

On Lipschitz regularity for bounded minimizers of functionals with (p, q) -growth

Karthik Adimurthi^{a,*}, Vivek Tewary^a

^aTata Institute of Fundamental Research, Centre for Applicable Mathematics, Bangalore, Karnataka, 560065, India

Abstract

We obtain Lipschitz estimates for bounded minimizers of functionals with nonstandard (p, q) -growth satisfying the dimension-independent restriction $q < p + 2$ with $p \geq 2$. This relation improves existing restrictions when $p \leq N - 1$, moreover our result is sharp in the range $N > \frac{p(2+p)}{2} + 1$. The standard Lipschitz regularity takes the form $W_{loc}^{1,\infty} - W_{loc}^{1,p}$, whereas we obtain $W_{loc}^{1,\infty} - L_{loc}^\infty$ regularity estimate and then make use of existing sharp L_{loc}^∞ bounds to obtain the required conclusion.

Keywords: nonuniformly elliptic equations, local Lipschitz continuity, (p, q) -growth, nonstandard growth conditions

2020 MSC: 35B65, 35J92

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Comparison to Previous Results	2
2	Notations and Preliminaries	4
2.1	Notations	4
2.2	Preliminaries for Regularization	4
3	Regularization	6
3.1	Approximation Scheme	6
3.2	Regularity of minimizers	6
4	Caccioppoli Inequality	7
5	Higher Integrability of gradient	8
6	Moser's Iteration	9
7	Proof of Theorem 1.3	11

*Supported by the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no. 12-R&D-TFR-5.01-0520 and SERB grant SRG/2020/000081

**Supported by the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no. 12-R&D-TFR-5.01-0520

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: karthikaditi@gmail.com and kadimurthi@tifrbng.res.in (Karthik Adimurthi*), vivek2020@tifrbng.res.in and vivektewary@protonmail.com (Vivek Tewary)**

1. Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 2$ be a bounded open set and we consider the problem of local regularity of minimizers of

$$\mathfrak{F}[u] := \int_{\Omega} f(\nabla u) \, dx, \quad (1.1)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a C^2 integrand satisfying (p, q) growth of the form

Assumption 1.1. *Let $2 \leq p \leq q < \infty$ and suppose there exist constants $m, M \in (0, \infty)$ such that for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the following holds*

$$m|z|^p \leq f(z) \leq M(1 + |z|)^q, \quad (1.2a)$$

$$m|z|^p \leq \langle Df(z), z \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |Df(z)| \leq M(1 + |z|^{q-1}), \quad (1.2b)$$

$$m|z|^{p-2}|\xi|^2 \leq \langle D^2f(z)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq M(1 + |z|^{q-2})|\xi|^2. \quad (1.2c)$$

Definition 1.2. *We say that $U \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a local minimizer of (1.1) provided the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(i) $f(\nabla U) \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ and

(ii) $\int_{\text{spt } \varphi} f(\nabla u) \, dx \leq \int_{\text{spt } \varphi} f(\nabla u + \nabla \varphi) \, dx$ holds for all $\varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $\text{spt}(\varphi) \Subset \Omega$.

Our main theorem reads as follows:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $2 \leq p \leq q < \infty$ with $q < p + 2$ and let $U \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^{\infty}(\Omega)$ be a bounded, local minimizer of \mathfrak{F} as in Definition 1.2, then $\nabla U \in L_{\text{loc}}^{\infty}(\Omega)$.*

1.1. Comparison to Previous Results

Regularity theory of variational problems with nonstandard (p, q) growth was pioneered by P.Marcellini in a series of seminal papers [27, 28, 29, 31, 30]. Since we are interested in Lipschitz regularity, let us recall that P.Marcellini proves Lipschitz bounds for $U \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ under the restriction

$$\frac{q}{p} < 1 + \frac{2}{N}.$$

In a recent paper, P.Bella and M.Schäffner [3] improved the restriction to

$$\frac{q}{p} < 1 + \min \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{N-1} \right\}, \quad \text{for } N \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad p \geq 2, \quad (1.3)$$

by employing a specialized test function that enables them to use Sobolev embedding on the sphere. There is a large body of work dealing with problems of (p, q) -growth as well as other nonstandard growth problems, for which we refer to [17, 18, 19, 20, 8, 7, 10, 11, 1, 15, 2, 16, 12, 13, 14]. A more detailed survey on the state of the art for problems with nonstandard growth may be found in [32, 33].

It is well known that Lipschitz continuity and even boundedness for (1.1) fail when p and q are far apart as evidenced by the following example of Hong [25], which is a variation on the famous counterexample of Giaquinta [21]:

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + |u_{x_n}|^4 \, dx,$$

which satisfies (1.2a)–(1.2c) for $p = 2$ and $q = 4$ and admits an unbounded minimizer if $N \geq 6$ (more examples of unbounded minimizers of (1.1) may be found in [26]). It was shown in [28, Section 6] that if $q > \frac{(N-1)p}{N-1-p}$, then

one cannot expect boundedness and only recently, this restriction was found to be sharp in [24], where it is proved that the minimizer is bounded provided

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{1}{N-1}. \quad (1.4)$$

It is easy to see that there is a gap between the restrictions in (1.4) and (1.3) and in this context, the authors in [3, 33] asked if one could obtain a Sobolev-type restriction (as in (1.4)) in order for the minimizer to be Lipschitz regular. *In this regard, we improve the restriction in (1.3) in some special ranges of p, q and N and also partially provide an answer to the question from [3, 33] by obtaining a Sobolev type restriction when $N > \frac{p(2+p)}{2} + 1$.*

- (i) For bounded minimizers, we require $q < p + 2$, see [Theorem 1.3](#).
- (ii) Combining the restriction $q < p + 2$ with the optimal restriction for boundedness from (1.4), we see that Lipschitz regularity for minimizers holds provided $\frac{q}{p} < \min \left\{ 1 + \frac{p}{N-1-p}, 1 + \frac{2}{p} \right\}$.
- (iii) In the case $p \leq N - 1$, we see that $\frac{2}{p} \geq \frac{2}{N-1}$, which suggests that [Theorem 1.3](#) improves the restriction given in (1.3). But it must be noted that our result additionally requires that the solutions are bounded which also requires the restriction (1.4) to be satisfied. We now compare the two results in a few special cases as follows:

Table 1: Admissible values of q , shaded regions denote sharp restrictions.

	$N = 2$	$N = 3$	$N = 4$	$N = 5$	$N = 6$	$N = 7$	
$p = 2$	$q < 4$	$q < 4$	$q < 4$	$q < 4$	$q \leq \frac{10}{3}$	$q \leq 3$	Theorem 1.3 + (1.4) - $C^{0,1}$
	$q < 4$	$q < 4$	$q < \frac{10}{3}$	$q < 3$	$q < \frac{14}{5}$	$q < \frac{8}{3}$	(1.3) - $C^{0,1}$
	$q \in (1, \infty]$	$q \in (1, \infty)$	$q \leq 6$	$q \leq 4$	$q \leq \frac{10}{3}$	$q \leq 3$	(1.4) - L^∞
$p = 3$	$q < 5$	$q < 5$	$q < 5$	$q < 5$	$q < 5$	$q < 5$	Theorem 1.3 + (1.4) - $C^{0,1}$
	$q < 6$	$q < 6$	$q < 5$	$q < \frac{9}{2}$	$q < \frac{21}{5}$	$q < 4$	(1.3) - $C^{0,1}$
	$q \in (1, \infty]$	$q \in (1, \infty]$	$q \in (1, \infty)$	$q \leq 12$	$q \leq \frac{15}{2}$	$q \leq 6$	(1.4) - L^∞
$p = 4$	$q < 6$	$q < 6$	$q < 6$	$q < 6$	$q < 6$	$q < 6$	Theorem 1.3 + (1.4) - $C^{0,1}$
	$q < 8$	$q < 8$	$q < \frac{20}{3}$	$q < 6$	$q < \frac{28}{5}$	$q < \frac{16}{3}$	(1.3) - $C^{0,1}$
	$q \in (1, \infty]$	$q \in (1, \infty]$	$q \in (1, \infty]$	$q \in (1, \infty)$	$q \leq 20$	$q \leq 12$	(1.4) - L^∞

- (iv) Since we require bounded solutions, we see that for minimizers, Lipschitz regularity would then require $\frac{q}{p} < 1 + \min \left\{ \frac{p}{N-1-p}, \frac{2}{p} \right\}$. In particular, if $N > \frac{p(p+2)}{2} + 1$, then $\frac{2}{p} > \frac{p}{N-1-p}$ and thus Lipschitz regularity holds for any minimizer as they are automatically bounded. In particular, due to the sharpness of the condition (1.4), we automatically obtain sharpness of the Lipschitz regularity in this range.
- (v) Our theorem improves the previous restriction for bounded minimizers of (1.1) which was found to be $q < p+1$ in [6, 9].

We now briefly describe the method of proof, first, we begin with a regularization procedure following [5] where a quadratic term is added to f . The regularized solution is shown to be in $C^{1,\gamma} \cap W^{2,2}$, and we exploit this $W^{2,2}$ regularity to obtain a gradient higher integrability result. After obtaining a Caccioppoli-type inequality for the gradient of U , we prove that $\nabla U \in L^s_{\text{loc}}$ for all $s \in (1, \infty)$. In fact, $\|\nabla U\|_s$ is estimated in terms of $\|U\|_{L^\infty}$ provided $q < p + 2$ holds. Finally, we use a Moser iteration adapted for solutions of equations with unbalanced growth to obtain the required result.

Remark 1.4. *After this paper was written, we became aware that this result has been proved previously by Bildhauer and Fuchs [4] in 2002. The methods are, for the most part, similar. Instead of De Giorgi iteration, we use a Moser iteration in the last step. Also, we use a quadratic term for the regularization and we use the notion of bounded slope condition to gain Lipschitz regularity for the regularized minimizer.*

2. Notations and Preliminaries

2.1. Notations

We begin by collecting the standard notation that will be used throughout the paper.

- We shall denote N to be the space dimension. A point in \mathbb{R}^N will be denoted by x .
- Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^N of boundary $\partial\Omega$.
- The notation $a \lesssim b$ is shorthand for $a \leq Cb$ where C is a constant independent of the regularization parameters σ and ε .
- We will use the symbol $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to denote the Euclidean inner product.

2.2. Preliminaries for Regularization

We list some of the preliminaries that are required in the subsequent sections. The regularization procedure relies on the addition of a quadratic term to the functional. Stampacchia [37] has proved some general theorems on the local Lipschitz regularity of minimizers to convex minimization problems posed on convex domains with boundary values satisfying the *bounded slope condition*.

Definition 2.1 (Uniformly Convex set). *A bounded, open set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is said to be uniformly convex if there exists $\nu > 0$ such that for every boundary point $x_0 \in \partial B$ there exists a hyperplane H_{x_0} passing through that point satisfying*

$$\text{dist}(y, H_{x_0}) \geq \nu|y - x_0|^2 \quad \text{for every } y \in \partial B.$$

Definition 2.2 (Bounded Slope Condition). *Let K be a positive real number and B an open bounded convex subset of \mathbb{R}^N . We say that a function $\phi : \partial B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the bounded slope condition of rank K if for any $x_0 \in \partial B$ there exists vectors $l_{x_0}^-$ and $l_{x_0}^+$ satisfying $\|l_{x_0}^-\| \leq K$ and $\|l_{x_0}^+\| \leq K$ such that*

$$\langle l_{x_0}^-, x - x_0 \rangle \leq \phi(x) - \phi(x_0) \leq \langle l_{x_0}^+, x - x_0 \rangle \quad \text{holds for every } x \in \partial B.$$

The following proposition gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a function to satisfy the bounded slope condition, see [23, Corollary 4.3] and [34] for the details of the proof.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded, open and uniformly convex domain with the boundary being $\partial B \in C^{1,1}$ regular. Then, a necessary and sufficient condition for any function $\phi(x)$, $x \in \partial B$ to satisfy bounded slope condition is that $\phi(x) \in C^{1,1}(\partial B)$.*

Theorem 2.4 ([37], Theorem 9.2). *Let $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and assume it satisfies $\langle D^2H(p)\zeta, \zeta \rangle \geq \nu|\zeta|^2$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^N$. If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is uniformly convex and $C^{1,1}$, then the integral given by $I(u) = \int_{\Omega} H(\nabla u) dx$ attains its minimum in the class of all Lipschitz functions in Ω assuming that the boundary values satisfy the bounded slope condition and are the trace of a $W^{2,p}$ function for some $p > n$.*

Let us now recall some basic facts from calculus of variations that will be needed later on. The first concerns the existence of a minimizer, the proof of which can be found in [35, Theorem 2.7].

Theorem 2.5. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a C^2 function such that*

- (i) *f satisfies the r -coercivity bound, i.e., $f(z) \geq m|z|^r$ holds for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and some $r \in (1, \infty)$.*
- (ii) *f is a convex function.*

Then, the associated functional $\mathcal{F}(u) = \int_{\Omega} f(\nabla u) dx$ has a minimizer over $W_g^{1,r}(\Omega) = \{u \in W^{1,r}(\Omega) : u|_{\partial\Omega} = g\}$, where $g \in W^{1-1/r,r}(\partial\Omega)$.

The second result discusses when does there exist a unique solution, the proof of which can be found in [35, Proposition 2.10].

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{F} : W^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $r \in [1, \infty)$, be an integral functional with a C^2 integrand $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If f is strictly convex, i.e.,*

$$f(\theta z_1 + (1 - \theta)z_2) < \theta f(z_1) + (1 - \theta)f(z_2),$$

holds for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$ and any $\theta \in (0, 1)$, then the minimizer $u_ \in W_g^{1,r}(\Omega) = \{u \in W^{1,r}(\Omega) : u|_{\partial\Omega} = g\}$ of \mathcal{F} , where $g \in W^{1-1/r,r}(\partial\Omega)$, if it exists, is unique.*

The next theorem gives a criterion for the integrand to be strictly convex, the proof of which can be found in [36, Theorem 1.5].

Theorem 2.7. *Let Ω be an open convex subset of \mathbb{R}^N and let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be C^2 . Suppose that for all $x \in \Omega$ the Hessian matrix $D^2f(x)$ is strictly positive-definite, then f is strictly convex.*

We end this subsection by recalling a maximum principle, whose proof may be found in [37, Theorem 2.1].

Theorem 2.8 (Maximum Principle). *Let $a_{ij}(x)$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ be measurable and bounded functions in B such that*

$$a_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geq \mu|\xi|^2, \text{ a.e. } x \in B, \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

If $u \in H^1(B)$ satisfies

$$\int_B a_{ij}(x)u_{x_i}(x)v_{x_j}(x) dx = 0, \text{ for all } v \in H_0^1(B),$$

then we have

$$u(x) \leq \max_{x \in \partial B} u(x) \text{ a.e. } x \in B.$$

We shall make use of the following well-known iteration lemma whose proof may be found in [22, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 2.9. *Let $Z(t)$ be a bounded non-negative function in the interval ρ, R . Assume that for $\rho \leq t < s \leq R$ we have*

$$Z(t) \leq [A(s-t)^{-\alpha} + B(s-t)^{-\beta} + C] + \vartheta Z(s)$$

with $A, B, C \geq 0$, $\alpha, \beta > 0$ and $0 \leq \vartheta < 1$. Then,

$$Z(\rho) \leq c(\alpha, \vartheta)[A(R-\rho)^{-\alpha} + B(R-\rho)^{-\beta} + C].$$

3. Regularization

3.1. Approximation Scheme

Let us fix a ball $B \Subset \Omega$ such that $4B \Subset \Omega$. Let $\varepsilon_0 = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\text{diam}(B)}{2} \right\} > 0$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, using a standard mollifier ρ_ε supported in a ball of radius ε centered at the origin, we define $U_\varepsilon := U * \rho_\varepsilon$. For $0 < \sigma < 1$, we define the regularized functional

$$\mathfrak{F}_\sigma(w) := \int_\Omega f_\sigma(\nabla w) dx := \int_\Omega f(\nabla w) + \frac{\sigma}{2} |\nabla w|^2 dx, \quad (3.1)$$

where $f_\sigma \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfies the following growth and ellipticity conditions: From [Assumption 1.1](#), we see that for $2 \leq p \leq q < \infty$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the following is satisfied:

$$\frac{\sigma}{2} |z|^2 + m|z|^p \leq f_\sigma(z) \leq M(1 + |z|)^q + \frac{\sigma}{2} |z|^2 \quad (3.2a)$$

$$\frac{\sigma}{2} |z|^2 + m|z|^p \leq \langle Df_\sigma(z), z \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |Df_\sigma(z)| \leq M(1 + |z|^{q-1}) \quad (3.2b)$$

$$m|z|^{p-2} |\xi|^2 + \sigma |\xi|^2 \leq \langle D^2 f_\sigma(z) \xi, \xi \rangle \leq M(1 + |z|^{q-2}) |\xi|^2 + \sigma |\xi|^2. \quad (3.2c)$$

An application of [Theorem 2.5](#) shows that there exists a minimizer $u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ of \mathfrak{F}_σ in B , i.e., the following holds:

$$\mathfrak{F}_\sigma(u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}) = \min_{v \in U_\varepsilon + W_0^{1,p}(B)} \int_\Omega f(\nabla v) + \frac{\sigma}{2} |\nabla v|^2 dx. \quad (3.3)$$

From [\(3.2c\)](#) and [Theorem 2.7](#), we see that f_σ is strictly convex and thus, [Theorem 2.6](#) shows that $u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ is unique.

3.2. Regularity of minimizers

Lemma 3.1. *The unique minimizer $u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ of [\(3.1\)](#) belongs to $u_{\sigma, \varepsilon} \in L^\infty(B) \cap C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}(B) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{2,2}(B)$. Moreover, for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $0 < \sigma < 1$, the following holds:*

$$\|u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(B)} \leq \|U\|_{L^\infty(2B)}.$$

Proof. Since the functional \mathfrak{F}_σ and boundary data U_ε given in [\(3.3\)](#) satisfies the hypothesis from [Theorem 2.4](#), we have the existence of a minimizer $u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ which is Lipschitz regular. Moreover, the minimizer is unique which follows from [Theorem 2.6](#) and [\(3.2c\)](#) applied with [Theorem 2.7](#).

Clearly the function $u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ satisfies the following Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\nabla \cdot (\nabla f_\sigma(\nabla u_{\sigma, \varepsilon})) = 0 \quad \text{in } B.$$

To prove the bound, we invoke the Maximum principle from [Theorem 2.8](#) along with [\(3.2b\)](#) to conclude that

$$\max_B |u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}| \leq \max_{\partial B} |u_{\sigma, \varepsilon}| = \max_{\partial B} |U_\varepsilon| \leq \max_{2B} |U|.$$

Thus, we get $u_{\sigma,\varepsilon} \in L^\infty(B) \cap W^{1,\infty}(B)$. Note that the L^∞ estimate is uniform and independent of σ and ε , whereas the Lipschitz bound could possibly depend on σ and ε .

Noting that the functional f_σ satisfies (3.2c), by a standard argument involving difference quotients, we can prove that $u_{\sigma,\varepsilon} \in W^{2,2}(B)$. Note that the $W^{2,2}(B)$ estimate comes from the regularizing term $\frac{\sigma}{2}|z|^2$ in (3.2a) and depends on the parameter σ . In particular, the $W^{2,2}(B)$ estimate could possibly blow up as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. \square

Remark 3.2. *In subsequent sections excepting Section 7, we shall suppress the subscript of $u_{\sigma,\varepsilon}$ for ease of notation.*

4. Caccioppoli Inequality

We shall prove the following Caccioppoli inequality for the gradient of u . Note that the proof is only formal and everything can be made rigorous using difference quotients and the a priori regularity from Lemma 3.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\alpha \geq 0$. Let u be the solution to (3.3). Then it holds that*

$$\int_B |\nabla u|^{p-2+\alpha} |\nabla^2 u|^2 \eta^2 dx \leq C(M, m) \left\{ \int_B (|\nabla u|^{q+\alpha} + |\nabla u|^{2+\alpha}) |\nabla \eta|^2 dx \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. The minimizer u of (3.3) satisfies the following Euler-Lagrange equation:

$$\int_B \langle Df_\sigma(\nabla u), \nabla \phi \rangle dx = 0.$$

By choosing $\phi = \psi_{x_j} \in H_0^1(B)$ and integrating by parts, we get

$$\int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla u_{x_j}, \nabla \psi \rangle dx = 0.$$

Now, for $\kappa > 0$, we choose $\psi = u_{x_j} (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \eta^2$, where $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B)$ such that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ in B , to get

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{\int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla u_{x_j}, \nabla u_{x_j} \rangle (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \eta^2 dx}_I &+ \underbrace{\int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla u_{x_j}, \nabla ((\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \rangle u_{x_j} \eta^2 dx}_{II} \\ &= -2 \underbrace{\int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla u_{x_j}, \nabla \eta \rangle u_{x_j} \eta (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} dx}_{III}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Now observe that due to the coercivity of $D^2 f_\sigma(z)$, we can apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for positive definite Hermitian matrix O given by $\langle Ox, y \rangle \leq \langle Ox, x \rangle^{1/2} \langle Oy, y \rangle^{1/2}$ along with Young's inequality to get

$$III \leq \frac{1}{2} I + 2 \int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla \eta, \nabla \eta \rangle u_{x_j}^2 (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} dx. \quad (4.3)$$

Substituting (4.3) in (4.2) and summing over $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla u_{x_j}, \nabla u_{x_j} \rangle (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \eta^2 dx &+ \sum_{j=1}^N \int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla u_{x_j}, \nabla ((\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \rangle u_{x_j} \eta^2 dx \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla \eta, \nabla \eta \rangle u_{x_j}^2 (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Observing that $\sum_{j=1}^N u_{x_j} \nabla u_{x_j} = (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \left((\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)$, we can rewrite the previous estimate as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla u_{x_j}, \nabla u_{x_j} \rangle (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \eta^2 dx \\ + \alpha \int_B \left\langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla \left((\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right), \nabla \left((\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right\rangle (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \eta^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \int_B \langle D^2 f_\sigma(\nabla u) \nabla \eta, \nabla \eta \rangle u_{x_j}^2 (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} dx.$$

Now, we shall apply (3.2c) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m}{2} \int_B |\nabla u|^{p-2} |\nabla^2 u|^2 (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \eta^2 dx + \alpha m \int_B |\nabla u|^{p-2} \left| \nabla \left((\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right|^2 (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \eta^2 dx \\ \leq 2(M+1) \int_B (|\nabla u|^q + |\nabla u|^2) (\kappa + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} |\nabla \eta|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

We can derive the required inequality by dropping the second term on the left hand side and passing to the limit $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ by an application of Dominated Convergence Theorem on the right hand side and Fatou's lemma on the left hand side. \square

5. Higher Integrability of gradient

In this section, we will prove that $\nabla u \in L_{\text{loc}}^s(B)$ for all $s \in (1, \infty)$ provided $q < p + 2$.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume that $q < p + 2$ and let u be the unique solution of (3.3) (recall Remark 3.2). For every $\beta \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C = C(N, p, q, \beta, M, m) > 0$ such that for every $0 < \sigma < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and every pair of concentric balls $B_{r_0} \Subset B_{R_0} \Subset B$, we have*

$$\int_{B_{r_0}} |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} \leq C R_0^N \left[\left(\frac{\|U\|_{L^\infty(2B_{R_0})}}{R_0 - r_0} \right)^{\frac{2(\beta+p)}{p}} + \left(\frac{\|U\|_{L^\infty(2B_{R_0})}}{R_0 - r_0} \right)^{\frac{2(\beta+p)}{2-q+p}} + \left(\frac{\|U\|_{L^\infty(2B_{R_0})}}{R_0 - r_0} \right)^{p+\beta} \right]. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof. We begin with the integral

$$\int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} \eta^2 dx = \int_B \nabla u \cdot (|\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2} \nabla u \eta^2) dx,$$

where $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B)$ to be eventually chosen appropriately. After integrating by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} \eta^2 dx &= - \int_B u \nabla \cdot (|\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2} \nabla u \eta^2) dx \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)} (p + \beta - 1) \underbrace{\int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2} |\nabla^2 u| \eta^2 dx}_{A_1} + 2 \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)} \underbrace{\int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-1} |\eta| |\nabla \eta| dx}_{A_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Young's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq \tau \int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} \eta^2 dx + \frac{1}{4\tau} \int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-4} |\nabla^2 u|^2 \eta^2 dx, \\ A_2 &\leq \tau \int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} \eta^2 dx + \frac{1}{4\tau} \int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2} |\nabla \eta|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\tau = \frac{1}{4\|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}(p + \beta - 1)}$, we get

$$\int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} \eta^2 dx \leq C(p, \beta) \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2 \left\{ \int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-4} |\nabla^2 u|^2 \eta^2 dx + \int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2} |\nabla \eta|^2 dx \right\}.$$

For the first integral on the RHS, we will apply Proposition 4.1 to get

$$\int_B |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} \eta^2 dx \leq C(p, \beta, M, m) \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2 \left\{ \int_B (|\nabla u|^{q+\beta-2} + |\nabla u|^\beta + |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2}) |\nabla \eta|^2 dx \right\}.$$

Let us now fix a pair of concentric balls $B_r \subset B_R \subset B$ and choose the cut-off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_R)$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_r and $|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{C}{R-r}$, to get

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} dx \leq C(p, \beta, M, m) \frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2}{(R-r)^2} \left\{ \int_{B_R} (|\nabla u|^{q+\beta-2} + |\nabla u|^\beta + |\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2}) dx \right\}. \quad (5.2)$$

Now, for $\tau > 0$ to be chosen, we estimate each of the terms on the right hand side of (5.2) as follows:

$$|\nabla u|^{p+\beta-2} \leq \tau |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} + \frac{C(p, \beta)}{\tau^{\frac{p+\beta-2}{2}}}, \quad (5.3a)$$

$$|\nabla u|^\beta \leq \tau |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} + \frac{C(\beta)}{\tau^{\frac{\beta}{p}}}, \quad (5.3b)$$

$$|\nabla u|^{q+\beta-2} = |\nabla u|^{q+\beta-2} \tau^{\frac{q+\beta-2}{p+\beta}} \leq \tau |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} + \frac{C(p, q, \beta)}{\tau^{\frac{q+\beta-2}{2-q+p}}}. \quad (5.3c)$$

For the last inequality (5.3c), we apply Young's inequality with exponents $\frac{p+\beta}{q+\beta-2}$ and $\frac{p+\beta}{2+p-q}$, which requires the condition $q < p+2$. Substituting (5.3a)–(5.3c) in (5.2), we get

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} dx \leq \frac{3C \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2}{(R-r)^2} \tau \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} dx + \frac{C \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2}{(R-r)^2} \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\tau^{\frac{p+\beta-2}{2}}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{\frac{\beta}{p}}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{\frac{q+\beta-2}{2-q+p}}} \right] R^N \right\},$$

where $C = C(p, q, M, m, \beta)$. Now, we choose $\tau = \frac{(R-r)^2}{6C \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2}$ to get

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^{p+\beta} dx + CR^N \left[\left(\frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}}{R-r} \right)^{p+\beta} + \left(\frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}}{R-r} \right)^{\frac{2(\beta+p)}{p+2-q}} + \left(\frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}}{R-r} \right)^{\frac{2(\beta+p)}{p}} \right].$$

Now, we fix $r_0 < R_0$, then by the iteration Lemma 2.9 for $r_0 \leq r < R \leq R_0$ and the maximum principle in Lemma 3.1, we obtain (5.1). \square

6. Moser's Iteration

Now, we are in a position to use Moser's iteration for an unbalanced Caccioppoli inequality as in (4.1). The difference from a standard Moser's iteration is that the starting point of our iteration must require an exponent of $|\nabla u|$ higher than p . In order to do this, we follow the same scheme as laid out in [6].

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that $q < p+2$ and let u be the solution to (3.3). Let $R_0 > 0$ be such that $B_{2R_0} \Subset B$ and we fix the following two exponents:*

$$2^* := \begin{cases} \frac{2N}{N-2}, & N > 2 \\ (2, \infty), & N = 2. \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_0 := \max \left\{ \frac{2q - 2^*p}{2^* - 2}, 2 \right\}.$$

Then, there exists $C = C(p, q, N, M, m, R_0, \|U\|_{L^\infty(2B)})$ such that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\frac{R_0}{2}}\right)} \leq C. \quad (6.1)$$

Proof. We restate the Caccioppoli inequality from Proposition 4.1 as:

$$\int_B \left| \nabla \left(|\nabla u|^{\frac{p+\alpha}{2}} \right) \right|^2 \eta^2 dx \leq C(M, m)(p+\alpha)^2 \left\{ \int_B (|\nabla u|^{q+\alpha} + |\nabla u|^{2+\alpha}) |\nabla \eta|^2 dx \right\},$$

which may be further revised to

$$\int_B \left| \nabla \left(|\nabla u|^{\frac{p+\alpha}{2}} \eta \right) \right|^2 dx \leq C(M, m)(p+\alpha)^2 \left\{ \int_B (|\nabla u|^{q+\alpha} + 1) |\nabla \eta|^2 dx \right\}.$$

By Sobolev's embedding, we have

$$\left(\int_B |\nabla u|^{\frac{(p+\alpha)2^*}{2}} \eta^{2^*} dx \right)^{2/2^*} \leq C(M, m)(p+\alpha)^2 \left\{ \int_B (|\nabla u|^{q+\alpha} + 1) |\nabla \eta|^2 dx \right\}.$$

Finally, for two concentric balls $B_\rho \subset B_R$ and $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_R)$ satisfying $\eta \equiv 1$ in B_ρ and $|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{C}{R-r}$, we have

$$\left(\int_{B_\rho} |\nabla u|^{\frac{(p+\alpha)2^*}{2}} dx \right)^{2/2^*} \leq \frac{C(M, m)(p+\alpha)^2}{(R-\rho)^2} \left\{ \int_{B_R} (|\nabla u|^{q+\alpha} + 1) dx \right\}. \quad (6.2)$$

Now, for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, we define $\rho_n := \frac{R_0}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2^n} \right)$ and choose α_n to satisfy $(p + \alpha_n) \frac{2^*}{2} = \alpha_{n+1} + q$. Therefore, we have

$$\alpha_n = \left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n \alpha_0 + \left(\frac{2^* p}{2} - q \right) \frac{\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n - 1}{\frac{2^*}{2} - 1}. \quad (6.3)$$

From (6.3), it is easy to see that if $\alpha_0 + \frac{2^* p - 2q}{2^* - 2} > 0$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \infty$. Thus, we can rewrite (6.2) as

$$\int_{B_{\rho_{n+1}}} |\nabla u|^{\alpha_{n+1}+q} dx \leq C^n \left\{ \int_{B_{\rho_n}} |\nabla u|^{q+\alpha_n} dx + 1 \right\}^{2^*/2}, \quad (6.4)$$

where $C = C(R_0, \alpha_0, N, M, m, p, q)$ is independent of n . Defining $Y_n := \int_{B_{\rho_n}} |\nabla u|^{\alpha_n+q} dx$, estimate (6.4) becomes

$$Y_{n+1} \leq C^n (Y_n + 1)^{\frac{2^*}{2}}. \quad (6.5)$$

By iterating (6.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n+1} &\leq C^n [Y_n + 1]^{2^*/2} \\ &\leq C^n \left\{ C^{n-1} [Y_{n-1} + 1]^{2^*/2} + 1 \right\}^{2^*/2} \\ &\leq C^{n+(n-1)\frac{2^*}{2}} 2^{\frac{2^*}{2}} [Y_{n-1} + 1]^{(2^*/2)^2} \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq C^{\sum_{j=0}^n (2^*/2)^j (n-j)} 2^{\sum_{j=0}^n (2^*/2)^{j+1}} [Y_0 + 1]^{(2^*/2)^{n+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we get

$$Y_n^{\frac{1}{\alpha_n+q}} \leq \left(C^{\sum_{j=0}^n (2^*/2)^j (n-j)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_n+q}} \left(2^{\sum_{j=0}^n (2^*/2)^{j+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_n+q}} [Y_0 + 1]^{\frac{(2^*)^n}{2^n(\alpha_n+q)}}. \quad (6.6)$$

We make the following three observations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n}{\alpha_n + q} &= \frac{\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n}{\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n \alpha_0 + \left(\frac{2^* p - 2q}{2^* - 2} \right) \left(\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n - 1 \right) + q} \xrightarrow{n \nearrow \infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \left(\frac{2^* p - 2q}{2^* - 2} \right)}, \\ \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^j (n-j)}{\alpha_n + q} &\leq \frac{\left(\frac{2^*}{2^* - 1} \right)^2 \left(\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n - 1 \right)}{\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n \alpha_0 + \left(\frac{2^* p - 2q}{2^* - 2} \right) \left(\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^n - 1 \right) + q} \leq C(N, \alpha_0, p, q) < \infty, \\ \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^{j+1}}{\alpha_n + q} &\leq \frac{\left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^j (n-j)}{\alpha_n + q} \leq C(\alpha_0, N, p, q) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Hence, following the observations from (6.7) and passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (6.6), we get

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_0/2})} \leq C \left(\int_{B_{R_0}} |\nabla u|^{\alpha_0+q} dx + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \left(\frac{2^* p - 2q}{2^* - 2} \right)}}, \quad (6.8)$$

where $C = C(R_0, \alpha_0, M, m, p, q, N)$.

Now, we make use of (5.1) with the choice of $\beta = \alpha_0 + q - p \geq 2$, estimate (6.8) becomes

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_0/2})} \leq C (\Gamma_1 + 1)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \left(\frac{2^* p - 2q}{2^* - 2} \right)}},$$

where

$$\Gamma_1 = R_0^N \left[\left(\frac{\|U\|_{L^\infty(2B)}}{R_0} \right)^{\frac{2(\alpha_0+q)}{p}} + \left(\frac{\|U\|_{L^\infty(2B)}}{R_0} \right)^{\frac{2(\alpha_0+q)}{2-q+p}} + \left(\frac{\|U\|_{L^\infty(2B)}}{R_0} \right)^{\alpha_0+q} \right].$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

7. Proof of Theorem 1.3

It remains to obtain the Lipschitz bound for U from the Lipschitz bound (6.1) for the regularized minimizer (recall Remark 3.2). We follow the scheme of the proof in [3], which is similar to the double approximation procedure in [17]. Observe that

$$\|\nabla u_{\sigma,\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_0/2})} \stackrel{(6.1)}{\leq} C,$$

where $C = C(p, q, N, M, m, \|U\|_{L^\infty(2B)})$. One can also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m \int_B |\nabla u_{\sigma,\varepsilon}|^p dx &\stackrel{(1.2a)}{\leq} \int_B f(\nabla u_{\sigma,\varepsilon}) dx \leq \int_B f_\sigma(\nabla u_{\sigma,\varepsilon}) dx \stackrel{\text{Definition 1.2}}{\leq} \int_B f_\sigma(\nabla U_\varepsilon) dx \\ &\stackrel{(3.1)}{=} \int_B f(\nabla U_\varepsilon) dx + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_B |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 dx \leq \int_{(1+\varepsilon)B} f(\nabla U) dx + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_B |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the convexity of f and Jensen's inequality. Now, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find $w_\varepsilon \in U_\varepsilon + W_0^{1,p}(B)$ such that, for a subsequence, as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\nabla u_{\sigma,\varepsilon} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla w_\varepsilon \text{ weak-}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(B_{R_0/2}),$$

$$u_{\sigma,\varepsilon} \rightharpoonup w_\varepsilon \text{ in } W^{1,p}(B)\text{-weak.}$$

Passing to the limit, as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we obtain, on account of weak and weak-* lower semicontinuity of norms,

$$\|\nabla w_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_0/2})} \leq C, \text{ and}$$

$$m \int_B |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^p dx \leq \int_B f(\nabla w_\varepsilon) dx \leq \int_{(1+\varepsilon)B} f(\nabla U) dx.$$

Once again, using the fact that, for a subsequence, $w_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup w$ in $U + W_0^{1,p}(B)$ -weak, we obtain by lower semicontinuity,

$$\|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_0/2})} \leq C, \text{ and} \tag{7.1}$$

$$m \int_B |\nabla w|^p dx \leq \int_B f(\nabla w) dx \leq \int_B f(\nabla U) dx. \tag{7.2}$$

Finally, by the strict convexity of f (see Remark 7.1), (7.2) and the fact that $w \in U + W_0^{1,p}(B)$, we have $w = U$. Hence, the Lipschitz continuity of U follows from (7.1).

Remark 7.1. *In order for uniqueness to hold, we want to make use of Theorem 2.6 which requires strict convexity. But in our situation, we have the additional condition (1.2c) and this implies strict convexity of the functional, as can be seen in the calculation from [2, Proof of Theorem 4.10].*

References

- [1] Paolo Baroni, Maria Colombo, and Giuseppe Mingione. Regularity for general functionals with double phase. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 57(2):Paper No. 62, 48, 2018. 2

- [2] Lisa Beck and Giuseppe Mingione. Lipschitz Bounds and Nonuniform Ellipticity. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 73(5):944–1034, 2020. [2](#), [11](#)
- [3] Peter Bella and Mathias Schäffner. On the regularity of minimizers for scalar integral functionals with (p, q) -growth. *Analysis & PDE*, 13(7):2241–2257, 2020. [2](#), [3](#), [11](#)
- [4] M. Bildhauer and M. Fuchs. Interior regularity for free and constrained local minimizers of variational integrals under general growth and ellipticity conditions. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)*, 288(Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 32):79–99, 271–272, 2002. [4](#)
- [5] Pierre Bousquet and Lorenzo Brasco. Lipschitz regularity for orthotropic functionals with nonstandard growth conditions. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 36(7):1989–2032, 2020. [4](#)
- [6] Hi Jun Choe. Interior behaviour of minimizers for certain functionals with nonstandard growth. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 19(10):933–945, November 1992. [3](#), [9](#)
- [7] Maria Colombo and Giuseppe Mingione. Bounded minimisers of double phase variational integrals. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 218(1):219–273, 2015. [2](#)
- [8] Maria Colombo and Giuseppe Mingione. Regularity for double phase variational problems. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 215(2):443–496, 2015. [2](#)
- [9] Giovanni Cupini, Paolo Marcellini, and Elvira Mascolo. Existence and regularity for elliptic equations under p, q -growth. *Advances in Differential Equations*, 19(7-8):693–724, 2014. [3](#)
- [10] Giovanni Cupini, Paolo Marcellini, and Elvira Mascolo. Local boundedness of minimizers with limit growth conditions. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 166(1):1–22, 2015. [2](#)
- [11] Giovanni Cupini, Paolo Marcellini, and Elvira Mascolo. Regularity of minimizers under limit growth conditions. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 153:294–310, April 2017. [2](#)
- [12] Cristiana De Filippis and Giuseppe Mingione. Lipschitz bounds and nonautonomous integrals. *arXiv:2007.07469 [math]*, July 2020. [2](#)
- [13] Cristiana De Filippis and Giuseppe Mingione. On the regularity of minima of non-autonomous functionals. *Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 30(2):1584–1626, 2020. [2](#)
- [14] Cristiana De Filippis and Giuseppe Mingione. Interpolative gap bounds for nonautonomous integrals. *Anal. Math. Phys.*, 11(3):Paper No. 117, 39, 2021. [2](#)
- [15] Cristiana De Filippis and Jehan Oh. Regularity for multi-phase variational problems. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 267(3):1631–1670, 2019. [2](#)
- [16] Michela Eleuteri, Paolo Marcellini, and Elvira Mascolo. Regularity for scalar integrals without structure conditions. *Advances in Calculus of Variations*, 13(3):279–300, July 2020. [2](#)

- [17] Luca Esposito, Francesco Leonetti, and Giuseppe Mingione. Higher integrability for minimizers of integral functionals with (p, q) growth. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 157(2):414–438, 1999. [2](#), [11](#)
- [18] Luca Esposito, Francesco Leonetti, and Giuseppe Mingione. Regularity for minimizers of functionals with p - q growth. *NoDEA. Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications*, 6(2):133–148, 1999. [2](#)
- [19] Luca Esposito, Francesco Leonetti, and Giuseppe Mingione. Regularity results for minimizers of irregular integrals with (p, q) growth. *Forum Mathematicum*, 14(2):245–272, 2002. [2](#)
- [20] Luca Esposito, Francesco Leonetti, and Giuseppe Mingione. Sharp regularity for functionals with (p, q) growth. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 204(1):5–55, 2004. [2](#)
- [21] Mariano Giaquinta. Growth conditions and regularity, a counterexample. *manuscripta mathematica*, 59(2):245–248, June 1987. [2](#)
- [22] Enrico Giusti. *Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003. [6](#)
- [23] Philip Hartman. On the bounded slope condition. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 18(3):495–511, 1966. [4](#)
- [24] Jonas Hirsch and Mathias Schäffner. Growth conditions and regularity, an optimal local boundedness result. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, page 2050029, June 2020. [3](#)
- [25] Min Chun Hong. Some remarks on the minimizers of variational integrals with nonstandard growth conditions. *Unione Matematica Italiana. Bollettino. A. Serie VII*, 6(1):91–101, 1992. [2](#)
- [26] Paolo Marcellini. Un exemple de solution discontinue d’un probleme variationnel dans le cas scalaire. *Mat. Univ. Firenze.*, Preprint No. 11 dell’Ist, 1987. [2](#)
- [27] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with nonstandard growth conditions. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 105(3):267–284, 1989. [2](#)
- [28] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity and existence of solutions of elliptic equations with p, q -growth conditions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 90(1):1–30, 1991. [2](#)
- [29] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity for Elliptic Equations with General Growth Conditions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 105(2):296–333, October 1993. [2](#)
- [30] Paolo Marcellini. Everywhere regularity for a class of elliptic systems without growth conditions. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Scienze*, 23(1):1–25, 1996. [2](#)
- [31] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity for some scalar variational problems under general growth conditions. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 90(1):161–181, July 1996. [2](#)
- [32] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity under general and p, q -growth conditions. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems. Series S*, 13(7):2009–2031, 2020. [2](#)

- [33] Giuseppe Mingione and Vicențiu Rădulescu. Recent developments in problems with nonstandard growth and nonuniform ellipticity. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, page 125197, March 2021. [2](#), [3](#)
- [34] Mario Miranda. Un teorema di esistenza e unicità per il problema dell'area minima in n variabili. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Scienze. Serie III*, 19:233–249, 1965. [4](#)
- [35] Filip Rindler. *Calculus of variations*. Springer, 2018. [5](#)
- [36] Barry Simon. *Convexity: an analytic viewpoint*, volume 187. Cambridge University Press, 2011. [5](#)
- [37] Guido Stampacchia. On some regular multiple integral problems in the calculus of variations. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 16:383–421, 1963. [4](#), [5](#)