JEMS

John L. Lewis · Kaj Nyström

Quasi-linear PDEs and low-dimensional sets

Abstract. We establish new results concerning boundary Harnack inequalities and the Martin boundary problem, for non-negative solutions to equations of p-Laplace type with variable coefficients. The key novelty is that we consider solutions which vanish only on a low-dimensional set Σ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, unlike the more traditional setting of boundary value problems set in the geometrical situation of a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ having a boundary with (Hausdorff) dimension in the range $[n-1, n)$. We establish our quantitative and scale-invariant estimates in the context of low-dimensional Reifenberg flat sets.

Keywords. Boundary Harnack inequality, p-harmonic function, A-harmonic function, variable coefficients, Reifenberg flat domain, low-dimensional sets, Martin boundary

1. Introduction

Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a bounded domain, i.e., a bounded, open and connected set, and let K be a compact subset of D. Let $\Omega := D \setminus K$, and let p with $1 < p < \infty$ be fixed. Given D and K, the *p-capacity* of K relative to D, $\text{Cap}_p(K, D)$ for short, is defined as

$$\text{Cap}_p(K, D) = \inf \left\{ \int_D |\nabla \phi|^p \, dy : \phi \in C_0^\infty(D), \ \phi \geq 1 \text{ in } K \right\}. \qquad (1.1)$$

If $\text{Cap}_p(K, D) > 0$, then the set K is not removable for the p-Laplace equation and given $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ there exists a unique p-harmonic function u in Ω satisfying $u = f$ on $\partial\Omega$ in the weak sense. Furthermore, if all points on $\partial\Omega$ are regular in the Dirichlet problem for the p-Laplace operator, then $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ and hence $u = f$ continuously on $\partial\Omega$. In particular, assuming that $\text{Cap}_p(K, D) > 0$, and that all points on $\partial\Omega$ are regular, one can conclude that there exists, given a non-negative function $f \in C(\partial D)$ which is not identically zero, a unique positive p-harmonic function u in Ω such that

J. L. Lewis: Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky,
Lexington, KY 40506-0027, USA; e-mail: johnl@uky.edu

K. Nyström: Department of Mathematics, Uppsala University,
S-751 06 Uppsala, Sweden; e-mail: kaj.nystrom@math.uu.se

$u = f$ on ∂D and $u = 0$ on ∂K. A sufficient condition for $w \in \partial\Omega$ being regular in this Dirichlet problem is that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ is p-thick at w in the sense that

$$\int_0^1 \left[\frac{\mathrm{Cap}_p((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) \cap B(w, t), B(w, 2t))}{\mathrm{Cap}_p(B(w, t), B(w, 2t))} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} = \infty. \qquad (1.2)$$

It is well known that if $p > n$ then the p-capacity of a point is positive and for $1 < p \leq n$, conditions on the set K which imply $\mathrm{Cap}_p(K, D) = 0$ can be formulated using Hausdorff measure and Hausdorff dimension. In particular, if $p = 2$, $n \geq 3$, and if the Hausdorff dimension of K is m, then the only cases which are non-trivial occur when $m \in (n-2, n]$. Hence, if we focus on sets with integer dimension, the only non-trivial low-dimensional case is $m = n - 1$. For more general p we see, assuming that the Hausdorff dimension of K is m, that given K the set-up is interesting whenever $p > n - m$. In particular, all low-dimensional cases are interesting as long as we consider p large enough. Phrased in another way, while the Laplace operator cannot be used as a vehicle for the extension of a function from a set of dimension $n-2$ or lower to neighborhoods of the set, the p-Laplace operator, for p sufficiently large, can always achieve such an extension. The conclusion is that the p-Laplacian, and p-harmonic functions, can be studied in many interesting geometrical situations beyond the traditional set-up of a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ having an $(n - 1)$-dimensional boundary.

The purpose of this paper is to pursue the line of thought outlined above in one direction by establishing certain refined boundary Harnack estimates for non-negative solutions to operators of p-Laplace type, assuming that the set K is well approximated by m-dimensional hyperplanes in the Hausdorff sense. To further put our work in perspective we recall that in [LN1]–[LN3] (see also [LN4]), a number of results concerning the boundary behavior of positive p-harmonic functions, $1 < p < \infty$, in a bounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ were proved. In particular, the boundary Harnack inequality and Hölder continuity for ratios of positive p-harmonic functions, $1 < p < \infty$, vanishing on a portion of $\partial\Omega$ were established. Furthermore, the p-Martin boundary problem at $w \in \partial\Omega$ was resolved under the assumption that Ω is either convex, C^1-regular or a Lipschitz domain with small constant. Also, in [LN5] these questions were resolved for p-harmonic functions vanishing on a portion of certain Reifenberg flat and Ahlfors regular NTA-domains. The results and techniques developed in [LN1]–[LN5] concerning p-harmonic functions have also been used and further developed in [LN6], [LN7], in the context of free boundary regularity in general two-phase free boundary problems for the p-Laplace operator, and in [LN8] in the context of regularity and free boundary regularity, below the continuous threshold, for the p-Laplace equation in Reifenberg flat and Ahlfors regular NTA-domains. In addition, in [LLuN] boundary Harnack inequalities and the Martin boundary problem were studied for more general operators of p-Laplace type with variable coefficients in Reifenberg flat domains. Further generalizations and applications can also be found in [ALuN1], [ALuN2], [AN].

All papers mentioned above are set in the traditional geometrical situation of a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ having a boundary with dimension in the range $[n - 1, n)$. In this paper we begin the development of the corresponding results in the rich low-dimensional

geometrical setting outlined above. This paper can be seen as a novel generalization of [LLuN] to the setting of non-negative solutions, to equations of p-Laplace type, vanishing on low-dimensional Reifenberg flat sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$. To our knowledge this paper is the first serious attack on problems of this type.

1.1. A-harmonic functions

Points in Euclidean n-space $\mathbb{R}^n$ will be denoted by $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ or (y', y_n) where $y' = (y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$; $\mathbb{S}^k$ will denote the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^k$. We let $\bar{E}, \partial E$, diam E be the closure, boundary and diameter of the set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and we define $d(y, E)$ to equal the distance from $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to E. Further, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and we let $|y| = \langle y, y \rangle^{1/2}$ be the Euclidean norm of y; $B(y, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : |z - y| < r\}$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r > 0$; and dy denotes Lebesgue n-measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let

$$h(E, F) = \max\big(\sup\{d(y, E) : y \in F\}, \sup\{d(y, F) : y \in E\}\big)$$

be the Hausdorff distance between the sets $E, F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. If $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open and $1 \le q \le \infty$, then we denote by $W^{1,q}(O)$ the space of equivalence classes of functions f with distributional gradient $\nabla f = (f_{y_1}, \ldots, f_{y_n})$, both of which are qth power integrable on O. Let $\|f\|_{1,q} = \|f\|_q + \||\nabla f|\|_q$ be the norm in $W^{1,q}(O)$ where $\| \cdot \|_q$ denotes the usual Lebesgue norm in O. Next let $C_0^\infty(O)$ be the set of infinitely differentiable functions with compact support in O and let $W_0^{1,q}(O)$ be the closure of $C_0^\infty(O)$ in the norm of $W^{1,q}(O)$. By $\nabla \cdot$ we denote the divergence operator.

Definition 1.1. Let $p, \beta, \alpha \in (1, \infty)$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Let $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_n) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, assume that $A = A(y, \eta)$ is continuous in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ and that $A(y, \eta)$, for fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is continuously differentiable in η_k, for every $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, whenever $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. We say that the function A belongs to the class $M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ if the following conditions are satisfied whenever $y, x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$:

(i) $\alpha^{-1}|\eta|^{p-2}|\xi|^2 \le \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(y, \eta)\xi_i\xi_j$ and $\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(y, \eta)\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \le \alpha|\eta|^{p-2}$,

(ii) $|A(x, \eta) - A(y, \eta)| \le \beta|x - y|^\gamma |\eta|^{p-1}$,

(iii) $A(y, \eta) = |\eta|^{p-1} A(y, \eta/|\eta|)$.

For short, we write $M_p(\alpha)$ for the class $M_p(\alpha, 0, \gamma)$.

Definition 1.2. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and let $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ for some (α, β, γ). Given a bounded domain G we say that u is A-harmonic in G provided $u \in W^{1,p}(G)$ and

$$\int \langle A(y, \nabla u(y)), \nabla\theta(y) \rangle \, dy = 0 \tag{1.3}$$

whenever $\theta \in W_0^{1,p}(G)$. We say that $u \in W^{1,p}(G)$ is an A-*subsolution* [A-*supersolution*] in G if (1.3) holds with $=$ replaced by $\le$ [$\ge$] whenever $\theta \in W_0^{1,p}(G)$, $\theta \ge 0$. If

$A(y, \eta) = |\eta|^{p-2}(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n)$, and u is a function satisfying (1.3), then u is said to be *p-harmonic* in G. As a short notation for (1.3) we write $\nabla \cdot A(y, \nabla u) = 0$ in G. Finally, an *A-subharmonic function* [*A-superharmonic function*] is a function which is upper [lower] semicontinuous and which satisfies the standard comparison principle with respect to A-harmonic functions.

Remark 1.3. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, suppose that $p > 1$ is given and let $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ for some (α, β, γ). Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be the composition of a translation, a rotation and a dilation $z \mapsto rz$, $r \in (0, 1]$. Suppose that u is A-harmonic in G and define $\hat{u}(z) = u(F(z))$ whenever $F(z) \in G$. Then $\hat{u}$ is $\hat{A}$-harmonic in $F^{-1}(G)$ and $\hat{A} \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. For a proof, see [LLuN, Lemma 2.15].

1.2. Geometry: low-dimensional Reifenberg flat sets

Definition 1.4. Let n, m be integers such that $1 \leq m \leq n - 1$. Given $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we let $\Lambda_m(w)$ denote the set of all m-dimensional hyperplanes which pass through w.

Definition 1.5. Let n, m be integers such that $1 \leq m \leq n - 1$. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set and let $r_0, \delta > 0$ be given. We say that Σ is (m, r_0, δ)-*Reifenberg flat* (in $\mathbb{R}^n$) if there exists, whenever $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, a hyperplane $\Lambda = \Lambda_m(w, r) \in \Lambda_m(w)$ such that

$$h(\Sigma \cap B(w, r), \Lambda \cap B(w, r)) \leq \delta r.$$

Definition 1.6. Let Σ be (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat (in $\mathbb{R}^n$) for some $r_0, \delta > 0$ and suppose $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$. We say that $\Sigma \cap B(w, r)$ is m-*Reifenberg flat with vanishing constant* if, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}(\epsilon) > 0$ with the following property. If $x \in \Sigma \cap B(w, r)$ and $0 < \rho < \tilde{r}$, then there exists a hyperplane $\Lambda' = \Lambda'_m(x, \rho) \in \Lambda_m(x)$ such that

$$h(\Sigma \cap B(x, \rho), \Lambda' \cap B(x, \rho)) \leq \epsilon \rho.$$

Remark 1.7. For our purposes the (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat sets form a rich class of sets. However, the literature devoted to this type of sets seems very limited. We are only aware of one paper [PTT] where analytic questions are considered in the same framework as ours. In particular, in [PTT] the authors are concerned with the quantity

$$R_t(w, r) = \frac{\mu(B(w, tr))}{\mu(B(w, r))} - t^m, \tag{1.4}$$

where $w \in \Sigma$, $r > 0$, $t \in (0, 1]$, and μ is a measure supported on Σ. The authors prove results concerning the relation between the regularity and flatness of Σ and the asymptotic behavior of $R_t(w, r)$ as $r \to 0$.

Remark 1.8. In [LLuN] all theorems were established for A-harmonic functions and in the context of $(n - 1, r_0, \delta)$-Reifenberg flat domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Consequently, in the present paper we will only consider the case when Σ is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat (in $\mathbb{R}^n$) for some m with $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$.

1.3. Main results

We here state the main results established in the paper; in light of Remark 1.8 we consider A-harmonic functions, $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, and we assume that Σ is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat for some m with $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$. It turns out that for $m = 1$ we are able to establish a complete analog of the results in [LLuN], while for $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$ we have to impose additional assumptions on A. We first prove the following two theorems.

Theorem 1.9. *Let* $m = 1$, $n \geq 3$, *and let* $p > n - 1$ *be given. Let* Σ *be a closed* $(1, r_0, \delta)$-*Reifenberg flat set in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *for some* $r_0, \delta > 0$. *Let* $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ *for some* (α, β, γ). *Let* $w \in \Sigma$ *and* $0 < r < r_0$. *Assume that* u, v *are positive* A-*harmonic functions in* $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, *continuous on* $B(w, 4r)$ *and with* $u = 0 = v$ *on* $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. *Then there exist* $\tilde{\delta} = \tilde{\delta}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) > 0$, $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \geq 1$ *and* $\sigma = \sigma(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) > 0$ *such that if* $0 < \delta < \tilde{\delta}$, *then*

$$\left| \log \frac{u(y_1)}{v(y_1)} - \log \frac{u(y_2)}{v(y_2)} \right| \leq c \left(\frac{|y_1 - y_2|}{r} \right)^\sigma$$

whenever $y_1, y_2 \in B(w, r/c) \setminus \Sigma$.

Theorem 1.10. *Let* n, m *be integers such that* $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$ *and let* $p > n - m$ *be given. Let* Σ *be a closed* (m, r_0, δ)-*Reifenberg flat set in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *for some* $r_0, \delta > 0$. *Let* $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ *for some* (α, β, γ), *and assume in addition that* A *satisfies one of the following conditions:*

(a) *There exists* $0 < \lambda < \infty$ *such that* $\left| \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(y, \eta) - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(y, \eta') \right| \leq \lambda |\eta - \eta'| \, |\eta|^{p-3}$
   whenever $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ *and* $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ *with* $\frac{1}{2}|\eta| \leq |\eta'| \leq 2|\eta|$.
(b) $A(y, \eta) = \kappa(y, \eta) |\langle C(y)\eta, \eta \rangle|^{p/2 - 1} C(y)\eta$ *for all* $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and* $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, *where* $C(y)$ *is a linear transformation of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *and* $\kappa(y, \cdot)$ *is homogeneous of degree* 0 *in* η *whenever* $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let $w \in \Sigma$, $0 < r < r_0$ *and let* u, v *be as in Theorem* 1.9 *(relative to* Σ*). Then the conclusion of Theorem* 1.9 *holds with the only difference that in the case of* (a)*, the constants may also depend on* λ.

Let n, m be integers such that $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and let $p > n - m$. Let Σ be a closed (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. Let $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ for some (α, β, γ). Let $w \in \Sigma$, r and u, v be as in Theorem 1.9 (relative to Σ). Then (see Lemma 3.7 below) there exist positive Borel measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}^n$, with support contained in $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$, such that

$$\int \langle A(y, \nabla u), \nabla \phi \rangle \, dx = - \int \phi \, d\mu, \quad \int \langle A(y, \nabla v), \nabla \phi \rangle \, dx = - \int \phi \, d\nu \qquad (1.5)$$

for all $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B(w, 4r))$. We deduce the following corollaries to Theorems 1.9 and 1.10.

Corollary 1.11. *Let n, m, p, Σ, r_0, A be as above. Let $w \in \Sigma$, r and u, v be as in Theorem* 1.9 *or* 1.10 *(relative to Σ). Let μ and ν be measures associated to u, v in the sense of* (1.5). *Let σ be as in the conclusion of Theorems* 1.9 *and* 1.10. *Then $d\mu = k\,dv$ for some $k \in L^1(\Sigma \cap B(w, 2r), dv)$, and there exists $c \geq 1$, depending at most on p, n, m, α, β, γ, λ, such that*

$$|\log k(y_1) - \log k(y_2)| \leq c(|y_1 - y_2|/r)^{\sigma} \tag{1.6}$$

whenever y_1, $y_2 \in \Sigma \cap B(w, r/c)$.

Corollary 1.12. *Let n, m, p, Σ, r_0, A, w, u, μ be as in Corollary* 1.11, *and suppose in addition that $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is m-Reifenberg flat with vanishing constant. Then*

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x, tr))}{\mu(B(x, r))} = t^m \quad \text{uniformly for } x \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(w, r)} \text{ and } t \in [1/2, 1].$$

We note that in the language of [PTT], a measure μ is said to be asymptotically optimally doubling on $\Sigma \cap \overline{B(w, r)}$ if the conclusion of Corollary 1.12 holds.

Finally, we prove a theorem which implies that the Martin boundary of $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$ agrees with the topological boundary of this set when $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat.

Theorem 1.13. *Let n, m be integers such that $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and let $p > n - m$ be given. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set and assume that $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat. Let $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ for some (α, β, γ), and assume in addition that either* (a) *or* (b) *of Theorem* 1.10 *holds in the case $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$. Then there exists $\delta^* = \delta^*(p, m, n, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, or $\delta^* = \delta^*(p, m, n, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$, such that the following is true whenever $0 < \delta < \delta^*$, $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$. Suppose that $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$ are positive A-harmonic functions in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $\overline{B(w, 4r)} \setminus \{w\}$ and with $\hat{u} = 0 = \hat{v}$ on $\partial(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma) \setminus \{w\}$. If $0 < \delta < \delta^*$, then $\hat{u}(y) = \tau \hat{v}(y)$ for all $y \in B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$ and for some constant τ.*

Remark 1.14. We emphasize that Theorems 1.9–1.13 are completely new and there is currently essentially no competing literature. Theorems 1.9, 1.10, 1.13 are proved in [LLuN] in the setting of $(n - 1, r_0, \delta)$-Reifenberg flat domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, assuming only that $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ for some (α, β, γ).

Remark 1.15. Theorem 1.10 applies in the case $A(y, \eta) = |\eta|^{p-2}(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n)$, i.e., in the case of the p-Laplace operator. In particular, using [LN5], or [LLuN], and Theorems 1.9–1.13, we can show that the conclusions of Theorems 1.9–1.13 hold in the context of p-harmonic functions whenever $1 \leq m \leq n - 1$ and $n - m < p < \infty$.

Remark 1.16. Condition (a) in Theorem 1.10 is an additional regularity condition on $A = A(y, \eta)$ in the η-variables. Condition (b) in Theorem 1.10 is a structural restriction on A. In particular, if

$$\nabla \cdot A(y, \nabla u) = \nabla \cdot \left((A(y)\nabla u \cdot \nabla u)^{p/2-1} A(y)\nabla u \right)$$

and $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, then (b) holds. The class $M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ is invariant with respect to translations, rotations and dilations $z \mapsto rz$, $r \in (0, 1]$, as discussed in Remark 1.3. The same applies to the classes of A's defined by conditions (a) and (b) in Theorem 1.10.

Remark 1.17. As discussed below, in the case $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, $p > n - m$, and in the proof of Theorem 1.10, the additional assumption on A beyond $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$—condition (a) or (b) in Theorem 1.10—is only used in one crucial estimate. Indeed, consider the geometrical baseline configuration for our results

$$\Sigma = \{y = (y', y'') : y' = (y_1, \ldots, y_m), \ y'' = (y_{m+1}, \ldots, y_n) = 0\}, \qquad (1.7)$$

and let $C_r(0) = \{y = (y', y'') : |y'|, \ |y''| < r\}$ for $r > 0$. Let $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, i.e., A has constant coefficients, and assume that u is a positive A-harmonic function in $C_4(0) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $C_4(0)$, with $u = 0$ on $\Sigma \cap C_4(0)$. Assume that $u(0, y'') = 1$ for some $|y''| = 1$. We then need to prove that there exists $c \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that

$$c^{-1}|y''|^\xi \leq u(y', y'') \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma, \qquad (1.8)$$

and where $\xi = (p - n + m)/(p - 1)$. In particular, the function $|y''|^\xi$ gives a lower bound of the growth away from the low-dimensional set Σ in analogy with the linear growth established in the case $m = n - 1$ in the corresponding baseline configuration (see [LLuN, Lemma 2.8]). The estimate in (1.8) is the only place where we have been unable to push our arguments through in the same generality as in [LLuN], and it is in the proof of (1.8) that (a) and (b) of Theorem 1.10 are used.

1.4. Outline of proofs and organization of the paper

As mentioned in Remark 1.14, Theorems 1.9, 1.10, and 1.13 are proved in [LLuN] in the more traditional setting of $(n - 1, r_0, \delta)$-Reifenberg flat domains Ω in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In the introduction in [LLuN] some effort is made to explain the key steps in the proof, stated as Steps A–D. The proofs of our main results, in particular Theorems 1.9 and 1.10, proceed, structurally, also along the lines of these steps but details are considerably more involved and often require some ingenuity.

Sections 2 and 3 are motivated by the fact that many of the basic estimates used in [LLuN] have to be derived in the low-dimensional case. For example, if δ is small enough, then a δ-Reifenberg flat domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is an NTA-domain in the sense of [JK]. In particular, from the outer corkscrew condition it then immediately follows that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ satisfies a uniform capacity density condition at every point $w \in \partial\Omega$, from which one can conclude that the continuous Dirchlet problem for A-harmonic functions is uniquely solvable and weak solutions with continuous boundary data are Hölder continuous up to the boundary. In our case, we first have to find a substitute for this argument, due to the lack of complement, and in Lemma 2.9 we prove that, for n, m, p, Σ as in Theorem 1.9 or Theorem 1.10, there exists $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m)$ such that if $0 < \delta < \hat{\delta}$, then $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is uniformly p-thick with constant $\eta = \eta(p, n, m) > 0$ (see Definition 2.8) whenever $w \in \Sigma$. Using this result we can then establish (see Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3) Hölder continuity for A-harmonic functions up to Σ.

In Section 4 we consider solutions to elliptic PDEs whose degeneracy is given in terms of an A_2-weight λ (see (4.1)). In case $\lambda = (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2}$, where u, v are A-harmonic and $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, in Lemma 4.7 we prove the existence of $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ > 0 and $c = c(n, m) \geq 1$ such that if $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ and $\tilde{r} = r/c$, then $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4\tilde{r})$ is uniformly $(2, \lambda)$-thick (see Definition 4.3) for some constant $\eta = \eta(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) > 0$. Using results in [FJK1] we can then guarantee Hölder continuity of solutions to these degenerate elliptic PDEs up to Σ. We also prove (Lemma 4.10) that if n, m, p, u, v, Σ are as in Theorem 1.9 or 1.10, and $(a|\nabla u| + b|\nabla v|)^{p-2}$ is an A_2-weight with A_2-constant independent of $a, b \in [0, \infty)$, then the conclusion of Theorem 1.9 or 1.10 is valid. In Subsection 4.2 we also list several other assumptions and prove that they imply the conclusios of Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 when Σ is an m-dimensional hyperplane.

In Section 5 we prove, for $A \in M_p(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{A}$ with $\tilde{A}_j = A_{m+j}$, $1 \leq j \leq n - m$, and $p > n - m$, the existence and uniqueness of a 'fundamental solution', say $\tilde{u}$, to $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}) = 0$ with pole at 0 in $\mathbb{R}^{n-m}$. It turns out that

$$\tilde{u}(z) = |z|^{\xi} \tilde{u}(z/|z|), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m} \setminus \{0\}, \quad |\nabla \tilde{u}|(z) \approx \tilde{u}(z)/|z| \approx |z|^{\xi-1}, \qquad (1.9)$$

where $\xi = (p - n + m)/(p - 1)$ and $\approx$ means the ratio of the two quantities is bounded above and below by constants depending only on the data, i.e., the structure constants in Definition 1.1 and n, m, p. Let $\bar{u}(y) = \tilde{u}(\pi(y))$ when $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\pi(y)$ denotes the projection of y onto $\mathbb{R}^{n-m}$. Then $\bar{u}$ is an A-harmonic function on $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$, vanishing on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\} \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$. In our arguments, $\bar{u}$ plays the same role as the function y_n does in [LLuN].

In Section 6 we prove Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 in the special case when $A \in M_p(\alpha)$ and Σ is as stated in (1.7) in Remark 1.17. Indeed, let u, v be positive A-harmonic functions in $B(0, 4) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(0, 4)$ and with $u = 0 = v$ on $\Sigma \cap B(0, 4)$. Assume that $u(0, y'') \approx v(0, y'') \approx 1$ for some $|y''| = 1$. The crucial estimate is to prove there exists $c \geq 1$ (depending only on the data) such that

$$c^{-1} \leq u(y)/v(y) \leq c \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma, \qquad (1.10)$$

where the sets $C_.(0)$ were introduced in Remark 1.17. To prove (1.10) in the case $m = 1$ we use an argument from [BL]. In fact (see Remark 6.3 below), this argument is also applicable in the case of the p-Laplace operator in the full range $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$, but the proof in this case relies heavily on the p-Laplacian being invariant under rotations. For general $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, in the case $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, we first note, in view of (1.9), that to prove (1.10) it suffices to establish it with $v = \bar{u}$, and in particular to establish the existence of $c \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that

$$c^{-1}|y''|^{\xi} \leq u(y', y'') \leq c|y''|^{\xi} \quad \text{whenever } (y', y'') \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma. \qquad (1.11)$$

To get the upper estimate in (1.11) we consider the function u' which is defined to be A-harmonic in $B(0, 8) \setminus (\Sigma \cap \overline{B(0, 4)})$ with continuous boundary values $u' \equiv 1$ on $\partial B(0, 8)$ and $u' \equiv 0$ on $\Sigma \cap \overline{B(0, 4)}$. Then, using Harnack's inequality, we have $u \leq cu'$, and we prove (see (6.9)) that u' satisfies the fundamental inequality

$$c^{-1} \frac{u'(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla u'(y)| \leq c \frac{u'(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \qquad (1.12)$$

whenever $y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$, where $c \geq 1$ depends only on the data. Using (1.12) and (1.9) we then conclude from our work in Section 4 that (1.10) holds with $u = u'$ and $v = \bar{u}$, which implies the upper bound in (1.11).

To get the lower bound in (1.11), for a general A as in Definition 1.1, turns out to be a more difficult problem and, as discussed in Remark 1.17, for $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$ this is the only place in the proof of Theorem 1.10 where we require (a) and (b) of Theorem 1.10. Our proof of the lower estimate in (1.11) is based on the construction of appropriate A-subsolutions (barriers). The constructions are rather subtle and make essential use of (1.9), and the $\bar{u}$ introduced above. In particular, in the cases (a) and (b) of Theorem 1.10, both the constructions rely on the function

$$f(y) = f(y', y'') = (1 - |y'|^2)(e^{\bar{u}(y)} - 1) = (1 - |y'|^2)(e^{\bar{u}(0, y'')} - 1). \qquad (1.13)$$

Note that f has a product structure, which facilitates computations.

In Section 7 we prove Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 in general, as well as Corollaries 1.11 and 1.12. Theorems 1.9 and 1.10, for $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ and Σ as in (1.7), follow from the corresponding results established in Section 6 in the baseline configuration and by a technique which can loosely be described as 'freezing the coefficients'. Indeed, given our results from Section 6, as well as our preliminary work in Sections 2–5, at this stage we can invoke the A-harmonic machine developed in [LLuN] (with modifications). In particular, exploiting the validity of Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 when Σ is as in (1.7), we can prove, for $u, v, \Sigma, m, n, p, \delta, \tilde{\delta}$ as in Theorems 1.9 and 1.10, that (1.12) holds with u' replaced by u, v in $B(w, r/c) \setminus \Sigma$, with $c \geq 1$ depending only on the data, provided $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ is small enough. We then use this result to prove that $(|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2}$ is an A_2-weight with A_2-constant bounded independently of u, v. In view of this fact we can once again invoke boundary Harnack and Hölder continuity results from [FJK2] to deduce Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 based on our work in Section 4. Finally, in Section 7 we easily obtain Corollaries 1.11 and 1.12 as consequences of Theorems 1.9 and 1.10. In the proof of Corollary 1.12 we also use a compactness and blow-up type argument for A-harmonic functions.

In Section 8 we prove Theorem 1.13. To do this we first prove it in the baseline case when $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \cup \{0\}$. Once this is done, we can use Theorems 1.9, 1.10, and Theorem 1.13 in the baseline case, to argue as earlier in order to eventually obtain Theorem 1.13.

2. Geometry of (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$

In this section we develop a number of results concerning the geometry of (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, we assume $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and we let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set which is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. Given $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Lambda_m(w)$ we can always introduce coordinates $y = (y', y'')$, $y' \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $y'' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$, such that

$$\Lambda_m(w) = \{y = (y' + w', y'' + w'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m} : y'' = 0\},$$

where $w = (w', w'')$. Using this coordinate system and $r > 0$, we let

$$a_\Lambda(w, r) = (a'_\Lambda(w, r), a''_\Lambda(w, r))$$

be any point satisfying $a'_\Lambda(w, r) = w'$ and $|a''_\Lambda(w, r) - w''| = r$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and suppose $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed set which is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. Then there exist $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n, m) > 0$ and $M = M(n, m) \geq 2$ such that the following is true whenever $0 < \delta < \delta_0$. Given $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, there is a point $a_r(w) \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$ such that*

$$d(a_r(w), \Sigma) > M^{-1}r, \quad M^{-1}r < |a_r(w) - w| \leq r.$$

Proof. Consider $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$. Then using Definition 1.5 we see that there exists $\Lambda = \Lambda_m(w, r) \in \Lambda_m(w)$ such that

$$h(\Sigma \cap B(w, r), \Lambda \cap B(w, r)) \leq \delta r.$$

For $\eta \in (1/4, 1)$ fixed we now let, using coordinates with respect to $\Lambda = \Lambda_m(w, r)$ as introduced above,

$$a_r(w) := a_\Lambda(w, \eta r). \tag{2.1}$$

It then immediately follows that there exist $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n, m) > 0$ and $M = M(n, m)$ such that the conclusion of the lemma holds whenever $0 < \delta < \delta_0$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Assume $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and let Σ be a closed (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. Then there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n, m) > 0$ such that the following is true whenever $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and $0 < r < r_0/2$. There exists $c = c(n, m) \geq 1$ such that*

$$\begin{align}
&\text{(i)} \quad h\big(\Lambda_m(w, r) \cap B(w, 1), \Lambda_m(w, r/2) \cap B(w, 1)\big) \leq c\delta, \\
&\text{(ii)} \quad h\big(\Lambda_m(\tilde{w}, r) \cap B(\tilde{w}, 1), \Lambda_m(\tilde{w}, r) \cap B(\tilde{w}, 1)\big) \leq c\delta,
\end{align} \tag{2.2}$$

whenever $w, \hat{w}, \tilde{w} \in \Sigma$ and $r/2 \leq |\hat{w} - \tilde{w}| \leq 2r$.

Proof. Let $w \in \Sigma$. Then using Definition 1.5 we see that

$$\begin{align}
&\text{(i')} \quad h\big(\Sigma \cap B(w, r), \Lambda_m(w, r) \cap B(w, r)\big) \leq \delta r, \\
&\text{(ii')} \quad h\big(\Sigma \cap B(w, r/2), \Lambda_m(w, r/2) \cap B(w, r/2)\big) \leq \delta r/2.
\end{align} \tag{2.3}$$

Hence, using (2.3) we find that

$$h\big(\Lambda_m(w, r) \cap B(w, r/2), \Lambda_m(w, r/2) \cap B(w, r/2)\big) \leq 2\delta r. \tag{2.4}$$

(2.2)(i) now follows from (2.4) by scaling and elementary geometry. To prove (2.2)(ii) we first note, using the definitions and the assumption $r/2 \leq |\hat{w} - \tilde{w}| \leq 2r$, $\hat{w}, \tilde{w} \in \Sigma$, that

$$\begin{align}
&\text{(i'')} \quad h\big(\Sigma \cap B(\hat{w}, 4r), \Lambda_m(\hat{w}, 4r) \cap B(\hat{w}, 4r)\big) \leq 4\delta r, \\
&\text{(ii'')} \quad h\big(\Sigma \cap B(\tilde{w}, r), \Lambda_m(\tilde{w}, r) \cap B(\tilde{w}, r)\big) \leq \delta r.
\end{align} \tag{2.5}$$

Since $B(\tilde{w}, r) \subset B(\hat{w}, 4r)$, we conclude from (2.5) that

$$h\big(\Lambda_m(\hat{w}, 4r) \cap B(\tilde{w}, r), \Lambda_m(\tilde{w}, r) \cap B(\tilde{w}, r)\big) \leq 5\delta r. \tag{2.6}$$

(2.2)(ii) follows from this observation, (2.2)(i), and scaling. $\qquad\square$

Definition 2.3. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set. Given $M \geq 2$, we say that a ball $B(y, r)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r > 0$, is an *M-non-tangential ball* (in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and with respect to Σ) if

$$M^{-1}r < d(B(y, r), \Sigma) < Mr.$$

Furthermore, given $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$ we say that a sequence of M-non-tangential balls (in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and with respect to Σ), $B(y_1, r_1), \ldots, B(y_p, r_p)$, is an *M-Harnack chain* of length p (in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and with respect to Σ), joining y to y', if $y \in B(y_1, r_1)$, $y' \in B(y_p, r_p)$, and $B(y_i, r_i) \cap B(y_{i+1}, r_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and let Σ be a closed (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. Then there exist $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n, m) > 0$ and $M = M(n, m) \geq 2$ such that the following is true. Assume $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, $w \in \Sigma$, and $0 < r < \tilde{r}_0$, where $\tilde{r}_0 = r_0/M$. Consider $y \in B(w, r) \setminus \Sigma$, let $\epsilon = d(y, \Sigma)$, and let $\hat{y} \in \Sigma$ be such that $\epsilon = d(y, \hat{y})$. Then y, $a_\epsilon(\hat{y})$, and $a_{2\epsilon}(\hat{y})$ can all be joined by M-Harnack chains (in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and with respect to Σ) which are contained in $B(\hat{y}, M\epsilon) \setminus \Sigma$ and have length depending only on n, m.*

Proof. This can be proved by using Lemma 2.2 and elementary observations. ☐

Lemma 2.5. *Assume $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and let Σ be a closed (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. Then there exist $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n, m) > 0$ and $M = M(n, m) \geq 2$ such that the following is true. Assume $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, $w \in \Sigma$, $0 < r < \tilde{r}_0$, and $\tilde{r}_0 = r_0/M$. Consider $y, y' \in B(w, r) \setminus \Sigma$ such that $d(y, \Sigma) \geq \epsilon$, $d(y', \Sigma) \geq \epsilon$, and $d(y, y') \leq C\epsilon$, for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $C \geq 1$. Then there exists an M-Harnack chain (in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and with respect to Σ), joining y and y', which is contained in $B(w, Mr) \setminus \Sigma$ and has length depending only on C, M, i.e., only on C, n, m.*

Proof. This can be proved by proceeding along the lines of the proof in [KT] of the corresponding statements in the more traditional setting of Reifenberg flat domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$. ☐

Remark 2.6. Let $1 \leq m \leq n-2$ be given. Throughout the paper we will always assume, given an (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, that $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ with $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n, m) > 0$, so that Lemmas 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5 are all valid. We will sometimes refer to M, r_0 as parameters defining (i) non-tangential approach regions to Σ as well as (ii) the connectivity of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$.

2.1. An estimate of p-capacity

Definition 2.7. Let $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and let K be a compact subset of O. Given $p > 1$, we let

$$\mathrm{Cap}_p(K, O) = \inf\left\{ \int_O |\nabla\phi|^p \, dy : \phi \in C_0^\infty(O), \phi \geq 1 \text{ in } K \right\}.$$

$\mathrm{Cap}_p(K, O)$ is referred to as the *p-capacity* of K relative to O. The p-capacity of an arbitrary set $E \subset O$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{Cap}_p(E, O) = \inf_{E \subset G \subset O, \, G \text{ open}} \quad \sup_{K \subset G, \, K \text{ compact}} \mathrm{Cap}_p(K, O). \tag{2.7}$$

Definition 2.8. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set and let $w \in \Sigma$ and $r > 0$. Let $p > 0$ be given and assume that there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\mathrm{Cap}_p(\Sigma \cap B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}), B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r}))}{\mathrm{Cap}_p(B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}), B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r}))} \geq \eta$$

whenever $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ and $0 < \hat{r} < r$. We then say that $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is *uniformly p-thick* with constant η.

Lemma 2.9. *Assume $1 \leq m \leq n-2$ and let Σ be a closed (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. Let $p > n-m$ be given. Then there exists $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m)$ such that if $0 < \delta < \hat{\delta}$, then $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is uniformly p-thick for some constant $\eta = \eta(p, n, m)$ whenever $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0/4$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ and $0 < \hat{r} < r$, let $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m)$ be a degree of freedom to be chosen and consider $0 < \delta < \hat{\delta}$. As uniform p-thickness is invariant under translation and dilation, we may assume that $\hat{w} = 0$ and $\hat{r} = 1$. We may also assume that p is fixed and $n - m < p < n - m/2$, as Lemma 2.9 for other values of p follows from this case and inclusion relations for Riesz capacities (see [AH, Theorem 5.51]).

To start the argument we note that there exists a hyperplane $\Lambda = \Lambda_m(0, 1)$ such that

$$h(\Sigma \cap B(0, 1), \Lambda \cap B(0, 1)) \leq \delta \leq \hat{\delta}. \tag{2.8}$$

In the following argument we let $N := \hat{\delta}^{-m}/(10^{10}A)$, where $A \geq 1$ is a large but fixed degree of freedom, depending on m, and to be chosen. Using (2.8) we find, for A large enough, that $B(0, 1/8)$ contains at least $\tilde{N} \geq N$ disjoint balls of radius $\hat{\delta}$, $\{B(y_i, \hat{\delta})\}_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}}$, with $y_i \in \Sigma \cap B(0, 1)$. Let Γ_1 denote a subcollection of these balls consisting of exactly N balls. In particular, $\Gamma_1 = \{B(z_i, \hat{\delta})\}_{i=1}^{N}$ for some $\{z_1, \ldots, z_N\} \subset \{y_1, \ldots, y_{\tilde{N}}\}$. Given a ball $B(z_i, \hat{\delta})$ in Γ_1 we can now repeat this construction with $B(0, 1)$, $B(0, 1/8)$, replaced by $B(z_i, \hat{\delta})$, $B(z_i, \hat{\delta}/8)$. Doing this for every ball in Γ_1 gives a new collection, denoted Γ_2, of N^2 balls of radius $\hat{\delta}^2$. Inductively we can in this way construct $\{\Gamma_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ where Γ_l is a collection of N^l disjoint balls of radius $\hat{\delta}^l$ such that each ball in Γ_{l+1} is contained in a ball in Γ_l. Furthermore, for $\hat{\delta}$ small enough, the closure of any ball in Γ_l is contained in $B(0, 1/4)$.

Next let

$$E_l := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : d(y, \Sigma) \leq \hat{\delta}^l\} \cap B(0, 1),$$

let l_0 be a large but fixed integer, and let ν_{l_0} denote the n-dimensional Lebesgue measure restricted to the balls in Γ_{l_0}. Then

$$\nu_{l_0}(E_{l_0} \cap B(0, 1)) = N^{l_0}\hat{\delta}^{nl_0}\gamma(n), \tag{2.9}$$

where $\gamma(n)$ is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\tilde{\nu}_{l_0} = \nu_{l_0}/\nu_{l_0}(E_{l_0} \cap B(0, 1))$ and let

$$W_{1,p}^{\tilde{\nu}_{l_0}}(y) = \int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{\tilde{\nu}_{l_0}(B(y, t))}{t^{n-p}}\right)^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{2.10}$$

denote the Wolff potential associated to $\tilde{v}_{l_0}$. We intend to prove, for some small fixed $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m) > 0$, that

$$W_{1,p}^{\tilde{v}_{l_0}}(y) \le c \quad \text{whenever } y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{2.11}$$

where $c = c(p, n, m)$, $1 \le c < \infty$. Using (2.11), the dual formulation of capacity proved in [AH, Theorem 2.2.7], as well as [AH, Theorem 4.5.4], we conclude that

$$\text{Cap}_p(E_{l_0} \cap B(0, 1), B(0, 2)) \ge \hat{c}^{-1}$$

for yet another $\hat{c} = \hat{c}(p, n, m) \ge 1$. In particular, letting $l_0 \to \infty$ we deduce that

$$\text{Cap}_p(\Sigma \cap B(0, 1), B(0, 2)) \ge \hat{c}^{-1}/2.$$

Furthermore, since $\text{Cap}_p(B(0, 1), B(0, 2)) \approx 1$, we see that Lemma 2.9, for $n - m < p < n - m/2$, follows immediately once (2.11) is proved.

To start the proof of (2.11) we first note that

$$W_{1,p}^{\tilde{v}_{l_0}}(y) \le \int_1^\infty \left(\frac{\tilde{v}_{l_0}(B(y, t))}{t^{n-p}} \right)^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} + \int_{\hat{\delta}^{l_0}}^1 \left(\frac{\tilde{v}_{l_0}(B(y, t))}{t^{n-p}} \right)^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}$$

$$+ \int_0^{\hat{\delta}^{l_0}} \left(\frac{\tilde{v}_{l_0}(B(y, t))}{t^{n-p}} \right)^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}$$

$$:= I_1(y) + I_2(y) + I_3(y). \tag{2.12}$$

Using $\tilde{v}_{l_0}(\mathbb{R}^n) = 1$ and integrating we obtain $I_1(y) \le c$, since $n - m < p < n - m/2$. Next, consider $l \le l_0$ and $\hat{\delta}^l \le t < \hat{\delta}^{l-1}$, and note that, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if $\tilde{v}_{l_0}(B(y, t)) \ne 0$, then $B(y, t)$ intersects at most $c(n)$ balls in Γ_{l-1}. Moreover, each of these balls has v_{l_0} measure at most $N^{l_0 - l + 2} \hat{\delta}^{n l_0} \gamma(n)$. Hence, using (2.9), we see that

$$\tilde{v}_{l_0}(B(y, t)) \le c(n) N^{-l+2} = c(n) \hat{\delta}^{m(l-2)} (10^{10} A)^{l-2} \le \frac{(10^{10} A)^{l-2}}{\hat{\delta}^{3m}} t^m \tag{2.13}$$

whenever $\hat{\delta}^l \le t < \hat{\delta}^{l-1}$, provided $\hat{\delta}$ is small enough. Furthermore, given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ it follows from (2.13) that there exist $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(n, m, \varepsilon)$ and $c = c(n, m, \varepsilon) \ge 1$ such that

$$\tilde{v}_{l_0}(B(\hat{y}, t)) \le c t^{m\varepsilon} \quad \text{whenever } \hat{\delta}^{l_0} \le t \le 1. \tag{2.14}$$

Let $\varepsilon = (1 + (n - p)/m)/2 \in (0, 1)$ and fix $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m) > 0$ to be the largest number such that the above inequalities hold. Then using (2.14) we see that

$$I_2(y) \le \int_{\hat{\delta}^{l_0}}^1 t^{(m\varepsilon + p - n)/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \le c(p, n, m).$$

Finally, using the trivial estimate $v_{l_0}(B(y, t)) \le \gamma(n) t^n$ whenever $0 < t < \hat{\delta}^{l_0}$, we get

$$I_3(y) \le c(N^{l_0} \hat{\delta}^{n l_0} \gamma(n))^{1/(1-p)} \int_0^{\hat{\delta}^{l_0}} t^{p/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \le c(p, n, m)$$

whenever $n - m < p < n - m/2$. Putting together the estimates for $I_1(y), I_2(y), I_3(y)$ we obtain (2.11) in the case $n - m < p < n - m/2$. From our earlier remarks we now conclude Lemma 2.9. $\qquad \square$

3. *A*-harmonic functions

In this section we first prove some fundamental estimates for non-negative *A*-harmonic functions. Throughout the section we assume, unless otherwise stated, that

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(i)} & p > n - m,\ 1 \leq m \leq n - 2, \\
\text{(ii)} & \Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is a closed } (m, r_0, \delta)\text{-Reifenberg flat set,} \\
\text{(iii)} & A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \text{ or } A \in M_p(\alpha) \text{ for some } (\alpha, \beta, \gamma).
\end{array}
\tag{3.1}
$$

Furthermore, assuming (3.1) we let $\bar{\delta} = \min\{\delta_0, \hat{\delta}\}$ where δ_0 is as in Lemmas 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5, and $\hat{\delta}$ is as in Lemma 2.9. Then $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(p, n, m)$. In particular, when we assume (3.1) and $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, then we ensure that

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(i)} & \text{Lemmas 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5 are valid for some } M = M(n, m) \geq 2, \\
\text{(ii)} & \text{there exists } \eta = \eta(p, n, m) > 0 \text{ such that } \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r) \text{ is uniformly} \\
& p\text{-thick with constant } \eta \text{ whenever } w \in \Sigma \text{ and } 0 < r < r_0/4.
\end{array}
\tag{3.2}
$$

Concerning constants, unless otherwise stated, c will denote a positive constant ≥ 1, not necessarily the same at each occurrence, depending at most on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda$, which sometimes we refer to as *depending on the data*. In general, $c(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ denotes a positive constant ≥ 1, which may depend at most on the data and $a_1, \ldots, a_m$, not necessarily the same at each occurrence. If $A \approx B$ then A/B is bounded from above and below by constants which, unless otherwise stated, depend at most on the data. Moreover, we let $\max_{B(z,s)} u$, $\min_{B(z,s)} u$ be the essential supremum and infimum of u on $B(z, s) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ whenever u is defined on $B(z, s)$.

3.1. Basic estimates

Lemma 3.1. *Given $p > 1$, assume that $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ for some (α, β, γ). Let u be a positive A-harmonic function in $B(w, 2r)$. Then*

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(i)} & r^{p-n} \displaystyle\int_{B(w, r/2)} |\nabla u|^p \, dy \leq c \left(\max_{B(w,r)} u \right)^p, \\[2ex]
\text{(ii)} & \displaystyle\max_{B(w,r)} u \leq c \min_{B(w,r)} u.
\end{array}
$$

Furthermore, there exists $\sigma = \sigma(p, n, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $x, y \in B(w, r)$, then

$$
\text{(iii)} \quad |u(x) - u(y)| \leq c(|x - y|/r)^{\sigma} \max_{B(w, 2r)} u.
$$

Lemma 3.2. *Assume (3.1) and $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$. Let $w \in \Sigma$ and consider $0 < r < r_0$. Then, given $f \in W^{1,p}(B(w, 4r))$, there exists a unique A-harmonic function $u \in W^{1,p}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$ such that $u - f \in W_0^{1,p}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$. Furthermore, let $u, v \in W_{\mathrm{loc}}^{1,p}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$ be an A-superharmonic function and an A-subharmonic function in Ω, respectively. If $\inf\{u - v, 0\} \in W_0^{1,p}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$, then $u \geq v$ a.e. in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$. Finally, every point $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is regular for the continuous Dirichlet problem for $\nabla \cdot A(x, \nabla u) = 0$.*

Proof. The first part of the lemma is a standard maximum principle, so we only prove the statement that every point $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is regular in the continuous Dirichlet problem for $\nabla \cdot A(x, \nabla u) = 0$, and to prove this we use results established in [HKM, Section 6]. Indeed, given $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$, from (3.1) and the assumption that $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ we know (see (3.2)) that there exist $r_{\hat{w}} > 0$ and $\eta = \eta(p, n, m) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\mathrm{Cap}_p(\Sigma \cap B(\hat{w}, \rho), B(\hat{w}, 2\rho))}{\mathrm{Cap}_p(B(\hat{w}, \rho), B(\hat{w}, 2\rho))} \geq \eta$$

whenever $0 < \rho < r_{\hat{w}}/2$. In particular,

$$\int_0^{r_{\hat{w}}/2} \left[\frac{\mathrm{Cap}_p(\Sigma \cap B(\hat{w}, \rho), B(\hat{w}, 2\rho))}{\mathrm{Cap}_p(B(\hat{w}, \rho), B(\hat{w}, 2\rho))} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} = \infty,$$

and hence $\hat{w}$ is regular in the Dirichlet problem for $\nabla \cdot A(x, \nabla u) = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Assume* (3.1), $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, *and* $w \in \Sigma$. *Assume also that* u *is a positive A-harmonic function in* $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, *continuous on* $B(w, 4r)$ *and with* $u = 0$ *on* $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. *Then*

$$\text{(i)} \quad r^{p-n} \int_{B(w, r/2)} |\nabla u|^p \, dy \leq c \left(\max_{B(w, r)} u \right)^p.$$

Furthermore, there exists $\sigma = \sigma(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ *such that if* $x, y \in B(w, r)$, *then*

$$\text{(ii)} \quad |u(x) - u(y)| \leq c(|x - y|/r)^\sigma \max_{B(w, 2r)} u.$$

Proof. (i) is a standard Caccioppoli inequality, so we only prove (ii). We note that, using Lemma 3.1, the triangle inequality and elementary arguments, it suffices to prove that there exist $c \geq 1$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, depending only on the data, such that

$$\max_{B(w, \rho)} u \leq c(\rho/r)^\sigma \max_{B(w, r)} u \quad \text{whenever } 0 < \rho \leq r. \tag{3.3}$$

To prove (3.3) we again use results established in [HKM, Section 6]. Indeed, using [HKM, Theorem 6.18] we immediately see that there exists a constant $c > 0$, depending only on the data, such that

$$\max_{B(w, \rho)} u \leq \exp\left(-c \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{\mathrm{Cap}_p(\Sigma \cap B(w, t), B(w, 2t))}{\mathrm{Cap}_p(B(w, t), B(w, 2t))} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \right) \max_{B(w, r)} u.$$

Furthermore, using (3.1) and the assumption that $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, we have

$$\exp\left(-c \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{\mathrm{Cap}_p(\Sigma \cap B(w, t), B(w, 2t))}{\mathrm{Cap}_p(B(w, t), B(w, 2t))} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \right) \leq \exp(-\hat{c} \ln(r/\rho)).$$

Putting these inequalities together we obtain (3.3). $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$. *Assume also that u is a positive A-harmonic function in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$. There exists $c = c(p, n, m) \geq 1$ such that if $\tilde{r} = r/c$, $w_1, w_2 \in B(w, \tilde{r}) \setminus \Sigma$, $\min\{d(w_1, \Sigma), d(w_2, \Sigma)\} > \epsilon$ and $|w_1 - w_2| \leq C\epsilon$, for some $\epsilon > 0$, then*

$$u(w_1) \leq \hat{c}u(w_2) \quad \text{for some } \hat{c} \geq 1 \text{ depending only on the data and } C.$$

Proof. The lemma is elementary and follows from Lemmas 2.5 and 3.1. □

Lemma 3.5. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$. *Assume also that u is a positive A-harmonic function in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 4r)$ and with $u = 0$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. There exists $c \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that if $\tilde{r} = r/c$, then*

$$\max_{B(w,\tilde{r})} u \leq cu(a_{\tilde{r}}(w)).$$

Proof. A proof for linear elliptic PDEs can be found in [CFMS]. The proof uses only analogues of Lemmas 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4 for linear PDEs; in particular, it also applies in our situation. □

Lemma 3.6. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$. *Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and suppose that u is a non-negative A-harmonic function in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 4r)$, and $u = 0$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. Then u has a representative in $W^{1,p}(B(w, 4r))$ with Hölder continuous partial derivatives in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$. Furthermore, there exists $\hat{\sigma} \in (0, 1]$, depending only on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$, such that if $x, y \in B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}/2)$ and $B(\hat{w}, 4\hat{r}) \subset B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, then*

(i) $c^{-1}|\nabla u(x) - \nabla u(y)| \leq (|x - y|/\hat{r})^{\hat{\sigma}} \max_{B(\hat{w},\hat{r})} |\nabla u| \leq c\hat{r}^{-1}(|x - y|/\hat{r})^{\hat{\sigma}} \max_{B(\hat{w},2\hat{r})} u.$

Furthermore, if $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, then

$$u(y)/d(y, \Sigma) \approx |\nabla u|(y), \quad y \in B(\hat{w}, 3\hat{r}),$$

and if A also satisfies condition (a) *of Theorem 1.10, then u has continuous second derivatives in $B(\hat{w}, 3\hat{r})$, and there exists $\bar{c} \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that*

(ii) $\displaystyle \max_{B(\hat{w},\hat{r}/2)} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} |\hat{u}_{y_i y_j}| \leq \bar{c}\left(\hat{r}^{-n} \int_{B(\hat{w},\hat{r})} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} |\hat{u}_{y_i y_j}|^2 \, dy\right)^{1/2} \leq \bar{c}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{w})/d(\bar{w}, \Sigma)^2.$

Proof. A proof of (i) can be found in [T1]; (ii) follows from the first display, the added assumptions, and Schauder type estimates (see [GT]). □

Lemma 3.7. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$. *Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and suppose that u is a non-negative A-harmonic function in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 4r)$, and $u = 0$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. There exists a unique finite positive Borel measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, with support in $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$, such that whenever $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B(w, 4r))$,*

(i) $\displaystyle \int \langle A(y, \nabla u(y)), \nabla \phi(y) \rangle \, dy = -\int \phi \, d\mu.$

Moreover, there exists $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \geq 1$ such that if $\tilde{r} = r/c$, then

(ii) $c^{-1}r^{p-n}\mu(\Sigma \cap B(w, \tilde{r})) \leq u(a_{\tilde{r}}(w))^{p-1} \leq cr^{p-n}\mu(\Sigma \cap B(w, \tilde{r}/2)).$

Proof. See [KZ]. □

3.2. Technical lemmas

Assume that $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$. For $0 \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$ and $0 < r_1, r_2 < \infty$, we let

$$C_{r_1, r_2}(0) = \{y = (y', y'') : |y'| < r_1, \ |y''| < r_2\}.$$

If $r_1 = r_2 = r$ we simply write $C_r(0)$. Given $w \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$ we assume that $\Sigma = \Lambda_m(w)$. Let T be the composition of a translation and a rotation which maps $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to w and $\{(y', y'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m} : y'' = 0\}$ to Σ. Making use of T we let

$$C_{r_1, r_2}(w) = T(C_{r_1, r_2}(0)), \quad C_r(w) = T(C_r(0)). \tag{3.4}$$

Furthermore, we let, whenever $0 < r_1 < \infty$,

$$\Sigma_{r_1}(w) = T(\{y = (y', y'') : |y'| < r_1, \ y'' = 0\}). \tag{3.5}$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $p > n - m$ and $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$, and assume that $A_1, A_2 \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ with*

$$|A_1(y, \eta) - A_2(y, \eta)| \leq \epsilon |\eta|^{p-1} \qquad \text{whenever } y \in C_1(0),$$

for some $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$. Let u_2 be a non-negative A_2-harmonic function in $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma_1(0)$, continuous on the closure of $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma_1(0)$, and with $u_2 = 0$ on $\Sigma_1(0)$. Furthermore, let u_1 be the A_1-harmonic function in $C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)$ which is continuous on the closure of $C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)$ and which coincides with u_2 on $\partial(C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0))$. Then given $\rho \in (0, 1/16)$, there exist $c, \tilde{c}, \theta$, and τ, all depending only on $p, n, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$, such that

$$|u_2(y) - u_1(y)| \leq c\epsilon^\theta u_2(a_{1/2}(w)) \leq \tilde{c}\epsilon^\theta \rho^{-\tau} u_2(y) \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_{1/4}(0) \setminus C_{1/4, \rho}(0).$$

Proof. The statement and its proof are similar to those of [LLuN, Lemma 3.1] but we include a proof for completeness. To start with, we observe that the existence and uniqueness of u_1, as stated in the lemma and given u_2, follows from Lemma 3.2. Next we note that if $y, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, and $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, then

$$A_i(y, \lambda) - A_i(y, \xi) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\lambda_j - \xi_j) \int_0^1 \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(y, t\lambda + (1-t)\xi) \, dt \tag{3.6}$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Using (3.6) and Definition 1.1 we see that

$$c^{-1}(|\lambda| + |\xi|)^{p-2} |\lambda - \xi|^2 \leq \langle A(y, \lambda) - A(y, \xi), \lambda - \xi \rangle \leq c(|\lambda| + |\xi|)^{p-2} |\lambda - \xi|^2. \tag{3.7}$$

In particular, using (3.7) we deduce that if

$$I = \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |\nabla u_2 - \nabla u_1|^p dy,$$

then

$$I \leq cJ,$$
$$J := \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} \langle A_1(y, \nabla u_1(y)) - A_1(y, \nabla u_2(y)), \nabla u_2(y) - \nabla u_1(y) \rangle \, dy, \tag{3.8}$$

since $p \geq 2$. As $\nabla \cdot (A_1(y, \nabla u_1(y))) = 0 = \nabla \cdot (A_2(y, \nabla u_2(y)))$ whenever $y \in C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)$, and as $\theta = u_2 - u_1 \in W_0^{1,p}(C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0))$, we see from the definition of J in (3.8) that

$$J = \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} \langle A_2(y, \nabla u_2(y)) - A_1(y, \nabla u_2(y)), \nabla u_2(y) - \nabla u_1(y) \rangle \, dy. \quad (3.9)$$

Hence, using (3.8), (3.9), the assumption on the difference $|A_1(y, \eta) - A_2(y, \eta)|$ stated in the lemma and Hölder's inequality, we can conclude that

$$I \leq c\epsilon \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} (|\nabla u_1|^p + |\nabla u_2|^p) \, dx. \quad (3.10)$$

Now from the observation above (3.9), (3.7) with $\xi = 0$, and Hölder's inequality we see that

$$\int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |\nabla u_1|^p \, dy \leq c \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} \langle A_1(y, \nabla u_1(y)), \nabla u_2(y) \rangle \, dy$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |\nabla u_1|^p \, dy + c \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |\nabla u_2|^p \, dy.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |\nabla u_1|^p \, dy \leq c \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |\nabla u_2|^p \, dy. \quad (3.11)$$

In particular, using (3.11) in (3.10), and Lemmas 3.1, 3.3, 3.5 for u_2, we obtain

$$I \leq c\epsilon u_2(e_n/2)^p. \quad (3.12)$$

Next using the Poincáre inequality for functions in $C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0))$ we deduce from (3.12) that

$$\int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |u_2 - u_1|^p \, dy \leq c \int_{C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)} |\nabla u_2 - \nabla u_1|^p \, dy$$

$$\leq c\epsilon u_2(e_n/2)^p. \quad (3.13)$$

In the following we let $\eta = 1/(p+2)$ and we introduce the sets

$$E = \{y \in C_{1/2}(0) : |u_2(y) - u_1(y)| \leq \epsilon^\eta u_2(e_n/2)\}, \quad F = C_{1/2}(0) \setminus E. \quad (3.14)$$

Moreover, for a measurable function f defined on $C_{1/2}(0)$ we introduce, for $y \in C_{1/2}(0)$, the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function

$$M(f)(y) := \sup_{\{r > 0 \, : \, C_r(y) \subset C_{1/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma_{1/2}(0)\}} \frac{1}{|C_r(y)|} \int_{C_r(y)} |f(z)| \, dz. \quad (3.15)$$

Let

$$G = \{y \in C_{1/2}(0) : M(\chi_F)(y) \le \epsilon^\eta\}, \tag{3.16}$$

where χ_F is the indicator function for the set F. Then using weak $(1, 1)$-estimates for the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function, (3.13) and (3.14), we see that

$$|C_{1/2}(0) \setminus G| \le c\epsilon^{-\eta}|F| \le c\epsilon^{-\eta}\epsilon^{-p\eta}\epsilon = c\epsilon^\eta, \tag{3.17}$$

by our choice of η. Also, using continuity of $u_2(y) - u_1(y)$ we find for $y \in G$ that

$$|u_2(y) - u_1(y)| = \lim_{r \to 0} \frac{1}{|B(y, r)|} \int_{B(y,r)} |u_2(z) - u_1(z)|\, dz \le c\epsilon^\eta u_2(e_n/2). \tag{3.18}$$

If $y \in C_{1/4}(0) \setminus G$, then from (3.17) we see that there exists $\hat{y} \in G$ such that $|y - \hat{y}| \le c(n)\epsilon^{\eta/n}$. Using Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 we hence get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|u_2(y) - u_1(y)| &\le |u_2(\hat{y}) - u_1(\hat{y})| + |u_2(y) - u_2(\hat{y})| + |u_1(y) - u_1(\hat{y})| \\
&\le c(\epsilon^\eta + \epsilon^{\sigma\eta/n})u_2(e_n/2). \tag{3.19}
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof of the first inequality stated in Lemma 3.8. Finally, using the Harnack inequality we see that there exists $\tau \ge 1$, depending only on the data, such that $u_2(e_n/2) \le c\rho^{-\tau}u_2(y)$ whenever $y \in C_{1/4}(0) \setminus C_{1/4,\rho}(0)$. □

Lemma 3.9. *Let $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and suppose that $p > 1$ and $A_1, A_2 \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. Also, suppose that $\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2$ are non-negative functions in O, $\hat{u}_1$ is A_1-harmonic in O, and $\hat{u}_2$ is A_2-harmonic in O. Let $\tilde{a} \ge 1$ and $y \in O$, and assume that*

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{a}} \frac{\hat{u}_1(y)}{d(y, \partial O)} \le |\nabla \hat{u}_1(y)| \le \tilde{a} \frac{\hat{u}_1(y)}{d(y, \partial O)}.$$

Let $\tilde{\epsilon}^{-1} = (c\tilde{a})^{(1+\hat{\sigma})/\hat{\sigma}}$, where $\hat{\sigma}$ is as in Lemma 3.6. If

$$(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})\hat{L} \le \hat{u}_2/\hat{u}_1 \le (1 + \tilde{\epsilon})\hat{L} \quad \text{in } B\left(y, \tfrac{1}{100}d(y, \partial O)\right)$$

for some $\hat{L} > 0$, then for $c = c(p, n, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ suitably large,

$$\frac{1}{c\tilde{a}} \frac{\hat{u}_2(y)}{d(y, \partial O)} \le |\nabla \hat{u}_2(y)| \le c\tilde{a} \frac{\hat{u}_2(y)}{d(y, \partial O)}.$$

Proof. This is [LLuN, Lemma 3.18] □

4. Linear degenerate elliptic equations

Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, and let λ be a real valued, non-negative, Lebesgue measurable function defined almost everywhere on $B(w, 2r)$. Then λ is said to belong to the class $A_2(B(w, r))$ if there exists a constant Γ such that

$$\tilde{r}^{-2n} \int_{B(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r})} \lambda\, dy \cdot \int_{B(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r})} \lambda^{-1} dy \le \Gamma \tag{4.1}$$

whenever $\tilde{w} \in B(w, r)$ and $0 < \tilde{r} \le r$. If $\lambda \in A_2(B(w, r))$ then λ is referred to as an $A_2(B(w, r))$-*weight*. The smallest Γ such that (4.1) holds is the *constant* of the weight.

Throughout the section we assume that

(i) $1 \le m \le n - 2$,

(ii) Σ is a closed (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $r_0, \delta > 0$,   (4.2)

(iii) $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ where δ_0 is as in Lemmas 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5.

We let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and we consider the operator

$$\hat{L} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left(\hat{a}_{ij}(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \right) \tag{4.3}$$

in $B(w, 16r) \setminus \Sigma$. We assume that the coefficients $\hat{a}_{ij}$ are bounded, Lebesgue measurable functions defined almost everywhere in $B(w, 16r)$ and

$$c^{-1} \lambda(y) |\xi|^2 \le \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \hat{a}_{ij}(y) \xi_i \xi_j \le c \lambda(y) |\xi|^2 \tag{4.4}$$

for almost every $y \in B(w, 16r)$, where $\lambda \in A_2(B(w, 8r))$. By definition $\hat{L}$ is a degenerate elliptic operator (in divergence form) in $B(w, 8r)$ with ellipticity measured by the function λ and c. If $O \subset B(w, 8r) \setminus \Sigma$ is open, then we let $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(O)$ be the weighted Sobolev space of equivalence classes of functions v with distributional gradient ∇v and norm

$$\|v\|_{1,2}^2 = \int_O v^2 \lambda \, dy + \int_O |\nabla v|^2 \lambda \, dy < \infty. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $\tilde{W}_0^{1,2}(O)$ be the closure of $C_0^\infty(O)$ in the $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(O)$ norm. We say that v is a *weak solution* to $\hat{L}v = 0$ in O if $v \in \tilde{W}^{1,2}(O)$ and

$$\int_O \sum_{i,j} \hat{a}_{ij} v_{y_i} \phi_{y_j} \, dy = 0 \tag{4.6}$$

for all $\phi \in C_0^\infty(O)$; $u \in \tilde{W}^{1,2}(O)$ is called a *subsolution* of $\hat{L}$ if (4.6) holds with $=$ replaced by $\le$ for all $\phi \in \tilde{W}^{1,2}(O)$ such that $\phi \ge 0$; and u is called a *supersolution* if $-u$ is a subsolution.

For the proof of the following lemma we refer to [FKS].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and let λ be an $A_2(B(w, 8r))$-weight with constant Γ. Suppose that v is a positive weak solution to $Lv = 0$ in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$. Then there exists a constant $c = c(n, \Gamma) \ge 1$ such that if $\hat{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\hat{r} > 1$, and $B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r}) \subset B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, then*

(i) $\displaystyle \hat{r}^2 \int_{B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}/2)} |\nabla v|^2 \lambda \, dy \le c \int_{B(\hat{w}, \hat{r})} |v|^2 \lambda \, dy,$

(ii) $\displaystyle \max_{B(\hat{w}, \hat{r})} v \le c \min_{B(\hat{w}, \hat{r})} v.$

Furthermore, there exists $\alpha = \alpha(n, \Gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $x, y \in B(\hat{w}, \hat{r})$, then

(iii) $\displaystyle |v(x) - v(y)| \le c(|x - y|/\hat{r})^\alpha \max_{B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r})} v.$

Definition 4.2. Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < r < r_0$, let $O \subset B(w, 8r)$ be open, let K be a compact subset of O, and assume that λ is a real valued, non-negative, Lebesgue measurable function defined almost everywhere on $B(w, 8r)$. We define

$$\text{Cap}_{2,\lambda}(K, O) = \inf\left\{ \int_O |\nabla\phi|^2 \lambda \, dy : \phi \in C_0^\infty(O), \ \phi \geq 1 \text{ in } K \right\}.$$

Then $\text{Cap}_{2,\lambda}(K, O)$ is referred to as the $(2, \lambda)$-*capacity* of K relative to O. The $(2, \lambda)$-capacity of an arbitrary set $E \subseteq O$ is defined by

$$\text{Cap}_{2,\lambda}(E, O) = \inf_{E \subset G \subset O, \, G \text{ open}} \ \sup_{K \subset G, \, K \text{ compact}} \ \text{Cap}_{2,\lambda}(K, O). \tag{4.7}$$

Definition 4.3. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set, let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < \infty$, and assume that λ is a real valued, non-negative, Lebesgue measurable function defined almost everywhere on $B(w, 8r)$. Also assume there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\text{Cap}_{2,\lambda}(\Sigma \cap B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}), \, B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r}))}{\text{Cap}_{2,\lambda}(B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}), \, B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r}))} \geq \eta$$

whenever $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ and $0 < \hat{r} < r$. We then say that $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is *uniformly* $(2, \lambda)$-*thick* with constant η.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and suppose that λ is an $A_2(B(w, 8r))$-weight. Furthermore, assume that* (4.2) *holds and $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is uniformly $(2, \lambda)$-thick for some constant $\eta > 0$. Then, given $f \in \tilde{W}^{1,2}(B(w, 4r))$, there exists a unique weak solution $u \in \tilde{W}^{1,2}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$ to $\hat{L}u = 0$ in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$ such that $u - f \in \tilde{W}_0^{1,2}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$. Furthermore, let $u, v \in \tilde{W}_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$ be an $\hat{L}$-supersolution and an $\hat{L}$-subsolution in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, respectively. If $\inf\{u - v, 0\} \in \tilde{W}_0^{1,2}(B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma)$, then $u \geq v$ a.e. in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$. Finally, every point $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is regular for the continuous Dirichlet problem for $\hat{L}u = 0$.*

Proof. The proof is essentially identical to the proof of Lemma 3.2; see also [FJK1]. □

Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 below are tailored to our situation and based on results in [FKS], [FJK1] and [FJK2]. We note that these authors assumed that $\hat{L}$ is symmetric, i.e., $\hat{a}_{ij} = \hat{a}_{ji}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, but, as pointed out in [LLuN], this assumption was not needed in the proof of these lemmas.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and suppose that λ is an $A_2(B(w, 8r))$-weight. Let v be a positive solution to $\hat{L}v = 0$ in $B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 2r)$ and with $v = 0$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 2r)$. Furthermore, assume that* (4.2) *holds and $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is uniformly $(2, \lambda)$-thick for some constant $\eta > 0$. Then there exists $c = c(n, \Gamma, \eta) \geq 1$ such that the following holds with $\tilde{r} = r/c$:*

(i) $\quad r^2 \displaystyle\int_{B(w, r/2)} |\nabla v|^2 \lambda \, dy \leq c \int_{B(w, r)} |v|^2 \lambda \, dy,$

(ii) $\quad \displaystyle\max_{B(w, \tilde{r})} v \leq c v(a_{\tilde{r}}(w)).$

Moreover, there exists $\alpha = \alpha(n, \Gamma, \eta) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $x, y \in B(w, \tilde{r})$, then

$$(\text{iii}) \quad |v(x) - v(y)| \le c(|x - y|/r)^\alpha \max_{B(w, 2\tilde{r})} v.$$

Lemma 4.6. *Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and suppose that λ is an $A_2(B(w, 8r))$-weight. Also let v_1, v_2 be two positive solutions to $\hat{L}v = 0$ in $B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 2r)$ and with $v_1 = 0 = v_2$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 2r)$. Furthermore, assume that (4.2) holds and $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$ is uniformly $(2, \lambda)$-thick for some constant $\eta > 0$. Then there exist $c = c(n, \Gamma, \eta) \ge 1$ and $\alpha = \alpha(n, \Gamma, \eta) \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\left| \log \frac{v_1(y_1)}{v_2(y_1)} - \log \frac{v_1(y_2)}{v_2(y_2)} \right| \le c \left(\frac{|y_1 - y_2|}{r} \right)^\alpha$$

whenever $y_1, y_2 \in B(w, r/c) \setminus \Sigma$.

4.1. A-harmonic functions: linearization and weighted capacity

Recall that we are assuming (3.1) and $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ so that also (3.2) holds (see (4.2)). Assume that $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ are two positive A-harmonic functions in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 4r)$ and satisfying $\hat{u} = 0 = \hat{v}$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. We define

$$e(y) = \hat{u}(y) - \hat{v}(y) \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, 2r), \tag{4.8}$$

$$u(y, \tau) = \tau \hat{u}(y) + (1 - \tau)\hat{v}(y) \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, 2r) \text{ and } \tau \in [0, 1]. \tag{4.9}$$

Clearly, $e(y) = u(y, 1) - u(y, 0)$ and it follows from (3.6) that e is a weak solution to

$$\hat{L}e := \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left(\hat{a}_{ij}(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma, \tag{4.10}$$

where, for $y \in B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma$ and $1 \le i, j \le n$,

$$\hat{a}_{ij}(y) = \int_0^1 a_{ij}(y, \tau) \, d\tau, \quad a_{ij}(y, \tau) = \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla u(y, \tau)). \tag{4.11}$$

In particular, using the structure assumptions in Definition 1.1, we observe from (4.10) and (4.11) that $e = \hat{u} - \hat{v}$ is a solution to a divergence form PDE with ellipticity constant, at $y \in B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma$, estimated by

$$\min\{p - 1, 1\}|\xi|^2 \lambda(y) \le \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \hat{a}_{ij}(y)\xi_i\xi_j \le \max\{p - 1, 1\}|\xi|^2 \lambda(y) \tag{4.12}$$

whenever $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Here,

$$\lambda(y) = \int_0^1 |\nabla u(y, \tau)|^{p-2} \, d\tau \approx (|\nabla \hat{u}(y)| + |\nabla \hat{v}(y)|)^{p-2} \tag{4.13}$$

whenever $y \in B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma$. In (4.13), $\approx$ means that the implied constants only depend on p, n, α. We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$. *Also suppose that* $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$ *are two positive A-harmonic functions in* $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, *continuous on* $B(w, 4r)$ *and satisfying* $\hat{u} = 0 = \hat{v}$ *on* $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. *Let* $\hat{\lambda} = \hat{\lambda}(y) = (|\nabla \hat{u}(y)| + |\nabla \hat{v}(y)|)^{p-2}$ *and suppose that* $\hat{\lambda} \neq 0$ *almost everywhere in* $B(w, 4r)$. *There exists* $c = c(n, m) \geq 1$ *such that if* $\tilde{r} = r/c$ *then* $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4\tilde{r})$ *is uniformly* $(2, \hat{\lambda})$-*thick for some constant* $\eta = \eta(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) > 0$.

Proof. In the following we simply choose $c = c(n, m) \geq 1$ and $\tilde{r} = r/c$ such that if $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4\tilde{r})$ and $0 < \hat{r} < \tilde{r}$, then $a_{\hat{r}}(\hat{w})$ and the point realizing $\sup_{B(\hat{w}, 4\hat{r})} \hat{u}$ can be joined by a Harnack chain contained in $B(w, r)$ and of length independent of $\hat{w}, \hat{r}$. Using this choice for $\tilde{r}$ we want to prove, for $\tilde{r}$ and η as stated, that

$$\frac{\text{Cap}_{2, \hat{\lambda}}(\Sigma \cap B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}), B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r}))}{\text{Cap}_{2, \hat{\lambda}}(B(\hat{w}, \hat{r}), B(\hat{w}, 2\hat{r}))} \geq \eta$$

whenever $\hat{w} \in \Sigma \cap B(w, 4\tilde{r})$ and $0 < \hat{r} < \tilde{r}$. By scaling we can assume that $\hat{w} = 0$ and $\hat{r} = 1$, and hence we want to bound the quotient

$$\frac{\text{Cap}_{2, \hat{\lambda}}(\Sigma \cap B(0, 1), B(0, 2))}{\text{Cap}_{2, \lambda}(B(0, 1), B(0, 2))} \tag{4.14}$$

from below with a positive constant depending at most on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$. Furthermore, we can, without loss of generality, assume that

$$\max\{\hat{u}(a_1(0)), \hat{v}(a_1(0))\} = \hat{u}(a_1(0)).$$

Let now $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 2))$, with $\phi \geq 1$ on $\Sigma \cap B(0, 1)$, be an admissible test function in the definition of $\text{Cap}_{2, \hat{\lambda}}(\Sigma \cap B(0, 1), B(0, 2))$. Let $\hat{\mu}$ be the measure corresponding to $\hat{u}$ as in Lemma 3.7. Then

$$\int \langle A(y, \nabla \hat{u}(y)), \nabla \phi(y) \rangle \, dy = -\int \phi \, d\hat{\mu}. \tag{4.15}$$

In particular,

$$\hat{\mu}(B(0, 1)) \leq \int |\langle A(y, \nabla \hat{u}(y)), \nabla \phi(y) \rangle| \, dy \leq c \int |\nabla \hat{u}|^{p-1} |\nabla \phi| \, dy, \tag{4.16}$$

and hence, simply using the Hölder inequality, we find that

$$\hat{\mu}(B(0, 1)) \leq c \left(\int |\nabla \phi|^2 \hat{\lambda}(y) \, dy \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{B(0, 2)} |\nabla \hat{u}|^p \, dy \right)^{1/2}.$$

Next, applying Lemma 3.1, the Harnack inequality and Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\left(\int_{B(0, 2)} |\nabla \hat{u}|^p \, dy \right)^{1/2} \leq \hat{u}(a_1(0))^{p/2}.$$

Furthermore, using Lemma 3.7(ii) and arguing as above we see that $\hat{\mu}(B(0,1)) \approx \hat{u}(a_1(0))^{p-1}$. In particular, using this fact and the above displays we deduce that

$$\hat{u}(a_1(0))^{p-2} \le c\left(\int |\nabla\phi|^2 \hat{\lambda}(y)\,dy\right). \tag{4.17}$$

As ϕ is an arbitrary admissible test function used in the definition of $\mathrm{Cap}_{2,\hat{\lambda}}(\Sigma \cap B(0,1), B(0,2))$, we conclude that

$$\hat{u}(a_1(0))^{p-2} \le c\,\mathrm{Cap}_{2,\hat{\lambda}}(\Sigma \cap B(0,1), B(0,2)), \tag{4.18}$$

and this is a lower bound for $\mathrm{Cap}_{2,\hat{\lambda}}(B(0,1), B(0,2))$.

To establish an upper bound we simply note that

$$\int_{B(0,2)} |\nabla\phi|^2 \hat{\lambda}(y)\,dy = \int_{B(0,2)} |\nabla\phi|^2 (|\nabla\hat{u}| + |\nabla\hat{v}|)^{p-2}\,dy$$

$$\le c\left(\int_{B(0,2)} (|\nabla\hat{u}| + |\nabla\hat{v}|)^p\,dy\right)^{1-2/p}\left(\int_{B(0,2)} |\nabla\phi|^p\,dy\right)^{2/p}. \tag{4.19}$$

Choosing ϕ as the p-capacitary function for $B(0,2) \setminus B(0,1)$ we can therefore conclude that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{2,\hat{\lambda}}(B(0,1), B(0,2)) \le c\left(\int_{B(0,2)} (|\nabla\hat{u}| + |\nabla\hat{v}|)^p\,dy\right)^{1-2/p}$$

$$\le c\big(\max\{\hat{u}(a_1(0)), \hat{v}(a_1(0))\}\big)^{p-2} = c\hat{u}(a_1(0))^{p-2}. \tag{4.20}$$

(4.18) and (4.20) now give the bound from below for the quotient in (4.14), and hence the proof of Lemma 4.7 is complete. □

4.2. A-harmonic functions: estimates based on linearization

In the following we again assume (3.1) and $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, so that also (3.2) holds. We also set

$$\tilde{\theta} = 1 \text{ when } m = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\theta} = \lambda, \text{ as in Theorem 1.10, when } 2 \le m \le n-2. \tag{4.21}$$

Let $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$, and $\hat{\lambda} = \hat{\lambda}_{\hat{u},\hat{v}}$ be as in the statement of Lemma 4.7. Then, by Lemma 4.7, there exists $c = c(n,m) \ge 1$ such that if $\varrho_0 = r/c$, then $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4\varrho_0)$ is uniformly $(2, \hat{\lambda})$-thick for some constant $\eta = \eta(p,n,m,\alpha,\beta,\gamma) > 0$. The analysis in this subsection is based on the following assumption.

Assumption 1. There exists $c_1 = c_1(p,n,m,\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\tilde{\theta}) \ge 1$ such that if $\varrho_1 = \varrho_0/c_1$, $a, b \in [0,\infty)$, and $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ are as above, then $\hat{\lambda}(y) := \hat{\lambda}(y,a,b,\hat{u},\hat{v}) = (a|\nabla\hat{u}(y)| + b|\nabla\hat{v}(y)|)^{p-2}$ is an $A_2(B(w,4\varrho_1))$-weight with constant $\Gamma = \Gamma(p,n,m,\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\tilde{\theta})$.

Lemma 4.8. *Assume* (3.1), $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, *and Assumption* 1. *Let* $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$, *and* ϱ_1 *be as in Lemma* 4.7 *with* $\hat{v} \leq \hat{u}$. *There exists* $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \Gamma) \geq 1$ *such that if* $\varrho_2 = \varrho_1/c$, *then*

$$c^{-1} \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_2}(w)) - \hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))} \leq \frac{\hat{u}(y) - \hat{v}(y)}{\hat{v}(y)} \leq c \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_2}(w)) - \hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}$$

whenever $y \in B(w, \varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma$.

Proof. We first prove the left hand inequality. To do so we show the existence of $T, c \geq 1$ such that if $\varrho_2 = \varrho_1/\hat{c}$, and if

$$e(y) = T\left(\frac{\hat{u}(y) - \hat{v}(y)}{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w)) - \hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} \right) - \frac{\hat{v}(y)}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} \tag{4.22}$$

for $y \in B(w, \varrho_1) \setminus \Sigma$, then

$$e(y) \geq 0 \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, 2\varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{4.23}$$

To do this, we initially allow $T, \hat{c} \geq 1$ in (4.22) to vary, and we fix them near the end of the argument. Set

$$u'(y) = \frac{T\hat{u}(y)}{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w)) - \hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))}, \quad v'(y) = \frac{T\hat{v}(y)}{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w)) - \hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} + \frac{\hat{v}(y)}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))}.$$

Observe from (4.22) that $e = u' - v'$. Let L be defined as in (4.10) using u', v' instead of $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$, and let e_1, e_2 be the solutions to $Le_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, in $B(w, \varrho_1) \setminus \Sigma$, with continuous boundary values

$$e_1(y) = \frac{\hat{u}(y) - \hat{v}(y)}{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w)) - \hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))}, \quad e_2(y) = \frac{\hat{v}(y)}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} \tag{4.24}$$

for $y \in \partial(B(w, \varrho_1) \setminus \Sigma)$. Note that by construction, and by Lemmas 4.7 and 4.4, e_1, e_2 are well defined. Furthermore, using Assumption 1 we see that Lemma 4.6 can be applied and we get, for some $c_+ \geq 1$ and $r_+ = \varrho_1/c_+$,

$$c_+^{-1} \frac{e_1(a_{r_+}(w))}{e_2(a_{r_+}(w))} \leq \frac{e_1(y)}{e_2(y)} \leq c_+ \frac{e_1(a_{r_+}(w))}{e_2(a_{r_+}(w))} \tag{4.25}$$

whenever $y \in B(w, 2r_+) \setminus \Sigma$. We now set

$$\hat{c} = c_+, \quad \varrho_2 = r_+, \quad T = \hat{c}\frac{e_2(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}{e_1(a_{\varrho_2}(w))},$$

and we observe from (4.25) that

$$Te_1(y) - e_2(y) \geq 0 \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, 2\varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{4.26}$$

Let $\hat{e} = Te_1 - e_2$ and note from linearity of L that $\hat{e}, e$ both satisfy the same linear locally uniformly elliptic subelliptic PDE in $B(w, \varrho_1) \setminus \Sigma$, and also they have the same

continuous boundary values on $\partial(B(w, \varrho_1) \setminus \Sigma)$. Hence, from the maximum principle for the operator L, it follows that $e = \hat{e}$ and then, by (4.26), $e(y) \geq 0$ in $B(w, 2\varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma$.

To complete the proof of the left hand inequality in Lemma 4.8 we prove that

$$T \leq c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \Gamma) = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}). \tag{4.27}$$

To do this, let $\hat{L}$ denote the operator corresponding to $\hat{u} - \hat{v}$ and defined as in (4.10). Then from the Harnack inequality in Lemma 4.1(ii) for $\hat{L}$, applied to $\hat{u} - \hat{v}$, and the definition of ϱ_2, we deduce the existence of $\zeta \in \partial B(w, \varrho_1) \setminus \Sigma$ with $d(\zeta, \Sigma) \geq r/c$ and such that $e_1 \geq c^{-1}$ on $\partial B(w, \varrho_1) \cap B(\zeta, d(\zeta, \Sigma)/4)$. Using this we find, essentially just using Lemma 4.5(iii) and the Harnack inequality in Lemma 4.1 applied to the function e_1, that $e_1(a_{\varrho_2}(w)) \geq \bar{c}^{-1}$. Also from Lemma 3.5 and the Harnack inequality applied to $\hat{v}$ we get $e_2(a_{\varrho_2}(w)) \leq \bar{c}$ for some $\bar{c} = \bar{c}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \Gamma)$. Thus (4.27) is true and the proof of the left hand inequality in Lemma 4.8 is complete.

To prove the right hand inequality in Lemma 4.8, one can proceed similarly and in this case one needs to prove, for e_1, e_2 as above, that $e_1(a_{\varrho_2}(w)) \leq \bar{c}$ and $e_2(a_{\varrho_2}(w)) \geq \bar{c}$. The second inequality follows, as above, essentially from Lemma 4.5(iii) and the Harnack inequality in Lemma 4.1 applied to e_2. The first inequality follows from Lemma 4.5(iii)(ii) for $\hat{L}$, applied to $\hat{u} - \hat{v}$, and the Harnack inequality. □

Lemma 4.9. *Assume* (3.1), $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, *and Assumption* 1. *Let* $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$, *and* ϱ_1 *be as in Lemma* 4.7. *There exists* $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}, \Gamma) \geq 1$ *such that if* $\varrho_2 = \varrho_1/c$, *then*

$$c^{-1} \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))} \leq \frac{\hat{u}(y)}{\hat{v}(y)} \leq c \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))} \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, \varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma.$$

Proof. Note that we are not assuming $\hat{v} \leq \hat{u}$. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.8. To prove the left hand inequality, we set

$$e(y) = \frac{T\hat{u}(y)}{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} - \frac{\hat{v}(y)}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} \quad \text{for } y \in B(w, \varrho_1) \setminus \Sigma, \tag{4.28}$$

and show that

$$e(y) \geq 0 \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, 2\varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma, \tag{4.29}$$

where T, $\hat{c}$, ϱ_2 are as in Lemma 4.9. In this case we let

$$u'(y) = \frac{T\hat{u}(y)}{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} \quad \text{and} \quad v'(y) = \frac{\hat{v}(y)}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))}.$$

Set $e = u' - v'$ and let L be defined as in (4.10) relative to u', v'. Repeating the argument in Lemma 4.8 from above (4.24), through the discussion below (4.27), we get the left hand inequality in Lemma 4.9. To prove the right hand inequality we argue as above with $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$ interchanged. □

Lemma 4.10. *Assume* (3.1), $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, *and Assumption* 1. *Let* $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$ *be as in Lemma* 4.7 *and let* ϱ_2 *be as in Lemma* 4.8. *Then there exist* $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}, \Gamma) \geq 1$ *and* $\sigma = \sigma(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \tilde{\theta}, \gamma, \Gamma) \in (0, 1)$ *such that if* $\varrho_3 = \varrho_2/c$, *then*

$$\left| \log \frac{\hat{u}(y_1)}{\hat{v}(y_1)} - \log \frac{\hat{u}(y_2)}{\hat{v}(y_2)} \right| \leq c \left(\frac{d(y_1, y_2)}{r} \right)^\sigma \quad \text{whenever } y_1, y_2 \in B(w, \varrho_3) \setminus \Sigma.$$

Proof. From Lemma 4.9, we have

$$c^{-1} \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))} \leq \frac{\hat{u}(y)}{\hat{v}(y)} \leq c \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_2}(w))} \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, \varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma.$$

Using this inequality we see that

$$\frac{\hat{u}(y_1)}{\hat{v}(y_1)} \leq c \frac{\hat{u}(y_2)}{\hat{v}(y_2)} \quad \text{whenever } y_1, y_2 \in B(w, \varrho_2) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{4.30}$$

Next if $\hat{w} \in B(w, \varrho_2/8) \cap \Sigma$, then we let

$$M(\rho) = \sup_{B(\hat{w}, \rho)} \frac{\hat{u}}{\hat{v}} \quad \text{and} \quad m(\rho) = \inf_{B(\hat{w}, \rho)} \frac{\hat{u}}{\hat{v}},$$

for $0 < \rho < \varrho_2/2$. We also let $\mathrm{osc}(\rho) := M(\rho) - m(\rho)$ for $0 < \rho < \varrho_2/2$. Then, if ρ is fixed we can apply Lemma 4.8 with $m(\rho)\hat{v}$ replacing $\hat{v}$ in $B(w, \rho) \setminus \Sigma$ to find that if $c_* \geq 1$ is large enough and $\tilde{\rho} = \rho/c_*$, then

$$M(\tilde{\rho}) - m(\rho) \leq c_*(m(\tilde{\rho}) - m(\rho)).$$

Likewise, applying Lemma 4.8 with $M(\rho)\hat{v}$, $\hat{u}$ playing the roles of $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$ respectively we find after multiplication by $\hat{u}/\hat{v}$ in view of (4.30) that

$$M(\rho) - m(\tilde{\rho}) \leq c_*(M(\rho) - M(\tilde{\rho})).$$

Adding these inequalities we obtain, after some arithmetic,

$$\mathrm{osc}(\tilde{\rho}) \leq \frac{c_* - 1}{c_* + 1} \mathrm{osc}(\rho) \tag{4.31}$$

where c_* has the same dependence as c in Lemma 4.10. Iterating (4.31) we conclude that

$$\mathrm{osc}(s) \leq c(s/t)^\phi \mathrm{osc}(t) \quad \text{whenever } 0 < s < t \leq \varrho_2/2, \tag{4.32}$$

for some $\phi > 0$ and $c \geq 1$. For slightly more details in the proof of (4.32), see [LLuN, (6.16)–(6.20)]. Now (4.32), (4.30), the arbitrariness of $\hat{w} \in B(w, \varrho_2/8) \cap \Sigma$ and the interior Hölder continuity-Harnack inequalities in Lemma 3.1, applied to $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$, are easily seen to imply Lemma 4.10.   □

Next we consider the following alternative assumptions to Assumption 1.

Assumption 1′. Let $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$ be as in Lemma 4.7. There exists $\hat{c}_1 = \hat{c}_1(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ ≥ 1 such that if $\hat{\varrho}_1 = \varrho_0/\hat{c}_1$, then for $y \in B(w, 4\hat{\varrho}_1) \setminus \Sigma$,

$$\hat{c}_1^{-1} \frac{\tilde{u}(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla \tilde{u}(y)| \leq \hat{c}_1 \frac{\tilde{u}(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \quad \text{for } \tilde{u} \in \{\hat{u}, \hat{v}\}.$$

Assumption 1″. Let $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$ be as in Lemma 4.7. There exists $\check{c}_1 = \check{c}_1(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ ≥ 1 such that if $\tilde{\varrho}_1 = \varrho_0/\check{c}_1$, then for $y \in B(w, 4\tilde{\varrho}_1) \setminus \Sigma$,

$$(i) \quad \check{c}_1^{-1} \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))} \leq \frac{\hat{u}(y)}{\hat{v}(y)} \leq \check{c}_1 \frac{\hat{u}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))}{\hat{v}(a_{\varrho_1}(w))},$$

$$(ii) \quad \check{c}_1^{-1} \frac{\hat{u}(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla \hat{u}(y)| \leq \check{c}_1 \frac{\hat{u}(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)}.$$

We end the section by proving that Assumption 1′ as well as Assumption 1″ imply Assumption 1 when Σ is an m-dimensional hyperplane and $A \in M_p(\alpha)$. Thus, in this particular case Lemma 4.10 is valid under either assumption.

Lemma 4.11. *Assume that* (3.1) *holds,* $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, *and* Σ *is an m-dimensional hyperplane. Assume either Assumption* 1′ *or Assumption* 1″. *Then Assumption* 1 *holds for some* c_1, Γ, *depending only on the data and either* $\hat{c}_1$ *or* $\check{c}_1$.

Proof. We first prove that Assumption 1′ implies Assumption 1. To do so, let $x \in B(w, \hat{\varrho}_1) \setminus \Sigma$ and consider $0 < \rho \leq c_*^{-1} \hat{\varrho}_1$ where $c_* \geq 100$ will eventually be chosen to depend only on the data. If $\rho \leq 3d(x, \Sigma)/4$, then from Assumption 1′, Lemma 2.4, and Harnack's inequality in Lemma 3.1 applied to $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$, we see that $\lambda = (a|\nabla \hat{u}| + b|\nabla \hat{v}|)^{p-2}$ satisfies

$$\int_{B(x,\rho)} \lambda^t \, dy \approx \left(\frac{a\hat{u}(x) + b\hat{v}(x)}{d(x, \Sigma)} \right)^{t(p-2)} \rho^n \quad \text{whenever } a, b \in [0, \infty) \text{ and } t = \pm 1.$$

(4.33)

If $\rho \geq 3d(x, \Sigma)/4$ let $z \in \Sigma$ with $|x - z| = d(x, \Sigma)$ and set $\bar{\rho} = c_*\rho$. Let P be an $(n-1)$-dimensional hyperplane with $z \in P$ and $\Sigma \subset P$. Let Ω be the component of $B(z, \bar{\rho}) \setminus P$ containing x and let $\Omega' = B(z, \bar{\rho}) \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ be the other component. Choose $y \in \Omega \cap \partial B(z, \bar{\rho})$ and $y' \in \Omega' \cap \partial B(z, \bar{\rho})$ with $\tilde{u}(y') \approx \tilde{u}(a_{\bar{\rho}}(z)) \approx \tilde{u}(y)$ whenever $\tilde{u} \in \{\hat{u}, \hat{v}\}$. Also choose $\hat{\rho} \approx \rho$ with $B(y, 2\hat{\rho}) \subset \Omega$ and $B(y', 2\hat{\rho}) \subset \Omega'$. Existence of $y, y', \hat{\rho}$ follows from elementary geometry and Harnack's inequality in Lemma 3.1 applied to $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$. Let u', v' be the A-harmonic functions in $B(z, \bar{\rho}) \setminus [P \cup \overline{B(y, \hat{\rho})} \cup \overline{B(y', \hat{\rho})}]$ with continuous boundary values $u' = v' = 0$ on $P \cup \partial B(z, \bar{\rho})$, while $u' = \hat{u}(a_{\bar{\rho}}(z))$ and $v' = \hat{v}(a_{\bar{\rho}}(z))$ on $\partial B(y, \hat{\rho}) \cup \partial B(y', \hat{\rho})$.

We remark that linear functions are A-harmonic when $A \in M_p(\alpha)$. Using this remark, and either [LLuN, Lemma 2.8] or just the barrier argument in that lemma, we deduce, for c_* large enough, that

$$u'(\hat{y})/d(\hat{y}, P) \geq c^{-1} \hat{u}(a_{\bar{\rho}}(z))/\bar{\rho} \quad \text{whenever } \hat{y} \in B(z, 4\rho) \setminus P, \qquad (4.34)$$

where c depends only on p, n, α. With c_* now fixed we use (4.34) and the maximum principle for A-harmonic functions to find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{u}(\hat{y}) &\geq u'(\hat{y}) \geq c^{-1}d(y, P)\hat{u}(a_{\bar{\rho}}(z))/\bar{\rho} \\
&\geq c^{-2}d(y, P)\tilde{u}(a_\rho(z))/\rho \quad \text{for } \hat{y} \in B(z, 4\rho) \setminus P.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.35}
$$

Note that (4.34), (4.35) are also valid with $\hat{u}, u'$ replaced by $\hat{v}, v'$. Let

$$
E = E(P) = \{\hat{y} \in B(z, 4\rho) \setminus P : d(\hat{y}, P) \geq \tfrac{1}{4}d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)\}.
$$

Using (4.35), Assumption $1'$ and the fact that $p > 2$, we see that

$$
\int_E \lambda^{-1}dx \leq c \left(\frac{a\hat{u}(a_\rho(z)) + b\hat{v}(a_\rho(z))}{\rho}\right)^{2-p} \rho^n.
\tag{4.36}
$$

From basic geometry we can choose $(n-1)$-dimensional hyperplanes $P_1, \ldots, P_N$, where $N = N(n)$, so that $B(z, 4\rho) \setminus \Sigma \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N E(P_i)$. Using this fact, and $B(x, \rho) \subset B(z, 4\rho)$, we conclude from (4.36) that

$$
\int_{B(x,\rho)} \lambda^{-1}\, dy \leq c' \left(\frac{a\hat{u}(a_\rho(z)) + b\hat{v}(a_\rho(z))}{\rho}\right)^{2-p} \rho^n,
\tag{4.37}
$$

where c' depends only on $\hat{c}_1$ and the data. Finally, observe from Lemmas 3.3, 3.5 for $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ and Hölder's inequality that

$$
\int_{B(x,\rho)} \lambda\, dy \leq \int_{B(z,4\rho)} \lambda\, dy \leq c'' \left(\frac{a\hat{u}(a_\rho(z)) + b\hat{v}(a_\rho(z))}{\rho}\right)^{p-2} \rho^n,
\tag{4.38}
$$

where c'' has the same dependence as c'. Combining (4.37) and (4.38) we find, in view of (4.33) and the arbitrariness of x, that the conclusion of Lemma 4.11 is true when Assumption $1'$ holds.

To prove the conclusion under Assumption $1''$ we assume, as we may, that

$$
\hat{u}(a_{\tilde{\varrho}_1}(w)) = \hat{v}(a_{\tilde{\varrho}_1}(w)) = 1,
\tag{4.39}
$$

since otherwise we can multiply $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ by appropriate constants to get (4.39) and then observe that the resulting functions satisfy the same PDE as $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$. From (4.39) and Assumption $1''$ we see that

$$
c_+^{-1} \leq \hat{u}(y)/\hat{v}(y) \leq c_+ \quad \text{in } B(w, \tilde{\rho}_1) \setminus \Sigma,
\tag{4.40}
$$

where $c_+ \geq 1$ depends only on $\check{c}_1$ in Assumption $1''$. Hence, if $2c_+\bar{u} = \hat{u}$, then

$$
\bar{u} \leq \hat{v}/2 \leq c_+^2\bar{u}.
\tag{4.41}
$$

Let now $\{u(\cdot, \tau)\}$, $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$, be the sequence of A-harmonic functions in $B(w, \tilde{\varrho}_1) \setminus \Sigma$ with continuous boundary values,

$$
u(y, \tau) = \tau\hat{v}(y) + (1-\tau)\bar{u}(y) \quad \text{for } y \in \partial(B(w, \tilde{\varrho}_1) \setminus \Sigma), 0 \leq \tau \leq 1.
\tag{4.42}
$$

Existence of $u(\cdot, \tau)$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$, is a consequence of Lemma 3.2. Also using the maximum principle for A-harmonic functions in Lemma 3.2, Assumption 1″, (4.41), and (4.42), we find for some $\tilde{c}$, depending on $\check{c}_1$ and the data, that

$$\tilde{c}^{-1} u(\cdot, \tau_1) \le \frac{u(\cdot, \tau_2) - u(\cdot, \tau_1)}{\tau_2 - \tau_1} \le \tilde{c} u(\cdot, \tau_1) \tag{4.43}$$

on $B(w, \tilde{\rho}_1) \setminus \Sigma$ whenever $0 \le \tau_1 < \tau_2 \le 1$. Let $\epsilon_0 = \tilde{\epsilon}$ where $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is as in Lemma 3.9 with $\tilde{a}$ replaced by $\check{c}_1$. From (4.43) we get the existence of ϵ_0' with $0 < \epsilon_0' \le \epsilon_0$, with the same dependence as ϵ_0, such that if $|\tau_2 - \tau_1| \le \epsilon_0'$, then

$$1 - \epsilon_0/2 \le \frac{u(\cdot, \tau_2)}{u(\cdot, \tau_1)} \le 1 + \epsilon_0/2 \quad \text{in } B(w, \rho_1) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{4.44}$$

Let $\xi_1 = 0 < \xi_2 < \cdots < \xi_l = 1$ and consider $[0,1]$ divided into $\{[\xi_k, \xi_{k+1}]\}$, $1 \le k \le l - 1$. We assume that all of these intervals have length $\epsilon_0'/2$, except possibly the interval containing $\xi_l = 1$ which is of length $\le \epsilon_0'/2$.

   Using Assumption 1″, $u(\cdot, \xi_1) = \bar{u} = (2c_+)^{-1} \hat{u}$, and (4.44) we see that Lemma 3.9 can be applied with $\hat{u}_1 = u(\cdot, \xi_1)$ and $\hat{u}_2 = u(\cdot, \xi_2)$. Doing this we first find, for some $c_- \ge 1$ depending only on $\check{c}_1$ and the data, that

$$c_-^{-1} \frac{u(y, \xi_2)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \le |\nabla u(y, \xi_2)| \le c_- \frac{u(y, \xi_2)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \tag{4.45}$$

whenever $y \in B(w, \tilde{\rho}_1/200) \setminus \Sigma$. Hence Assumption 1′ applies to $u(\cdot, \xi_1)$, $u(\cdot, \xi_2)$ with $\hat{\varrho}_1$ replaced by $\tilde{\rho}_1/200$. Second, from the first part of our proof it follows that Assumption 1 is satisfied for these functions, so we can use Lemma 4.10 to conclude that

$$\left| \log\left(\frac{u(y_1, \xi_2)}{u(y_1, \xi_1)}\right) - \log\left(\frac{u(y_2, \xi_2)}{u(y_2, \xi_1)}\right) \right| \le c \left(\frac{|y_1 - y_2|}{\tilde{\rho}}\right)^\sigma \quad \text{for } y_1, y_2 \in B(w, \tilde{\rho}/c), \tag{4.46}$$

where c depends on $p, n, m, \alpha, \tilde{\theta}, \check{c}_1$. We can now continue by induction, as in [LN2, proof of (4.24)–(4.28) in Theorem 2] to eventually obtain (see [LN2, Lemma 4.28]) that (4.45) holds with $u(\cdot, \xi_2)$ replaced by $u(\cdot, \xi_l) = \hat{v}$ whenever $y \in B(w, \tilde{\rho}/\bar{c})$. Here $\bar{c}$ depends only on $\check{c}_1$ and the data. Thus $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Assumption 1′, and so Assumption 1 is also valid. The proof of Lemma 4.11 is now complete.   □

5. Existence and uniqueness of fundamental solutions

Let n, m be integers such that $1 \le m \le n - 2$ and let $p > n - m$ be given. In this section we assume that $A \in M_p(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$, i.e., we consider operators with constant coefficients. Furthermore, we consider coordinates $y = (y', y'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$, and let $\Sigma = \{y = (y', y'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m} : y'' = 0\}$. We are here interested in constructing $u = u_{n-m}$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma)$, u is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $u = 0$ on Σ, $u > 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$, and u is a weak solution to $\nabla \cdot A(\nabla u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$. To start

the construction we let $k = n - m$ and we define $\tilde{A} = (\tilde{A}_1, \ldots, \tilde{A}_k) : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ by setting $\tilde{A}_j(\eta) = A_{m+j}(0, \eta)$ for $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Then also $\tilde{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$ in the sense of Definition 1.1, but with $\mathbb{R}^n$ replaced by $\mathbb{R}^k$. Points in $\mathbb{R}^k$ will be denoted by $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_k)$. We now say that $\tilde{u}$ is a *fundamental solution* to the equation $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, with pole at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, if

$\quad$ (i) $\quad \tilde{u} \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^k)$, $\tilde{u}$ is continuous in $\mathbb{R}^k$, $\tilde{u}(0) = 0$, $\tilde{u} > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$,

$\quad$ (ii) $\quad \int \langle \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}(z)), \nabla \theta(z) \rangle \, dz = -\theta(0)$ for all $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^k)$.

$\hfill$ (5.1)

Note that (5.1)(ii) implies that $\tilde{u}$ is a weak solution to $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$. We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer and let $p > k$. Let $\xi = (p - k)/(p - 1)$. Assume that $\tilde{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$ with $\mathbb{R}^k$ as the underlying space. Then there exists a fundamental solution $\tilde{u}$ to the equation $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, with pole at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, in the sense of (5.1), and a constant $c = c(p, k, \alpha) \geq 1$ such that*

$\quad$ (i$'$) $\quad c^{-1}|z|^\xi \leq \tilde{u}(z) \leq c|z|^\xi,$

$\quad$ (ii$'$) $\quad c^{-1}|z|^{\xi-1} \leq |\nabla \tilde{u}(z)| \leq c|z|^{\xi-1},$

$\hfill$ (5.2)

whenever $z \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. Assume that $\tilde{u}$ is a fundamental solution to the equation $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, with pole at 0, i.e., $\tilde{u}$ is an $\tilde{A}$-harmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying (5.1). Using $p > k$ and $\tilde{u}(0) = 0$, we find as in Lemma 3.7 with Σ replaced by $\{0\}$ that there exists a unique finite positive Borel measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on $\mathbb{R}^k$, with support at $\{0\}$, such that

$$\int \langle \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}(z)), \nabla \theta(z) \rangle \, dz = - \int \theta \, d\tilde{\mu} \qquad (5.3)$$

for all $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^k)$. In particular, from uniqueness and (5.1)(ii) we see that $\tilde{\mu}(\mathbb{R}^k) = 1$. Also using Lemma 3.7 we immediately deduce that $\tilde{u}$ satisfies (5.2)(i$'$).

$\quad$ Hence, it suffices to prove the existence of a $\tilde{u}$ satisfying (5.1) and (5.2)(ii$'$). In the following all balls $B(0, \varrho)$ are standard Euclidean k-dimensional balls. To start the proof of the existence of $\tilde{u}$ we let, for $\epsilon > 0$ given and small,

$$\tilde{A}(\eta, \epsilon) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \tilde{A}(\eta - \zeta)\theta_\epsilon(\zeta) \, d\zeta \qquad \text{for all } \eta \in \mathbb{R}^k, \qquad (5.4)$$

where $\theta \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1))$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \theta \, d\zeta = 1$ and $\theta_\epsilon(\zeta) = \epsilon^{-k}\theta(\zeta/\epsilon)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Using the definition of the class $M_p(\alpha)$ and standard properties of approximations to the identity, we deduce that for some $c = c(p, k) \geq 1$,

$\quad$ (i) $\quad (c\alpha)^{-1}(\epsilon + |\eta|)^{p-2}|\xi|^2 \leq \displaystyle\sum_{i,j=1}^k \frac{\partial \tilde{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\eta, \epsilon)\xi_i\xi_j,$

$\quad$ (ii) $\quad \left| \dfrac{\partial \tilde{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\eta, \epsilon) \right| \leq c\alpha(\epsilon + |\eta|)^{p-2}, \qquad 1 \leq i, j \leq k,$

$\hfill$ (5.5)

for all $\eta, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Moreover, $\tilde{A}(\cdot, \epsilon)$ is, for fixed ϵ, infinitely differentiable. We now let $w(\cdot, \epsilon)$ be the unique solution to $\nabla \cdot (\tilde{A}(\nabla w(z, \epsilon), \epsilon)) = 0$ in $B(0, 1) \backslash \{0\}$ which is continuous on the closure of $B(0, 1)$ and satisfies $w(\cdot, \epsilon) = 1$ on $\partial B(0, 1)$, and $w(0, \epsilon) = 0$. Note that, using [T1], [T2], [Li], we find that $w(\cdot, \epsilon)$ is in $C^{1,\hat{\sigma}}(B(0, 1) \backslash \{0\})$ for some $\hat{\sigma} > 0$ with constants independent of ϵ. Letting $\epsilon \to 0$, using the definition of the class $M_p(\alpha)$, one can prove that subsequences of $\{w(\cdot, \epsilon)\}$, $\{\nabla w(\cdot, \epsilon)\}$ converge pointwise to w, ∇w on $\overline{B(0, 1)}$ and $B(0, 1) \backslash \{0\}$, respectively, where w is the unique solution to $\nabla \cdot (\tilde{A}(\nabla w)) = 0$ in $B(0, 1) \backslash \{0\}$ which is continuous on the closure of $B(0, 1)$ and satisfies $w = 1$ on $\partial B(0, 1)$ and $w(0) = 0$. To proceed we let

$$\tilde{A}_{ij}^*(z, \epsilon) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\epsilon + |\nabla w(z, \epsilon)|)^{2-p}\left[\frac{\partial \tilde{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla w(z, \epsilon), \epsilon) + \frac{\partial \tilde{A}_j}{\partial \eta_i}(\nabla w(z, \epsilon), \epsilon)\right]$$

for $z \in B(0, 1) \backslash \{0\}$ and $1 \le i, j \le k$. From (5.5)(ii) and Schauder type estimates we see that $w(\cdot, \epsilon)$ is a classical solution to the non-divergence form uniformly elliptic equation

$$L^*\zeta = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \tilde{A}_{ij}^*(z, \epsilon)\zeta_{z_i z_j} = 0 \tag{5.6}$$

for $z \in B(0, 1) \backslash \{0\}$. Note also from (5.5) that the ellipticity constant for $(\tilde{A}_{ij}^*(z, \epsilon))$ and the L^∞-norm of $\tilde{A}_{ij}^*(z, \epsilon)$, $1 \le i, j \le k$, in $B(0, 1) \backslash \{0\}$, depend only on p, k, α. To continue we again note that it follows from the assumption $p > k$ that points are uniformly p-thick. In particular, using the Harnack inequality and Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, we immediately see that

$$c(1 - w(z, \epsilon)) \ge 1 \quad \text{whenever } z \in B(0, 1/2), \tag{5.7}$$

for some $c = c(p, k, \alpha) \ge 1$. We now let

$$\psi(z) = \frac{e^{-N|z|^2} - e^{-N}}{e^{-N/4} - e^{-N}} \tag{5.8}$$

for $z \in B(0, 1) \backslash \overline{B(0, 1/2)}$, where N is a non-negative integer. Then ψ is a subsolution to L^* in $B(0, 1) \backslash \overline{B(0, 1/2)}$ if $N = N(p, n, \alpha)$ is sufficiently large, and $\psi \equiv 1$ on $\partial B(0, 1/2)$, while $\psi \equiv 0$ on $\partial B(0, 1)$. Hence, using the comparison principle we see that

$$c(1 - w(z, \epsilon)) \ge \psi(z) \quad \text{on } B(0, 1) \backslash \overline{B(0, 1/2)}, \tag{5.9}$$

where c is independent of ϵ. Furthermore, it is easily seen that

$$c\psi(z) \ge 1 - |z| \quad \text{on } B(0, 1) \backslash \overline{B(0, 3/4)}, \tag{5.10}$$

for some $c = c(p, k, \alpha)$. We can therefore conclude that

$$\hat{c}(1 - w(z, \epsilon)) \ge 1 - |z| \quad \text{on } B(0, 1) \backslash \overline{B(0, 3/4)}, \tag{5.11}$$

for some $\hat{c} = \hat{c}(p, k, \alpha)$. Furthermore, letting $\epsilon \to 0$ we also have, by the above argument,

$$\hat{c}(1 - w(z)) \ge 1 - |z| \quad \text{on } B(0, 1) \backslash \overline{B(0, 3/4)}. \tag{5.12}$$

Next, given $R \geq 1$ let $\tilde{w}_R$ be the unique solution to $\nabla \cdot (\tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{w}_R)) = 0$ in $B(0, R) \setminus \{0\}$ which is continuous on the closure of $B(0, R)$ and satisfies $\tilde{w}_R = 1$ on $\partial B(0, R)$ and $\tilde{w}_R(0) = 0$. We observe, using Definition 1.1(iii) for $\tilde{A}$, and the maximum principle in Lemma 3.2, that $w(z/R) = \tilde{w}_R(z)$ for $z \in B(0, R)$. Thus we can apply (5.12) to conclude that

$$\hat{c}(1 - \tilde{w}_R(z)) \geq \frac{R - |z|}{R} \quad \text{on } B(0, R) \setminus \overline{B(0, 3R/4)}. \tag{5.13}$$

Using (5.13) and the comparison principle we find, for $\lambda > 1$ given, that

$$\frac{\tilde{w}_R(\lambda z) - \tilde{w}_R(z)}{\lambda - 1} \geq c^{-1} \tilde{w}_R(z), \tag{5.14}$$

in $B(0, R/\lambda) \setminus \{0\}$ for some constant c which can be chosen independent of λ whenever $1 < \lambda < 9/8$. Next, letting $\lambda \to 1$ in (5.14) we obtain

$$|z| \langle \nabla \tilde{w}_R(z), z/|z| \rangle \geq c^{-1} \tilde{w}_R(z) \quad \text{whenever } z \in B(0, R) \setminus \{0\}. \tag{5.15}$$

Let $\hat{w}_R = \tilde{w}_R / \tilde{w}_R(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. From Harnack's inequality and Hölder $1 - k/p$ continuity of Sobolev functions in $W^{1,p}$ when $p > k$, as well as the basic estimates of Section 3, we see that a subsequence of $(\hat{w}_R)$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^k$ to u' satisfying (5.1)(i) and $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla u') = 0$ weakly in $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$. Arguing as in (5.3) we now deduce that $\tilde{u} = cu'$ satisfies (5.1) for some $c = c(p, k, \alpha)$. Also the lower bound in (5.2)(ii$'$) is a consequence of (5.15). The upper bound follows immediately from (5.2)(i$'$) and interior regularity (see Lemma 3.6). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.1. $\qquad \square$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $p > k$ be given. Let $\xi = (p - k)/(p - 1)$. Assume that $\tilde{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$ with $\mathbb{R}^k$ as the underlying space. Then there exists a unique fundamental solution $\tilde{u}$ to the equation $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, with pole at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, in the sense of (5.1). Furthermore, there exist $\sigma = \sigma(p, k, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ and $\psi \in C^{1,\sigma}(\mathbb{S}^k)$ such that $u(z) = |z|^\xi \psi(z/|z|)$ whenever $z \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.1 we have the existence of a fundamental solution $\tilde{u}$ to the equation $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{u}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, with pole at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, in the sense of (5.1), satisfying also (5.2). We want to prove that $\tilde{u}$ is the unique fundamental solution in the sense of (5.1). To do this let $\tilde{v}$ be another fundamental solution to $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{v}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, with pole at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, in the sense of (5.1). Then, as in the proof of Lemma 5.1 we see that $\tilde{v}$ also satisfies (5.2)(i$'$). In particular, $\tilde{u} \approx \tilde{v}$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$. From this fact and (5.2)(ii$'$) for $\tilde{u}$ we observe that $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Assumption $1''$ in $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$. Using this observation and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.11 we deduce first that $\tilde{v}$ also satisfies (5.2)(ii$'$), with constants depending only on the data, and thereupon that $\lambda(\cdot, a, b, u, v) = (a|\nabla \tilde{u}| + b|\nabla \tilde{v}|)^{p-2}$ is an A_2-weight on $\mathbb{R}^k$ with constants independent of $a, b \in [0, \infty)$. Now arguing as earlier, we find that Lemma 4.10 holds on $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$ with $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ replaced by $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$. Exponentiating both sides of the inequality in that lemma we conclude the existence of $c = c(p, k, \alpha) \geq 1$ and $\sigma = \sigma(p, k, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\tilde{u}(z'')}{\tilde{v}(z'')} - \frac{\tilde{u}(z')}{\tilde{v}(z')} \right| \leq c(|z'' - z'|/R)^\sigma \max_{\partial B(0, R)} \frac{\tilde{u}}{\tilde{v}} \leq c^2 (|z'' - z'|/R)^\sigma \tag{5.16}$$

whenever $z', z'' \in B(0, R/4) \setminus \{0\}$. In particular, letting $R \to \infty$ we see that $\tilde{u} \equiv \tilde{v}$ on $\mathbb{R}^k$, and this completes the proof of uniqueness.

To prove the structural statement, let $\tilde{u}$ be as in the statement, and let $\tilde{v}(z) = \tilde{u}(tz)$ for some $t > 0$. Then, again using homogeneity in Definition 1.1(iii), we check that $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{v}) = 0$ weakly in $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$, and also we easily deduce, for fixed $t \in (0, \infty)$, that $t^{-\xi} \tilde{u}(tz)$ satisfies both conditions in (5.1). Hence, by uniqueness we have $\tilde{u}(tz) = t^\xi \tilde{u}(z)$ whenever $z \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$, or equivalently

$$\tilde{u}(z) = |z|^\xi \tilde{u}(z/|z|) \quad \text{whenever } z \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}. \tag{5.17}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.2 is now complete. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 5.3. *Let n, m be integers such that $1 \le m \le n - 2$ and let $p > n - m$ be given. Let $\xi = (p - n + m)/(p - 1)$. Assume that $A \in M_p(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$, consider coordinates $y = (y', y'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$ and let $\Sigma = \{y = (y', y'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m} : y'' = 0\}$. Then there exists a function $\bar{u} = u_{n-m}$, defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$, which satisfies*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{(i)} \quad \bar{u} \in W^{1,p}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma), \ \bar{u} \text{ is continuous on } \mathbb{R}^n, \\
&\text{(ii)} \quad \bar{u} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \ \bar{u} > 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma, \\
&\text{(iii)} \quad \bar{u} \text{ is a weak solution to } \nabla \cdot A(\nabla \bar{u}) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.18}
$$

and the quantitative estimates

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{(i}') \quad c^{-1}|y''|^\xi \le \bar{u}(y) \le c|y''|^\xi, \\
&\text{(ii}') \quad c^{-1}|y''|^{\xi-1} \le |\nabla \bar{u}(y)| \le c|y''|^{\xi-1},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.19}
$$

for some constant $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha) \ge 1$, whenever $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$. Moreover, $\bar{u}(y) = |y''|^\xi \psi(y''/|y''|)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$, where $\sigma = \sigma(p, n, m, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ and $\psi \in C^{1,\sigma}(\mathbb{S}^{n-m})$.

Proof. To construct $\bar{u} = u_{n-m}$ we simply let

$$\bar{u}(y) = \bar{u}(y', y'') := \tilde{u}(y'') \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma,$$

where $\tilde{u}$ is as in Lemma 5.2. Then obviously $\bar{u}$ satisfies (5.18) and (5.19). Also the last statement of the lemma follows from Lemma 5.2. $\qquad\square$

6. Proof of Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 in the baseline case

In this section we prove Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 in the special case when Σ is an m-dimensional hyperplane passing through 0, and $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, i.e., we consider only operators with constant coefficients. We note that if h is a weak solution to $\nabla \cdot A(\nabla h) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$, and T is a rotation of $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$ which maps $\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$ onto Σ, then, as follows by straightforward calculation, $\tilde{h}(x) = h(Tx)$ is a weak solution to a PDE, $\nabla \cdot \tilde{A}(\nabla \tilde{h}) = 0$, in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\})$, with $\tilde{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$. Thus, we can assume that $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$ since otherwise we can change coordinate systems. As usual we write $y = (y', y'')$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $y' \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $y'' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$. Furthermore, given $w = (w', w'') \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < r_1, r_2 < \infty$, we let $C_{r_1, r_2}(w)$ be as defined in (3.4), and if $r_1 = r_2 = r$, we write $C_r(w)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let n, m be integers such that $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and let $p > n - m$. Let $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$ and $0 < r < \infty$, and assume that $A \in M_p(\alpha)$. Let u, v be positive A-harmonic functions in $C_{4r}(0) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $C_{4r}(0)$, with $u = 0 = v$ on $\Sigma \cap C_{4r}(0)$. If $m = 1$, then there exists $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha) \geq 1$ such that*

$$c^{-1} \frac{u(a_r(0))}{v(a_r(0))} \leq \frac{u(y)}{v(y)} \leq c \frac{u(a_r(0))}{v(a_r(0))} \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_r(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.1}$$

If $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, and if condition (a) *or* (b) *of Theorem* 1.10 *holds, then there exists $c \geq 1$, depending at most on p, n, m, α, λ, such that* (6.1) *holds.*

Lemma 6.2. *Theorems* 1.9 *and* 1.10 *are valid for p, n, m, A, u, v as in Lemma* 6.1.

Proof. Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 in this baseline case follow immediately from Lemmas 6.1, 5.3, 4.11, and 4.10. $\qquad \square$

Below we give the proof of Lemma 6.1 divided into cases. As the PDEs satisfied by u, v are invariant under dilation and scaling, we may assume that

$$r = 1, \quad u(a_1(0)) = 1 = v(a_1(0)). \tag{6.2}$$

Hence, we want to prove that there exists $c \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that

$$c^{-1} \leq u(y)/v(y) \leq c \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.3}$$

In light of Lemma 5.3 it is sufficient to prove (6.3) with v replaced by $\bar{u} = u_{n-m}$. Equivalently, it suffices to establish the existence of $c \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that

$$c^{-1} |y''|^{\xi} \leq u(y) \leq c|y''|^{\xi} \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.4}$$

6.1. The case $m = 1$

In this case we need not use the explicit structure of $v = \bar{u}$. Indeed, to estimate u/v, suppose $u/v \geq \zeta$ on $\partial C_1(0)$ for some large $\zeta > 0$. Let $s \in (1, 3)$; from Harnack's inequality for A-harmonic functions, for ζ large enough, we have $u/v > \zeta$ at some point in $\partial C_s(0)$ with $y' = \pm s$. This implies there exists a closed interval $I \subset [1, 3] \cup [-3, -1]$ of length 1 such that for all $t \in I$ there exists $y'' = y''(t)$ with $|y''| \leq 1$ and $(u/v)(t, y'') > \zeta$. Indeed, if for some $z' \in (1, 2) \cup (-2, -1)$ we have $(u/v)(z', z'') \leq \zeta$ whenever $|z''| \leq 2$, then we can apply the above analysis to cylinders of radius 2 whose boundary contains $\{(z', z'') : |z''| \leq 2\}$ in order to conclude the existence of $I \subset [2, 3] \cup [-3, -2]$. Otherwise we choose $I = [1, 2]$.

Let μ, ν be the measures corresponding to u, v as in Lemma 3.7. Note, from Lemma 3.7(ii), and Harnack's inequality for u, v, that μ, ν are doubling measures in the sense that

$$\theta(B(y, 2s)) \leq c\theta(B(y, s)) \quad \text{whenever } y = (y', 0) \text{ with } |y'| + 4s < 4 \text{ and } \theta \in \{\mu, \nu\}. \tag{6.5}$$

Given $t \in I$, choose $y''(t)$ as above and set $\rho(t) = |y''(t)|$ and $\tau = (t, 0)$. Using Lemma 3.7(ii) we deduce, for some $c \geq 1$ depending only on p, n, α, that

$$\zeta^{p-1} \leq \left(\frac{u(t, y''(t))}{v(t, y''(t))} \right)^{p-1} \leq c \frac{\mu(B(\tau, \rho(t)))}{v(B(\tau, \rho(t)))}. \tag{6.6}$$

Using a standard covering lemma we see there exists $\{t_j\}$, $0 < t_j < 1/2$, for which (6.6) holds with $t, y''(t), \rho(t), \tau$ replaced by $t_j, y''(t_j), \rho(t_j), \tau_j$. Also

$$I \subset \bigcup_j B(\tau_j, \rho_j) \quad \text{and} \quad B(\tau_k, \rho_k/5) \cap B(\tau_l, \rho_l/5) = \emptyset \text{ when } k \neq l. \tag{6.7}$$

From (6.5)–(6.7) and Lemma 3.7 it follows, for some $\tilde{c} \geq 1$ depending only on the data, that

$$1 \approx v(B(0, 7/2)) \leq \tilde{c} v \left(\bigcup_j B(\tau_j, \rho_j) \right) \leq \tilde{c}^2 \zeta^{1-p} \mu \left(\bigcup_j B(\tau_j, \rho_j/5) \right)$$
$$\leq \tilde{c}^2 \zeta^{1-p} \mu(B(0, 7/2)) \approx \zeta^{1-p}. \tag{6.8}$$

Thus ζ cannot be too big (depending on the data). This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1 when $m = 1$.

Remark 6.3. We remark that Lemma 6.1 can be proved, using the above argument, also when u, v are solutions to the p-Laplace equation and $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$. Indeed, in this case one can construct p-harmonic $\tilde{v}, \tilde{u}$ that are rotationally symmetric in y', y'' and satisfy $u \leq c\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{v} \leq cv$. Then, using the two-dimensional character of $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$, one can essentially repeat the above argument to get the conclusion of Lemma 6.1 for $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$, and so also for u, v. We emphasize that this argument heavily uses the fact that the p-Laplacian is invariant under rotations.

For another proof of Lemma 6.1 when u, v are p-harmonic, see [Lu].

6.2. The upper bound in (6.4) for $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$

For $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$, and $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, let u' be the A-harmonic function in $B(0, 8) \setminus (\Sigma \cap \overline{B(0, 4)})$ with continuous boundary values $u' \equiv 1$ on $\partial B(0, 8)$ and $u' \equiv 0$ on $\Sigma \cap \overline{B(0, 4)}$. We will first prove, for some $\check{c} = \check{c}(p, n, m, \alpha)$, that

$$\check{c}^{-1} \frac{u'(y)}{|y''|} \leq |\nabla u'|(y) \leq \check{c} \frac{u'(y)}{|y''|} \quad \text{when } y \in C_4(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.9}$$

In order to prove (6.9) we observe, from Lemma 3.3 and Harnack's inequality applied to $1 - u'$, that $1 - u' \geq c^{-1}$ in $B(0, 6)$. Using this fact, and a barrier argument as in

(5.7)–(5.12), we obtain

$$1 - u'(y) \geq \bar{c}^{-1} d(y, \partial B(0,8)) \quad \text{when } y \in B(0,8) \setminus B(0,6). \tag{6.10}$$

Given $\hat{x} \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(0,4)}$, set $u_+(y) = u'(\hat{x} + y)$ when $y \in \Omega := \{z : z + \hat{x} \in B(0,8)\}$. Let $\Sigma' = \{z : z + \hat{x} \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(0,4)}\}$. Since A-harmonic functions, for $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, are invariant under translation and dilation, it follows first that u_+ is A-harmonic in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma'$, and second that if $s > 1$, then the function $y \mapsto u_+(sy)$ is A-harmonic in $\Omega(s)$ where $\Omega(s) = \{y \in \Omega : sy \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma'\}$. Using (6.10) and comparing boundary values we deduce, for $1 < s < 1.01$, that

$$\frac{u_+(sy) - u_+(y)}{s - 1} \geq c^{-1} u_+(y) \quad \text{when } y \in \partial\Omega(s), \tag{6.11}$$

where c depends on p, n, m, α. From the maximum principle for A-harmonic functions we see that (6.11) holds in $\Omega(s)$. Letting $s \to 1$ and using Lemma 3.6 we find that

$$\langle \nabla u'(y), y - \hat{x} \rangle \geq c^{-1} u'(y) \quad \text{for } y \in B(0,8) \setminus \Sigma . \tag{6.12}$$

From arbitrariness of $\hat{x} \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(0,4)}$, (6.12), and the fact that $|y''| = d(y, \Sigma)$, we deduce that the left hand inequality in (6.9) is valid. The right hand inequality follows from Lemma 3.6.

Next, let ξ be as in Lemma 5.3 and let $\bar{u} = u_{n-m}$ denote the A-harmonic function in that lemma. Then $u', \bar{u}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Assumption $1'$ of Section 4. Hence, using Lemmas 4.10 and 4.11, we have

$$c_*^{-1} \leq u'(y)/|y''|^\xi \leq c_* \tag{6.13}$$

whenever $y \in C_{1/\hat{c}}(0)$ for some c_* depending only on p, n, m, α. Repeating this argument with $C_1(0)$ replaced by $C_1(w)$ where $w \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(0,1)}$, and using Harnack's inequality again, we see that (6.13) holds for $y \in C_1(0)$, with c_* replaced by a larger constant also depending only on the data. Moreover, if u is as in (6.3), then $u \leq cu'$ in $C_4(0)$, so the right hand inequality in (6.13) holds with u' replaced by u. In particular, we get the upper bound in (6.4) for $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$.

6.3. The lower bound in (6.4): A as in (a) of Theorem 1.10

Let $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, and assume that A satisfies condition (a) of Theorem 1.10. We here prove the lower bound in (6.4), i.e., assuming (6.2) we prove that

$$|y''|^\xi \leq cu \quad \text{on } C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.14}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1 in the case considered. To prove (6.14) we first observe, by the same argument as in (4.34), (4.35), that

$$d(y, \Sigma) = |y''| \leq \tilde{c}_1 u(y) \quad \text{when } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma, \tag{6.15}$$

for some $\tilde{c}_1 = \tilde{c}_1(p, n, m, \alpha) \geq 1$. Let $\bar{u} = u_{n-m}$ be as in Lemma 5.3, and set

$$f(y) = (1 - |y'|^2)(e^{\bar{u}(y)} - 1) \quad \text{for } y \in C_1(0). \tag{6.16}$$

We claim that

$$f \leq \tilde{c}_2 u \quad \text{on } C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma \tag{6.17}$$

for some $\tilde{c}_2 = \tilde{c}_2(p, n, m, \lambda) \geq 1$. To prove this claim we first observe that $f \leq cu$ on $\partial(C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma)$, as follows from $u(a_1(0)) = 1$ and $f(y) \equiv 0$ when $|y'| = 1$ or $y \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(0, 1)}$. Hence, using (6.15), the maximum principle and Lemma 3.6, we see that in order to prove (6.17) it suffices to show, for some $\tilde{c}_3 = \tilde{c}_3(p, n, m, \alpha, \lambda)$, that if

$$y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma \quad \text{and} \quad f(y) \geq \tilde{c}_3 |y''|, \tag{6.18}$$

then

$$\nabla \cdot A(\nabla f)(y) \geq 0, \tag{6.19}$$

where the latter inequality is taken in the strong or classical sense. In order to prove that (6.18) implies (6.19) we let $\tilde{c}_3$ be a degree of freedom to be fixed and depending only on p, n, m, α, λ.

Let

$$\nabla' f(y) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_m} \right)(y), \quad \nabla'' f(y) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y_{m+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_n} \right)(y), \tag{6.20}$$

for $y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$. We write $\nabla f(y) = (\nabla' f(y), \nabla'' f(y))$. Note that

$$\nabla \cdot A(\nabla f)(y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y)) f_{y_i y_j} = T_1 + T_2 + T_3, \tag{6.21}$$

where

$$T_1 := \sum_{i,j}^{\hat{}} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y)) f_{y_i y_j},$$

$$T_2 := \sum_{m+1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left(\frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y)) - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(0, \nabla'' f(y)) \right) f_{y_i y_j},$$

$$T_3 := \sum_{m+1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(0, \nabla'' f(y)) f_{y_i y_j}, \tag{6.22}$$

where the sum $\sum_{i,j}^{\hat{}}$ is taken over all i, j for which $i \leq m$ or $j \leq m$. To estimate T_1 we note that if $i \leq m$ or $j \leq m$, then Lemma 5.3 shows that

$$|f_{y_i y_j}| \leq c |y''|^{\xi - 1} \quad \text{when } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.23}$$

Hence, from (6.23) and Definition 1.1(i) it follows that

$$|T_1| \leq c |y''|^{\xi - 1} |\nabla f(y)|^{p-2}. \tag{6.24}$$

We next estimate T_2 and T_3. From the definition of f, Lemma 5.3, and (6.18) we see that

$$1 - |y'|^2 \geq c^{-1} \tilde{c}_3 |y''|^{1-\xi}, \tag{6.25}$$

where $c \geq 1$ depends only on p, n, m, α. From (6.25) and Lemma 5.3 we observe that

$$|\nabla' f(y)| \leq c' |y''|^{\xi} \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla'' f(y)| \geq \tilde{c}_3 / c', \tag{6.26}$$

where c' has the same dependence as c in (6.25). From (6.26) and condition (a) in Theorem 1.10, with $\eta = (\nabla' f(y), \nabla'' f(y))$ and $\eta' = (0, \nabla'' f(y))$, we see that if $\tilde{c}_3$ is large

enough, then

$$\left| \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y)) - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(0, \nabla'' f(y)) \right| \leq \lambda |\nabla' f(y)| |\nabla f(y)|^{p-3}$$
$$\leq \lambda (c^*/\tilde{c}_3)|y''|^{\xi} |\nabla f(y)|^{p-2} \qquad (6.27)$$

where again c^* depends only on p, n, m, α. Note that

$$f_{y_i y_j} = e^{\bar{u}}(1 - |y'|^2)(\bar{u}_{y_i}\bar{u}_{y_j} + \bar{u}_{y_i y_j}) \qquad (6.28)$$

whenever $y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$ and $m + 1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Using Lemma 3.6, (6.28), and Lemma 5.3 we find that

$$|f_{y_i y_j}| \leq c|y''|^{\xi-2}(1 - |y'|^2) \quad \text{when } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma \text{ and } m + 1 \leq i, j \leq n. \quad (6.29)$$

Hence, using (6.27) and (6.29) we see that

$$|T_2| \leq (c/\tilde{c}_3)(1 - |y'|^2)|y''|^{2\xi-2}|\nabla f(y)|^{p-2}. \qquad (6.30)$$

To estimate T_3 we first deduce, using (6.28), Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3, as well as $(p-2)$-homogeneity of derivatives of A, that

$$T_3 = (1 - |y'|^2)e^{\bar{u}} \sum_{m+1 \leq i,j \leq n} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(0, \nabla'' f)\bar{u}_{y_i}\bar{u}_{y_j}. \qquad (6.31)$$

Now, from Definition 1.1(i), Lemma 5.3, (6.26), and the above equality it follows, for some $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \lambda) \geq 1$, that

$$T_3 \geq c^{-1}(1-|y'|^2)|\nabla\bar{u}(y)|^2|\nabla'' f(y)|^{p-2} \geq c^{-2}(1-|y'|^2)|y''|^{2\xi-2}|\nabla f(y)|^{p-2}. \quad (6.32)$$

In view of (6.30), (6.32), and (6.25) we see, for $\tilde{c}_3$ large enough, depending on p, n, m, α, λ, that

$$\sum_{m+1 \leq i,j \leq n} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y))f_{y_i y_j} = T_2 + T_3 \geq c^{-1}(1 - |y'|^2)|y''|^{2\xi-2}|\nabla f(y)|^{p-2}$$
$$\geq \tilde{c}_3 c^{-2}|y''|^{\xi-1}|\nabla f(y)|^{p-2}. \qquad (6.33)$$

Combining (6.24) and (6.33) we conclude that if $\tilde{c}_3$ is sufficiently large, depending only on p, n, m, α, λ, then (6.19) holds. As a consequence, (6.17) is valid. (6.17) implies (6.14).

6.4. The lower bound in (6.4): A as in (b) of Theorem 1.10

Let $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, and assume that $A \in M_p(\alpha)$ satisfies condition (b) of Theorem 1.10. To complete the proof of Lemma 6.1 in this case we again have to prove (6.14). Since A now has constant coefficients in the y variable, we write C for $C(y)$ and κ for $\kappa(y, \cdot)$. In the proof we assume, as we may, that C is a symmetric linear transformation, since otherwise we can replace C by $(C + C^t)/2$, where C^t denotes the transpose of C, and note that the weak formulation of solutions is unchanged. Also since

rotations preserve $M_p(\alpha)$ and functions homogeneous of degree 0, we may assume that C has a representation in the standard basis as a diagonal matrix. Finally, observe that dilations in the coordinate directions change $M_p(\alpha)$ into $M_p(\tilde\alpha)$ with $\tilde\alpha \approx \alpha$, while κ remains homogeneous of degree 0. Thus we assume, as we may, that C is the identity transformation, so that

$$A(\eta) = \kappa(\eta)|\eta|^{p-2}\eta \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \cdot (\kappa(\nabla v)|\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v) = 0 \quad \text{weakly in } C_4(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.34}$$

Let $\tilde u(y'') = |y''|^\xi$. Since this function is also a solution to the p-Laplace equation in $\mathbb{R}^{n-m} \setminus \{0\}$, we see from (6.34) that

$$\nabla \cdot (\kappa(\nabla\tilde u)|\nabla\tilde u|^{p-2}\nabla\tilde u) = \langle \nabla\kappa(\nabla\tilde u), \nabla\tilde u\rangle|\nabla\tilde u|^{p-2} \quad \text{at } y'' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m} \setminus \{0\}. \tag{6.35}$$

Moreover, using the degree zero homogeneity of κ, and Euler's equation, shows that

$$\langle \nabla\kappa(\nabla\tilde u), \nabla\tilde u\rangle|\nabla\tilde u|^{p-2} = \xi|y''|^{(\xi-2)}\langle \nabla\kappa(y''), y''\rangle|\nabla\tilde u|^{p-2} = 0 \quad \text{at } y'' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m} \setminus \{0\}. \tag{6.36}$$

In particular, $\tilde u$ is A-harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^{n-m} \setminus \{0\}$ and we can conclude, by uniqueness in Lemma 5.2, that if u_{n-m} is the fundamental solution on $\mathbb{R}^{n-m}$ in Lemma 5.3, relative to the A in (6.34), then

$$u_{n-m}(y'') = c|y''|^\xi, \quad y'' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}, \tag{6.37}$$

for some $c = c(n, m, p)$.

We now proceed as in the proof of the lower bound in (6.4) in the case of condition (a) of Theorem 1.10. Indeed, in this case we let, in view of (6.37), $\bar u(y) = |y''|^\xi$ and we define f as in (6.16) using this $\bar u$. Again we prove (6.17), for sufficiently large $c_3 = c_3(p, n, m, \alpha)$, by proving that (6.19) is valid for A as in (6.34). In this case we let, using (6.28),

$$\nabla \cdot A(\nabla f)(y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y)) f_{y_i y_j} = S_1 + S_2 + S_3, \tag{6.38}$$

where now

$$S_1 := \sum_{i,j}^{\hat{}} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y)) f_{y_i y_j},$$

$$S_2 := (1 - |y'|^2)e^{\bar u} \sum_{m+1 \le i,j \le n} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y))\bar u_{y_i y_j}, \tag{6.39}$$

$$S_3 := (1 - |y'|^2)e^{\bar u} \sum_{m+1 \le i,j \le n} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y))\bar u_{y_i}\bar u_{y_j},$$

where again $\sum_{i,j}^{\hat{}}$ is taken over all i, j for which $i \le m$ or $j \le m$. Arguing as in the proofs of (6.24) and (6.32), we see that

$$|S_1| \le c|y''|^{\xi-1}|\nabla f(y)|^{p-2}, \tag{6.40}$$

$$S_3 \ge c^{-1}(1 - |y'|^2)|y''|^{2\xi-2}|\nabla f(y)|^{p-2}, \tag{6.41}$$

at $y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$.

To estimate S_2 we note, for $1 \le i, j \le n$, that $\frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla f(y)) = b_{ij}(y) + c_{ij}(y)$, where at y,

$$b_{ij} = \kappa(\nabla f)|\nabla f|^{p-4}[(p-2)f_{y_i}f_{y_j} + \delta_{ij}|\nabla f|^2],$$
$$c_{ij} = |\nabla f|^{p-2}\kappa_{\eta_j}(\nabla f)f_{y_i}. \tag{6.42}$$

In (6.42), δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta. We write, at $y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$,

$$S_2 = (1 - |y'|^2)e^{\bar{u}} \sum_{m+1 \le i, j \le n} b_{ij}\bar{u}_{y_iy_j} + (1 - |y'|^2)e^{\bar{u}} \sum_{m+1 \le i, j \le n} c_{ij}\bar{u}_{y_iy_j} =: S_{21} + S_{22}. \tag{6.43}$$

Since $\bar{u}$ is also a solution to the p-Laplace equation, it follows that, at $y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$,

$$S_{21} = (1 - |y'|^2)e^{\bar{u}}|\nabla' f|^2|\nabla f|^{p-4} \sum_{m+1 \le i, j \le n} \bar{u}_{y_iy_i}, \tag{6.44}$$

where $\nabla' f$ was defined in (6.20). Using (6.26) and (6.29) in (6.44) we obtain, for y in $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$,

$$|S_{21}(y)| \le (c/c_3)^2(1 - |y'|^2)|\nabla f|^{p-2}|y''|^{3\xi-2}. \tag{6.45}$$

To estimate S_{22} we first observe, for $m + 1 \le i, j \le n$, that

$$\bar{u}_{y_i} = \xi y_i|y''|^{\xi-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{u}_{y_iy_j} = \xi(\xi-2)y_iy_j|y''|^{\xi-4} + \xi\delta_{ij}|y''|^{\xi-2}. \tag{6.46}$$

We rewrite (6.46) as

$$\bar{u}_{y_iy_j} = e^{-2\bar{u}(y)}(1 - 2/\xi)(1 - |y'|^2)^{-2}|y''|^{-\xi}f_{y_i}f_{y_j} + \xi\delta_{ij}|y''|^{\xi-2}. \tag{6.47}$$

Putting this expression for $\bar{u}_{y_iy_j}$ into S_{22}, and using the definition of c_{ij}, we get

$$S_{22} = |\nabla f|^{p-2}e^{-\bar{u}(y)}(1 - 2/\xi)(1 - |y'|^2)^{-1}|y''|^{-\xi} \sum_{m+1 \le i, j \le n} \kappa_{\eta_j}(\nabla f)f_{y_i}^2 f_{y_j}$$
$$+ |\nabla f|^{p-2}e^{\bar{u}(y)}\xi(1 - |y'|^2)|y''|^{\xi-2} \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} \kappa_{\eta_i}(\nabla f)f_{y_i} \tag{6.48}$$

whenever $y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$. Now using Definition 1.1(i) it is not difficult to show that

$$|k(\eta)| + |\eta| \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\kappa_{\eta_i}| \le c$$

where c depends only on p, n, m, α. From this fact, 0-homogeneity of κ, and (6.26) we see that

$$\left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} \kappa_{\eta_i}(\nabla f)f_{y_i} \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m} \kappa_{\eta_i}(\nabla f)f_{y_i} \right| \le (c/c_3)|y''|^\xi. \tag{6.49}$$

Using (6.49) in (6.48) we arrive at

$$|S_{22}| \le (c/c_3)|(1 - |y'|^2)|y''|^{2\xi-2}|\nabla f|^{p-2} \quad \text{for } y \in C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{6.50}$$

Putting (6.50) and (6.45) into (6.4) we find (6.50) holds with S_{22} replaced by S_2. We can now complete the proof as in the proof of the lower bound in (6.4) in the case of condition (a) of Theorem 1.10. We omit further details.

Remark 6.4. Note that if A, for fixed y, satisfies condition (b) of Theorem 1.10, then A does not in general give rise to a rotationally symmetric solution in y', y'' even when $C(y) = I =$ the identity transformation. However, as explored in the proof, the fundamental solution in Lemma 5.2 for $C(y) = I$ is a radial solution having an extension to $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is symmetric in y', y''.

7. Proof of Theorems 1.9, 1.10 and Corollaries 1.11, 1.12

In this section we prove Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 and Corollaries 1.11 and 1.12. As in Section 4, we will use the convention that

$$\tilde{\theta} = 1 \quad \text{when } m = 1, \quad \tilde{\theta} = \lambda \quad \text{when } 2 \leq m \leq n - 2,$$

where λ is the constant appearing in (a) of Theorem 1.10. The proofs of Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 are based on the following two lemmas:

Lemma 7.1. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ *so that also* (3.2) *holds. If* $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, *assume in addition that either* (a) *or* (b) *of Theorem* 1.10 *holds. Let* $w \in \Sigma$, $0 < r < r_0$. *Assume that* u *is a positive A-harmonic function in* $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, *continuous on* $B(w, 4r)$ *and with* $u = 0$ *on* $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. *Then there exist* $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$, $\hat{c} = \hat{c}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ *and* $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ *such that if* $0 < \delta \leq \hat{\delta}$, *then*

$$\bar{\lambda}^{-1} \frac{u(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla u(y)| \leq \bar{\lambda} \frac{u(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, r/\hat{c}) \setminus \Sigma.$$

Lemma 7.2. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ *so that also* (3.2) *holds. If* $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, *assume in addition that either* (a) *or* (b) *of Theorem* 1.10 *holds. Let* $w \in \Sigma$ *and* $0 < r < \min\{r_0, 1\}$. *Assume that* u, v *are positive A-harmonic functions in* $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, *continuous on* $B(w, 4r)$ *and with* $u = 0 = v$ *on* $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. *Then there exist* $\delta' = \delta'(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ *and* $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}) \geq 1$ *such that if* $0 < \delta < \delta'$ *and* $\hat{r} = r/c$, *then* $\hat{\lambda}_{u,v} := (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2}$ *is an* $A_2(B(w, \hat{r}))$*-weight with constant depending only on* $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}$.

7.1. Non-degeneracy of $|\nabla u|$: proof of Lemma 7.1

Given $w = (w', w'') \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < r_1, r_2 < \infty$, recall the notation introduced in (3.4) and (3.5). Using Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9 we first prove the following lemma in the baseline case.

Lemma 7.3. *Assume* $p > n - m$ *and* $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$. *Assume that* $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ *for some* (α, β, γ). *If* $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, *assume in addition that either* (a) *or* (b) *of Theorem* 1.10 *holds. Let* $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$ *and suppose that* u *is a positive A-harmonic function in* $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$, *continuous on the closure of* $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$, *and* $u = 0$ *on* Σ. *Then there exist* $\hat{c} = \hat{c}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ *and* $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$ *such that*

$$\bar{\lambda}^{-1} \frac{u(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla u(y)| \leq \bar{\lambda} \frac{u(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_{1/\hat{c}}(0) \setminus \Sigma.$$

Proof. Let $A = A(y, \eta) \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ be as in the statement. Set $A_2(y, \eta) = A(y, \eta)$ and $A_1(\eta) = A(0, \eta)$. Clearly, $A_1, A_2 \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. We first note that Lemma 7.3 holds for the operator A_1. Indeed, assume that u is a positive A_1-harmonic function in $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on the closure of $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$, and $u = 0$ on Σ. Let $\hat{u}_1(y', y'') = \bar{u}(y', y'') = u_{n-m}(y', y'')$ be as in Lemma 5.3. Then $\hat{u}_1$ is A_1-harmonic in $C_1(0) \setminus \Sigma$ and $\hat{u}_1 = 0$ on Σ. Let $\hat{u}_2 = u$. Then, by Lemma 6.2 applied to the pair $\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2$,

$$\left| \log\left(\frac{\hat{u}_1(y_1)}{\hat{u}_2(y_1)} \right) - \log\left(\frac{\hat{u}_1(y_2)}{\hat{u}_2(y_2)} \right) \right| \le c|y_1 - y_2|^\sigma \tag{7.1}$$

whenever $y_1, y_2 \in C_{1/16}(0) \setminus \Sigma$. Exponentiation yields the equivalent inequality

$$\left| \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_1)}{\hat{u}_2(y_1)} - \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_2)}{\hat{u}_2(y_2)} \right| \le c' \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_2)}{\hat{u}_2(y_2)} |y_1 - y_2|^\sigma \tag{7.2}$$

whenever $y_1, y_2 \in C_{1/16}(0) \setminus \Sigma$, for some c' depending at most on $p, n, m, \alpha, \tilde{\theta}$. Let $O = C_{1/16}(0) \setminus \Sigma$ and note that if $y_2 \in C_{1/32}(0) \setminus \Sigma$ then (see Lemma 5.3)

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{a}} \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_2)}{d(y_2, \partial O)} \le |\nabla \hat{u}_1(y_2)| \le \tilde{a} \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_2)}{d(y_2, \partial O)} \tag{7.3}$$

for some $\tilde{a} = \tilde{a}(p, n, m, \alpha)$. Let r be defined through the relation $c' r^\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\epsilon}$ where $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is as in Lemma 3.9. Using (7.2) we then see that

$$(1 - \tilde{\epsilon}/2) \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_2)}{\hat{u}_2(y_2)} \le \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_1)}{\hat{u}_2(y_1)} \le (1 + \tilde{\epsilon}/2) \frac{\hat{u}_1(y_2)}{\hat{u}_2(y_2)} \tag{7.4}$$

whenever $y_1 \in B(y_2, r)$. From (7.3), (7.4), and Lemma 3.9 we conclude that Lemma 7.3 holds for the operator A_1.

We now establish Lemma 7.3 for A_2 using comparison principles. We let $\varrho \in (0, 1/16)$ and $\bar{\varrho} \in (0, 1/8)$ be degrees of freedom to be chosen below. Let $\hat{u}_1$ be the A_1-harmonic function in $C_{\bar{\varrho}/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma$ which is continuous on the closure of $C_{\bar{\varrho}/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma$ and which satisfies $\hat{u}_1 = u$ on $\partial(C_{\bar{\varrho}/2}(0) \setminus \Sigma)$. Then, using Lemma 7.3 for A_1, we see that there exist $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(p, n, m, \alpha, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\hat{c}_1 = \hat{c}_1(p, n, m, \alpha, \tilde{\theta}) \ge 1$ such that

$$\lambda_1^{-1} \frac{\hat{u}_1(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \le |\nabla \hat{u}_1(y)| \le \lambda_1 \frac{\hat{u}_1(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_{\bar{\varrho}/\hat{c}_1}(0) \setminus \Sigma. \tag{7.5}$$

Moreover, using Definition 1.1(iii) we have

$$|A_2(y, \eta) - A_1(y, \eta)| \le \epsilon |\eta|^{p-2} \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_{\bar{\varrho}}(0), \ \epsilon = 2\beta \bar{\varrho}^\gamma. \tag{7.6}$$

Let $\hat{u}_2 = u$. Using Lemma 3.8 we see that there exist c', θ, τ, each depending only on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \tilde{\theta}$, such that

$$|\hat{u}_2(y) - \hat{u}_1(y)| \le c' \epsilon^\theta \varrho^{-\tau} \hat{u}_2(y) \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_{\bar{\varrho}/4}(0) \setminus C_{\bar{\varrho}/4, \varrho\bar{\varrho}}(0). \tag{7.7}$$

Let $\tilde{\epsilon}$ be as in the statement of Lemma 3.9 relative to λ_1 and set $\varrho = 1/(32\hat{c}_1)$. Fix $\bar{\varrho}$ subject to $c'\epsilon^\theta \varrho^{-\tau} = c'(2\beta\bar{\varrho}^\gamma)^\theta \varrho^{-\tau} = \min\{\tilde{\epsilon}/2, 10^{-8}\}$. In particular, $\bar{\varrho} = \bar{\varrho}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \tilde{\theta})$. Then from (7.7) we see that

$$1 - \tilde{\epsilon} \leq \frac{\hat{u}_2(y)}{\hat{u}_1(y)} \leq 1 + \tilde{\epsilon} \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_{\bar{\varrho}/4}(0) \setminus C_{\bar{\varrho}/4, \varrho\bar{\varrho}}(0). \tag{7.8}$$

Using (7.5), (7.8), and Lemma 3.9 we therefore conclude that

$$\lambda_2^{-1} \frac{\hat{u}_2(y)}{d(y, \Sigma_1(0))} \leq |\nabla \hat{u}_2(y)| \leq \lambda_2 \frac{\hat{u}_2(y)}{d(y, \Sigma_1(0))} \tag{7.9}$$

whenever $y \in C_{\bar{\varrho}/\hat{c}_1}(0) \setminus C_{\bar{\rho}/\hat{c}_1, 2\varrho\bar{\varrho}}(0)$, for some $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$. Moreover, if $y \in C_{\bar{\varrho}/\hat{c}_1, 2\varrho\bar{\varrho}}(0)$, then we can also prove that (7.9) is valid at y by essentially repeating the previous argument and by making use of the invariance of the class $M_p(\alpha, \beta, \tilde{\theta})$, as well as of conditions (a) and (b) in Theorem 1.10, with respect to translations and dilations. □

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Let $A = A(y, \eta) \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ be as in the statement. Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < r_0$, and suppose that u is a positive A-harmonic function in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 4r)$, and $u = 0$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. We use Lemmas 7.3 and 3.8. Let $c_1 = \hat{c}$ be as in Lemma 7.3 and choose $c' \geq 100c_1$ so that if $\hat{y} \in B(w, r/c') \setminus \Sigma$, $s = 4c_1 d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)$, and $z \in \Sigma$ with $|\hat{y} - z| = d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)$, then

$$\max_{B(z, 4s)} u \leq cu(\hat{y}) \tag{7.10}$$

for some $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. Using Definition 1.5 with w, r replaced by $z, 4s$, we see that there exists an m-dimensional hyperplane $\Lambda = \Lambda_m(z, 4s), z \in \Lambda$, such that

$$h\big(\Sigma \cap B(z, 4s), \Lambda \cap B(z, 4s)\big) \leq 4\delta s. \tag{7.11}$$

For the moment we allow $\hat{\delta}$ in the statement of the lemma to vary but shall later fix it as a number satisfying several conditions. First, since the class $M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$, as well as conditions (a) and (b) in Theorem 1.10, are invariant under rotations, we may again assume that $z = 0$ and $\Lambda = \{(y', y'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m} : y'' = 0\}$. Thus if s' is largest such that $C_{4s'}(0) \subset \overline{B(0, 4s)}$ then

$$h(\Sigma \cap C_{4s'}(0), \Lambda \cap C_{4s'}(0)) \leq 4c'\delta s \tag{7.12}$$

for some harmless constant c'. Next, we let v be a non-negative A-harmonic function in $C_{4s'}(0)$ with continuous boundary values on $\partial(C_{4s'}(0) \setminus \Lambda)$ defined as follows. We construct v such that $v = 0$ on $C_{4s'}(0) \cap \Lambda$,

$$v(y) = \begin{cases} u(y) & \text{for } y \in \partial C_{4s'}(0) \setminus \partial C_{4s', 30c'\delta s}(0), \\ 0 & \text{for } y \in \partial C_{4s'}(0) \cap \partial C_{4s', 20c'\delta s}(0), \end{cases}$$

and

$$v \leq u \quad \text{on } \partial C_{4s'}(0) \cap (\partial C_{4s', 30c'\delta s}(0) \setminus \partial C_{4s', 20c'\delta s}(0)).$$

Then, by construction, using Lemma 3.3, we see that

$$u \leq v + c\delta^\sigma u(\hat{y}) \quad \text{on } \partial(C_{4s'}(0) \setminus C_{4s',20c'\delta s}(0)), \quad (7.13)$$

and hence the same holds, again by the maximum principle for A-harmonic functions, in $C_{4s'}(0) \setminus C_{4s',20c'\delta s}(0)$. Similarly,

$$v \leq u + c\delta^\sigma u(\hat{y}) \quad \text{on } C_{4s'}(0) \setminus C_{4s',20c'\delta s}(0). \quad (7.14)$$

In particular, using the Harnack inequality we conclude that

$$(1 + c\delta^\sigma)^{-1} \leq \frac{u(y)}{v(y)} \leq (1 - c\delta^\sigma)^{-1} \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(\hat{y}, d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)/4). \quad (7.15)$$

Furthermore, using Lemma 7.3 and the construction, we have

$$\hat{\lambda}^{-1} \frac{v(\hat{y})}{d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla v(\hat{y})| \leq \hat{\lambda} \frac{v(\hat{y})}{d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)} \quad (7.16)$$

for some $\hat{\lambda} = \hat{\lambda}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$. In particular, from (7.15), (7.16), we see, if $0 < \delta < \hat{\delta}$ and if we fix $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ to be small enough, that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.9 are satisfied with $O = B(\hat{y}, d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)/4)$ and $\tilde{a} = \hat{\lambda}$. Now, using Lemma 3.9 we conclude that

$$\bar{\lambda}_1^{-1} \frac{u(\hat{y})}{d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla u(\hat{y})| \leq \bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{u(\hat{y})}{d(\hat{y}, \Sigma)}$$

for some $\bar{\lambda}_1 = \bar{\lambda}_1(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta})$. As $\hat{y} \in B(w, r/c') \setminus \Sigma$ is arbitrary, the proof of Lemma 7.1 is complete. $\square$

7.2. $(|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2}$ is an A_2-weight: proof of Lemma 7.2

Our proof of Lemma 7.2 is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 7.4. *Assume* (3.1) *and* $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ *so that also* (3.2) *holds. If* $2 \leq m \leq n - 2$, *assume in addition that either* (a) *or* (b) *of Theorem* 1.10 *holds. Let* $w \in \Sigma$ *and* $0 < r < r_0$. *Assume that* u *is a positive A-harmonic function in* $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, *continuous on* $B(w, 4r)$, *and* $u = 0$ *on* $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. *Then there exist, for* $\epsilon^* > 0$ *given,* $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\delta}(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}, \epsilon^*) \in (0, \bar{\delta})$ *and* $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}, \epsilon^*) \geq 1$ *such that*

$$c^{-1} \left(\frac{\hat{r}}{r}\right)^{\xi(1+\epsilon^*)} \leq \frac{u(a_{\hat{r}}(w))}{u(a_r(w))} \leq c \left(\frac{\hat{r}}{r}\right)^{\xi(1-\epsilon^*)}$$

whenever $0 < \delta \leq \hat{\delta}$ *and* $0 < \hat{r} < r/4$, *where* $\xi = (p - n + m)/(p - 1)$.

Proof. In the more traditional setting of Reifenberg flat domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ a version of Lemma 7.4 is proved in [LLuN, Lemma 4.8]. The proof is based on some rather straightforward, but still delicate, comparisons of non-negative solutions. Let $A = A(y, \eta) \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ be as in the statement. Set $A_2(y, \eta) = A(y, \eta)$ and $A_1(\eta) = A(w, \eta)$. Then

$A_1, A_2 \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. Let u be an A_2-harmonic function as in the statement. Observe, using Definition 1.5, that it suffices to prove the lemma for $\delta = \hat{\delta}$. Moreover, we can assume that $r = 4$, $w = 0$ and $u(a_1(0)) = 1$. In the following we let $\check{\delta} \leq \hat{\delta}$ and ϱ be small constants to be chosen below. In particular, $\check{\delta}, \varrho$ will be fixed to depend only on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}$. For ϱ fixed we can again also assume that

$$h\big(\Sigma \cap B(0, 4\varrho), \Lambda \cap B(0, 4\varrho)\big) \leq 4\check{\delta}\varrho,$$

where $\Lambda = \{(y', y'') \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m} : y'' = 0\}$. In particular, we see that it suffices to prove that

$$c^{-1}\hat{r}^{\xi(1+\epsilon^*)} \leq u(a_{\hat{r}}(0)) \leq c\hat{r}^{\xi(1-\epsilon^*)} \quad \text{whenever } 0 < \hat{r} < \varrho. \tag{7.17}$$

To begin, we introduce an auxiliary function u^+. We let u^+ be A_2-harmonic in $C_\varrho(0) \setminus \Lambda$ with continuous boundary values on $\partial(C_\varrho(0) \setminus \Lambda)$, defined as follows. We let $u^+ = 0$ on $C_\varrho(0) \cap \Lambda$,

$$u^+(y) = \begin{cases} u(y) & \text{if } y \in \partial(C_\varrho(0)) \setminus \partial(C_{\varrho, 16\check{\delta}\varrho}(0)), \\ 0 & \text{if } y \in \partial(C_\varrho(0)) \cap \partial(C_{\varrho, 8\check{\delta}\varrho}(0)). \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, on $\partial(C_\varrho(0)) \cap (\partial(C_{\varrho, 16\check{\delta}\varrho}(0)) \setminus \partial(C_{\varrho, 8\check{\delta}\varrho}(0)))$ we define u^+ so that $u^+ \leq u$. Now, arguing as in the proof of (7.13) and (7.14), we see that

$$u \leq u^+ + c\check{\delta}^\sigma u(a_{\varrho/4}(0)), \quad u^+ \leq u + c\check{\delta}^\sigma u(a_{\varrho/4}(0)) \quad \text{on } C_\varrho(0) \setminus C_{\varrho, 8\check{\delta}\varrho}(0), \tag{7.18}$$

for some $\sigma = \sigma(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$. Using Definition 1.5(iii) we next note that

$$|A_2(y, \eta) - A_1(y, \eta)| \leq \epsilon |\eta|^{p-1} \quad \text{whenever } y \in C_\varrho(0), \ \epsilon = 2\beta\varrho^\gamma. \tag{7.19}$$

To proceed, we let $\bar{u}^+$ be the A_1-harmonic function in $C_{\varrho/2}(0) \setminus \Lambda$ which is continuous on the closure of $C_{\varrho/2}(0) \setminus \Lambda$ and coincides with u^+ on $\partial(C_{\varrho/2}(0) \setminus \Lambda)$. Finally, we define $v^+(y) := |y''|^\xi$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

To prove the right hand inequality in (7.17), we first see, using (7.19) and Lemma 3.8, that

$$u^+(y) \leq (1 - \tilde{c}\epsilon^\theta \check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}\bar{u}^+(y) \quad \text{for } y \in C_{\varrho/4}(0) \setminus C_{\varrho/4, 4\check{\delta}\varrho}(0), \tag{7.20}$$

for some constants $\tilde{c}, \theta, \tau$, depending only on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$. Then, by Lemmas 6.2 and 5.3 (see (6.4)), there exists a constant $\bar{c} = \bar{c}(p, n, m, \alpha, \tilde{\theta}) \geq 1$ such that

$$u^+(y) \leq (1 - \tilde{c}\epsilon^\theta \check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}\bar{u}^+(y) \leq c(1 - \tilde{c}\epsilon^\theta \check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}\bar{u}^+(a_{\varrho/4}(0))\frac{v^+(y)}{\varrho^\xi} \tag{7.21}$$

whenever $y \in C_{\varrho/\bar{c}}(0) \setminus C_{\varrho/\bar{c}, 4\check{\delta}\varrho}(0)$. In particular, using (7.18), (7.21) and the Harnack inequality we see that

$$u(y) \leq c(1 - \tilde{c}\epsilon^\theta \check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}\bar{u}^+(a_{\varrho/8}(0))\frac{v^+(y)}{\varrho^\xi} + c\check{\delta}^\sigma u(a_{\varrho/8}(0)) \tag{7.22}$$

whenever $y \in C_{\varrho/\bar{c}}(0) \setminus C_{\varrho/\bar{c}, 4\check{\delta}\varrho}(0)$. We now let $\tilde{\delta}$ be defined through the relation

$$\tilde{\delta}^{\xi} = \max\{\check{\delta}^{\xi}, \check{\delta}^{\sigma}\}. \tag{7.23}$$

Note that $\tilde{\delta} \geq \check{\delta}$; moreover, applying (7.22) for $y = a_{8\tilde{\delta}\varrho}(0)$ we see, as long as

$$a_{8\tilde{\delta}\varrho}(0) \in C_{\varrho/\bar{c}}(0) \setminus C_{\varrho/\bar{c}, 4\check{\delta}\varrho}(0), \tag{7.24}$$

that

$$u(a_{8\tilde{\delta}\varrho}(0)) \leq c(1 - \tilde{c}\epsilon^{\theta}\check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}\bar{u}^{+}(a_{\varrho/8}(0))(8\tilde{\delta})^{\xi} + c\check{\delta}^{\sigma}u(a_{\varrho/8}(0))$$

$$\leq \left(c(1 - \tilde{c}\epsilon^{\theta}\check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}(8\tilde{\delta})^{\xi} + c\tilde{\delta}^{\xi}\right)u(a_{\varrho/8}(0)), \tag{7.25}$$

where we have also used $\bar{u}^{+}(a_{\varrho/8}(0)) \approx u(a_{\varrho/8}(0))$. In particular, simply using the Harnack inequality once more, and the normalization $u(a_1(0)) = 1$, we see that

$$u(a_{\tilde{\delta}\varrho}(0)) \leq c(1 - \tilde{c}\epsilon^{\theta}\check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}(8\tilde{\delta})^{\xi} + c\tilde{\delta}^{\xi}. \tag{7.26}$$

Next, let $\check{\delta} < 1/(16\bar{c})$ and let ϱ be defined through the relation

$$1/2 = \tilde{c}\epsilon^{\theta}\check{\delta}^{-\tau} = \tilde{c}(2\beta\varrho^{\gamma})^{\theta}\check{\delta}^{-\tau}. \tag{7.27}$$

Then $\varrho = \varrho(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}, \check{\delta}) = \varrho(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\delta})$ and

$$u(a_{\tilde{\delta}\varrho}(0)) \leq \hat{c}\tilde{\delta}^{\xi}. \tag{7.28}$$

We now proceed by induction and we suppose that we have shown, for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, that

$$u(a_{\tilde{\delta}^k\varrho}(0)) \leq (\hat{c}\tilde{\delta}^{\xi})^k \tag{7.29}$$

for some $\hat{c}$ depending at most on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}$. Then, again using Definition 1.5 we see there exists $\Lambda' \in \Lambda_m(0)$ such that

$$h\left(\Sigma \cap B(0, 4\tilde{\delta}^k\varrho), \Lambda' \cap B(0, 4\tilde{\delta}^k\varrho)\right) \leq 4\check{\delta}\tilde{\delta}^k\varrho.$$

We can now repeat the above argument with Λ replaced by Λ' and 4 replaced by $4\tilde{\delta}^k$ and with cylinders of size defined by $\tilde{\delta}^k\varrho$ instead of ϱ. As a result,

$$u(a_{\tilde{\delta}^{k+1}\varrho}(0)) \leq \hat{c}\tilde{\delta}^{\xi}u(a_{\tilde{\delta}^k\varrho}(0)) \leq (\hat{c}\tilde{\delta}^{\xi})^{k+1}, \tag{7.30}$$

by the induction hypothesis. In particular, by induction, (7.29) is true for all positive integers k. Next we fix $\tilde{\delta}$ through the relation

$$\tilde{\delta}^{-\xi\epsilon^*} = \hat{c}, \tag{7.31}$$

where $\hat{c}$ is the constant in (7.30). Then $\tilde{\delta}$, as well as ρ, depend only on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}$ and ϵ^*. Moreover, given $0 < \hat{r} < \varrho$, let k be the smallest integer such that $\tilde{\delta}^k\varrho \leq \hat{r}$. Then, simply using the Harnack inequality, (7.29), and our choice of $\tilde{\delta}$ in (7.31) we see

that $u(a_{\hat{r}}(0)) \leq c\hat{r}^{\xi(1-\epsilon^*)}$ for some $c = c(p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}, \epsilon^*)$, and hence the proof of the right hand inequality in (7.17) is complete.

To prove the left hand inequality we argue in a similar manner. Indeed, in this case we first see that

$$u(y) \geq u^+(y) - c\check{\delta}^\sigma u(a_{\varrho/4}(0)) \geq (1 + \tilde{c}\epsilon^\theta \check{\delta}^{-\tau})^{-1}\bar{u}^+(y) - c\check{\delta}^\sigma u(a_{\varrho/4}(0)) \quad (7.32)$$

for $y \in C_\varrho(0) \setminus C_{\varrho, 8\check{\delta}\varrho}(0)$, and then, again as a consequence Lemmas 6.2 and 5.3 (see (6.4)), and familiar arguments, we deduce that

$$u(a_{32\tilde{\delta}\varrho}(0)) \geq \hat{c}^{-1}\tilde{\delta}^\xi \quad (7.33)$$

for some $\hat{c}$ depending only on $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}$. The left hand inequality in (7.17) then follows as above by induction. We omit further details. □

Proof of Lemma 7.2. Assume (3.1) and $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ so that also (3.2) holds. Let $w \in \Sigma$ and $0 < r < \min\{r_0, 1\}$. Assume that u, v are positive A-harmonic functions in $B(w, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $B(w, 4r)$, and $u = 0 = v$ on $\Sigma \cap B(w, 4r)$. We want to prove that there exist $\delta' > 0$ and $c \geq 1$ depending only on the data (i.e., $p, n, m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \tilde{\theta}$) such that if $0 < \delta < \delta'$ and $\hat{r} = r/c$, then $\hat{\lambda}_{u,v}(y) := (|\nabla u(y)| + |\nabla v(y)|)^{p-2}$ is an $A_2(B(w, \hat{r}))$-weight with constant depending only on the data. We first see, using Lemma 7.1, that there exist $\hat{\delta}, \hat{c}$ and $\bar{\lambda}$, depending on the data, such that if $0 < \delta \leq \hat{\delta}$, then

$$\bar{\lambda}^{-1}\tilde{\lambda}_{u,v} \leq \hat{\lambda}_{u,v} \leq \bar{\lambda}\tilde{\lambda}_{u,v} \quad \text{whenever } y \in B(w, r/\hat{c}) \setminus \Sigma, \quad (7.34)$$

where

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{u,v}(y) := \left(\frac{u(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} + \frac{v(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)}\right)^{p-2}. \quad (7.35)$$

We now simply let $\hat{r} = r/(100\hat{c}^2)$ and we consider $\tilde{w} \in B(w, \hat{r})$ and $\tilde{r} \leq \hat{r}$. We want to prove

$$\Gamma(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r}) := \tilde{r}^{-2n} \int_{B(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r})} \hat{\lambda}_{u,v} \, dy \cdot \int_{B(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r})} \hat{\lambda}_{u,v}^{-1} \, dy \leq c^*, \quad (7.36)$$

where c^* depends only on the data. To do this we first note from Harnack's inequality that if $d(\tilde{w}, \Sigma) \geq 2\tilde{r}$, then $\Gamma(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r}) \leq c$, and hence we can assume that $d(\tilde{w}, \Sigma) \leq 2\tilde{r}$. In the latter case we let $\hat{w} \in \Sigma$ be such that $|\tilde{w} - \hat{w}| = d(\tilde{w}, \Sigma)$. Now, from the definition of $\hat{\lambda}_{u,v}$, Lemmas 3.1–3.5, and Hölder's inequality, it follows that

$$\int_{B(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r})} \hat{\lambda}_{u,v} \, dy \leq c\tilde{A}\tilde{r}^{n+2-p}, \quad (7.37)$$

where $\tilde{A} := u(a_{\tilde{r}}(\hat{w}))^{p-2} + v(a_{\tilde{r}}(\hat{w}))^{p-2}$. Next, we let

$$\eta = \min\{1, (n - m + (1 - \xi)(p - 2))/(\xi(p - 2))\}/20.$$

Then, using Lemma 7.4 we see, for $\hat{\delta}$ small enough, that

$$c\tilde{u}(y) \geq \tilde{u}(a_{\tilde{r}}(\hat{w}))(d(y, \Sigma)/\tilde{r})^{\xi(1+\eta)}, \quad \tilde{u} \in \{u, v\}, \tag{7.38}$$

whenever $y \in B(\hat{w}, 50\tilde{r}) \setminus \Sigma$. Using (7.38) and (7.34), we deduce that

$$\int_{B(\tilde{w},\tilde{r})} \hat{\lambda}_{u,v}^{-1} \, dy \leq c\tilde{r}^{\xi(1+\eta)(p-2)}\tilde{A}^{-1} \int_{B(\hat{w},50\tilde{r})} d(y, \Sigma)^{(1-\xi(1+\eta))(p-2)} \, dy. \tag{7.39}$$

In particular, from (7.36) and (7.37), we see that

$$\Gamma(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r}) \leq c\tilde{r}^{-2n}\tilde{r}^{n+2-p}\tilde{r}^{\xi(1+\eta)(p-2)} \int_{B(\hat{w},50\tilde{r})} d(y, \Sigma)^{(1-\xi(1+\eta))(p-2)} \, dy. \tag{7.40}$$

To complete the estimate in (7.40) we define

$$I(z, s) = \int_{B(z,s)} d(y, \Sigma)^{(1-\xi(1+\eta))(p-2)} \, dy$$

for $z \in \Sigma \cap B(w, r/100)$ and $0 < s < r/100$. Let

$$E_k = B(z, s) \cap \{y : d(y, \partial\Omega) \leq \delta^k s\} \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

and recall that $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$ and Σ is a closed (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $r_0, \delta > 0$. We prove that

$$\int_{E_k} dy \leq c_+^k \delta^{(n-m)k} s^n \tag{7.41}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Indeed, since Σ is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat, E_1 can be covered by at most c/δ^m balls of radius $100\delta s$ and with centers in $\Sigma \cap B(z, s)$, and hence (7.41) follows readily for $k = 1$. One can then repeat this argument in each of the balls to find that (7.41) holds for E_2. Arguing by induction, we get (7.41) for all positive integers k. Using (7.41) and writing $I(z, s)$ as a sum over $E_k \setminus E_{k+1}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, we get

$$I(z, s) \leq cs^{n+(1-\xi(1+\eta))(p-2)} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(c_+^k \delta^{(n-m)k}s^n)(\delta^k s)^{(1-\xi(1+\eta))(p-2)}$$

$$\leq \tilde{c}s^{n+(1-\xi(1+\eta))(p-2)}, \tag{7.42}$$

where $\tilde{c} = \tilde{c}(p, n, m)$, provided δ' is small enough by the choice of η. Using this estimate with $s = \tilde{r}$, we can continue our calculation in (7.40) and conclude that

$$\Gamma(\tilde{w}, \tilde{r}) \leq c\tilde{r}^{-2n}\tilde{r}^{n+2-p}\tilde{r}^{\xi(1+\eta)(p-2)}\tilde{r}^{n+(1-\xi(1+\eta))(p-2)} \leq c. \tag{7.43}$$

The proof of Lemma 7.2 is now complete. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

7.3. The final proof of Theorems 1.9 and 1.10

Assuming (3.1) and $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, and using Lemma 7.2, we see that Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 follow immediately from Lemma 4.10.

7.4. Proof of Corollary 1.11

Let $u, v, n, m, p, \Sigma, w, r_0, A, \sigma$ be as in Theorem 1.9 or 1.10, and let μ, ν be the corresponding measures as in (1.5). If $z \in B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma$, then from these theorems, with w replaced by z, we see that

$$\left| \frac{u(x)}{v(x)} - \frac{u(y)}{v(y)} \right| \le c \frac{u(x)}{v(x)} \left(\frac{|x - y|}{r} \right)^\sigma \tag{7.44}$$

whenever $x, y \in B(z, r/c) \setminus \Sigma$. From (7.44) we deduce that

$$0 < f(z) = \lim_{y \to z} \frac{u(y)}{v(y)} \quad \text{exists,}$$

and (7.44) holds with $u(y)/v(y)$ replaced by $f(z)$. Hence there exists c', depending only on the data, such that if $0 < s < r/c$ and $x \in B(z, s) \setminus \Sigma$, then

$$u(x)(1 - c'(s/r)^\sigma) < f(z)v(x) < u(x)(1 + c'(s/r)^\sigma). \tag{7.45}$$

Set

$$\tau_1 = \frac{f(z)}{(1 + c'(s/r)^\sigma)}, \quad \tilde{v} = \tau_1 v, \quad h = u - \tilde{v} > 0 \quad \text{in } B(z, s) \setminus \Sigma.$$

Given $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(z, s))$ and small positive numbers θ_1, θ_2, we set $\phi = \max\{h - \theta_1, 0\}^{\theta_2} \psi$. Arguing as in (3.8) we see that

$$0 \le \int \langle A(x, \nabla u) - A(x, \nabla \tilde{v}), \nabla(\max\{h - \theta_1, 0\}^{\theta_2}) \rangle \psi \, dx. \tag{7.46}$$

Also from the usual limiting argument we find that ϕ can be used as a test function in the weak formulation of A-harmonicity for both $u, \tilde{v}$. Doing this, using (7.46), and letting first $\theta_1 \to 0$, and then $\theta_2 \to 0$, we conclude from (7.46) and (1.5) that

$$\int \psi \, (\tau_1^{p-1} \, d\nu - d\mu) \le \int_{B(z,s)} \langle A(x, \nabla u) - A(x, \nabla \tilde{v}), \nabla \psi \rangle \, dx \le 0, \tag{7.47}$$

where we have also used $(p - 1)$-homogeneity of A in Definition 1.1(iii) to deduce the measure corresponding to $\tilde{v}$. From arbitrariness of ψ it follows that $\tau_1^{p-1} \nu \le \mu$ on $B(z, s) \cap \Sigma$. Similarly if $\tau_2 = f(z)/(1 - c'(s/r)^\sigma)$ then $\mu \le \tau_2^{p-1} \nu$ on $B(z, s) \cap \Sigma$. From this discussion we see that μ, ν are mutually absolutely continuous on $B(w, 4r_0)$, and if $d\mu = k d\nu$, then

$$\tau_1^{p-1} \le k(\hat{z}) \le \tau_2^{p-1} \quad \text{when } \hat{z} \in B(z, s) \cap \Sigma \text{ and } k(z) = f(z)^{p-1}. \tag{7.48}$$

Taking logarithms yields

$$c^{-1}(s/r)^\sigma \le |\log(k(\hat{z})/k(z))| \le c(s/r)^\sigma \tag{7.49}$$

for some $c \ge 1$ depending only on the data. From (7.49) and arbitrariness of s, z we conclude that Corollary 1.11 is valid.

7.5. Proof of Corollary 1.12

If Corollary 1.12 is false, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $t_j \in [1/2, 1]$, $x_j \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(w, r)}$, $0 < r_j \leq 10^{-j}r$, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that

$$\epsilon \leq \left| \frac{\mu(B(x_j, t_j r_j))}{\mu(B(x_j, r_j))} - t_j^m \right|. \tag{7.50}$$

We may assume that $t_j \to t \in [1/2, 1]$ and $x_j \to \hat{x} \in \Sigma \cap \overline{B(w, r)}$ as $j \to \infty$. Let

$$u_j(x) = \frac{u(x_j + r_j x)}{u(a_{r_j}(x_j))} \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_j = \{x : x_j + r_j x \in B(w, 2r) \setminus \Sigma\}.$$

Let $A_j(x, \eta) = A(x_j + r_j x, \eta)$ for $x, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using the $(p-1)$-homogeneity of A (see Definition 1.1), we see that u_j is a weak solution to $\nabla \cdot A_j(x, \nabla u_j) = 0$ in Ω_j. Note that A_j has the same structure constants as do A in (i) and (iii) of Definition 1.1, while β in (ii) is replaced by βr_j^γ. From the vanishing Reifenberg flat assumption in Corollary 1.12 we see, for a subsequence of (Ω_j) (also denoted (Ω_j)) that $\partial \Omega_j \to \Lambda$ as $j \to \infty$, where Λ is an m-dimensional hyperplane through 0, uniformly in the Hausdorff distance on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. From Lemmas 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4, as well as Harnack's inequality, and the NTA property of Ω_j, we see, given $R > 0$, that there exists j_0 such that whenever $j \geq j_0$, then u_j is Hölder continuous with exponent σ, and the Hölder norm of u_j in $B(0, R)$ is uniformly bounded. Also given a compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$, we find from Lemma 3.6 that ∇u_j is $\hat{\sigma}$-Hölder continuous on K with a uniformly bounded Hölder norm for j large enough. Moreover, by these lemmas, (u_j) is bounded in the norm of $W^{1,p}(B(0, R))$.

Using these facts we deduce from Ascoli's theorem that subsequences of (u_j), (∇u_j) (not relabelled) converge uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$ to $\hat{u}$, $\nabla \hat{u}$. From weak compactness of $W^{1,p}$ we may also assume that $u_j \to \hat{u}$ weakly in $W^{1,p}(B(0, R))$ for each $R > 0$. By construction, $\hat{u}$ is σ-Hölder continuous in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\hat{u} \equiv 0$ on Λ. It is also easily seen that $\hat{u}$ is $\hat{A}$-harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$ with $\hat{A}(\eta) = A(\hat{x}, \eta)$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. To reach a contradiction we assume, as we may, that $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$. Indeed, otherwise we first rotate the coordinate system so that Λ becomes $\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$ and $\hat{u}$ becomes u', a weak solution to $\nabla \cdot A'(\nabla u') = 0$. We then apply the following argument to u'.

Applying Theorem 1.9 or 1.10 with u, v replaced by $\hat{u}, u_{n-m}$, with u_{n-m} as in Lemma 5.3, and then letting $r \to \infty$, we see that $\hat{u}$ is a constant multiple of u_{n-m}. Using this and Lemma 5.3 we deduce that the measure, say $\hat{\mu}$, corresponding to $\hat{u}$ is a constant multiple of Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$. Let μ_j be the measure corresponding to u_j for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Using the above convergence results, we easily deduce that $\mu_j \to \hat{\mu}$ weakly as measures. From weak convergence and the fact that $\hat{\mu}(B(0, s))$ is a constant multiple of s^m when $s \in (0, 1]$, we conclude

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{\mu_j(B(0, t_j))}{\mu_j(B(0, 1))} = \frac{\hat{\mu}(B(0, t))}{\hat{\mu}(B(0, 1))} = t^m. \tag{7.51}$$

Finally, we note from $(p-1)$-homogeneity of A that

$$\frac{\mu_j(B(0, t_j))}{\mu_j(B(0, 1))} = \frac{\mu(B(x_j, t_j r_j))}{\mu(B(x_j, r_j))} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{7.52}$$

Using (7.50)–(7.52) we deduce that

$$\epsilon \leq \lim_{j \to \infty} \left| \frac{\mu(B(x_j, t_j r_j))}{\mu(B(x_j, r_j))} - t_j^m \right| = \lim_{j \to \infty} \left| \frac{\mu_j(B(0, t_j))}{\mu_j(B(0, 1))} - t_j^m \right| = 0. \tag{7.53}$$

We have reached a contradiction. Hence Corollary 1.12 is valid.

8. Proof of Theorem 1.13

To begin the proof, we assume that Σ is (m, r_0, δ)-Reifenberg flat with $0 < \delta < \tilde{\delta}$, where $\tilde{\delta}$ is the constant appearing in Theorem 1.9 or 1.10. We start by making several key observations.

First, if $\hat{u}$, $\hat{v}$, w, r, Σ are as in the statement of Theorem 1.13, then by Theorem 1.9 or 1.10, and Harnack's inequality, it follows that

$$\sup_{\partial B(w,s) \setminus \Sigma} \hat{u}/\hat{v} \leq c \inf_{\partial B(w,s) \setminus \Sigma} \hat{u}/\hat{v} \quad \text{as } s \to 0. \tag{8.1}$$

In particular, there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$K \leq \hat{u}/\hat{v} \leq cK \quad \text{in } B(w, r) \setminus \Sigma, \tag{8.2}$$

where c depends only on the data. Indeed, suppose $\hat{u}/\hat{v}$ is unbounded in $B(w, r) \setminus \Sigma$. Then from the maximum principle for A-harmonic functions we see that

$$\sup_{\partial B(w,s) \setminus \Sigma} \hat{u}/\hat{v} \to \infty \quad \text{as } s \to 0.$$

From (8.1) it follows that

$$\sup_{\partial B(w,s) \setminus \Sigma} \hat{u}/\hat{v} \leq c \inf_{\partial B(w,s) \setminus \Sigma} \hat{u}/\hat{v} \to \infty \quad \text{as } s \to 0. \tag{8.3}$$

The maximum principle for A-harmonic functions then implies that $\hat{v} \equiv 0$ in $B(w, r)$. From this contradiction and the same argument as in (8.3) we conclude the validity of (8.2).

Second, suppose $0 < s \ll 4r < \tilde{r}_0$, where $\tilde{r}_0 = \min\{r_0, 1\}$, and suppose that $\bar{u}$ is an A-harmonic function in $B(w, 4r) \setminus (\Sigma \cup \overline{B(w, s)})$ with $\bar{u} = 0$ continuously on $\Sigma \setminus \overline{B(w, s)}$. We can apply Lemma 7.1 to conclude that there exist $\delta^* \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{c}, \bar{\lambda} \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that if $0 < \delta \leq \delta^*$ and $\hat{y} \in (\Sigma \cap B(w, 2r)) \setminus B(w, 2s)$, then the 'fundamental inequality'

$$\bar{\lambda}^{-1} \frac{\bar{u}(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla \bar{u}(y)| \leq \bar{\lambda} \frac{\bar{u}(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \tag{8.4}$$

holds whenever $y \in B(\hat{y}, |\hat{y} - w|/\bar{c}) \setminus \Sigma$. Using this fact we see that if $0 < \delta \leq \delta^*$, then there exists $\tilde{\eta}$, depending only on the data, such that if we define a non-tangential approach region at w by $\tilde{\Omega}(w, \tilde{\eta}) = \{y \in B(w, \tilde{r}_0) : d(y, \Sigma) \geq \tilde{\eta}|y - w|\}$, then

$$\bar{u} \text{ satisfies (8.4) for } y \in B(w, 2r) \setminus [\tilde{\Omega}(w, \tilde{\eta}) \cup B(w, 2s)]. \tag{8.5}$$

To prove Theorem 1.13 we now use (8.2)–(8.5), and proceed essentially along the same proof scheme as used in the proofs of Theorems 1.9 and 1.10. In particular, we first prove that the quantitative estimates underlying the conclusion in Theorem 1.13 are true in the baseline case when $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$. We then use this to complete the proof in the general case. We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 8.1. *Under the structure assumptions of either Theorem 1.9 or Theorem 1.10 suppose $0 < s < r/100$, $w = 0$, $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$, and $A \in M_p(\alpha)$. Let $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma \setminus B(0, 2s)$ and let u be A-harmonic in $\Omega = B(0, 4r) \setminus [\Sigma_1 \cup \overline{B(0, s)}]$ with continuous boundary values $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \overline{B(0, s)}$ and $u = 1$ on $\partial B(0, s)$. Then for some $\bar{\lambda}$, depending only on the data, (8.4) is valid with $\bar{u}$ replaced by u in $\Omega \cap [B(0, 2r) \setminus B(0, 2s)]$.*

Proof. We first argue as in the proof of (5.13). Consider $\lambda > 1$ given with $\lambda - 1$ small. We assert that

$$\frac{u(x) - u(\lambda x)}{\lambda - 1} \geq c^{-1} u(x) \quad \text{whenever } x \in \Omega(\lambda) = \{x \in \Omega : \lambda x \in \Omega\}. \tag{8.6}$$

Indeed, from basic geometry it follows that this holds trivially on $\partial\Omega(\lambda) \setminus \overline{B(0, s)}$ as $u \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \overline{B(0, s)}$. For $x \in \partial\Omega(\lambda) \cap \partial B(0, s)$, we use Lemma 3.3 applied to u, and Harnack's inequality applied to $1 - u$, to conclude that

$$1 - u \geq c^{-1} \quad \text{on } \partial B(0, 7s/4). \tag{8.7}$$

As in (5.8) we set

$$\hat{\psi}(z) = \frac{e^{N|z|^2} - e^N}{e^{49N/16} - e^N} \tag{8.8}$$

for $z \in B(0, 7/4) \setminus \overline{B(0, 1)}$, where N is a non-negative integer. Set $\psi(x) = \hat{\psi}(x/s)$, $x \in B(0, 7s/4) \setminus \overline{B(0, s)}$. Using (8.7) and (8.8), and repeating the argument leading up to (5.13), we see that there exists $c_+ \geq 1$, depending only on the data, such that

$$c_+(1 - u(z)) \geq \psi(z) \geq c_+^{-1} d(z, \partial B(0, s))/s \quad \text{for } z \in B(0, 7s/4) \setminus \overline{B(0, s)}. \tag{8.9}$$

If $x \in \partial B(0, s)$ we can use (8.9), with z replaced by λx, to find that (8.6) is also valid on $\partial B(0, s)$. From the maximum principle for A-harmonic functions, we conclude that (8.6) holds in $\Omega(\lambda)$. Letting $\lambda \to 1$ in (8.6) we have

$$-\langle x, \nabla u(x) \rangle \geq c^{-1} u(x) \quad \text{whenever } x \in B(0, 2r) \setminus [B(0, 2s) \cup \Sigma]. \tag{8.10}$$

From (8.10), (8.5) and basic geometry we deduce the validity of Lemma 8.1. □

8.1. Proof of Theorem 1.13 in the baseline case when $A \in M_p(\alpha)$

We here prove the following lemma.

Lemma 8.2. *Theorem* 1.13 *is valid when* $w = 0$, $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$, *and* $A \in M_p(\alpha)$.

Proof. Let u_k, for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, be the A-harmonic function u defined in Lemma 8.1 with $w = 0$ and $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, but with s replaced by $s_k = 10^{-4k}r$. Set $\tilde{u}_k = u_k/u_k(a_r(0))$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. From Lemma 8.1 and our work in Sections 3 and 4, we deduce, as in the proof of Corollary 1.12, that subsequences of $(\tilde{u}_k)$, $(\nabla \tilde{u}_k)$ converge uniformly on compact subsets of $B(0, 4r) \setminus \{0\}$, $B(0, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, respectively, to $\tilde{u}$, $\nabla \tilde{u}$, where $\tilde{u}$ is an A-harmonic function in $B(0, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$ with $\tilde{u}(a_r(0)) = 1$. Furthermore, the fundamental inequality (8.4) holds for $\tilde{u}$ in $B(0, 2r) \setminus \Sigma$, and $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$ continuously on the boundary of $B(0, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$ except at $\{0\}$. Fix $0 < s < 10^{-4}r$ and $A \in M_p(\alpha)$, recall that $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$, and let $\bar{v} \not\equiv 0$ be A-harmonic in $D = B(0, 4r) \setminus [\Sigma \cup \overline{B(0, s)}]$. Assume also that $\bar{v}$ has continuous boundary values with $\bar{v} \equiv 0$ on $\partial D \setminus \partial B(0, s)$. We will use the fundamental inequality for $\tilde{u}$, and the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.11, under Assumption $1''$, to first prove that if $0 < c's \le r/100$, $D_1 = B(0, 4r) \setminus [\Sigma \cup \overline{B(0, c's)}]$, and c' is large enough, then

> (8.4) is valid with $\bar{u}$ replaced by $\bar{v}$, in $D_1 \cap B(0, r)$,
>
> with constants depending only on the data.   (8.11)

Using this we will prove that if $t \in (0, r)$ and

$$m(t) = \inf_{\partial B(0,t)} \tilde{u}/\bar{v}, \quad M(t) = \sup_{\partial B(0,t)} \tilde{u}/\bar{v}, \quad \mathrm{osc}(t) = M(t) - m(t),$$

and if s is as above, then for some $\check{c} \ge 1$ and $a \in (0, 1)$, depending only on the data,

$$\mathrm{osc}(t) \le \check{c}(s/t)^a \mathrm{osc}(s) \quad \text{whenever } s \le t \le r. \quad (8.12)$$

Now the proof of Lemma 8.2 can be completed. Indeed, suppose that $\tilde{v}$ is a positive A-harmonic function in $B(0, 4r) \setminus \Sigma$, continuous on $\overline{B(0, 4r)} \setminus \{0\}$, and $\tilde{v} = 0$ on $\partial(B(0, 4r) \setminus \Sigma) \setminus \{0\}$. For $s > 0$ fixed as above, let $\bar{v}$ denote the restriction of $\tilde{v}$ to D. Applying (8.12) and letting $s \to 0$ in this inequality we find that $\tilde{v}$ is a constant multiple of $\tilde{u}$.

To prove (8.11) and (8.12) we assume, as we may by the same argument as in (8.2), that

$$2 \le \bar{v}/\tilde{u} \le c_+ \quad \text{in } D \setminus B(0, 2s) \text{ where } c_+ \text{ depends only on the data.} \quad (8.13)$$

Also let $u(\cdot, \tau)$, $\tau \in [0, 1]$, be A-harmonic functions in $D_2 = B(0, 4r) \setminus [\Sigma \cup \overline{B(0, 2s)}]$ with continuous boundary values,

$$u(y, \tau) = \tau \bar{v}(y) + (1 - \tau)\tilde{u}(y) \quad \text{for } y \in \partial D_2, \, 0 \le \tau \le 1. \quad (8.14)$$

Existence of $u(\cdot, \tau)$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$, is a consequence of Lemma 3.2. Using the maximum principle for A-harmonic functions and (8.13) we find, for some $\tilde{c} \ge 1$ depending only on the data, that

$$\tilde{c}^{-1}u(\cdot, \tau_1) \le \frac{u(\cdot, \tau_2) - u(\cdot, \tau_1)}{\tau_2 - \tau_1} \le \tilde{c}u(\cdot, \tau_1) \quad (8.15)$$

in D_2 whenever $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 \leq 1$. Copying the argument after (4.43) we deduce, since $\tilde{u}$ satisfies the fundamental inequality in D_2, that there exists ϵ_0', depending only on the data, such that if $\xi_2 = \epsilon_0'$, then

$$c_-^{-1} \frac{u(y, \xi_2)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla u(y, \xi_2)| \leq c_- \frac{u(y, \xi_2)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \quad \text{whenever } y \in D_2. \qquad (8.16)$$

Using (8.16), as well as the fundamental inequality for $\tilde{u}$, and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.11 under Assumption $1'$, we find that Assumption 1 in Section 4 holds with $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ replaced by $\tilde{u}, u(\cdot, \xi_2)$ in $D_2 \setminus B(0, 2s)$, and with constants depending only on the data. Next we use this fact and argue as in (4.31), (4.32) to obtain (8.12) with $\bar{v}$ replaced by $u(\cdot, \xi_2)$ and s by $2s$. Continuing by induction, as in the proof of (4.46), we eventually get (8.11) in $D \cap B(0, r) \setminus B(0, c's)$, and then (8.12) with s replaced by $2c's$, where c' depends only on the data. Since $\mathrm{osc}(\cdot)$ is decreasing on $(0, r)$, we also have (8.12). $\qquad \square$

8.2. Final proof of Theorem 1.13

To prove Theorem 1.13 in the general case, assuming that $A \in M_p(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ and that $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ are functions as in the statement, we note, for some $b \in (0, 1)$ and $c \geq 1$, depending only on the data, that

$$u^*(a_{t_2}(w)) \leq c(t_1/t_2)^b u^*(a_{t_1}(w)) \quad \text{whenever } 0 < t_1 < t_2 < 4r, \qquad (8.17)$$

and $u^* \in \{\hat{u}, \hat{v}\}$. Also from the Harnack inequality we have, for some $\hat{b} \geq 2$ depending only on the data,

$$u^*(a_{t_2}(w)) \geq (t_1/t_2)^{\hat{b}} u^*(a_{t_1}(w)) \quad \text{whenever } 0 < t_1 < t_2 < 4r, \qquad (8.18)$$

and $u^* \in \{\hat{u}, \hat{v}\}$. Let $s_1 \leq r$ and let $\bar{c}$ be a large positive constant such that $0 < \bar{c}s \leq s_1 \leq r$. Let $A_1(\eta) = A(w, \eta), \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, and let u_1, v_1 be A_1-harmonic functions in $D_3 = B(w, \bar{c}s) \setminus (\Sigma \cup \overline{B(w, s)})$ having continuous boundary values and $u_1 = \hat{u}, v_1 = \hat{v}$ on ∂D_3. We first show that if $\bar{c}$ is large enough, then there exist $c_1, c_2 \geq 1$ such that

$$c_1^{-1} \frac{u^*(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \leq |\nabla u^*(y)| \leq c_1 \frac{u^*(y)}{d(y, \Sigma)} \text{ for } y \in B(w, 6c_2 s) \setminus [\Sigma \cup B(w, 2c_2 s)], \qquad (8.19)$$

and $u^* \in \{u_1, v_1\}$. To outline the argument we can without loss of generality assume that $w = 0$ and

$$h[B(0, \bar{c}s) \cap \Sigma, B(0, \bar{c}s) \cap (\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\})] \leq 2\bar{c}\delta s.$$

For u^* as above, let $v^* \geq 0$ be the A_1-harmonic function in $D_3 = B(0, \bar{c}s) \setminus [(\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}) \cup \overline{B(0, s)}]$ with continuous boundary values, $v^* \equiv 0$ on $\partial D_3 \setminus \partial B(0, s)$, while $v^* \leq u^*$ on $\partial B(0, s)$, and $v^* \equiv u^*$ at points z in this set with $d(z, \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}) \geq 20\bar{c}\delta s$. Using (8.17) and Lemma 3.3, we deduce, for c large enough, depending only on the data, that

$$u^* \leq c[(\bar{c})^{-b} + (\bar{c}\delta)^\sigma] u^*(a_s(0)) + v^* \quad \text{and} \quad v^* \leq c(\bar{c}\delta)^\sigma u^*(a_s(0)) + u^* \quad \text{on } D_3. \qquad (8.20)$$

Also using (8.18), we see that if $c_2 \ll \bar{c}$ is large enough, depending only on the data, then

$$\min\{v^*(x) : x \in \tilde{\Omega}(w, \tilde{\eta}/2) \cap B(0, 8c_2 s) \setminus B(0, c_2 s)\} \geq c_2^{-2\hat{b}} u^*(a_s(0)). \qquad (8.21)$$

We can, without loss of generality, also assume that $c_2 > 2c'$, where c' is the constant in (8.11). Using this assumption we see that the fundamental inequality (8.11) holds for v^* in $D_3 \cap [B(0, \bar{c}s/4) \setminus B(0, c_2 s)]$, with $\bar{c}s$ playing the role of $4r$. With c_2 now fixed, we observe from (8.20), (8.21) that the ratio of u^*/v^* in $\tilde{\Omega}(w, \tilde{\eta}/2) \cap [B(0, 8c_2 s) \setminus B(0, c_2 s)]$ can be made arbitrarily close to 1 by first choosing $\bar{c}$ large, and then choosing $\delta < \delta^*$ small enough depending on $\bar{c}$. In view of (8.11) for v^*, these constants can in fact be chosen to depend only on the data and in such a way that Lemma 3.9 can be applied to u^*, v^*. Hence, applying Lemma 3.9 we can conclude (8.19) for u_1, v_1 in $\tilde{\Omega}(w, \tilde{\eta}) \cap B(0, 6c_2 s) \setminus B(0, 2c_2 s)$. From this conclusion and (8.5) we obtain (8.19).

Armed with (8.19), we can now repeat the argument in Lemma 3.8 with A_1, A_2 replaced by A, A_1, and with cylinders replaced by balls, in order to conclude that

$$|u_1(x) - \hat{u}(x)| \leq c s_1^{\theta} u_1(x), \quad x \in \tilde{\Omega}(w, \tilde{\eta}/2) \cap \bar{B}(w, 6c_2 s) \setminus [\Sigma \cup B(w, 2c_2 s)], \qquad (8.22)$$

for some c, θ, depending only on the data. Further, (8.22) also holds for $v_1, \hat{v}$. From (8.22) and Lemma 3.9 we see, for s_1 small enough, that (8.19) is valid for $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ on $\tilde{\Omega}(w, \tilde{\eta}) \cap [B(w, 5c_2) \setminus B(w, 3c_2)]$ with c_1 replaced by $c_4 \geq c_1$, depending only on the data. Using this fact and once more (8.5) we get the fundamental inequality for $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ on $B(w, 5c_2 s) \setminus [\Sigma \cup B(w, 3c_2 s)]$ provided $s_1 \leq r/c^*$ and c^* is large enough.

From arbitrariness of s we deduce that the fundamental inequality holds for $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$ in $B(0, r/c) \setminus \Sigma$ with constants depending only on the data. Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 now easily imply that if $a, b \in (0, \infty)$, then $(a|\nabla \hat{u}| + b|\nabla \hat{v}|)^{p-2}$ is an A_2-weight on cubes $\subset B(0, r/c) \setminus B(0, s)$, $0 < s \leq r/c$, with constants that can be chosen independent of a, b. Using this fact, and the same argument as in the proof of (8.12), we see that if

$$m(t, w) = \inf_{\partial B(w,t)} \hat{u}/\hat{v}, \quad M(t, w) = \sup_{\partial B(w,t)} \hat{u}/\hat{v}, \quad \operatorname{osc}(t, w) = M(t, w) - m(t, w),$$

then for some $\hat{c} \geq 1$ and $\hat{a} \in (0, 1)$, depending only on the data, we have

$$\operatorname{osc}(t, w) \leq \hat{c}(s/t)^{\hat{a}} \operatorname{osc}(s, w), \quad s \leq t \leq r. \qquad (8.23)$$

Theorem 1.13 now follows from (8.23) if we let $s \to 0$.

References

[AH]   Adams, D., Hedberg, L.: Function Spaces and Potential Theory. Springer (1996)
          Zbl 0834.46021 MR 1411441

[ALuN1]   Avelin, B., Lundström, N., Nyström, K.: Boundary estimates for solutions to operators of p-Laplace type with lower order terms. J. Differential Equations **250**, 264–291 (2011) Zbl 1248.35082 MR 2737843

[ALuN2]   Avelin, B., Lundström, N., Nyström, K.: Optimal doubling, Reifenberg flatness and operators of p-Laplace type. Nonlinear Anal. **74**, 5943–5955 (2011)   Zbl 1226.35018 MR 2833365

[AN]   Avelin, B., Nyström, K.: Estimates for solutions to equations of p-Laplace type in Ahlfors regular NTA-domains. J. Funct. Anal. **266**, 5955–6005 (2014)   Zbl 1308.31007 MR 3182967

[BL]   Bennewitz, B., Lewis, J.: On the dimension of p-harmonic measure. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **30**, 459–505 (2005)   Zbl 1194.35189 MR 2173375

[CFMS]   Caffarelli, L., Fabes, E., Mortola, S., Salsa, S.: Boundary behavior of nonnegative solutions of elliptic operators in divergence form. Indiana Univ. J. Math. **30**, 621–640 (1981) Zbl 0512.35038 MR 0620271

[FJK1]   Fabes, E., Jerison, D., Kenig, C.: The Wiener test for degenerate elliptic equations. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **32**, no. 3, 151–182 (1982)   Zbl 0488.35034 MR 0688024

[FJK2]   Fabes, E., Jerison, D., Kenig, C.: Boundary behavior of solutions to degenerate elliptic equations. In: Conference on Harmonic Analysis in Honor of Antoni Zygmund (Chicago, IL, 1981), Vol. II, Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, 577–589 (1983) Zbl 0503.35038 MR 0730093

[FKS]   Fabes, E., Kenig, C., Serapioni, R.: The local regularity of solutions to degenerate elliptic equations. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **7**, 77–116 (1982)   Zbl 0498.35042 MR 0643158,

[GZ]   Gariepy, R., Ziemer, W.: A regularity condition at the boundary for solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **67**, 25–39 (1977)   Zbl 0389.35023 MR 0492836

[GT]   Gilbarg, D., Trudinger, N. S.: Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order. 2nd ed., Springer (1983)   Zbl 0562.35001 MR 0737190

[HKM]   Heinonen, J., Kilpeläinen, T., Martio, O.: Nonlinear Potential Theory of Degenerate Elliptic Equations. Rev. ed., Dover (2006)   Zbl 1115.31001 MR 2305115

[JK]   Jerison, D., Kenig, C.: Boundary behavior of harmonic functions in non-tangentially accessible domains. Adv. Math. **46**, 80–147 (1982)   Zbl 0514.31003 MR 0676988

[KT]   Kenig, C., Toro, T.: Harmonic measure on locally flat domains. Duke Math J. **87**, 509–551 (1997)   Zbl 0878.31002 MR 1446617

[KZ]   Kilpeläinen, T., Zhong, X.: Growth of entire A-subharmonic functions. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **28**, 181–192 (2003)   Zbl 1018.35027 MR 1976839

[LLuN]   Lewis, J., Lundström, N., Nyström, K.: Boundary Harnack inequalities for operators of p-Laplace type in Reifenberg flat domains. In: Perspectives in Partial Differential Equations, Harmonic Analysis and Applications, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 79, Amer. Math. Soc., 229–266 (2008)   Zbl 1160.35423 MR 2500495

[LN1]   Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: Boundary behaviour for p harmonic functions in Lipschitz and starlike Lipschitz ring domains. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **40**, 765–813 (2007) Zbl 1134.31008 MR 2382861

[LN2]   Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: Boundary behavior and the Martin boundary problem for p harmonic functions in Lipschitz domains. Ann. of Math. **172**, 1907–1948 (2010) Zbl 1210.31004 MR 2726103

[LN3]   Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: Regularity and free boundary regularity for the p-Laplacian in Lipschitz and C^1-domains. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **33**, 523–548 (2008) Zbl 1202.35110 MR 2431379

[LN4] Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: New results for *p*-harmonic functions. Pure Appl. Math. Quart. **7**, 345–363 (2011) Zbl 1241.35110 MR 2815383

[LN5] Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: Boundary behaviour of *p*-harmonic functions in domains beyond Lipschitz domains. Adv. Calc. Var. **1**, 133–177 (2008) Zbl 1169.31004 MR 2427450

[LN6] Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: Regularity of Lipschitz free boundaries in two-phase problems for the *p*-Laplace operator. Adv. Math. **225**, 2565–2597 (2010) Zbl 1200.35335 MR 2680176

[LN7] Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: Regularity of flat free boundaries in two-phase problems for the *p*-Laplace operator. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **29**, 83–108 (2012) Zbl 1241.35221 MR 2876248

[LN8] Lewis, J., Nyström, K.: Regularity and free boundary regularity for the *p*-Laplace operator in Reifenberg flat and Ahlfors regular domains. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **25**, 827–862 (2012) Zbl 1250.35084 MR 2904575

[Li] Lieberman, G.: Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. Nonlinear Anal. **12**, 1203–1219 (1988) Zbl 0675.35042 MR 0969499

[Lu] Lundström, N.: Estimates for *p*-harmonic functions vanishing on a flat. Nonlinear Anal. **74**, 6852–6860 (2011) Zbl 1234.35050 MR 2833675

[PTT] Preiss, D., Tolsa, X., Toro, T.: On the smoothness of Hölder doubling measures. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **35**, 339–363 (2009) Zbl 1171.28001 MR 2481829

[T1] Tolksdorf, P.: Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations. J. Differential Equations **51**, 126–150 (1984) Zbl 0488.35017 MR 0727034

[T2] Tolksdorf, P., Everywhere regularity for some quasilinear systems with a lack of ellipticity. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **134**, 241–266 (1983) Zbl 0538.35034 MR 0736742