CONVEXITY FOR A PARABOLIC FULLY NONLINEAR FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM WITH SINGULAR TERM

SEONGMIN JEON AND HENRIK SHAHGHOLIAN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study a parabolic free boundary problem in an exterior domain

 $\begin{cases} F(D^2u) - \partial_t u = u^a \chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty), \\ u = u_0 & \text{on } \{t = 0\}, \\ |\nabla u| = u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)), \\ u = 1 & \text{in } K \times [0, \infty). \end{cases}$

Here, *a* belongs to the interval (-1, 0), *K* is a (given) convex compact set in \mathbb{R}^n , $\Omega = \{u > 0\} \supset K \times (0, \infty)$ is an unknown set, and *F* denotes a fully nonlinear operator. Assuming a suitable condition on the initial value u_0 , we prove the existence of a nonnegative quasiconcave solution to the aforementioned problem, which exhibits monotone non-decreasing behavior over time.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Main results	3
1.3. Notation	4
2. Regularized problem	4
3. Subsolution property of envelopes	5
4. Existence of a quasiconcave solution	11
Appendix A. Nondegeneracy	18
Declarations	23
References	23

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Background.** Let *K* be a given compact convex set in \mathbb{R}^n ($n \ge 1$), u_0 a nonnegative function with compact support in \mathbb{R}^n with $u_0 = 1$ on *K*. We consider the problem of

To the memory of Marek Fila, a scientific luminary we dearly miss.

Date: February 6, 2024.

²⁰²⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. 35R35, 52A01.

Key words and phrases. α -parabolically quasiconcavity, parabolic fully nonlinear equation, quasiconcave envelope.

S. Jeon was supported by the Academy of Finland grant 347550. H. Shahgholian was supported by Swedish Research Council grant nr 2021-03700. This work was partially done when H. Shahgholian was spending time at YSU (Armenia), whose support and hospitality is acknowledged.

finding a solution *u* to

(1.1)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^2u) - \partial_t u = g(u) & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty), \\ u = u_0 & \text{on } \{t = 0\}, \\ |\nabla u| = u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)), \\ u = 1 & \text{in } K \times [0, \infty), \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega = \{u > 0\}$ is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ such that $K \times (0, \infty) \subset \Omega$, *F* is a fully nonlinear operator, and $g(s) = s^a \chi_{\{s>0\}}$ for some $a \in (-1, 0)$. Notice that $g(u) = g(u)\chi_{\{u>0\}}$.

Free boundary problems featuring singular right-hand sides like u^a , where -1 < a < 0, were examined by Alt-Phillips [2] for the Laplacian case. Araújo-Teixeira [4] extended the analysis to problems involving fully nonlinear operators. Recently, Araújo-Sá-Urbano [3] addressed the singular fully nonlinear free boundary problem in the parabolic setting. Convexity configurations in parabolic partial differential equations have been extensively explored in the literature; refer to Definition 1 for various convexity concepts. Noteworthy studies include parabolic quasiconcavity in [17, 18], space-time quasiconcavity in [6, 9], and a more general notion of parabolic power concavity in [19, 20]. The concept of a "spatially quasiconvex envelope" in the parabolic setting is discussed in [22]. Additional references encompass [7, 9, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24].

The authors, in their recent work [21], investigated the obstacle-type convexity problem involving the fully nonlinear operator and the *p*-Laplacian. In this paper, we extend specific results from the elliptic to the parabolic setting. The main objective of this study is to show the existence of a space-time quasiconcave solution to the singular parabolic fully nonlinear free boundary problem (1.1).

Definition 1. Let u be a continuous function in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ be a constant.

(1) We say that u is spatially quasiconcave if

$$u((1-\rho)x_0+\rho x_1,t) \ge \min\{u(x_0,t), u(x_1,t)\}$$

for every $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, t > 0 and $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

(2) *u* is said to be α -parabolically quasiconcave if

$$u\left((1-\rho)x_{0}+\rho x_{1},\left((1-\rho)t_{0}^{\alpha}+\rho t_{1}^{\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha}\right)\geq\min\{u(x_{0},t_{0}),u(x_{1},t_{1})\}$$

for every $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t_0, t_1 > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

(3) *u* is called to be space-time quasiconcave if it is 1-parabolically quasiconcave, i.e.,

$$u((1-\rho)z_0+\rho z_1) \ge \min\{u(z_0), u(z_1)\}$$

for every $z_0, z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

The following notion of *parabolic convexity* of sets was introduced in [7].

Definition 2. We say that a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$ is α -parabolically convex if

$$\left((1-\rho)x_0+\rho x_1,\left((1-\rho)t_0^{\alpha}+\rho t_1^{\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha}\right)\in E$$

whenever $(x_0, t_0), (x_1, t_1) \in E$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

Remark 1. It is easy to see that the α -parabolically quasiconcavity of u is equivalent to the spacetime quasiconcavity of $\tilde{u}(x,t) := u(x,t^{1/\alpha})$. Moreover, u is α -parabolically quasiconcave if and only if its super-level sets $\{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) : u(x,t) \ge l\}$ are α -parabolically convex for every $l \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly, u is space-time quasiconcave if and only if its super-level sets are (n + 1)-dimensional convex sets. 1.2. **Main results.** Let S = S(n) be the space of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices. For constants $\Lambda \ge \lambda > 0$, we let $\mathfrak{M}^+_{\lambda,\Lambda'}, \mathfrak{M}^-_{\lambda,\Lambda}$ be the extremal Pucci operators

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

where e_i 's are eigenvalues of $M \in S$. We assume $F : S \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

(1.2)
$$\begin{cases} -F \text{ is uniformly elliptic, i.e., there are constants } \Lambda \ge \lambda > 0 \text{ such that} \\ \mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(M-N) \le F(M) - F(N) \le \mathcal{M}^{+}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(M-N) \text{ for every } M, N \in S, \\ -F \text{ is convex,} \end{cases}$$

(- *F* is homogeneous of degree 1. That is, F(rM) = rF(M) for all r > 0, $M \in S$.

Regarding the initial value $u_0 : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, we assume

(1.3) $\begin{cases} -u_0 \text{ is nonnegative, quasiconcave and compactly supported in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ -u_0 = 1 \quad \text{in } K, \\ -F(D^2u_0) \ge g(u_0) \quad \text{in } \{u_0 > 0\} \setminus K. \end{cases}$

The following is the central result of this paper.

Theorem 1. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact convex set with a nonempty interior and $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$. Suppose that the initial data u_0 satisfies (1.3). Then there exists a nonnegative space-time quasiconcave function u, which is nondecreasing in time and satisfies (1.1) with $\Omega = \{u > 0\}$ and $\{u_0 > 0\} \times (0, \infty) \subset \Omega \subset B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$ for some $R_0 > 0$.

It is worth noting that the solution *u* in Theorem 1 is also α -parabolically quasiconcave for any $\alpha > 1$. This follows from the time-monotonicity of *u*, and the monotonicity of $\alpha \mapsto \left((1-\rho)t_0^{\alpha} + \rho t_1^{\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha}$ for every $t_0, t_1 > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ as a consequence of Hölder's inequality.

We would like to emphasize that the quasiconcavity condition on the initial value u_0 in Theorem 1 is not redundant. This is because the quasiconcavity of the solution implies the quasiconcavity of the initial value u_0 due to continuity.

In Theorem 1, we assume that u_0 is a subsolution of $F(D^2u_0) = g(u_0)$. It is worth noting that for general quasiconcave initial data u_0 , even the solution of the homogeneous heat equation may not be spatially quasiconcave, as demonstrated in [16]. Furthermore, [8] provides a counterexample illustrating that the additional subharmonicity assumption on u_0 is still insufficient to ensure the quasiconcavity of the solution.

We observe that the question of uniqueness in the free boundary problem addressed in this paper can be straightforwardly established through the application of the Lavrentiev principle when the free boundary is sufficiently smooth, for instance, C^1 in space and Lipschitz in time. As indicated in [21, Remark 1], an alternative method is necessary, even in the elliptic case, to rule out the possibility of a free boundary point with singularity. Furthermore, it can be shown that the solution converges to its elliptic counterpart, provided the elliptic solution has a unique solution, which holds true within the class of smooth boundaries.

We would like to enumerate several open questions to which our main result, Theorem 1, can be extended:

(1) Equations with a right-hand side f(u), and how general can this f(u) be, to allow existence of convex solutions.

- (2) Asymptotic convexity, i.e., the convexity of the solution after some (uniform) time, starting from a general initial value.
- (3) Problems with unbounded support of initial data.
- (4) The case when the compact set *K* is a "flat piece," as considered in the elliptic problem [21].

1.3. Notation. We denote the points of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} by $z = (x, t) = (x', x_n, t)$, where $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. For $z^0 = (x^0, t^0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and r > 0, we denote

$$B_r(x^0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x^0| < r\} : \text{ ball in } \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$Q_r(z^0) := B_r(x^0) \times (t^0 - r^2, t^0]$$
: parabolic cylinder in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .

We denote the gradient of *u* by

$$\nabla u = Du = (\partial_{x_i} u, \cdots, \partial_{x_n} u)$$

We also use the notation D^2u to indicate the Hessian of u, representing the $n \times n$ matrix with entries $\partial_{x_ix_j}u$. For -1 < a < 0, we consistently fix the following constant throughout the paper

$$\beta:=\frac{2}{1-a}\in(1,2).$$

2. Regularized problem

In our problem, the presence of a highly singular right-hand side in (1.1) adds complexity to the investigation of the existence of quasiconcave solutions. To overcome this challenge, we employ an approach where we approximate the r.h.s. *g* with more regular functions.

For some small constant $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, we consider a function $h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

(2.1)
$$h(s) := \begin{cases} 0, & -\infty < s \le 0, \\ \varepsilon_1^a, & 0 < s < \varepsilon_1, \\ s^a, & s \ge \varepsilon_1. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $h(s) = h(s)\chi_{\{s>0\}}$. Moreover, let $v_0 : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function satisfying the first two conditions in (1.3) and $F(D^2v_0) \ge h(v_0)$ in $\{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K$.

We find a nonnegative compactly supported function $v_{\infty} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

(2.2)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^2 v_{\infty}) = h(v_{\infty}) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K, \\ v_{\infty} = 1 & \text{in } K, \\ |\nabla v_{\infty}| = 0 & \text{on } \partial \{v_{\infty} > 0\}, \end{cases}$$

with $\{v_{\infty} > 0\} \supset \{v_0 > 0\}$ in the following way: for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $v_{\infty}^k : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a compactly support nonnegative function satisfying

(2.3)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^2 v_{\infty}^k) = h(v_{\infty}^k) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K, \\ v_{\infty}^k = 1 + \frac{1}{k} & \text{in } K, \\ |\nabla v_{\infty}^k| = 0 & \text{on } \partial \{v_{\infty}^k > 0\} \end{cases}$$

with $v_{\infty}^{k} > v_{0}$ in $\{v_{\infty}^{k} > 0\}$.

The existence of $\{v_{\infty}^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ can be obtained by the application of the Perron's method, see the proof of [21, Lemma 1]. Then, over a subsequence, v_{∞}^k is uniformly convergent in compact sets, say to v_{∞} , and it satisfies (2.2). See the proof of Theorem 1 for the

fully nonlinear case in [21]. (2.3) will play an important role in the proof of the support condition of the solution in Lemma 3, specifically in Step 3.

We consider the following regularized problem:

Proposition 1. Let K and α be as in Theorem 1 and h, v_0 and v_∞ be as above. Let $R_0 > 0$ be such that supp $v_\infty \subset B_{R_0}$. Then there exists a space-time quasiconcave nonnegative function v in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ which is nondecreasing in time and satisfies

(2.4)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^2v) - \partial_t v = h(v) & in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty), \\ v = v_0 & on \{t = 0\}, \\ |\nabla v| = v = 0 & on \partial \Omega_v \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)), \\ v = 1 & in K \times [0, \infty), \end{cases}$$

with $\Omega_v = \{v > 0\}$ satisfying $\{v_0 > 0\} \times (0, \infty) \subset \Omega_v \subset B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$. Moreover, there exist constants C > 0 and $\gamma > 0$, depending only on a, λ, Λ , n and v_0 , such that for any $Q_r(z_0) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$ with $z_0 \in \partial \Omega_v \cap \{t > 0\}$

(2.5)
$$\sup_{Q_r(z_0)} v \leq C r^{1+\gamma}.$$

We remark that (2.5) is much stronger statement that $|\nabla v| = 0$ on $\partial \Omega_v \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$. In Section 4, we will prove Proposition 1 and utilize it to establish Theorem 1.

3. Subsolution property of envelopes

For a function v as in Proposition 1, we say that a function v^* is the α -parabolically quasiconcave envelope of v if v^* is the smallest α -parabolically quasiconcave function that lies above v. The main objective of this section is to establish the subsolution property of v^* (see Corollary 1), which will play a pivotal role in the proof of Proposition 1 in Section 4.

To achieve this goal, we introduce some notation. Given $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and T > 0, we define \mathcal{D}_v to be the α -parabolically convex hull of the set {v > 0}. In other words, \mathcal{D}_v is the smallest α -parabolically convex set that contains {v > 0}. We also define $A_v := \mathcal{D}_v \setminus (K \times [0, T])$.

For each

$$\mu \in \mathbb{M} := \left\{ \mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{n+2}) \in (0, 1)^{n+2} : \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i = 1 \right\},$$

we set

$$A_{v}^{\mu} := \left\{ (x,t) \in A_{v} : x = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i} x_{i} \text{ and } t = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i} t_{i}^{\alpha} \right)^{1/\alpha} \text{ for some } (x_{i},t_{i}) \in \{v > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0,T]), \ 1 \le i \le n+2 \right\}.$$

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ small, we also define

$$A_{v,\varepsilon} := \{ (x,t) \in A_v : \operatorname{dist}((x,t), \partial A_v \cap \{0 < t < T\}) > \varepsilon \},\$$

$$A_{v,\varepsilon}^{\mu} := \{ (x,t) \in A_v^{\mu} : \operatorname{dist}((x,t), \partial A_v^{\mu} \cap \{0 < t < T\}) > \varepsilon \}.$$

Next, for $b = (b_1, \dots, b_{n+2}) \in (0, \infty)^{n+2}$, $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ and $p \in [-\infty, \infty]$, we denote the μ -weighted *p*-mean of *b* by

$$M_{p}(b;\mu) := \begin{cases} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i} b_{i}^{p}\right]^{1/p} & \text{if } p \neq -\infty, 0, \infty, \\ \max\{b_{1}, \cdots, b_{n+2}\} & \text{if } p = \infty, \\ b_{1}^{\mu_{1}} \cdots b_{n+2}^{\mu_{n+2}} & \text{if } p = 0, \\ \min\{b_{1}, \cdots, b_{n+2}\} & \text{if } p = -\infty. \end{cases}$$

We say that a function v is α -parabolically p-concave if

$$v\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i x_i, M_{\alpha}(t_1, \cdots, t_{n+2}; \mu)\right) \ge M_p(v(x_1, t_1), \cdots, v(x_{n+2}, t_{n+2}); \mu)$$

for every $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ and $\{(x_i, t_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+2}$. In addition, we define the α -parabolic *p*-convolution of *v* for $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$: for $(x, t) \in A_v^{\mu}$

$$(3.1) \quad V_{p,\mu}(x,t) := \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i v(x_i, t_i)^p \right)^{1/p} : (x_i, t_i) \in \{v > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0, T]), \\ x = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i x_i, \ t = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i t_i^\alpha \right)^{1/\alpha} \right\}.$$

We also set

$$V_p(x,t) := \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{M}} V_{p,\mu}(x,t).$$

Notice that V_p is the α -parabolically p-concave envelope of v, i.e., the smallest α -parabolically p-concave function greater than or equal to v. Similarly, we define

$$V_{\mu}^{*}(x,t) := \sup \left\{ \min\{v(x_{i},t_{i}) : 1 \le i \le n+2\} : (x_{i},t_{i}) \in \{v > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0,T]), \\ x = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i} x_{i}, t = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i} t_{i}^{\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha} \right\}$$

and let

$$V^*(x,t) := \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{M}} V^*_{\mu}(x,t).$$

Clearly, V^* is the α -parabolically quasiconcave envelope of v. For $p \in (-\infty, 0)$, let $w_p : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T^{\alpha}] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined by

$$w_p(x,\tau) := v^p(x,\tau^{1/\alpha})$$

which corresponds to (1.21) in [15]. Recall (3.1), and define

$$W_{p,\mu}(x,\tau) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i w_p(x_i,\tau_i) : (x_i,\tau_i) \in \{w > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0,T^{\alpha}]), \\ x = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i x_i, \ \tau = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i \tau_i \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$W_{p,\mu}(x,\tau) = V_{p,\mu}(x,\tau^{1/\alpha}).$$

In the following lemma, we prove that the supremum in (3.1) is achieved at interior points $(x_i, t_i) \in (\{v > 0\} \cap \{0 < t \le T\}) \setminus (K \times [0, T]), 1 \le i \le n + 2$. This corresponds to the situation with p < 0 in [15, Lemma 4.1], which is trivial under their assumption of zero boundary data. However, in our case, this becomes nontrivial and requires additional technical difficulty.

Lemma 1. Let $v \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative function which is nondecreasing in time and satisfies (2.4). Let $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$ and suppose that for every $x \in \{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K$

(3.2)
$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{v^p(x,t) - v^p(x,0)}{t^{\alpha}} = -\infty.$$

Given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $\overline{p} \in (-\infty, 0)$ such that for any $p \in (-\infty, \overline{p})$, $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ and $(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) \in A_{v,\varepsilon}^{\mu} \cap \{0 < t < T\}$, there exist $(x_i, t_i) \in (\{v > 0\} \cap \{0 < t \le T\}) \setminus (K \times [0, T]), 1 \le i \le n+2$, such that

(3.3)
$$\hat{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i x_i, \quad \hat{t} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i t_i^{\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha} \quad and \quad V_{p,\mu}(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i v(x_i, t_i)^p\right)^{1/p}.$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two steps.

Step 1. By continuity of v, we can find $(x_i, t_i) \in \{v > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0, T]), 1 \le i \le n + 2$, such that (3.3) holds. We first claim that no (x_i, t_i) can be contained on $\{v = 0\} \cup (\{0 < v_0 < 1\} \times \{0\})$.

To prove the claim, we assume to the contrary that $(x_i, t_i) \in \{v = 0\} \cup (\{0 < v_0 < 1\} \times \{0\})$ for some *i*, say i = 1. If $v(x_1, t_1) = 0$, then we readily have $V_{p,\mu}(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) = 0$ due to the negativity of *p*. This is a contradiction since $V_{p,\mu} > 0$ in A_v^{μ} . Therefore, we may assume $0 < v_0(x_1) < 1$ and $t_1 = 0$. If $t_i = 0$ for all *i*, then $\hat{t} = 0$, which contradicts $\hat{t} > 0$. Thus, we may assume without loss of generality $(x_2, t_2) \in (\{v > 0\} \cap \{t > 0\}) \setminus (K \times [0, T])$. Writing $\hat{\tau} = \hat{t}^{\alpha}$ and $\tau_i = t_i^{\alpha}$, (3.3) reads

$$\hat{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i x_i, \quad \hat{\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i \tau_i \quad \text{and} \quad V^p_\mu(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) = W_{p,\mu}(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i w_p(x_i, \tau_i).$$

For small $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we consider $\{(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{\tau}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+2}$ defined by

$$\tilde{x}_i = x_i \text{ for } 1 \le i \le n+2,$$

 $\tilde{\tau}_1 = \frac{\rho}{\mu_1}, \ \tilde{\tau}_2 = \tau_2 - \frac{\rho}{\mu_2}, \text{ and } \tilde{\tau}_i = \tau_i \text{ for } 3 \le i \le n+2.$

Note that $\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i \tilde{\tau}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i \tau_i = \hat{\tau}$ and that both $(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{\tau}_1)$ and $(\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{\tau}_2)$ are contained in $(\{w_p < \infty\} \cap \{t > 0\}) \setminus (K \times [0, T^{\alpha}])$ for $\rho > 0$ small. The Lipschitz continuity of w_p near $(\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{\tau}_2)$ gives that for some constant $C_0 > 0$, independent of ρ ,

(3.4)
$$\mu_2(w_p(\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{\tau}_2) - w_p(x_2, \tau_2)) \le C_0 \rho.$$

On the other hand, we observe that (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{t \to 0+} \frac{w_p(x,t) - w_p(x,0)}{t} = -\infty, \quad x \in \{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K.$$

This gives that

$$w_p(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{\tau}_1) - w_p(x_1, \tau_1) = w_p\left(x_1, \frac{\rho}{\mu_1}\right) - w_p(x_1, 0) \le -2C_0 \frac{\rho}{\mu_1}$$

if $\rho > 0$ is small enough. Combining this with (3.4) yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i w_p(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{\tau}_i) = \mu_1(w_p(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{\tau}_1) - w_p(x_1, \tau_1)) + \mu_2(w_p(\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{\tau}_2) - w_p(x_2, \tau_2)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i w_p(x_i, \tau_i)$$

$$\leq -C_0 \rho + W_{p,\mu}(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}).$$

This is a contradiction by the definition of $W_{p,\mu}$.

Step 2. In this step, we prove the lemma by making use of the result obtained in Step 1 and the idea in [11, Lemma 5.1]. We assume to the contrary that the lemma is not true. Then we can find sequences $p_j \in (-\infty, 0)$, $(\hat{x}_j, \hat{t}_j) \in A_{v,\varepsilon}^{\mu} \cap \{0 < t \le T\}$ and $\{(x_{j,i}, t_{j,i})\}_{i=1}^{n+2} \subset \{v > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0, T])$ such that $p_j \to -\infty$, $(x_{j,1}, t_{j,1}) \in \partial K \times (0, T]$, $\hat{x}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i x_{j,i}$, $\hat{t}_j = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i t_{j,i}^{\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha}$ and $V_{p_j,\mu}(\hat{x}_j, \hat{t}_j) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} v(x_{j,i}, t_{j,i})^{p_j}\right)^{1/p_j}$. Over a subsequence, we have that $(\hat{x}_j, \hat{t}_j) \to (\hat{x}, \hat{t}) \in \overline{A_{v,\varepsilon}^{\mu}}$, $(x_{j,1}, t_{j,1}) \to (x_1, t_1) \in \partial K \times [0, T]$ and $(x_{j,i}, t_{j,i}) \to (x_i, t_i)$ for $2 \le i \le n + 2$. Clearly, we have $\hat{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i x_i$ and $\hat{t} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i t_i^{\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha}$. Moreover, for each q < 0, we have for large j so that $p_j < q$

$$V_{p_{j,\mu}}(\hat{x}_{j}, \hat{t}_{j}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i} v(x_{j,i}, t_{j,i})^{p_{j}}\right)^{1/p_{j}} \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i} v(x_{j,i}, t_{j,i})^{q}\right)^{1/p_{j}}$$

by the Jensen's inequality. Taking $j \rightarrow \infty$ gives

$$V^*_{\mu}(\hat{x},\hat{t}) \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i v(x_i,t_i)^q\right)^{1/q}$$

We then let $q \to -\infty$ to get

 $V^*_{\mu}(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) \le \min\{v(x_i, t_i) : 1 \le i \le n+2\}.$

By the definition of V_{μ}^* , we find

(3.5)
$$V_{\mu}^{*}(\hat{x},\hat{t}) = \min\{v(x_{i},t_{i}) : 1 \le i \le n+2\}.$$

We consider the two cases either $\hat{t} = 0$ or $\hat{t} > 0$.

Case 1. If $\hat{t} = 0$, then $t_i = 0$ for all $1 \le i \le n + 2$. Thus

$$V_{\mu}^{*}(\hat{x}, 0) = \min\{v_{0}(x_{i}) : 1 \le i \le n+2\},\$$

with $\hat{x} \in \{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K$ and $x_1 \in \partial K$. Since $V^*_{\mu}(\cdot, 0)$ is the μ -quasiconcave envelope of v_0 , we can apply [11, Lemma 4.2 and Remark 4.2] (see also [10]) to get a contradiction. In fact, the conditions in [11] require $|\nabla v_0| > 0$ within the domain to guarantee $0 < v_0 < 1$ in the considered region. In our case, despite lacking $|\nabla v_0| > 0$, we have $0 < v_0 < 1$ in our domain $\{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K$. This is because v_0 cannot have a local maximum, as $F(D^2v_0) \ge h(v_0) > 0$ in $\{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K$.

Case 2. Suppose $\hat{t} > 0$. Then (\hat{x}, \hat{t}) is contained in $\overline{A_{v,\varepsilon}^{\mu}} \cap \{t > 0\}$, i.e., it is away from $\partial_{p}A_{v}^{\mu}$. Using that $F(D^{2}v) - \partial_{t}v = h(v) > 0$ in $\{v > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0, T])$, we can follow the argument in [11, Lemma 4.2 and Remark 4.2] to contradict (3.5).

Next, we prove the subsolution property for the envelopes V_p for small $p \in (-\infty, 0)$ by following the approach in [15]. A similar outcome is demonstrated in [15, Theorem 1.1]. However, direct application of this result to our case is not available, as [15] assumes a zero-Dirichlet boundary condition, whereas we are dealing with more general boundary data.

Proposition 2. Let v be as in Lemma 1. Then, for any $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $\bar{p} \in (-\infty, 0)$ such that for any $p \in (-\infty, \bar{p})$, V_v satisfies

$$F(D^2V_p) - \partial_t V_p \ge h(V_p) \quad in \ A_{v,\varepsilon} \cap \{0 < t < T\}.$$

Proof of Proposition 2. For $p \in (-\infty, 0)$, let $G_{p,k} : (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times S(n) \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$G_{p,k}(r,\xi,X) := r^{k+\frac{1}{p}-2}F\left(-\frac{r}{p}X + \frac{p-1}{p^2}\xi \otimes \xi\right) + r^k h(r^{1/p}), \quad \text{where } k = 1 - 1/p,$$

which corresponds to (1.9) in [15]. We note that $w_{\nu}(x,\tau) = v^{\nu}(x,\tau^{1/\alpha})$ is nonincreasing in time. A direct computation shows that

(3.6)
$$t^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}}\partial_t w_p(x,t) + \frac{p}{\alpha}G_{p,k}(w_p,\nabla w_p,D^2w_p) = 0.$$

We claim that the following two conditions, corresponding to (H1) and (H2) in [15], respectively, are satisfied:

- (C1) Either $\frac{1}{p} 1 + k \le 0$ or $\alpha \left(\frac{1}{p} 1 + k\right) \ge 1$. (C2) For any $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$, $r \in (0, \infty)$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $Y \in S(n)$,

$$G_{p,k}(r,\xi,Y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i G_{p,k}(r_i,\xi,X_i)$$

holds for
$$(r_i, X_i) \in (0, \infty) \times S(n)$$
 $(i = 1, 2, \dots, n + 2)$ satisfying $\sum_i \mu_i r_i = r$ and

$$\operatorname{sgn}^{*}(p)\begin{pmatrix} \mu_{1}X_{1} & & \\ & \mu_{2}X_{2} & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \mu_{n+2}X_{n+2} \end{pmatrix} \leq \operatorname{sgn}^{*}(p)\begin{pmatrix} \mu_{1}^{2}Y & \mu_{1}\mu_{2}Y & \cdots & \mu_{1}\mu_{n+2}Y \\ \mu_{2}\mu_{1}Y & \mu_{2}^{2}Y & \cdots & \mu_{2}\mu_{n+2}Y \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mu_{n+2}\mu_{1}Y & \mu_{n+2}\mu_{2}Y & \cdots & \mu_{n+2}^{2}Y \end{pmatrix}$$

Indeed, (C1) simply holds due to our choice of k = 1 - 1/p. For (C2), we observe that $r \mapsto r^{k}h(r^{1/p}) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_{1}^{a}r^{k}, & 0 < r < \varepsilon_{1}^{p}, \\ r^{k+\frac{a}{p}}, & r \ge \varepsilon_{1}^{p} \end{cases} \text{ is convex as } k = 1 - 1/p > 1 \text{ and } a/p > 0. \text{ Moreover,}$ the convexity of *F* gives that for each fixed ξ , $(r, X) \mapsto r^{k+\frac{1}{p}-2}F\left(-\frac{r}{p}X + \frac{p-1}{p^{2}}\xi \otimes \xi\right)$ is convex.

Thus, $(r, X) \mapsto G_{p,k}(r, \xi, X)$ is a convex function, and hence $G_{p,k}$ satisfies the condition (C2); see pages 348-349 in [15].

Suppose the condition (3.2) is true, which enables us to use Lemma 1. With this lemma, the monotonicity of w_p in time and conditions (C1) and (C2) at hand, we can follow the argument in the proof of [15, Lemma 4.2] to obtain that for \bar{p} as in Lemma 1, $W_{p,\mu}$ is a supersolution of (3.6) for any $p \in (-\infty, \bar{p})$. By [15, Lemma 3.1], we see that $V_{p,\mu}$ with $p \in (-\infty, \bar{p})$ is a subsolution of

$$F(D^2 V_{p,\mu}) - \partial_t V_{p,\mu} = h(V_{p,\mu}) \quad \text{in } A^{\mu}_{v,\varepsilon} \cap \{0 < t < T\}.$$

This implies that $V_p = \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{M}} V_{p,\mu}$ is a subsolution.

To close the argument, we need to prove (3.2). For this, we use the idea on pages 367-368 in [15]. For small $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$, let $F_{\tilde{\varepsilon}} := F + \tilde{\varepsilon}$ and let $v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ be a solution of (2.4), with F replaced by $F_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$. We take a nonnegative function $\psi_0 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that supp $\psi_0 \subset$ supp v_0 . By continuity, we may assume $\alpha > 1$. We take $\gamma \in (1, \alpha)$ and set $\psi(x, t) := v_0(x) + \psi_0(x)t^{\gamma}$. Then we have in $\{v_0 > 0\} \times (0, t_0)$ with small $t_0 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(D^{2}\psi) - \partial_{t}\psi - h(\psi) &\geq F(D^{2}v_{0} + t^{\gamma}D^{2}\psi_{0}) + \tilde{\varepsilon} - \gamma t^{\gamma-1}\psi_{0} - h(\psi) \\ &\geq F(D^{2}v_{0}) + t^{\gamma}\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}\psi_{0}) + \tilde{\varepsilon} - \gamma r^{\gamma-1}\psi_{0} - h(\psi) \\ &\geq h(v_{0}) - h(\psi) + t^{\gamma}\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}\psi_{0}) - \gamma t^{\gamma-1}\psi_{0} + \tilde{\varepsilon} \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used that *h* is nonincreasing and that $\gamma > 1$. Since $\psi_0 = 0$ on $\partial \{v_0 > 0\}$, we have $v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \ge \psi$ on $\partial_p(\{v_0 > 0\} \times (0, t_0))$, thus the comparison principle implies $v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \ge \psi$ in $\{v_0 > 0\} \times (0, t_0)$. This, together with the strict inequality $\alpha > \gamma$, implies (3.2) for $v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$:

$$\lim_{t\to 0+}\frac{v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^p(x,t)-v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^p(0,t)}{t^{\alpha}}\leq \lim_{t\to 0+}\frac{(v_0(x)+\psi_0(x)t^{\gamma})^p-v_0^p(x)}{t^{\alpha}}=-\infty.$$

This proves Proposition 2 for $v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$. We then pass to the limit $\tilde{\varepsilon} \to 0$ to conclude Proposition 2 for v.

Lemma 2. Let \mathcal{D} be a bounded domain \mathbb{R}^{n+1} and $u : \overline{\mathcal{D}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. For $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (-\infty, 0)$, we denote by v_p the α -parabolically p-concave envelope of \mathcal{D} and v^* the α -parabolically quasiconcave envelope of v in \mathcal{D} . Then $v_p \to v^*$ uniformly in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ as $p \to -\infty$.

Proof. The proof of similar to that of its elliptic counterpart [11, Theorem 4.3]. However, we present the full proof for the sake of completeness. We note that $v_p \searrow v^*$ pointwise in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ as $p \to -\infty$. For each p < 0, we take $\overline{z}_p = (\overline{x}_p, \overline{t}_p) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ such that $v_p(\overline{z}_p) - v^*(\overline{z}_p) = \max_{z \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} (v_p(z) - v^*(z))$. We also take $\mu_p = (\mu_{1,p}, \cdots, \mu_{n+2,p}) \in \mathbb{M}$ and $\{z_{i,p} = (x_{i,p}, t_{i,p})\}_{i=1}^{n+2}$ such that $\overline{x}_p = \sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i,p} x_{i,p}, \overline{t}_p = (\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i,p} t_{i,p}^{\alpha})^{1/\alpha}$ and $v_p(\overline{z}_p) = (\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i,p} v(z_{i,p})^p)^{1/p}$. Fixing q < 0, we have that for every p < q

$$v_p(\bar{z}_p) - v^*(\bar{z}_p) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i,p} v(z_{i,p})^p\right)^{1/p} - v^*(\bar{z}_p)$$
$$\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_{i,p} v(z_{i,p})^q\right)^{1/q} - \min\{v(z_{1,p}), \cdots, v(z_{n+2,p})\}.$$

Over a subsequence, $\mu_p \to \mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{n+2}) \in \mathbb{M}$ and $z_{i,p} \to z_i \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ as $p \to -\infty$. It then follows that

$$\limsup_{p \to -\infty} \max_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}} |v_p(z) - v^*(z)| = \limsup_{p \to -\infty} (v_p(\overline{z}_p) - v^*(\overline{z}_p))$$
$$\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+2} \mu_i v(z_i)^q\right)^{1/q} - \min\{v(z_1), \cdots, v(z_{n+2})\}.$$

Finally, by taking $q \rightarrow -\infty$, we conclude the lemma.

From Proposition 2 and Lemma 2, we immediately obtain the following subsolution property of the α -parabolically quasiconcave envelope of v.

10

Corollary 1. Let v be as in Lemma 1. Then, for any $\alpha \ge 1$, the α -parabolically quasiconcave envelope v^* of v satisfies

$$F(D^2v^*) - \partial_t v^* \ge h(v^*)$$
 in $\{v^* > 0\} \setminus (K \times [0, T]).$

4. Existence of a quasiconcave solution

The objective of this section is to prove Proposition 1 and utilize it to establish Theorem 1. To prove Proposition 1, we need some auxiliary results, Lemma 3 and Lemma 4.

Lemma 3. Let h, v_0 , K and R_0 be as in Proposition 1. Then there exists a nonnegative function v in $B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$ that satisfies

(4.1)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^2v) - \partial_t v = h(v) & in (B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, \infty), \\ v = v_0 & on \{t = 0\}, \\ v = 1 & in K \times [0, \infty), \\ v = 0 & on \partial B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, v satisfies the growth condition (2.5) *and the support condition* $\{v_0 > 0\} \times [0, \infty) \subset$ supp $v \subset B_{R_0} \times [0, \infty)$, and it is nondecreasing in time-variable in $B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$.

Proof. We split the proof into several steps.

Step 1 (Existence & growth condition): For $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ as in (2.1), we consider two functions v_{\sharp} and v^{\sharp} , satisfying

(4.2)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^2 v_{\sharp}) - \partial_t v_{\sharp} = \varepsilon_1^a \chi_{\{v_{\sharp}>0\}} & \text{in } B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty), \\ v_{\sharp} = v_0 & \text{on } \{t = 0\}, \\ v_{\sharp} = 1 & \text{in } K \times [0, \infty), \\ v_{\sharp} = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty), \end{cases}$$

and

(4.3)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^{2}v^{\sharp}) - \partial_{t}v^{\sharp} = 0 & \text{in } B_{R_{0}} \times (0, \infty), \\ v^{\sharp} = v_{0} & \text{on } \{t = 0\}, \\ v^{\sharp} = 1 & \text{in } K \times [0, \infty), \\ v^{\sharp} = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{R_{0}} \times (0, \infty), \end{cases}$$

respectively. We note that their existence follows from the standard Perron's method (smallest super-solution) and $v^{\sharp} \ge 0$ in $B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$ due to the minimum principle. We claim that

(4.4)
$$v_{\sharp} \ge 0 \text{ in } B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty).$$

To prove it by contradiction, we assume to the contrary for some $T \in (0, \infty)$

 $A := \{z \in (B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times [0, T) : v_{\sharp}(z) < 0\} \neq \emptyset.$

Clearly, $F(D^2v_{\sharp}) - \partial_t v_{\sharp} = 0$ in A. In addition, since $v_{\sharp} \ge 0$ on $\partial_p((B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times [0, T))$, we have $v_{\sharp} = 0$ on $\partial_p A$. Those violate the minimum principle.

To find a solution of (4.1) by making use of v_{\sharp} and v^{\sharp} , we use the penalization method adopted in [3]. Let $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ be compactly supported in [0, 1] with $\int_{0}^{1} \varphi(\rho) d\rho = 1$. For

 $\beta = \frac{2}{1-a} \in (1, 2)$ and a parameter $0 < \sigma_0 < 1$, define for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathcal{B}_{j}(s) := \int_{0}^{\frac{s-\sigma_{0}j^{-\beta}}{j^{-\beta}}} \varphi(\rho) d\rho, \quad s \in \mathbb{R},$$

and notice that \mathcal{B}_j is an approximation of the characteristic function $\chi_{(0,\infty)}$. For a Lipschitz function $h_j := \mathcal{B}_j h$, we then consider the problem

(4.5)
$$\begin{cases} F(D^2 v^j) - \partial_t v^j = h_j(v^j) & \text{in } (B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, \infty), \\ v^j = v_0 & \text{on } \{t = 0\}, \\ v^j = 1 & \text{in } K \times [0, \infty), \\ v^j = 0 & \text{in } \partial B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, v_{\sharp} and v^{\sharp} are sub- respectively supersolution to

(4.6)
$$F(D^2w) - \partial_t w = h_i(w) \quad \text{in } (B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$$

Let

$$S^{j} := \{ w \in C(B_{R_0} \times [0, \infty)) : v_{\sharp} \le w \le v^{\sharp} \text{ and } w \text{ is a supersolution of (4.6)} \}.$$

Then,

(4.7)
$$v^j := \inf_{w \in \mathbb{S}^j} w$$

is a solution of (4.6), see e.g. [25, Theorem 3.1]. From $v_{\sharp} \leq v^j \leq v^{\sharp}$, it is evident that v^j satisfies (4.5). Furthermore, utilizing $0 \leq h_j(v^j) \leq (v^j)^a \chi_{\{v^j>0\}}$, we can easily verify that the argument supporting the regularity of solutions to the regularized problem in [3] is applicable in our context. Since $v^j \leq 1$ by the maximum principle, there exists a constant C > 0, independent of j, such that

$$\sup_{Q_r(z_0)} v^j \le C r^{1+\gamma}$$

whenever $z_0 \in \partial \{v^j > 0\} \cap \{t > 0\}$ and $Q_r(z_0) \Subset (B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$. By the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, there exists a continuous function v in $(B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$ such that, along a subsequence, $v^j \to v$ uniformly on compact subsets of $(B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$. Letting v = 1in $K \times (0, \infty)$ and considering the uniform convergence and the fact that $v_{\sharp} \leq v^j \leq v^{\sharp}$, we deduce that v satisfies (4.1) and the growth condition (2.5).

Step 2 (Monotonicity): In this step, we establish that each solution v^j of (4.5) is nondecreasing in the time variable within $B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$. Notably, this property readily extends to v due to the uniform convergence $v^j \rightarrow v$. To demonstrate the monotonicity of v^j , we extend v_0 from \mathbb{R}^n to $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$ by

$$v_0(x,t) := v_0(x).$$

We first claim that

(4.8)
$$v^{j} \ge v_{0} \quad \text{in } \{v_{0} > 0\} \times (0, \infty).$$

To prove the claim, we assume to the contrary that for some T > 0, $A_0 := \{v^j < v_0\} \cap ((\{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K) \times (0, T])$ is nonempty. Since $v^j \ge v_0$ on $\partial_p((\{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K) \times (0, T])$, we have

 $v^j = v_0$ on $\partial_p A_0$. Moreover, observe that $h_j = \mathcal{B}_j h \le h$ as $0 \le \mathcal{B}_j \le 1$. This, along with the Lipschitz regularity of h_j , gives that for some constant $c_j > 0$, we have in A_0

$$\mathcal{M}^{+}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^{2}(v_{0}-v^{j})) - \partial_{t}(v_{0}-v^{j}) \geq (F(D^{2}v_{0}) - \partial_{t}v_{0}) - (F(D^{2}v^{j}) - \partial_{t}v^{j})$$

$$\geq h(v_{0}) - h_{j}(v^{j}) \geq h_{j}(v_{0}) - h_{j}(v^{j})$$

$$\geq -c_{j}(v_{0}-v^{j}).$$

Now consider the function

$$w(x,t) := e^{-c_j t} (v_0 - v^j)(x,t)$$

which satisfies w > 0 in A_0 and w = 0 on $\partial_v A_0$. Moreover, in A_0

$$\mathcal{M}^+_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2w) - \partial_t w = e^{-c_j t} \left(\mathcal{M}^+_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2(v_0 - v^j)) - \partial_t(v_0 - v^j) \right) + c_j e^{-c_j t} (v_0 - v^j) \ge 0.$$

These properties contradict the maximum principle, and hence (4.8) is proved.

Next, we consider translations of v^{j} in time: for $\rho > 0$

$$v_{\rho}^{j}(x,t) := v^{j}(x,t+\rho), \quad (x,t) \in B_{R_{0}} \times (0,\infty).$$

We claim that for every $\rho > 0$

(4.9)
$$v^j \le v^j_\rho \quad \text{in } B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty).$$

Notice that this assertion immediately implies the nondecreasing nature of v^j in time within $B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$, thereby completing the proof. To establish (4.9), we assume, for contradiction, that there exist $\rho > 0$ and T > 0 such that $A_{\rho} := v^j > v_{\rho}^j \cap ((B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, T)) \neq \emptyset$. Since $v_{\rho}^j \ge v^j$ on $\partial_p ((B_{R_0} \setminus K) \times (0, T))$ due to (4.8), it follows that $v_{\rho}^j = v^j$ on $\partial_p A_{\rho}$. Moreover, by using the Lipschitz continuity of h_j , we have in A_{ρ}

$$\mathcal{M}^+_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2(v^j - v^j_{\rho})) - \partial_t(v^j - v^j_{\rho}) \ge (F(D^2v^j) - \partial_tv^j) - (F(D^2v^j_{\rho}) - \partial_tv^j_{\rho})$$
$$= h_j(v^j) - h_j(v^j_{\rho}) \ge -c_j(v^j - v^j_{\rho}).$$

Then, for

$$w_{\rho}(x,t) := e^{-c_j t} (v^j - v_{\rho}^j)(x,t),$$

we can argue as above to get

$$\begin{cases} w_{\rho} > 0 \ , \ \mathcal{M}^{+}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^{2}w_{\rho}) - \partial_{t}w_{\rho} \ge 0 & \text{in } A_{\rho}, \\ w_{\rho} = 0 & \text{on } \partial_{p}A_{\rho} \end{cases}$$

This contradicts the maximum principle.

Step 3 (Support condition): In this step, we show $\{v_0 > 0\} \times [0, \infty) \subset \text{supp } v \subset B_{R_0} \times [0, \infty)$. The first inclusion simply follows from the monotonicity of v in time. For the second inclusion, it is sufficient to prove

(4.10)
$$v(x,t) \le v_{\infty}(x) \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : v_{\infty}(x) > 0\} \times (0,\infty).$$

To prove (4.10), let $\{v_{\infty}^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be as in (2.3). We extend v_{∞} and v_{∞}^k from \mathbb{R}^n to $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$ by

$$v_{\infty}(x,t) := v_{\infty}(x), \quad v_{\infty}^{k}(x,t) := v_{\infty}^{k}(x).$$

For small $\varepsilon > 0$, we write $A_{k,\varepsilon} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : v_{\infty}^k(x) > \varepsilon\}$. We claim

(4.11)
$$v_{\infty}^{k} > v \quad \text{in } A_{k,\varepsilon} \times (0,\infty).$$

Indeed, since $v_{\infty}^k > v_0 = v$ on the compact set $\overline{A_{k,\varepsilon}} \times \{0\}$, we have by continuity

(4.12)
$$v_{\infty}^k > v \quad \text{in } \overline{A_{k,\varepsilon}} \times [0, T_0) \quad \text{for some } T_0 > 0.$$

Suppose the claim (4.11) is not true. Then, due to (4.12), we can find a point $(x^0, t^0) \in (A_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$ such that $v_{\infty}^k = v > 0$ at (x^0, t^0) and $v_{\infty}^k > v$ in $A_{k,\varepsilon} \times (0, t^0)$. In particular, we have $v_{\infty}^k - v \ge 0$ in an open set $D := ((A_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus K) \times (0, t^0)) \cap \{v > 0\}$. Moreover, using the monotonicity of h, we obtain that in D

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}(v_{\infty}^{k}-v)) - \partial_{t}(v_{\infty}^{k}-v) \leq (F(D^{2}v_{\infty}^{k}) - \partial_{t}v_{\infty}^{k}) - (F(D^{2}v) - \partial_{t}v)$$
$$= h(v_{\infty}^{k}) - h(v) \leq 0.$$

Then, the strong minimum principle implies that $v_{\infty}^{k} = v$ in *D*. This contradicts (4.12), and hence the claim (4.11) is proved.

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, (4.11) gives that $v_{\infty}^k > v$ in $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : v_{\infty}^k(x) > 0\} \times (0, \infty)$. Taking $k \to \infty$, we conclude (4.10).

Lemma 4. Let $v \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative function which is nondecreasing in time and satisfies (2.4). Then

$$\operatorname{supp} v \cap \{t = 0\} = \operatorname{supp} v_0$$

Proof. We first claim that each time section of supp v is connected. Assuming the contrary, suppose the claim is not true. Then, due to the monotonicity of v, we can find $t_1 > 0$ such that a connected component of a time section supp $v \cap \{t = t_1\}$, say $A_1 \times \{t_1\}$, satisfies $A_1 \cap \text{supp } v_0 = \emptyset$. For $A_1 := (\text{Int } A_1 \times (0, t_1)) \cap \{v > 0\}$, this implies that v = 0 on $\partial_p A_1$. On the other hand, v > 0 and $F(D^2v) - \partial_t v = h(v) > 0$ in A_1 . Those violate the maximum principle.

Now, we observe that the monotonicity of v gives $\sup p v \cap \{t = 0\} \supset \sup p v_0$. To prove the reverse inclusion, we assume to the contrary that $A_2 := \operatorname{Int} (\sup p v \cap \{t = 0\}) \setminus \sup v_0$ is a nonempty open set in \mathbb{R}^n . Notice that A_2 is connected due to the claim above. By the monotonicity of v, we have v > 0 in $A_2 \times (0, \infty)$. Since v = 0 on $\overline{A_2} \times \{0\}$, we can find a small constant $t_2 > 0$ such that $v < \varepsilon_1$ in $A_2 \times (0, t_2)$, where $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ is as in (2.1). Then

$$F(D^2v) = \partial_t v + h(v) \ge \varepsilon_1^a \quad \text{in } A_2 \times (0, t_2).$$

By the nondegeneracy, there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{A_2 \times \{s\}} v \ge c_0 \quad \text{for every } 0 < s < t_2.$$

Taking $s \to 0$ gives $\sup_{A_2} v_0 \ge c_0$, which is a contradiction since $v_0 = 0$ in A_2 .

Now we prove Proposition 1 by making use of Lemmas 3 and 4.

Proof of Proposition 1. Let $v \in C(B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty))$ be a function as in Lemma 3. We extend v to $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ by letting $v \equiv 0$ in $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{R_0}) \times (0, \infty)$. Then, from the support condition supp $v \subset B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$ and the growth condition (2.5), we see that v satisfies (2.4). In view of Lemma 3, it remains to prove the space-time quasiconcavity of v. To this aim, let v^* be the space-time quasiconcave envelope of v, which, by Corollary 1, is a subsolution of

$$F(D^2v^*) - \partial_t v^* = h(v^*) \quad \text{in } \{v^* > 0\} \setminus (K \times (0, \infty)).$$

As v^* is space-time quasiconcave and $v^* \ge v$, it is sufficient to prove $v \ge v^*$. We will use the Lavrentiev Principle to achieve this. We assume without loss of generality that the

origin 0 is contained in K° , the interior of *K*. We define for T > 1 and $0 < \rho < 1$

$$D_T := \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T] : v(x,t) > 0\}, \quad D_T^* := \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T] : v^*(x,t) > 0\}, \\ v^{\rho}(x,t) := v(\rho x, \rho^2 t), \quad D_T^{\rho} := \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T] : v^{\rho}(x,t) > 0\},$$

and let

$$E_T := \{0 < \rho < 1 : v^{\rho} \ge v^* \text{ in } D_T^*\}$$

Notice that both D_T and D_T^* are bounded since v restricted to $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$ has a compact support. As $v_0 : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a nonnegative compactly supported function satisfying $F(D^2v_0) \ge h(v_0) > 0$ in $\{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K$ and $v_0 = 1$ in K, the maximum principle gives $0 \le v_0 \le 1$ in \mathbb{R}^n . This in turn implies by the maximum principle $0 \le v \le 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$, and hence $0 \le v^* \le 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$. On the other hand, the assumption $0 \in K^\circ$ guarantees that $D_T^* \subset (\rho^{-1}K) \times (0, T]$ for small $\rho > 0$. Since $v^\rho = 1$ in $(\rho^{-1}K) \times (0, T]$, we have $v^\rho \ge v^*$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T]$ for such $\rho > 0$, and hence $E_T \ne \emptyset$. Note that our desired inequality $v \ge v^*$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ follows once we show that $\sup E_T = 1$ for every T > 1. Now, we assume towards a contradiction that for some T > 1, $\rho_0 := \sup E_T \in (0, 1)$.

We claim that there is a point $z^0 \in \overline{D_T^*} \setminus (K \times [0, T])$ such that $v^{\rho_0}(z^0) = v^*(z^0)$. To prove it by contradiction, suppose that $v^{\rho_0} > v^*$ in $\overline{D_T^*} \setminus (K \times [0, T])$. For a fixed $\tilde{\rho}_0 \in (\rho_0, 1)$, we have $v^{\rho_0} > v^*$ in a smaller compact set $\overline{D_T^*} \setminus (\tilde{\rho}_0^{-1}K^\circ \times [0, T])$. By continuity, there exists $\rho_1 \in (\rho_0, \tilde{\rho}_0)$ such that $v^{\rho_1} \ge v^*$ in $\overline{D_T^*} \setminus (\tilde{\rho}_0^{-1}K^\circ \times [0, T])$. Since $v^{\rho_1} = 1 \ge v^*$ in $\rho_1^{-1}K \times [0, T]$ and $\rho_1^{-1}K \times [0, T] \supset \tilde{\rho}_0^{-1}K^\circ \times [0, T]$, we have $v^{\rho_1} \ge v^*$ in $\overline{D_T^*}$, contradicting $\rho_0 = \sup E_T$.

Now we consider the following three possibilities.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} : & z^{0} \in \left(D_{T}^{*} \setminus (K \times [0, T])\right) \cap \{t = 0\}, \\ \mathbf{B} : & z^{0} \in \left(\overline{D_{T}^{*}} \setminus (K \times [0, T])\right) \cap \{t > 0\} \text{ and } v^{*}(z^{0}) = v^{\rho_{0}}(z^{0}) > 0, \\ \mathbf{C} : & z^{0} \in \left(\overline{D_{T}^{*}} \setminus (K \times [0, T])\right) \cap \{t > 0\} \text{ and } v^{*}(z^{0}) = v^{\rho_{0}}(z^{0}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case **A**. We first consider the case $z^0 = (x^0, 0) \in \{t = 0\}$. Using the fact that $\tilde{v}^*(x, t) := v^*(x, t^{1/\alpha})$ is space-time quasiconcave in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$, it is easy to see that $v^*(\cdot, 0)$ is the quasiconcave envelope of $v(\cdot, 0)$ in \mathbb{R}^n . This, along with the quasiconcavity assumption on v_0 , implies that $v^* = v_0 = v$ on $\{t = 0\}$. We further split into two cases

either
$$v^*(z^0) = v^{\rho_0}(z^0) = 0$$
 or $v^*(z^0) = v^{\rho_0}(z^0) > 0$.

Case **A.1**. Suppose $v^*(x^0, 0) = v^{\rho_0}(x^0, 0) = 0$. Note that this is equivalent to $v_0(x^0) = v_0(\rho_0 x^0) = 0$. Since supp v^* is the convex hull of supp v, we have by Lemma 4 that supp $v^* \cap \{t = 0\} = \text{supp } v_0$. Thus, it follows that both x^0 and $\rho_0 x^0$ are contained on $\partial \{v_0 > 0\}$. This is a contradiction since $\{v_0 > 0\}$ is a convex set containing the origin.

Case **A.2**. Next, we suppose $\alpha_0 := v^*(x^0, 0) = v^{\rho_0}(x^0, 0) > 0$. Since $v_0(x^0) = v_0(\rho_0 x^0) = \alpha_0$ and v_0 is quasiconcave, we have $v_0 = \alpha_0$ on the line $l := [\rho_0 x^0, x^0]$. This, combined with the fact that both $\{v_0 \ge \alpha_0\}$ and $\{v_0 > \alpha_0\}$ are convex sets, implies that $\{v_0 = \alpha_0\} = \{v_0 \ge \alpha_0\} \setminus \{v_0 > \alpha_0\}$ is an *n*-dimensional convex ring/shell containing a nonempty open set. This is a contradiction since $F(D^2v_0) > 0$ in $\{v_0 > 0\} \setminus K$.

Case **B**. Suppose $z^0 \in (\overline{D_T^*} \setminus (K \times [0, T])) \cap \{t > 0\}$ and $v^*(z^0) = v^{\rho_0}(z^0) > 0$. Then $z^0 \in (D_T^* \cap D_T^{\rho_0}) \setminus (K \times [0, T])$. Since *h* is strictly positive in $(0, \infty)$, we have $h(v^*(z^0)) = h(v^{\rho_0}(z^0)) > 0$.

 $\rho_0^2 h(v^{\rho_0}(z^0))$. By continuity, we further have $h(v^*) > \rho_0^2 h(v^{\rho_0})$ in $Q_r(z^0) \subset (D_T^* \cap D_T^{\rho_0}) \setminus (K \times (0, T])$ for some small r > 0. It follows that

$$F(D^2v^*) - \partial_t v^* \ge h(v^*) > \rho_0^2 h(v^{\rho_0}) = F(D^2v^{\rho_0}) - \partial_t v^{\rho_0} \quad \text{in } Q_r(z^0),$$

which yields

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}(v^{\rho_{0}}-v^{*})) - \partial_{t}(v^{\rho_{0}}-v^{*}) \leq (F(D^{2}v^{\rho_{0}}) - \partial_{t}v^{\rho_{0}}) - (F(D^{2}v^{*}) - \partial_{t}v^{*}) < 0 \quad \text{in } Q_{r}(z^{0}).$$

On the other hand, we have $v^{\rho_0} - v^* \ge 0$ in $Q_r(z^0)$ by the definition of ρ_0 , and thus $v^{\rho_0} - v^*$ attains a local minimum at z^0 . Therefore, by the strong minimum principle, we get $v^{\rho_0} - v^* \equiv 0$ in $Q_r(z^0)$. This contradicts the strict inequality $\mathcal{M}^-_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2(v^{\rho_0} - v^*)) - \partial_t(v^{\rho_0} - v^*) < 0$.

Case **C**. Next, we consider the case when $z^0 = (x^0, t^0) \in (\overline{D_T^*} \setminus (K \times [0, T])) \cap \{t > 0\}$ and $v^*(z^0) = v^{\rho_0}(z^0) = 0$. Notice that $z^0 \in \partial \{v^* > 0\} \cap \partial \{v^{\rho_0} > 0\} \cap \{t > 0\}$. For $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ as in (2.1), we can find by continuity small r > 0 such that $0 < v^* \le v^{\rho_0} \le \varepsilon_1$ in $Q_r(z^0) \cap D_T^*$. Then $h(v^*) = h(v^{\rho_0}) = \varepsilon_1^a$ in $Q_r(z^0) \cap D_T^*$, thus we can proceed as in Case **B** to obtain

(4.13)
$$\mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2(v^{\rho_0} - v^*)) - \partial_t(v^{\rho_0} - v^*) < 0 \quad \text{in } Q_r(z^0) \cap D^*_T$$

This implies $v^{\rho_0} > v^*$ in $Q_r(z^0) \cap D_T^*$, otherwise $v^{\rho_0} - v^*$ has a local minimum and we can argue as in Case **B** to get a contradiction.

We claim that there exist a spatial vector $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a constant $\tau \ge 0$ such that for any small $\eta > 0$, we can construct a spatial cone $C_{\eta,\mu}^{x^0} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{x-x^0}{|x-x^0|} \cdot \frac{\mu}{|\mu|} > \eta \right\}$ and an oblique cylinder

$$\mathcal{E}_{\eta,\mu,\tau}^{z^0} := \{ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : t \in (t^0 - 1, t^0], x \in \mathcal{C}_{\eta,\mu}^{x^0} + \tau(t^0 - t)\mu \}$$

satisfying

(4.14)
$$\mathcal{E}_{\eta,\mu,\tau}^{z^0} \cap Q_r(z^0) \subset D_T^*$$
 for a small constant $r > 0$.

Suppose now the claim is true. We let *w* be a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2w) - \partial_t w = 0 & \text{ in } \mathcal{E}^{z^0}_{\eta,\mu,\tau} \cap Q_r(z^0), \\ w = 0 & \text{ on } \partial_p \mathcal{E}^{z^0}_{\eta,\mu,\tau} \cap Q_r(z^0), \\ w = v^{\rho_0} - v^* & \text{ on } \mathcal{E}^{z^0}_{\eta,\mu,\tau} \cap \partial_p Q_r(z^0). \end{cases}$$

By using (4.13) and that $v^{\rho_0} > v^*$ in $Q_r(z^0) \cap D^*_T$, we can apply the comparison principle to deduce $w \le v^{\rho_0} - v^*$ in $\mathcal{E}^{z^0}_{\eta,\mu,\tau} \cap Q_r(z^0)$. Thus, by taking $\eta > 0$ small enough, we have by Lemma 6 in Appendix A that for s > 0 small

(4.15)
$$\sup_{(B_{s}(x^{0})\times\{t^{0}\})\cap\mathcal{E}^{z^{0}}_{\eta,\mu,\tau}}(v^{\rho_{0}}-v^{*})\geq \sup_{(B_{s}(x^{0})\times\{t^{0}\})\cap\mathcal{E}^{z^{0}}_{\eta,\mu,\tau}}w\geq cs^{3/2}.$$

On the other hand, we notice that v^{ρ_0} solves $F(D^2 v^{\rho_0}) - \partial_t v^{\rho_0} = \rho_0^2 h(v^{\rho_0})$ in $Q_r(z^0) \cap D_T^{\rho_0}$. Since $h = \varepsilon_1^a$ on $(0, \varepsilon_1)$ and $v^{\rho_0}(z^0) = 0$, v^{ρ_0} belongs to $C_x^{1,1} \cap C_t^{0,1}$ inside $Q_s(z^0) \cap D_T^{\rho_0}$ for small s > 0, see e.g. [13]. Thus, $\sup_{(B_s(x^0) \times \{t^0\}) \cap \varepsilon_{\eta,\mu,\pi}^{z^0}} v^{\rho_0} \le cs^2$ for small s > 0, which contradicts (4.15).

To close the argument, we need to prove the claim (4.14). By the Caratheodory's theorem (see also [5, 10]), z^0 can be written as a (space-time) convex combination of points z^1, \dots, z^k , with $k \le n + 1$, such that $z^i \in \partial \{v > 0\}$, $1 \le i \le k$, and there exists a hyperplane Π in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} supporting $\partial \{v^* > 0\}$ at z^0 and $\partial \{v > 0\}$ at z^i , $1 \le i \le k$. Since $v^* = 1$

on $\{\mathbf{0}\} \times (0, \infty)$ and $z^0 \in \partial \{v^* > 0\}$ with $x^0 \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $t^0 > 0$, we have by the space-time quasiconcavity of v^*

$$v^* > 0$$
 in $\{(s_1 x^0, s_2 t^0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty) : s_2 > 0, 0 < s_1 < \min\{s_2, 1\}\}$

This implies that if $v = (v_{x^0}, v_{t^0})$ is the unit normal to Π pointing towards $\{v^* > 0\}$ at z^0 and $\partial\{v > 0\}$ at z^i , then v cannot be parallel to (0, 1), i.e., $v_{x^0} \neq 0$.

Next, we observe that from (2.1) and (2.4), v can be seen as a nonnegative solution of

$$F(D^2v) - \partial_t v = \varepsilon_1^a \chi_{\{v>0\}}$$
 near each free boundary point on $\partial\{v>0\}$.

Thus $\partial \{v > 0\} \cap \{t > 0\}$ is locally C^1 in space-time near points satisfying a thickness condition on $\{v = 0\}$, see e.g., [13]. As $z^0 \in \{t > 0\}$, at least one of $z^{i'}$ s are contained in $\{t > 0\}$, say z^1 . It then follows that $\partial \{v > 0\}$ is C^1 in space-time near z^1 . This allows us to construct an *n*-dimensional spatial cone $C_{\eta,\nu,0}^{x^1}$ such that for large $\tau_0 > 0$ and small $r_1 > 0$,

(4.16)
$$\mathcal{E}_{\eta,\nu_{x^{0}},\tau_{0}}^{z^{1}} \cap Q_{r_{1}}(z^{1}) \subset \{v > 0\} \subset \{v^{*} > 0\}$$

Here, τ_0 can be chosen independently of η , as the requirement for τ_0 is that the "slope" of the oblique cylinder $\mathcal{E}_{\eta,\nu_{\chi^0},\tau_0}^{z^1}$ is less than that of the hyperplane Π . This condition can be expressed analytically as

$$\frac{1}{\tau_0|\nu_{x^0}|} < \frac{|\nu_{x^0}|}{|\nu_{t^0}|}.$$

Recall we have showed $v_{x^0} \neq 0$.

Now, since $\{v^* > 0\}$ is a convex set and z^0 is a convex combination of $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^k$, (4.16) implies (4.14).

We are now ready to prove our main result, Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. For large $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $g^i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined by

$$g^{i}(s) := \begin{cases} 0, & -\infty < s \le 0, \\ (1/2)^{ia}, & 0 < s < (1/2)^{i}, \\ s^{a}, & s \ge (1/2)^{i}. \end{cases}$$

Note that $g^i \nearrow g$ as $i \to \infty$ and $F(D^2u_0) \ge g(u_0) \ge g^i(u_0)$. Moreover, we consider a sequence of nonnegative compactly supported functions u^i_{∞} satisfying (2.2) with g^i and u_0 in the place of h and v_0 , respectively. Since $0 \le u^i_{\infty} \le 1$ by the maximum principle, we have

$$F(D^2 u_{\infty}^i) = g^i(u_{\infty}^i) \ge 1 \text{ in } \{u_{\infty}^i > 0\}.$$

Thus, the non-degeneracy gives that supp $u_{\infty}^{i} \subset B_{R_{0}}$ for some $R_{0} > 0$, independent of *i*.

Now, thanks to Proposition 1, for each *i* there exists a nonnegative space-time quasiconcave function u^i which satisfies the regularized problem

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2u^i) - \partial_t u^i = g^i(u^i) & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty), \\ u^i = u_0 & \text{on } \{t = 0\}, \\ |\nabla u| = u = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega_i \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)), \\ u^i = 1 & \text{in } K \times [0, \infty), \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega_i = \{u^i > 0\}$. Moreover, each u^i is monotone in time and satisfies (2.5) and $\{u_0 > 0\} \times (0, \infty) \subset \Omega_i \subset B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$. Since $g^i \ge 0$ and u_0 is bounded above by 1, we have by the maximum principle that $0 \le u^i \le 1$ in $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$. By the Arzelà-Ascoli

Theorem, there exists a nonnegative continuous function u in $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$ such that over a subsequence $u^i \to u$ uniformly on compact subsets of $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$. From the convergence $g^i \to g$ in every compact subset of $(0, \infty)$, we infer that u is a space-time quasiconcave function which is nondecreasing in time and satisfies $F(D^2u) - \partial_t u = g(u)$ in $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \times (0, \infty)$. Clearly, $\{u > 0\} \subset B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$. In addition, for v^{\sharp} as in (4.3) with the initial value v_0 replaced by u_0 , we have $u^i \leq v^{\sharp}$; see Step 1 in the proof of Lemma 3. This, along with the monotonicity of u^i , yields $u_0(x) \leq u^i(x, t) \leq v^{\sharp}(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in B_{R_0} \times (0, \infty)$. Taking $i \to \infty$ and letting $u \equiv 1$ in $K^{\circ} \times (0, \infty)$, we get u = 1 in $K \times [0, \infty)$, $u = u_0$ on $\{t = 0\}$ and $\{u_0 > 0\} \times (0, \infty) \subset \{u > 0\}$. Finally, the growth condition (2.5) for u^i and the uniform convergence $u^i \to u$ give $|\nabla u| = u = 0$ on $\partial \Omega \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$. This completes the proof. \Box

Appendix A. Nondegeneracy

In this section, we derive the nondegeneracy result for the parabolic equation involving Pucci operator, following the argument for the elliptic counterpart in [1].

We use the same notation $D_{L,R}$ as in [1] for Lipschitz domains in \mathbb{R}^n :

$$D_{L,R} := \{ (x', x_n) \in B_R : x_n > f(x') \},\$$

where *f* is a Lipschitz function with constant at most *L* and satisfies f(0) = 0. For such $D_{L,R}$ and a constant $\tau \ge 0$, we define

$$E_{L,R,\tau} := \{ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : t \in (-1,0], x \in D_{L,R} - \tau te_n \}.$$

Lemma 5. For any $\tau \ge 0$, there exist small constants $\eta > 0$, $\kappa_* > 0$ and $c_* > 0$, depending only on n, λ , Λ , τ , such that if u satisfies

(A.1)

$$\begin{cases}
(a) \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}u) - \partial_{t}u = 0 & \text{in } E_{L,1,\tau}, \\
(b) u \ge 0 & \text{in } E_{L,1,\tau}, \\
(c) u(e_{n}/2, -\kappa_{*}) \ge 1, \\
(d) L \le \eta,
\end{cases}$$

then $u(x, t) \ge c_* x_n$ whenever $(x, t) \in E_{L,1/16,\tau}$, $x_n \ge 2\eta$ and $-(64\eta)^2 \le t \le 0$.

Proof. We divide the proof of this lemma into a few of steps.

Step 1. We define a spatial cone $\mathcal{C} := \{x \in (x', x_n) \in B_1 : x_n > \frac{1}{8}|x'|\}$ and an oblique cylinder $\mathcal{E}_{\tau} := \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : t \in (-1, 0], x \in \mathcal{C} - \tau te_n\}$, and notice that $\mathcal{E}_{\tau} \subset E_{L,1,\tau}$ whenever $L \le \eta \le 1/16$. We take $0 < \kappa < 1/8$ small, depending only on τ , such that

$$B_{3/8}(e_n/2)\times [-\kappa,0]\subset \mathcal{E}_{\tau}.$$

By Harnack inequality (Theorem 2.4.32 in [14]), we have for some constant $c_1 = c_1(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$

$$\inf_{Q_{\kappa}(e_{n}/2,0)} u \ge c_{1} \sup \left\{ u(x,t) : |x - e_{n}/2| < \frac{\kappa}{2\sqrt{2}}, -\kappa + \frac{3}{8}\kappa^{2} < t < -\kappa + \frac{1}{2}\kappa^{2} \right\}$$

By taking $\kappa_* := \kappa - \frac{1}{2}\kappa^2$ and using (*c*) in (A.1), we further have

$$\inf_{Q_{\kappa}(e_n/2,0)} u \geq c_1$$

We let $\phi(x) := |x|^{-q}$ for some large constant q > 0 to be determined later, and consider a function

$$h(x,t) := c_1 \frac{\left(1 + \frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^2} t\right)^q \phi(x - e_n/2) - (3/8)^{-q}}{\kappa^{-q} - (3/8)^{-q}}$$

and a set

$$A := \{ (x,t) \in Q_1 : -\kappa^2 \le t \le 0, \ 0 \le h(x,t) \le c_1 \}.$$

Here, the function h and the set A are constructed so that

(A.2)
$$A \in E_{L,1,\tau}$$
 and $u \ge h$ on $\partial_p A$.

Indeed, one can easily see that

$$A = \left\{ (x,t) : -\kappa^2 \le t \le 0, \ \kappa \left(1 + \frac{1 - \frac{8\kappa}{3}}{\kappa^2} t \right) \le |x - e_n/2| \le 3/8 \left(1 + \frac{1 - \frac{8\kappa}{3}}{\kappa^2} t \right) \right\}.$$

Thus, each time slice of *A* at time t, $-\kappa^2 \le t \le 0$, is an annulus centered at $e_n/2$, and the annuli shrink as time t decreases. In particular,

$$A \cap \{t = 0\} = (B_{3/8}(e_n/2) \setminus B_{\kappa}(e_n/2)) \times \{0\},\$$

$$A \cap \{t = -\kappa^2\} = (B_{\kappa}(e_n/2) \setminus B_{8\kappa^2/3}(e_n/2)) \times \{-\kappa^2\}.$$

This readily gives

$$A \subset B_{3/8}(e_n/2) \times [-\kappa^2, 0] \Subset \mathcal{E}_{\tau} \subset E_{L,1,\tau}$$

In addition, the lateral boundary $\partial_p A \cap \{-\kappa^2 < t \le 0\}$ consists of the following two surfaces:

the outer surface
$$S_1 = \{(x, t) \in Q_1 : -\kappa^2 < t \le 0, h(x, t) = 0\}$$
,
the inner surface $S_2 = \{(x, t) \in Q_1 : -\kappa^2 < t \le 0, h(x, t) = c_1\}$.

Notice that both S_1 and S_2 are lateral boundaries of conical frustums. The parabolic boundary $\partial_p A$ is composed of S_1 , S_2 and the bottom $\partial_p A \cap \{t = -\kappa^2\}$. On S_1 , we simply have $h = 0 \le u$. Regarding S_2 and $\partial_p A \cap \{t = -\kappa^2\}$, as they are contained in $\overline{Q_{\kappa}(e_n/2, 0)}$ and $h \le c_1$ in A, we have $h \le c_1 \le u$ on $S_2 \cup (\partial_p A \cap \{t = -\kappa^2\})$. Hence, (A.2) holds.

Next, we show that *h* is a subsolution in *A*. For this purpose, we compute that in $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$

$$D^2\phi(x) = q|x|^{-q-2}\left(\frac{q+2}{|x|^2}x \otimes x - I_n\right),$$

and thus

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2\phi) &\geq q|x|^{-q-2} \left(\frac{q+2}{|x|^2} \mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(x\otimes x) + \mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(-I_n) \right) \\ &= q|x|^{-q-2} \left(\lambda(q+2) - \Lambda n \right). \end{split}$$

It follows that in *A*

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}h) &- \partial_{t}h \\ &= c_{1} \frac{\left(1 + \frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^{2}}t\right)^{q}}{\kappa^{-q} - (3/8)^{-q}} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}\phi(x - e_{n}/2)) - \partial_{t}h \\ &\geq c_{1} \frac{\left(1 + \frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^{2}}t\right)^{q}}{\kappa^{-q} - (3/8)^{-q}} q |x - e_{n}/2|^{-q-2} \left(\lambda(q + 2) - \Lambda n\right) \\ &- c_{1} \frac{\phi(x - e_{n}/2)}{\kappa^{-q} - (3/8)^{-q}} q \left(1 + \frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^{2}}t\right)^{q-1} \left(\frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^{2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{c_{1}q|x - e_{n}/2|^{-q-2}}{\kappa^{-q} - (3/8)^{-q}} \left(1 + \frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^{2}}t\right)^{q-1} \times \\ &\times \left[\left(1 + \frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^{2}}t\right) (\lambda(q + 2) - \Lambda n) - |x - e_{n}/2|^{2} \left(\frac{1 - 8\kappa/3}{\kappa^{2}}\right) \right]. \end{split}$$

Here, if *q* is large, then we have

$$\begin{split} \Big(1+\frac{1-8\kappa/3}{\kappa^2}t\Big)(\lambda(q+2)-\Lambda n)-|x-e_n/2|^2\Big(\frac{1-8\kappa/3}{\kappa^2}\Big)\\ \geq \Big(\frac{8\kappa}{3}\Big)(\lambda(q+2)-\Lambda n)-\frac{(3/8)^2}{\kappa^2}>0, \end{split}$$

thus

$$\mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2h) - \partial_t h \ge 0 = \mathcal{M}^{-}_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2u) - \partial_t u \quad \text{in } A$$

With this and (A.2) at hand, we can apply the comparison principle and get

 $u \ge h$ in A.

Step 2. Let

$$c_0 := c_1 \frac{(11/32)^{-q} - (3/8)^{-q}}{\kappa^{-q} - (3/8)^{-q}} \in (0, c_1).$$

Then $A_0 := \{(x, t) \in Q_1 : -\kappa^2 \le t \le 0, c_0 < h(x, t) < c_1\}$ satisfies the following:

$$A_0 \subset A$$
, $u \ge h > c_0$ in A_0 , $A_0 \cap \{t = 0\} = (B_{11/32}(e_n/2) \setminus B_{\kappa}(e_n/2)) \times \{t = 0\}.$

Fix a point $(y, 0) = (y', y_n, 0)$ with $|y'| \le 1/16$ and $y_n = 1/4$. For $r := 1/4 - \eta$, we define

$$h_y(x,t) := c_0 \frac{\left(1 + \frac{1 - \tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^2} t\right)^q \tilde{\phi}(x-y) - r^{-\tilde{q}}}{\tilde{\kappa}^{-\tilde{q}} - r^{-\tilde{q}}}$$

in

$$A_y := \{ (x, t) \in Q_1 : -\tilde{\kappa}^2 \le t \le 0, \ 0 < h_y(x, t) < c_0 \}.$$

Here, $\tilde{\kappa}$ and \tilde{q} are small constants, depending only on n, λ , Λ , τ , to be determined later, and $\tilde{\phi}(x) := |x|^{-\tilde{q}}$. Then,

$$\begin{split} A_y &\subset \{(x,t) \in Q_1 \ : \ -\tilde{\kappa}^2 \le t \le 0, \ 0 < h_y(x,t)\} \\ &= \{(x,t) \in Q_1 \ : \ -\tilde{\kappa}^2 \le t \le 0, \ |x-y| < r + \frac{r - \tilde{\kappa}}{\tilde{\kappa}^2}t\} \\ &\subset \{(x,t) \in Q_1 \ : \ -\tilde{\kappa}^2 \le t \le 0, \ |x-y| < r + \frac{t}{\tilde{\kappa}}\}. \end{split}$$

This, along with the fact that $r = 1/4 - \eta < |y|$, implies that $A_y \in E_{L,1,\tau}$ for small $\tilde{\kappa} > 0$. Moreover, as before, the lateral boundary $\partial_p A_y \cap \{-\tilde{\kappa}^2 < t \le 0\}$ consists of two conical cylinder-shaped surfaces. On the outer surface, we simply have $h_y = 0 \le u$. Concerning the inner surface $S_y := \{(x, t) \in Q_1 : -\tilde{\kappa}^2 \le t \le 0, h_y(x, t) = c_0\}$, we observe that

$$S_{y} \cap \{t = 0\} = B_{\tilde{\kappa}}(y) \times \{0\} \subset (B_{11/32}(e_{n}/2) \setminus B_{\kappa}(e_{n}/2)) \times \{0\} = A_{0} \cap \{t = 0\},$$

where the inclusion holds whenever $\kappa + \tilde{\kappa} < 1/8$. Thus, if $\tilde{\kappa}$ is small enough, then we have $S_y \Subset A_0$, and thus $h_y = c_0 \le u$ in S_y . Similarly, from $\partial_p A_y \cap \{t = -\tilde{\kappa}^2\} = (B_{\tilde{\kappa}}(y) \setminus B_{\tilde{\kappa}^2/r}(y)) \times \{-\tilde{\kappa}^2\}$ and $B_{\tilde{\kappa}}(y) \subset B_{11/32}(e_n/2) \setminus B_{\kappa}(e_n/2)$, we infer that $\partial_p A_y \cap \{t = -\tilde{\kappa}^2\} \subset A_0$ for $\tilde{\kappa}$ small enough, and hence $h_y \le c_0 \le u$ on $\partial_p A_y \cap \{t = -\tilde{\kappa}^2\}$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$h_y \leq u \quad \text{on } \partial_p A_y.$$

In addition, we can compute (as we have done for $\mathcal{M}^-_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2h) - \partial_t h$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^{-}(D^{2}h_{y}) - \partial_{t}h_{y} &\geq \frac{c_{0}\tilde{q}|x-y|^{-\tilde{q}-2}}{\tilde{\kappa}^{-\tilde{q}} - r^{-\tilde{q}}} \left(1 + \frac{1-\tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^{2}}t\right)^{q-1} \times \\ &\times \left[\left(1 + \frac{1-\tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^{2}}t\right) (\lambda(\tilde{q}+2) - \Lambda n) - |x-y|^{2} \frac{1-\tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^{2}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

in A_y . Using that $r = 1/4 - \eta \in (1/8, 1/4)$, we can obtain that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\lambda,\Lambda}(D^2h_y) - \partial_t h_y \ge 0$ in A_y if $\tilde{q} = \tilde{q}(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \tilde{\kappa})$ is large enough. Thus, by the comparison principle,

$$u \ge h_y \quad \text{in } A_y$$

Step 3. Now, we are ready to prove Lemma 5. For *y* as above (i.e., $|y'| \le 1/16$ and $y_n = 1/4$), let (*x*, *t*) be a point satisfying x' = y', $2\eta < x_n < 1/4 - \tilde{\kappa}$ and $-(64\eta)^2 \le t \le 0$. Then (*x*, *t*) $\in A_y$ for small $\eta > 0$. Thus

$$\begin{split} u(x,t) &\geq h_{y}(x,t) \\ &= \frac{c_{0}}{\tilde{\kappa}^{-\tilde{q}} - r^{-\tilde{q}}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1 - \tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^{2}} t \right)^{\tilde{q}} |x - y|^{-\tilde{q}} - r^{-\tilde{q}} \right] \\ &\geq c_{0} \tilde{\kappa}^{\tilde{q}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1 - \tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^{2}} t \right)^{\tilde{q}} |x - y|^{-\tilde{q}} - r^{-\tilde{q}} \right] \\ &= c_{0} \tilde{\kappa}^{\tilde{q}} \left(|x - y|^{-\tilde{q}} - r^{-\tilde{q}} \right) - c_{0} \tilde{\kappa}^{\tilde{q}} \left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{1 - \tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^{2}} t \right)^{\tilde{q}} \right) |x - y|^{-\tilde{q}} \\ &=: I - II. \end{split}$$

Using $x_n \ge 2\eta$, we get

$$I = c_0 \tilde{\kappa}^{\tilde{q}} \left((1/4 - x_n)^{-\tilde{q}} - (1/4 - \eta)^{-\tilde{q}} \right) \ge c(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \tau)(x_n - \eta) \ge c_2 x_n$$

for some $c_2 = c_2(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \tau) > 0$. On the other hand, to bound *II*, we observe that for η small

$$1 - \left(1 + \frac{1 - \tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^2}t\right)^q \le 1 - \left(1 + \frac{1 - \tilde{\kappa}/r}{\tilde{\kappa}^2}(64\eta)^2\right)^q \le C\eta^2 \le C\eta x_n.$$

From |x'| = |y'| and $x_n < 1/4 - \tilde{\kappa}$, we also have

$$|x-y|^{-\tilde{q}} = |1/4 - x_n|^{-\tilde{q}} \le \tilde{\kappa}^{-\tilde{q}} \le C(n,\lambda,\Lambda,\tau).$$

Thus,

$$II \le C\eta x_n \le c_2/2 x_n$$

where the last inequality holds if we take η small enough. Therefore, we conclude by taking $c_* := c_2/2$

$$u(x,t) \ge I - II \ge c_* x_n.$$

This completes the proof.

Lemma 6. Let $\tau \ge 0$ and $1 < \gamma < 2$ be given. Then, there exist small constants $\kappa_* > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, depending only on $n, \lambda, \Lambda, \tau, \gamma$, such that if u solves (A.1), then

$$u(x,0) \ge c(n,\lambda,\Lambda,\gamma) \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial D_{L,1})^{\gamma}$$
 for all $x \in D_{L,1/64}$.

Proof. Let $c_* = c_*(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \tau) > 0$ be as in Lemma 5. One can easily check in its proof that c_* was chosen independently of η . We let $r_1 := 64\eta$ for small $\eta > 0$ to be determined later. Particularly, we ask η to be smaller than the one in Lemma 5. We claim that if $x = (x', x_n) \in \partial D_{L,1/64}$, then

(A.3)
$$u(x',\rho,s) \ge \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^{k+1} (\rho - x_n)$$

whenever $x_n + 2\eta r_1^k \le \rho \le x_n + r_1^k/16$ and $-r_1^{2(k+1)} \le s \le 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, $(x', \rho, s) \in E_{L,1/16,\tau}$ holds for small r_1 (or, equivalently, for small η). We prove the claim by induction on $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

For k = 1, we let $\kappa_* = \kappa_*(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \tau) > 0$ be as in Lemma 5 and consider

$$u_1(y,t) := \frac{u(x+r_1y,r_1^2t)}{u(x+\frac{r_1}{2}e_n,-r_1^2\kappa_*)}, \quad (y,t) \in E_{L,1,\tau}.$$

Here, the set $E_{L,1,\tau}$ may be equipped with a different Lipschitz function f from the one in (A.1). Clearly, u_1 satisfies the conditions (a) – (d) in (A.1). Applying Lemma 5 to u and u_1 gives

$$u\left(x + \frac{r_1}{2}e_n, -r_1^2\kappa_*\right) \ge c_*\left(x_n + \frac{r_1}{2}\right) \ge \frac{c_*}{2}r_1,$$

$$u_1(0, y_n, t) \ge c_*y_n \quad \text{for } 2\eta \le y_n \le 1/16, -r_1^2 \le t \le 0.$$

By putting $\rho = x_n + r_1 y_n$ and $s = r_1^2 t$, we obtain that

$$u(x', \rho, s) = u(x', x_n + r_1 y_n, r_1^2 t) = u_1(0, y_n, t) u\left(x + \frac{r_1}{2}e_n, -r_1^2 \kappa_*\right)$$
$$\geq \frac{c_*^2}{2}(r_1 y_n) \geq \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^2(\rho - x_n)$$

for $x_n + 2\eta r_1 \le \rho \le x_n + r_1/16$ and $-r_1^4 \le s \le 0$. This proves (A.3) for k = 1.

Now we suppose that (A.3) holds for k - 1, and prove it for k. For this aim, we define

$$u_k(y,t) := \frac{u(x+r_1^k y, r_1^{2k} t)}{u\left(x+\frac{r_1^k}{2}e_{n,t}-r_1^{2k}\kappa_*\right)}, \quad (y,t) \in E_{L,1,\tau}.$$

From $2\eta r_1^{k-1} \le \frac{r_1^k}{2} \le \frac{r_1^{k-1}}{16}$, we have by the induction hypothesis

$$u\left(x+\frac{r_1^k}{2}e_n,-r_1^{2k}\kappa_*\right) \ge \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^k \left(\frac{r_1^k}{2}\right)$$

Since u_k satisfies (a) – (d) in (A.1), we can apply Lemma 5 to obtain that

$$u_k(0, y_n, t) \ge c_* y_n \quad \text{for } 2\eta \le y_n \le 1/16, \ -r_1^2 \le t \le 0.$$

By putting $\rho = x_n + r_1^k y_n$ and $s = r_1^{2k} t$, we deduce that

$$u(x',\rho,s) = u(x',x_n + r_1^k y_n, r_1^{2k} t) = u_k(0,y_n,t)u\left(x + \frac{r_1^k}{2}e_n, -r_1^{2k}\kappa_*\right)$$
$$\geq \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^{k+1}(r_1^k y_n) = \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^{k+1}(\rho - x_n).$$

This finishes the proof for the claim (A.3).

Now, we are ready to prove Lemma 6. To this end, we fix $x = (x', x_n) \in \partial D_{L,1/64}$ and let $\rho \in (x_n, 2\eta)$. Then we can take $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2\eta r_1^k \le \rho - x_n \le r_1^k/16$. By (A.3),

$$u(x',\rho,0) \ge \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^{k+1} (\rho - x_n)$$

From $r_1^k \leq \frac{\rho - x_n}{2\eta}$, we have

$$\left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^k \ge \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^{\log_{r_1}\left(\frac{\rho-x_n}{2\eta}\right)} = \left(\frac{\rho-x_n}{2\eta}\right)^{\log_{r_1}\left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)}$$

If $\eta = \eta(n, \lambda, \Lambda, \tau, \gamma)$ is small enough, then

$$\log_{r_1}\left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right) = \frac{\log\left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)}{\log(64\eta)} \in (0, \gamma - 1).$$

Thus, we have for $x_n < \rho < 2\eta$

$$u(x',\rho,0) \ge \left(\frac{c_*}{2}\right)^k \frac{c_*}{2}(\rho-x_n) \ge \left(\frac{\rho-x_n}{2\eta}\right)^{\gamma-1} \frac{c_*}{2}(\rho-x_n)$$
$$\ge c(n,\lambda,\Lambda,\tau,\gamma)(\rho-x_n)^{\gamma}.$$

On the other hand, when $(x', \rho) \in D_{L,1/64}$ with $\rho \ge 2\eta$, we can simply use Lemma 5 to obtain

$$u(x',\rho,0) \ge c_*\rho \ge c_*(\rho-x_n)^{\gamma}$$

Therefore, we conclude that if $(x', \rho) \in D_{L,1/64}$ (and $x = (x', x_n) \in \partial D_{L,1/64}$), then

$$u(x', \rho, 0) \ge c(\rho - x_n)^{\gamma} \ge c \operatorname{dist}((x', \rho), \partial D_{L,1})^{\gamma}$$

This completes the proof.

Declarations

Data availability statement: All data needed are contained in the manuscript.

Funding and/or Conflicts of interests/Competing interests: The authors declare that there are no financial, competing or conflict of interests.

References

- [1] M. Allen, D. Kriventsov and H. Shahgholian, *The inhomogeneous boundary Harnack principle for fully nonlinear and p-Laplace equations* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire **40** (2023), 133–156
- [2] H. W. Alt and D. Phillips A free boundary problem for semilinear elliptic equations, J. Reine Angew. Math. 368, (1986), 63–107
- [3] D.J. Araújo, G.S. Sá and J M. Urbano, *Sharp regularity for a singular fully nonlinear parabolic free boundary problem* J. Differential Equations **389**, (2024), 90–113
- [4] D. Araújo and E. Teixeira, *Geometric approach to nonvariational singular elliptic equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **209**, (2013), 1019–1054.

- [5] C. Bianchini, M. Longinetti and P. Salani, *Quasiconcave solutions to elliptic problems in convex rings* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58** (2009), 1565–1589
- [6] C. Borell, Brownian motion in a convex ring and quasiconcavity Comm. Math. Phys. 86 (1982), no. 1, 143–147
- [7] C. Borell, A note on parabolic convexity and heat conduction Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. (1996), 387–393
- [8] A. Chau and B. Weinkove, *Counterexamples to quasiconcavity for the heat equation* Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2020), 8564–8579
- [9] C. Chen, X. Ma and P. Salani, On space-time quasiconcave solutions of the heat equation Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. (2019), v+81
- [10] A. Colesanti and P. Salani, quasiconcave envelope of a function and convexity of level sets of solutions to elliptic equations Math. Nachr. 258 (2003), 3–15
- [11] P. Cuoghi and P. Salani, *Convexity of level sets for solutions to nonlinear elliptic problems in convex rings* Electron. J. Differential Equations **2006** (2006), 1–12.
- [12] J. I. Diaz and B. Kawohl, On convexity and starshapedness of level sets for some nonlinear elliptic and parabolic problems on convex rings J. Math. Anal. Appl. 177 (1993), 263–286
- [13] A. Figalli and H. Shahgholian, A general class of free boundary problems for fully nonlinear parabolic equations Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **194** (2015), 1123–1134
- [14] C. Imbert and L. Silvestre, An introduction to fully nonlinear parabolic equations, in: An introduction to the Kähler-Ricci flow, in: Lecture Notes in Math., (2013), 7–88
- [15] K. Ishige, Q. Liu and P. Salani, Parabolic Minkowski convolutions and concavity properties of viscosity solutions to fully nonlinear equations J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 141 (2020), 342–370
- [16] K. Ishige and P. Salani, Is quasiconcavity preserved by heat flow? Arch. Math. 90 (2008), 450-460
- [17] K. Ishige and P. Salani, Parabolic quasiconcavity for solutions to parabolic problems in convex rings Math. Nachr. (2010), 1526–1548
- [18] K. Ishige and P. Salani, On a new kind of convexity for solutions of parabolic problems Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S (2011), no. 4, 851—864
- [19] K. Ishige and P. Salani, Parabolic power concavity and parabolic boundary value problems Math. Ann. 358 (2014), 1091–1117
- [20] K. Ishige and P. Salani, A note on parabolic power concavity Kodai Math. J. 37 (2014), 668-679
- [21] S. Jeon and H. Shahgholian, *Convexity for free boundaries with singular term (nonlinear elliptic case)*, Math. Ann. (2023)
- [22] T. Kagaya, Q. Liu and H. Mitake, *Quasiconvexity preserving property for fully nonlinear nonlocal parabolic equations* NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **30** (2023), Paper No. 13, 28
- [23] K. Lee, A. Petrosyan and J.L. Vázquez, *Large-time geometric properties of solutions of the evolution p-Laplacian equation J. Differential Equations* **229** (2008), 389–411
- [24] A. Petrosyan, On existence and uniqueness in a free boundary problem from combustion Comm. Partial Differential Equations 27 (2002), 763–789
- [25] G. Ricarte, R. Teymurazyan and J.M. Urbano, Singularly perturbed fully nonlinear parabolic problems and their asymptotic free boundaries Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 35, (2019), 1535–1558

(Seongmin Jeon) Department of Mathematics and Statistics University of Jyväskylä P.O. Box 35, 40014, Jyväskylä, Finland *Email address*: seongmin.s.jeon@jyu.fi

(Henrik Shahgholian) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY 100 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN Email address: henriksh@kth.se