



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Regularity results for vectorial minimizers of a class of degenerate convex integrals

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Cupini, G., Giannetti, F., Giova, R., Passarelli di Napoli, A. (2018). Regularity results for vectorial minimizers of a class of degenerate convex integrals. JOURNAL OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS, 265(9), 4375-4416 [10.1016/j.jde.2018.06.010].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/649631> since: 2021-08-02

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2018.06.010>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Cupini, Giovanni, Flavia Giannetti, Raffaella Giova, e Antonia Passarelli di Napoli. «Regularity Results for Vectorial Minimizers of a Class of Degenerate Convex Integrals». Journal of Differential Equations 265, n. 9 (novembre 2018): 4375–4416.

The final published version is available online at:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2018.06.010>

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

J. Differential Equations ••• (••••) •••–•••

**Journal of
Differential
Equations**
www.elsevier.com/locate/jde

Regularity results for vectorial minimizers of a class of degenerate convex integrals

Giovanni Cupini ^a, Flavia Giannetti ^b, Raffaella Giova ^c,
Antonia Passarelli di Napoli ^b

^a *Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bologna, Piazza di Porta san Donato 5, 40126 Bologna, Italy*

^b *Dipartimento di Matematica e Appl. "R. Caccioppoli", Università di Napoli "Federico II", Via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

^c *Dipartimento di Studi Economici e Giuridici, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Parthenope", Palazzo Pacanowsky – Via Generale Parisi, 13, 80132 Napoli, Italy*

Received 23 May 2017; revised 2 May 2018

Abstract

We establish the higher differentiability and the higher integrability for the gradient of vectorial minimizers of integral functionals with (p, q) -growth conditions. We assume that the non-homogeneous densities are uniformly convex and have a radial structure, with respect to the gradient variable, only at infinity. The results are obtained under a possibly discontinuous dependence on the spatial variable of the integrand.

© 2018 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

MSC: 49N60; 49N99; 35J47

Keywords: Regularity; Asymptotic convexity; Minimizer; (p, q) -growth

E-mail addresses: giovanni.cupini@unibo.it (G. Cupini), giannett@unina.it (F. Giannetti), raffaella.giova@uniparthenope.it (R. Giova), antpassa@unina.it (A. Passarelli di Napoli).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2018.06.010>

0022-0396/© 2018 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study the regularity of vectorial local minimizers of functionals of the form

$$\mathcal{F}(u; \Omega) := \int_{\Omega} f(x, Du) dx, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, is a bounded open set, $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, $N > 1$, is a Sobolev map and $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is a Carathéodory function, convex and of class C^2 with respect to the second variable. The main features of the energy densities $f(x, \xi)$ considered here are the following:

- they satisfy the so-called (p, q) -growth conditions,
- they are uniformly convex only for large values of $|\xi|$,
- the partial map $x \mapsto f(x, \xi)$ is possibly discontinuous.

The interest in the study of non-autonomous degenerate convex functionals relies on the fact that they are strictly connected with the study of optimal transport problems with congestion effects (for more details we refer to [2], [3], [4]). Actually, the Euler–Lagrange equation of the non-autonomous model functional with (p, q) -growth

$$\int_{\Omega} (|Du| - \delta)_+^p + a(x)(|Du| - \delta)_+^q dx$$

with a nonnegative and bounded function $a(x)$, $\delta > 0$, can be interpreted as the flow in an origin-destination network, in traffic problems that take into account the behavior of the flow in every position x of the path and with different constrained capacities.

Let us now list our assumptions.

The integrand f will satisfy the so-called (p, q) -growth conditions, i.e. there exist exponents $2 \leq p \leq q < \infty$ and constants $c_1, c_2, L > 0$ such that

$$c_1 |\xi|^p - c_2 \leq f(x, \xi) \leq L(1 + |\xi|^q) \quad (1.2)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$.

The further properties of f will be assumed to hold only for large values of the modulus of the gradient variable ξ ; i.e., for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$, such that $|\xi| \geq R$ for some positive R . For the sake of simplicity and without loss of generality, we will assume from now on $R = 1$.

As it is well known since the famous example by De Giorgi [16] (see also [40], [41], [45]), in order to avoid the irregularity phenomena peculiar of the vectorial minimizers, the dependence of the energy density on the modulus of the gradient variable is imposed. More precisely, we assume that there exist $\tilde{f} : \Omega \times [1, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, nondecreasing in the last variable, and constants $\nu, L_1 > 0$ such that

$$f(x, \xi) = \tilde{f}(x, |\xi|) \quad (1.3)$$

$$\langle D_{\xi\xi} f(x, \xi)\lambda, \lambda \rangle \geq \nu(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\lambda|^2 \quad (1.4)$$

$$|D_{\xi\xi} f(x, \xi)| \leq L_1(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \quad (1.5)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus B_1(0)$.

As we already mentioned, we will not ask a regular dependence of f on the x -variable. Indeed, the function $x \rightarrow D_{\xi} f(x, \xi)$ will be required to be weakly differentiable for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus B_1(0)$ and it will be assumed that there exists a nonnegative function $k \in L_{\text{loc}}^{\sigma}(\Omega)$, with $\sigma > 1$, such that

$$|D_{\xi x} f(x, \xi)| \leq k(x)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{q-1}{2}} \quad (1.6)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus B_1(0)$. Finally, we assume that there exists a constant $\mu > 1$, such that for every $t > 1$

$$f(x, t\xi) \leq t^{\mu} f(x, \xi) \quad (1.7)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus B_1(0)$.

Note that (1.7) will be used only to obtain the local boundedness of the minimizers ([12]).

In order to explain the difficulties of our problem, we now recall some class of functionals included in our setting and some known regularity properties of the related minimizers.

The study of the regularity of local minimizers of not uniformly convex functionals started in [7] (see also [30]), where integrals as in (1.1) with integrand enjoying a p -Laplacian type structure at infinity were considered. This means that the energy density f satisfies (1.2)–(1.6) with $p = q$ and $k \in L^{\infty}$.

Under these assumptions it has been proven that the minimizers of the functional \mathcal{F} are locally Lipschitz continuous (see for example [19], [22], [24], [25], [26], [44]). Later on, the Lipschitz continuity of local minimizers of the functional $\mathcal{F}(v, \Omega)$ with integrand f satisfying assumptions (1.6) with $k \in L^{\infty}$ and (1.4), but under the growth assumption (1.5) with $q > p$ has been widely investigated (see for example [6], [11], [20], [23]).

The study of regularity of minimizers of functionals satisfying (p, q) -growth conditions began with the pioneering papers by Marcellini ([36], [37], [38]) and later on widely investigated. From the very beginning it has been clear that if p and q are too far apart no regularity can be expected for the local minimizers (see [29], [35]), while if p and q are sufficiently close many regularity results are available. Actually, the research in this field is so intense that it is almost impossible to give an exhaustive and comprehensive list of references; we confine ourselves to refer the interested reader to the survey [39] and the more recent papers [1], [8], [9] and the references therein.

It is well known that the presence of the x -variable in the integrand of functionals with nonstandard growth conditions may yield the so-called Lavrentiev phenomenon, even under a continuity assumption on the coefficients. Such phenomenon does not occur in case of standard growth condition, i.e. if $p = q$. Actually, it has been proven that minimizers of the functional \mathcal{F} under assumptions (1.4) and (1.5) with $p = q$ are regular even weakening the Lipschitz regularity of the integrand f in a Sobolev type regularity on the partial map $x \mapsto f(x, \xi)$. Indeed, if there exists a nonnegative function $k(x) \in L^n(\Omega)$ such that (1.6) is satisfied, then the minimizer possesses second derivatives and for its gradient a higher integrability result holds true (see e.g. [33], [42], [43] and, for other regularity results under a Sobolev type assumption with respect to the x -variable, see [18], [27], [28], [31]).

A Sobolev type assumption, combined with a degenerate ellipticity and nonstandard growth conditions, has been used in [17], where it is proven the local Lipschitz continuity of minimizers of \mathcal{F} , under assumptions (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6) with $k \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$, $\sigma > n$, with $q \geq p$ satisfying

$$\frac{q}{p} < 1 + \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{\sigma}.$$

Note that such a Sobolev assumption yields the Hölder continuity of the partial map $x \mapsto D_\xi f(x, \xi)$ through the Sobolev imbedding Theorem. If $\sigma \rightarrow n$, the inequality above implies that $q \rightarrow p$. This case, i.e. $k \in L^n(\Omega)$, has been faced in [10], where we proved that, weakening the Sobolev regularity of the coefficients, leads not only to deal with standard growth conditions, but also to the loss of the Lipschitz regularity of the minimizers. Actually, we were able to prove that the gradient of the minimizer belongs to L^t for every $t \geq p$, thus that the minimizers are α -Hölder continuous, for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

When treating the regularity of minimizers, the proof of their local boundedness can be seen as a first step in the analysis of further regularity properties (see [12], [13] for recent contributions to the (p, q) growth case). It is now clear that the Sobolev conjugate exponent of p denoted by p^* is a threshold level for q to expect local bounded minimizers: actually if q is below p^* then the local boundedness is attained, otherwise, if $q > p^*$, irregularity occurs. In the present paper we use the bound $q < p^*$ in order to deal with locally bounded minimizers and we take advantage from this information to prove higher regularity properties of minimizers of functionals with nonstandard growth conditions, not uniformly convex and with a Sobolev x -dependence that can be even weaker than $W^{1,n}$.

More precisely, our main results are a local boundedness for the local minimizers and a higher integrability result for their gradients (Theorem 1.1) and a higher differentiability result (see Theorem 1.2).

Theorem 1.1 (Higher integrability). *Let $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ be a local minimizer of (1.1). Assume (1.2)–(1.7), with p, q, σ satisfying $q < p^*$ and*

$$2 \leq p \leq q < p + 1, \quad \sigma \geq \frac{p + 2}{p + 1 - q}. \quad (1.8)$$

Then u is locally bounded and $Du \in L_{\text{loc}}^{p+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{nN})$.

Moreover we have the following

Theorem 1.2 (Higher differentiability). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, setting*

$$\mathcal{G}(t) := \int_0^t s(2+s)^{\frac{p-4}{2}} ds,$$

we have

$$\mathcal{G}(|Du| - 2)_+ \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad (|Du| - 2)_+ \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega). \quad (1.9)$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} (|Du| - 2)_+^2 (2 + (|Du| - 2)_+)^{-2} |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ & \leq C \left(1 + \|k\|_{L^\sigma(B_r)}\right)^{\frac{p+2}{p-q+1}} \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right)^\gamma \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

for every ball $B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$, every $0 < \rho < r$, for some $C = C(n, N, p, q, \sigma, c_1, c_2, L, L_1, v, \rho, r, \text{diam } \Omega)$ and for some $\gamma > 1$ depending on n, p, q .

Notice that, by Theorem 1.1, $Du \in L_{\text{loc}}^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{nN})$ and this implies the absence of the Lavrentiev phenomenon. We point out that, by (1.8), if $p < n - 2$ we can consider $k \in L_{\text{loc}}^\sigma(\Omega)$ also with the parameter σ below the threshold n . We also note that, even in the case $\sigma = p + 2$, that implies $q = p$, our result improves a very recent one obtained in [32] concerning the regularity of local minimizers of functionals uniformly convex in the whole \mathbb{R}^{nN} . There the local minimizers are assumed to be a priori locally bounded, so no structure assumptions, such as (1.3) and (1.7) is needed. Let also remark that, if $\sigma = +\infty$, we extend to the case of degenerate convex functionals a previous result for a priori bounded minimizers contained in [5].

The first step in the proof of the results above is an a priori estimate for local minimizers u of the functional \mathcal{F} which are Lipschitz continuous and such that $(|Du| - 1)_+ \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

Such a priori estimate is achieved by the use of test functions that vanish on the set where the Euler–Lagrange system associated to \mathcal{F} fails to be uniformly elliptic. It is worth pointing out that the key tools in the proof are the local boundedness of the minimizers, which is known to hold true by virtue of the bound $q < p^*$ (see Theorems 2.2 and 2.3) and a suitable interpolation inequality (see Proposition 2.5). In particular, the interpolation inequality together with the a priori assumption $(|Du| - 1)_+ \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, allows us to prove an a priori estimate. Indeed the gradient of the minimizers is locally in L^{p+2} and this higher integrability reveals to be useful in the estimates of terms with critical summability (see the proof of Theorem 3.2, Step 2).

Once the a priori estimate is established we have to use an approximation procedure. Since such approximation yields the conclusions of both Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 at the same time, we unify the proofs. Usually the approximating sequence of functionals are constructed regularizing the integrand of \mathcal{F} in order that their minimizers are sufficiently regular to satisfy the a priori estimate.

Since the regularity of minimizers of the approximating functionals can be proven only in the region where the energy densities are uniformly convex, which may vary terms by terms, one of the difficulties that we have to face is to transfer this regularity information to the limit. This difficulty is overcome by using Proposition 2.6, a measure theory result, which may be of interest by itself.

Another difficulty comes from the lack of a global uniform convexity of the integrand that yields a lack of uniqueness of the minimizers. Therefore, in principle, we could only say that the sequence of the minimizers of the approximating functionals converges to a regular minimizer, but not that all the minimizers of \mathcal{F} have the desired regularity. In order to overcome this problem, following [6], we introduce in the approximating problem a penalization term that does not effect the a priori estimate and that forces the approximating sequence to converge to an arbitrarily fixed local minimizer.

The plan of the paper is the following: in Section 2 we fix the notations and collect preliminary results; in Section 3 we establish the a priori estimate and in Section 4 we give the proof of our main results.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we introduce some notations and collect several results that we shall use to establish our main result.

We will follow the usual convention and denote by c or C a general constant that may vary on different occasions, even within the same line of estimates. Relevant dependencies on parameters and special constants will be suitably emphasized using parentheses or subscripts. All the norms we use on \mathbb{R}^n , \mathbb{R}^N and \mathbb{R}^{nN} will be the standard Euclidean ones and denoted by $|\cdot|$ in all cases. In particular, for matrices $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$ we write $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle := \text{trace}(\xi^T \eta)$ for the usual inner product of ξ and η , and $|\xi| := \langle \xi, \xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for the corresponding Euclidean norm.

In what follows, $B_r(x)$ will denote the ball in \mathbb{R}^n centered at x of radius r . The integral mean of a function u over a ball $B_r(x)$ will be denoted by $u_{x,r}$; i.e.,

$$u_{x,r} := \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} u(y) dy,$$

where $|B_r(x)|$ is the Lebesgue measure of the ball in \mathbb{R}^n . If no confusion may arise we shall omit the dependence on the center.

The following lemma is an important application in the so called hole-filling method. Its proof can be found for example in [34, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $h : [r, R_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a nonnegative bounded function and $0 < \vartheta < 1$, $A, B \geq 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Assume that*

$$h(s) \leq \vartheta h(t) + \frac{A}{(t-s)^\beta} + B,$$

for all $r \leq s < t \leq R_0$. Then

$$h(r) \leq \frac{cA}{(R_0-r)^\beta} + cB,$$

where $c = c(\vartheta, \beta) > 0$.

2.1. Some useful regularity results

The following local boundedness result is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2.1 in [12], see also [14].

Theorem 2.2. *Assume (1.2)–(1.5) and (1.7), with $1 < p \leq q < p^*$. Then any local minimizer u of (1.1) is locally bounded. Moreover, for every $B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$ there exists $c > 0$, depending on the data, such that*

$$\|u - u_{x_0,r}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/(2\sqrt{n})}(x_0))} \leq c \left\{ 1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \right\}^\vartheta,$$

with a positive $\vartheta = \vartheta(q, p, n)$.

A similar result holds for a suitable perturbation of the functional. Precisely, let us fix $B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$, $\bar{u} \in W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$ and define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v; B_r(x_0)) := \mathcal{F}(v; B_r(x_0)) + \int_{B_r(x_0)} \arctan(|v(x) - \bar{u}(x)|^2) dx, \tag{2.1}$$

where \mathcal{F} is defined in (1.1). Then the following local boundedness result holds.

Theorem 2.3. *Assume (1.2)–(1.5) and (1.7), with $1 < p \leq q < p^*$, and let $u \in W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$. Then any minimizer $v \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v; B_r(x_0))$ is locally bounded and for every $B_\rho(\bar{x}) \Subset B_r(x_0)$*

$$\|v - v_{\bar{x},\rho}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\rho/(2\sqrt{n})}(\bar{x}))} \leq c \left\{ 1 + \int_{B_\rho(\bar{x})} f(x, Dv) dx \right\}^\vartheta,$$

where $\vartheta = \vartheta(q, p, n)$.

Proof. Let us define $g(x, v) := \arctan(|v - \bar{u}(x)|^2)$. Since v is a local minimizer of the functional $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, then v satisfies the Euler's system

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^n f_{\xi_i^\alpha}(x, Dv) \varphi_{x_i}^\alpha(x) dx \\ &= \int_{B_r(x_0)} g(x, v) \varphi^\alpha(x) dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N), \alpha = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

By our choice of g , we can conclude following the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [12], with the obvious modifications. \square

We now recall a regularity result for minimizers of functionals with standard growth conditions and smooth dependence on the x -variable. This is a well known result, if the perturbation term $\int_\Omega \arctan(|w(x) - \bar{u}(x)|^2) dx$ in the integral in (2.2) below is absent. In this case, we refer to [30] for the higher differentiability result and to Theorem 1.1 in [11] as far as the Lipschitz continuity of the local minimizers is concerned. In presence of the perturbation term $\int_\Omega \arctan(|w - \bar{u}(x)|^2) dx$, the proofs can be easily adapted because of the boundedness of its integrand and of its derivative with respect to the variable w .

More precisely, if we define the functional

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(g(x, Dw) + \arctan(|w - \bar{u}(x)|^2) \right) dx \tag{2.2}$$

with $g \in C^2(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nN}; [0, +\infty))$ and $\bar{u} \in C^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$, then the following regularity result holds.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that there exists $p \geq 2$ such that for every $x \in \Omega$ and every $\xi, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 |\xi|^p - c_2 &\leq g(x, \xi) \leq L(1 + |\xi|^p), \\ \langle D_{\xi\xi} g(x, \xi) \lambda, \lambda \rangle &\geq \nu (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\lambda|^2, \\ |D_{\xi\xi} g(x, \xi)| &\leq L_1 (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad |D_{\xi x} g(x, \xi)| \leq K (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

with positive constants c_1, c_2, L, L_1, ν, K . Then any local minimizer v of (2.2) is in $W_{loc}^{2,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$(1 + |Dv|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |D^2 v|^2 \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega).$$

Moreover, if g satisfies a structure condition of the type (1.3), then $v \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$.

2.2. An interpolation inequality

We take advantage from the local boundedness of minimizers of the functional \mathcal{F} in (1.1) through the following Gagliardo–Nirenberg type interpolation inequality, see also [5]. For \mathcal{G} defined as

$$\mathcal{G}(t) := \int_0^t s(1+s)^{\frac{p-4}{2}} ds \tag{2.3}$$

we have the following

Proposition 2.5. *Let $u \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \cap W_{loc}^{1,p+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$, $p \geq 2$, be such that both $(|Du| - 1)_+$ and $\mathcal{G}(|Du| - 1)_+$ are in $W_{loc}^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Then, for every $\psi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ and every $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 dx \\ &\leq c \left(1 + \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp } \psi)}^2 \right) \int_{\Omega} (\psi^2 + |D\psi|^2) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\ &\quad + c \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp } \psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 |D(\mathcal{G}(|Du| - 1)_+)|^2 dx, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

for a positive constant $c = c(p)$.

Proof. Consider $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and the nonnegative increasing function

$$G(t) = t(1+t)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

An integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \psi^2(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |Du|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \psi^2(G((|Du| - 1)_+))^2 |Du|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} \langle \psi^2(G((|Du| - 1)_+))^2 Du, Du \rangle dx \\ &= - \sum_{i,\alpha} \int_{\Omega} (u^\alpha - \kappa^\alpha) [\psi^2(G((|Du| - 1)_+))^2 Du^\alpha]_{x_i} dx \\ &\leq 2 \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)} \int_{\Omega} |\psi| |D\psi| (G((|Du| - 1)_+))^2 |Du| dx \\ &+ 2 \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)} \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 G((|Du| - 1)_+) G'((|Du| - 1)_+) |D^2u| |Du| dx \\ &+ \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)} \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (G((|Du| - 1)_+))^2 |D^2u|^2 dx =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Recalling the definition of G and using Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq c_\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} |D\psi|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\ &+ \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |Du|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

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

Taking into account that $G(t)G'(t) \leq \frac{p}{2}t(1+t)^{p-2}$, by Young's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq c(p) \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)} \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (|Du| - 1)_+ (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} |D^2u| |Du| dx \\ &\leq c_\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &+ \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p |Du|^2 dx \\ &\leq c_\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |Du|^2 dx \\
 & + 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} |Du|^2 dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we used the elementary inequality

$$(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^2 \leq 2 + 2((|Du| - 1)_+)^2.$$

Moreover, by the definition of G and by Young's inequality again

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_3 & \leq \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)} \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & \leq c_\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & \quad + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 dx \\
 & \leq c_\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & \quad + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |Du|^2 dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$1 + (|Du| - 1)_+ = |Du| \quad \text{a.e. in the set } \{|Du| > 1\}.$$

Inserting the estimates of I_1 , I_2 , I_3 , in (2.5), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |Du|^2 dx \\
 & \leq c_\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} |D\psi|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\
 & \quad + 4\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |Du|^2 dx \\
 & \quad + c_\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx
 \end{aligned}$$

$$+ 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} |Du|^2 dx.$$

The integrability assumptions on u imply that the right hand side is finite, in particular

$$|D(\mathcal{G}((|Du| - 1)_+))|^2 = (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \quad (2.6)$$

is in $L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. Choosing $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{8}$, we can reabsorb the second integral in the right hand side by the left hand side, thus getting

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-2} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |Du|^2 dx \\ & \leq c \left(1 + \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \right) \int_{\Omega} (\psi^2 + |D\psi|^2) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\ & \quad + c \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 |D(\mathcal{G}((|Du| - 1)_+))|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.6) in the last integral. The inequality (2.4) follows. \square

2.3. A measure theory result

This subsection is devoted to the proof of a result, which is of interest by itself, that will be used in the approximating procedure (see Step 3 in Section 4).

Proposition 2.6. *Let \mathcal{G} be the function defined in (2.3) and let f be a function in $W^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$, $p \geq 2$, weakly approximated in $W^{1,p}$ by a sequence $f_k \in W^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$, with $(|Df_k| - 1)_+$ and $\mathcal{G}((|Df_k| - 1)_+)$ both in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Assume that*

$$\|(|Df_k| - 1)_+\|_{L^{p+\varepsilon}(\Omega)} \leq c, \quad \int_{\Omega} |D(\mathcal{G}((|Df_k| - 1)_+))|^2 dx \leq c \quad (2.7)$$

hold for some $\varepsilon > 0$ uniformly w.r.t. k . Then $(|Df| - 1)_+ \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and, up to subsequences,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |Df_k| = |Df| \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \cap \{|Df| > 1\} \text{ and strongly in } L^p(\Omega \cap \{|Df| > \tau\}) \text{ for a.e. } \tau > 1.$$

Proof. By the last inequality in (2.7) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (1 + (|Df_k| - 1)_+)^{-2} ((|Df_k| - 1)_+)^p |D^2f_k|^2 dx \\ & = \int_{\Omega} |D(\mathcal{G}((|Df_k| - 1)_+))|^2 dx \leq c, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

with c independent of k . This implies that, for every $\tau > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}} |Df_k|^{-2} (|Df_k| - 1)^p |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}} (1 + (|Df_k| - 1)_+)^{-2} ((|Df_k| - 1)_+)^2 ((|Df_k| - 1)_+)^{p-2} |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} |D(\mathcal{G}((|Df_k| - 1)_+))|^2 dx \leq c, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

with c independent of k .

Since the function $t \mapsto \frac{t-1}{t}$ is positive, increasing and bounded in $[\tau, \infty)$, there exists $c(\tau) > 0$ such that

$$\left(\frac{t-1}{t}\right)^2 \geq c(\tau) \quad \forall t \in [\tau, \infty), \quad (2.10)$$

which implies

$$\frac{(t-1)^p}{t^2} = (t-1)^{p-2} \left(\frac{t-1}{t}\right)^2 \geq (\tau-1)^{p-2} c(\tau) \quad \forall t \in [\tau, \infty).$$

The above inequality with $t = |Df_k(x)|$, gives

$$|Df_k|^{-2} (|Df_k| - 1)^p \geq (\tau - 1)^{p-2} c(\tau) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}.$$

Thus, (2.9) implies

$$\int_{\Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}} |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \leq \frac{c}{(\tau - 1)^{p-2} c(\tau)},$$

or, equivalently, there exists $C(\tau, p)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| D((|Df_k| - \tau)_+) \right|^2 dx \leq C(\tau, p).$$

This implies that the sequence $(|Df_k| - \tau)_+$ converges weakly in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ to a function $G(\tau) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Therefore, up to a not relabeled subsequence, we also have that

$$(|Df_k| - \tau)_+ \rightarrow G(\tau) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Analogously, by (2.10),

$$|Df_k|^{-2} (|Df_k| - 1)^2 \geq c(\tau) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}.$$

Therefore, by (2.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & c(\tau) \int_{\Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}} (|Df_k| - \tau)^{p-2} |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \\
 & \leq \int_{\Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}} |Df_k|^{-2} (|Df_k| - 1)^2 (|Df_k| - \tau)^{p-2} |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \\
 & \leq \int_{\Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}} |Df_k|^{-2} (|Df_k| - 1)^2 (|Df_k| - 1)^{p-2} |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \\
 & = \int_{\Omega \cap \{|Df_k| > \tau\}} (1 + (|Df_k| - 1)_+)^{-2} ((|Df_k| - 1)_+)^p |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \\
 & \leq \int_{\Omega} |D(\mathcal{G}((|Df_k| - 1)_+))|^2 dx \leq c.
 \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\int_{\Omega} ((|Df_k| - \tau)_+)^{p-2} |D^2 f_k|^2 dx \leq C(\tau)$$

that yields

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| D \left(((|Df_k| - \tau)_+)^{p/2} \right) \right|^2 dx \leq C(\tau).$$

Thus, up to subsequences, the sequence

$$((|Df_k| - \tau)_+)^{p/2}$$

converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This is equivalent to say that there exists a function $F(\tau) \in L^p(\Omega)$, such that

$$(|Df_k| - \tau)_+ \rightarrow F(\tau) \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(\Omega),$$

that is

$$\lim_k \int_{\Omega} |(|Df_k| - \tau)_+ - F(\tau) |^p = 0. \tag{2.11}$$

We also have that

$$(|Df_k| - \tau)_+ \rightarrow F(\tau) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \tag{2.12}$$

1 and

$$2 \quad (|Df_k| - \tau)_+ \rightarrow F(\tau) \quad \text{in measure.} \quad (2.13)$$

3 Note that the uniqueness of the a.e. limit implies that $G(\tau) = F(\tau)$ a.e. in Ω and so $F(\tau) \in$
 4 $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. For every $t > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$5 \quad A_{k,\tau}(t) := \{x \in \Omega : (|Df_k| - \tau)_+ > t\} = \{x \in \Omega : |Df_k| > \tau + t\},$$

$$6 \quad A_\tau(t) := \{x \in \Omega : F(\tau) > t\}.$$

7 The function $t \mapsto |A_\tau(t)|$ is continuous a.e., where $|A_\tau(t)|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of the
 8 set $A_\tau(t)$. It can be easily checked that if t is a continuity point of $|A_\tau(\cdot)|$, then (2.13) implies

$$9 \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |A_{k,\tau}(t)| = |A_\tau(t)|$$

10 or, equivalently,

$$11 \quad \|\chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow \|\chi_{A_\tau(t)}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

12 Moreover, by (2.12),

$$13 \quad \chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)} \rightarrow \chi_{A_\tau(t)} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

14 Thus, for a.e. $t > 0$

$$15 \quad \chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)} \rightarrow \chi_{A_\tau(t)} \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\Omega). \quad (2.14)$$

16 By (2.11) and the definition of $A_{k,\tau}(t)$, we have

$$17 \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_{k,\tau}(t)} ||Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau)|^p = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

18 Let us prove that

$$19 \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_\tau(t)} ||Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau)|^p dx = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

20 To this aim, notice that (2.15) implies

$$21 \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_\tau(t)} ||Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau)|^p dx$$

$$22 \quad = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_\tau(t)} ||Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau)|^p dx - \lim_k \int_{A_{k,\tau}(t)} ||Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau)|^p dx$$

$$= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \left| |Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau) \right|^p (\chi_{A_{\tau}(t)}(x) - \chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)}(x)) dx. \tag{2.17}$$

By the first inequality in (2.7)

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| (|Df_k| - \tau)_+ \right|^{p+\varepsilon} dx \leq C \tag{2.18}$$

with a constant C independent of k and τ . This yields that, up to subsequences, $(|Df_k| - \tau)_+$ weakly converges in $L^{p+\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ to a function $H(\tau) \in L^{p+\varepsilon}(\Omega)$.

Due to (2.11), $H(\tau) = F(\tau)$ a.e. in Ω and so $F(\tau) \in L^{p+\varepsilon}(\Omega)$. Therefore by Hölder's inequality and thanks to (2.18) and (2.14), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_k \left| \int_{\Omega} \left| |Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau) \right|^p (\chi_{A_{\tau}(t)}(x) - \chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)}(x)) dx \right| \\ & \leq \lim_k \int_{\Omega} \left| |Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau) \right|^p |\chi_{A_{\tau}(t)}(x) - \chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)}(x)| dx \\ & \leq \lim_k \left(\int_{\Omega} \left| |Df_k| - \tau - F(\tau) \right|^{p+\varepsilon} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p+\varepsilon}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\chi_{A_{\tau}(t)} - \chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)}|^{\frac{p+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} dx \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{p+\varepsilon}} \\ & \leq C(\tau) \lim_k \left(\int_{\Omega} |\chi_{A_{\tau}(t)} - \chi_{A_{k,\tau}(t)}| dx \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{p+\varepsilon}} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

By (2.19) and (2.17), we get (2.16), i.e.,

$$|Df_k| \rightarrow F(\tau) + \tau \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(A_{\tau}(t)) \tag{2.20}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and, of course, also weakly and, up to subsequences, almost everywhere.

By assumption, f_k is weakly convergent in $W^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ to f , so, by the essential uniqueness of the weak limit we conclude that

$$|Df| = F(\tau) + \tau \quad \text{a.e. in } A_{\tau}(t). \tag{2.21}$$

Therefore

$$A_{\tau}(t) = \{x \in \Omega : |Df| > \tau + t\}.$$

By (2.20) and (2.21) and the equality above, there exists a subsequence (not relabeled) of f_k such that

$$|Df_k| \rightarrow |Df| \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(\{x \in \Omega : |Df| > \tau + t\}), \tag{2.22}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Recalling that $F(\tau) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, from the equality in (2.21) we deduce also that

$$(|Df| - \tau)_+ \in W^{1,2}(\Omega).$$

The conclusion follows by the arbitrariness of $\tau > 1$, and the arbitrariness of t , that can be chosen, up to a negligible set, arbitrarily in $(0, \infty)$. \square

3. The a priori estimate

This section is devoted to the proof of an a priori estimate which is the main tool in the proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. More precisely, we establish an estimate for the minimizers of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ defined as in (2.1) i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(v; B_r(x_0)) := \mathcal{F}(v; B_r(x_0)) + \int_{B_r(x_0)} \arctan(|v - \bar{u}(x)|^2) dx,$$

where $B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$ and $u, \bar{u} \in W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume (1.2)–(1.6) and (1.8). If $v \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$ is a minimizer of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, satisfying*

$$v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,2}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1,\infty}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{and} \quad (1 + |Dv|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |D^2v|^2 \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_r(x_0)),$$

then, for every $B_{\bar{r}}(\bar{x}) \Subset B_r(x_0)$, every $0 < \rho < r' \leq \bar{r}$ and every $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_\rho(\bar{x})} (1 + (|Dv| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Dv| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2v|^2 dx \\ & \leq \frac{c}{(r' - \rho)^4} \int_{B_{r'}(\bar{x})} (1 + (|Dv| - 1)_+)^p dx \\ & + C \left(1 + \|v - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'}(\bar{x}))}^\gamma \right) \left(\int_{B_{r'}(\bar{x})} (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

for some constant $C = C(n, N, p, q, L_1, v, \text{diam } \Omega)$ and for some exponent $\gamma = \gamma(p, q)$ both positive.

As far as the proof is concerned, the integral $\int_{B_r(x_0)} \arctan(|v - \bar{u}|^2) dx$ is a perturbation of $\mathcal{F}(v; B_r(x_0))$ that provides no difficulties. Indeed, denoted $g(x, v) := \arctan(|v - \bar{u}(x)|^2)$, we have that g and its derivatives g_{v^α} , $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$, are bounded. Thus, for the sake of clarity, we prefer to drop this perturbation term, and to state, and prove an a priori estimate for local minimizers of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; \Omega)$ only, see Theorem 3.2 below. Its proof, that can be easily adapted to obtain Theorem 3.1, follows the one of [17, Proposition 3.1], but it is drastically different in the

second step, where we have to take into account the weaker assumption on the function $k(x)$ appearing in (1.6).

Theorem 3.2. *Let $u \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ be a local minimizer of (1.1). Assume (1.2)–(1.6) and (1.8). If*

$$u \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \cap W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{and} \quad (1 + |Du|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |D^2u|^2 \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega),$$

then, for every $B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$, for every ρ , such that $0 < \rho < r$, and for every $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\ & \leq \frac{c}{(r - \rho)^4} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\ & + C \left(1 + \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))}^\gamma\right) \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx\right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for some constant $C = C(n, N, p, q, L_1, v, \text{diam } \Omega)$ and for some exponent $\gamma = \gamma(p, q)$, both positive.

Proof. We shall divide the proof into two steps.

Step 1. Our first aim is to prove that for every cut off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, the following integral estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k^2(x)) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx + C \int_{\Omega} |D\eta|^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

with $C = C(n, N, q, L_1, v)$.

Since u is a local minimizer of the functional $\mathcal{F}(u, \Omega)$, then u satisfies the Euler's system

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,\alpha} f_{\xi_i^\alpha}(x, Du) \varphi_{x_i}^\alpha(x) dx = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N),$$

and, using the second variation, for every $s = 1, \dots, n$ it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} \left\{ \sum_{i,j,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) \varphi_{x_i}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta + \sum_{i,\alpha} f_{\xi_i^\alpha x_s}(x, Du) \varphi_{x_i}^\alpha \right\} dx = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N). \tag{3.4}$$

Fix $s = 1, \dots, n$, a cut off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and consider the function

$$\varphi^\alpha := \eta^4 u_{x_s}^\alpha (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{-2} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, N.$$

Therefore, denoting

$$\Phi(t) := (1 + t)^{-2} t^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{x_i}^\alpha &= 4\eta^3 \eta_{x_i} u_{x_s}^\alpha \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ \\ &+ \eta^4 u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ + \eta^4 u_{x_s}^\alpha \Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+ [(|Du| - 1)_+]_{x_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to our assumptions on the minimizer u , through a standard density argument, we can use φ as test function in the equation (3.4), thus getting

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} 4\eta^3 \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) \eta_{x_i} u_{x_s}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+ \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) u_{x_s}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta [(|Du| - 1)_+]_{x_i} dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} 4\eta^3 \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ \sum_{i,s,\alpha} f_{\xi_i^\alpha x_s}(x, Du) \eta_{x_i} u_{x_s}^\alpha dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ \sum_{i,s,\alpha} f_{\xi_i^\alpha x_s}(x, Du) u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+ \sum_{i,s,\alpha} f_{\xi_i^\alpha x_s}(x, Du) u_{x_s}^\alpha [(|Du| - 1)_+]_{x_i} dx \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Let us now estimate the integrals I_j , $j = 1, \dots, 6$. In the estimates we will use some properties of Φ . In particular, notice that since $\Phi(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(t) \leq 1$ for every t , then

$$\Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ |Du|^\tau \leq (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{\tau} \quad \forall \tau \geq 0. \tag{3.6}$$

ESTIMATE OF I_1 . By assumptions (1.4) and (1.5), we can estimate the integral I_1 by the use of Cauchy–Schwartz and Young’s inequalities as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 |I_1| &\leq 4 \int_{\Omega} \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) \left\{ \eta^2 \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) \eta_{x_i}^\alpha u_{x_s}^\alpha \eta_{x_j}^\beta u_{x_s}^\beta \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \\
 &\quad \times \left\{ \eta^4 \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\
 &\leq C(\varepsilon, q, L_1) \int_{\Omega} \eta^2 |D\eta|^2 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^q dx \\
 &\quad + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ will be chosen later. Using (3.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 |I_1| &\leq C(\varepsilon, q, L_1) \int_{\Omega} \eta^2 |D\eta|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx \\
 &\quad + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta dx. \tag{3.7}
 \end{aligned}$$

ESTIMATE OF I_3 . Since for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus \{0\}$

$$f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, \xi) = \left(\frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |\xi|)}{|\xi|^2} - \frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |\xi|)}{|\xi|^3} \right) \xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta + \frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |\xi|)}{|\xi|} \delta_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}$$

and

$$(|Du| - 1)_+]_{x_i} = (|Du|)_{x_i} = \frac{1}{|Du|} \sum_{\alpha,s} u_{x_i x_s}^\alpha u_{x_s}^\alpha \quad \text{a.e. in } \{|Du| \geq 1\} \tag{3.8}$$

then, for a.e. $x \in \{|Du| \geq 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) u_{x_s}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta [(|Du| - 1)_+]_{x_i} \\
 &= \left(\frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|)}{|Du|^2} - \frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|)}{|Du|^3} \right) \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} u_{x_s}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta u_{x_i}^\alpha u_{x_j}^\beta [(|Du| - 1)_+]_{x_i} \\
 &\quad + \frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|)}{|Du|} \sum_{i,s,\alpha} u_{x_s}^\alpha u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha [(|Du| - 1)_+]_{x_i}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\frac{\tilde{f}_{tt}(x, |Du|)}{|Du|} - \frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|)}{|Du|^2} \right) \sum_{i,s,\alpha} u_{x_s}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_s} u_{x_i}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_i} \\
&+ \frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|)}{|Du|} \sum_{i,s,\alpha} u_{x_s}^\alpha u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_i} \\
&= \left(\frac{\tilde{f}_{tt}(x, |Du|)}{|Du|} - \frac{\tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|)}{|Du|^2} \right) \sum_{\alpha} \left(\sum_i u_{x_i}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_i} \right)^2 \\
&+ \tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|) |D(|Du|)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+ \frac{\tilde{f}_{tt}(x, |Du|)}{|Du|} \sum_{\alpha} \left(\sum_i u_{x_i}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_i} \right)^2 dx \\
&+ \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+ \tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|) \left(|D(|Du|)|^2 - \frac{\sum_{\alpha} \left(\sum_i u_{x_i}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_i} \right)^2}{|Du|^2} \right) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, if we use the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\sum_{\alpha} \left(\sum_i u_{x_i}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_i} \right)^2 \leq |Du|^2 |D(|Du|)|^2.$$

Since

$$\Phi'(t) = \frac{2t}{(1+t)^3}, \tag{3.9}$$

is nonnegative for every $t \geq 0$ and, by (1.3), $\tilde{f}_t(x, |Du|) \geq 0$, then we conclude that

$$I_3 \geq \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+ \frac{\tilde{f}_{tt}(x, |Du|)}{|Du|} \sum_{\alpha} \left(\sum_i u_{x_i}^\alpha (|Du|)_{x_i} \right)^2 dx \geq 0. \tag{3.10}$$

ESTIMATE OF I_4 . By using assumption (1.6) we obtain

$$|I_4| \leq c(q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^3 |D\eta| k(x) \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ |Du|^q dx.$$

Hence, by (3.6) we get

$$|I_4| \leq c(q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^3 |D\eta| k(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx. \tag{3.11}$$

ESTIMATE OF I_5 . Using assumption (1.6) and Young’s inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |I_5| &\leq c(q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) k(x) |Du|^{q-1} |D^2u| dx \\
 &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 &\quad + C(\varepsilon, q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) k^2(x) |Du|^{2q-p} dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

that implies, by (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
 |I_5| &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 &\quad + C(\varepsilon, q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx. \tag{3.12}
 \end{aligned}$$

ESTIMATE OF I_6 . Using assumption (1.6) and equality (3.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 |I_6| &\leq c(q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) k(x) |Du|^{q-1} |Du| |D((|Du| - 1)_+)| dx \\
 &\leq c(n, N, q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) k(x) |Du|^q |D^2u| dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying and dividing the integrand in the right hand side by $2^{-1/2}(\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{1/2}$, with $0 < \delta < 1$ to be chosen later, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |I_6| &\leq \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) (\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad \times \left\{ 2c^2 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) k^2(x) (\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{-1} |Du|^{2q-p+2} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\
 &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) (\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 &\quad + C_{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) k^2(x) (\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{-1} |Du|^{2q-p+2} dx, \tag{3.13}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used Young's inequality. In order to estimate the first integral in the right hand side of (3.13) we note that, by virtue of (3.9),

$$t\Phi'(t) = \frac{2t^2}{(1+t)^3} = \frac{2}{1+t}\Phi(t) \leq 2\Phi(t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Therefore we have

$$\Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+)(|Du| - 1)_+ \leq 2\Phi((|Du| - 1)_+).$$

This also implies, recalling that $\delta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+)\chi_{\{|Du| \geq 2\}} &\leq \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+)(|Du| - 1)_+\chi_{\{|Du| \geq 2\}} \\ &\leq 2\Phi((|Du| - 1)_+)\chi_{\{|Du| \geq 2\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\Phi'(t) \leq 1$ in $[0, 1]$ (see (3.9)), we have that

$$\Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+)\chi_{\{1 \leq |Du| \leq 2\}} \leq \chi_{\{1 \leq |Du| \leq 2\}}.$$

Hence, the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) (\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) (|Du| - 1)_+ |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{2} \int_{\{|Du| \geq 2\}} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{2} \int_{\{1 \leq |Du| \leq 2\}} \eta^4 \Phi'((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &+ \varepsilon \int_{\{|Du| \geq 2\}} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{2} \int_{\{1 \leq |Du| \leq 2\}} \eta^4 |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx + \varepsilon \delta \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx. \quad (3.14) \end{aligned}$$

Let us now estimate the second integral in the right hand side of (3.13). By (3.9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+}{\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+} &= \frac{2}{(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^3} \frac{(|Du| - 1)_+}{\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^3} \leq \frac{2}{(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi'(|Du| - 1)_+ k^2(x) (\delta + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{-1} |Du|^{2q-p+2} dx \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Inserting the estimates (3.14) and (3.15) in (3.13), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_6| &\leq C_{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \delta \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Observe that equality (3.5) can be written as follows

$$I_2 + I_3 = -I_1 - I_4 - I_5 - I_6,$$

and that, by virtue of (3.10), we get

$$I_2 \leq |I_1| + |I_4| + |I_5| + |I_6|.$$

Therefore, recalling the estimates (3.7), (3.11), (3.12) and (3.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi(|Du| - 1)_+ \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^{\alpha} \xi_j^{\beta}}(x, Du) u_{x_s x_i}^{\alpha} u_{x_s x_j}^{\beta} dx \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon, q, L_1) \int_{\Omega} \eta^2 |D\eta|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx \\ &\quad + C(q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^3 |D\eta| k(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & +C(\varepsilon, q) \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x)(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx \\
 & +3\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & +\varepsilon \delta \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

By assumption (1.4), the integral in the left hand side of (3.17) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) \sum_{i,j,s,\alpha,\beta} f_{\xi_i^\alpha \xi_j^\beta}(x, Du) u_{x_s x_i}^\alpha u_{x_s x_j}^\beta dx \\
 & \geq \nu \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (1 - \varepsilon)\nu \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & \leq 3\varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & + C \int_{\Omega} \eta^2 |D\eta|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx + C \int_{\Omega} \eta^3 |D\eta| k(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx \\
 & + C \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx + \varepsilon \delta \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

with $C = C(n, N, q, \nu, L_1, \varepsilon)$. Choosing $\varepsilon = \frac{\nu}{6+\nu}$, we can reabsorb the first integral in the right hand side of the previous inequality by the left hand side, thus getting

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & \leq C \int_{\Omega} \eta^2 |D\eta|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx + C \int_{\Omega} \eta^3 |D\eta| k(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx \\
 & + C \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx + C \delta \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Since $|Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ by assumption, we can let δ go to 0 in (3.18), and so the last term goes to 0. Moreover

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta^3 |D\eta| k(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \eta^2 |D\eta|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx.$$

Thus estimate (3.18) implies

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} \eta^2 |D\eta|^2 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^q dx + C \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 k^2(x) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx,$$

with $C = C(n, N, q, L_1, \nu)$. Using Young's inequality again in the first integral of the right hand side of previous inequality we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 \Phi((|Du| - 1)_+) |Du|^{p-2} |D^2u|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |D\eta|^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx + C \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k^2(x)) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx$$

Estimate (3.3) follows recalling the definition of Φ .

Step 2. In this step we conclude the proof.

Fix radii $0 < \rho < s < t \leq r'$ and a cut off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_t)$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_s and $|D\eta| \leq \frac{2}{t-s}$. First let us consider the case $k \in L_{loc}^\sigma(\Omega)$, $\sigma < \infty$. By using the assumption $k \in L_{loc}^\sigma(\Omega)$ and Hölder's inequality with exponents $\frac{\sigma}{2}$, $\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-2}$ in the first integral of the right hand side of (3.3), we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{2}{\sigma}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{\frac{(2q-p)\sigma}{\sigma-2}} dx \right)^{\frac{\sigma-2}{\sigma}} + C \int_{\Omega} |D\eta|^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx. \tag{3.19}$$

Note that, by the assumptions on q , we have that $\frac{(2q-p)\sigma}{\sigma-2} \leq p + 2$. In the case $\frac{(2q-p)\sigma}{\sigma-2} < p + 2$, we can apply Hölder's inequality with exponents $\frac{(p+2)(\sigma-2)}{(2q-p)\sigma}$ and $\frac{(p+2)(\sigma-2)}{(p+2)(\sigma-2) - \sigma(2q-p)}$ thus obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
& \leq C_1 \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{2}{\sigma}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p+2} dx \right)^{\frac{2q-p}{p+2}} \\
& + C_2 \int_{\Omega} |D\eta|^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx, \tag{3.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(n, p, q, \sigma, \text{diam } \Omega)$ and $C_2 = C_2(n, N, q, L_1, \nu)$. In the case $\frac{(2q-p)\sigma}{\sigma-2} = p+2$, the estimate (3.19) obviously gives (3.20), without applying Hölder's inequality.

Since by virtue of assumption (1.8) we have that $\frac{2q-p}{p+2} < 1$, we can use Young's inequality in the first term in the right hand side of previous estimate and the inequality $(1 + |a|)^{p+2} \leq 2(1 + |a|)^p |a|^2 + 2(1 + |a|)^p$, thus getting

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
& \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p+2} dx + C_2 \int_{\Omega} |D\eta|^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\
& + \frac{C_3}{\varepsilon^{\gamma/2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}} \\
& \leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 dx \\
& + (\varepsilon + C_2) \int_{\Omega} (\eta^4 + |D\eta|^4) (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\
& + \frac{C_3}{\varepsilon^{\gamma/2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma = \gamma(p, q)$ and $C_3 = C_3(n, N, p, q, L_1, \nu, \sigma, \text{diam } \Omega)$ are positive. By the interpolation inequality of Proposition 2.5, with $\psi = \eta^2$, and using equality (2.6), we deduce that for every $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^N$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
& \leq c\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'})}^2 \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + c\varepsilon \left(1 + \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'})}^2\right) \int_{\Omega} (\eta^4 + |D\eta|^4)(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\
 & + (\varepsilon + C_2) \int_{\Omega} (\eta^4 + |D\eta|^4)(1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\
 & + \frac{C_3}{\varepsilon^{\gamma/2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By the properties of the cut off function η , previous estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{B_s} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & \leq c\varepsilon \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'})}^2 \int_{B_t} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & + c \left(\varepsilon \left(1 + \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'})}^2\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{(t-s)^4}\right) + 1 \right) \int_{B_{r'}} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\
 & + \frac{C_3}{\varepsilon^{\gamma/2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

If $\|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'})} = 0$ the claim follows, otherwise, since c is a constant independent of ε , we can choose

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2c \left(1 + \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'})}^2\right)}$$

thus getting

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{B_s} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_t} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} (|Du| - 1)_+^2 |D^2u|^2 dx \\
 & + c \left(1 + \frac{1}{(t-s)^4}\right) \int_{B_{r'}} (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx \\
 & + C(1 + \|u - \kappa\|_{L^\infty(B_{r'})}^\gamma) \left(\int_{B_{r'}} (1 + k(x))^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that

$$1 + \frac{1}{(t-s)^4} \leq \frac{c(\text{diam } \Omega)}{(t-s)^4}$$

and using the iteration Lemma 2.1 we get (3.2).

Now, let us consider the case $\sigma = \infty$; i.e., $k \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$. By (3.3), we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{p-4} ((|Du| - 1)_+)^2 |D^2u|^2 dx$$

$$\leq C \int_{\Omega} \eta^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^{2q-p} dx + C \int_{\Omega} |D\eta|^4 (1 + (|Du| - 1)_+)^p dx,$$

with C depending on $\|k\|_\infty$. Since $q < p + 1$, then we get an inequality analogous to (3.20), actually simpler. Then, the proof goes on with straightforward changes. \square

4. Proof of the main results

Before going on with the proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we state two approximation results for the energy density f . More precisely, the first one approximates f through an increasing sequence (f_j) of integrands satisfying p -growth conditions, the second one approximates each f_j through a sequence $(f_{j,h})$ of uniformly elliptic integrands having smooth dependence on the x -variable. The dependence of the constants with respect to j or h will be indicated.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a Carathéodory function which satisfies assumptions (1.2)–(1.7). Then there exists a sequence of Carathéodory functions $f_j : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, monotonically convergent to f , such that the following properties hold for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$:*

$$f_j(x, \xi) \leq f_{j+1}(x, \xi) \leq f(x, \xi) \tag{4.1}$$

$$K_0(|\xi|^p - 1) \leq f_j(x, \xi) \leq L(1 + |\xi|)^q \quad \text{and} \quad f_j(x, \xi) \leq K_1(j)(1 + |\xi|)^p, \tag{4.2}$$

with positive constants K_0 and $K_1(j)$. In addition, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus B_1(0)$,

$$f_j(x, \xi) = \tilde{f}_j(x, |\xi|), \quad t \mapsto \tilde{f}_j(x, t) \quad \text{nondecreasing}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\langle D_{\xi\xi} f_j(x, \xi)\lambda, \lambda \rangle \geq \bar{\nu}(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\lambda|^2 \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{nN},$$

with $\bar{\nu} > 0$ and

$$f_j(x, t\xi) \leq t^\mu f_j(x, \xi) \quad \forall t > 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover, the vector field $x \mapsto D_\xi f_j(x, \xi)$ is weakly differentiable and, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus B_1(0)$,

$$|D_{\xi x} f_j(x, \xi)| \leq k(x)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{q-1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad |D_{\xi x} f_j(x, \xi)| \leq C(j)k(x)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}.$$

For the proof we refer to Lemma 4.1 in [11]. The proof of (4.4), absent in [11], trivially follows by (1.7) and the definition of f_j .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, be a Carathéodory function which satisfies assumptions (1.2)–(1.7). Let f_j be the sequence of functions in Lemma 4.1. Fixed an open set $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$, for every j there exists a sequence of C^2 -functions $f_{j,h} : \Omega' \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, $f_{j,h}$ convex in the last variable, such that $f_{j,h}$ converges to f_j pointwise a.e. in Ω' and everywhere in \mathbb{R}^{nN} . Moreover, $f_{j,h}$ satisfies the following properties for every $x \in \Omega'$ and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$*

$$f_{j,h}(x, \xi) \leq (L + 1)(1 + |\xi|)^q \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{c}_1|\xi|^p - \tilde{c}_2 \leq f_{j,h}(x, \xi) \leq \tilde{K}_1(j)(1 + |\xi|)^p, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\mu(h)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\lambda|^2 \leq \langle D_{\xi\xi} f_{j,h}(x, \xi)\lambda, \lambda \rangle \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}, \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$|D_{\xi\xi} f_{j,h}(x, \xi)| \leq \sigma(j, h)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}$$

with positive constants $\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{K}_1(j), \mu(h), \sigma(j, h)$. In addition, for every $x \in \Omega'$ and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{nN} \setminus B_2(0)$ we have:

$$f_{j,h}(x, \xi) = \tilde{f}_{j,h}(x, |\xi|), \quad \text{with } t \mapsto \tilde{f}_{j,h}(x, t) \text{ nondecreasing,}$$

$$f_{j,h}(x, t\xi) \leq t^\mu f_{j,h}(x, \xi), \quad \forall t > 1,$$

$$\tilde{\nu}(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\lambda|^2 \leq \langle D_{\xi\xi} f_{j,h}(x, \xi)\lambda, \lambda \rangle \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{nN},$$

$$|D_{\xi\xi} f_{j,h}(x, \xi)| \leq \overline{L}_1(j)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}},$$

$$|D_{\xi x} f_{j,h}(x, \xi)| \leq \Lambda(j, h)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}, \quad (4.7)$$

$$|D_{\xi x} f_{j,h}(x, \xi)| \leq \overline{C}(j)k_h(x)(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}, \quad (4.8)$$

with $\tilde{\nu}, \overline{L}_1(j), \Lambda(j, h), \overline{C}(j)$, positive constants. Here $k_h \in C^\infty(\Omega')$ is a nonnegative function, such that $k_h \rightarrow k$ in $L^\sigma(\Omega')$ as h goes to ∞ .

For the proof we refer to Proposition 4.1 in [10].

Now we are in position to give the proof of our regularity results.

Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Let u be a local minimizer of \mathcal{F} in (1.1). By Theorem 2.2, $u \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and so we have to prove the higher differentiability result (1.9) and the estimate (1.10).

Step 1. The approximation. Fixed an open set $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$, let f_j be defined as in Lemma 4.1 and $f_{j,h}$ be the sequence defined in Lemma 4.2. Fix a ball $B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega'$. Consider the smooth functions $u_{\frac{1}{r}} \in C^\infty(\Omega')$,

$$u_{\frac{1}{r}}(x) = \int_{B_1} \sigma(y)u \left(x + \frac{1}{r}y \right) dy$$

where $\sigma \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ is the usual nonnegative, radially symmetric mollifier and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \geq i_0$, with i_0 sufficiently large so that $B_{r+\frac{1}{i_0}}(x_0) \Subset \Omega'$. Without loss of generality we can assume $i_0 = 1$.

Inspired by [6], we introduce the functional

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j,h}(w; B_r(x_0)) := \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Dw) dx + \int_{B_r(x_0)} \arctan(|w - u_{\frac{1}{i}}(x)|^2) dx,$$

and the corresponding minimization problem

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j,h}(w; B_r(x_0)) : w \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \right\}.$$

By virtue of (4.5) and (4.6), we have the existence of a minimizer $v_{i,j,h} \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$ of the problem above.

From (4.5) and the minimality of $v_{i,j,h}$, there exists $c > 0$, independent of i , j and h , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |Dv_{i,j,h}|^p dx &\leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f_{j,h}(x, Dv_{i,j,h}) + \arctan(|v_{i,j,h}(x) - u_{\frac{1}{i}}(x)|^2)) dx \\ &\leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f_{j,h}(x, Du) + \arctan(|u(x) - u_{\frac{1}{i}}(x)|^2)) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

By (4.5) and the pointwise convergence of $f_{j,h}$ to f_j , we can use the dominated convergence theorem to deduce that

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Du) dx = \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_j(x, Du) dx.$$

The properties of \limsup imply that there exists $h_0 = h_0(j) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Du) dx &\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f_{j,h}(x, Du)) dx \\ &= \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f_j(x, Du)) dx \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Since $f_j \leq f$, we have

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Du) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \quad (4.11)$$

1 Inserting (4.11) in (4.9), we get that there exists c , independent of i, j, h , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{B_r(x_0)} |Dv_{i,j,h}|^p dx &\leq \frac{c}{3} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du) + \arctan(|u(x) - u_{\frac{1}{7}}(x)|^2)) dx \\
 &\leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \quad \forall i, \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \quad (4.12)
 \end{aligned}$$

2 So there exists $v_{j,h} \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that, up to a subsequence, as $i \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$v_{i,j,h} \rightharpoonup v_{j,h} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j) \quad (4.13)$$

$$v_{i,j,h} \rightarrow v_{j,h} \text{ a.e. in } B_r(x_0) \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \quad (4.14)$$

3 By (4.5) and by Proposition 8.7, Corollary 8.8, Proposition 8.10 in [15], see also Proposition 2.20 in [21], $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j,h}(\cdot; B_r(x_0))\}$ Γ -converges, as $i \rightarrow \infty$, to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,h}(w; B_r(x_0)) := \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Dw) dx + \int_{B_r(x_0)} \arctan(|w - u(x)|^2) dx \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j)$$

4 with respect to the weak $W^{1,p}$ -topology induced on $u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$. This implies that for every j and every $h \geq h_0(j)$,

$$v_{j,h} \text{ is a minimizer of } \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,h}(\cdot; B_r(x_0)) \text{ in } u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N),$$

5 see Corollary 7.20 in [15].

6 From (4.5) and the minimality of $v_{j,h}$, there exists $c > 0$, independent of j and h , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{B_r(x_0)} |Dv_{j,h}|^p dx &\leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(1 + f_{j,h}(x, Dv_{j,h}) + \arctan(|v_{j,h}(x) - u(x)|^2)\right) dx \\
 &\leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f_{j,h}(x, Du)) dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

7 The inequalities above, (4.5), (4.2), the dominated convergence theorem and (4.1) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
 \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |Dv_{j,h}|^p dx &\leq c \limsup_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f_{j,h}(x, Du)) dx \\
 &\leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f_j(x, Du)) dx \leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

8 Therefore, there exists a function $v_j \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0))$, such that, up to a subsequence, as $h \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$v_{j,h} \rightharpoonup v_j \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \quad \forall j, \tag{4.15}$$

$$v_{j,h} \rightarrow v_j \text{ a.e. in } B_r(x_0) \quad \forall j. \tag{4.16}$$

By the p -growth conditions (4.2) and (4.5), by the convexity of the functions $f_{j,h}(x, \cdot)$ and f_j , the pointwise convergence a.e. in Ω' of $f_{j,h}(\cdot, \xi)$ to $f_j(\cdot, \xi)$, we have that the sequence $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,h}(\cdot; B_r(x_0))\}_{h \geq h_0(j)}$ Γ -converges to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j(w; B_r(x_0)) := \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_j(x, Dw) dx + \int_{B_r(x_0)} \arctan(|w - u(x)|^2) dx,$$

with respect to the weak $W^{1,p}$ -topology induced on $u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$, see Proposition 6.21, Theorem 5.14 in [15] and Theorem 2.8, Proposition 2.20 in [21]. Moreover, by the minimality of $v_{j,h}$ and (4.15), we have that for every j

$$v_j \text{ is a minimizer of } \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j(\cdot; B_r(x_0)) \text{ in } u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \tag{4.17}$$

and

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,h}(v_{j,h}; B_r(x_0)) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j(v_j; B_r(x_0)), \tag{4.18}$$

see Corollary 7.20 in [15].

By the weak lower semicontinuity of the L^p -norm, (??) implies

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |Dv_j|^p dx \leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx.$$

As a consequence we have, up to a subsequence, that there exists a function $v \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$, such that, up to a subsequence, as $j \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$v_j \rightharpoonup v \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N), \tag{4.19}$$

$$v_j \rightarrow v \text{ a.e. in } B_r(x_0). \tag{4.20}$$

We claim that v is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; B_r(x_0))$. Using (4.18) and the minimality of $v_{j,h}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_j(x, Dv_j) dx &\leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f_j(x, Dv_j) + \arctan(|v_j - u|^2) \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f_{j,h}(x, Dv_{j,h}) + \arctan(|v_{j,h} - u|^2) \right) dx \\ &\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Du) dx. \end{aligned}$$

By the dominated convergence theorem and using that $f_j \leq f$, see (4.3), we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Du) dx = \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_j(x, Du) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx.$$

Collecting the above inequalities we get

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} f_j(x, Dv_j) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx. \tag{4.21}$$

Now, fix $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. By (4.3) and (4.21)

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j_0}(x, Dv_j) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_j(x, Dv_j) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \quad \forall j \geq j_0. \tag{4.22}$$

Therefore, (4.19) and the lower semicontinuity of the functional $v \mapsto \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j_0}(x, Dv) dx$ with respect to the weak topology in $W^{1,p}$ imply

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j_0}(x, Dv) dx \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_{j_0}(x, Dv_j) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx.$$

By (4.3) we can use the monotone convergence theorem, so to obtain, as $j_0 \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Dv) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx.$$

Since u is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; B_r(x_0))$ and $v \in u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0))$ we conclude that v is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; B_r(x_0))$.

Step 2. In this step we prove that $v = u$. Using that u and v are minimizers of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; B_r(x_0))$ in $u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$, (4.1), the convergence (4.19), the semicontinuity of the functionals $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j(\cdot; B_r(x_0))$ with respect to the weak topology in $u + W_0^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$ and using also that v_j minimizes $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j(\cdot; B_r(x_0))$, see (4.17), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Dv) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f(x, Dv) + \arctan(|v - u|^2) \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{j_0 \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f_{j_0}(x, Dv) + \arctan(|v - u|^2) \right) dx \\ &\leq \lim_{j_0 \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f_{j_0}(x, Dv_j) + \arctan(|v_j - u|^2) \right) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f_j(x, Dv_j) + \arctan(|v_j - u|^2) \right) dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x_0)} f_j(x, Du) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx = \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Dv) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since f is nonnegative, this obviously implies that

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} \arctan(|v - u|^2) dx = 0$$

and so $u \equiv v$ a.e. in $B_r(x_0)$.

Step 3. In this step we prove the regularity of u and the estimate (1.10). By virtue of Lemma 4.2, the integrands of the functionals $\tilde{F}_{i,j,h}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorems 2.4 and 3.1. By Theorem 2.4,

$$v_{i,j,h} \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \cap W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \tag{4.23}$$

and

$$(1 + |Dv_{i,j,h}|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{4}} |D^2 v_{i,j,h}| \in L_{loc}^2(B_r(x_0)).$$

Let \mathcal{G} be the function defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(t) := \int_0^t s(2+s)^{\frac{p-4}{2}} ds.$$

Of course, $\mathcal{G}(|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+ \in L_{loc}^2(B_r(x_0))$. We claim that

$$\mathcal{G}(|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+ \in W^{1,2}(B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)) \tag{4.24}$$

and the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} |D(\mathcal{G}(|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)|^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right) \\ &+ C \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \right)^{\tilde{\vartheta}} \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + k_h^\sigma) dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}} \quad \forall i, \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j), \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

where $\tilde{\vartheta} = \tilde{\vartheta}(q, p, n)$ and $C = C(n, N, p, q, L_1, \nu, r, \text{diam } \Omega)$ are positive constants independent of i, j and h and $h_0(j)$ is as in (4.10).

To prove the claim we start by applying Theorem 3.1 to the functional $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j,h}$, with

$$\bar{x} = x_0, \quad \rho = \frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}, \quad r' = \frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}, \quad \bar{r} = \frac{r}{2}, \quad \kappa = (v_{i,j,h})_{x_0, \frac{r}{2}}.$$

Notice that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j,h}$ has an integrand $f_{j,k}$ that satisfies, with respect to the gradient variable, the radial condition and the p -ellipticity property outside $B_2(0)$.

Since

$$\frac{(|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+}{2 + (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+} |Dv_{i,j,h}|^{\frac{p-2}{2}} = (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+ (2 + (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^{\frac{p-4}{2}}$$

a.e. in $B_r(x_0)$, then Theorem 3.1, implies (4.24) and, by (3.1), for every i, j, h ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} |D(\mathcal{G}(|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)|^2 dx \\ & \leq C \int_{B_{\frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (2 + (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^p dx \\ & + C \left(1 + \|v_{i,j,h} - (v_{i,j,h})_{x_0, \frac{r}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))}^\gamma \right) \left(\int_{B_{\frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (1 + k_h^\sigma) dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

where $\gamma = \gamma(p, q)$ and $C = C(n, N, p, q, L_1, v, r, \text{diam } \Omega)$ are positive constants, independent of i, j and h , and k_h is the function in (4.8).

Let us now estimate the right hand side of (4.26).

Since $u_{\frac{1}{i}} \in W^{1,p}(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(B_r(x_0); \mathbb{R}^N)$ and $f_{j,h}$ satisfies the properties listed in Lemma 4.2, we can apply Theorem 2.3 to the functions $v_{i,j,h}$, so obtaining

$$\|v_{i,j,h} - (v_{i,j,h})_{x_0, \frac{r}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))} \leq c \left\{ 1 + \int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Dv_{i,j,h}) dx \right\}^\vartheta, \quad (4.27)$$

where $\vartheta = \vartheta(q, p, n)$.

By the minimality of $v_{i,j,h}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Dv_{i,j,h}) dx \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f_{j,h}(x, Dv_{i,j,h}) + \arctan(|v_{i,j,h} - u_{\frac{1}{i}}|^2) \right) dx \\ & \leq \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(f_{j,h}(x, Du) + \arctan(|u - u_{\frac{1}{i}}|^2) \right) dx \leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (f_{j,h}(x, Du) + 1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.11) to estimate the last integral, we get that for every j there exists $h_0(j)$ such that

$$\int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x_0)} f_{j,h}(x, Dv_{i,j,h}) dx \leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \quad \forall i, \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \quad (4.28)$$

Therefore by (4.27) and (4.28) we have

$$\|v_{i,j,h} - (v_{i,j,h})_{x_0, \frac{r}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))} \leq c \left\{ 1 + \int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \right\}^\vartheta, \quad \forall i, \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j), \quad (4.29)$$

with c possibly depending on r . To estimate the first integral at the right hand side of (4.26) we use (4.12), which implies that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (2 + (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^p dx &\leq 2^p \int_{B_{\frac{r}{4\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (1 + |Dv_{i,j,h}|)^p dx \\ &\leq c \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \quad \forall i, \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Therefore, by (4.26), (4.29) and (4.30) we get (4.24) and (4.25). The claim is proved.

Setting $w_{i,j,h} := \mathcal{G}((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)$, we deduce that there exists $w_{j,h} \in W^{1,2}(B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))$, such that, for a subsequence, as $i \rightarrow \infty$

$$w_{i,j,h} \rightharpoonup w_{j,h} \quad \text{in } W^{1,2}\left(B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)\right) \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j), \quad (4.31)$$

and

$$w_{i,j,h} \rightarrow w_{j,h} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2\left(B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)\right) \text{ and a.e. in } B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \quad (4.32)$$

We note that $v_{i,j,h}$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.5, see (4.23) and (4.24).

Thus, applying Proposition 2.5 to the function $v_{i,j,h}$ with $\Omega = B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)$, $\kappa = (v_{i,j,h})_{x_0, \frac{r}{2}}$ and with $\psi \in C_c^\infty(B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))$,

$$\psi \equiv 1 \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0), \quad |D\psi| \leq \frac{2}{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}} - \frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}},$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (2 + (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^p ((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^2 dx \\
 & \leq c \left(1 + \|v_{i,j,h} - (v_{i,j,h})_{x_0, \frac{r}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \right) \int_{B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (2 + (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^p dx \\
 & + c \|v_{i,j,h} - (v_{i,j,h})_{x_0, \frac{r}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}\psi)}^2 \int_{B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} |D(\mathcal{G}((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+))|^2 dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

By (4.29), (4.30) and (4.25) the right hand side is finite and uniformly bounded w.r.t. i . More precisely, we get that, for every i, j and every $h \geq h_0(j)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (2 + (|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^p ((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+)^2 dx \\
 & \leq c \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right)^{\bar{\vartheta}} \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} k_h^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}} \tag{4.33}
 \end{aligned}$$

with c and $\bar{\vartheta}$ positive constants independent of i, j and $h \geq h_0(j)$.

Since $k_h \rightarrow k$ in $L^\sigma(B_r(x_0))$, the inequality above implies that

$$\sup_i \|(|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+\|_{L^{p+2}(B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))} \leq c, \tag{4.34}$$

with c independent of j and h . By (4.13), (4.23), (4.24) and (4.34) the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 are satisfied with $\Omega = B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)$, $f = v_{j,h}$ and $(f_k)_k$ to be read as $(v_{i,j,h})_i$. Thus

$$(|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+ \in W^{1,2}(B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)) \tag{4.35}$$

and, up to subsequences,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |Dv_{i,j,h}| \rightarrow_{i \rightarrow \infty} |Dv_{j,h}| \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_{j,h}| > \tau\}), \quad \text{for a.e. } \tau > 2, \\
 & |Dv_{i,j,h}| \rightarrow_{i \rightarrow \infty} |Dv_{j,h}| \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_{j,h}| > 2\}, \\
 & \mathcal{G}((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+) \rightarrow_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}((|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+) \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_{j,h}| > 2\}, \tag{4.36}
 \end{aligned}$$

and, by (4.34),

$$(|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+ \rightharpoonup_{i \rightarrow \infty} (|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+ \quad \text{weakly in } L^{p+2}(B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)). \tag{4.37}$$

This last convergence, the sequential weak lower semicontinuity of the norm and (4.33) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} |Dv_{j,h}|^{p+2} dx \leq \int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (2 + (|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+)^{p+2} dx \\ & \leq c \left(1 + \int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} (2 + (|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+)^p (|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+^2 dx \right) \\ & \leq c \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{p}} \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} k_h^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}} \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

Let us recall that

$$w_{i,j,h} := \mathcal{G}((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+),$$

and, by (4.32),

$$w_{i,j,h} \rightarrow w_{j,h} \text{ a.e. in } B_{\frac{r}{8\sqrt{n}}}(x_0).$$

Therefore, (4.36) implies that

$$w_{j,h} = \mathcal{G}((|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+) \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_{j,h}| > 2\}.$$

By using (4.31), we have

$$D\mathcal{G}((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+) \rightharpoonup_{i \rightarrow \infty} D\mathcal{G}((|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+) \quad \text{in } L^2(B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_{j,h}| > 2\}).$$

The sequential weak lower semicontinuity of the norm and (4.25) give

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_{j,h}| > 2\}} |D(\mathcal{G}((|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+))|^2 dx \\ & \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_{i,j,h}| > 2\}} |D(\mathcal{G}((|Dv_{i,j,h}| - 2)_+))|^2 dx \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ C \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \right)^{\tilde{\vartheta}} \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} k_h^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}}. \quad (4.39)$$

This clearly implies

$$\int_{B_{\frac{r}{16\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)} |D(\mathcal{G}(|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+)|^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right) + C \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \right)^{\tilde{\vartheta}} \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} k_h^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}} \quad \forall j, \forall h \geq h_0(j). \quad (4.40)$$

Since $k_h \rightarrow k$ in $L^\sigma(B_r(x_0))$ and (4.15), (4.34), (4.35), (4.38), (4.40) and Proposition 2.5 hold, we obtain

$$\sup_{h \geq h_0(j)} \|(|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+\|_{L^{p+2}(B_{\frac{r}{32\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))} \leq c \quad \forall j$$

and we are in position to apply Proposition 2.6 to the sequence of functions $(v_{j,h})_h$. Thus, we get

$$(|Dv_j| - 2)_+ \in W^{1,2}(B_{\frac{r}{32\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))$$

and, up to subsequences, as $h \rightarrow \infty$,

$$|Dv_{j,h}| \rightarrow |Dv_j| \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(B_{\frac{r}{32\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_j| > \tau\}), \quad \text{for a.e. } \tau > 2,$$

$$|Dv_{j,h}| \rightarrow |Dv_j| \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{\frac{r}{32\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_j| > 2\},$$

$$\mathcal{G}(|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(|Dv_j| - 2)_+ \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{\frac{r}{32\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_j| > 2\},$$

and

$$(|Dv_{j,h}| - 2)_+ \rightharpoonup (|Dv_j| - 2)_+ \quad \text{weakly in } L^{p+2}(B_{\frac{r}{32\sqrt{n}}}(x_0)).$$

Reasoning as in (4.39), we obtain

$$\int_{B_{\frac{r}{32\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Dv_j| > 2\}} |D(\mathcal{G}(|Dv_j| - 2)_+)|^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right) + C \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \right)^{\tilde{\vartheta}} \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} k^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}},$$

where we used the strong convergence of k_h to k in L^σ . Arguing similarly it can be shown that the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 are satisfied by the sequence of functions (v_j) , thus obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\frac{r}{64\sqrt{n}}}(x_0) \cap \{|Du| > 2\}} |D(\mathcal{G}(|Du| - 2)_+)|^2 dx \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (1 + f(x, Du)) dx \right) + C \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} f(x, Du) dx \right)^{\tilde{\nu}} \left(1 + \int_{B_r(x_0)} k^\sigma dx \right)^{\frac{p+2}{\sigma(p-q+1)}} \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

and $(|Du| - 2)_+ \in L^{p+2}(B_{\frac{r}{64\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))$, that trivially implies $|Du| \in L^{p+2}(B_{\frac{r}{64\sqrt{n}}}(x_0))$. These facts, together with a covering argument, allow to conclude. \square

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Matteo Focardi for helpful discussions. Part of this work was carried out while G. Cupini was visiting the Mathematical Department *R. Caccioppoli*, University of Napoli “Federico II”, and R. Giova and A. Passarelli di Napoli the Mathematical Department of the University of Bologna. These authors thank these Institutions for their warm hospitality. The first author was partially supported by “Progetto inviti 2016” of the Mathematical Department *R. Caccioppoli*, University of Napoli “Federico II”. The third author was partially supported by University of Napoli “Parthenope” through the projects “Sostengo alla Ricerca individuale” (Annualità 2015–2016–2017) and “Sostenibilità, esternalità e uso efficiente delle risorse ambientali” (2017–2019). All the authors are members of the Gruppo Nazionale per l’Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

References

- [1] P. Baroni, M. Colombo, G. Mingione, Harnack inequalities for double phase functionals, *Nonlinear Anal.* 121 (2015) 206–222.
- [2] P. Bousquet, L. Brasco, Global Lipschitz continuity for minima of degenerate problems, *Math. Ann.* 366 (2016) 1403–1450.
- [3] L. Brasco, Global L^∞ gradient estimates for solutions to a certain degenerate elliptic equation, *Nonlinear Anal.* 74 (2011) 516–531.
- [4] L. Brasco, G. Carlier, On certain anisotropic elliptic equations arising in congested optimal transport: local gradient bounds, *Adv. Calc. Var.* 7 (2014) 379–407.
- [5] M. Carozza, J. Kristensen, A. Passarelli di Napoli, Higher differentiability of minimizers of convex variational integrals, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 28 (2011) 395–411.
- [6] P. Celada, G. Cupini, M. Guidorzi, Existence and regularity of minimizers of nonconvex integrals with p - q growth, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 13 (2007) 343–358.
- [7] M. Chipot, L.C. Evans, Linearisation at infinity and Lipschitz estimates for certain problems in the calculus of variations, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 102 (3–4) (1986) 291–303.
- [8] M. Colombo, G. Mingione, Regularity for double phase variational problems, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 215 (2015) 443–496.
- [9] M. Colombo, G. Mingione, Bounded minimisers of double phase variational integrals, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 218 (2015) 219–273.

- 1 [10] G. Cupini, F. Giannetti, R. Giova, A. Passarelli di Napoli, Higher integrability for minimizers of asymptotically
2 convex integrals with discontinuous coefficients, *Nonlinear Anal.* 154 (2017) 7–24.
- 3 [11] G. Cupini, M. Guidorzi, E. Mascolo, Regularity of minimizers of vectorial integrals with $p - q$ growth, *Nonlinear*
4 *Anal.* 54 (2003) 591–616.
- 5 [12] G. Cupini, P. Marcellini, E. Mascolo, Local boundedness of solutions to some anisotropic elliptic systems, in:
6 *Recent Trends in Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations. II. Stationary Problems*, in: *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 595,
7 Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 169–186.
- 8 [13] G. Cupini, P. Marcellini, E. Mascolo, Regularity of minimizers under limit growth conditions, *Nonlinear Anal.* 153
9 (2017) 294–310.
- 10 [14] A. Dall’Aglio, E. Mascolo, L^∞ estimates for a class of nonlinear elliptic systems with nonstandard growth, *Atti*
11 *Semin. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena* 50 (2002) 65–83.
- 12 [15] G. Dal Maso, *An Introduction to Γ -Convergence*, *Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, vol. 8, Birkhäuser,
13 Boston, 1993.
- 14 [16] E. De Giorgi, Un esempio di estremali discontinue per un problema variazionale di tipo ellittico, *Boll. Unione Mat.*
15 *Ital.* (4) Ser. 1 (1968) 135–137.
- 16 [17] M. Eleuteri, P. Marcellini, E. Mascolo, Lipschitz estimates for systems with ellipticity conditions at infinity, *Ann.*
17 *Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 195 (2016) 1575–1603.
- 18 [18] M. Eleuteri, P. Marcellini, E. Mascolo, Lipschitz continuity for energy integrals with variable exponents, *Atti Accad.*
19 *Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* 27 (2016) 61–87.
- 20 [19] L. Esposito, G. Mingione, C. Trombetti, On the Lipschitz regularity for certain elliptic problems, *Forum Math.* 18
21 (2006) 263–292.
- 22 [20] K. Fey, M. Foss, Morrey regularity results for asymptotically convex variational problems with (p, q) growth,
23 *J. Differential Equations* 246 (2009) 4519–4551.
- 24 [21] M. Focardi, Γ -convergence: a tool to investigate physical phenomena across scales, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 35
25 (2012) 1613–1658.
- 26 [22] I. Fonseca, N. Fusco, P. Marcellini, An existence result for a nonconvex variational problem via regularity, *ESAIM*
27 *Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 7 (2002) 69–96.
- 28 [23] M. Foss, C.S. Goodrich, Partial Hölder continuity of minimizers of functionals satisfying a general asymptotic
29 relatedness condition, *J. Convex Anal.* 22 (2015) 219–246.
- 30 [24] M. Foss, A. Passarelli di Napoli, A. Verde, Morrey regularity and continuity results for almost minimizers of asymptotically
31 convex integrals, *Appl. Math. (Warsaw)* 35 (2008) 335–353.
- 32 [25] M. Foss, A. Passarelli di Napoli, A. Verde, Global Morrey regularity results for asymptotically convex variational
33 problems, *Forum Math.* 20 (2008) 921–953.
- 34 [26] M. Foss, A. Passarelli di Napoli, A. Verde, Global Lipschitz regularity for almost minimizers of asymptotically
35 convex variational problems, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 189 (2010) 127–162.
- 36 [27] F. Giannetti, A $C^{1,\alpha}$ partial regularity result for integral functionals with $p(x)$ -growth condition, *Adv. Calc. Var.* 9
37 (2016) 395–407.
- 38 [28] F. Giannetti, A. Passarelli di Napoli, Higher differentiability of minimizers of variational integrals with variable
39 exponents, *Math. Z.* 280 (2015) 873–892.
- 40 [29] M. Giaquinta, Growth conditions and regularity: a counterexample, *Manuscripta Math.* 59 (1987) 245–248.
- 41 [30] M. Giaquinta, G. Modica, Remarks on the regularity of the minimizers of certain degenerate functionals,
42 *Manuscripta Math.* 57 (1986) 55–99.
- 43 [31] R. Giova, Regularity results for non-autonomous functionals with $L \log L$ -growth and Orlicz Sobolev coefficients,
44 *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 23 (6) (2016) 64.
- 45 [32] R. Giova, A. Passarelli di Napoli, Regularity results for a priori bounded minimizers of non autonomous functionals
46 with discontinuous coefficients, *Adv. Calc. Var.* (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1515/acv-2016-0059>.
- 47 [33] R. Giova, Higher differentiability for n -harmonic systems with Sobolev coefficients, *J. Differential Equations* 259
(2015) 5667–5687.
- [34] E. Giusti, *Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003.
- [35] P. Marcellini, Un exemple de solution discontinue d’un problème variationnel dans le cas scalaire, Preprint 11,
Istituto Matematico “U. Dini”, Università di Firenze, 1987.
- [36] P. Marcellini, Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with non standard growth conditions,
Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 105 (1989) 267–284.
- [37] P. Marcellini, Regularity and existence of solutions of elliptic equations with p, q -growth conditions, *J. Differential*
Equations 90 (1991) 1–30.
- [38] P. Marcellini, Everywhere regularity for a class of elliptic systems without growth conditions, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super.*
Pisa Cl. Sci. 23 (1996) 1–25.

- 1 [39] G. Mingione, Regularity of minima: an invitation to the dark side of calculus of variations, *Appl. Math.* 51 (2006). 1
- 2 [40] C. Mooney, O. Savin, Some singular minimizers in low dimensions in the calculus of variations, *Arch. Ration.* 2
- 3 *Mech. Anal.* 221 (2016) 1–22. 3
- 4 [41] J. Nečas, Example of an irregular solution to a nonlinear elliptic system with analytic coefficients and conditions 4
- 5 for regularity, in: *Theory Nonlin. Oper., Proc. Fourth Internat. Summer School, Acad. Sci., Berlin, 1975*, in: *Abh.* 4
- 6 *Akad. Wiss. DDR Abt. Math.-Natur.-Tech.*, vol. 1, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1977, pp. 197–206. 5
- 7 [42] A. Passarelli di Napoli, Higher differentiability of minimizers of variational integrals with Sobolev coefficients, 6
- 8 *Adv. Calc. Var.* 7 (1) (2014) 59–89. 7
- 9 [43] A. Passarelli di Napoli, Higher differentiability of solutions of elliptic systems with Sobolev coefficients: the case 8
- 10 $p = n = 2$, *Potential Anal.* 41 (3) (2014) 715–735. 9
- 11 [44] A. Passarelli di Napoli, A. Verde, A regularity result for asymptotically convex problems with lower order terms, 10
- 12 *J. Convex Anal.* 15 (2008) 131–148. 10
- 13 [45] V. Sverák, X. Yan, Non-Lipschitz minimizers of smooth uniformly convex functionals, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 11
- 12 99 (24) (2002) 15269–15276. 12
- 13 13
- 14 14
- 15 15
- 16 16
- 17 17
- 18 18
- 19 19
- 20 20
- 21 21
- 22 22
- 23 23
- 24 24
- 25 25
- 26 26
- 27 27
- 28 28
- 29 29
- 30 30
- 31 31
- 32 32
- 33 33
- 34 34
- 35 35
- 36 36
- 37 37
- 38 38
- 39 39
- 40 40
- 41 41
- 42 42
- 43 43
- 44 44
- 45 45
- 46 46
- 47 47