

Regularity results for solutions to obstacle problems with Sobolev coefficients

Michele Caselli, Andrea Gentile, Raffaella Giova

January 27, 2022

Abstract

We establish the higher differentiability of solutions to a class of obstacle problems of the type

$$\min \left\{ \int_{\Omega} f(x, Dv(x)) dx : v \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega) \right\},$$

where ψ is a fixed function called obstacle, $\mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega) = \{v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) : v \geq \psi \text{ a.e. in } \Omega\}$ and the convex integrand f satisfies p -growth conditions with respect to the gradient variable. We derive that the higher differentiability property of the weak solution v is related to the regularity of the assigned ψ , under a suitable Sobolev assumption on the partial map $x \mapsto D_{\xi} f(x, \xi)$. The main novelty is that such assumption is independent of the dimension n and that, in the case $p \leq n - 2$, improves previous known results.

AMS Classifications. 35J87; 49J40; 47J20.

Key words and phrases. Local minimizers; Obstacle problems; Higher differentiability; Sobolev coefficients.

1 Introduction

We are interested in the study of the regularity of the gradient of the solutions to variational obstacle problems of the form

$$\min \left\{ \int_{\Omega} f(x, Dv(x)) : v \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega) \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded open set, $\psi : \Omega \mapsto [-\infty, +\infty)$ belonging to the Sobolev class $W_{\text{loc}}^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}$ is the *obstacle*, and

$$\mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega) = \{v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) : v \geq \psi \text{ a.e. in } \Omega\}$$

is the class of the admissible functions.

Let us observe that $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a solution to the obstacle problem (1.1) in $\mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega)$ if and only if $u \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega)$ and u is a solution to the variational inequality

$$\int_{\Omega} \langle A(x, Du(x)), D(\varphi(x) - u(x)) \rangle dx \geq 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega), \quad (1.2)$$

where the operator $A(x, \xi) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as follows

$$A_i(x, \xi) = D_{\xi_i} f(x, \xi) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We assume that A is a p -harmonic operator, that satisfies the following p -ellipticity and p -growth conditions with respect to the ξ -variable. There exist positive constants ν, L, ℓ and an exponent $p \geq 2$ and a parameter $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ such that

$$\langle A(x, \xi) - A(x, \eta), \xi - \eta \rangle \geq \nu |\xi - \eta|^2 (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$|A(x, \xi) - A(x, \eta)| \leq L |\xi - \eta| (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$|A(x, \xi)| \leq \ell (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for almost every $x \in \Omega$.

The regularity for solutions of obstacle problems has been object of intense study not only in the case of variational inequalities modelled upon the p - Laplacean energy [8, 9, 13, 29] but also in the case of more general structures [4, 5, 11, 16, 17]

It is usually observed that the regularity of solutions to the obstacle problems depends on the regularity of the obstacle itself: for linear problems the solutions are as regular as the obstacle; this is no longer the case in the nonlinear setting for general integrands without any specific structure. Hence along the years, in this situation there has been an intense research activity in which extra regularity has been imposed on the obstacle to balance the nonlinearity (see [2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 27])

In some very recent papers the authors analyzed how an extra differentiability of integer or fractional order of the gradient of the obstacle transfers to the gradient of the solutions (see [13, 14]).

The analysis comes from the fact that the regularity of the solutions to the obstacle problem (1.1) is strictly connected to the analysis of the regularity of the solutions to partial differential equation of the form

$$\operatorname{div} A(x, Du) = \operatorname{div} A(x, D\psi). \quad (1.3)$$

It is well known that no extra differentiability properties for the solutions can be expected even if the obstacle ψ is smooth, unless some assumption is given on the x -dependence of the operator A . Therefore, inspired by recent results concerning the higher differentiability of integer ([12, 18, 20, 21, 22, 30, 31]) and fractional ([1, 10]) order for the solutions to elliptic equations or systems, in a number of papers the higher differentiability of the solution of an obstacle problem is proved under a suitable Sobolev assumption on the partial map $x \mapsto A(x, \xi)$. More precisely, in [13] is proved the higher differentiability of the solution of an homogeneous obstacle problem with the energy density satisfying p -growth conditions; in [14] the integrand f depends also on the v variable; in [17] the energy density satisfies (p, q) -growth conditions. The nonhomogeneous obstacle problem is considered in [28] when the energy density satisfies p -growth conditions and in [7] when the energy density satisfies (p, q) -growth conditions. All previous quoted higher differentiability results have been obtained under a $W^{1,r}$ with $r \leq n$ Sobolev assumption on the dependence on x of the operator A .

It is well known that the local boundedness of the solutions to a variational problem is a turning point in the regularity theory. Actually, in [22] it has been proved that, when dealing with bounded solutions to (1.3), the higher differentiability holds true under weaker assumptions on the partial map $x \mapsto A(x, \xi)$ with respect to $W^{1,n}$. Recently, in [7] it is proved that a local bound assumption on the obstacle ψ implies a local bound for the solutions to the obstacle problem (1.1), and this allows us to prove that the higher differentiability of solutions to (1.1) persists assuming that the partial map $x \mapsto A(x, \xi)$ belongs to a Sobolev class that is not related to the dimension n but to the growth exponent of the functional. More precisely, we assume that there exists a non-negative function $\kappa \in L_{\text{loc}}^{p+2}(\Omega)$ such that

$$|A(x, \xi) - A(y, \xi)| \leq (\kappa(x) + \kappa(y)) |x - y| (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \quad (\text{A4})$$

for almost every $x, y \in \Omega$ and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The condition (A4) is equivalent to assume that the operator A has a Sobolev-type dependence on the x -variable (see [24]). Such assumption has been used for non constrained minimizers in [25, 26]. We will prove a higher differentiability result assuming that

$D\psi \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}(\Omega)$. More precisely, we shall prove the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $A(x, \xi)$ satisfy the conditions (A1)–(A4) for an exponent $p \geq 2$ and let $u \in \mathcal{K}_\psi(\Omega)$ be a solution to the obstacle problem (1.2). Then, if $\psi \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$ the following implication holds*

$$D\psi \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}(\Omega) \Rightarrow \left(\mu^2 + |Du|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4}} Du \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega),$$

with the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}} \left| D \left[\left(\mu^2 + |Du|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4}} Du \right] \right|^2 dx \leq \\ \frac{c(\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|u\|_{L^{p^*}(B_R)}^2)}{R^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_R} \left[1 + |D^2\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + |D\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + \kappa^{p+2} + |Du|^p \right] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

Note that in the case $p < n - 2$ Theorem 1.1 improves the results in [13] and [14]. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is achieved combining a suitable a priori estimate for the second derivative of the local solutions, obtained using the difference quotient method, with a suitable approximation argument. The local boundedness allows us to use an interpolation inequality that gives the higher local integrability L^{p+2} of the gradient of the solutions. Such higher integrability is the key tool in order to weaken the assumption on κ that in previous results has been assumed at least in L^n .

Moreover, our result is obtained under a weaker assumption also on the gradient of the obstacle. Indeed, previous results assumed $D\psi \in W^{1,p}$ while our assumption is $D\psi \in W^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}$ with $p > 2$.

Finally, we observe that the assumption of boundedness of the obstacle ψ is needed to get the boundedness of the solution (see Theorem 2.2). Therefore if we deal with a priori bounded minimizers, then the result holds without the hypothesis $\psi \in L^\infty$.

2 Notations and preliminary results

In this section we list the notations that we use in this paper and recall some tools that will be useful to prove our results.

We shall follow the usual convention and denote by C or c a general constant that may vary on different occasions, even within the same line of estimates. Relevant dependencies on parameters and special constants will be suitably emphasized using parentheses or subscripts. All the norms we use on \mathbb{R}^n , \mathbb{R}^N and $\mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ will be the standard Euclidean ones and denoted by $|\cdot|$ in all cases. In particular, for matrices $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ we write $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle := \text{trace}(\xi^T \eta)$ for the usual inner product of ξ and η , and $|\xi| := \langle \xi, \xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for the corresponding Euclidean norm. When $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we write $a \otimes b \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ for the tensor product defined as the matrix that has the element $a_r b_s$ in its r -th row and s -th column. For a C^2 function $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we write

$$D_\xi f(x, \xi)[\eta] := \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} f(x, \xi + t\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\xi\xi} f(x, \xi)[\eta, \eta] := \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} f(x, \xi + t\eta)$$

for $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ and for almost every $x \in \Omega$.

With the symbol $B(x, r) = B_r(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |y - x| < r\}$, we will denote the ball centered at x of radius r and

$$(u)_{x_0, r} = \int_{B_r(x_0)} u(x) dx,$$

stands for the integral mean of u over the ball $B_r(x_0)$. We shall omit the dependence on the center when it is clear from the context. In the following, we will denote, for any ball $B = B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < r\} \Subset \Omega$

$$\oint_B u(x) dx = \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B u(x) dx. \quad (2.1)$$

Here we recall some results that will be useful in the following. The following Gagliardo-Nirenberg type inequalities are stated as in [22]. For the proofs see the Appendix A of [6] and Lemma 3.5 in [19] (in case $p(x) \equiv p, \forall x$) respectively.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $\phi \in C_0^1(\Omega)$ with $\phi \geq 0$, and any C^2 map $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \phi^{\frac{m}{m+1}(p+2)}(x) |Dv(x)|^{\frac{m}{m+1}(p+2)} dx \\ & \leq (p+2)^2 \left(\int_{\Omega} \phi^{\frac{m}{m+1}(p+2)}(x) |v(x)|^{2m} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \cdot \left[\left(\int_{\Omega} \phi^{\frac{m}{m+1}(p+2)}(x) |D\phi(x)|^2 |Dv(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + n \left(\int_{\Omega} \phi^{\frac{m}{m+1}(p+2)}(x) |Dv(x)|^{p-2} |D^2v(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

for any $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $m > 1$. Moreover, for any $\mu \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \phi^2(x) \left(\mu^2 + |Dv(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} |Dv(x)|^2 dx \\ & \leq c \|v\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}(\phi))}^2 \int_{\Omega} \phi^2(x) \left(\mu^2 + |Dv(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |D^2v(x)|^2 dx \\ & \quad + c \|v\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}(\phi))}^2 \int_{\Omega} \left(\phi^2(x) + |D\phi(x)|^2 \right) \left(\mu^2 + |Dv(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

for a constant $c = c(p)$.

By a density argument, one can easilt estimates (2.2) and (2.3) are still true for any map $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(\Omega)$.

Moreover, if we recall Theorem 1.1 in [7] in the case $p = q$ that suits with our ellipticity and growth assumptions:

Theorem 2.2. *Let u in $K_\psi(\Omega)$ be a solution of (3.8) under the assumptions (A1) and (A2). If the obstacle $\psi \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$, then $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$ and the following estimate*

$$\sup_{B_{R/2}} |u| \leq \left[\sup |\psi| + \left(\int_{B_R} |u|^{p^*} dx \right) \right]^\gamma \quad (2.4)$$

holds for every ball $B_R \Subset \Omega$, for $\gamma(n, p) > 0$ and $c = c(\ell, \nu, p, n)$,

We will use the auxiliary function $V_p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, defined as

$$V_p(\xi) := \left(\mu^2 + |\xi|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4}} \xi, \quad (2.5)$$

for which the following estimates hold (see [?])

Lemma 2.3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. There is a constant $c = c(n, p) > 0$ such that*

$$c^{-1} (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \leq \frac{|V_p(\xi) - V_p(\eta)|^2}{|\xi - \eta|^2} \leq c (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, \quad (2.6)$$

for any $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, for a C^2 function g , there is a constant $C(p)$ such that

$$C^{-1} |D^2 g|^2 (\mu^2 + |Dg|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \leq |D(V(Dg))|^2 \leq C |D^2 g|^2 (\mu^2 + |Dg|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \quad (2.7)$$

The next lemma can be proved using an iteration technique, and will be needed in the following. Its proof can be found for example in [23, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 2.4 (Iteration Lemma). *Let $h : [\rho, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a nonnegative bounded function, $0 < \theta < 1$, $A, B \geq 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. Assume that*

$$h(r) \leq \theta h(d) + \frac{A}{(d-r)^\gamma} + B$$

for all $\rho \leq r < d \leq R_0 < R$. Then

$$h(\rho) \leq \frac{cA}{(R_0 - \rho)^\gamma} + cB,$$

where $c = c(\theta, \gamma) > 0$.

2.1 Difference quotient

In order to get the regularity of the solutions of the problem (1.1), we shall use the difference quotient method. We recall here the definition and basic results.

Definition 2.5. Given $h \in \mathbb{R}$, for every function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the finite difference operator is defined by

$$\tau_h F(x) = F(x + h) - F(x).$$

We recall some properties of the finite difference operator that will be needed in the sequel. We start with the description of some elementary properties that can be found, for example, in [23].

Proposition 2.6. *Let F and G be two functions such that $F, G \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, with $p \geq 1$, and let us consider the set*

$$\Omega_{|h|} := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > |h|\}.$$

Then

$$(d1) \quad \tau_h F \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{|h|}) \text{ and}$$

$$D_i(\tau_h F) = \tau_h(D_i F).$$

$$(d2) \quad \text{If at least one of the functions } F \text{ or } G \text{ has support contained in } \Omega_{|h|} \text{ then}$$

$$\int_{\Omega} F \tau_h G \, dx = \int_{\Omega} G \tau_{-h} F \, dx.$$

$$(d3) \quad \text{We have}$$

$$\tau_h(FG)(x) = F(x + h)\tau_h G(x) + G(x)\tau_h F(x).$$

The next result about finite difference operator is a kind of integral version of Lagrange Theorem.

Lemma 2.7. *If $0 < \rho < R$, $|h| < \frac{R-\rho}{2}$, $1 < p < +\infty$, and $F, DF \in L^p(B_R)$ then*

$$\int_{B_\rho} |\tau_h F(x)|^p dx \leq c(n, p) |h|^p \int_{B_R} |DF(x)|^p dx.$$

Moreover

$$\int_{B_\rho} |F(x+h)|^p dx \leq \int_{B_R} |F(x)|^p dx.$$

We conclude this section recalling this result, that is proved in [23].

Lemma 2.8. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, $f \in L^p(B_R)$ with $1 < p < +\infty$. Suppose that there exist $\rho \in (0, R)$ and $M > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{s=1}^n \int_{B_\rho} |\tau_{s,h} f(x)|^p dx \leq M^p |h|^p$$

for every $h < \frac{R-\rho}{s}$. Then $f \in W^{1,p}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover

$$\|Df\|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \leq M.$$

3 Proof of the Theorem 1.1

The proof of the theorem will be divided in two steps: in the first one, we will establish the a priori estimate, while in the second one we will conclude through an approximation argument.

Proof. Step 1: The a priori estimate. Suppose that u is a local solution to the obstacle problem in $\mathcal{K}_\psi(\Omega)$ such that

$$Du \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\mu^2 + |Du|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4}} Du \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$$

. By estimate (2.4) and Lemma 2.1, we also have $|Du| \in L_{\text{loc}}^{p+2}(\Omega)$. Note that the a priori assumption $|Du| \in L_{\text{loc}}^{p+2}(\Omega)$ implies that the variational inequality (1.2), by a simple density argument, holds true for every $\varphi \in W^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}$.

In order to choose suitable test functions φ in (1.2) that involve the different quotient of the solution and at the same time belong to the class of the admissible functions $\mathcal{K}_\psi(\Omega)$, we proceed as done in [13].

Let us fix a ball $B_R \Subset \Omega$ and arbitrary radii $\frac{R}{2} < r < s < t < \lambda r < R$, with $1 < \lambda < 2$. Let us consider a cut off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_t)$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_s and $|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{c}{t-s}$. From now on, with no loss of generality, we suppose $R < 1$.

Let $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be such that

$$u - \psi + \tau v \geq 0 \quad \forall \tau \in [0, 1], \quad (3.1)$$

and observe that $\varphi := u + \tau v \in \mathcal{K}_\psi(\Omega)$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$, since $\varphi = u + \tau v \geq \psi$. For $|h| < \frac{R}{4}$, we consider

$$v_1(x) = \eta^2(x) [(u(x+h) - \psi(x+h)) - (u(x) - \psi(x))], \quad (3.2)$$

so we have $v_1 \in W_0^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}(\Omega)$, and, for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$, v_1 satisfies (3.1). Indeed, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
u(x) - \psi(x) + \tau v_1(x) &= u(x) - \psi(x) + \tau \eta^2(x) [(u - \psi)(x + h) - (u - \psi)(x)] \\
&= \tau \eta^2(x)(u - \psi)(x + h) + (1 - \tau \eta^2(x))(u - \psi)(x) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since $u \in \mathcal{K}_\psi(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$.

So we can use $\varphi = u + \tau v_1$ as a test function in inequality (1.2), thus getting

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x, Du(x)), D[\eta^2(x) [(u - \psi)(x + h) - (u - \psi)(x)]] \rangle dx. \quad (3.3)$$

In a similar way, we define

$$v_2(x) = \eta^2(x - h) [(u - \psi)(x - h) - (u - \psi)(x)], \quad (3.4)$$

and we have $v_2 \in W_0^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}(\Omega)$, and (3.1) still is satisfied for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$, since

$$\begin{aligned}
u(x) - \psi(x) + \tau v_2(x) &= u(x) - \psi(x) + \tau \eta^2(x - h) [(u - \psi)(x - h) - (u - \psi)(x)] \\
&= \tau \eta^2(x)(u - \psi)(x - h) + (1 - \tau \eta^2(x - h))(u - \psi)(x) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By using in (1.2) as test function $\varphi = u + \tau v_2$, we get

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x, Du(x)), D[\eta^2(x - h) [(u - \psi)(x - h) - (u - \psi)(x)]] \rangle dx, \quad (3.5)$$

and by means of a change of variable, we obtain

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x + h, Du(x + h)), D[\eta^2(x) [(u - \psi)(x) - (u - \psi)(x + h)]] \rangle dx. \quad (3.6)$$

Now we can add (3.3) and (3.6), thus getting

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x, Du(x)), D[\eta^2(x) [(u - \psi)(x + h) - (u - \psi)(x)]] \rangle dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x + h, Du(x + h)), D[\eta^2(x) [(u - \psi)(x) - (u - \psi)(x + h)]] \rangle dx,
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x, Du(x)) - A(x + h, Du(x + h)), D[\eta^2(x) [(u - \psi)(x + h) - (u - \psi)(x)]] \rangle dx,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x + h, Du(x + h)) - A(x, Du(x)), \eta^2(x) D[(u - \psi)(x + h) - (u - \psi)(x)] \rangle dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x + h, Du(x + h)) - A(x, Du(x)), 2\eta(x) D\eta(x) [(u - \psi)(x + h) - (u - \psi)(x)] \rangle dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Previous inequality can be rewritten as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x+h, Du(x+h)) - A(x+h, Du(x)), \eta^2(x)(Du(x+h) - Du(x)) \rangle dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x+h, Du(x+h)) - A(x+h, Du(x)), \eta^2(x)(D\psi(x+h) - D\psi(x)) \rangle dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x+h, Du(x+h)) - A(x+h, Du(x)), 2\eta(x)D\eta(x)\tau_h(u(x) - \psi(x)) \rangle dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x+h, Du(x)) - A(x, Du(x)), \eta^2(x)(Du(x+h) - Du(x)) \rangle dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x+h, Du(x)) - A(x, Du(x)), \eta^2(x)(D\psi(x+h) - D\psi(x)) \rangle dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \langle A(x+h, Du(x)) - A(x, Du(x)), 2\eta(x)D\eta(x)\tau_h(u - \psi) \rangle dx \\
&=: I + II + III + IV + V + VI,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

so we have

$$I \leq |II| + |III| + |IV| + |V| + |VI|. \tag{3.8}$$

By the ellipticity assumption (A1), we get

$$I \geq \nu \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx. \tag{3.9}$$

By virtue of assumption (A2), using Young's inequality with exponents $(2, 2)$, and then Hölder's inequality with exponents $\left(\frac{p+2}{4}, \frac{p+2}{p-2}\right)$, by the properties of η , we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| &\leq L \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)| \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\tau_h D\psi(x)| dx \\
&\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + c_{\varepsilon}(L) \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h D\psi(x)|^2 \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + c_{\varepsilon}(L) \left(\int_{B_t} |\tau_h D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{4}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x+h)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p+2}} \\
&\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + c_{\varepsilon}(L) |h|^2 \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{4}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x+h)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p+2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where we used Lemma 2.7. Similarly, by Young's and Hölder's inequality, by virtue of the properties of η , and Lemma 2.7, we can estimate the term $|III|$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
|III| &\leq 2L \int_{\Omega} \eta |D\eta| |\tau_h Du(x)| (\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\tau_h(u-\psi)| dx \\
&\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 (\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + \frac{c_{\varepsilon}(L)}{(t-s)^2} \int_{B_t \setminus B_s} (\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\tau_h(u-\psi)|^2 dx \\
&\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 (\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + \frac{c_{\varepsilon}(L)}{(t-s)^2} \cdot |h|^2 \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D(u-\psi)(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{4}{p+2}}. \quad (3.11)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate the term $|IV|$, we use assumption (A4), Young's inequality with exponents $(2, 2)$ and the properties of η , thus getting

$$\begin{aligned}
|IV| &\leq |h| \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) (\kappa(x+h) + \kappa(x)) (\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} |\tau_h Du(x)| dx \\
&\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 (\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \int_{B_t} (\kappa(x+h) + \kappa(x))^2 (\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

and using Hölder's inequality with exponents $(\frac{p+2}{2}, \frac{p+2}{p})$, and the properties of η , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|IV| &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 (\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p+2}}. \quad (3.12)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate the term $|V|$, we use the condition (A4) again, than Hölder's inequality with exponents $(p+2, \frac{p+2}{p-1}, \frac{p+2}{2})$, the properties of η , and the properties of difference quotients of Sobolev functions, so we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|V| &\leq |h| \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) (\kappa(x+h) + \kappa(x)) (\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} |\tau_h D\psi(x)| dx \\
&\leq |h| \left(\int_{B_t} (\kappa(x+h) + \kappa(x))^{p+2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+2}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} |\tau_h D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}} \\
&\leq |h|^2 \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+2}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}}, \quad (3.13)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption $D\psi \in W^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}$ and first estimate of Lemma 2.7.

For what concerns the term $|VI|$, using the condition (A4), the properties of η , Hölder's inequality with exponents $\left(p+2, \frac{p+2}{p-1}, \frac{p+2}{2}\right)$, and the properties of difference quotients of Sobolev functions, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|VI| &\leq 2|h| \int_{\Omega} \eta(x) |D\eta(x)| (\kappa(x+h) + \kappa(x)) (\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} |\tau_h(u-\psi)| dx \\
&\leq \frac{c|h|}{t-s} \left(\int_{B_t} (\kappa(x+h) + \kappa(x))^{p+2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+2}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} |\tau_h(u-\psi)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}} \\
&\leq \frac{c|h|^2}{t-s} \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa(x)^{p+2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+2}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D(u-\psi)(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}}. \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.9), (3.10), (3.11), (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14) into (3.8), and choosing $\varepsilon = \frac{\nu}{6}$, and reabsorbing the terms with the same integral of the right-hand side of (3.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nu \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 (\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
&\leq c|h|^2 \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{4}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p+2}} \\
&\quad + \frac{c|h|^2}{(t-s)^2} \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D(u-\psi)(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{4}{p+2}} \\
&\quad + c|h|^2 \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p+2}} \\
&\quad + c|h|^2 \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+2}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}} \\
&\quad + \frac{c|h|^2}{t-s} \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa(x)^{p+2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}} \cdot \left(\int_{B_t} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+2}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D(u-\psi)(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}}. \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we apply Young's inequality with exponents $\left(\frac{p+2}{4}, \frac{p+2}{p-2}\right)$ to the first two terms of the right-hand side of (3.15), Young's inequality with exponents $\left(\frac{p+2}{2}, \frac{p+2}{p}\right)$ to the third one, and $\left(p+2, \frac{p+2}{p-1}, \frac{p+2}{2}\right)$ to the last two terms, and since $u \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nu \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h Du(x)|^2 \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x+h)|^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} dx \\
& \leq \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x+h)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2 \psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + \frac{c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \cdot \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \\
& \quad + \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \frac{c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Recalling the right-hand side of the inequality (2.6) in Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nu \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |\tau_h V_p(Du(x))|^2 dx \\
& \leq \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x+h)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2 \psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + \frac{c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \cdot \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \\
& \quad + \varepsilon |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \frac{c_{\varepsilon} |h|^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Now we divide both sides by $|h|^2$ and use the Lemma 2.8, thus getting

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |DV_p(Du(x))|^2 dx \leq 4\varepsilon \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2 \psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + c_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + c_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \\
& \quad + \frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

and, by left-hand side of inequality (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |D^2 u(x)|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) |DV_p(Du(x))|^2 dx \\
& \leq 4\varepsilon \int_{B_{\lambda r}} (\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2}) dx + c_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2 \psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + c_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + c_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx + \frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

By inequality (2.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} |Du(x)|^2 dx \\
& \leq c \|u\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}(\eta))}^2 \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |D^2u(x)|^2 dx \\
& \quad + c \|u\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}(\eta))}^2 \int_{\Omega} \left(|\eta(x)|^2 + |D\eta(x)|^2 \right) \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Hence, thanks to estimate (3.19), and the properties of η we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \eta^2(x) \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} |Du(x)|^2 dx \leq \varepsilon \cdot c \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\lambda r})}^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \left(\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2} \right) dx \\
& \quad + c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\lambda r})}^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\lambda r})}^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + \frac{c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\lambda r})}^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\lambda r})}^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \\
& \quad + \frac{c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\lambda r})}^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx + \frac{c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\lambda r})}^2}{(t-s)^2} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Taking into account the properties of η again, since $p \geq 2$ and $t - s < 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_r} \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} |Du(x)|^2 dx \leq \varepsilon \cdot c \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \int_{B_{\lambda r}} \left(\mu^{p+2} + |Du(x)|^{p+2} \right) dx \\
& \quad + c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \int_{B_R} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \\
& \quad + c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx + \frac{c_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \left[\int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx + \int_{B_R} \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} dx \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and choosing ε such that $\varepsilon \cdot c \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, previous estimate becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_r} |Du(x)|^{p+2} dx \leq \int_{B_r} \left(\mu^2 + |Du(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} |Du(x)|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |Du(x)|^{p+2} dx \\
& \quad + c \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \left[\int_{B_R} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{c \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2}{(t-s)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \left[\int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx + \int_{B_R} |Du(x)|^p dx + c(\mu, p) |B_R| \right] + c(\mu, p) |B_R|,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

where $c = c(p, L, \nu, \mu)$ is independent of t and s . Since (3.22) is valid for any $\frac{R}{2} < r < s < t < \lambda r < R < 1$, taking the limit as $s \rightarrow r$ and $t \rightarrow \lambda r$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_r} |Du(x)|^{p+2} dx &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{\lambda r}} |Du(x)|^{p+2} dx \\
&+ c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \left[\int_{B_R} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \right] \\
&+ \frac{c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2}{r^{\frac{p+2}{2}}(\lambda-1)^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \left[\int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx + \int_{B_R} |Du(x)|^p dx + c(\mu, p)|B_R| \right] + c(\mu, p)|B_R|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Now, setting

$$h(r) = \int_{B_r} |Du(x)|^{p+2} dx,$$

$$A = c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \left[\int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx + \int_{B_R} |Du(x)|^p dx + c(\mu, p)|B_R| \right],$$

and

$$B = c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \left[\int_{B_R} |D^2\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} |D\psi(x)|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2}(x) dx \right] + c(\mu, p)|B_R|,$$

we can use Lemma 2.4, with

$$\theta = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = \frac{p+2}{2},$$

thus obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |Du|^{p+2} dx &\leq c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \left[\int_{B_R} |D^2\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} |D\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2} dx \right] + c(\mu, p)|B_R| + \frac{c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2}{R^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \left[\int_{B_R} |D\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} dx + \int_{B_R} \kappa^{p+2} dx \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_{B_R} |Du|^p dx + c(\mu, p)|B_R| \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Since $R < 1$, estimate (3.24) can be written as follows

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |Du|^{p+2} dx \leq \frac{c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2}{R^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_R} \left[1 + |D^2\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + |D\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + \kappa^{p+2} + |Du|^p \right] dx. \tag{3.25}$$

Now, we consider the estimate in (3.18) choosing a cut off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_{\frac{R}{2}})$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on $B_{\frac{R}{4}}$; so that, thanks to (3.25), we obtain

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}} |DV_p(Du(x))|^2 dx \leq \frac{c\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2}{R^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_R} \left[1 + |D^2\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + |D\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + \kappa^{p+2} + |Du|^p \right] dx.$$

By virtue of estimate (2.4), we conclude with

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}} |DV_p(Du(x))|^2 dx \leq \frac{c(\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|u\|_{L^{p^*}(B_R)}^2)}{R^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_R} \left[1 + |D^2\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + |D\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + \kappa^{p+2} + |Du|^p \right] dx. \quad (3.26)$$

Step 2: The approximation.

Fix a compact set $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$, and for a smooth kernel $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_1(0))$ with $\phi \geq 0$ and $\int_{B_1(0)} \phi = 1$, let us consider the corresponding family of mollifiers $(\phi_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ and put

$$\kappa_\varepsilon = \kappa * \phi_\varepsilon, \quad \psi_\varepsilon = \psi * \phi_\varepsilon,$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\psi_\varepsilon}(\Omega) = \{v \in u + W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) : v \geq \psi_\varepsilon \text{ almost everywhere in } \Omega\}$$

and

$$A_\varepsilon(x, \xi) = \int_{B_1} \phi(\omega) A(x + \varepsilon\omega, \xi) d\omega \quad (3.27)$$

on Ω' , for each positive $\varepsilon < \text{dist}(\Omega', \Omega)$. The assumptions (A1)–(A3) imply that

$$\langle A_\varepsilon(x, \xi) - A_\varepsilon(x, \eta), \xi - \eta \rangle \geq \nu |\eta - \xi|^2 (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \quad (\text{A1}')$$

$$|A_\varepsilon(x, \xi) - A_\varepsilon(x, \eta)| \leq L |\xi - \eta| (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \quad (\text{A2}')$$

$$|A_\varepsilon(x, \xi)| \leq \ell (\mu^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}, \quad (\text{A3}')$$

By virtue of assumption (A4), we have that

$$|A_\varepsilon(x, \xi) - A_\varepsilon(y, \xi)| \leq (\kappa_\varepsilon(x) + \kappa_\varepsilon(y)) |x - y| (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}. \quad (\text{A4}')$$

for almost every $x, y \in \Omega$ and for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let u be a solution of the variational inequality (1.2) and let fix a ball $B_R \Subset \Omega'$. Let us denote by $u_\varepsilon \in W^{1,p}(B_R)$ the solution of the problem

$$\int_{\Omega} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Dv), D(\varphi - v) \rangle dx \geq 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi_\varepsilon}(\Omega). \quad (3.28)$$

Thanks to [13, Theorem 1.1] we have $(\mu^2 + |Du_\varepsilon|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{4}} Du_\varepsilon \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_R)$ and, since A_ε satisfies conditions (A1')–(A4'), for ε sufficiently small, we are legitimate to apply estimate (3.26) to get

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}} |DV_p(Du_\varepsilon(x))|^2 dx \leq \frac{c(\|\psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p^*}(B_r)}^2)}{r^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_r} \left[1 + |D^2\psi_\varepsilon|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + |D\psi_\varepsilon|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + \kappa_\varepsilon^{p+2} + |Du_\varepsilon|^p \right] dx. \quad (3.29)$$

for every ball $B_r \Subset B_R$ and for a constant $c = c(\cdot)$.

We recall that, since $D\psi \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1, \frac{p+2}{2}}(\Omega)$ and $\kappa \in L_{\text{loc}}^{p+2}(\Omega)$, then

$$D\psi_\varepsilon \rightarrow D\psi \quad \text{and} \quad D^2\psi_\varepsilon \rightarrow D^2\psi \quad \text{strongly in } L_{\text{loc}}^{\frac{p+2}{2}}(\Omega'), \quad (3.30)$$

$$\kappa_\varepsilon \rightarrow \kappa \quad \text{strongly in } L_{\text{loc}}^{p+2}(\Omega'). \quad (3.31)$$

Since from (A3') the function $|A_\varepsilon(x, Du)| \leq \ell(\mu^2 + |Du|)^{p-1}$ and since $A_\varepsilon(x, Du)$ converges almost everywhere to $A(x, Du)$, by the dominated convergence Theorem we have

$$A_\varepsilon(x, Du) \rightarrow A(x, Du) \quad \text{strongly in } L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega'). \quad (3.32)$$

Using the ellipticity condition (A1') we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R} (\mu^2 + |Du|^2 + |Du_\varepsilon|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |Du_\varepsilon - Du|^2 dx \\ & \leq \int_{B_R} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Du_\varepsilon) - A_\varepsilon(x, Du), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx \\ & = \int_{B_R} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Du_\varepsilon), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx - \int_{B_R} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Du), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx \\ & = \int_{B_R} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Du_\varepsilon), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx - \int_{B_R} \langle A(x, Du), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx \\ & \quad - \int_{B_R} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Du) - A(x, Du), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Using $\varphi = u$ and $\varphi = u_\varepsilon$ as test functions in (3.28) and (1.2) respectively we have

$$\int_{B_R} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Du_\varepsilon), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad - \int_{B_R} \langle A(x, Du), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx \leq 0,$$

therefore from the inequality (3.33) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R} (\mu^2 + |Du|^2 + |Du_\varepsilon|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |Du_\varepsilon - Du|^2 dx \leq - \int_{B_R} \langle A_\varepsilon(x, Du) - A(x, Du), Du_\varepsilon - Du \rangle dx \\ & \leq \left(\int_{B_R} |A(x, Du) - A_\varepsilon(x, Du)|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int_{B_R} |Du - Du_\varepsilon|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Since $p \geq 2$, by well known means, from previous inequality, we deduce

$$\int_{B_R} |Du - Du_\varepsilon|^p dx \leq \int_{B_R} |A(x, Du) - A_\varepsilon(x, Du)|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dx$$

Taking the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in previous inequality, by virtue of (3.32), we deduce that u_ε converges strongly to u in $W^{1,p}(B_R)$ and therefore a.e. in B_R for a not relabeled sequence.

The strong convergence of u_ε to u in $W^{1,p}(B_R)$ implies also that u_ε converges strongly to u in $L^{p^*}(B_R)$ and allows us to pass to the limit in (3.29). So that, by virtue of the Fatou's Lemma and (3.31), we get

$$\int_{B_{\frac{r}{4}}} |DV_p(Du_\varepsilon(x))|^2 dx \leq \frac{c(\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p^*}(B_r)}^2)}{r^{\frac{p+2}{2}}} \int_{B_r} \left[1 + |D^2\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + |D\psi|^{\frac{p+2}{2}} + \kappa^{p+2} + |Du|^p \right] dx.$$

i.e. the conclusion. \square

Acknowledgements: The third author has been partially supported by the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM) and by Università degli Studi di Napoli Parthenope through the projects "sostegno alla Ricerca individuale" (triennio 2015 - 2017) and "Sostenibilità, eternalità e uso efficiente delle risorse ambientali" (triennio 2017-2019).

References

- [1] A. L. Baisoun, A. Clop, R. Giova, J. Orobitg, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Fractional differentiability for solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*. Potential Anal. 46 (2017), no. 3, 403–430.
- [2] V. Bögelein, F. Duzaar, G. Mingione, *Degenerate problems with irregular obstacles*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 650 (2011), 107–160.
- [3] M. Bildhauer, M. Fuchs, G. Mingione, *A priori gradient bounds and local $C^{1,\alpha}$ -estimates for (double) obstacle problems under non-standard growth conditions*. Z. Anal. Anwendungen 20 (2001), no. 4, 959–985.
- [4] S.-S. Byun, S. Liang, S.-Z. Zheng, *Nonlinear gradient estimates for double phase elliptic problems with irregular double obstacles*. Proceedings of the AMS, to appear.
- [5] S.-S. Byun, K.-A. Lee, J. Oh, J. Park, *Regularity results of the thin obstacle problem for the $p(x)$ -Laplacian*. J. Functional Analysis 276 (2019), 496–519.
- [6] M. Carozza, J. Kristensen, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Higher differentiability of minimizers of convex variational integrals*. Annales Inst. H. Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis, **28** (2011), no. 3, 395–411.
- [7] M. Caselli, M. Eleuteri, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Regularity results for a class of obstacle problems with p, q - growth conditions* arXiv:1907.08527
- [8] H. J. Choe, *A Regularity Theory for a General Class of Quasilinear Elliptic Partial Differential Equations and Obstacle Problems*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 114 (1991), 383–394.
- [9] H. J. Choe, J. L. Lewis, *On the obstacle problem for quasilinear elliptic equations of p -Laplace type*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 22 (1991), no. 3, 623–638.
- [10] A. Clop, R. Giova, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Besov regularity for solutions of p -harmonic equations*. Adv. Nonlinear Anal. 8 (2019), no. 1, 762–778.
- [11] M. Eleuteri, P. Harjulehto, T. Lukkari, *Global regularity and stability of solutions to obstacle problems with nonstandard growth*. Rev. Mat. Complut. 26 (2013), (1), 147–181.
- [12] M. Eleuteri, P. Marcellini, E. Mascolo: *Lipschitz estimates for systems with ellipticity conditions at infinity*, Ann. Mat. Pura e Appl. (4), 195 (2016) 1575–1603.
- [13] M. Eleuteri, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Higher differentiability for solutions to a class of obstacle problems*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 57 (2018), no. 5, 115, 29 pp.
- [14] M. Eleuteri, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Regularity results for a class of non-differentiable obstacle problems* DOI: 10.1016/j.na.2019.01.024
- [15] M. Fuchs, *Hölder continuity of the gradient for degenerate variational inequalities*. Nonlinear Anal. 15 (1990), no. 1, 85–100.
- [16] M. Fuchs, G. Mingione, *Full $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity for free and constrained local minimizers of elliptic variational integrals with nearly linear growth*. Manuscripta Math. 102 (2000), 227–250.
- [17] C. Gavioli *Higher differentiability of solutions to a class of obstacle problems under non-standard growth conditions*. Forum Mathematicum DOI:https://doi.org/10.1515/forum-2019-0148.
- [18] A. Gentile, *Regularity for minimizers of non-autonomous non-quadratic functionals in the case $1 < p < 2$: an a priori estimate*, Rend. Acc. Sc. fis. mat. Napoli, Vol LXXXV (2018) 185–200.
- [19] F. Giannetti, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Higher differentiability of minimizers of variational integrals with variable exponents*. Math. Z. 280 (2015), no. 3–4, 873–892.

- [20] R. Giova, *Higher differentiability for n -harmonic systems with Sobolev coefficients*. J. Differential Equations 259 (2015), no. 11, 5667–5687.
- [21] R. Giova, *Regularity results for non-autonomous functionals with $L \log L$ -growth and Orlicz Sobolev coefficients*. NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 23 (2016), no. 6, Art. 64, 18 pp.
- [22] R. Giova, A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Regularity results for a priori bounded minimizers of non autonomous functionals with discontinuous coefficients*. Adv. Calc. Var. 12 (2019), no. 1, 85–110.
- [23] E. Giusti, *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*. World Scientific, 2003.
- [24] P. Hajlasz. *Sobolev Spaces on an Arbitrary Metric Space*, Potential Anal. **5** (1996), 403–415.
- [25] J. Kristensen and G. Mingione, *Boundary Regularity in Variational Problems*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 198 (2010) 369–455.
- [26] T. Kuusi and G. Mingione, *Universal potential estimates*, Journal of Functional Analysis 262 (2012) 4205–4269. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **262**, 4205–4269.
- [27] P. Lindqvist, *Regularity for the gradient of the solution to a nonlinear obstacle problem with degenerate ellipticity*. Nonlinear Anal. 12 (1988), no. 11, 1245–1255.
- [28] L. Ma, Z. Zhang *Higher differentiability for solutions of nonhomogeneous elliptic obstacle problems* J. Math. Anal. Appl. 479 (2019), no. 1, 789–816.
- [29] J. Mu, W. P. Ziemer, *Smooth regularity of solutions of double obstacle problem involving degenerate elliptic equations*. Comm. PDE 16 (1991), nos.4-5, 821–843.
- [30] A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Higher differentiability of minimizers of variational integrals with Sobolev coefficients*. Adv. Cal. Var. 7 (2014), no. 1, 59–89.
- [31] A. Passarelli di Napoli, *Higher differentiability of solutions of elliptic systems with Sobolev coefficients: the case $p = n = 2$* . Pot. Anal. 41 (2014), no. 3, 715–735.

M. Caselli

ETH Zürich, Department of Mathematics
E-mail address: mcaselli@student.ethz.ch

A. Gentile

Università degli Studi di Napoli “Federico II” Dipartimento di Mat. e Appl. “R. Caccioppoli”, Via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy
E-mail address: andrea.gentile@unina.it

R. Giova

Università degli Studi di Napoli “Parthenope”
 Palazzo Pacanowsky - Via Generale Parisi, 13
 80132 Napoli, Italy
E-mail address: raffaella.giova@uniparthenope.it