

# Porosity of Free Boundaries in A-Obstacle Problems

S. Challal and A. Lyaghfour  
Fields Institute, 222 College Street  
Toronto M5T 3J1, Canada

## Abstract

We establish the exact growth of the solution of the A-obstacle problem near the free boundary from which we deduce its porosity.

MSC: 35R35, 35B05, 35J60

Key words : A-Obstacle Problem, A-Laplacian, Orlicz Sobolev Spaces, Free Boundary, Porosity.

## Introduction

The solution of the obstacle problem in the degenerate and singular cases is known to be  $C^{1,\alpha}$  but there is only little information regarding the free boundary. Recently, it has been proved, for an identically zero obstacle (see [4]), that the free boundary is porous and hence of Lebesgue's measure zero.

In this paper, we give the exact growth of the solution of the A-obstacle problem near the free boundary which agrees with the one for the  $p$ -Laplacian when  $A(t) = t^p$ . Then we deduce the porosity result.

## 1 Statement of the problem and preliminary results

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $g \in W^{1,A}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $g \geq 0$ . We consider the obstacle problem for the A-Laplace equation

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_A u = \operatorname{div} \left( \frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u \right) = f(x) & \text{in } [u > 0], \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The weak formulation of this problem is given by the following variational inequality

$$(P) \begin{cases} \text{Find } u \in K_g \text{ such that :} \\ \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u \cdot \nabla (v - u) + f(x)(v - u) \right) dx \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in K_g, \end{cases}$$

where  $K_g = \{v \in W^{1,A}(\Omega), \quad v - g \in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega), \quad v \geq 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega\}$ ,

$$A(t) = \int_0^t a(\tau) d\tau, \quad a \text{ is a } C^1 \text{ function from } [0, +\infty[ \text{ into } [0, +\infty[ \text{ such that } a(0) = 0,$$

$$a_0 \leq \frac{ta'(t)}{a(t)} \leq a_1 \quad \forall t > 0, \quad a_0, a_1 \text{ are positive constants.} \quad (1.1)$$

As a consequence of (1.1), we can easily verify (see [2]) that

$$\left( \frac{a(|\xi|)}{|\xi|} \xi - \frac{a(|\zeta|)}{|\zeta|} \zeta \right) (\xi - \zeta) > 0 \quad \forall \xi, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \quad \xi \neq \zeta. \quad (1.2)$$

We recall the definition of the Orlicz class  $\tilde{L}^A(\Omega)$

$$\tilde{L}^A(\Omega) = \{u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\} / u \text{ is measurable and } \int_{\Omega} A(|u(x)|) dx < +\infty\}.$$

The Orlicz space  $L^A(\Omega)$  is defined by

$$L^A(\Omega) = \{u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\} / u \text{ is measurable and } \exists k > 0 : \int_{\Omega} A\left(\frac{|u(x)|}{k}\right) dx < +\infty\}.$$

We easily deduce from (1.1) (see [6]) that

$$A(st) \leq (1 + a_1) \max(s^{1+a_0}, s^{1+a_1}) A(t) \quad \forall s, t \geq 0$$

from which it is clear that  $\tilde{L}^A(\Omega) = L^A(\Omega)$ . Moreover  $L^A(\Omega)$  is a Banach space when equipped with the Luxemburg norm

$$\|u\|_A = \inf \left\{ k > 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} A\left(\frac{|u(x)|}{k}\right) dx \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The Orlicz-Sobolev space is defined by  $W^{1,A}(\Omega) = \{u \in L^A(\Omega) / |\nabla u| \in L^A(\Omega)\}$ . It is a Banach space when equipped with the norm  $\|u\|_{1,A} = \|u\|_A + \|\nabla u\|_A$ . The space  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$  is defined as the closure of  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  in  $W^{1,A}(\Omega)$  with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{1,A}$ . For definitions and properties of Orlicz and Orlicz-Sobolev spaces, we refer the reader to [1].

Now we give some useful inequalities that will be needed afterwards and which can be deduced from (1.1) (see [6]).

$$\min(s^{1/a_0}, s^{1/a_1})a^{-1}(t) \leq a^{-1}(st) \leq \max(s^{1/a_0}, s^{1/a_1})a^{-1}(t) \quad \forall s, t \geq 0, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\frac{a_0}{1+a_0}ta^{-1}(t) \leq \tilde{A}(t) = \int_0^t a^{-1}(\tau)d\tau \leq ta^{-1}(t) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

$$\tilde{A}(st) \leq \frac{a_0}{1+a_0} \max(s^{1+1/a_0}, s^{1+1/a_1})\tilde{A}(t) \quad \forall s, t \geq 0. \quad (1.5)$$

$a^{-1}$  is the inverse function of  $a$  which exists since  $a$  is continuous and increasing on  $[0, \infty)$ .

For the existence of a solution of  $(P)$ , we refer to [3] or [5]. Moreover using the monotonicity property (1.2), it is easy to show that the solution is unique. Regarding regularity, we refer to [7] where it is proved that  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . In particular,  $[u > 0]$  is an open set. As a matter of fact this regularity will not be used in the proofs of our results. Indeed only the continuity of the solution and the following properties will be used.

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of  $(P)$ .*

$$\begin{aligned} f \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega &\implies 0 \leq u \leq \|g\|_\infty \quad \text{in } \Omega. \\ \Delta_A u = f &\quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'([u > 0]). \\ f\chi([u > 0]) \leq \Delta_A u \leq f &\quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* i) Note that  $u \geq 0$  since  $u \in K_g$ . To get the upper bound of  $u$ , we take  $\min(u, \|g\|_\infty) = u - (u - \|g\|_\infty)^+$  as a test function in  $(P)$ . We obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} a(|\nabla(u - \|g\|_\infty)^+|)|\nabla(u - \|g\|_\infty)^+| \leq - \int_{\Omega} f(u - \|g\|_\infty)^+ \leq 0.$$

Then  $\nabla(u - \|g\|_\infty)^+ = 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ . We deduce that  $(u - \|g\|_\infty)^+ = 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$  since  $u = g$  on  $\partial\Omega$ .

ii) Let  $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}([u > 0])$ ,  $\zeta \geq 0$ . Set  $\delta = \min_{\text{supp}\zeta} u$  and take  $u \pm \delta \frac{\zeta}{\|\zeta\|_\infty}$  as test functions for  $(P)$ . We get

$$\int_{[u>0]} \frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u \nabla \zeta + f\zeta = 0 \quad \text{and then} \quad -\Delta_A u + f = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'([u > 0]).$$

iii) Let  $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ ,  $\zeta \geq 0$ . Since  $u + \zeta \in K_g$ , we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u \nabla \zeta + f\zeta \geq 0 \quad \text{and then} \quad -\Delta_A u + f \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

Now for  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $u - H_\epsilon(u - \epsilon)\zeta \in K_g$  with  $H_\epsilon(s) = \min(1, \frac{s^+}{\epsilon})$ . Then we have

$$\int_{\Omega} H_\epsilon(u - \epsilon) \frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u \nabla \zeta + f H_\epsilon(u - \epsilon) \zeta \leq 0.$$

Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u \nabla \zeta + f \chi([u > 0]) \zeta \leq 0 \quad \text{and then} \quad -\Delta_A u + f \chi([u > 0]) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

□

In all what follows, we assume that there exists two positive constants  $\lambda_0$  and  $\Lambda_0$  such that

$$0 < \lambda_0 \leq f \leq \Lambda_0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

## 2 A class of functions on the unit ball

In this section, we study a family  $\mathcal{F}_A$  of problems defined on the unit ball  $B_1 = B_1(0)$ . More precisely,  $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$  if it satisfies :

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in W^{1,A}(B_1), & \|\Delta_A u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} &\leq 1 \\ 0 &\leq u \leq 1 & \text{in } B_1, & \quad u(0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We know (see [7]) that  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . The following theorem gives a growth of the elements of  $\mathcal{F}_A$ . This extends a result proved in [4] for the p-Laplace operator where the authors have proved a growth of order  $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *There exists a positive constant  $C = C(a, n)$  such that for every  $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$ , we have*

$$0 \leq u(x) \leq C \tilde{A}(|x|) \quad \forall x \in B_1$$

where  $\tilde{A}$  is the function defined in (1.4).

In order to prove Theorem 2.1, we need to introduce some notations inspired from [4]. For a nonnegative bounded function  $u$ , we define the quantities

$$S(r, u, y) = \sup_{x \in B_r(y)} u(x), \quad S(r, u) = S(r, u, 0).$$

We also define for  $u \in \mathcal{F}_A$  the set

$$\mathbb{M}(u) = \{j \in \mathbb{N} / mS(2^{-j-1}, u) \geq S(2^{-j}, u)\}$$

where  $m = 2^{1+\frac{1}{a_0}} \frac{a_0}{1+a_0}$  is the number that appears in the inequality (1.5) for  $s = 2$ , i.e.

$$\tilde{A}(2t) \leq m\tilde{A}(t) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Then we have

**Lemma 2.1.** *Assume that  $\mathbb{M}(u) \neq \emptyset$ . Then, there exists a constant  $C_1 = C_1(a, n)$  such that*

$$S(2^{-j-1}, u) \leq C_1 \tilde{A}(2^{-j}) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{F}_A, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{M}(u).$$

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction. Then,

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \exists u_k \in \mathcal{F}_A, \quad \exists j_k \in \mathbb{M}(u_k) \quad \text{such that} \quad S(2^{-j_k-1}, u_k) \geq k\tilde{A}(2^{-j_k}).$$

Consider  $\omega_k(x) = \frac{u_k(2^{-j_k}x)}{2^{-j_k}}$  defined in  $B_1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_A \omega_k(x) &= 2^{-j_k} (\Delta_A u_k)(2^{-j_k}x), & \|\Delta_A \omega_k\|_\infty &\leq 2^{-j_k} \\ 0 \leq \omega_k &\leq \frac{1}{2^{-j_k}} \quad \text{in } B_1, & \inf_{B_{1/2}} \omega_k &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Harnack's inequality (see Corollary 1.4 [6]), we have for some constant  $C = C(n, a_0, a_1)$ ,

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}} \omega_k \leq C \left( \inf_{B_{1/2}} \omega_k + a^{-1}(2^{-j_k}) \right) = Ca^{-1}(2^{-j_k}).$$

Now let  $v_k(x) = \frac{2^{-j_k}}{S(2^{-j_k-1}, u_k)} \omega_k(x) = \frac{u_k(2^{-j_k}x)}{S(2^{-j_k-1}, u_k)}$  defined in  $B_1$ . We have

$$1 = \sup_{B_{1/2}} v_k \leq C \frac{2^{-j_k}}{S(2^{-j_k-1}, u_k)} a^{-1}(2^{-j_k}).$$

By assumption, we have  $\frac{1}{S(2^{-j_k-1}, u_k)} \leq \frac{1}{k\tilde{A}(2^{-j_k})}$ . Then

$$1 \leq \frac{C}{k} \cdot \frac{2^{-j_k} a^{-1}(2^{-j_k})}{\tilde{A}(2^{-j_k})}.$$

By (1.4), we have  $\frac{ta^{-1}(t)}{\tilde{A}(t)} \leq \frac{1+a_0}{a_0} \quad \forall t > 0$ . Hence, we get

$$1 \leq \frac{C}{k} \cdot \frac{1+a_0}{a_0}.$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ , we get a contradiction.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* First, we prove that for  $C_2 = \max(mC_1, 1/\tilde{A}(1))$  we have

$$S(2^{-j}, u) \leq C_2 \tilde{A}(2^{-j}) \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We proceed by induction.

For  $j = 0$ , we have  $S(2^{-0}, u) = S(1, u) \leq 1 \leq C_2 \tilde{A}(2^{-0})$  since  $C_2 \geq 1/\tilde{A}(1)$ .

Let  $j \geq 1$ . Assume that  $S(2^{-j}, u) \leq C_2 \tilde{A}(2^{-j})$ . We distinguish two cases :

– If  $j \in \mathbb{M}(u)$ , we have by Lemma 2.1 and (1.5),

$$S(2^{-j-1}, u) \leq C_1 \tilde{A}(2^{-j}) = C_1 \tilde{A}(2 \cdot 2^{-j-1}) \leq C_1 m \tilde{A}(2^{-j-1}) \leq C_2 \tilde{A}(2^{-j-1}).$$

– If  $j \notin \mathbb{M}(u)$ , we have  $S(2^{-j-1}, u) < S(2^{-j}, u)/m$ . Using the induction assumption and (1.5), we get

$$S(2^{-j-1}, u) \leq \frac{1}{m} C_2 \tilde{A}(2^{-j}) \leq C_2 \tilde{A}(2^{-j-1}).$$

Now, let  $x \in B_1$  and set  $r = |x|$ . Then there exists  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $2^{-j-1} \leq r \leq 2^{-j}$  and we have

$$u(x) \leq \sup_{\overline{B_r}} u = S(r, u) \leq S(2^{-j}, u) \leq C_2 \tilde{A}(2^{-j}) \leq C_2 \tilde{A}(2r) \leq C_2 m \tilde{A}(r) = C \tilde{A}(|x|).$$

□

### 3 Porosity of the free boundary

The following lemma gives the growth of the solution of  $(P)$  near the free boundary  $(\partial[u > 0]) \cap \Omega$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose that  $u \in W^{1,A}(\Omega)$  is a nonnegative continuous function satisfying*

$$\Delta_A u = f \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{D}'([u > 0]).$$

*Then for each  $y \in \overline{[u > 0]}$  and  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r(y) \subset \Omega$ , we have*

$$S(r, u, y) \geq \sup_{\partial B_r(y)} u \geq \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} r\right) + u(y).$$

*Proof.* It is enough to prove the result for  $y \in [u > 0]$ . We consider for  $\epsilon > 0$  the following functions

$$u_\epsilon(x) = u(x) - (1 - \epsilon)u(y), \quad v(x) = \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} |x - y|\right).$$

Then we have

$$\nabla v = \tilde{A}'\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}|x-y|\right) \frac{x-y}{|x-y|} = a^{-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}|x-y|\right) \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}, \quad |\nabla v| = a^{-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}|x-y|\right)$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_A v &= \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{a(|\nabla v|)}{|\nabla v|} \nabla v\right) = \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}|x-y| \frac{1}{a^{-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}|x-y|\right)} \cdot a^{-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}|x-y|\right) \cdot \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}\right) \\ &= \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}(x-y)\right) = \lambda_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\Delta_A u_\epsilon = \Delta_A u = f \geq \lambda_0 = \Delta_A v \quad \text{in } B_r(y) \cap [u > 0].$$

Moreover

$$u_\epsilon = -(1-\epsilon)u(y) \leq 0 \leq v \quad \text{on } (\partial[u > 0]) \cap B_r(y).$$

If we assume that

$$u_\epsilon \leq v \quad \text{on } (\partial B_r(y)) \cap [u > 0],$$

then we get by the weak maximum principle

$$u_\epsilon \leq v \quad \text{in } B_r(y) \cap [u > 0].$$

But  $u_\epsilon(y) = \epsilon u(y) > 0 = v(y)$  which is a contradiction.

So we have

$$\sup_{\partial B_r(y)} (u - (1-\epsilon)u(y)) = \sup_{\partial B_r(y)} u_\epsilon \geq \sup_{\partial B_r(y) \cap [u > 0]} u_\epsilon \geq \sup_{\partial B_r(y) \cap [u > 0]} v = \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}r\right).$$

Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we get

$$S(r, u, y) = \sup_{\overline{B_r(y)}} u \geq \sup_{\partial B_r(y)} u \geq \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n}r\right) + u(y).$$

□

The main result of this paper is the following theorem establishing the porosity of the free boundary  $(\partial[u > 0]) \cap \Omega$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (P). Let  $R > 0$  and  $x_0 \in \Omega$ . Then for every closed ball  $\overline{B_R(x_0)} \subset \Omega$ , the intersection  $(\partial[u > 0]) \cap \overline{B_R(x_0)}$  is porous with porosity constant depending only on  $\|g\|_\infty$ ,  $\lambda_0$ ,  $\Lambda_0$ ,  $\operatorname{dist}(\overline{B_R(x_0)}, \partial\Omega)$ ,  $a$  and  $n$ .*

We recall that a set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is called porous with porosity  $\delta$ , if there is an  $r_0 > 0$  such that

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \forall r \in (0, r_0), \quad \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{such that} \quad B_{\delta r}(y) \subset B_r(x) \setminus E.$$

A porous set has Hausdorff dimension not exceeding  $n - c\delta^n$ , where  $c = c(n) > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $n$ . In particular a porous set has Lebesgue measure zero.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let  $R > 0$  such that  $\overline{B_{4R}(x_0)} \subset \Omega$  and let  $x \in \partial[u > 0] \cap \overline{B_R(x_0)}$ . By Lemma 3.1, we have for each  $0 < r < R$  such that  $B_r(x) \subset B_{2R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$

$$\sup_{\partial B_r(x)} u \geq \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} r\right) + u(x) = \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} r\right).$$

There exists then  $y \in \partial B_r(x)$  such that  $u(y) = \sup_{\partial B_r(x)} u$ . Then we have

$$u(y) \geq \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} r\right) > 0.$$

Hence  $y \in B_{2R}(x_0) \cap [u > 0]$ . Now we define  $d(y) = \text{dist}(y, \overline{B_{2R}(x_0)} \cap [u = 0])$  the distance from  $y$  to the set  $\overline{B_{2R}(x_0)} \cap [u = 0]$ . By continuity of  $d$ , there exists  $y_0 \in \overline{B_{2R}(x_0)} \cap [u = 0]$  such that  $d(y) = |y - y_0|$ .

We define a function  $v$  in  $B_1$  by  $v(z) = \frac{u(y_0 + Rz)}{R}$ . Then we have

$$\Delta_A v = \text{div}\left(\left(\frac{a(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \nabla u\right)(y_0 + Rz)\right) = R(\Delta_A u)(y_0 + Rz).$$

It follows that  $v$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_A v\|_\infty &\leq R\Lambda_0 \\ 0 \leq v &\leq \frac{\|g\|_\infty}{R} \\ v(0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now in order to apply Theorem 2.1, we introduce the functions

$$b(t) = \frac{a(tM)}{a(M)}, \quad w(z) = \frac{v(z)}{M} \quad \text{with} \quad M = \max\left(a^{-1}(R\Lambda_0), \frac{\|g\|_\infty}{R}\right).$$

Note that  $b$  satisfies (1.1) with the same constants  $a_0$  and  $a_1$ .

If we set  $B(t) = \int_0^t b(\tau) d\tau = \frac{A(Mt)}{Ma(M)}$ , we see that  $w$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_B w\|_\infty &= \left\| \frac{1}{a(M)} \Delta_A v \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{R\Lambda_0}{a(M)} \leq 1 \\ 0 \leq w &\leq \frac{\|g\|_\infty}{MR} \leq 1 \\ w(0) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $w \in \mathcal{F}_B$  and we get by Theorem 2.1 for a positive constant  $C$  depending only on  $n$ ,  $a_0$  and  $a_1$

$$w(z) \leq C\tilde{B}(|z|) \quad \forall z \in B_1 \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{B}(t) = \int_0^t b^{-1}(\tau) d\tau = \frac{\tilde{A}(ta(M))}{Ma(M)}.$$

In particular for  $z = \frac{y-y_0}{R} \in B_1$ , we obtain

$$w\left(\frac{y-y_0}{R}\right) \leq C\tilde{B}\left(\frac{|y-y_0|}{R}\right) \iff u(y) \leq CMR\tilde{B}\left(\frac{d(y)}{R}\right).$$

We deduce that

$$\frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} r\right) \leq u(y) \leq CMR \cdot \frac{\tilde{A}\left(\frac{d(y)}{R} a(M)\right)}{Ma(M)} = C \cdot \frac{\tilde{A}\left(d(y) \cdot \frac{a(M)}{R}\right)}{\frac{a(M)}{R}}$$

By (1.5), we have

$$\frac{\tilde{A}\left(d(y) \cdot \frac{a(M)}{R}\right)}{\frac{a(M)}{R}} \leq \frac{a_0}{1+a_0} \max\left(\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right)^{1/a_0}, \left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right)^{1/a_1}\right) \tilde{A}(d(y)) = \theta\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right) \tilde{A}(d(y)).$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\theta\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right)} \cdot \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} r\right) \leq \tilde{A}(d(y)).$$

Since  $a(M)/R \geq \Lambda_0$  and  $\theta\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right) \geq \theta(\Lambda_0)$ , then if we choose  $C$  such that

$$C > \frac{1}{\theta(\Lambda_0)} \cdot \frac{n}{\lambda_0} = \frac{a_0 + 1}{a_0} \cdot \left(\max(\Lambda_0^{1/a_0}, \Lambda_0^{1/a_1})\right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{n}{\lambda_0}$$

we get  $\frac{1}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\theta\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right)} \cdot \frac{n}{\lambda_0} < 1$  and by the convexity of  $\tilde{A}$ , we obtain

$$\tilde{A}\left(\frac{1}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\theta\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right)} r\right) \leq \frac{1}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\theta\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right)} \cdot \frac{n}{\lambda_0} \tilde{A}\left(\frac{\lambda_0}{n} r\right) \leq \tilde{A}(d(y))$$

from which we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\theta\left(\frac{a(M)}{R}\right)} r \leq d(y).$$

Let  $\delta = \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{C \cdot \frac{1}{\theta\left(\frac{\alpha(M)}{R}\right)}}\right) < 1$  and  $y^* \in [x, y]$  such that  $|y - y^*| = \delta r/2$ . Then we have

$$B_{\frac{\delta}{2}r}(y^*) \subset B_{\delta r}(y) \cap B_r(x).$$

Indeed, let  $m \in B_{\frac{\delta}{2}r}(y^*)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} |m - y| &\leq |m - y^*| + |y^* - y| < \frac{\delta r}{2} + \frac{\delta r}{2} = \delta r \\ |m - x| &\leq |m - y^*| + (|x - y| - |y^* - y|) \leq \frac{\delta r}{2} + \left(r - \frac{\delta r}{2}\right) = r. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$B_{\delta r}(y) \cap B_r(x) \subset [u > 0]$$

since  $d(y) \geq \delta r > 0$  and  $B_{\delta r}(y) \subset B_{d(y)}(y) \subset [u > 0]$ .

Hence, if we set  $E = \partial[u > 0] \cap \overline{B_R(x_0)}$ , we have

$$B_{\frac{\delta}{2}r}(y^*) \subset B_{\delta r}(y) \cap B_r(x) \subset B_r(x) \setminus \partial[u > 0] \subset B_r(x) \setminus E.$$

□

## References

- [1] R. A. Adams : Sobolev spaces. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 65. Academic Press, New York-London, 1975.
- [2] S. Challal, A. Lyaghfouri : Hölder Continuity of Solutions to the  $A$ -Laplace Equation Involving Measures. To appear in Communications in Pure and Applied Analysis.
- [3] J. P. Gossez, V. Mustonen : Variational inequalities in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces. Non-linear Anal. Vol. 11, No. 3, 379-392 (1987).
- [4] L. Karp, T. Kilpeläinen, A. Petrosyan and H. Shahgholian : On the Porosity of Free Boundaries in Degenerate Variational Inequalities. J. Differential Equations Vol. 164, 110-117 (2000).
- [5] V. K. Le, K. Schmitt : Quasilinear elliptic equations and inequalities with rapidly growing coefficients. J. London Math. Soc. (2) 62, No. 3, 852-872 (2000).
- [6] G. M. Lieberman : The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural'tseva for elliptic equations. Comm. Partial Differential Equations Vol. 16, No. 2-3, 311-361 (1991).
- [7] G. M. Lieberman : Regularity of Solutions to Some degenerate Double Obstacle Problems. Indiana University Mathematics Journal, Vol. 40, No. 3, 1009-1028 (1991).