

# Explosion versus decay for boundary derivatives of $p$ -harmonic functions as $p$ tends to 1: nonlocality

Yuval Peres and Han Wang

**ABSTRACT.** We consider the Dirichlet problem for the  $p$ -Laplacian on a bounded Lipschitz domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with a  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued function as the boundary condition and study the dependence of the boundary derivative on  $p$  as  $p \downarrow 1$ . We provide sufficient conditions for the derivative to explode at rate  $\frac{C_\Omega}{p-1}$  and to decay at rate  $\exp(-\frac{c_\Omega}{p-1})$ . Surprisingly, whether explosion or decay occurs is not determined locally. We also present a critical example of a cylinder where this derivative explodes at rate  $\frac{C_d}{\sqrt{p-1}}$ .

MSC 2020: 35J92, 91A15.

KEYWORDS:  $p$ -harmonic functions, Hopf lemma, tug-of-war with noise.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We study the boundary behavior of  $p$ -harmonic functions, i.e., weak solutions to the  $p$ -Laplace equation  $\Delta_p u = 0$ , where  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $\Delta_p u = \nabla \cdot (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$ . Let  $u$  be a non-constant  $p$ -harmonic function in a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then  $u$  satisfies the Hopf boundary point lemma, which says that at every point on  $\partial\Omega$  where  $u$  is minimized and  $\Omega$  admits an interior supporting ball, the inward normal derivative is positive if it exists (this follows from [13, Proposition 3.2.1]). Our goal is to determine the asymptotic behavior of this derivative as  $p \downarrow 1$ .

Since the Dirichlet problem for the  $p$ -Laplacian is, in general, not solvable for  $p = 1$ , it is natural to expect singularities as  $p \downarrow 1$ . The following example shows two different behaviors near the boundary. Let  $\gamma(p, d) = \frac{d-p}{p-1}$ . Recall that the function

$$u_p(x) = \frac{|x|^{-\gamma} - 1}{2^{-\gamma} - 1}$$

is  $p$ -harmonic on  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, 1 < |x| < 2\}$  and satisfies the boundary conditions  $u_p(x) = 0$  for  $|x| = 1$  and  $u_p(x) = 1$  for  $|x| = 2$ . A simple calculation shows that as  $p$  tends to 1, the normal derivative of  $u_p$  explodes on  $\{|x| = 1\}$ , and tends to 0 rapidly on  $\{|x| = 2\}$ . See Figures 1 and 2.




FIGURE 1. The behavior of radial  $p$ -harmonic function for different  $p$ . As  $p$  approaches 1, the boundary derivative grows rapidly near  $\{|x| = 1\}$ , while it approaches 0 near  $\{|x| = 2\}$ .




FIGURE 2. The (absolute value) of the boundary derivative at the boundary as a function of  $p$ .

The natural question is how to classify such behaviors. From the example, a naive guess is that the curvature of the boundary determines them. However, this is not the complete story. As we shall see later, the limiting behavior of the normal derivative is actually determined by some nonlocal conditions on the boundary values.

We focus on the special case where the boundary values form an upper semicontinuous  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued function. In this case, the Perron solution is the canonical solution of the Dirichlet problem; see [3, Chapter 9] for precise definitions.

Our main results are the following two characterizations of boundary derivative asymptotics. The definitions of the notation are in Section 2.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded Lipschitz domain and assume  $\partial\Omega$  is  $C^2$  near  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ . Let  $F$  be an indicator function of a closed subset of  $\partial\Omega$ . We assume  $F(x_0) = 0$ . For  $p \in (1, 2)$ , let  $u$  be the  $p$ -harmonic function with Dirichlet boundary condition  $F$ .*

(a)

$$\exists C = C(\Omega, F) > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \overline{\frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}}(x_0) \leq \frac{C}{p-1}. \quad (1.1)$$

(b) *If there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $\{F = 0\} \setminus \{x_0\} \subset B(x_0 - R\vec{\mathbf{n}}(x_0), R)$ , then*

$$\exists c = c(\Omega, F) > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \frac{c}{p-1} \leq \underline{\frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}}(x_0). \quad (1.2)$$

Here, the condition of order  $\frac{1}{p-1}$  explosion in (b) means that the region  $\{F = 0\}$  is dominated by a large ball centered outside  $\Omega$ ; see figure 3.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded Lipschitz domain and assume  $\partial\Omega$  is  $C^2$  near  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ . Let  $F$  be an indicator function of a closed subset of  $\partial\Omega$ . We assume  $F(x_0) = 0$ . For  $p \in (1, 2)$ , let  $u$  be the  $p$ -harmonic function with Dirichlet boundary condition  $F$ .*

(a) *(hyperplane separation) If there exist  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\xi \cdot x_0 > \beta$  and  $\{x \in \partial\Omega : F(x) = 1\} \subset \{\xi \cdot x < \beta\}$ , then*

$$\exists C = C(\Omega, F) > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \overline{\frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}}(x_0) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{C}{p-1}\right). \quad (1.3)$$

(b) *If  $\{F = 1\}$  has a nonempty relative interior in  $\partial\Omega$ , then*

$$\exists c = c(\Omega, F) > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \underline{\frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}}(x_0) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{c}{p-1}\right). \quad (1.4)$$




FIGURE 3. If  $\{F = 0\} \setminus \{x_0\}$  is contained in a ball (with red boundary) tangent at  $x_0$ , then a lower bound of order  $\frac{1}{p-1}$  on the boundary derivative holds as  $p \downarrow 1$ ; see Theorem 1.1.

On the other hand, the condition of exponential decay in Theorem 1.2 is about  $\{F = 1\}$  being separated by a hyperplane from  $x_0$ . See figure 4. The exact definitions and proof of the results are in Section 2 and 3.




FIGURE 4. If  $\{F = 1\}$  is separated by a hyperplane from  $x_0$ , then the exponential decay of boundary derivative holds in Theorem 1.2. The curvature at  $x_0$  is irrelevant.

A special method using measure transformations also appears in the probabilistic approach. The intermediate result in this approach, Lemma 3.1, is also of its own interest, as it gives a lower bound (with explicit dependence on  $p$  and  $d$ ) for the hitting probability of the tug-of-war process. See [11] for an application of this lemma.

In Section 4, we analyze a critical example that falls between the cases described in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In this example, the transition between the boundary

values occurs on the tangent plane at  $x_0$ , and we show that the boundary derivative is of order  $(p-1)^{-1/2}$  as  $p \downarrow 1$ .




FIGURE 5. The cylinder and the boundary condition in Theorem 1.3.  $F = 1$  on the top and sides of the cylinder.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Consider the cylinder  $Q = \{(x, y) : x \in B^d(0, 1), y \in (0, 1)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  depicted in Figure 5, where  $d \geq 1$ . Let  $F : \partial Q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be the indicator function:*

$$F(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & |x| = 1 \text{ or } y = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and let  $u$  be the  $p$ -harmonic function on  $Q$  with boundary condition  $F$ . Then,

$$c \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}} \leq \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}(0, 0) \leq \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}}, \quad (1.5)$$

where  $c = \frac{1}{24}$ .

This example suggests that the boundary derivative can exhibit a range of behaviors between the explosion and exponential decay regimes.

**1.1. Related results.** The Hopf boundary point lemma was first proved by Hopf in [4] for classical harmonic functions. Tolksdorf in [13, Proposition 3.2.1] proved a generalization for  $p$ -harmonic functions with  $1 < p < \infty$  and the result is now known for a wide class of degenerate nonlinear equations; see, for example, [12, Theorem 5.1.1]. There is also recent progress that generalizes this to the fractional  $p$ -Laplacian for  $p \geq 2$  in [5, 9].

In general, the boundary derivative of a  $p$ -harmonic function may not be well-defined. It was shown in a series of works of DiBenedetto, Evans, Lewis, Tolksdorf, Uhlenbeck and Ural'seva that (weak)  $p$ -harmonic functions have a Hölder continuous derivative in the interior; see [1, 2, 6, 14, 15, 16]. To ensure the existence of the boundary derivative, further assumptions on the domain and the boundary conditions are needed. For example, when the boundary is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  and the boundary values are of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$ , the existence was shown by Lieberman in [7].

## 2. NONLOCAL BEHAVIOR VIA COMPARISON

In this part, we derive some nonlocal behavior of the boundary derivative of  $p$ -harmonic functions as  $p$  approaches 1. We will give the proof of Theorem 1.1 and part (a) of Theorem 1.2.

**2.1. Notation.** Throughout the section, we assume that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a bounded Lipschitz domain and  $\partial\Omega$  is  $C^2$  near  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ . We use  $\vec{\mathbf{n}} = \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x_0)$  to denote the inward normal vector of  $\partial\Omega$  at  $x_0$ . For any function  $u$  on  $\Omega$  that is continuous near  $x \in \partial\Omega$ , we set  $\overline{\frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\mathbf{n}}}}(x) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(x+h\vec{\mathbf{n}}) - u(x)}{h}$  and  $\underline{\frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\mathbf{n}}}}(x) = \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(x+h\vec{\mathbf{n}}) - u(x)}{h}$ .

We recall the definition of solutions to the  $p$ -Laplace equation. For more details, one may refer to [3] or [8].

We say a function  $h \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega)$  is a (weak) solution to the equation  $\nabla \cdot (|\nabla h|^{p-2} \nabla h) = 0$  if for any  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ , it holds that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla h|^{p-2} \nabla h \cdot \nabla \varphi = 0.$$

To deal with non-continuous boundary conditions, we need the notion of Perron solutions.

We say a function  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  **$p$ -superharmonic** in  $\Omega$  if  $u$  is lower semicontinuous and the following conditions hold: For any bounded open  $D$  with  $\overline{D} \subset \Omega$  and each continuous function  $h \in C(\overline{D}) \cap W_{loc}^{1,p}(D)$  that solves  $-\nabla \cdot (|\nabla h|^{p-2} \nabla h) = 0$  weakly, one has: if  $h \leq u$  on  $\partial D$ , then  $h \leq u$  in  $D$ .

A function  $u$  is said to be  **$p$ -subharmonic** if  $-u$  is  $p$ -superharmonic.

For any function  $F$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , we let  $\mathcal{U}_F$  be the class of  $p$ -superharmonic functions  $u$  in  $\Omega$  that are bounded below and satisfy  $\liminf_{x \rightarrow x_0} u(x) \geq F(x_0)$  for all  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ . Similarly,  $\mathcal{L}_F$  is the class  $p$ -subharmonic functions  $u$  in  $\Omega$  that are bounded above and satisfy  $\limsup_{x \rightarrow x_0} u(x) \leq F(x_0)$  for all  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ . We define the **upper and lower Perron solutions** respectively as

$$\overline{H}_F = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_F} u. \quad (2.1)$$

$$\underline{H}_F = \sup_{u \in \mathcal{L}_F} u. \quad (2.2)$$

In our case, the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  is Lipschitz, and hence satisfies the exterior cone condition. In particular, for any continuous boundary values, there exists a continuous  $p$ -harmonic extension to  $\Omega$ . Therefore,  $\Omega$  is regular in the sense of [3, 9.5]. In particular, any upper (or lower) semicontinuous boundary values  $F$  are resolutive. We have  $\overline{H}_F = \underline{H}_F$ . In this case, we say  $u = \overline{H}_F = \underline{H}_F$  is the  **$p$ -harmonic function with Dirichlet boundary condition  $F$** . Furthermore,  $u$  is continuous near every point of continuity of  $F$ . Note that this definition coincides with the classical definition if  $F$  is continuous.

We also use  $B^m(x, R)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $R > 0$  to denote the  $m$ -dimensional ball centered at  $x$  with radius  $R$ . When  $m = d$ , we also write  $B(x, R) = B^d(x, R)$ .

## 2.2. Proof of main results.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* For simplicity, we assume  $x_0 = 0$  and  $\vec{\mathbf{n}}(0) = e_1$  throughout the proof.

### Lower bound in (b):

Let  $R$  be the constant in the assumption. Then we choose a large constant  $M > 2 \operatorname{diam}(\Omega)$ . Let  $v$  be the unique  $p$ -harmonic function on  $\Omega' = B(-Re_1, R + M) \setminus \overline{B}(-Re_1, R)$  with boundary condition  $v = 0$  on  $\partial B(-Re_1, R)$  and  $v = 1$  on  $\partial B(-Re_1, R + M)$ . See Figure 6. More precisely,

$$v(x) = \frac{|x - Re_1|^{-\gamma} - R^{-\gamma}}{(R + M)^{-\gamma} - R^{-\gamma}},$$

where recall that  $\gamma = \gamma(p, d) = \frac{d-p}{p-1}$ . Then we restrict  $v$  to  $\Omega \cap \Omega'$  and have that  $v \leq u$  on  $\partial(\Omega \cap \Omega')$ . Then it follows from the comparison principle that  $v \leq u$  in  $\Omega \cap \Omega'$ . In particular,  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial e_1}(0) \geq \frac{\partial v}{\partial e_1}(0) \geq \frac{c}{p-1}$  for  $c = \frac{10d}{R}$  when  $p$  is close to 1.




FIGURE 6. The test function  $v$  for the lower bound in (b).

#### Upper bound in (a):

We then show an upper bound for any general domain. The strategy is similar. Since the boundary is locally  $C^2$ , it satisfies the exterior ball condition; hence we can find a ball  $B(-\delta e_1, \delta)$  such that  $\overline{B}(-\delta e_1, \delta) \cap \overline{\Omega} = \{0\}$ . We then pick  $\delta'$  small enough so that  $\partial\Omega \cap \{F = 1\} \cap B(-\delta e_1, \delta + \delta') = \emptyset$ . Again we let  $w$  be the unique  $p$ -harmonic function on  $\Omega'' = B(-\delta e_1, \delta + \delta') \setminus \overline{B}(-\delta e_1, \delta)$  with boundary condition  $w = 0$  on  $\partial B(-\delta e_1, \delta)$  and  $w = 1$  on  $\partial B(-\delta e_1, \delta + \delta')$ . See Figure 7. Since  $w \geq u$  on  $\partial(\Omega \cap \Omega'')$ , we conclude that  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial e_1}(0) \leq \frac{\partial w}{\partial e_1}(0) \leq \frac{C}{p-1}$ , with the choice  $C = \frac{d}{10\delta}$  for  $p$  close to 1.  $\square$




FIGURE 7. The test function  $w$  for the upper bound in (a).

*Proof of (a) of Theorem 1.2.* In this proof, it is convenient to assume  $\xi = -e_1, \beta = 0$  by a rotation and a translation. In other words,  $\{F = 1\} \subset \{x_1 > 0\}$  and  $x_0 \in \{x_1 < 0\}$ .

Since  $\Omega$  is bounded, we can find  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $R > 0$  so that  $\partial B(y, R)$  also separates  $x_0$  and  $\{F = 1\}$ , i.e.,  $\{F = 1\} \subset B(y, R)$  and  $x_0 \notin \overline{B}(y, R)$ . In particular, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $x_0 \notin \overline{B}(y, R + \varepsilon)$ . We also find  $R'$  sufficiently large so that  $\Omega \subset B(y, R')$ .

Let

$$v(x) = \frac{|x - y|^{-\gamma} - (R')^{-\gamma}}{R^{-\gamma} - (R')^{-\gamma}},$$

which is  $p$ -harmonic in  $\Omega_1 = B(y, R') \setminus \overline{B}(y, R)$ . Then we observe that  $v \geq u$  on  $\partial(\Omega_1 \cap \Omega)$ . Therefore, by the comparison principle, we have  $u(x) \leq v(x)$  in  $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega$ . In particular, for any  $x \in \partial B(y, R + \varepsilon) \cap \Omega$ , we have

$$u(x) \leq \frac{(R')^{-\gamma} - (R + \varepsilon)^{-\gamma}}{(R')^{-\gamma} - R^{-\gamma}}. \quad (2.3)$$

We then consider the  $p$ -harmonic function  $w$  on  $\Omega_2 = \Omega \setminus \overline{B}(y, R + \varepsilon)$  with Dirichlet boundary condition  $w = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega \setminus \overline{B}(y, R + \varepsilon)$  and  $w = 1$  on  $\partial B(y, R + \varepsilon) \cap \Omega$ . By Theorem 1.1, we know there exists  $C$  such that  $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(x_0) \leq \frac{C}{p-1}$ . Also, from (2.3), we know  $u \leq \frac{(R')^{-\gamma} - (R + \varepsilon)^{-\gamma}}{(R')^{-\gamma} - R^{-\gamma}} w$  on  $\partial\Omega_2$ . Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(x_0) \leq \frac{(R')^{-\gamma} - (R + \varepsilon)^{-\gamma}}{(R')^{-\gamma} - R^{-\gamma}} \frac{C}{p-1} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{C'}{p-1}\right),$$

for  $C' = C'(R, \varepsilon, d) = 10d \log(1 + \varepsilon/R) > 0$  and for  $p$  sufficiently close to 1, which is the desired estimate.  $\square$

### 3. AN EXPONENTIAL LOWER BOUND VIA TUG-OF-WAR

For the proof of an exponential lower bound, we consider the probabilistic approach developed in [10]. We estimate the value of  $p$ -harmonic functions by calculating the hitting probability of the tug-of-war game. This allows us to use some probabilistic methods. In particular, we use a perturbation of the probability measure to give lower bounds.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose  $0 < r < R$  and  $0 < h < H$  are fixed real numbers. Let  $Q = \{(x, y) : x \in B^{d-1}(0, R), y \in (0, H)\}$ . Let  $u$  be the  $p$ -harmonic function for  $1 < p \leq 2$  in  $Q$  with the Dirichlet boundary condition*

$$u(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & y = 0 \text{ or } |x| = R, \\ 1 & y = H \text{ and } |x| < R, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

as indicated in Figure 8. Then there exists a finite positive constant  $C = C(r, R, h, H)$  such that for any  $x_0$  with  $|x_0| \leq r$ , we have

$$u(x_0, h) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{Cd}{p-1}\right). \quad (3.2)$$

*Proof.* It suffices to assume  $x_0 = 0$ , since for general  $x_0$ , we can apply the result to the  $p$ -harmonic function in  $Q_1 = B^{d-1}(x_0, R - r) \times (0, H)$  and use the comparison principle. Furthermore, we can assume  $R = 1$  after replacing  $H$  and  $h$  by  $H/R$  and  $h/R$ .




FIGURE 8. The boundary condition in Lemma 3.1.

By the comparison principle, we may prove the estimate for another  $p$ -harmonic function  $v$  with a continuous boundary condition  $F : \partial Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where

$$F(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & y = 0 \text{ or } |x| = 1, \\ \min\{1, 10 - 10|x|\}, & y = H \text{ and } |x| < 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Now we consider the tug-of-war with noise on  $Q = B^{d-1}(0, 1) \times (0, H)$ , with initial state  $(0, h)$ , boundary condition  $F$ , and sufficiently small step size  $\varepsilon$ . To be more precise, we consider the stochastic zero-sum game  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  between two players, described below. The initial value is  $X_0 = (0, h) \in Q$ . To determine  $X_{n+1}$  from  $X_n$ , we toss a fair coin between the two players, and the winning player may choose a vector  $v_{n+1} \in B(0, \varepsilon)$ . Then a random noise vector  $w_{n+1}$  perpendicular to  $v_n$ . with  $|w_{n+1}| = \sqrt{\frac{d-1}{p-1}}|v_n|$  is drawn uniformly. The position is moved to  $X_{n+1} = X_n + v_{n+1} + w_{n+1}$ . We continue playing the game until the stopping time

$$\tau := \inf \left\{ n \geq 0 : d(X_n, \partial Q) < \left( \sqrt{\frac{d-1}{p-1}} + 1 \right) \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Then the winner of the next coin toss may choose a boundary point

$$X_{\tau+1} \in B \left( X_\tau, \left( \sqrt{\frac{d-1}{p-1}} + 1 \right) \varepsilon \right) \cap \partial Q$$

and end the game.

Let  $\mathcal{M}_1(\cdot)$  be the space of Borel probability measures on a space. A strategy for a player is a collection of functions  $(h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , where  $h_n : B(0, \varepsilon)^{n-1} \times B \left( 0, \sqrt{\frac{d-1}{p-1}} \varepsilon \right)^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(B(0, \varepsilon))$  determines what the player will do (i.e. a probability measure on  $B(0, \varepsilon)$ ) given the moves and noises up to time  $n-1$ . Then for each pair of strategies  $(S_I, S_{II})$ , there exists a probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  on a suitable space that determines the process. And the game value (for player II) is defined as

$$v_2^\varepsilon = \inf_{S_{II}} \sup_{S_I} \mathbb{E}(F(X_{\tau+1}) \mathbf{1}_{\tau < \infty}).$$

Furthermore, as shown in [10], under this choice of parameters, we have  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} v_2^\varepsilon = v(0, h)$ , where  $v$  is the  $p$ -harmonic function described by boundary condition (3.3). Here the continuity of  $F$  is necessary. For more details, see [10].

This probabilistic description allows us to consider the stochastic game instead of the original  $p$ -harmonic function. To give a lower bound on the value of player II,

we need to define a good strategy  $S_I$  given any strategy  $S_{II}$  of player II. Let  $c > 0$  be a fixed constant to be determined later, and define the counter strategy as follows. Given  $S_{II} = (h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , we define the probability measures

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}_n(A) &= h_n(-A), \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d). \\ g_n &= \frac{1 - \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}}{1 + \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}} \bar{h}_n + \frac{\frac{4c\varepsilon}{p-1}}{1 + \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}} \delta_{\varepsilon e_d}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\bar{h}_n$  is the strategy opposite to  $h_n$ , and  $\delta_{\varepsilon e_d}$  (a dirac measure) is just the strategy that always pushes in the  $d$ -th coordinate direction. The expression denotes the convex combination of two probability measures. In other words, the strategy  $g_n$  means that with probability  $\frac{1 - \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}}{1 + \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}}$ , we choose a direction opposite to the opponent's strategy, while otherwise we just move  $\varepsilon$  in the  $d$ -th direction. We will show that with this counter strategy  $S_I = (g_n)$ , the probability of reaching  $B^{d-1}(0, 1) \times \{H\}$  is bounded below.

The basic idea to show this lower bound is to consider the biased process. First, we will show that we will reach the upper boundary with constant probability if we slightly perturb the process.

Fixing the strategy pair  $(S_I, S_{II})$  described above, we denote  $\mathbb{P}$  as the probability measure that determines the process  $(X_n)$ . We consider another probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  on the same probability space, which assigns player I winning probability  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c\varepsilon}{p-1}$  rather than  $\frac{1}{2}$  during each coin toss, while keeping randomness from noises and strategies unchanged.

Under this new probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ , during each step, the probability that player II moves is  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{c\varepsilon}{p-1}$ . The probability that player I moves a vector opposite to player II's strategy is also  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{c\varepsilon}{p-1}$ . The probability that player I moves upward by  $\varepsilon$  directly is  $\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}$ . Also note that all the noises are unbiased. Therefore, if we denote

$$X_n = (\rho_n, Y_n),$$

where  $\rho_n \in B^{d-1}(0, 1)$  is the first  $d-1$  coordinates of  $X_n$  and  $Y_n$  is the  $d$ -th coordinate of  $X_n$ , then under  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ ,

$$M_n = Y_n - \frac{2c\varepsilon^2 n}{p-1} \tag{3.4}$$

is a martingale up to time  $\tau = \inf \{n \geq 0, d(X_n, \partial Q) < (\sqrt{\frac{d-1}{p-1}} + 1)\varepsilon\}$  with respect to the natural filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_n)$  of the process. In other words,  $M_{n \wedge \tau}$  is a martingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ .

Furthermore, we also compute  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[|\rho_{n+1}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_n]$ . We denote the first  $d-1$  coordinates of the move  $v_n$  by  $\xi_n$  and the first  $d-1$  coordinates of the noise  $w_n$  by  $\eta_n$ . Up to time  $\tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\rho_{n+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[(\rho_n + \eta_{n+1} + \xi_{n+1})^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\rho_n^2 + \xi_{n+1}^2 - 2\rho_n \cdot \xi_{n+1} + \eta_{n+1}^2 - 2(\rho_n + \xi_{n+1}) \cdot \eta_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \rho_n^2 + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\xi_{n+1}^2] + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\eta_{n+1}^2] \\ &\leq \rho_n^2 + \frac{d-1}{p-1} \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 \\ &\leq \rho_n^2 + \frac{d}{p-1} \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here from the second line to the third line, we observe that  $(\xi_{n+1}, \eta_{n+1})$  are independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ . We also make use of the fact that  $(\rho_n, \xi_{n+1})$  has the same law as  $(\rho_n, -\xi_{n+1})$ ;  $(\rho_n, \eta_{n+1}, \xi_{n+1})$  has the same law as  $(\rho_n, -\eta_{n+1}, \xi_{n+1})$ . The calculation above means

$$N_n = \rho_n^2 - \frac{d\varepsilon^2 n}{p-1}$$

is a supermartingale up to time  $\tau$  under  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ .

We first apply the optional stopping theorem to  $M$  to obtain

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}M_\tau = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}Y_\tau - \frac{2c\varepsilon^2}{p-1}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\tau = h.$$

In particular, for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left[Y_\tau \leq 2\left(\frac{d-1}{p-1} + 1\right)\varepsilon\right] \leq \frac{H - \tilde{\mathbb{E}}Y_\tau}{H - 2\left(\frac{d-1}{p-1} + 1\right)\varepsilon} \leq \frac{H-h}{H-\frac{h}{2}} =: 1 - C_1(H, h). \quad (3.5)$$

Also, if we denote

$$T_0 = \frac{H(p-1)}{C_1(H, h)c\varepsilon^2},$$

then we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}[\tau > T_0] \leq T_0^{-1}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\tau \leq \frac{H(p-1)}{2c\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{H(p-1)}{C_1(H, h)c\varepsilon^2}\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{C_1}{2}. \quad (3.6)$$

Now we apply the optional stopping theorem to  $N$  to obtain

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}N_{\tau \wedge T_0} = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\rho_{\tau \wedge T_0}^2 - \frac{d\varepsilon^2}{p-1}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\tau \wedge T_0] \leq 0.$$

In particular,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\rho_{\tau \wedge T_0}^2 \leq \frac{d\varepsilon^2}{p-1}T_0 \leq \frac{Hd}{C_1c}.$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left[\tau < T_0, \rho_\tau^2 > \frac{1}{2}\right] \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left[\rho_{\tau \wedge T_0}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\right] \leq 2\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\rho_{\tau \wedge T_0}^2 \leq \frac{2Hd}{C_1c}.$$

With the choice of  $c = c(d, H, h) = \frac{8Hd}{C_1^2}$ , we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left[\tau < T_0, \rho_\tau^2 > \frac{1}{2}\right] \leq \frac{C_1}{4}. \quad (3.7)$$

Also, to control the Radon-Nikodym derivative between the two measures, we consider the number of steps the two players take. We define

$$Z_n = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if player I wins the } n\text{-th coin toss,} \\ -1, & \text{if player II wins the } n\text{-th coin toss.} \end{cases}$$

Define

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i.$$

The Radon-Nikodym derivative between the two probability measures can be written as a function of  $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$ . More precisely, we have

$$f_t(Z) := \frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c\varepsilon}{p-1}}{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{t+S_t}{2}} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{c\varepsilon}{p-1}}{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{t-S_t}{2}} = \left(\frac{1 + \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}}{1 - \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}}\right)^{\frac{S_t}{2}} \left(1 - \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{t}{2}}.$$

A direct calculation shows that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[f_{t+1}(Z)|\mathcal{F}_t] = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2 f_t(Z) + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2 f_t(Z) = \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right) f_t(Z).$$

This means

$$Q_n = \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{-n} f_n(Z)$$

is a positive martingale under  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ . In particular, by a standard stopping time argument, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq n \leq T_0} Q_n \geq \frac{8}{C_1} \right] \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left[ Q_{\nu \wedge T_0} \geq \frac{8}{C_1} \right] \leq \frac{C_1}{8},$$

where  $\nu$  is the first time  $Q_n$  exceeds  $\frac{8}{C_1}$ .

Combining this with (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7), we conclude with

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \tau < T_0, \rho_\tau^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}, Y_\tau > 2 \left( \frac{d-1}{p-1} + 1 \right) \varepsilon, \max_{0 \leq n \leq T_0} Q_n < \frac{8}{C_1} \right] \geq \frac{C_1}{8}.$$

Finally, we compute the probability of this event under the original probability measure. Note that under this event,

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{T_0} \max_{0 \leq n \leq T_0} Q_n \leq \frac{8}{C_1} \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{T_0}.$$

Combining the two displays above, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \tau < T_0, \rho_\tau^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}, Y_\tau > 2 \left( \frac{d-1}{p-1} + 1 \right) \varepsilon, \max_{0 \leq n \leq T_0} Q_n < \frac{8}{C_1} \right] \geq \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{-T_0} \frac{C_1^2}{64}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[ X_{\tau+1} \in B^{d-1} \left(0, \frac{9}{10}\right) \times \{H\}, \tau < \infty \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \tau < T_0, \rho_\tau^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}, Y_\tau > 2 \left( \frac{d-1}{p-1} + 1 \right) \varepsilon, \max_{0 \leq n \leq T_0} Q_n < \frac{8}{C_1} \right] \\ & \geq C' \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{-\frac{C(p-1)}{\varepsilon^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

for some constants  $C, C', c$  depending only on  $d, H, h$ .

Since the estimate is true for any strategy  $S_{II}$  and the described strategy  $S_I$ , we have

$$v_2^\varepsilon \geq \inf_{S_{II}} \sup_{S_I} \mathbb{P} \left( X_{\tau+1} \in B^{d-1} \left(0, \frac{9}{10}\right) \times \{H\}, \tau < \infty \right) \geq C' \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{-\frac{C(p-1)}{\varepsilon^2}}.$$

We pass to the limit to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v(0, H) & \geq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} C' \left(1 + \left(\frac{2c\varepsilon}{p-1}\right)^2\right)^{-\frac{C(p-1)}{\varepsilon^2}} = C' \exp \left( -\frac{4Cc^2}{p-1} \right), \\ & \geq \frac{h^2}{64(2H-h)^2} \exp \left( -\frac{32H^2(2H-h)^3 d}{h^3(p-1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Using this special case on a cylinder, we can finish the proof of Theorem 1.2. Although there are many details concerning a general domain, the spirit is simple: we construct a finite sequence of cylinders from any point to the target boundary and repeatedly use the estimate in Lemma 3.1.

*Proof of (b) in Theorem 1.2.* We first fix a point  $y \in \partial\Omega$  such that there exists a ball  $B(y, r)$  with  $B(y, r) \cap \partial\Omega \subset \{F = 1\}$ . Shrinking  $r$ , we may assume  $\partial\Omega$  is the graph of a Lipschitz function in  $B(y, r)$ . In particular, we find a small cylinder  $Q \subset B(y, r)$  containing  $y$ , with its top contained in  $\Omega^c$  and its bottom contained in  $\Omega$ . Fix a point  $y' \in \Omega \cap Q$ . By the interior ball condition, we also find a small ball  $B(x_1, r')$  near  $x_0$  such that

$$B(x_1, r') \subset \Omega \text{ and } \partial B(x_1, r') \cap \partial\Omega = \{x_0\}.$$

We take a piecewise straight path  $\gamma = \cup_{i=1}^N [x_i, x_{i+1}]$  joining  $x_1$  and  $x_{N+1} = y$  in  $\Omega$ . Here,  $[x_i, x_{i+1}] := \{\lambda x_i + (1 - \lambda)x_{i+1}, \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$  denotes the line segment connecting  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$ .

Let  $\delta = \frac{1}{10} \min(d(\gamma, \partial\Omega), d(y', \partial Q), r'/4) > 0$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , we define the cylinder  $Q_i$  to be centered at the line segment  $[x_i - (1 + \frac{i}{N})\delta \frac{x_{i+1} - x_i}{|x_{i+1} - x_i|}, x_{i+1}]$  (i.e., with bottom center  $x_i - (1 + \frac{i}{N})\delta \frac{x_{i+1} - x_i}{|x_{i+1} - x_i|}$  and top center  $x_{i+1}$ ) and with radius  $(1 + \frac{i}{N})\delta$ . See Figure 9. In particular,  $Q_i \subset \Omega$  by our definition of  $\delta$ .




FIGURE 9. The cylinder  $Q_i$  and  $Q_{i+1}$ .

We use  $\Gamma_i$  to denote the top hypersurface of  $\partial Q_i$  (i.e. the flat hypersurface at  $x_{i+1}$ ). Then our choice guarantees that  $\Gamma_i$  is contained in  $Q_{i+1}$ , at a distance  $\frac{1}{N}\delta$  from its boundary. In particular, Lemma 3.1 applies to  $Q_{i+1}$ . Let  $v_{i+1}$  be the  $p$ -harmonic

function on  $Q_{i+1}$  with boundary value 1 on  $\Gamma_{i+1}$  and 0 elsewhere. Then there exists a constant  $C_i$  independent of  $p$  such that for  $1 \leq i \leq N-1$

$$v_{i+1}(x) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C_{i+1}}{p-1}\right), \quad \forall x \in \Gamma_i. \quad (3.9)$$

We also make use of the estimate for  $v_1$  in  $Q_1$ . Since  $B(x_1, \delta/2) \subset Q_1$ , we have

$$v_1(x) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C_1}{p-1}\right), \quad \forall x \in B\left(x_1, \frac{\delta}{2}\right). \quad (3.10)$$

By the comparison principle on  $Q_{i+1}$ , we see that for the non-negative  $p$ -harmonic function  $u$ , we have for  $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ ,

$$\inf_{x \in \Gamma_i} u(x) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C_{i+1}}{p-1}\right) \inf_{x \in \Gamma_{i+1}} u(x). \quad (3.11)$$

The estimate is still true when  $i = 0$  if we replace  $\Gamma_0$  by  $B(x_1, \frac{\delta}{2})$ .

Now recall the cylinder  $Q$  containing  $y'$ . We also let  $v$  be the  $p$ -harmonic function in  $Q$  with boundary value  $v = 1$  on top (the surface contained in  $\Omega^c$ ) and  $v = 0$  elsewhere. Then for the same reason

$$v(x) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C}{p-1}\right), \quad \forall x \in \Gamma_N. \quad (3.12)$$

The comparison principle on  $Q \cap \Omega$  implies

$$\inf_{x \in \Gamma_N} u(x) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C}{p-1}\right). \quad (3.13)$$

We combine all the estimates above, and show the existence of a constant  $C$ , depending only on  $\Omega$  and  $F$ , such that

$$\inf_{x \in B(x_1, \frac{\delta}{2})} u(x) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C}{p-1}\right). \quad (3.14)$$

Finally, we compare  $u$  with the fundamental solution in  $B(x_1, r') \setminus \overline{B}(x_1, \frac{\delta}{2})$  to see

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\mathbf{n}}}(x_0) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{C(\Omega, F)}{p-1}\right). \quad (3.15)$$

□

#### 4. A CRITICAL EXAMPLE

In this part, we show an example of critical behaviors not contained in the result above. When the conditions in Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 are not satisfied, the boundary derivative can exhibit a different asymptotic. In our example, we consider the Dirichlet problem on a  $(d+1)$ -dimensional cylinder. We show that the asymptotic order of the boundary derivative behaves as  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p-1}})$ .

Write  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  as  $z = (x, y)$  with  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, y \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Consider the cylinder

$$Q = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid |x|^2 < 1, 0 < y < 1\}.$$

Let  $F : \partial Q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be the indicator function

$$F(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & y = 1 \text{ or } |x| = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

See Figure 5.

Let  $u$  be the  $p$ -harmonic function in  $Q$  with Dirichlet boundary condition  $F$ . We claim the following asymptotic behavior.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose  $p \in (1, 2)$ . Then*

$$c_1 \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}} \cdot y \leq u(0, y) \leq \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}} \cdot y, \quad (4.1)$$

for  $y \in \left[0, \sqrt{\frac{p-1}{d}}\right]$ , where  $c_1 = 1/40$ .

*Remark 4.2.* For simplicity, in the following calculation, we use a normalized  $p$ -Laplacian defined as  $\Delta_p^N u = |\nabla u|^{4-p} \Delta_p u = |\nabla u|^2 \cdot \Delta u + (p-2) \Delta_\infty^N u$ , where  $\Delta_\infty^N u = \sum_{i,j} \partial_i u \partial_{ij} u \partial_j u$ .

*Remark 4.3.* The lower bound  $u(x, y) \geq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}} \cdot y$  applies for  $y \leq 20 \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}}$  and also in the infinite cylinder  $\{(x, y) \mid |x| < 1, y > 0\}$ .

In particular, we have the following derivative estimate. Note that in this example, we can use a monotonicity argument to verify that the boundary derivative exists.

**Corollary 4.4.** *We have*

$$c_1 \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}} \leq \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}(0) \leq \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}}. \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show the existence of the boundary derivative. We first show that  $u(0, y) = \inf_{x \in B^d(0,1)} u(x, y)$  for all  $y \in (0, 1)$ .

For any  $x_0 \in B^d(0, 1)$ , consider the function  $\tilde{u}(x, y) = u(x + x_0, y)$  defined on  $\tilde{Q} = \{(x, y) : x \in B(-x_0, 1), (x + \frac{x_0}{2}) \cdot x_0 > 0, 0 < y < 1\}$ . Note that  $\partial \tilde{Q}$  consists of the following parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \tilde{Q} &= \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3, \\ \Gamma_1 &= \left\{ (x, y) : x \in \overline{B}(-x_0, 1), (x + \frac{x_0}{2}) \cdot x_0 \geq 0, y \in \{0, 1\} \right\}; \\ \Gamma_2 &= \left\{ (x, y) : x \in \partial B(-x_0, 1), (x + \frac{x_0}{2}) \cdot x_0 \geq 0, 0 < y < 1 \right\}; \\ \Gamma_3 &= \left\{ (x, y) : x \in \overline{B}(-x_0, 1), (x + \frac{x_0}{2}) \cdot x_0 = 0, 0 < y < 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition  $u = \tilde{u}$  on  $\Gamma_1$ . Note that  $\tilde{u} = 1 \geq u$  on  $\Gamma_2$ . On  $\Gamma_3$ , we use the observation that  $u$  has a spherical symmetry in  $x$  that  $u(x, y) = u(x', y)$  as long as  $|x| = |x'|$ . Therefore, we have  $\tilde{u} = u$  on  $\Gamma_3$ . The comparison principle shows  $u(x_0, y) = \tilde{u}(0, y) \geq u(0, y)$ .

Therefore, for any  $y_1 > 0$ , the  $p$ -harmonic function  $\frac{y}{y_1} u(0, y_1)$  is less than or equal to  $u$  on the set  $\{y = y_1\}$ . Applying the comparison principle on  $B(0, 1) \times (0, y_1)$ , we have  $u(0, y_2) \geq \frac{y_2}{y_1} u(0, y_1)$ . This means that  $\frac{u(0, y)}{y}$  is decreasing in  $y$ . Together with (4.1), we conclude that the limit at 0 exists.  $\square$

Now we return to the original estimate.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* We will use the quadratic test functions

$$w(x, y) = |x|^2 + 2ay - by^2.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla w &= 2(x, a - by); \\ \Delta w &= 2(d - b); \\ \Delta_\infty^N w &= 8(|x|^2 - b(a - by)^2).\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_p^N w &= 8\left[ (|x|^2 + (a - by)^2)(d - b) + (p - 2)(|x|^2 - b(a - by)^2) \right] \\ &= 8\left[ |x|^2(d - b + p - 2) + (a - by)^2(d - b(p - 1)) \right].\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

**Upper bound on  $u(0, y)$ :**

Let  $b = \frac{d}{p-1}$  so that  $d - b + p - 2 < 0$  for  $1 < p < 2$ . Then  $\Delta_p w < 0$  in (4.4).

Moreover, for  $a = \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}} = \sqrt{b}$  and  $y_1 = \sqrt{\frac{p-1}{d}}$ , we have

- $w(x, y_1) \geq w(0, y_1) = 1;$
- $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} w(x, y) \geq w(x, 0) = 1 \\ \text{if } |x| = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq y \leq y_1 \end{array} \right\}.$

Thus  $w \geq u$  on  $\partial Q_1$  where

$$Q_1 = \{(x, y) \in Q \mid y \leq y_1\}.$$

Since  $w$  is  $p$ -superharmonic, we conclude that  $u \leq w$  on  $Q_1$ . In particular,

$$y \leq \sqrt{\frac{p-1}{d}} \implies u(0, y) \leq ay = y\sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}}.$$

**Lower bound on  $u(0, y)$ :**

Let  $y_k = k\sqrt{\frac{p-1}{d}}$  and  $b = \frac{d}{2(p-1)}$ .

For  $\Delta_p w \geq 0$  it suffices by (4.4) that

$$b \leq \frac{d}{2}(a - by)^2.\tag{4.5}$$

For (4.5) to hold in  $Q_k = \{(x, y) \in Q \mid y \leq y_k\}$  we need

$$\frac{1}{p-1} \leq (a - by_k)^2,$$

that is,

$$a \geq by_k + (p-1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{k\sqrt{d} + 2}{2\sqrt{p-1}}.\tag{4.6}$$

Let  $a_k = \frac{(k+2)\sqrt{d}}{2\sqrt{p-1}}$  so that  $\frac{a_k}{b} = (k+2)\sqrt{\frac{p-1}{d}} = y_{k+2}$ .

Then

$$f(x, y) = \frac{b \cdot (y - y_{k+2})^2 + 1 - |x|^2}{b \cdot y_{k+2}^2}$$

satisfies  $f(x, 0) \geq 1$  when  $|x| \leq 1$  and  $f(x, y) \geq 0$  in  $Q$ .

Thus

$$1 - f(x, y) = \frac{2b \cdot y \cdot y_{k+2} - by^2 - 1 + |x|^2}{b \cdot y_{k+2}^2} = \frac{b \cdot (2a_k \cdot y - by^2 + |x|^2 - 1)}{a_k^2}$$

satisfies  $1 - f(x, 0) \leq 0$  and  $1 - f(x, y) \leq 1$  on  $\partial Q_k$ , where recall

$$Q_k = \{(x, y) \mid y \leq y_k\}.$$

Since  $a_k$  satisfies (4.6), we have

$$\Delta_p(1 - f) \geq 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Define  $m_k = \min\{u(x, y_k) \mid |x| \leq 1\}$ . Then  $m_k \cdot (1 - f) \leq u$  on  $\partial Q_k$  which implies that  $m_k \cdot (1 - f) \leq u$  on  $Q_k$ .

In particular,

$$|x| \leq 1 \implies u(x, y_{k-1}) \geq m_k \cdot [1 - f(x, y_{k-1})]. \quad (4.8)$$

Observe that

$$f(x, y_{k-1}) \leq \frac{2b \left(3\sqrt{\frac{p-1}{d}}\right)^2 + 2}{2b \cdot y_{k+2}^2} = \frac{11}{(k+2)^2}. \quad (4.9)$$

Thus by (4.9)

$$m_{k-1} \geq m_k \left(1 - \frac{11}{(k+2)^2}\right) \text{ for all } k \geq 2. \quad (4.10)$$

Therefore

$$m_k \geq \prod_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{11}{(\ell+2)^2}\right) \geq 1 - \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{11}{(\ell+1)(\ell+2)} = 1 - \frac{11}{k+2}.$$

In particular,  $m_{20} \geq 1/2$ .

Finally, observe that  $u(x, y) \geq \frac{m_k}{y_k} y$  on  $\partial Q_k$ , so  $u(x, y) \geq \frac{m_k y}{y_k}$  on  $Q_k$ . This implies that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{40} \sqrt{\frac{d}{p-1}} \cdot y \text{ for } (x, y) \in Q_{20} \\ u(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ for } (x, y) \in Q \setminus Q_{20} \end{array} \right\}.$$

□

*Remark 4.5.* Since

$$\prod_{\ell=7}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{11}{(\ell+2)^2}\right) = 0.2651 \dots \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

the constant  $\frac{1}{40}$  can be improved to  $\frac{1}{24}$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research of Y. Peres and H. Wang is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China RFIS grant (No. W2531011). In addition, the research of H. Wang is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12595284, 12595280).

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. DiBenedetto.  $C^{1+\alpha}$  local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 7(8):827–850, 1983.
- [2] L. C. Evans. A new proof of local  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity for solutions of certain degenerate elliptic p.d.e. *J. Differential Equations*, 45(3):356–373, 1982.
- [3] J. Heinonen, T. Kilpeläinen, and O. Martio. *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1993. Oxford Science Publications.
- [4] E. Hopf. A remark on linear elliptic differential equations of second order. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3:791–793, 1952.
- [5] L. Jin and Y. Li. A hopf’s lemma and the boundary regularity for the fractional p-laplacian, 2017.
- [6] J. L. Lewis. Regularity of the derivatives of solutions to certain degenerate elliptic equations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 32(6):849–858, 1983.
- [7] G. M. Lieberman. Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 12(11):1203–1219, 1988.
- [8] P. Lindqvist. *Notes on the stationary p-Laplace equation*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [9] P. Ochoa and A. Salort. Hopf’s lemmas and boundary point results for the fractional p-laplacian, 2024.
- [10] Y. Peres and S. Sheffield. Tug-of-war with noise: a game-theoretic view of the p-Laplacian. *Duke Math. J.*, 145(1):91–120, 2008.
- [11] Y. Peres and H. Wang. Harnack inequality for p-harmonic functions: improved dimension dependence via tug of war, 2026.
- [12] P. Pucci and J. Serrin. *The maximum principle*, volume 73 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.
- [13] P. Tolksdorf. On the dirichletproblem for quasilinear equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 8(7):773–817, 1983.
- [14] P. Tolksdorf. Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 51(1):126–150, 1984.
- [15] K. Uhlenbeck. Regularity for a class of non-linear elliptic systems. *Acta Math.*, 138(3-4):219–240, 1977.
- [16] N. N. Ural’ ceva. Degenerate quasilinear elliptic systems. *Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 7:184–222, 1968.

Y. PERES, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS, BEIJING, CHINA

*Email address:* yperes@bimsa.cn

H. WANG, QIUZHEN COLLEGE, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA

*Email address:* wanghan21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn