

**ON SOLVABILITY OF PARABOLIC EQUATIONS WITH
SINGULAR COEFFICIENTS IN ODD MIXED-NORM
MORREY-SOBOLEV SPACES**

N.V. KRYLOV

ABSTRACT. We prove an existence and uniqueness theorem for second-order parabolic equations in the whole space with constant zeroth-order coefficient in mixed-norm Morrey-Sobolev spaces. The main coefficient a is assumed to be measurable in t and BMO in x and the first-order coefficients b are in an appropriate mixed-norm Morrey classes (thus admitting rather rough singularities). The mixed-norm Morrey-Sobolev spaces are “odd” in the sense that the interior integration in the formula defining the norm is performed with respect to t and not to x as is customary.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{R}^d be a Euclidean space of points $x = (x^1, \dots, x^d)$, $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} = \{(t, x) : t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, $\mathbb{R}_t^{d+1} = (t, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$. In [12] the author proved a theorem about unique solvability in mixed-norm Morrey-Sobolev spaces for second-order parabolic equations in the whole space \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . The main coefficient a was assumed to be measurable in t and BMO in x and the lower-order coefficients b and c were in appropriate mixed-norm Morrey classes (thus admitting rather rough singularities). Mixed-norm spaces in [12] are based on the norm

$$\|f\|_{L_{p,q}} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^p dx \right)^{q/p} dt \right)^{1/q}. \quad (1.1)$$

In contrast in this paper we use

$$\|f\|_{L_{q,p}} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f|^q dt \right)^{p/q} dx \right)^{1/p}. \quad (1.2)$$

This is done for two reasons. First, one can find in the literature not completely justified claims that much of the theory using (1.2) is quite parallel to that using (1.1). Here, indeed, our main result, proved with all necessary details, looks almost identical to the main result of [12]. The second reason is that we need the result associated with exactly (1.2) in our investigation of Itô stochastic equations. Remark 2.2 sheds some light to that effect.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35K10, 35K67.

Key words and phrases. Sobolev-Morrey spaces, mixed-norm existence theorems for parabolic equations, singular coefficients.

In addition to these differences the exposition here follows quite a different path. If in [12] obtaining main a priori estimates in *Morrey-Sobolev* spaces was tied to the solvability of model equations in cylinders, which is a very nontrivial fact, here we use only equations in the whole space \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . This streamlines the matter and shows the path for generalization of our results on the solvability in *Morrey-Sobolev* spaces to higher-order parabolic equations. We leave these generalizations to the interested reader. In addition, we only consider the operators with constant zeroth-order coefficient. Again we leave to the reader making it to belong to appropriate Morrey classes.

To compare our results with existing literature observe that it looks like this article is the first one treating from the beginning to the end equations in mixed-norm Morrey spaces based on (1.2), in addition, to singular first-order coefficients (this article is based on an earlier preprint [14] where $\beta \in (1, 2)$). Then, in our setting we can allow $|b| = c/|x|$ with sufficiently small c . This function is independent of time and it does not fit in [5], [2], [16], which are about the *elliptic* equations with Morrey coefficients and solutions in Morrey class in [5] or in Sobolev class in [2] and [16]. In the case of elliptic equation one can find plenty of information on generalized versions of Morrey spaces and the Dirichlet problem in the recent article [6] (with no lower-order terms in the main text) and in the references therein.

The literature on the parabolic equations in Morrey spaces (no mixed-norms) is not as rich as in the case of elliptic equations, although it is worth drawing the reader's attention to [15], [17], [18], [19] and the references therein. However, it is worth noting that equations in the "unusual" mixed normed Sobolev (not Morrey-Sobolev) spaces were earlier considered in [8] (see also the references therein).

We use the following basic notation. Set $|G|$ to be the Lebesgue measure of $G \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$,

$$\int_G f \, dxdt = \frac{1}{|G|} \int_G f \, dxdt, \quad \|f\|_{L_p(G)} = \left(\int_G |f(t, x)|^p \, dxdt \right)^{1/p}.$$

Similar notation is used for the functions of x and t only.

For $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ we introduce the spaces $\mathbf{L}_{q,p}$, $\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(\Gamma)$, as the sets of functions with finite norms (1.2),

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(\Gamma)} = \|fI_\Gamma\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}}.$$

Define $\rho(t, x) = |x| + \sqrt{|t|}$,

$$B_R = \{x : |x| < R\}, \quad B_R(x) = x + B_R,$$

$$C_{T,R} = [0, T) \times B_R, \quad C_R = C_{R^2,R},$$

$$C_{T,R}(t, x) = (t, x) + C_{T,R}, \quad C_R(t, x) = C_{R^2,R}(t, x),$$

and let \mathbb{C}_R be the collection of $C_R(t, x)$ and $\mathbb{C} = \cup_R \mathbb{C}_R$.

Set

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(C_R(t,x))}^p = \int_{B_R(x)} \left(\int_{(t,t+R^2)} |f(s, y)|^q \, ds \right)^{p/q} dy.$$

We use the notation $D_i = \partial/\partial x^i$, $D_{ij} = D_i D_j$, $Du = (D_i u)$, $D^2 u = (D_{ij} u)$, $D^n u$ is the collection of all derivatives of u of order n with respect to x , $\partial_t u = \partial u/\partial t$. All derivatives are assumed to be Sobolev derivatives (if they exist). Denote $C_0^\infty = C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

Finally, fix $\delta \in (0, 1]$ throughout the article and set \mathbb{S}_δ to be the set of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices whose eigenvalues are in $[\delta, \delta^{-1}]$.

2. MAIN RESULT

Take $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and $\beta \geq 0$ and introduce the Morrey space $\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}$ as the set of $g \in \mathbf{L}_{q,p,\text{loc}}$ such that

$$\|g\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}} := \sup_{\rho \leq 1, C \in \mathbb{C}_\rho} \rho^\beta \|g\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(C)} < \infty. \quad (2.1)$$

Observe that $\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta} = \mathbf{E}_{q,p,2/q+d/p}$ for $\beta \geq 2/q + d/p$. Define the Morrey-Sobolev spaces by

$$\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2} = \{u : u, Du, D^2 u, \partial_t u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}\},$$

where $Du, D^2 u, \partial_t u$ are Sobolev derivatives, and provide $\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$ with an obvious norm.

Suppose that on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} we are given an \mathbb{S}_δ -valued function $a(t, x)$ and an \mathbb{R}^d -valued function $b(t, x)$.

For $\rho > 0$ introduce

$$a_\rho^\# = \sup_{r \leq \rho} \sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}_r} \int_C |a(t, x) - \tilde{a}_C(t)| dx dt, \quad \tilde{a}_C(t) = \int_C a(t, x) dx ds \quad (2.2)$$

(note t and ds),

$$\bar{b}_{q,p,\rho} = \sup_{r \leq \rho} r \sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}_r} \|b\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(C)}. \quad (2.3)$$

Define

$$\mathcal{L}u = \partial_t u + a^{ij} D_{ij} u + b^i u.$$

Fix p, q, β such that

$$p, q \in (1, \infty), \quad 1 < \beta \leq \frac{d}{p} + \frac{2}{q}. \quad (2.4)$$

Also fix $\rho_a, \rho_b \in (0, 1]$. Here is our main result.

Theorem 2.1. *There exist*

$$\hat{a} = \hat{a}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta) > 0, \quad \hat{b} = \hat{b}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a) > 0,$$

$$\lambda_0 = \hat{\lambda}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a) > 0, \quad N = N(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a),$$

such that, if $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 \rho_b^{-2}$ and

$$a_{\rho_a}^\# \leq \hat{a}, \quad \bar{b}_{q\beta, p\beta, \rho_b} \leq \hat{b},$$

then for any $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$

$$\|\lambda u, \sqrt{\lambda} Du, \partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq N \rho_b^{-\alpha} \|f\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}}, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$f = \mathcal{L}u - \lambda u, \quad \alpha = d + 2 + \beta - \frac{d}{p} - \frac{2}{q}.$$

Furthermore, for any $f \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 \rho_b^{-2}$ there exists a unique $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$ such that in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}

$$\mathcal{L}u - \lambda u = f.$$

This theorem is proved in Section 5 after we develop the necessary tools in Sections 3 and 4.

Remark 2.2. This theorem allows b to be bounded. Also the function

$$g(t, x) := \frac{1}{|x| + \sqrt{|t|}} I_{|x| \leq 1, |t| \leq 1}$$

belongs, for instance, to $\mathbf{E}_{p,p,1}$ as long as $1 < p < d + 2$, so that, if $|b| = cg$ with sufficiently small c , b is a valid choice for Theorem 2.1 for $\rho_b = 1$ and appropriate β .

Indeed, if $|x|, \sqrt{|t|} \leq 2\rho$, then $C_\rho(t, x) \subset (-5\rho^2, 5\rho^2) \times B_{3\rho}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{d+2} \|g\|_{\mathbf{L}_{p,p}(C_\rho(t,x))}^p &= N \|g\|_{\mathbf{L}_{p,p}(C_\rho(t,x))}^p \leq N \int_{B_{3\rho}} \int_0^{5\rho^2} \frac{1}{(|x| + \sqrt{t})^p} dt dx \\ &= N \rho^{d+2-p} \int_{|y| < 3} |y|^{2-p} \int_0^{5/|y|^2} \frac{dt}{(1 + \sqrt{t})^p} dy. \end{aligned}$$

The last factor of $N \rho^{d+2-p}$ is finite if $p > 2$ because

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{(1 + \sqrt{t})^p} < \infty$$

and $2 - p > -d$. It is also obviously finite if $p \in (1, 2]$.

In case $\max(|x|, \sqrt{|t|}) \geq 2\rho$ for $(s, y) \in C_\rho(t, x)$, we have

$$|y| + \sqrt{|s|} \geq \max(|y|, \sqrt{|s|}) \geq \max(|x|, \sqrt{|t|}) - \max(|x - y|, \sqrt{|t - s|}) \geq \rho.$$

We see that in both cases

$$\|g\|_{\mathbf{L}_{p,p}(C_\rho(t,x))} \leq N \rho^{-1}.$$

Remark 2.3. Theorem 2.1 is also true if we use the traditional way to define the mixed-norm spaces integrating first in x and then in t . However, there are cases when (2.4) holds and

$$\sup_{\rho \leq 1, C \in \mathbf{C}_\rho} \rho \|b\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,\beta,p,\beta}(C)} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\rho \leq q, C \in \mathbf{C}_\rho} \rho \|bI_C\|_{L_{p,\beta,q,\beta}} = \infty. \quad (2.6)$$

Therefore, developing the theory of solvability in $\mathbf{L}_{q,p,\beta}$ was worth the effort. By the way, Minkowski's inequality shows that (2.6) is impossible if $q \geq p$.

To show an example of (2.6), take $p, q, \beta > 1$, such that

$$\beta \leq \frac{d}{p} + \frac{2}{q}, \quad 2 \leq q\beta < p\beta < d + 1.$$

Set $p_0 = \beta p, q_0 = \beta q$ and let b be such that

$$|b(t, x)| = f(t, x) := I_{t>0} |x|^{-1} \left| \frac{\sqrt{t}}{|x|} - 1 \right|^{-1/p_0}.$$

Observe that for any constant $\lambda > 0$ we have $f(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x) = \lambda^{-1} f(t, x)$, implying that for any $C_r(t, x)$

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q_0, p_0}(C_r(t, x))} = r^{-1} \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q_0, p_0}(C_1(t/r^2, x/r))}. \quad (2.7)$$

Next,

$$\int_0^1 |f(t, x)|^{q_0} dt = |x|^{2-q_0} \int_0^{1/|x|^2} |\sqrt{s} - 1|^{-q/p} ds =: |x|^{2-q_0} J(1/|x|^2).$$

Here $q/p < 1$, so that the singularity in J is integrable and $J(t) \sim t^{1-q/(2p)}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, so that $J(t) \leq N t^{1-q/(2p)}$. It follows that

$$\left(\int_0^1 |f(t, x)|^{q_0} dt \right)^{1/q_0} \leq N |x|^{1/p_0-1},$$

where N is independent of x , and since $1 - p_0 > -d$, the right-hand side to the power p_0 is summable over B_1 . Together with (2.7) this yields

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q\beta, p\beta}(C_r)} \leq N r^{-1} \quad r > 0. \quad (2.8)$$

If $t > 0$ and $\rho(t, x) \leq 3r$, then

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q\beta, p\beta}(C_r(t, x))} \leq N \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q\beta, p\beta}(C_{4r})} \leq N r^{-1}.$$

In case $t > 0$ and $\rho(t, x) > 3r$ use (2.7) which shows that

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q\beta, p\beta}(C_r(t, x))} = r^{-1} \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q\beta, p\beta}(C_1(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}))} = N r^{-1} \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q\beta, p\beta}(C_1(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}))}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\tilde{t} = t/r^2, \tilde{x} = x/r$, so that $\rho(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) > 3$. This case we split into two subcases: A) $\tilde{t} > 1$, B) $|\tilde{x}| > 2$.

In case A)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{t}}^{\tilde{t}+1} |f(t, x)|^{q_0} dt &= |x|^{2-q_0} \int_{\tilde{t}/|x|^2}^{(\tilde{t}+1)/|x|^2} |\sqrt{s} - 1|^{-q/p} ds \\ &= I_{\tilde{t}>|x|^2} \dots + I_{\tilde{t}\leq|x|^2} \dots = J_1 + J_2 \leq J_1 + J(2). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $J_1(\tilde{t})$ has negative derivative for $\tilde{t} > |x|^2$. Therefore,

$$J_1 \leq |x|^{2-q_0} \int_1^{2/|x|^2} |\sqrt{s} - 1|^{-q/p} ds.$$

It follows as above that

$$\left(\int_{\tilde{t}}^{\tilde{t}+1} |f(t, x)|^{q_0} dt \right)^{1/q_0} \leq N |x|^{1/p_0-1} + N,$$

where the integrals over unit balls of the right-hand side to the power p_0 are dominated by a finite constant. This provides the desired estimate of the left-hand side of (2.9) in case A).

In case B) one can use the same arguments augmented by the fact that on $B_1(\tilde{x})$ we have $|x| \geq 1$.

Finally, notice that for $t \in (0, 1)$

$$\int_{|x| \leq 1} f^{p_0}(t, x) dx = N \int_0^1 \rho^{d-1-p_0} \left| \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\rho} - 1 \right|^{-1} d\rho = \infty.$$

This proves the second relation in (2.6).

Remark 2.4. With f from Remark 2.3 and $|b(t, x)| = cf(t, x)$ with sufficiently small $c > 0$ the equation $\partial_t u + \Delta u + b^i D_i u - \lambda u = f$ for sufficiently large λ has a unique solution in $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q, \beta}^{1,2}$ with $\beta < 2$ if f is, say bounded function with compact support. This is a particular case of Theorem 2.1. By embedding theorems for Morrey-Sobolev spaces u is bounded and Hölder continuous. However, if you use the theory of solvability in Sobolev spaces you will only be able to conclude that $u \in W_q^{1,2}$ which does not guarantee that u is even bounded if $q < (d+2)/2$. This shows an advantage of considering Morrey-Sobolev spaces.

Remark 2.5. Example 3.8 of [12] shows that the smallness assumption on \bar{b} is unavoidable.

Remark 2.6. If a, b are independent of t , Theorem 2.1 yields a result containing the *corresponding* results in [2], [5], [15], [16] applied to equations in the *whole* space on account of the presence of b which is not necessarily in $L_{d, \text{loc}}$ and can be such that $|b| = c/|x|$.

3. THE CASE OF MAIN COEFFICIENTS DEPENDING ONLY ON t

Here we start on our way of proving Theorem 2.1 following a quite different path from [12]. Fix a $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and let $a = a(t)$ be an \mathbb{S}_δ -valued function on \mathbb{R} .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $a \in \mathbb{S}_\delta$. Then for any $d \times d$ symmetric matrix u we have*

$$\{a, u\} := a^{ij} a^{kr} u_{ik} u_{jr} \geq \delta^2 \sum_{i,j} u_{ij}^2, \quad (3.1)$$

$$(1 - \delta^2)^2 \{a, u\} \geq \{a - \delta(\delta^{ij}), u\} \geq 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. If λ_p, ℓ_p are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of a , then the left-hand side of (3.1) is written as

$$\sum_{p,q} \lambda_p \lambda_q \left(\sum_{i,j} u_{ij} \ell_p^i \ell_q^j \right)^2 \geq \delta^2 \sum_{p,q} \left(\sum_{i,j} u_{ij} \ell_p^i \ell_q^j \right)^2 = \delta^2 u_{ij} \ell_p^i \ell_q^j u_{kr} \ell_p^k \ell_q^r$$

and the latter equals the right-hand side of (3.1) because $\ell_p^i \ell_p^k = \delta^{ik}$, $\ell_q^j \ell_q^r = \delta^{jr}$.

Since $a \in \mathbb{S}_\delta$, $(1 - \delta^2)\lambda_p \geq \lambda_p - \delta \geq 0$. This yields (3.2). \square

Let $u \in C_0^\infty$. Set

$$-f = \partial_t u + a^{ij}(t) D_{ij} u.$$

Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f^2 dz = I_1 + I_2 + I_3,$$

where integrating by parts and observing that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \partial_t u \delta^{ij} D_{ij} u dz = -(1/2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \partial_t (|Du|^2) dz = 0,$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |\partial_t u|^2 dz, \\ I_3 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} a^{ij} D_{ij} u a^{kr} D_{kr} u dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \{a, D^2 u\} dz. \\ I_2 &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \partial_t u a^{ij} D_{ij} u dz = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \partial_t u [a^{ij} - \delta \delta^{ij}] D_{ij} u dz \\ &\geq -2I_1^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \{a - \delta(\delta^{ij}), D^2 u\} dz \right)^{1/2} \geq -2(1 - \delta^2) I_1^{1/2} I_3^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 + I_3 &\leq \delta^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f^2 dz, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} (|\partial_t u|^2 + \delta^2 |D^2 u|^2) dz &\leq \delta^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f^2 dz. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Introduce $B^{0,\infty}$ as the space of function $u(t, x)$ on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} which are infinitely differentiable in x for every t with each derivative locally bounded on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . By $B^{1,\infty}$ we mean the subspace of $B^{0,\infty}$ consisting of functions $u(t, x)$ such that $\partial_t u \in B^{0,\infty}$. By $B_0^{i,\infty}$ we mean the subspaces of $B^{i,\infty}$ consisting of functions with compact support, $i = 0, 1$.

Note that estimate (3.3) is also true for $u \in B^{1,\infty}$ such that, for some $\alpha > d/2$ and $\rho(t, x) = \sqrt{|t| + |x|}$, $\xi = \rho^{\alpha-1}$, $\eta = \rho^\alpha$ the function

$$\xi|u| + \eta|Du| \quad (3.4)$$

is bounded. This is easily proved by taking $u(t, x)\zeta(n^2 t, nx)$ in place of u with $\zeta \in C_0^\infty$ such that $\zeta(0) = 1$ and sending $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The following is just a reminder of standard computations. Define

$$A_{t,t+s} = \int_t^{t+s} a(r) dr = s \int_0^1 a(t+rs) dr, \quad \sigma_{t,t+s} = s^{-1/2} A_{t,t+s}^{1/2},$$

recall that for $c_d = (4\pi)^{-d/2}$

$$\mathfrak{p}(t, x) = c_d t^{-d/2} e^{-|x|^2/(4t)} I_{t>0}$$

is the fundamental solution of the heat equation and for $\lambda \geq 0$ introduce

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda f(t, x) &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda s} f(t+s, x + \sigma_{t,t+s} y) \mathfrak{p}(s, y) dy ds \\ &= e^{\lambda t} \int_t^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda s} f(s, x + \sigma_{t,s} y) \mathfrak{p}(s-t, y) dy ds \end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_t^\infty e^{-\lambda s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(s, y) \mathbf{p}(t, s, y - x) dy ds,$$

where $\mathbf{p}(t, s, x) = \mathbf{p}(s - t, \sigma_{t,s}^{-1}x) \det \sigma_{t,s}^{-1}$.

Remark 3.2. Observe that $\sigma_{t,s} \geq \delta^{1/2}$, which implies that for $n \geq 0$ and $s > t$

$$|D^n \mathbf{p}(t, s, x)| \leq N(d, n, \delta) \frac{1}{(s - t)^{(d+n)/2}} e^{-|x|^2 \delta / (8(s-t))}. \quad (3.5)$$

Furthermore, from $\mathbf{p}(t, s, x) = \mathbf{p}(s - t, \sigma_{t,s}^{-1}x) \det \sigma_{t,s}^{-1}$ we get that the Fourier transform \tilde{p} of p satisfies

$$\tilde{p}(t, s, \xi) = \exp(-(A_{t,s}\xi, \xi)), \quad \partial_t \tilde{p}(t, s, \xi) - (a(t)\xi, \xi) \tilde{p}(t, s, \xi) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\partial_t p(t, s, x) + a^{ij}(t) D_{ij} p(t, s, x) = 0$$

and (3.5) implies that for $n \geq 0$ and $s > t$

$$|\partial_t D^n \mathbf{p}(t, s, x)| \leq N(d, n, \delta) \frac{1}{(s - t)^{1+(d+n)/2}} e^{-|x|^2 \delta / (8(s-t))}. \quad (3.6)$$

For $k, s, r > 0, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and appropriate $f(t, x)$'s on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} define

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\alpha,k}(s, r) &= \frac{1}{s^{(d+2-\alpha)/2}} e^{-r^2/(ks)} I_{s>0}, \\ P_{\alpha,k} f(t, x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} p_{\alpha,k}(s, |y|) f(t + s, x + y) dy ds \\ &= \int_t^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_{\alpha,k}(s - t, |y - x|) f(s, y) ds dy. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.3. For $\alpha \leq d + 2$ there is a constant $N = N(d, \alpha)$ such that

$$p_{\alpha,k}(s, |x|) \leq N \frac{1}{\rho^{d+2-\alpha}(s, x)}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\rho(s, x) = |x| + \sqrt{|t|}$.

Indeed, if $|x| \leq \sqrt{|s|}$, then

$$p_{\alpha,k}(s, |x|) \leq \frac{1}{s^{(d+2-\alpha)/2}} = \frac{1}{\rho^{d+2-\alpha}(s, x)} \frac{\rho^{d+2-\alpha}(s, x)}{s^{(d+2-\alpha)/2}},$$

where the last fraction is dominated by $2^{d+2-\alpha}$. In case $|x| \geq \sqrt{|s|}$,

$$p_{\alpha,k}(s, |x|) \leq \frac{1}{|x|^{d+2-\alpha}} \phi(|x|/\sqrt{|s|}),$$

where $\phi(t) = t^{d+2-\alpha} e^{-t^2/k}$ is a bounded function on $(0, \infty)$. In that case we get (3.7) again.

As a consequence of this estimate we obtain that, if f is a bounded function with compact support, then

$$|P_{\alpha,k} f(t, x)| \leq N(1 + \rho(t, x))^{-(d+2-\alpha)}, \quad (3.8)$$

where N is independent of (t, x) .

Introduce

$$\mathcal{L}^0 u(t, x) = \partial_t u(t, x) + a^{ij}(t) D_{ij} u(t, x).$$

The following two results are well known and proved, for instance, by using the Fourier transform with respect to x . Assertion (ii) in Theorem 3.4 follows from the fact that

$$|R_\lambda f| \leq N(1 + \rho)^{-d}, \quad |DR_\lambda f| \leq N(1 + \rho)^{-(d+1)},$$

which is a consequence of (3.8).

Theorem 3.4. *Let $f \in B_0^{0, \infty}$. Then*

(i) *we have $u := R_\lambda f \in B^{1, \infty}$ and*

$$\mathcal{L}^0 u - \lambda u = -f; \tag{3.9}$$

(ii) *there is $\alpha > d/2$ such that the function (3.4) is bounded.*

Lemma 3.5. *Let $u \in C_0^\infty$, $\lambda \geq 0$. Then*

$$u = R_\lambda(\lambda u - \mathcal{L}^0 u).$$

Define

$$\text{osc}_C g := \iint_C \iint_C |g(z_1) - g(z_2)| dz_1 dz_2, \quad g^\sharp(t, x) = \sup_{\substack{C \in \mathbb{C}, \\ C \ni (t, x)}} \text{osc}_C g.$$

Also for $\beta \geq 0$ define

$$\mathbb{M}_\beta g(t, x) = \sup_{\rho > 0} \rho^\beta \sup_{\substack{C \in \mathbb{C}_\rho, \\ C \ni (t, x)}} \int_C |g| dz, \quad \mathbb{M}g = \mathbb{M}_0 g.$$

Here is a particular case of Lemma 2.2 of [11].

Lemma 3.6. *For any $\alpha < \beta$, $\beta \geq 0$, and $k > 0$, there exists a constants N such that for any $f \geq 0$, $\rho > 0$, we have on C_ρ that*

$$P_{\alpha, k}(IC_{2\rho}^c f) \leq N \rho^{\alpha - \beta} \mathbb{M}_\beta f(0). \tag{3.10}$$

We need this for the following.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $f \in B_0^{0, \infty}$ and $u = R_0 f$. Then for any $\kappa \geq 2$ and $\rho > 0$*

$$\text{osc}_{C_\rho} D^2 u \leq N(d, \delta) \kappa^{(d+2)/2} \|f\|_{L_2(C_{\kappa\rho})} + N(d, \delta) \kappa^{-1} \mathbb{M}f(0).$$

In particular, if $u \in C_0^\infty$ then

$$\text{osc}_{C_\rho} D^2 u \leq N(d, \delta) \kappa^{(d+2)/2} \|\mathcal{L}^0 u\|_{L_2(C_{\kappa\rho})} + N(d, \delta) \kappa^{-1} \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{L}^0 u)(0).$$

Proof. Observe that the case of arbitrary $\rho > 0$ is reduced to $\rho = 1$ by using scale changes. In case $\rho = 1$ take $\zeta \in C_0^\infty$ such that $\zeta = 1$ in C_κ , $\zeta = 0$ outside $C_{2\kappa}^c \cap \mathbb{R}_0^{d+1}$, $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ and note that for $g = f\zeta$, $h = f(1 - \zeta)$ and $(G, H) = R_0(g, h)$ we have $u = G + H$, and for $m = 0, 1, n \geq 0$

$$\partial_t^m D^n H(t, x) = \int_{C_\zeta^c} \partial_t^m D^n \mathbf{p}(t, s, y - x) h(s, y) ds dy.$$

By using (3.5) we get that in C_1

$$|\partial_t D^2 H| + |D^3 H| \leq P_{-2,\delta/8}|h| + P_{-1,\delta/8}|h|,$$

which by Lemma 3.6 (with $\beta = 0$) implies that

$$|\partial_t D^2 H(t, x)| + |D^3 H(t, x)| \leq N\kappa^{-1}\mathbb{M}h(0). \quad (3.11)$$

It follows that

$$\int_{C_1} \int_{C_1} |D^2 H(z_1) - D^2 H(z_2)| dz_1 dz_2 \leq N\kappa^{-1}\mathbb{M}f(0).$$

Regarding G we have in light of (3.3) and Theorem 3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{C_1} \int_{C_1} |D^2 G(z_1) - D^2 G(z_2)| dz_1 dz_2 &\leq N \int_{C_1} |D^2 G(t, x)| dx dt \\ &\leq N \|g\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \leq N\kappa^{(d+2)/2} \|f\|_{L_2(C_\kappa)}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first assertion of the theorem. The second one is a consequence of the first one and Lemma 3.5. \square

Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$. Recall the definition of $L_{q,p}$ and let the space $W_{q,p}^{1,2}(Q)$ be defined as the collection of functions $u(t, x)$ on Q such that $u, Du, D^2 u, \partial_t u \in L_{q,p}(Q)$. The space $W_{q,p}^{1,2}(Q)$ is provided with a natural norm. We set $W_{q,p}^{1,2} = W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

Theorem 3.8. *There is a constant $N = N(d, \delta, p, q)$ such that for any $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}$*

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{L_{q,p}} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}^0 u\|_{L_{q,p}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.5 and Theorem 3.7 with $\kappa = 2$ for $u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we have

$$(D^2 u)^\# \leq N(d, \delta)(\mathbb{M}((\mathcal{L}^0 u)^2))^{1/2},$$

which by the Muckenhoupt weights versions of the Fefferman-Stein and Hardy-Littlewood theorems, proved by Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim in [4], yields for $p > 2$ and $w \in A_p$ (A_p is the Muckenhoupt class of weights)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |D^2 u|^p w dx dt \leq N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |\mathcal{L}^0 u|^p w dx dt.$$

After that the estimate for $D^2 u$ follows from another Dong-Kim theorem found in [4]. The term $\partial_t u$ as usual is estimated from $\partial_t u = \mathcal{L}u - a^{ij} D_{ij}u$. \square

Estimate (3.12) for $p = q$ (and variable a) was first obtained in [7], for $p \neq q$ it is proved in [9]. The ideas used here are quite different from both [7] and [9] and are borrowed from [4], where mixed norm estimate are obtained with the integration on x and t in any order.

Next, we introduce the term λu by using the well-known Agmon's method (see, for instance, the proof of Lemma 6.3.8 of [10]) and adding an interpolation inequality, allowing to estimate the norms of Du through the norms of u and $D^2 u$ (see Remark 3.10 below), conclude that the a priori estimate

(3.13) with $s = -\infty$ is true for $u \in C_0^\infty$. For any $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}$ it holds because C_0^∞ is dense in $W_{q,p}^{1,2}$.

Define

$$\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1} = (s, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Theorem 3.9. *There is a constant $N = N(d, \delta, p, q)$ such that for any $s \in [-\infty, \infty)$, $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ and $\lambda \geq 0$*

$$\|\lambda u, \sqrt{\lambda} Du, \partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{L_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}^0 u - \lambda u\|_{L_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})}. \quad (3.13)$$

Furthermore, for any $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in L_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ there is a unique $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ such that $\mathcal{L}^0 u - \lambda u = f$ in \mathbb{R}_s^{d+1} .

The existence result for $s = -\infty$ follows from (3.13) and Theorem 3.4 in which, as is easy to see, $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. For $s > -\infty$ estimate (3.13) and the existence part follow from the case $s = \infty$ and uniqueness when $s > -\infty$. In turn the uniqueness of $W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ -solutions (the causality property) follows from the representation of solutions in Lemma 3.5, which extends to $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ by continuity and (3.13).

Remark 3.10. Above and a few times below we use interpolation inequalities of the following type. Take $a = (\delta^{ij})$ and notice that according to (3.5)

$$|DR_\lambda f(t, x)| \leq N \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda s} \frac{|f(s+t, x+y)|}{s^{(d+1)/2}} e^{-|y|^2/(8s)} dy ds,$$

which estimates $|DR_\lambda f|$ in term of the “sum” with respect to (s, y) with weights depending only on (s, y) of functions $|f(s+t, x+y)|$ as functions of (t, x) . Minkowski’s inequality that the norm of a sum is less than the sum of norms now leads to the first assertion in the following. The second assertion follows from Lemma 3.5.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $s \in [-\infty, \infty)$ and let \mathfrak{B} be a Banach space of functions on \mathbb{R}_s^{d+1} such that if $f \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $(s, y) \in \mathbb{R}_0^{d+1}$, then $f_{s,y} \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $\|f_{s,y}\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leq \|f\|_{\mathfrak{B}}$, where $f_{s,y}(t, x) = f(s+t, x+y)$. Also assume that, if $g \in \mathfrak{B}$ and a measurable f satisfies $|f| \leq g$, then $f \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $\|f\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leq \|g\|_{\mathfrak{B}}$. Then for any $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in \mathfrak{B}$ we have*

$$\lambda^{1/2} \|DR_\lambda f\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leq N(d) \|f\|_{\mathfrak{B}}.$$

Furthermore, if $C_0^\infty \subset \mathfrak{B}$ then for any $u \in C_0^\infty$ and $\lambda > 0$

$$\|Du\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leq N \lambda^{-1/2} \|\partial_t u + \Delta u - \lambda u\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leq N (\lambda^{-1/2} \|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathfrak{B}} + \lambda^{1/2} \|u\|_{\mathfrak{B}}),$$

where $N = N(d)$.

4. VARIABLE MAIN COEFFICIENTS AND SOBOLEV SPACES

Now we are going to extend Theorem 3.8 to operators with \mathbb{S}_δ -valued $a = a(t, x)$. Define

$$a^\# = a_\infty^\# = \sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}} \int_C |a(t, x) - \tilde{a}_C(t)| dx dt, \quad \tilde{a}_C(t) = \int_C a(t, x) dx ds.$$

Observe that if a is independent of x , then $a^\# = 0$.
Set

$$\mathcal{L}_0 u = \partial_t u + a^{ij} D_{ij} u.$$

For $C \in \mathbb{C}$ and

$$\mathcal{L}_C u := \partial_t u + \tilde{a}_C^{ij} D_{ij} u, \quad f = \mathcal{L}_0 u$$

we have

$$f = \mathcal{L}_C u + [(a^{ij} - \tilde{a}_C^{ij}) D_{ij} u],$$

whereas for $q > 2$

$$\| (a^{ij} - \tilde{a}_C^{ij}) D_{ij} u \|_{L_2 C} \leq N(d, \delta, q) a^\# (\mathbb{M}(|D^2 u|^q))^{1/q}.$$

This and Theorem 3.7 lead to the following.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $q > 2$, $\kappa \geq 2$, and $u \in C_0^\infty$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (D^2 u)^\# &\leq N(d, \delta, q, \kappa) \left(\mathbb{M}(|\mathcal{L}_0 u|^q) \right)^{1/q} \\ &+ (N(d, \delta, q, \kappa) a^\# + N(d, \delta) \kappa^{-1}) \left(\mathbb{M}(|D^2 u|^q) + \mathbb{M}(|\partial_t u|^q) \right)^{1/q}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Since $\partial_t u = \mathcal{L}_0 u - a^{ij} D_{ij} u$, similar estimate holds for $\partial_t u$. Therefore, the Fefferman-Stein and Hardy-Littlewood allow us to do the next step for $p > 2$ as in the case of Theorem 3.8.

Lemma 4.2. *For any $p > 1$, $w \in A_p$, $\kappa \geq 2$, and $u \in C_0^\infty$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2 u\|_{L_p(w)}^p + \|\partial_t u\|_{L_p(w)}^p &\leq N([w]_{A_p}) \left(N(d, \delta, p, \kappa) \|\mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{L_p(w)}^p \right. \\ &\left. + (N(d, \delta, p, \kappa) a^\# + N(d, \delta) \kappa^{-1})^p \left(\|D^2 u\|_{L_p(w)}^p + \|\partial_t u\|_{L_p(w)}^p \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

We will use a particular A_1 -weight. By the way, recall that A_1 -weights are also A_p -weights if $p > 1$.

Lemma 4.3. *Define $w_\alpha = (|x| + \sqrt{|t|})^{-\alpha}$. Then for any $\alpha \in [0, d + 2)$ the function w_α is an A_1 -weight, that is, there is a constant N such that $\mathbb{M} w_\alpha \leq N w_\alpha$.*

This lemma is proved by routine estimates. The most important property of w_α for us is the following.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\alpha \geq 0, \alpha + \beta > d + 2$. Then for any $f \geq 0$*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f(w_\alpha \wedge 1) dy ds \leq \mathbb{M}_\beta f(0). \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Without losing generality we suppose that f is bounded and has compact support. Set

$$Q_1 = \{(s, y) : |y| \geq \sqrt{|s|}\}, \quad Q_2 = \{(s, y) : |y| \leq \sqrt{|s|}\}.$$

Note that on Q_1 we have $w_\alpha(s, y) \leq N|y|^{-\alpha}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_1} f(w_\alpha \wedge 1) dy ds &\leq N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 \wedge |y|^{-\alpha}) \int_{-|y|^2}^{|y|^2} f(s, y) ds dy \\
&\leq N \int_0^\infty (1 \wedge r^{-\alpha}) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int_{B_r} \int_{-|y|^2}^{|y|^2} f(s, y) ds dy \right) dr \\
&= N \int_1^\infty r^{-\alpha-1} \int_{B_r} \int_{-|y|^2}^{|y|^2} f(s, y) ds dy dr \\
&\leq N M_\beta f(0) \int_1^\infty r^{-\alpha-\beta+(d+2)-1} dr \leq N M_\beta f(0).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, on Q_2 we have $w_\alpha(s, y) \leq N|s|^{-\alpha/2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_2} f(w_\alpha \wedge 1) I_{s>0} dy ds &\leq N \int_0^\infty (1 \wedge s^{-\alpha/2}) \int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}} f(s, y) dy ds \\
&\leq N \int_0^\infty (1 \wedge s^{-\alpha/2}) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \int_0^s \int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}} f(t, y) dt dy \right) ds \\
&\leq N \int_1^\infty s^{-\alpha/2-1} \int_0^s \int_{B_{\sqrt{s}}} f(t, y) dt dy ds \\
&\leq N M_\beta f(0) \int_1^\infty s^{-\alpha/2+(d+2)/2-\beta/2-1} ds \leq N M_\beta f(0).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we estimate the part of the integral of $f(w_\alpha \wedge 1)$ over $Q_2 \cap \{s < 0\}$. \square

Take $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and $\beta > 0$ and introduce the Morrey space $\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}$ as the set of $g \in \mathcal{L}_{q,p,\text{loc}}$ such that (note $\rho > 0$)

$$\|g\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}} := \sup_{\rho>0, C \in \mathcal{C}_\rho} \rho^\beta \# \|g\|_{\mathcal{L}_{q,p}(C)} < \infty. \quad (4.4)$$

Define

$$\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2} = \{u : u, Du, D^2u, \partial_t u \in \dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}\},$$

where $Du, D^2u, \partial_t u$ are the Sobolev derivatives, and provide $\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$ with an obvious norm. If $p = q$ we drop q in the *notation* of these spaces.

Now we can make the first crucial step towards proving Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, $\beta > 0$. Then there is a constant $\hat{a} = \hat{a}(d, \delta, p, \beta) > 0$ and a constant $N = N(d, \delta, p, \beta)$ such that if*

$$a^\# \leq \hat{a}, \quad (4.5)$$

then for any $\lambda \geq 0$ and $u \in \dot{E}_{p,\beta}^{1,2}$

$$\|\lambda u, \sqrt{\lambda} Du, \partial_t u, D^2u\|_{\dot{E}_{p,\beta}} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}_0 u - \lambda u\|_{\dot{E}_{p,\beta}}. \quad (4.6)$$

Furthermore, for any $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in \dot{E}_{p,\beta}$ there exists a unique solution $u \in \dot{E}_{p,\beta}^{1,2}$ of the equation $\mathcal{L}_0 u - \lambda u = f$.

Proof. Just in case, note that, if $\beta > d/p$, our assertions are trivial because then $\dot{E}_{p,\beta}$ consists of only zero function. Then to prove (4.6) observe that the case of arbitrary $\lambda \geq 0$ is reduced to $\lambda = 0$ by Agmon's method and interpolation. After that it is not hard to see that we may assume that u has compact support, so that $u \in W_p^{1,2}$.

Now take $\alpha \in [0, d+2)$ such that $\alpha + p\beta > d+2$ and let $w = w_\alpha \wedge 1$, so that w is an A_1 -weight owing to Lemma 4.3. Approximating u by smooth functions in $W_p^{1,2}$ we conclude that (4.2) holds for our u .

Then we borrow an idea from [3]. By using Lemma 4.4, we get from (4.2) and the Muckenhoupt theorem and Hölder's inequality that with $w = w_\alpha \wedge 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{C_1} |D^2 u|^p dx dt \right)^{1/p} &\leq N \|D^2 u\|_{L_p(w)} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{\dot{E}_{p,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \\ &+ (N(d, \delta, p, \kappa, \beta) a^\# + N(d, \delta, \beta) \kappa^{-1}) \|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\dot{E}_{p,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Shifting w , using the self-similarity and also treating $\partial_t u$ in the same way give

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\dot{E}_{p,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} &\leq N \|\mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{\dot{E}_{p,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \\ &+ (N(d, \delta, p, \kappa, \beta) a^\# + N(d, \delta, \beta) \kappa^{-1}) \|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\dot{E}_{p,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})}, \end{aligned}$$

which easily yields (4.6) with $\lambda = 0$.

The solvability part of the theorem, as usual, is proved by the method of continuity starting from the heat equation when the explicit formulas for solutions are available. \square

Theorem 4.5 is derived from Lemma 4.2. This lemma also allows us to get the following result by using the same arguments that lead to Theorem 3.8.

Lemma 4.6. *For any $p, q \in (1, \infty)$, $\kappa \geq 2$, and $u \in C_0^\infty$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}} &\leq N_0(d, \delta, p, q, \kappa) \|\mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}} \\ &+ (N_1(d, \delta, p, q, \kappa) a^\# + N_2(d, \delta, p, q) \kappa^{-1}) \|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Corollary 4.7. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and assume that*

$$a^\# \leq (1/4) N_1^{-1}(d, \delta, p, q, 4N_2(d, \delta, p, q)). \quad (4.8)$$

Then for any $u \in C_0^\infty$ we have

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}} \leq 2N_0(d, \delta, p, q, 4N_2(d, \delta, p, q)) \|\mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}}, \quad (4.9)$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, p, q)$.

We restate this corollary as follows.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$. Then there are constants $\hat{a} = \hat{a}(d, \delta, p, q) > 0$ and $N = N(d, \delta, p, q)$ such that if*

$$a^\# \leq \hat{a}, \quad (4.10)$$

then for any $u \in C_0^\infty$ we have

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}}. \quad (4.11)$$

Next, as in the case of Theorem 3.9 we introduce $\lambda \geq 0$ to see that for $\lambda \geq 0$ and $u \in C_0^\infty$

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u, \sqrt{\lambda} Du, \lambda u\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}_0 u - \lambda u\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}}.$$

In this way we arrive at the first assertion in the following theorem if $u \in C_0^\infty$ and $s = -\infty$.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$, $s \in [-\infty, \infty)$ and assume (4.10). Then there exists $N = N(d, \delta, p, q)$ such that for any $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ and $\lambda \geq 0$*

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u, \sqrt{\lambda} Du, \lambda u\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}_0 u - \lambda u\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})}. \quad (4.12)$$

Furthermore, for any $f \in \mathbf{L}_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ and $\lambda > 0$ there exists a unique $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_s^{d+1})$ satisfying in \mathbb{R}_s^{d+1}

$$\mathcal{L}_0 u - \lambda u + f = 0.$$

For $s = -\infty$ the a priori estimate (4.12) extends from C_0^∞ to $W_{q,p}^{1,2}$ due to the denseness of the former in the latter and the solvability result is obtained by the method of continuity starting from Theorem 3.9. General s is treated as in the proof of Theorem 3.9 by observing that the causality property is preserved under the method of continuity.

Here is a useful interior estimate.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and assume (4.10). Let $0 < r < \rho < \infty$, $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(C_\rho)$. Set $f := \mathcal{L}_0 u$. Then*

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(C_r)} \leq N (\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(C_\rho)} + (\rho - r)^{-2} \|u - c\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(C_\rho)}), \quad (4.13)$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, p, q)$ and $c = c(x)$ is any affine function.

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 2.4.4 of [10]. For obvious reasons we may assume that $u \in C^{1,2}(\bar{C}_\rho)$ and $c = 0$. Then, let $\chi(s)$ be an infinitely differentiable function on \mathbb{R} such that $\chi(s) = 1$ for $s \leq 0$ and $\chi(s) = 0$ for $s \geq 1$. For $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ introduce ($r_0 = r$)

$$r_m = r + (\rho - r) \sum_{j=1}^m 2^{-j}, \quad \xi_m(x) = \chi(2^{m+1}(\rho - r)^{-1}(|x| - r_m)),$$

$$\eta_m(t) = \chi(2^{2m+2}(\rho - r)^{-2}(t - r_m^2)), \quad \zeta_m(t, x) = \xi_m(x)\eta_m(t).$$

As is easy to check, for

$$C(m) = C_{r_m} = (0, r_m^2) \times B_{r_m}$$

it holds that

$$\zeta_m = 1 \quad \text{on } C(m), \quad \zeta_m = 0 \quad \text{on } C_\rho \setminus C(m+1).$$

Also (observe that $N2^{m+1} = N_1 2^m$ with $N_1 = 2N$)

$$\begin{aligned} |D\zeta_m| &\leq N2^m(\rho - r)^{-1}, & |\partial_t \zeta_m| &\leq N2^{2m}(\rho - r)^{-2}, \\ |D^2 \zeta_m| &\leq N2^{2m}(\rho - r)^{-2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Next, the function $\zeta_m u$ is in $W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_0^{d+1})$ and satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_0(\zeta_m u) = \zeta_m f + u \mathcal{L}_0 \zeta_m + 2a^{ij} D_i \zeta_m D_j u.$$

By Theorem 4.8 and the above-mentioned properties of ζ_m

$$A_m := \|\partial_t(\zeta_m u), D^2(\zeta_m u)\|_{L_{q,p}(Q(m+1))} \leq N \|f\|_{L_{q,p}(C_\rho)} + N 2^{2m} (\rho - r)^{-2} I + N J_m,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \|u\|_{L_{q,p}(C_\rho)}, \quad J_m = \|2a^{ij} D_i \zeta_m D_j u\|_{L_{q,p}(C_\rho)} \\ &\leq N 2^m (\rho - r)^{-1} \|Du\|_{L_{q,p}(Q(m+1))}. \end{aligned}$$

By interpolation inequalities for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|Du\|_{L_{q,p}(Q(m+1))} &\leq \|D(\zeta_{m+1} u)\|_{L_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_0^{d+1})} \\ &\leq \varepsilon (\rho - r) 2^{-m} A_{m+1} + N \varepsilon^{-1} (\rho - r)^{-1} 2^m I. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

It follows that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$

$$A_m \leq N \|f\|_{L_{q,p}(C_\rho)} + N \varepsilon^{-1} 2^{2m} (\rho - r)^{-2} I + \varepsilon A_{m+1}.$$

Now we take $\varepsilon = 1/8$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^m A_m &\leq N \varepsilon^m \|f\|_{L_{q,p}(C_\rho)} + N \varepsilon^{m-1} 2^{2m} (\rho - r)^{-2} I + \varepsilon^{m+1} A_{m+1}, \\ A_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^m A_m &\leq N \|f\|_{L_{q,p}(C_\rho)} + N (\rho - r)^{-2} I + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^m A_m. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Here the series converges because owing to (4.14),

$$A_m \leq N(1 + 4^m (\rho - r)^{-2}) \|u\|_{W_{q,p}^{1,2}(C_\rho)}.$$

Therefore upon cancelling like terms in (4.16), we see that A_0 is less than the right-hand side of (4.13). Since its left-hand side is obviously less than A_0 , the theorem is proved. \square

Remark 4.11. Similarly we get that A_1 is dominated by the right-hand side of (4.13) and this along with (4.15) shows that $\|Du\|_{L_{q,p}(C_r)}$ is dominated by the right-hand side of (4.13) as well.

To proceed further take $p, q \in (1, \infty)$, $r \in (1, p \wedge q]$ and find an integer $n = n(d, p, q) \geq 2$ and $t_0 = 1 > t_1 > \dots > t_n = 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{p_{k+1}} + \frac{2}{q_{k+1}} \leq \frac{d}{p_k} + \frac{2}{q_k} + 1, \quad (4.17)$$

where

$$p_k = r + t_k(p - r), \quad q_k = r + t_k(q - r).$$

Note that t_k and p_k, q_k decrease as k increases, $(p_0, q_0) = (p, q)$, $(p_n, q_n) = (r, r)$.

The following result provides a key to extending Theorem 7.27 of [14] to $\beta \in (1, \infty)$ instead of $\beta \in (1, 2)$.

Theorem 4.12. *Suppose that condition (4.10) is satisfied with*

$$\hat{a} = \hat{a}_0(d, \delta, p, q, r) := \min_{k=0, \dots, n} \hat{a}(d, \delta, p_k, q_k). \quad (4.18)$$

Let $u \in W_{q,p}^{1,2}(C_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}_0 u = 0$ in C_2 . Then

$$\|u\|_{L_{q,p}(C_1)} \leq N \|u\|_{L_r(C_2)}, \quad (4.19)$$

where N depends only on $d, \delta, p_k, q_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. Let $\chi(s)$ be an infinitely differentiable function on \mathbb{R} such that $\chi(s) = 1$ for $s \leq 0$ and $\chi(s) = 0$ for $s \geq 1/2$. For $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_k(x) &= \chi(n(|x| - 1 - k/n)), & \eta_k(t) &= \chi(n^2(t - (1 + k/n)^2)), \\ \zeta_k(t, x) &= \eta_k(t)\xi_k(x), & \rho_k &= 1 + k/n. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $C_{\rho_0} = C_1, C_{\rho_n} = C_2$ and $\zeta_k = 1$ on $C_{\rho_k}, \zeta_k = 0$ in $C_2 \setminus C_{\rho_{k+1/2}}$.

By Theorem 10.2 of [1] for any $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_{q_k, p_k}(C_{\rho_k})} &\leq \|u\zeta_k\|_{L_{q_k, p_k}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})} \\ &\leq N(\|\partial_t(u\zeta_k), D^2(u\zeta_k)\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}} + \|u\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

By Theorem 4.8 we can continue as

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_{q_k, p_k}(C_{\rho_k})} &\leq N(\|\mathcal{L}_0(u\zeta_k)\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}} + \|u\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})}) \\ &\leq N\|Du|D\zeta_k|\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})} + \|u\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\mathcal{L}_0 u = 0$. In light of Remark 4.11

$$\begin{aligned} \|Du|D\zeta_k|\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})} &\leq N\|Du\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1/2}})} \\ &\leq N\|u\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$

$$\|u\|_{L_{q_k, p_k}(C_{\rho_k})} \leq N\|u\|_{L_{q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}}(C_{\rho_{k+1}})},$$

and (4.19) follows. \square

Theorem 4.13. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty), \beta \in (1, \infty), u \in \dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$. Suppose that condition (4.10) is satisfied with \hat{a}_0 from (4.18) when $r = p \wedge q$. Then*

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq N(d, \delta, p, q, \beta) \|f\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}}, \quad (4.21)$$

where $f = \mathcal{L}_0 u$.

Proof. First we observe that it suffices to prove (4.21) for u with compact support. For such u and $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ define

$$f_\lambda = \mathcal{L}_0 u - \lambda u, \quad g_\lambda = f_\lambda I_{C_4}, \quad h_\lambda = f_\lambda I_{C_4^c}$$

and let G_λ, H_λ be solutions of class $W_{q,p}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ of the equations

$$\mathcal{L}_0 G_\lambda - \lambda G_\lambda = g_\lambda, \quad \mathcal{L}_0 H_\lambda - \lambda H_\lambda = h_\lambda. \quad (4.22)$$

Since f_λ is compactly supported element of $\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}$, it belongs to $L_{q,p}$ and G_λ, H_λ exist by Theorem 4.9. Furthermore, $f_\lambda \in \dot{E}_{p \wedge q, \beta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, so that by

Theorem 4.5 the equations in (4.22) have solutions in $\dot{E}_{p \wedge q, \beta}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. These are the same G_λ, H_λ , since these solutions in different spaces were obtained by the method of continuity starting from the heat equation for which the explicit formulas for solutions are available.

Next, note that $\hat{H}_\lambda := e^t H_\lambda$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \hat{H}_\lambda - (\lambda + 1) \hat{H}_\lambda = e^t h_\lambda := \hat{h}_\lambda$$

and $\hat{h}_\lambda \in L_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_0^{d+1})$ with its norm dominated by a constant independent of λ , since h_λ has compact support. It follows from Theorem 4.9 that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in (0,1]} \|H_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_0^{d+1})} \leq \sup_{\lambda \in (0,1]} \|\hat{H}_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}(\mathbb{R}_0^{d+1})} < \infty. \quad (4.23)$$

Concerning G_λ note that by Theorem 4.9

$$\|D^2 G_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}(C_1)} \leq N \|g_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}} \leq N \|f_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}(C_4)} \leq N \|f_\lambda\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}}.$$

Now observe that $\mathcal{L}_0(e^{-\lambda t} H_\lambda) = e^{-\lambda t} h_\lambda = 0$ in C_4 and by Theorem 4.12 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-\lambda t} H_\lambda - c\|_{L_{q,p}(C_2)} &\leq N \|e^{-\lambda t} H_\lambda - c\|_{L_{q \wedge p}(C_4)} \\ &\leq N \|H_\lambda - c\|_{L_{q \wedge p}(C_4)} + (1 - e^{-16\lambda}) \|H_\lambda\|_{L_{q \wedge p}(C_4)} \\ &\leq N \|H_\lambda - c\|_{L_{q \wedge p}(C_4)} + N(1 - e^{-16\lambda}), \end{aligned}$$

where c is any affine function and we used (4.23). It follows by Theorem 4.10 that

$$\|D^2 H_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}(C_1)} \leq N \|e^{-\lambda t} H_\lambda - c\|_{L_{q,p}(C_2)} \leq N \|H_\lambda - c\|_{L_{q \wedge p}(C_4)} + N(1 - e^{-16\lambda}).$$

By Poincaré's inequality for appropriate c

$$\|H_\lambda - c\|_{L_{q \wedge p}(C_4)} \leq N \|\partial_t H_\lambda, D^2 H_\lambda\|_{L_{q \wedge p}(C_4)} \leq N \|\partial_t H_\lambda, D^2 H_\lambda\|_{\dot{E}_{p \wedge q, \beta}}$$

which, in turn, by Theorem 4.5 is dominated by

$$N \|h_\lambda\|_{\dot{E}_{p \wedge q, \beta}} \leq N \|f_\lambda\|_{\dot{E}_{p \wedge q, \beta}} \leq N \|f_\lambda\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}}.$$

Since $u = G_\lambda + H_\lambda$ and (4.23) holds it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2 u\|_{L_{q,p}(C_1)} &\leq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} (\|D^2 G_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}(C_1)} + \|D^2 H_\lambda\|_{L_{q,p}(C_1)}) \\ &\leq N \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \|f_\lambda\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq N \|f\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Parabolic scaling (preserving (4.10)) shows that for any $\rho > 0$

$$\rho^\beta \|D^2 u\|_{L_{q,p}(C_\rho)} \leq N \|f\|_{\dot{E}_{q,p,\beta}}$$

and then shifting the origin leads to (4.21) in what concerns $D^2 u$. Since $\partial_t u = f - a^{ij} D_{ij} u$, the theorem is proved. \square

5. LOCALIZING (4.5), (4.10) AND THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

Here we argue under condition (2.4).

Remark 5.1. If $f(t, x) \geq 0$ is nonnegative, $r \in (0, \infty)$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$, then with $\zeta = |C_{r\mu}|^{-1}I_{C_{r\mu}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{C_r}f\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}} &= N(d)r^{-d/p-2/q} \left\| \int_{C_{(1+\mu)r}} \zeta(s-\cdot, y-\cdot)I_{C_r}f(\cdot, \cdot) dy ds \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}} \\ &\leq Nr^{-d/p-2/q} \int_{C_{(1+\mu)r}} \|\zeta(s-\cdot, y-\cdot)f\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}} dy ds \\ &\leq N(d)(1+\mu)^{d+2} \mu^{d/p+2/q-(d+2)} \sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}_{\mu r}} \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}(C)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu \leq 1$ and $p, q > 1$ it follows that for $\rho \leq r$

$$\sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}_r} \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}(C)} \leq N(d)(\rho/r)^{d/p+2/q-(d+2)} \sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}_\rho} \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}_{q,p}(C)}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *There exist a constant $\kappa = \kappa(d) \in (0, 1)$ and a constant $K = K(d)$ such that for any $\rho > 0$ there exists an \mathbb{S}_δ -valued \check{a} on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} such that $a = \check{a}$ in $C_{\kappa\rho}$ and $\check{a}^\# \leq Ka_\rho^\#$.*

This lemma is proved in [13].

Recall that we fixed

$$\rho_a, \rho_b \in (0, 1].$$

Let $\zeta_0 \in C_0^\infty$ have support in $C_{\kappa\rho_a}$ and equal 1 in $(1/2)C_{\kappa\rho_a}$ (with dimensions $(1/2)\kappa\rho_a$ in the x -space and $(1/4)\kappa^2\rho_a^2$ in time and the same center), where κ is taken from Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.3. *There exists $\hat{a} = \hat{a}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta) > 0$ such that, if $a_{\rho_a}^\# \leq \hat{a}$, then for any $u \in \mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$*

$$\|\zeta_0\partial_t u, \zeta_0 D^2 u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq N\|f\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}} + N_1\|Du, u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $f = \mathcal{L}_0 u$, $N = N(d, \delta, p, q, \beta)$, $N_1 = N(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a)$.

Proof. Observe that

$$\|\zeta_0\partial_t u, \zeta_0 D^2 u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq \|\partial_t(\zeta_0 u), D^2(\zeta_0 u)\|_{\dot{\mathbb{E}}_{q,p,\beta}} + N\|Du, u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \quad (5.2)$$

and, owing to Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 4.13, the first term is estimated through

$$(\partial_t + \check{a}^{ij}D_{ij})(\zeta_0 u) = \mathcal{L}_0(\zeta_0 u) = \zeta_0 f + g,$$

where, thanks to $\beta \leq d/p + 2/q$, the $\dot{\mathbb{E}}_{q,p,\beta}$ -norm of g is estimated by the last term in (5.2). \square

Naturally, (5.1) holds for any shift of ζ_0 and this along with Remark 5.1 proves the following with $\|Du, u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}}$ in place of $\|u\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}}$. The term $\|Du\|_{\mathbb{E}_{q,p,\beta}}$ is eliminated by using interpolation inequalities.

Theorem 5.4. *There exists $\hat{a} = \hat{a}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta) > 0$ such that, if $a_{\rho_a}^\# \leq \hat{a}$, then for any $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$*

$$\|\partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq N \|\mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}} + N \|u\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $N = N(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a)$.

Next, as a few times before, we use Agmon's idea along with the interpolation inequalities to treat $\mathcal{L}_0 - \lambda$. After that to deal with the first-order terms, note that for $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(2C_1)$ such that $\zeta = 1$ on C_1 , by Hölder's inequality we obtain for $\rho \leq 1$ and $u \in C_0^\infty$ that

$$\rho^\beta \|b^i D_i u\|_{\mathbf{L}_{q,p}(C_\rho)} \leq \|\zeta b^i D_i(\zeta u)\|_{\dot{\mathbf{E}}_{q,p,\beta}(C_\rho)} \leq N \|b\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q\beta,p\beta,1}} \|D(\zeta u)\|_{\dot{\mathbf{E}}_{r_1,r_2,\beta-1}},$$

where $r_1(\beta-1) = q\beta, r_2(\beta-1) = p\beta$. By the embedding theorem (see Corollary 5.7 of [11] in which the order of integration in the mixed-norm space did not play any crucial role) $\|D(\zeta u)\|_{\dot{\mathbf{E}}_{r_1,r_2,\beta-1}} \leq N \|\zeta u\|_{\dot{\mathbf{E}}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}}$, implying that

$$\|b^i D_i u\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq N \|b\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q\beta,p\beta,1}} \|u\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}}. \quad (5.4)$$

By considering the cut-off mollifiers of $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p}^{1,2}$ we extend (5.4) to all $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p}^{1,2}$. In this way we come to the a priori estimate below. Note 1 in the condition on \bar{b} .

Theorem 5.5. *There exist*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{a} &= \hat{a}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta) > 0, & \hat{b} &= \hat{b}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a) > 0, \\ \lambda_0 &= \hat{\lambda}(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a) > 0, & N_0 &= N_0(d, \delta, p, q, \beta, \rho_a), \end{aligned}$$

such that, if

$$a_{\rho_a}^\# \leq \hat{a}, \quad \bar{b}_{q\beta,p\beta,1} \leq \hat{b}, \quad (5.5)$$

then for any $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$

$$\|\lambda u, \sqrt{\lambda} D u, \partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}} \leq N_0 \|f\|_{\mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}}, \quad (5.6)$$

where $f = \mathcal{L}_0 u + b^i D_i u - \lambda u$. Furthermore, for any $f \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ there exists a unique $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$ such that in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}

$$\mathcal{L}_0 u + b^i D_i u - \lambda u = f.$$

Proof. Of course, in condition (5.5) we take \hat{a} from Theorem 5.4 and find \hat{b}, λ_0, N_0 as described before the statement of the theorem. To prove the existence of solutions we use the method of continuity. In light of the a priori estimate (5.6), for this method to work, we need only prove the solvability for the heat equation

$$\partial_t u + \Delta u - \lambda u = f.$$

If f is bounded and with each derivative bounded, the solution u admits an explicit representation, is bounded and has bounded derivatives. Therefore, $u \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}^{1,2}$ and admits estimate (5.6). For general $f \in \mathbf{E}_{q,p,\beta}$ it suffices to use its mollifiers. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We take the same \hat{a} , \hat{b} , λ_0 , N_0 as in the above proof. Recall that $\rho_b \in (0, 1]$. Owing to Theorem 5.5 our assertions are true if $\rho_b = 1$. Then, having (2.5) for $\rho_b = 1$, for $\rho_b < 1$ we make a parabolic dilation (not affecting $a_{\rho_a}^{\#} \leq \hat{a}$) and see that for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 \rho_b^{-2}$, where λ_0 is from Theorem 5.5,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\rho \leq \rho_b} \rho^\beta \sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}_\rho} \|\lambda u, \sqrt{\lambda} Du, \partial_t u, D^2 u\|_{L_{q,p}(C)} \\ & \leq N_0 \sup_{\rho \leq \rho_b} \rho^\beta \sup_{C \in \mathbb{C}_\rho} \|f\|_{L_{q,p}(C)} \leq N_0 \|f\|_{E_{q,p,\beta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

By Remark 5.1 the left-hand side of (5.7) times $N(d)\rho_b^{-\alpha}$ dominates the left-hand side of (2.5). This proves the theorem. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] O.V. Besov, V.P. Il'in, and S.M. Nikol'skii, "Integral representations of functions and imbedding theorems", Vol. I, Translated from the Russian. Scripta Series in Mathematics. Edited by Mitchell H. Taibleson. V. H. Winston & Sons, Washington, D.C.; Halsted Press [John Wiley & Sons], New York-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1978, viii+345 pp.
- [2] P. Cavaliere, M. Longobardi, and A. Vitolo, *Imbedding estimates and elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients in unbounded domains*, *Le Matematiche*, Vol. 51 (1996), No. 1, 87–104.
- [3] F. Chiarenza and M. Frasca, *Morrey spaces and Hardy-Littlewood maximal function*, *Rend. Mat. Appl.* (7) 7 (1987), No. 3–4, 273–279 (1988).
- [4] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim, *On L_p -estimates for elliptic and parabolic equations with A_p weights*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 370 (2018), No. 7, 5081–5130.
- [5] G. Di Fazio, D.I. Hakim, and Y. Sawano, *Elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients in generalized Morrey spaces*, *Europ. J. Math.*, Vol. 3 (2017), 729–762.
- [6] V. S. Guliyev and M. N. Omarova, *Estimates for operators on generalized weighted Orlicz-Morrey spaces and their applications to non-divergence elliptic equations*, *Positivity* 26 (2022), no. 2, Paper No. 40, 27 pp.
- [7] B.F. Jones, *A class of singular integrals*, *Amer. Jour. of Math.* Vol. 86 (1964), 441–462.
- [8] V. Kozlov and A. Nazarov, *Oblique derivative problem for non-divergence parabolic equations with time-discontinuous coefficients*, *Proc. St. Petersburg Math. Soc.* XV; *AMS Transl. Series 2*, Vol. 232 (2014), 177–191, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1301.4415>
- [9] N.V. Krylov, *The heat equation in $L_q((0, T), L_p)$ -spaces with weights*, *SIAM J. on Math. Anal.*, Vol. 32, No. 5 (2001), 1117–1141.
- [10] N.V. Krylov, "Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Sobolev spaces", *Amer. Math. Soc.*, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [11] N.V. Krylov, *On parabolic Adams's, the Chiarenza-Frasca theorems, and some other results related to parabolic Morrey spaces*, *Mathematics in Engineering*, Vol. 5 (2023), No. 2, Paper No. 038, 20 pp. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2110.09555>, DOI:10.3934/mine.2023038
- [12] N.V. Krylov, *On parabolic equations in Morrey spaces with VMO a and Morrey b, c* , *NoDEA*, Vol. 32 (2025), No. 1, Paper No. 9, 20 pp., <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03736>
- [13] N.V. Krylov, *Extending BMO functions in parabolic setting*, arXiv:2507.09723
- [14] N.V. Krylov, *Essentials of Real Analysis and Morrey-Sobolev spaces for second-order elliptic and parabolic PDEs with singular first-order coefficients*, arXiv:2505.14863

- [15] G.M. Lieberman, *A mostly elementary proof of Morrey space estimates for elliptic and parabolic equations with VMO coefficients*, J. Funct. Anal. 201 (2003), No. 2, 457–479.
- [16] S. Monsurrò and M. Transirico, *A priori bounds in L^p and $W^{2,p}$ for solutions of elliptic equations*, Abstract and Applied Analysis, Volume 2013, Article ID 650870, 7 pages, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/650870>
- [17] L.G. Softova, *Morrey-type regularity of solutions to parabolic problems with discontinuous data*, Manuscr. Math., Vol. 136 (3–4) (2011), 365–82.
- [18] Chao Zhang, *Estimates for parabolic equations with measure data in generalized Morrey spaces*, Commun. Contemp. Math., Vol. 21 (2019), No. 5, 1850044, 21 pp.
- [19] Lin Zhang, Yin Sheng Jiang, and Jiang Zhou, *Parabolic Equations with VMO Coefficients in Generalized Morrey Spaces*, Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series, Vol. 26 (2010), No. 1, 117–130.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MN, 55455
Email address: nkrylov@umn.edu