ON THE EXISTENCE AND HÖLDER REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS TO SOME NONLINEAR CAUCHY-NEUMANN PROBLEMS

ALESSANDRO AUDRITO

Abstract. We prove existence and Hölder regularity of weak solutions to a class of weighted nonlinear Cauchy-Neumann problems arising in combustion theory and fractional diffusion. Weak solutions are obtained through a nonstandard variational approximation procedure, known in the literature as the Weighted Inertia-Energy-Dissipation method. To pass to the limit, we show the existence of an approximating sequence satisfying some new uniform parabolic Hölder estimate of De Giorgi-Nash-Moser type and some uniform energy estimates.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to construct Hölder continuous weak solutions to the weighted nonlinear Cauchy-Neumann problem

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
&y^a \partial_t U - \nabla \cdot (y^a \nabla U) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{N+1} \times (0, \infty) \\
&-\partial_y^a U = -\beta(u) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\} \times (0, \infty) \\
&U|_{t=0} = U_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{N+1},
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

where $N \geq 1$, $a \in (-1, 1)$, $\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1} := \{X = (x, y) : x \in \mathbb{R}^N, y > 0\}$, $\nabla$ and $\nabla \cdot$ stand for the gradient and the divergence operators w.r.t. $X$, respectively, and $u := U|_{y=0}$ and $\partial_y^a U := \lim_{y \to 0^+} y^a \partial_y U$.

The weight $y^a$ belongs to the Muckenhoupt $A_2$-class (cf. [15, 19]), the function $U_0$ is a given initial data and $\beta \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ is of combustion type, satisfying

\begin{equation}
\beta \geq 0, \quad \text{supp} \beta = [0, 1], \quad \int_0^1 \beta(v) \, dv = \frac{1}{2}.
\end{equation}

Problem (1.1) is related to the localized/extended version of the reaction-diffusion equation

\begin{equation}
(\partial_t - \Delta)^s u = -\beta(u),
\end{equation}

where $s := \frac{1-a}{2} \in (0, 1)$ (see [31, 40] and [5, Section 2]), and the diffusion process is governed by the fractional power of the heat operator, which is nonlocal both in space and time:

\begin{equation}
(\partial_t - \Delta)^s u(x,t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s)} \int_{-\infty}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [u(x,t) - u(z,\tau)] \frac{G_N(x-z,t-\tau)}{(t-\tau)^{1+s}} \, dz \, d\tau,
\end{equation}
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where $G_N$ is the fundamental solution to the heat equation and $\Gamma$ is the gamma function (cf. [34, Section 28]). For smooth functions $u$ depending only on the space variables $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, it reduces to the fractional laplacian $(-\Delta)_s$, while if $u = u(t)$, it is the Marchaud derivative $(\partial_t)_s$ (cf. [25, 40]).

Such operators appear in a wide range of applications such as biology, physics and finance (see e.g. [21, 16] and the monograph [22]) and have notable interpretations in Continuous Time Random Walks theory (see [26] and the references therein). In recent years this class of equations has been the subject of intensive research: we quote [11, 12] for traveling analysis, [5] and [21, 8, 9] for unique continuation and obstacle problems, and [4] for nodal set analysis. In our context, solutions to (1.3) may be employed to approximate some free boundary problems arising in combustion theory and flame propagation, in the singular limit $\beta \to \frac{1}{2} \delta_0$ (cf. [13, 33] for the nonlocal elliptic framework and [14] for the local parabolic one).

In this work, weak solutions to (1.1) will obtained through a variational approximation procedure known in the literature as the Weighted Inertia-Energy-Dissipation method, introduced in the works of Lions [24] and Oleinik [32] (see also the paper of De Giorgi [18] in the context of nonlinear wave equations). Later, it has been investigated by many authors: we quote the works of Akagi and Stefanelli [1], Mielke and Stefanelli [27], Bögelein et al. [8, 9] and the references therein. However, the variational techniques we use are inspired by the methods developed by Serra and Tilli in [35, 36] (see also the more recent [3]). We introduce below the main ideas in a rather informal way, and postpone the precise definitions and statements in subsequent sections.

We set

$$\Phi(u) := 2 \int_0^u \beta(v) \, dv,$$

and, for every fixed $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we introduce the functional

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(W) = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-t/\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} y^a \left( \varepsilon |\partial_t W|^2 + |\nabla W|^2 \right) \, dX + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\}} \Phi(w) \, dx \right\} \, dt.$$  

If $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ has a minimizer $U_\varepsilon$ (or a minimizer pair $(U_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon := U_\varepsilon|_{y=0})$) in some suitable space $U_0$ (see (1.8)) with $U_{\varepsilon|t=0} = U_0$, then $U_\varepsilon$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}
-\varepsilon y^a \partial_t U_\varepsilon + y^a \partial_t u_\varepsilon - \nabla \cdot (y^a \nabla U_\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ \times (0, \infty) \\
-\partial_y^a U_\varepsilon = -\beta(u_\varepsilon) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\} \times (0, \infty) \\
U_{\varepsilon|t=0} = U_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+,
\end{cases}
$$

in the weak sense (see Lemma [2.2]). The above problem is nothing more than (1.1) with the extra term $-\varepsilon y^a \partial_t u_\varepsilon$: it is thus reasonable to conjecture that under suitable boundedness and compactness properties (which must be uniform w.r.t. $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$), one may pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ along some subsequence and obtain a limit weak solution $U$ to (1.1).

We stress that for each $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ the approximating problem (1.5) is elliptic in space-time and the drift $y^a \partial_t u_\varepsilon$ is a lower order term, while, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, it degenerates along the time direction and, in the limit, the problem completely changes nature, becoming parabolic.

As mentioned above, the main problem is to establish uniform estimates for families of minimizers of the functional $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ and then pass to the limit by compactness. We will deal with two types of uniform bounds: global energy estimates and Hölder estimates. The former are obtained adapting the techniques of [35, 36], while the latter will follow from a De Giorgi-Nash-Moser type result ([17, 30, 28]).
for weak solutions to
\[
\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
  -\varepsilon y^\alpha \partial_t W_\varepsilon + y^\beta \partial_t W_\varepsilon - \nabla \cdot (y^\beta \nabla W_\varepsilon) = F_\varepsilon, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times \mathbb{R}, \\
  -\partial_y^\alpha W_\varepsilon = f_\varepsilon, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R},
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\]
where $F_\varepsilon$ and $f_\varepsilon$ belong to suitable classes of spaces (see Appendix A and (1.11)).

This is our main contribution: we prove parabolic Hölder estimates “up to $\{y = 0\}$” for weak solutions to problem (1.6), that we transfer to sequences of minimizers of (1.4) and, in turn, to the limit function $U$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We anticipate that even though these Hölder estimates have a local nature (we work directly with the local weak formulation of (1.6)), we will need an extra compactness assumption that, luckily, is guaranteed by the global energy estimates, depending on the initial data $U_0$ (see Proposition 2.1).

Since problem (1.6) is elliptic for every $\varepsilon > 0$ but becomes parabolic in the limit $\varepsilon = 0$, we cannot expect to prove uniform elliptic Hölder estimates (i.e. elliptic in the $(X,t)$ variables), but “only” parabolic ones. To do this, we will combine uniform local energy estimates, uniform local $L^2 \to L^\infty$ bounds and a uniform oscillation decay lemma, exploiting also some Hölder estimates for weighted elliptic equations, recently obtained by Sire et al. [38, 39]. It is important to stress that the proofs of these intermediate steps are not just the mere adaptation of the parabolic theory (see for instance [28, 41]), but are tailored to the specific nature of the elliptic problem, that degenerates as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first result in this direction: in the existing literature, the results concerning the Hölder regularity of weak solutions to parabolic weighted equations are obtained working in the purely nonlocal setting, and are based on the validity of some Harnack inequality in the spirit of Moser [28] (see e.g. [5, 10, 15, 20] and the references therein). We also point out that our method allows us to treat both the existence and the Hölder regularity of weak solutions using the spirit of Moser [28] (see e.g. [5, 10, 15, 20] and the references therein). We also point out that our method allows us to treat both the existence and the Hölder regularity of weak solutions using the same approximating sequence, in contrast with the classical theory where the two issues are often unrelated.

Finally, it is important to mention that our strategy seems to be quite flexible and different parabolic problems may be attacked with similar techniques. For instance, one may fix $s \in (0,1)$ and try to approximate weak solutions to
\[
\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u = -\beta(u)
\]
with a sequence of minimizers of
\[
\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\varepsilon(w) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t/\varepsilon} \left\{ \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\partial_t w|^2 \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|w(x,t) - w(z,t)|^2}{|x-z|^{N+2s}} \, dx \, dz + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi(w) \, dx \right\} \, dt,
\]
over a suitable functional space (notice that here we work in the purely nonlocal framework, without making use of the extension theory for the fractional laplacian). In view of [11, 36], the techniques we use to prove the energy estimates should easily be adapted to this setting too, whilst the general strategy we follow to obtain the Hölder bounds seems to be more difficult to repeat and must be adapted depending on the different nature of the problem.

1.1. Functional Setting. To simplify the notation, we work with the functional
\[
\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(U) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t/\varepsilon} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^\alpha \left( \varepsilon |\partial_t U|^2 + |\nabla U|^2 \right) \, dX + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\}} \Phi(U) \, dx \right\} \, dt,
\]
and then we will transfer the information to the minimizers of (1.4), using standard even reflections w.r.t. $y$ (see Lemma 2.4 and Remark 2.5). Indeed, notice that $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ is nothing more than $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ but the integration is on the whole $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and, as always, $u := U|_{y=0}$.
We consider the space
\[ \mathcal{U} := \bigcap_{R>0} H^{1,a}(Q^+_R), \quad Q^+_R := \mathbb{B}_R \times (0, R^2), \]
made of functions \( U \in L^{2,a}(Q^+_R) \) with weak derivatives \( \partial_t U \in L^{2,a}(Q^+_R) \), \( \nabla U \in (L^{2,a}(Q^+_R))^{N+1} \), for every \( R > 0 \) (precise definitions of the \( L^{p,a} \) type spaces are given in Appendix A). In particular, by [29], each function \( U \in \mathcal{U} \) has a trace on the hyperplane \( \{ y = 0 \} \) and an “initial” trace we denote with
\[
\hat{u} := U|_{y=0} \in H^{1,a}(Q_\infty), \quad U_0 := U|_{t=0} \in H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}),
\]
respectively \( (Q_\infty := \mathbb{R}^N \times \{ 0 \} \times (0, \infty)) \).

Since each term in (1.7) is nonnegative, we will view \( F_\varepsilon \) as a functional defined on \( \mathcal{U} \) taking values in \([0, +\infty]\) and we will minimize it on the space \( \mathcal{U} \), subject to the initial condition
\[
|_{t=0} = U_0, \quad U_0 \in H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}).
\]
The choice of \( U_0 \in H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}) \) is quite important for our approach: we have \( U_0 \in \mathcal{U} \) (and thus \( \mathcal{U} \) is not empty) and, by [29] again, we also have that
\[
u_0 := U_0|_{y=0} \in H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^N)
\]
is well-defined. To prove our main estimates, it will be crucial to assume
\[
\mathcal{L}^N(\{ u_0 > 0 \}) < +\infty,
\]
where \( \mathcal{L}^N \) denotes the \( N \)-dimensional Lebesgue measure. This is not a very restrictive assumption: in the majority of the applications the function \( u_0 \) is assumed to be smooth and compactly supported in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). To simplify the notations, it is convenient to introduce the set of initial traces
\[
\mathcal{T}_0 := \{ U_0 \in H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}) : U_0 \neq 0, \mathcal{L}^N(\{ u_0 > 0 \}) < +\infty \},
\]
and the (non-empty) closed convex linear space
\[
\mathcal{U}_0 := \{ U \in \mathcal{U} : U|_{t=0} = U_0 \in \mathcal{T}_0 \}.
\]
Notice that the assumptions on the initial trace guarantee that any minimizer \( U \in \mathcal{U}_0 \) is nontrivial.

### 1.2. The main result
Before stating our main result, we give the definition of weak solutions to problem (1.1).

**Definition 1.1.** Let \( N \geq 1, a \in (-1, 1) \) and \( \beta \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}) \) satisfying (1.2). We say that the pair \( (U, u) \) is a weak solution to (1.1) if

- \( U \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(0, \infty; H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})) \) with \( \partial_t U \in L^2(0, \infty; L^{2,a}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})) \).
- \( u = U|_{y=0} \) and \( U_0 = U|_{t=0} \) in the sense of traces.
- \( U \) satisfies
\[
\int_0^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} y^a (\partial_t U \eta + \nabla U \cdot \nabla \eta) \, dx \, dt + \int_0^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta(u)\eta|_{y=0} \, dx \, dt = 0,
\]
for every \( \eta \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times (0, \infty)) \).

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( N \geq 2, a \in (-1, 1) \) and \( \beta \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}) \) satisfying (1.2). Then there exist \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) depending only on \( N, a \), \( \| \beta \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \) and \( U_0 \), a weak solution \( (U, u) \) to (1.1) satisfying
\[
U \in C^\alpha_{\text{loc}}\left( (0, \infty) \right) \times (0, \infty),
\]
where \( C^\alpha_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times (0, \infty)) \)

a sequence $\varepsilon_k \to 0^+$ and a sequence of minimizers $\{U_{\varepsilon_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of (1.4) in $U_0$ such that, as $k \to +\infty$,

$$U_{\varepsilon_k} \to U \quad \text{weakly in } U$$

$$U_{\varepsilon_k} \to U \quad \text{in } C_{loc}([0, \infty) : L^2(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$$

$$U_{\varepsilon_k} \to U \quad \text{in } C^\alpha_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times (0, \infty)).$$

**Proof.** As mentioned above, in view of Lemma 2.4 and Remark 2.5 (see also Subsection 1.3), it is the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem completes the proof. □

**Remark 1.3.**

Given $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and given a generic parabolic cylinder $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$, we define

$$\|U\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}_s(Q)} := \|U\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|U\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}_s(Q)},$$

where

$$[U]_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}_s(Q)} := \sup_{(X,t), (Y,\tau) \in Q} \frac{|U(X,t) - U(Y,\tau)|}{\|(X-Y, t-\tau)\|^\alpha}, \quad \|Z, s\| := \max\{|Z|, \sqrt{|s|}\}.$$

### 1.3. The linear problem (1.6)

Let $N \geq 1$ and $a \in (-1,1)$. We will always consider exponents $p,q \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$p > \frac{N + 3 + a}{2}, \quad q > \frac{N}{1-a}.$$

The notion of weak solutions to (1.6) related to the one given in Definition 1.1 for problem (1.1):

Let $R > 0$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, $(p,q)$ satisfying (1.11), $F_\varepsilon \in L^p(\mathbb{B}_R^+ \times (-R^2, R^2))$ and $f_\varepsilon \in L^q_{loc}(Q R)$. We say that $W_\varepsilon$ is a weak solution to (1.6) in $\mathbb{B}_R^+ \times (-R^2, R^2)$ if

- $W_\varepsilon \in L^2_{loc}(-R^2, R^2 : H^{1,a}(\mathbb{B}_R^+))$ with $\partial_t W_\varepsilon \in L^2(-R^2, R^2 : L^2(\mathbb{B}_R^+))$.

---

1. If $Q := B \times I$, $\|f\|_{L^p_\infty(Q)} := \text{ess sup}_{t \in I} \|f(t)\|_{L^p(B)}$, and $L^p_\infty(Q)$ is the closure of $C^\infty(Q)$ w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_{L^p_\infty(Q)}$. 

---
for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty(Q_R)$ (or, by density, $\eta \in H^{1,a}_0(Q_R)$).

Even in the setting of problem (1.6), it is convenient to simplify the notation as follows. If $W_\varepsilon$ is a weak solution, we notice that the even extension always work with weak solutions defined in the whole cylinder $Q$, for every nonnegative $\eta$.

Definition 1.4. Let $N \geq 1$, $a \in (-1,1)$, $R > 0$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, $(p,q)$ satisfying (1.11), $F_\varepsilon \in L^{p,a}(Q_R)$ and $f_\varepsilon \in L^{2q}(Q_R)$. We say that $U_\varepsilon$ is a weak subsolution (supersolution) in $Q_R$ if

- $U_\varepsilon \in L^2(-R^2,R^2;H^{1,a}(\mathbb{B}_R))$ with $\partial_t U_\varepsilon \in L^2(-R^2,R^2:L^{2,a}(\mathbb{B}_R))$.
- $U_\varepsilon$ satisfies the differential inequality

$$
\int_{Q_R} |y|^a (\varepsilon \partial_t U_\varepsilon \partial_t \eta + \partial_t U_\varepsilon \eta + \nabla U_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \eta - F_\varepsilon \eta) \, dx 
\geq \int_{Q_R} \int_{Q_R} f_\varepsilon \eta |y=0| \, dx \, dt = 0,
$$

for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R \times (-R^2,R^2))$, where $\tilde{F}_\varepsilon$ is the even extension of $F_\varepsilon$. For this reason, we will always work with weak solutions defined in the whole cylinder $Q_R$ and, to recover the information on $W_\varepsilon$, we restrict them to the upper-half cylinder $Q_R \cap \{y > 0\}$. Below the precise definition.

Remark 1.5. (Scaling) In the proof of Proposition 4.1, we will use that if $R > 0$ and $U_\varepsilon$ is a weak solution in $Q_R$, then the function

$$
V_{\varepsilon,R}(X,t) := U_\varepsilon(RX,R^2t), \quad (X,t) \in Q_1,
$$

satisfies

$$
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a (\frac{1}{R^2} \partial_t V_{\varepsilon,R} \partial_t \eta + \partial_t V_{\varepsilon,R} \eta + \nabla V_{\varepsilon,R} \cdot \nabla \eta - F_{\varepsilon,R} \eta) \, dx 
\geq \int_{Q_1} \int_{Q_1} f_{\varepsilon,R} \eta |y=0| \, dx \, dt = 0,
$$

for every $\eta \in H^{1,a}_0(Q_1)$, that is $V_{\varepsilon,R}$ is a weak solution in $Q_1$ (replacing $\varepsilon$ with $\frac{1}{R}$), with

$$
F_{\varepsilon,R}(X,t) := R^2 F_\varepsilon(RX,R^2t),
$$

$$
f_{\varepsilon,R}(x,t) := R^{1-a} f_\varepsilon(Rx,R^2t).
$$

We end this subsection with a technical lemma. The proof is quite standard, but we include it for completeness.
Lemma 1.6. Let $N \geq 1$, $a \in (-1,1)$, $R > 0$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, $(p,q)$ satisfying (1.11), $F_\varepsilon \in L^{p,a}(\mathbb{Q}_R)$ and $f_\varepsilon \in L_\infty^a(\mathbb{Q}_R)$. Then, the following statements hold true:

(i) If $U_\varepsilon$ is a weak solution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$, then for every $l \in \mathbb{R}$, the functions

$$V_+ := (U_\varepsilon - l)_+ \quad \text{and} \quad V_- := (U_\varepsilon - l)_-$$

are weak subsolutions in $\mathbb{Q}_R$, with $F_\varepsilon$ and $f_\varepsilon$ replaced by $(F_\varepsilon)_+$ and $(f_\varepsilon)_+$, and $(F_\varepsilon)_-$ and $(f_\varepsilon)_-$, respectively.

(ii) If $U_\varepsilon$ is a weak subsolution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$ and $F_\varepsilon, f_\varepsilon \geq 0$, then for every $l \geq 0$, the function

$$V = \max\{U, l\}$$

is a weak subsolution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$.

Proof. We give a sketch of the proof of (i) (part (ii) follows analogously). Let $U = U_\varepsilon$, $F = F_\varepsilon$, $f = f_\varepsilon$ and $l \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $U - l$ is still a weak solution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$, it is enough to consider the case $l = 0$.

Let $p(U) = U_+$ and consider a sequence of smooth functions $p_j : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$p_j, p'_j, p''_j \geq 0, \quad p_j = p \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \setminus (-\frac{1}{j}, \frac{1}{j}), \quad \|p_j - p\|_{H_1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \frac{1}{j};$$

and let $V_j := p_j(U)$ for every integer $j \geq 1$. We fix a nonnegative $\eta \in H_0^{1,1}(\mathbb{Q}_R)$ and consider

$$\int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} |y|^a (\varepsilon \partial_t V_j \partial_t \eta + \partial_t V_j \eta + \nabla V_j \cdot \nabla \eta - F_+ \eta) \, dx \, dt - \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} f_+ \eta |_{y=0} \, dx \, dt$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} |y|^a (\varepsilon p'_j(U) \partial_t U \partial_t \eta + p'_j(U) \partial_t U \eta + p''_j(U) \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla \eta - F_+ \eta) \, dx \, dt - \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} f_+ \eta |_{y=0} \, dx \, dt$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} |y|^a \left[ \varepsilon \partial_t U \partial_t (p'_j(U) \eta) + \partial_t U (p'_j(U) \eta) + p'_j(U) \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla (p'_j(U) \eta) \right] \, dx \, dt$$

$$\quad - \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} (\partial_t U)^2 p''_j(U) \eta \, dx \, dt - \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} \nabla U |^2 p''_j(U) \eta \, dx \, dt - \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} |y|^a F_+ \eta \, dx \, dt - \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} f_+ \eta |_{y=0} \, dx \, dt$$

$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} |y|^a Fp'_j(U) \eta \, dx \, dt + \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} f p'_j(u) \eta |_{y=0} \, dx \, dt - \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} |y|^a F_+ \eta \, dx \, dt - \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} f_+ \eta |_{y=0} \, dx \, dt$$

where we have used (1.12) with test $p'_j(U) \eta$ and that $\eta, p'_j, p''_j \geq 0$. Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} |y|^a Fp'_j(U) \eta \, dx \, dt + \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R} f p'_j(u) \eta |_{y=0} \, dx \, dt \to \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R, \{U>0\}} |y|^a F \eta \, dx \, dt + \int_{\mathbb{Q}_R, \{U<0\}} f \eta |_{y=0} \, dx \, dt,$$

as $j \to +\infty$, thanks to the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem (and trace theorem), we deduce that $U_+$ is a weak subsolution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$ with $F_+$ and $f_+$ by passing to the limit as $j \to +\infty$.

To complete the proof, it is enough to notice that $-U$ is a weak solution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$ with $-F$ and $-f$. Then $U_- = (-U)_+$ is a weak subsolution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$ with $F_- = (-F)_+$ and $f_- = (-f)_+$. \qed

Remark 1.7. The same proof shows that if $U_\varepsilon$ is a weak subsolution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$, then for every $l \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $(U_\varepsilon - l)_+$ is a weak subsolution in $\mathbb{Q}_R$, with $F_\varepsilon$ and $f_\varepsilon$ replaced by $(F_\varepsilon)_+$ and $(f_\varepsilon)_+$, respectively.
1.4. Structure of the paper. The paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2 we prove the existence of minimizers of $F_\varepsilon$ in $U_0$ (for every fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$) and we establish the main global uniform energy estimates (2.8) and (2.9), which play a key role in the proof of Proposition 2.1. This is the first main step in our analysis: we show the existence of a sequence of minimizers $U_{\varepsilon j}$ weakly converging to some function $U$ which is also a weak solution to (1.1).

In Section 3 we prove a $L^{2,\alpha} \rightarrow L^\infty$ local uniform bound for weak solutions to (1.6) (see Proposition 3.1). The main difficulty here is to derive a uniform energy estimate. Indeed, since problem (1.6) is elliptic for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ but becomes parabolic in the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the best we can expect is to obtain a uniform energy estimate of parabolic type. However, the standard parabolic techniques do not work in this framework (see Remark 3.4) and new methods that exploit the degeneracy of the equation are used.

In Section 4 we show Proposition 4.1: under the additional compactness assumption (4.1), there is a sequence of weak solutions to (1.6) having locally bounded $C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}$ seminorm. As explained in Remark 4.4, this compactness assumption is required in order to prove a parabolic version of the so-called “De Giorgi isoperimetric lemma” (cf. Lemma 4.2), while, in the pure parabolic setting, such compactness can be derived from the equation itself.

Finally, in Appendix A and Appendix B we recall some technical tools and results we exploit through the paper, and the full list of notations.

2. Global uniform energy estimates

This section is devoted to the proof of the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \in U_0$ be a family of minimizers of $F_\varepsilon$. Then there exist $U \in U_0$ and a sequence $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ such that if $u = U|_{y=0}$, then

\begin{align*}
U_{\varepsilon_j} &\rightharpoonup U \quad \text{weakly in } U \\
U_{\varepsilon_j} &\rightarrow U \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty) : L^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})) \\
u_{\varepsilon_j} &\rightarrow u \quad \text{in } L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty)),
\end{align*}

and, furthermore, the pair $(U, u)$ satisfies

\begin{align*}
(2.1) \quad \int_{Q_\infty} |y|^\alpha (\partial_t U \eta + \nabla U \cdot \nabla \eta) \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_\infty} \beta(u) \eta|_{y=0} \, dx \, dt &= 0,
\end{align*}

for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty(Q_\infty)$. In particular, $(U, u)$ is a weak solution to (1.1).

Before addressing to the proof of the above statement, we show some basic properties of minimizers of the functional $F_\varepsilon$.

2.1. Existence and basic properties of minimizers. We begin with the Euler-Lagrange equations.

**Lemma 2.2.** Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $U_\varepsilon \in U_0$ be a minimizer of $F_\varepsilon$. Then

\begin{align*}
(2.3) \quad \varepsilon \int_{Q_\infty} |y|^\alpha \partial_t U_\varepsilon \partial_t \eta \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_\infty} |y|^\alpha (\partial_t U_\varepsilon \eta + \nabla U_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \eta) \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_\infty} \beta(u_\varepsilon) \eta|_{y=0} \, dx \, dt &= 0,
\end{align*}

for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty(Q_\infty)$. 

Proof. Fix \( \varepsilon > 0 \), let \( \varphi \in C_0^\infty(Q_\infty) \), \( h \neq 0 \), and assume that \( U := U_\varepsilon \in U_0 \) is a minimizer of \( F_\varepsilon \). It is not difficult to compute

\[
\frac{F_\varepsilon(U + h \varphi) - F_\varepsilon(U)}{h} = 2 \int_0^\infty e^{-t/\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a (\varepsilon \partial_t U \partial_t \varphi + \nabla U \cdot \nabla \varphi) \, dX \, dt + \int_0^\infty e^{-t/\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\Phi(u + h \varphi|_{y=0}) - \Phi(u)}{h} \, dx \, dt + h \int_0^\infty e^{-t/\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a (\varepsilon |\partial_t \varphi|^2 + |\nabla \varphi|^2) \, dX \, dt.
\]

Notice that, since \( \varphi \in C_0^\infty(Q_\infty) \), the last integral converges to zero as \( h \to 0 \), while

\[
\frac{\Phi(u + h \varphi|_{y=0}) - \Phi(u)}{h} \to \Phi'(u) \varphi|_{y=0} = 2 \beta(u) \varphi|_{y=0} \quad \text{a.e. in } Q_\infty,
\]
as \( h \to 0 \). Consequently, using that \( \beta \) is bounded, \( \varphi|_{y=0} \) is compactly supported and the minimality of \( U \), we can pass to the limit as \( h \to 0 \), to deduce

\[
\int_0^\infty e^{-t/\varepsilon} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a (\varepsilon \partial_t U \partial_t \varphi + \nabla U \cdot \nabla \varphi) \, dX + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta(u) \varphi|_{y=0} \, dx \right\} dt = 0.
\]

Now, \( \eta \in C_0^\infty(Q_\infty) \) and take \( \varphi = e^{t/\varepsilon} \eta \). Noticing \( \partial_t \varphi = e^{t/\varepsilon} (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \eta + \partial_t \eta) \) and rearranging terms, \((2.3)\) follows.

Now, we show that for every \( \varepsilon \in (0,1) \) the functional \( F_\varepsilon \) has a minimizer in \( U_0 \). To simplify the notations, we introduce the functional

\[
J_\varepsilon(V) := \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a (|\partial_t V|^2 + \varepsilon |\nabla V|^2) \, dX + \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\}} \Phi(v) \, dx \right\} dt,
\]
defined for \( V \in U \), where \( v = V|_{y=0} \). This functional is related to \((1.7)\) through the following relations

\[
F_\varepsilon(U) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} J_\varepsilon(V), \quad V(X,t) = U(X,\varepsilon t).
\]

Since \( V_0 := V|_{t=0} = U|_{t=0} \) (and so \( v_0 := V_0|_{y=0} = u_0 \)) and \( U_0 \) is convex and invariant under time transformations, the minimization of \( J_\varepsilon \) on \( U_0 \) is equivalent to the minimization of \( F_\varepsilon \) on the same space. In other words, \( U \in U_0 \) is a minimizer of \( F_\varepsilon \) if and only if \( V \in U_0 \) is a minimizer of \( J_\varepsilon \).

Lemma 2.3. For every \( \varepsilon \in (0,1) \), the functional \( J_\varepsilon \) defined in \((2.4)\) has a minimizer in \( U_0 \).

Further, there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) depending only on \( N \), \( a \) and \( V_0 \) such that for every family \( \{V_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \in U_0 \) of minimizers of \( J_\varepsilon \), we have

\[
J_\varepsilon(V_\varepsilon) \leq C \varepsilon.
\]

Proof. Let \( V = V_\varepsilon \). First, we have \( J_\varepsilon \neq +\infty \) on \( U_0 \). Indeed, \( V_0 \in U_0 \) by definition and, further,

\[
J_\varepsilon(V_0) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a (|\partial_t V_0|^2 + \varepsilon |\nabla V_0|^2) \, dX + \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi(v_0) \, dx \right\} dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a |\nabla V_0|^2 \, dX + \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x(v_0 > 0) \, dx \leq \varepsilon \|V_0\|_{H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})}^2 + \varepsilon \mathcal{L}^N(\{v_0 > 0\}) \leq C \varepsilon,
\]

where we have used Hölder’s inequality and assumption \((1.8)\). From the above inequality, \((2.6)\) follows too: if \( V \in U_0 \) is a minimizer, we have \( J_{\varepsilon,\delta}(V) \leq J_{\varepsilon,\delta}(V_0) \leq C \varepsilon \) and \( C \) depends only on \( N \), \( a \) and \( V_0 \).
We are left to prove the existence of a minimizer. Since $V_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0$ and $J_\varepsilon(V_0) < +\infty$, there exists a minimizing sequence $\{V_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}_0$:

$$
\lim_{j \to +\infty} J_\varepsilon(V_j) = \inf_{V \in \mathcal{U}_0} J_\varepsilon(V) \in [0, +\infty).
$$

In particular, for every fixed $R > 0$, we have

$$
\int_{Q^+_R} |y|^a \left( |\partial_t V_j|^2 + \varepsilon |\nabla V_j|^2 \right) \, dx \, dt \leq C_R,
$$

for some $C_R > 0$ independent of $j$ and so, since $V_j|_{t=0} = V_0|_{t=0}$ for every $j$, $\{V_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $H^{1,a}(Q^+_R)$. By the compactness of the inclusion $L^{2,a}(Q^+_R) \hookrightarrow H^{1,a}(Q^+_R)$, there exists $V \in H^{1,a}(Q^+_R)$ such that $V_j \rightharpoonup V$ weakly in $H^{1,a}(Q^+_R)$ and $V_j \to V$ a.e. in $Q^+_R$ and in $L^{2,a}(Q^+_R)$, up to passing to a suitable subsequence, still denoted with $V_j$.

Similar, setting $v_j := V_j|_{y=0}$, we have that $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $H^{1,a}(Q^+_R)$ by the trace theorem (see for instance [29]) and so, up to a subsequence, $v_j \to v$ a.e. in $Q^+_R$ and in $L^{2}(Q^+_R)$, where $v := V|_{y=0}$.

Now, since $Q_\infty = \cup_{R>0} Q^+_R$ and $Q_\infty = \cup_{R>0} Q^+_R$, a standard diagonal argument shows that

$V_j \to V$ weakly in $\mathcal{U}$

$V_j \to V$ a.e. in $Q_\infty$ and in $L^{2,a}(Q_\infty)$,

$v_j \to v$ a.e. in $Q_\infty$ and in $L^{2}(Q_\infty)$,

up to passing to an additional subsequence. Notice that since $\mathcal{U}_0$ is closed and convex, we have $V \in \mathcal{U}_0$. Further, by continuity, we have $\Phi(v_j) \to \Phi(v)$ a.e. in $Q$ and so, by lower semicontinuity and Fatou’s lemma, it follows

$$
J_\varepsilon(V) \leq \lim_{j \to +\infty} J_\varepsilon(V_j) = \inf_{V \in \mathcal{U}_0} J_\varepsilon(V),
$$

i.e., $V$ is a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ be fixed. Then:

- If $V_0 \geq 0$ a.e. and $V_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_0$ is a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$, then $V_\varepsilon \geq 0$ a.e. (and $V_\varepsilon \neq 0$).
- If $V_0 \leq 1$ a.e. and $V_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_0$ is a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$, then $V_\varepsilon \leq 1$ a.e.
- If $V_0$ is even w.r.t. $y$, then there exists a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{U}_0$ which is even w.r.t. $y$.

**Proof.** Let $V := V_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_0$ be a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$ and assume $V_0 \geq 0$ a.e.. Then $V_+$ is an admissible competitor, with $J_\varepsilon(V_+) < J_\varepsilon(V)$, unless $V \geq 0$ a.e.

Similar if $V_0 \leq 1$ a.e., $W := \min\{V, 1\}$ is an admissible competitor and, since $\Phi(v) = 1$ for $v \geq 1$ in view of (1.2), we have $J_\varepsilon(W) < J_\varepsilon(V)$, unless $V \leq 1$ a.e.

Finally, if $V_0$ is even w.r.t. $y$ and $V \in \mathcal{U}_0$ is a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$, then

$$
V_\varepsilon(x, y, t) := \begin{cases} V(x, y, t) & \text{if } y \geq 0 \\ V(x, -y, t) & \text{if } y < 0 \end{cases}
$$

is an admissible competitor, with $J_\varepsilon(V_\varepsilon) = J_\varepsilon(V)$.

**Remark 2.5.** The last point of the above statement and Lemma 2.3 tell us that if the initial data is even w.r.t. $y$, then we may assume that $F_\varepsilon$ has a minimizer $U_\varepsilon$ which is even w.r.t. $y$. Such minimizer satisfy

$$
F_\varepsilon(U_\varepsilon) = 2\varepsilon_\varepsilon(U_\varepsilon),
$$


where $E_\varepsilon$ is defined in (1.4), and thus, since $U_\varepsilon$ minimizes $F_\varepsilon$ in $U_0$, it minimizes $E_\varepsilon$ too (among functions in $U_0$ which are even w.r.t. $y$).

2.2. Proof of Proposition 2.1. Proposition 2.1 will be obtained as a consequence of the following energy estimates.

**Proposition 2.6.** (Global uniform energy estimates) There exists $C > 0$ depending only on $N, a$ and $U_0$ such that for every family $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \subset U_0$ of minimizers of $F_\varepsilon$, we have

\[
\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a |\partial_t U_\varepsilon|^2 \, dX \, d\tau \leq C,
\]

and, for every $R \geq \varepsilon$,

\[
\int_0^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 \, dX \, d\tau + \int_0^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi(u_\varepsilon) \, dx \, d\tau \leq CR.
\]

The above statement is the key result of this section and will be proved by combining Lemma 2.7 and Corollary 2.8 that we show below. As in the above subsection, we consider a minimizer $V$ of $J_\varepsilon$ and we write

\[
J_\varepsilon(V) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} [I(t) + R(t)] \, dt,
\]

where

\[
I(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a |\partial_t V|^2 \, dX, \quad R(t) := \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} |y|^a |\nabla V|^2 \, dX + \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi(v) \, dx.
\]

Notice that, since $V$ is a minimizer, we have $I, R \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $t \to e^{-t} [I(t) + R(t)] \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Further, we introduce the function

\[
E(t) := e^t \int_t^\infty e^{-\tau} [I(\tau) + R(\tau)] \, d\tau,
\]

which belongs to $W^{1,1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^+) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, and satisfies $E(0) = J_\varepsilon(V)$ and

\[
E' = E - I - R \quad \text{in } D'(\mathbb{R}^+).
\]

The main idea of the following lemma is to find a different expression for the derivative of the function $E$ defined in (2.12). The new formulation for $E'$ is crucial to prove our main estimates.

**Lemma 2.7.** Let $V \in U_0$ be a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$. Then

\[
E' = -2I \quad \text{in } D'(\mathbb{R}^+).
\]

**Proof.** We follow the proof of [35, Proposition 3.1] (see also [8, Lemma 4.5] and [3, Lemma 4.2]).

Let $V \in U_0$ be a minimizer of $J_\varepsilon$. Fix $\eta \in C_0^\infty(0, \infty)$, consider $\zeta(t) := \int_0^t \eta(\tau) \, d\tau$, and, given $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, define

\[
\varphi(t) := t - \lambda \zeta(t), \quad t \geq 0.
\]

It is easily seen that, if $|\lambda| \leq \lambda_0$ for some $\lambda_0 > 0$ small enough, then $\varphi$ is strictly increasing with $\varphi(0) = 0$. In particular, the inverse $\psi = \varphi^{-1}$ exists, it is smooth and, by (2.15), satisfies

\[
\psi(\tau) = \tau + \lambda \zeta(\psi(\tau)).
\]
The key idea of the proof is to use the function \( \varphi \) to construct a competitor \( W \). It is obtained as an inner variation of \( V \):
\[
W(X,t) := V(X, \varphi(t)).
\]
Since \( \varphi(0) = 0 \), we have \( W = V \) when \( t = 0 \) and so \( W \in \mathcal{U}_0 \). Further, by (2.15), \( W = V \) when \( \lambda = 0 \) (by sake of simplicity, the dependence on \( \lambda \) is omitted in the notations for \( \varphi \), \( \psi \) and \( W \)).

Now, from the formulation of \( \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \) introduced in (2.10) and the change of variable \( t = \psi(\tau) \), we have
\[
\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(W) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} y^2 (|\partial t W|^2 + \varepsilon |\nabla W|^2) \, dX + \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi(w) \, dx \right\} \, dt
\]
\[
= \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \left[ \varphi'(t)^2 I(\varphi(t)) + R(\varphi(t)) \right] \, dt = \int_0^\infty \psi'(\tau)e^{-\psi(\tau)} \left[ \varphi'(\psi(\tau))^2 I(\tau) + R(\tau) \right] \, d\tau.
\]
In view of (2.16) and (2.10), \( \varphi', \psi' \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+) \) and \( e^{-\psi(\tau)} \leq e^{|\lambda|L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)e^{-\tau}} \), and thus \( \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(W) < +\infty \). In particular, we deduce that, for any small \( \lambda (|\lambda| \leq \lambda_0) \), \( W \in \mathcal{U}_0 \) is an admissible competitor. Actually, recalling that \( W = V \) when \( \lambda = 0 \) and \( V \) is a minimizer, it must be
\[
(2.17) \quad \lim_{\lambda \to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(W) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(V)}{\lambda} = 0.
\]
Proceeding exactly as in [3, Lemma 4.2], we compute
\[
(2.18) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \left( \psi'(\tau)e^{-\psi(\tau)} \right) \bigg|_{\lambda=0} = \zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau} - \zeta(\tau)e^{-\tau}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} |\varphi'(\psi(\tau))|^2 \bigg|_{\lambda=0} = -2\zeta'(\tau).
\]
Consequently, recalling that \( t \to e^{-t}\{I(t) + R(t)\} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+) \) and using the dominated convergence theorem, we can pass to the limit in (2.17) and, making use of (2.18), we can write (2.17) explicitly:
\[
(2.19) \quad \int_0^\infty \left[ \zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau} - \zeta(\tau)e^{-\tau} \right] (I(\tau) + R(\tau)) \, d\tau - 2\int_0^\infty e^{-\tau}\zeta'(\tau)I(\tau) \, d\tau = 0,
\]
where we have used \( \psi(\tau) = \tau \), and \( \varphi' = \psi' = 1 \) when \( \lambda = 0 \) (see (2.15) and (2.16)).

Now, we show how equation (2.19) leads to (2.14). Recalling that \( \zeta' = \eta \) and writing (2.13) with test function \( \zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau} \), we easily obtain
\[
(2.20) \quad \int_0^\infty \zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau}[I(\tau) + R(\tau)] \, d\tau = \int_0^\infty E(\tau)[\zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau} + (\zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau})'] \, d\tau
\]
\[
= \int_0^\infty \zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau}E(\tau) \, d\tau + \int_0^\infty E(\tau)(\eta(\tau)e^{-\tau})' \, d\tau.
\]
Further, using the definition of \( E \) given in (2.12) and integrating by parts, it follows
\[
(2.21) \quad \int_0^\infty \zeta'(\tau)e^{-\tau}E(\tau) \, d\tau = \int_0^\infty \zeta'(\tau) \int_\tau^\infty e^{-\theta}[I(\theta) + R(\theta)] \, d\theta \, d\tau
\]
\[
= \int_0^\infty \zeta(\tau)e^{-\tau}[I(\tau) + R(\tau)] \, d\tau.
\]
The “boundary terms” in the integration by parts disappear since \( \zeta(0) = 0 \) and \( e^{-t}E(t) \to 0 \) as \( t \to +\infty \). Finally, plugging (2.20) and (2.21) into (2.19), it follows
\[
\int_0^\infty E(\tau)(e^{-\tau}\eta(\tau))' \, d\tau = 2\int_0^\infty e^{-\tau}\eta(\tau)I(\tau) \, d\tau,
\]
and, since \( \eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+) \) is arbitrary, (2.14) is proved. \( \square \)
Corollary 2.8. Let $V \in \mathcal{U}_0$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$. Then
\[
\int_0^\infty \int_\mathbb{R}^{N+1} |y| \partial_t V^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \epsilon,
\]
and, for every $t \geq 0$,
\[
\int_t^{t+1} \int_\mathbb{R}^{N+1} |y| \nabla V^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_t^{t+1} \int_\mathbb{R}^N \Phi(v) \, dx \, dt \leq C,
\]
for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $U_0$.

Proof. First, recalling that $E \in C(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $I \geq 0$, a direct integration of \((2.14)\) shows that $E(t) \leq E(0)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Moreover, since $E(0) = \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(V)$ and \((2.6)\), we obtain
\[
E(t) \leq \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(V) \leq C \epsilon,
\]
for all $t \geq 0$, where $C > 0$ depends only on $N$, $a$ and $V_0$.

From \((2.14)\), \((2.24)\) and that $E \geq 0$, we deduce
\[
2 \int_0^t I(\tau) \, d\tau = E(0) - E(t) \leq E(0) \leq C \epsilon,
\]
for all $t \geq 0$. Consequently, \((2.22)\) follows by passing to the limit as $t \to +\infty$ and the first definition in \((2.11)\).

To prove the second part of the statement, we fix $t \geq 0$ and we notice that \((2.24)\) implies
\[
\int_t^{t+1} R(\tau) \, d\tau \leq e^{t+1} \int_t^{t+1} e^{-\tau} R(\tau) \, d\tau \leq eE(t) \leq eC \epsilon.
\]
The thesis follows by the second definition in \((2.11)\). \qed

Proof of Proposition 2.7. Let $U$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ in $\mathcal{U}_0$ and define $V(X,t) := U(X,\epsilon t)$. Then, $V$ is a minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ in $\mathcal{U}_0$.

As a first consequence, we immediately see that \((2.8)\) follows changing variable ($t = \epsilon \tau$) in \((2.22)\). Similar, the same change of variable in \((2.23)\) yields
\[
\int_\epsilon^{\epsilon+\epsilon} \int_\mathbb{R}^{N+1} |y| \nabla V^2 \, dx \, d\tau + \int_\epsilon^{\epsilon+\epsilon} \int_\mathbb{R}^N \Phi(v) \, dx \, d\tau \leq C \epsilon,
\]
for all $t \geq 0$. Now, let $R \geq \epsilon$ and define $k = \lfloor R/\epsilon \rfloor$. In view of the arbitrariness of $t$, we can apply the above estimate for $t = j$ and sum over $j = 0, \ldots, k - 1$ to obtain
\[
\int_0^{k_\epsilon} \int_\mathbb{R}^{N+1} |y| \nabla V^2 \, dx \, d\tau + \int_0^{k_\epsilon} \int_\mathbb{R}^N \Phi(v) \, dx \, d\tau \leq C k \epsilon.
\]
Since $\epsilon \leq R \leq k \epsilon$, \((2.9)\) follows. \qed

Proof of Proposition 2.7. In view of \((2.8)\) and \((2.9)\), $\{U_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0,1)}$ is equibounded in $H^{1,a}(\mathbb{Q}_R^+) \times \{0,1\}$ for every fixed $R > 0$. Consequently, the usual diagonal procedure shows the existence of a sequence $\epsilon_j \to 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_0$ such that the first and the third limit in \((2.1)\) are satisfied (here we may also use Sobolev embedding and trace theorems as in Lemma 2.3). The second limit in \((2.1)\) follows by \([37, \text{Corollary 8}]\), up to passing to another subsequence, since for every $R > 0$, $\{U_{\epsilon_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0,R^2; H^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}))$ and $\{\partial_t U_{\epsilon_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0,R^2; L^{2,a}(\mathbb{R}))$.

Finally, \((2.2)\) follows by passing into the limit as $j \to +\infty$ into \((2.3)\) (with $\epsilon = \epsilon_j$) and using \((2.1)\). \qed
3. Uniform $L^{2,a} \to L^\infty$ estimates

This section is devoted to the proof of the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.1.** (Uniform $L^{2,a} \to L^\infty$ estimate) Let $N \geq 2$, $a \in (-1, 1)$ and $(p, q)$ satisfying $\{1.11\}$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $q$ such that every family $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ of weak solutions in $Q_1$ in the sense of Definition $[1.4]$ satisfy

$$\|U_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})} \leq C(\|U_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,a}(Q_1)} + \|F_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_1)} + \|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)}),$$

for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$.

We divide the proof of Proposition $3.1$ in two main steps: we establish an energy estimate for solutions and nonnegative subsolutions (Lemma $3.2$) and then we exploit it to prove a “no-spikes” estimate (see Lemma $3.5$). In the whole section, even if not mentioned, we will always work with weak solutions (or subsolutions) in the sense of Definition $[1.4]$.

**Lemma 3.2.** (Energy estimate) Let $N \geq 1$, $a \in (-1, 1)$ and $(p, q)$ satisfying $\{1.11\}$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $q$ such that for every $r \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\rho \in [\frac{1}{2}, r)$ and every family $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ of nonnegative subsolutions in $Q_1$ such that

$$\|F_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_1)} + \|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \leq 1$$

for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\text{ess sup}_{t \in (-\rho^2, \rho^2)} \int_{B_\rho} |y|^a U_\varepsilon^2(X, t) \, dX + \int_{Q_\rho} |y|^a |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 \, dX \, dt + \varepsilon \int_{Q_\rho} |y|^a |\partial_t U_\varepsilon|^2 \, dX \, dt$$

$$\leq C \left[ (r - \rho)^{-2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U_\varepsilon^2 \, dX \, dt + \|U_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p',a}(Q_r)} \right].$$

**Proof.** Let $U = U_\varepsilon$, $F = F_\varepsilon$, $f = f_\varepsilon$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho < r \leq 1$. Since $U$ is a weak subsolution, we may assume $F, f \geq 0$ (up to replacing them with $F_+$ and $f_+$, respectively) and so, by Lemma $[1.6]$ (part (ii)), we may also assume $U \geq 1$ in $Q_1$ (up to consider the subsolution $\max\{U, 1\}$ instead of $U$).

Let $\psi$ be a Lipschitz function vanishing on $\partial Q_1$, which will be chosen later. Testing the differential inequality of $U$ with $\eta = U \psi^2$, we easily obtain the differential inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi (\psi + 2 \varepsilon \varepsilon \partial_t \psi) \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \psi^2 \, dX \, dt + \varepsilon \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\partial_t U|^2 \psi^2 \, dX \, dt$$

$$\leq -2 \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U \psi \nabla U \cdot \nabla \psi \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a FU \psi^2 \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_1} f u \psi^2 \, dX \, dt,$$

where we recall that $u = U|_{y=0}$ in the sense of traces and $\psi|_{y=0}(x, t) = \psi(x, 0, t)$.

The energy inequality (3.2) will be obtained combing two different bounds that we prove in two separate steps.

**Step 1.** We prove that

$$\text{ess sup}_{t \in (-\rho^2, \rho^2)} \int_{B_\rho} |y|^a U^2(X, t) \, dX \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{(r - \rho)^2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dX \, dt + \|U\|_{L^{p',a}(Q_r)},$$

for some $\tilde{c} > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $q$.

Fix $t_* \in [-\rho^2, \rho^2]$ such that

$$\int_{B_\rho} |y|^a U^2(X, t_*) \, dX \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ess sup}_{t \in (-\rho^2, \rho^2)} \int_{B_\rho} |y|^a U^2(X, t) \, dX.$$
Taking into account the relation
\[ |\nabla U|^2 \psi^2 + 2U \psi \nabla U \cdot \nabla \psi = \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} \left( \psi \partial_t U + U \partial_t \psi \right)^2 - |\nabla \psi|^2 U^2, \]
we rewrite (3.3) neglecting the nonnegative term in the l.h.s. involving \( \partial_t U \) to deduce
\[
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi (\psi + 2 \varepsilon \partial_t \psi) \, dX dt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \psi^2 \, dX dt \\
\leq 2 \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla \psi|^2 U^2 \, dX dt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a FU \psi^2 \, dX dt + \int_{Q_1} f \psi^2 \, |y=0 \, dX dt.
\]
Let \( \varphi \in C_0^\infty (\mathbb{B}_r), \) \( 0 \leq \varphi \leq 1 \) with
\[
\varphi = 1 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{B}_r, \quad |\nabla \varphi| \leq \frac{c_0}{r - \varrho},
\]
for some \( c_0 > 0 \) depending only on \( N, \) and \( \phi = \phi(t) \) be defined by
\[
\phi(t) := \begin{cases} 
0 & t \in [-1, r^2] \cup [r^2, 1] \\
\frac{r^2 + t}{r^2 - \varrho^2} & t \in (-r^2, r^2) \\
1 & t \in [-\varrho^2, t_*] \\
\alpha_* + (1 - \alpha_*) \frac{t - t_*}{r^2 - \varrho^2} & t \in (t_*, r^2),
\end{cases}
\]
\( \alpha_* := \frac{1}{e^{\frac{r^2 - \varrho^2}{2 \varepsilon}} - 1} < 0. \)
An immediate computation shows that \( \phi(-r^2) = \phi(r^2) = 0, \) \( \phi(t_*) = 1, \) \( 0 \leq \phi \leq 1 \) and
\[
\phi + 2 \varepsilon \partial_t \phi = \alpha_* \quad \text{in} \quad (t_*, r^2).
\]
Furthermore, since \( \frac{1}{e^{\frac{r^2 - \varrho^2}{2 \varepsilon}}} \leq \frac{2}{e} \) for every \( r > 0, \) and \( t_* \leq \varrho^2, \) we have
\[
|\alpha_*| \leq \frac{4 \varepsilon}{r^2 - t_*} \leq \frac{8 \varepsilon}{r - \varrho}, \quad |\phi'| \leq \frac{1 + |\alpha_*|}{2 \varepsilon} \quad \text{in} \quad (t_*, r^2).
\]
Now, choose \( \psi(X, t) = \varphi(X) \phi(t) \) and write
\[
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi (\psi + 2 \varepsilon \partial_t \psi) \, dX dt = \int_{-1}^{-\varrho^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi (\psi + 2 \varepsilon \partial_t \psi) \, dX dt \\
+ \int_{-\varrho^2}^{t_*} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi (\psi + 2 \varepsilon \partial_t \psi) \, dX dt \\
+ \int_{t_*}^1 \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi (\psi + 2 \varepsilon \partial_t \psi) \, dX dt := I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\]
Using the definitions of \( \phi \) and \( \phi' \) in \([-1, t_*], \) that \( \varphi \in C_0^\infty (\mathbb{B}_r) \) with \( 0 \leq \varphi \leq 1 \) and integrating by parts, we find
\[
I_1 = \int_{-\varrho^2}^{-\varrho^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \phi^2 (\phi + 2 \varepsilon \phi') \, dX dt \\
\geq -2 \int_{-\varrho^2}^{-\varrho^2} (\phi \phi' + \varepsilon (\phi'))^2 \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 \phi^2 \, dX dt + \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 (X, -\varrho^2) \phi^2 \, dX \\
\geq -\frac{8}{(r - \varrho)^2} \int_{Q_1} U^2 \, dX dt + \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 (X, -\varrho^2) \phi^2 \, dX,
\]
and
\[
I_2 = \int_{t_*}^{t} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \varphi^2 \, dX \, dt = \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 (X, t_*) \varphi^2 (X) \, dX - \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 (X, -\vartheta^2) \varphi^2 (X) \, dX.
\]
Further, by (3.8) and (3.9),
\[
I_3 = \alpha_* \int_{t_*}^{t} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \varphi^2 \, dX \, dt = |\alpha_*| \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 (X, t_*) \varphi^2 (X) \, dX + |\alpha_*| \int_{t_*}^{t} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 \varphi^2 \phi' \, dX \, dt
\]
\[
\geq -|\alpha_*| \int_{t_*}^{t} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 \varphi^2 |\phi'| \, dX \, dt \geq -\frac{36}{(r-\vartheta)^2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dX \, dt,
\]
and thus by (3.3) and (3.7)
\[
(3.10) \quad I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ess sup}_{t \in (-\vartheta^2, \vartheta^2)} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 (X, t) \, dX - \frac{44}{(r-\vartheta)^2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dX \, dt.
\]
Now let us estimate the terms into the r.h.s. of (3.6). First, we have
\[
(3.11) \quad \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla \psi|^2 U^2 \, dX \, dt \leq \int_{Q_r} |y|^a |\nabla \varphi|^2 \phi^2 U^2 \, dX \, dt \leq \frac{c_0}{(r-\vartheta)^2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dX \, dt,
\]
thanks to (3.7) and the fact that $\phi = 0$ in $[-1, -r^2] \cup [r^2, 1]$. Second, by Hölder’s inequality
\[
(3.12) \quad \int_{Q_1} |y|^a FU \psi^2 \, dX \, dt \leq \int_{Q_r} |y|^a FU \, dX \, dt \leq \|F\|_{L^p, a(Q_1)} \|U\|_{L^p', a(Q_1)} \leq \|U\|_{L^{p', a}(Q_1)},
\]
since $\|F\|_{L^p, a(Q_1)} \leq 1$ (and $F \geq 0$) by assumption.

We are left to estimate the trace term, that we reabsorb using the second term in the l.h.s. of (3.6). Using that $u \geq 1$ and $f \geq 0$, applying Hölder’s inequality and recalling that $\|f\|_{L^1, a(Q_1)} \leq 1$, we obtain
\[
\int_{Q_1} f u \psi^2 \big|_{y = 0} \, dX \, dt \leq \int_{Q_1} f (u \psi) \big|_{y = 0} \, dX \, dt \leq \|f\|_{L^1, a(Q_1)} \|v^2\|_{L^1(\hat{Q}_1)} \leq \|v\|_{L^2, \phi'(Q_1)}^2 = \|v\|_{L^2, \phi'(Q_1)},
\]
where we have set $v := u \psi = 0$, and $\phi'$ is the conjugate of $\phi$. Since $\phi > \frac{N}{1-\alpha}$, we have $2 \leq 2\phi' \leq 2\hat{\sigma}$, where $\hat{\sigma} := \frac{N}{1-\alpha}$ (cf. Theorem A.1) and so, by interpolation and Young’s inequality, we obtain
\[
\|v\|_{L^2, \phi'(Q_1)}^2 \leq \int_{\hat{Q}_1} \|v\|_{L^2(\hat{Q}_1)}^2 \cdot \|v\|_{L^{2\phi'}(\hat{Q}_1)}^{2(1-\phi)} \, dt \leq \delta \|v\|_{L^2, \phi'(Q_1)}^2 + c_\delta \|v\|_{L^2, \phi'(Q_1)}^2,
\]
for every $\delta > 0$ and a suitable $c_\delta > 0$, satisfying $c_\delta \to +\infty$ as $\delta \to 0$ ($\vartheta \in (0, 1)$ is given in the interpolation inequality and depends on $N, \alpha$ and $\phi$). Now, by (A.2), the definition of $v$ and Cauchy-Schwartz’ inequality, we have
\[
\|v\|_{L^2, \phi'(Q_1)}^2 \leq c \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla (U \psi)|^2 \, dX \, dt \leq 2c \left( \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \psi^2 \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U^2 |\nabla \psi|^2 \, dX \, dt \right),
\]
for some $c > 0$ depending only in $N$ and $a$, while, by (A.1) and the Cauchy-Schwartz’s inequality again,
\[
\|v\|_{L^2(\hat{Q}_1)} \leq c \left( A^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U^2 \psi^2 \, dX \, dt + A^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla (U \psi)|^2 \, dX \, dt \right)
\]
\[
\leq 2c \left( A^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U^2 (\psi^2 + |\nabla \psi|^2) \, dX \, dt + A^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \psi^2 \, dX \, dt \right).
for every $A > 1$. Now, we fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$, such that $2\epsilon \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $A > 1$ such that $2\epsilon \delta A^2 \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (notice that both $\delta$ and $A$ depend only on $N$, $a$ and $q$). Combing the last four inequalities with (3.6), we obtain

$$
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi (\psi + 2\epsilon \partial_t \psi) \, dXdt \leq c \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U^2 (\psi^2 + |\nabla \psi|^2) \, dXdt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a F U \psi^2 \, dXdt,
$$

for some new $c > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $q$, and thus (3.4) follows in light of (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12).

**Step 2.** In this second step we show

$$
(3.13) \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \, dXdt + \varepsilon \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\partial_t U|^2 \, dXdt \leq \frac{\overline{c}}{\overline{r}^2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dXdt + \|U\|_{L^p(a(Q_r))},
$$

for some $\overline{c} > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $q$.

Test (3.3) with $\psi_0 (X, t) = \varphi (X) \phi_0 (t)$, where $\varphi$ is as in (3.7), while $\phi_0 \in C_0^\infty ([r^2, r^2])$, $0 \leq \phi_0 \leq 1$ and

$$
\phi_0 = 1 \text{ in } [-\overline{r}^2, \overline{r}^2], \quad \|\phi_0\|_{L^\infty (0, 1)} \leq \frac{c_1}{r - \overline{r}},
$$

for some numerical constant $c_1 \geq 1$. Integrating by parts w.r.t. time the first term in the l.h.s. of (3.3), it follows

$$
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi_0^2 \, dXdt = -2 \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \varphi^2 (X) \phi_0 (t) \phi_0' (t) \, dXdt,
$$

since $\varphi \in C_0^\infty (\mathbb{B}_r)$ and $\phi_0 \in C_0^\infty ([r^2, r^2])$ and thus, we may write (3.3) as

$$
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \psi_0^2 \, dXdt + \varepsilon \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\partial_t U|^2 \psi_0^2 \, dXdt
$$

$$
\leq -2 \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U \psi_0 \nabla U \cdot \nabla \psi_0 \, dXdt - 2\varepsilon \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U \psi_0 \partial_t U \partial_t \psi_0 \, dXdt
$$

$$
+ \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U \varphi^2 (X) \phi_0 (t) \phi_0' (t) \, dXdt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a F U \psi_0^2 \, dXdt + \int_{Q_1} f U \psi_0^2 \, dXdt.
$$

Now, using Cauchy-Schwartz’s inequality ($2AB \leq 2\epsilon A^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} B^2$ with $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$), (3.7)-(3.14) and Hölder’s inequality, we obtain

$$
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \psi_0^2 \, dXdt + \varepsilon \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\partial_t U|^2 \psi_0^2 \, dXdt
$$

$$
(3.15) \leq 4 \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \left[ \varphi^2 \phi_0 |\phi_0'| + |\nabla \varphi|^2 \phi_0^2 + \varepsilon \varphi^2 (\phi_0')^2 \right] \, dXdt + \|U\|_{L^p, a(Q_r)} + \int_{Q_1} f U \psi_0^2 |y=0 \, dXdt
$$

$$
\leq \frac{4(c_1 + c_2^2 + c_3^2)}{(r - \overline{r})^2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dXdt + \|U\|_{L^p, a(Q_r)} + \int_{Q_1} f U \psi_0^2 |y=0 \, dXdt,
$$

and so, reabsorbing the trace term as we have done in Step 1, and using (3.7)-(3.14) again, (3.13) follows.

**Step 3.** The energy estimate (3.2) follows by summing (3.4) and (3.13), and taking $C = \overline{c} + \overline{c}$. □

**Remark 3.3.** The same proof works if we assume that $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)}$ is a family of solutions, without sign restrictions.
Remark 3.4. The energy estimate (3.2) is the main step for proving the \( L^2 \rightarrow L^\infty \) bound (3.1). In light of what comes next, we believe it is important to compare the proof w.r.t. the classical parabolic framework (formally, the limit case \( \varepsilon = 0 \)). Assume for simplicity \( F = 0 \) and \( f = 0 \) and consider a weak solution to

\[
(3.16) \quad |y|^a \partial_t U - \nabla \cdot (|y|^a \nabla U) = 0 \quad \text{in} \; Q_1.
\]

Testing the weak formulation with \( \eta := U \psi^2 \), we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_1} |y|^a \partial_t (U^2) \psi^2 \; dXdt + \int_{Q_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \psi^2 \; dXdt \leq -2 \int_{Q_1} |y|^a U \psi \nabla U \cdot \nabla \psi \; dXdt,
\]

which is (3.3) “with \( \varepsilon = 0 \)”. For every fixed \( -1 < \tau < r < 1 \), one may choose \( \psi^2(X,t) = \varphi^2(X) \chi_{[s,\tau]}(t) \) and so, integrating by parts w.r.t. time and using Young’s inequality, it is not difficult to find

\[
(3.17) \quad \int_{B_1} |y|^a U^2(X,\tau) \varphi^2(X) \; dX - \int_{B_1} |y|^a U^2(X,s) \varphi^2(X) \; dX \leq C \int_s^\tau \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla \varphi|^2 \; dXdt,
\]

for some \( C > 0 \) (depending only on \( N \) and \( a \)). The bound (3.4) immediately follows from (3.17), choosing \( \varphi \) as in (3.7) and neglecting the nonpositive term in the l.h.s. The \( L^{2,\delta} \) bound for \( \nabla U \) is obtained similar to (3.13).

In our setting the main difficulty is that, when working with weak solutions to (1.12), the test \( \psi^2 = \varphi^2(X) \chi_{[s,\tau]}(t) \) is not admissible since the problem is elliptic for every fixed \( \varepsilon \in (0,1) \), and the bound for \( \int_{B_1} |y|^a U^2(X,\tau) \; dX \) must be obtained using different techniques.

Lemma 3.5. (No-spikes estimate) Let \( N \geq 2 \), \( a \in (-1,1) \) and \( (p,q) \) satisfying (1.11). Then there exists a constant \( \delta > 0 \) depending only on \( N \), \( a \) and \( q \) such that for every family \( \{U_{\varepsilon}\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \) of subsolutions in \( Q_1 \) such that

\[
(3.18) \quad \|F_{\varepsilon}\|_{L^{p,q}(Q_1)} + \|f_{\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{Q_1} (U_{\varepsilon})^2 \; dXdt \leq \delta,
\]

for every \( \varepsilon \in (0,1) \), then

\[
(3.19) \quad \|U_{\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})} \leq 1,
\]

for every \( \varepsilon \in (0,1) \).

Proof. Let us set \( U = U_{\varepsilon}, \; F_{\varepsilon} = F \) and \( f_{\varepsilon} = f \). For every integer \( j \geq 0 \), define

\[
\bar{B}_j := B_{r_j}, \quad \hat{B}_j := B_{r_j}, \quad r_j := \frac{1}{2} + 2^{-j-1},
\]

the nonnegative subsolutions (with \( F_+ \) and \( f_+ \), see Lemma 1.6)

\[
V_j := (U - C_j)_+, \quad C_j := 1 - 2^{-j},
\]

and the quantity

\[
E_j := \int_{\hat{Q}_j} |y|^a V_j^2 \; dXdt.
\]

Applying the energy inequality (3.2) to \( V_{j+1} \) with \( q = r_{j+1} \) and \( r = r_j \), we have

\[
\frac{1}{r_{j+1}} \int_{\hat{Q}_{j+1}} |y|^a V_{j+1}^2 \; dXdt + \text{ess sup}_{t \in (-r_{j+1}^2, r_{j+1}^2)} \int_{B_{r_{j+1}}} |y|^a |\nabla V_{j+1}(X,t)|^2 \; dX + \int_{\hat{Q}_{j+1}} |y|^a |\nabla V_{j+1}|^2 \; dXdt \leq C \left( (r_j - r_{j+1})^{-2} \int_{Q_j} |y|^a V_{j+1}^2 \; dXdt + \|V_{j+1}\|_{L^{p,q}Q_{j+1}} \right),
\]

for every \( j \geq 0 \).
for some $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $q$ and thus, by Sobolev inequality (cf. Theorem A.3) and the definition of $V_j$, we deduce

$$
\left( \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j+1}} |y|^{a} V_{j+1}^{2\gamma} \, dX \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \leq C 2^{2j} \left( \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j+1}} |y|^{a} V_{j+1}^{2} \, dX \, dt + C \| V_{j+1} \|_{L^{p'}(\tilde{Q}_{j+1})} \right) \leq C 2^{2j} \left( \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j}} |y|^{a} V_{j}^{2} \, dX \, dt + C \| V_{j+1} \|_{L^{p'}(\tilde{Q}_{j+1})} \right),
$$

(3.20)

for some new $C > 0$ and $\gamma > 1$ (depending only on $N$, $a$ and $q$). On the other hand, by Hölder’s inequality

$$
E_{j+1} = \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j+1}} |y|^{a} V_{j+1}^{2} \, dX \, dt \leq \left( \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j+1}} |y|^{a} V_{j+1}^{2\gamma} \, dX \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \cdot |\{ V_{j+1} > 0 \} \cap \tilde{Q}_{j+1}|_{\frac{1}{\gamma}},
$$

(3.21)

where $\gamma'$ is the conjugate exponent of $\gamma$, and $|A|_{a} := \int_{A} |y|^{a} \, dX$ for every measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$. Further, using the definition of $V_j$, it follows

$$
|\{ V_{j+1} > 0 \} \cap \tilde{Q}_{j+1}|_{a} = |\{ V_{j} > 2^{-j-1} \} \cap \tilde{Q}_{j+1}|_{a} = |\{ V_{j} > 2^{-2j-2} \} \cap \tilde{Q}_{j+1}|_{a} \leq 2^{2j+2} \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j+1}} |y|^{a} V_{j}^{2} \, dX \, dt \leq 2^{2j+2} \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j}} |y|^{a} V_{j}^{2} \, dX \, dt = 2^{2j+2} E_j,
$$

(3.22)

and, by Hölder’s inequality again,

$$
\| V_{j+1} \|_{L^{p'}(\tilde{Q}_{j+1})} \leq \left( \int_{\tilde{Q}_{j}} |y|^{a} V_{j+1}^{2} \, dX \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \| \{ V_{j+1} > 0 \} \cap \tilde{Q}_{j+1} \|_{a}^{\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{p-2}{2p}} \leq E_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \| \{ V_{j+1} > 0 \} \cap \tilde{Q}_{j+1} \|_{a}^{\frac{p-2}{2p}}. \quad (3.23)
$$

So, combining (3.20), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.23), and using (3.18), we obtain

$$
\begin{cases}
E_{j+1} \leq C^{1+j} (E_j^{1+1/\gamma'} + E_j^{1+\gamma}) \\
E_0 \leq \delta,
\end{cases}
$$

for every $j \geq 1$ and for some new $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$ and $p$, where $\gamma := \frac{1}{\gamma'} - \frac{1}{p} > 0$ (in view of (1.11) and the definition of $\gamma$, cf. Theorem A.3).

To complete the argument, it is sufficient to notice that since $\gamma < \frac{1}{\gamma'}$, we have $E_{j+1} \leq C^{1+j} E_j^{1+\gamma}$ and

$$
E_j \leq C^{(1+\gamma)j} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+i)^{\gamma'}} \right)^{\delta(1+\gamma')j} \leq C^{(1+\gamma)j} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+i)^{\gamma'}} \right)^{\delta(1+\gamma')j} = (C\delta)^{(1+\gamma)j},
$$

for some new $C > 0$ (depending only on $N$ and $a$), whenever $E_j \leq 1$. Thus, choosing $\delta$ such that $C\delta < 1$, we deduce $E_j \leq 1$ for every $j$ and $E_j \to 0$ as $j \to +\infty$. Finally, since $C_j \to 1$ and $r_j \to \frac{1}{2}$ as $j \to +\infty$, we obtain by definition of $V_j$

$$
E_j \to \int_{Q_{1/2}} (U - 1)^{2} \, dX \, dt = 0,
$$

which implies (3.19) and our statement follows. \(\square\)

**Proof of Proposition 3.7.** Set $U = U_{e}$ and define

$$
V := \lambda_{+} U_{+}, \quad \lambda_{+} := \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{\| U_{+} \|_{L^{2}.a(Q_1)} + \| F_{+} \|_{L^{p}.a(Q_1)} + \| f_{+} \|_{L^{q}.(Q_1)}},
$$

$\boxtimes$
Lemma 4.2. \textbf{"(De Giorgi isoperimetric lemma")} Let $C > 0$ be the counterpart, that we state in Lemma 4.2 (the proof is a modification of \cite[Lemma 10]{41}).

A parabolic version of the "De Giorgi isoperimetric lemma" (see Lemma 4.3). Lemma 4.3 is the key definition 4.3.

Proposition 4.1. Let $N \geq 2$, $a \in (-1, 1)$ and $(p, q)$ satisfying \eqref{1.11}. There exist $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$, $p$ and $q$ such that for every nontrivial $U$, every sequence $\varepsilon_j \to 0$ and every sequence \{\(U_{\varepsilon_j}\)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} of nontrivial weak solutions in $Q_8$ satisfying \eqref{1.1} with $r = 4$ and (4.1)

\[
U_{\varepsilon_j} \to U \quad \text{in } C\left([-r^2, r^2] : L^{2,a}(\mathbb{B}_r)\right) \quad \text{as } j \to +\infty,
\]

for some $r > 0$ and some $U \in C\left([-r^2, r^2] : L^{2,a}(\mathbb{B}_r)\right)$. As pointed out in Remark \ref{4.4} in the classical parabolic framework this property can be deduced working directly with the equation and exploiting the local energy estimate, while in our approximating setting, using the equation is not enough.

Anyway, in light of Proposition \ref{2.1} \eqref{1.1} is always guaranteed when working with sequences \{\(U_{\varepsilon_j}\)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} of minimizers of the functional \eqref{1.7}.

The following proposition is the main result of this section.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $N \geq 2$, $a \in (-1, 1)$ and $(p, q)$ satisfying \eqref{1.11}. There exist $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$, $p$ and $q$ such that for every nontrivial $U$, every sequence $\varepsilon_j \to 0$ and every sequence \{\(U_{\varepsilon_j}\)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} of nontrivial weak solutions in $Q_8$ satisfying \eqref{1.1} with $r = 4$ and

\[
\|F_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_4)} + \|f_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^{q}(Q_4)} \leq C_0
\]

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $C_0 > 0$, then there exist a subsequence $j_k \to +\infty$ such that

\[
\|U_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^{2,a/2}(Q_1)} \leq C\left(\|U_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}\|_{L^{2}(Q_4)} + \|F_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_4)} + \|f_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}\|_{L^{q}(Q_4)}\right),
\]

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The estimate \eqref{4.3} will follows as a consequence of an oscillation decay type result which, in turn, is obtained by combining the $L^{2,a} \to L^{\infty}$ bound for nonnegative subsolutions (see Proposition \ref{3.1}) and a parabolic version of the "De Giorgi isoperimetric lemma" (see Lemma \ref{4.3}). Lemma \ref{4.2} is the key step: our approach is based on the ideas of \cite[Section 3]{11} and relies on the validity of its \"elliptic\" counterpart, that we state in Lemma \ref{1.2} (the proof is a modification of \cite[Lemma 10]{11}).

**Lemma 4.2.** ("De Giorgi isoperimetric lemma") Let $N \geq 1$, $a \in (-1, 1)$. Let $U \in H^{1,a}(\mathbb{B}_1)$ satisfying

\[
\int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \, dX \leq C_0,
\]

for some $C_0 > 0$ and

\[ A := \{U \geq 1/2\} \cap \mathbb{B}_1, \quad C := \{U \leq 0\} \cap \mathbb{B}_1, \quad D := \{0 < U < 1/2\} \cap \mathbb{B}_1. \]
Then for every $p \in (1, 2)$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$, $C_0$ and $p$ such that
\[
|A_a| \cdot |C_a| \leq c|D_a|^{\frac{2-p}{p}}.
\]

Proof. We consider a new function $V$ defined as $V = U$ in $D$, $V = \frac{1}{2}$ in $A$ and $V = 0$ in $C$. Clearly, it satisfies $\nabla V = 0$ in $\mathbb{B}_1 \setminus D$ and $\int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a|\nabla V|^2 \, dX \leq C_0$.

Now, setting $\nabla a := |\mathbb{B}_1|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a V(X) \, dX$ and writing $X = (x, y)$ and $Z = (z, \zeta)$, we have
\[
|A_a| \cdot |C_a| = 2 \int_C |z| \, dZ \cdot \int_A |y|^a V(X) \, dX \leq 2 \int_C \int_A |y|^a |\zeta| |V(X) - V(Z)| \, dX \, dZ \\
\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |\zeta|^a |V(X) - \nabla a| \, dX \, dZ + 2 \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |\zeta|^a |V(Z) - \nabla a| \, dX \, dZ \\
\leq 4|\mathbb{B}_1|\int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |V(X) - \nabla a|^p \, dX \leq 4|\mathbb{B}_1|^{1+1/p} \left( \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |V(X) - \nabla a|^p \, dX \right)^{1/p},
\]
where, in the last inequality, we have used Hölder’s inequality. By [19] Theorem 1.5 and Hölder’s inequality again, we have
\[
\int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |V(X) - \nabla a|^p \, dX \leq c \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |\nabla V|^p \, dX = c \int_D |y|^a |\nabla V|^p \, dX \\
\leq c \left( \int_{\mathbb{B}_1} |y|^a |\nabla V|^2 \, dX \right)^{p/2} |D_a|^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \leq c C_0^{\frac{2}{p}} |D_a|^{\frac{2-p}{p}},
\]
for some $c > 0$ depending on $p$. Combining the two inequalities, our statement follows. \hfill $\square$

Lemma 4.3. Let $N \geq 1$, $a \in (-1, 1)$, $(p, q)$ satisfying (1.1), and $\tilde{Q} := \mathbb{B}_1 \times (-2, -1)$.

Assume there exist $\delta > 0$, a sequence $\varepsilon_j \to 0$ and a family $\{U_{\varepsilon_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of weak solutions in $Q_2$ such that
\[
\|U_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1, \quad \{|U_{\varepsilon_j} \geq 1/2\} \cap Q_1|_a \geq \delta, \quad \{|U_{\varepsilon_j} \leq 0\} \cap \tilde{Q}|_a \geq \frac{|\tilde{Q}|_a}{2},
\]
and
\[
\|F_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^p(Q_2)} + \|f_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1,
\]
for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists $\sigma > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$, $p$, $q$ and $\delta$ such that for every $U$ and every $\varepsilon_{j_k} \to 0$ satisfying (4.1) (with $j = j_k$ and $r = 2$), we have
\[
\{|0 < U_{\varepsilon_{j_k}} < 1/2\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})|_a \geq \sigma,
\]
for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We assume by contradiction there exist sequences $\varepsilon_k := \varepsilon_{j_k} \to 0$, $F_k := F_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}$, $f_k := f_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}$ satisfying
\[
\|F_k\|_{L^p(Q_2)} + \|f_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1,
\]
$U \in C([-4, 4] : L^2_a(\mathbb{B}_2))$ and a sequence of weak solutions $U_k := U_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}$ satisfying $\|U_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1$ and $U_k \to U$ in $C([-4, 4] : L^2_a(\mathbb{B}_2))$, such that if $A_k := \{U_k \geq 1/2\} \cap Q_1$, $C_k := \{U_k \leq 0\} \cap \tilde{Q}$ and $D_k := \{0 < U_k < 1/2\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})$, then
\[
|A_k|_a \geq \delta, \quad |C_k|_a \geq |\tilde{Q}|_a/2, \quad |D_k|_a \leq \frac{1}{k},
\]
for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that in view of (3.2) (combined with $\|U_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1$) we may also assume that $U_k \rightharpoonup U$ in $L^2((-2, 2) : H^{1,a}(\mathbb{B}_1))$ and so
\[
\|\nabla U\|_{L^{2,a}((-2,2) \times \mathbb{B}_1)} \leq C,
\]
for some $C > 0$ depending only on $N$, $a$, $p$ and $q$. Further, as a consequence of $C([-4, 4] : L^{2,a}(\mathbb{B}_2))$ convergence, we also have convergence in measure: for every $\epsilon > 0$,
\[
\lim_{k \to +\infty} |\{|U_k - U| \geq \epsilon\} \cap Q_2|_a = 0.
\]

**Step 1.** We prove that
\[
|\{0 < U < \frac{1}{2}\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})|_a = 0.
\]
To see this, we notice that given $\epsilon > 0$, the set $\{\epsilon \leq U \leq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon\}$ can be trivially written as the disjoint union of $\{|U_k - U| \geq \epsilon\}$ and $\{|U_k - U| < \epsilon\}$. Furthermore,
\[
\epsilon \leq U \leq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \cap \{|U_k - U| < \epsilon\} \subseteq \epsilon \leq U \leq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \cap \{0 < U_k < \frac{1}{2}\},
\]
which implies
\[
|\{\epsilon \leq U \leq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})|_a \leq |\{|U_k - U| \geq \epsilon\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})|_a + |\{0 < U_k < \frac{1}{2}\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})|_a.
\]
Since $Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q} \subset Q_2$, we may pass to the limit as $k \to +\infty$ and notice that the last relation in (4.5) and (4.6) yield $|\{\epsilon \leq U \leq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})|_a = 0$ and thus, by the arbitrariness of $\epsilon > 0$, (4.7) follows.

**Step 2.** Now we show that
\[
|\{U \leq 0\} \cap \tilde{Q}|_a \geq \frac{\tilde{Q}|_a}{2}.
\]
First, we notice that (4.7), combined with the fact that $\nabla U(\cdot, t) \in L^{2,a}(\mathbb{B}_1)$ for a.e. $t \in (-2, 1)$, allows us to apply Lemma 4.2 obtaining
\[
\text{either } U(\cdot, t) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}_1 \\
or \quad U(\cdot, t) \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}_1,
\]
for a.e. $t \in (-2, 1)$. Now, following the proof of (4.7), we notice that if $U_k \leq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is fixed, then either $|U_k - U| \geq \epsilon$ or $U \leq \epsilon$. Therefore
\[
\frac{\tilde{Q}|_a}{2} \leq |\{U_k \leq 0\} \cap \tilde{Q}|_a \leq |\{|U_k - U| \geq \epsilon\} \cap \tilde{Q}|_a + |\{U < \epsilon\} \cap \tilde{Q}|_a,
\]
and thus, taking the limit as $k \to +\infty$ and then as $\epsilon \to 0$, we deduce (4.8), where we have exploited (4.5) and (4.6) again.

**Step 3.** This is the most delicate part of the proof. We prove that
\[
U \leq 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1.
\]
For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the subsolution $V_k := (U_k)_+$ (with $v_k := (u_k)_+$) and we test its differential inequality with $\eta_k = V_k \psi_k^2$, for a sequence of test functions $\psi_k$ we will choose in a moment. Following
the proof of Lemma 3.2, we obtain (cf. (3.3))

\[
\frac{1}{2} \int Q_2 |y|^a \partial_t (V_k^2 \psi_k^2) dX dt + \int Q_2 |y|^a |\nabla V_k|^2 \psi_k^2 dX dt + \varepsilon_k \int Q_2 |y|^a |\partial_t V_k|^2 \psi_k^2 dX dt \\
\leq -2 \int Q_2 |y|^a (\psi_k \nabla V_k) \cdot (V_k \nabla \psi_k) dX dt - \varepsilon_k \int Q_2 |y|^a \partial_t V_k (V_k \partial_t (\psi_k^2)) dX dt \\
+ \int Q_2 |y|^a (F_k) + V_k \psi_k^2 dX dt + \int Q_2 (f_k) + v_k \psi_k^2 |y=0 dX dt.
\]

Now, using Young’s inequality, we reabsorb the gradient part of the first term in the r.h.s. with the second term in the l.h.s., and we apply Hölder’s inequality to the last three terms in the r.h.s. to obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2} \int Q_2 |y|^a \partial_t (V_k^2 \psi_k^2) dX dt \leq C_0 \int Q_2 |y|^a V_k^2 |\nabla \psi_k|^2 dX dt + \varepsilon_k \|\partial_t V_k\|_{L^2_a(Q_2)} \|V_k \partial_t (\psi_k^2)\|_{L^2_a(Q_2)} \\
+ \|F_k\|_{L^p_a(Q_2)} \|V_k \psi_k^2\|_{L^{p'}_a(Q_2)} + \|f_k\|_{L^q_a(Q_2)} \|v_k \psi_k\|_{L^1(Q_2)} \\
\leq C_0 \int Q_2 |y|^a |\nabla \psi_k|^2 dX dt + \varepsilon_k \|\partial_t V_k\|_{L^2_a(Q_2)} \|\partial_t (\psi_k^2)\|_{L^2_a(Q_2)} \\
+ \|\psi_k^2\|_{L^{p'}_a(Q_2)} + \|\psi_k\|_{L^1(Q_2)}
\]

for some numerical constant $C_0 > 0$ (the last inequality easily follows in light of (4.4) and that $\|U_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1$).

Now, we fix $-2 < s < \tau < 1$ and choose $\psi_k^2(X,t) = \varphi^2(X) \chi_k(t)$ where $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$ satisfies

\[
\varphi \geq 0, \quad \int_{B_1} |y|^a \varphi^2(X) dX = 1,
\]

while $\chi_k$ is a Lipschitz approximation of $\chi_{[s,\tau]}$ as $k \to +\infty$, defined as follows

\[
\chi_k(t) := \begin{cases} 
0 & t \leq s - \delta_k \text{ or } t \geq \tau + \delta_k \\
\frac{1}{\delta_k} (t - s + \delta_k) & t \in (s - \delta_k, s) \\
\frac{1}{\delta_k} (\tau + \delta_k - t) & t \in (\tau, \tau + \delta_k) \\
1 & t \in [s, \tau],
\end{cases}
\]

for some positive $\delta_k \to 0$ as $k \to +\infty$. Notice that, by dominated convergence,

\[
\int Q_2 |y|^a |\nabla \psi_k|^2 dX dt = \int_{-2}^{2} \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla \varphi|^2 \chi_k(t) dX dt \to \int_{s}^{\tau} \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla \varphi|^2 dX dt \leq C(\tau - s),
\]

as $k \to +\infty$, for some $C > 0$ depending only on $N$ and $a$. Similar

\[
\|\psi_k^2\|_{L^{p'}_a(Q_2)} + \|\psi_k\|_{L^1(Q_2)} \to \left( \int_{s}^{\tau} \int_{B_1} |y|^a \varphi^{2p'} dX dt \right)^{1/p'} + \int_{s}^{\tau} \left( \int_{B_1} \varphi^{2q'} d\mu \right)^{1/q'} dt \\
\leq C \left[ (\tau - s)^{1/p'} + (\tau - s) \right] \leq C(\tau - s)^{1/p'},
\]
as $k \to +\infty$, for some new $C > 0$ depending also on $p$ and $q$. Furthermore, by taking $C > 0$ larger and using (3.2), we have

\begin{equation}
\varepsilon_k \|\partial_t V_k\|_{L^2, a(Q_2)} \|\partial_t (\psi_k^2)\|_{L^2, a(Q_2)} \leq C \varepsilon_k^{1/2} \|\partial_t (\psi_k^2)\|_{L^2, a(Q_2)} = C \varepsilon_k^{1/2} \left( \int_{Q_2} |y|^a \varphi^4(X)(\chi_k(t))^2 \, dX \, dt \right)^{1/2} \leq C \varepsilon_k^{1/2} \|\varphi^2\|_{L^2, a(B_2)} \left( \frac{1}{2^k} \int_{s-\delta_k}^s \, dt + \frac{1}{\delta_k} \int_{s}^{\tau+\delta_k} \, dt \right)^{1/2} \leq C \varepsilon_k^{1/2} \rightarrow 0,
\end{equation}

by choosing $\delta_k = \varepsilon_k^{1/2}$. Finally, using the definition of $\chi_k$ and integrating by parts in time, we find

\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_2} |y|^a \partial_t (V_k^2) \psi_k^2 \, dX = \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_2} |y|^a \partial_t (V_k^2 \varphi^2) \chi_k(t) \, dX dt = \frac{1}{2 \delta_k} \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta_k} \int_{B_1} |y|^a V_k^2 \varphi^2(X) \, dX \, dt - \frac{1}{2 \delta_k} \int_{s-\delta_k}^s \int_{B_1} |y|^a V_k^2 \varphi^2(X) \, dX \, dt \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |y|^a U_+^2(\tau) \varphi^2(X) \, dX - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |y|^a U_+^2(s) \varphi^2(X) \, dX,
\end{equation}

as $k \to +\infty$. To check the limit, we use that $V_k, U_+$ and $\varphi$ are bounded in $Q_2$, to see that

\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{\delta_k} \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta_k} \int_{B_1} |y|^a V_k^2 - U_+^2 |\varphi^2(X) \, dX \, dt \leq \frac{C}{\delta_k} \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta_k} \int_{B_1} |y|^a V_k - U_+ |\varphi^2 | \, dX \, dt \leq \frac{C}{\delta_k} \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta_k} \|V_k(t) - U_+(t)\|_{L^2, a(B_1)} \, dt \leq C \sup_{\tau \in (-4, 4)} \|V_k(t) - U_+(t)\|_{L^2, a(B_1)} \rightarrow 0,
\end{equation}

as $k \to +\infty$ and thus the limit in (4.16) follows by triangular inequality. Consequently, passing to the limit as $k \to +\infty$ in (4.11) and using (4.13), (4.14), (4.15) and (4.16), we deduce

\[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |y|^a U_+^2(\tau) \varphi^2(X) \, dX - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |y|^a U_+^2(s) \varphi^2(X) \, dX \leq C(\tau - s)^{1/p'}, \]

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only $N, a, p, q$ and $\varphi$.

Now, by (4.8), we may choose $s \in (-2, -1)$ such that $U(\cdot, s) \leq 0$ in $B_1$, to obtain

\[ \int_{B_1} |y|^a U_+^2(X, \tau) \varphi^2(X) \, dX \leq C(\tau - s)^{1/p'}, \]

On the other hand, by (4.9), we know that either $U(\cdot, \tau) \leq 0$ or $U(\cdot, \tau) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ in $B_1$ for a.e. $\tau \in (-2, 1)$. However, if $U(\cdot, \tau) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ in $B_1$, the above inequality and (4.12) yield

\[ (\tau - s)^{1/p'} \geq c_0, \]

for some $c_0 > 0$ depending only $N, a, p, q$ and $\varphi$, and thus it must be $U(\cdot, \tau) \leq 0$ in $B_1$ for a.e. $\tau \leq s + c_0^{1/p'}$. Iterating this procedure, (4.10) follows.

Step 4. Finally, arguing as in (4.7), whenever $U_k \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then either $|U - U_k| \geq \epsilon$ or $U > \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ and so

\[ \delta \leq |\{U_k \geq 1/2\} \cap Q_1|_a \leq |\{U - U_k| \geq \epsilon\} \cap Q_1|_a + |\{U \geq 1/2 - \epsilon\} \cap Q_1|_a. \]
Passing to the limit as \( k \to +\infty \) and then as \( \epsilon \to 0 \), we deduce \(|\{U \geq 1/2\} \cap Q_1|_a \geq \delta \), which is in contradiction with (4.10). \( \square \)

**Remark 4.4.** To understand the role played by the assumption (4.1), it is useful to compare with the classical parabolic framework. The main difference here is that the parabolic equation (combined with the parabolic energy estimate) gives enough compactness for carrying out the contradiction argument. Indeed, let \( U_k \) be a sequence of weak solutions to (3.16) satisfying \( \|U_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1 \) in \( Q_2 \). For every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), we have

\[
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a \partial_t U_k \eta \, dX dt = - \int_{Q_1} |y|^a \nabla U_k \cdot \nabla \eta \, dX dt,
\]

for every \( \eta \in H^{1,a}_0(Q_1) \). Thus, noticing that the sequence \( \{U_k\}_k \) is uniformly bounded in \( L^2(-1,1: H^{1,a}(\mathbb{B}_1)) \) (by the parabolic energy estimate, see Remark 3.4) and using the equation of \( U_k \) above, we obtain that \( \{\partial_t U_k\}_k \) is uniformly bounded in \( L^2(-1,1: H^{-1,a}(\mathbb{B}_1)) \) and so, by the Aubin-Lions lemma, we have \( U_k \to U \) in \( L^{2,a}(Q_1) \), up to passing to a suitable subsequence. This is enough to show that \( U \) satisfies (4.4) and (3.8). To prove (4.10), it is enough to notice that, since \( \{U_k(t)\}_k \) is uniformly bounded in \( H^{1,a}(\mathbb{B}_1) \) for a.e. \( t \in (-1,1) \), we may also assume \( U_k(t_n) \to U(t_n) \) in \( L^{2,a}(\mathbb{B}_1) \) for a finite increasing sequence of times \( t_n \in (-1,1) \), up to passing to another subsequence. This allows us to pass to the limit into (3.17) (with \( \tau = t_{n+1} \) and \( s = t_n \)) and complete the argument of Step 3.

On the contrary, in our approximation setting, the weak formulation (1.12) and the energy estimate (3.2) are not sufficient to obtain strong compactness, which has to be required as an assumption, that is (4.1).

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \( N \geq 2 \), \( a \in (-1,1) \), \( (p,q) \) satisfying (1.11), and \( \tilde{Q} := \mathbb{B}_1 \times (-2,1) \). There exist \( \delta_0, \theta_0 \in (0,1) \) depending only on \( N, a, p \) and \( q \) such that for every \( U \), every sequence \( \varepsilon_j \to 0 \) and every sequence \( \{U_{\varepsilon_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) of weak solutions in \( Q_2 \) satisfying (4.1) with \( r = 2 \), such that

\[
\|U_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1, \quad |\{U_{\varepsilon_j} \leq 0\} \cap \tilde{Q}|_a \geq \frac{|\tilde{Q}|_a}{2},
\]

and

\[
(4.17) \quad \|F_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_2)} + \|f_{\varepsilon_j}\|_{L^{\infty}_a(Q_2)} \leq \delta_0,
\]

for every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), then

\[
U_{\varepsilon_j} \leq 1 - \tilde{\theta}_0 \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2},
\]

for every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \).

**Proof.** Let \( \sigma > 0 \) be as in Lemma 4.3, \( \delta_0 := 2^{-n_0} \sqrt{7} \), where \( n_0 \) is the largest integer such that

\[
(n_0 - 1) \sigma \leq |Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q}|_a,
\]

and \( \delta \in (0,1) \) will be chosen later. Let us set \( U_j = U_{\varepsilon_j}, F_j = F_{\varepsilon_j}, f_j = f_{\varepsilon_j} \) and define

\[
V_{j,n} := 2^n [U_j - (1 - 2^{-n})], \quad j, n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

The assumptions on \( U_j \) imply that \( V_{n,j} \) is a solution in \( Q_2 \) with \( F_{j,n} := 2^n F_j \) and \( f_{j,n} := 2^n f_j \), satisfying

\[
\|V_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1, \quad |\{V_{j,n} \leq 0\} \cap \tilde{Q}|_a \geq \frac{|\tilde{Q}|_a}{2},
\]

for every \( j, n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( V_{j,n} \to V_n := 2^n [U - (1 - 2^{-n})] \) in \( C([-4,4]: L^{2,a}(\mathbb{B}_2)) \) as \( j \to +\infty \). Further, notice that by (4.17) and the definition of \( \delta_0 \), we have

\[
\|F_{j,n}\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_2)} + \|f_{j,n}\|_{L^{\infty}_a(Q_2)} \leq 2^n \delta_0 \leq 2^{-n_0} \sqrt{7} \leq 1,
\]
for every \( n \leq n_0 \) and every \( j \). Now, fix \( \delta \in (0,1) \) and assume

\[
(4.18) \quad \int_{Q_1} |y|^a(V_{j,n+1})_+^2 \, dX \, dt \geq \delta.
\]

Then, using the definition of \( V_{j,n} \) (and \( V_{j,n+1} \)) and that \( V_{j,n} \leq 1 \), we easily see that

\[
|\{V_{j,n} \geq \frac{1}{2}\} \cap Q_1|_a = |\{V_{j,n+1} \geq \frac{1}{2}\} \cap Q_1|_a \geq \int_{Q_1} |y|^a(V_{j,n+1})_+^2 \, dX \, dt \geq \delta.
\]

Consequently, if \( (4.18) \) holds true for every \( n \leq n_0 \) and some \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), \( V_{j,n} \) satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 4.3 and so

\[
\{0 < V_{j,n} < 1/2\} \cap (Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q})|_a \geq \sigma,
\]

for every \( n \leq n_0 \). However, since \( \{0 < V_{j,n} < 1/2\} \cap \{0 < V_{j,m} < 1/2\} = \emptyset \) for every \( m \neq n \) and every \( j \), the above inequality implies \( |Q_1 \cup \tilde{Q}|_a \geq n_0 \sigma \), in contradiction with the definition of \( n_0 \). Consequently, \( (4.18) \) fails for \( n = n_0 \) and every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), that is

\[
\int_{Q_1} |y|^a(V_{j,n_0+1})_+^2 \, dX \, dt \leq \delta,
\]

for every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \). Let us set \( k_0 := n_0 + 1 \). Since \( (V_{j,k_0})_+ \) is a nonnegative subsolution (with \( (F_{j,k_0})_+ \) and \( (f_{j,k_0})_+ \)), we obtain by (3.1) and the definition of \( \delta_0 \)

\[
\|V_{j,k_0}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})} \leq C(\|V_{j,k_0}\|_{L^{\infty,a}(Q_1)} + \|F_{j,k_0}\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_1)}) \leq C\sqrt{\delta},
\]

for some \( C > 0 \) depending only on \( N, a, p \) and \( q \), and every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \). Now, taking \( \delta \) such that \( C\delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \), the above inequality gives \( V_{j,k_0} \leq \frac{1}{2} \) in \( Q_{1/2} \) for every \( j \) and thus

\[
U_j \leq 2^{-k_0-1} + (1 - 2^{-k_0}) = 1 - 2^{-k_0-1} \quad \forall j \in Q_{1/2},
\]

for every \( j \), which is our thesis, choosing \( \tilde{\theta}_0 := 2^{-k_0-1} \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.6.** Let \( N \geq 2, a \in (-1,1) \) and \( (p,q) \) satisfying (1.1). There exist \( \delta_0, \theta_0 \in (0,1) \) depending only on \( N, a, p \) and \( q \) such that for every \( U \) non-constant in \( \text{Q}_2 \), every sequence \( \{U_{\varepsilon_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) of weak solutions in \( \text{Q}_4 \) satisfying (4.11) with \( r = 4 \) and (4.2) for every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and some \( C_0 > 0 \), then there exist a subsequence \( j_k \to +\infty \) such that

\[
\text{osc}_Q U_{\varepsilon_{j_k}} \leq (1 - \theta_0) \text{osc}_Q U_{\varepsilon_{j_k}} + \frac{1}{\delta_0} (\|F_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_2)} + \|f_{\varepsilon_{j_k}}\|_{L^q_a}(Q_2))
\]

for every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

**Proof.** Let \( \delta_0, \tilde{\theta}_0 > 0 \) be as in Lemma 4.3. We set \( U_j = U_{\varepsilon_j}, F_j = F_{\varepsilon_j}, f_j = f_{\varepsilon_j} \) and define

\[
V_j := \frac{2}{K_j} \left(U_j - \text{ess sup}_{\text{Q}_2} U_j + \text{ess inf}_{\text{Q}_2} U_j\right), \quad K_j := \text{osc} \, U_j + \frac{2}{\delta_0} (\|F_j\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_2)} + \|f_j\|_{L^q_a(Q_2)}).
\]

Since \( U_j \to U \) a.e. in \( \text{Q}_4 \) and \( U \) is non-constant in \( \text{Q}_2 \), may assume \( \text{osc}_{\text{Q}_2} U_j \geq \delta \), for some \( \delta > 0 \) and every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) (in particular, \( K_j \geq \delta \) for every \( j \)). Further, each \( V_j \) is a weak solution in \( \text{Q}_4 \) (and thus in \( \text{Q}_2 \)) with \( \tilde{F}_j := \frac{2}{K_j} F_j, \tilde{f}_j := \frac{2}{K_j} f_j \) satisfying

\[
\|V_j\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \leq 1, \quad \|\tilde{F}_j\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_2)} + \|\tilde{f}_j\|_{L^q_a(Q_2)} = \frac{2}{K_j} (\|F_j\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_2)} + \|f_j\|_{L^q_a(Q_2)}) \leq \delta_0,
\]

for every \( j \), by definition of \( K_j \).
Now, in view of (4.1), we have that \( \{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) is uniformly bounded in \( L^{2,\alpha}(Q_4) \) and thus, by (3.1) and (4.2), it is bounded in \( L^\infty(Q_2) \). This implies the existence of a subsequence \( j_k \to +\infty, K \in [\delta, +\infty) \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) (both \( K \) and \( t \) are finite depending on \( \delta_0 \) and \( \|U\|_{L^{2,\alpha}(Q_2)} \)) such that

\[
K_k \to K, \quad \text{ess sup}_{Q_2} U_k + \text{ess inf}_{Q_2} U_k \to l
\]
as \( k \to +\infty \), where \( U_k := U_{j_k} \) and \( K_k := K_{j_k} \). As a consequence, one can easily verify that

\[
V_k \to V := \frac{2}{K} \left( U - \frac{l}{2} \right) \quad \text{in } C([-4, 4] : L^{2,\alpha}(B_2)),
\]
as \( k \to +\infty \), where \( V_k := V_{j_k} \). Furthermore, we notice that

\[
\text{if } |\{V_k \leq 0\} \cap \hat{Q}_a| \geq \frac{\|\hat{Q}\|}{2} \quad \text{for a finite number of indexes}
\]
then \( |\{-V_k \leq 0\} \cap \hat{Q}_a| \geq \frac{\|\hat{Q}\|}{2} \quad \text{for an infinite number of indexes},
\]
and thus, up to passing to an additional subsequence and eventually considering \(-V_k\) instead of \(V_k\), we may assume

\[
|\{V_k \leq 0\} \cap \hat{Q}_a| \geq \frac{\|\hat{Q}\|}{2},
\]
for every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Then, Lemma 4.5 yields

\[
V_k \leq 1 - \tilde{\theta}_0 \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2},
\]
for every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), that is

\[
U_k \leq \frac{1 - \tilde{\theta}_0}{2} \text{osc}_{Q_2} U_k + \frac{\text{ess sup}_{Q_2} U_k + \text{ess inf}_{Q_2} U_k}{2} + \frac{1 - \tilde{\theta}_0}{\delta_0} (\|F_k\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(Q_2)} + \|f_k\|_{L^p_{\infty}(Q_2)}) \quad \text{in } Q_{1/2}.
\]
Taking the sup_{Q_1/2} and subtracting inf_{Q_1/2} \(U_k\) in both sides, it is not difficult obtain

\[
\text{osc}_{Q_{1/2}} U_k \leq \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\theta}_0}{2}\right) \text{osc}_{Q_2} U_k + \frac{1 - \tilde{\theta}_0}{\delta_0} (\|F_k\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(Q_2)} + \|f_k\|_{L^p_{\infty}(Q_2)}),
\]
which is our thesis with \( \theta_0 = \frac{\tilde{\theta}_0}{2} \).

**Proof of Proposition 4.7.** Let \( \delta_0 \) and \( \theta_0 \) as in Corollary 4.6 We set \( U_j := U_{\varepsilon_j}, F_j := F_{\varepsilon_j}, f_j := f_{\varepsilon_j} \) and define

\[
V_j(X,t) := \frac{1}{K_j} U_j(X,t), \quad K_j := \|U_j\|_{L^\infty(Q_4)} + \|F_j\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(Q_4)} + \|f_j\|_{L^p_{\infty}(Q_4)},
\]
for every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \). Notice that thanks to (4.2), (4.1) and (3.1), \( \{K_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) is uniformly bounded from above and, since each \( U_j \) and \( U \) are non trivial in \( Q_4 \), we may also assume \( K_j \geq \delta \), for some \( \delta > 0 \) and every \( j \). Then, up to passing to a subsequence, \( K_j \to K \in \mathbb{R} \), with \( K \geq \delta \) as \( j \to +\infty \) and so

\[
(4.19) \quad V_j \to V \quad \text{in } C([-16, 16] : L^{2,\alpha}(B_4)), \quad V = \frac{1}{K} U,
\]
as \( j \to +\infty \).

Let \( r_n := 4^{-n}, n \in \mathbb{N} \). We show that there exist \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N}, C > 0 \) and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) depending only on \( N, a, p \) and \( q \) such that, up to passing to a subsequence \( \varepsilon_k := \varepsilon_{jk} \to 0 \) as \( k \to +\infty \), if \( V_k := V_{j_k} \), then for every \( (X_0, t_0) := (x_0, y_0, t_0) \in Q_1 \) we have

\[
(4.20) \quad \text{osc}_{Q_{4^{-n+1}}(X_0,t_0)} V_k \leq C 4^{-\alpha n},
\]
for every \( n \geq n_0 \) and every \( k \) such that \( \varepsilon_k \leq r_k^2 \). A standard contradiction argument (see for instance \[1\] Proof of Theorem 6.1, \[28\] Proof of Theorem 4.1) shows that it is enough to prove (4.20) for points \((X_0, t_0)\) with \( y_0 = 0 \): basically, if Hölder regularity (or oscillation decay) fails at some point, then such point must belong to the region where the weight \(|y|^a\) is degenerate or singular). As a consequence, since the equation of \( V_k \) is invariant under translations w.r.t. \( x \) and \( t \), it is enough to consider the case \((X_0, t_0) = 0\).

Now, let us define

\[
V_{j,n}(X, t) := \frac{1}{K_j} V_j(r_n X, r_nt), \quad j, n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

By Remark \[15\] each \( V_{j,n} \) satisfies

\[
\int_{Q_4} |y|^a (\varepsilon_j \xi_n \partial_t V_{j,n} \partial_t \eta + \partial_t V_{j,n} \eta + \nabla V_{j,n} \cdot \nabla \eta - F_{j,n} \eta) \, dX dt - \int_{Q_4} f_{j,n} \eta|_{y=0} \, dx dt = 0,
\]

for every \( \eta \in H^{1,a}_0(Q_4) \), where

\[
F_{j,n}(X, t) := \frac{1}{K_j} r_n^2 F_j(r_n X, r_n^2 t),
\]

\[
f_{j,n}(x, t) := \frac{1}{K_j} r_n^{-a} f_j(r_n x, r_n^2 t).
\]

By definition and scaling, we easily see that \( \|V_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty(Q_4)} \leq 1 \) and

\[
\|F_{j,n}\|_{L^{p,a}(Q_4)} + \|f_{j,n}\|_{L^p_{\infty}(Q_4)} \leq 2 \frac{r_n^{N+3+a}}{p} + r_n^{-a} \frac{\|f_j\|_{L^p_{\infty}(Q_4)}}{K_j} \leq r_n^\beta \leq \delta_0,
\]

for every \( n \geq n_0 \), some \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) we will fix below, and every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), where we have set \( \beta := \min\{2 - \frac{N+3+a}{p}, 1 - a - \frac{a}{q}\} > 0 \) (the fact that \( \beta > 0 \) follows from (1.11)). Further, exploiting (4.19), it is not difficult to check that for every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( V_{j,n} \to V_n \) in \( C([-16, 16] : L^{2,a}(\mathbb{R}_4)) \) as \( j \to +\infty \), where \( V_n(X, t) := V(r_n X, r_n^2 t) \).

Then, for every fixed \( n \geq n_0 \) the sequence \( V_{j,n} \) satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 4.6 and thus there exist subsequences \( j_k \to +\infty \) and \( \varepsilon_k := \varepsilon_{j_k} \to 0 \) such that for every fixed \( n \geq n_0 \) and every \( k \) such that \( \varepsilon_k \leq r_n^2 \), we have

\[
\text{osc}_{Q_1} V_{k,n} \leq (1 - \theta_0) \text{osc}_{Q_4} V_{k,n} + \frac{1}{\theta_0 r_n^\beta},
\]

where \( V_{k,n} := V_{j_k,n} \). Scaling back, it follows

\[
\text{osc}_{Q_4 - n} V_k \leq (1 - \theta_0) \text{osc}_{Q_4 - n+1} V_k + \frac{1}{\theta_0} 4^{-\beta n}
\]

for every \( k \) such that \( \varepsilon_k \leq r_n^2 \). Let us take \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( C > 0 \) satisfying

\[
\alpha < \beta, \quad 1 - \frac{\theta_0}{2} \leq 4^{-\alpha}, \quad 4^{\beta n_0} \geq \frac{1}{\theta_0}, \quad C = 2 \cdot 4^{\alpha n_0}.
\]

Then, if \( n = n_0 \), (4.20) holds true by definition of \( C \), recalling that \( \|V_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_4)} \leq 1 \), for every \( k \). Now, assume that (4.20) holds true for some \( n \geq n_0 \). Then, by definition of \( n_0, \alpha, C \) and (4.21) and the inductive assumption, we obtain

\[
\text{osc}_{Q_4 - n} V_k \leq (1 - \theta_0) \text{osc}_{Q_4 - n+1} V_k + \theta_0 4^{\beta(n_0-n)} \leq (1 - \theta_0) C 4^{-\alpha n} + \theta_0 4^{\beta(n_0-n)}
\]

\[
\leq (1 - \theta_0) C 4^{-\alpha n} + \theta_0 4^{\alpha(n_0-n)} = (1 - \frac{\theta_0}{2}) C 4^{-\alpha n} \leq C 4^{-\alpha(n+1)},
\]
for every $k$ such that $\varepsilon_k \leq r_{n+1}^2$, and so (4.20) follows.

To complete the proof, it is enough to check that

\begin{equation}
|V_k(X,t) - V_k(0)| \leq C\|(X,t)\|^\alpha,
\end{equation}

for every $(X,t) \in Q_1$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, taking eventually new $C > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$ depending only on $N$, $a$, $p$ and $q$. Given $(X,t) \in Q_1$, there is $n$ (depending on $(X,t)$) such that $(X,t) \in Q_{4^n} \setminus Q_{4^{n-1}}$, that is $4^{-n-1} \leq \|(X,t)\| \leq 4^{-n}$. If $n \leq n_0$, then

$$
|V_k(X,t) - V_k(0)| \leq \text{osc}_{Q_{4^n}} V_k \leq 2\|V_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_{4^n})} \leq 2 \leq 2 \cdot 4^{\alpha(n_0+1)}4^{-\alpha(n+1)} \leq 4^\alpha C\|(X,t)\|^\alpha,
$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where we have used that $\|V_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \leq 1$. If $n \geq n_0$ and $k$ is such that $\varepsilon_k \leq r_{n+1}^2$, then by (4.20), we have

$$
|V_k(X,t) - V_k(0)| \leq \text{osc}_{Q_{4^n}} V_k \leq C4^{-\alpha(n+1)} \leq C\|(X,t)\|^\alpha.
$$

Finally, if $n \geq n_0$ and $\frac{q}{p} \geq 1$, then the equation of $V_k$ (that is (1.12) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$, $R = 4$, $F = \frac{1}{R_k}F_k$ and $f = \frac{1}{R_k}f_k$) is an elliptic equation w.r.t. the variables $(X,t)$ (the coefficient in front of $\partial_t V_k$ is uniformly positive) and so by [38, Theorem 8.2] and [39, Theorem 1.5], we have the elliptic Hölder bound

$$
|V_k(X,t) - V_k(0)| \leq \tilde{C}\max\{|X|,|t|\}^{\tilde{\alpha}},
$$

for some $\tilde{C} > 0$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0,1)$ depending only on $N$, $a$, $p$ and $q$, and thus we obtain (4.22), since $|t| \leq |t|^{1/2}$ for every $t \in (-1,1)$. Re-writing it in terms of $U_k$, (4.3) follows. \hfill \Box

**Appendix A.**

In this section we review the definitions and some well-known properties of a class of energy spaces we use in our functional setting. The references for this part are [15, 19, 21, 23]. The symbols $I$, $B$ and $Q$ denote a generic interval in $\mathbb{R}$, a generic ball in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, and a generic parabolic cylinder in $\mathbb{R}^{N+2}$, respectively.

For $p > 1$ and $a \in (-1,1)$, we define

$$
\|U\|_{L^p,a(B)} := \left(\int_B |y|^a |U|^p \, dX\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|U\|_{L^p,a(Q)} := \left(\int_Q |y|^a |U|^p \, dXdt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
$$

We denote with $L^{p,a}(B)$ the closure of $C_0^\infty(B)$ w.r.t. the norm $\| \cdot \|_{L^p,a(B)}$, and $L^{p,a}(Q)$ the closure of $C_0^\infty(Q)$ w.r.t. the norm $\| \cdot \|_{L^p,a(Q)}$.

We set

$$
\|U\|_{H^{1,a}(B)} := \left(\int_B |y|^a U^2 \, dX + \int_B |y|^a \nabla U|^2 dX\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
$$

$$
\|U\|_{H^{1,a}(Q)} := \left(\int_Q |y|^a U^2 \, dXdt + \int_Q |y|^a (|\partial_t U|^2 + |\nabla U|^2) \, dXdt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
$$

The space $H^{1,a}(B)$ is the closure of $C^\infty(B)$ w.r.t. the norm $\| \cdot \|_{H^{1,a}(B)}$, while $H_0^{1,a}(B)$ denotes the closure of $C_0^\infty(B)$ w.r.t. the norm $\| \cdot \|_{H^{1,a}(B)}$. The spaces $H^{1,a}(Q)$ and $H_0^{1,a}(Q)$ are defined analogously, while $H^{-1,a}(B)$ is the dual space of $H_0^{1,a}(B)$. 


Finally, we set
\[ \|U\|_{L^2(I; L^2,α(\mathbb{B}))} := \left( \int_I \|U(t)\|_{L^2,α(\mathbb{B})}^2 \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \]
\[ \|U\|_{L^2(I; H^1,α(\mathbb{B}))} := \left( \int_I \|U(t)\|_{H^1,α(\mathbb{B})}^2 \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \]
and we define the spaces $L^2(I; L^2,α(\mathbb{B}))$ and $L^2(I; H^1,α(\mathbb{B}))$ as the closure of the space $C^∞(\mathbb{B} \times I)$ w.r.t. the norms $\| \cdot \|_{L^2(I; L^2,α(\mathbb{B}))}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{L^2(I; H^1,α(\mathbb{B}))}$, respectively.

As it is well-known, these spaces enjoy some notable properties that we resume below.

**Theorem A.1. (cf. [19, Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.6])**

Let $N \geq 1$, $a ∈ (-1, 1)$. There exist a unique bounded linear operator $|y=0 : H^1,α(\mathbb{B})_1 \to H^{\frac{1}{2}+a}(B_1)$ and a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $N$ and $a$, such that if $u = U|_{y=0}$ then
\[ \int_{B_1} u^2 \, dx + \iint_{B_1 \times B_1} \frac{(u(x) - u(z))^2}{|x - z|^{N+1-a}} \, dx \, dz \leq C \left( \int_{B_1} |y|^a U^2 \, dx + \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \, dx \right) \]
for every $U ∈ H^1,α(\mathbb{B})_1$. Furthermore, we have
\[ \int_{B_1} u^2 \, dx \leq C \left( A^{\frac{1}{2}+a} \int_{B_1} |y|^a U^2 \, dx + A^{-\frac{1}{2}+a} \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \, dx \right), \]
for every $A = 1$. Finally, we also have
\[ \left( \int_{B_1} |u|^{2q} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \, dx, \]
for every $U ∈ H^{\frac{1}{2}+a}(\mathbb{B})$ and every $q ∈ [1, \hat{σ}]$, where
\[ \hat{σ} := \frac{N}{N - 1 + a} = 1 + \frac{1 - a}{N - 1 + a}. \]

**Theorem A.2. ([19, Theorem 1.2] and [21, Theorem 6, $p = 2$, $s = N + 1 + a$])**

Let $N \geq 2$, $a ∈ (-1, 1)$ and $r > 0$. Then there exists a constant $S_0 > 0$ depending only on $N$ and $a$ such that
\[ \left( \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U|^{2σ} \, dX \right)^{\frac{1}{σ}} \leq S_0 \left( \frac{1}{r^a} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dX + \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \, dX \right), \]
for every $U ∈ H^1,α(\mathbb{B}_r)$, where
\[ σ := 1 + \frac{2}{N - 1 + a}. \]

**Theorem A.3. ([15, Lemma 2.1])**

Let $N \geq 2$, $a ∈ (-1, 1)$ and $r > 0$. Then there exists a constant $S > 0$ depending only on $N$ and $a$ such that
\[ \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U|^{2γ} \, dX \, dt \leq S \left( \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{Q_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dX \, dt + \int_{Q_r} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2 \, dX \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{σ}} \sup_{t ∈ (-r^2, r^2)} \left( \int_{\mathbb{B}_r} |y|^a U^2 \, dX \right)^{γ - 1}, \]
for every $U ∈ L^2(-r^2, r^2 : H^1,α(\mathbb{B}_r))$, where
\[ γ := \frac{2σ - 1}{σ} = 1 + \frac{2}{N + 1 + a}. \]
Proof. It is enough to prove the statement in the case \( r = 1 \). Let \( U \in L^2(-1, 1 : H^{1,\alpha}(B_1)) \), \( \sigma \) as in Theorem A.3, \( \gamma = (2\sigma - 1)/\sigma \) and \( \sigma' = \sigma/(\sigma - 1) \). For a.e. \( t \in (0, 1) \), we have

\[
\int_{B_1} |y|^\alpha |U|^2 \gamma \, dX = \int_{B_1} |y|^\alpha |U|^2/\sigma' \, dX \leq \left( \int_{B_1} |y|^\alpha |U|^2/\sigma \, dX \right)^{1/\sigma} \left( \int_{B_1} |y|^\alpha U^2 \, dX \right)^{1/\sigma'}
\]

\[
\leq C \left( \int_{B_1} |y|^\alpha U^2 \, dX + \int_{B_1} |y|^\alpha |\nabla U|^2 \, dX \right) \text{ess sup}_{t \in (-1, 1)} \left( \int_{B_1} |y|^\alpha U^2 \, dX \right)^{\gamma - 1},
\]

by Hölder inequality and Theorem A.3. The thesis follows integrating in time. \qed

APPENDIX B.

We report below the list of notations we use in the paper.

- \( I \) denotes a generic interval in \( \mathbb{R} \)
- \( X = (x, y) \)
- \( B_r(x_0) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x - x_0|^2 < r^2 \} \)
- \( B \) denotes a generic ball in \( \mathbb{R}^N \)
- \( |B|_1 := \int_B |y|^\alpha \, dX \)
- \( B_r(X_0) = \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} : |x - x_0|^2 + |y - y_0|^2 < r^2 \} \)
- \( B \) denotes a generic ball in \( \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \)
- \( Q_r(x_0, t_0) = B_r(x_0) \times \{0\} \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0 + r^2) \) (parabolic cylinder in \( \mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\} \times (0, \infty) \))
- \( Q \) denotes a generic parabolic cylinder in \( \mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\} \times (0, \infty) \)
- \( Q^+_r(x_0, t_0) := B_r(x_0) \times \{0\} \times (t_0, t_0 + r^2) \)
- \( Q_\infty = \mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\} \times (0, \infty) \)
- \( Q_r(X_0, t_0) = B_r(X_0) \times (t_0 - r^2, t_0 + r^2) \) (parabolic cylinder in \( \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times (0, \infty) \))
- \( Q^+_r(X_0, t_0) = B_r(X_0) \times (t_0, t_0 + r^2) \)
- \( Q_\infty = \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times (0, \infty) \)
- \( Q \) denotes a generic parabolic cylinder in \( \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times (0, \infty) \)
- \( |Q|_a := \int_Q |y|^\alpha \, dX \, dt \)
- \( \mathbb{R}^N_+ := \mathbb{R}^N \times \{ y > 0 \} \)
- \( \text{osc}_Q U := \text{ess sup}_Q U - \text{ess inf}_Q U \).
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