

STRESS CONCENTRATION FOR NONLINEAR INSULATED CONDUCTIVITY PROBLEM WITH ADJACENT INCLUSIONS

QIONGLEI CHEN AND ZHIWEN ZHAO

ABSTRACT. A high-contrast two-phase nonlinear composite material with adjacent inclusions of m -convex shapes is considered for $m > 2$. The mathematical formulation consists of the insulated conductivity problem with p -Laplace operator in \mathbb{R}^d for $p > 1$ and $d \geq 2$. The stress, which is the gradient of the solution, always blows up with respect to the distance ε between two inclusions as ε goes to zero. We first establish the pointwise upper bound on the gradient possessing the singularity of order $\varepsilon^{-\beta}$ with $\beta = (1 - \alpha)/m$ for some $\alpha \geq 0$, where $\alpha = 0$ if $d = 2$ and $\alpha > 0$ if $d \geq 3$. In particular, we give a quantitative description for the range of horizontal length of the narrow channel in the process of establishing the gradient estimates, which provides a clear understanding for the applied techniques and methods. For $d \geq 2$, we further construct a supersolution to sharpen the upper bound with any $\beta > (d + m - 2)/(m(p - 1))$ when $p > d + m - 1$. Finally, a subsolution is also constructed to show the almost optimality of the blow-up rate $\varepsilon^{-1/\max\{p-1, m\}}$ in the presence of curvilinear squares. This fact reveals a novel dichotomy phenomena that the singularity of the gradient is uniquely determined by one of the convexity parameter m and the nonlinear exponent p except for the critical case of $p = m + 1$ in two dimensions.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and motivation. This work is devoted to studying the stress concentration phenomena appearing in high-contrast composite materials whose constituents comprise of densely packed fibers and the matrix with significantly different properties. Our initial interest was motivated by the problem of material failure initiation, which has been paid great attention due to its extensive engineering applications. High-contrast composites with close-to-touching fibers can be described by elliptic equations and systems with discontinuous coefficients. The problem of quantitatively characterizing the behavior of the stress, which is the gradient of the solution, was first proposed in the famous work [3] in relation to numerical analysis of damage initiation and growth in fiber-reinforced composites. From the view of mathematics, one may represent the background matrix by a bounded domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 2$) with $C^{1,1}$ boundary, whose interior contains two $C^{1,1}$ inclusions D_1 and D_2 . These two inclusions are ε apart and far from the external boundary ∂D , where ε is a sufficiently small positive constant. Denote $\Omega := D \setminus \overline{D_1 \cup D_2}$. A scalar mathematical model of high-contrast two-phase composite materials is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(a_k(x)|\nabla u_k|^{p-2}\nabla u_k) = 0, & \text{in } D, \\ u_k = \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Date: June 7, 2023.

where $u_k \in W^{1,p}(D)$, $p > 1$, $\varphi \in C^{1,1}(\partial D)$, and

$$a_k(x) = \begin{cases} k \in (0, \infty), & \text{in } D_1 \cup D_2, \\ 1, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

This model is also called the conductivity model and k is called the conductivity. When $p = 2$, it describes a linear background medium and in this case the gradient of the solution has been proved to be bounded independently of the distance ε , see [7, 34]. Li and Nirenberg [33] further extended the results to general divergence form elliptic systems with piecewise Hölder continuous coefficients, which completely demonstrates the numerical observation in [3]. For more studies on the finite coefficients, see [8, 13, 17, 26] and the references therein. However, when the background matrix is nonlinear, to the best of our knowledge, there has not been any corresponding result for problem (1.1) with $p \neq 2$.

When the conductivity k degenerates to be zero or infinity, the situation becomes very different. The key feature of the conductivity problem with degenerate conductivities is that the stress always exhibits singular behavior with respect to the distance between two inclusions. Observe that applying the proofs in the appendixes of [5, 6] with minor modification, we obtain that by sending $k \rightarrow 0$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$, the solution sequence $\{u_k\}$ of the original problem (1.1) converges weakly in $W^{1,p}$ to the solution u of the following insulated and perfect conductivity problems

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial D_i, i = 1, 2, \\ u = \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = C_i, & \text{on } \partial D_i, i = 1, 2, \\ \int_{\partial D_i} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \\ u = \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

respectively, where C_i , $i = 1, 2$ are the free constants determined by the third line of (1.3) and ν is the unit outer normal to the domain. From the degenerate elliptic regularity theory in [29], we know that the regularity of weak solution u to problem (1.2) or (1.3) can be improved to be of $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. With regard to the linear perfect conductivity problem (1.3) with $p = 2$, there has been a long series of literature involving different techniques and methods to study the singular behavior of the gradient. The principal result is that for two strictly convex inclusions, the gradient blow-up rate has been revealed to be

$$\rho_d(\varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{-1/2}, & \text{if } d = 2, \\ |\varepsilon \ln \varepsilon|^{-1}, & \text{if } d = 3, \\ \varepsilon^{-1}, & \text{if } d \geq 4, \end{cases}$$

see [1, 2, 4, 5, 25, 40, 41] for $d = 2$, [5, 6, 28, 37] for $d = 3$, and [5] for $d \geq 4$, respectively. It is worth emphasizing that the gradient blow-up rate for the perfect conductivity problem only depends on the dimension, but not on the curvatures of interfacial boundaries of inclusions. This is greatly different from the insulated conductivity problem. Specifically, Dong, Li and Yang [15] found that for $p = 2$ and $d \geq 3$, the optimal blow-up rate is in close touch with the first non-zero eigenvalue of

a divergence form elliptic operator on \mathbb{S}^{d-2} , which is determined by the relative principal curvatures of the insulators. When the relative principal curvatures of these two inclusions keep the same (see [14]), the blow-up rate is more explicit and of order $\varepsilon^{-1/2+\beta}$ with $\beta = [-(d-1) + \sqrt{(d-1)^2 + 4(d-2)}]/4$. For a special case of two spherical insulators in three dimensions, Yun revealed the blow-up rate in the earlier work [42] by establishing the optimal gradient estimates in the shortest segment between two inclusions. For two unit balls in dimensions greater than three, Weinkove [39] developed a clear and concise procedure to obtain an explicit blow-up rate by constructing an appropriate auxiliary function, although it is not optimal. Regarding the case when one insulator is in close proximity to the matrix boundary, see [38]. As for the case of $d = 2$, the singularity of the gradient in the linear case has been made clear about two decades ago in [1, 2].

However, the techniques and methods developed in these above-mentioned work are mainly used to deal with the linear problems. There makes no progress on the study of nonlinear case until Gorb and Novikov [23] constructed the explicit upper and lower barriers of the solution to the nonlinear perfect conductivity problem (1.3). These barrier functions precisely capture the singularities of the gradient. The subsequent work [9, 10] completed by Ciruolo and Sciammetta further extended the results to the anisotropic perfect conductivity problem modeled by the Finsler p -Laplacian. Their results showed that for $d \geq 2$,

$$|\nabla u| \sim \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{-\frac{d-1}{2(p-1)}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{d+1}{2}, \\ \varepsilon^{-1} |\ln \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}, & \text{if } p = \frac{d+1}{2}, \\ \varepsilon^{-1}, & \text{if } p < \frac{d+1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Recently, Dong, Yang and Zhu [16] made a breakthrough in the investigation on stress concentration for the nonlinear insulated conductivity problem (1.2). In the presence of two adjacent strictly convex insulators, they first used mean oscillation estimates to establish the pointwise gradient estimate with the upper bound depending on the height of the narrow region and the local oscillation of the solution. Subsequently, the upper bound was further improved at the sacrifice of the oscillation in a little larger domain by establishing the Krylov-Safonov Harnack inequality in the narrow region. However, the blow-up exponent in the improved gradient estimate is still not explicit. So they continued to construct a supersolution to capture an explicit blow-up rate of the gradient in all dimensions and meanwhile verified the almost optimality of the blow-up rate in two dimensions by providing an explicit subsolution. For the purpose of achieving these above results, a lot of techniques and tools, such as the flattening map, the rescale argument, the extension theory, the comparison estimates, the iterate scheme and the Harnack inequality, are involved. We here would like to point out that the key to understanding their proofs lies in making clear the required range of the value for horizontal length of the thin gap in the process of applying these techniques and tools. In their proofs, the horizontal length of the narrow region is only assumed to be small. So one of our major objectives in this paper is to give a quantitative description for the range of the length of the narrow channel, which greatly contributes to the readers' understanding on the employed idea and techniques. Moreover, we extend their results to the general m -convex inclusions (see the definition in Subsection 1.2), especially including curvilinear squares with rounded-off angles which are frequently used to design the optimal shape of insulated composites. In fact, we see from [36, 44, 45]

that the blow-up rate exponent will decrease to zero as the convexity exponent m increases to infinity. From the view of geometry, the increase of the convexity exponent m implies that the interfacial boundaries of two adjacent insulators in the narrow region become more and more flat. Besides the local m -convex structures, the whole concentric core-shell structure has been revealed to be another type of optimal insulation shape of composite materials in [43]. In addition, the two-dimensional results obtained in this paper reveal a novel blow-up phenomena that contrary to the case of $p < m + 1$, the singular behavior of the gradient in the case of $p > m + 1$ is completely determined by the nonlinear degree exponent p , but independent of the convexity exponent m which characterizes the geometrical feature of the thin gap. Then the case of $p = m + 1$ can be called the critical case according to the dichotomy blow-up phenomena.

1.2. Assumptions and main results. In order to properly state the major results, we first introduce some notations and parameterize the domain. After appropriate shifting and rotation of the coordinate, we suppose that D_1 and D_2 are translations of the following two touching inclusions

$$D_1 := D_1^* + (0', \varepsilon/2), \quad \text{and } D_2 := D_2^* + (0', -\varepsilon/2),$$

where D_i^* , $i = 1, 2$ satisfy

$$D_i^* \subset \{(x', x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (-1)^{i+1} x_d > 0\}, \quad \text{and } \partial D_1^* \cap \partial D_2^* = \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Here and below, we denote $(d - 1)$ -dimensional variables and domains by adding superscript prime (for instance, x' and B').

For some constant $R_0 > 0$ independent of ε , let the portions of ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 near the origin be, respectively, the graphs of two C^m functions $\varepsilon/2 + h_1(x')$ and $-\varepsilon/2 + h_2(x')$, and h_i , $i = 1, 2$ satisfy that for $m \geq 2$,

$$\text{(H1)} \quad \kappa_1 |x'|^m \leq h_1(x') - h_2(x') \leq \kappa_2 |x'|^m, \quad \text{if } x' \in B'_{2R_0},$$

$$\text{(H2)} \quad |\nabla_{x'} h_i(x')| \leq \kappa_3 |x'|^{m-1}, \quad \text{if } x' \in B'_{2R_0},$$

$$\text{(H3)} \quad \|h_1\|_{C^m(B'_{2R_0})} + \|h_2\|_{C^m(B'_{2R_0})} \leq \kappa_4,$$

where κ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are four positive ε -independent constants, $C^m := C^{[m], m-[m]}$ with $[m]$ representing the integer part of m . Remark that the parameter m is introduced to describe the convexity feature of interfacial boundaries of the insulators. Especially when $m > 2$, the curvatures of the interfacial boundaries degenerate to be zero at the points $(0', \pm\varepsilon/2)$ of the shortest distance between two inclusions which are also called the planar points.

We denote by $B_r(x)$ the ball of radius r centered at x and set

$$B_r = B_r(0), \quad \Omega_r(x) = \Omega \cap B_r(x).$$

For $z' \in B'_{R_0}$, $0 < t \leq 2R_0$, define a narrow channel by

$$\Omega_{z', t} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |x' - z'| < t, -\varepsilon/2 + h_2(x') < x_d < \varepsilon/2 + h_1(x')\}.$$

For simplicity, write $\Omega_t := \Omega_{0', t}$ if $z' = 0'$. Its upper and lower boundaries are, respectively, represented by

$$\Gamma_t^+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_d = \varepsilon/2 + h_1(x'), |x'| < t\},$$

and

$$\Gamma_t^- := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_d = -\varepsilon/2 + h_2(x'), |x'| < t\}.$$

For $x \in B'_{2R_0}$, define

$$\delta := \delta(x') = \varepsilon + h_1(x') - h_2(x'). \quad (1.4)$$

From the classical $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates and the maximum principle (see, for example, [22, 29]), we know

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{R_0})} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,1}(\partial D)}.$$

This means that it only needs to estimate $|\nabla u|$ in the narrow channel Ω_{R_0} . Then we reduce the original problem (1.2) to the problem in the neck as follows:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_{2R_0}, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

Introduce the following five constants:

$$c_0 = \kappa_1^{-1/m} \min\{1, 2^{-(m+1)} \kappa_1 \kappa_3^{-1}\}, \quad (1.6)$$

$$\tilde{c}_0 = \kappa_1^{-1/m} \min\{1, \kappa_1 \kappa_3^{-1} (51840 + 4^{m+1})^{-1/2}\}, \quad (1.7)$$

$$R_{0,1} = 2^{-\frac{m}{m-1}} (\kappa_2 \kappa_3)^{-\frac{1}{2m-2}} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{(\kappa_1^{1/m} c_0)^{\frac{1}{2m-2}}}{2^{\frac{1}{m-1}}}, \frac{(\kappa_1 \kappa_3^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2m-2}}}{2^{\frac{2m-1}{2m-2}}} \right\}, \quad (1.8)$$

$$R_{0,2} = \min\{2^{-\frac{2m+1}{2m-1}} \kappa_3^{-\frac{1}{m-1}}, (\sqrt{2} \kappa_2 \kappa_4 (d-1)^2)^{-\frac{1}{m}}\}, \quad (1.9)$$

$$R_{0,3} = \left(\frac{12}{13} \tilde{c}_0 \mu_0^{j_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \kappa_2^{-1/m}, \quad (1.10)$$

where $j_0 = \lceil \frac{6d}{\min\{p, 2\}} \rceil + 1$ and μ_0 is given by (2.59) below. The first main result is listed as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $D_1, D_2 \subset D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 2$) are defined as above, conditions (H1)–(H3) hold. Let $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R_0})$ be the solution of (1.5) with $p > 1$. If $0 < R_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} R_{0,i}$, then for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega_{R_0}$,*

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^m)^{-1/m} \underset{\Omega_{x',\varrho}}{\operatorname{osc}} u, \quad \varrho = \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{3} \delta^{1/m}, \quad (1.11)$$

where $C = C(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$, δ and \tilde{c}_0 are, respectively, defined by (1.4) and (1.7).

Remark 1.2. Observe from (1.11) that the upper bound comprises of the blow-up term $(\varepsilon + |x'|^m)^{-1/m}$ and the oscillation term $\underset{\Omega_{x',\varrho}}{\operatorname{osc}} u$. The oscillation term is actually a small term due to the boundness of the solution u and the smallness of oscillation domain $\Omega_{x',\varrho}$. Then in the following we aim to extract the remaining decay rate exponent from this oscillation term.

Remark 1.3. We now give some explanations for the implications of these parameters introduced in (1.6)–(1.10). First, the constants c_0 and \tilde{c}_0 are geometrical quantities which are used to characterize the height equivalence between $\delta(x')$ and other height lines in the thin gap $\Omega_{x',\varrho}$, see (2.3) below. Second, the values of horizontal length parameters $R_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ of the thin gap are gradually determined in the process of establishing the pointwise gradient estimate, which represent the valid scope of the techniques and methods employed in this paper. Furthermore, there are some distinct differences for their values. To be specific, $R_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2$

are two geometrical quantities independent of the equation, while the dependence of $R_{0,3}$ is more comprehensive and its value depends on $d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_4$, that is, $R_{0,3}$ is determined by the domain and p -Laplace equation, which can be regarded as the most important parameter to ensure the validity in terms of applications of the techniques and methods.

For any fixed $0 < R_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} R_{0,i}$ and $0 < \beta < 1$, we define the following constants:

$$r_{0,1} = \min \left\{ 2^{1/m}, \frac{2}{3} R_0 \right\}, \quad (1.12)$$

$$r_{0,2} = \left(\frac{\min\{1, 4^{-(m+1)} \kappa_1\}}{\kappa_2(\kappa_3 + \kappa_4) + \kappa_3(\kappa_3 + 1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \begin{cases} \frac{6^{-\frac{m+2}{m-1}}}{(d-1)^{\frac{m-1}{2}}}, & \text{if } 2 \leq m < 3, \\ 4^{-\frac{m}{m-1}}, & \text{if } m \geq 3, \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

$$r_{0,3} = 2^{-\frac{3(m+1)}{m-1}} (\kappa_1 \kappa_3^{-1})^{\frac{1}{m-1}}, \quad r_{0,4} = \frac{\min\{R_0^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}}, 2^{-\frac{1}{\beta}}\}}{\tilde{c}_0 (2\kappa_2)^{1/m}}, \quad (1.14)$$

where \tilde{c}_0 is given by (1.7). For $d \geq 3$, the upper bound in (1.11) can be further improved as follows.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $D_1, D_2 \subset D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 3$) be defined as above and conditions (H1)–(H3) hold. Assume that $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R_0})$ is the solution of (1.5) with $p > 1$. For any fixed $0 < R_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} R_{0,i}$ and $0 < \beta < 1$, if $0 < r_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 4} r_{0,i}$, then for a arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega_{r_0}$, there exist two positive constants $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $C > 0$ depending only on d, m, p, κ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ such that*

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^m)^{\frac{\beta\gamma-1}{m}} \underset{\Omega_{x', \tilde{\rho}^{1-\beta}}}{\text{osc}} u, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \tilde{c}_0 \delta^{1/m}, \quad (1.15)$$

where δ and \tilde{c}_0 are defined by (1.4) and (1.7), respectively.

As shown in Theorem 1.4, although the upper bound on the gradient has been improved, its blow-up exponent is still not clear. So in the next theorem we aim to obtain the explicit gradient blow-up rate. For that purpose, we prepare to consider a class of axisymmetric insulators, whose upper and lower boundaries of the narrow region are, respectively, formulated as follows: for $i = 1, 2$ and $|x'| < \tilde{r}_0$,

$$x_d = (-1)^{i+1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + h(x') \right) = (-1)^{i+1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \lambda |x'|^m + O(|x'|^{m+\sigma_0}) \right), \quad (1.16)$$

where \tilde{r}_0, λ and σ_0 are three positive constants independent of ε . Here $O(1)$ represents that $|O(1)| \leq C_0$ for some ε -independent constant $C_0 > 0$ which may depend on d, m, σ_0 and \tilde{r}_0 . We further assume that the derivative of $h(x')$ satisfies

$$\partial_{x_i} h(x') = m \lambda x_i |x'|^{m-2} + O(|x'|^{m-1+\sigma_0}), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, d-1. \quad (1.17)$$

The prototypes of these two insulators under such assumptions are two axisymmetric ellipsoids as follows:

$$|x'|^m + |x_d - \varepsilon/2 - \tilde{r}_0|^m = \tilde{r}_0^m, \quad \text{and } |x'|^m + |x_d + \varepsilon/2 + \tilde{r}_0|^m = \tilde{r}_0^m. \quad (1.18)$$

Here \tilde{r}_0 is called the radius of ellipsoids. In particular, when $m > 2$ and $d = 2$, the shapes of insulators resembling curvilinear squares with rounded-off angles.

Applying Taylor expansion to (1.18), we reformulate the top and bottom boundaries of the thin gap as follows: for $|x'| < \tilde{r}_0$,

$$x_d = (-1)^{i+1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{1}{m\tilde{r}_0^{m-1}} |x'|^m \right) + O(|x'|^{2m}), \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

When $p > d + m - 1$, we improve the upper bounds in Theorems 1.1 and 1.4 as follows.

Theorem 1.5. *For $d \geq 2$, $m > 2$ and $p > d + m - 1$, let $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{\tilde{r}_0})$ be the solution of (1.5) with $\Gamma_{\tilde{r}_0}^{\pm}$ given by (1.16). Then for any $0 < \tau < \frac{1}{2}(p + 1 - d - m)$, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small,*

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^m)^{-\frac{d+m-2+2\tau}{m(p-1)}}, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_{\tilde{r}_0}, \quad (1.19)$$

where $C = C(d, m, p, \tau, \lambda, \sigma_0, \tilde{r}_0)$.

Remark 1.6. First, the blow-up rate $\varepsilon^{-\frac{d+m-2+2\tau}{m(p-1)}}$ is more explicit than that in (1.15). Second, since $0 < \tau < \frac{1}{2}(p + 1 - d - m)$, then the blow-up rate $\varepsilon^{-\frac{d+m-2+2\tau}{m(p-1)}}$ is less than $\varepsilon^{-1/m}$, which sharpens the result of $p > d + m - 1$ in Theorem 1.1.

Remark 1.7. From (1.19), we see that for any fixed $d \geq 2$ and $m > 2$, the gradient blow-up rate will decrease as the nonlinear exponent p increases. This indicates that nonlinear composite materials are generally superior to linear composites from the perspective of reducing stress concentration. In summary, in order to improve the properties of composite materials with closely located fibers, we should choose curvilinear squares and cubes as the shapes of fibers and embed them in the nonlinear matrix. Meanwhile, we weaken the convexity of interfacial boundaries of fibers and enhance the nonlinear degree of the matrix as much as possible.

Remark 1.8. Unlike Theorems 1.1 and 1.4, the results corresponding to the case of $m = 2$ cannot be directly obtained by sending $m \rightarrow 2$ in the proofs of Theorems 1.5 and 1.9. In fact, a close inspection of the proofs shows that the adapted constructions for explicit supersolution and subsolution in the case of $m > 2$ make the computations quite different from that of $m = 2$, see Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3 for the finer details.

For $d = 2$, we also demonstrate the almost optimality of the gradient blow-up rates captured in Theorem 1.1 for $1 < p \leq m + 1$ and Theorem 1.5 for $p > m + 1$ by establishing the lower bounds as follows.

Theorem 1.9. *For $d = 2$ and $m > 2$, Let $D := B_5$ and D_i , $i = 1, 2$ be given by (1.18) with $\tilde{r}_0 = 1$. For $p > 1$, suppose that $u \in W^{1,p}(D)$ is the solution of (1.2) with $\varphi = x_1$ on ∂D . Then for any $\tau \in (0, m - 2)$ and a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,*

(i) if $1 < p \leq m + 1$,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{(4m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}})} \geq \frac{1}{C} \varepsilon^{\frac{\tau-1}{m}}; \quad (1.20)$$

(ii) if $p > m + 1$,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{(4m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}})} \geq \frac{1}{C} \varepsilon^{\frac{2\tau-m}{m(p-1)}}, \quad (1.21)$$

where $C = C(m, p, \tau)$.

Remark 1.10. First, a combination of (1.11) and (1.20) yields that the blow-up rate $\varepsilon^{-1/m}$ is almost optimal when $1 < p \leq m + 1$. Second, combining (1.19) and (1.21), we prove the almost sharpness of the blow-up rate $\varepsilon^{-1/(p-1)}$ when $p > m + 1$. These two facts show a bifurcation phenomena that when $p \neq m + 1$, the gradient blow-up rate depends only on one of the nonlinear exponent p and the convexity parameter m . Therefore, the case of $p = m + 1$ can be regarded as the critical case.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1 by establishing mean oscillation estimates on the gradient. Section 3 is devoted to proving Theorem 1.4 by considering a smooth approximating equation which reduces the original problem to the establishment of the Krylov-Safonov Harnack inequality for a second-order uniformly elliptic equation of non-divergence form. In Section 4, we aim to construct explicit supersolution and subsolution to complete the proofs of Theorems 1.5 and 1.9.

2. POINTWISE UPPER BOUND ON THE GRADIENT

From classical elliptic regularity theory and Caccioppoli inequality, we know that for any $B_R(\bar{x}) \subset \Omega$ and $0 < r < \frac{R}{2}$, there has pointwise gradient estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u(\bar{x})| &\leq C(d, p) \left(\int_{B_r(\bar{x})} |\nabla u|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \frac{C(d, p)}{r} \left(\int_{B_{2r}(\bar{x})} \left| u(x) - \int_{B_{2r}(\bar{x})} u \right|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \frac{C(d, p)}{r} \text{osc}_{B_{2r}(\bar{x})} u, \end{aligned}$$

where $\int_{B_r(\bar{x})} := \frac{1}{|B_r(\bar{x})|} \int_{B_r(\bar{x})}$. However, the considered domain in this paper is a narrow region such that we cannot directly use this way to achieve the pointwise gradient estimate with explicit dependence on the height of thin gap. To overcome this difficulty, we first locally flatten the boundary of the narrow region and then carry out the even extension and periodic extension for the transformed equation. Therefore, we have enough space to establish mean oscillation decay estimates on the gradient, which is critical to the establishment of the desired pointwise gradient estimates.

For any given point $x_0 = (x'_0, x_d) \in \Omega_{R_0}$, write

$$\delta_0 := \delta(x'_0) = \varepsilon + h_1(x'_0) - h_2(x'_0). \quad (2.1)$$

Observe that there appears at most three cases in terms of the relations between ball $B_r(x_0)$ and the top and bottom boundaries $\Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$ of the narrow region Ω_{2R_0} , as the radius r varies from small to large. To be specific,

Case 1. $B_r(x_0)$ has no intersection with $\Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$ for small r ;

Case 2. $B_r(x_0)$ only intersects one of $\Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$ for intermediate r ;

Case 3. $B_r(x_0)$ intersects both $\Gamma_{2R_0}^+$ and $\Gamma_{2R_0}^-$ for large r .

It is worth pointing out that the second case will not occur if the narrow region is symmetric and x_0 is the midpoint of the height δ_0 . The first case implies that $B_r(x_0)$ is contained in the thin gap Ω_{2R_0} , which leads to the following interior mean

oscillation decay estimate. For $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R_0})$ and $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_{2R_0}$, denote

$$\phi(x_0, r) := \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{B_r(x_0)}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then we have

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 in [16]). *Assume that $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R_0})$ is a solution of problem (1.5). Then there exist two constants $C_0 = C_0(d, p) > 1$ and $0 < \alpha = \alpha(d, p) < 1$ such that for any $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_{2R_0}$, $\rho \in (0, r]$,*

$$\phi(x_0, \rho) \leq C_0 \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^\alpha \phi(x_0, r). \quad (2.2)$$

This implies that for any $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_{2R_0}$, $\mu \in (0, \mu_1)$, $\mu_1 = \min\{(2C_0)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}, 1\}$, and $0 \leq i_0 < j$,

$$\sum_{k=i_0}^j \phi(x_0, \mu^k r) \leq 2\phi(x_0, \mu^{i_0} r).$$

Remark 2.2. We here would like to point out that the interior mean oscillation estimates in (2.2) under different exponents can be, respectively, seen in Theorem 5 of [12], Theorem 3.3 of [18] and Lemma 5.1 of [30].

From Lemma 2.1, we see that there is no restriction on the value of the length parameter R_0 of the narrow region Ω_{2R_0} in terms of the establishment of interior mean oscillation estimate (2.2). However, when $B_r(x_0)$ intersects at least one of $\Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$, we will show that it needs to restrict the value of R_0 to be small enough so that the transformed equations also preserve the similar mean oscillation properties to p -Laplace equation.

2.1. Mean oscillation decay estimates under intermediate r . In the second case when $B_r(x_0)$ only intersects one of $\Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$, assume without loss of generality that $B_r(x_0) \cap \Gamma_{2R_0}^- \neq \emptyset$ and $B_r(x_0) \cap \Gamma_{2R_0}^+ = \emptyset$. Then we can find a point $\hat{x}_0 = (\hat{x}'_0, -\varepsilon/2 + h_2(\hat{x}'_0)) \in \Gamma_{2R_0}^-$ satisfying that $\text{dist}(x_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^-) = |x_0 - \hat{x}_0|$. Similarly, there exists some point $\tilde{x}_0 = (\tilde{x}'_0, \varepsilon/2 + h_1(\tilde{x}'_0)) \in \Gamma_{2R_0}^+$ such that $\text{dist}(\hat{x}_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^+) = |\hat{x}_0 - \tilde{x}_0|$.

Claim 1. If $0 < R_0 \leq R_{0,1}$, then we have $B_r(\hat{x}_0) \cap \Gamma_{2R_0}^+ = \emptyset$ for any $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4}\delta_0]$, where $R_{0,1}$ and δ_0 are, respectively, defined by (1.8) and (2.1).

Proof of Claim 1. For $0 < s \leq c_0\delta_0^{1/m}$ with c_0 given by (1.6), using conditions **(H1)** and **(H2)**, we obtain that for $|x' - x'_0| \leq s$, there exist two points x'_{θ_1} and x'_{θ_2} between x' and x'_0 such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta(x') - \delta_0| &\leq |h_1(x') - h_1(x'_0)| + |h_2(x') - h_2(x'_0)| \\ &\leq (|\nabla_{x'} h_1(x'_{\theta_1})| + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(x'_{\theta_2})|) |x' - x'_0| \\ &\leq \kappa_3 s (|x'_{\theta_1}|^{m-1} + |x'_{\theta_2}|^{m-1}) \\ &\leq 2^{m-1} \kappa_3 s (s^{m-1} + |x'_0|^{m-1}) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 \leq \delta(x') \leq \frac{3}{2}\delta_0, \quad \text{in } \overline{B'_s(x'_0)}. \quad (2.3)$$

Observe that the straight line l_{x_0, \hat{x}_0} passing through points x_0 and \hat{x}_0 can be represented as follows: for any $x \in l_{x_0, \hat{x}_0}$,

$$\frac{x_i - \hat{x}_{0,i}}{\partial_{x_i} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)} = \frac{x_d + \varepsilon/2 - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)}{-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_0 - \hat{x}_0| &= \sqrt{|x'_0 - \hat{x}'_0|^2 + |x_{0,d} + \varepsilon/2 - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2} \\ &= |x_{0,d} + \varepsilon/2 - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| \sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Denote $\nu_{\hat{x}_0} := \frac{(-\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}}$. Let $\hat{\theta}_0$ be the angle between vectors $(0', 1)$ and $\nu_{\hat{x}_0}$.

Then we have $\cos \hat{\theta}_0 = \nu_{\hat{x}_0} \cdot (0', 1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}}$. Hence we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |x'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| &= |x_0 - \hat{x}_0| \sin \hat{\theta}_0 = |x_{0,d} + \varepsilon/2 - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| \\ &\leq \delta(\hat{x}'_0) |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| \leq \kappa_3 (\varepsilon + \kappa_2 |\hat{x}'_0|^m) |\hat{x}'_0|^{m-1} \\ &\leq 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2} |\hat{x}'_0|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Here we used $|\hat{x}'_0| \leq 2R_0$ rather than $|\hat{x}'_0| \leq R_0$ in the last inequality, since there may appear $|\hat{x}'_0| > R_0$ when the interfacial boundary of D_2 is concave near x_0 . From (2.5), we see that if $0 < R_0 \leq 2^{-\frac{m}{m-1}} (\kappa_2 \kappa_3)^{-\frac{1}{2m-2}}$,

$$|\hat{x}'_0| \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2}} |x'_0| \leq 2|x'_0|. \quad (2.6)$$

By the same arguments as in (2.4)–(2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{x}_0 - \tilde{x}_0| &= \sqrt{|\hat{x}'_0 - \tilde{x}'_0|^2 + |\varepsilon + h_1(\tilde{x}'_0) - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2} \\ &= |\varepsilon + h_1(\tilde{x}'_0) - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| \sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_1(\tilde{x}'_0)|^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{x}'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| &= |\varepsilon + h_1(\tilde{x}'_0) - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| |\nabla_{x'} h_1(\tilde{x}'_0)| \\ &\leq \delta(\hat{x}'_0) |\nabla_{x'} h_1(\tilde{x}'_0)| \leq 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2} |\tilde{x}'_0|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

which, in combination with (2.6), reads that if $0 < R_0 \leq 2^{-\frac{m}{m-1}} (\kappa_2 \kappa_3)^{-\frac{1}{2m-2}}$,

$$|\tilde{x}'_0| \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2}} |\hat{x}'_0| \leq \frac{1}{(1 - 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2})^2} |x'_0| \leq 4|x'_0|. \quad (2.9)$$

Then we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |x'_0 - \tilde{x}'_0| &\leq |x'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| + |\hat{x}'_0 - \tilde{x}'_0| \leq 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2} (|\hat{x}'_0| + |\tilde{x}'_0|) \\ &\leq 2^{2m+2} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2} |x'_0| \leq 2^{2m+2} \kappa_1^{-1/m} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2} \delta_0^{1/m}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if R_0 further satisfies

$$0 < R_0 \leq 2^{-\frac{m}{m-1}} (\kappa_2 \kappa_3)^{-\frac{1}{2m-2}} \min\{1, 2^{-\frac{1}{m-1}} (\kappa_1^{1/m} c_0)^{\frac{1}{2m-2}}\}, \quad (2.10)$$

then we have

$$|x'_0 - \tilde{x}'_0| \leq c_0 \delta_0^{1/m},$$

where c_0 is given by (1.6). This, together with (2.3), gives that

$$\begin{aligned} |\varepsilon + h_1(\tilde{x}'_0) - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| &\geq \delta(\tilde{x}'_0) - |h_2(\tilde{x}'_0) - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 - |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\xi'_0)| |\tilde{x}'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 - \kappa_3 |\xi'_0|^{m-1} |\tilde{x}'_0 - \hat{x}'_0|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where ξ'_0 is some point between \tilde{x}'_0 and \hat{x}'_0 . If condition (2.10) holds, we deduce from (2.6)–(2.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi'_0| &\leq |\xi'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| + |\hat{x}'_0| \leq |\tilde{x}'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| + |\hat{x}'_0| \\ &\leq 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2} |\tilde{x}'_0| + \frac{1}{1 - 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2}} |\hat{x}'_0| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2}}{(1 - 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2})^2} + \frac{1}{1 - 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2}} \right) |\hat{x}'_0| \leq 4 |\hat{x}'_0|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\tilde{x}'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| \leq \frac{2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2}}{(1 - 2^{2m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2})^2} |\hat{x}'_0| \leq 2^{2m+1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 R_0^{2m-2} |\hat{x}'_0|.$$

Substituting these two relational expressions into (2.11), we obtain that if R_0 further satisfies $0 < R_0 \leq \left(\frac{\kappa_1}{2^{4m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3}\right)^{\frac{1}{2m-2}}$ besides (2.10),

$$\begin{aligned} |\varepsilon + h_1(\tilde{x}'_0) - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| &\geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 - \kappa_3 |\xi'_0|^{m-1} |\tilde{x}'_0 - \hat{x}'_0| \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 - 2^{4m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3^2 R_0^{2m-2} |\hat{x}'_0|^m \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 - 2^{4m-1} \kappa_1^{-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3^2 R_0^{2m-2} \delta_0 \geq \frac{1}{4}\delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Then in light of (2.7), we have

$$\text{dist}(\hat{x}_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^+) = |\tilde{x}_0 - \hat{x}_0| \geq \frac{1}{4}\delta_0.$$

This implies that Claim 1 holds. \square

We now introduce a local coordinate $y = (y', y_d)$ in $B_{\frac{1}{4}\delta_0}(\hat{x}_0)$ satisfying that $y_d(\hat{x}_0) = 0$, the y_d -axis direction is consistent with the normal vector $\nu_{\hat{x}_0} = \frac{(-\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}}$, and $\Gamma_{2R_0}^- \cap B_{\frac{1}{4}\delta_0}(\hat{x}_0)$ can be formulated by a C^m function $y_d = \chi(y')$. We now use $z = \Lambda(y) = (y', y_d - \chi(y'))$ to straighten the boundary. With regard to the properties of χ and Λ , we have

Claim 2. If $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$, we obtain that for any $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4}\delta_0]$,

$$\begin{cases} \chi(0') = 0, & \nabla_{y'} \chi(0') = 0, & \|\chi\|_{C^m} \leq C \|h_2\|_{C^m}, \\ |\nabla \Lambda(y) - I_d| = |\nabla_{y'} \chi(y')| \leq \sqrt{2} \kappa_4 (d-1)^2 |y'| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

and, for any $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$,

$$\Omega_{r/2}(\hat{x}_0) \subset \Lambda^{-1}(B_r^+) \subset \Omega_{2r}(\hat{x}_0), \quad |B_{r/2}^+| \leq |\Omega_r(\hat{x}_0)| \leq |B_{2r}^+|, \quad (2.13)$$

where $R_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2$ are given by (1.8)–(1.9), I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix, B_r^+ is the upper half of ball B_r under the coordinate z , and the constant C depends only on d, κ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, but not on ε .

Proof of Claim 2. Note that the tangential vectors at \hat{x}_0 on the surface $\Gamma_{2R_0}^-$ are given by

$$\tau_i = e_i + \partial_{x_i} h_2(\hat{x}_0) e_d, \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1,$$

where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Introduce the projection operator as follows:

$$\text{proj}_a b = \frac{(a, b)}{(a, a)} a,$$

where (a, b) represents the inner product of these two vectors and $(a, a) = |a|^2$. In order to let these above tangential vectors be orthogonal to each other, we carry out the following Gram-Schmidt process:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_1 &= \tau_1, & \hat{\tau}_1 &= \frac{\tilde{\tau}_1}{|\tilde{\tau}_1|}, \\ \tilde{\tau}_2 &= \tau_2 - \text{proj}_{\hat{\tau}_1} \tau_2, & \hat{\tau}_2 &= \frac{\tilde{\tau}_2}{|\tilde{\tau}_2|}, \\ & \vdots & & \\ \tilde{\tau}_{d-1} &= \tau_{d-1} - \sum_{i=1}^{d-2} \text{proj}_{\hat{\tau}_i} \tau_{d-1}, & \hat{\tau}_{d-1} &= \frac{\tilde{\tau}_{d-1}}{|\tilde{\tau}_{d-1}|}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\mathcal{R} = (\hat{\tau}_1^T, \dots, \hat{\tau}_{d-1}^T, \nu_{\hat{x}_0}^T) =: (\mathcal{R}_{ij})_{d \times d}$. The transform from x to y consists of translation and rotation, which can be written as $y = \mathcal{R}^T(x - \hat{x}_0)$ and $x = \hat{x}_0 + \mathcal{R}y$. Then we obtain that for $x \in \Gamma_{2R_0}^- \cap B_{\frac{1}{4}\delta_0}(\hat{x}_0)$,

$$\chi(y') = \nu_{\hat{x}_0} \cdot (x - \hat{x}_0) = \frac{h_2(x') - h_2(\hat{x}'_0) - (x' - \hat{x}'_0) \cdot \nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}}, \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\partial_{y_j} \chi(y') = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \partial_{x_i} \chi(y') \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_j}.$$

From condition **(H3)**, we see

$$|\partial_{x_i} \chi(y')| = \frac{|\partial_{x_i} h_2(x') - \partial_{x_i} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}} \leq \kappa_4 |x' - \hat{x}'_0|,$$

which, together with the fact that $|\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_j}| = |\mathcal{R}_{ij}| \leq 1$, shows that

$$|\nabla_{y'} \chi(y')| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |\partial_{y_j} \chi(y')| \leq (d-1) \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |\partial_{x_i} \chi(y')| \leq \kappa_4 (d-1)^2 |x' - \hat{x}'_0|. \quad (2.15)$$

Since $|y| = |x - \hat{x}_0|$ on $\Gamma_{2R_0}^- \cap B_{\frac{1}{4}\delta_0}(\hat{x}_0)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |y'|^2 &= |x' - \hat{x}'_0|^2 + (h_2(x') - h_2(\hat{x}'_0))^2 - |\chi(y')|^2 \\ &= |x' - \hat{x}'_0|^2 + \frac{(h_2(x') - h_2(\hat{x}'_0))^2 |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(x' - \hat{x}'_0) \cdot \nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0) (h_2(x') - h_2(\hat{x}'_0))}{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2} - \frac{((x' - \hat{x}'_0) \cdot \nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0))^2}{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from condition **(H2)** that if $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, 2^{-\frac{2m+1}{2m-1}} \kappa_3^{-\frac{1}{m-1}}\}$, where $R_{0,1}$ is given by (1.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |y'|^2 &\geq |x' - \hat{x}'_0|^2 - \frac{2|x' - \hat{x}'_0| |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)| |h_2(x') - h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|}{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{((x' - \hat{x}'_0) \cdot \nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0))^2}{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\hat{x}'_0)|^2} \\ &\geq (1 - 2^{2m} \kappa_3^2 R_0^{2m-2}) |x' - \hat{x}'_0|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} |x' - \hat{x}'_0|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

If we further require that $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$, then we obtain from (2.15) and (2.16) that

$$|\nabla_{y'} \chi(y')| \leq \sqrt{2} \kappa_4 (d-1)^2 |y'| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} \kappa_4 (d-1)^2 \delta_0 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \kappa_2 \kappa_4 (d-1)^2 R_0^m < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Combining these above results, we obtain that (2.12) holds. We now proceed to prove (2.13).

Observe from conditions **(H2)**–**(H3)**, (2.14) and (2.16) that for $|y'| < r$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8} \delta_0]$,

$$|\chi(y')| \leq \kappa_4 |x' - \hat{x}'_0|^2 \leq 2\kappa_4 r^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \kappa_4 \delta_0 r < \frac{1}{2} \kappa_2 \kappa_4 R_0^m r. \quad (2.17)$$

This shows that for any $z \in B_r^+$ with $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8} \delta_0]$, if $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |y|^2 &= |y'|^2 + |\chi(y') + z_d|^2 = |z|^2 + (\chi(y'))^2 + 2z_d \chi(y') \\ &< (1 + 4^{-1} \kappa_2^2 \kappa_4^2 R_0^{2m} + \kappa_2 \kappa_4 R_0^m) r^2 < 4r^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $z \in \Lambda(\Omega_{2r}(\hat{x}_0))$ and thus $\Lambda^{-1}(B_r^+) \subset \Omega_{2r}(\hat{x}_0)$.

On the other hand, for $y \in \Omega_{r/2}(\hat{x}_0)$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8} \delta_0]$, it follows from (2.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} |z|^2 &= |y'|^2 + |y_d - \chi(y')|^2 = |y|^2 + |\chi(y')|^2 - 2y_d \chi(y') \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} (1 + \kappa_2^2 \kappa_4^2 R_0^{2m} + 2\kappa_2 \kappa_4 R_0^m) r^2 < r^2, \end{aligned}$$

which reads that $z \in B_r^+$ and then $\Omega_{r/2}(\hat{x}_0) \subset \Lambda^{-1}(B_r^+)$. Moreover, since $\det(\nabla \Lambda) = 1$ and $\Omega_{r/2}(\hat{x}_0) \subset \Lambda^{-1}(B_r^+) \subset \Omega_{2r}(\hat{x}_0)$, we have $|B_{r/2}^+| \leq |\Omega_r(\hat{x}_0)| \leq |B_{2r}^+|$ for $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8} \delta_0]$. The proof of Claim 2 is complete. \square

Remark that by precisely calculating the values of length parameters $R_{0,1}$ and $R_{0,2}$, we obtain the required properties after the transforms including translation, rotation and flattening. We now study the transformed equation and establish the corresponding mean oscillation decay estimates near \hat{x}_0 . Note that p -Laplace equation is invariant with respect to translation and rotation of the coordinate. Set $u_1(z) := u(\Lambda^{-1}(z))$. Then u_1 is the solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_z(|A^T \nabla_z u_1|^{p-2} A A^T \nabla_z u_1) = 0, & \text{in } B_{\frac{1}{8} \delta_0}^+, \\ (|A^T \nabla_z u_1|^{p-2} A A^T \nabla_z u_1)_d = 0, & \text{on } B_{\frac{1}{8} \delta_0} \cap \partial \mathbb{R}_+^d, \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

where $A := A(z) := (a_{ij}(z)) := \nabla \Lambda(\Lambda^{-1}(z))$. Using the conormal boundary condition, we implement the even extension of u_1 , a_{dd} and a_{ij} , $i, j = 1, \dots, d-1$ and the odd extension of a_{id} and a_{di} , $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ with respect to $z_d = 0$, respectively.

For simplicity, the extended function and coefficient matrix are still represented by u_1 and A . Therefore, u_1 solves

$$-\operatorname{div}_z(\mathcal{A}(z, \nabla_z u_1)) = 0, \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{1}{8}\delta_0}, \quad (2.19)$$

where \mathcal{A} is a nonlinear operator given by $\mathcal{A}(z, \xi) = |A^T \xi|^{p-2} A A^T \xi$ with $z \in B_{\frac{1}{8}\delta_0}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Since $A|_{z=0} = I_d$, then $\mathcal{A}(0, \xi) = |\xi|^{p-2} \xi$. Similar to Lemma 2.3 in [16], we have

Lemma 2.3. *Let $p > 1$. If $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$, then for any $z \in B_{\frac{1}{8}\delta_0}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|\mathcal{A}(z, \xi) - \mathcal{A}(0, \xi)| \leq \mathcal{M}|z'| |\xi|^{p-1},$$

where $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}(d, p, \kappa_4)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{M}(d, p, \kappa_4) = \sqrt{2}\kappa_4(d-1)^2 \left(\left(d + \frac{1}{4}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + \bar{c}_{p-2} \left(d + \frac{5}{4}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \right) \quad (2.20)$$

with \bar{c}_{p-2} defined by (2.22).

Proof. By Lemma 2.1 in [24] and Lemma 2.2 in [21], we see that for any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma > -1$,

$$\underline{c}_\sigma \leq \frac{||\xi_1|^\sigma \xi_1 - |\xi_2|^\sigma \xi_2|}{|\xi_1 - \xi_2| (|\xi_1|^2 + |\xi_2|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}} \leq \bar{c}_\sigma, \quad (2.21)$$

where \underline{c}_σ and \bar{c}_σ are, respectively, defined by

$$\underline{c}_\sigma = \begin{cases} 1 + \sigma, & -1 < \sigma \leq 0, \\ 5^{-(1+\frac{\sigma}{2})}, & \sigma > 0, \end{cases} \quad \bar{c}_\sigma = \begin{cases} \max\{2, 10^{\frac{1}{2}|\sigma|}\}, & -1 < \sigma < 0, \\ (1 + \sigma)2^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}, & \sigma \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

It then follows from (2.12) and (2.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}(z, \xi) - \mathcal{A}(0, \xi)| &\leq ||A^T \xi|^{p-2} (A - I_d) A^T \xi| + ||A^T \xi|^{p-2} A^T \xi - |\xi|^{p-2} \xi| \\ &\leq |A - I_d| |A^T \xi|^{p-1} + \bar{c}_p (|A^T \xi|^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |A^T \xi - \xi| \\ &\leq \left(|A^T|^{p-1} + \bar{c}_p (|A^T|^2 + 1)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \right) |A^T - I_d| |\xi|^{p-1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\kappa_4(d-1)^2 \left(\left(d + \frac{1}{4}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + \bar{c}_p \left(d + \frac{5}{4}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \right) |z'| |\xi|^{p-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used the fact that $|A^T - I_d| = |A - I_d|$ and $|A| = \sqrt{d + |\nabla_{y'} \chi(y')|^2}$. \square

For $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$, we define $v_1 \in W^{1,p}(B_r)$ as the unique solution of the following homogeneous Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_z(\mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z v_1)) = 0, & \text{in } B_r, \\ v_1 = u_1, & \text{on } \partial B_r, \end{cases} \quad (2.23)$$

where u_1 satisfies equation (2.19). In order to establish mean oscillation estimate for the solution u_1 to the transformed equation (2.19), we need the following comparison estimate.

Lemma 2.4. For $p > 1$, let u_1 and v_1 be the solutions of (2.19) and (2.23), respectively. If $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$, then for any $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$,

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^p \leq \mathfrak{S}_p r^{\min\{2,p\}} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p, \quad (2.24)$$

where \mathfrak{S}_p is given by

$$\mathfrak{S}_p = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p 2^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}} \mathcal{M}^p}{\underline{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p (p-1)^p} \left[\left(\frac{2^p (p-1)^{p-1}}{p^p} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} + 1 \right], & 1 < p < 2, \\ 4 \max\{1, 2^{p-3}\} \mathcal{M}^2, & p \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

with \mathcal{M} , $\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}$, $\underline{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}$ defined by (2.20)–(2.21).

Remark 2.5. Although the proof of Lemma 2.4 has been contained in [18, 19] for the general degenerate elliptic equations, we also present its proof with an explicit constant \mathfrak{S}_p in (2.24).

Before proving Lemma 2.4, we recall a classical inequality (see Chapter 12 in [32]) as follows.

Lemma 2.6. Let $d \geq 2$. For any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

(i) if $1 < p < 2$,

$$\langle |\xi_1|^{p-2} \xi_1 - |\xi_2|^{p-2} \xi_2, \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle \geq \frac{p-1}{2^{\frac{2-p}{2}}} (|\xi_1|^2 + |\xi_2|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2; \quad (2.25)$$

(ii) if $p \geq 2$,

$$\langle |\xi_1|^{p-2} \xi_1 - |\xi_2|^{p-2} \xi_2, \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} (|\xi_1|^{p-2} + |\xi_2|^{p-2}) |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2. \quad (2.26)$$

For readers' convenience, the proof of Lemma 2.6 is left in the appendix.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. We divide the proof into two cases including $1 < p < 2$ and $p \geq 2$.

Step 1. Consider the case when $1 < p < 2$. Due to the fact that both u_1 and v_1 are the solutions, it follows from (2.21), Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6, Hölder's inequality and Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} (|\nabla_z u_1|^2 + |\nabla_z v_1|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2^{\frac{2-p}{2}}}{p-1} \int_{B_r} \langle \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z u_1) - \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z v_1), \nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1 \rangle \\ & = \frac{2^{\frac{2-p}{2}}}{p-1} \int_{B_r} \langle \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z u_1) - \mathcal{A}(z, \nabla_z u_1), \nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1 \rangle \\ & \leq \frac{2^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \mathcal{M} r}{p-1} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^{p-1} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^{p-2} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2 + \frac{2^{2-p} \mathcal{M}^2 r^2}{2(p-1)^2} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p, \end{aligned}$$

which reads that

$$\int_{B_r} (|\nabla_z u_1|^2 + |\nabla_z v_1|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2 \leq \frac{2^{2-p} \mathcal{M}^2 r^2}{(p-1)^2} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p.$$

For notational convenience, denote $V(\xi) := |\xi|^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \xi$ for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It then follows from (2.21) that

$$\int_{B_r} |V(\nabla_z u_1) - V(\nabla_z v_1)|^2 \leq \frac{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^2 2^{2-p} \mathcal{M}^2 r^2}{(p-1)^2} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p, \quad (2.27)$$

where $\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}$ and \mathcal{M} are given by (2.20)–(2.21). Observe from (2.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^p \\ &= [(|\nabla_z u_1|^2 + |\nabla_z v_1|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2]^{\frac{p}{2}} (|\nabla_z u_1|^2 + |\nabla_z v_1|^2)^{\frac{p(2-p)}{4}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p} |V(\nabla_z u_1) - V(\nabla_z v_1)|^p (|\nabla_z u_1|^2 + |\nabla_z v_1|^2)^{\frac{p(2-p)}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Picking test function $v_1 - u_1$ for equation (2.23), it follows from Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z v_1|^p &= \int_{B_r} \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z v_1) \nabla_z v_1 = \int_{B_r} \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z v_1) \nabla_z u_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z v_1|^p + \frac{2^{p-1} (p-1)^{p-1}}{p^p} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (2.27)–(2.28) and Hölder's inequality, yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^p \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p} \left(\int_{B_r} |V(\nabla_z u_1) - V(\nabla_z v_1)|^p \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\int_{B_r} (|\nabla_z u_1|^2 + |\nabla_z v_1|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p 2^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}} \mathcal{M}^{p^2}}{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p (p-1)^p} \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\int_{B_r} (|\nabla_z u_1|^2 + |\nabla_z v_1|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p 2^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}} \mathcal{M}^{p^2}}{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p (p-1)^p} \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} + \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z v_1|^p \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p 2^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}} \mathcal{M}^p}{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p (p-1)^p} \left[\left(\frac{2^p (p-1)^{p-1}}{p^p} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} + 1 \right] r^p \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Consider the case of $p \geq 2$. Analogously as above, since both u_1 and v_1 are the solutions, we have from Hölder's inequality, Young's inequality, Lemmas

2.3 and 2.6 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_r} (|\nabla_z u_1|^{p-2} + |\nabla_z v_1|^{p-2}) |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2 \\
& \leq 2 \int_{B_r} \langle \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z u_1) - \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z v_1), \nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1 \rangle \\
& = 2 \int_{B_r} \langle \mathcal{A}(0, \nabla_z u_1) - \mathcal{A}(z, \nabla_z u_1), \nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1 \rangle \\
& \leq 2\mathcal{M}r \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^{p-1} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^{p-2} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2 + 2\mathcal{M}^2 r^2 \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives that

$$\int_{B_r} (|\nabla_z u_1|^{p-2} + |\nabla_z v_1|^{p-2}) |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2 \leq 4\mathcal{M}^2 r^2 \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^p & \leq \max\{1, 2^{p-3}\} \int_{B_r} (|\nabla_z u_1|^{p-2} + |\nabla_z v_1|^{p-2}) |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^2 \\
& \leq 4 \max\{1, 2^{p-3}\} \mathcal{M}^2 r^2 \int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

For $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$, denote

$$\psi(\hat{x}_0, r) = \left(\int_{\Omega_r(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla_{y'} u - (\nabla_{y'} u)_{\Omega_r(\hat{x}_0)}|^p + |\partial_{y_d} u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (2.29)$$

where $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R_0})$ is the solution to (1.5). Similar to Lemma 2.5 in [16], by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4, we can obtain mean oscillation estimate for the solution u near \hat{x}_0 as follows.

Lemma 2.7. *Assume as above. Let $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R_0})$ be the solution to (1.5). If $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$, then for any $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$ and $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$,*

$$\psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu r) \leq C_1 \mu^\alpha \psi(\hat{x}_0, r) + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} r^\theta \left(\int_{\Omega_r(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $\theta := \theta_p = \min\{1, 2/p\}$, $C_1 = C_1(d, p)$, $C_2 = C_2(d, p, \kappa_4)$, α is given by Lemma 2.1 and ψ is defined by (2.29). Further, choose $\mu_2 = \min\{(2C_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \frac{1}{4}\}$ such that for any $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$, $\mu \in (0, \mu_2)$, and $0 \leq i_0 < j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=i_0}^j \psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu^k r) \\
& \leq 2\psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu^{i_0} r) + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=i_0+1}^j \sum_{i=i_0}^{k-1} (C_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} (\mu^i r)^\theta \left(\int_{\Omega_{\mu^i r}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $u_1 \in W^{1,p}(B_{\frac{1}{8}\delta_0}^+)$ be the solution to equation (2.18). We first establish mean oscillation estimate for the solution u_1 as follows: for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B_{\mu r}^+} |\nabla_{z'} u_1 - (\nabla_{z'} u_1)_{B_{\mu r}^+}|^p + |\partial_{z_d} u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C_1 \mu^\alpha \left(\int_{B_r^+} |\nabla_{z'} u_1 - (\nabla_{z'} u_1)_{B_r^+}|^p + |\partial_{z_d} u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} r^\theta \left(\int_{B_r^+} |\nabla_z u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(d, p)$, $C_2 = C_2(d, p, \kappa_4)$, $\theta = \min\{1, 2/p\}$ and α is given by Lemma 2.1.

Utilizing Lemma 6.13 in [31], the triangle inequality, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B_{\mu r}} |\nabla_z u_1 - (\nabla_z u_1)_{B_{\mu r}}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 2 \left(\int_{B_{\mu r}} |\nabla_z u_1 - (\nabla_z v_1)_{B_{\mu r}}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq 2 \left(\int_{B_{\mu r}} |\nabla_z v_1 - (\nabla_z v_1)_{B_{\mu r}}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2 \left(\int_{B_{\mu r}} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C \mu^\alpha \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z v_1 - (\nabla_z v_1)_{B_r}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C \mu^\alpha \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - (\nabla_z u_1)_{B_r}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + C \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - \nabla_z v_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C_1 \mu^\alpha \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - (\nabla_z u_1)_{B_r}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} r^\theta \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(d, p)$, $C_2 = C_2(d, p, \kappa_4)$, and we also used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z v_1 - (\nabla_z v_1)_{B_r}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 2 \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z v_1 - (\nabla_z u_1)_{B_r}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq 2 \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z u_1 - (\nabla_z u_1)_{B_r}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2 \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_z v_1 - \nabla_z u_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that u_1 is even in z_d and thus $\partial_{z_d} u_1$ is odd in z_d . Then (2.30) follows from (2.31).

Recall an elementary inequality that for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $p > 1$,

$$|a + b|^p \geq 2^{1-p} |a|^p - |b|^p. \quad (2.32)$$

For $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $r \in (0, \frac{1}{16}\delta_0]$, it follows from (2.12)–(2.13) and (2.32) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{\mu r}^+} |\nabla_{z'} u_1 - (\nabla_{z'} u_1)_{B_{\mu r}^+}|^p + |\partial_{z_d} u|^p \\
&= \int_{\Lambda^{-1}(B_{\mu r}^+)} |\nabla_{y'} u + \partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi - (\nabla_{y'} u + \partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi)_{\Lambda^{-1}(B_{\mu r}^+)}|^p + |\partial_{y_d} u|^p \\
&\geq 2^{1-p} \int_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)} (|\nabla_{y'} u - (\nabla_{y'} u)_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)}|^p + |\partial_{y_d} u|^p) - 2^p \int_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)} |\partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi|^p \\
&\geq 2^{1-p} (\psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu r/2))^p - (\sqrt{2}\kappa_4(d-1)^2 \mu r)^p \int_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p, \tag{2.33}
\end{aligned}$$

where we also utilized the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)} |\partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi - (\partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi)_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)}|^p \\
&\leq 2^{p-1} \left(\int_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)} |\partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi|^p + |(\partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi)_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)}|^p \right) \\
&\leq 2^p \int_{\Omega_{\mu r/2}(\hat{x}_0)} |\partial_{y_d} u \nabla_{y'} \chi|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

By the same argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{2r}^+} |\nabla_{z'} u_1 - (\nabla_{z'} u_1)_{B_{2r}^+}|^p + |\partial_{z_d} u|^p \\
&\leq 2^{p-1} (\psi(\hat{x}_0, 2r))^p + 2^{3p-1} (\sqrt{2}\kappa_4(d-1)^2 r)^p \int_{\Omega_{2r}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p. \tag{2.34}
\end{aligned}$$

A consequence of (2.30) and (2.33)–(2.34) shows that

$$\psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu r/2) \leq C_1 \mu^\alpha \psi(\hat{x}_0, 2r) + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} r^\theta \left(\int_{\Omega_{2r}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{2.35}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(d, p)$ and $C_2 = C_2(d, p, \kappa_4)$. Letting μ, r substitute for $\mu/4, 2r$ in (2.35), we obtain that for any $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$,

$$\psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu r) \leq C_1 \mu^\alpha \psi(\hat{x}_0, r) + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} r^\theta \left(\int_{\Omega_r(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then for $r \in (0, \frac{1}{8}\delta_0]$, and $0 \leq i_0 < k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu^k r) \\
&\leq (C_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-i_0} \psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu^{i_0} r) + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{i=i_0}^{k-1} (C_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} (\mu^i r)^\theta \left(\int_{\Omega_{\mu^i r}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to that for any $0 < \mu < \min\{(2C_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \frac{1}{4}\}$ and $0 \leq i_0 < j$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=i_0}^j \psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu^k r) \\ & \leq \frac{\psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu^{i_0} r)}{1 - C_1 \mu^\alpha} + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=i_0+1}^j \sum_{i=i_0}^{k-1} (C_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} (\mu^i r)^\theta \left(\int_{\Omega_{\mu^i r}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq 2\psi(\hat{x}_0, \mu^{i_0} r) + C_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=i_0+1}^j \sum_{i=i_0}^{k-1} (C_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} (\mu^i r)^\theta \left(\int_{\Omega_{\mu^i r}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2. Mean oscillation decay estimates under large r . In this subsection, we aim to establish mean oscillation estimates for the solution to the transformed equation in the case when $B_r(x_0)$ may potentially intersect both $\Gamma_{2R_0}^+$ and $\Gamma_{2R_0}^-$. Consider $r \in [\frac{1}{24}\delta_0, \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}]$, where \tilde{c}_0 is given by (1.7). Define a constant as follows:

$$\bar{R}_0 := \left(\frac{12}{13} \tilde{c}_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \kappa_2^{-1/m}. \quad (2.36)$$

Then if $0 < R_0 \leq \bar{R}_0$, then $\frac{1}{24}\delta_0 < \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}$. Introduce a cylinder as follows: for $s, t > 0$,

$$Q_{s,t} := \{\tilde{z} = (\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |\tilde{z}'| < s, |\tilde{z}_d| < t\}. \quad (2.37)$$

Under the flattening transform $\tilde{z} = \tilde{\Lambda}(x)$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{z}' = x' - x'_0, \\ \tilde{z}_d = \delta_0 \left(\frac{x_d - h_2(x') + \varepsilon/2}{\varepsilon + h_1(x') - h_2(x')} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \end{cases}$$

the narrow region $\Omega_{x'_0, R_0}$ is mapped to be a cylinder $Q_{R_0, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0}$ with its upper and lower boundaries written as

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{R_0, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0}^\pm := \left\{ \tilde{z} = (\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |\tilde{z}'| < R_0, \tilde{z}_d = \pm \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 \right\}.$$

Define $\tilde{u}_1(\tilde{z}) = u(\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}(\tilde{z}))$. Then \tilde{u}_1 satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{z}}(|\tilde{A}^T \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^{p-2} (\det(\tilde{A}))^{-1} \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^T \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1) = 0, & \text{in } Q_{R_0, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0}, \\ (|\tilde{A}^T \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^{p-2} (\det(\tilde{A}))^{-1} \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^T \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1)_d = 0, & \text{on } \tilde{\Gamma}_{R_0, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0}^\pm, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{A} := \tilde{A}(\tilde{z}) := (\tilde{a}_{ij}(\tilde{z})) := \nabla \tilde{\Lambda}(\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}(\tilde{z}))$. For $\tilde{z} \in Q_{R_0, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0}$, let $x = \tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}(\tilde{z})$. Recall that $\delta_0 = \delta(x'_0)$ and $\delta = \delta(x')$. Then the elements of \tilde{A} satisfy that $\tilde{a}_{ii} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, $\tilde{a}_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$, $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, $\det(\tilde{A}) = \tilde{a}_{dd} = \delta_0 \delta^{-1}$, and

$$\tilde{a}_{dj} = -\delta_0 \delta^{-1} \partial_{x_j} h_2(x') - \delta^{-1} \left(\tilde{z}_d + \frac{\delta_0}{2} \right) \partial_{x_j} \delta, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, d-1.$$

Therefore, for any $\tilde{z} \in Q_{R_0, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0}$ with $|\tilde{z}'| = |x' - x'_0| \leq r$, $r \in [\frac{1}{24}\delta_0, \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}]$, $0 < \tilde{c}_0 \leq c_0$, it follows from conditions **(H1)**–**(H2)** and (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |\tilde{a}_{dj}|^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (2|\partial_{x_j} h_1| + 4|\partial_{x_j} h_2|)^2 \leq 8|\nabla_{x'} h_1|^2 + 32|\nabla_{x'} h_2|^2 \\ &\leq 40\kappa_3^2 |x'|^{2m-2} \leq 40\kappa_1^{2/m-2} \kappa_3^2 \delta_0^{2-2/m} \leq 90\kappa_1^{2/m-2} \kappa_3^2 \delta_0^{2-2/m} \\ &\leq 51840\kappa_1^{2/m-2} \kappa_3^2 r^2 \delta_0^{-2/m} < \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

and, there exist two points ξ'_i , $i = 1, 2$ between x'_0 and x' such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{a}_{dd} - 1| &= |\delta - \delta_0| \delta^{-1} \leq \kappa_3 \delta^{-1} (|\nabla_{x'} h_1(\xi'_1)| + |\nabla_{x'} h_2(\xi'_2)|) |x' - x'_0| \\ &\leq 2^{m-2} \kappa_3 r \delta^{-1} (|\xi'_1 - x'_0|^{m-1} + |\xi'_2 - x'_0|^{m-1} + 2|x'_0|^{m-1}) \\ &\leq 2^m \kappa_3 r \delta_0^{-1} (r^{m-1} + |x'_0|^{m-1}) \leq 2^m \kappa_3 (\tilde{c}_0^{m-1} + \kappa_1^{1/m-1}) r \delta_0^{-1/m} \\ &\leq 2^{m+1} \kappa_1^{1/m-1} \kappa_3 r \delta_0^{-1/m} < \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$|(\det(\tilde{A}))^{-1} - 1| = |\tilde{a}_{dd}^{-1} - 1| = |\delta - \delta_0| \delta_0^{-1} \leq 2^m \kappa_1^{1/m-1} \kappa_3 r \delta_0^{-1/m} < \frac{1}{4}, \quad (2.39)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{A}(\tilde{z}) - I_d| &= \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \tilde{a}_{dj}^2 + (\tilde{a}_{dd} - 1)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{51840 + 4^{m+1} \kappa_1^{1/m-1} \kappa_3 r \delta_0^{-1/m}} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.40)$$

We now perform the even extension of \tilde{u}_1 , \tilde{a}_{dd} and \tilde{a}_{ij} , $i, j = 1, \dots, d-1$ and the odd extension of \tilde{a}_{id} and \tilde{a}_{di} , $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ with respect to the hyperplane $\tilde{z}_d = \frac{1}{2}\delta_0$, respectively. Then we carry out the periodic extension for them in \tilde{z}_d axis with the period $2\delta_0$. For brevity, we still denote the extended function and coefficient matrix by \tilde{u}_1 and \tilde{A} . Hence by the conormal boundary condition, we see that \tilde{u}_1 solves

$$-\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\tilde{z}, \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1)) = 0, \quad \text{in } Q_{R_0, \infty}, \quad (2.41)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is a nonlinear operate defined by $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\tilde{z}, \xi) = (\det(\tilde{A}))^{-1} |\tilde{A}^T \xi|^{p-2} \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^T \xi$ with $\tilde{z} \in Q_{R_0, \infty}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Similarly as in Lemma 2.3, it follows from (2.3), (2.21) and (2.38)–(2.40) that for any $r \in [\frac{1}{24}\delta_0, \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}]$, $\tilde{z} \in B_r$, and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|\tilde{A}| = \sqrt{d-1 + (\delta_0 \delta^{-1})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |\tilde{a}_{dj}|^2} \leq \sqrt{d + \frac{13}{4}},$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} &|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\tilde{z}, \xi) - |\xi|^{p-2} \xi| \\ &\leq |((\det(\tilde{A}))^{-1} - 1) \tilde{A}^T \xi|^{p-2} \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^T \xi| + \|\tilde{A}^T \xi\|^{p-2} (\tilde{A} - I_d) \tilde{A}^T \xi| \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{A}^T \xi\|^{p-2} \tilde{A}^T \xi - |\xi|^{p-2} \xi| \\ &\leq |(\det(\tilde{A}))^{-1} - 1| \tilde{A}^p |\xi|^{p-1} + \left(|\tilde{A}|^{p-1} + \tilde{c}_p (|\tilde{A}|^2 + 1)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \right) |\tilde{A} - I_d| |\xi|^{p-1} \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{M}} r \delta_0^{-1/m} |\xi|^{p-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

where \bar{c}_p is defined by (2.22) and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} := \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(d, p, m, \kappa_1, \kappa_3)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = & 2^m \left(d + \frac{13}{4} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \kappa_1^{1/m-1} \kappa_3 \\ & + \sqrt{51840 + 4^{m+1}} \left(\left(d + \frac{13}{4} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + \bar{c}_p \left(d + \frac{17}{4} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \right) \kappa_1^{1/m-1} \kappa_3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

Let \tilde{v}_1 be the unique solution to the following Dirichlet problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_{\bar{z}}(|\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{v}_1|^{p-2} \nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{v}_1) = 0, & \text{in } B_r, \\ \tilde{v}_1 = \tilde{u}_1, & \text{on } \partial B_r. \end{cases}$$

Making use of (2.42), it follows from the proof of Lemma 2.4 with minor modification that if $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}, \bar{R}_0\}$, then for any $r \in [\frac{1}{24}\delta_0, \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}]$,

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1 - \nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{v}_1|^p \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_p (r\delta_0^{-1/m})^{\min\{2,p\}} \int_{B_r} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p, \quad (2.44)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_p = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p 2^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^p}{\underline{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}^p (p-1)^p} \left[\left(\frac{2^p (p-1)^{p-1}}{p^p} \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} + 1 \right], & 1 < p < 2, \\ 4 \max\{1, 2^{p-3}\} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^2, & p \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

with $\bar{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}, \underline{c}_{\frac{p-2}{2}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ defined by (2.20) and (2.43). For $r \in [\frac{1}{24}\delta_0, \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}]$, write

$$\tilde{\psi}(r) = \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1 - (\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1)_{B_r}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Therefore, following the same proof of (2.31) except replacing (2.24) with (2.44), we obtain that for $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $r \in [\frac{1}{24}\delta_0, \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}]$,

$$\tilde{\psi}(\mu r) \leq \tilde{C}_1 \mu^\alpha \tilde{\psi}(r) + \tilde{C}_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} (r\delta_0^{-1/m})^\theta \left(\int_{B_r} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $\tilde{C}_1 = \tilde{C}_1(d, p)$, $\tilde{C}_2 = \tilde{C}_2(d, p, m, \kappa_1, \kappa_3)$, $\theta = \min\{1, 2/p\}$, and α is given by Lemma 2.1. Denote

$$\mu_3 = \min\{(2\tilde{C}_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}, 1\}.$$

Then similar to Lemma 2.7, we have

Lemma 2.8. *Assume as above. Let $\tilde{u}_1 \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(Q_{R_0, \infty})$ be the solution to (2.41). If $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}, \bar{R}_0\}$ with $R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}$ and \bar{R}_0 given by (1.8)–(1.9) and (2.36), then for any $r \in [\frac{1}{24}\delta_0, \tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m}]$, $\mu \in (0, \mu_3)$, and $0 \leq i_0 < j$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=i_0}^j \tilde{\psi}(\mu^k r) \\ & \leq 2\tilde{\psi}(\mu^{i_0} r) + \tilde{C}_2 \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=i_0+1}^j \sum_{i=i_0}^{k-1} (\tilde{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} (\mu^i r \delta_0^{-1/m})^\theta \left(\int_{B_{\mu^i r}} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now give the proof of Theorem 1.1 by combining Lemmas 2.1, 2.7 and 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For any fixed $x_0 \in \Omega_{R_0}$, $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{\bar{R}_0, R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$, and $0 < \mu \leq \frac{2}{3} \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mu_i \leq \frac{1}{6}$, denote $r_j = \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{13} \mu^j \delta_0^{1/m}$ for $j \geq 0$, where \tilde{c}_0 and δ_0 are defined by (1.7) and (2.1), and μ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ are, respectively, given by Lemmas 2.1, 2.7 and 2.8. Pick two nonnegative integers j_1 and j_2 such that

$$r_{j_1} \geq \frac{1}{24} \delta_0, \quad r_{j_1+1} < \frac{1}{24} \delta_0, \quad r_{j_2} \geq \text{dist}(x_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm), \quad r_{j_2+1} < \text{dist}(x_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm).$$

We here explain the implication of indices j_1 and j_2 . To be specific, when $j \geq j_1 + 1$, $B_{r_j}(x_0)$ intersects at most one of $\Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$; when $j \geq j_2 + 1$, $B_{r_j}(x_0)$ is located in the interior of Ω_{2R_0} ; when $j \leq j_1$ or $j \leq j_2$, there may appear the third case that $B_{r_j}(x_0)$ intersects both $\Gamma_{2R_0}^+$ and $\Gamma_{2R_0}^-$. Note that since $0 < R_0 \leq \bar{R}_0$, we have $\frac{1}{24} \delta_0 \leq \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{13} \delta_0^{1/m}$, where \bar{R}_0 is given by (2.36).

For $j \geq 0$, define

$$\phi_j = \begin{cases} \left(\int_{B_{13r_j}} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1 - (\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1)_{B_{13r_j}}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq j_1, \\ \left(\int_{\Omega_{r_j}(x_0)} |\nabla u - (\nabla u)_{\Omega_{r_j}(x_0)}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{for } j \geq j_1 + 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$T_j = \begin{cases} \left(\int_{B_{13r_j}} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq j_1, \\ \left(\int_{\Omega_{3r_j}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{for } j \geq j_1 + 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\omega_j = \begin{cases} (\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1)_{B_{13r_j}}, & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq j_1, \\ (\nabla u)_{\Omega_{r_j}(x_0)}, & \text{for } j \geq j_1 + 1. \end{cases}$$

Step 1. Since $0 < \mu \leq \frac{1}{6}$, we have $\Omega_{3r_{j_1+1}}(x_0) \subset \Omega_{\frac{1}{2}r_j}(x_0)$ for $j \geq 0$. Note that $3r_{j_1+1} < \frac{1}{8} \delta_0$, it then follows from (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{j_1+1} &\leq \left(\frac{|\Omega_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}}(x_0)|}{|\Omega_{3r_{j_1+1}}(x_0)|} \int_{\Omega_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C(d) \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

In view of $r_{j_1} \geq \frac{1}{24} \delta_0$, we have $Q_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0} \subset B_{13r_{j_1}}$. Then we obtain that $\tilde{\Lambda}(\Omega_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}}(x_0)) \subset \tilde{\Lambda}(\Omega_{x_0', \frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}}) = Q_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}, \frac{1}{2}\delta_0} \subset B_{13r_{j_1}}$. This, together with (2.13), leads to that if $0 < R_0 \leq \min\{\bar{R}_0, R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}$,

$$\left(\int_{\Omega_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(d) \left(\frac{|B_{13r_{j_1}}|}{|\Omega_{\frac{1}{2}r_{j_1}}(x_0)|} \int_{B_{13r_{j_1}}} |\nabla_{\bar{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(d) T_{j_1}.$$

Inserting this into (2.45), we have $T_{j+1} \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}T_{j_1}$. Hence we further obtain that for any $j \geq 0$,

$$T_{j+1} \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}T_j,$$

which, in combination with the triangle inequality, reads that for any $j \leq j_1$,

$$T_{j+1} \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}T_j \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}(|\omega_j| + \phi_j).$$

Observe that for $j \geq 0$, there has $\Omega_{3r_{j+1}}(x_0) \subset \Omega_{r_j}(x_0)$ in virtue of $0 < \mu \leq \frac{1}{6}$. It then follows from (2.13) and the triangle inequality again that for any $j \geq j_1 + 1$,

$$T_{j+1} \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega_{r_j}(x_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}(|\omega_j| + \phi_j).$$

Consequently, we have

$$T_{j+1} \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}(|\omega_j| + \phi_j), \quad \text{for any } j \geq 0. \quad (2.46)$$

Note that for $0 \leq k \leq j_1$,

$$|\omega_k - \omega_{k-1}|^p \leq 2^{p-1}(|\omega_k - \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1(\tilde{z})|^p + |\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1(\tilde{z}) - \omega_{k-1}|^p).$$

Integrating it in \tilde{z} on B_{13r_k} and taking the p -th root, we obtain

$$|\omega_k - \omega_{k-1}| \leq 2^{\frac{p-1}{p}}(\phi_k + \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}\phi_{k-1}),$$

which, together with Hölder's inequality, gives that

$$|\omega_j| \leq \begin{cases} T_{j_0}, & \text{if } 0 \leq j = j_0 \leq j_1, \\ T_{j_0} + 4\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_0}^j \phi_k, & \text{if } 0 \leq j_0 < j \leq j_1, \end{cases} \quad (2.47)$$

In exactly the same way, we have from (2.13) that

$$|\omega_j| \leq \begin{cases} C(d)T_j, & \text{if } j = l \geq j_1 + 1, \\ C(d)(T_l + \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=l}^j \phi_k), & \text{if } j > l \geq j_1 + 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.48)$$

When $0 \leq j_0 \leq j \leq j_1$, it follows from Lemma 2.8, (2.47), the triangle inequality and Hölder's inequality that

(i) if $j = j_0$,

$$|\omega_{j_0}| + \phi_{j_0} \leq 3T_{j_0}; \quad (2.49)$$

(ii) if $j > j_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_j| + \sum_{k=j_0}^j \phi_k &\leq T_{j_0} + 5\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_0}^j \phi_k \\ &\leq T_{j_0} + 10\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}\phi_{j_0} + \tilde{C}_2\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\tilde{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} (\mu^i \tilde{c}_0)^\theta \left(\int_{B_{13r_i}} |\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq (1 + 20\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}})T_{j_0} + \tilde{C}_2\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\tilde{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} T_i, \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

where $\tilde{C}_1 = \tilde{C}_1(d, p)$ and $\tilde{C}_2 = \tilde{C}_2(d, p, m, \kappa_1, \kappa_3)$.

We now proceed to consider the case when $j \geq j_1 + 1$. Since there may appear no intersection point or only one intersection point between $B_{r_j}(x_0)$ and $\Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$ in

this case, we need to compare the values of j_1 and j_2 for the purpose of establishing the similar estimates as in (2.49)–(2.50). Therefore, we divide into two subcases to discuss as follows.

Case 1. Consider the case when $j_1 < j_2$. First, let $j_1 + 1 \leq j \leq j_2$. Then we have $r_j \geq \text{dist}(x_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm)$. Pick $\hat{x}_0 \in \Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm$ such that $\text{dist}(x_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm) = |x_0 - \hat{x}_0|$. Then we have $\Omega_{r_j}(x_0) \subset \Omega_{2r_j}(\hat{x}_0) \subset \Omega_{3r_j}(x_0)$ and $2r_j < \frac{1}{8}\delta_0$. Therefore, it follows from (2.13) and Lemma 2.7 that

(i) if $j = j_1 + 1$,

$$\phi_{j_1+1} \leq C(d)\psi(\hat{x}_0, 2r_{j_1+1}) \leq C(d)Y_{j_1+1} \leq C(d)T_{j_1+1}; \quad (2.51)$$

(ii) if $j > j_1 + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=j_1+1}^j \phi_k &\leq C(d) \sum_{k=j_1+1}^j \psi(\hat{x}_0, 2r_k) \\ &\leq C(d)Y_{j_1+1} + C_2\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_1+2}^j \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{k-1} (C_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} Y_i \\ &\leq C(d)T_{j_1+1} + C_2\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_1+2}^j \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{k-1} (C_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} T_i, \end{aligned} \quad (2.52)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(d, p)$, $C_2 = C_2(d, p, m, \kappa_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$,

$$Y_j := \left(\int_{\Omega_{2r_j}(\hat{x}_0)} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \text{for } j_1 + 1 \leq j \leq j_2.$$

Then combining (2.46), (2.48) and (2.51)–(2.52), we obtain that for $j_1 + 1 \leq j \leq j_2$,

(i) if $j = j_1 + 1$,

$$|\omega_{j_1+1}| + \phi_{j_1+1} \leq C(d)T_{j_1+1}; \quad (2.53)$$

(ii) if $j > j_1 + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_j| + \sum_{k=j_1+1}^j \phi_k &\leq C(d) \left(T_{j_1+1} + \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_1+1}^j \phi_k \right) \\ &\leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} T_{j_1+1} + C_2\mu^{-\frac{2d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_1+2}^j \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{k-1} (C_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} T_i \\ &\leq \mu^{-\frac{2d}{p}} \left(C(d)(|\omega_{j_1}| + \phi_{j_1}) + C_2 \sum_{k=j_1+2}^j \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{k-1} (C_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} T_i \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.54)$$

On the other hand, for $j \geq j_2 + 1$, we deduce from Lemma 2.1, (2.46) and (2.48) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_j| + \sum_{k=j_2+1}^j \phi_k &\leq C(d) \left(T_{j_2+1} + \mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_2+1}^j \phi_k \right) \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}} T_{j_2+1} \\ &\leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{2d}{p}} (|\omega_{j_2}| + \phi_{j_2}). \end{aligned}$$

This, in combination with (2.54), yields that for any $j \geq j_2 + 1 > j_1 + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\omega_j| + \sum_{k=j_1+1}^j \phi_k &= |\omega_j| + \sum_{k=j_2+1}^j \phi_k + \sum_{k=j_1+1}^{j_2} \phi_k \\
&\leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{2d}{p}}(|\omega_{j_2}| + \phi_{j_2}) + \sum_{k=j_1+1}^{j_2} \phi_k \\
&\leq \mu^{-\frac{4d}{p}} \left(C(d)(|\omega_{j_1}| + \phi_{j_1}) + C_2 \sum_{k=j_1+2}^j \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{k-1} (C_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} T_i \right), \quad (2.55)
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (2.54) again, shows that (2.55) holds for any $j > j_1 + 1$.

Case 2. Consider the case when $j_1 \geq j_2$. Then for any $j \geq j_1 + 1$, we have $r_j \leq \text{dist}(x_0, \Gamma_{2R_0}^\pm)$. Hence, using Lemma 2.1, (2.46) and (2.48), we derive

$$|\omega_j| + \sum_{k=j_1+1}^j \phi_k \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{2d}{p}}(|\omega_{j_1}| + \phi_{j_1}). \quad (2.56)$$

A combination of (2.49)–(2.50), (2.53) and (2.55)–(2.56) gives that for any $0 \leq j_0 \leq j_1$ and $j \geq j_0$,

(i) if $j = j_0$,

$$|\omega_{j_0}| + \phi_{j_0} \leq 3T_{j_0}; \quad (2.57)$$

(ii) if $j > j_0$,

$$|\omega_j| + \sum_{k=j_0}^j \phi_k \leq \mu^{-\frac{5d}{p}} \left(C(d)T_{j_0} + \bar{C}_2 \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} T_i \right), \quad (2.58)$$

where $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_1(d, p)$ and $\bar{C}_2 = \bar{C}_2(d, p, m, \kappa_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$.

Step 3. Choose an integer j_0 such that $0 \leq j_0 \leq j_1$, whose value will be determined later. We first calculate the series $\sum_{k=j_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta}$, where \bar{C}_1 is given by (2.58). On one hand, if $\theta \neq \alpha$, then for any $j \geq j_0 + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=j_0+1}^j \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} = \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j (\bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1} \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\bar{C}_1^{-1}\mu^{\theta-\alpha})^i \\
&= \frac{(\bar{C}_1^{-1}\mu^{\theta-\alpha})^{j_0}}{1 - \bar{C}_1^{-1}\mu^{\theta-\alpha}} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j (\bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{k-1} - \frac{1}{\bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha(1 - \bar{C}_1^{-1}\mu^{\theta-\alpha})} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j \mu^{k\theta} \\
&= \frac{1}{1 - \bar{C}_1^{-1}\mu^{\theta-\alpha}} \left(\frac{\mu^{j_0\theta}(1 - (\bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha)^{j-j_0})}{1 - \bar{C}_1\mu^\alpha} - \frac{\mu^{(j_0+1)\theta-\alpha}(1 - \mu^{(j-j_0)\theta})}{\bar{C}_1(1 - \mu^\theta)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we require $\mu \neq \overline{C}_1^{\frac{1}{\theta-\alpha}}$ and $\mu \neq \overline{C}_1^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ by decreasing μ if necessary. By sending $j \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that if $\mu \leq (2\overline{C}_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} &= \frac{1}{1 - \overline{C}_1^{-1} \mu^{\theta-\alpha}} \left(\frac{\mu^{j_0\theta}}{1 - \overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha} - \frac{\mu^{(j_0+1)\theta-\alpha}}{\overline{C}_1(1 - \mu^\theta)} \right) \\ &= \frac{\mu^{j_0\theta}}{(1 - \overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)(1 - \mu^\theta)} \leq \frac{2\mu^{j_0\theta}}{1 - 6^{-\theta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used the fact that $0 < \mu \leq \frac{1}{6}$.

On the other hand, if $\theta = \alpha$, then for any $j \geq j_0 + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} &= \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j (\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1} \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} \overline{C}_1^{-i} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\overline{C}_1^{j_0-1} (\overline{C}_1 - 1)} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^j (\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1} = \frac{(\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{j_0} (1 - (\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{j-j_0})}{\overline{C}_1^{j_0-1} (\overline{C}_1 - 1) (1 - \overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)}, \end{aligned}$$

which reads that if $\mu \leq (2\overline{C}_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$,

$$\sum_{k=j_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} \leq \frac{\overline{C}_1 \mu^{j_0\theta}}{(\overline{C}_1 - 1)(1 - \overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)} \leq \frac{2\overline{C}_1 \mu^{j_0\theta}}{\overline{C}_1 - 1}.$$

Denote

$$\mu^* := \min \left\{ \frac{2}{3} \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mu_i, (2\overline{C}_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \left(\frac{1 - 6^{-\theta}}{4\overline{C}_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{j_0\theta - \frac{6d}{p}}}, \left(\frac{\overline{C}_1 - 1}{4\overline{C}_1 \overline{C}_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{j_0\theta - \frac{6d}{p}}} \right\}.$$

Therefore, if μ is chosen to be μ_0 with μ_0 given by

$$\mu_0 = \begin{cases} \min\{\mu^*, \overline{C}_1^{\frac{1}{\theta-\alpha}}\}, & \text{if } \theta \neq \alpha, \\ \mu^*, & \text{if } \theta = \alpha, \end{cases} \quad (2.59)$$

we have

$$\overline{C}_2 \mu^{-\frac{6d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\overline{C}_1 \mu^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (2.60)$$

where \overline{C}_i , $i = 1, 2$ are given by (2.62) below. In order to ensure the validity of μ_0 and $j_0 \leq j_1$, we choose $j_0 = \lceil \frac{6d}{p\theta} \rceil + 1 = \lceil \frac{6d}{\min\{p, 2\}} \rceil + 1 > \frac{6d}{p\theta}$ and let $0 < R_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} R_{0,i}$, where $R_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ are defined by (1.8)–(1.10).

Claim that if $0 < R_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} R_{0,i}$ and $\mu = \mu_0$,

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq CT_{j_0}, \quad (2.61)$$

where $C = C(d, p, m, \kappa_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$. The pointwise gradient estimate in (2.61) implies that for any fixed point $x_0 \in \Omega_{R_0}$, the gradient $|\nabla u(x_0)|$ can be controlled by the p -average integration of the transformed gradient $|\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|$ over a ball $B_{13r_{j_0}}$ with the scale of radius larger than the height δ_0 of the thin gap.

We now divide into four subcases to prove (2.61) as follows.

Case 1. If $|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq T_{j_0}$, then (2.61) holds.

Case 2. If $|\nabla u(x_0)| > T_{j_0}$ and $|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq T_{j_0+1}$, we deduce from (2.46) and (2.57) that

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq T_{j_0+1} \leq C(d)\mu_0^{-\frac{d}{p}}(|\omega_{j_0}| + \phi_{j_0}) \leq C(d)\mu_0^{-\frac{d}{p}}T_{j_0}.$$

Case 3. If $|\nabla u(x_0)| > T_j$ for any $j_0 < j \leq j_3$ and $|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq T_{j_3+1}$, it then follows from (2.46), (2.58) and (2.60) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u(x_0)| &\leq T_{j_3+1} \leq C(d)\mu^{-\frac{d}{p}}(|\omega_{j_3}| + \phi_{j_3}) \\ &\leq C(d)\mu_0^{-\frac{6d}{p}}T_{j_0} + \bar{C}_2\mu_0^{-\frac{6d}{p}} \sum_{k=j_0+1}^{j_3} \sum_{i=j_0}^{k-1} (\bar{C}_1\mu_0^\alpha)^{k-1-i} \mu^{i\theta} |\nabla u(x_0)| \\ &\leq C(d)\mu_0^{-\frac{6d}{p}}T_{j_0} + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u(x_0)|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.62)$$

where $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_1(d, p)$ and $\bar{C}_2 = \bar{C}_2(d, p, m, \kappa_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$. Consequently, (2.61) holds under this case. We additionally remark that the value of \bar{C}_1 in (2.62) is consistent with that in (2.58), while the value of \bar{C}_2 in (2.62) is greater than that in (2.58).

Case 4. In the case when $|\nabla u(x_0)| > T_j$ for any $j \geq j_0$, it then follows from (2.58) and (2.60) that

$$|\omega_j| \leq C(d)\mu_0^{-\frac{5d}{p}}T_{j_0} + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u(x_0)|.$$

Since $u \in C^1(\Omega_{2R_0})$, it then follows from Lebesgue-Besicovitch Differentiation Theorem (see Theorem 1.32 in [20]) that

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq C(d)\mu_0^{-\frac{5d}{p}}T_{j_0} + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u(x_0)|,$$

which implies that (2.61) holds.

Step 4. This step aims to establish the Caccioppoli inequality for the solution \tilde{u}_1 , which is used to extract the height δ_0 from the pointwise gradient estimate (2.61). Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and choose a nonnegative smooth cutoff function η such that $\eta = 1$ in $B_{13r_{j_0}}$, $\eta = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{26r_{j_0}}$, and $|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{2}{13r_{j_0}}$. Since $\mu = \mu_0 \leq \frac{1}{6}$ and $j_0 > 1$, then

$$26r_{j_0} = 2\tilde{c}_0\mu_0^{j_0}\delta_0^{1/m} < \frac{1}{3}\tilde{c}_0\delta_0^{1/m} < R_0. \quad (2.63)$$

Hence, multiplying equation (2.41) by test function $\eta^p(\tilde{u}_1 - \lambda)$ and integrating by parts over $B_{26r_{j_0}}$, we have

$$\int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} \eta^p \langle \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tilde{z}, \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1), \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1 \rangle = -p \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} \eta^{p-1}(\tilde{u}_1 - \lambda) \langle \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tilde{z}, \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1), \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1 \rangle.$$

On one hand, it follows from (2.42) and (2.59) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} \eta^p \langle \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tilde{z}, \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1), \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1 \rangle \\ &\geq \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} \eta^p |\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p - \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} \eta^p |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tilde{z}, \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1) - |\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^{p-2} \nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1| |\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1| \\ &\geq (1 - 26r_{j_0} \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \delta_0^{-1/m}) \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} |\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p \geq \frac{3}{4} \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} |\nabla_{\tilde{z}} \tilde{u}_1|^p, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that

$$26r_{j_0}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}\delta_0^{-1/m} = 2\widetilde{c}_0\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}\mu_0^{j_0} < \overline{C}_2\mu_0^{j_0} \leq \overline{C}_2 \left(\frac{1-6^{-\theta}}{4\overline{C}_2} \right)^{\frac{j_0}{j_0\theta - \frac{6d}{p}}} < \frac{1}{4}. \quad (2.64)$$

On the other hand, combining (2.42), (2.59), (2.64) and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} p\eta^{p-1}(\tilde{u}_1 - \lambda) \langle \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tilde{z}, \nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1), \nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1 \rangle \\ & \leq \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} p\eta^{p-1}|\tilde{u}_1 - \lambda| |\nabla\eta| (|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tilde{z}, \nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1) - |\nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1|^{p-2}\nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1| + |\nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1|^{p-1}) \\ & \leq \frac{5p}{26r_{j_0}} \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} \eta^{p-1}|\nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1|^{p-1}|\tilde{u}_1 - \lambda| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} \eta^p |\nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1|^p + \frac{C(p)}{r_{j_0}^p} \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} |\tilde{u}_1 - \lambda|^p. \end{aligned}$$

A consequence of these above results gives the Caccioppoli inequality as follows:

$$\int_{B_{13r_{j_0}}} |\nabla_{\tilde{z}}\tilde{u}_1|^p \leq \frac{C(p)}{r_{j_0}^p} \int_{B_{26r_{j_0}}} |\tilde{u}_1 - \lambda|^p,$$

which, in combination with (2.61), (2.63) and taking $\lambda = (\tilde{u}_1)_{B_{26r_{j_0}}}$, shows that if $0 < R_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} R_{0,i}$,

$$|\nabla u(x_0)| \leq C\delta_0^{1/m} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{x',e}} u, \quad \varrho = \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{3}\delta_0^{1/m},$$

where $C = C(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$. □

3. IMPROVED POINTWISE UPPER BOUND ON THE GRADIENT

Before proving Theorem 1.4, we first briefly expound the idea and techniques developed in [16, 35]. The key to improving the gradient estimate obtained in Theorem 1.1 lies in establishing the decay estimate for the oscillation of u in small narrow regions. As shown in [35], for the linear elliptic equation of divergence form, the problem is directly reduced to the establishment of the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser Harnack inequality for the solution to the transformed and extended equation for the purpose of ensuring that the constant in Harnack inequality is independent of the height of the narrow region. However, as pointed out in [16], the situation becomes fairly different for the nonlinear p -Laplace equations including the singular case of $1 < p < 2$ and the degenerate case of $p > 2$. In the nonlinear case, it needs to establish the Krylov-Safonov Harnack inequality for the solution to the normalized p -Laplace equation after the transform and extension, which can be actually regarded as a second-order uniformly elliptic equation of non-divergence form. For any $\varsigma > 0$, we start by considering the following approximation equation

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}((\varsigma + |\nabla u_\varsigma|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \nabla u_\varsigma) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u_\varsigma}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial D_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ u_\varsigma = \varphi, & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Note that $\|u_\varsigma\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega_{2R_0})}$ stays bounded independent of ς for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then we only need to prove Theorem 1.4 for u_ς . Furthermore, the weak solution u_ς of equation (3.1) possesses better regularity than that of the original problem (1.2) and is in the class C^2 , see [11]. This means that u_ς will be the solution of normalized p -Laplace equation in the classical sense. For simplicity, we still denote $u = u_\varsigma$ in the following proof. Rewrite equation (3.1) into the following normalized p -Laplace equation

$$a_{ij}\partial_{ij}u = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2R_0}, \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$a_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + (p-2)(\varsigma + |\nabla u|^2)^{-1}\partial_i u \partial_j u \quad (3.3)$$

satisfies uniformly elliptic condition

$$\min\{1, p-1\}|\xi|^2 \leq a_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \leq \max\{1, p-1\}|\xi|^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad p > 1. \quad (3.4)$$

Here, for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$, while $\delta_{ij} = 0$ if $i \neq j$.

Pick $r \in (2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m}, r_0]$, where $0 < r_0 \leq R_0$ is independent of ε and will be determined later. For $i = 1, 2$, denote

$$\tilde{h}_i(x') := \begin{cases} h_i(x'), & \text{for } |x'| \leq 2r_0, \\ 0, & \text{for } |x'| > 2r_0. \end{cases}$$

For $s, t > 0$, let $Q_{s,t}$ be a cylinder defined by (2.37) above. For brevity, denote

$$\tilde{\delta} = \tilde{\delta}(y') = \varepsilon + \tilde{h}_1(y') - \tilde{h}_2(y'),$$

for any given $|y'| \leq 2r_0$. For $y \in Q_{2r,r^m} \setminus Q_{r/4,r^m}$, introduce the map $x = \Phi(y)$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} x' = y' - g(y), \\ x_d = \frac{1}{2}(y_d r^{-m} \tilde{\delta} + \tilde{h}_1(y') - \tilde{h}_2(y')), \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

where $g(y) := (g_1(y), \dots, g_{d-1}(y))$ is defined by

$$g(y) = (y_d^2 - r^m)(y_d + r^m)f(y),$$

$$f(y) = \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{8r^{3m}} \begin{cases} y_d \nabla_{y'}(\tilde{h}_1^\tau(y') + \tilde{h}_2^\tau(y')) + r^m \nabla_{y'}(\tilde{h}_1^\tau(y') - \tilde{h}_2^\tau(y')), & \text{if } 2 \leq m < 3, \\ y_d \nabla_{y'}(\tilde{h}_1(y') + \tilde{h}_2(y')) + r^m \nabla_{y'}(\tilde{h}_1(y') - \tilde{h}_2(y')), & \text{if } m \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Here \tilde{h}_i^τ is a mollification of \tilde{h}_i defined by

$$\tilde{h}_i^\tau(y') = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \varphi(z') dz', \quad \tau = \frac{r^{2m} - y_d^2}{r^{m-1}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (3.6)$$

where φ is the standard mollifier, that is, a positive C^∞ function with unit integration and its support contained in B'_1 . The objectives for the introduction of function g are two-fold: on one hand, it makes its inverse transform Φ^{-1} preserve the flattening property that Φ^{-1} maps the top and bottom boundaries of $\Omega_{2r} \setminus \Omega_{r/4}$ onto the upper and lower boundaries of $Q_{2r,r^m} \setminus Q_{r/4,r^m}$; on the other hand, it ensures that the solution of the transformed equation still satisfies the Neumann boundary condition on the upper and lower boundaries $\{y_d = \pm r^m\}$. In addition, the introduction of mollification in the case of $2 \leq m < 3$ is to make Φ possess second-order derivatives, which is necessary to keep uniform ellipticity of the coefficients for the transformed equation.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume as above. Then we obtain that if $2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} r_{0,i}$ with $r_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ defined by (1.12)–(1.14),*

(i) *there holds*

$$\begin{cases} Q_{1.9r,r^m} \setminus Q_{0.35r,r^m} \subset \Phi^{-1}(\Omega_{2r} \setminus \Omega_{r/4}), \\ \Omega_r \setminus \Omega_{r/2} \subset \Phi(Q_{1.1r,r^m} \setminus Q_{0.4r,r^m}), \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

and, for $y \in Q_{2r,r^m} \setminus Q_{r/4,r^m}$,

$$\frac{I_d}{C_0} \leq \nabla_y \Phi(y) \leq C_0 I_d, \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$C_0 = \max\{2(\min\{1, 4^{-(m+1)}\kappa_1\})^{-1}, 2^{-1} \min\{1, 4^{-(m+1)}\kappa_1\} + \max\{1, 2^m\kappa_2\}\}; \quad (3.9)$$

(ii) *if $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2r} \setminus \Omega_{r/4})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}((\varsigma + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_{2r} \setminus \Omega_{r/4}, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \Omega_{2r} \setminus \Omega_{r/4} \cap \Gamma_{2r_0}^\pm, \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

for some $\varsigma > 0$, then $v(y) := u(\Phi(y))$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{ij} v(y) + \tilde{b}_i \partial_i v(y) = 0, & \text{in } Q_{1.9r,r^m} \setminus Q_{0.35r,r^m}, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \{y_d = \pm r^m\}, \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

with

$$\frac{I_d}{C_1} \leq \tilde{a} \leq C_1 I_d, \quad |\tilde{b}| \leq \frac{C_2}{r},$$

where I_d represents the $d \times d$ identity matrix, $C_1 = C_1(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$, and $C_2 = C_2(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$.

Proof. Step 1. To begin with, it follows from condition **(H2)** that for $y \in Q_{2r,r^m}$ and $i = 1, 2$, we have $|\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i| \leq 2^{m-1} \kappa_3 r^{m-1}$, and for $j = 1, \dots, d-1$, if $r \leq 2^{1/m}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{y_j} \tilde{h}_i^\tau(y')| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\partial_{y_j} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z')| \varphi(z') dz' \leq \kappa_3 (|y'| + \tau)^{m-1} \\ &\leq \kappa_3 (2r + r^{m+1})^{m-1} \leq 3^{m-1} \kappa_3 r^{m-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Then we obtain that for $r \in (2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m}, \min_{1 \leq i \leq 2} r_{0,i}]$ and $y \in Q_{2r,r^m}$,

(i) if $2 \leq m < 3$,

$$|g(y)| \leq 2^{m-1} \kappa_2 r^m (|\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_1^\tau| + |\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_2^\tau|) \leq 6^m (d-1) \kappa_2 \kappa_3 r^{2m-1} < \frac{r}{10};$$

(ii) if $m \geq 3$,

$$|g(y)| \leq 2^{m-1} \kappa_2 r^m (|\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_1| + |\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_2|) \leq 4^{m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 r^{2m-1} < \frac{r}{10}.$$

Then we obtain that (3.7) holds.

Using condition **(H3)**, we obtain that for $i = 1, 2$, and $j, l = 1, \dots, d-1$, if $r \leq \frac{2}{3} R_0$,

$$|\partial_{y_j y_l} \tilde{h}_i(y')| \leq \kappa_4, \quad |\partial_{y_j y_l} \tilde{h}_i^\tau(y')| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\partial_{y_j y_l} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z')| \varphi(z') dz' \leq \kappa_4,$$

which, together with (3.12), leads to that for $y \in Q_{2r, r^m}$ and $j, l = 1, \dots, d-1$, if $2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq \min\{2^{1/m}, \frac{2}{3}R_0\}$,

(i) for $2 \leq m < 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{y_j} g_l(y)| &\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(|\partial_{y_j} \tilde{\delta}| \sum_{i=1}^2 |\partial_{y_l} \tilde{h}_i^\tau| + \tilde{\delta} \sum_{i=1}^2 |\partial_{y_j y_l} \tilde{h}_i^\tau| \right) \\ &\leq 6^{m-1} \kappa_3^2 r^{2m-2} + 2^m \kappa_2 \kappa_4 r^m \leq (6^m \kappa_3^2 + 2^m \kappa_2 \kappa_4) r^m, \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$|\nabla_{y'} g(y)| \leq (d-1)^2 (6^m \kappa_3^2 + 2^m \kappa_2 \kappa_4) r^m; \quad (3.13)$$

(ii) for $m \geq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{y'} g(y)| &\leq \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\sum_{j,l=1}^{d-1} \left(|\partial_{y_j} \tilde{\delta}| \sum_{i=1}^2 |\partial_{y_l} \tilde{h}_i| + \tilde{\delta} \sum_{i=1}^2 |\partial_{y_j y_l} \tilde{h}_i| \right)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{|\nabla_{y'} \tilde{\delta}|^2 \sum_{i=1}^2 |\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i|^2 + \tilde{\delta}^2 \sum_{i=1}^2 |\nabla_{y'}^2 \tilde{h}_i|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(2^{2m-1} \kappa_3^2 r^{2m-2})^2 + (2^{m+1} \kappa_2 \kappa_4 r^m)^2} \\ &\leq 2^m (2^{m-1} \kappa_3^2 + \kappa_2 \kappa_4) r^m, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.13), reads that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla_{y'} x' - I_{d-1}| \\ &= |\nabla_{y'} g(y)| \leq \begin{cases} (d-1)^2 (6^m \kappa_3^2 + 2^m \kappa_2 \kappa_4) r^m, & \text{if } 2 \leq m < 3, \\ 2^m (2^{m-1} \kappa_3^2 + \kappa_2 \kappa_4) r^m, & \text{if } m \geq 3. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Similarly as above, we obtain that for $y \in Q_{2r, r^m}$, $i = 1, 2$, $l = 1, \dots, d-1$,

$$|\partial_{y_l y_d} \tilde{h}_i^\tau| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial y_d} \right| |\partial_{y_j y_l} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z')| |z'| \varphi(z') dz' \leq 2\kappa_4 r.$$

Then we obtain that for $y \in Q_{2r, r^m}$ and $l = 1, \dots, d-1$, if $2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq \min\{2^{1/m}, \frac{2}{3}R_0\}$,

(i) for $2 \leq m < 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{y_d} g_l(y)| &\leq 2^{m+1} \kappa_2 \sum_{i=1}^2 (r^m |\partial_{y_d y_l} \tilde{h}_i^\tau| + |\partial_{y_l} \tilde{h}_i^\tau|) \\ &\leq 2^{m+2} \kappa_2 (3^{m-1} \kappa_3 + 4\kappa_4) r^{m-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$|\partial_{y_d} g(y)| \leq 2^{m+2} (d-1) \kappa_2 (3^{m-1} \kappa_3 + 4\kappa_4) r^{m-1}; \quad (3.15)$$

(ii) for $m \geq 3$,

$$|\partial_{y_d} g(y)| \leq 2^{m-2} \kappa_2 \sum_{i=1}^2 |\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i| \leq 4^{m-1} \kappa_2 \kappa_3 r^{m-1}.$$

This, in combination with (3.15), gives that

$$|\partial_{y_d} x'| = |\partial_{y_d} g(y)| \leq \begin{cases} 2^{m+2}(d-1)\kappa_2(3^{m-1}\kappa_3 + 4\kappa_4)r^{m-1}, & \text{if } 2 \leq m < 3, \\ 4^{m-1}\kappa_2\kappa_3r^{m-1}, & \text{if } m \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

From conditions **(H1)**–**(H2)**, we obtain that for $y \in Q_{2r, r^m} \setminus Q_{r/4, r^m}$,

$$|\nabla_{y'} x_d| \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 |\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i| \leq 2^m \kappa_3 r^{m-1}, \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\frac{\kappa_1}{4^{m+1}} \leq \partial_{y_d} x_d = \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{2r^m} \leq 2^m \kappa_2. \quad (3.18)$$

Define a matrix as follows:

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{2r^m} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.19)$$

Observe that

$$|\nabla_y x - B| \leq |\nabla_{y'} g(y)| + |\partial_{y_d} g(y)| + |\nabla_{y'} x_d|.$$

Then combining (3.14), (3.16) and (3.17), we deduce that for $y \in Q_{2r, r^m}$, if $2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq r_{0,1} = \min\{2^{1/m}, \frac{2}{3}R_0\}$,

$$|\nabla_y x - B| \leq \begin{cases} 6^{m+1}(d-1)^2(\kappa_2(\kappa_3 + \kappa_4) + \kappa_3(\kappa_3 + 1))r^{m-1}, & \text{if } 2 \leq m < 3, \\ 4^m(\kappa_2(\kappa_3 + \kappa_4) + \kappa_3(\kappa_3 + 1))r^{m-1}, & \text{if } m \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

If r further satisfies $2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 2} r_{0,i}$ with $r_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2$ given by (1.12)–(1.13), we have

$$|\nabla_y x - B| \leq \frac{1}{2} \min\{1, 4^{-(m+1)}\kappa_1\}, \quad (3.20)$$

which leads to that for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^T \nabla_y x \xi &= \xi^T B \xi + \xi^T (\nabla_y x - B) \xi \geq |\xi'|^2 + \partial_{y_d} x_d \xi_d^2 - |\nabla_y x - B| |\xi|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min\{1, 4^{-(m+1)}\kappa_1\} |\xi|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^T \nabla_y x \xi &\leq |\xi'|^2 + \partial_{y_d} x_d \xi_d^2 + |\nabla_y x - B| |\xi|^2 \\ &\leq (2^{-1} \min\{1, 4^{-(m+1)}\kappa_1\} + \max\{1, 2^m \kappa_2\}) |\xi|^2. \end{aligned}$$

These two inequalities imply that (3.8) holds.

Step 2. Note that u is in the class C^2 . Then by the chain rule, we have

$$\partial_{x_k} u(x) = \partial_{y_i} v(y) \partial_{x_k} y_i, \quad \partial_{x_k x_l} u(x) = \partial_{y_i y_j} v(y) \partial_{x_k} y_i \partial_{x_l} y_j + \partial_{y_i} v(y) \partial_{x_k x_l} y_i.$$

Then we have from (3.2)–(3.3) that $v(y)$ solves

$$\tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{ij} v(y) + \tilde{b}_i \partial_i v(y) = 0,$$

where $\tilde{a}_{ij} = a_{kl}\partial_{x_k}y_i\partial_{x_l}y_j$ and $\tilde{b}_i = a_{kl}\partial_{x_kx_l}y_i$. Using (3.8), we also have

$$\frac{I_d}{C_0} \leq \nabla_x y = \nabla_x \Phi^{-1}(x) \leq C_0 I_d,$$

where C_0 is given by (3.9). Denote

$$\mathcal{K}(y) := -2r^m \tilde{\delta}^{-1} \nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_2 - \tilde{\delta}^{-1} (y_d + r^m) \nabla_{y'} \tilde{\delta}.$$

If $2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq r_{0,3}$ with $r_{0,3}$ given by (1.14), it then follows from conditions **(H1)**–**(H2)** that for $y \in Q_{2r,r^m} \setminus Q_{r/4,r^m}$,

$$|\mathcal{K}(y)| \leq 2^{3m+1} \kappa_1^{-1} \kappa_3 r^{m-1} \leq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (3.21)$$

In view of (3.5), we deduce from (3.20) and (3.21) that if $2^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} r_{0,i}$ and $y \in Q_{2r,r^m} \setminus Q_{r/4,r^m}$,

$$|\nabla_x y| \leq |B^{-1}| + (|\nabla_y g(y)| + |\mathcal{K}(y)|) |\nabla_x y| \leq |B^{-1}| + \frac{3}{4} |\nabla_x y|,$$

and thus,

$$|\nabla_x y| \leq 4|B^{-1}| \leq 4\sqrt{d-1+4r^{2m}\tilde{\delta}^{-2}} \leq 4\sqrt{d-1+4^{2m+1}\kappa_1^{-2}}, \quad (3.22)$$

where B^{-1} is the inverse matrix of B defined by (3.19). Then we have from (3.18) and (3.20) that

$$|\nabla_y x| \leq |\nabla_y x - B| + |B| \leq \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{d-1+4^{-1}r^{-2m}\tilde{\delta}^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{d-1+2^{2m}\kappa_2^2},$$

which gives that

$$|\xi| = |\nabla_y x \nabla_x y \xi| \leq C(d, m, \kappa_2) |\nabla_x y \xi|, \quad \text{for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This, together with (3.4) and (3.22), reads that for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\frac{1}{C_1} |\xi|^2 \leq \min\{1, p-1\} |\nabla_x y \xi|^2 \leq \xi_i \tilde{a}_{ij} \xi_j \leq \max\{1, p-1\} |\nabla_x y|^2 |\xi|^2 \leq C_1 |\xi|^2,$$

where $C_1 = C_1(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$. That is, $\frac{I_d}{C_1} \leq \tilde{a} \leq C_1 I_d$.

We now proceed to estimate $|\nabla_x^2 y|$ for the purpose of estimating $|\tilde{b}|$. By differentiating $\partial_{x_k} y_i \partial_{y_j} x_k = \delta_{ij}$ in x_l , we have from the chain rule that

$$\partial_{x_k x_l} y_i \partial_{y_j} x_k + \partial_{x_k} y_i \partial_{x_l} y_s \partial_{y_j y_s} x_k = 0.$$

This, in combination with (3.8) and (3.22), reads that

$$|\nabla_x^2 y| \leq C(d, m, \kappa_1) |\nabla_y^2 x|. \quad (3.23)$$

Using **(H2)**–**(H3)**, we deduce that $|\nabla_y^2 x_d| \leq C(m, \kappa_3, \kappa_4) r^{-1}$. It remains to estimate $|\nabla_y^2 x'|$. When $m \geq 3$, it follows from a direct computation that $|\nabla_y^2 x'| \leq C(d, m, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4) r^{-1}$. In the case when $2 \leq m < 3$, the key is to estimate the following terms

$$\nabla_{y'}^3 \tilde{h}_i^\tau(y'), \quad \nabla_{y'}^2 \partial_{y_d} \tilde{h}_i^\tau(y'), \quad \nabla_{y'} \partial_{y_d}^2 \tilde{h}_i^\tau(y'), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Observe from integration by parts that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i^\tau &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \varphi(z') dz' = -\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{z'} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \varphi(z') dz' \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \nabla_{z'} \varphi(z') dz',\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{y_d} \tilde{h}_i^\tau &= \frac{2y_d}{r^{m-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \cdot z' \varphi(z') dz' \\ &= -\frac{2y_d}{\tau r^{m-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{z'} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \cdot z' \varphi(z') dz' \\ &= \frac{2y_d}{\tau r^{m-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \operatorname{div}_{z'}(z' \varphi(z')) dz'.\end{aligned}\quad (3.24)$$

Then we obtain from condition **(H3)** that if $2^{-1}(\varepsilon \kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} r_{0,i}$ and $y \in Q_{2r, r^m} \setminus Q_{r/4, r^m}$, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$|\nabla_{y'}^3 \tilde{h}_i^\tau| = \frac{1}{\tau} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{y'}^2 \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \nabla_{z'} \varphi(z') dz' \right| \leq \frac{Cr^{m-1}}{r^{2m} - y_d^2},$$

and

$$|\nabla_{y'}^2 \partial_{y_d} \tilde{h}_i^\tau| = \left| \frac{2y_d}{\tau r^{m-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{y'}^2 \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \operatorname{div}_{z'}(z' \varphi(z')) dz' \right| \leq \frac{Cr^m}{r^{2m} - y_d^2},$$

where $C = C(d, m, \kappa_4)$. By differentiating the last line of (3.24) in y_d , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{y_d}^2 \tilde{h}_i^\tau &= \frac{2}{\tau r^{m-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \operatorname{div}_{z'}(z' \varphi(z')) dz' \\ &\quad + \frac{4y_d^2}{\tau r^{2m-2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \cdot z' \operatorname{div}_{z'}(z' \varphi(z')) dz'.\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_{y_d}^2 \tilde{h}_i^\tau| &\leq \frac{2}{r^{2m} - y_d^2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{y'} \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \operatorname{div}_{z'}(z' \varphi(z')) dz' \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{4r^{m+1}}{r^{2m} - y_d^2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \nabla_{y'}^2 \tilde{h}_i(y' - \tau z') \cdot z' \operatorname{div}_{z'}(z' \varphi(z')) dz' \right| \\ &\leq \frac{Cr^{m-1}}{r^{2m} - y_d^2},\end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(d, m, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$. In light of these above results, it follows from a direct calculation that

$$|\nabla_{y'}^2 x| \leq C(d, m, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4) r^{-1},$$

which, together with (3.23), yields that $|\tilde{b}| \leq Cr^{-1}$, where C depends only on d, m and κ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

It remains to demonstrate that $\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\{y_d = \pm r^m\}$. For that purpose, it suffices to explain the construction of $g(y)$ in (3.5). For $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, let

$$g_i(y) = (y_d^2 - r^{2m})(\beta_i(y') y_d + \gamma_i(y')),$$

where $\beta_i(y')$ and $\gamma_i(y')$ are constructed to satisfy the Neumann boundary condition. From the chain rule, we know

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \nabla v \cdot e_d = \nabla_x u(x) \cdot \nabla_y \Phi(y) e_d, \quad \text{on } \{y_d = \pm r^m\},$$

where $e_d = (0', 1)$. So in order to let $\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\{y_d = \pm r^m\}$, it requires that $\nabla_y \Phi(y) e_d // (-\nabla_{x'} \tilde{h}_j, 1)$ on $\{y_d = (-1)^{j+1} r^m\}$ for $j = 1, 2$. This means that for $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ and $j = 1, 2$,

$$2r^{2m} \beta_i(y') + (-1)^{j+1} 2r^m \gamma_i(y') = \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{2r^m} \partial_{y_i} \tilde{h}_j, \quad \text{on } \{y_d = (-1)^{j+1} r^m\},$$

where we used the fact that $x' = y'$ on $\{y_d = \pm r^m\}$. This leads to that

$$\beta_i(y') = \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{8r^{3m}} \partial_{y_i} (\tilde{h}_1(y') + \tilde{h}_2(y')), \quad \gamma_i(y') = \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{8r^{2m}} \partial_{y_i} (\tilde{h}_1(y') - \tilde{h}_2(y')).$$

From the above proof, we see that the third-order derivatives of \tilde{h}_1 and \tilde{h}_2 are involved. Hence, we replace \tilde{h}_i with its mollification \tilde{h}_i^τ in the case of $2 \leq m < 3$ for $i = 1, 2$, as shown in (3.6). The proof is complete. \square

In view of Lemma 3.1 and using the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [16] with minor modification, we obtain the Krylov-Safonov Harnack inequality for the solution u to equation (3.10) as follows.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $d \geq 3$ and $2^{-1}(\varepsilon \kappa_2^{-1})^{1/m} < r \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} r_{0,i}$ with $r_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ defined by (1.12)–(1.14). Assume that $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2r} \setminus \Omega_{r/4})$ is a nonnegative solution to (3.10) with some $\varsigma > 0$. Then we have*

$$\sup_{\Omega_r \setminus \Omega_{r/2}} u \leq C \inf_{\Omega_r \setminus \Omega_{r/2}} u, \quad (3.25)$$

where $C = C(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$.

For readers' convenience, we leave the proof of Corollary 3.2 in the appendix.

Remark 3.3. We here would like to emphasize that the Harnack inequality gives a qualitative characterization in terms of small propagation property for the solution, which is critical to the establishment of oscillation decay estimate of the solution in the following.

Remark 3.4. By slightly modifying the proofs in Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.2, we obtain that (3.25) also holds in $\Omega_{x',r} \setminus \Omega_{x',r/2}$ for any $x \in \Omega_{r_0}$, $0 < r_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} r_{0,i}$.

Lemma 3.5. *For $d \geq 3$, let $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R_0})$ be the solution to equation (3.1) with some $\varsigma > 0$. For any fixed $0 < R_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 3} R_{0,i}$ and $0 < \beta < 1$, if $0 < r_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 4} r_{0,i}$, then for a arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega_{r_0}$, there exists a positive constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ depending only on d, m, p and κ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ such that*

$$\text{osc}_{\Omega_{x',\tilde{\varrho}}} u \leq 2\tilde{\varrho}^{\beta\gamma} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{x',\tilde{\varrho}^{1-\beta}}} u,$$

where $\tilde{\varrho} = \tilde{c}_0 \delta^{1/m}$.

Proof. For the convenience of presentation, we drop the x' subscript and write $\Omega_r = \Omega_{x',r}$ in this proof. Since $0 < r_0 \leq r_{0,4}$, we have $2\tilde{\varrho} < \tilde{\varrho}^{1-\beta} \leq R_0$. Then for any $\tilde{\varrho} \leq r < \tilde{\varrho}^{1-\beta}$, define $w := \sup_{\Omega_{2r}} u - u$. Note that w satisfies equation (3.1) in Ω_{2r} , it then follows from the maximum principle that

$$\sup_{\Omega_r \setminus \Omega_{r/2}} w = \sup_{\Omega_r} w, \quad \inf_{\Omega_r \setminus \Omega_{r/2}} w = \inf_{\Omega_r} w,$$

which, together with Corollary 3.2 and Remark 3.4, shows that

$$\sup_{\Omega_r} w \leq C_0 \inf_{\Omega_r} w, \quad \text{with } C_0 = C_0(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4) > 1.$$

This leads to that

$$C_0 \sup_{\Omega_r} u - \inf_{\Omega_r} u \leq (C_0 - 1) \sup_{\Omega_{2r}} u. \quad (3.26)$$

By adding $-(C_0 - 1) \inf_{\Omega_r} u \leq -(C_0 - 1) \inf_{\Omega_{2r}} u$ to (3.26), we obtain

$$\text{osc}_{\Omega_r} u \leq \frac{C_0 - 1}{C_0} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{2r}} u.$$

Pick $\gamma = \frac{\ln \frac{C_0}{C_0 - 1}}{\ln 2}$. Then we have

$$\text{osc}_{\Omega_r} u \leq 2^{-\gamma} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{2r}} u. \quad (3.27)$$

For $i \geq 0$, write $r_i = \frac{\tilde{\varrho}^{1-\beta}}{2^i}$. Take k such that $\tilde{\varrho} \leq r_k < 2\tilde{\varrho}$. Then iterating (3.27) for k times, we have

$$\text{osc}_{\Omega_{\tilde{\varrho}}} u \leq \text{osc}_{\Omega_{r_k}} u \leq 2^{-k\gamma} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{r_0}} u \leq 2^\gamma \tilde{\varrho}^{\beta\gamma} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{\tilde{\varrho}^{1-\beta}}} u,$$

where we used the fact that $2^{-k} \tilde{\varrho}^{1-\beta} = 2^{-k} r_0 = r_k < 2\tilde{\varrho}$. The proof is complete. \square

Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. A combination of Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 3.5 shows that for any $x \in \Omega_{r_0}$, $0 < r_0 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq 4} r_{0,i}$,

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C \delta^{-1/m} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{x',\tilde{\varrho}}} u \leq C \delta^{\frac{\beta\gamma-1}{m}} \text{osc}_{\Omega_{x',\tilde{\varrho}^{1-\beta}}} u, \quad \tilde{\varrho} = \tilde{c}_0 \delta^{1/m},$$

where $C = C(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$. The proof is finished. \square

4. GRADIENT ESTIMATES WITH EXPLICIT BLOW-UP RATES

In order to prove Theorem 1.5, we see from Theorem 1.1 that it suffices to establish the oscillation decay estimate of the solution u with an explicit rate. For that purpose, we plan to construct its explicit supersolution in the following. For $m > 2$, $\tau > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, define an auxiliary function as follows:

$$w(x) = (|x'|^m + a|x'|^{m-2}x_d^2)^{\frac{\tau}{m}}, \quad a = \frac{m(m+\tau)}{2}, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_{\tilde{r}_0}. \quad (4.1)$$

The auxiliary function w will be proved to be a local supersolution as follows.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume as in Theorem 1.5. Let $d \geq 2$, $m > 2$ and $p > d + m - 1$. Then for any $\tau \in (0, p - d - m + 1)$ and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{p-d-m+1-\tau}{p-1})$, there exists a small constant $0 < \hat{r}_0 = \hat{r}_0(d, m, p, \lambda, \gamma, \tau, \tilde{r}_0) \leq \tilde{r}_0$ such that for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla w|^{p-2}\nabla w) > 0, & \text{in } \Omega_{\tilde{r}_0} \setminus \Omega_{\varepsilon^{2/m}}, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} > 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_{\tilde{r}_0}^\pm \cap \overline{\Omega_{\tilde{r}_0} \setminus \{x' = 0\}}, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where w is given by (4.1).

Remark 4.2. If we take $m = 2$ in (4.1), the auxiliary function becomes the separation form of $|x'|$ and x_d , which is adopted in recent work [16]. However, when $m > 2$, the required form becomes more complex and leads to a different computation in the following. Moreover, the results of $m = 2$ cannot be derived by directly letting $m \rightarrow 2$. See the following proofs for more details.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. For simplicity, in the following we use $O(1)$ to represent that $|O(1)| \leq C$ for some constant C , which may differ at each occurrence and depend only on $d, m, p, \lambda, \gamma, \tau, \sigma_0, \tilde{r}_0$, but not on ε . Denote $Q = (|x'|^m + a|x'|^{m-2}x_d^2)^{1/m}$ and then $w(x) = Q(x)^\gamma$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |x_d| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \lambda|x'|^m + C_0|x'|^{m+\sigma_0} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + 2\lambda|\tilde{r}_0|^{\frac{m}{2}} + 2C_0|\tilde{r}_0|^{\frac{m}{2}+\sigma_0})|x'|^{\frac{m}{2}}, \quad \text{for } \varepsilon^{2/m} \leq |x'| < \tilde{r}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

In light of (4.3), it follows from a direct calculation that for $\varepsilon^{2/m} \leq |x'| < \tilde{r}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{x'} w &= \gamma Q^{\gamma-m} |x'|^{m-1} (x_i |x'|^{-1} + O(1)|x'|^{m-2}), \quad \partial_d w = \frac{2a\gamma}{m} Q^{\gamma-m} |x'|^{m-2} x_d, \\ \partial_{ii} w &= \gamma Q^{\gamma-2m} |x'|^{2m-2} (1 + (\gamma-2)x_i^2 |x'|^{-2} + O(1)|x'|^{m-2}), \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1, \\ \partial_{ij} w &= \gamma Q^{\gamma-2m} |x'|^{2m-2} ((\gamma-2)x_i x_j |x'|^{-2} + O(1)|x'|^{m-2}), \quad i \neq j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, d-1, \\ \partial_{id} w &= \frac{2a\gamma(\gamma-2)}{m} Q^{\gamma-2m} |x'|^{2m-2} (x_i x_j |x'|^{-2} + O(1)|x'|^{\frac{3m-6}{2}}), \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1, \\ \partial_{dd} w &= \gamma Q^{\gamma-2m} |x'|^{2m-2} (m + \tau + O(1)|x'|^{m-2}). \end{aligned}$$

We here would like to remark that when $m > 2$, there produces explicit high order terms $|x'|^{m-2}$ and $|x'|^{\frac{3m-6}{2}}$, which ensure that it suffices to decrease the horizontal length of the thin gap for the purpose of letting w become the supersolution in the following computations. This is greatly different from the case of $m = 2$, as shown in Lemma 4.1 of [16]. In fact, besides decreasing \tilde{r}_0 , it also needs to require that $|x'| \geq C\varepsilon$ for a large constant C in the case when $m = 2$. In view of (1.16), we have

$$\nu = \frac{(-\nabla_{x'} h(x'), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h(x')|^2}}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\tilde{r}_0}^+.$$

Then on $\Gamma_{\tilde{r}_0}^+ \cap \overline{\Omega_{\tilde{r}_0} \setminus \{x' = 0'\}}$, we obtain from (1.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} &= \frac{\partial_d w - \nabla_{x'} h \nabla_{x'} w}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h|^2}} \\ &= \frac{\lambda \gamma Q^{\gamma-m} |x'|^{2m-2}}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h|^2}} (\tau + O(1) |x'|^{\min\{m-2, \sigma_0\}}) + \frac{\gamma(m+\tau) Q^{\gamma-m} |x'|^{m-2} \varepsilon}{2\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h|^2}} \\ &> \frac{\lambda \gamma Q^{\gamma-m} |x'|^{2m-2}}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{x'} h|^2}} (\tau - C_1 |x'|^{\min\{m-2, \sigma_0\}}). \end{aligned}$$

Pick $\hat{r}_{0,1} = \left(\frac{\tau}{C_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\min\{m-2, \sigma_0\}}}$. Then we have $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} > 0$ on $\Gamma_{\hat{r}_{0,1}}^+ \cap \overline{\Omega_{\hat{r}_{0,1}} \setminus \{x' = 0'\}}$. Similarly, we also obtain that $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} > 0$ on $\Gamma_{\hat{r}_{0,1}}^- \cap \overline{\Omega_{\hat{r}_{0,1}} \setminus \{x' = 0'\}}$.

Note that

$$\operatorname{div}(|\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w) |\nabla w|^{4-p} = |\nabla w|^2 \Delta w + (p-2) \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_i w \partial_j w \partial_{ij} w.$$

From (4.3), we obtain that for $\varepsilon^{2/m} \leq |x'| < \tilde{r}_0$,

$$|\nabla w|^2 = \gamma^2 Q^{2\gamma-2m} |x'|^{2m-2} (1 + O(1) |x'|^{m-2}),$$

and

$$\Delta w = \gamma Q^{\gamma-2m} |x'|^{2m-2} (d + m + \gamma - 3 + \tau + O(1) |x'|^{m-2}).$$

Therefore, we deduce that for $\varepsilon^{2/m} \leq |x'| < \tilde{r}_0$,

$$\frac{|\nabla w|^2 \Delta w}{\gamma^3 Q^{3\gamma-4m} |x'|^{4m-4}} = d + m + \gamma - 3 + \tau + O(1) |x'|^{m-2}. \quad (4.4)$$

By a similar computation, we have from (4.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d-1} \partial_i w \partial_j w \partial_{ij} w &= \gamma^3 Q^{3\gamma-4m} |x'|^{4m-4} (\gamma - 1 + O(1) |x'|^{m-2}), \\ 2 \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \partial_i w \partial_d w \partial_{id} w &= O(1) \gamma^3 Q^{3\gamma-4m} |x'|^{\frac{2m}{2}-5}, \\ (\partial_d w)^2 \partial_{dd} w &= O(1) \gamma^3 Q^{3\gamma-4m} |x'|^{5m-6}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these three equations, we derive that for $\varepsilon^{2/m} \leq |x'| < \tilde{r}_0$,

$$\frac{(p-2) \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_i w \partial_j w \partial_{ij} w}{\gamma^3 Q^{3\gamma-4m} |x'|^{4m-4}} = (p-2)(\gamma-1) + O(1) |x'|^{\frac{m-2}{2}},$$

which, together with (4.4), reads that

$$\frac{\operatorname{div}(|\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w) |\nabla w|^{4-p}}{\gamma^3 Q^{3\gamma-4m} |x'|^{4m-4}} \leq d + m - 2 + (p-1)(\gamma-1) + \tau + C_2 |x'|^{\frac{m-2}{2}}. \quad (4.5)$$

Define

$$\hat{r}_{0,2} = \left(\frac{(p-1)(1-\gamma) + 2 - d - m - \tau}{C_2} \right)^{\frac{2}{m-2}}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\operatorname{div}(|\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w) < 0, \quad \text{for } \varepsilon^{2/m} \leq |x'| < \hat{r}_{0,2}.$$

By taking $\hat{r}_0 = \min_{1 \leq i \leq 2} \hat{r}_{0,i}$, we obtain that (4.2) holds. \square

Once Lemma 4.1 is proved, we can give the proof Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Assume without loss of generality that $u(0) = 1$ and $\text{osc}_{\Omega_{\hat{r}_0}} u =$

1. Applying Theorem 1.1, we have

$$|u(x)| \leq C\varepsilon^{1/m}, \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega}_{\varepsilon^{2/m}}, \quad (4.6)$$

which implies that $\pm u \leq Cw$ on $(\{|x'| = \varepsilon^{2/m}\} \cup \{|x'| = \hat{r}_0\}) \cap \overline{\Omega}_{\hat{r}_0}$, where w is defined by (4.1) with $\gamma = \frac{p-d-m+1-2\tau}{p-1}$ for any $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2}(p+1-d-m))$ and \hat{r}_0 is given in Lemma 4.1. It then follows from the comparison principle that $|u| \leq Cw \leq C|x'|^\gamma$ in $\Omega_{\hat{r}_0} \setminus \Omega_{\varepsilon^{2/m}}$. This, in combination with (4.6), leads to that

$$|u| \leq C(|x'|^\gamma + \varepsilon^{1/m}) \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^m)^{\frac{p-d-m+1-2\tau}{m(p-1)}}, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\hat{r}_0},$$

which reads that for $x \in \Omega_{\hat{r}_0/2}$,

$$\text{osc}_{\Omega_{x',\varrho}} u \leq 2\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{x',\varrho})} \leq C(\varepsilon + |x'|^m)^{\frac{p-d-m+1-2\tau}{m(p-1)}}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $C = C(d, m, p, \tau, \lambda, \sigma_0, \tilde{r}_0)$, $\varrho = \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{3}\delta^{1/m} \leq \frac{\hat{r}_0}{3} < \frac{\hat{r}_0}{2}$ with δ and \tilde{c}_0 defined by (1.4) (1.7), respectively. A consequence of (4.7) and Theorem 1.1 shows that Theorem 1.5 holds. \square

We next prove the almost sharpness of gradient blow-up rates obtained in Theorem 1.1 for $1 < p \leq m+1$ and Theorem 1.5 for $p > m+1$ in dimension two. Similarly as above, we first construct an auxiliary function as follows: for $m > 2$ and $\tau, \gamma > 0$,

$$\underline{w}(x) := [(|x_1|^m + b|x_1|^{m-2}x_2^2)^{\frac{\gamma}{m}} - (2m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{\frac{\gamma}{m}}]_+, \quad \text{in } \Omega_1, \quad (4.8)$$

where $b = \frac{m(m-\tau)}{2}$. We now prove that the auxiliary function \underline{w} is actually a subsolution for problem (1.5). To be specific, we have

Lemma 4.3. *Assume as in Theorem 1.9. Let $d = 2$, $m > 2$ and $p > 1$. Then for any $\tau \in (0, m-2)$ and $\gamma > \max\{0, \frac{p-m-1+\tau}{p-1}\}$, there exists a small constant $0 < \hat{r}_0 = \hat{r}_0(m, p, \gamma, \tau) < 1$ such that if $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div}(|\nabla \underline{w}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{w}) \leq 0, & \text{in } \Omega_{\hat{r}_0}, \\ \frac{\partial \underline{w}}{\partial \nu} \leq 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_{\hat{r}_0}^\pm, \end{cases}$$

where \underline{w} is defined by (4.8).

Proof. For simplicity, denote $\Theta = (|x_1|^m + b|x_1|^{m-2}x_2^2)^{\frac{1}{m}}$, $v = \Theta^\gamma$ and $h(x_1) = 1 - (1 - |x_1|^m)^{\frac{1}{m}}$. A straightforward computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 v &= \gamma \Theta^{\gamma-m} x_1 |x_1|^{m-4} \left(x_1^2 + \frac{b(m-2)}{m} x_2^2 \right), \\ \partial_2 v &= \frac{2a\gamma}{m} \Theta^{\gamma-m} |x_1|^{m-2} x_2, \quad \partial_1 h = x_1 |x_1|^{m-2} (1 - |x_1|^m)^{1/m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the upward normal vector on Γ_1^+ is $\nu = (-x_1|x_1|^{m-2}, (1-|x_1|^m)^{1-1/m})$. Then on $\Gamma_1^+ \cap \{|x_1| \geq (m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}}{\gamma \Theta^{\gamma-m} |x_1|^{m-2}} \\ &= (m-\tau)x_2(\varepsilon/2 + 1 - x_2)^{m-1} - |x_1|^m - \frac{b(m-2)}{m} |x_1|^{m-2} x_2^2 \\ &< (m-\tau)x_2(\varepsilon/2 + 1 - x_2)^{m-1} + (\varepsilon/2 + 1 - x_2)^m - 1 \\ &= (\varepsilon/2 + 1 - x_2)^{m-2} \left(-(m-1-\tau)x_2^2 + (m-2-\tau)(1+\varepsilon/2)x_2 + \varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} \right) \\ &\quad + (\varepsilon/2 + 1 - x_2)^{m-2} - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

It is worth emphasizing that since the implication of τ lies in keeping its arbitrary smallness to show the almost sharpness of the blow-up rate, then we require $\tau \in (0, m-2)$ if $m > 2$. By contrast, there is no such a restrictive condition in the case of $m = 2$. Note that $x_2 = \varepsilon/2 + 1 - (1-|x_1|^m)^{1/m}$ on Γ_1^+ . Then for $|x_1| \geq (m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}$, we have $x_2 \geq \max\{\frac{\varepsilon}{m-2-\tau}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\}$. This leads to that

$$\begin{cases} (\varepsilon/2 + 1 - x_2)^{m-2} - 1 \leq 0, \\ -(m-1-\tau)x_2^2 + (m-2-\tau)(1+\varepsilon/2)x_2 + \varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Inserting this into (4.9), we deduce

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \leq 0, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1^+ \cap \{|x_1| \geq (m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}\}. \quad (4.10)$$

When $|x_1| \leq (m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}$, we have $v \leq (2m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{\gamma/m}$ on $\overline{\Omega}_{(m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}}$ for a sufficiently small ε . That is,

$$\underline{w} = 0, \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega}_{(m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}}. \quad (4.11)$$

Then we have $\frac{\partial \underline{w}}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\Gamma_{(m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}}^+$, which, together with (4.10), gives that $\frac{\partial \underline{w}}{\partial \nu} \leq 0$ on Γ_1^+ . By the same argument, we also have $\frac{\partial \underline{w}}{\partial \nu} \leq 0$ on Γ_1^- .

On the other hand, in exactly the same way to (4.5), we obtain that for $x \in \Omega_1 \cap \{|x_1| \geq (m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}\}$,

$$\frac{\operatorname{div}(|\nabla \underline{w}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{w}) |\nabla \underline{w}|^{4-p}}{\gamma^3 Q^{3\gamma-4m} |x_1|^{4m-4}} \geq m + (p-1)(\gamma-1) - \tau - \widehat{C}_0 |x'|^{m-2},$$

where $\widehat{C}_0 = \widehat{C}_0(m, d, \gamma, \tau)$. By picking

$$\hat{r}_0 = \left(\frac{m + (p-1)(\gamma-1) - \tau}{\widehat{C}_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{m-2}},$$

we deduce that $\operatorname{div}(|\nabla \underline{w}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{w}) \geq 0$ in $\Omega_{\hat{r}_0} \cap \{|x_1| \geq (m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}\}$. This, in combination with (4.11), yields that $\operatorname{div}(|\nabla \underline{w}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{w}) \geq 0$ in $\Omega_{\hat{r}_0}$. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.9.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. For any $m > 2$ and $\tau \in (0, m - 2)$, let \underline{w} be given by (4.8) with

$$\gamma = \begin{cases} \tau, & \text{if } 1 < p \leq m + 1, \\ \frac{p-m-1+2\tau}{p-1}, & \text{if } p > m + 1. \end{cases}$$

Observe from symmetry of the domain and the maximum principle that

$$u(0, x_2) = 0, \text{ if } |x_2| < \varepsilon/2, \quad \text{and } u(x) > 0, \text{ if } x_1 > 0.$$

This, in combination with the comparison principle, yields that $u \geq \frac{1}{C}\underline{w}$ in $\Omega_{\hat{r}_0} \cap \{x_1 > 0\}$. Then for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$u((4m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}, 0) \geq \frac{1}{C}\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma}{m}},$$

where $C = C(m, p, \tau)$. Due to the fact that $u(0) = 0$, it then follows from the mean value theorem that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{(4m\varepsilon/(m-2-\tau))^{1/m}})} \geq \frac{1}{C}\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{m}}.$$

The proof is finished. □

5. APPENDIX: THE PROOFS OF LEMMA 2.6 AND COROLLARY 3.2

Proof of Lemma 2.6. We first prove (2.25) under the condition of $1 < p < 2$. Note that for any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\xi_1|^{p-2}\xi_1 - |\xi_2|^{p-2}\xi_2 \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} [|\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2)|^{p-2}(\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2))] dt \\ &= (\xi_1 - \xi_2) \int_0^1 |\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2)|^{p-2} dt \\ &\quad + (p-2) \int_0^1 |\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2)|^{p-4} \langle \xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2), \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle (\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 < p < 2$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle |\xi_1|^{p-2}\xi_1 - |\xi_2|^{p-2}\xi_2, \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle \\ &= |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2 \int_0^1 |\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2)|^{p-2} dt \\ &\quad + (p-2) \int_0^1 |\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2)|^{p-4} (\langle \xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2), \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle)^2 dt \\ &\geq (p-1) |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2 \int_0^1 |\xi_2 + t(\xi_1 - \xi_2)|^{p-2} dt \\ &\geq (p-1) |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2 (|\xi_1| + |\xi_2|)^{p-2} \geq \frac{p-1}{2^{\frac{2-p}{2}}} |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2 (|\xi_1|^2 + |\xi_2|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, (2.25) holds if $1 < p < 2$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle |\xi_1|^{p-2}\xi_1 - |\xi_2|^{p-2}\xi_2, \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(|\xi_1|^{p-2} + |\xi_2|^{p-2})|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2 + \frac{1}{2}(|\xi_1|^{p-2} - |\xi_2|^{p-2})(|\xi_1|^2 - |\xi_2|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

If $p \geq 2$, it then follows from (5.1) that

$$\langle |\xi_1|^{p-2}\xi_1 - |\xi_2|^{p-2}\xi_2, \xi_1 - \xi_2 \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}(|\xi_1|^{p-2} + |\xi_2|^{p-2})|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2.$$

Then (2.26) holds if $p \geq 2$. □

Proof of Corollary 3.2. Recall that v is the solution to equation (3.11) in the annular cylinder $Q_{1.9r, r^m} \setminus Q_{0.35r, r^m}$. We now use the Neumann boundary to extend the solution along y_d -axis to a larger domain $Q_{1.9r, 2r} \setminus Q_{0.35r, 2r}$. For $i, j = 1, \dots, d-1$, we carry out the odd extension of $\tilde{a}_{id}, \tilde{a}_{di}, \tilde{b}_d$ and the even extension of $\tilde{a}_{ij}, \tilde{a}_{dd}, \tilde{b}_i$ with respect to $y_d = r^m$, respectively. Subsequently, we perform the periodic extension with the period $4r^m$. Also denote by v, \tilde{a}, \tilde{b} the extended solution and coefficients. Therefore, v verifies

$$\tilde{a}_{ij}\partial_{ij}v(y) + \tilde{b}_i\partial_iv(y) = 0, \quad \text{in } Q_{1.9r, 2r} \setminus Q_{0.35r, 2r}.$$

Let $\hat{a}_{ij}(y) = \tilde{a}_{ij}(ry)$, $\hat{b}_i(y) = r\tilde{b}_i(ry)$, and $\hat{v}(y) = v(ry)$. Then \hat{v} solves

$$\hat{a}_{ij}\partial_{ij}\hat{v}(y) + \hat{b}_i\partial_i\hat{v}(y) = 0, \quad \text{in } Q_{1.9, 2} \setminus Q_{0.35, 2}.$$

Here

$$\frac{I_d}{C_1} \leq \hat{a} \leq C_1 I_d, \quad |\hat{b}| \leq C_2,$$

where $C_1 = C_1(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$, and $C_2 = C_2(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$. Observe that $Q_{1.9, 2} \setminus Q_{0.35, 2}$ is connected in the case when $d \geq 3$. It then follows from the Krylov-Safonov theorem (see Section 4.2 in [27]) that

$$\sup_{Q_{1.1, 1} \setminus Q_{0.4, 1}} \hat{v} \leq C \sup_{Q_{1.1, 1}} \setminus Q_{0.4, 1},$$

which yields that

$$\sup_{Q_{1.1r, r^m} \setminus Q_{0.4r, r^m}} v \leq C \sup_{Q_{1.1r, r^m}} \setminus Q_{0.4r, r^m},$$

where $C = C(d, m, p, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$. This, together with (3.7), gives that Corollary 3.2 holds. □

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Prof. C.X. Miao for his constant encouragement and useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Key research and development program of China (No. 2020YFA0712903). Q. Chen was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12071043). Z. Zhao was partially supported by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (No. 2021M700358).

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Ammari, H. Kang, and M. Lim, Gradient estimates for solutions to the conductivity problem, *Math. Ann.* 332 (2005), 277-286.
- [2] H. Ammari, H. Kang, H. Lee, J. Lee, and M. Lim, Optimal estimates for the electric field in two dimensions, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 88 (2007), no. 4, 307-324.
- [3] I. Babuška, B. Andersson, P. Smith, and K. Levin, Damage analysis of fiber composites. I. Statistical analysis on fiber scale, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* 172 (1999), 27-77.
- [4] B. Budiansky and G.F. Carrier, High shear stresses in stiff fiber composites, *J. App. Mech.* 51 (1984), 733-735.
- [5] E. Bao, Y.Y. Li, and B. Yin, Gradient estimates for the perfect conductivity problem, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 193 (2009), 195-226.
- [6] E. Bao, Y.Y. Li, and B. Yin, Gradient estimates for the perfect and insulated conductivity problems with multiple inclusions, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 35 (2010), 1982-2006.
- [7] E. Bonnetier and M. Vogelius, An elliptic regularity result for a composite medium with “touching” fibers of circular cross-section, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 31 (2000), 651-677.
- [8] V. M. Calo, Y. Efendiev, and J. Galvis, Asymptotic expansions for high-contrast elliptic equations, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 24 (2014), no. 3, 465-494.
- [9] G. Ciraolo and A. Sciammetta, Gradient estimates for the perfect conductivity problem in anisotropic media, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 127 (2019), 268-298.
- [10] G. Ciraolo and A. Sciammetta, Stress concentration for closely located inclusions in nonlinear perfect conductivity problems, *J. Differential Equations*, 266 (2019), 6149-6178.
- [11] E. DiBenedetto, $C^{1+\alpha}$ local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.* 7 (1983), no. 8, 827-850.
- [12] E. DiBenedetto and J. Manfredi, On the higher integrability of the gradient of weak solutions of certain degenerate elliptic systems. *Amer. J. Math.* 115 (1993), no. 5, 1107-1134.
- [13] H.J. Dong and H.G. Li, Optimal estimates for the conductivity problem by Green’s function method, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 231 (2019), no. 3, 1427-1453.
- [14] H.J. Dong, Y.Y. Li, and Z.L. Yang, Optimal gradient estimates of solutions to the insulated conductivity problem in dimension greater than two, arXiv:2110.11313, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, to appear.
- [15] H.J. Dong, Y.Y. Li, and Z.L. Yang, Gradient estimates for the insulated conductivity problem: the non-umbilical case, arXiv:2203.10081.
- [16] H.J. Dong, Z.L. Yang and H.Y. Zhu, The insulated conductivity problem with p -Laplacian. arXiv:2304.08472v2.
- [17] H.J. Dong and H. Zhang, On an elliptic equation arising from composite materials, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 222 (2016), no. 1, 47-89.
- [18] F. Duzaar and G. Mingione, Gradient estimates via linear and nonlinear potentials. *J. Funct. Anal.* 259 (2010), no. 11, 2961-2998.
- [19] F. Duzaar and G. Mingione, Gradient estimates via non-linear potentials. *Amer. J. Math.* 133 (2011), no. 4, 1093-1149.
- [20] L.C. Evans and R.F. Gariepy, Measure theory and fine properties of functions. Revised edition. Textbooks in Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015.
- [21] M. Giaquinta and G. Modica, Partial regularity of minimizers of quasiconvex integrals. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 3 (1986), no. 3, 185-208.
- [22] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Reprint of the 1998 edition. *Classics in Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001
- [23] Y. Gorb and A. Novikov, Blow-up of solutions to a p -Laplace equation, *Multiscale Model. Simul.* 10 (2012), no. 3, 727-743.
- [24] C. Hamburger, Regularity of differential forms minimizing degenerate elliptic functionals. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 431 (1992), 7-64.
- [25] J.B. Keller, Stresses in narrow regions, *Trans. ASME J. APPL. Mech.* 60 (1993) 1054-1056.
- [26] J. Kim and M. Lim, Electric field concentration in the presence of an inclusion with eccentric core-shell geometry, *Math. Ann.* 373 (2019), no. 1-2, 517-551.
- [27] N. V. Krylov, Nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations of the second order. Translated from the Russian by P. L. Buzyskiy [P. L. Buzyskiĭ]. *Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series)*, 7. D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1987.

- [28] J. Lekner, Electrostatics of two charged conducting spheres, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 468 (2012), no. 2145, 2829-2848.
- [29] G.M. Lieberman, Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. Nonlinear Anal. 12 (1988), no. 11, 1203-1219.
- [30] G.M. Lieberman, The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural'tseva for elliptic equations. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 16 (1991), no. 2-3, 311-361.
- [31] G.M. Lieberman, Second order parabolic differential equations. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996.
- [32] P. Lindqvist, Notes on the stationary p -Laplace equation. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [33] Y.Y. Li and L. Nirenberg, Estimates for elliptic system from composite material, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 56 (2003), 892-925.
- [34] Y.Y. Li and M. Vogelius, Gradient estimates for solutions to divergence form elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 153 (2000), 91-151.
- [35] Y.Y. Li and Z.L. Yang, Gradient estimates of solutions to the insulated conductivity problem in dimension greater than two. Math. Ann. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-022-02368-x>.
- [36] Y.Y. Li and Z.L. Yang, Gradient estimates of solutions to the conductivity problem with flatter insulators, Anal. Theory Appl. 37 (2021), 114-128.
- [37] M. Lim and K. Yun, Blow-up of electric fields between closely spaced spherical perfect conductors, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 34 (2009), pp. 1287-1315.
- [38] L.J. Ma, Optimal estimates for the conductivity problem close to the boundary in dimension greater than two. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 43 (2023), no. 1, 162-176.
- [39] B. Weinkove, The insulated conductivity problem, effective gradient estimates and the maximum principle. Math. Ann. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-021-02314-3>.
- [40] K. Yun, Estimates for electric fields blown up between closely adjacent conductors with arbitrary shape, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 67 (2007), 714-730.
- [41] K. Yun, Optimal bound on high stresses occurring between stiff fibers with arbitrary shaped cross-sections, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 350 (2009), 306-312.
- [42] K. Yun, An optimal estimate for electric fields on the shortest line segment between two spherical insulators in three dimensions, J. Differential Equations 261 (2016), no. 1, 148-188.
- [43] Z.W. Zhao, Exact solutions for the insulated and perfect conductivity problems with concentric balls. Math. Eng. 5 (2023), no. 3, Paper No. 060, 11 pp.
- [44] Z.W. Zhao, Gradient estimates for the insulated conductivity problem: the case of m -convex inclusions. J. Math. Phys. 64 (2023), no. 3, Paper No. 031505, 17 pp.
- [45] Z.W. Zhao, Gradient estimates for the insulated conductivity problem with inclusions of the general m -convex shapes, arXiv:2204.07290.

(Q.L. Chen) INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS, BEIJING, 100088, CHINA.

Email address: chen_qionglei@iapcm.ac.cn

(Z.W. Zhao) BEIJING COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCE RESEARCH CENTER, BEIJING 100193, CHINA.

Email address: zwzhao365@163.com