

A REMARK ON $C^{1,\alpha}$ -REGULARITY FOR DIFFERENTIAL INEQUALITIES IN VISCOSITY SENSE

ARMIN SCHIKORRA

ABSTRACT. We prove interior $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity for solutions

$$-\Lambda \leq F(D^2u) \leq \Lambda$$

where Λ is a constant and F is fully nonlinear, 1-homogeneous, uniformly elliptic.

The proof is based on a reduction to the homogeneous equation $F(D^2u) = 0$ by a blow-up argument – i.e. just like what is done in the case of viscosity solutions $F(D^2u) = f$ for $f \in L^\infty$.

However it was not clear to us that the above inequality implies $F(D^2u) = f$ for some bounded f (as would be the case for linear equations in distributional sense by approximation). Nor were we able to find the literature on $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity for viscosity inequalities. So we thought this result might be worth recording.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Ingredients and definitions	4
3. Proof of the main theorem	6
Acknowledgment	9
References	9

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a classical result in the regularity theory of viscosity solutions that viscosity solutions $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to a large class of fully nonlinear elliptic equation

$$(1.1) \quad F(D^2u) = f \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

actually have Hölder continuous gradient, see e.g. [3, Theorem 8.3]. See Section 2 for the precise definition of F we consider here.

Let us recall that a viscosity solution to (1.1) is a map $u \in C^0(\Omega)$ such that

$$F(D^2u) \leq f, \text{ and } F(D^2u) \geq f$$

both hold in viscosity sense. And $F(D^2u) \leq f$ holds in viscosity sense if for any $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi - u$ attains its maximum in some $x_0 \in \Omega$ we have

$$F(D^2\varphi(x_0)) \leq f(x_0).$$

Similarly, $F(D^2u) \geq f$ holds in viscosity sense if for any $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi - u$ attains its minimum in some $x_0 \in \Omega$ we have

$$F(D^2\varphi(x_0)) \geq f(x_0).$$

For an introduction to the theory of viscosity solutions we refer e.g. to [3, 8, 9].

In this small note we want to record that the $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity theory for equations $F(D^2u) = f$ also holds for differential inequalities. More precisely we have

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $u \in C^0(\Omega)$ for some $\beta > 0$ solves in viscosity sense*

$$(1.2) \quad -\Lambda \leq F(D^2u) \leq \Lambda \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where F is a uniformly elliptic operator and 1-homogeneous (see Section 2), and $\Lambda < \infty$ is a constant. Then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha < 1$.

Let us remark that Theorem 1.1 does not seem to follow (even in the linear case $F(D^2u) = \Delta u$ and even with right-hand side in $f \in L^\infty$) only from considering incremental quotients and using Harnack inequality (as in [3, §5.3] where the right-hand side is zero). The incremental quotient of f is not uniformly bounded and blows up as $h \rightarrow 0$.

The problem that lead us to searching in the literature for Theorem 1.1 is the following: in [7] Khomrutai and the author study a geometric obstacle problem. In this geometric problem one is lead to consider obstacle problems for obstacles $\psi \in C^2$ where the energies is of the form

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 + u^2 g \quad \text{where } u \geq \psi.$$

For $g \geq 0$ and $g \in L^1$ one can show boundedness of u . If one has g bounded one obtains Hölder continuity of u . In particular, in the latter case one obtains in viscosity sense the following three inequalities.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u &\leq ug & \text{in } \Omega \\ \Delta u &= ug & \text{in } \{u > \psi\} \\ \Delta u &\geq \Delta\psi & \text{in } \{u = \psi\}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, one can find Λ such that

$$\Delta u \leq \Lambda,$$

and

$$\Delta u \geq \Lambda,$$

both hold in viscosity sense, but it is not obvious how to find a priori a function f such that $\Delta u = f \in L^\infty$. If these inequalities were to hold for distributional solutions one easily gets $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity, cf. Theorem 1.2. For this linear problem one might hope to use an argument as in [6] for the p -Laplacian to show that the inequality is actually true also in a weak sense.

Another approach to prove Theorem 1.1 might be to appeal to the relation between Viscosity solutions and pointwise strong solutions as in [4], and show this to hold for inequalities.

Our choice of proof for Theorem 1.1 is very similar to the usual arguments used for equations $F(D^2u) = f \in L^\infty$, namely one uses a blow-up procedure to reduce the regularity theory to the homogeneous solutions. We saw similar arguments appear e.g. in [1, 11, 10, 2].

However, while Hölder continuity for solutions of viscosity inequalities are well-established and easily citable, e.g. in [3], we were not able to find in the literature a statement regarding Hölder continuity for the gradient of solutions to such inequalities. The author would have appreciated such a statement recorded somewhere, and thought it might be useful also for others.

Let us also remark that in the weak sense a theorem similar to Theorem 1.1 holds true – simply by approximation.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a symmetric positive definite matrix, and let $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ open, solve*

$$f_1 \leq \operatorname{div}(A\nabla u) \leq f_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

that is we have for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, $\varphi \geq 0$,

$$-\int \langle A\nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle \leq \int f_2 \varphi,$$

and

$$-\int \langle A\nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle \geq \int f_1 \varphi.$$

Then for every Ball $B(2r) \subset \Omega$,

$$\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p(B(r))} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^p(B(2r))} + \|f_2\|_{L^p(B(2r))} + \|u\|_{L^2(B(2r))}.$$

In particular, by Sobolev embedding, if $p > n$ we obtain $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity estimates for u .

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(0,1))$, $\eta \equiv 1$ on $B(0,1/2)$, and $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ on $B(0,1)$ be the usual mollifying kernel and set $\eta_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{-n} \eta(\cdot/\varepsilon)$. Denote the convolutions with η_ε by $u_\varepsilon := \eta_\varepsilon * u$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon := \eta_\varepsilon * \varphi$. Moreover we define

$$(1.3) \quad g_\varepsilon := \operatorname{div}(A\nabla u_\varepsilon) \in C^\infty(\Omega_{-\varepsilon}).$$

Here

$$\Omega_{-\varepsilon} := \{x \in \Omega, \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon\}.$$

We have for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, $\varphi \geq 0$,

$$\int g_\varepsilon \varphi = - \int \langle A \nabla u_\varepsilon, \nabla \varphi \rangle = - \int \langle A \nabla u, \nabla \varphi_\varepsilon \rangle \leq \int f_2 * \eta_\varepsilon \varphi.$$

and likewise

$$\int g_\varepsilon \varphi \geq \int f_1 * \eta_\varepsilon \varphi.$$

With the same argument that one uses to prove the fundamental theorem of calculus, namely letting φ approximate the dirac-function, we obtain

$$f_1 * \eta_\varepsilon \leq g_\varepsilon \leq f_2 * \eta_\varepsilon \quad \text{pointwise everywhere in } \Omega_{-\varepsilon}.$$

In particular, for $\varepsilon < r$ and $B(2r) \subset \Omega$ we readily obtain for any $p \in (1, \infty)$

$$\|g_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(B(r))} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^p(B(2r))} + \|f_2\|_{L^p(B(2r))}.$$

Thus, from standard Calderon-Zygmund elliptic theory for the (constant coefficient-) equation (1.3) we find

$$\|\nabla^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(B(r))} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^p(B(2r))} + \|f_2\|_{L^p(B(2r))} + \|u\|_{L^2(B(2r))}$$

with constants independent of ε . Since $u_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u$ in $W_{loc}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ we obtain from the boundedness of the $W^{2,p}$ -norm of u_ε that the weak limit $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\Omega)$. Moreover, from weak convergence we have the estimate

$$\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p(B(r))} \lesssim \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\nabla^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(B(r))} \leq \|f_1\|_{L^p(B(2r))} + \|f_2\|_{L^p(B(2r))} + \|u\|_{L^2(B(2r))}$$

□

2. INGREDIENTS AND DEFINITIONS

Denote by $\mathcal{S}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ the symmetric matrices and let $F : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a uniformly elliptic operator, that is we shall assume there exists ellipticity constants $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda_1 \text{tr}(N) \leq F(M + N) - F(M) \leq \lambda_2 \text{tr}(N) \quad \forall M, N \in \mathcal{S}^n, \quad N \geq 0.$$

Moreover, we shall assume that F is 1-homogeneous, i.e. that $F(\sigma N) = \sigma F(N)$.

For solutions u to the homogeneous equations $F(D^2 u) = 0$ we have by e.g. [3, Corollary 5.7.]

Theorem 2.1 ($C^{1,\alpha}$ for homogeneous equation). *Assume that F is as above, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open and in viscosity sense $u \in C^0(\Omega)$ solves*

$$F(D^2 u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha < 1$.

Theorem 1.1 is thus a consequence of the following

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and assume that F is a homogeneous, uniformly elliptic operator as above such that every viscosity solution $v \in C^0(\Omega)$ of the homogeneous equation*

$$F(D^2v) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

satisfies $v \in C^{1,\alpha}$.

Assume that $u \in C^0(\Omega)$ solves in viscosity sense (1.2). Then $u \in C^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$ for any Hölder exponent $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$.

Hölder regularity of solutions u of differential inequalities in viscosity sense are standard, they follow from Harnack's inequality. See, e.g., [3, Proposition 4.10].

Lemma 2.3 (Uniform Hölder regularity). *Let u solve (1.2) for F as above. For some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ we have C^γ -regularity, namely for any ball $B(2r) \subset \Omega$ we have*

$$[u]_{C^\gamma(B(r))} \leq C(\Lambda, r, \|u\|_{L^\infty(B(2r))})$$

As a last ingredient we need the (standard) result about limits of uniformly converging viscosity (sub/super)-solutions.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ open, $u_k \in C^0(\Omega)$, and $\Lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of (viscosity) solutions to*

$$F(D^2u_k) \leq \Lambda_k \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

or

$$F(D^2u_k) \geq \Lambda_k \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

respectively.

Assume that $\Lambda_k \rightarrow \Lambda_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ and u_k converges locally uniformly to u_∞ . Then u_∞ is a solution in viscosity sense of

$$F(D^2u_\infty) \leq \Lambda_\infty \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

or

$$F(D^2u_\infty) \geq \Lambda_\infty \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

Proof. This is of course well known, but we repeat the argument for the \leq -case.

Let $u_k \in C^0(\Omega)$ converge locally uniformly to $u_\infty \in C^0(\Omega)$, and assume that

$$(2.2) \quad F(D^2u_k) \leq \Lambda_k$$

in viscosity sense, for some constants $\Lambda_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda$. We will show that then (also in viscosity sense)

$$F(D^2u) \leq \Lambda.$$

So let $\varphi \in C^2(\Omega)$ be a function testfunction for u , i.e. assume that $\varphi \leq u$ and $\varphi(x_0) = u(x_0)$. We need to show that

$$(2.3) \quad F(D^2\varphi(x_0)) \leq \Lambda.$$

Set

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x) := \varphi(x) - |x - x_0|^4.$$

Now we observe that for any y satisfying

$$(2.4) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(y) - u_k(y) \geq \tilde{\varphi}(x_0) - u_k(x_0)$$

we also have

$$\tilde{\varphi}(y) - u(y) \geq \tilde{\varphi}(x_0) - u(x_0) - 2\|u - u_k\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Since $u(y) \geq \varphi(y)$ and $\varphi(x_0) = u(x_0)$ we obtain from the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}$,

$$-|y - x_0|^4 \geq \varphi(y) - u(y) - |y - x_0|^4 \geq -2\|u - u_k\|_{L^\infty},$$

that is any y satisfying (2.4) also satisfies

$$|y - x_0|^4 \leq 2\|u - u_k\|_{L^\infty} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

In particular we can find a sequence $x_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} x_0$ such that

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x_k) - u_k(x_k) = \max_x (\tilde{\varphi}(x) - u_k(x)) \geq \tilde{\varphi}(x_0) - u_k(x_0)$$

That is, $\tilde{\varphi}(x)$ is a testfunction for u_k at x_k , and from (2.2) we get

$$F(D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_k)) \leq \Lambda_k.$$

From the ellipticity condition (2.1) we also obtain (see [3, Lemma 2.2]) for $M = D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_k)$ and $N = D^2\varphi(x_0) - D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_k)$

$$F(D^2\varphi(x_0)) \leq F(D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_k)) + C(\Lambda) |D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_k) - D^2\varphi(x_0)| \leq \Lambda_k + C(\Lambda) |D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_k) - D^2\varphi(x_0)|.$$

But since $x_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} x_0$ we have $D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_k) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} D^2\tilde{\varphi}(x_0) = D^2\varphi(x_0)$. Thus, we obtain (2.3). \square

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

The heart of the matter is the following decay estimate for the oscillation, we found this kind of argument in [2, Lemma 3.4].

Proposition 3.1. *Let F be as above, and α as in Theorem 2.2. For any $\beta < \alpha$ and any $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ such that the following holds.*

Let $u \in C^0(B(0, 1))$ with $\text{osc}_{B(0,1)} u \leq 1$ and

$$-\varepsilon \leq F(D^2u) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{in } B(0, 1)$$

Then there exists $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\text{osc}_{B(\lambda)} (u - \langle q, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) < \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{1+\beta}.$$

Proof. Assume the claim is false for some fixed $\beta < \alpha$ and $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1)$. Then we find for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ functions $u_k \in C^0(B(0, 1))$ with $\text{osc}_{B(0,1)} u_k \leq 1$ solving

$$-\frac{1}{k} \leq F(D^2 u_k) \leq \frac{1}{k},$$

but for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ we have

$$\inf_{q^* \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{osc}_{B(\lambda)} (u_k - \langle q^*, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{1+\beta}.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $u_k(0) = 0$ (since otherwise $u_k - u_k(0)$ satisfies the same assumptions), and since $\text{osc}_{B(0,1)} u_k \leq 1$ we have $\|u_k\|_\infty \leq 1$. By Lemma 2.3 the u_k are uniformly bounded in C^α , for some fixed $\alpha > 0$. By Arzela-Ascoli we thus may assume, up to taking a subsequence, that $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$ locally uniformly in $B(0, 1)$.

In view of Lemma 2.4 we find that u_∞ solves the homogeneous equation

$$F(D^2 u_\infty) = 0 \quad \text{in } B(0, 1).$$

From the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 we know that $u_\infty \in C^{1,\alpha}$. From Taylor's theorem we have thus for any $\lambda \in (0, 1/4)$,

$$\inf_{q^* \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{osc}_{B(\lambda)} (u_\infty - \langle q^*, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \lesssim [u_\infty]_{C^{1,\alpha}(B(0,1/2))} \lambda^{1+\alpha}.$$

On the other hand, by locally uniform convergence of u_k we have for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$.

$$\inf_{q^* \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{osc}_{B(\lambda)} (u_\infty - \langle q^*, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{1+\beta}.$$

That is, we have that for all $\lambda \in (0, 1/4)$, $\lambda < \lambda_0$.

$$\lambda^{\beta-\alpha} \leq [u_\infty]_{C^{1,\alpha}}$$

Since $\beta < \alpha$ this is impossible for very small λ . □

Iterating Proposition 3.1 we obtain

Corollary 3.2. *Let F be as above, and α as in Theorem 2.2. For any $\beta < \alpha$ and any $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1)$ there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ such that the following holds.*

Assume u solves

$$(3.1) \quad -\varepsilon \leq F(D^2 u) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{in } B(0, 1)$$

and

$$\text{osc}_{B(0,1)} u < 1.$$

Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, there exists $q_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\lambda^{-k(1+\beta)} \text{osc}_{B(\lambda^k)} (u(x) - q_k \cdot x) < 2^{-k}.$$

Proof. Let λ_0 w.l.o.g. be such that $2\lambda_0^{1-\beta} < 1$ and let $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ be from Proposition 3.1. For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we set

$$u_k(x) := 2^k \lambda^{-k(1+\beta)} (u(\lambda^k x) - q_k \cdot \lambda^k x),$$

where $q_0 = 0$ and $q_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $k \geq 1$, remains to be chosen.

Regardless of the choice of the constant vector q_k we obtain from (3.1), for every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$,

$$-2^k \lambda^{k(1-\beta)} \varepsilon \leq F(D^2 u_k) \leq 2^k \lambda^{k(1-\beta)} \varepsilon \quad \text{in } B(0, 1).$$

By the choice of λ_0 and since $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ we have in particular for every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$,

$$(3.2) \quad -\varepsilon \leq F(D^2 u_k) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{in } B(0, 1).$$

The claim follows, once we show

$$(3.3) \quad \operatorname{osc}_{B(0,1)} u_k < 1 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We prove (3.3) by induction, for $k = 0$ this holds already by assumption. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As induction hypothesis we assume the following holds

$$\operatorname{osc}_{B(0,1)} u_{k-1} < 1.$$

In view of (3.2) we can apply Proposition 3.1, and find $\tilde{q}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$2\lambda^{-1-\beta} \operatorname{osc}_{B(\lambda)} (u_{k-1} - \langle \tilde{q}_k, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) < 1.$$

That is

$$2\lambda^{-1-\beta} \operatorname{osc}_{B(1)} (u_{k-1}(\lambda \cdot) - \langle \lambda \tilde{q}_k, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) < 1.$$

By the definition of u_{k-1} ,

$$2^k \lambda^{-k(1+\beta)} \operatorname{osc}_{B(1)} (u(\lambda^k x) - \langle q_{k-1} - 2^{1-k} \lambda^{(k-1)(1+\beta)} \lambda^{1-k} \tilde{q}_k, \lambda^k x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) < 1.$$

so if we set

$$q_k := q_{k-1} - 2^{1-k} \lambda^{(k-1)(1+\beta)} \lambda^{1-k} \tilde{q}_k,$$

we have obtained

$$\operatorname{osc}_{B(1)} (u_k) < 1.$$

That is, by induction, (3.3) holds for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup 0$. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let F be as above, and α as in Theorem 2.2. For any $\beta < \alpha$ let u solve for some ball $B(R) \subset \Omega$*

$$-\Lambda \leq F(D^2 u) \leq \Lambda \quad \text{in } B(R)$$

Then

$$\sup_{r < R} r^{-1-\beta} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \operatorname{osc}_{B(r)} (u - \langle q, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \leq C(\beta, \alpha, \Lambda, R, \operatorname{osc}_{B(R)} u).$$

Proof. By otherwise considering $u_{\kappa,R} := \kappa^{-1}u(Rx)$ for

$$\kappa := \frac{\Lambda}{\varepsilon} + R^2 + \operatorname{osc}_{B(R)} u + 1,$$

we can assume that $R = 1$, $\Lambda < \varepsilon$ and $\operatorname{osc}_{B(1)} u < 1$. Here ε is from Corollary 3.2.

Denoting for the ball $B(r)$

$$\Phi(B(r)) := r^{-1-\beta} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \operatorname{osc}_{B(r)} (u_\infty - \langle q, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}),$$

we get from Corollary 3.2 for any $r \in (\lambda^{k-1}, \lambda^k)$

$$\Phi(B(r)) \leq \lambda^{-1-\beta} \Phi(B(\lambda^k)) \leq C(\lambda) 2^{-k} \Phi(B(1)) \leq C(\lambda) r^{\frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda}} \Phi(B(1)).$$

This implies for $\sigma := \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda} > 0$

$$\sup_{r < R} r^{-\sigma} \Phi(B(r)) \leq C(\lambda) \Phi(B(1)).$$

Dropping the σ , the claim is now proven. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact set. By a covering argument for any $\beta < \alpha$ we obtain from Corollary 3.3

$$\sup_{x \in K, r < \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)} r^{-1-\beta} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \operatorname{osc}_{B(r)} (u - \langle q, x \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}) < \infty$$

This readily implies that $u \in C^{1,\beta}(K)$ for any $\beta < \alpha$, see, e.g. [5]. See also [12, Theorem 4.4.]. □

Acknowledgment. Partial support by the Daimler and Benz foundation through grant no. 32-11/16 and Simons foundation through grant no 579261 is gratefully acknowledged.

The author would like to thank Quoc-Hung Nguyen, Cyril Imbert, Erik Lindgren, Qing Liu, Russel Schwab, and Pablo Stinga for helpful suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Attouchi, M. Parviainen, and E. Ruostenoja. $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity for the normalized p -Poisson problem. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 108(4):553–591, 2017. [3](#)
- [2] I. Birindelli and F. Demengel. Hölder regularity of the gradient for solutions of fully nonlinear equations with sub linear first order term. In *Geometric methods in PDE's*, volume 13 of *Springer INdAM Ser.*, pages 257–268. Springer, Cham, 2015. [3](#), [6](#)
- [3] L. Caffarelli and X. Cabré. *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, volume 43 of *AMS Colloquium Publications*. AMS, Providence, RI, 1995. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [4] L. Caffarelli, M. G. Crandall, M. Kocan, and A. Świąch. On viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear equations with measurable ingredients. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 49(4):365–397, 1996. [3](#)
- [5] S. Campanato. Proprietà di una famiglia di spazi funzionali. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3)*, 18:137–160, 1964. [9](#)

- [6] P. Juutinen, P. Lindqvist, and J. J. Manfredi. On the equivalence of viscosity solutions and weak solutions for a quasi-linear equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 33(3):699–717, 2001. [3](#)
- [7] S. Khomrutai and A. Schikorra. On $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity theory for critical points of a geometric obstacle-type problem. *preprint*, 2018. [2](#)
- [8] S. Koike. *A beginner's guide to the theory of viscosity solutions*. www.math.tohoku.ac.jp/~koike/evis2012version.pdf. 2012. [2](#)
- [9] N. Krylov. *Sobolev and Viscosity Solutions for Fully Nonlinear Elliptic and Parabolic Equations*, volume 233 of *AMS Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. AMS, Providence, RI, 2018. [2](#)
- [10] E. Lindgren. On the regularity of solutions of the inhomogeneous infinity Laplace equation. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142(1):277–288, 2014. [3](#)
- [11] E. Lindgren and P. Lindqvist. Regularity of the p -Poisson equation in the plane. *J. Anal. Math.*, 132:217–228, 2017. [3](#)
- [12] H. Rafeiro, N. Samko, and S. Samko. Morrey-Campanato spaces: an overview. In *Operator theory, pseudo-differential equations, and mathematical physics*, volume 228 of *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, pages 293–323. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2013. [9](#)

(Armin Schikorra) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, 301 THACKERAY HALL, PITTSBURGH, PA 15260, USA

E-mail address: `armin@pitt.edu`