# On the boundary behavior of solutions to a class of elliptic partial differential equations 
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1. The object of this paper is to investigate the behavior at the boundary of solutions to the uniformly elliptic, semi-linear equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
a^{i j}(X) u_{i j}(X)=F\left(X, u, u_{i}, u_{i j}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a^{i j}$ are continuous or Hölder continuous and $F$ satisfies

$$
\left|F\left(X, u, u_{i}, u_{i j}\right)\right| \leqslant \frac{\beta(\delta(X))}{\delta^{2}(X)}+\frac{\alpha(\delta(X))}{\delta^{2}(X)}|u|+\frac{\alpha(\delta(X))}{\delta(X)}\left|u_{i}\right|+\alpha(\delta(X))\left|u_{i j}\right| .
$$

Here $\delta(X)$ denotes the distance from $X$ to the boundary, and $\beta(t)$ and $\alpha(t)$ are functions which in most of the cases considered tend to zero with a prescribed speed, as $t \searrow 0$.

In particular our results are valid for the linear equation

$$
a^{i j} u_{i j}+b^{i} u_{i}+c u=f
$$

if $b^{i}, c$, and $f$ satisfy corresponding inequalities.
An important feature of this class of equations is that, in a certain sense, it is invariant under mappings between Liapunov regions, and this makes it possible to get results e.g. about harmonic functions in Liapunov regions which have been obtained earlier by different methods. For these results see Keldyš and Lavrent'ev [13], and Widman [27]. It may be noted that all the results of [27] are contained in this paper.

Section 2 and 3 contain basic assumptions and definitions, and some lemmata of various types, respectively.

Section 4 contains theorems assuring the finiteness of weighted integrals of derivatives of solutions, given some information about the integrability of the solution itself. These theorems are formulated for quite general regions. Specializing to the case of a half space, some other estimates of derivatives and integrals of derivatives are given. Finally we prove two theorems on solutions in cones, at least one of which is previously known for the case of harmonic functions. As a corollary we get a generalization of a theorem by Wallin.

In Section 5 we give the generalization to solutions of (1.1) of the theorem that a positive harmonic function in the unit disc belongs to the Hardy class $H^{1}$.

Section 6 contains results on the boundary behavior of Green potentials, one of which is needed in the sequel.

Section 7 contains theorems on the existence and type of assumption of boundary values of solutions of (1.1). Apart from the case of harmonic functions results in this direction have earlier been obtained by Łojasiewicz [16] and implicitely by Serrin [19].

Section 8 finally gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of boundary values to a solution of (I.1). In the case of harmonic functions, this theorem can be found in [22].
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2. We place ourselves in $R^{n}$, the points of which are denoted by $X, Y, \ldots, X=$ $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ etc., $|X-Y|^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-y_{i}\right)^{2}$. Points of $R^{n-1}$ will often be denoted by $X^{\prime}, Y^{\prime}$, and often $X^{\prime}$ will be the orthogonal projection of $X$ on $R^{n-1}$. In general our methods will be applicable in $R^{n}$ for $n \geqslant 2$, but since there are often special methods from the theory of generalized analytic functions available in the plane, see e.g. Vekua [24], and since some minor complications arise from the logaritmic singularity of the fundamental solution of the Laplacian in this case, we will concentrate on $R^{n}$ with $n \geqslant 3$. Integrals over $n$-dimensional regions will be denoted by $\iint(\cdot) d X$, over $n$-1-dimensional surfaces by $\int(\cdot) d S, d S$ being the surface element. $\int(\cdot) d X_{(i)}$ can be interpreted as $\int(\cdot) \cos \gamma_{i} d S$, where $\cos \gamma_{i}$ is the scalar product of the $i$ th unit vector and the normalized outer normal of the surface.

By a Liapunor surface we mean a closed, bounded $n$-1-dimensional surface $S$ satisfying the following conditions:
$1^{\circ}$ At every point of $S$ there exists a uniquely defined tangent (hyper-)plane, and thus also a normal.
$2^{\circ}$ There exist two constants $C>0$ and $\gamma, 0<\gamma \leqslant 1$, such that if $\theta$ is the angle between two normals, and $r$ is the distance between their foot points, then the inequality $\theta<C \cdot r \gamma$ holds.
$3^{\circ}$ There is a constant $\varrho>0$ such that if $\Sigma_{e}$ is a sphere with radius $\varrho$ and center $X_{0} \in S$, a line parallel to the normal at $X_{0}$ meets $S$ at most once inside $\Sigma_{e}$.
For the properties of Liapunov surfaces in $R^{3}$, see Gunther [10]. It is easy to see that the simple facts about Liapunov surfaces in $R^{n}$ that we need can be derived in the same way as in [10]. A Liapunov region is a region the boundary of which is a Liapunov surface.

The boundary of any set $D$ will be denoted by $\partial D$, and $\bar{D}$ is the closed hull of $D$. $\delta(X)$ is the distance from $X$ to $\partial D . R_{+}^{n}$ will as usual be the set $\left\{X \mid x_{n}>0\right\} . C^{\infty}(\Omega)$, $C^{m}(\Omega)$ denote the space of infinitely, and $m$ times, continuously differentiable functions in $\Omega$, respectively, and $C^{\gamma}(\bar{\Omega})$ will be the space of Hölder continuous (with exponent $\gamma$ ) functions in $\bar{\Omega}$.

The assumptions on the equation will be
(i) $a^{i j}$ and $F$ are measurable functions of their arguments.
(ii) $a^{i j}$ are defined in $\bar{\Omega}$ and there exists a constant $\lambda>0$, the ellipticity constant, such that

$$
\lambda|\xi|^{2} \leqslant a^{i j}(X) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda}|\xi|^{2}
$$

for all $X \in \Omega$ and all vectors $\xi=\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \ldots, \xi_{n}\right) \neq 0$.
(iii) $a^{i j}=a^{j i}$. We also assume $\operatorname{det}\left(a^{i j}\right)=1$, which is no further restriction.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|a^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}(Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \alpha(|X-Y|), X \in \partial \Omega, Y \in \bar{\Omega} \tag{iv}
\end{equation*}
$$

(iv) ${ }^{\prime}$

$$
\left|a^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}(Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \alpha(|X-Y|), X, Y \in \bar{\Omega} .
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
=|f(X)| & +\delta^{-1}(X) \cdot \alpha(\delta(X))\left|u_{i}\right|+\delta^{-2}(X) \cdot \alpha(\delta(X))|u|  \tag{v}\\
& +\alpha(\delta(X))\left|u_{i j}\right| . \\
|f(X)| & \leqslant K \cdot \delta^{-2}(X) \cdot \beta(\delta(X)) . \tag{vi}
\end{align*}
$$

We shall work with three types of equations:
(A): where we assume (i)-(vi) with $\alpha(t)$ satisfying $\lim _{t \rightarrow+0} \alpha(t)=0$ and $\beta(t)$ bounded;
(B): (i)-(vi) with $\alpha(t)=t^{\alpha}, \alpha>0, \beta(t)$ nondecreasing and satisfying $\int_{0}^{1}(\beta(t) / t) d t<\infty$;
(C): where we assume the same as in (B) and in addition (iv)' and that $F$ is independent of $u_{i j}$.
When we say that $u$ is a solution of (1.1 A) we mean that $u$ is a solution of the equation (1.1), about which we assume the conditions A, etc.

With a solution of (1.1) in a general region $\Omega$, we mean a function $u$ belonging to $C^{2}(\Omega)$, and satisfying (1.1) almost everywhere. When we work with solutions in $R_{+}^{n}$, or parts thereof, we can allow a weaker concept of solution; $u$ is a solution of (1.1) in $R_{+}^{n}$ if $u$ has distributional derivatives of order $\leqslant 2$ which are locally bounded functions, and satisfies (1.1) almost everywhere. In some of the theorems it is even sufficient to assume the second derivatives to be in $L^{p}$ locally, for some $p>n$. Although we shall not stress this point, we note that it is well known, see e.g. [8], that in both these cases the first derivatives of $u$ are continuous functions which are locally absolutely continuous on all straight lines parallel to one of the coordinate axis except those issuing from a set of $n$-1-dimensional Lebesgue measure zero on the orthogonal hyperplane.

In the case of ( 1.1 B and C ) we will often have occasion to rewrite the equation in regular regions $\Omega$. To that effect we use Lemma 3.9 to extend the functions $a^{i j}(X)$ on $\partial \Omega$, into $\Omega$ in such a way that the new functions $\bar{a}^{i j}$ satisfy

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tilde{a}^{i j} \in C^{\infty o}(\Omega), \quad \bar{a}^{i j} \in C^{\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}), \quad \bar{a}^{i j}=a^{i j} \text { on } \partial \Omega, \\
\left|\operatorname{grad} \bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \delta^{\alpha-1}(X) .
\end{gathered}
$$

The Hölder constant and $K$ will not depend on $\Omega$, which is seen from Lemma 3.9. A solution $u(X)$ of (1.1) will then also be a solution of the equation

$$
\bar{a}^{i j}(X) u_{i j}(X)=F\left(X, u, u_{i}, u_{i j}\right)+\left[\bar{a}^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j} .
$$

$H^{p}, 1 \leqslant p \leqslant \infty$, will be the class of solutions $u$ of (1.1) in $R_{+}^{n}$, satisfying

$$
\sup _{0<x_{n}<1} \int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant Q}\left|u\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)\right|^{p} d X^{\prime}<\infty, \quad p<\infty
$$

and

$$
\underset{|X| \leqslant \varrho}{\operatorname{esssup}}|u(X)|<\infty, \quad p=\infty
$$

respectively, for every $\varrho=0$.

When $X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$ and $h>0$ we shall denote by $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ the truncated cone

$$
\left\{Y \mid y_{n}^{2} \geqslant h^{2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(y_{i}-x_{i}\right)^{2}, 0<y_{n}<1\right\},
$$

and when $X_{0} \in \partial \Omega \quad V_{h}\left(X_{0}\right)$ will be a cone congruent to $V_{h}(O)$, with axis along the inner normal to $\partial \Omega$ at $X_{0}$, the normal always assumed to exist in case we use this notation, and with the convention that we truncate the cone more, if necessary, in order that $V_{h}\left(X_{0}\right)$ lie inside $\Omega$. If $F \subset R^{n-1}$ we define

$$
W_{h}(F)=\bigcup_{X^{\prime} \in F} V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right) .
$$

With some obvious exceptions, subindices denote differentiation.
The summation convention is used freely. We shall also use the convention that when the summation convention does not apply, $u_{i}$ and $u_{i j}$ are vectors in $R^{n}$ and $R^{n^{2}}$, i.e. $u_{i}$ is the gradient vector, and $\left|u_{i}\right|$ and $\left|u_{i j}\right|$ are the respective Euclidean norms.
$K$ will denote a generic constant which constantly changes its value. If doubtful, we shall try to indicate the important variables on which $K$ does or does not depend.

## 3. Lemmata

Lemma 3.1. Let $D$ be any bounded, open region in $R^{n}$, and let $\{S\}$ be the set of spheres $S=S(X, \delta(X) / 4)$ with center $X$ and radius $\delta(X) / 4, \delta(X)$ being the distance from $X$ to $\partial D$. Then there exists a denumerable sequence of spheres $\left\{S_{\nu}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}, S_{\nu}=S\left(X_{\nu}, \delta\left(X_{\nu}\right) / 4\right)$ with the property that $\cup S_{\nu}=D$ and such that every point of $D$ is inside at most $K(n)$ of the spheres $\left\{S_{\nu}^{\prime}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}, S_{v}^{\prime}=S\left(X_{\nu}, 3 \delta\left(X_{\nu}\right) / 4\right)$. $K(n)$ depends only on $n$.

Remark. From the proof follows a crude upper bound of $K(n): K(n) \leqslant(343 / 3)^{n}$.
Proof. It is sufficient to consider connected regions $D$. We use the following lemma of Aronszajn and Smith [1], p. 162: It is possible to find a sequence $S_{\nu}$ such that $\cup S_{\nu}=\Omega$ and such that the spheres $S_{v}^{\prime \prime}=S\left(X_{\nu}, \delta\left(X_{\nu}\right) / 16\right)$ are pairwise disjoint.

Now let $X_{0}$ be any point of $D$. A sphere $S_{v}^{\prime}$ containing $X_{0}$ has radius $\leqslant 4 \delta\left(X_{0}\right)$. This implies that the corresponding $S_{v}^{\prime \prime}$ lies in a sphere with center $X_{0}$ and radius $49 \delta\left(X_{0}\right) / 12$, i.e. all the $S_{\nu}^{\prime \prime}$ of this type cover a region of volume $\leqslant \omega_{n} \cdot(49 / 12)^{n} \cdot \delta^{n}\left(X_{0}\right)$. On the other hand, $S_{v}^{\prime}$ may not have radius $<3 \delta\left(X_{0}\right) / 7$ if it is to contain $X_{0}$, i.e. the corresponding $S_{v}^{\prime \prime}$ has radius $\geqslant \delta\left(X_{0}\right) / 28$. Since the $S_{v}^{\prime \prime \prime}$ are pairwise disjoint we get

$$
K \cdot \omega_{n}\left(\frac{\delta\left(X_{0}\right)}{28}\right)^{n} \leqslant \omega_{n}\left(\frac{\delta\left(X_{0}\right) \cdot 49}{12}\right)^{n}
$$

if $K$ is the number of spheres $S_{v}^{\prime}$ containing $X_{0}$. Hence $K \leqslant(343 / 3)^{n}$.
The following two lemmata are essentially contained in Stein [22].
Lemma 3.2. Assume $f$ is measurable, locally bounded in $R_{+}^{n}$ and such that

$$
\iint_{W_{k}(E)}|f| d X<\infty
$$

for some measurable set $E \subset R^{n-1}$. Then

$$
\iint_{V_{k}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{1-n}|f| d X<\infty
$$

for all $k>0$ and almost all $X^{\prime} \in E$.
Lemma 3.3. Assume $f$ is measurable, locally bounded in $R_{+}^{n}$ and such that

$$
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}|f| d X<\infty
$$

for $X^{\prime}$ belonging to some bounded measurable set $E \subset R^{n-1}$, and where $h$ may vary with $X^{\prime}$. Then to every $\varepsilon>0$ and every $k>0$ there is a closed set $F \subset E, \operatorname{mes}(E-F)<\varepsilon$ such that

$$
\iint_{W_{k}(F)} x_{n}^{n-1}|f| d X<\infty
$$

The proof of Lemma 3.3 uses the following Egorov like theorem by Calderón, which we shall use several times. See Lemma 1 in [22].

Lemma 3.4. Let $f(X)$ be locally bounded and measurable in $R_{+}^{n}$. Suppose we are given a bounded, measurable set $E \subset R^{n-1}$ with the following property. Whenever $X_{0}^{\prime} \in E$, $f(X)$ is bounded as $X$ ranges in some cone $V_{h}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)$. (The bound and $h$ may depend on $X_{0}^{\prime}$.) For any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a closed subset $F, F \subset E$ such that
(1) $\operatorname{mes}(E-F)<\varepsilon$,
(2) if $k$ is fixed, $f(X)$ is uniformly bounded in $W_{k}(F)$.

It is also clear that if we assume that $f \rightarrow 0$ as $x_{n} \rightarrow 0$ in $V_{h}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ for every $X_{0}^{\prime} \in E$, with the same method of proof we can find an $F$ such that mes $(E-F)<\varepsilon$ and $f$ tends to zero uniformly in $W_{k}(F)$ when $x_{n} \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 3.5. Let $L=a^{i j} \partial^{2} / \partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}$ be a differential operator with constant coefficients satisfying $|\xi|^{2} \lambda \leqslant a^{i j} \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \leqslant 1 / \lambda|\xi|^{2}$ for all $\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \ldots, \xi_{n}\right) \neq 0$, and let $\operatorname{det}\left(a^{i j}\right)=1$. If $G(X, Y)$ is the Green function of $L$ in $R_{+}^{n}$, then $G$ satisfies the following inequalities:

$$
\begin{gather*}
G(X, Y) \leqslant K \cdot|X-Y|^{2-n}  \tag{i}\\
G(X, Y) \leqslant K \cdot \frac{x_{n} \cdot y_{n}}{|X-Y|^{n}},  \tag{ii}\\
\left|G_{x_{i}}(X, Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot|X-Y|^{1-n}  \tag{iii}\\
\left|G_{x_{i}}(X, Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \frac{y_{n}}{|X-Y|^{n}},  \tag{iv}\\
\left|G_{x_{i} x_{j}}(X, Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \frac{y_{n}}{|X-Y|^{n+1}}, \tag{v}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $K$ depends on $n$ and $\lambda$ only.
Proof. Let $A$ be the matrix ( $a^{i j}$ ) and define $B$ by $B \cdot B=A$. By the coordinate transformation $X^{\prime}=X B^{-1}, L$ is transformed into the Laplace operator $\Delta$, i.e.
$G^{\prime}\left(X^{\prime}, Y^{\prime}\right)=G\left(X^{\prime} B, Y^{\prime} B\right)$ is the Green function of $\Delta$ in some region, the boundary of which is a hyperplane.

The corresponding inequalities for $G^{\prime}$, i.e. where $x_{n}$ and $y_{n}$ are replaced by $\delta(X)$ and $\delta(Y)$ respectively, are either well known or easy to derive, since we know $G^{\prime}$ explicitly. Here $K$ depends on $n$ only. Now (i)-(v) follow easily, since the dilation of distance is bounded above and below with $1 / \lambda$ and $\lambda$.

Lemma 3.6. Let $L$ be the differential operator of Lemma 3.5, and let $G(X, Y)$ be the Green function of $L$ for the sphere $|X| \leqslant \varrho$. Then

$$
\begin{gather*}
|G(X, Y)| \leqslant K \cdot|X-Y|^{2-n}  \tag{i}\\
\left|\operatorname{grad}_{X} G(X, Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot|X-Y|^{1-n} \tag{ii}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $|X|,|Y| \leqslant \varrho$, and

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{i}} \operatorname{grad}_{X} G(X, Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \varrho^{-n},  \tag{iii}\\
\left|\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial y_{i} \partial y_{j}} \operatorname{grad}_{X} G(X, Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \varrho^{-n-1}, \tag{iv}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $|Y| \leqslant \varrho / 2,|X|=\varrho$, where $K$ depends on $\lambda$ and $n$ only.
Proof. The inequalities are evidently true for $\varrho=1$ (cf. the proof of Lemma 3.5), and the general case follows with a homothety.

Lemma 3.7. Let $D$ be an open bounded region, and let $X_{0}$ and $X_{0}^{*}$ be arbitrary points in $D$ and $\bar{D}$ respectively. Put $l=\delta\left(X_{0}\right) / 4$ and let $p>1$. Then the following inequalities hold for any solution of (1.1) in $D$.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l} \delta^{p}(X)\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant  \tag{i}\\
& \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l} \delta^{2 p}(X)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant  \tag{ii}\\
& \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K \cdot \int_{\left|X-x_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}\left\{|u|^{p+n p}+\delta^{2 p}(X)\left[|F|^{p}+\left|h^{*}\right|^{p}\right]\right\} d X,  \tag{iii}\\
& \left.\quad+K \iint_{\left|X-x_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|u| d X\right]^{p} \\
& \quad \int_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l} \delta^{2 p}(X)\left\{|F|^{p}+\left|h^{*}\right|^{p}\right\} d X,
\end{align*}
$$

where $h^{*}=\left[a^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{*}\right)\right] u_{i j}$ and where $K$ does not depend on $u, X_{0}$, or $X_{0}^{*}$.
Proof. We rewrite the equation (1.1):

$$
a^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{*}\right) u_{i j}=F+h^{*} .
$$

According to a well-known formula, almost everywhere

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega_{n} u(Y)=\int_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant \varrho} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v_{X}}(X, Y) u(X) d S_{X}+\iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant e} G(X, Y)\left\{F+h^{*}\right\} d X=v_{1}^{o}+v_{2}^{o}, \tag{3.7.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $2 l \leqslant \varrho \leqslant 3 l, G$ is the Green function of $L=a^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{*}\right) \partial^{2} / \partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}$ in $|X| \leqslant \varrho$ and $\partial / \partial v$ denotes the corresponding co-normal derivative. We observe that the formula is valid because $u$ and $u_{i}$ are absolutely continuous on almost every line parallel to one of the coordinate axis, and thus partial integration is allowed. Now using Lemma 3.6,

$$
\left|\frac{\partial v_{1}^{o}}{\partial y_{k}}(Y)\right|^{p} \leqslant\left[K \cdot \varrho^{-n} \int_{\left|X-X_{0}\right|=e}|u| d S_{X}\right]^{p} \leqslant K \cdot l^{1-p-n} \int_{\left|X-X_{0}\right|=\varrho}|u|^{p} d S
$$

from which follows

$$
\iint_{\left|Y-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l}\left|\frac{\partial v_{1}^{o}}{\partial y_{k}}(Y)\right|^{p} \delta^{p}(Y) d Y \leqslant K \cdot l \cdot \int_{\left|X-X_{0}\right|=\varrho}|u|^{p} d S .
$$

On the other hand, also by Lemma 3.5

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{\partial v_{2}^{o}}{\partial y_{k}}(Y)\right|^{p}=\left|\iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant \rho} G_{y_{k}}(X, Y)\left[F+h^{*}\right] d X\right|^{p} \\
& \quad \leqslant K \cdot\left[\iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|X-Y|^{\gamma-n} d X\right]^{p-1}\left[\iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|Y-X|^{p-\gamma p+\gamma-n}\left|F+h^{*}\right|^{p} d X\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

or

$$
\iint_{\left|Y-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l}\left|\frac{\partial v_{2}^{\varrho}}{\partial y_{k}}(Y)\right|^{p} \delta^{p}(Y) d Y \leqslant K \cdot l^{2 p} \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}\left|F+h^{*}\right|^{p} d X
$$

Adding, integrating with respect to $\varrho$ from $2 l$ to $3 l$ and dividing by $l$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\left|Y-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l} \delta^{p}(Y)\left|u_{i}(Y)\right|^{p} d Y \\
& \quad \leqslant K \cdot \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|u|^{p} d X+K \cdot l^{2 p} \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}\left\{|F|^{p}+\left|h^{*}\right|^{p}\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to (i).
To prove (ii) we use the same method as above to get

$$
\iint_{\left|Y-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l} \delta^{2 p}(Y)\left|\frac{\partial^{2} v_{1}^{\varrho}}{\partial y_{k} \partial y_{m}}(Y)\right|^{v} d Y \leqslant K \cdot l \cdot \int_{\left|X-X_{0}\right|=Q}|u|^{p} d S .
$$

Now

$$
\frac{\partial^{2} G}{\partial y_{k} \partial y_{m}}(X, Y)=K(X, Y)+L(X, Y)
$$

where $K$ is a Calderón-Zygmund type kernel [6] and $L(X, Y)$ satisfies $\mid L(X, Y) \leqslant$ $K \cdot l^{-n}$ for $\left|Y-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l$. We use the well-known Calderón-Zygmund theory from [6] to conclude that

$$
\frac{\partial^{2} v_{2}^{\varrho}}{\partial y_{k} \partial y_{m}}(Y)=\iint_{\left|X-x_{0}\right| \leqslant \rho} \frac{\partial^{2} G}{\partial y_{k} \partial y_{m}}(X, Y)\left[F+h^{*}\right] d X
$$

exists almost everywhere and that
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\left|Y-X_{0}\right| \leqslant l}\left|\frac{\partial^{2} v_{2}^{o}}{\partial y_{k} \partial y_{m}}(Y)\right|^{p} d Y \\
& \leqslant \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}\left|F+h^{*}\right|^{p} d X+K \cdot l^{-n(p-1)+n(p-1)} \cdot \iint_{\left|X-Y_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}\left|F+h^{*}\right|^{p} d X .
\end{aligned}
$$

After multiplication by $l^{2 p}$, adding, integrating with respect to $\varrho$, and dividing by $l$, (ii) follows.

Finally, still by Lemma 3.6 (ii) and (iv)

$$
|u(Y)| \leqslant K \cdot \varrho^{1-n} \int_{\left|X-X_{0}\right|=\varrho}|u| d S+K \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|X-Y|^{2-n}\left|F+h^{*}\right| d X
$$

and after integration with respect to $\varrho$ between $2 l$ and $3 l$

$$
|u(Y)| \leqslant K \cdot l^{-n} \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|u| d X+K \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|X-Y|^{2-n}\left|F+h^{*}\right| d X
$$

By Hölder's and Minkowski's inequalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\left|X-x_{0}\right| \leqslant l}|u(Y)|^{p} d Y \\
& \quad \leqslant K \cdot l^{n-n p}\left[\iint_{\left|X-x_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l}|u| d X\right]^{p}+K \cdot \iint_{\left|X-X_{0}\right| \leqslant 3 l} \delta^{2 p}(X)\left|F+h^{*}\right|^{p} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

which proves (iii).
Lemma 3.8. Assume $f \in L^{1}\left(R^{n}\right)$. Then for every $i, i=1, \ldots, n-1$, and every $\gamma>0$

$$
\iint_{R^{n}}\left|x_{i}-t\right|^{\gamma-1}|f(X)| d X
$$

is finite for almost every $t \in R^{1}$.
Proof. Obvious by Fubini's theorem.
We need the following modification of the Whitney extension theorem. ${ }^{1}$ We temporarily change the notation and put $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right) \alpha_{i}$ non-negative integers, $|\alpha|=\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}+\ldots+\alpha_{n}$,

$$
D^{(\alpha)} f=f^{(\alpha)}=\frac{\hat{\partial}^{|\alpha|} f}{\partial x_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \partial x_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \ldots \partial x_{n}^{\alpha_{n}}} .
$$

Lemma 3.9. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a compact set in $R^{n}$ and let $f \in C^{l}$ in $R^{n}$. Assume also

$$
\left|f^{(\alpha)}(X)-f^{(\alpha)}(Y)\right| \leqslant \omega(|X-Y|), \quad|\alpha|=l
$$

where $\omega(t)$ is a non-decreasing function, $\lim _{t \rightarrow+0} \omega(t)=0$, satistying $\omega(2 t) \leqslant 2 \cdot \omega(t$. $)$ Then there exists a function $\Phi(X)$ with the following properties

[^0]$1^{\circ} \quad \Phi(X) \in C^{\infty}, \quad X \notin \mathcal{A}$,
$2^{\circ} \Phi(X) \in C^{l}\left(R^{n}\right)$,
$3^{\circ} \quad \Phi^{(\alpha)}(X)=f^{(\alpha)}(X), \quad X \in \mathcal{A}, \quad|\alpha| \leqslant l$,
$4^{0} \quad\left|\Phi^{(\alpha)}(X)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \delta^{-1}(X) \cdot \omega(\delta(X)), \quad|\alpha|=l+1, \quad|X| \leqslant \varrho$,
$5^{\circ} \quad\left|\Phi^{(\alpha)}(X)-\Phi^{(\alpha)}(Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \omega(|X-Y|), \quad|\alpha|=l, \quad|X|,|Y| \leqslant \varrho$,
where $\delta(X)$ denotes the distance to $\mathcal{A}$ and $K$ depends on $n, \varrho, l$ and $\omega$ only.
Proof. We follow the presentation of Whitney's extension theorem in Hörmander [12]. By Lemma 3 of that paper there is a sequence of functions $\varphi_{j} \in C_{0}^{\infty}$ with support in the complement of $\mathcal{A}$ with the following properties.
$\varphi_{j}(X) \geqslant 0, \quad \Sigma_{j} \varphi_{j}=1, \quad X \notin \mathcal{A}$.
A compact set in $C A$ intersects only a finite number of the support of $\varphi_{j}$.
$\Sigma_{j}\left|\varphi_{j}^{(\alpha)}(X)\right| \leqslant C_{\alpha}\left(\delta^{-|\alpha|}(X)+1\right)$, where $C_{\alpha}$ is independent of $\mathcal{A}$.
There is a constant $C$ independent of $j$ and $\mathcal{A}$ such that the diameter of the support of $\varphi_{j}$ is $\leqslant C$ times the distance to $\mathcal{A}$.

If $X^{*}$ is a point of $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying $\delta(X)=\left|X-X^{*}\right|$ and $X^{j}$ is any fixed point in the support of $\varphi_{j}$, we define $\Phi$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi(X)=\sum_{j} \varphi_{j}(X) f_{l}\left(X, X^{j}\right)=f_{l}\left(X, X^{*}\right)+\sum_{j} \varphi_{j}(X)\left\{f_{l}\left(X, X^{j}\right)-f_{l}\left(X, X^{*}\right)\right\}, \quad X \notin \mathcal{A}, \\
& \Phi(X)=f(X), \quad x \in \mathcal{A}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $f_{l}(X, Y)$ is the Taylor expansion of order $l$ at $Y$;

$$
f(X)=f_{l}(X, Y)+R_{l}(X, Y)
$$

Our assumptions about $f$ imply

$$
\left|R_{l}^{(\alpha)}(X, Y)\right| \leqslant \frac{|X-Y|^{2-|\alpha|}}{(l-|\alpha|)!} \omega(|X-Y|), \quad|\alpha| \leqslant l .
$$

Taking $|\alpha|=l+1$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi^{(\alpha)}(X) & =\sum_{\substack{\beta+\eta-\alpha \\
|\beta|>0}} \sum_{j} \varphi_{j}^{(\beta)}\left\{f_{l}^{(\eta)}\left(X, X^{j}\right)-f_{l}^{(n)}\left(X, X^{*}\right)\right\} \\
& =\sum_{\beta, \eta} \sum_{j} \varphi_{j}^{(\beta)}\left\{R_{l}^{(\eta)}\left(X, X^{j}\right)-R_{l}^{(\eta)}\left(X, X^{*}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies, using that $\left|X-X^{j}\right| \leqslant(C+1) \delta(X)$ if $X$ is in the support of $\varphi_{j}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\Phi^{(\alpha)}(X)\right| & \leqslant \sum_{\beta, \eta} \sum_{j}\left|\varphi_{j}^{(\beta)}\right| \cdot K \cdot \delta^{L-|\eta|}(X) \cdot \omega(\delta(X)) \\
& \leqslant K \sum_{\beta, \eta} \delta^{l-|\eta|} \cdot \delta^{-|\beta|} \cdot \omega(\delta) \leqslant K \cdot \delta^{-1}(X) \cdot \omega(\delta(X))
\end{aligned}
$$

and $4^{\circ}$ is proved.
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To prove $5^{\circ}$, first assume that $|X-Y| \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \delta(X)$. Then using $4^{\circ}$, for $|\alpha|=l$,

$$
\left|\Phi^{(\alpha)}(X)-\Phi^{(\alpha)}(Y)\right| \leqslant|X-Y| \cdot \sup \left|\Phi^{(\beta)}(Z)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \omega(|X-Y|)
$$

where the supremum is taken over those $Z$ and $\beta$ for which $|Z-X| \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \delta(X)$ and $|\beta|=|\alpha|+1=l+1$ respectively. On the other hand, if $\delta(X)<2|X-Y|$ we have $\delta(Y) \leqslant 4|X-Y|$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\Phi^{(\alpha)}(X)-f^{(\alpha)}\left(X^{*}\right)\right| \leqslant\left|f_{l}^{(\alpha)}\left(X, X^{*}\right)-f^{(\alpha)}\left(X^{*}\right)\right| \\
& \quad+\sum_{\beta, \eta} \sum_{j}\left|\varphi_{j}^{(\beta)}\right|\left|R_{l}^{(\eta)}\left(X, X^{j}\right)-R_{l}^{(\eta)}\left(X, X^{*}\right)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \omega(\delta(X)) \leqslant K \cdot \omega(|X-Y|) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly,

$$
\left|\Phi^{(\alpha)}(Y)-f^{(\alpha)}\left(Y^{*}\right)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \omega(\delta(Y)) \leqslant K \cdot \omega(|X-Y|)
$$

Since by assumption

$$
\left|f^{(\alpha)}\left(X^{*}\right)-f^{(\alpha)}\left(Y^{*}\right)\right| \leqslant \omega\left(\left|X^{*}-Y^{*}\right|\right) \leqslant K \cdot \omega(|X-Y|)
$$

the lemma follows with the triangle inequality.
Remark. If $\mathcal{A}$ is the boundary of a convex set $\Omega$, say, and $f$ is defined and has the properties required in theorem in $\bar{\Omega}$ only, we can extend $f$ from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\bar{\Omega}$ by using only those $\varphi_{j}$ which have support in $\Omega$.
4. In this section we shall be concerned with the connections between the solution and its derivatives.

Theorem 4.1. If $u(X)$ is a solution of (1.1 A) in an open bounded region $D$ which has the property that

$$
\iint_{D} \delta^{\gamma-1}(X) d X<\infty \quad \text { for all } \quad \gamma>0
$$

then, if $p>1, \gamma>0$, the finiteness of the first of the following integrals implies the finiteness of the two others.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{D} \delta^{\gamma-1}(X)|u(X)|^{p} d X  \tag{4.1.1}\\
& \iint_{D} \delta^{p-1+\gamma}(X)\left|u_{i}(X)\right|^{p} d X  \tag{4.1.2}\\
& \iint_{D} \delta^{2 p-1+\gamma}(X)\left|u_{i j}(X)\right|^{p} d X \tag{4.1.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Remark 1. One important type of permissible regions are those whose boundary admits a local representation satisfying a Lipschitz condition, i.e. to every point $X_{0} \in \partial D$ there is a sphere $\Sigma$ such that the part of $\partial D$ which is inside $\Sigma$ may be represented as $\xi_{n}=\varphi\left(\xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{n-1}\right)$, where the coordinate system ( $\xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{n}$ ) has $X_{0}$ as origin and $\varphi$ satisfies a Lipschitz condition of order one.

Remark 2. If $D$ satisfies the condition of Remark 1, then the finiteness of any one of the integrals (4.1.1-3) implies the finiteness of the two others. This is a consequence of the representation of $u$ (and $u_{i}$ ) as an indefinite integral and the following inequality of Hardy;

$$
\int_{0}^{1} x^{s}\left|\int_{x}^{1} f(t) d t\right|^{p} d x \leqslant\left(\frac{p}{s+1}\right)^{p} \int_{0}^{1} x^{s+p}|f(x)|^{p} d x,
$$

which is valid for $p \geqslant 1$ and $s>-1$, see [11], Theorem 330.
Proof. Consider the region $D_{t}$ defined by

$$
D_{t}=\{X \mid \delta(X)>t\}
$$

where $\delta(X)$ is the boundary distance function of $D$ while $\delta_{t}$ will be that of $D_{i}$.
We shall first prove that there exists a sequence $\left\{t_{i}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}, t_{i} \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$
\iint_{D_{t_{i}}} \delta_{t_{i}}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K<\infty
$$

Suppose there is no such sequence. Then the function

$$
g(t)=\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p} d X
$$

tends to infinity as $t \rightarrow 0$. It is then easy to see that there is a function $\varepsilon_{1}(t) \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0} \frac{\varepsilon_{1}(t)}{t} d t<\infty \\
& \int_{0} \frac{\varepsilon_{1}(t) g(t)}{t} d t=\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

In fact, if $a_{\nu}=\inf g(t)$ where the infimum is taken over $\left(2^{-\nu-1}, 2^{-\nu}\right)$ we can always find a convergent positive series $\Sigma b_{\nu}$ with the property that $\Sigma a_{\nu} b_{\nu}=\infty$, since $a_{\nu} \rightarrow \infty$. Then define $\varepsilon_{1}(t)=b_{\nu}$ for $2^{-\nu-1} \leqslant t<2^{-\nu}$.

Now we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty=\int_{0} \frac{\varepsilon_{1}(t) g(t)}{t} d t \leqslant \iint_{D}|u|^{p} d X \int_{0}^{\delta(X)} \frac{\varepsilon_{1}(t)}{t} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1} d t \\
& \quad \leqslant \iint_{D}|u|^{p}\left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_{1}(t)}{t}|\delta(X)-t|^{\gamma-1} d t\right] d X \leqslant \iint_{D}|u|^{p} \delta^{\gamma-1}(X) d X<\infty,
\end{aligned}
$$

an obvious contradiction.
Choose a covering $\left\{S_{v}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}$ of $D_{t}$ in the sense of Lemma 3.1. Assuming the centers of the spheres in the covering to be $\left\{X_{\nu}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}$, define $X_{v}^{*}$ as one of the points satisfying $X_{\nu}^{*} \in \partial D,\left|X_{\nu}-X_{v}^{*}\right|=\delta\left(X_{\nu}\right)$. Then apply Lemma 3.7 (i) for each $v$ with $X_{0}=X_{\nu}$ and $X_{0}^{*}=X_{\nu}^{*}$. Since $K_{1} l_{\nu} \leqslant \delta_{t}(X) \leqslant K_{2} l_{\nu}$ for $\left|X-X_{\nu}\right| \leqslant 3 l_{\nu}, l_{\nu}=\delta_{t}\left(X_{\nu}\right) / 4$, we get
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\left|X-X_{\nu}\right| \leqslant l_{\nu}} \delta^{p-1+\gamma}(X)\left|u_{v}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K \iint_{\left|X-X_{\nu}\right| \leqslant 3 l_{\nu}} \delta_{t}^{\nu-1}|u|^{p} d X \\
& \quad+K \cdot \iint_{\left|X-X_{\nu}\right| \leqslant 3 l_{\nu}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}(X)\left\{|F|^{p}+\alpha^{p}(\delta(X))\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

Now sum over $\boldsymbol{v}$ on both sides:
$\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p} d X+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left\{|F|^{p}+\alpha^{p}(\delta)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X$.
We have $\left|F^{p}\right| \leqslant K|u|^{p} \delta^{-2 p}(X) \cdot \alpha^{p}(\delta)+K\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} \delta^{-p} \cdot \alpha^{p}(\delta)+K \alpha^{p}(\delta)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}+|t|^{p}$, and since $K$ does not depend on $t$, and $\alpha(\delta)$ tends to zero with $\delta$, we can find some $t^{\prime}$ which is independent of $t$, and is such that $K \cdot \alpha^{p}(\delta(X))<\frac{1}{2}$ if $\delta(X)<t^{\prime}$. Then if $t<t^{\prime} / 2$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K \cdot \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma} \delta^{-p} \alpha^{p}(\delta)\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \iint_{D_{t} \cap\left(\delta \leqslant t^{\prime}\right\}} \delta_{t}^{p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \\
& \quad+K \iint_{D_{t} \cap\left\{\delta>t^{\prime}\right\}} \delta_{t^{\prime} / 2}^{p-1+\gamma} \delta^{-p} \alpha^{p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X+K\left(t^{\prime}\right)=I_{1}+I_{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If we combine this inequality with (4.1.4) and move $I_{1}$ to the left hand side in the resulting inequality, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1+p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(t^{\prime}\right)+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p}+\delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left\{\alpha^{p}(\delta)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}+|f|^{p}\right\} d X, \tag{4.1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K\left(t^{\prime}\right)$ depends on $u_{i}$ and $t^{\prime}$, but not on $t$, and $K$ does not depend on $u, t$, or $t^{\prime}$. Now use Lemma 3.7 (ii) in the same way as above to get

$$
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p} d X+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left\{|F|^{p}+\alpha^{p}(\delta)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X
$$

in which we use (4.1.5):

$$
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(t^{\prime}\right)+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p} d X+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left\{|f|^{p}+\alpha^{p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X
$$

We choose $t^{\prime \prime}$ such that $K \cdot \alpha^{p}(\delta(X))<\frac{1}{2}$ when $\delta(X)<t^{\prime \prime}$ and get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(t^{\prime \prime}\right)+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p} d X+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}|f|^{p} d X \tag{4.1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we put $t=t_{\nu}$ and let $v \rightarrow \infty$, (4.1.6) implies that (4.1.3) is finite, with Fatou's lemma, since it is easy to see that

$$
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}|f|^{p} d X \leqslant K<\infty
$$

The finiteness of (4.1.2) follows from (4.1.5) and (4.1.6). The theorem is proved.

Corollary 4.2. If $u \in H^{p}, p>1$, then

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{p+1-\gamma}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X<\infty  \tag{4.2.1}\\
& \iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X<\infty \tag{4.2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

for every bounded subdomain $\Omega$ of $R_{+}^{n}$ and every $\gamma>0$.
Proof. Put $D=\left\{X\left|\varrho>x_{n}>0,\left|x_{i}\right|<\varrho, i=1, \ldots, n-1\right\}\right.$. By Lemma 3.8, for almost every $\varrho \in R_{+}^{1}$,

$$
\left.\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \iint_{R_{+}^{n}}\left|x_{i} \pm \varrho^{\gamma-1}\right| u\right|^{p} d X<\infty
$$

and (4.2.1) and (4.2.2) follow from the theorem with

$$
\Omega=\left\{X\left|\varrho / 2>x_{n}>0,\left|x_{i}\right|<\varrho / 2, i=1, \ldots, n-1\right\} .\right.
$$

It is clear that the region used here fulfils the hypothesis of the theorem.
Theorem 4.3. Let $D$ be a region satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. Assume that $u$ is a solution of (1.1 A) which for some $\gamma>0$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{D} \delta^{\gamma-1}(X)|u| d X<\infty \tag{4.3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then if $\gamma_{1} \geqslant n \gamma /(\mathbf{1}-\gamma)$ and $p \leqslant 1+\gamma_{1} / n$ we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{D} \delta^{\gamma_{1}-1}|u|^{p} d X<\infty,  \tag{4.3.2}\\
& \iint_{D} \delta^{p-1+\gamma_{1}}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X<\infty,  \tag{4.3.3}\\
& \iint_{D} \delta^{2 p-1+\gamma_{1}}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X<\infty . \tag{4.3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. We cover $D_{t}$ using Lemma 3.1, the centers of the spheres being $\left\{X_{\nu}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}$ as before. By Lemma 3.7 (iii) where we put $X_{0}=X_{\nu}$ and $X_{0}^{*}=X_{\nu}^{*}$, we get, since $\delta_{t}$ is bounded above and below by $l_{\nu}$ times a positive constant,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iint_{\left|X-x_{\nu}\right| \leqslant l_{\nu}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma_{1}-1}|u|^{p} d X & \leqslant K \cdot l_{v}^{p^{\prime}}\left[\iint_{\left|X-x_{\nu}\right| \leqslant 3 t_{\nu}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u| d X\right]^{p} \\
& +K \cdot \iint_{\left|X-x_{\nu}\right| \leqslant 3 l_{\nu}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left\{|F|^{p}+\left|h^{*}\right| p\right\} d X .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $p^{\prime}=\gamma_{1}-1-p \gamma+p+n-n p \geqslant 0$ by the assumptions. Now sum over $v$ and use the elementary inequality $\Sigma\left|a_{\nu}\right|^{p} \leqslant\left(\Sigma\left|a_{\nu}\right|\right)^{p}$ to get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma_{1}-1}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left[\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u| d X\right]^{p}+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left\{|F|^{p}+\alpha^{p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X . \tag{4.3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we combine (4.3.5) with the inequalities (4.1.5) and (4.1.6) from the proof of Theorem 4.1 we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma_{1}-1}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(t^{\prime \prime}\right) & +K\left[\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\nu-1}|u| d X\right]^{p} \\
& +K \cdot \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\gamma_{1}}\left\{|f|^{p}+\alpha^{p} \cdot \delta^{-2 p}|u|^{p}\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

There is a $t^{\prime \prime \prime}$ such that $K \cdot \alpha^{p}(\delta)<\frac{1}{2}$ when $\delta<t^{\prime \prime \prime}$ which with the moving of a suitable part of the right hand side gives rise to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma_{2}-1}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(t^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)+K\left[\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u| d X\right]^{p}+K \cdot \iint_{D_{t}} \delta^{\gamma_{1}-1}(X) d X . \tag{4.3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

There is also a sequence $t_{v} \downarrow 0$ such that

$$
\iint_{D_{t v}} \delta_{t_{v}}^{\gamma-1}|u| d X \leqslant K<\infty
$$

which proves (4.3.2). The rest of the theorem follows from Theorem 4.1.
Corollary 4.4. Let $u \in H^{1}$. Then to every $\gamma>0$ there is a $p>1$ such that for every bounded subdomain $\Omega$ of $R_{+}^{n}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{p} d X<\infty  \tag{4.4.1}\\
& \iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X<\infty  \tag{4.4.2}\\
& \iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X<\infty \tag{4.4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

The following estimate is well known for a more restrictive class of elliptic equations, see [18].

Theorem 4.5. Let $D$ be a region satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. Assume that $u$ is a bounded solution of (1.1B) in D. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\operatorname{grad} u(X)| \leqslant K \cdot \delta^{-1}(X) \tag{4.5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Since $H^{p} \supset H^{\infty}$ we have by Theorem 4.1

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{D}\left\{\delta^{p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i}\right|+\delta^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X<\infty \tag{4.5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Making obvious estimates in the representation formula (3.7.4) of Lemma 3.7 we get

$$
\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{k}}(Y)\right| \leqslant \frac{K}{\delta(Y)}+K \cdot \iint_{|X-X| \leqslant \frac{1}{2}(Y)}|X-Y|^{1-n}\left\{\delta^{\alpha-1}(X)\left|u_{i}\right|+\delta^{\alpha}(X)\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X
$$

Choose $p>n / \alpha \geqslant n$, use Hölder's inequality and apply (4.5.2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{k}}(Y)\right| \leqslant \frac{K}{\partial(Y)}+K \cdot \delta^{\alpha-2+(1-\gamma) / p}(Y)\left[\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \delta(Y)}|X-Y|^{(1-n) q} d X\right]^{1 / q} \\
& \times\left[\iint_{D} \delta^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left\{\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}+\delta^{-p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p} \leqslant \frac{K}{\delta(Y)}+K \cdot \delta^{\alpha-2+(1-\gamma) / p-(n / p)+1}(Y) \leqslant K \cdot \delta^{-1}(Y)
\end{aligned}
$$

if $\gamma$ is small enough.
Remark. Whether $\left|u_{i j}\right|=O\left(\delta^{-2}\right)$ is also true remains an open question. We will not need this result in the sequel, however.

Theorem 4.6. Let $u$ be a solution of (1.1B) belonging to $H^{p}, p \geqslant 1$. Then

$$
\int_{\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho}\left|u_{i}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n-1}, y_{n}\right)\right|^{p} d Y^{\prime} \leqslant K(\varrho) \cdot y_{n}^{-p} .
$$

Proof. By formula (3.7.4)

$$
\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{k}}(Y)\right| \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{1-n} \int_{|X-Y|=y_{n} / 2}|u| d S+K \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}|X-Y|^{1-n}\left\{|F|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X .
$$

If $p>$ I choose $\gamma>0$ and use Hölder's inequality:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{k}}(Y)\right|^{p} \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{1-n-p} \int_{|X-Y|-\left.y_{n}\right|^{2}}|u|^{p} d S+K \cdot y_{n}^{p-1-\gamma} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}|X-Y|^{1-n+\gamma} \\
& \times\left\{|F|^{p}+x_{n}^{\alpha p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X \\
& \text { or } \quad \int_{\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant e} y_{n}^{p}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{k}}(Y)\right|^{p} d Y^{\prime} \leqslant K+\iint x_{n}^{2 p-1}\left\{|F|^{p}+x_{n}^{\alpha p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} \leqslant K<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

by Corollary 4.2 if the double integral is taken e.g. over $|X| \leqslant 2 \varrho, x_{n}>0$.
If $p=1$,
$\int_{\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant e} y_{n}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{k}}(Y)\right| d Y^{\prime} \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{1-n} \int_{\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho} d Y^{\prime} \int_{|X-Y|=y_{n} / 2}|u| d S_{X}$
$+K \cdot y_{n} \int_{\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant e} d Y^{\prime} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} \mid 2}|X-Y|^{1-n}|f| d X$
$+K \cdot y_{n} \int_{\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant e} d Y^{\prime} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}|X-Y|^{1-n}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-2}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha-1}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X$
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leqslant K+\iint|\log | x_{n}-y_{n}| |\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X \\
& \leqslant K+K\left[y_{n}^{\alpha-1} \iint_{\left(y_{n} / 2\right)<x_{n}<\left(3 y_{n} / 2\right)}|\log | x_{n}-y_{n}| |^{\alpha^{\prime}} d X\right]^{1 / q^{\prime}}\left[\int \int \left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{p^{\prime}}+x_{n}^{p^{\prime}-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p^{\prime}}\right.\right. \\
& \\
& \left.\left.+x_{n}^{2 p^{\prime}-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p^{\prime}}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

by Corollary 4.4 if $p^{\prime}$ is small enough.
Theorem 4.7. If $u$ is a solution of (1.1B), then $u \in H^{2}$ if and only if

$$
\iint_{\Omega} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for every bounded $\Omega \subset R_{+}^{n}$.
Proof. Assume $u \in H^{2}$. It suffices to take $\Omega=\boldsymbol{Q}_{\boldsymbol{e}}$,

$$
Q_{\varrho}=\left\{X\left|0<x_{n}<\varrho,\left|x_{i}\right|<\varrho, i=1, \ldots, n-1\right\} .\right.
$$

We will need a special type of test functions $\psi(X)=\psi(\varepsilon, X)$ with the following properties:
$1^{\circ} \psi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(R_{+}^{n}\right), \operatorname{supp}(\psi) \subset Q_{2 Q}$.
$2^{\circ}$ When $X \in Q_{\rho}, \psi$ depends on $x_{n}$ (and $\varepsilon$ ) only.
$3^{\circ} \psi(X)=0$ for $x_{n}<\varepsilon / 2$.
$4^{\circ} 0 \leqslant \psi(X) \leqslant x_{n}$ everywhere, $\psi(X)=x_{n}$ for $X \in Q_{\varrho}, \varepsilon<x_{n}<\varrho$.
$5^{\circ}\left|\psi_{i}\right| \leqslant K,\left|\psi_{i j}\right| \leqslant K \cdot x_{n}^{-1}$ where $K$ does not depend on $\varepsilon$.
$6^{\circ} \int_{0}^{2 o}\left\{\max _{X^{\prime} \leqslant 40^{2}}\left|\psi_{i j}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, t\right)\right|\right\} d t \leqslant K$ where $K$ does not depend on $\varepsilon$.
Such a function clearly exists, e.g. $\psi(X)=\eta^{1}\left(x_{n}\right) \cdot \eta^{2}\left(\sqrt{x_{1}^{2}+\ldots+x_{n-1}^{2}}\right)$ where $\eta^{2}(t)=1$ for $|t| \leqslant \varrho$ and $=0,|t| \geqslant 2 \varrho$ and does not depend on $\varepsilon$, while $\eta^{1}$ satisfies $3^{\circ}$ and $4^{0}$ above, and $d^{2} \eta^{1}(t) / d t^{2}$ changes sign, say, at most four times.

Now regularize the equation (1.1) in $R_{+}^{n}$, multiply with $\psi(X) \cdot u(X)$ and integrate partially:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} \psi u\left[\bar{a}^{i j} u_{i j}-F+\left(a^{i j}-\bar{a}^{i j}\right) u_{i j}\right] d X=0, \\
& \begin{aligned}
\iint_{Q_{2 Q}} \psi \bar{a}^{i j} u_{i} u_{j} d X & =\iint_{Q_{2 Q}}-\psi_{j} \bar{a}^{i j} u u_{i}-\psi \bar{a}_{j}^{i j} u u_{i}+\psi u\left[-F+\left(a^{i j}-\bar{a}^{i j}\right) u_{i j}\right] d X \\
= & \left.\frac{1}{2} \iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}}\left\{\psi_{j i} u^{2} \bar{a}^{i j}+\psi_{j} u^{2} \bar{a}_{i}^{i j}\right\} d X+\frac{1}{2} \iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}}\left\{\psi_{i} u^{2} \bar{a}_{j}^{i j}+\psi u^{2} \bar{a}_{j i}\right\}\right\} d X \\
& +\iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} \psi u\left[-F+\left(a^{i j}-\bar{a}^{i j}\right) u_{i j}\right] d X .
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\tau$ is small enough, $\bar{a}^{i j}(X) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \geqslant \lambda / 2|\xi|^{2}$ for $x_{n}<\tau$, and hence on the left hand side

$$
\iint_{Q_{2 Q}} \psi u_{i} u_{j} \bar{a}^{i j} d X \geqslant \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{Q_{2 \varrho} \mathrm{n}\left\{x_{n}<\tau\right\}} \psi\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X-K(\tau)
$$

On the right hand side we have three integrals to estimate. We get using the properties of $\psi$ and Corollary 4.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\iint_{Q_{2 Q}}\left\{\psi_{i j} u^{2} \bar{a}^{i j}+\psi_{j} u^{2} \bar{a}_{i}^{i j}\right\} d X\right| \\
& \quad \leqslant K \cdot \int_{0}^{2 \varrho} \max _{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2 \varrho}\left|\psi_{i j}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, t\right)\right| d t \int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \Omega \varrho}|u|^{2} d X^{\prime}+K \iint_{Q_{2 Q}} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2} d X \leqslant K
\end{aligned}
$$

independently of $\varepsilon$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}}\left\{\psi_{i} \bar{a}_{j}^{i j} u^{2}+\psi u^{2} \bar{a}_{j i}^{i j}\right\} d X\right| \leqslant K \iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2} d X \\
& \mid \iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} \psi u[F \\
& \left.\quad+\left(\bar{a}^{i j}-a^{i j}\right) u_{i j}\right]\left.d X\left|\leqslant K \iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}\right| u\right|^{2} d X \\
& \quad+K\left[\iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} \frac{\beta\left(x_{n}\right)}{x_{n}}|u|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} \frac{\beta\left(x_{n}\right)}{x_{n}} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad+K\left[\iint_{Q_{2 \varrho}} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\iint_{Q_{Q_{Q}}} x_{n}^{\alpha+1}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2}+x_{n}^{3+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we get

$$
\iint_{Q_{2 \varrho} \cap\left\{x_{n}<\tau\right\}} \psi\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X \leqslant K+K(\tau)
$$

or

$$
\iint_{Q_{\varrho} \cap\left\{x_{n}>\varepsilon\right\}} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X \leqslant K+K(\tau) .
$$

Since $K$ and $K(\tau)$ do not depend on $\varepsilon$, the necessity part of the theorem is proved.
To prove the sufficiency, assume

$$
\iint_{\Omega} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for every bounded subdomain $\Omega$ of $R_{+}^{n}$. An easy application of Schwarz's inequality then shows that
for every $\gamma>0$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{\gamma-1}|u|^{2} d X<\infty \\
& \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\beta\left(x_{n}\right)}{x_{n}}|u|^{2} d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

## к.-o. widman, Boundary behavior of solutions

From Theorem 4.1 we conclude that the following integral is bounded when $\Omega$ is bounded

$$
\iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{3+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{2} d X
$$

Let $D$ be a convex bounded region $\subset R_{+}^{n}$ the boundary of which is sufficiently regular and contains the set $\left\{X\left|x_{n}=0,\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right\}\right.$ for an arbitrarily chosen $\varrho>0$. Such a region is easily constructed. If we denote by $\delta(X)$ the boundary distance function of $D$, while $\delta_{\tau}$ is that of $D_{\tau}$, we can construct a positive function $\Delta(X)$, coinciding with $\delta(X)$ for $\delta(X)$ sufficiently small, and belonging to $C^{2}(\bar{D})$. We observe that $\Delta(X)-\tau \leqslant \delta_{\tau}(X)$ if $\delta$ is small enough.

Integrating partially, we find

$$
\iint_{D_{\tau}} \bar{a}^{i j} 2 u u_{i} \Delta_{j}(X) d X=-\iint_{D_{\tau}}\left\{\bar{a}_{j}^{i j} 2 u u_{i}(\Delta-\tau)+\bar{a}^{i j} 2 u_{i} u_{j}(\Delta-\tau)+\bar{a}^{i j} 2 u u_{i j}(\Delta-\tau)\right\} d X .
$$

On the other hand

$$
\iint_{D_{\tau}} \bar{a}^{i j} 2 u u_{i} \Delta_{j}(X) d X=\int_{\partial D_{\tau}} \bar{a}^{i j} u^{2} \Delta_{j} d X_{(i)}-\iint_{D_{\tau}}\left\{\bar{a}_{i}^{i j} u^{2} \Delta_{j}+\bar{a}^{i j} u^{2} \Delta_{j i}\right\} d X
$$

Thus using the fact that $u$ is a solution and that

$$
\bar{a}^{i j} \Delta_{j} d X_{(i)} \geqslant \lambda / 2 \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial n} d S=\frac{\lambda}{2} d S
$$

on that part of $\partial D_{\tau}$ which is below $x_{n}=\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon>0$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\partial D_{\tau} \cap\left\{x_{n}<e\right\}} u^{2} d S \leqslant K \int_{\partial D_{\tau} \cap\left\{x_{n}>\varepsilon\right\}} u^{2} d S+K \iint_{D_{\tau}}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2}+x_{n}^{\alpha}|u|\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n} u_{i}^{2}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+x_{n}|u|\left[|F|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right]\right\} d X \leqslant K \cdot \max _{\left\{x_{n}>\varepsilon\right\}}|u|^{2}+K \cdot \iint_{D}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2}+x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2}\right\} d X \\
& \quad+K\left[\iint_{D} x_{n}^{2 \alpha-1}|u|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\iint_{D} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}+K \iint_{D} \frac{\varepsilon\left(x_{n}\right)}{x_{n}}|u| d X \\
& \quad+K\left[\iint_{D} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\iint_{D} x_{n}^{3+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the right hand side is finite and independent of $\tau$, we have

$$
\int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho} u^{2}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, \tau\right) d X^{\prime} \leqslant \int_{\partial D_{\tau} \cap\left\{x_{n}<\varepsilon\right\}} u^{2} d S \leqslant K<\infty
$$

and the theorem is proved.
Theorem 4.8. Consider the equation (1.1A) in $R_{+}^{n}$. If $u$ is a solution, possibly defined only in $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right),{ }^{1}$ satisfying

[^1]$$
\iint_{v_{n}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{\gamma-n}|u| d X<\infty
$$
for some $\gamma>0$, then for all $p \geqslant 1$ and all $h^{\prime}>h$
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n}|u|^{p} d X<\infty \\
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime}}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{p+p \gamma-n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X<\infty \\
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime}}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{2 p-n+p \gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

Proof. We introduce the sets $V^{\tau}=V_{h}^{\tau}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right) \cap\left\{X \mid x_{n}>\tau>0\right\}$. Let $\delta_{r}(X)$ denote the distance from $X$ to $\partial V^{\tau}$. Using Lemma 3.1, we cover $V^{\tau}$ with spheres having centers $X_{v}$, then apply Lemma 3.7 (i) and (ii) with $X_{0}^{*}=X^{\prime}$. After multiplication by $x_{n}^{n \gamma-n p} \cdot \delta_{\tau}^{n p-n}$ we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\left|X-x_{y}\right| \leqslant l_{v}} \delta_{\tau}^{p+n p-n} \cdot x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant \\
& \iint_{\left|X-X_{y}\right| \leqslant l_{v}} \delta_{\tau}^{2 p \div n p \sim n} \cdot x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant \\
& \quad+K \iint_{\left|X-x_{v}\right| \leqslant 3 l_{\nu}} \delta_{\tau}^{2 p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}\left\{|F|^{p}+\alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right)\left|u_{i j}\right| p\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

After summing over $\nu$ we note that the constants do not depend on $\tau$ and in a manner by now familiar we get the inequalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{V^{\tau}} \delta^{2 p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-p n}\left|u_{i j}\right| p d X \\
& \quad \leqslant K\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)+K \iint_{V^{\tau}}\left\{\delta_{\tau}^{n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}|u|^{p}+\delta_{\tau}^{p+n p-n} \cdot x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p} \alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right)\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}\right\} d X \\
& \iint_{V^{\tau}} \delta_{\tau}^{p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \\
& \quad \leqslant K\left(\tau^{\prime \prime}\right)+K \cdot \iint_{V^{\tau}}\left\{\delta_{\tau}^{n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}|u|^{p}+\delta_{\tau}^{2 p+n p-n} \cdot x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p} \alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

which combined give rise to

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\iint_{V^{\tau}} \delta_{\tau}^{p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant  \tag{4.8.2}\\
\iint_{V^{\tau}} \delta_{\tau}^{2 p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant
\end{array}\right\} K\left(\tau^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)+K \iint_{V^{\tau}} \delta_{\tau}^{n p-n} \cdot x_{n}^{q \gamma-n p}|u|^{p} d X
$$

Using the same covering of $V^{\tau}$ as above, we now apply Lemma 3.7 (iii)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\left|X-X_{\nu}\right| \leqslant l_{\nu}} \delta_{z}^{n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left[\iint_{\left|X-X_{\nu}\right| \leqslant 3 l_{\nu}} x_{n}^{p-n}|u| d X\right]^{p} \\
&+K \iint_{\left|X-X_{\nu}\right| \leqslant 3 l_{\nu}} \delta_{\tau}^{2 p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \nu-n p}\left\{|F|^{p}+\alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X .
\end{aligned}
$$

Sum over $\nu$ and use the inequality $\Sigma\left|a_{n}\right|^{p} \leqslant\left(\Sigma\left|a_{n}\right|\right)^{p}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{V^{\tau}} \delta_{\tau}^{n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(\tau^{(i v)}\right)+K\left[\iint_{V^{\tau}} x_{n}^{\gamma-n}|u| d X\right]^{p} \\
& \quad+K \iint_{V^{\tau}}\left\{\delta_{\tau}^{n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p} \alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right)|u|^{p}+\delta_{\tau}^{p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p} \alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right)\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\delta_{\tau}^{2 p+n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p} \alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right)\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X .
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying (4.8.2) and (4.8.3) while noticing that $K \alpha^{p}\left(x_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$ independently of $\tau$ we get

$$
\iint_{V_{h}^{\tau}} \delta_{\tau}^{n p-n} x_{n}^{p \gamma-n p}|u|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(\tau^{(v)}\right)+K\left[\iint_{V_{h}} x_{n}^{\gamma-n}|u| d X\right]^{p} .
$$

Since the right hand side is independent of $\tau$, Fatou's lemma gives

$$
\iint_{V_{h}} \delta^{n p-n} x_{n}^{p y-n p}|u|^{p} d X<\infty
$$

Now (4.8.2) and (4.8.3) give the corresponding results for $u_{i}$ and $u_{i j}$, and the theorem follows with the observation that for every $h^{\prime}>h, \delta(X) \geqslant K \cdot x_{n}$ for $X \in V_{h^{\prime}}$.

Remark. In the case of Laplace's equation, Theorem 4.8 follows much easier if we use the Poisson representation. In fact, Fubini's theorem implies that there is an $h^{\prime \prime}, h<h^{\prime \prime}<h^{\prime}$ such that

$$
\int_{\partial v_{h^{\prime \prime}}} x_{n}^{\gamma+1-n}|u| d S<\infty .
$$

Since $V_{h^{\prime \prime}}$ is convex, $|\partial G / \partial n(X, Y)| \leqslant K \cdot|X-Y|^{1-n}$ and with Hölder's inequality

$$
|u(Y)|^{p} \leqslant\left[\int_{\partial V_{h^{\prime \prime}}}|X-Y|^{1-n} x_{n}^{\gamma}|u(X)| d S_{X}\right]^{p / q} \cdot\left[\int_{\partial V_{h^{\prime \prime}}}|X-Y|^{1-n} x_{n}^{-\gamma(p-1)}|u| d S\right]
$$

As $Y \in V_{n^{\prime}},|X-Y| \geqslant x_{n} \cdot K$, and hence the first integral is finite. Multiplication with $y_{n}^{p \gamma-n}$ and integration over $V_{h^{\prime}}$ gives

$$
\iint_{V_{h^{\prime}}} y_{n}^{p \nu-n}|u(Y)|^{p} d Y \leqslant K \cdot \int_{\partial V_{h^{\prime \prime}}} x_{n}^{-\gamma(p-1)}|u(X)| d X \iint_{V_{h^{\prime}}} y_{n}^{p \gamma-n}|X-Y|^{1-n} d Y
$$

The proof follows with the observation that

$$
\iint_{V_{h^{\prime}}} y_{n}^{p \gamma-n}|X-Y|^{1-n} d Y \leqslant K \cdot x_{n}^{\gamma p+1-n} .
$$

The following theorem for harmonic functions can e.g. be found in [22].
Theorem 4.9. Consider the equation (1.1B) in $R_{+}^{n}$. If $u$ is a solution, possibly defined in $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ only, satisfying

$$
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{2-n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty .
$$

Then

$$
x_{n}\left|u_{i}(X)\right| \rightarrow 0
$$

as $x_{n} \rightarrow 0$ in $V_{h^{\prime}}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ for every $h^{\prime}>h$.
Proof. Using Schwarz's inequality, we see that the assumption implies

$$
\iint_{V_{h}(X)} x_{n}^{\gamma-n}|u|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for every $\gamma>0$. By Theorem 4.8, we can conclude the finiteness of the following integrals for every $\gamma>0$ and every $h^{\prime \prime}>h$.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime \prime}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}} x_{n}^{\gamma-n}|u|^{p} d X,  \tag{4.9.1}\\
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime \prime}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}} x_{n}^{p+\gamma-n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X,  \tag{4.9.2}\\
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime \prime}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}} x_{n}^{2 p+\gamma-n}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X . \tag{4.9.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Choose an arbitrary $h^{\prime}>h$ and let $h^{\prime}>h^{\prime \prime}>h$. Then there is a constant $k$ such that a sphere around $Y \in V_{h^{\prime}}$, with radius $k \cdot y_{n}$ lies inside $V_{h^{\prime \prime}}$. In this sphere we can write $u$ as the sum of two functions

$$
\begin{aligned}
u(Z)= & \frac{1}{\omega_{n}} \int_{|X-Y|=k \cdot y_{n}} \frac{\partial G}{\partial y}(X, Z) u(X) d S_{X} \\
& +\frac{1}{\omega_{n}} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}} G(X, Z)\left[F+\left\{a^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right\} u_{i j}\right] d X=u^{(1)}+u^{(2)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $G$ is the Green function of the operator $a^{i j}\left(X^{\prime}\right) \partial^{2} / \partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}$ in $|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}$. Since $u^{(1)}$ is the solution of an operator with constant coefficients we find

$$
\left|\frac{\partial u^{(1)}}{\partial x_{l}}(Y)\right|^{2} \leqslant\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{K}{y_{n}^{n}} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}}\left|\frac{\partial u^{(1)}}{\partial x_{i}}\right| d X\right]^{2} \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{-n} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}}\left|u_{i}^{(1)}\right|^{2} d X
$$

## K.-o. widman, Boundary behavior of solutions

By the Dirichlet principle

$$
\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}}\left|u_{i}^{(1)}\right|^{2} d X \leqslant K \cdot \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X .
$$

On the other hand

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\lvert\, \frac{\partial u^{(2)}}{\partial x_{l}}(Y)\right. & \leqslant K \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} \cdot k}|X-Y|^{1-n}\left\{|F|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X \\
& \leqslant K\left[\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}}|X-Y|^{(1-n) q} d X\right]^{1 / q}\left[\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}}\left\{|F|^{p}+x_{n}^{\alpha p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p} \\
& \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{-1}\left[\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant k \cdot y_{n}} x_{n}^{2 p-n}\left\{|F|^{p}+x_{n}^{\alpha p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p}
\end{aligned}
$$

if $p>n$. Combining these inequalities we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
y_{n}\left|u_{i}(Y)\right| & \leqslant K \cdot\left[\iint_{V_{h^{\prime \prime}}\left\{x_{n} \leqslant 2 y_{n}\right\}} x_{n}^{2-n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& +K\left[\iint_{V_{h^{\prime \prime}} \cap\left\{x_{n} \leqslant 2 y_{n}\right\}} x_{n}^{2 p-n}\left\{|f|^{p}+x_{n}^{p \alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}+x_{n}^{(\alpha-1) p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}+x_{n}^{(\alpha-2) p}|u|^{p}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.9.1-3) above we find that the right hand side tends to zero as $y_{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$.
Our next theorem is a corollary of Theorem 4.9 and the following theorem by Wallin [25].

If $u$ is a continuous Beppo-Levi function in $R_{n}^{+}$such that for some $\gamma, 0 \leqslant \gamma<n$

$$
\iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{\gamma}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for every bounded subdomain $\Omega$ of $R_{+}^{n}$, then $\lim _{x_{n} \rightarrow 0} u(X)$ exists and is finite for all $X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$ except when $X^{\prime}$ belongs to a certain Borel set $E$ of $m-\mathbf{2}+\gamma$-capacity zero.

A Beppo-Levi function is a function which is absolutely continuous on almost every line parallel to some coordinate axis. A Borel set $E$ is said to be of $m-2+\gamma-$ capacity zero if for every non-trivial non-negative mass function $\mu$ with support in $E$ the potential

$$
u^{\mu}(X)=\int_{R^{n}}|X-Y|^{2-m-\gamma} d \mu(Y)
$$

is unbounded.
Theorem 4.10. If $u$ is a solution of (1.1B) in $R_{+}^{n}$ with the property that

$$
\iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{\nu}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for every bounded subdomain $\Omega$ of $R_{+}^{n}$, then $u$ has a nontangential finite limit at every $X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$ except in a set of $m-2+\gamma$-capacity zero.

Proof. Since, by our definition of solution, $u$ is automatically a continuous BeppoLevi function, Wallin's theorem shows that perpendicular limits exist except in a set of the right size. Moreover, it can be proved that

$$
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{2-n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for every $h>0$ and $X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$ except for those $X^{\prime}$ belonging to a set of $n-2+\gamma-$ dimensional Hausdorff measure zero. See Wallin [25], Lemma 5. Combining these facts with Theorem 4.8, the present theorem is proved.
5. It is well known that a positive harmonic function in the unit disc belongs to $H^{1}$. The traditional way of proving a theorem of this sort is to use the Poisson representation of the harmonic function and show that the normal derivative of Green's function is bounded away from zero. See e.g. [27]. However, it is possible to do without the Poisson representation.

Theorem 5.1. Suppose $u$ is a non-negative solution of (1.1C). Then $u \in H^{1}$.
Proof. Choose an arbitrary $\varrho>0$. We shall prove that

$$
\int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho}\left|u\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)\right| d X^{\prime} \leqslant K<\infty \quad \text { as } \quad x_{n} \rightarrow 0 .
$$

Let $D$ be the convex bounded region $\subset R_{+}^{n}$ whose boundary contains

$$
\left\{X\left|x_{n}=0,\left|X^{\prime}\right|<\varrho\right\}\right.
$$

that was constructed in the proof of Theorem 4.7. $D_{t}, \delta, \delta_{t}$, and $\Delta(X)$ will have the same meaning as there. Define

$$
m(t)=\max _{\tau \geqslant t}\left[\int_{\delta(X)=\tau}|u(X)| d S_{X}\right] .
$$

We shall prove the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{\delta \geqslant t} \delta_{t}^{p-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X+\iint_{\delta \geqslant t} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+\varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right)[m(t)]^{p} \tag{5.1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $p>1, t<t_{0}$, where $\varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right)$ and $K\left(t_{0}\right)$ do not depend on $t$, and $\varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right)$ does not depend on $u$, while $\lim _{t_{0} \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right)=0$.

To do that choose $p<1+\alpha / n$ and $\gamma<1-1 / p$, and combine the inequalities (4.1.5) and (4.1.6) from the proof of Theorem 4.1, with $\gamma=\alpha$, and (4.3.6) of Theorem 4.3, with $\gamma_{1}=\alpha$. We get

But $\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u| d X \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+K m(t) \cdot \int_{t}^{t_{0}}(s-t)^{\gamma-1} d s \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+K \cdot m(t) \cdot t_{0}^{\gamma}$,

$$
\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{p-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X+\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+K\left[\iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\gamma-1}|u| d X\right]^{p}
$$

which proves inequality (5.1.1).
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Now we regularize the equation in the region $D_{t}$ the boundary of which is sufficiently regular if $t$ is small enough, due to our assumptions. Thus we can find functions $\bar{a}^{i j}(t, X) \in C^{\infty}\left(D_{t}\right),\left|\partial / \partial x_{k} \bar{a}^{i j}\right| \leqslant K \cdot \delta_{t}^{\alpha-1}, \bar{a}^{i j} \in C^{\alpha}\left(\bar{D}_{t}\right), \bar{a}^{i j}(t, X)=a^{i j}(X)$ for $\delta(X)=t$, where $K$ and the Hölder constants of $\bar{a}^{i j}$ are independent of $t$. It is also clear that $2 \lambda^{-1} \xi_{i}^{2} \geqslant \bar{a}^{i j} \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \geqslant 2^{-1} \lambda \xi_{i}^{2}$ when $t<\delta(X)<\tau$ for $\tau$ small enough. We get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\iint_{D_{t}} \bar{a}^{i j} u \Delta_{i j}(X) d X\right| \leqslant K \iint_{D_{t}}|u| d X \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+K \cdot t \cdot[m(t)] . \tag{5.1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, using partial integration

$$
\iint_{D_{t}} \bar{a}^{i j} u \Delta_{i j} d X=\int_{\partial D_{t}} \bar{a}^{i j} u \Delta_{i} d X_{(j)}-\iint_{D_{t}}\left\{\bar{a}_{j}^{i j} u \Delta_{i}+\bar{a}^{i j} u_{j} \Delta_{i}\right\} d X .
$$

In the surface integral

$$
\bar{a}^{i j} \Delta_{i} d X_{(j)} \geqslant \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial n} d S=\frac{\lambda}{2} d S
$$

for $\delta(X)<\tau$, from which we conclude, using the positiveness of $u$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\partial D_{t}} \bar{a}^{i j} u \Delta_{i} d X_{(j)} \geqslant K \int_{\partial D_{t}}|u| d S . \tag{5.1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first part of the double integral admits the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
K \cdot \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{x-1}|u| d X \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+K \cdot \varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right) \cdot m(t) \tag{5.1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the second part, we integrate partially and use the fact that $u$ is a solution:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\iint_{D_{t}} \bar{a}^{i j} u_{j} \Delta_{i} d X\right| & =\left|\int_{\partial D_{t}} \bar{a}^{i j} u_{j}(\Delta-t) d X_{(j)}-\iint_{D_{t}}\left\{\bar{a}_{i}^{i j} u_{j}(\Delta-t)+\bar{a}^{i j} u_{i j}(\Delta-t)\right\} d X\right| \\
& \leqslant \iint_{D_{t}}\left\{\delta_{t}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+\delta_{t}\left[|F|+\left(\bar{a}^{i j}-a^{i j}\right) u_{i j}\right\} d X\right. \\
& \leqslant K+K \iint_{D_{t}} \delta_{t}^{\alpha-1}|u| d X+K\left[\iint_{D_{t}}\left\{\delta_{t}^{p-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}+\delta_{t}^{2 p-1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If we use the inequality (5.1.1) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\iint_{D_{t}} \bar{a}^{i j} u_{j} \Delta_{i} d X\right| \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+\varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right) m(t) . \tag{5.1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (5.1.2)-(5.1.5) we get

$$
\int_{\delta(X)=t}|u| d S \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+\varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right)[m(t)] .
$$

As we may assume that $m(t)=\int_{\delta-t}|u| d S$ for some sequence $\left\{t_{\nu}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}, t_{\nu} \searrow 0$,

$$
m\left(t_{\nu}\right) \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)+\varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right) m\left(t_{\nu}\right), \quad \nu=1,2, \ldots .
$$

If we choose $t_{0}$ so small that $\varepsilon\left(t_{0}\right)<\frac{1}{2}, m\left(t_{\nu}\right) \leqslant K\left(t_{0}\right)$, and since $m(t)$ is a non-increasing function, it follows that

$$
\int_{\delta(X)-t}|u| d S \leqslant K<\infty \quad \text { as } \quad t \rightarrow 0
$$

which implies the theorem.
We might ask ourselves whether this theorem is sharp or if it is possible to weaken the conditions on the equation. It seems probable that the coefficients in front of $u_{i}$ and $u$ in the assumptions on $F$ may be replaced by $\varepsilon(\delta(X)) / \delta(X)$ and $\varepsilon(\delta(X)) / \delta^{2}(X)$ respectively, where $\varepsilon(t)$ is a Dini function, i.e. is monotonic and satisfying

$$
\int_{0} \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} d t<\infty .
$$

However, in general it is not possible to go further with this type of assumption, as is seen from the following theorem. For further discussions, see after Theorem 7.3.

Theorem 5.2. Let $\varepsilon(t)$ be a non-decreasing function on ( $0, \infty$ ), satisfying

$$
\int_{0}^{1} \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} d t=\infty, \quad \varepsilon(2 t) \leqslant 2 \cdot \varepsilon(t)
$$

Then there exists a positive function $u(x, y), y>0$ such that $u \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow 0$ for all $x \in(-1,1)$, and such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\Delta u| \leqslant K \cdot \frac{\varepsilon(y)}{y}\left|u_{y}\right|+K \frac{\varepsilon(y)}{y^{2}}|u| . \tag{5.2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Define $\varphi(x)=\int_{0}^{x} \varepsilon(|t|) d t,|x| \leqslant 2$, and use Lemma 3.9 to construct a function $\Phi(x, y), y>0$ with the following properties:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi(x, 0)=\varphi(x), \\
& \left|\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y}(x, y)-\mathbf{1}\right| \leqslant K \cdot \varepsilon(y), \\
& \left|D^{(2)} \Phi\right| \leqslant K \cdot \frac{\varepsilon(y)}{y}, \\
& \left|\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x, y)-\varepsilon(x)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \varepsilon(y), \\
& K \cdot \varphi \leqslant \Phi \leqslant K \cdot y+K \cdot x .
\end{aligned}
$$

If we put

$$
u(x, y)=\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{\Phi(x+t, y)}{\Phi^{2}(x+t, y)+(x+t)^{2}} d t
$$

elementary calculations show that $u$ satisfies (5.2.1). Also
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$$
u(x, y) \geqslant \int_{|x-t| \geqslant y} \frac{\Phi}{\Phi^{2}+(x+t)^{2}} d t \geqslant K \int_{|t| \geqslant y} \frac{\varphi(t)}{t^{2}} d t-K \rightarrow \infty \quad \text { as } \quad y \rightarrow 0
$$

if $|x| \leqslant 1$, which proves the theorem.
6. Before we go on with solutions to the equation (1.1) we shall investigate the boundary behavior of a special type of solutions to the equation $\Delta u=f$, namely so called Green potentials

$$
u(Y)=\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} G(X, Y) f(X) d X
$$

where $G$ is the Green function of the Laplacian, or, more generally, of any linear homogeneous second order elliptic operator with constant coefficients.

We note first that in order that the defining integral exist as an absolutely convergent integral it is necessary that

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} \frac{x_{n}|f|}{1+|X|^{n}} d X<\infty .
$$

As the behavior of $u$ in the neighborhood of a boundary point depends on the values of $f$ in a neighborhood of this point, we shall assume in this section that $f$ has compact support, say in $\left\{X \| X \mid \leqslant 1, x_{n} \geqslant 0\right\}$. The necessary condition above is also sufficient to guarantee the existence of perpendicular boundary values of $u$, a fact which was first proved by Littlewood [15] for $n=2$. The proof in the general case is similar and we state here without proof:

Theorem 6.1. If

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f(X)| d X<\infty,
$$

then the Green potential $u$ of $f$ satisfies

$$
\lim _{y_{n} \rightarrow 0} u\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{n-1}, y_{n}\right)=0
$$

for almost every $\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n-1}\right) \in R^{n-1}$.
In order to ensure the existence of non-tangential boundary values, we have to assume higher order integrability of $f$. One such condition was given by Solomencev [20], namely essentially

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}^{p}|f|^{p} d X<\infty
$$

for some $p>n / 2$. This result can be improved. We also believe our method of proof to be simpler than the ones used earlier.

Theorem 6.2. If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f(X)| d X<\infty \tag{6.2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and if there is a $p>n / 2$ such that to every $X^{\prime}$ belonging to some (measurable) set $E \subset R^{n-1}$ there is an $h>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{2 p-n}|f|^{p} d X<\infty \tag{6.2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then the Green potential $u$ of $f$ has non-tangential limit zero at almost all points of $E$.
Proof. By Lemmata 3.2 and 3.3 there is a set $E^{\prime} \subset E$ such that $E-E^{\prime}$ has measure zero and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{2 p-n}|f|^{p} d X<\infty \tag{6.2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $h>0$ and all $X^{\prime} \in E^{\prime}$. If

$$
\varepsilon(\tau)=\iint_{0<x_{n}<\tau} x_{n}|f(X)| d X
$$

then $\lim _{\tau \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon(\tau)=0$.
Define the set function $\Phi(e), e \subset R^{n-1}$, by

$$
\Phi(e)=\iint x_{n}|f| d X
$$

where the integration is performed over

$$
\left\{X \mid 0<x_{n}<\tau,\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}\right) \in e\right\} .
$$

By a well-known theorem from the theory of integration (6.2.1) implies that $\Phi$ has a finite regular derivative almost everywhere, and a simple argument shows that

$$
\left|\Phi^{\prime}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant \eta(\tau)=\sqrt{\varepsilon(\tau)}
$$

except in a set $E^{\prime \prime}$ of measure at most $\eta(\tau)$. Let $X_{0}^{\prime} \in E^{\prime} \cap C E^{\prime \prime}$. The proof shows that it is no restriction to assume $X_{0}^{\prime}=0$. We shall prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\substack{Y \rightarrow 0 \\ X \in V_{h}(0)}} \sup |u| \leqslant K \cdot \eta(\tau) \tag{6.2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $h>0$. By choosing a suitable sequence $\tau_{\nu}$ tending to zero sufficiently fast, it is not difficult to see that the theorem is hereby proved.

To prove (6.2.4) choose $\delta$ so small that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\Phi(e)}{\varrho^{n-1}} \leqslant 2 \omega_{n-1} \cdot \eta \tag{6.2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $\varrho<\delta$ and $e=\left\{X\left|x_{n}=0,\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right\}\right.$.
We have with a fixed $Y \in V_{h}$

$$
|u(Y)| \leqslant \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} G(X, Y)|f| d X \leqslant I_{\tau}+I_{\delta}+I_{0}^{\prime}+I_{0}^{\prime \prime}+\sum_{\nu=1}^{N} I_{v},
$$
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where the regions of integration are

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{\tau}: & \left\{X \mid x_{n}>\tau\right\}, \\
I_{\delta}: & \left\{X\left|\left|X^{\prime}\right| \geqslant \delta\right\},\right. \\
I_{0}^{\prime}: & \left\{X\left|0<x_{n}<\tau,\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2 \varrho,|X-Y| \geqslant \frac{y_{n}}{2}\right\},\right. \\
I_{0}^{\prime \prime}: & \left\{X\left||X-Y| \leqslant \frac{y_{n}}{2}\right\},\right. \\
I_{\nu}: & \left\{X\left|0<x_{n}<\tau, 2^{\nu} \varrho \leqslant\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2^{v+1} \varrho\right\},\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$\varrho=|Y|$, and $N$ is chosen so that $\delta \leqslant 2^{N+1} \varrho<2 \delta$.
Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{y_{n} \rightarrow 0} \sup I_{\tau} \leqslant \lim \sup K \cdot \tau^{-n} \cdot y_{n} \iint_{x_{n}>\tau} x_{n}|f| d X=0, \\
& \lim _{y_{n} \rightarrow 0} \sup I_{\delta} \leqslant \lim \sup K \cdot \delta^{-n} \cdot y_{n} \iint_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \geqslant \delta} x_{n}|f| d X=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, by (6.2.5)

$$
\left|I_{\nu}\right| \leqslant K \cdot \frac{y_{n}}{\left(2^{v} \varrho\right)^{n}} \iint_{\mid X^{\prime} \leqslant 2^{p+1} \varrho} x_{n}|f| d X \leqslant K \cdot \frac{y_{n}}{\left(2^{v} \varrho\right)^{n}} 2 \eta\left(2^{p+1} \varrho\right)^{n-1}=K \cdot 2^{-\prime} \eta
$$

and so

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sum_{\nu=1}^{N} I_{\nu} \leqslant K \cdot \eta \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} 2^{-\nu}=K \cdot \eta \\
\left|I_{0}^{\prime}\right| \leqslant K \cdot \varrho^{1-n} \iint_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2 \varrho} x_{n}|f| d X \leqslant K \cdot \eta .
\end{gathered}
$$

Finally,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|I_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right|^{p} & \leqslant\left[K \cdot \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}|X-Y|^{2-n}|f(X)| d X\right]^{p} \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2} x_{n}^{2 p-n}|f|^{p} d X \cdot\left[y_{n}^{(n-2 p) /(p-1)} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}|X-Y|^{(2-n) q} d X\right]^{p-1} \\
& \leqslant K \iint x_{n}^{2 p-n}|f|^{p} d X,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last integral is performed over $V_{h / n}(O) \cap\left\{x_{n}<2 y_{n}\right\}$. This integral tends to zero with $y_{n}$ by (6.2.3). The theorem is proved.

By Lemma 3.2 we get the following Corollary. While this manuscript was in its final stage of preparation, Arsove and Huber [2] announced a similar result for $n=2$.

Corollary 6.3. If

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f| d X<\infty \\
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{p} d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $p>n / 2$, then $u$ has non-tangential boundary values zero almost everywhere.

By Hölder's inequality we get
Corollary 6.4. If

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}^{2 p-1-\varepsilon}|f|^{p} d X<\infty
$$

for some $p>n / 2$ and some $\varepsilon>0$, then $u$ has non-tangential boundary values zero almost everywhere.

It is not possible to allow $p=n / 2$ in Theorem 6.2 , which is seen from the following example.

Example 6.5. To every positive, locally bounded weight function $g(t), 0<t \leqslant 1$, there exists an $f$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f| d X<\infty, \\
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} g\left(x_{n}\right)|f|^{n / 2} d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

while the Green potential $u$ of $f$ does not have non-tangential boundary values anywhere in $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 1$, with the possible exception of a set of measure zero.

Proof. For each $\nu$, construct a grid of points $X_{\nu i}$, lying in the plane $x_{n}=2^{-\nu}$, the $n-1$ first coordinates of which are integral multiples of $2^{-\nu}$. Inside $|X| \leqslant 1$ there are roughly $2^{-\nu(1-n)}$ such points for each $\nu$. Let $B_{\nu i}$ be the ball having center $X_{\nu i}$ and radius $2^{-\nu-2}$. Define the sequence $\left\{k_{\nu}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}, k_{\nu} \geqslant 1$, in such a way that

$$
2^{\left.-\nu k_{y}(n / 2)-1\right)+\nu n} \sup g(t) \leqslant 1
$$

where the supremum is taken over those $t$ for which $t \geqslant 2^{-\nu-1}$. Now define

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(X) & =\left|X-X_{v i}\right|^{-2} 2^{-k_{\nu} \nu} & & \text { if } X \in B_{v i} \text { and } \exp \left(-2^{k_{\nu} \nu}\right) \leqslant\left|X-X_{v i}\right| \leqslant 2^{-v-2} \\
& =0 & & \text { elsewhere. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $\quad \iint x_{n}|f| d X \leqslant \sum_{\nu} 2^{\nu(n-1)} 2^{-\nu} \cdot 2^{-k_{\nu} \nu} \iint_{B_{v i}}\left|X-X_{v i}\right|^{-2} d X \leqslant \sum_{\nu} 2^{-k_{\nu} \nu}<\infty$,

$$
\iint g\left(x_{n}\right)|f|^{n / 2} d X=\sum_{\nu} 2^{-\nu} \cdot 2^{-\nu k_{\nu}((n / 2)-1)+\nu n} \sup g(t) \leqslant \sum_{\nu} 2^{-\nu}<\infty .
$$

But

$$
G(X, Y) \geqslant K \cdot|X-Y|^{2-n} \text { in } B_{v i} \text { and hence }
$$

$$
u\left(X_{v i}\right) \geqslant K \cdot 2^{-k_{\nu^{\nu}}} \iint\left|X-X_{\nu i}\right|^{-n} d X \geqslant K \cdot 2^{-k_{\nu} \nu} \int_{\exp \left(-2^{k_{\nu} \nu}\right)}^{2^{-\nu-1}} \frac{d r}{r} \geqslant K>0 .
$$

Now if $X^{\prime}$ is any point satisfying $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 1$ and $h$ is small enough, $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ contains at least one grid point $X_{\nu i}$ for each $\nu$, and our assertion is proved, since by Theorem 6.2

$$
\lim _{\substack{X \rightarrow X^{\prime} \\ X \in V_{h} \\\left(X^{\prime}\right)}} \inf u(X)=0 .
$$

On the other hand, for a given $p>n / 2, x_{n}^{2 p-1}$ is the largest weight function we can allow:

Example 6.6. If for some $p>n / 2, \lim _{t \rightarrow 0} g(t) \cdot t^{1-2 p}=0$, then there exists a function. $f \geqslant 0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f| d X<\infty \\
& \iint g\left(x_{n}\right)|f|^{p} d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

but whose Green potential $u$ does not have non-tangential limits anywhere in $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 1$ with the possible exception of a set of measure zero.

Proof. Choose a suite $t_{v}, t_{\nu+1}<2^{-1} t_{v}$ such that $g\left(t_{\nu}\right) \cdot t_{v}^{1-2 p} \leqslant 2^{-\nu}$. In the plane $x_{n}=t_{\nu}$ we construct a grid of points as in 6.5. If $B_{v i}$ is the ball with center $X_{v i}$ and radius $t_{\nu} \cdot \nu^{-2}$ we define $f=\nu^{4} \cdot t_{\nu}^{-2}$ in $B_{\nu i}$ and $f=0$ elsewhere. That $f$ satisfies the hypothesis and assertion of the theorem follows as in 6.5.

Theorem 6.2 is, however, not the ultimate in this connection.
Theorem 6.7. Suppose $M(t)$ and $N(t)$ are complementary in the sense of Young. If $f$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f| d X<\infty \\
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}^{n-1} M(f(X)) d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

and if

$$
\iint_{|X|=1} N\left(|X|^{2-n}\right) d X<\infty
$$

then the Green potential $u$ of $f$ has non-tangential limit zero at almost all boundary points.
Remark. As examples of $M(t)$ which satisfy these requirements, we mention

$$
M(t) \sim t^{n / 2}(\log t)^{(n / 2)-1}(\log \log t)^{(n / 2)-1} \ldots(\log \log \ldots \log t)^{(n / 2)-1+\varepsilon}, \quad \varepsilon>0
$$

for large values of $t$. By [14], p. 75, we have

$$
N(t) \sim \frac{n-2}{n} t^{(n-2) / n}\left[(\log t)(\log \log t) \ldots(\log \log \ldots \log t)^{[(2 e) /(n-2)]+1}\right]^{-1} .
$$

We also remark that Theorem 6.7 does not contain Corollary 6.3.
Proof. The proof proceeds with Lemma 3.2 as in Theorem 6.2, except that Young's inequality is used instead of Hölder's in the estimate of $I_{0}^{\prime \prime}$.

From the theory of Orlicz spaces, see [14], we know that if

$$
\iint_{|X|<1} N\left(|X|^{2-n}\right) d X=\infty
$$

we can find $f$ such that
while

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{|X|<k} M(f) d X \leqslant 1 \\
& \iint_{|X|<k}|X|^{2-n} f d X
\end{aligned}
$$

can be made arbitrarily large, for each $k$. Using this, it is possible to prove
Example 6.8. If $M$ and $N$ are complementary, and

$$
\iint_{|X|<1} N\left(|X|^{2-n}\right) d X=\infty
$$

then to every positive, locally bounded weight function $g(t), 0<t \leqslant 1$ it is possible to find an $f$ satisfying

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f| d X<\infty, \\
& \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} g\left(x_{n}\right) M(|f|) d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

but whose Green potential $u$ does not have non-tangential boundary values in $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \mathbf{1}$, disregarding a set of measure zero.

For the sake of completeness, we state the corresponding results in the case $n=2$.
Theorem 6.9. If for $n=2, f$ satisfies

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{2}} x_{2}|f(X)| \log |f(X)| d X<\infty
$$

then the Green potential $u$ of $f$ has non-tangential limit zero almost everywhere on the boundary.

Remark. This theorem was proved by Tolsted [23]. In [20], Solomencev claims to prove a more general condition, namely

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{2}} x_{2}|f| \stackrel{+}{\log }\left[x_{2}|f|\right] d X<\infty
$$

However, if $f$ satisfies Solomencev's condition, it also satisfies Tolsted's, since

$$
x_{2}|f| \stackrel{+}{\log }|f| \leqslant 2 \cdot x_{2}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{+}{\log } 2 x_{2}^{-\frac{3}{2}}+4 x_{2}|f|{ }^{+} \log _{2}|f| .
$$

Contrary to the case $n \geqslant 3, M(t)=t \log t$ is the best possible for $n=2$.
Example 6.10. If $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t)[t \stackrel{+}{\log t}]^{-1}=0$, then to every positive locally_bounded weight function $h(t), 0<t \leqslant 1$, there is an $f$ such that
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{R_{+}^{2}} x_{2}|f| d X<\infty \\
& \iint_{R_{+}^{2}} h\left(x_{n}\right) g(|f|) d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

but whose Green potential $u$ does not have non-tangential limits in $\left|x_{1}\right| \leqslant 1$, with the exception of a set of measure zero.

The proof presents no new difficulties, and we omit it.
We shall investigate what the integrability condition on $f$ means when $1<p \leqslant n / 2$. In order to do so, we need some new notation. Consider the " $k$-dimensional cone"

$$
\left\{X \mid x_{k}=x_{k+1}=\ldots=x_{n-1}=0, h\left(x_{1}^{2}+\ldots+x_{k-1}^{2}\right)<x_{n}^{2}<1\right\}
$$

where $2 \leqslant k \leqslant n-1$ and $h>0$. For a fixed $k$ we denote by $\vartheta_{h}(O)$ the image of this "cone" after an orthonormal mapping of $R^{n-1}$ into itself leaving the origin fixed. $\vartheta_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ will be the usual translation of $\vartheta_{h}(O)$. A typical case where the situation can be visualized is $n=3, k=2$. The convention that $f$ has support $\subset\{|X|<1\}$ is still in force.

Theorem 6.11. If $\vartheta_{h}(O)$ is a fixed $k$-dimensional cone, and $f$ satisfies
and

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f| d X<\infty
$$

$$
\iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{p} d X<\infty \quad \text { with } \quad p>\frac{k}{2}
$$

then

$$
\lim _{\substack{Y \rightarrow X^{\prime} \\ Y \in \boldsymbol{v}_{h} X^{\prime}}} u(Y)=0
$$

for almost every $X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$, if $u$ is the Green potential of $f$.
Proof. With a suitable coordinate transformation, we can always assume that $\vartheta_{h}(O)$ is of the original type considered above. Define

$$
\varepsilon(\tau)=\iint_{x_{n}<\tau} x_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{v} d X
$$

An inspection of the proof of Theorem 6.2 shows that it is sufficient to consider the integral $I_{0}^{\prime \prime}$, i.e. the integral over $\left\{X\left||X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2\right\}\right.$.

Put

$$
X=\left(X^{\prime}, x_{n}\right)=\left(X^{\prime \prime}, X^{\prime \prime \prime}, x_{n}\right)=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{k-1}, x_{k}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)
$$

and define

$$
\boldsymbol{W}^{\tau}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)=\left\{\cup \vartheta_{n i n}\left(X^{\prime \prime}, X^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)\right\} \cap\left\{x_{n}<\tau\right\},
$$

where the union is taken over all $X^{\prime \prime \prime} \in R^{n-k}$. If $\psi\left(Y, X^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is the characteristic function of $\mathscr{W}^{1}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)$, we have

$$
\int_{R^{k-1}} \psi\left(Y, X^{\prime \prime}\right) d X^{\prime \prime} \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{k-1}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{R^{k-1}} d X^{\prime \prime} \iint_{w^{\tau}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)} y_{n}^{2 p-k}|f(Y)|^{p} d Y & =\int_{R^{n-k}} d X^{\prime \prime} \iint_{x_{n}<\tau} \psi\left(Y, X^{\prime \prime \prime}\right) y_{n}^{2 p-k}|f|^{p} d Y \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \iint_{x_{n}<\tau} y_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{p} d X=K \cdot \varepsilon(\tau)
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies that

$$
\iint_{\psi^{\tau}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)} y_{n}^{2 p-k}|f|^{p} d Y<K \cdot \eta(\tau)=K \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon(\tau)}
$$

except for $X^{\prime \prime}$ in a set whose $k$-1-dimensional measure is less than $\eta(\tau)$. If $X^{\prime \prime}$ is not in this exceptional set, the set function $\Phi(e), e \subset R^{n-k}$, defined by

$$
\Phi(e)=\int_{e} d X^{\prime \prime \prime} \int_{\left\{\vartheta_{h / n}\left(X^{\prime \prime}, X^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\} \cap\left\{x_{n}<\tau\right\}} y_{n}^{2 p-k}|f|^{p} d Y^{\prime \prime} d y_{n}
$$

has a derivative $<K \cdot \sqrt{\eta(\tau)}$ except in a set of at most $n$ - $k$-dimensional measure $\sqrt{\eta(\tau)}$. If $X_{0}^{\prime}=\left(X_{0}^{\prime \prime}, X_{0}^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ and $X_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $X_{0}^{\prime \prime \prime}$ do not belong to the exceptional sets above, we have for $y_{n}$ small enough

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|I_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right|^{p} \leqslant\left[\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2} \frac{|f(X)|}{|X-Y|^{n-2}} d X\right]^{p} & \leqslant K \iint \frac{|f|^{p}}{|X-Y|^{n-k-\gamma}} d X\left[\iint|X-Y|^{s} d X\right]^{p-1} \\
& \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{2 p-k-\gamma} \cdot \iint \frac{|f|^{p}}{|X-Y|^{n-k-\gamma}} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

where $s=(n-k-\gamma+2 p-n p) /(p-1)>-n$ if $\gamma$ is small enough.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iint \frac{|f|^{p}}{|X-Y|^{n-k-\gamma}} d X & \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty}\left(2^{\nu} y_{n}^{-1}\right)^{n-k-\gamma} \iint_{D \nu} x_{n}^{2 p-k}|f(X)|^{p} d X \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \sqrt{\eta(\tau)} \cdot y_{n}^{k-2 p+\gamma} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\gamma \nu} \leqslant K \cdot \sqrt{\eta(\tau)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
D_{\nu}=\left\{\cup \mathfrak{V}_{h / n}\left(X_{0}^{\prime \prime}, X^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)\right\} \cap\left\{x_{n}<\tau\right\},
$$

the union being taken over those $X^{\prime \prime \prime}$ for which $\left|X^{\prime \prime \prime}-X_{0}^{\prime \prime \prime}\right| \leqslant 2^{-v} y_{n}$. Hence

$$
\lim _{\substack{\left.Y \rightarrow X_{0^{\prime}} \\ Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{h} X_{0^{\prime}}\right)}} \sup \left|I_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right| \leqslant K \cdot[\eta(\tau)]^{1 / 2 p},
$$

and since $\eta(\tau) \rightarrow 0$, the theorem follows in the usual way.
Theorem 6.12. Suppose
and

$$
\begin{gathered}
\iint x_{n}|f| d X<\infty \\
\iint x_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{p} d X<\infty, \quad 1<p \leqslant \frac{n}{2},
\end{gathered}
$$
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then for every $p^{\prime}<p^{* *}=n p /(n-2 p)$ we have

$$
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} y_{n}^{\gamma^{\prime-n}}|u(X)|^{p^{\prime}} d Y<\infty
$$

for almost every $X^{\prime}$, all $\gamma>0$ and all $h>0$.
Proof. Choose an arbitrary $h>0$, and let $X_{0}^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$ be a point where the set function

$$
\Phi(e)=\int_{e} d X^{\prime} \int_{0}^{1} x_{n}|f| d X, \quad e \subset R^{n-1}
$$

has a finite derivative and where

Put

$$
\begin{gathered}
\iint_{V_{h i n}} x_{n}^{2 p-n}|f|^{p} d X<\infty . \\
u(Y)=\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}+\iint_{|X-Y| \geqslant y_{n} / 2} G(X, Y) f d X=u_{1}+u_{2} .
\end{gathered}
$$

With Minkowski's inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[\iint_{V_{h^{\left(X 0^{\prime}\right)}}} y_{n}^{\gamma-n}\left|u_{2}(Y)\right|^{p^{\prime}} d Y\right]^{1 / p^{\prime}} \leqslant \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n} f(X) } & {\left[\iint|X-Y|^{-n p^{\prime}} \cdot y_{n}^{\gamma+p^{\prime}-n} d Y\right]^{1 / p^{\prime}} d X } \\
\leqslant K \cdot \iint_{R_{+}^{n}} x_{n}|f|\left|X^{\prime}-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|^{\gamma+1-n} d X & \leqslant K \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} 2^{\nu(n-1-\gamma)} \iint_{\left|X^{\prime}-X_{0^{\prime} \mid}\right| \leqslant 2^{-\nu+1}} x_{n}|f| d X \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} 2^{-v \gamma}<\infty,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the double integral without integration limits is taken over

$$
\left\{y_{n} \leqslant\left|X^{\prime}-X_{0}^{\prime}\right| \cdot K\right\} \cap V_{h}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right) .
$$

With Hölder's inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|u_{1}(Y)\right| & \leqslant \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2} \frac{|f(X)|}{|X-Y|^{n-2}} d X \\
& \leqslant\left[\iint \frac{d X}{|X-Y|^{n-\gamma}}\right]^{1 / q}\left[\iint \frac{x_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{p}}{|X-Y|^{p^{\prime \prime}}} d X\right]^{1 / p^{\prime}}\left[\iint x_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{p} d X\right]^{1 / p-1 / p^{\prime}} \\
& \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{p^{\prime \prime \prime \prime}}\left[\iint \frac{x_{n}^{2 p-1}|f|^{p}}{|X-Y|^{p^{\prime \prime}}} d X\right]^{1 / p^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $p^{\prime \prime}=p^{\prime}\left[n-2+(\gamma-n) q^{-1}\right]$ and $p^{\prime \prime \prime}=\gamma p q^{-1}+(n-1)\left(p^{\prime}-p\right)\left(p p^{\prime}\right)^{-1}$ from which follows

$$
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)} y_{n}^{-n}|u(Y)|^{p^{\prime}} d Y \leqslant K \iint_{V_{n / n}\left(X_{0^{\prime}}\right)} x_{n}^{2 p-n}|f|^{p} d X<\infty .
$$

The theorem is proved.

Remark. By putting $f(X)=x_{n}^{-2}\left(\log \left(1 / x_{n}\right)\right)^{-1}\left(\log \log \left(1 / x_{n}\right)\right)^{-2}$ in $0<x_{n}<1,\left|X^{\prime}\right|<1$, we see that it is not possible to allow $\gamma=0$ in the theorem above. Likewise, by using the grid of Example 6.5 and defining $t=2^{4 \nu+\left(\nu n / p^{\prime}\right)}$ in $\left|X-X_{\nu i}\right|<2^{-2 \nu}$ we see that we cannot take $p^{\prime}>n p /(n-2 p)$. It is probable, however, that $p^{\prime}=n p /(n-2 p)$ would do.
7. In this section we state and prove some theorems on the existence of boundary values of solutions to (1.1), and how these are approached. The first ones are extensions of the Fatou theorem [9].

Theorem 7.1. Suppose $u$ is a solution of (1.1B) in $R_{+}^{n}$, and $u \in H^{1}$. Then at almost every point of $R^{n-1}, u$ has a finite, non-tangential limit. The limit function is locally summable.

Proof. It is clearly sufficient to prove the existence of limits in bounded sets, $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$ for arbitrarily large $\varrho$. Put

$$
D_{\tau}=\left\{X\left|\tau<x_{n}<1+\tau,\left|x_{i}\right|<\varrho, i=1, \ldots, n-1\right\}, \quad \tau \geqslant 0\right.
$$

and $D_{0}=D$. The part of $\partial D_{\tau}$ satisfying $x_{n}=\tau$ will be denoted by $\partial^{\prime} D_{\tau}$.
By definition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{\Omega} x_{n}^{\gamma-1}|u| d X<\infty \tag{7.1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\gamma>0$ and all bounded sets $\subset R_{+}^{n}$. From Corollary 4.4 we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{\Omega}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X<\infty . \tag{7.1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, (7.1.1) implies that

$$
\iint_{V_{h^{\prime}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}} x_{n}^{\gamma-n}|u| d X<\infty
$$

for all $h>0$, all $\gamma>0$ and almost all $X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$. By Theorem 4.8

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-n}|u|^{p}+x_{n}^{p-n+\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}+x_{n}^{2 p-n+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X<\infty \tag{7.1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $h>0, \gamma>0$, and almost all $X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$.
The next step will be to find a suitable representation formula for $u$. To that end we first note that by (7.1.2) and Fubini's theorem

$$
\int_{D \cap\left\{x_{j}=t\right\}} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right| d S<\infty
$$

for $j=1, \ldots, n-1$ and almost all $t \in R^{1}$. We can assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\partial D-\partial^{\prime} D} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right| d S \leqslant \infty \quad \text { and } \quad \int_{\partial D-\partial^{\prime} D}|u| d S<\infty . \tag{7.1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Consider the sequence $d \mu^{(k)}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=u\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, \tau^{(k)}\right) d X^{\prime}$ on $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho$. By the definition of $H^{1}$ we can pick out a subsequence $\left\{\tau^{\left(k_{\nu}\right)}\right\}_{1}^{\infty}$ such that $d \mu^{\left(c_{y}\right)}$ converges weakly to $d \mu$, say. By the Lebesgue decomposition theorem, $d \mu=\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}+d m$, where $\bar{u} \in L^{1}\left(\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right)$ and $d m$ is a singular measure. Let $X_{0}^{\prime}$ be any fixed point in $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$ and let $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right), h>0$, be an arbitrary cone. If $Y$ is a point in this cone, denote by $Y_{\tau}$ the point $Y+(0, \ldots, \tau) . G^{\tau}$ will be the Green function in $\left\{X \mid x_{n}>\tau\right\}$ of the operator $a^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\left(\partial^{2} / \partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}\right)$. Now apply Green's formula in $D_{\tau}$. We get

$$
\begin{aligned}
u\left(Y_{\tau}\right)=\frac{1}{\omega_{n}} \int_{\partial D_{\tau}} & \frac{\partial G^{\tau}}{\partial v}\left(X, Y_{\tau}\right) u(X) d S_{X} \\
& \quad-\frac{1}{\omega_{n}} \int_{\partial D_{\tau}-\partial^{\prime} D_{\tau}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v}(X) G^{\tau}\left(X, Y_{\tau}\right) d S_{X}+\iint_{D_{\tau}} G^{\tau} \bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right) u_{i j} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

and after using the fact that $u$ satisfies the regularized equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right) u_{i j}= & F+\left[\bar{a}^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j}+\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j} \\
\omega_{n} \cdot u\left(Y_{\tau}\right)= & \int_{\partial D_{\tau}} \frac{\partial G^{\tau}}{\partial v} u d S_{X}-\int_{\partial D_{\tau}-\partial^{\prime} D_{\tau}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} G^{\tau} d S_{X} \\
& +\iint_{D_{\tau}} G^{\tau}\left(X, Y_{\tau}\right)\left\{F+\left[\bar{a}^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j}\right\} d X \\
& +\iint_{D_{\tau}} G^{\tau}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

Before letting $\tau$ tend to zero we integrate partially in the last integral over the region $D_{\tau}-\left\{X| | X-Y_{\tau} \mid \leqslant \sigma\right\}=D_{\tau}-B_{\sigma \tau}$, where $y_{n} / 4 \leqslant \sigma \leqslant y_{n} / 2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iint_{D_{\tau^{-}} B_{\sigma \tau}}\{ \} d X=\int_{\partial D_{\tau}} & -\int_{\partial B_{\sigma \tau}} G^{\tau}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i} d X_{(j)}-\iint_{D_{\tau^{-B}}} G^{r} \bar{a}^{i j} u_{i} d X \\
& -\left\{\int_{\partial D_{\tau}}-\int_{\partial B_{\sigma \tau}}\right\} G_{j}^{\tau}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u d X_{(i)} \\
& +\iint_{D_{\tau^{-B}}}\left\{G_{j i}^{\tau}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u+G_{j}^{\tau} \bar{a}_{i}^{i j} u\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

Now put $\tau=\tau^{(k)}$ and let $k \rightarrow \infty$. If we use (7.1.2), (7.1.4), the fact that $d \mu^{(k)}$ converges weakly and Lebesgue's principle of dominated convergence, we see that all passages to the limit are allowed. After this we integrate with respect to $\sigma$ between $y_{n} / 4$ and $y_{n} / 2$, divide by $y_{n} / 4$, and get the following representation formula for $u$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
\omega_{n} \cdot u(Y)= & \int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}(X, Y)\left\{\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}+d m\right\}  \tag{7.1.5}\\
& +\int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho} \frac{\partial G}{\partial x_{j}}(X, Y)\left[\bar{a}^{n j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{n j}(X)\right]\left\{\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}+d m\right\} \tag{7.1.6}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& +\int_{\partial D_{\tau^{-} \partial^{\prime} D_{\tau}}} \bar{a}^{i j}(X) u G_{j} d X_{(i)}-G \bar{a}^{i j}(X) u_{i} d X_{(j)}  \tag{7.1.7}\\
& +\frac{4}{y_{n}} \int_{y_{n} / 4}^{y_{n} / 2} d \sigma\left\{\int_{\partial B_{\sigma}} G\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i} d X_{(j)}\right. \\
& \left.+G_{j}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u d X_{(i)}\right\}  \tag{7.1.8}\\
& +\iint_{D} G\left\{F+\left[\bar{a}^{i j}(X)-a^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j}\right\} d X  \tag{7.1.9}\\
& +\frac{4}{y_{n}} \int_{y_{n} / 4}^{y_{n} / 2} d \sigma \iint_{B_{\sigma}} G\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j} d X  \tag{7.1.10}\\
& +\frac{4}{y_{n}} \int_{y_{n} / 4}^{y_{n} / 2} d \sigma \iint_{D-B_{\sigma}}\left\{G_{j i}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u\right. \\
& \left.+G_{j} \bar{a}_{i}^{i j} u-G \bar{a}_{j}^{i j} u_{i}\right\} d X . \tag{7.1.11}
\end{align*}
$$

We intend to prove that $u \rightarrow \bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ at almost all points of $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$. To do so we note that

$$
\int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}(X, Y) d S_{X}=\omega_{n}
$$

and hence if $X_{0}^{\prime}$ is a point in the Lebesgue set of $\bar{u} d X^{\prime}+d m$, i.e. a point where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(t)=t^{1-n} \int_{\mid X^{\prime}-X_{0} 0^{\prime} \leqslant t}\left\{\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| d X^{\prime}+d m\right\} \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow 0 \tag{7.1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \omega_{n}\left|(7.1 .5)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| \\
& \quad \leqslant \int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}\left(X^{\prime}, Y\right)\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| d X^{\prime}+\int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v} d m+\int_{\partial D-\partial^{\prime} D} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}(X, Y) \bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right) d S_{X} \\
& \quad \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{N} \frac{y_{n}}{\left(2^{n} l\right)^{n}} \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-X_{0} \prime^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2^{v+1}}\left\{\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| d X^{\prime}+d m\right\} \\
& \quad+K \cdot \delta^{-n} \cdot y_{n} \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-X_{0^{\prime}}\right| \geqslant \delta}\left\{\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| d X^{\prime}+d m\right\}+K \cdot \varrho^{-n} \cdot y_{n} \int_{\partial D-\partial^{\prime} D}|u| d S_{X} \\
& \quad \leqslant K \cdot \varepsilon(\delta) \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} 2^{-\nu}+K_{\delta} \cdot y_{n},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $l=\left|Y-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|$ and $\varepsilon(\delta)=\sup _{0<t<\delta} h(t)$.
By (7.1.11) $\varepsilon(\delta)$ tends to zero with $\delta$ and hence for every $\varepsilon>0$

$$
\lim _{\substack{\lim _{\begin{subarray}{c}{Y \\
\mathrm{~V}_{h}\left(X^{\prime} X_{0}^{\prime}\right)} }}}\end{subarray}} \sup \omega_{n}\left|(7.1 .5)-u\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right|<\varepsilon,
$$

i.e. (7.1.5) tends to $\omega_{n} \cdot \bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ as $Y \rightarrow X_{0}^{\prime}$ non-tangentially almost everywhere. In the same way,

$$
|(7.1 .6)| \leqslant K \cdot \delta^{\alpha}+K_{\delta} \cdot y_{n}
$$

whence (7.1.6) $\rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere. The integral (7.1.7) admits the estimate

$$
K \cdot y_{n} \cdot \varrho^{-n} \int_{\partial D-\partial^{\prime} D}\left\{x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|+|u|\right\} d S_{X}
$$

which tends to zero for all $X_{\mathbf{0}}^{\prime}$, by (7.1.4). (7.1.8) and (7.1.10) can be estimated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K \cdot y_{n}^{1-n} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} \mid 2} x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right| d X \\
& \quad+K \cdot y_{n}^{-n} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2} x_{n}^{\alpha}|u| d X+K \iint|X-Y|^{2-n} x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right| d X \\
& \quad \leqslant K \iint x_{n}^{1+\alpha-n}\left|u_{i}\right| d X+K \iint x_{n}^{\alpha-n}|u| d X+K\left[\iint x_{n}^{2 p-n+\alpha p}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right]^{1 / p}
\end{aligned}
$$

if $p>1$, all the integrations in the last membrum being performed over $V_{h / n}\left(X_{\mathbf{0}}^{\prime}\right) \cap$ $\left\{x_{n}<2 y_{n}\right\}$ from which we conclude, using (7.1.3), that (7.1.8) and (7.1.10) tend to zero for almost every $X_{0}^{\prime}$. Also by (7.1.3), (7.1.2) and Theorem 6.2 we find that (7.1.9) and the last term in (7.1.11) tend to zero almost everywhere in the prescribed way. To estimate the first term of (7.1.11), put

$$
\varepsilon(r)=\iint_{\left\{x_{n}<r\right\} \cap D} x_{n}^{(\alpha / 2)-1}|u| d X
$$

Then the set function

$$
\int_{e} d X^{\prime} \int_{0}^{r} x_{n}^{(\alpha / 2)-1}|u| d x_{n}, \quad e \subset R^{n-1}
$$

has a derivative $\leqslant 1$ except in a set of measure $\leqslant \varepsilon(r)$. If $X_{0}^{\prime}$ is outside of this set we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{4}{y_{n}} \int_{y_{n} / 4}^{y_{n} / 2} d \sigma \iint_{D-B_{\sigma}} G_{j_{i}[ }\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u d X\right| \\
& \quad \leqslant \iint_{D-B y_{n} / 4} \frac{y_{n}}{}|X-Y|^{n+1}\left|X-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|^{\alpha}|u| d X \\
& \quad \leqslant K \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} \frac{y_{n}\left(2^{v+1} \cdot y_{n}\right)^{\alpha}}{\left(2^{v} l\right)^{n+1}} \iint_{\left|X-X_{0^{\prime}}\right| \leqslant 2^{v+1} l}|u| d X+K_{r} \cdot y_{n} \iint_{\left|X-X_{0^{\prime}}\right| \geqslant r / 2}|u| d X \\
& \quad \leqslant K \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} \frac{y_{n} \cdot r^{\alpha / 2}}{\left(2^{v} l\right)^{n}} \iint_{\left|X-X_{0^{\prime}}\right| \leqslant 2^{\nu+1}} x_{n}^{(\alpha / 2)-1}|u| d X+K_{r} \cdot y_{n} \leqslant K \cdot r^{\alpha / 2} \sum_{v=1}^{N} 2^{-v}+K_{r} \cdot y_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $l=\left|Y-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|$ and $r \cdot 2^{-1} \leqslant 2^{N+1} \cdot l \leqslant r$. Hence with the usual argument we see that this integral tends to zero for almost every $X_{0}^{\prime}$. The second term of (7.1.11) is estimated in the same way. Since $\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right) \in L^{1}\left(\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right)$, the last statement of the theorem, and thereby the whole theorem, is proved.

An examination of the proof of Theorem 7.1 shows that nowhere has the fact that $u$ is a solution in $R_{+}^{n}$ been used, only that $u$ is a solution in a region $\Omega$, one part of the boundary of which lies in a hyperplane $H$, or, more carefully, to every $X$ in this part of $\partial \Omega$ there is a neighborhood $N$ such that $\partial \Omega \cap N \subset H$. This and the same remark about Theorem 5.1 imply the following theorem.

Theorem 7.2. If $u$ is a non-negative solution of (1.1C) in a region $\Omega$, some part $\Gamma$ of the boundary of which lies in a hyperplane in the sense stated above, then at almost every point of $\Gamma$, u has a finite, non-tangential limit.

Theorem 7.3. If $u$ is a non-negative solution of (1.1C) in a Liapunov region $\Omega$, then $u$ has a non-tangential, finite limit at almost every point of the boundary $\partial \Omega$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the almost everywhere existence of limits in a neighborhood of an arbitrary point $X_{0} \in \partial \Omega$. By the definition of Liapunov surfaces, there is a sphere $\Sigma_{\varrho}$ of radius $\varrho>0$ and center $X_{0}$ such that a line parallel to the normal at $X_{0}$ intersects $\partial \Omega$ at most once inside $\Sigma_{\rho}$. We can also choose $\varrho$ so small that any two normals issuing from points of $\partial \Omega$ inside $\Sigma_{o}$ form an angle $<\pi / 4$, say. It will be no restriction to assume that $X_{0}=O$ and that the positive $x_{n}$-axis is along the (inner) normal of $\partial \Omega$ at $X_{0}$. Then, inside $\Sigma_{\rho}, \partial \Omega$ is described by $x_{n}=\varphi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}\right)$, where $\varphi \in C^{1+\gamma}\left(\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho+\varepsilon\right)$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be this part of $\partial \Omega$, and use Lemma 3.9 to extend the function $x_{n}-\varphi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}\right)$ from $\mathcal{A}$ into $R^{n}$. We assume that we have multiplied the extension $\Phi(X)$ by a function in $C_{0}^{\infty}$ which is identically one in $|X| \leqslant 10 \varrho$, say. Since $\partial \Phi / \partial x_{n}=1$ on $A$ we can consider the connected region $D=$ that connected component of the set $\left\{X\left|\left|X^{\prime}\right|<\frac{1}{2} \varrho, \partial \Phi / \partial x_{n}>\frac{1}{2}, \Phi>0\right\}\right.$ which has $\mathcal{A}$ as part of its boundary. It is clear that $\Phi$ has the following properties in $D$ :

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1^{\circ} & \Phi \in C^{1+\gamma}(\bar{D}) \\
2^{\circ} & K_{1}\left[x_{n}-\varphi\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right] \leqslant \Phi \leqslant K_{2}\left[x_{n}-\varphi\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right], \quad K_{i}>0 \\
3^{\circ} & \left|D^{(2)} \Phi\right| \leqslant K \cdot \Phi^{\gamma-1}
\end{array}
$$

$4^{\circ}$ For each $X^{\prime},\left|X^{\prime}\right|<\frac{1}{2} \varrho$, $\Phi$ is strictly monotonic considered as a function of $x_{n}$.
The mapping $Y=H(X)=\left(h^{1}, h^{2}, \ldots, h^{n}\right)=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, \Phi(X)\right), X \in \bar{D}$, is one-one and maps $\bar{D}$ onto a region $\bar{D}^{\prime}$ which contains the set $\left\{Y\left|\left|Y^{\prime}\right|<\frac{1}{2} \varrho, 0<y_{n}<\tau\right\}\right.$, for some $\tau>0$, in such a way that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\left\{\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \varrho\right\}$ correspond. Consider the function $v(Y)=u\left(H^{-1}(Y)\right)$. We shall prove that $v$ satisfies the following differential equation, which is of admissible type in $D^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{a}^{k l}(Y) v_{k l}=\hat{F}\left(Y, v(Y), v_{k}(Y)\right)-\hat{b}^{k}(Y) v_{k}(Y) \tag{7.3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{a}^{k l}(Y)=a^{i j}\left(H^{-1}(Y)\right) h_{j}^{l}\left(H^{-1}(Y)\right) h_{i}^{k}\left(H^{-1}(Y)\right), \\
& \hat{F}=F\left(H^{-1}(Y), v(Y), v_{i}(Y) h_{k}^{i}\left(H^{-1}(Y)\right)\right. \\
& \hat{b}^{k}(Y)=a^{i j}\left(H^{-1}(Y)\right) h_{i j}^{k}\left(H^{-1}(Y)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

In fact, since $u=v(H(X))$ we get $u_{i}=v_{k}(H(X)) h_{i}^{k}(X)$ and $u_{i j}=v_{k l} h_{i}^{k} h_{j}^{l}+v_{k} h_{i j}^{k}$, and after substitution in (1.1):

$$
a^{i j} u_{i j}=a^{i j} u_{i j} v_{k l} h_{i}^{k} h_{j}^{l}+a^{i j} v_{k} h_{i j}^{k}=F\left(X, u(X), u_{i}(X)\right)
$$

By reordering and putting $X=H^{-1}(Y)$ we get (7.3.1). To see that (7.3.1) is of admissible type we note that the functional determinant $\|\mathcal{H}\|$ of $H$ is $=\partial \Phi / \partial x_{n} \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$. Hence
and

$$
\inf _{x \in D} \min _{\mid\{\mid=1}|\mathcal{H} \xi| \geqslant K>0
$$

Here we have denoted by $\mathcal{H} \xi$ the matrix $\mathcal{H}$ operating on the vector $\xi$ of $R^{n},(.,$.$) is$ the inner product in $R^{n}$, and $A$ is the matrix $a^{i j}$. Thus (7.3.1) is uniformly elliptic in $D^{\prime}$. Also since $\partial \Phi / \partial x_{n} \geqslant \frac{1}{2}, H^{-1}(Y)$ is Hölder continuous, in fact with exponent one. The $h_{j}^{l}$ being Hölder continuous by $1^{\circ}$, we see that $\hat{a}^{k l}$ are too. Using $2^{\circ}$ and $3^{\circ}$ it is also easy to check that the growth properties of $\hat{F}$ and $\hat{b}^{t c}$ are the right ones.

Thus $v(Y)$ satisfies the requirements of 7.2 and we can conclude that $v$ has nontangential limits almost everywhere in $\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$. Again since $\partial \Phi / \partial x_{n} \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$ the image of an essential part of every truncated cone with vertex in $\left|X-X_{0}\right|<\varrho / 2$ is contained in some cone $V_{h}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)$. The theorem is proved with the observation that sets of measure zero in $\mathcal{A}$ correspond to null sets in $\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$ and inversely, due to $1^{\circ}$ and the fact that $\partial \Phi / \partial x_{n} \geqslant 1$ on $\mathcal{A}$.

Remark. It is easy to see that the mapping $H$ works with solutions of (1.1B) also.
The question might be asked, whether the hypotheses on the equation can be weakened while the theorems just proved still hold. It is not difficult to see that if we assume the same growth conditions as in the discussion after Theorem 5.1 then $u \in H^{p}$ with $p>1$ implies the existence of non-tangential boundary values of $u$. It seems probable that $p=1$ or $u \geqslant 0$ would suffice in this case also. However, Theorem 5.2 shows that in general no more is true. In particular $u=\cos \log x_{n}$ is a bounded solution of

$$
\Delta u+\frac{1}{x_{n}} u_{x_{n}}+\frac{1}{x_{n}^{2}} u=0
$$

in $R_{+}^{n}$ without boundary values.
On the other hand, if we consider the equation

$$
L u=\Delta u+\frac{k}{x_{n}} u_{x_{n}}=0
$$

with $k<1$, it is well known that the boundary value problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
L u & =0 \quad \text { in } \quad R_{+}^{n} \\
u & =\varphi\left(X^{\prime}\right) \quad X^{\prime} \in R^{n-1},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\varphi$ has suitable properties, has the solution

$$
u(Y)=K \cdot y_{n}^{1-k} \int_{R^{n-1}} \frac{\varphi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(y_{i}-x_{i}\right)^{2}+y_{n}^{2}\right]^{(n-k) / 2}}
$$

see Weinstein [26]. Now it is easy to see that it is possible to represent a positive solution of $L u=0$ in a similar manner with a positive measure $d \mu\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ instead of $\varphi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}$, and in a standard way it follows that $u$ has non-tangential boundary values almost everywhere.

Whether the uniform ellipticity is necessary is not clear. If we keep the other conditions, and $a^{i j}$ satisfy only

$$
a^{i j \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \geqslant \varepsilon\left(x_{n}\right)|\xi|^{2}, ~}
$$

where $\varepsilon(t) \searrow 0$, then it is necessary that

$$
\int_{0} \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} d t=\infty
$$

since else $u=\sin \left(\log x_{n}\right)$ is a solution of

$$
\frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x_{1}^{2}}+\ldots+\varepsilon\left(x_{n}\right) \frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x_{n}}=t
$$

where

$$
|f|=\left|-\frac{\varepsilon\left(x_{n}\right)}{x_{n}^{2}}\left(\sin \log x_{n}+\cos \log x_{n}\right)\right| \leqslant \frac{2 \varepsilon\left(x_{n}\right)}{x_{n}^{2}} .
$$

The author hopes to return to the question of the "right" conditions in this context.
Theorem 7.4. If $u$ is a solution of (1.1B) and belongs to $H^{p}, p>1$, then $u\left(X^{\prime}, x_{n}\right)$ converges in $L^{p}(\Omega)$ when $x_{n} \rightarrow 0$ to its almost everywhere boundary function $\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ for every bounded subdomain $\Omega$ of $R^{n-1}$.

Proof. We shall prove that for every $\varrho>0, u\left(X^{\prime}, x_{n}^{(k)}\right)$ converges to $\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ in $L^{p}\left(\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2\right)$ for every sequence $\left\{x_{n}^{(k)}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ tending to zero. Since the limit function is unique, the theorem follows.

By Egorov's theorem it is sufficient to find an $L^{p}$ function which majorizes $u$ independently of $x_{n}$. This majorant function is constructed with the help of the maximal functions of Hardy and Littlewood.

We use the representation formula from the proof of Theorem 7.1. Since $u \in H^{p}$, the choice of the limit measure $d \mu$ can be made in such a way that $d \mu=\bar{u} d S$ where $\bar{u} \in L^{p}\left(\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right)$. Using some by now evident estimates we get the following inequality:

$$
\begin{aligned}
|u(Y)| \leqslant K & +K \int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}(X, Y)|\bar{u}| d X^{\prime}+K \cdot y_{n}^{1-n} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|\right\} d X \\
& +K \iint_{D} G(X, Y)\left\{|F|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X+K \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2} G(X, Y) x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right| d X \\
& +K \iint_{D-\left\{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 4\right\}}\left\{\left|G_{i j}\right|\left|X-Y^{\prime}\right|^{\alpha}|u|+\left|G_{j}\right| x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|+G \cdot x_{n}^{\alpha-1}\left|u_{i}\right|\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

where $Y^{\prime}$ is the orthogonal projection of $Y$ on $R^{n-1}$ and $G$ is the Green function of $a^{i j}\left(Y^{\prime}\right) \partial^{2} / \partial^{2} x_{i} \partial x_{j}$.
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Define

$$
\varphi\left(X^{\prime}\right)=\int_{0}^{o}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d x_{n}
$$

for $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho, \varphi=0$ elsewhere. Hölder's inequality shows that $\varphi \in L^{p}\left(R^{n-1}\right)$. The maximal function $\bar{u}^{*}$ and $\varphi^{*}$ of $|\bar{u}|$ and $\varphi$ respectively, defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varphi^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)=\sup _{\sigma>0} \frac{1}{\omega_{n-1} \sigma^{n-1}} \cdot \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \sigma} \varphi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime} \\
& \bar{u}^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)=\sup _{\sigma>0} \frac{1}{\omega_{n-1} \sigma^{n-1}} \cdot \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \sigma}\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right| d X^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

both belong to $L^{p}\left(R^{n-1}\right)$, cf. Zygmund [28], p. 32. We shall prove that $u(Y) \leqslant$ $K\left[1+\bar{u}^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)+\varphi^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)\right],\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$. In fact, using the inequalities of Lemma 3.5 and choosing $N$ suitably large,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\lvert\, \int_{\mid X^{\prime} \leqslant \leqslant} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}\right. & \left(X^{\prime}, Y\right)|\bar{u}| d X^{\prime} \mid \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant y_{n}}(\cdot) d X^{\prime}+K \cdot \sum_{v=0}^{N} \int_{2^{y_{y}} y_{n} \leqslant \mid X^{\prime}-Y^{\prime} \leqslant 2^{v+1} y_{n}} \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}\left(X^{\prime}, Y\right)|\bar{u}| d X^{\prime} \\
& \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{1-n} \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant y_{n}}|\bar{u}| d X^{\prime}+K \sum_{\nu=0}^{N} \frac{y_{n}}{\left(2^{y} y_{n}\right)^{n}} \cdot \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2^{v+1} y_{n}}|\bar{u}| d X^{\prime} \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \bar{u}^{*}+K \sum_{\nu=0}^{N} 2^{-v}|\bar{u}|^{*}=K \cdot \bar{u}^{*} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iint_{D}(\cdot) d X & \leqslant \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}+\iint_{\left\{|X-Y| \geqslant y_{n} \mid 2\right\} \cap D} \\
\left|\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}\right| & \leqslant K+K \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \iint_{2^{-v-1} y_{n} \leqslant|X-Y| \leqslant 2^{-y_{y_{n}}}} G\left[x_{n}^{\alpha-2}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha-1}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right] d X \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_{n}^{-1}}{\left(2^{-v} y_{n}\right)^{n-2}} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant 2^{-v} y_{n}}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} 2^{-v} \varphi^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)=K \cdot \varphi^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)+K \\
\left|\iint_{|X-Y| \geqslant y_{n} / 2}\right| & \leqslant K+K \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{N} \frac{y_{n}}{\left(2^{v} y_{n}\right)^{n}} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant 2^{v} y_{n}}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X \\
& \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{N} 2^{-v} \varphi^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)=K \cdot \varphi^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)+K .
\end{aligned}
$$

The remaining integrals are estimated essentially in the same way. As an example

$$
\iint_{D-\left\{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n}(2)\right.}\left|G_{j}\right| x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u| d X \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{N} \frac{y_{n}}{\left(2^{v} y_{n}\right)^{n}} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant 2^{p} y_{n}} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u| d X \leqslant K \cdot \varphi^{*}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)
$$

The theorem is proved.

Theorem 7.5. If $u$ is a bounded solution of (1.1 B) in a Liapunov region $\Omega$, or $u \in H^{p}$ in $R_{+}^{n}$, with $p>1+(n-1) / 2$, and $u \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere on a set $E$ on the boundary, then $u \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on every subset $F$ of $E$ whose distance to the complement of $E$ is greater than zero.

Proof. If we use the mapping of Theorem 7.3 we see that it is sufficient to assume that $u$ is a solution in $\left\{X\left|x_{n}>0,|X| \leqslant 2 \varrho\right\}\right.$, that $u$ tends to zero almost everywhere in $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho$ and to prove the uniform convergence in $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$.

We use the representation formula of Theorem 7.1 with $\bar{X}_{0}^{\prime}=Y^{\prime}=$ the orthogonal projection of $Y$ on $R^{n-1}$. Theorems 7.1 and 7.4 show that $\bar{u}$ is identically zero. We get the inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
|u(Y)| & \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}+\iint_{D} G|f| d X+K \iint_{D} G\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-2}|u|+x_{n}^{\alpha-1}\left|u_{i}\right|+x_{n}^{\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X \\
& +K \iint_{|X-X| \leqslant y_{n} / 2} x_{n}^{\alpha-n}|u| d X+K \cdot \iint_{D-\left\{|X-Y| \geqslant y_{n}(4\}\right.}\left\{\left|G_{i j}\right|\left|X-Y^{\prime}\right|^{\alpha}|u|\right. \\
& \left.+\left|G_{j}\right| x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

for $\left|Y^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho / 2$. In the remaining part of the proof $K$ will denote constants independent of $Y^{\prime}$. The first two terms on the right hand side tend to zero uniformly with $y_{n}$. In the third term we divide the area of integration into two parts, $|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2$ and $|X-Y| \geqslant y_{n} / 2$. With Hölder's inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}(\cdot) d X\right| \\
& \leqslant \\
& \leqslant \cdot y_{n}^{\alpha-2+(1 / p)-(\alpha / p)}\left[\iint_{D} x_{n}^{2 p-1+\alpha\{ }\left\{\left.u_{i j}\right|^{p}+x_{n}^{-p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}+x_{n}^{-2 p}|u|^{p}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p} \\
& \quad \times\left[\iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}|X-Y|^{\mid(2-n)} d X\right]^{1 / q} \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{\alpha+(1-n-\alpha) / p}=K \cdot y_{n}^{v}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\gamma>0$, from the assumption on $p$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\iint_{|X-Y| \geqslant y_{n} / 2}(\cdot) d X\right| \leqslant K \cdot y_{n} \cdot\left[\iint_{D} x_{n}^{2 p-1+\alpha}\left\{\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}+x_{n}^{-p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}+x_{n}^{-2 p}|u|^{p}\right\} d X\right]^{1 / p} \\
& \quad \times\left[\iint_{|X-Y| \geqslant y_{n} / 2}|X-Y|^{n q} d X\right]^{1 / q} \\
& \quad \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}\left[\sum_{v=-1}^{N}\left(2^{v} y_{n}\right)^{-n q} \iint_{|X-Y| \leqslant 2^{v+1} y_{n}} x_{n}^{\alpha-1} d X\right]^{1 / q} \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}^{\gamma_{1}, \gamma_{1}>0}
\end{aligned}
$$

The remaining integrals are treated similarly after which the theorem is proved.
8. In [22] Stein proved that a necessary and sufficient condition for the harmonic function $u$ defined in $R_{+}^{n}$ to have non-tangential boundary values at almost every boundary point is that the "generalized area integral"
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$$
\iint_{V_{h^{(X)}}} x_{n}^{2-n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X
$$

is finite for almost every $X^{\prime}\left(h>0\right.$ may vary with $\left.X^{\prime}\right)$. This theorem had been proved in the case $n=2$ by Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund [17], and Spencer [21], and the necessity part of it for $n>2$ by Calderón [5]. Widman [27] proved the same theorem for regions other than a half space. In [4] Calderón proved that a sufficient condition for $u$ to have non-tangential boundary values is that $u$ is bounded in $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ for almost every $X^{\prime}$. This was later generalized by Carleson [7], who proved that it is sufficient to assume boundedness below in almost every $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$. See also the work of Brelot and Doob in [3]. We shall prove the theorems of Stein and Calderón in the case when $u$ is a solution of (1.1). The reader will notice that the manner of proof is somewhat different in some aspects. Thus Stein uses Calderón's theorem in his proof, while we will get Calderón's theorem as a corollary of that of Stein. The chief difference lies in the sufficiency part of Stein's theorem. The proof of the theorem corresponding to Carleson's generalization has so far escaped our efforts.

Theorem 8.1. Suppose $u$ is a solution of (1.1B), in a Liapunov region $\Omega$, with the property that for almost every $X_{0} \in \partial \Omega$ there is an $h>0$ such that $u$ is bounded in $V_{h}\left(X_{0}\right)$. Then

$$
\iint_{V_{k}\left(X_{0}\right)} \delta^{2-n}(X)\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for all $k>0$ and almost all $X_{0} \in \partial \Omega$.
Proof. Using the mapping of Theorem 7.3 we realize that it is sufficient to consider the case $\Omega=R_{+}^{n}$.

By Theorem 4.8 we see that the boundedness of $u$ in $V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}} x_{n}^{p-n+\gamma}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p} d X<\infty, \\
& \iint_{V_{h^{\prime}(X,}} x_{n}^{2 p-n+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X<\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $\gamma>0, h^{\prime}>h$ and $p>1$. Moreover by Theorem $4.5 x_{n}\left|u_{i}(X)\right| \leqslant K<\infty$ in each $V_{h^{\prime}}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$. If we take an arbitrary $\varepsilon>0$, an arbitrary $\varrho>0$ and an arbitrary $k>0$ we can find a closed set $F \subset\left\{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right\}$ such that $\operatorname{mes}(F)>\omega_{n-1} \cdot \varrho^{n-1} /(n-1)-\varepsilon$, and such that

$$
\iint_{w_{k}(F)} x_{n}^{2 p-1+\gamma}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p} d X<\infty,
$$

$|u|$ and $x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right| \leqslant K$ in $W_{k}(F)$. In order to be able to integrate partially in $W_{k}(F)$ we approximate the irregular part of the boundary of $W_{k}(F)$ with a sequence of regular surfaces $\Gamma_{\nu}: x_{n}=\varphi_{\nu}\left(X^{\prime}\right) \in C^{\infty}$, the normal of $\Gamma_{\nu}$ always making an angle with the $x_{n}$-axis which is bounded above by $\pi / 2-\varkappa$, where $x>0$ depends on $k$. For this construction, see Stein [22]. The $\Gamma_{\nu}$,s are constructed in such a way that $W_{k}^{v} \subset W_{k}^{v+1}$ and $U_{\nu} W_{k}^{\nu}=W_{k}(F)$ where $W_{k}^{v}$ denotes $W_{k}(F) \cap\left\{X \mid x_{n}>\varphi_{\nu}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right\}$. If $\varepsilon$ is small enough,
and $\nu$ large enough, the boundary of $W_{k}^{v}$ consists of two parts, namely $\Gamma_{\nu}$ and a section of the hyperplane $x_{n}=1$.

Now multiply the regularized equation by $x_{n} \cdot u$ and integrate partially in $W_{k}^{y}$.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\iint_{W_{k}^{v}} x_{n} u\left[\bar{a}^{i j} u_{i j}-F+\left(a^{i j}-\bar{a}^{i j}\right) u_{i j}\right] d X=0, \\
\int_{\partial W_{k}^{v}} x_{n} u \bar{a}^{i j} u_{i} d X_{(j)}-\iint_{W_{k}^{v}} x_{n} \bar{a}^{i j} u_{i} u_{j} d X-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial W_{k}^{v}} \bar{a}^{i n} u^{2} d X_{\langle i\rangle}+\frac{1}{2} \iint_{W_{k}^{v}} \bar{a}_{i}^{i n} u^{2} d X \\
-\iint_{W_{k}^{v}} x_{n} \vec{a}_{j}^{i j} u u_{i} d X+\iint_{W_{k}^{v}} x_{n} u\left[\left(a^{i j}-\bar{a}^{i j}\right) u_{i j}-F\right] d X=0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

By the ellipticity

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{W_{k}^{v}} x_{n} u_{i}^{2} d X \leqslant K+K \iint_{w_{k}^{v}} \bar{a}^{i j} u_{i} u_{j} x_{n} d X \leqslant K \cdot \int_{\partial W_{k}^{v}} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right||u| d S \\
& \quad+K \int_{\partial w_{k}^{v}} u^{2} d S+K \iint_{W_{k}^{v}}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2}+x_{n}^{\alpha-1}\left|x_{n} \cdot u_{i}\right| \cdot|u|+x_{n}|f| \cdot|u|+|u| \cdot x_{n}^{1+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\} d X .
\end{aligned}
$$

The right hand side of this inequality is bounded independently of $\boldsymbol{v}$, since the area of $\Gamma_{\nu}$ is bounded by a fix constant over $\cos \left(\frac{1}{2} \pi-\chi\right)$, and hence

$$
\iint_{W_{k^{\prime}}(F)} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty .
$$

By Lemma 3.2 we conclude that

$$
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X^{\prime}\right)} x_{n}^{2-n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty
$$

for almost every point of $F$ and every $h>0$. As the measure of $F$ differs from that of $\left\{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right\}$ by the arbitrary $\varepsilon$, the theorem is proved.

Theorem 8.2. If $u$ is a solution of (1.1B) in a Liapunov region $\Omega$, and for almost every $X_{0} \in \partial \Omega$ there is an $h>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X_{0}\right)} \delta^{2-n}(X)\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty \tag{8.2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $u$ has a non-tangential limit at almost every boundary point.
Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 8.1, it is sufficient to consider the case $\Omega=R_{+}^{n}$. Taking arbitrarily $\varepsilon>0$ and $\varrho>0$, and using Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 4.8 we see that to every $k>0$ we can find a closed set $F \subset\left\{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right\}$ whose measure differs from that of $\left\{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho\right\}$ by at most $\varepsilon$, such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\iint_{W_{k}(F)} x_{n}^{2 p-1+\alpha}\left\{x_{n}^{-2 p}|u|^{p}+x_{n}^{-p}\left|u_{i}\right|^{p}+\left|u_{i j}\right|^{p}\right\} d X<\infty  \tag{8.2.2}\\
\iint_{W_{k}(F)} x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty \tag{8.2.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

with $p>n / 2$ and also with $p=2$. Moreover, by Theorem 4.9 and Lemma 3.4 we may assume $x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|=\sigma(1)$ when $x_{n} \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in $W_{k}(F)$.

We shall construct a representation formula similar to that of Theorem 7.1, but first we have to prove that $u \in H^{2}$, in a certain sense at least. To that effect, let $W_{k, t}(F)=\left\{X \mid\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}-t\right) \in W_{k}(F)\right\}$. Then approximate the lower part of $\partial W_{k, t}(F)$ by surfaces $\Gamma_{t, v}$ like in the previous proof. If $W_{k, t}^{v}$ is that part of $W_{k, t}$ which lies above $\Gamma_{t, v}, W_{k, t}^{v}$ is connected if $\varepsilon$ is small enough, and $\partial W_{k, t}^{v}$ consists of $\Gamma_{t, n}$ and a section of the hyperplane $x_{n}=1+t$. In $W_{k, t}^{v}$ we integrate partially to get, with $\left[x_{n}\right]_{j}=$ $\partial x_{n} / \partial x_{j}$

$$
\iint_{w_{k, t}^{v}} \bar{a}^{i j} 2 u u_{i}\left[x_{n}\right]_{j} d X=\int_{\partial w_{k, t}^{v}} \bar{a}^{i j} u^{2}\left[x_{n}\right]_{j} d X_{(i)}-\iint_{w_{k, t}^{v}} \bar{a}_{i}^{i j} u^{2}\left[x_{n}\right]_{j} d X
$$

On the other hand

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{W_{k, t}^{v}} \bar{a}^{i j} 2 u u_{i}\left[x_{n}\right]_{j} d X \\
& \quad=\int_{\partial w_{k, t}^{v}} \bar{a}^{i j} 2 u u_{i} x_{n} d X_{(j)}-\iint_{W_{k, t}^{v}}\left\{\bar{a}_{j}^{i j} 2 u u_{i} x_{n}+\bar{a}^{i j} 2 u_{i j} u x_{n}+\bar{a}^{i j} 2 u_{i} u_{j} x_{n}\right\} d X
\end{aligned}
$$

We can assume that $t, k$ and $\varepsilon$ beforehand were chosen so small that $\bar{a}^{i j}\left[x_{n}\right]_{j} d X_{(i)} \geqslant$ $\lambda / 4 d S$ on $\Gamma_{t, n}$ which implies, using (8.2.2), (8.2.3), and the fact that $u$ is a solution,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Gamma_{t, v}} u^{2} d S \leqslant K & +K \iint_{w_{k, t}^{v}}\left\{x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2}+x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|+x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|^{2}\right\} d X+K \cdot \int_{\Gamma_{t, v}}|u| d S \\
& +\left[\iint_{w_{k, t}^{v}} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\iint_{W_{k, t}^{v}} x_{n}^{3+\alpha}\left|u_{i j}\right|^{2} d X\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant K+K \int_{\Gamma_{t, v}}|u| d S
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the $K$ 's can be chosen so as not to depend on $\nu$ or $t$, we conclude that

$$
\int_{\Gamma_{t, v}} u^{2} d S \leqslant K<\infty
$$

In particular,

$$
\int\left|u^{t}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2} d X^{\prime}=\int\left|u\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, \varphi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}\right)+t\right)\right|^{2} d X^{\prime} \leqslant K<\infty
$$

where $x_{n}=\varphi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}\right)$ is the equation of that part of $\partial W_{k}(F)$ which does not lie in $x_{n}=1$, and the integration is performed over the domain of this function. Thus we may select a subsequence $t_{i} \searrow 0$ such that $u^{t_{i}}$ converges weakly to a function $\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ in $L^{2}$. We choose a point $X_{0}^{\prime}$ which is in the Lebesgue set of $\bar{u}$ and which is
also a point of density of $F$. Let $V_{h}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ be any appropriate cone. $Y$ is a point of $V_{h}$ and $Y_{t}$ denotes the point $Y+(0, \ldots, t)$. Using the Green function $G^{t}$ of the operator $a^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right) \partial^{2} / \partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}$ in $\left\{X \mid x_{n}>t\right\}$, and integrating partially in $W_{k, t}^{v}-B_{\sigma, t}$, where $B_{\sigma, t}=$ $\left\{X\left|\left|X-Y_{t}\right| \leqslant \sigma\right\}\right.$, we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \omega_{n} u\left(Y_{t}\right) \\
& =\int_{\partial W_{k, t}^{v}} \frac{\partial G^{t}}{\partial v}\left(X, Y_{t}\right) u(X) d S_{X}-\int_{\partial W_{k, t}^{p}} G^{t} \bar{a}^{i j} u_{i} d X_{(j)}-\int_{\partial w_{k, t}^{p}} G_{j}^{t}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u d X_{(i)} \\
& \quad+\int_{\partial B_{\sigma, t}} G^{t}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i} d X_{(i)}-\int_{\partial B_{\sigma, t}} G_{j}^{t}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u d X_{(i)} \\
& \quad+\iint_{W_{k, t}^{v}} G^{t}\left\{F-\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i}\right\} d X_{(i)}+\iint_{B_{\sigma, t}} G^{t}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u_{i j} d X \\
& \quad+\iint_{w_{k, t}^{v}-B_{\sigma, t}}\left\{G_{j i}^{t}\left[\bar{a}^{i j}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)-\bar{a}^{i j}(X)\right] u+G_{j}^{t} \bar{a}_{i}^{i j} u-G^{t} \bar{a}_{j}^{i j} u_{i}\right\} d X .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now consider the projection onto $R^{n-1}$ of the absolutely continuous measure $\left(\partial G^{t} / \partial \nu\right)\left(X, Y_{t}\right) d S$ on $\Gamma_{v, t}$. We observe that this measure is independent of $t$, and is bounded by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{K \cdot y_{n}}{\left|\varphi_{v}\left(\bar{X}^{\prime}\right)-Y\right|^{n}} d X^{\prime} \tag{8.2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we can select a subsequence $v_{j}$ converging weakly in $L^{2}$, say, to the measure $\psi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}$. We use the fact that

$$
\omega_{n}^{\cdot} \bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)=\int_{\partial W_{k, t}^{\prime \prime}} \frac{\partial G^{t}}{\partial \nu}\left(X, Y_{t}\right) \bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right) d S
$$

integrate with respect to $\sigma$ and let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{j} \rightarrow \infty$. After some obvious estimates we get the following inequality:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \omega_{n}\left|u\left(Y_{t}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant K \cdot y_{n}+\left|\int\left[u^{t}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right] \psi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}\right| \\
& \quad+K \int_{\Gamma_{t}} G^{t}\left(X, Y_{t}\right)\left|u_{i}\right| d S+K \int\left|\varphi_{v}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|^{\alpha}\left|u^{t}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right| \psi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime} \\
& \quad+K \iint_{\left|X-Y_{t}\right| \leqslant y_{n} / 2}\left\{\left.y_{n}^{1-n}\left|X-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|\right|^{\alpha}\left|u_{i}\right|+y_{n}^{-n}\left|X-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|^{\alpha}|u|\right\} d X \\
& \left.\quad+K \iint_{W_{k, t}} G^{t}\left|F-\left[\bar{a}^{i j}-a^{i j}\right] u_{i j}\right| d X+K \iint_{W_{k, t^{-}-\left\{\left|X-Y_{t}\right| \geqslant y_{n} \mid 4\right\}}\left\{G^{t} x_{n}^{\alpha-1}\left|u_{i}\right|\right.} \quad+\left|G_{i j}^{t}\right|\left|X-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|^{\alpha}|u|+\left|G_{j}^{t}\right| x_{n}^{\alpha-1}|u|\right\} d X .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $X_{0}^{\prime}$ is a point of density of $F$ we find that $x_{n}\left|u_{i}\right|<\varepsilon$ on $\Gamma_{t}$, if $t$ is small enough and $\left|X-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|<\delta$, say. Thus on this part of $\Gamma_{t}$

$$
\int G^{t}\left|u_{i}\right| d S \leqslant \varepsilon \cdot \int \frac{y_{n}}{\left|X-Y_{t}\right|^{n}} d S \leqslant K \cdot \varepsilon
$$

On the remaining part of $\Gamma_{t}$

$$
\int G^{t}\left|u_{i}\right| d S \leqslant y_{n} \cdot K(\delta)
$$

Now put $t=t_{i}$, use the estimates just obtained, let $i \rightarrow \infty$ and use the weak convergence of $u^{t}$; it is easy to check that all the integrals involved are convergent. We get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\omega_{n}\left|u(Y)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant K(\delta) \cdot y_{n} & +K \cdot \varepsilon+\left|\int\left[\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right] \psi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}\right| \\
& +\int\left|X^{\prime}-X_{0}^{\prime}\right|\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right| \psi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}+\ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

Assuming that $X_{0}^{\prime}$ does not belong to a certain subset of $F$ having measure zero, as in the proof of Theorem 7.1 we find that the integrals represented by dots tend to zero as $Y \rightarrow X_{0}^{\prime}$ inside the given cone. The following estimate presents no difficulties, if we use (8.2.4)

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|\int\left[\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right] \psi\left(X^{\prime}\right) d X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant K \cdot \sum_{v=0}^{N} \frac{y_{n}}{\left(2^{n} l\right)^{n}} \int_{\left|X^{\prime}-X_{0}^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2^{2} l}\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| d X^{\prime} \\
+K(\delta) \cdot y_{n} \int_{\left|X^{\prime}\right| \geqslant \delta}\left|\bar{u}\left(X^{\prime}\right)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| d X^{\prime} \leqslant K \cdot \varepsilon+K(\delta) \cdot y_{n}
\end{gathered}
$$

where $l=\left|X_{0}^{\prime}-Y\right|$. Hence

$$
\lim _{\substack{Y \rightarrow X_{1}^{\prime} \\ Y \in V_{h}\left(X_{0^{\prime}}\right)}}\left|u(Y)-\bar{u}\left(X_{0}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant K \cdot \varepsilon .
$$

$\varepsilon$ being arbitrarily small we see that $u$ has a finite non-tangential limit at almost all points of $F$. But the difference in measure between $F$ and $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leqslant \varrho$ can also be made arbitrarily small, and the theorem is proved.

As immediate corollaries of Theorems 8.1 and 8.2 we get the following two theorems.
Theorem 8.3. Suppose $u$ is a solution of (1.1B) in a Liapunov region $\Omega$. A necessary and sufficient condition for $u$ to have non-tangential boundary values almost everywhere is that to almost every $X_{0} \in \partial \Omega$ there is an $h>0$ such that

$$
\iint_{V_{h}\left(X_{0}\right)} \delta^{2-n}(X)\left|u_{i}\right|^{2} d X<\infty .
$$

Theorem 8.4. Suppose $u$ is a solution of (1.1B) in a Liapunov region $\Omega$. If to almost every $X_{0} \in \partial \Omega$ there is an $h>0$ such that $u$ is bounded in $V_{h}\left(X_{0}\right)$, then $u$ has non-tangential boundary values almost everywhere.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ At this point the author has profited from a discussion with Dr. L. I. Hedberg.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ In this case we assume that $u, u_{i}$, and $u_{i j}$ are bounded in $\left\{x_{n}>\frac{1}{2}\right\}$, say.

