Pacific Journal of Mathematics

CAPILLARY SURFACES OVER OBSTACLES

GERHARD HUISKEN

Vol. 117, No. 1 January 1985

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 117, No. 1, 1985

CAPILLARY SURFACES OVER OBSTACLES

GERHARD HUISKEN

We consider the usual capillarity problem with the additional requirement that the capillary surface lies above some obstacle. This involves a variational inequality instead of a boundary value problem. We prove existence of a solution to the variational inequality and study the boundary regularity. In particular, global $C^{1,1}$-regularity is shown for a wider class of variational inequalities with conormal boundary condition.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and let

$$(0.1) \qquad A = -D_i(a^i(p)),^1 \qquad a^i(p) = p_i \cdot \left(1 + |p|^2\right)^{-1/2}$$

be the minimal surface operator. Then we study the variational inequality

$$(0.2) \qquad \langle Au + H(x,u), v - u\rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in K,$$
$$K := \{ v \in H^{1,\infty} | v \geq \psi \}$$

where

$$(0.3) \qquad \langle Au, \eta\rangle = \int_\Omega a^i(Du) \cdot D_i\eta \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \beta\eta dH_{n-1}.$$

Here H describes a gravitational field, ψ is the obstacle and β is the cosine of the contact angle at the boundary. We make the assumption that

$$(0.4) \qquad H = H(x,t) \in C^{0,1}(\mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}), \qquad \beta \in C^{0,1}(\partial\Omega)$$

satisfy the conditions

$$(0.5) \qquad \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} \geq \kappa > 0$$

and

$$(0.6) \qquad |\beta| \leq 1 - a, \qquad a > 0.$$

Under these assumptions Gerhardt [2] showed, that (0.2) admits a solution $u \in H^{2,p}(\Omega)$, if we impose on ψ the further condition

$$(0.7) \qquad -a^i(D\psi) \cdot \gamma_i \geq \beta \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

[1] Here and in the following we sum over repeated indices.

where $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)$ is the exterior normal to $\partial\Omega$. The main theorem which we shall prove, is the following:

THEOREM 0.1. *Let $\partial\Omega$ be of class C^2, let $\psi \in H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ and assume that H and β satisfy* (0.4)–(0.6). *Then the variational inequality* (0.2) *admits a solution*

$$u \in H^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap H^{2,2}(\Omega) \cap H^{2,\infty}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$$

with continuous tangential derivatives at the boundary. In the case $n = 2$ we have $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. Furthermore, if we assume that $\partial\Omega$ is of class $C^{3,\alpha}$, $\beta \in C^{1,1}(\partial\Omega)$ and that ψ satisfies (0.7) *then we have*

$$u \in H^{2,\infty}(\Omega).$$

REMARKS. (i) The physically interesting problem, where ψ is the bottom of a cylinder containing some liquid of prescribed volume, is also included in this setting: a solution of this problem fulfills (0.2), if we replace H by $(H + \lambda)$ with some Lagrange multiplier λ. (See Gerhardt [**2**, **3**]).

(ii) The boundary regularity results in Theorem 0.1 are valid for solutions of a much wider class of variational inequalities with conormal boundary condition, see §§3 and 4 below.

To prove the existence of a solution to (0.2) it is necessary to establish a priori estimates for the gradient of solutions to the corresponding boundary value problem:

$$Au + \tilde{H}(x, u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{0.8}$$

$$-a^i(Du) \cdot \gamma_i = \beta \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{0.9}$$

Using ideas of Ural′ceva [**12**] and Gerhardt [**2**] we can find a bound for $|Du|_\Omega$ which does not explicitly depend on $|\tilde{H}(\cdot, u)|_\Omega$.

At this place the author wishes to thank Claus Gerhardt for many helpful discussions.

NOTATION. We shall denote by $|\cdot|_\Omega$ the supremum norm on Ω and by $\|\cdot\|_p$ the norms of the L^p-spaces. By $c = c(\cdots)$ we shall denote various constants whereas indices will be used, if a constant recurs at another place.

1. Existence. To get a Lipschitz solution to (0.2), we consider the following related boundary value problems:

$$\begin{aligned} Au_\varepsilon + H(x, u_\varepsilon) + \mu\Theta_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon - \psi) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ -a^i(Du_\varepsilon) \cdot \gamma_i &= \beta \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mu > 0$ is a parameter tending to infinity and Θ_ε is a sequence of smooth monotone functions approximating the maximal monotone graph Θ:

$$(1.2)\quad \Theta(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t > 0, \\ [-1,0], & t = 0, \\ -1, & t < 0, \end{cases} \qquad \Theta_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \geq 0, \\ -1, & t \leq -\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

We want to use the following existence result from ([**2**], Theorem 2.1):

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $\partial\Omega$ be of class $C^{2,\alpha}$ and suppose that H and β are $C^{1,\alpha}$-functions in their arguments. Then the boundary value problem* (0.8), (0.9) *has a unique solution $u \in C^{2,\lambda}(\overline{\Omega})$, where λ, $0 < \lambda < 1$, is determined by the above quantities.*

Assuming for a moment these sharper differentiability condition on $\partial\Omega$, β and H, we get a unique regular solution u_ε of (1.1) for any ε, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. In §2 we shall establish a priori estimates for u_ε:

THEOREM 1.2. *There is a large constant M, so that*

$$(1.3)\qquad |u_\varepsilon|_\Omega + |Du_\varepsilon|_\Omega \leq M$$

uniformly in ε and μ. Furthermore, for each ε, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we can choose μ as large that

$$(1.4)\qquad u_\varepsilon - \psi \geq -3\varepsilon.$$

Thus we conclude, that in the limit case a subsequence of the u_ε converges uniformly to some function $u \in H^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, which satisfies (0.2).

Since the estimate (1.3) is independent of the sharper differentiability assumptions, an approximation argument shows, that the variational problem (0.2) has a solution $u \in H^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ assuming only the weaker conditions.

2. A priori estimates for $|u|$ and $|Du|$. To derive an upper bound for u_ε, we multiply (1.1) with $\max(u_\varepsilon - k, 0)$ for an arbitrary $k \geq k_0 = \sup_\Omega \psi$. Observing that the critical term

$$(2.1)\qquad \int_{u_\varepsilon > k} \Theta_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon - \psi)(u_\varepsilon - k)\, dx$$

vanishes because of $k \geq \sup \psi$, we get an uniform upper bound in view of the strict monotonicity of H.

For proving the estimate (1.4), we multiply (1.1) with

$$w = \max(\psi - u_\varepsilon - \delta, 0) \tag{2.2}$$

and denote by $A(\delta)$ the set $\{x \in \Omega | u_\varepsilon < \psi - \delta\}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{A(\delta)} a^i(Du_\varepsilon)\cdot(D_i\psi - D_i u_\varepsilon)\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \beta w\,dH_{n-1}\\ + \int_{A(\delta)} H(x, u_\varepsilon)(\psi - u_\varepsilon - \delta)\,dx\\ + \mu\cdot\int_{A(\delta)} \Theta_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon - \psi)(\psi - u_\varepsilon - \delta)\,dx = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

On $A(\delta)$ we have $\Theta_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon - \psi) = -1$ and $H(x, u_\varepsilon) \le H(x, \psi)$ because of $\delta \ge \varepsilon$ and in view of the monotonicity of H. To estimate the boundary integral, we use (0.6) and the inequality

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} g\,dH_{n-1} \le \int_\Omega |Dg|dx + c(\Omega, n)\cdot\int_\Omega |g|dx, \qquad g \in H^{1,1} \tag{2.4}$$

which is proven in ([4], Lemma 1). We get

$$\begin{aligned} a\cdot\int_{A(\delta)} |Du_\varepsilon|dx + \mu\cdot\int_{A(\delta)} \psi - u_\varepsilon - \delta\,dx\\ \le \left(1 + 2|D\psi|_\Omega\right)|A(\delta)| + |H(\cdot, \psi)|_\Omega\cdot\int_{A(\delta)} \psi - u_\varepsilon - \delta\,dx\\ + c\cdot\int_{A(\delta)} \psi - u_\varepsilon - \delta\,dx\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

or, better

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |Dw|dx + \mu\cdot\int_\Omega w\,dx \le c\left(a, |D\psi|_\Omega\right)|A(\delta)|\\ + \left(c_1 + |H(\cdot, \psi)|_\Omega\right)\cdot\int_\Omega w\,dx.\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Choosing now

$$\mu \ge \mu_1 + |H(\cdot, \psi)|_\Omega + c_1 \tag{2.7}$$

we get by the Sobolev imbedding theorem

$$\|w\|_{n/(n-1)} + \mu_1\cdot\int_\Omega w\,dx \le c|A(\delta)| \qquad \forall\,\delta \ge \varepsilon. \tag{2.8}$$

From this we derive the inequalities

$$\left.\begin{aligned}(\delta_1 - \delta_2)|A(\delta_1)| \le c|A(\delta_2)|^{1+1/n}\\ (\delta_1 - \delta_2)|A(\delta_1)| \le \mu_1^{-1}\cdot c|A(\delta_2)|\end{aligned}\right\} \quad \forall\,\delta_1 > \delta_2 \ge \varepsilon. \tag{2.9}$$

From a lemma due to Stampacchia ([**11**], Lemma 4.1) we now deduce from the first inequality

$$u_\varepsilon - \psi \geq -2\varepsilon - c(a, |D\psi|_\Omega)|A(2\varepsilon)|^{1/n} \tag{2.10}$$

and then from the second

$$|A(2\varepsilon)| \leq \mu_1^{-1} \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot c|A(\varepsilon)|. \tag{2.11}$$

Thus, inequality (1.4) follows by choosing μ_1 large enough, where μ_1 depends on ε, a, $|D\psi|_\Omega$, Ω.

The gradient bound will be established by a suitable modification of a proof in [**2**].

In view of the smoothness of $\partial\Omega$, we can extend β and γ into the whole domain Ω, so that $\beta \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ still satisfies (0.6) and so that the vectorfield γ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in Ω and absolutely bounded by 1.We denote by S the graph of u_ε

$$S = \left\{ X = (x, x^{n+1}) | x^{n+1} = u_\varepsilon(x) \right\} \tag{2.12}$$

and by $\delta = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{n+1})$ the differential operators on S, i.e.

$$\delta_i g = D_i g - \nu_i \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \nu^k \cdot D_k g, \qquad g \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}^{n+1}) \tag{2.13}$$

where $\nu = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{n+1})$ is the exterior unit normal to S

$$\nu = \left(1 + |Du_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{-1/2} \cdot (-D_1 u_\varepsilon, \ldots, -D_n u_\varepsilon, 1). \tag{2.14}$$

As in [**2**] and [**12**] we want to prove that the function

$$v = \left(1 + |Du_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{1/2} + \beta \cdot D_k u_\varepsilon \cdot \gamma^k \equiv W + \beta \cdot D_k u_\varepsilon \cdot \gamma^k \tag{2.15}$$

is uniformly bounded in Ω. Notice, that

$$|Du_\varepsilon| \leq \left(1 + |Du_\varepsilon|^2\right)^{1/2} = W \leq \frac{1}{a} \cdot v. \tag{2.16}$$

During the proof we shall write u instead of u_ε and we set

$$\tilde{H}(x, u) := H(x, u) + \mu \cdot \Theta_\varepsilon(u - \psi). \tag{2.17}$$

We need the following lemmata:

LEMMA 2.1. *For any function $g \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ we have the inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_S |g|^{n/(n-1)} dH_n\right)^{(n-1)/n} \\ &\qquad \leq c_2(n) \cdot \left(\int_S |\delta g| dH_n + \int_S |\tilde{H}|\, |g| dH_n + \int_{\partial\Omega} |g| \cdot W dH_{n-1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

For functions vanishing on the boundary, this inequality was first established in [9], whereas a proof of the general case can be found in [2].

LEMMA 2.2. *On the boundary* $\partial\Omega$ *we have the estimate*

$$\left|\gamma^i \cdot a^{ij}\left(D_j v - D_j(\beta\gamma^k) \cdot D_k u\right)\right| \leq c_3 \tag{2.19}$$

where $c_3 = c_3(\partial\Omega, |D\beta|_\Omega)$ *and* $a^{ij} = \partial a^i/\partial p_j$.

LEMMA 2.3. *For any positive function* $\eta \in H^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ *we have the estimate*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} v\eta \, dH_{n-1} \leq \int_S |\delta\eta| dH_n + \int_S \left(|\tilde{H}| + |\delta\gamma|\right)\eta \, dH_n. \tag{2.20}$$

For a poof of these two lemmata see ([2], Lemma 1.2 and Lemma 1.4).

Furthermore, from the proof of Lemma 1.3 in [2] we get the following inequalities:

LEMMA 2.4. *In the whole domain* Ω *we have*

$$a^{ij} D_j D_k u \cdot a^{k1} D_i D_1 u \geq \frac{1}{n} |\tilde{H}|^2 \tag{2.21}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|a^{ij} D_j D_k u \cdot D_i(\beta\gamma^k)\right| \\ &\qquad \leq \eta \cdot a^{ij} D_j D_k u \cdot a^{k1} D_i D_1 u + c_\eta \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|\delta v|}{W}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where $0 < \eta < 1$ *is arbitrary and* $c_\eta = c_\eta(a, n, |D(\beta\gamma)|)$.

Now we are ready to bound the function v, or equivalently

$$w = \log v. \tag{2.23}$$

As in [2], we start with the integral identity

$$\int_\Omega D_k a^i D_i \chi \, dx = -\int_\Omega D_k D_i a^i \chi \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma^i \cdot D_k a^i \chi \, dH_{n-1}. \tag{2.24}$$

Choosing now $\chi = (a^k + \beta\gamma^k)\eta$, $0 \leq \eta \in H^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with $\operatorname{supp} \eta \subset \{w > h\}$, where h is large, we obtain in view of (1.1)

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega a^{ij}\left[D_j v - D_j(\beta\gamma^k) \cdot D_k u\right] D_i \eta + a^{ij} D_k D_j u \cdot a^{k1} D_1 D_i u \cdot \eta \, dx \\ &\qquad + \int_\Omega D_k \tilde{H} \cdot (a^k + \beta\gamma^k)\eta \, dx \\ &\qquad = -\int_\Omega a^{ij} D_k D_j u \cdot D_i(\beta\gamma^k)\eta \, dx \\ &\qquad + \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma^i \cdot a^{ij}\left[D_j v - D_j(\beta\gamma^k) \cdot D_k u\right]\eta \, dH_{n-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Remark that

$$D_j v = (a^k + \beta\gamma^k) \cdot D_k D_j u + D_j(\beta\gamma^k) \cdot D_k u. \tag{2.26}$$

In the following we shall use the relations

$$a^{ij} D_i g \cdot D_j g = W^{-1} |\delta g|^2 \qquad \forall g \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}) \tag{2.27}$$

$$\left| a^{ij} D_i g \cdot D_j \chi \right| \le W^{-1} \cdot |\delta g| \, |D\chi| \qquad \forall \chi \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}) \tag{2.28}$$

$$a \cdot W \le v \le 2 \cdot W \tag{2.29}$$

$$a^{ij} p_i q_j \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot a^{ij} p_i p_j + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \cdot a^{ij} q_i q_j \qquad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \tag{2.30}$$

Now observe that

$$D_k \tilde{H} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} \cdot D_k u + \mu \Theta'_\varepsilon \cdot D_k (u - \psi). \tag{2.31}$$

Then in view of the assumptions (0.5) and (0.6) and in view of the Lemmata 2.2 and 2.4 we can deduce from (2.25)

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega a^{ij} \left[D_j v - D_j(\beta\gamma^k) \cdot D_k u \right] D_i \eta \, dx + \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2n} |\tilde{H}|^2 \eta \, dx \\ &\qquad \le c_3 \cdot \int_{\partial\Omega} \eta \, dH_{n-1} + c_4 \cdot \int_\Omega \left(\frac{|\delta v|}{W} + 1 \right) \eta \, dx \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

where $c_4 = c_4(|\delta(\beta\gamma)|_\Omega, |\partial/\partial x \, H(\cdot, u)|_\Omega)$. Here we used that $\operatorname{supp} \eta \subset \{w > h_0\}$, $h_0 = h_0(a, |D\psi|_\Omega)$ large. We choose

$$\eta = v \cdot \max(w - k, 0) \equiv v \cdot z \tag{2.33}$$

and set $A(k) = \{X \in S | w(x) > k\}$, $|A(k)| = H_n(A(k))$. Taking the relations (2.27)–(2.30) into account, we obtain in view of $dH_n = W dx$ and in view of Lemma 2.3

$$\int_{A(k)} |\delta z|^2 \, dH_n + \int_{A(k)} \frac{1}{n} \cdot |\tilde{H}|^2 z \, dH_n \le c \cdot |A(k)| + c \cdot \int_{A(k)} z \, dH_n \tag{2.34}$$

where $c = c(a, n, |D\gamma|_\Omega, |D\beta|_\Omega, |(\partial/\partial x) H(\cdot, u)|_\Omega)$. To proceed further, we need the following Lemma:

Lemma 2.5. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ the integral $\int_{A(k)} w - k \, dx$ can be estimated by*

$$\varepsilon \cdot \int_{A(k)} |\delta z|^2 \, dH_n + \varepsilon \cdot \int_{A(k)} |\tilde{H}|^2 z \, dH_n + c \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} |A(k)|. \tag{2.35}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.5. We shall use the identity

$$(2.36)\qquad \int_\Omega a^i D_i\eta\,dx + \int_\Omega \tilde{H}\eta\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \beta\eta\,dH_{n-1} = 0$$

with $\eta = u\cdot\max(w-k,0) = u\cdot z$. The boundary integral can be estimates with the help of (2.4) and we obtain in view of (0.6)

$$\begin{aligned}(2.37)\quad a\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} W\cdot z\,dx &\le \int_{\{w>k\}} |\tilde{H}|\,|u|z\,dx + c\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} |u|\,|Dw|dx\\ &\quad + c\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} |u|z\,dx\\ &\le \varepsilon\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} |\tilde{H}|^2 z\,dx + c\cdot\varepsilon^{-1}\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} z\,dx\\ &\quad + \varepsilon\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} |Dw|^2 W^{-1}\,dx + c\cdot\varepsilon^{-1}\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} W\,dx\\ &\le \varepsilon\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} W|\delta w|^2\,dx + \varepsilon\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} |\tilde{H}|^2 z\,dx\\ &\quad + c\cdot\varepsilon^{-1}\cdot\int_{\{w>k\}} W\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $z \le W$ for $k \ge k_0$. The conclusion of the Lemma now immediately follows.

By Lemma 2.5 we deduce from (2.34) for $k \ge k_0$

$$(2.38)\qquad \int_{A(k)} |\delta w|^2\,dH_n + \int_{A(k)} \frac{1}{n}|\tilde{H}|^2 z\,dH_n \le c\cdot|A(k)|.$$

Furthermore, from the Sobolev imbedding, Lemma 2.1 and from Lemma 2.3 we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}(2.39)\qquad &\left(\int_S |z|^{n/(n-1)}\,dH_n\right)^{(n-1)/n}\\ &\le c(n)\cdot\left(\int_S |\delta z|dH_n + \int_S |\tilde{H}|z\,dH_n + \int_\Omega W\cdot z\,dH_n\right)\\ &\le c\cdot\left(\left(\int_S |\delta z|^2\,dH_n\right)^{1/2}|A(k)|^{1/2}\right.\\ &\qquad \left. +\varepsilon\cdot\int_S |\tilde{H}|^2\cdot z\,dH_n + c_\varepsilon\cdot\int_S z\,dH_n\right).\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the first term on the righthand side we note that in view of (2.38) we have

$$(2.40)\qquad \left(\int_S |\delta z|^2\, dH_n\right)^{1/2} \le c|A(k)|^{1/2}.$$

Hence, we deduce from (2.38) and (2.39)

$$(2.41)\qquad \begin{aligned}&\left(\int_S |z|^{n/(n-1)}\, dH_n\right)^{(n-1)/n} + \int_S |\delta z|^2\, dH_n + \int_S \frac{1}{n}|\tilde{H}|^2 z\, dH_n\\ &\quad \le c|A(k)| + \varepsilon\cdot\int_{A(k)} |\tilde{H}|^2 z\, dH_n + c_\varepsilon\cdot\int_{A(k)} z\, dH_n.\end{aligned}$$

Applying again Lemma 2.5 we conclude finally

$$(2.42)\qquad \left(\int_S |z|^{n/(n-1)}\, dH_n\right)^{(n-1)/n} \le c\cdot|A(k)| \qquad \forall\, k \ge k_0.$$

The Hölder inequality yields

$$(2.43)\qquad \int_S z\, dH_n \le c|A(k)|^{1+1/n} \qquad \forall\, k \ge k_0$$

and we are now in the same situation as in (2.8). It follows that

$$(2.44)\qquad w = \log v \le k_0 + c\cdot|A(k_0)|^{1/n}$$

where $k_0 = k_0(a, |D\psi|_\Omega, n)$ and $c = c(|(\partial/\partial x)H(\cdot, u)|_\Omega, a, n, |\delta\gamma|_\Omega, |D\beta|_\Omega, \Omega)$.

To complete the proof of the gradient bound, we have to establish an estimate for $|S| = \int_\Omega W\, dx$ independent of μ and ε. To accomplish this, we use (2.36) with $\eta = u - \psi$. We obtain

$$(2.45)\qquad \begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega a^i(Du)\cdot D_i(u-\psi)\, dx + \int_\Omega H(x,u)(u-\psi)\, dx\\ &\quad + \mu\cdot\int_\Omega \Theta_\varepsilon(u-\psi)(u-\psi)\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \beta\cdot(u-\psi)\, dH_{n-1} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

The critical term

$$(2.46)\qquad \mu\cdot\int_\Omega \Theta_\varepsilon(u-\psi)(u-\psi)\, dx$$

is positive in view of the monotonicity of Θ_ε. Using again (0.5), (0.6) and (2.4) we conclude

$$(2.47)\qquad a\cdot\int_\Omega W\, dx \le c\big(|\Omega|, |u|_\Omega, |\psi|_\Omega, |H(\cdot,\psi)|_\Omega, |D\psi|_\Omega, a, n\big).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

REMARK. (i) As a consequence of (2.44) and (2.47) there is a gradient bound for solutions u of (0.8), (0.9), which does not depend on $|\tilde{H}(\cdot, u)|_\Omega$, but only on $|\tilde{H}(\cdot, 0)|_\Omega$.

(ii) After having finished the present article the author became acquainted with a paper of Lieberman **[8]** who obtained a gradient bound for solutions to conormal derivative problems.

3. C^1**-Regularity.** It is well known, that a solution of u of (0.2) satisfies

$$Au \in L^\infty(\Omega) \tag{3.1}$$

and therefore is in $H^{2,p}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ for any finite p.

To prove regularity results up to the boundary, we transform a neighbourhood $\Omega_\delta = \Omega \cap B_\delta(x_0)$ of a point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ with a C^2-diffeomorphism y into

$$B_1^+ = \{ x \in \mathbf{R}^n |\ |x| < 1, x^n > 0\} \tag{3.2}$$

such that

$$\Gamma = y(\partial\Omega \cap B_\delta(x_0)) = \{ x \in \mathbf{R}^n |\ |x| < 1, x^n = 0\}. \tag{3.3}$$

The transformed u satisfies in B_1^+ a local variational inequality of the same type as (0.2), where the transformed a^i depend now on x too. Furthermore, the relations

$$\begin{aligned} a^\rho(\hat{p}, p^n) &= a^\rho(\hat{p}, -p^n), \qquad 1 \le \rho \le n-1, \\ a^n(\hat{p}, p^n) &= -a^n(\hat{p}, -p^n) \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

are not lost by the transformation.

In order to prove the continuity of the tangential derivatives of u, we shall use an approach due to Frehse **[1]**. We introduce the notations

$$[\xi]^p = |\xi|^{p-1} \cdot \xi, \qquad \forall \xi \in \mathbf{R}, \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$D_i^{\pm h} g(x) = \pm h^{-1} \cdot \{ g(x \pm h e_i) - g(x)\} \tag{3.6}$$

where e_i denotes the ith unit vector.

By the same arguments as in ([**1**], Lemma 2.1) we have

LEMMA 3.1. *Let u be a solution to* (0.2) *and let* $0 \le \Phi \in H_0^{1,\infty}(B_1(0))$, $\operatorname{supp}\Phi \subset B_1$. *Then for each* $h \in]0, \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp}\Phi, \partial B_1)[$ *and each* $p \ge 1$, $c \in \mathbf{R}$ *there is an* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that the functions*

$$u_\varepsilon := u + \varepsilon \cdot D_j^{-h}\big(\Phi \cdot D_j^h(u - \psi)\big), \qquad j = 1, \ldots, n-1, \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$(3.8)\quad u_\varepsilon^p := u + \varepsilon \cdot D_j^{-h}\left[\Phi \cdot D_j^h(u-\psi) - c\right]^p, \qquad j = 1,\dots,n-1,$$

lie in K.

Now we can show the following Lemma

LEMMA 3.2. *The solution u of the local variational inequality obtained from* (0.2) *lies in* $H^{2,2}(B_{1/2}^+)$ *and satisfies*

$$(3.9)\qquad \int_{B_{1/2}^+} |D^2u|^2 \cdot |x|^{2-n}\, dx < \infty.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. (i) We insert the function u_ε of Lemma 3.1 into the variational inequality and obtain

$$(3.10)\qquad -\int_{B_1^+} D_j^h(a^i(x, Du))D_i\big(\Phi D_j^h(u-\psi)\big)\,dx$$
$$-\int_\Gamma D_j^h\beta \cdot \Phi D_j^h(u-\psi)\,d\hat{x}$$
$$+\int_{B_1^+} H(x,u)\cdot D_j^{-h}\big(\Phi D_j^h(u-\psi)\big)\,dx \ge 0$$

in view of $1 \le j \le n-1$ and since $\Phi = \tau^2$ is a cut-off function in $C_0^\infty(B_1)$. The boundary integral can be estimated by

$$(3.11)\quad |D\beta|\left(\int_{B_1^+}\left|D\big(\tau^2 D_j^h(u-\psi)\big)\right|dx + c\cdot\int_{B_1^+}\tau^2\left|D_j^h(u-\psi)\right|dx\right).$$

Since $u \in H^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, the $a^{ij}(x, Du(x))$ are uniformly elliptic and we obtain by standard arguments that D_j^hDu is uniformly bounded in $L^2(B_{1/2}^+)$ as $h \to 0$ and thus $D_jDu \in L^2(B_{1/2}^+)$. Now we deduce from this and from (3.1), that $D_nDu \in L^2(B_{1/2}^+)$.

(ii) Let $n \ge 3$. By Lemma 3.1 and by (i) we have the inequality

$$(3.12)\quad \big\langle Au + H(x,u), D_j\big(\Phi\cdot D_j(u-\psi)\big)\big\rangle \ge 0, \qquad 1 \le j \le n-1.$$

In order to find a suitable test function Φ, we define in $B_1(0)$

$$(3.13)\qquad b^{ij}(\hat{x}, x^n) = \begin{cases} a^{ij}(x; D\tilde{u}(x)), & x^n > 0,\\ a^{ij}(\hat{x}, -x^n; D\tilde{u}(x)), & x^n < 0,\end{cases}$$

where

$$\tilde{u}(\hat{x}, x^n) = \begin{cases} u(x), & x^n > 0, \\ u(\hat{x}, -x^n), & x^n < 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

The function $\tilde{\psi}$ is defined similarly.

Now let $\delta_h \in L^\infty(B_1(0))$ satisfy $\delta_h \geq 0$, supp $\delta_h \subset B_1(0)$ and

$$\int_{B_1} \delta_h \, dx = 1, \quad \delta_h(\hat{x}, x^n) = \delta_h(\hat{x}, -x^n). \tag{3.15}$$

Since the b^{ij} are elliptic in B_1, there is a function $G_h \in H_0^{1,2}(B_1)$ so that

$$\int_{B_1} b^{ik} D_k v \cdot D_i G_h \, dx = \int_{B_1} \delta_h v \, dx \qquad \forall\, v \in H_0^{1,2}(B_1). \tag{3.16}$$

It is known (see [**1**, **6**]), that G_h is uniformly bounded in $H_0^{1,q}(B_1)$, $q < n/(n-1)$ and that $G_h \geq 0$. Furthermore, $G_h \to G$ in $H^{1,q}$, where G has the property

$$m|x|^{2-n} \leq G(x) \leq m^{-1}|x|^{2-n} \tag{3.17}$$

with some constant $m > 0$. The functions G_h satisfy

$$G_h(\hat{x}, x^n) = G_h(\hat{x}, -x^n). \tag{3.18}$$

To see this, we observe that $\hat{G}_h(\hat{x}, x^n) = G_h(\hat{x}, -x^n)$ is also a solution of (3.16) in view of the symmetry properties of δ_h and b^{ij}. Then, (3.18) follows from the uniqueness of G_h.

Now we can use (3.12) with $\Phi = \tau^2 G_h$, where $\tau \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$ satisfies $\tau \geq 0$, $\tau \equiv 1$ in $B_{1/2}$ and $\tau(\hat{x}, x^n) = \tau(\hat{x}, -x^n)$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1^+} & a^{ik} D_k D_j u \cdot D_i D_j u \cdot \tau^2 G_h \, dx \\ & \leq |D\beta| \int_\Gamma |D_j(u - \psi)| G_h \tau^2 \, d\hat{x} \\ & \quad + \int_{B_1^+} a^{ik} D_k D_j u \cdot D_j(\psi - u) \cdot D_i G_h \tau^2 \, dx \\ & \quad + \int_{B_1^+} a^{ik} D_k D_j u \cdot D_i D_j \psi \cdot \tau^2 G_h \, dx \\ & \quad - \int_{B_1^+} a^{ik} D_k D_j u D_j(u - \psi) G_h \tau \cdot 2 D_i \tau \, dx \\ & \quad + \int_{B_1^+} \left(|H| + \left| \frac{\partial a^i}{\partial x_k} \right| \right) \left| D\left(G_h \tau^2 \cdot D_j(u - \psi) \right) \right| dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

The critical term

$$(3.20)\qquad \begin{aligned}&\int_{B_1^+} a^{ik} D_k D_j u \cdot D_j(\psi - u) \cdot D_\iota G_h \tau^2\, dx\\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \int_{B_1^+} a^{ik} D_k\Big(\tau^2\big(D_j(u-\psi)\big)^2\Big) \cdot D_\iota G_h\, dx + B\end{aligned}$$

where B stands for lower order terms, can be rewritten as

$$(3.21)\qquad \frac{1}{4} \cdot \int_{B_1} b^{ik} D_k\Big(\tau^2\big(D_j(\tilde{u} - \tilde{\psi})\big)^2\Big) \cdot D_\iota G_h\, dx + B.$$

This follows from the symmetry properties of $\tilde{u}$, $\tilde{\psi}$, τ, G_h and b^{ij}. But (3.21) equals

$$(3.22)\qquad \frac{1}{4} \cdot \int_{B_1} \delta_h \cdot \tau^2\big(D_j(\tilde{u} - \tilde{\psi})\big)^2\, dx + B = B$$

since $\tau^2 \cdot (D_j(\tilde{u} - \tilde{\psi}))^2$ lies in $H_0^{1,2}(B_1)$, $j = 1,\ldots,n-1$. Thus we obtain from (3.19)—using ellipticity—that

$$(3.23)\qquad \int_{B_1^+} |D_k D_j u|^2 G_h \tau^2\, dx \leq \text{const.}$$

for $h \to 0$, $j = 1,\ldots,n-1$; $k = 1,\ldots,n$.

For $j = 1,\ldots,n-1$ the conclusion of the lemma now follows by a lower semicontinuity argument and by (3.17). For $j = n$ the conclusion follows from (3.1) and from the boundedness of

$$(3.24)\qquad \int_{B_{1/2}^+} |D_k D_j u|^2 G\, dx, \qquad k = 1,\ldots,n; j = 1,\ldots,n-1.$$

Now we are ready to establish the main inequality, from which we can start an iteration process. Therefore we insert the function u_ε^p (see Lemma 3.1) into the variational inequality, where $\Phi = \tau^2$ is a cut-off function. Passing to the limit $h \to 0$ we obtain

$$(3.25)\qquad \begin{aligned}&-\int_{B_1^+} D_j a^\iota(x, Du) \cdot D_\iota[z - \hat{c}]^p \tau^2\, dx\\ &-\int_\Gamma D_j\beta \cdot \tau^2[z - \hat{c}]^p\, d\hat{x} + \int_{B_1^+} H(x,u)\big(D_j\big(\tau^2[z-\hat{c}]^p\big)\big)\, dx\\ &-\int_{B_1^+} D_j a^i(x, Du) \cdot D_i\tau \cdot 2\tau[z - \hat{c}]^p\, dx \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

where we set $z = D_j u - D_j\psi$.

Due to (2.4) we can estimate the boundary integral by

$$(3.26)\quad |D\beta| \cdot \left(\int_{B_1^+} |D\tau| \cdot 2\tau [z - \hat{c}]^p \right) dx + \int_{B_1^+} \tau^2 \cdot p |z - \hat{c}|^{p-1} |Dz| dx + c \cdot \int_{B_1^+} \tau^2 |z - \hat{c}|^p \, dx.$$

Using ellipticity and Hölder's inequality we deduce from (3.25) after some calculation the main inequality

$$(3.27)\quad \int_{B_1^+} \left| D\left(\tau [z - \hat{c}]^{(p+1)/2} \right) \right|^2 dx \le p^2 \cdot c \cdot \int_{B_1^+} |z - \hat{c}|^{p-1} \left(|D\tau|^2 + \chi_\tau \right) dx$$

where χ_τ is the characteristic function of supp τ and $c = c(|z|_\Omega, |H(\cdot, u)|_\Omega, |\partial a^i/\partial x_k|, |D\beta|, |D\gamma|)$. Here, we used that (3.27) will be only applied with $|\hat{c}| \le |z|_\Omega$.

From inequality (3.27) we can start an iteration as in ([**1**], Lemma 1.3 and 1.4). We obtain for $R \le \frac{1}{2}$

$$(3.28)\quad \operatorname{osc}\left\{ z(x) | x \in B_R^+(0) \right\} \le c \cdot \left(R^{2-n} \int_{**} |Dz|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/n} + c \cdot R^\alpha$$

for $n \ge 3$ and $\alpha = 2 \cdot (n - 2) \cdot n^2$,

and for $n = 2$

$$(3.29)\quad \operatorname{osc}\left\{ z(x) | x \in B_R^+(0) \right\} \le c \cdot \left(\int_{**} |Dz|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2 - 2/(t+4)} + c \cdot R^{2/(t+4)} \cdot \left(\int_{*} |Dz|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2 - 2/(t+4)} \qquad \forall t > 0.$$

We used the notation $(**) = B_{2R}^+ - B_R^+$ and $(*) = B_{2R}^+$.

Since $R^{2-n} \le c \cdot |x|^{2-n}$ on $(**)$, we obtain by Lemma 3.2 that

$$(3.30)\quad R^{2-n} \cdot \int_{**} |Dz|^2 \, dx \le c \cdot \int_{**} |Dz|^2 |x|^{2-n} \, dx$$

is small if R is small. Together with (3.28) and (3.29) this means the continuity of $z = D_j u - D_j \psi$.

Again following Frehse's proof in ([**1**], Chap. 3) we conclude that in the case $n = 2$ $D_n(u - \psi)$ too is uniformly continuous.

REMARK. Obviously this regularity result applies to any elliptic operator

$$A = -D_i\left(a^i(x, Du)\right)$$

if the a^i's satisfy the symmetry condition (3.4). It is not clear, whether Lemma 3.2 can be established without this assumption.

4. Estimates in $H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$. In the following we shall consider a slightly more general problem than considered in the introduction. Let u_0 be a solution of the variational inequality

$$(4.1) \qquad \langle Au_0 + Hu_0, v - u_0 \rangle \geq 0 \qquad \forall v \in K,$$
$$K := \{ v \in H^{1,\infty}(\Omega) | v \geq \psi \}$$

where A is an elliptic operator and

$$(4.2) \qquad \langle Au, \eta \rangle = \int_\Omega a^i D_i \eta \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \beta \eta \, dH_{n-1},$$
$$Au = -D_i(a^i(x, u, Du)), \quad Hu = H(x, u, Du).$$

It is well known, that u_0 satisfies

$$(4.3) \qquad Au_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$$

and therefore is of class $H^{2,p}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ for any finite p, if the coefficients are smooth enough. Furthermore, if we assume that

$$(4.4) \qquad -a^i(x, \psi, D\psi) \cdot \gamma_i \geq \beta \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

holds we have (see [2]) $u_0 \in H^{2,p}(\Omega)$ and u_0 satisfies

$$(4.5) \qquad -a^i(x, u_0, Du_0) \cdot \gamma_i = \beta \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Recently, Gerhardt [5] showed that a solution of the corresponding Dirichlet problem lies in $H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$, if the boundary data are of class C^3.

We shall prove the following

THEOREM 4.1. *Let $\partial\Omega$ be of class $C^{3,\alpha}$, $\beta \in C^{1,1}(\partial\Omega)$ and assume that $\psi \in H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ satisfies* (4.4). *Let the a^i's be of class C^2 in x and u and of class C^3 in the p-variable. Moreover, assume that H is of class $C^{0,1}$ in all its arguments. Then any solution of the variational inequality* (4.1) *is in $H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$.*

As in [5], we want to show uniform a priori estimates for the solutions of approximating problems. Since a solution u_0 of (4.1) is of class $H^{2,p}$ in view of (4.4), there is a constant M with

$$(4.6) \qquad 1 + |u_0|_\Omega + |Du_0|_\Omega \leq M.$$

Thus, we can replace A and H by operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{H}$ so that

$$(4.7) \qquad \hat{A}u_0 + \hat{H}u_0 = Au_0 + Hu_0$$

and so that the corresponding boundary value problems are always solvable (see [5] for details).

Furthermore, we can choose a constant γ so large that the operator

$$\hat{A}u + \hat{H}u + \gamma u \tag{4.8}$$

is uniformly monotone, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \hat{A}u_1 + \hat{H}u_1 + \gamma u_1 - \hat{A}u_2 - \hat{H}u_2 - \gamma u_2, u_1 - u_2 \rangle \\ &\geq c \cdot \|u_1 - u_2\|^2_{1,2}, \qquad c > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

We shall write A and H instead of $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{H}$ in the following. Let us assume for the moment, that the a^i's and H are of class C^4 in their arguments. Then we consider the boundary value problems

$$\begin{aligned} &Au + Hu + \gamma u + \mu\Theta(u - \psi) = \gamma u_0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ &-a^i(x, u, Du) \cdot \gamma_i = \beta - \delta = \beta_1 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where $\delta > 0$ is small and where now

$$\Theta(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t > 0, \\ -t^2, & t \leq 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

Again μ is a parameter tending to infinity. In view of our assumptions on A and H, the boundary value problem (4.10) has always a solution $u \in C^{3,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$. We want to show, that the second derivatives of u are bounded independent of μ and δ. In the limit case $\mu \to \infty$, u tends to a solution $\tilde{u}_0$ of (4.1), where β is replaced by β_1. On $\partial\Omega$, $\tilde{u}_0$ satisfies

$$-a^i(x, \tilde{u}_0, D\tilde{u}_0) \cdot \gamma_i = \beta_1. \tag{4.12}$$

Removing then the sharper differentiability assumptions and letting δ tend to zero we shall conclude, that $\tilde{u}_0$ tends to u_0 which therefore lies in $H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$.

As a first step we need the following Lemma.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let u be a solution of* (4.10). *Then $u - \psi \geq -c \cdot \mu^{-1/2}$ and*

$$\mu \cdot |\Theta(u - \psi)| \leq c^2 \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$c^2 = \sup_{\Omega} |A\psi + H\psi|, \qquad c > 0. \tag{4.14}$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We multiply the inequality

$$Au - A\psi + Hu - H\psi + \gamma(u - \psi) + \mu\Theta(u - \psi) + c^2 \geq 0 \tag{4.15}$$

by $v = \min(u - \psi + c \cdot \mu^{-1/2}, 0)$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(4.16)\qquad &\int_\Omega \big(a^i(x,u,Du) - a^i(x,\psi,D\psi)\big)\cdot D_i v\,dx \\ &+\mu\int_\Omega \big(\Theta(u-\psi) + c^2\mu^{-1}\big)v\,dx \\ &+\int_\Omega \big(Hu - H\psi + \gamma(u-\psi)\big)v\,dx \\ &+\int_{\partial\Omega}\big(a^i(x,\psi,D\psi)\cdot\gamma_i + \beta\big)v\,dH_{n-1} \le 0.\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion now essentially follows from the boundary condition on ψ (4.4).

We deduce from this Lemma that

$$(4.17)\qquad Au \in L^\infty(\Omega)$$

with an uniform bound and

$$(4.18)\qquad \|u\|_{2,p} \le c, \qquad \forall 1 \le p < \infty,$$

where the constant depends on p, $\|\psi\|_{2,\infty}$, $\partial\Omega$ and other known quantities.

We shall denote by f^i any vectorfield such that

$$(4.19)\qquad \|f^i\|_p \le c\big(1 + \|u\|_{2,p}\big)^m$$

for any $1 \le p \le \infty$, where c and m are arbitrary constants depending on p. Furthermore, f denotes any function which can be estimated as in (4.19).

As in §3 we assume the equation (4.10) to hold in $B_1^+ = \{x \in B_1(0) \mid x^n > 0\}$. Then the boundary condition takes the form

$$(4.20)\qquad -a^n = \beta_2(x) \quad \text{on } \Gamma = \big\{x \in B_1 \mid x^n = 0\big\}$$

where β_2 is related to β_1 by some positive factor depending on the transformation.

LEMMA 4.2. *The solution $\tilde{u}_0$ of*

$$(4.21)\qquad \big\langle A\tilde{u}_0 + H\tilde{u}_0 + \gamma(\tilde{u}_0 - u_0), v - \tilde{u}_0\big\rangle \ge 0, \qquad \forall v \in K,$$

where

$$(4.22)\qquad \langle A\tilde{u}_0, \eta\rangle = \int_\Omega a^i D_i\eta\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}\beta_1\eta\,dH_{n-1}$$

satisfies the strict inequality

$$(4.23)\qquad \tilde{u}_0 > \psi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.2. In view of (4.12) and (4.4) we have

$$-a^i(x,\tilde u_0,D\tilde u_0)\cdot\gamma_i < -a^i(x,\psi,D\psi)\cdot\gamma_i \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \tag{4.24}$$

or equivalently

$$-a^n(x,\tilde u_0,D\tilde u_0) < -a^n(x,\psi,D\psi) \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{4.25}$$

Now assume that there is $x_0\in\partial\Omega$ such that

$$\tilde u_0(x_0)=\psi(x_0). \tag{4.26}$$

It follows that $D_j(\tilde u_0-\psi)(x_0)=0$, $\forall\, 1\le j\le n-1$. Thus, we obtain from (4.25)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \int_0^1 a^{nj}(x_0, t\tilde u_0+(1-t)\psi, tD\tilde u_0+(1-t)D\psi) \\ &\qquad\times\left(D_j(\tilde u_0-\psi)(x_0)\right)dt \\ &\quad+\int_0^1 \frac{\partial a^n}{\partial u}(x_0,t\tilde u_0+(1-t)\psi, tD\tilde u_0+(1-t)D\psi) \\ &\qquad\times\left((\tilde u_0-\psi)(x_0)\right)dt \\ &=\int_0^1 a^{nn}(\cdots)\cdot D_n(\tilde u_0-\psi)(x_0)\,dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

But in view of $\tilde u_0\ge\psi$ we have

$$D_n(\tilde u_0-\psi)\le 0 \quad \text{at } x_0. \tag{4.28}$$

Thus, the contradiction is a consequence of ellipticity.

Since we already know that in the case $\mu\to\infty$ the solutions u of the approximating problems (4.10) tend to $\tilde u_0$ uniformly, we can assume in the following that μ is so large that

$$u>\psi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{4.29}$$

In particular we have

$$\Theta(u-\psi)=\Theta'(u-\psi)=0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{4.30}$$

Now we are ready to estimate the second tangential derivatives of u.

LEMMA 4.3. *The second tangential derivatives of u can be estimated by*

$$\sup_{B^+_{1/2}} |D_\rho D_\sigma u| \le c\cdot\left(1+\|u\|_{2,\infty}\right)^{\varepsilon} \tag{4.31}$$

for any ε, $0<\varepsilon<1$, where c depends on ε, $\|u\|_{2,p}$ and known quantities.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Following ideas in [5] and [7] we shall estimate the quantity

$$\lambda\cdot a^{kl}D_kD_lu \pm D_\sigma D_\rho u, \qquad 1\le\rho,\sigma\le n-1, \tag{4.32}$$

from below. As in [5] we derive the differential inequality

$$(4.33)\qquad -D_i\big(a^{ij}D_jw\big)+\gamma w+\mu\Theta'(w-\overline{w})\geq f+D_if^i$$

where

$$(4.34)\qquad \begin{aligned} w&=\lambda\cdot a^{kl}D_kD_lu\pm D_rD_su,\\ \overline{w}&=\lambda\cdot a^{kl}D_kD_l\psi\pm D_rD_s\psi,\end{aligned}\qquad 1\leq r,s\leq n,$$

and λ is large.

We set $r=\rho$, $s=\sigma$ and multiply (4.33) with

$$(4.35)\qquad w_k\cdot\eta^2=\min(w\cdot\eta^2+k,0)\cdot\eta^2$$

where $\eta\equiv 1$ in $B_{1/2}$ and supp $\eta\subset B_1$ and

$$(4.36)\qquad k\geq k_0=\sup_\Omega|\overline{w}|.$$

Using ellipticity and (4.19) we obtain

$$(4.37)\qquad \begin{aligned}&\int_{B_1^+}|Dw|^2\eta^4\,dx+\gamma\cdot\int_{B_1^+}w_k^2\,dx\\ &\quad\leq c\cdot(1+\|u\|_{2,\infty})^m|A(k)|\\ &\qquad+\int_\Gamma|f^n\cdot w_k|d\hat{x}+\int_\Gamma\big|a^{nj}D_jw\cdot\eta^2\cdot w_k\big|d\hat{x}\end{aligned}$$

where $A(k)$ is the set $\{x\in B_1^+|w\cdot\eta^2<-k\}$. The first boundary integral can be estimated by

$$(4.38)\qquad \begin{aligned}&\|f\|_\infty\cdot\left(\int_{B_1^+}|Dw_k|dx+c\cdot\int_{B_1^+}w_k\,dx\right)\\ &\quad\leq\varepsilon\cdot\int_{B_1^+}|Dw|^2\eta^4\,dx+c\cdot(1+\|u\|_{2,\infty})^m|A(k)|.\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the second boundary integral, we conclude from the equation in view of (4.30) that

$$(4.39)\qquad D_jw=D_jF+D_jD_\rho D_\sigma u$$

where $D_jF=f$. In order to estimate the critical term

$$(4.40)\qquad a^{nj}D_kD_\rho D_\sigma u$$

we differentiate the boundary condition (4.20) and obtain

$$(4.41)\qquad -a^{nj}D_jD_\sigma u=D_\sigma\beta_2+\frac{\partial a^n}{\partial u}\cdot D_\sigma u+\frac{\partial a^n}{\partial x_\sigma}$$

and

$$(4.42)\qquad -a^{nj}D_jD_\sigma D_\rho u = D_\sigma D_\rho \beta_2 + D_\rho\left(\frac{\partial a^n}{\partial u}\cdot D_\sigma u + \frac{\partial a^n}{\partial x_\sigma}\right) + D_\rho(a^{nj})\cdot D_jD_\sigma u.$$

But this equals f and so we have

$$(4.43)\qquad \int_\Gamma \left|a^{nj}D_jw\cdot\eta^2\cdot w_k\right|d\hat{x} \leq \int_\Gamma |f\cdot w_k|\,d\hat{x}$$

which can be estimated as in (4.38). Finally, we conclude

$$(4.44)\qquad \int_{B_1^+}|Dw_k|^2\,dx + \gamma\cdot\int_{B_1^+} w_k^2\,dx \leq c\cdot\left(1+\|u\|_{2,\infty}\right)^m\cdot|A(k)|$$

for any $k \geq k_0$. Now the conclusion of the Lemma follows from the same arguments as in ([5], Theorem 2.2).

To get a similar bound for the mixed derivatives $D_nD_\sigma u$, we remark that due to (4.41)

$$(4.45)\qquad -a^{nn}D_nD_\sigma u = g + a^{n\rho}D_\rho D_\sigma u \quad \text{on } \Gamma$$

with some bounded function g and so—again using $a^{nn} > 0$—we deduce that

$$(4.46)\qquad |D_nD_\sigma u| \leq c\left(1+|D_\sigma D_\rho u|\right) \leq \hat{c}_\varepsilon\cdot\left(1+\|u\|_{2,\infty}\right)^\varepsilon$$

holds on Γ. Repeating now the proof of Lemma 4.3 with $w = \lambda\cdot a^{kl}D_kD_lu \pm D_nD_\sigma u$ and $k \geq \hat{k}_0 = k_0 + \hat{c}_\varepsilon(1+\|u\|_{2,\infty})^\varepsilon$, we conclude that (4.46) holds in $B_{1/2}^+$ since no boundary integrals occur.

Finally, using the equation we can estimate D_nD_nu in terms of $D_\sigma D_\rho u$ and $D_nD_\sigma u$. Thus, we obtain

$$(4.47)\qquad \|u\|_{2,\infty,B_{1/2}^+} \leq c_\varepsilon\cdot\left(1+\|u\|_{2,\infty}\right)^\varepsilon$$

for any ε, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

As $\partial\Omega$ is compact, this estimate holds in a boundary neighbourhood. In the interior of Ω the estimate can be derived by a version of the proof of Lemma 4.3. Thus, we have an a priori estimate for $\|u\|_{2,\infty,\Omega}$ depending only on known quantities, but not on μ and δ.

Letting now μ tend to infinity, u tends to the (unique) solution $\tilde{u}_0$ of (4.21). Then, letting δ tend to zero, we arrive at a function $\hat{u} \in H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ solving the variational inequality

$$(4.48)\qquad \begin{aligned} &\langle A\hat{u} + H\hat{u} + \gamma(\hat{u}-u_0), v-\hat{u}\rangle \geq 0, \qquad \forall v \in K,\\ &\langle A\hat{u}, \eta\rangle = \int_\Omega a^iD_i\eta\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}\beta\eta\,dH_{n-1}\end{aligned}$$

where A and H satisfy the sharper differentiability assumptions. By an approximation argument we conclude, that (4.48) admits a solution $\hat{u} \in H^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ assuming only the weaker conditions, since the estimates are independent of the sharper assumptions. The conclusion

$$\hat{u} = u_0 \tag{4.49}$$

now follows from the uniqueness of a solution of (4.48).

References

[1] J. Frehse, *On Signorini's problem and variational problems with thin obstacles*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa, S IV, **4** (1977), 343–362.

[2] C. Gerhardt, *Global regularity of the solutions to the capillarity problem*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa, S IV, **3** (1976), 157–175.

[3] ———, *On the capillarity problem with constant volume*, Ann. Sci. Norm. Sup. Pisa, S IV, **2** (1975), 304–320.

[4] ———, *Existence and regularity of capillary surfaces*, Boll. U.M.I., **10** (1974), 317–335.

[5] ———, *Global $C^{1,1}$-regularity for solutions to quasi-linear variational inequalities*, Preprint, to appear in 'Arch. Rat. Mech.'.

[6] M. Gruter and K. O. Widman, *The Green function for uniformly elliptic equations*, Manusc. Math., **37** (1982), 303–342.

[7] R. Jensen, *Boundary regularity for variational inequalities*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **29** (1980), 495–504.

[8] G. M. Lieberman, *The conormal derivative problem for elliptic equations of variational type*, J. Differential Equations, **49**, No. 2 (1983), 218–257.

[9] J. H. Michael and L. M. Simon, *Sobolev and mean value inequalities on generalized submanifolds of* $\mathbf{R}^n$, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **26** (1973), 361–379.

[10] J. Spruck, *On the existence of a capillary surface with prescribed contact angle*, Comm. Pure Appl., **28** (1975), 189–200.

[11] G. Stampacchia, *Equations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus*, Montréal, Les Presses de l'Université, 1966.

[12] N. N. Ural'ceva, *The solvability of the capillarity problem*, Vestnik Leningrad Univ. No. 19 Mat. Meh. Astronom. Vyp., **4** (1973), 54–64, Russian.

Received February 2, 1983.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
CANBERRA, A.C.T. 2600, AUSTRALIA

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 117, No. 1 January, 1985

Amos Altshuler and Leon Steinberg, The complete enumeration of the 4-polytopes and 3-spheres with eight vertices . . . 1
Michael James Beeson, The 6π theorem about minimal surfaces . . . 17
Jeffrey Lawrence Caruso and Stefan Waner, An approximation theorem for equivariant loop spaces in the compact Lie case . . . 27
Jo-Ann Deborah Cohen, Topologies on the quotient field of a Dedekind domain . . . 51
Szymon Dolecki, Gabriele H. Greco and Alois Andreas Lechicki, Compactoid and compact filters . . . 69
Roger William Hansell (Sr.), Generalized quotient maps that are inductively index-σ-discrete . . . 99
Gerhard Huisken, Capillary surfaces over obstacles . . . 121
Jun Shung Hwang, A problem on continuous and periodic functions . . . 143
Ronald Fred Levy and Michael David Rice, The extension of equi-uniformly continuous families of mappings . . . 149
Kevin Mor McCrimmon, Derivations and Cayley derivations of generalized Cayley-Dickson algebras . . . 163
H. M. (Hari Mohan) Srivastava, A multilinear generating function for the Konhauser sets of biorthogonal polynomials suggested by the Laguerre polynomials . . . 183
Zhu Jia Lu, Some maximum properties for a family of singular hyperbolic operators . . . 193