see Section 9.

We next turn to studying the regularity properties of the free boundary. We start with the so-called *regular set* $\mathcal{R}(v)$, which corresponds to free boundary points of minimal frequency $\kappa = 3/2$. Similarly to the elliptic case, studied in [ACS08, CSS08], the Lipschitz regularity of $\mathcal{R}(v)$ with respect to the space variables follows by showing that there is a cone of spatial directions in which $v - \varphi$ is monotone. The $1/2$ -Hölder regularity in t is then a consequence of the fact that the blowups at regular points are t -independent, see Theorem 11.3. Thus, after possibly rotating the coordinate axes in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , we obtain that $\mathcal{R}(v)$ is given locally as a graph

$$x_{n-1} = g(x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, t),$$

where g is parabolically Lipschitz (or $\text{Lip}(1, \frac{1}{2})$ in alternative terminology). To prove the Hölder $H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}$ regularity of $\partial_{x_i} g$, $i = 1, \dots, n-2$, we then use an idea that goes back to the paper of Athanasopoulos and Caffarelli [AC85] based on an application of the boundary Harnack principle (forward and backward) for so-called domains with thin Lipschitz complement, i.e, domains of the type

$$Q_1 \setminus \{(x', t) \in Q'_1 \mid x_{n-1} \leq g(x'', t)\},$$

see Lemma 11.9. This result was recently established in the work of the third named author and Shi [PS13]. We emphasize that, unlike the elliptic case, the boundary Harnack principle for such domains cannot be reduced to the other known results in the parabolic setting (see e.g. [Kem72, FGS84] for parabolically Lipschitz domains, or [HLN04] for parabolically NTA domains with Reifenberg flat boundary).

Another type of free boundary points that we study are the so-called *singular points*, where the coincidence set $\{v = \varphi\}$ has zero \mathcal{H}^n -density in the thin manifold with respect to the thin parabolic cylinders. This corresponds to free boundary points with frequency $\kappa = 2m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The blowups at those points are parabolically κ -homogeneous polynomials, see Section 12.

Following the approach in [GP09], in Section 13 we establish appropriate parabolic versions of monotonicity formulas of Weiss and Monneau type. Using such formulas we are able to prove the uniqueness of the blowups at singular free boundary points (x_0, t_0) , and consequently obtain a Taylor expansion of the type

$$v(x, t) - \varphi(x', t) = q_\kappa(x - x_0, t - t_0) + o(\|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|^\kappa), \quad t \leq t_0,$$

where q_κ is a polynomial of parabolic degree κ that depends continuously on the singular point (x_0, t_0) with frequency κ . We note that such expansion holds only for $t \leq t_0$ and may fail for $t > t_0$ (see Remark 12.8). Nevertheless, we show that this expansion essentially holds when restricted to singular points (x, t) , even for $t \geq t_0$. This is necessary in order to verify the compatibility condition in a parabolic version of the Whitney's extension theorem (given in Appendix B). Using the latter we are then able to prove a structural theorem for the singular set. For the elliptic counterpart of this result see [GP09]. It should be mentioned at this moment that one difference between the parabolic case treated in the present paper and its elliptic counterpart is the presence of new types of singular points, which we call *time-like*. At such points the blowup may become independent of the space variables x' . We show that such singular points are contained in a countable union of graphs of the type

$$t = g(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}),$$

where g is a C^1 function. The other singular points, which we call *space-like*, are contained in countable union of d -dimensional $C^{1,0}$ manifolds ($d < n-1$). After a

possible rotation of coordinates in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , such manifolds are locally representable as graphs of the type

$$(x_{d+1}, \dots, x_{n-1}) = g(x_1, \dots, x_d, t),$$

with g and $\partial_{x_i} g$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, continuous.

1.2. Related problems. The time-independent version of the Signorini problem is closely related to the obstacle problem for the half-Laplacian in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}

$$u \geq \varphi, \quad (-\Delta_{x'})^{1/2} u \geq 0, \quad (u - \varphi)(-\Delta_{x'})^{1/2} u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

More precisely, if we consider a harmonic extension of u from $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$ to \mathbb{R}_+^n (by means of a convolution with the Poisson kernel), we will have that

$$(-\Delta_{x'})^{1/2} u = -c_n \partial_{x_n} u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}.$$

Thus, the extension u will solve the Signorini problem in \mathbb{R}_+^n . More generally, in the above problem instead of the half-Laplacian one can consider an arbitrary fractional power of the Laplacian $(-\Delta_{x'})^s$, $0 < s < 1$, see e.g. the thesis of Silvestre [Sil07]. Problems of this kind appear for instance in mathematical finance, in the valuation of American options, when the asset prices are modelled by jump processes. The time-independent problem corresponds to the so-called perpetual options, with infinite maturity time. In such framework, with the aid of an extension theorem of Caffarelli and Silvestre [CS07], many of the results known for $s = 1/2$ can be proved also for all powers $0 < s < 1$, see [CSS08].

The evolution version of the problem above is driven by the fractional diffusion and can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} u(x', t) - \varphi(x') &\geq 0, \\ ((-\Delta_{x'})^s + \partial_t) u &\geq 0, \\ (u(x', t) - \varphi(x'))((-\Delta_{x'})^s + \partial_t) u &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times (0, T)$ with the initial condition

$$u(x', 0) = \varphi(x').$$

This problem has been recently studied by Caffarelli and Figalli [CF12]. We emphasize that, although their time-independent versions are locally equivalent, the problem studied in [CF12] is very different from the one considered in the present paper.

In relation to temperature control problems on the boundary, described in [DL76], we would like to mention the two recent papers by Athanasopoulos and Caffarelli [AC10], and by Allen and Shi [AS13]. Both papers deal with two-phase problems that can be viewed as generalizations of the one-phase problem (with $\varphi = 0$) considered in this paper. The paper [AS13] establishes the phenomenon of separation of phases, thereby locally reducing the study of the two-phase problem to that of one-phase. A similar phenomenon was shown earlier in the elliptic case by Allen, Lindgren, and the third named author [ALP12].

1.3. Structure of the paper. In what follows we provide a brief description of the structure of the paper.

- In Section 2 we introduce the notations used throughout the paper, and describe the relevant parabolic functional classes.

- In Section 3 we overview some of the known basic regularity properties of the solution v of the parabolic Signorini problem. The main ones are: $v \in W_{2,\text{loc}}^{2,1} \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$; and, $\nabla v \in H_{\text{loc}}^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Such results will be extensively used in our paper.
- In Section 4 we introduce the classes of solutions $\mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ of the parabolic Signorini problem with a thin obstacle φ , and show how to effectively “subtract” the obstacle by maximally using its regularity. In this process we convert the problem to one with zero thin obstacle, but with a non-homogeneous right hand side f in the equation. In order to apply our main monotonicity formulas we also need to extend the resulting functions from Q_1^+ to the entire strip S_1^+ . We achieve this by multiplication by a cutoff function, and denote the resulting class of functions by $\mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$.
- Section 5 contains generalizations of $W_2^{2,1}$ estimates to the weighted spaced with Gaussian measure. These estimates will be instrumental in the proof of the generalized frequency formula in Section 6 and in the study of the blowups in Section 7. In order not to distract the reader from the main content, we have deferred the proof of these estimates to the Appendix A.
- Section 6 is the most technical part of the paper. There, we generalize Almgren’s (Poon’s) frequency formula to solutions of the parabolic Signorini problem.
- In Section 7 we prove the existence and homogeneity of the blowups at free boundary points where the separation rate of the solution from the thin obstacle dominates the error (truncation) terms in the generalized frequency formula.
- In Section 8 we prove that the minimal homogeneity of homogeneous solution of the parabolic Signorini problem is $3/2$.
- Section 9 contains the proof of the optimal $H_{\text{loc}}^{3/2,3/4}$ regularity of the solutions of the parabolic Signorini problem.
- In the remaining part of the paper we study the free boundary. We start in Section 10 by classifying the free boundary points according to the homogeneity of the blowups at the point in question. We also use the assumed regularity of the thin obstacle in the most optimal way.
- In Section 11, we study the so-called regular set $\mathcal{R}(v)$ and show that it can be locally represented as a graph with $H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ regular gradient.
- In Section 12 we give a characterization of the so-called singular points.
- Section 13 contains some new Weiss and Monneau type monotonicity formulas for the parabolic problem. These results generalize the ones in [GP09] for the elliptic case.
- In Section 14 we prove the uniqueness of blowups at singular points and the continuous dependence of blowups on compact subsets of the singular set. We then invoke a parabolic version of Whitney’s extension theorem (given in Appendix B) to prove a structural theorem on the singular set.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. To proceed, we fix the notations that we are going to use throughout the paper.

\mathbb{N}	$= \{1, 2, \dots\}$	(natural numbers)
\mathbb{Z}	$= \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$	(integers)
\mathbb{Z}_+	$= \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$	(nonnegative integers)
\mathbb{R}	$= (-\infty, \infty)$	(real numbers)
s^\pm	$= \max\{\pm s, 0\}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}$	(positive/negative part of s)
\mathbb{R}^n	$= \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \mid x_i \in \mathbb{R}\}$	(Euclidean space)
\mathbb{R}_+^n	$= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > 0\}$	(positive half-space)
\mathbb{R}_-^n	$= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n < 0\}$	(negative half-space)
\mathbb{R}^{n-1}	identified with $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$	(thin space)
x'	$= (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1})$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we also identify x' with $(x', 0)$	
x''	$= (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-2})$	
$ x $	$= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2\right)^{1/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n$	(Euclidean norm)
$\ (x, t)\ $	$= (x ^2 + t)^{1/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R}$	(parabolic norm)
x^α	$= x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$	
$\bar{E}, E^\circ, \partial E$	closure, interior, boundary of the set E	
$\partial_X E$	boundary in the relative topology of X	
$\partial_p E$	parabolic boundary of E	
E^c	complement of the set E	
$\mathcal{H}^s(E)$	s -dimensional Hausdorff measure of a Borel set E	

For $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $r > 0$ we let

$B_r(x_0)$	$= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x - x_0 < r\}$	(Euclidean ball)
$B_r^\pm(x_0)$	$= B_r(x_0) \cap \mathbb{R}_\pm^n, \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$	(Euclidean half-ball)
$B'_r(x_0)$	$= B_r(x_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$	(thin ball)
$B''_r(x_0)$	$= B'_r(x_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-2}, \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$	
\mathcal{C}'_η	$= \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mid x_{n-1} \geq \eta x'' \}, \quad \eta > 0$	(thin cone)
$Q_r(x_0, t_0)$	$= B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0]$	(parabolic cylinder)
$Q_r^\pm(x_0, t_0)$	$= B_r^\pm(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0]$	(parabolic half-cylinders)
$\tilde{Q}_r(x_0, t_0)$	$= B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0 + r^2)$	(full parabolic cylinder)
$Q'_r(x_0, t_0)$	$= B'_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0]$	(thin parabolic cylinder)
$Q''_r(x_0, t_0)$	$= B''_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0]$	
S_r	$= \mathbb{R}^n \times (-r^2, 0]$	(parabolic strip)

$$\begin{aligned}
S_r^\pm &= \mathbb{R}_\pm^n \times (-r^2, 0] && (\text{parabolic half-strip}) \\
S'_r &= \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times (-r^2, 0] && (\text{thin parabolic strip})
\end{aligned}$$

When $x_0 = 0$ and $t_0 = 0$, we routinely omit indicating the centers x_0 and (x_0, t_0) in the above notations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_e u, u_e & \quad \text{partial derivative in the direction } e \\
\partial_{x_i} u, u_{x_i} &= \partial_{e_i} u, \quad \text{for standard coordinate} \\
& \quad \text{vectors } e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \\
\partial_t u, u_t & \quad \text{partial derivative in } t \text{ variable} \\
u_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_k}} &= \partial_{x_{i_1}} \dots \partial_{x_{i_k}} u = \partial_{x_{i_1}} \dots \partial_{x_{i_k}} u \\
\partial_x^\alpha u &= \partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_{x_n}^{\alpha_n} u, \\
& \quad \text{for } \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \\
\nabla u, \nabla_x u &= (\partial_{x_1} u, \dots, \partial_{x_n} u) && (\text{gradient}) \\
\nabla' u, \nabla_{x'} u &= (\partial_{x_1} u, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}} u) && (\text{tangential or thin gradient}) \\
\nabla'' u, \nabla_{x''} u &= (\partial_{x_1} u, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-2}} u) \\
D^k u, D_x^k u &= (\partial_x^\alpha u)_{|\alpha|=k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \\
& \quad \text{where } |\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n \\
\Delta u, \Delta_x u &= \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_{x_i x_i} u && (\text{Laplacian}) \\
\Delta' u, \Delta_{x'} u &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \partial_{x_i x_i} u && (\text{tangential or thin Laplacian})
\end{aligned}$$

We denote by G the *backward heat kernel* on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$

$$G(x, t) = \begin{cases} (-4\pi t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{\frac{x^2}{4t}}, & t < 0, \\ 0, & t \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

We will often use the following properties of G :

$$(2.1) \quad \Delta G + \partial_t G = 0, \quad G(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t) = \lambda^{-n} G(x, t), \quad \nabla G = \frac{x}{2t} G.$$

Besides, to simplify our calculations, we define the differential operator:

$$(2.2) \quad Zu = x \nabla u + 2t \partial_t u,$$

which is the generator of the parabolic scaling in the sense that

$$(2.3) \quad Zu(x, t) = \frac{d}{d\lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=1} u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t).$$

Using (2.1), the operator Z can also be defined through the following identity:

$$(2.4) \quad Zu = 2t \left(\nabla u \frac{\nabla G}{G} + \partial_t u \right).$$

2.2. Parabolic functional classes. For the parabolic functional classes, we have opted to use notations similar to those in the classical book of Ladyzhenskaya, Solonnikov, and Uraltseva [LSU67].

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open subset in \mathbb{R}^n and $\Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T]$ for $T > 0$. The class $C(\Omega_T) = C^{0,0}(\Omega_T)$ is the class of functions continuous in Ω_T with respect to parabolic (or Euclidean) distance. Further, given for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we say $u \in C^{2m,m}(\Omega_T)$ if for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$ $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u \in C^{0,0}(\Omega_T)$, and define the norm

$$\|u\|_{C^{2m,m}(\Omega_T)} = \sum_{|\alpha|+2j \leq 2m} \sup_{(x,t) \in \Omega_T} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u(x, y)|.$$

The parabolic Hölder classes $H^{\ell, \ell/2}(\Omega_T)$, for $\ell = m + \gamma$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ are defined as follows. First, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u \rangle_{\Omega_T}^{(0)} &= |u|_{\Omega_T}^{(0)} = \sup_{(x,t) \in \Omega_T} |u(x, t)|, \\ \langle u \rangle_{\Omega_T}^{(m)} &= \sum_{|\alpha|+2j=m} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u|_{\Omega_T}^{(0)}, \\ \langle u \rangle_{x, \Omega_T}^{(\beta)} &= \sup_{\substack{(x,t), (y,t) \in \Omega_T \\ 0 < |x-y| \leq \delta_0}} \frac{|u(x, t) - u(y, t)|}{|x - y|^\beta}, \quad 0 < \beta \leq 1, \\ \langle u \rangle_{t, \Omega_T}^{(\beta)} &= \sup_{\substack{(x,t), (x,s) \in \Omega_T \\ 0 < |t-s| < \delta_0^2}} \frac{|u(x, t) - u(x, s)|}{|t - s|^\beta}, \quad 0 < \beta \leq 1, \\ \langle u \rangle_{x, \Omega_T}^{(\ell)} &= \sum_{|\alpha|+2j=m} \langle \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u \rangle_{x, \Omega_T}^{(\gamma)}, \\ \langle u \rangle_{t, \Omega_T}^{(\ell/2)} &= \sum_{m-1 \leq |\alpha|+2j \leq m} \langle \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u \rangle_{t, \Omega_T}^{((\ell-|\alpha|-2j)/2)}, \\ \langle u \rangle_{\Omega_T}^{(\ell)} &= \langle u \rangle_{x, \Omega_T}^{(\ell)} + \langle u \rangle_{t, \Omega_T}^{(\ell/2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we define $H^{\ell, \ell/2}(\Omega_T)$ as the space of functions u for which the following norm is finite:

$$\|u\|_{H^{\ell, \ell/2}(\Omega_T)} = \sum_{k=0}^m \langle u \rangle_{\Omega_T}^{(k)} + \langle u \rangle_{\Omega_T}^{(\ell)}.$$

The parabolic Lebesgue space $L_q(\Omega_T)$ indicates the Banach space of those measurable functions on Ω_T for which the norm

$$\|u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)} = \left(\int_{\Omega_T} |u(x, t)|^q dx dt \right)^{1/q}$$

is finite. The parabolic Sobolev spaces $W_q^{2m,m}(\Omega_T)$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, denote the spaces of those functions in $L_q(\Omega_T)$, whose distributional derivative $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u$ belongs to $L_q(\Omega_T)$, for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$. Endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W_q^{2m,m}(\Omega_T)} = \sum_{|\alpha|+2j \leq 2m} \|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)},$$

$W_q^{2m,m}(\Omega_T)$ becomes a Banach space.

We also denote by $W_q^{1,0}(\Omega_T)$, $W_q^{1,1}(\Omega_T)$ the Banach subspaces of $L^q(\Omega_T)$ generated by the norms

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{W_q^{1,0}(\Omega_T)} &= \|u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)}, \\ \|u\|_{W_q^{1,1}(\Omega_T)} &= \|u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L_q(\Omega_T)}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $E \subset S_R$ for some $R > 0$. The weighted Lebesgue space $L_p(E, G)$, $p > 1$, with Gaussian weight $G(x, t)$, will appear naturally in our proofs. The norm in this space is defined by

$$\|u\|_{L_p(E, G)}^p = \int_E |u(x, t)|^p G(x, t) dx dt.$$

When E is a relatively open subset of S_R , one may also define the respective weighted Sobolev spaces. We will also consider weighted spatial Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces $L_p(\Omega, G(\cdot, s))$, and $W_p^m(\Omega, G(\cdot, s))$ with Gaussian weights $G(\cdot, s)$ on \mathbb{R}^n for some fixed $s < 0$. For instance, the norm in the space $L_p(\Omega, G(\cdot, s))$ is given by

$$\|u\|_{L_p(\Omega, G(\cdot, s))}^p = \int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^p G(x, s) dx.$$

3. KNOWN EXISTENCE AND REGULARITY RESULTS

In this section we recall some known results about the existence and the regularity of the solution of the parabolic Signorini problem that we are going to take as the starting point of our analysis. For detailed proofs we refer the reader to the works of Arkhipova and Uraltseva [AU88, AU96]. For simplicity we state the relevant results only in the case of the unit parabolic half-cylinder Q_1^+ .

Suppose we are given functions $f \in L_{\infty}(Q_1^+)$, $\varphi \in W_{\infty}^{2,1}(Q_1')$, $g \in W_{\infty}^{2,1}((\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1, 0])$, and $\varphi_0 \in W_{\infty}^2(B_1^+)$ obeying the compatibility conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_0 &= g(\cdot, -1) \quad \text{a.e. on } (\partial B_1)^+, \\ \varphi_0 &\geq \varphi(\cdot, -1) \quad \text{a.e. on } B_1', \\ g &\geq \varphi \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial B_1' \times (-1, 0].\end{aligned}$$

Given φ and g as above, we introduce the following closed subset of $W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)$

$$\mathfrak{K} = \{v \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+) \mid v \geq \varphi \text{ a.e. on } Q_1', v = g \text{ a.e. on } (\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1, 0]\}.$$

We say that $u \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)$ satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad \Delta u - \partial_t u = f(x, t) \quad \text{in } Q_1^+,$$

$$(3.2) \quad u \geq \varphi, \quad -\partial_{x_n} u \geq 0, \quad (u - \varphi)\partial_{x_n} u = 0 \quad \text{on } Q_1',$$

$$(3.3) \quad u = g \quad \text{on } (\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1, 0],$$

$$(3.4) \quad u(\cdot, -1) = \varphi_0 \quad \text{on } B_1^+,$$

if u solves the variational inequality

$$\int_{Q_1^+} [\nabla u \nabla(v - u) + \partial_t u(v - u) + f(v - u)] \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } v \in \mathfrak{K},$$

$$u \in \mathfrak{K}, \quad \partial_t u \in L_2(Q_1^+),$$

$$u(\cdot, -1) = \varphi_0 \quad \text{on } B_1^+.$$

Under the assumptions above there exists a unique solution to the problem (3.1)–(3.4). Moreover, the solution will have Hölder continuous spatial gradient: $\nabla u \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')$ for any $0 < r < 1$ with the Hölder exponent $\alpha > 0$ depending only on the dimension, see [AU88, AU96]. Below, we sketch the details in the case $\varphi = 0$ and $g = 0$, that would be most relevant in our case.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we denote by f^ε a mollifications of f and consider the solution u^ε to the approximating problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u^\varepsilon - \partial_t u^\varepsilon &= f^\varepsilon(x, t) \quad \text{in } Q_1^+, \\ \partial_{x_n} u^\varepsilon &= \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \quad \text{on } Q_1', \\ u^\varepsilon &= 0 \quad \text{on } (\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1, 0], \\ u^\varepsilon(\cdot, -1) &= \varphi_0 \quad \text{on } B_1^+, \end{aligned}$$

where the penalty function $\beta_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is such that

$$(3.5) \quad \beta_\varepsilon(s) = 0 \quad \text{for } s \geq 0, \quad \beta_\varepsilon(s) = \varepsilon + s/\varepsilon \quad \text{for } s \leq -2\varepsilon^2, \\ \text{and } \beta'_\varepsilon(s) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The solutions u^ε to the penalization problems are shown to be smooth in Q_1^+ up to Q_1' , and it can be proved that they are uniformly bounded $W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$. To this end, for any $\eta \in W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)$ vanishing a.e. on $(\partial B_1)^+ \times (-1, 0]$ and $(t_1, t_2] \subset (-1, 0]$, one writes the integral identity

$$(3.6) \quad \int_{B_1^+ \times (t_1, t_2]} (\nabla u^\varepsilon \nabla \eta + u^\varepsilon_t \eta + f^\varepsilon \eta) dx dt + \int_{B_1^+ \times (t_1, t_2]} \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \eta dx' dt = 0.$$

Taking in (3.6) first $\eta = u^\varepsilon$, and then $\eta = u^\varepsilon_t$, one obtains the following global uniform bounds for the family $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon < 1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in (-1, 0]} \|u^\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L_2(B_1^+)}^2 + \|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}^2 &\leq C_n (\|\varphi_0\|_{L_2(B_1^+)}^2 + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}^2), \\ \sup_{t \in (-1, 0]} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L_2(B_1^+)}^2 + \|\partial_t u^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}^2 &\leq C_n (\|\nabla \varphi_0\|_{L_2(B_1^+)}^2 + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the family $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon < 1}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$ and passing to the weak limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ one obtains the existence of solutions of the Signorini problem (3.1)–(3.4) in the case $\varphi = 0$, $g = 0$. Besides, by choosing the test functions $\eta = \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon - w^\varepsilon) |\beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon - w^\varepsilon)|^{p-2}$, $p > 1$, where w solves the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w - \partial_t w &= f^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } Q_1^+, \\ w &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial_p Q_1^+, \end{aligned}$$

one can show the global uniform bound

$$\sup_{Q_1^+} |\beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)| \leq C_n (\|\varphi_0\|_{W_\infty^2(B_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)}).$$

For complete details, see the proofs of Lemmas 4 and 5 in [AU88].

Next we have a series of local estimates. With $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$, we take the function $\eta = \partial_{x_i}[(\partial_{x_i} u^\varepsilon) \zeta^2(x)]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ in (3.6). Integrating by parts, we obtain the following local, uniform, second order estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2 u^\varepsilon\|_{L_2(Q_r^+)} &\leq C_{n,r} (\|\nabla u\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}^2 + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}) \\ &\leq C_{n,r} (\|\varphi_0\|_{L_2(B_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}), \quad 0 < r < 1. \end{aligned}$$

One should compare with our proof of Lemma 5.1 in Appendix A which is the weighted version of this estimate. Furthermore, with more work one can establish the following locally uniform spatial Lipschitz bound

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_\infty^1(Q_r^+)} \leq C_{n,r} (\|\varphi_0\|_{W_\infty^2(B_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)}), \quad 0 < r < 1,$$

see Lemma 6 in [AU88].

Finally, one can show that there exists a dimensional constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $\nabla u^\varepsilon \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')$ for any $0 < r < 1$, with the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')} &\leq C_{n,r,\rho} (\|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(Q_\rho^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_\rho^+)}), \quad 0 < r < \rho < 1 \\ &\leq C_{n,r} (\|\varphi_0\|_{W_\infty^2(B_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)}), \end{aligned}$$

see Theorem 2.1 in [AU96].

We summarize the estimates above in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $u \in W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$ be a solution of the Signorini problem (3.1)–(3.4) with $f \in L_2(Q_1^+)$, $\varphi_0 \in W_2^1(B_1^+)$, $\varphi = 0$, and $g = 0$. Then, $u \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_r^+)$ for any $0 < r < 1$ and*

$$\|u\|_{W_2^{2,1}(Q_r^+)} \leq C_{n,r} (\|\varphi_0\|_{W_2^1(B_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_2(Q_1^+)}). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $u \in W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+)$ be a solution of the Signorini problem (3.1)–(3.4) with $f \in L_\infty(Q_1^+)$, $\varphi_0 \in W_\infty^2(B_1^+)$, $\varphi = 0$, and $g = 0$. Then, for any $0 < r < 1$, $u \in L_\infty(Q_r^+)$, $\nabla u \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')$ with a dimensional constant $\alpha > 0$ and*

$$\|u\|_{L_\infty(Q_r^+)} + \|\nabla u\|_{H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')} \leq C_{n,r} (\|\varphi_0\|_{W_\infty^2(B_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)}). \quad \square$$

We will also need the following variant of Lemma 3.2 that does not impose any restriction on the boundary data g and φ_0 .

Lemma 3.3. *Let $v \in W_2^{1,1}(Q_1^+) \cap W_\infty^{1,0}(Q_1^+)$ be a solution of the Signorini problem (3.1)–(3.4) with $f \in L_\infty(Q_1^+)$, and $\varphi \in H^{2,1}(Q_1')$. Then, for any $0 < r < 1$, $\nabla v \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')$ with a universal $\alpha > 0$, and*

$$\|\nabla v\|_{H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_r^+ \cup Q_r')} \leq C_{n,r} (\|v\|_{W_\infty^{1,0}(Q_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_1')}).$$

Proof. Consider the function

$$u(x, t) = [v(x, t) - \varphi(x', t)]\eta(x, t)$$

with $\eta \in C_0^\infty(Q_1^+)$, such that

$$\eta = 1 \quad \text{on } Q_r, \quad \eta(x', -x_n, t) = \eta(x', x_n, t).$$

In particular, $\partial_{x_n}\eta = 0$ on Q'_1 . Then u satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.2 with $\varphi = 0$, $g = 0$, $\varphi_0 = 0$ and with f replaced by

$$[f - (\Delta' - \partial_t)\varphi]\eta + (v - \varphi)(\Delta - \partial_t)\eta + 2(\nabla v - \nabla\varphi)\nabla\eta.$$

The assumptions on v and φ now imply the required estimate from that in Lemma 3.2. \square

In Section 5 we generalize the estimates in Lemma 3.1 for the appropriate weighted Gaussian norms. The proof of these estimates are given in Appendix A. One of our main results in this paper is the optimal value of the Hölder exponent α in Lemma 3.3. We show that $\nabla u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{1/2, 1/4}$, or slightly stronger, that $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{3/2, 3/4}$, when f is bounded, see Theorem 9.1.

4. CLASSES OF SOLUTIONS

In this paper we are mostly interested in local properties of the solution v of the parabolic Signorini problem and of its free boundary. In view of this, we focus our attention on solutions in parabolic (half-)cylinders. Furthermore, thanks to the results in Section 3, we can, and will assume that such solutions possess the regularity provided by Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2.

Definition 4.1 (Solutions in cylinders). Given $\varphi \in H^{2,1}(Q'_1)$, we say that $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ if $v \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_1^+) \cap L_\infty(Q_1^+)$, $\nabla v \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_1^+ \cup Q'_1)$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, and v satisfies

$$(4.1) \quad \Delta v - \partial_t v = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1^+,$$

$$(4.2) \quad v - \varphi \geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} v \geq 0, \quad (v - \varphi)\partial_{x_n} v = 0 \quad \text{on } Q'_1,$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad (0, 0) \in \Gamma_*(v) := \partial_{Q'_1} \{(x', t) \in Q'_1 \mid v(x', 0, t) = \varphi(x', t), \partial_{x_n} v(x', 0, t) = 0\},$$

where $\partial_{Q'_1}$ is the boundary in the relative topology of Q'_1 .

We call the set $\Gamma_*(v)$ the *extended free boundary* for the solution v . Recall that the *free boundary* is given by

$$\Gamma(v) := \partial_{Q'_1} \{(x', t) \in Q'_1 \mid v(x', 0, t) > \varphi(x', t)\}.$$

Note that by definition $\Gamma_*(v) \supset \Gamma(v)$. The reason for considering this extension is that parabolic cylinders do not contain information on “future times”. This fact may create a problem when restricting solutions to smaller subcylinders. The notion of extended free boundary removes this problem. Namely, if $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v)$ and $r > 0$ is such that $Q_r^+(x_0, t_0) \subset Q_1^+$, then $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v|_{Q_r^+(x_0, t_0)})$. Sometimes, we will abuse the terminology and call $\Gamma_*(v)$ the free boundary.

Replacing Q_1^+ and Q'_1 by Q_R^+ and Q'_R respectively in the definition above, we will obtain the class $\mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_R^+)$. Note that if $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_R^+)$ then the parabolic rescaling

$$v_R(x, t) = \frac{1}{C_R} v(Rx, R^2 t),$$

where $C_R > 0$ can be arbitrary (but typically chosen to normalize a certain quantity), belongs to the class $\mathfrak{S}_{\varphi_R}(Q_1^+)$. Having that in mind, we will state most of the results only for the case $R = 1$.

The function $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ allows a natural extension to the entire parabolic cylinder Q_1 by the even reflection in x_n coordinate:

$$v(x', -x_n, t) := v(x', x_n, t).$$

Then v will satisfy

$$\Delta v - \partial_t v = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1 \setminus \Lambda(v),$$

where

$$\Lambda(v) := \{(x', t) \in Q_1' \mid v(x', 0, t) = \varphi(x', t)\},$$

is the so-called *coincidence set*. More generally,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v - \partial_t v &\leq 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1, \\ \Delta v - \partial_t v &= 2(\partial_{x_n}^+ v) \mathcal{H}^n|_{\Lambda(v)} \quad \text{in } Q_1, \end{aligned}$$

in the sense of distributions, where \mathcal{H}^n is the n -dimensional Hausdorff measure and by $\partial_{x_n}^+ v$ we understand the limit from the right $\partial_{x_n} v(x', 0+, t)$ on Q_1' .

We next show how to reduce the study of the solutions with nonzero obstacle φ to the ones with zero obstacle. As the simplest such reduction we consider the difference $v(x, t) - \varphi(x', t)$, which will satisfy the Signorini conditions on Q_1' with zero obstacle, but at an expense of solving nonhomogeneous heat equation instead of the homogeneous one. One may further extend this difference to the strip $S_1^+ = \mathbb{R}_+^n \times (-1, 0]$ by multiplying with a cutoff function in x variables. More specifically, let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that

$$(4.4) \quad 0 \leq \psi \leq 1, \quad \psi = 1 \quad \text{on } B_{1/2}, \quad \text{supp } \psi \subset B_{3/4},$$

$$(4.5) \quad \psi(x', -x_n) = \psi(x', x_n), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and consider the function

$$(4.6) \quad u(x, t) = [v(x, t) - \varphi(x', t)]\psi(x) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in S_1^+.$$

It is easy to see that u satisfies the nonhomogeneous heat equation in S_1^+

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u - \partial_t u &= f(x, t) \quad \text{in } S_1^+, \\ f(x, t) &= -\psi(x)[\Delta' \varphi - \partial_t \varphi] + [v(x, t) - \varphi(x', t)]\Delta \psi + 2\nabla v \nabla \psi, \end{aligned}$$

and the Signorini boundary conditions on S_1'

$$u \geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} u \geq 0, \quad u \partial_{x_n} u = 0 \quad \text{on } S_1'.$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that f is uniformly bounded.

Definition 4.2 (Solutions in strips). We say that $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$, for $f \in L_\infty(S_1^+)$ if $u \in W_2^{2,1}(S_1^+) \cap L_\infty(S_1^+)$, $\nabla u \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(S_1^+ \cup S_1')$, u has a bounded support and solves

$$(4.7) \quad \Delta u - \partial_t u = f \quad \text{in } S_1^+,$$

$$(4.8) \quad u \geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} u \geq 0, \quad u \partial_{x_n} u = 0 \quad \text{on } S_1',$$

and

$$(0, 0) \in \Gamma_*(u) = \partial_{S_1'} \{(x', t) \in S_1' \mid u(x', 0, t) = 0, \partial_{x_n} u(x', 0, t) = 0\}.$$

If we only assume $\varphi \in H^{2,1}(Q_1')$, then in the construction above we can only say that the function $f \in L_\infty(S_1^+)$. For some of the results that we are going to prove (such as the optimal regularity in Theorem 9.1) this will be sufficient. However, if we want to study a more refined behavior of u near the origin, we need to assume more regularity on φ .

Thus, if we assume $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q_1')$ with $\ell = k + \gamma \geq 2$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, then for its parabolic Taylor polynomial $q_k(x', t)$ of parabolic degree k at the origin, we have

$$|\varphi(x', t) - q_k(x', t)| \leq M\|(x', t)\|^\ell,$$

for a certain $M > 0$, and more generally

$$|\partial_{x'}^{\alpha'} \partial_t^j \varphi(x', t) - \partial_{x'}^{\alpha'} \partial_t^j q_k(x', t)| \leq M\|(x', t)\|^{\ell - |\alpha'| - 2j},$$

for $|\alpha'| + 2j \leq k$.

To proceed, we calorically extend the polynomial $q_k(x', t)$ in the following sense.

Lemma 4.3 (Caloric extension of polynomials). *For a given polynomial $q(x', t)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ there exists a caloric extension polynomial $\tilde{q}(x, t)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, symmetric in x_n , i.e.,*

$$(\Delta - \partial_t)\tilde{q}(x, t) = 0, \quad \tilde{q}(x', 0, t) = q(x', t), \quad \tilde{q}(x', -x_n, t) = \tilde{q}(x', x_n, t).$$

Moreover, if $q(x', t)$ is parabolically homogeneous of order κ , then one can find $\tilde{q}(x, t)$ as above with the same homogeneity.

Proof. It is easily checked that the polynomial

$$\tilde{q}(x', x_n, t) = \sum_{j=0}^N (\partial_t - \Delta_{x'})^j q(x', t) \frac{x_n^{2j}}{2j!}$$

is the desired extension. Here N is taken so that the parabolic degree of the polynomial $q(x', t)$ does not exceed $2N$. \square

Let now \tilde{q}_k be the extension of the parabolic Taylor polynomial q_k of φ at the origin and consider

$$v_k(x, t) := v(x, t) - \tilde{q}_k(x, t), \quad \varphi_k(x', t) := \varphi(x', t) - q_k(x', t).$$

It is easy to see that v_k solves the Signorini problem with the thin obstacle φ_k , i.e. $v_k \in \mathfrak{S}_{\varphi_k}(Q_1^+)$, now with an additional property

$$|\partial_{x'}^{\alpha'} \partial_t^j \varphi_k(x', t)| \leq M\|(x', t)\|^{\ell - |\alpha'| - 2|j|}, \quad \text{for } |\alpha'| + 2j \leq k.$$

Then if we proceed as above and define

$$\begin{aligned} u_k(x, t) &= [v_k(x, t) - \varphi_k(x', t)]\psi(x) \\ &= [v(x, t) - \varphi(x, t) - (\tilde{q}_k(x, t) - q_k(x', t))]\psi(x) \end{aligned}$$

then u_k will satisfy (4.7)–(4.8) with the right-hand side

$$f_k = -\psi(x)[\Delta' \varphi_k - \partial_t \varphi_k] + [v_k(x, t) - \varphi_k(x', t)]\Delta\psi + 2\nabla v_k \nabla \psi,$$

which additionally satisfies

$$|f_k(x, t)| \leq M\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in S_1^+,$$

for M depending only on ψ , $\|u\|_{W_\infty^{1,0}(Q_1^+)}$, and $\|\varphi\|_{H^{\ell,\ell/2}(Q_1^+)}$. Moreover, for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq k - 2$ one will also have

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j f_k(x, t)| \leq M_{\alpha,j} \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2-|\alpha|-2j} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in Q_{1/2}^+.$$

We record this construction in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell,\ell/2}(Q_1')$, $\ell = k + \gamma \geq 2$, $k \in N$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. If q_k is the parabolic Taylor polynomial of order k of φ at the origin, \tilde{q}_k is its extension given by Lemma 4.3, and ψ is a cutoff function as in (4.4)–(4.5), then*

$$u_k(x, t) = [v(x, t) - \tilde{q}_k(x, t) - (\varphi(x', t) - q_k(x', t))]\psi(x)$$

belongs to the class $\mathfrak{S}^{f_k}(S_1^+)$ with

$$|f_k(x, t)| \leq M \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in S_1^+$$

and more generally, for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq k - 2$,

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j f_k(x, t)| \leq M_{\alpha,j} \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2-|\alpha|-2j} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in Q_{1/2}^+.$$

Furthermore, $u_k(x', 0, t) = v(x', 0, t) - \varphi(x', t)$, $\partial_{x_n} u_k(x', 0, t) = \partial_{x_n} v(x', 0, t)$ in $Q'_{1/2}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(u_k) \cap Q'_{1/2} &= \Gamma(v) \cap Q'_{1/2}, \\ \Gamma_*(u_k) \cap Q'_{1/2} &= \Gamma_*(v) \cap Q'_{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

5. ESTIMATES IN GAUSSIAN SPACES

In this section we state $W_2^{2,1}$ -estimates with respect to the Gaussian measure $G(x, t)dxdt$ in the half-strips S_ρ^+ . The estimates involves the quantities that appear in the generalized frequency formula that we prove in the next section. Since the computations are rather long and technical, to help with the readability of the paper, we have moved the proofs to Appendix A.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $f \in L_\infty(S_1^+)$. Then, for any $0 < \rho < 1$ we have the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_\rho^+} |t| |\nabla u|^2 G &\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_1^+} (u^2 + |t|^2 f^2) G, \\ \int_{S_\rho^+} |t|^2 (|D^2 u|^2 + u_t^2) G &\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_1^+} (u^2 + |t|^2 f^2) G. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.2. Even though the estimates above are most natural for our further purposes, we would like to note that slightly modifying the proof one may show that

$$\int_{S_\rho^+} |\nabla u|^2 G \leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_1^+} (u^2 + f^2) G,$$

i.e., without the weights $|t|$ and $|t|^2$ in the integrals for $|\nabla u|^2$ and f^2 . More generally, the same estimate can be proved if $u(\Delta - \partial_t)u \geq 0$ in S_1 , with the half-strips S_ρ^+ and S_1^+ replaced by the full strips S_ρ and S_1 .

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose $u_i \in \mathfrak{S}^{f_i}(S_1^+)$, $i = 1, 2$, with $f_i \in L_\infty(S_1^+)$. Then for any $0 < \rho < 1$ we have the estimate*

$$\int_{S_\rho^+} |t| |\nabla(u_1 - u_2)|^2 G \leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_1^+} [(u_1 - u_2)^2 + |t|^2 (f_1 - f_2)^2] G.$$

6. THE GENERALIZED FREQUENCY FUNCTION

In this section we will establish a monotonicity formula, which will be a key tool for our study. The origins of this formula go back to Almgren's Big Regularity Paper [Alm00], where he proved that for (multiple-valued) harmonic functions in the unit ball, the frequency function

$$N_u(r) = r \frac{\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2}{\int_{\partial B_r} u^2}$$

is monotonically increasing in $r \in (0, 1)$. Versions of this formula have been used in different contexts, most notably in unique continuation [GL86, GL87] and more recently in the thin obstacle problem [ACS08, GP09]. Almgren's monotonicity formula has been generalized by Poon to solutions of the heat equation in the unit strip S_1 . More precisely, he proved in [Poo96] that if $\Delta u - u_t = 0$ in S_1 , then its caloric frequency, defined as

$$N_u(r) = \frac{r^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u|^2(x, -r^2) G(x, -r^2) dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(x, -r^2)^2 G(x, -r^2) dx},$$

is monotone non-decreasing in $r \in (0, 1)$. This quantity, which to a large extent plays the same role as Almgren's frequency function, differs from the latter in that it requires u to be defined in an entire strip. Thereby, it is not directly applicable to caloric functions which are only locally defined, for instance when u is only defined in the unit cylinder Q_1 . One possible remedy to this obstruction is to consider an extension of a caloric function in Q_1 to the entire strip S_1 by multiplying it with a spatial cutoff function ψ , supported in B_1 :

$$v(x, t) = u(x, t) \psi(x).$$

Such extension, however, will no longer be caloric in S_1 , and consequently the parabolic frequency function N_v is no longer going to be monotone. However, there is a reasonable hope that N_v is going to exhibit properties close to monotonicity. In fact, to be able to control the error terms in the computations, we will need to consider a "truncated" version of N . Moreover, we will be able to extend this result to functions $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$, and to functions $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$, via the constructions in Proposition 4.4.

To proceed, we define the following quantities:

$$h_u(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u(x, t)^2 G(x, t) dx,$$

$$i_u(t) = -t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |\nabla u(x, t)|^2 G(x, t) dx,$$

for any function u in the parabolic half-strip S_1^+ for which the integrals involved are finite. Note that, if u is an even function in x_n , then Poon's parabolic frequency function is given by

$$N_u(r) = \frac{i_u(-r^2)}{h_u(-r^2)}.$$

There are many substantial technical difficulties involved in working with this function directly. To overcome such difficulties, we consider the following averaged versions of h_u and i_u :

$$\begin{aligned} H_u(r) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{-r^2}^0 h_u(t) dt = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} u(x, t)^2 G(x, t) dx dt, \\ I_u(r) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{-r^2}^0 i_u(t) dt = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} |t| |\nabla u(x, t)|^2 G(x, t) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

One further obstruction is represented by the fact that the above integrals may become unbounded near the endpoint $t = 0$, where G becomes singular. To remedy this problem we introduce the following truncated versions of H_u and I_u . For a constant $0 < \delta < 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} H_u^\delta(r) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{-r^2}^{-\delta^2 r^2} h_u(t) dt = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} u(x, t)^2 G(x, t) dx dt, \\ I_u^\delta(r) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{-r^2}^{-\delta^2 r^2} i_u(t) dt = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} |t| |\nabla u(x, t)|^2 G(x, t) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma plays a crucial role in what follows.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that $v \in C_0^{4,2}(S_1^+ \cup S_1')$ satisfies*

$$\Delta v - \partial_t v = g(x, t) \quad \text{in } S_1^+.$$

Then, for any $0 < \delta < 1$ we have the following differentiation formulas

$$\begin{aligned} (H_v^\delta)'(r) &= \frac{4}{r} I_v^\delta(r) - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t v g G - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t v v_{x_n} G \\ (I_v^\delta)'(r) &= \frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} (Zv)^2 G + \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t (Zv) g G + \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t v_{x_n} (Zv) G, \end{aligned}$$

where the vector field Z is as in (2.2).

Proof. The main step in the proof consists in establishing the following differentiation formulas for $-1 < t < 0$:

$$(6.1) \quad h'_v(t) = \frac{2}{t} i_v(t) - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v g G - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v v_{x_n} G,$$

and

$$(6.2) \quad i'_v(t) = \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (Zv)^2 G + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (Zv)gG + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v_{x_n}(Zv)G.$$

Once this is done, then noting that

$$H_u^\delta(r) = \int_{-1}^{-\delta^2} h_u(r^2 s) ds, \quad I_u^\delta(r) = \int_{-1}^{-\delta^2} i_u(r^2 s) ds,$$

we find

$$(H_u^\delta)'(r) = 2r \int_{-1}^{-\delta^2} s h'_u(r^2 s) ds, \quad (I_u^\delta)'(r) = 2r \int_{-1}^{-\delta^2} s i'_u(r^2 s) ds.$$

Using (6.1) we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (H_v^\delta)'(r) &= \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{-r^2}^{-\delta^2 r^2} t h'_v(t) dt \\ &= \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{-r^2}^{-\delta^2 r^2} \left(2i_v(t) - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} t v g G(\cdot, t) dx - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v v_{x_n} G(\cdot, t) dx \right) dt \\ &= \frac{4}{r} I_v^\delta(r) - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t v g G - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r' \setminus S_{\delta r}'} t v v_{x_n} G. \end{aligned}$$

The formula for $(I_v^\delta)'(r)$ is computed similarly. We are thus left with proving (6.1) and (6.2).

(1°) We start with claiming that

$$i_v(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v Z v G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v g G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v v_{x_n} G.$$

Indeed, noting that $\Delta(v^2/2) = v\Delta v + |\nabla v|^2$ in S_1^+ , and keeping in mind that the outer unit normal to \mathbb{R}_+^n on \mathbb{R}^{n-1} is given by $\nu = -e_n = (0, \dots, 0, -1)$, we integrate by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} i_v(t) &= -t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (\Delta(v^2/2) - v\Delta v) G \\ &= t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v \nabla v \nabla G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v v_{x_n} G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v v_t G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v g G \\ &= t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \left(\nabla v \frac{\nabla G}{G} + v_t \right) v G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v g G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v v_{x_n} G \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v (Zv) G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v g G + t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v v_{x_n} G, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first integral of the last equality we have used (2.4). This proves the claim.

(2°) We now prove the formula (6.1) for h'_v . Note that for $\lambda > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_v(\lambda^2 t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v(x, \lambda^2 t)^2 G(x, \lambda^2 t) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v(\lambda y, \lambda^2 t)^2 G(\lambda y, \lambda^2 t) \lambda^n dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v(\lambda y, \lambda^2 t)^2 G(y, t) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the identity $G(\lambda y, \lambda^2 t) \lambda^n = G(y, t)$. Differentiating with respect to λ at $\lambda = 1$, and using (2.3), we therefore obtain

$$2th'_v(t) = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v Z v G,$$

or equivalently

$$h'_v(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v Z v G.$$

Using now the formula for i_v in (1°), and the fact that $\Delta v - v_t = g$, we obtain

$$h'_v(t) = \frac{2}{t} i_v(t) - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} v g G - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v v_{x_n} G.$$

(3°) To obtain the differentiation formula (6.2) for i_v , note that using the scaling properties of G , similarly to what was done for h_v , we have

$$i_v(\lambda^2 t) = -\lambda^2 t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |\nabla v(\lambda y, \lambda^2 t)|^2 G(y, t) dy.$$

Differentiating with respect to λ at $\lambda = 1$, we obtain

$$2t i'_v(t) = -t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} Z(|\nabla v|^2) G - 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |\nabla v|^2 G = -t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (Z(|\nabla v|^2) + 2|\nabla v|^2) G.$$

We now use the following easily verifiable identity

$$Z(|\nabla v|^2) + 2|\nabla v|^2 = 2\nabla v \cdot \nabla(Zv),$$

which, after substitution in the latter equation and integration by parts, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
2t i'_v(t) &= -2t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \nabla v \cdot \nabla(Zv)G \\
&= 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \Delta v(Zv)G + 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (Zv) \nabla v \nabla G + 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v_{x_n}(Zv)G \\
&= 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} g(Zv)G + 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} Zv \left(\nabla v \frac{\nabla G}{G} + v_t \right) G + 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v_{x_n}(Zv)G \\
&= 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} g(Zv)G + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (Zv)^2 G + 2t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v_{x_n}(Zv)G.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$i'_v(t) = \frac{1}{2t} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (Zv)^2 G + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} g(Zv)G + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} v_{x_n}(Zv)G,$$

which establishes (6.2). \square

With Lemma 6.1 in hands, we turn to establishing the essential ingredient in the proof of our main monotonicity result.

Proposition 6.2 (Differentiation formulas for H_u and I_u). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$. Then, H_u and I_u are absolutely continuous functions on $(0, 1)$ and for a.e. $r \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
H'_u(r) &= \frac{4}{r} I_u(r) - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} t u f G, \\
I'_u(r) &\geq \frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} (Zu)^2 G + \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} t (Zu) f G.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We note that, thanks to the estimates in Lemma 5.1 above, all integrals in the above formulas are finite. The idea of the proof of the proposition is to approximate u with smooth solutions u^ε to the Signorini problem, apply Lemma 6.1, and then pass to the limit in ε . The limit process is in fact more involved than one may expect. One complication is that although we have the estimates in Lemma 5.1 for the solution u , we do not have similar estimates, uniform in ε , for the approximating u^ε . This is in fact the main reason for which we have to consider truncated quantities $H_{u^\varepsilon}^\delta$ and $I_{u^\varepsilon}^\delta$, let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ first, and then $\delta \rightarrow 0$. However, the main difficulty is to show that the integrals over S'_r vanish. This is relatively easy to do for H_u , since $uu_{x_n} = 0$ on S'_1 . On the other hand, proving the formula for I'_u is considerably more difficult, since one has to justify that $u_{x_n} Zu = 0$ on S'_1 . Furthermore, the vanishing of this term should be interpreted in a proper sense, since we generally only know that $Zu \in L_2(S_1^+)$, and thus its trace may not even be well defined on S'_1 .

With this being said, in the sequel we justify only the formula for I'_u , the one for H'_u being analogous, but much simpler.

(1°) Assume that u is supported in $B_{R-2}^+ \times (-1, 0]$, $R \geq 3$. Multiplying u with a cutoff function $\eta(t)$ such that $\eta = 1$ on $[-\tilde{r}^2, 0]$ and $\eta = 0$ on $(-1, -\tilde{r}^2]$ for $0 < r < \tilde{r} < \tilde{\tilde{r}} < 1$, without loss of generality we may assume that $u(\cdot, -1) = 0$. We then approximate u in $B_R^+ \times (-1, 0]$ with the solutions of the penalized problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u^\varepsilon - \partial_t u^\varepsilon &= f^\varepsilon && \text{in } B_R^+ \times (-1, 0], \\ \partial_{x_n} u^\varepsilon &= \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) && \text{on } B'_R \times (-1, 0], \\ u^\varepsilon &= 0 && \text{on } (\partial B_R)^+ \times (-1, 0], \\ u^\varepsilon(\cdot, -1) &= 0 && \text{on } B_R^+, \end{aligned}$$

where f^ε is a mollification of f . For any $\rho \in (0, 1)$, let

$$Q_{R-1, \rho}^+ = B_{R-1}^+ \times (-\rho^2, 0], \quad Q'_{R-1, \rho} = B'_{R-1} \times (-\rho^2, 0].$$

From the estimates in Section 3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^{2,1}(Q_{R-1, \rho}^+)}, \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(Q_{R-1, \rho}^+)}, \|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(Q_{R-1, \rho}^+)} &\leq C(\rho, u), \\ \max_{Q'_{R-1, \rho}} |\beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)| &\leq C(\rho, u), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

(2°) Now, in order to extend u^ε to S_1^+ , pick a cutoff function $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$0 \leq \zeta \leq 1, \quad \zeta = 1 \quad \text{on } B_{R-2}, \quad \text{supp } \zeta \subset B_{R-1}, \quad \zeta(x', -x_n) = \zeta(x', x_n),$$

and define

$$v^\varepsilon(x, t) = u^\varepsilon(x, t)\zeta(x).$$

Note that since u is supported in $B_{R-2}^+ \times (-1, 0]$, v^ε will converge to u and we will have the uniform estimates

$$\|v^\varepsilon\|_{W_2^{2,1}(S_\rho^+)}, \|v^\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(S_\rho^+)}, \|\nabla v^\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(S_\rho^+)} \leq C(\rho, u) < \infty.$$

For v^ε we have that

$$\Delta v^\varepsilon - \partial_t v^\varepsilon = f^\varepsilon \zeta + u^\varepsilon \Delta \zeta + 2\nabla u^\varepsilon \nabla \zeta =: g^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } S_1^+.$$

It is easy to see that g^ε converges strongly to f in $L_2(S_\rho^+ \setminus S_{\delta\rho}^+, G)$ for $0 < \delta < 1$. Besides, we also have

$$v_{x_n}^\varepsilon = u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta, \quad Zv^\varepsilon = \zeta(Zu^\varepsilon) + (Z\zeta)u^\varepsilon \quad \text{on } S_1',$$

and therefore

$$v_{x_n}^\varepsilon Zv^\varepsilon = \zeta(Z\zeta)u^\varepsilon \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) + \zeta^2 u_{x_n}^\varepsilon (Zu^\varepsilon) \quad \text{on } S_1'.$$

(3°) We now fix a small $\delta > 0$, apply the differentiation formulas in Lemma 6.1 to v^ε and pass to the limit. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (I_{v^\varepsilon}^\delta)'(r) &= \frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} (Zv^\varepsilon)^2 G + \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t(Zv^\varepsilon)g^\varepsilon G + \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r' \setminus S_{\delta r}'} tv_{x_n}^\varepsilon (Zv^\varepsilon)G \\ &= J_1 + J_2 + J_3. \end{aligned}$$

(3.i°) To pass to the limit in J_1 , we note that Zv^ε converges to Zu weakly in

$L_2(S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+, G)$. Indeed, this follows from the uniform $W_2^{2,1}$ estimates on v^ε in (2°) and the boundedness of G in $S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+$. Thus, in the limit we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} (Zu)^2 G \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} (Zv^\varepsilon)^2 G.$$

Note that here we cannot claim equality, as we do not have a strong convergence of Zv^ε to Zu .

(3.ii $^\circ$) In J_2 , the weak convergence of Zv^ε to Zu , combined with the strong convergence of g^ε to f in $L_2(S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+, G)$ is enough to conclude that

$$\frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t(Zu)fG = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t(Zv^\varepsilon)g^\varepsilon G.$$

Moreover, the convergence will be uniform in $r \in [r_1, r_2] \subset (0, 1)$.

(3.iii $^\circ$) Finally, we claim that $J_3 \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r' \setminus S_{\delta r}'} tv_{x_n}^\varepsilon (Zv^\varepsilon)G = 0.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_r' \setminus S_{\delta r}'} tv_{x_n}^\varepsilon (Zv^\varepsilon)G &= \int_{S_r' \setminus S_{\delta r}'} t\zeta(Z\zeta)u^\varepsilon \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)G + \int_{S_r' \setminus S_{\delta r}'} t\zeta^2 \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)(Zu^\varepsilon)G \\ &=: E_1 + E_2. \end{aligned}$$

We then estimate the integrals E_1 and E_2 separately.

(3.iii.a $^\circ$) We start with E_1 . Recall that $|\beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)| \leq C(\rho)$ in $Q'_{R-1,\rho}$. By (3.5), this implies that $u^\varepsilon \geq -C(\rho)\varepsilon$ in $Q'_{R-1,\rho}$ and therefore

$$|E_1| \leq C(\rho)r^3\varepsilon, \quad 0 < r \leq \rho < 1.$$

(3.iii.b $^\circ$) A similar estimate holds also for E_2 , but the proof is a little more involved. To this end consider

$$\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(t) = \int_0^t \beta_\varepsilon(s)ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

From (3.5), it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t > 0, \quad \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(t) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } t, \quad \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(t) = C_\varepsilon + \varepsilon t + \frac{t^2}{2\varepsilon} \quad \text{for } t \leq -2\varepsilon^2,$$

with $C_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(-2\varepsilon^2) \leq 2\varepsilon^3$. Note that the uniform bound $u^\varepsilon \geq -C(\rho)\varepsilon$ in $Q'_{R-1,\rho}$ implies that

$$\max_{Q'_{R-1,\rho}} |\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(v^\varepsilon)| \leq C(\rho)\varepsilon.$$

To use this fact, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2 &= \int_{S'_r \setminus S'_{\delta r}} t\zeta^2 \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)(Zu^\varepsilon)G = \int_{S'_r \setminus S'_{\delta r}} t\zeta^2 [Z\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)]G \\
&= \int_{S'_r \setminus S'_{\delta r}} Z[t\zeta^2 \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)]G - \int_{S'_r \setminus S'_{\delta r}} Z(t\zeta^2)\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)G \\
&=: E_{22} - E_{21}.
\end{aligned}$$

(3.iii.b. α°) The estimate for E_{21} is straightforward:

$$|E_{21}| \leq C(\rho)r^3\varepsilon, \quad 0 < r \leq \rho.$$

(3.iii.b. β°) To estimate E_{22} , denote $U^\varepsilon = t\zeta^2 \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)$. Then, substituting $t = -\lambda^2$, $x' = \lambda y'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{22} &= \int_{S'_r} ZU^\varepsilon G dx' dt = \int_{\delta r}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} (ZU^\varepsilon)(\lambda y', -\lambda^2)G(\lambda y', -\lambda^2)2\lambda^n dy' d\lambda \\
&= 2 \int_{\delta r}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \lambda \frac{d}{d\lambda} U^\varepsilon(\lambda y', -\lambda^2)G(y', -1)dy' d\lambda \\
&= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} [rU^\varepsilon(ry', -r^2) - \delta rU^\varepsilon(\delta ry', -\delta^2 r^2)]G(y', -1)dy' \\
&\quad - 2 \int_{\delta r}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} U^\varepsilon(\lambda y', -\lambda^2)G(y', -1)dy' d\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$|E_{22}| \leq C(\rho)r^3\varepsilon, \quad 0 < r \leq \rho.$$

Combining the estimates in (3.iii.a $^\circ$)–(3.iii.b $^\circ$) above, we obtain

$$|J_3| = \left| \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S'_r \setminus S'_{\delta r}} t v_{x_n}^\varepsilon (Zv^\varepsilon)G \right| \leq C(\rho)\varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 < r \leq \rho.$$

(4 $^\circ$) Now, writing for any $0 < r_1 < r_2 < 1$

$$I_{v^\varepsilon}^\delta(r_2) - I_{v^\varepsilon}^\delta(r_1) = \int_{r_1}^{r_2} (I_{v^\varepsilon}^\delta)'(r)dr,$$

collecting the facts proved in (3.i $^\circ$)–(3.iii $^\circ$), and passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$I_u^\delta(r_2) - I_u^\delta(r_1) \geq \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} (Zu)^2 G + \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_{\delta r}^+} t(Zu)fG \right) dr.$$

Next, note that by Lemma 5.1 the integrands are uniformly bounded with respect to δ (for fixed r_1 and r_2). Therefore, we can let $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the latter inequality, to obtain

$$I_u(r_2) - I_u(r_1) \geq \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} (Zu)^2 G + \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} t(Zu) f G \right) dr.$$

This is equivalent to the sought for conclusion for I'_u . \square

To state the main result of this section, the generalized frequency formula, we need the following notion. We say that a positive function $\mu(r)$ is a log-convex function of $\log r$ on \mathbb{R}^+ if $\log \mu(e^t)$ is a convex function of t . This simply means that

$$\mu(e^{(1-\lambda)s+\lambda t}) \leq \mu(e^s)^{1-\lambda} \mu(e^t)^\lambda, \quad 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1.$$

This is equivalent to saying that μ is locally absolutely continuous on \mathbb{R}_+ and $r\mu'(r)/\mu(r)$ is nondecreasing. For instance, $\mu(r) = r^\kappa$ is a log-convex function of $\log r$ for any κ . The importance of this notion in our context is that Almgren's and Poon's frequency formulas can be regarded as log-convexity statements in $\log r$ for the appropriately defined quantities $H_u(r)$.

Theorem 6.3 (Generalized frequency formula). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with f satisfying the following condition: there is a positive monotone nondecreasing log-convex function $\mu(r)$ of $\log r$, and constants $\sigma > 0$ and $C_\mu > 0$, such that*

$$\mu(r) \geq C_\mu r^{4-2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) dx.$$

Then, there exists $C > 0$, depending only on σ , C_μ and n , such that the function

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{d}{dr} \log \max\{H_u(r), \mu(r)\} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1)$$

is nondecreasing for $r \in (0, 1)$.

Note that on the open set where $H_u(r) > \mu(r)$ we have $\Phi_u(r) \sim \frac{1}{2} r H'_u(r)/H_u(r)$ which coincides with $2N_u$, when $f = 0$. The purpose of the “truncation” of $H_u(r)$ with $\mu(r)$ is to control the error terms in computations that appear from the right-hand-side f .

Proof of Theorem 6.3. First, we want to make a remark on the definition of $r \mapsto \Phi_u(r)$, for $r \in (0, 1)$. The functions $H_u(r)$ and $\mu(r)$ are absolutely continuous and therefore so is $\max\{H_u(r), \mu(r)\}$. It follows that Φ_u is uniquely identified only up to a set of measure zero. The monotonicity of Φ_u should be understood in the sense that there exists a monotone increasing function which equals Φ_u almost everywhere. Therefore, without loss of generality we may assume that

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{\mu'(r)}{\mu(r)} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1)$$

on $\mathcal{F} = \{H_u(r) \leq \mu(r)\}$ and

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1)$$

in $\mathcal{O} = \{H_u(r) > \mu(r)\}$. Following an idea introduced in [GL86, GL87] we now note that it will be enough to check that $\Phi'_u(r) > 0$ in \mathcal{O} . Indeed, from the assumption

on μ , it is clear that Φ_u is monotone on \mathcal{F} . Next, if (r_0, r_1) is a maximal open interval in \mathcal{O} , then $H_u(r_0) = \mu(r_0)$ and $H_u(r_1) = \mu(r_1)$ unless $r_1 = 1$. Besides, if Φ_u is monotone in (r_0, r_1) , it is easy to see that the limits $H'_u(r_0+)$ and $H'_u(r_1-)$ will exist and satisfy

$$\mu'(r_0+) \leq H'_u(r_0+), \quad H'_u(r_1-) \leq \mu'(r_1-) \quad (\text{unless } r_1 = 1)$$

and therefore we will have

$$\Phi_u(r_0) \leq \Phi_u(r_0+) \leq \Phi_u(r_1-) \leq \Phi_u(r_1),$$

with the latter inequality holding when $r_1 < 1$. This will imply the monotonicity of Φ_u in $(0, 1)$.

Therefore, we will concentrate only on the set $\mathcal{O} = \{H_u(r) > \mu(r)\}$, where the monotonicity of $\Phi_u(r)$ is equivalent to that of

$$\left(r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} + 4\right) e^{Cr^\sigma} = 2\Phi_u(r) + 4.$$

The latter will follow, once we show that

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left(r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right) \geq -C \left(r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} + 4 \right) r^{-1+\sigma}$$

in \mathcal{O} . Now, from Proposition 6.2 we have

$$r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} = 4 \frac{I_u(r)}{H_u(r)} - \frac{4}{r^2} \frac{\int_{S_r^+} t u f G}{H_u(r)} := 4E_1(r) + 4E_2(r).$$

We then estimate the derivatives of each of the quantities $E_i(r)$, $i = 1, 2$.

(1°) Using the differentiation formulas in Proposition 6.2, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} r^5 H_u^2(r) E'_1(r) &= r^5 H_u^2(r) \frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{I_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right) \\ &= r^5 (I'_u(r) H_u(r) - I_u(r) H'_u(r)) \\ &\geq r^2 H_u(r) \left(\int_{S_r^+} (Zu)^2 G + 2 \int_{S_r^+} t (Zu) f G \right) \\ &\quad - r^2 I_u(r) r^3 H'_u(r) \\ &= r^2 H_u(r) \left(\int_{S_r^+} (Zu + tf)^2 G - \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\int_{S_r^+} t u f G + \frac{r^3}{4} H'_u(r) \right) r^3 H'_u(r) \\ &= \int_{S_r^+} u^2 G \left(\int_{S_r^+} (Zu + tf)^2 G - \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{r^3}{2} H'_u(r) + \int_{S_r^+} t u f G \right)^2 + \left(\int_{S_r^+} t u f G \right)^2 \\ &= \left[\int_{S_r^+} u^2 G \int_{S_r^+} (Zu + tf)^2 G - \left(\int_{S_r^+} u (Zu + tf) G \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$- \int_{S_r^+} u^2 G \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G + \left(\int_{S_r^+} t u f G \right)^2.$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain that the term in square brackets above is nonnegative. Therefore,

$$r^5 H_u^2(r) E_1'(r) \geq - \int_{S_r^+} u^2 G \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G$$

or equivalently,

$$E_1'(r) \geq - \frac{1}{r^3 H_u(r)} \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G.$$

(2°) We next estimate the derivative of $E_2(r)$.

$$\begin{aligned} E_2'(r) &= \frac{d}{dr} \left(- \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\int_{S_r^+} t u f G}{H_u(r)} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{r^3} \frac{\int_{S_r^+} t u f G}{H_u(r)} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (-r^2) u(\cdot, -r^2) f(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2)}{H_u(r)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{H_u'(r) \int_{S_r^+} t u f G}{H_u(r)^2} \\ &\geq - \frac{2}{r^3 H_u(r)} \left(\int_{S_r^+} u^2 G \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{r H_u(r)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} \left(r^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - r \frac{H_u'(r)}{H_u(r)} \frac{1}{r^3 H_u(r)} \left(\int_{S_r^+} u^2 G \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2} \\ &= - \frac{2}{r^2 H_u(r)^{1/2}} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{r H_u(r)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} \left(r^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - r \frac{H_u'(r)}{H_u(r)} \frac{1}{r^2 H_u(r)^{1/2}} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

(3°) Combining together the estimates for $E'_1(r)$ and $E'_2(r)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \left(r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right) &\geq -\frac{4}{r^3 H_u(r)} \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G - \frac{8}{r^2 H_u(r)^{1/2}} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - \frac{8}{r H_u(r)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} \left(r^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \frac{4}{r^2 H_u(r)^{1/2}} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the third term separately. First, from

$$\frac{d}{dr} \int_{S_r^+} u^2 G = 2r \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) dx$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) &= \frac{1}{2r} \frac{d}{dr} (r^2 H_u(r)) \\ &= H_u(r) + \frac{r}{2} H'_u(r). \end{aligned}$$

From here we see that

$$1 + \frac{r}{2} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \geq 0$$

and therefore we also have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} &= 2 H_u(r)^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{r}{2} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq H_u(r)^{1/2} \left(2 + \frac{r}{2} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting into the inequality above, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \left(r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right) &\geq -\frac{4}{r^3 H_u(r)} \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G - \frac{8}{r^2 H_u(r)^{1/2}} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - \left(2 + \frac{r}{2} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right) \frac{4}{r H_u(r)^{1/2}} \left(r^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \frac{4}{r^2 H_u(r)^{1/2}} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the set $\{H_u(r) > \mu(r)\}$, we easily have

$$\begin{aligned} H_u(r) &\geq C_\mu r^{4-2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2), \\ H_u(r) &\geq C_\mu r^{-2-2\sigma} \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G, \end{aligned}$$

and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \left(r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right) &\geq -Cr^{-1+2\sigma} - Cr^{-1+\sigma} - \left(2 + \frac{r}{2} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \right) Cr^{-1+\sigma} - Cr \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} r^{-1+\sigma} \\ &\geq -C \left(r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} + 4 \right) r^{-1+\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the last step we have again used the fact that $1 + \frac{r}{2} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \geq 0$. The desired conclusion follows readily. \square

7. EXISTENCE AND HOMOGENEITY OF BLOWUPS

In this section, we show how the generalized frequency formula in Theorem 6.3 can be used to study the behavior of the solution u near the origin. The central idea is to consider some appropriately normalized rescalings of u , indicated with u_r (see Definition 7.2), and then pass to the limit as $r \rightarrow 0+$ (see Theorem 7.3). The resulting limiting functions (over sequences $r = r_j \rightarrow 0+$) are known as *blowups*. However, because of the truncation term $\mu(r)$ in the generalized frequency function $\Phi_u(r)$, we can show the existence of blowups only when the growth rate of u can be “detected,” in a certain proper sense to be made precise below. Finally, as a consequence of the monotonicity of $\Phi_u(r)$, we obtain that the blowups must be parabolically homogeneous solutions of the Signorini problem in $S_\infty = \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, 0]$.

Henceforth, we assume that $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$, and that $\mu(r)$ be such that the conditions of Theorem 6.3 are satisfied. In particular, we assume that

$$r^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) dx \leq \frac{r^{2\sigma} \mu(r)}{C_\mu}.$$

Consequently, Theorem 6.3 implies that the function

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{d}{dr} \log \max\{H_u(r), \mu(r)\} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1)$$

is nondecreasing for $r \in (0, 1)$. Hence, there exists the limit

$$(7.1) \quad \kappa := \Phi_u(0+) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \Phi_u(r).$$

Since we assume that $r\mu'(r)/\mu(r)$ is nondecreasing, the limit

$$(7.2) \quad \kappa_\mu := \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{r\mu'(r)}{\mu(r)}$$

also exists. We then have the following basic proposition concerning the values of κ and κ_μ .

Lemma 7.1. *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ and μ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 6.3. With κ , κ_μ as above, we have*

$$\kappa \leq \kappa_\mu.$$

Moreover, if $\kappa < \kappa_\mu$, then there exists $r_u > 0$ such that $H_u(r) \geq \mu(r)$ for $0 < r \leq r_u$. In particular,

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{rH'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} = 2 \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{I_u(r)}{H_u(r)}.$$

Proof. As a first step we show that

$$(7.3) \quad \kappa \neq \kappa_\mu \Rightarrow \text{there exists } r_u > 0 \text{ such that } H_u(r) \geq \mu(r) \text{ for } 0 < r \leq r_u.$$

Indeed, if the implication claimed in (7.3) fails, then for a sequence $r_j \rightarrow 0+$ we have $H_u(r_j) < \mu(r_j)$. This implies that

$$\Phi_u(r_j) = \frac{1}{2} r_j e^{Cr_j^\sigma} \frac{\mu'(r_j)}{\mu(r_j)} + 2(e^{Cr_j^\sigma} - 1),$$

and therefore

$$\kappa = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_u(r_j) = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} r_j \frac{\mu'(r_j)}{\mu(r_j)} = \kappa_\mu,$$

which contradicts $\kappa \neq \kappa_\mu$. We have thus proved (7.3).

Now, (7.3) implies that, if $\kappa \neq \kappa_\mu$, then

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1), \quad 0 < r < r_u.$$

Passing to the limit, we conclude that, if $\kappa \neq \kappa_\mu$, then

$$(7.4) \quad \kappa = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{r H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)}.$$

However, in this case we also have

$$(7.5) \quad \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{r H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} = 2 \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{I_u(r)}{H_u(r)}.$$

Indeed, recall that (see Proposition 6.2)

$$r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} = 4 \frac{I_u(r)}{H_u(r)} - \frac{4}{r^2} \frac{\int_{S_r^+} t u f G}{H_u(r)},$$

and (7.5) will follow once we show that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\int_{S_r^+} t u f G}{H_u(r)} = 0.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_{S_r^+} t u f G}{r^2 H_u(r)} &\leq \frac{(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G)^{1/2} (\int_{S_r^+} u^2 G)^{1/2}}{r^2 H_u(r)} = \frac{(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G)^{1/2}}{r H_u(r)^{1/2}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\mu(r)}{C_\mu H_u(r)} \right)^{1/2} r^\sigma \leq C_\mu^{-1} r^\sigma \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality before the limit we have used (7.3). Summarizing, the assumption $\kappa \neq \kappa_\mu$ implies (7.4)–(7.5) above. Therefore, the proof will be completed if we show that the case $\kappa > \kappa_\mu$ is impossible.

So, assume towards a contradiction that $\kappa > \kappa_\mu$, and fix $0 < \varepsilon < \kappa - \kappa_\mu$. For such ε choose $r_\varepsilon > 0$ so that

$$\frac{r H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} > 2\kappa - \varepsilon, \quad \frac{r \mu'(r)}{\mu(r)} < 2\kappa_\mu + \varepsilon, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon.$$

Integrating these inequalities from r to r_ε , we obtain

$$H_u(r) \leq \frac{H_u(r_\varepsilon)}{r_\varepsilon^{2\kappa - \varepsilon}} r^{2\kappa - \varepsilon}, \quad \mu(r) \geq \frac{\mu(r_\varepsilon)}{r_\varepsilon^{2\kappa_\mu + \varepsilon}} r^{2\kappa_\mu + \varepsilon}.$$

Since by our choice of $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $2\kappa - \varepsilon > 2\kappa_\mu + \varepsilon$, the above inequalities imply that $H_u(r) < \mu(r)$ for small enough r , contrary to the established conclusion of (7.3) above. Hence, the case $\kappa > \kappa_\mu$ is impossible, which implies that we always have $\kappa \leq \kappa_\mu$. \square

To proceed, we define the appropriate notion of rescalings that works well with the generalized frequency formula.

Definition 7.2 (Rescalings). For $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ and $r > 0$ define the *rescalings*

$$u_r(x, t) := \frac{u(rx, r^2t)}{H_u(r)^{1/2}}, \quad (x, t) \in S_{1/r}^+ = \mathbb{R}_+^n \times (-1/r^2, 0].$$

It is easy to see that the function u_r solves the nonhomogeneous Signorini problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_r - \partial_t u_r &= f_r(x, t) \quad \text{in } S_{1/r}^+, \\ u_r &\geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} u_r \geq 0, \quad u_r \partial_{x_n} u_r = 0 \quad \text{on } S'_{1/r}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$f_r(x, t) = \frac{r^2 f(rx, r^2t)}{H_u(r)^{1/2}}.$$

In other words, $u_r \in \mathfrak{S}^{f_r}(S_{1/r}^+)$. Further, note that u_r is normalized by the condition

$$H_{u_r}(1) = 1,$$

and that, more generally, we have

$$H_{u_r}(\rho) = \frac{H_u(\rho r)}{H_u(r)}.$$

We next show that, unless we are in the borderline case $\kappa = \kappa_\mu$, we will be able to study the so-called blowups of u at the origin. The condition $\kappa < \kappa_\mu$ below can be understood, in a sense, that we can “detect” the growth of u near the origin.

Theorem 7.3 (Existence and homogeneity of blowups). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$, μ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 6.3, and*

$$\kappa := \Phi_u(0+) < \kappa_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} r \frac{\mu'(r)}{\mu(r)}.$$

Then, we have:

i) *For any $R > 0$, there is $r_{R,u} > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{S_R^+} (u_r^2 + |t| |\nabla u_r|^2 + |t|^2 |D^2 u_r|^2 + |t|^2 (\partial_t u_r)^2) G \leq C(R), \quad 0 < r < r_{R,u}.$$

ii) *There is a sequence $r_j \rightarrow 0+$, and a function u_0 in $S_\infty^+ = \mathbb{R}_+^n \times (-\infty, 0]$, such that*

$$\int_{S_R^+} (|u_{r_j} - u_0|^2 + |t| |\nabla(u_{r_j} - u_0)|^2) G \rightarrow 0.$$

We call any such u_0 a blowup of u at the origin.

iii) u_0 is a nonzero global solution of Signorini problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_0 - \partial_t u_0 &= 0 \quad \text{in } S_\infty^+ \\ u_0 &\geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} u_0 \geq 0, \quad u_0 \partial_{x_n} u_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } S'_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

in the sense that it solves the Signorini problem in every Q_R^+ .

iv) u_0 is parabolically homogeneous of degree κ :

$$u_0(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t) = \lambda^\kappa u_0(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in S_\infty^+, \quad \lambda > 0$$

The proof of Theorem 7.3 is based on the following lemmas.

Lemma 7.4. *If $\kappa < \kappa' < \kappa_\mu$ and $r_u > 0$ is such that $\Phi_u(r) < \kappa'$ and $H_u(r) \geq \mu(r)$ for $0 < r < r_u$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} H_{u_r}(\rho) &\geq \rho^{2\kappa'} \quad \text{for any } 0 < \rho \leq 1, \quad 0 < r < r_u, \\ H_{u_r}(R) &\leq R^{2\kappa'} \quad \text{for any } R \geq 1, \quad 0 < r < r_u/R. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From the assumptions we have

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1) \leq \kappa',$$

for $0 < r < r_u$, which implies that

$$\frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \leq \frac{2\kappa'}{r}.$$

Integrating from ρr to r and exponentiating, we find

$$\frac{H_u(r)}{H_u(\rho r)} \leq \rho^{-2\kappa'},$$

which implies that

$$H_{u_r}(\rho) = \frac{H_u(\rho r)}{H_u(r)} \geq \rho^{2\kappa'}.$$

Similarly, integrating from r to Rr (under the assumption that $Rr \leq r_u$) we find

$$H_{u_r}(R) = \frac{H_u(Rr)}{H_u(r)} \leq R^{2\kappa'}.$$

□

Lemma 7.5. *Under the notations of the previous lemma, for any $R \geq 1$ and $0 < r < r_u/R$, we have*

$$\int_{S_R^+} t^2 f_r^2 G \leq c_\mu R^{2+2\sigma+2\kappa'} r^{2\sigma}.$$

Proof. Note that from the assumptions we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(r) &\geq C_\mu r^{4-2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}_n^+} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2), \\ \mu(r) &\geq C_\mu r^{-2-2\sigma} \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G. \end{aligned}$$

Now take $R \geq 1$. Then, making the change of variables and using the inequalities above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_R^+} t^2 f_r^2 G &= \frac{r^4}{H_u(r)} \int_{S_R^+} t^2 f(rx, r^2 t)^2 G(x, t) dx dt \\ &= \frac{1}{r^2 H_u(r)} \int_{S_{Rr}^+} t^2 f^2 G \leq R^{2+2\sigma} r^{2\sigma} \frac{\mu(Rr)}{C_\mu H_u(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $0 < r < r_u/R$, then $H_u(Rr) \geq \mu(Rr)$ and therefore

$$\int_{S_R^+} t^2 f_r^2 G \leq c_\mu R^{2+2\sigma} r^{2\sigma} \frac{H_u(Rr)}{H_u(r)} \leq c_\mu R^{2+2\sigma+2\kappa'} r^{2\sigma}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We will also need the following well-known inequality (see [Gro75]) and one of its corollaries.

Lemma 7.6 (log-Sobolev inequality). *For any $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n, G(\cdot, s))$ one has*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2 \log(f^2) G(\cdot, s) \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2 G(\cdot, s) \right) \log \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2 G(\cdot, s) \right) + 4|s| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 G(\cdot, s). \quad \square$$

Lemma 7.7. *For any $f \in W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n, G(\cdot, s))$, let $\omega = \{|f| > 0\}$. Then,*

$$\log \frac{1}{|\omega|_s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2 G(\cdot, s) \leq 2|s| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 G(\cdot, s),$$

where

$$|\omega|_s = \int_{\omega} G(\cdot, s).$$

Proof. Let $\psi(y) = y \log y$ for $y > 0$ and $\psi(0) = 0$. Then, the log-Sobolev inequality can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(f^2) G(\cdot, s) \leq \psi \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2 G(\cdot, s) \right) + 2|s| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 G(\cdot, s).$$

On the other hand, since ψ is convex on $[0, \infty)$, by Jensen's inequality we have

$$\frac{1}{|\omega|_s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(f^2) G(\cdot, s) \geq \psi \left(\frac{1}{|\omega|_s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2 G(\cdot, s) \right).$$

Combining these inequalities and using the identity $\lambda \psi \left(\frac{a}{\lambda} \right) - \psi(a) = a \log \frac{1}{\lambda}$, we arrive at the claimed inequality. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.3. i) From Lemmas 7.4 and 7.5 as well as Lemma 5.1, for $R \geq 1$, $0 < r < r_{R,u}$ we have

$$\int_{S_{R/2}^+} (u_r^2 + |t| |\nabla u_r|^2 + |t|^2 |D^2 u_r|^2 + |t|^2 |\partial_t u_r|^2) G \leq C_R (1 + c_\mu r^{2\sigma}).$$

Since $R \geq 1$ is arbitrary, this implies the claim of part i).

ii) Note that, in view of Lemma 5.3, it will be enough to show the existence of u_0 , and the convergence

$$\int_{S_R^+} |u_{r_j} - u_0|^2 G \rightarrow 0.$$

From Lemma 7.1 it follows that $\kappa \geq 0$,* and therefore we obtain

$$r \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \geq -1, \quad 0 < r < r_0.$$

Integrating, we obtain that for small $\delta > 0$

$$H_u(r\delta) \leq H_u(r)\delta^{-1},$$

which gives

$$H_{u_r}(\delta) \leq \delta^{-1}$$

and consequently

$$\int_{S_\delta^+} u_r^2 G < \delta, \quad 0 < r < r_0.$$

Next, let $\zeta_A \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a cutoff function, such that

$$0 \leq \zeta \leq 1, \quad \zeta_A = 1 \quad \text{on } B_{A-1}, \quad \text{supp } \zeta \subset B_A.$$

We may take A so large that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{A-1}} G(x, t) dx < e^{-1/\delta}$ for $-R^2 < t < 0$. Then from Lemma 7.7, we have that

$$\int_{S_R^+ \cap \{|x| \geq A\}} u_r^2 G \leq \int_{S_R^+} u_r^2 (1 - \zeta_A)^2 G \leq \delta \int_{S_R^+} (u_r^2 + |t| |\nabla u_r|^2) G \leq \delta C(R),$$

for small enough r , where in the last step we have used the uniform estimate from part i).

Next, notice that on $E = E_{R, \delta, A} = (S_R^+ \setminus S_\delta^+) \cap \{|x| \leq A\} = B_A \times (-R^2, -\delta^2]$ the function G is bounded below and above and therefore the estimates in i) imply that the family $\{u_r\}_{0 < r < r_{R, u}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_2^{1,1}(E^\circ)$ and thus we can extract a subsequence u_{r_j} converging strongly in $L_2(E)$ and consequently in $L_2(E, G)$. Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and $A \rightarrow \infty$, combined with the estimates above, by means of the Cantor diagonal method, we complete the proof of this part.

iii) We first start with the Signorini boundary conditions. From the estimates in ii) we have that $\{u_r\}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_2^{2,1}(B_R^+ \times (-R^2, -\delta^2])$ for any $0 < \delta < R$. We thus obtain that $u_{r_j} \rightarrow u_0$ strongly, and $\partial_{x_n} u_{r_j} \rightarrow \partial_{x_n} u_0$ weakly in $L_2(B_R' \times (-R^2, -\delta^2])$. This is enough to pass to the limit in the Signorini boundary conditions and to conclude that

$$u_0 \geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} u_0 \geq 0, \quad u_0 \partial_{x_n} u_0 = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times (-\infty, 0).$$

Besides, arguing similarly, and using Lemma 7.5 we obtain that

$$\Delta u_0 - \partial_t u_0 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n \times (-\infty, 0).$$

Thus, to finish the proof of this part it remains to show that u_0 is in the unweighted Sobolev class $W_2^{1,1}(Q_R^+)$ for any $R > 0$. Because of the scaling properties, it is sufficient to prove it only for $R = 1/8$. We argue as follows. First, extend u_0 by even symmetry in x_n to $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, 0)$. We then claim that u_0^\pm are subcaloric

*We will prove later that $\kappa \geq 3/2$, but the information $\kappa \geq 0$ will suffice in this proof.

functions in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, 0)$. Indeed, this would follow immediately, if we knew the continuity of u_0 , since u_0 is caloric where nonzero. But since we do not know the continuity of u_0 at this stage, we argue as follows. By continuity of u_r we easily obtain

$$(\Delta - \partial_t)u_r^\pm \geq -f_r^\mp \quad \text{in } B_R \times (-R^2, -\delta^2].$$

Then, passing to the limit as $r = r_j \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that u_0^\pm are subcaloric, since $|f_r| \rightarrow 0$ in $L_2(B_R \times (-R^2, -\delta^2])$ by Lemma 7.5. Further, we claim that u_0^\pm satisfy the sub mean-value property

$$u_0^\pm(x, t) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^\pm(y, -1) G(x - y, -t - 1) dy,$$

for any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (-1, 0)$. The proof of this fact is fairly standard, since, by the estimates in part i), u_0 satisfies an integral Tychonoff-type condition in the strips $S_1 \setminus S_\delta$, $\delta > 0$. Nevertheless, for completeness we give the details below. For large $R > 0$ let $\zeta_R \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a cutoff function such that $0 \leq \zeta_R \leq 1$, $\zeta_R = 1$ on B_R , $\text{supp } \zeta_R \subset B_{R+1}$, $|\nabla \zeta_R| \leq 1$. Let now $w = u_0^\pm \zeta_R$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-1, 0)$. From the fact that u_0^\pm are subcaloric, we have that

$$(\Delta - \partial_t)w \geq 2\nabla u_0^\pm \nabla \zeta_R.$$

The advantage of w now is that it has a bounded support, and therefore we can write

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(x, t)^\pm \zeta_R(x) = w(x, t) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^\pm(y, -1) \zeta_R(y) G(x - y, -t - 1) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{-1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_0(y, s)| |\nabla \zeta_R(y, s)| G(x - y, s - t) dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, fix $A > 0$ large and $a > 0$ small and consider $|x| \leq A$ and $-1 < t < -a$. We want to show that the second integral above will vanish as we let $R \rightarrow \infty$. This will be done with suitable estimates on the kernel G .

Claim 7.8. Let $|x| \leq A$, $-1 < s < -a < 0$, and $s < t < 0$. Then

$$G(x - y, s - t) \leq \begin{cases} CG(y, s), & \text{if } t - s < -s/8, |y| \geq R \\ CG(y, s)e^{C|y|}, & \text{if } t - s \geq -s/8 \end{cases}$$

with $C = C_{n,a,A}$, $R = R_{n,a,A}$.

Proof. (1°) $t - s < -s/8$. Choose $R = 2A + 1$ and let $|y| \geq R$. Then

$$|x - y|^2 \geq \frac{|x - y|^2}{2} + \frac{|x - y|^2}{2} \geq \frac{|R - A|^2}{2} + \frac{(|y|/2)^2}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{|y|^2}{8}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} G(x - y, s - t) &= \frac{1}{(4\pi(t - s))^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|x - y|^2}{4(t - s)}} \leq \frac{1}{(4\pi(t - s))^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{8(t - s)}} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{32(t - s)}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(4\pi(t - s))^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{8(t - s)}} e^{\frac{|y|^2}{4s}} \leq C_n e^{\frac{|y|^2}{4s}} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{n,a}}{(4\pi(-s))^{n/2}} e^{\frac{|y|^2}{4s}} \leq C_{n,a} G(y, s), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that the function $r \mapsto 1/(4\pi r)^{n/2} e^{-1/4r}$ is uniformly bounded on $(0, \infty)$.

(2°) Suppose now $t - s \geq -s/8$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} G(x - y, s - t) &= \frac{1}{(4\pi(t - s))^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4(t-s)}} \leq \frac{8^{n/2}}{(4\pi(-s))^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4s}} \\ &\leq \frac{C_n}{(4\pi(-s))^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{(|y|-|A|)^2}{4s}} \\ &\leq \frac{C_n}{(4\pi(-s))^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{4s}} e^{C_{a,A}|y|} \leq C_n G(y, s) e^{C_{a,A}|y|}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the claim follows. \square

Using the claim, the facts that $\int_{S_1} |\nabla u_0|^2 G < \infty$ and $\int_{S_1} e^{C|y|} G(y, s) dy ds < \infty$, and letting $R \rightarrow \infty$, we then easily obtain

$$u_0^\pm(x, t) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^\pm(y, -1) G(x - y, -t - 1) dy.$$

Then, using the second estimate in Claim 7.8, for $(x, t) \in Q_{1/2}$ we obtain

$$|u_0(x, t)| \leq C_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_0(y, -1)| G(y, -1) e^{C_n|y|} dy.$$

More generally, changing the initial point $s = -1$ to arbitrary point $s \in (-1, -1/2]$ we will have

$$|u_0(x, t)| \leq C_n \int_{S_1 \setminus S_{1/2}} |u_0(y, s)| G(y, s) e^{C_n|y|} dy ds$$

and by applying Cauchy-Schwarz

$$\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})}^2 \leq C_n \int_{S_1} u_0^2 G = C_n H_{u_0}(1) < \infty.$$

The energy inequality applied to u_0^\pm then yields $u_0 \in W^{1,0}(Q_{1/4})$. Further, applying the estimate in Lemma 3.1 for $u(x, t) = u_0(x, t)\zeta(x, t)$, where ζ is a smooth cutoff function in $Q_{1/4}$, equal to 1 on $Q_{1/8}$, with $\varphi_0 = 0$ and $f = 2\nabla u_0 \nabla \zeta + u_0(\Delta \zeta - \partial_t \zeta)$, we obtain that $u_0 \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_{1/8}^+)$. As remarked earlier, the scaling properties imply that $u_0 \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_R^+)$ for any $R > 0$.

iv) Finally, we show that u_0 is parabolically homogeneous of degree κ . Let $r_j \rightarrow 0+$ be such that $u_{r_j} \rightarrow u_0$ as in ii). Then by part ii) again we have for any $0 < \rho < 1$

$$H_{u_{r_j}}(\rho) \rightarrow H_{u_0}(\rho), \quad I_{u_{r_j}}(\rho) \rightarrow I_{u_0}(\rho).$$

Moreover, since by Lemma 7.4 $H_{u_r}(\rho) \geq \rho^{2\kappa'}$ for sufficiently small r , we also have

$$H_{u_0}(\rho) \geq \rho^{2\kappa'}, \quad 0 < \rho < 1.$$

Hence, we obtain that for any $0 < \rho < 1$

$$2 \frac{I_{u_0}(\rho)}{H_{u_0}(\rho)} = 2 \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{I_{u_{r_j}}(\rho)}{H_{u_{r_j}}(\rho)} = 2 \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{I_u(r_j \rho)}{H_u(r_j \rho)} = \kappa,$$

by Lemma 7.1. Thus the ratio $2I_{u_0}(\rho)/H_{u_0}(\rho)$ is constant in the interval $(0, 1)$. Further, notice that passing to the limit in the differentiation formulas in Proposition 6.2, we will obtain the similar formulas hold for u_0 for any $0 < r < \infty$. Thus, from computations in step (1°) in Theorem 6.3, before the application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{I_{u_0}(r)}{H_{u_0}(r)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{r^5 H_{u_0}(r)} \left[\int_{S_r^+} u_0^2 G \int_{S_r^+} (Zu_0)^2 G - \left(\int_{S_r^+} u_0 (Zu_0) G \right)^2 \right].$$

Note here that $H_{u_0}(r)$ is never zero, since $H_{u_0}(r) \geq r^{2\kappa'}$ for $r \leq 1$ and $H_{u_0}(r) \geq r^{-2} H_{u_0}(1) \geq r^{-2}$. And since we know that the above derivative must be zero it implies that we have equality in Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\int_{S_r^+} u_0^2 G \int_{S_r^+} (Zu_0)^2 G = \left(\int_{S_r^+} u_0 (Zu_0) G \right)^2,$$

which can happen only if for some constant κ_0 we have

$$Zu_0 = \kappa_0 u_0 \quad \text{in } S_\infty^+,$$

or that u_0 is parabolically homogeneous of degree κ_0 . But then, in this case it is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned} H_{u_0}(r) &= Cr^{2\kappa_0}, \\ H'_{u_0}(r) &= \frac{4}{r} I_{u_0}(r) = 2\kappa_0 Cr^{2\kappa_0-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$2 \frac{I_{u_0}(r)}{H_{u_0}(r)} = \kappa_0.$$

This implies that $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and completes the proof of the theorem. \square

8. HOMOGENEOUS GLOBAL SOLUTIONS

In this section we study the homogeneous global solutions of the parabolic Signorini problem, which appear as the result of the blowup process described in Theorem 7.3. One of the conclusions of this section is that the homogeneity κ of the blowup is

$$\text{either } \kappa = \frac{3}{2} \quad \text{or} \quad \kappa \geq 2,$$

see Theorem 8.6 below. This will have two important consequences: (i) the fact that $\kappa \geq 3/2$ will imply the optimal $H_{\text{loc}}^{3/2, 3/4}$ regularity of solutions (see Theorem 9.1) and (ii) the “gap” $(3/2, 2)$ between possible values of κ will imply the relative openness of the so-called regular set (see Proposition 11.2).

We start by noticing that $\kappa > 1$.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ be as in Theorem 7.3. Then, $\kappa \geq 1 + \alpha$, where α is the Hölder exponent of ∇u in Definition 4.2.*

For the proof we will need the following fact.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$. Then,*

$$H_u(r) \leq C_u r^{2(1+\alpha)}, \quad 0 < r < 1,$$

where α is the Hölder exponent of ∇u in Definition 4.2.

Proof. Since $(0, 0) \in \Gamma_*(u)$, we must have $|\nabla u(0, 0)| = 0$. Recalling also that u has a bounded support, we obtain that

$$|\nabla u| \leq C_0 \|(x, t)\|^\alpha, \quad (x, t) \in S_1^+.$$

Let us show that for $C > 0$

$$|u| \leq C \|(x, t)\|^{1+\alpha}, \quad (x, t) \in S_1^+.$$

Because of the gradient estimate above, it will be enough to show that

$$|u| \leq C r^{1+\alpha} \quad \text{in } Q_r^+.$$

First, observe that since $u \geq 0$ on Q'_r , we readily have

$$u \geq -C_0 r^{1+\alpha} \quad \text{in } Q_r^+.$$

To show the estimate from above, it will be enough to establish that

$$u(0, -r^2) \leq C_1 r^{1+\alpha}.$$

Note that since u is bounded, it is enough to show this bound for $0 < r < 1/2$. Assuming the contrary, let $r \in (0, 1/2)$ be such that $u(0, -r^2) \geq C_1 r^{1+\alpha}$ with large enough C_1 . Then, from the bound on the gradient, we have $u \geq (C_1 - C_0) r^{1+\alpha}$ on $B_r \times \{-r^2\}$. In particular,

$$u(\tfrac{1}{2} r e_n, -r^2) \geq (C_1 - C_0) r^{1+\alpha}.$$

Also, let M be such that $|f(x, t)| \leq M$ in S_1^+ . Then, consider the function

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) = u(x, t) + C_0 (2r)^{1+\alpha}.$$

We will have

$$\tilde{u} \geq 0, \quad |(\Delta - \partial_t)\tilde{u}| \leq M \quad \text{in } Q_{2r}^+.$$

Besides,

$$\tilde{u}(\tfrac{1}{2} r e_n, -r^2) \geq C_1 r^{1+\alpha}.$$

Then, from the parabolic Harnack inequality (see e.g. [Lie96, Theorems 6.17–6.18])

$$\tilde{u}(\tfrac{1}{2} e_n, 0) \geq C_n C_1 r^{1+\alpha} - M r^2,$$

or equivalently,

$$u(\tfrac{1}{2} e_n, 0) \geq (C_n C_1 - C_0 2^{1+\alpha}) r^{1+\alpha} - M r^2.$$

But then from the bound on the gradient we will have

$$u(0, 0) \geq (C_n C_1 - C_0 2^{1+\alpha} - C_0) r^{1+\alpha} - M r^2 > 0,$$

if C_1 is sufficiently large, a contradiction. This implies the claimed estimate

$$|u(x, t)| \leq C \|(x, t)\|^{1+\alpha}.$$

The estimate for $H_u(r)$ is then a simple corollary:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_u(r) &\leq \frac{C}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} (|x|^2 + |t|)^{1+\alpha} G(x, t) dx dt \\
&= \frac{C}{r^2} \int_0^{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} s^{1+\alpha} (y^2 + 1) G(s^{1/2}y, -s) s^{n/2} dy ds \\
&= \frac{C}{r^2} \int_0^{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} s^{1+\alpha} (y^2 + 1) G(y, -1) dy ds \\
&= Cr^{2(1+\alpha)}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Proposition 8.1 now follows easily.

Proof of Proposition 8.1. Let $\kappa' \in (\kappa, \kappa_\mu)$ be arbitrary. Then, by Lemma 7.4 we have

$$H_u(r) \geq c_u r^{2\kappa'}, \quad 0 < r < r_u.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 8.2 (proved below) we have the estimate

$$H_u(r) \leq C_u r^{2(1+\alpha)}, \quad 0 < r < 1.$$

Hence, $\kappa' \geq 1 + \alpha$. Since this is true for any $\kappa' \in (\kappa, \kappa_\mu)$, we obtain that $\kappa \geq 1 + \alpha$, which is the sought for conclusion. \square

We will also need the following technical fact.

Lemma 8.3. *Let u_0 be a nonzero κ -parabolically homogeneous solution of the Signorini problem in S_∞^+ , as in Theorem 7.3(iii). Then, $\nabla u_0 \in H_{\text{loc}}^{\alpha, \alpha/2}((\mathbb{R}_+^n \cup \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \times (-\infty, 0))$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$.*

Remark 8.4. Note that this does not follow from Lemmas 3.2 or 3.3 directly, since they rely on W_∞^2 -regularity of φ_0 (which is given by the function u_0 itself), or $W_\infty^{1,0}$ -regularity of u_0 , which has to be properly justified.

Proof. Note that because of the homogeneity, it is enough to show that $g(x) := u_0(x, -1)$ is in $H_{\text{loc}}^{1+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}_+^n \cup \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$. Indeed, $g \in W_2^2(B_R^+)$ for any $R > 0$ and since $x \nabla u_0 + 2t \partial_t u_0 = \kappa u_0$, we obtain that g solves the Signorini problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta g - \frac{1}{2} x \nabla g + \frac{\kappa}{2} g &= 0 \quad \text{in } B_R^+, \\
g &\geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} g \geq 0, \quad g \partial_{x_n} g = 0 \quad \text{on } B'_R.
\end{aligned}$$

But now, the known results for the elliptic Signorini problem for operators with variable coefficients (see e.g. [AU96]) imply that $g \in H_{\text{loc}}^{1+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}_+^n \cup \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$, as claimed. \square

Proposition 8.5 (Homogeneous global solutions of homogeneity $1 < \kappa < 2$). *Let u_0 be a nonzero κ -parabolically homogeneous solution of the Signorini problem in $S_\infty^+ = \mathbb{R}_+^n \times (-\infty, 0]$ with $1 < \kappa < 2$. Then, $\kappa = 3/2$ and*

$$u_0(x, t) = C \operatorname{Re}(x' \cdot e + ix_n)_+^{3/2} \quad \text{in } S_\infty^+$$

for some tangential direction $e \in \partial B_1'$.

Proof. Extend u_0 by even symmetry in x_n to the strip S_∞ , i.e., by putting

$$u_0(x', x_n, t) = u_0(x', -x_n, t).$$

Take any $e \in \partial B'_1$, and consider the positive and negative parts of the directional derivative $\partial_e u_0$

$$v_e^\pm = \max\{\pm \partial_e u_0, 0\}.$$

We claim that they satisfy the following conditions

$$(\Delta - \partial_t)v_e^\pm \geq 0, \quad v_e^\pm \geq 0, \quad v_e^+ \cdot v_e^- = 0 \quad \text{in } S_\infty.$$

The last two conditions are obvious. The first one follows from the fact that v_e^\pm are continuous in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, 0)$ (by Lemma 8.2) and caloric where positive. Hence, we can apply Caffarelli's monotonicity formula to the pair v_e^\pm , see [Caf93]. Namely, the functional

$$\varphi(r) = \frac{1}{r^4} \int_{S_r} |\nabla v_e^+|^2 G \int_{S_r} |\nabla v_e^-|^2 G,$$

is monotone nondecreasing in r . On the other hand, from the homogeneity of u , it is easy to see that

$$\varphi(r) = r^{4(\kappa-2)} \varphi(1), \quad r > 0.$$

Since $\kappa < 2$, $\varphi(r)$ can be monotone increasing if and only if $\varphi(1) = 0$ and consequently $\varphi(r) = 0$ for all $r > 0$. In fact, one has to exclude the possibility that $\varphi(1) = \infty$ as well. This can be seen in two different ways. First, by Remark 5.2, one has

$$\int_{S_1} |\nabla v_e^\pm|^2 G \leq C_n \int_{S_2} (v_e^\pm)^2 G \leq \int_{S_4} u_0^2 G.$$

Alternatively, from Theorem 7.3 (i) and (iv) it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla v_e^\pm|^2 G(\cdot, -1) dx = j^\pm < \infty.$$


Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_1} |\nabla v_e^\pm|^2 G(x, t) dx dt &= \int_{S_1} |\nabla v_e^\pm(|t|^{1/2} y, t)|^2 G(|t|^{1/2} y, t) |t|^{n/2} dy dt \\ &= j^\pm \int_{-1}^0 |t|^{(\kappa-2)} dt < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

since $\kappa > 1$.

From here it follows that one of the functions v_e^\pm is identically zero, which is equivalent to $\partial_e u_0$ being either nonnegative or nonpositive on the entire $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, 0]$. Since this is true for any tangential direction $e \in \partial B_1$, it thus follows that u_0 depends only on one tangential direction, and is monotone in that direction. Therefore, without loss of generality we may assume that $n = 2$ and that the coincidence set at $t = -1$ is an infinite interval

$$\Lambda_{-1} = \{(x', 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid u_0(x', 0, -1) = 0\} = (-\infty, a] \times \{0\} =: \Sigma_a^-.$$

FIGURE 2. The slit domain $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Sigma_a^+$, $\Sigma_a^+ = [a, \infty) \times \{0\}$.

Besides, repeating the monotonicity formula argument above for the pair of functions $\max\{\pm w, 0\}$, where

$$w(x, t) = \begin{cases} -\partial_{x_2} u_0(x_1, x_2, t), & x_2 \geq 0 \\ \partial_{x_2} u_0(x_1, x_2, t), & x_2 < 0 \end{cases}$$

is a caloric function in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, 0] \setminus \Lambda$, parabolically homogeneous of degree $\kappa - 1$, we obtain that also w does not change sign in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, 0]$. Noting also that $w \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\} \times (-\infty, 0]$, we see that $w \geq 0$ everywhere (unless $w = 0$ identically on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times (-\infty, 0]$, in which case w is a polynomial of degree $\kappa - 1$, which is impossible, since κ is noninteger). Hence, we get

$$\partial_{x_1} u_0 \geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_2} u_0(x_1, x_2, t) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times (-\infty, 0].$$

Further if $g_1(x) = \partial_{x_1} u_0(x, -1)$ and using that $\partial_{x_1} u_0(x, t)$ is caloric we obtain that

$$g_1 = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_a^-, \quad -\Delta g_1 + \frac{1}{2} x \nabla g_1 = \frac{\kappa - 1}{2} g_1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Sigma_a^-.$$

Since also g_1 is nonnegative and not identically zero, then g_1 is the ground state for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Sigma_a^-$ and

$$\frac{\kappa - 1}{2} = \lambda(\Sigma_a^-) = \inf_{v|_{\Sigma_a^-} = 0} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla v|^2 e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}} dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v^2 e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}} dx}.$$

On the other hand, let $g_2(x) = -\partial_{x_2} u_0(x_1, x_2, -1)$ in $x_2 \geq 0$ and $g_2(x) = \partial_{x_2} u_0(x_1, x_2, -1)$ for $x_2 < 0$. Then, we have

$$g_2 = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_a^+, \quad -\Delta g_2 + \frac{1}{2} x \nabla g_2 = \frac{\kappa - 1}{2} g_2 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Sigma_a^+.$$

with $\Sigma_a^+ := [a, \infty) \times \{0\}$. Thus, this time g_2 is the ground state for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Sigma_a^+$, and therefore

$$\frac{\kappa - 1}{2} = \lambda(\Sigma_a^+) = \inf_{v|_{\Sigma_a^+} = 0} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla v|^2 e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}} dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v^2 e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}} dx}.$$

Observe now that $\lambda(\Sigma_a^+) = \lambda(\Sigma_a^-)$ and therefore from the above equations we have

$$\lambda(\Sigma_a^-) = \lambda(\Sigma_a^+).$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that the function $a \mapsto \lambda(\Sigma_a^-)$ is strictly monotone and therefore the above equality can hold only if $a = 0$. In particular,

$$\kappa = 1 + 2\lambda(\Sigma_0^-).$$

We now claim that $\lambda(\Sigma_0^-) = 1/4$. Indeed, consider the function

$$v(x) = \operatorname{Re}(x_1 + i|x_2|)^{1/2},$$

which is harmonic and homogeneous of degree $1/2$:

$$\Delta v = 0, \quad x \nabla v - \frac{1}{2}v = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$v = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_0^-, \quad -\Delta v + \frac{1}{2}x \nabla v = \frac{1}{4}v \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Sigma_0^-.$$

Also, since v is nonnegative, we obtain that v is the ground state of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Sigma_0^-$. This implies in particular that $\lambda(\Sigma_0^-) = \frac{1}{4}$, and consequently

$$\kappa = 3/2.$$

Moreover, $g_1(x) = \partial_{x_1} u_0(x, -1)$ must be a multiple of the function v above and from homogeneity we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1} u_0(x, t) &= (-t)^{1/4} g_1(x/(-t)^{1/2}) = C(-t)^{1/4} \operatorname{Re}((x_1 + i|x_2|)/(-t)^{1/2})^{1/2} \\ &= C \operatorname{Re}(x_1 + i|x_2|)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

From here it is now easy to see that necessarily

$$u_0(x, t) = C \operatorname{Re}(x_1 + i|x_2|)^{3/2}. \quad \square$$

Combining Propositions 8.1 and 8.5 we obtain the following result.

Theorem 8.6 (Minimal homogeneity). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ and μ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 6.3. Assume also $\kappa_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r \mu'(r)/\mu(r) \geq 3/2$. Then*

$$\kappa := \Phi_u(0+) \geq 3/2.$$

More precisely, we must have

$$\text{either } \kappa = 3/2 \quad \text{or} \quad \kappa \geq 2. \quad \square$$

Remark 8.7. Very little is known about the possible values of κ . However, we can say that the following values of κ do occur:

$$\kappa = 2m - 1/2, \quad 2m, \quad 2m + 1, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This can be seen from the following explicit examples of homogeneous solutions (that are actually t -independent)

$$\operatorname{Re}(x_1 + ix_n)^{2m-1/2}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(x_1 + ix_n)^{2m}, \quad -\operatorname{Im}(x_1 + ix_n)^{2m+1}.$$

It is known (and easily proved) that in t -independent case and dimension $n = 2$, the above listed values of κ are the only ones possible. In all other cases, finding the set of possible values of κ is, to the best of our knowledge, an open problem.

9. OPTIMAL REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS

Using the tools developed in the previous sections we are now ready to prove the optimal regularity of solutions of the parabolic Signorini problem with sufficiently smooth obstacles. In fact, we will establish our result for a slightly more general class of functions solving the Signorini problem with nonzero obstacle and nonzero right-hand side.

Theorem 9.1 (Optimal regularity in the parabolic Signorini problem). *Let $\varphi \in H^{2,1}(Q_1^+)$, $f \in L_\infty(Q_1^+)$. Assume that $v \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_1^+)$ be such that $\nabla v \in H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(Q_1^+ \cup Q_1')$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, and satisfy*

$$(9.1) \quad \Delta v - \partial_t v = f \quad \text{in } Q_1^+,$$

$$(9.2) \quad v - \varphi \geq 0, \quad -\partial_{x_n} v \geq 0, \quad (v - \varphi)\partial_{x_n} v = 0 \quad \text{on } Q_1'.$$

Then, $v \in H^{3/2,3/4}(Q_{1/2}^+ \cup Q_{1/2}')$ with

$$\|v\|_{H^{3/2,3/4}(Q_{1/2}^+ \cup Q_{1/2}')} \leq C_n \left(\|v\|_{W_2^{1,0}(Q_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_1')} \right).$$

The proof of Theorem 9.1 will follow from the interior parabolic estimates and the growth bound of u away from the free boundary $\Gamma(v)$.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $\|u\|_{L_\infty(S_1^+)}, \|f\|_{L_\infty(S_1^+)} \leq M$. Then,*

$$H_r(u) \leq C_n M^2 r^3.$$

Proof. The L_∞ bound on f allows us to apply Theorem 6.3 with the following specific choice of μ in the generalized frequency function. Indeed, fix $\sigma = 1/4$ and let $\mu(r) = M^2 r^{4-2\sigma}$. Then,

$$r^{4-2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f^2(\cdot, -r^2) G(\cdot, -r^2) \leq \mu(r)$$

and therefore

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{d}{dr} \log \max\{H_u(r), M^2 r^{4-2\sigma}\} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1)$$

is monotone for $C = C_n$. By Theorem 8.6 we have that $\Phi_u(0+) \geq 3/2$.

Now, for $H_u(r)$ we have two alternatives: either $H_u(r) \leq \mu(r) = M^2 r^{4-2\sigma}$ or $H_u(r) > \mu(r)$. In the first case the desired estimate is readily satisfied, so we concentrate on the latter case. Let (r_0, r_1) be a maximal interval in the open set $\mathcal{O} = \{r \in (0, 1) \mid H_u(r) > \mu(r)\}$. Then, for $r \in (r_0, r_1)$ we have

$$\Phi_u(r) = \frac{1}{2} r e^{Cr^\sigma} \frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} + 2(e^{Cr^\sigma} - 1) \geq \Phi_u(0+) \geq \frac{3}{2}.$$

We thus have,

$$\frac{H'_u(r)}{H_u(r)} \geq \frac{3}{r} (1 - Cr^\sigma), \quad r \in (r_0, r_1),$$

which, after integration, implies

$$\log \frac{H_u(r_1)}{H_u(r)} \geq \log \frac{r_1^3}{r^3} - Cr_1^\sigma,$$

and therefore

$$H_u(r) \leq Cr^3 \frac{H_u(r_1)}{r_1^3}.$$

Now, for r_1 we either have $r_1 = 1$ or $H_u(r_1) = \mu(r_1)$. Note that $H_u(1) \leq M^2$ from the L_∞ bound on u , and thus in both cases we have $H_u(r_1) \leq M^2 r_1^3$. We thus have the desired conclusion

$$H_u(r) \leq CM^2 r^3.$$

□

To apply the results of the previous sections, we will need the following $L_\infty - L_2$ type estimates.

Lemma 9.3. *Let w be a nonnegative function with at most polynomial growth at infinity in the strip S_R , and such that for some $\gamma > 0$*

$$\Delta w - \partial_t w \geq -M\|(x, t)\|^{\gamma-2} \quad \text{in } S_R.$$

Then,

$$\sup_{Q_{r/2}} w \leq C_n H_w(r)^{1/2} + C_{n,\gamma} M r^\gamma, \quad 0 < r < R.$$

Proof. Choosing a constant $C_{n,\gamma} > 0$ we can guarantee that

$$\tilde{w}(x, t) = w(x, t) + C_{n,\gamma} M(|x|^2 - t)^{\gamma/2}$$

is still nonnegative, has a polynomial growth at infinity and satisfies

$$\Delta \tilde{w} - \partial_t \tilde{w} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } S_R.$$

Moreover,

$$H_{\tilde{w}}(r)^{1/2} \leq H_w(r)^{1/2} + C_{n,\gamma} M \left(\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r} (|x|^2 + |t|)^\gamma G(x, t) dx dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

From the scaling properties of G it is easily seen that

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r} (|x|^2 + |t|)^\gamma G(x, t) dx dt = C_n r^{2\gamma}$$

and therefore we may assume that $M = 0$ from the beginning.

The rest of the proof is now similar to that of Theorem 7.3(iii).

Indeed, for $(x, t) \in Q_{r/2}$ and $s \in (-r^2, -r^2/2]$ we have the sub mean-value property

$$w(x, t) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, s) G(x - y, t - s) dy.$$

This can be proved as in Theorem 7.3(iii) by combining the fact that $\int_{S_\rho \setminus S_\delta} |\nabla w|^2 G < \infty$ for any $0 < \delta < \rho < R$, with the polynomial growth assumption on w , and the energy inequality. On the other hand, for our choice of t and s , we have $|s|/4 < t - s < |s|$. Thus, arguing as in Claim 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(x - y, t - s) &= \frac{1}{(4\pi(t - s))^{n/2}} e^{-|x-y|^2/4(t-s)} \\ &\leq \frac{C_n}{(4\pi|s|)^{n/2}} e^{-|x-y|^2/4|s|} \\ &\leq C_n G(y, s) e^{(x \cdot y)/2|s|}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$w(x, t) \leq C_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, s) e^{(x \cdot y)/2|s|} G(y, s) dy.$$

Now, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we will have

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &\leq C_n \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, s)^2 G(y, s) dy \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{(x \cdot y)/|s|} G(y, s) dy \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C_n \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, s)^2 G(y, s) dy \right)^{1/2} e^{2|x|^2/|s|} \\ &\leq C_n \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, s)^2 G(y, s) dy \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used that $|x| \leq r$ and $|s| \geq r^2/2$. Integrating over $s \in [-r^2, -r^2/4]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &\leq \frac{C_n}{r^2} \int_{-r^2}^{-r^2/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, s)^2 G(y, s) dy \right)^{1/2} ds \\ &\leq C_n \left(\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{-r^2}^{-r^2/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, s)^2 G(y, s) dy ds \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C_n H_w(r)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 9.4. *Let w be a nonnegative bounded function in S_R satisfying*

$$0 \leq w \leq M, \quad \Delta w - \partial_t w \geq -M \quad \text{in } S_R,$$

and let $(x_0, t_0) \in S'_R$, $r_0 > 0$ be such that for some constant A

$$\sup_{Q_r(x_0, t_0)} w \leq A r^{3/2}, \quad 0 < r < r_0.$$

Then,

$$w(x, t) \leq C \|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|^{3/2}, \quad (x, t) \in S_R,$$

with $C = C_{n, r_0, R}(A + M)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $x_0 = 0$. Then, from the assumptions on w we have that

$$w(x, t_0) \leq C|x|^{3/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and more generally

$$w(x, t) \leq C \|(x, t - t_0)\|^{3/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad t \in (-R^2, t_0],$$

where $C = C_{n,r_0,R}(A + M)$. To propagate the estimate to $t \in (t_0, 0)$ we use the sub-mean value property. Namely, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t_0 < t < 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(y, t_0) G(x - y, t - t_0) dy + M(t - t_0) \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^{3/2} G(x - y, t - t_0) dy + M(t - t_0). \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the desired conclusion, we notice that the integral

$$V(x, s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^{3/2} G(x - y, s) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, s > 0$$

is parabolically homogeneous of degree $3/2$ in the sense that

$$V(\lambda x, \lambda^2 s) = \lambda^{3/2} V(x, s), \quad \lambda > 0$$

and therefore we immediately obtain that

$$V(x, s) \leq C_n \|(x, s)\|^{3/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, s > 0.$$

Consequently, this yields

$$w(x, t) \leq C_n C \|(x, t - t_0)\|^{3/2} + M(t - t_0), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in (t_0, 0],$$

which implies the statement of the lemma. \square

Lemma 9.5. *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ and $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(u) \cap Q'_{3/4}$. Then,*

$$|u(x, t)| \leq C \|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|^{3/2}, \quad (x, t) \in S_1^+,$$

with

$$C = C_n (\|u\|_{L_\infty(S_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(S_1^+)}).$$

Proof. This is simply a combination of Lemma 9.2 for u and Lemmas 9.3–9.4 applied for $w = u^\pm$. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.1. As in Section 4, let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a cutoff function satisfying (4.4)–(4.5), and consider

$$u(x, t) = [v(x, t) - \varphi(x', t)]\psi(x).$$

We may also assume that $|\nabla \psi| \leq C_n$. We will thus have $u \in \mathfrak{S}^g(S_1^+)$ with

$$\|g\|_{L_\infty(S_1^+)} \leq C_n \left(\|v\|_{W_\infty^{1,0}(Q_1^+)} + \|f\|_{L_\infty(Q_1^+)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_1')} \right).$$

In the remaining part of the proof, C will denote a generic constant that has the same form as the right-hand side in the above inequality. For $(x, t) \in Q_{1/2}$, and

$$Q_r^*(x, t) := \tilde{Q}_r(x, t) \cap S_\infty = B_r(x) \times ((t - r^2, t + r^2) \cap (-\infty, 0]),$$

let

$$d = d(x, t) = \sup\{r > 0 \mid Q_r^*(x, t) \subset Q_1 \setminus \Gamma_*(u)\}.$$

We first claim that

$$(9.3) \quad |u| \leq C d^{3/2} \quad \text{in } Q_d^*(x, t).$$

Indeed, if $d > 1/4$, this follows from boundedness of u . If instead $d \leq 1/4$, then there exist $(x_0, t_0) \in Q'_{3/4} \cap \Gamma_*(u) \cap \partial Q_d^*(x, t)$ and by Lemma 9.5 we have the desired estimate. Next, we claim that

$$(9.4) \quad |\nabla u| \leq Cd^{1/2} \quad \text{in } Q_{d/2}^*(x, t)$$

This will follow from the interior gradient estimates, applied to the even or odd extension of u in x_n variable. More specifically, consider the intersection $Q_d^*(x, t) \cap Q'_1$. Since there are no points of $\Gamma_*(u)$ in this set, we have a dichotomy: either (i) $u > 0$ on $Q_d^*(x, t) \cap Q'_1$, or (ii) $u = 0$ on $Q_d^*(x, t) \cap Q'_1$. Accordingly, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(x', x_n, t) &= \begin{cases} u(x', x_n, t), & x_n \geq 0 \\ u(x', -x_n, t), & x_n \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in case (i),} \\ \tilde{u}(x', x_n, t) &= \begin{cases} u(x', x_n, t), & x_n \geq 0 \\ -u(x', -x_n, t), & x_n \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in case (ii).} \end{aligned}$$

In either case \tilde{u} satisfies a nonhomogeneous heat equation

$$(\Delta - \partial_t)\tilde{u} = \tilde{g} \quad \text{in } Q_d^*(x, t),$$

for an appropriately defined \tilde{g} . The claimed estimate for $|\nabla u| = |\nabla \tilde{u}|$ now follows from parabolic interior gradient estimates, see e.g. [LSU67, Chapter III, Theorem 11.1]. Moreover, by [LSU67, Chapter IV, Theorem 9.1], one also has that $\tilde{u} \in W_q^{2,1}(Q_{d/2}^*(x, t))$ for any $3/2 < q < \infty$. To be more precise, we apply the latter theorem to $\tilde{u}\zeta$, where ζ is a cutoff function supported in $Q_d^*(x, t)$, such $\zeta = 1$ on $Q_{d/2}^*(x, t)$, $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$, $|\nabla \zeta| \leq C_n/d$, $|\partial_t \zeta| \leq C_n/d^2$. From the estimates on \tilde{u} and $|\nabla \tilde{u}|$, we thus have

$$|(\Delta - \partial_t)(\tilde{u}\zeta)| \leq Cd^{-1/2},$$

which provides the estimate

$$\|D^2 \tilde{u}\|_{L_q(Q_{d/2}^*(x, t))} + \|\partial_t \tilde{u}\|_{L_q(Q_{d/2}^*(x, t))} \leq Cd^{-1/2}d^{(n+2)/q}.$$

Then, from the Sobolev embedding of $W_q^{2,1}$ into $H^{2-\frac{n+2}{q}, 1-\frac{n+2}{2q}}$ when $q > n+2$, we obtain the estimates for Hölder seminorms

$$\langle \nabla \tilde{u} \rangle_{Q_{d/2}^*(x, t)}^{(\alpha)} + \langle \tilde{u} \rangle_{t, Q_{d/2}^*(x, t)}^{((1+\alpha)/2)} \leq Cd^{1/2-\alpha},$$

for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, see [LSU67, Chapter II, Lemma 3.3]. In particular, we have

$$(9.5) \quad \langle \nabla \tilde{u} \rangle_{Q_{d/2}^*(x, t)}^{(1/2)} + \langle \tilde{u} \rangle_{t, Q_{d/2}^*(x, t)}^{(3/4)} \leq C.$$

Now take two points $(x^i, t^i) \in Q_{1/2}^+$, $i = 1, 2$, and let $d^i = d(x^i, t^i)$. Without loss of generality we may assume $d_1 \geq d_2$. Let also $\delta = (|x^1 - x^2|^2 + |t^1 - t^2|)^{1/2}$.

Consider two cases:

1) $\delta > \frac{1}{2}d_1$. In this case, we have by (9.4)

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u(x^1, t^1) - \nabla u(x^2, t^2)| &\leq |\nabla u(x^1, t^1)| + |\nabla u(x^2, t^2)| \\ &\leq C(d^1)^{1/2} + C(d^2)^{1/2} \leq C\delta^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

2) $\delta < \frac{1}{2}d_1$. In this case, both $(x^i, t^i) \in Q_{d_1/2}^*(x^1, t^1)$, and therefore by (9.5)

$$|\nabla u(x^1, t^1) - \nabla u(x^2, t^2)| \leq C\delta^{1/2}$$

This gives the desired estimate for the seminorm $\langle \nabla u \rangle_{Q_{1/2}^+}^{1/2}$. Arguing analogously, we can also prove a similar estimate for $\langle u \rangle_{t, Q_{1/2}^+}^{(3/4)}$, thus completing the proof of the theorem. \square

10. CLASSIFICATION OF FREE BOUNDARY POINTS

After establishing the optimal regularity of the solutions, we are now able to undertake the study of the free boundary

$$\Gamma(v) = \partial\{(x', t) \mid v(x', 0, t) > \varphi(x', t)\}.$$

We start with classifying the free boundary points and more generally points in

$$\Gamma_*(v) = \{(x', t) \mid v(x', 0, t) = \varphi(x', t), \partial_{x_n} v(x', 0, t) = 0\}.$$

As we will see the higher is the regularity of φ , the finer is going to be the classification.

Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q_1')$, $\ell = k + \gamma \geq 2$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $u_k \in \mathfrak{S}^{f_k}(S_1^+)$ be as constructed in Proposition 4.4. In particular, f_k satisfies

$$|f_k(x, t)| \leq M \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}, \quad (x, t) \in S_1^+.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f_k(x, -r^2)^2 G(x, -r^2) dx &\leq M^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (|x|^2 + r^2)^{\ell-2} G(x, -r^2) dx \\ &= M^2 r^{2\ell-4} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (|y|^2 + 1)^\ell G(y, -1) dy \\ &= C_\ell M^2 r^{2\ell-4}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we choose

$$\mu(r) = r^{2\ell_0}, \quad \text{with } k \leq \ell_0 < \ell \text{ and } \sigma \leq \ell - \ell_0,$$

then μ , f_k and u_k will satisfy the conditions of Theorem 6.3. In particular, we will have that

$$(10.1) \quad \Phi_{u_k}^{(\ell_0)}(r) := \frac{1}{2} r e^{C r^\sigma} \frac{d}{dr} \log \max\{H_{u_k}(r), r^{2\ell_0}\} + 2(e^{C r^\sigma} - 1)$$

is monotone increasing in $r \in (0, 1)$ and consequently there exists the limit (see (7.1) above)

$$\kappa = \Phi_{u_k}^{(\ell_0)}(0+).$$

Recalling the definition (7.2) of κ_μ , we note that in the present case we have

$$\kappa_\mu = \ell_0.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 7.1 we infer that

$$\kappa \leq \ell_0 < \ell.$$

Generally speaking, the value of κ may depend on the cutoff function that we have chosen to construct u_k . However, as the next result proves, it is relatively straightforward to check that this is not the case.

Lemma 10.1. *The limit $\kappa = \Phi_{u_k}^{(\ell_0)}(0+)$ does not depend on the choice of the cutoff function ψ in the definition of u_k .*

Proof. Indeed, if we choose a different cutoff function ψ' , satisfying (4.4)–(4.5) and denote by u'_k the function corresponding to u_k in the construction above, and by κ' the corresponding value as in (7.1), then by simply using the fact that $u_k = u'_k$ on $B_{1/2}^+ \times (-1, 0]$ and that $|G(x, t)| \leq e^{-c_n/r^2}$ for $|x| \geq 1/2$ and $-r^2 < t \leq 0$, we have

$$|H_{u_k}(r) - H_{u'_k}(r)| \leq Ce^{-c_n/r^2}.$$

To show now that $\kappa = \kappa'$, we consider several cases.

- 1) If $\kappa = \kappa' = \ell_0$, then we are done.
- 2) If $\kappa < \ell_0$, then Lemma 7.1 implies that

$$2\kappa - \varepsilon \leq r \frac{H'_{u_k}(r)}{H_{u_k}(r)} \leq 2\kappa + \varepsilon, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon.$$

Integrating these inequalities we obtain

$$c_\varepsilon r^{2\kappa+\varepsilon} \leq H_{u_k}(r) \leq C_\varepsilon r^{2\kappa-\varepsilon}, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon,$$

for some (generic) positive constants $c_\varepsilon, C_\varepsilon$. This will also imply

$$c_\varepsilon r^{2\kappa+\varepsilon} \leq H_{u'_k}(r) \leq C_\varepsilon r^{2\kappa-\varepsilon}, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon.$$

Now, if ε is so small that $2\kappa + \varepsilon < \ell_0$, we will have that $H_{u'_k}(r) > \mu(r) = r^{\ell_0}$ for $0 < r < r_\varepsilon$. But then, we also have $\kappa' = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r H'_{u'_k}(r) / H_{u'_k}(r)$, and therefore

$$c_\varepsilon r^{2\kappa'+\varepsilon} \leq H_{u'_k}(r) \leq C_\varepsilon r^{2\kappa'-\varepsilon}, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon,$$

for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. Obviously, the above estimates imply that $\kappa' = \kappa$.

- 3) If $\kappa' < \ell_0$, we argue as in 2) above. \square

Definition 10.2 (Truncated homogeneity). To stress in the above construction the dependence only of the function v , we will denote the quantity $\kappa = \Phi_{u_k}^{(\ell_0)}(0+)$ by

$$\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(0, 0).$$

More generally, for $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v)$ we let

$$v^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) := v(x_0 + x, t_0 + t),$$

which translates (x_0, t_0) to the origin. Then, $v^{(x_0, t_0)} \in \mathfrak{S}^{f^{(x_0, t_0)}}(Q_r^+)$ for some small $r > 0$. The construction above has been carried out in Q_1^+ , rather than Q_r^+ . However, a simple rescaling argument generalizes it to any $r > 0$. Thus, we can define

$$\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(x_0, t_0) = \kappa_{v^{(x_0, t_0)}}^{(\ell_0)}(0, 0),$$

which we will call the *truncated homogeneity* of v at an extended free boundary point (x_0, t_0) .

Suppose now for a moment that the thin obstacle φ , that was assumed to belong to the class $H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q'_1)$, has a higher regularity. To fix the ideas, suppose $\varphi \in H^{\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\ell}/2}(Q'_1)$, for some $\tilde{\ell} \geq \ell \geq 2$, with $\tilde{\ell} = \tilde{k} + \tilde{\gamma}$, $\tilde{k} \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{k} \geq k$, $0 < \tilde{\gamma} \leq 1$. We may thus define

$$\kappa_v^{(\tilde{\ell}_0)}(x_0, t_0),$$

for any $\tilde{k} \leq \tilde{\ell}_0 < \tilde{\ell}$. It is natural to ask about the relation between $\kappa_v^{(\tilde{\ell}_0)}(x_0, t_0)$ and $\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(x_0, t_0)$. The following proposition provides an answer to this question.

Proposition 10.3 (Consistency of truncated homogeneities). *If $\ell \leq \tilde{\ell}$, $\ell_0 \leq \tilde{\ell}_0$ are as above, then*

$$\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(x_0, t_0) = \min\{\kappa_v^{(\tilde{\ell}_0)}(x_0, t_0), \ell_0\}.$$

This proposition essentially says that $\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(x_0, t_0)$ is the truncation of $\kappa_v^{(\tilde{\ell}_0)}(x_0, t_0)$ by the value ℓ_0 .

Proof. It will be sufficient to prove the statement for $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$. To simplify the notation in the proof, we are going to denote

$$\kappa = \kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(0, 0), \quad \tilde{\kappa} = \kappa_v^{(\tilde{\ell}_0)}(0, 0),$$

so we will need to show that

$$\kappa = \min\{\tilde{\kappa}, \ell_0\}.$$

First, we fix a cutoff function ψ is the definition of the functions u_k and $u_{\tilde{k}}$, and note that

$$|u_k(x, t) - u_{\tilde{k}}(x, t)| \leq C\|(x, t)\|^\ell.$$

This implies that

$$|H_{u_k}(r) - H_{u_{\tilde{k}}}(r)| \leq Cr^{2\ell}.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 10.1, we obtain that, in fact,

$$\kappa = \Phi_{u_k}^{(\ell_0)}(0+) = \Phi_{u_{\tilde{k}}}^{(\ell_0)}(0+).$$

Using this information, from now on in this proof we will abbreviate $H_{u_{\tilde{k}}}(r)$ with $H(r)$.

We consider two cases.

(1°) Assume first that $\tilde{\kappa} < \ell_0$. In this case we need to show that $\kappa = \tilde{\kappa}$.

From the assumption we will have that $\tilde{\kappa} < \tilde{\ell}_0$ and by Lemma 7.1

$$\tilde{\kappa} = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{rH'(r)}{H(r)}.$$

Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we obtain

$$r \frac{H'(r)}{H(r)} \leq 2\tilde{\kappa} + \varepsilon, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon.$$

Integrating, we find

$$H(r) \geq \frac{H(r_\varepsilon)}{r_\varepsilon^{2\tilde{\kappa} + \varepsilon}} r^{2\tilde{\kappa} + \varepsilon}, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon.$$

In particular, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is so small that $2\tilde{\kappa} + \varepsilon < 2\ell_0$, then $H(r) > r^{2\ell_0}$ and therefore

$$\kappa = \Phi^{(\ell_0)}(0+) = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{rH'(r)}{H(r)} = \tilde{\kappa}.$$

(2°) Assume now that $\tilde{\kappa} \geq \ell_0$. We need to show in this case that $\kappa = \ell_0$. In general, we know that $\kappa \leq \ell_0$, so arguing by contradiction, assume $\kappa < \ell_0$. We thus know by Lemma 7.1 that $H(r) \geq r^{2\ell_0}$ for $0 < r < r_0$, and

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{rH'(r)}{H(r)}.$$

But then, we also have $H(r) \geq r^{2\tilde{\ell}_0}$ for $0 < r < r_0$ and therefore

$$\tilde{\kappa} = \Phi^{(\tilde{\ell}_0)}(0+) = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{rH'(r)}{H(r)} = \kappa < \ell_0,$$

contrary to the assumption. \square

Definition 10.4 (Truncated homogeneity, part II). In view of Proposition 10.3, if $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q'_1)$ we can push ℓ_0 in the definition of the truncated homogeneity up to ℓ by setting

$$\kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0) = \sup_{\ell_0 < \ell} \kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(x_0, t_0).$$

Indeed, Proposition 10.3 guarantees that $\ell_0 \mapsto \kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}$ is monotone increasing. Moreover, we have

$$\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)} = \min\{\kappa_v^{(\ell)}, \ell_0\}.$$

Lemma 10.5. *The function $(x, t) \mapsto \kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x, t)$ is upper semicontinuous on $\Gamma_*(v)$ (with respect to Euclidean or, equivalently, parabolic distance), i.e., for any $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v)$ one has*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\tilde{Q}'_\delta(x_0, t_0) \cap \Gamma_*(v)} \kappa_v^{(\ell)} \leq \kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0).$$

Proof. Suppose first $\kappa = \kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0) < \ell$ and fix $\ell_0 \in (\kappa, \ell)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $r_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\Phi_u^{(\ell_0)}(r_\varepsilon) < \kappa + \varepsilon < \ell_0$, where $u = u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}$. This implies that $H_u(r) \geq Cr^{2(\kappa+\varepsilon)}$ for $0 < r < r_\varepsilon$. Since the mapping $(x, t) \mapsto H_{u_k^{(x, t)}}(r_\varepsilon)$ is continuous on $\Gamma_*(v)$, we will have

$$H_{u_k^{(x, t)}}(r_\varepsilon) \geq (C/2)r_\varepsilon^{2(\kappa+\varepsilon)} > r_\varepsilon^{2\ell_0},$$

if $|x - x_0|^2 + |t - t_0| < \eta_\varepsilon^2$, $(x, t) \in \Gamma_*(v)$, provided r_ε and $\eta_\varepsilon > 0$ are small enough. In particular, this implies the explicit formula

$$\Phi_{u_k^{(x, t)}}^{(\ell_0)}(r_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} r_\varepsilon e^{Cr_\varepsilon^\sigma} \frac{H'_{u_k^{(x, t)}}(r_\varepsilon)}{H_{u_k^{(x, t)}}(r_\varepsilon)} + 2(e^{Cr_\varepsilon^\sigma} - 1).$$

Therefore, taking $\eta_\varepsilon > 0$ small, we can guarantee

$$|\Phi_{u_k^{(x, t)}}^{(\ell_0)}(r_\varepsilon) - \Phi_{u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}}^{(\ell_0)}(r_\varepsilon)| \leq \varepsilon,$$

if $|x - x_0|^2 + |t - t_0| < \eta_\varepsilon^2$, $(x, t) \in \Gamma_*(v)$. It follows that, for such (x, t) , one has

$$\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}(x, t) \leq \Phi_{u_k^{(x, t)}}^{(\ell_0)}(r_\varepsilon) \leq \kappa + 2\varepsilon,$$

which implies the upper semicontinuity of $\kappa_v^{(\ell_0)}$ and $\kappa_v^{(\ell)}$ at (x_0, t_0) .

If $\kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0) = \ell$, the upper continuity follows immediately since $\kappa_v^{(\ell)} \leq \ell$. \square

The truncated homogeneity $\kappa_v^{(\ell)}$ gives a natural classification of extended free boundary points.

Definition 10.6 (Classification of free boundary points). Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$, with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q'_1)$. For $\kappa \in [3/2, \ell]$, we define

$$\Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(v) := \{(x, t) \in \Gamma_*(v) \mid \kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x, t) = \kappa\}.$$

As a direct corollary of Proposition 10.3, we have the following consistency for the above definition.

Proposition 10.7 (Consistency of classification). *If $\varphi \in H^{\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\ell}/2}(Q'_1)$ with $\tilde{\ell} \geq \ell \geq 2$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\kappa}^{(\ell)}(v) &= \Gamma_{\kappa}^{(\tilde{\ell})}(v), \quad \text{if } \kappa < \ell, \\ \Gamma_{\ell}^{(\ell)}(v) &= \bigcup_{\ell \leq \kappa \leq \tilde{\ell}} \Gamma_{\kappa}^{(\tilde{\ell})}(v). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

The latter identity essentially means that, if φ is more regular than $H^{\ell, \ell/2}$, then $\Gamma_{\ell}^{(\ell)}(v)$ is an “aggregate” of points with higher homogeneities κ .

We conclude this section with the following description of the free boundary, based on the fact that the function $\kappa_v^{(\ell)}$ never takes certain values. We also characterize the points that are in the extended free boundary $\Gamma_*(v)$, but not in the free boundary $\Gamma(v)$.

Proposition 10.8. *If $v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\varphi}(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q'_1)$, $\ell \geq 2$, then for any $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v)$, either we have*

$$\kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0) = \frac{3}{2}, \quad \text{or} \quad 2 \leq \kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0) \leq \ell.$$

As a consequence,

$$\Gamma_*(v) = \Gamma_{3/2}^{(\ell)}(v) \cup \bigcup_{2 \leq \kappa \leq \ell} \Gamma_{\kappa}^{(\ell)}(v).$$

Moreover,

$$\Gamma_*(v) \setminus \Gamma(v) \subset \Gamma_{\ell}^{(\ell)}(v) \cup \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_{2m+1}^{(\ell)}(v).$$

Proof. The first part is nothing but Theorem 8.6.

Suppose now $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v) \setminus \Gamma(v)$ and that $\kappa = \kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0) < \ell$. Then, there exists a small $\delta > 0$ such that $v = \varphi$ on $Q'_{\delta}(x_0, t_0)$. Next, consider the translate $v^{(x_0, t_0)} = v(x_0 + \cdot, t_0 + \cdot)$ and let $u = u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}$ be obtained from $v^{(x_0, t_0)}$ as in Proposition 4.4. Since $\kappa < \ell$, by Theorem 7.3, there exists a blowup u_0 of u over some sequence $r = r_j \rightarrow 0+$. Since $u = 0$ on Q'_{δ} , u_0 will vanish on S'_{∞} . Hence, extending it as an odd function \tilde{u}_0 of x_n from S_{∞}^+ to S_{∞} , we will obtain a homogeneous caloric function in S_{∞} . Then, by the Liouville theorem, \tilde{u}_0 must be a caloric polynomial of degree κ . Thus, κ is an integer. We further claim that κ is odd. Indeed, \tilde{u}_0 solves the Signorini problem in S_{∞}^+ and therefore we must have that $-\partial_{x_n} u_0(x', 0, t)$ is a nonnegative polynomial on S'_{∞} of homogeneity $\kappa - 1$. The latter is possible when either $\kappa - 1$ is even or if $-\partial_{x_n} u_0$ vanishes on S'_{∞} . However, the latter case is impossible, since otherwise Holmgren’s uniqueness theorem would imply that u_0 is identically zero, contrary to Theorem 7.3. Thus, the only possibility is that $\kappa - 1$ is even, or equivalently, κ is odd. Since we also have $\kappa \geq 3/2 > 1$, we obtain that $\kappa \in \{2m + 1 \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$. \square

Remark 10.9. It is easy to construct $v \in \mathfrak{S}_0(Q_1^+)$ such that $\Gamma(v) = \emptyset$ and $\Gamma_*(v) = \Gamma_{2m+1}^{(\ell)}(v) \neq \emptyset$. The simplest example is perhaps

$$v(x, t) = -\operatorname{Im}(x_1 + ix_n)^{2m+1}.$$

It is easy to verify that $v \in \mathfrak{S}_0(Q_1^+)$, and $v = 0$ on Q_1' . Thus, $\Gamma(v) = \emptyset$. However, $\Gamma_*(v) = \{0\} \times \{0\} \times (-1, 0]$, and because of the $(2m+1)$ -homogeneity of v with respect to any point on $\Gamma_*(v)$, if we choose $\ell > 2m+1$, we have that $\Gamma_*(v) = \Gamma_{2m+1}^{(\ell)}(v)$.

11. FREE BOUNDARY: REGULAR SET

In this section we study a special subset $\mathcal{R}(v)$ of the extended free boundary. Namely, the collection of those points having minimal frequency $\kappa = 3/2$.

Definition 11.1 (Regular set). Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q_1')$, $\ell \geq 2$. We say that $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v)$ is a *regular* free boundary point if it has a minimal homogeneity $\kappa = 3/2$, or equivalently $\kappa_v^{(\ell)}(x_0, t_0) = 3/2$. The set

$$\mathcal{R}(v) := \Gamma_{3/2}^{(\ell)}(v)$$

will be called the *regular set* of v .

We have the following basic fact about $\mathcal{R}(v)$.

Proposition 11.2. *The regular set $\mathcal{R}(v)$ is a relatively open subset of $\Gamma(v)$. In particular, for any $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathcal{R}(v)$ there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\Gamma(v) \cap Q'_{\delta_0}(x_0, t_0) = \mathcal{R}(v) \cap Q'_{\delta_0}(x_0, t_0).$$

Proof. First note that, by Proposition 10.8, we have $\mathcal{R}(v) \subset \Gamma(v)$. The relative openness of $\mathcal{R}(v)$ follows from the upper semicontinuity of the function $\kappa_v^{(\ell)}$ and from the fact that it does not take any values between $3/2$ and 2 . \square

We will show in this section that, if the thin obstacle φ is sufficiently smooth, then the regular set can be represented locally as a $(n-2)$ -dimensional graph of a parabolically Lipschitz function. Further, such function can be shown to have Hölder continuous spatial derivatives. We begin with the following basic result.

Theorem 11.3 (Lipschitz regularity of $\mathcal{R}(v)$). *Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q_1')$, $\ell \geq 3$ and that $(0, 0) \in \mathcal{R}(v)$. Then, there exist $\delta = \delta_v > 0$, and $g \in H^{1, 1/2}(Q''_\delta)$ (i.e., g is a parabolically Lipschitz function), such that possibly after a rotation in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , one has*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(v) \cap Q'_\delta &= \mathcal{R}(v) \cap Q'_\delta = \{(x', t) \in Q'_\delta \mid x_{n-1} = g(x'', t)\}, \\ \Lambda(v) \cap Q'_\delta &= \{(x', t) \in Q'_\delta \mid x_{n-1} \leq g(x'', t)\}, \end{aligned}$$

For an illustration, see Fig 3. Following the well-known approach in the classical obstacle problem, see e.g. [PSU12, Chapter 4], the idea of the proof is to show that there is a cone of directions in the thin space, along which $v - \varphi$ is increasing. This approach was successfully used in the elliptic Signorini problem in [ACS08], [CSS08], see also [PSU12, Chapter 9], and in the arguments below we generalize the constructions in these papers to the parabolic case. This will establish the Lipschitz regularity in the space variables. To show the $1/2$ -Hölder regularity in t (actually better than that), we will use the fact that the $3/2$ -homogeneous solutions of the parabolic Signorini problem are t -independent (see Proposition 8.5).

However, in order to carry out the program outlined above, in addition to (i) and (ii) in Theorem 7.3 above, we will need a stronger convergence of the rescalings u_r to the blowups u_0 . This will be achieved by assuming a slight increase in the




FIGURE 3. The regular set $\mathcal{R}(v)$ in Q'_δ , given by the graph $x_{n-1} = g(x'')$ with $g \in H^{1,1/2}(Q''_\delta)$ and $\nabla'' g \in H^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(Q''_\delta)$ by Theorems 11.3 and 11.6

regularity assumptions on the thin obstacle φ , and, consequently, on the regularity of the right-hand side f in the construction of Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 11.4. *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$, and suppose that for some $\ell_0 \geq 2$*

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x, t)| &\leq M \|(x, t)\|^{\ell_0-2} \quad \text{in } S_1^+, \\ |\nabla f(x, t)| &\leq L \|(x, t)\|^{(\ell_0-3)^+} \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2}^+, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H_u(r) \geq r^{2\ell_0}, \quad \text{for } 0 < r < r_0.$$

Then, for the family of rescalings $\{u_r\}_{0 < r < r_0}$ we have the uniform bounds

$$\|u_r\|_{H^{3/2, 3/4}(Q_R^+ \cup Q_R')} \leq C_u, \quad 0 < r < r_{R,u}.$$

In particular, if the sequence of rescalings u_{r_j} converges to u_0 as in Theorem 7.3, then over a subsequence

$$u_{r_j} \rightarrow u_0, \quad \nabla u_{r_j} \rightarrow \nabla u_0 \quad \text{in } H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_R^+ \cup Q_R'),$$

for any $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ and $R > 0$.

Proof. Because of Theorem 9.1, it is enough to show that u_r , $|\nabla u_r|$, and f_r are bounded in Q_R^+ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_r(x, t)| &= \frac{r^2 |f(rx, r^2 t)|}{H_u(r)^{1/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{Mr^{\ell_0} \|(x, t)\|^{\ell_0-2}}{H_u(r)^{1/2}} \leq M \|(x, t)\|^{\ell_0-2}, \quad (x, t) \in S_R^+. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla f_r(x, t)| &= \frac{r^3 |\nabla f(rx, r^2 t)|}{H_u(r)^{1/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{Lr^{\max\{\ell_0, 3\}} \|(x, t)\|^{(\ell_0-3)^+}}{H_u(r)^{1/2}} \leq L \|(x, t)\|^{(\ell_0-3)^+}, \quad (x, t) \in Q_R^+. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the functions

$$w_{\pm} = (u_r)_{\pm} \quad (\text{evenly reflected to } S_R^-)$$

satisfy

$$\Delta w_{\pm} - \partial_t w_{\pm} \geq -M \|(x, t)\|^{\ell_0-2} \quad \text{in } S_R.$$

By Lemma 9.3 we thus obtain

$$\sup_{Q_{R/2}} |u_r| \leq C(H_{u_r}(R)^{1/2} + MR^{\ell_0}) \leq CR^{\ell_0}(1+M),$$

for small r . Then, by the energy inequality for w_{\pm} in $Q_{R/2}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{R^{n+2}} \int_{Q_{R/4}} |\nabla u_r|^2 \leq CR^{-2} R^{2\ell_0} (1+M)^2 + CR^2 R^{2(\ell_0-2)} M^2 \leq CR^{2\ell_0-2} (1+M)^2.$$

On the other hand, using that for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$(w_i)_{\pm} = (\partial_{x_i} u_r)_{\pm} \quad (\text{evenly reflected to } S_R^-)$$

satisfy

$$\Delta(w_i)_{\pm} - \partial_t(w_i)_{\pm} \geq -LR^{(\ell_0-3)+} \quad \text{in } Q_R,$$

then from $L_{\infty} - L_2$ estimate for subcaloric functions, we obtain

$$\sup_{Q_{R/8}} |\nabla u_r| \leq C_n R^{\max\{\ell_0-1, 2\}} (1+M+L).$$

Thus, u_r , $|\nabla u_r|$ and f_r are uniformly bounded in $Q_{R/8}^+$ for small $r < r_{R,u}$, and this completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The next lemma will allow to deduce the monotonicity of the solution u in a cone of directions in the thin space, from that of the blowup. It is the parabolic counterpart of [ACS08, Lemma 4] and [CSS08, Lemma 7.2].

Lemma 11.5. *Let Λ be a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times (-\infty, 0]$, and $h(x, t)$ a continuous function in Q_1 . For any $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, depending only on δ_0 and n , such that if*

- i) $h \geq 0$ on $Q_1 \cap \Lambda$,
- ii) $(\Delta - \partial_t)h \leq \varepsilon_0$ in $Q_1 \setminus \Lambda$,
- iii) $h \geq -\varepsilon_0$ in Q_1 ,
- iv) $h \geq \delta_0$ in $Q_1 \cap \{|x_n| \geq c_n\}$, $c_n = 1/(32\sqrt{n-1})$,

then $h \geq 0$ on $Q_{1/2}$.

Proof. It is enough to show that $h \geq 0$ on $Q_{1/2} \cap \{|x_n| \leq c_n\}$. Arguing by contradiction, let $(x_0, t_0) \in Q_{1/2} \cap \{|x_n| \leq c_n\}$ be such that $h(x_0, t_0) < 0$. Consider the auxiliary function

$$w(x, t) = h(x, t) + \frac{\alpha_0}{2(n-1)} |x' - x'_0|^2 + \alpha_0(t_0 - t) - \left(\alpha_0 + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}\right) x_n^2,$$

where $\alpha_0 = \delta_0/2c_n^2$. It is immediate to check that

$$w(x_0, t_0) < 0, \quad (\Delta - \partial_t)w \leq 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1 \setminus \Lambda.$$

Now, consider the function w in the set $U = (Q_{3/4} \cap \{|x_n| \leq c_n, t \leq t_0\}) \setminus \Lambda$. By the maximum principle, we must have

$$\inf_{\partial_p U} w < 0.$$

Analyzing the different parts of $\partial_p U$ we show that this inequality cannot hold:

- 1) On $\Lambda \cap \partial_p U$ we have $w \geq 0$.
- 2) On $\{|x_n| = c_n\} \cap \partial_p U$ we have

$$w(x, t) \geq h(x, t) - 2\alpha_0 x_n^2 \geq \delta_0 - 2\alpha_0 c_n^2 \geq 0,$$

if $\varepsilon_0 \leq 2\alpha_0$.

- 3) On $\{|x_n| < c_n\} \cap \partial_p U$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &\geq -\varepsilon_0 + \frac{\alpha_0}{2(n-1)} |x' - x'_0|^2 - 2\alpha_0 x_n^2 \\ &\geq -\varepsilon_0 + \alpha_0 \varepsilon_n, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\varepsilon_n = \frac{1}{128(n-1)} - 2c_n^2 = \frac{3}{512(n-1)} > 0.$$

If we choose $\varepsilon_0 < \alpha_0 \varepsilon_n$, we conclude that $w \geq 0$ on this portion of $\partial_p U$.

- 4) On $t = -9/16$ we have

$$w(x, t) \geq -\varepsilon_0 + \alpha_0 \frac{5}{16} - 2\alpha_0 c_n^2 \geq -\varepsilon_0 + \alpha_0 \left(\frac{5}{16} - 2c_n^2 \right) \geq 0,$$

for $\varepsilon_0 < \alpha_0/4$.

In conclusion, if ε_0 is sufficiently small, we see that we must have $\inf_{\partial_p U} w \geq 0$, thus arriving at a contradiction with the assumption that $h(x_0, t_0) < 0$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 11.3. Let $u = u_k$ and $f = f_k$ be as in Proposition 4.4. From the assumption $\ell \geq 3$, we have that $|f| \leq M$ in S_1^+ and $|\nabla f| \leq L$ in $Q_{1/2}^+$. We also choose $\ell_0 = 2$. We thus conclude that $H_u(r) \geq r^{2\ell_0}$ for $0 < r < r_u$. In view of Theorem 7.3, the rescalings u_{r_j} converge (over a sequence $r = r_j \rightarrow 0+$) to a homogeneous global solution u_0 of degree $3/2$. Furthermore, we note that Lemma 11.4 is also applicable here. In view of Proposition 8.5, after a possible rotation in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , we may assume that

$$u_0(x, t) = C_n \operatorname{Re}(x_{n-1} + ix_n)^{3/2}.$$

It can be directly calculated that for any $e \in \partial B'_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_e u_0(x, t) &= \frac{3}{2} C_n (e \cdot e_{n-1}) \operatorname{Re}(x_{n-1} + ix_n)^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{3}{2\sqrt{2}} C_n (e \cdot e_{n-1}) \sqrt{\sqrt{x_{n-1}^2 + x_n^2} + x_{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if for any given $\eta > 0$ we consider the thin cone around e_{n-1}

$$\mathcal{C}'_\eta := \{x' = (x'', x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mid x_{n-1} \geq \eta |x''|\},$$

then it is immediate to conclude that for any $e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta$, $|e| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_e u_0 &\geq 0, & \text{in } Q_1^+ \\ \partial_e u_0 &\geq \delta_{n,\eta} > 0, & \text{in } Q_1^+ \cap \{x_n \geq c_n\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_n = 1/(32\sqrt{n-1})$ is the dimensional constant in Lemma 11.5. We next observe that, by Lemma 11.4, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$ we will have for all directions $e \in \partial B'_1$

$$|\partial_e u_{r_j} - \partial_e u_0| < \varepsilon \quad \text{on } Q_1^+,$$

provided j is sufficiently large. Moreover, note that in view of Proposition 4.4 we can estimate

$$|(\Delta - \partial_t)\partial_e u_{r_j}| = \frac{Cr_j^\ell \| (x, t) \|^{\ell-3}}{H_u(r_j)^{1/2}} \leq Cr_j^{\ell-\ell_0} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } Q_1^+.$$

Thus, the function $h = \partial_e u_{r_j}$ (evenly reflected to Q_1) will satisfy the conditions of Lemma 11.5, and therefore we conclude that

$$\partial_e u_{r_j} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2}^+, \quad \text{for any } e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta, \quad |e| = 1,$$

for $j \geq j_\eta$. Scaling back, we obtain that

$$\partial_e u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } Q_{r_\eta}^+, \quad \text{for any } e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta, \quad |e| = 1,$$

where $r_\eta = r_{j_\eta}/2$. Now a standard argument (see [PSU12, Chapter 4, Exercise 4.1]) implies that

$$\{u(x', 0, t) > 0\} \cap Q'_{r_\eta} = \{(x', t) \in Q'_{r_\eta} \mid x_{n-1} > g(x'', t)\},$$

where, for every fixed $t \in (-r_\eta^2, 0]$, $x'' \mapsto g(x'', t)$ is a Lipschitz continuous function with

$$|\nabla'' g| \leq \eta.$$

We are now left with showing that g is $(1/2)$ -Hölder continuous in t . In fact, we are going to show that $|g(x, t) - g(x, s)| = o(|t - s|^{1/2})$, uniformly in $Q''_{r_\eta/2}$.

Suppose, towards a contradiction, that for $x''_j \in B''_{r_\eta/2}$, $-r_\eta^2/4 \leq s_j < t_j \leq 0$, $t_j - s_j \rightarrow 0$, we have for some $C > 0$

$$(11.1) \quad |g(x''_j, t_j) - g(x''_j, s_j)| \geq C|t_j - s_j|^{1/2}.$$

Let

$$x'_j = (x''_j, g(x''_j, t_j)), \quad y'_j = (x''_j, g(x''_j, s_j))$$

and

$$\delta_j = \max\{|g(x''_j, t_j) - g(x''_j, s_j)|, |t_j - s_j|^{1/2}\}.$$

Let also

$$\xi'_j = \frac{y'_j - x'_j}{\delta_j}, \quad \tau_j = \frac{s_j - t_j}{\delta_j^2}.$$

Note that

$$\xi'_j = |\xi'_j|e_{n-1}, \quad (\xi'_j, \tau_j) \in \partial_p Q'_1.$$

Moreover, we claim that $\delta_j \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, we may assume that the sequences x'_j , y'_j , t_j , δ_j converge to some x' , y' , t , δ respectively. If $\delta > 0$ then we obtain that $(x', t), (y', t) \in \Gamma(v)$. But $y' - x' = |y' - x'|e_{n-1}$, which cannot happen since $\Gamma(v)$ is given as a graph $\{x_{n-1} = g(x'', t)\}$ in Q'_{r_η} . Thus, $\delta_j \rightarrow 0$.

Consider now the rescalings of u at (x_j, t_j) by the factor of δ_j :

$$(11.2) \quad w_j(x, t) = \frac{u(x_j + \delta_j x, t_j + \delta_j^2 t)}{H_{u(x_j, t_j)}(\delta_j)^{1/2}}.$$

We want to show that the sequence w_j converges to a homogeneous global solution in S_∞ , of homogeneity $3/2$. For that purpose, we first assume that r_η is so small that

$$\Gamma(u) \cap Q'_{r_\eta} = \Gamma_{3/2}^{(2)}(u) \cap Q'_{r_\eta}.$$

This is possible by the upper semicontinuity of the mapping $(x, t) \mapsto \kappa_u^{(2)}(x, t) = \Phi_{u(x,t)}^{(2)}(0+)$ on $\Gamma_*(u)$ as in Lemma 10.5, the equality $\kappa_u^{(2)}(0, 0) = \kappa_v^{(2)}(0, 0) = 3/2$, and Theorem 8.6. Moreover, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 10.5, we may assume that

$$\Phi_{u(x,t)}^{(2)}(r) < 7/4, \quad \text{if } r < r_0, \quad (x, t) \in \Gamma(u) \cap Q'_{r_\eta}.$$

This assumption implies

$$H_{u(x,t)}(r) \geq r^4, \quad \text{if } r < r_0, \quad (x, t) \in \Gamma(u) \cap Q'_{r_\eta}.$$

Otherwise, we would have $\Phi_{u(x,t)}^{(2)}(r) \geq 2$, a contradiction. As a consequence, the functions

$$\varphi_r(x, t) = \Phi_{u(x,t)}^{(2)}(r), \quad (x, t) \in \Gamma(u) \cap Q'_{r_\eta}$$

will have an explicit representation through $H_{u(x,t)}(r)$ and its derivatives, and therefore will be continuous. We thus have a monotone family of continuous functions $\{\varphi_r\}$ on a compact set $K = \Gamma(u) \cap \overline{Q'_{r_\eta/2}}$ such that

$$\varphi_r \searrow 3/2 \quad \text{on } K \quad \text{as } r \searrow 0.$$

By the theorem of Dini the convergence $\varphi_r \rightarrow 3/2$ is uniform on K . This implies that

$$\varphi_{r_j}(x_j, t_j) \rightarrow 3/2 \quad \text{for any } (x_j, t_j) \in \Gamma(u) \cap \overline{Q'_{r_\eta/2}}, \quad r_j \rightarrow 0.$$

For the functions w_j defined in (11.2) above this implies

$$\Phi_{w_j}^{(2)}(r) \rightarrow 3/2 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

for any $r > 0$. Now, analyzing the proof of Theorem 7.3, we realize that the same conclusions can be drawn about the sequence w_j as for the sequence of rescalings u_{r_j} . In particular, over a subsequence, we have $w_j \rightarrow w_0$ in $L_{2,\text{loc}}(S_\infty)$, where w_0 is a 3/2-homogeneous global solution of the Signorini problem. By Proposition 8.5 we conclude that for some direction $e_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ it must be

$$w_0(x, t) = C_n \operatorname{Re}(x' \cdot e_0 + ix_n)^{3/2}.$$

Further, since $\partial_e u \geq 0$ for unit $e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta$, we must have

$$\partial_e w_0 \geq 0, \quad \text{in } S_\infty^+, \quad e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta.$$

Therefore,

$$e_0 \cdot e \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta \Rightarrow e_0 \cdot e_{n-1} > 0.$$

Further, note that since $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f| \leq M$ in S_1^+ , and $|\nabla f| \leq L$ in $Q_{1/2}^+$, we can repeat the arguments in the proof of Lemma 11.4 (with $\ell_0 = 2$) to obtain for any $R > 0$

$$(11.3) \quad w_j \rightarrow w_0, \quad \nabla w_j \rightarrow \nabla w_0 \quad \text{in } H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(Q_R^+ \cup Q'_R).$$

Going back to the construction of the functions w_j , note that $(\xi'_j, \tau_j) \in \Gamma(w_j)$, in addition to $(\xi'_j, \tau_j) \in \partial_p Q'_1$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $(\xi'_j, \tau_j) \rightarrow (\xi'_0, \tau_0) \in \partial_p Q'_1$. But then the convergence (11.3) implies that $w_0(\xi'_0, \tau_0) = 0$ and $\nabla w_0(\xi'_0, \tau_0) = 0$. From the explicit formula for w_0 it follows that

$$(\xi'_0, \tau_0) \in \{(x', t) \in S'_\infty \mid x' \cdot e_0 = 0\},$$

or equivalently, $\xi'_0 \cdot e_0 = |\xi'_0| e_{n-1} \cdot e_0 = 0$. Since $e_{n-1} \cdot e_0 > 0$, we must have $\xi'_0 = 0$. Thus, we have proved that

$$|\xi'_j| = \frac{|g(x''_j, s_j) - g(x''_j, t_j)|}{\max\{|g(x''_j, s_j) - g(x''_j, t_j)|, |t_j - s_j|^{1/2}\}} \rightarrow 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{|g(x''_j, s_j) - g(x''_j, t_j)|}{|t_j - s_j|^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0,$$

contrary to our assumption (11.1). \square

We next show that, following an idea in [AC85], the regularity of the function g can be improved with an application of a boundary Harnack principle.

Theorem 11.6 (Hölder regularity of $\nabla'' g$). *In the conclusion of Theorem 11.3, one can take $\delta > 0$ so that $\nabla'' g \in H^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q'_\delta)$ for some $\alpha > 0$.*

To prove this theorem we first show the following nondegeneracy property of $\partial_e u$.

Proposition 11.7 (Nondenegeracy of $\partial_e u$). *Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ and $u = u_k$ be as Theorem 11.3. Then, for any $\eta > 0$ there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$\partial_e u \geq cd(x, t) \quad \text{in } Q_\delta^+, \quad \text{for any } e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta, \quad |e| = 1,$$

where

$$d(x, t) = \sup\{r \mid \tilde{Q}_r(x, t) \cap Q_\delta \subset Q_\delta \setminus \Lambda(v)\}$$

is the parabolic distance from the point (x, t) to the coincidence set $\Lambda(v) \cap Q'_\delta$.

The proof is based on the following improvement on Lemma 11.5, which is the parabolic counterpart of [CSS08, Lemma 7.3].

Lemma 11.8. *For any $\delta_0 > 0$ there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$, depending only on δ_0 and n , such that if h is a continuous function on $Q_1 \cap \{0 \leq x_n \leq c_n\}$, $c_n = 1/(32\sqrt{n-1})$, satisfying*

- i) $(\Delta - \partial_t)h \leq \varepsilon_0$ in $Q_1 \cap \{0 < x_n < c_n\}$,
- ii) $h \geq 0$ in $Q_1 \cap \{0 < x_n < c_n\}$,
- iii) $h \geq \delta_0$, on $Q_1 \cap \{x_n = c_n\}$,

then

$$h(x, t) \geq c_0 x_n \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2} \cap \{0 < x_n < c_n\}.$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Lemma 11.5. Let $(x_0, t_0) \in Q_{1/2} \cap \{0 < x_n < c_n\}$, and consider the auxiliary function

$$w(x, t) = h(x, t) + \frac{\alpha_0}{2(n-1)} |x' - x'_0|^2 + \alpha_0(t_0 - t) - \left(\alpha_0 + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}\right) x_n^2 - c_0 x_n,$$

with $\alpha_0 = \delta_0/2c_n^2$.

As before, we have $(\Delta - \partial_t)w \leq 0$ in $Q_1 \cap \{0 < x_n < c_n\}$. We now claim that $w \geq 0$ on $U^+ = Q_{3/4} \cap \{0 < x_n < c_n, t < t_0\}$. This will follow once we verify that $w \geq 0$ on $\partial_p U^+$.

We consider several cases:

- 1) On $\{x_n = 0\} \cap \partial_p U^+$, we clearly have $w \geq 0$.

2) On $\{x_n = c_n\} \cap \partial_p U^+$, one has

$$w \geq \delta_0 - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_0 c_n^2 - c_0 c_n = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0 c_n^2 - c_0 c_n \geq 0,$$

provided $\varepsilon_0 \leq \alpha_0$ and $c_0 \leq c_n \alpha_0 / 2$.

3) On $\{0 < x_n < c_n\} \cap \partial_p U^+$ we have

$$w \geq \frac{\alpha_0}{128(n-1)} - 2\alpha_0 c_n^2 - c_0 c_n \geq \frac{3\alpha_0}{512(n-1)} - c_0 c_n \geq 0,$$

provided $c_0 < 3\alpha_0 / (512(n-1)c_n)$.

4) On $\{t = -9/16\} \cap \partial_p U^+$ we have

$$w \geq \frac{5\alpha_0}{16} - 2\alpha_0 c_n^2 - c_0 c_n \geq \frac{\alpha_0}{4} - c_0 c_n \geq 0,$$

provided $c_0 < \alpha_0 / (4c_n)$.

In conclusion, for small enough ε_0 and c_0 , we have $w \geq 0$ in U , and in particular $w(x_0, t_0) \geq 0$. This implies that $h(x_0, t_0) > c_0(x_0)_n$, as claimed. \square

Proof of Proposition 11.7. Considering the rescalings u_r as in the proof of Theorem 11.3, and applying Lemma 11.8, we obtain

$$\partial_e u_r \geq c_\eta |x_n| \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2}, \quad e \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta,$$

for $0 < r = r_\eta$ small. (Here, we assume that u has been extended by even symmetry in x_n variable to Q_1 .) Besides, by choosing r small, we can also make

$$|(\Delta - \partial_t)\partial_e u_r| \leq C r^{\ell-\ell_0} \leq c_\eta \varepsilon_n \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2} \setminus \Lambda(u_r),$$

for a dimensional constant $\varepsilon_n > 0$ to be specified below. Let now $(x, t) \in Q_{1/4}^+$ and $d = d_r(x, t)$ be the parabolic distance from (x, t) to $\Lambda(u_r) \cap Q'_1$. Consider the lowest rightmost point on the boundary $\partial \tilde{Q}_d(x, t)$

$$(x_*, t_*) = (x + e_n d, t - d^2).$$

We have

$$\partial_e u_r(x_*, t_*) \geq c_0 d.$$

By the parabolic Harnack inequality (see, e.g., [Lie96, Theorems 6.17–6.18])

$$\partial_e u_r(x, t) \geq c_n c_0 d - C_n c_0 \varepsilon_n d^2 \geq c d,$$

if we take ε_n sufficiently small. Scaling back to u , we complete the proof of the proposition. \square

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 11.6 is the following version of the parabolic boundary Harnack principle for domains with thin Lipschitz complements established in [PS13, Section 7]. To state the result, we will need the following notations. For a given $L \geq 1$ and $r > 0$ denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_r'' &= \{(x'', t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \times \mathbb{R} \mid |x_i| < r, i = 1, \dots, n-2, -r^2 < t \leq 0\}, \\ \Theta_r' &= \{(x', t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} \mid (x'', t) \in \Theta_r'', |x_{n-1}| < 4nLr\}, \\ \Theta_r &= \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid (x'', t) \in \Theta_r', |x_n| < r\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 11.9 (Boundary Harnack principle). *Let*

$$\Lambda = \{(x', t) \in \Theta'_1 \mid x_{n-1} \leq g(x'', t)\}$$

for a parabolically Lipschitz function g in Θ'_1 with Lipschitz constant $L \geq 1$ such that $g(0, 0) = 0$. Let u_1, u_2 be two continuous nonnegative functions in Θ_1 such that for some positive constants c_0, C_0, M , and $i = 1, 2$,

- i) $0 \leq u_i \leq M$ in Θ_1 and $u_i = 0$ on Λ ,
- ii) $|(\Delta - \partial_t)u_i| \leq C_0$ in $\Theta_1 \setminus \Lambda$,
- iii) $u_i(x, t) \geq c_0 d(x, t)$ in $\Theta_1 \setminus \Lambda$, where $d(x, t) = \sup\{r \mid \tilde{\Theta}_r(x, t) \cap \Lambda = \emptyset\}$.

Assume additionally that u_1 and u_2 are symmetric in x_n . Then, there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{u_1}{u_2} \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(\Theta_{1/2}).$$

Furthermore, α and the bound on the corresponding norm $\|u_1/u_2\|_{H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(\Theta_{1/2})}$ depend only on n, L, c_0, C_0 , and M . \square

Remark 11.10. We note that, unlike the elliptic case, Lemma 11.9 above cannot be reduced to the other known results in the parabolic setting (see, e.g., [Kem72], [FGS84] for parabolically Lipschitz domains, or [HLN04] for parabolically NTA domains with Reifenberg flat boundary). We also note that this version of the boundary Harnack is for functions with nonzero right-hand side and therefore the nondegeneracy condition as in iii) is necessary. The elliptic version of this result has been established in [CSS08].

We are now ready to prove Theorem 11.6.

Proof of Theorem 11.6. Fix $\eta > 0$ and let $\theta = \theta_\eta$ be such that $e = (\cos \theta)e_{n-1} + (\sin \theta)e_j \in \mathcal{C}'_\eta$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-2$. Consider two functions

$$u_1 = \partial_e u \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 = \partial_{e_{n-1}} u.$$

Then, by Proposition 11.7, the conditions of Lemma 11.9 are satisfied for some rescalings of u_1 and u_2 . Hence, applying Lemma 11.9 and scaling back, we obtain that for a small $\delta > 0$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\frac{\partial_e u}{\partial_{e_{n-1}} u} \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(\Theta_\delta).$$

This gives

$$\frac{\partial_{e_j} u}{\partial_{e_{n-1}} u} \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(\Theta_\delta), \quad j = 1, \dots, n-2.$$

Hence, the level surfaces $\{u = \varepsilon\} \cap \Theta'_\delta$ are given as graphs

$$x_{n-1} = g_\varepsilon(x'', t), \quad x'' \in \Theta''_\delta,$$

with uniform in ε estimates on $\langle \nabla'' g_\varepsilon \rangle_{\Theta''_\delta}^{(\alpha)}$ for small $\varepsilon > 0$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\nabla'' g \in H^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(\Theta''_\delta),$$

and this completes the proof of the theorem. \square

12. FREE BOUNDARY: SINGULAR SET

We now turn to the study of a special class of free boundary points, called *singular points*, that are characterized by the property that the coincidence set has a zero density at those points with respect to the \mathcal{H}^n measure in the thin space. In the time-independent Signorini problem the analysis of the singular set was carried in the paper [GP09].

Definition 12.1 (Singular points). Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q_1')$, $\ell \geq 2$. We say that $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_*(v)$ is *singular* if

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(\Lambda(v) \cap Q_r'(x_0, t_0))}{\mathcal{H}^n(Q_r')} = 0.$$

We will denote the set of singular points by $\Sigma(u)$ and call it the *singular set*. We can further classify singular points according to the homogeneity of their blowup, by defining

$$\Sigma_\kappa(v) := \Sigma(v) \cap \Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(v), \quad \kappa \leq \ell.$$

Since we are going to work with the blowups, we will write $\ell = k + \gamma$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, and construct the functions $u_k \in \mathfrak{S}^{f_k}(S_1^+)$ as in Proposition 4.4. By abusing the notation, we will write $0 \in \Sigma_\kappa(u_k)$ whenever $0 \in \Sigma_\kappa(v)$. Also, for technical reasons, similarly to what we did in the study of the regular set, we will assume that $\ell \geq 3$ for most of the results in this section.

The following proposition gives a complete characterization of the singular points in terms of the blowups and the generalized frequency. In particular, it establishes that

$$\Sigma_\kappa(v) = \Gamma_\kappa(v) \quad \text{for } \kappa = 2m < \ell, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proposition 12.2 (Characterization of singular points). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f(x, t)| \leq M\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$ in S_1^+ , $|\nabla f(x, t)| \leq L\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-3}$ in $Q_{1/2}^+$, $\ell \geq 3$ and $0 \in \Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(u)$ with $\kappa < \ell$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $0 \in \Sigma_\kappa(u)$.
- (ii) *any blowup of u at the origin is a nonzero parabolically κ -homogeneous polynomial p_κ in S_∞ satisfying*

$$\Delta p_\kappa - \partial_t p_\kappa = 0, \quad p_\kappa(x', 0, t) \geq 0, \quad p_\kappa(x', -x_n, t) = p_\kappa(x', x_n, t).$$

We denote this class by \mathfrak{P}_κ .

- (iii) $\kappa = 2m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Recall that the rescalings u_r satisfy

$$\Delta u_r - \partial_t u_r = f_r + 2(\partial_{x_n}^+ u_r) \mathcal{H}^n|_{\Lambda(u_r)} \quad \text{in } S_{1/r},$$

in the sense of distributions, after an even reflection in x_n variable. Since u_r are uniformly bounded in $W_2^{2,1}(Q_{2R}^+)$ for small r by Theorem 7.3, $\partial_{x_n}^+ u_r$ are uniformly bounded in $L_2(Q_R')$. On the other hand, if $0 \in \Sigma(u)$, then

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}^n(\Lambda(u_r) \cap Q_R')}{R^n} = \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(\Lambda(u) \cap Q_{Rr})}{(Rr)^n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0,$$

and therefore

$$(\partial_{x_n}^+ u_r) \mathcal{H}^n|_{\Lambda(u_r)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } Q_R.$$

in the sense of distributions. Further, the bound $|f(x, t)| \leq M\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |f_r(x, t)| &= \frac{r^2 |f(rx, r^2 t)|}{H_u(r)^{1/2}} \leq \frac{Mr^\ell}{H_u(r)^{1/2}} \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2} \\ &\leq Cr^{\ell-\ell_0} R^{\ell-2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } Q_R, \end{aligned}$$

where $\ell_0 \in (\kappa, \ell)$ and we have used the fact that $H_u(r) \geq r^{2\ell_0}$ for $0 < r < r_u$. Hence, any blowup u_0 is caloric in Q_R for any $R > 0$, meaning that it is caloric in the entire $S_\infty = \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, 0]$. On the other hand, by Proposition 7.3(iv), the blowup u_0 is homogeneous in S_∞ and therefore has a polynomial growth at infinity. Then by the Liouville theorem we can conclude that u_0 must be a homogeneous caloric polynomial p_κ of a certain integer degree κ . Note that $p_\kappa = u_0 \not\equiv 0$ by construction. The properties of u also imply that $p_\kappa(x', 0, t) \geq 0$ for all $(x', t) \in S'_\infty$ and $p_\kappa(x', -x_n, t) = p_\kappa(x', x_n, t)$ for all $(x', x_n, t) \in S_\infty$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) Let p_κ be a blowup of u at the origin. Since p_κ is a polynomial, clearly $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$. If κ is odd, the nonnegativity of p_κ on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\} \times \{-1\}$ implies that p_κ vanishes there identically, implying that $p_\kappa \equiv 0$ on S'_∞ . On the other hand, from the even symmetry in x_n we also have that $\partial_{x_n} p_\kappa \equiv 0$ on S'_∞ . Since p_κ is caloric in \mathbb{R}^n and S'_∞ is not characteristic for the heat operator, Holmgren's uniqueness theorem implies that $p_\kappa \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n , contrary to the assumption. Thus, $\kappa \in \{2m \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii) The proof of this implication is stated as a separate Liouville-type result in Lemma 12.3 below.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Suppose that 0 is not a singular point and that over some sequence $r = r_j \rightarrow 0+$ we have $\mathcal{H}^n(\Lambda(u_r) \cap Q'_1) \geq \delta > 0$. By Lemma 11.4, taking a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that u_{r_j} converges locally uniformly to a blowup u_0 . We claim that

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\Lambda(u_0) \cap Q'_1) \geq \delta > 0.$$

Indeed, otherwise there exists an open set U in S'_∞ with $\mathcal{H}^n(U) < \delta$ such that $\Lambda(u_0) \cap \overline{Q'_1} \subset U$. Then for large j we must have $\Lambda(u_{r_j}) \cap \overline{Q'_1} \subset U$, which is a contradiction, since $\mathcal{H}^n(\Lambda(u_{r_j}) \cap \overline{Q'_1}) \geq \delta > \mathcal{H}^n(U)$. Since $u_0 = p_\kappa$ is a polynomial, vanishing on a set of positive \mathcal{H}^n -measure on S'_∞ , it follows that u_0 vanishes identically on S'_∞ . But then, applying Holmgren's uniqueness theorem one more time, we conclude that u_0 must vanish on S_∞ , which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

The implication (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) in Proposition 12.2 is equivalent to the following Liouville-type result, which is the parabolic counterpart of Lemma 1.3.3 in [GP09].

Lemma 12.3. *Let v be a parabolically κ -homogeneous solution of the parabolic Signorini problem in S_∞ with $\kappa = 2m$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then v is a caloric polynomial.*

This, in turn, is a particular case of the following lemma, analogous to Lemma 1.3.4 in [GP09] in the elliptic case, which stems from Lemma 7.6 in [Mon09].

Lemma 12.4. *Let $v \in W_{2,\text{loc}}^{1,1}(S_\infty)$ be such that $\Delta v - \partial_t v \leq 0$ in S_∞ and $\Delta v - \partial_t v = 0$ in $S_\infty \setminus S'_\infty$. If v is parabolically $2m$ -homogeneous, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and has a polynomial growth at infinity, then $\Delta v - \partial_t v = 0$ in S_∞ .*

Proof. Consider $\mu := \Delta v - \partial_t v$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, 0)$. By the assumptions, μ is a nonpositive measure, supported on $\{x_n = 0\} \times (-\infty, 0)$. We are going to show that in fact $\mu = 0$. To this end, let $P(x, t)$ be a parabolically $2m$ -homogeneous caloric polynomial, which is positive on $\{x_n = 0\} \times (-\infty, 0)$. For instance, one can take

$$P(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}(x_j + ix_n)^{2m} + (-1)^m \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{m!}{(m-k)!(2k)!} x_n^{2k} t^{m-k}.$$

It is straightforward to check that P is caloric. Moreover on $\{x_n = 0\} \times (-\infty, 0)$ we have

$$P = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} x_j^{2m} + (-t)^m,$$

so it is positive on $\{x_n = 0\} \times (-\infty, 0)$. Further, let $\eta \in C_0^\infty((0, \infty))$, with $\eta \geq 0$, and define

$$\Psi(x, t) = \eta(t)G(x, t) = \frac{\eta(t)}{(-4\pi t)^{n/2}} e^{|x|^2/4t}.$$

Note that we have the following identity (similar to that of $G(x, t)$)

$$\nabla \Psi = \frac{x}{2t} \Psi.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta v, \Psi P \rangle &= - \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla v \cdot \nabla(\Psi P) \, dx \, dt \\ &= - \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\Psi \nabla v \cdot \nabla P + P \nabla v \cdot \nabla \Psi] \, dx \, dt \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\Psi v \Delta P + v \nabla \Psi \cdot \nabla P - P \nabla v \cdot \nabla \Psi] \, dx \, dt \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[v \Delta P + \frac{1}{2t} v (x \cdot \nabla P) - \frac{1}{2t} P (x \cdot \nabla v) \right] \Psi \, dx \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the identities $\Delta P - \partial_t P = 0$, $x \cdot \nabla P + 2t \partial_t P = 2mP$, $x \cdot \nabla v + 2t \partial_t v = 2mv$ to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta v, \Psi P \rangle &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [2mPv - P(x \cdot \nabla v)] \frac{\Psi}{2t} \, dx \, dt \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_t v \Psi P \, dx \, dt \\ &= \langle \partial_t v, \Psi P \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\langle \mu, \Psi P \rangle = \langle \Delta v - \partial_t v, \Psi P \rangle = 0$. Since μ is a nonpositive measure, this implies that actually $\mu = 0$ and the proof is complete. \square

Definition 12.5. Throughout the rest of the paper we denote by \mathfrak{P}_κ , $\kappa = 2m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the class of κ -homogeneous harmonic polynomials described in Proposition 12.2(ii).

In the rest of this section we state our main results concerning the singular set: κ -differentiability at singular points (Theorem 12.6) and a structural theorem on the singular set (Theorem 12.12). The proofs will require additional technical tools (two families of monotonicity formulas) that we develop in the next section. The proofs themselves will be given in Section 14.

Theorem 12.6 (κ -differentiability at singular points). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f(x, t)| \leq M\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$ in S_1^+ , $|\nabla f(x, t)| \leq L\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-3}$ in $Q_{1/2}^+$, $\ell \geq 3$, and $0 \in \Sigma_\kappa(u)$ for $\kappa = 2m < \ell$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there exists a nonzero $p_\kappa \in \mathfrak{P}_\kappa$ such that*

$$u(x, t) = p_\kappa(x, t) + o(\|(x, t)\|^\kappa), \quad t \leq 0.$$

Moreover, if $v \in \mathfrak{S}^\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q_1')$, $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa(v)$ and $u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}$ is obtained as in Proposition 4.4 for $v^{(x_0, t_0)} = v(x_0 + \cdot, t_0 + \cdot)$, then in the Taylor expansion

$$u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) = p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) + o(\|(x, t)\|^\kappa), \quad t \leq 0,$$

the mapping $(x_0, t_0) \mapsto p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}$ from $\Sigma_\kappa(v)$ to \mathfrak{P}_κ is continuous.

Remark 12.7. Note that since \mathfrak{P}_κ is a convex subset of a finite-dimensional vector space, namely the space of all κ -homogeneous polynomials, its topology can be induced from any norm on that space. For instance, the topology can be induced from the embedding of \mathfrak{P}_κ into $L_2(S_1^+, G)$, or even into $L_2(Q_1')$, since the elements of \mathfrak{P}_κ can be uniquely recovered from their restriction to the thin space.

Remark 12.8. We want to emphasize here that the asymptotic development, as stated in Theorem 12.6, does not generally hold for $t > 0$. Indeed, consider the following example. Let $u : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that

- $u(x, t) = -t - x_n^2/2$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \leq 0$.
- In $\{x_n \geq 0, t \geq 0\}$, u solves the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u - \partial_t u &= 0, & x_n > 0, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) &= -x_n^2, & x_n \geq 0, \\ u(x', 0, t) &= 0 & t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

- In $\{x_n \leq 0, t \geq 0\}$, we extend the function by even symmetry in x_n :

$$u(x', x_n, t) = u(x', -x_n, t).$$

It is easy to see that u solves the parabolic Signorini problem with zero obstacle and zero right-hand side in all of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, u is homogeneous of degree two and clearly $0 \in \Sigma_2(u)$. Now, if $p(x, t) = -t - x_n^2/2$, then $p \in \mathfrak{P}_2$ and we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= p(x, t), & \text{for } t \leq 0, \\ u(x', 0, t) &= 0, \quad p(x', 0, t) = -t & \text{for } t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So for $t \geq 0$ the difference $u(x, t) - p(x, t)$ is not $o(\|(x, t)\|^2)$, despite being zero for $t \leq 0$.

We next want to state a structural theorem for the singular set, similar to the ones in [Caf98] for the classical obstacle problem and [GP09] for the thin obstacle problem. In order to do so, we define the spatial dimension $d = d_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)}$ of $\Sigma_{\kappa}(v)$ at a given point (x_0, t_0) based on the polynomial $p_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)}$.

Definition 12.9 (Spatial dimension of the singular set). For a singular point $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_{\kappa}(v)$ we define

$$d_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)} = \dim\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mid \xi \cdot \nabla_{x'} \partial_{x'}^{\alpha'} \partial_t^j p_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)} = 0 \\ \text{for any } \alpha' = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}) \text{ and } j \geq 0 \text{ such that } |\alpha'| + 2j = \kappa - 1\},$$

which we call the *spatial dimension* of $\Sigma_{\kappa}(v)$ at (x_0, t_0) . Clearly, $d_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)}$ is an integer between 0 and $n - 1$. Then, for any $d = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ define

$$\Sigma_{\kappa}^d(v) := \{(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_{\kappa}(v) \mid d_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)} = d\}.$$

The case $d = n - 1$ deserves a special attention.

Lemma 12.10 (Time-like singular points). *Let $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_{\kappa}^{n-1}(v)$, $\kappa = 2m < \ell$. Then*

$$p_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) = C(-1)^m \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{t^{m-k}}{(m-k)!} \frac{x_n^{2k}}{2k!},$$

for some positive constant C . In other words, $p_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)}$ depends only on x_n and t and is unique up to a multiplicative factor. We call such singular points *time-like*.

Proof. The condition $d_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)} = n - 1$ is equivalent to the following property of $p_{\kappa} = p_{\kappa}^{(x_0, t_0)}$:

$$\nabla_{x'} \partial_{x'}^{\alpha'} \partial_t^j p_{\kappa} = 0,$$

for any multi-index $\alpha' = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ and j such that $|\alpha'| + 2j = \kappa - 1$. It is easy to see that this is equivalent to vanishing of $\partial_{x_i} p_{\kappa}$ on S'_{∞} for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$. On the other hand, $\partial_{x_i} p_{\kappa}$ is caloric in S_{∞} and is also even symmetric in x_n variable, implying that $\partial_{x_n} \partial_{x_i} p_{\kappa} = 0$ on S'_{∞} . Then, by Holmgren's uniqueness theorem $\partial_{x_i} p_{\kappa}$ is identically 0 in S_{∞} , implying that $p_{\kappa}(x, t)$ depends only on x_n and t . The homogeneity of p_{κ} implies that we can write it in the form

$$p_{\kappa}(x, t) = \sum_{k=0}^m a_k \frac{t^{m-k}}{(m-k)!} \frac{x_n^{2k}}{(2k)!}.$$

The rest of the proof is then elementary. \square

Definition 12.11 (Space-like and time-like manifolds). We say that a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional manifold $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$, $d = 0, \dots, n - 2$, is *space-like* of class $C^{1,0}$, if locally, after a rotation of coordinate axes in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} one can represent it as a graph

$$(x_{d+1}, \dots, x_{n-1}) = g(x_1, \dots, x_d, t),$$

where g is of class $C^{1,0}$, i.e., g and $\partial_{x_i} g$, $i = 1, \dots, d$ are continuous.

We say that $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifold $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ is *time-like* of class C^1 if it can be represented locally as

$$t = g(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}),$$

where g is of class C^1 .




FIGURE 4. Structure of the singular set $\Sigma(v) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, 0]$ for the solution v with $v(x_1, x_2, 0, t) = -t(t + x_1^2)^4$, $t \leq 0$ with zero thin obstacle. Note that the points on Σ_4^1 and Σ_{10}^1 are space-like, and the points on Σ_2^2 are time-like.

Theorem 12.12 (Structure of the singular set). *Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q_1')$, $\ell \geq 3$. Then, for any $\kappa = 2m < \ell$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\Gamma_\kappa(v) = \Sigma_\kappa(v)$. Moreover, for every $d = 0, 1, \dots, n-2$, the set $\Sigma_\kappa^d(v)$ is contained in a countable union of $(d+1)$ -dimensional space-like $C^{1,0}$ manifolds and $\Sigma_\kappa^{n-1}(v)$ is contained in a countable union of $(n-1)$ -dimensional time-like C^1 manifolds.*

For a small illustration, see Fig. 4.

13. WEISS AND MONNEAU TYPE MONOTONICITY FORMULAS

In this section we construct two families of monotonicity formulas that will play a crucial role in the study of the singular set. They generalize the corresponding formulas in [GP09] in the study of the elliptic thin obstacle problem.

The first family of monotonicity formulas goes back to the work of Weiss [Wei99a] in the elliptic case and [Wei99b] in the parabolic case; see also [CPS04].

Theorem 13.1 (Weiss-type monotonicity formula). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f(x, t)| \leq M\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$ in S_1^+ , $\ell \geq 2$. For any $\kappa \in (0, \ell)$, define the Weiss energy functional*

$$\begin{aligned} W_u^\kappa(r) &:= \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} \left(|t| |\nabla u|^2 - \frac{\kappa}{2} u^2 \right) G \\ &= \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa}} \left(I_u(r) - \frac{\kappa}{2} H_u(r) \right), \quad 0 < r < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $\sigma < \ell - \kappa$ there exists $C > 0$ depending only on σ , ℓ , M , and n , such that

$$\frac{d}{dr} W_u^\kappa \geq -Cr^{2\sigma-1}, \quad \text{for a.e. } r \in (0, 1).$$

In particular, the function

$$r \mapsto W_u^\kappa(r) + Cr^{2\sigma}$$

is monotonically nondecreasing for $r \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. The proof is by direct computation using Proposition 6.2. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
r^{2\kappa+1} \frac{d}{dr} W_u^\kappa(r) &= r I'_u(r) - 2\kappa I_u(r) - \frac{\kappa}{2} r H'_u(r) + \kappa^2 H_u(r) \\
&\geq r \left(\frac{1}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} (Zu)^2 G \, dx \, dt + \frac{2}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} t(Zu) f G \, dx \, dt \right) - 2\kappa I_u(r) \\
&\quad - \frac{\kappa}{2} r \left(\frac{4}{r} I_u(r) - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} t u f G \, dx \, dt \right) + \kappa^2 H_u(r) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} (Zu)^2 G \, dx \, dt + \frac{2}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} t(Zu) f G \, dx \, dt \\
&\quad + \frac{2\kappa}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} t u f G \, dx \, dt - 4\kappa I_u(r) + \kappa^2 H_u(r) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} (Zu)^2 G \, dx \, dt + \frac{2}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} t(Zu) f G \, dx \, dt + \frac{2\kappa}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} t u f G \, dx \, dt \\
&\quad - 4\kappa \left(\frac{1}{2r^2} \int_{S_r^+} u(Zu) G \, dx \, dt + \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} t u f G \, dx \, dt \right) + \kappa^2 \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} u^2 \, dx \, dt \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} (Zu + t f - \kappa u)^2 G \, dx \, dt - \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \, dx \, dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the integral estimate on f as at the beginning of Section 10, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dr} W_u^\kappa(r) &\geq -\frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \, dx \, dt \\
&\geq -C \frac{r^{2\ell+2}}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \\
&\geq -C r^{2\sigma-1},
\end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired conclusion. \square

Note that in Theorem 13.1, we do not require $0 \in \Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(u)$. However, if we do so, then we will have the following fact.

Lemma 13.2. *Let u be as in Theorem 13.1, and assume additionally that $0 \in \Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(u)$, $\kappa < \ell$. Then,*

$$W_u^\kappa(0+) = 0.$$

The proof will require the following growth estimate, which we will use a few more times in the remaining part of the paper.

Lemma 13.3 (Growth estimate). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f(x, t)| \leq M \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$, $\ell \geq 2$, and $0 \in \Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(u)$ with $\kappa < \ell$ and let $\sigma < \ell - \kappa$. Then*

$$H_r(u) \leq C(\|u\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)}^2 + M^2) r^{2\kappa}, \quad 0 < r < 1,$$

with C depending only on σ, ℓ, n .

Proof. Take $\mu(r) = (\|u\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)}^2 + M^2)r^{2\ell-2\sigma}$ and proceed as in the proof of Lemma 9.2. We omit the details. \square

We can now prove Lemma 13.2.

Proof of Lemma 13.2. Since $\kappa < \ell$, by Lemma 7.1 we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{I_u(r)}{H_u(r)} = \frac{\kappa}{2}.$$

Further, by Lemma 13.3 above, we will have

$$H_u(r) \leq Cr^{2\kappa}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} W_u^\kappa(r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{H_u(r)}{r^{2\kappa}} \left(\frac{I_u(r)}{H_u(r)} - \frac{\kappa}{2} \right) = 0. \quad \square$$

The next monotonicity formula is specifically tailored for singular points. It goes back to the paper of Monneau [Mon03] for the classical obstacle problem. The theorem below is the parabolic counterpart of the Monneau-type monotonicity formula in [GP09].

Theorem 13.4 (Monneau-type monotonicity formula). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f(x, t)| \leq M\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$ in S_1^+ , $|\nabla f(x, t)| \leq L\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-3}$ in $Q_{1/2}^+$, $\ell \geq 3$. Suppose that $0 \in \Sigma_\kappa(u)$ with $\kappa = 2m < \ell$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Further, let p_κ be any parabolically κ -homogeneous caloric polynomial from class \mathfrak{P}_κ as in Definition 12.5. For any such p_κ , define Monneau's functional as*

$$\begin{aligned} M_{u, p_\kappa}^\kappa(r) &:= \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} (u - p_\kappa)^2 G, \quad 0 < r < 1, \\ &= \frac{H_w(r)}{r^{2\kappa}}, \quad \text{where } w = u - p_\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $\sigma < \ell - \kappa$ there exists a constant C , depending only on σ , ℓ , M , and n , such that

$$\frac{d}{dr} M_{u, p_\kappa}^\kappa(r) \geq -C \left(1 + \|u\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} + \|p_\kappa\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} \right) r^{\sigma-1}.$$

In particular, the function

$$r \mapsto M_{u, p_\kappa}^\kappa(r) + Cr^\sigma$$

is monotonically nondecreasing for $r \in (0, 1)$ for a constant C depending σ , ℓ , M , n , $\|u\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)}$, and $\|p_\kappa\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)}$.

Proof. First note that $W_{p_\kappa}^\kappa(r)$ is constant in r , which follows easily from the homogeneity of p_κ . Then, since also $0 \in \Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(p_\kappa)$, by Lemma 13.2 we have $W_{p_\kappa}^\kappa(0+) = 0$, implying that

$$W_{p_\kappa}^\kappa(r) \equiv 0.$$

Therefore, integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_u^\kappa(r) &= W_u^\kappa(r) - W_{p_\kappa}^\kappa(r) \\
&= W_w^\kappa(r) - \frac{2}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} t \nabla w \nabla p_\kappa G - \frac{\kappa}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} w p_\kappa G \\
&= W_w^\kappa(r) + \frac{2}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} t w (\Delta p_\kappa G + \nabla p_\kappa \nabla G) - \frac{\kappa}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} w p_\kappa G \\
&= W_w^\kappa(r) + \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} 2 t w \left(\partial_t p_\kappa + \nabla p_\kappa \frac{x}{2t} \right) G - \frac{\kappa}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} w p_\kappa G \\
&= W_w^\kappa(r) + \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} w (Z p_\kappa - \kappa p_\kappa) G \\
&= W_w^\kappa(r).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we want to compute the derivative of M_{u,p_κ}^κ . With this objective in mind, we remark that we can compute the derivative of H_w by a formula similar to that in Lemma 6.1:

$$H'_w(r) = \frac{4}{r} I_w(r) - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S_r^+} t w f G - \frac{4}{r^3} \int_{S'_r} t w_{x_n} w G,$$

for a.e. $r \in (0, 1)$. Indeed, we first note that Lemma 6.1 holds for smooth functions with a polynomial growth at infinity, since the same spatial integration by parts used to derive Lemma 6.1 is still valid. Then, as in Proposition 6.2 approximate u by the solutions u^ε of the penalized problem, apply Lemma 6.1 for $(H_{w^\varepsilon}^\delta)'(r)$, where $w^\varepsilon = u^\varepsilon \zeta - p_\kappa$, and then pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$ as in Proposition 6.2. We thus arrive at the formula for $H'_w(r)$ given above.

We therefore can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dr} M_{u,p_\kappa}^\kappa(r) &= \frac{H'_w(r)}{r^{2\kappa}} - \frac{2\kappa}{r^{2\kappa+1}} H_w(r) \\
&= \frac{4}{r^{2\kappa+1}} I_w(r) - \frac{4}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \int_{S_r^+} t w f G - \frac{4}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \int_{S'_r} t w_{x_n} w G - \frac{2\kappa}{r^{2\kappa+1}} H_w(r) \\
&= \frac{4}{r} W_w^\kappa(r) - \frac{4}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \int_{S_r^+} t w f G + \frac{4}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \int_{S'_r} t u_{x_n} p_\kappa G.
\end{aligned}$$

We now estimate each term on the right hand side.

To estimate the first term we use that, in view of Theorem 13.1, for an appropriately chosen C , the function $W_u^\kappa(r) + C r^{2\sigma}$ is nondecreasing, and therefore

$$W_w^\kappa(r) = W_u^\kappa(r) \geq W_u^\kappa(0+) - C r^{2\sigma} = -C r^{2\sigma},$$

where in the last equality we have used Lemma 13.2.

The second term can be estimated by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the integral estimate on f at the beginning of Section 10, and Lemma 13.3:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \int_{S_r^+} t w f G &\leq \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+3}} \left(\int_{S_r^+} w^2 G \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{S_r^+} t^2 f^2 G \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{Cr}{r^{2\kappa+3}} (H_u(r)^{1/2} + H_{p_\kappa}(r)^{1/2}) C r^{\ell+1} \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \|u\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} + \|p_\kappa\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} \right) r^{\ell-\kappa-1} \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \|u\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} + \|p_\kappa\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} \right) r^{\sigma-1}. \end{aligned}$$

For the last term, just notice that on S'_1 ,

$$t \leq 0, \quad u_{x_n} \leq 0, \quad p_\kappa \geq 0$$

and thus,

$$\int_{S'_r} t u_{x_n} p_\kappa G \geq 0.$$

Combining all these estimates, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} M_{u, p_\kappa}^\kappa(r) &\geq -C r^{2\sigma-1} - C \left(1 + \|u\|_{L_2(S_1, G)} + \|p_\kappa\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} \right) r^{\sigma-1} \\ &\geq -C \left(1 + \|u\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} + \|p_\kappa\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} \right) r^{\sigma-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired conclusion. \square

14. STRUCTURE OF THE SINGULAR SET

In this section, we prove our main results on the singular set, stated at the end of Section 14 as Theorems 12.6 and 12.12.

We start by remarking that in the following proofs it will be more convenient to work with a slightly different type of rescalings and blowups, than the ones used up to now. Namely, we will work with the following κ -homogeneous rescalings

$$u_r^{(\kappa)}(x, t) := \frac{u(rx, r^2 t)}{r^\kappa}$$

and their limits as $r \rightarrow 0+$. The next lemma shows the viability of this approach.

Lemma 14.1 (Nondegeneracy at singular points). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f(x, t)| \leq M \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$ in S_1^+ , $|\nabla f(x, t)| \leq L \|(x, t)\|^{\ell-3}$ in $Q_{1/2}^+$, $\ell \geq 3$, and $0 \in \Sigma_\kappa(u)$ for $\kappa < \ell$. Then, there exists $c = c_u > 0$ such that*

$$H_u(r) \geq c r^{2\kappa}, \quad \text{for any } 0 < r < 1.$$

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then for a sequence $r = r_j \rightarrow 0$ one has

$$H_u(r) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{S_1^+} u^2 G = o(r^{2\kappa}).$$

Since 0 is a singular point, by Proposition 12.2, we have that, over a subsequence,

$$u_r(x, t) = \frac{u(rx, r^2 t)}{H_u(r)^{1/2}} \rightarrow q_\kappa(x, t),$$

as described in Theorem 7.3, for some nonzero $q_\kappa \in \mathfrak{P}_\kappa$. Now, for such q_κ we apply Theorem 13.4 to $M_{u,q_\kappa}^\kappa(r)$. From the assumption on the growth of u it is easy to recognize that

$$M_{u,q_\kappa}^\kappa(0+) = \int_{S_1^+} q_\kappa^2 G = \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} q_\kappa^2 G.$$

Therefore, using the monotonicity of $M_{u,q_\kappa}^\kappa(r) + C r^\sigma$ (see Theorem 13.4) for an appropriately chosen $C > 0$, we will have that

$$C r^\sigma + \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} (u - q_\kappa)^2 G \geq \frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} q_\kappa^2 G,$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{1}{r^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_r^+} (u^2 - 2uq_\kappa) G \geq -C r^\sigma.$$

After rescaling, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r^{2\kappa}} \int_{S_1^+} (H_u(r) u_r^2 - 2H_u(r)^{1/2} r^\kappa u_r q_\kappa) G \geq -C r^\sigma,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\int_{S_1^+} \left(\frac{H_u(r)^{1/2}}{r^\kappa} u_r^2 - 2u_r q_\kappa \right) G \geq -C \frac{r^{\kappa+\sigma}}{H_u(r)^{1/2}}.$$

Now from the arguments in the proof of Lemma 7.4, we have $H_u(r) > c r^{2\kappa'}$, for any $\kappa' > \kappa$, for sufficiently small r . Hence, choosing $\kappa' < \kappa + \sigma$, we will have that $r^{\kappa+\sigma}/H_u(r)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$. Thus, passing to the limit over $r = r_j \rightarrow 0$, we will arrive at

$$-\int_{S_1^+} q_\kappa^2 \geq 0,$$

which is a contradiction, since $q_\kappa \neq 0$. \square

One consequence of the nondegeneracy at singular points is that the singular set has a topological type F_σ ; this will be important in our application of Whitney's extension theorem in the proof of Theorem 12.12.

Lemma 14.2 ($\Sigma_\kappa(v)$ is F_σ). *For any $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell,\ell/2}(Q_1')$, the set $\Sigma_\kappa(v)$ with $\kappa = 2m < \ell$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, is of topological type F_σ , i.e., it is a union of countably many closed sets.*

Proof. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \geq 2$, let E_j be the set of points $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa(v) \cap \overline{Q_{1-1/j}}$ satisfying

$$(14.1) \quad \frac{1}{j} r^{2\kappa} \leq H_{u_{(x_0, t_0)}}(r) \leq j r^{2\kappa}$$

for every $0 < r < \min\{1 - |x_0|, \sqrt{1 + t_0}\}$.

By Lemmas 13.3 and 14.1, we have that

$$\Sigma_\kappa(v) \subset \bigcup_{j=2}^{\infty} E_j.$$

So to complete the proof, it is enough to show that E_j are closed. Indeed, if $(x_0, t_0) \in \overline{E_j}$, then it readily satisfies (14.1). That, in turn, implies that $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma_\kappa^{(\ell)}(v)$ and by Proposition 12.2 that $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa(v)$. Hence $(x_0, t_0) \in E_j$. This completes the proof. \square

We next show the existence and uniqueness of blowups with respect to κ -homogeneous rescalings.

Theorem 14.3 (Uniqueness of κ -homogeneous blowups at singular points). *Let $u \in \mathfrak{S}^f(S_1^+)$ with $|f(x, t)| \leq M\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-2}$ in S_1^+ , $|\nabla f(x, t)| \leq L\|(x, t)\|^{\ell-3}$ in $Q_{1/2}^+$, $\ell \geq 3$, and $0 \in \Sigma_\kappa(u)$ with $\kappa < \ell$. Then there exists a unique nonzero $p_\kappa \in \mathfrak{P}_\kappa$ such that*

$$u_r^{(\kappa)}(x, t) := \frac{u(rx, r^2t)}{r^\kappa} \rightarrow p_\kappa(x, t).$$

Proof. By Lemmas 13.3 and 14.1, there are positive constants c and C such that

$$c r^\kappa \leq H_u(r)^{1/2} \leq C r^\kappa, \quad 0 < r < 1.$$

This implies that any limit u_0 of the κ -homogeneous rescalings $u_r^{(\kappa)}$ over any sequence $r = r_j \rightarrow 0+$ is just a positive multiple of a limit of regular rescalings $u_r(x, t) = u(rx, r^2t)/H_u(r)^{1/2}$, since over a subsequence $H_u(r)^{1/2}/r^\kappa$ converges to a positive number. Since the limits of rescalings u_r are polynomials of class \mathfrak{P}_κ , we obtain also that $u_0 \in \mathfrak{P}_\kappa$.

To show the uniqueness of u_0 , we apply Theorem 13.4 with $p_\kappa = u_0$. This result implies that the limit $M_{u, u_0}^\kappa(0+)$ exists and can be computed by

$$M_{u, u_0}^\kappa(0+) = \lim_{r_j \rightarrow 0+} M_{u, u_0}^\kappa(r_j) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_1^+} (u_{r_j}^{(\kappa)} - u_0)^2 G = 0.$$

The latter equality is a consequence of Theorem 7.3, and of the argument at the beginning of this proof. In particular, we obtain that

$$\int_{S_1^+} (u_r^{(\kappa)} - u_0)^2 G = M_{u, u_0}^\kappa(r) \rightarrow 0$$

as $r \rightarrow 0+$ (not just over $r = r_j \rightarrow 0+$). Thus, if u'_0 is a limit of $u_r^{(\kappa)}$ over another sequence $r = r'_j \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that

$$\int_{S_1^+} (u'_0 - u_0)^2 G = 0.$$

This implies that $u'_0 = u_0$ and completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Theorem 14.4 (Continuous dependence of blowup). *Let $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\varphi(Q_1^+)$ with $\varphi \in H^{\ell, \ell/2}(Q'_1)$, $\ell \geq 3$, and $\kappa = 2m < \ell$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa(v)$, let $u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}$ be as constructed in Proposition 4.4 for the function $v^{(x_0, t_0)} = v(x_0 + \cdot, t_0 + \cdot)$, and denote by $p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}$ the κ -homogeneous blowup of $u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}$ at (x_0, t_0) as in Theorem 14.3, so that*

$$u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) = p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) + o(\|(x, t)\|^\kappa).$$

Then, the mapping $(x_0, t_0) \mapsto p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}$ from $\Sigma_\kappa(v)$ to \mathfrak{P}_κ is continuous. Moreover, for any compact subset K of $\Sigma_\kappa(v)$ there exists a modulus of continuity $\sigma = \sigma^K$, $\sigma(0+) = 0$ such that

$$|u_k^{x_0, t_0}(x, t) - p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t)| \leq \sigma(\|(x, t)\|)\|(x, t)\|^\kappa, \quad t \leq 0.$$

for any $(x_0, t_0) \in K$.

Proof. Given $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa(v)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ fix $r_\varepsilon = r_\varepsilon(x_0, t_0) > 0$ such that

$$M_{u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}, p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}}^\kappa(r_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{r_\varepsilon^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_{r_\varepsilon}^+} (u_k^{(x_0, t_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)})^2 G < \varepsilon.$$

Then, there exists $\delta_\varepsilon = \delta_\varepsilon(x_0, t_0)$ such that if $(x'_0, t'_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa(u)$ and $\|(x'_0 - x_0, t'_0 - t_0)\| < \delta_\varepsilon$ one has

$$M_{u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)}, p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}}^\kappa(r_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{r_\varepsilon^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_{r_\varepsilon}^+} (u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)})^2 G < 2\varepsilon.$$

This follows from the continuous dependence of $u_k^{(x_0, t_0)}$ on $(x_0, t_0) \in \Gamma(v)$ in $L_2(S_{r_\varepsilon}^+, G)$ norm, which is a consequence of $H^{\ell, \ell/2}$ regularity of the thin obstacle φ . Then, from Theorem 13.4, we will have that

$$M_{u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)}, p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}}^\kappa(r_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{r_\varepsilon^{2\kappa+2}} \int_{S_{r_\varepsilon}^+} (u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)})^2 G < 2\varepsilon + C r_\varepsilon^\sigma, \quad 0 < r < r_\varepsilon,$$

for a constant $C = C(x_0, t_0)$ depending on L_2 norms of $u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)}$ and $p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}$, which can be made uniform for (x'_0, t'_0) in a small neighborhood of (x_0, t_0) . Letting $r \rightarrow 0$ we will therefore obtain

$$M_{u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)}, p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}}^\kappa(0+) = \int_{S_1^+} (p_\kappa^{(x'_0, t'_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)})^2 G \leq 2\varepsilon + C r_\varepsilon^\sigma.$$

This shows the first part of the theorem (see Remark 12.7).

To show the second part, we notice that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x'_0, t'_0)}\|_{L_2(S_r^+, G)} &\leq \|u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}\|_{L_2(S_r^+, G)} \\ &\quad + \|p_\kappa^{(x'_0, t'_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}\|_{L_2(S_r^+, G)} \\ &\leq 2(2\varepsilon + C r_\varepsilon^\sigma)^{1/2} r^{\kappa+1}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\|(x'_0 - x_0, t'_0 - t_0)\| < \delta_\varepsilon$, $0 < r < r_\varepsilon$, or equivalently

$$(14.2) \quad \|w_r^{x'_0, t'_0} - p_\kappa^{(x'_0, t'_0)}\|_{L_2(S_1^+, G)} \leq 2(2\varepsilon + C r_\varepsilon^\sigma)^{1/2},$$

where

$$w_r^{(x'_0, t'_0)}(x, t) := \frac{u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)}(rx, r^2t)}{r^\kappa}$$

is the homogeneous rescaling of $u_k^{(x'_0, t'_0)}$. Making a finite cover of the compact K with full parabolic cylinders $\tilde{Q}_{\delta_\varepsilon}(x_0^i, t_0^i)(x_0^i, t_0^i)$ for some $(x_0^i, t_0^i) \in K$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, we see that (14.2) is satisfied for all $(x'_0, t'_0) \in K$, $r < r_\varepsilon^K := \min\{r_\varepsilon(x_0^i, t_0^i) \mid i = 1, \dots, N\}$ and $C = C^K := \max\{C(x_0^i, t_0^i) \mid i = 1, \dots, N\}$.

Now note that $w_r^{(x'_0, t'_0)}$ solves the parabolic Signorini problem in Q_1^+ with zero thin obstacle and the right-hand side

$$|g_r^{(x'_0, t'_0)}(x, t)| = \left| \frac{f^{(x'_0, t'_0)}(rx, r^2t)}{r^{\kappa-2}} \right| \leq Mr^{\ell-\kappa} \quad \text{in } Q_1^+.$$

Besides, $p_\kappa^{(x'_0, t'_0)}$ also solves the parabolic Signorini problem with zero thin obstacle, and zero right-hand side. This implies

$$(\Delta - \partial_t) \left(w_r^{(x'_0, t'_0)}(x, t) - p_\kappa^{(x'_0, t'_0)}(x, t) \right)_\pm \geq -Mr^{\ell-\kappa} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1,$$

and therefore using the $L_\infty - L_2$ bounds as in the proof of Theorem 7.3(iii), we obtain that

$$\|w_r^{(x'_0, t'_0)} - p_\kappa^{(x'_0, t'_0)}\|_{L_\infty(Q_{1/2})} \leq C_\varepsilon,$$

for all $(x'_0, t'_0) \in K$, $r < r_\varepsilon^K$ and $C_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. It is now easy to see that this implies the second part of the theorem. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorems 12.6 and 12.12.

Proof of Theorem 12.6. Simply combine Theorems 14.3 and 14.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 12.12.

Step 1: Parabolic Whitney's extension. For any $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa(v)$ let the polynomial $p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)} \in \mathfrak{P}_\kappa$ be as in Theorem 14.4. Write it in the expanded form

$$p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x) = \sum_{|\alpha|+2j=\kappa} \frac{a_{\alpha,j}(x_0, t_0)}{\alpha!j!} x^\alpha t^j.$$

Then, the coefficients $a_{\alpha,j}(x, t)$ are continuous on $\Sigma_\kappa(v)$. Next, for any multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and integer $j = 0, \dots, m$, let

$$f_{\alpha,j}(x, t) = \begin{cases} 0, & |\alpha| + 2j < \kappa \\ a_{\alpha,j}(x, t), & |\alpha| + 2j = \kappa, \end{cases} \quad (x, t) \in \Sigma_\kappa(v).$$

Then, we have the following compatibility lemma.

Lemma 14.5. *Let $K = E_j$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$, as in Lemma 14.2. Then for any $(x_0, t_0), (x, t) \in K$*

$$(14.3) \quad f_{\alpha,j}(x, t) = \sum_{|\beta|+2k \leq \kappa - |\alpha| - 2j} \frac{f_{\alpha+\beta, j+k}(x_0, t_0)}{\beta!k!} (x - x_0)^\beta (t - t_0)^k + R_{\alpha,j}(x, t; x_0, t_0)$$

with

$$(14.4) \quad |R_{\alpha,j}(x, t; x_0, t_0)| \leq \sigma_{\alpha,j}(\|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|) \|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|^{\kappa - |\alpha| - 2j},$$

where $\sigma_{\alpha,j} = \sigma_{\alpha,j}^K$ is a certain modulus of continuity.

Proof. 1) In the case $|\alpha| + 2j = \kappa$ we have

$$R_{\alpha,j}(x, t; x_0, t_0) = a_{\alpha,j}(x, t) - a_{\alpha,j}(x_0, t_0)$$

and the statement follows from the continuity of $a_{\alpha,j}(x, t)$ on $\Sigma_\kappa(v)$.

2) For $0 \leq |\alpha| + 2j < \kappa$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_\alpha(x, t, x_0, t_0) &= - \sum_{\substack{(\gamma, k) \geq (\alpha, j) \\ |\gamma| + 2k = \kappa}} \frac{a_{\gamma, k}(x_0, t_0)}{(\gamma - \alpha)!(k - j)!} (x - x_0)^{\gamma - \alpha} (t - t_0)^{k - j} \\
&= -\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x - x_0, t - t_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that there exists no modulus of continuity $\sigma_{\alpha, j}$ such that (14.4) is satisfied for all $(x_0, t_0), (x, t) \in K$. Then, there exists $\eta > 0$ and a sequence $(x_0^i, t_0^i), (x^i, t^i) \in K$, with

$$\max\{|x^i - x_0^i|, |t^i - t_0^i|^{1/2}\} =: \delta_i \rightarrow 0,$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(14.5) \quad & \left| \sum_{\substack{(\gamma, k) \geq (\alpha, j) \\ |\gamma| + 2k = \kappa}} \frac{a_{\gamma, k}(x_0^i)}{(\gamma - \alpha)!(k - j)!} (x^i - x_0^i)^{\gamma - \alpha} (t^i - t_0^i)^{k - j} \right| \\
& \geq \eta \|(x^i - x_0^i, t^i - t_0^i)\|^{\kappa - |\alpha| - 2j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the rescalings

$$w^i(x, t) = \frac{u_k^{(x_0^i, t_0^i)}(\delta_i x, \delta_i t^2)}{\delta_i^\kappa}, \quad (\xi^i, \tau^i) = \left(\frac{x^i - x_0^i}{\delta_i}, \frac{t^i - t_0^i}{\delta_i^2} \right).$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $(x_0^i, t_0^i) \rightarrow (x_0, t_0) \in K$ and $(\xi^i, \tau^i) \rightarrow (\xi_0, \tau_0) \in \partial \tilde{Q}_1$. Then, by Theorem 14.4, for any $R > 0$ and large i we have for a modulus of continuity $\sigma = \sigma^K$

$$|w^i(x, t) - p_\kappa^{(x_0^i, t_0^i)}(x, t)| \leq \sigma(\delta_i \|(x, t)\|) \|(x, t)\|^\kappa, \quad (x, t) \in S_R,$$

and therefore

$$(14.6) \quad w^i(x, t) \rightarrow p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) \quad \text{in } L_\infty(Q_R).$$

Note that we do not necessarily have the above convergence in the full parabolic cylinder \tilde{Q}_R . Next, consider the rescalings at (x^i, t^i) instead of (x_0^i, t_0^i)

$$\tilde{w}^i(x, t) = \frac{u_k^{(x^i, t^i)}(\delta_i x, \delta_i^2 t)}{\delta_i^\kappa}.$$

Then, by the same argument as above

$$(14.7) \quad \tilde{w}^i(x, t) \rightarrow p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) \quad \text{in } L_\infty(Q_R).$$

We then claim that the $H^{\ell, \ell/2}$ regularity of the thin obstacle φ implies that

$$(14.8) \quad w^i(x + \xi^i, t + \tau^i) - \tilde{w}^i(x, t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L_\infty(\tilde{Q}_R)$$

for any $R > 0$, or equivalently

$$(14.9) \quad w^i(x, t) - \tilde{w}^i(x - \xi^i, t - \tau^i) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L_\infty(\tilde{Q}_R).$$

Indeed, if $q_k^{(x_0, t_0)}(x', t)$ (as usual) denotes the k -th parabolic Taylor polynomial of the thin obstacle $\varphi(x')$ at (x_0, t_0) , then[†]

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{q_k^{(x_0, t_0)}(\delta_i(x' + \xi^i), \delta_i^2(t + \tau^i)) - q_k^{(x^i, t^i)}(\delta_i x', \delta_i^2 t)}{\delta_i^\kappa} \\ &= \frac{\varphi(x_0^i + \delta_i(x' + \xi^i), t_0^i + \delta_i^2(t + \tau^i)) + O(\delta_i^\ell \|(x' + \xi^i, t + \tau^i)\|^\ell)}{\delta_i^\kappa} \\ & \quad - \frac{\varphi(x^i + \delta_i x', t^i + \delta_i^2 t) + O(\delta_i^\ell \|(x', t)\|^\ell)}{\delta_i^\kappa} \\ &= O(\delta_i^{\ell-\kappa}) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

and this implies the convergence (14.8), if we write the explicit definition of w^i using the construction in Proposition 4.4.

To proceed further, we consider two different cases:

- 1) There are infinitely many indexes i such that $\tau^i \geq 0$.
- 2) There are infinitely many indexes i such that $\tau^i \leq 0$.

In both cases, passing to subsequences we may assume that $\tau^i \geq 0$ (≤ 0) for all indexes i .

In case 1) we proceed as follows. If we take any $(x, t) \in Q_1$, because of the nonpositivity of τ_i we have $(x - \xi^i, t - \tau^i) \in Q_2$. Passing to the limit in (14.6), (14.7), and (14.9), we thus obtain

$$(14.10) \quad p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t) = p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x - \xi_0, t - \tau_0), \quad \text{for any } (x, t) \in Q_1.$$

Because of the real analyticity of polynomials, it follows that (14.10) holds in fact for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. But then, we also obtain

$$(14.11) \quad p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x + \xi_0, t + \tau_0) = p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(x, t), \quad \text{for any } (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}.$$

In particular, this implies that

$$\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(\xi_0, \tau_0) = \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(0, 0) = 0, \quad |\alpha| + 2j < \kappa.$$

On the other hand, dividing both sides of (14.5) by $\delta_i^{\kappa-|\alpha|-2j}$ and passing to the limit, we obtain

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}(\xi_0, \tau_0)| = \left| \sum_{\substack{(\gamma, k) \geq (\alpha, j) \\ |\gamma| + 2k = \kappa}} \frac{a_{\gamma, k}(x_0)}{(\gamma - \alpha)!} \xi_0^{\gamma - \alpha} \tau_0^{k - j} \right| \geq \eta > 0,$$

a contradiction.

In case 2), when there are infinitely many indexes i so that $\tau^i \leq 0$, passing to the limit in (14.6), (14.7), and (14.8), we obtain (14.11) for $(x, t) \in Q_1$. Again by real analyticity, we have the same conclusion for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Then, we complete the proof arguing as in case 1). \square

So in all cases, the compatibility conditions (14.3)–(14.4) are satisfied and we can apply the parabolic Whitney's extension theorem that we have proved in Appendix B, see Theorem B.1. Thus, there exists a function $F \in C^{2m, m}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j F = f_{\alpha, j} \quad \text{on } K,$$

for any $|\alpha| + 2j \leq \kappa$.

[†]just note that the arguments inside φ are the same

Step 2: Implicit function theorem. Suppose now $(x_0, t_0) \in \Sigma_\kappa^d(v) \cap K$.

We will consider two subcases: $d \leq n-2$ and $d = n-1$.

1) $d \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$. Then, there are multi-indexes (β'_i, k_i) with $|\beta'_i| + 2k_i = \kappa - 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1-d$ such that

$$v_i = \nabla \partial_{x'}^{\beta'_i} \partial_t^{k_i} F(x_0, t_0) = \nabla \partial_{x'}^{\beta'_i} \partial_t^{k_i} p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)}$$

are linearly independent.

On the other hand,

$$\Sigma_\kappa^d(v) \cap K \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^{n-1-d} \{\partial_{x'}^{\beta'_i} \partial_t^{k_i} F = 0\}.$$

Therefore, in view of the implicit function theorem, the linear independence of v_1, \dots, v_{n-1-d} implies that $\Sigma_\kappa^d(v) \cap K$ is contained in a d -dimensional space-like $C^{1,0}$ manifold in a neighborhood of (x_0, t_0) . Finally, since $\Sigma_\kappa(u) = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty E_j$ this implies the statement of the theorem in the case $d \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$.

2) Suppose now $d = n-1$. In this case, by Lemma 12.10, we have

$$\partial_t^m F(x_0, t_0) = \partial_t^m p_\kappa^{(x_0, t_0)} \neq 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\Sigma_\kappa^d(v) \cap K \subset \{\partial_t^{m-1} F = 0\}.$$

Thus, by the implicit function theorem we obtain that $\Sigma_\kappa^d(v) \cap K$ in a neighborhood of (x_0, t_0) is contained in a time-like $(n-1)$ -dimensional C^1 manifold, as required. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

APPENDIX A. ESTIMATES IN GAUSSIAN SPACES: PROOFS

In this section we give the proofs of the estimates stated in Section 5.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. (1°) For the given $\rho > 0$, choose $\rho < \tilde{\rho} < 1$. Then, note that without loss of generality we may assume that $u(\cdot, -1) = 0$, by multiplying u with a smooth cutoff function $\eta(t)$ such that $\eta = 1$ on $[-\tilde{\rho}^2, 0]$ and $\eta = 0$ near $t = -1$.

Next, fix a cutoff function $\hat{\zeta}_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and let R be so large that $\hat{\zeta}_0$ vanishes outside B_{R-1} and u vanishes outside $B_{R-1} \times (-1, 0]$. Then, approximate u with the solutions of the penalized problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u^\varepsilon - \partial_t u^\varepsilon &= f^\varepsilon && \text{in } B_R^+ \times (-1, 0], \\ \partial_{x_n} u^\varepsilon &= \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) && \text{on } B_R' \times (-1, 0], \\ u^\varepsilon &= 0 && \text{on } (\partial B_R)^+ \times (-1, 0], \\ u^\varepsilon(\cdot, -1) &= 0 && \text{on } B_R^+, \end{aligned}$$

where f^ε is a mollification of f .

Let now $r \in [\rho, \tilde{\rho}]$ be arbitrary. Then, for any small $\delta > 0$ and $\eta \in W_2^{1,0}(B_R^+ \times (-r^2, -\delta^2])$, vanishing on $(B_R^+ \setminus B_{R-1}^+) \times (-r^2, -\delta^2]$, we will have

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [\nabla u^\varepsilon \nabla \eta + u_t^\varepsilon \eta + f^\varepsilon \eta] dx dt = - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \eta dx' dt.$$

Now, for the cutoff function $\hat{\zeta}_0$ as above, define the family of homogeneous functions in S_1 by letting

$$\zeta_k(x, t) = |t|^{k/2} \hat{\zeta}_0(x/\sqrt{|t|}).$$

Then, choosing $\eta = u^\varepsilon \zeta_1^2 G$, we will have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_1^2 G + (u^\varepsilon \nabla u^\varepsilon \nabla G \zeta_1^2 + u^\varepsilon u_t^\varepsilon \zeta_1^2 G) + 2u^\varepsilon \zeta_1 \nabla u^\varepsilon \nabla \zeta_1 G + f^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \zeta_1^2 G \\ &= - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) u^\varepsilon \zeta_1^2 G dx' dt \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $s\beta_\varepsilon(s) \geq 0$. Next, recalling that $\nabla G = \frac{x}{2t} G$ and that $Z((u^\varepsilon)^2) = 2u^\varepsilon(Zu^\varepsilon) = 2u^\varepsilon(x\nabla u^\varepsilon + 2t\partial_t u^\varepsilon)$, we can rewrite the above inequality as

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_1^2 G + \frac{1}{4t} Z((u^\varepsilon)^2) \zeta_1^2 G + 2u^\varepsilon \zeta_1 \nabla u^\varepsilon \nabla \zeta_1 G + f^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \zeta_1^2 G \leq 0.$$

We then can use the standard arguments in the proof of energy inequalities, except that we need to handle the term involving $Z((u^\varepsilon)^2)$. Making the change of variables $t = -\lambda^2$, $x = \lambda y$ and using the identities

$$G(\lambda x, -\lambda^2) = \lambda^n G(x, -1), \quad \zeta_1(\lambda y, -\lambda^2) = \lambda \hat{\zeta}_0(y),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} \frac{1}{2t} Z((u^\varepsilon)^2) \zeta_1^2 G dx dt \\ &= - \int_{\delta}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \lambda Z((u^\varepsilon)^2)(\lambda y, -\lambda^2) \hat{\zeta}_0^2(y) G(y, -1) dy d\lambda \\ &= - \int_{\delta}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \lambda^2 \left[\frac{d}{d\lambda} (u^\varepsilon(\lambda y, -\lambda^2)^2) \right] \hat{\zeta}_0^2(y) G(y, -1) dy d\lambda \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} [r^2 u^\varepsilon(r y, -r^2)^2 - \delta^2 u^\varepsilon(\delta y, -\delta^2)^2] \hat{\zeta}_0^2(y) G(y, -1) dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\delta}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} 2\lambda u^\varepsilon(\lambda y, -\lambda^2)^2 \hat{\zeta}_0^2 G(y, -1) dy d\lambda \\ &\geq -r^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^\varepsilon(r y, -r^2)^2 \hat{\zeta}_0^2(y) G(y, -1) dy \\ &= -r^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^\varepsilon(\cdot, -r^2) \zeta_0^2 G(\cdot, -r^2) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used integration by parts in λ variable. Thus, using Young's inequality, we conclude that

$$(A.1) \quad \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_1^2 G \leq C_{n,\rho} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u^\varepsilon(\cdot, -r^2)^2 \zeta_0^2 G(\cdot, -r^2) \right. \\ \left. + \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [(u^\varepsilon)^2 (|\nabla \zeta_1|^2 + \zeta_0^2) + (f^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2] G \right).$$

Now, integrating over $r \in [\rho, \tilde{\rho}]$, we obtain

$$\int_{S_\rho^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_1^2 G \leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_\rho^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [(u^\varepsilon)^2 (|\nabla \zeta_1|^2 + \zeta_0^2) + (f^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2] G.$$

Letting first $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+$, then letting the support of the cutoff function $\hat{\zeta}_0$ sweep \mathbb{R}^n , $\delta \rightarrow 0$, and replacing the integral over S_ρ^+ by S_1^+ , we conclude that

$$\int_{S_\rho^+} |t| |\nabla u|^2 G \leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_1^+} (u^2 + |t|^2 f^2) G.$$

(2°) Let $\hat{\zeta}_0$, R , homogeneous functions ζ_k , the approximations u^ε , $r \in [\rho, \tilde{\rho}]$, and δ be as above. Then, choosing as a test function η_{x_i} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, with $\eta \in W_2^{2,1}(S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+)$ vanishing in $(B_R^+ \setminus B_{R-1}^+) \times (-r^2, -\delta^2]$ and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [\nabla u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \nabla \eta + u_{x_i t}^\varepsilon \eta + f^\varepsilon \eta_{x_i}] dx dt = - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} \beta'_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \eta dx' dt.$$

Then, plugging $\eta = u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G$ in the above identity, we will have

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u_{x_i}^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G + (u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \nabla u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \nabla G \zeta_2^2 + u_{x_i t}^\varepsilon u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G) + 2u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \zeta_2 \nabla u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \nabla \zeta_2 G \\ + \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} f^\varepsilon u_{x_i x_i}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G + 2f^\varepsilon u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \zeta_2 (\zeta_2)_{x_i} G + f^\varepsilon u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G_{x_i} \\ = - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} \beta'_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) (u_{x_i}^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2 G \leq 0.$$

Then, again using the identity $\nabla G = \frac{x}{2t} G$, we may rewrite the above inequality as

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u_{x_i}^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G + \frac{1}{4t} Z((u_{x_i}^\varepsilon)^2) \zeta_2^2 G + 2u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \zeta_2 \nabla u_{x_i}^\varepsilon \nabla \zeta_2 G \\ \leq \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |f^\varepsilon| |u_{x_i x_i}^\varepsilon| \zeta_2^2 G + 2|f^\varepsilon| |u_{x_i}^\varepsilon| |\zeta_2| |\nabla \zeta_2| G + |f^\varepsilon| |u_{x_i}^\varepsilon| \zeta_2^2 \frac{|x|}{2|t|} G.$$

Arguing as in step (1°) above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} \frac{1}{2t} Z((u_{x_i}^\varepsilon)^2) \zeta_2^2 G &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} [r^4 u_{x_i}^\varepsilon (ry, -r^2)^2 - \delta^4 u_{x_i}^\varepsilon (\delta y, -\delta^2)^2] \hat{\zeta}_0(y)^2 G(y, -1) \\
&\quad + 4 \int_{\delta}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \lambda^3 (u_{x_i}^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_0^2 G \\
&\geq -r^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{x_i}^\varepsilon (ry, -r^2)^2 \hat{\zeta}_0(y)^2 G(y, -1) dy \\
&= -r^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{x_i}^\varepsilon(\cdot, -r^2)^2 \zeta_1^2 G(\cdot, -r^2).
\end{aligned}$$

We further estimate, by the appropriate Young inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |f^\varepsilon| |u_{x_i}^\varepsilon| \zeta_2^2 \frac{|x|}{2|t|} G &\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} (f^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2 G + c_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_1^2 \frac{|x|^2}{t} G \\
&\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} (f^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2 G \\
&\quad + c_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [|\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 (\zeta_1^2 + |\nabla \zeta_2|^2) + |D^2 u|^2 \zeta_2^2] G,
\end{aligned}$$

with a small constant $c_{n,\rho} > 0$, where in the last step we have used that the following claim.

Claim A.1. For any $v \in W_2^1(\mathbb{R}^n, G)$ and $t < 0$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2 \frac{|x|^2}{|t|} G(x, t) \leq C_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v^2 + |t| |\nabla v|^2) G.$$

Proof. Using that $\nabla G = \frac{x}{2t} G$, and then integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2 \frac{|x|^2}{2|t|} G &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2 x \cdot \nabla G = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \operatorname{div}(x v^2) G \\
&= n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2 G + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 2v(x \nabla v) G \\
&\leq n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2 G + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^2 \frac{|x|^2}{4|t|} G + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 4|t| |\nabla v|^2 G,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired estimate. \square

Combining the estimates above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u_{x_i}^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G \\
& \leq C_{n,\rho} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{x_i}^\varepsilon(\cdot, -r^2)^2 \zeta_1^2 G(\cdot, -r^2) + \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [|\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 (\zeta_1^2 + |\nabla \zeta_2|^2) + (f^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2] G \right) \\
& \quad + c_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |D^2 u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G.
\end{aligned}$$

(3°) Using the notations of the previous step, taking a test function η_{x_n} and integrating by parts, we will obtain

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [\nabla u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \nabla \eta + u_{x_n t}^\varepsilon \eta + f^\varepsilon \eta_{x_n}] dx dt = - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} [u_t^\varepsilon \eta + \nabla' u^\varepsilon \nabla' \eta] dx' dt.$$

Plugging $\eta = u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G$, we will have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u_{x_n}^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G + (u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \nabla u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \nabla G \zeta_2^2 + u_{x_n t}^\varepsilon u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G) + 2u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2 \nabla u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \nabla \zeta_2 G \\
& \quad + \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} f^\varepsilon u_{x_n x_n} \zeta_2^2 G + 2f^\varepsilon u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2 (\zeta_2)_{x_n} G + f^\varepsilon u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G_{x_n} \\
& = - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} [\nabla' u^\varepsilon \nabla' G \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \zeta_2^2 + u_t^\varepsilon \beta_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \zeta_2^2 G] + |\nabla' u_{x_i}^\varepsilon|^2 \beta_\varepsilon'(u^\varepsilon) \zeta_2^2 G \\
& \quad - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} 2u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \nabla' u^\varepsilon \nabla' \zeta_2 \zeta_2 G.
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u_{x_n}^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G + \frac{1}{4t} Z((u_{x_n}^\varepsilon)^2) \zeta_2^2 G + 2u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2 \nabla u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \nabla \zeta_2 G \\
& \quad + \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} f^\varepsilon u_{x_n x_n} \zeta_2^2 G + 2f^\varepsilon u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2 (\zeta_2)_{x_n} G + f^\varepsilon u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \zeta_2^2 G_{x_n} \\
& \leq - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} \frac{1}{4t} Z(\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)) \zeta_2^2 G + 2u_{x_n}^\varepsilon \nabla' u^\varepsilon \nabla' \zeta_2 \zeta_2 G = J_1 + J_2.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate J_1 we argue as before, however we now take into account that the spatial dimension is less by one:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= - \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} \frac{1}{4t} Z(\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)) \zeta_2^2 G \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} [r^3 \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon(ry', -r^2)) - \delta^3 \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon(\delta y', -\delta^2))] \hat{\zeta}_0(y')^2 G(y', -1) dy' \\
&\quad - \frac{3}{2} \int_{\delta}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \lambda^2 \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon(\lambda y', -\lambda^2)) \hat{\zeta}_0(y')^2 G(y' - 1) dy' d\lambda \\
&\leq C_{n,\rho} \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(s) \geq 0$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and we have used that $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \leq C_{n,\rho} \varepsilon$ on $B'_{R-1} \times [\rho, \tilde{\rho}]$. For more details see the proof of Proposition 6.2, step (3.iii.b°).

In order to estimate J_2 we write it as a solid integral

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} \partial_{x_n} (u_{x_n}^\varepsilon u_{x_i}^\varepsilon (\zeta_2^2)_{x_i} G) \\
&= \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} u_{x_n x_n}^\varepsilon u_{x_i}^\varepsilon (\zeta_2^2)_{x_i} G + u_{x_n}^\varepsilon u_{x_i x_n}^\varepsilon (\zeta_2^2)_{x_i} G + u_{x_n}^\varepsilon u_{x_i}^\varepsilon (\zeta_2^2)_{x_i x_n} G \\
&\quad + \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} u_{x_n}^\varepsilon u_{x_i}^\varepsilon (\zeta_2^2)_{x_i} G_{x_n} = J_{21} + J_{22}.
\end{aligned}$$

The terms in J_{21} are estimated in a standard way by the appropriate Young inequalities. The integral J_{22} is estimated by using Claim A.1:

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_{22}| &\leq \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2 |\nabla \zeta_2| \frac{x_n}{t} G dx dt \\
&\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 |\nabla \zeta_2|^2 G + c_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_1^2 \frac{|x|^2}{|t|} G \\
&\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 |\nabla \zeta_2|^2 G + c_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [|\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 (\zeta_1^2 + |\nabla \zeta_2|^2) G + |D^2 u|^2 \zeta_2^2 G],
\end{aligned}$$

for a small constant $c_{n,\rho} > 0$.

We further treat the term

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} \frac{1}{4t} Z((u_{x_n}^\varepsilon)^2) \zeta_2^2 G$$

analogously to the similar term with $u_{x_i}^\varepsilon$ in (2°). Collecting all estimates in this step, combined with appropriate Young inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |\nabla u_{x_n}^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G &\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{x_n}^\varepsilon(\cdot, -r^2)^2 \zeta_1^2 G(\cdot, -r^2) \\ &\quad + C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [|\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 (\zeta_1^2 + |\nabla \zeta_2|^2 + |D^2 \zeta_3|^2) + (f^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2] G \\ &\quad + c_{n,\rho} \int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |D^2 u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G + C_{n,\rho} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

(4°) Now combining the estimates in (2°) and (3°) above and integrating over $r \in [\rho, \tilde{\rho}]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_\rho^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} |D^2 u^\varepsilon|^2 \zeta_2^2 G &\leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_\rho^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [|\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 (\zeta_1^2 + |\nabla \zeta_2|^2 + |D^2 \zeta_3|^2) + (f^\varepsilon)^2 \zeta_2^2] G \\ &\quad + C_{n,\rho} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As before, passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, increasing the support of $\hat{\zeta}_0$, and then letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that

$$\int_{S_\rho^+} |t|^2 |D^2 u|^2 G \leq C_{n,\rho} \int_{S_1^+} (|t| |\nabla u|^2 + |t|^2 f^2) G.$$

Finally noticing that $u_t = \Delta u - f$, we obtain the desired integral estimate for u_t as well. The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3. The proof is very similar to part (1°) of the proof of Lemma 5.1. Indeed, for approximations u_i^ε , $i = 1, 2$, we have the integral identities

$$\int_{S_r^+ \setminus S_\delta^+} [\nabla u_i^\varepsilon \nabla \eta + \partial_t u_i^\varepsilon \eta + f_i^\varepsilon \eta] dx dt = - \int_{S_r' \setminus S_\delta'} \beta_\varepsilon(u_i^\varepsilon) \eta dx' dt.$$

Taking the difference, choosing $\eta = (u_1^\varepsilon - u_2^\varepsilon) \zeta_1^2 G$, and using the inequality

$$[\beta_\varepsilon(u_1^\varepsilon) - \beta_\varepsilon(u_2^\varepsilon)](u_1^\varepsilon - u_2^\varepsilon) \geq 0,$$

we complete the proof as in step (1°) of the proof of Lemma 5.1. \square

APPENDIX B. PARABOLIC WHITNEY'S EXTENSION THEOREM

Let E be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ and $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a certain continuous function. Here we want to establish a theorem of Whitney type (see [Whi34]) that will allow the extension of the function f to a function of class $C^{2m,m}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. In fact, for that we need to have a family of functions $\{f_{\alpha,j}\}_{|\alpha|+2j \leq m}$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and j is a nonnegative integer.

Theorem B.1 (Parabolic Whitney's extension). *Let $\{f_{\alpha,j}\}_{|\alpha|+2j \leq m}$ be a family of functions on E , with $f_{0,0} \equiv f$, satisfying the following compatibility conditions: there exists a family of moduli of continuity $\{\omega_{\alpha,j}\}_{|\alpha|+2j \leq 2m}$, such that*

$$f_{\alpha,j}(x,t) = \sum_{|\beta|+2k \leq 2m-|\alpha|-2j} \frac{f_{\alpha+\beta,j+k}(x_0,t_0)}{\beta!k!} (x-x_0)^\beta (t-t_0)^k + R_{\alpha,j}(x,t;x_0,t_0)$$

and

$$|R_{\alpha,j}(x,t;x_0,t_0)| \leq \omega_{\alpha,j}(\|(x-x_0,t-t_0)\|) \|(x-x_0,t-t_0)\|^{2m-|\alpha|-2j}.$$

Then, there exists a function $F \in C^{2m,m}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ such that $F = f$ on E and moreover $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j F = f_{\alpha,j}$ on E , for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$.

The construction of the extension is done in the following four steps.

Step 1: Parabolic Whitney cube decomposition of $E^c = (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus E$. We say that Q is a parabolic (k) -dyadic cube if it has a form

$$Q = [a_1 2^{-k}, (a_1 + 1) 2^{-k}] \times \cdots \times [a_n 2^{-k}, (a_n + 1) 2^{-k}] \times [b 2^{-2k}, (b + 1) 2^{-2k}],$$

where $a_i, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. We will call 2^{-k} the size of Q and denote it by $\ell(Q)$. We will also call $((a_1 + \frac{1}{2}) 2^{-k}, \dots, (a_n + \frac{1}{2}) 2^{-k}, (b + \frac{1}{2}) 2^{-2k})$ the center of Q .

The proof of the following lemma is very similar to its Euclidean counterpart and is therefore omitted. (A slightly different version of this lemma can be found in [FS82, Lemma 1.67], for more general homogeneous spaces.)

Lemma B.2 (Parabolic Whitney cube decomposition). *For any closed set E there exists a family $\mathcal{W} = \{Q_i\}$ of parabolic dyadic cubes with the following properties:*

- (i) $\bigcup_i Q_i = \Omega = E^c$,
- (ii) $Q_i^\circ \cap Q_j^\circ = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$,
- (iii) $c_n \ell(Q_i) \leq \text{dist}_p(Q_i, E) \leq C_n \ell(Q_i)$ for some positive constants c_n, C_n depending only on the dimension n . \square

For every Q_i let (x_i, t_i) be the center and ℓ_i the size of the parabolic cube Q_i . Then let $Q_i^* = \delta_{1+\varepsilon}[Q_i - (x_i, t_i)] + (x_i, t_i)$, where $\delta_\lambda : (x, t) \mapsto (\lambda x, \lambda^2 t)$ is the parabolic dilation. Clearly, the family of $\{Q_i^*\}$ is no longer disjoint, however, we every point in E^c has a small neighborhood that intersects at most $N = N_n$ cubes Q_i^* , provided $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_n$ is small. Then define

$$\varphi_i(x, t) = \varphi\left(\frac{x - x_i}{\ell_i}, \frac{t - t_i}{\ell_i^2}\right),$$

where $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\varphi \geq 0, \quad \varphi > 0 \text{ on } I_1, \quad \text{supp } \varphi \subset I_{1+\varepsilon},$$

where

$$I_\lambda = [-\lambda/2, \lambda/2] \times \cdots \times [-\lambda/2, \lambda/2] \times [-\lambda^2/2, \lambda^2/2].$$

We also observe that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j \varphi_i(x, t)| \leq A_{\alpha,j} \ell_i^{-|\alpha|-2j},$$

for some constants $A_{\alpha,j}$. Next, we define a partition of unity $\{\varphi_i^*\}$ subordinate to $\{Q_i^*\}$ as follows. Let

$$\varphi_i^*(x, t) = \frac{\varphi_i(x, t)}{\Phi(x, t)}, \quad \Phi(x, t) = \sum_k \varphi_k(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in E^c.$$

Note that in the definition of Φ , the sum is locally finite and therefore C^∞ in E^c , and also satisfies $1 \leq \Phi \leq N$. Then φ_i^* are also C^∞ in E^c and we have

$$\sum_i \varphi_i^* = 1 \quad \text{in } E^c,$$

where again the sum is locally finite. Moreover, it is easy to see that, similarly to φ_i , we have the estimates

$$(B.1) \quad |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j \varphi_i^*(x, t)| \leq A_{\alpha, j}^* \ell_i^{-|\alpha| - 2j}.$$

Step 2: For every $(x_0, t_0) \in E$ let

$$P(x, t; x_0, t_0) = \sum_{|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m} \frac{f_{\alpha, j}(x_0, t_0)}{\alpha! j!} (x - x_0)^\alpha (t - t_0)^j.$$

In addition to P , it is convenient to introduce

$$P_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_0, t_0) = \sum_{|\beta| + 2k \leq 2m - |\alpha| - 2j} \frac{f_{\alpha + \beta, j + k}(x_0, t_0)}{\beta! k!} (x - x_0)^\beta (t - t_0)^k$$

for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$. Note that in fact $P_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_0, t_0) = \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j P(x, t; x_0, t_0)$. Then by definition

$$f_{\alpha, j}(x, t) = P_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_0, t_0) + R_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_0, t_0),$$

for any $(x, t), (x_0, t_0) \in E$.

Lemma B.3. *For any $(x_0, t_0), (x_1, t_1) \in E$ and $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$P(x, t; x_1, t_1) - P(x, t; x_0, t_0) = \sum_{|\beta| + k \leq 2m} R_{\beta, k}(x_1, t_1; x_0, t_0) \frac{(x - x_1)^\beta}{\beta!} \frac{(t - t_1)^k}{k!}$$

and more generally

$$P_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_1, t_1) - P_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_0, t_0) = \sum_{|\beta| + k \leq 2m - |\alpha| - 2j} R_{\alpha + \beta, j + k}(x_1, t_1; x_0, t_0) \frac{(x - x_1)^\beta}{\beta!} \frac{(t - t_1)^k}{k!}.$$

Proof. We will prove the latter formula. It is enough to check that the partial derivatives $\partial_x^\beta \partial_t^k$ of both sides equal to each other for $|\beta| + 2k \leq 2m - |\alpha| - 2j$, as both sides are polynomials of parabolic degree $2m - |\alpha| - 2j$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^\beta \partial_t^k P_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_1, t_1) \Big|_{(x, t) = (x_1, t_1)} &= f_{\alpha + \beta, j + k}(x_1, t_1) \\ \partial_x^\beta \partial_t^k P_{\alpha, j}(x, t; x_0, t_0) \Big|_{(x, t) = (x_1, t_1)} &= P_{\alpha + \beta, j + k}(x_1, t_1; x_0, t_0), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired equality. \square

Step 3: We are now ready to define the extension function F . For every Q_i let $(y_i, s_i) \in E$ be such that $\text{dist}_p(Q_i, E) = \text{dist}_p(Q_i, (y_i, s_i))$. Note that (y_i, s_i) is not necessarily unique. Then define

$$F(x, t) = \begin{cases} f(x, t) = f_{0,0}(x, t), & (x, t) \in E \\ \sum_i P(x, t; y_i, s_i) \varphi_i^*(x, t), & (x, t) \in E^c. \end{cases}$$

From the local finiteness of the partition of unity, it is clear that F is C^∞ in E^c . Then we can define

$$F_{\alpha,j}(x,t) = \begin{cases} f_{\alpha,j}(x,t), & (x,t) \in E \\ \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j F(x,t), & (x,t) \in E^c, \end{cases}$$

for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$.

Lemma B.4. *There exist moduli of continuity $\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\omega}_{0,0}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\alpha,j}$, $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$, such that for $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ and $(x_0, t_0) \in E$ we have*

$$|F(x,t) - P(x,t; x_0, t_0)| \leq \tilde{\omega}(\|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|) \|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|^{2m},$$

and more generally

$$|F_{\alpha,j}(x,t) - P_{\alpha,j}(x,t; x_0, t_0)| \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\alpha,j}(\|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|) \|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|^{2m-|\alpha|-2j},$$

for $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$.

Proof. Note that for $(x,t) \in E$, the estimates follows from the compatibility assumptions. For $(x,t) \in E^c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F(x,t) - P(x,t; x_0, t_0)| &= \left| \sum_i [P(x,t; y_i, s_i) - P(x,t; x_0, t_0)] \varphi_i^*(x,t) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_i \sum_{|\alpha|+2j \leq 2m} |R_{\alpha,j}(y_i, s_i; x_0, t_0)| \frac{|x - y_i|^\alpha}{\alpha!} \frac{|t - s_i|^j}{j!} \varphi_i^*(x,t) \\ &\leq \sum_{i, |\alpha|+2j \leq 2m} \omega_{\alpha,j}(C_n \|(x - y_i, t_0 - s_i)\|) \|(x - y_i, t - s_i)\|^{2m-|\alpha|-2j+|\alpha|+2j} \varphi_i^*(x,t) \\ &\leq \tilde{\omega}(\|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|) \|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|^{2m}, \end{aligned}$$

using that

$$\|(x_0 - y_i, t_0 - s_i)\| \leq C_n \|(x - y_i, t - s_i)\| \leq C_n^2 \|(x - x_0, t - t_0)\|$$

for $(x,t) \in Q_i^*$.

The second estimate in the lemma is obtained in a similar way. Indeed, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} |F_{\alpha,j}(x,t) - P_{\alpha,j}(x,t)| &= |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j [F(x,t) - P(x,t; x_0, t_0)]| \\ &= |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j \sum_i [P(x,t; y_i, s_i) - P(x,t; x_0, t_0)] \varphi_i^*(x,t)| \\ &= \sum_{i, \beta \leq \alpha, k \leq j} C_{\beta,k}^{\alpha,j} [P_{\beta,k}(x,t; y_i, s_i) - P_{\beta,k}(x,t; x_0, t_0)] \partial_x^{\alpha-\beta} \partial_t^{j-k} \varphi_i^*(x,t) \end{aligned}$$

and then we argue as above by using Lemma B.3 and the estimates (B.1). \square

Proof of Theorem B.1. Note that Lemma B.4 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^\beta F_{\alpha,j}(x,t) &= F_{\alpha+\beta,j}(x,t), \quad \text{for } |\beta| = 1, \text{ if } |\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m - 1 \\ \partial_t F_{\alpha,j}(x,t) &= F_{\alpha,j+1}(x,t), \quad \text{if } |\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m - 2 \end{aligned}$$

at every $(x,t) \in E$. The same equalities hold also in E^c , by the definition of $F_{\alpha,j}$. Thus, arguing by induction in the order of the derivative $|\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m$ and using Lemma B.4, we prove that everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$

$$\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^j F = F_{\alpha,j}, \quad |\alpha| + 2j \leq 2m.$$

We also note that $F_{\alpha,j}$ are continuous by Lemma B.4. The proof is complete. \square

REFERENCES

- [ALP12] M. Allen, E. Lindgren, and A. Petrosyan, *The two-phase fractional obstacle problem* (2012), available at [arXiv:1212.1492](#).
- [AS13] M. Allen and W. Shi, *The two phase parabolic Signorini problem* (2013), available at [arXiv:1304.0424](#).
- [Alm00] F. J. Almgren Jr., *Almgren's big regularity paper*, World Scientific Monograph Series in Mathematics, vol. 1, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2000. Q -valued functions minimizing Dirichlet's integral and the regularity of area-minimizing rectifiable currents up to codimension 2; With a preface by Jean E. Taylor and Vladimir Scheffer. MR1777737 (2003d:49001)
- [And12] J. Andersson, *Optimal regularity and free boundary regularity for the Signorini problem*, *Algebra i Analiz* **24** (2012), no. 3, 1–21, DOI 10.1090/S1061-0022-2013-01244-1; English transl., *St. Petersburg Math. J.* **24** (2013), no. 3, 371–386. MR3014126
- [AU88] A. A. Arkhipova and N. N. Ural'tseva, *Regularity of the solution of a problem with a two-sided limit on a boundary for elliptic and parabolic equations*, *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov.* **179** (1988), 5–22, 241 (Russian). Translated in *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **1989**, no. 2, 1–19; *Boundary value problems of mathematical physics*, 13 (Russian). MR964910 (90h:35044)
- [AU96] A. Arkhipova and N. Ural'tseva, *Sharp estimates for solutions of a parabolic Signorini problem*, *Math. Nachr.* **177** (1996), 11–29, DOI 10.1002/mana.19961770103. MR1374941 (97a:35084)
- [Ath82] I. Athanasopoulos, *Regularity of the solution of an evolution problem with inequalities on the boundary*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **7** (1982), no. 12, 1453–1465, DOI 10.1080/03605308208820258. MR679950 (84m:35052)
- [Ath84] I. Athanasopoulos, *A temperature control problem*, *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.* **7** (1984), no. 1, 113–116, DOI 10.1155/S0161171284000120. MR743830 (85i:35143)
- [AC85] I. Athanasopoulos and L. A. Caffarelli, *A theorem of real analysis and its application to free boundary problems*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **38** (1985), no. 5, 499–502, DOI 10.1002/cpa.3160380503. MR803243 (86j:49062)
- [AC04] I. Athanasopoulos and L. A. Caffarelli, *Optimal regularity of lower dimensional obstacle problems*, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* **310** (2004), no. Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 35 [34], 49–66, 226, DOI 10.1007/s10958-005-0496-1 (English, with English and Russian summaries); English transl., *J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.)* **132** (2006), no. 3, 274–284. MR2120184 (2006i:35053)
- [AC10] ———, *Continuity of the temperature in boundary heat control problems*, *Adv. Math.* **224** (2010), no. 1, 293–315, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2009.11.010. MR2600998 (2011b:35587)
- [ACS08] I. Athanasopoulos, L. A. Caffarelli, and S. Salsa, *The structure of the free boundary for lower dimensional obstacle problems*, *Amer. J. Math.* **130** (2008), no. 2, 485–498, DOI 10.1353/ajm.2008.0016. MR2405165 (2009g:35345)
- [Bré72] H. Brézis, *Problèmes unilatéraux*, *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* **51** (1972), 1–168. MR0428137 (55 #1166)
- [Caf79] L. A. Caffarelli, *Further regularity for the Signorini problem*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **4** (1979), no. 9, 1067–1075, DOI 10.1080/03605307908820119. MR542512 (80i:35058)
- [Caf93] L. A. Caffarelli, *A monotonicity formula for heat functions in disjoint domains*, *Boundary value problems for partial differential equations and applications*, *RMA Res. Notes Appl. Math.*, vol. 29, Masson, Paris, 1993, pp. 53–60. MR1260438 (95e:35096)
- [Caf98] L. A. Caffarelli, *The obstacle problem revisited*, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **4** (1998), no. 4-5, 383–402, DOI 10.1007/BF02498216. MR1658612 (2000b:49004)
- [CF12] L. Caffarelli and A. Figalli, *Regularity of solutions to the parabolic fractional obstacle problem*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, posted on 2012, DOI 10.1515/crelle.2012.036, (to appear in print).
- [CPS04] L. Caffarelli, A. Petrosyan, and H. Shahgholian, *Regularity of a free boundary in parabolic potential theory*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **17** (2004), no. 4, 827–869, DOI 10.1090/S0894-0347-04-00466-7. MR2083469 (2005g:35303)

- [CSS08] L. A. Caffarelli, S. Salsa, and L. Silvestre, *Regularity estimates for the solution and the free boundary of the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian*, Invent. Math. **171** (2008), no. 2, 425–461, DOI 10.1007/s00222-007-0086-6. MR2367025 (2009g:35347)
- [CS07] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **32** (2007), no. 7-9, 1245–1260, DOI 10.1080/03605300600987306. MR2354493 (2009k:35096)
- [DL76] G. Duvaut and J.-L. Lions, *Inequalities in mechanics and physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976. Translated from the French by C. W. John; Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 219. MR0521262 (58#25191)
- [GL86] N. Garofalo and F.-H. Lin, *Monotonicity properties of variational integrals, A_p weights and unique continuation*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **35** (1986), no. 2, 245–268, DOI 10.1512/iumj.1986.35.35015. MR833393 (88b:35059)
- [GL87] ———, *Unique continuation for elliptic operators: a geometric-variational approach*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **40** (1987), no. 3, 347–366, DOI 10.1002/cpa.3160400305. MR882069 (88j:35046)
- [GP09] N. Garofalo and A. Petrosyan, *Some new monotonicity formulas and the singular set in the lower dimensional obstacle problem*, Invent. Math. **177** (2009), no. 2, 415–461, DOI 10.1007/s00222-009-0188-4. MR2511747
- [Gro75] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, Amer. J. Math. **97** (1975), no. 4, 1061–1083. MR0420249 (54 #8263)
- [FGS84] E. B. Fabes, N. Garofalo, and S. Salsa, *Comparison theorems for temperatures in non-cylindrical domains*, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. (8) **77** (1984), no. 1-2, 1–12 (1985) (English, with Italian summary). MR884371 (88i:35069)
- [Fic63] G. Fichera, *Problemi elastostatici con vincoli unilaterali: Il problema di Signorini con ambigue condizioni al contorno*, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Mem. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Sez. I (8) **7** (1963/1964), 91–140 (Italian). MR0178631 (31 #2888)
- [FS82] G. B. Folland and E. M. Stein, *Hardy spaces on homogeneous groups*, Mathematical Notes, vol. 28, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1982. MR657581 (84h:43027)
- [HLN04] S. Hofmann, J. L. Lewis, and K. Nyström, *Caloric measure in parabolic flat domains*, Duke Math. J. **122** (2004), no. 2, 281–346, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-04-12222-5. MR2053754 (2005e:35092)
- [Kem72] J. T. Kemper, *Temperatures in several variables: Kernel functions, representations, and parabolic boundary values*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **167** (1972), 243–262. MR0294903 (45 #3971)
- [LSU67] O. A. Ladyženskaja, V. A. Solonnikov, and N. N. Ural’ceva, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Translated from the Russian by S. Smith. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 23, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1967 (Russian). MR0241822 (39 #3159b)
- [Lie96] G. M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996. MR1465184 (98k:35003)
- [LS67] J.-L. Lions and G. Stampacchia, *Variational inequalities*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **20** (1967), 493–519. MR0216344 (35 #7178)
- [Mon03] R. Monneau, *On the number of singularities for the obstacle problem in two dimensions*, J. Geom. Anal. **13** (2003), no. 2, 359–389, DOI 10.1007/BF02930701. MR1967031 (2004a:35223)
- [Mon09] ———, *Pointwise estimates for Laplace equation. Applications to the free boundary of the obstacle problem with Dini coefficients*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **15** (2009), no. 3, 279–335, DOI 10.1007/s00041-009-9066-0. MR2511866 (2010h:35064)
- [PSU12] A. Petrosyan, H. Shahgholian, and N. Uraltseva, *Regularity of free boundaries in obstacle-type problems*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 136, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. MR2962060
- [PS13] A. Petrosyan and W. Shi, *Parabolic Boundary Harnack Principle in Domains with Thin Lipschitz Complement* (2013), in preparation.
- [Poo96] C.-C. Poon, *Unique continuation for parabolic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **21** (1996), no. 3-4, 521–539, DOI 10.1080/03605309608821195. MR1387458 (97f:35081)

- [Ric78] D. J. A. Richardson, *Variational problems with thin obstacles*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1978. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of British Columbia (Canada). MR2628343
- [Sig59] A. Signorini, *Questioni di elasticità non linearizzata e semilinearizzata*, Rend. Mat. e Appl. (5) **18** (1959), 95–139 (Italian). MR0118021 (22 #8794)
- [Sil07] L. Silvestre, *Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **60** (2007), no. 1, 67–112, DOI 10.1002/cpa.20153. MR2270163 (2008a:35041)
- [Ura85] N. N. Ural'tseva, *Hölder continuity of gradients of solutions of parabolic equations with boundary conditions of Signorini type*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **280** (1985), no. 3, 563–565 (Russian). MR775926 (87b:35025)
- [Wei99a] G. S. Weiss, *A homogeneity improvement approach to the obstacle problem*, Invent. Math. **138** (1999), no. 1, 23–50, DOI 10.1007/s002220050340. MR1714335 (2000h:35057)
- [Wei99b] G. S. Weiss, *Self-similar blow-up and Hausdorff dimension estimates for a class of parabolic free boundary problems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **30** (1999), no. 3, 623–644 (electronic), DOI 10.1137/S0036141097327409. MR1677947 (2000d:35267)
- [Whi34] H. Whitney, *Analytic extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **36** (1934), no. 1, 63–89, DOI 10.2307/1989708. MR1501735

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907, USA
E-mail address: `danielli@math.purdue.edu`

DIPARTIMENTO D'INGEGNERIA CIVILE E AMBIENTALE (DICEA), UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA, VIA TRIESTE 63, 35131 PADOVA, ITALY
E-mail address: `rembrandt54@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907, USA
E-mail address: `arshak@math.purdue.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907, USA
E-mail address: `totung@gmail.com`