

REGULARITY OF FREE BOUNDARY FOR THE MONGE-AMPÈRE OBSTACLE PROBLEM

GENGGENG HUANG, LAN TANG, AND XU-JIA WANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove the regularity of the free boundary in the Monge-Ampère obstacle problem $\det D^2v = f(y)\chi_{\{v>0\}}$. By duality, the regularity of the free boundary is equivalent to that of the asymptotic cone of the solution to the singular Monge-Ampère equation $\det D^2u = 1/f(Du) + \delta_0$ at the origin. We first establish an asymptotic estimate for the solution u near the singular point, then use a partial Legendre transform to change the Monge-Ampère equation to a singular, fully nonlinear elliptic equation, and establish the regularity of solutions to the singular elliptic equation.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study the Monge-Ampère obstacle problem

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \det D^2v &= f \chi_{\{v>0\}} && \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= v_0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , f, v_0 are positive functions on $\overline{\Omega}$, and χ is the characteristic function. Denote $\Gamma := \partial\{v = 0\}$ the free boundary. The main objective of the paper is to prove the regularity of the free boundary Γ .

Problem (1.1) is the Monge-Ampère counterpart of the classical free boundary problem

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta v &= f \chi_{\{v>0\}} && \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= v_0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

A central issue for the prototypal obstacle problem (1.2) is the regularity of the free boundary $\Gamma = \partial\{v = 0\}$. In a seminal work [3], Caffarelli proved that the free boundary is C^1 smooth at regular points; and hence is C^∞ smooth and analytic [28]. Since then the regularity of free boundary problems has been extensively studied.

Regularity of free boundary problems associated with the Monge-Ampère equation has also been studied in a number of papers [7, 9, 16, 17, 30, 31, 35]. See also [10, 11, 19] for

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J96, 35R35, 35B65.

Key words and phrases. Monge-Ampère equation, free boundary, regularity.

The first author was supported by NNSFC 11871160, the second author was supported by NNSFC 11831009 and NNSFC 12171185, the third author was supported by ARC DP200101084.

a related free boundary problem with the Gauss curvature flow. In [35], Savin studied problem (1.1) and proved that the free boundary Γ is uniformly convex and $C^{1,1}$ smooth. He also pointed out two other interpretations of the obstacle problem (1.1), as a model in the optimal transportation with a Dirac measure and in the Monge-Ampère equation with a cone singularity. In dimensions two, Galvez, Jiménez and Mira [16] proved that the free boundary Γ is C^∞ smooth and analytic, if f is respectively smooth and analytic. As pointed out in [16], some of the arguments in [16] are specific of the two-dimensional case, since they rely on complex analysis and surface theory. Also in dimension two, Daskalopoulos and Lee [11] obtained the regularity of the free boundary in the Gauss curvature flow. For fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equations, the corresponding results can be found in [29, 38, 39]. An open problem is the regularity of the free boundary problem (1.1) in high dimensions. In this paper we resolve the problem completely.

Theorem 1.1. *Let v be a generalized solution to the obstacle problem (1.1), in the sense of Aleksandrov. Assume that Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n , and $f, v_0 > 0$. Then the free boundary Γ is smooth if f is smooth; and Γ is analytic if f is analytic.*

Monge-Ampère type equations are different from uniformly elliptic equations in many ways, and the techniques for uniformly elliptic equations [3, 6, 29, 38, 39] do not apply to the Monge-Ampère obstacle problem (1.1). A key property for uniformly elliptic equations is the growth estimate $\sup_{B_r(0)} v \approx r^2$ (assuming that 0 is a point on the free boundary). By this property, the blow-up profile at 0 is either of the form $\frac{1}{2} \max\{x \cdot e, 0\}^2$ for a vector e , or of the form $\frac{1}{2} x \cdot Ax$ for a matrix A . In the former case, 0 is a regular point and the free boundary is smooth at the point. But for the Monge-Ampère equation (1.1), we have instead the estimate $\sup_{B_r(0)} v \approx r^{1+\frac{1}{n}}$. It implies that equation (1.1) is both singular and degenerate near the free boundary. Therefore to prove the regularity of the free boundary, one needs a completely different approach.

Our new approach to the problem involves a series of transforms. We first make the Legendre transform (1.3) to obtain the equation (1.4) with point singularity. By estimate (1.9) we then make the change (1.8) to get equation (1.10) in the polar coordinates. Regularity of the free boundary Γ is thus reduced to that for equation (1.10). To establish the a priori estimate for (1.10), we again make a partial Legendre transform (1.13) to obtain a fully nonlinear, singular elliptic equation (1.14). The linearized equation of (1.14) is a degenerate equation of Keldysh type after a change of variables. By the Hölder regularity of the linearized equation of (1.14), we can prove the blow-up limits for equation (1.14) is a quadratic function (Theorem 1.3). Technically the most difficult part in the

approach is to prove the uniqueness of the blow-up limits, namely all blow-up sequences around a point converge to the same limit, from which the C^2 regularity of solutions follows. We will prove the uniqueness of the blow-up limits by consecutively using the maximum principle in an infinite sequence of domains. See also Remark 4.4.

The Monge-Ampère equation has a very useful property, namely the duality. Let v be the solution to the obstacle problem (1.1), as in Theorem 1.1. Then v is convex and the set $\{v = 0\}$ is a convex sub-set of Ω . We may assume that the set $\{v = 0\}$ has positive measure, otherwise the free boundary does not exist [35]. Let u be the Legendre transform of v , given by

$$(1.3) \quad u(x) = \sup\{x \cdot y - v(y) : y \in \Omega\}, \quad x \in \Omega^* =: D_y v(\Omega).$$

Then u is a generalized solution to the following Monge-Ampère equation with point singularity,

$$(1.4) \quad \det D^2 u = g(Du) + c^* \delta_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^*,$$

where $g(Du(x)) = \frac{1}{f(y)}$ at $y = Du(x)$, and $c^* = |\{v = 0\}|$ is a constant. There is no loss of generality in assuming that $c^* = 1$. By a translation of the coordinates we assume that the origin is an interior point of the convex set $\{v = 0\}$. Then $u(0) = 0$ and $u(y) > 0 \forall y \neq 0$. Let ϕ be the tangential cone of u at 0, namely it is a homogeneous function of degree one defined in \mathbb{R}^n and satisfying

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} u(x) &\geq \phi(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega^*, \\ u(x) - \phi(x) &= o(|x|) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

such that $\partial\phi\{0\} = \partial u\{0\}$. Given a convex function w , we denote by $\partial w\{p\}$ the sub-differential of w at p ,

$$\partial w\{p\} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : w(x) \geq \xi \cdot (x - p) + w(p) \quad \forall x \text{ near } p\}.$$

By duality,

$$\partial\phi\{0\} = \{v = 0\}.$$

Hence the section $S_{1,\phi} =: \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \phi(x) < 1\}$ is the polar body of $\{v = 0\}$, i.e.,

$$(1.6) \quad S_{1,\phi} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \cdot y < 1 \quad \forall y \in \{v = 0\}\}.$$

Denote $L = \partial S_{1,\phi}$. Hence L is C^k smooth ($k \geq 2$) and uniformly convex if and only if the free boundary Γ is. It was proved in [35] that Γ is uniformly convex and $C^{1,1}$ smooth for $f \equiv 1$. In the two dimensional case, it was proved in [16] that the curve L is smooth and analytic. Moreover, if u is an entire solution to (1.4) with $g \equiv 1$, namely u is defined in

the whole space \mathbb{R}^n , then u must be rotationally symmetric after an affine transform of coordinates [25, 26]. In this paper, we prove

Theorem 1.2. *Let u be a strictly convex solution of (1.4). Then in the spherical coordinates (θ, r) , u is smooth as a function of θ and r if f is smooth, and we have the Taylor expansion*

$$(1.7) \quad u(\theta, r) = r \sum_{i=0}^k \phi_i(\theta) r^{ni} + O(r^{1+(k+1)n})$$

for any integer $k \geq 0$, where ϕ_i are smooth functions of θ . Moreover, if f is analytic, then u is analytic in θ .

By the condition $v_0 > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we know that u is strictly convex in Ω^* [5]. Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 1.2 by the duality between the free boundary Γ and the section L . The Taylor expansion (1.7) reveals a special geometric profile of the solution u at the origin, namely $\frac{u(\theta, r)}{r}$ is a smooth function of θ and r^n .

To prove Theorem 1.2, our goal is to prove that $\frac{u}{r}$, as a function of θ, r , is smooth. Therefore we will make the change

$$(1.8) \quad \zeta(\theta, r) = \frac{u(\theta, r)}{r}, \quad s = r^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

The proof of Theorems 1.2 can be divided into three steps.

Step 1: We first prove that the function $w = u - \phi$ satisfies the growth condition near 0,

$$(1.9) \quad C_1 |x|^{n+1} \leq w(x) \leq C_2 |x|^{n+1}$$

for two positive constants $C_2 \geq C_1 > 0$. Estimates (1.9) are built on Pogorelov and Savin's interior second derivative estimates. (1.9) is a key estimate in this paper. It implies that equation (1.10) below is uniformly elliptic.

Step 2: We next prove that the free boundary is C^2 smooth. We express the solution u in the spherical coordinates (θ, r) , and make the changes (1.8). Then in an orthonormal frame θ on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , ζ satisfies the equation

$$(1.10) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^2 \zeta_{ss} + \frac{n(n+2)}{4} \frac{\zeta_s}{s} & \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_1} & \cdots & \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_{n-1}} \\ \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_1} & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_1} + \zeta + \frac{n}{2} s \zeta_s & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_{n-1}} & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_{n-1}\theta_{n-1}} + \zeta + \frac{n}{2} s \zeta_s \end{pmatrix} = g.$$

This is a fully nonlinear singular elliptic equation. By (1.9) we have

$$(1.11) \quad C_1 s^2 \leq \zeta(\theta, s) - \frac{\phi}{r} \leq C_2 s^2.$$

From (1.11), we deduce that equation (1.10) is uniformly elliptic. Moreover, the regularity of the free boundary is equivalent to that of the function $\zeta(\theta, 0)$.

Therefore the main task of the paper is to establish the regularity, at the boundary $\{s = 0\}$, for the fully nonlinear, singular elliptic equation (1.10). A key step is to obtain the C^2 regularity of the solution ζ . Recall that for the classical obstacle problem (1.2), the key estimate is the C^1 regularity, proved in [3].

The proof of the C^2 regularity of ζ will be carried out as follows. We first use a blow-up argument to simplify equation (1.10) to the following equation

$$(1.12) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{x_n x_n} + \frac{n+2}{n} \frac{\psi_{x_n}}{x_n} & \psi_{x_n x_1} & \cdots & \psi_{x_n x_{n-1}} \\ \psi_{x_n x_1} & \psi_{x_1 x_1} & \cdots & \psi_{x_1 x_{n-1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_{x_n x_{n-1}} & \psi_{x_1 x_{n-1}} & \cdots & \psi_{x_{n-1} x_{n-1}} \end{pmatrix} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

where $\mathbb{R}_+^n = \mathbb{R}^n \cap \{x_n > 0\}$. The RHS of (1.12) is a positive constant, which we assume is one.

We then make a partial Legendre transform for ψ [32], i.e.,

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{aligned} y_n &= x_n, \\ y' &= D_{x'} \psi, \\ \psi^* &= x' \cdot D_{x'} \psi - \psi, \end{aligned}$$

where $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$. Then ψ^* satisfies

$$(1.14) \quad \psi_{y_n y_n}^* + \frac{n+2}{n} \frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n} + \det D_{y'}^2 \psi^* = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

A nice feature of equation (1.14) is that the singular part $\frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n}$ is separate from the nonlinear part of the equation, which enables us to prove the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity for equation (1.14). Hence by a scaling argument, we obtain the following Bernstein theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\psi \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ be a solution to (1.12). Assume that $\psi_{x_n}(x', 0) = 0 \forall x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and equation (1.12) is uniformly elliptic. Then*

$$(1.15) \quad \psi(x) = q(x') + ax_n^2$$

where a is a positive constant and q is a quadratic polynomial.

To prove the C^2 -continuity of $\zeta(\theta, s)$ at $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \{s = 0\}$, we use a blow-up argument. By Theorem 1.3, the limit of a blow-up sequence is a quadratic polynomial of the form (1.15). The most delicate part of the paper is to prove the uniqueness of the limit, namely the limit is independent of the choice of the blow-up sequences. The uniqueness of the

limit implies that the second derivatives $D^2\zeta$ are continuous. Our proof of the uniqueness is by employing the maximum principle consecutively in an infinite sequence of domains.

Step 3: We differentiate equation (1.10) to obtain a linearized equation, of which a prototype is of the form

$$(1.16) \quad \Delta_{x'}u + u_{nn} + b\frac{u_n}{x_n} = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

where $b > 1$, $u_n = u_{x_n}$. Equation (1.16) is a singular elliptic equation of Keldysh type. In [22, 23], Horiuchi introduced the Green function for (1.16) and proved the $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate for (1.16). In this paper, we use his Green function to establish a weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate for equation (1.16), extending the classical $W^{2,p}$ estimate for the Poisson equation.

We then use the freezing coefficient method and the weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate to obtain the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity of ζ in θ . By the weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate and the bootstrap technique, we show that the solution $\zeta \in C^\infty$ up to the boundary.

Finally we prove that the free boundary is analytic. The analyticity of solutions has been extensively studied in literature [15, 33, 28]. A simple proof was found in [27, 2]. To prove the analyticity of our free boundary, we need to prove the analyticity of ζ in θ . We will adopt the method in [27, 2].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we establish the asymptotic estimate (1.9), which is the first step of our proof. The second step of the proof consists of Sections 3 and 4. In Section 3 we prove the Hölder continuity for the singular term $\frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n}$ in equation (1.14), from which we obtain the Bernstein Theorem 1.3. In Section 4, we use the Bernstein Theorem and construct auxiliary functions to prove the C^2 -regularity of the free boundary. Step 3 of the proof consists of Sections 5 and 6. In Section 5 we establish a weighted $W^{2,p}$ -estimate for (1.16), and use it to prove the C^∞ regularity of the free boundary. The analyticity of the free boundary will be proved in Section 6.

2. Asymptotic behaviour at the singularity

Let u be a generalized solution to

$$(2.1) \quad \det D^2u = g(Du) + \delta_0 \quad \text{in } B_1(0).$$

Assume that $u(0) = 0$, $u \geq 0$ and $u > 0$ on $\partial B_1(0)$. Assume also that g is a smooth and positive function. There is no loss of generality in assuming that the unit ball $B_1(0) \subset \Omega^*$. By extending v to \mathbb{R}^n such that v is smooth and uniformly convex away from the free boundary Γ , we may also assume that $\Gamma \subset B_1(0) \subset \Omega$. Therefore in the following we

will consider problems (1.1) and (1.4) in $B_1(0)$. By the regularity of the Monge-Ampère equation, we may also assume that $|D^4u| \leq M_0$, $|D^4v| \leq M_0$ near $\partial B_1(0)$. In the following we will use Ω to denote a general bounded convex domain.

Let

$$(2.2) \quad u = w + \phi$$

where ϕ is the tangent cone of u at 0, defined in (1.5). Then

$$(2.3) \quad w(x) \geq 0, \quad w(x) = o(|x|) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow 0.$$

Let Γ be the free boundary of the obstacle problem (1.1). In [35], Savin proved that Γ is uniformly convex and $C^{1,1}$ smooth for the case $f \equiv 1$. In this section, we show that his argument also applies to general function $f(x)$ provided $f(x)$ is positive and smooth, and obtain the estimate (1.9).

Lemma 2.1. (*Pogorelov's estimate*) *Let $\psi \in C^4(\Omega)$ be a convex solution to*

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \det D^2\psi &= h(x, \psi, D\psi) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on n , $\sup_{\Omega}(|\psi| + |D\psi|)$, and $\|\log h\|_{C^2}$, such that

$$(2.5) \quad [-\psi(x)] |D^2\psi(x)| \leq C \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

The proof for Pogorelov's estimate can be found in several papers. See for instance [18, 34]. Here we omit the proof.

Corollary 2.1. *Let u be the strictly convex solution to (2.1). We have the estimate*

$$(2.6) \quad |x| |D^2u(x)| \leq C \quad \forall x \in B_1 \setminus \{0\}.$$

where C depends only on $n, M_0, \sup_{B_1}(|u| + |Du|)$, and $\|\log g\|_{C^2}$.

Proof. Consider a point $x_0 \in B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$ near the origin. Choose the coordinates such that $x_0 = |x_0|e_n$, where $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Subtracting a linear function, one can assume

$$\phi(te_n) = 0 \text{ for } t > 0, \quad \text{and } \phi(x) \geq 0 \text{ for } x \in B_1.$$

Denote $\Omega_{\varepsilon_0} = \{x \in B_1 \mid u(x) < \varepsilon_0 x_n\}$, for some small but fixed $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Applying Lemma 2.1 to $u - \varepsilon_0 x_n$ in Ω_{ε_0} , we obtain

$$(\varepsilon_0 |x_0| - u(x_0)) |D^2u|(x_0) \leq C \quad \forall x_0 \in \Omega_{\varepsilon_0}.$$

Note that $u(x_0) = o(|x_0|)$. We obtain (2.6). □

Corollary 2.2. *Let ϕ be the tangential convex cone of u at 0. Then there holds*

$$(2.7) \quad |x| |D^2\phi(x)| \leq C \quad \forall 0 \neq x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for the same constant C in (2.6).

Proof. Consider a point $x_0 \in B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$ near the origin. Denote $t = |x_0| \in (0, 1)$. Make the dilation $X = x/t$ and $U_t(X) = u(x)/t$, and choose the coordinates such that $X_0 =: x_0/t = e_n$. Then ϕ is also the tangential convex cone of U_t at 0. By Corollary 2.1, U_t satisfies

$$|X| |D_X^2 U_t(X)| = |x| |D_x^2 u(x)| \leq C \quad \forall X \neq 0.$$

Since $U_t(X) \rightarrow \phi(X)$ locally uniformly in \mathbb{R}^n as $t \rightarrow 0$, we obtain (2.7). \square

Estimates (2.6), (2.7) are due to Savin [35]. By duality, (2.7) implies that the free boundary Γ is strictly convex. In fact, for any point $p \in \Gamma$, we can choose the coordinates such that $p = 0$, $\Gamma \subset \{x_n \geq 0\}$, and locally Γ is given by $x_n = \eta(x')$. Then (2.7) implies that $\eta(x') \geq |x'|^2/C$. By (2.6) and (2.7), we also have

$$(2.8) \quad |x| |D^2 w(x)| \leq C \quad \forall x \in B_1 \setminus \{0\}.$$

where w is the function given in (2.2).

Lemma 2.2. *(Savin's estimate) Consider the Monge-Ampère obstacle problem*

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \det D^2 v &= f(x, v) \chi_{\{v > 0\}} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= v_0 > 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that f is non-decreasing in v and $0 < \lambda \leq f \leq \Lambda < +\infty$. Then there exists a constant C , depending only on $n, \lambda, \Lambda, \|D_x \log f\|_{L^\infty}, \|D_x^2 \log f\|_{L^\infty}$ and the strict convexity of Γ , such that

$$(2.10) \quad \kappa_i \leq C \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

where $(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1})$ are the principal curvatures of $\partial\{v = h\}$, for $h > 0$ small.

Proof. The following proof is due to Savin's [35], where he considered the case $f = f(v)$. His proof also applies to the case $f = f(x, v)$, so we will just sketch the proof.

1). Let p_0 be a point on the free boundary Γ . We choose the coordinates such that x_n is the outer normal of $\{v = 0\}$ at p_0 , and express the graph of v by a function \mathbf{v} in the form $x_n = -\mathbf{v}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})$. Then

$$\frac{\det D^2 \mathbf{v}}{(1 + |D\mathbf{v}|^2)^{(n+2)/2}} = K = \frac{\det D^2 v}{(1 + |Dv|^2)^{(n+2)/2}} = \frac{f(x, v)}{(1 + |Dv|^2)^{(n+2)/2}},$$

where K is the Gauss curvature of the graph of v . Hence \mathbf{v} satisfies the equation

$$\det D^2 \mathbf{v} = f(x, v) \frac{(1 + |D\mathbf{v}|^2)^{(n+2)/2}}{(1 + |Dv|^2)^{(n+2)/2}}.$$

From the relation $x_{n+1} = v(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, -\mathbf{v}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}))$, we have

$$v_1 - v_n \mathbf{v}_1 = 0, \quad \dots, \quad v_{n-1} - v_n \mathbf{v}_{n-1} = 0, \quad v_n \mathbf{v}_{n+1} = -1.$$

Hence $Dv = (\frac{-\mathbf{v}_1}{\mathbf{v}_{n+1}}, \dots, \frac{-\mathbf{v}_{n-1}}{\mathbf{v}_{n+1}}, \frac{-1}{\mathbf{v}_{n+1}})$, and $\frac{(1+|D\mathbf{v}|^2)^{(n+2)/2}}{(1+|Dv|^2)^{(n+2)/2}} = |\mathbf{v}_{n+1}|^{n+2}$. The above equation becomes

$$(2.11) \quad \det D^2 \mathbf{v} = \bar{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) |\mathbf{v}_{n+1}|^{n+2},$$

where $\bar{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, -\mathbf{v}, x_{n+1})$. The variables of \mathbf{v} are $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}$.

By a translation of the coordinates, assume that $p_0 = ae_n$ for a small constant $a > 0$. By the strict convexity of Γ , there exists a small constant $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{v}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})$ is a graph in $(-2\delta_0, 2\delta_0)^{n-1} \times (0, 2\delta_0)$, \mathbf{v}_1 is bounded in $(-\delta_0, \delta_0)^{n-1} \times (0, \delta_0)$, $\mathbf{v}(0) < 0$, and $\mathbf{v} > 0$ on $\partial((-\delta_0, \delta_0)^{n-1}) \times [0, \delta_0]$.

2). To prove (2.10), it suffices to prove that \mathbf{v}_{11} is bounded near p_0 . The same argument applies to \mathbf{v}_{ii} for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$. Let

$$G = (-\mathbf{v})\eta\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}_1^2\right)\mathbf{v}_{11}.$$

be the auxiliary function of Pogorelov. Assume that G attains its maximum at an *interior point* $x_0 \in \{\mathbf{v} < 0\} \cap \{(-\delta_0, \delta_0)^{n-1} \times (0, \delta_0)\}$. We make the coordinate transform

$$(2.12) \quad y_1 = x_1 + \frac{\mathbf{v}_{1i}(x_0)}{\mathbf{v}_{11}(x_0)}x_i, \quad y_i = x_i \quad (i = 2, \dots, n-1), \quad \text{and} \quad y_n = x_{n+1},$$

such that $D^2 \mathbf{v}$ is diagonal at x_0 . This coordinate transform does not change the value of $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_{11}$. Then at x_0 , we have

$$(\log G)_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}^{ii} (\log G)_{ii} \leq 0.$$

Carrying out the calculation in [35] and choosing $\eta(t) = e^{\alpha t}$ for some $\alpha > 0$ small, we obtain $G \leq C$.

3). In step 2), we assume that x_0 is an interior point. Next we use approximation [35] to rule out the case when $x_0 \in \{x_{n+1} = 0\}$ is a boundary point. Consider

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \det D^2 v &= f_\varepsilon(x, v) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= v_0 > 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

where $f_\varepsilon(x, v) = a_\varepsilon(v)f(x, v)$. We choose smooth functions a_ε such that

$$a_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{when } t < -\varepsilon, \\ 1 & \text{when } t > 0. \end{cases}$$

Let v_ε be the solution to (2.13). By assumption, $f(x, v)$ is non-decreasing in v , there is a unique solution to the obstacle problem. Hence v_ε converges to the unique solution v as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Define \mathbf{v}_ε similarly as above, such that $x_{n+1} = v_\varepsilon(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, -\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon)$. We then apply the above argument to \mathbf{v}_ε and obtain an upper bound for $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon)_{11}$ near the origin, and the upper bound is independent of ε . Sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain (2.10). \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let u be the solution to (2.1). We have the estimate*

$$(2.14) \quad |x| |\partial_\xi^2 u(x)| \geq C_1 \quad \forall 0 \neq x \in B_1(0), \quad \xi \perp x, \quad |\xi| = 1$$

where the constant C_1 depends only on $n, M_0, \sup_{B_1}(|u| + |Du|)$, and $\|\log g\|_{C^{1,1}}$.

Proof. Denote by ℓ_x the tangent plane of u at x . For any given point $x_0 \neq 0$ in $B_1(0)$ near the origin, let $h = \ell_{x_0}(0)$ ($h < 0$) and $\phi_h(x)$ be the convex cone given by

$$\phi_h(x) = \sup\{L(x) : L \text{ is affine function, } L(\cdot) < u(\cdot) \text{ in } B_1(0) \text{ and } L(0) = h\}.$$

Let v be Legendre transform of u , i.e. $v = x \cdot Du - u$. Then v is a solution to (1.1). By the duality between u and v , we have $\partial\phi_h\{0\} = \{v \leq -h\}$. So (2.10) implies that

$$(2.15) \quad |x| |\partial_\xi^2 \phi_h(x)| \geq C_1 \quad \forall x \neq 0, \quad \xi \perp x, \quad |\xi| = 1.$$

It is easy to see that (2.15) implies (2.14) at point x_0 . \square

Sending $h \rightarrow 0$, from (2.15) we also obtain

Corollary 2.4. *Let ϕ be the tangential cone of u at 0. Then*

$$(2.16) \quad |x| |\partial_\xi^2 \phi(x)| \geq C_1 \quad \forall 0 \neq x \in B_1(0), \quad \xi \perp x, \quad |\xi| = 1.$$

We denote $a \approx b$ if two quantities a and b are positive and there is a constant C under control such that $\frac{a}{b} + \frac{b}{a} \leq C$. Given two convex domains A and B , we denote $A \sim B$ if $C^{-1}(A - p) \subset B - q \subset C(A - p)$, where p, q are the geometric centres of A and B , respectively.

Corollary 2.5. *Let u be the solution to (2.1). Let $\lambda_1(x) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(x)$ be the eigenvalues of D^2u at $x \neq 0$. Then $\lambda_1(x) \approx \dots \approx \lambda_{n-1}(x) \approx |x|^{-1}$ and $\lambda_n(x) \approx |x|^{n-1}$.*

Proof. By (2.6) and (2.14), we have $\lambda_1 \approx \cdots \approx \lambda_{n-1} \approx |x|^{-1}$. By virtue of the equation (2.1) we then have $\lambda_n \approx |x|^{n-1}$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let w be the function given in (2.2). There exist two constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$, depending only on $n, M_0, \sup_{B_1}(|u| + |Du|)$, and $\|\log g\|_{C^{1,1}}$, such that*

$$(2.17) \quad C_1|x|^{n+1} \leq w(x) \leq C_2|x|^{n+1} \quad \forall x \in B_1(0).$$

Proof. For any given point $x_0 \in B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$ near the origin, by a rotation of the coordinates we assume that x_0 is on the positive x_1 -axis. Subtracting a linear function we assume

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi(te_1) &= 0 \quad \forall t \geq 0, \\ \phi(x) &\geq 0 \quad \forall x \in B_1(0), \end{aligned}$$

where $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. To prove the first inequality of (2.17), it suffices to prove

$$u(te_1) \geq Ct^{n+1} \quad \text{for } t > 0 \text{ small.}$$

By Corollary 2.5, we have

$$u_{11}(se_1) \geq Cs^{n-1}.$$

Hence

$$u_1(te_1) = \int_0^t u_{11}(se_1) ds \geq Ct^n,$$

and so we have

$$u(te_1) = \int_0^t u_1(se_1) ds \geq Ct^{n+1}.$$

Next we prove the second inequality of (2.17). Similarly as in Corollary 2.3, denote by ℓ_x the tangent plane of u at x . For any given point te_1 , $t > 0$, let $\phi_t(x)$ be the convex cone, given by

$$\phi_t(x) = \sup\{L(x) : L \text{ is affine function, } L(\cdot) < u(\cdot) \text{ in } B_1(0) \text{ and } L(0) = \ell_{te_1}(0)\}.$$

Then from the proof of Corollary 2.3, we have

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 \phi_t(te_1) = 0, \quad \partial_{x_i}^2 \phi_t(te_1) \geq \frac{C}{t}, \quad i = 2, \dots, n.$$

Let ξ be a unit eigenvector of the least eigenvalue of $D^2u(te_1)$. We claim

$$(2.19) \quad |\langle \xi, e_1 \rangle| \geq 1 - C_1 t^n$$

for a sufficiently large constant C_1 . Indeed, let $\xi = ae_1 + b\eta$, where $\eta \perp e_1$ and $|\eta| = 1$. If (2.19) is not true, then $|b| \geq (C_1 t^n)^{1/2}$ for t small enough. Since u and ϕ_t are tangent at te_1 and $u \geq \phi_t$, and since $\phi_t(te_1)$ is linear in t , we have

$$t^{n-1} \approx \partial_\xi^2 u(te_1) \geq \partial_\xi^2 \phi_t(te_1) = b^2 \partial_\eta^2 \phi_t(te_1) \geq CC_1 t^{n-1}$$

which is impossible if we choose C_1 large enough. This proves the claim.

By (2.19), we infer that

$$(2.20) \quad \partial_{x_1}^2 u(te_1) \leq C_2 t^{n-1}.$$

Indeed, from (2.19), we have $a \approx 1$ and $|b| \leq Ct^{\frac{n}{2}}$. By the convexity of u , we have

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} t^{n-1} &\approx \partial_\xi^2 u(te_1) = a^2 \partial_{x_1}^2 u(te_1) + 2ab \partial_{x_1 \eta} u(te_1) + b^2 \partial_\eta^2 u(te_1) \\ &\geq \left(a \sqrt{\partial_{x_1}^2 u(te_1)} - |b| \sqrt{\partial_\eta^2 u(te_1)} \right)^2 \\ &\geq a^2 \left(\sqrt{\partial_{x_1}^2 u(te_1)} - Ct^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \right)^2 \geq \frac{C_2}{4} t^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

if $\partial_{x_1}^2 u(te_1) \geq C_2 t^{n-1}$ for a sufficiently large C_2 , which is a contradiction. Hence

$$u_1(te_1) = \int_0^t u_{11}(se_1) ds \leq C_3 t^n$$

and so we have

$$u(te_1) = \int_0^t u_1(se_1) ds \leq C_4 t^{n+1}.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

We express equation (2.1) in the spherical coordinates (θ, r) , where $r = |x|$ and $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1})$ is an orthonormal frame on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} .

Lemma 2.4. *In the spherical coordinate (θ, r) , one has*

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} |\partial_r^k w(p)| &\leq c|p|^{n+1-k}, \quad k = 0, \dots, n+1, \\ |\partial_\theta^2 w(p)| &\leq c|p|, \\ |\partial_{r\theta} w(p)| &\leq c|p|^{\frac{n}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for any point $p \neq 0$ near the origin.

Proof. As in Lemma 2.3, we may assume (2.18) holds. Denote $G_\varepsilon = \{x \in B_1(0) : u(x) < \varepsilon x_1\}$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small constant. By the strict convexity of u , we have $G_\varepsilon \subset\subset B_1$.

For any point $x = (x_1, \tilde{x}) \in G_\varepsilon$, where $\tilde{x} = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$, by (2.16) we have

$$(2.23) \quad u(x) \geq \phi(x) \geq c_0 \frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{x_1}.$$

Hence

$$(2.24) \quad G_\varepsilon \subset \{x \in B_1(0) : |\tilde{x}| \leq c_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} x_1\}.$$

Denote

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{aligned} s_\varepsilon &= \sup\{s : se_1 \in G_\varepsilon\}, \\ t_\varepsilon &= \sup\{x_1 : x \in G_\varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.3, we have $t_\varepsilon \geq s_\varepsilon \approx \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}$.

By the definition of t_ε in (2.25), and the strict convexity of u , there exists a unique \tilde{x}_ε such that $(t_\varepsilon, \tilde{x}_\varepsilon) \in \partial G_\varepsilon$. Then by Lemma 2.3,

$$\varepsilon t_\varepsilon = u(t_\varepsilon, \tilde{x}_\varepsilon) \geq \phi(t_\varepsilon, \tilde{x}_\varepsilon) + C(t_\varepsilon^2 + |\tilde{x}_\varepsilon|^2)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \geq Ct_\varepsilon^{n+1},$$

which implies $t_\varepsilon \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}$. Hence $t_\varepsilon \approx s_\varepsilon \approx \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}$.

By (2.17), we also have

$$\inf_{G_\varepsilon}(u - \varepsilon x_1) = \inf_{G_\varepsilon}(\phi + w - \varepsilon x_1) \approx -\varepsilon s_\varepsilon.$$

Let $A_\varepsilon = G_\varepsilon \cap \{x_1 = \beta s_\varepsilon\}$, where $\beta > 0$ is a small constant. By Corollary 2.4, we have $A_\varepsilon \subset \{|\tilde{x}| < C\varepsilon^{1/2}s_\varepsilon\} \cap \{x_1 = \beta s_\varepsilon\}$, where $\tilde{x} = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$. For a point $(x_1, \tilde{x}) \in \partial A_\varepsilon$, by Corollary 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we have

$$u(x_1, \tilde{x}) \leq \phi(x_1, \tilde{x}) + C(|x_1|^2 + |\tilde{x}|^2)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \leq C \frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{x_1} + 2C\beta^{n+1}s_\varepsilon^{n+1}.$$

The left hand side $u(x_1, \tilde{x}) = \varepsilon x_1 = \beta \varepsilon s_\varepsilon$ since $(x_1, \tilde{x}) \in \partial A_\varepsilon$. Choosing a small $\beta \ll 1$ such that $\beta^{n+1}s_\varepsilon^{n+1} \approx \beta^{n+1}\varepsilon s_\varepsilon \ll \beta \varepsilon s_\varepsilon$, we obtain $|\tilde{x}| \geq c\varepsilon^{1/2}s_\varepsilon$, namely $\{|\tilde{x}| < c\varepsilon^{1/2}s_\varepsilon\} \cap \{x_1 = \beta s_\varepsilon\} \subset A_\varepsilon$.

Now we make the coordinate change $x \rightarrow y = T(x)$, given by

$$(2.26) \quad y_1 = \frac{x_1}{s_\varepsilon}, \quad y_k = \frac{x_k}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}s_\varepsilon} \quad (k = 2, \dots, n),$$

We have shown that $A_\varepsilon \sim \{|\tilde{x}| < \varepsilon^{1/2}s_\varepsilon\}$ (as a convex domain in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}). Hence $T(G_\varepsilon)$ has a good shape, namely, $T(G_\varepsilon) \sim B_1(0)$. Let $\tilde{u}(y) = \frac{u(x) - \varepsilon x_1}{\varepsilon s_\varepsilon}$. Then \tilde{u} satisfies

$$(2.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \det D^2 \tilde{u} &= c_\varepsilon \tilde{g}(D\tilde{u}) \quad \text{in } T(G_\varepsilon), \\ \tilde{u} &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial T(G_\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-1}s_\varepsilon^n \approx 1$, $\tilde{g}(D\tilde{u}) = g(\varepsilon \tilde{u}_{y_1} + \varepsilon, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u}_{\tilde{y}})$. Hence by the regularity theory for the Monge-Ampère equation, \tilde{u} is smooth in $T(G_\varepsilon)$, and we have the estimate

$$(2.28) \quad \|D^k \tilde{u}\|_{S_{h_0/2, \tilde{u}}} \leq C_k, \quad k \geq 2$$

where $S_{h_0/2, \tilde{u}} = \{\tilde{u} < -h_0/2\}$, $h_0 =: -\tilde{u}(\frac{1}{2}, 0) \approx 1$. Restricting to the x_1 -axis, we obtain

$$\|D_{y_1}^k \tilde{u}\|_{S_{h_0/2, \tilde{u}} \cap \{|\tilde{x}|=0\}} = \|D_{y_1}^k \tilde{u}\|_{S_{h_0/2, \tilde{u}} \cap \{|\tilde{x}|=0\}} \leq C_k, \quad k \geq 2,$$

where $\tilde{w}(y) = \frac{w(x)}{\varepsilon s_\varepsilon}$. Scaling back to the original coordinates, we obtain

$$|D_{x_1}^k w(p)| \leq C_k t_\varepsilon^{n+1-k}, \quad k \geq 2,$$

where $p = te_1$ with $t \approx t_\varepsilon$. We obtain the first estimate in (2.22). The second and third estimates in (2.22), for which $k = 2$, also follows from (2.28) by rescaling. \square

3. Bernstein theorem for a singular Monge-Ampère equation

In this section we prove a Bernstein theorem for the singular Monge-Ampère type equation in half space,

$$(3.1) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{x_n x_n} + b \frac{\psi_{x_n}}{x_n} & \psi_{x_n x_1} & \cdots & \psi_{x_n x_{n-1}} \\ \psi_{x_n x_1} & \psi_{x_1 x_1} & \cdots & \psi_{x_1 x_{n-1}} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \psi_{x_n x_{n-1}} & \psi_{x_1 x_{n-1}} & \cdots & \psi_{x_{n-1} x_{n-1}} \end{pmatrix} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n = \mathbb{R}^n \cap \{x_n > 0\}.$$

Equation (3.1) is the limit of equation (1.10) in a blow-up argument. We have the following Bernstein theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\psi \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ be a solution to (3.1) with constant $b > -1$. Assume that $D\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi_{x_n}(x', 0) = 0 \forall x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and equation (3.1) is uniformly elliptic. Then ψ is a quadratic polynomial of the form*

$$(3.2) \quad \psi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} c_{ij} x_i x_j + \frac{1}{2} c_{nn} x_n^2$$

where $\{c_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{n-1}$ is positive definite and $c_{nn} > 0$.

In Theorem 3.1, we denote $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n} = \mathbb{R}_+^n \cup \{x_n = 0\}$. To prove the Bernstein theorem, we make use of the Hölder continuity for the following degenerate elliptic equation.

$$(3.3) \quad \partial_n(x_n \partial_n u) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \partial_i(a_{ij}(x) \partial_j u) + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(x) \partial_i u = f(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

We assume that the coefficients a_{ij} and b_i satisfy the following conditions.

(i) a_{ij} are measurable and satisfy

$$C_*^{-1} |\xi|^2 \leq a_{ij} \xi_i \xi_j \leq C_* |\xi|^2 \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1},$$

where C_* is a positive constant.

(ii) $b_1 = \cdots = b_{n-1} = 0$ and b_n is a positive constant.

By a change of variables, a model of equation (3.3) is

$$(3.4) \quad \Delta u + \frac{b}{x_n} u_{x_n} = f(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

This is the classical Keldysh equation.

Denote $B_R^+(0) = B_R(0) \cap \{x_n > 0\}$. We have the following Hölder continuity.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $u \in C^2(B_1^+) \cap L^\infty(B_1^+)$ be a solution to (3.3). Assume conditions (i), (ii), and $f \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for some $q > (n+1)/2$. Then u is continuous up to $x_n = 0$, and there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$(3.5) \quad |u(x) - u(\tilde{x})| \leq C \left(\sup_{B_1^+} |u| + \|f\|_{L^q(B_1^+)} \right) |x - \tilde{x}|^\alpha \quad \forall x, \tilde{x} \in B_{1/2}^+,$$

where α and C are positive constants depending only on n, b, q, C_* .

The Hölder continuity of solutions for degenerate elliptic equations has been studied by many authors. For proofs of Proposition 3.1, we refer the readers to [13, 20].

In Theorem 1.11 of [13], the authors proved the Hölder continuity for weak solutions to the variational equation (1.19) in [13], where the bilinear $a(u, v)$ was given in (1.13) and the coefficients satisfy Assumption 1.11 of the paper. In Section 5 of [20], the authors studied equation (3.3) and proved the Hölder continuity in dimension two, with application to a geometric problem in \mathbb{R}^3 , but the proof in [20] is valid in all dimensions. In fact, the proofs in [13] and [20] are similar, both of them use the Nash-Moser iteration.

In [13, 20] the coefficients b_i can be more general, here we assume condition (ii), which suffices for our purpose. In Proposition 3.1 we also assume that $u \in C^2(B_1^+) \cap L^\infty(B_1^+)$, which is stronger than the assumption that u is a weak solution in [13, 20].

To apply Proposition 3.1 to the singular Monge-Ampère equation (3.1), we make a partial Legendre transform [32], to change equation (3.1) to the form (3.3).

Let

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} y_n &= x_n, \\ y' &= D_{x'} \psi, \\ \psi^* &= x' \cdot D_{x'} \psi - \psi. \end{aligned}$$

Then by direct computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial x_n} &= 1, & \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial x'} &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial y'}{\partial x_n} &= D_{x'}\psi_{x_n}, & \frac{\partial y'}{\partial x'} &= D_{x'}^2\psi,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial x_n}{\partial y_n} &= 1, & \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial y'} &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial x'}{\partial y'} &= (D_{x'}^2\psi)^{-1}, \\ \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_n} &= \Psi^{in}(\det(D_{x'}^2\psi))^{-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1\end{aligned}$$

where $\{\Psi^{ij}\}$ is the cofactor matrix of $D^2\psi$. Hence ψ^* satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{y_n}^* &= -\psi_{x_n}, & D_{y'}\psi^* &= x', \\ D_{y'}^2\psi^* &= (D_{x'}^2\psi)^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{y_n y_n}^* &= -\frac{\partial \psi_{x_n}}{\partial y_n} \\ &= -\psi_{x_n x_n} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial \psi_{x_n}}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_n} \\ &= -\psi_{x_n x_n} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \psi_{x_i x_n} \Psi^{in}(\det D_{x'}^2\psi)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$-\frac{\psi_{y_n y_n}^* + b \frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n}}{\det D_{y'}^2\psi^*} = \psi_{x_i x_n} \Psi^{in} + (\psi_{x_n x_n} + b \frac{\psi_{x_n}}{x_n}) \det D_{x'}^2\psi = 1.$$

Hence ψ^* satisfies

$$(3.7) \quad \psi_{y_n y_n}^* + b \frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n} + \det D_{y'}^2\psi^* = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

In equation (3.7), the singular term $\frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n}$ is separate from the nonlinear part $\det D_{y'}^2\psi^*$. This is a very helpful property. Moreover, the Monge-Ampère operator $\det D_{y'}^2\psi^*$ is of divergence form. Hence equation (3.7) is of the same form as (3.4). Moreover, we assume that $\psi \in C^{1,1}$ such that (3.1) is uniformly elliptic. We have the following key estimate.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\psi^* \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ be a solution to (3.7) with $b > -1$. Assume $\psi_{y_n}^*(y', 0) = 0 \ \forall \ y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and $D_{y'}^2\psi^*$ is positive definite. Then $\frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,*

and we have the estimate

$$(3.8) \quad \left\| \frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [0,1])} \leq C$$

for a constant C depending only on b, n , $\|D_y^2 \psi^*\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}$ and $\|(D_{y'}^2 \psi^*)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}$.

Proof. Let $z_n = \frac{1}{4}y_n^2$, $z' = y'$. Then equation (3.7) is changed to

$$z_n \psi_{z_n z_n}^* + \frac{b+1}{2} \psi_{z_n}^* + \det D_{z'}^2 \psi^* = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

Denote $\Psi = \psi_{z_n}^*$. Differentiating the above equation in z_n gives

$$\partial_{z_n}(z_n \Psi_{z_n}) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \partial_{z_i}(a^{ij} \Psi_{z_j}) + \frac{b+1}{2} \Psi_{z_n} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

Here $\{a^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{n-1}$ is the cofactor matrix of $D_{z'}^2 \psi^*$. By assumption, $D_{y'}^2 \psi^*$ is positive definite. Hence $\lambda I \leq \{a^{ij}\} \leq \Lambda I$ for two positive constants λ, Λ depending only on $\|D_y^2 \psi^*\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}$ and $\|(D_{y'}^2 \psi^*)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}$. Moreover,

$$(3.9) \quad \Psi(z) = \psi_{z_n}^* = \frac{2\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n} = 2 \int_0^1 \psi_{y_n y_n}^*(y', ty_n) dt \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n).$$

Therefore all the conditions in Proposition 3.1 are satisfied.

By Proposition 3.1, we obtain the Hölder continuity of Ψ . By (3.9), $\Psi(z) = \frac{2\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n}$. Hence we obtain (3.8). \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\psi \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ be a solution to (3.1) with $b > -1$. Assume $\psi_{x_n}(x', 0) = 0 \ \forall \ x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and equation (3.1) is uniformly elliptic. Then $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. Let ψ^* be the partial Legendre transform of ψ . Then ψ^* satisfies equation (3.7) and the assumptions of Lemma 3.1. Hence by Lemma 3.1, $\frac{\psi_{y_n}^*}{y_n} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$. Recall that $\frac{\psi_{x_n}(x)}{x_n} = -\frac{\psi_{y_n}^*(y)}{y_n}$. We therefore have

$$\left| \frac{\psi_{x_n}(x)}{x_n} - \frac{\psi_{x_n}(\tilde{x})}{\tilde{x}_n} \right| = \left| \frac{\psi_{y_n}^*(y)}{y_n} - \frac{\psi_{y_n}^*(\tilde{y})}{\tilde{y}_n} \right| \leq C|y - \tilde{y}|^\alpha.$$

By the partial Legendre transform, $y_n = x_n$, $y' = D_{x'} \psi$. It follows that

$$|y' - \tilde{y}'| = |D_{x'} \psi(x) - D_{x'} \psi(\tilde{x})| \leq \|D^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} |x - \tilde{x}|.$$

Hence $\frac{\psi_{x_n}}{x_n} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ and we have the estimate

$$(3.10) \quad \left\| \frac{\psi_{x_n}}{x_n} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [0,1])} \leq C$$

for a constant C depending only on b, n , and $\|D_x^2 \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}$.

We make an even extension of $\psi(x)$ with respect to the variable x_n and still denote it by $\psi(x)$. Regard $\frac{\psi_{x_n}}{x_n}$ as a known function, which is Hölder continuous. Then we can write equation (3.1) in the form

$$\mathcal{F}(x, D^2 \psi) = 1.$$

By our assumption, \mathcal{F} is fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic, and is C^α smooth in x . Since $\mathcal{F}_n^{\frac{1}{n}}$ is concave in $D^2 \psi$, by the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity [4], we also conclude that $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. \square

In Lemma 3.2, we assume that ψ is $C^{1,1}$ and the equation (3.1) is uniformly elliptic. Without these conditions, Lemma 3.2 does not hold. Here is an example.

Example 3.1. *The function*

$$u(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{|y|^{1+\varepsilon}}{(1+\varepsilon)\varepsilon}.$$

is strictly convex and satisfies the equation

$$(3.11) \quad (u_{xx} - 1 + |y|^{1-\varepsilon})u_{yy} - u_{xy}^2 = 1.$$

But u is not $C^{1,1}$ smooth.

With the aid of Lemma 3.2, we can now prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1: Let ψ be the solution in Theorem 3.1. Let

$$(3.12) \quad \psi^m(x) = \frac{\psi(mx)}{m^2}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

be a blow-down sequence of ψ . Since (3.1) is uniformly elliptic for ψ , it is also uniformly elliptic for ψ^m with the same ellipticity constants. The uniform ellipticity implies that there is a constant $\hat{C} > 0$, independent of m , such that

$$(3.13) \quad \hat{C}^{-1}\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{M}_{\psi^m} \leq \hat{C}\mathcal{I},$$

where \mathcal{I} is the unit matrix and \mathcal{M}_{ψ} denotes matrix in equation (3.1). Hence the first entry in the matrix \mathcal{M}_{ψ^m} satisfies

$$\psi_{x_n x_n}^m + b \frac{\psi_{x_n}^m}{x_n} = \hat{f},$$

for a function \hat{f} satisfying $\hat{C}^{-1} \leq \hat{f} \leq \hat{C}$. We can solve the above equation, regarding it as an ode with variable x_n ,

$$(3.14) \quad \psi^m(\cdot, x_n) = \psi^m(\cdot, 0) + \int_0^{x_n} r^{-b} \int_0^r s^b \hat{f}(\cdot, s) ds.$$

In (3.14) we have used the initial condition $\psi_{x_n}^m(\cdot, 0) = 0$. Note that (3.13) implies that $\psi^m(x', 0) = O(|x'|^2)$. Hence from (3.14) we have $\psi^m(x) = O(|x|^2)$ near 0.

Hence by the assumptions in Theorem 3.1, ψ^m satisfies the conditions in Lemma 3.2, uniformly in m . Therefore, by Lemma 3.2 we have

$$(3.15) \quad |D^2\psi(x) - D^2\psi(0)| = \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} |D^2\psi^m\left(\frac{x}{m}\right) - D^2\psi^m(0)| = 0$$

for any given point $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. That is, $D^2\psi(x) = D^2\psi(0) \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Hence ψ is a quadratic polynomial. By the assumption $\psi_{x_n}(x', 0) = 0 \forall x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, we have $c_{in} = 0$ in the polynomial (3.2). \square

The following example shows that the Bernstein theorem 3.1 is not unconditionally true.

Example 3.2. *Let*

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x_2^2 + \cdots + x_{n-1}^2) + \frac{1}{2}x_1^2x_n^{b-1} + \frac{x_n^{3-b}}{2(3-b)},$$

where $b > 1$. By direct computation, ψ satisfies equation (3.1).

It is well known that the classical Bernstein theorem for the Monge-Ampère equation was proved by Jörgens for dimension $n = 2$, Calabi for $3 \leq n \leq 5$, and Pogorelov for all dimensions [34]. In [24], a Bernstein type theorem on a different singular Monge-Ampère type equation in half space was proved,

Example 3.3 ([24]). *Let u be a convex solution to*

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \det D^2u &= \left(\frac{u_{x_n}}{x_n}\right)^{n+2} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ u(x', 0) &= \frac{1}{2}|x'|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then either $u = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$, or $u(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x'|^2$.

In contrast to the above example, it is also interesting to mention the following counterexample by Savin [37].

Example 3.4 ([37]). *Let*

$$u(x) = \frac{x_1^2}{2(1+x_n)} + \frac{1}{2}(x_2^2 + \cdots + x_n^2) + \frac{1}{6}x_n^3.$$

Then u satisfies

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \det D^2u &= 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ u(x', 0) &= \frac{1}{2}|x'|^2. \end{aligned}$$

4. C^2 regularity of free boundary

In this section, we prove the C^2 regularity of the free boundary, which is equivalent to the C^2 regularity of the tangent cone of the following singular Monge-Ampère equation

$$(4.1) \quad \det D^2 u = g(Du) + \delta_0 \quad \text{in } B_1(0).$$

Assume that g is a smooth function and satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad 0 < \lambda \leq g \leq \Lambda < +\infty$$

for positive constants $\Lambda \geq \lambda > 0$. Let u be a strictly convex solution to (4.1). Assume that $u(0) = 0$, $u \geq 0$ and $u > 0$ on $\partial B_1(0)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let ϕ be the tangential cone of u at 0. Then the section $S_{1,\phi} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \phi(x) < 1\}$ is uniformly convex and C^2 smooth provided g is C^2 smooth and satisfies (4.2).*

We have shown in §2 that $S_{1,\phi}$ is uniformly convex and $C^{1,1}$ smooth. In this section we raise the regularity of $S_{1,\phi}$ from $C^{1,1}$ to C^2 . This is the most delicate part in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Our proof uses a blow-up argument, and uses the maximum principle in an infinite sequence of specially chosen domains.

Denote

$$(4.3) \quad \zeta = \frac{u}{r},$$

where $r = |x| \in (0, 1]$. We can extend ζ continuously to $r = 0$. By (2.17), $\zeta(\theta, 0) = \phi(\theta, r)/r$. To prove Theorem 4.1, we will prove that $\zeta(\theta, r) \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$, namely the second derivatives of ζ can continuously extend to $r = 0$ (Theorem 4.2). First we derive the equation for ζ in (θ, r) .

Lemma 4.1. *Let θ be an orthonormal frame on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Then ζ satisfies the Monge-Ampère type equation*

$$(4.4) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\zeta_{rr}}{r^{n-2}} + \frac{2\zeta_r}{r^{n-1}} & \frac{\zeta_{r\theta_1}}{r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} & \cdots & \frac{\zeta_{r\theta_{n-1}}}{r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \\ \frac{\zeta_{r\theta_1}}{r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_1} + \zeta + r\zeta_r & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \frac{\zeta_{r\theta_{n-1}}}{r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_{n-1}\theta_{n-1}} + \zeta + r\zeta_r \end{pmatrix} = \bar{g},$$

where $\bar{g} =: g(Du)$ is a smooth function of $\zeta, r\zeta_r, \zeta_\theta$. The subscript θ means covariant derivatives on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} .

Proof. For any given point $(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times (0, 1]$, there is no loss in assuming that $\theta = 0$ and $r = 1$. To derive equation (4.4), we use the spherical polar coordinates

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} x_1 = r \sin \theta_1, \\ x_2 = r \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_2, \\ \quad \dots, \\ x_{n-1} = r \cos \theta_1 \cdots \cos \theta_{n-2} \sin \theta_{n-1}, \\ x_n = r \cos \theta_1 \cdots \cos \theta_{n-1}. \end{cases}$$

In the local coordinates (4.5), we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \theta_1}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \theta_{n-1}}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial r}{\partial x_1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial \theta_1}{\partial x_n} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \theta_{n-1}}{\partial x_n} & \frac{\partial r}{\partial x_n} \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{I} \quad \text{at } \theta = 0.$$

By direct computation, we also have, at $\theta = 0$,

$$\frac{\partial^2 \theta_\alpha}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = \begin{cases} -\delta_{\alpha j} & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq n-1, i = n, \\ -\delta_{\alpha i} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-1, j = n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \leq n-1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Rescaling back to $r \in (0, 1]$, we obtain

$$(4.6) \quad D_{x_i x_j}^2 u = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{r^2} u_{\theta_i \theta_j} + \frac{u_r}{r} \delta_{ij} & \text{if } 1 \leq i, j \leq n-1, \\ \frac{u_{r \theta_i}}{r} - \frac{u_{\theta_i}}{r^2} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-1, j = n, \\ u_{rr} & \text{if } i = j = n. \end{cases}$$

By the change $u = r\zeta$, we then obtain

$$D^2 u = \begin{pmatrix} r\zeta_{rr} + 2\zeta_r & \zeta_{r\theta_1} & \cdots & \zeta_{r\theta_{n-1}} \\ \zeta_{r\theta_1} & \frac{1}{r}\zeta_{\theta_1\theta_1} + \zeta_r + \frac{1}{r}\zeta & \cdots & \frac{1}{r}\zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \zeta_{r\theta_{n-1}} & \frac{1}{r}\zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{r}\zeta_{\theta_{n-1}\theta_{n-1}} + \zeta_r + \frac{1}{r}\zeta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence we obtain (4.4) at $\theta = 0$. As the Monge-Ampère equation is invariant under rotation of the coordinates, we see that (4.4) holds at a general point $(\theta, r) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times (0, 1)$.

To see that $\bar{g} =: g(Du)$ is a smooth function of $\zeta, r\zeta_r, \zeta_\theta$, we just need to compute

$$(4.7) \quad u_{x_i} = (r\zeta)_{x_i} = (r\zeta)_r \frac{\partial r}{\partial x_i} + r\zeta_{\theta_j} \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial x_i} = \begin{cases} \zeta_{\theta_i} & i < n, \\ \zeta + r\zeta_r & i = n, \end{cases} \quad \text{at } \theta = 0.$$

□

Note that the local coordinates θ in (4.5) is not orthonormal on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , but it is second order close to an orthonormal frame at $\theta = 0$. Hence we can use it to calculate the equation at $\theta = 0$. Here we say a coordinate system $\alpha = \alpha(\theta)$ is second order close to θ if $\frac{d\alpha}{d\theta} = \mathcal{I} + O(|\theta|^2)$. By our notation, $\zeta = \phi(\theta) + \frac{w}{r}$ (here we denote $\phi(\theta) = \phi(\theta, 1)$ for the function ϕ in (2.2)). Hence

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta_r &= \frac{w_r}{r} - \frac{w}{r^2}, \\ \zeta_{rr} &= \frac{w_{rr}}{r} - \frac{2w_r}{r^2} + \frac{2w}{r^3}, \\ \zeta_{r\theta} &= \frac{w_{r\theta}}{r} - \frac{w_\theta}{r^2}, \\ \zeta_{\theta\theta} &= \phi_{\theta\theta} + \frac{w_{\theta\theta}}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4, all the entries in (4.4) are uniformly bounded. To make (4.4) uniformly elliptic, let

$$s = r^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Then

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta_s &= \frac{2}{n} r^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \zeta_r, \\ \zeta_{s\theta} &= \frac{2}{n} r^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \zeta_{r\theta}, \\ \zeta_{ss} &= \frac{4\zeta_{rr}}{n^2 r^{n-2}} - \frac{2(n-2)\zeta_r}{n^2 r^{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (4.8), (4.9), and Lemma 2.4, we have

Corollary 4.1. *As a function of θ and s , ζ satisfies $\zeta_s(\theta, 0) = 0$ and $\zeta \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.*

By (4.9), equation (4.4) changes to

$$(4.10) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^2 \zeta_{ss} + \frac{n(n+2)}{4} \frac{\zeta_s}{s} & \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_1} & \cdots & \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_{n-1}} \\ \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_1} & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_1} + \zeta + \frac{n}{2} s \zeta_s & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{s\theta_{n-1}} & \zeta_{\theta_{n-1}\theta_{n-1}} & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_{n-1}\theta_{n-1}} + \zeta + \frac{n}{2} s \zeta_s \end{pmatrix} = \bar{g}.$$

After the change $s = r^{\frac{n}{2}}$, we have $r\zeta_r = \frac{n}{2}s\zeta_s$. Hence by (4.7), \bar{g} is still a smooth function, and \bar{g} is analytic if g is.

In the following we regard ζ as a function of θ and s , except otherwise specified.

Lemma 4.2. *Equation (4.10) is uniformly elliptic in θ and s .*

Proof. As shown in Corollary 4.1, ζ is $C^{1,1}$ in (θ, s) . Note that all the entries of the matrix in (4.10) are uniformly bounded. By our assumption, the function $\bar{g} > 0$. Hence the eigenvalues of the matrix are uniformly bounded and positive. Hence equation (4.10) is uniformly elliptic. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\zeta(\theta, s) \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$ be a solution to (4.10) and satisfy $\zeta_s(\theta, 0) = 0$. Assume that \bar{g} is positive and C^2 smooth. Then $\zeta(\theta, s) \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.*

Once Theorem 4.2 is proved, Theorem 4.1 follows by our definition of ζ .

To prove Theorem 4.2, one may wish to apply the partial Legendre transform (3.6) to (4.10). But due to the term $s\zeta_s$, equation (4.10) becomes very complicated after the change (3.6). In the following we will use a blow-up argument to prove Theorem 4.2. By the C^2 regularity of ζ for $s > 0$, it suffices to prove it at $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \{s = 0\}$. By Theorem 3.1, a blow-up sequence converges to a quadratic polynomial ψ of the form (3.2), in which the mixed derivatives $\psi_{x_i x_n}$ vanish for $i < n$. It implies that all the blow-up sequences sub-converge to the same limit and so the mixed derivatives $\zeta_{s\theta}$ are continuous at $s = 0$. For other second derivatives, we need to prove that all the blow-up sequences at a given point converge to the same quadratic polynomial, namely the limit is independent of the blow-up sequences. It implies not only the existence but also the continuity of the second derivatives. For clarity we divide the proof into three lemmas.

For any given point $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, by a rotation of the coordinate system, we assume $\theta_0 = 0$. By subtracting a linear function, there is no loss of generality in assuming that $\zeta(0) = D\zeta(0) = 0$ in the following argument.

Lemma 4.3. *Let ζ be as in Theorem 4.2. Then $\zeta_{s\theta} \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.*

Proof. We only need to prove that

$$(4.11) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \zeta_{s\theta}(\theta, s) = 0.$$

If (4.11) is not true, there exists a sub-sequence $(\theta^k, s^k) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ such that

$$(4.12) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} |\zeta_{s\theta}(\theta^k, s^k)| \geq \varepsilon_0$$

for a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. In this case, we make the coordinate transform

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \theta &= \lambda_k \varphi + \theta^k, \\ s &= \lambda_k \tau, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_k = s^k$, and set

$$(4.14) \quad \zeta^k(\varphi, \tau) = \frac{\zeta(\theta, s) - \zeta(\theta^k, 0) - D_\theta \zeta(\theta^k, 0) \cdot (\theta - \theta^k)}{\lambda_k^2}.$$

Note that (4.13) means a dilation and a rotation of the coordinates. We can regard φ as an orthonormal frame on $\lambda_k^{-1}\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then by the $C^{1,1}$ regularity of ζ , we have

$$|\zeta^k(\varphi, \tau)| \leq C(\tau^2 + |\varphi|^2)$$

for a constant $C > 0$ independent of k . Moreover, ζ^k satisfies the equation

$$(4.15) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} (\frac{n}{2})^2 \zeta_{\tau\tau}^k + \frac{n(n+2)}{4} \frac{\zeta_\tau^k}{\tau} & \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{\tau\varphi_1}^k & \cdots & \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{\tau\varphi_{n-1}}^k \\ \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{\tau\varphi_1}^k & \zeta_{\varphi_1\varphi_1}^k + h^k(\varphi, \tau) & \cdots & \zeta_{\varphi_1\varphi_{n-1}}^k \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \frac{n}{2} \zeta_{\tau\varphi_{n-1}}^k & \zeta_{\varphi_{n-1}\varphi_{n-1}}^k & \cdots & \zeta_{\varphi_{n-1}\varphi_{n-1}}^k + h^k(\varphi, \tau) \end{pmatrix} = \bar{g}^k$$

where $h^k = \lambda_k^2(\zeta^k + \frac{n}{2}\tau\zeta_\tau) + \zeta(\theta^k, 0) + \lambda_k D_\theta \zeta(\theta^k, 0) \cdot \varphi$, and \bar{g}^k is a smooth function converging to a positive constant.

Write (4.15) as a general fully nonlinear elliptic equation of the form

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{F}_k(\varphi, \tau, \zeta^k, D\zeta^k, D^2\zeta^k) = 0.$$

By Lemma 4.2, \mathcal{F}_k is uniformly elliptic. Moreover, $\mathcal{F}_k^{\frac{1}{n}}$ is concave with respect to its variables $D^2\zeta^k$ and is $C^{1,1}$ smooth in all arguments in $\tau > 0$. Hence by Evans-Krylov's interior regularity theory [18], we have

$$(4.17) \quad \|\zeta^k\|_{C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq C_\Omega \quad \forall \Omega \subset \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

where the constant C_Ω is independent of k . By passing to a subsequence, we have

$$(4.18) \quad \zeta^k(\varphi, \tau) \rightarrow \bar{\zeta}(\varphi, \tau) \quad \text{in} \quad C_{loc}^{3,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1-\varepsilon}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$$

for a function $\bar{\zeta} \in C_{loc}^{3,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is any small constant, and $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n} = \mathbb{R}_+^n \cup \{x_n = 0\}$. Moreover, the $C^{1,1}$ norm of $\bar{\zeta}$ is independent of the choice of the blow-up sequences, it depends only on the $C^{1,1}$ norm of ζ . Hence $\bar{\zeta}$ satisfies equation (3.1) with $b = \frac{n+2}{n}$ under the coordinates $x' = \varphi$, $x_n = \tau$. By Theorem 3.1, $\bar{\zeta}$ is a quadratic polynomial of the form

$$(4.19) \quad \bar{\zeta}(\varphi, \tau) = \frac{1}{2}c_{00}\tau^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}c_{ij}\varphi_i\varphi_j.$$

Note that in (4.19), the mixed derivatives $\bar{\xi}_{\tau\varphi}(0', 1) = 0$. By the interior regularity for (4.16), it implies that

$$(4.20) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \zeta_{s\theta}(\theta^k, s^k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \zeta_{\tau\varphi}^k(0', 1) = \bar{\xi}_{\tau\varphi}(0', 1) = 0.$$

By the interior regularity (4.17), we see that (4.20) is in contradiction with (4.12). This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let ζ be as in Theorem 4.2. Then $\zeta_{ss} \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.*

Proof. To prove the continuity of ζ_{ss} on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \{s = 0\}$, we need to prove the limit $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+, \theta \rightarrow 0} \zeta_{ss}(\theta, s)$ exists. By Lemma 4.2, $\zeta_{ss}(\theta, s)$ is uniformly bounded. Hence there is a sub-sequence $s^k \rightarrow 0$ such that $\zeta_{ss}(0, s^k)$ is convergent. We introduce the coordinates (φ, τ) and function ζ^k as in (4.13) and (4.14), with $\theta^k = 0$.

By the proof of Lemma 4.3, we have

$$(4.21) \quad \zeta^k(\varphi, \tau) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}c_{00}\tau^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}c_{ij}\varphi_i\varphi_j \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^{3,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1-\varepsilon}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}),$$

by passing to a subsequence if necessary. To prove Lemma 4.4, we need to prove that

$$(4.22) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+, \theta \rightarrow 0} \zeta_{ss}(\theta, s) = c_{00}.$$

By the convergence (4.21) and the interior regularity of equation (4.15), we can choose a subsequence, such that

$$(4.23) \quad \left\| \frac{\zeta_\tau^k(\varphi, \tau)}{\tau} - c_{00} \right\|_{L^\infty(Q_k)} \leq \frac{1}{2k} \quad \text{in } Q_k =: \{(\varphi, \tau) : |\varphi| \leq 1, \frac{1}{k} \leq \tau \leq 1\}.$$

Scaling back to $\zeta(\theta, s)$, we obtain

$$(4.24) \quad \left\| \frac{\zeta_s(\theta, s)}{s} - c_{00} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_k)} \leq \frac{1}{2k} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_k =: \{(\theta, s) : |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \frac{\lambda_k}{k} \leq s \leq \lambda_k\}.$$

Let $t = \frac{s^2}{4}$. The above estimate implies that

$$(4.25) \quad \|\zeta_t - 2c_{00}\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\Sigma}_k)} \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{in } \widehat{\Sigma}_k = \{(\theta, t) : |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \frac{\lambda_k^2}{4k^2} \leq t \leq \frac{\lambda_k^2}{4}\}.$$

Moreover, equation (4.10) changes to

$$(4.26) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} t\zeta_{tt} + \frac{n+1}{n}\zeta_t & \zeta_{t\theta_1} & \cdots & \zeta_{t\theta_{n-1}} \\ t\zeta_{t\theta_1} & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_1} + \zeta + t\zeta_t & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_1\theta_{n-1}} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ t\zeta_{t\theta_{n-1}} & \zeta_{\theta_{n-1}\theta_{n-1}} + \zeta + t\zeta_t & \cdots & \zeta_{\theta_{n-1}\theta_{n-1}} + \zeta + t\zeta_t \end{pmatrix} = \frac{4\bar{g}}{n^2}.$$

Note that in the matrix (4.26), there is a coefficient t in the first column. This is due to $\zeta_{s\theta} = t^{1/2}\zeta_{t\theta}$. After the change $t = \frac{s^2}{4}$, we have $s\zeta_s = 2t\zeta_t$. Hence by (4.7), \bar{g} is still a positive and smooth function of its arguments.

Writing equation (4.26) as $\log \det W_{ij} = \log \frac{4\bar{g}}{n^2}$ and differentiating in t , we have

$$W^{ij} \partial_t W_{ij} = \partial_t \log \frac{4\bar{g}}{n^2},$$

where $\{W^{ij}\}$ is the inverse of $\{W_{ij}\}$. Dividing the above equation by W^{11} , and denoting $V = \zeta_t$, we can write the above equation as

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(V) =: & tV_{tt} + \frac{2n+1}{n}V_t + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} a^{ij}V_{\theta_i\theta_j} \\ & + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} t\zeta_{t\theta_j}\tilde{a}^{ij}V_{t\theta_i} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} (\zeta_{t\theta_i}b^{ij} + b^j)V_{\theta_j} = h \end{aligned}$$

where $a^{ij}, \tilde{a}^{ij}, b^{ij}, b^j$ and h are continuous functions of the elements in the matrix in (4.26), namely $t, \zeta, \zeta_t, \zeta_{\theta_k\theta_l}, t\zeta_{tt}, t\zeta_{t\theta_k}\zeta_{t\theta_l}$. From the assumptions in Theorem 4.2, all the elements are uniformly bounded, namely

$$(4.28) \quad |\zeta_t| + |t\zeta_{tt}| + |t\zeta_{t\theta_i}\zeta_{t\theta_j}| + |D_\theta^2\zeta| \leq C \quad \forall (\theta, t) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, \frac{1}{16}].$$

It implies that $a^{ij}, \tilde{a}^{ij}, b^{ij}, b^j, h$ are uniformly bounded.

Let η be a cut-off function of θ such that

$$\eta(\theta) \equiv 1 \quad \text{when } |\theta| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \eta \equiv 0 \quad \text{when } |\theta| > 1, \quad \text{and } 0 \leq \eta \leq 1.$$

Denote $\eta_k(\theta) = \eta(\frac{\theta}{\lambda_k})$ and $V_k = \eta_k V$. Then V_k satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}(V_k) = \eta_k h - [\eta_k, \mathcal{L}]V =: h_k,$$

where $[\eta_k, \mathcal{L}]V = \eta_k \mathcal{L}V - \mathcal{L}(\eta_k V)$. By (4.28), we have

$$(4.29) \quad |h_k| \leq C(1 + \lambda_k^{-2} + \lambda_k^{-1}t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \leq C\lambda_k^{-1}t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{when } 0 < t < \lambda_k^2,$$

where C is a positive constant independent of k .

Denote $\delta_{k,-1} = 1, \delta_{k,0} = \frac{1}{4k^2}$. Let

$$(4.30) \quad \begin{cases} \delta_{k,l+1} = (\delta_{k,l})^{1+\frac{n}{4}}, \\ \varepsilon_{k,l} = C_1 \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{n}} \lambda_k^{\frac{2}{n}}, \end{cases} \quad l = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where C_1 is a fixed large constant.

Claim: For any given $m \geq 1$, we have

$$(4.31) \quad |V_k - 2\eta_k c_{00}| \leq \frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{4}} \quad \text{when } |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \quad \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2 \leq t \leq \delta_{k,m-1}\lambda_k^2.$$

We prove (4.31) by induction. First note that by (4.25),

$$|V_k - 2\eta_k c_{00}| \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{when } |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \quad \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2 \leq t \leq \delta_{k,m-1}\lambda_k^2,$$

which is exactly (4.31) for $m = 0$. Assuming that (4.31) holds for m , we prove that it holds for $m + 1$. We introduce the auxiliary functions

$$(4.32) \quad \sigma_{k,m}^{\pm}(\theta, t) = 2\eta_k c_{00} \pm \left(\frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon_{k,m} t^{-\frac{1}{n}} \right).$$

By our choice of η_k and (4.29), we have

$$(4.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(V_k - \sigma_{k,m}^+) &= h_k - 2c_{00}\mathcal{L}(\eta_k) + \frac{\varepsilon_{k,m}}{n} t^{-1-\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\geq \frac{t^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{n} (\varepsilon_{k,m} t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{n}} - C\lambda_k^{-1}) \\ &> 0 \quad \text{when } 0 < t \leq \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

if the constant C_1 in (4.30) is chosen large. By our induction assumptions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_k - \sigma_{k,m}^+ &\leq 0 \quad \text{if } |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \quad t = \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2, \\ V_k - \sigma_{k,m}^+ &= -\left(\frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon_{k,m} t^{-\frac{1}{n}} \right) < 0 \quad \text{if } |\theta| = \lambda_k, \\ \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} (V_k - \sigma_{k,m}^+) &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the maximum principle, it follows that

$$V_k - \sigma_{k,m}^+ \leq 0 \quad \text{if } |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \quad 0 < t \leq \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2.$$

Similarly, we have

$$V_k - \sigma_{k,m}^- \geq 0 \quad \text{if } |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \quad 0 < t \leq \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2.$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |V_k - 2c_{00}\eta_k| &\leq \frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon_{k,m} t^{-\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon_{k,m} \delta_{k,m+1}^{-\frac{1}{n}} \lambda_k^{-\frac{2}{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^m \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{4}} \quad \text{if } |\theta| \leq \lambda_k, \quad \delta_{k,m+1}\lambda_k^2 \leq t \leq \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2. \end{aligned}$$

The claim (4.31) is proved.

For any point $(\hat{\theta}, \hat{t})$ near $(0, 0)$ with $\hat{t} > 0$, we can choose $k > 0$ such that

$$(\hat{\theta}, \hat{t}) \in \left\{ (\theta, t) : |\theta| \leq \frac{\lambda_k}{2}, 0 < t \leq \frac{\lambda_k^2}{4} \right\}.$$

We then choose $m \geq 0$ such that $\delta_{k,m+1}\lambda_k^2 \leq \hat{t} \leq \delta_{k,m}\lambda_k^2$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |V_k - 2\eta_k c_{00}| &\leq \frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^m \delta_{k,l}^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
 (4.34) \qquad &\leq \frac{1}{k} + C_1 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{4k^2} \right)^{(1+n/4)^l/4} \\
 &\leq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{k}} \quad \text{at } (\hat{\theta}, \hat{t}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Because $(\hat{\theta}, \hat{t})$ is an arbitrary point near $(0, 0)$ with $\hat{t} > 0$. Hence from (4.34) we conclude that (recall that $V = \zeta_t = 2\frac{\zeta_s(\theta, s)}{s}$)

$$(4.35) \qquad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\zeta_s(\theta, s)}{s} = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} V(\theta, s) = c_{00}.$$

The convergence (4.35) implies that the constant c_{00} in the blow-up limit (4.19) is independent of the choice of the blow-up sequence. Hence by the blow-up argument in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we infer that

$$(4.36) \qquad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} \zeta_{ss}(\theta, s) = c_{00}.$$

By the convergence (4.36), we can define ζ_{ss} on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \{s = 0\}$ as the limit $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \zeta_{ss}(\theta, s)$. The above proof also implies that ζ_{ss} is continuous on $\{s = 0\}$. For if not, let us assume that ζ_{ss} is dis-continuous at $(\theta, s) = (0, 0)$. Then there exist two sequences $(\theta_1^k, s_1^k) \rightarrow 0$ and $(\theta_2^k, s_2^k) \rightarrow 0$ such that $\zeta_{ss}(\theta_1^k, s_1^k)$ and $\zeta_{ss}(\theta_2^k, s_2^k)$ converge to different limits, which is in contradiction with (4.36). This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.1. *In the first paragraph of the above proof, we must choose the sequence (θ^k, s^k) on the line $\{\theta = 0\}$, namely we must assume $\theta^k = 0$. Otherwise if $\frac{|\theta^k|}{s^k}$ is too large, by the changes (4.13), (4.14), and the definition of the cube Q_k , the set Σ_k and $\widehat{\Sigma}_k$ may not intersect with the line $\{\theta = 0\}$. In this case, we can only obtain the convergence $\zeta_{ss}(\theta, s)$ for θ, s near (θ^k, s^k) , but not the full convergence (4.35) and (4.36).*

Lemma 4.5. *Let ζ be as in Theorem 4.2. Then $D_\theta^2 \zeta \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.*

Proof. To prove the continuity of $D_\theta^2 \zeta$ on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \{s = 0\}$, we need to prove the limit $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+, \theta \rightarrow 0} D_\theta^2 \zeta(\theta, s)$ exists. By Lemma 4.2, $D_\theta^2 \zeta(\theta, s)$ is uniformly bounded. Hence there is a sub-sequence $s^k \rightarrow 0^+$ such that $D_\theta^2 \zeta(0, s^k)$ is convergent. We introduce the coordinates (φ, τ) and function ζ^k as in (4.13) and (4.14), with $\theta^k = 0$.

Let \mathbb{B} denote the set of all convergent blow up sequences $\{\zeta^k\}$ given by (4.14) (with $\theta^k \equiv 0$). For any fixed unit vector $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, define

$$(4.37) \quad c_{\gamma\gamma} = \inf_{\{\zeta^k\} \in \mathbb{B}} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \zeta_{\gamma\gamma}^k(0', 1).$$

where $\zeta_{\gamma\gamma}^k = \zeta_{\theta_i \theta_j}^k \gamma_i \gamma_j$. By a diagonal process, we can extract a subsequence in \mathbb{B} , which for simplicity we still denote as $\{\zeta^k\}$, such that

$$(4.38) \quad c_{\gamma\gamma} = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \zeta_{\gamma\gamma}^k(0', 1).$$

We *claim*

$$(4.39) \quad \overline{\lim}_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} \zeta_{\gamma\gamma}(\theta, s) \leq c_{\gamma\gamma}.$$

Indeed, by the convergence (4.21) and the interior regularity of equation (4.15), similarly to (4.23) we can pass to a subsequence such that

$$\|\zeta_{\gamma\gamma}^k(\varphi, \tau) - c_{\gamma\gamma}\|_{L^\infty(Q_k)} \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{in } Q_k.$$

Scaling back to $\zeta(\theta, s)$, this implies

$$(4.40) \quad \|\zeta_{\gamma\gamma}(\theta, s) - c_{\gamma\gamma}\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_k)} \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_k,$$

Here the domains Q_k, Σ_k are the same as in (4.23) and (4.24).

To simplify the notation, let us denote the matrix in (4.26) as $R = (r_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$, and rewrite equation (4.10) as

$$(4.41) \quad \mathcal{F}(r_{ij}) =: \log(\det R) = \log \bar{g}.$$

Then \mathcal{F} is concave in its variables r_{ij} . Differentiating (4.41) in direction γ twice and by the concavity, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{r_{ij} r_{ij, \gamma\gamma}} \geq (\log \bar{g})_{\gamma\gamma}.$$

Denote $V = \zeta_{\gamma\gamma}$. Similarly to (4.27), one obtains

$$(4.42) \quad \mathcal{L}(V) =: V_{ss} + \frac{n+2}{n} \frac{V_s}{s} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} a^{ij} V_{\theta_i \theta_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a^i V_{\theta_i s} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b^i V_i + b^0 V_s \geq h,$$

where a^{ij}, a^i, b^i, b^0, h are continuous functions of $\theta, s, \zeta, D\zeta, D^2\zeta, \frac{\zeta_s}{s}$. Here $D\zeta$ and $D^2\zeta$ denotes derivatives of ζ with respect to both s and θ . Note that the operator in (4.42) is different from that in (4.27) but we use the same notation \mathcal{L} . When differentiating (4.41) in γ twice to obtain (4.42), we need to exchange the derivatives in γ and θ . By the Ricci identity, it arises some second derivatives of ζ . They are all merged to the RHS h .

We now introduce the auxiliary function $\sigma_{k,m}^\pm$ as in (4.32), and apply the same argument thereafter to obtain (4.39).

Remark 4.2. *In the proof of Lemma 4.4, we differentiate equation (4.26) in t once to obtain equation (4.27). Here we differentiate equation (4.26) in θ twice and use the concavity of \mathcal{F} to obtain the inequality (4.42). Hence by the auxiliary function σ^+ , we obtain the inequality (4.39). We cannot obtain the reverse of the inequality by the auxiliary function σ^- .*

Remark 4.3. *Combining the definition of $c_{\gamma\gamma}$ in (4.37) and the estimate (4.39), we obtain*

$$(4.43) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \zeta_{\gamma\gamma}(0, s) = c_{\gamma\gamma}.$$

Note that the convergence in (4.43) is on the line $\theta = 0$.

To prove the convergence $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} \zeta_{\gamma\gamma}(\theta, s) = c_{\gamma\gamma}$, we make use of the equation (4.10). By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, and noting that $s\zeta_s = o(1)$ near $s = 0$, we can write (4.10) as

$$(4.44) \quad \det(D_\theta^2 \zeta + \zeta I) = \frac{2\bar{g}(0)}{n(n+1)c_{00}} + o(1) \quad \text{for } (\theta, s) \text{ near } (0', 0).$$

The left hand side is the standard Monge-Ampère operator on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . For a $k \times k$ positive definite matrix W , its determinant $\det W$ can be written as [14]

$$(4.45) \quad \det W = \min_{(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k) \in SO(k)} \prod_{i=1}^k \nu_i^T W \nu_i$$

where $SO(k)$ is the set of orthogonal matrices and ν_i are column vectors of the matrix.

Consider a blow up sequence $\{\zeta^k\} \in \mathbb{B}$. By the convergence (4.21) and the interior regularity we may assume that, after passing to a subsequence,

$$(4.46) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, (\theta, s) \in \Sigma_k} (D_\theta^2 \zeta + \zeta I) \rightarrow A$$

for a positive definite matrix A , where Σ_k is given in (4.24).

Let O be an orthogonal matrix such that $O^T A O$ is diagonal. Then we have

$$(4.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \det(D_\theta^2 \zeta + \zeta I) &= \det(O^T (D_\theta^2 \zeta + \zeta I) O) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\zeta_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta) + o(1) \quad \text{in } \Sigma_k \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \gamma^{(n-1)}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . By (4.39) it then follows

$$\begin{aligned} \det A &= \lim_{\Sigma_k \ni (\theta, s) \rightarrow (0', 0)} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\zeta_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta) \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (c_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta(0)). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $c_{\gamma\gamma}$ in (4.37) and the convergence (4.46), we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (c_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta(0)) \leq \lim_{\Sigma_k \ni (\theta, s) \rightarrow (0', 0)} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\zeta_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta) = \det A.$$

Combining the above two inequalities, we obtain

$$(4.48) \quad \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (c_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta(0)) = \det A = \frac{2\bar{g}(0)}{n(n+1)c_{00}}.$$

We are ready to conclude the continuity of $D_\theta^2 \zeta$. Indeed, by (4.44) and (4.45), we have

$$(4.49) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{2\bar{g}(0)}{n(n+1)c_{00}} &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} \det(D_\theta^2 \zeta + \zeta I) \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\zeta_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta). \end{aligned}$$

By (4.39) and (4.48), the RHS of (4.49)

$$(4.50) \quad \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (c_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} + \zeta(0)) = \det A.$$

Therefore the inequalities in (4.49) and (4.50) becomes equalities. Choosing the coordinates such that $\gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \gamma^{(n-1)}$ are the axial directions. As the inequality in (4.49) becomes equality, we see that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} D_{\theta_i \theta_j}^2 \zeta(\theta, s) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \neq j.$$

By (4.39) and since the inequality (4.50) becomes equality, we infer that

$$(4.51) \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow 0^+} \zeta_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}} = c_{\gamma^{(i)}\gamma^{(i)}}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.4. In §3 and §4, we employ the blow-up argument to prove the continuity of the second derivatives. The blow-up technique has been frequently used in geometric and analysis problems. It usually contains two steps, one is to classify the blow-up limits and the other one is to show that the limit is independent of choice of the blow-up sequences. In the first step, one proves that a blow-up sequence at a fixed point converges along a subsequence to a nice limit. In the second step, one needs to prove that all blow-up sequences around a given point converges to the same limit. The second step is usually rather difficult. See [3, 6] for the classical obstacle problem (1.2). There are many examples, for which one can prove the first step but the second one becomes extremely complicated, such as singularity profiles for the Ricci flow and the mean curvature flow, and the C^1 regularity of infinity harmonic functions. For infinity harmonic functions, the blow-up at a fixed point is an affine function [12], but the C^1 regularity in high dimensions is still open.

5. Higher regularity of free boundary

In this section we first establish a weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate for a linear singular elliptic equation of Keldysh type. Then we prove the higher regularity of the free boundary.

5.1. Linear singular elliptic equations of Keldysh type. First we consider the Neumann problem of the singular elliptic equation with constant coefficients:

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_b(u) &= -\Delta u - b \frac{u_{x_n}}{x_n} = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ u_{x_n}(x', 0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We assume that $b > 0$ is a constant, $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$.

Horiuchi [22, 23] introduced the Green function for (5.1) and proved a weighted Schauder type estimate. In [22], he found the following representation formula for the solution to (5.1),

$$(5.2) \quad u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} K_b(x, y) y_n^b f(y) dy =: T_b(f)(x),$$

where $K_b(x, y)$ is the Green function, given by

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} K_b(x, y) &= D_b \int_0^1 (|x - y|^2(1 - \tau) + |x - y^*|^2\tau)^{-\frac{n-2+b}{2}} [\tau(1 - \tau)]^{\frac{b}{2}-1} d\tau, \\ D_b &= 2^{b-2} \pi^{-\frac{n}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+b-2}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{b}{2})}, \quad y^* = (y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}, -y_n). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $b > 0$, the following estimates hold,

$$(5.4) \quad |\partial_x^{\gamma_1} \partial_y^{\gamma_2} K_b(x, y)| \leq \begin{cases} C |x - y^*|^{-b} \ln \left(2 + \frac{|x - y^*|}{|x - y|} \right) & \text{if } n = 2 \text{ and } |\gamma_1| = |\gamma_2| = 0, \\ C |x - y^*|^{-b} |x - y|^{2-n-|\gamma_1|-|\gamma_2|}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for any indexes $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{N}^n$, where C depends on n, b, γ_1, γ_2 (see Lemma 5-3 in [22]).

Horiuchi [22] proved that the function $u = T_b(f)$, given in (5.2), is a solution to (5.1). By the representation formula (5.2), he also proved the following $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate by careful computation as in [18].

Theorem 5.1. [Theorem 2-1, [22]] Assume that $f \in C^\alpha(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$, $\text{supp } f \subset B_1$, and $b > 0$. Then

$$(5.5) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n \|\partial_{ij} T_b(f)(x)\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})} + \left\| \frac{\partial_n T_b(f)(x)}{x_n} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})} \leq C \|f\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})},$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and C depends only on n, b, α .

Since $u = T_b(f)$ and f has compact support, from (5.5) we also have

$$(5.6) \quad \|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})} + \left\| \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})} \leq C \|f\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})}.$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |f|^p(x) x_n^b dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \|f\|_{W_{\mu_b}^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \|D^\alpha f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $u = T_b(f)$ be given by (5.2). Assume that f has compact support. Then for any $p > 1$ and $b > 1$, we have the estimate*

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n \|u_{x_i x_j}\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} + \left\| \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ depending only on p, n, b .

Note that (5.7) is invariant under dilation of coordinates. Hence to prove Theorem 5.2, we may assume that $\text{supp } f \subset B_1(0)$. By Theorem 5.2, we have

Corollary 5.1. *Let $u = T_b(f)$ be given by (5.2). Assume that $\text{supp } f \subset B_1(0)$. Then for any $p > \frac{n+b}{n-2+b}$ and $b > 1$, we have the estimate*

$$(5.8) \quad \|u\|_{W_{\mu_b}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} + \left\| \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)},$$

where the constant C depends on p, n, b .

Remark 5.1. (i) The condition $b > 1$ is used only in (5.31), otherwise it suffices to assume $b > 0$. The condition $p > \frac{n+b}{n-2+b}$ in Corollary 5.1 is for the estimate $\|u\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p}$. (ii) A different version of the $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate in Theorem 5.1 was also obtained in [21]. The paper [21] has also established a weighted $W^{2,p}$ estimate by the method of Fourier transformation and oscillatory integral method [21, Theorem 1.2]. However, the coefficient $a > \frac{3}{2}$ is needed in [21] which corresponds to $b > 2$ in our present case. Hence we can't apply [21] to the problem in this paper.

In the following we prove Theorem 5.2. Recall that the $W^{2,p}$ estimate for the Laplace equation can be obtained by the Calderon-Zygmund decomposition and the Marcinkiewicz interpolation [18]. Our proof will adopt a similar idea. But due to the singular term $\frac{u_{x_n}}{x_n}$, we need to introduce a new variable in the proof (see function \tilde{u} in (5.29)). We include the details of the proof for convenience of the reader.

First, we notice the following asymptotic estimate for $T_b(f)$ near ∞ .

Lemma 5.1. *Let $u = T_b f$ be given by (5.2). Assume that $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$, $\text{supp } f \subset B_1(0)$, and $b > 0$. Then we have the following asymptotic estimate,*

$$(5.9) \quad |D_x^\gamma u(x)| \leq \frac{C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}}{|x|^{n-2+b+|\gamma|}} \quad \forall |x| > 2,$$

where the constant C depends only on n, γ, b .

Proof. From (5.4), one has

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |D_x^\gamma u(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \partial_x^\gamma K_b(x, y) y_n^b f(y) dy \right| \\ &\leq C(\gamma, b) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |x - y^*|^{-b} |x - y|^{2-n-|\gamma|} f(y) y_n^b dy \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\gamma, b} \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}}{|x|^{n-2+b+|\gamma|}} \end{aligned}$$

provided $|x| > 2$. □

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$, $\text{supp } f \subset B_1$, and $b > 0$. Then $u = T_b f$ satisfies the weighted $W^{2,2}$ estimate*

$$(5.11) \quad \|D^2 u\|_{L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}^2 + b \left\| \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right\|_{L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}^2 = \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}^2.$$

Proof. Since u satisfies equation (5.1), we have

$$(5.12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \left(\Delta u + b \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right)^2 x_n^b dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f^2 x_n^b dx.$$

By Lemma 5.1, we can carry out integration by parts and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} (\Delta_x u)^2 x_n^b dx &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{x_i x_j}^2 x_n^b dx, \\ 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{ii} u_{nn} x_n^b dx &= -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_i u_{nni} x_n^b dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{ni}^2 x_n^b dx + 2b \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_i u_{ni} x_n^{b-1} dx, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2b \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{ii} u_n x_n^{b-1} dx &= -2b \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_i u_{ni} x_n^{b-1} dx, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ 2b \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_{nn} u_n x_n^{b-1} dx &= -b(b-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_n^2 x_n^{b-2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, and noticing that the two integrals $2b \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_i u_{ni} x_n^{b-1} dx$ are cancelled each other, and the last integral $-b(b-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} u_n^2 x_n^{b-2} dx$ is partly cancelled by the left hand side of (5.12), we obtain (5.11). \square

By Lemma 5.2, we see that $\partial_{ij} T_b$, $\frac{\partial_n T_b}{x_n}$ are bounded linear operators from $L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ to $L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$. Next we show that they are bounded linear operators from $L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ to $L_{\mu_b, \omega}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$, where

$$(5.13) \quad L_{\mu_b, \omega}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n) = \{v \text{ is measurable} : \mu_b\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : |v(x)| > \alpha\} \leq C\alpha^{-1} \forall \alpha > 0\},$$

and the measure μ_b is defined as $\mu_b(E) = \int_E x_n^b dx$ for any measurable set E .

As a first step, we give the following weighted Calderon-Zygmund decomposition in \mathbb{R}_+^n .

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose $f \in L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ and $b > 0$. Then for any given constant $\alpha > 0$, there is a sequence of disjoint cubes $\{Q_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and a decomposition*

$$f = g + h = g + \sum_{k \geq 1} h_k$$

such that

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{(i) } |g(x)| \leq c\alpha \text{ for } \mu_b\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \text{ and} \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |g(x)| d\mu_b \leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |f(x)| d\mu_b. \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{(ii) For each } k \geq 1, h_k \text{ is supported in } Q_k \text{ and satisfies} \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |h_k| d\mu_b \leq c\alpha \mu_b(Q_k) \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} h_k d\mu_b = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{(iii)} \\ & \sum_k \mu_b(Q_k) \leq \frac{c}{\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |f| d\mu_b. \end{aligned}$$

Here the constant c depends only on n and b .

Proof. The Calderon-Zygmund decomposition for the Lebesgue measure is well-known [4, 18]. Here we replace the Lebesgue measure by the measure μ_b but the idea is the same. Consider a partition of \mathbb{R}_+^n by cubes $\mathcal{K}_0 = \{Q\}$ whose side length d is chosen such that

$$\alpha > \frac{1}{\mu_b([0, d]^n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |f| d\mu_b.$$

Then for any cube $Q \in \mathcal{K}_0$, we have $|f|_Q \leq \alpha$, where $|f|_Q = \frac{1}{\mu_b(Q)} \int_Q |f| d\mu_b$.

To obtain the sequence of disjoint cubes $\{Q_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ stated in the lemma, we first consider an arbitrary cube $Q \in \mathcal{K}_0$, by bisecting the edges of Q , we subdivide Q into 2^n congruent

sub-cubes $\{Q'_i\}_{i=1}^{2^n}$ with disjoint interiors. For any sub-cube Q'_i , we have either $|f|_{Q'_i} \geq \alpha$ or $|f|_{Q'_i} < \alpha$. Denote by \mathcal{K}_1 the set of all sub-cubes of side-length $d/2$.

(a) If $|f|_{Q'_i} \geq \alpha$, set

$$h_{Q'_i} = \chi_{Q'_i}(f - f_{Q'_i}) \quad \text{and} \quad g_{Q'_i} = \chi_{Q'_i} f_{Q'_i},$$

where χ is the characteristic function, $f_{Q'_i} = \frac{1}{\mu_b(Q'_i)} \int_{Q'_i} f d\mu_b$ is the μ_b -average of f in Q'_i . In this case we will not divide Q'_i any more, and this Q'_i will be counted as an element in the family $\{Q_k\}$.

(b) If $|f|_{Q'_i} < \alpha$, we divide Q'_i into 2^n equal sub-cubes $\{Q''_i\}$ as above, and denote by \mathcal{K}_2 the set of all the sub-cubes of side-length $d/4$. For any sub-cube $Q''_i \in \mathcal{K}_1$, if $|f|_{Q''_i} \geq \alpha$, we define the functions $h_{Q''_i}$ and $g_{Q''_i}$ as in (a) above, and count Q''_i as an element in the family $\{Q_k\}$. If $|f|_{Q''_i} < \alpha$, we divide Q''_i into 2^n equal sub-cubes again.

Repeating the above procedure indefinitely, we obtain a sequence of disjoint cubes $\{Q_k\}$ such that $|f|_{Q_k} \geq \alpha$ for all $k \geq 1$. Now we define

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} h_i &= h_{Q_i} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, \\ g(x) &= \begin{cases} f_{Q_k} & \text{if } x \in Q_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \\ f(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus (\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} Q_k). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For any cube Q_k in the sequence, let \tilde{Q}_k be its predecessor, namely Q_k is one of the 2^n sub-cubes obtained from \tilde{Q}_k . By the above decomposition, it is easy to see

$$(5.18) \quad |f|_{Q_k} \leq \frac{\mu_b(\tilde{Q}_k)}{\mu_b(Q_k)} |f|_{\tilde{Q}_k} \leq 2^{n+2b+1} |f|_{\tilde{Q}_k} \leq 2^{n+2b+1} \alpha.$$

One can verify that (5.14) - (5.16) hold with $c = 2^{n+2b+1}$. To finish the proof, it remains to show that $|g(x)| \leq C\alpha \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Since the set $\cup_k \partial Q_k$ has measure zero, there is no loss of generality in assuming that x is a Lebesgue point and $x \notin \cup_k \partial Q_k$. Then in the procedure described in (a) and (b) above, eventually there will be a cube Q_k such that $x \in Q_k$ and $|f|_{Q_k} \geq \alpha$ if $g(x) > c\alpha$. Hence by our definition of g in (5.17), we have $|g(x)| = |f_{Q_k}| \leq C\alpha$ for $x \in Q_k$ by (5.18). This completes the proof. \square

Next we show that $\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b$ and $\frac{\partial_n T_b}{x_n}$ are bounded linear operators from $L^1_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ to $L^1_{\mu_b, \omega}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$, for any $b > 0$.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume $f \in L^1_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$ and $\text{supp } f \subset B_1(0)$. Then for any constant $\alpha > 0$, $u = T_b(f)$ satisfies*

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_b\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : |u_{ij}(x)| > \alpha\} &\leq C\alpha^{-1}\|f\|_{L^1_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)}, \\ \mu_b\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : \left|\frac{u_n}{x_n}(x)\right| > \alpha\} &\leq C\alpha^{-1}\|f\|_{L^1_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)}, \end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C depending only on n, b .

Proof. Let $f = g + h = g + \sum_k h_k$ be the decomposition given in Lemma 5.3. Since T_b is a linear operator, we have

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mu_b(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : |\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b f(x)| > \alpha\}) \\ &\leq \mu_b(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : |\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b g(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}\}) + \mu_b(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : |\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b h(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}\}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.3, we have $|g| \leq C\alpha$, and g is compactly supported since f is. By Lemma 5.2, one has

$$(5.21) \quad \|\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b g(x)\|_{L^2_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)}^2 \leq \|g\|_{L^2_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)}^2 \leq C\alpha\|g\|_{L^1_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)} \leq C\alpha\|f\|_{L^1_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)}.$$

This implies

$$(5.22) \quad \mu_b(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : |\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b g(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}\}) \leq C\alpha^{-1}\|f\|_{L^1_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)}.$$

Now for any cube Q_k in Lemma 5.3, let $Q_k^* = (q + 2(Q_k - q)) \cap \mathbb{R}^n_+$, where q is the center of Q_k . Then for any $x \in (Q_k^*)^c$, there holds

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} |(\partial_{x_i x_j} T h_k)(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \partial_{x_i x_j} K_b(x, y) h_k(y) d\mu_b(y) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{Q_k} [\partial_{x_i x_j} K_b(x, y) - \partial_{x_i x_j} K_b(x, q)] h_k(y) d\mu_b(y) \right| \\ &\leq \int_{Q_k} |\partial_{x_i x_j} K_b(x, y) - \partial_{x_i x_j} K_b(x, q)| |h_k(y)| d\mu_b(y) \\ &\leq C \int_{Q_k} \frac{|y_n - q_n| |h_k(y)|}{|x - y^*|^b |x - y|^{n+1}} d\mu_b(y), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality, we used (ii) in Lemma 5.3. By (5.23) we then have

$$(5.24) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{(Q_k^*)^c} |(\partial_{x_i x_j} T h_k)(x)| d\mu_b(x) \\ &\leq C \int_{Q_k} |h_k(y)| d\mu_b(y) \int_{(Q_k^*)^c} \frac{|y_n - q_n| d\mu_b(x)}{|x - y^*|^b |x - y|^{n+1}} \\ &\leq C \int_{Q_k} |h_k(y)| d\mu_b(y) \leq C\alpha\mu_b(Q_k), \end{aligned}$$

where y^* is reflection of y in $\{x_n = 0\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_b(\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : |\partial_{x_i x_j} T_h(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}\}) \\ & \leq \sum_k \mu_b(Q_k^*) + \frac{2}{\alpha} \sum_k \int_{(Q_k^*)^c} |(\partial_{x_i x_j} T_h)(x)| d\mu_b(x) \leq \frac{C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}}{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain the first inequality in (5.19).

For the second inequality in (5.19), recall that $T_b f$ satisfies equation (5.1). Hence by (5.1), we infer that $\frac{\partial_n T_b}{x_n}$ is also a bounded linear operator from $L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ to $L_{\mu_b, \omega}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$. \square

With the above preparation, we are ready to prove Theorem 5.2

Proof of Theorem 5.2. By Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.4, the operator $\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (5.25) \quad & \|\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b(f)\|_{L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C_{n,b} \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}, \\ & \|\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b(f)\|_{L_{\mu_b, \omega}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C_{n,b} \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \end{aligned}$$

for any $b > 0$, where

$$\|v\|_{L_{\mu_b, \omega}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} =: \sup_{\alpha > 0} \alpha \mu_b\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : |v| > \alpha\}.$$

Hence by the Marcinkiewicz Interpolation [Theorem 1.3.1, [1]], we infer that

$$(5.26) \quad \|\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b(f)\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C_{n,b,p} \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}$$

for any $p \in (1, 2]$, and for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. In applying the Marcinkiewicz Interpolation, we regard $\partial_{x_i x_j} T_b$ as the mapping in [1].

When $p > 2$, let $p' = \frac{p}{p-1} < 2$. For any $f, g \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$, noting that the kernel $K_b(x, y)$ in (5.3) is symmetric in x' and y' , we have

$$(5.27) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} g \partial_{ij} T_b(f) d\mu_b(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f \partial_{ij} T_b(g) d\mu_b(x) \quad \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq n-1.$$

Here we denote by $C_c^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ smooth functions in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$ with compact support. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} (5.28) \quad & \|\partial_{ij} T_b(g)\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} = \sup_{\|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^{p'}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} f \partial_{ij} T_b(g) d\mu_b(x) \\ & \leq \sup_{\|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^{p'}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}=1} \|g\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \|\partial_{ij} T_b(f)\|_{L_{\mu_b}^{p'}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \\ & \leq C_{p'} \|g\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \quad \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq n-1. \end{aligned}$$

By approximation, we see that (5.28) holds for non-smooth function g .

To prove the estimate (5.28) for $\partial_{in}T_b(g)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, we need to introduce a new function \tilde{u} defined in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} (raising the dimension to $n+1$). Denote $u(x) = T_b(g)$ and

$$(5.29) \quad \tilde{u}(x, x_{n+1}) = u\left(x', \sqrt{x_n^2 + x_{n+1}^2}\right) = u(x', r),$$

where $(x, x_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, $r = \sqrt{x_n^2 + x_{n+1}^2}$. By direct computation, we have

$$(5.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_{x_i}(x', x_n, x_{n+1}) &= u_{x_i}(x', r), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \frac{\tilde{u}_{x_n}(x', x_n, x_{n+1})}{x_n} &= \frac{u_r(x', r)}{r}, \\ \frac{\tilde{u}_{x_{n+1}}(x', x_n, x_{n+1})}{x_{n+1}} &= \frac{u_r(x', r)}{r}, \end{aligned}$$

Hence \tilde{u} satisfies

$$(5.31) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta_{x, x_{n+1}} \tilde{u} + \frac{b-1}{x_{n+1}} \tilde{u}_{x_{n+1}} = \tilde{g} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ \tilde{u}_{x_{n+1}}(x, 0) = 0 & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{g}(x, x_{n+1}) = g(x', r)$, $\tilde{u}_{n+1} := \tilde{u}_{x_{n+1}}$. The boundary condition $\tilde{u}_{n+1}(x, 0) = 0$ is due to that u is even in x_{n+1} . For equation (5.31), we need to assume that $b > 1$ for the $W^{2,p}$ estimate.

As \tilde{u} and $T_{b-1}(\tilde{g})$ satisfy the same equation (5.31), by the Neumann boundary condition and the decay at ∞ , we infer that $\tilde{u} = T_{b-1}(\tilde{g})$. Hence for $b > 1$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$, similarly to estimate (5.28), we have

$$(5.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} |\tilde{u}_{ni}|^p x_{n+1}^{b-1} dx dx_{n+1} &\leq C_{p,b} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} |\tilde{g}|^p x_{n+1}^{b-1} dx dx_{n+1} \\ &= \tilde{C}_{p,b} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |g|^p x_n^b dx. \end{aligned}$$

For the equality above, we use the polar coordinates for the variables x_n, x_{n+1} , i.e. $x_n = r \cos \theta$, $x_{n+1} = r \sin \theta$, $\theta \in [0, \pi]$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} |\tilde{u}_{ni}|^p x_{n+1}^{b-1} dx dx_{n+1} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} \left| u_{ri} \cdot \frac{x_n}{r} \right|^p x_{n+1}^{b-1} dx dx_{n+1} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |u_{ri}|^p r^b dx' dr \cdot \int_0^\pi |\cos \theta|^p (\sin \theta)^{b-1} d\theta \\ &= \overline{C}_{p,b} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |u_{ni}|^p x_n^b dx. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$(5.33) \quad \|\partial_{ij} T_b g\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C_{b,n,p} \|g\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}, \quad p \in (1, +\infty)$$

for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

By equation (5.1) and estimate (5.33), we also have

$$(5.34) \quad \left\| \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.2. \square

Proof of Corollary 5.1. By Theorem 5.2 and the interpolation inequality, it suffices to prove

$$(5.35) \quad \|u\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)} \leq C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}.$$

By a dilation of the coordinates, we assume that $\text{supp } f \subset B_1(0)$. By Lemma 5.1, we have

$$(5.36) \quad |u(x)| \leq \frac{C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}}{|x|^{n-2+b}} \leq \frac{C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}}{|x|^{n-2+b}}, \quad |x| \geq 2.$$

It follows that

$$(5.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_2} |u|^p d\mu_b &\leq C^p \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}^p \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_2} \frac{x_n^b}{|x|^{p(n-2+b)}} dx \\ &\leq C_1 C^p \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}^p \end{aligned}$$

provided $p(n-2+b) > n+b$.

Let $\xi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a cut-off function satisfying $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}^n , $\xi = 1$ in B_2 , and $\xi = 0$ outside B_4 . Then by Poincaré's inequality, we have

$$(5.38) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |\xi u|^p d\mu_b &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} |D^2(\xi u)|^p d\mu_b \\ &\leq C \int_{B_4 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n} (|D^2 u|^p + |D^2 \xi|^p |u|^p) d\mu_b \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^n)}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two estimates yields (5.35). \square

We have obtained the $C^{2,\alpha}$ and $W^{2,p}$ estimates for the special solution $u = T_b(f)$. Next we prove that these two a priori estimates hold for any other solutions to (5.1). First we prove

Lemma 5.5. *Let $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap C^1(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ be a solution to*

$$(5.39) \quad -\Delta u - b \frac{u_{x_n}}{x_n} = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

Assume $b > 1$, $p > n + b$, and $f \in L_{\mu_b}^p(B_1^+)$. Then u satisfies

$$(5.40) \quad u_{x_n} = 0 \quad \text{on } x_n = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\eta(\tau) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a cut-off function which satisfies $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_1(0)$, and $\text{supp } \eta \subset B_2(0)$. Let $\eta_\varepsilon(x) = \eta\left(\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon}\right)$ for a small constant $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $v = \eta_\varepsilon u$. Then v solves the following equation

$$\mathcal{R}(v) =: \Delta v + b \frac{v_{x_n}}{x_n} = \eta_\varepsilon f + 2\partial_i u \partial_i \eta_\varepsilon + u \Delta \eta_\varepsilon + b u \frac{\partial_n \eta_\varepsilon}{x_n} =: \hat{f}.$$

Denote $W = T_b(\hat{f})$, where $T_b(\cdot)$ is the integral operator given by (5.2). Denote $H(x_n) = x_n^{1-b}$. Then $\mathcal{R}(H) = 0$ and $H \rightarrow \infty$ as $x_n \rightarrow 0^+$. Hence

$$\mathcal{R}(v - W + \epsilon H) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

By Lemma 5.1, $|W(x)| \leq C/|x|^{n-2+b} = o(H)$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (v - W + \epsilon H) \geq 0$$

for any given small $\epsilon > 0$. By Theorem 5.2, $W \in W_{\mu_b}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$. Hence $W \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ by the Sobolev embedding [21, Lemma B.3]. We obtain

$$\lim_{x_n \rightarrow 0} (v - W + \epsilon H) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, since $W \in W_{\mu_b}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ for $p > n$ and $v \in C^2(B_1^+)$, we can apply Aleksandrov's maximum principle for strong solution [18] and obtain $v - W \geq -\epsilon H$. Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $v \geq W$. Similarly, we have $W \geq v$. This implies

$$(5.41) \quad \eta_\varepsilon u = v = W = T_b(\hat{f})$$

and so (5.40) is proved. \square

The condition $u \in C^1(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$ in Lemma 5.5 is such that u_{x_n} exists on $x_n = 0$. If $p > n + b$ and $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$, by the Sobolev embedding we have $u \in C^1(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n})$. For the proof of (5.41), it suffices to assume that $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$. When $b \geq 1$ is an integer, $u_{x_n x_n} + \frac{b}{x_n} u_{x_n}$ is actually the Laplacian operator for rotationally symmetric functions in \mathbb{R}^{1+b} . Lemma 5.5 means for bounded solutions, the singularity at $x_n = 0$ is removable.

By (5.41), we see that the $C^{2,\alpha}$ and $W^{2,p}$ estimates in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 hold for any solutions $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$. Moreover, the estimates can be extended easily to linear singular elliptic equations of Keldysh type with variable coefficients,

$$(5.42) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n a^{ij} \partial_{ij} u + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b^i \partial_i u + \frac{b^n}{x_n} \partial_n u + cu = f \quad \text{in } B_1^+.$$

Assume that

$$(5.43) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 < \lambda I &\leq (a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^n \leq \Lambda I < +\infty \quad \text{in } B_1^+, \\ \frac{b^n}{a^{nn}} &= b > 1 \quad \text{is a constant,} \\ |c| + \sum_{i=1}^n |b^i| &\leq \Lambda \quad \text{in } B_1^+, \end{aligned}$$

for two positive constants λ, Λ . Then by the freezing coefficient method, we have the following a priori estimates.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ be a solution to (5.42). Assume that $a^{ij} \in C(\overline{B_1^+})$ satisfy conditions (5.43), and $f \in L_{\mu_b}^p(B_1^+)$ for some $p > n + b$. Then $u \in W_{\mu_b}^{2,p}(B_{1/2}^+)$ and satisfies the estimate*

$$(5.44) \quad \|u\|_{W_{\mu_b}^{2,p}(B_{1/2}^+)} + \left\| \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(B_1^+)} + \|u\|_{L_{\mu_b}^p(B_1^+)} \right),$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on p, n, λ, Λ and the modulus of continuity of a^{ij} .

Theorem 5.4. *Let $u \in C^2(B_1^+) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a solution to (5.42). Assume that $a^{ij}, b^n, c, f \in C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})$ and condition (5.43) holds. Then $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})$ and we have the estimate*

$$(5.45) \quad \|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})} + \left\| \frac{u_n}{x_n} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})} + \|u\|_{C^0(\overline{B_1^+})} \right)$$

for a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $n, \alpha, \lambda, \Lambda$ and $\|a^{ij}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})}, \|b^i\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})}, \|c\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_1^+})}$.

5.2. Smoothness of free boundary. By the $C^{2,\alpha}$ and $W^{2,p}$ estimates in Section 5.1, we can prove the higher regularity of the tangent cone of the solution u to (4.1). As before we assume that $u(0) = 0$ and $u(x) > 0 \forall x \neq 0$.

Theorem 5.5. *Let ϕ be the tangential cone of u at 0. Then the section $S_{1,\phi} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \phi(x) < 1\}$ is uniformly convex and C^∞ smooth if g is positive and C^∞ smooth.*

To prove Theorem 5.5, by the definition of ζ in (4.3), it suffices to prove that $\zeta(\theta, 0) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. We have the following stronger result, which implies Theorems 5.5 and 1.2.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $\zeta(\theta, s) \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$ be a solution to (4.10). Assume that $\zeta_s(\theta, 0) = 0$ and \bar{g} is positive and smooth. Then $\zeta(\theta, s) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.*

Proof. Differentiating (4.10) with respect to θ_k , one gets

$$(5.46) \quad \mathcal{L}(V) = V_{ss} + \frac{n+2}{n} \frac{V_s}{s} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} a^{ij} V_{\theta_i \theta_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a^{in} V_{\theta_i s} = h$$

where $V = \zeta_{\theta_k}$. To apply the a priori estimate in §5.1 to (5.46), we express equation (5.46) in a *local coordinates* on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . By Theorem 4.2, a^{ij} and h are continuous in θ, s . By Lemma 4.2, the operator \mathcal{L} is uniformly elliptic. Hence all the assumptions in Theorem 5.3 are fulfilled for V . Letting $p > n + b$ and by the Sobolev embedding, $W_{\mu_b}^{1,p} \rightarrow C^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$ (Lemma B.3, [21]), we have $V = \zeta_{\theta_k} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.

Write equation (4.10) in the form

$$(5.47) \quad \zeta_{ss} + \frac{n+2}{n} \frac{\zeta_s}{s} = \tilde{f} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1]),$$

where \tilde{f} is a smooth function of $\theta, s, \zeta, D\zeta, D\zeta_\theta$. Hence \tilde{f} is Hölder continuous in s, θ . The solution to (5.47) is given by

$$(5.48) \quad \zeta(\theta, s) = \zeta(\theta, 0) + \int_0^s r^{-\frac{n+2}{n}} \int_0^r \lambda^{\frac{n+2}{n}} \tilde{f}(\theta, \lambda) d\lambda.$$

Hence we have

$$(5.49) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta_s(\theta, s) &= s^{-\frac{n+2}{n}} \int_0^s \lambda^{\frac{n+2}{n}} \tilde{f}(\theta, \lambda) d\lambda, \\ \zeta_{ss}(\theta, s) &= -\frac{n+2}{n} s^{-\frac{n+2}{n}-1} \int_0^s \lambda^{\frac{n+2}{n}} \tilde{f}(\theta, \lambda) d\lambda + \tilde{f} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1]). \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\zeta \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$. Hence the coefficients $a^{ij}, h \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$.

By the Hölder continuity of the coefficients, we can obtain the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity of $D_\theta^k \zeta$ for all $k \geq 1$. Indeed, differentiating equation (5.46) in θ , and by Theorem 5.4, we infer that $\zeta_{\theta_k} \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$. Differentiating equation (5.46) in θ again, and also by Theorem 5.4, we have $D_\theta^2 \zeta \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$. Repeating the argument we obtain $D_\theta^k \zeta \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$ for all integers $k \geq 0$.

To prove the higher order regularity of ζ in s and the expansion (1.7), let $t = \frac{s^2}{4}$. Then equation (4.10) changes to equation (4.26). Differentiating (4.26) in t and letting $V = \zeta_t$, one gets

$$(5.50) \quad \mathcal{L}(V) = tV_{tt} + \frac{2n+1}{n} V_t + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} a^{ij} V_{\theta_i \theta_j} + t \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{a}^{ij} V_{t\theta_i} = h$$

where $a^{ij}, \tilde{a}^{ij}, h$ are smooth as functions of $\theta, t, \zeta, D_{\theta,t}\zeta, D_{\theta}^2\zeta, \zeta_{t\theta}, t\zeta_{tt}$. Note that the operator \mathcal{L} in (5.50) is different from that in (4.27). We have moved some terms to the right hand side.

By the regularity $\zeta(\theta, s), \zeta_{\theta}(\theta, s) \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1))$ and the relation $t = \frac{s^2}{4}$, we have $D_{\theta}^2\zeta, \zeta_{t\theta}, t\zeta_{tt} \in C^{\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1))$ in variables θ, t . Hence, $a^{ij}, \tilde{a}^{ij}, h \in C^{\alpha}$ in variables θ, t .

To apply Theorem 5.4 to equation (5.50), we need to change the Hölder norm from the variable s to $t = s^2/4$. Hence we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\tilde{C}^{\alpha}(\overline{B_1^+})} &= \|f\|_{L^{\infty}(B_1^+)} + \sup_{x \neq y \in B_1^+} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{(|x' - y'|^2 + (\sqrt{x_n} - \sqrt{y_n})^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \\ \|f\|_{\tilde{C}^{k,\alpha}(\overline{B_1^+})} &= \|f\|_{C^k(\overline{B_1^+})} + \sup_{x \neq y \in B_1^+, |\beta|=k} \frac{|D^{\beta}f(x) - D^{\beta}f(y)|}{(|x' - y'|^2 + (\sqrt{x_n} - \sqrt{y_n})^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then estimate (5.45) can be reiterated as

$$\begin{aligned} (5.51) \quad & \|tu_{tt}\|_{\tilde{C}^{\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})} + \|t^{\frac{1}{2}}D_{\theta}u_t\|_{\tilde{C}^{\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})} + \|D_{\theta}^2u\|_{\tilde{C}^{\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})} \\ & + \|u\|_{\tilde{C}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{\tilde{C}^{\alpha}(\overline{B_1^+})} + \|u\|_{\tilde{C}^{\alpha}(\overline{B_1^+})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (5.51) to equation (5.50), we obtain $t\partial_t^3\zeta, \partial_{\theta}^2\partial_t\zeta, t^{1/2}\partial_t^2\partial_{\theta}\zeta \in \tilde{C}^{\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1))$, and $\zeta_t \in \tilde{C}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1))$. Differentiating (5.50) in t repeatedly and using estimate (5.51), we obtain $\zeta \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, 1))$.

In the above we have shown that ζ is smooth in t . Recall that $t = \frac{s^2}{4} = \frac{r^n}{4}$, and $\zeta = \frac{u}{r}$. Hence we obtain the Taylor expansion (1.7). This completes the proof of Theorem 5.6 and also that of Theorem (1.2). \square

6. Analyticity of the free boundary

In this section, we prove the analyticity of the free boundary Γ . Let u be the solution to (4.1). Let $\zeta = \frac{u}{r}$ and $s = r^{n/2}$ as in §4, so that ζ satisfies equation (4.10). Then the analyticity of the free boundary is equivalent to showing $\zeta(\theta, 0) \in C^{\omega}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Here C^{ω} denotes the set of analytic functions. As before we assume that $u(0) = 0$ and $u(x) > 0 \forall x \neq 0$. We have the following result.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\zeta(\theta, s)$ be a solution to (4.10). Assume that \bar{g} is positive and analytic. Then $\zeta(\cdot, s) \in C^{\omega}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, for any $s \in [0, 1)$.*

To prove the analyticity of a function u , one needs to control the growth rate of its derivatives. That is, for any multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, we need to prove

$$(6.1) \quad |\partial^\alpha u| \leq CA^{|\alpha|} \alpha!$$

for sufficiently large constants C, A , independent of α , where $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n$, $\alpha! = \alpha_1! \dots \alpha_n!$, and $\partial^\alpha = \partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_{x_n}^{\alpha_n}$.

We will use the local coordinate system (4.5) in a neighbourhood of $\theta = 0$. For simplicity of notations, we use $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ to denote $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1})$, and use x_n to denote s . Then in the coordinates (4.5), equation (4.10) can be written in the form

$$(6.2) \quad \zeta_{nn} + b \frac{\zeta_n}{x_n} + F(x, \zeta, \partial_{x_i} \zeta, \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 \zeta) = 0, \quad (x', x_n) \in Q_{r_0},$$

where $b = \frac{n+2}{n}$, $Q_{r_0} = B'_{r_0}(0) \times [0, 1]$, and $B'_{r_0}(0) = \{|x'| < r_0\}$ is a ball in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} .

The function $F(x, z, p, r)$ is defined for $x \in Q_{r_0}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^1$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $r = (r_{ij}) \in \mathbb{S}^{n \times n}$ but is independent of r_{nn} . As a function, F is analytic in its arguments. By Lemma 4.2, equation (6.2) is uniformly elliptic.

The analyticity of solutions to uniformly elliptic equations has been studied by many people [15, 33]. A simple proof for the linear elliptic equation was found in [27], and it was extended to nonlinear elliptic equation in [2]. Here we adopt the proof from [27, 2]. By [15, 33], $\zeta(x)$ is analytic when $x_n > 0$. Here we show that $\zeta(x)$ is analytic in x' when $x_n = 0$.

In [27], Kato demonstrated his idea by considering the equation

$$(6.3) \quad \Delta u = u^2 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where Ω is a domain in \mathbb{R}^n . Instead of (6.1), Kato's strategy is to establish the estimate

$$(6.4) \quad \|\rho^{|\alpha|} \partial_x^\alpha u\|_{H^m(B_{r_0})} \leq CA^{|\alpha|} |\alpha|!,$$

where ρ is a cut-off function such that $\rho = 1$ in $B_{r_0/2}$ and $\rho = 0$ outside B_{r_0} . He chooses $m = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1$ such that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{r_0})} \leq C_{r_0} \|u\|_{H^m(B_{r_0})}$. Hence (6.4) implies (6.1). In [2], Blatt extended the estimate (6.4) to the general fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equation

$$(6.5) \quad \Phi(x, u(x), Du(x), D^2u(x)) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

The proof in [27] is rather simple, one can easily see that the norm $H^m(B_{r_0})$ in [27, 2] can be replaced by the Hölder space $C^\delta(B_{r_0})$, using the $C^{2,\delta}$ estimate (Schauder estimate) for the Laplace equation.

To apply the argument in [27, 2] to our equation (6.2), we use the Hölder norm $\|\cdot\|_{C^\delta(B_{r_0})}$ instead of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^m(B_{r_0})}$, and use the $C^{2,\delta}$ estimate (Theorem 5.4). As our equation contains the singular term $\frac{\zeta_n}{x_n}$, we cannot obtain the analyticity of ζ on x_n (near $x_n = 0$) by their simple proof, but we can obtain the analyticity of ζ on x' , namely

$$(6.6) \quad \|\rho^{|\alpha|} \partial_{x'}^\alpha \zeta\|_{C^\delta(B_{r_0})} \leq C A^{|\alpha|} |\alpha|!$$

for all multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. As the proof is similar to that in [27, 2], we sketch the main idea only. Let

$$(6.7) \quad \mathcal{L}[\phi] =: \phi_{nn} + b \frac{\phi_n}{x_n} + \sum_{i+j < 2n} a_{ij}(x) \phi_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(x) \phi_i + c(x) \phi$$

be the linearized operator of (6.2), where a_{ij}, b_i, c are functions of $x, \zeta, \partial_i \zeta$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) and $\partial_{ij}^2 \zeta$ ($i + j < 2n$), and $b = \frac{n+2}{n}$. From the proof of Lemma 4.3, we have $a_{in}(0) = 0$ for $i \leq n-1$. Denote

$$\mathcal{L}_0[\phi] =: \phi_{nn} + b \frac{\phi_n}{x_n} + \sum_{i,j < n} a_{ij}(0) \phi_{ij}.$$

Let $\rho = \rho(|x'|)$ be a cut-off function of x' , such that $\rho(x') = 1$ when $|x'| < r_0/2$ and $\rho(x) = 0$ when $|x'| > r_0$. For any multi-indices $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\alpha| = N-1 \geq 1$ and $|\beta| = 2$, as in [27, 2], we compute

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\rho^{N-1} \partial_x^\beta \partial_{x'}^\alpha u\| &\leq \|\partial_x^\beta [\rho^{N-1} \partial_{x'}^\alpha u]\| + \|[\partial_x^\beta, \rho^{N-1}] \partial_{x'}^\alpha u\| \\ &\leq C \|\mathcal{L}_0[\rho^{N-1} \partial_{x'}^\alpha u]\| + \|[\partial_x^\beta, \rho^{N-1}] \partial_{x'}^\alpha u\| + C A^{N+1} (N+1)! \\ &= C \|\mathcal{L}_0[\rho^{N-1} \partial_{x'}^\alpha u]\| + \|[\partial_{x'}^\beta, \rho^{N-1}] \partial_{x'}^\alpha u\| + C A^{N+1} (N+1)! \\ &\leq C \|\rho^{N-1} \partial_{x'}^\alpha \mathcal{L}_0[u]\| + C \|[\mathcal{L}_0, \rho^{N-1}] \partial_{x'}^\alpha u\| + \|[\partial_{x'}^\beta, \rho^{N-1}] \partial_{x'}^\alpha u\| + C A^{N+1} (N+1)! \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + C A^{N+1} (N+1)!. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta(\overline{B}'_{r_0} \times [0, r_0])}$, $B'_{r_0} = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |x'| < r_0\}$, and

$$[\partial_x^\beta, \rho^{N-1}] \partial_{x'}^\alpha u = \rho^{N-1} \partial_{x'}^\alpha \partial_x^\beta u - \partial_x^\beta [\rho^{N-1} \partial_{x'}^\alpha u].$$

In the second inequality of (6.8), we use the $C^{2,\delta}$ estimate (Theorem 5.4) in the form

$$(6.9) \quad \|u\|_{C^{2,\delta}(\overline{B}'_{r_0} \times [0, r_0])} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B}'_{2r_0} \times [0, 2r_0])} + \|u\|_{C^0(\overline{B}'_{2r_0} \times [0, 2r_0])} \right).$$

But the cut-off function ρ is supported in B'_{r_0} and u is analytic in the interior. Hence when applying (6.9) to (6.8), the domain $\overline{B}'_{2r_0} \times [0, 2r_0]$ on the RHS of (6.9) can be replaced by $\overline{B}'_{r_0} \times [0, r_0]$ plus an additional term $C A^{N+1} (N+1)!$.

The estimation for I_1, I_2, I_3 is the same as in [27, 2] and is omitted here. Note that by (6.8) and iteration, we not only obtain (6.6), but also

$$(6.10) \quad \|\rho^{|\alpha|} \partial_x^2 \partial_{x'}^{\alpha-2} \zeta\|_{C^\delta(B_{r_0})} \leq C A^{|\alpha|} |\alpha|!.$$

(6.10) is needed in the estimation of I_1, I_2, I_3 when differentiating equation (6.7). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, Interpolation spaces: An introduction, Springer-Verlag, 1976.
- [2] S. Blatt, On the analyticity of solutions to nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations, arXiv:2009.08762v1.
- [3] L.A. Caffarelli, The regularity of free boundaries in higher dimensions, *Acta Math.* **139** (1977), 155–184.
- [4] L.A. Caffarelli, Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations, *Ann. of Math.* **130** (1989), 189–213.
- [5] L.A. Caffarelli, A localization property of viscosity solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation and their strict convexity, *Ann. Math.* **131** (1990), 129–134.
- [6] L.A. Caffarelli, The obstacle problem revisited, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **4** (1998), 383–402.
- [7] L.A. Caffarelli and R.J. McCann, Free boundaries in optimal transport and Monge-Ampère obstacle problems, *Ann. of Math.* **171** (2010), 673–730.
- [8] L.A. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg, and J. Spruck, The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations I. Monge-Ampère equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **37** (1984), 369–402.
- [9] K.-S. Chou and Y.-D. Wang, An obstacle problem for the Monge-Ampère equation, *Comm. Partial Diff. Equa.* **18** (1993), 1069–1084.
- [10] P. Daskalopoulos and R. Hamilton, The free boundary in the Gauss curvature flow with flat sides, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **510** (1999), 187–227.
- [11] P. Daskalopoulos and K.-A. Lee, Worn stones with flat sides all time regularity of the interface, *Invent. Math.* **156** (2004) 445–493.
- [12] L.C. Evans and C. K. Smart, Everywhere differentiability of infinity harmonic functions, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **42** (2011), 289–299.
- [13] P.M.N. Feehan and C.A. Pop, Boundary-degenerate elliptic operators and Hölder continuity for solutions to variational equations and inequalities, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **34** (2017), 1075–1129.
- [14] B.D. Froese and A.M. Oberman, Convergent finite difference solvers for viscosity solutions of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation in dimensions two and higher, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **49** (2011), 1692–1714.
- [15] A. Friedman, On the regularity of the solutions of nonlinear elliptic and parabolic systems of partial differential equations, *J. Math. Mech.* **7** (1958), 43–59.
- [16] J.A. Gálvez, A. Jiménez, and P. Mira, A classification of isolated singularities of elliptic Monge-Ampère equations in dimension two, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **68** (2015), 2085–2107.
- [17] J.A. Gálvez, A. Jiménez, and P. Mira, Isolated singularities of graphs in warped products and Monge-Ampère equations, *J. Diff. Equa.* **260** (2016), 2163–2189.
- [18] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [19] R. Hamilton, Worn stones with flat sides. A tribute to Ilya Bakelman, *Discourses Math. Appl.* **3** (1994), 69–78,

- [20] Q. Han, J. Hong, and G. Huang, Compactness of Alexandrov-Nirenberg Surfaces, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **70** (2017), 1706–1753.
- [21] J. Hong and G. Huang, L^p and Hölder estimates for a class of degenerate elliptic partial differential equations and its applications, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2012, no. 13, 2889–2941.
- [22] T. Horiuchi, The Schauder approach to degenerate elliptic equations with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition I, *Bull. Fac. Sci. Ibaraki Univ. Ser. A* **27** (1995), 7–32.
- [23] T. Horiuchi, The Schauder approach to degenerate elliptic equations with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition II, *Bull. Fac. Sci. Ibaraki Univ. Ser. A* **28** (1996), 23–42.
- [24] H. Jian and X.-J. Wang, Bernstein theorem and regularity for a class of Monge-Ampère equations, *J. Diff. Geom.* **93** (2013), 431–469.
- [25] T. Jin and J. Xiong, Solutions of some Monge-Ampère equations with isolated and line singularities, *Adv. Math.* **289** (2016), 114–141.
- [26] Jörgens, K., Harmonische Abbildungen und die Differentialgleichung $rt - s^2 = 1$, *Math. Ann.* **129** (1955), 330–344.
- [27] K. Kato, New idea for proof of analyticity of solutions to analytic nonlinear elliptic equations, *SUT J. Math.* **32** (1996), 157–161.
- [28] D. Kinderlehrer and L. Nirenberg, Regularity in free boundary problems, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, **4** (1977), 373–391.
- [29] K.-A. Lee, Obstacle problems for the fully nonlinear elliptic operators, Ph.D. Thesis, New York University, 1998, 53 pp.
- [30] K.-A. Lee, The obstacle problem for Monge-Ampère equation, *Comm. Partial Diff. Equa.* **26** (2001), 33–42.
- [31] K.-A. Lee, T. Lee, and J. Park, The obstacle problem for the Monge-Ampère equation with the lower obstacle, *Nonlinear Analysis*, **210** (2021), paper no. 112374, 23pp.
- [32] N.Q Le and O. Savin, Schauder estimates for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations and smoothness of the eigenfunctions, *Invent. Math.* **207** (2017), 389–423.
- [33] C.B. Morrey, Jr., On the analyticity of the solutions of analytic non-linear elliptic systems of partial differential equations I. Analyticity in the interior, *Amer. J. Math.* **80** (1958), 198–218.
- [34] A.V. Pogorelov, On the improper convex affine hyperspheres, *Geometriae Dedicata* **1** (1972), 33–46.
- [35] O. Savin, The obstacle problem for Monge Ampère equation, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **22** (2005), 303–320.
- [36] O. Savin, Pointwise $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates at the boundary for the Monge-Ampère equation, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **26** (2013), 63–99.
- [37] O. Savin, A localization theorem and boundary regularity for a class of degenerate Monge-Ampère equations, *J. Diff. Equa.* **256** (2014), 327–388.
- [38] O. Savin and H. Yu, Regularity of the singular set in the fully nonlinear obstacle problem, [arXiv:1905.02308](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.02308).
- [39] O. Savin and H. Yu, On the fine regularity of the singular set in the nonlinear obstacle problem, [arXiv:2101.11759](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.11759).

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200433, CHINA.

Email address: genggenghuang@fudan.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430079, CHINA.

Email address: lantang@mail.ccnu.edu.cn

CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS, THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, CANBERRA, ACT 0200, AUSTRALIA

Email address: Xu-Jia.Wang@anu.edu.au