

GROWTH CONDITIONS AND REGULARITY, AN OPTIMAL LOCAL BOUNDEDNESS RESULT

JONAS HIRSCH AND MATHIAS SCHÄFFNER

ABSTRACT. We prove local boundedness of local minimizers of scalar integral functionals $\int_{\Omega} f(x, \nabla u(x)) dx$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ where the integrand satisfies (p, q) -growth of the form

$$|z|^p \lesssim f(x, z) \lesssim |z|^q + 1$$

under the optimal relation $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{1}{n-1}$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

In this note, we establish a sharp local boundedness result for local minimizers of integral functionals

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{F}[u, \Omega] := \int_{\Omega} f(x, \nabla u) dx,$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, is a bounded domain and the integrand $f(x, \nabla u)$ satisfies (p, q) -growth of the form

$$(2) \quad |z|^p \lesssim f(x, z) \lesssim |z|^q + 1,$$

see Assumption 1 below. Local boundedness and Hölder continuity of local minimizer of (1) in the case $1 < p = q$ are classical, see the original reference [18] or the textbook [20]. Giaquinta [16] provided an example of an autonomous convex integrand satisfying (2) with $p = 2$ and $q = 4$ that admits unbounded minimizer in dimension $n \geq 6$. Similar examples can be found in [25, 21], in particular it follows from [25, Section 6] that if

$$(3) \quad q > \frac{(n-1)p}{n-1-p} =: p_{n-1}^* \quad \text{and} \quad 1 < p < n-1,$$

then one cannot expect local boundedness for minimizers of (1) in general. In this paper we show that condition (3) is sharp. Before we state our main result, we recall a standard notion of local minimizer and quasi-minimizer in the context of functionals with (p, q) -growth

Definition 1. *Given $Q \geq 1$, we call $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ a Q -minimizer of (1) if and only if*

$$\mathcal{F}(u, \text{supp } \varphi) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}(u, \text{supp } \varphi) \leq Q\mathcal{F}(u + \varphi, \text{supp } \varphi)$$

for any $\varphi \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ satisfying $\text{supp } \varphi \Subset \Omega$. If $Q = 1$, then u is a local minimizer of (1). Moreover, we call u a quasi-minimizer if and only if there exists $Q \geq 1$ such that u is a Q -minimizer.

Assumption 1. *Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Caratheodory function and suppose that $z \mapsto f(x, z)$ is convex for almost every $x \in \Omega$. Moreover, there exist $1 \leq L < \infty$, $\mu \geq 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and almost every $x \in \Omega$*

$$(4) \quad |z|^p \leq f(x, z) \leq L|z|^q + 1,$$

$$(5) \quad f(x, 2z) \leq \mu + Lf(x, z),$$

Now we are in position to state the main result of the present paper

Theorem 1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$ and suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with $1 \leq p \leq q < \infty$ such that*

$$(6) \quad \frac{1}{q} \geq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n-1}.$$

Let $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ be a quasi-minimizer of the functional \mathcal{F} given in (1). Then, $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$.

Remark 1. *We provide the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 3. We establish a slightly more general results in which the growth condition (4) is replaced by*

$$|z|^p - g(x)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \leq f(x, z) \leq L(|z|^q + g(x)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}),$$

and optimal assumptions (in the Lorentz-scale) on g are imposed.

Let us now relate Theorem 1 to previous results in the literature. To the best of our knowledge, the best previously known relation between p and q that ensures local boundedness under Assumption 1 can be found in the paper by Fusco & Sbordone [14] and reads

$$(7) \quad \frac{1}{q} \geq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n},$$

see [14, Theorem 2] (see also the more recent result [11, Theorem 2.3]) which also implies local boundedness with condition (7)). Obviously, relation (6) is less restrictive than (7) and in view of the discussion above optimal for local boundedness (compare (6) and (3)). However, we want to emphasize that [11, 14] (and similarly [6, 15]) contain sharp local boundedness results under additional structural assumptions on the growth of f , namely *anisotropic growth* of the form

$$(8) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|^{p_i} \lesssim f(x, z) \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^n M(1 + |z_i|^{p_i}).$$

In this case, local boundedness is proven under the condition $q \leq \bar{p}^*$, where $\frac{1}{\bar{p}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p_i}$ and $\bar{p}^* = \frac{n\bar{p}}{n-\bar{p}}$. This condition is optimal for local boundedness in view of the above mentioned counterexamples (the integrands in [16, 25, 21] satisfy growth of the form (8)).

The systematic study of higher regularity of minimizers of functionals with (p, q) -growth was initiated by Marcellini [24, 25]. By now there is a large and quickly growing literature on regularity results for minimizers of functionals with (p, q) -growth, and more general non-standard growth [23, 26]. We refer to [27] for an overview. A currently quite active field of research is the regularity theory for so-called double phase problems where the model functional is given by

$$(9) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^p + a(x)|\nabla u(x)|^q dx,$$

where $0 \leq a \in C^{0,\alpha}$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ see e.g. [1, 9, 10, 12, 13]) and [31, 22] for some motivation for functionals of the form (9). For this kind of functionals rather sharp conditions for higher ($C^{1,\beta}$ -) regularity are known, where α has to be balanced with p, q , and n . In [10] it was observed that the conditions on the data can be relaxed if one a priori knows that the minimizer is bounded. Obviously by Theorem 1 the results of [10] can be applied without any a priori assumption whenever $\frac{1}{q} \geq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}$ and in particular can be used to improve [10, Theorem 5.3]. Similarly, Theorem 1 improves the applicability of some results in [7, 8] where also higher regularity results are proven *assuming* a priori boundedness of the minimizer.

Let us very briefly explain the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1 and the origin of our improvement. In principle, we use a variation of the De-Giorgi type iteration similar to e.g. [14, 15, 11]. Recall that De-Giorgi iteration is based on a Caccioppoli inequality (which yield a reverse Poincaré inequality) and Sobolev inequality. The main new ingredient here is to use in the Caccioppoli inequality cut-off functions that are optimized with respect to the minimizer u (instead of using affine cut-offs). This enables us to use Sobolev inequality on $((n-1)$ -dimensional) spheres instead of $(n$ -dimensional) balls and thus get the desired improvement. This idea, combined with a variation of Moser-iteration, was recently used by the second author and Bella in the analysis of linear non-uniformly elliptic equations [3]

(improving in an essentially optimal way classic results of Trudinger [30]) and for higher regularity for integral functionals with (p, q) -growth [5] (see also [4] for an application in stochastic homogenization). The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we recall some definitions and useful results regarding Lorentz spaces and present a technical lemma which is used to derive an improved version of Caccioppoli inequality which plays a prominent role in the proof of Theorem 1. In Section 3, we prove a slightly more general version of Theorem 1 which in particular includes some a priori estimates.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

2.1. Preliminary lemmata. A key ingredient in the prove of Theorem 1 is the following lemma which is a variation of [5, Lemma 3]

Lemma 1. *Fix $n \geq 2$. For given $0 < \rho < \sigma < \infty$, $v \in L^1(B_\sigma)$ and $s > 1$, we consider consider*

$$J(\rho, \sigma, v) := \inf \left\{ \int_{B_\sigma} |v| |\nabla \eta|^s dx \mid \eta \in C_0^1(B_\sigma), \eta \geq 0, \eta = 1 \text{ in } B_\rho \right\}.$$

Then for every $\delta \in (0, 1]$

$$(10) \quad J(\rho, \sigma, v) \leq (\sigma - \rho)^{-(s-1+\frac{1}{\delta})} \left(\int_\rho^\sigma \left(\int_{S_r} |v| \right)^\delta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 1. Estimate (10) follows directly by minimizing among radial symmetric cut-off functions. Indeed, we obviously have for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$

$$J(\rho, \sigma, v) \leq \inf \left\{ \int_\rho^\sigma |\eta'(r)|^s \left(\int_{S_r} |v| + \varepsilon \right) dr \mid \eta \in C^1(\rho, \sigma), \eta(\rho) = 1, \eta(\sigma) = 0 \right\} =: J_{1d, \varepsilon}.$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, the one-dimensional minimization problem $J_{1d, \varepsilon}$ can be solved explicitly and we obtain

$$(11) \quad J_{1d, \varepsilon} = \left(\int_\rho^\sigma \left(\int_{S_r} |v| + \varepsilon \right)^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} dr \right)^{-(s-1)}.$$

Let us give an argument for (11). First we observe that using the assumption $v \in L^1(B_\sigma)$ and a simple approximation argument we can replace $\eta \in C^1(\rho, \sigma)$ with $\eta \in W^{1, \infty}(\rho, \sigma)$ in the definition of $J_{1d, \varepsilon}$. Let $\tilde{\eta} : [\rho, \sigma] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be given by

$$\tilde{\eta}(r) := 1 - \left(\int_\rho^\sigma b(r)^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} dr \right)^{-1} \int_\rho^r b(r)^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} dr, \quad \text{where } b(r) := \int_{S_r} |v| + \varepsilon.$$

Clearly, $\tilde{\eta} \in W^{1, \infty}(\rho, \sigma)$ (since $b \geq \varepsilon > 0$), $\tilde{\eta}(\rho) = 1$, $\tilde{\eta}(\sigma) = 0$, and thus

$$J_{1d, \varepsilon} \leq \int_\rho^\sigma |\tilde{\eta}'(r)|^s b(r) dr = \left(\int_\rho^\sigma b(r)^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} dr \right)^{-(s-1)}.$$

The reverse inequality follows by Hölder's inequality: For every $\eta \in W^{1, \infty}(\rho, \sigma)$ satisfying $\eta(\rho) = 1$ and $\eta(\sigma) = 0$, we have

$$1 = \left(\int_\rho^\sigma \eta'(r) dr \right)^s \leq \int_\rho^\sigma |\eta'(r)|^s b(r) dr \left(\int_\rho^\sigma b(r)^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} dr \right)^{s-1}.$$

Clearly, the last two displayed formulas imply (11).

Due to the monotonicity of $(-\infty, \infty) \ni m \mapsto \left(\int_\rho^\sigma v^m(r) dr \right)^{\frac{1}{m}}$, we deduce from (11) for every $\delta > 0$

$$J_{1d, \varepsilon} \leq (\sigma - \rho)^{-(s-1+\frac{1}{\delta})} \left(\int_\rho^\sigma \left(\int_{S_r} |v| + \varepsilon \right)^\delta dr \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}}.$$

Sending ε to zero, we obtain (10). □

In order to derive a suitable Caccioppoli type inequality in the proof of Theorem 1, we make use of the so-called 'hole-filling' trick combined with the following useful (and well-kown) lemma

Lemma 2 (Lemma 6.1, [20]). *Let $Z(t)$ be a bounded non-negative function in the interval $[\rho, \sigma]$. Assume that for every $\rho \leq s < t \leq \sigma$ it holds*

$$Z(s) \leq \theta Z(t) + (t-s)^{-\alpha} A + B,$$

with $A, B \geq 0$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\theta \in [0, 1)$. Then, there exists $c = c(\alpha, \theta) \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$Z(s) \leq c((t-s)^{-\alpha} A + B).$$

2.2. Non-increasing rearrangement and Lorentz-spaces. We recall the definition and useful properties of the non-increasing rearrangement f^* of a measurable function f and Lorentz spaces, see e.g. [29, Section 22]. For a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the non-increasing rearrangement is defined by

$$f^*(t) := \inf\{\sigma \in (0, \infty) : |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x)| > \sigma\}| \leq t\}.$$

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function with $\text{supp } f \subset \Omega$, then it holds for all $p \in [1, \infty)$

$$(12) \quad \int_{\Omega} |f(x)|^p dx = \int_0^{|\Omega|} (f^*(t))^p dt.$$

A simple consequence of (12) and the fact $f \leq g$ implies $f^* \leq g^*$ is the following inequality

$$(13) \quad \sup_{\substack{|A| \leq t \\ A \subset \Omega}} \int_A |f(x)|^p \leq \int_0^t (f_{\Omega}^*(t))^p dt,$$

where f_{Ω}^* denotes the non-increasing rearrangement of $f \chi_{\Omega}$ (inequality (13) is in fact an *equality* but for our purpose the upper bound suffices).

The Lorentz space $L^{n,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be defined as the space of measurable functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{L^{n,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \int_0^{\infty} t^{\frac{1}{n}} f^*(t) \frac{dt}{t} < \infty.$$

Moreover, for $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\|f\|_{L^{n,1}(\Omega)} := \int_0^{|\Omega|} t^{\frac{1}{n}} f_{\Omega}^*(t) \frac{dt}{t} < \infty,$$

where f_{Ω} defined as above. Let us recall that $L^{n+\varepsilon}(\Omega) \subset L^{n,1}(\Omega) \subset L^n(\Omega)$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, where $L^{n,1}(\Omega)$ is the space of all measurable functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\|f\|_{L^{n,1}(\Omega)} < \infty$ (here we identify f with its extension by zero to $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$). Following [28, Section 9], we define for given $\alpha > 0$ the Lorentz-Zygmund space $L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as the space of all measurable functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \int_0^{\infty} t^{\frac{1}{n}} (1 + |\log(t)|)^{\alpha} f^*(t) \frac{dt}{t} < \infty.$$

As above, for $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\|f\|_{L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\alpha}(\Omega)} := \int_0^{|\Omega|} t^{\frac{1}{n}} (1 + |\log(t)|)^{\alpha} f_{\Omega}^*(t) \frac{dt}{t} < \infty,$$

and denote by $L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\alpha}(\Omega)$ the space of all measurable functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\|f\|_{L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\alpha}(\Omega)} < \infty$. Obviously, we have for every bounded domain Ω that $L^{n+\varepsilon}(\Omega) \subset L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\alpha}(\Omega) \subset L^{n,1}(\Omega)$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In this section, we provide a proof of Theorem 1. As mentioned in the introduction, we establish a slightly stronger statement where the growth condition (4) is relaxed in order to introduce a right-hand side (see Remark 2 below).

Assumption 2. Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Caratheodory function and suppose that $z \mapsto f(x, z)$ is convex for almost every $x \in \Omega$. Moreover, there exist $1 \leq L < \infty$, $\mu \geq 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and almost every $x \in \Omega$

$$(14) \quad |z|^p - g(x)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \leq f(x, z) \leq L|z|^q + g(x)^{\frac{p}{p-1}},$$

$$(15) \quad f(x, 2z) \leq \mu + Lf(x, z),$$

where g is a non-negative function satisfying $g \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)$.

In order to state an a priori estimate it is convenient to introduce suitable scale invariant versions of Soblev and L^p norms. For any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we set

$$\|v\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)} := |\Omega|^{-\frac{1}{n}} \|v\|_{\underline{L}^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{L}^p(\Omega)},$$

where

$$\|v\|_{\underline{L}^p(\Omega)} := |\Omega|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Note that by definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)}$, it holds

$$(16) \quad \forall v \in W^{1,p}(B_R), R > 0: \quad \|v\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(B_R)} = \|v_R\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(B_1)} \quad \text{where } v_R := \frac{1}{R}v(R\cdot) \in W^{1,p}(B_1).$$

Theorem 2. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$ and suppose Assumption 2 is satisfied with $1 \leq p < q < \infty$ satisfying

$$(17) \quad \varepsilon := \varepsilon(n, p, q) := \min\left\{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n-1}, 1\right\} - \frac{1}{p} \geq 0,$$

and suppose that

$$g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \in L^{n,1}(\Omega) \quad \text{if } p < n \quad \text{and} \quad g^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \in L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\frac{n-1}{n}}(\Omega) \quad \text{if } p = n.$$

Let $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ be a quasi-minimizer of the functional \mathcal{F} given in (1). Then, $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$. Moreover, if

$$(18) \quad \varepsilon(n, p, q) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq p < n,$$

there exists $c = c(L, n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$ such that every Q -minimizer of (1) satisfies for every $x_0 \in \Omega$ with $B_R := B_R(x_0) \Subset \Omega$ the estimate

$$(19) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{R}{2}})} \leq c(R\|u\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(B_R)} + R\|u\|_{\underline{W}^{1,p}(B_R)}^{1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{n})(1-\frac{p}{q})}) + \|g^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\|_{L^{n,1}(B_R)}.$$

Remark 2. As mentioned above, Theorem 2 is optimal with respect to the relation between the exponents p and q . Moreover, it is also optimal with respect to the assumption on g (at least for $p < n$). Indeed, for $p > 1$ consider

$$(20) \quad f(x, z) := \frac{p+1}{p}|z|^p + G \cdot z,$$

where $G \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Clearly f satisfies Assumption 2 with $1 < p = q$, $g = \frac{p-1}{p}|G|$ and $L = \frac{p+2}{p}$. Note that $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is a local minimizer of the functional \mathcal{F} given in (1) and f given as in (20) if and only if it solves locally

$$(21) \quad -\Delta_p u := -\text{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) = \frac{1}{p+1}\text{div} G.$$

Hence, Theorem 2 yields local boundedness for every weak solution of (21) provided $|G|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \in L^{n,1}(\Omega)$. On the contrary, the (unbounded) function $u(x) = \log(-\log(|x|))$ solves (trivially) (21) on $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$ with right-hand side $G = -(p+1)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u$ satisfying $|G|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} = c(p)|\nabla u|$ and thus $|G|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \in L^{n,1+\delta}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})$ for every $\delta > 0$ (in particular $|G|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \in L^{n,n}(B_{\frac{1}{2}}) = L^n(B_{\frac{1}{2}})$) but $|G|^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \notin L^{n,1}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})$.

In the interesting recent paper [2], a related result is proven on the Lipschitz-scale. More precisely it is proven that local minimizer of $\int_\Omega f(\nabla u) - gu \, dx$ are locally Lipschitz if f satisfies (controlled) (p, q) -growth i.e.

$$(22) \quad (1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\lambda|^2 \lesssim \langle D^2 f(z)\lambda, \lambda \rangle \lesssim (1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} |\lambda|^2$$

with $\frac{q}{p} < 1 + \frac{2}{n}$ and g is in the optimal Lorentz space $L^{n,1}(\Omega)$ (provided $n \geq 3$). Very recently, Lipschitz-regularity of minimizers for integrands satisfying (22) is proven in [5] under the less restrictive relation $\frac{q}{p} < 1 + \frac{2}{n-1}$ in the case $g \equiv 0$. It would be interesting if the methods of [5] and [2] can be combined to obtain Lipschitz estimates under the assumption $\frac{q}{p} < 1 + \frac{2}{n-1}$ and $g \in L^{n,1}$ provided $n \geq 3$.

Proof of Theorem 2. By standard scaling and translation arguments it suffices to suppose that $B_1 \Subset \Omega$ and prove that u is locally bounded in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence, we suppose from now on that $B_1 \Subset \Omega$. In Step 1–Step 3 below, we consider the case $p \in [1, n)$. We first derive a suitable Caccioppoli-type inequality (Step 1) and perform a De Giorgi-type iteration (Step 2 and 3) to prove boundedness from above for a Q -minimizer. In Step 4, we discuss how this implies the claim of the theorem in the case $p \in [1, n)$. In Step 5, we sketch the adjustments for the remaining non-trivial case $p = n$.

Step 1. Basic energy estimate.

We claim that there exists $c = c(n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$ such that for every $k \geq 0$ and every $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho < \sigma \leq 1$ it holds

$$(23) \quad \|\nabla(u - k)_+\|_{L^p(B_\rho)}^p \leq c \left(\omega(|A_{k,\sigma}|) + \frac{L|A_{k,\sigma}|^{q\varepsilon}}{(\sigma - \rho)^\gamma} \|(u - k)_+\|_{W^{1,p}(B_\sigma)}^q \right),$$

where $\gamma = \gamma(n, q) := q - 1 + q \min\{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n-1}, 1\}$, ε as in (17),

$$(24) \quad A_{l,r} := B_r \cap \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > l\} \quad \text{for all } r > 0 \text{ and } l > 0,$$

and $\omega : [0, |B_1|] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is defined by

$$(25) \quad \omega(t) := \int_0^t ((g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(t))^p dt.$$

Fix $M > k$ and let $\eta \in C_c^1(B_1, [0, 1])$ be such that $\eta = 1$ in B_ρ and $\text{supp } \eta \subset B_\sigma$. Define $w := \max\{u_M - k, 0\}$ where $u_M := \min\{u, M\}$ and set $\varphi := -\eta^q w$. Since u is a quasi-minimizer, we obtain with help of convexity of f that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_{k,\sigma}} f(x, \nabla u(x)) dx &\leq Q \int_{A_{k,\sigma}} f(x, \nabla(u + \varphi)(x)) dx \\ &= Q \int_{A_{k,\sigma} \cap \{u \leq M\}} f(x, (1 - \eta^q) \nabla u - q\eta^{q-1} \nabla \eta (u_M - k)_+) dx \\ &\quad + Q \int_{A_{k,\sigma} \cap \{u > M\}} f(x, \nabla u + q\eta^{q-1} \nabla \eta (-(u_M - k)_+) dx \\ &\leq Q \int_{A_{k,\sigma} \cap \{u \leq M\}} (1 - \eta^q) f(x, \nabla u) + \eta^q f(x, -\frac{q \nabla \eta}{\eta} (u_M - k)_+) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{Q}{2} \int_{A_{k,\sigma} \cap \{u > M\}} f(x, 2\nabla u) + f(x, -2q\eta^{q-1} \nabla \eta (u_M - k)_+) dx \end{aligned}$$

and thus, using (14), (15) and $|\eta| \leq 1$,

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{A_{k,\sigma}} f(x, \nabla u(x)) dx &\leq Q \int_{A_{k,\sigma} \setminus B_\rho} f(x, \nabla u) dx + \frac{Q}{2} \int_{A_{k,\sigma} \cap \{u > M\}} \mu + Lf(x, \nabla u) dx \\ &\quad + Q \int_{A_{k,\sigma}} g^{\frac{p}{p-1}} + Lq^q(1 + 2^q)|\nabla \eta|^q (u_M - k)_+^q dx. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that there exists $c = c(n, q) \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$(27) \quad \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{A}(\rho, \sigma)} \int_{A_{k,\sigma}} |\nabla \eta|^q (u_M - k)_+^q \leq c(\sigma - \rho)^{-\gamma} \|(u - k)_+\|_{W^{1,p}(B_\sigma \setminus B_\rho)}^q |A_{k,\sigma}|^{q\varepsilon},$$

where $\mathcal{A}(\rho, \sigma) := \{\eta \in C_c^1(B_\sigma), \eta \equiv 1 \text{ on } B_\rho\}$. To show (27), we use the Sobolev inequality on spheres, i.e there exists $c = c(n, q) \in [1, \infty)$ such that for every $r > 0$

$$(28) \quad \left(\int_{S_r} |\varphi|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq c \left(\left(\int_{S_r} |\nabla \varphi|^{q_*} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_*}} + \frac{1}{r} \left(\int_{S_r} |\varphi|^{q_*} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_*}} \right),$$

where $q_* \geq 1$ is given by $\frac{1}{q_*} = \min\{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n-1}, 1\}$. Combining (28) applied to $\varphi = (u - k)_+$ and Lemma 1 with $\delta := \frac{q_*}{q} > 0$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{A}(\rho, \sigma)} \int_{A_{k, \sigma}} |\nabla \eta|^q |(u_M - k)_+|^q \\ & \leq (\sigma - \rho)^{-(q-1+\frac{q}{q_*})} \left(\int_\rho^\sigma \left(\int_{S_r} |(u - k)_+|^q \right)^{\frac{q_*}{q}} dr \right)^{\frac{q}{q_*}} \\ & \leq c(\sigma - \rho)^{-\gamma} \left(\int_\rho^\sigma \left[\left(\int_{S_r} |\nabla(u - k)_+|^{q_*} \right) + \left(\int_{S_r} |(u - k)_+|^{q_*} \right) \right] dr \right)^{\frac{q}{q_*}} \end{aligned}$$

(note that we ignored the factor $\frac{1}{r}$ in (28) in view of $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho < \sigma \leq 1$). Finally, we observe that $\varepsilon \geq 0$ implies that $q_* \leq p$ and we obtain with help of Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{A}(\rho, \sigma)} \int_{A_{k, \sigma}} |\nabla \eta|^q |(u_M - k)_+|^q & \leq c(\sigma - \rho)^{-\gamma} \|(u - k)_+\|_{W^{1, q_*}(B_\sigma \setminus B_\rho)}^q \\ & \leq c(\sigma - \rho)^{-\gamma} \|(u - k)_+\|_{W^{1, p}(B_\sigma \setminus B_\rho)}^q |A_{k, \sigma}|^{q\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

and (27) is proven.

Since (26) is valid for all $\eta \in \mathcal{A}(\rho, \sigma)$, we deduce from (27), (13) and $f(x, z) \geq -g(x) \frac{p}{p-1}$

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{A_{k, \rho}} f(x, \nabla u) dx & \leq Q \int_{A_{k, \sigma} \setminus B_\rho} f(x, \nabla u) dx + \frac{Q}{2} \int_{A_{k, \sigma} \cap \{u > M\}} \mu + Lf(x, \nabla u) dx \\ & + (Q + 1)\omega(|A_{k, \sigma}|) + \frac{cLQ}{(\sigma - \rho)^\gamma} \|(u - k)_+\|_{W^{1, p}(B_\sigma)}^q |A_{k, \sigma}|^{q\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c = c(n, p, q) \in [1, \infty)$ and ω is defined in (25). Since u is a quasi-minimizer and we assume $B_1 \Subset \Omega$, we have that $f(\cdot, \nabla u) \in L^1(B_1)$ and $u \in W^{1, 1}(B_1)$. Thus, we can send $M \rightarrow \infty$ in (29) and the second term on the right-hand side in (29) vanishes. Hence, we obtain with help of the hole-filling trick (namely adding $Q \int_{A_{k, \rho}} f(x, \nabla u) dx$ to both sides of inequality (29))

$$\int_{A_{k, \rho}} f(x, \nabla u(x)) dx \leq \theta \int_{A_{k, \sigma}} f(x, \nabla u(x)) dx + c \left(\omega(|A_{k, \sigma}|) + \frac{L|A_{k, \sigma}|^{q\varepsilon}}{(\sigma - \rho)^\gamma} \|(u - k)_+\|_{W^{1, p}(B_\sigma)}^q \right),$$

with $\theta = \frac{Q}{Q+1} \in [0, 1)$ and $c = c(n, p, q) \in [1, \infty)$. Estimate (23) follows by Lemma 2 and (14).

Step 2. One-step improvement.

We claim that there exist $c_1 = c_1(n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$ and $c_2 = c_2(n, p) \in [1, \infty)$ such that for every $k > h \geq 0$ and every $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho < \sigma < 1$ it holds

$$(30) \quad J(k, \rho) \leq c_1 \left(\omega \left(\frac{c_2 J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{p_n^*}{p}}}{(k-h)^{p_n^*}} \right) + L \left(\frac{J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{k-h} \right)^{p_n^* q \varepsilon} \frac{J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{q}{p}}}{(\sigma - \rho)^\gamma} + \left(\frac{J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{(k-h)} \right)^{p_n^* \frac{p}{n}} J(h, \sigma) \right),$$

where $p_n^* := \frac{pn}{n-p}$ and for any $l \geq 0$ and $r > 0$

$$J(l, r) := \|(u - l)_+\|_{W^{1, p}(B_r)}^p.$$

Note that $k - h < u - h$ on $A_{k, r}$ for every $r > 0$ and thus with help of Sobolev inequality

$$(31) \quad |A_{k, \sigma}| \leq \int_{A_{k, \sigma}} \left(\frac{u(x) - h}{k - h} \right)^{p_n^*} \leq \frac{\|(u - h)_+\|_{L^{p_n^*}(B_\sigma)}^{p_n^*}}{(k - h)^{p_n^*}} \leq c \frac{J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{p_n^*}{p}}}{(k - h)^{p_n^*}},$$

where $c = c(n, p) \in [1, \infty)$. Combining the above estimate with (23), we obtain

$$(32) \quad \|\nabla(u - k)_+\|_{L^p(B_\rho)}^p \leq c_1 \left(\omega \left(\frac{c_2 J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{p_n^*}{p}}}{(k - h)^{p_n^*}} \right) + L \left(\frac{J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{k - h} \right)^{p_n^* q \varepsilon} \frac{J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{q}{p}}}{(\sigma - \rho)^\gamma} \right),$$

where $c_1 = c_1(n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$ and $c_2 = c_2(n, p) \in [1, \infty)$. It is left to estimate $\|(u - k)_+\|_{L^p(B_\rho)}$. A combination of Hölder inequality, Sobolev inequality and estimate (31) yield

$$(33) \quad \|(u - k)_+\|_{L^p(B_\rho)}^p \leq \|(u - h)_+\|_{L^{p_n^*}(B_\sigma)}^p |A_{k, \sigma}|^{\frac{p}{n}} \leq c \left(\frac{J(h, \sigma)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{(k - h)} \right)^{p_n^* \frac{p}{n}} J(h, \sigma)$$

Combining (32) and (33), we obtain (30).

Step 3. Iteration.

For $k_0 \geq 0$ and a sequence $(\Delta_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty)$ specified below, we set

$$(34) \quad k_\ell := k_0 + \Delta_\ell, \quad \sigma_\ell = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{\ell+1}}.$$

For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, we set $J_\ell := J(k_\ell, \sigma_\ell)$. From (30), we deduce for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(35) \quad J_\ell \leq c_1 \left(\omega \left(\frac{c_2 J_{\ell-1}^{\frac{p_n^*}{p}}}{(\Delta_\ell)^{p_n^*}} \right) + L 2^{(\ell+1)\gamma} \left(\frac{J_{\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\Delta_\ell} \right)^{p_n^* q \varepsilon} J_{\ell-1}^{\frac{q}{p}} + \left(\frac{J_{\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\Delta_\ell} \right)^{p_n^* \frac{p}{n}} J_{\ell-1} \right),$$

where c_1 and c_2 are as in Step 2. Fix $\tau = \tau(n, p, q) \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(36) \quad 2^\gamma \tau^{\frac{q}{p}(1+p_n^*\varepsilon)-1} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

We claim that we can choose $\{\Delta_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$(37) \quad \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_\ell < \infty$$

and k_0 (in the borderline case $\varepsilon = 0$) in such a way that

$$(38) \quad J_\ell \leq \tau^\ell J_0 \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Substep 3.1. Suppose that $\varepsilon > 0$. Set $k_0 = 0$ and choose Δ_ℓ to be the smallest number such that

$$(39) \quad c_1 \omega \left(\frac{c_2 (\tau^{\ell-1} J_0)^{\frac{p_n^*}{p}}}{(\Delta_\ell)^{p_n^*}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{3} \tau^\ell J_0, \quad c_1 \tau^{-(\frac{p_n^*}{p}+1)} J_0^{\frac{p_n^*}{n}} \tau^{\ell \frac{p_n^*}{p}} \leq \frac{1}{3} \Delta_\ell^{p_n^* \frac{p}{n}}$$

and

$$(40) \quad c_1 L 2^\gamma \tau^{-\frac{q}{p}(1+p_n^*\varepsilon)} J_0^{\frac{q}{p}(1+p_n^*\varepsilon)-1} 2^{-\ell} \leq \frac{1}{3} \Delta_\ell^{p_n^* q \varepsilon}$$

is valid. The choice of τ (see (36)), Δ_ℓ and estimate (35) combined with a straightforward induction argument yield (38). Using $\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} (2^{-\alpha} + \tau^\beta) < \infty$ for any $\alpha, \beta > 0$, we deduce from (39) and (40)

$$(41) \quad \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_\ell \leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{c_2^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}} (\tau^{\ell-1} J_0)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{(\omega^{-1}(\frac{\tau^\ell J_0}{3c_1}))^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}}} + c(J_0^{\frac{1}{p}} + J_0^{\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n})(1 - \frac{p}{q})^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}),$$

where $c = c(L, n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$. Next, we show that $g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \in L^{n,1}(B_1)$ ensures that the first term on the right-hand side of (41) is bounded and thus (37) is valid. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{(\tau^\ell J_0)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{(\omega^{-1}(\frac{\tau^\ell J_0}{3c_1}))^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}}} &\lesssim \int_1^\infty \frac{(\tau^x J_0)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{(\omega^{-1}(\frac{\tau^x J_0}{3c_1}))^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}}} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{|\log \tau|} \int_0^\tau \frac{(t J_0)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{(\omega^{-1}(\frac{t J_0}{3c_1}))^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}}} \frac{dt}{t} \\
(42) \quad &\leq \frac{(3c_1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{|\log \tau|} \int_0^{\omega^{-1}(\frac{\tau J_0}{3c_1})} \frac{(\omega(s))^{\frac{1}{p}} \omega'(s)}{s^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}} \omega(s)} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall $\omega(t) = \int_0^t ((g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(s))^p ds$ and $(g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*$ is non-increasing, thus $\omega(t) \geq t(g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(t)^p$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{\omega^{-1}(\frac{\tau J_0}{3c_1})} \frac{(\omega(s))^{\frac{1}{p}} \omega'(s)}{s^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n}} \omega(s)} ds &\leq \int_0^\infty s^{\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{p}} (s((g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(s))^p)^{-(1-\frac{1}{p})} ((g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(s))^p ds \\
(43) \quad &= \int_0^\infty s^{\frac{1}{n}} (g^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(s) \frac{ds}{s} = \|g^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\|_{L^{n,1}(B_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that (38) and $k_0 = 0$ implies

$$\|(u - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_\ell)_+\|_{L^p(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} u \leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_\ell$$

and thus

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} u \leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_\ell.$$

Hence, appealing to (41)-(43), we find $c = c(L, n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$(44) \quad \sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} u \leq c(\|(u)_+\|_{W^{1,p}(B_1)} + \|(u)_+\|_{W^{1,p}(B_1)}^{1+(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{n})(1-\frac{p}{q})\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} + \|g\|_{L^{n,1}(B_1)}).$$

Substep 3.1. Suppose that $\varepsilon = 0$. We claim that

$$(45) \quad \lim_{k_0 \rightarrow \infty} J_0 = 0.$$

Before, we give the argument for (45) we explain how (45) implies the desired claim (38) in the case $\varepsilon = 0$. Choose Δ_ℓ to be the smallest number such that (39) is satisfied and choose k_0 sufficiently large such that

$$c_1 L 2^\gamma \tau^{-\frac{q}{p}} J_0^{\frac{q}{p}-1} \leq \frac{1}{3}.$$

It is now easy to see that the choice of τ , Δ_ℓ , k_0 and estimate (35) yield (38). In view of Substep 3.1 we also have $\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_\ell < \infty$ and we have

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} u \leq k_0 + c(\|(u)_+\|_{W^{1,p}(B_1)} + \|g\|_{L^{n,1}(B_1)}) < \infty,$$

where $c = c(L, n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$.

Let us now show (45). For $k \geq 2^{\frac{1}{p}} |B_1|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|u\|_{L^p(B_1)}$ we have $|A_{k,1}| \leq \frac{1}{2} |B_1|$ and thus a suitable version of Poincare inequality (see e.g. [17, Proposition 3.15]) yields

$$\int_{B_1} |(u - k)_+|^p dx \leq c \int_{B_1} |\nabla(u - k)_+|^p dx,$$

where $c = c(n, p) \in [1, \infty)$. Hence, it suffices to show $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla(u - k)_+\|_{L^p(B_1)}^p = 0$. By (14), we have for every $k \geq 0$

$$(46) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla(u - k)_+|^p = \int_{A_{k,1}} |\nabla u|^p \leq \int_{A_{k,1}} f(x, \nabla u) + g^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(x) dx.$$

Since $B_1 \Subset \Omega$ and $f(x, \nabla u), g^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$, the right-hand side in (46) tends to zero as k tends to infinity and thus (45) is proven.

Step 4. Conclusion in the case $p < n$.

In view of Step 1–Step 3, we have that if $B_1 \Subset \Omega$ then u is locally bounded from above in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and in the case $\varepsilon > 0$, we have the estimate (44). Moreover, if u is a Q -minimizer of \mathcal{F} , then $-u$ is a Q -minimizer of the functional $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v) := \int_{\Omega} \tilde{f}(x, \nabla v(x)) dx$ with $\tilde{f}(x, z) := f(x, -z)$. Clearly, \tilde{f} is convex in the second component and satisfies the same growth conditions as f . Hence, we obtain that u is locally bounded in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Moreover, if $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $c = c(L, n, p, q, Q) \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq c(\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_1)} + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_1)}^{1+(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{n})(1-\frac{p}{q})\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} + \|g\|_{L^{n,1}(B_1)}).$$

The conclusion of the theorem in the case $p \in [1, n)$ now follows by standard scaling, translation and covering arguments (here we use (16)).

Step 5. The case $p = n$.

We use the same notation as in the previous steps and sketch the necessary adjustments. Note that for $p = n$ we cannot use Sobolev inequality in the form (31). In the parts not involving ω it suffices to replace p_n^* by any $\tilde{p} \in [q, \infty)$ (recall $q > p = n$) and we leave the details to the reader. Using this replacement for the estimates related to ω , we obtain local boundedness under slightly stronger assumptions on g , namely $g^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \in L^{n+\delta}(\Omega)$ for some $\delta > 0$ (in fact this statement is already contained in [15]). Thus we may appeal to the Moser-Trudinger inequality, which gives for some dimensional constant $c > 0$, $0 \leq h < k$, $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$

$$(47) \quad |A_{k,\sigma}| \leq c \exp\left(-\frac{1}{c} \left(\frac{k-h}{J(h,\sigma)^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right).$$

Let us first conclude and present the the derivation of the above inequality below.

In view of Step 3 and (47) it suffices to show that the sequence $\{\Delta_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by the identity

$$\omega\left(c \exp\left(-\frac{1}{c} \frac{\Delta_\ell^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{(\tau^{\ell-1} J_0)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}\right)\right) = \bar{c} \tau^\ell J_0,$$

for some $\bar{c} > 0$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$ is summable. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_\ell &\lesssim \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} (\tau^{\ell-1} J_0)^{\frac{1}{n}} (1 + |\log(\frac{1}{\bar{c}} \omega^{-1}(\bar{c} \tau^\ell J_0))|)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\tau^{\frac{1}{n}} |\log(\tau)|} \int_0^\tau (t J_0)^{\frac{1}{n}} (1 + |\log(\omega^{-1}(\bar{c} t J_0))|)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\tau \bar{c})^{\frac{1}{n}} |\log(\tau)|} \int_0^{\omega^{-1}(\bar{c} \tau J_0)} (\omega(s))^{\frac{1}{n}} (1 + |\log(s)|)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \frac{\omega'(s)}{\omega(s)} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can continue as before, i.e. using $\omega(s) \geq s(g^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(s)^n$ and $\omega'(s) = (g^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(s)^n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\omega^{-1}(\bar{c} \tau J_0)} (\omega(s))^{\frac{1}{n}} (1 + |\log(s)|)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \frac{\omega'(s)}{\omega(s)} ds &\leq \int_0^\infty s^{\frac{1}{n}} (1 + |\log(s)|)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} ((g^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \chi_{B_1})^*(s))^{\frac{ds}{s}} \\ &= \|g^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\|_{L^{n,1}(\log L)^{\frac{n-1}{n}}(B_1)} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we present the argument for (47). For this we recall the Moser-Trudinger inequality in the following form: there exists $c_i = c_i(n) > 0$, $i = 1, 2$ such that for every ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and every $v \in W^{1,n}(B)$

$$\int_B \exp\left(\left(\frac{|v - f_B v|}{c_1 \|\nabla v\|_{L^n(B)}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right) \leq c_2$$

(see e.g. [19, Chapter 7]). Since

$$A_{k,\sigma} \subset B_\sigma \cap \{x: (u - h)_+ \geq k - h\} =: E_{h,k,\sigma}$$

Chebychev's inequality combined with Moser-Trudinger inequality gives (47):

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{h,k,\sigma}| &\lesssim \exp\left(-\left(\frac{k-h}{2^{\frac{n}{n-1}} c_1 J(h,\sigma)^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right) \int_{B_\sigma} \exp\left(\left(\frac{(u-h)_+}{2^{\frac{n}{n-1}} c_1 J(h,\sigma)^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right) dx \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\left(\frac{k-h}{2^{\frac{n}{n-1}} c_1 J(h,\sigma)^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right) \exp\left(\left(\frac{f_{B_\sigma}(u-h)_+}{c_1 J(h,\sigma)^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right) c_2 |B_\sigma| \\ &\lesssim \exp\left(-\left(\frac{k-h}{2^{\frac{n}{n-1}} c_1 J(h,\sigma)^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use in the last estimate the Poincaré inequality the assumption $\sigma \leq 1$. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

M.S. was supported by the German Science Foundation DFG in context of the Emmy Noether Junior Research Group BE 5922/1-1. J.H. was supported by the German Science Foundation DFG in context of the Priority Program SPP 2026 "Geometry at Infinity".

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Baroni, M. Colombo and G. Mingione, Regularity for general functionals with double phase, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **57** (2018), no. 2, Art. 62.
- [2] L. Beck and G. Mingione, Lipschitz bounds and non-uniform ellipticity, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, to appear.
- [3] P. Bella and M. Schäffner, Local boundedness and Harnack inequality for solutions of linear non-uniformly elliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, doi:10.1002/cpa.21876.
- [4] P. Bella and M. Schäffner, Quenched invariance principle for random walks among random degenerate conductances, *Ann. Probab.*, to appear. arXiv:1902.05793.
- [5] P. Bella and M. Schäffner, On the regularity of minimizers for scalar integral functionals with (p, q) -growth, *Anal. PDE*, to appear. arXiv:1904.12279.
- [6] L. Boccardo, P. Marcellini and C. Sbordone, L^∞ -regularity for variational problems with non standard growth conditions, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.* **4(A)**, 219–225 (1990)
- [7] P. Bousquet and L. Brasco, Lipschitz regularity for orthotropic functionals with nonstandard growth conditions, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, to appear. Preprint available at arXiv:1810.03837.
- [8] M. Carozza, J. Kristensen and A. Passarelli di Napoli, Higher differentiability of minimizers of convex variational integrals, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **28** (2011), no. 3, 395–411.
- [9] M. Colombo and G. Mingione, Regularity for double phase variational problems, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **215** (2015), no. 2, 443–496.
- [10] M. Colombo and G. Mingione, Bounded minimisers of double phase variational integrals, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **218** (2015), no. 1, 219–273.
- [11] G. Cupini, P. Marcellini and E. Mascolo, Local boundedness of minimizers with limit growth conditions, *J. Optimization Th. Appl.* **166** (2015), 1–22.
- [12] C. De Filippis and G. Mingione, On the regularity of minima of non-autonomous functionals, *J. Geom. Anal.*, to appear. Preprint available at arXiv:1905.10534.
- [13] L. Esposito, F. Leonetti and G. Mingione, Sharp regularity for functionals with (p, q) growth, *J. Differential Equations* **204** (2004), no. 1, 5–55.
- [14] N. Fusco and C. Sbordone, Local boundedness of minimizers in a limit case, *Manuscripta Math.* **69** (1990), no. 1, 19–25.
- [15] N. Fusco and C. Sbordone, Some remarks on the regularity of minima of anisotropic integrals, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **18** (1993), 153–167.
- [16] M. Giaquinta, Growth conditions and regularity, a counterexample, *Manuscripta Math.* **59** (1987), no. 2, 245–248.

- [17] M. Giaquinta and L. Martinazzi, *An Introduction to the Regularity Theory for Elliptic Systems, Harmonic Maps and Minimal Graphs*, Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa, seconda edizione edition, 2012.
- [18] M. Giaquinta, E. Giusti, On the regularity of the minima of certain variational integrals, *Acta Math.* **148** (1982) 31–46.
- [19] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Springer, 1998.
- [20] E. Giusti, *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003. viii+403 pp
- [21] M. C. Hong, Some remarks on the minimizers of variational integrals with nonstandard growth conditions, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. A (7)* **6** (1992), no. 1, 91–101.
- [22] V. V. Jikov, S. M. Kozlov and O. A. Oleinik, *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, (1994).
- [23] G. M. Lieberman, The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Uraltseva for elliptic equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **16** (1991), 311–361.
- [24] P. Marcellini, Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with nonstandard growth conditions, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **105** (1989), no. 3, 267–284.
- [25] P. Marcellini, Regularity and existence of solutions of elliptic equations with p, q -growth conditions, *J. Differential Equations* **90** (1991), no. 1, 1–30.
- [26] P. Marcellini, Regularity for elliptic equations with general growth conditions, *J. Differential Equations* **105** (1993), no. 3, 296–333.
- [27] G. Mingione, Regularity of minima: an invitation to the dark side of the calculus of variations, *Appl. Math.* **51** (2006), no. 4, 355–426.
- [28] L. Pick, A. Kufner, O. John and S. Fućk, *Function spaces. Vol. 1*. Second revised and extended edition. De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications, 14. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2013.
- [29] L. Tartar, *An introduction to Sobolev spaces and interpolation spaces*, Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana, 3. Springer, Berlin; UMI, Bologna, 2007.
- [30] N. S. Trudinger, On the regularity of generalized solutions of linear, non-uniformly elliptic equations, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **42** (1971), 50–62.
- [31] V. V. Zhikov, Averaging of functionals of the calculus of variations and elasticity theory (in Russian), *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.* **50** (1986), no. 4, 675–710; English translation in *Izv. Math.* **29** (1987), no. 1, 33–66.

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG, AUGUSTUSPLATZ 10, 04103 LEIPZIG, GERMANY.

E-mail address: jonas.hirsch@math.uni-leipzig.de

MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK IN DEN NATURWISSENSCHAFTEN, INSELSTRASSE 22, 04103 LEIPZIG, GERMANY.

E-mail address: mathias.schaeffner@mis.mpg.de