

# NEW REGULARITY ESTIMATES FOR FULLY NONLINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

THIALITA M. NASCIMENTO & EDUARDO V. TEIXEIRA

**ABSTRACT.** We establish new quantitative Hessian integrability estimates for viscosity supersolutions of fully nonlinear elliptic operators. As a corollary, we show that the optimal Hessian power integrability  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\lambda, \Lambda, n)$  in the celebrated  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$ -regularity estimate satisfies

$$\frac{\left(1 + \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\right)^{n-1}}{\ln n^4} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{n-1} \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{n\lambda}{(n-1)\Lambda + \lambda},$$

where  $n \geq 3$  is the dimension and  $0 < \lambda < \Lambda$  are the ellipticity constants. In particular,  $\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{n-1} \varepsilon(\lambda, \Lambda, n)$  blows-up, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; previous results yielded fast decay of such a quantity. The upper estimate improves the one obtained by Armstrong, Silvestre, and Smart in [1].

**Keywords:** Fully nonlinear elliptic PDEs, Viscosity supersolutions, Hessian integrability, Quantitative regularity estimates.

**MSC(2010):** 35B65; 35J60; 35D40.

**ABSTRACT.** [Résumé] Nous établissons de nouvelles estimations quantitatives d'intégrabilité pour la matrice Hessienne de sursolutions de viscosité d'opérateurs elliptiques complètement non linéaires. Conséquemment, nous montrons que l'exposant optimal de l'intégrabilité du hessien  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\lambda, \Lambda, n)$  dans la fameuse estimée de régularité  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  satisfait

$$\frac{\left(1 + \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\right)^{n-1}}{\ln n^4} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{n-1} \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{n\lambda}{(n-1)\Lambda + \lambda},$$

où  $n \geq 3$  est la dimension et  $0 < \lambda < \Lambda$  sont les constantes d'ellipticité. En particulier,  $\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{n-1} \varepsilon(\lambda, \Lambda, n)$  explose, quand  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; les résultats précédents ont donné une décroissance rapide d'une telle quantité. L'estimation supérieure améliore celle obtenue par Armstrong, Silvestre et Smart en [1].

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	4
3. A new Lemma	7
4. Improved $W^{2,\varepsilon}$ estimates	12
5. Global $W^{2,\varepsilon}$ estimates	17
6. New upper bound	20
References	23

## 1. INTRODUCTION

That solutions of the uniformly elliptic inequality

$$(1.1) \quad a_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}u(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

belong to the Sobolev space  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  for some  $0 < \varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \leq 1$  is a foundational result in the theory of elliptic PDEs. It was originally proven independently by Fang-Hua Lin [11] and Lawrence C. Evans [7], and later extended to the fully nonlinear framework by Luis Caffarelli [4], see also the book by Caffarelli and Cabre [5].

A careful look at the original constructions reveals that the exponent  $\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$  obtained, as a function of the ellipticity ratio,  $\lambda/\Lambda$ , and the dimension, decays to zero very rapidly, i.e. exponentially fast. Improvements in such a decay have been recently obtained by Nam Le in [10] and by Connor Mooney in [13] by means of powerful ideas *ala* Cabre in [6] and Savin in [19], viz. the sliding paraboloids method to bypass the Aleksandrov-Bakelman-Pucci (ABP) estimate. This in turn improves the measure estimate of the contact points, yielding sharper control on the Hessian estimate.

Indeed, the measure estimate obtained by Le in [10] implies that  $\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \geq c_0(n) \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{(n+1)}$  where  $c_0(n) \sim n^{-n/2}$ . Mooney in [13] improves the degree of the polynomial decay, however, the dimensional constant dependence is smaller, viz.  $\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \geq c_1(n) \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{n-1}$ , where  $c_1(n) \sim n^{-n}$ .

Universal Hessian estimates, such as in the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$ -regularity theory, yield compactness properties of solutions which can be used to obtain further, refined regularity of solutions in more organized media, e.g. [18, 20, 21] and references therein.

Quantitative estimates for fully nonlinear elliptic equations involving a large number of independent variables have become a prominent field of research as they naturally appear in models from financial engineering, machine learning and deep learning, among others, see for instance [2, 8], and references therein. In particular, improved Hessian exponent integrability for viscosity supersolutions, in very high dimensional spaces, is a relevant endeavor from both pure and applied viewpoints.

From the theoretical aspect of the theory, quantitative estimates upon  $\varepsilon$  relate to the Hausdorff measure of eventual singular sets of solutions to fully nonlinear equations of the form

$$(1.2) \quad F(D^2u) = 0, \quad B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Indeed, since the program carried out by Nikolai Nadirashvili and Serge Vlăduț, [14, 15, 16, 17] it has been known that viscosity solutions to (1.2) may fail to be twice differentiable and that  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates are, in fact, optimal. Under  $C^1$  regularity of  $F$ , Armstrong, Silvestre, and Smart in [1] proved  $C^2$  differentiability of viscosity solutions to (1.2) in the complement of a closed subset  $\Sigma$ . The authors actually manage to estimate the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set  $\Sigma$  by  $n - \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is precisely the exponent of the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$ -regularity theory. In [1] the authors also show that  $2/((\Lambda/\lambda) + 1)$  is a universal upper bound for the exponent  $\varepsilon$ . Upon some heuristics inferences, the authors are then led to conjecture that

$$(1.3) \quad \varepsilon_\star = \frac{2}{(\Lambda/\lambda) + 1}$$

is the (universal) optimal exponent in the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  estimates. This has been an important, influential conjecture since then; see e.g. the introduction of [10] and [22] for further details.

In this paper we continue the program of obtaining improved bounds for the optimal Hessian exponent integrability,  $\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$ , for a viscosity supersolution of fully nonlinear elliptic equations. We are particularly interested in problems modeled in high-dimensional spaces and our main theorem states as follows:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $u$  be viscosity solution of*

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^- : \mathcal{S}(n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denotes the Pucci extremal operator and  $n \geq 3$ . Then,  $u \in W^{2, \varepsilon}(B_{1/2})$ , with universal estimates, for an optimal exponent  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$  satisfying

$$(1.5) \quad \mu_n \frac{\left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)\right)^{n-1}}{\ln n} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{n-1} \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{n\lambda}{(n-1)\Lambda + \lambda},$$

for a computable, increasing sequence of positive numbers,  $\frac{1}{4} < \mu_n \rightarrow 1 - e^{-1}$ .

We actually prove a much stronger result as byproduct of the new ingredients introduced in this paper. For now, one should note that the upper bound in (1.5) solves, in the negative, the Armstrong-Silvestre-Smart conjecture, (1.3). The lower bound, on the other hand, provides a considerable improvement on the dimensional dependence, viz. the constants  $c_0(n) \sim n^{-n/2}$  and  $c_1(n) \sim n^{-n}$  from Le's and Mooney's theorems respectively. In particular, if  $\lambda < \Lambda$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda)}{\left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{n-1}} = +\infty.$$

Thus, our result suggests that the sharp polynomial decay on  $\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$ , as a function of  $\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}$ , should likely be less than  $(n-1)$ .

We conclude this introduction by discussing the main new ideas involved in the proof of Theorem 1. As usual, the lower bound is obtained from an improved  $L^\varepsilon$  estimate of the type:

$$\left| \left\{ \underline{\Theta}_u > t \right\} \cap B_{1/2} \right| \leq Ct^{-\varepsilon}$$

for a universal constant  $C > 0$ , where  $\underline{\Theta}_u(x)$  measures the maximum aperture of concave paraboloids touching  $u$  by below at  $x$ , see (2.2). We follow [13]; however the decision upon the dyadic iteration is delegated to an optimization process; a sort of *intrinsic scaling* for the problem. More precisely, for a new parameter  $\delta > 0$ , to be later selected by an optimization routine, we estimate the measure decay of the set of points where  $u$  is above its lower envelope of paraboloids with opening  $-(1+\delta)^k$ , for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By choosing “the best possible”  $\delta > 0$  and changing variables, we are able to show that the sharp  $\varepsilon$  in the  $W^{2, \varepsilon}$ -regularity theory satisfies:

$$(1.6) \quad \varepsilon \geq \sup_{(0,1)} \frac{\ln(1 - c\gamma^n)}{\ln(1 - \gamma)},$$

for a carefully crafted constant  $0 < c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) < 1$ . The bigger the  $c$ , the bigger the above supremum. Hence, we decide on the “best possible” value for  $c$  through yet another optimization problem which takes into account the number of possible negative eigenvalues of  $D^2u$ . Since viscosity supersolutions must have at least one negative eigenvalue, we show  $c(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \geq \left(1 + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right)\frac{1}{n-1}\right)^{1-n}$ , and this combined with (1.6) yields

$$\varepsilon \geq \mu_n \frac{\left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)\right)^{n-1}}{\ln n} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{n-1},$$

which is the lower bound stated in Theorem 1.

The upper bound is obtained by carefully extending Armstrong-Silvestre-Smart's original example; the analysis though is considerably more involved. As a consequence of our upper estimate, if it is possible to establish an *adimensional*  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  regularity theory, as suggested in [1], then such an  $\varepsilon$  must be less than or equal to  $\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}$ .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we collect preliminaries definitions and results that will assist the analysis throughout the paper. In Section 3, we establish a new key lemma which yields faster geometric measure decay of sets. In Section 4 we obtain improved  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  estimates and in Section 5 we discuss how our analysis, combined with the arguments from [13], yield improved global Hessian integrability. Finally in Section 6 we craft a viscosity supersolution whose Hessian *does not* belong to  $L^{\frac{n}{(n-1)\lambda/\Lambda+1}}$ , fostering a the new upper bound of the theory.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For a positive integer  $n \geq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{S}_n$  be the set of all real  $n \times n$  symmetric matrices. We define for  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$  and  $M \in \mathcal{S}_n$  the Pucci's extremal operators by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(M) = \inf_{\lambda \text{Id}_n \leq A \leq \Lambda \text{Id}_n} \text{trace}(AM) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^+(M) = \sup_{\lambda \text{Id}_n \leq A \leq \Lambda \text{Id}_n} \text{trace}(AM)$$

where the inf and sup are taken over all symmetric matrices  $A$  whose eigenvalues belong to  $[\lambda, \Lambda]$ . Given a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a function  $u \in C(\Omega)$  we define the function  $\underline{\Theta}(u, \Omega)(x_0)$  as

$$(2.2) \quad \inf \left\{ A > 0 \mid u(x) \geq u(x_0) + y \cdot (x - x_0) - \frac{A}{2} |x - x_0|^2 \text{ in } \Omega, \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}.$$

If there is no tangent paraboloid from bellow at  $x_0$  then we say  $\underline{\Theta}(u, \Omega)(x_0) = +\infty$ . For  $a > 0$  and  $L(x)$  an affine function, we say

$$P_L^a(x) = -\frac{a}{2}|x|^2 + L(x),$$

is a paraboloid of opening  $-a$ . Following [13], if  $\Omega$  is a bounded, strictly convex domain and  $v \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ , we define the  $a$ -convex envelope  $\Gamma_v^a$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$  as

$$\Gamma_v^a(x) := \sup_L \{ P_L^a(x) : P_L^a \leq v \text{ in } \bar{\Omega} \}.$$

By convexity of  $\Omega$ , one verifies that  $\Gamma_v^a = v$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Also, taking  $a = 0$ , one recovers the usual notion of convex envelopes by affine functions. Next we define

$$A_a(v) := \left\{ x \in \Omega \mid v(x) = \Gamma_v^a(x) \right\}.$$

That is,  $A_a(v)$  is the set of points in  $\Omega$  where  $v$  has a tangent paraboloid of opening  $-a$  from below in  $\Omega$ . One can check that  $A_a(v)$  is closed in  $\Omega$  and that  $A_a(v) \subset A_b(v)$  if  $a \leq b$ . Also, it is easy to verify that for any  $\lambda, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta > 0$ , there holds:

$$(2.3) \quad \Gamma_{\beta v + \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^2}^\lambda = \beta \Gamma_v^{\frac{\lambda+\gamma}{\beta}} + \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad A_\lambda \left( \beta v + \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^2 \right) = A_{\frac{\lambda+\gamma}{\beta}}(v).$$

Throughout the paper,  $\Omega$  denotes a bounded, strictly convex domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The next two lemmas have been established by C. Mooney in [13] and they are the starting point of our analysis:

**Lemma 1** (Mooney [13, Lemma 3.1]). *Assume that  $v \in C(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2v) \leq K < \infty$ . Let  $P$  be a paraboloid of opening  $-a < 0$  tangent from below to  $\Gamma_v^0$  at  $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega} \setminus A_0(v)$ . Slide  $P$  up until  $P + t$ ,  $t > 0$ , touches  $v$  from below at  $x_1 \in \bar{\Omega}$ . Then,  $x_1 \in \bar{\Omega} \setminus A_0(v)$ .*

**Lemma 2** (Mooney [13, Lemma 3.2]). *Assume that  $v$  is convex. For any measurable set  $F \subset \Omega$ , let  $V$  denote the set of vertices of all tangents paraboloids of opening  $-a < 0$  to  $v$  at points in  $F$ . Then,  $|V| \geq |F|$ .*

We conclude this preliminary section with a few concepts and definitions.

**Definition 1.** *Let  $M \in \mathcal{S}_n$  be a symmetric matrix. We denote by  $\text{Spec}(M) := \{\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n\}$  the eigenvalues of  $M$  (counting multiplicity) and*

$$s^-(M) := \#\{\lambda \in \text{Spec}(M) \mid \lambda \leq 0\}.$$

**Definition 2.** *Let  $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ . We say  $D^2u(x)$  has at least  $k$  nonpositive eigenvalues (in the viscosity sense) if for all  $\varphi \in C^2(\Omega)$  such that  $u - \varphi$  has a local minimum at  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , then*

$$(2.4) \quad s^-(D^2\varphi(x_0)) \geq k.$$

*The biggest such a  $k$  that makes (2.4) true for all  $x_0 \in \Omega$  is called the minimal number of nonpositive eigenvalues of  $D^2u(x)$  in the viscosity sense.*

We note that if  $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$  is a viscosity supersolution of  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$  in  $\Omega$ , then the minimal number of nonpositive eigenvalues of  $D^2u(x)$  is at least 1.

We finish this preliminary section with a quick discussion upon the classical Lambert  $W$  function, as it will play an important role in section 4. For a complex number  $z$  the Lambert  $W$  function is defined as the function that solves the equation

$$(2.5) \quad W(z)e^{W(z)} = z.$$

This equation has infinitely many solutions given by  $W_k(z)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , called the  $k^{\text{th}}$ -branch of  $W$ . Its branches are defined through the equations

$$W_k(z) \exp(W_k(z)) = z, \quad W_k(z) \sim \ln_k(z), \quad |z| \rightarrow \infty$$

and  $\ln_k(z) = \ln|z| + 2\pi ik$  is the  $k^{\text{th}}$ -branch of the complex natural logarithm, see for instance [3]. When dealing with real numbers, we use the real-valued branches of the Lambert  $W$  function, namely  $W_0$  and  $W_{-1}$ .  $W_0$  is called the *principal branch* and  $W_{-1}$  is the only other branch that takes real values.




FIGURE 1. Real branches for the Lambert  $W$  function

As the range of the function  $y \mapsto ye^y$  is  $[-e^{-1}, \infty)$ , for real numbers  $x$  and  $y$ , the equation

$$ye^y = x$$

has a solution if, and only if  $x \geq -e^{-1}$ . For  $x \geq 0$ , the solution is  $y = W_0(x)$  and for  $-e^{-1} \leq x < 0$  we have two solutions given by  $y = W_0(x)$  and  $y = W_{-1}(x)$ . From the defining equation of  $W$ , (2.5), it is easy to obtain a few special values such as:

$$W_0(0) = 0, \quad W_{-1}(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} W_{-1}(x) = -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad W_{-1}(-e^{-1}) = W_0(-e^{-1}) = -1.$$

From the definition we have the following identities:

$$W_0(xe^x) = x, \quad \text{for } x \geq -1,$$

and

$$W_{-1}(xe^x) = x, \quad \text{for } x \leq -1,$$

Note, though, that since  $f(x) = xe^x$  is not injective, then  $W(f(x)) = x$  might not always hold. In fact, for a fixed  $x < 0$  and  $x \neq -1$ , the equation  $xe^x = ye^y$  has two real solutions in  $y$ . One of which is of course  $y = x$ . And the other solution is

$$y = \begin{cases} W_0(x), & x < -1 \\ W_{-1}(x), & -1 < x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Differentiating (2.5) and solving for  $W'(z)$  one easily gets:

$$\frac{dW}{dz} = \frac{1}{z + e^{W(z)}}, \quad z \neq -\frac{1}{e}.$$

In addition, if  $z \neq 0$ , there holds

$$\frac{dW}{dz} = \frac{W(z)}{z(1 + W(z))},$$

and since  $W(0) = 0$ , it follows  $W'_0(0) = 1$ .

We now present lower and upper inequalities for the branch  $W_{-1}$  that will be useful for us in Section 4. These inequalities can be derived easily from the elementary properties of the Lambert  $W$  function, but we decided to include a proof as a courtesy to the readers.

**Lemma 3.** *For any  $u \geq 0$ , the following sharp inequalities hold:*

$$-\frac{e}{e-1}(u+1) \leq W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \leq -(u+1).$$

*Proof.* First we note that, from the definition

$$W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \exp(W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})) = -e^{-(u+1)}.$$

Multiplying by  $-1$  and applying the logarithm function to both sides we obtain,

$$W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) = -u - 1 - \ln(-W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})).$$

since  $W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \leq -1$ , for all  $u \geq 0$  then  $\ln(-W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})) \geq 0$ . Therefore,

$$(2.6) \quad W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \leq -u - 1.$$

Next, consider the function  $f(u, a) = W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) + a(u+1)$  for  $u \geq 0$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that,  $f_a(u, a) = u+1 > 0$  for all  $u \geq 0$  which implies that  $a \mapsto f(u, a)$  is an increasing function. Moreover, since  $f(u, 1) = W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) + u+1 \leq 0$  by (2.6), and  $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} f(u, a) = \infty$ , then for each fixed  $u \geq 0$ , there exists  $a(u)$  such that  $f(u, a(u)) = 0$ . That is,

$$a(u) = \frac{-W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})}{u+1}.$$

Note next that

$$a'(u) = \frac{W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})}{(1 + W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}))(u+1)^2} (u+2 + W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})).$$

The sign of  $a'(u)$  is dictated by the sign of the term  $u + 2 + W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})$ . Since  $u + 2 + W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \geq 0$  if and only if  $W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \geq -(u + 2)$ , and the function  $xe^x$  is decreasing if  $x \leq -1$  then, the last inequality above holds if and only if

$$W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \exp(W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)})) \leq -(u + 2)e^{-(u+2)}$$

i.e.,

$$-e^{-(u+1)} \leq -(u + 2)e^{-(u+2)},$$

which holds if and only if  $e - 2 \geq u$ . Therefore,  $a(u)$  is increasing in  $(0, e - 2)$  and decreasing in  $(e - 2, \infty)$ . Moreover, since

$$a(0) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} a(u) = 1$$

it follows that

$$1 \leq a(u) \leq a(e - 2) = e/(e - 1),$$

for all  $u \geq 0$ . Hence we can conclude

$$-\frac{e}{e-1}(u+1) \leq W_{-1}(-e^{-(u+1)}) \leq -(u+1).$$

□

The Lambert  $W$  function, also known as the *ProdictLog* function, has many other applications in pure and applied mathematics, we refer the interested readers to [3] and [12] for further reading on this theme.

### 3. A NEW LEMMA

In this section we establish our first new key lemma in the endeavor of improving the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  regularity estimate. The proof follows a line of reasoning similar to [13]; the key main novelty though is the introduction of the new parameter  $\delta$ , which yields enhanced measure estimates by means of an optimization problem, to be discussed in the next section. We also carry out a more general analysis, yielding an arbitrary number of nonpositive eigenvalues.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$  and assume  $M_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Let  $k \in [1, n]$  be the minimal number of nonpositive eigenvalues of  $D^2u(x)$ . Given  $a, \delta > 0$  and a measurable set  $F \subset \{u > \Gamma_u^a\}$ , take the paraboloids of opening  $-(1 + \delta)a$ , tangents from below to  $\Gamma_u^a$  on  $F$ , and slide them up until they touch  $u$  on a set  $E$ . If  $E \Subset \Omega$  then,*

$$(3.1) \quad |A_{(1+\delta)a}(u) \setminus A_a(u)| \geq c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{-n} |F|,$$

where  $c = c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  is given by:

$$(3.2) \quad c := \left(1 + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) \frac{k}{n-k}\right)^{k-n}.$$

*Proof.* We start off by defining the function

$$v := \frac{1}{a}u + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$$

and noting that, in view of (2.3), there holds:

$$\Gamma_u^a = a\Gamma_v^0 - \frac{a}{2}|x|^2, \quad A_a(u) = A_0(v), \quad \text{and} \quad A_{(1+\delta)a}(u) = A_\delta(v).$$

In particular,  $F \subset \{u > \Gamma_u^a\}$  implies  $F \subset \bar{\Omega} \setminus A_0(v)$ . Next, if  $P$  is a paraboloid of opening  $-(1+\delta)a < 0$ , tangent to  $\Gamma_u^a$  at  $x_0 \in F$ , then  $P$  is also tangent to  $a\Gamma_v^0 - \frac{a}{2}|x|^2$  at  $x_0 \in F$ . Since there exists an affine function  $L(x)$  such that

$$P(x) = -\frac{(1+\delta)a}{2}|x|^2 + L(x) \leq a\Gamma_v^0 - \frac{a}{2}|x|^2$$

with equality at  $x_0$ , we conclude

$$-\frac{\delta}{2}|x|^2 + \frac{1}{a}L(x) \leq \Gamma_v^0$$

with equality at  $x = x_0$ . That is, there exists a paraboloid,  $P_L^\delta$ , of opening  $-\delta < 0$ , tangent from below to  $\Gamma_v^0$  at  $x_0 \in F$ .

Next, we slide  $P_L^\delta$  up until it touches  $v$  from below at a point  $x_1 \in \bar{\Omega}$ . Lemma 1 yields  $x_1 \in \bar{\Omega} \setminus A_0(v)$  and hence,  $x_1 \in A_\delta(v) \setminus A_0(v)$ . Collecting all such points  $x_1$  in a new contact set  $E \subset \bar{\Omega}$ , we have,

$$E \subset A_\delta(v) \setminus A_0(v) = A_{(1+\delta)a}(u) \setminus A_a(u).$$

If  $V_F$  is the set of vertices of all tangent paraboloids of opening  $-\delta$  from below to  $\Gamma_v^0$  in  $F$ , then by Lemma 2,

$$(3.3) \quad |V_F| \geq |F|.$$

Moreover, the vertex of the paraboloid  $P_L^\delta$  remains the same after we slide it up, so

$$V_F = V_E,$$

where  $V_E$  is the set of vertices of paraboloids tangent to  $v$  on the set  $E$ .

For the time being, let us suppose that  $u$  is semi-concave, and thus twice differentiable a.e in  $E$ . For such points  $x \in E$ , we have that the correspondent vertex is given by

$$\Phi(x) := x_V = x + \frac{1}{\delta}\nabla v(x).$$

Since  $\Phi(x)$  is a Lipschitz map, we can apply the area formula,

$$(3.4) \quad |V_E| = |\Phi(E)| \leq \int_E |\det(D\Phi)| dx$$

By the definition of  $\Phi$  (and of  $v$ ), the eigenvalues of  $D\Phi$  are of the form

$$\lambda_i^\Phi = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{\delta a}\lambda_i^u, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $\lambda_i^u$  are the eigenvalues of  $D^2u$ . Now, because  $x \in E \subset A_{(1+\delta)a}(u) \setminus A_a(u)$  we have

$$D^2u(x) \geq -(1+\delta)a \cdot \text{Id}.$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of  $D\Phi(x)$  are all non-negative. Next, since  $\mathcal{M}_\Lambda^-(D^2u) \leq 0$ , for some  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the Hessian of  $u$  has  $k$  nonpositive eigenvalues, i.e.

$$\lambda_i^u \leq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k$$



for some  $1 \leq k = k(x) \leq n$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2u(x)) \leq 0$ , we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^\Phi &= n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{\delta a} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^u \\ &= n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{\delta a} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^u + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \lambda_i^u \right] \\ &\leq n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{\delta a} \left(1 - \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^u \\ &= n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{\delta a} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) \sum_{i=1}^k (-\lambda_i^u). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, as  $\lambda_i^u \geq -(1 + \delta)a$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^\Phi \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left[ n + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) k \right].$$

Next we estimate,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(D\Phi) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^\Phi \\ &\leq \lambda_1^\Phi \cdots \lambda_k^\Phi \left( \frac{(1 + \delta^{-1}) \left( n + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) k \right) - \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^\Phi}{n - k} \right)^{n-k} \\ (3.5) \quad &\leq \lambda_1^\Phi \cdots \lambda_k^\Phi \left( \frac{(1 + \delta^{-1}) \left( n + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) k \right) - k(\lambda_1^\Phi \cdots \lambda_k^\Phi)^{1/k}}{n - k} \right)^{n-k}; \end{aligned}$$

we have used the classical mean inequality in the last step. We note that the right hand side of (3.5) is an increasing function of  $t = \lambda_1^\Phi \cdots \lambda_k^\Phi$  in the interval  $[0, (1 + \delta^{-1})^k]$ , and thus we can further estimate:

$$(3.6) \quad \det(D\Phi) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^n \left(1 + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) \frac{k}{n - k}\right)^{n-k} = c^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^n,$$

where  $c = c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  is from (3.2). Finally we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} |F| \leq |V_E| &\leq \int_E \det(D\Phi(x)) \\ &\leq c^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^n |E| \\ &\leq c^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^n |A_\delta(v) \setminus A_\theta(v)| \\ &= c^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^n |A_{(1+\delta)a}(u) \setminus A_a(u)| \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma is proved for semi-concave functions.

For the general case, we reduce it to the previous one by using the inf-convolution

$$u_m := \inf_{y \in \Omega} \{u(y) + m|y - x|^2\}.$$

Indeed, one can show, see e.g. proof of Lemma 2.1 in [19], that  $u_m$  are semi-concave and converge locally uniformly to  $u$  in  $\Omega$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore  $u_m$  is a viscosity supersolution of the same equation in  $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$  and by the first part of the proof,

$$|E_m| \geq \beta|F|,$$

where  $E_m$  is the correspondent touching set for  $u_m$ . One can easily check that

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} E_m = \bigcap_{m \geq 1} \bigcup_{i \geq m} E_i \subset E,$$

and thus,

$$|A_{(1+\delta)\alpha}(u) \setminus A_\alpha(u)| \geq \beta|F|,$$

and the proof of Lemma is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 3.1.* As we shall discuss in the next Section, the constant  $c = c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  defined in (3.2) plays a critical role in the endeavor of establishing quantitative lower bounds for the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  regularity theory. The bigger the  $c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  the better the lower estimate upon Hessian integrability exponent, viz.  $\varepsilon$  in the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  regularity theory.

Viscosity supersolutions to  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$  must have at least one nonpositive eigenvalue, that is, one is always entitled to take  $k = 1$ . Geometric restrictions on the problem may impose a higher number of nonpositive eigenvalues for  $D^2u$ . In such situations, one can take  $k$  to be greater than 1, but it is not obvious that this would increase the value of  $c$ . If not, one could simply disregard this extra information. That is, under the hypotheses of Lemma 4, its thesis, i.e. (3.1) actually holds if one substitutes  $c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  by

$$(3.7) \quad c_\star := \max \{c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, 1), c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, 2), \dots, c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)\}.$$

Motivated by Remark 3.1 next proposition discusses the best choice for  $c_\star$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $t_0$  be the point of maximum in  $[1, n)$  of the function*

$$f(t) = \left(1 + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) \frac{t}{n-t}\right)^{n-t}.$$

*Then  $t_0$  is a continuously decreasing function of the ellipticity ratio  $\varrho := \Lambda/\lambda$  and, moreover, for any  $\beta \in (1, n)$ , there exists  $1 < \varrho_\beta$  such that*

$$t_0(\varrho_\beta) = \frac{n}{\beta}.$$

*Proof.* For  $\lambda, \Lambda$  and  $n$  fixed, by making the change of variables

$$x = 1 + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) \frac{t}{n-t},$$

the maximum of  $f$  in  $[1, n)$  is attained at

$$t_0 = t_0\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right) = \frac{n(x_0 - 1)}{(\Lambda/\lambda) - 2 + x_0},$$

where  $x_0$  verifies

$$(3.8) \quad \ln(x_0) = \frac{(\Lambda/\lambda) - 2 + x_0}{x_0}.$$

That is,

$$x_0 = x_0\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right) = \frac{\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 2}{W_0\left(\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 2\right)e^{-1}\right)} \in (1, \infty)$$

where  $W_0$  denoted the principal branch of the Lambert function. Since  $x_0$  solves (3.8) we can write

$$t_0 = \frac{n(x_0 - 1)}{x_0 \ln(x_0)}.$$

Next, we note that  $t_0(1^+) = n$  and  $t_0$  is a continuous, decreasing function of  $x_0$ . Furthermore,

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} x'_0 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right) &= \frac{W_0 - e^{-1}(\Lambda/\lambda - 2)W'_0}{W_0^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + W_0}. \end{aligned}$$

By the classical properties of the Lambert function:

$$W'(z) = \frac{W(z)}{z(1 + W(z))}, \quad \text{for all } z \neq 0, -e^{-1}.$$

In our case, (3.9) is valid for all  $\Lambda/\lambda \neq 1, 2$ . However, since

$$\lim_{\Lambda/\lambda \rightarrow 2} x'_0 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right) = 1$$

and  $x'_0$  is decreasing, we may define  $x'_0(2) = 1$ . Furthermore, since  $x'_0 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right) > 0$  for all  $\Lambda/\lambda > 1$  then, chain rule yields

$$t'_0 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right) = t'_0 \left( x_0 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right) \right) x'_0 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right) \leq 0$$

for all  $\Lambda/\lambda > 1$ . Therefore,  $t_0$  is decreasing with respect to  $\Lambda/\lambda$  in  $(1, \infty)$ .

Next, given  $1 < \beta \leq n$ , we are now interested in finding  $\lambda, \Lambda$  such that  $t_0(\Lambda/\lambda) = \beta^{-1}n$ . We then set

$$\frac{n}{\beta} = \frac{n(x_0 - 1)}{x_0 \ln(x_0)},$$

which holds if and only if

$$(3.10) \quad \ln(x_0) = \beta \frac{x_0 - 1}{x_0},$$

which is equivalent to

$$-\beta e^{-\beta} = -\frac{\beta}{x_0} e^{-\frac{\beta}{x_0}}.$$

The above equation has two solutions, one is of course  $x_0(\Lambda/\lambda) = 1$  and the second is

$$(3.11) \quad x_0(\Lambda/\lambda) = \frac{-\beta}{W_0(-\beta e^{-\beta})}.$$

Since  $x_0(\Lambda/\lambda) = 1$  if only if  $\Lambda = \lambda$  and  $t_0(1^+) = n$ , we are seeking  $0 < \lambda < \Lambda$  such that  $x_0(\Lambda/\lambda)$  is given by (3.11) and solves both (3.8) and (3.10). We readily obtain

$$\frac{(\Lambda/\lambda) - 2 + x_0}{x_0} = \beta \frac{x_0 - 1}{x_0} \implies \Lambda/\lambda = 2 - \beta + (\beta - 1)x_0,$$

and thus, using (3.11), we have

$$\Lambda_\beta/\lambda_\beta = 2 - \beta + (\beta - 1) \frac{-\beta}{W_0(-\beta e^{-\beta})}.$$

□

In particular, Proposition 1 informs that for any  $\lambda, \Lambda$  such that  $1 \leq (\Lambda/\lambda) \leq (\Lambda_\beta/\lambda_\beta)$  we have

$$t_0(\Lambda/\lambda) \geq t_0(\Lambda_\beta/\lambda_\beta) = \frac{n}{\beta}.$$

#### 4. IMPROVED $W^{2,\varepsilon}$ ESTIMATES

In this section we establish improved quantitative  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  regularity estimates for viscosity supersolutions of fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equations.

**Theorem 2.** (*Interior  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  estimate*) Let  $u \in C(\bar{B}_1)$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$  in  $B_1$ . Assume  $D^2u(x)$  has at least  $k$  nonpositive eigenvalues, for some  $k \in [1, n]$ . There exists universal numbers  $\gamma_0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $0 < \alpha < \varepsilon$ ,

$$(4.1) \quad \left| \left\{ \frac{\Theta}{-u} > \left( \frac{1-\gamma_0}{\gamma_0} \right) 2^6 \|u\|_\infty t \right\} \cap B_{1/2} \right| \leq |B_1| t^{-\alpha}$$

holds for  $t \geq (1-\gamma_0)^{-j(\alpha)-1}$  where  $j(\alpha) = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha(\varepsilon - \alpha)^{-1} \leq j\}$ . In addition,  $\gamma_0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  are related by the following formula:

$$(4.2) \quad \varepsilon = \varepsilon(\gamma_0) := \sup_{(0,1)} \frac{\ln(1-c\gamma^n)}{\ln(1-\gamma)} = \frac{\ln(1-c\gamma_0^n)}{\ln(1-\gamma_0)}$$

where  $c = c_*(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  is the constant discussed in Remark 3.1, i.e.

$$c = \max\{c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, 1), c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, 2), \dots, c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)\},$$

for  $c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, i) = \left(1 + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1\right) \frac{i}{n-i}\right)^{i-n}$ .

*Proof.* We start off by noticing that since  $\alpha < \varepsilon$  then there exists a natural number  $j$  such that

$$\alpha \leq \frac{j}{1+j} \varepsilon$$

and hence the set  $\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha(\varepsilon - \alpha)^{-1} \leq j\}$  is nonempty. Next, for convenience, we set  $\delta_0 = \frac{\gamma_0}{1-\gamma_0} > 0$  and assume, with no loss of generality, that  $0 \leq u < \delta_0 2^{-4}$ . Consider the extension

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{cases} \min(u, \frac{\delta_0}{4}(1-|x|^2)), & \text{in } B_1 \\ \frac{\delta_0}{4}(1-|x|^2), & \text{in } B_R \setminus B_1 \end{cases}$$

for  $R$  large. Note that  $\tilde{u} \in C(\bar{B}_R)$  with  $\tilde{u} = u$  in  $B_{\sqrt{3}/2}$  and  $B_R \setminus A_{\delta_0}(\tilde{u}) \Subset B_1$ . Next we verify that

$$(4.3) \quad |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(\tilde{u})| \leq \left(1 - c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta_0}\right)^{-n}\right)^j |B_1|,$$

for all  $j \geq 0$ . We argue by induction. The case  $j = 0$  follows easily. Assume (4.3) has been checked for  $j$  and define

$$F_j := B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(\tilde{u})$$

and consider the paraboloids of opening  $-(1+\delta_0)^{j+1}$  tangents from below to  $\Gamma_{\tilde{u}}^{(1+\delta_0)^j}$  in  $F_j$ . Slide them up until they touch  $\tilde{u}$  in a set  $E_j$ . From Lemma 1 and the very definition of  $E_j$ , we have

$$E_j \subset A_{(1+\delta_0)^{j+1}}(\tilde{u}) \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(\tilde{u}) \subset \bar{B}_1 \Subset B_R.$$

From Lemma 4 we obtain,

$$|B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(u)| \leq c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta_0}\right)^{-n} |A_{(1+\delta_0)^{j+1}}(u) \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(u)|.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^{j+1}}(\tilde{u})| &= |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(\tilde{u})| - |A_{(1+\delta_0)^{j+1}}(\tilde{u}) \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(\tilde{u})| \\ &\leq \left(1 - c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta_0}\right)^{-n}\right) |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(\tilde{u})|, \end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis we have

$$|B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^{j+1}}(\tilde{u})| \leq \left(1 - c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta_0}\right)^{-n}\right)^{j+1} |B_1|,$$

and (4.3) is proved.

Continuing with the reasoning, since  $\tilde{u} \leq u$  and both functions agree in  $B_{\sqrt{3}/2}$ , for  $j \geq 0$  there holds

$$\{\underline{\Theta}_u > (1 + \delta_0)^j\} \cap B_{1/2} \subset B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^j}(u).$$

To conclude, we note that for any  $t \geq (1 + \delta_0)^{1+j(\alpha)}$  there exists  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(4.4) \quad (1 + \delta_0)^{j+j(\alpha)} \leq t < (1 + \delta_0)^{j+j(\alpha)+1},$$

and thus the following inclusions hold:

$$(4.5) \quad \{\underline{\Theta}_u > t\} \subset \{\underline{\Theta}_u > (1 + \delta_0)^{j+j(\alpha)}\} \subset B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta_0)^{j+j(\alpha)}}(u).$$

We have proven that

$$|\{\underline{\Theta}_u > t\} \cap B_{1/2}| \leq \left(1 - c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta_0}\right)^{-n}\right)^{j+j(\alpha)} |B_1|,$$

which, in view of (4.4), yields the aimed estimate as long as we take

$$\alpha \leq -\frac{(j + j(\alpha)) \ln(1 - c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta_0}\right)^{-n})}{(j + j(\alpha) + 1) \ln(1 + \delta_0)} = \frac{j + j(\alpha)}{j + j(\alpha) + 1} \frac{\ln(1 - c\gamma_0^n)}{\ln(1 - \gamma_0)},$$

for all  $j \geq 1$ , which is guaranteed by the definition of  $j(\alpha)$ .

We conclude the proof of Theorem 2 by commenting that condition  $0 \leq u < \delta_0 2^{-4}$  is not restrictive. Indeed, given a generic supersolution  $u$ , consider

$$v = \delta_0 \frac{u + \|u\|_\infty}{2^6 \|u\|_\infty}$$

and note that  $0 \leq v < \delta_0 2^{-4}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 v) \leq 0$  in  $B_1$ . Moreover,

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \{\underline{\Theta}_v > t\} &= \{\underline{\Theta}_u > \delta_0^{-1} 2^6 \|u\|_\infty t\} \\ &= \left\{ \underline{\Theta}_u > \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_0}{\gamma_0}\right) 2^6 \|u\|_\infty t \right\} \end{aligned}$$

□

The function defining  $\varepsilon$  in (4.2), i.e.  $\varphi: (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given as

$$\varphi(\gamma) := \frac{\ln(1 - c\gamma^n)}{\ln(1 - \gamma)},$$

can be explored to provide lower bounds for  $\varepsilon$ . The critical point  $\gamma_0$ , used in the proof of Theorem 2, satisfies

$$\frac{nc\gamma_0^{n-1}}{(1 - c\gamma_0^n)}(1 - \gamma_0) = \varepsilon(\gamma_0).$$

Such an equation comes from simplifying  $\varepsilon'(\gamma_0) = 0$  and can be numerically solved for chosen values of  $n$  and  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ .

We further note that

$$-\ln(1 - c\gamma^n) = -c \ln\left((1 - c\gamma^n)^{1/c}\right) \geq c\gamma^n,$$

with asymptotic equality as  $0 < c \ll 1$ . Thus, we can write down the pointwise inequality

$$\varphi(\gamma) \geq \frac{c\gamma^n}{-\ln(1 - \gamma)} =: f(\gamma).$$

The new function  $f(\gamma)$  can be used as lower bounds for  $\varepsilon$  and it is a slightly easier function to analyze. In particular,  $\varepsilon(\gamma_0) \geq \varepsilon(\gamma_*)$ , where  $\gamma_*$  is the critical point for  $f(\gamma)$  in  $(0, 1)$ .

**Proposition 2** (Improved bound in the plane). *Let  $u \in C(\bar{B}_1)$  satisfy  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$  in  $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . Then  $u \in W_{loc}^{2, \varepsilon}(B_1)$ , with universal estimates, for an optimal  $\varepsilon > 0$  satisfying:*

$$0.407 \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{2}{\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} + 1}.$$

*Proof.* The upper bound is the one from [1]. As for the lower bound, we initially note that  $c = c(2, \lambda, \Lambda, 1)$ , as defined in (3.2), equals  $\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}$ . Hence, from the above discussion

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \frac{\gamma^2}{-\ln(1 - \gamma)},$$

for all  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . Evaluating at  $\gamma = 0.715$  yields the result.  $\square$

The analysis for higher dimensions is a bit more involved and it is the content of our next proposition:

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $\varepsilon(\gamma_0)$  be defined as in Theorem 2. There holds:*

$$\varepsilon(\gamma_0) \geq \frac{n(e-1)}{1+ne \ln(n)} \left( \frac{n \ln(n)}{1+n \ln(n)} \right)^n c,$$

for all  $n \geq 3$ .

*Proof.* By simplifying the equation  $f'(\gamma) = 0$ , we see that the critical point of  $f$  in  $(0, 1)$ ,  $\gamma_*$ , satisfies the equation

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} = -n \ln(1-\gamma)$$

which can be analytically solved in  $(0, 1)$  by using the Lambert  $W$  function. Indeed, (4.7) is equivalent to

$$-\frac{1}{n(1-\gamma)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{n(1-\gamma)}\right) = -\frac{1}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{n}\right),$$

whose solutions are  $\gamma = 0$  and

$$-\frac{1}{n(1-\gamma)} = W_{-1}\left(-\frac{1}{n}e^{-1/n}\right).$$

Therefore, in  $(0, 1)$  the critical point is

$$\gamma_* := 1 + \frac{1}{nW_{-1}\left(-\frac{1}{n}e^{-1/n}\right)}.$$

From (4.7) and the definition of  $\gamma_\star$ , we then have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi(\gamma_\star) &= \frac{-\ln(1 - c\gamma_\star^n)}{-\ln(1 - \gamma_\star)} \\
 (4.8) \quad &= (-\ln(1 - c\gamma_\star^n)) \left( \frac{n(1 - \gamma_\star)}{\gamma_\star} \right) \\
 &= (-\ln(1 - c\gamma_\star^n)) \left( \frac{-1}{w_n + \frac{1}{n}} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have set  $w_n := W_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n}e^{-1/n})$ .

Now, from Lemma 3, the branch  $W_{-1}$  of the Lambert W function satisfies the following inequalities:

$$(4.9) \quad -\frac{e}{e-1}(u+1) \leq W_{-1}(-e^{-u-1}) < -(u+1)$$

for all  $u > 0$ . Letting  $u = \ln(n) - \left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right)$ , for  $n \geq 2$ , in (4.9) we reach

$$\frac{-e}{e-1} \left( \ln(n) + \frac{1}{n} \right) \leq w_n < -\ln(n) - \frac{1}{n}.$$

Add  $1/n$  to both sides of the above inequalities:

$$(4.10) \quad -\frac{e}{e-1} \ln(n) - \frac{1}{n(e-1)} \leq w_n + \frac{1}{n} < -\ln(n),$$

and hence the left hand side of (4.10) yields

$$\frac{-1}{w_n + 1/n} \geq \frac{n(e-1)}{en \ln(n) + 1}.$$

The above inequality and (4.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi(\gamma_\star) &\geq (-\ln(1 - c\gamma_\star^n)) \frac{n(e-1)}{1 + ne \ln(n)} \\
 &\geq c\gamma_\star^n \frac{n(e-1)}{1 + ne \ln(n)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, using the right hand side of (4.10) and the definition of  $\gamma_\star$ , we note that

$$\gamma_\star^n \geq \left( \frac{n \ln(n)}{1 + n \ln(n)} \right)^n,$$

for all  $n \geq 2$  and hence

$$(4.11) \quad \varepsilon(\gamma_0) > \varphi(\gamma_\star) \geq \frac{n(e-1)}{1 + ne \ln(n)} \left( \frac{n \ln(n)}{1 + n \ln(n)} \right)^n c,$$

for all  $n \geq 2$ , and the proposition is proven.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $\varepsilon(\gamma_0)$  be defined as in Theorem 2. Then,*

$$\varepsilon(\gamma_0) \geq \frac{\tau_n}{\ln n} c,$$

for an increasing sequence of positive numbers,  $\frac{1}{4} < \tau_n \rightarrow 1 - e^{-1}$ ,  $n \geq 3$ . In particular,  $\varepsilon(\gamma_0) > \frac{c}{\ln n^4}$ , for all  $n \geq 3$ .

*Proof.* It follows from (4.11) that

$$\varepsilon(\gamma_0) > \varphi(\gamma_*) \geq \frac{n(e-1)}{1+ne \ln(n)} \left( \frac{n \ln(n)}{1+n \ln(n)} \right)^n \ln n \cdot \frac{c}{\ln n}.$$

Easily one sees that

$$\tau_n := \frac{n(e-1) \ln n}{1+ne \ln(n)} \left( \frac{n \ln(n)}{1+n \ln(n)} \right)^n$$

is an increasing sequence converging to  $1 - e^{-1}$ . Direct calculation yields:

$$\tau_3 \approx 0.2568 > \frac{1}{4},$$

and the Corollary is proven.  $\square$

We now turn our attention to asymptotic lower bounds for the constant  $c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  defined in (3.2). The case  $k = \frac{n}{2}$  divides the theory. Indeed, it readily follows that:

$$c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \frac{n}{2}) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}},$$

and thus, Theorem 2 along with Corollary 1 implies that if  $u \in C(\bar{B}_1)$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 u) \leq 0$  in  $B_1$  and  $D^2 u(x)$  has at least  $\frac{n}{2}$  nonpositive eigenvalues, then  $u \in W^{2, \alpha}(B_{1/2})$ , with universal estimates, for all

$$\alpha < \frac{1}{\ln n^4} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

In the case  $\frac{n}{2} < k < n$ , for  $n$  fixed, Theorem 2 along with Corollary 1 yields the existence of a constant  $g_n > 0$  such that for  $u \in C(\bar{B}_1)$  with  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2 u) \leq 0$  in  $B_1$  and  $D^2 u(x)$  has at least  $k$  nonpositive eigenvalues, then  $u \in W^{2, \alpha}(B_{1/2})$ , with universal estimates, for all

$$\alpha < g_n \cdot \left( \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right)^{n-k}.$$

The constant  $g_n$ , however, goes to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, in view of Remark 3.1, in the case  $\frac{n}{2} < k < n$ , one can select

$$c = \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left\{ \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1 \right) \frac{k}{n-i} \right)^{i-n} \right\}.$$

Proposition 1 informs how to optimize such a choice.

We now turn our attention to the important case  $1 \leq k < \frac{n}{2}$ ; recall for viscosity supersolutions, with no further information, one can always take  $k = 1$  in the analysis.

**Proposition 4.** Let  $c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k) = \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1 \right) \frac{k}{n-k} \right)^{k-n}$  and assume  $k < \frac{n}{2}$ . Then

$$c = c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k) \geq \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right)^{k-n} \cdot \left( 1 + \left( \frac{n-2k}{n-k} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right) \right)^{n-k}.$$

*Proof.* We readily obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c &:= \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1 \right) \frac{k}{n-k} \right)^{k-n} \\ &= \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right)^{k-n} \cdot \left( \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} + \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right) \frac{k}{n-k} \right)^{k-n}. \end{aligned}$$



We can further estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\frac{k}{n-k}\right)^{k-n} &= \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\left(1 - \frac{k}{n-k}\right)\right)^{k-n} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\left(1 - \frac{k}{n-k}\right)}\right)^{n-k} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\left(1 - \frac{k}{n-k}\right) \right]^j\right)^{n-k} \\
&> \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\left(1 - \frac{k}{n-k}\right)\right)^{n-k} \\
&= \left(1 + \left(\frac{n-2k}{n-k}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\right)^{n-k},
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed.  $\square$

Finally, combining Theorem 2, Proposition 3, and Proposition 4 we obtain:

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $u \in C(\bar{B}_1)$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$  in  $B_1$ . Let  $k \in [1, n]$  be the minimal number of nonpositive eigenvalues of  $D^2u(x)$ . Assume  $n \geq 3$  and  $1 \leq k < \frac{n}{2}$ . Then  $u \in W^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2})$  with universal estimates, for all*

$$\alpha < \frac{\left(1 + \left(\frac{n-2k}{n-k}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)\right)^{n-k}}{\ln n^4} \cdot \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{k-n}$$

In particular, if  $\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)$  is the quantity  $\varepsilon(\gamma_0)$  defined in Theorem 2, with  $\lambda < \Lambda$ , then:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varepsilon(n, \lambda, \Lambda, k)}{\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{k-n}} = +\infty.$$

In the case  $k = 1$ , that is, with no further assumption other than  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$ , the last information provided by Theorem 3 seems to suggest that the sharp polynomial decay for Hessian integrability of  $u$ , as a function of  $\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}$ , should indeed be smaller than  $n - 1$ . In [1], Armstrong, Silvestre, and Smart conjectured that the decay should be linear. We shall discuss this important conjecture in Section 6.

## 5. GLOBAL $W^{2,\varepsilon}$ ESTIMATES

In this intermediary section we comment on global  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  estimates. We follow closely [13, Section 5]; the main difference is the advent of a new intrinsic optimization procedure, introduced in the analysis, as to accelerate the geometric measure decay.

**Theorem 4.** *(Global  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  estimate) Assume  $u \in C(\bar{B}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2u) \leq 0$  in  $B_1$ . Let  $k \in [1, n]$  be the minimal number of nonpositive eigenvalues of  $D^2u(x)$ . Then, for all  $0 < \alpha < \varepsilon^G$*

$$\left| \left\{ \Theta_u > \frac{n^2(3 + \sqrt{5})^9 \|u\|_{\infty}}{2^5(1 + \sqrt{5})^4} t \right\} \right| \leq t^{-\alpha} |B_1|$$

for  $t \geq (2^{-1}(3 + \sqrt{5}))^{1+j(\alpha)}$ , where  $j(\alpha) = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha(\varepsilon - \alpha)^{-1} \leq j\}$  and

$$(5.1) \quad \varepsilon^G = \frac{\ln \left(1 - 2c \frac{(1 + \sqrt{5})^n}{(3 + \sqrt{5})^{n+1}}\right)}{\ln \left(2(3 + \sqrt{5})^{-1}\right)},$$

where  $c$  is the same constant defined in (3.2).

*Proof.* First, assume that

$$(5.2) \quad 0 < u < \frac{\delta^4}{n^2(1+\delta)^8} \leq (1+\delta)^j \rho_j^2$$

for all  $j \geq 0$ , where  $\delta > 0$  and  $0 < \rho_j < (1+\delta)^{-2}$  are to be determined over the course of the proof. Let

$$P(x) = -\frac{(1+\delta)^{j+1}}{2}|x-x_0|^2 + y \cdot (x-x_0) + \Gamma_u^{(1+\delta)^j}(x_0)$$

be a paraboloid of opening  $-(1+\delta)^{j+1}$  tangent to  $\Gamma_u^{(1+\delta)^j}$  at  $x_0 \in B_{1-(1+\delta)^2\rho_j}$ . Since the vertex of  $P$  can be written as

$$x_v = x_0 + \frac{1}{(1+\delta)^{j+1}}y,$$

and  $0 < \Gamma_u^{(1+\delta)^j}$ , we have that

$$\frac{\|x_v - x_0\|^2}{2(1+\delta)^{j+1}} \leq P(x_v) \leq \Gamma_u^{(1+\delta)^j}(x_v) \leq u(x_v) < (1+\delta)^j \rho_j^2$$

and then,

$$\|x_v - x_0\|^2 \leq \sqrt{2}(1+\delta)^{-1/2}\rho_j.$$

Therefore,

$$\|x_v\| \leq 1 - (1+\delta)^2\rho_j + \sqrt{2}(1+\delta)^{-1/2}\rho_j.$$

After sliding  $P$  up until it touches  $u$ , the new contact point,  $x_1$  will then satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_1\| &\leq \|x_1 - x_v\| + \|x_v\| \\ &\leq 1 - \left[ (1+\delta)^2 - 2 \cdot \sqrt{2}(1+\delta)^{-1/2} \right] \rho_j. \end{aligned}$$

To ensure that  $E_j \Subset B_1$ , it suffices to have

$$0 < \left[ (1+\delta)^2 - 2 \cdot \sqrt{2}(1+\delta)^{-1/2} \right] \rho_j < 1.$$

Since  $0 < \rho_j < (1+\delta)^{-2}$ , then the above inequalities hold if

$$(5.3) \quad \left[ (1+\delta)^2 - 2 \cdot \sqrt{2}(1+\delta)^{-1/2} \right] > 0 \iff \delta > 2^{3/5} - 1.$$

For values of  $\delta$  in this range, we have, by Lemma (4) that,

$$|A_{(1+\delta)^{j+1}} \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}| \geq c \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{-n} |F_j|,$$

where  $F_j := B_{1-(1+\delta)^2\rho_j} \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}$ . Our next goal is then to show that

$$(5.4) \quad |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}| \leq \left(1 - c \frac{\delta^n}{(1+\delta)^{n+1}}\right)^j |B_1|$$

for all  $j \geq 0$ . As in the interior estimate, we argue by induction. The case  $k = 0$  is easy to see. For the induction step we consider two cases:

**Case I:**  $|F_j| \geq \frac{1}{1+\delta}|B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}|$ . In this case, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^{j+1}}| &= |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}| - |A_{(1+\delta)^{j+1}} \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}| \\
 &\leq \left(1 - c \frac{\delta^n}{(1+\delta)^{n+1}}\right) |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}| \\
 (5.5) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq \left(1 - c \frac{\delta^n}{(1+\delta)^{n+1}}\right)^{j+1} |B_1|,
 \end{aligned}$$

using the inductive hypothesis.

**Case II:**  $|F_j| < \frac{1}{1+\delta}|B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}|$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^{j+1}}| &\leq |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}| \\
 &\leq |F_j| + |B_1 \setminus B_{1-(1+\delta)^2\rho_j}| \\
 &< \frac{1}{1+\delta}|B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^j}| + |B_1 \setminus B_{1-(1+\delta)^2\rho_j}|,
 \end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^{j+1}}| &\leq \left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\right) |B_1 \setminus B_{1-(1+\delta)^2\rho_j}| \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\right) [1 - (1 - (1+\delta)^2\rho_j)^n] |B_1| \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\right) n(1+\delta)^2\rho_j |B_1|
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by using Bernoulli's inequality.

Now, we choose  $\rho_j$  such that

$$(5.6) \qquad \qquad \qquad \left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\right) n(1+\delta)^2\rho_j = \left(1 - c \frac{\delta^n}{(1+\delta)^{n+1}}\right)^{j+1}$$

and hence,

$$|B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^{j+1}}| \leq \left(1 - c \frac{\delta^n}{(1+\delta)^{n+1}}\right)^{j+1} |B_1|.$$

With this choice of  $\rho_j$ , the induction step is satisfied in both cases and therefore, (5.4) is proved.

Note that equation (5.6) completely determines  $\rho_j$  and  $0 < \rho_j < (1+\delta)^{-2}$  holds for such a  $\rho_j$ . Moreover,

$$\frac{\delta^4}{n^2(1+\delta)^8} \leq (1+\delta)^j \rho_j^2$$

for all  $j \geq 0$ , if we take  $\delta = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ .

To conclude the proof, we now argue as in Theorem 2. For any  $t \geq (1+\delta)^{1+j(\alpha)}$ , there exists  $j \geq 1$  such that

$$(5.7) \qquad \qquad \qquad (1+\delta)^{j+j(\alpha)} \leq t < (1+\delta)^{j+j(\alpha)+1},$$

and thus the following inclusions hold:

$$(5.8) \qquad \qquad \qquad \{\underline{\Theta}_u > t\} \subset \{\underline{\Theta}_u > (1+\delta)^{j+j(\alpha)}\} \subset B_1 \setminus A_{(1+\delta)^{j+j(\alpha)}}(u)$$

which in view of 5.4 yields the aimed estimate if

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &\leq \frac{-(j + j(\alpha)) \ln\left(1 - c \frac{\delta^n}{(1+\delta)^{n+1}}\right)}{(j + j(\alpha) + 1) \ln(1 + \delta)} \\ &= \frac{j + j(\alpha)}{j + j(\alpha) + 1} \frac{\ln\left(1 - 2c \frac{(1+\sqrt{5})^n}{(3+\sqrt{5})^{n+1}}\right)}{\ln\left(2(3 + \sqrt{5})^{-1}\right)}.\end{aligned}$$

And the above inequality holds for any  $j \geq 1$  by the definition of  $j(\alpha)$ .

Finally, as in Theorem 2, the condition (5.2) on  $u$  is not restrictive. If  $u$  is a generic supersolution, we consider

$$\begin{aligned}v &= \delta^4 \frac{u + \|u\|_\infty}{2n^2(1 + \delta)^9 \|u\|_\infty} \\ &= \frac{2^5(1 + \sqrt{5})^4}{n^2(3 + \sqrt{5})^9 \|u\|_\infty} (u + \|u\|_\infty)\end{aligned}$$

and note that (5.2) holds for  $v$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(D^2v) \leq 0$  in  $B_1$ , and

$$\{\underline{\Theta}_v > t\} = \left\{ \underline{\Theta}_u > \frac{n^2(3 + \sqrt{5})^9 \|u\|_\infty}{2^5(1 + \sqrt{5})^4} t \right\}.$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 5.1.* Again, the bigger the constant  $c$  in (5.1) the sharper the lower bound for  $\varepsilon^G$ . Hence, as in the interior case, one is entitled to choose  $c$  as

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left\{ \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1 \right) \frac{k}{n-i} \right)^{i-n} \right\}.$$

Proposition 1 informs about such an optimization problem.

## 6. NEW UPPER BOUND

In this section we discuss an upper bound for the Hessian integrability of viscosity supersolutions of fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equations. For each  $n \geq 3$ , we shall craft a supersolution  $v$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  showing that the exponent  $\varepsilon$  as stated in Theorem 2 cannot be larger than  $\frac{n\lambda}{(n-1)\lambda + \lambda}$ . This solves, in the negative, Armstrong-Silvestre-Smart's conjecture, [1, Conjecture 3.1].

Let  $\alpha, R > 0$  be given. We consider the function  $u = u_{\alpha,R}$  defined over the  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  by

$$u(x) := \begin{cases} R^{\alpha+2}|x|^{-\alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{2}|x|^2 - (1 + \frac{\alpha}{2})R^2 & \text{for } 0 < |x| < R \\ 0 & \text{for } R \leq |x| < \infty, \end{cases}$$

Clearly  $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$  and it is a non-negative function. Chain rule yields,

$$\partial_i u = -\alpha R^{\alpha+2} |x|^{-(\alpha+2)} x_i + \alpha x_i, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n$$

and for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$

$$\partial_{ij} u = \alpha(\alpha + 2)R^{\alpha+2}|x|^{-\alpha-4}(x_i x_j) - (\alpha R^{\alpha+2}|x|^{-\alpha-2} - \alpha) \delta_{ij},$$

where  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta. Therefore,

$$D^2 u(x) = \alpha(\alpha + 2)R^{\alpha+2}|x|^{-\alpha-4} x \otimes x^T - \alpha|x|^{-\alpha-2} (R^{\alpha+2} - |x|^{\alpha+2}) I_n$$

for all  $0 < |x| < R$ , where  $x \otimes x^T$  is the vector direct product of  $x$  and itself. Therefore the eigenvalues of  $D^2u(x)$  are

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_{n-1} &= -\alpha|x|^{-\alpha-2} \left( R^{\alpha+2} - |x|^{\alpha+2} \right) \quad \text{and} \\ \lambda_n &= \left( \alpha(\alpha+1)R^{\alpha+2}|x|^{-\alpha-2} + \alpha \right). \end{aligned}$$

in  $0 < |x| < R$ . Thus, we can estimate,

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2u) &= \Lambda \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i \right) + \lambda \cdot \lambda_n \\ &\leq -\Lambda(n-1)\alpha|x|^{-\alpha-2} \left( R^{\alpha+2} - |x|^{\alpha+2} \right) + \lambda \left( \alpha(\alpha+1)R^{\alpha+2}|x|^{-\alpha-2} + \alpha \right) \\ &= -\alpha|x|^{-\alpha-2}R^{\alpha+2} (\Lambda(n-1) - \lambda(\alpha+1)) + \alpha\Lambda(n-1) + \lambda\alpha \\ &\leq \Lambda n\alpha \end{aligned}$$

provided that

$$\Lambda(n-1) - \lambda(\alpha+1) \geq 0.$$

That is,

$$(6.3) \quad 0 < \alpha \leq (n-1) \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1$$

Since  $u \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(0, R)$ , then (6.2) actually holds (in the viscosity sense) in the entire set  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ .

Our example is now constructed, as in [13], as follows: For  $R > 0$  small enough, define the function  $v = v_{\alpha, R}$  by

$$v(x) = -|x|^2 + \sum_y \min \left( 1, \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda\alpha} u(x - 2Ry) \right)$$

where  $B(2Ry, R)$  are disjoint balls and  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ .

One can easily check that

$$(6.4) \quad \sup_{B_1} |v| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(D^2v) \leq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let  $N$  denote a generic open neighborhood of  $x \in B(0, R) \setminus \{0\}$ . In  $N$ , we can estimate:

$$\underline{\Theta}(u, N)(x) \geq -\lambda_1 = \alpha|x|^{-\alpha-2} \left( R^{\alpha+2} - |x|^{\alpha+2} \right)$$

Therefore, we conclude that if  $x \in B(0, R/2) \setminus \{0\}$

$$(6.5) \quad \underline{\Theta}(u, N)(x) \geq c\alpha R^{\alpha+2}|x|^{-\alpha-2}$$

for  $c$  given by

$$c = \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^{\alpha+2}} \right).$$

By choosing  $R > 0$  small enough, we can assure,

$$\min \left( 1, \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda\alpha} u(x - 2Ry) \right) = \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda\alpha} u(x - 2Ry)$$

whenever  $|x - 2Ry| \geq \tilde{c}R^{(\alpha+2)/\alpha}$ , where  $\tilde{c} = (\lambda/\Lambda\alpha)^{1/\alpha}$ .

Moreover, for any neighborhood  $N$  of  $x$  in  $\{\tilde{c}R^{(\alpha+2)/\alpha} \leq |x - 2Ry| \leq R/2\}$  we have, as in (6.5),

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \underline{\Theta}(v, N)(x) &\geq 2 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda\alpha} \lambda_1^u \\ &\geq c\alpha R^{\alpha+2} |x - 2Ry|^{-\alpha-2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_1^u$  is a negative eigenvalue of  $D^2u$ .

Next, if we take  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$(6.7) \quad \left( (n-1) \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} + 1 \right) \varepsilon > n,$$

we can choose  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$(6.8) \quad (n-1) \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} - 1 \geq \alpha > \frac{n}{\varepsilon} - 2.$$

Furthermore, for any ball  $B(2Ry, R) \subset B_{1/2}$ , owing to (6.6) we can estimate

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B(2Ry, R)} |\underline{\Theta}(v, B_1)(x)|^\varepsilon dx &\geq cR^{(\alpha+2)\varepsilon} \int_{(B_{R/2}(2Ry) \setminus B_{\tilde{c}R^{(\alpha+2)/\alpha}}(2Ry))} (|x - 2Ry|)^{-(\alpha+2)\varepsilon} dx \\ &= cR^{(\alpha+2)\varepsilon} \int_{(B_{R/2} \setminus B_{\tilde{c}R^{(\alpha+p)/\alpha}})} (|x|^{-(\alpha+2)})^\varepsilon dx \\ &= |\partial B_1| cR^{(\alpha+2)\varepsilon} \int_{\tilde{c}R^{(\alpha+p)/\alpha}}^{R/2} t^{-(\alpha+2)\varepsilon+n-1} dt, \\ &= \frac{C}{(\alpha+2)\varepsilon - 2} \left[ cR^{(\alpha+2)(n-2\varepsilon)/\alpha} - \frac{R^n}{2^{n-(\alpha+2)\varepsilon}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

The idea now is to estimate  $\|\underline{\Theta}(v, B_1)\|_{L^\varepsilon(B_{1/2})}$  by counting the number of disjoint balls  $B(2Ry, R)$  that fits inside  $B_{1/2}$ . Let  $R > 0$  be such that

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{8\sqrt{n}R} = m + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}},$$

for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  large. Then, if we choose  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  such that

$$0 < |y_j| \leq \frac{1-4R}{8\sqrt{n}R} = m, \quad j = 1, \dots, n$$

then  $B(2Ry, R)$  is entirely inside  $B(0, 1/2)$ , and with this choice of  $R$  and  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , there exist at least  $\left(\frac{1-4R}{8\sqrt{n}R}\right)^n$  disjoint balls of the form  $B(2Ry, R)$ , with  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  inside  $B(0, 1/2)$ .

Finally we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{1/2}} |\underline{\Theta}(v, B_1)|^\varepsilon dx &\geq C \left( \frac{1-4R}{8\sqrt{n}R} \right)^n \left[ cR^{(\alpha+2)(n-2\varepsilon)/\alpha} - \frac{R^n}{2^{n-(\alpha+2)\varepsilon}} \right] \\ &= C(1-4R)^n \left[ cR^{2(n-(\alpha+2)\varepsilon)/\alpha} - 2^{-n+(\alpha+2)\varepsilon} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and since, again in view of (6.8), the exponent  $2(n - (\alpha + 2)\varepsilon)/\alpha$  is negative, we conclude

$$\|\underline{\Theta}(v, B_1)\|_{L^\varepsilon(B_{1/2})} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow 0.$$

In conclusion, as the decay proven in (4.1) implies  $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}(u, B_1) \in L^{\hat{\varepsilon}}(B_{1/2})$ , for any  $0 < \hat{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$ , the example we just crafted show that, in dimension  $n \geq 3$ , the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  estimates as stated in Theorem 2 cannot hold (universally) for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  large enough so that

$$((n-1)\Lambda/\lambda + 1)\varepsilon > n.$$

That is, the  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  regularity theory for viscosity supersolutions requires

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{n}{(n-1)\Lambda/\lambda + 1},$$

for any  $n \geq 3$ . This quantity is strictly less than the one Conjectured in [1].

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Armstrong, Scott N, Silvestre, Luis E., and Smart, Charles K. *Partial regularity of solutions of fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 65 (2012), no. 8, 1169–1184.
- [2] Beck, Christian, E, Weinan, and Jentzen, Arnulf *Machine learning approximation algorithms for high-dimensional fully nonlinear partial differential equations and second-order backward stochastic differential equations*. J. Nonlinear Sci. 29 (2019), no. 4, 1563–1619.
- [3] Corless, Robert M, Gonnet, Gaston H, Hare, David EG, Jeffrey, David J, and Knuth, Donald E. *On the Lambert W function*. Adv Comput Math. 5 (1996), no. 1, 329–359.
- [4] Caffarelli, L. A. *Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations*. Ann. of Math. (2) 130 (1989), no. 1, 189–213.
- [5] Caffarelli, Luis and Cabré, X. *Fully Nonlinear Elliptic Equations*. Amer. Math. Soc.: Colloquium publications. 43 (1995).
- [6] Cabré, X. *Nondivergent elliptic equations on manifolds with nonnegative curvature*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 50 (1997), no. 7, 623–665.
- [7] Evans, L.C., *Some estimates for nondivergence structure, second order elliptic equations*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 287 (1985) no. 2, 701–712.
- [8] Han, Jiequn, Jentzen, Arnulf, and E, Weinan *Solving high-dimensional partial differential equations using deep learning*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 115 (2018), no. 34
- [9] Hare, DEG and Corless, Robert M *Unwinding the branches of the Lambert W function*. Math Sci. 21 (1996), 1–7.
- [10] Le, Nam Q. *Polynomial decay in  $W^{2,\varepsilon}$  estimates for viscosity supersolutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. Math. Res. Lett. 27 (2020) no. 1, 189–207.
- [11] Lin, Fang-Hua. *Second derivative  $L_p$ -estimates for elliptic equations of nondivergent type*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 96 (1986), 447–451.
- [12] Mező, István, Baricz, Árpád. *On the generalization of the Lambert W function*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 369 (2017) no. 11, 7917–7934.
- [13] Mooney, Connor *A proof of the Krylov-Safonov theorem without localization*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 44 (2019), no. 8, 681–690.
- [14] Nadirashvili, Nikolai S. and Vlăduț, Serge *Nonclassical solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. Geom. Funct. Anal. 17 (2007), no. 4, 1283–1296.
- [15] Nadirashvili, Nikolai S. and Vlăduț, Serge *Singular viscosity solutions to fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 89 (2008), no. 2, 107–113.
- [16] Nadirashvili, Nikolai S. and Vlăduț, Serge *Ocotonions and singular solutions of Hessian elliptic equations*. Geom. Funct. Anal. 21 (2011), no. 2, 483–498.
- [17] Nadirashvili, Nikolai S. and Vlăduț, Serge *Singular solutions of Hessian fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. Adv. Math. 228 (2011), no. 3, 1718–1741.
- [18] Pimentel, Edgard A and Teixeira, Eduardo V. *Sharp Hessian integrability estimates for nonlinear elliptic equations: an asymptotic approach*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 106 (2016), no. 4, 744–767.
- [19] Savin, Ovidiu *Small perturbation solutions for elliptic equations*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 32 (2007), no. 4-6, 557–578.
- [20] Silvestre, Luis and Teixeira, Eduardo V. *Regularity estimates for fully non linear elliptic equations which are asymptotically convex*. Contributions to nonlinear elliptic equations and systems, 425–438, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., 86, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [21] Teixeira, Eduardo V. *Universal moduli of continuity for solutions to fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 211 (2014), no. 3, 911–927.

- [22] Teixeira, Eduardo V. *Regularity theory for nonlinear diffusion processes*. Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 67 (2020), no. 4, 475–483.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA, ORLANDO, FL, USA

*Email address:* `thnascimento@knights.ucf.edu`

*Email address:* `eduardo.teixeira@ucf.edu`