

Improved regularity for elliptic equations in the double-divergence form

Edgard A. Pimentel

PUC-Rio, Rio de Janeiro

Swedish Summer PDEs

KTH, Stockholm

26 August 2019

General overview

1. Elliptic equations in the **double-divergence** form

General overview

1. Elliptic equations in the **double-divergence** form;
2. Motivation: former developments and **applications**

General overview

1. Elliptic equations in the **double-divergence** form;
2. Motivation: former developments and **applications**;
3. Regularity in **Hölder** spaces

1. Elliptic equations in the **double-divergence** form;
2. Motivation: former developments and **applications**;
3. Regularity in **Hölder** spaces;
4. Regularity transmission by approximation methods.

The double-divergence setting

The double-divergence equation

We are interested in the following PDE:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1$$

The double-divergence equation

We are interested in the following PDE:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

where

1. the matrix $(a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is Hölder continuous in B_1

The double-divergence equation

We are interested in the following PDE:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

where

1. the matrix $(a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is Hölder continuous in B_1 ; that is

$$a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^\beta(B_1) \quad \text{for every } i, j = 1, \dots, d$$

The double-divergence equation

We are interested in the following PDE:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

where

1. the matrix $(a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is Hölder continuous in B_1 ; that is

$$a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^\beta(B_1) \quad \text{for every } i, j = 1, \dots, d.$$

2. Uniform ellipticity - there exist constants $0 < \lambda < \Lambda$ such that

$$\lambda Id \leq (a^{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^d \leq \Lambda Id,$$

Motivation: stochastic analysis

Stochastic analysis: Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equation associated with certain **stochastic processes**

Motivation: stochastic analysis

Stochastic analysis: Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equation associated with certain **stochastic processes**;

In particular, diffusions with **infinitesimal generators** of the form

$$Lv(x) := a^{ij}(x)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 v(x)$$

Motivation: stochastic analysis

Stochastic analysis: Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equation associated with certain **stochastic processes**;

In particular, diffusions with **infinitesimal generators** of the form

$$Lv(x) := a^{ij}(x)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 v(x)$$

have KFP given by

$$L^*v(x) := \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)v(x)) = 0$$

Motivation: stochastic analysis

Stochastic analysis: Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equation associated with certain **stochastic processes**;

In particular, diffusions with **infinitesimal generators** of the form

$$Lv(x) := a^{ij}(x)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 v(x)$$

have KFP given by

$$L^*v(x) := \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)v(x)) = 0;$$

→ **Anisotropic diffusion (e.g., green noise)**

Motivation: stochastic analysis

Stochastic analysis: Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equation associated with certain **stochastic processes**;

In particular, diffusions with **infinitesimal generators** of the form

$$Lv(x) := a^{ij}(x)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 v(x)$$

have KFP given by

$$L^*v(x) := \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)v(x)) = 0;$$

- Anisotropic diffusion (e.g., green noise)
- Bogachev, Krylov, **many others**

Motivation: stochastic analysis

Stochastic analysis: Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equation associated with certain **stochastic processes**;

In particular, diffusions with **infinitesimal generators** of the form

$$Lv(x) := a^{ij}(x)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 v(x)$$

have KFP given by

$$L^*v(x) := \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)v(x)) = 0;$$

- Anisotropic diffusion (e.g., green noise)
- Bogachev, Krylov, **many others**

Solutions describe the **distribution** of the population driven by the process

Motivation: stochastic analysis

Stochastic analysis: Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equation associated with certain **stochastic processes**;

In particular, diffusions with **infinitesimal generators** of the form

$$Lv(x) := a^{ij}(x)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 v(x)$$

have KFP given by

$$L^*v(x) := \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)v(x)) = 0;$$

- Anisotropic diffusion (e.g., green noise)
- Bogachev, Krylov, **many others**

Solutions describe the **distribution** of the population driven by the process.

- Bogachev, Krylov, Röckner, Shaposhnikov

Motivation: mean-field games

Toy-model of the form

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2V) = g(u) & \text{in } B_1 \\ \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (F^{ij}(D^2V)u(x)) = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \end{cases}$$

Motivation: mean-field games

Toy-model of the form

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2V) = g(u) & \text{in } B_1 \\ \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (F^{ij}(D^2V)u(x)) = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases}$$

where $F : \mathcal{S}(d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (λ, Λ) -elliptic operator and $F^{ij}(M)$ stands for the derivative of F with respect to the entry $m_{i,j}$ of M

Motivation: mean-field games

Toy-model of the form

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2V) = g(u) & \text{in } B_1 \\ \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (F^{ij}(D^2V)u(x)) = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases}$$

where $F : \mathcal{S}(d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (λ, Λ) -elliptic operator and $F^{ij}(M)$ stands for the derivative of F with respect to the entry $m_{i,j}$ of M ;

Introduced in the works of J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions circa 2006

Motivation: mean-field games

Toy-model of the form

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2V) = g(u) & \text{in } B_1 \\ \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (F^{ij}(D^2V)u(x)) = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases}$$

where $F : \mathcal{S}(d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (λ, Λ) -elliptic operator and $F^{ij}(M)$ stands for the derivative of F with respect to the entry $m_{i,j}$ of M ;

Introduced in the works of J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions circa 2006; further developed by several authors

→ Bensoussan, Frehse, Yam; Cardaliaguet; Gomes, P., Voskanyan

Motivation: mean-field games

Toy-model of the form

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2V) = g(u) & \text{in } B_1 \\ \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (F^{ij}(D^2V)u(x)) = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases}$$

where $F : \mathcal{S}(d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (λ, Λ) -elliptic operator and $F^{ij}(M)$ stands for the derivative of F with respect to the entry $m_{i,j}$ of M ;

Introduced in the works of J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions circa 2006; further developed by several authors

→ Bensoussan, Frehse, Yam; Cardaliaguet; Gomes, P., Voskanyan

Recent developments: existence and regularity theory for fully nonlinear MFG

Motivation: mean-field games

Toy-model of the form

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2V) = g(u) & \text{in } B_1 \\ \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (F^{ij}(D^2V)u(x)) = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \end{cases}$$

where $F : \mathcal{S}(d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (λ, Λ) -elliptic operator and $F^{ij}(M)$ stands for the derivative of F with respect to the entry $m_{i,j}$ of M ;

Introduced in the works of J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions circa 2006; further developed by several authors

→ Bensoussan, Frehse, Yam; Cardaliaguet; Gomes, P., Voskanyan

Recent developments: existence and regularity theory for fully nonlinear MFG;

→ Jointly w/ P. Andrade

Motivation: Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian manifolds

Fix $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$

Motivation: Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian manifolds

Fix $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. The gradient graph of u is

$$\Gamma_u := \{(x, Du(x)), x \in \Omega\}$$

Motivation: Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian manifolds

Fix $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. The **gradient graph of u** is

$$\Gamma_u := \{(x, Du(x)), x \in \Omega\}.$$

The **volume of Γ_u** is given by

$$F_\Omega(u) = \int_\Omega \left(\det(I + (D^2u)^T D^2u) \right)^{1/2} dx$$

Motivation: Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian manifolds

Fix $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. The **gradient graph of u** is

$$\Gamma_u := \{(x, Du(x)), x \in \Omega\}.$$

The **volume of Γ_u** is given by

$$F_\Omega(u) = \int_\Omega \left(\det(I + (D^2u)^T D^2u) \right)^{1/2} dx.$$

→ Choose u as to **minimize the volume** of the gradient graph

Motivation: Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian manifolds

Fix $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. The **gradient graph of u** is

$$\Gamma_u := \{(x, Du(x)), x \in \Omega\}.$$

The **volume of Γ_u** is given by

$$F_\Omega(u) = \int_\Omega \left(\det(I + (D^2u)^T D^2u) \right)^{1/2} dx.$$

→ Choose u as to **minimize the volume** of the gradient graph

Critical points satisfy the (Euler) equation

$$\partial_{x_j x_l}^2 \left(\sqrt{\det g} g^{ij} \delta^{kl} u_{x_i x_k} \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

Motivation: Hamiltonian stationary Lagrangian manifolds

Fix $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. The **gradient graph of u** is

$$\Gamma_u := \{(x, Du(x)), x \in \Omega\}.$$

The **volume of Γ_u** is given by

$$F_\Omega(u) = \int_\Omega \left(\det(I + (D^2u)^T D^2u) \right)^{1/2} dx.$$

→ Choose u as to **minimize the volume** of the gradient graph

Critical points satisfy the (Euler) equation

$$\partial_{x_j x_l}^2 \left(\sqrt{\det g} g^{ij} \delta^{kl} u_{x_i x_k} \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $g := I + (D^2u)^T D^2u$ is the induced metric.

Previous developments

Maximum principles for supersolutions of the double-divergence equation

Previous developments

Maximum principles for supersolutions of the double-divergence equation;

→ Littman (59)

Previous developments

Maximum principles for supersolutions of the double-divergence equation;

→ Littman (59)

A potential theory, with analogous properties to the case of

$$a^{ij}(\cdot) \partial_{x_i x_j}^2$$

Previous developments

Maximum principles for supersolutions of the double-divergence equation;

→ Littman (59)

A potential theory, with analogous properties to the case of

$$a^{ij}(\cdot)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2;$$

→ Hervé (62)

Previous developments

Maximum principles for supersolutions of the double-divergence equation;

→ Littman (59)

A potential theory, with analogous properties to the case of

$$a^{ij}(\cdot)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2;$$

→ Hervé (62)

Improved maximum principles and preliminary approximation schemes

Previous developments

Maximum principles for supersolutions of the double-divergence equation;

—→ Littman (59)

A potential theory, with analogous properties to the case of

$$a^{ij}(\cdot)\partial_{x_i x_j}^2;$$

—→ Hervé (62)

Improved maximum principles and preliminary approximation schemes;

—→ Littman (63)

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^\beta(B_1)$

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^\beta(B_1)$;

→ Sjögren (73)

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^{\beta}(B_1)$;

→ Sjögren (73)

Properties of the associated Green's function

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^\beta(B_1)$;

→ Sjögren (73)

Properties of the associated Green's function; gains of integrability of the type $L^1 \implies L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^\beta(B_1)$;

→ Sjögren (73)

Properties of the associated Green's function; gains of integrability of the type $L^1 \implies L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$;

→ Fabes-Stroock, Duke Mathematical Journal (84)

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^{\beta}(B_1)$;

→ Sjögren (73)

Properties of the associated Green's function; gains of integrability of the type $L^1 \implies L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$;

→ Fabes-Stroock, Duke Mathematical Journal (84)

Study of the density of the solutions, in the sense of Radon-Nykodim derivatives

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^{\beta}(B_1)$;

—→ Sjögren (73)

Properties of the associated Green's function; gains of integrability of the type $L^1 \implies L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$;

—→ Fabes-Stroock, Duke Mathematical Journal (84)

Study of the density of the solutions, in the sense of Radon-Nykodim derivatives;

—→ Bogachev-Krylov-Röckner, Comm. Partial Differential Equations (01)

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^{\beta}(B_1)$;

—→ Sjögren (73)

Properties of the associated Green's function; gains of integrability of the type $L^1 \implies L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$;

—→ Fabes-Stroock, Duke Mathematical Journal (84)

Study of the density of the solutions, in the sense of Radon-Nykodim derivatives;

—→ Bogachev-Krylov-Röckner, Comm. Partial Differential Equations (01)

—→ Bogachev-Krylov-Röckner (15)

Previous developments

Regularity theory in Hölder spaces provided $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^{\beta}(B_1)$;

—→ Sjögren (73)

Properties of the associated Green's function; gains of integrability of the type $L^1 \implies L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$;

—→ Fabes-Stroock, Duke Mathematical Journal (84)

Study of the density of the solutions, in the sense of Radon-Nykodim derivatives;

—→ Bogachev-Krylov-Röckner, Comm. Partial Differential Equations (01)

—→ Bogachev-Krylov-Röckner (15)

—→ Bogachev-Shaposhnikov (17)

A (very) distinctive feature

Regularity of the **coefficients** acts as an upper bound for the regularity of the **solutions**

A (very) distinctive feature

Regularity of the **coefficients** acts as an upper bound for the regularity of the **solutions**;

$$(a(x)u(x))_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in }]-1, 1[$$

Let $\ell(x)$ be an **affine function** and set $v(x) := \ell(x)/a(x)$

A (very) distinctive feature

Regularity of the **coefficients** acts as an upper bound for the regularity of the **solutions**;

$$(a(x)u(x))_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in }]-1, 1[$$

Let $\ell(x)$ be an **affine function** and set $v(x) := \ell(x)/a(x)$.

Then,

$$\int_{-1}^1 a(x) \frac{\ell(x)}{a(x)} \phi_{xx}(x) \, dx = 0$$

for every $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^2(]-1, 1[)$

A (very) distinctive feature

Regularity of the **coefficients** acts as an upper bound for the regularity of the **solutions**;

$$(a(x)u(x))_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in }]-1, 1[$$

Let $\ell(x)$ be an **affine function** and set $v(x) := \ell(x)/a(x)$.

Then,

$$\int_{-1}^1 a(x) \frac{\ell(x)}{a(x)} \phi_{xx}(x) \, dx = 0$$

for every $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^2(]-1, 1[)$; therefore, v is a **solution**

A (very) distinctive feature

Regularity of the **coefficients** acts as an upper bound for the regularity of the **solutions**;

$$(a(x)u(x))_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in }]-1, 1[$$

Let $\ell(x)$ be an **affine function** and set $v(x) := \ell(x)/a(x)$.

Then,

$$\int_{-1}^1 a(x) \frac{\ell(x)}{a(x)} \phi_{xx}(x) \, dx = 0$$

for every $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^2(]-1, 1[)$; therefore, v is a **solution**;

→ **Were $a(x)$ discontinuous, so would be $v(x)$.**

Our program and main results

Our program

Regularity theory along zero level-sets; focus on $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$

Our program

Regularity theory along zero level-sets; focus on $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$;

→ *nonphysical free boundary*

Our program

Regularity theory along zero level-sets; focus on $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$;

→ *nonphysical free boundary*

Regularity transmission by approximation methods

Our program

Regularity theory along zero level-sets; focus on $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$;

—→ *nonphysical free boundary*

Regularity transmission by approximation methods

—→ Caffarelli, Ann. Math. (89)

Our program

Regularity theory along zero level-sets; focus on $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$;

—→ *nonphysical free boundary*

Regularity transmission by approximation methods

—→ Caffarelli, Ann. Math. (89)

—→ Teixeira, Math. Ann. (14)

Our program

Regularity theory along zero level-sets; focus on $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$;

→ *nonphysical free boundary*

Regularity transmission by approximation methods

→ Caffarelli, Ann. Math. (89)

→ Teixeira, Math. Ann. (14)

→ Teixeira (15)

Our program

Regularity theory along zero level-sets; focus on $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$;

→ *nonphysical free boundary*

Regularity transmission by approximation methods

→ Caffarelli, Ann. Math. (89)

→ Teixeira, Math. Ann. (14)

→ Teixeira (15)

Are there **gains of regularity**, as solutions approach their zero level-sets?

Import information from the well-understood non-divergence problem

$$\operatorname{Tr}(a^{ij}D^2u) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

for which a richer regularity theory is available

Our program

Import information from the well-understood non-divergence problem

$$\operatorname{Tr}(a^{ij}D^2u) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

for which a richer regularity theory is available

The regularity of the coefficients is an upper bound for the regularity of the solutions 'in the large'. Therefore, we look for regularity improvements at $x_0 \in \{u = 0\}$.

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2$$

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2,$$

where $(\bar{a}^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is a constant matrix

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2,$$

where $(\bar{a}^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is a constant matrix.

Then, $u \in C^{1-}_{loc}(B_1 \cap \partial\{u > 0\})$

Hölder continuity

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2,$$

where $(\bar{a}^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is a constant matrix.

Then, $u \in C^{1-}_{loc}(B_1 \cap \partial\{u > 0\})$ and for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists $C_\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{B_r(x_0)} |u(x) - u(x_0)| \leq C_\alpha r^\alpha,$$

for every $0 < r \ll 1/2$ and $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$.

A few remarks

Gains of regularity are **independent** of the data

A few remarks

Gains of regularity are **independent** of the data;

$$a^{ij} \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1) \quad \implies \quad u \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1)$$

A few remarks

Gains of regularity are **independent** of the data;

$$a^{ij} \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1) \implies u \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1);$$

however, **at the free boundary** u is of class \mathcal{C}^{1-}

A few remarks

Gains of regularity are **independent** of the data;

$$a^{ij} \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1) \implies u \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1);$$

however, **at the free boundary** u is of class \mathcal{C}^{1-} ;

Our results extend to equations involving **lower-order** terms

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) + \partial_{x_i} (b^i(x)u(x)) + c(x)u(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1$$

A few remarks

Gains of regularity are **independent** of the data;

$$a^{ij} \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1) \implies u \in \mathcal{C}_{loc}^\varepsilon(B_1);$$

however, **at the free boundary** u is of class \mathcal{C}^{1-} ;

Our results extend to equations involving **lower-order** terms

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) + \partial_{x_i} (b^i(x)u(x)) + c(x)u(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

provided $b^i, c : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are **well-prepared**.

Strategy of the proof

GOAL: to control the oscillation of the solutions within balls of radius $0 < r \ll 1$, centered at points $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$

Strategy of the proof

GOAL: to control the oscillation of the solutions within balls of radius $0 < r \ll 1$, centered at points $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$;

Main **ingredients** are

Strategy of the proof

GOAL: to control the oscillation of the solutions within balls of radius $0 < r \ll 1$, centered at points $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$;

Main **ingredients** are:

→ Preliminary (uniform) **compactness**

Strategy of the proof

GOAL: to control the oscillation of the solutions within balls of radius $0 < r \ll 1$, centered at points $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$;

Main **ingredients** are:

- Preliminary (uniform) **compactness**;
- Approximation results **preserving** zero level-sets

GOAL: to control the oscillation of the solutions within balls of radius $0 < r \ll 1$, centered at points $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$;

Main **ingredients** are:

- Preliminary (uniform) **compactness**;
- Approximation results **preserving** zero level-sets;
- Iteration mechanism through scaling techniques.

Zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation

Zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon$$

Zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon,$$

one can find $h \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfying

$$\|u - h\|_{L^\infty(B_{9/10})} < \delta$$

Zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon,$$

one can find $h \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfying

$$\|u - h\|_{L^\infty(B_{9/10})} < \delta.$$

Moreover,

$$h(x_0) = 0$$

for every $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$.

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$.

For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon$$

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$.

For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon,$$

then

$$\sup_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(x)| \leq \rho^\alpha$$

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$.

For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon,$$

then

$$\sup_{B_\rho(x_0)} |u(x)| \leq \rho^\alpha,$$

for every $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$.

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon$$

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon.$$

Then

$$\sup_{B_{\rho^n}(x_0)} |u(x)| \leq \rho^{n\alpha}$$

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in C^\beta_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon.$$

Then

$$\sup_{B_{\rho^n}(x_0)} |u(x)| \leq \rho^{n\alpha},$$

for every $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Hölder regularity of the gradient

Impose further conditions on the coefficients to unlock a similar analysis at the level of the gradient Du ; in principle, to ask for

$$a^{ij} \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(B_1) \quad \text{for every } i, j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Hölder regularity of the gradient

Impose **further conditions on the coefficients** to unlock a similar analysis at the level of the **gradient Du** ; in principle, to ask for

$$a^{ij} \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(B_1) \quad \text{for every } i, j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Consider a **suitable zero level-set** in this context:

$$\{u = |Du| = 0\}.$$

Hölder continuity of the gradient

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation

Hölder continuity of the gradient

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2$$

Hölder continuity of the gradient

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2,$$

where $(\bar{a}^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is a constant matrix

Hölder continuity of the gradient

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2,$$

where $(\bar{a}^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is a constant matrix.

Then, $u \in C^{1,1-}_{loc}(B_1 \cap \partial\{u > 0\})$

Hölder continuity of the gradient

Theorem (Leitão, P., Santos, 2019)

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfies

$$\|a^{ij}(\cdot) - \bar{a}^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ll 1/2,$$

where $(\bar{a}^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$ is a constant matrix.

Then, $u \in C^{1,1-}_{loc}(B_1 \cap \partial\{u > 0\})$ and there exists $C_\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{B_r(x_0)} |Du(x) - Du(x_0)| \leq C_\alpha r^\alpha,$$

for every $0 < r \ll 1/2$, and $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap \partial\{|Du| > 0\}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Key: First-order zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation

Key: First-order zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(B_1)$. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon$$

Key: First-order zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(B_1)$. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon,$$

one can find $h \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfying

$$\|u - h\|_{L^\infty(B_{9/10})} < \delta$$

Key: First-order zero level-set approximation lemma

Proposition

Let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ be a weak solution to the double-divergence equation. Suppose $a^{ij} \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(B_1)$. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if

$$\sup_{B_{9/10}} |a^{ij}(x) - \bar{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon,$$

one can find $h \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(B_1)$ satisfying

$$\|u - h\|_{L^\infty(B_{9/10})} < \delta.$$

Moreover,

$$h(x_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Dh(x_0) = \mathbf{0}$$

for every $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap \partial\{|Du| > 0\}$.

Further directions and open problems

1. **Extrapolate** improved regularity to the interior

Further directions and open problems

1. **Extrapolate** improved regularity to the interior;
→ **adding a constant** changes the equation

Further directions and open problems

1. **Extrapolate** improved regularity to the interior;
 - **adding a constant** changes the equation;
 - not reasonable, given the **regularity of the coefficients**

Further directions and open problems

1. **Extrapolate** improved regularity to the interior;
 - adding a constant changes the equation;
 - not reasonable, given the **regularity of the coefficients**.
2. **Non-homogeneous** setting:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = f \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

for a **well-prepared** source term $f : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

Further directions and open problems

1. **Extrapolate** improved regularity to the interior;
 - adding a constant changes the equation;
 - not reasonable, given the **regularity of the coefficients**.
2. **Non-homogeneous** setting:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = f \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

for a **well-prepared** source term $f : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;

3. Parabolic setting

Further directions and open problems

1. **Extrapolate** improved regularity to the interior;
 - adding a constant changes the equation;
 - not reasonable, given the **regularity of the coefficients**.
2. **Non-homogeneous** setting:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = f \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

for a **well-prepared** source term $f : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;

3. Parabolic setting:
 - **scaling arguments**

Further directions and open problems

1. **Extrapolate** improved regularity to the interior;
 - adding a constant changes the equation;
 - not reasonable, given the **regularity of the coefficients**.
2. **Non-homogeneous** setting:

$$\partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (a^{ij}(x)u(x)) = f \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

for a **well-prepared** source term $f : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;

3. **Parabolic** setting:
 - **scaling arguments**;
 - **preliminary compactness**.

Thank you very much!