A Necessary and Sufficient Condition for the Continuity of Local Minima of Parabolic Variational Integrals with Linear Growth
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Abstract

For proper minimizers of parabolic variational integrals with linear growth with respect to $|Du|$, we establish a necessary and sufficient condition for $u$ to be continuous at a point $(x_o, t_o)$, in terms of a sufficient fast decay of the total variation of $u$ about $(x_o, t_o)$ (see (1.4) below). These minimizers arise also as proper solutions to the parabolic 1-laplacian equation. Hence, the continuity condition continues to hold for such solutions (§3).
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1 Introduction

Let $E$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, and denote by $BV(E)$ the space of functions $v \in L^1(E)$ with finite total variation \cite{9}.

$$\|Dv\|(E) := \sup_{\varphi \in C^1_0(E)^N, |\varphi| \leq 1} \left\{ \langle Dv, \varphi \rangle = -\int_E v \text{div} \varphi \, dx \right\} < \infty.$$  

Here $Dv = (D_1v, \ldots, D_Nv)$ is the vector valued Radon measure, representing the distributional gradient of $v$. A function $v \in BV_{\text{loc}}(E)$ if $v \in BV(E')$ for all open sets $E' \subseteq E$. For $T > 0$, let $E_T = E \times (0, T)$, and denote by $L^1(0, T; BV(E))$ the collection of all maps $v : [0, T] \to BV(E)$ such that

$$v \in L^1(E_T), \quad \|Dv(t)\|(E) \in L^1(0, T),$$

and the maps

$$(0, T) \ni t \to \langle Dv(t), \varphi \rangle$$

are measurable with respect to the Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}$, for all $\varphi \in [C^1_0(E)]^N$.

A function $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(0, T; BV_{\text{loc}}(E))$ is a local parabolic minimizer of the total variation flow in $E_T$, if

$$\int_0^T \left[ \int_E -u \varphi_t \, dx + \|Du(t)\|(E) \right] \, dt \leq \int_0^T \|D(u + \varphi)(t)\|(E) \, dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

for all non-negative $\varphi \in C^{\infty}_c(E_T)$. The notion has been introduced in \cite{3}. It is a parabolic version of the elliptic local minima of total variation flow as introduced in \cite{10}.

1.1 The Main Result

Let $B_\rho(x_o)$ denote the ball of radius $\rho$ about $x_o$. If $x_o = 0$, write $B_\rho(x_o) = B_\rho$. Introduce the cylinders $Q_\rho(\theta) = B_\rho \times (-\theta \rho, 0]$, where $\theta$ is a positive parameter to be chosen as needed. If $\theta = 1$ we write $Q_\rho(1) = Q_\rho$. For a point $(x_o, t_o) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ we let $[(x_o, t_o) + Q_\rho(\theta)]$ be the cylinder of “vertex” at $(x_o, t_o)$ and congruent to $Q_\rho(\theta)$, i.e.,

$$[(x_o, t_o) + Q_\rho(\theta)] = B_\rho(x_o) \times (t_o - \theta \rho, t_o],$$

and we let $\rho > 0$ be so small that $[(x_o, t_o) + Q_\rho(\theta)] \subset E_T$.

**Theorem 1.1** Let $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(0, T; BV_{\text{loc}}(E))$ be a local parabolic minimizer of the total variation flow in $E_T$, satisfying in addition

$$u \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(E_T) \text{ and } u_t \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(E_T).$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)

Then, $u$ is continuous at some $(x_o, t_o) \in E_T$, if and only if

$$\lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \sup_{\rho > 0} \frac{\rho}{|Q_\rho|} \int_{t_o - \rho}^{t_o} \|Du(\cdot, t)\|(B_\rho(x_o)) \, dt = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.3)
For stationary, elliptic minimizers, condition (1.3) has been introduced in [10]. The stationary version of (1.3) implies that $u$ is quasi-continuous at $x_o$. For time-dependent minimizers, however, (1.3) gives no information on the possible quasi-continuity of $u$ at $(x_o, t_o)$. Condition (1.3), is only a measure-theoretical restriction on the speed at which a possible discontinuity may develop at $(x_o, t_o)$. For this reason our proof is entirely different than [10], being based instead on a DeGiorgi-type iteration technique that exploits precisely such a measure-theoretical information.

2 Comments on Boundedness and Continuity

The theorem requires that $u$ is locally bounded and that $u_t \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(E_T)$. In the elliptic case, local minimizers of the total gradient flow in $E$, are locally bounded ([10 § 2]). This is not the case, in general, for parabolic minimizers in $E_T$, even if $u_t \in C_\infty^{\text{loc}}(0, T; L^1_{\text{loc}}(E))$. Consider the function

$$B_1 \times (-\infty, 1) \ni (x, t) \mapsto F(|x|, t) = (1 - t)^{N-1} |x|, \quad \text{for } N \geq 3.$$ 

Denote by $D_a F$ that component of the measure $DF$ which is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}^N$. One verifies that $DF = D_a F$ and $\|DF(t)\| (B_1) = \|D_a F(t)\|_{1, B_1}$. By direct computation

$$\int_0^T \int_{B_1} \left( -F \varphi_t + \frac{D_a F}{|D_a F|} \cdot D_a \varphi \right) dx dt = 0,$$

for all $\varphi \in C_\infty^{\text{loc}}(B_1 \times (0, T)), 0 < T < 1$. From this

$$\int_0^T \int_{B_1} \left( -F \varphi_t + \frac{D_a F}{|D_a F|} \cdot D_a F \right) dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{B_1} \frac{D_a F}{|D_a F|} \cdot D_a (F - \varphi) dx dt,$$

which yields

$$\int_0^T \int_{B_1} \left( -F \varphi_t + |D_a F| \right) dx dt \leq \int_0^T \int_{B_1} |D_a (F - \varphi)| dx dt.$$

Thus $F$ is a local, unbounded, parabolic minimizer of the total variation flow. The requirement $u \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(E_T)$ could be replaced by asking that $u \in L^r_{\text{loc}}(E_T)$ for some $r > N$. A discussion on this issue is provided in Appendix [4].

2.1 On the Modulus of Continuity

While Theorem [1] gives a necessary and sufficient condition for continuity at a given point, it provides no information on the modulus of continuity of $u$ at $(x_o, t_o)$. Consider the two time-independent functions in $B_{\rho} \times (0, \infty)$, for some
\( \rho < 1: \)

\[
\begin{align*}
  u_1(x_1, x_2) &= \begin{cases} 
    \frac{1}{\ln x_1} & \text{for } x_1 > 0; \\
    0 & \text{for } x_1 = 0; \\
    -\frac{1}{\ln(-x_1)} & \text{for } x_1 < 0.
  \end{cases} \\
  u_2(x_1, x_2) &= \begin{cases} 
    \sqrt{x_1} & \text{for } x_1 > 0; \\
    -\sqrt{-x_1} & \text{for } x_1 \leq 0.
  \end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Both are stationary parabolic minimizers of the total variation flow in the sense of (1.1)–(1.2), over \( B_{\rho} \times (0, \infty) \). We establish this for \( u_1 \), the analogous statement for \( u_2 \) being analogous. Since \( u_1 \in W^{1,1}(B_{\rho}) \), and is time-independent, one also has \( u \in L^1(0, T; BV(B_{\rho})) \). To verify (1.1), one needs to show that

\[
\|Du_1\|(B_{\rho}) \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|D(u_1 + \varphi)(\cdot, t)\|(B_{\rho})dt \tag{*}
\]

for all \( T > 0 \), and all \( \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_{\rho} \times (0, T)) \). Let \( \mathcal{H}^k(A) \) denote the \( k \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure of a Borel set \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^N \). One checks that \( \mathcal{H}^N([Du_1 = 0]) = 0 \) and there exists a closed set \( K \subset B_{\rho} \), such that \( \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(K) = 0 \) and

\[
\int_{B_{\rho} - K} \frac{Du_1}{|Du_1|} \cdot D\varphi \, dx = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_{\rho} - K).
\]

From this, by Lemma 4 of [5, § 8], for all \( \psi \in C_0^\infty(B_{\rho}) \), one has

\[
\|Du_1\|(B_{\rho}) \leq \|D(u_1 + \psi)\|(B_{\rho}),
\]

which, in turn, yields (*). The two functions \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) can be regarded as equibounded near the origin. They both satisfy (1.3), and exhibit quite different moduli of continuity at the origin. This occurrence is in line with a remark of Evans ([8]). A sufficiently smooth minimizer of the elliptic functional \( \|Du\|(E) \) is a function whose level sets are surfaces of zero mean curvature. Thus, if \( u \) is a minimizer, so is \( \varphi(u) \) for all continuous monotone functions \( \varphi(\cdot) \). This implies that a modulus of continuity cannot be identified solely in terms of an upper bound of \( u \).

### 3 Singular Parabolic DeGiorgi Classes

Let \( \mathcal{C}(Q, \theta) \) denote the class of all non-negative, piecewise smooth, cutoff functions \( \zeta \) defined in \( Q, \theta \), vanishing outside \( B_{\rho} \), such that \( \zeta_t \geq 0 \) and satisfying

\[
|D\zeta| + \zeta_t \in L^\infty(Q, \theta).
\]
For a measurable function \( u : E_T \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( k \in \mathbb{R} \) set
\[
(u - k)_\pm = \{ \pm (u - k) \wedge 0 \}.
\]

The singular, parabolic DeGiorgi class \([DG]^\pm (E_T; \gamma)\) is the collection of all measurable maps
\[
u \in C_{loc}((0, T); L^2_{loc}(E)) \cap L^1_{loc}(0, T; BV_{loc}(E)),
\]
satisfying
\[
sup_{t_o - \theta \rho \leq t \leq t_o} \int_{B_\rho(x_o)} (u - k)^2 \zeta(x, t) dx + \int_{t_o - \theta \rho}^{t_o} \|D((u - k)_\pm \zeta)(\tau)\| \Vert B_\rho(x_o) \Vert dt
\leq \gamma \int_{[(x_o, t_o) + Q_\rho(\theta)]} [(u - k)_\pm \vert D\zeta \vert + (u - k)^2_\pm \vert \zeta_t \vert] dx dt + \int_{B_\rho(x_o)} (u - k)^2_\pm \zeta(x, t_o - \theta \rho) dx
\]
for all \([(x_o, t_o) + Q_\rho(\theta)] \subset E_T\), all \( k \in \mathbb{R} \), and all \( \zeta \in C((x_o, t_o) + Q_\rho(\theta)) \), for a given positive constant \( \gamma \). The singular DeGiorgi classes \([DG](E_T; \gamma)\) are defined as \([DG](E_T; \gamma) = [DG]^+(E_T; \gamma) \cap [DG]^-(E_T; \gamma)\).

3.1 The Main Result

The main result of this note is that the necessary and sufficient condition of Theorem 1.1 holds for functions \( u \in DG(E_T; \gamma) \cap L^\infty_{loc}(E_T) \). Indeed, the proof of Theorem 1.1 only uses the local integral inequalities (3.2). In particular, the second of (1.2) is not needed.

Proposition 3.1 Let \( u \) in the functional classes (3.1), be a parabolic minimizer of the total variation flow in \( E_T \), in the sense of (1.1), satisfying in addition (1.2). Then \( u \in DG(E_T; 2) \).

The proof will be given in Appendix A.

Remark 3.1 Note that in the context of \( DG(E_T) \) classes, the characteristic condition (1.3), holds with no further requirement that \( u_t \in L^1_{loc}(E_T) \). The latter however is needed to cast a parabolic minimizer of the total variation flow into a \( DG(E_T) \)-class as stated by Proposition 3.1.

4 A Singular Diffusion Equation

Consider formally, the parabolic 1-Laplacian equation
\[
 u_t - \text{div} \left( \frac{Du}{|Du|} \right) = 0 \quad \text{formally in } E_T.
\]
Let \( P \) be the class of all Lipschitz continuous, non-decreasing functions \( p(\cdot) \) defined in \( \mathbb{R} \), with \( p' \) compactly supported. Denote by \( \mathcal{C}(E_T) \) the class of all non-negative functions \( \zeta \) defined in \( E_T \), such that \( \zeta(\cdot, t) \in C^1_0(E) \) for all \( t \in (0, T) \), and \( 0 \leq \zeta \leq \infty \) in \( E_T \). A function \( u \in C_{loc}(0, T; L^1(E)) \) is a local solution to (4.1) if

a. \( p(u) \in L^1_{loc}(0, T; BV(E)) \), for all \( p \in P \);

b. there exists a vector valued function \( z \in [L^\infty(E_T)]^N \) with \( \|z\|_{\infty, E} \leq 1 \), such that \( u_t = \text{div} \, z \) in \( D'(E_T) \);

c. denoting by \( d(\|Dp(u - \ell)\|) \) the measure in \( E \) generated by the total variation \( \|Dp(u - \ell)\| \),

\[
\int_E \left( \int_0^{u-\ell} p(s) ds \right) \zeta(x, t_2) \, dx + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_E \zeta d(\|D(p(u - \ell))\|) dt \\
\leq \int_E \left( \int_0^{u-\ell} p(s) ds \right) \zeta(x, t_1) \, dx - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_E \left( \int_0^{u-\ell} p(s) ds \right) \zeta dx dt \tag{4.2}
\]  

for all \( \ell \in \mathbb{R} \), all \( p \in P \), all \( \zeta \in \mathcal{C}(E_T) \) and all \( [t_1, t_2] \subset (0, T) \). The notion is a local version of a global one introduced in [1, Chapter 3]. Similar notions are in [1 3 4 11], associated with issues of existence for the Cauchy problem and boundary value problems associated with (4.1). The notion of solution in [3], called \textit{variational}, is different and closely related to the variational integrals (1.1).

Our results are local in nature and disengaged from any initial or boundary conditions. Let \( u \) be a local solution to (4.1) in the indicated sense, which in addition is locally bounded in \( E_T \). In (4.2) take \( \ell = 0 \), and \( p_{\pm}(u) = \pm(u - k)_{\pm} \). Since \( u \in L^\infty_{loc}(E_T) \) one verifies that \( p_{\pm} \in P \). Standard calculations then yield that \( u \) is in the DeGiorgi classes \( [DG]^\pm(E; \gamma) \), for some fixed \( \gamma > 0 \). As a consequence, we have the following:

**Corollary 4.1** Let \( u \in L^\infty_{loc}(E_T) \) be a local solution to (4.1), in \( E_T \), in the sense (a)-(c) above. Then, \( u \) is continuous at some \( (x_o, t_o) \in E_T \) if and only if (1.3) holds true.

**Acknowledgement.** We thank the referee for the valuable comments.

## 5 Proof of the Necessary Condition

Let \( u \in [DG](E_T; \gamma) \) be continuous at \( (x_o, t_o) \in E_T \), which we may take as the origin of \( \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \), and may assume \( u(0, 0) = 0 \). In (3.2) for \( (u - k)_+ \), take \( \theta = 1 \).
and $k = 0$. Let also $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}(Q_{2\rho})$ be such that $\zeta(\cdot, -2\rho) = 0$, such that $\zeta = 1$ on $Q_{\frac{3}{2}\rho}$, and

$$|D\zeta| + \zeta \leq \frac{3}{\rho}.$$  

Repeat the same choices in (3.2) for $(u-k)$. Adding the resulting inequalities gives

$$\frac{\rho}{|Q_{\rho}|} \int_{-2\rho}^{0} \|D(u\zeta)(\cdot, t)\|(B_{2\rho}) dt \leq 2^{N+1}\gamma \iint_{Q_{2\rho}} (u + u^2) dx dt.$$  

(5.1)

Since the total variation $\|Dw\|$ of a function $w \in BV$ can be seen as a measure (see, for example, [13, Chapter 1, §1]), we have

$$\frac{\rho}{|Q_{\rho}|} \int_{-\rho}^{0} \|D(u\zeta)(\cdot, t)\|(B_{\rho}) dt \leq \frac{\rho}{|Q_{\rho}|} \int_{-2\rho}^{0} \|D(u\zeta)(\cdot, t)\|(B_{2\rho}) dt;$$

on the other hand, $u\zeta \equiv u$ in $Q_{\frac{3}{2}\rho} \supset Q_{\rho}$, and therefore we conclude

$$\frac{\rho}{|Q_{\rho}|} \int_{-\rho}^{0} \|Du(\cdot, t)\|(B_{\rho}) dt \leq 2^{N+1}\gamma \iint_{Q_{2\rho}} (u + u^2) dx dt.$$ 

The right-hand side tends to zero as $\rho \to 0$, thereby implying the necessary condition of Theorem 1.1. 

6 A DeGiorgi-Type Lemma

For a fixed cylinder $[(y, s) + Q_{2\rho}(\theta)] \subset E_T$, denote by $\mu_\pm$ and $\omega$, non-negative numbers such that

$$\mu_+ \geq \text{ess sup}_{[(y, s) + Q_{2\rho}(\theta)]} u, \quad \mu_- \leq \text{ess inf}_{[(y, s) + Q_{2\rho}(\theta)]} u, \quad \omega \geq \mu_+-\mu_-.$$  

(6.1)

Let $\xi \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ be fixed and let $\theta = 2\xi\omega$. This is an intrinsic cylinder in that its length $\theta\rho$ depends on the oscillation of $u$ within it. We assume momentarily that the indicated choice of parameters can be effected.

**Lemma 6.1** Let $u$ belong to $[DG]^{-}(E_T, \gamma)$. There exists a number $\nu_-$ depending on $N$, and $\gamma$ only, such that if

$$||u \leq \mu_- + \xi\omega \cap [(y, s) + Q_{2\rho}(\theta)]|| \leq \nu_- |Q_{2\rho}(\theta)|,$$  

then

$$u \geq \mu_- + \frac{1}{2}\xi\omega \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [(y, s) + Q_{\rho}(\theta)].$$  

(6.3)

Likewise, if $u$ belongs to $[DG]^{+}(E_T, \gamma)$, there exists a number $\nu_+$ depending on $N$, and $\gamma$ only, such that if

$$||u \geq \mu_+ - \xi\omega \cap [(y, s) + Q_{2\rho}(\theta)]|| \leq \nu_+ |Q_{2\rho}(\theta)|,$$  

then

$$u \leq \mu_+ - \frac{1}{2}\xi\omega \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [(y, s) + Q_{\rho}(\theta)].$$  

(6.5)
**Proof:** We prove (6.2)–(6.3), the proof for (6.4)–(6.5) being similar. We may assume \((y, s) = (0, 0)\) and for \(n = 0, 1, \ldots\), set

\[
\rho_n = \rho + \frac{\rho}{2^n}, \quad B_n = B_{\rho_n}, \quad Q_n = B_n \times (-\theta \rho_n, 0].
\]

Apply (3.2) over \(B_n\) and \(Q_n\) to \((u - k_n)_-\), for the levels

\[
k_n = \mu_\gamma + \xi_n \omega \quad \text{where} \quad \xi_n = \frac{1}{2} \xi + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \xi.
\]

The cutoff function \(\zeta\) is taken of the form

\[
\zeta_1 = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{in } B_{n+1} \\
0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N - B_n 
\end{cases}

|D\zeta_1| \leq \frac{1}{\rho_n - \rho_{n+1}} = \frac{2^{n+1}}{\rho}
\]

\[
\zeta_2 = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } t < -\theta \rho_n \\
1 & \text{for } t \geq -\theta \rho_{n+1}
\end{cases}

0 \leq \zeta_2, t \leq \frac{1}{\theta(\rho_n - \rho_{n+1})} = \frac{2^{(n+1)}}{\theta \rho}.
\]

Inequality (8.2) with these stipulations yields

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ess sup}_{-\theta \rho_n < t < 0} \int_{B_n} (u - k_n)_- \zeta(x, t) dx + \int_{-\theta \rho_n}^0 \|D(u - k_n)_- \zeta\|(B_n) dt & \\
& \leq \frac{2^n}{\rho} \left( \iint_{Q_n} (u - k_n)_- dx dt + \frac{1}{\theta} \iint_{Q_n} (u - k_n)_-^2 dx dt \right) \\
& \leq \frac{2^n (\xi \omega)}{\rho} |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n|.
\end{align*}
\]

By the embedding Proposition 4.1 of [7] Preliminaries

\[
\iint_{Q_n} [(u - k_n)_- \zeta]^\frac{N+2}{N} dx dt \leq \int_{-\theta \rho_n}^0 \|D[(u - k_n)_- \zeta]\|(B_n) dt \\
\times \left( \text{ess sup}_{-\theta \rho_n < t < 0} \int_{B_n} [(u - k_n)_- \zeta(x, t)]^2 dx \right) \frac{1}{\rho} \\
\leq \gamma \left( \frac{2^n}{\rho} \xi \omega \right)^\frac{N+1}{N} |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n|^{\frac{N+1}{2}}.
\]

Estimate below

\[
\iint_{Q_n} [(u - k_n)_- \zeta]^\frac{N+2}{N} dx dt \geq \left( \frac{\xi \omega}{2^{n+2}} \right)^\frac{N+2}{N} |[u < k_{n+1}] \cap Q_{n+1}|.
\]

and set

\[
Y_n = \frac{|[u < k_n] \cap Q_n|}{|Q_n|}.
\]
Then
\[ Y_{n+1} \leq \gamma b^n Y_n^{1 + \frac{1}{N}} \]
where
\[ b = 2^{\frac{1}{N}[3N+4]} \].
By Lemma 5.1 of [7, Preliminaries], \( \{Y_n\} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \), provided
\[ Y_0 < \gamma - N \cdot b^{-N^2} \text{ def } = \nu_-. \]
The proof of (6.4)–(6.5) is almost identical. One starts from inequalities 3.2+ written for the truncated functions
\[ (u - k_n)_+ \quad \text{with} \quad k_n = \mu_+ - \xi_n \omega \]
for the same choice of \( \xi_n \).

7 A Time Expansion of Positivity

For a fixed cylinder
\[ [(y, s) + Q_2^+(\theta)] = B_{2\rho}(y) \times (s, s + \theta \rho) \subset E_T, \]
denote by \( \mu_\pm \) and \( \omega \), non-negative numbers satisfying the analog of (6.1). Let also \( \xi \in (0, 1) \) be a fixed parameter. The value of \( \theta \) will be determined by the proof; we momentarily assume that such a choice can be done.

Lemma 7.1 Let \( u \in [DG]^-(E_T, \gamma) \) and assume that for some \( (y, s) \in E_T \) and some \( \rho > 0 \)
\[ |u(\cdot, s) \geq \mu_- + \xi \omega| \cap B_\rho(y)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B_\rho(y)|. \]
Then, there exist \( \delta \) and \( \epsilon \) in \( (0, 1) \), depending only on \( N, \gamma \), and independent of \( \xi \), such that
\[ |[u(\cdot, t) > \mu_- + \epsilon \xi \omega| \cap B_\rho(y)| \geq \frac{1}{4}|B_\rho| \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in (s, s + \delta(\xi \omega) \rho]. \]

Proof: Assume \((y, s) = (0, 0)\) and for \( k > 0 \) and \( t > 0 \) set
\[ A_{k,\rho}(t) = [u(\cdot, t) < k] \cap B_\rho. \]
The assumption implies
\[ |A_{\mu_- + \xi \omega, \rho}(0)| \leq \frac{1}{4}|B_\rho|. \]
Write down inequalities 3.2+ for the truncated functions \((u - (\mu_- + \xi \omega))_+\), over the cylinder \( B_\rho \times (0, \theta \rho] \), where \( \theta > 0 \) is to be chosen. The cutoff function \( \zeta \) is taken independent of \( t \), non-negative, and such that
\[ \zeta = 1 \quad \text{on} \quad B_{(1-\sigma)\rho}, \quad \text{and} \quad |D\zeta| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma \rho}, \]
where $\sigma \in (0,1)$ is to be chosen. Discarding the non-negative term containing $D(u - (\mu_+ + \xi \omega))_-$ on the left-hand side, these inequalities yield

$$
\int_{B_{(1-\sigma)}^\rho} \rho (u - (\mu_+ + \xi \omega))_-^2 \, dx \leq \int_{B_{\rho}^\theta} \rho (u - (\mu_+ + \xi \omega))_-^2 \, dx \\
+ \frac{\gamma}{\sigma \rho} \int_0^\theta \int_{B_{\rho}^\theta} (u - (\mu_+ + \xi \omega))_- \, dx \, dt \\
\leq (\xi \omega)^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\gamma \theta}{\sigma (\xi \omega)} \right] \rho |B_{\rho}^\theta|
$$

for all $t \in (0,\theta \rho)$, where we have enforced (7.1). The left-hand side is estimated below by

$$
\int_{B_{(1-\sigma)}^\rho} \rho (u - (\mu_+ + \xi \omega))_-^2 \, dx \\
\geq \int_{B_{(1-\sigma)}^\rho \cap [u < \mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega]} (u - (\mu_+ + \xi \omega))_-^2 \, dx \\
\geq (\xi \omega)^2 (1 - \epsilon)^2 |A_{\mu_+ + \xi \omega,(1-\sigma)}^\rho(t)|
$$

where $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ is to be chosen. Next, estimate

$$
|A_{\mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega, \rho}(t)| = |A_{\mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega, (1-\sigma)}^\rho(t) \cup (A_{\mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega, \rho}(t) - A_{\mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega, (1-\sigma)}^\rho(t))| \\
\leq |A_{\mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega, (1-\sigma)}^\rho(t)| + |B_{\rho} - B_{(1-\sigma)}^\rho| \\
\leq |A_{\mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega, (1-\sigma)}(t)| + N \sigma |B_{\rho}|.
$$

Combining these estimates gives

$$
|A_{\mu_+ + \epsilon \xi \omega, \rho}(t)| \leq \frac{1}{(\xi \omega)^2 (1 - \epsilon)^2} \int_{B_{(1-\sigma)}^\rho} (u - (\mu_+ + \xi \omega))_-^2 \, dx + N \sigma |B_{\rho}| \\
\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \epsilon)^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\gamma \theta}{\sigma (\xi \omega)} + N \sigma \right] |B_{\rho}|.
$$

Choose $\theta = \delta(\xi \omega)$ and then set

$$
\sigma = \frac{1}{16 N}, \quad \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{32}, \quad \delta = \frac{1}{2^{8} \gamma N}.
$$

This proves the lemma.

8 Proof of the Sufficient Part of Theorem 1.1

Having fixed $(x_o, t_o) \in E_T$ assume it coincides with the origin of $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and let $\rho > 0$ be so small that $Q_{\rho} \subset E_T$. Set

$$
\mu_+ = \text{ess sup}_{Q_{\rho}} u, \quad \mu_- = \text{ess inf}_{Q_{\rho}} u, \quad \omega = \mu_+ - \mu_- = \text{ess osc}_{Q_{\rho}} u.
$$
Without loss of generality, we may assume that \( \omega \leq 1 \) so that
\[
Q_\rho(\omega) = B_\rho \times (-\omega \rho, 0] \subset Q_\rho \subset E_T
\]
and
\[
\text{ess osc}_{Q_\rho(\omega)} u \leq \omega.
\]
If \( u \) were not continuous at \((x_o, t_o)\), there would exist \( \rho_o > 0 \) and \( \omega_o > 0 \), such that
\[
\omega_\rho = \text{ess osc}_{Q_\rho(u)} u \geq \omega_o > 0 \quad \text{for all } \rho \leq \rho_o. \tag{8.1}
\]
Let \( \delta \) be determined from the last of (7.2). At the time level \( t = -\delta \omega \rho \), either
\[
\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{|B_\rho|} \int_{{\mathcal{E}}} |Du(\cdot, t)| \geq \frac{1}{4} |B_\rho|, \quad \text{or}
\]
Assuming the former holds, by Lemma 7.1
\[
\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{|B_\rho|} \int_{{\mathcal{E}}} |Du(\cdot, t)| \geq \frac{1}{4} |B_\rho| \quad \text{for all } t \in (-\delta \omega \rho, 0]. \tag{8.2}
\]
Next, apply the discrete isoperimetric inequality of Lemma 2.2 of [7, Preliminaries] to the function \( u(\cdot, t) \), for \( t \) in the range \((-\xi \omega \rho, 0]\), over the ball \( B_\rho \), for the levels
\[
k = \mu_- + \xi \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \ell = \mu_- + 2\xi \omega \quad \text{so that} \quad \ell - k = \xi \omega.
\]
This inequality is stated and proved in [7] for functions in \( W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(E) \). It continues to hold for \( u \in BV_{\text{loc}}(E) \), by virtue of the approximation procedure of [9, Theorem 1.17]. Taking also into account (8.2) this gives
\[
\xi \omega |u(\cdot, t) < \mu_- + \xi \omega| \cap B_\rho| \leq \gamma \rho |Du(\cdot, t)| \cap B_\rho|.
\]
Integrating in \( dt \) over the time interval \((-\xi \omega \rho, 0]\), gives
\[
\frac{|[u < \mu_- + \xi \omega]| \cap Q_\rho(\xi \omega)|}{|Q_\rho(\xi \omega)|} \leq \frac{\gamma}{(\xi \omega)^2} \frac{\rho}{|Q_\rho|} \int_{{-\rho}}^{0} |Du(\cdot, t)| (B_\rho) dt.
\]
By the assumption, the right-hand side tends to zero as \( \rho \searrow 0 \). Hence, there exists \( \rho \) so small that
\[
\frac{|[u < \mu_- + \xi \omega]| \cap Q_\rho(\xi \omega)|}{|Q_\rho(\xi \omega)|} \leq \nu_-
\]
where $\nu_-$ is the number claimed by Lemma 6.1 for such choice of parameters. The Lemma then implies
\[
\text{ess inf}_{Q_{\frac{3}{2}\rho}(\xi)} u \geq \mu_- + \frac{1}{2}\xi \omega,
\]
and hence
\[
\text{ess osc}_{Q_{\frac{3}{2}\rho}(\xi)} u \leq \eta \omega \quad \text{where} \quad \eta = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\xi \in (0, 1).
\]
Setting $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}\xi \omega \rho$ gives
\[
\omega \rho_1 = \text{ess osc}_{Q_{\rho_1} u} \leq \eta \omega.
\]
Repeat now the same argument starting from the cylinder $Q_{\rho_1}$, and proceed recursively to generate a decreasing sequence of radii $\{\rho_n\} \to 0$ such that
\[
\omega \leq \text{ess osc}_{Q_{\rho_n} u} \leq \eta^n \omega \quad \text{for all} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

**Appendix A  Proof of Proposition 3.1**

The proof uses an approximation procedure of [2]. Observe first that the assumption $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(E_T)$ permits to cast (1.1) in the form
\[
\|Du(t)\|_{(E)} \leq \|D(u + \varphi)(t)\|_{(E)} - \int_E u_t \varphi dx
\]  (A.1)
for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ for all
\[
\varphi \in \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(E) \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(E) \quad \text{with supp}\{\varphi\} \subset E.
\]  (A.2)
We only prove the estimate for $(u - k)_+$, the one for $(u - k)_-$ being similar. Fix a cylinder
\[
[(x_0, t_0) + Q_{\rho}(\theta)] \subset E_T.
\]
Up to a translation, assume that $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$ and fix a time $t \in (-\theta \rho, 0)$ for which
\[
\int_{B_{\rho}} |u_t(x,t)| dx < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad u(\cdot, t) \in \text{BV}(E) \cap L^\infty(B_{\rho}).
\]
The next approximation procedure is carried out for such $t$ fixed and we write $u(\cdot, t) = u$. By [3, Theorem 1.17], there exists $\{u_j\} \subset C^\infty(B_{\rho})$ such that
\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \int_{B_{\rho}} |u_j - u| dx = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|Du\|_{(E)} = \lim_{j \to \infty} \int_E |Du_j| dx.
\]  (A.3)
Test (A.1) with $\varphi = -\zeta(u - k)_+$, where $\zeta \in C(Q_{\rho}(\theta))$. This is an admissible choice, since $u \in \text{BV}(E) \cap L^\infty(B_{\rho})$. Set $\varphi_j = -\zeta(u_j - k)_+$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. For a given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
\[
\int_E |Du_j| dx < \|Du(\cdot, t)\|_{(E)} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \quad \text{for all} \quad j \geq j_0.
\]
Here we have used the second of (A.3). By the first, \((u_j + \varphi_j) \rightarrow (u + \varphi)\) in \(L^1(E)\). Therefore, for any \(\psi \in [C_0^1(E)]^N\) with \(\|\psi\| \leq 1\),

\[
\int_E (u + \varphi) \text{div} \, \psi \, dx = \lim_{j \to \infty} \int_E (u_j + \varphi_j) \text{div} \, \psi \, dx
\leq \lim \inf_{j \to \infty} \int_E |D(u_j + \varphi_j)| \, dx.
\]

Taking the supremum over all such \(\psi\) gives

\[
\|D(u + \varphi)(t)\|(E) \leq \lim \inf_{j \to \infty} \int_E |D(u_j + \varphi_j)| \, dx.
\]

Therefore, up to redefining \(j_o\) we may also assume that

\[
\int_E |D(u_j + \varphi_j)| \, dx \geq \|D(u + \varphi)\|(E) - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \quad \text{for all } j \geq j_o.
\]

Combining the preceding inequalities gives that

\[
\int_E |Du_j| \, dx < \|Du(\cdot, t)\|(E) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon
\leq \|D(u + \varphi)(\cdot, t)\|(E) + \int_E u_t(\cdot, t) \varphi \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \quad \text{(A.4)}
\leq \int_E |D(u_j + \varphi_j)| \, dx + \int_E u_t(\cdot, t) \varphi \, dx + \epsilon
\]

for all \(j \geq j_o\). Next, estimate the first integral on the right-hand side as,

\[
\int_E |D(u_j + \varphi_j)| \, dx = \int_E |D(u_j - \zeta(u_j - k) + \varphi_j)| \, dx
\leq \int_E |Du_j - \zeta D(u_j - k) + \varphi_j| \, dx + \int_E |D\zeta|(u_j - k) + \varphi_j| \, dx
\leq \int_E (1 - \zeta) |Du_j| + \zeta |Du_j - D(u_j - k) + \varphi_j| \, dx + \int_E |D\zeta|(u_j - k) + \varphi_j| \, dx.
\]

Put this in (A.4), and absorb the first integral on the right-hand side into the left-hand side, to obtain

\[
\int_E \zeta |Du_j - k + \varphi_j| \, dx = \int_E \zeta |Du_j - k| + |Du_j - D(u_j - k) + \varphi_j| \, dx
\leq \int_E |D\zeta|(u_j - k) + \varphi_j| \, dx + \int_E u_t(\cdot, t) \varphi \, dx + \epsilon.
\]

From this

\[
\int_E |D(\zeta(u_j - k) + \varphi_j)| \, dx \leq 2 \int_E |D\zeta|(u_j - k) + \varphi_j| \, dx + \int_E u_t(\cdot, t) \varphi \, dx + \epsilon.
\]
Next let $j \to \infty$, using the lower semicontinuity of the total variation with respect to $L^1$-convergence. This gives

$$\|D(\zeta (u - k) +)\|(B_\rho) \leq \liminf_{j \to \infty} \int_E |D(\zeta (u_j - k) +)dx$$

$$\leq \lim_{j \to \infty} 2 \int_E |D\zeta|(u_j - k)_+dx + \int_E u_t \varphi dx + \epsilon$$

$$= 2 \int_E |D\zeta|(u - k)_+dx + \int_E u_t \varphi dx + \epsilon.$$

Finally let $\epsilon \to 0$ and use the definition of $\varphi$ to get

$$\|D(\zeta (u - k) +)\|(B_\rho) \leq 2 \int_{B_\rho} |D\zeta|(u - k)_+dx - \int_{B_\rho} \zeta u_t (u - k)_+dx.$$

To conclude the proof, integrate in $dt$ over $(-\theta \rho, 0)$.

**Appendix B  Boundedness of Minimizers**

**Proposition B.1** Let $u : E_T \to \mathbb{R}$ be a parabolic minimizer of the total variation flow in the sense of (1.1). Furthermore, assume that $u \in L^r_{\text{loc}}(E_T)$ for some $r > N$, and that it can be constructed as the limit in $L^r_{\text{loc}}(E_T)$ of a sequence of parabolic minimizers satisfying (1.2). Then, there exists a positive constant $\gamma$ depending only upon $N, \gamma, r$, such that

$$\sup_{B_\rho(y) \times [s,t]} u_\pm \leq \gamma \left( \frac{\rho}{t - s} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{r}} \left( \frac{1}{\rho^N(t - s)} \int_{2s - t}^t \int_{B_{2\rho}(y)} u_\pm^r dx d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{r - N}}$$

for all cylinders

$$B_{4\rho}(y) \times [s - (t - s), s + (t - s)] \subset E_T.$$

The constant $\gamma(N, \gamma, r) \to \infty$ as either $r \to N$, or $r \to \infty$.

**Remark B.1** It is not required that the approximations to $u$ satisfy (1.2) uniformly. The latter is only needed to cast a function satisfying (1.1) into a DeGiorgi class. The proof of the proposition only uses such a membership, and turns such a qualitative, non-uniform information into the quantitative information (B.1).

**Proof** (of Proposition B.1). Let $\{u_j\}$ be a sequence of approximating functions to $u$. Since $u_j$ satisfy (1.2), they belong to the classes $[DG](E_T; 2)$, by Proposition 3.1. It will suffice to establish (B.1) for such $u_j$ for a constant $\gamma$ independent of $j$. Thus in the calculations below we drop the suffix $j$ from $u_j$. The proof will be given for non-negative $u \in [DG]^+(E_T; 2)$, the proof for the remaining
case being identical; it is very similar to the proof of Proposition A.2.1 given in \[4, \S A.2\]. Assume \((y, s) = (0, 0)\) and for fixed \(\sigma \in (0, 1)\) and \(n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\) set
\[
\begin{align*}
\rho_n &= \sigma \rho + \frac{1 - \sigma}{2^n} \rho, \\
B_n &= B_{\rho_n}, \\
t_n &= -\sigma t + \frac{1 - \sigma}{2^n} t, \\
Q_n &= B_n \times (t_n, t).
\end{align*}
\]
This is a family of nested and shrinking cylinders with common “vertex” at \((0, t)\), and by construction
\[
Q_0 = B_\rho \times (-t, t) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_\infty = B_{\sigma \rho} \times (-\sigma t, t).
\]
We have assumed that \(u\) can be constructed as the limit in \(L^{1}_{loc}(E_T)\) of a sequence of bounded parabolic minimizers. By working with such approximations, we may assume that \(u\) is qualitatively locally bounded. Therefore, set
\[
M = \text{ess sup}_{Q_0} \max\{u, 0\}, \quad M_\sigma = \text{ess sup}_{Q_\infty} \max\{u, 0\}.
\]
We first find a relationship between \(M\) and \(M_\sigma\). Denote by \(\zeta\) a non-negative, piecewise smooth cutoff function in \(Q_n\) that equals one on \(Q_{n+1}\), and has the form
\[
\begin{align*}
\zeta_1 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1 & \text{in } B_{n+1} \\
0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N - B_n \end{array} \right. \quad |D\zeta_1| \leq \frac{2^{n+1}}{(1 - \sigma)\rho} \\
\zeta_2 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{for } t \leq t_n \\
1 & \text{for } t \geq t_{n+1} \end{array} \right. \quad 0 \leq \zeta_{2,t} \leq \frac{2^{n+1}}{(1 - \sigma)t};
\end{align*}
\]
introduce the increasing sequence of levels \(k_n = k - 2^{-n}k\), where \(k > 0\) is to be chosen, and in \([3.2]_+,\) take such a test function, to get
\[
\begin{align*}
\sup_{t_n \leq \tau \leq t} & \int_{B_n} (u - k_{n+1})_+ \zeta^2(x, \tau) dx + \int_{t_n}^{t} \|D[(u - k_{n+1})_+ \zeta](\cdot, \tau)\|_{(B_n)} d\tau \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma 2^n}{(1 - \sigma)\rho} \int_{Q_n} (u - k_{n+1})_+ dx d\tau \\
& \quad + \frac{\gamma 2^n}{(1 - \sigma)t} \int_{Q_n} (u - k_{n+1})^2_+ dx d\tau. \tag{B.2}
\end{align*}
\]
Estimate
\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{Q_n} (u - k_{n+1})_+ dx d\tau & \leq \frac{\gamma 2^{n(r-1)}}{k^{r-1}} \int_{Q_n} (u - k_{n})_+^r dx d\tau, \\
\int_{Q_n} (u - k_{n+1})^2_+ dx d\tau & \leq \frac{\gamma 2^{n(r-2)}}{k^{r-2}} \int_{Q_n} (u - k_{n})_+^r dx d\tau.
\end{align*}
\]
Taking these estimates into account yields
\[
\sup_{t_n < \tau \leq t} \int_{B_n} [(u - k_{n+1}) + \zeta]^2(x, \tau) \, dx + \int_{t_n}^t \|D[(u - k_{n+1}) + \zeta](\cdot, \tau)](B_n) \, d\tau \\
\leq \gamma \frac{2^{nr}}{(1 - \sigma)t} \left[ \left( \frac{N}{N+1} \right)^{k-2} + \frac{1}{k^{r-2}} \right] \int_{Q_n} (u - k_n)^r_+ \, dx \, d\tau.
\]
Assuming that \( k > \frac{t}{\rho} \), this implies
\[
\sup_{t_n < \tau \leq t} \int_{B_n} [(u - k_{n+1}) + \zeta]^2(x, \tau) \, dx + \int_{t_n}^t \|D[(u - k_{n+1}) + \zeta](\cdot, \tau)](B_n) \, d\tau \\
\leq \frac{\gamma 2^{nr}}{(1 - \sigma)t} \left[ \left( \frac{N}{N+1} \right)^{k-2} + \frac{1}{k^{r-2}} \right] \int_{Q_n} (u - k_n)^r_+ \, dx \, d\tau.
\]
Set
\[
Y_n = \frac{1}{|Q_n|} \int_{Q_n} (u - k_n)^r_+ \, dx \, d\tau
\]
and estimate
\[
Y_{n+1} \leq \|u\|_{r, Q_n}^{r-q} \left( \frac{1}{|Q_n|} \int_{Q_n} (u - k_{n+1})^q_+ \, dx \, d\tau \right),
\]
where \( q \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{N-2}{r+2} \). Applying the embedding Proposition 4.1 of [7, Preliminaries], the previous inequality can be rewritten as
\[
Y_{n+1} \leq \gamma \|u\|_{r, Q_o}^{r-q} \left( \frac{b^n}{(1 - \sigma)^{\frac{b}{2}(N+1)}} \right) \frac{1}{k^{r-2N}} Y_n^{1 + \frac{b}{2}},
\]
where \( b \overset{\text{def}}{=} 2^r \frac{2^{r+N}}{r+2} \). Apply Lemma 5.1 of [7, Preliminaries], and conclude that \( Y_n \to 0 \) as \( n \to +\infty \), provided \( k \) is chosen to satisfy
\[
Y_o = \iint_{Q_o} u^r \, dx \, d\tau = \gamma (1 - \sigma)^{N+1} \|u\|_{r, Q_o}^{-(r-q)N} \left( \frac{t}{\rho} \right)^N k^{(r-2)(N+1)},
\]
which yields
\[
M_\sigma \leq \gamma \frac{M^{N+(r-q)N}}{(1 - \sigma)^{r-2N}} \left( \frac{t}{\rho} \right)^{N(N+1)(r-2)} \left( \iint_{Q_o} u^r \, dx \, d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{(r-2)(N+1)}}.
\]
The proof is concluded by the interpolation Lemma 5.2 of [7, Preliminaries].
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