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Abstract
In this contribution we obtain partial $C^{0,\alpha}$-regularity for bounded solutions of a certain class of cross-diffusion systems, which are strongly coupled, degenerate quasilinear parabolic systems. Under slightly more restrictive assumptions, we obtain partial $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity. The cross-diffusion systems that we consider have a formal gradient flow structure, in the sense that they are formally identical to the gradient flow of a convex entropy functional. Furthermore, we assume that the cross-diffusion systems are not volume-filling. The main novel tool that we introduce in this contribution is a “glued entropy density,” which allows us to emulate the classical theory of partial Hölder regularity for nonlinear parabolic systems by Giaquinta and Struwe within this new setting. To demonstrate the applicability of our results, we give two examples of well-studied cross-diffusion systems that satisfy our assumptions—one of which is the two component Shigesada-Kawasaki-Teramoto (SKT) model for population dynamics.

1 Introduction
In this paper we are interested in the partial Hölder regularity of bounded weak solutions of cross-diffusion systems, which are reaction-diffusion systems with non-diagonal diffusion coefficients. Systems of this type find application in many areas, including in the modelling of gaseous or fluid mixtures [23, 31], the dynamics of competing populations [29], or in the study of tumour growth [15]. Formally, cross-diffusion systems have the form

$$\partial_t u_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \nabla \cdot A_{ij}(u) \nabla u_j = f_i(u) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0, T);$$

(1.1)

the components $u_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, are interpreted as chemical or population densities, the interactions of which are governed by the diffusion coefficients $A_{ij}(u)$ and the reaction terms $f_i(u)$. We assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 2$, is a bounded smooth domain and $T > 0$. The system (1.1) is usually complemented with the boundary and initial conditions

$$A_{ij}(u) \nabla u_j \cdot \nu = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega \times (0, T) \quad \text{and} \quad u(\cdot, 0) = u_0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega,$$

where $\nu$ denotes the outer normal on $\partial \Omega$. In the sequel, we abbreviate (1.1) as

$$\partial_t u - \nabla \cdot A(u) \nabla u = f(u) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0, T),$$

where $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ and $(A(u))_{ij} = A_{ij}(u)$.

As the diffusion matrix $(A_{ij}(u))_{i,j=1,\ldots,n}$ is neither assumed to be symmetric nor positive-definite, the issue of obtaining a priori estimates for solutions of (1.1) can be rather delicate. In particular, the standard energy methods usually used in the context of parabolic (or elliptic) systems are, without further insight, of no use in the setting of (1.1). This makes classical methods used in the partial Hölder regularity theory for nonlinear parabolic systems seem out of reach. In order overcome these difficulties, in this paper we restrict ourselves to the class of cross-diffusion systems with a strict entropy structure.
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By definition, this means that there exists a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a convex function $h : D \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $h'' A : D \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is uniformly strictly positive-definite and the range of $u$ is contained in $D$. This $h$ is called the entropy density. Throughout this paper the solutions of (1.1) that we consider are bounded and we assume that $D = [0, d_1] \times \cdots \times [0, d_n]$ with $d_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

The presence of an entropy structure is useful in the analysis of cross-diffusion systems because it gives one access to an entropy estimate. In particular, defining the entropy as $\mathcal{H}(u) := \int_D h(u) \, dx$, we then have that

$$
\partial_t \mathcal{H}[u] = \int_D \partial_t u \cdot h'(u) \, dx = - \int_D \nabla u : h''(u) A(u) \nabla u \, dx + \int_D f(u) \cdot h'(u) \, dx 
$$

(1.2)

The relation (1.2) implies that when $\int_D f(u) \cdot h'(u) \leq 0$ and $\mathcal{H}(u_0) < \infty$, then the entropy $\mathcal{H}$ is a Lyapunov functional for (1.1).

In the analysis of cross-diffusion systems with entropy structure, the estimate (1.2) often plays a similar role as the standard energy estimate for parabolic systems satisfying a positive-definiteness condition. This can, in particular, be seen in the existence theory for global weak solutions via the boundedness-by-entropy method [16]. Under certain additional assumptions on (1.1), the strategy in [16] for obtaining global solutions is to do a twofold regularization of (1.1) by first discretizing the time derivative with a first-order implicit Euler scheme and then adding vanishing viscosity and massive terms. As is seen in [16, Lemma 5], the regularized equations (which are elliptic) can then be solved using a Lax-Milgram argument. Using uniform estimates for the regularized solutions that are obtained as versions of (1.2), one can then pass to the limit in the regularization.

Another tool that becomes available to us when (1.1) has an entropy structure is the relative entropy

$$
\mathcal{H}[u,v] := \mathcal{H}[u] - \mathcal{H}[v] - \langle \mathcal{H}'[v], u - v \rangle,
$$

(1.3)

for $u, v \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Intuitively, the relative entropy is a way of measuring the distance between two functions $u$ and $v$. To obtain the expression (1.3) one seeks an affine functional of $u, \ell(u)$, such that $\mathcal{H}[u] - \mathcal{H}[v] - \ell(u)$ is positive and takes its minimum value of 0 at $u = v$. As we will take advantage of in our arguments, the relative entropy also satisfies an entropy estimate similar to (1.2). Lastly, we mention that the relative entropy density $h(\cdot | v)$ for $v \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is related to the entropy density $h$ as

$$
h(\cdot | v) = h(\cdot) - h(v) - \langle h'(v), u - v \rangle,
$$

so that $\mathcal{H}[\cdot | v] = \int_D h(\cdot | v) \, dx$.

In the current contribution we capitalize on the fact that within the context of cross-diffusion systems with entropy structure (or reaction-diffusion systems), the relative entropy represents a notion of distance between two functions that is well-suited to obtaining estimates. This is seen, e.g., in the use of the relative entropy in the uniqueness theory for solutions of cross-diffusion systems. Without an entropy structure, the first uniqueness result for systems of the type (1.1) is in [1]– it assumes that the time derivative of the solution is integrable and the diffusion is linear. Subsequently, in [25] (for finite energy solutions of scalar equations) and [26] (under the assumption of a strictly positive-definite diffusion matrix), the assumptions were loosened. When one has access to an entropy structure, it is useful to replace the $L^2$-distance between two solutions (that one might usually use to prove uniqueness results) with the expression (1.3). In the context of cross-diffusion systems we highlight the contributions [7, 18, 33] and for diagonal reaction-diffusion systems [9]. We remark that the relative entropy has also been used to obtain (exponential) convergence rates to equilibrium in [3].

While cross-diffusion systems with entropy structure are quite well-studied –see the contributions already listed above, the survey article [24], or the book [17]– not much is know about the regularity of solutions. In the current work, under certain assumptions on (1.1), we construct a technical tool that, for reasons that will become clear in the next section, we call the “glued entropy.” For a given system the availability of the “glued entropy” opens the door for us to emulate the classical partial Hölder regularity theory for nonlinear parabolic systems by Giaquinta and Struwe found in [13]. In particular, the classical arguments proceed via a Campanato iteration. With our “glued entropy” in-hand, our strategy is to, within the techniques contained in [13], replace the $L^2$-distance with the relative entropy and energy estimates with entropy estimates –this is possible thanks to the properties satisfied by the “glued entropy.” With this technique we prove a result of the type:
“Theorem” Under the assumptions (H1)-(H3) given below, there exists a “glued entropy” for the system (1.1). If we additionally assume that $A$ is uniformly continuous and $f \in C^0(\partial_0; \mathbb{R}^n)$, then bounded weak solutions of (1.1) satisfy a partial $C^{0,\alpha}$-regularity result for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

If $A$ is, furthermore, assumed to be Hölder continuous with exponent $\sigma \in (0,1)$, then we find that the gradient of a bounded weak solution also satisfies a partial $C^{1,\sigma}$-regularity result.

The assumptions (H1)-(H3) are, e.g., satisfied by the 2-component Shigesada-Kawasaki-Teramoto (SKT) model for population dynamics. Since $\Lambda_{SKT} \in C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we find that bounded weak solutions of the SKT system satisfy a partial $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity result.

We would like to mention some previous works concerned with the Hölder regularity of solutions to cross-diffusion systems. In particular, there are contributions by Le and then by Le and Nguyen [19, 20, 22]. In these papers the main strategy is to use the method of heat approximation. We remark, however, that the assumptions that we place on the cross-diffusion system (1.1) here are different than those in the above mentioned previous works and we specifically take heavy advantage of the entropy structure. In this context would like to again emphasize the applicability of our methods to the SKT model (for $n = 2$), which was originally suggested in [29] and is perhaps the most well-studied example of a cross-diffusion system. Our techniques can also handle the semiconductor model with electron-hole scattering derived in [28] and later studied in [6, 16], again for $n = 2$.

As we explain in more detail below, we expect our strategy to be quite robust. In particular, while (H1) stipulates a non-volume filling system, we expect it to be possible to also extend our strategy to the case of volume-filling systems, such as the Maxwell-Stefan system [23, 31].

1.1 Notation
We will use the notation
\[ \Lambda := \Omega \times (-T,0), \quad \text{where} \quad \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{and} \quad T > 0. \]

Furthermore, a point $z_0 \in \Lambda$ can be decomposed as $z_0 = (x_0, t_0)$ for $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $t_0 \in (-T,0)$. For $R > 0$ and a point $z_0 \in \Lambda$, we then let
\[ \Gamma_R(t_0) := (t_0 - R^2, t_0) \quad \text{and} \quad B_R(x_0) := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |x - x_0| < R \}. \]

The corresponding parabolic cylinder is
\[ C_R(z_0) := B_R(x_0) \times \Gamma_R(t_0) \]
with the parabolic boundary $\partial^P C_R(z_0)$ of $C_R(z_0)$ given by
\[ \partial^P C_R(z_0) := (B_R(x_0) \times \{ t_0 - R^2 \}) \cup (\partial B_R(x_0) \times \{ t_0 - R^2, t_0 \}). \]

We use two notions and corresponding notations for the average of a function on a parabolic cylinder. The first notion is the standard one and for a function $u$, radius $R > 0$, and point $z_0 \in \Lambda$ is given by
\[ (u)_{z_0,R} := \int_{C_R(z_0)} u \, dz = \frac{1}{|C_R(z_0)|} \int_{C_R(z_0)} u \, dz. \]

The second notion is a weighted average: For a point $x_0 \in \Omega$ we introduce a cut-off function $\chi_{x_0} \in C_0^\infty(B_2(x_0))$ such that $\chi_{x_0} \equiv 1$ on $B_1(x_0)$ and $|\nabla \chi_{x_0}| \leq 2$. Rescaling, we then let
\[ \chi_{x_0,R} := \chi_{x_0} \left( \frac{\cdot}{R} \right) \quad \text{for} \quad R > 0, \quad (1.4) \]
where we notice that $\chi_{x_0,R}$ is supported in $B_{2R}(x_0)$. This allows us to define the time-dependent weighted average on balls
\[ (\bar{u})_{x_0,R}(t) := \frac{\int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} u(x,t) \chi_{x_0,R}^2 \, dx}{\int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} \chi_{x_0,R}^2 \, dx}. \]

for which solutions are known to exhibit finite-time β Hölder regularity for nonlinear parabolic systems contained in [13]. These classical techniques rely on energy methods and, as we will explain in Section 3.2, require access to a Caccioppoli-type estimate for solutions of (1.1), as well as for solutions of a corresponding “frozen” system. We now give the heuristics for obtaining a Caccioppoli-type estimate for a solution of (1.1):

Throughout this paper, we will use the notation “f ≤ g” to denote “f ≤ C(d, n, A, ε)g”. Here ε > 0 is determined by the availability of a glued entropy density hε, which we introduce in the next section.

2 The glued entropy and our assumptions

2.1 Motivation for the glued entropy

The applicability of the regularity theory that we develop in this paper is entirely dependent on the availability of a “glued entropy.” In order to motivate this concept, we first give some heuristics at hand of an example, namely the SKT model.

Example 1 (Shigesada-Kawasaki-Teramoto model). This model is used to describe the population dynamics of interacting subpopulations –Here, we give it for n = 2. The model is given by (1.1) with the diffusion matrix

\[ A_{SKT}(u) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{10} + 2\alpha_{11}u_1 + \alpha_{12}u_2 \\ \alpha_{21}u_2 \\ \alpha_{20} + \alpha_{21}u_1 + 2\alpha_{22}u_2 \end{bmatrix}, \]

where we assume that each α_{ij} > 0. One usually considers this model with Lotka-Volterra type source terms

\[ f_i(u) = (\beta_{i0} - \beta_{i1}u_1 - \beta_{i2}u_2)u_i \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \]

where the β_{ij} ≥ 0. A simple calculation shows that the SKT model has an entropy structure with

\[ h(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i(u_i) = \frac{u_1}{\alpha_{12}}(\log(u_1) - 1) + \frac{u_2}{\alpha_{21}}(\log(u_2) - 1). \quad (2.1) \]

For more details on the SKT model, see [17, Section 4.5].

For the applicability of our regularity theory, we notice that it was shown that there exist non-negative global weak solutions of the SKT model in d = 1 in [10]. This result was extended to arbitrary space-dimension in [4, 5] –the second of these works considered the case without self-diffusion, i.e. assuming that α_{11} = α_{22} = 0. The SKT model also falls within those models for which global non-negative weak solutions can be constructed via the boundedness-by-entropy method [16].

The issue of L∞-bounds for weak solutions of the SKT system is unresolved in general. When α_{10} = α_{20} and d = 1, uniform upper bounds were proven in [30]. In [21] it was shown that when self-diffusion dominates, in the sense that α_{11} > α_{12} and α_{22} > α_{21}, then weak solutions are bounded and Hölder continuous. Global bounded solutions are constructed in the case that w_{21} = 0 (a triangular system) in [8]. Finally, in [18] the third author and Jüngel derived sufficient conditions on the parameters to obtain uniform L∞-bounds for weak solutions via entropy methods. However, as is noted in [18], uniform L∞-bounds should not be expected without the assumption α_{ij} ≥ 0: For α_{10} = α_{20} = 1, α_{12} = −1, and β_{11} = β_{22} = 1, with all other parameters set to 0, one obtains the parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel model for which solutions are known to exhibit finite-time L∞ blow-up (see e.g. [14]).

As we have already emphasized, in this contribution we would like to fall back on the theory of partial Hölder regularity for nonlinear parabolic systems contained in [13]. These classical techniques rely on energy methods and, as we will explain in Section 3.2, require access to a Caccioppoli-type estimate for solutions of (1.1), as well as for solutions of a corresponding “frozen” system. We now give the heuristics for obtaining a Caccioppoli-type estimate for a solution of (1.1):
Heuristic argument for Caccioppoli-type estimate satisfied by $u$: Let $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and $R > 0$ such that $C_{2R}(z_0) \subset \Lambda$ and, for simplicity, assume that $f \equiv 0$. The idea then is to mimic the entropy estimate (1.2) applied to the relative entropy

$$\int h(u|(\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}) \eta^2 \, dx, \tag{1.2}$$

but within the framework of the argument one usually uses to prove the standard Caccioppoli estimate for nonlinear parabolic systems (see e.g. [13, Lemma 2.1]).

To mimic (1.2), letting $\eta$ be a specific cut-off function for $C_R(z_0)$ in $C_{2R}(z_0)$, we take the time derivative of $\int h(u|(\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}) \eta^2 \, dx$. After some manipulations that are contained in the proof of Lemma 3, this yields that

$$\int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 \nabla u : h''(u)A(u) \nabla u \, dz \tag{2.2}$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \left( h(u|(\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}) + \sup_{y \in \mathcal{D}} |h''(y)|^2 |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \right) \, dz$$

$$+ R^{d+4} \|f\|_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(z_0))}.$$  

In order to obtain a Caccioppoli-type estimate, on top of requiring that the first inequality in (2.2) holds, we then also require that

$$h(u|b) \lesssim |u - b|^2 \quad \text{for} \ b \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{y \in \mathcal{D}} h''(y) \lesssim 1. \quad \tag{2.3}$$

Notice that when $h \in C^2$, Taylor’s theorem shows that these two conditions are equivalent via the definition (1.3).

Using the entropy given in (2.1) as a guiding example, we see that the conditions in (2.3) do not hold when the components $u_i \to 0$. Therefore, when this happens we must seek alternative methods in order to obtain the required Caccioppoli-type estimate. In the setting of the SKT model, the observation that makes this possible is that as $u \to 0$, the $(A_{SKT}(u))_{ij} \to \alpha_{ij}$, in particular, our strategy for constructing the “glued entropy density” that will replace $h$ in the above calculations and will satisfy the conditions in (2.3), is to (when $f \equiv 0$) view the cross-diffusion system (1.1) as a perturbation of $n$ decoupled heat equations when the components of $u$ vanish. Recalling that any convex function is an entropy density of the heat equation, we select the quadratic entropy density—the Hessian of which is clearly bounded. To obtain the “glued entropy density” we glue the quadratic entropy density for the decoupled heat equations when the components of $u$ vanish. The above discussion then motivates the conditions that we require of the glued entropy density:

**Requirements on the glued entropy density:** For the regularity results that we prove to hold for a bounded weak solution of a given cross-diffusion system $-u$ with range contained in $\mathcal{D} = [0, d_1] \times \cdots \times [0, d_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we require there exists a convex function $h_\epsilon \in C^2(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R})$ that satisfies:

(C1) There exists $\kappa > 0$ such that for any $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}$, we have that

$$\rho \cdot h''_\epsilon(y)A(y)\rho \geq \kappa |\rho|^2.$$

(C2) There exists $\kappa' > 0$ such that for any $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}$, it holds that

$$\rho \cdot h''_\epsilon(y)\rho \geq \kappa'|\rho|^2;$$

furthermore, $\kappa' \leq |h''_\epsilon(y)| \lesssim 1$.

Notice that the condition (C2) implies that for $u$ and $v \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, the relation

$$|u - v|^2 \lesssim h_\epsilon(u|v) \lesssim |u - v|^2 \tag{2.4}$$

holds. Here $h_\epsilon(u|v)$ represents the relative entropy density induced by the glued entropy density $h_\epsilon$; i.e.

$$h_\epsilon(u|v) := h_\epsilon(u) - h_\epsilon(v) - \langle h'_\epsilon(v), u - v \rangle. \tag{2.5}$$
2.2 Construction of the glued entropy

For this construction we assume that the cross-diffusion system (1.1) has an entropy structure and that the entropy density \( h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) takes the form

\[
h(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i(u_i). \tag{2.6}
\]

Our assumption on the structure of the entropy density restricts our analysis to systems without volume-filling, see Section 2.6 for more details. Again, we also assume that the range of the bounded weak solution \( u \) is contained in \( D = [0, d_1] \times \ldots \times [0, d_n] \).

Now, let \( \epsilon > 0 \) be arbitrary and take a partition of unity subordinate to the cover of \( \mathbb{R} \) given by \( A_1 = (-\infty, 2\epsilon) \) and \( A_2 = (\epsilon, +\infty) \) – this partition of unity consists of \( \eta_1^\epsilon \) and \( \eta_2^\epsilon \) and we, furthermore, assume that each \( |\nabla \eta_i^\epsilon| \lesssim 1/\epsilon \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). We define the \textit{glued entropy density} \( h_\epsilon \) as

\[
h_\epsilon(u) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{\epsilon,i}(u_i), \quad \text{with} \quad h_{\epsilon,i}(x) := \int_0^x \int_0^{z_i} h_i''(\epsilon \eta_i^\epsilon(y) + y \eta_i^\epsilon(y)) \, dy \, dz. \tag{2.7}
\]

Notice that, since \( h_i'' \) is bounded from above and below on \( [0, \infty) \), then \( h_\epsilon \) defined as in (2.7) satisfies the boundedness of the Hessian required in (C2).

Before giving examples of cross-diffusion systems for which there exists \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that \( h_\epsilon \) defined above satisfies (C1) and (C2), we revisit the intuition behind the above construction. For this we again reference the SKT model from Example 1 and for simplicity set \( \alpha_{21} = \alpha_{12} = 1 \), which implies that

\[
h_\epsilon(u_i) = u_i(\log(u_i) - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad h_i''(u_i) = \frac{1}{u_i}. \tag{2.8}
\]

To make sure that \( h_\epsilon'' \lesssim 1 \) on \( D \), the most naive ansatz for \( h_\epsilon \) would be

\[
h_{\epsilon,i}(x)'' = \int_0^x \int_0^{z_i} h_i''(\max\{y, \epsilon\}) \, dy \, dz. \tag{2.9}
\]

Choosing the quadratic entropy density \( \hat{h}_\epsilon(u) = (2\epsilon)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2 \) for a system of \( n \) decoupled heat equations, we notice that (2.9) corresponds to gluing \( \hat{h}_\epsilon'' \) to \( h_i'' \) and integrating up the result – this, of course, guarantees the boundedness of the Hessian required in (C2). Going from the naive ansatz (2.9) to the actual definition (2.7) is a simple matter of replacing \( \max\{\cdot, \epsilon\}'' \) by a smooth gluing so that \( h_\epsilon \in C^2(D; \mathbb{R}) \).

Notice that since the quadratic entropy and the gluing are smooth, the smoothness of \( h_\epsilon \) is only limited by the smoothness of \( h \). In particular, for the SKT model the glued entropy density is actually smooth.

2.3 Sufficient conditions for the existence of a glued entropy density

We now give sufficient conditions under which for a cross-diffusion system of the form (1.1) and a bounded weak solution \( u \) with range contained in \( D = [0, d_1] \times \ldots \times [0, d_n] \subset \mathbb{R}^n \), there exists \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that \( h_\epsilon \) defined in (2.7) satisfies (C1) and (C2).

We will require that:

(H1) The system (1.1) has an entropy structure and the entropy \( h : D \to [0, \infty) \) has the form

\[
h(y) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i(y_i) \tag{2.10}
\]

for \( y \in D \), where \( y_i = y \cdot e_i \) and \( h_i \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+; [0, \infty)) \). For \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), we assume that \( h_i''(y_i) \to \infty \) monotonically as \( y_i \to 0 \) in such a way that there exists \( C \in \mathbb{R} \) for which \( h_i''(\epsilon) \leq Ch_i''(2\epsilon) \) holds for any \( \epsilon > 0 \).
(H2) There exists $\beta' > 0$ such that for any $y \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have that
\[ \rho \cdot h''(y)A(y)\rho \geq \beta' |\rho|^2. \]  
(2.11)
Furthermore, $h''(y)A(y)$ is symmetric.

(H3) There exist functions $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in C^0(\mathcal{D})$ such that
\[ \mu := \min_{i=1,\ldots,n} \inf_{y} a_i > 0 \]  
(2.12)
and the relation
\[ \max_{i,j=1,\ldots,n} |A_{ij}(y) - a_i(y)\delta_{ij}| |h''(y_i)| \lesssim 1 \]  
(2.13)
holds for any $y \in \mathcal{D}$.

Notice that the boundedness of $\mathcal{D}$ and the monotonicity of $h''(y)$ assumed in (H1) imply that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that for any $y \in \mathcal{D}$ the relation
\[ \min_{i=1,\ldots,n} h''(y_i) \geq \beta \]  
holds.

To see that the conditions (H1) - (H3) are sufficient for the construction of the glued entropy, we first notice that (C2) is guaranteed by the definition (2.7) of the glued entropy density in conjunction with the assumption (H1). It then remains to check that $\epsilon > 0$ can be chosen in such a manner that (C1) is satisfied. In particular, we will show that

**Proposition 1.** Under the conditions (H1) - (H3) and using the definition (2.7) of $h_\epsilon$, we find that there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that
\[ \rho \cdot h''(y)A(y)\rho \geq \kappa |\rho|^2 \]  
(2.14)
for any $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}$.

The proof of Proposition 1, which we now immediately give, is one of the main novel contributions of this paper.

Here is the argument:

**Proof.** Let $y \in \mathcal{D}$ be arbitrary. For $\epsilon > 0$ we define the sets:
\[ S_\epsilon(y) := \{ i \in S : y_i \geq 2\epsilon \} \quad \text{and} \quad S_\epsilon^c(y) := \{ i \in S : y_i < 2\epsilon \}, \]
where $S = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. By the assumption (H2), the statement of Proposition 1 is trivially true for all $y \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $S_\epsilon(y) = S$. Therefore, throughout this argument we will assume that $S_\epsilon(y) \neq \emptyset$ (and a fortiori $S \neq \emptyset$).

To begin we fix an arbitrary $\lambda > 0$ and notice that by (H1), there exists $\beta_\lambda > 0$ such that
\[ |h''(y_i)| \geq \lambda \quad \text{for} \quad i \in S \quad \text{and} \quad y_i \in [0, \beta_\lambda]. \]

Also, notice that by (2.13) of (H3) we have that
\[ \max_{i,j=1,\ldots,n} |h''(y_i)||A_{ij}(y) - a_i(y)\delta_{ij}| \lesssim 1 \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \mathcal{D}, \]  
(2.15)
since $h''(y_i) \lesssim h''(y)$ on $\mathcal{D}$. The latter observation follows from the definition (2.7) along with the assumptions on the $h''(y)$ given in (H1).

Now, fix $\epsilon < \beta_\lambda / 2$ and for $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^n$ define $\hat{\rho} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as
\[ \hat{\rho} = (\hat{\rho}_1, \ldots, \hat{\rho}_n) \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\rho}_i := \begin{cases} \rho_i, & i \in S_\epsilon(y), \\ 0, & i \in S_\epsilon^c(y). \end{cases} \]

To show (2.14), we use the decomposition
\[ \rho \cdot h''(y)A(y)\rho = (\rho - \hat{\rho}) \cdot h''(y)A(y)\rho + \hat{\rho} \cdot h''(y)A(y)\rho \]  
(2.16)
and bound the two terms on the right-hand side separately.

Starting with the first term of (2.16), we use the definition (2.7) of \(h_i\) to write

\[
(\rho - \hat{\rho}) \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha_i(y)A(y)\rho = \sum_{i \in S^c_i(y)} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho_i \hat{h}^\alpha_{ij}(y_i)A_{ij}(y)\rho_j \\
= \sum_{i \in S^c_i(y)} \rho_i \hat{h}^\alpha_{ij}(y_i)a_i(y)\rho_i + \sum_{i \in S^c_i(y)} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho_i \hat{h}^\alpha_{ij}(y_i)(A_{ij}(y) - a_i(y)\delta_{ij})\rho_j.
\]

Notice that by the definition (2.7) and since \(h^\alpha_{ij}(y_i) \geq h^\alpha_{ij}(2\epsilon) \geq \lambda\) for \(i \in S^c_i(y)\).

Using (2.12) of (H3) and (2.15) it follows that

\[
(\rho - \hat{\rho}) \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha_i(y)A(y)\rho \geq \mu \lambda \sum_{i \in S^c_i(y)} |\rho_i|^2 - C(n) \sum_{i \in S^c_i(y)} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\rho_i||\rho_j| \\
\geq \mu \lambda |\rho - \hat{\rho}|^2 - C(n)|\rho||\rho - \hat{\rho}| \\
\geq (\mu \lambda - C(n))|\rho - \hat{\rho}|^2 - C(n)|\hat{\rho}||\rho - \hat{\rho}|,
\]

where the \(C(n)\) are generic constants depending on \(n\). We remark that in (2.17) we have used that \(C(n)|\rho| \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\rho_i|\) for some positive \(C(n) \in \mathbb{R}\).

Writing \(\rho = (\rho - \hat{\rho}) + \hat{\rho}\), using the form of \(h\) given in (2.10) of (H1), and the symmetry of \(h^\alpha(\rho)A(\rho)\) stated in (H2) leads to

\[
\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha(y)A(y)\rho = \rho \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha(y)A(y)\rho + \sum_{i \in S^c_i(y)} \sum_{j \in S^c_i(y)} \rho_i \hat{h}^\alpha_{ij}(y_i)A_{ij}(y)\rho_j \\
= \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha(y)A(y)\hat{\rho} + \sum_{i \in S^c_i(y)} \sum_{j \in S^c_i(y)} \rho_i \hat{h}^\alpha_{ij}(y_i)(A_{ij}(y) - a_i(y)\delta_{ij})\rho_j.
\]

Using (2.11) from the assumption (H2) and (2.13) from (H3), we deduce

\[
\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha(y)A(y)\rho \geq \beta'|\hat{\rho}|^2 - C(n)|\rho - \hat{\rho}|\hat{\rho}|.
\]

Additionally using the definition (2.7) of \(h_i\), we conclude that

\[
\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha_i(y)A(y)\rho = \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha_i(y)A(y)\rho + \rho_i \hat{h}^\alpha_{ij}(y_i)A_{ij}(y)\rho_j \\
\geq \beta'|\hat{\rho}|^2 - C(n)|\rho - \hat{\rho}|\hat{\rho}|.
\]

Combining (2.16), (2.17), and (2.18) and using Young’s inequality in the form

\[
2C(n)|\rho - \hat{\rho}|\hat{\rho}| \leq \frac{\beta'}{2} |\hat{\rho}|^2 + \frac{8C(n)^2}{\beta'} |\rho - \hat{\rho}|^2,
\]

leads to

\[
\rho \cdot \hat{h}^\alpha_i(y)A(y)\rho \geq \frac{\beta'}{2} |\hat{\rho}|^2 + \left(\mu \lambda - \frac{8C(n)^2}{\beta'}\right) |\rho - \hat{\rho}|^2.
\]

Choosing \(\lambda > 0\) sufficiently large yields the statement. \(\square\)

### 2.4 Conditions for the applicability of our regularity theory.

On top of the conditions (H1)-(H3), the applicability of the regularity theory that we develop also requires two more assumptions:

(H4) \(A\) is continuous on \(D\). Since \(D\) is assumed to be bounded, this implies \(|A(y)| \leq 1\) for any \(y \in D\).

(H5) \(f \in C^0(D; \mathbb{R}^n)\). Since \(D\) is assumed to be bounded, this implies that \(f(y) \leq 1\) for any \(y \in D\).

### 2.5 Examples of admissible cross-diffusion systems

We now give two examples of cross-diffusion systems that verify conditions (H1) - (H4). We begin by showing that the conditions are verified for bounded weak solutions of the SKT model from Example 1.
Conditions (H1) - (H4) for bounded solutions of the SKT model. Notice that for \( \alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21} = 1 \) we have already specified the \( h \) and \( h'' \) in (2.8) and that (H1) is verified. The property (2.11) holds for some \( \beta' > 0 \) by virtue of \( h \) being an entropy of the SKT system. The symmetry of \( h''(y)A(y) \) for \( y \in \mathcal{D} \) can be verified via a simple calculation, which shows that

\[
h''(u)A(u) = \left[ \frac{\alpha_{12}u_1}{\alpha_{21}u_1} \left( \alpha_{10} + 2\alpha_{11}u_1 + \alpha_{12}u_2 \right) \right] \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha_{21}u_2} \left( \alpha_{20} + \alpha_{21}u_1 + 2\alpha_{22}u_2 \right) \right].
\]

For (H3), since we assume that \( u \) is non-negative as part of the definition of weak solution (Definition 1) and each \( \alpha_{ij} > 0 \), for

\[
a_1 = \alpha_{10} + \alpha_{12}u_2 \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 = \alpha_{20} + \alpha_{21}u_1
\]

we see that (2.12) is satisfied. Furthermore, again recalling (2.8), we find that (2.13) also holds.

We now give a second example:

**Example 2** (Semiconductor model with electron-hole scattering). This is a model for the carrier transport through a semiconductor under the influence of strong electron-hole scattering (EHS), but without an electric field. The system is given, in particular, by (1.1) with

\[
A(u) = \frac{1}{1 + \mu_2u_1 + \mu_1u_2} \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
\mu_1(1 - \mu_2u_1) & \mu_1\mu_2u_1 \\
\mu_1\mu_2u_2 & \mu_2(1 + \mu_1u_2)
\end{array} \right],
\]

where \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) represent the electron and hole densities and \( \mu_1, \mu_2 > 0 \) are the mobility constants. This system has an entropy structure with almost the same entropy as the SKT model. In particular, the entropy is given by (2.1) with \( \alpha_{21} = \alpha_{12} = 1 \). For the applicability of our partial regularity theory, we remark that the existence of global non-negative weak solutions of this system has been shown in [6, 16]. To the best of our knowledge, there are no results available showing uniform \( L^\infty \)-bounds for weak solutions.

For more details on this model we refer the reader to [16, Section 2.2]

Conditions (H1) - (H4) for bounded solutions of the semiconductor model. Since the entropy is basically the same as for the SKT model, it is given in (2.8), we must only check that (H2) and (H3) hold. For (H2), we let

\[
a_1 = \frac{\mu_1}{1 + \mu_2u_1 + \mu_1u_2} \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 = \frac{\mu_2}{1 + \mu_2u_1 + \mu_1u_2},
\]

and notice that (2.12) holds because the components of \( u \) are non-negative and the \( \mu_i > 0 \). We also find that (2.13) is satisfied. The symmetry of \( h''(y)A(y) \) for \( y \in \mathcal{D} \) is easily verified via a calculation.

### 2.6 Possible future extension: Volume-filling systems

Notice that our results are only applicable for systems without volume-filling — i.e. there is no volume constraint \( \sum_{i \in I} u_i \leq 1 \). However, in practice, some of the most commonly used cross-diffusion systems, e.g. the Maxwell-Stefan model, are volume-filling. Such systems have an entropy not of the form (2.6), but also include an additional term \( \alpha_{n+1}u_{n+1} \) with \( u_{n+1} = \sum_{i \in I} u_i \). This means that (H1) is not verified and a glued entropy cannot be constructed using the ansatz (2.7) without modification.

We now give some heuristics, again at hand of an example:

**Volume-filling model of Burger:** This is a model for the transport of ions through narrow passages; here, the different components represent the ion concentration and the electrical potential. The model is given by (1.1) with

\[
A(u) = \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
D_1(1 - \rho + u_1) & D_1u_1 \\
D_2u_2 & D_2(1 - \rho + u_2)
\end{array} \right],
\]

where \( \rho = \sum_{i=1}^2 u_i \) and \( D_i > 0 \). This system has the entropy

\[
h(u) = u_1(\log(u_1) - 1) + u_2(\log(u_2) - 1) + (1 - \rho)(\log(1 - \rho) - 1).
\]
We point out that classical techniques from regularity theory to the setting of cross-diffusion systems.

Recall that for the cross-diffusion systems without volume-filling there were, on a heuristic level, two regimes: In the first, the components \( u_i \) are bounded away from 0 and partial regularity results can obtained using the entropy structure. In the second, the components \( u_i \to 0 \), in which case the system \((1.1)\) is viewed as a perturbation of decoupled heat equations (when \( f \equiv 0 \)). Now, there is a third regime, which is when \( \rho \to 1 \) and we have that

\[
\mathcal{A}(u) \to \begin{bmatrix}
D_1u_1 & D_1u_1 \\
D_2u_2 & D_2u_2
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

We expect that in this regime it is possible to use the entropy structure and regularity theory of the porous medium equation in order to proceed. This issue will be investigated in a forthcoming work.

3 Overview of our main results and strategy

Recall that \( \mathcal{D} = [0, d_1] \times \ldots \times [0, d_n] \) for some \( d_i > 0 \) is assumed to contain the range of \( u \). We remark that the non-negativity and boundedness assumptions that we place on the weak solutions that we consider in this paper are built into the below definition.

Assume that the initial data \( u_0 : \Omega \to \mathcal{D} \) is a Lebesgue-measurable function and \( \mathcal{H}(u_0) < \infty \). Then the notion of weak solution of \((1.1)\) that we use is as follows:

**Definition 1** (Weak solution). A weak solution to \((1.1)\) is a function \( u : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \to \mathcal{D} \) with \( u \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)) \) and \( \partial_t u \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)) \) such that

\[
\int_0^T (\partial_t u, \phi) \, dt + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \nabla \phi : A(u) \nabla u \, dx \, dt = \int_0^T \int_\Omega f(u) \cdot \phi \, dx \, dt
\]

for any \( \phi \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)) \) and

\[ u(\cdot, t) \to u_0 \text{ strongly in } L^2(\Omega) \text{ as } t \to 0. \]

Here, \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) denotes the dual pairing of \( H^1(\Omega) \)' and \( H^1(\Omega) \).

We point out that \( u \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)) \) thanks to [34, Prop. 23.23] and, therefore, the strong \( L^2(\Omega)\)-limit \( \lim_{t \to 0} u(\cdot, t) \) exists.

3.1 Main Results

Since the strategy that we follow is to adapt the arguments of [13] to the setting of \((1.1)\) through means of the glued entropy, our main theorems quite closely mimic the results (especially Theorems 3.1 and 3.2) contained in [13]. We emphasize that the main contribution of this paper should be seen as the construction of the glued entropy and the observation that it is able to facilitate the adaptation of classical techniques from regularity theory to the setting of cross-diffusion systems.

Here is our first main theorem:

**Theorem 1** (Partial \( C^{0, \alpha} \)-regularity). Let \( u \) be a bounded weak solution of \((1.1)\) in the sense of Definition 1 and assume that the conditions \((H1) - (H5)\) hold. Then there exists an open set \( \Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda \) such that \( u \in C^{0, \alpha}_{loc}(\Lambda_0) \) for any \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \). Furthermore, there exist \( \epsilon_0 \) and \( \epsilon_1 > 0 \) such that

\[
\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0 \subset \left\{ z_0 \in \Lambda \mid \liminf_{R \to 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}_R(z_0)} |u - (u)_{z_0, R}|^2 \, dz > \epsilon_0 \right\}
\]

and

\[
\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0 \subset \left\{ z_0 \in \Lambda \mid \liminf_{R \to 0} R^{-d} \int_{\mathcal{C}_R(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz > \epsilon_1 \right\}.
\]
We remark that throughout this paper, we use parabolic Hölder spaces; i.e. they are defined in terms of the parabolic metric
\[ \delta(z_0, z_1) = \max \{ |x_0 - x_1|, |t_0 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \}. \] (3.3)

Using classical arguments, Theorem 1 can be reinterpreted to give the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the singular set \( \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0 \) satisfies
\[ H^{d-\gamma}(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0) = 0, \] (3.4)
for some \( \gamma > 0 \).

Here \( H^k(\cdot) \) for \( k \geq 0 \) denotes the \( k \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure defined in terms of \( \delta \) given in (3.3). In particular, for \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \) we have that
\[ H^k(\Lambda) = \liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \{ \sum_i \delta(\Lambda_i)^k | \Lambda \subset \cup_i \Lambda_i \text{ and } \delta(\Lambda_i) < \epsilon \}, \] (3.5)
where \( \delta(\Lambda_i) \) denotes the diameter of the set \( \Lambda_i \) with respect to the metric \( \delta \).

To finish our analysis we show the following: Fix \( \alpha \) for some fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \). Throughout our arguments we make use of this glued entropy with no further notice.

**Theorem 2** (Partial \( C^{1,\sigma} \)-regularity). Let \( i, j = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( \sigma \in (0, 1) \). We adopt the assumptions of Theorem 1 and additionally assume that \( A_{ij} \in C^{0,\sigma}(\mathcal{D}) \). Under these conditions, we find that \( \nabla u \in C^{0,\sigma}_{\text{loc}}(\Lambda_0) \), where \( \Lambda_0 \) is determined in Theorem 1.

With the tools used to prove Theorem 1 at our disposal, the proof of Theorem 2 is quite classical and a similar argument can be found in [13, Theorem 3.2].

### 3.2 Strategy of the proof of Theorem 1: A Campanato iteration

Recall that the conditions (H1) - (H3) are sufficient for the existence of a glued entropy density \( h_z \) satisfying (C1) and (C2). Therefore, under the assumptions of Theorem 1 we have access to a glued entropy for some fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \). Throughout our arguments we make use of this glued entropy without further notice.

The strategy that we pursue for proving Theorem 1 is to use a Campanato iteration. In particular, define the tilt excess of \( u \) as
\[ \phi(z_0; R) := \int_{C_{R}(z_0)} |u - (u)_{z_0, R}|^2 \, dz. \] (3.6)

We then show the following: Fix \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \). There exists \( \Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda \) that satisfies (3.1) and (equivalently) (3.2) such that, for any \( z_0 \in \Lambda_0 \) and \( R_0 > 0 \) sufficiently small, a neighborhood \( U \) of \( z_0 \) exists with the property that
\[ \phi(z_0'; r) \lesssim \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{2\alpha} \phi(z_0'; R) + R^{2\alpha} \] (3.7)
holds uniformly with respect to \( z_0' \in U \) and for any \( 0 < r \leq R < R_0 \). It is a standard result, see e.g. [13, Proposition 1.1] or [27, Theorem 3.1], that the above condition is equivalent to the \( C^{0,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(\Lambda_0) \)-regularity of \( u \).

The method for obtaining (3.7) for two sufficiently small radii \( 0 < r \leq R \) is to view \( u \) as a perturbation of the weak solution \( \bar{u} \) of the frozen system
\[ \partial_t \bar{u} - \nabla \cdot A((u)_{z_0, R}) \nabla \bar{u} = f(u) \quad \text{in} \quad C_{R/8}(z_0), \]
\[ \bar{u} = u \quad \text{on} \quad \partial^P C_{R/8}(z_0). \] (3.8)

We remark that the radius “\( R/8 \)” is used here for technical reasons that will become clear below.
The issue of the solvability of (3.8) can easily be settled using the (glued) entropy structure of (1.1), which in some sense survives the freezing-in of the coefficients. In particular, notice that left-multiplying the system (3.8) by \( B = \sqrt{h''(u)_{z_0,R}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) yields
\[
\partial_t B\bar{u} - \nabla \cdot BA((u)_{z_0,R})\nabla \bar{u} = Bf(u) \quad \text{in} \quad C_{R/8}(z_0),
\]
\[
\bar{u} = u \quad \text{on} \quad \partial^\nu C_{R/8}(z_0).
\]
(3.9)

Since \( h''(u)_{z_0,R} \) is diagonal with positive entries, we know that \( B \) is also diagonal with positive entries. Furthermore, the conditions (C2) and (H5) yield that \( h''(u)_{z_0,R}f(u) \in L^\infty(\Lambda) \). Testing (3.9) with \( B\bar{u} \) and using that \( h''((u)_{z_0,R})A((u)_{z_0,R}) \) is strictly positive-definite by (C1), we then obtain the energy estimate required in order to perform a standard Galerkin approximation argument. In particular, we find that the system (3.9) has a unique weak solution \( \bar{u} \). Left-multiplying the system (3.9) by \( B^{-1} \) shows that this \( \bar{u} \) solves the original system (3.8).

In order to transfer regularity from \( \bar{u} \) onto \( u \), we must first show that \( \bar{u} \) is sufficiently regular. To see this it is necessary to show that \( \bar{u} \) satisfies a Caccioppoli inequality. In particular, we show that:

**Lemma 1** (Caccioppoli inequality for solutions of (3.8)). We adopt the assumptions of Theorem 1. For a point \( z_0 \in \Lambda \), let \( \bar{u} \) be the weak solution of the frozen system (3.8) on \( C_{R/8}(z_0) \). Then, for \( z_0' \in C_{R/8}(z_0) \) and radii \( 0 < r < R < 1 \) such that \( C_{2r}(z_0') \subset C_{R/8}(z_0) \), and \( r > 0 \) such that \( C_{2r}(z_0') \subset C_{R/8}(z_0) \), we have that
\[
\int_{C_{r}(z_0')} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz \lesssim \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{d+2} \int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4}
\]
for any \( b \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

We remark that in the proof of Lemma 1, we replace the role of the energy estimate in the proof of the classical Caccioppoli estimate for parabolic systems by a “frozen-in” entropy estimate. Using Lemma 1, we can then derive the required interior regularity estimates for \( \bar{u} \), which we give in the below corollary.

**Corollary 2** (Interior regularity estimates for solutions of (3.8)). We adopt the assumptions of Theorem 1. Let \( z_0 \in \Lambda \) and \( \bar{u} \) be the weak solution of the frozen system (3.8) on \( C_{R/8}(z_0) \). Then, for any point \( z_0' \in C_{R/8}(z_0) \) and radii \( 0 < r < R < 1 \) such that \( C_{R/8}(z_0') \subset C_{R/8}(z_0) \), we find that
\[
\int_{C_{r}(z_0')} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz \lesssim \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{d+2} \int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4}
\]
and
\[
\int_{C_{r}(z_0')} \left| \nabla \bar{u} - (\nabla \bar{u})_{z_0',R} \right|^2 \, dz \lesssim \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{d+4} \int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} \left| \nabla \bar{u} - (\nabla \bar{u})_{z_0',R} \right|^2 \, dz + R^{d+6}.
\]
(3.10)

We now indicate how to transfer the regularity from \( \bar{u} \) onto \( u \) in order to obtain (3.7). First, notice that we may assume that \( r < R/16 \). Then, the triangle inequality allows us to write
\[
\int_{C_{2r}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim \int_{C_{2r}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz + \int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{v}|^2 \, dz,
\]
(3.12)
where we have introduced the error \( \bar{v} := \bar{u} - u \). Using the interior regularity estimates from Corollary 2 and the additional observation that
\[
\int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz \lesssim \int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz,
\]
we find that (3.12) becomes
\[
\int_{C_{2r}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{d+2} \int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} + \int_{C_{R/8}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{v}|^2 \, dz.
\]
(3.13)

Let us now treat the term in (3.14) involving \( \bar{v} \). To do this, we notice that \( \bar{v} \) is a weak solution of
\[
\partial_t B\bar{v} - \nabla \cdot BA((u)_{z_0,R})\nabla \bar{v} = \nabla \cdot B(\nabla u_{z_0,R} - A(u))\nabla u \quad \text{in} \quad C_{R/8}(z_0),
\]
\[
\bar{v} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial^\nu C_{R/8}(z_0),
\]
(3.15)
where we again use $B = \sqrt{R^p(\|u\|_{Z_0,R})} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. To obtain the desired estimate for $\bar{v}$ we then test (3.15) with $B\bar{v}$ and use the properties of the glued entropy, to write
\[
\int_{C_{R/2}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{v}|^2 \, dz \lesssim \left( \int_{C_{R/2}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^p \, dz \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \left( \int_{C_{R/2}(z_0)} |A((u)_{z_0,R}) - A(u)|^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p}}, \tag{3.16}
\]
for $p > 2$.

The right-hand side of (3.16) is exactly analogous to the classical setting—see [13]. And, just as in the classical setting, to handle (3.16) we now rely on the solution $u$ of (1.1) satisfying a reverse Hölder inequality. In particular, in Section 5 we show that:

**Proposition 2** (Reverse Hölder inequality for solutions of (1.1)). We adopt the assumptions of Theorem 1. Fix $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and $R > 0$ such that $C_{4R}(z_0) \subset \Lambda$.

Then, there exists $p > 2$ such that $\|\nabla u\|_{L^p(C_R(z_0))}$ and
\[
\left( \int_{C_R(z_0)} |\nabla u|^p \, dz \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \lesssim \left( \int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} + R. \tag{3.17}
\]

Thereby, by choosing the appropriate $p > 2$ in (3.16) we find that
\[
\int_{C_{R/2}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{v}|^2 \, dz \lesssim \left( \int_{C_{R/2}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \right) \left( \int_{C_{R/2}(z_0)} |A((u)_{z_0,R}) - A(u)|^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p}}, \tag{3.18}
\]
As we will justify in Section 7, by combining (3.14) and (3.18) and using that $z_0 \in \Lambda_0$ with the characterization (3.1), we obtain (3.7) with $z_0 = z_0$ for $R_0 > 0$ small enough. We then argue that (3.7) holds uniformly in a neighborhood of $z_0$.

## 4 An estimate of Poincaré-Wirtinger type for solutions of (1.1)

Throughout our arguments, we will make repeated use of the following Poincaré-Wirtinger type inequality that is satisfied by solutions of (1.1), and also of (3.8). An argument of the type we use below can be found in [32, Lemmas 3 and 4].

**Lemma 2.** Let $u$ be a weak solution of (1.1) such that $A(u) \lesssim 1$. Fix $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and $R > 0$ such that $C_{2R}(z_0) \subset \Lambda$. Then, we find that the relation
\[
\int_{C_R(z_0)} |u - (u)_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz \lesssim R^2 \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^d \|f(u)\|^2_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(z_0))}, \tag{4.1}
\]
holds.

The estimate (4.1) also holds for weak solutions of the frozen system (3.8), as long as $C_{2R}(z_0)$ is contained in the domain where the system is defined.

**Proof.** Let $t_1$ and $t_2 \in \Gamma_{2R}(t_0)$ such that $0 < t_1 < t_2$. We will first show that
\[
|(\bar{v})_{x_0,R}(t_1) - (\bar{v})_{x_0,R}(t_2)|^2 \lesssim R^{-d} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^d \|f(u)\|^2_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(z_0))}, \tag{4.2}
\]
where we use the notation (1.5). For this we test the system (1.1) with $\chi_{x_0,R}^2(t_1,t_2)$, which yields that
\[
\int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} \chi_{x_0,R}^2 u \, dx \bigg|_{t=t_2} - \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} \chi_{x_0,R}^2 u \, dx \bigg|_{t=t_1} = - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} [1 \otimes \nabla \chi_{x_0,R}] : A(u) \nabla u \, dx \, dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} \chi_{x_0,R}^2 f(u) \, dx \, dt.
\]

Recall that “1” denotes the vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with all entries equal to 1. Taking the absolute value of both sides and using the definition (1.5), we obtain
\[
R^d |(\bar{v})_{x_0,R}(t_2) - (\bar{v})_{x_0,R}(t_1)|
\lesssim \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} |[1 \otimes \nabla \chi_{x_0,R}] : A(u)\nabla u| \, dx \, dt + R^d \|f(u)\|^2_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(z_0))}. \tag{4.3}
\]
We then apply Hölder’s inequality and inject the properties of \( \chi_R \) to write
\[
\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} |[1 \otimes \nabla \chi_{z_0,R}^2] \cdot A(u) \nabla u| \, dx \, dt \lesssim R^2 \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]
which is combined with (4.3) to give
\[
|\tilde{u}_{x_0,R}(t_2) - \tilde{u}_{x_0,R}(t_1)| \lesssim R^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + R^2 \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(x_0))}.
\]
The relation (4.2) follows.

We now show (4.1). In particular, using a slight variant of the standard Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality and (4.2), we write
\[
\int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} |u - (u)_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz \\
\leq \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |u - \int_{\Gamma_{2R}(t_0)} (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}(t) \, dt|^2 \, dz \\
\leq \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz + \int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} |(\tilde{u})_{z_0,R} - \int_{\Gamma_{2R}(t_0)} (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}(t) \, dt|^2 \, dz \\
\lesssim R^2 \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^d \int_{\Gamma_{2R}(t_0)} \int_{\Gamma_{2R}(t_0)} |(\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}(s) - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}(t)|^2 \, dt \, ds \\
\lesssim R^2 \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+2} \left( R^{-d} \int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^2 \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(z_0))}^2 \right). \\
\]
The same strategy as above can be applied to weak solutions of (3.8).

\[\square\]

5 Argument for Proposition 2: A reverse Hölder inequality for solutions of (1.1)

We follow the outline of the proof of [13, Theorem 2.1], but within the framework of the glued entropy introduced above. In particular, the proof of Proposition 2 relies on the following result:

**Proposition 3.** Let \( Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \) be a bounded space-time domain. Let \( g, h : Q \to \mathbb{R} \) be non-negative functions, where \( g \in L^q(Q) \) and \( h \in L^r(Q) \) with \( r > q > 1 \). Suppose that for any \( z_0 \in Q \) and \( R > 0 \) such that \( C_{4R}(z_0) \subset Q \) the estimate
\[
\int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} g^q \, dz \leq b \left( \int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} g^q \, dz \right) + \int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} h^q \, dz \]
holds for \( \gamma > 0 \). Under these assumptions there exists a constant \( \gamma_0 = \gamma_0(q, r, d) \) such that if \( \gamma < \gamma_0 \), then there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( g \in L_p^q(Q) \) for \( p \in [q, q + \delta] \) and
\[
\int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} g^q \, dz \lesssim c \left( \int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} g^q \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left( \int_{C_{4R}(z_0)} h^q \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}
\]
for any \( z_0 \in Q \) and \( R > 0 \) such that \( C_{4R}(z_0) \subset Q \). The constant \( c \) and \( \delta \) depend on \( b, q, r, \gamma, \) and \( d \) only.

The proof of this result can be found for elliptic systems in [12, Proposition 5.1]. The argument goes via a Calderón-Zygmund cube decomposition and can be adapted to the parabolic setting by replacing Euclidean cubes by parabolic cubes.

As we will see below, to be able to apply Proposition 3 we require two additional ingredients: First, a Caccioppoli-type estimate like that in Lemma 1, but for solutions of (1.1); and second, another estimate of Poincaré-Wirtinger type satisfied by solutions of (1.1), different from that in Lemma 2. We start with the Caccioppoli-type estimate:
Lemma 3. We adopt the assumptions of Theorem 1. Fix $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and $R > 0$ such that $C_{2R}(z_0) \subset \Lambda$. We show that

$$\int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \|f(u)\|_{L^{\infty}(C_{2R}(z_0))}^2.$$ 

The argument for Lemma 3 is essentially an entropy estimate for $\int_{R^d} h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \, dt$, but infused with ingredients usually used to prove the classical Caccioppoli inequality. Before moving on, we remark that it follows from Lemma 3 that for any $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\int_{C_{R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim \frac{1}{R} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |u - b|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \|f(u)\|_{L^{\infty}(C_{2R}(z_0))}^2. \tag{5.1}$$

Using a similar method, we can also prove the other estimate of Poincaré-Wirtinger type mentioned above:

Lemma 4. We adopt the assumptions of Theorem 1. Fix $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and $R > 0$ such that $C_{2R}(z_0) \subset \Lambda$. Then we find that

$$\sup_{t \in \Gamma_R(t_0)} \int_{B_R(z_0)} |u(t) - (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}(t)|^2 \, dx \lesssim \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \|f(u)\|_{L^{\infty}(C_{2R}(z_0))}^2. \tag{5.2}$$

We remark that Lemma 4 is an analogue of [13, Lemma 2.2].

5.1 Proof of Lemma 3: A Caccioppoli-type estimate for solutions of (1.1)

Proof. Let $\tau \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\tau \equiv 1$ on $\Gamma_R(t_0)$, $\tau \equiv 0$ on the set $t \leq t_0 - (2R)^2$, and $|\nabla \tau| \lesssim 1/R^2$. Defining the cut-off function $\eta = \chi_{z_0, R \tau}$, with the notation (1.4), and using the definition (2.5), we then write

$$\partial_t (h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta^2)$$

$$= \partial_t h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta^2 + 2 h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta \partial_t \eta$$

$$= \eta^2 \partial_t h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \cdot \partial_t u + \eta^2 \partial_t h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \cdot \partial_t (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R} + 2 h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta \partial_t \eta$$

$$= \eta^2 (h'_c(u) - h'_c((\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}))(u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \cdot \partial_t (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R} + 2 h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta \partial_t \eta. \tag{5.3}$$

After integrating this identity and using the definition of $\eta$, we obtain

$$0 < \int_{B_2(z_0)} h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta^2 \, dx \bigg|_{t=t_0}$$

$$= \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \partial_t (h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta^2) \, dz$$

$$= \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 (h'_c(u) - h'_c((\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}))(u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \cdot \partial_t (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R} + 2 \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta \partial_t \eta \, dz$$

$$= I + II + III. \tag{5.4}$$

Here we have used that $\partial_t (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R} \in L^1(\Gamma_{2R}(t_0))$—which can be seen by testing (1.1) with $\chi_{R \tau}^{2}(t, t_0)$ as in the proof of Lemma 2— and (5.3) in the form

$$\left\| \partial_t \int_{B_2(z_0)} h_c(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \eta^2 \, dx \right\|_{L^1(\Gamma_{2R}(t_0))}$$

$$\leq R \left\| u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R} \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{2R}(t_0); H^1(B_2(z_0)))} \left\| \partial_t u \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{2R}(t_0); H^{-1}(B_2(z_0)))}$$

$$+ \left\| \partial_t (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R} \right\|_{L^1(\Gamma_{2R}(t_0))} \left\| (u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R}) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_{2R}(z_0), L^2(B_2(z_0)))}$$

$$+ \left\| u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0, R} \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{2R}(t_0), L^2(B_2(z_0)))} < \infty,$$

where we have additionally made use of the properties of the glued entropy. We remark that the above heuristic computation can be made formal with a standard approximation argument.
Let us now treat the terms on the right-hand side of (5.4) separately, starting with \( I \). From (1.1) it follows:

\[
I = - \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \nabla \left( (h'_e(u) - h'_e((\tilde{u})_{z_0,R})) \eta^2 \right) \cdot A(u) \nabla u \, dz + \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 (h'_e(u) - h'_e((\tilde{u})_{z_0,R})) \cdot f(u) \, dz \\
= - \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 \nabla h'_e(u) \cdot A(u) \nabla u \, dz - 2 \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta (h'_e(u) - h'_e((\tilde{u})_{z_0,R})) \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla u \, dz \\
+ \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 (h'_e(u) - h'_e((\tilde{u})_{z_0,R})) \cdot f(u) \, dz \\
=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\]

From (C1) we then obtain

\[
I_1 = - \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 \nabla u : h''_e(u) A(u) \nabla u \, dz \lesssim - \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 |\nabla u|^2 \, dz.
\]

The term \( I_2 \) is treated using (C2) and the boundedness of \( A \) from (H4) as

\[
|I_2| \lesssim \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta |\nabla \eta| |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}| |\nabla u| \, dz \\
\lesssim \gamma \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + C(\gamma) \gamma \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |\nabla \eta|^2 |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz,
\]

for any \( \gamma > 0 \). For \( I_3 \) we use (C2) and Young’s inequality to write

\[
|I_3| \lesssim \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 \left( \frac{1}{R^2} |h'_e(u) - h'_e((\tilde{u})_{z_0,R})|^2 + R^2 |f(u)|^2 \right) \, dz \\
\lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(z_0))}^2.
\]

To handle III we notice that by the definition (1.5), we obtain

\[
\frac{\partial_t (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}}{\chi_R} = \frac{\chi_R^2 \partial_t u \, dx}{\int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} \chi_R^2 \, dx} = - \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} (2\chi_R [1 \otimes \nabla \chi_R] : A(u) \nabla u - \chi_R^2 \cdot f(u)) \, dx \\
\]

where we have dropped the dependence of \( \chi_{z_0,R} \) on \( x_0 \) for brevity. Notice that in the above identity there are no boundary terms thanks to our use of the weighted average \((\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}\). Using (C2) and the definition of \( \eta \) along with \(|\nabla \chi_R| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \), we are then able to write

\[
|IIII| \lesssim R^{-d} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \left( \eta^2 |h''_e((\tilde{u})_{z_0,R})| |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}| \right) \\
\times \left( \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} |2\chi_R [1 \otimes \nabla \chi_R] : A(u) \nabla u| \, dx + \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} \chi_R^2 |f(u)| \, dx \right) \, dz \\
\lesssim \frac{C(\gamma)}{R^2} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz \\
+ \frac{\gamma R^2}{R^{2d}} \int_{C_{2R}(z_0)} \eta^2 \left( \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} |2\chi_R [1 \otimes \nabla \chi_R] : A(u) \nabla u| \, dx \right)^2 + R^{2d} \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_{2R}(z_0))}^2 \, dz
\]

for any \( \gamma > 0 \).
To finish, we remark that by (C2), in the form (2.4), II in (5.4) can be estimated as

\[ |II| \lesssim \int_{C_{2n}(z_0)} \eta |\partial_t \eta||u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{C_{2n}(z_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz. \]  

(5.10)

We then combine the estimates (5.4), (5.5), (5.6), (5.7), (5.8), (5.9), and (5.10) and choose \( \gamma > 0 \) small enough to absorb the appropriate terms. Using that \( \eta \equiv 1 \) on \( C_R(z_0) \) then yields the result. \( \square \)

5.2 Proof of Lemma 4: Another estimate of Poincaré-Wirtinger type for solutions of (1.1)

The strategy for obtaining (5.2) is similar to that used in the proof of Lemma 3.

Proof. Let \( t_1 \in \Gamma_R(t_0) \) and set \( \eta = \chi_{x_0,R} \tau 1_{t \leq t_1} \). Then, by (5.4) and the bounds contained in the proof of Lemma 3, taking the time derivative of \( \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} h_{\nu}(u | (\tilde{u})_{R,x_0}) \, dx \) yields

\[ \int_{B_{2R}(x_0)} h_{\nu}(u | (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}) \chi_{\mathcal{R}}^2 \, dx \bigg|_{t=t_1} \leq \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{C_{2n}(z_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \| f(u) \|_{L^\infty(C_{2n}(z_0))}^2. \]

Then, by the definition of \( \chi_R \) and using a slight modification of the classical Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality along with (2.4), we obtain

\[ \int_{B_R(x_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz \bigg|_{t=t_1} \leq \int_{C_{2n}(z_0)} \| \nabla u \|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \| f(u) \|_{L^\infty(C_{2n}(z_0))}^2. \]

Taking the supremum over \( t_1 \in \Gamma_R(t_0) \) yields that

\[ \sup_{t \in \Gamma_R(t_0)} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |u - (\tilde{u})_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz \leq \int_{C_{2n}(z_0)} \| \nabla u \|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \| f(u) \|_{L^\infty(C_{2n}(z_0))}^2. \]

\( \square \)

5.3 Proof of Proposition 2

Given the estimates contained in Lemmas 3 and 4, the proof of the reverse Hölder inequality in Proposition 2 is now a slight modification of the argument for [13, Theorem 2.1]. We give the argument for \( d \geq 3 \) — the argument for \( d = 2 \) goes in a similar way.

Proof of Proposition 2. The main tool that we use is Proposition 3. Let \( z_0 = 0 \) and \( Q = C_{3/2}(0) \), which we assume for simplicity is in \( \Lambda \). We will show that for any \( 0 < R < 3/2 \) and \( z_0' \in Q \) such that \( C_{4\Gamma}(z_0') \subset Q \) the estimate

\[ \int_{C_{4\Gamma}(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim C_{\gamma}\left\{ \left( \int_{C_{\gamma z_0}(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \| f(u) \|_{L^\infty(C_{3/2}(0))}^2 \right\} \gamma \int_{C_{4\Gamma}(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz, \]  

(5.11)

holds for any \( \gamma > 0 \) with \( 2_\star = 2d/(d+2) \).

Applying Proposition 3 with \( g = |\nabla u|^2, \quad h = \| f(u) \|_{L^\infty(C_{3/2}(0))}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad q = 2/2_\star \) yields

\[ \left( \int_{C_{1/4}(0)} |\nabla u|^{2-p} \, dz \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \lesssim \left( \int_{C_1(0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \| f(u) \|_{L^\infty(C_{3/2}(0))}^2 \]  

(5.12)

for \( p \in [2/2_\star, 2/2_\star + \delta] \) with \( \delta > 0 \). This gives the reverse Hölder inequality (3.17) for \( z_0 = 0 \) and \( R = 1 \). We obtain (3.17) for any \( z_0 \in \Lambda \) and \( R \in (0,1) \) by applying (5.12) to the rescaled and translated \( \tilde{u}(x,t) = u(R^2(t-t_0), R(x-x_0)) \), which solves (1.1) with the reaction terms \( f(z) = R^z f(z) \).
It remains to show (5.11). We begin with applications of Hölder’s inequality in both space and time and an application of Lemma 4 with (H5):

\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0)} |u - (\bar{u})|_{2R}^2 \, dz \\
\leq \sup_{x \in \Gamma_n(t_0')} \left( \int_{B_{2R}(x_0')} |u - (\bar{u})|_{2R}^2 \, dx \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\Gamma_n(t_0')} \left( \int_{B_{2R}(x_0')} |u - (\bar{u})|_{2R}^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\lesssim \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\times \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\Gamma_n(t_0')} \left( \int_{B_{2R}(x_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\lesssim R^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\quad \times \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\quad + R^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

where \(2^* = \frac{2d}{d-2}\). Using slight variants of the classical Poincaré-Wirtinger and the Poincaré-Sobolev inequalities, we further bound the right-hand side of the last string of inequalities by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\lesssim R^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\quad \times \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\quad + R^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

for \(a = \frac{2}{d-1}\). Treating the two terms on the right-hand side of (5.14) separately, we notice that an application of Young’s inequality yields that

\[
\begin{align*}
R^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} + R^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \\
\lesssim C R^2 \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + C(\gamma) R^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

for any \(\gamma > 0\). For the second term of (5.14), we additionally use that \(R \leq 3/2\) and two applications of Young’s inequality to write

\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + C(\gamma) R^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \\
\lesssim C R^2 \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + C(\gamma) R^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z_0')} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right)^\frac{1}{2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

for any \(\gamma > 0\). To obtain (5.11) we then combine (5.13), (5.14), (5.15), and (5.16) with the result of Lemma 3.
6 Argument for Corollary 2: Interior regularity estimates for solutions of (3.8)

6.1 Proof of Lemma 1: A Caccioppoli inequality for solutions of (3.8)

The main idea for the proof of Lemma 1 is to linearize the methods in the argument for Lemma 3. In particular, the motivation for the below argument is that we approximate \( h_\epsilon \) with its Taylor expansion out to second order, keeping only the convex term. This leads us to replacing the calculation (5.4) by instead taking the time derivative of \((\bar{u} - b) \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})(\bar{u} - b)\) for \( b \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

**Proof of Lemma 1.** We use essentially the same cut-off function \( \eta \) as in the proof of Lemma 3. In particular, we let \( \eta = \chi_{x_0 + \tau} \), where \( \tau \equiv 1 \) on \( \Gamma_r(t'_0) \) and \( \tau \equiv 0 \) for \( t \leq t'_0 - (2r)^2 \) such that \( |\partial_t \tau| \lesssim 1/r^2 \).

We then take the time derivative of \((\bar{u} - b) \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})(\bar{u} - b)\eta^2\):

\[
\int_{B_{2r}(x_1)} (\bar{u} - b) \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})(\bar{u} - b)\eta^2 \, dx \bigg|_{t=t'_0} \\
= \int_{C_{2r}(z'_0)} \partial_t ((\bar{u} - b) \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})(\bar{u} - b)\eta^2) \, dz \\
= 2 \int_{C_{2r}(z'_0)} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta^2 (c_i \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})c_i)(\bar{u}_i - b_i) \partial_i \bar{u}_i \, dz + 2 \int_{C_{2r}(z'_0)} (\bar{u} - b) \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})(\bar{u} - b)\eta \partial_t \eta \, dz \\
= -2 \int_{C_{2r}(z'_0)} \eta^2 \nabla \bar{u} : h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})A((u)_{20, R}) \nabla \bar{u} \\
- 4 \int_{C_{2r}(z'_0)} \eta h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})(\bar{u} - b) \odot \nabla \eta : A((u)_{20, R}) \nabla \bar{u} \\
+ 2 \int_{C_{2r}(z'_0)} \eta^2 (\bar{u} - b) \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})f(u) \\
+ 2 \int_{C_{2r}(z'_0)} (\bar{u} - b) \cdot h''_\epsilon((u)_{20, R})(\bar{u} - b)\eta \partial_t \eta \, dz.
\]

Using both the properties (C1) and (C2), the assumption (H4), and the properties of \( \eta \), we can then complete the argument just as in Lemma 3.

6.2 Proof of Corollary 2

Using the standard arguments we now upgrade the Caccioppoli estimate of Lemma 1 into the required interior regularity estimates for \( \bar{u} \).

**Proof of Corollary 2.** We begin by showing (3.10). We may assume \( r \leq \bar{R}/4 \) as otherwise the estimate is clear. Also, initially we assume that \( \bar{R} = 1 \).

To begin, in the cylinder \( C_1(z'_0) \) we decompose \( \bar{u} = w + \bar{w} \), where \( \bar{w} \) solves

\[
\partial_t \bar{w} - \nabla \cdot A((u)_{20, R}) \nabla \bar{w} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad C_1(z'_0), \\
\bar{w} = \bar{u} \quad \text{on} \quad \partial^P C_1(z'_0).
\]

By the triangle inequality we then have that

\[
\int_{C_1(z'_0)} |\nabla \bar{w}|^2 \, dz \leq \int_{C_{r}(z'_0)} |\nabla w|^2 \, dz + \int_{C_{r}(z'_0)} |\nabla w|^2 \, dz. \quad (6.1)
\]

To treat the first term on the right-hand side of (6.1), we notice that an iterative application of Lemma 1 with \( f \equiv 0 \) yields that

\[
\int_{C_{1/2}(z'_0)} |\nabla^{k+1} \bar{w}|^2 \, dz \lesssim_k \int_{C_1(z'_0)} |\nabla \bar{w}|^2 \, dz \quad (6.2)
\]
for any \( k \geq 0 \), where we have used that (3.8) has constant coefficients. If there are also time derivatives involved, then we find that
\[
\int_{C_r(z_0')} |\partial_t^l \nabla^{k+1} \tilde{w}|^2 \, dz \lesssim_{k,l} \int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{w}|^2 \, dz
\]
for \( l, k \geq 0 \), which can be shown by induction on \( l \). In particular, the base case of this induction is given by (6.2) and the inductive step is proven by using the equation (3.8) to replace a time derivative by spatial derivatives. We remark that this argument can be found in [2]. The Sobolev embedding and (6.3) then yield
\[
\int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{w}|^2 \, dz \lesssim r^{d+2} \sup_{y \in C_1(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{w}(y)|^2 
\]
\[
\lesssim r^{d+2} \|\tilde{w}\|_{H^d(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \lesssim r^{d+2} \int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{w}|^2 \, dz \lesssim r^{d+2} \int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 \, dz,
\]
where we have used an argument analogous to (7.2) and (7.3) for the last relation.

For the second term on the right-hand side of (6.1), we notice that \( w \) solves
\[
\partial_t w - \nabla \cdot A((u)_{z_0,R}) \nabla w = f(u) \quad \text{in } C_1(z_0),
\]
\[
w = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial^P C_1(z_0).
\]
Left-multiplying the system by \( B = \sqrt{h''((u)_{z_0,R})} \) and testing with \( Bw \) yields
\[
\int_{C_1(z_0')} |\nabla w|^2 \, dz \lesssim \int_{C_1(z_0')} \nabla w : h''((u)_{z_0,R}) A((u)_{z_0,R}) \nabla w \, dz 
\]
\[
\lesssim \int_{C_1(z_0')} |w f(u)| \, dz \lesssim \left( \int_{C_1(z_0')} |\nabla w|^2 \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_1(z_0'))}
\]
where we have again used the properties of the glued entropy. After rescaling, the combination of (6.1), (6.4) and (6.5) yields (3.10).

We then notice that (3.11) can be deduced from a slight variant of (3.10). In particular, assuming that \( r \leq \tilde{R}/8 \) and letting \( \tilde{R} = 1 \), we apply Lemmas 2 and then 1 along with (3.10) to write
\[
\int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{u} - (\nabla \tilde{u})_{z_0,1}|^2 \, dz \lesssim \int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{u} - (\nabla \tilde{u})_{z_0,1}|^2 \, dz + \int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla w - (\nabla w)_{z_0,1}|^2 \, dz 
\]
\[
\lesssim r^2 \left( \int_{C_r(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 \, dz + r^{d+4} + r^2 \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_1(z_0'))} \right)^2
\]
\[
\lesssim r^{d+4} \int_{C_{r/2}(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{w}|^2 \, dz + r^2 \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_1(z_0'))}^2 + r^{d+6}
\]
\[
\lesssim r^{d+4} \int_{C_1(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{u} - (\nabla \tilde{u})_{z_0,1}|^2 \, dz + r^2 \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_1(z_0'))}^2 + r^{d+6}
\]
\[
\lesssim r^{d+4} \int_{C_1(z_0')} |\nabla \tilde{u} - (\nabla \tilde{u})_{z_0,1}|^2 \, dz + r^2 \|f(u)\|_{L^\infty(C_1(z_0'))}^2 + r^{d+6},
\]
where we have also used a slight variant of (6.5). Notice that the last inequality follows from an argument similar to that in (8.1). Rescaling yields (3.11). \( \square \)

7 Proofs of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1: Partial \( C^{0,\alpha} \)-Regularity

7.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We are now in the position to prove Theorem 1. Since we have already described the strategy in Section 3.2, we will now only fill in the details.

\textbf{Proof.} Fix \( z_0 \in \Lambda_0 \), where we assume that \( \Lambda_0 \) satisfies (3.1) and the equivalent (3.2), and \( R > 0 \) such that \( C_R(z_0) \subset \Lambda \). Recall that we assume \( 0 < r < R/16 \) as otherwise (3.7) trivially holds.
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As already mentioned in Section 3.2, our strategy is to view \( u \) as a perturbation of \( \bar{u} \) solving (3.8). To finish our argument we now assume that \( r = \tau R \) for some \( \tau \in (0,1/16) \). By the condition (3.1) on \( \Lambda_0 \), we can choose \( R_0 \) small enough so that

\[
\chi(z_0, R) := \omega \left( \int_{C_R(z_0)} |(u)_{z_0,R} - u|^2 \, dz \right)^{(p-2)/p} \lesssim \tau^{d+2},
\]

for \( R < R_0 \). Combining this with (7.1) and (7.5), along with the estimate (5.1), and Lemma 2, we then have

\[
\int_{C_{2z}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{d+2} \int_{C_{\Lambda}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} + \int_{C_{\Lambda}(z_0)} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 \, dz.
\]
obtain that
\[
\int_{C_{\tau R}(z_0)} |u - (u)_{z_0, \tau R}|^2 \, dz \lesssim (\tau R)^2 (\tau^{d+2}) \int_{C_{\tau R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} + \int_{C_{\tau R}(z_0)} |\nabla \psi|^2 \, dz
\]
\[
\lesssim \tau^{d+2} (\tau R)^2 \int_{C_{\tau R}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4}
\]
(7.7)
where we have used that \(r < R < 1\) and \(\tau < 1\). Now, for given \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\), from (7.7) we can set \(R_0\) and, thereby, \(\tau\) small enough so that
\[
\phi(z_0; \tau R) \leq \tau^{2\alpha} \phi(z_0; R) + R^{2\alpha},
\]
(7.8)
where \(\phi\) is defined in (3.6).

7.2 Proof of Corollary 1: Estimate on the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set

Using the characterization (3.2) of the singular set \(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0\), the argument for Corollary 1 is entirely classical and taken from [13]. We include it here only for completeness.

The proof of Corollary 1 mainly depends on the following result from [11].

**Proposition 4.** For \(f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Lambda)\) and \(0 < k < d + 2\), we denote
\[
F_k := \left\{ z_0 \in \Lambda \mid \limsup_{\rho \to 0} \rho^{-k} \int_{C_{\rho}(z_0)} |f| \, dz > 0 \right\}.
\]
Then we find that
\[
H^k(F_k) = 0.
\]
Here, we use the Hausdorff measure with respect to \(\delta\) –see (3.5).

We now apply this result to prove Corollary 1:

**Proof of Corollary 1.** To obtain the result we apply Proposition 4 with \(f = |\nabla u|^p\), where \(p > 2\) is chosen such that Proposition 2 holds. For this we first notice that \(|\nabla u|^p \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Lambda)\), since \(u \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n))\) and by an application of Proposition 2. Furthermore, notice that by Hölder’s inequality and the characterization (3.2) of the singular set, we have that
\[
0 < \epsilon_1 < \limsup_{\rho \to 0} \rho^{-d} \int_{C_{\rho}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim \limsup_{\rho \to 0} \left( \rho^{-(d-(p-2))} \int_{C_{\rho}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^p \, dz \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}
\]
for any \(z_0 \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0\). By Proposition 4 this yields (3.4) for \(\gamma = p - 2 > 0\).

8 Proof of Theorem 2: Partial \(C^{1,\alpha}\)-Regularity under slightly more restrictive assumptions

The argument for Theorem 2 is a slight variation of the proof of Theorem 1, which takes advantage of the Hölder continuity of the coefficients \(A_{ij}\) and uses (3.11) as opposed to (3.10). The Hölder regularity of the coefficients, in particular, gives us more control over the modulus of continuity called \(\omega\) in the proof of Theorem 1. The following argument is inspired by the proof of [13, Theorem 3.2].
Proof. Let \( z_0 \in \Lambda_0 \) and assume that \( C_R(z_0) \subset \Lambda \). As in the argument for Theorem 1, we assume that \( r < R/16 \).

We begin by using (3.11), the triangle inequality, and the observation that
\[
\int_{C_R(z_0)} |\nabla \tilde{v} - (\nabla \tilde{u})_{z_0,R/8}|^2 \, dz \\
\leq \int_{C_R(z_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{z_0,R/8}|^2 \, dz + \int_{C_R(z_0)} |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 \, dz \\
+ \int_{C_R(z_0)} |(\nabla u)_{z_0,R/8} - (\nabla \tilde{u})_{z_0,R/8}|^2 \, dz \\
\leq \int_{C_R(z_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{z_0,R/8}|^2 \, dz + \int_{C_R(z_0)} |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 \, dz, 
\]
(8.1)
in order to write
\[
\int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{z_0,r}|^2 \, dz \leq \int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla \tilde{u})_{z_0,r}|^2 \, dz \\
\leq \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{d+4} \int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz + R^{d+6} + \int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 \, dz. 
\]
(8.2)
Just as in the proof of Theorem 1, it now only remains to treat the term involving \( \nabla \tilde{v} \) on the right-hand side of (8.2). For this we use the same calculation as in (7.5), but additionally that for any \( \omega \), we have that \( \omega(s) \leq cs^\sigma \) for \( c \in \mathbb{R} \). Also, since the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied we have that
\[
R^{-d} \int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \lesssim R^{2\alpha}
\]
for any \( \alpha \in (0,1) \). Combining these observations we find that
\[
\int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 \, dz \\
\lesssim \left( \int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} \right) \omega \left( \int_{C_r(z_0)} |(u)_{z_0,R} - u|^2 \, dz \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \\
\lesssim R^{d+2\alpha} R^{2\alpha \sigma \frac{p-2}{p}}, 
\]
(8.3)
where we have additionally used Lemma 2 and that \( R < 1 \).

Together, (8.2) and (8.3) give that
\[
\int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{z_0,r}|^2 \, dz \leq \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{d+4} \int_{C_r(z_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{z_0,R}|^2 \, dz + R^{d+4} + R^{d+2\alpha+2\alpha \sigma \frac{p-2}{p}}.
\]
Using the same arguments as in Theorem 1, we see that this implies that \( \nabla u \in C^{\alpha,\beta}_{\text{loc}}(\Lambda_0) \) for some \( \beta \in (0,1) \). From this we deduce that \( \nabla u \) is bounded in compact subsets of \( \Lambda_0 \).

Using this boundedness we review our estimate for the \( \nabla \tilde{v} \) term in (8.2). In particular, we replace (7.4) with
\[
- \int_{C_{R/4}(z_0)} \nabla \tilde{v} : h''((u)_{z_0,R})(A((u)_{z_0,R}) - A(u)) \nabla u \, dz \\
\lesssim \gamma \int_{C_{R/4}(z_0)} |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 \, dz + C(\gamma) \int_{C_{R/4}(z_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \sup_{z_0' \in C_R(z_0)} |h''((u)_{z_0,R})(A((u)_{z_0,R}) - A(u))|^2 \\
\lesssim \gamma \int_{C_{R/4}(z_0)} |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 \, dz + C(\gamma) R^{d+2+2\sigma}.
\]
Combining this with (8.2) then yields the result via the same arguments as in Theorem 1. \( \square \)

Acknowledgements

CR gratefully acknowledges partial support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), grants P30000, W1245, and F65. NZ gratefully acknowledges support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (AvH).
References


