arXiv:2106.02653v1 [math.AP] 4 Jun 2021

NONLOCAL EQUATIONS WITH GRADIENT CONSTRAINTS

MOHAMMAD SAFDARI [1]

Abstract. We prove the existence and $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity of solutions to nonlocal fully nonlinear elliptic equations with gradient constraints. We do not assume any regularity about the constraints; so the constraints need not be C^1 or strictly convex. We also obtain $C^{0,1}$ boundary regularity for these problems. Our approach is to show that these nonlocal equations with gradient constraints are related to some nonlocal double obstacle problems. Then we prove the regularity of the double obstacle problems. In this process, we also employ the monotonicity property for the second derivative of obstacles, which we have obtained in a previous work.

Mathematics Subject Classification. 35R35, 47G20, 35B65.

1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the existence and regularity of solutions to the equation with gradient constraint

$$\begin{cases} \max\{-Iu,\ H(Du)\} = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u = \varphi & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n - U. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here I is a nonlocal elliptic operator, of which a prototypical example is the fractional Laplacian

$$-(-\Delta)^s u(x) = c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x)}{|y|^{n+2s}}\, dy.$$

Nonlocal operators appear naturally in the study of discontinuous stochastic processes as the jump part of their infinitesimal generator. These operators have also been studied extensively in recent years from the analytic viewpoint of integro-differential equations. The foundational works of Caffarelli and Silvestre [7, 8, 9] paved the way and set the framework for such studies. They provided an appropriate notion of ellipticity for nonlinear nonlocal equations, and obtained their $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity. They also obtained Evans-Krylov-type $C^{2s+\alpha}$ regularity for convex equations. An interesting property of their estimates is their uniformity as $s \uparrow 1$, which provides a new proof for the corresponding classical estimates for local equations.

[1] Department of Mathematical Sciences, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
Email address: safdari@sharif.edu.

Free boundary problems involving nonlocal operators have also seen many advancements. Silvestre [45] obtained $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity of the obstacle problem for fractional Laplacian. Caffarelli et al. [10] proved the optimal $C^{1,s}$ regularity for this problem when the obstacle is smooth enough. Bjorland, Caffarelli, and Figalli [5] studied a double obstacle problem for the infinity fractional Laplacian which appear in the study of a nonlocal version of the tug-of-war game. Korvenpää et al. [24] studied the obstacle problem for operators of fractional p-Laplacian type. Petrosyan and Pop [29] considered the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian with drift in the subcritical regime $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and Fernández-Real and Ros-Oton [17] studied the critical case $s = \frac{1}{2}$. There has also been some works on other types of nonlocal free boundary problems, like the work of Rodrigues and Santos [31] on nonlocal linear variational inequalities with constraint on the fractional gradient.

A major breakthrough in the study of nonlocal free boundary problems came with the work of Caffarelli et al. [11], in which they obtained the regularity of the solution and of the free boundary of the obstacle problem for a large class of nonlocal elliptic operators. These problems appear naturally when considering optimal stopping problems for Lévy processes with jumps, which arise for example as option pricing models in mathematical finance. We should mention that in their work, the boundary regularity results of Ros-Oton and Serra [32, 33] for nonlocal elliptic equations were also essential. In [40] we proved existence and $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity of solutions to double obstacle problems for a wide class of nonlocal fully nonlinear operators. We also obtained their boundary regularity. In contrast to [11], we allowed less smooth obstacles, and did not require them to be C^1.

In this paper we prove $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity of the equation with gradient constraint (1.1) for a large class of nonlocal fully nonlinear operators I. We do not require the operator to be convex. We also do not require the constraint to be strictly convex or differentiable. Furthermore, we obtain $C^{0,1}$ boundary regularity for these problems, which is more than the expected boundary regularity for nonlocal Dirichlet problems, due to the presence of the constraint. Our estimates in this work are uniform as $s \uparrow 1$; hence they provide a new proof for the corresponding regularity results for local equations with gradient constraints. Nonlocal equations with gradient constraints appear for example in portfolio optimization with transaction costs when prices are governed by Lévy processes with jumps; see [3, 4] and [28, Chapter 8] for more details.

Let us now mention some of the works on local equations with gradient constraints. The study of elliptic equations with gradient constraints was initiated by Evans [16] when he considered the problem

$$\max\{Lu - f,\ |Du| - g\} = 0,$$

where L is a (local) linear elliptic operator of the form

$$Lu = -a_{ij} D^2_{ij} u + b_i D_i u + cu.$$

Equations of this type stem from dynamic programming in a wide class of singular stochastic control problems. Evans proved $W^{2,p}_{\text{loc}}$ regularity for u. He also obtained the optimal $W^{2,\infty}_{\text{loc}}$

regularity under the additional assumption that a_{ij} are constant. Wiegner [48] removed this additional assumption and obtained $W^{2,\infty}_{\text{loc}}$ regularity in general. Later, Ishii and Koike [23] allowed the gradient constraint to be more general, and proved global $W^{2,\infty}$ regularity. We also mention that Shreve and Soner [43, 44] considered similar problems with special structure, and proved the existence of classical solutions.

Yamada [49] allowed the differential operator to be more general, and proved the existence of a solution in $W^{2,\infty}_{\text{loc}}$ to the problem

$$\max_{1\le k\le N}\{L_k u - f_k,\ |Du| - g\} = 0,$$

where each L_k is a (local) linear elliptic operator. Recently, there has been new interest in these types of problems. Hynd [20] considered problems with more general gradient constraints of the form

$$\max\{Lu - f,\ \tilde{H}(Du)\} = 0,$$

where $\tilde{H}$ is a convex function. He proved $W^{2,\infty}_{\text{loc}}$ regularity when $\tilde{H}$ is strictly convex. Finally, Hynd and Mawi [22] studied (local) fully nonlinear elliptic equations with strictly convex gradient constraints of the form

$$\max\{F(x, D^2u) - f,\ \tilde{H}(Du)\} = 0.$$

Here $F(x, D^2u)$ is a fully nonlinear elliptic operator. They obtained $W^{2,p}_{\text{loc}}$ regularity in general, and $W^{2,\infty}_{\text{loc}}$ regularity when F does not depend on x. Let us also mention that Hynd [19, 21] considered eigenvalue problems for (local) equations with gradient constraints too.

Closely related to these problems are variational problems with gradient constraints. An important example among them is the well-known elastic-plastic torsion problem, which is the problem of minimizing the functional $\int_U \frac{1}{2}|Dv|^2 - v\,dx$ over the set

$$W_{B_1} := \{v \in W^{1,2}_0(U) : |Dv| \le 1 \text{ a.e.}\}.$$

The $W^{2,p}$ regularity for this problem was proved by Brezis and Stampacchia [6], and its optimal $W^{2,\infty}_{\text{loc}}$ regularity was obtained by Caffarelli and Rivière [13]. An interesting property of variational problems with gradient constraints is that under mild conditions they are equivalent to double obstacle problems. For example the minimizer of $\int_U G(Dv)\,dx$ over W_{B_1} also satisfies $-d \le v \le d$ and

$$\begin{cases} -D_i(D_iG(Dv)) = 0 & \text{in } \{-d < v < d\}, \\ -D_i(D_iG(Dv)) \le 0 & \text{a.e. on } \{v = d\}, \\ -D_i(D_iG(Dv)) \ge 0 & \text{a.e. on } \{v = -d\}, \end{cases}$$

where d is the distance to ∂U; see for example [36, 39]. This problem can be more compactly written as

$$\max\{\min\{F(x, D^2v), v + d\}, v - d\} = 0,$$

where $F(x, D^2v) = -D_i(D_iG(Dv)) = -D^2_{ij}G(x)D^2_{ij}v$.

Variational problems with gradient constraints have also seen new developments in recent years. De Silva and Savin [15] investigated the minimizers of some functionals subject to gradient constraints, arising in the study of random surfaces. In their work, the functional is allowed to have certain kinds of singularities. Also, the constraints are given by convex polygons; so they are not strictly convex. They showed that in two dimensions, the minimizer is C^1 away from the obstacles. In [34–36, 39] we have studied the regularity and the free boundary of several classes of variational problems with gradient constraints. Our goal was to understand the behavior of these problems when the constraint is not strictly convex; and we have been able to obtain their optimal $C^{1,1}$ regularity in arbitrary dimensions. This has been partly motivated by the above-mentioned problem about random surfaces.

There has also been similar interests in elliptic equations with gradient constraints which are not strictly convex. These problems emerge in the study of some singular stochastic control problems appearing in financial models with transaction costs; see for example [2, 30]. In [38] we extended the results of [22] and proved the optimal $C^{1,1}$ regularity for (local) fully nonlinear elliptic equations with non-strictly convex gradient constraints. Our approach was to obtain a link between double obstacle problems and elliptic equations with gradient constraints. This link has been well known in the case where the double obstacle problem reduces to an obstacle problem. However, we have shown that there is still a connection between the two problems in the general case. In this approach, we also studied (local) fully nonlinear double obstacle problems with singular obstacles.

Now let us introduce the problem in more detail. First we recall some of the definitions and conventions about nonlocal operators introduced in [7]. Let

$$\delta u(x,y) := u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x).$$

A linear nonlocal operator is an operator of the form

$$Lu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta u(x,y) a(y)\, dy,$$

where the kernel a is a positive function which satisfies $a(-y) = a(y)$, and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{1, |y|^2\} a(y)\, dy < \infty.$$

We say a function u belongs to $C^{1,1}(x)$ if there are quadratic polynomials P, Q such that $P(x) = u(x) = Q(x)$, and $P \le u \le Q$ on a neighborhood of x. A nonlocal operator I is an operator for which $Iu(x)$ is well-defined for bounded functions $u \in C^{1,1}(x)$, and $Iu(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on an open set if u is C^2 over that open set. The operator I is *uniformly elliptic* with respect to a family of linear operators $\mathcal{L}$ if for any bounded functions $u, v \in C^{1,1}(x)$ we have

$$M^-_{\mathcal{L}}(u-v)(x) \le Iu(x) - Iv(x) \le M^+_{\mathcal{L}}(u-v)(x), \tag{1.2}$$

where the extremal Pucci-type operators $M^{\pm}_{\mathcal{L}}$ are defined as

$$M^{-}_{\mathcal{L}}u(x) = \inf_{L\in\mathcal{L}} Lu(x), \qquad M^{+}_{\mathcal{L}}u(x) = \sup_{L\in\mathcal{L}} Lu(x).$$

Let us also note that $\pm M^{\pm}_{\mathcal{L}}$ are subadditive and positively homogeneous.

An important family of linear operators is the class $\mathcal{L}_0$ of linear operators whose kernels are comparable with the kernel of fractional Laplacian $-(-\Delta)^s$, i.e.

$$(1-s)\frac{\lambda}{|y|^{n+2s}} \le a(y) \le (1-s)\frac{\Lambda}{|y|^{n+2s}}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $0 < s < 1$ and $0 < \lambda \le \Lambda$. It can be shown that in this case the extremal operators $M^{\pm}_{\mathcal{L}_0}$, which we will simply denote by $M^{\pm}$, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} M^{+}u &= (1-s)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\Lambda\delta u(x,y)^{+} - \lambda\delta u(x,y)^{-}}{|y|^{n+2s}}\,dy, \\ M^{-}u &= (1-s)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\lambda\delta u(x,y)^{+} - \Lambda\delta u(x,y)^{-}}{|y|^{n+2s}}\,dy, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $r^{\pm} = \max\{\pm r, 0\}$ for a real number r.

We will also only consider "constant coefficient" nonlocal operators, i.e. we assume that I is translation invariant:

$$I(\tau_z u) = \tau_z(Iu)$$

for every z, where $\tau_z u(x) := u(x-z)$ is the translation operator. In addition, without loss of generality we can assume that $I(0) = 0$, i.e. the action of I on the constant function 0 is 0. Because by translation invariance $I(0)$ is constant, and we can consider $I - I(0)$ instead of I.

Next let us recall some concepts from convex analysis. Let K be a compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose interior contains the origin.

Definition 1. The **gauge** function of K is the function

$$\gamma_K(x) := \inf\{\lambda > 0 : x \in \lambda K\}. \tag{1.5}$$

And the **polar** of K is the set

$$K^{\circ} := \{x : \langle x, y\rangle \le 1 \text{ for all } y \in K\}, \tag{1.6}$$

where $\langle\,,\rangle$ is the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The gauge function γ_K is convex, subadditive, and positively homogeneous; so it looks like a norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$, except that $\gamma_K(-x)$ is not necessarily the same as $\gamma_K(x)$. The polar set K° is also a compact convex set containing the origin as an interior point. (For more details, and the proofs of these facts, see [42].)

We assume that the exterior data $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded Lipschitz function which satisfies

$$-\gamma_K(y-x) \le \varphi(x) - \varphi(y) \le \gamma_K(x-y), \tag{1.7}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then by Lemma 2.1 of [47] this property implies that $D\varphi \in K^\circ$ a.e.

Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set. Then for $x \in \overline{U}$ the obstacles are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x) = \rho_{K,\varphi}(x;U) &:= \min_{y\in\partial U}[\gamma_K(x-y) + \varphi(y)], \\ \bar\rho(x) = \bar\rho_{K,\varphi}(x;U) &:= \min_{y\in\partial U}[\gamma_K(y-x) - \varphi(y)]. \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

It is well known (see [26, Section 5.3]) that ρ is the unique viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_{K^\circ}(Dv) = 1 & \text{in } U, \\ v = \varphi & \text{on } \partial U. \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

Now, note that $-K$ is also a compact convex set whose interior contains the origin. We also have $\bar\rho_{K,\varphi} = \rho_{-K,-\varphi}$, since $\gamma_{-K}(\cdot) = \gamma_K(-\cdot)$. Thus we have a similar characterization for $\bar\rho$ too.

Notation. To simplify the notation, we will use the following conventions

$$\gamma := \gamma_K, \qquad \gamma^\circ := \gamma_{K^\circ}, \qquad \bar\gamma := \gamma_{-K}.$$

Thus in particular we have $\bar\gamma(x) = \gamma(-x)$.

In [39] we have shown that $-\bar\rho \le \rho$, and

$$-\gamma(x-y) \le \rho(y) - \rho(x) \le \gamma(y-x). \tag{1.10}$$

The above inequality also holds if we replace ρ, γ with $\bar\rho, \bar\gamma$. Thus in particular, $\rho, \bar\rho$ are Lipschitz continuous. We have also shown that $-\bar\rho = \varphi = \rho$ on ∂U. We extend $\rho, -\bar\rho$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ by setting them equal to φ on $\mathbb{R}^n - U$. In other words we set

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} \min\limits_{y\in\partial U}[\gamma(x-y) + \varphi(y)] & x \in U, \\ \varphi(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n - U, \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

and similarly for $-\bar\rho$. Note that these extensions are continuous functions, and using (1.7) we can easily show that $\rho, -\bar\rho$ satisfy (1.10) for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Motivated by the double obstacle problems arising from variational problems, in [38] we have studied (local) fully nonlinear double obstacle problems of the form

$$\begin{cases} \max\{\min\{F(D^2u),\ u + \bar\rho\}, u - \rho\} = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial U, \end{cases}$$

and employed them to obtain the regularity of (local) elliptic equations with gradient constraints. And motivated by this result, in [40] we proved the existence and $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity of solutions to nonlocal double obstacle problems of the form (1.13), in which the obstacles are assumed to be semi-concave/convex functions. As we will see, this regularity result will play a critical role in obtaining the regularity of nonlocal equations with gradient constraints.

Now let us state our main results. We denote the Euclidean distance to ∂U by $d(\cdot) = d(\cdot, \partial U) := \min_{y \in \partial U} |\cdot - y|$. First let us collect all the assumptions we made so far to facilitate their referencing.

Assumption 1. *We assume that*

(a) *I is a translation invariant operator which is uniformly elliptic with respect to $\mathcal{L}_0$ with ellipticity constants λ, Λ, and $0 < s_0 < s < 1$. We also assume that $I(0) = 0$.*

(b) *$U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded open set, and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and satisfies (1.7). Also, φ is convex on a neighborhood of ∂U.*

(c) *$K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a compact convex set whose interior contains the origin, and the obstacles $\rho, -\bar{\rho}$ are defined by (1.8) and extended as in (1.11).*

(d) *The gradient constraint is $H := \gamma^\circ - 1$.*

Remark. Note that we are not assuming any regularity about ∂K or ∂K°. In particular, γ°, which defines the gradient constraint, need not be C^1 or strictly convex. Also, the obstacles can be highly irregular. Furthermore, note that any convex gradient constraint of the general form $\tilde{H}(Du) \le 0$ for which the set $\{\tilde{H}(\cdot) \le 0\}$ is bounded, and contains a neighborhood of the origin (which is a natural requirement in these problems), can be written in the form $\gamma^\circ - 1$ with respect to the convex set $K = \{\tilde{H}(\cdot) \le 0\}^\circ$. (Note that $\{\tilde{H}(\cdot) \le 0\} = K^\circ$, because the double polar of such convex sets are themselves, as shown in Section 1.6 of [42].)

Theorem 1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Also suppose ∂U is C^2, and φ is C^2 with $\gamma^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$. In addition, suppose there is a bounded continuous function $-\bar{\rho} \le v \le \rho$ that satisfies $-Iv \le 0$ in the viscosity sense in U. Then the nonlocal elliptic equation with gradient constraint (1.1) has a viscosity solution u, and*

$$u \in C^{1,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(U) \cap C^{0,1}(\overline{U})$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ depending only on n, λ, Λ, s_0. And for an open subset $V \subset\subset U$ we have

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{V})} \le C(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_V), \tag{1.12}$$

where C depends only on n, λ, Λ, s_0, and $d(V, \partial U)$; and C_V depends only on these constants together with $K, \partial U, \varphi$.

Remark. Note that if the equation with gradient constraint (1.1) has a solution then we must have a subsolution ($-I \cdot \le 0$) in U with $\gamma^\circ(D\,\cdot) \le 1$, which easily implies that $-\bar{\rho} \le \cdot \le \rho$. Thus the existence of v is a natural requirement.

Remark. Note that our estimate is uniform for $s > s_0$; so we can retrieve the interior estimate for local equations with gradient constraints as $s \to 1$. In addition, note that unlike the results on local fully nonlinear equations with gradient constraints in [22, 38], we do not have any convexity assumption about I.

We split the proof of Theorem 1 into two parts. In Theorem 3 we show that there is $u \in C^{1,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(U)$ that satisfies the nonlocal double obstacle problem (1.13). (Note that this result is stronger than the regularity result in [40], since here we do not have the assumption of semi-concavity/convexity of the obstacles; an assumption which fails to hold when ∂K is not smooth enough.) And in Theorem 2 we prove that u must also satisfy the nonlocal equation with gradient constraint (1.1).

Theorem 2. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Also suppose there is a bounded continuous function $-\bar{\rho} \leq v \leq \rho$ that satisfies $-Iv \leq 0$ in the viscosity sense in U. Let $u \in C^1(U)$ be a viscosity solution of the double obstacle problem*

$$\begin{cases} \max\{\min\{-Iu,\ u+\bar{\rho}\}, u-\rho\} = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u = \varphi & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n - U. \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

Then u is also a viscosity solution of the equation with gradient constraint (1.1).

Theorem 3. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Also suppose ∂U is C^2, and φ is C^2 with $\gamma^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$. Then the double obstacle problem (1.13) has a viscosity solution u, and*

$$u \in C^{1,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(U) \cap C^{0,1}(\overline{U})$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ depending only on n, λ, Λ, s_0. And for an open subset $V \subset\subset U$ the estimate (1.12) holds for $\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{V})}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 2. Here we use Lemma 1 in which we show that a solution to the double obstacle problem (1.13) must also satisfy the gradient constraint; and Lemma 2 in which we prove that a solution to the double obstacle problem (1.13) must be larger than a solution to the elliptic equation with gradient constraint (1.1). Then we review some well-known facts about the regularity of K, and its relation to the regularity of $K^\circ, \gamma, \gamma^\circ$. After that we consider the function ρ more carefully. We will review the formulas for the derivatives of ρ that we have obtained in [39], especially the novel explicit formula (2.20) for $D^2\rho$. To the best of author's knowledge, formulas of this kind have not appeared in the literature before, except for the simple case where ρ is the Euclidean distance to the boundary. (Although, some special two dimensional cases also appeared in our earlier works [34, 37].)

One of the main applications of the formula (2.20) for $D^2\rho$ is in the relation (2.21) for characterizing the set of singularities of ρ. Another important application is in Lemma 4, which implies that $D^2\rho$ attains its maximum on ∂U. This interesting property is actually

a consequence of a more general property of the solutions to Hamilton-Jacobi equations (remember that ρ is the viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.9)). This little-known monotonicity property is investigated in [39]; but we included a brief account at the end of Section 2 for reader's convenience.

In Section 3 we prove the regularity result for double obstacle problem (1.13), aka Theorem 3, when the exterior data φ is zero. We separated this case to reduce the technicalities so that the main ideas can be followed more easily. The proof of the general case of nonzero exterior data is postponed to Appendix A. The idea of the proof of Theorem 3 is to approximate K° with smoother convex sets. Then we have to find uniform bounds for the various norms of the approximations u_k to u. In order to do this, we construct appropriate barriers, which resemble the obstacles $\rho, -\bar{\rho}$. Then, among other estimations, we will use the fact that the second derivative of the barriers attain their maximums on the boundary. A more detailed sketch of proof for Theorem 3 is given at the beginning of its proof (before its Part I) on page 17.

2. Assumptions and Preliminaries

Let us start by defining the notion of viscosity solutions of nonlocal equations. We want to study the nonlocal double obstacle problems and nonlocal equations with gradient constraints. So we state the definition of viscosity solution in the more general case of a nonlocal operator $\tilde{I}(x, u(x), Du(x), u(\cdot))$ whose value also depends on the pointwise values of $x, u(x), Du(x)$ (see [1] for more details). For example, in the case of the double obstacle problem and the equation with gradient constraint we respectively have

$$-\tilde{I}(x, r, u(\cdot)) = \max\{\min\{-Iu(x),\ r - \psi^-(x)\}, r - \psi^+(x)\},$$
$$-\tilde{I}(x, p, u(\cdot)) = \max\{-Iu(x),\ H(p)\},$$

where we replaced $u(x)$ with r and $Du(x)$ with p to clarify the dependence of $\tilde{I}$ on its arguments.

Definition 2. An upper semi-continuous function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a *viscosity subsolution* of $-\tilde{I} \le 0$ in U if whenever ϕ is a bounded C^2 function and $u - \phi$ has a maximum over $\mathbb{R}^n$ at $x_0 \in U$ we have

$$-\tilde{I}(x_0, u(x_0), D\phi(x), \phi(\cdot)) \le 0.$$

And a lower semi-continuous function u is a *viscosity supersolution* of $-\tilde{I} \ge 0$ in U if whenever ϕ is a bounded C^2 function and $u - \phi$ has a minimum over $\mathbb{R}^n$ at $x_0 \in U$ we have

$$-\tilde{I}(x_0, u(x_0), D\phi(x), \phi(\cdot)) \ge 0.$$

A continuous function u is a *viscosity solution* of $-\tilde{I} = 0$ in U if it is a subsolution of $-\tilde{I} \le 0$ and a supersolution of $-\tilde{I} \ge 0$ in U.

Lemma 1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let $u \in C^1(U)$ be a viscosity solution of the double obstacle problem (1.13). Then over U we have*

$$\gamma^\circ(Du) \le 1.$$

Remark. An immediate consequence of this lemma is that $u \in C^{0,1}(\overline{U})$, since u and its derivative are bounded, and ∂U is smooth enough.

Proof. On the open set $V := \{u < \rho\}$ we know that $-Iu \ge 0$ in the viscosity sense. Also, on the open set $V_0 := \{-\bar\rho < u\}$ we know that $-Iu \le 0$ in the viscosity sense. Hence due to the translation invariance of I, for any h we have $-Iu(\cdot + h) \le 0$ in the viscosity sense in $V_0 - h$. Therefore by Lemma 5.8 of [7] we have

$$M^+(u(\cdot + h) - u(\cdot)) \ge 0$$

in the viscosity sense in $V_1 := V \cap (V_0 - h)$. Thus by Lemma 5.10 of [7] we have

$$\sup_{V_1}(u(\cdot + h) - u(\cdot)) \le \sup_{\mathbb{R}^n - V_1}(u(\cdot + h) - u(\cdot)). \tag{2.1}$$

Let us estimate $u(\cdot+h)-u(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n - V_1$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n - V_1$. Then either $x \notin V$, or $x+h \notin V_0$. Suppose $x \notin V$. Then $u(x) = \rho(x)$ (note that outside of U we also have $u = \varphi = \rho$). So

$$u(x + h) - u(x) \le \rho(x + h) - \rho(x) \le \gamma(h).$$

Next suppose $x + h \notin V_0$. Then $u(x + h) = -\bar\rho(x + h)$. Hence we have

$$u(x + h) - u(x) \le -(\bar\rho(x + h) - \bar\rho(x)) = \bar\rho(x) - \bar\rho(x + h) \le \bar\gamma(-h) = \gamma(h).$$

Therefore by (2.1) for every $x \in V_1$, and hence for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $u(x + h) - u(x) \le \gamma(h)$. Hence for $t > 0$ we get

$$\frac{u(x + th) - u(x)}{t} \le \frac{1}{t}\gamma(th) = \gamma(h).$$

Thus at the points of differentiability of u we have $\langle Du, h\rangle \le \gamma(h)$, and consequently $\gamma^\circ(Du) \le 1$ due to (2.5). □

Lemma 2. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Also suppose there is a bounded continuous function $-\bar\rho \le v \le \rho$ that satisfies $-Iv \le 0$ in the viscosity sense in U. Let u be a viscosity solution of the double obstacle problem (1.13). Then we have*

$$v \le u.$$

As a result we get

$$\max\{-Iu,\ u - \rho\} = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

in the viscosity sense in U.

Remark. In fact, this lemma is still true if we replace $\rho, -\bar{\rho}$ by any other upper and lower obstacles which agree on $\mathbb{R}^n - U$. We can also replace $I\cdot$ by $I \cdot -f$ for some continuous function f.

Proof. On the open set $V := \{u < \rho\} \subset U$ we have $-Iu \geq 0$ and $-Iv \leq 0$ in the sense of viscosity. Also note that on $\mathbb{R}^n - V$ we have $u = \rho \geq v$. Hence by Theorem 5.2 of [7] (also see Lemma 6.1 of [27]) we have $u \geq v$ on V too, as desired.

Now let us prove (2.2). Suppose $u - \phi$ has a global maximum at $x_0 \in U$. Then at x_0 we have

$$\max\{\min\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u + \bar{\rho}\}, u - \rho\} \leq 0.$$

We know that $-\bar{\rho}(x_0) \leq u(x_0) \leq \rho(x_0)$. If $-\bar{\rho}(x_0) < u(x_0)$ then we must have $-I\phi(x_0) \leq 0$. And if $-\bar{\rho}(x_0) = u(x_0)$ then $v(x_0) = -\bar{\rho}(x_0) = u(x_0)$, since $-\bar{\rho} \leq v \leq u$. Hence for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$v(x_0) - \phi(x_0) = u(x_0) - \phi(x_0) \geq u(x) - \phi(x) \geq v(x) - \phi(x).$$

So $v - \phi$ has a global maximum at x_0, and therefore $-I\phi(x_0) \leq 0$. Thus in either case we have

$$\max\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u - \rho\} \leq 0.$$

Next suppose $u - \phi$ has a global minimum at $x_0 \in U$. Then at x_0 we have

$$\max\{\min\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u + \bar{\rho}\}, u - \rho\} \geq 0.$$

So if $u(x_0) < \rho(x_0)$ then we must have $-I\phi(x_0) \geq 0$, which implies that

$$\max\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u - \rho\} \geq 0.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. Suppose $u - \phi$ has a global minimum at $x_0 \in U$. Then Lemma 2 implies that at x_0 we have

$$\max\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u - \rho\} \geq 0.$$

We need to show that

$$\max\{-I\phi(x_0),\ \gamma^\circ(D\phi(x_0)) - 1\} \geq 0.$$

If $-I\phi(x_0) \geq 0$ then we have the desired. Otherwise we must have $u(x_0) = \rho(x_0)$. Let $y_0 \in \partial U$ be a ρ-closest point to x_0, i.e. $\rho(x_0) = \gamma(x_0 - y_0) + \varphi(y_0)$. Then by Lemma 3, y_0 is also a ρ-closest point on ∂U to $x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0)) &= \gamma(x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0) - y_0) + \varphi(y_0) \\ &= (1 - t)\gamma(x_0 - y_0) + \varphi(y_0).\end{aligned}$$

So $u(x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0)) \leq \rho(x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0)) = (1 - t)\gamma(x_0 - y_0) + \varphi(y_0)$. On the other hand, for small negative t we have $\rho(x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0)) \leq (1 - t)\gamma(x_0 - y_0) + \varphi(y_0)$, since y_0 may not be a ρ-closest point on ∂U to $x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0)$. Hence for t near 0 we have

$$u(x_0 + t(y_0 - x_0)) \leq (1 - t)\gamma(x_0 - y_0) + \varphi(y_0).$$

And the equality holds at $t = 0$. Thus by differentiating we get $\langle Du(x_0), x_0 - y_0\rangle = \gamma(x_0 - y_0)$. Therefore by (2.5) we get $\gamma^\circ(D\phi(x_0)) \geq 1$, as desired.

Next suppose $u - \phi$ has a global maximum at $x_0 \in U$. We need to show that

$$\max\{-I\phi(x_0),\ \gamma^\circ(D\phi(x_0)) - 1\} \leq 0.$$

By Lemma 2 we know that at x_0 we have

$$\max\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u - \rho\} \leq 0.$$

So $-I\phi(x_0) \leq 0$; and we only need to show that $\gamma^\circ(D\phi(x_0)) \leq 1$. However we know that

$$D\phi(x_0) = Du(x_0),$$

since u is C^1 in U. Hence we get the desired by Lemma 1. □

2.1. **Regularity of the gauge function.** In this subsection we review some of the properties of γ, γ° and K, K° briefly. For detailed explanations and proofs see [42]. Recall that the gauge function γ satisfies

$$\gamma(rx) = r\gamma(x),$$
$$\gamma(x + y) \leq \gamma(x) + \gamma(y),$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r \geq 0$. Also, note that as $B_{1/C}(0) \subseteq K \subseteq B_{1/c}(0)$ for some $C \geq c > 0$, we have

$$c|x| \leq \gamma(x) \leq C|x| \tag{2.3}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In addition, since K is closed we have $K = \{\gamma \leq 1\}$, and since K has nonempty interior we have $\partial K = \{\gamma = 1\}$.

It is well known that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\langle x, y\rangle \leq \gamma(x)\gamma^\circ(y). \tag{2.4}$$

In fact, more is true and we have

$$\gamma^\circ(y) = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\langle x, y\rangle}{\gamma(x)}. \tag{2.5}$$

For a proof of this see page 54 of [42].

It is easy to see that the the strict convexity of K (which means that ∂K does not contain any line segment) is equivalent to the strict convexity of γ. By homogeneity of γ the latter is equivalent to

$$\gamma(x + y) < \gamma(x) + \gamma(y)$$

when $x \neq cy$ and $y \neq cx$ for any $c \geq 0$.

Suppose that ∂K is $C^{k,\alpha}$ ($k \geq 1$, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$). Then γ is $C^{k,\alpha}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n - \{0\}$ (see for example [39]). Conversely, note that as $\partial K = \{\gamma = 1\}$ and $D\gamma \neq 0$ by (2.6), ∂K is as smooth as γ. Suppose in addition that K is strictly convex. Then γ is strictly convex too. By Remark 1.7.14 and Theorem 2.2.4 of [42], K° is also strictly convex and its boundary is C^1. Therefore

γ° is strictly convex, and it is C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^n - \{0\}$. Furthermore, by Corollary 1.7.3 of [42], for $x \neq 0$ we have

$$D\gamma(x) \in \partial K^\circ, \qquad D\gamma^\circ(x) \in \partial K, \tag{2.6}$$

or equivalently

$$\gamma^\circ(D\gamma) = 1, \qquad \gamma(D\gamma^\circ) = 1.$$

In particular $D\gamma, D\gamma^\circ$ are nonzero on $\mathbb{R}^n - \{0\}$.

Now assume that $k \geq 2$ and the principal curvatures of ∂K are positive everywhere. Then K is strictly convex. We can also show that γ° is $C^{k,\alpha}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n - \{0\}$. To see this let $n_K : \partial K \to \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be the Gauss map, i.e. let $n_K(y)$ be the outward unit normal to ∂K at y. Then n_K is $C^{k-1,\alpha}$ and its derivative is an isomorphism at the points with positive principal curvatures, i.e. everywhere. Hence n_K is locally invertible with a $C^{k-1,\alpha}$ inverse n_K^{-1}, around any point of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Now note that as it is well known, γ° equals the support function of K, i.e.

$$\gamma^\circ(x) = \sup\{\langle x, y\rangle : y \in K\}.$$

Thus as shown in page 115 of [42], for $x \neq 0$ we have

$$D\gamma^\circ(x) = n_K^{-1}(\frac{x}{|x|}).$$

Which gives the desired result. As a consequence, ∂K° is $C^{k,\alpha}$ too. Furthermore, as shown on page 120 of [42], the principal curvatures of ∂K° are also positive everywhere.

Let us recall a few more properties of γ, γ°. Since they are positively 1-homogeneous, $D\gamma, D\gamma^\circ$ are positively 0-homogeneous, and $D^2\gamma, D^2\gamma^\circ$ are positively (-1)-homogeneous, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma(tx) = t\gamma(x), \quad D\gamma(tx) = D\gamma(x), \quad D^2\gamma(tx) = \frac{1}{t}D^2\gamma(x), \\ &\gamma^\circ(tx) = t\gamma^\circ(x), \quad D\gamma^\circ(tx) = D\gamma^\circ(x), \quad D^2\gamma^\circ(tx) = \frac{1}{t}D^2\gamma^\circ(x), \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

for $x \neq 0$ and $t > 0$. As a result, using Euler's theorem on homogeneous functions we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle D\gamma(x), x\rangle = \gamma(x), \qquad D^2\gamma(x)\, x = 0, \\ &\langle D\gamma^\circ(x), x\rangle = \gamma^\circ(x), \qquad D^2\gamma^\circ(x)\, x = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

for $x \neq 0$. Here $D^2\gamma(x)\, x$ is the action of the matrix $D^2\gamma(x)$ on the vector x.

Finally let us mention that by Corollary 2.5.2 of [42], when $x \neq 0$, the eigenvalues of $D^2\gamma(x)$ are 0 with the corresponding eigenvector x, and $\frac{1}{|x|}$ times the principal radii of curvature of ∂K° at the unique point that has x as an outward normal vector. Remember that the principal radii of curvature are the reciprocals of the principal curvatures. Thus by our assumption, the eigenvalues of $D^2\gamma(x)$ are all positive except for one 0. We have a similar characterization of the eigenvalues of $D^2\gamma^\circ(x)$.

2.2. **Regularity of the obstacles.** Next let us consider the obstacles $\rho, -\bar{\rho}$, and review some of their properties. All the results of this subsection are proved in [39].

Definition 3. When $\rho(x) = \gamma(x-y) + \varphi(y)$ for some $y \in \partial U$, we call y a **ρ-closest** point to x on ∂U. Similarly, when $\bar{\rho}(x) = \gamma(y-x) - \varphi(y)$ for some $y \in \partial U$, we call y a **$\bar{\rho}$-closest** point to x on ∂U.

Let us also introduce some more notation. For two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $[x,y]$, $]x,y[$, $[x,y[$, $]x,y]$ will denote the closed, open, and half-open line segments with endpoints x, y, respectively.

Lemma 3. *Suppose y is one of the ρ-closest points on ∂U to $x \in U$. Then*

(a) *y is a ρ-closest point on ∂U to every point of $]x,y[$. Therefore ρ varies linearly along the line segment $[x,y]$.*

(b) *If in addition, for all $x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have*

$$-\gamma(y-x) < \varphi(x) - \varphi(y) < \gamma(x-y), \tag{2.9}$$

then we also have $]x,y[\subset U$.

(c) *If in addition γ is strictly convex, and the strict Lipschitz property (2.9) for φ holds, then y is the unique ρ-closest point on ∂U to the points of $]x,y[$.*

Next, we generalize the notion of ridge introduced by Ting [46], and Caffarelli and Friedman [12]. Intuitively, the ρ-ridge is the set of singularities of ρ.

Definition 4. The **ρ-ridge** of U is the set of all points $x \in U$ where $\rho(x)$ is not $C^{1,1}$ in any neighborhood of x. We denote it by

$$R_\rho.$$

We have shown that when γ is strictly convex and the strict Lipschitz property (2.9) for φ holds, the points with more than one ρ-closest point on ∂U belong to ρ-ridge, since ρ is not differentiable at them. This subset of the ρ-ridge is denoted by

$$R_{\rho,0}.$$

Similarly we define $R_{\bar{\rho}}, R_{\bar{\rho},0}$.

We know that $\rho, \bar{\rho}$ are Lipschitz functions. We want to characterize the set over which they are more regular. In order to do that, we need to impose some additional restrictions on K, U and φ.

Assumption 2. *Suppose that $k \geq 2$ is an integer, and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. We assume that*

(a) *$K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a compact convex set whose interior contains the origin. In addition, ∂K is $C^{k,\alpha}$, and its principal curvatures are positive at every point.*

(b) *$U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded open set, and ∂U is $C^{k,\alpha}$.*

(c) *$\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a $C^{k,\alpha}$ function, such that $\gamma^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$.*

Remark. As shown in Subsection 2.1, the above assumption implies that K, γ are strictly convex. In addition, K°, γ° are strictly convex, and $\partial K^\circ, \gamma^\circ$ are also $C^{k,\alpha}$. Furthermore, the principal curvatures of ∂K° are also positive at every point. Similar conclusions obviously hold for $-K, -\varphi$ and $(-K)^\circ = -K^\circ$ too. Hence in the sequel, whenever we state a property for ρ, it holds for $\bar{\rho}$ too.

Let ν be the inward unit normal to ∂U. Then for every $y \in \partial U$ there is a unique scalar $\lambda(y) > 0$ such that

$$\gamma^\circ\Big(D\varphi(y) + \lambda(y)\nu(y)\Big) = 1. \tag{2.10}$$

In addition, λ is a $C^{k-1,\alpha}$ function of y. We set

$$\mu(y) := D\varphi(y) + \lambda(y)\nu(y). \tag{2.11}$$

We also set

$$X := \frac{1}{\langle D\gamma^\circ(\mu), \nu\rangle} D\gamma^\circ(\mu) \otimes \nu, \tag{2.12}$$

where $a \otimes b$ is the rank 1 matrix whose action on a vector z is $\langle z, b\rangle a$. We also know that

$$\langle D\gamma^\circ(\mu), \nu\rangle > 0. \tag{2.13}$$

Let $x \in U$, and suppose y is one of the ρ-closest points to x on ∂U. Then we have

$$\frac{x-y}{\gamma(x-y)} = D\gamma^\circ(\mu(y)) \tag{2.14}$$

(see Figure 2.1), or equivalently

$$x = y + \Big(\rho(x) - \varphi(y)\Big)\, D\gamma^\circ(\mu(y)). \tag{2.15}$$

Also, ρ is differentiable at x if and only if $x \in U - R_{\rho,0}$. And in that case we have

$$D\rho(x) = \mu(y), \tag{2.16}$$

where y is the unique ρ-closest point to x on ∂U.

In addition, for every $y \in \partial U$ there is an open ball $B_r(y)$ such that ρ is $C^{k,\alpha}$ on $\overline{U} \cap B_r(y)$. Furthermore, y is the ρ-closest point to some points in U, and we have

$$D\rho(y) = \mu(y). \tag{2.17}$$

We also have

$$D^2\rho(y) = (I - X^T)\Big(D^2\varphi(y) + \lambda(y)D^2 d(y)\Big)(I - X), \tag{2.18}$$

where I is the identity matrix, d is the Euclidean distance to ∂U, and X is given by (2.12).

Remark. As a consequence, R_ρ has a positive distance from ∂U.




FIGURE 2.1. y is a ρ-closest point to x.

Let $x \in U - R_{\rho,0}$, and let y be the unique ρ-closest point to x on ∂U. Let

$$W = W(y) := -D^2\gamma^\circ(\mu(y))D^2\rho(y),$$

$$Q = Q(x) := I - \Big(\rho(x) - \varphi(y)\Big)W, \tag{2.19}$$

where I is the identity matrix. If $\det Q \neq 0$ then ρ is $C^{k,\alpha}$ on a neighborhood of x. In addition we have

$$D^2\rho(x) = D^2\rho(y)Q(x)^{-1}. \tag{2.20}$$

We also have

$$x \in R_\rho \text{ if and only if } \det Q(x) = 0. \tag{2.21}$$

Remark. When $\varphi = 0$, the function ρ is the distance to ∂U with respect to the Minkowski distance defined by γ. So this case has a geometric interpretation. An interesting fact is that in this case the eigenvalues of W coincide with the notion of curvature of ∂U with respect to some Finsler structure. For the details see [14].

Lemma 4. *Suppose the Assumption 2 holds. Let $x \in U - R_\rho$, and let y be the unique ρ-closest point to x on ∂U. Then we have*

$$D^2_{\xi\xi}\rho(x) \leq D^2_{\xi\xi}\rho(y)$$

for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

As we mentioned in the introduction, the above monotonicity property is true because ρ satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.9), and the segment $]x, y[$ is the characteristic curve associated to it. Let us review the general case of the monotonicity property below. (Although note that the assumptions in Lemma 4 are weaker than what we assume in the following calculations. For a proof of Lemma 4 see the proof of Lemma 4 in [39].)

Monotonicity of the second derivative of the solutions to Hamilton-Jacobi equations: Suppose v satisfies the equation $\tilde{H}(Dv) = 0$, where $\tilde{H}$ is a convex function. Let $x(s)$ be a characteristic curve of the equation. Then we have $\dot{x} = D\tilde{H}$. Let us assume that v is C^3 on a neighborhood of the image of $x(s)$. For some vector ξ let

$$q(s) := D^2_{\xi\xi} v(x(s)) = \xi_i \xi_j D^2_{ij} v.$$

Here we have used the convention of summing over repeated indices. Then we have

$$\dot{q} = \xi_i \xi_j D^3_{ijk} v \, \dot{x}^k = \xi_i \xi_j D^3_{ijk} v D_k \tilde{H}.$$

On the other hand, if we differentiate the equation we get $D_k \tilde{H} D^2_{ik} v = 0$. And if we differentiate one more time we get

$$D^2_{kl} \tilde{H} D^2_{jl} v D^2_{ik} v + D_k \tilde{H} D^3_{ijk} v = 0.$$

Now if we multiply the above expression by $\xi_i \xi_j$, and sum over i, j, we obtain the following Riccati type equation

$$\dot{q} = -\xi^T D^2 v \, D^2 \tilde{H} \, D^2 v \xi. \tag{2.22}$$

So $\dot{q} \leq 0$, since $\tilde{H}$ is convex. Thus we have

$$D^2_{\xi\xi} v(x(s)) = q(s) \leq q(0) = D^2_{\xi\xi} v(x(0)),$$

as desired. This result also holds in the more general case of $\tilde{H}(x, v, Dv) = 0$, when $\tilde{H}$ is a convex function in all of its arguments (see [39]).

3. Proof of Theorem 3

In this section we prove Theorem 3, i.e. we will prove that the double obstacle problem (1.13) has a viscosity solution $u \in C^{1,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(U)$, without assuming any regularity about K. Here we only consider the case of zero exterior data. The case of general nonzero exterior data φ is considered in Appendix A.

Proof of Theorem 3 for zero exterior data. As it is well known, a compact convex set with nonempty interior can be approximated, in the Hausdorff metric, by a shrinking sequence of compact convex sets with nonempty interior which have smooth boundaries with positive curvature (see for example [41]). We apply this result to K°. Thus there is a sequence K°_k of compact convex sets, that have smooth boundaries with positive curvature, and

$$K^\circ_{k+1} \subset \text{int}(K^\circ_k), \qquad K^\circ = \bigcap K^\circ_k.$$

Notice that we can take the approximations of K° to be the polar of other convex sets, because the double polar of a compact convex set with 0 in its interior is itself. Also note that K_k's are strictly convex compact sets with 0 in their interior, which have smooth boundaries with positive curvature. Furthermore we have $K = (K^\circ)^\circ \supset K_{k+1} \supset K_k$. For the proof of these facts see [42, Sections 1.6, 1.7 and 2.5].

To simplify the notation we use $\gamma_k, \gamma_k^\circ, \rho_k, \bar{\rho}_k$ instead of $\gamma_{K_k}, \gamma_{K_k^\circ}, \rho_{K_k,0}, \bar{\rho}_{K_k,0}$, respectively. Note that $K_k, U, \varphi = 0$ satisfy the Assumption 2. Hence as we have shown in [39], $\rho_k, \bar{\rho}_k$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1 of [40]. Thus there are viscosity solutions $u_k \in C^{1,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U)$ of the double obstacle problem

$$\begin{cases} \max\{\min\{-Iu_k,\ u_k + \bar{\rho}_k\}, u_k - \rho_k\} = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u_k = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n - U. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

And $\alpha > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, s_0.

In addition, we know that

$$-\bar{\rho}_1 \le -\bar{\rho}_k \le u_k \le \rho_k \le \rho_1. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that $\rho_k \le \rho_1$ and $\bar{\rho}_k \le \bar{\rho}_1$, since $\gamma_k \le \gamma_1$ due to $K_k \supset K_1$. Let us also show that $\rho_k \to \rho$ and $\bar{\rho}_k \to \bar{\rho}$ uniformly on U. It is easy to see that for nonzero z we have $\frac{z}{\gamma(z)} \in \partial K$. Each ray emanating from the origin intersects $\partial K_k, \partial K$ at a pair of points. Let δ_k be the maximum distance between these pairs of points. Then we have

$$\Big|\frac{z}{\gamma(z)} - \frac{z}{\gamma_k(z)}\Big| \le \delta_k \implies |\gamma_k(z) - \gamma(z)| \le \delta_k \frac{\gamma(z)\gamma_k(z)}{|z|} \le C\delta_k |z|,$$

where the last estimate is obtained by (2.3). Now let $x \in U$, and let $y \in \partial U$ be a ρ-closest point to x. Then we have

$$|\rho_k(x) - \rho(x)| \le |\gamma_k(x-y) - \gamma(x-y)| \le C\delta_k |x-y|. \tag{3.3}$$

Since $\delta_k \to 0$ and U is bounded we get the desired.

Furthermore, by Lemma 1 we have $\gamma_k^\circ(Du_k) \le 1$. Hence we have

$$Du_k \in K_k^\circ \subset K_1^\circ \quad \text{a.e.}$$

Therefore u_k is a bounded sequence in $W^{1,\infty}(U) = C^{0,1}(\overline{U})$. Hence by the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem a subsequence of u_k, which we still denote by u_k, uniformly converges to a continuous function $u \in C^0(\overline{U})$. Note that $u|_{\partial U} = 0$, because $u_k|_{\partial U} = 0$ for every k. We extend u to all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ by setting it equal to 0 in $\mathbb{R}^n - U$. Note that u is a continuous function.

We divide the rest of this proof into three parts. In Part I we derive the uniform bound (3.4), i.e. we show that Iu_k is bounded independently of k by using suitable barriers. This is possible mainly for two reasons. First we will use the fact that similarly to $D^2\rho_k$, the second derivative of the barrier attains its maximum on the boundary; so we get a one-way bound for Iu_k. For the other bound, we use the fact that u_k is a subsolution or a supersolution of $-I = 0$ in the regions in which u_k touches one of the obstacles. In Part II we prove the main properties of the barriers which we employed in Part I. Then in Part III we show that a subsequence of u_k converges to u in $C^{1,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}$, and u is a viscosity solution of the double obstacle problem (1.13). Here we use the bound (3.4), obtained in Part I, to show that the $C^{1,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ norm of u_k is uniformly bounded, so that we can extract a convergent subsequence of u_k.

PART I:

Let us show that for every bounded open set $V \subset\subset U$ and every k we have

$$-C_V \leq Iu_k \leq C_V \tag{3.4}$$

in the viscosity sense in V, for some constant C_V independent of k. In addition, we can choose C_V uniformly for $s > s_0$.

Suppose ϕ is a bounded C^2 function and $u_k - \phi$ has a minimum over $\mathbb{R}^n$ at $x_0 \in V$. We must show that

$$-I\phi(x_0) \geq -C_V.$$

We can assume that $u_k(x_0) - \phi(x_0) = 0$ without loss of generality, since we can consider $\phi + c$ instead of ϕ without changing I (because $M^{\pm}(c) = 0$). So we can assume that $u_k - \phi \geq 0$, or $u_k \geq \phi$. We also know that at x_0 we have

$$\max\{\min\{-I\phi(x_0), u_k + \bar{\rho}_k\}, u_k - \rho_k\} \geq 0,$$

since u_k is a viscosity solution of (3.1). In addition remember that $-\bar{\rho}_k \leq u_k \leq \rho_k$. Now if $u_k(x_0) < \rho_k(x_0)$ then we must have $-I\phi(x_0) \geq 0$. And if $u_k(x_0) = \rho_k(x_0)$ then ϕ is also touching ρ_k from below at x_0, since $\phi \leq u_k \leq \rho_k$. Now let $y_0 \in \partial U$ be a ρ_k-closest point to x_0. (Note that y_0 can depend on k.) Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{U}$ be an open ball such that $\partial B \cap \partial U = \{y_0\}$. Note that the radius of B can be chosen to be independent of y_0, since ∂U is C^2. Now on the domain $\mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$ consider the function

$$\rho_{k,B^c} := \rho_{K_k,0}(\cdot\,; \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}) = \min_{z \in \partial B} \gamma_k(\cdot - z). \tag{3.5}$$

The idea is to use ρ_{k,B^c} as a barrier to obtain the desired bound for $-I\phi$.

Let $z \in \partial B$, and let y be a point on $\partial U \cap [z, x_0[$. Then we have

$$\gamma_k(x_0 - y_0) \leq \gamma_k(x_0 - y) = \gamma_k(x_0 - z) - \gamma_k(y - z) \leq \gamma_k(x_0 - z).$$

Hence y_0 is also a ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point to x_0 on ∂B. Consequently we have

$$\rho_{k,B^c}(x_0) = \gamma_k(x_0 - y_0) = \rho_k(x_0).$$

Now consider $x \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$, and let $z \in \partial B$ be a ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point to x. Let y be a point on $\partial U \cap [z, x[$. Then similarly to the above we can show that

$$\rho_k(x) \leq \gamma_k(x - y) \leq \gamma_k(x - z) = \rho_{k,B^c}(x).$$

As for ρ_k, we extend ρ_{k,B^c} to all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ by setting it equal to 0 on B. Then for $x \notin U$ we have $\rho_k(x) = 0 \leq \rho_{k,B^c}(x)$. Hence, ϕ is also touching ρ_{k,B^c} from below at x_0.

As we will show below in Part II, $I\rho_{k,B^c}(x) \leq C_V$ for $x \in V$. So by ellipticity of I we must have

$$I\phi(x_0) \leq I\rho_{k,B^c}(x_0) + M^+(\phi - \rho_{k,B^c})(x_0) \leq C_V,$$

since it is easy to see that $M^+(\phi - \rho_{k,B^c})(x_0) \leq 0$ as $L(\phi - \rho_{k,B^c})(x_0) \leq 0$ for any linear operator L. The upper bound for $-Iu_k$ can be shown to hold similarly.

PART II:

First let us show that ρ_{k,B^c} is C^2 on $\mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$. By the results of Section 2.2 we need to show that x has only one ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point on ∂B, and $\det Q_{k,B^c}(x) \neq 0$ where Q_{k,B^c} is given by (3.8). (Note that although $\mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$ is not bounded, the function ρ_{k,B^c} can be studied as in Section 2.2, since ∂B is compact.) Let $y \in \partial B$ be a ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point to x. Then the convex set $x - \rho_{k,B^c}(x)K_k$ intersects ∂B at y, and has empty intersection with B. But $\overline{B}$ is strictly convex; so $x - \rho_{k,B^c}(x)K_k$ cannot intersect ∂B at any other point (see Figure 2.1). Thus y is the unique ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point on ∂B to x.

Next note that since the exterior data $\varphi = 0$, the equations (2.10)–(2.12) reduce to

$$\lambda_k(y) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)}, \qquad \mu_k(y) = \frac{\nu}{\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)}, \qquad X_k = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)} D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu) \otimes \nu, \tag{3.6}$$

where ν is the normal to ∂B at y. Here we also used (2.7),(2.8) to simplify the last expression. Hence by (2.18) we have

$$D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)}(I - X_k^T)D^2 d_{B^c}(y)(I - X_k), \tag{3.7}$$

where d_{B^c} is the Euclidean distance to ∂B on $\mathbb{R}^n - B$. But the eigenvalues of $D^2 d$ are minus the principal curvatures of the boundary, and a zero eigenvalue corresponding to the normal direction (see [18, Section 14.6]). So the nonzero eigenvalues of $D^2 d_{B^c}$ are $\frac{1}{r_0}$, where r_0 is the radius of B (note that we are in the exterior of B, so the principal curvatures are $\frac{-1}{r_0}$). Therefore $D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y)$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. Now let us consider the matrices W, Q for ρ_{k,B^c} given by (2.19). The eigenvalues of

$$W_{k,B^c}(y) = -D^2\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k(y))D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y)$$

must be nonpositive, because $D^2\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k)$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. Therefore the eigenvalues of

$$Q_{k,B^c}(x) = I - \rho_{k,B^c}(x)W_{k,B^c}(y) = I - \gamma_k(x-y)W_{k,B^c}(y) \tag{3.8}$$

are greater than or equal to 1. Hence $\det Q_{k,B^c}(x) > 0$, and we can conclude that ρ_{k,B^c} is C^2 on a neighborhood of an arbitrary point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$, as desired.

In addition, by Lemma 4 we have

$$D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(x) \leq D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)}(I - X_k^T)D^2 d_{B^c}(y)(I - X_k).$$

Let us show that $D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y)$ is bounded independently of k, y, B. Since the radius of B is fixed, $D^2 d_{B^c}(y)$ is bounded independently of y, B. So we only need to show that $X_k, 1/\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)$ are uniformly bounded. And in order to do this, by (3.6), it suffices to show that $D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu), 1/\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)$ are uniformly bounded. Note that we have $\gamma_k(D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)) = 1$ due to (2.6). Thus $\gamma(D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)) \leq 1$ for every k, since $\gamma \leq \gamma_k$ due to $K \supset K_k$. So $D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)$ is bounded independently of k. On the

other hand, by (2.3) we have $\gamma_k^\circ(\nu) \geq \gamma_1^\circ(\nu) \geq c_1|\nu| = c_1$ for some $c_1 > 0$. Hence $1/\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)$ is uniformly bounded too. Therefore $D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(x)$ has a uniform upper bound, independently of k, x, B.

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\rho_{k,B^c}(x,h) &= \rho_{k,B^c}(x+h) + \rho_{k,B^c}(x-h) - 2\rho_{k,B^c}(x)\\ (\hat{h} = h/|h|) \qquad &= |h|^2 \int_0^1 \int_{-1}^1 t D^2_{\hat{h}\hat{h}} \rho_{k,B^c}(x+sth)\, dsdt \leq C|h|^2\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C independent of k, x, B, provided that the segment $[x-h, x+h]$ does not intersect B. Now we truncate ρ_{k,B^c} outside of a neighborhood of $\overline{U}$ to make it bounded. Note that we can choose this bound uniformly, since

$$\rho_{k,B^c}(x) = \gamma_k(x-y) \leq \gamma_1(x-y) \leq \gamma_1(l),$$

where l is the diameter of the chosen neighborhood of $\overline{U}$. Also note that we can still make sure that $\rho_k \leq \rho_{k,B^c}$ after truncation, since $\rho_k = 0$ outside U.

Now suppose $x \in V$ and $d(V, \partial U) > \tau$. We can make C larger if necessary so that for $|h| > \tau$ we have $\delta\rho_{k,B^c}(x,h) \leq C\tau^2$, since ρ_{k,B^c} is bounded independently of k, B. (It suffices to take $C \geq \frac{4}{\tau^2} \sup_{k,B} \|\rho_{k,B^c}\|_{L^\infty}$.) Then by ellipticity of I we have

$$\begin{aligned}I\rho_{k,B^c}(x) &\leq I0(x) + M^+\rho_{k,B^c}(x)\\ &= 0 + (1-s)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\Lambda\delta\rho_{k,B^c}(x,h)^+ - \lambda\delta\rho_{k,B^c}(x,h)^-}{|h|^{n+2s}}\, dh\\ &\leq (1-s)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{(\Lambda+\lambda)C\min\{\tau^2, |h|^2\}}{|h|^{n+2s}}\, dh\\ &= (1-s)(\Lambda+\lambda)C\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\int_0^\infty \frac{\min\{\tau^2, r^2\}}{r^{n+2s}}\, r^{n-1} dr dS\\ &= (1-s)\hat{C}\int_0^\infty \min\{\tau^2, r^2\}\, r^{-1-2s} dr = \frac{\hat{C}}{2s}\tau^{2-2s} \leq \frac{\hat{C}\tau^{2-2s}}{2s_0} =: C_V < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

PART III:

Let $x_0 \in V$ then $B_\tau(x_0) \subset U$. Thus by the estimate (3.4) and Theorem 4.1 of [25] we have

$$\|u_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{\tau/2}(x_0))} \leq \frac{C}{\tau^{1+\alpha}}(\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_V\tau^{2s}),$$

where C, α depend only on n, s_0, λ, Λ. For simplicity we are assuming that $\tau \leq 1$. (Note that by considering the scaled operator $I_\tau v(\cdot) = \tau^{2s} I v(\frac{\cdot}{\tau})$, which has the same ellipticity constants λ, Λ as I, and using the translation invariance of I, we have obtained the estimate on the

domain $B_{\tau/2}(x_0)$ instead of $B_{1/2}(0)$.) Then we can cover $V \subset\subset U$ with finitely many open balls contained in U and obtain

$$\|u_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{V})} \leq C(\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_V), \tag{3.9}$$

where C depends only on n, λ, Λ, s_0, and $d(V, \partial U)$. In particular C does not depend on k.

Therefore u_k is bounded in $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{V})$ independently of k, because $\|u_k\|_{L^\infty}$ is uniformly bounded by (3.2). Hence there is a subsequence of u_k that is convergent in C^1 norm to a function in $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{V})$. But the limit must be u, since u_k converges uniformly to u on U. Thus $u \in C^{1,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(U)$. Also note that u_k converges uniformly to u on $\mathbb{R}^n$, because u_k, u are zero outside of U. In addition, if we let $k \to \infty$ in (3.9), we obtain the same estimate for $\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{V})}$.

Finally, let us show that due to the stability of viscosity solutions, u must satisfy the double obstacle problem (1.13) for zero exterior data. Suppose ϕ is a bounded C^2 function and $u - \phi$ has a maximum over $\mathbb{R}^n$ at $x_0 \in U$. Let us first consider the case where $u - \phi$ has a strict maximum at x_0. We must show that at x_0 we have

$$\max\{\min\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u + \bar{\rho}\}, u - \rho\} \leq 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Now we know that $u_k - \phi$ takes its global maximum at a point x_k where $x_k \to x_0$; because u_k uniformly converges to u on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

We also know that $-\bar{\rho} \leq u \leq \rho$. If $-\bar{\rho}(x_0) = u(x_0)$ then (3.10) holds trivially. So suppose $-\bar{\rho}(x_0) < u(x_0)$. Then for large k we have $-\bar{\rho}_k(x_k) < u_k(x_k)$, since $u_k + \bar{\rho}_k$ locally uniformly converges to $u + \bar{\rho}$. Hence since u_k is a viscosity solution of the equation (3.1), at x_k we have

$$\max\{\min\{-I\phi(x_k),\ u_k + \bar{\rho}_k\}, u_k - \rho_k\} \leq 0.$$

But $u_k + \bar{\rho}_k > 0$ at x_k, so we must have $-I\phi(x_k) \leq 0$. Thus by letting $k \to \infty$ and using the continuity of $I\phi$ we see that (3.10) holds in this case too.

Now if the maximum of $u - \phi$ at x_0 is not strict, we can approximate ϕ with $\phi_\epsilon = \phi + \epsilon\tilde{\phi}$, where $\tilde{\phi}$ is a bounded C^2 functions which vanishes at x_0 and is positive elsewhere. Then, as we have shown, when $-\bar{\rho}(x_0) < u(x_0)$ we have $-I\phi_\epsilon(x_0) \leq 0$. Hence by the ellipticity of I we get

$$-I\phi(x_0) \leq M^+(\epsilon\tilde{\phi})(x_0) - I\phi_\epsilon(x_0) \leq \epsilon M^+\tilde{\phi}(x_0) \underset{\epsilon\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0,$$

as desired. Similarly, we can show that when $u - \phi$ has a minimum at $x_0 \in U$ we have

$$\max\{\min\{-I\phi(x_0),\ u + \bar{\rho}\}, u - \rho\} \geq 0.$$

Therefore u is a viscosity solution of equation (1.13) as desired. At the end note that by Lemma 1 we also have $u \in C^{0,1}(\overline{U})$, since u and its derivative are bounded, and ∂U is smooth enough. $\square$

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 3 for nonzero exterior data

We do not use the next two propositions directly in the proof of Theorem 3, however, they enhance our understanding of double obstacle problems and equations with gradient constraints. First let us introduce the following terminology for the solutions of the double obstacle problem (1.13). (The notation is motivated by the physical properties of the elastic-plastic torsion problem, in which E stands for the *elastic* region, and P stands for the *plastic* region.)

Definition 5. Let

$$P^+ := \{x \in U : u(x) = \rho(x)\}, \qquad P^- := \{x \in U : u(x) = -\bar{\rho}(x)\}.$$

Then $P := P^+ \cup P^-$ is called the **coincidence** set; and

$$E := \{x \in U : -\bar{\rho}(x) < u(x) < \rho(x)\}$$

is called the **non-coincidence** set. We also define the **free boundary** to be $\partial E \cap U$.

Proposition 1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let $u \in C^1(U)$ be a viscosity solution of the double obstacle problem (1.13). If $x \in P^+$, and y is a ρ-closest point on ∂U to x such that $[x, y[\subset U$, then we have $[x, y[\subset P^+$. Similarly, if $x \in P^-$, and y is a $\bar{\rho}$-closest point on ∂U to x such that $[x, y[\subset U$, then we have $[x, y[\subset P^-$.*

Remark. If the strict Lipschitz property (2.9) for φ holds, then by Lemma 3 we automatically have $[x, y[\subset U$.

Proof. Suppose $x \in P^-$; the other case is similar. We have

$$u(x) = -\bar{\rho}(x) = -\gamma(y - x) + \varphi(y).$$

Let $\tilde{v} := u - (-\bar{\rho}) \geq 0$, and $\xi := \frac{y-x}{\gamma(y-x)} = -\frac{x-y}{\bar{\gamma}(x-y)}$. Then $\bar{\rho}$ varies linearly along the segment $]x, y[$, since y is a $\bar{\rho}$-closest point to the points of the segment. So we have $D_\xi(-\bar{\rho}) = D_{-\xi}\bar{\rho} = 1$ along the segment. Note that we do not assume the differentiability of $\bar{\rho}$; and $D_{-\xi}\bar{\rho}$ is just the derivative of the restriction of $\bar{\rho}$ to the segment $]x, y[$. Now by Lemma 1 we get

$$D_\xi u = \langle Du, \xi \rangle \leq \gamma^\circ(Du)\gamma(\xi) \leq 1.$$

So we have $D_\xi \tilde{v} \leq 0$ along $]x, y[$. Thus as $\tilde{v}(x) = \tilde{v}(y) = 0$, and $\tilde{v}$ is continuous on the closed segment $[x, y]$, we must have $\tilde{v} \equiv 0$ on $[x, y]$. Therefore $u = -\bar{\rho}$ along the segment as desired. □

Proposition 2. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let $u \in C^1(U)$ be a viscosity solution of the double obstacle problem (1.13). Suppose Assumption 2 holds too. Then we have*

$$R_{\rho,0} \cap P^+ = \emptyset, \qquad R_{\bar{\rho},0} \cap P^- = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Note that due to Assumption 2, the strict Lipschitz property (2.9) for φ holds, and γ is strictly convex. Let us show that $R_{\bar\rho,0} \cap P^- = \emptyset$; the other case is similar. Suppose to the contrary that $x \in R_{\bar\rho,0} \cap P^-$. Then there are at least two distinct points $y, z \in \partial U$ such that

$$\bar\rho(x) = \gamma(y-x) - \varphi(y) = \gamma(z-x) - \varphi(z).$$

Now by Lemma 3 we know that $[x,y[, [x,z[\subset U$; so by Proposition 1 we get $[x,y[, [x,z[\subset P^-$. In other words, $u = -\bar\rho$ on both of these segments. Therefore by Lemma 3, u varies linearly on both of these segments. Hence we get

$$\Big\langle Du(x), \frac{y-x}{\gamma(y-x)} \Big\rangle = 1 = \Big\langle Du(x), \frac{z-x}{\gamma(z-x)} \Big\rangle.$$

However, since γ is strictly convex, and by Lemma 1 we know that $\gamma^\circ(Du(x)) \le 1$, this equality implies that z, y must be on the same ray emanating from x. But this contradicts the fact that $[x,y[, [x,z[\subset U$. □

Remark. Since here we do not have $C^{1,1}$ regularity for u, we cannot imitate the proof given in the local case to show that P^+, P^- do not intersect $R_\rho, R_{\bar\rho}$. In addition, merely knowing that the solution does not touch the obstacles at their singularities is not enough to obtain uniform bounds for Iu_k in the proof of Theorem 3, because we need to have a uniform positive distance from the ridges too, due to the nonlocal nature of the operator. As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 3, we overcome these limitations by using some suitable barriers.

Next let us review some well-known facts from convex analysis which are needed in the following proof. Consider a compact convex set K. Let $x \in \partial K$ and $\mathrm{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n - \{0\}$. We say the hyperplane

$$\Gamma_{x,\mathrm{v}} := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y-x, \mathrm{v}\rangle = 0\} \tag{A.1}$$

is a *supporting hyperplane* of K at x if $K \subset \{y : \langle y-x, \mathrm{v}\rangle \le 0\}$. In this case we say v is an *outer normal vector* of K at x (see Figure A.1). The *normal cone* of K at x is the closed convex cone

$$N(K,x) := \{0\} \cup \{\mathrm{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n - \{0\} : \mathrm{v} \text{ is an outer normal vector of } K \text{ at } x\}. \tag{A.2}$$

It is easy to see that when ∂K is C^1 we have

$$N(K,x) = \{tD\gamma(x) : t \ge 0\}.$$

For more details see [42, Sections 1.3 and 2.2].

Proof of Theorem 3 for nonzero exterior data. As before we approximate K° by a sequence K_k° of compact convex sets, that have smooth boundaries with positive curvature, and

$$K_{k+1}^\circ \subset \mathrm{int}(K_k^\circ), \qquad K^\circ = \bigcap K_k^\circ.$$

Then K_k's are strictly convex compact sets with 0 in their interior, which have smooth boundaries with positive curvature. Furthermore we have $K = (K^\circ)^\circ \supset K_{k+1} \supset K_k$. To simplify the notation we use $\gamma_k, \gamma_k^\circ, \rho_k, \bar\rho_k$ instead of $\gamma_{K_k}, \gamma_{K_k^\circ}, \rho_{K_k,\varphi}, \bar\rho_{K_k,\varphi}$, respectively. Note that K_k, U, φ satisfy the Assumption 2. In particular we have $\gamma_k^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$, since $D\varphi \in K^\circ \subset \mathrm{int}(K_k^\circ)$. Hence as we have shown in [39], $\rho_k, \bar\rho_k$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1 of [40]. Thus there are viscosity solutions $u_k \in C^{1,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U)$ of the double obstacle problem

$$\begin{cases} \max\{\min\{-Iu_k,\ u_k + \bar\rho_k\}, u_k - \rho_k\} = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ u_k = \varphi & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n - U. \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

And $\alpha > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, s_0.

As before, we can easily see that u_k's and their derivatives are uniformly bounded. Hence a subsequence of them converges uniformly to a continuous function u, which we extend to all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ by setting it equal to φ in $\mathbb{R}^n - U$. In Part I we consider the barrier

$$\rho_{k,B^c} := \rho_{K_k,\varphi}(\cdot\,; \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}) = \min_{z\in\partial B}[\gamma_k(\cdot - z) + \varphi(z)], \tag{A.4}$$

where $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{U}$ is an open ball such that $\partial B \cap \partial U = \{y_0\}$, in which $y_0 \in \partial U$ is a ρ_k-closest point to x_0.

Let $z \in \partial B$, and let y be a point on $\partial U \cap [z, x_0[$. Then by the Lipschitz property (1.7) for φ with respect to γ_k (note that $\gamma_k^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k(x_0 - y_0) + \varphi(y_0) &\le \gamma_k(x_0 - y) + \varphi(y) \\ &= \gamma_k(x_0 - z) + \varphi(z) - \gamma_k(y - z) + \varphi(y) - \varphi(z) \le \gamma_k(x_0 - z) + \varphi(z). \end{aligned}$$

Hence y_0 is also a ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point to x_0 on ∂B. Consequently we have

$$\rho_{k,B^c}(x_0) = \gamma_k(x_0 - y_0) + \varphi(y_0) = \rho_k(x_0).$$

Now consider $x \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$, and let $z \in \partial B$ be a ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point to x. Let y be a point on $\partial U \cap [z, x[$. Then similarly to the above we can show that

$$\rho_k(x) \le \gamma_k(x - y) + \varphi(y) \le \gamma_k(x - z) + \varphi(z) = \rho_{k,B^c}(x).$$

As for ρ_k, we extend ρ_{k,B^c} to all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ by setting it equal to φ on B. Then for $x \notin U$ we either have $\rho_k(x) = \varphi(x) = \rho_{k,B^c}(x)$ when $x \in B$, or

$$\rho_k(x) = \varphi(x) \le \gamma_k(x - z) + \varphi(z) = \rho_{k,B^c}(x),$$

when $x \notin B$ and $z \in \partial B$ is a ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point to x. Hence, ϕ is also touching ρ_{k,B^c} from below at x_0.

The rest of the proof in Part I, and Part III of the proof, go as before. So we only need to prove the properties of the new barrier ρ_{k,B^c}, similarly to the Part II of the proof in the case of zero exterior data. First let us show that ρ_{k,B^c} is C^2 on $\mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$. By the results of Section 2.2 we need to show that x has only one ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point on ∂B, and $\det Q_{k,B^c}(x) \neq 0$ where Q_{k,B^c} is given by (A.6).

Suppose to the contrary that $y, \tilde{y} \in \partial B$ are two ρ_{k,B^c}-closest points to x. Let $z = \frac{y+\tilde{y}}{2} \in B$. We assume that the radius of B is small enough so that φ is convex on a neighborhood of it. Then we have

$$\gamma_k(x-z) + \varphi(z) \le \frac{1}{2}\Big(\gamma_k(x-y) + \gamma_k(x-\tilde{y}) + \varphi(y) + \varphi(\tilde{y})\Big) = \rho_{k,B^c}(x).$$

Let $\tilde{z}$ be the point on $\partial B \cap]z, x[$. Then by the strict Lipschitz property (2.9) for φ with respect to γ_k (note that $\gamma_k^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_k(x-\tilde{z}) + \varphi(\tilde{z}) &= \gamma_k(x-z) + \varphi(z) - \gamma_k(\tilde{z}-z) + \varphi(\tilde{z}) - \varphi(z)\\ &< \gamma_k(x-z) + \varphi(z) \le \rho_{k,B^c}(x),\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. So x must have a unique ρ_{k,B^c}-closest point y on ∂B.

Next note that by (2.18) at $y \in \partial B$ we have

$$D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y) = (I - X_k^T)\Big(D^2\varphi(y) + \lambda_k(y) D^2 d_{B^c}(y)\Big)(I - X_k), \tag{A.5}$$

where d_{B^c} is the Euclidean distance to ∂B on $\mathbb{R}^n - B$, and λ_k, X_k are given by (2.10),(2.12) (using γ_k° instead of γ°). But the eigenvalues of $D^2 d$ are minus the principal curvatures of the boundary, and a zero eigenvalue corresponding to the normal direction (see [18, Section 14.6]). So the nonzero eigenvalues of $D^2 d_{B^c}$ are $\frac{1}{r_0}$, where r_0 is the radius of B (note that we are in the exterior of B, so the curvatures are $\frac{-1}{r_0}$). Hence $D^2 d_{B^c}$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. Therefore $D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y)$ is also a positive semidefinite matrix, since φ is convex on a neighborhood of ∂U. (Although the convexity of φ is not really needed here. Because by using $\gamma^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$ we can easily show that λ_k has a uniform positive lower bound independently of k, B. Then by decreasing the radius r_0 and using the boundedness of $D^2\varphi$ we can get the desired.)

Now let us consider the matrices W, Q for ρ_{k,B^c} given by (2.19). The eigenvalues of

$$W_{k,B^c}(y_0) := -D^2\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k(y)) D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y)$$

must be nonpositive, because $D^2\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k)$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. Therefore the eigenvalues of

$$Q_{k,B^c}(x) := I - \Big(\rho_{k,B^c}(x) - \varphi(y)\Big) W_{k,B^c}(y) = I - \gamma_k(x-y) W_{k,B^c}(y) \tag{A.6}$$

are greater than or equal to 1. Hence $\det Q_{k,B^c}(x) > 0$, and we can conclude that ρ_{k,B^c} is C^2 on a neighborhood of an arbitrary point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n - \overline{B}$, as desired.

In addition, by Lemma 4 we have

$$D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(x) \le D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y) = (I - X_k^T)\Big(D^2\varphi(y) + \lambda_k(y) D^2 d_{B^c}(y)\Big)(I - X_k).$$

Let us show that $D^2\rho_{k,B^c}(y)$ is bounded independently of k, y, B. Since the radius of B is fixed, $D^2 d_{B^c}(y)$ is bounded independently of y, B. So we only need to show that X_k, λ_k are

uniformly bounded. Note that $\gamma_k^\circ \geq \gamma_1^\circ$, since $K_k^\circ \subset K_1^\circ$. Thus by (2.10) we have

$$\gamma_1^\circ(D\varphi + \lambda_k \nu) \leq \gamma_k^\circ(D\varphi + \lambda_k \nu) = 1.$$

Hence by (2.3) applied to γ_1°, we have $|D\varphi + \lambda_k \nu| \leq C$ for some $C > 0$. Therefore we get $|\lambda_k| = |\lambda_k \nu| \leq C + |D\varphi|$. Thus λ_k is bounded independently of k, y, B.

Hence we only need to show that the entries of $X_k = \frac{1}{\langle D\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k), \nu\rangle} D\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k) \otimes \nu$ are bounded. Note that by (2.6) we have $\gamma_k(D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)) = 1$. Thus $\gamma(D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)) \leq 1$ for every k, since $\gamma \leq \gamma_k$ due to $K \supset K_k$. So $D\gamma_k^\circ(\nu)$ is bounded independently of k. Therefore it only remains to show that $\langle D\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k), \nu\rangle$ has a positive lower bound independently of k, y, B. Note that for every k, B, $\langle D\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k), \nu\rangle$ is a continuous positive function on the compact set ∂B, as explained in Section 2.2. Hence there is $c_{k,B} > 0$ such that $\langle D\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k), \nu\rangle \geq c_{k,B}$. Suppose to the contrary that there is a sequence of balls B_j, points $y_j \in \partial B_j$, and k_j (which we simply denote by j) such that

$$\langle D\gamma_j^\circ(\mu_j(y_j)), \nu_j\rangle \to 0, \tag{A.7}$$

where ν_j is the unit normal to ∂B_j at y_j. By passing to another subsequence, we can assume that $y_j \to y$, since y_j's belong to a compact neighborhood of ∂U. Now remember that

$$\mu_j(y_j) = D\varphi(y_j) + \lambda_j(y_j)\nu_j,$$

where $\lambda_j > 0$. As we have shown in the last paragraph, λ_j is bounded independently of j, B_j. Hence by passing to another subsequence, we can assume that $\lambda_j \to \lambda^* \geq 0$. Also, $|\nu_j| = 1$. Thus by passing to yet another subsequence we can assume that $\nu_j \to \nu^*$, where $|\nu^*| = 1$. Therefore we have

$$\mu_j(y_j) \to \mu^* := D\varphi(y) + \lambda^*\nu^*.$$

On the other hand we have $\gamma_j^\circ(\mu_j(y_j)) = 1$. Hence $\gamma^\circ(\mu_j(y_j)) \geq 1$, since $\gamma_j^\circ \leq \gamma^\circ$ due to $K^\circ \subset K_j^\circ$. Thus we get $\gamma^\circ(\mu^*) \geq 1$. However we cannot have $\gamma^\circ(\mu^*) > 1$. Because then μ^* will have a positive distance from K°, and therefore it will have a positive distance from K_j° for large enough j. But this contradicts the facts that $\mu_j(y_j) \to \mu^*$ and $\mu_j(y_j) \in K_j^\circ$. Thus we must have $\gamma^\circ(\mu^*) = 1$, i.e. $\mu^* \in \partial K^\circ$.

Now note that $\mathrm{v}_j := D\gamma_j^\circ(\mu_j(y_j))$ belongs to the normal cone $N(K_j^\circ, \mu_j(y_j))$. In addition we have $\gamma_j(\mathrm{v}_j) = 1$ due to (2.6). Hence we have $\mathrm{v}_j \in K_j \subset K$. Thus by passing to yet another subsequence we can assume that $\mathrm{v}_j \to \mathrm{v} \in K$. We also have $\gamma_1(\mathrm{v}_j) \geq 1$, since $\gamma_j \leq \gamma_1$ due to $K_j \supset K_1$. So we get $\gamma_1(\mathrm{v}) \geq 1$. In particular $\mathrm{v} \neq 0$. We claim that $\mathrm{v} \in N(K^\circ, \mu^*)$. To see this note that we have

$$K^\circ \subset K_j^\circ \subset \{z : \langle z - \mu_j(y_j), \mathrm{v}_j\rangle \leq 0\}.$$

Hence for every $z \in K^\circ$ we have $\langle z - \mu_j(y_j), \mathrm{v}_j\rangle \leq 0$. But as $j \to \infty$ we have $z - \mu_j(y_j) \to z - \mu^*$. So we get $\langle z - \mu^*, \mathrm{v}\rangle \leq 0$. Therefore

$$K^\circ \subset \{z : \langle z - \mu^*, \mathrm{v}\rangle \leq 0\},$$

as desired.




FIGURE A.1. The relative situation of v, ν^* does not allow $\langle \mathrm{v}, \nu^* \rangle$ to be zero.

On the other hand, by (A.7) we obtain

$$\langle \mathrm{v}, \nu^* \rangle = \lim \langle \mathrm{v}_j, \nu_j \rangle = 0. \tag{A.8}$$

Now note that $D\varphi = \mu^* - \lambda^* \nu^*$ belongs to the ray passing through $\mu^* \in \partial K^\circ$ in the direction $-\nu^*$. However, we know that $D\varphi$ is in the interior of K°, since $\gamma^\circ(D\varphi) < 1$. Hence we must have $\lambda^* > 0$ (since $\gamma^\circ(\mu^*) = 1$). And thus the ray $t \mapsto \mu^* - t\nu^*$ for $t > 0$ passes through the interior of K°. Therefore this ray and K° must lie on the same side of the supporting hyperplane $\Gamma_{\mu^*,\mathrm{v}}$. In addition, the ray cannot lie on the hyperplane, since it intersects the interior of K°. Hence we must have $\langle \mathrm{v}, \nu^* \rangle = -\langle \mathrm{v}, -\nu^* \rangle > 0$, which contradicts (A.8). See Figure A.1 for a geometric representation of this argument.

Thus $\langle D\gamma_k^\circ(\mu_k), \nu \rangle$ must have a positive lower bound independently of k, y, B, as desired. Therefore $D^2 \rho_{k,B^c}(x)$ has a uniform upper bound, independently of k, x, B. Then as before it follows that

$$\delta\rho_{k,B^c}(x,h) = \rho_{k,B^c}(x+h) + \rho_{k,B^c}(x-h) - 2\rho_{k,B^c}(x) \le C|h|^2$$

for some constant C independent of k, x, B, provided that the segment $[x-h, x+h]$ does not intersect B. Now we truncate ρ_{k,B^c} outside of a neighborhood of $\overline{U}$ to make it bounded. Note that we can choose this bound uniformly, since

$$\rho_{k,B^c}(x) = \gamma_k(x-y) + \varphi(y) \le \gamma_1(x-y) + \varphi(y) \le \gamma_1(l) + \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty},$$

where l is the diameter of the chosen neighborhood of $\overline{U}$. Also note that we can still make sure that $\rho_k \leq \rho_{k,B^c}$ after truncation, since $\rho_k = \varphi$ outside U. And finally we can show that $I\rho_{k,B^c}(x) \leq C_V$ for $x \in V$, similarly to the case of zero exterior data. □

Acknowledgement. This research was in part supported by Iran National Science Foundation Grant No 97012372.

References

[1] G. Barles and C. Imbert. Second-order elliptic integro-differential equations: viscosity solutions' theory revisited. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 25(3):567–585, 2008.

[2] G. Barles and H. M. Soner. Option pricing with transaction costs and a nonlinear Black-Scholes equation. *Finance Stoch.*, 2(4):369–397, 1998.

[3] F. E. Benth, K. H. Karlsen, and K. Reikvam. Optimal portfolio selection with consumption and nonlinear integro-differential equations with gradient constraint: a viscosity solution approach. *Finance Stoch.*, 5(3):275–303, 2001.

[4] F. E. Benth, K. H. Karlsen, and K. Reikvam. Portfolio optimization in a Lévy market with intertemporal substitution and transaction costs. *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.*, 74(3-4):517–569, 2002.

[5] C. Bjorland, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Figalli. Nonlocal tug-of-war and the infinity fractional laplacian. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 65(3):337–380, 2012.

[6] H. Brezis and G. Stampacchia. Sur la régularité de la solution d'inéquations elliptiques. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 96:153–180, 1968.

[7] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(5):597–638, 2009.

[8] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. The Evans-Krylov theorem for nonlocal fully nonlinear equations. *Ann. Math.*, pages 1163–1187, 2011.

[9] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. Regularity results for nonlocal equations by approximation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 200(1):59–88, 2011.

[10] L. Caffarelli, S. Salsa, and L. Silvestre. Regularity estimates for the solution and the free boundary of the obstacle problem for the fractional laplacian. *Invent. Math.*, 171 (2):425–461, 2008.

[11] L. Caffarelli, X. Ros-Oton, and J. Serra. Obstacle problems for integro-differential operators: regularity of solutions and free boundaries. *Invent. Math.*, 208(3):1155–1211, 2017.

[12] L. A. Caffarelli and A. Friedman. The free boundary for elastic-plastic torsion problems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 252:65–97, 1979.

[13] L. A. Caffarelli and N. M. Rivière. The Lipschitz character of the stress tensor, when twisting an elastic plastic bar. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 69(1):31–36, 1979.

[14] G. Crasta and A. Malusa. The distance function from the boundary in a Minkowski space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(12):5725–5759 (electronic), 2007.
[15] D. De Silva and O. Savin. Minimizers of convex functionals arising in random surfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 151(3):487–532, 2010.
[16] L. C. Evans. A second-order elliptic equation with gradient constraint. *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.*, 4(5):555–572, 1979.
[17] X. Fernández-Real and X. Ros-Oton. The obstacle problem for the fractional laplacian with critical drift. *Math. Ann.*, 371(3):1683–1735, 2018.
[18] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations Of Second Order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
[19] R. Hynd. The eigenvalue problem of singular ergodic control. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 65(5):649–682, 2012.
[20] R. Hynd. Analysis of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations arising in stochastic singular control. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 19(1):112–128, 2013.
[21] R. Hynd. An eigenvalue problem for a fully nonlinear elliptic equation with gradient constraint. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 56(2):34, 2017.
[22] R. Hynd and H. Mawi. On hamilton-jacobi-bellman equations with convex gradient constraints. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 18(3):291–315, 2016.
[23] H. Ishii and S. Koike. Boundary regularity and uniqueness for an elliptic equation with gradient constraint. *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.*, 8(4):317–346, 1983.
[24] J. Korvenpää, T. Kuusi, and G. Palatucci. The obstacle problem for nonlinear integro-differential operators. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 55(3):63, 2016.
[25] D. Kriventsov. $C^{1,\alpha}$ interior regularity for nonlinear nonlocal elliptic equations with rough kernels. *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.*, 38(12):2081–2106, 2013.
[26] P.-L. Lions. *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, volume 69 of *Research Notes in Mathematics*. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass.-London, 1982.
[27] C. Mou and A. Święch. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions for a class of integro-differential equations. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.*, 22(6):1851–1882, 2015.
[28] B. Øksendal and A. Sulem. *Applied stochastic control of jump diffusions*, volume 498. Springer, third edition, 2019.
[29] A. Petrosyan and C. A. Pop. Optimal regularity of solutions to the obstacle problem for the fractional laplacian with drift. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 268(2):417–472, 2015.
[30] D. Possamaï, H. M. Soner, and N. Touzi. Homogenization and asymptotics for small transaction costs: the multidimensional case. *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.*, 40(11): 2005–2046, 2015.
[31] J. F. Rodrigues and L. Santos. On nonlocal variational and quasi-variational inequalities with fractional gradient. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 80(3):835–852, 2019.
[32] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. Boundary regularity for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 165(11):2079–2154, 2016.

[33] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. Boundary regularity estimates for nonlocal elliptic equations in C^1 and $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, 196(5):1637–1668, 2017.
[34] M. Safdari. The free boundary of variational inequalities with gradient constraints. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 123-124:1–22, 2015.
[35] M. Safdari. On the shape of the free boundary of variational inequalities with gradient constraints. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 19(2):183–200, 2017.
[36] M. Safdari. The regularity of some vector-valued variational inequalities with gradient constraints. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 17(2):413–428, 2018.
[37] M. Safdari. The distance function from the boundary of a domain with corners. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 181:294–310, 2019.
[38] M. Safdari. Double obstacle problems and fully nonlinear PDE with non-strictly convex gradient constraints. *J. Differ. Equ.*, 278:358–392, 2021.
[39] M. Safdari. Global optimal regularity for variational problems with nonsmooth non-strictly convex gradient constraints. *J. Differ. Equ.*, 279:76–135, 2021.
[40] M. Safdari. Nonlocal fully nonlinear double obstacle problems. *preprint*, arxiv.org/abs/2105.09417, 2021.
[41] M. Schmuckenschlaeger. A simple proof of an approximation theorem of H. Minkowski. *Geom. Dedicata*, 48(3):319–324, 1993.
[42] R. Schneider. *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, volume 151 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, expanded edition, 2014.
[43] S. E. Shreve and H. M. Soner. Regularity of the value function for a two-dimensional singular stochastic control problem. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 27(4):876–907, 1989.
[44] S. E. Shreve and H. M. Soner. A free boundary problem related to singular stochastic control: the parabolic case. *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.*, 16(2-3):373–424, 1991.
[45] L. Silvestre. Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the laplace operator. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(1):67–112, 2007.
[46] T. W. Ting. The ridge of a Jordan domain and completely plastic torsion. *J. Math. Mech.*, 15:15–47, 1966.
[47] G. Treu and M. Vornicescu. On the equivalence of two variational problems. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 11(3):307–319, 2000.
[48] M. Wiegner. The $C^{1,1}$-character of solutions of second order elliptic equations with gradient constraint. *Commun. Partial. Differ. Equ.*, 6(3):361–371, 1981.
[49] N. Yamada. The hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation with a gradient constraint. *J. Differ. Equ.*, 71:185–199, 1988.