

**MARCINKIEWICZ REGULARITY FOR SINGULAR PARABOLIC
 p -LAPLACE TYPE EQUATIONS WITH MEASURE DATA**

JUNG-TAE PARK

ABSTRACT. We consider quasilinear parabolic equations with measurable coefficients when the right-hand side is a signed Radon measure with finite total mass, having p -Laplace type:

$$u_t - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{a}(Du, x, t) = \mu \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}.$$

In the singular range $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$, we establish regularity estimates for the spatial gradient of solutions in the Marcinkiewicz spaces, under a suitable density condition of the right-hand side measure.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study some integrability results of the spatial gradient of solutions to nonlinear parabolic problems with measure data, having the p -Laplace type:

$$(1.1) \quad u_t - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{a}(Du, x, t) = \mu \quad \text{in } \Omega_T,$$

where μ is a signed Radon measure with finite total mass, that is, $|\mu|(\Omega_T) < \infty$. As usual the unknown is $u : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $u = u(x, t)$, where $\Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T)$ is a cylindrical domain with a bounded, open subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, and $T > 0$. We write $Du := D_x u$. The vector field $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is assumed to be measurable in (x, t) , continuous in ξ , and subject to the structure conditions

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} |\mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)| \leq \Lambda_1 |\xi|^{p-1}, \\ \langle \mathbf{a}(\xi_1, x, t) - \mathbf{a}(\xi_2, x, t), \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle \geq \Lambda_0 \left(|\xi_1|^2 + |\xi_2|^2 \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2 \end{cases}$$

for almost every $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, for any $\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for some constants $\Lambda_1 \geq \Lambda_0 > 0$. A typical prototype of (1.1) is the parabolic p -Laplace equation

$$(1.3) \quad u_t - \operatorname{div} (|Du|^{p-2} Du) = \mu.$$

According to the range of p , the equation (1.3) can be divided into three types. If $p = 2$, then (1.3) just becomes the classical heat equation. At points where $|Du| = 0$, the diffusivity coefficient $|Du|^{p-2}$ vanishes if $p > 2$ and it blows up if $1 < p < 2$. Thus (1.3) for $p > 2$ is called *degenerate parabolic p -Laplace equation*. When $1 < p < 2$, (1.3) is referred to as *singular parabolic p -Laplace equation*.

Date: July 20, 2021.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35K92; Secondary 35R06, 35B65.

Key words and phrases. singular parabolic equation; measure data; Marcinkiewicz space.

J.-T. Park was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea grant (No. NRF-2019R1C1C1003844) from the Korea government and a KIAS Individual Grant (No. MG068102) from Korea Institute for Advanced Study.

In this paper, we shall deal with the singular range

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1},$$

while the other singular range $2 - \frac{1}{n+1} < p < 2$ has been considered in [5], and the degenerate range $p \geq 2$ has been treated in [3, 8]. The lower bound on p in (1.4) is natural and sharp, since it is related to the existence of the (Barenblatt) fundamental solution (see for instance [40, Chapter 11.4]).

Our aim of this paper is to establish Marcinkiewicz estimates for the spatial gradient of solutions to the singular parabolic measure data problems (1.1) satisfying (1.2) and (1.4), under some decay conditions on the right-hand side measure (see Section 2.3). To formulate our main results, we define certain so-called *Morrey-type condition* for a measure as follow. For a signed Radon measure μ with finite total mass, we say that μ satisfies a *Morrey-type condition*, written $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa}(\Omega_T)$, provided that

$$|\mu|(Q) \leq C_0 |Q|^{1-\frac{\kappa}{N}} \quad (0 \leq \kappa \leq N, C_0 \geq 1)$$

holds for any parabolic cylinder $Q \subset \Omega_T$ of parabolic dimension N (see Definition 2.2 for details). Then we shall prove

$$\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa}(\Omega_T) \text{ for } \kappa_c < \kappa \leq N \implies Du \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}^\gamma(\Omega_T),$$

where two constants $\kappa_c = \kappa_c(n, p, N) \geq 1$ and $\gamma = \gamma(n, p, \kappa, N) \geq 1$ are determined explicitly later. Here $\mathcal{M}^\gamma(\Omega_T)$ is the Marcinkiewicz space (see (2.2) for definition).

To prove our main results, we use some covering arguments via a so-called *maximal function free technique* introduced in [1] (see Section 4). This approach is suitable to the situation in which it occurs the lack of homogeneity (roughly speaking it scales differently in time and space) of nonlinear parabolic problems, such as p -Laplacian with $p \neq 2$ or porous medium equation. In this paper, this covering arguments are considered under the following intrinsic parabolic cylinders:

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{s}{r^2} = \lambda^{2-p} \quad \text{with} \quad \int_{Q_{r,s}(z_0)} |Du|^\theta dxdt \approx \lambda^\theta \quad \text{for some } \theta \in (0, 1),$$

where $Q_{r,s}(z_0) := B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - s, t_0 + s)$. We point out that the spatial gradient of a solution u of (1.1) may not belong to the L^1 space under (1.4). For this reason, we need a notion of solution in a renormalized sense (see Section 2.2). Also, in this circumstance, we show a decay estimate of the upper-level sets of $|Du|$ (see Section 4.2), alongside with (1.5) and difference estimates (see Section 3).

There are several results concerning gradient regularity for parabolic p -Laplace type equations with measure data for $p > 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$, as follows.

- Potential estimates: e.g. [18] for $p = 2$, [27, 28] for $p \geq 2$, and [26] for $2 - \frac{1}{n+1} < p \leq 2$.
- Marcinkiewicz estimates: e.g. [3, 8] for $p \geq 2$, and [5] for $2 - \frac{1}{n+1} < p < 2$.
- Fractional differentiability: e.g. [4, 6, 9] for $p = 2$.
- Calderón-Zygmund type estimates: e.g. [11, 31, 32] for $p = 2$, and [12] for $p > 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$.

Compared to the results mentioned above, there are few regularity results for the case $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$. We refer to [36] for global Calderón-Zygmund type estimates on nonsmooth domains. It is worthwhile to note that there are regularity estimates (see [16, 33–35]) for elliptic measure data problems with $1 < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notation, terminologies and renormalized solutions, and we present our main results. In Section 3, we collect comparison estimates between our p -Laplace type problem and its reference problems. Finally, in Section 4, we prove our main results, by deriving decay estimates via covering arguments under intrinsic parabolic cylinders.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Notation and definitions. In what follows, we denote by c a universal positive constant that can be computed in terms of known quantities. The exact value denoted by c may be different from line to line. Let $B_r(x_0)$ denote the open ball in \mathbb{R}^n with center x_0 and radius $r > 0$, and let $I_r(t_0) := (t_0 - r^2, t_0 + r^2)$. We denote by

$$Q_r(z_0) := B_r(x_0) \times I_r(t_0)$$

the *standard parabolic cylinder* in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} =: \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with center $z_0 := (x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, radius r and height $2r^2$, of *parabolic dimension* $N := n + 2$. For $\lambda > 0$, we consider the *intrinsic parabolic cylinder*

$$Q_r^\lambda(z_0) := \underbrace{\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < \lambda^{\frac{p-2}{2}} r \right\}}_{=: B_r^\lambda(x_0)} \times I_r(t_0).$$

When $p = 2$ or $\lambda = 1$, the intrinsic parabolic cylinder coincides with the standard parabolic cylinder. Also we have $Q_r^\lambda(z_0) \subset Q_r(z_0)$ if $\lambda \geq 1$ and $p \leq 2$. The concept of *intrinsic* means, roughly speaking, that the size of parabolic cylinders depends on the solution of a given PDE in some integral average sense; in particular, the formulation (1.5) can be rewritten as

$$\int_{Q_r^\lambda(z_0)} |Du|^\theta dxdt \approx \lambda^\theta \quad \text{for some } \theta \in (0, 1).$$

Under this setting, we shall consider various a priori estimates for the spatial gradient of a solution later. We refer to [13, 28, 39] for more detailed information of intrinsic geometry related to the intrinsic parabolic cylinder.

Let us define the truncation operator

$$(2.1) \quad T_k(s) := \max\{-k, \min\{k, s\}\} \quad \text{for any } k > 0 \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For each set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $|Q|$ is the $(n + 1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure of Q and χ_Q is the usual characteristic function of Q . For $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, \bar{f}_Q stands for the integral average of f over a parabolic cylinder $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$; that is,

$$\bar{f}_Q := \int_Q f(z) dxdt := \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q f(z) dxdt, \quad \text{where } z := (x, t).$$

Finally, we define a certain function space. For $0 < \gamma < \infty$, the space $\mathcal{M}^\gamma(\Omega_T)$ is the so-called *Marcinkiewicz space* (or the *weak- L^γ space*), defined as the set of all measurable functions f such that

$$(2.2) \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{M}^\gamma(\Omega_T)} := \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda |\{z \in \Omega_T : |f(z)| > \lambda\}|^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} < \infty.$$

We observe the following connection between the Marcinkiewicz and Lebesgue spaces: $L^\gamma(\Omega_T) \subset \mathcal{M}^\gamma(\Omega_T) \subset L^{\gamma-\varepsilon}(\Omega_T)$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma)$. We refer to [22, Chapter 1] for various properties for the Marcinkiewicz space.

2.2. Renormalized solutions. Our solution u will be treated in a very weak sense because our solution does not generally belong to the usual energy space. Moreover, under (1.4), the spatial gradient of a solution may not be in $L^1(\Omega_T)$ (see [26, Section 1.3]). For this, we have the following: if u is a measurable function defined in Ω_T , finite almost everywhere, such that $T_k(u) \in L^p(0, T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ for any $k > 0$, then there exists a unique measurable function U such that $DT_k(u) = U\chi_{\{|u|<k\}}$ a.e. in Ω_T for all $k > 0$. In this case, we denote the spatial gradient Du of u by $Du := U$. We note that if $u \in L^1(0, T; W_0^{1,1}(\Omega))$, then it coincides with the usual weak gradient. Also, to define a new notion of solution, let us introduce a nonlinear parabolic capacity (see [2, 17, 23, 38] for details). For every open subset $Q \subset \Omega_T$, the p -parabolic capacity of Q is defined by

$$\text{cap}_p(Q) := \inf \{ \|u\|_W : u \in W, u \geq \chi_Q \text{ a.e. in } \Omega_T \},$$

where $W := \left\{ u \in L^p(0, T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)) : u_t \in L^{p'}(0, T; W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)) \right\}$ endowed with the norm $\|u\|_W := \|u\|_{L^p(0,T;W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))} + \|u_t\|_{L^{p'}(0,T;W^{-1,p'}(\Omega))}$. Here $p' := \frac{p}{p-1}$. Let $\mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$ (or $\mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega)$, $\mathfrak{M}_b(0, T)$) be the space of all signed Radon measures on Ω_T (or Ω , $(0, T)$, respectively) with finite total mass. We denote by $\mathfrak{M}_a(\Omega_T)$ the subspace of $\mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$, which is absolutely continuous with respect to the p -parabolic capacity. We also denote by $\mathfrak{M}_s(\Omega_T)$ the space of finite signed Radon measures in Ω_T with support on a set of zero p -parabolic capacity. Then a measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$ can be uniquely decomposed into the following: $\mu = \mu_a + \mu_s$, where $\mu_a \in \mathfrak{M}_a(\Omega_T)$ and $\mu_s \in \mathfrak{M}_s(\Omega_T)$, see [20, Lemma 2.1]. Also, $\mu_a \in \mathfrak{M}_a(\Omega_T)$ if and only if $\mu_a = f + g_t + \text{div } G$, where $f \in L^1(\Omega_T)$, $g \in L^p(0, T; V)$ and $G \in L^{p'}(\Omega_T)$, see [17, 25]. We write $\mu = \mu^+ - \mu^-$, where μ^+ and μ^- are the positive and negative parts, respectively, of a measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$ and set $|\mu| := \mu^+ + \mu^-$.

Now we introduce the suitable notion of a solution as follows:

Definition 2.1 (See [37]). *Let $\mu = \mu_a + \mu_s \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$ with $\mu_a \in \mathfrak{M}_a(\Omega_T)$ and $\mu_s \in \mathfrak{M}_s(\Omega_T)$. A function $u \in L^1(\Omega_T)$ is a renormalized solution of the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem*

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} u_t - \text{div } \mathbf{a}(Du, x, t) = \mu & \text{in } \Omega_T, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial_p \Omega_T, \end{cases}$$

satisfying (1.2) and (1.4) if $T_k(u) \in L^p(0, T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ for every $k > 0$ and the following property holds: for any $k > 0$ there exist sequences of nonnegative measures $\nu_k^+, \nu_k^- \in \mathfrak{M}_a(\Omega_T)$ such that

$$\nu_k^+ \rightarrow \mu_s^+, \nu_k^- \rightarrow \mu_s^- \quad \text{tightly as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad - \int_{\Omega_T} T_k(u) \varphi_t \, dxdt + \int_{\Omega_T} \langle \mathbf{a}(DT_k(u), x, t), D\varphi \rangle \, dxdt = \int_{\Omega_T} \varphi \, d\mu_k$$

for every $\varphi \in W \cap L^\infty(\Omega_T)$ with $\varphi(\cdot, T) = 0$, where $\mu_k := \mu_a + \nu_k^+ - \nu_k^-$.

Here the parabolic boundary of Ω_T is $\partial_p \Omega_T := (\partial\Omega \times [0, T]) \cup (\Omega \times \{0\})$, and we say that a sequence $\{\mu_k\} \subset \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$ converges *tightly* (or *in the narrow topology of measures*) to $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$ if

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_T} \varphi \, d\mu_k = \int_{\Omega_T} \varphi \, d\mu$$

for every bounded and continuous function φ on Ω_T . We refer to [36, Section 1.1] and the references given there for further discussion of renormalized solutions.

2.3. Main results. We start by introducing a density condition of a measure.

Definition 2.2. (i) For $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$, we say that μ satisfies a Morrey-type condition, written $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa}(\Omega_T)$, provided that

$$|\mu|(Q) \leq C_0 |Q|^{1-\frac{\kappa}{N}} \quad (0 \leq \kappa \leq N, C_0 \geq 1)$$

holds for any parabolic cylinder $Q(\equiv Q_r(z_0)$ or $Q_r^\lambda(z_0)) \subset \Omega_T$.

(ii) Similarly, for $\mu_1 \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega)$, we define

$$\mu_1 \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa_1}(\Omega) \iff |\mu_1|(B) \leq C_1 |B|^{1-\frac{\kappa_1}{n}} \quad (0 \leq \kappa_1 \leq n, C_1 \geq 1)$$

holds for any ball $B(\equiv B_r(x_0)$ or $B_r^\lambda(x_0)) \subset \Omega$.

(iii) Also, for $\mu_2 \in \mathfrak{M}_b(0, T)$, we define

$$\mu_2 \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa_2}(0, T) \iff |\mu_2|(I_r(t_0)) \leq C_2 |I_r(t_0)|^{1-\frac{\kappa_2}{2}} \quad (0 \leq \kappa_2 \leq 2, C_2 \geq 1)$$

holds for any interval $I_r(t_0) \subset (0, T)$.

Remark 2.3. (i) By definition, we have $\mathcal{L}^{1,N}(\Omega_T) \equiv \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$. For example, the dirac measure charging a point in Ω_T belongs to $\mathcal{L}^{1,N}(\Omega_T)$.

(ii) Indeed, our definition captures information of intrinsic parabolic cylinders as well as standard ones (see cf. [3, 5]).

We are ready to state the first main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.4. Let $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$. There exists a constant $\kappa_c = \kappa_c(n, p) \geq 1$ such that if u is a renormalized solution of the problem (2.3) under (1.2) with $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa}(\Omega_T)$ for $\kappa_c < \kappa \leq N := n + 2$, then

$$(2.5) \quad Du \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}^\gamma(\Omega_T), \quad \text{where } \gamma := \frac{\kappa((n+1)p - n)}{(\kappa - 1)(n + 2)}.$$

Moreover, for any given θ satisfying

$$(2.6) \quad \max \left\{ \frac{n+2}{2(n+1)}, \frac{(2-p)n}{2} \right\} < \theta < p - \frac{n}{n+1} \leq 1,$$

there is a constant $c = c(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \kappa, C_0, \theta) \geq 1$ such that

$$(2.7) \quad \|Du\|_{\mathcal{M}^\gamma(Q_R)}^\gamma \leq cR^N \left\{ \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{|Q_{2R}|} \right]^d + \left(\int_{Q_{2R}} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{d\gamma}{\theta}} + 1 \right\}$$

for any standard parabolic cylinder $Q_{2R} \equiv Q_{2R}(z_0) \Subset \Omega_T$, where the scaling deficit d is defined by

$$(2.8) \quad d := \frac{2\theta}{2\theta - (2-p)n}.$$

Theorem 2.4 provides a precise quantitative estimate of the spatial gradient of a renormalized solution in terms of the Marcinkiewicz space, under the assumption that the measure on the right-hand side satisfies the Morrey-type condition. Roughly speaking, the less concentrated the measure μ is (i.e. the smaller κ is), the better the integrability of Du is (i.e. the bigger γ is).

Remark 2.5. (i) When $\kappa = N$, the value γ has the minimum $p - \frac{n}{n+1}$. Also, κ_c is the critical value such that $\gamma = p(1 + \sigma)$; that is, $\frac{\kappa_c((n+1)p-n)}{(\kappa_c-1)(n+2)} = p(1 + \sigma)$, see Section 4.3 for details. Here σ is the constant coming from a higher integrability for homogeneous problems (Lemma 3.3). Thus, we have

$$p - \frac{n}{n+1} \leq \gamma < p(1 + \sigma) \quad \text{for } \kappa_c < \kappa \leq N.$$

- (ii) As $p \searrow \frac{2n}{n+1}$, the constant c in (2.7) blows up.
- (iii) The relation (2.6) comes from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 below, which determines the lower bound of p .
- (iv) The scaling deficit like (2.8) occurs when we study regularity theories for PDE having anisotropic structures such as parabolic p -Laplace ($p \neq 2$) equations, see e.g. [1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 24, 26–28, 36].
- (v) There are previous results related to Theorem 2.4, see [3, 8] for $p \geq 2$ and [5] for $2 - \frac{1}{n+1} < p < 2$. We also refer to [29, 30] for counterparts of elliptic problems.

Theorem 2.4 also gives the following direct consequence when μ is merely a finite signed Radon measure (i.e. $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$).

Corollary 2.6. Let $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$. If u is a renormalized solution of (2.3) under (1.2) satisfying $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_b(\Omega_T)$, then $Du \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}^{p-\frac{n}{n+1}}(\Omega_T)$. Moreover, the estimate (2.7) holds for $\kappa = N$ and $\gamma = p - \frac{n}{n+1}$.

When the measure μ is time- or space-independent or can be decomposed as

$$\mu = \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2,$$

we obtain Marcinkiewicz bounds like Theorem 2.4. Here the symbol \otimes denotes the usual tensor product of measures.

Theorem 2.7. Let $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$ and let u be a renormalized solution of the problem (1.1) under (1.2).

- (i) Let $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{L}^{1, \kappa_1}(\Omega)$ for $\kappa_1 \in (1, n]$ and let $\mu_2 \in L^s(0, T)$ for $s \in [N, \infty]$. Then there exists a constant $\kappa_{1,c} = \kappa_{1,c}(n, p) \geq 1$ such that for $\kappa_{1,c} < \kappa_1 \leq n$, we have

$$(2.9) \quad Du \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}^{\gamma_1}(\Omega_T), \quad \text{where } \gamma_1 := \frac{\kappa_1((n+1)p-n)}{\kappa_1 N - n}.$$

- (ii) Let $\mu_1 \in L^\tau(\Omega)$ for $\tau \in [N, \infty]$ and let $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{L}^{1, \kappa_2}(0, T)$ for $\kappa_2 \in (1, 2]$. Then there exists a constant $\kappa_{2,c} = \kappa_{2,c}(n, p) \geq 1$ such that for $\kappa_{2,c} < \kappa_2 \leq 2$, we have

$$(2.10) \quad Du \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}^{\gamma_2}(\Omega_T), \quad \text{where } \gamma_2 := \left[1 - \frac{n}{(\kappa_2 - 1)\tau + n} \right] \frac{\kappa_2((n+1)p-n)}{(\kappa_2 - 1)(n+2)}.$$

Remark 2.8. (i) By analogy with Remark 2.5(i), we see that

$$p - \frac{n}{n+1} \leq \gamma_i < p(1 + \sigma) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

- (ii) γ_1 is independent of the time parameter s , while γ_2 depends on both space and time parameters τ and κ_2 , see Lemma 3.6 for details.
- (iii) In Theorem 2.7, there are some quantitative estimates similar to (2.7).

Theorem 2.4 can be improved under more regular vector field than (1.2). We consider the vector field $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)$ measurable in (x, t) and C^1 -regular in ξ , satisfying

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{cases} |\mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)| + |\xi| |D_\xi \mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)| \leq \Lambda_1 |\xi|^{p-1}, \\ \Lambda_0 |\xi|^{p-2} |\eta|^2 \leq \langle D_\xi \mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t) \eta, \eta \rangle \end{cases}$$

for almost every $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, for every $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and for some constants $\Lambda_1 \geq \Lambda_0 > 0$. Note that (2.11) implies the monotonicity condition (1.2)₂. For an improvement of Theorem 2.4, we also need the following condition. Let $\delta, R_0 > 0$. We say that the vector field $\mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)$ is (δ, R_0) -BMO if

$$(2.12) \quad \sup_{t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{0 < r \leq R_0} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_r(y)} \Theta(\mathbf{a}, B_r(y))(x, t) \, dx dt \leq \delta,$$

where

$$\Theta(\mathbf{a}, B_r(y))(x, t) := \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \left| \frac{\mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)}{|\xi|^{p-1}} - \int_{B_r(y)} \frac{\mathbf{a}(\xi, \tilde{x}, t)}{|\xi|^{p-1}} \, d\tilde{x} \right|.$$

We remark that the map $x \mapsto \frac{\mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)}{|\xi|^{p-1}}$ is of BMO (Bounded Mean Oscillation) such that its BMO seminorm is less than δ , uniformly in ξ and t . This condition allows merely measurability in t -variable and discontinuity in x -variable. It also includes VMO (Vanishing Mean Oscillation) condition.

Finally, we obtain the following regularity result.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$. Assume that the vector field \mathbf{a} satisfies (2.11) and a (δ, R_0) -BMO condition for some $\delta, R_0 > 0$. If u be a renormalized solution of the problem (1.1) with $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1, \kappa}(\Omega_T)$ for $1 < \kappa \leq N$, then we have $Du \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}^\gamma(\Omega_T)$, where γ is given by (2.5) with the range $p - \frac{n}{n+1} \leq \gamma < \infty$. Moreover the estimate (2.7) holds.*

3. COMPARISON ESTIMATES

In this section we derive comparison estimates between the problem (2.3) and its references problems, under the assumptions on the vector field $\mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t)$ and the measure μ . (see Propositions 3.7 and 3.9). From Definition 2.1, we can regard $T_k(u) \in L^p(0, T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ as a weak solution of (2.4) with $\mu_k \in L^{p'}(0, T; W^{-1,p'}(\Omega))$. Throughout this section, we replace $T_k(u)$ by u and μ_k by μ .

Let w be the unique weak solution to the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} w_t - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{a}(Dw, x, t) = 0 & \text{in } Q_{4r}^\lambda(z_0) \Subset \Omega_T, \\ w = u & \text{on } \partial_p Q_{4r}^\lambda(z_0), \end{cases}$$

where the vector field \mathbf{a} satisfies (1.2). In this section, we for simplicity omit the center z_0 in $Q_{4r}^\lambda(z_0)$.

We first give a comparison estimate for $Du - Dw$ as follows:

Lemma 3.1 (See [36, Lemma 3.1]). *Let $\frac{3n+2}{2n+2} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$, let u be a weak solution of (2.4) and let w as in (3.1) under (1.2). Then there exists a constant*

$c = c(n, \Lambda_0, p, \theta) \geq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{Q_{4r}^\lambda} |Du - Dw|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} &\leq c \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} \\ &\quad + c \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right] \left(\int_{Q_{4r}^\lambda} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{(2-p)(n+1)}{\theta(n+2)}} \end{aligned}$$

for any constant θ such that $\frac{n+2}{2(n+1)} < \theta < p - \frac{n}{n+1} \leq 1$.

Remark 3.2. We refer to [26, Lemma 4.3] for $2 - \frac{1}{n+1} < p \leq 2$ and [28, Lemma 4.1] for $p \geq 2$.

We next introduce a higher integrability result for Dw .

Lemma 3.3 (See [24, 36]). Let $\frac{2n}{n+2} < p \leq 2$ and let $\frac{(2-p)n}{2} < \theta \leq p$. If w is the weak solution of (3.1) under (1.2) satisfying

$$\int_{Q_{4r}^\lambda} |Dw|^\theta dxdt \leq c_w \lambda^\theta$$

for some constant $c_w \geq 1$, then there exist two constants $\sigma = \sigma(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta) > 0$ and $c = c(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta, c_w) \geq 1$ such that

$$\int_{Q_{2r}^\lambda} |Dw|^{p(1+\sigma)} dxdt \leq c \lambda^{p(1+\sigma)}.$$

Remark 3.4. Lemma 3.3 also holds for the case $p \geq 2$ under an appropriate range of θ (see [12, 24]).

If the measure μ satisfies a Morrey-type condition (see Definition 2.2), then we have the following relation:

Lemma 3.5. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa}(\Omega_T)$ for some $1 < \kappa \leq N := n + 2$. Then there exists a constant $c = c(n, p, \kappa, C_0) \geq 1$, where C_0 is given in Definition 2.2(i), such that

$$\left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} \leq c \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

where γ is given by (2.5).

Proof. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} (3.2) \quad \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} &= \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} |Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{1}{(n+1)p-n}} \\ &= \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{\alpha \frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{(1-\alpha) \frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} |Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{1}{(n+1)p-n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is to be determined later. On the other hand, the assumption $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa}(\Omega_T)$ provides

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \leq C_0 |Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{-\frac{\kappa}{N}} \quad \text{for any } Q_{4r}^\lambda \subset \Omega_T.$$

Inserting (3.3) into the second term on the right-hand side of (3.2) yields

$$(3.4) \quad \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} \leq \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^\alpha C_0^{(1-\alpha)\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} |Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\tilde{\alpha}},$$

where $\tilde{\alpha} := -\frac{\kappa(1-\alpha)}{(n+1)p-n} + \frac{1}{(n+1)p-n}$. Here we fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $\tilde{\alpha} = 0$; i.e., $\alpha = \frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa}$. Such a choice of α in (3.4) gives

$$\left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} \leq C_0^{\frac{n+2}{\kappa((n+1)p-n)}} \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{\frac{(\kappa-1)(n+2)}{\kappa((n+1)p-n)}},$$

which completes the proof. \square

If the measure μ admits a favorable decomposition, we obtain

Lemma 3.6. *Assume that the measure μ has the following decomposition*

$$\mu = \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2.$$

- (i) *Let $r \in (0, 1]$. If $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{L}^{1, \kappa_1}(\Omega)$ for $1 < \kappa_1 \leq n$ and $\mu_2 \in L^s(0, T)$ for $s \in [N, \infty]$, then there exists a constant $c = c(n, p, \kappa_1, C_1, s, \|\mu_2\|_{L^s(0, T)}) \geq 1$, where C_1 is given in Definition 2.2 (ii), such that*

$$(3.5) \quad \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} \leq c \left[\frac{|\mu_1|(B_{4r}^\lambda)}{|B_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1}},$$

where γ_1 is given in (2.9).

- (ii) *Let $\lambda \geq 1$. If $\mu_1 \in L^\tau(\Omega)$ for $\tau \in [N, \infty]$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{L}^{1, \kappa_2}(0, T)$ for $1 < \kappa_2 \leq 2$, then there exists a constant $c = c(n, p, \kappa_2, C_2, \tau, \|\mu_1\|_{L^\tau(\Omega)}) \geq 1$, where C_2 is given in Definition 2.2 (iii), such that*

$$(3.6) \quad \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{n+2}}} \right]^{\frac{n+2}{(n+1)p-n}} \leq c \left[\frac{|\mu_2|(I_{4r})}{|I_{4r}|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2}},$$

where γ_2 is given in (2.10).

Proof. To derive (3.5), our assumption implies

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{|\mu_1|(B_{4r}^\lambda)}{|B_{4r}^\lambda|} \leq C_1 |B_{4r}^\lambda|^{-\frac{\kappa_1}{n}} \quad \text{and} \\ |\mu_2|(I_{4r}) := \int_{I_{4r}} |\mu_2| \, dxdt \leq \|\mu_2\|_{L^s(I_{4r})} |I_{4r}|^{1-\frac{1}{s}}.$$

Then similar computations as in (3.2) and (3.4) applying (3.7) yield

$$(3.8) \quad \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{N}}} \right]^{\frac{N}{(n+1)p-n}} \leq c_1 \left[\frac{|\mu_1|(B_{4r}^\lambda)}{|B_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^\alpha \lambda^{\alpha_1} (4r)^{\alpha_2}$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ to be determined later, where

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &:= \|\mu_2\|_{L^s(B_{4r}^\lambda)}^{\frac{N}{(n+1)p-n}} C_1^{(1-\alpha)\frac{N}{(n+1)p-n}}, \\ \alpha_1 &:= \frac{n(p-2)}{2((n+1)p-n)} \left(1 - (1-\alpha)\kappa_1 \frac{N}{n}\right), \\ \alpha_2 &:= \frac{N}{(n+1)p-n} \left(-\kappa_1(1-\alpha) - \frac{2}{s} + 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we choose $\alpha = 1 - \frac{n}{\kappa_1 N}$ such that $\alpha_1 = 0$, which determines γ_1 ,

$$\alpha_1 = 0 \iff \alpha = 1 - \frac{n}{\kappa_1 N} \iff \gamma_1 = \frac{\kappa_1((n+1)p-n)}{\kappa_1 N - n}.$$

Then such choice of α yields that $\alpha_2 \geq 0$ for any $s \in [N, \infty]$; hence, $r^{\alpha_2} \leq 1$ for any $r \in (0, 1]$, which proves (3.5).

To prove (3.6), we deduce from the assumption that

$$(3.9) \quad |\mu_1|(B_{4r}^\lambda) \leq \|\mu_1\|_{L^\tau(B_{4r}^\lambda)} |B_{4r}^\lambda|^{1-\frac{1}{\tau}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\mu_2|(I_{4r})}{|I_{4r}|} \leq C_2 |I_{4r}|^{-\frac{\kappa_2}{2}}.$$

According to calculations similar to (3.8) with (3.9), we see

$$\left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|^{\frac{n+1}{N}}} \right]^{\frac{N}{(n+1)p-n}} \leq c_2 \left[\frac{|\mu_2|(I_{4r})}{|I_{4r}|} \right]^{\alpha \frac{N}{(n+1)p-n}} \lambda^{\alpha_3} (4r)^{\alpha_4}$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ to be determined later, where

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &:= \|\mu_1\|_{L^\tau(B_{4r}^\lambda)}^{\frac{N}{(n+1)p-n}} C_2^{(1-\alpha)\frac{N}{(n+1)p-n}}, \\ \alpha_3 &:= \frac{n(p-2)N}{2((n+1)p-n)} \left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{\tau}\right), \\ \alpha_4 &:= \frac{N}{(n+1)p-n} \left(-\kappa_2(1-\alpha) + 1 - \frac{n}{\tau}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\alpha_4 = 0 \iff \alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{\kappa_2} \left(1 - \frac{n}{\tau}\right) \iff \gamma_2 = \frac{\kappa_2 \tau ((n+1)p-n)}{(\tau(\kappa_2-1) + n)N}.$$

Also for any $\tau \in [N, \infty]$, it holds $\alpha_3 \leq 0$; hence, $\lambda^{\alpha_3} \leq 1$ for any $\lambda \geq 1$, which proves (3.5). \square

Combining all the previous results, we derive

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$, let $0 < \delta < 1$, and let θ be a constant such that $\max\left\{\frac{n+2}{2(n+1)}, \frac{(2-p)n}{2}\right\} < \theta < p - \frac{n}{n+1} \leq 1$. If u and w are weak solutions of (2.4) and (3.1), respectively, satisfying (1.2), $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\kappa}(\Omega_T)$ for some $1 < \kappa \leq N$,*

$$\int_{Q_{4r}^\lambda} |Du|^\theta dxdt \leq \lambda^\theta \quad \text{and} \quad \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \leq \delta \lambda,$$

then there are constants $\sigma = \sigma(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta) > 0$ and $c = c(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta, \kappa, C_0) \geq 1$ such that

$$\int_{Q_{4r}^\lambda} |Du - Dw|^\theta dxdt \leq c \delta^{\theta \frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}} \lambda^\theta \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{Q_{2r}^\lambda} |Dw|^{p(1+\sigma)} dxdt \leq c \lambda^{p(1+\sigma)}.$$

To prove Theorem 2.9, we need a more comparison estimate as follows. Assume that the vector field \mathbf{a} satisfies (2.11) and a (δ, R_0) -BMO condition for some $R_0 > 4r$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We consider the unique weak solution v to the coefficient frozen problem

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} v_t - \operatorname{div} \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{B_{2r}^\lambda}(Dv, t) = 0 & \text{in } Q_{2r}^\lambda, \\ v = w & \text{on } \partial_p Q_{2r}^\lambda, \end{cases}$$

where a freezing operator $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{B_{2r}^\lambda} = \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{B_{2r}^\lambda}(\xi, t) : \mathbb{R}^n \times (-4r^2, 4r^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{B_{2r}^\lambda}(\xi, t) := \int_{B_{2r}^\lambda} \mathbf{a}(\xi, x, t) dx.$$

Then the operator $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{B_{2r}^\lambda}$ satisfies (2.11).

Now we derive the following comparison result between (3.1) and (3.10):

Lemma 3.8. *Let $p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$. Assume that the vector field \mathbf{a} satisfies (2.11) and a (δ, R_0) -BMO condition for some $R_0 > 4r$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. If w and v are weak solutions of (3.1) and (3.10), respectively, then there is a constant $c = c(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p) \geq 1$ such that*

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{Q_{2r}^\lambda} |Dw - Dv|^p dxdt \leq c\delta^{\sigma_1} \lambda^p \quad \text{and} \quad \|Dv\|_{L^\infty(Q_r^\lambda)} \leq c\lambda,$$

where $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p) > 0$.

Proof. The first estimate of (3.11) follows from Lemma 3.3, (2.12), and [10, Lemma 3.10]. For interior regularity results (see [13–15]), the second estimate of (3.11) holds. \square

Finally, we combine Lemmas 3.1, 3.3, 3.5 and 3.8 to obtain the following regularity estimate:

Proposition 3.9. *Let $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$ and let θ be a constant such that $\max\left\{\frac{n+2}{2(n+1)}, \frac{(2-p)n}{2}\right\} < \theta < p - \frac{n}{n+1} \leq 1$. Assume that the vector field \mathbf{a} satisfies (2.11) and a (δ, R_0) -BMO condition for some $R_0 > 4r$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. If u, w and v are weak solutions of (2.4), (3.1) and (3.10), respectively, satisfying $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1, \kappa}(\Omega_T)$ for some $1 < \kappa \leq N$,*

$$\int_{Q_{4r}^\lambda} |Du|^\theta dxdt \leq \lambda^\theta \quad \text{and} \quad \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{4r}^\lambda)}{|Q_{4r}^\lambda|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \leq \delta\lambda,$$

then there exists a constant $c_0 = c_0(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta, \kappa, C_0) \geq 1$ such that

$$\int_{Q_{2r}^\lambda} |Du - Dv|^\theta dxdt \leq c_0\delta^{\sigma_0} \lambda^\theta \quad \text{and} \quad \|Dv\|_{L^\infty(Q_r^\lambda)} \leq c_0\lambda,$$

where $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta) > 0$.

4. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we derive Marcinkiewicz estimates (Theorems 2.4, 2.7 and 2.9) for spatial gradient of a renormalized solution u of the problem (2.3). For this, we employ a so-called *stopping-time argument* introduced in [1], to obtain decay estimates on the upper-level set of $|Du|$.

We consider a renormalized solution u of (2.3). We denote by $u_k := T_k(u)$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) the truncation of u and $\mu_k \in L^{p'}(0, T; W^{-1, p'}(\Omega))$ the corresponding measure given in (2.4). We also denote by w_k and v_k the corresponding weak solutions of (3.1) and (3.10), respectively. We know that $\mu_k = \mu_a^+ - \mu_a^- + \nu_k^+ - \nu_k^-$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\mu_a^\pm + \nu_k^\pm \rightarrow \mu_a^\pm + \mu_s^\pm$ tightly as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\mu_k|(K) \leq |\mu|(K) \quad \text{for every compact subset } K \subset \Omega_T.$$

Let $\frac{2n}{n+1} < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n+1}$, let θ be a constant such that (2.6) holds, and take $Q_{2R} \equiv Q_{2R}(y_0, \tau_0) \Subset \Omega_T$. Assume that $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^{1, \kappa}(\Omega_T)$ for some $\kappa \in (1, N]$, where $N := n + 2$. We consider a parameter λ_0 to be defined, such that

$$(4.2) \quad \lambda_0^{\frac{1}{d}} := \left(\int_{Q_{2R}} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{|Q_{2R}|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} + 1,$$

where the constant d is given by (2.8) and γ is given by (2.5). The number $\delta \in (0, 1)$ will be determined later as a universal constant depending only on $n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta, \kappa$ and C_0 .

4.1. Stopping-time arguments. For $\Lambda > \lambda_0$ and $r \in (0, 2R]$, we define

$$E(r, \Lambda) := \{z \in Q_r : |Du(z)| > \Lambda\}.$$

For fixed radii $R \leq R_1 < R_2 \leq 2R$, the relation $Q_r^\lambda(z_0) \subset Q_{R_2} \subset Q_{2R}$ holds whenever $z_0 \in Q_{R_1}$, $r \in (0, R_2 - R_1]$ and $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \infty)$. Fix $z_0 \in E(R_1, 4\lambda)$. For almost every such point, Lebesgue's differentiation theorem implies

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{s \searrow 0} \left[\left(\int_{Q_s^\lambda(z_0)} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \left[\frac{|\mu|([Q_s^\lambda(z_0)])}{|Q_s^\lambda(z_0)|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \right] \geq |Du(z_0)| > 4\lambda,$$

where the symbol $[Q]$ denotes the parabolic closure of Q defined as $[Q] := Q \cup \partial_p Q$. We consider

$$(4.4) \quad \lambda > B\lambda_0, \quad \text{where } B := \left(\frac{320R}{R_2 - R_1} \right)^{\frac{dN}{\theta}} > 1.$$

For any radius s with

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{R_2 - R_1}{160} \leq s \leq \frac{R_2 - R_1}{2},$$

we see from (4.2), (4.5) and (2.8) that

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{Q_s^\lambda(z_0)} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \left[\frac{|\mu|([Q_s^\lambda(z_0)])}{|Q_s^\lambda(z_0)|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{|Q_{2R}|}{|Q_s^\lambda|} \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \left(\int_{Q_{2R}} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\frac{|Q_{2R}|}{|Q_s^\lambda|} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{|Q_{2R}|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{2R}{s} \right)^{\frac{N}{\theta}} \lambda^{\frac{(2-p)n}{2\theta}} \lambda_0^{\frac{1}{d}} \leq \left(\frac{320R}{R_2 - R_1} \right)^{\frac{N}{\theta}} \lambda_0^{\frac{1}{d}} \lambda^{\frac{(2-p)n}{2\theta}} \\ & = (B\lambda_0)^{\frac{1}{d}} \lambda^{\frac{(2-p)n}{2\theta}} < \lambda < 4\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the inequality $\theta < \gamma$, see (2.6) and Remark 2.5(i). According to (4.3), (4.6) and the (absolute) continuity of the integral and the measure, there exists a maximal radius $r_{z_0} \in (0, \frac{R_2 - R_1}{160})$ such that

$$(4.7) \quad \left(\int_{Q_{r_{z_0}}^\lambda(z_0)} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \left[\frac{|\mu|(\lfloor Q_{r_{z_0}}^\lambda(z_0) \rfloor)}{|Q_{r_{z_0}}^\lambda(z_0)|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} = 4\lambda$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad \left(\int_{Q_s^\lambda(z_0)} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \left[\frac{|\mu|(\lfloor Q_s^\lambda(z_0) \rfloor)}{|Q_s^\lambda(z_0)|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} < 4\lambda \quad \text{for any } s \in \left(r_{z_0}, \frac{R_2 - R_1}{2} \right].$$

4.2. Decay estimates. The goal of this subsection is to derive a decay estimate on a upper-level set of $|Du|$, see (4.22) below. Let $z_0 \in E(R_1, 4\lambda)$, let $r_{z_0} \in (0, \frac{R_2 - R_1}{160})$ be a maximal radius as in (4.7). For $\lambda > B\lambda_0$, the upper-level set $E(R_1, 4\lambda)$ can be covered by a family $\mathcal{F} \equiv \left\{ Q_{4r_{z_0}}^\lambda(z_0) \right\}_{z_0 \in E(R_1, 4\lambda)}$. By the standard Vitali covering lemma (see e.g. [7, Theorem C.1] or [19, Theorem 1.24]), there exists a countable subfamily $\left\{ Q_{4r_{z_i}}^\lambda(z_i) \right\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ consisting of pairwise disjoint cylinders such that

$$E(R_1, 4\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{N} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_{20r_{z_i}}^\lambda(z_i) \subset Q_{R_2},$$

where \mathcal{N} is a Lebesgue-zero set with $|\mathcal{N}| = 0$. For simplicity, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i^0 &:= Q_{r_{z_i}}^\lambda(z_i), \quad Q_i^1 := Q_{4r_{z_i}}^\lambda(z_i), \quad Q_i^2 := Q_{20r_{z_i}}^\lambda(z_i), \\ Q_i^3 &:= Q_{40r_{z_i}}^\lambda(z_i), \quad \text{and } Q_i^4 := Q_{80r_{z_i}}^\lambda(z_i). \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $160r_{z_i} < R_2 - R_1 \leq R$, we have $Q_i^4 \subset Q_{R_2} \subset Q_{2R}$.

We now fix $H \geq 4$ to be chosen later and we estimate

$$(4.9) \quad |E(R_1, H\lambda)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |Q_i^2 \cap E(R_2, H\lambda)|.$$

We first split into

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_i^2 \cap E(R_2, H\lambda)| &= |\{z \in Q_i^2 : |Du| > H\lambda\}| \\ &\leq \left| \left\{ z \in Q_i^2 : |Du - Du_k| > \frac{H\lambda}{3} \right\} \right| \\ (4.10) \quad &+ \left| \left\{ z \in Q_i^2 : |Du_k - Dw_{k,i}| > \frac{H\lambda}{3} \right\} \right| \\ &+ \left| \left\{ z \in Q_i^2 : |Dw_{k,i}| > \frac{H\lambda}{3} \right\} \right| \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \end{aligned}$$

where $w_{k,i}$ is the weak solution of the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w_{k,i} - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{a}(Dw_{k,i}, x, t) = 0 & \text{in } Q_i^4, \\ w_{k,i} = u_k & \text{on } \partial_p Q_i^4. \end{cases}$$

From the absolute continuity of the Lebesgue integral and (4.8), for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \frac{3^\theta |Q_i^2|}{(H\lambda)^\theta} \int_{Q_i^2} |Du - Du_k|^\theta dxdt = \frac{3^\theta |Q_i^2|}{(H\lambda)^\theta} \int_{Q_i^2} \chi_{\{|Du|>k\}} |Du|^\theta dxdt \\ &\leq \frac{c\varepsilon}{H^\theta} |Q_i^2| \end{aligned}$$

for k large enough. Moreover, applying Proposition 3.7 with $r = 20r_{z_i}$ and using (4.1) and (4.8), we deduce

$$(4.13) \quad I_2 \leq \frac{3^\theta}{(H\lambda)^\theta} \int_{Q_i^2} |Du_k - Dw_{k,i}|^\theta dxdt \leq \frac{c\delta^\theta \frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}}{H^\theta} |Q_i^2|$$

and

$$(4.14) \quad I_3 \leq \left(\frac{3}{H\lambda}\right)^{p(1+\sigma)} \int_{Q_i^2} |Dw_{k,i}|^{p(1+\sigma)} dxdt \leq \frac{c}{H^{p(1+\sigma)}} |Q_i^2|$$

for some constants $c = c(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta, \kappa, C_0) \geq 1$.

Plugging (4.12)–(4.14) into (4.10), we obtain

$$(4.15) \quad |Q_i^2 \cap E(R_2, H\lambda)| \leq \left(\frac{c\varepsilon}{H^\theta} + \frac{c\delta^\theta \frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}}{H^\theta} + \frac{c}{H^{p(1+\sigma)}} \right) |Q_i^2|.$$

Now we will estimate $|Q_i^2|$. Recalling (4.7), we have then either

$$(4.16) \quad 2\lambda \leq \left(\int_{Q_i^0} |Du|^\theta dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \quad \text{or} \quad 2\lambda \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \left[\frac{|\mu|(|Q_i^0|)}{|Q_i^0|} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}.$$

We assume that the first case of (4.16) holds. Then it follows

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} (2^\theta - 1)\lambda^\theta &\leq \frac{1}{|Q_i^0|} \int_{Q_i^0 \cap \{|Du|>\lambda\}} |Du|^\theta dxdt \\ &\leq \left(\int_{Q_i^0} |Du|^{\tilde{\theta}} dxdt \right)^{\frac{\theta}{\tilde{\theta}}} \left(\frac{|Q_i^0 \cap \{|Du|>\lambda\}|}{|Q_i^0|} \right)^{1-\frac{\theta}{\tilde{\theta}}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\tilde{\theta} \in \left(\theta, p - \frac{n}{n+1}\right)$. Applying Proposition 3.7 with $\tilde{\theta}$ instead of θ and utilizing (4.1) and (4.8), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_i^0} |Du|^{\tilde{\theta}} dxdt &\leq \int_{Q_i^0} |Du - Du_k|^{\tilde{\theta}} dxdt + \int_{Q_i^0} |Du_k - Dw_{k,i}|^{\tilde{\theta}} dxdt \\ &\quad + \int_{Q_i^0} |Dw_{k,i}|^{\tilde{\theta}} dxdt \\ &\leq c\lambda^{\tilde{\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this estimate into (4.17), we obtain

$$(4.18) \quad |Q_i^0| \leq c |Q_i^0 \cap \{|Du|>\lambda\}|.$$

If the second case of (4.16) holds, then we see

$$(4.19) \quad |Q_i^0| \leq \frac{|\mu|(|Q_i^0|)}{(2\delta\lambda)^\gamma}.$$

Assertions (4.18) and (4.19) yield

$$(4.20) \quad |Q_i^2| = 20^N |Q_i^0| \leq c |Q_i^1 \cap E(R_2, \lambda)| + \frac{c|\mu|(|Q_i^0|)}{(\delta\lambda)^\gamma}.$$

We combine (4.15) and (4.20) to obtain

$$(4.21) \quad |Q_i^2 \cap E(R_2, H\lambda)| \leq \left(\frac{c\varepsilon}{H^\theta} + \frac{c\delta^{\theta\frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}}}{H^\theta} + \frac{c}{H^{p(1+\sigma)}} \right) |Q_i^1 \cap E(R_2, \lambda)| + \frac{c|\mu|(|Q_i^1|)}{(\delta\lambda)^\gamma}.$$

Since the cylinders $\{Q_i^1\}$ are pairwise disjoint, we have from (4.9) and (4.21) that

$$(4.22) \quad |E(R_1, H\lambda)| \leq \left(\frac{c\varepsilon}{H^\theta} + \frac{c\delta^{\theta\frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}}}{H^\theta} + \frac{c}{H^{p(1+\sigma)}} \right) |E(R_2, \lambda)| + \frac{c|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{(\delta\lambda)^\gamma}$$

for some constant $c = c(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta, \kappa, C_0) \geq 1$.

4.3. Marcinkiewicz estimates. Before Theorems 2.4, 2.7 and 2.9, we introduce the following technique lemma:

Lemma 4.1 (See [21, Lemma 6.1]). *Let $\phi : [r, \rho] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a nonnegative bounded function. Assume that for $r \leq t < s \leq \rho$ we have*

$$\phi(t) \leq \vartheta\phi(s) + A(s-t)^{-\beta} + C$$

with $0 \leq \vartheta < 1$, $A, C \geq 0$, and $\beta > 0$. Then there holds

$$\phi(r) \leq c(\beta, \vartheta) [A(\rho-r)^{-\beta} + C].$$

Now we prove Theorems 2.4, 2.7 and 2.9.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. For $r \in (0, 2R]$, we define the upper-level set

$$E_l(r, \lambda) := \{z \in Q_r : T_l(|Du|) > \lambda\},$$

where T_l is the truncation operator (2.1). Then it follows from (4.22) that

$$(4.23) \quad |E_l(R_1, H\lambda)| \leq \left(\frac{c\varepsilon}{H^\theta} + \frac{c\delta^{\theta\frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}}}{H^\theta} + \frac{c}{H^{p(1+\sigma)}} \right) |E_l(R_2, \lambda)| + \frac{c|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{(\delta\lambda)^\gamma}$$

whenever $l > H\lambda$. Multiplying (4.23) by $(H\lambda)^\gamma$, we have

$$(H\lambda)^\gamma |E_l(R_1, H\lambda)| \leq \left(\frac{c\varepsilon}{H^{\theta-\gamma}} + \frac{c\delta^{\theta\frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}}}{H^{\theta-\gamma}} + \frac{c}{H^{p(1+\sigma)-\gamma}} \right) \lambda^\gamma |E_l(R_2, \lambda)| + \frac{cH^\gamma}{\delta^\gamma} |\mu|(Q_{2R})$$

for some constant $c = c(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta, \kappa, C_0) \geq 1$. First choose H sufficiently large such that

$$(4.24) \quad \frac{c}{H^{p(1+\sigma)-\gamma}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad H \geq 4,$$

and then choose ε and δ sufficiently small such that

$$\frac{c\varepsilon}{H^{\theta-\gamma}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{c\delta^{\theta\frac{(n+1)p-n}{n+2}}}{H^{\theta-\gamma}} \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

From (4.24), γ have to be chosen such that $\gamma < p(1 + \sigma)$. Thus, we choose the critical value κ_c such that $\gamma = p(1 + \sigma)$; that is, $\frac{\kappa_c((n+1)p-n)}{(\kappa_c-1)(n+2)} = p(1 + \sigma)$. Taking the supremum with respect to $\lambda > B\lambda_0$, we obtain

$$\sup_{\lambda > HB\lambda_0} \lambda^\gamma |E_l(R_1, \lambda)| \leq \frac{3}{4} \sup_{\lambda > B\lambda_0} \lambda^\gamma |E_l(R_2, \lambda)| + c|\mu|(Q_{2R}),$$

whenever $l > H\lambda$. Recalling (2.2), we see from (4.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_l(|Du|)\|_{\mathcal{M}^\gamma(Q_{R_1})}^\gamma &\leq \frac{3}{4} \|T_l(|Du|)\|_{\mathcal{M}^\gamma(Q_{R_2})}^\gamma + c|\mu|(Q_{2R}) + (HB\lambda_0)^\gamma |Q_{R_1}| \\ &\leq \frac{3}{4} \|T_l(|Du|)\|_{\mathcal{M}^\gamma(Q_{R_2})}^\gamma + c|\mu|(Q_{2R}) + c\lambda_0^\gamma \left(\frac{R}{R_2 - R_1}\right)^{\frac{\gamma dN}{\theta}} R^N \end{aligned}$$

for all $R \leq R_1 < R_2 \leq 2R$. Applying Lemma 4.1 and letting $l \rightarrow \infty$, we discover

$$\begin{aligned} \|Du\|_{\mathcal{M}^\gamma(Q_R)}^\gamma &\leq c|\mu|(Q_{2R}) + c\lambda_0^\gamma R^N \\ &\leq cR^N \frac{|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{|Q_{2R}|} + cR^N + cR^N \left(\int_{Q_{2R}} |Du|^\theta dxdt\right)^{\frac{d\gamma}{\theta}} \\ &\quad + cR^N \left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{|Q_{2R}|}\right]^d, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.7. In view of Lemma 3.6, we replace, in Sections 4.1–4.2, (4.25)

$$\left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{|Q_{2R}|}\right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \text{ by } \begin{cases} \left[\frac{|\mu_1|(B_{2R})}{|B_{2R}|}\right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1}} & \text{if the assumption of Theorem 2.7 (i) holds,} \\ \left[\frac{|\mu_2|(I_{2R})}{|I_{2R}|}\right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2}} & \text{if the assumption of Theorem 2.7 (ii) holds,} \end{cases}$$

and

(4.26)

$$\left[\frac{|\mu|(Q_r^\lambda(z_0))}{|Q_r^\lambda(z_0)|}\right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \text{ by } \begin{cases} \left[\frac{|\mu_1|(B_r^\lambda(x_0))}{|B_r^\lambda(x_0)|}\right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1}} & \text{if the assumption of Theorem 2.7 (i) holds,} \\ \left[\frac{|\mu_2|(I_r(t_0))}{|I_r(t_0)|}\right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2}} & \text{if the assumption of Theorem 2.7 (ii) holds.} \end{cases}$$

Proceeding as in Sections 4.1–4.2 and the *proof of Theorem 2.4* above with (4.25) and (4.26), we can obtain Theorem 2.7. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.9. We proceed as in Section 4. We only mention the parts that change in Section 4. We choose $H \geq \max\{4, 3c_0\}$, where the constant c_0 is given by Proposition 3.9. Instead of (4.10), we split into

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_i^2 \cap E(R_2, H\lambda)| &= |\{z \in Q_i^2 : |Du| > H\lambda\}| \\ &\leq \left| \left\{ z \in Q_i^2 : |Du - Du_k| > \frac{H\lambda}{3} \right\} \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \left\{ z \in Q_i^2 : |Du_k - Dv_{k,i}| > \frac{H\lambda}{3} \right\} \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \left\{ z \in Q_i^2 : |Dv_{k,i}| > \frac{H\lambda}{3} \right\} \right| \\ &=: J_1 + J_2 + J_3, \end{aligned}$$

where $v_{k,i}$ is the weak solution of the Cauchy-Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v_{k,i} - \operatorname{div} \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{B_{40r_{z_i}}}^\lambda (Dv_{k,i}, t) = 0 & \text{in } Q_i^3, \\ v_{k,i} = w_{k,i} & \text{on } \partial_p Q_i^3. \end{cases}$$

Here $w_{k,i}$ is the weak solution of (4.11). Then we see from Proposition 3.9 and the choice of H that $J_3 = 0$. Also, we can estimate J_1 and J_2 similar to the estimates of I_1 and I_2 in Section 4.2. Performing the rest of Section 4.2, we obtain, instead of (4.22), the following decay estimate

$$(4.27) \quad |E(R_1, H\lambda)| \leq \left(\frac{c\varepsilon}{H^\theta} + \frac{c\delta^{\sigma_0}}{H^\theta} \right) |E(R_2, \lambda)| + \frac{c|\mu|(Q_{2R})}{(\delta\lambda)^\gamma},$$

where $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(n, \Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, p, \theta) > 0$. Proceeding as in the *proof of Theorem 2.4* above with (4.27), we deduce Theorem 2.9. We remark that we obtain Theorem 2.9 without (4.24); that is, $\gamma < \infty$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Pilsoo Shin for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Acerbi and G. Mingione, *Gradient estimates for a class of parabolic systems*, Duke Math. J. **136** (2007), no. 2, 285–320.
- [2] B. Avelin, T. Kuusi, and M. Parviainen, *Variational parabolic capacity*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **35** (2015), no. 12, 5665–5688.
- [3] P. Baroni, *Marcinkiewicz estimates for degenerate parabolic equations with measure data*, J. Funct. Anal. **267** (2014), no. 9, 3397–3426.
- [4] ———, *Nonlinear parabolic equations with Morrey data*, Riv. Math. Univ. Parma (N.S.) **5** (2014), no. 1, 65–92.
- [5] ———, *Singular parabolic equations, measures satisfying density conditions, and gradient integrability*, Nonlinear Anal. **153** (2017), 89–116.
- [6] P. Baroni and J. Habermann, *Calderón-Zygmund estimates for parabolic measure data equations*, J. Differential Equations **252** (2012), no. 1, 412–447.
- [7] V. Bögelein, *Regularity results for weak and very weak solutions of higher order parabolic systems*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2007.
- [8] T. A. Bui and X. T. Duong, *Global Marcinkiewicz estimates for nonlinear parabolic equations with nonsmooth coefficients*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **18** (2018), no. 3, 881–916.
- [9] S.-S. Byun, N. Cho, and K. Song, *Optimal fractional differentiability for nonlinear parabolic measure data problems*, Appl. Math. Lett. **112** (2021), 106816, 10 pp.
- [10] S.-S. Byun, J. Ok, and S. Ryu, *Global gradient estimates for general nonlinear parabolic equations in nonsmooth domains*, J. Differential Equations **254** (2013), no. 11, 4290–4326.
- [11] S.-S. Byun and J.-T. Park, *Global weighted Orlicz estimates for parabolic measure data problems: application to estimates in variable exponent spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **467** (2018), no. 2, 1194–1207.
- [12] S.-S. Byun, J.-T. Park, and P. Shin, *Global regularity for degenerate/singular parabolic equations involving measure data*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **60** (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 18, 32 pp.
- [13] E. DiBenedetto, *Degenerate parabolic equations*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [14] E. DiBenedetto and A. Friedman, *Hölder estimates for nonlinear degenerate parabolic systems*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **357** (1985), 1–22.
- [15] ———, *Addendum to: “Hölder estimates for nonlinear degenerate parabolic systems”*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **363** (1985), 217–220.

- [16] H. Dong and H. Zhu, *Gradient estimates for singular p-laplace type equations with measure data*, 2021. arXiv:2102.08584.
- [17] J. Droniou, A. Porretta, and A. Prignet, *Parabolic capacity and soft measures for nonlinear equations*, *Potential Anal.* **19** (2003), no. 2, 99–161.
- [18] F. Duzaar and G. Mingione, *Gradient estimates via non-linear potentials*, *Amer. J. Math.* **133** (2011), no. 4, 1093–1149.
- [19] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, Revised, Textbooks in Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015.
- [20] M. Fukushima, K.-i. Sato, and S. Taniguchi, *On the closable parts of pre-Dirichlet forms and the fine supports of underlying measures*, *Osaka J. Math.* **28** (1991), no. 3, 517–535.
- [21] E. Giusti, *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003.
- [22] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier analysis*, Third, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 249, Springer, New York, 2014.
- [23] J. Kinnunen, R. Korte, T. Kuusi, and M. Parviainen, *Nonlinear parabolic capacity and polar sets of superparabolic functions*, *Math. Ann.* **355** (2013), no. 4, 1349–1381.
- [24] J. Kinnunen and J. L. Lewis, *Higher integrability for parabolic systems of p-Laplacian type*, *Duke Math. J.* **102** (2000), no. 2, 253–271.
- [25] T. Klimesiak and A. Rozkosz, *On the structure of diffuse measures for parabolic capacities*, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **357** (2019), no. 5, 443–449.
- [26] T. Kuusi and G. Mingione, *Gradient regularity for nonlinear parabolic equations*, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* **12** (2013), no. 4, 755–822.
- [27] ———, *Riesz potentials and nonlinear parabolic equations*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **212** (2014), no. 3, 727–780.
- [28] ———, *The Wolff gradient bound for degenerate parabolic equations*, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **16** (2014), no. 4, 835–892.
- [29] G. Mingione, *The Calderón-Zygmund theory for elliptic problems with measure data*, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* **6** (2007), no. 2, 195–261.
- [30] ———, *Gradient estimates below the duality exponent*, *Math. Ann.* **346** (2010), no. 3, 571–627.
- [31] Q.-H. Nguyen, *Global estimates for quasilinear parabolic equations on Reifenberg flat domains and its applications to Riccati type parabolic equations with distributional data*, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **54** (2015), no. 4, 3927–3948.
- [32] ———, *Potential estimates and quasilinear parabolic equations with measure data*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear. arXiv:1405.2587.
- [33] Q.-H. Nguyen and N. C. Phuc, *Good- λ and Muckenhoupt-Wheeden type bounds in quasilinear measure datum problems, with applications*, *Math. Ann.* **374** (2019), no. 1-2, 67–98.
- [34] ———, *Pointwise gradient estimates for a class of singular quasilinear equations with measure data*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **278** (2020), no. 5, 108391, 35 pp.
- [35] ———, *Existence and regularity estimates for quasilinear equations with measure data: the case $1 < p \leq \frac{3n-2}{2n-1}$* , *Anal. PDE*, to appear. arXiv:2003.03725.
- [36] J.-T. Park and P. Shin, *Regularity estimates for singular parabolic measure data problems with sharp growth*, 2020. arXiv:2004.03889.
- [37] F. Petitta and A. Porretta, *On the notion of renormalized solution to nonlinear parabolic equations with general measure data*, *J. Elliptic Parabol. Equ.* **1** (2015), 201–214.
- [38] M. Pierre, *Parabolic capacity and Sobolev spaces*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **14** (1983), no. 3, 522–533.
- [39] J. M. Urbano, *The method of intrinsic scaling*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1930, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008. A systematic approach to regularity for degenerate and singular PDEs.
- [40] J. L. Vázquez, *Smoothing and decay estimates for nonlinear diffusion equations*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 33, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006. Equations of porous medium type.

J.-T. PARK: KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, SEOUL 02455, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
 Email address: ppark00@kias.re.kr