

5. IMPROVED REGULARITY

Proposition ?? establishes the existence of a weak solution, which further belongs to the regularity class

$$(u, \theta) \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\beta}(\bar{U}) \times \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\bar{U}).$$

We notice that, were we given a solution in $W_0^{1,p(\cdot)}(U) \times \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}(\bar{U})$, elliptic regularity theory and Lemma ?? would lead to the same levels of regularity. In this section, we make this assumption to improve the regularity for θ .

The tangential analysis methods we will use operate in two distinct layers: they first finely combine stability and compactness for solutions and then localize the analysis through a scaling argument, unveiling the geometric properties of the problem. Accordingly, we proceed by producing an approximation result for the solutions to (??).

Proposition 5.1 (Approximation Lemma). *Suppose A??-A?? are in force and let*

$$(u, \theta) \in W_0^{1,p(\cdot)}(U) \times \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}(\bar{U})$$

be a solution to (??). Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, if

$$\|\lambda\|_{L^\infty(U)} < \delta,$$

then there exists a harmonic function $h \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(U)$ satisfying

$$\|\theta - h\|_{L^\infty(U)} < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. We argue by a contradiction argument; suppose the statement of the Proposition is false. Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and sequences of functions $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\|\lambda_n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}\left(|Du_n|^{\sigma(\theta_n(x))-2} Du_n\right) = f & \text{in } U \\ -\Delta\theta_n = \lambda_n(\theta_n)|Du_n|^{\sigma(\theta_n)} & \text{in } U, \end{cases}$$

but

$$\|\theta_n - h\|_{L^\infty(U)} > \varepsilon_0,$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(U)$ harmonic.