

RECONSTRUCTION OF COEFFICIENTS IN THE DOUBLE PHASE PROBLEM

CĂTĂLIN I. CĂRSTEA AND PHILIPP ZIMMERMANN

ABSTRACT. The main purpose of this article is to reconstruct the nonnegative coefficient a in the double phase problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + a|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = f & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

from the Dirichlet to Neumann (DN) map Λ_a . We show that this can be achieved, when the coefficient a has Hölder continuous first order derivatives and the exponents satisfy $1 < p \neq q < \infty$. Our reconstruction method relies on a careful analysis of the asymptotic behavior of the solution u to the double phase problem with small or large Dirichlet datum f (depending on the ordering of p and q) as well as the related DN map Λ_a . As is common for inverse boundary value problems, we need a sufficiently rich family of special solutions to a related partial differential equation, which is independent of the coefficient one aims to reconstruct (in our case to the p -Laplace equation). We construct such families of solutions by a suitable linearization technique.

Keywords. Nonlinear PDEs, double phase problems, degenerate coefficients, inverse problems.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): Primary 35R30; secondary 35J62, 35J70

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Main results and comparison to the literature	2
1.2. Organization of the article	4
2. Notation	4
3. The double phase problem	5
3.1. Well-posedness	5
3.2. Local minimizers of the double phase functional	8
3.3. Maximum and comparison principle	9
4. Asymptotic expansion of solutions to the double phase	11
4.1. Asymptotic expansion of solutions for $p < q$	11
4.2. Asymptotic expansion of solutions for $p > q$	18
5. DN map of the double phase problem	19
6. Linearization of the p -Laplace equation	20
7. Proof of Theorem 1.1	22
7.1. Reconstruction of a in the range $p < q$	23
7.2. Reconstruction of a in the range $p > q$	28
References	28

1. INTRODUCTION

In the present article, we intend to uniquely recover the nonnegative (scalar) coefficient a in the *double phase problem*

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + a|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = f & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

from the *Dirichlet to Neumann (DN) map* Λ_a . The later is formally given by the expression

$$(1.2) \quad \Lambda_a f := (|\nabla u|^{p-2}\partial_\nu u + a|\nabla u|^{q-2}\partial_\nu u)|_{\partial\Omega},$$

where u is the unique solution to (1.1) with boundary value $f \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, $\partial_\nu = \nu \cdot \nabla$ and ν denotes the outer normal unit vector field to $\partial\Omega$. The DN map Λ_a will be rigorously introduced in Section 5. Here and throughout this article, we assume that Ω is a smoothly bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$ and the exponents p, q and coefficient a satisfy the conditions

$$1 < p \neq q < \infty \text{ and } 0 \leq a \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$$

for some $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. In Section 3.1, we first show by variational methods that the Dirichlet problem (1.1) is uniquely solvable for boundary values in appropriate Sobolev spaces. More concretely, in the case $p < q$, it is established that for boundary values $f \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ the solution $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, satisfying $a|\nabla u|^q \in L^1(\Omega)$, can be constructed as the unique minimizer of the *double phase functional*

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{v \in M_f} \mathcal{F}(v; \Omega), \\ \mathcal{F}(u; \Omega) := \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla u|^p + \frac{p}{q} a |\nabla u|^q \right) dx, \\ M_f := f + W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ with } f \in W^{1,q}(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, a similar characterization holds in the range $p > q$. The key property of the functional \mathcal{F} , leading to its name, is that its growth behaviour is in general non-constant over Ω as the coefficient a can vanish in some subregions of Ω . The region $\{a = 0\}$ is usually called the p phase, the region $\{a > 0\}$ the (p, q) phase, and one thinks of $\partial\{a > 0\}$ as modeling a phase transition. In recent years several researchers investigated the regularity properties of local minimizers of such variational integrals exhibiting different phases. For example, in the article [CM15] the authors showed that bounded, local minimizers of the double phase functional are in $C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega'})$, for any $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$, as long as $a \in C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and the exponents p, q satisfy the additional restriction $p < q \leq p + \alpha$ (see also [BCM18, DFO19, DF21] for regularity results on broader classes of double phase type functionals). For a more comprehensive discussion on the regularity theory of such variational integrals we refer the interested reader to the aforementioned articles and the references therein.

1.1. Main results and comparison to the literature. Our main result on the above mentioned inverse problem reads as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smoothly bounded domain, $1 < p \neq q < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. If $a \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ is a nonnegative function, then we can explicitly compute a from the DN map Λ_a .*

Note that when $p = q$ equation (1.3) becomes the weighted p -Laplace equation

$$\operatorname{div}((1+a)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) = 0.$$

The inverse problem for this equation has been investigated previously. In [BKS15, Bra16, BHKS18, BIK18, GKS16, KW17, SZ12] partial results such as boundary determination of the weight, identification of inclusions, etc. have been obtained.

In dimension $n = 2$, a general uniqueness result (i.e. that $\Lambda_{a_1} = \Lambda_{a_2}$ implies that $a_1 = a_2$) has been shown in [CF24], together with a weaker result for $n \geq 3$, when the weight is real-analytic and slowly varying in one direction. The general case when $n \geq 3$ remains open. Given all this, it is interesting that a reconstruction result is available for the double phase equation when $p \neq q$. To borrow an often used phrase, we can say that the p -Laplace nonlinearity helps with the recovery of the weighted q -Laplacian term.

The study of inverse problems for nonlinear equations has attracted a lot of interest over the last decade. Examples of works for semilinear equations include [FO20, Isa93, IN95, IS94, KU20a, KU20b, LLLS21, LLLS20, Sun10] and for quasilinear equations we can refer the reader to [CF21, CF23, CFK⁺21, CGN25, CGU23, CNV19, Câr22, EPS14, HS02, Isa01, KN02, MU20, Sha20, Sun96, Sun05, SU97]. We want to highlight separately the articles [BKS15, Bra16, BHKS18, BIK18, CF24, CK20, Câr24, GKS16, KW17, SZ12], which deal with equations involving the p -Laplacian and related operators. Some of the results obtained in the aforementioned articles have also been extended to nonlocal operators. For example, the articles [KLZ24, KRZ23] consider fractional p -Laplace and fractional p -biharmonic operators, whereas [LZ23] studies an inverse problem for nonlocal porous medium type equations.

We would like to emphasize that the number of works for degenerate equations is still quite small. To the best of our knowledge, these questions have only been addressed with somewhat partial results in [BKS15, Bra16, BHKS18, BIK18, GKS16, KW17, SZ12], and with more general uniqueness results in the more recent papers [CF24, CGN25, CGU23]. The results of our paper add to this newly developing field.

The problem we consider in the present paper is somewhat similar to that considered in [CK20], where an equation of the form

$$\operatorname{div}(\gamma \nabla u + a |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) = 0$$

is studied. Indeed, if $\gamma = 1$, the result of [CK20] can be seen as a particular case of Theorem 1.1, with $p = 2$. The other paper that studies a similar equation is [Câr24], where the equation

$$\operatorname{div}(a \nabla u + |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = 0$$

is considered, with a a (uniformly elliptic) matrix-valued coefficient. This case is partially analogous to taking $q = 2$ in this paper.

Most works on inverse problems for nonlinear equations employ the so-called *second/higher linearization* method, which was first introduced in [Isa93]. In this method one uses Dirichlet data f that depend on small parameters $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_N$, typically of the form $\sum_k \epsilon_k \phi_k$, then one considers derivatives of different orders in $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_N$ of the equation and the DN map $\Lambda(\sum_k \epsilon_k \phi_k)$, in order to accumulate information about the coefficients appearing in the original partial differential equation (PDE).

Here, we use a slightly different approach. For illustration purposes, suppose that we are in the $1 < p < q < \infty$ regime. We take Dirichlet data of the form $f = \epsilon v$ and we expect that as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ the p -Laplace term dominates the equation. Assuming v is a p -harmonic function (which for technical reasons needs to have no critical points), we show that the corresponding solution u_ϵ of (1.1) has the asymptotic behavior

$$u_\epsilon = \epsilon v + \epsilon^{1+q-p} R_v + o(\epsilon^{1+q-p}),$$

where R_v is independent of ϵ but depends on v and a , as it is the unique solution in $C_0^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ (the zero indicates that it vanishes on the boundary) of a linear elliptic

equation

$$\operatorname{div}(A_v^p \nabla R) = -\operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v),$$

with v -dependent matrix coefficients A_v^p . This asymptotic expansion of u_ε then guarantees an expansion for $\Lambda_a(\varepsilon v)$. For any $\omega \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, we will show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varepsilon^{1-q} \langle (\Lambda_a - \Lambda_0)(\varepsilon v), \omega \rangle = \int_{\Omega} (A_v^p \nabla R_v + a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx.$$

We then make special choices of functions ω and p -harmonic functions v in order to recover a .

1.2. Organization of the article. We first introduce in Section 2 the main conventions imposed in this article. Afterwards, in Section 3 we discuss some background material on the double phase problem, like the well-posedness theory and the maximum/comparison principle. Then, in Section 4 we move on to the asymptotic analysis of solutions to the double phase problem with small (large) Dirichlet data. In Section 5, we give the rigorous definition of the DN map and discuss some of its properties. Section 6 deals with the construction of families v_τ of p harmonic functions, which have a prescribed asymptotic expansion. In Section 7 we give the proof of Theorem 1.1, which combines the material of Sections 4 and 6 with the method of linearization.

2. NOTATION

Throughout this article, we make use of the following conventions.

- $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smoothly bounded domain, although all our results extend to lower regular domains (e.g. $C^{2,\alpha}$ domains), and points in \mathbb{R}^n are denoted by $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.
- For any scalar valued function u on Ω , we denote by $\nabla u = (\partial_1 u, \dots, \partial_n u)$ the gradient of u , where $\partial_j = \partial_{x_j}$ is the partial derivative with respect to x_j , and for vector valued functions u the expression ∇u stands for its Jacobian matrix $(\nabla u)_{ij} = (\partial_j u_i)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. More generally, we define the k -th order gradient ∇^k inductively by the formula $\nabla^k = \nabla^{k-1} \nabla$ for all $k \geq 2$.
- For any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $C^k(\Omega)$ stands for the space of k -times continuously differentiable functions in Ω and $C^k(\overline{\Omega})$ is the subspace of $C^k(\Omega)$ such that $\nabla^\ell u$, $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, can be continuously extended to $\overline{\Omega}$. The later space is a Banach under the norm

$$\|u\|_{C^k(\overline{\Omega})} = \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} \|\nabla^\ell u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{with} \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \sup_{x \in \Omega} |u(x)|.$$

We also write $u \in C^k(\overline{\Omega})$ ($u \in C^k(\Omega)$) and $\|u\|_{C^k(\overline{\Omega})}$, when u is a vector valued function as the range will always be clear from the context and the particular used norm on the range does not matter for our analysis. The same applies to other function spaces, like Hölder or Sobolev spaces, and the related norms.

- If $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $C^{k,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ is the space of $C^k(\overline{\Omega})$ functions such that the k -th order derivative is α Hölder continuous, that is, there holds

$$[\nabla^k u]_{C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} := \sup_{x \neq y \in \Omega} \frac{|\nabla^k u(x) - \nabla^k u(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} < \infty.$$

We endow $C^{k,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ with the following norm

$$\|u\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} = \|u\|_{C^k(\overline{\Omega})} + [\nabla^k u]_{C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})},$$

under which they become Banach spaces.

- For all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we denote by $L^p(\Omega)$ the space of measurable functions u in Ω such that

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} := \left(\int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx \right)^{1/p} < \infty$$

and by $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$ the space of $u \in L^p(\Omega)$ such that the distributional derivatives $\nabla^\ell u$, $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, belong to $L^p(\Omega)$. We endow the Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)} = \left(\sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} \|\nabla^\ell u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

As usual, the spaces $L^p_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $W^{k,p}_{loc}(\Omega)$ consist of all measurable functions u such that $u \in L^p(\Omega')$ and $u \in W^{k,p}(\Omega')$, respectively, for all $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$.

3. THE DOUBLE PHASE PROBLEM

Here, we collect some basic results on the double phase problem: In Section 3.1 we show the well-posedness of (1.1), in Section 3.2 we briefly explain its relation to local minimizers of the double phase functional and establish in Section 3.3 a maximum/comparison principle.

3.1. Well-posedness. Let us start by introducing for any bounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $a \geq 0$ and $1 < p \leq q < \infty$, the Sobolev type spaces

$$\begin{aligned} (3.1) \quad W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega) &:= \{u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega); a|\nabla u|^q \in L^1(\Omega)\}, \\ W_{a,loc}^{1,p,q}(\Omega) &:= \{u \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega); a|\nabla u|^q \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)\}, \\ W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega) &:= W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Under the norm

$$(3.2) \quad \|u\|_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega;a)},$$

where

$$\|v\|_{L^q(\Omega;a)} := \left(\int_{\Omega} a|v|^q dx \right)^{1/q},$$

the spaces $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ and $W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ defined in (3.1) become Banach spaces. This is a direct consequence of the fact that $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $L^q(\Omega;a)$ are Banach spaces. We have the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and assume that $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $a \geq 0$. The space $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)}$ is a separable, reflexive Banach space.*

Proof. Step 1: First, we show that $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space. From the definitions it is clear that $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is a normed space and hence we only need to show that its complete. For this purpose, assume that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is a Cauchy sequence. Then $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $(\nabla u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $L^q(\Omega;a)$. By completeness of these spaces, there exist $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^q(\Omega;a)$ such that

$$u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } W^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ and } \nabla u_n \rightarrow v \text{ in } L^q(\Omega;a)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As L^r convergence implies a.e. convergence for a suitable subsequence, we may infer $v = \nabla u$ a.e. with respect to the measure $a dx$ and hence $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$

such that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. This proves the completeness of $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$.

Step 2. Next, we prove that $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is separable and reflexive. To this end, let us consider the mapping

$$(3.3) \quad j: W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega) \text{ with } j(u) := (u, \nabla u, a^{1/q} \nabla u).$$

Let $\|\cdot\|_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)}^*$ be the equivalent norm

$$\|u\|_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)}^* := \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|a^{1/q} \nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$$

on $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. Then the map j , defined by (3.3), is an isometric embedding, when we use the product norm

$$\|(u, v, w)\|_{L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)}^* = \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|w\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$$

for $(u, v, w) \in L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)$. As the target space is a cartesian product of separable spaces, it is separable and $j(W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega))$ is separable. Now, using that j is an isometry, we see that $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is separable. The space $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is also separable under the original norm as separability is preserved in the class of equivalent norms.

This time we endow $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ and $L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)$ with the equivalent norms

$$\|u\|'_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)} := (\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^r + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^r + \|a^{1/q} \nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^r)^{1/r},$$

$$\|(u, v, w)\|'_{L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)} := (\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^r + \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^r + \|w\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^r)^{1/r}$$

for some $1 < r < \infty$. Then j is again an isometry. From [Cla36, Theorem 1] and the fact that Clarkson's inequalities imply the uniform convexity of $L^s(\Omega)$ for $1 < s < \infty$, it follows that $L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)$ is uniformly convex. Next, observe that by Step 1 the linear subspace $j(W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega))$ of $L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)$ is closed. Hence, $j(W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega))$ is uniformly convex. The Milmann–Pettis theorem now shows that $j(W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega))$ is reflexive. As reflexivity is preserved under isomorphisms, we can conclude that $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is reflexive. The same remains true for the usual norm on $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. \square

To prove the well-posedness of (1.1), we need in addition the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 3.2 (cf. [Sim78, eq. (2.2)], [GM75, Lemma 5.1-5.2] and [SZ12, Appendix A]). *For all $1 < r < \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there holds*

$$(3.4) \quad |x|^r \geq |y|^r + r|y|^{r-2}y \cdot (x - y),$$

$$(3.5) \quad (|x|^{r-2}x - |y|^{r-2}y) \cdot (x - y) \gtrsim \begin{cases} |x - y|^r, & \text{for } r \geq 2, \\ \frac{|x - y|^2}{(|x| + |y|)^{2-r}}, & \text{for } 1 < r < 2, \end{cases}$$

$$(3.6) \quad \left| |x|^{r-2}x - |y|^{r-2}y \right| \lesssim (|x| + |y|)^{r-2} |x - y|$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad \left| |x|^r - |y|^r \right| \leq r(|x|^{r-1} + |y|^{r-1})(x - y).$$

Using the above spaces and the previous auxiliary lemma, we can establish the following well-posedness result:

Theorem 3.3 (Well-posedness). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ a nonnegative function. Then the Dirichlet problem (1.1) has for any $f \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ a unique solution $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$, that is there holds*

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx = 0$$

for all $\varphi \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ and $u = f$ on $\partial\Omega$ in the sense of traces.

Moreover, u can be characterized as the unique minimizer of (1.3) and satisfies the estimates

$$(3.9) \quad \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C(\|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{q/p} + \|f\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)})$$

and

$$(3.10) \quad \|u\|_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)} \leq C(\|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{p/q} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{q/p} + \|f\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}).$$

for some $C > 0$ depending increasingly on $\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$.

Proof. First, we consider the minimization problem (1.3). Since $f \in W^{1,q}(\Omega) \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have $\mathcal{F}(f; \Omega) < \infty$. Therefore, the strict convexity of the integrand of (1.3) and [Dac07, Theorem 3.30] ensure the existence of a unique minimizer $u \in M_f \cap W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ of (1.3). By the minimality property of u , we have

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \leq \mathcal{F}(u; \Omega) \leq \mathcal{F}(f; \Omega).$$

Using the Poincaré inequality

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{\Omega} |v|^p dx \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^p dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} |v|_{\partial\Omega}^p d\sigma \right)$$

for $v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and some $C > 0$ only depending on n, p and Ω (see, for example, [FRRO23]), we get

$$(3.12) \quad \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C((\mathcal{F}(f; \Omega))^{1/p} + \|f\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}).$$

Furthermore, by the minimality property we also have

$$(3.13) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega; a)}^q \lesssim \mathcal{F}(u; \Omega) \lesssim \mathcal{F}(f; \Omega).$$

Using $p \leq q$ and $f \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, we can estimate

$$\mathcal{F}(f; \Omega) \leq C(1 + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) (\|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^p + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q)$$

and thus

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{F}(f; \Omega))^{1/p} &\leq C(1 + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})^{1/p} (\|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{q/p}) \\ (\mathcal{F}(f; \Omega))^{1/q} &\leq C(1 + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})^{1/q} (\|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{p/q}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, from (3.12), (3.13), (3.14), (3.2) and $p \leq q$, we get (3.9) and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)} &\leq C((\mathcal{F}(f; \Omega))^{1/p} + \|f\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)} + (\mathcal{F}(f; \Omega))^{1/q}) \\ &\leq C(1 + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})^{1/p} (\|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{p/q} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{q/p} + \|f\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (3.10).

Next, we show that u is in fact a solution of (1.1). By construction of u , we know that $u + \varepsilon\varphi = (u - f) + (f + \varepsilon\varphi) \in M_f \cap W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varphi \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. Thus, the minimality of u implies that $\varepsilon \mapsto \mathcal{F}(u + \varepsilon\varphi; \Omega)$ attains its minimum at $\varepsilon = 0$. Using $u, \varphi \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ and the dominated convergence theorem, we may calculate

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{F}(u + \varepsilon\varphi; \Omega) \\ &= \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla u + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi|^p + \frac{p}{q} a |\nabla u + \varepsilon\nabla\varphi|^q \right) dx \\ &= p \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla\varphi dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, u is a weak solution of (1.1) in the sense of (3.8).

Finally, it remains to show that the solution u is unique. This in turn is a consequence of the observation that any solution $w \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ of (1.1) is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot, \Omega)$ over M_f . In fact, if $\bar{u} \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is another solution of (1.1), then \bar{u} also minimizes $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; \Omega)$ over M_f and as minimizers of this problem are unique, we can conclude that $\bar{u} = u$.

For proving that solutions are minimizers, let us choose any $v \in M_f \cap W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. Then, using (3.4) and (3.8), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(v; \Omega) &= \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla v|^p + \frac{p}{q} a |\nabla v|^q \right) dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla w|^p + \frac{p}{q} a |\nabla w|^q \right) dx \\ &\quad + p \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w + a |\nabla w|^{q-2} \nabla w) \cdot \nabla(v-w) dx \\ &= \mathcal{F}(w; \Omega), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $v - w \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. On the other hand, if $v \in M_f$ does not belong to $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$, then $\mathcal{F}(v; \Omega) = \infty$ and the previous estimate holds trivially. Hence, we have shown that any solution $w \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ of (1.1) is a minimizer of (1.3).

Hence, in summary, we have demonstrated that the unique minimizer u of (1.3) is the unique $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ -solution of (1.1) and moreover it satisfies the estimate (3.10). \square

3.2. Local minimizers of the double phase functional. The only purpose of this section is to show that solutions to the Dirichlet problem (1.1) are local minimizers of the double phase functional in the sense of Definition 3.4. By combining this with the maximum principle (Theorem 3.7), one then sees that all (local) regularity results established in the work [CM15] can be applied to solutions of (1.1), when the Dirichlet datum f is bounded and in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$.

Definition 3.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $a \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ a nonnegative function. Then, a function $u \in W_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is said to be a local minimizer of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; \Omega)$, when $\mathcal{F}(u; \Omega') < \infty$ for all $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ and there holds*

$$(3.15) \quad \mathcal{F}(u; \text{supp}(u-v)) \leq \mathcal{F}(v; \text{supp}(u-v))$$

for all $v \in W_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ such that $\text{supp}(u-v) \subset \Omega$.

Remark 3.5. *Note that this definition makes sense as $\text{supp}(u-v) \subset \Omega$ is contained in some $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$. In fact, as $\text{supp}(u-v) \subset \Omega$ and $\partial\Omega$ are closed and compact sets, respectively, we have $\text{dist}(\text{supp}(u-v), \partial\Omega) \geq \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ and so one can take $\Omega' = \{x \in \Omega; \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \delta/2\}$. Furthermore, let us note that by (3.1) the first part of Definition 3.4 means nothing else than $u \in W_{a,loc}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$.*

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $a \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ a nonnegative function. If $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is a minimizer of (1.3) for some $f \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, then it is also a local minimizer in the sense of Definition 3.4.*

Proof. Let $v \in W_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and suppose that $\text{supp}(u-v) \subset \Omega$. Assume first that $v \notin W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, then $\mathcal{F}(v; \Omega) = \infty$ and we have trivially

$$(3.16) \quad \mathcal{F}(u; \Omega) \leq \mathcal{F}(v; \Omega).$$

Next, we assert that (3.16) also holds when $v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. In this case, we write $v = u + \varphi$, where $\varphi = v - u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Moreover, by assumption and Remark 3.5

we know that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset \Omega'$ for some $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$. Let us denote by $(\rho_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the standard mollifier and define the functions $\varphi_\varepsilon = \rho_\varepsilon * \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ for some sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. By the properties of mollification, we know that

$$\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \nabla \varphi \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega$$

along a suitable subsequence. Moreover, by Young's inequality there holds

$$|\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(x)| \leq \|\rho_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

So, by boundedness of Ω , the dominated convergence theorem and the minimality of $u \in M_f$, we get

$$(3.17) \quad \mathcal{F}(u; \Omega) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{F}(u + \varphi_\varepsilon; \Omega) = \mathcal{F}(v; \Omega).$$

Hence, also in this case we have (3.16). Finally, we may observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(v; \Omega) &= \mathcal{F}(v; \text{supp}(u - v)) + \mathcal{F}(v; \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{supp}(u - v)) \\ &= \mathcal{F}(v; \text{supp}(u - v)) + \mathcal{F}(u; \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{supp}(u - v)). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into the right hand side of (3.17) and using the same decomposition for the left hand side, we achieve the identity (3.15). This concludes the proof. \square

3.3. Maximum and comparison principle. Next, let us recall that solutions to the double phase problem (1.1) satisfy a maximum principle (see [CM15, Lemma 2.2] and [Leo91]):

Theorem 3.7 (Maximum principle). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ a nonnegative function. If $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ solves the Dirichlet problem (1.1) with $f \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, then*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

On the one hand, the advantage of this formulation of the maximum principle is that it is also valid in the vector-valued case $N \geq 2$, in the sense that there holds

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq N^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

On the other hand, Theorem 3.7 can be derived in the scalar case by very elementary considerations, namely from a weak comparison principle. As a preparatory step, we demonstrate the following weak maximum principle.

Lemma 3.8 (Weak maximum principle). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ a nonnegative function. If $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{cases} -\text{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

then $u \geq 0$ in Ω .

The proof is very standard, but for the readers convenience and later usage we present the short argument.

Proof. Let us write $u = u_+ - u_-$, where $u_\pm = \max(\pm u, 0)$. It is well-known that $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ implies $u_\pm \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ with

$$(3.19) \quad \nabla u_+ = \chi_{\{u>0\}} \nabla u \text{ and } \nabla u_- = -\chi_{\{u<0\}} \nabla u.$$

Furthermore, $u \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ implies $u_- \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. Also, recall that u is a solution to (3.18) means nothing else than

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \geq 0$$

for all $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ with $\varphi \geq 0$. In particular, we can take $\varphi = u_-$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u_- \, dx \\ &\stackrel{(3.19)}{=} - \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_-|^p + a |\nabla u_-|^q) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

By the Poincaré inequality (3.11), we get $u_- = 0$ in Ω and so the claim follows. \square

The above technique of proof can be used to prove a comparison principle, which in turn implies the maximum principle as stated in Theorem 3.7 (use $\pm \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ as comparing functions).

Proposition 3.9 (Comparison principle). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ a nonnegative function. If $u, v \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ solve (1.1) with boundary values $u_0, v_0 \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ such that $u_0 \geq v_0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then there holds $u \geq v$ in Ω .*

Proof. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.8, we may test the PDEs for u and v , respectively, by $\varphi = (u-v)_- \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$. After subtracting the resulting identities and applying Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v)_- \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} a (|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v)_- \, dx \\ (3.20) \quad &= \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v) \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} a (|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v) \, dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

For $p \geq 2$, we deduce from formula (3.5) the estimate

$$0 \gtrsim \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} |\nabla u - \nabla v|^p \, dx = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla (u-v)_-|^p \, dx.$$

Hence, from the Poincaré inequality and $(u-v)_- = (u_0 - v_0)_- = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we get $(u-v)_- = 0$ in Ω , which is equivalent to $u \geq v$ in Ω .

For $p \leq 2$, we may observe that (3.5) implies

$$|x - y|^p \lesssim [(|x|^{p-2}x - |y|^{p-2}y) \cdot (x - y)]^{p/2} (|x| + |y|)^{(2-p)p/2}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using Hölder's inequality with $\frac{2-p}{2} + \frac{p}{2} = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} |\nabla (u-v)_-|^p \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} |\nabla (u-v)|^p \, dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} [(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v)] (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{(2-p)p/2} \, dx \\ &\lesssim \| |\nabla u| + |\nabla v| \|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) \cdot (\nabla (u-v)) \, dx \right)^{p/2} \\ &\lesssim \| |\nabla u| + |\nabla v| \|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{p(2-p)}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v) \, dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < v\}} a (|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla (u-v) \, dx \right)^{p/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.20) the expression in the last line is identically zero and so we can again conclude from Poincaré's inequality and $u_0 \geq v_0$ on $\partial\Omega$ that $u \geq v$ in Ω . This concludes the proof. \square

4. ASYMPTOTIC EXPANSION OF SOLUTIONS TO THE DOUBLE PHASE

In this section, we consider the asymptotic behaviour of solutions to the double phase problem (1.1), when the boundary values f become very small ($p < q$) or very large ($p > q$).

4.1. Asymptotic expansion of solutions for $p < q$. Here, we prove that for any smooth p -harmonic function v without critical points, the solution u_ε to

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + a|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \varepsilon v & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

provided by Theorem 3.3, can be expanded as

$$(4.2) \quad u_\varepsilon = \varepsilon v + \varepsilon^{1+q-p}R_v + o(\varepsilon^{1+q-p})$$

for a suitable function R_v and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Before establishing the asymptotic expansion (4.2), we need to demonstrate some preliminary Hölder estimates in $C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and to shorten the notation we will sometimes omit the dependence on the domain Ω in the appearing norms and write, for example, $\|\cdot\|_{C^{0,\beta}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smoothly bounded domain, $0 < \beta < 1$ and $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Moreover, assume that $u \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfies*

$$\inf_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |\nabla u(x)| \geq \lambda_1$$

for some $\lambda_1 > 0$.

(i) *If $s \geq 1$, then there holds*

$$(4.3) \quad \|\nabla u\|^s_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq \|\nabla u\|^s_{L^\infty} + 2s\|\nabla u\|^s_{C^{0,\beta}}.$$

(ii) *If $0 < s < 1$, then there holds*

$$(4.4) \quad \|\nabla u\|^s_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq \|\nabla u\|^s_{L^\infty} + \frac{2s}{\prod_{j=1}^{k_s} \lambda_1^{2^{j-1}s}} \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{2^{k_s}s}$$

where $k_s \in \mathbb{N}$ is given by

$$(4.5) \quad k_s = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N}; k \geq |\log s|/\log 2\}.$$

(iii) *If $-1 < s < 0$, then there holds*

$$(4.6) \quad \|\nabla u\|^s_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq \lambda_1^s + \frac{2|s|}{\lambda_1^{2|s|} \prod_{j=1}^{k_{|s|}} \lambda_1^{2^{j-1}s}} \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{2^{k_{|s|}}|s|}$$

where $k_{|s|} > 0$ is again the constant from (4.5).

(iv) *If $s \leq -1$, then there holds*

$$(4.7) \quad \|\nabla u\|^s_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq \lambda_1^s + 2|s|\lambda_1^{2s}\|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{|s|}.$$

Proof. Let us note that it is enough to prove (i)–(ii) as the others are consequences of these. In fact, if we set $t := -s$ for $s < 0$, then we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\nabla u(x)|^{-t} - |\nabla u(y)|^{-t} \right| &= \frac{||\nabla u(x)|^t - |\nabla u(y)|^t|}{|\nabla u(x)|^t |\nabla u(y)|^t} \\ &\leq \lambda_1^{-2t} \left| |\nabla u(x)|^t - |\nabla u(y)|^t \right| \\ &= \lambda_1^{2s} \left| |\nabla u(x)|^t - |\nabla u(y)|^t \right| \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$[|\nabla u|^{-t}]_{C^{0,\beta}} = \lambda_1^{2s} [|\nabla u|^t]_{C^{0,\beta}}.$$

Using this, it is easy to see that the estimate (4.6) can be deduced from (4.4) and the bound (4.7) from (4.3).

The estimate (4.3) follows from the triangle inequality for $s = 1$ and (3.7) for $s > 1$, respectively.

Finally, to get the bound (4.4) we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} (4.8) \quad \left| |\nabla u(x)|^s - |\nabla u(y)|^s \right| &\leq \frac{||\nabla u(x)|^{2s} - |\nabla u(y)|^{2s}|}{|\nabla u(x)|^s + |\nabla u(y)|^s} \\ &\leq \frac{||\nabla u(x)|^{2s} - |\nabla u(y)|^{2s}|}{2\lambda_1^s} \\ &\leq \frac{||\nabla u(x)|^{4s} - |\nabla u(y)|^{4s}|}{2^2 \lambda_1^s \lambda_1^{2s}} \\ &\leq \dots \\ &\leq \frac{||\nabla u(x)|^{2^k s} - |\nabla u(y)|^{2^k s}|}{2^k \prod_{j=1}^k \lambda_1^{2^{j-1} s}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If we apply (4.8) with $k = k_s$ (see (4.5)), which guarantees that $2^{k_s} \geq 1$, and (3.7), we deduce

$$\| |\nabla u|^s \|_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq \frac{2s}{\prod_{j=1}^{k_s} \lambda_1^{2^{j-1} s}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^{2^{k_s}-1} [\nabla u]_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq \frac{2s}{\prod_{j=1}^{k_s} \lambda_1^{2^{j-1} s}} \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{2^{k_s}}.$$

So, combining this with a trivial bound for the L^∞ norm of $|\nabla u|^s$, we get the estimate (4.6) and this finishes the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

Next, let us introduce for all $1 < r < \infty$ the functions $J^r = (J_1^r, \dots, J_n^r): \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$J^r(\xi) = |\xi|^{r-2} \xi.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that the Jacobian matrix of J^r is given by

$$(4.9) \quad \nabla_\xi J^r(\xi) = |\xi|^{r-2} \left(\mathbf{1} + (r-2) \frac{\xi \otimes \xi}{|\xi|^2} \right)$$

for all $\xi \neq 0$. Here, $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the $n \times n$ unit matrix and for all $\eta, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the matrix $\eta \otimes \zeta$ has components $(\eta \otimes \zeta)_{ij} = \eta_i \zeta_j$. Using this notation, we can formulate the asymptotic behaviour of u_ε , solving the problem (4.1), as follows:

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smoothly bounded domain, $1 < p < q < \infty$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $0 < \gamma < \beta < 1$ with $\beta \leq \alpha$ and assume that $a \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ is nonnegative. Moreover, suppose that $v \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is a p -harmonic function without critical points. Then the unique solution u_ε , $\varepsilon > 0$, to (4.1) has the asymptotic expansion*

$$(4.10) \quad u_\varepsilon = \varepsilon v + \varepsilon^{1+q-p} R_v + o(\varepsilon^{1+q-p})$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in the sense of $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. Here, $R_v \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ denotes the unique solution to

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_v^p \nabla R) = -\operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ R = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $A_v^p = \nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v)$ is uniformly elliptic (see (4.9) and (4.16)).

Proof. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $u_\varepsilon \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ be the unique solution to (4.1) (see Theorem 3.3). Moreover, let us define the functions $w_\varepsilon \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ by the Ansatz

$$(4.12) \quad u_\varepsilon = \varepsilon(v + w_\varepsilon).$$

From (3.6) we deduce that J^r is locally Lipschitz continuous and hence applying the fundamental theorem of calculus to the Lipschitz function $t \mapsto J^r(\xi + t(\zeta - \xi))$ yields the identity

$$(4.13) \quad J^r(\zeta) = J^r(\xi) + \int_0^1 \nabla_\xi J^r(\xi + t(\zeta - \xi)) dt (\zeta - \xi)$$

for all $\zeta, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using the expansion (4.12), formula (4.13) with $\zeta = \nabla u_\varepsilon$, $\xi = \varepsilon \nabla v$ and the $r-2$ homogeneity of $\nabla_\xi J^r$ (see (4.9)), we may expand the p phase and (p, q) phase contributions as

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^{p-2} \nabla u_\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon^{p-1} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) + \varepsilon^{p-1} \operatorname{div}(A^p(w_\varepsilon) \nabla w_\varepsilon) \\ &= \varepsilon^{p-1} \operatorname{div}(A^p(w_\varepsilon) \nabla w_\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.15) \quad \operatorname{div}(a|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^{q-2} \nabla u_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{q-1} \operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) + \varepsilon^{q-1} \operatorname{div}(aA^q(w_\varepsilon) \nabla w_\varepsilon),$$

where we set

$$(4.16) \quad A^r(w_\varepsilon) := \int_0^1 \nabla_\xi J^r(\nabla v + t \nabla w_\varepsilon) dt$$

for $1 < r < \infty$. In (4.14), we have also used the fact that v is p -harmonic. By using the notation

$$(4.17) \quad A_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon) := A^p(w_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{q-p} a A^q(w_\varepsilon),$$

we deduce from (4.14), (4.15) and (4.1) that $w_\varepsilon \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ solves

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon) \nabla w_\varepsilon) = -\varepsilon^{q-p} \operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The reverse is also true, in that any solution $W_\varepsilon \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ of (4.18) induces through the formulas (4.12) and (4.13) a solution $U_\varepsilon \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ to (4.1). Hence, there is a one-to-one correspondence between solutions to (4.18) and solutions to the double phase problem (4.1). In particular, Theorem 3.3 ensures that solutions $W_\varepsilon \in W_{a,0}^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ to (4.18) are unique.

Next, let us fix exponents $0 < \gamma < \beta < 1$ with $\beta \leq \alpha$ as in the statement, introduce the quantity

$$\lambda_0 := \inf_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |\nabla v(x)| > 0$$

and define the convex set

$$C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}) := \{V \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}); \|V\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \lambda_0/2\} \subset C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}).$$

Moreover, let us formally define the map

$$(4.19) \quad \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon: C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ with } \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(V) := W_\varepsilon,$$

where $W_\varepsilon \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ denotes the solution to

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(V) \nabla W) = -\varepsilon^{q-p} \operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ W = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Next, we show that \mathcal{T}_ε is indeed well-defined for small $\varepsilon > 0$. To this end, we derive with the help of Lemma 4.1 various properties of the matrix functions $A_\varepsilon(V)$, which are uniform in $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$.

Claim 4.3 (Properties of $A_\varepsilon(V)$). *The symmetric matrix functions $A_\varepsilon(V)$ with $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ have the following properties:*

(a) *The matrices $A_\varepsilon(V)$ are uniformly elliptic and satisfy*

$$(4.21) \quad \eta \cdot A_\varepsilon(V)\eta \geq \begin{cases} (\lambda_0/2)^{p-2}|\eta|^2 & \text{for } p \geq 2, \\ (p-1)(\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty} + \lambda_0/2)^{p-2}|\eta|^2 & \text{for } 1 < p < 2 \end{cases}$$

for all nonzero $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$.

(b) *For any $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, we have $A_\varepsilon(V), \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(V)) \in C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and there exists a constant*

$$(4.22) \quad C_0 = C_0(\lambda_0, p, q, \|v\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})}, (\operatorname{diam} \Omega)^{\alpha-\beta}, \|a\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)}) > 0$$

such that

$$(4.23) \quad \|A_\varepsilon(V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + \|\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq C_0.$$

Remark 4.4. *The estimate (4.21) and the uniform upper bound for $A_\varepsilon(V)$ in (4.23) also hold, when $V \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfies $\|V\|_{C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \lambda_0/2$.*

Proof. The symmetry of the matrix $A_\varepsilon(V)$ is an immediate consequence of (4.9).

(a): By formula (4.9) we have for all $1 < r < \infty$ and $\xi, \eta \neq 0$:

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta \cdot \nabla_\xi J^r(\xi)\eta &= |\xi|^{r-2} \left(|\eta|^2 + (r-2) \frac{|\xi \cdot \eta|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) \\ &= |\xi|^{r-2} (1 + (r-2) |\hat{\xi} \cdot \hat{\eta}|^2) |\eta|^2 \\ &\geq \min(1, r-1) |\xi|^{r-2} |\eta|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the above calculation, we used the notation $\hat{\xi} = \xi/|\xi|$. Next, we observe that for all $(x, t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1]$ and $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$, we have the uniform bounds

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} |\nabla v(x) + t\nabla V(x)| &\geq \lambda_0 - t|\nabla V(x)| \geq \lambda_0/2, \\ |\nabla v(x) + t\nabla V(x)| &\leq \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \lambda_0/2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by combining (4.24) and (4.25), we deduce that for all $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$, $(x, t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1]$ and $\eta \neq 0$ there holds

$$\eta \cdot \nabla_\xi J^r(\nabla v(x) + t\nabla V(x))\eta \geq \begin{cases} (\lambda_0/2)^{r-2}|\eta|^2 & \text{for } r \geq 2, \\ (r-1)(\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty} + \lambda_0/2)^{r-2}|\eta|^2 & \text{for } 1 < r < 2. \end{cases}$$

Inserting this into (4.16)–(4.17) and using $a \geq 0$, we obtain the uniform ellipticity bound (4.21).

(b): We first prove $A_\varepsilon(V) \in C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$. Let us start by recalling that for all $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq 1$ and $u_j \in C^{0,\alpha_j}(\overline{\Omega})$, $j = 1, 2$, there holds

$$(4.26) \quad \|u_1 u_2\|_{C^{0,\alpha_1}} \leq \max(1, (\operatorname{diam} \Omega)^{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}) \|u_1\|_{C^{0,\alpha_1}} \|u_2\|_{C^{0,\alpha_2}}.$$

Now, using (4.26) and (4.16)–(4.17), a direct calculation shows that

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \|A_\varepsilon(V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} &\leq \|A^p(V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + \|a\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \|A^q(V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\ &\leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|\nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v + t\nabla V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + \|a\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|\nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v + t\nabla V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\ &\leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|\nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v + t\nabla V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + (\operatorname{diam} \Omega)^{\alpha-\beta} \|a\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|\nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v + t\nabla V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$. Hence, it remains to bound $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|\nabla_\xi J^r(\nabla v + t\nabla V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}}$ for $r = p, q$ uniformly to obtain the desired conclusion. By (4.26), Lemma 4.1 with $u := v_0 + tV$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_0/2$ and (4.25), we have

(4.28)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_\xi J^r(\nabla u)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} &\leq \| |\nabla u|^{r-2} \|_{C^{0,\beta}} \left\| \mathbf{1} + \frac{\nabla u \otimes \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^2} \right\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\ &\leq \| |\nabla u|^{r-2} \|_{C^{0,\beta}} (1 + \|\nabla u \otimes \nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \| |\nabla u|^{-2} \|_{C^{0,\beta}}) \\ &\leq C \| |\nabla u|^{r-2} \|_{C^{0,\beta}} (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^2 (\lambda_1^{-2} + 4\lambda_1^{-4} \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^2)) \\ &\leq \begin{cases} C_1 (\|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{r-2} + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^r + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{r+2}) & \text{for } r \geq 3, \\ C_2 (\|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{r-2} + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{2\kappa_r(r-2)}) (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^4) & \text{for } 2 \leq r < 3, \\ C_3 (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{2\kappa_r(2-r)}) (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^4) & \text{for } 1 < r < 2, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the constants C_1, C_2, C_3 only depend on λ_1, r and $\kappa_r = k_{|r-2|}$, where $k_{|2-r|}$ is the constant from Lemma 4.1.

Finally, taking into account the uniform bound

$$\lambda_0/2 \leq \|\nabla v + t\nabla V\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq \|v\|_{C^{1,\beta}} + \lambda_0/2$$

for all $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$, we establish from the estimates (4.27) and (4.28) the existence of a constant

$$C_0^{(1)} = C_0^{(1)}(\lambda_0, p, q, \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}, \|a\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}, (\text{diam } \Omega)^{\alpha-\beta}) > 0$$

such that

$$(4.29) \quad \|A_\varepsilon(V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq C_0^{(1)}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Next, we prove the β Hölder continuity of $\text{div}(A_\varepsilon(V))$. First, note that

$$\text{div}(A_\varepsilon(V)) = \text{div}(A^p(V)) + \varepsilon^{q-p} a \text{div}(A^q(V)) + \varepsilon^{q-p} A^q(V) \nabla a.$$

From (4.29), (4.26) and $a \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, we already know that there exists a constant

$$C_0^{(2)} = C_0^{(2)}(\lambda_0, p, q, \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}, \|a\|_{C^{1,\alpha}}, (\text{diam } \Omega)^{\alpha-\beta}) > 0$$

such that

$$(4.30) \quad \varepsilon^{q-p} \|A^q(V) \nabla a\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \leq (\text{diam } \Omega)^{\alpha-\beta} \|A^q(V)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \|a\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq C_0^{(2)}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$. Hence, it remains to uniformly bound $\|\text{div}(A^r(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}}$, $1 < r < \infty$, by some constant $C_0^{(3)}$, having the same dependence structure as C_0 in (4.22), to deduce the existence of a constant $C_2 > 0$ with (4.22) such that the estimate (4.23) holds.

To achieve this, for a given function $v \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ without critical points and $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i \partial_\xi J_k^r(\nabla v) &= \partial_i (|\nabla v|^{r-2} \delta_{jk} + (r-2) |\nabla v|^{r-4} \partial_j v \partial_k v) \\ (4.31) \quad &= (r-2) |\nabla v|^{r-4} (\delta_{jk} \partial_\ell v \partial_{i\ell} v + \partial_{ij} v \partial_k v + \partial_j v \partial_{ik} v) \\ &\quad + (r-4)(r-2) |\nabla v|^{r-6} \partial_j v \partial_k v \partial_\ell v \partial_{i\ell} v. \end{aligned}$$

Here and in the rest of this article, we are adopting the Einstein summation convention. In the first equality we used (4.9) and in the second equality the identity

$$(4.32) \quad \partial_i |\nabla v|^s = s |\nabla v|^{s-2} \partial_\ell v \partial_{i\ell} v$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Now, suppose again that

$$\inf_{x \in \Omega} |\nabla v(x)| \geq \lambda_1$$

for some $\lambda_1 > 0$. Using (4.31), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
(\operatorname{div} \nabla_\xi J^r(\nabla v))_i &= \partial_j (\nabla_\xi J(\nabla v))_{ij} = \partial_j \partial_{\xi_j} J_i^r(\nabla v) \\
&= \partial_j (|\nabla v|^{r-2} \delta_{ij} + (r-2)|\nabla v|^{r-4} \partial_i v \partial_j v) \\
(4.33) \quad &= (r-2)|\nabla v|^{r-4} (\delta_{ij} \partial_\ell v \partial_{j\ell} v + \partial_{jj} v \partial_i v + \partial_j v \partial_{ji} v) \\
&\quad + (r-2)(r-4)|\nabla v|^{r-6} \partial_j v \partial_i v \partial_\ell v \partial_{j\ell} v
\end{aligned}$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Now, applying the estimate (4.26) and Lemma 4.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\operatorname{div} \nabla_\xi J^r(\nabla v)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
&\leq C(\|\nabla v\|^{r-4}\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + \|\nabla v\|^{r-6}\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^2) \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
&\leq C\|\nabla v\|^{r-4}\|_{C^{0,\beta}} (1 + \|\nabla v\|^{-2}\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^2) \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
&\leq C\|\nabla v\|^{r-4}\|_{C^{0,\beta}} (1 + \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^4) \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
&\leq C\|\nabla v\|^{r-4}\|_{C^{0,\beta}} (1 + \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^4) \|\nabla^2 v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
&\leq \begin{cases} c_1 \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{r-4} (1 + \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^4) \|\nabla^2 v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} & \text{for } r \geq 5, \\ c_2 (\|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{r-2} + \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{2\kappa_r(r-2)}) (1 + \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^4) \|\nabla^2 v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} & \text{for } 4 \leq r < 5, \\ c_3 (1 + \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^{2\kappa_r(2-r)}) (1 + \|\nabla v\|_{C^{0,\beta}}^4) \|\nabla^2 v\|_{C^{0,\beta}} & \text{for } 1 < r < 4, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ only depend on λ_1, r and κ_r is the same as in (4.28). Now, we can argue as in the case of $A_\varepsilon(V)$ (see (4.27)), while using

$$\lambda_0/2 \leq \|\nabla v + t\nabla V\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \|v\|_{C^{2,\beta}} + \lambda_0/2,$$

to deduce the desired uniform bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\operatorname{div}(A^p(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + \varepsilon^{q-p} \|a \operatorname{div}(A^p(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
(4.34) \quad &\leq \|\operatorname{div}(A^p(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + \|a\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \|\operatorname{div}(A^p(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
&\leq \|\operatorname{div}(A^p(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}} + (\operatorname{diam} \Omega)^{\alpha-\beta} \|a\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \|\operatorname{div}(A^p(V))\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \\
&\leq C_0^{(3)}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$, $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and some constant

$$C_0^{(3)} = C_0^{(3)}(\lambda_0, p, q, \|v\|_{C^{2,\beta}}, (\operatorname{diam} \Omega)^{\alpha-\beta}, \|a\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)}) > 0.$$

Hence, by the estimates (4.29), (4.30) and (4.34), we see that we have proved (4.23) with $C_0 = \sum_{j=1}^3 C_0^{(j)}$. This finishes the proof of Claim 4.3. \square

Now, by expanding the partial differential operator $\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(V)\nabla W)$ as

$$(4.35) \quad \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(V)\nabla W) = A_\varepsilon(V) : \nabla^2 W + \operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(V)) \cdot \nabla W,$$

where we set $A : B = A_{ij} B_{ij}$ for two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and using Claim 4.3, we can apply [GT98, Theorem 6.14] for any $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ to deduce the existence of a unique solution $W_\varepsilon \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ to (4.20). By [GT98, Theorem 6.6] this unique solution W_ε satisfies

$$\|W_\varepsilon\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C(\|W_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \varepsilon^{q-p} \|f_0\|_{C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})})$$

for some $C > 0$ only depending on $n, \Omega, \alpha, \beta, p, q, \lambda_0, \|v\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})}$ and $\|a\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})}$, where we set

$$f_0 := -\operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2}\nabla v).$$

Furthermore, from [GT98, Theorem 3.7] and Claim 4.3 we get the estimate

$$\|W_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c\varepsilon^{q-p} \|f_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ only depending on $\lambda_0, p, q, \alpha, \beta, \|v\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})}$, $\text{diam } \Omega$ and $\|a\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)}$. Therefore, the solution W_ε satisfies

$$(4.36) \quad \|W_\varepsilon\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_1 \varepsilon^{q-p} \|f_0\|_{C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})},$$

where $C_1 > 0$ only depends on $\lambda_0, p, q, \alpha, \beta, \|v\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})}$, $\text{diam } \Omega$ and $\|a\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)}$.

Thus, if we choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$C_1 \varepsilon_0^{q-p} \|f_0\|_{C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \lambda_0/2,$$

then the map \mathcal{T}_ε , with $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and defined by formula (4.19), maps $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ to itself and so \mathcal{T}_ε is well-defined for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Next, we show that $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ is compact in the topology inherited from $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. To this end, let us recall that the embedding

$$(4.37) \quad C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$$

is compact and so $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ is precompact in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. By using the Arzelá–Ascoli theorem, we can conclude that $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ is closed in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ and so compact in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. To see that it is closed, let $(V_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and assume that $V_k \rightarrow V$ in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then [FRRO23, Section 1.1, (H8)], which is a consequence of the Arzelá–Ascoli theorem, implies that $V \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\|V\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \lambda_0/2$. Therefore, we have $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and so the assertion follows.

Finally, we show that the map \mathcal{T}_ε is continuous for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, where $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ is considered again as a subset of $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. Hence, let $(V_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and assume that $V_k \rightarrow V$ in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some $V \in C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. As $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ is closed, we have $V \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover, let us denote the corresponding solutions to (4.20) by W_k and \widetilde{W} , respectively. Recall that by the arguments above these solutions belong to $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$, when $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ (see Claim 4.3 and [GT98, Theorem 6.14]). Arguing as for (4.36), we deduce that $\|W_k\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})}$ is uniformly bounded in k and hence compactness of the embedding (4.37) implies that $W_k \rightarrow \widetilde{W}$ in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (up to subsequences) for some $\widetilde{W} \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying the same bounds as W_k (see [FRRO23, Section 1.1, (H8)]). Then, we may deduce that

$$(4.38) \quad \text{div}(A_\varepsilon(V_k) \nabla W_k) \rightarrow \text{div}(A_\varepsilon(V) \nabla \widetilde{W})$$

and hence by uniqueness of solutions to (4.20) there holds $\widetilde{W} = W$. In (4.38), we are using that the divergence operator can be written in the form (4.35) and that $V \mapsto A_\varepsilon(V), \text{div}(A_\varepsilon(V))$ is continuous from $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ to $C(\overline{\Omega})$ as long as $\|V\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \lambda_0/2$, which follows from (4.16), (4.33), Claim 4.3 and the dominated convergence theorem. As the limit does not depend on the extracted subsequence, we can conclude that the whole sequence W_k converges to W in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. Thus, the map \mathcal{T}_ε is continuous for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Therefore, by the above observations on the maps \mathcal{T}_ε , $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, we can apply Schauder’s fixed point theorem [GT98, Theorem 11.1] to deduce that for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ the map \mathcal{T}_ε has a fixed point W_ε in $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$. Furthermore, by uniqueness of solutions to (4.18) and $C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}) \subset W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ we must have

$$(4.39) \quad w_\varepsilon = W_\varepsilon \in C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}),$$

where w_ε is defined by (4.12). Hence, (4.36) and (4.39) ensure that there holds

$$(4.40) \quad \|w_\varepsilon\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_0 \varepsilon^{q-p}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Because of the asymptotic behaviour (4.40), we now introduce the functions

$$R_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{p-q} w_\varepsilon$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$. Moreover, the estimate (4.40) demonstrates that R_ε , $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, is uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and hence, as above, we can conclude that there exists $R_v \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$(4.41) \quad R_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow R_v \text{ in } C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for a suitable subsequence $(\varepsilon_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, \varepsilon_0]$. Therefore, using (4.40), $q > p$ and (4.41), we see that passing to the limit in (4.18), and noting that $A_v^p = A^p(0)$, yields

$$(4.42) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_v^p \nabla R_v) = -\operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ R_v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

To see that we obtain in the limit the PDE (4.42), one can argue similarly as for the continuity of the operators \mathcal{T}_ε , $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Since $R_v \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ is the unique solution of (4.42), it does not depend on the subsequence taken and hence the whole sequence $(R_\varepsilon)_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0}$ needs to converge to R_v . Furthermore, for example by [GT98, Theorem 6.19], it follows that $R_v \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$. Therefore, we have shown the desired asymptotic expansion (4.10). \square

4.2. Asymptotic expansion of solutions for $p > q$. The goal of this section is to prove that for any smooth p -harmonic function v without critical points and $1 < q < p < \infty$, the solution u_μ to

$$(4.43) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \mu v & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

can be expanded as

$$(4.44) \quad u_\mu = \mu v + \mu^{1+q-p} R_v + o(\mu^{1+q-p})$$

for a suitable function R_v as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, if the p -Laplacian is the dominant term, then we consider large boundary values instead of small ones as used in the range $p < q$. Note that in the latter case the weighted q -Laplacian yields the major contribution.

Let us start by observing several facts for the double phase problem (4.43), when $q < p$ and the boundary condition μv is replaced by an arbitrary function $f: \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

- (F1) *Function space:* If $1 < q < p < \infty$, then $W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega) = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.
- (F2) *Well-posedness:* Theorem 3.3 remains valid for $1 < q < p < \infty$, when $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{1,q}(\Omega)$. More concretely, in this case [Dac07, Theorem 3.30] and the arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.3 ensure the existence of a unique solution $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ of the double phase problem with boundary value f , which coincides with the unique minimizer of \mathcal{F} over the set $M_f = f + W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.
- (F3) *Comparison and maximum principle:* The comparison principle (Proposition 3.9) still holds in the case $1 < q < p < \infty$ and as explained in Section 3.3 this in turn guarantees the validity of the maximum principle. Thus, if $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ solves the double phase problem with boundary condition $f \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, then one has

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Next, we show the asymptotic expansion (4.44). More precisely, we have the following result:

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smoothly bounded domain, $1 < q < p < \infty$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $0 < \gamma < \beta < 1$ with $\beta \leq \alpha$ and assume that $a \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ is nonnegative. Moreover, suppose that $v \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is a p -harmonic function without critical points. Then the unique solution u_μ , $\mu > 0$, to (4.43) has the asymptotic expansion (4.44) in the sense of $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$, in which $R_v \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ again denotes the unique solution to*

$$(4.45) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_v^p \nabla R) = -\operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ R = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where A_v^p is the uniformly elliptic matrix $\nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v)$ (see (4.9) and (4.16)).

Proof. Since the proof of Proposition 4.5 is very similar to the one of Proposition 4.2 we omit some of the details.

Assume $v \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is any p -harmonic function without any critical points and let us denote by $u_\mu \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $\mu > 0$, the unique solution to (4.43) (see (F2)). By the maximum principle we know that there holds

$$\|u_\mu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \mu \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

(see (F3)) and thus we define $w_\mu \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ by the Ansatz

$$u_\mu = \mu(v + w_\mu),$$

which solves

$$(4.46) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_\mu(w_\mu) \nabla w_\mu) = -\mu^{q-p} \operatorname{div}(a|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_\mu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where

$$A_\mu(w_\mu) = A^p(w_\mu) + \mu^{q-p} a A^q(w_\mu)$$

and $A^r(w)$, $1 < r < \infty$, is defined as in (4.16) (see (4.14), (4.15) and (4.18)). So, we end up with precisely the same problem as for w_ε , but with the replacement $\varepsilon \rightarrow \mu$ and $w_\varepsilon \rightarrow w_\mu$. Furthermore, note that in Claim 4.3 the ordering of the exponents p, q has no influence and thus the assertions remain valid as long as $\mu \geq 1$. Hence, by following the arguments in the proof of Proposition 4.2 (essentially Schauder's fixed point theorem) we may deduce that for $\mu \geq \mu_0$, with $\mu_0 \geq 1$ large, the solution w_μ of (4.46) is of class $C_{\lambda_0}^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ and there holds

$$(4.47) \quad \|w_\mu\|_{C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \lesssim \mu^{q-p}$$

for any $0 < \beta < \min(1, \alpha)$ (see proof of Proposition 4.2). Thus, we deduce that the function $R_\mu = \mu^{p-q} w_\mu$ are uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for $\mu \geq \mu_0$, with $\mu_0 \geq 1$ large. By (4.47) and the usual compactness argument we deduce that there exists $R_v \in C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$R_\mu \rightarrow R_v \text{ in } C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$$

as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ (up to the extraction of a subsequence), for any $0 < \gamma < \beta$. This function R_v again satisfies (4.45) (as $p > q$ and $w_\mu \rightarrow 0$ in $C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$) and hence by elliptic regularity theory it follows that $R_v \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and the full sequence R_μ , $\mu \geq \mu_0$, converges to R_v . This already ensures the desired asymptotic expansion (4.44). \square

5. DN MAP OF THE DOUBLE PHASE PROBLEM

In this section, we rigorously introduce the Dirichlet to Neumann map related to double phase problem (1.1), which we defined formally in (1.2).

First, let us note the following simple lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ a nonnegative function. Assume that $u_j \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is the unique solution to (1.1) with $f = f_j \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for $j = 1, 2$ (see Theorem 3.3). If $f_1 = f_2$ on $\partial\Omega$, then $u_1 = u_2$ in Ω . Hence, in particular, for any $f \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$ there exists a unique solution $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ to (1.1). Furthermore, we have the following continuity estimates*

$$(5.1) \quad \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f\|_{W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)} + \|f\|_{W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)}^{q/p})$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad \|u\|_{W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f\|_{W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)} + \|f\|_{W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)}^{p/q} + \|f\|_{W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)}^{q/p}).$$

Proof. The first part follows from the comparison principle (Proposition 3.9). The second part of the lemma is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.3, the previous established independence of the extension of the boundary value $f|_{\partial\Omega}$ and the fact that the image of the trace operator $\text{tr}: W^{1,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^q(\partial\Omega)$ coincides with $W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$. Finally, to see the continuity estimates, suppose that $F \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ is an extension of $f \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$. By applying (3.9) and (3.10), respectively, and using the continuity of the extension operator $E: W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, we get the estimates (5.1) and (5.2). Therefore, we can conclude the proof. \square

Proposition 5.2 (DN map). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ a nonnegative function. Then we define the Dirichlet to Neumann (DN) map Λ_a by*

$$(5.3) \quad \langle \Lambda_a f, g \rangle := \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx$$

for all $f, g \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$, where $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ is the unique solution of (1.1) and $\omega \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ is an extension of $g \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$.

Proof. First, recall that by Lemma 5.1 there exists a unique solution $u \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$ to (1.1), for any $f \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$. Next, let $\omega \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ be any extension of $g \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$. Note that the integral in (5.3) exists by Hölder's inequality with $\frac{p-1}{p} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$ and $\frac{q-1}{q} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, respectively. In fact, we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Lambda_a f, g \rangle| &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{p-1} \|\nabla \omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega;a)}^{q-1} \|\nabla \omega\|_{L^q(\Omega;a)} \\ &\leq (\|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{p-1} + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{1/q} \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega;a)}^{q-1}) \|\nabla \omega\|_{L^q(\Omega)} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the value of $\langle \Lambda_a f, g \rangle$ does not depend on the extension $\omega \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ of g as u solves (1.1) (see (3.8)). \square

Remark 5.3 (DN map for $p > q$). *The results of Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 continue to hold for $p > q$, when one chooses boundary values $f, g \in W^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\Omega)$ (see (F1)–(F3)).*

6. LINEARIZATION OF THE p -LAPLACE EQUATION

This section is concerned with the construction of families of solutions (v_τ) to the p -Laplace equation

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = f & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

with a prescribed zeroth order term. More precisely, we shall prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smoothly bounded domain and $1 < p < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Moreover, suppose that $v_0 \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is any p -harmonic function without critical points, $\phi \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ and V is the solution to the Dirichlet problem*

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_{v_0}^p \nabla V) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ V = \phi & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

then there exists an exponent $0 < \beta' < 1$ with the following property: For any $0 < \gamma' < \beta' < 1$, there exists $\tau_0 > 0$ and a family $(v_\tau)_{\tau \in [-\tau_0, \tau_0]} \subset C^{1, \gamma'}(\overline{\Omega})$ of p -harmonic functions that have the asymptotic expansion

$$(6.3) \quad v_\tau = v_0 + \tau V + o(\tau),$$

in the sense of $C^{1, \gamma'}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 6.2. *Note that (6.1) has smooth solutions without critical points in Ω . For example, any non-trivial affine function is such a solution.*

Remark 6.3. *Observe that if $v_0 \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is a fixed p -harmonic function without critical points and V is any smooth solution of $\operatorname{div}(A_{v_0}^p \nabla V) = 0$ in Ω , then we can always find a corresponding family (v_τ) of p -harmonic functions having the asymptotic expansion (6.3). Furthermore, let us point out that the assertion of Lemma 6.1 continues to hold when $v_0, V \in C^{1, \nu}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\nu > 0$, but for our purposes it is enough to work in the smooth setting.*

Proof. Let us start by recalling that if $f \in C^{1, \alpha}(\partial\Omega)$ satisfies $\|f\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C_0$ and u is a bounded weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = f & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

with $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_1$, then there exist positive constants $\beta' = \beta'(\alpha, p, n) \in (0, 1)$, $C = C(\alpha, p, C_0, C_1, n, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1, \beta'}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

This is a special case of [Lie88, Theorem 1] with $m = p - 2$, $\kappa = 0$, $\lambda = \min(1, p - 1)$ and $\Lambda = \max(1, p - 1)$ (see (4.24)).

Now, suppose that $v_0 \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is a smooth solution of (6.1) without critical points and $\phi \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ is a given boundary value. Furthermore, let $v_\tau \in W^{1, p}(\Omega)$, $-1 < \tau < 1$, be the unique solution to

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla v_\tau|^{p-2} \nabla v_\tau) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v_\tau = v_0 + \tau \phi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Note that by Theorem 3.7 with $p = q$, $a = 0$ we have

$$\|v_\tau\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|v_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)},$$

where $\Phi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is any smooth extension of $\phi \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$. Since the boundary data $v_0 + \tau \phi$ satisfy $\|v_0 + \tau \phi\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(\partial\Omega)} \leq \|v_0\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(\partial\Omega)} + \|\phi\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(\partial\Omega)}$, the solutions v_τ are uniformly bounded with respect to τ in $C^{1, \beta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ by the aforementioned result of Lieberman. Next, fix some $\gamma' < \delta' < \beta'$. By the theorem of Arzelà–Ascoli, there must exist $\tilde{v}_0 \in C^{1, \beta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that, after passing to a subsequence, $v_\tau \rightarrow \tilde{v}_0$ in $C^{1, \delta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. Taking the limit of (6.4) (e.g. in the sense of $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$) and using the trace theorem, it follows that \tilde{v}_0 solves (6.1), with the same Dirichlet data as v_0 . Therefore, by Theorem 3.3, we may deduce that $\tilde{v}_0 = v_0$ and hence $v_\tau \rightarrow v_0$ in $C^{1, \delta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. This also shows that v_τ has no critical points for $|\tau| \leq \tau_0$, when $\tau_0 > 0$ is small enough.

Let $V_\tau \in C^{1,\beta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ be defined by the Ansatz

$$(6.5) \quad v_\tau = v_0 + \tau V_\tau.$$

Then, similarly as in the proof of Proposition 4.2, we see that there holds

$$\operatorname{div}(|\nabla v_\tau|^{p-2} \nabla v_\tau) = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla v_0|^{p-2} \nabla v_0) + \tau \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}^\tau \nabla V_\tau),$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^\tau = \int_0^1 \nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v_0 + t\tau \nabla V_\tau) dt.$$

Therefore, as v_τ and v_0 are p -harmonic, V_τ solves

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}^\tau \nabla V_\tau) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ V_\tau = \phi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Since v_0 does not have critical points and $\tau V_\tau \rightarrow 0$ in $C^{1,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, it follows (by Claim 4.3 and Remark 4.4, with $a \equiv 0$) that there exists a $\tau_0 > 0$ such that the matrices $\mathcal{A}^\tau \in C^{0,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ are uniformly elliptic and furthermore they have ellipticity and $\|\cdot\|_{C^{0,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})}$ bounds that are independent of $\tau \in [-\tau_0, \tau_0]$. From [GT98, Theorems 8.33 & 8.34] we deduce that $V_\tau \in C^{1,\beta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfies

$$(6.7) \quad \|V_\tau\|_{C^{1,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C(\|V_\tau\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\Phi\|_{C^{1,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})}),$$

where $C > 0$ only depends on the uniform the ellipticity constant of \mathcal{A}_τ , a uniform upper bound of $\|\mathcal{A}_\tau\|_{C^{0,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})}$, Ω and n . Hence, the maximum principle for (uniformly) elliptic PDEs [FRRO23, Proposition 2.30] ensures that

$$(6.8) \quad \|V_\tau\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}$$

and thus V_τ is uniformly bounded with respect to $\tau \in [-\tau_0, \tau_0]$ in $C^{1,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})$.

By the theorem of Arzelà–Ascoli, there must exist a $V \in C^{1,\delta'}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $V_\tau \rightarrow V$ in $C^{1,\gamma'}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, after passing to a subsequence. Passing to the limit in (6.6) shows that V must be a weak solution to (6.2). For the previous convergence assertion, we use the fact that $V \mapsto \nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v_0 + t\nabla V)$ is continuous from $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ to $C(\overline{\Omega})$ (when $\|V\|_{C^{1,\gamma'}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \lambda_0/2$, see Remark 4.4), the uniform bound of $\nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v_0 + t\tau \nabla V_\tau)$ in t provided by Claim 4.3 and Remark 4.4 for small τ as well as the dominated convergence theorem. Since solutions to (6.2) are unique, it follows that

$$(6.9) \quad V_\tau \rightarrow V \text{ in } C^{1,\gamma'}(\overline{\Omega})$$

as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, without passing to a subsequence. Hence, we deduce that

$$v_\tau = v_0 + \tau V + \tau(V_\tau - V) = v_0 + \tau V + o(\tau)$$

in $C^{1,\gamma'}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we establish the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 7.1, we prove Theorem 1.1 in the range $p < q$ and in Section 7.2 in the range $p > q$.

7.1. Reconstruction of a in the range $p < q$. In this section, we detail our reconstruction procedure of the coefficient a in the double phase problem (1.1) when $p < q$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 for $p < q$. Let $u_\varepsilon \in W_a^{1,p,q}(\Omega)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, be the unique solutions to (4.1) for some p -harmonic function $v \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ without critical points and let $0 < \gamma < \beta < 1$ be some exponents as in Proposition 4.2, which we shall fix at a later stage of the proof. We claim that for any $g \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$, with extension $\omega \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, there holds

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \Lambda_a \varepsilon v, g \rangle &= \varepsilon^{p-1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\ &+ \varepsilon^{q-1} \int_{\Omega} (A_v^p \nabla R_v + a |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx + o(\varepsilon^{q-1}) \end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, where $R_v \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ is the unique solution of (4.11) (see Proposition 4.2).

Indeed, recalling from the proof of Proposition 4.2 that we may expand u_ε as

$$u_\varepsilon = \varepsilon(v + w_{v,\varepsilon}) \text{ with } w_{v,\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{q-p} R_{v,\varepsilon} \text{ and } R_{v,\varepsilon} \rightarrow R_v \text{ in } C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}),$$

we obtain by formula (4.13) the identities

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^{p-2} \nabla u_\varepsilon &= \varepsilon^{p-1} |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v + \varepsilon^{q-1} A_v^p(w_{v,\varepsilon}) \nabla R_{v,\varepsilon} \\ &= \varepsilon^{p-1} |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v + \varepsilon^{q-1} A_v^p \nabla R_v \\ &+ \varepsilon^{q-1} [A_v^p \nabla (R_{v,\varepsilon} - R_v) + (A_v^p(w_{v,\varepsilon}) - A_v^p) \nabla R_{v,\varepsilon}] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(7.3) \quad a |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^{q-2} \nabla u_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{q-1} a |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v + \varepsilon^{q-1} \varepsilon^{q-p} a A_v^q(w_{v,\varepsilon}) \nabla R_{v,\varepsilon}.$$

The matrices $A_v^r(w_{v,\varepsilon})$, $1 < r < \infty$, appearing in (7.2)–(7.3), are given by (4.16) and we added the subscript v on these matrices and the functions $w_\varepsilon, R_\varepsilon$ to highlight their dependence on v . Since $R_{v,\varepsilon} \rightarrow R_v$ and $w_{v,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ in $C^{2,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the claim (7.1) follows from the definition of the DN map (5.3) and the dominated convergence theorem. This shows that, for any p -harmonic function v without critical points and any $g \in W^{1-1/q,q}(\partial\Omega)$ with extension $\omega \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, we can compute the quantity

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} I(v, g) &:= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varepsilon^{1-q} (\langle \Lambda_a \varepsilon v, g \rangle - \langle \Lambda_0 \varepsilon v, g \rangle) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (A_v^p \nabla R_v + a |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

from the DN map Λ_a of the double phase problem and the DN map Λ_0 of the p -Laplacian Δ_p .

Next, we consider the family $(v_\tau)_{\tau \in [-\tau_0, \tau_0]}$ of p -harmonic functions constructed in Lemma 6.1, which are supposed to have zeroth order term v_0 and first order term V . Thus, the previous calculation can be applied to v_τ when $\beta := \beta'$ and $\gamma := \gamma' < \beta'$. We wish to compute the derivative

$$(7.5) \quad J(v_0, V, \omega) := \left. \frac{d}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} I(v_\tau, g) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{I(v_\tau, g) - I(v_0, g)}{\tau}.$$

First, note that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V) &:= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-1} (A_{v_\tau}^p - A_{v_0}^p) \\
&= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-1} (\nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v_\tau) - \nabla_\xi J^p(\nabla v_0)) \\
(7.6) \quad &= (p-2)|\nabla v_0|^{p-4} (\nabla v_0 \cdot \nabla V) \left[\mathbf{1} + (p-4) \frac{\nabla v_0 \otimes \nabla v_0}{|\nabla v_0|^2} \right] \\
&\quad + (p-2)|\nabla v_0|^{p-4} (\nabla v_0 \otimes \nabla V + \nabla V \otimes \nabla v_0)
\end{aligned}$$

in $C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. This can be seen as follows. First, using (4.9) and a straight forward calculation, we obtain

$$(7.7) \quad \partial_{\xi_i \xi_j} J_k^p(\xi) = (p-2)|\xi|^{p-4} (\xi_i \delta_{kj} + \xi_j \delta_{ki} + \xi_k \delta_{ij}) + (p-2)(p-4)|\xi|^{p-6} \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k$$

for all $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$ and $\xi \neq 0$. Secondly, the map $\xi \mapsto \nabla_\xi J^p(\xi)$ is locally Lipschitz away from the origin $\xi = 0$ (see (3.6)). Hence, the fundamental theorem of calculus ensures

$$(7.8) \quad \partial_{\xi_i} J_k^p(\eta) - \partial_{\xi_i} J_k^p(\xi) = \int_0^1 \partial_{\xi_i \xi_j} J_k^p(\xi + t(\eta - \xi)) dt (\eta_j - \xi_j)$$

for all $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, as long as the straight line from ξ to η does not go through the origin. Thus, the nondegeneracy of ∇v_τ , $|\tau| \leq \tau_0$, ensures that we can apply (7.8) to $\eta = \nabla v_\tau$ and $\xi = \nabla v_0$. Using the convergence $V_\tau \rightarrow V$ in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ and (7.7) in the obtained identity, we get the formula in (7.6).

Furthermore, by [GT98, Theorem 8.34] and $\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V) \in C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, we can denote by $\dot{R} \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ the unique solution to

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_{v_0}^p \nabla \dot{R}) = -\operatorname{div}(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V) \nabla R_{v_0}) - \operatorname{div}(a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \dot{R} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Next, let us observe that using (4.11) we can write

$$(7.10) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_{v_0}^p \nabla (R_{v_\tau} - R_{v_0})) = \operatorname{div}((A_{v_0}^p - A_{v_\tau}^p) \nabla R_{v_\tau}) + \operatorname{div} f_\tau & \text{in } \Omega, \\ R_{v_\tau} - R_{v_0} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(7.11) \quad f_\tau := a(|\nabla v_0|^{q-2} \nabla v_0 - |\nabla v_\tau|^{q-2} \nabla v_\tau) \in C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}).$$

Next, we claim that there holds

$$(7.12) \quad \sup_{|\tau| \leq \tau_0} \|\nabla R_{v_\tau}\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} < \infty$$

for some possibly smaller $\tau_0 > 0$. First, we observe that (4.11), Claim 4.3 applied to $A_{v_\tau}^p$ and [GT98, Theorem 8.33] imply

$$(7.13) \quad \|R_{v_\tau}\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C(\|R_{v_\tau}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|a|\nabla v_\tau|^{q-2} \nabla v_\tau\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})}),$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of τ . From the proof of Lemma 6.1, we know that $v_\tau = v_0 + \tau V_\tau$ and $V_\tau \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfies the estimate

$$\|V_\tau\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C\|\Phi\|_{C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})},$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of τ and $\Phi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is an extension of $\phi \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ (see (6.7) and (6.8)). This ensures the bound

$$(7.14) \quad \|v_\tau\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C(\|v_0\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} + \|\Phi\|_{C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})})$$

uniformly in τ . Furthermore, [GT98, Theorem 8.16] and (4.11) (for R_{v_τ}) demonstrate that

$$\|R_{v_\tau}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C\|a|\nabla v_\tau|^{q-2} \nabla v_\tau\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Combining this with (7.13), we get

$$(7.15) \quad \|R_{v_\tau}\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C \|a|\nabla v_\tau|^{q-2}\nabla v_\tau\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})}$$

uniformly in τ . By the product rule (4.26), the uniform nondegeneracy of ∇v_τ , (7.14) and Lemma 4.1, we can uniformly bound the right hand side of (7.15), which yields (7.12).

We next assert that

$$(7.16) \quad R_{v_\tau} \rightarrow R_{v_0} \text{ in } C^{1,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})$$

for some $0 < \delta < \gamma$. In fact, from (7.12) and a compactness argument we can conclude that $R_{v_\tau} \rightarrow \tilde{R}_{v_0}$ in $C^{1,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})$ along a subsequence for some $0 < \delta < \gamma$. Using (6.3) and passing to the limit in the PDE for R_{v_τ} , we see that R_{v_0} and \tilde{R}_{v_0} solve the same Dirichlet problem, and hence $R_{v_0} = \tilde{R}_{v_0}$. That the coefficient $A_{v_\tau}^p$ in the PDE for R_{v_τ} converges to $A_{v_0}^p$ can be shown in a similar way as done at the end of the proof of Lemma 6.1. Since the limit is independent of the chosen subsequence, we infer the convergence (7.16).

Finally, we show that

$$(7.17) \quad \dot{R} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_{v_\tau} - R_{v_0}}{\tau}$$

in $C^{1,\kappa}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $0 < \kappa < \delta$, where $\dot{R} \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ is the unique solution of (7.9). From (7.10), we see that

$$(7.18) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div} \left(A_{v_0}^p \nabla \frac{R_{v_\tau} - R_{v_0}}{\tau} \right) = \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{A_{v_0}^p - A_{v_\tau}^p}{\tau} \nabla R_{v_\tau} \right) + \operatorname{div} \frac{f_\tau}{\tau} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{R_{v_\tau} - R_{v_0}}{\tau} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

for any $\tau \neq 0$. From (7.6) and (7.16), we deduce that

$$(7.19) \quad \sup_{|\tau| \leq \tau_0} \max \left(\left\| \frac{A_{v_\tau}^p - A_{v_0}^p}{\tau} \right\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})}, \|R_{v_\tau}\|_{C^{1,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})} \right) < \infty$$

for some small $\tau_0 > 0$. On the other hand, the formulas (4.13), (7.11) and (6.5) ensure that there holds

$$f_\tau = -\tau a \left(\int_0^1 \nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v_0 + t\tau \nabla V_\tau) dt \right) \nabla V_\tau.$$

So, from (6.9) and the product rule in Hölder spaces, we see that

$$(7.20) \quad f_\tau / \tau \rightarrow -a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V$$

in $C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, which demonstrates that there holds

$$(7.21) \quad \|f_\tau / \tau\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} < \infty$$

for $|\tau| \leq \tau_0$ for some small $\tau_0 > 0$. More concretely, to obtain the convergence (7.20) we make use of the fact that

$$(7.22) \quad \|\nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v_0 + t\tau \nabla V_\tau) - \nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v_0)\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, uniformly for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. This in turn can be shown by using (7.8), (7.7) and Lemma 4.1. For similar arguments, we refer the reader to the proof of Claim 4.3 and Lemma 6.1. Now, using (4.26), (7.19), (7.21) and [GT98, Theorem 8.16 & 8.33], we see that

$$\left\| \frac{R_{v_\tau} - R_{v_0}}{\tau} \right\|_{C^{1,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})} < \infty$$

uniformly in τ . Hence, there exists $\dot{\mathcal{R}} \in C^{1,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$(7.23) \quad \frac{R_{v_\tau} - R_{v_0}}{\tau} \rightarrow \dot{\mathcal{R}}$$

in $C^{1,\kappa}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $0 < \kappa < \delta$. By the convergence results (7.6), (7.20) and (7.23), we see that passing to the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ in (7.18) reveals that $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \in C^{1,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})$ solves (7.9). Thus, we may conclude that $\hat{\mathcal{R}} = \hat{R}$, which in turn implies the convergence (7.17).

Finally, we observe that (6.5), (4.13), $V_\tau \rightarrow V$ in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ and (7.22) demonstrate that there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \frac{d}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} \int_{\Omega} a |\nabla v_\tau|^{q-2} \nabla v_\tau \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
&= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} a \left(\int_0^1 \nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v_0 + t\tau \nabla V_\tau) dt \right) \nabla V_\tau \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
(7.24) \quad &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} a \left(\int_0^1 [\nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v_0 + t\tau \nabla V_\tau) - \nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v_0)] dt \right) \nabla V_\tau \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
&\quad + \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} a \nabla_\xi J^q(\nabla v_0) \nabla V_\tau \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (7.5), (7.4) with $v = v_\tau$, (7.6), (7.16), (7.17) and (7.24) that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J(v_0, V, \omega) &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \frac{A_{v_\tau}^p \nabla R_{v_\tau} - A_{v_0}^p \nabla R_{v_0}}{\tau} \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
&\quad + \left. \frac{d}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} \int_{\Omega} a |\nabla v_\tau|^{q-2} \nabla v_\tau \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
(7.25) \quad &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{A_{v_\tau}^p - A_{v_0}^p}{\tau} \nabla R_{v_\tau} + A_{v_0}^p \frac{\nabla R_{v_\tau} - \nabla R_{v_0}}{\tau} \right) \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V) \nabla R_{v_0} + A_{v_0}^p \nabla \dot{R} + a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V \right) \cdot \nabla \omega \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $V_1, V_2 \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ are two solutions of the equation $\operatorname{div}(A_{v_0}^p \nabla V) = 0$ with boundary data $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ (see [GT98, Theorem 6.15]). Using Lemma 6.1, the symmetry of the matrices $A_{v_0}^p, \dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ (the regularity assertions follows from (4.9), (4.31), (7.6), (4.32), the nondegeneracy of ∇v_0 and $v_0, V_1 \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$) and the fact that $R, \dot{R} \in C^{1,\kappa}(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy $R_{v_0}|_{\partial\Omega} = \dot{R}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, we get by an integration by parts in the first two terms of (7.25) the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.26) \quad J(v_0, V_1, V_2) &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \nabla R_{v_0} + A_{v_0}^p \nabla \dot{R} + a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V_1 \right) \cdot \nabla V_2 \, dx \\
&= - \int_{\Omega} [R_{v_0} \operatorname{div}(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \nabla V_2) + \dot{R} \operatorname{div}(A_{v_0}^p \nabla V_2)] \, dx + \int_{\Omega} a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V_1 \cdot \nabla V_2 \, dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left(a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V_1 \cdot \nabla V_2 - R_{v_0} \operatorname{div}(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \nabla V_2) \right) \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Up to now we have assumed that all functions are real-valued, but in the next final step we want to choose $V_j, j = 1, 2$, complex-valued while keeping v_0 real-valued. For this let us note that $V \mapsto \dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V)$ is linear and hence if we decompose the

possibly complex-valued solutions V_j as $V_j = U_j + iW_j$, $j = 1, 2$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left(a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V_1 \cdot \nabla V_2 - R_{v_0} \operatorname{div}(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \nabla V_2) \right) dx \\ &= (J(v_0, U_1, U_2) - J(v_0, W_1, W_2)) + i(J(v_0, U_1, W_2) + J(v_0, W_1, U_2)). \end{aligned}$$

As all terms in the last line are determined by the DN map $\langle \Lambda_a f, g \rangle$ for appropriate real-valued boundary conditions f and g , the same remains true for the integral

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(a A_{v_0}^q \nabla V_1 \cdot \nabla V_2 - R_{v_0} \operatorname{div}(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \nabla V_2) \right) dx,$$

which we still denote by $J(v_0, V_1, V_2)$. This notation is justified by the fact that if V_j , $j = 1, 2$, solve (6.2), then the same holds for the real and imaginary parts as v_0 is real-valued.

Let $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|z| = 1$ and set $v_0 = z \cdot x$. Then using $A_{v_0}^r = \nabla_{\xi} J^r(\nabla v_0)$, (4.9) and (7.6), we deduce

$$(7.27) \quad A_{v_0}^p = \mathbf{1} + (p-2)z \otimes z, \quad A_{v_0}^q = \mathbf{1} + (q-2)z \otimes z,$$

and

$$(7.28) \quad \dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) = (p-2) \left[(z \cdot \nabla V_1) \mathbf{1} + (p-4)(z \cdot \nabla V_1) z \otimes z + z \otimes \nabla V_1 + \nabla V_1 \otimes z \right].$$

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $\xi \perp z$. For $s > 0$ to be chosen later, we introduce the complex vectors

$$\zeta_{\pm} = \pm s z + i \xi.$$

By (7.27), $\zeta_{\pm} \cdot \zeta_{\pm} = s^2 - |\xi|^2$, $z \cdot \zeta_{\pm} = \pm s$ and

$$(7.29) \quad (a \otimes b)c = a(b \cdot c)$$

for all $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we have

$$\zeta_{\pm} \cdot A_{v_0}^p \zeta_{\pm} = (p-1)s^2 - |\xi|^2.$$

So, if we choose

$$(7.30) \quad s = (p-1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\xi|,$$

then the functions

$$V_1(x) = e^{\zeta_+ \cdot x}, \quad V_2(x) = e^{\zeta_- \cdot x},$$

are both global smooth solutions of $\operatorname{div}(A_{v_0}^p \nabla V) = 0$.

Using (7.28), (7.29), $\zeta_+ \cdot \zeta_- = -(s^2 + |\xi|^2)$ and (7.30), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \nabla V_2 &= (p-2) e^{2i\xi \cdot x} (s \mathbf{1} + s(p-4)z \otimes z + z \otimes \zeta_+ + \zeta_+ \otimes z) \zeta_- \\ &= (p-2) e^{2i\xi \cdot x} (s \zeta_- - s^2(p-4)z - (s^2 + |\xi|^2)z - s \zeta_+) \\ &= -(p-2) e^{2i\xi \cdot x} [(p-1)s^2 + |\xi|^2] z = -2(p-2) |\xi|^2 e^{2i\xi \cdot x} z \end{aligned}$$

and thus it follows from $\xi \perp z$ that

$$(7.31) \quad \operatorname{div}(\dot{A}_{v_0}^p(V_1) \nabla V_2) = 0.$$

On the other hand, by (7.29), (7.30), $\zeta_{\pm} \cdot \zeta_{\pm} = s^2 - |\xi|^2$, $z \cdot \zeta_{\pm} = \pm s$ and $\zeta_+ \cdot \zeta_- = -(s^2 + |\xi|^2)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (7.32) \quad A_{v_0}^q \nabla V_1 \cdot \nabla V_2 &= e^{2i\xi \cdot x} A_{v_0}^q \zeta_+ \cdot \zeta_- \\ &= -e^{2i\xi \cdot x} ((q-1)s^2 + |\xi|^2) \\ &= -\frac{p+q-2}{p-1} |\xi|^2 e^{2i\xi \cdot x}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by using (7.26), (7.31) and (7.32), we deduce that

$$J(z \cdot x, e^{\zeta_+ \cdot x}, e^{\zeta_- \cdot x}) = -\frac{p+q-2}{4(p-1)} \int_{\Omega} a(x) |2\xi|^2 e^{2i\xi \cdot x} dx.$$

Hence, if we set a outside of $\overline{\Omega}$ equal to zero, then we get

$$(7.33) \quad \hat{a}(\xi) = -\frac{4(p-1)}{p+q-2} \frac{J(z \cdot x, e^{\tilde{\zeta}_+ \cdot x}, e^{\tilde{\zeta}_- \cdot x})}{|\xi|^2}$$

for all $\xi \perp z$, where

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{\pm} = \pm \frac{|\xi|}{2(p-1)^{1/2}} z + i \frac{\xi}{2}.$$

As formula (7.33) holds for all $z \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $\xi \neq 0$ with $\xi \perp z$, we can conclude that $\hat{a}(\xi)$ is determined by J for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, by Fourier's inversion theorem we have shown that a can be recovered from the DN map Λ_a (see (7.4), (7.5) and (7.33)).

This concludes the proof. \square

7.2. Reconstruction of a in the range $p > q$. In this section, we explain the necessary changes of Section 7.1 to reconstruct the coefficient a in the double phase problem (1.1) when $p > q$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 for $p > q$. In a similar manner as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we consider the unique solution $u_{\mu} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ to (4.43) for some p -harmonic function $v \in C^{\infty}(\overline{\Omega})$ without critical points and large $\mu \gg 1$.

First note that with the help of Proposition 4.5 we can repeat the argument of the proof of Theorem 1.1 to conclude that there holds

$$\begin{aligned} I(v, g) &:= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{1-q} (\langle \Lambda_a \mu v, g \rangle - \langle \Lambda_0 \mu v, g \rangle) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (A_v^p \nabla R_v + a |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v) \cdot \nabla \omega dx. \end{aligned}$$

Also the rest of the proof does not depend on the ordering of the exponents p, q and hence we get the desired result by using the very same reasoning. \square

Acknowledgments. C. I. Cârstea was supported by the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) grant number 113-2115-M-A49-018-MY3. P. Zimmermann is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF), under the grant number 214500.

REFERENCES

- [BCM18] P. Baroni, M. Colombo, and G. Mingione. Regularity for general functionals with double phase. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 57:1–48, 2018.
- [BHKS18] T. Brander, B. Harrach, M. Kar, and M. Salo. Monotonicity and enclosure methods for the p -Laplace equation. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 78(2):742–758, 2018.
- [BIK18] T. Brander, J. Ilmavirta, and M. Kar. Superconductive and insulating inclusions for linear and non-linear conductivity equations. *Inverse Problems & Imaging*, 12(1):91–123, 2018.
- [BKS15] T. Brander, M. Kar, and M. Salo. Enclosure method for the p -Laplace equation. *Inverse Problems*, 31(4):045001, 2015.
- [Bra16] T. Brander. Calderón problem for the p -Laplacian: First order derivative of conductivity on the boundary. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 144(1):177–189, 2016.
- [Câr22] C. I. Cârstea. On an inverse boundary value problem for a nonlinear time harmonic Maxwell system. *Journal of Inverse and Ill-posed Problems*, 30(3):395–408, 2022.
- [Câr24] C. I. Cârstea. Prescribed nonlinearity helps in an anisotropic Calderón-type problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14970*, 2024.

- [CF21] C. I. Cârstea and A. Feizmohammadi. An inverse boundary value problem for certain anisotropic quasilinear elliptic equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 284:318–349, 2021.
- [CF23] C. I. Cârstea and A. Feizmohammadi. A density property for tensor products of gradients of harmonic functions and applications. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 284(2):109740, 2023.
- [CF24] C. I. Cârstea and A. Feizmohammadi. Two uniqueness results in the inverse boundary value problem for the weighted p -Laplace equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04123*, 2024.
- [CFK⁺21] C. I. Cârstea, A. Feizmohammadi, Y. Kian, K. Krupchyk, and G. Uhlmann. The Calderón inverse problem for isotropic quasilinear conductivities. *Advances in Mathematics*, 391:107956, 2021.
- [CGN25] C. I. Cârstea, T. Ghosh, and G. Nakamura. An inverse boundary value problem for the inhomogeneous porous medium equation. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 85(1):278–293, 2025.
- [CGU23] C. I. Cârstea, T. Ghosh, and G. Uhlmann. An inverse problem for the porous medium equation with partial data and a possibly singular absorption term. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 55(1):162–185, 2023.
- [CK20] C. I. Cârstea and M. Kar. Recovery of coefficients for a weighted p -Laplacian perturbed by a linear second order term. *Inverse Problems*, 37(1):015013, 2020.
- [Cla36] J. A. Clarkson. Uniformly convex spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 40(3):396–414, 1936.
- [CM15] M. Colombo and G. Mingione. Bounded minimisers of double phase variational integrals. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal*, 218(1):219–273, 2015.
- [CNV19] C. I. Cârstea, G. Nakamura, and M. Vashisth. Reconstruction for the coefficients of a quasilinear elliptic partial differential equation. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 2019.
- [Dac07] B. Dacorogna. *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*, volume 78. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [DF21] C. De Filippis. Optimal gradient estimates for multi-phase integrals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.04898*, 2021.
- [DFO19] C. De Filippis and J. Oh. Regularity for multi-phase variational problems. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 267(3):1631–1670, 2019.
- [EPS14] H. Egger, J.-F. Pietschmann, and M. Schlottbom. Simultaneous identification of diffusion and absorption coefficients in a quasilinear elliptic problem. *Inverse Problems*, 30(3):035009, 2014.
- [FO20] A. Feizmohammadi and L. Oksanen. An inverse problem for a semi-linear elliptic equation in Riemannian geometries. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 269(6):4683–4719, 2020.
- [FRRO23] X. Fernández-Real and X. Ros-Oton. Regularity theory for elliptic pde. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01564*, 2023.
- [GKS16] C.-Y. Guo, M. Kar, and M. Salo. Inverse problems for p -Laplace type equations under monotonicity assumptions. *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste*, 48:79–99, 2016.
- [GM75] R. Glowinski and A. Marroco. Sur l’approximation, par éléments finis d’ordre un, et la résolution, par pénalisation-dualité, d’une classe de problèmes de Dirichlet non linéaires. *Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge Anal. Numér.*, 9(R-2):41–76, 1975.
- [GT98] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, volume 224. Springer, 1998.
- [HS02] D. Hervas and Z. Sun. An inverse boundary value problem for quasilinear elliptic equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 27(11-12):2449–2490, 2002.
- [IN95] V. Isakov and A. I. Nachman. Global uniqueness for a two-dimensional semilinear elliptic inverse problem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 347(9):3375–3390, 1995.
- [IS94] V. Isakov and J. Sylvester. Global uniqueness for a semilinear elliptic inverse problem. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 47(10):1403–1410, 1994.
- [Isa93] V. Isakov. On uniqueness in inverse problems for semilinear parabolic equations. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 124(1):1–12, 1993.
- [Isa01] V. Isakov. Uniqueness of recovery of some quasilinear partial differential equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 26(11-12):1947–1973, 2001.
- [KLZ24] M. Kar, Y.-H. Lin, and P. Zimmermann. Determining coefficients for a fractional p -Laplace equation from exterior measurements. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 406:338–365, 2024.

- [KN02] H. Kang and G. Nakamura. Identification of nonlinearity in a conductivity equation via the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. *Inverse Problems*, 18(4):1079, 2002.
- [KRZ23] M. Kar, J. Railo, and P. Zimmermann. The fractional p -biharmonic systems: optimal Poincaré constants, unique continuation and inverse problems. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 62(4):Paper No. 130, 36, 2023.
- [KU20a] K. Krupchyk and G. Uhlmann. Partial data inverse problems for semilinear elliptic equations with gradient nonlinearities. *Mathematical Research Letters*, 27(6), 2020.
- [KU20b] K. Krupchyk and G. Uhlmann. A remark on partial data inverse problems for semilinear elliptic equations. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 148(2):681–685, 2020.
- [KW17] M. Kar and J.-N. Wang. Size estimates for the weighted p -Laplace equation with one measurement. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-B*, 22(11):0, 2017.
- [Leo91] F. Leonetti. Maximum principle for vector-valued minimizers of some integral functionals. *BOLLETTINO DELLA UNIONE MATEMATICA ITALIANA*, 5(1):51–56, 1991.
- [Lie88] G. M. Lieberman. Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 12(11):1203–1219, 1988.
- [LLLS20] M. Lassas, T. Liimatainen, Y.-H. Lin, and M. Salo. Partial data inverse problems and simultaneous recovery of boundary and coefficients for semilinear elliptic equations. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 37(4):1553–1580, 2020.
- [LLLS21] M. Lassas, T. Liimatainen, Y.-H. Lin, and M. Salo. Inverse problems for elliptic equations with power type nonlinearities. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 145:44–82, 2021.
- [LZ23] Y.-H. Lin and P. Zimmermann. Unique determination of coefficients and kernel in nonlocal porous medium equations with absorption term. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16282*, 2023.
- [MU20] C. Munoz and G. Uhlmann. The Calderón problem for quasilinear elliptic equations. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 2020.
- [Sha20] R. Shankar. Recovering a quasilinear conductivity from boundary measurements. *Inverse Problems*, 37(1):015014, 2020.
- [Sim78] J. Simon. Régularité de la solution d'une équation non linéaire dans \mathbf{R}^N . In *Journées d'Analyse Non Linéaire (Proc. Conf., Besançon, 1977)*, volume 665 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 205–227. Springer, Berlin, 1978.
- [SU97] Z. Sun and G. Uhlmann. Inverse problems in quasilinear anisotropic media. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 119(4):771–797, 1997.
- [Sun96] Z. Sun. On a quasilinear inverse boundary value problem. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 221(1):293–305, 1996.
- [Sun05] Z. Sun. Anisotropic inverse problems for quasilinear elliptic equations. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, volume 12, page 156. IOP Publishing, 2005.
- [Sun10] Z. Sun. An inverse boundary-value problem for semilinear elliptic equations. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations (EJDE)[electronic only]*, 2010:Paper–No, 2010.
- [SZ12] M. Salo and X. Zhong. An inverse problem for the p -Laplacian: boundary determination. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 44(4):2474–2495, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL YANG MING CHIAO TUNG UNIVERSITY, HSINCHU, TAIWAN

Email address: catalin.carstea@gmail.com

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, BARCELONA, SPAIN

Email address: philipp.zimmermann@ub.edu