

EXCEPTIONAL BOUNDARY SETS FOR SOLUTIONS OF FULLY NONLINEAR PARABOLIC PDES

RAM BARAN VERMA AND MOHAN MALLICK

ABSTRACT. This article investigates the exceptional set of the boundary for the following problem:

$$-\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2u) + b(x, t) \cdot Du + c(x, t)u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_T,$$

We provide a sufficient condition on the exceptional set in terms of the bound of the Hausdorff measure of this boundary portion. This condition ensures that even if the boundary values are not nonnegative on this portion, the supersolution remains nonnegative.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article, we consider the following parabolic problem:

$$(1.1) \quad -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2u) + b(x, t) \cdot Du + c(x, t)u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_T,$$

where $\Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The function $b(x, t) : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded vector field, and c is a bounded function. The precise conditions on b and c will be given below (see (A1)). $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+$ is Pucci's extremal operator defined by (2.1).

The term "exceptional sets" appears in various contexts and generally refers to situations where certain properties are retained if we ignore the "exceptional" set. One of the problems related to exceptional sets is measuring their "size." In the context of partial differential equations or related areas, size usually means a certain measure (Lebesgue, Hausdorff) or, more generally, capacity. For an introduction to terms like Hausdorff measure and capacity, we refer to [8, 11]. A more detailed analysis of their relation to exceptional sets and related problems can be found in [3]. For the exceptional set of a Sobolev function and its relation to capacity, see Section 2.42 in [11].

This article deals with the uniqueness of the solution to (3.1). The parabolic boundary Ω_T consists of two parts: the base and the lateral portion of the boundary. We will provide sufficient conditions for the exceptional sets of the base and lateral parts of the boundary separately. As discussed above, an exceptional set in this context is a subset of the boundary such that if we change the boundary values on these sets, the corresponding solution remains unchanged. For divergence form operators, the exceptional set of the boundary and the corresponding uniqueness has been discussed in [9] and Chapter 6 of [4]. For linear elliptic and parabolic equations of the non-divergence form, we refer to [13] and [14], respectively. Here, we consider the fully nonlinear operator of the non-divergence form.

This type of problem is closely related to the results of Zaremba and Phragmén-Lindelöf, which state that if u is subharmonic in a domain, even though

$$\liminf_{y \rightarrow x} u(y) \geq 0$$

fails to hold at some (single) point of the boundary, the solution is still non-negative in the whole domain. For results related to Zaremba, we refer to Theorem 3.6.29 in [12]. It is noteworthy that the Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem was first established by D. Gilbarg and E. Hopf for the Laplace equation in two and arbitrary finite dimensions, respectively (see [10, 15]). We also refer to [17, 18]. Later, Miller obtained the Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem for general uniformly elliptic equations without the continuity assumption on the coefficients in [16]. For a nice introduction and development of this topic, we refer to [19]. In the context of fully nonlinear elliptic equations, this result was obtained by I. C. Dolcetta and A. Vitolo [7].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 35K10, 35K20; Secondary: 35K10, 35K20.

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear parabolic operator, Phragmén-Lindelöf principle, exceptional boundary set, Hausdorff dimension.

This result has been extended to the case of unbounded coefficients in [20]. Recently, this result has also been extended to fully nonlinear parabolic equations with unbounded measurable coefficients [21].

Here, our interest is to extend the result of Hile and Yeh [14] in the context of fully nonlinear parabolic equations, which concerns not only a single point but a subset of the boundary. We have obtained a sufficient condition in terms of the Hausdorff measure of the exceptional set, so that if the boundary values are changed on this subset, the solution remains unchanged. The Hausdorff dimension in this case will be $(n - 1)$. We will see that for the base boundary, the upper bound of the Hausdorff measure depends only on the ellipticity constant, while for the lateral boundary, it depends on the size of the singular barrier constructed by Miller. For more details, see Section 3.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we have collected some elementary definitions and results that will be used throughout this article. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the main result in the case of the base boundary. In the last section, we construct the singular barrier following the approach of Miller and prove the main result of the article in the case of the lateral boundary.

2. AUXILIARY NOTATION AND DEFINITION

In this section, we collect definitions and results that will be used throughout the article. For given constants $0 < \lambda < \Lambda$, Pucci's extremal operators are defined as follows:

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^{\pm}(M) = \Lambda \sum_{\pm e_i > 0} e_i + \lambda \sum_{\pm e_i < 0} e_i,$$

where M is a symmetric matrix of size $N \times N$ and e_i are its eigenvalues. In the definition of Pucci's extremal operator, we need to compute the eigenvalues of the Hessian D^2u of the function. In general, it is very difficult to compute the eigenvalues of the Hessian. However, if the function u is radial, then the eigenvalues of D^2u are given by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 3.1 [6]). *Let $\tilde{u} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2 function such that $u(x) = \tilde{u}(|x|)$. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, the eigenvalues of the Hessian $D^2u(x)$ are $\frac{\tilde{u}'(|x|)}{|x|}$ with multiplicity $N - 1$ and $\tilde{u}''(|x|)$ with multiplicity 1.*

Although the definition of the Hausdorff measure and Hausdorff dimension of a set is well known, we recall it here for the sake of completeness.

Definition 2.2. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 \leq s < \infty$. We define the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure to be:*

$$\mathcal{H}^s(A) := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\delta^s(A) = \sup_{\delta > 0} \mathcal{H}_\delta^s,$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_\delta^s(A) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha(s) \left(\frac{\text{Diam } C_i}{2} \right)^s \mid A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} C_i, \text{Diam}(C_i) \leq \delta \right\},$$

and

$$\alpha(s) = \frac{\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}.$$

We also recall a simple corollary which will be of use.

Lemma 2.3. *Let E be a subset of \mathbb{R}^n with Hausdorff dimension $\mathcal{H}(E)$. If μ is a positive number such that $\mathcal{H}(E) < \mu$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\nu > 0$, there exists a countable covering of E by open balls $\{B_i\}$ in \mathbb{R}^n such that the center of each B_i is a point of E , each radius r_i of B_i satisfies $0 < r_i \leq \nu$, and moreover, $\sum_i r_i^\mu < \varepsilon$.*

Lemma 2.4 (Comparison Principle). *Consider the equation*

$$(2.2) \quad -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2u) + b(x, t) \cdot Du + c(x, t)u = f(x, t) \quad \text{in } \Omega_T.$$

Suppose that u is a subsolution and v is a supersolution such that $u \leq v$ on $\partial_{\mathcal{P}}\Omega_T$. Then, $u \leq v$ in Ω_T .

Remark 2.5. *Through this article we will be assuming $c \leq 0$.*

Remark 2.6. If (x_0, t_0) is a point on $\partial_P \Omega_T$ and u is a real-valued function in Ω_T , by the phrase $u \geq 0$ at (x_0, t_0) , we mean that $\liminf u(x, t) \geq 0$ as (x, t) approaches (x_0, t_0) from inside Ω_T . If \mathcal{D} is a subset of $\partial \Omega_T$, by $u \geq 0$ on \mathcal{D} we mean that $u \geq 0$ at every point (x, t) on \mathcal{D} . If $u \geq 0$ on the intersection of $\partial \Omega_T - \mathcal{D}$ with a neighborhood of (x, t) (or of \mathcal{D}), then we say $u \geq 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{D} - E$ near (x, t) (or, respectively, near E).

3. MAIN RESULT IN THE CASE OF THE BASE BOUNDARY

In this section, we prove Theorem 4.1, which asserts a sufficient condition in terms of the Hausdorff measure of the exceptional set. To prove this theorem, we need several elementary results as discussed in [14].

Consider the problem:

$$(3.1) \quad -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2 u) + b(x, t) \cdot Du + c(x, t)u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_T,$$

where $\Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T)$, and $b(x, t) = (b_1(x, t), b_2(x, t), \dots, b_n(x, t))$, and $c(x, t)$ are functions defined on Ω_T . The basic assumptions on the coefficients b and c are as follows:

(A1) There are two non-negative functions b_0 and c_0 defined on $(0, T)$ such that for all $(x, t) \in \Omega_T$, we have

$$|b(x, t)| \leq b_0(t) = o(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \text{and} \quad |c(x, t)| \leq c_0(t) = o(t^{1-\beta}),$$

for some $0 < \beta < 1$. Observe that this condition also implies $c_0(t) = o(t^{-1})$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 3.1. Given two positive constants α and σ satisfying

$$(3.2) \quad 0 < 2\alpha < 4n\lambda\sigma < \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda},$$

define

$$\psi(x, t) = t^{-\alpha} e^{-\frac{\sigma|x|^2}{t}}.$$

Then there exist positive constants T_1 and γ_1 depending on the ellipticity constants, b_0 , c_0 , σ , and α , such that for $(x, t) \in \Omega_{T_1}$, we have

$$(3.3) \quad -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2 \psi) + b(x, t) \cdot D\psi + c(x, t)\psi \leq -\gamma_1(t + |x|^2)t^{-2}\psi(x, t),$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} (i) & |D_i \psi(x, t)| \leq (\gamma_1 t)^{-1} |x| \psi(x, t) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ (ii) & |D_{ij} \psi(x, t)| \geq \gamma_1^{-1} t^{-2} (\delta_{ij} t + |x|^2) \psi(x, t) \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ (iii) & |D_t \psi(x, t)| \leq \gamma_1^{-1} t^{-2} (\delta_{ij} t + |x|^2) \psi(x, t). \end{cases}$$

Proof. From the expression of ψ , it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} D\psi(x, t) &= \frac{-2\sigma}{t} x \psi, \\ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} &= \left(-\frac{\alpha}{t} + \frac{\sigma|x|^2}{t^2} \right) \psi, \\ D^2 \psi(x, t) &= \left(\frac{-2\sigma}{t} I + \frac{4\sigma^2}{t^2} x \otimes x \right) \psi. \end{aligned}$$

Consider

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2 \psi) + b(x, t) \cdot D\psi + c(x, t)\psi = \\ & \left(\frac{\alpha}{t} - \frac{\sigma|x|^2}{t^2} \right) \psi + \psi \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+ \left(\frac{-2\sigma}{t} I + \frac{4\sigma^2}{t^2} x \otimes x \right) - \frac{2\sigma}{t} \psi b(x, t) \cdot x + c(x, t)\psi \\ & \leq \left(\frac{\alpha}{t} - \frac{\sigma|x|^2}{t^2} \right) \psi - \frac{2\sigma}{t} \psi \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(I) + \frac{4\sigma^2}{t^2} \psi \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(x \otimes x) + \frac{2\sigma}{t} b_0(t) |x| \psi + c_0(t) \psi \\ & = \left(\frac{\alpha}{t} - \frac{\sigma|x|^2}{t^2} \right) \psi - \frac{2n\lambda\sigma}{t} \psi + \frac{4\sigma^2}{t^2} \Lambda |x|^2 \psi + \frac{2\sigma}{t} b_0(t) |x| \psi + c_0(t) \psi. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using Young's inequality, we obtain:

$$2b_0(t)|x| \leq \epsilon \frac{|x|^2}{t} + \frac{tb_0^2(t)}{\epsilon},$$

where $\epsilon = (1 - 4n\sigma\Lambda)/2$. Observe that ϵ is a positive constant because of the condition (3.2). With this choice of ϵ , the calculation in (3.5) takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left(\alpha - 2\sigma\lambda n + \frac{2t\sigma b_0^2(t)}{1 - 4n\sigma\Lambda} + tc_0(t) \right) \frac{\psi}{t} + (-2 + 8\sigma\Lambda + 2\epsilon) \frac{\sigma|x|^2}{2t^2} \psi \\ &= \left(\alpha - 2\sigma\lambda n + \frac{2t\sigma b_0^2(t)}{1 - 4n\sigma\Lambda} + tc_0(t) \right) \frac{\psi}{t} - \left(1 + 8\sigma\Lambda \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) \right) \frac{\sigma|x|^2}{2t^2} \psi. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we choose T_1 such that for all $t \in (0, T_1)$ we have

$$\frac{2t\sigma b_0^2(t)}{1 - 4n\sigma\Lambda} + tc_0(t) \leq \frac{2\sigma\lambda n - \alpha}{2},$$

which is always possible in view of the assumptions on b_0 and c_0 . Then (3.3) follows with

$$\gamma_1 = \min \left(\frac{2\sigma\lambda n - \alpha}{2}, \left(1 + 8\sigma\Lambda \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) \right) \frac{\sigma}{2} \right).$$

□

Now consider

$$(3.6) \quad \phi(x, t) = t^{1-\beta} + (1 + t^\beta)|x|^2 \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty),$$

where β is the same as in the definition of c_0 .

Proposition 3.2. *There exist positive constants T_2 and γ_2 depending on n, Λ, β, b_0 , and c_0 such that in Ω_{T_2} we have the following:*

$$(3.7) \quad -\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2\phi) + b(x, t) \cdot D\phi + c(x, t)\phi \leq -\gamma_2 (t^{-\beta} + t^{\beta-1}|x|^2).$$

It is also clear from the definition of ϕ that

$$(3.8) \quad \left| \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} \right| \leq [t^{-\beta} + t^{\beta-1}|x|^2].$$

Proof. From the calculations, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} D\phi(x, t) &= 2(1 + t^\beta)x, \\ D^2\phi(x, t) &= 2(1 + t^\beta)I. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2\phi) + b(x, t) \cdot D\phi + c(x, t)\phi \\ &\leq 2n\Lambda(1 + t^\beta) + 2(1 + t^\beta)b(x, t) \cdot x - (1 - \beta)t^{-\beta} - \beta t^{\beta-1}|x|^2 + c(x, t) [t^{1-\beta} + (1 + t^\beta)|x|^2] \\ &\leq 4n\Lambda + \frac{8}{\beta}t^{1-\beta}b_0^2(t) - (1 - \beta)t^{-\beta} - \beta t^{\beta-1}|x|^2 + \{tc_0(t)\}t^{-\beta} + 2\{t^{\beta-1}c_0(t)\}t^{1-\beta}|x|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the above calculations, we have used the following Young's inequality:

$$b_0(t) \leq \frac{\beta}{8}t^{\beta-1}|x|^2 + \frac{2}{\beta}t^{1-\beta}b_0^2(t).$$

Now, we choose T_2 sufficiently small such that

$$\begin{cases} 4n\Lambda t^\beta + \frac{8}{\beta}tb_0^2(t) + tc_0t < \frac{(1 - \beta)}{2}, \\ 2c_0(t)t^{\beta-1} < \frac{\beta}{2}, \end{cases}$$

holds for $0 < t \leq T_2 \leq 1$. Note that the above choice of T_2 is possible in view of the assumptions on b_0 and c_0 . Finally, (3.3) follows by taking $\gamma_2 = \min \{\beta/2, (1 - \beta)/2\}$. □

4. MAIN RESULT IN THE CASE OF THE BASE BOUNDARY

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that b and c satisfy the above-mentioned conditions. Let $E \subset \overline{\Omega}$ with*

$$\mathcal{H}(E) < \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}$$

and let y_0 be a point on E . Let u be a real-valued function in $\Omega \times (0, T)$ of class $C^{2,1}$. Suppose that for some constant $L > 0$ and $\tau \in (0, \beta)$, we have:

$$u(x, t) \geq -L \quad \text{and} \quad u \leq Lt^{-\tau} \quad \text{for} \quad (x, t) \in \Omega_T.$$

Then $u \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega_T \setminus (E \times \{0\})$ near $(y_0, 0)$ implies $u \geq 0$ at $(y_0, 0)$.

Proof. As the given PDE is translation invariant, without loss of generality we can assume that $y_0 = 0$. From the given hypothesis, we can find a ball $\mathcal{B}_r \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that

$$u \geq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \overline{\mathcal{B}_r} \cap [\partial\Omega_T \setminus (E \times \{0\})]$$

for all $0 < r < r_0$, for some $r_0 > 0$. Our aim is to produce an open neighborhood \mathcal{N} of $(0, 0)$ in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} such that $\liminf_{(x,t) \rightarrow (0,0)} u \geq 0$ in $\mathcal{N} \cap \Omega_T$. Let us begin by observing that the function $u + \phi$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{L}(u + \phi) \leq \mathbb{L}(u) + \mathbb{L}(\phi) \leq (Mt^{\beta-\tau} - \gamma_2)t^{-\beta},$$

where ϕ is constructed in Lemma 3.2. Since $\beta > \tau$, if necessary, we may choose r smaller such that:

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{L}(u + \phi) < 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T.$$

Now, let us define $\delta = [\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - \mathcal{H}(E)]/2$ and choose positive constants α and σ satisfying

$$0 \leq \mathcal{H}(E) = \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - 2\delta < \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - \delta < 2\alpha < 4n\lambda\sigma < \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}.$$

In view of $\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - \delta - 2\alpha < 0$, we can choose $\nu > 0$ sufficiently small satisfying

$$(4.2) \quad 0 < \nu < r, \quad r + \nu^2 < T \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_1 \nu^{\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - \delta - 2\alpha} > L.$$

Moreover, by definition of δ , we have $\mathcal{H}(E) < \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - \delta$, so for any $\epsilon > 0$, Lemma 2.3 provides an open covering $\{B_i\}$ of E by balls in \mathbb{R}^n with the following properties:

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} \text{The centers of these balls lie in } E, \\ \text{The radii of the balls satisfy } 0 < r_i \leq \nu, \\ \sum_i r_i^{\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - \delta} < \epsilon. \end{cases}$$

Corresponding to each ball B_i in the covering, we define the following inverted paraboloids:

$$P_i := \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid |x - y_i|^2 + t < r_i^2\}.$$

Observe that each paraboloid contains the corresponding ball from the covering. Therefore, $\{P_i\}$ also covers $E \times \{0\}$. Let us define open sets:

$$A = \mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T \quad \text{and} \quad P := \bigcup_i P_i.$$

Since $t \leq \nu < r$ in P_i for each i , we find that $A \setminus \overline{P}$ is nonempty. Now, we show that \mathcal{B}_r plays the role of \mathcal{N} . To show this, let us define the following auxiliary function:

$$w(x, t) = u(x, t) + \left(1 + \frac{L}{r^2}\right) \phi(x, t) + \sum_i r_i^{\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - \delta} \psi(x - y_i, t + r_i^2).$$

Observe from (4.2) that $t + r_i^2 \leq t + \nu^2 \leq r + \nu^2 < T$ in $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T$; thus, each function $\psi(x - y_i, t + r_i^2)$ is defined for (x, t) in $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T$, and moreover will satisfy appropriately translated versions of (3.4). In fact, the estimates in (3.4) and the sum in (4.3), along with the estimate $\psi(x, t) \leq t^{-\alpha}$, show that the series in the definition of w converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T$, along with the series of space derivatives up to order two and the time derivative up to order one. Thus, the series represents a

function in $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T$ of class $C^{2,1}$, and the series may be differentiated termwise up to these orders. From (3.3), (3.7), and (4.1), we conclude therefore that in $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T$,

$$\mathcal{L}w \leq \mathcal{L}u + \left(1 + \frac{L}{r^2}\right) \mathcal{L}\psi \leq \mathcal{L}(u + \psi) < 0.$$

Now, by applying the minimum principle, we want to show that $w \geq 0$ in $A \setminus \overline{P}$.

Claim: This will be accomplished once we have

$$w \geq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial_{\mathcal{P}}(A \setminus \overline{P}).$$

Proof of the claim: For this, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(A \cup (\overline{P})^c) &\subset (\partial A \cap (\overline{P})^c) \cup (A \cap \partial \overline{P}) \cup (\partial A \cap \partial \overline{P}) \\ &\subset (\partial A \setminus P) \cup (A \cap \partial P) \\ &\subset (\partial_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{B}_r) \cap \overline{\Omega_T} \setminus P) \cup (\mathcal{B}_r \cap \partial_{\mathcal{P}}\Omega_T \setminus P) \cup (\mathcal{B}_r \cap (A \cap \partial P)). \end{aligned}$$

Based on the above containment of $\partial(A \setminus \overline{P})$, we consider three cases separately:

Case I: On $\partial(\mathcal{B}_r) \cap \overline{\Omega_T} \setminus P$, we have $0 \leq t \leq 1$, $|x|^2 + t^2 = r^2$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &\geq u(x, t) + \left(\frac{L}{r^2}\right) \phi(x, t) \\ &\geq -L + \frac{L}{r^2}(t^2 + |x|^2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case II: On $(\mathcal{B}_r \cap \partial_p \Omega_T \setminus P)$, we have $w \geq 0$ since $u \geq 0$ on $\overline{\mathcal{B}_r} \cap [\partial(\Omega_T) \setminus (E \times \{0\})]$ by hypothesis and $(\mathcal{B}_r \cap \partial(\Omega_T) \setminus P) \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}_r} \cap [\partial(\Omega_T) \setminus (E \times \{0\})]$.

Case III: On $A \cap \partial P$, we have $t > 0$. Also, for $t \in P_i$, $t \leq r_i$ for each i and $r_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, in view of (4.3). So for each $(x, t) \in A \cap \partial P$, there exists a positive constant $d_{(x,t)}$ such that the distance from (x, t) to \overline{P}_i is larger than $d_{(x,t)}$ for all but finitely many i . Thus, for each $(x, t) \in A \cap \partial P$, there exists a positive integer N such that

$$(x, t) \in \partial \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^N P_i \right) \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^N \partial P_i.$$

Thus, $(x, t) \in \partial P_i$ for some i . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &\geq u(x, t) + r_i^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa} - \delta} \psi(x - y_i, t + r_i^2) \\ &\geq -L + r_i^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa} - \delta} (\gamma_1 r_i^{-2\alpha}) \\ &\geq -L + \gamma_1 \nu^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa} - \delta - 2\alpha} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the claim. Now, by the definition of ψ and the sum in (4.3), the series in the definition of w is bounded by $\frac{\epsilon}{t^\alpha}$. Therefore, $w \geq 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T \setminus \overline{P}$ implies

$$u(x, t) + \left(1 + \frac{L}{r^2}\right) \phi(x, t) \geq -\epsilon t^\alpha.$$

If we let $\nu \rightarrow 0^+$, while preserving (4.2), and $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T \setminus \overline{P}$ widens to include all of $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T$ since $t \leq \nu$ in P ; since ϵ is also arbitrary, we get

$$u(x, t) + \left(1 + \frac{L}{r^2}\right) \phi(x, t) \geq 0,$$

in $\mathcal{B}_r \cap \Omega_T$. As by the definition of ϕ in (3.6), we have $\phi(x, t) \rightarrow (0, 0)$, we have $\phi \rightarrow 0$, and we get $\liminf_{(x,t) \rightarrow (0,0^+)} u(x, t) \geq 0$. \square

5. SINGULAR BARRIER AND EXCEPTIONAL LATERAL BOUNDARY

For a given $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ and $R > 0$, we denote by

$$C_{\theta, R} = B_R(0) \cap \left(\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \arccos \left(\frac{x_n}{|x|} \right) \leq \theta \right\} \cup \{0\} \right).$$

the truncated cone with vertex at 0, axis along x_n , aperture θ , and radius R . The cone with an arbitrary vertex $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be obtained by translating the cone with vertex at 0, and we will denote it by $C_{\theta, R}(x_0)$. Now, we present the following result from Theorem 2 [16], see also [1, 5].

Theorem 5.1. *Given $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ and $\lambda < \Lambda$, there exist positive constants $\eta(\lambda, \Lambda, n, \theta_0)$ and $\mu(\lambda, \Lambda, n, \theta_0)$, and a positive function $h \in C^2(0, \theta_0)$ such that for all $|\alpha| < \mu$, the function $v(x) = |x|^\alpha h(\theta(x))$ satisfies*

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2 v(x)) \leq -\eta |x|^{\alpha-2},$$

where $\theta(x) = \arccos \left(\frac{x_n}{|x|} \right)$ and $x \in \text{int}(C_{\theta_0, R})$.

There are some remarks:

- If $\alpha > 0$ is positive in the above definition then the function v is called regular barrier. While if $\alpha < 0$ then the barrier is called singular.
- At this juncture, we would also like to point out that the similar barrier also works for degenerate fully nonlinear elliptic operator. For the details see, section 3.1 [2].
- We by choosing R and μ further small in the above theorem we can show that similar statement also hold if we replace $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+$ by more general elliptic operator with bounded lower order terms. For example \mathcal{M}_t defined below. For the details in the case of linear elliptic equation we refer to Theorem 10.8.5, Lemma 10.8.6 and Corollary 10.8.7 [12].
- By examining the expression of v , we can also show that there are positive constants C_1, C_2, \dots, C_5 , and an $r_0 > 0$ such that all the conditions (i)-(v) of the Definition 5.2 hold if $z = 0$, that is $h_0(x) = v(x)$. Here we have assumed that $(0, t)$ lies on the parabolic boundary of the cylinder Ω_T . Moreover, as the class of equations considered here are invariant under rotation and translation so the similar barrier can be obtained by translating the vertex of the cone and corresponding function.

5.1. Family of Elliptic Operators and associated barriers. For each fixed $t \in (0, T)$, consider the following family of elliptic operators:

$$\mathcal{M}_t = \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2(\cdot)) + \sum_{i=1}^N b_i(\cdot, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + c(\cdot, t),$$

where $|b(x, t)| \leq K$ and $c(x, t) \leq 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T)$. Let $E \subset \partial\Omega$ and $\{h_z\}$ be a family of functions indexed by points $z \in E$.

Definition 5.2. *The family of functions $\{h_z\}$ is called a family of uniformly strong local barriers of order μ for the family of $\{\mathcal{M}_t\}$ in $(0, T)$ in Ω at E if for some positive constants r_0, C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 , the functions $h(y, z) := h_z$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1) *Each h_z is defined and continuous in $\overline{\Omega} \cap \{x \mid 0 < |x-y| < r_0\}$ and C^2 on $\Omega \cap \{x \mid 0 < |x-y| < r_0\}$.*
- (2) *For $z \in E$ and $y \in \Omega$ with $0 < |y-z| < r_0$,*

$$(5.2) \quad C_1 |y-z|^\mu \leq h(y, z) \leq C_2 |y-z|^\mu,$$

- (3) *$|D_i h(y, z)| \leq C_3 |y-z|^{\mu-1}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$,*
- (4) *$|D_{ij} h(y, z)| \leq C_4 |y-z|^{\mu-2}$,*
- (5) *$\mathcal{M}_t h(y, z) \leq -C_5 |y-z|^{\mu-2}$, for $t \in (0, T)$.*

Now let us consider the operator $\mathcal{L} = -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2 u) + b(x, t) \cdot Du + c(x, t)u$, where $|b| \leq K$ and $c \leq 0$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let \mathcal{L} be the operator as given above in Ω_T and let $E \subset \partial\Omega$, with a point $z_0 \in E$. Suppose there exists a family of uniformly strong local singular barriers of order $-\mu$ for the family of elliptic operators $\{\mathcal{M}_t\}$ $t \in (0, T)$ in Ω at E and there exists a strong local regular barrier of order η for*

the same class of uniformly elliptic operators in Ω at z_0 . Suppose also that $\mathcal{H}(E) < \mu$. Let $u \in C^{2,1}(\Omega_T)$. Suppose also that for some non-negative constant M we have

$$(5.3) \quad u(x, t) \geq -L, \quad \mathcal{L}u(x, t) \leq L \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega_T.$$

Then for $0 < t_0 < T$, $u(z_0, t_0) \geq 0$ follows provided the boundary condition

$$(5.4) \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{on } (\partial\Omega \setminus E) \times (0, T) \quad \text{near } (z_0, t_0)$$

is fulfilled.

Remark 5.4. The assumption regarding the existence of regular and singular barrier of order μ in the statement of above theorem is justified by the remark below Theorem 5.1.

Proof. Let $h^r = h(\cdot, z_0)$ and $h^s = h(\cdot, z_0)$ be the regular and singular barriers of order η and $-\mu$ at $z_0 \in E$ in Ω , respectively. In view of (5.4), there exists an open cylinder S , say,

$$S = \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid |x - z_0| < r, |t - t_0| < s\}$$

such that

$$(5.5) \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{on } [(\partial\Omega \setminus E) \times (0, T)] \cap \bar{S}.$$

Define $\delta = [\mu - \mathcal{H}(E)]/2$ and choose ϵ_1 sufficiently small such that

$$(5.6) \quad 0 < \epsilon_1 < r \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 \epsilon_1^{-\delta} \geq L.$$

By the definition of the Hausdorff dimension, for given $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$, we can find a covering of E by balls $\{B_{r_i}(z_i)\}$, where $z_i \in E$ and $0 < r_i \leq \epsilon_1$, such that

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_i r_i^{\mu - \delta} < \epsilon_2.$$

We may discard all the balls that do not intersect with $E \cap B_r(z_0)$. Now for $(x, t) \in S \cap \Omega_T$ and each i ,

$$|x - z_i| \leq |x - z_0| + |z_0 - z_i| \leq 2r + \epsilon_1 < 3r < r_0.$$

Moreover, $|x - z_0| \leq r < r_0$. Therefore, $h^r(x)$ and all $h^s(x, z_i)$ are defined and $C^{2,1}$ functions in $S \cap \Omega_T$. Furthermore, for any $(x, t) \in S \cap \Omega_T$, we also have

$$0 < \text{dist}(x, E) \leq |x - z_i| < r_0.$$

Therefore, in view of (5.7) and conditions (1) – (5) in the definition of the singular barrier, we find that the function

$$(5.8) \quad w(x, t) := u(x, t) + \left(1 + \frac{L}{C_1 r^\eta}\right) h^r(x) + \sum_i r_i^{\mu - \delta} h^s(x, z_i) + \frac{L}{\eta^2} (t - t_0)^2$$

is well defined. Moreover, in view of (5.7), we find that the termwise twice-differentiated series converges locally uniformly on $S \cap \Omega_T$. Therefore, this function is $C^{2,1}$ in $S \cap \Omega_T$. Furthermore, in view of (5.8), (5.3), and (5) in the definition of the singular barrier, and the properties of the Pucci extremal operators, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(w) \leq \mathcal{L}(u)(x, t) + \mathcal{L}(g)(x) - \frac{2L}{s^2} (t - t_0) < 0.$$

Let us set $\hat{S} := S \cap \Omega_T$ and $P = (\cup_i B_i) \times \mathcal{R}$. Observe that $\hat{S} \setminus \bar{P}$ is nonempty provided ϵ_1 is sufficiently small. In fact, any $(x, t) \in \hat{S}$ lies in $\hat{S} \setminus \bar{P}$ if $\epsilon_1 < \text{dist}(x, E)$. To prove the claim, we first show that $w \geq 0$ on $\hat{S} \setminus \bar{P}$. Since w is a supersolution, we need to show that $w \geq 0$ on the boundary of $\hat{S} \setminus \bar{P}$. Let us divide the boundary of $\hat{S} \setminus \bar{P}$ into the following three parts:

$$\partial(\hat{S} \setminus \bar{P}) \subset (\partial S \cap \overline{\Omega_T} \setminus P) \cup (S \cap \partial\Omega_T \setminus P) \cup (\hat{S} \cap \partial P).$$

Let us treat the above three cases separately:

- (1) On $\partial S \cap \overline{\Omega_T} \setminus P$, we have either $|x - z_0| = r$ or $|t - t_0| = s$. If $|x - z_0| = r$, then by the definition of w , (5.3), and condition (1) in the definition of the barrier, and $|t - t_0| \leq s$, we have

$$w(x, t) \geq -L + \frac{L}{C_1 r^\eta} C_1 |x - z_0|^\eta = 0.$$

On the other hand, if $|t - t_0| = s$, again by the definition of w , (5.3), and condition (1) in the definition of the barrier, we have

$$w(x, t) \geq -L + \frac{L}{s^2} s^2 = 0.$$

- (2) Since $\hat{S} \cap \partial P \subset [(\partial\Omega \setminus E) \times (0, T)] \cap \overline{S}$, so $w \geq 0$ follows by (5.5).
 (3) Let $x \in \hat{S} \cap \partial P$, then we have $\text{dist}(x, E) > 0$. But the radius of the balls $B_{r_i}(z_i)$ converges to zero by (5.7), therefore $x \in \overline{B_j}$ for at most a finite number of j , say N . Therefore, we have

$$x \in \partial \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N B_i \right) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N (\partial B_i),$$

which implies $x \in \partial B_k$ for some k . Then again by the definition of w , (5.3), condition (1), (5.6), and $r_j \leq \epsilon_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &\geq u(x, t) + r_k^{\mu-\delta} h^s(x, z_k) \\ &\geq -L + r_k^{\mu-\delta} C_1 |x - y_k|^{-\mu} \\ &\geq -L + C_1 r_k^{-\delta} \geq -L + C_1 \epsilon_1^{-\delta} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the minimum principle implies that $w \geq 0$ in $S \cap \Omega_T \setminus \overline{P}$. By condition (1) in the definition of the barrier and (5.3), the series defining w can be bounded in $S \cap \Omega_T$ as follows:

$$\sum_i r_i^{\mu-\delta} \leq \sum_i r_i^{\mu-\delta} C_2 |x - z_i|^{-\mu} \leq \epsilon_2 C_2 [\text{dist}(x, E)]^{-\mu};$$

Therefore, $w \geq 0$ implies

$$u(x, t) + \left(1 + \frac{L}{C_1 s^\eta} \right) h^r(x) + \frac{L}{s^2} (t - t_0)^2 \geq -\epsilon_2 C_2 [\text{dist}(x, E)]^{-\mu}.$$

Now, we shrink P by taking $\epsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$ while preserving (5.6). Since ϵ_1 is arbitrary, we obtain that in $S \cap \Omega_T$,

$$u(x, t) + \left(1 + \frac{L}{C_1 s^\eta} \right) h^r(x) + \frac{L}{s^2} (t - t_0)^2 \geq 0.$$

Now by using $\liminf_{z \rightarrow z_0} h^r(z) = 0$, we obtain $\liminf u \geq 0$ as $(x, t) \rightarrow (z_0, t_0)$ in $S \cap \Omega_T$. \square

By applying the above theorem to all the points of $E \times (0, T)$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.5. *If in Theorem 5.3 the hypothesis (5.4) is replaced by $u \geq 0$ on $(\partial\Omega \setminus E) \times (0, T)$ near $E \times (0, T)$, then we have $u \geq 0$ on $E \times (0, T)$.*

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Banerjee and N. Garofalo. Boundary behavior of nonnegative solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic equations. *Manuscripta Mathematica*, 146:201–222, 2015.
- [2] I. Birindelli and F. Demengel. Eigenvalue and dirichlet problem for fully-nonlinear operators in non-smooth domains. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 352(2):822–835, 2009.
- [3] L. Carleson. *Selected Problems on Exceptional Sets*. Mathematical studies, 13. Van Nostrand, 1967.
- [4] J. Chabrowski. *The Dirichlet problem with L2-boundary data for elliptic linear equations*. Springer, 2006.
- [5] M. G. Crandall, M. Kocan, P.-L. Lions, and A. Swiech. Existence results for boundary problems for uniformly elliptic and parabolic fully nonlinear equations. 1999.
- [6] A. Cutriand F. Leoni. On the Liouville property for fully nonlinear equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 17(2):219–245, 2000.
- [7] I. C. Dolcetta and A. Vitolo. A qualitative phragmén–lindelöf theorem for fully nonlinear elliptic equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 243(2):578–592, 2007.
- [8] L. Evans. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. Routledge, 2018.
- [9] S. Gaïdenko. On exceptional sets on the boundary and the uniqueness of solutions of the dirichlet problem for a second order elliptic equation. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 39(1):107, 1981.
- [10] D. Gilbarg. The phragmén–lindelöf theorem for elliptic partial differential equations. *Journal of Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 1:411–417, 1952.

- [11] J. Heinonen, T. Kipelainen, and O. Martio. *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*. Courier Dover Publications, 2018.
- [12] L. Helms. *Potential Theory*. Universitext. Springer London, 2009.
- [13] G. Hile and R. Yeh. Exceptional boundary sets for solutions of elliptic partial differential inequalities. *Indiana University mathematics journal*, 35(3):611–621, 1986.
- [14] G. Hile and R. Yeh. Exceptional boundary sets for solutions of parabolic partial differential inequalities. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 306(2):607–621, 1988.
- [15] E. Hopf. Remarks on the preceding paper by d. gilbarg. *Journal of Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 1:419–424, 1952.
- [16] K. Miller. Barriers on cones for uniformly elliptic operators. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 76(1):93–105, 1967.
- [17] J. Oddson. Phragmen-lindelöf theorems for elliptic equations in the plane. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 145:347–356, 1969.
- [18] J. K. Oddson. Some solutions of elliptic extremal equations in the plane. *Matematiche (Catania)*, 23:273–289, 1968.
- [19] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger. *Maximum principles in differential equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [20] F. Punzo. Phragmén-lindelöf principles for fully nonlinear elliptic equations with unbounded coefficients. *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, 9(5):1439–1461, 2010.
- [21] S. Tateyama. The phragmén-lindelöf theorem for lp-viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic equations with unbounded ingredients. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 133:172–184, 2020.

(Ram Baran Verma) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SRM UNIVERSITY AMARAVATI, ANDHRA PRADESH-522502, INDIA
Email address: rambaran.v@srmmap.edu.in

(Mohan Mallick) VISVESVARAYA NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, INDIA-522502
Email address: mohan.math09@gmail.com, mohanmallick@math.vnit.ac.in