

A QUANTITATIVE PROOF OF THE HÖLDER REGULARITY OF STABLE SOLUTIONS TO SEMILINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

XAVIER CABRÉ

In memory of Ireneo Peral

ABSTRACT. This article provides quantitative proofs of the results obtained in [Cabré, Figalli, Ros-Oton, and Serra, *Acta Math.* 224 (2020)], a work that proved the Hölder regularity of stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations in the optimal range of dimensions $n \leq 9$. Some results in that paper were established through compactness proofs, arguing by contradiction —the boundary regularity arguments being specially delicate. Here we provide proofs that do not rely on compactness and, in particular, allow to quantify the Hölder regularity exponent. For this, we establish two new estimates which control the solution in L^1 by the L^1 norm of its radial derivative.

For expository purposes, we provide self-contained proofs of the full Hölder regularity results. They only involve basic Analysis tools.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. New results	4
1.2. Structure of the proofs of Theorems I.0 and II.0	10
1.3. Open problems and related equations	12
1.4. Reading the article	14
PART I: INTERIOR REGULARITY	
2. The weighted L^2 estimate for radial derivatives	14
3. Hessian and $W^{1,2}$ estimates	16
4. The radial derivative controls the function in L^1	19
5. C^α estimate	22
6. $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ estimate	24
PART II: BOUNDARY REGULARITY	
7. The boundary weighted L^2 estimate for radial derivatives	27
8. Boundary Hessian and $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ estimates	28
9. The radial derivative controls the function in L^1 up to the boundary	37
10. Boundary C^α estimate	43
APPENDICES	

The author is supported by grants MTM2017-84214-C2-1-P and RED2018-102650-T funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF A way of making Europe”, as well as by the Spanish State Research Agency through the Severo Ochoa and María de Maeztu Program for Centers and Units of Excellence in R&D (CEX2020-001084-M).

Appendix A.	Two simple interpolation inequalities in cubes	45
Appendix B.	Absorbing errors in larger balls	48
Appendix C.	Morrey's embedding theorem stated with radial derivatives	49
Appendix D.	Gradient estimate for a mixed boundary value problem	51
Appendix E.	Singular solutions satisfying the weighted radial derivative estimate	52
References		54

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper concerns the semilinear elliptic equation

$$-\Delta u = f(u) \quad \text{in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.1)$$

where Ω is a bounded domain, $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, and $u : \overline{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Notice that (1.1) is the first variation of the functional

$$\mathcal{E}[u] := \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} - F(u) \right) dx, \quad (1.2)$$

where F is a primitive of f . Consider the second variation of \mathcal{E} at u , given by

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{d\varepsilon^2} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{E}[u + \varepsilon\xi] = \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla \xi|^2 - f'(u)\xi^2 \right) dx.$$

We say that u is a *stable* solution of equation (1.1) in Ω if the second variation at u is nonnegative, namely, if

$$\int_{\Omega} f'(u)\xi^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \xi|^2 dx \quad \text{for all } \xi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ with } \xi|_{\partial\Omega} \equiv 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Note that the stability of u is defined within the class of functions $u + \varepsilon\xi$ agreeing with u on the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Stability is equivalent to assuming the nonnegativeness of the first Dirichlet eigenvalue in Ω for the linearized operator of (1.1) at u , namely $-\Delta - f'(u)$.

If a *local minimizer* of \mathcal{E} exists (that is, a minimizer for small perturbations having same boundary values), then it will be a stable solution as well.

This paper concerns the regularity of stable solutions to (1.1), a question that has been investigated since the seventies. It was motivated by the Gelfand-type problems (1.5) described below, for which $f(u) = e^u$ is a model case. Notice that for this nonlinearity, and more generally when f satisfies (1.4) below, the energy functional (1.2) is unbounded below—even among functions with same boundary values as u on $\partial\Omega$.¹ Thus, the functional admits no absolute minimizer. However, we will see that it often admits stable solutions. This class of solutions are the subject of our work.

Two other remarks may be helpful to settle the general framework and goals. First, note that once a solution is proven to be bounded, further regularity follows

¹To see this, consider $\mathcal{E}[u + tv]$ for any $v \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ with $v \geq 0$ and $v \not\equiv 0$, and let $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

from classical linear elliptic theory, since the right-hand side $f(u)$ becomes bounded.² Second, recall that within the class of all solutions (not being necessarily stable), L^∞ bounds are available, generally speaking, only for nonlinearities f growing at most as the critical Sobolev power. The goal is to reach a larger class of nonlinearities when we restrict ourselves to stable solutions.

This problem is a PDE analogue of another fundamental question: the regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^n . It is known that these surfaces may be singular for $n \geq 8$ (the Simons cone being an explicit example). On the other hand, their regularity has been established for $n = 3$ in the late seventies (independently by Fischer-Colbrie and Schoen and by Do Carmo and Peng) and for $n = 4$ in the very recent paper [CL] by Chodosh and Li. The question remains open for $5 \leq n \leq 7$.

In our setting, as in minimal surfaces, there is an explicit singular stable solution (with finite energy) in large dimensions. Indeed, for $n \geq 3$,

$$u = \log \frac{1}{|x|^2} \quad \text{solves (1.1) weakly, with } f(u) = 2(n-2)e^u \text{ and } \Omega = B_1.$$

Using Hardy's inequality, we see that the linearized operator $-\Delta - 2(n-2)e^u = -\Delta - 2(n-2)|x|^{-2}$ is nonnegative when $2(n-2) \leq (n-2)^2/4$, i.e., when $n \geq 10$. Thus, there exist singular $W^{1,2}(B_1)$ stable solutions to equations of the form (1.1) whenever $n \geq 10$. From our results we will see that this does not occur for $n \leq 9$.

Stable solutions exist and play an important role in the so called Gelfand-type problems. The case $f(u) = e^u$ arose, in the sixties, from an ignition problem in combustion theory [G] and motivated the subsequent literature on stable solutions. Assume that $f : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C^1 and that

$$f \text{ is nondecreasing, convex, and satisfies } f(0) > 0 \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(t)}{t} = +\infty. \quad (1.4)$$

Given a constant $\lambda > 0$ consider the problem³

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

Note first that $-\Delta u = \lambda f(u)$ admits no trivial solution ($u \equiv 0$ is not a solution since $\lambda f(0) > 0$). At the same time, the functional \mathcal{E} is unbounded from below (see Footnote 1) and thus admits no absolute minimizer. However, (1.5) admits a unique *stable* classical solution u_λ for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, where $\lambda^* \in (0, +\infty)$ is a certain parameter; see e.g. the book [D] by Dupaigne.⁴ On the other hand, no weak solution exists for $\lambda > \lambda^*$ (under various definitions of weak solution). The

²Hence, $f(u) \in L^p$ for all $p < \infty$ and one can apply first Calderon-Zygmund theory, and later Schauder theory.

³Problem (1.5) can be written equivalently in the form (1.12) used later. Indeed, assuming (1.4), extend f to $(-\infty, 0)$, no matter how but to have $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $f \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R} . Then, by the maximum principle, solutions of the problem $-\Delta u = \lambda f(u)$ in Ω , $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, coincide (for $\lambda > 0$) with those of (1.5).

⁴See [C4] for a related situation concerning catenoids in minimal surfaces theory.

functions u_λ , which are bounded in $\overline{\Omega}$ for $\lambda < \lambda^*$, increase as $\lambda \uparrow \lambda^*$ towards an $L^1(\Omega)$ distributional *stable* solution u^* of (1.5) for $\lambda = \lambda^*$. It is called *the extremal solution* of the problem and, depending on the nonlinearity f and the domain Ω , it may be either bounded or singular.

In the seventies, the seminal paper of Crandall and Rabinowitz [CR] established the boundedness of u^* when $n \leq 9$ and f is either the exponential $f(u) = e^u$ or a power $f(u) = (1 + u)^p$ with $p > 1$. In the mid-nineties Brezis asked for a similar result in the larger class of nonlinearities (1.4) (see, e.g., [B]), a question that gave rise to the following works, among others, cited in chronological order.

Nedev [N] proved the regularity of u^* for $n \leq 3$. In the radial case, Cabré and Capella [CC] established the boundedness of every $W_0^{1,2}(B_1)$ stable radial weak solution to (1.1) in the unit ball whenever $n \leq 9$, for every nonlinearity f . Back to the general nonradial case, an interior L^∞ bound for stable solutions holding for all nonlinearities was established for $n \leq 4$ by Cabré [C1] in 2010. The author gave a different proof of this result more recently, in [C3]. Finally, the optimal dimension $n \leq 9$ has been reached in 2020, by Cabré, Figalli, Ros-Oton, and Serra [CFRS], assuming $f \geq 0$ for interior regularity, and $f \geq 0$, $f' \geq 0$, and $f'' \geq 0$ for boundary regularity.

The monograph [D] contains detailed presentations of these developments, except for those of [CFRS], which are more recent. The survey [C2], which is a shorter presentation of the topic, contains also most of the proofs prior to [CFRS].

Some results of [CFRS] were established through contradiction-compactness proofs. The purpose of this article is to give quantitative proofs of all of them.

1.1. New results.

The following is the interior regularity result of [CFRS]. It provides a universal interior Hölder a priori bound for stable solutions when $n \leq 9$. It also establishes, in every dimension, an interior $W^{1,2}$ estimate (indeed a better $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ bound). All quantities are controlled in terms of only the L^1 norm of the solution. Regarding the nonlinearity, all what we need is $f \geq 0$.

Here, and throughout the paper, by “dimensional constant” we mean a constant that depends only on n .

Theorem I.0. ([CFRS]) *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B}_1)$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some nonnegative function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(B_{1/2})} \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)} \quad (1.6)$$

for some dimensional constants $\gamma > 0$ and C . In addition,

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B}_{1/2})} \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)} \quad \text{if } n \leq 9, \quad (1.7)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and C are dimensional constants.

The theorem is stated as an a priori bound for smooth stable solutions. From it one may deduce, by approximation results,⁵ interior regularity for $W^{1,2}$ stable weak solutions to (1.1) when f is, in addition, nondecreasing and convex; see Proposition 4.2 and Corollary 4.3 in [CFRS]. Together with our boundary estimates, the theorem will also lead to regularity results up to the boundary for the extremal solution u^* to (1.5), as commented below.

For $n \geq 10$ (and still $f \geq 0$), [CFRS] proved that stable solutions belong, in the interior of the domain, to certain Morrey spaces. This was an almost optimal result that has been improved by Peng, Zhang, and Zhou [PZZ1], reaching optimality. For instance, for $n = 10$, [PZZ1] shows that stable solutions are BMO in the interior, a result also found, independently, by Figalli and Mayboroda (personal communication).

Also after [CFRS], another interesting result by the same authors Peng, Zhang, and Zhou [PZZ2] proves that, for $n = 5$, the hypothesis $f \geq 0$ is not needed to conclude interior Hölder regularity. The Hölder control, however, is given by the $W^{1,2}$ norm of the solution instead of the L^1 norm. This establishes in dimension 5 previous analogue results of the author [C1, C3] for $n \leq 4$. More details on this are given below in Subsection 1.3, Open problem 1.3.1.

Remark 1.1. Our quantitative proof of Theorem I.0 allows for an easy extension of the result to the case $f \geq -K$ for some positive constant K . The resulting estimates in this case are those of Theorem I.0 with the right-hand sides replaced by $C(\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)} + K)$, where C is still a dimensional constant. The necessary changes in the proofs will be explained at the end of Section 6.

We point out that it was not clear how to obtain such a result for $f \geq -K$ by extending the proof in [CFRS], due to the compactness argument used in that paper. This has been accomplished recently by Fa Peng [P].

The proof of Theorem I.0 is divided into three steps, as described in next subsection. The last step consists of controlling some norm of u by its radial derivative u_r in an annulus. Here and throughout the paper we will use the notation

$$r = |x| \quad \text{and} \quad u_r = \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla u. \quad (1.8)$$

In [CFRS] this step of the proof controlled $|\nabla u|$ in L^2 by u_r in L^2 , under a *doubling assumption* on $|\nabla u|^2$. More precisely, [CFRS, Lemma 3.1] proved that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{3/2})}^2 \leq C_\delta \|u_r\|_{L^2(B_{3/2} \setminus B_1)}^2 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2 \geq \delta \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)}^2 \quad (1.9)$$

and u is a stable solution in B_2 . This was accomplished through a contradiction-compactness argument. Compactness in the $W^{1,2}$ norm followed from the higher integrability bound (1.6) (obtained in $B_{3/2}$ instead of $B_{1/2}$). The contradiction came from analyzing the validity of (1.9) in the limiting case $u_r \equiv 0$. This is simple, since if $u_r \equiv 0$, then u is 0-homogeneous and, thus, u is a superharmonic function

⁵Here one needs to approximate f by smooth nonlinearities, since we assume $u \in C^\infty$. This is not necessary in [CFRS], which only assumes $u \in C^2$.

for the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the unit sphere (recall that $f \geq 0$). This yields u to be constant, and hence $|\nabla u| \equiv 0$.

In this paper we give a quantitative proof of this third step —which is the only one that used a contradiction-compactness argument in [CFRS]. The new proof does not rely on a compactness argument and, as a consequence, it allows to quantify the Hölder exponent α of Theorem I.0. At the same time, having two different proofs of the regularity result is of interest for possible future extensions to other frameworks. For instance, our quantitative proof can be easily adapted to the case when f is bounded below (instead of being nonnegative); see Remark 1.1 above. It can also be extended to operators with variable coefficients, as done by Erneta in [E1]. However, the main applications of our quantitative approach, commented below, concern the boundary regularity treatment and its extensions to other equations.

Our interior quantitative proof is based on the following new estimate. We replace (1.9) by the new bound (1.10) in annuli, which still suffices to complete the proof of Theorem I.0. Instead, we will not use estimate (1.11) in balls, which follows easily from (1.10) and is stated here only for completeness.

Theorem I.1. *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$ be superharmonic in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Then, there exists a constant t , which depends on u , such that

$$\|u - t\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} \quad (1.10)$$

and

$$\|u - t\|_{L^1(B_1)} \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1)} \quad (1.11)$$

for some dimensional constant C .

With respect to (1.9), we have replaced L^2 norms by L^1 norms, as well as $|\nabla u|$ by $u - t$ for some constant t .

Notice also that the new estimate (1.10) does not require a doubling assumption, unlike (1.9). In addition, it holds for all superharmonic functions.⁶ This is in contrast with the much more delicate case of boundary regularity, treated below, where the analogue estimate will crucially require u to be a stable solution of a semilinear equation for a certain class of nonlinearities.

At least for $n \geq 3$, Theorem I.1 also holds when replacing (1.10), or (1.11), by the stronger bound

$$\|u - t\|_{L^1(B_1)} \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} \quad (\text{if } n \geq 3).$$

This can be shown proceeding as in Remark 9.2, where the details are done for the boundary case.

The proof of Theorem I.1 uses a harmonic replacement together with the maximum principle. This allows us to reduce the problem to the case when u is harmonic —here it will be crucial that we work with L^1 instead of L^2 norms. But when $\Delta u = 0$, we confront a Neumann problem for the homogeneous Laplace equation (since u_r , restricted to any sphere, may be thought as the Neumann data), for which the estimate of the theorem is not surprising and, in fact, easy to prove.

⁶Still, we could not find it in previous literature.

Let us now turn into boundary regularity. It is well known that the interior bound of Theorem I.0 and the moving planes method yield an L^∞ bound for u up to the boundary when the domain Ω is convex; see [C1] and Corollary 1.4 of [CFRS]. Since this procedure does not work for nonconvex domains, [CFRS] undertook the study of boundary regularity in general domains and proved the following result.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain of class C^3 and $u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ be a stable solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

Assuming that $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is nonnegative, nondecreasing, and convex, [CFRS] established that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(\Omega)} \leq C_\Omega \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$$

and that

$$\text{if } n \leq 9, \text{ then } \|u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_\Omega \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)},$$

where $\gamma > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ are dimensional constants, while C_Ω depends only on Ω .

From these two a priori estimates, one deduces the corresponding regularity results for the extremal solution u^* to (1.5). This is accomplished by using the above estimates for the family of *bounded* stable solutions u_λ , where $\lambda < \lambda^*$.

To prove the estimates, one first covers $\partial\Omega$ by small enough balls so that $\partial\Omega$ is almost flat (in the sense of [CFRS]) inside each of the balls. Thus, it is sufficient to prove a local-boundary result⁷ for almost flat boundaries. To simplify the exposition, in the current paper we place ourselves in the simpler setting of a flat boundary. A forthcoming work by Erneta [E2] will extend our quantitative proof to almost flat boundaries. This will allow, in [E2], to avoid the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [CFRS], which is a delicate blow-up and compactness argument used together with a Liouville theorem in the half-space. It was needed there since the contradiction-compactness argument (Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 6.3 in [CFRS]) required the boundary to be flat.

We introduce the notation

$$\mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_n > 0\}, \quad B_\rho^+ = \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_\rho, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial^0 B_\rho^+ = \{x_n = 0\} \cap \partial B_\rho^+,$$

and state the result of [CFRS] in the case of flat boundaries.

Theorem II.0. ([CFRS]) *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative, nondecreasing, and convex.*

Then,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \quad (1.13)$$

for some dimensional constants $\gamma > 0$ and C . In addition,

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})} \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \quad \text{if } n \leq 9, \quad (1.14)$$

⁷See the statement of Theorem II.0 to understand the expression ‘‘local-boundary result’’. It concerns a bound in a half-ball smaller than the half-ball where the equation and part of the boundary data are assumed.

where $\alpha > 0$ and C are dimensional constants.

It is important here to assume the solution u to be nonnegative —an assumption that will hold when applying the theorem to the global problem (1.12), since $f \geq 0$. Note also that the result requires more assumptions on the nonlinearity than the interior theorem.

As in the interior case, the proof of Theorem II.0 consists of three steps. The last one, on control of the solution u by its radial derivative u_r , is where [CFRS] used a contradiction-compactness argument (Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 6.3 in that paper). Carrying it out required to establish a rather delicate, but powerful, closedness result for stable solutions to semilinear equations with different (varying) nonlinearities. This is Theorem 4.1 of [CFRS], further commented below, which will not be needed in our quantitative proof. As a consequence, it will be simpler to implement our proof in other frameworks than that of [CFRS]. This is the case of stable solutions for operators with variable coefficients, as treated in [E2].

Our quantitative proof of boundary regularity will use estimate (1.15) below, which is the main result of this paper.

Theorem II.1. *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative, nondecreasing, and convex.*

Then,

$$\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+ \setminus B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1^+ \setminus B_{1/2}^+)} \quad (1.15)$$

and

$$\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \quad (1.16)$$

for some dimensional constant C .

Several comments are in order.

We will show in Remark 9.1 that, unlike the interior case of Theorem I.1, estimate (1.15) does not hold in the larger class of nonnegative superharmonic functions in B_1^+ which are smooth up to the boundary of B_1^+ and vanish on $\partial^0 B_1^+$.

In Remark 9.2 we will prove that, at least for $n \geq 3$, Theorem II.1 also holds when replacing (1.15), or (1.16), by the stronger bound

$$\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1^+ \setminus B_{1/2}^+)} \quad (\text{if } n \geq 3).$$

The proof of Theorem II.1 is rather delicate and required new ideas, described below. It uses not only the semilinear equation for u , but also the stability condition. Furthermore, it requires the nonlinearity to satisfy $f \geq 0$, $f' \geq 0$, and $f'' \geq 0$. Note that these are the exactly same assumptions needed in the contradiction-compactness proof in [CFRS]. This fact came partly as a surprise, since our quantitative proof and the one of [CFRS] are based in very different ingredients, as described next.

As we did in the interior case, it is interesting to first look at the extreme case of Theorem II.1 in which $u_r \equiv 0$ —this can be seen as a first validity test for

(1.15). In fact, such case had to be analyzed also in the contradiction-compactness proof of [CFRS] —which does not prove (1.15) but a boundary version of (1.9). In contrast with the interior case, “bad news” arise here. Indeed, there exist nonzero nonnegative superharmonic functions u in B_1^+ which vanish on $\partial^0 B_1^+$ and are 0-homogeneous (i.e., for which $u_r \equiv 0$) —obviously, they are not smooth at the origin as in our statement of Theorem II.1, but belong to $W^{1,2}(B_1^+)$ when $n \geq 3$. An example is given by the function

$$u(x) = \frac{x_n}{|x|}.$$

This is the key reason behind the fact that Theorem II.1 does not hold in the class of superharmonic functions which are smooth up to the flat boundary, as we will show in Remark 9.1.

As a consequence, the contradiction in [CFRS] could not come from the limiting function being superharmonic —as in the interior case—, but from a stronger property. Namely, Theorem 4.1 of [CFRS] established that the class of $W^{1,2}$ functions u for which there exists a nonnegative, nondecreasing, and convex nonlinearity f (with f blowing-up, perhaps, at the value $\sup u$) such that u is a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$, is closed under the L^1 -convergence in compact sets of the functions u . Note that the class does not correspond to stable solutions of only one equation, but of all equations with such nonlinearities. This is a very strong result, of interest by itself, which will not be needed in the current paper. [CFRS] used it to find that, in the extreme case discussed above, the limiting function u would be not only superharmonic, but also a solution of an equation $-\Delta u = g(u)$ for some nonlinearity g with the properties listed above. This gave a contradiction, since then $g(u)$ would be 0-homogeneous (being u_r identically 0), while $-\Delta u$ would be -2 -homogeneous.

Instead, the proof of Theorem II.1 originates from the identity

$$-2\Delta u + \Delta(x \cdot \nabla u) = -f'(u) x \cdot \nabla u, \quad (1.17)$$

which is easily checked by computing $\Delta(x \cdot \nabla u)$.⁸ After multiplying (1.17) by an appropriate test function and integrating by parts in a half-annulus, it is easily seen that the left-hand side bounds the L^1 norm of u by below, modulus an error which is admissible for (1.15): the L^1 norm of $x \cdot \nabla u = ru_r$. The main difficulty is how to control the right-hand side of (1.17) by above, in terms of only u_r . This is delicate, due to the presence of $f'(u)$. We will explain the details in Section 9. The proof involves introducing the functions $u_\lambda(x) := u(\lambda x)$, interpreting the radial derivative $x \cdot \nabla u(\lambda x)$ as $\frac{d}{d\lambda} u_\lambda(x)$, considering a “ u_λ -version” of (1.17), and averaging such version in λ to reduce the number of derivatives falling on the solution u through the proof arguments.

⁸This is the same identity as (2.3) in the interior proof. It is the crucial expression leading to the requirement $n \leq 9$ for interior regularity.

1.2. Structure of the proofs of Theorems I.0 and II.0.

We first note that, by approximation, the stability inequality (1.3),

$$\int_{\Omega} f'(u)\xi^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla\xi|^2 dx,$$

holds not only for $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ functions ξ vanishing on $\partial\Omega$, but also for all Lipschitz functions ξ in $\overline{\Omega}$ which vanish on $\partial\Omega$. Hence, we can consider a test function of the form $\xi = \mathbf{c}\eta$, where $\mathbf{c} \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$, η is a Lipschitz function in $\overline{\Omega}$, and $\mathbf{c}\eta$ vanishes on $\partial\Omega$. Then, a simple integration by parts argument gives that

$$\int_{\Omega} (\Delta\mathbf{c} + f'(u)\mathbf{c})\mathbf{c}\eta^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{c}^2 |\nabla\eta|^2 dx. \quad (1.18)$$

This expression brings the linearized operator $\Delta + f'(u)$, acting on \mathbf{c} , into play. The rest of the paper will make three different crucial choices for the function \mathbf{c} , all of them displayed later in this subsection.

The proof of Hölder regularity is based on putting together three estimates. In the interior case, the first one, and where the restriction $n \leq 9$ appears, is the following. Here $f \geq 0$ is not needed.

Theorem I.2. ([CFRS]) *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B}_1)$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

If $3 \leq n \leq 9$, then

$$\int_{B_\rho} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C\rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{3\rho/2} \setminus B_\rho} |\nabla u|^2 dx \quad (1.19)$$

for all $\rho < 2/3$, where C is a dimensional constant.

This result will be proven using (1.18) with

$$\mathbf{c} = x \cdot \nabla u \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = r^{(2-n)/2} \zeta, \quad (1.20)$$

where ζ is a cut-off function. Recall that $r = |x|$.

Note that the theorem requires $n \geq 3$. However, adding superfluous independent variables to the solution, as in [CFRS], one can use it to establish Theorem I.0 also in dimensions one and two.

Notice that the left-hand side of estimate (1.19) is rescale invariant. That is, it is an adimensional quantity —like the L^∞ norm of u in B_ρ is, as well. As we will see, if the right-hand side of estimate (1.19) had u_r^2 as integrand, instead of $|\nabla u|^2$, then Hölder regularity of u would be a simple consequence of it. Instead, in Appendix E we will show that in the actual form (1.19), Theorem I.2 (even when used with radial derivatives taken with respect to any point, and not only the origin) is not enough to deduce an interior L^∞ bound for u . This is true even assuming that u is an (unstable)⁹ solution to (1.1) for some nonnegative nonlinearity f . We emphasize this fact since we (and some other experts) initially thought that that the estimate of Theorem I.2, used with respect to any base point, could suffice. Therefore, still

⁹Instead, the L^∞ bound holds among stable solutions, by Theorem I.0.

having Theorem I.2 at hand, to get Hölder regularity one needs to exploit again the stability of the solution u .

The second and third ingredients will allow to replace $|\nabla u|^2$ by u_r^2 as integrand in the right-hand side of (1.19). The second one, already contained in [CFRS], uses the choice

$$\mathbf{c} = |\nabla u| \tag{1.21}$$

in (1.18). It was first introduced by Sternberg and Zumbrun [SZ] while studying the Allen-Cahn equation. It will lead, in every dimension, to certain L^2 and L^1 second derivative estimates. From them, we will deduce the $W^{1,2}$ estimate of the following theorem, which holds in all dimensions.

Before stating it, let us mention that the two key test functions (1.20) and (1.21) used in the stability inequality correspond, respectively, to the following perturbations of the solution u (one in the radial direction, the other in the normal direction to the level sets):

$$u(x + \varepsilon r^{(2-n)/2} \zeta(x)x) \quad \text{and} \quad u\left(x + \varepsilon \eta(x) \frac{\nabla u(x)}{|\nabla u(x)|}\right),$$

where ζ and η are cut-off functions. Indeed, making the derivative of these expressions with respect to ε , at $\varepsilon = 0$, we obtain the above test functions $\xi = \mathbf{c}\eta$.

Theorem I.3. ([CFRS]) *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some nonnegative function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})} \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(B_1)} \tag{1.22}$$

for some dimensional constant C .

This $W^{1,2}$ regularity result solves [BV, Open problem 1], a question posed by Brezis and Vázquez. Previously, it had been proven, under the stronger hypotheses (1.4) on the nonlinearity, for $n \leq 5$ by Nedev [N] and for $n = 6$ by Villegas [V].

Theorem I.3 provides the second step towards the Hölder regularity proof. Indeed, one starts from estimate (1.19) of Theorem I.2 with, for instance, $\rho = 5/8$. Now, one covers the annulus in the right-hand side of (1.19) by a universal number of balls with an appropriate universally small radius. Next, in each of these balls one uses (1.22), properly rescaled, with u replaced by the stable solution $u - t$ —a solution of $-\Delta v = f(v + t)$ —, where t is a constant to be chosen later. Adding the right-hand sides of (1.22) in all the balls, one concludes that the integral of $r^{2-n}u_r^2$ in $B_{1/2}$ can be controlled by the L^1 norm of $u - t$ in the annulus $B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}$. Finally, one uses the third ingredient, estimate (1.10) of Theorem I.1.

In this way, one concludes that the integral of $r^{2-n}u_r^2$ in $B_{1/2}$ is controlled by its integral on the annulus $B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}$. This estimate, used at all scales and iterated—this is sometimes called “the hole filling technique”, referring to the hole of the annulus— will easily lead to the Hölder regularity of u .

Let us now switch to estimates up to $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^n$, that is, global regularity in the case of flat boundaries. Theorem II.0 will follow from three results, which are the analogues

of the interior ones described above. The last one is our main result, Theorem II.1, from the previous subsection. The other two ingredients are the following.

Theorem II.2. ([CFRS]) *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$, for some nonlinearity $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

If $3 \leq n \leq 9$, then

$$\int_{B_\rho^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C_\lambda \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{\lambda\rho}^+ \setminus B_\rho^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx$$

for all $\lambda > 1$ and $\rho < 1/\lambda$, where C_λ is a constant depending only on n and λ .

For the proof of this result, as well as of the following one, the stability condition is used with certain test functions $\xi = \mathbf{c}\eta$ for which it is important that η does not vanish on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Thus, we will need to take \mathbf{c} vanishing on the flat boundary. For the previous theorem, one makes the same choice $\mathbf{c} = x \cdot \nabla u$ as in the interior case, which indeed does vanish on the flat boundary.

Instead, for the following result one cannot use the choice $\mathbf{c} = |\nabla u|$ made in the interior case, since this function does not vanish on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. In [CFRS] we found that

$$\mathbf{c} = |\nabla u| - u_{x_n},$$

which vanishes on $\partial^0 B_1^+$, is a suitable replacement. This allowed to establish the following $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ estimate. Note that while the previous theorem required no condition on f , we now require f to be nonnegative and nondecreasing—but not necessarily convex.

Theorem II.3. ([CFRS]) *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing.*

Then,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(B_{1/4}^+)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)},$$

for some dimensional constants $\gamma > 0$ and C .

To use this result as second ingredient towards the Hölder estimate, it would suffice to have the exponent $2 + \gamma$ to be 2 (as it was the case in the interior regularity). However, as a novelty with respect to the interior theory, Theorem II.3 will be used also to establish the control of u by u_r (that is, Theorem II.1, our main result). For this, having the integrability exponent $2 + \gamma$ larger than 2 will be crucial.

1.3. Open problems and related equations.

1.3.1. The assumption $f \geq 0$ is not needed in the interior L^∞ estimates of [C1, C3] for $n \leq 4$, nor in the interior Hölder bound of [PZZ2] for $n \leq 5$. It is neither needed in the bounds for $n \leq 9$ of the radial case, [CC]. In the general nonradial case, it is not known if an interior L^∞ estimate could hold for $6 \leq n \leq 9$ without the hypothesis $f \geq 0$.

For future developments, it is of interest to keep in mind the test functions used in the stability inequality (1.3). Up to trivial cut-off functions ζ , [C1] used $\xi =$

$|\nabla u|\varphi(u)\zeta$ for some appropriate function φ . Both [CFRS] and the current paper use, for interior regularity, the two test functions $\xi = \mathbf{c}\eta$ given by (1.20) and (1.21) (this last one with η being a cut-off). Instead, [C3] and the recent [PZZ2] use

$$\xi = |\nabla u|rr^{-\beta}\zeta$$

for some positive exponents β —[PZZ2] takes the optimal exponent $\beta = (n - 2)/2$.

1.3.2. Our boundary regularity results require $f \geq 0$, $f' \geq 0$, and $f'' \geq 0$. Both the proof in [CFRS] and the one of this paper, which are completely different, turn out to need these three conditions. It is not known if these hypotheses could be relaxed.

Theorem 1.5 in [CFRS] establishes Hölder regularity up to the boundary in domains Ω of class C^3 . May the regularity of the domain be improved?

1.3.3. It is an open problem to extend the techniques of [CFRS] to stable solutions of MEMS problems (see, e.g. [EGG, LY]) and reach a regularity result in the optimal range $n \leq 6$. Here one has the equation $-\Delta u = \lambda f(u)$ for positive nonlinearities $f : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which blow-up at $u = 1$ in such a way that $\int_0^1 f = +\infty$. In this new setting, a solution is said to be regular when $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < 1$.¹⁰

1.3.4. The results of [CFRS] have been extended by Figalli and Zhang [FZ] to finite Morse index solutions (a larger class than stable solutions). Here the nonlinearity must be required to be supercritical, in an appropriate sense. It would be interesting to make further progress on finite Morse index solutions, both in bounded domains and in the entire space. See also the presentation and open problems in [W].

1.3.5. Dupaigne and Farina [DF] have used the results of [CFRS] to establish Liouville theorems for entire stable solutions. One of them, for dimensions $n \leq 10$ and nonlinearities $f \geq 0$, applies to all stable solutions which are bounded by below. Still, [DF] and [W] raise some open questions in this topic.

1.3.6. The interior result of [CFRS] has been extended to the p -Laplacian by Cabré, Miraglio, and Sanchón [CMS]. This work reaches the optimal dimension for interior regularity of stable solutions when $p > 2$. It remains an open problem to accomplish the expected optimal dimension for $1 < p < 2$. On the other hand, to our knowledge, boundary regularity à la [CFRS] has not yet been treated (for any p).

1.3.7. For the equation $(-\Delta)^s u = f(u)$ involving the fractional Laplacian, the optimal dimension for regularity of stable solutions has only been reached when $f(u) = \lambda e^u$. This was accomplished by Ros-Oton [R-O]. The dimension found in that paper, which depends on $s \in (0, 1)$, is expected to also give the correct range of dimensions for other nonlinearities. This is however an open problem, even in the radial case. The most recent progress (in the general nonradial case) is the paper [CS] by Cabré and Sanz-Perela, where the techniques of [CFRS] are extended

¹⁰Note that the results of [CFRS] apply to this class of blow-up nonlinearities —in fact, they appeared naturally while proving the results of Section 4 in that paper. Thus, Corollary 4.3 of [CFRS] gives Hölder regularity of stable solutions to MEMS problems when $n \leq 9$. However, this does not prevent the solution to be singular in the new meaning, that is, equal to 1 at some points.

for the half-Laplacian ($s = 1/2$) to prove interior regularity in dimensions $n \leq 4$ for all nonnegative convex nonlinearities —here, with $s = 1/2$, one expects $n \leq 8$ to be the optimal result.

1.4. Reading the article.

The monograph [D] and the shorter survey [C2] present the general framework and previous regularity results on stable solutions, except for those from [CFRS]. Besides regularity issues, [D] treats other questions on stable solutions.

For expository purposes, the presentation in the current paper is self-contained, in the sense that all results are fully proven. In addition, a novel, non-expert, reader in elliptic PDEs can follow all proofs, since we only use basic Analysis tools (for instance, in the interior regularity proofs, we do not even use the Sobolev inequality).

The article is divided into two parts, dealing with interior and boundary regularity, respectively. The new results, Theorems I.1 and II.1, are proven in the third sections of Part I and Part II, respectively (Sections 4 and 9). The appendices also contain new results that are needed in our proofs. The lemmas in the remaining sections, and most of their proofs, are taken from [CFRS]. We will point out those passages which simplify some arguments of that paper.

PART I: INTERIOR REGULARITY

This first part of the article concerns interior regularity. Thanks to the new result of Theorem I.1, which is proven in Section 4, we avoid the contradiction-compactness argument of [CFRS].

In addition, our proof of the $W^{1,2}$ estimate of Theorem I.3 (given in Section 3) is more elementary than that of [CFRS], which needed the higher integrability result (1.6) for $|\nabla u|$. While this last result was obtained through the Sobolev inequality and some estimates on each level set of the solution, we will instead use a new and simple interpolation inequality.

2. THE WEIGHTED L^2 ESTIMATE FOR RADIAL DERIVATIVES

The following is the key estimate towards the interior regularity result. In particular, it is here (and only here) where the condition $n \leq 9$ arises. It is proven by using the test function $\xi = (x \cdot \nabla u)\eta$ in the stability condition and by later taking $\eta = r^{(2-n)/2}\zeta$ for some cut-off function ζ . Recall the notation (1.8) for r and u_r .

Throughout the paper, some subscripts denote partial derivatives, that is, $u_i = \partial_i u$, $u_{ij} = \partial_{ij} u$, etc.

Lemma 2.1 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then,

$$\int_{B_1} \left(\{(n-2)\eta + 2x \cdot \nabla \eta\} \eta |\nabla u|^2 - 2(x \cdot \nabla u) \nabla u \cdot \nabla (\eta^2) - |x \cdot \nabla u|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 \right) dx \leq 0 \quad (2.1)$$

for all Lipschitz functions η vanishing on ∂B_1 . As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(n-2)(10-n)}{4} \int_{B_1} r^{2-n} u_r^2 \zeta^2 dx \\ & \leq \int_{B_1} (-2)r^{3-n} |\nabla u|^2 \zeta \zeta_r dx + \int_{B_1} 4r^{3-n} u_r \zeta \nabla u \cdot \nabla \zeta dx \\ & \quad + \int_{B_1} (2-n)r^{3-n} u_r^2 \zeta \zeta_r dx + \int_{B_1} r^{4-n} u_r^2 |\nabla \zeta|^2 dx \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

for all Lipschitz functions ζ vanishing on ∂B_1 .

Proof. We first establish (2.1). We choose $\mathbf{c}(x) := x \cdot \nabla u(x)$. By a direct computation we have that

$$\Delta \mathbf{c} = x \cdot \nabla \Delta u + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_{ii} = -f'(u) \mathbf{c} + 2 \Delta u \quad \text{in } B_1. \quad (2.3)$$

Substituting this identity in (1.18) we get¹¹

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} |x \cdot \nabla u|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 dx & \geq \int_{B_1} (\Delta \mathbf{c} + f'(u) \mathbf{c}) \mathbf{c} \eta^2 dx = 2 \int_{B_1} (x \cdot \nabla u) \Delta u \eta^2 dx \\ & = \int_{B_1} \left(\operatorname{div}(2(x \cdot \nabla u) \nabla u - |\nabla u|^2 x) + (n-2) |\nabla u|^2 \right) \eta^2 dx \\ & = \int_{B_1} \left(-2(x \cdot \nabla u) \nabla u \cdot \nabla(\eta^2) + |\nabla u|^2 x \cdot \nabla(\eta^2) + (n-2) |\nabla u|^2 \eta^2 \right) dx, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes (2.1).

We can now deduce (2.2). Given $a \in (0, n)$, we would like to take $\eta := r^{-a/2} \zeta$, with ζ Lipschitz and vanishing on ∂B_1 , as test function in (2.1). Since in general η is not Lipschitz, we approximate it by the Lipschitz function

$$\eta_\varepsilon := \min\{r^{-a/2}, \varepsilon^{-a/2}\} \zeta$$

for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, which agrees with η in $B_1 \setminus B_\varepsilon$. We have that $\eta_\varepsilon \rightarrow \eta$ and $\nabla \eta_\varepsilon \rightarrow \nabla \eta$ a.e. in B_1 as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. At the same time, when η is chosen to be η_ε , every term in (2.1) is bounded in absolute value by $C r^{-a} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \tilde{C} r^{-a} \in L^1(B_1)$, since $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$. Hence, the dominated convergence theorem gives that (2.1) also holds with $\eta := r^{-a/2} \zeta$.

Now, noticing that

$$x \cdot \nabla \eta = -\frac{a}{2} r^{-a/2} \zeta + r^{-a/2} x \cdot \nabla \zeta, \quad \nabla(\eta^2) = -a r^{-a-2} \zeta^2 x + 2 r^{-a} \zeta \nabla \zeta,$$

and

$$|\nabla \eta|^2 = \left| -\frac{a}{2} r^{-a/2-2} \zeta x + r^{-a/2} \nabla \zeta \right|^2 = \frac{a^2}{4} r^{-a-2} \zeta^2 + r^{-a} |\nabla \zeta|^2 - a r^{-a-2} \zeta (x \cdot \nabla \zeta),$$

(2.2) follows from (2.1) by choosing $a = n - 2$. \square

¹¹The same computation arises in the proof of the classical Pohozaev identity.

From the lemma, we easily deduce our key estimate in dimensions $3 \leq n \leq 9$.

Proof of Theorem I.2. Given $\rho \in (0, 2/3)$, consider a Lipschitz function ζ satisfying $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$, $\zeta|_{B_\rho} = 1$, $\zeta|_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3\rho/2}} = 0$, and $|\nabla\zeta| \leq C/\rho$. Using it in (2.2) and noticing that $r = |x|$ is comparable to ρ inside $\text{supp}(\nabla\zeta) \subset \overline{B_{3\rho/2}} \setminus B_\rho$, the result follows. \square

3. HESSIAN AND $W^{1,2}$ ESTIMATES

To establish the $W^{1,2}$ estimate of Theorem I.3 we use again the stability of u , but choosing now another test function: $\xi = |\nabla u|\eta$ with η a cut-off. This choice was introduced by Sternberg and Zumbrun [SZ] in 1998 while studying the Allen-Cahn equation. It leads to the following result.

Define

$$\mathcal{A} := \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{ij} u_{ij}^2 - \sum_i \left(\sum_j u_{ij} \frac{u_j}{|\nabla u|} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} & \text{if } \nabla u \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \nabla u = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Lemma 3.1 ([SZ]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then,

$$\int_{B_1} \mathcal{A}^2 \eta^2 dx \leq \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 dx \quad (3.2)$$

for all Lipschitz functions η vanishing on ∂B_1 .

Proof. We would like to take $\mathbf{c} := |\nabla u|$ in the alternative form (1.18) of stability. A simple computation shows that

$$|\nabla u|(\Delta|\nabla u| + f'(u)|\nabla u|) = \mathcal{A}^2 \quad \text{in } \{\nabla u \neq 0\}. \quad (3.3)$$

This, together with (1.18), suggests that (3.2) should hold. However a complete argument is needed, since we used integration by parts to derive (1.18), $\mathbf{c} = |\nabla u|$ may not be differentiable where the gradient vanishes, and (3.3) in principle only holds in $\{\nabla u \neq 0\}$.

The following is the most elementary proof of the lemma.¹² As in [C1], for $\varepsilon > 0$ we consider

$$\mathbf{c}_\varepsilon := (|\nabla u|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}$$

and introduce

$$\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon := \left(\sum_{ij} u_{ij}^2 - \sum_i \left(\sum_j u_{ij} \frac{u_j}{\mathbf{c}_\varepsilon} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

¹²See [CFRS] for an alternative proof which does not require to compute $\Delta|\nabla u|$ and hence applies to C^2 solutions u —it uses, however, Stampacchia's theorem to ensure that $D^2u = 0$ a.e. in $\{\nabla u = 0\}$. A third proof, similar to the one we give here and that does not rely on Stampacchia's result, can be given following an argument for the p -Laplacian from [CMS]. It consists of using (1.18) with $\mathbf{c} = |\nabla u|\phi(|\nabla u|/\varepsilon)$, where $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is nondecreasing, $\phi(t) = 0$ for $t \leq 1$, and $\phi(t) = 1$ for $t \geq 2$, and letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ at the end.

Note that we are taking the square root of nonnegative numbers and that now \mathbf{c}_ε is a C^∞ function in all of B_1 . Since $\Delta u_j + f'(u)u_j = 0$ and $\mathcal{A} = 0$ in $\{\nabla u = 0\}$, it is simple to verify that

$$(\Delta \mathbf{c}_\varepsilon + f'(u)\mathbf{c}_\varepsilon) \mathbf{c}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^2 f'(u) + \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon^2 \geq \varepsilon^2 f'(u) + \mathcal{A}^2 \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Now, from (1.18) used with \mathbf{c} replaced by \mathbf{c}_ε we deduce that

$$\int_{B_1} (\varepsilon^2 f'(u) + \mathcal{A}^2) \eta^2 dx \leq \int_{B_1} (|\nabla u|^2 + \varepsilon^2) |\nabla \eta|^2 dx.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we conclude the lemma. \square

We can now deduce two L^1 estimates for second derivatives. One of them, (3.5), is weighted by the gradient and will lead to our $W^{1,2}$ a priori bound. We now assume $f \geq 0$ and use crucially the superharmonicity of the stable solution.

Lemma 3.2 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some nonnegative function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then,

$$\|D^2 u\|_{L^1(B_{3/4})} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\| |\nabla u| D^2 u \|_{L^1(B_{3/4})} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2 \quad (3.5)$$

for some dimensional constant C .

Proof. Define $\nu = \nabla u / |\nabla u|$ in the set $\{\nabla u \neq 0\}$ and $\nu = 0$ in $\{\nabla u = 0\}$. We claim that

$$|D^2 u - (D^2 u[\nu, \nu])\nu \otimes \nu| \leq C\mathcal{A} \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1 \quad (3.6)$$

and, as a consequence,

$$|D^2 u| \leq |\Delta u| + C\mathcal{A} \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1, \quad (3.7)$$

for some dimensional constants C .

Indeed, at points x for which $\nabla u(x) \neq 0$, (3.6) follows from the fact that \mathcal{A}^2 , as defined in (3.1), is larger or equal than half the squared Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the matrix $D^2 u - (D^2 u[\nu, \nu])\nu \otimes \nu$. This is easily seen by writing the symmetric matrix $D^2 u(x)$ in any orthonormal basis having $\nu(x)$ as last (say) basic vector. We conclude the validity, almost everywhere, of (3.6) using Stampacchia's result (see for instance [LL, Theorem 6.19]), which ensures that $D^2 u = 0$ a.e. in $\{\nabla u = 0\}$.

Now, to prove (3.7), notice that by (3.6) it suffices to control $|D^2 u[\nu, \nu]|$. To accomplish this, we simply rely on

$$D^2 u[\nu, \nu] = \Delta u - \text{tr}(D^2 u - (D^2 u[\nu, \nu])\nu \otimes \nu)$$

and use again (3.6).

Now, choose a nonnegative function $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ with $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $B_{3/4}$. Then, since $-\Delta u \geq 0$, we have

$$\int_{B_{3/4}} |\Delta u| dx \leq - \int_{B_1} \Delta u \zeta dx = \int_{B_1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \zeta dx \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \quad (3.8)$$

This bound, together with (3.7) and Lemma 3.1, gives (3.4).

To establish (3.5), we begin from the pointwise identity

$$\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u) = |\nabla u| \left(\sum_{ij} \frac{u_{ij} u_i u_j}{|\nabla u|^2} + \Delta u \right) \quad \text{in } \{\nabla u \neq 0\},$$

from which we deduce

$$\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u) = -|\nabla u| \operatorname{tr}(D^2 u - (D^2 u[\nu, \nu])\nu \otimes \nu) + 2|\nabla u| \Delta u \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1, \quad (3.9)$$

where tr denotes the trace. Here we used again Stampacchia's result ([LL, Theorem 6.19]), now also applied to each of the functions $|\nabla u|u_j$. For this, one needs to verify that $|\nabla u|u_j$ has weak derivatives locally in L^1 .¹³ Stampacchia's theorem ensures then that $\partial_k(|\nabla u|u_j) = 0$ a.e. in $\{u_j = 0\}$ for all k . In particular, $\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u) = 0$ a.e. in $\{\nabla u = 0\}$.

Next, let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ be a cut-off function with $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{3/4}$. We use (3.9), (3.6), and Lemma 3.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_{B_{3/4}} |\nabla u| |\Delta u| dx &\leq - \int_{B_1} 2|\nabla u| \Delta u \eta^2 dx \\ &= - \int_{B_1} |\nabla u| \operatorname{tr}(D^2 u - (D^2 u[\nu, \nu])\nu \otimes \nu) \eta^2 dx - \int_{B_1} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u) \eta^2 dx \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \eta^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{B_1} \mathcal{A}^2 \eta^2 dx \right)^{1/2} + \int_{B_1} |\nabla u| \nabla u \cdot \nabla(\eta^2) dx \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Using this bound and (3.7) (together with a similar argument as the previous one, to control the integral of $|\nabla u| \mathcal{A}$ in $B_{3/4}$), we conclude (3.5). \square

We now prove that the Dirichlet energy of a stable solution in a ball can be controlled by its L^1 norm in a larger ball. To get this result, we combine the previous weighted Hessian estimate with two new (but easy) interpolation lemmas proven in Appendix A. This proof is more elementary than the one of [CFRS], which was based on the $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ bound of Section 6 below and on the Sobolev inequality.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We cover $B_{1/2}$ (except for a set of measure zero) with a family of disjoint open cubes Q_j of side-length small enough (depending only on n) such that $Q_j \subset B_{3/4}$. We now combine the interpolation inequalities of Propositions A.1 and A.2 in each cube Q_j (we rescale them to pass from the unit cube to the cubes Q_j), used with $p = 2$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{3/2}$ for a given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We obtain that

$$\int_{Q_j} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon \int_{Q_j} |\nabla u| |D^2 u| dx + C\varepsilon \int_{Q_j} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \left(\int_{Q_j} |u| dx \right)^2$$

¹³This can be done replacing $|\nabla u|$ by $(|\nabla u|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}$ in the definition of weak derivative, and letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ at the end.

and thus, using $Q_j \subset B_{3/4}$ and estimate (3.5), that

$$\int_{Q_j} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \left(\int_{B_1} |u| dx \right)^2.$$

Adding up all these inequalities (note that the number of cubes Q_j depends only on n), we get

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2 + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}^2.$$

Applying this estimate to the functions $u_{\rho,y}(\bar{x}) := u(y + \rho\bar{x})$, where $\bar{x} \in B_1$ and $B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$ (note that $u_{\rho,y}$ is a stable solution to the semilinear equation $-\Delta u_{\rho,y} = f_\rho(u_{\rho,y})$ in B_1 with $f_\rho(t) = \rho^2 f(t)$, and thus all the previous results apply to $u_{\rho,y}$ as well), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{n+2} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(y)} |\nabla u|^2 dx &\leq C\varepsilon \rho^{n+2} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \left(\int_{B_\rho(y)} |u| dx \right)^2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \rho^{n+2} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \left(\int_{B_1} |u| dx \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. By Lemma B.1, applied with $\sigma(B) := \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2$ and ε sufficiently small, the result follows. \square

4. THE RADIAL DERIVATIVE CONTROLS THE FUNCTION IN L^1

In the previous section we have controlled the $W^{1,2}$ norm of a stable solution by its L^1 norm. We now prove, as claimed in Theorem I.1, that the L^1 norm of the solution (in fact of any superharmonic function) in an annulus (respectively, in a ball) can be controlled, up to an additive constant, by the L^1 norm of its radial derivative, taken also in the annulus (respectively, in the ball). For this, we first need a similar result for harmonic functions.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $v \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$ solve $\Delta v = 0$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then,*

$$\|v - v(0)\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)} \leq 2n^{3/2} \|v_r\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\|v - t\|_{L^1(\partial B_1)} \leq 2n^{3/2} \|v_r\|_{L^1(\partial B_1)}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $t := \inf \{ \bar{t} : |\{v > \bar{t}\} \cap \partial B_1| \leq |\partial B_1|/2 \}$ is the median of v .

The previous estimates should not be surprising. Indeed, we are controlling the solution to a boundary value problem for an homogeneous equation by its Neumann data $v_r|_{\partial B_1}$. Alternatively, the flux $v_r|_{\partial B_1}$ can be considered as a first-order elliptic integro-differential operator acting on the function $v|_{\partial B_1}$. This operator is a kind of “half-Laplacian”, since we extend the data $v|_{\partial B_1}$ harmonically in the ball—the half-Laplacian corresponds to the harmonic extension in a half-space. Anyhow, these comments will not be needed in the following elementary proof.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We start proving (4.1). From it, we will easily deduce (4.2) by duality.

Let

$$w(x) := x \cdot \nabla v(x) = r v_r \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{B}_1.$$

We claim that

$$|w(x)| \leq 2n^{3/2} \|v_r\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)} r \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{B}_1. \quad (4.3)$$

From this, (4.1) will clearly follow since, for all $\sigma \in \partial B_1$ we have

$$v(\sigma) - v(0) = \int_0^1 v_r(r\sigma) dr = \int_0^1 r^{-1} w(r\sigma) dr.$$

Now, to prove (4.3), note that w is harmonic in B_1 and agrees with v_r on ∂B_1 . Consequently,

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq \|v_r\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)}. \quad (4.4)$$

It follows that (4.3) holds whenever $|x| = r \geq 1/2$.

Assume now that $x \in B_{1/2}$. Note that

$$|w(x)| = |w(x) - w(0)| \leq \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2})} r. \quad (4.5)$$

Using that the partial derivatives w_i of w are harmonic and also (4.4), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |w_i(x)| &= \frac{1}{|B_{1/2}|} \left| \int_{B_{1/2}(x)} w_i dx \right| = \frac{1}{|B_{1/2}|} \left| \int_{\partial B_{1/2}(x)} w \nu^i d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|\partial B_{1/2}|}{|B_{1/2}|} \|v_r\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)} = 2n \|v_r\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $|\nabla w(x)| \leq 2n^{3/2} \|v_r\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)}$, which combined with (4.5), gives (4.3) when $r < 1/2$.

Next, we establish (4.2) by a duality argument. First note that the value t is finite and well-defined. Replacing v by $v - t$ we may assume that $t = 0$, and therefore that $0 = \inf \{\bar{t} : |\{v > \bar{t}\} \cap \partial B_1| \leq |\partial B_1|/2\}$. It follows that $|\{v > 0\} \cap \partial B_1| \leq |\partial B_1|/2$ and that $|\{v > \bar{t}\} \cap \partial B_1| > |\partial B_1|/2$ for all $\bar{t} < 0$. As a consequence, $|\{v < \bar{t}\} \cap \partial B_1| \leq |\partial B_1|/2$ for all $\bar{t} < 0$, and thus $|\{v < 0\} \cap \partial B_1| \leq |\partial B_1|/2$.

Let now $\text{sgn}(v) := v/|v|$ where $v \neq 0$. Since $|\{v > 0\} \cap \partial B_1| \leq |\partial B_1|/2$ and $|\{v < 0\} \cap \partial B_1| \leq |\partial B_1|/2$, it is possible to extend $\text{sgn}(v)$ to $\{v = 0\} \cap \partial B_1$, still taking values ± 1 and in such a way that we have $\int_{\partial B_1} \text{sgn}(v) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = 0$.¹⁴ In addition, it will also hold that $|v| = v \text{sgn}(v)$ on ∂B_1 .

We now define the functions

$$g_k(x) := \int_{\partial B_1} \text{sgn}(v)(y) \rho_k(|x - y|) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y),$$

¹⁴This follows from the fact that, given a measurable set $A \subset \partial B_1$ (which we take here to be $\{v = 0\} \cap \partial B_1$) and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a measurable subset $B \subset A$ with $|B| = \theta|A|$. This follows from the continuity with respect to ρ of the quantity $|A \cap B_\rho(1, 0, \dots, 0)|$.

where $\{\rho_k = \rho_k(|\cdot|)\}$ is a sequence of smooth mollifiers on ∂B_1 . We have that $g_k \in C^\infty(\partial B_1)$, $|g_k| \leq 1$, and $\int_{\partial B_1} g_k d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = 0$ since $\text{sgn}(v)$ has zero average on ∂B_1 . In addition, since $|v| = v \text{sgn}(v)$ a.e. on ∂B_1 , it holds that

$$\int_{\partial B_1} |v| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \lim_k \int_{\partial B_1} v g_k d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}. \quad (4.6)$$

Now, since g_k is smooth and has zero average on ∂B_1 , we can uniquely solve the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \varphi_k = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \\ \partial_r \varphi_k = g_k & \text{on } \partial B_1 \end{cases}$$

by imposing, additionally, $\varphi_k(0) = 0$. By (4.1), we have $\|\varphi_k\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_1)} \leq 2n^{3/2}$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\partial B_1} v g_k d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| &= \left| \int_{\partial B_1} v \partial_r \varphi_k d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| = \left| \int_{B_1} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi_k dx \right| = \left| \int_{\partial B_1} v_r \varphi_k d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| \\ &\leq 2n^{3/2} \int_{\partial B_1} |v_r| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (4.6), concludes the proof of (4.2). \square

We can now give the

Proof of Theorem I.1. Since

$$\|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} = \frac{1}{1/2} \int_{1/2}^1 \left(\int_{\partial B_r} \frac{1}{2} |u_r| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right) dr,$$

there exists $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$ such that $\|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\rho} |u_r| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$.

Let v be the harmonic function in B_ρ which agrees with u on ∂B_ρ . We have $v \in C^\infty(\overline{B_\rho})$. Decompose the radial derivatives $u_r = u_r^+ - u_r^-$ and $v_r = v_r^+ - v_r^-$ in their positive and negative parts. Since $v \leq u$ in B_ρ and the functions agree on the boundary, we have $v_r \geq u_r$ on ∂B_ρ . As a consequence, $v_r^- \leq u_r^-$ on ∂B_ρ . Since, in addition $0 = \int_{B_\rho} \Delta v dx = \int_{\partial B_\rho} v_r d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \int_{\partial B_\rho} v_r^+ d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} - \int_{\partial B_\rho} v_r^- d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} &= \int_{\partial B_\rho} |u_r| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \geq \int_{\partial B_\rho} u_r^- d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\ &\geq \int_{\partial B_\rho} v_r^- d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \int_{\partial B_\rho} v_r^+ d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\rho} |v_r| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$, we can rescale the estimate (4.2) in Lemma 4.1 and apply it to the harmonic function v to deduce

$$C \int_{\partial B_\rho} |v_r| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \geq \int_{\partial B_\rho} |v - t| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \int_{\partial B_\rho} |u - t| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$$

for some value t and a dimensional constant C , where in the last equality we used that $v = u$ on ∂B_ρ . Therefore, by the previous two estimates, the theorem will be proven once we establish that

$$\|u - t\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} \leq C \left(\int_{\partial B_\rho} |u - t| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})} \right) \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\|u - t\|_{L^1(B_{1/2})} \leq C \left(\int_{\partial B_\rho} |u - t| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1)} \right). \quad (4.8)$$

This is simple. For both estimates, we will use that

$$(u - t)(s\sigma) = (u - t)(\rho\sigma) - \int_s^\rho u_r(r\sigma) dr$$

for every $s \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma \in S^{n-1}$.

Now, to check (4.7) we take $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and note that

$$s^{n-1} |(u - t)(s\sigma)| \leq 2^{n-1} \rho^{n-1} |(u - t)(\rho\sigma)| + 2^{n-1} \int_{1/2}^1 r^{n-1} |u_r(r\sigma)| dr.$$

Integrating in $\sigma \in S^{n-1}$, and then in $s \in (1/2, 1)$, we conclude (4.7).

Finally, to prove (4.8) we take $s \in (0, 1/2)$ and note that (since $\rho \geq 1/2 > s$)

$$\begin{aligned} s^{n-1} |(u - t)(s\sigma)| &\leq \rho^{n-1} |(u - t)(\rho\sigma)| + \int_s^\rho r^{n-1} |u_r(r\sigma)| dr \\ &\leq \rho^{n-1} |(u - t)(\rho\sigma)| + \int_0^1 r^{n-1} |u_r(r\sigma)| dr. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating in $\sigma \in S^{n-1}$, and then in $s \in (0, 1/2)$, we conclude (4.8) by using also (4.7). \square

5. C^α ESTIMATE

Here we prove the interior Hölder estimate for $n \leq 9$. It yields, in particular, an interior L^∞ bound for stable solutions.

Proof of the Hölder estimate (1.7) in Theorem I.0. We may assume $3 \leq n \leq 9$. Indeed, in case $n \leq 2$ one can easily reduce the problem to the case $n = 3$ by adding artificial variables. This simply means looking at the function of two variables (or, respectively, of one variable) as a function of three variables which does not depend on the third Euclidean variable (or, respectively, on the last two variables). Note that both the equation and the stability condition are preserved under this procedure.

Using Theorem I.2 with $\rho = 5/8$, we have

$$\int_{B_{1/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \int_{B_{5/8}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_{15/16} \setminus B_{5/8}} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \quad (5.1)$$

Now, since $1/2 < 5/8 < 15/16 < 1$, we can cover the annulus $B_{15/16} \setminus B_{5/8}$ by a finite number of balls B_j , all of them with the same radius, that we choose small enough for the balls $2B_j$ (with same center as B_j and twice its radius) to satisfy $2B_j \subset B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}$. Now, let $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In each ball $2B_j$ we can apply Theorem I.3, rescaled, with u replaced by $u - t$, since $u - t$ is also a stable solution of the same equation. We deduce that

$$\int_{B_j} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C \|u - t\|_{L^1(2B_j)}^2 \leq C \|u - t\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})}^2.$$

Adding up in j , this yields

$$\int_{B_{15/16} \setminus B_{5/8}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C \|u - t\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})}^2 \quad (5.2)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

We now use estimate (1.10) from Theorem I.1 to see that

$$\|u - t\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})}^2 \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})}^2 \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^2(B_1 \setminus B_{1/2})}^2 \leq C \int_{B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx$$

for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$ (which depends on u) —it is here that we make the choice of the constant t . This, together with (5.1) and (5.2), leads to

$$\int_{B_{1/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_1 \setminus B_{1/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx.$$

We can write this inequality, in an equivalent way, as

$$\int_{B_{1/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \theta \int_{B_1} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx$$

for the dimensional constant $\theta = \frac{C}{1+C} \in (0, 1)$.

For every $\rho \in (0, 1)$, this estimate applied to the stable solution $u(\rho \cdot)$ yields

$$\int_{B_{\rho/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \theta \int_{B_\rho} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \quad (5.3)$$

(note that the integrals are rescale invariant). This inequality can be iterated, in the balls of radius 2^{-j} centered at 0, for $j \geq 1$ an integer, to obtain

$$\int_{B_{2^{-j}}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \theta^{j-1} \int_{B_{1/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx.$$

Since $\theta \in (0, 1)$, it follows that, for some dimensional $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_{B_\rho} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \rho^{2\alpha} \int_{B_{1/3}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \rho^{2\alpha} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})}^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \leq 1/3, \quad (5.4)$$

where we have used Theorem I.2 with $\rho = 1/3$ in the last inequality. In particular, since $\rho^{2-n} \leq r^{2-n}$ in B_ρ , we conclude that

$$\int_{B_\rho} u_r^2 dx \leq C\rho^{n-2+2\alpha} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})}^2 \leq C\rho^{n-2+2\alpha} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \leq 1/3,$$

where we have used Theorem I.3 in the last inequality.

Next, given $y \in \overline{B}_{1/12}$, we can apply the last estimate to the function $u_y(x) := u(y + \frac{x}{2})$, defined for $x \in B_1$, since $y + \frac{1}{2}B_1 \subset B_1$. Denoting by

$$u_{r_y}(x) := \frac{x - y}{|x - y|} \cdot \nabla u(x)$$

the radial derivative based at the point y , we get

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)} u_{r_y}^2 dx \leq C\rho^{n-2+2\alpha} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}^2 \quad \text{for all } y \in \overline{B}_{1/12} \text{ and } \rho \leq 1/6. \quad (5.5)$$

From (5.5), we immediately get

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)} |u_{r_y}| dx \leq C\rho^{n-1+\alpha} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1)} \quad \text{for all } y \in \overline{B}_{1/12} \text{ and } \rho \leq 1/6. \quad (5.6)$$

At this point we use Morrey's estimate, as stated and proven in Appendix C. By Theorem C.2 applied to $u(\frac{\cdot}{3})$ with $\overline{C} = C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}$, (5.6) yields¹⁵

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B}_{1/12})} \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}.$$

Finally, from this estimate, (1.7) follows by a standard covering and scaling argument. \square

6. $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ ESTIMATE

Here we establish a higher $L^{2+\gamma}$ integrability result for the gradient of the solution, as stated in Theorem I.0. In [CFRS] this result was used crucially to get compactness in $W^{1,2}$, locally in the interior, for any sequence of stable solutions that are uniformly bounded in L^1 —here the solutions may correspond to different non-negative nonlinearities. This was an essential tool in the non-quantitative proof of Hölder continuity in [CFRS], when controlling the full gradient by the radial derivative. Instead, in the current paper we do not use the higher integrability result to establish interior Hölder continuity.

¹⁵In [CFRS] we employed an alternative way to conclude the Hölder estimate. It consists of averaging (5.5) with respect to y to get the analogue estimate with the radial derivative in the integrand replaced by the full gradient. From this, by classical estimates on Morrey spaces (see for instance [GT, Theorem 7.19]) one deduces the desired bound. Instead, in this paper we see that there is no need to average in y since, as we show in Appendix C, Morrey's proof involves, in fact, radial derivatives—and not the full gradient.

The proof of the $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ estimate will be based in the following bound on every level set of the solution.¹⁶

Lemma 6.1 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1})$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some nonnegative function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then, for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{1/2}} |\nabla u|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2 \quad (6.1)$$

for some dimensional constant C .

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{3/4})$ with $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{1/2}$. Combining (3.9) with (3.6) and (3.10), and using again Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} |\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u)| \eta^2 dx &\leq C \int_{B_1} |\nabla u| \mathcal{A} \eta^2 dx + \int_{B_1} 2|\nabla u| |\Delta u| \eta^2 dx \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \eta^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{B_1} \mathcal{A}^2 \eta^2 dx \right)^{1/2} + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2 \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Now, by Sard's theorem, $\{u = t\}$ is a smooth hypersurface for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For such values of t , we can apply the divergence theorem and get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{1/2}} |\nabla u|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} &\leq \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_1} |\nabla u|^2 \eta^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\ &= - \int_{\{u>t\} \cap B_1} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u \eta^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

This bound, combined with (6.2), gives (6.1). \square

Proof of the $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ estimate (1.6) in Theorem I.0. Since $u/\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ is a stable solution of a new equation, we may assume $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1)} = 1$. This normalization will simplify the following proof.

First note that, by the Sobolev inequality with average for $W^{1,2}$ functions, we have

$$\left(\int_{B_1} |u - \bar{u}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \left(\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = C$$

for some dimensional exponent $p > 2$ and constant C , where $\bar{u} := \int_{B_1} u$. Using this and the coarea formula, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_1 \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} |t - \bar{u}|^p |\nabla u|^{-1} = \int_{B_1} |u - \bar{u}|^p 1_{\{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} dx \leq C. \quad (6.3)$$

¹⁶Since level sets appear here, it is worth noticing (even though we will not use this in the paper) that the quantity \mathcal{A} in (3.1) controls the second fundamental form of every level set of u . This was crucially used in [C1], in combination with the Sobolev-type inequality of Michael-Simon and Allard (applied on every level set of u), to prove regularity of stable solutions up to dimension $n \leq 4$ for all nonlinearities f (including sign-changing nonlinearities).

Also, since $p > 2$, we may choose dimensional constants $q > 1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1/3)$ such that $p/q = (1 - \theta)/\theta$. Thus, defining

$$h(t) := \max \{1, |t - \bar{u}|\}$$

and using the coarea formula and Hölder's inequality (note that $p\theta - q(1 - \theta) = 0$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{1/2}} |\nabla u|^{3-3\theta} dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{1/2} \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} h(t)^{p\theta - q(1-\theta)} |\nabla u|^{-\theta + 2(1-\theta)} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_1 \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} h(t)^p |\nabla u|^{-1} \right)^\theta \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{1/2}} h(t)^{-q} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{1-\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe now that, thanks to (6.3) and the definition of $h(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_1 \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} h(t)^p |\nabla u|^{-1} \\ \leq \int_{\bar{u}-1}^{\bar{u}+1} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_1 \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} |\nabla u|^{-1} + C \\ \leq |B_1| + C \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Also, since $q > 1$ it follows that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} h(t)^{-q} dt$ is finite, and thus (6.1) leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dt h(t)^{-q} \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{1/2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(t)^{-q} dt \leq C.$$

Therefore, we have proven that $\int_{B_{1/2}} |\nabla u|^{3-3\theta} dx \leq C$ for some dimensional constants $\theta \in (0, 1/3)$ and C , as desired. \square

We finish this section by pointing out the necessary changes in the previous proofs to treat the case $f \geq -K$, as claimed in Remark 1.1. First, the estimates of Lemma 3.2 and Theorem I.3 still hold after adding K , in their right-hand sides, to the L^2 norm of ∇u and to the L^1 norm of u . These changes come from the argument in (3.8), which is now done for the superharmonic function $v := u - K|x|^2/(2n)$ instead of u . Second, Theorem I.1, applied to v instead of u , gives its validity also for $f \geq -K$ after adding K , in its right-hand sides, to the L^1 norm of u_r .

Next, one proceeds to the proof of the Hölder estimate of Theorem I.0, as given in Section 5. Here one must replace inequality (5.3), to be iterated, by

$$\int_{B_{\rho/2}} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \theta \left(\int_{B_\rho} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx + \rho^4 K^2 \right).$$

Now, using Lemma 8.23 of [GT] (taking $\mu = 1/2$, for instance), we see that (5.4) still holds when adding K to the L^2 norm of ∇u . Finally, with this same change, all

arguments in the current section remain the same and establish the $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ estimate when $f \geq -K$.

PART II: BOUNDARY REGULARITY

In this second part of the article, we establish the boundary regularity results. Sections 9 and 10 are the main novelties. They significantly simplify the proofs in [CFRS], which used delicate compactness, blow-up, and Liouville-type arguments.

With $\mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_n > 0\}$ and $r = |x|$, we use the notation

$$B_\rho^+ = \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_\rho, \quad A_{\rho,\bar{\rho}} := \{\rho < r < \bar{\rho}\}, \quad A_{\rho,\bar{\rho}}^+ := \{x_n > 0, \rho < r < \bar{\rho}\},$$

and

$$\partial^0\Omega = \{x_n = 0\} \cap \partial\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \partial^+\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap \partial\Omega$$

for an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

7. THE BOUNDARY WEIGHTED L^2 ESTIMATE FOR RADIAL DERIVATIVES

The following is the boundary analogue of the key lemma that yield an interior weighted L^2 bound for the radial derivative. The proof will be essentially the same as in the interior case. Note that, in the following statement, the test function η does not necessarily vanish on $\partial^0 B_1^+$.

Lemma 7.1 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$, for some nonlinearity $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then,

$$\int_{B_1^+} \left(\{(n-2)\eta + 2x \cdot \nabla \eta\} \eta |\nabla u|^2 - 2(x \cdot \nabla u) \nabla u \cdot \nabla(\eta^2) - |x \cdot \nabla u|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 \right) dx \leq 0 \quad (7.1)$$

for all Lipschitz functions η vanishing on ∂B_1 . As a consequence, given $\lambda > 1$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/\lambda)$, we have

$$\int_{B_\rho^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C_\lambda \int_{A_{\rho,\lambda\rho}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx \quad \text{if } n \geq 3, \quad (7.2)$$

and

$$\int_{B_\rho^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C_\lambda \rho^{2-n} \int_{A_{\rho,\lambda\rho}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx \quad \text{if } 3 \leq n \leq 9,$$

where C_λ is a constant depending only on n and λ .

Proof of Lemma 7.1 and of Theorem II.2. As in the interior case, we use $\xi = \mathbf{c}\eta = (x \cdot \nabla u)\eta$ as test function in the stability inequality in B_1^+ . Since $\mathbf{c} = x \cdot \nabla u$ vanishes in $\partial^0 B_1^+$, we do not need to require η to vanish on this set. Now, the integration by parts argument in the beginning of Subsection 1.2 leads to

$$\int_{B_1^+} (\Delta \mathbf{c} + f'(u)\mathbf{c}) \mathbf{c} \eta^2 dx \leq \int_{B_1^+} \mathbf{c}^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 dx.$$

From this, repeating the same computations of the interior case (in which now two boundary integrals on $\partial^0 B_1^+$ arise, but they vanish), we deduce (7.1).

Next, let $\lambda > 1$ and $\psi \in C_c^\infty(B_\lambda)$ be a nonnegative radially nonincreasing function with $\psi \equiv 1$ in B_1 . For $\rho \in (0, 1/\lambda)$, set $\psi_\rho(x) := \psi(x/\rho)$. Note that $|\nabla\psi_\rho| \leq C_\lambda/\rho$ (where C_λ depends only on λ) and that $\nabla\psi_\rho$ vanishes outside of the annulus $A_{\rho, \lambda\rho}$.

Choosing $\eta = \psi_\rho$ in (7.1), we immediately deduce (7.2).

To derive the last estimate of the lemma, for $a < n$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \rho)$ we use the Lipschitz function $\eta_\varepsilon(x) := \min\{r^{-a/2}, \varepsilon^{-a/2}\}\psi_\rho(x)$ as a test function in (7.1). Throwing away the term $\int_{B_\varepsilon^+} (n-2)\eta_\varepsilon^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\lambda\rho}^+ \setminus B_\varepsilon^+} \left\{ (n-2-a)|\nabla u|^2 + \left(2a - \frac{a^2}{4}\right)u_r^2 \right\} r^{-a}\psi_\rho^2 dx \\ & \leq C_{a,\lambda} \rho^{-a} \int_{B_{\lambda\rho}^+ \setminus B_\rho^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_{a,\lambda}$ depending only on n , a , and λ . Choosing $a := n-2$, since $2a - \frac{a^2}{4} = (n-2)\left(2 - \frac{n-2}{4}\right) = \frac{1}{4}(n-2)(10-n) > 0$ for $3 \leq n \leq 9$ we deduce

$$\int_{B_{\lambda\rho}^+ \setminus B_\varepsilon^+} r^{2-n}u_r^2 \psi_\rho^2 dx \leq C_\lambda \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{\lambda\rho}^+ \setminus B_\rho^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx.$$

Recalling that $\psi_\rho \equiv 1$ in B_ρ and letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we conclude the proof. \square

8. BOUNDARY HESSIAN AND $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ ESTIMATES

The following lemma, which is based on a Pohozaev identity, will be crucial and used several times in what follows. From now on, we will assume the solution to be nonnegative and the nonlinearity to satisfy some hypotheses.

Lemma 8.1 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing.*

Then,

$$\|u_\nu\|_{L^2(\partial^0 B_{7/8}^+)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)},$$

where $u_\nu = -u_n$ is the exterior normal derivative of u on $\partial^0 B_1^+$ and C is a dimensional constant.

Proof. Take a cut-off function $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ such that $\eta = 1$ in $B_{7/8}$, and consider the vector-field $\mathbf{X}(x) := x + \mathbf{e}_n$. Multiplying the identity

$$\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^2 \mathbf{X} - 2(\mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla u) \nabla u) = (n-2)|\nabla u|^2 - 2(\mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla u) \Delta u$$

by η^2 , integrating in B_1^+ , and taking into account that $u_\nu^2 = |\nabla u|^2$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$ since $u = 0$ on this set, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial^0 B_1^+} u_\nu^2 \eta^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} - \int_{B_1^+} (|\nabla u|^2 \mathbf{X} - 2(\mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla u) \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \eta^2 dx \\ = \int_{B_1^+} ((n-2)|\nabla u|^2 - 2(\mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla u) \Delta u) \eta^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since, for $F(t) := \int_0^t f(s) ds$ we have $\mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla(F(u)) = f(u) \mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla u = -\Delta u \mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla u$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial^0 B_1^+} u_\nu^2 \eta^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} &\leq C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx + 2 \int_{B_1^+} \mathbf{X} \cdot \nabla(F(u)) \eta^2 dx \\ &= C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx - 2 \int_{B_1^+} F(u) \operatorname{div}(\eta^2 \mathbf{X}) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Observe now that, since f is nondecreasing, $0 \leq F(t) \leq tf(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Hence, noticing that the function $g := |\operatorname{div}(\eta^2 \mathbf{X})|$ is Lipschitz and that u and f are nonnegative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{B_1^+} F(u) \operatorname{div}(\eta^2 \mathbf{X}) dx &\leq \int_{B_1^+} u f(u) g dx = - \int_{B_1^+} u \Delta u g dx \\ &= \int_{B_1^+} (|\nabla u|^2 g + u \nabla u \cdot \nabla g) dx \\ &\leq C \int_{B_1^+} (u^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude using Poincaré's inequality for functions u vanishing on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. \square

The following is the boundary analogue of the Sternberg and Zumbrun [SZ] inequality. It bounds the quantity \mathcal{A} defined in (3.1). Its proof, taken from [CFRS], required a new key idea since the test function $|\nabla u|$ used in the interior case does not vanish on $\partial^0 B_1^+$ (and hence cannot be used in the stability inequality).

Lemma 8.2 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing.*

Then,

$$\|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(B_{7/8}^+)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)} \quad (8.1)$$

for some dimensional constant C .

Proof. The key idea is to use $(|\nabla u| - u_n)\eta$, properly regularized, as test function in the stability inequality. Note that, by taking η with compact support in B_1 , this function vanishes on ∂B_1^+ , since $|\nabla u| - u_n = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$.

Step 1: We prove that

$$\int_{B_{1/2}^+} \mathcal{A}^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_{3/4}^+} |\nabla u| |D^2 u| dx + C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad (8.2)$$

where \mathcal{A} is defined by (3.1).

For $\delta > 0$, we set

$$\phi_\delta(z) := |z| 1_{\{|z| > \delta\}} + \left(\frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{|z|^2}{2\delta} \right) 1_{\{|z| < \delta\}},$$

a convex $C^{1,1}$ regularization of the absolute value. Notice that $\phi_\delta(\nabla u) \in W^{2,\infty}(B_1^+)$, since the first derivatives of ϕ_δ match on $\{|z| = \delta\}$. Moreover, since u is nonnegative and superharmonic, the Hopf lemma yields $|\nabla u| \geq c > 0$ on $\partial^0 B_{3/4}^+$ for some constant c —unless $u \equiv 0$, in which case there is nothing to prove. Hence, for $\delta > 0$ small enough we have

$$\phi_\delta(\nabla u) = |\nabla u| \quad \text{in a neighborhood of } \partial^0 B_{3/4}^+ \text{ inside } \overline{B_{3/4}^+}. \quad (8.3)$$

Choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough such that (8.3) holds, we set

$$\mathbf{c}_\delta := \phi_\delta(\nabla u) - u_n$$

and we take $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{3/4})$ satisfying $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{1/2}$. Now, since \mathbf{c}_δ vanishes on $\partial^0 B_{3/4}^+$, we are allowed to take $\xi = \mathbf{c}_\delta \eta$ as a test function in the stability inequality (1.18) with $\Omega = B_1^+$ —recall that, as pointed out in the beginning of Subsection 1.2, $\mathbf{c}_\delta \in W^{2,\infty}(B_1^+)$ suffices for the integration by parts argument that allows to pass from (1.3) to (1.18). We obtain that

$$\int_{B_1^+} (\Delta \mathbf{c}_\delta + f'(u) \mathbf{c}_\delta) \mathbf{c}_\delta \eta^2 dx \leq \int_{B_1^+} \mathbf{c}_\delta^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 dx. \quad (8.4)$$

Note now that, since $\Delta u_n + f'(u) u_n = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta \mathbf{c}_\delta + f'(u) \mathbf{c}_\delta) \mathbf{c}_\delta &= (\Delta[\phi_\delta(\nabla u)] + f'(u) \phi_\delta(\nabla u)) \phi_\delta(\nabla u) \\ &\quad - (\Delta[\phi_\delta(\nabla u)] + f'(u) \phi_\delta(\nabla u)) u_n. \end{aligned} \quad (8.5)$$

Next, since $\Delta \nabla u = -f'(u) \nabla u$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\Delta[\phi_\delta(\nabla u)] + f'(u) \phi_\delta(\nabla u)) \phi_\delta(\nabla u) \\ &= f'(u) \phi_\delta(\nabla u) \left(\phi_\delta(\nabla u) - \sum_j (\partial_j \phi_\delta)(\nabla u) u_j \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

$$+ \phi_\delta(\nabla u) \sum_{i,j,k} (\partial_{jk}^2 \phi_\delta)(\nabla u) u_{ij} u_{ik}. \quad (8.7)$$

Notice that, inside the set $\{|\nabla u| \leq \delta\}$, the term (8.7) is nonnegative since ϕ_δ is convex, while the term (8.6) is equal to

$$f'(u) \phi_\delta(\nabla u) \left(\frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2\delta} \right)$$

and, therefore, it is also nonnegative (all three factors are nonnegative). On the other hand, inside the set $\{|\nabla u| > \delta\}$, the term (8.6) vanishes, while the term (8.7) equals \mathcal{A}^2 —recall that \mathcal{A} is defined by (3.1). Therefore, we conclude that

$$(\Delta[\phi_\delta(\nabla u)] + f'(u)\phi_\delta(\nabla u))\phi_\delta(\nabla u) \geq \mathcal{A}^2 1_{\{|\nabla u| > \delta\}}. \quad (8.8)$$

Coming back to (8.5), since $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{3/4})$, integrating by parts and recalling (8.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1^+} \Delta[\phi_\delta(\nabla u)] u_n \eta^2 dx \\ &= \int_{B_1^+} \phi_\delta(\nabla u) \Delta u_n \eta^2 dx + \int_{B_1^+} (2\phi_\delta(\nabla u) \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla(\eta^2) + \phi_\delta(\nabla u) u_n \Delta(\eta^2)) dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\partial^0 B_1^+} (\partial_n(|\nabla u|) u_n \eta^2 - |\nabla u| \partial_n(u_n \eta^2)) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.9)$$

Now, on $\partial^0 B_1^+$ it holds $\partial_n(|\nabla u|) u_n = u_{nn} u_n = |\nabla u| u_{nn}$ and therefore, thanks to Lemma 8.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\partial^0 B_1^+} (\partial_n(|\nabla u|) u_n \eta^2 - |\nabla u| \partial_n(u_n \eta^2)) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right| \\ & \leq C \int_{\partial^0 B_{3/4}^+} |u_\nu|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (8.10)$$

Thus, by (8.9) and (8.10), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{B_1^+} (\Delta[\phi_\delta(\nabla u)] + f'(u)\phi_\delta(\nabla u)) u_n \eta^2 dx \right| \\ & \leq C \int_{B_{3/4}^+} (|\nabla u| + \delta) (|D^2 u| + |\nabla u|) dx + C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this last bound with (8.4), (8.5), and (8.8), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1^+} \mathcal{A}^2 \eta^2 1_{\{|\nabla u| > \delta\}} dx \\ & \leq C \int_{B_{3/4}^+} \{(|\nabla u| + \delta)^2 + (|\nabla u| + \delta) (|D^2 u| + |\nabla u|)\} dx + C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{1/2}$, by letting $\delta \downarrow 0$ we conclude (8.2), as desired.

Step 2: We show that

$$\int_{B_{1/2}^+} \mathcal{A}^2 dx \leq \varepsilon \int_{B_1^+} \mathcal{A}^2 dx + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2$$

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

Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{7/8})$ satisfy $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{3/4}$. From (3.9) and (3.6) —note that these are pointwise relations that also hold for solutions in half-balls instead of full balls—, we have that

$$-\int_{B_1^+} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u) \eta^2 dx \geq \int_{B_1^+} (-2\Delta u - C\mathcal{A}) |\nabla u| \eta^2 dx. \quad (8.11)$$

Hence, since $|D^2u| \leq |\Delta u| + C\mathcal{A}$ a.e. —recall (3.7)— and since $\Delta u \leq 0$, (8.11) yields

$$\int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u| |D^2u| \eta^2 dx \leq \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1^+} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u) \eta^2 dx \right| + C \int_{B_1^+} \mathcal{A} |\nabla u| \eta^2 dx. \quad (8.12)$$

On the other hand, using Lemma 8.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_1^+} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u) \eta^2 dx \right| &= \left| - \int_{\partial B_1^+} (u_\nu)^2 \eta^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} - \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u| \nabla u \cdot \nabla(\eta^2) dx \right| \\ &\leq C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (8.13)$$

Thus, by (8.12) and (8.13), we see that

$$\int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u| |D^2u| \eta^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_1^+} \mathcal{A} |\nabla u| \eta^2 dx + C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \quad (8.14)$$

Recalling that $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{3/4}$, (8.2) and (8.14) yield, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{1/2}^+} \mathcal{A}^2 dx &\leq C \int_{B_{3/4}^+} |\nabla u| |D^2u| dx + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2 \\ &\leq C \int_{B_1^+} \mathcal{A} |\nabla u| dx + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_{B_1^+} \mathcal{A}^2 dx + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Conclusion.

We first claim that

$$\rho^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_{\rho/2}(y))}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \rho^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_\rho(y))}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2 \quad (8.15)$$

for every ball $B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Note that $B_\rho(y)$ is not necessarily centered at a point on $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^n$. The proof of the lemma will be finished once this is shown. Indeed, (8.15) and Lemma B.1, applied to the subadditive quantity

$$\sigma(B) := \|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B)}^2 \quad \text{for } B \subset B_1$$

(note here that the L^2 norm is not taken in B , but in its intersection with the upper half-space) lead to (8.1) with $B_{7/8}^+$ replaced by $B_{1/2}^+$. Finally, a standard covering and scaling argument gives the same estimate with $B_{7/8}^+$ in its left-hand side.

It remains to show (8.15). To do this, it is easy to check that there is a dimensional number of balls $\{B_{\rho/16}(y_i)\}_i$ and $\{B_{3\rho/16}(z_j)\}_j$ which cover $\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_{\rho/2}(y)$ and have

the following properties. Each ball $B_{\rho/16}(y_i)$ is interior, in the sense that the ball with twice its radius satisfies $B_{\rho/8}(y_i) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_\rho(y) \subset B_1^+$. The part of $\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_{\rho/2}(y)$ not covered by any of the previous balls is covered by the union of the half-balls $B_{3\rho/16}^+(z_j)$, where $z_j \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^n$. In addition, the half-ball with twice its radius satisfies $B_{3\rho/8}^+(z_j) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_\rho(y) \subset B_1^+$.¹⁷

Now, in each interior ball $B_{\rho/16}(y_i)$ we use Lemma 3.2, rescaled, to deduce

$$\rho^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/16}(y_i))}^2 \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/8}(y_i))}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2,$$

since $\varepsilon < 1$. Instead, for the balls $\{B_{3\rho/16}(z_j)\}_j$ we use the statement of Step 2 above (after rescaling and a translation to make $z_j \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^n$ to be the origin) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(B_{3\rho/16}^+(z_j))}^2 &\leq \varepsilon \rho^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(B_{3\rho/8}^+(z_j))}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{3\rho/8}^+(z_j))}^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \rho^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_\rho(y))}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Adding all these inequalities we obtain (8.15) —notice that ε is multiplied by a dimensional constant C in (8.15). \square

The following L^1 estimates for the full Hessian will be useful in several occasions, not only in this section to control the gradient in L^2 by the function in L^1 , but also in next section for the control of the L^1 norm of u by its radial derivative in L^1 .

Lemma 8.3 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing.*

Then,

$$\| |\nabla u| D^2 u \|_{L^1(B_{3/4}^+)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2 \quad (8.16)$$

and

$$\|D^2 u\|_{L^1(B_{3/4}^+)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)} \quad (8.17)$$

for some dimensional constant C .

Proof. We first show (8.16). By taking $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{7/8})$ with $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{3/4}$, the estimate follows from (8.14), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and Lemma 8.2.

¹⁷This can be easily seen as follows. Take a dimensional number of points $y_k \in B_{\rho/2}(y)$ such that $B_{\rho/2}(y) \subset \cup_k B_{\rho/16}(y_k)$. Keep those balls which are interior, in the sense that $B_{\rho/8}(y_i) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Note that we will also have $B_{\rho/8}(y_i) \subset B_\rho(y)$. To cover all of $\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_{\rho/2}(y)$, it remains to consider those balls $B_{\rho/16}(y_j)$ which intersect \mathbb{R}_+^n and with $B_{\rho/8}(y_j) \not\subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$. It follows that there exists a point $z_j \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_{\rho/8}(y_j)$. Now, the claimed covering property holds, since $B_{\rho/16}(y_j) \subset B_{3\rho/16}(z_j)$. In addition, $B_{3\rho/8}(z_j) \subset B_\rho(y)$.

To prove (8.17), we choose a nonnegative function $\chi \in C_c^\infty(B_{7/8})$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ in $B_{3/4}$. Since $-\Delta u \geq 0$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta u\|_{L^1(B_{3/4}^+)} &\leq \int_{B_{7/8}^+} (-\Delta u) \chi \, dx = - \int_{\partial^0 B_{7/8}^+} u_\nu \chi \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + \int_{B_{7/8}^+} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \chi \, dx \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.18)$$

where we have used Lemma 8.1.

Recall now that $|D^2 u| \leq |\Delta u| + C\mathcal{A}$ a.e. in $B_{3/4}^+$ —note that the pointwise inequality in (3.7) also holds for solutions in half-balls instead of full balls. Now, estimate (8.17) follows from this inequality, (8.18), and Lemma 8.2. \square

With the weighted Hessian estimate (8.16) at hand, we can now control the gradient in L^2 by the solution in L^1 .

Lemma 8.4 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing.*

Then,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)},$$

for some dimensional constant C .

Proof. We cover $B_{1/2}^+$ (except for a set of measure zero) with a family of disjoint open cubes $Q_j \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ of side-length which depends only on n and is small enough such that $Q_j \subset B_{3/4}^+$. We now combine the interpolation inequalities of Propositions A.1 and A.2 in each cube Q_j (we rescale them to pass from the unit cube to the cubes Q_j), used with $p = 2$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{3/2}$ for any given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We obtain that

$$\int_{Q_j} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \leq C\varepsilon \int_{Q_j} |\nabla u| |D^2 u| \, dx + C\varepsilon \int_{Q_j} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \left(\int_{Q_j} |u| \, dx \right)^2.$$

Now, using $Q_j \subset B_{3/4}^+$ and estimate (8.16) from Lemma 8.3, we deduce

$$\int_{Q_j} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \leq C\varepsilon \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \left(\int_{B_1^+} |u| \, dx \right)^2.$$

Adding up all these inequalities (note that the number of cubes Q_j depends only on n), we get

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}^+)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}^2 + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}^2.$$

This estimate, applied to rescaled solutions, yields

$$\rho^{n+2} \int_{B_{\rho/2}^+} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \leq C\varepsilon \rho^{n+2} \int_{B_\rho^+} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \left(\int_{B_\rho^+} |u| \, dx \right)^2 \quad (8.19)$$

for all $\rho < 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

We now claim that, for all balls $B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$ (not necessarily contained in B_1^+) and every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\rho^{n+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_{\rho/2}(y)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon \rho^{n+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_\rho(y)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C\varepsilon^{-2-\frac{3n}{2}} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}^2. \quad (8.20)$$

To show this, we proceed exactly as in Step 3 of the proof of Lemma 8.2, where we proved (8.15). That is, we use a covering by balls which are either centered at $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^n$ or interior to \mathbb{R}_+^n . For the first ones we use (8.19) (with ρ multiplied by a small dimensional factor), while for the interior ones we employ Theorem I.3 (recalling that $\varepsilon < 1$). We conclude (8.20).

Finally, by Lemma B.1 applied to the subadditive quantity $\sigma(B) := \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B)}^2$, the result follows. \square

The following higher integrability result is of interest by itself, but it will be also needed in next section to control the L^1 norm of u in a half-annulus by its radial derivative in L^1 .

Lemma 8.5 ([CFRS]). *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing.*

Then,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(B_{3/4}^+)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)}$$

for some dimensional constants $\gamma > 0$ and C .

Proof. Step 1: We show that, for almost every $t > 0$,

$$\int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{3/4}^+} |\nabla u|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \quad (8.21)$$

Take $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{7/8})$ with $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{4/5}$. We combine (3.9) and (3.6) —note that these are pointwise relations that also hold for solutions in half-balls instead of full balls— with Lemma 8.2 and (8.14), to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{4/5}^+} |\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u)| dx &\leq C \int_{B_{4/5}^+} |\nabla u| \mathcal{A} dx + \int_{B_{4/5}^+} -2|\nabla u| \Delta u dx \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{B_{4/5}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{B_{4/5}^+} \mathcal{A}^2 dx \right)^{1/2} + C \int_{B_{7/8}^+} \mathcal{A}^2 dx + C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(B_{4/5})$ with $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $B_{3/4}$. By Sard's theorem, $\{u = t\}$ is a smooth hypersurface for almost every $t > 0$. For such values of t , from the previous

bound we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{3/4}^+} |\nabla u|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\
& \leq \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{4/5}^+} |\nabla u|^2 \zeta^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = - \int_{\{u>t\} \cap B_{4/5}^+} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u| \nabla u \zeta^2) dx \\
& \leq C \int_{B_1^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx,
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Step 2: Conclusion.

Here it is convenient to assume $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_1^+)} = 1$, which can be achieved after multiplying u by a constant.

Setting $h(t) = \max\{1, t\}$, by the Sobolev embedding for functions vanishing on $\partial^0 B_1^+$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_1^+ \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} h(t)^p |\nabla u|^{-1} \\
& \leq |B_1^+ \cap \{u < 1\}| + \int_{B_1^+} u^p dx \leq C
\end{aligned} \tag{8.22}$$

for some $p > 2$. Hence, choosing dimensional constants $q > 1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1/3)$ such that $p/q = (1 - \theta)/\theta$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{3/4}^+} |\nabla u|^{3-3\theta} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{3/4}^+ \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} h(t)^{p\theta - q(1-\theta)} |\nabla u|^{-\theta + 2(1-\theta)} \\
& \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_1^+ \cap \{|\nabla u| \neq 0\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} h(t)^p |\nabla u|^{-1} \right)^\theta \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} h(t)^{-q} dt \int_{\{u=t\} \cap B_{3/4}^+} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{1-\theta}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (8.22) and (8.21), this yields

$$\int_{B_{3/4}^+} |\nabla u|^{3-3\theta} dx \leq C,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

We can now give the

Proof of Theorem II.3. By rescaling Lemma 8.5, we deduce that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(B_{1/4}^+)} \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(B_{3/8}^+)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}^+)}.$$

This and Lemma 8.4 conclude the proof. \square

For future use, note also that putting together Lemma 8.4 with (8.17) (rescaled), we obtain that

$$\|D^2u\|_{L^1(B_{1/4}^+)} \leq \|D^2u\|_{L^1(B_{3/8}^+)} \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}. \quad (8.23)$$

When proving Theorem II.1 in next section, we will need the following bounds in half-annuli. They follow from a simple covering and scaling argument combined with the boundary estimates that we have just proven and their interior analogues (i.e., those in balls whose double is contained in \mathbb{R}_+^n).

Corollary 8.6. *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_1^+})$ be a nonnegative stable solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in $B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $u = 0$ on $\partial^0 B_1^+$. Assume that $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing. Let $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_2 < \rho_3 < \rho_4 \leq 1$.*

Then,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(A_{\rho_2, \rho_3}^+)} \leq C_{\rho_i} \|u\|_{L^1(A_{\rho_1, \rho_4}^+)} \quad (8.24)$$

and

$$\|D^2u\|_{L^1(A_{\rho_2, \rho_3}^+)} \leq C_{\rho_i} \|u\|_{L^1(A_{\rho_1, \rho_4}^+)} \quad (8.25)$$

for some dimensional constant $\gamma > 0$ and some constant C_{ρ_i} depending only on n , ρ_1 , ρ_2 , ρ_3 , and ρ_4 .

Proof. We first cover $\partial^0 A_{\rho_2, \rho_3}^+$ by a finite number of balls B_j centered at $\{x_n = 0\}$ and with a sufficiently small radius δ_0 such that the balls $4B_j$ (with same centers as the previous ones, and with radius $4\delta_0$) are contained in A_{ρ_1, ρ_4} . We now cover $\overline{A_{\rho_2, \rho_3}^+} \setminus \cup_j B_j$ by balls B_k of a smaller radius δ_1 in such a way that $4B_k \subset A_{\rho_1, \rho_4}$. In this way we obtain a covering of A_{ρ_2, ρ_3}^+ made of half-balls B_j^+ (centered at $\{x_n = 0\}$) and interior balls B_k , with $4B_j^+$ and $4B_k$ all contained in A_{ρ_1, ρ_4}^+ .

Now, to deduce our two estimates, in each half-ball B_j^+ we use Theorem II.3 and (8.23) (both rescaled). Instead, in the interior balls B_k we apply (1.6) as well as (3.4) (both rescaled). In this way we control the norms of the quantities on the left-hand sides of (8.24) and of (8.25) but now integrated in any of the previous balls, by $C_{\rho_i} \|u\|_{L^1(A_{\rho_1, \rho_4}^+)}$ (each of them). Adding all the inequalities completes the proof. \square

9. THE RADIAL DERIVATIVE CONTROLS THE FUNCTION IN L^1 UP TO THE BOUNDARY

In this section we establish our main result, Theorem II.1. This will be much more delicate than the interior case of Theorem I.1, which holds assuming only that the function u is superharmonic. Instead, in the boundary setting, superharmonicity is not enough for the theorem to hold, as the following remark shows. Hence, within the proof we will need to use the semilinear equation satisfied by u and, in fact, also the stability of u .

Remark 9.1. For $n \geq 2$, the estimate (1.15) of Theorem II.1, controlling the function in L^1 in a half-annulus by its radial derivative in L^1 (or even in L^∞), also

in a half-annulus, cannot not hold within the class of nonnegative superharmonic functions which are smooth in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$ and vanish on $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Indeed, for $\delta \in (0, 1)$, consider

$$u^\delta(x) := \frac{x_n}{|(x', x_n + \delta)|} \quad \text{for } x = (x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}, x_n \geq 0.$$

The function u^δ is nonnegative and smooth in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$, vanishes on $\{x_n = 0\}$, and, as a simple computation shows,¹⁸ is superharmonic in \mathbb{R}_+^n for $n \geq 2$. At the same time, in the half-annulus it satisfies

$$|\partial_r u^\delta| = \frac{x_n}{r |(x', x_n + \delta)|^3} \delta(x_n + \delta) \leq C\delta \quad \text{in } A_{1/2,1}^+$$

for some constant C independent of δ . By taking δ small enough, this shows that the estimate (1.15) of Theorem II.1 cannot hold within this class of functions.

Note also that in the limiting case $\delta = 0$, we are exhibiting a nonnegative superharmonic function $u^0 = x_n/r$ which belongs to $W^{1,2}(B_1^+)$ for $n \geq 3$, vanishes a.e. on $\{x_n = 0\}$, and is zero homogeneous (i.e., $\partial_r u^0 \equiv 0$).

To control the L^1 norm of a stable solution in a half-annulus by its radial derivative in L^1 , the starting idea is to use the equation

$$-2\Delta u + \Delta(x \cdot \nabla u) = -f'(u) x \cdot \nabla u, \quad (9.1)$$

after multiplying it against a cut-off function and integrating it in the half-annulus. We will see that this easily yields a lower bound for the integral of the left-hand side which is appropriate for our purposes. The difficulty is how to control the integral of the right-hand side, by above, in terms of only $x \cdot \nabla u = ru_r$. As we will explain later in Footnote 19, we wish to use the stability condition to deal with the factor $f'(u)$ in (9.1). However, through the simplest approach this would force to control the L^2 norm of $\nabla(x \cdot \nabla u)$ —which is not at our hands since we do not have L^2 control on the full Hessian of u .

To proceed in a similar manner but reducing the number of derivatives falling on u , for $\lambda > 0$ we consider the functions

$$u_\lambda(x) := u(\lambda x)$$

and note that $\frac{d}{d\lambda} u_\lambda(x) = x \cdot \nabla u(\lambda x) = \lambda^{-1} x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda(x)$. Using this and noticing that $\lambda^{-2} \Delta u_\lambda = -f(u_\lambda)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -2\lambda^{-3} \Delta u_\lambda + \lambda^{-2} \Delta(\lambda^{-1} x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda) &= \frac{d}{d\lambda} (\lambda^{-2} \Delta u_\lambda) \\ &= -\frac{d}{d\lambda} f(u_\lambda) = -f'(u_\lambda) \lambda^{-1} x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (9.2)$$

Evaluating the first and last expressions at $\lambda = 1$, we recover (9.1). However, it will be crucial (see the later Footnote 19) to use instead the equality between the first and third expressions, after integrating them not only in x , but also in λ . Integrating in λ will be essential to reduce the number of derivatives falling on u .

¹⁸One may start from $\Delta u^\delta = x_n \Delta \varphi + 2\varphi_{x_n}$, where $\varphi = (|x|^2 + 2\delta x_n + \delta^2)^{-1/2}$.

In addition, the monotonicity and convexity of f will allow to use the stability condition appropriately.

This will be understood in all detail going through the following proof, which is the main novelty of this paper.

Proof of Theorem II.1. By rescaling, we may suppose that we have a stable solution in B_6^+ instead of B_1^+ .

We choose a nonnegative smooth function ζ with compact support in the full annulus $A_{4,5}$ and such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $A_{4.1,4.9}$. Then, the function $\xi := x_n \zeta$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &\geq 0 \text{ in } A_{4,5}^+, & \xi &= 0 \text{ on } \partial^0 A_{4,5}^+, \\ \xi &= \xi_\nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial^+ A_{4,5}^+, & \text{and } \xi &= x_n \text{ in } A_{4.1,4.9}^+. \end{aligned}$$

The proof starts from the identity

$$\begin{aligned} 2\lambda^{-3} \int_{A_{4,5}^+} (-\Delta u_\lambda) \xi \, dx + \lambda^{-2} \int_{A_{4,5}^+} \Delta(\lambda^{-1}x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda) \xi \, dx \\ = -\frac{d}{d\lambda} \int_{A_{4,5}^+} f(u_\lambda) \xi \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (9.3)$$

which follows from the equality between the first and third expressions in (9.2). In a first step, we will bound the left-hand side of (9.3) by below. But the subtle part of the proof, where we use the stability of the solution, will be the second step. It will bound the right-hand side of (9.3) by above, but only after averaging it in λ . For this, we will use that

$$\int_1^{1.1} \left(-\frac{d}{d\lambda} \int_{A_{4,5}^+} f(u_\lambda) \xi \, dx \right) d\lambda = \int_{A_{4,5}^+} (f(u) - f(u_{1.1})) \xi \, dx, \quad (9.4)$$

where

$$u_{1.1} := u_{11/10} = u((11/10) \cdot).$$

Step 1: We prove that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\lambda^{-3} \int_{A_{4,5}^+} (-\Delta u_\lambda) \xi \, dx + \lambda^{-2} \int_{A_{4,5}^+} \Delta(\lambda^{-1}x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda) \xi \, dx \\ \geq c \|u\|_{L^1(A_{4.7,4.8}^+)} - C \|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} \end{aligned} \quad (9.5)$$

for every $\lambda \in [1, 1.1]$, where c and C are positive dimensional constants.

To bound by below the second integral in (9.5) is easy. Since ξ and ξ_ν vanish on $\partial^+ A_{4,5}^+$, and both ξ and $x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda$ vanish on $\partial^0 A_{4,5}^+$, we deduce that

$$\int_{A_{4,5}^+} \Delta(x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda) \xi \, dx = \int_{A_{4,5}^+} x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda \Delta \xi \, dx \geq -C \|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{4,5,6}^+)} \quad (9.6)$$

since $x \cdot \nabla u_\lambda(x) = \lambda x \cdot \nabla u(\lambda x) = \lambda r u_r(\lambda x)$.

Next, to control the first integral in (9.5), given any $\rho_1 \in (4.1, 4.2)$ and $\rho_2 \in (4.8, 4.9)$ we consider the solution φ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi = 1 & \text{in } A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+ \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial^0 A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+ \\ \varphi_\nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial^+ A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+. \end{cases} \quad (9.7)$$

Note that $\varphi \geq 0$ by the maximum principle. In addition, as shown in Appendix D, we have $|\nabla\varphi| \leq C$ in A_{ρ_1, ρ_2}^+ for some dimensional constant C . This bound yields $c\varphi \leq x_n = \xi$ in A_{ρ_1, ρ_2}^+ for some small dimensional constant $c > 0$. Since, in addition, $-\Delta u_\lambda$, ξ , and φ are all nonnegative, it follows that (for positive constants c and C that may differ from line to line)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_{4,5}^+} (-\Delta u_\lambda) \xi \, dx &\geq c \int_{A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+} (-\Delta u_\lambda) \varphi \, dx \\ &= -c \int_{\partial^+ A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+} (u_\lambda)_\nu \varphi \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + c \int_{A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+} u_\lambda \, dx \\ &\geq -C \int_{\partial^+ B_{\rho_1}^+} |(u_\lambda)_r| \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} - C \int_{\partial^+ B_{\rho_2}^+} |(u_\lambda)_r| \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + c \|u\|_{L^1(A_{\lambda\rho_1, \lambda\rho_2}^+)} \\ &\geq -C \int_{\partial^+ B_{\rho_1}^+} |(u_\lambda)_r| \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} - C \int_{\partial^+ B_{\rho_2}^+} |(u_\lambda)_r| \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} + c \|u\|_{L^1(A_{4.7, 4.8}^+)} \end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda\rho_1 \leq 1.1 \cdot 4.2 \leq 4.7$ and $4.8 \leq \lambda\rho_2$. Finally, integrating first in $\rho_1 \in (4.1, 4.2)$ and then in $\rho_2 \in (4.8, 4.9)$, we arrive at

$$\int_{A_{4,5}^+} (-\Delta u_\lambda) \xi \, dx \geq -C \|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{4.1, 6}^+)} + c \|u\|_{L^1(A_{4.7, 4.8}^+)},$$

since $1.1 \cdot 4.9 \leq 6$.

This and (9.6) establish the claim of Step 1.

Step 2: We prove that, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_{A_{4,5}^+} (f(u) - f(u_{1.1})) \xi \, dx \leq C(\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} + \varepsilon^{-1-2\frac{2+\gamma}{\gamma}} \|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)}) \quad (9.8)$$

for some dimensional constants $\gamma > 0$ and C —with γ being the exponent in Corollary 8.6.

By convexity of f we have $f(u) - f(u_{1.1}) \leq f'(u)(u - u_{1.1})$. We now use that $\xi = 0$ on $\partial A_{4,5}^+$ and that $u - u_{1.1} = 0$ on $\partial^0 A_{3.9, 5.1}^+$ in order to take advantage, twice, of the stability of u . Taking a function $\phi \in C_c^\infty(A_{3.9, 5.1})$ with $\phi = 1$ in $A_{4,5}$, and

since ξ and $f'(u)$ are nonnegative, we deduce

$$\int_{A_{4,5}^+} (f(u) - f(u_{1.1}))\xi \, dx \leq \int_{A_{4,5}^+} f'(u)(u - u_{1.1})\xi \, dx \quad (9.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left(\int_{A_{4,5}^+} f'(u)\xi^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{A_{4,5}^+} f'(u)(u - u_{1.1})^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{A_{4,5}^+} |\nabla \xi|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{A_{3.9,5.1}^+} f'(u)((u - u_{1.1})\phi)^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{A_{3.9,5.1}^+} |\nabla((u - u_{1.1})\phi)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^2(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.10)$$

where in the last bound we have used Poincaré's inequality in $A_{3.9,5.1}^+$ for functions vanishing on $\partial^0 A_{3.9,5.1}^+$. The previous chain of inequalities, which are a crucial part of the proof, have used the stability of the solution twice.¹⁹

Next, by the $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ estimate (8.24) (rescaled to hold in B_6^+ instead of B_1^+) and taking $q := \frac{2(1+\gamma)}{2+\gamma}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^2(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)} &\leq \|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)}^{\frac{1}{q}} \|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^1(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2+\gamma}(A_{3.9,5.1,1.1}^+)}^{\frac{1}{q}} \|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^1(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)}^{\frac{1}{q}} \|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^1(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)}^{\frac{1}{q'}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} + C\varepsilon^{-\frac{q'}{q}} \|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^1(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)} \end{aligned} \quad (9.11)$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Now, by the interpolation inequality in cubes of Proposition A.1 applied with $p = 1$, we claim that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^1(A_{3.9,5.1}^+)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{1+\frac{q'}{q}} \|D^2(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^1(A_{3.8,5.2}^+)} + C\varepsilon^{-1-\frac{q'}{q}} \|u - u_{1.1}\|_{L^1(A_{3.8,5.2}^+)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{1+\frac{q'}{q}} \|D^2 u\|_{L^1(A_{3.8,5.8}^+)} + C\varepsilon^{-1-\frac{q'}{q}} \|u - u_{1.1}\|_{L^1(A_{3.8,5.2}^+)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.12)$$

¹⁹Note first that a simple Cauchy-Schwarz argument to control the right-hand side of (9.9) would not work, since we do not have control on the integral of $f'(u)^2$. On the other hand, we would be in trouble if we had performed the above chain of inequalities starting from (9.1) instead of (9.2). Indeed, in such case, $f'(u)(u - u_{1.1})\xi$ in (9.9) would be replaced by $f'(u)x \cdot \nabla u \xi$. Hence, proceeding as we have done above, the final quantity appearing in (9.10) would be the L^2 norm of $\nabla(x \cdot \nabla u)$. But recall that we do not have control on the L^2 norm of the full Hessian of u .

To see the first inequality, one covers the half-annulus $A_{3,9,5,1}^+$ (except for a set of measure zero) by cubes of sufficiently small side-length to be contained in $A_{3,8,5,2}^+$. One then applies Proposition A.1 with $p = 1$, after rescaling it and renaming ε , in each of these cubes, and finally one adds up all the inequalities —exactly as we did in the beginning of the proof of Theorem I.3 in Section 3.

From (9.12) and the Hessian bound (8.25) (rescaled to hold in B_6^+ instead of B_1^+) we conclude

$$\|\nabla(u - u_{1.1})\|_{L^1(A_{3,9,5,1}^+)} \leq C\varepsilon^{1+\frac{q'}{q}}\|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} + C\varepsilon^{-1-\frac{q'}{q}}\|u - u_{1.1}\|_{L^1(A_{3,8,5,2}^+)}.$$

Putting together this last bound with (9.10) and (9.11), we arrive at

$$\int_{A_{4,5}^+} (f(u) - f(u_{1.1}))\xi \, dx \leq C\varepsilon\|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} + C\varepsilon^{-1-2\frac{2+\gamma}{\gamma}}\|u - u_{1.1}\|_{L^1(A_{3,8,5,2}^+)}.$$

At the same time, since $\frac{d}{d\lambda}u_\lambda(x) = x \cdot \nabla u(\lambda x) = r u_r(\lambda x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_{1.1}\|_{L^1(A_{3,8,5,2}^+)} &= \int_{A_{3,8,5,2}^+} dx \left| \int_1^{1.1} d\lambda r u_r(\lambda x) \right| \\ &\leq C \int_1^{1.1} d\lambda \int_{A_{3,8,5,2,1.1}^+} dy |u_r(y)| \leq C\|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)}. \end{aligned}$$

The last two bounds establish Step 2.

Step 3: Conclusion.

We integrate (9.3) in $\lambda \in (1, 1.1)$ and use (9.4), as well as (9.5) and (9.8) in the statements of Steps 1 and 2. We obtain the bound

$$\|u\|_{L^1(A_{4,7,4,8}^+)} \leq C(\varepsilon\|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} + \varepsilon^{-1-2\frac{2+\gamma}{\gamma}}\|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)}) \quad (9.13)$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. It is now simple to conclude the desired estimate

$$\|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} \leq C\|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)}. \quad (9.14)$$

Indeed, we first show that

$$\|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^1(A_{4,7,4,8}^+)} + \|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)}). \quad (9.15)$$

To prove this, use that

$$u(s\sigma) = u(t\sigma) - \int_s^t u_r(r\sigma) \, dr \quad (9.16)$$

for $s \in (3, 6)$, $t \in (4.7, 4.8)$, and $\sigma \in S^{n-1}$. We deduce

$$(s/6)^{n-1}|u(s\sigma)| \leq (t/4)^{n-1}|u(t\sigma)| + \int_3^6 (r/3)^{n-1}|u_r(r\sigma)| \, dr.$$

Integrating in $\sigma \in S^{n-1}$, and then in $s \in (3, 6)$ and in $t \in (4.7, 4.8)$, we conclude (9.15).

Now, we use (9.15) to bound the right-hand side of (9.13). In the resulting inequality we choose $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small enough so that the constant $C\varepsilon$ multiplying $\|u\|_{L^1(A_{4.7,4.8}^+)}$ satisfies $C\varepsilon \leq 1/2$. We deduce

$$\|u\|_{L^1(A_{4.7,4.8}^+)} \leq C\|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)},$$

that, together with (9.15), yields (9.14).

Next, to show $\|u\|_{L^1(B_6^+)} \leq C\|u_r\|_{L^1(B_6^+)}$, by (9.14) it suffices to show $\|u\|_{L^1(B_3^+)} \leq C\|u_r\|_{L^1(B_6^+)}$. Using again (9.14), it is indeed enough to show

$$\|u\|_{L^1(B_3^+)} \leq C \left(\|u\|_{L^1(A_{3,6}^+)} + \|u_r\|_{L^1(B_6^+)} \right).$$

This is easily shown using (9.16), with a similar argument as above or as in the interior case of Theorem I.1.

The proven bounds hold for a solution in B_6^+ . By rescaling we conclude the estimates of the theorem for solutions in B_1^+ . \square

For $n \geq 3$, the estimate that we have just proven can be improved as follows.

Remark 9.2. When $n \geq 3$, Theorem II.1 also holds when replacing $\|u\|_{L^1(A_{1/2,1}^+)}$, in the left-hand side of (1.15), by $\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}$.

To show this, and given the theorem, it suffices to prove

$$\|u\|_{L^1(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(A_{1/2,1}^+)}.$$

But notice that, by the Poincaré inequality for functions vanishing on $\partial^0 B_{1/2}^+$, we have that $\|u\|_{L^1(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{4/6}^+)}$. Now, using (7.2) (here we use $n \geq 3$) we can bound this last quantity by $C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(A_{4/6,5/6}^+)}$. Finally, by (8.24) we know that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(A_{4/6,5/6}^+)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(A_{1/2,1}^+)}.$$

10. BOUNDARY C^α ESTIMATE

We have now all the ingredients to give the

Proof of Theorem II.0. The proof of (1.13) follows from Theorem II.3 and a standard covering and scaling argument.

To prove the Hölder estimate (1.14), we may assume (as in the interior case) that $3 \leq n \leq 9$ by adding superfluous variables. Note here that the “half-ball geometry” in the statement of the theorem allows, when adding variables, to deduce the result for $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ from the one for $n = 3$.

Using Theorem II.2 with $\rho = 3/5$ and $\lambda = 4/3$, we obtain

$$\int_{B_{1/2}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \int_{B_{3/5}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \int_{A_{3/5,4/5}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \quad (10.1)$$

Now, since $1/2 < 3/5 < 4/5 < 1$, (8.24) in Corollary 8.6 yields

$$\int_{A_{3/5,4/5}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(A_{1/2,1}^+)}^2. \quad (10.2)$$

At the same time, by the estimate (1.15) from Theorem II.1 we have

$$\|u\|_{L^1(A_{1/2,1}^+)}^2 \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^1(A_{1/2,1}^+)}^2 \leq C \|u_r\|_{L^2(A_{1/2,1}^+)}^2 \leq C \int_{A_{1/2,1}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx.$$

This, together with (10.1) and (10.2), leads to

$$\int_{B_{1/2}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \int_{A_{1/2,1}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx.$$

We can write this inequality, in an equivalent way, as

$$\int_{B_{1/2}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \theta \int_{B_1^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx$$

for the dimensional constant $\theta = \frac{C}{1+C} \in (0, 1)$.

This estimate (which is rescale invariant), applied to the rescaled stable solutions $u(\rho \cdot)$, yields

$$\int_{B_{\rho/2}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \theta \int_{B_\rho^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx$$

for all $\rho \in (0, 1)$. This inequality can be iterated, in balls of radius 2^{-j} , with $j \geq 1$ an integer, to obtain $\int_{B_{2^{-j}}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq \theta^{j-1} \int_{B_{1/2}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx$. Since $0 < \theta < 1$, it follows that, for some dimensional $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_{B_\rho^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \rho^{2\alpha} \int_{B_{1/2}^+} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \rho^{2\alpha} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}^2 \quad \text{for all } \rho \leq 1/2,$$

where we have used (10.1) and (10.2) in the last inequality. In particular, since $\rho^{2-n} \leq r^{2-n}$ in B_ρ^+ , we conclude that

$$\int_{B_\rho^+} |u_r| dx \leq C \rho^{n-1+\alpha} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \quad \text{for all } \rho \leq 1/2.$$

Next, given $y' \in \partial^0 B_{1/2}^+$, we can apply the last estimate to the function $u_{y'}(x) := u(y' + \frac{x}{2})$, defined for $x \in B_1^+$, since $y' + \frac{1}{2} B_1^+ \subset B_1^+$. Using the notation $u_{r_{y'}}(x) := |x - y'|^{-1} (x - y') \cdot \nabla u(x)$, we get

$$\int_{B_\rho^+(y')} |u_{r_{y'}}| dx \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)} \rho^{n-1+\alpha} \quad \text{for all } y' \in \partial^0 B_{1/2}^+ \text{ and } \rho \leq 1/4.$$

At this point we can reflect u oddly to get a C^1 function in all B_1 , which we still call u and which satisfies the previous estimate but now with the integral of $|u_{r_{y'}}|$ extended to the whole ball $B_\rho(y')$. Thus, given $0 < y_n \leq 1/8$, we can apply Lemma C.1 in

$B_{2y_n}(y')$ (that is, with y replaced by y' and $d = 2y_n$) and with $S := B_{2y_n}^+(y')$ to get (recall that $u \geq 0$)

$$\frac{1}{(y_n)^n} \|u\|_{L^1(B_{2y_n}^+(y'))} = C|u_S| = C|u(y') - u_S| \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}(y_n)^\alpha. \quad (10.3)$$

We are now ready to control the Hölder norm of u up to the boundary. Given $y = (y', y_n) \in B_{1/8}^+$, by the interior Hölder estimate (1.7) of Theorem I.0 (applied in the interior ball $B_{y_n}(y)$ and properly rescaled) and by (10.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{y_n/2}(y))} + (y_n)^\alpha [u]_{C^\alpha(\overline{B_{y_n/2}(y)})} &\leq \frac{C}{(y_n)^n} \|u\|_{L^1(B_{y_n}(y))} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(y_n)^n} \|u\|_{L^1(B_{2y_n}^+(y'))} \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}(y_n)^\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (10.4)$$

In particular, $|u(y)| \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}$ and thus we have controlled the L^∞ norm of u in $B_{1/8}^+$.

Finally, to bound $|u(y) - u(z)|$ for another given point $z \in B_{1/8}^+$, note that, by symmetry, we may assume $z_n \leq y_n$. Now, if $|z - y| \leq y_n/2$ then from (10.4) we get $|u(y) - u(z)|/|y - z|^\alpha \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}$. Instead, if $|z - y| > y_n/2$ we apply the L^∞ estimate in (10.4) (also with the point y replaced by z) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |u(y) - u(z)| &\leq u(y) + u(z) \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}((y_n)^\alpha + (z_n)^\alpha) \\ &\leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}(y_n)^\alpha \leq C\|u\|_{L^1(B_1^+)}|y - z|^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus controlled the C^α -seminorm of u in $B_{1/8}^+$ for every stable solution in B_1^+ . From this, the Hölder estimate (1.14) of Theorem II.0 follows by a standard covering and scaling argument. \square

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. TWO SIMPLE INTERPOLATION INEQUALITIES IN CUBES

In contrast with [CFRS], in this paper we have not used the $W^{1,2+\gamma}$ bound to prove the interior $W^{1,2}$ regularity result. This has been accomplished thanks to the following interpolation inequality in cubes, which has been used also in our boundary regularity proof. Thus, we use the interpolation inequality twice —with $p = 2$ in the interior case and with $p = 1$ in the boundary case.

The inequality concerns the quantity $\int |\nabla u|^{p-1} |D^2 u| dx$. It is stated in cubes, it does not assume any boundary values, and it is extremely simple to be established. Indeed, in contrast with other interpolation results for functions with no prescribed boundary values, such as [GT, Theorem 7.28], proving our inequality in a cube of \mathbb{R}^n will be immediate once we prove it in dimension one.²⁰

²⁰Instead, the interpolation inequality [GT, Theorem 7.28] for functions with arbitrary boundary values requires a result on Sobolev seminorms for extension operators (i.e., operators extending functions of n variables to a larger domain).

We conceived the inequality recently, in our work [CMS, Proposition A.3], in order to extend the results of [CFRS] to the $(p+1)$ -Laplacian operator.²¹ We do not know if the interpolation inequality has appeared somewhere before.

Proposition A.1. *Let $Q = (0, 1)^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $p \geq 1$, and $u \in C^2(\overline{Q})$.*

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

$$\int_Q |\nabla u|^p dx \leq C_p \left(\varepsilon \int_Q |\nabla u|^{p-1} |D^2 u| dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^p} \int_Q |u|^p dx \right), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where C_p is a constant depending only on n and p .

Proof. We first prove it for $n = 1$, in the interval $(0, \delta)$ for a given $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $u \in C^2([0, \delta])$. Let $x_0 \in [0, \delta]$ be such that $|u'(x_0)| = \min_{[0, \delta]} |u'|$. For $0 < y < \frac{\delta}{3} < \frac{2\delta}{3} < z < \delta$, since $(u(z) - u(y))/(z - y)$ is equal to u' at some point, we deduce that $|u'(x_0)| \leq 3\delta^{-1}(|u(y)| + |u(z)|)$. Integrating this inequality first in y and later in z , we see that $|u'(x_0)| \leq 9\delta^{-2} \int_0^\delta |u| dx$. Raising this inequality to the power $p \in [1, \infty)$ we get

$$|u'(x_0)|^p \leq 9^p \delta^{-p-1} \int_0^\delta |u|^p dx. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now, for $x \in (0, \delta)$, integrating $(|u'|^p)'$ in the interval with end points x_0 and x , we deduce

$$|u'(x)|^p \leq p \int_0^\delta |u'|^{p-1} |u''| dx + |u'(x_0)|^p.$$

Combining this inequality with (A.2) and integrating in $x \in (0, \delta)$, we obtain

$$\int_0^\delta |u'|^p dx \leq p \delta \int_0^\delta |u'|^{p-1} |u''| dx + 9^p \delta^{-p} \int_0^\delta |u|^p dx. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We come back now to the statement of the proposition in dimension one and let $u \in C^2([0, 1])$. For any given integer $k > 1$ we divide $(0, 1)$ into k disjoint intervals of length $\delta = 1/k$. Since for (A.3) we did not require any specific boundary values for u , we can use the inequality in each of these intervals of length $\delta = 1/k$ (instead of in $(0, \delta)$), and then add up all the inequalities, to deduce

$$\int_0^1 |u'|^p dx \leq \frac{p}{k} \int_0^1 |u'|^{p-1} |u''| dx + (9k)^p \int_0^1 |u|^p dx. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Since $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exists an integer $k > 1$ such that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \leq k < \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$. This and (A.4) establish the proposition in dimension one.

²¹The proof that we give here in cubes is exactly the same as that of [CMS]. However, [CMS] claimed the same interpolation inequality in balls instead of cubes, and this made the proof in [CMS] not to be correct. Indeed, proving inequality (A.5) of [CMS] contains a mistake: it fails when, given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, one has $|I| \ll \varepsilon$ —as it occurs later in the proof in \mathbb{R}^n when 1d sections of the ball are very small compared to ε . Despite this, all other results of [CMS] remain correct since, within Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [CMS], the interpolation inequality may be applied in small enough cubes covering the ball $B_{1/2}$ (as we do in the current paper) instead of applying it in the whole ball.

Finally, for $u \in C^2([0, 1]^n)$, denote $x = (x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Using (A.1) with $n = 1$ for every x' , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q |u_{x_1}|^p dx &= \int_{(0,1)^{n-1}} dx' \int_0^1 dx_1 |u_{x_1}(x)|^p \\ &\leq C_p \varepsilon \int_{(0,1)^{n-1}} dx' \int_0^1 dx_1 |u_{x_1}(x)|^{p-1} |u_{x_1 x_1}(x)| \\ &\quad + C_p \varepsilon^{-p} \int_{(0,1)^{n-1}} dx' \int_0^1 dx_1 |u(x)|^p \\ &= C_p \left(\varepsilon \int_Q |u_{x_1}(x)|^{p-1} |u_{x_1 x_1}(x)| dx + \varepsilon^{-p} \int_Q |u(x)|^p dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the same inequality holds for the partial derivatives with respect to each variable x_k instead of x_1 , adding up the inequalities we conclude (A.1). \square

We also use Nash's interpolation inequality, which will allow us to replace the L^2 norm of u by the square of its L^1 norm in (A.1), when $p = 2$. The following provides an elementary proof of it.

Proposition A.2. *Let $Q = (0, 1)^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $p \geq 1$, and $u \in C^2(\overline{Q})$.*

Then, for every $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_Q |u|^p dx \leq C_p \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}^p \int_Q |\nabla u|^p dx + \frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{n(p-1)}} \left(\int_Q |u| dx \right)^p \right), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where C_p is a constant depending only on n and p .

Proof. Following [L, Proposition 12.29], we first give a very simple proof of Poincaré's inequality in a cube:

$$\int_Q |u - u_Q|^p dx \leq n^p \int_Q |\nabla u|^p dx, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where u_Q is the average of u in Q . To establish it, for x and y in Q , notice that

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| &\leq |u(x) - u(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, y_n)| + \dots + |u(x_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) - u(y)| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 |u_{x_i}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)| dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)|^p &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 |\nabla u(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)|^p dt \right)^{1/p} \right)^p \\ &\leq n^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 |\nabla u(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)|^p dt. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude Poincaré's inequality, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_Q |u(x) - u_Q|^p dx &= \int_Q \left| \int_Q (u(x) - u(y)) dy \right|^p dx \\
&\leq \int_Q \int_Q |u(x) - u(y)|^p dy dx \\
&\leq n^{p-1} \int_Q \int_Q \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 |\nabla u(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)|^p dt dy dx \\
&= n^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_Q |\nabla u(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)|^p dx_1 dx_{i-1} dt dy_{i+1} \dots dy_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, rescaling (A.6), we see that Poincaré's inequality for functions in a cube Q_δ of side-length δ reads as $\|u - u_{Q_\delta}\|_{L^p(Q_\delta)} \leq n\delta \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(Q_\delta)}$. By the triangular inequality we deduce

$$\|u\|_{L^p(Q_\delta)} \leq n\delta \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(Q_\delta)} + |Q_\delta|^{1/p} |u_{Q_\delta}| = n\delta \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(Q_\delta)} + \delta^{-n/p'} \int_{Q_j} |u| dx.$$

Now, for any given integer $k > 1$ we divide Q into k^n disjoint cubes Q_j of side-length $\delta = 1/k$. By the previous inequality we have

$$\int_{Q_j} |u|^p dx \leq C_p \left(\frac{1}{k^p} \int_{Q_j} |\nabla u|^p dx + k^{n(p-1)} \left(\int_{Q_j} |u| dx \right)^p \right)$$

on each cube Q_j . Adding up all these inequalities and taking into account that $\sum_j (\int_{Q_j} |u| dx)^p \leq (\sum_j \int_{Q_j} |u| dx)^p = (\int_Q |u| dx)^p$, we deduce (A.5) by choosing an integer k such that $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} \leq k < 2\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1}$. \square

APPENDIX B. ABSORBING ERRORS IN LARGER BALLS

The following is a general “abstract” lemma due to L. Simon [S]. We include its proof for completeness. For brevity of the proof we take $\beta \geq 0$ in its statement, although the lemma also holds for all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma B.1 ([S]). *Let $\beta \geq 0$ and $\overline{C} > 0$. Let \mathcal{B} be the class of all open balls B contained in the unit ball B_1 of \mathbb{R}^n and let $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ satisfy the following subadditivity property:*

$$\sigma(B) \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma(B^j) \quad \text{whenever } N \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \{B^j\}_{j=1}^N \subset \mathcal{B}, \text{ and } B \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^N B^j.$$

It follows that there exists a constant $\delta > 0$, which depends only on n and β , such that if

$$\rho^\beta \sigma(B_{\rho/2}(y)) \leq \delta \rho^\beta \sigma(B_\rho(y)) + \overline{C} \quad \text{whenever } B_\rho(y) \subset B_1, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

then

$$\sigma(B_{1/2}) \leq C_\beta \overline{C}$$

for some constant C_β which depends only on n and β .

Proof. Define

$$S := \sup_{B_\rho(y) \subset B_1} \rho^\beta \sigma(B_{\rho/2}(y)).$$

We clearly have that $S < \infty$ by subadditivity, since $\beta \geq 0$ and $\sigma(B_1) < \infty$.

Consider a finite covering $B_{1/2} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^M B_{1/8}(x_i)$ of $B_{1/2}$ by M balls (with M depending only on n) of radius $1/8$ centered at points of $x_i \in B_{1/2}$.

Now, given a ball $B_\rho(y)$ contained in B_1 , we have that

$$B_{\rho/2}(y) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^M B_{\rho/8}(y + \rho x_i)$$

and $B_{\rho/2}(y + \rho x_i) \subset B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$. Hence, using the subaditivity of σ , assumption (B.1), and the definition of S we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^\beta \sigma(B_{\rho/2}(y)) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^M \rho^\beta \sigma(B_{\rho/8}(y + \rho x_i)) \\ &\leq 4^\beta \sum_{i=1}^M \{ \delta (\rho/4)^\beta \sigma(B_{\rho/4}(y + \rho x_i)) + \overline{C} \} \\ &= 2^\beta \delta \sum_{i=1}^M (2\rho/4)^\beta \sigma(B_{\rho/4}(y + \rho x_i)) + 4^\beta M \overline{C} \\ &\leq 2^\beta \delta M S + 4^\beta M \overline{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking supremum for all balls $B_\rho(y) \subset B_1$ in the left-hand side we obtain

$$S \leq 2^\beta \delta M S + 4^\beta M \overline{C}.$$

Choosing $\delta := 1/(2^{1+\beta} M)$ we deduce $S/2 \leq 4^\beta M \overline{C}$. This clearly leads to the desired bound on $\sigma(B_{1/2})$. \square

APPENDIX C. MORREY'S EMBEDDING THEOREM STATED WITH RADIAL DERIVATIVES

Here we give all details of the proof of Morrey's estimate, stated using radial derivatives instead of the usual full gradient —since we will need this version in our applications. As in Section 5, we use the notation

$$u_{r_y}(x) := \frac{x-y}{|x-y|} \cdot \nabla u(x).$$

Lemma C.1. *Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $d > 0$, and u be a C^1 function in $\overline{B}_d(y) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that, for some positive constants α and \overline{C} ,*

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)} |u_{r_y}| dx \leq \overline{C} \rho^{n-1+\alpha} \quad \text{for all } \rho \leq d. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Let S be any measurable subset of $B_d(y)$ and $u_S := \frac{1}{|S|} \int_S u \, dx$. Then,

$$|u(y) - u_S| \leq C_\alpha \bar{C} \frac{d^n}{|S|} d^\alpha$$

for some constant C_α depending only on n and α .

Proof. We follow [GT, Chapter 7]. Given $z \in S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(z) - u(y) &= \int_0^{|z-y|} \frac{z-y}{|z-y|} \cdot \nabla u \left(y + \rho \frac{z-y}{|z-y|} \right) d\rho \\ &= \int_0^{|z-y|} u_{r_y} \left(y + \rho \frac{z-y}{|z-y|} \right) d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Averaging in $z \in S$, taking absolute values, and using spherical coordinates $z = \bar{\rho}\omega$ centered at y (hence, $\bar{\rho} = |z-y|$), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |u(y) - u_S| &= \left| \frac{1}{|S|} \int_S dz \int_0^{|z-y|} d\rho u_{r_y} \left(y + \rho \frac{z-y}{|z-y|} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|S|} \int_{B_d(y)} dz \int_0^d d\rho \left| u_{r_y} \left(y + \rho \frac{z-y}{|z-y|} \right) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{|S|} \int_0^d d\bar{\rho} \bar{\rho}^{n-1} \int_{S^{n-1}} d\omega \int_0^d d\rho |u_{r_y}(y + \rho\omega)| \\ &= \frac{d^n}{n|S|} \int_{S^{n-1}} d\omega \int_0^d d\rho |u_{r_y}(y + \rho\omega)| \\ &= \frac{d^n}{n|S|} \int_{B_d(y)} r_y^{1-n} |u_{r_y}| \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

We now control this last integral. For this, we define

$$\varphi(\rho) := \int_{B_\rho(y)} |u_{r_y}| \, dx$$

and recall that $\varphi'(\rho) = \int_{\partial B_\rho(y)} |u_{r_y}| \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$. We now use (C.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_d(y)} r_y^{1-n} |u_{r_y}| \, dx &= \int_0^d \rho^{1-n} \varphi'(\rho) \, d\rho = d^{1-n} \varphi(d) + (n-1) \int_0^d \rho^{-n} \varphi(\rho) \, d\rho \\ &\leq \bar{C} d^{1-n} d^{n-1+\alpha} + (n-1) \bar{C} \int_0^d \rho^{-n} \rho^{n-1+\alpha} \, d\rho \leq C_\alpha \bar{C} d^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Theorem C.2. *Let u be a C^1 function in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, for some positive constants α and \bar{C} ,*

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)} |u_{r_y}| \, dx \leq \bar{C} \rho^{n-1+\alpha} \quad \text{for all } y \in \bar{B}_{1/4} \text{ and } \rho \leq 1/2.$$

Then,

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{B}_{1/4})} \leq C_\alpha (\overline{C} + \|u\|_{L^1(B_1)})$$

for some constant C_α depending only on n and α .

Proof. Given $y \in \overline{B}_{1/4}$ and $\overline{y} \in \overline{B}_{1/4}$, define

$$d := |y - \overline{y}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad S := B_d(y) \cap B_d(\overline{y}).$$

We use Lemma C.1 both in $B_d(y)$ and in $B_d(\overline{y})$ (hence, the second time with y replaced by \overline{y}) and, since $|S| = c(n)d^n$ for some positive dimensional constant $c(n)$, we conclude that $|u(y) - u(\overline{y})| \leq |u(y) - u_S| + |u_S - u(\overline{y})| \leq C_\alpha \overline{C} d^\alpha = C_\alpha \overline{C} |y - \overline{y}|^\alpha$. We have thus controlled the C^α -seminorm of u in $\overline{B}_{1/4}$.

To bound the L^∞ norm, given $y \in \overline{B}_{1/4}$ we choose a point $\overline{y} \in \overline{B}_{1/4}$ such that $d = |y - \overline{y}| \geq 1/4$. We now use the previous bounds to obtain $|u(y)| \leq |u(y) - u_S| + |u_S| \leq C_\alpha \overline{C} d^\alpha + C d^{-n} \|u\|_{L^1(B_1)}$. Since $1/4 \leq d \leq 1/2$, this concludes the proof. \square

APPENDIX D. GRADIENT ESTIMATE FOR A MIXED BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM

Here we show that the solution to (9.7), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi = 1 & \text{in } A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+ \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial^0 A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+ \\ \varphi_\nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial^+ A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+, \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

with $\rho_1 \in (4.1, 4.2)$ and $\rho_2 \in (4.8, 4.9)$ —that we used in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem II.1— satisfies $|\nabla\varphi| \leq C$ in A_{ρ_1, ρ_2}^+ for some dimensional constant C . Note that the equation is posed in a nonsmooth domain and that this is a mixed Dirichlet-Neumann problem.

To establish this gradient estimate, we first need to control the L^∞ norm of φ . For this, recall that, by the maximum principle, $\varphi \geq 0$. Multiplying the equation in (D.1) by φ^β , with $\beta \geq 1$, and integrating by parts, we get

$$\int_{A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+} |\nabla(\varphi^{(\beta+1)/2})|^2 dx \leq \frac{(\beta+1)^2}{4\beta} \int_{A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+} \varphi^\beta dx. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

We now proceed with a standard iteration procedure, as in the proof of Theorem 8.15 in [GT]. To bound by below the left-hand side of (D.2), we use the Sobolev inequality for functions vanishing on $\partial^0 A_{\rho_1, \rho_2}^+$ and also that the averaged L^p norms of φ are increasing in p and, hence, greater or equal than $\|\varphi\|_{L^1}$. Note also that $\|\varphi\|_{L^1} = \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}^2$ is a positive universal quantity —the solution can be found variationally and thus belongs to $W^{1,2}$. In this way, we obtain the recurrence inequality $\|\varphi\|_{L^{\chi\beta}} \leq (C\beta)^{1/\beta} \|\varphi\|_{L^\beta}$ with $\chi = n/(n-2) > 1$. As in the proof of Theorem 8.15 in [GT], this leads to an L^∞ bound for φ .

Now, a simple way to prove the gradient estimate consists of considering the function $\tilde{\varphi} := \varphi + x_n^2/2$, which is harmonic and vanishes on the flat boundary. Reflecting it oddly, it becomes a harmonic function in the full annulus A_{ρ_1, ρ_2} (a smooth domain) and has $\tilde{\varphi}_r = |x_n|x_n/r$ as Neumann data on its boundary. Since

this data is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function, we can now apply global Schauder's regularity theory for the Neumann problem. We use Theorems 6.30 and 6.31 in [GT] to get a $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate for $\tilde{\varphi}$ up to the boundary —and, in particular, a global gradient estimate. The $C^{2,\alpha}$ bound depends only on the $C^{1,\alpha}$ norm of the Neumann data, the L^∞ norm of $\tilde{\varphi}$ (that we already controlled), and the smoothness of the annulus A_{ρ_1,ρ_2} (which is uniform in ρ_1 and ρ_2 due to the constraints we placed on these parameters).

APPENDIX E. SINGULAR SOLUTIONS SATISFYING THE WEIGHTED RADIAL DERIVATIVE ESTIMATE

In this appendix we clarify a non obvious Real Analysis question that has remained open for some years. The question originated when discovering Theorem I.2 around 2013. Its simplest statement (and answer) is the following.

For $n \geq 3$, given a function u defined in some ball of \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin, the estimates

$$\int_{B_\rho(y)} r_y^{2-n} u_{r_y}^2 dx \leq C \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{3\rho/2}(y) \setminus B_\rho(y)} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad (\text{E.1})$$

assumed for all y in a neighborhood of the origin and all ρ small enough, do not lead to an interior L^∞ bound for u around the origin. We use the notation

$$u_{r_y}(x) := \frac{x-y}{|x-y|} \cdot \nabla u(x).$$

This is in contrast with the situation for dimension $n = 2$, in which case (E.1) leads to an interior L^∞ bound for u . Indeed, in this dimension the weight r_y^{2-n} in the left-hand side of (E.1) is identically 1 and one can average the inequality with respect to y (taking y and ρ in appropriate sets, as we did in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [CFRS]) to get the estimate

$$\int_{B_\rho} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_{\lambda\rho} \setminus B_\rho} |\nabla u|^2 dx$$

for all ρ small enough and for some $\lambda > 1$. Now, as in previous sections, this (when used with balls centered at any other given point instead of the origin) leads to the interior Hölder regularity of u , since here $n = 2$.

Instead, for $n \geq 3$, we (as well as some other experts) thought that estimate (E.1) could perhaps suffice to get interior boundedness. Here we show that this is not the case. For this, note that we cannot take u to be a positive radially decreasing function of n variables. Indeed, in such case, (E.1) used with $y = 0$ can be iterated (as in previous sections) since $u_r^2 = |\nabla u|^2$, leading to the boundedness of u around the origin.

The following is the precise fact that we prove and the class of functions that provide a counterexample.

Claim. *For $n \geq 3$, there exist $W^{1,2}$ weak solutions of equations of the form $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in a ball of \mathbb{R}^n around 0, with f smooth, nonnegative, increasing, and convex,*

that satisfy (E.1) but are unbounded in any neighborhood of the origin. In view of Theorem I.0, such solutions are unstable in dimensions $3 \leq n \leq 9$.

An explicit example of such a solution is given by the function

$$u(x) = u(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \log(-\log(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1/2}), \quad x \in B_{1/e} \subset \mathbb{R}^n, n \geq 3. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Note that this is a function of two variables placed in \mathbb{R}^n . On the one hand, one can easily check that the function u in (E.2) is an unbounded $W^{1,2}(B_{1/e})$ positive weak solution of $-\Delta u = e^{2(e^u - u)}$ in $B_{1/e} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where $f(u) = e^{2(e^u - u)}$ is a nonnegative, increasing, and convex function of $u > 0$. On the other hand, we will next show that u satisfies (E.1).

A larger family of counterexamples consists of functions of two Euclidean variables placed in \mathbb{R}^n :

$$u(x) = u(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \tilde{u}(x_1, x_2),$$

where \tilde{u} is an unbounded $W^{1,2}(B_1^2)$ function. Here we use the notation

$$B_\rho^n := B_\rho \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

for balls in \mathbb{R}^n . We first claim that, for $n \geq 3$, any such function u satisfies (E.1).

Indeed, to check (E.1) we may assume that $y = 0$ —note that we are not assuming \tilde{u} to be radially symmetric with respect to a point. Now, let

$$x = (x', x'') \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}, \quad r' = |x'|, \quad \text{and} \quad r'' = |x''|.$$

Since $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x')$, we have that $ru_r = x \cdot \nabla u = r' \tilde{u}_{r'}$ and

$$\int_{B_\rho^n} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx = \int_{B_\rho^2} dx' r'^2 \tilde{u}_{r'}^2 \int_{B_{\frac{\rho^2 - r'^2}{\rho^2 - r'^2}}^{n-2}} dx'' (r'^2 + r''^2)^{-n/2}.$$

Now, since, for every r' ,

$$\int_{B_{\frac{\rho^2 - r'^2}{\rho^2 - r'^2}}^{n-2}} dx'' (r'^2 + r''^2)^{-n/2} = |S^{n-3}| \int_0^{\sqrt{(\frac{\rho}{r'})^2 - 1}} \frac{t^{n-3}}{r'^2 (1+t^2)^{n/2}} dt \leq \frac{C}{r'^2}$$

for some dimensional constant C , we deduce that

$$\int_{B_\rho^n} r^{2-n} u_r^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_\rho^2} \tilde{u}_{r'}^2 dx'. \quad (\text{E.3})$$

Next, to control the integral on an annulus in the right-hand side of (E.1), we use that

$$\int_{B_\rho^n} |\nabla u|^2 dx = |B_1^{n-2}| \int_{B_\rho^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 (\rho^2 - r'^2)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} dx' \quad (\text{E.4})$$

for the radii ρ and $3\rho/2$. We bound by below the integral on $B_{3\rho/2}^n$ by integrating the right-hand side of (E.4) (corresponding to $3\rho/2$ instead of ρ) only on B_ρ^2 (instead of

on $B_{3\rho/2}^2$). In this way, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{3\rho/2}^n \setminus B_\rho^n} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ \geq |B_1^{n-2}| \int_{B_\rho^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 \left\{ \left((3/2)^2 - (r'/\rho)^2 \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} - \left(1 - (r'/\rho)^2 \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \right\} dx'. \end{aligned}$$

Now, calling $a := r'/\rho \in (0, 1)$ and differentiating the function $(t^2 - a^2)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$ with respect to t , we see that

$$\left((3/2)^2 - (r'/\rho)^2 \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} - \left(1 - (r'/\rho)^2 \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} = (n-2) \int_1^{3/2} (t^2 - a^2)^{\frac{n-4}{2}} t dt.$$

Note that $(t^2 - a^2)^{\frac{n-4}{2}} \geq (t^2 - 1)^{\frac{n-4}{2}}$ if $n \geq 4$, and that $(t^2 - a^2)^{\frac{n-4}{2}} \geq (3/2)^{-1}$ if $n = 3$. We deduce that

$$\rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{3\rho/2}^n \setminus B_\rho^n} |\nabla u|^2 dx \geq c \int_{B_\rho^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 dx'$$

for some positive dimensional constant c . This, together with (E.3), establishes that (E.1) holds for this class of functions.

Next, we need to exhibit an unbounded function $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(x_1, x_2)$ in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ which is solution of a semilinear equation for some smooth nonlinearity —note that once \tilde{u} is solution in a ball of \mathbb{R}^2 , u is solution of the same equation in a ball of \mathbb{R}^n . For this, we take \tilde{u} to be radially decreasing in \mathbb{R}^2 , smooth outside the origin, with $\tilde{u}(0) = +\infty$, and belonging to $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In this way, it is guaranteed that \tilde{u} solves the semilinear equation $-\Delta \tilde{u} = f(\tilde{u})$, outside the origin, for some smooth nonlinearity f . To guarantee that \tilde{u} is also a $W^{1,2}$ weak solution in a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 , we test the equation with a smooth test function ξ after multiplying ξ by a cut-off function vanishing in B_ε^2 and equals 1 outside $B_{2\varepsilon}^2$. Integrating by parts once, we will conclude our goal if we take \tilde{u} in such a way that $f(\tilde{u})$ (which is the same as $-\Delta \tilde{u}$) is integrable around the origin and

$$\int_{B_{2\varepsilon}^2 \setminus B_\varepsilon^2} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |\nabla \tilde{u}| dx' \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In such a case, we will deduce that u is a weak solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ in a ball centered at the origin in \mathbb{R}^n .

An example that satisfies all the properties for \tilde{u} listed above is given by the function $\tilde{u}(r') = \log(-\log r')$ in (E.2), for which one can check that $f(\tilde{u}) = e^{2(e^{\tilde{u}} - \tilde{u})}$. This nonlinearity is nonnegative and convex everywhere, as well as increasing when $\tilde{u} > 0$ (i.e., when $r' < 1/e$).

REFERENCES

- [B] Brezis, Haim. Is there failure of the inverse function theorem? *Morse theory, minimax theory and their applications to nonlinear differential equations*, 23-33, New Stud. Adv. Math., 1, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2003.

- [BV] Brezis, Haim; Vázquez, Juan Luis. Blow-up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems. *Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid* 10 (1997), 443-469.
- [C1] Cabré, Xavier. Regularity of minimizers of semilinear elliptic problems up to dimension 4. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 63 (2010), 1362-1380.
- [C2] Cabré, Xavier. Boundedness of stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations: a survey. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* 17 (2017), 355-368.
- [C3] Cabré, Xavier. A new proof of the boundedness results for stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 39 (2019), 7249-7264.
- [C4] Cabré, Xavier. Regularity of stable solutions to reaction-diffusion elliptic equations. To appear in *Proceedings of the 8th European Congress of Mathematics*. *arXiv:2112.08277 [math.AP]*.
- [CC] Cabré, Xavier; Capella, Antonio. Regularity of radial minimizers and extremal solutions of semilinear elliptic equations. *J. Funct. Anal.* 238 (2006), 709-733.
- [CFRS] Cabré, Xavier; Figalli, Alessio; Ros-Oton, Xavier; Serra, Joaquim. Stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations are smooth up to dimension 9. *Acta Math.* 224 (2020), 187-252.
- [CMS] Cabré, Xavier; Miraglio, Pietro; Sanchón, Manel. Optimal regularity of stable solutions to nonlinear equations involving the p-Laplacian. *Adv. Calc. Var.* (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1515/acv-2020-0055>.
- [CS] Cabré, Xavier; Sanz-Perela, Tomás. A universal Hölder estimate up to dimension 4 for stable solutions to half-Laplacian semilinear equations. *J. Differential Equations* 317 (2022), 153-195.
- [CL] Chodosh, Otis; Li, Chao. Stable minimal hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^4 . *arXiv:2108.11462 [math.DG]*.
- [CR] Crandall, Michael G.; Rabinowitz, Paul H. Some continuation and variational methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 58 (1975), 207-218.
- [D] Dupaigne, Louis. *Stable Solutions of Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Monogr. Surv. Pure Appl. Math. 143, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2011.
- [DF] Dupaigne, Louis; Farina, Alberto. Classification and Liouville-type theorems for semilinear elliptic equations in unbounded domains. *arXiv:1912.11639 [math.AP]*.
- [E1] Erneta, Iñigo U. Stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations for operators with variable coefficients. *Forthcoming*.
- [E2] Erneta, Iñigo U. Boundary regularity for stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations. *Forthcoming*.
- [EGG] Esposito, Pierpaolo; Ghoussoub, Nassif; Guo, Yujin. *Mathematical analysis of partial differential equations modeling electrostatic MEMS*. Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 20. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [FZ] Figalli, Alessio; Zhang, Yi Ru-Ya. Uniform boundedness for finite Morse index solutions to supercritical semilinear elliptic equations. *arXiv:2106.10959 [math.AP]*.
- [G] Gel'fand, Izrail' M. Some problems in the theory of quasilinear equations. *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2)* 29 (1963), 295-381.
- [GT] Gilbarg, David; Trudinger, Neil S. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Reprint of the 1998 edition. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [L] Leoni, Giovanni. *A first course in Sobolev spaces*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 105. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.
- [LL] Lieb Elliot H.; Loss, Michael. *Analysis*. Second edition. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 14. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [LY] Lin, Fanghua; Yang, Yisong. Nonlinear non-local elliptic equation modelling electrostatic actuation. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 463 (2007), 1323-1337.

- [MW] Ma, Li; Wei, Juncheng. Properties of positive solutions to an elliptic equation with negative exponent. *J. Funct. Anal.* 254 (2008), 1058-1087.
- [N] Nedev, Gueorgui. Regularity of the extremal solution of semilinear elliptic equations. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 330 (2000), 997-1002.
- [P] Peng, Fa. The boundedness of stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations for lower bound on nonlinearities. *Forthcoming*.
- [PZZ1] Peng, Fa; Zhang, Yi Ru-Ya; Zhou, Yuan. Optimal regularity & Liouville property for stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 10$. *arXiv:2105.02535 [math.AP]*.
- [PZZ2] Peng, Fa; Zhang, Yi Ru-Ya; Zhou, Yuan. Interior Hölder regularity for stable solutions to semilinear elliptic equations up to dimension 5. *arXiv:2204.06345 [math.AP]*.
- [R-O] Ros-Oton, Xavier. Regularity for the fractional Gelfand problem up to dimension 7. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 419 (2014), 10-19.
- [S] Simon, Leon. Schauder estimates by scaling. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 5 (1997), 391-407.
- [SZ] Sternberg, Peter; Zumbrun, Kevin. Connectivity of phase boundaries in strictly convex domains. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 141 (1998), 375-400.
- [V] Villegas, Salvador. Boundedness of extremal solutions in dimension 4. *Adv. Math.* 235 (2013), 126-133.
- [W] Wang, Kelei. Recent progress on stable and finite Morse index solutions of semilinear elliptic equations. *Electron. Res. Arch.* 29 (2021), 3805-3816.

X.C.^{1,2,3} — ¹ICREA, PG. LLUIS COMPANYS 23, 08010 BARCELONA, SPAIN & ²UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE CATALUNYA, DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES AND IMTECH, DIAGONAL 647, 08028 BARCELONA, SPAIN & ³CENTRE DE RECERCA MATEMÀTICA, EDIFICI C, CAMPUS BELLATERRA, 08193 BELLATERRA, SPAIN

Email address: xavier.cabre@upc.edu