

# A priori estimates for classical solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations

CAO Yi<sup>1,\*</sup>, LI DongSheng<sup>1</sup> & WANG LiHe<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Science, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710049, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, The University of Iowa, Iowa City IA 52242-1419, USA

Email: signal717@gmail.com, lids@mail.xjtu.edu.cn, lwang.iowa@gmail.com

Received November 4, 2009; accepted June 29, 2010

**Abstract** For the fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic equation  $F(D^2u) = 0$ , it is well known that the viscosity solutions are  $C^{2,\alpha}$  if the nonlinear operator  $F$  is convex (or concave). In this paper, we study the classical solutions for the fully nonlinear elliptic equation where the nonlinear operators  $F$  is locally  $C^{1,\beta}$  almost everywhere for any  $0 < \beta < 1$ . We will prove that the classical solutions  $u$  are  $C^{2,\alpha}$ , moreover, the  $C^{2,\alpha}$  norm of  $u$  depends on  $n, F$  and the continuous modulus of  $D^2u$ .

**Keywords** fully nonlinear, classical solutions,  $C^{2,\alpha}$  estimates

**MSC(2000):** 20M31, 33Q21

**Citation:** CAO Yi, et al. Science China: Mathematics Journal Sample. Sci China Math, 2010, 53, doi: 10.1007/s11425-009-0044-4

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following fully non-linear uniformly elliptic equations:

$$F(D^2u) = 0. \quad (1)$$

Let now  $\mathcal{S}_n$  denote the space of  $n \times n$  symmetric matrices. Equation (1) is uniformly elliptic if there exist two constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$  such that

$$\lambda \|N\| \leq F(M + N) - F(M) \leq \Lambda \|N\|, \quad (2)$$

for any  $M, N \in \mathcal{S}_n$  with  $N \geq 0$ , where  $N \geq 0$  means  $N$  is positive semi-definite.

Under the assumption that  $F$  is convex (or concave), it is well known that the viscosity solutions of (1) are  $C^{2,\alpha}$ . This result was proved by Evans and later Caffarelli simplified the proof (see [1-7]). In the proof of above result, the convex (or concave) hypothesis for  $F$  is essential since all the existing proofs depend on  $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial e \partial e}$ , the second derivative of  $u$  along any direction  $e$ , is a sub-solution of Pucci's extremal operator  $\mathcal{M}^+$  (see [1] for the definition of  $\mathcal{M}^+$ ).

Without the convex (or concave) hypothesis on  $F$ , Caffarelli and Yuan Yu proved that the viscosity solutions of (1) are  $C^{2,\alpha}$  if the level set  $\Sigma = \{M : F(M) = 0\}$  satisfies: (i)  $\sum \bigcap \{M : \text{tr}(M) = t\}$  is strictly

\*Corresponding author

convex for all constants  $t$ ; (ii) the angle between the identity matrix  $I$  and the normal  $F_{ij}$  to  $\Sigma$  is strictly positive on the non-convex part of  $\Sigma$  (see [8]).

In this paper, we prove the interior  $C^{2,\alpha}$  regularity of classical solutions for (1). Our hypothesis is that  $F$  is locally  $C^{1,\beta}$  almost everywhere for  $0 < \beta < 1$ . Precisely,  $F$  is differentiable almost everywhere and for any bounded domain  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{S}_n$ , there exists a constant  $K$  such that for any  $M, N \in \mathcal{D}$ , if  $F$  is differentiable at  $N$ , then

$$|F(M) - F(N) - \text{tr}(F'(N)(M - N))| \leq K|M - N|^{1+\beta}. \quad (3)$$

(Recall that  $\text{tr}(A)$  denotes the trace of the matrix  $A$ .) We point out that if  $F$  is convex (or concave), then according to Alexandroff-Buselman-Feller theorem ([1][9]),  $F$  is locally  $C^{1,1}$  almost everywhere. Our main theorem is as following.

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose  $F$  is locally  $C^{1,\beta}$  almost everywhere for  $0 < \beta < 1$  and  $u \in C^2(B_1)$  is a solution of (1). If  $\rho$  is a non-decreasing function defined on  $R^+$  such that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \rho(\delta) = 0$ , and

$$|D^2u(x) - D^2u(y)| \leq \rho(|x - y|) \quad \forall x, y \in B_1, \quad (4)$$

then there exist uniform constants  $0 < \alpha < 1$  depending only on  $\lambda, \Lambda, n$  and  $C$  depending only on  $\lambda, \Lambda, n, \rho$  such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}})} \leq C\|u\|_{C^2(\overline{B_{3/4}})}. \quad (5)$$

Theorem 1.1 will be proven in Section 3 by an iteration. Before this, in Section 2, we demonstrate that the Hölder continuity can be measured by  $L^p$  norm.

Throughout this paper, we will use the following notations.  $B_r(x)$  denotes the open ball in  $R^n$  centered at  $x$  with radius  $r$ ;  $B_r := B_r(0)$ ,  $D_r(x) := B_1 \cap B_r(x)$ ;  $\mathcal{B}_r$  denotes the open ball in  $\mathcal{S}_n$  centered at the origin with radius  $r$ ;  $|E|$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of any measurable set  $E$ ;  $\overline{u_D}$  denotes the average of the function  $u$  over the set  $D$ ;  $\text{osc}_D u$  denotes the oscillation of the function  $u$  in the set  $D \subset R^n$ , exactly,

$$\text{osc}_D u := \sup_{x, y \in D} |u(x) - u(y)|.$$

## 2 Hölder continuity

A function  $u$  defined on  $\overline{B_1}$  is  $C^\alpha(\overline{B_1})$  (or Hölder continuous with exponent  $\alpha$ ) if there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$[u]_{\alpha, \overline{B_1}} := \sup_{x, y \in \overline{B_1}, x \neq y} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \leq C,$$

where  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . This is the usual definition of Hölder continuity of  $u$ , where the continuity is measured by  $L^\infty$  norm. The following theorem claims that it can also be measured by  $L^p$  norm for any  $p \geq 1$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** Suppose  $u \in L^p(B_1)$  with  $p \geq 1$ . If there exist constants  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and  $A > 0$  such that for any  $x \in \overline{B_1}$  and any  $r > 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{|D_r(x)|} \int_{D_r(x)} |u - \overline{u_{D_r(x)}}|^p \leq Ar^{\alpha p}, \quad (6)$$

then

$$[u]_{\alpha, \overline{B_1}} \leq C_0 A^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant depending only on  $n$  and  $\alpha$ . (see [p70 of 10, Theorem 1.2])

**Corollary 2.1.** Suppose  $u \in L^p(B_1)$  with  $p \geq 1$ . If there exist constants  $0 < \alpha < 1$ ,  $0 < r_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $A_1 > 0$  such that for any  $x \in \overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}}}$  and any  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , there exists a constant  $a_{x,m}$  satisfying

$$\frac{1}{|B_{r_1^m}(x)|} \int_{B_{r_1^m}(x)} |u - a_{x,m}|^p \leq A_1 r_1^{\alpha m p}, \quad (8)$$

then

$$[u]_{\alpha, \overline{B}_{1/2}} \leq C_1 r_1^{-\frac{n}{p} - \alpha} (A_1^{\frac{1}{p}} + \|u\|_{L^p(B_1)}), \quad (9)$$

where  $C_1$  is a constant depending only on  $n, \alpha$  and  $\|u\|_{L^p(B_1)}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A = \max\{\frac{2^{p+1}\|u\|_{L^p(B_1)}^p}{|B_{r_1}|r_1^{p\alpha}}, 2^p A_1 r_1^{-n-p\alpha}\}$ , then we only need to show (6) holds for any  $x \in \overline{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and any  $r > 0$ . Since (6) holds clearly for  $r > r_1$ , we only need to show the case of  $r \leq r_1$ . If  $r \leq r_1$ , then  $D_r(x) = B_r(x)$  since  $r_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $x \in \overline{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Let  $m$  satisfy  $r_1^{m+1} < r \leq r_1^m$ , from

$$|\overline{u_{B_r(x)}} - a_{x,m}| \leq \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u - a_{x,m}| \leq \left( \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u - a_{x,m}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u - \overline{u_{B_r(x)}}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left( \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u - a_{x,m}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + |\overline{u_{B_r(x)}} - a_{x,m}| \\ &\leq 2 \left( \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u - a_{x,m}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

By  $\frac{|B_{r_1^k}(x)|}{|B_{r_1^{k+1}}(x)|} = \frac{1}{r_1^n}$  and (8), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u - a_{x,m}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left( \frac{1}{|B_{r_1^m}(x)|} \int_{B_{r_1^m}(x)} |u - a_{x,m}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \\ &\leq \left( A_1 r_1^{\alpha m p} \frac{|B_{r_1^m}(x)|}{|B_r(x)|} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left( A_1 r_1^{\alpha m p} r_1^{-n} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq A_1^{\frac{1}{p}} r_1^{-\frac{n}{p} - \alpha} r^{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (10), we have (6) holds with  $A \geq 2^p A_1 r_1^{-n-p\alpha}$ .

### 3 The Proof of Theorem 1.1

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $u$  be a harmonic function defined in  $B_1$  and  $\varphi$  be a continuous function defined on  $\partial B_1$ . If  $u = \varphi$  on  $\partial B_1$ , then

$$\sup_{x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}} |D^k u(x)| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}, \quad (11)$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending only on  $n$  and  $k$ .

*Proof.* Let  $v$  be the harmonic function satisfying  $v = |\varphi|$  on  $\partial B_1$ , the maximum principle now imply that  $v(x) \geq 0$  and  $-v(x) \leq u(x) \leq v(x)$  in  $B_1$ . By Mean Value equalities and Hölder inequality, we have that

$$v(0) = \frac{1}{|\partial B_1|} \int_{\partial B_1} |\varphi| ds \leq \frac{1}{|\partial B_1|} \left( \int_{\partial B_1} |\varphi|^2 ds \right)^{1/2} |\partial B_1|^{1/2} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}; \quad (12)$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending only on  $n$ . On the other hand, we have that

$$\sup_{x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}} |D^k u(x)| \leq C_1 \sup_{x \in B_{\frac{3}{4}}} |u(x)| \leq C_1 \sup_{x \in B_{\frac{3}{4}}} v(x) \leq C_1 v(0); \quad (13)$$

The last inequality is the Harnack inequality. Here we have used the same letter  $C_1$  to denote constants depending only on  $n$  and  $k$ . By (12) and (13), it is easy to see (11) holds.

**Remark 3.1.** Suppose that  $u(x)$  is the solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -a_{ij} D_{ij} u = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases}$$

where  $(a_{ij})_{n \times n}$  is a constant matrix satisfying  $\lambda I \leq (a_{ij})_{n \times n} \leq \Lambda I$ , then the conclusion of lemma 3.1 will be still true.

We prove Theorem 1.1 through the following key lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** Suppose  $u \in C^2(B_1)$  is a solution of (1) with  $D^2u(x) \in \mathcal{B}_1$  for any  $x \in B_1$ ,  $F$  satisfies (3) for any  $M \in \mathcal{B}_2$  and almost every  $N \in \mathcal{B}_2$ . There exist positive constants  $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$  depending only on  $\lambda, \Lambda, n, \beta, K$  and  $0 < \delta_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$  depending only on  $\lambda, \Lambda, n$  such that if

$$\text{osc}_{B_1} D^2u \leq \epsilon_0 \quad (14)$$

and there exists  $M_1 \in \mathcal{B}_2$  satisfying

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_1|} \int_{B_1} |D^2u - M_1|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 2\epsilon \leq 2\epsilon_0, \quad (15)$$

then there exists  $M_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$  satisfying

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_{\delta_0}|} \int_{B_{\delta_0}} |D^2u - M_2|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon. \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* By (15) and  $F$  is differentiable in  $\mathcal{B}_2$  a.e., we can and we do choose  $\tilde{M} = (\tilde{m}_{ij})_{n \times n} \in \mathcal{B}_2$  such that

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_1|} \int_{B_1} |D^2u - \tilde{M}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 3\epsilon \quad (17)$$

and that  $F$  is differentiable at  $\tilde{M}$  with  $F'(\tilde{M}) = (a_{ij})_{n \times n} \in \mathcal{S}_n$ . (2) implies

$$\lambda I \leq (a_{ij})_{n \times n} \leq \Lambda I \quad (18)$$

in the sense of positive semi-definite. We claim that

$$\|D^2u - \tilde{M}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq 3\epsilon_0 \quad (19)$$

In fact, if (19) is false, then by (14),  $|D^2u(x) - \tilde{M}| > 2\epsilon_0$  for any  $x \in B_1$ . This contradicts with (17).

Set  $P_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T \tilde{M}x$  for any  $x \in R^n$ . According to Poincaré's inequality, there exists a constant  $C$  depending only on  $n$  such that

$$\|(u - P_1) - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1} \cdot x - \overline{(u - P_1)}_{B_1}\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq C \|D(u - P_1) - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1}\|_{L^2(B_1)}$$

and

$$\|D(u - P_1) - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1}\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq C \|D^2(u - P_1)\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

It follows that

$$\|(u - P_1) - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1} \cdot x - \overline{(u - P_1)}_{B_1}\|_{W^{1,2}(B_1)} \leq C \|D^2(u - P_1)\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

By trace theorem and (17), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u - P_1 - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1} \cdot x - \overline{(u - P_1)}_{B_1}\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)} \\ & \leq C \|u - P_1 - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1} \cdot x - \overline{(u - P_1)}_{B_1}\|_{W^{1,2}(B_1)} \\ & \leq C \|D^2u - \tilde{M}\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq C\epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $C$  depends only on  $n$ .

Let  $h(x)$  be the solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -a_{ij}D_{ij}h = 0 & \text{in } B_1; \\ h = u - P_1 - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1} \cdot x - \overline{(u - P_1)}_{B_1} & \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that  $(a_{ij})_{n \times n}$  is a constant matrix satisfying (18) (Recall  $(a_{ij})_{n \times n} = F'(\tilde{M})$ ). By remark 3.1 we have that for any  $x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}$ ,

$$|D^3 h(x)| \leq C \|u - P_1 - \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1} \cdot x - \overline{(u - P_1)}_{B_1}\|_{L^2(\partial B_1)}; \quad (21)$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending only on  $\lambda, \Lambda$  and  $n$ . In view of (20), then for any  $x \in B_{1/2}$ ,

$$|D^3 h(x)| \leq \hat{C} \epsilon,$$

where  $\hat{C}$  depends on  $\lambda, \Lambda$  and  $n$ . Let

$$\delta_0 = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\hat{C}}\right\}. \quad (22)$$

Therefore for any  $x \in B_{\delta_0}$ ,

$$|D^2 h(x) - D^2 h(0)| \leq \|D^3 h\|_{L^\infty(B_{\delta_0})} \delta_0 \leq \hat{C} \delta_0 \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon. \quad (23)$$

Set

$$f(x) = -F(\tilde{M}) - a_{ij}(D_{ij}u(x) - \tilde{m}_{ij}) \quad (24)$$

and from (3), it follows that  $|f(x)| \leq K|D^2 u(x) - \tilde{M}|^{1+\beta}$  for any  $x \in B_1$ . Then by (17) and (19),

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^2(B_1)} &\leq K \left( \int_{B_1} |D^2 u - \tilde{M}|^{2(1+\beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq K(3\epsilon_0)^\beta \left( \int_{B_1} |D^2 u - \tilde{M}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq K\sqrt{|B_1|}(3\epsilon_0)^\beta 2\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Let  $v \in W^{2,2}(B_1)$  be the solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -a_{ij}D_{ij}v = f & \text{in } B_1, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases}$$

then there exists a constant  $C$  depending only on  $\lambda, \Lambda$  and  $n$  such that

$$\|v\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \sqrt{|B_1|}CK(3\epsilon_0)^\beta 2\epsilon.$$

Therefore we can and we do choose  $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$  such that

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_{\delta_0}|} \int_{B_{\delta_0}} |D^2 v|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon, \quad (26)$$

where  $\delta_0$  is given by (22).

Let  $P_2$  be the solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -a_{ij}D_{ij}P_2 = F(\tilde{M}) & \text{in } B_1, \\ P_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases}$$

Since  $(a_{ij})_{n \times n}$  is a constant matrix, we have  $P_2$  is a second order polynomial.

Set  $w = P_1 + P_2 + v + h + \overline{D(u - P_1)}_{B_1} \cdot x + \overline{(u - P_1)}_{B_1}$  and then by (24),

$$-a_{ij}D_{ij}w = -a_{ij}\tilde{m}_{ij} + F(\tilde{M}) + f = -a_{ij}D_{ij}u \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Since  $w|_{\partial B_1} = u|_{\partial B_1}$ , we have  $w = u$  in  $B_1$  and then

$$D^2 u = D^2 w = \tilde{M} + D^2 P_2 + D^2 v + D^2 h \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Set  $M_2 = \tilde{M} + D^2 P_2 + D^2 h(0)$ . It follows that for any  $x \in B_{\delta_0}$ ,

$$|D^2 u(x) - M_2| = |D^2 v(x) + D^2 h(x) - D^2 h(0)| \leq |D^2 v(x)| + |D^2 h(x) - D^2 h(0)|.$$

By (23) and (26), we have (16) holds.

**Corollary 3.1.** Assume that all the hypotheses of Lemma 3.2 hold, and  $\epsilon_0$  and  $\delta_0$  are given by it. If there exists  $M_1 \in \mathcal{B}_2$  satisfying

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_1|} \int_{B_1} |D^2 u - M_1|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{|B_{\delta_0}|}{|B_1|}} \epsilon_0 \delta_0^{\frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0}}, \quad (27)$$

then  $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{B_{1/2}})$  with  $\alpha = \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0}$ , moreover,

$$[D^2 u]_{\alpha, \overline{B_{1/2}}} \leq 2C_1 \delta_0^{-\frac{n}{2}} \epsilon_0, \quad (28)$$

where  $C_1$  is the constant given by Corollary 2.1.

*Proof.* We only need to show that for any  $x_0 \in \overline{B_{1/2}}$  and any  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , there exists  $M_{x_0, k} \in \mathcal{B}_2$  such that

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_{\delta_0^k}(x_0)|} \int_{B_{\delta_0^k}(x_0)} |D^2 u - M_{x_0, k}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon_0 \delta_0^k \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0}. \quad (29)$$

Then we infer (28) by Corollary 2.1 since  $\delta_0^{\frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0}} = 1/2$ .

In order to prove (29), we use the mathematical induction method. First, for  $k = 1$ , since  $B_{\delta_0}(x_0) \subset B_1$ , (27) implies (29) clearly for  $M_{x_0, 1} = M_1$ . Suppose that there exists a matrix  $M_{x_0, k} \in \mathcal{B}_2$  such that (29) holds for  $k = m$ . Then for  $k = m + 1$ , set  $y = \frac{x - x_0}{\delta_0^m}$  and  $v(y) = \frac{u(x_0 + \delta_0^m y)}{\delta_0^{2m}}$  for any  $x \in B_{\delta_0^m}(x_0)$  and  $y \in B_1$ . Since  $D_x^2 u(x) = D_y^2 v(y)$  as  $y = \frac{x - x_0}{\delta_0^m}$ , we have (14) still holds with  $u$  replaced by  $v$  and

$$F(D^2 v(y)) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

By the induction hypothesis, there exists  $M_{x_0, m} \in \mathcal{B}_2$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{1}{|B_1|} \int_{B_1} |D^2 v - M_{x_0, m}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \left( \frac{1}{|B_{\delta_0^m}(x_0)|} \int_{B_{\delta_0^m}(x_0)} |D^2 u - M_{x_0, m}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \epsilon_0 \delta_0^m \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0} \leq \epsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 3.2, there exists  $M_{x_0, m+1} \in \mathcal{B}_2$  such that

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_{\delta_0}|} \int_{B_{\delta_0}} |D^2 v - M_{x_0, m+1}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_0 \delta_0^m \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0},$$

that is,

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_{\delta_0^{m+1}}(x_0)|} \int_{B_{\delta_0^{m+1}}(x_0)} |D^2 u - M_{x_0, m+1}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon_0 \delta_0^{(m+1)} \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0}.$$

Then, (29) holds for  $k = m + 1$ .

*proof of Theorem 1.1*

Let  $\mathcal{D} = D^2 u(B_{3/4})$ , then  $\mathcal{D}$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{S}_n$  since  $D^2 u$  is continuous. By  $F$  is locally  $C^{1,\beta}$  almost everywhere, there exists  $K$  such that (3) holds for any  $M \in \mathcal{D}$  and any  $N \in \mathcal{D}$  where  $F$  is differentiable. Let  $\epsilon_0$  and  $\delta_0$  be given by Lemma 3.2. (Recall  $\epsilon_0$  and  $\delta_0$  depend only on  $\lambda, \Lambda, n, \beta$  and  $K$ .) By (4), there exists a uniform constant  $0 < r_0 < 1/4$  depending only on  $\rho$  such that, for any  $x_0 \in B_{1/2}$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in B_{r_0}(x_0)} |D^2 u(x) - D^2 u(x_0)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_0 \delta_0^{\frac{n}{2}} \leq \epsilon_0,$$

then we have

$$\left( \frac{1}{|B_{r_0}(x_0)|} \int_{B_{r_0}(x_0)} |D^2 u - D^2 u(x_0)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{|B_{\delta_0}|}{|B_1|}} \epsilon_0 \delta_0^{\frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln \delta_0}}.$$

Set  $y = \frac{x-x_0}{r_0}$  and  $v(y) = \frac{u(x_0+r_0y)}{r_0^2}$  for any  $x \in B_{r_0}(x_0)$ , then  $D^2v(y) = D^2u(x)$  for  $y \in B_1$ . It follows that all the hypotheses of Lemma 3.2 hold for  $v \in C^2(B_1)$ . According to corollary 3.1, for  $\alpha = \frac{\ln \delta_0}{\ln(1/2)}$ , we have

$$[D^2v]_{\alpha, \overline{B_{1/2}}} \leq C_2 \delta_0^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|v\|_{C^2(\overline{B_1})},$$

where  $C_2$  is a constant depending only on  $n, \alpha$  since  $\|D^2v\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \epsilon_0$ . Then we derive

$$[D^2u]_{\alpha, \overline{B_{r_0/2}}(x_0)} \leq C_2 \delta_0^{-\frac{n}{2}} r_0^{-\alpha} \|u\|_{C^2(\overline{B_{3/4}})}.$$

By the standard covering method, we have (5) holds.

**Acknowledgements** This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10771166). The authors cordially thank the referees for their careful reading and helpful comments.

## References

- 1 Caffarelli L A, Cabre X. Fully nonlinear elliptic equations. RI: AMS 43, Providence, 1995.
- 2 Caffarelli L A. Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations. Ann. of Math., 1989, 130(2): 189-213.
- 3 Caffarelli L A. Interior  $W^{2,p}$  estimates for solutions of Monge-Ampere equations. Ann. of Math., 1990, 131(2): 135-150.
- 4 Evans L C. Classical solutions of fully nonlinear, convex, second-order elliptic equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 1982, XXV: 333-363.
- 5 Krylov N V. Boundedly nonhomogeneous elliptic and parabolic equations. Izv.Akad.Nak.SSSR Ser.Mat. 1982, 46: 487-523; English transl. in Math. USSR Izv. 1983, 20: 459-492.
- 6 Krylov N V. Boundedly nonhomogeneous elliptic and parabolic equations in a domain. Izv.Akad.Nak.SSSR Ser.Mat. 1983, 47: 75-108; English transl. in Math. USSR Izv. 1984, 22: 67-97.
- 7 Gilbarg D, Trudinger N S. Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- 8 Caffarelli L A, Yuan Yu. A priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations with convex level set. Ann. I. H. Poincaré-an. 2001, 18(2): 261-270.
- 9 Evans L C, Gariepy, R F. Measure theory and fine properties of functions. New York: Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, 1992.
- 10 Giaquinta M. Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.