

# SYMMETRY FOR A FULLY NONLINEAR FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM WITH HIGHLY SINGULAR TERM

LAYAN EL HAJJ, SEONGMIN JEON, AND HENRIK SHAHGHOLIAN

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove radial symmetry for solutions to a free boundary problem with a singular right hand side, in both elliptic and parabolic regime. More exactly, in the unit ball  $B_1$  we consider a solution to the fully nonlinear elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2u) = f(u) & \text{in } B_1 \cap \{u > 0\}, \\ u = M & \text{on } \partial B_1, \\ 0 \leq u < M & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases}$$

where the right hand side  $f(u)$ , near  $u = 0$ , behaves like  $u^a$  with negative values for  $a \in (-1, 0)$ . Due to lack of  $C^2$ -smoothness of both  $u$  and the free boundary  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ , we cannot apply the well-known Serrin-type boundary point lemma. We circumvent this by an exact assumption on a first order expansion and the decay on the second order, along with an ad-hoc comparison principle.

We treat equally the parabolic case of the problem, and state a corresponding result.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Main Results	3
1.3. Notation	5
2. Proof of Theorem 1	5
3. Proof of Theorem 2	10
Appendix A. Properties of $A_{x^0}$ and $A_{z^0}$	15
Appendix B. A non-standard comparison principle	15
B.1. Elliptic Case	16
B.2. Parabolic case	17
Declarations	18
References	18

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Background.** In this paper we deal with rigidity question of a fully nonlinear Dirichlet problem in the unit ball with constant boundary values. Our problem, due to presence of a discontinuous right hand side gives rise to a free boundary; the r.h.s. in our problem is given by  $f(u) \approx u^a$  with  $-1 < a < 0$ , when  $0 < u \approx 0$ . Such singularities imply much less regularity of the solutions up to the free boundary, as is a customary assumptions in rigidity theory. A further difficulty in our problem is the fact that the moving plane technique, which is the main tool, usually requires

---

*Date:* July 5, 2022.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35B06, 35R35.

*Key words and phrases.* Symmetry, fully nonlinear equations, moving plane, free boundary.

HS is supported by Swedish Research Council.

Lipschitz right hand sides. This is naturally missing in our problem, due to the highly singular r.h.s.

The fully nonlinear case, as dealt with here, introduces yet another technical problem, which has to do with the equation itself and what definition should be appropriate. An obvious choice of definition would be viscosity (which we also adopt in the bulk) but the problem is the regularity issue for such solutions at the free boundary.

In the Laplacian case, problems with highly singular r.h.s., and in a general setting, have been studied earlier by Alt-Phillips [2], as minimizers, and by Teixeira [19] as viscosity solutions. See also a recent work by Desilva-Savin [9] for the case  $-3 < a < -1$ , where the authors consider minimizers of a corresponding functional and define viscosity solutions through an asymptotic behaviour for solutions near the free boundary.

Two of the current authors [11] have also treated the symmetry problem for the Laplacian case, where the authors considered (a stronger form of) asymptotic expansion, for the solution, to by pass the low-regular nature of the solutions and that of the free boundary.

The fully nonlinear case with singular terms has been considered earlier; see e.g., [3], [13]. However, no results has been found in the literature where symmetry aspects have been considered, for singular right hand side.

It would be an interesting project to consider analysis of the free boundary problem in the nonlinear setting, in the way Desilva-Savin [9] have done for the Laplacian case. Also the weaker version of asymptotic expansion of DeSilva-Savin is far from sufficient for treating any symmetry problems. To circumvent this obstacle, we shall assume a second order asymptotic expansion, which is justified<sup>1</sup> from a regularity point of view; see Asymptotic Property (1.4), (1.5).

We will now define our problem more specifically, in both elliptic and parabolic cases. The elliptic case of our problem is given by the equation (with  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  a priori unknown)

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} F(D^2u) = f(u) & \text{in } B_1 \cap \{u > 0\}, \\ u = M & \text{on } \partial B_1, \\ 0 \leq u < M & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases}$$

where  $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ) is the unit ball,  $M > 0$  is a given fixed constant, and the functions  $f$  and  $F$  are defined below.

The parabolic counter part of our problem is expressed through the equation

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} F(D^2u) - \partial_t u = f(u) & \text{in } Q_1 \cap \{u > 0\}, \\ u(x, t) = M_t & \text{on } \partial_p Q_1, \\ 0 \leq u(x, t) < M_t & \text{in } Q_1. \end{cases}$$

Here,  $Q_1 = B_1 \times (0, 1]$  is the parabolic unit cylinder and  $\partial_p Q_1 = (\partial B_1 \times [0, 1]) \cup (B_1 \times \{0\})$  is its parabolic boundary.  $M_t$  is a positive continuous function of  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

In both problems we shall have an additional assumption of the behaviour of the solution close to the (unknown) free boundary  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ . This assumption is expressed in terms of an asymptotic expansion, that assumes the solution close to  $C^1$  free boundaries behave like a one-dimensional solution and the second term in the expansion has much faster decay with respect to the distance to the free boundary.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although this is a challenging problem even in the Laplacian case, it is reasonable to expect such an expansion.

For the Laplacian case Alt-Phillips considered existence and regularity of solutions and the free boundary in their work [2], through minimization, which does not work for non-divergence equations. For the fully nonlinear case one may consider a singular perturbation technique, as in [3]. The latter approach seems plausible for the parabolic case.

**1.2. Main Results.** To specify the function  $f$  in (1.1) and (1.2), we fix  $-1 < a < 0$ ,  $\kappa_0 > 0$  and  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$  small. We assume that  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the following properties

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} (a) \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \frac{f(\rho+\varepsilon)-f(\rho)}{\varepsilon} \leq \kappa_0 \rho^{a-1}, & \rho > 0, \\ (b) f(\rho) = 0, & \rho \leq 0, \\ (c) f(\rho) = \rho^a, & 0 < \rho < \varepsilon_1, \\ (d) |f(\rho)| \leq C_0, & \rho \geq \varepsilon_1. \end{cases}$$

To describe the operator  $F$ , let  $S = S(n)$  be the space of  $n \times n$  symmetric matrices,  $\Lambda \geq \lambda > 0$  be constants, and  $P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-, P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+$  be the extremal Pucci operators defined by

$$P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(N) = \lambda \Sigma_{e_i > 0} e_i + \Lambda \Sigma_{e_i < 0} e_i, \quad P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(N) = \lambda \Sigma_{e_i < 0} e_i + \Lambda \Sigma_{e_i > 0} e_i,$$

where each  $e_i$  is an eigenvalue of  $N \in S$ . Our assumption on  $F : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the following:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} - F \text{ is convex.} \\ - F(0) = 0. \\ - F \text{ is homogeneous of degree 1, i.e., } F(rN) = rF(N) \text{ for any } r > 0, N \in S. \\ - \text{There are constants } \Lambda \geq \lambda > 0 \text{ such that for any } N_1, N_2 \in S, \text{ we have} \\ \quad P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(N_1 - N_2) \leq F(N_1) - F(N_2) \leq P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(N_1 - N_2). \\ - 1 \leq \Lambda/\lambda \leq \eta_0 \text{ for some } \eta_0 > 1, \text{ defined in Appendix B.} \\ - F \text{ is Hessian, i.e., } F(R^T N R) = F(N) \text{ for each orthogonal matrix } R \text{ and } N \in S. \end{array} \right.$$

### Asymptotic Property

For  $-1 < a < 0$  we fix the following constant throughout the paper:

$$\beta = \frac{2}{1-a}.$$

Elliptic case: We say that a function  $u : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies *Asymptotic Property* if at any free boundary point  $x^0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$  the asymptotic expansion holds

$$(1.4) \quad |u(x) - A_{x^0}((x - x^0) \cdot \nu^{x^0})_+^\beta| \leq C_0 |x - x^0|^{2+\delta_\beta}, \quad x \in B_{d_{x^0}}(x^0).$$

Here,  $C_0 > 0$  and  $0 < \delta_\beta < \beta - 1$  are fixed constants independent of  $x^0$ , while a unit vector  $\nu^{x^0} \in \partial B_1$ , a radius  $d_{x^0} \geq c_0 > 0$  and a constant  $A_{x^0} > 0$  depend on  $x^0$ .

Parabolic case: The parabolic case needs a similar type of asymptotic property. Let  $u : Q_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function, with  $0 < T_1 < 1$  the first time we encounter a free boundary point  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ . We say that  $u$  satisfies (*Parabolic*) *Asymptotic Property* if at every free boundary point  $z^0 = (x^0, t^0) \in \partial\{u > 0\}$  with  $t^0 > T_1$  the asymptotic expansion holds

$$(1.5) \quad |u(x, t) - A_{z^0}((x - x^0) \cdot \mu^{z^0})_+^\beta| \leq C_0 \left( |x - x^0| + \sqrt{|t - t^0|} \right)^{2+\delta_\beta}, \quad (x, t) \in \tilde{Q}_{d_{z^0}}(z^0).$$

Here,  $C_0 > 0$  and  $0 < \delta_\beta < \beta - 1$  are fixed constants independent of  $z^0$ , while a spatial unit vector  $\mu^{z^0} \in \partial B_1$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , a constant  $A_{z^0} > 0$  and a radius

$$d_{z^0} := \min\{|1 - t^0|^{1/2}, |t^0 - T_1|^{1/2}\}$$

depend on  $z^0$ .

**Remark 1.** *It is noteworthy that the above asymptotic property (1.4) implies that the free boundary is uniformly  $C^{1,|a|}$  in the elliptic case.*

*On the other hand, in the parabolic case the asymptotic property (1.5) implies  $C^{1/2,|a|/2}$  in time direction and  $C^{1,|a|}$  in space directions for each point on  $\partial\{u > 0\} \cap \{t > T_1\}$ , with uniform norm, depending on the distance of the free boundary point to the time slice  $\{t = T_1\}$ .*

The asymptotic expansions (1.4) and (1.5) guarantee that the homogeneous rescalings  $u_r(x) := \frac{u(rx+x^0)}{r^\beta}$  converge (up to a subsequence) to  $q_{x^0}(x) := A_{x^0}(x \cdot \nu^{x^0})_+^\beta$ , and similarly  $u_r(x, t) := \frac{u(rx+x^0, r^2t+t^0)}{r^\beta}$  converge to (a time-independent version)  $q_{z^0}(x, t) := A_{z^0}(x \cdot \mu^{z^0})_+^\beta$ . Since  $f(u) = u^a$  near the free boundary  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ , it is reasonable to expect that they solve  $F(D^2q_{x^0}) = q_{x^0}^a$  and  $F(D^2q_{z^0}) - \partial_t q_{z^0} = q_{z^0}^a$ , which will determine  $A_{x^0}$  and  $A_{z^0}$ , respectively. See Appendix A for their exact values and properties.

By the result of Remark 1 on the regularity of the free boundary  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ , it is easy to see that the vector  $\nu^{x^0}$  in (1.4) should be the unit normal to the free boundary at  $x^0$ , which points toward  $\{u > 0\}$ . Similarly, in (1.5), if  $\nu^{z^0} = (\nu_x^{z^0}, \nu_t^{z^0})$  is the unit normal to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  pointing toward  $\{u > 0\}$  then  $\mu^{z^0} = \frac{\nu_x^{z^0}}{|\nu_x^{z^0}|}$ .

Our results are the following theorems.

**Theorem 1.** *For  $-1 < a < 0$ , let  $u$  be a viscosity solution of (1.1). Suppose that  $f$  satisfies (1.3) and  $f(\rho) \geq 0$  for  $\rho \geq M - \varepsilon_1$ , and that the asymptotic property (1.4) holds. Then  $u$  is spherically symmetric in  $B_1$  and  $\partial_{|x|}u \geq 0$ .*

Our second main result concerning the parabolic equation is as follows.

**Theorem 2.** *For  $-1 < a < 0$ , let  $u$  be a viscosity solution of (1.2). Suppose that  $f$  satisfies (1.3),  $f(\rho) \geq 0$  for  $\rho \geq \inf_{0 \leq t \leq 1} M_t - \varepsilon_1$  and  $\inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \frac{f(\rho+\varepsilon)-f(\rho)}{\varepsilon} \geq -\kappa_0\rho^{a-1}$  for  $\rho > 0$ . We assume that the asymptotic property (1.5) holds. Then, for each  $0 < t < 1$ ,  $u(\cdot, t)$  is spherically symmetric around the origin, and  $\partial_{|x|}u(x, t) \geq 0$ .*

The assumption (in parabolic case) that close to every free boundary point we have AP property is somehow restrictive, and we believe the theorem should be true without this. The trouble point (which we could not deal with) is that if there are more points failing (1.5) after time  $T_1$ , then standard comparison/maximum principles are much harder to work out at such points, as their appears several possibilities, some of which we could handle but some of them resisted all our attempts, and would need some further tools, unknown to us at this stage.

We remark that when  $a \geq 0$  the above symmetry results easily follow from the standard moving plane technique, due to the monotonicity of the r.h.s.  $f(u) = u^a$  close to  $u = 0$ . We have thus left out this particular case, even though a similar machinery of moving plane would be needed, but the subtle technical approach in this paper is not needed anymore for this case.

1.3. **Notation.** For  $z^0 = (x^0, t^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , where  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $r > 0$ , we let

$$\begin{aligned} B_r(x^0) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x^0| < r\} : \text{Euclidean ball,} \\ Q_r(z^0) &= B_r(x^0) \times (t^0, t^0 + r^2] : \text{parabolic cylinder,} \\ \tilde{Q}_r(z^0) &= B_r(x^0) \times (t^0 - r^2, t^0 + r^2) : \text{full parabolic cylinder,} \\ \partial_p Q_r(z^0) &= \overline{Q_r(z^0)} \setminus Q_r(z^0) : \text{parabolic boundary.} \end{aligned}$$

For a general bounded open set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , its parabolic boundary  $\partial_p \Omega$  is defined as the set of all points  $z \in \partial\Omega$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  the interior of the parabolic cylinder  $Q_\varepsilon(z)$  contains at least one point in  $\Omega^c$ .

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

For  $0 \leq \tau < 1$  and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , we define

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_\tau = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 = \tau\} : \text{the hyperplane,} \\ x^\tau = (2\tau - x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n) : \text{the reflection of } x \text{ with respect to } \Pi_\tau, \\ \Sigma_\tau = \{x : x^\tau \in B_1, x_1 < \tau\} : \text{the reflection of the right side of } B_1, \\ u_\tau(x) = u(x^\tau) : \text{the reflection of } u \text{ with respect to } \Pi_\tau. \end{cases}$$

By Hessian property of  $F$  it is enough to prove symmetry only in  $x_1$ -direction. It further suffices to show that  $u_\tau \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$  for any  $0 < \tau < 1$ . The theorem will then follow from this.

Before proving  $u_\tau \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$ ,  $0 < \tau < 1$ , we observe that (by Hessian property)  $u_\tau$  satisfies the equation

$$(2.1) \quad F(D^2 u_\tau) = f(u_\tau) \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\tau \cap \{u_\tau > 0\},$$

and also the asymptotic property at every  $y \in \partial\{u_\tau > 0\}$

$$(2.2) \quad |u_\tau(x) - A_{y^\tau} \left( (x - y) \cdot \tilde{\nu}^{y^\tau} \right)_+^\beta| \leq C_0 |x - y|^{2+\delta_\beta}, \quad x \in B_{d_{y^\tau}}(y).$$

Here,  $\tilde{\nu}^{y^\tau}$  is the reflection of the unit normal  $\nu^{y^\tau}$  of  $u$  at  $y^\tau$  through the plane  $\{x_1 = 0\}$  (i.e., if  $\nu^{y^\tau} = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  then  $\tilde{\nu}^{y^\tau} = (-\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n)$ ). Notice that  $\tilde{\nu}^{y^\tau}$  is equal to the unit normal of  $u_\tau$  at  $y$  pointing into  $\{u_\tau > 0\}$ . Indeed, for (2.1), one can compute, using  $u_\tau(x) = u(x^\tau) = u(2\tau - x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $D^2 u_\tau(x) = R^T D^2 u(x^\tau) R$  for a diagonal matrix  $R$  with entries  $-1, 1, \dots, 1$ . Then

$$F(D^2 u_\tau(x)) = F(R^T D^2 u(x^\tau) R) = F(D^2 u(x^\tau)) = f(u(x^\tau)) = f(u_\tau(x)) \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\tau \cap \{u_\tau > 0\}.$$

To prove (2.2), we employ the asymptotic property of  $u$  at  $y^\tau \in \partial\{u > 0\}$  to deduce that for  $x \in B_{d_{y^\tau}}(y)$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| u_\tau(x) - A_{y^\tau} \left( (x - y) \cdot \tilde{\nu}^{y^\tau} \right)_+^\beta \right| &= \left| u(x^\tau) - A_{y^\tau} \left( (x^\tau - y^\tau) \cdot \nu^{y^\tau} \right)_+^\beta \right| \\ &\leq C_0 |x^\tau - y^\tau|^{2+\delta_\beta} = C_0 |x - y|^{2+\delta_\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2 u) \geq F(D^2 u) - F(0) = f(u) \geq 0$  near  $\partial B_1$ , we have by Hopf's Lemma (Proposition 2.6 in [8]) that

$$(2.3) \quad \partial_\nu u < 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_1,$$

for any unit vector  $\nu$  on  $\partial B_1$  pointing into  $B_1$ . Thus  $\partial_{x_1} u > 0$  in a small neighborhood of  $e_1 = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ . This gives that for any  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  close to 1,  $u_\tau > u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$ . Hence we can start our moving plane and we define  $\tau_0$  as the smallest value such that  $u_\tau \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$  for all  $\tau_0 < \tau < 1$ .

Towards a contradiction, we assume that  $\tau_0 > 0$ , and take sequences  $\varepsilon_i \searrow 0$ ,  $\tau_i = \tau_0 - \varepsilon_i > 0$  satisfying  $D_i := \{w_{\tau_i} < 0\} \cap \Sigma_{\tau_i} \neq \emptyset$ , where  $w_{\tau_i} := u_{\tau_i} - u$ . For such  $D_i$ , we define

$$D_0 := \{x^0 \in \overline{B_1} : x^{i_k} \rightarrow x^0 \text{ for some subsequence } x^{i_k} \in D_{i_k}\} \subset \overline{\Sigma_{\tau_0}}.$$

From  $D_i \neq \emptyset$ , we have  $D_0 \neq \emptyset$ . For  $w_{\tau_0} := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} w_{\tau_i} = u_{\tau_0} - u$ , we claim

$$w_{\tau_0} = |\nabla w_{\tau_0}| = 0 \quad \text{in } D_0.$$

Indeed, the fact that  $w_{\tau_i} < 0$  in  $D_i$  yields  $w_{\tau_0} \leq 0$  on  $D_0$ , while the definition of  $\tau_0$  implies  $w_{\tau_0} \geq 0$  in  $\overline{\Sigma_{\tau_0}} \supset D_0$ . Thus  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ . To see that  $\nabla w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ , let  $x^0 \in D_0$  and  $x^i \in D_i$  with  $x^i \rightarrow x^0$  over a subsequence. We also let  $e \in \partial B_1$  be an arbitrary direction. Since  $D_i$  is open, there is a line segment  $(z_1^i, z_2^i) \subset D_i$  such that  $z_1^i, z_2^i \in \partial D_i$ ,  $z_1^i = z_2^i + re$  for some  $r > 0$ , and  $x^i$  lies on  $(z_1^i, z_2^i)$ . Since  $w_{\tau_i} \geq 0$  on  $\partial \Sigma_{\tau_i}$ , we have  $w_{\tau_i} = 0$  on  $\partial D_i$ . In particular,  $w_{\tau_i}(z_1^i) = w_{\tau_i}(z_2^i) = 0$ . Combining this with the  $C^1$ -regularity of  $w_{\tau_i}$  in  $\overline{\Sigma_{\tau_i}}$ , we deduce that if  $z_3^i \in (z_1^i, z_2^i)$  is a local minimum point of  $w_{\tau_i}$  on  $(z_1^i, z_2^i)$  then  $\partial_e w_{\tau_i}(z_3^i) = 0$ . Over a subsequence  $[x^i, z_3^i]$  converges either to a point  $\{x^0\}$  or to a line segment  $[x^0, z^0] \subset D_0$ . In either case we have  $\partial_e w_{\tau_0}(x^0) = 0$ . Since  $e$  and  $x^0$  are arbitrary, we conclude that  $\nabla w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ .

Now, we decompose  $D_0$  into two parts

$$D_0 = (D_0 \cap \{u > 0\}) \cup (D_0 \cap \{u = 0\}),$$

and will prove that these sets are empty, contradicting that  $D_0 \neq \emptyset$ .

Claim A:  $D_0 \cap \{u > 0\} = \emptyset$ .

Claim A will follow once we show the following:

- (A1)  $D_0 \cap \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\} = \emptyset$ ,
- (A2)  $D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\} = \emptyset$ .

We first prove (A1). From (2.1) and (a) in (1.3), we can see that  $w_{\tau_0}$  satisfies in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$

$$(2.4) \quad P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 w_{\tau_0}) \leq F(D^2 u_{\tau_0}) - F(D^2 u) = f(u_{\tau_0}) - f(u) \leq \kappa_0 u^{a-1} w_{\tau_0}.$$

We also note that  $w_{\tau_0} \geq 0$  in  $\overline{\Sigma_{\tau_0}}$  and  $u^{a-1}$  is bounded in every compact subset of  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$ . By the strong minimum principle (Proposition 2.6 in [8]), for every connected component  $C$  of  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$ , either  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  in  $C$  or  $w_{\tau_0} > 0$  in  $C$ . We claim that

$$(2.5) \quad w_{\tau_0} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\},$$

which readily implies (A1). To this end, we assume to the contrary that for some component  $C$ ,  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  in  $C$ . Since  $C$  is an open set and  $\partial C \cap (\partial \Sigma_{\tau_0} \setminus \Pi_{\tau_0}) = \emptyset$ , we can take two points  $y, z$  with  $y \in \partial C \cap \Sigma_{\tau_0}$  and  $z \in C$  satisfying  $u(y) = u_{\tau_0}(y) = 0$ ,  $u(z) = u_{\tau_0}(z) > 0$  and  $z = y + re_1$  for some  $r > 0$ . Then the reflected points  $y^{\tau_0}, z^{\tau_0} \in B_1 \cap \{x_1 > \tau_0\}$  satisfy  $u(y^{\tau_0}) = 0$ ,  $u(z^{\tau_0}) > 0$  and  $y = z + re_1$ . This is a contradiction, since  $u$  is nondecreasing in  $x_1$ -direction in  $B_1 \cap \{x_1 > \tau_0\}$  by the definition of  $\tau_0$ ; we could also have used the fact that  $u_\tau \geq u$  for  $\tau = \frac{y_1^{\tau_0} + z_1^{\tau_0}}{2} > \tau_0$ .

To prove (A2), suppose there is a point  $x^0 \in D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$ . If  $x^0 \in \partial B_1$ , then  $\partial_{x_1} u(x^0) = -1/2 \partial_{x_1} w_{\tau_0}(x^0) = 0$ , which contradicts (2.3). Thus we may assume that  $x^0 \in B_1$ . Then we can take a small ball in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$  which touches  $\Pi_{\tau_0}$  at  $x^0$ .

From (2.5),  $w_{\tau_0}(x^0) = 0$  and  $w_{\tau_0} > 0$  in that ball. By using (2.4) and Hopf's lemma, we get

$$\partial_{x_1} w_{\tau_0}(x^0) < 0.$$

This is a contradiction since  $\nabla w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ , and the proof of *Claim A* is completed.

*Claim B:*  $D_0 \cap \{u = 0\} = \emptyset$ .

For each  $D_i = \{w_{\tau_i} < 0\} \cap \Sigma_{\tau_i}$  defined in the beginning of the proof, we take a minimum point  $x^i$  of  $w_{\tau_i}$  in  $D_i$  (or, equivalently, in  $\Sigma_{\tau_i}$ ), so that  $\nabla w_{\tau_i}(x^i) = 0$ . This is possible since  $w_{\tau_i} < 0$  in  $D_i$  and  $w_{\tau_i} \geq 0$  on  $\partial D_i$ . Then, over a subsequence  $x^i \rightarrow x^0 \in D_0$ . By the result of *Claim A*,  $x^0 \in D_0 \cap \{u = 0\}$ . Note that we have from  $w_{\tau_0} = u_{\tau_0} - u = M - u > 0$  on  $\partial \Sigma_{\tau_0} \setminus \Pi_{\tau_0}$  and  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$  that  $D_0 \subset \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cup \Pi_{\tau_0}$ . We then have the following three possibilities:

- (i)  $x^0 \in D_0 \cap \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u = 0\}$ .
- (ii)  $x^0 \in D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u = 0\}$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_0}$  is orthogonal to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $x^0$ .
- (iii)  $x^0 \in D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u = 0\}$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_0}$  is non-orthogonal<sup>2</sup> to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $x^0$ .

Before discussing the above three cases, we prove that  $x^0 \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap \partial\{u_{\tau_0} > 0\}$ .

Indeed, it follows from  $u(x^i) > u_{\tau_i}(x^i) \geq 0$  and  $u(x^0) = 0$  that  $x^0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ . In addition, from  $u > 0$  on  $\partial B_1$  we see  $D_0 \cap \{u = 0\} \subset \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cup (\Pi_{\tau_0} \setminus \partial B_1)$ . This implies  $x^i \in \Sigma_{\tau_0}$  for large  $i$ . Using  $u_{\tau_0} \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0}$ , we have  $u_{\tau_0}(x^i) \geq u(x^i) > 0$ . Combining those with  $u_{\tau_0}(x^0) = w_{\tau_0}(x^0) + u(x^0) = 0$  yields  $x^0 \in \partial\{u_{\tau_0} > 0\}$ .

We simultaneously consider the cases (i) and (ii), for they both follow from the application of the result in Appendix B. We claim that the asymptotic property gives

$$(2.6) \quad w_{\tau_0}(x) = O(|x - x^0|^{2+\delta_\beta}).$$

Indeed, (2.6) is trivial for the case (ii) due to its orthogonality assumption. For the case (i), we use the asymptotic expansions (1.4) of  $u$  at  $x^0$  and (2.2) of  $u_{\tau_0}$  at  $x^0$ , respectively, to have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &= A_{x^0} \left( (x - x^0) \cdot \nu^{x^0} \right)_+^\beta + O(|x - x^0|^{2+\delta_\beta}), \\ u_{\tau_0}(x) &= A_{(x^0)_{\tau_0}} \left( (x - x^0) \cdot \tilde{\nu}^{(x^0)_{\tau_0}} \right)_+^\beta + O(|x - x^0|^{2+\delta_\beta}). \end{aligned}$$

The fact that  $u_{\tau_0} \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0}$  and  $x^0 \in \Sigma_{\tau_0}$  implies  $u_{\tau_0} \geq u$  in a neighborhood of  $x^0$ , which yields  $\nu^{x^0} = \tilde{\nu}^{(x^0)_{\tau_0}}$ . This in turn implies, employing the equality  $A_y = [\beta(\beta - 1)F(\nu^y \otimes \nu^y)]^{-\beta/2}$ ,  $y \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ , in Appendix A, that  $A_{x^0} = A_{(x^0)_{\tau_0}}$ . Thus, (2.6) holds in Case (i) as well.

Next, we observe that for small  $r > 0$

$$P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 w_{\tau_0}) \leq f(u_{\tau_0}) - f(u) = u_{\tau_0}^a - u^a \leq 0 \quad \text{in } A_r := \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\} \cap B_r(x^0).$$

To use the result in Appendix B.1, let the  $n$ -dimensional cone  $K^\varepsilon$  and the function  $H^\varepsilon$  be as in Appendix B.1, with small  $\varepsilon > 0$  satisfying (B.2). Thanks to the  $C^{1,|\alpha|}$ -regularity of  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ , we can take possible rotations and translations on  $K^\varepsilon$  and  $H^\varepsilon$

<sup>2</sup>The reader may ask why this case is handled in our problem, despite it being ignored in most (if not all) other similar problems. This depends on the use of the maximum principle in small domains, that does not work (at least we do not know how) in our case due to the singularity in the r.h.s.

to obtain a cone  $K$  and a function  $H$  satisfying for small  $r > 0$

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & K \cap B_r(x^0) \subset A_r, \\ & P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2H) = 0 \quad \text{in } K \cap B_r(x^0), \quad H = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial K \cap B_r(x^0), \\ & H(x^j) \geq |x^j - x^0|^{2+\delta_\beta/2} \quad \text{for a sequence } x^j \in K \cap B_r(x^0) \text{ with } |x^j - x^0| \searrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $K \cap \partial B_r(x^0)$  is compactly supported in  $\{w_{\tau_0} > 0\}$ , the minimum of  $w_{\tau_0}$  on  $K \cap \partial B_r(x^0)$  is strictly positive. Thus we have for some constant  $c_* > 0$

$$c_*H \leq w_{\tau_0} \quad \text{on } K \cap \partial B_r(x^0).$$

This, together with the fact that  $c_*H = 0 \leq w_{\tau_0}$  on  $\partial K \cap B_r(x^0)$ , gives

$$w_{\tau_0} - c_*H \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial(K \cap B_r(x^0)).$$

Moreover,

$$P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2(w_{\tau_0} - c_*H)) \leq P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2w_{\tau_0}) - c_*P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2H) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } K \cap B_r(x^0).$$

Therefore, we have by the maximum principle  $w_{\tau_0} \geq c_*H$  in  $K \cap B_r(x^0)$ . This contradicts (2.6)–(2.7).

Now we consider case (iii). Let  $\nu^0 = (\nu_1^0, \dots, \nu_n^0)$  be the unit normal vector of  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $x^0$  pointing toward  $\{u > 0\}$ , i.e.,  $\nu^0 = \nu^{x^0}$ . Since the non-orthogonality assumption in (iii) gives  $\nu_1^0 \neq 0$  and the fact that  $w_{\tau_0} \geq 0$  in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0}$  implies  $\nu_1^0 \geq 0$ , we have  $\nu_1^0 > 0$ .

For each  $i$  we take a free boundary point  $y^i \in \partial\{u > 0\}$  closest to  $x^i$ . Then, for  $\rho_i := |x^i - y^i|$ ,  $\nu^i := \frac{x^i - y^i}{\rho_i}$  is the unit normal to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $y^i$ . Due to the  $C^1$ -smoothness of  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ ,  $\nu^i \rightarrow \nu^0$ , and thus  $\nu_1^i \geq \nu_1^0/2 > 0$  for large  $i$ . Similarly, for each  $i$  we take a point  $\bar{y}^i \in \partial\{u_{\tau_i} > 0\}$  closest to  $x^i$ . Then, for  $\bar{\rho}_i := |x^i - \bar{y}^i|$ ,  $\bar{\nu}^i := \frac{x^i - \bar{y}^i}{\bar{\rho}_i}$  is the unit normal to  $\partial\{u_{\tau_i} > 0\}$  at  $\bar{y}^i$ .  $\nu_1^0 > 0$  implies that the first components  $\nu_1^i, \bar{\nu}_1^i$  of  $\nu^i, \bar{\nu}^i$ , respectively, satisfy  $\nu_1^i < \tau_i < \bar{\nu}_1^i$ . This, combined with  $x^i \in \Sigma_{\tau_i} \subset \{x_1 < \tau_i\}$ , yields  $\bar{\rho}_i \geq \rho_i$  and  $\bar{\nu}_1^i \leq 0$ . Notice that  $x^i, y^i, \bar{y}^i$  and  $(\bar{y}^i)^{\tau_i}$  all converge to  $x^0$ .

We claim that  $\frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 2$  for large  $i$ . Otherwise,  $\frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} > 2$  over a subsequence. Using  $\rho_i = \text{dist}(x^i, \partial\{u > 0\})$  and applying asymptotic property (1.4) of  $u$  at  $y^i$  gives for large  $i$

$$u(x^i) \leq A_{x^i} \rho_i^\beta + C_0 \rho_i^{2+\delta_\beta} \leq \sqrt{3/2} A_{x^0} \rho_i^\beta + C_0 \rho_i^{2+\delta_\beta} \leq \sqrt{2} A_{x^0} \rho_i^\beta.$$

Similarly, using  $\bar{\rho}_i = \text{dist}(x^i, \partial\{u_{\tau_i} > 0\})$  and applying asymptotic property (2.2) of  $u_{\tau_i}$  at  $\bar{y}^i$ , we obtain for large  $i$

$$u_{\tau_i}(x^i) \geq A_{(\bar{y}^i)^{\tau_i}} \left( (x^i - \bar{y}^i) \cdot \bar{\nu}^{(\bar{y}^i)^{\tau_i}} \right)_+^\beta - C_0 |x^i - \bar{y}^i|^{2+\delta_\beta} = A_{(\bar{y}^i)^{\tau_i}} \bar{\rho}_i^\beta - C_0 \bar{\rho}_i^{2+\delta_\beta} \geq \frac{A_{x^0}}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\rho}_i^\beta.$$

Here, in the second step we have used the fact that  $\bar{\nu}^{(\bar{y}^i)^{\tau_i}}$  is the unit normal  $\bar{\nu}^i$  of  $u_{\tau_i}$  at  $\bar{y}^i$ . It follows that

$$w_{\tau_i}(x^i) = u_{\tau_i}(x^i) - u(x^i) \geq \frac{A_{x^0}}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\rho}_i^\beta - \sqrt{2} A_{x^0} \rho_i^\beta > 0,$$

which contradicts  $x^i \in D_i = \{w_{\tau_i} < 0\} \cap \Sigma_{\tau_i}$ .

Next, we consider the rescalings

$$q_i(x) := \frac{u(\rho_i x + y^i)}{\rho_i^\beta}, \quad \bar{q}_i(x) := \frac{u_{\tau_i}(\rho_i x + \bar{y}^i)}{\rho_i^\beta}.$$



Using the asymptotic property of  $u$  at  $y^i$  and  $u_{\tau_i}$  at  $\bar{y}^i$  again,

$$\begin{aligned} |q_i(x) - A_{y^i}(x \cdot \nu^i)_+^\beta| &\leq C_0 \rho_i^{2+\delta_\beta-\beta} |x|^{2+\delta_\beta}, \\ \left| \bar{q}_i(x) - A_{(\bar{y}^i)\tau_i} \left( \left( x + \frac{y^i - \bar{y}^i}{\rho_i} \right) \cdot \bar{\nu}^i \right)_+^\beta \right| &\leq C_0 \rho_i^{2+\delta_\beta-\beta} \left| x + \frac{y^i - \bar{y}^i}{\rho_i} \right|^{2+\delta_\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

For large  $i$  these estimates hold in  $B_{1/2}(v^i)$ , and thus in  $B_{1/4}(v^0)$  as well. From  $\frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 2$ , we see that

$$\frac{|y^i - \bar{y}^i|}{\rho_i} \leq \frac{|y^i - x^i| + |x^i - \bar{y}^i|}{\rho_i} = \frac{\rho_i + \bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 3.$$

Thus, over a subsequence,

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &\rightarrow q_0(x) := A_{x^0}(x \cdot \nu^0)_+^\beta \quad \text{uniformly in } B_{1/4}(v^0), \\ \bar{q}_i &\rightarrow \bar{q}_0(x) := A_{x^0}((x + z^0) \cdot \bar{\nu}^0)_+^\beta \quad \text{uniformly in } B_{1/4}(v^0), \end{aligned}$$

for some  $z^0 \in \overline{B_3}$  and  $\bar{\nu}^0 \in \partial B_1$ . Note that from  $\bar{\nu}_1^0 \leq 0$ ,  $\bar{\nu}_1^0 \leq 0$ .

In fact, we have the above convergence in the  $C^1$ -sense as well. For this purpose, we observe that by the asymptotic property, there exist constants  $c_1 > 0$  and  $C_1 > 0$ , independent of  $i$ , such that

$$c_1 \leq \frac{u}{\rho_i^\beta} \leq C_1, \quad c_1 \leq \frac{u_{\tau_i}}{\bar{\rho}_i^\beta} \leq C_1 \quad \text{in } B_{\rho_i/2}(x^i).$$

This is equivalent to

$$c_1 \leq q_i \leq C_1, \quad c_1 \leq \left( \frac{\rho_i}{\bar{\rho}_i} \right)^\beta \bar{q}_i \leq C_1 \quad \text{in } B_{1/2}(v^i).$$

From  $1 \leq \frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 2$ , it follows that  $q_i$  and  $\bar{q}_i$  are uniformly bounded below and above by positive constants (independent of  $i$ ) in  $B_{1/3}(v^0)$ . In addition, since  $F(D^2u) = u^\alpha$  in  $\{u > 0\}$  near the free boundary, we have  $F(D^2q_i) = q_i^\alpha$  and  $F(D^2\bar{q}_i) = \bar{q}_i^\alpha$  in  $B_{1/3}(v^0)$ . Thus, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\|q_i\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/4}(v^0))} \leq C(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \alpha) \left( \|q_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/3}(v^0))} + \|q_i^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/3}(v^0))} \right) \leq C,$$

and similarly,

$$\|\bar{q}_i\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/4}(v^0))} \leq C.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &\rightarrow q_0 \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(B_{1/4}(v^0)), \\ \bar{q}_i &\rightarrow \bar{q}_0 \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(B_{1/4}(v^0)). \end{aligned}$$

Now, to reach a contradiction (and complete the proof), we recall that  $\nabla w_{\tau_i}(x^i) = 0$ , which is equivalent to  $\nabla(q_i - \bar{q}_i)(v^i) = 0$ . By the  $C^1$ -convergence we have  $\nabla q_0(v^0) = \nabla \bar{q}_0(v^0)$ . Comparing their first components, we get (by using  $q_0(x) = A_0(x \cdot \nu^0)_+^\beta$  and  $\bar{q}_0(x) = A_0((x + z^0) \cdot \bar{\nu}^0)_+^\beta$ )

$$\nu_1^0 (v^0 \cdot \nu^0)_+^{\beta-1} = \bar{\nu}_1^0 ((v^0 + z^0) \cdot \bar{\nu}^0)_+^{\beta-1}.$$

Since  $\nu_1^0 > 0$  and  $\bar{\nu}_1^0 \leq 0$ , we see that the left-hand side of the equation is strictly positive, while the right-hand side is nonpositive. This is a contradiction.

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

In analogy with the elliptic case, we use the following notations in this proof: for  $0 \leq \tau < 1$  and  $z = (x, t) = (x_1, \dots, x_n, t)$ ,

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_\tau = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x_1 = \tau\} : \text{the hyperplane,} \\ z^\tau = (2\tau - x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n, t) : \text{the reflection of } z \text{ with respect to } \Pi_\tau, \\ \Sigma_\tau = \{z : z^\tau \in Q_1, x_1 < \tau\} : \text{the reflection of the right side of } Q_1, \\ u_\tau(z) = u(z^\tau) : \text{the reflection of } u \text{ with respect to } \Pi_\tau. \end{cases}$$

We observe that  $u_\tau$ ,  $0 < \tau < 1$ , satisfies the equation

$$(3.1) \quad F(D^2u_\tau) - \partial_t u_\tau = f(u_\tau) \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\tau \cap \{u_\tau > 0\},$$

and the asymptotic property at each  $z^0 = (x^0, t^0) \in \partial\{u_\tau > 0\}$  with  $t^0 > T_1$

$$(3.2) \quad \left| u_\tau(x, t) - A_{(z^0)^\tau} \left( (x - x^0) \cdot \tilde{\mu}^{(z^0)^\tau} \right)_+^\beta \right| \leq C_0 \left( |x - x^0| + \sqrt{|t - t^0|} \right)^{2+\delta_\beta}, \quad (x, t) \in \tilde{Q}_{d(z^0)^\tau}(z^0).$$

They follow from Hessian property of  $F$  and the asymptotic property (1.5) of  $u$  at  $(z^0)^\tau \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ , respectively, as in their elliptic counterparts (2.1) and (2.2).

We first prove the symmetry and monotonicity results in Theorem 2 for  $0 < t < T_1$ , where there is no free boundary points. As in the elliptic case, by Hessian property of  $F$ , it is enough to show that  $u_\tau \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$  for every  $0 < \tau < 1$ . To prove it by contradiction, we assume that the set  $D_\tau^T := \{u_\tau < u\} \cap \Sigma_\tau \cap \{0 < t < T\}$  is nonempty for some  $0 < \tau < 1$  and  $0 < T < T_1$ .

By using the additional assumption on  $f$  in Theorem 2, (3.1) and  $\inf_{B_1 \times [0, T]} u > 0$ ,  $w_\tau := u_\tau - u$  satisfies in  $D_\tau^T = \{w_\tau < 0\}$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2w_\tau) - \partial_t w_\tau &\leq (F(D^2u_\tau) - \partial_t u_\tau) - (F(D^2u) - \partial_t u) \\ &= f(u_\tau) - f(u) = -(f(u) - f(u_\tau)) \\ &\leq \kappa_0 u_\tau^{a-1} (u - u_\tau) \leq -\kappa_0 \left( \inf_{B_1 \times [0, T]} u \right)^{a-1} w_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (1.2) implies that  $w_\tau \geq 0$  on  $\partial_p \Sigma_\tau$ , thus  $w_\tau = 0$  on  $\partial_p D_\tau^T$ . For  $m := \kappa_0 \left( \inf_{B_1 \times [0, T]} u \right)^{a-1}$ , we define  $W_\tau(x, t) := e^{-m(t-t^0)} w_\tau(x, t)$ . Then

$$W_\tau = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial_p D_\tau^T, \quad W_\tau < 0 \quad \text{in } D_\tau^T,$$

and

$$P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2W_\tau) - \partial_t W_\tau = e^{-m(t-t^0)} \left( P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2w_\tau) - \partial_t w_\tau \right) + m e^{-m(t-t^0)} w_\tau \leq 0 \quad \text{in } D_\tau^T.$$

Note that in  $D_\tau^T$ ,  $W_\tau$  takes its minimum at an interior point  $z^0 = (x^0, t^0)$ , say. We then take  $r > 0$  so that the cylinder  $Q := B_r(x^0) \times (t^0 - r^2, t^0)$  is inside  $D_\tau^T$  and  $\partial_p Q$  touches  $\partial_p D_\tau^T$ . Then the minimum principle implies that  $W_\tau \equiv \inf_{D_\tau^T} W_\tau < 0$  in  $Q$ . This is a contradiction since  $W_\tau = 0$  on  $\partial_p D_\tau^T$ .

By continuity  $u(\cdot, T_1)$  is radial symmetric and  $\partial_{|x|} u(\cdot, T_1) \geq 0$  in  $B_1$ , which implies  $\{u(\cdot, T_1) = 0\}$  is either a one-point set  $\{0\}$  or a ball  $B_{r_0}$  for some  $0 < r_0 < 1$ . We want to show  $\{u(\cdot, T_1) = 0\} = \{0\}$ . For this aim, and towards a contradiction, assume  $\{u(\cdot, T_1) = 0\} = B_{r_0}$ . From  $(r_0 e_1, T_1) \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ , we can find a small constant  $0 < \rho \ll r_0$  such that  $u < \varepsilon_1$  in a cylinder  $B_{3\rho}(r_0 e_1) \times (T_1 - \rho^2, T_1]$ , where  $\varepsilon_1$  is as in (1.3). We consider a smaller cylinder  $A := B_\rho((r_0 - 2\rho)e_1) \times (T_1 - \rho^2, T_1]$  and let  $\tau := r_0 - \rho \in (0, 1)$ . Then  $w_\tau = u_\tau - u \geq 0$  in  $A \subset B_1 \times (0, T_1]$  and

$$P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2w_\tau) - \partial_t w_\tau \leq f(u_\tau) - f(u) = u_\tau^a - u^a \leq 0 \quad \text{in } A.$$

Since  $w_\tau((r_0 - 2\rho)e_1, T_1) = u(r_0e_1, T_1) - u((r_0 - 2\rho)e_1, T_1) = 0 - 0 = 0$  and  $((r_0 - 2\rho)e_1, T_1) \in A \setminus \partial_p A$ , the minimum principle gives  $w_\tau \equiv 0$  in  $A$ . However, using  $\{u(\cdot, T_1) = 0\} = B_{r_0}$ , we have  $w_\tau((r_0 - 3\rho)e_1, T_1) = u((r_0 + \rho)e_1, T_1) - u((r_0 - 3\rho)e_1, T_1) > 0$  for a point  $((r_0 - 3\rho)e_1, T_1) \in \bar{A}$ . This is a contradiction.

We now prove Theorem 2 for every  $0 < t < 1$ . As before, it suffices to show that  $u_\tau \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$  for each  $0 < \tau < 1$ . Since  $F(D^2u) - \partial_t u = f(u) \geq 0$  near  $\partial_p Q_1$ , we have by parabolic Hopf Lemma (Theorem 4.2 in [6]) that

$$(3.3) \quad \partial_\nu u < 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_1 \times (0, 1],$$

for any spatial unit vector  $\nu$  on  $\partial B_1 \times (0, 1]$  which points into  $Q_1$ . This implies that  $\partial_{x_1} u > 0$  in a neighborhood of  $\{e_1\} \times [T_1/2, 1]$ . Combining this with the monotonicity of  $u(\cdot, t)$  for  $t < T_1$  gives that for any  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  close to 1, we have  $u_\tau \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$ . Hence we can start our moving plane and we let  $\tau_0$  to be the smallest value such that  $u_\tau \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_\tau$  for all  $\tau_0 < \tau < 1$ .

Towards a contradiction, we assume  $\tau_0 > 0$ , and take sequences  $\varepsilon_i \searrow 0$  and  $\tau_i := \tau_0 - \varepsilon_i > 0$  such that  $D_i := \{w_{\tau_i} < 0\} \cap \Sigma_{\tau_i} \neq \emptyset$ , where  $w_{\tau_i} := u_{\tau_i} - u$ . For such  $D_i$ 's, we define

$$D_0 := \{z^0 \in \overline{Q_1} : z^i \rightarrow z^0 \text{ for some subsequence } z^i \in D_i\}.$$

Note that  $D_i \neq \emptyset$  implies  $D_0 \neq \emptyset$ . For  $w_{\tau_0} := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} w_{\tau_i} = u_{\tau_0} - u$ , we claim that

$$w_{\tau_0} = |\nabla w_{\tau_0}| = 0 \quad \text{in } D_0.$$

Indeed, from  $w_{\tau_i} < 0$  in  $D_i$  we have  $w_{\tau_0} \leq 0$  on  $D_0$ . Moreover, by the definition of  $\tau_0$ , we also have  $w_{\tau_0} \geq 0$  in  $\overline{\Sigma_{\tau_0}} \supset D_0$ , thus  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ . To see that  $\nabla w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ , let  $z^0 \in D_0$  and  $z^i \in D_i$  with  $z^i \rightarrow z^0$  over a subsequence. Fix a spatial unit vector  $e \in \partial B_1$ . Since each  $D_i$  is open relative to  $Q_1$ , there is a line segment  $(y_1^i, y_2^i) \subset D_i$  such that  $y_1^i, y_2^i \in \partial_p D_i$ ,  $y_1^i = y_2^i + se$  for some  $s > 0$ , and  $z^i$  lies on  $(y_1^i, y_2^i)$ . Since  $w_{\tau_i} \geq 0$  on  $\partial_p \Sigma_{\tau_i}$ , we have  $w_{\tau_i} = 0$  on  $\partial_p D_i$ . In particular,  $w_{\tau_i}(y_1^i) = w_{\tau_i}(y_2^i) = 0$ . Since  $w_{\tau_i}$  is at least pointwise  $C_x^1$  in  $\overline{\Sigma_{\tau_i}}$ , if  $y_3^i \in (y_1^i, y_2^i)$  is a local minimum point of  $w_{\tau_i}$  on  $(y_1^i, y_2^i)$ , then  $\partial_e w_{\tau_i}(y_3^i) = 0$ . Then, over a subsequence  $[z^i, y_3^i]$  converges either to a point  $\{z^0\}$  or to a line segment  $[z^0, y^0] \subset \overline{D_0}$ . In either case we have  $\partial_e w_{\tau_0}(z^0) = 0$ . Since  $e$  and  $z^0$  are arbitrary, we see that  $\nabla w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ .

We now decompose  $D_0$  into two parts

$$D_0 = (D_0 \cap \{u > 0\}) \cup (D_0 \cap \{u = 0\})$$

and will prove that these sets are empty, contradicting  $D_0 \neq \emptyset$ .

Claim A:  $D_0 \cap \{u > 0\} = \emptyset$ .

Note that *Claim A* follows once we show

$$(A1) \quad D_0 \cap \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\} = \emptyset,$$

$$(A2) \quad D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\} = \emptyset.$$

Since  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  in  $D_0$ , to prove (A1) it is enough to show that

$$(3.4) \quad w_{\tau_0} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}.$$

To this aim, we recall that  $u_{\tau_0} \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0}$  and observe that in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 w_{\tau_0}) - \partial_t w_{\tau_0} &\leq (F(D^2 u_{\tau_0}) - \partial_t u_{\tau_0}) - (F(D^2 u) - \partial_t u) \\ &= f(u_{\tau_0}) - f(u) \leq \kappa_0 u^{a-1} w_{\tau_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $C$  be a connected component of  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$ . Then, using (3.5) and the fact that  $u^{n-1}$  is bounded in every compact subset of  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$ , we can deduce by parabolic Hopf Lemma that  $w_{\tau_0}$  cannot attain its minimum in the interior of  $C$  unless it is a constant in  $C$ . In particular, we have either  $w_{\tau_0} \equiv 0$  in  $C$  or  $w_{\tau_0} > 0$  in  $C$ . To prove (3.4) by contradiction, we assume that  $w_{\tau_0} \equiv 0$  in some component  $C$ . From the fact that  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$  is relatively open in  $Q_1$  and  $w_{\tau_0} > 0$  on  $(\partial_p \Sigma_{\tau_0} \setminus \Pi_{\tau_0}) \cap Q_1$ , it follows that  $C$  is relatively open and  $\partial_p C \cap (\partial_p \Sigma_{\tau_0} \setminus \Pi_{\tau_0}) \cap Q_1 = \emptyset$ . This enables us to take two points  $y \in \partial_p C \cap \Sigma_{\tau_0}$  and  $z \in C$  such that  $u(y) = u_{\tau_0}(y) = 0$ ,  $u(z) = u_{\tau_0}(z) > 0$ , and  $z - y = (re_1, 0)$  for some  $r > 0$ . Then, the reflected points  $y^{\tau_0}, z^{\tau_0} \in Q_1 \cap \{x_1 > \tau_0\}$  satisfy that  $u(y^{\tau_0}) = 0$ ,  $u(z^{\tau_0}) > 0$ , and  $y^{\tau_0} - z^{\tau_0} = (re_1, 0)$ . This is a contradiction, since  $u$  is nondecreasing in  $x_1$ -direction in  $Q_1 \cap \{x_1 > \tau_0\}$  by the definition of  $\tau_0$ .

To prove (A2) by contradiction, we suppose that there exists a point  $z^0 = (x^0, t^0) \in D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$ . Note that  $t^0 \geq T_1$ . If  $x^0 \in \partial B_1$ , then  $\partial_{x_1} u(z^0) = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_1} w_{\tau_0}(z^0) = 0$ , which contradicts (3.3). Thus we may assume  $x^0 \in B_1$ . Then, we can find a small  $r > 0$  such that a cylinder  $B_r(x^0 - re_1) \times (t^0 - r^2, t^0)$  is contained in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\}$ . Notice that the cylinder touches  $\Pi_{\tau_0}$  on  $\{x^0\} \times (t^0 - r^2, t^0)$ . By taking smaller  $r$  if necessary, we may assume that  $u > c_0$  in the cylinder for some positive constant  $c_0 > 0$ . From (3.4) and (3.5), together with the fact that  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $\Pi_{\tau_0}$ , we have  $\partial_{x_1} w_{\tau_0}(z^0) < 0$  by Hopf Lemma. This contradicts that  $\nabla w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ , and completes the the proof of *Claim A*.

*Claim B:*  $D_0 \cap \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u = 0\} = \emptyset$ .

For each open set  $D_i = \{w_{\tau_i} < 0\} \cap \Sigma_{\tau_i}$  defined in the beginning of the proof, since  $w_{\tau_i} < 0$  in  $D_i$  and  $w_{\tau_i} \geq 0$  on  $\partial_p D_i$ , we can take a point  $z^i = (x^i, t^i) \in D_i$  such that  $\nabla w_{\tau_i}(z^i) = 0$ . Then, over a subsequence  $z^i \rightarrow z^0 = (x^0, t^0) \in D_0$ . From *Claim A*,  $z^0 \in D_0 \cap \{u = 0\}$ . Note that from  $w_{\tau_0} = u_{\tau_0} - u = M_t - u > 0$  on  $(\partial_p \Sigma_{\tau_0} \setminus \Pi_{\tau_0}) \cap Q_1$ , we have  $D_0 \subset \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cup \Pi_{\tau_0}$ . Let  $\nu^0 = (\nu_{x'}^0, \nu_t^0) = (\nu_1^0, \dots, \nu_n^0, \nu_t^0)$  be the normal vector to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $z^0$  pointing toward  $\{u > 0\}$ . We then have the following three possibilities:

- (i)  $z^0 \in D_0 \cap \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u = 0\}$ .
- (ii)  $z^0 \in D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u = 0\}$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_0}$  is orthogonal to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $z^0$  (i.e.,  $\nu_1^0 = 0$ ,  $\nu_x^0 \neq 0$ ).
- (iii)  $z^0 \in D_0 \cap \Pi_{\tau_0} \cap \{u = 0\}$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_0}$  is non-orthogonal to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $z^0$  (i.e.,  $\nu_1^0 \neq 0$ ).

Before discussing the above three cases, we prove that  $z^0 \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap \partial\{u_{\tau_0} > 0\}$  and  $t^0 > T_1$ .

Indeed, we easily have  $z^0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$  due to  $u(z^i) > u_{\tau_i}(z^i) > 0$  and  $u(z^0) = 0$ . Moreover, it follows from  $u > 0$  on  $\partial_p Q_1$  that  $D_0 \cap \{u = 0\} \subset \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cup (\Pi_{\tau_0} \setminus \partial_p Q_1)$ , which implies  $z^i \in \Sigma_{\tau_0}$  for large  $i$ . Using  $u_{\tau_0} \geq u$  in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0}$  we also have  $u_{\tau_0}(z^i) \geq u(z^i) > 0$ . Those combined with  $u_{\tau_0}(z^0) = w_{\tau_0}(z^0) + u(z^0) = 0$  yield  $z^0 \in \partial\{u_{\tau_0} > 0\}$ . It remains to prove  $t^0 > T_1$ . Otherwise, we have  $t^0 = T_1$ , since  $z^0$  is a free boundary point. Recalling  $\{u(\cdot, T_1) = 0\} = \{0\}$ , we see that  $z^0 = (0, T_1)$ . From  $\tau_0 > 0$ , we obtain  $w_{\tau_0}(z^0) = u((z^0)^{\tau_0}) - u(z^0) > 0$ , which contradicts  $w_{\tau_0} = 0$  on  $D_0$ , as desired.

We deal with the cases (i) and (ii) at the same time, as they both follow from the application of the result in Appendix B. As in the elliptic problem, the (parabolic) asymptotic properties (1.5) and (3.2) give

$$(3.6) \quad w_{\tau_0}(x, t) = O\left(\left(|x - x^0| + \sqrt{|t - t^0|}\right)^{2+\delta_\beta}\right).$$

For small  $r > 0$ ,

$$P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 w_{\tau_0}) - \partial_t w_{\tau_0} \leq f(u_{\tau_0}) - f(u) = u_{\tau_0}^a - u^a \leq 0 \quad \text{in } A_r := \Sigma_{\tau_0} \cap \{u > 0\} \cap \tilde{Q}_r(z^0).$$

Let  $(n+1)$ -dimensional domain  $\Omega^\varepsilon$  and the function  $H^\varepsilon$  be as in Appendix B.2, with small  $\varepsilon > 0$  satisfying (B.5). Due to the  $C_x^{1, |a|} \cap C_t^{1/2 + |a|/2}$ -regularity of  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ , we can take possible rotations and translations on  $\Omega^\varepsilon$  and  $H^\varepsilon$  to get a domain  $\Omega$  and a function  $H$  as well as a sequence  $z^j \in \Omega \cap \tilde{Q}_r(z^0)$  with  $z^j \rightarrow z^0$  such that for small  $r > 0$

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} \Omega \cap \tilde{Q}_r(z^0) \subset A_r, \\ P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 H) - \partial_t H = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap \tilde{Q}_r(z^0), \quad H = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial_p \Omega \cap \tilde{Q}_r(z^0), \\ H(z^j) \geq |x_1^j - x_1^0|^{2+\sigma}, \quad w_{\tau_0}(x^j) \leq C|x_1^j - x_1^0|^{2+\delta_\beta}. \end{cases}$$

Here, the last inequality containing  $w_{\tau_0}$  follows by using (3.6). Since  $H \leq \|h\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$  on  $\partial_p \Omega$  and  $w_{\tau_0} > 0$  on  $\partial_p \Omega \setminus \{H = 0\}$ , we have for some constant  $C^* > 0$

$$H \leq C^* w_{\tau_0} \quad \text{on } \partial_p \Omega,$$

and obtain, by applying the comparison principle,

$$H \leq C^* w_{\tau_0} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

By taking  $\sigma \in (0, \delta_\beta)$ , this contradicts (3.7).

We now consider the case (iii). The assumption  $v_1^0 \neq 0$  in (iii) and the fact that  $u_{\tau_0} \geq 0$  in  $\Sigma_{\tau_0}$  imply  $v_1^0 > 0$ .

Since the normal vector  $v^0$  at  $z^0$  is not parallel to the time axis  $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$ ,  $\partial\{u > 0\} \cap \{t = t^0\}$  and  $\partial\{u > 0\} \cap \{t = t^i\}$  are  $(n-1)$ -dimensional surfaces on  $B_1 \times \{t^0\}$  and  $B_1 \times \{t^i\}$ , respectively, for large  $i$ . For such  $i$  we take a point  $y^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  so that  $z_f^i := (y^i, t^i) \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap \{t = t^i\}$  is closest to  $z^i = (x^i, t^i)$ . In analogy to notations  $v^0$  and  $\mu^0$ , we let  $v^i = (v_x^i, v_t^i) = (v_1^i, \dots, v_n^i, v_t^i)$  be the unit normal to  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  at  $z_f^i$  pointing toward  $\{u > 0\}$ , and denote  $\mu^i := \frac{v_x^i}{|v_x^i|}$ . Then,  $\mu^i = \frac{x^i - y^i}{\rho_i}$  for  $\rho_i := |x^i - y^i|$ . Due to the  $C^1$ -smoothness of  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  near  $z^0$ ,  $v^i \rightarrow v^0$  and  $\mu^i \rightarrow \mu^0$ . In particular,  $v_1^i \geq v_1^0/2 > 0$  for large  $i$ . Next, we take a point  $\bar{y}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  so that  $\bar{z}_f^i := (\bar{y}^i, t^i) \in \partial\{u_{\tau_i} > 0\} \cap \{t = t^i\}$  is closest to  $z^i = (x^i, t^i)$ . As before, let  $\bar{v}^i = (\bar{v}_x^i, \bar{v}_t^i) = (\bar{v}_1^i, \dots, \bar{v}_n^i, \bar{v}_t^i)$  be the unit normal to  $\partial\{u_{\tau_i} > 0\}$  at  $\bar{z}_f^i$  pointing toward  $\{u_{\tau_i} > 0\}$ , and denote  $\bar{\mu}^i := \frac{\bar{v}_x^i}{|\bar{v}_x^i|}$ , so that  $\bar{\mu}^i = \frac{x^i - \bar{y}^i}{\bar{\rho}_i}$  for  $\bar{\rho}_i := |x^i - \bar{y}^i|$ . Since  $\bar{z}_f^i \rightarrow z^0 \in \partial\{u_{\tau_0} > 0\}$ , we have  $\bar{v}^i \rightarrow \bar{v}^0$ , where  $\bar{v}^0 := (\bar{v}_x^0, \bar{v}_t^0) = (-v_1^0, v_2^0, \dots, v_n^0, v_t^0)$  and  $\bar{\mu}^i \rightarrow \bar{\mu}^0 := \frac{\bar{v}_x^0}{|\bar{v}_x^0|}$ . That is,  $\bar{\mu}^0$  is the reflection of  $\mu^0$  with respect to  $\{x_1 = 0\}$ . Notice that  $\rho_i \leq \bar{\rho}_i$ ,  $v^i \leq \bar{v}^i$ , and that  $z^i, z_f^i, \bar{z}_f^i, (\bar{z}_f^i)^{\tau_i}$  all converge to  $z^0$ .

We claim that  $\frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 2$  for large  $i$ . Otherwise, we have that over a subsequence  $\frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} > 2$ . Applying the asymptotic property of  $u$  at  $z_f^i$  and  $u_{\tau_i}$  at  $\bar{z}_f^i$ , respectively, we obtain for large  $i$

$$\begin{aligned} u(z^i) &\leq A_{z_f^i}((x^i - y^i) \cdot \mu^i)_+^\beta + C_0|x^i - y^i|^{2+\delta_\beta} = A_{z_f^i}\rho_i^\beta + C_0\rho_i^{2+\delta_\beta} \leq \sqrt{2}A_{z^0}\rho_i^\beta, \\ u_{\tau_i}(z^i) &\geq A_{(\bar{z}_f^i)^{\tau_i}}((x^i - \bar{y}^i) \cdot \bar{\mu}^i)_+^\beta - C_0|x^i - \bar{y}^i|^{2+\delta_\beta} = A_{z_f^i}\bar{\rho}_i^\beta - C_0\bar{\rho}_i^{2+\delta_\beta} \geq \frac{A_{z^0}}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{\rho}_i^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain

$$w_{\tau_i}(z^i) = u_{\tau_i}(z^i) - u(z^i) \geq \sqrt{2}A_{z^0}\rho_i^\beta \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \right)^\beta - 1 \right) > 0,$$

which contradicts that  $z^i \in D_i = \{w_{\tau_i} < 0\} \cap \Sigma_{\tau_i}$ .

Next, we consider the homogeneous rescalings

$$q_i(x, t) := \frac{u(\rho_i x + y^i, \rho_i^2 t + t^i)}{\rho_i^\beta}, \quad \bar{q}_i(x, t) := \frac{u_{\tau_i}(\rho_i x + y^i, \rho_i^2 t + t^i)}{\rho_i^\beta}.$$

Again, we use the asymptotic property of  $u$  at  $z_f^i$  and  $u_{\tau_i}$  at  $\bar{z}_f^i$ , respectively, to get

$$\begin{aligned} |q_i(x, t) - A_{z_f^i}(x \cdot \mu^i)_+^\beta| &\leq C_0 \rho_i^{2+\beta_\beta-\beta} (|x| + |t|^{1/2})^{2+\delta_\beta}, \\ \left| \bar{q}_i(x, t) - A_{(\bar{z}_f^i)^{\tau_i}} \left( \left( x + \frac{y^i - \bar{y}^i}{\rho_i} \right) \cdot \bar{\mu}^i \right)_+^\beta \right| &\leq C_0 \rho_i^{2+\delta_\beta-\beta} \left( \left| x + \frac{y^i - \bar{y}^i}{\rho_i} \right| + |t|^{1/2} \right)^{2+\delta_\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

For large  $i$ , these estimates hold in  $\tilde{Q}_{1/2}(\mu^i, 0)$ , and thus in  $\tilde{Q}_{1/4}(\mu^0, 0)$  as well. From  $\frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 2$ , we see that

$$\frac{|y^i - \bar{y}^i|}{\rho_i} \leq \frac{|y^i - x^i| + |x^i - \bar{y}^i|}{\rho_i} = \frac{\rho_i + \bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 3.$$

Thus, over a subsequence,

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &\rightarrow q_0(x, t) := A_{z^0}(x \cdot \mu^0)_+^\beta \quad \text{uniformly in } B_{1/4}(\mu^0, 0), \\ \bar{q}_i &\rightarrow \bar{q}_0(x, t) := A_{z^0}((x + \eta^0) \cdot \bar{\mu}^0)_+^\beta \quad \text{uniformly in } B_{1/4}(\mu^0, 0) \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\eta^0 \in \overline{B_3}$ .

In fact, we have the above convergence in the  $C^1$ -sense as well. For this purpose, we observe that by the asymptotic property, there exist constants  $C_1 > c_1 > 0$ , independent of  $i$ , such that

$$c_1 \leq \frac{u}{\rho_i^\beta} \leq C_1, \quad c_1 \leq \frac{u_{\tau_i}}{\bar{\rho}_i^\beta} \leq C_1 \quad \text{in } \tilde{Q}_{\rho_i/2}(z^i).$$

This is equivalent to

$$c_1 \leq q_i \leq C_1, \quad c_1 \leq \left( \frac{\rho_i}{\bar{\rho}_i} \right)^\beta \bar{q}_i \leq C_1 \quad \text{in } \tilde{Q}_{1/2}(\mu^i, 0).$$

From  $1 \leq \frac{\bar{\rho}_i}{\rho_i} \leq 2$ , it follows that  $q_i$  and  $\bar{q}_i$  are uniformly bounded above and below by positive constants, independent of  $i$ , in  $\tilde{Q}_{1/3}(\mu^0, 0)$ . In addition, since  $F(D^2 u) - \partial_t u = u^a$  in  $\{u > 0\}$  near the free boundary, we have  $F(D^2 q_i) - \partial_t q_i = q_i^a$  and  $F(D^2 \bar{q}_i) - \partial_t \bar{q}_i = \bar{q}_i^a$  in  $\tilde{Q}_{1/3}(\mu^0, 0)$ . Thus, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\|q_i\|_{C_x^{1,\alpha}(\tilde{Q}_{1/4}(\mu^0, 0))} \leq C(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \alpha) \left( \|q_i\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q}_{1/3}(\mu^0, 0))} + \|q_i^a\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q}_{1/3}(\mu^0, 0))} \right) \leq C,$$

and similarly,

$$\|\bar{q}_i\|_{C_x^{1,\alpha}(\tilde{Q}_{1/4}(\mu^0, 0))} \leq C.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &\rightarrow q_0 \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\tilde{Q}_{1/4}(\mu^0, 0)), \\ \bar{q}_i &\rightarrow \bar{q}_0 \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\tilde{Q}_{1/4}(\mu^0, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

To reach a contradiction, we recall that  $\nabla w_{\tau_i}(z^i) = 0$ , which implies  $\nabla(q_i - \bar{q}_i)(\mu^i, 0) = 0$ . By the  $C^1$ -convergence we have  $\nabla q_0(\mu^0, 0) = \nabla \bar{q}_0(\mu^0, 0)$ . Comparing their first components, we get

$$\mu_1^0(\mu^0 \cdot \mu^0)_+^{\beta-1} = -\mu_1^0((\mu^0 + \eta^0) \cdot \bar{\mu}^0)_+^{\beta-1},$$

where  $\mu_1^0$  is the first component of  $\mu^0$ . From  $\nu_1^0 > 0$ , we have  $\mu_1^0 > 0$ , thus the left-hand side of the equation is strictly positive, while the right-hand side is nonpositive. This is a contradiction.

#### APPENDIX A. PROPERTIES OF $A_{x^0}$ AND $A_{z^0}$

In this section we discuss values and properties of  $A_{x^0} > 0$  and  $A_{z^0} > 0$ , when  $q_{x^0}(x) = A_{x^0}(x \cdot \nu^{x^0})_+^\beta$  and  $q_{z^0}(x, t) = A_{z^0}(x \cdot \mu^{z^0})_+^\beta$  are solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} F(D^2 q_{x^0}) &= q_{x^0}^a \quad \text{in } B_1, \\ F(D^2 q_{z^0}) - \partial_t q_{z^0} &= q_{z^0}^a \quad \text{in } \tilde{Q}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\nu^{x^0}$  and  $\mu^{z^0}$  are unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . To get  $A_{x^0}$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} F(D^2 q_{x^0}) &= A_{x^0} \beta(\beta - 1)(x \cdot \nu^{x^0})_+^{\beta-2} F(\nu^{x^0} \otimes \nu^{x^0}), \\ q_{x^0}^a &= A_{x^0}^a (x \cdot \nu^{x^0})_+^{\beta a} = A_{x^0}^a (x \cdot \nu^{x^0})_+^{\beta-2}. \end{aligned}$$

They readily give

$$A_{x^0} = [\beta(\beta - 1)F(\nu^{x^0} \otimes \nu^{x^0})]^{-\beta/2}.$$

For its bounds, we observe that  $\nu^{x^0} \otimes \nu^{x^0}$  has the eigenvalues  $1, 0, \dots, 0$ , which implies  $\lambda \leq F(\nu^{x^0} \otimes \nu^{x^0}) \leq \Lambda$ . Thus, we obtain the uniform lower and upper bounds on  $A_{x^0}$

$$[\beta(\beta - 1)\Lambda]^{-\beta/2} \leq A_{x^0} \leq [\beta(\beta - 1)\lambda]^{-\beta/2}.$$

Since  $q_{z^0}$  is time independent, it also satisfies  $F(D^2 q_{z^0}) = q_{z^0}^a$ . Thus, repeating the above process with  $q_{z^0}$  will yield

$$A_{z^0} = [\beta(\beta - 1)F(\mu^{z^0} \otimes \mu^{z^0})]^{-\beta/2}$$

and

$$[\beta(\beta - 1)\Lambda]^{-\beta/2} \leq A_{z^0} \leq [\beta(\beta - 1)\lambda]^{-\beta/2}.$$

Finally, if  $\nu, \mu \in \partial B_1$  with  $F(\nu \otimes \nu) \geq F(\mu \otimes \mu)$ , then for the eigenvalues  $e_i$ 's of  $\nu \otimes \nu - \mu \otimes \mu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\nu \otimes \nu) - F(\mu \otimes \mu) &\leq P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(\nu \otimes \nu - \mu \otimes \mu) \leq \Lambda \Sigma |e_i| \\ &\leq n\Lambda \|\nu \otimes \nu - \mu \otimes \mu\| \leq C(n, \Lambda) \|\nu - \mu\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\nu \mapsto A_\nu$  is continuous.

#### APPENDIX B. A NON-STANDARD COMPARISON PRINCIPLE

For small  $\sigma > 0$ , we construct<sup>3</sup> in Appendix B.1 an  $n$ -dimensional Lipschitz cone  $K$ , centered at the origin and contained in  $\{x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0\}$ , and a function  $H : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the following: for  $1 \leq \Lambda/\lambda \leq \eta_0$  with  $\eta_0 > 1$  depending only on  $\sigma$ ,

$$\begin{cases} -P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 H) = 0, & H \geq 0 \text{ in } K, \quad H = 0 \text{ on } \partial K, \\ -H \text{ does not decay faster than } |x|^{2+\sigma} \text{ near the center of } K, \text{ see (B.2).} \end{cases}$$

We prove its parabolic counterpart in Appendix B.2, see (B.5).

<sup>3</sup>After finalizing this paper we found out that a different (but similar in nature) construction for elliptic case has been done by Silvestre-Sirakov [18], that hinges on an earlier result by Armstrong-Sirakov-Smart [4], where an higher dimensional homogeneous solution in cones are constructed.

**B.1. Elliptic Case.** We fix a small constant  $\sigma_0 \in (0, \sigma)$ , and consider a function  $\tilde{h}$ , defined in a 2-dimensional cone  $\mathcal{C}$ , such that

$$\begin{cases} - \mathcal{C} \subset \{x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ with opening } \pi/2 - \mu, \\ - \tilde{h} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is a positive solution to } P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 \tilde{h}) = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{C} \text{ and } \tilde{h} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{C}, \\ - \tilde{h} \text{ is homogeneous of degree } 2 + \sigma_0. \end{cases}$$

For  $1 \leq \Lambda/\lambda \leq \eta_0 = \eta_0(\sigma_0)$  and small  $\mu > 0$ , this follows from [17]. Indeed, thanks to Theorem 2.4 in [17] we can find a nonnegative  $\alpha$ -homogeneous solution  $\tilde{h}$  of  $P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 \tilde{h}) = 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  with zero boundary value. Here, the homogeneity  $\alpha$  is determined from the equation

$$g_\eta(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(\pi/2 - \mu),$$

where

$$g_\eta(\alpha) = \arctan \sqrt{\eta} + \frac{2 - \alpha}{\sqrt{(\alpha - 1 + 1/\eta)(\alpha - 1 + \eta)}} \arctan \sqrt{\frac{\eta(\alpha - 1 + 1/\eta)}{\alpha - 1 + \eta}}, \quad \eta = \Lambda/\lambda.$$

We can see that  $\alpha$  is completely determined by the opening of the cone,  $\pi/2 - \mu$ , and the value  $\eta = \Lambda/\lambda$ . To see if we can make  $\alpha = 2 + \sigma_0$ , we first take  $\eta = 1$  and compute  $g_1(\alpha) = \frac{\pi}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \right)$ . Solving  $\frac{\pi}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \right) = \frac{1}{2}(\pi/2 - \mu)$  gives  $\alpha = 2 + \frac{2\mu}{\pi - 2\mu}$ , thus  $\alpha = 2 + \sigma_0$  holds for small  $\mu > 0$  (specifically,  $\mu = \frac{\sigma_0 \pi}{2(\sigma_0 + 1)}$ ). This computation implies that for  $\eta = \Lambda/\lambda$  larger than 1, say  $1 < \eta < \eta_0 = \eta_0(\sigma_0)$ , we can still find small  $\mu > 0$  to have  $\alpha = 2 + \sigma_0$ .

Next, by possibly multiplying a constant on  $\tilde{h}$ , we assume  $|x|^{2+\sigma} < \tilde{h}/2$  on the line  $\{0 < x_1 = x_2 < 1\}$ . We then extend  $\tilde{h}$  from  $\mathcal{C}$  to the cylindrical cone  $\mathcal{C} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  by defining

$$h(x_1, x_2, x'') := \tilde{h}(x_1, x_2), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{C}, \quad x'' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}.$$

For small  $\varepsilon > 0$  we define  $n$ -dimensional cones

$$K^\varepsilon := \{h > 0\} \cap \{x_1 + x_2 > \varepsilon|x''|\}, \quad K^0 = \{h > 0\},$$

and observe that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} K^\varepsilon = K^0$ .

Let now  $H^\varepsilon$  be a solution of

$$\begin{cases} - P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 H^\varepsilon) = 0 \text{ in } K^\varepsilon \cap B_1, \\ - H^\varepsilon = h \text{ on } K^\varepsilon \cap \partial B_1, \\ - H^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ on } \partial K^\varepsilon \cap B_1. \end{cases}$$

By applying the comparison principle,  $H^\varepsilon \leq h$  in  $K^\varepsilon \cap B_1$ , and moreover

$$(B.1) \quad H^\varepsilon \rightarrow h \text{ in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(K^0 \cap B_1), \quad \text{and} \quad H^\varepsilon \nearrow h \text{ pointwise in } K^0 \cap B_1.$$

We claim now that for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough there is a sequence  $x^j \in L_{r_j} := \{x_1 = x_2 > 0, x'' = 0\} \cap \overline{B_{r_j}}$ , where  $r_j := |x^j| \searrow 0$  and such that

$$(B.2) \quad H^\varepsilon(x^j) \geq |x^j|^{2+\sigma}.$$

To prove claim (B.2) we argue by contradiction. If (B.2) is not true, then using (B.1) we can find sequences  $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$  and  $x^j \in L_{r_j}$  with  $r_j = |x^j| \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$H^{\varepsilon_j}(x^j) = |x^j|^{2+\sigma}, \quad \text{and} \quad H^{\varepsilon_j}(x) < |x|^{2+\sigma} \quad \forall x \in L_{r_j}.$$

Consider

$$\tilde{H}_j(x) := \frac{H^{\varepsilon_j}(r_j x)}{(r_j)^{2+\sigma}},$$



which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 \tilde{H}_j) = 0 & \text{in } K^{\varepsilon_j} \cap B_{1/r_j}, \\ -\tilde{H}_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial K^{\varepsilon_j} \cap B_{1/r_j}. \end{cases}$$

Set  $y^0 := \frac{x^j}{r_j} \in L_1 \cap \partial B_1$  (note that  $L_1 \cap \partial B_1$  is a singleton). Then by construction, we have

$$\tilde{H}_j(y^0) = |y^0|^{2+\sigma} = 1, \quad \tilde{H}_j(x) \leq |x|^{2+\sigma} \quad \text{for } x \in L_1.$$

This, combined with Harnack inequality, implies that in every compact subset of  $K^0$ ,  $\tilde{H}_j$  is uniformly bounded in  $j$ . Thus,  $\tilde{H}_j \rightarrow \tilde{H}_0$  in  $K^0$ , where  $\tilde{H}_0$  solves the same PDE as above, and satisfies

$$(B.3) \quad \tilde{H}_0(y^0) = 1, \quad \tilde{H}_0(x) \leq |x|^{2+\sigma} \quad \text{for } x \in L_1.$$

Applying Boundary Harnack Principle to  $\tilde{H}_0$  and  $h$  in  $K^0 \cap B_1$  implies

$$ch \leq \tilde{H}_0 \quad \text{in } K^0 \cap B_{1/2}.$$

This in combination with (B.3) implies

$$c|x|^{2+\sigma_0} \approx ch \leq \tilde{H}_0 \leq |x|^{2+\sigma}, \quad x \in L_{1/2},$$

which is a contradiction, since  $\sigma > \sigma_0$ .

**B.2. Parabolic case.** Let the function  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $n$ -dimensional cone  $K^\varepsilon = \{h > 0\} \cap \{x_1 + x_2 > \varepsilon|x''|\}$  be as in the elliptic case. For a spatial unit vector  $\nu_x^0 \in \partial B_1$ , we define  $(n+1)$ -dimensional domain

$$\Omega^\varepsilon := \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : -1 < t < 1, x \in (K^\varepsilon \cap B_1) + \varepsilon|t|^{1/2}\nu_x^0\}.$$

Note that every time-slice of  $\Omega^\varepsilon$  is a truncated cone of shape  $K^\varepsilon \cap B_1$  with vertex  $\varepsilon|t|^{1/2}\nu_x^0$ . We can observe that as  $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ ,  $K^\varepsilon$  and  $\Omega^\varepsilon$  converge to  $n$ -dimensional cylinder  $K^0 = \{h > 0\}$  and  $(n+1)$ -dimensional cylinder  $\Omega^0 := (K^0 \cap B_1) \times (-1, 1)$ , respectively.

Let  $H^\varepsilon$  be a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 H^\varepsilon) - \partial_t H^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \\ -\text{For } -1 < t < 1, H^\varepsilon(\cdot, t) = h(\cdot - \varepsilon|t|^{1/2}\nu_x^0) & \text{on } \partial(K^\varepsilon \cap B_1) + \varepsilon|t|^{1/2}\nu_x^0, \\ -\text{For } t = -1, H^\varepsilon(\cdot, -1) = h(\cdot - \varepsilon\nu_x^0) & \text{on } (K^\varepsilon \cap B_1) + \varepsilon\nu_x^0. \end{cases}$$

The Maximum Principle yields  $H^\varepsilon \leq \|h\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$  in  $\Omega^\varepsilon$ , thus for some function  $H^0$  we have over a subsequence

$$(B.4) \quad H^\varepsilon \rightarrow H^0 \text{ in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega^0), \quad \text{and } H^\varepsilon \rightarrow H^0 \text{ pointwise in } \Omega^0.$$

The fact that  $\Omega^0$  is a cylinder gives

$$\begin{cases} P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 H^0) - \partial_t H^0 = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^0, \\ H^0 = h & \text{on } \partial_p \Omega^0, \end{cases}$$

thus we have by the uniqueness  $H^0 = h$  in  $\Omega^0$ .

We now claim that for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough there exists a sequence  $z^j = (x^j, t^j) = (x_1^j, \dots, x_n^j, t^j) \in A_{r_j} := \{(a, a, 0, \dots, 0, a^2) : 0 < a < r_j\}$ , where  $r_j \searrow 0$ , and such that

$$(B.5) \quad H^\varepsilon(z^j) \geq (x_1^j)^{2+\sigma}.$$

To prove (B.5) we argue by contradiction. If (B.5) is not true, then, using (B.4) we can find sequences  $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$  and  $z^j \in A_{r_j}$  with  $r_j = |x_1^j| \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$H^{\varepsilon_j}(z^j) = (x_1^j)^{2+\sigma}, \quad \text{and } H^{\varepsilon_j}(z) < (x_1)^{2+\sigma} \text{ for all } z \in A_{r_j}.$$

Consider

$$\tilde{H}_j(x, t) := \frac{H^{\varepsilon_j}(r_j x, r_j^2 t)}{r_j^{2+\sigma}},$$

which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 \tilde{H}_j) - \partial_t \tilde{H}_j = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}^j, \\ \text{For } |t| < 1/r_j^2, \tilde{H}_j(\cdot, t) = 0 & \text{on } (\partial K^{\varepsilon_j} \cap B_{1/r_j}) + \varepsilon_j |t|^{1/2} \nu_x^0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Omega}^j := \left\{ (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : -\frac{1}{r_j^2} < t < \frac{1}{r_j^2}, x \in (K^{\varepsilon_j} \cap B_{1/r_j}) + \varepsilon_j |t|^{1/2} \nu_x^0 \right\}.$$

Set  $y^0 := (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . By construction

$$\tilde{H}_j(y^0) = 1, \quad \tilde{H}_j(z) < (x_1)^{2+\sigma} \text{ for } z \in A_1.$$

By parabolic Harnack inequality, in every compact subset of  $(K^0 \cap B_{1/2}) \times (-1/2, 1/2)$ ,  $\tilde{H}^j$  is uniformly bounded in  $j$ . Thus, over a subsequence  $\tilde{H}^j \rightarrow \tilde{H}^0$  in  $(K^0 \cap B_{1/2}) \times (-1/2, 1/2)$ , where  $\tilde{H}^0$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} P_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 \tilde{H}^0) - \partial_t \tilde{H}^0 = 0 & \text{in } (K^0 \cap B_{1/2}) \times (-1/2, 1/2), \\ \tilde{H}^0 = 0 & \text{on } (\partial K^0 \cap B_{1/2}) \times (-1/2, 1/2), \\ \tilde{H}^0(z) \leq (x_1)^{2+\sigma} & \text{for } z \in A_{1/4}. \end{cases}$$

Applying parabolic Boundary Harnack Principle to  $\tilde{H}^0$  and  $h$  in  $(K^0 \cap B_{1/2}) \times (-1/2, 1/2)$  implies that

$$ch \leq \tilde{H}^0 \quad \text{in } (K^0 \cap B_{1/4}) \times (-1/4, 1/4).$$

Therefore

$$c(x_1)^{2+\sigma_0} \approx ch(z) \leq \tilde{H}^0(z) \leq (x_1)^{2+\sigma}, \quad z \in A_{1/8},$$

which is a contradiction since  $\sigma > \sigma_0$ .

#### DECLARATIONS

**Data availability statement:** All data needed are contained in the manuscript.

**Funding and/or Conflicts of interests/Competing interests:** The authors declare that there are no financial, competing or conflict of interests.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alessandrini and N. Garofalo, *Symmetry for degenerate parabolic equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. (1989), 161–174.
- [2] H. W. Alt and D. Phillips, *A free boundary problem for semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Reine Angew. Math. (1986), 63–107.
- [3] D. Araújo and E. Teixeira, *Geometric approach to nonvariational singular elliptic equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. (2013), 1019–1054.
- [4] S. N. Armstrong, B. Sirakov, and C. K. Smart, *Singular solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations and applications*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 205 (2012), no. 2, 345–394.
- [5] X. Cabré and L. Caffarelli, *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 43. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (1995) vi+104 pp.
- [6] L. Caffarelli, Y. Li and L. Nirenberg, *Some remarks on singular solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations III: viscosity solutions including parabolic operators*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. (2013), 109–143.
- [7] L. Caffarelli, A. Petrosyan, H. Shahgholian, *Regularity of a free boundary in parabolic potential theory*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 17 (2004), no. 4, 827–869.
- [8] F. Da Lio and B. Sirakov, *Symmetry results for viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic equations*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (2007), 317–330.
- [9] D. De Silva and O. Savin, *On certain degenerate one-phase free boundary problems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. (2021), 649–680.
- [10] D. De Silva and O. Savin, *The Alt-Phillips functional for negative powers*, Preprint.

- [11] L. El Hajj and H. Shahgholian, *Radial symmetry for an elliptic PDE with a free boundary*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B (2021), 311–319.
- [12] M. Feldman, *Regularity of Lipschitz free boundaries in two-phase problems for fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. (2001), 1171–1200.
- [13] P. Felmer, A. Quaas and B. Sirakov, *Existence and regularity results for fully nonlinear equations with singularities*, Math. Ann.(2012), 377–400.
- [14] C. Imbert and L. Silvestre, *An introduction to fully nonlinear parabolic equations*, in: *An introduction to the Kähler-Ricci flow*, in: *Lecture Notes in Math.*, (2013), 7–88.
- [15] K. Miller, *Extremal barriers on cones with Phragmén-Lindelöf theorems and other applications*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) (1971) 297–329.
- [16] E. Milakis, *Two-phase transition problems for fully nonlinear parabolic equations of second order*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. (2005), 1751–1768.
- [17] F. Leoni, *Homogeneous solutions of extremal Pucci’s equations in planar cones*, J. Differential Equations (2017) 863–879.
- [18] L. Silvestre and B. Sirakov, *Overdetermined problems for fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 54 (2015), 989–1007.
- [19] E. Teixeira, *Nonlinear elliptic equations with mixed singularities*, Potential Anal. (2018), 325–335.
- [20] P. Tolksdorf, *On the Dirichlet problem for quasilinear equations in domains with conical boundary points*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations (1083), 773–817.
- [21] Y. Wu and H. Yu, *On the fully nonlinear Alt-Phillips equation*, Preprint.

(Layan El Hajj) MATHEMATICS DIVISION  
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN DUBAI  
DUBAI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES  
Email address, Layan El Hajj: lhajj@aud.edu

(Seongmin Jeon) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
100 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN  
Email address, Seongmin Jeon: seongmin@kth.se

(Henrik Shahgholian) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
100 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN  
Email address, Henrik Shahgholian: henriksh@kth.se