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# A remark on a paper by Bhattacharya and Leonetti 
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#### Abstract

We prove higher integrability for the gradient of bounded minimizers of some variational integrals with anisotropic growth.
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## Introduction

In this note we refer to Bhattacharya and Leonetti's paper [1]; in the sequel formulas containing two numbers and a dot in between, like (1.2), are taken from [1]; on the other hand, formulas containing only one number, like (3), are new and appear only in the present note. For motivation, definitions and further references we address the reader to [1]. We study regularity for functions $u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N}$ minimizing the variational integral

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(u)=\int_{\Omega} F(D u(x)) d x \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $F(\xi)$ behaves like the model example

$$
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left|\xi_{i}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{p}\left(1+\left|\xi_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{p / 2}
$$

precise conditions are given by (1.2), .., (1.6). The aim of this note is to show that the additional assumption " $u$ is bounded" allows us to improve the result contained in [1] in dimension 4; also, it simplifies the proof very much. In the scalar case $N=1$, Moscariello-Nania [4] and Fusco-Sbordone [2], [3], proved that minimizers are locally bounded.
More precisely, we have the following
Theorem. Let $u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N}$ verify

$$
\begin{equation*}
u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega), \quad D_{i} u \in L^{2}(\Omega), \quad i=1, \ldots, n-1, \quad D_{n} u \in L^{p}(\Omega) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\Omega$ bounded, open $\subset \mathbb{R}^{n}, n \geq 2$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
1<p<2 \quad \text { if } \quad n=2,3,4 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
2-4 / n<p<2 \quad \text { if } \quad n \geq 5 \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
u \in L^{\infty}(\Omega) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$u$ minimizes the variational integral (1.1) and (1.2), ..., (1.5) are fulfilled, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{n} u \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{2}(\Omega) \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, the second weak derivatives exist:

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{i} D u \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{2}(\Omega), \quad i=1, \ldots, n-1 \quad \text { and } \quad D_{n} D u \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{p}(\Omega) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

This theorem and [2], [3], yield the following
Corollary. In the scalar case, that is, when $u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we assume (1), (2), (1.10). If $u$ minimizes the variational integral (1.1), if (1.2), ..., (1.5) are fulfilled and (0.2) holds with $q_{1}=\cdots=q_{n-1}=2, q_{n}=p$, then $u$ is locally bounded in $\Omega$ and (1.11), (4), hold true.
Proof of the Theorem: We argue as in [1] and we arrive at (3.8); in the sequel, $C_{i}$ will denote a positive constant, independent of $h$. Since we only know that $D_{n} u \in L^{p}$, the integral corresponding to $s=n$ in (3.8) is dealt with as follows. Let us assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{n} u \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{\sigma}(\Omega), \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $\sigma$ verifying $p \leq \sigma<2$. We write

$$
\int_{B_{R}}\left|\tau_{n, h} u\right|^{2} d x=\int_{B_{R}}\left|\tau_{n, h} u\right|^{\sigma}\left|\tau_{n, h} u\right|^{2-\sigma} d x
$$

We recall our assumption (3): $u$ is bounded; then $|u(y)| \leq C_{6}$ for every $y \in B_{2 R}$, thus $\left|\tau_{n, h} u(x)\right|^{(2-\sigma)} \leq\left(2 C_{6}\right)^{(2-\sigma)}$ for every $x \in B_{R}$ and every $h:|h|<R$. Since we assumed (5), we may apply Lemma 2.1 with $t=\sigma$ and we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{B_{R}}\left|\tau_{n, h} u\right|^{2} d x \leq C_{7}|h|^{\sigma} \int_{B_{2 R}}\left|D_{n} u\right|^{\sigma}=C_{8}|h|^{\sigma} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\sigma<2$ and $R \leq 1,(3.8),(6)$ and (3.7) yield

$$
\sum_{s=1}^{n} \int_{B_{\rho}}\left|\tau_{s, h} \hat{V}(D u)\right|^{2} d x \leq C_{9}|h|^{\sigma} \quad \forall h:|h|<R .
$$

Now via Lemma 2.3 we improve the integrability:

$$
\hat{V}(D u) \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{r}(\Omega) \quad \forall r<2 n /(n-\sigma)
$$

If we recall (3.5), then

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{n} u \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{t}(\Omega) \quad \forall t<p n /(n-\sigma)=\hat{t}(\sigma) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

So we started from (5) and we boosted the integrability up to (7); let us estimate $\hat{t}(\sigma)-\sigma$ :

$$
\hat{t}(\sigma)-\sigma=\frac{\sigma^{2}-n \sigma+p n}{n-\sigma}=\frac{f(\sigma)}{g(\sigma)}
$$

When $p \leq \sigma<2,0<g(\sigma) \leq n-p$. The function $f$ is decreasing in $(-\infty, n / 2)$ and increasing in $(n / 2,+\infty)$, thus it achieves its minimum value for $\sigma=n / 2$ : $f(\sigma) \geq f(n / 2)=n(4 p-n) / 4$; such a value turns out to be positive when $n=2$ or $n=3$ or $n=4$. When $5 \leq n$, we have $2<n / 2$, thus $f(\sigma)$ decreases for $\sigma \in[p, 2]$, so that

$$
f(\sigma) \geq f(2)=4-2 n+p n=n(p-(2-4 / n))>0,
$$

since we assumed (1.10). We can summarize as follows: because of (2) and (1.10),

$$
\hat{t}(\sigma)-\sigma \geq \frac{\min _{\sigma \in[p, 2]} f(\sigma)}{n-p}=\delta(n, p)>0
$$

for every $\sigma \in[p, 2)$. Let us recall (5) and (7): we have proved that, if for some $\sigma \in[p, 2)$ we have $D_{n} u \in L_{\text {loc }}^{\sigma}$, then we also have $D_{n} u \in L_{\text {loc }}^{\sigma+\delta / 2}$. This allows us to start a bootstrap argument which completes the proof of (1.11). The higher differentiability (4) follows from (1.11) as it is shown in [1].
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