

# Mean oscillation gradient estimates for elliptic systems in divergence form with VMO coefficients

Luc Nguyen \*

*Dedicated to Professor Duong Minh Duc on the occasion of his 70th birthday*

## Abstract

We consider gradient estimates for  $H^1$  solutions of linear elliptic systems in divergence form  $\partial_\alpha(A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta u^j) = 0$ . It is known that the Dini continuity of coefficient matrix  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})$  is essential for the differentiability of solutions. We prove the following results:

- (a) If  $A$  satisfies a condition slightly weaker than Dini continuity but stronger than belonging to VMO, namely that the  $L^2$  mean oscillation  $\omega_{A,2}$  of  $A$  satisfies

$$X_{A,2} := \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C_* \int_t^R \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) dt < \infty,$$

where  $C_*$  is a positive constant depending only on the dimensions and the ellipticity, then  $\nabla u \in BMO$ .

- (b) If  $X_{A,2} = 0$ , then  $\nabla u \in VMO$ .  
 (c) If  $A \in VMO$  and if  $\nabla u \in L^\infty$ , then  $\nabla u \in VMO$ .  
 (d) Finally, examples satisfying  $X_{A,2} = 0$  are given showing that it is not possible to prove the boundedness of  $\nabla u$  in statement (b), nor the continuity of  $\nabla u$  in statement (c).

## 1 Introduction

Let  $n \geq 2$ ,  $N \geq 1$  and consider the elliptic system for  $u = (u^1, \dots, u^N)$

$$\partial_\alpha(A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta u^j) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_4, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (1.1)$$

---

\*Mathematical Institute and St Edmund Hall, University of Oxford, Andrew Wiles Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK. Email: luc.nguyen@maths.ox.ac.uk.

where  $B_4$  is the ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of radius four and centered at the origin, and the coefficient matrix  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})$  is assumed to be bounded and measurable in  $B_4$  and to satisfy, for some positive constants  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ ,

$$|A(x)| \leq \Lambda \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in B_4, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\int_{B_2} A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta \varphi^j \partial_\alpha \varphi^i dx \geq \lambda \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(B_4)}^2 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in H_0^1(B_4). \quad (1.3)$$

It is well known that if the coefficient matrix  $A$  belongs to  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(B_4)$  then every solution  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  of (1.1) belongs to  $C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\alpha}(B_2)$ ; see e.g. Giaquinta [13, Theorem 3.2] where the result is attributed to Campanato [7] and Morrey [23]. It was conjectured by Serrin [24] that the assumption  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  can be relaxed to  $u \in W^{1,1}(B_4)$ . This has been settled in the affirmative by Brezis [2, 3]. (See Hager and Ross [14] for the relaxation from  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  to  $u \in W^{1,p}(B_4)$  for some  $1 < p < 2$ .) Moreover, in [2, 3], it was shown that if  $A$  satisfies the Dini condition

$$\int_0^2 \frac{\bar{\omega}_A(t)}{t} dt < \infty \quad \text{where } \bar{\omega}_A(r) := \sup_{x,y \in B_2, |x-y| < r} |A(x) - A(y)|, \quad (1.4)$$

then every solution  $u \in W^{1,1}(B_4)$  of (1.1) belongs to  $C^1(B_2)$ . For related works on the differentiability of weak solutions under suitable conditions on  $\bar{\omega}_A$ , see also [15, 21, 22].

Differentiability of weak solutions under weaker Dini conditions involving integral mean oscillation of  $A$  has also been studied. For  $0 < r \leq 2$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varphi}_A(r) &:= \sup_{x \in B_2} \left\{ \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |A(y) - A(x)|^2 dy \right\}^{1/2}, \\ \omega_A(r) &:= \sup_{x \in B_2} \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |A(y) - (A)_{B_r(x)}| dy, \\ (A)_{B_r(x)} &:= \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} A(y) dy, \quad 0 < r \leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

In Li [20] it was shown that if

$$\int_0^2 \frac{\bar{\varphi}_A(t)}{t} dt < \infty, \quad (1.5)$$

then every solution  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  of (1.1) belongs to  $C^1(B_2)$ . In Dong and Kim [12] (see also [9]), this conclusion was shown to remain valid under the weaker condition that

$$\int_0^2 \frac{\omega_A(t)}{t} dt < \infty. \quad (1.6)$$

(Note that the finiteness of  $\int_0^2 \frac{\omega_A(t)}{t} dt$  or  $\int_0^2 \frac{\bar{\varphi}_A(t)}{t} dt$  implies that  $A$  is continuous.)

The Dini condition (1.4) and its integral variants (1.5), (1.6) are phenomenologically sharp for the differentiability of weak solutions of (1.1). In Jin, Maz'ya and van Schaftingen [17], examples of continuous coefficient matrices  $A$  with moduli of continuity  $\bar{\omega}_A(t) \sim \frac{1}{|\ln t|}$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$  were given showing the following phenomena:

- there exists a solution  $u \in W^{1,1}(B_4)$  of (1.1) such that  $u \in W^{1,p}(B_4)$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , and  $\nabla u \in BMO_{\text{loc}}(B_4)$  but  $\nabla u \notin L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(B_2)$  and  $\nabla u \notin VMO_{\text{loc}}(B_2)$ .<sup>1</sup>
- there exists a solution  $u \in W^{1,1}(B_4)$  of (1.1) such that  $u \in W^{1,p}(B_4)$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$  but  $\nabla u \notin BMO_{\text{loc}}(B_2)$ .

In this paper, we consider mean oscillation estimates for  $\nabla u$  when  $A$  slightly fails the Dini conditions (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6). For  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , let  $\omega_{A,p} : (0, 2] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  denote the  $L^p$  mean oscillation of  $A$ :

$$\omega_{A,p}(r) = \sup_{x \in B_2} \left\{ \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |A(y) - (A)_{B_r(x)}|^p dy \right\}^{1/p}.$$

It is clear that  $\omega_{A,1} = \omega_A$ ,  $\omega_{A,2} \leq \bar{\varphi}_A$ ,  $\omega_{A,p}$  is non-decreasing in  $p$ , and  $\omega_{A,p} \leq \bar{\omega}_A$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$ .

We now state our first result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})$  satisfy (1.2) and (1.3). There exists a constant  $C_* > 0$ , depending only on  $n, N, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$  such that if*

$$X_{A,2} := \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C_* \int_t^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) dt < \infty, \quad (1.7)$$

then every solution  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  of (1.1) satisfies  $\nabla u \in BMO_{\text{loc}}(B_2)$ . Moreover, if

$$X_{A,2} = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

then every solution  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  of (1.1) satisfies  $\nabla u \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(B_2)$ .

Note that condition (1.7) implies that  $\omega_{A,2}(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$  i.e.  $A \in VMO_{\text{loc}}(B_2)$ .

**Remark 1.2.** *Let  $1 < p < \infty$ . Theorem 1.1 remains valid if  $\omega_{A,2}$  is replaced by  $\omega_{A,p}$  and the regularity assumption  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  is replaced by  $u \in W^{1,p}(B_4)$ , where the constant  $C_*$  is now allowed to depend also on  $p$ . For  $p \geq 2$ , this follows from the inequality  $\omega_{A,2} \leq \omega_{A,p}$  for those  $p$ . For  $1 < p < 2$ , see Proposition 2.3.*

---

<sup>1</sup>The statement that  $\nabla u \notin VMO_{\text{loc}}(B_2)$  is not explicitly stated in [17], but can be seen from the proof of Proposition 1.5 therein.

It is clear that if  $\omega_{A,2}$  satisfies (1.5), then it satisfies (1.8) (and hence (1.7)). The following lemma gives examples which satisfy (1.8) but not necessarily (1.5).

**Lemma 1.3.** *If  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \omega_{A,2}(t) \ln \frac{1}{t} < \frac{1}{C_*}$ , then  $X_{A,2} = 0$ . If  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \omega_{A,2}(t) \ln \frac{1}{t} > \frac{1}{C_*}$ , then  $X_{A,2} = \infty$ .*

We note that, in case  $\omega_{A,2}(t) \ln \frac{1}{t} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ , the BMO regularity of  $\nabla u$  was proved by Acquistapace [1]. (See also [16].)

By Lemma 1.3, an explicit example of  $\omega_{A,2}$  satisfying (1.8) (for any constant  $C_*$ ) but not (1.5) is

$$\omega_{A,2}(t) \sim \frac{1}{\ln \frac{64}{t} (\ln \ln \frac{64}{t})^\beta}, \quad \beta \in (0, 1].$$

In addition, unlike (1.5) or (1.6), (1.8) does not imply that  $A$  is continuous, e.g.

$$A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(x) = \left(2 + \sin \ln \ln \ln \frac{64}{|x|}\right) \delta_{ij} \delta^{\alpha\beta}.$$

(This can be checked using the fact that the function  $s \mapsto \sin s$  is Lipschitz on  $\mathbb{R}$  and the fact that the function  $x \mapsto \ell(x) := \ln \ln \ln \frac{64}{|x|}$  has  $L^2$  mean oscillation  $\omega_{\ell,2}(t) \sim \frac{1}{\ln \frac{64}{t} \ln \ln \frac{64}{t}}$ .)

When  $A$  is merely of vanishing mean oscillation, we have the following result.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})$  belong to  $VMO(B_4)$  and satisfy (1.2) and (1.3). Then every solution  $u \in W^{1,\infty}(B_4)$  of (1.1) satisfies  $\nabla u \in VMO(B_2)$ .*

The obtained regularity in the above theorems appears sharp. As in [17], counterexamples can be produced to show that, under (1.8),

- solutions of (1.1) may not have bounded gradients (though their gradients are of vanishing mean oscillation by Theorem 1.1),
- $W^{1,\infty}$  solutions of (1.1) may not be differentiable (though their gradients are of vanishing mean oscillation by Theorem 1.4).

**Proposition 1.5.** *There exist a coefficient matrix  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}) \in C(\bar{B}_4)$  satisfying (1.2), (1.3) and (1.8) and a solution  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  of (1.1) such that  $\nabla u \in VMO(B_4)$  but  $\nabla u \notin L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(B_2)$ .*

**Proposition 1.6.** *There exist a coefficient matrix  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}) \in C(\bar{B}_4)$  satisfying (1.2), (1.3) and (1.8) and a solution  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  of (1.1) such that  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(B_4) \cap VMO(B_4)$  but  $\nabla u \notin C(B_2)$ .*

Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4 are consequences of the following proposition on the mean oscillation of the gradient  $\nabla u$  in terms of the  $L^2$  mean oscillation  $\omega_{A,2}$  of  $A$ .

**Proposition 1.7.** *Let  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})$  satisfy (1.2) and (1.3). Then there exists a constant  $C_* > 0$ , depending only on  $n, N, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$  such that for every  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  satisfying (1.1) and for  $0 < r \leq R/4 \leq 1/2$ , there hold*

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \frac{C_* r^n}{R^n} \exp\left(2C_* \int_{2r}^R \frac{\omega_{A,2}(t)}{t} dt\right) \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_r|^2 dx &\leq \frac{C_* r^{n+2}}{R^n} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 dx \times \\ &\times \left\{ \int_{2r}^R \frac{\omega_{A,2}(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C_* \int_t^R \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \right\}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

where  $(\nabla u)_r = \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \nabla u dx$  for  $0 < r \leq 2$ .

Moreover, if  $u \in W^{1,\infty}(B_4)$ , then, for  $0 < r \leq R/4 \leq 1/2$ ,

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_r|^2 dx \leq \frac{C_* r^{n+2}}{R^n} \left\{ \int_{2r}^R \frac{\omega_{A,2}(t)}{t^2} dt \right\}^2 \sup_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2. \quad (1.11)$$

**Remark 1.8.** *Let  $1 < p < 2$ . Under an additional assumption that  $[A]_{BMO(B_4)}$  is sufficiently small, the estimates in Proposition 1.7 hold if  $\omega_{A,2}$  is replaced by  $\omega_{A,p}$  and the regularity assumption  $u \in H^1(B_4)$  is replaced by  $u \in W^{1,p}(B_4)$ . We do not know if this smallness assumption can be dropped except for  $p$  close to 2. See Proposition 2.3.*

**Acknowledgment.** The author would like to thank Professor Yanyan Li for drawing his attention to the problem.

## 2 Proof of the main results

*Proof of Lemma 1.3.* We claim: For  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $a \in (0, \infty)$ , the limit

$$L_a = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^\delta \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-1} dt$$

satisfies  $L_a = \infty$  if  $a > 1$ ,  $L_a = 1$  if  $a = 1$  and  $L_a \leq (\ln \frac{1}{\delta})^{a-1}$  if  $a < 1$ .

When  $a = 1$ , the claim is clear. By integrating by parts, we have

$$\int_r^\delta \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-1} dt = -\frac{1}{t} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-1} \Big|_r^\delta - (a-1) \int_r^\delta \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-2} dt. \quad (2.1)$$

If  $a < 1$ , we see from (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} L_a &= |a-1| \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^\delta \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-2} dt \leq |a-1| \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_r^\delta \frac{1}{t} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-2} dt \\ &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-1} \Big|_r^\delta = \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{a-1}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the claim in the case  $a > 1$ , we may assume without loss of generality that  $a < 2$ . Note that (2.1) implies

$$L_a + (a-1)L_{a-1} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \left\{ -\frac{1}{t} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{a-1} \Big|_r^\delta \right\} = \infty.$$

As  $L_{a-1}$  is finite (as  $1 < a < 2$ ), we thus have that  $L_a = \infty$ . The claim is proved.

We now apply the claim to obtain the desired conclusions. Consider first the case that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \omega_{A,2}(t) \ln \frac{1}{t} < \frac{1}{C_*}$ . Then there exist  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{C_*})$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  so that  $\omega_{A,2}(t) \leq \varepsilon (\ln \frac{1}{t})^{-1}$  in  $(0, \delta)$ . For  $\hat{\delta} \in (0, \delta)$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} X_{A,2} &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^\delta \frac{\omega_{A,2}(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C_* \int_t^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \\ &\leq \varepsilon \left(\ln \frac{1}{\hat{\delta}}\right)^{-C_*\varepsilon} \exp\left(C_* \int_{\hat{\delta}}^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^{\hat{\delta}} \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{C_*\varepsilon-1} dt. \end{aligned}$$

As  $C_*\varepsilon < 1$ , we can apply the claim to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X_{A,2} &\leq \varepsilon \left(\ln \frac{1}{\hat{\delta}}\right)^{-1} \exp\left(C_* \int_{\hat{\delta}}^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \left(\ln \frac{1}{\hat{\delta}}\right)^{-1+C_*\varepsilon} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\hat{\delta}}\right)^{-C_*\varepsilon} \exp\left(C_* \int_{\hat{\delta}}^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right). \end{aligned}$$

Sending  $\hat{\delta} \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain that  $X_{A,2} = 0$ .

Consider next the case that  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \omega_{A,2}(t) \ln \frac{1}{t} > \frac{1}{C_*}$ . Then there exist  $b > \frac{1}{C_*}$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  so that  $\omega_{A,2}(t) \geq b (\ln \frac{1}{t})^{-1}$  in  $(0, \delta)$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} X_{A,2} &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^\delta \frac{\omega_{A,2}(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C_* \int_t^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \\ &\geq b \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{-C_*b} \exp\left(C_* \int_\delta^2 \frac{\omega_{A,2}(s)}{s} ds\right) \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r \int_r^\delta \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{C_*b-1} dt. \end{aligned}$$

As  $C_*b > 1$ , we deduce from the claim that  $X_{A,2} = \infty$  as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4.* The results follow immediately from Proposition 1.7.  $\square$

In order to prove Proposition 1.7, we need the following estimate for harmonic replacements. (Compare [5, Lemma 3.5], [19, Lemma 3.1].)

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $A, \bar{A}$  satisfy (1.2) and (1.3) with  $\bar{A}$  being constant in  $B_4$  and  $f = (f_i^\alpha) \in L^2(B_4)$ . Let  $R \in (0, 2)$  and suppose  $u, h \in H^1(B_{2R})$  satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha(A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u^j) &= \partial_\alpha f_i^\alpha \quad \text{in } B_{2R}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \partial_\alpha(\bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta h^j) &= 0 \quad \text{in } B_{2R}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ u &= h \quad \text{on } \partial B_{2R}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $n, N, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$  such that

$$\|\nabla(u - h)\|_{L^2(B_{3R/2})} \leq C \left[ \|f\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} + R^{-n/2} \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \right].$$

*Proof.* In the proof,  $C$  denotes a generic positive constant which depends only on  $n, N, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$ . Using that  $\bar{A}$  is constant, we have by standard elliptic estimates that

$$\|\nabla h\|_{L^\infty(B_{7R/4})} \leq CR^{-n/2} \|\nabla h\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \leq CR^{-n/2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R})}.$$

Observing that

$$\partial_\alpha(A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta (u - h)^j) = \partial_\alpha(f_i^\alpha + (\bar{A} - A)_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta h^j) \quad \text{in } B_{2R}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(u - h)\|_{L^2(B_{3R/2})} &\leq C \left[ \|f\|_{L^2(B_{7R/4})} + \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^2(B_{7R/4})} \|\nabla h\|_{L^\infty(B_{7R/4})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + R^{-(n+2)/2} \|u - h\|_{L^1(B_{7R/4})} \right] \\ &\leq C \left[ \|f\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} + R^{-n/2} \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + R^{-(n+2)/2} \|u - h\|_{L^1(B_{2R})} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

To estimate  $\|u - h\|_{L^1(B_{2R})}$ , fix some  $t > 0$  and consider an auxiliary equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\beta(\bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \phi^i) &= \frac{(u - h)^j}{\sqrt{|u - h|^2 + t^2}} \quad \text{in } B_{2R}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \\ \phi &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_{2R}. \end{aligned}$$

Testing the above against  $u - h$ , we obtain

$$\int_{B_{2R}} \frac{|u - h|^2}{\sqrt{|u - h|^2 + t^2}} dx = \int_{B_{2R}} \bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \phi^i \partial_\beta (u - h)^j dx. \quad (2.3)$$

As  $u - h$  satisfies

$$\partial_\alpha (\bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta (u - h)^j) = \partial_\alpha (f_i^\alpha + (\bar{A} - A)_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u^j) \quad \text{in } B_{2R}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

we have

$$\int_{B_{2R}} \bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta (u - h)^j \partial_\alpha \phi^i dx = \int_{B_{2R}} (f_i^\alpha + (\bar{A} - A)_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u^j) \partial_\alpha \phi^i dx. \quad (2.4)$$

Inserting (2.4) into (2.3) and noting that  $\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} \leq CR$  (as  $|\partial_\beta (\bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \phi^i)| \leq 1$ ), we arrive at

$$\int_{B_{2R}} \frac{|u - h|^2}{\sqrt{|u - h|^2 + t^2}} dx \leq C \left[ R^{(n+2)/2} \|f\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} + R \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \right].$$

Noting that the constant  $C$  is independent of  $t$ , we may send  $t \rightarrow 0$  to obtain

$$\|u - h\|_{L^1(B_{2R})} \leq CR^{(n+2)/2} \left[ \|f\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} + R^{-n/2} \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R})} \right]. \quad (2.5)$$

The conclusion follows from (2.2) and (2.5).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.7.* We only need to give the proof for a fixed  $R$ , say  $R = 2$ . Our proof is inspired by that of [20].

In the proof,  $C$  denotes a generic positive constant which depends only on  $n$ ,  $N$ ,  $\Lambda$  and  $\lambda$ . In particular it is independent of the parameter  $k$  which will appear below. Also, we will simply write  $\omega$  instead of  $\omega_{A,2}$ .

Proof of (1.9): For  $k \geq 0$ , let  $R_k = 4^{-k}$ ,  $\bar{A}_k = (A)_{B_{2R_k}}$  and  $h_k \in H^1(B_{2R_k})$  be the solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha ((\bar{A}_k)_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta h_k^j) &= 0 \quad \text{in } B_{2R_k}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ h_k &= u \quad \text{on } \partial B_{2R_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $a_k = R_k^{-n/2} \|\nabla(u - h_k)\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})}$  and  $b_k = \|\nabla h_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_k})}$ .

Note that, by triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \leq R_k^{n/2} (a_k + b_k). \quad (2.6)$$



By elliptic estimates for  $h_k$ , we have

$$\|\nabla h_k\|_{L^2(B_{2R_k})} \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R_k})}, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\|\nabla h_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{3R_k/2})} \leq CR_k^{-n/2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R_k})}, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\|\nabla^2 h_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{3R_k/2})} + R_k\|\nabla^3 h_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{3R_k/2})} \leq CR_k^{-(n+2)/2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R_k})}. \quad (2.9)$$

By Lemma 2.1,

$$\|\nabla(u - h_k)\|_{L^2(B_{3R_k/2})} \leq C\omega(2R_k)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R_k})}. \quad (2.10)$$

By (2.10) and (2.7),

$$R_k^{n/2}(a_k + b_k) \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2R_k})}.$$

By (2.6) and (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(u - h_{k+1})\|_{L^2(B_{R_{k+1}})} &\leq C\omega(2R_k)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \\ &\leq C\omega(2R_k)R_k^{n/2}(a_k + b_k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$a_{k+1} \leq C\omega(2R_k)(a_k + b_k). \quad (2.11)$$

Next, we have by (2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(h_{k+1} - h_k)\|_{L^2(B_{3R_{k+1}/2})} &\leq \|\nabla(u - h_{k+1})\|_{L^2(B_{3R_{k+1}/2})} + \|\nabla(u - h_k)\|_{L^2(B_{3R_{k+1}/2})} \\ &\leq C\omega(2R_k)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \\ &\leq C\omega(2R_k)R_k^{n/2}(a_k + b_k). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that  $h_{k+1} - h_k$  satisfies

$$\partial_\alpha((\bar{A}_k)_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta(h_{k+1} - h_k)^j) = \partial_\alpha((\bar{A}_k - \bar{A}_{k+1})_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta h_{k+1}^j) \quad \text{in } B_{2R_{k+1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

we thus have by elliptic estimates and (2.8) and (2.9) (applied to  $h_{k+1}$ ) that

$$\|\nabla(h_{k+1} - h_k)\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_{k+1}})} \leq C\omega(2R_k)(a_k + b_k), \quad (2.12)$$

$$R_{k+1}\|\nabla^2(h_{k+1} - h_k)\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_{k+1}})} \leq C\omega(2R_k)(a_k + b_k). \quad (2.13)$$

By (2.12),

$$b_{k+1} \leq b_k + C\omega(2R_k)(a_k + b_k). \quad (2.14)$$

By (2.11) and (2.14), we have

$$a_{k+1} + b_{k+1} \leq (1 + C\omega(2R_k))(a_k + b_k).$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
a_k + b_k &\leq \prod_{j=0}^k (1 + C\omega(2R_j))(a_0 + b_0) \leq C \exp\left(C \sum_{j=0}^k \omega(2R_j)\right) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)} \\
&\leq C \exp\left(C \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt\right) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)}, \tag{2.15}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $\omega(t) \leq C\omega(s)$  whenever  $0 < t \leq s \leq 4t$ . We have thus shown that

$$\int_{B_{R_k}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq CR_k^n \exp\left(C \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt\right) \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 dx \text{ for } k \geq 0.$$

Estimate (1.9) is readily seen.

Proof of (1.10): We write

$$h_{R_k} = \sum_{j=0}^k w_j \text{ where } w_0 = h_{R_0} \text{ and } w_j = h_{R_j} - h_{R_{j-1}} \text{ for } j \geq 1.$$

Using the estimate  $\|\nabla^2 h_{R_0}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)}$  together with (2.13) and (2.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla h_{R_k}(x) - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)| &\leq C|x| \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{\omega(2R_j)}{R_j} \exp\left(C \int_{2R_j}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt\right) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)} \\
&\leq C|x| \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C \int_t^2 \frac{\omega(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)}, \tag{2.16}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have again used the fact that  $\omega(t) \leq C\omega(s)$  whenever  $0 < t \leq s \leq 4t$ . This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla h_{R_k} - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \\
&\leq CR_k^{(n+2)/2} \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C \int_t^2 \frac{\omega(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)}. \tag{2.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.17) with (2.10) and (2.15), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{R_k}\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} &\leq \|\nabla u - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \\
&\leq \|\nabla(u - \nabla h_{R_k})\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} + \|\nabla u - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \\
&\leq CR_k^{(n+2)/2} \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C \int_t^2 \frac{\omega(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)} \\
&\quad + CR_k^{n/2} \omega(2R_k) \exp\left(C \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt\right) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)}. \tag{2.18}
\end{aligned}$$

As  $\omega(2R_k) \leq C\omega(t)$  whenever  $2R_k \leq t \leq 4R_k$ , we have

$$\int_{2R_k}^{4R_k} \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C \int_t^2 \frac{\omega(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \geq \frac{\omega(2R_k)}{CR_k} \exp\left(C \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(s)}{s} ds\right)$$

Using this in (2.18), we deduce that for  $k \geq 1$  that

$$\|\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{R_k}\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \leq CR_k^{(n+2)/2} \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C \int_t^2 \frac{\omega(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_2)}.$$

Estimate (1.10) follows.

Proof of (1.11): We adjust the proof of (1.10) exploiting the fact that  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(B_2)$ . First, using the fact that  $a_k + b_k \leq CR_k^{n/2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)}$  in (2.13) we get instead of (2.16) the stronger estimate

$$|\nabla h_{R_k}(x) - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)| \leq C|x| \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)}, \quad (2.19)$$

and so

$$\|\nabla h_{R_k} - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \leq CR_k^{(n+2)/2} \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)}. \quad (2.20)$$

Combining (2.20) with (2.10), we get for  $k \geq 1$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{R_k}\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} &\leq \|\nabla u - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \\ &\leq \|\nabla(u - \nabla h_{R_k})\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} + \|\nabla u - \nabla h_{R_k}(0)\|_{L^2(B_{R_k})} \\ &\leq CR_k^{(n+2)/2} \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} \\ &\quad + CR_k^{n/2} \omega(2R_k) \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} \\ &\leq CR_k^{(n+2)/2} \int_{2R_k}^2 \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} dt \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

Estimate (1.11) follows.  $\square$

**Remark 2.2.** *If the Dini condition (1.4) or (1.5) holds, it can be seen from (2.12) that  $\{\nabla h_k(0)\}$  converges to some  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ , from which it follows that*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-n/2} \|\nabla u - P\|_{L^2(B_r)} = 0,$$

*yielding the continuity of  $\nabla u$  at the origin. We have thus recovered the results on the differentiability of  $H^1$  solutions of Brezis [2, 3] and Li [20].*

*Proof of Proposition 1.5.* We take  $N = 1$  and drop the indices  $i, j$  in the expression of  $A$  (so that  $A = (A^{\alpha\beta})$ ). Following [17, Lemma 2.1], we make the ansatz that

$$A^{\alpha\beta}(x) = \delta^{\alpha\beta} + a(|x|) \left( \delta^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{x^\alpha x^\beta}{|x|^2} \right),$$

$$u(x) = x^1 v(|x|).$$

Then

$$\partial_\alpha (A^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u) = x^1 \left( v''(|x|) + \frac{n+1}{|x|} v'(|x|) - \frac{n-1}{|x|^2} a(|x|) v(|x|) \right).$$

Selecting now

$$a(r) = -\frac{1 + n \ln \frac{64}{r}}{(n-1) \left( \ln \frac{64}{r} \right)^2 \ln \ln \frac{64}{r}},$$

$$v(r) = \ln \ln \frac{64}{r},$$

we see that  $A$  is continuous in  $\bar{B}_4$ , satisfies (1.2), (1.3) and  $u$  is an  $H^1$  solution of (1.1). The matrix  $A$  admits a modulus of continuity  $\bar{\omega}_A(t) \sim \frac{1}{\ln \frac{64}{t} \ln \ln \frac{64}{t}}$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$  and so (1.8) holds. It is readily seen that  $u \in W^{1,p}(B_4)$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\nabla u \in VMO(B_4)$  but  $\nabla u \notin L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(B_2)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.6.* Instead of the choice in the proof of Proposition 1.5, we now choose

$$a(r) = -\frac{\sin \ln \ln \ln \frac{64}{r} + \cos \ln \ln \ln \frac{64}{r} (1 + \ln \frac{64}{r} + n \ln \frac{64}{r} \ln \ln \frac{64}{r})}{(n-1) \left( \ln \frac{64}{r} \right)^2 \left( \ln \ln \frac{64}{r} \right)^2 (2 + \sin \ln \ln \frac{64}{r})},$$

$$v(r) = 2 + \sin \ln \ln \ln \frac{64}{r}.$$

It is readily checked that  $A$  is continuous in  $\bar{B}_4$ , satisfies (1.2), (1.3), (1.8) and  $u$  is an  $H^1$  solution of (1.1),  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(B_4) \cap VMO(B_4)$  but  $\nabla u \notin C(B_2)$ .  $\square$

Finally, we briefly touch on the validity of Theorem 1.1 when  $\omega_{A,2}$  is replaced by  $\omega_{A,p}$  for  $1 < p < 2$ . For this, we only need the following  $L^p$  version of Proposition 1.7.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $A = (A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})$  satisfy (1.2) and (1.3). Let  $1 < p < 2$ . Then there exist constants  $\gamma > 0$  and  $C_* > 0$  depending only on  $n, N, p, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$  such that, provided  $[A]_{BMO}(B_4) < \gamma$ , there hold for every  $u \in W^{1,p}(B_4)$  satisfying (1.1) and for  $0 < r \leq R/4 \leq 1/2$  that*

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq \frac{C_* r^n}{R^n} \exp \left( 2C_* \int_{2r}^R \frac{\omega_{A,p}(t)}{t} dt \right) \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^p dx, \quad (2.22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_r|^p dx &\leq \frac{C_* r^{n+2}}{R^n} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^p dx \times \\ &\times \left\{ \int_{2r}^R \frac{\omega_{A,p}(t)}{t^2} \exp\left(C_* \int_t^R \frac{\omega_{A,p}(s)}{s} ds\right) dt \right\}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

where  $(\nabla u)_r = \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \nabla u dx$  for  $0 < r \leq 2$ .

Moreover, if  $u \in W^{1,\infty}(B_4)$ , then, for  $0 < r \leq R/4 \leq 1/2$ ,

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_r|^p dx \leq \frac{C_* r^{n+2}}{R^n} \left\{ \int_{2r}^R \frac{\omega_{A,p}(t)}{t^2} dt \right\}^2 \sup_{B_R} |\nabla u|^p. \quad (2.24)$$

The proof of Proposition 2.3 is the same as that of Proposition 1.7, but now using the following harmonic replacement estimate:

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $1 < p < 2$ . Let  $A, \bar{A}$  satisfy (1.2) and (1.3) with  $\bar{A}$  being constant in  $B_4$  and  $f = (f_i^\alpha) \in L^{p'}(B_4)$ . Let  $R \in (0, 1)$  and suppose  $u, h \in W^{1,p}(B_{4R})$  satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha(A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u^j) &= \partial_\alpha f_i^\alpha \quad \text{in } B_{3R}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \partial_\alpha(\bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta h^j) &= 0 \quad \text{in } B_{2R}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ u &= h \quad \text{on } \partial B_{2R}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there exist constants  $\gamma > 0$  and  $C > 0$  depending only on  $n, N, p, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$  such that, provided  $[A]_{BMO(B_{4R})} \leq \gamma$ ,

$$\|\nabla(u - h)\|_{L^p(B_{3R/2})} \leq C \left[ R^{n(1/p-1/p')} \|f\|_{L^{p'}(B_{3R})} + R^{-n/p} \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^p(B_{3R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(B_{3R})} \right].$$

*Proof.* We amend the proof of Lemma 2.1 using  $L^p$  theories for elliptic systems whose leading coefficients have small  $BMO$  semi-norm.<sup>2</sup> In the proof,  $C$  denotes a generic positive constant which depends only on  $n, N, p, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$ .

It is known that (see e.g. Dong and Kim [10, 11])<sup>3</sup>, provided  $[A]_{BMO(B_{4R})} \leq \gamma$  for some small enough  $\gamma$  depending only on  $n, N, p, \Lambda$  and  $\lambda$ , one has

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{p'}(B_{2R})} \leq C \left[ \|f\|_{L^{p'}(B_{3R})} + R^{n(1/p'-1/p)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(B_{3R})} \right]. \quad (2.25)$$

Using that  $\bar{A}$  is constant, we have by standard elliptic estimates that

$$\|\nabla h\|_{L^\infty(B_{7R/4})} \leq CR^{-n/p} \|\nabla h\|_{L^p(B_{2R})} \leq CR^{-n/p} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(B_{2R})}.$$

<sup>2</sup>When  $p$  is close to 2 such smallness assumption is not needed, see e.g. [6, 25].

<sup>3</sup>For further references, see [4, 5, 8, 18, 25].

Using

$$\partial_\alpha(A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta(u-h)^j) = \partial_\alpha(f_i^\alpha + (\bar{A} - A)_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta h^j) \quad \text{in } B_{2R}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

and once again the fact that  $[A]_{BMO(B_{4R})} \leq \gamma$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(u-h)\|_{L^p(B_{3R/2})} &\leq C \left[ \|f\|_{L^p(B_{7R/4})} + \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^p(B_{7R/4})} \|\nabla h\|_{L^\infty(B_{7R/4})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + R^{-(n+p')/p'} \|u-h\|_{L^1(B_{7R/4})} \right] \\ &\leq C \left[ R^{n(1/p-1/p')} \|f\|_{L^{p'}(B_{2R})} + R^{-n/p} \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^p(B_{2R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(B_{2R})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + R^{-(n+p')/p'} \|u-h\|_{L^1(B_{2R})} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

To estimate  $\|u-h\|_{L^1(B_{2R})}$ , recall from the proof of Lemma 2.1 the chain of identities

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{2R}} \frac{|u-h|^2}{\sqrt{|u-h|^2+t^2}} dx &= \int_{B_{2R}} \bar{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \phi^i \partial_\beta (u-h)^j dx \\ &= \int_{B_{2R}} (f_i^\alpha + (\bar{A} - A)_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u^j) \partial_\alpha \phi^i dx, \end{aligned}$$

which imply

$$\int_{B_{2R}} \frac{|u-h|^2}{\sqrt{|u-h|^2+t^2}} dx \leq C \left[ R^{(n+p)/p} \|f\|_{L^{p'}(B_{2R})} + R \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^p(B_{2R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p'}(B_{2R})} \right].$$

Noting that the constant  $C$  is independent of  $t$ , we may send  $t \rightarrow 0$  to obtain

$$\|u-h\|_{L^1(B_{2R})} \leq CR^{(n+p)/p} \left[ \|f\|_{L^{p'}(B_{2R})} + R^{-n/p} \|A - \bar{A}\|_{L^p(B_{2R})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p'}(B_{2R})} \right]. \quad (2.27)$$

The conclusion follows from (2.25), (2.26) and (2.27).  $\square$

## References

- [1] P. ACQUISTAPACE, *On BMO regularity for linear elliptic systems*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), 161 (1992), pp. 231–269.
- [2] H. BREZIS, *On a conjecture of J. Serrin*, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl., 19 (2008), pp. 335–338.

- [3] H. BREZIS, *Solution of a conjecture by J. Serrin* in A. ANCONA, *Elliptic operators, conormal derivatives and positive parts of functions*, J. Funct. Anal., 257 (2009), pp. 2124–2158.
- [4] S.-S. BYUN, *Elliptic equations with BMO coefficients in Lipschitz domains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 357 (2005), pp. 1025–1046.
- [5] S.-S. BYUN AND L. WANG, *Elliptic equations with BMO coefficients in Reifenberg domains*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 57 (2004), pp. 1283–1310.
- [6] L. A. CAFFARELLI AND I. PERAL, *On  $W^{1,p}$  estimates for elliptic equations in divergence form*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 51 (1998), pp. 1–21.
- [7] S. CAMPANATO, *Equazioni ellittiche del II° ordine e spazi  $\mathcal{L}^{(2,\lambda)}$* , Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), 69 (1965), pp. 321–381.
- [8] G. DI FAZIO,  *$L^p$  estimates for divergence form elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. A (7), 10 (1996), pp. 409–420.
- [9] H. DONG, L. ESCAURIAZA, AND S. KIM, *On  $C^1$ ,  $C^2$ , and weak type-(1,1) estimates for linear elliptic operators: part II*, Math. Ann., 370 (2018), pp. 447–489.
- [10] H. DONG AND D. KIM, *Parabolic and elliptic systems with VMO coefficients*, Methods Appl. Anal., 16 (2009), pp. 365–388.
- [11] ———, *Elliptic equations in divergence form with partially BMO coefficients*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 196 (2010), pp. 25–70.
- [12] H. DONG AND S. KIM, *On  $C^1$ ,  $C^2$ , and weak type-(1,1) estimates for linear elliptic operators*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 42 (2017), pp. 417–435.
- [13] M. GIAQUINTA, *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems*, vol. 105 of Annals of Mathematics Studies, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983.
- [14] R. A. HAGER AND J. ROSS, *A regularity theorem for linear second order elliptic divergence equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3), 26 (1972), pp. 283–290.
- [15] P. HARTMAN AND A. WINTNER, *On uniform Dini conditions in the theory of linear partial differential equations of elliptic type*, Amer. J. Math., 77 (1955), pp. 329–354.

- [16] Q. HUANG, *Estimates on the generalized Morrey spaces  $L_{\phi}^{2,\lambda}$  and  $BMO_{\psi}$  for linear elliptic systems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 45 (1996), pp. 397–439.
- [17] T. JIN, V. MAZ'YA, AND J. VAN SCHAFTINGEN, *Pathological solutions to elliptic problems in divergence form with continuous coefficients*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 347 (2009), pp. 773–778.
- [18] N. V. KRYLOV, *Parabolic and elliptic equations with VMO coefficients*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 32 (2007), pp. 453–475.
- [19] Y. LI AND L. NIRENBERG, *Estimates for elliptic systems from composite material*, vol. 56, 2003, pp. 892–925. Dedicated to the memory of Jürgen K. Moser.
- [20] Y. Y. LI, *On the  $C^1$  regularity of solutions to divergence form elliptic systems with Dini-continuous coefficients*, Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B, 38 (2017), pp. 489–496.
- [21] G. M. LIEBERMAN, *Hölder continuity of the gradient of solutions of uniformly parabolic equations with conormal boundary conditions*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), 148 (1987), pp. 77–99.
- [22] V. MAZ'YA AND R. MCOWEN, *Differentiability of solutions to second-order elliptic equations via dynamical systems*, J. Differential Equations, 250 (2011), pp. 1137–1168.
- [23] C. B. MORREY, JR., *Second-order elliptic systems of differential equations*, in Contributions to the theory of partial differential equations, Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 33, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1954, pp. 101–159.
- [24] J. SERRIN, *Pathological solutions of elliptic differential equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3), 18 (1964), pp. 385–387.
- [25] B. STROFFOLINI, *Elliptic systems of PDE with BMO-coefficients*, Potential Anal., 15 (2001), pp. 285–299.