

$C^{1,\alpha}$  REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS TO PARABOLIC  
MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATIONS

PANAGIOTA DASKALOPOULOS\* AND OVIDIU SAVIN\*\*

ABSTRACT. We study interior  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity of viscosity solutions of the parabolic Monge-Ampère equation

$$u_t = b(x, t) (\det D^2 u)^p,$$

with exponent  $p > 0$  and with coefficients  $b$  which are bounded and measurable. We show that when  $p$  is less than the critical power  $\frac{1}{n-2}$  then solutions become instantly  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in the interior. Also, we prove the same result for any power  $p > 0$  at those points where either the solution separates from the initial data, or where the initial data is  $C^{1,\beta}$ .

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we investigate interior regularity of viscosity solutions of the parabolic Monge-Ampère equation

$$(1.1) \quad u_t = b(x, t) (\det D^2 u)^p,$$

with exponent  $p > 0$  and with coefficients  $b$  which are bounded measurable and satisfy

$$(1.2) \quad \lambda \leq b(x, t) \leq \Lambda$$

for some fixed constants  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\Lambda < \infty$ . We assume that the function  $u$  is convex in  $x$  and increasing in  $t$ .

Equations of the form of (1.1) appear in geometric evolution problems and in particular in the motion of a convex  $n$ -dimensional hyper-surface  $\Sigma_t^n$  embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  under Gauss curvature flow with exponent  $p$ , namely the equation

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = K^p \mathbf{N}$$

where each point  $P$  moves in the inward direction  $\mathbf{N}$  to the surface with velocity equal to the  $p$ -power of its Gaussian curvature  $K$ . If we express the surface  $\Sigma^n(t)$

---

\*\* : Partially supported by NSF grant 0701037 and a Sloan Fellowship.

locally as a graph  $x_{n+1} = u(x, t)$ , with  $x \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , then the function  $u$  satisfies the parabolic Monge-Ampère equation

$$(1.4) \quad u_t = \frac{(\det D^2 u)^p}{(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{(n+2)p-1}{2}}}.$$

Since any convex solution satisfies locally the bound  $|\nabla u| \leq C$ , equation (1.4) becomes of the form (1.1).

The case  $p = 1$  corresponds to the well studied Gauss curvature flow which was first introduced by W. Firey in [9] as a model for the wearing process of stones. It follows from the work of Tso [15] that uniformly strictly convex hyper-surfaces will become instantly  $C^\infty$  smooth and they remain smooth up to their vanishing time  $T$ . However, convex surfaces which are not necessarily uniformly strictly convex, may not become instantly strictly convex and smooth (c.f. [12], [5]) and their regularity poses an interesting problem that we will investigate in this paper.

Equations of the form (1.3) for different powers of  $p > 0$  were studied by B. Andrews in [1] (see also in [6]). He showed that when  $p \leq 1/n$  any convex hyper-surface will become instantly strictly uniformly convex and smooth.

It can be seen from radially symmetric examples that, when  $p > 1/n$ , surfaces evolving by (1.3) or (1.1) may have a flat side that persists for some time before it disappears. These surfaces are of class  $C^{1,\gamma_p}$  with  $\gamma_p := \frac{p}{np-1}$ . Since  $\gamma_p < 1$  if  $p > \frac{1}{n-1}$ , solutions which are not strictly convex fail, in general, to be of class  $C^{1,1}$  in this range of exponents. In particular, solutions to the Gauss curvature flow ( $p = 1$ ) with flat sides are no better than  $C^{1,\frac{1}{n-1}}$  while the flat sides persist. The  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity of solutions of (1.3) for any  $p > 0$  will be addressed in this work.

In dimension  $n = 2$ , the regularity for the Gauss curvature flow ( $p = 1$ ) is well understood. It follows from the work of B. Andrews in [2] that, in this case, all surfaces become instantly of class  $C^{1,1}$  and remain so up to a time when they become strictly convex and therefore smooth, before they contract to a point. Also, it follows from the works of the first author with Hamilton [7] and Lee [8] that  $C^{1,1}$  is the optimal regularity here, as can be seen from evolving surfaces  $\Sigma_t^2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with flat sides. The optimal regularity of surfaces with flat sides and interfaces was further discussed in [7, 8].

We mention that  $C^{1,\alpha}$  and  $W^{2,p}$  interior estimates were established by Gutiérrez and Huang in [11] for equations similar to (1.1) for  $p = -1$  and by Huang and Lu for  $p = \frac{1}{n}$ . However, their work requires uniform convexity of the initial data and strict monotonicity of the function on the lateral boundary.

If  $w$  is a solution to the Monge-Ampère equation

$$\det D^2w = 1, \quad x \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n,$$

then  $u(x, t) = w(x) + t$  solves equation (1.1) with  $b \equiv 1$  for any  $p$ . The question of regularity for the Monge-Ampère equation is closely related to the strict convexity of  $w$ . Strict convexity does not always hold in the interior as it can be seen from a classical example due to Pogorelov [14]. However, Caffarelli [3] showed that if the convex set  $D$  where  $w$  coincides with a tangent plane contains at least a line segment then all extremal points of  $D$  must lie on  $\partial\Omega$ . We prove the parabolic version of this result for solution of (1.1). Our result says that, if at a time  $t$  the convex set  $D$  where  $u$  equals a tangent plane contains at least a line segment then, either the extremal points of  $D$  lie on  $\partial\Omega$  or  $u(\cdot, t)$  coincides with the initial data on  $D$  (see Theorem 5.3). The second behavior occurs for example in those solutions with flat sides. In other words, a line segment in the graph of  $u$  at time  $t$  either originates from the boundary data at time  $t$  or from the initial data.

We prove a similar result for angles instead of line segments, which is crucial for our estimates. We show that if at a time  $t$  the solution  $u$  admits a tangent angle from below then either the set where  $u$  coincides with the edge of the angle has all extremal points on  $\partial\Omega$  or the initial data has the same tangent angle from below (see Theorem 6.1).

The  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity is closely related to understanding whether or not solutions separate instantly away from the edges of a tangent angle of the initial data. It turns out that when  $p > \frac{1}{n-2}$  the set where  $u$  coincides with the edge of the angle may persist for some time (see Proposition 4.8), hence  $C^1$  regularity does not hold in this case without further hypotheses. If  $p < \frac{1}{n-2}$  we prove that, at any time  $t$  after the initial time, solutions are  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in the interior of any section of  $u(\cdot, t)$  which is included in  $\Omega$  (see Theorem 8.1). For the critical exponent  $p = \frac{1}{n-2}$  we show that solutions are  $C^1$  with a logarithmic modulus of continuity for the gradient (see Theorem 8.2).

In the case of any power  $p > 0$  we prove  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates at all points  $(x, t)$  where  $u$  separates from the initial data (see Theorem 8.4). Also, if we assume that the initial data is  $C^{1,\beta}$  in some direction  $e$  then we show that the solution is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in the same direction  $e$  for all later times (see Theorem 8.3).

In particular, our methods can be applied for solutions with flat sides. If the initial data has a flat side  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , then solutions are  $C^{1,\alpha}$  for all later times in the

interior of  $D$ . A similar statement holds for solutions that contain edges of tangent angles: they are  $C^{1,\alpha}$  along the direction of the edge for all later times. To be more precise we state these results below.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $u$  be a viscosity solution of (1.1) in  $\Omega \times [0, T]$  with  $u(x, 0) \geq 0$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $u(x, 0) \geq 1$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . There exists  $\alpha > 0$  depending on  $n, \lambda, \Lambda, p$  such that*

a)  *$u(x, t)$  is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in  $x$  at all points  $(x, t)$  with  $x$  an interior point of the set  $\{u(x, 0) = 0\}$  and  $u(x, t) < 1$ .*

b) *If  $u(x, 0) \geq |x_n|$  then  $u(x, t)$  is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in the  $x'$  variables at all points  $((x', 0), t)$  with  $x'$  an interior point of the set  $\{x' : u((x', 0), 0) = 0\}$  and  $u(x, t) < 1$ .*

We finally remark that the equations (1.1) for negative and positive powers are in some sense dual to each other. Indeed, if  $u$  is a solution of (1.1) and  $u^*(\xi, t)$  is the Legendre transform of  $u(\cdot, t)$  then

$$u_t^* = -\tilde{b}(\xi, t)(\det D^2 u^*)^{-p}, \quad \lambda \leq \tilde{b}(\xi, t) \leq \Lambda.$$

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the notation and some geometric properties of sections of convex functions. In sections 3 we derive estimates for subsolutions and supersolutions. In section 4 we discuss the separation of solutions away from constant solutions such as planes and angles. In sections 5 and 6 we discuss the geometry of lines and angles. In section 7 and 8 we quantify the results of section 6 and prove the main theorems concerning  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We use the standard notation  $B_r(x_0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < r\}$  to denote the open ball of radius  $r$  and center  $x_0$ , and we write shortly  $B_r$  for  $B_r(0)$ . Also, given a point  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we denote by  $x'$  the point  $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ .

Throughout the paper we refer to positive constants depending on  $n, \lambda, \Lambda$  and  $p$  as universal constants. We denote them by abuse of notation as  $c$  for small constants and  $C$  for large constants, although their values change from line to line. If a constant depends on universal constants and other parameters  $d, \delta$  etc. then we denote them by  $c(d, \delta), C(d, \delta)$ .

We use the following definition to say that a function is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in a pointwise sense.

**Definition 2.1.** *A function  $w$  is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  at a point  $x_0$  if there exists a linear function  $l(x)$  and a constant  $C$  such that*

$$|w(x) - l(x)| \leq C|x - x_0|^{1+\alpha}.$$

A function is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in a set  $D$  if it is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  at each  $x \in D$ .

A function is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  at a point  $x_0$  in the direction  $\mathbf{e}$  if it is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  at  $x_0$  when restricted to the line  $x_0 + s\mathbf{e}$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Next we introduce the notion of a section. We denote by  $S_h(x, t) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  a section at height  $h$  of the function  $u$  at the point  $(x, t)$  defined by

$$S_h(x, t) := \{y \in \Omega : u(y, t) \leq u(x, t) + p_h \cdot (y - x) + h\},$$

for some  $p_h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Sometimes, in order to simplify the notation, we denote such sections as  $S_h$ ,  $S_h(t)$  whenever there is no possibility of confusion.

We define the notion of  $d$ -balanced convex set with respect to a point.

**Definition 2.2** ( $d$ -balanced convex set). *A convex set  $S$  with  $0 \in S$  is called  $d$ -balanced with respect to the origin, if there exists a linear transformation  $A$  (which maps the origin into the origin) such that*

$$B_1 \subset AS \subset B_d.$$

Clearly, the notion of  $d$ -balanced set around 0 is invariant under linear transformations. Next we recall

**John's lemma** *Every convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is  $C_n$ -balanced with respect to its center of mass, with  $C_n$  depending only on  $n$ .*

It is often convenient to consider sections at a point  $x$  that have  $x$  as center of mass. We denote such sections by  $T_h(x, t)$  instead of  $S_h(x, t)$ . The existence of centered sections is due to Caffarelli [4].

**Theorem.** [Centered sections] *Let  $w$  be a convex function defined on a bounded convex domain  $\Omega$ . For each  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , and  $h > 0$  there exists a centered  $h$ -section  $T_h(x_0)$  at  $x_0$*

$$T_h(x_0) := \{w(x) < w(x_0) + h + p_h \cdot (x - x_0)\}$$

(for some  $p_h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ) which has  $x_0$  as its center of mass.

The following simple observations follow from the definition of  $d$ -balanced sets and will be used throughout the paper.

*Remark 2.3.* Assume that the  $h$ -section of  $w$ ,

$$S_h(x_0) = \{w(x) < w(x_0) + h + p_h \cdot (x - x_0)\},$$

is  $d$ -balanced around  $x_0$ . Then,

$$-dh < w(x) - (w(x_0) + h + p_h \cdot (x - x_0)) < 0, \quad \text{in } S_h(x_0).$$

Also, if we assume  $w \geq 0$  and  $w(x_0) = 0$ , then  $w(x) \leq dh$  for all  $x \in S_h(x_0)$ .

Next lemma proves the existence of certain balanced sections which are compactly included in the domain of definition. It says that if we have a  $d$ -balanced section  $S_h$  which is compactly included in  $\Omega$ , then we can find  $C_n d$ -balanced sections for all smaller heights than  $h$  that are included in  $S_h$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** (a) *Assume that  $w$  is a convex function defined on a set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $w(0) = 0$  such that  $S_1 := \{x : w(x) < 1\} \subset\subset \Omega$  is  $d$ -balanced around 0. Then, there exists a constant  $C_n > 0$  depending only on  $n$ , such that for every  $h < 1$  we can find a section  $S_h$  at height  $h$  with  $S_h \subset S_1$  and  $S_h$  is  $C_n d$ -balanced around 0.*

(b) *Let us denote by  $r(x)$  the volume of the maximal ellipsoid centered at  $x$  that is included in  $S_1$ . Then, there exists a number  $C_n > 0$  such that the section  $S_h$  in part (a) is either  $C_n$ -balanced around 0 or  $r(x^*) \geq 2r(0)$  where  $x^*$  is the center of mass of  $S_h$ .*

*Proof.* a) For  $h < 1$  fixed, consider the section  $S_h$  at height  $h$  that has 0 as its center of mass. If  $S_h \subset S_1$  we have nothing to prove. Assume not and let's say

$$S_h = \{w(x) < h + \alpha e_n \cdot x\}, \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 0.$$

We decrease the slope  $\alpha$  continuously till we obtain the section  $S_{h,t} := \{w < h + t e_n \cdot x\}$  for which the set

$$\{(x, x_{n+1}) : x \in \overline{S}_{h,t}, x_{n+1} = h + t e_n \cdot x\}$$

becomes tangent to the hyper-plane  $x_{n+1} = 1$  at a point  $(x_0, 1)$ . We will show that  $S_{h,t}$  satisfies (a) and (b).

Clearly  $S_{h,t} \subset S_1$ . At the point  $x_0$  we have  $x_0 \in \partial S_1$  and

$$S_1 \subset \{(x - x_0) \cdot e_n \leq 0\}.$$

Since  $S_1$  is  $d$ -balanced, we may assume that  $B_1 \subset S_1 \subset B_d$  hence  $1 \leq x_0 \cdot e_n$ . Also,  $S_h \cap \{x_n = 0\} = S_{h,t} \cap \{x_n = 0\}$ , hence the section  $S_{h,t}$  is already  $C_n$ -balanced in  $x' := (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$  around 0.

Since  $t \leq \alpha$ , the center of mass  $x^*$  of  $S_{h,t}$  satisfies  $x^* \cdot e_n \leq 0$ . This together with  $x_0 \cdot e_n \geq 1$  and  $x_0 \in \partial S_{h,t} \subset \overline{B}_d$ , implies that  $S_{h,t}$  is  $C_n d$ -balanced around 0 in all the directions.

b) If we assume that

$$(2.1) \quad -x^* \cdot e_n \leq C_0(n) x_0 \cdot e_n$$

then we obtain that  $S_{h,t}$  is  $C(n, C_0(n))$  balanced with respect to 0. Assume now that (2.1) doesn't hold and denote by  $E$  the maximum volume ellipsoid centered at 0 which is included in  $S_1$ . After an affine transformation we have the following:

$$E = B_1 \subset S_1, \quad S_{h,t} \subset \{(x - x_0) \cdot e_n \leq 0\}, \quad x_0 \in \partial S_{h,t}$$

and

$$-x^* \cdot e_n > C_0(n) x_0 \cdot e_n \geq C_0(n)$$

which implies that  $|x^*| \geq C_0(n)$ . Since  $x^*$  is the center of mass of  $S_{h,t}$  and  $0 \in S_{h,t}$  we see from John's lemma that  $(1 + c_n)x^* \in S_{h,t} \subset S_1$ . Hence if  $C_0(n)$  is sufficiently large we can find an ellipsoid of volume 2 centered at  $x^*$  and included in the convex set generated by  $(1 + c_n)x^*$  and  $B_1$ . This convex set is contained in  $S_1$ , and this concludes the proof of part (b).  $\square$

### 3. ESTIMATES FOR SUBSOLUTIONS AND SUPERSOLUTIONS

In this section we use the scaling of the equation to derive estimates for viscosity subsolutions and supersolutions of

$$(3.1) \quad \lambda (\det D^2 u)^p \leq u_t \leq \Lambda (\det D^2 u)^p, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Throughout the paper we assume that  $u$  is convex in  $x$ , increasing in  $t$  and the domain  $\Omega$  is convex and bounded.

Let us now introduce the scaling of equation (3.1). Given an affine transformation  $A := \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h > 0, m > 0$  positive constants, the function

$$v(x, t) := \frac{1}{h} u(Ax, mt)$$

is a solution of equation (3.1) provided

$$m = \frac{(\det A)^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

The equation is not affected by adding or subtracting a linear function in  $x$ . For this reason we write our comparison results using constant functions instead of linear functions.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $u$  be a viscosity subsolution in  $B_1$  i.e.*

$$u_t \leq \Lambda(\det D^2 u)^p$$

with

$$u(0, 0) \geq -1, \quad u(x, 0) \leq 0 \text{ on } \partial B_1.$$

Then

$$u(0, t) \geq -2 \quad \text{for } t \geq -c,$$

with  $c > 0$  universal.

*Proof.* If  $u(0, -c) \leq -2$  then, by convexity,  $u$  at time  $-c$  is below the cone generated by  $(0, -2)$  and  $\partial B_1$  i.e

$$u(x, -c) \leq -2 + 2|x| \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

This implies that  $u \leq w$  on the boundary of the parabolic cylinder  $B_1 \times [-c, 0]$  for

$$w(x, t) := m(t + c) + 2|x|^2 - \frac{3}{2} \quad \text{with } m = \Lambda 4^{np}.$$

Since  $w_t = \Lambda(\det D^2 w)^p$  we obtain by the maximum principle that  $u(0, 0) \leq w(0, 0)$  and we reach a contradiction by choosing  $c = 1/(4m)$ . □

*Remark 3.2.* The conclusion can be replaced by  $u(0, t) \geq -(1 + \delta)$  for  $t \geq -c(\delta)$ .

The scaling of the equation and the previous lemma give the following:

**Proposition 3.3.** *Assume that  $u$  is a viscosity subsolution in a convex set  $S$  with center of mass 0. If*

$$u(0, 0) \geq -h, \quad u(x, 0) \leq 0 \text{ on } \partial S,$$

then

$$u(0, t) \geq -2h \quad \text{for } t \geq -c \frac{|S|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}},$$

with  $c$  universal.

*Proof.* From John's lemma there exists a linear transformation  $A$  such that

$$B_1 \subset A^{-1}S \quad \text{with } \det A \geq c(n)|S|.$$

The proposition follows by applying Lemma 3.1 to the rescaled solution

$$v(x, t) := \frac{1}{h} u(Ax, mt), \quad m = \frac{(\det A)^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

□

*Remark 3.4.* We obtain a slightly different version of Proposition 3.3 by requiring  $S$  to be only  $d$ -balanced around the origin and by replacing the conclusion by  $u(0, t) \geq -(1 + \delta)h$ . In this case we need to take the constant  $c = c(d, \delta)$  depending also on  $d$  and  $\delta$  as can be seen from the proofs of Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.3.

*Remark 3.5.* In general we apply Proposition 3.3 at a point  $(x_0, t_0)$  in an  $h$ -section  $S_h = S_h(x_0, t_0)$  which is  $d$ -balanced around  $x_0$  to conclude that

$$u(x_0, t) \geq u(x_0, t_0) - h \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 - c \frac{|S_h|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

*Remark 3.6.* At a given point we can apply the Proposition directly in the sections given by its tangent plane. Indeed, taking  $S$  to be the set

$$S_h = S_h(0, 0) := \{u < h + P(x)\}, \quad P(x) := u(0, 0) + \nabla u(0, 0) \cdot x$$

we conclude that  $u(x^*, t) \geq P(x^*) - 2h$  with  $x^*$  the center of mass of  $S_h$ . This, by John's lemma, implies a bound in whole  $S_h$

$$u(x, t) \geq P(x) - C(n)h, \quad \text{for all } x \in S_h, \quad t \geq -c \frac{|S_h|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}},$$

with  $C(n)$  depending only on the dimension.

**Corollary 3.7.** *Assume that  $u$  is a bounded subsolution of equation (3.1) in the cylinder  $Q_1 := B_1 \times [-1, 0]$ . Then,  $u$  is uniformly Hölder continuous in time  $t$  on the cylinder  $Q_{1/2} := B_{1/2} \times [-1/2, 0]$ , namely  $u \in C^{1,\beta}(Q_{1/2})$ , with  $\beta = 1/(np + 1)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $u$  is bounded on  $Q_1$ , the convexity of  $u(\cdot, t)$  implies that  $|\nabla u|$  is bounded by a constant  $M$  in  $Q_{3/4}$ . Then, by Proposition 3.3 applied in  $B_h(x)$ , with  $x \in B_{1/2}$  and  $h < 1/4$ , we have

$$(3.2) \quad -2Mh \leq u(x, t) - u(x, 0) \leq 0 \quad \text{if } -c \frac{|B_h(x)|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}} \leq t \leq 0.$$

Taking  $t = -c_1 h^{np+1}$ , we find that for all  $t$  small enough

$$|u(x, t) - u(x, 0)| \leq C(M) t^{1/(np+1)}$$

from which the desired result readily follows. □

As a consequence we obtain compactness of viscosity solutions.

**Corollary 3.8.** *A sequence of bounded solutions of (3.1) in  $\Omega \times [-T, 0]$  has a subsequence that converges uniformly on compact sets to a solution of the same equation.*

Next we discuss the case of supersolutions.

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $u$  be a viscosity supersolution in  $S \subset B_1$  i.e.*

$$u_t \geq \lambda (\det D^2 u)^p$$

with

$$u(x, 0) \geq -1 \text{ in } S, \quad u(x, 0) \geq 0 \text{ on } \partial S.$$

Then

$$u(x, t) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \text{ for } t \geq C,$$

with  $C > 0$  universal.

*Proof.* The lemma follows by comparison of our solution  $u$  with the function

$$w(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} (|x|^2 - 1) + \lambda (t - C)$$

on the cylinder  $S \times [0, C]$ . The function  $w$  is a solution of the equation  $w_t = \lambda (\det D^2 w)^p$  and, since  $S \subset B_1$ , satisfies  $w \leq 0$  on  $\partial S(0) \times [0, C]$ . In addition, by choosing  $C = 1/\lambda$ , we have  $w(x, 0) \leq -1 \leq u(x, 0)$  for  $x \in S$ . The comparison principle implies  $u(x, C) \geq w(x, C) \geq -1/2$  in  $S$ . □

*Remark 3.10.* We can replace  $-1/2$  by  $-\delta$  in the lemma above by taking  $C = C(\delta)$  depending also on  $\delta$ .

*Remark 3.11.* If we assume that  $S$  is  $d$ -balanced around 0 and  $u(0, 0) = -1$ ,  $u(x, 0) = 0$  on  $\partial S$ , then the same conclusion holds by taking  $C = C(d)$  depending also on  $d$ . Indeed, in this case we obtain  $u(x, 0) \geq -C(d)$  for all  $x \in S$  and the desired conclusion follows as before.

The scaling of the equation and the previous lemma give the following:

**Proposition 3.12.** *Let  $u$  be a supersolution in  $\Omega$  and assume*

$$u(x, 0) \geq 0, \quad \text{and } S_h := \{u(x, 0) < h\} \subset\subset \Omega.$$

Then

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq \frac{h}{2}, \quad \text{for } t \geq C \frac{|S_h|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}},$$

with  $C$  universal.

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be a linear transformation such that  $A^{-1}S_h \subset B_1$  so that  $\det A \leq C(n)|S_h|$ . We then apply the previous lemma to the re-scaled solution

$$v_h = \frac{1}{h}u(Ax, mt) - 1, \quad m = \frac{(\det A)^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

□

*Remark 3.13.* In view of Remark 3.11 we obtain a version of Proposition 3.12 for sections  $S_h = S_h(x_0, t_0)$  which are  $d$ -balanced around  $x_0$  and are compactly included in  $\Omega$ , and conclude that

$$u(x_0, t) \geq u(x_0, t_0) + (1 - \delta)h \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 + C(\delta, d) \frac{|S_h|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

#### 4. SEPARATION FROM CONSTANT SOLUTIONS

In this section we consider the case when the solution  $u$  at the initial time  $t = 0$  is above a given function  $w$  depending only on  $n - 1$  variables,  $u$  and  $w$  coincide at the origin, and  $u > w$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . We investigate whether  $u$  separates from  $w$  instantaneously for positive times, i.e  $u(0, t) > w(0)$  for all  $t > 0$ . Of particular interest is the case of angles given by  $w = |x_n|$ .

Throughout this section we assume that  $u(x, 0) \geq 0$ . For  $h > 0$  we will consider the sub-level set  $S_h(t)$  of our solution  $u(\cdot, t)$  in  $\Omega$  which is defined as

$$S_h(t) := \{x \in \Omega : u(x, t) < h\}.$$

We will also consider balls  $B'_\rho \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , namely

$$B'_\rho := \{x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : |x'| < \rho\}.$$

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $u$  be a supersolution in  $\Omega \times [0, T]$  with  $u \geq 0$  at  $t = 0$ . Assume that  $S_h(0) \cap \{x_n < 2\beta\}$  is compactly included in  $\Omega$  and is included as well in the cylinder  $\{0 < x_n < 2\beta\} \times S'$  for a bounded domain  $S' \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and two positive constants  $h > 0, \beta > 0$ . Then,*

$$S_{h/4}(t_0) \subset \{x_n > \beta\}, \quad \text{for } t_0 = C \frac{(\beta |S'|)^{2p}}{h^{np-1}},$$

with  $C$  universal.

*Proof.* We apply Proposition 3.3 for

$$\tilde{u} = u + \frac{h}{2\beta}x_n$$

and see that  $\tilde{u} \geq u \geq 0$ . Also  $\{\tilde{u}(x, 0) < h\}$  is compactly included in  $\Omega$  and is included in  $\{0 < x_n < 2\beta\} \times S'$ . We conclude that  $\tilde{u}(x, t_0) \geq \frac{3}{4}h$  with  $t_0$

given above. This implies that if  $x_n \leq \beta$  then  $u(x, t_0) \geq \tilde{u}(x, t_0) - \frac{h}{2} \geq \frac{h}{4}$  hence  $S_{h/4}(t_0) \subset \{x_n > \beta\}$ .  $\square$

From Proposition 4.1 we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $u$  be a supersolution in  $\Omega \times [0, T]$  and assume that*

$$u(x, 0) \geq w(x') \geq 0, \quad u(0, 0) = w(0) = 0, \quad u(x, 0) > 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

for a function  $w$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Suppose that  $w$  satisfies

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{a_{h_j}^{2p}}{h_j^{np-1}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{for a sequence } h_j \rightarrow 0.$$

with

$$a_h := |\{w(x') < h\} \cap \pi_n(\Omega)|, \quad \text{where } \pi_n(x) := x'.$$

Then,

$$u(0, t) > 0 \quad \text{for any } t > 0.$$

*Proof.* Let  $h > 0$  be small such that the sub-level sets  $S_h(0)$  of  $u$  is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ . Since  $u \geq w$  we obtain that

$$S_h(0) \subset (\{w(x') < h\} \cap \pi_n(\Omega)) \times [b, \infty),$$

for some  $b < 0$  (since  $0 \in S_h(0)$ ). We apply Proposition 4.1 for  $h_j \leq h$  (hence  $S_{h_j}(0) \subset S_h(0)$ ), with  $\beta = -b$ . We conclude that

$$S_{h_j/4}(t_j) \subset \{x_n > 0\}, \quad t_j = C\beta^{2p} \frac{a_{h_j}^{2p}}{h_j^{np-1}},$$

and obtain  $u(0, t_j) \geq h_j/4 > 0$  for a sequence  $t_j \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.3.* If  $p > 1/2$  and the sequence above is bounded, then the conclusion of Corollary 4.2 still holds true.

Next we investigate the case when  $w$  is identically 0.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $u$  be a supersolution in  $\Omega \times [0, T]$  with  $p \leq 1/n$ . Assume that  $u \geq 0$  at  $t = 0$  and  $u(x, 0) > 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Then,  $u > 0$  in  $\Omega$  for any  $t > 0$ .*

*Proof.* For  $p < 1/n$  the proposition follows from Corollary 4.2.

Let  $p = 1/n$ . Assume that for  $h > 0$  small we have  $S_h(0) \subset B_\rho$  for some  $\rho$  in  $0 < \rho \leq 1$ , and  $S_h(0)$  is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ . We first show that for  $\beta \in (0, \rho]$  small, we have

$$(4.2) \quad S_{h/4}(t_0) \subset B_{\rho-\beta}(0), \quad \text{for } t_0 = C\beta^{1+\frac{1}{n}}.$$

To this end, we will apply Proposition 4.1 for each  $x_0 \in \partial B_\rho$  in the direction  $(-x_0)$ . Let us assume for simplicity that  $x_0 = (0, \dots, 0, -\rho)$ . Then, since  $S_h(0) \subset B_\rho$ , we have

$$S_h(0) \cap \{-\rho < x_n < -\rho + 2\beta\} \subset B'_{2\sqrt{\beta}} \times (-\rho, -\rho + 2\beta).$$

Applying Proposition 4.1, we obtain that

$$S_{h/4}(t_0) \subset \{x_n > -\rho + \beta\}, \quad \text{for } t_0 = C(\beta \beta^{\frac{n-1}{2}})^{2/n}.$$

and (4.2) readily follows.

We will now use (4.2) to show that  $u > 0$  for  $t > 0$ . Let  $t > 0$  and fixed. Choose  $\beta := 1/k > 0$  with  $k$  the smallest integer so that  $C\beta^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq t$ , with  $C$  the constant from (4.2). Using this  $\beta$  we repeat the argument above  $k$  times, starting at  $\rho = 1$ , to conclude that

$$S_{h/4^k}(t_0) \subset B_{1-k\beta}, \quad \text{for } t_0 = Ck\beta^{1+\frac{1}{n}}.$$

This shows that  $S_{h/4^k}(t_0) = \emptyset$ , for  $t_0 = C\beta^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq t$  hence  $u(\cdot, t) \geq h/4^k > 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.5.* For  $p > 1/n$  there exist radial solutions with a flat side that persists for some time.

*Remark 4.6.* In the proof we showed in fact that if  $u \geq 0$ ,  $u(x, 0) \geq h$  on  $\partial B_1$  then

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq he^{-Ct^{-n}}$$

for some  $C$  universal.

In the next results we investigate the case of angles i.e when  $w(x) = |x_n|$ . First proposition shows that  $u$  separates instantly from the edge of the angle when the exponent  $p \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$ . The second proposition shows that this is not the case when  $p > \frac{1}{n-2}$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *Assume  $u$  is a supersolution, and  $p \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$ . If  $u(x, 0) \geq |x_n|$  and  $u(x, 0) > 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , then  $u > 0$  for any  $t > 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $p > \frac{1}{n-2}$  then the proposition follows from Corollary 4.2 since  $a_h \leq Ch$ .

Let  $p = \frac{1}{n-2}$ . Since  $u \geq |x_n|$  we may assume without loss of generality that  $S_h(0) \subset B'_1 \times [-h, h]$ . For each  $x'_0 \in B'_1$  we apply Proposition 4.1 in the direction  $(-x'_0)$ , in a manner similar to that used in Proposition 4.4, to show that

$$S_{\frac{h}{4}}(t_0) \subset B'_{1-\beta} \times [-h/4, h/4], \quad \text{for } t_0 = C \frac{(\beta |S'|)^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

Notice that this time  $|S'| = h |B''_{2\sqrt{\beta}}|$ , where  $B''_r$  is an  $n-2$  dimensional ball, hence (since  $p = \frac{1}{n-2}$ )

$$t_0 \geq C \frac{(h \beta^{\frac{n}{2}})^{2p}}{h^{np-1}} = C \beta^{\frac{n}{n-2}}.$$

Now the proof continues as in the proof of Proposition 4.4 and we obtain

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq h e^{-Ct^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}}.$$

□

**Proposition 4.8.** *There exists a non-trivial solution  $u$  of equation*

$$(4.3) \quad u_t = (\det D^2 u)^p, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$$

for which  $u(x, 0) \geq |x_n|$  and  $u(0, t) = 0$ , for all  $t \in [0, \delta]$ , for some  $\delta > 0$ .

*Proof.* We will seek for a solution  $u$  of the form

$$(4.4) \quad u(x, t) = f(t) v\left(\frac{x}{g(t)}\right)$$

for some functions  $f = f(t)$  and  $v = v(y)$ . The function  $u$  satisfies (4.3) if and only if

$$(-f') \left( \frac{x}{f} \nabla v\left(\frac{x}{f}\right) - w \right) = f^{-np} (\det D^2 v)^p.$$

We pick a function  $f$  which satisfies

$$(4.5) \quad -f' = f^{-np}.$$

Solving (4.5) gives us

$$(4.6) \quad f(t) = [(1 + np)(T - t)]^{\frac{1}{1+np}}$$

for any constant  $T > 0$ . We will next show that there exists a function  $v = v(y)$  such that

$$(4.7) \quad y \cdot \nabla v - v = (\det D^2 v)^p, \quad v(y) \geq |y_n|, \quad v(0) = 0.$$

The existence of such a function  $v$  implies the claim of our proposition. To this end, we seek for  $v$  of the form

$$(4.8) \quad v(y', y_n) = \tilde{v}(|y'|, y_n) = \varphi(|y'|) g\left(\frac{y_n}{\varphi(|y'|)}\right),$$

with  $g(s) \geq |s|$ . A direct computation shows that,

$$\tilde{v}_1 = \varphi' g - \varphi' \frac{y_n}{\varphi} g' = \varphi' (g - s g'), \quad \tilde{v}_2 = g' \left(\frac{y_n}{\varphi}\right) = g'(s)$$

with  $s = y_n/\varphi$ . Also,

$$\tilde{v}_{11} = \varphi'' (g - s g') + \varphi' s g'' \frac{y_n}{\varphi^2} \varphi', \quad \tilde{v}_{12} = -\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} s g'', \quad \tilde{v}_{22} = \frac{1}{\varphi} g''.$$

Using that  $y_n/\varphi = s$ , we get

$$y \cdot \nabla v - v = |y'| \varphi' (g - s g') + y_n g' - \varphi g = (|y'| \varphi' - \varphi) (g - s g'),$$

and also,

$$\det D^2 v = \frac{\varphi''}{\varphi} g'' (g - s g')^{n-1} \left( \frac{\varphi'}{|y'|} \right)^{n-2}.$$

Separating the functions  $g$  and  $\phi$ , we conclude that  $v$  satisfies (4.5), if

$$g'' (g - s g')^{n-1-\frac{1}{p}} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi'' \left( \frac{\varphi'}{|y'|} \right)^{n-2} = (|y'| \varphi' - \varphi)^{\frac{1}{p}} \varphi.$$

For the second equation we seek for a solution in the form  $\varphi(r) = C_{n,p} r^\beta$  with  $\beta > 1$ . We find that  $\varphi$  satisfies the above equation if

$$(\beta - 2)(n - 1) = \frac{\beta}{p} + \beta$$

which after we solve for  $\beta$  yields to

$$\beta = \frac{2(n - 1)}{(n - 2 - 1/p)}.$$

Since we need  $\beta > 1$ , we have to restrict ourselves to the exponents  $p > \frac{1}{n-2}$ .

Next we find an even function  $g$ , convex of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$ , that solves the ODE for  $g$  in the viscosity sense and for which  $g(s) = |s|$  for large values of  $s$ . Rewriting the ODE and the conditions above in terms of the Legendre transform  $g^*$  of  $g$  we find

$$(g^*)'' = |g^*|^{n-1-1/p} \quad \text{in } [-1, 1], \quad g^*(1) = g^*(-1) = 0.$$

The existence of  $g^*$  follows by scaling the negative part of any even solution  $\tilde{g}$  to the ODE above, i.e  $g^*(t) = a\tilde{g}(t/b)$  for appropriate constants  $a$  and  $b$ . We obtain the function  $g$  by taking the Legendre transform of  $g^*$ . □

*Remark 4.9.* Proposition 4.8 shows that in the Gauss curvature flow (1.3) with exponent  $p$ , if the initial data is a cube, then the edges ( $n - 1$ -dimensional) move instantaneously if and only if  $p \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$ . In the particular case of the classical Gauss curvature flow with  $p = 1$ , the edges of the cube move instantaneously if and only  $n \leq 3$ .

## 5. THE GEOMETRY OF LINES

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 5.3, which constitutes the parabolic version of the result of Caffarelli for Monge-Ampere equation. Theorem 5.3 deals with extremal points of the set  $\{u = 0\}$  for a nonnegative solution  $u$  of (3.1). We begin by giving the definition of an *extremal point* of a convex set (cf. in [10], Chapter 5).

**Definition 5.1.** *Let  $D$  be a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The point  $x_0 \in \partial D$  is an extremal point of  $D$  if  $x_0$  is not a convex combination of other points in  $\overline{D}$ .*

We now give the main results of this section. The first Theorem states that a constant segment in time can be extended backward all the way to the initial data.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of equation (3.1) on  $\Omega \times [-T, 0]$ . Assume  $u(0, t) = 0$  for  $t \in [-\delta, 0]$  and there exists a section  $S_{h_0}(0) := \{u(x, 0) < h_0 + p_{h_0} \cdot x\}$  at  $(0, 0)$  that is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ . Then  $u(0, t) = 0$  for all  $t \in [-T, 0]$ .*

The second Theorem states that if the graph of  $u$  at a given time coincides with a tangent plane in a set  $D$  that has an extremal point in  $\Omega$ , and  $D$  contains at least a line segment, then  $u$  agrees with the initial data on  $D$ .

In other words, a line segment at a given time either originates from the boundary data at that particular time or from the data at the initial time.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of equation (3.1) on  $\Omega \times [-T, 0]$ , for some convex domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Suppose that at time  $t = 0$  we have  $u \geq 0$ , and the set*

$$D := \{u(x, 0) = 0\}$$

*contains a line segment and  $D$  has an extremal point in  $\Omega$ . Then,*

$$u(x, -T) = 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in D.$$

As a consequence of the theorems above we obtain the following:

**Corollary 5.4.** *Assume  $u$  is defined in  $\Omega \times [-T, 0]$  and  $u(x, -T) \geq 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Then  $u$  is strictly convex in  $x$  and strictly increasing in  $t$  at all points  $(x, t)$  that satisfy  $u(x, -T) < u(x, t) < 0$ .*

We first prove Theorem 5.2.

*Proof of Theorem 5.2.* By continuity of  $u$  the section

$$S_{h_0}(-\sigma) := \{u(x, -\sigma) < h_0 + p_{h_0} \cdot x\}$$

at  $(0, -\sigma)$  is also compactly included in  $\Omega$  for a small  $\sigma \in [0, \delta]$ . Let  $d$  be sufficiently large so that  $S_{h_0}(-\sigma)$  is  $d$ -balanced around 0. By Lemma 2.4, for each  $h \leq h_0$  we can find a section  $S_h(-\sigma)$  which is  $C_n d$ -balanced around 0. We apply Proposition 3.12 (see Remark 3.13) and use that  $u(0, 0) - u(-\sigma, 0) = 0 < h/2$  to conclude

$$\sigma \leq C(d) \frac{|S_h(-\sigma)|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

Assume next that  $u(0, -t_0) = 0$ , for some  $t_0 > \sigma$ . We apply Proposition 3.3 (see Remark 3.4) at  $(0, -t_0)$  in the set  $S := S_h(-\sigma)$  and conclude

$$u(0, t) \geq -h, \quad \text{for } t \geq -t_0 - c(d) \frac{|S_h(-\sigma)|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

Using the bound on  $\sigma$  we find that  $u(0, t) = 0$  for  $t \geq -t_0 - c(d)\sigma$  and the conclusion follows.  $\square$

Next lemma is the key step in the proof of Theorem 5.3.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Assume  $u(se_n, 0) = 0$  for  $s \in [0, 2]$ , and for some  $t_0 > 0$*

$$u(e_n, -t_0) \geq -h, \quad T_{6h}(0, -t_0) \subset B_\delta \subset\subset \Omega,$$

where  $T_{6h}(0, -t_0)$  is the centered section at 0 at time  $-t_0$ . Then

$$u(e_n, -Mt_0) \geq -2h, \quad \text{with } M = 1 + c\delta^{-2p}, \quad (c \text{ universal}).$$

*Proof.* Since  $u(2e_n, -t_0) \leq u(2e_n, 0) = 0$ , the convexity of  $u(\cdot, -t_0)$  implies that  $u(0, -t_0) \geq -2h$ . We apply Proposition 3.12 (see Remark 3.13) in the section

$$T_{6h} := T_{6h}(0, -t_0) = \{u(x, -t_0) < u(0, -t_0) + 6h + p_{6h} \cdot x\}$$

and conclude that

$$t_0 \leq C \frac{|T_{6h}|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

Indeed, otherwise we obtain  $u(0, 0) \geq h$  which contradicts the hypothesis. Since  $T_{6h} \subset B_\delta$  and has 0 as center of mass, we find

$$|T_{6h}| \leq C\delta |T'_{6h}|, \quad \text{where } T'_{6h} := \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mid (x', 0) \in T_{6h}\},$$

for some  $C$  depending only on  $n$ . Using the inequality for  $t_0$  we conclude

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{|T'_{6h}|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}} \geq c\delta^{-2p} t_0.$$

Now we apply Proposition 3.3 (see Remark 3.4) for the function

$$\tilde{u} = u - p'_{6h} \cdot x' - 6h$$

in the convex set  $S$  which is the convex hull generated by the  $n - 1$  dimensional set  $T'_{6h} \times \{0\}$  and the segment  $[0, 2e_n]$ . Notice that  $\tilde{u}$  is negative at time  $-t_0$  in  $S$  and  $\tilde{u}(e_n, -t_0) \geq -7h$ . Since  $S$  is  $d$ -balanced with respect to  $e_n$  with  $d$  depending only on  $n$  we conclude that

$$\tilde{u}(e_n, -t) \geq -8h \quad \text{for } t \geq -t_0 - c \frac{(2|T'_{6h}|)^{2p}}{h^{np-1}},$$

with  $c$  universal. Using (5.1) we find  $u(e_n, t) \geq -2h$  if  $t \geq -t_0(1 + c\delta^{-2p})$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 5.3.* Assume for simplicity that  $0 \in \Omega$  is an extremal point for  $D$  and  $2e_n \in D$ . We want to prove that  $u(2e_n, -T) = 0$ .

Fix  $\delta > 0$  small, smaller than a universal constant to be specified later. There exists  $\sigma > 0$  depending on  $u$  and  $\delta$  such that

$$T_{6h}(0, -t) \subset B_\delta \subset \subset \Omega \quad \text{for all } h, t \in [0, \sigma].$$

Indeed, otherwise we can find a sequence of  $h_n, t_n$  tending to 0 for which the inclusion above fails. In the limit we obtain that 0 can be written as a linear combination of two other points in  $D$  (one of them outside  $B_\delta$ ) and contradict that 0 is an extremal point.

First we show that  $u(x, -\sigma) = 0$  on the line segment  $[0, 2e_n]$ . Using the Holder continuity of  $u$  in  $t$  at the point  $(e_n, 0)$  we find that for small  $t_0 > 0$ ,

$$u(e_n, -t_0) \geq -h := -C(u)t_0^{\frac{1}{np+1}}.$$

We can apply Lemma 5.5 inductively and conclude that as long as  $M^{k-1}t_0 \leq \sigma$ ,  $2^{k-1}h \leq \sigma$  then

$$u(e_n, -M^k t_0) \geq -2^k h.$$

We choose  $\delta$  small enough so that  $M = 1 + c\delta^{-2p} > 4^{np+1}$ . Then

$$2^k h \leq C(u)2^{-k}(M^k t_0)^{\frac{1}{np+1}} \leq C(u)2^{-k}(M\sigma)^{\frac{1}{np+1}}.$$

This shows that if we start with  $t_0$  small enough then  $M^{k-1}t_0 \leq \sigma$  implies  $2^{k-1}h \leq \sigma$  and moreover, as  $t_0 \rightarrow 0$  then  $2^k h \rightarrow 0$  as well. We conclude that  $u(e_n, -\sigma) = 0$  hence  $u(x, -\sigma) = 0$  on the line segment  $[0, 2e_n]$ .

Now we can use Theorem 5.2 for the points  $(se_n, 0)$  for small  $s \geq 0$  which are included in a compact section at the origin at time  $t = 0$ . Since  $u(se_n, t) = 0$  for

$t \in [-\sigma, 0]$ , we conclude that  $u(se_n, -T) = 0$  for small  $s$ . Then convexity in  $x$  and monotonicity in  $t$  imply  $u(x, -T) = 0$  on the segment  $[0, 2e_n]$ . □

## 6. THE GEOMETRY OF ANGLES

Our goal in this section is to prove the analogue of Theorem 5.3 for angles. That is, if  $u : \Omega \times [-T, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a solution to (3.1) for which the graph of  $u$  at time  $t = 0$  has a tangent angle from below, then this angle originates either from the initial data  $u(\cdot, -T)$  or from the boundary data on  $\partial\Omega$  at time  $t = 0$ .

Throughout this section we will denote by  $x'$  points  $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and by  $x = (x', x_n)$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Our result states as follows.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $u : \Omega \times [-T, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a solution of equation (3.1) with  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Assume that at time  $t = 0$ , we have  $u(0, 0) = 0$ ,  $u(x, 0) \geq |x_n|$  and 0 is an extremal point for the set  $D := \{x \in \Omega : u(x, 0) = 0\}$ . Then,  $u(x, -T) \geq |x_n|$ .*

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is more involved than that of Theorem 5.3. We introduce the following convenient notation.

**Definition 6.2.** *For negative times  $t \leq 0$  we say that*

$$(h, \alpha) \in A_t(u) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2$$

*if there exist vectors  $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that*

$$u(x, t) \geq u(0, 0) - h + \max\{q_1 \cdot x, q_2 \cdot x\}$$

*in  $\Omega$  and  $(q_1 - q_2) \cdot e_n \geq \alpha$ . Whenever there is no possibility of confusion we write  $A_t$  instead of  $A_t(u)$ .*

*Remark 6.3.* The statement  $(h, \alpha) \in A_t$  is in fact a one-dimensional condition on  $u(x, t)$ . It says that, when restricted to the line  $se_n$ , we can find a certain angle below the graph of  $u(\cdot, t)$ . The vertex of the angle is at distance  $h$  below  $u(0, 0)$  at the origin and the difference in the slopes of the lines that form the angle is  $\alpha$ .

Clearly, if  $(h, \alpha) \in A_{t_1}$  then  $(h, \alpha) \in A_t$  for all  $t \geq t_1$ . The statement  $(h, \alpha) \in A_t$  remains true if we add to  $u$  a linear function in  $x$  or if we perform an affine transformation in the  $x$  variable that leaves  $e_n$  invariant.

Next proposition is the key step in proving Theorem 6.1 and later for obtaining interior  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates.

**Proposition 6.4.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of equation (3.1) with  $u(0,0) = 0$ . Assume that at time  $-t_0$ , ( $t_0 > 0$ ) the solution  $u$  satisfies for a fixed constant  $C_0$  and a parameter  $\delta \leq 1$ :*

- i.  $(h, \alpha) \in A_{-t_0}$  and  $(C_0 h, (1 + \delta)\alpha) \notin A_{-t_0}$ , and
- ii. there exists a section (at distance  $h$  from the origin)

$$S_h := \{u(x, -t_0) < h + q \cdot x\}$$

of  $u(\cdot, -t_0)$  which is  $d$ -balanced with respect to the origin and is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ .

Then,

$$\left(C_0^2 h, \frac{\alpha}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}}\right) \in A_{-t}, \quad \text{for } t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + c(d) \delta^{-2p} t_0$$

for some  $c(d) > 0$ .

*Remark 6.5.* From the proof we will see that we can take the constant  $C_0 = 100$ .

*Proof.* Since  $(h, \alpha) \in A_{-t_0}$ , we have  $u(x, t) \geq -h + \max\{q_1 \cdot x, q_2 \cdot x\}$ , for some vectors  $q_1, q_2$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $q_1, q_2$  have only components in the  $e_n$  direction. This reduction is possible by first subtracting the linear map  $\frac{q_1 + q_2}{2} \cdot x$  and then performing a linear transformation that leaves  $e_n$  invariant. Thus, assume that

$$u(x, -t_0) \geq -h + \frac{\alpha}{2} |x_n|.$$

Since  $S_h$  is  $d$ -balanced, the inequality above and Remark 2.3 imply that

$$S_h \subset \{|x_n| < 4d \frac{h}{\alpha}\}.$$

Thus, if  $S'_h := S_h \cap \{x_n = 0\}$ , we have

$$|S_h| \leq Cd \frac{h}{\alpha} |S'_h|.$$

Since  $u(0,0) = 0$  and  $u(0, -t_0) \geq -h$ , Proposition 3.12 implies that

$$t_0 \leq C(d) \frac{|S_h|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}},$$

and from the previous estimate we have

$$(6.1) \quad t_0 \leq C(d) \frac{(|S'_h| \frac{h}{\alpha})^{2p}}{h^{np-1}}.$$

On the other hand, since  $(C_0 h, (1 + \delta) \alpha) \notin A_{-t_0}$  there exists  $s_1 e_n \in \Omega$  with  $s_1 > 0$ , such that

$$u(s_1 e_n, -t_0) < -C_0 h + \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 + 2\delta) s_1.$$

Otherwise the angle with vertex at  $-C_0$  and lines of slopes  $-\alpha/2$ ,  $\alpha/2 + \delta\alpha$  would be below the graph of  $u(x, -t_0)$  on the line  $x = s e_n$  and we reach a contradiction.

Since  $u(s_1 e_n, -t_0) \geq -h + \frac{\alpha}{2} s_1$ , the above yields the bound

$$s_1 \geq \frac{(C_0 - 1) h}{\alpha \delta} := s_0.$$

Moreover, since  $u(0, -t_0) \leq u(0, 0) \leq 0$  and

$$u(s_1 e_n, -t_0) < -C_0 h + \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 + 2\delta) s_1 < \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 + 2\delta) s_1$$

the convexity of  $u(\cdot, -t_0)$  implies that

$$u(s e_n, -t_0) < \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 + 2\delta) s, \quad \forall s \in [0, s_0] \subset [0, s_1].$$

Hence, if  $s \in [0, s_0]$ , then

$$u(s e_n, -t_0) < \frac{\alpha}{2} s + \alpha \delta s_0 = (C_0 - 1) h + \frac{\alpha}{2} s.$$

Recalling that  $S_h := \{u(x, -t_0) < h + q' \cdot x' + q_n x_n\}$ , it follows from the above discussion that the set

$$\{u(x, -t_0) < (C_0 - 1) h + q' \cdot x' + \frac{\alpha}{2} x_n\}$$

contains the convex set  $\tilde{S}$  which is generated by  $S'_h := S_h \cap \{x_n = 0\}$  and the segment  $[0, s_0 e_n]$ . It follows from the convexity of  $\tilde{S}$  that

$$(6.2) \quad |\tilde{S}| \geq c_n |S'_h| s_0 = c_n |S'_h| \frac{(C_0 - 1) h}{\alpha \delta}$$

for some universal  $c_n > 0$ .

We apply Proposition 3.3 (see Remark 3.4) for  $\tilde{S}$  which is  $Cd$ -balanced around  $s_0 e_n/2$  and with  $\tilde{h} = C_0 h$ ,  $\tilde{\delta} = 1/30$ , and find that (since  $C_0 \geq 100$ )

$$u\left(\frac{s_0 e_n}{2}, -t\right) \geq -h + \frac{\alpha}{2} \frac{s_0}{2} - \frac{C_0 h}{30} \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{5}\right) \frac{s_0}{2}$$

for

$$-t_0 - c(d) \frac{|\tilde{S}|^{2p}}{h^{np-1}} \leq -t \leq -t_0.$$

Observing that a similar consideration holds for negative  $x_n$  and using (6.2) we conclude

$$u\left(\pm \frac{s_0 e_n}{2}, -t\right) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{5}\right) \frac{s_0}{2}$$

for

$$-t_0 - c(d) \frac{\left(|S'_h| \frac{(C_0-1)h}{\alpha\delta}\right)^{2p}}{h^{np-1}} \leq -t \leq -t_0,$$

or, from (6.1), for

$$-t_0 - c(d)\delta^{-2p}t_0 \leq -t \leq -t_0.$$

It follows that for such  $t$  we have (since  $u(0, -t) \leq 0$ )

$$\nabla u\left(\pm \frac{s_0 e_n}{2}, -t\right) \cdot (\pm e_n) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{5}\right).$$

Setting

$$\tilde{q}_1 = \nabla u\left(\frac{s_0 e_n}{2}, -t\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{q}_2 = \nabla u\left(-\frac{s_0 e_n}{2}, -t\right)$$

we obtain

$$(\tilde{q}_1 - \tilde{q}_2) \cdot e_n \geq \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{5}\right) \geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}}$$

since  $\delta \leq 1$ . From the convexity of  $u(\cdot, -t)$  and the inequalities

$$u(s_0 e_n, -t) \leq u(s_0 e_n, -t_0) \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} s_0 + (C_0 - 1)h$$

$$u\left(\frac{s_0 e_n}{2}, -t\right) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \frac{s_0}{2} - \frac{C_0 - 1}{20}h$$

we conclude that the tangent planes at  $\pm \frac{s_0 e_n}{2}$  for  $u(\cdot, -t)$  are above  $-2C_0 h$  (and therefore  $-C_0^2 h$ ) at the origin. This implies that

$$\left(C_0^2 h, \frac{\alpha}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}}\right) \in A_{-t}, \quad \text{if } t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + c(d) \delta^{-2p} t_0$$

which finishes the proof of the proposition. □

*Remark 6.6.* If hypothesis ii) is satisfied only for a time  $-\tilde{t}$  with  $\tilde{t} \leq t_0$  i.e

$$S_h := \{u(x, -\tilde{t}) \leq h + q \cdot x\} \subset \subset \Omega \quad \text{and } S_h \text{ is } d\text{-balanced around } 0,$$

then the same conclusion holds in the smaller time interval

$$\left(h, \frac{\alpha}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}}\right) \in A_{-t}, \quad \text{for } t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + c(d) \delta^{-2p} \tilde{t}.$$

Indeed, the only difference appears when estimating  $|S'_h|$  from below: in (6.1) we have to replace the left hand side  $t_0$  by  $\tilde{t}$ .

*Remark 6.7.* If  $x^*$  denotes the center of mass of the  $d$ -balanced section  $S_h$  at time  $-t_0$ , then it follows from the proof of Proposition 6.4 and Remark 2.3 that

$$u(x, -t) \geq u(x^*, -t_0) - C(d)h + \max_{i=1,2} \{\tilde{q}_i \cdot (x - x^*)\}$$

for  $t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + c(d) \delta^{-2p} t_0$ , with

$$(\tilde{q}_1 - \tilde{q}_2) \cdot e_n \geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}}, \quad \tilde{q}_i = \nabla u\left(\frac{s_0 e_n}{2}, -t\right).$$

In other words, if  $\tilde{u}$  is the translation of  $u$  defined by

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) = u(x + x^*, t - t_0) - u(x^*, -t_0)$$

then

$$\left(C(d)h, \frac{\alpha}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}}\right) \in A_{-t}(\tilde{u}), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq c(d) \delta^{-2p} t_0.$$

We will now proceed to the proof of Theorem 6.1.

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* We will denote throughout the proof by  $u_0 := u(\cdot, 0)$ . Since  $u_0 \geq 0$ , and 0 is an extremal point for the set  $D = \{u_0 = 0\}$  we can find (as in the proof of Theorem 5.3)  $\sigma_0 := \sigma_0(u) > 0$  small, depending on  $u$ , such that if  $0 \leq h, t \leq \sigma_0$  then the section

$$T_{h,-t} := \{u(x, -t) \leq h + q \cdot x\}$$

of  $u(\cdot, -t)$  that has  $x = 0$  as center of mass is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ . Thus, by John's lemma  $T_{h,-t}$  is  $C_n$ -balanced with respect to the origin.

Let  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$  with  $\delta_0$  small universal constant to be made precise later. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $u_0$  is tangent to  $|x_n|$  on the line  $x' = 0$  at the origin, i.e. we have

$$(6.3) \quad \lim_{x_n \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u_0(0, x_n)}{x_n} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x_n \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{u_0(0, x_n)}{x_n} = -1.$$

Hence, by taking  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(\delta, u)$  smaller than  $\sigma_0$ , depending also on  $\delta$ , we can assume that

$$\left(\tilde{h}, 2\left(1 + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)\right) \notin A_0, \quad \text{for } \tilde{h} \leq \sigma_1.$$

Choose  $h \ll \sigma_1$ . Since  $u_0$  is Lipschitz in say  $B_a \subset \Omega$  with  $|\nabla u_0| < 1/a$ , for some small  $a$  we find (using Proposition (3.3)) that at time  $-t_0$ , given by

$$t_0 := c(a) \frac{h^{n2p}}{h^{np-1}} = c(a) h^{np+1}$$

the we have  $u(x, -t_0) \geq u_0(x) - h$  for  $x \in B_a$ . This easily implies

$$(6.4) \quad (h, \alpha) \in A_{-t_0}, \quad \alpha := 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{a}h\right).$$

Also notice that

$$\left(\tilde{h}, \alpha(1 + \delta)\right) \notin A_0, \quad \text{if } h, \tilde{h} \leq \sigma_2 = \sigma_2(a, \sigma_1).$$

We choose  $\delta_0$  such that

$$M^2 := c(C_n) \delta^{-2p} \geq c(C_n) \delta_0^{-2p} := C_0^{10(np+1)}$$

where  $c(d)$  is the constant that appears in Proposition 6.4.

**Lemma 6.8.** *As long as  $M^k t_0 \leq \sigma_0$  and  $C_0^{3k+1} h \leq \sigma_2$ , there exists  $0 \leq m \leq k$  such that*

$$(6.5) \quad \left(C_0^{3k-m} h, \alpha \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}} \cdots \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2^m}}\right) \in A_{-M^k t_0}.$$

*Proof.* We will use induction in  $k$ . When  $k = 0$  we take  $m = 0$  and we use (6.4). Assume now that the statement holds for  $k$  and let  $m$  be the smallest so that (6.5) holds. If  $m > 0$ , then

$$\left(C_0^{3k-(m-1)} h, \alpha \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}} \cdots \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2^{m-1}}}\right) \notin A_{-M^k t_0}.$$

Combining this with (6.5), and applying Proposition 6.4 we find that

$$\left(C_0^{3k-m+2} h, \alpha \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}} \cdots \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2^{m+1}}}\right) \in A_{-t}, \quad \text{if } t \leq M^{k+2} t_0$$

which proves (6.5) for the pair  $(k+1, m+1)$ .

If  $m = 0$ , then  $(C_0^{3k} h, \alpha) \in A_{-M^k t_0}$ . On the other hand, since  $C_0^{3k+1} h \leq \sigma_2$  we have  $(C_0^{3k+1} h, \alpha(1 + \delta)) \notin A_0$ , thus

$$(C_0^{3k+1} h, \alpha(1 + \delta)) \notin A_{-M^k t_0}.$$

Hence, by Proposition 6.4

$$(C_0^{3k+2} h, \alpha \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\delta}{2}}) \in A_{-t}$$

for  $t \leq M^{k+2} t_0$  which again proves (6.5) for the pair  $(k+1, 1)$ . This concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We will now finish the proof of the theorem. Since  $M \geq C_0^{5(np+1)}$  and  $t_0 = ch^{np+1}$  we see that for the last  $k$  for which  $M^k t_0 \leq \sigma_0$  we satisfy

$$C_0^{3k+1} h \leq C_0 M^{\frac{3}{5} \frac{k}{np+1}} h \leq C(\sigma_0) h^{\frac{2}{5}} < \sigma_2$$

if  $h \ll \sigma_2$  is sufficiently small. Also, if  $\delta$  is chosen small, depending on  $\sigma_0$  and  $T$ , for the last  $k$  we also have  $M^{k+2} t_0 \geq T$ . We conclude from the lemma above that

$$(C(\sigma_0) h^{\frac{2}{5}}, \alpha e^{-\delta}) \in A_{-T}$$

and by letting  $h \rightarrow 0$  we obtain

$$(0, 2e^{-\delta}) \in A_{-T}.$$

Finally, letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  we conclude that  $(0, 2) \in A_{-T}$  which proves the theorem.  $\square$

## 7. $C^{1,\alpha}$ REGULARITY - I

In the next two sections we establish  $C^{1,\alpha}$  interior regularity of solutions to (3.1). They are based on quantifying the result of Theorem 6.1. In the elliptic case  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity is obtained by a compactness argument. However, in our setting compactness methods would only give  $C^1$  continuity for exponents  $p \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$ . The reason for this is that in the parabolic setting it is more delicate to normalize a solution in space and time.

The main result of this section is the following Theorem (see Definition 2.1).

**Theorem 7.1.** *Let  $u$  be a solution to (3.1) in  $\Omega \times [-T, 0]$  and assume there exists a section of  $u(x, 0)$  which is  $d$ -balanced around 0 and is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ .*

*a) If the initial data  $u(x, -T)$  is  $C^{1,\beta}$  at 0 in the  $e$  direction then  $u(x, 0)$  is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  at the origin in the  $e$  direction with  $\alpha = \alpha(\beta, d)$  depending on  $\beta, d$  and the universal constants.*

*b) If  $u(0, 0) > u(0, -T)$  then  $u(x, 0)$  is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  at the origin with  $\alpha = \alpha(d)$  depending on  $d$  and the universal constants.*

Part b) will be improved in Theorem 8.4 in which we show that  $\alpha$  can be taken to be a universal constant. As a consequence we obtain Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* In view of Remark 2.3, at a point  $(x, t)$  for which  $u(x, t) \leq c_n$ , with  $c_n$  small depending only on  $n$  the centered section  $T_h(x, t)$  at  $x$ , for small  $h$ , is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ . Clearly  $u(x, 0)$  is  $C^{1,1}$  at an interior point of the set  $\{u(x, 0) = 0\}$ . Thus we can apply Theorem 7.1 with  $d$  depending only on  $n$  and

$\beta = 1$  and obtain the desired result. If  $c_n < u(x, t) < 1$  then we can apply directly Theorem 8.4 and obtain the same conclusion. The second part of the theorem follows similarly.  $\square$

The following simple lemma gives the relation between the sets  $A_t$  defined in Definition 6.2 and  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity. Its proof is straightforward and is left to the reader.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function with  $f(0) = 0$  and let  $q$  be a sub-gradient of  $f$  at  $x = 0$ . If, for some  $x$ , we have  $f(x) - q \cdot x \geq a|x|^{1+\alpha}$ , then*

$$(7.1) \quad \left(h, a^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} h^{\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}}\right) \in A(f)$$

with  $h = a|x|^{1+\alpha}$ . Conversely, if for some number  $h$ , (7.1) holds, then

$$f(x) - q \cdot x \geq \frac{a}{4^{\alpha+1}} |x|^{1+\alpha}$$

for some  $x$  with  $|x| = 4\left(\frac{h}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}$ .

As a consequence we obtain the following useful corollary.

**Corollary 7.3.** *The function  $u(x, 0)$  is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  at 0 in the  $e_n$  direction if and only if*

$$\left(h, Ch^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}\right) \notin A_0$$

for some large  $C$  and for all small  $h$ .

Theorem 7.1 will follow from the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.4.** *Assume that  $u : \Omega \times [-T, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a solution of (3.1) such that  $u(0, 0) = 0$ ,  $u(x, -T) > 1$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , and*

$$(7.2) \quad B_{\frac{1}{2}} \subset \{u(x, 0) < 1\} \subset \{u(x, -T) < 1\} \subset B_1.$$

Choose  $\delta_0(d)$  sufficiently small, so that

$$(7.3) \quad c(C_n d) \delta_0^{-2p} = C_0^{12(np+1)} := M,$$

where  $c(C_n d)$  and  $C_0$  are the constants from Proposition 6.4 and  $C_n$  the constant from Lemma 2.4. Assume also that  $(C_0^{-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_{-t_0}$ , for some  $k \geq 0$  and some  $0 < t_0 \leq T$ .

There exists a constant  $C_1(d) > 0$  such that if  $m_0$  is an integer satisfying

$$3m_0 \leq k - l - C_1(d) \quad \text{and} \quad M^{m_0} t_0 \geq T,$$

then

$$\left( C_0^{C_1(d)+l+3m_0-k}, (1+\delta_0)^{-l-C_1(d)} \right) \in A_{-T}.$$

*Proof.* Define  $\eta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  as

$$(C_0^{-k}, (1+\delta_0)^{-\eta(k)-1}) \in A_{-t_0} \quad \text{but} \quad (C_0^{-k}, (1+\delta_0)^{-\eta(k)}) \notin A_{-t_0}.$$

Clearly,

- i)  $\eta$  is nondecreasing i.e  $\eta(k+1) \geq \eta(k)$ ,
- ii)  $\eta(0) \geq -C_1(d)$ , and
- iii)  $\eta(k) < l$  (by assumption).

For each integer  $m$  with  $0 \leq m \leq \frac{k-l-C_1(d)}{3}$ , we define  $s_m$  as the largest  $s$ ,  $0 \leq s \leq k$  that satisfies

$$\eta(k-s) \leq l+3m-s.$$

Notice that we satisfy the inequality above when  $s=0$  and the opposite inequality when  $s=k$ . We obtain:

$$(7.4) \quad \eta(k-s_m) = l+3m-s_m, \quad \text{thus} \quad s_m - 3m \leq l + C_1(d).$$

Also, from the definition of  $s_m$  we find that  $s_{m+1} \geq s_m + 3$ .

**Claim:** *There exists  $(r_1, r_2, r_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ ,  $r_i \geq 0$ , such that*

$$(7.5) \quad \left( C_0^{r_1-k}, (1+\delta_0)^{r_2-l} \frac{1}{(1+\frac{\delta_0}{2}) \cdots (1+\frac{\delta_0}{2r_3})} \right) \in A_{-t_m}, \quad t_m = M^m t_0$$

with

$$(7.6) \quad r_1 - r_2 + r_3 = 3m, \quad r_3 \leq m, \quad r_1 + r_3 \leq s_m \quad (\Leftrightarrow 0 \leq r_2 \leq s_m - 3m).$$

*Proof of Claim:* In order to simplify the notation, instead of (7.5) we write

$$(r_1, r_2, r_3) \in \mathcal{A}_{-t_m}$$

We will use induction on  $m$ . For  $m=0$  the claim holds from our assumption  $(C_0^{-k}, (1+\delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_{-t_0}$ , if  $(r_1, r_2, r_3) = (0, 0, 0)$ .

Assume now that the claim holds for  $m$ . Consider the pairs

$$(r_1 + s, r_2, r_3 - s), \quad \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq r_3$$

$$(r_1 + s, r_2 + s - r_3, 0), \quad \text{if } s \geq r_3$$

where  $(r_1, r_2, r_3)$  comes from the induction step  $m$ . When  $s = 0$  the first pair belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_{-t_m}$ , by the induction hypothesis, and when  $s = s_m - r_1$  the second pair doesn't belong to  $\mathcal{A}_{-t_m}$ , since for that choice of  $s$  the second pair is

$$\left( C_0^{s_m - k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-(l + 3m - s_m)} \right) = \left( C_0^{-(k - s_m)}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-\eta(k - s_m)} \right) \notin \mathcal{A}_{-t_0}$$

from the definition of the function  $\eta$  given above. Note that for  $s = r_3$  the two pairs are the same.

It follows that either there exists an  $s < r_3$  such that

$$(r_1 + s, r_2, r_3 - s) \in \mathcal{A}_{-t_m} \quad \text{and} \quad (r_1 + s + 1, r_2, r_3 - s - 1) \notin \mathcal{A}_{-t_m}$$

or, there exists an  $r_3 \leq s < s_m - r_1$  such that

$$(r_1 + s, r_2 + s - r_3, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{-t_m} \quad \text{and} \quad (r_1 + s + 1, r_2 + s + 1 - r_3, 0) \notin \mathcal{A}_{-t_m}.$$

In either case we can apply Proposition 6.4. Indeed, the hypothesis (7.2) and Lemma 2.4 imply the existence of a section  $S_h$  of  $u(\cdot, t)$  that satisfies ii) in Proposition 6.4 for any  $h \leq 1$  and any  $t \in [-T, 0]$ . More precisely,  $S_h$  is  $C_n d$ -balanced section around 0 and it is compactly supported in  $\Omega$ . We conclude that either  $(r_1 + s + 2, r_2, r_3 - s + 1)$  for some  $0 \leq s < r_3$  or  $(r_1 + s + 2, r_2 + s - r_3, 1)$  for some  $s \geq r_3$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_{-Mt_m}$ . Notice that in both cases the sum of the first and third component is less than  $s_m + 3 \leq s_{m+1}$ . This concludes the proof of the claim.

The lemma follows now from the claim above. Since  $M^{m_0} t_0 \geq T$  and

$$r_1 \leq s_{m_0} \leq l + 3m_0 + C_1(d), \quad r_2 \geq 0,$$

we conclude that

$$\left( C_0^{C_1(d) + l + 3m_0 - k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l} e^{-\delta_0} \right) \in \mathcal{A}_{-T}.$$

□

*Remark 7.5.* If we assume that hypothesis (7.2) holds only on a smaller interval  $t \in [-T_1, 0]$  instead of the full interval  $[-T, 0]$  then the same conclusion holds by replacing  $C_1(d)$  with a constant  $C_1(d, T/T_1)$ .

The only difference occurs in the inductive step that shows  $(r_1, r_2, r_3) \in \mathcal{A}_{-t_m}$ , and we have to distinguish whether  $t_m \leq T_1$  or  $t_m > T_1$ . The case when  $t_m \leq T_1$  is the same and we obtain  $t_{m+1} = Mt_m$  as before. In the case when  $t_m > T_1$  we apply Remark 6.6 of Proposition 6.4 and obtain  $t_{m+1} = t_m + MT_1$ . This second

case occurs at most  $T/(MT_1) = C(d, T/T_1)$  times and therefore we need to replace  $m_0$  by  $m_0 + C(d, T/T_1)$ .

*Remark 7.6.* If in the assumption (7.2) we have a constant  $a$  instead of 1 i.e

$$B_{\frac{1}{2}} \subset \{x : u(x, 0) < a\} \subset \{x : u(x, -T) < a\} \subset B_1$$

then the conclusion is the same, except that  $k \geq 0$  is replaced by  $k \geq C(a)$  and  $C_1(d)$  is replaced by  $C_1(d, a)$ .

Indeed,  $\tilde{u}(x, t) := \frac{1}{a} u(x, a^{1-np} t)$  satisfies the assumptions of the lemma with  $\tilde{t}_0 = a^{np-1} t_0$  and  $\tilde{T} = a^{np-1} T$  and  $(C_0^{-k+C(a)}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-C(a)}) \in A_{-\tilde{t}_0}(\tilde{u})$ , hence the conclusion of the lemma follows.

Next we prove Theorem 7.1.

*Proof of Theorem 7.1.* From the continuity of  $u$  we can assume that, after a linear transformation, we have the following situation:  $u(0, 0) = 0$ ,  $u(x, -T_1) > 1$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and

$$B_{\frac{1}{2d}} \subset \{u(x, 0) < 1\} \subset \{u(x, -T_1) < 1\} \subset B_1$$

for some small  $T_1 \in (0, T]$ .

Let  $k \geq 0$ ,  $l$  be integers such that

$$(C_0^{-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_0.$$

In view of Corollary 7.3 it suffices to show that there exists  $\varepsilon := \varepsilon(d, \beta)$  small (or  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d)$  for the second part) such that  $l \geq \varepsilon k$  for all large  $k$ . Assume by contradiction that

$$l < \varepsilon k \quad \text{for a sequence of } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then, from the Lipschitz continuity of  $u(x, 0)$  in  $B_{1/4d}$  and Proposition 3.3 we find (as in the proof of Theorem 6.1) that  $(2C_0^{-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l} - C(d)C_0^{-k}) \in A_{-t_0}$  or, for  $k$  large enough

$$(7.7) \quad (C_0^{1-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-1}) \in A_{-t_0} \quad \text{with } t_0 := c(d)C_0^{-k(np+1)}.$$

Now we can apply Remark 7.5 and conclude that if

$$3m_0 \leq k - l - C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad M^{m_0} t_0 \geq T$$

then

$$(C_0^{C_1+3m_0+l-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-C_1}) \in A_{-T} \quad \text{with } C_1 = C_1(d, T/T_1).$$

We choose  $m_0 = \lceil \frac{k}{6} \rceil$  to be the smallest integer greater than  $k/6$ . Clearly both inequalities for  $m_0$  are satisfied for  $k$  large (we assume  $\varepsilon \leq 1/6$ ) since  $M = C_0^{12(np+1)}$  and

$$M^{m_0} t_0 \geq C_0^{2k(np+1)} t_0 \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus

$$(C_0^{-k/6}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-2\varepsilon k}) \in A_{-T} \quad \text{for a sequence of } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

We reached a contradiction if  $u(0, -T) < 0$  (we choose  $\varepsilon = 1/6$ ).

If we assume that  $u(0, -T) = 0$  and  $u(x, -T)$  is  $C^{1,\beta}$  at 0 in the  $e_n$  direction then it follows from Corollary 7.3,

$$\frac{\log C_0}{6} \frac{\beta}{\beta + 1} \leq 2\varepsilon \log(1 + \delta_0)$$

and we reach a contradiction again by choosing  $\varepsilon(d, \beta)$  small.  $\square$

## 8. $C^{1,\alpha}$ REGULARITY - II

In this section we prove the main estimates. Let  $u$  be a solution defined in  $\Omega \times [-T, 0]$  and assume that  $u > l(x)$  on  $\partial\Omega \times [-T, 0]$  for some linear function  $l(x)$ . We are interested in obtaining  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates in  $x$  at time  $t = 0$  in any compact set  $K$  included in the section  $\{u(x, 0) < l(x)\}$ . Theorem 7.1 gives such estimates but with the exponent  $\alpha$  depending also on the distance from  $K$  to  $\partial\{u(x, 0) < l(x)\}$  which is not desirable.

We can assume that after rescaling we are in the following situation:

$$(8.1) \quad \lambda (\det D^2 u)^p \leq u_t \leq \Lambda (\det D^2 u)^p, \quad \text{in } \Omega \times [-T, 0],$$

$$(8.2) \quad u > 1 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times [-T, 0], \quad \Omega \subset B_1(y) \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$(8.3) \quad u_0(x) := u(x, 0) \text{ satisfies } u_0(0) = 0.$$

First two theorems deal with the case  $p < \frac{1}{n-2}$  and  $p = \frac{1}{n-2}$ . In view of the results of Section 3,  $C^{1,\alpha}$  (or  $C^1$ ) continuity is expected for these exponents regardless of the behavior of the initial data at time  $-T$ .

**Theorem 8.1.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (8.1)-(8.3) with  $0 < p < \frac{1}{n-2}$  and  $T \leq 1$ . Then,*

$$\|u_0\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(K)} \leq C(K) T^{-\gamma} \quad \text{for any set } K \subset\subset \{u_0(x) < 1\}.$$

*The constants  $\alpha, \gamma > 0$  are universal (depend only on  $n, p, \lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ ), and  $C(K)$  depends on the universal constants and the distance between  $K$  and  $\partial\{u_0(x) < 1\}$ .*

The example in Proposition 4.8 shows that the Theorem 8.1 fails when  $p > \frac{1}{n-2}$ . For the critical exponent  $p = \frac{1}{n-2}$  we obtain a logarithmic modulus of continuity of the gradient.

**Theorem 8.2.** *Under the same assumptions and notation as in Theorem 8.1, if  $p = \frac{1}{n-2}$ , then*

$$|\nabla u_0(x) - \nabla u_0(y)| \leq C(K) |\log |x - y||^{-\alpha} T^{-\gamma}, \quad \forall x, y \in K.$$

Next two theorems deal with the case of general exponents  $p > 0$ . First theorem states that if the initial data  $u(x, -T)$  is  $C^{1,\beta}$  in the  $e$  direction then  $u(x, 0)$  is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in the  $e$  direction with  $\alpha = \alpha(\beta)$ .

**Theorem 8.3.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (8.1)-(8.3) with  $p > 0$ . If*

$$\partial_e u(\cdot, -T) \in C^\beta(\bar{S}), \quad S := \{u(x, -T) < 1\},$$

*for some  $\beta > 0$  small, then for any set  $K \subset\subset \{u_0(x) < 1\}$*

$$\|\partial_e u_0\|_{C^\alpha(K)} \leq C(K) \|\partial_e u(\cdot, -T)\|_{C^\beta(\bar{S})}.$$

*The constant  $\alpha = \alpha(\beta) > 0$  depends on  $\beta$  and the universal constants.*

The second Theorem is a pointwise  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimate at points that separated from the initial data at time  $-T$ .

**Theorem 8.4.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (8.1)-(8.3) with  $p > 0$ . If*

$$u(0, 0) - u(0, -T) := a > 0$$

*then, there exists  $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for which*

$$|u_0(x) - q \cdot x| \leq C(a) |x|^{1+\alpha}$$

*with  $\alpha$  universal and  $C(a)$  depends on  $a$ , the distance from 0 to  $\partial\{u_0 < 1\}$  and the universal constants.*

The theorems above will follow from a refinement of Lemma 7.4. We show that we may choose  $\delta_0$  universal in Lemma 7.4 and satisfy the conclusion at a point  $\tilde{x}$  possibly different from the origin. The key step is to use the part b) of Lemma 2.4.

**Lemma 8.5.** *Let  $u : \Omega \times [-T, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a solution of (3.1) such that  $u > 1$  on  $\partial\Omega \times [-T, 0]$  and  $u(0, 0) = 0$ . Let  $E$  be an ellipsoid centered at the origin such that  $|E| \geq 2^{-j} |B_1|$  and*

$$E \subset \{u(x, 0) < 1\} \subset \{u(x, -T) < 1\} \subset B_1(y).$$

Let  $\delta_0, M$  be universal as they appear in Lemma 7.4 for  $d = C_n$  the constant from Lemma 2.4. Then, there exists a constant  $C(j)$  (depending on universal constants and  $j$ ) such that if  $k \geq 0, l$  are integers and

$$(C_0^{-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_{-t_0} \quad \text{for some } t_0 \in (0, T]$$

and  $m_0$  is an integer satisfying

$$3m_0 \leq k - l - C(j), \quad M^{m_0} t_0 \geq C(j) T,$$

then we can find  $\tilde{x} \in \{u(x, -T) < 1\}$  such that

$$u(x, -T) \geq u(\tilde{x}, -\tilde{t}) - C_0^{C(j)+l+3m_0-k} + \max_{i=1,2} \{q_i \cdot (x - \tilde{x})\},$$

with

$$\tilde{t} = T - \frac{T}{C(j)} \quad (q_2 - q_1) \cdot e_n \geq (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-C(j)}.$$

*Remark 8.6.* Another way of stating the conclusion of the lemma is that the translation

$$(8.4) \quad \tilde{u}(x, t) := u(x + \tilde{x}, t - \tilde{t}) - u(\tilde{x}, -\tilde{t}), \quad \tilde{t} = T - \frac{T}{C(j)}$$

satisfies

$$\left( C_0^{C(j)+l+3m_0-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-C(j)} \right) \in A_{-T/C(j)}(\tilde{u}).$$

*Proof.* The proof is by induction in  $j$ .

The case  $j = 1$  is proved in Lemma 7.4. Indeed, since  $B_{1/2} \subset E \subset B_1(y) \subset B_{d/2}$  we see that the hypothesis (7.2) is satisfied and the conclusion holds for  $\tilde{x} = 0$ .

For a general  $j$  we start the proof as before. The only difference here is that we cannot guarantee in the induction step  $m \Rightarrow m + 1$  that there exists a section at time  $-t_m = -M^m t_0$  which is  $C_n d = C_n^2$  balanced around the origin.

Let's assume this fails for a first integer  $m$ . By Lemma 2.4 we can find a  $C_1(j)$ -balanced section (with  $C_1(j) > C_n^2$ ) at the time  $-t_m$ . The idea is to apply Proposition 6.4 as in the induction step and then to “replace” the origin with the center of mass  $x^*$  of this section. To be more precise, by Remark 6.7, the translation

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) = u(x^* + x, t - t_m) - u(x^*, -t_m)$$

satisfies

$$\left( C_2(j) C_0^{r_1-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{r_2-l} e^{-\delta_0} \right) \in A_{-\tilde{t}_0}(\tilde{u})$$

with

$$\tilde{t}_0 := c_1(j) t_m = c_1(j) M^m t_0$$

and from (7.4)-(7.6)

$$r_1 \leq 3m + r_2, \quad 0 \leq r_2 \leq l + C_3(j).$$

Here we assumed that  $T > t_m + \tilde{t}_0$ , otherwise the proof is the same as before by taking  $\tilde{x} = 0$ , and there is no need to change the origin. Notice that  $m_0 > m$  if  $C(j) > 1/c_1(j)$ .

The above imply

$$(C_0^{-\tilde{k}}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-\tilde{l}}) \in A_{-\tilde{t}_0}(\tilde{u})$$

with

$$\tilde{l} := l - r_2 + C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{k} = k - (3m + r_2) - C_4(j).$$

Now we apply the induction  $(j - 1)$ -step for  $\tilde{u}$ . First we set

$$\tilde{m}_0 := m_0 - m \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{T} := T - t_m,$$

and we have  $\tilde{T} \geq \tilde{t}_0 \geq c_1(j)t_m \geq c_2(j)T$ .

By Lemma 2.4 the maximal ellipsoid centered at the origin and included in the set  $\{\tilde{u}(x, 0) < \tilde{a}\}$  has volume greater than  $2^{j-1}|B_1|$ . The constant  $\tilde{a} = 1 - u(x^*, -t_m)$  and by Remark 2.3,  $c_3(j) \leq \tilde{a} \leq 1/c_3(j)$ . Thus in order to apply the rescaled induction step for  $\tilde{u}$  we need to check that (see Remark 7.6)

$$\tilde{k} \geq C'(j), \quad 3\tilde{m}_0 \leq \tilde{k} - \tilde{l} - C'(j), \quad M^{\tilde{m}_0}\tilde{t}_0 \geq \tilde{T}C'(j)$$

for some large constant  $C'(j)$ .

If  $C(j)$  is sufficiently large then

$$M^{\tilde{m}_0}\tilde{t}_0 = M^{m_0-m}c_1(j)M^m t_0 \geq C(j)c_1(j)T \geq C'(j)\tilde{T},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{k} - (\tilde{l} + 3\tilde{m}_0) &= k - l - 3(m + \tilde{m}_0) - C_4(j) - C_1 \\ (8.5) \quad &= (k - l - 3m_0) - C_5(j) \\ &\geq C(j) - C_5(j) \geq C'(j). \end{aligned}$$

and also,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{k} &\geq k - (3m + l) - C_3(j) - C_4(j) \\ &\geq k - (3m_0 + l) - C_6(j) \geq C(j) - C_6(j) \geq C'(j). \end{aligned}$$

From the equality in (8.5),  $\tilde{T} \geq c_2(j)T$  and  $\tilde{l} \leq l + C_1$  we clearly obtain the desired result when we apply the induction step by choosing  $C(j)$  sufficiently large.  $\square$

*Remark 8.7.* If in addition to the hypothesis of the lemma we have

$$u(0, 0) - u(0, -T) \geq a,$$

then

$$u(\tilde{x}, -\tilde{t}) - u(\tilde{x}, -T) \geq \frac{a}{C(j)} - C_0^{C(j)+l+3m_0-k}, \quad \text{for } \tilde{t} = T - \frac{T}{C(j)}.$$

This and the conclusion of the lemma imply

$$a \leq C_0^{C(j)+l+3m_0-k},$$

with  $C(j)$  a constant larger than the previous ones.

*Proof of Remark 8.7.* From the proof of Lemma 8.5 we see that when for a certain  $m$  we replace 0 with the center of mass  $x^*$  of the section  $S_h := \{u(x, -t_m) \leq l(x)\}$  (for  $l$  linear) with  $h = C_0^{r_1-k}$ , then

$$u(x^*, -t_m) - l(x^*) \geq -C(j)h.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$u(0, -T) - l(0) \leq u(0, -T) - u(0, 0) \leq -a,$$

and since  $u(x, -T) - l(x)$  is negative in  $S_h$ , at  $x^*$  we have

$$u(x^*, -T) - l(x) \leq -\frac{a}{C(j)}.$$

In conclusion

$$u(x^*, -t_m) \geq u(x^*, -T) + \tilde{a}, \quad \tilde{a} := \frac{a}{C(j)} - C(j)h.$$

Since we perform this change of origin at most  $j$  times we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 8.1.* Let

$$(C_0^{-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_0, \quad \text{for some } k \geq 0$$

where  $C_0$  and  $\delta_0$  are the constants taken from Lemma 8.5. Let  $E$  be an ellipsoid of volume  $2^{-j}$  around the origin included in the set  $\{x : u_0(x) < 1\}$  where  $j$  depends on  $\text{dist}(k, \partial\{u_0(x) < 1\})$ . In view of Lemma 7.2, it suffices to prove the existence of constants  $\epsilon_0$  and  $C_1$  universal and  $\tilde{C}(j)$  such that

$$(8.6) \quad l \geq \epsilon_0 (k + C_1 \log T) - \tilde{C}(j).$$

Since our assumption  $(C_0^{-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_0$  implies that  $l \geq -C_0(j)$  if  $k \geq 0$ , it follows that (8.6) is satisfied, for some  $\tilde{C}(j)$ , if

$$k \leq -C_1 \log T + C_1(j),$$

where  $C_1(j)$  will be specified later. Assume, by contradiction that (8.6) does not hold. Thus, since  $T \leq 1$ ,

$$(8.7) \quad \epsilon_0 k > l, \quad \text{for some } k > -C_1 \log T + C_1(j) \geq C_1(j).$$

Using the Lipschitz continuity of  $u_0$  we obtain, as in (7.7), that

$$(C_0^{-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_0 \Rightarrow (C_0^{-k+1}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l} - C(j) C_0^{-k}) \in A_{-t_0}$$

with  $t_0 = c(j) C_0^{-k(np+1)}$  which implies that

$$(C_0^{-k+1}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-1}) \in A_{-t_0}.$$

We now apply Lemma 8.5 with  $m_0 = \lceil \frac{k}{6} \rceil$  and check that the hypotheses are satisfied. Recall that  $M = C_0^{12(np+1)}$  hence

$$M^{m_0} t_0 \geq c(j) C_0^{(12m_0-k)(np+1)} \geq C(j) \geq C(j) T.$$

Also,  $l < \epsilon_0 k$  implies that

$$(8.8) \quad k \geq \frac{2k}{3} \geq 3m_0 + l + C(j)$$

by choosing  $C_1(j)$  sufficiently large.

Thus, Lemma 8.5 holds. Now we apply the estimate (6.1) for the translation function  $\tilde{u}$  of (8.4) that appears in the conclusion of Lemma 8.5. In our case

$$\tilde{h} = C_0^{C(j)+3m_0+l-k}, \quad \tilde{\alpha} = (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-C(j)}, \quad \tilde{t}_0 = \frac{T}{C(j)}.$$

Since  $S'_h \subset B_1(y)$  we have  $|S'_h| \leq C$ , hence

$$\tilde{h}^{1-(n-2)p} \tilde{\alpha}^{-2p} \geq \frac{T}{C_2(j)}.$$

Using (8.8) we have

$$(1 - (n-2)p) \left(-\frac{k}{3}\right) \log C_0 + 2pl \log(1 + \delta_0) \geq \log T - C_3(j)$$

or

$$l - 2\epsilon_0 k \geq C \log T - C_4(j), \quad \epsilon_0 := \frac{(1 - (n-2)p) \log C_0}{12p \log(1 + \delta_0)}$$

and  $C$  universal. We obtain the inequality

$$\epsilon_0 k \leq C |\log T| + C_4(j)$$

which contradicts our assumption (8.7) if we choose the constants  $C_1$  and  $C_1(j)$  appropriately. This concludes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

We will next sketch the proof of Theorem 8.2 for the case  $p = \frac{1}{n-2}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 8.2.* The proof is the same as above with the difference that we need to replace  $k$  by  $\log k$  in (8.6), i.e. we need to show that there exists  $\epsilon_0$  and  $C_1$  universal such that

$$(8.9) \quad l \geq \epsilon_0 (\log k + C_1 \log T) - \tilde{C}(j).$$

After we apply Lemma 8.5 we know that the translation  $\tilde{u}$  is above an angle of opening  $\tilde{\alpha}$  at time  $-\tilde{t}_0$  and it separates away from it at most a distance  $\tilde{h}$  at time 0. Now we use the stronger estimate (rescaled) obtained in Proposition 4.7 instead of (6.1). We find

$$\tilde{h} \geq c(j) e^{-C\tilde{\alpha}^{-1}\tilde{t}_0^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}},$$

hence

$$C_0^{C(j)+3m_0+l-k} \geq e^{-\frac{C(j)(1+\delta_0)^l}{TC}}.$$

We obtain

$$\frac{k}{3} \leq \frac{C(j)(1+\delta_0)^l}{TC},$$

or

$$l \geq 2\epsilon_0 \log k + C \log T - C(j),$$

and we finish the proof as before.  $\square$

We will now proceed with the proof of Theorem 8.3.

*Proof of Theorem 8.3.* We begin by observing that since  $u_0(0) = 0$ , then

$$T \leq C(\|u(\cdot, -T)\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{S})}).$$

We want to prove that if  $(C_0^{-k}, (1+\delta_0)^{-l}) \in A_0$ , for some  $k \geq 0$ , then

$$(8.10) \quad l \geq \epsilon_0 k + C(j, a) \quad \text{with} \quad a := \|\partial_{e_n} u(\cdot, -T)\|_{C^\beta(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}$$

for some  $\epsilon_0$  depending on  $\beta$  and universal constants. To show (8.10) we argue similarly as before. If (8.10) doesn't hold, then

$$\epsilon_0 k > l, \quad \text{for some} \quad k > C_1(j, a).$$

We set  $m_0 = \lfloor \frac{k}{6} \rfloor$  and that the hypotheses of Lemma 8.5 are clearly satisfied. We find that

$$\left( C_0^{C(j)+3m_0+l-k}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-C(j)} \right) \in A_{-\tilde{T}}(\tilde{u})$$

from which we conclude that

$$\left( C_0^{-\frac{k}{3}}, (1 + \delta_0)^{-l-C(j)} \right) \in A_{-\tilde{T}}(\tilde{u}).$$

Using that  $\partial_{e_n} u(\cdot, -T) \in C^\beta$  at  $\tilde{x}$  we obtain

$$\frac{\log(1 + \delta_0)}{\log C_0} (l + C(j)) \geq \frac{\beta}{\beta + 1} \frac{k}{3} - C(j, a)$$

from which we derive a contradiction if  $\epsilon_0(\beta)$  is chosen sufficiently small and  $C_1(j, a)$  is chosen large. This concludes the proof of our theorem.  $\square$

We finish with the proof of Theorem 8.4.

*Proof of Theorem 8.4.* We use the previous notation. It suffices to show that for some  $\epsilon_0$  universal

$$l \geq \epsilon_0 k - C(j, a).$$

From Proposition 3.12 we obtain the bound  $T \leq C(j, a)$ . Now the proof is the same as before. In view of the Remark 8.7 our hypothesis implies that

$$C_0^{C(j)+3m_0+l-k} \geq a,$$

and the conclusion clearly follows.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Andrews, B., *Motion of hypersurfaces by Gauss curvature*; Pacific J. Math. 195 (2000), no. 1, 1–34.
- [2] Andrews, B., *Gauss curvature flow: the fate of the rolling stones*; Invent. Math. 138 (1999), no. 1, 151–161.
- [3] Caffarelli, L. A., *A localization property of viscosity solutions to the Mongé-Ampère equation and their strict convexity*, Ann. of Math. **131** (1990), 129–134.
- [4] Caffarelli, L. A., *Boundary regularity of maps with convex potentials*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **45** (1992), no. 9, 1141–1151.
- [5] Chopp, D., Evans, L. C. and Ishii, H. , *Waiting time effects for Gauss curvature flows*; Indiana Univ. Math. J. 48 (1999), 311–334.
- [6] B. Chow, *Deforming convex hypersurfaces by the  $n$ th-root of the Gaussian curvature*; J. Differential Geom. 22 (1985), 117–138.
- [7] Daskalopoulos, P. and Hamilton R., *The Free Boundary on the Gauss Curvature Flow with Flat Sides*; J. Reine Angew. Math. 510 (1999), 187–227.
- [8] Daskalopoulos, P. and Lee, K., *Worn stones with flat Sides: all time regularity of the interface*; Invent. Math, 156 (2004), no. 3, 445–493.
- [9] Firey, W.J., *Shapes of worn stones*; Mathematika 21 (1974), 1–11.
- [10] Gutierrez, C. E., *The Monge-Ampère equation*; Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications. 44, Birkhauser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, (2001).
- [11] Gutiérrez, C.E., and Huang, Q.,  *$W^{2,p}$  estimates for the parabolic Monge-Ampère Equation*; Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 159 (2001), 137–177.
- [12] Hamilton, R., *Worn stones with flat sides*; in a tribute to Ilya Bakelman, Discourses Math. Appl. 3 (1993), 69–78.
- [13] Huang, Q. and Lu, G., *On a priori  $C^{1,\alpha}$  and  $W^{2,p}$  estimates for a parabolic Monge-Ampère equation in the Gauss curvature flows*, Amer. J. Math. 128 (2006), no. 2, 453–480.
- [14] Pogorelov, A. V *The Minkowski Multidimensional Problem*, John Wiley Sons, Washington DC, 1978.
- [15] Tso, K., *Deforming a Hypersurface by its Gauss-Kronecker Curvature*; Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. XXXVIII (1985), 867–882.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, USA

*E-mail address:* pdaskalo@math.columbia.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, USA

*E-mail address:* savin@math.columbia.edu