

# The $C^\alpha$ regularity of a class of hypoelliptic ultraparabolic equations

WANG Wendong and ZHANG Liqun \*

Institute of Mathematics, AMSS, Academia Sinica, Beijing

## Abstract

We obtained the  $C^\alpha$  continuity for weak solutions of a class of ultraparabolic equations with measurable coefficients of the form  $\partial_t u = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_0} X_i(a_{ij}(x,t)X_j u) + X_0 u$ . The result is proved by simplifying and generalizing our earlier arguments for the  $C^\alpha$  regularity of homogeneous ultraparabolic equations.

keywords: Hypoelliptic, ultraparabolic equations,  $C^\alpha$  regularity

## 1 Introduction

We are concerned with the regularity of a class of ultraparabolic equations. One of the typical example of the ultraparabolic equations is the following equation

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + y \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - u^2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} = 0,$$

which is of strong degenerated parabolic type equations, more precisely, an ultraparabolic type equation. On the other hand, the equation (1.1), if we

---

\*The research is partially supported by the Chinese NSF under grant 10325104. Email: wangwendong@amss.ac.cn and lqzhang@math.ac.cn

consider it as an equation of  $\frac{1}{u}$ , has the divergent form. The recent paper of Pascucci and Polidoro [18], has proved that the Moser iterative method still works for a class of ultraparabolic equations with measurable coefficients which are called homogeneous Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equations (or KFP-equations). By the same technique, Cinti, Pascucci, Polidoro [3] consider a nonhomogeneous KFP-equations, and Cinti, Polidoro [4] deal with a more general ultraparabolic equation which we will concentrate on in this paper. Their result shows that for a non-negative sub-solution  $u$  of the ultraparabolic equation they considered, the  $L^\infty$  norm of  $u$  is bounded by the  $L^p$  norm ( $p \geq 1$ ).

From mathematical points of view, the ultraparabolic equation that we considered has some special algebraic structures and is degenerated. There are more and more studies on this problem in recent years. We have proved that if the weak solution obtained in [21] of (1.1) is of  $C^\alpha$  class, then  $u$  is smooth. The second author [23] has proved  $C^\alpha$  property of weak solutions by Kruzhkov's approach for homogeneous KFP-equations, and the authors deal with nonhomogeneous KFP-equations in [20]. By simplifying the cut-off function and generalizing our earlier arguments, we are able to prove the  $C^\alpha$  regularity for weak solutions of more general ultraparabolic equations. We prove a Poincaré type inequality for non-negative weak sub-solutions of (1.2). Then we apply the inequality to obtain a local priori estimate which implies the Hölder estimates.

Consider a class of ultraparabolic operator on  $R^{N+1}$ :

$$(1.2) \quad Lu \equiv \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_0} X_i(a_{ij}(x,t)X_j u) + X_0 u - \partial_t u = 0,$$

where  $(x, t) = z \in R^{N+1}$ ,  $1 \leq m_0 \leq N$ , and  $X_j$ 's are smooth vector fields on  $R^N$ , for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, m_0$ .

We follow the notations as in [4]. Let  $A = (a_{ij})_{m_0 \times m_0}$ , and  $A_0$  be the

identity matrix of  $m_0 \times m_0$ . Put  $Y = X_0 - \partial_t$ , and denote

$$(1.3) \quad L_1 := \sum_{k=1}^{m_0} X_k^2 + Y$$

A curve  $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow R^{N+1}$  is called  $L_1$ -admissible, if it is absolutely continuous and satisfies

$$\gamma'(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{m_0} \lambda_k(s) X_k(\gamma(s)) + Y(\gamma(s)), \quad \text{a.e. in } [0, T],$$

for suitable bounded measurable functions  $\lambda_1(s), \dots, \lambda_{m_0}(s)$ .

We make the following assumptions on the operator  $L$ :

**[H<sub>1</sub>]** : the coefficients  $a_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq m_0$ , are real valued, measurable functions of  $(x, t)$ . Moreover,  $a_{ij} = a_{ji} \in L^\infty(R^{N+1})$  and there exists a  $\lambda > 0$  such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} \xi_i^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_0} a_{ij}(x, t) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} \xi_i^2$$

for every  $(x, t) \in R^{N+1}$ , and  $\xi \in R^{m_0}$ .  $X_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N b_j(x) \partial_{x_j}$  with smooth functions  $b_j(x)$ ;

**[H<sub>2</sub>]** : there exists a homogeneous Lie group  $G \equiv (R^{N+1}, \circ, \delta_\mu)$  such that  
(i)  $X_1, \dots, X_{m_0}, Y$  are left translation invariant on  $G$ ,  
(ii)  $X_1, \dots, X_{m_0}$  are  $\delta_\mu$ -homogeneous of degree one and  $Y$  is  $\delta_\mu$ -homogeneous of degree two;

**[H<sub>3</sub>]** : for every  $(x, t), (\xi, \tau) \in R^{N+1}$  with  $t > \tau$ , there exists an  $L_1$ -admissible path  $\gamma : [0, t-\tau] \rightarrow R^{N+1}$  such that  $\gamma(0) = (x, t), \gamma(t-\tau) = (\xi, \tau)$ .

The requirements of **[H<sub>2</sub>]** and **[H<sub>3</sub>]** ensure that the operator  $L_1$  satisfies the well-known Hörmander's hypoellipticity condition by Kogoj and Lanconelli [8]. We refer to [4] and [8] for more details on the hypoelliptic type operator on  $R^{N+1}$ .

The Schauder type estimate of (1.2) has been obtained, for example, Lunardi [12] and Manfredini [14]. Besides, the regularity of weak solutions have been studied by Bramanti, Cerutti and Manfredini [2], Polidoro and Ragusa [19], Manfredini and Polidoro [13] assuming a weak continuity on the coefficient  $a_{ij}$ . It is quite interesting whether the weak solution has Hölder regularity under the assumption  $[\mathbf{H}_1]$ . One of the approaches to the Hölder estimates is to obtain the Harnack type inequality. In the case of elliptic equations with measurable coefficients, the Harnack inequality is obtained by J. Moser [15] via an estimate of BMO functions due to F. John and L. Nirenberg together with the Moser iteration method. J. Moser [16] also obtained the Harnack inequality for parabolic equations with measurable coefficients by generalizing the John-Nirenberg estimates to the parabolic case. Also De Giorgi developed an approach to obtain the Hölder regularity for elliptic equations. Another approach to the Hölder estimates is given by S. N. Kruzhkov [9], [10] based on the Moser iteration to obtain a local priori estimate, which provides a short proof for the parabolic equations. Nash [17] introduced another technique relying on the Poincaré inequality and obtained the Hölder regularity.

Let  $X$  be the gradient with respect to the variables  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{m_0}$ , and  $Xu = (X_1u, X_2u, \dots, X_{m_0}u)^T$ . We say that  $u$  is a *weak solution* if it satisfies (1.2) in the distribution sense, that is for any  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $\Omega$  is a open subset of  $R^{N+1}$ , then

$$(1.3) \quad \int_{\Omega} \phi Yu - (Xu)^T AX\phi = 0,$$

where  $u, Xu, Yu \in L_{loc}^2(\Omega)$ .

Our main result is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** *Under the assumptions  $[\mathbf{H}_1] \sim [\mathbf{H}_3]$ , the weak solution of (1.2) is Hölder continuous.*

## 2 Some Preliminary and Known Results

We follow the earlier notations to give some basic properties. For the more details of the subject, we refer to Cinti and Polidoro [4], Kogoj and Lanconelli [8], or Bonfiglioli, Lanconelli and Uguzzoni[1].

We say a Lie group  $G = (R^{N+1}, \circ)$  is *homogeneous* if a family of dilations  $(\delta_\mu)_{\mu>0}$  exists on  $G$  and is an automorphism of the group:  $\delta_\mu(z \circ \zeta) = \delta_\mu(z) \circ \delta_\mu(\zeta)$ , for all  $z, \zeta \in R^{N+1}$  and  $\mu > 0$ , where

$$\delta_\mu = \text{diag}(\mu^{\alpha_1}, \mu^{\alpha_2}, \dots, \mu^{\alpha_N}, \mu^2),$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ ,  $\alpha_i$  is a positive integer, and  $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_N$ . Moreover, the dilation  $\delta_\mu$  induces a direct sum decomposition on  $R^N$ , and  $R^N = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_k$ . If we denote  $x = x^{(1)} + x^{(2)} + \dots + x^{(k)}$  with  $x^{(j)} \in V_j$ , then

$$\delta_\mu(x, t) = (D_\mu x, \mu^2 t),$$

where

$$D_\mu(x^{(1)} + x^{(2)} + \dots + x^{(k)}) = (\mu x^{(1)} + \mu^2 x^{(2)} + \dots + \mu^k x^{(k)}).$$

Let

$$Q = \dim V_1 + 2\dim V_2 + \dots + k\dim V_k,$$

then the number  $Q + 2$  is usually called the *homogeneous* dimension of  $(R^{N+1}, \circ)$  with respect to the dilation  $\delta_\mu$ .

A real function  $f(x)$  defined on  $R^N$  is called  $\delta_\mu$ -*homogeneous* of degree  $m \in R$ , if  $f(x)$  does not vanish identically and, for every  $x \in R^N$  and  $\mu > 0$ , it holds

$$f(\delta_\mu(x, 0)) = \lambda^m f(x).$$

A non-identically-vanishing vector field  $X$  is called  $\delta_\mu$ -homogeneous of degree  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ , if for every  $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , and  $\mu > 0$ , it holds

$$X(\phi(\delta_\mu(x, 0))) = \mu^m (X\phi)(\delta_\mu(x, 0)).$$

The norm in  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ , related to the group of translations and dilation to the equation is defined by

$$\|(x, t)\| = r,$$

if  $r$  is the unique positive solution to the equation

$$\frac{x_1^2}{r^{2\alpha_1}} + \frac{x_2^2}{r^{2\alpha_2}} + \cdots + \frac{x_N^2}{r^{2\alpha_N}} + \frac{t^2}{r^4} = 1,$$

where  $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \setminus \{0\}$  and by **[H<sub>2</sub>]** and Hörmander's hypoellipticity condition, we attain

$$\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_{m_0} = 1, \quad 1 < \alpha_{m_0+1} \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_N.$$

And  $\|(0, 0)\| = 0$ . Obviously

$$\|\delta_\mu(x, t)\| = \mu \|(x, t)\|,$$

for all  $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ . The quasi-distance in  $G$  is

$$d(z, \zeta) := \|\zeta^{-1} \circ z\|, \quad \forall z, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1},$$

where

$$(2.1) \quad \zeta^{-1} \circ z = (S(x, t, \xi, \tau), t - \tau)$$

and  $S \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is smooth (see [8]). Moreover, for every compact domain  $K \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ , there exists a positive constant  $C_K$  such that

$$(2.2) \quad C_K^{-1}|z - \zeta| \leq d(z - \zeta) \leq C_K|z - \zeta|^{\frac{1}{k}}, \quad \forall z, \zeta \in K$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the usual Euclidean modulus (see for instance, Prop 11.2 in [7]).

The ball at a point  $(x_0, t_0)$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_r(x_0, t_0) = \{(x, t) \mid \|(x_0, t_0)^{-1} \circ (x, t)\| \leq r\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_r^-(x_0, t_0) = \mathcal{B}_r(x_0, t_0) \cap \{t < t_0\}.$$

For convenience, we sometimes use the cube instead of the balls. The cube at point  $(0, 0)$  is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_r(0, 0) = \{(x, t) \mid |t| \leq r^2, \quad |x_1| \leq r^{\alpha_1}, \dots, |x_N| \leq r^{\alpha_N}\}.$$

It is easy to see that there exists a constant  $\Lambda_1$  such that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\frac{r}{\Lambda_1}}(0, 0) \subset \mathcal{B}_r(0, 0) \subset \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1 r}(0, 0),$$

where  $\Lambda_1$  only depends on  $Q$  and  $N$ .

We recall  $L_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{m_0} X_k^2 + Y$ , whose fundamental solution  $\Gamma_1(\cdot, \zeta)$  with pole in  $\zeta \in R^{N+1}$  is smooth out of the diagonal of  $R^{N+1} \times R^{N+1}$ , has the following properties:

(2.3)

$$(i) \quad \Gamma_1(z, \zeta) = \Gamma_1(\zeta^{-1} \circ z, 0) = \Gamma_1(\zeta^{-1} \circ z), \quad \forall z, \zeta \in R^{N+1}, \quad z \neq \zeta;$$

$$(ii) \quad \Gamma_1(z, \zeta) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_1(x, t, \xi, \tau) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad t > \tau;$$

$$(iii) \quad \int_{R^N} \Gamma_1(x, t, \xi, \tau) dx = \int_{R^N} \Gamma_1(x, t, \xi, \tau) d\xi = 1, \quad \text{if} \quad t > \tau;$$

$$(iv) \quad \Gamma_1(\delta_\mu \circ z) = \mu^{-Q} \Gamma_1(z), \quad \forall z \neq 0, \quad \mu > 0;$$

moreover,

$$(2.4) \quad \Gamma_1(z, \zeta) \leq C \|\zeta^{-1} \circ z\|^{-Q},$$

for all  $z, \zeta \in R^{N+1}$  (see [4] or [8]).

A *weak sub-solution* of (1.2) in a domain  $\Omega$  is a function  $u$  such that  $u, Xu, Yu \in L^2_{loc}(\Omega)$  and for any  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $\phi \geq 0$ ,

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{\Omega} \phi Yu - (Xu)^T AX \phi \geq 0.$$

A result of Cinti and Polidoro obtained by using the Moser's iterative method (see Prop 4.4 in [4]) states as follows.

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $u$  be a non-negative weak sub-solution of (1.2) in  $\Omega$ . Let  $(x_0, t_0) \in \Omega$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{B}_r^-(x_0, t_0)} \subset \Omega$  and  $p \geq 1$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $C$  which depends only on the operator  $L$  such that, for  $0 < r \leq 1$*

$$(2.6) \quad \sup_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{2}}^-(x_0, t_0)} u^p \leq \frac{C}{r^{Q+2}} \int_{\mathcal{B}_r^-(x_0, t_0)} u^p,$$

*provided that the last integral converges.*

We make use of a classical potential estimates (see (1.11) in [5]) here to prove the Poincaré type inequality.

**Lemma 2.2** *Let  $(R^{N+1}, \circ)$  is a homogeneous Lie group of homogeneous dimension  $Q + 2$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, Q + 2)$  and  $G \in C(R^{N+1} \setminus \{0\})$  be a  $\delta_\mu$ -homogeneous function of degree  $\alpha - Q - 2$ . If  $f \in L^p(R^{N+1})$  for some  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , then*

$$G_f(z) \equiv \int_{R^{N+1}} G(\zeta^{-1} \circ z) f(\zeta) d\zeta,$$

*is defined almost everywhere and there exists a constant  $C = C(Q, p)$  such that*

$$(2.7) \quad \|G_f\|_{L^q(R^{N+1})} \leq C \max_{\|z\|=1} |G(z)| \|f\|_{L^p(R^{N+1})},$$

*where  $q$  is defined by*

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{\alpha}{Q + 2}.$$



**Corollary 2.1** *Let  $f \in L^2(R^{N+1})$ , and recall the definitions in [3]*

$$\Gamma_1(f)(z) = \int_{R^{N+1}} \Gamma_1(z, \zeta) f(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad \forall z \in R^{N+1},$$

and

$$\Gamma_1(X_j f)(z) = - \int_{R^{N+1}} X_j^{(\zeta)} \Gamma_1(z, \zeta) f(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad \forall z \in R^{N+1},$$

where  $j = 1, \dots, m_0$ , then exists a positive constant  $C = C(Q)$  such that

$$(2.8) \quad \|\Gamma_1(f)\|_{L^{2\tilde{k}}(R^{N+1})} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(R^{N+1})},$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \|\Gamma_1(X_j f)\|_{L^{2k}(R^{N+1})} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(R^{N+1})},$$

where  $\tilde{k} = 1 + \frac{4}{Q-2}$ ,  $k = 1 + \frac{2}{Q}$ , and  $j = 1, \dots, m_0$ .

### 3 Proof of Main Theorem

We may consider the local estimate at a ball centered at  $(0, 0)$ , since the equation (1.2) is invariant under the left translation when  $a_{ij}$  is constant. The key point in our argument is to obtain a Poincaré type inequality. Then by using the Poincaré type inequality, we prove the following Lemma 3.5 which is essential in the oscillation estimates in Kruzhkov's approaches in parabolic case. Then the  $C^\alpha$  regularity result follows easily by the standard arguments. We follow the same route as [23] and [20], but the idea is more simple and technical. We give them together for completeness.

For convenience, we let  $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{m_0})$  and  $x = (x', \bar{x})$ . We consider the estimates in the following cube, instead of  $\mathcal{B}_r^-$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_r^- = \{ & (x, t) \mid -r^2 \leq t < 0, |x'| \leq r, |x_{m_0+1}| \leq (\lambda' r)^{\alpha_{m_0+1}}, \dots, \\ & |x_N| \leq (\lambda' r)^{\alpha_N} \}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda' > 1$  is a positive constant, to be decided in (3.8). Let

$$K_r = \{x' \mid |x'| \leq r\},$$

$$S_r = \{\bar{x} \mid |x_{m_0+1}| \leq (\lambda'r)^{\alpha_{m_0+1}}, \dots, |x_N| \leq (\lambda'r)^{\alpha_N}\}.$$

Let  $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$  be constants, for fixed  $t$  and  $h$ , we denote

$$\mathcal{N}_{t,h} = \{(x', \bar{x}) \mid (x', \bar{x}) \in K_{\beta r} \times S_{\beta r}, \quad u(\cdot, t) \geq h\}.$$

By the homogeneousness of  $X_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m_0$ , we can deduce

$$X_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} C_i^{(j)} \partial_{x_i} + \sum_{i>m_0} C_i^{(j)}(x) \partial_{x_i},$$

where  $C_i^{(j)}$  is a constant for  $i \leq m_0$  and  $C_i^{(j)}(x)$  is a polynomial of homogeneous degree  $\alpha_i - 1$  for  $i > m_0$ . Similarly

$$X_0 = \sum_{i>m_0} b_i(x) \partial_{x_i},$$

where  $b_i(x)$  is a polynomial of homogeneous degree  $\alpha_i - 2$ . In the following discussions, we always assume  $r \ll 1$ , and that the constants  $C_i^{(j)}$  ( $i \leq m_0$ ) and the coefficients of these polynomial functions  $b_j(x)$  and  $C_i^{(j)}(x)$  ( $i > m_0$ ) are bounded by  $\lambda$ , since we can choose  $\lambda$  as a large constant. Moreover, all constants dependant on  $m_0$ ,  $k$  or  $Q$  will be denoted by dependence on  $B$ .

**Lemma 3.1** *Suppose that  $u(x, t) \geq 0$  be a solution of equation (1.2) in  $\mathcal{C}_r^-$  centered at  $(0, 0)$  and*

$$\text{mes}\{(x, t) \in \mathcal{C}_r^-, \quad u \geq 1\} \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{mes}(\mathcal{C}_r^-),$$

*then there exist constants  $\alpha, \beta$  and  $h$ ,  $0 < \alpha, \beta, h < 1$  which only depend on  $B, \lambda$  and  $N$  such that for almost all  $t \in (-\alpha r^2, 0)$ ,*

$$\text{mes}\{\mathcal{N}_{t,h}\} \geq \frac{1}{11} \text{mes}\{K_{\beta r} \times S_{\beta r}\}.$$

*Proof:* Let

$$v = \ln^+ \left( \frac{1}{u + h \frac{g}{8}} \right),$$

where  $h$  is a constant,  $0 < h < 1$ , to be determined later. Then  $v$  at points where  $v$  is positive, satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_0} X_i(a_{ij}(x,t)X_j v) - (Xv)^T AXv + X_0 v - \partial_t v = 0.$$

Let  $\eta(s)$  be a smooth cut-off function so that

$$\eta(s) = 1, \quad \text{for } s < \beta r,$$

$$\eta(s) = 0, \quad \text{for } s \geq r.$$

Moreover,  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$  and  $|\eta'| \leq \frac{2}{(1-\beta)r}$ .

Now we let  $\eta_1 = \eta(|x'|)$  and  $\eta_2 = \prod_{j>m_0} \eta_j$ , where  $\eta_j = \eta(\frac{1}{\lambda^j} |x_j|^{\frac{1}{\alpha_j}})$  for  $j > m_0$ .

Multiplying  $\eta_1^2 \eta_2^2$  to (3.1) and integrating by parts on  $K_r \times S_r \times (\tau, t)$

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{K_{\beta r}} \int_{S_{\beta r}} v(t, x', \bar{x}) d\bar{x} dx' + \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\tau}^t \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 |Xv|^2 d\bar{x} dx' dt \\ & \leq \frac{C(B, \lambda, N)}{\beta^{3Q} (1-\beta)^2} (1 + \lambda^{-1} + \lambda^{-2}) |S_{\beta r}| |K_{\beta r}| \\ & + \int_{\tau}^t \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 X_0 v d\bar{x} dx' dt + \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} v(\tau, x', \bar{x}) d\bar{x} dx' \\ & \leq \frac{C(B, \lambda, N)}{\beta^{3Q} (1-\beta)^2} |S_{\beta r}| |K_{\beta r}| + \int_{\tau}^t \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 X_0 v d\bar{x} dx' dt \\ & + \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} v(\tau, x', \bar{x}) d\bar{x} dx', \quad \text{a.e. } \tau, t \in (-r^2, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$I_B \equiv \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \sum_{j>m_0} b_j(x) \partial_{x_j} v d\bar{x} dx',$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.4) \quad |I_B| &= \left| \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} \eta_1^2 \sum_{j>m_0} (b_j(x) \partial_{x_j} \eta_2^2) v d\bar{x} dx' \right| \\
&\leq C(\lambda, N) \ln(h^{-\frac{9}{8}}) \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} \sum_{j>m_0} |\eta'(|x_j|^{\frac{1}{\alpha_j}} \frac{1}{\lambda'})| \frac{1}{\lambda'} |x_j|^{\frac{1}{\alpha_j}-1} (\lambda' r)^{\alpha_j-2} \\
&\leq \frac{C(\lambda, N)}{(1-\beta)r^2 \lambda'^2} \beta^{-2Q} |S_{\beta r}| |K_{\beta r}| \ln(h^{-\frac{9}{8}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating by t to  $I_B$ , we have

$$(3.5) \quad \int_{\tau}^t \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 X_0 v d\bar{x} dx' dt \leq \frac{C(\lambda, N)}{(1-\beta)\lambda'^2} \beta^{-2Q} |S_{\beta r}| |K_{\beta r}| \ln(h^{-\frac{9}{8}}).$$

We shall estimate the measure of the set  $\mathcal{N}_{t,h}$ . Let

$$\mu(t) = \text{mes}\{(x', \bar{x}) \mid x' \in K_r, \bar{x} \in S_r, u(\cdot, t) \geq 1\}.$$

By our assumption, for  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$

$$\frac{1}{2} r^2 \text{mes}(S_r) \text{mes}(K_r) \leq \int_{-r^2}^0 \mu(t) dt = \int_{-r^2}^{-\alpha r^2} \mu(t) dt + \int_{-\alpha r^2}^0 \mu(t) dt,$$

that is

$$\int_{-r^2}^{-\alpha r^2} \mu(t) dt \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha\right) r^2 \text{mes}(S_r) \text{mes}(K_r),$$

then there exists a  $\tau \in (-r^2, -\alpha r^2)$ , such that

$$(3.6) \quad \mu(\tau) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha\right) (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \text{mes}(S_r) \text{mes}(K_r).$$

By noticing  $v = 0$  when  $u \geq 1$ , we have

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{K_r} \int_{S_r} v(\tau, x', \bar{x}) d\bar{x} dx' \leq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \text{mes}(S_r) \text{mes}(K_r) \ln(h^{-\frac{9}{8}}).$$

Now we choose  $\alpha$  (near zero),  $\beta$  (near one), and  $\lambda'$  large enough such that

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{C(\lambda, N)}{(1-\beta)\lambda'^2} \beta^{-2Q} + \frac{1}{2\beta^Q(1-\alpha)} \leq \frac{4}{5},$$

and fix them from now on.

By (3.2), (3.5), (3.7) and (3.8), we deduce

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{K_{\beta r}} \int_{S_{\beta r}} v(t, x', \bar{x}) d\bar{x} dx' \\ & \leq \left[ \frac{C(B, \lambda, N)}{\beta^{3Q}(1-\beta)^2} + \frac{4}{5} \ln(h^{-\frac{9}{8}}) \right] mes(K_{\beta r} \times S_{\beta r}). \end{aligned}$$

When  $(x', \bar{x}) \notin \mathcal{N}_{t,h}$ , we have

$$\ln\left(\frac{1}{2h}\right) \leq \ln^+\left(\frac{1}{h + h^{\frac{9}{8}}}\right) \leq v,$$

then

$$\ln\left(\frac{1}{2h}\right) mes(K_{\beta r} \times S_{\beta r} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{t,h}) \leq \int_{K_{\beta r}} \int_{S_{\beta r}} v(t, x', \bar{x}) d\bar{x} dx'.$$

Since

$$\frac{C + \frac{4}{5} \ln(h^{-\frac{9}{8}})}{\ln(h^{-1})} \longrightarrow \frac{9}{10}, \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

then there exists constant  $h_1$  such that for  $0 < h < h_1$  and  $t \in (-\alpha r^2, 0)$

$$mes(K_{\beta r} \times S_{\beta r} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{t,h}) \leq \frac{10}{11} mes(K_{\beta r} \times S_{\beta r}).$$

Then we proved our lemma.

Let  $\chi(s)$  be a smooth function given by

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(s) &= 1 & \text{if } s \leq \theta^{\frac{1}{Q}} r, \\ \chi(s) &= 0 & \text{if } s > r, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta^{\frac{1}{Q}} < \frac{1}{2}$  is a constant. Moreover, we assume that

$$0 \leq -\chi'(s) \leq \frac{2}{(1 - \theta^{\frac{1}{Q}})r}, \quad |\chi''(s)| \leq \frac{C}{r^2},$$

and for any  $\beta_1, \beta_2$ , with  $\theta^{\frac{1}{Q}} < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < 1$ , we have

$$|\chi'(s)| \geq C(\beta_1, \beta_2)r^{-1} > 0,$$

if  $\beta_1 r \leq s \leq \beta_2 r$ .

For  $x \in R^N$ ,  $t \leq 0$ , we set

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{(x', \bar{x}, t) \mid -r^2 \leq t \leq 0, x' \in K_{\frac{r}{\theta}}, |x_j| \leq (\frac{r}{\theta})^{\alpha_j}, j = m_0 + 1, \dots, N\}.$$

We define the cut off functions by

$$\phi_0(x, t) = \chi([\sum_{j=m_0+1}^N \frac{\theta^{2\alpha_j} x_j^2}{r^{2\alpha_j-Q}} - C_1 t r^{Q-2}]^{\frac{1}{Q}}),$$

$$\phi_1(x, t) = \chi(\theta|x'|),$$

$$(3.10) \quad \phi(t, x) = \phi_0(t, x)\phi_1(x, t),$$

where  $C_1 > 1$  is chosen so that

$$C_1 r^{Q-2} \geq |\sum_{j>m_0} 2\theta^{2\alpha_j} b_j(x) x_j r^{Q-2\alpha_j}|,$$

for all  $z \in \mathcal{Q}$ .

**Remark 3.1** *By the definition of  $\phi$  and the above arguments, it is easy to check that, for  $\theta$ ,  $r$  small enough and  $t \leq 0$*

(1)  $\phi(z) \equiv 1$ , in  $\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-$ ,

(2)  $\text{supp}\phi \cap \{(x, t) \mid x \in R^N, t \leq 0\} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ ,

(3) there exists  $\alpha_1 > \theta$ , which depends on  $C_1$ , such that

$$\{(x, t) \mid -\alpha_1 r^2 \leq t < 0, x' \in K_{\beta r}, \bar{x} \in S_{\beta r}\} \subseteq \text{supp}\phi,$$

(4)  $0 < \phi_0(z) < 1$ , for  $z \in \{(x, t) \mid -\alpha_1 r^2 \leq t \leq -\theta r^2, x' \in K_{\beta r}, \bar{x} \in S_{\beta r}\}$ .

**Lemma 3.2** *Under the above notations, we have*

$$Y\phi_0(z) \leq 0, \quad \text{for } z \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

*Proof:* Let  $[\sum_{j=m_0+1}^N \frac{\theta^{2\alpha_j} x_j^2}{r^{2\alpha_j-Q}} - C_1 t r^{Q-2}]$  be denoted by  $[\dots]$ . Then

$$Y\phi_0 = \chi'([\dots]^{\frac{1}{Q}})^{\frac{1}{Q}} [\dots]^{\frac{1}{Q}-1} [C_1 r^{Q-2} + \sum_{j>m_0} (2\theta^{2\alpha_j} b_j(x) x_j r^{Q-2\alpha_j})]$$

For the term  $b_j(x) x_j r^{Q-2\alpha_j}$ , since  $|b_j(x)| \leq C(\lambda, N) (\frac{r}{\theta})^{\alpha_j-2}$ , we obtain

$$|\sum_{j>m_0} 2\theta^{2\alpha_j} b_j(x) x_j r^{Q-2\alpha_j}| \leq C(\lambda, N) \theta^2 r^{Q-2}.$$

We can choose a positive constant  $C_1 > 1$ , such that  $C(\lambda, N) \theta^2 < C_1$ , then  $Y\phi_0(z) \leq 0$  ( $z \in \mathcal{Q}$ ) holds.

We sometimes abuse the notations of  $\mathcal{B}_r^-$  and  $\mathcal{C}_r^-$ , since there are equivalent. Now we have the following Poincaré's type inequality.

**Lemma 3.3** *Let  $w$  be a non-negative weak sub-solution of (1.2) in  $\mathcal{B}_1^-$ . Then there exists a constant  $C$ , only depends on  $B$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $N$ , such that for  $r < \theta < 1$*

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-} (w(z) - I_0)_+^2 \leq C \theta^2 r^2 \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} |Xw|^2,$$

where  $I_0$  is given by

$$(3.12) \quad I_0 = \sup_{\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-} [I_1(z) + C_2(z)],$$

and

$$(3.13) \quad I_1(z) = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [-\Gamma_1(z, \cdot) w Y\phi](\zeta) d\zeta,$$

$$C_2(z) = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [\sum_{j=1}^{m_0} |X_j^2 \phi| \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) w](\zeta) d\zeta,$$

where  $\Gamma_1$  is the fundamental solution, and  $\phi$  is given by (3.10).

*Proof:* We represent  $w$  in terms of the fundamental solution of  $\Gamma_1$ , i.e.

$$\varphi(z) = - \int_{R^{N+1}} \Gamma_1(z, \zeta) L_1 \varphi(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(R^{N+1}).$$

By an approximation and the support of  $\phi$  and  $\Gamma_1$ , for  $z \in \mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.14) \quad w(z) &= \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [\langle A_0 X(w\phi), X\Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \rangle - \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) Y(w\phi)](\zeta) d\zeta \\ &= I_1(z) + I_2(z) + I_3(z) + C_2(z), \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_1(z)$  are given by (3.13) and

$$I_2(z) = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [\langle (A_0 - A)Xw, X\Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \rangle \phi - \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \langle (A + A_0)Xw, X\phi \rangle](\zeta) d\zeta,$$

$$I_3(z) = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [\langle AXw, X(\Gamma_1(z, \cdot)\phi) \rangle - \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \phi Yw](\zeta) d\zeta.$$

$$C_2(z) = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [\langle A_0 X\phi, X\Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \rangle w + \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \langle A_0 Xw, X\phi \rangle](\zeta) d\zeta$$

Note that  $\text{supp}\phi \cap \{\tau \leq 0\} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-$  and  $\langle A_0 X\phi, X\Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \rangle$  vanishes in a small neighborhood of  $z$ . Integrating by parts we have

$$C_2(z) = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [\sum_{j=1}^{m_0} |X_j^2 \phi| \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) w](\zeta) d\zeta.$$

From our assumption,  $w$  is a weak sub-solution of (1.2), and  $\phi$  is a test function of this semi-cylinder. In fact, we let

$$\tilde{\chi}(\tau) = \begin{cases} 1 & \tau \leq 0, \\ 1 - n\tau & 0 \leq \tau \leq 1/n, \\ 0 & \tau \geq 1/n. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\tilde{\chi}(\tau)\phi\Gamma_1(z, \cdot)$  can be a test function (see [4]). As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $\phi\Gamma_1(z, \cdot)$  as a legitimate test function, and  $I_3(z) \leq 0$ . Then in  $\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-$ ,

$$0 \leq (w(z) - I_0)_+ \leq I_2(z) = I_{21} + I_{22}.$$



By Corollary 2.1 we have

$$(3.15) \quad \|I_{21}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-)} \leq C(\lambda, N)\theta r \|I_{21}\|_{L^{2+\frac{4}{Q}}(\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-)} \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\theta r \|Xw\|_{L^2(\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-)}.$$

Similarly for  $I_{22}$ ,

$$\|I_{22}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-)} \leq |\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-|^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{Q-2}{2Q+4}} \|I_{22}\|_{L^{2\bar{k}}(\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-)} \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\theta^2 r^2 \|Xw\|_{L^2(\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-)} \|X\phi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-)},$$

where

$$|X\phi_1| = |\chi'(\theta|\xi')|\theta X(|\xi'|) \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\frac{\theta}{r},$$

and

$$|X\phi_0| \leq |\chi'| \frac{1}{Q} [\dots]^{\frac{1}{Q}-1} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m_0, j > m_0} \left| \frac{2C_j^{(i)}(x)\theta^{2\alpha_j} x_j}{r^{2\alpha_j-Q}} \right| \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\theta^{\frac{1}{Q}} r^{-1},$$

thus

$$\|I_{22}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-)} \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\theta^2 r \|Xw\|_{L^2(\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-)}.$$

Then we proved our lemma.

Now we apply Lemma 3.3 to the function  $w = \ln^+ \frac{h}{u+h^{\frac{1}{8}}}$ . If  $u$  is a weak solution of (1.2), obviously  $w$  is a weak sub-solution. We estimate the value of  $I_0$  given by Lemma 3.3.

**Lemma 3.4** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.3, there exist constants  $\lambda_0$ ,  $r_0$  and  $r_0 < \theta$ .  $\lambda_0$  only depends on constants  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $B$ ,  $N$ , and  $\phi$ ,  $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$ , such that for  $r < r_0$*

$$(3.16) \quad |I_0| \leq \lambda_0 \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}).$$

*Proof:* We first come to estimate  $C_2(z)$  and as before, denote  $x = (x', \bar{x}, t)$  and  $\zeta = (\xi', \bar{\xi}, \tau)$ . Note  $z \in \mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |C_2(z)| \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [\sum_{j=1}^{m_0} |X_j^2 \phi| \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) w](\zeta) d\zeta \\ & \leq r^2 \sup_{\xi \in \text{supp}(X\phi)} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} |X_j^2 \phi| \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}). \quad (\text{By (iii) in (2.3)}) \end{aligned}$$

We only need to estimate  $|X_j^2\phi|$ ,

$$|X_j^2\phi| \leq |X_j^2\phi_1| + 2|X_j\phi_1X_j\phi_0| + |X_j^2\phi_0|,$$

where  $|X_j\phi_1| = |\theta\chi'(\theta|\xi'|)\partial_{\xi_j}|\xi'| \leq 2\theta r^{-1}$ ,  $|X_j^2\phi_1| \leq C\theta^{2-\frac{1}{Q}}r^{-2}$  and

$$|X_j\phi_0| = |\chi' \frac{1}{Q} [\cdot \cdot]^{\frac{1}{Q}-1} (\sum_{i>m_0} \frac{C_i^{(j)}(\xi) 2\xi_i \theta^{2\alpha_i}}{r^{2\alpha_i-Q}})| \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\theta^{\frac{1}{Q}}r^{-1},$$

moreover,

$$|X_j^2\phi_0| \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\theta^{\frac{1}{Q}}r^{-2}.$$

Hence

$$(3.17) \quad |C_2(z)| \leq C(B, \lambda, N)\theta^{\frac{1}{Q}} \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}) = C(B, \lambda, N)\theta^{\alpha_0} \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}})$$

where  $\alpha_0 = \frac{1}{Q} > 0$ .

Since  $X_0 = \sum_{j>m_0} b_j(x)\partial_{x_j}$ , we know  $Y\phi = \phi_1Y\phi_0$ . Now we let  $w \equiv 1$ , then for  $z \in \mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-$  (3.14) gives,

$$(3.18) \quad 1 = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{r}{\theta}}^-} [-\phi_1\Gamma_1(z, \cdot)Y\phi_0](\zeta)d\zeta + C_2(z)|_{w=1}.$$

By Lemma 3.2,

$$(3.19) \quad -\phi_1\Gamma_1(z, \cdot)Y\phi_0 \geq 0,$$

we only need to prove  $-\phi_1\Gamma_1(z, \cdot)Y\phi_0$  has a positive lower bound in a domain which  $w$  vanishes, and this bound independent of  $r$  and small  $\theta$ . So we can find a  $\lambda_0$ ,  $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$ , such that this lemma holds and  $\lambda_0$  is independent of  $r$  and small  $\theta$ . We observe that the support of  $\chi'(s)$  is in the region  $\theta^{\frac{1}{Q}}r < s < r$ , thus for some  $\beta' < 1$ , the set  $\mathcal{B}_{\beta' r}^- \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\sqrt{\theta} r}^-$  with  $\theta r^2/C_1 \leq |t| \leq \alpha_1 r^2$  is contained in the support of  $\phi_1\phi_0'$ . Then we can prove that the integral of (3.19) on a subset of the domain  $\mathcal{B}_{\beta' r}^- \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\sqrt{\theta} r}^-$  is lower bounded by a positive constant.

For  $z \in B_{\theta r}^-$ ,  $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha$  and set

(3.20)

$$\zeta \in Z = \{(\xi, \tau) \mid -\alpha_1 r^2 \leq \tau \leq -\frac{\alpha_1}{2} r^2, \xi' \in K_{\beta r}, \bar{\xi} \in S_{\beta r}, w(\xi, \tau) = 0\},$$

then  $|Z| = C(\alpha_1, \beta, B, \lambda, N)r^{Q+2}$  by Lemma 3.1. We note that when  $\zeta = (\xi, \tau) \in Z$  and  $\theta$  is small,  $w(\zeta) = 0$ ,  $\phi_1(\zeta) = 1$ ,

$$|\chi'([\cdot \cdot \cdot]^{\frac{1}{Q}})] \geq C(\alpha_1, B, \lambda, N)r^{-1} > 0.$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Z [-\phi_1 \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) Y \phi_0](\zeta) d\zeta \\ &= - \int_Z \phi_1 \Gamma_1(z, \cdot) \chi'([\cdot \cdot \cdot]^{\frac{1}{Q}})] \frac{1}{Q} [\cdot \cdot \cdot]^{\frac{1}{Q}-1} [C_1 r^{Q-2} + \sum_{j>m_0} (2\theta^{2\alpha_j} b_j(\xi) \xi_j r^{Q-2\alpha_j})] d\zeta \\ &\geq C(B, \lambda, \alpha_1, N) \int_Z r^{Q-2} [r^Q]^{\frac{1}{Q}-1} r^{-1} \Gamma_1(\zeta^{-1} \circ z, 0) d\zeta \\ &\geq C(B, \lambda, \alpha_1, N) \int_Z r^{-2} \Gamma_1(\zeta^{-1} \circ z, 0) d\zeta \\ &= C(B, \lambda, \alpha, \beta, N) = C_4 > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $\Gamma_1(z, \zeta) \geq Cr^{-Q}$ , as  $\tau \leq -\frac{\alpha_1}{2} r^2$  and  $z \in B_{\theta r}^-$ . In fact, by (iv) in (2.3) one get

$$\Gamma_1(z, \zeta) = r^{-Q} \Gamma_1(S(x, t, \xi, \tau), \frac{t-\tau}{r^2}),$$

where  $\frac{\alpha_1}{2} \leq \frac{t-\tau}{r^2} \leq 1$  and  $S$  is bounded by (2.1), hence by the property (ii) in (2.3) of  $\Gamma_1$ , we have  $\Gamma_1(z, \zeta) \geq C(\alpha_1)r^{-Q}$ . Then we can choose a small  $\theta$  which is fixed from now on and  $r_0 < \theta$ , such that

$$(3.21) \quad |I_0| \leq (1 - C_4 + C_3 \theta^{\alpha_0}) \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}) + C_3 \theta^{\alpha_0} \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}) \leq \lambda_0 \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}})$$

where  $0 < r < r_0$ ,  $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$ , depends on  $\alpha, \beta, B, \lambda, N$ , and  $\phi$ .

**Lemma 3.5** *Suppose that  $u(x, t) \geq 0$  is a solution of equation (1.2) in  $\mathcal{B}_r^-$  centered at  $(0, 0)$  and  $\text{mes}\{(x, t) \in \mathcal{B}_r^-, u \geq 1\} \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{mes}(\mathcal{B}_r^-)$ . Then there*

exist constant  $\theta$  and  $h_0$ ,  $0 < \theta, h_0 < 1$  which only depend on  $B, \lambda, \lambda_0$  and  $N$  such that

$$u(x, t) \geq h_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-.$$

*Proof:* We consider

$$w = \ln^+\left(\frac{h}{u + h^{\frac{9}{8}}}\right),$$

for  $0 < h < 1$ , to be decided. By applying Lemma 3.3 to  $w$  and scaling, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-} (w - I_0)_+^2 \leq C(B, \lambda, N) \frac{\theta \beta r^2}{|\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-|} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\beta r}^-} |Xw|^2.$$

Let  $\tilde{u} = \frac{u}{h}$ , then  $\tilde{u}$  satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.1. We can get similar estimates as (3.2), (3.5), (3.7) and (3.8), hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & C(B, \lambda, N) \frac{\theta r^2}{|\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-|} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\beta r}^-} |Xw|^2 \\ (3.22) \quad & \leq C(B, \lambda, N) \frac{\theta r^2}{|\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-|} \left[ \frac{C(B, \lambda, N)}{\beta^{3Q}(1-\beta)^2} + \frac{4}{5} \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}) \right] \text{mes}(K_{\beta r} \times S_{\beta r}) \\ & \leq C(\theta, B, N, \lambda) \ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta$  has been chosen. By Lemma 2.1, there exists a constant, still denoted by  $\theta$ , such that for  $z \in \mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-$ ,

$$(3.23) \quad w - I_0 \leq C(B, \lambda, N) (\ln(h^{-\frac{1}{8}}))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore we may choose  $h_0$  small enough, so that

$$C \left( \ln\left(\frac{1}{h_0^{\frac{1}{8}}}\right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \ln\left(\frac{1}{2h_0^{\frac{1}{8}}}\right) - \lambda_0 \ln\left(\frac{1}{h_0^{\frac{1}{8}}}\right),$$

then (3.16) and (3.23) gives

$$\sup_{\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-} \frac{h_0}{u + h_0^{\frac{9}{8}}} \leq \frac{1}{2h_0^{\frac{1}{8}}},$$

which implies  $\inf_{\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-} u \geq h_0^{\frac{9}{8}}$ , then we have finished our proof.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** We may assume that  $M = \sup_{\mathcal{B}_r^-}(+u) = \sup_{\mathcal{B}_r^-}(-u)$ , otherwise we replace  $u$  by  $u - c$ , since  $u$  is bounded locally. Then either  $1 + \frac{u}{M}$  or  $1 - \frac{u}{M}$  satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.5, and we suppose  $1 + \frac{u}{M}$  does it, thus Lemma 3.5 implies existing  $h_0 > 0$  such than  $\inf_{\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-}(1 + \frac{u}{M}) \geq h_0$ , i.e.  $u \geq M(h_0 - 1)$ , then

$$Osc_{\mathcal{B}_{\theta r}^-} u \leq M - M(h_0 - 1) \leq (1 - \frac{h_0}{2})Osc_{\mathcal{B}_r^-} u,$$

which implies the  $C^\alpha$  regularity of  $u$  near point  $(0, 0)$  by the standard iteration arguments. By the left invariant translation group action, we know that  $u$  is  $C^\alpha$  in the interior.

## References

- [1] A. Bonfiglioli, E. Lanconelli and F. Uguzzoni, *Stratified Lie Groups and Potential Theory for their Sub-Laplacians*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007
- [2] M. Bramanti, M. C. Cerutti and M. Manfredini.  *$L^p$  estimates for some ultraparabolic equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 200 (2) 332-354 (1996).
- [3] C. Cinti, A. Pascucci and S. Polidoro, *Pointwise estimates for solutions to a class of non-homogenous Kolmogorov equations*, Mathematische Annalen, Volume 340, n.2, pp.237-264, 2008
- [4] C. Cinti and S. Polidoro, *Pointwise local estimates and Gaussian upper bounds for a class of uniformly subelliptic ultraparabolic operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 338 (2008) 946-969

- [5] G. B. Folland, *Subelliptic estimates and function space on nilpotent Lie groups*, Ark. Math., 13 (2): 161-207, (1975).
- [6] M. Di Francesco and S. Polidoro, *Harnack inequality for a class of degenerate parabolic equations of Kolmogorov type*. Adv. Diff. Equ. 11, 1261C1320 (2006)
- [7] P. Hajlasz and P. Koskela, *Sobolev met Poincaré*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 145 (2000) x+101.
- [8] A. E. Kogoj and E. Lanconelli, *An invariant Harnack inequality for a class of hypoelliptic ultraparabolic equations*, Mediterr. J. Math. 1 (2004) 51C80.
- [9] S. N. Kruzhkov, *A priori bounds and some properties of solutions of elliptic and parabolic equations*, Math. Sb. (N.S.) 65 (109) 522-570, (1964).
- [10] S. N. Kruzhkov, *A priori bounds for generalized solutions of second-order elliptic and parabolic equations*, (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 150 748–751, (1963).
- [11] E. Lanconelli and S. Polidoro, *On a class of hypoelliptic evolution operators*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino, 52,1 (1994), 29-63, 1994
- [12] A. Lunardi, *Schauder estimates for a class of degenerate elliptic and parabolic operators with unbounded coefficients in  $R^N$* . Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. 24(4), 133-164 (1997) 23.
- [13] M. Manfredini and S. Polidoro, *Interior regularity for weak solutions of ultraparabolic equations in the divergence form with discontinuous coefficients*, Boll Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. (8), 1 (3) 651-675, (1998).

- [14] M. Manfredini, *The Dirichlet problem for a class of ultraparabolic equations*. Adv. Diff. Equ. 2, 831-866 (1997) 24.
- [15] J. Moser, *On Harnack's theorem for elliptic differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 14 577–591 (1961).
- [16] J. Moser, *A Harnack inequality for parabolic differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 17 101–134 (1964).
- [17] J. Nash, *Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations*, Amer. J. Math., 80, 931-954, (1958).
- [18] A. Pascucci and S. Polidoro, *The moser's iterative method for a class of ultraparabolic equations*, Commun. Contemp. Math. Vol. 6, No. 3 (2004) 395-417.
- [19] S. Polidoro and M. A. Ragusa, *Hölder regularity for solutions of ultraparabolic equations in divergence form*, Potential Anal. 14 no. 4, 341–350 (2001).
- [19] W. Wang and L. Zhang, *The  $C^\alpha$  regularity of a class of non-homogeneous ultraparabolic equations*, arXiv:math.AP/0711.3411.
- [21] Z. P. Xin and L. Zhang *On the global existence of solutions to the Prandtl's system*, Adv. in Math. 181 88-133 (2004).
- [22] Z. P. Xin, L. Zhang and J. N Zhao, *Global well-posedness for the two dimensional Prandtl's boundary layer equations*, preprint.
- [23] L. Zhang, *The  $C^\alpha$  regularity of a class of ultraparabolic equations*, arXiv:math.AP/0510405v2 25Dec 2006