

## Lecture 18: Regularity of $L$ harmonic functions Part III

### 1 Finishing the proof

In order to finish the proof from last time we need a lemma.

**Lemma 1.1** *Let  $\phi$  be a positive and increasing function on the positive reals, and let  $\alpha, c$  be positive constants. For all  $0 < \gamma < \alpha$  there is  $\epsilon > 0$  such that*

$$\phi(r) \leq c \left( \left( \frac{r}{s} \right)^\alpha + \epsilon \right) \phi(s) \quad (1)$$

for  $0 < r < s$  implies

$$\phi(r) \leq c' \left( \frac{r}{s} \right)^\gamma \phi(s) \quad (2)$$

for some constant  $c'$ .

**Proof** Choose  $0 < \tau < 1$  such that  $\epsilon \leq \tau^\alpha$ . Then

$$\phi(\tau s) \leq c(\tau^\alpha + \epsilon)\phi(s) \leq 2c\tau^\alpha\phi(s). \quad (3)$$

Therefore

$$\phi(\tau^k s) \leq (2c\tau^\alpha)^k \phi(s). \quad (4)$$

Pick  $\gamma$  so that  $2c\tau^{\alpha-\gamma} \leq 1$  and we have

$$\phi(\tau^k s) \leq \tau^{k\gamma} \phi(s). \quad (5)$$

When  $r = \tau^k s$  this is precisely what we wanted with  $c' = 1$ . If instead  $\tau^{k+1} s \leq r \leq \tau^k s$  then

$$\phi(r) \leq \phi(\tau^k s) \leq \tau^{k\gamma} \phi(s) \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \left( \frac{r}{s} \right)^\gamma \phi(s) \quad (6)$$

which is what we needed. Note that by taking  $\tau$  very small we can get  $\gamma$  as close to  $\alpha$  as we like. ■

Now we apply this to what we were doing last time. Let  $\phi(r) = \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2$ . We showed that

$$\phi(r) \leq \left( \left( \frac{r}{s} \right)^n + k \|A_{ij} - A_{ij}(x_0)\| \right) \phi(s) \quad (7)$$

By picking  $s$  we can get  $\|A_{ij} - A_{ij}(x_0)\|$  as small as we like so we will be able to apply our lemma. Pick  $0 < \beta < 1$  and set  $\gamma = n - 2 + 2\beta$ . By our lemma there is a constant  $k'$  with

$$\phi(r) \leq k' \left( \frac{r}{s} \right)^{n-2+2\beta} \phi(s). \quad (8)$$

In our old notation this is

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \leq k' \left( \frac{r}{s} \right)^{n-2+2\beta} \int_{B_s(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2, \quad (9)$$

and Holder continuity follows by Morrey's lemma.