

# RIGIDITY OF EUCLIDEAN PRODUCT STRUCTURE: BREAKDOWN FOR LOW SOBOLEV EXPONENTS

BRUCE KLEINER, STEFAN MÜLLER, LÁSZLÓ SZÉKELYHIDI, JR.,  
AND XIANGDONG XIE

*Dedicated to Professor Vladimír Šverák on the occasion of his 65th birthday*

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Setting and main results	2
1.2. Strategy of the proof	4
2. Lipschitz differential inclusions	7
2.1. Basic definitions and tools	7
2.2. Laminates	9
2.3. Laminates and differential inclusions	10
3. Staircase laminates	12
3.1. Staircase laminates and differential inclusions	13
3.2. Properties of staircase laminates	14
3.3. Examples of staircase laminates	16
4. Differential inclusions for Sobolev maps	23
4.1. Exact solutions	23
4.2. Iteration property	26
4.3. Staircase laminate criterion	30
5. Proof of the main results	34
5.1. Breaking the construction into stages and the proof of the main theorems	34
5.2. Stage 1: Proof of Proposition 5.1	35
5.3. Stage 2: Proof of Proposition 5.2	36
5.4. Stage 3: Proof of Proposition 5.3	37
Appendix A. Further examples based on staircase laminates	38
A.1. Very weak solutions to linear elliptic equations with measurable coefficients	39

---

BK was supported by NSF grants DMS-1711556 and DMS-2005553, and a Simons Collaboration grant.

SM has been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through the Hausdorff Center for Mathematics (GZ EXC 59 and 2047/1, Projekt-ID 390685813) and the collaborative research centre *The mathematics of emerging effects* (CRC 1060, Projekt-ID 211504053).

LSz gratefully acknowledges the support of Grant Agreement No. 724298-DIFFINCL of the European Research Council and the support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through GZ SZ 325/2-1.

XX has been supported by Simons Foundation grant # 315130.

A.2. Weak solutions of the $p$ -Laplace equation	42
References	45

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First we show that the results in the companion paper [KMSJX23] on product rigidity for maps  $f : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  in the Sobolev space  $W^{1,p}$  are sharp with respect to  $p$ . Specifically, we show that for all  $n \geq 2$  and all  $p < 2$  there exist maps  $f \in W^{1,p}$  such that the weak differential  $\nabla f$  is invertible almost everywhere and preserves or reverses the product structure almost everywhere, but  $f$  is not of the form  $f(x, y) = (f_1(x), f_2(y))$  or  $f(x, y) = (f_2(y), f_1(x))$ , see Theorem 1.2 below for the precise statement.

Secondly, we develop a general toolbox to study  $W^{1,p}$  solutions of differential inclusions  $\nabla u \in K$  for unbounded sets  $K$ . A key notion is the concept that a subset  $K$  of the space  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  of  $d \times m$  matrices can be reduced to another set  $K'$ , see Definition 1.1. A closely related notion was introduced by M. Sychev [Syc01] for bounded sets  $K$ . It turns out that the concept of reduction is both simpler and more powerful for unbounded sets  $K$ , see the discussion after Definition 1.1. As an illustration we show in the Appendix how result on optimal  $L^p$  regularity for elliptic systems with bounded measurable coefficients [AFS08] as well as recent results on irregular solutions of the  $p$ -Laplace equation [CT22] can easily be obtained by this method, once one can perform at certain algebraic construction in matrix space leading to a staircase laminate (see Definition 3.1, Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 4.3).

**1.1. Setting and main results.** For sets  $X_1, X_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  we say that a mapping  $f : X_1 \times X_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is split (or preserves product structure) if there exist functions  $f_1 : X_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $f_2 : X_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that either  $f(x, y) = (f_1(x), f_2(y))$  for all  $(x, y) \in X_1 \times X_2$  or  $f(x, y) = (f_2(y), f_1(x))$  for all  $(x, y) \in X_1 \times X_2$ . We are interested in the following question about mappings  $f : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , where  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are connected open subsets and  $f$  is assumed to be in the Sobolev space  $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}$  for some  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .

**Question 1.1.** If the (approximate) differential  $\nabla f(x)$  is split and invertible for almost every  $x \in \Omega$ , is  $f$  split? More generally, if the differential is “approximately split”, must  $f$  itself be “approximately split”?

Our motivation for considering this question comes from geometric group theory, geometric mapping theory, and the theory of nonlinear partial differential equations; see the introduction of [KMSJX23] and [KMX20] for discussion of this context.

We now fix connected open subsets  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and let  $\Omega := \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ . Note that Question 1.1 is trivial for  $C^1$  maps: if  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is  $C^1$  and the differential  $\nabla f(x)$  is bijective and split everywhere, then  $f$  is clearly

split, since  $\nabla f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  is a continuous map taking values in the set of split and bijective linear maps, which consists of two components – the block diagonal and the block anti-diagonal invertible matrices. On the other hand, if  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is Lipschitz then its differential is only measurable, so in principle oscillations between the two types of behavior might arise. In fact, for  $n = 1$  it is easy to find Lipschitz maps such that  $\nabla f$  is bijective and split a.e., but  $f$  is not split, see [KMSJX23].

In the companion paper [KMSJX23] we obtained rigidity results for Sobolev maps with split or “approximately split” differentials. The first purpose of this paper is to show that the conditions on the  $L^p$  integrability of the weak derivative in these results are sharp. To do so, we introduce a new strategy for constructing solutions to differential inclusions for low Sobolev exponents.

We first discuss maps with split differentials. In [KMSJX23] the following result was obtained.

**Theorem 1.1** ([KMSJX23]). *Suppose that  $n \geq 2$ ,  $f \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{2n})$  and that the weak differential  $\nabla f(x)$  is split and bijective for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$ . Then  $f$  is split.*

Our first result is that the integrability exponent 2 is sharp. In fact we show the result can fail for Sobolev maps whose gradient in the Marcinkiewicz space weak- $L^2$ , even if we strengthen the condition that  $\nabla f(x)$  be bijective to the condition that  $\det \nabla f(x) = 1$ .

To state the result, we say that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  is a regular domain if  $\Omega$  is open, bounded, connected and the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  has zero  $m$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure. We use the notation

$$(1.2) \quad L := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} : X \text{ is split}\},$$

$$(1.3) \quad \Sigma := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} : \det X = 1\}$$

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exists a constant  $M \geq 1$  with the following property. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  be a regular domain,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Then there exists a continuous map  $u : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  such that  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  and the following properties hold:*

- $u(x) = Ax$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ,
- $\|u - Ax\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta$ ,
- $\nabla u(x) \in L \cap \Sigma$  for almost every  $x \in \Omega$ ,
- for any  $t > 0$

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq M(1 + |A|^2)t^{-2}|\Omega|.$$

*In particular  $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  for any  $p < 2$  and, if  $A \notin L$  then  $u$  is not split.*

To state the results for maps with “approximately split” differentials we denote by  $L_1$  the space of block-diagonal matrices and by  $L_2$  the space of block anti-diagonal matrices, so that  $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ . In [KMSJX23] we show the following rigidity result for sequences of maps which approximate

the condition of having  $\nabla f$  in  $L \cap \Sigma$ . We denote weak convergence by the half-arrow  $\rightharpoonup$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Suppose that  $n \geq 2$  and*

$$(1.4) \quad f_j \rightharpoonup f \text{ in } W^{1,2n}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{2n}),$$

$$(1.5) \quad \text{dist}(\nabla f_j, L) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^1(\Omega),$$

and

$$(1.6) \quad \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\{x \in \Omega : \det \nabla f_j(x) < \delta\}| = 0.$$

Then  $\nabla f \in L$  a.e. and hence  $f$  is split. Moreover

$$(1.7) \quad \text{dist}(\nabla f_j, L_i) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^q(\Omega) \quad \text{for } i = 1 \text{ or for } i = 2.$$

and all  $q < 2n$ .

Here we show that the integrability exponent  $2n$  in Theorem 1.3 is optimal.

**Theorem 1.4.** *There exists a constant  $M \geq 1$  with the following property. Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} \setminus L$  with  $\text{rank } A = 1$ . Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  be a regular domain, and  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . Then there exists a sequence of maps  $u^{(j)} : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  such that  $u^{(j)} \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$ ,  $u^{(j)} = l_A$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , and*

$$(1.8) \quad \left| \{|\nabla u^{(j)}| > t\} \right| \leq M(1 + |A|^{2n})|\Omega|t^{-2n} \quad \text{for } t > 0,$$

$$(1.9) \quad \int_{\{|\nabla u^{(j)}| \notin L \cap \Sigma\}} (1 + |\nabla u^{(j)}|^s) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in [1, \infty),$$

$$(1.10) \quad u^{(j)} \rightarrow l_A \text{ in } C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega}),$$

$$(1.11) \quad u^{(j)} \rightharpoonup l_A \text{ in } W^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ for all } p \in [1, 2n)$$

and

$$(1.12) \quad \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{dist}(\nabla u^{(j)}, L_i)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} > 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

In the statement above we write  $l_A(x) = Ax$  for the linear map with gradient  $A$  (see more on our notation below in Section 2.1). One may take, for example,  $A = (e_1 + e_{n+1}) \otimes e_1$ . We remark that the weak-type bound (1.8) and convergence in  $C^\alpha$  imply that the sequence  $u^{(j)}$  is bounded in  $W^{1,p}$  for any  $p < 2n$ . Moreover, estimate (1.9) implies that  $\text{dist}(\nabla u^{(j)}, L \cap \Sigma) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^s(\Omega)$  for all  $s \in [1, \infty)$  and  $|\{\det \nabla u^{(j)} \neq 1\}| \rightarrow 0$ .

**1.2. Strategy of the proof.** The proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.4 follow a well-developed overall strategy for solving differential inclusions. The general setting is as follows. Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  be open. We want to find a map  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  in a suitable Sobolev space such that

$$(1.13) \quad \nabla u(x) \in K \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \Omega.$$

Moreover, as is typical in problems of this type, we seek solutions which in addition satisfy affine boundary conditions.

Differential inclusions of this type have a long history, both in the Lipschitz setting for compact  $K$  [Gro86, MŠ96, DM99, Mül99, Syc01, MS01, KŠM03, Kir03, MŠ03, Cel05, Szé07] as well as the Sobolev setting for unbounded  $K$  [Far03, KŠM03, CFM05, CFMM05, AFS08, BSV13, LM16, Oli16, FMCO18, FLS21, CT22]. In most of these works the differential inclusion (1.13) is solved using convex integration, an iterative construction of highly oscillatory approximate solutions which are locally almost one-dimensional.

Our approach rests on the following notion of an 'approximate solution', which we believe is a very natural building block for the construction of solutions of the differential inclusion (1.13). Here and in the following we say that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  is a regular domain if it is open, bounded, connected and the boundary has vanishing  $m$ -dimensional measure. We say that a map  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  from a regular domain  $\Omega$  is piecewise affine if there exists disjoint regular domains  $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$  and a null set  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $u$  is affine on  $\Omega_i$  and  $\Omega = \bigcup_i \Omega_i \cup \mathcal{N}$ . Since each  $\Omega_i$  has positive measure, the collection of sets  $\Omega_i$  is at most countable. Finally, for  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we denote by  $l_{A,b}$  the affine map given by  $l_{A,b}(x) = Ax + b$ .

**Definition 1.1.** For  $K, K' \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $1 < p < \infty$  we say that

*$K$  can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$*

provided there exists a constant  $M = M(K, K', p) \geq 1$  with the following property: let  $A \in K$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\varepsilon, \alpha \in (0, 1)$   $s \in (1, \infty)$ , and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  a regular domain. Then there exists a piecewise affine map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$  with  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and such that, with  $\Omega_{error} := \{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) \notin K'\}$  we have

$$(1.14a) \quad \int_{\Omega_{error}} (1 + |\nabla u|)^s dx < \varepsilon |\Omega|,$$

$$(1.14b) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq M^p (1 + |A|^p) |\Omega| t^{-p} \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

We remark that if  $K$  can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$  for some  $p < \infty$  then also  $K$  can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^q$  for any  $q < p$ . To prove this one just needs to check that the weak  $L^q$  bound follows from the weak  $L^p$  bound (see Remark 4.2).

There are three key properties which make our definition very useful.

- (P1) (*Exact solutions*) If  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  can be reduced to  $K$  then for each  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  there exist  $u \in W^{1,1} \cap C^\alpha$  such that  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ,  $\nabla u \in K$  a.e. and  $\nabla u$  is in weak  $L^p$  and hence in  $L^q$  for all  $q \in [1, p)$ , see Theorem 4.1
- (P2) (*Iteration property*) If  $K$  be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$  and  $K'$  and be reduced to  $K''$  in weak  $L^q$  with  $q \neq p$ , then  $K$  and be reduced to  $K''$  in weak  $L^{\min(p,q)}$ , see Theorem 4.2

(P3) (*Sufficiency of staircase laminates*) To show that the condition holds, it suffices to show the existence of certain probability measures – called *staircase laminates* – with support in  $K'$ , barycenter in  $K$  and corresponding moment bounds, see Theorem 4.3. Roughly speaking, it suffices to show that there are sufficiently many rank-one connected matrices in  $K'$  such that their convex combinations generate  $K$ . In fact, one does not even need rank-one connections in  $K'$ , but one can first use matrices outside  $K'$  and then iteratively remove them.

In fact, the condition in Definition 1.1 is not new. M. Sychev [Syc01] introduced a very similar condition for the case of compact sets (see also [MS01]). The main difference is that in these papers one requires in addition that  $\nabla u \in \mathcal{U}$  for almost every  $x \in \Omega$ , for some bounded open set  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ . This is related to the fact that in [Syc01] and [MS01] one wants to find Lipschitz solutions and therefore one needs to ensure that the gradients remain bounded also in  $\Omega_{error}$ . In our case we are interested in solutions with unbounded gradients and so conceptually we can take  $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  which makes the condition  $\nabla u \in \mathcal{U}$  vacuous. Thus, if we can show in the end that  $K$  can be reduced to the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  (in the sense of Definition 1.1) we do not need an extra condition.

We now return to our concrete setting. In view of properties (P1) and (P2) above the proof of Theorem 1.2 can be reduced to the following three statements

- (Stage 1)  $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  can be reduced to  $\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} : \text{rank } X \leq 1\}$  in weak  $L^2$ ;
- (Stage 2)  $\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} : \text{rank } X \leq 1\}$  can be reduced to  $L$  in weak  $L^q$  for all  $q < \infty$
- (Stage 3)  $L_i$  can be reduced to  $L_i \cap \Sigma$  in weak  $L^{2n}$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ .

All these results can be easily proved by first exploiting symmetry to reduce the result to a statement about diagonal matrices and then finding a suitable staircase laminates in connection with property (P3). In fact, we will split Stage 1 further into  $2n - 1$  substages using property (P2) and show instead that  $\Lambda^{(m)}$  can be reduced to  $\Lambda^{(m-1)}$  in weak  $L^m$  for any  $m = 2, \dots, 2n$ , where  $\Lambda^{(m)}$  denotes the set of matrices with  $\text{rank} \leq m$ . We also show how Theorem 1.4 follows from Stages 2 and 3. Since Stage 1 is not needed here, we obtain Sobolev integrability  $p < 2n$  (or weak  $L^{2n}$ ), while for Theorem 1.2 can only get  $p < 2$  (or weak  $L^2$ ).

We believe that Definition 1.1 in connection with the key properties (P1)–(P3) discussed above can be useful beyond the application for the specific problem in this paper. The main point is that it essentially reduces all the work to the (algebraic) task of finding staircase laminates for the individual stages. All the 'analysis' has been put in black boxes corresponding to the three key properties.

Let us mention a few examples.

- (a) Reduction to singular matrices. Stage 1 in our construction, the reduction to matrices of rank  $\leq 1$ , in combination with Theorem 4.1 shows that for every matrix  $A$  there exists a map  $u$  with affine boundary conditions  $l_A$ ,  $\text{rank } \nabla u \leq 1$  and  $\nabla u$  in weak  $L^2$ . This result was already shown in [FMCO18, LM16]. Our approach gives a simpler proof because we only need to show that  $\Lambda^{(m)}$  can be reduced to  $\Lambda^{(m-1)}$  in weak  $L^m$ . This is easy by exhibiting a simple staircase laminate on diagonal matrices and exploiting rotational symmetry. In the original proof in [FMCO18] the laminates for different  $m$  are not considered separately, but combined in a complicated and careful bookkeeping strategy.
- (b) Very weak solutions to isotropic second-order elliptic equations with measurable coefficients, following [AFS08].
- (c) Recent examples of very weak solutions of the  $p$ -Laplace equation [CT22]

Although these examples indicate the wide applicability of our framework, as a word of warning we point out that our approach so far depends on the fact that one ultimately can reduce to the full space  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ . For instance, this restriction means that we are not able to directly apply the general results in this paper to the case of higher integrability of  $W^{1,2}$  weak solutions of second-order elliptic equations in [AFS08].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we collect certain standard notions and definitions used in the theory of differential inclusions for Lipschitz mappings. In Section 3 we introduce ‘staircase laminates’, as required for property (P3) for solving differential inclusions in the Sobolev setting, prove certain key properties of such laminates required for controlling weak  $L^p$  bounds, and give several examples. The heart of the analysis is contained in Section 4, where we work with Definition 1.1 and prove properties (P1)–(P3). In Section 5 we then apply the general framework developed in Section 4 to prove our main theorems. Finally, in the Appendix we show how the same framework can be used to treat examples (b) and (c) above with very little effort.

## 2. LIPSCHITZ DIFFERENTIAL INCLUSIONS

In this section we summarize the main toolbox used in the theory of differential inclusions of the type (1.13). All of the material in this section is well known and contained in various references cited above, it is included here for the convenience of the reader.

### 2.1. Basic definitions and tools.

- **Regular domains.** We say that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  is a regular domain if  $\Omega$  is open, bounded, connected and the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  has zero  $m$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure. Throughout the paper we will always work under the assumption that  $\Omega$  is a regular domain.

- **Push-forward measure.** Given the scaling and translation symmetries of differential inclusions of the type (1.13), a natural object is the pushforward measure of the gradient: for Lipschitz maps  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  it is defined as the measure  $\nu_u \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$ , defined by duality as

$$(2.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}} F d\nu_u = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} F(\nabla u(x)) dx \quad \text{for all } F \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}).$$

With this definition it is easy to see that (1.13) is equivalent to

$$(2.2) \quad \text{supp } \nu_u \subset K.$$

- **Affine maps.** For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we denote by  $l_{A,b}$  the affine map  $l_{A,b}(x) = Ax + b$ .
- **Piecewise affine maps.** We call a map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$  piecewise affine if there exists an at most countable decomposition  $\Omega = \bigcup_i \Omega_i \cup \mathcal{N}$  into pairwise disjoint regular domains  $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$  and a nullset  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $u$  agrees with an affine map on each  $\Omega_i$ . That is, for any  $i$  there exists  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $u = l_{A_i, b_i}$  on  $\Omega_i$ . We will also denote by  $\mathring{\Omega}_u = \bigcup_i \mathring{\Omega}_i$  (or simply  $\mathring{\Omega}$  if the corresponding map  $u$  is clear from the context) the open subset of  $\Omega$  where  $u$  is locally affine. Note that the regular domains  $\Omega_i$  are exactly the connected components of  $\mathring{\Omega}$  and in particular the collection  $\{\Omega_i\}$  is uniquely determined by  $\mathring{\Omega}$ .
- **Gluing argument.** Let  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ , let  $\{\Omega_i\}_i$  be a family of pairwise disjoint open subsets of  $\Omega$ , and for each  $i$  let  $v_i \in W^{1,1}(\Omega_i) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega_i})$  such that  $v_i = u$  on  $\partial\Omega_i$ . Define

$$\tilde{u}(x) = \begin{cases} v_i(x) & x \in \Omega_i \text{ for some } i, \\ u(x) & x \notin \bigcup_i \Omega_i. \end{cases}$$

Then<sup>1</sup>  $\tilde{u} \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  with

$$\|\tilde{u} - u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} \leq 2 \sup_i \|v_i - u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega_i})}.$$

- **Rescaling and covering argument.** Assume  $v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega_0) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega_0})$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  with  $v = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega_0$  for some affine map  $l_{A,b}$  and regular domain  $\Omega_0$ . Given any  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  regular domain we can cover  $\Omega$  by a countable family of suitably rescaled copies

<sup>1</sup>Here we use that for every open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  the space  $X = \{u \in C(\overline{U}) \cap W^{1,1}(U) : u = 0 \text{ on } \partial U\}$  is a subset of  $W_0^{1,1}(U)$  (the closure of  $C_c^\infty(U)$  in  $W^{1,1}(U)$ ) and thus the extension  $\bar{u} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\bar{u} = u$  in  $\Omega$  and  $\bar{u} = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus U$  belongs to  $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and satisfies  $D\bar{u} = 0$  a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega$ . To show that  $X \subset W_0^{1,1}(U)$  one can argue as follows. Let  $T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^1$  function such that  $T(t) = t$  if  $|t| \geq 1$ ,  $T(t) = 0$  on  $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $|T'| \leq 4$ . Set  $T_k(t) = k^{-1}T(kt)$ . Then  $T_k \circ u$  has compact support in  $U$  and hence belongs to  $W_0^{1,1}(U)$ . Moreover we have  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|u| \leq k^{-1}} |Du| dx = \int_{u=0} |Du| dx = 0$  (for the last identity see [GT01][Lemma 7.7]). Thus the chain rule implies that  $T_k \circ u \rightarrow u$  in  $W^{1,1}(U)$  and it follows that  $u \in W_0^{1,1}(U)$ .

$\Omega_i = r_i\Omega_0 + x_i$  upto measure zero. More precisely, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $r_i \in (0, 1)$  with  $r_i^{1-\alpha} \leq \varepsilon$  and  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$  so that  $\{\Omega_i\}_i$  is a pairwise disjoint family of open subsets of  $\Omega$  with  $|\Omega \setminus \bigcup_i \Omega_i| = 0$ . Set  $v_i(x) = r_i v(\frac{x-x_i}{r_i}) + Ax_i + (1-r_i)b$  for  $x \in \Omega_i$ . It can readily be checked that  $v_i = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega_i$  and  $\|v_i - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega_i})} \leq r_i^{1-\alpha} \|v - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})}$ .

Then the gluing argument above applies with  $l_{A,b}$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $v_i$  in  $\Omega_i$ , and we obtain a map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  with  $\nu_u = \nu_v$  (c.f. (2.1)). Moreover

$$\|u - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} \leq 2\varepsilon \|v - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})}.$$

The rescaling and covering argument implies that the  $C^\alpha$  estimate in Theorem 1.2 follows automatically, once we have a map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  with affine boundary conditions and so that  $\nu_u$  satisfies (2.2). Thus, the main issue is to be able to construct  $\nu_u$  in prescribed ways. The basic tool for this is provided by the concept of *laminates*.

**2.2. Laminates.** Let  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  denote the space of (signed) Radon measures on  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and let  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  be the subset of probability measures. It is well known that  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  can be identified with the dual space of  $C_c(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  of continuous functions with compact support, equipped with its natural locally convex topology.

The concept of laminates of finite order and laminates with bounded support was introduced by Pedregal [Ped93]. The definition of a laminate of finite order has its root in the condition  $(H_n)$ , introduced by Dacorogna [Dac85] in connection with a formula for the rank-one convex envelope of a function. The importance of laminates of finite order stems from the following fact (see Lemma 2.2 below): if  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  is a laminate of finite order with center of mass  $A$  and if  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  is a regular domain, then there exist piecewise affine Lipschitz maps  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  for which  $\nu_u$  (see (2.1)) approximates  $\mu$  and  $u(x) = Ax$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . We recall the main concepts.

- **Elementary splitting.** Given probability measures  $\nu, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  we say that  $\mu$  is obtained from  $\nu$  by *elementary splitting* if  $\nu$  has the form  $\nu = \lambda\delta_A + (1-\lambda)\tilde{\nu}$  for some  $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$ , there exist matrices  $B, B' \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $\lambda' \in (0, 1)$  such that  $A = \lambda'B + (1-\lambda')B'$  and  $\text{rank}(B' - B) = 1$ , and moreover

$$\mu = \lambda(\lambda'\delta_B + (1-\lambda')\delta_{B'}) + (1-\lambda)\tilde{\nu}.$$

- **Laminates of finite order.** The set  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  of *laminates of finite order* is defined as the smallest set which is invariant under elementary splitting and contains all Dirac masses.
- **Splitting sequence.** One sees easily that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  is equivalently characterized by the condition that it contains all probability measures which can be obtained by starting from a Dirac mass and applying elementary splitting a finite number of times - we will refer

to this sequence of operations as a *splitting sequence* for the laminate in question. We remark that the splitting sequence is in general not uniquely determined by the laminate.

- **Barycenter.** Each  $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  is supported on a finite set of matrices, i.e. is of the form  $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \delta_{A_i}$ . The center of mass, or *barycenter*, of  $\nu$  will be denoted by  $\bar{\nu} := \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i A_i$ . It is easy to see that the center of mass is invariant under splitting.
- **Convex combinations.** Let  $N \geq 2$  and  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Further, assume that  $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \delta_{A_i}$  is a laminate of finite order, where  $A_i = \bar{\nu}_i$ . Then  $\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \nu_i$  is also a laminate of finite order. In particular, if  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  and  $\text{rank}(\bar{\nu}_2 - \bar{\nu}_1) \leq 1$ , then  $\lambda \nu_1 + (1 - \lambda) \nu_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  for any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ .
- **Linear transformations.** Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  be a linear map preserving rank-one matrices, i.e. with the property that  $\text{rank}(A) = 1$  if and only if  $\text{rank}(T(A)) = 1$ . Then, if  $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \delta_{A_i}$  is a laminate of finite order, so is  $T_* \nu := \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \delta_{T(A_i)}$ .

**2.3. Laminates and differential inclusions.** Now we come to the cornerstone of the theory. Having introduced a sufficiently rich set of probability measures  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  we now show that these measures can be well approximated by gradient distributions of Lipschitz maps with affine boundary conditions. There are various versions of the statements below in the literature, e.g. [Cel93, DM99, Syc01, KŠM03, DMP08, Pom10], but for our purposes the following variant of the basic building block (see [MŠ03, Kir03]) will prove most useful.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $A, A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  be matrices such that*

$$\text{rank}(A_1 - A_2) = 1, \text{ and } A = \lambda_1 A_1 + \lambda_2 A_2$$

*for some  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ ,  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$ . For any  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any regular domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  there exists a piecewise affine Lipschitz map  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and  $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \max(|A_1|, |A_2|)$  and for  $i = 1, 2$*

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \lambda_i |\Omega| \leq |\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) = A_i\}| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \lambda_i |\Omega|.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\text{rank}(A_1 - A_2) = 1$ , there exist nonzero vectors  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $A_2 - A_1 = \eta \otimes \xi$ . Note that we can write  $A_1 = A - \lambda_2 \eta \otimes \xi$  and  $A_2 = A + \lambda_1 \eta \otimes \xi$ .

Let  $r \in (0, 1)$  to be fixed later and let  $\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(J)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be further nonzero vectors with  $|\xi^{(j)}| < r$  so that  $0 \in \text{int conv}\{\xi, -\xi, \xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(J)}\}$ . Then the set

$$\Omega_0 := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m : x \cdot \xi^{(j)} > -1 \text{ for all } j = 1 \dots J \text{ and } |x \cdot \xi| < 1 \right\}$$

is a convex open and bounded set containing 0.

Finally, let  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a 1-periodic Lipschitz function with  $h(0) = 0$  and  $h'(t) \in \{-\lambda_2, \lambda_1\}$  for a.e.  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , a saw-tooth function with

$$|\{t \in (0, 1) : h'(t) = -\lambda_2\}| = \lambda_1 \text{ and } |\{t \in (0, 1) : h'(t) = \lambda_1\}| = \lambda_2.$$

Observe that  $h(Nx \cdot \xi) = 0$  whenever  $x \cdot \xi \in \{-1, 1\}$ . Then, for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  the function  $f_N : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$f_N(x) = \min \left\{ \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} (1 + x \cdot \xi^{(j)}), \frac{1}{N} h(Nx \cdot \xi) \right\}$$

is a piecewise affine Lipschitz function with  $f_N = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega_0$ , and

$$(2.3) \quad \nabla f_N(x) \in \left\{ -\lambda_1 \xi, \lambda_2 \xi, \xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(J)} \right\} \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega_0.$$

Moreover, by choosing  $N$  sufficiently large we can achieve that

$$\frac{1}{N} h(Nx \cdot \xi) < \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} (1 + x \cdot \xi^{(j)}) \quad \text{on } (1-r)\Omega_0,$$

from which we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\{x \in \Omega_0 : \nabla f_N(x) = -\lambda_2 \xi\}| &\geq (1-r)^m |\Omega_0| \\ |\{x \in \Omega_0 : \nabla f_N(x) = \lambda_1 \xi\}| &\geq (1-r)^m |\Omega_0|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by choosing  $r > 0$  sufficiently small, the map  $u : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  defined by

$$u(x) = b + Ax + \eta f_N(x)$$

satisfies all the claimed properties in the lemma for the special domain  $\Omega_0$ . Here we use the fact that  $\max\{|A_1|, |A_2|\} > |A|$ . For a general regular domain  $\Omega$  we apply a rescaling and covering argument from Section 2.1.  $\square$

An obvious iteration of Lemma 2.1 along the splitting sequence of any laminate  $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  (c.f. Section 2.2) leads to the following lemma, which makes laminates so useful for inclusion problems of the type (1.13).

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$  be a laminate of finite order with center of mass  $A$ . Write  $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j \delta_{A_j}$  with  $\lambda_j > 0$  and  $A_j \neq A_k$  for  $j \neq k$ . For any  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any regular domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  there exists a piecewise affine Lipschitz map  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ,  $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \max_i |A_i|$  and such that*

$$(2.4) \quad (1 - \varepsilon) \lambda_j |\Omega| \leq |\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) = A_j\}| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \lambda_j |\Omega|$$

for each  $j = 1, \dots, J$ .

We remark that, since  $\sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j = 1$ , estimate (2.4) also implies

$$(2.5) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) \notin \text{supp } \nu\}| \leq \varepsilon |\Omega|.$$

## 3. STAIRCASE LAMINATES

Lemma 2.2, together with the basic splitting mechanism for laminates described in Section 2.2, gives a flexible method to construct Lipschitz solutions of differential inclusions of the type (1.13) involving compact sets  $K$ .

For differential inclusions involving unbounded sets, as in Theorem 1.2, one needs to extend this method to unbounded laminates (more precisely, sequences of laminates with increasing support) as well as the corresponding construction from Lipschitz to Sobolev maps. This was first recognized by D. Faraco in [Far03] in the context of isotropic elliptic equations in the plane.

To set the stage, we briefly describe the problem studied in [Far03] and subsequently in [AFS08] and how it leads to a staircase laminate. The question is to find the optimal higher integrability of weak solutions of isotropic elliptic equations of the form

$$(3.1) \quad \operatorname{div}(a(x)\nabla u) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2,$$

with  $a(x) \in \{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^{-1}\}$  for a.e.  $x$ . The associated differential inclusion in this case is of the form

$$(3.2) \quad \nabla u(x) \in E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}} \text{ a.e. } x$$

where

$$E_{\rho} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \rho\lambda \end{pmatrix} R : \lambda \geq 0, R \in SO(2) \right\}.$$

The constant  $\mathcal{K} > 1$  is related to the ellipticity constant of the associated PDE.

For the convenience of the reader we briefly recall the argument to pass from the PDE (3.1) to the differential inclusion (3.2). Indeed, assuming that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a simply connected regular domain, we see that for any  $\sigma \in L^1(\Omega)$  the condition  $\operatorname{div}\sigma = 0$  is equivalent to the existence of  $w \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$  with  $\sigma^\perp = (-\sigma_2, \sigma_1) = \nabla w$ . Then, writing  $u = (v, w)$  we immediately deduce that the differential inclusion (3.2) is equivalent to the equation (3.1).

The question is about the optimal higher integrability of solutions  $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}$  of (3.2). Since such solutions are automatically  $\mathcal{K}$ -quasiregular, it follows [Ast94] that  $\nabla u \in L_{loc}^p$  for any  $p < p_{\mathcal{K}} := \frac{2\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}-1}$ , with radial mappings showing optimality in the class of  $\mathcal{K}$ -quasiregular mappings. Whether this bound is also optimal in the isotropic case was the remaining issue.

In [Far03] Faraco constructed, for any  $\mathcal{K} > 1$  a sequence of laminates of finite order  $\nu^N$ ,  $N = 1, 2, \dots$ , with the properties that  $\nu^N = \tilde{\nu}^N + \beta_N \delta_{A_N}$ , where  $\operatorname{supp} \tilde{\nu}^N \subset E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{-\mathcal{K}}$ ,  $A_N = \begin{pmatrix} N & 0 \\ 0 & N+1 \end{pmatrix}$ , and  $\nu^{N+1}$  is obtained inductively from  $\nu^N$  by a sequence of two elementary splittings, starting with  $\delta_{A_N}$  (these splittings form the steps of the “staircase”). The key computation

in [Far03], see also Proposition 3.10 in [AFS08], is then the estimate

$$\frac{1}{C}N^{-p\kappa} \leq \nu^N(\{A_N\}) \leq CN^{-p\kappa}$$

for some constant  $C$  which is independent of  $N$ . This estimate then implies the weak  $L^{p\kappa}$  bound for the limiting measure  $\nu^\infty$ :

$$\frac{1}{C}t^{-p\kappa} \leq \nu^\infty(\{|X| > t\}) \leq Ct^{-p\kappa}$$

for some (possibly larger) constant  $C > 1$  and all  $t > 1$ .

**3.1. Staircase laminates and differential inclusions.** Since the original application of Faraco, staircase laminates have been applied in several situations where one can expect endpoint weak  $L^p$  bounds [KŠM03, CFM05, CFMM05, AFS08, BSV13, FMCO18, FLS21, CT22]. Although staircase laminates are a very versatile tool, we were unable to find a general treatment of staircase laminates analogous to the case of bounded laminates described in Section 2.2 and in particular a corresponding generalization of Lemma 2.2.

In the following we offer such a general treatment, which will be able to not just provide the solution to our setting in Theorem 1.2, but also applies to a number of further examples that have appeared in the literature.

**Proposition 3.1** (Staircase laminates). *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $A \notin K$ . Suppose that there exists a sequence of matrices  $A_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \setminus K$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  with  $A_0 = A$ , a sequence of probability measures  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{P}(K)$  supported in  $K$  as well as scalars  $\gamma_n \in (0, 1)$  such that*

- (1) for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the probability measures

$$\omega_n = (1 - \gamma_n)\mu_n + \gamma_n\delta_{A_n}$$

are laminates of finite order with barycenter  $\overline{\omega_n} = A_{n-1}$ ;

- (2) the sequence  $|A_n|$  is monotone increasing with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |A_n| = \infty$ ;

- (3)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n = 0$ , where  $\beta_n := \prod_{k=1}^n \gamma_k$ ,  $\beta_0 = 1$ .

Define the probability measures  $\nu^N$ ,  $N = 1, 2, \dots$  by iteratively replacing  $\delta_{A_{n-1}}$  by  $\omega_n$  for  $1 \leq n \leq N$ , i.e., by

$$\nu^N = \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_{n-1}(1 - \gamma_n)\mu_n + \beta_N\delta_{A_N}.$$

Then  $\nu^N$  is a laminate of finite order with  $\text{supp } \nu^N \subset K \cup \{A_N\}$  and barycenter  $\overline{\nu^N} = A$ . Moreover, for any Borel set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  the limit

$$\nu^\infty(E) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \nu^N(E)$$

exists and defines a probability measure  $\nu^\infty$  with  $\text{supp } \nu^\infty \subset K$  and  $\overline{\nu^\infty} = A$ .

*Proof.* The subprobability measures

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{\nu}^N := \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_{n-1}(1 - \gamma_n)\mu_n = \nu^N - \beta_N \delta_{A_N}$$

are supported in  $K$  and increasing in  $N$ . Thus for each Borel set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  the limit  $\nu^\infty(E) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \nu^N(E)$  exists. Since  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \beta_N = 0$ , we see that  $\nu^\infty$  is a probability measure supported in  $K$ . In fact,  $\nu^\infty$  is a countable sum of Dirac masses.  $\square$

Staircase laminates in general involve a particular inductive construction which can be used to “push mass to infinity”, as denoted by condition (2) above. The rate at which mass can be pushed to infinity (equivalently, the rate of convergence  $\beta_n \rightarrow 0$ ) determines the exponent  $p$  at which weak  $L^p$  bounds will hold.

**Definition 3.1** (Staircase laminates). A probability measure  $\nu^\infty$  defined by the procedure outlined in Proposition 3.1 is called a *staircase laminate*.

**3.2. Properties of staircase laminates.** In this section we collect some basic properties of staircase laminates. First of all, the very definition of staircase laminates implies that the invariance property of finite order laminates (see Section 2.2) can be directly transferred.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  be a linear map preserving rank-one matrices, i.e. with the property that  $\text{rank}(A) = 1$  if and only if  $\text{rank}(T(A)) = 1$ . Then, if  $\nu^\infty = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i \delta_{A_i}$  is a staircase laminate with barycenter  $A$ , so is  $T_*\nu^\infty := \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i \delta_{T(A_i)}$  with barycenter  $T(A)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows directly from the invariance property of finite order laminates, applied to the sequence  $\nu^N$  in Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

Next we address criteria leading to bounds of the type (4.23).

**Lemma 3.3** (Weak  $L^p$  bounds for staircase laminates). *Suppose  $\nu^\infty$  is a staircase laminate with barycenter  $A$ , defined by sequences  $\{A_n, \mu_n, \gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as in Proposition 3.1, and suppose*

$$(3.4) \quad |A_n| \leq |A_{n+1}| \leq c|A_n| \quad \text{for all } n$$

for some  $c > 1$ .

- (Upper bound) Assume that for some  $1 \leq p < \infty$  there exists  $c_0, M_0 \geq 1$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$(3.5a) \quad \text{supp } \mu_n \subset \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} : |X| \leq c_0|A_n|\},$$

$$(3.5b) \quad \beta_n |A_n|^p \leq M_0.$$

Then

$$(3.6) \quad \nu^\infty(\{|X| > t\}) \leq M_0 c^p c_0^p t^{-p} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

- (Lower bound) Assume that for some  $1 \leq p < \infty$  there exists  $0 < c_1, M_1$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$(3.7a) \quad \mu_n(\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} : |X| \geq c_1|A_n|\}) \geq c_1,$$

$$(3.7b) \quad \beta_n|A_n|^p \geq M_1.$$

Then

$$(3.8) \quad \nu^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \geq M_1 c^{-p} c_1^{1+p} t^{-p} \quad \text{for all } t > c_1|A|.$$

*Proof.*

**Upper bound.** For any  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  let  $t_n = c_0|A_n|$ . Using (3.5a) we observe that  $\mu_k(\{X : |X| > t_n\}) = 0$  for all  $k \leq n$ , and hence, for any  $N \geq n$

$$\nu^N(\{X : |X| > t_n\}) \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^N \beta_{k-1}(1 - \gamma_k) + \beta_N.$$

Noting that  $\beta_{k+1} = \gamma_{k+1}\beta_k$ , we see that the sum is telescoping and we deduce, using in addition (3.5b),

$$\nu^N(\{X : |X| > t_n\}) \leq \beta_n \leq M_0|A_n|^{-p} = M_0 c_0^p t_n^{-p}.$$

Letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain (3.6) for  $t_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . More generally, for any  $t \geq t_0$  choose  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  so that  $t_n \leq t < t_{n+1}$ . Using (3.4) we then estimate

$$\nu(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq M_0 c_0^p t_n^{-p} \leq M_0 c^p c_0^p t^{-p}.$$

Finally, if  $t < t_0 = c_0|A_0|$ , then, using again (3.5b),

$$M_0 c^p c_0^p t^{-p} > M_0 c^p |A_0|^{-p} \geq c^p \geq 1$$

so that (3.6) is trivially satisfied.

**Lower bound.** Arguing analogously to above, for any  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  we define  $t_n = c_1|A_n|$ . Using (3.7a) we observe that for any  $k \geq n$  we have

$$\mu_k(\{X : |X| > t_n\}) \geq \mu_k(\{X : |X| > t_k\}) \geq c_1.$$

Then, for any  $N \geq n$  we have

$$\nu^N(\{X : |X| > t_n\}) \geq c_1 \sum_{k=n}^N \beta_{k-1}(1 - \gamma_k) + \beta_N.$$

As before, the sum is telescoping and we deduce, using in addition (3.7b),

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^N(\{X : |X| > t_n\}) &\geq c_1 \beta_{n-1} + \beta_N(1 - c_1) \geq c_1 \beta_{n-1} \\ &\geq M_1 c_1 |A_{n-1}|^{-p} = M_1 c_1^{1+p} t_{n-1}^{-p} \geq M_1 c_1^{1+p} t_n^{-p}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain (3.8) for  $t = t_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . More generally, for any  $t > t_0 = c_1|A|$  choose  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  so that  $t_n \leq t < t_{n+1}$ . Then using (3.4) we estimate

$$\nu(\{X : |X| > t\}) \geq M_1 c_1^{1+p} t_{n+1}^{-p} \geq M_1 c^{-p} c_1^{1+p} t^{-p}$$

as required.  $\square$

**3.3. Examples of staircase laminates.** In this section we give several examples of staircase laminates. The first two examples are related to Propositions 5.1 and 5.3 which correspond to Stage 1 and Stage 3 in the construction of non-split maps which have split and invertible differentials almost everywhere. Subsequent examples are provided to illustrate the effectiveness of our general approach to differential inclusions.

*Example 1.* We use the notation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D} &= \{ \text{diagonal } d \times d \text{ matrices} \}, \\ \Sigma &= \{ d \times d \text{ matrices with determinant} = 1 \}\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.4** (Laminates supported in  $\det = 1$ ). *Let  $A$  be a diagonal  $d \times d$  matrix with entries  $A = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$  satisfying  $|a_i| > 1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . There exists a laminate  $\omega \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$  with barycenter  $\bar{\omega} = A$  such that  $\omega$  can be written as  $\omega = (1 - \gamma)\mu + \gamma\delta_{2A}$  for some probability measure  $\mu$  with support*

$$(3.9) \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset \mathcal{D} \cap \Sigma \cap \{X : |X| \leq 2|A|\}$$

and

$$(3.10) \quad \gamma = \frac{\det A - 1}{2^d \det A - 1}.$$

Moreover there exists  $c = c(A, d) > 0$  such that

$$(3.11) \quad \mu(\{X : |X| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}|A|\}) \geq c.$$

*Proof.* We construct  $\omega$  by exhibiting its splitting sequence:

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned}\delta_A &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{B_1} + \alpha'_1 \delta_{C_1} \\ &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{B_1} + \alpha_2 \delta_{B_2} + \alpha'_2 \delta_{C_2} \\ &\vdots \\ &\mapsto \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j \delta_{B_j} + \alpha'_d \delta_{C_d},\end{aligned}$$

in such a way that  $B_j \in \mathcal{D} \cap \Sigma$ ,  $\alpha'_d = \gamma$ ,  $C_d = 2A$ , and furthermore

$$\text{rank}(B_j - C_j) = 1, \alpha_j, \alpha'_j > 0, \sum_{i=1}^j \alpha_i + \alpha'_j = 1$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, d$ .

To this end we start by setting  $D = \det A$ ,  $B_1 = \text{diag}(\frac{a_1}{D}, a_2, \dots, a_d)$ ,  $C_1 = \text{diag}(2a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d)$ . Then  $\det B_1 = 1$  and  $\text{rank}(B_1 - C_1) = 1$ . Moreover,  $a_1 = \alpha_1 \frac{a_1}{D} + (1 - \alpha_1)(2a_1)$  with  $\alpha_1 = \frac{D}{2D-1}$ . Since we assume that  $|D| > 1$ , it can be checked directly that  $1/3 < \alpha_1 < 1$ , and then we obtain  $A = \alpha_1 B_1 + \alpha'_1 C_1$  with  $\alpha'_1 = 1 - \alpha_1$ .

The definition of  $B_j, C_j, \alpha_j$  for  $j \geq 2$  proceeds analogously. In general we set  $B_j = \text{diag}(b_{j,1}, \dots, b_{j,d})$  and  $C_j = \text{diag}(c_{j,1}, \dots, c_{j,d})$  with

$$(3.13) \quad b_{j,i} = \begin{cases} 2a_i & i < j, \\ \frac{a_i}{2^{j-1}D} & i = j, \\ a_i & i > j, \end{cases} \quad c_{j,i} = \begin{cases} 2a_i & i \leq j, \\ a_i & i > j. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$C_{j-1} = \tilde{\alpha}_j B_j + (1 - \tilde{\alpha}_j) C_j,$$

where  $\tilde{\alpha}_j = \frac{2^{j-1}D}{2^j D - 1}$ . We can again check directly that  $\tilde{\alpha}_j \in (1/3, 1)$ . Setting inductively

$$(3.14) \quad \alpha_j = \tilde{\alpha}_j \alpha'_{j-1} \text{ and } \alpha'_j = (1 - \tilde{\alpha}_j) \alpha'_{j-1}$$

we obtain a laminate of finite order as in (3.12). Furthermore

$$\alpha'_d = \prod_{j=1}^d (1 - \tilde{\alpha}_j) = \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{2^{j-1}D - 1}{2^j D - 1} = \frac{D - 1}{2^d D - 1} = \gamma,$$

as claimed in (3.10).

Concerning the lower bound (3.11), we can compute, using (3.14),

$$\mu_n(\{B_j\}) = \alpha_j = \frac{2^{j-1}D(D-1)}{(2^j D - 1)(2^{j-1}D - 1)}.$$

Using that  $|D| = |\det A| > 1$  we can directly verify

$$\alpha_j \geq \begin{cases} \frac{D-1}{2^d D} & \text{if } D > 1, \\ \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^d} & \text{if } D < -1. \end{cases}$$

Thus, in either case there exists  $c = c(A, d) > 0$  such that

$$(3.15) \quad \mu(\{B_j\}) \geq c \text{ for all } j.$$

Let  $j_* \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $|a_{j_*}| = \max_i |a_i|$ . If  $j_* < d$  then, by construction,  $|B_d| \geq 2|a_{j_*}|$ , whereas if  $j_* = d$ , then  $|B_1| \geq |a_{j_*}|$ . In either case

$$(3.16) \quad \max_j |B_j| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} |A|.$$

From (3.15)-(3.16) follows

$$\mu(\{X : |X| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} |A|\}) \geq \min_j \alpha_j \geq c$$

as claimed.  $\square$

**Example 3.1.** Lemma 3.4 can be directly applied in Proposition 3.1 as follows. Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be a diagonal matrix with entries  $A = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$  satisfying  $|a_i| \geq 2$  for all  $i$ , and let  $A_n = 2^n A$  for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Applying

Lemma 3.4 to each  $A_n$  leads to finite order laminates  $\omega_n = (1 - \gamma_n)\mu_n + \gamma_n\delta_{A_n}$  with barycenter  $\bar{\omega}_n = A_{n-1}$  with

$$\gamma_n = \frac{\det A_{n-1} - 1}{2^d \det A_{n-1} - 1} = \frac{2^{(n-1)d} \det A - 1}{2^{nd} \det A - 1}.$$

Then

$$\beta_n = \prod_{k=1}^n \gamma_k = \frac{\det A - 1}{2^{nd} \det A - 1}.$$

Using  $|\det A| \geq 2$  we obtain

$$(3.17) \quad 2^{-nd-1} \leq \beta_n \leq 2^{-nd+1}.$$

In particular the conditions of Proposition 3.1 are satisfied and we obtain the sequence of laminates  $\nu^N$  with  $\text{supp } \nu^N \subset (\mathcal{D} \cap \Sigma) \cup \{A_N\}$  and barycenter  $A$ .

Furthermore, (3.9) implies (3.5a), (3.11) implies (3.7a) with  $c_0 = 2$ , whereas (3.17) implies (3.5b) and (3.7b) with  $c_1 = 1/2$ . Thus, the conditions in Lemma 3.3 are satisfied and we deduce the weak  $L^d$  bounds

$$(3.18) \quad 2^{-2-d}|A|^{d-t} \leq \nu^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq 2^{1+d}|A|^{d-t}$$

for all  $t > |A|$ .

*Example 2.* In the second example we define

$$\Lambda^{(m)} = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \text{rank}(A) \leq m\},$$

for  $m = 1, \dots, d$ , the set of matrices of rank at most  $m$ . Thus in particular  $\Lambda^{(1)}$  is the rank-one cone of  $d \times d$  matrices,  $\Lambda^{(d)} = \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and in general  $\Lambda^{(m)} \subset \Lambda^{(m+1)}$ . These sets arise in the construction of Sobolev homeomorphisms with low rank gradients [LM16, FMCO18].

**Lemma 3.5** (Laminates supported in  $\Lambda^{(m-1)}$ ). *Let  $A \in \Lambda^{(m)} \cap \mathcal{D}$  for some  $m \geq 2$ . There exists a laminate  $\omega \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$  with barycenter  $\bar{\omega} = A$  such that  $\omega$  can be written as  $\omega = (1 - \gamma)\mu + \gamma\delta_{2A}$  for some probability measure  $\omega$  with support*

$$(3.19) \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset \Lambda^{(m-1)} \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \{X : |X| \leq 2|A|\}$$

and

$$(3.20) \quad \gamma = 2^{-m}.$$

Moreover,

$$(3.21) \quad \mu(\{X : |X| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|A|\}) \geq \frac{1}{2^m}.$$

*Proof.* We proceed analogously to the proof of Lemma 3.4, by defining a splitting sequence as in (3.12). After permuting the entries of  $A$  if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that  $A = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_m, 0, \dots, 0)$  for some  $m \geq 2$ . Then the splitting sequence can be written even more explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_A &\mapsto \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\text{diag}(0, a_2, \dots, a_m, 0, \dots)} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\text{diag}(2a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m, 0, \dots)} \\ &\mapsto \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\text{diag}(0, a_2, \dots, a_m, 0, \dots)} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\delta_{\text{diag}(2a_1, 0, a_3, \dots, a_m, 0, \dots)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\text{diag}(2a_1, 2a_2, a_3, \dots, a_m, 0, \dots)}\right) \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\mapsto \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{2^j}\delta_{B_j} + \frac{1}{2^m}\delta_{2A}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $B_j = \text{diag}(b_{j,1}, \dots, b_{j,d})$  is defined by

$$b_{j,i} = \begin{cases} 2a_i & \text{if } i < j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j \text{ or } i > m, \\ a_i & \text{if } j < i \leq m. \end{cases}$$

In particular we directly obtain the formula (3.20), i.e. that  $\gamma = 2^{-m}$ .

Concerning the lower bound (3.21), we proceed analogously to Lemma 3.4. First of all, note that

$$(3.22) \quad \mu(\{B_j\}) \geq \frac{1}{2^m} \text{ for all } j.$$

Let  $j_* \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $|a_{j_*}| = \max_i |a_i|$ . If  $j_* < d$  then, by construction,  $|B_d| \geq 2|a_{j_*}|$ , whereas if  $j_* = d$ , then  $|B_1| \geq |a_{j_*}|$ . In either case

$$(3.23) \quad \max_j |B_j| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|A|.$$

From (3.22)-(3.23) follows

$$\mu(\{X : |X| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|A|\}) \geq \frac{1}{2^m}$$

as claimed. □

**Example 3.2.** As in the case of Lemma 3.4, Lemma 3.5 can also be used to obtain a staircase laminate via Proposition 3.1. Let  $A \in \Lambda^{(m)} \cap \mathcal{D}$  for some  $m \geq 2$  and set  $A_n = 2^n A$  for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Applying Lemma 3.5 to each  $A_n$  leads to finite order laminates  $\omega_n = (1 - \gamma_n)\mu_n + \gamma_n\delta_{A_n}$  with barycenter

$A_{n-1}$  and  $\gamma_n = 2^{-m}$ . Then

$$\beta_n = \prod_{k=1}^n \gamma_k = 2^{-nm},$$

so that the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 are satisfied. We obtain a sequence of laminates  $\nu^N$  with  $\text{supp } \nu^N \subset (\mathcal{D} \cap \Lambda^{(m-1)}) \cup \{A_N\}$  and barycenter  $A$ . Furthermore, we deduce from (3.19) and (3.21) that the conditions of Lemma 3.3 are satisfied with  $p = m$ ,  $c_0 = 2$  and  $c_1 = 2^{-m}$ . Consequently, the limiting staircase laminate  $\nu^\infty$  satisfies the weak  $L^m$  bound

$$(3.24) \quad 2^{-m(2+p)} |A|^m t^{-m} \leq \nu^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq 2^{1+m} |A|^m t^{-m}$$

for all  $t > |A|$ .

*Example 3.* Our third example is from [AFS08] and arises in the theory of very weak solutions to linear elliptic equations with measurable coefficients in the plane (c.f. (3.2)). For any  $\rho \geq 1$  set

$$E_\rho = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \rho\lambda \end{pmatrix} R : \lambda \geq 0, R \in SO(2) \right\}.$$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{K} > 1$ . For any  $x \geq 1$  define  $A(x)$  to be the  $2 \times 2$  diagonal matrix with entries  $A(x) = \text{diag}(-x, x)$ . There exists a laminate  $\omega \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$  with barycenter  $\bar{\omega} = A(x)$  such that  $\omega$  can be written as  $\omega = (1 - \gamma)\mu + \gamma\delta_{A(x+1)}$  for some probability measure  $\mu$  with*

$$(3.25) \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset \mathcal{D} \cap (E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}})$$

and

$$(3.26) \quad \gamma = \frac{x}{x+1} \left( 1 - \frac{1 - \mathcal{K}^{-1}}{1 + (1 + \mathcal{K}^{-1})x} \right).$$

Moreover,

$$(3.27) \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset \left\{ X : \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |A(x)| \leq |X| \leq \sqrt{2} |A(x)| \right\}.$$

*Proof.* This time the splitting sequence for  $\omega$  is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{A(x)} &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{B_1(-x)} + (1 - \alpha_1) \delta_{C(x)} \\ &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{B_1(-x)} + \alpha_2 \delta_{B_2(x+1)} + \gamma \delta_{A(x+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_1(x) = \text{diag}(x, \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}x), \quad B_2(x) = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}x, x), \quad C(x) = \text{diag}(-x, x+1)$$

and

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{1 + x(1 + \mathcal{K}^{-1})}, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{x}{x+1} \frac{1}{1 + x(1 + \mathcal{K}^{-1})},$$

and  $\gamma$  is given by (3.26). Observe that  $B_1(x) \in E_{\mathcal{K}-1}$  and  $B_2(x) \in E_{\mathcal{K}}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . The bound (3.27) follows from

$$(3.28) \quad |x| \leq |B_1(x)| = |B_2(x)| \leq |A(x)| \leq \sqrt{2}|x|.$$

□

**Example 3.3.** We apply Proposition 3.1 to Lemma 3.6 to obtain a staircase laminate with properties as used in Section 3.2 of [AFS08]. Let  $A_n = A(n)$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . We obtain, using Lemma 3.6, finite order laminates  $\omega_n = (1 - \gamma_n)\mu_n + \gamma_n\delta_{A_{n+1}}$  with barycenter  $A_n$  and  $\gamma_n$  given by (3.26) with  $x = n$ . Then

$$\beta_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \prod_{k=1}^n \left( 1 - \frac{\mathcal{K}-1}{\mathcal{K}+k(\mathcal{K}+1)} \right).$$

We estimate

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \prod_{k=1}^n \left( 1 - \frac{\mathcal{K}-1}{\mathcal{K}+1} \frac{1}{k} \right) \leq \beta_n \leq \frac{1}{n+1} \prod_{k=1}^n \left( 1 - \frac{\mathcal{K}-1}{\mathcal{K}+1} \frac{1}{k+1} \right).$$

By taking logarithms<sup>2</sup>, we deduce that there exists  $C = C(\mathcal{K}) > 1$  such that

$$(3.29) \quad C^{-1}n^{-\bar{q}} \leq \beta_n \leq Cn^{-\bar{q}}$$

with  $\bar{q} = \frac{2\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}+1}$ . Thus, the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 are satisfied and we obtain a sequence of laminates  $\nu^N$  with  $\text{supp } \nu^N \subset (\mathcal{D} \cap (E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}})) \cup \{A_{N+1}\}$  and barycenter  $A(1) = \text{diag}(-1, 1)$ . From (3.28) and (3.29) we deduce

$$C^{-1} \leq \beta_n |A_n|^{\bar{q}} \leq C$$

for some  $C = C(\mathcal{K}) > 1$ , and then Lemma 3.3 implies

$$(3.30) \quad \tilde{C}^{-1}t^{-\frac{2\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}+1}} \leq \nu^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq \tilde{C}t^{-\frac{2\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}+1}} \quad \text{for all } t > 1.$$

for some  $\tilde{C} > 1$ .

*Example 4.* Our fourth example is from [CT22] and arises in the theory of the  $p$ -harmonic operator. For any  $p \in (1, \infty)$  let

$$(3.31) \quad K_p = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{p-1} \end{pmatrix} R : \lambda \geq 0, R \in SO(2) \right\}.$$

<sup>2</sup>Let  $\alpha_n = \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - \frac{c}{k})$  for some  $0 < c < 1$ . Then  $\log \alpha_n = -\sum_{k=1}^n f(k)$ , where  $f(x) = \log(x) - \log(x-c)$ . By direct computation we verify that  $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is monotone decreasing, hence  $\int_1^n f(x) dx \leq \sum_{k=1}^n f(k) \leq \int_1^{n+1} f(x) dx$ . On the other hand, by evaluating the integral we see that

$$\int_1^n f(x) dx = c \log n - (n-c) \log\left(\frac{n-c}{n}\right) + (1-c) \log(1-c) = c \log n + O(1)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The assertion (3.29) follows with  $c = \frac{\mathcal{K}-1}{\mathcal{K}+1}$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $1 < p < 2$  and  $b > 1$ . For any  $x \geq 1$  define  $A(x)$  to be the  $2 \times 2$  diagonal matrix with entries  $A(x) = \text{diag}(bx, -x^{p-1})$ . There exists a laminate  $\omega \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$  with barycenter  $\bar{\omega} = A(x)$  such that  $\omega$  can be written as  $\omega = (1 - \gamma)\mu + \gamma\delta_{A(x+1)}$  for some probability measure  $\mu$  with*

$$(3.32) \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset \mathcal{D} \cap K_p$$

and

$$(3.33) \quad \gamma = \left(1 - \frac{b}{(b+1)(1+x)}\right) \left(1 - \frac{(1+x^{-1})^{p-1} - 1}{b^{p-1} + (1+x^{-1})^{p-1}}\right).$$

Moreover,

$$(3.34) \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset \{X : \frac{1}{\sqrt{2b}}|A(x)| \leq |X| \leq \sqrt{2b}|A(x)|\}.$$

*Proof.* This time the splitting sequence for  $\omega$  is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{A(x)} &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{B_1(bx)} + (1 - \alpha_1) \delta_{C(x)} \\ &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{B_1(bx)} + \alpha_2 \delta_{B_2(x+1)} + \gamma \delta_{A(x+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_1(x) = \text{diag}(x, x^{p-1}), \quad B_2(x) = \text{diag}(-x, -x^{p-1}), \quad C(x) = \text{diag}(bx, -(x+1)^{p-1})$$

and

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{(x+1)^{p-1} - x^{p-1}}{(bx)^{p-1} + (x+1)^{p-1}}, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{b}{(b+1)(x+1)} \frac{(bx)^{p-1} - x^{p-1}}{(bx)^{p-1} + (x+1)^{p-1}},$$

and  $\gamma$  is given by (3.33). Observe that  $B_1(x), B_2(x) \in K_p$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The bound (3.34) follows from

$$(3.35) \quad |x| \leq |B_1(x)| = |B_2(x)| \leq |A(x)| \leq \sqrt{2b}|x|.$$

□

**Example 3.4.** We apply Proposition 3.1 to Lemma 3.7 to obtain a staircase laminate with properties as used in [CT22]. Let  $A_n = A(n)$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . We obtain, using Lemma 3.7, finite order laminates  $\omega_n = (1 - \gamma_n)\mu_n + \gamma_n \delta_{A_{n+1}}$  with barycenter  $A_n$  and  $\gamma_n$  given by (3.33) with  $x = n$ . The main observation is that, for a suitable  $b > 1$ , we have

$$(3.36) \quad \beta_n := \prod_{j=1}^n \gamma_j \sim n^{-\bar{q}} \quad \text{with } \bar{q} \in (1, p).$$

To see this, note that (arguing analogously to (3.29))

$$(3.37) \quad -\log \gamma_{n+1} = \bar{q}n^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-2}) \quad \text{with } \bar{q} = \frac{p-1}{b^{p-1}+1} + \frac{b}{b+1}$$

Thus  $\log \beta_n - \bar{q} \log n$  is uniformly bounded from above and below and hence

$$(3.38) \quad \frac{1}{C}n^{-\bar{q}} \leq \beta_n \leq Cn^{-\bar{q}}$$

for some constant  $C$ . Clearly  $\bar{q} < p$ . Moreover, with  $a = b^{-1}$  we have

$$\bar{q} - 1 = \frac{p-1}{b^{p-1}+1} - \frac{1}{b+1} = \frac{(p-1)a^{p-1}}{1+a^{p-1}} - \frac{a}{1+a}.$$

Since  $p-1 \in (0, 1)$  we have  $a^{p-1} \gg a$  for  $0 < a \ll 1$  and we conclude that  $\bar{q} > 1$  for sufficiently small  $a > 0$  or, equivalently, for sufficiently large  $b > 1$ .

Thus, the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 are satisfied and we obtain a sequence of laminates  $\nu^N$  with  $\text{supp } \nu^N \subset (\mathcal{D} \cap K_p \cup \{A_{N+1}\})$  and barycenter  $A(1) = \text{diag}(b, -1)$ . From (3.35) and (3.38) we deduce

$$C^{-1} \leq \beta_n |A_n|^{\bar{q}} \leq C$$

for some  $C = C(p, b) > 1$ , and then Lemma 3.3 implies

$$(3.39) \quad \tilde{C}^{-1} t^{-\bar{q}} \leq \nu^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq \tilde{C} t^{-\bar{q}} \quad \text{for all } t > 1.$$

for some  $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(p, b) > 1$ .

#### 4. DIFFERENTIAL INCLUSIONS FOR SOBOLEV MAPS

In this section we return to general differential inclusions of the form

$$(4.1) \quad \nabla u(x) \in K \text{ for almost every } x \in \Omega,$$

where  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  is a regular domain, and  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  is a prescribed (typically unbounded) closed set. As mentioned in the introduction we complement (4.1) with affine boundary conditions.

In this section we recall the definition of the property 'K can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$ ' and verify the three key features of this property announced in Section 4.7:

- existence of solutions if  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  can be reduced to  $K$
- stability of the reduction property under iteration
- sufficiency of staircase laminates for the reduction property

**4.1. Exact solutions.** Recall from our discussion in the introduction, that our general strategy is to solve (4.1) by first obtaining the following approximation result: for any regular domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ , any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $s \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\varepsilon, \alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exists a piecewise affine map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$  with  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and

$$\int_{\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) \notin K\}} (1 + |\nabla u|^s) dx < \varepsilon |\Omega|,$$

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq M^p (1 + |A|^p) |\Omega| t^{-p} \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

If  $K$  has this property with some  $M$  and  $p > 1$ , we say that  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  can be reduced to  $K$  in weak  $L^p$  (c.f. Definition 1.1). Our first goal in this section is to show how this property leads to solvability of the differential inclusion (4.1).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $1 < p < \infty$  such that  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  can be reduced to  $K$  in weak  $L^p$ . Then for any regular domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ , any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exists a piecewise affine map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  with  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  such that*

$$(4.2a) \quad \nabla u(x) \in K \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

$$(4.2b) \quad \|u - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta,$$

and for all  $t > 0$

$$(4.2c) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq 2M^p(1 + |A|^p)|\Omega|t^{-p}.$$

*Remark 4.1.* A version of this result also holds if the condition

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq M^p(1 + |A|^p)|\Omega|t^{-p} \text{ for all } t > 0$$

in the definition of ' $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  can be reduced to  $K$ ' (see Definition 1.1) is replaced by the weaker condition that there exists an  $r \geq p$  such that

$$(4.3) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq M^p(1 + |A|^r)|\Omega|t^{-p} \text{ for all } t > 0$$

Then the conclusion (4.2c) has to be replaced by the weaker conclusion

$$(4.4) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq 2M^p(1 + |A|^r)|\Omega|t^{-p}.$$

*Proof.* We show the stronger result mentioned in Remark 4.1. To do so, we construct inductively a sequence of piecewise affine maps  $u_k \in W^{1,1} \cap C^\alpha$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  such that  $u_k = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and, with  $\Omega_{error}^{(k)} := \{x \in \Omega_{u_k} : \nabla u_k(x) \notin K\}$  we have

$$(4.5a) \quad \int_{\Omega_{error}^{(k)}} (1 + |\nabla u_k|^r) dx < 2^{-k}|\Omega|,$$

$$(4.5b) \quad \|u_k - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta(1 - 2^{-k}),$$

$$(4.5c) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_k(x)| > t\}| \leq M^p(1 + |A|^r)|\Omega|t^{-p} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 2^{-i}.$$

The map  $u_1$  is obtained directly by applying Definition 1.1 with  $s = r$  (and, for  $r \geq p$  using (4.3) in Remark 4.1). In addition, invoking the rescaling and covering argument from Section 2.1 we can ensure  $\|u_1 - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta/2$ .

For the inductive step we assume the existence of  $u_k$ . Since  $u_k$  is piecewise affine, there exist pairwise disjoint open subsets  $\Omega_i \subset \Omega_{error}^{(k)}$  such that  $|\Omega_{error}^{(k)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Omega_i| = 0$  and  $u_k = l_{A_i, b_i}$  in  $\Omega_i$ .

We then apply Definition 1.1 and (4.3) in each  $\Omega_i$  (again with  $s = r$ ) to obtain piecewise affine maps  $v_i \in W^{1,1}(\Omega_i) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega}_i)$  with  $v_i = l_{A_i, b_i}$  on  $\partial\Omega_i$  such that, with

$$\tilde{\Omega}_i := \{x \in \Omega_i : \nabla v_i(x) \notin K\}$$

we have

$$(4.6a) \quad \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} (1 + |\nabla v_i|^r) dx < 2^{-(k+1)} |\Omega_i|,$$

$$(4.6b) \quad \|v_i - l_{A_i, b_i}\|_{C^\alpha(\tilde{\Omega}_i)} < \delta 2^{-k-2},$$

$$(4.6c) \quad |\{x \in \Omega_i : |\nabla v_i(x)| > t\}| \leq M^p (1 + |A_i|^r) |\Omega_i| t^{-p}.$$

Using the basic gluing and covering/rescaling arguments from Section 2.1 we thus obtain the piecewise affine map  $u_{k+1} \in W^{1,1} \cap C^\alpha$  with  $u_{k+1} = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and with the following properties:

- By construction

$$\nabla u_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \nabla v_i & \text{in } \Omega_i \\ \nabla u_k & \text{a.e. outside } \Omega_{error}^{(k)} \end{cases}$$

and in particular  $|\Omega_{error}^{(k+1)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \tilde{\Omega}_i| = 0$ .

- Consequently, using (4.6a),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_{error}^{(k+1)}} (1 + |\nabla u_{k+1}|^r) dx &= \sum_i \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} (1 + |\nabla v_i|^r) dx \\ &< 2^{-(k+1)} \sum_i |\Omega_i| \leq 2^{-(k+1)} |\Omega| \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain (4.5a) for  $k+1$ .

- Using (4.6c), for any  $t \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} &|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_{k+1}(x)| > t\}| \\ &\leq |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_k(x)| > t\}| + \sum_i |\{x \in \Omega_i : |\nabla v_i(x)| > t\}| \\ &\leq M^p (1 + |A|^r) |\Omega| t^{-p} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 2^{-i} + M^p t^{-p} \sum_i (1 + |A_i|^r) |\Omega_i| \\ &= M^p (1 + |A|^r) |\Omega| t^{-p} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 2^{-i} + M^p t^{-p} \int_{\Omega_{error}^{(k)}} (1 + |\nabla u_k|^r) dx \\ &\leq M^p (1 + |A|^r) |\Omega| t^{-p} \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{-i}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows (4.5c) for  $k+1$  (note that the bound is trivial for  $t < 1$  since  $M \geq 1$ ).

- Moreover, we obtain

$$(4.7) \quad \|u_{k+1} - u_k\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} \leq 2 \max_i \|v_i - l_{A_i, b_i}\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega}_i)} \leq \delta 2^{-k-1},$$

from which (4.5b) follows for  $k+1$ .

This concludes the induction step.

Having constructed the sequence  $(u_k)_k$ , we now show that a limit  $k \rightarrow \infty$  exists and satisfies the properties in the statement of the theorem. First note that  $u_{k+1} = u_k$  outside  $\Omega_{error}^{(k)}$  and  $\Omega_{error}^{(k+1)} \subset \Omega_{error}^{(k)}$  for any  $k$ . Furthermore, it follows from (4.5a) that  $|\Omega_{error}^{(k)}| \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus for almost every  $x \in \Omega$  the pointwise limit  $u(x) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k(x)$  exists and  $u$  is piecewise affine. From (4.7) we further obtain that  $u_k$  converges to  $u$  in  $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  with

$$u = l_{A,b} \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \text{and } \|u - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta.$$

From (4.5c) we deduce the uniform weak  $L^p$  bound

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_k(x)| > t\}| \leq 2M^p(1 + |A|^r)|\Omega|t^{-p},$$

which in particular implies that the sequence  $\{u_k\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  for any  $q < p$ . It follows that the limit satisfies  $u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  for any  $q < p$ , as well as the same weak  $L^p$  bound. This proves the statement of the theorem.  $\square$

**4.2. Iteration property.** In certain cases it may be simpler to show the reduction property  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  to  $K$ , required in Theorem 4.1, via several intermediate stages. The key point is to tie together these different reduction stages whilst retaining control of the appropriate weak  $L^p$  bound. This is the subject of the following statement:

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $K, K', K'' \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ . Suppose that for some  $1 \leq p, q < \infty$  with  $p \neq q$ :  $K$  can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$  and that  $K'$  can be reduced to  $K''$  in weak  $L^q$ . Then  $K$  can be reduced to  $K''$  in weak  $L^r$  where  $r = \min\{p, q\}$ .*

Before we give the proof of Theorem 4.2, we collect some useful classical estimates.

*Remark 4.2.*

- Let us define, for any  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $\langle A \rangle_p := (1 + |A|^p)^{1/p}$ , and  $\langle A \rangle_\infty = \max\{1, |A|\}$ . By direct computation one can check that for any  $A$  the function  $p \mapsto \langle A \rangle_p$  is monotonic decreasing.
- Using Chebyshev's inequality, a strong  $L^p$  estimate of the type

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq M^p(1 + |A|^p)|\Omega|$$

implies the weak  $L^p$  estimate (1.14b).

- Conversely, the weak  $L^p$  estimate (1.14b) implies a strong  $L^q$  estimate for any  $q < p$ : for any  $a > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q dx &= q \int_0^{\infty} t^{q-1} |\{|\nabla u| > t\}| dt \\ &\leq q \int_0^a t^{q-1} dt |\Omega| + q \int_a^{\infty} t^{q-p-1} dt (M\langle A \rangle_p)^p |\Omega| \\ &= a^q |\Omega| \left( 1 + \frac{q}{q-p} \left( \frac{M\langle A \rangle_p}{a} \right)^p \right) \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $a = \left( \frac{q}{p-q} \right)^{1/p} M\langle A \rangle_p$  and using the monotonicity of  $p \mapsto \langle A \rangle_p$ , we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q dx \leq 2 \left( \frac{q}{p-q} \right)^{q/p} M^q (1 + |A|^q) |\Omega|.$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  be a regular domain and fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $1 \leq s < \infty$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . Let  $A \in K$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

By the assumption that  $K$  can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$  we know that there exists a map  $u' \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,1}(\Omega)$  with  $u' = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and mutually disjoint open sets  $\Omega'_i$  and a nullset  $\mathcal{N}'$  with  $\Omega = \mathcal{N}' \cup \bigcup_i \Omega'_i$  such that  $u'$  is affine on  $\Omega'_i$  (i.e.  $u'|_{\Omega'_i} = l_{A_i, b_i}$ ) and

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{\Omega'_{error}} (1 + |\nabla u'|)^s dx < \varepsilon/2 |\Omega|$$

where

$$(4.9) \quad \Omega'_{error} := \{x \in \mathring{\Omega}_{u'} : \nabla u' \notin K'\} \cup \mathcal{N}'.$$

Moreover, for any  $t > 1$

$$(4.10) \quad |\{|\nabla u'| > t\}| \leq (M'\langle A \rangle_p)^p |\Omega| t^{-p}$$

Let  $G$  be the set of “good” indices  $G = \{i : \nabla u' \in K' \text{ in } \Omega'_i\}$ .

In each open set  $\Omega'_i$  with  $i \in G$  apply the assumption that  $K'$  can be reduced to  $K''$  in  $L^p$  with  $A_i \in K'$  and  $b_i$ . This yields piecewise affine maps  $u''_i \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega'_i}) \cap W^{1,1}(\Omega'_i)$  with  $u''_i = u'$  on  $\partial\Omega'_i$ , and a closed nullset  $\mathcal{N}''_i$  such that  $u''_i$  is locally affine on  $\Omega'_i \setminus \mathcal{N}''_i$ . Moreover,

$$(4.11) \quad \int_{\Omega''_{error,i}} (1 + |\nabla u''_i|)^s dx \leq \varepsilon/2 |\Omega'_i|$$

where

$$(4.12) \quad \Omega''_{error,i} := \{x \in \mathring{\Omega}_{u''_i} : \nabla u''_i(x) \notin K''\} \cup \mathcal{N}''_i,$$

and

$$(4.13) \quad |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u''_i(x)| > t\}| \leq (M''\langle A_i \rangle_q)^q |\Omega'_i| t^{-q}$$

By the gluing argument the map  $u''$  defined by

$$(4.14) \quad u''(x) = \begin{cases} u''_i(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega_i, i \in G \\ u'(x) & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

satisfies  $u'' \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,1}(\Omega)$  and  $u'' = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Moreover  $u''$  is piecewise affine (locally affine on  $\Omega \setminus \mathcal{N}' \cup \bigcup_i \mathcal{N}''_i$ ) and  $\nabla u''(x) \in K''$  if  $x \in \mathring{\Omega}_{u''} \setminus \Omega''_{error}$  where

$$\Omega''_{error} := \bigcup_{i \in G} \Omega''_{error,i} \cup \Omega'_{error}.$$

Summing (4.11) over  $i \in G$  and using (4.8) as well as the fact that  $u''$  and  $u'$  agree on  $\Omega'_{error}$  we get

$$(4.15) \quad \int_{\Omega''_{error}} (1 + |\nabla u''|)^s dx < \varepsilon |\Omega|.$$

It only remains to show that (1.14b) holds with exponent  $r = \min\{p, q\}$ . More precisely, we claim the estimate

$$(4.16) \quad |\{|\nabla u| > t\}| \leq 4(1 + \frac{q}{|q-p|})(M' M'')^r (1 + |A|^r) |\Omega| t^{-r}.$$

In order to show this we treat the cases  $p < q$  and  $p > q$  separately.

**The case  $p < q$**

We calculate, for any  $t > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| &= \sum_i |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \\ &= \sum_{i: |A_i| > t/M''} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| + \sum_{i: |A_i| \leq t/M''} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \\ &\leq \sum_{i: |A_i| > t/M''} |\Omega'_i| + \sum_{i: |A_i| \leq t/M''} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \\ &= |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u'(x)| > t\}| + \sum_{i \in G: |A_i| \leq t/M''} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u''_i(x)| > t\}|. \end{aligned}$$

In the last sum we could restrict to  $i \in G$ , because  $M'' \geq 1$  and if  $i \notin G$  then  $\nabla u(x) = \nabla u'_i(x) = A_i$  for all  $x \in \Omega'_i$ . The first term can directly estimated

using (4.10). On the second term we use (4.13) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i \in G: |A_i| \leq t/M''} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u''_i(x)| > t\}| &\leq (M'')^q t^{-q} \sum_{i \in G: |A_i| \leq t/M''} (1 + |A_i|^q) |\Omega'_i| \\
 &\leq (M'')^q t^{-q} \int_{\{|\nabla u'| \leq t/M''\}} (1 + |\nabla u'|^q) dx \\
 &\leq (M'')^q |\Omega| t^{-q} + q(M'')^q t^{-q} \int_0^{t/M''} s^{q-1} |\{|\nabla u'_i| > s\}| ds \\
 &\stackrel{(4.10)}{\leq} (M'')^q |\Omega| t^{-q} + q(M'')^q (M')^p \langle A \rangle_p^p |\Omega| t^{-q} \int_0^{t/M''} s^{q-p-1} ds \\
 &= (M'')^q |\Omega| t^{-q} + \frac{q}{q-p} (M'')^p (M')^p \langle A \rangle_p^p |\Omega| t^{-p}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together we deduce

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq (1 + \frac{q}{q-p})(M' M'')^p (1 + |A|^p) |\Omega| t^{-p} + (M'')^q t^{-q} |\Omega|.$$

If  $t \geq M''$ , then  $(M'')^q t^{-q} \leq (M'')^p t^{-p}$  (since  $p < q$ ), hence in this case we can estimate

$$(4.17) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq (2 + \frac{q}{q-p})(M' M'')^p (1 + |A|^p) |\Omega| t^{-p}.$$

On the other hand, if  $t < M''$ , then the right hand side of (4.17) is bounded below by  $|\Omega|$ , which is the trivial upper bound for  $|\{|\nabla u(x)| > t\}|$ . Therefore in this case (4.17) is also valid.

**The case  $p > q$**

This time we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| &= \sum_i |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \\
 &= \sum_{i \in G} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u''_i(x)| > t\}| + \sum_{i \notin G} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u'(x)| > t\}| \\
 &\stackrel{(4.9)}{=} \sum_{i \in G} |\{x \in \Omega'_i : |\nabla u''(x)| > t\}| + |\{x \in \Omega'_{error} : |\nabla u'(x)| > t\}| \\
 &\stackrel{(4.13)}{\leq} (M'')^q t^{-q} \sum_{i \in G} (1 + |A_i|^q) |\Omega'_i| + t^{-q} \int_{\Omega'_{error}} |\nabla u'|^q dx \\
 &\leq (M'')^q t^{-q} |\Omega| + (M'')^q t^{-q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u'|^q dx \\
 &\leq (M'')^q t^{-q} |\Omega| + 2 \left(\frac{q}{p-q}\right)^{q/p} (M')^q (M'')^q (1 + |A|^q) |\Omega| t^{-q},
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used Remark 4.2. Since  $q < p$  we conclude

$$(4.18) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq 2(2 + \frac{q}{p-q})(M' M'')^q (1 + |A|^q) |\Omega| t^{-q}.$$

□

*Remark 4.3.* The estimates in Theorem 4.2 have nothing to do with the gradient structure, they hold for unbounded probability measures as follows: Let  $\nu' = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \delta_{A_i}$  be a probability measure with

$$(4.19) \quad \nu'(\{|X| > t\}) \leq M'(1 + |A|^p)t^{-p} \quad \text{for all } t > 0$$

and for every  $i$   $\nu''_i$  be a probability measure with

$$(4.20) \quad \nu''_i(\{|X| > t\}) \leq M''(1 + |A_i|^q)t^{-q} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Assume that  $p \neq q < \infty$ . Then the measure

$$(4.21) \quad \nu = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \nu''_i$$

is a probability measure with

$$(4.22) \quad \nu(\{|X| > t\}) \leq C_{p,q} M' M'' (1 + |A|^r) t^{-r} \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

with  $r = \min\{p, q\}$  and  $C_{p,q} = 4(1 + \frac{q}{|p-q|})$ . The proof is entirely analogous to the case of gradients presented above.

*Remark 4.4.* If  $p = q < \infty$  then it may happen that  $|\nu'|_p < \infty$ ,  $|\nu''|_p < \infty$ , but  $|\nu|_p = \infty$ , where  $\nu$  is defined in (4.21). Consider, for example,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $d = m = 1$ ,  $A_i = 2^i$ , and  $\lambda_i = c_p 2^{-ip}$  with  $c_p = (1 - 2^{-p})$ . Then  $\nu' = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i \delta_{A_i}$  is a probability measure with barycentre  $A = \frac{c_p}{c_p - 1}$ . Set  $\nu''_i = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda_k \delta_{\frac{1}{A} 2^{i+k}}$ . Then  $\nu''_i$  is a probability measure with barycentre  $A_i = 2^i$ . Moreover

$$\nu = \sum_{i,k=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i \lambda_k \delta_{\frac{1}{A} 2^{i+k}} = c_p^2 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (l+1) 2^{-lp} \delta_{\frac{1}{A} 2^l}.$$

Thus  $|\nu'|_p < \infty$ ,  $|\nu''|_p < \infty$ , but  $|\nu|_p = \infty$ .

**4.3. Staircase laminate criterion.** We saw in the previous subsections that the condition  $K$  can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$  (c.f. Definition 1.1) is key to being able to solve the differential inclusion (4.1). The following is a useful criterion for verifying this property, based on the notion of staircase laminates introduced in Section 3.1.

**Theorem 4.3** (Staircase laminate criterion). *Let  $K, K' \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  and  $1 < p < \infty$ , and assume that there exists a constant  $M \geq 1$  with the following property: for any  $A \in K$  there exists a staircase laminate  $\nu_A^\infty$  supported on  $K'$ , with barycenter  $A$  and satisfying the bound*

$$(4.23) \quad \nu_A^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq M^p (1 + |A|^p) t^{-p} \quad \text{for all } t > 1.$$

*Then  $K$  can be reduced to  $K'$  in weak  $L^p$ .*

The proof of Theorem 4.3 actually follows from the more general statement of Proposition 4.4 below, which in turn can be seen as an analogue of Lemma 2.2 for unbounded staircase laminates, where the  $L^\infty$  bound on the gradient is replaced by a weak  $L^p$  bound.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Suppose  $\nu^\infty$  is a staircase laminate supported on  $K$ , with barycenter  $A$  and satisfying the bound (3.6) for some  $p > 1$ . Then, for each  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $s \in (1, \infty)$ , and each regular domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ , there exists a piecewise affine map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$  with  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and the following properties: with  $\Omega_{error} := \{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) \notin K\}$  we have*

$$(4.24a) \quad \int_{\Omega_{error}} (1 + |\nabla u|)^s dx < \varepsilon |\Omega|,$$

and, for each Borel set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ ,

$$(4.24b) \quad (1 - \varepsilon)\nu^\infty(E) \leq \frac{|\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u(x) \in E\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\nu^\infty(E).$$

We show first how Theorem 4.3 follows easily from Proposition 4.4.

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* The proof follows immediately from Proposition 4.4 below, by taking  $E = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} : |X| > t\}$  and  $\varepsilon = 1/2$  in (4.24b) and using (4.23).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.4.* First note that the assumption  $A_N \notin K$  implies  $\nu^N(\{A_N\}) = \beta_N$ .

Let  $s \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\eta > 0$  and set

$$c_N = \prod_{j=1}^N (1 + 2^{-j}\eta).$$

We construct a sequence of piecewise affine Lipschitz maps  $u_N : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $u_N = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  such that the following holds: recalling that  $\Omega = \mathring{\Omega} \cup \mathcal{N}$  is the decomposition defined in Section 2.1 corresponding to the piecewise affine map  $u_N$ , set

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{error}^{(N)} &:= \left\{ x \in \mathring{\Omega} : \nabla u_N(x) \notin \text{supp } \nu_A^{(N)} \right\} \cup \mathcal{N}, \\ \Omega_{inductive}^{(N)} &:= \left\{ x \in \mathring{\Omega} : \nabla u_N(x) = A_N \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We then have, for every Borel set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ ,

$$(4.25a) \quad \int_{\Omega_{error}^{(N)}} 1 + |\nabla u_N|^s dx \leq \eta |\Omega| (1 - 2^{-N})$$

$$(4.25b) \quad u_N = u_k \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_{inductive}^{(k)}, \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq N - 1,$$

$$(4.25c) \quad c_N^{-1} \nu^N(E) \leq \frac{|\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u_N(x) \in E\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq c_N \nu^N(E)$$

The existence of  $u_1$  satisfying the estimates above follows immediately from applying Lemma 2.2 to  $\nu^1$ , and in particular from the estimates (2.4)-(2.5) with a suitable choice of  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

To obtain  $u_{N+1}$  from  $u_N$  we note that, by construction, there exists a decomposition of  $\Omega_{inductive}^{(N)}$  into a disjoint union of (at most) countably many

regular domains:  $\Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(N)} = \bigcup_i \Omega_i$ , such that  $u_N$  is affine on  $\Omega_i$  with  $\nabla u_N = A_N$ . Then, we obtain  $u_{N+1}$  by applying Lemma 2.2 to  $\omega_{N+1}$  in each  $\Omega_i$ , and gluing the resulting mapping  $v_i$  to  $u_N$  as explained in Section 2.1, i.e.

$$(4.26) \quad u_{N+1} = \begin{cases} u_N & \text{outside } \Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(N)}, \\ v_i & \text{in } \Omega_i. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we can achieve that

$$(4.27) \quad \|u_{N+1} - u_N\|_{C^\alpha} \leq 2^{-N}\eta.$$

Furthermore, for each Borel set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u_{N+1}(x) \in E\}| = \\ & \stackrel{(4.26)}{=} |\{x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(N)} : \nabla u_N(x) \in E\}| + |\{x \in \Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(N)} : \nabla u_{N+1}(x) \in E\}| \\ & = |\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u_N(x) \in E \setminus \{A_N\}\}| + \sum_i |\{x \in \Omega_i : \nabla v_i(x) \in E\}| \end{aligned}$$

Now, by the inductive assumption (4.25c),

$$c_N^{-1} \nu^N(E \setminus \{A_N\}) \leq \frac{|\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u_N(x) \in E \setminus \{A_N\}\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq c_N \nu^N(E \setminus \{A_N\}).$$

Moreover, by applying Lemma 2.2 with an appropriate choice of  $\varepsilon > 0$  in each  $\Omega_i$  we may ensure that

$$(1+2^{-(N+1)}\eta)^{-1} \omega_{N+1}(E) \leq \frac{|\{x \in \Omega_i : \nabla v_i(x) \in E\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq (1+2^{-(N+1)}\eta) \omega_{N+1}(E).$$

Recall from (3.3) that  $\nu^N = \tilde{\nu}^N + \beta_N \delta_{A_N}$  and  $\nu^{N+1} = \tilde{\nu}^N + \beta_N \omega_N$ . Since  $A_N \notin K$  and  $\text{supp } \tilde{\nu}^N \subset K$ , we obtain  $\nu^N(E \setminus \{A_N\}) = \tilde{\nu}^N(E)$ . Thus, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u_{N+1}(x) \in E\}| & \leq c_N \tilde{\nu}^N(E) + (1+2^{-(N+1)}\eta) \sum_i |\Omega_i| \omega_{N+1}(E) \\ & = c_N |\Omega| \tilde{\nu}^N(E) + (1+2^{-(N+1)}\eta) |\Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(N)}| \omega_{N+1}(E) \\ & \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} c_N |\Omega| \tilde{\nu}^N(E) + (1+2^{-(N+1)}\eta) c_N |\Omega| \gamma_N \omega_{N+1}(E) \\ & \leq c_{N+1} |\Omega| \tilde{\nu}^{N+1}(E). \end{aligned}$$

In inequality (\*) we used again the inductive assumption (4.25c) with  $E = \{A_N\}$ . The lower bound follows entirely analogously, thus verifying (4.25c) for  $N+1$ .

Regarding (4.25b), we have  $u_{N+1} = u_N$  on  $\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(N)}$ . Since  $\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(k)} \subset \Omega \setminus \Omega_{\text{inductive}}^{(N)}$  for  $k < N$ , assertion (4.25b) follows for  $N+1$  from the induction assumption.

It follows from (4.26) that

$$(4.28) \quad \Omega_{error}^{(N)} \subset \Omega_{error}^{(N+1)} \subset \Omega_{error}^{(N)} \cup \Omega_{inductive}^{(N)}.$$

Thus to verify (4.25a) we estimate, using (4.28),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_{error}^{(N+1)}} 1 + |\nabla u_{N+1}|^s dx \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_{error}^{(N)}} 1 + |\nabla u_N|^s dx + \int_{\Omega_{inductive}^{(N)} \cap \Omega_{error}^{(N+1)}} 1 + |\nabla u_{N+1}|^s dx \\ & \leq \eta(1 - 2^{-N})|\Omega| + \sum_i \int_{\Omega_i \cap \Omega_{error}^{(N+1)}} 1 + |\nabla v_i|^s dx \\ & \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \eta(1 - 2^{-N})|\Omega| + \sum_i \eta 2^{-(N+1)}|\Omega_i| \\ & \leq \eta(1 - 2^{-(N+1)})|\Omega|, \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (\*) is a consequence of (2.5) in the application of Lemma 2.2, with a suitable choice of  $\varepsilon > 0$ . This concludes the proof of properties (4.25a)–(4.25c).

We now study the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows from (4.27) that there exists a  $u \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$  such that  $u_N \rightarrow u$  uniformly. We next study the distribution function of  $\nabla u_N$ .

It follows from (4.25c) and the choice of  $c_N$  that, for any Borel set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  we have

$$(4.29) \quad e^{-\eta} \nu^N(E)|\Omega| \leq |\{x \in \Omega : \nabla u_N(x) \in E\}| \leq e^\eta \nu^N(E)|\Omega|.$$

With  $E = \{A_N\}$  we obtain

$$|\Omega_{inductive}^{(N)}| \leq e^\eta \beta_N |\Omega| \rightarrow 0.$$

In addition, from (4.25b) it follows that  $u = u_N$  almost everywhere on  $\Omega \setminus \Omega_{inductive}^{(N)}$ . Consequently  $\nabla u_N$  converges to  $\nabla u$  in measure. Next, we set  $E = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} : |X| > t\}$  in (4.29) and use (3.6) to conclude

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}| \leq C|A|^p t^{-p}$$

for some  $C > 1$  and all  $t > 0$ . Together with convergence of  $\nabla u_N$  in measure we deduce that  $\nabla u_N \rightarrow \nabla u$  in  $L^q$  for any  $q < p$ , in particular  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ . Moreover,

$$\nabla u(x) \in K \quad \text{if } x \notin \Omega_{error} = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \Omega_{error}^{(N)}.$$

Fatou's lemma and (4.25a) imply

$$\int_{\Omega_{error}} (1 + |\nabla u|)^s dx \leq 2^{s-1} \int_{\Omega_{error}} (1 + |\nabla u|^s) dx \leq 2^{s-1} \eta |\Omega|$$

Thus, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can choose  $\eta > 0$  sufficiently small so that the condition (4.24a) is satisfied, whereas (4.25c) follows from the passage  $N \rightarrow$

$\infty$  in (4.29) provided that  $e^\eta \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  (in which case also  $e^{-\eta} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ ). This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.4.  $\square$

## 5. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section we give the proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.4. These are about the existence of exact and approximate solutions to the differential inclusion

$$(5.1) \quad \nabla u(x) \in L \cap \Sigma \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

with appropriate weak  $L^2$  bounds and affine boundary conditions. Recall that  $L$  is the set of split  $2n \times 2n$  matrices and  $\Sigma$  is the set of matrices of determinant = 1, see (1.2)-(1.3).

### 5.1. Breaking the construction into stages and the proof of the main theorems.

Our strategy to solve the problem (5.1) consists of three stages, each corresponding to a simpler inclusion problem:

- (1) We construct for any  $l_{A,b}$  piecewise affine approximate solutions to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(\nabla u(x)) &= 1 \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \\ u(x) &= l_{A,b}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

- (2) Having reduced to affine pieces with rank one, we construct piecewise affine approximate solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla u(x) &\in L \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \\ u(x) &= l_{A,b}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

for any  $A$  with  $\text{rank}(A) = 1$ .

- (3) Finally, we pass from general affine pieces in  $L$  to  $L \cap \Sigma$  by constructing piecewise affine approximate solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla u(x) &\in L_i \cap \Sigma \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \\ u(x) &= l_{A,b}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

for any  $A \in L_i$ , for both  $i = 1, 2$  separately.

The idea behind this overall strategy is that even though there are no rank-one connections between  $L_1 \cap \Sigma$  and  $L_2 \cap \Sigma$ , rank-one connections between  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  do exist for singular matrices non-vanishing matrices. For example we have  $e_1 \otimes e_1 \in L_1$ ,  $e_{n+1} \otimes e_1 \in L_2$ , and  $\text{rank}(e_1 \otimes e_1 - e_{n+1} \otimes e_1) = 1$ .

The precise statements corresponding to the three stages above are as follows:

**Proposition 5.1** (Stage 1).  $\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  can be reduced to  $\{X : \text{rank } X \leq 1\}$  in weak  $L^2$ .

Proposition 5.1, together with Theorem 4.1, implies the existence of continuous Sobolev mappings with arbitrary affine boundary values, with weak  $L^2$  gradients and such that  $\text{rank } \nabla u \leq 1$  a.e. This latter statement is already known, see [FMCO18, LM16].

**Proposition 5.2** (Stage 2). *The set  $\{X : \text{rank } X \leq 1\}$  can be reduced to  $L$  in weak  $L^p$  for any  $p < \infty$ .*

**Proposition 5.3** (Stage 3). *The set  $L_1$  can be reduced to  $L_1 \cap \Sigma$  in weak  $L^{2n}$ , and  $L_2$  can be reduced to  $L_2 \cap \Sigma$  in weak  $L^{2n}$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* According to Theorem 4.1, Theorem 1.2 follows from the statement that  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  can be reduced to  $L \cap \Sigma$  in weak  $L^2$ . In turn, this latter statement is a direct consequence of Propositions 5.1-5.3 together with Theorem 4.2.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Suppose  $\text{rank } A = 1$  and  $A \notin L$ . Let  $s_k > 2n$  with  $s_k < s_{k+1}$  and  $s_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . By combining Stages 2 (Proposition 5.2) and 3 (Proposition 5.3 via Theorem 4.2), we obtain the statement: *The set  $\{X : \text{rank } X \leq 1\}$  can be reduced to  $L \cap \Sigma$  in weak  $L^{2n}$ .* Therefore there exist maps  $u^{(k)} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  such that  $u^{(k)} \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  with  $u^{(k)} = l_A$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and we have

$$(5.5a) \quad \int_{\{\nabla u^{(k)} \notin L \cap \Sigma\}} (1 + |\nabla u^{(k)}|^{s_k}) dx < 2^{-k} |\Omega|,$$

$$(5.5b) \quad |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u^{(k)}(x)| > t\}| \leq M^{2n} (1 + |A|^{2n}) |\Omega| t^{-2n}.$$

By the rescaling and covering argument we may assume that, in addition,  $\|u^{(k)} - l_A\|_{C^\alpha} < 2^{-k}$ . Hence  $u^{(k)} \rightarrow l_A$  in  $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$ . Let  $1 \leq p < 2n$ . Then it follows from (5.5b) that  $\sup_k \|\nabla u^{(k)}\|_{L^p} < \infty$ . Thus  $u^{(k)} \rightarrow l_A$  in  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ . Since  $s_k \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows from (5.5a) that  $\int_{\{\nabla u^{(k)} \notin L \cap \Sigma\}} (1 + |\nabla u^{(k)}|^s) dx$  converges to zero, for all  $s \in [1, \infty)$ .

Finally, if  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\nabla u^{(k)}, L_1) = 0$  in  $L^1(\Omega)$ , then arguing along a subsequence for which the limit inferior is achieved we see that  $A \in L_1$ , since  $L_1$  is a linear subspace and hence weakly closed. This contradicts the hypothesis  $A \notin L$ . Similarly we see that  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\nabla u^{(k)}, L_2) > 0$ .  $\square$

**5.2. Stage 1: Proof of Proposition 5.1.** Recall the sets  $\Lambda^{(m)}$  introduced in Section 2.2, for the case  $d = 2n$ :

$$\Lambda^{(m)} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} : \text{rank } X \leq m\}.$$

We start with the following consequence of Theorem 4.3 and the construction of staircase laminates in Example 3.2:

**Corollary 5.4.** *For any  $2 \leq m \leq 2n$  the set  $\Lambda^{(m)}$  can be reduced to  $\Lambda^{(m-1)}$  in weak  $L^m$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \Lambda^{(m)}$ . The singular value decomposition of  $A$  has the form  $RDQ$  with  $R, Q \in O(2n)$  orthogonal and  $D \in \mathcal{D} \cap \Lambda^{(m)}$  diagonal. Then Example 3.2 provides a staircase laminate  $\nu_D^\infty$  with barycenter  $D$  and weak  $L^m$  bound

$$\nu^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq 2^{1+m}|D|^m t^{-m} \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

Then we apply the invariance principle Lemma 3.2 with  $T(F) = RFQ$  for  $F \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$ . Observe that  $T(\Lambda^{(m-1)}) = \Lambda^{(m-1)}$ , so that  $\nu_A^\infty := T_*\nu^\infty$  is a staircase laminate supported in  $\Lambda^{(m-1)}$  with barycenter  $RDQ = A$ . Moreover,  $|A| \leq |R||D||Q| \leq d|D|$  and hence there exists  $C = C(m, n) > 1$  such that

$$\nu_A^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq C(m, n)|A|^m t^{-m} \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

The claim follows from Theorem 4.3.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* Applying Corollary 5.4 and Theorem 4.2 inductively, starting with  $m = 2n$  and then  $2n \mapsto 2n - 1 \mapsto \dots \mapsto 1$ , we see that  $\Lambda^{(2n)} = \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  can be reduced to  $\Lambda^{(1)}$  in weak  $L^2$ . This concludes the proof of Proposition 5.1.  $\square$

**5.3. Stage 2: Proof of Proposition 5.2.** The proof of Proposition 5.2 immediately follows from Lemma 2.2 together with the following

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  with  $\text{rank } A \leq 1$ . Then there exists a discrete laminate  $\nu$  with barycenter  $\bar{\nu} = A$  and support*

$$\text{supp } \nu \subset L \cap \{|X| \leq 2|A|\}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $A = a \otimes b$  for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and write

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

with  $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Define the matrices

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 2a_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 2b_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, & A_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 2a_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2b_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ A_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2a_2 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 2b_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, & A_4 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2a_2 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2b_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 2a_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}, & B_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2a_2 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\text{rank}(B_1 - B_2) \leq 1$  and  $\frac{1}{2}B_1 + \frac{1}{2}B_2 = A$ . Moreover,  $\text{rank}(A_1 - A_2) \leq 1$ ,  $\text{rank}(A_3 - A_4) \leq 1$ , and  $\frac{1}{2}A_1 + \frac{1}{2}A_2 = B_1$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}A_3 + \frac{1}{2}A_4 = B_2$ . Therefore

$$\nu = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 \delta_{A_i}$$

is a laminate with the desired properties.  $\square$

**5.4. Stage 3: Proof of Proposition 5.3.** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote the  $2n \times 2n$  diagonal matrices,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\geq 2} &= \{X = \text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) \text{ with } |x_i| \geq 2 \text{ for all } i\}, \\ \Sigma &= \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} : \det X = 1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.3 and Example 3.1 leads to the following statement.

**Corollary 5.6.** *The set  $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 2}$  can be reduced to  $\mathcal{D} \cap \Sigma$  in weak  $L^{2n}$ .*

*Proof.* The statement follows from the existence of the staircase laminates constructed in Example 3.1 with  $d = 2n$ , together with Theorem 4.3.  $\square$

Next, we have the following elementary construction.

**Lemma 5.7.** *For any  $A \in \mathcal{D}$  there exists a finite order laminate  $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n})$  with barycenter  $\bar{\nu} = A$  and support*

$$\text{supp } \nu \subset \mathcal{D}_{\geq 2} \cap \{|X| \leq C(1 + |A|)\},$$

where  $C = C(n) \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Let us write  $A = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_{2n})$  and, without loss of generality, assume that  $|a_1| \leq 2$ . Then  $a_1 \in \{-2, 2\}^{\text{co}}$ , more precisely we can write  $a_1 = \frac{2+a_1}{4} \cdot 2 + \frac{2-a_1}{4} \cdot (-2)$  as a convex combination. Correspondingly, since  $\text{rank}(A_1 - A_2) = 1$ , the (possibly degenerate) splitting

$$\delta_A \mapsto \frac{2+a_1}{4} \delta_{A_1} + \frac{2-a_1}{4} \delta_{A_2},$$

where  $A_1 = \text{diag}(2, a_2, \dots, a_{2n})$ ,  $A_2 = \text{diag}(-2, a_2, \dots, a_{2n})$ , defines a simple laminate with barycenter  $A$ . By repeating the same splitting procedure for the entries  $a_2, \dots, a_{2n}$ , if necessary, we deduce that there exists a laminate of finite order  $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n})$  with barycenter  $\bar{\nu} = A$  and

$$\nu = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \lambda_i \delta_{A_i} \quad \text{with } A_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\geq 2} \text{ for all } i.$$

Note also that there exists a constant  $C = C(n)$  such that, for all  $A \in \mathcal{D}$ ,

$$(5.6) \quad |A_i| \leq C(1 + |A|)$$

$\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.3.* First of all we observe that Lemma 2.2, applied to the laminate in Lemma 5.7, implies: the set  $\mathcal{D}$  can be reduced to  $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 2}$  in weak  $L^p$  for any  $p < \infty$ . By choosing  $p > 2n$  and combining with Corollary 5.6 via Theorem 4.2 leads to the statement:

(\*) the set  $\mathcal{D}$  can be reduced to  $\mathcal{D} \cap \Sigma$  in weak  $L^{2n}$ .

Next, observe that left and right multiplication by  $R, Q \in SO(2n) \cap L_1$  leaves the set  $L_1 \cap \Sigma$  invariant. Therefore, by the invariance property of laminates (Section 2.2 and Lemma 3.2) and the fact that (\*) was the consequence of the existence of two laminates (the staircase laminate in Example 3.1 and the finite order laminate in Lemma 5.7), Proposition 5.3 follows if we can show that for any  $A \in L_1$  there exist  $R, Q \in SO(2n) \cap L_1$  and  $D \in L_1 \cap \mathcal{D}$  such that  $A = RDQ^T$ .

To this end write

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

in  $n \times n$  block matrix form. The singular value decomposition of  $A_i$  has the form  $R_i D_i Q_i^T$  with  $R_i, Q_i \in O(n)$  orthogonal and  $D_i \in \mathcal{D}$  diagonal  $n \times n$  matrices. Then we obtain also  $A = \tilde{R} \tilde{D} \tilde{Q}^T$ , where

$$\tilde{R} = \begin{pmatrix} R_1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tilde{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} Q_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} D_1 & 0 \\ 0 & D_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $\det R_1 \det R_2 = \det Q_1 \det Q_2 = 1$ , then we simply set  $R = \tilde{R}$ ,  $Q = \tilde{Q}$  and  $D = \tilde{D}$ . If, instead, for instance  $\det R = -1$ , then set  $R = \tilde{R}J$  and  $D = J\tilde{D}$ , where  $J = \text{diag}(-1, 1, \dots, 1)$ . We can deal with the case  $\det Q = -1$  similarly. □

#### APPENDIX A. FURTHER EXAMPLES BASED ON STAIRCASE LAMINATES

We start with a simple but useful generalization of Proposition 4.4.

*Remark A.1.* The statement of Proposition 4.4 (and consequently that of Theorem 4.3) continues to hold if the requirement that “ $\nu_A^\infty$  is a staircase laminate supported in  $K$ ” is replaced by requiring that it is a probability measure of the form

$$(A.1) \quad \nu^\infty = \sum_{j=1}^{J'} \lambda_j \delta_{B_j} + \sum_{j=J'+1}^J \lambda_j \tilde{\nu}_j^\infty,$$

with

- (a)  $\sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j \delta_{B_j}$  is a laminate of finite order with barycenter  $A$ ;
- (b) For every  $j = 1, \dots, J'$  we have  $B_j \in K$ ;
- (c) For every  $j = J' + 1, \dots, J$  the probability measure  $\tilde{\nu}_j^\infty$  is a staircase laminate supported in  $K$  in the sense of Definition 3.1 with barycenter  $B_j$ .

The proof of this claim follows immediately from applying Lemma 2.2 to the laminate of finite order in (a), followed by  $J - J'$  applications of Proposition 4.4, applied to each  $\nu_j^\infty$  in (c).

**A.1. Very weak solutions to linear elliptic equations with measurable coefficients.** The main result in [AFS08] rests on the following result, which is a variant of Theorem 3.18 in [AFS08]. Recall that

$$E_\rho = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \rho\lambda \end{pmatrix} R : \lambda \geq 0, R \in SO(2) \right\}.$$

**Theorem A.1.** *For any  $\mathcal{K} > 1$  there exists  $M > 1$  with the following property. For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , any  $\alpha, \delta \in [0, 1)$  and any  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  regular domain there exists a piecewise affine mapping  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$  with*

- $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ,
- $\|u - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} < \delta$ ,
- $\nabla u(x) \in E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}}$  for almost every  $x \in \Omega$ ,
- for any  $t > 1 + |A|$

$$M^{-1}(1 + |A|^{q_{\mathcal{K}}})t^{-q_{\mathcal{K}}} \leq \frac{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq M(1 + |A|^{q_{\mathcal{K}}})t^{-q_{\mathcal{K}}},$$

where  $q_{\mathcal{K}} = \frac{2\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}+1}$ . In particular  $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  for any  $p < q_{\mathcal{K}}$  but  $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{q_{\mathcal{K}}} dx = \infty$ .

To prove Theorem A.1 we need the following extension of the construction in Example 3.3.

**Lemma A.2.** *For any  $\mathcal{K} > 1$  there exists a constant  $M = M(\mathcal{K}) > 1$  with the following property. For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  there exists a probability measure  $\nu_A^\infty$  of the form (A.1) with barycenter  $A$  which is supported on  $E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}}$  and satisfies the bound*

$$(A.2) \quad M^{-1}(1 + |A|^{q_{\mathcal{K}}})t^{-q_{\mathcal{K}}} \leq \nu_A^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq M(1 + |A|^{q_{\mathcal{K}}})t^{-q_{\mathcal{K}}}$$

for all  $t > 1 + |A|$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by different levels of generality of the matrix  $A$ . Observe that Example 3.3 precisely treats the case  $A = \text{diag}(-1, 1)$ , yielding a staircase laminate  $\nu^\infty$ .

**Step 1.** If  $A = \text{diag}(-x, x)$  for some  $x \geq 2$ , we can use the invariance property in Lemma 3.2 with  $T(A) = xA$ . Indeed, it is clear that both the set of rank-one matrices and  $E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}}$  are invariant under  $T$ . Then  $T_*\nu^\infty$ , where  $\nu^\infty$  is the staircase laminate from Example 3.3, has barycenter  $T(\text{diag}(-1, 1)) = \text{diag}(-x, x)$ , and we directly obtain (A.2).

**Step 2.** If  $A = \text{diag}(x, y)$  with  $\max\{|x|, |y|\} \geq 2$ , assume without loss of generality  $y \geq 2$ ,  $y \geq |x|$  and  $y \neq -x$ . Consider the laminate

$$(A.3) \quad \tilde{\nu} = \alpha \delta_{\text{diag}(-y, y)} + (1 - \alpha) \delta_{\text{diag}(\mathcal{K}y, y)},$$

with  $\alpha = \frac{\mathcal{K} - \frac{x}{y}}{\mathcal{K} + 1}$ . Since  $y \geq |x|$  and  $y \neq -x$ , it follows that  $1 > \alpha \geq \frac{\mathcal{K} - 1}{\mathcal{K} + 1}$ . Then, if  $\nu_y^\infty$  is the staircase laminate from Step 1 with barycenter

$\text{diag}(-y, y)$ , the probability measure

$$\tilde{\nu}^\infty = \alpha \nu_y^\infty + (1 - \alpha) \delta_{\text{diag}(\mathcal{K}y, y)}$$

satisfies the conditions of Remark A.1 with  $J' = 1$ ,  $J = 2$ , and the  $\mathcal{K}$ -dependent lower bound on  $\alpha$  implies that (A.2) continues to hold with a possibly larger constant  $M$  (but only depending on  $\mathcal{K} > 1$ ).

**Step 3.** If  $A = \text{diag}(x, y)$  with  $\max\{|x|, |y|\} < 2$ , then we consider the splitting sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{diag}(x, y)} &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{\text{diag}(-2, y)} + (1 - \alpha_1) \delta_{\text{diag}(2, y)} \\ &\mapsto \alpha_1 (\alpha_2 \delta_{\text{diag}(-2, -2)} + (1 - \alpha_2) \delta_{\text{diag}(-2, 2)}) + \\ &\quad + (1 - \alpha_1) (\alpha_2 \delta_{\text{diag}(2, -2)} + (1 - \alpha_2) \delta_{\text{diag}(2, 2)}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_1 = \frac{2-x}{4}$ ,  $\alpha_2 = \frac{2-y}{4}$ . The two terms  $\delta_{\text{diag}(-2, -2)}$  and  $\delta_{\text{diag}(2, 2)}$  can now be split further as in (A.3). Overall we then obtain a laminate of finite order

$$\mu = \lambda_1 \delta_{\text{diag}(2, -2)} + \lambda_2 \delta_{\text{diag}(-2, 2)} + \lambda_3 \delta_{\text{diag}(-2\mathcal{K}, -2)} + \lambda_4 \delta_{\text{diag}(2\mathcal{K}, 2)},$$

with  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq \frac{\mathcal{K}-1}{\mathcal{K}+1}$ . supported on the the matrices  $\{(\pm 2, \pm 2)\}$  with

$$\mu(\{\text{diag}(2, -2), \text{diag}(-2, 2)\}) \geq \frac{\mathcal{K} - 1}{\mathcal{K} + 1}.$$

Then, with  $\nu_{\pm 2}^\infty$  being the staircase laminates from Step 1, the measure

$$\tilde{\nu}^\infty = \lambda_1 \nu_{-2}^\infty + \lambda_2 \nu_2^\infty + \lambda_3 \delta_{\text{diag}(-2\mathcal{K}, -2)} + \lambda_4 \delta_{\text{diag}(2\mathcal{K}, 2)}$$

is of the form (A.1) with  $J' = 2$ ,  $J = 4$ , and the estimate (A.2) again holds with a  $\mathcal{K}$ -dependent constant  $M$ .

**Step 4.** Next, we may use the invariance property (Lemma 3.2) with  $T(A) = AR$  for  $R \in SO(2)$  together with the invariance of the set  $E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}}$  under  $T$  to show that the statement of the Lemma holds for matrices of the form  $A = DR$ , where  $D$  is diagonal and  $R \in SO(2)$ . In particular this is the case for any conformal or anti-conformal matrix (i.e. matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ -y & x \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ y & -x \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Step 5**

More generally, any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  can be decomposed<sup>3</sup> as  $A = A_+ + A_-$ , with  $A_+$  conformal and  $A_-$  anti-conformal. Assuming that  $A_+, A_- \neq 0$ , we can write  $A = \lambda B + (1 - \lambda)C$ , with

$$B = \frac{|A_+| + |A_-|}{|A_+|} A_+, \quad C = \frac{|A_+| + |A_-|}{|A_-|} A_-, \quad \lambda = \frac{|A_+|}{|A_+| + |A_-|}.$$

Since  $\det(B - C) = 0$ , the measure  $\lambda \delta_B + (1 - \lambda) \delta_C$  is a laminate with barycenter  $A$ . We can then further split this measure using Step 4 and thus obtain a measure of the form A.1.  $\square$

<sup>3</sup>For the well-known connection relating this decomposition to equations of the form (3.1) and quasiconformal mappings of the plane we refer to [AFS08]

It follows from Theorem 4.3 that  $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  can be reduced to  $E_{\mathcal{K}} \cup E_{1/\mathcal{K}}$  in weak  $L^{q_{\mathcal{K}}}$ . In turn, Theorem 4.1 then almost implies the statement of Theorem A.1, except the lower bound. However, the proof of Theorem 4.1 can easily be modified to yield the following statement:

**Theorem A.3.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ ,  $1 < p \leq r < \infty$  and  $0 \leq \rho \leq r$  be such that, for some  $M > 1$  the following holds. For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  there exists a probability measure  $\nu_A^\infty$  of the form A.1 with barycenter  $A$  which is supported on  $K$  and satisfies the bound*

$$M^{-p}(1 + |A|^\rho)t^{-p} \leq \nu_A^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq M^p(1 + |A|^r)t^{-p}$$

for all  $t > 1 + |A|$ . Then for any regular domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ , any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  there exists a piecewise affine map  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  with  $u = l_{A,b}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  such that

$$(A.4) \quad \nabla u \in K \text{ a.e. in } \Omega,$$

$$(A.5) \quad \|u - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta$$

and for all  $t > |A|$

$$(A.6) \quad \frac{1}{2}M^{-p}(1 + |A|^\rho)t^{-p} \leq \frac{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq 2M^p(1 + |A|^r)t^{-p}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is precisely the proof of Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.1 with the following additional observation. As a result of Proposition 4.4, in the proof of Theorem 4.1 the first approximation  $u_1$  satisfies in addition the lower bound

$$\frac{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_1(x)| > t\}|}{|\Omega|} \geq \frac{2}{3}M^p(1 + |A|^\rho)t^{-p}$$

for any  $t > 1 + |A|$ . Furthermore, using estimate (4.24a) in Proposition 4.4 with a sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can ensure

$$\frac{|\{x \in \Omega_{error}^{(1)} : |\nabla u_1(x)| > t\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq \frac{1}{6}M^{-p}t^{-p},$$

therefore we obtain

$$\frac{|\{x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_{error}^{(1)} : |\nabla u_1(x)| > t\}|}{|\Omega|} \geq \frac{1}{2}M^p(1 + |A|^\rho)t^{-p}.$$

Now, since for any  $k \geq 2$  the subsequent approximations  $u_k$  satisfy  $\nabla u_k = \nabla u_1$  outside  $\Omega_{error}^{(1)}$ , it follows that the limit  $u = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k$  satisfies

$$\frac{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}|}{|\Omega|} \geq \frac{1}{2}M^p(1 + |A|^\rho)t^{-p}.$$

This proves the additional lower bound, as stated in Theorem A.3.  $\square$

By standard arguments one also has the following extension of Theorem A.3:

**Corollary A.4.** *Under the conditions of Theorem A.3 there exists  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  such that (A.4) and (A.5) hold and, in addition,*

$$(A.7) \quad \int_B |\nabla u|^p dx = \infty$$

for all balls  $B \subset \Omega$ .

We include the proof for the convenience of the reader (such use of the Baire category theorem has appeared e.g. in [Kir03, AFS08]).

*Proof.* Let

$$X = \left\{ u \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega}) : u = l_{A,b} \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \|u - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \delta \right\}.$$

Equipped with the  $C^0$  topology,  $X$  is a complete metric space. Further, for any ball  $B \subset \Omega$  and any  $R > R_B := |A|^p|B|$  let

$$X_{B,R} = \left\{ u \in X : u|_B \in W^{1,p}(B), \int_B |\nabla u|^p dx \leq R \right\}.$$

By weak lower-semicontinuity of the  $L^p$  norm it follows that  $X_{B,R}$  is a closed subset of  $X$ .

Moreover, using Theorem A.3 one can easily show that  $X_{B,R}$  has empty interior. Indeed, for any  $u \in X_{B,R}$  let  $v = l_{A,b} + \lambda(u - l_{A,b})$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Since  $R > R_B$ , by the triangle inequality we obtain  $\|\nabla v\|_{L^p(B)} \leq (1-\lambda)\|A\|_{L^p(B)} + \lambda\|\nabla u\|_{L^p(B)} \leq (1-\lambda)R_B + \lambda R < R$  and  $\|v - l_{A,b}\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta$ . After choosing  $1 - \lambda$  sufficiently small and then approximating  $v$  uniformly by a piecewise affine mapping, for any  $\varepsilon$  we can obtain a piecewise affine  $u_1 \in X_{B,R}$  with  $\|u - u_1\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} < \varepsilon$ . In particular there exists a nonempty open subset  $\tilde{\Omega} \subset B$  where  $u_1$  is affine. Then, we can apply Theorem A.3 to  $u_1|_{\tilde{\Omega}}$  and obtain  $u_2 \in X$  with  $\|u_2 - u_1\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega})} < \varepsilon$  and  $\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla u_2|^p dx = \infty$ . This shows that  $X_{B,R}$  has empty interior.

We now apply the Baire category theorem to conclude that  $Y := \bigcup_{B \subset \Omega} \bigcup_{R > R_B} X_{B,R}$  is meager<sup>4</sup>, i.e.  $X \setminus Y$  is dense, in particular nonempty. On the other hand  $X \setminus Y$  consists of all  $u \in X$  which satisfy the conclusions of Theorem A.3 (except possibly not piecewise affine) and in addition also A.7 for all  $B \subset \Omega$ .  $\square$

**A.2. Weak solutions of the  $p$ -Laplace equation.** In a recent paper Colombo and Tione [CT22] solved a longstanding question by Iwaniec and Sbordone about uniqueness and higher regularity of low regularity solutions of the  $p$ -Laplace equation.

**Theorem A.5** ([CT22]). *Let  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  an open disc. Let  $p \in (1, \infty) \setminus \{2\}$ . Then there exists  $q \in (\max(1, p-1), p)$  and a continuous solution  $v \in W^{1,q}(B) \cap C(\overline{B})$  of the  $p$ -Laplace equation*

$$(A.8) \quad \operatorname{div} |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v = 0 \quad \text{in } B$$

<sup>4</sup>It suffices to take the union over all balls  $B \subset \Omega$  with rational center and rational radius, and the union over all rational  $R > R_B$

with affine boundary conditions such that

$$(A.9) \quad \int_{B'} |\nabla v|^p dx = \infty \quad \text{for each disc } B' \subset B$$

In the above, (A.8) is understood in the sense of distributions.

Our aim here is to show that Theorem A.5 easily follows from our general results about the passage from staircase laminates to approximate and exact solutions, once one has the key insight in [CT22], namely the construction of a staircase laminate with the right integrability properties. Actually in [CT22] a slightly sharper version of the statement is shown: one can achieve in addition that  $\frac{3}{4} < \partial_2 v < \frac{5}{4}$ . Our approach does not give this extra condition, but leads to a shorter proof of the theorem as stated.

First of all, arguing analogously to the case of elliptic equations with measurable coefficients (c.f. 3.1 and (3.2) in the introduction of Section 3), we see that (A.8) is equivalent to the first order differential inclusion

$$(A.10) \quad \nabla u \in K_p \quad \text{almost everywhere}$$

where

$$(A.11) \quad K_p = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{p-1} \end{pmatrix} R : \lambda \geq 0, R \in SO(2) \right\},$$

We seek a solution of  $u = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ w \end{pmatrix}$  of (A.11) such that  $v \in W^{1,q}(B)$  for some  $q \in (\max(1, p-1), p)$  and  $\int_{B'} |\nabla v|^p dx = \infty$  for every open disc  $B' \subset B$ .

In the following we will focus on the case

$$(A.12) \quad p \in (1, 2).$$

By the following duality argument this is no loss of generality. Let  $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$  denote the dual exponent of  $p$ . Then  $p' - 1 = \frac{1}{p-1}$ . Setting  $\mu = \lambda^{p-1}$  one easily sees that  $u = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ w \end{pmatrix}$  satisfies  $\nabla u \in K_p$  a.e. if and only if  $u' = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ v \end{pmatrix}$  satisfies  $\nabla u' \in K_{p'}$  a.e. Moreover  $|\nabla w|^{p'-1} = |\nabla v|$ . Thus  $\nabla v$  in  $L^q$  with  $q \in (\max(1, p-1), p)$  if and only if  $\nabla w \in L^s$  with  $s \in (\max(1, p'-1), p')$  and  $|\nabla w|^{p'} = |\nabla v|^p$ .

For  $p \in (1, 2)$  solutions  $u = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ w \end{pmatrix}$  of (A.10) satisfy  $|\nabla w| = |\nabla v|^{p-1}$  and hence, by Young's inequality,

$$(A.13) \quad |\nabla v|^2 \leq |\nabla u|^2 \leq 1 + 2|\nabla v|^2$$

Thus in the following we can focus on the integrability properties of  $\nabla u$ . The key result is the following

**Theorem A.6.** *For any  $1 < p < 2$  there exists  $\bar{q}_p \in (1, p)$  and  $M > 1$  with the following property. For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  and  $\alpha, \delta \in (0, 1)$  and any regular domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  there exists a piecewise affine mapping  $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$  with*

- $u(x) = Ax$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ,
- $\|u - Ax\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} < \delta$ ,
- $\nabla u(x) \in K_p$  for almost every  $x \in \Omega$ ,

- for any  $t > 1 + |A|$

$$M^{-1}(1 + |A|^{\frac{\bar{q}_p}{p-1}})t^{-q_p} \leq \frac{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u(x)| > t\}|}{|\Omega|} \leq M(1 + |A|^{\frac{\bar{q}_p}{p-1}})t^{-q_p}.$$

In particular  $u \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$  for any  $q < \bar{q}_p$  but  $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{\bar{q}_p} dx = \infty$ .

The proof follows from Theorem A.3, provided we can show the existence of certain laminates with the right integrability properties. This is based on Example 3.4 and Lemma A.7 below. First of all, recall from (3.37) in Example 3.4 the function

$$\bar{q}(p, b) = \frac{p-1}{b^{p-1}+1} + \frac{b}{b+1}.$$

For definiteness, for any  $p \in (1, 2)$  set  $\bar{q}_p = \max_{b>1} \bar{q}(p, b)$  and denote by  $\bar{b} = \bar{b}(p) > 1$  a value of  $b$  for which the maximum is achieved (note that  $\bar{q}(p, 1) = p/2 < 1$  and  $\bar{q}(p, b) \rightarrow 1$  as  $b \rightarrow \infty$ , so that, by the argument in Example 3.4,  $\bar{q}_p \in (1, p)$  and  $\bar{b} \gg 1$  exists and is finite, for any  $p \in (1, 2)$ ).

**Lemma A.7.** *For any  $1 < p < 2$  there exists a constant  $M = M(p) > 1$  with the following property. For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  there exists a probability measure  $\nu_A^\infty$  of the form (A.1) with barycenter  $A$  which is supported on  $K_p$  and satisfies the bound*

$$(A.14) \quad M^{-1}(1 + |A|^{(p-1)\bar{q}_p})t^{-q_p} \leq \nu_A^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq M(1 + |A|^{\frac{\bar{q}_p}{p-1}})t^{-q_p}$$

for all  $t > 1 + |A|$ .

*Proof.* As in Lemma A.2 we proceed by different levels of generality of the matrix  $A$ . We start by noting that Example 3.4 with  $b = \bar{b}(p)$  treats the case  $A = \text{diag}(\bar{b}, -1)$ , yielding a staircase laminate  $\nu_1^\infty$ .

**Step 1.** If  $A = \text{diag}(-\bar{b}, 1)$  we use the invariance property (Lemma 3.2) with  $T(X) = -X$ . The linear map  $T$  clearly preserves rank-one lines and also the set  $K_p$ . If  $\nu_1^\infty$  is the staircase laminate from Example 3.4, then  $\nu_{-1}^\infty := T_*\nu_1^\infty$  is a staircase laminate supported in  $K_p$  with barycenter  $T(\text{diag}(\bar{b}, -1)) = A$ . Moreover

$$T_*\nu_1^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) = \nu_1^\infty(\{X : |TX| > t\}).$$

Since  $|T(X)| = |X|$  we get

$$(A.15) \quad \nu_{-1}^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) = \nu_1^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}).$$

Thus the estimate (A.14) follows from the estimate (3.39) for  $\nu_1^\infty$  in Example 3.4.

**Step 2.** If  $A = \text{diag}(x, y)$  with  $\max(|x|, |y|) \leq \frac{1}{2}$  we consider the splitting sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{diag}(x,y)} &\mapsto \alpha_1 \delta_{\text{diag}(x,-1)} + (1 - \alpha_1) \delta_{\text{diag}(x,1)} \\ &\mapsto \alpha_1(\alpha_2 \delta_{\text{diag}(-1,-1)} + (1 - \alpha_2) \delta_{\text{diag}(\bar{b},-1)}) \\ &\quad + (1 - \alpha_1)(\alpha_3 \delta_{\text{diag}(-\bar{b},1)} + (1 - \alpha_3) \delta_{\text{diag}(1,1)}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_1 = \frac{1-y}{2}$ ,  $\alpha_2 = \frac{\bar{b}-x}{b+1}$ ,  $\alpha_3 = \frac{1-x}{b+1}$ . The two terms  $\delta_{\text{diag}(\bar{b},1)}$  and  $\delta_{\text{diag}(-\bar{b},1)}$  can now be split further using Example 3.4 and Step 1. We finally obtain the probability measure

$$\tilde{\nu}^\infty = \lambda_1 \nu_1^\infty + \lambda_2 \nu_{-1}^\infty + \lambda_3 \delta_{\text{diag}(-1,-1)} + \lambda_4 \delta_{\text{diag}(1,1)},$$

with  $\lambda_1 = \alpha_1(1-\alpha_2)$  and  $\lambda_2 = (1-\alpha_1)\alpha_3$ . This measure is of the form (A.1) with  $J' = 2$ ,  $J = 4$ . Since  $\min(\alpha_1, 1-\alpha_1) \geq \frac{1}{4}$  and  $(1-\alpha_2) = \alpha_3 \geq \frac{1}{2(b+1)}$ , the estimate (A.14) again holds with a  $\bar{b}$ -dependent constant  $M$ .

**Step 3.** If  $A = \text{diag}(x, y)$  with  $\max(|x|, |y|) > \frac{1}{2}$  we set

$$\lambda = \max(2|x|, (2|y|)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}), \quad (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \text{diag}(\lambda^{-1}x, \lambda^{-(p-1)}y).$$

Then  $\lambda > 1$  and  $\max(|\bar{x}|, |\bar{y}|) = \frac{1}{2}$ . Thus by Step 2 there exists a measure  $\nu_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}^\infty$  of the form (A.1) with barycentre  $\text{diag}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  which satisfies

$$(A.16) \quad M^{-1}t^{-\bar{q}p} \leq \nu_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) \leq Mt^{-\bar{q}p}$$

for all  $t \geq 1$  (the upper bound trivially holds also for  $t < 1$ ). We now use the invariance property (Lemma 3.2) with  $T(X) = \text{diag}(\lambda, \lambda^{p-1})X$ . The linear map  $T$  clearly preserves rank-one lines and also the set  $K_p$ . By the invariance property, the pushforward measure  $\nu_A^\infty := T_*\nu_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}^\infty$  is of the form (A.1) and it has barycentre  $\text{diag}(\lambda, \lambda^{p-1})\text{diag}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = A$ . Moreover

$$T_*\nu_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}^\infty(\{X : |X| > t\}) = \nu_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}^\infty(\{X : |TX| > t\}).$$

Since  $\lambda > 1$  we have

$$\lambda^{p-1}|X| \leq |TX| \leq \lambda|X|.$$

Hence (A.16) implies that, for all  $t \geq \lambda^{p-1}$ ,

$$M^{-1}\lambda^{(p-1)\bar{q}p}t^{-q_p} \leq \nu_A^\infty(X : |X| > t) \leq M\lambda^{\bar{q}p}t^{-q_p}$$

Since  $\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{p-1} \leq |A| \leq \lambda$  we get, for all  $t \geq 2|A|$ ,

$$M^{-1}|A|^{(p-1)\bar{q}p}t^{-\bar{q}p} \leq \nu_A^\infty(X : |X| > t) \leq M|A|^{\frac{\bar{q}p}{p-1}}t^{-\bar{q}p}.$$

Thus we get the desired estimate (A.14).

**Step 4.** For a general  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  we use once more the invariance property (Lemma 3.2) with  $T(A) = AR$  for  $R \in SO(2)$ , together with the invariance of the set  $K_p$  under  $T$ , and argue as in Steps 4 and 5 of the proof of Lemma A.2. This concludes the proof of Lemma A.7.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [AFS08] Kari Astala, Daniel Faraco, and László Székelyhidi, Jr., *Convex integration and the  $L^p$  theory of elliptic equations*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **7** (2008), no. 1, 1–50. MR 2413671
- [Ast94] Kari Astala, *Area distortion of quasiconformal mappings*, Acta Math. **173** (1994), no. 1, 37–60. MR 1294669

- [BSV13] Nicholas Boros, László Székelyhidi, Jr., and Alexander Volberg, *Laminates meet Burkholder functions*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **100** (2013), no. 5, 687–700.
- [Cel93] Arrigo Cellina, *On minima of a functional of the gradient: necessary conditions*, Nonlinear Anal. **20** (1993), no. 4, 337–341. MR 1206422
- [Cel05] A. Cellina, *A view on differential inclusions*, Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino **63** (2005), no. 3, 197–209.
- [CFM05] Sergio Conti, Daniel Faraco, and Francesco Maggi, *A new approach to counterexamples to  $L^1$  estimates: Korn’s inequality, geometric rigidity, and regularity for gradients of separately convex functions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **175** (2005), no. 2, 287–300. MR 2118479
- [CFMM05] S. Conti, D. Faraco, F. Maggi, and S. Müller, *Rank-one convex functions on  $2 \times 2$  symmetric matrices and laminates on rank-three lines*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **24** (2005), no. 4, 479–493. MR 2180863
- [CT22] M. Colombo and R. Tione, *Non-classical solutions of the  $p$ -laplace equation*, arXiv:2201.07484, 2022.
- [Dac85] B. Dacorogna, *Remarques sur les notions de polyconvexité, quasi-convexité et convexité de rang 1*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **64** (1985), no. 4, 403–438. MR 839729
- [DM99] B. Dacorogna and P. Marcellini, *Implicit partial differential equations*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 37, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999. MR 1702252
- [DMP08] B. Dacorogna, P. Marcellini, and E. Paolini, *Lipschitz-continuous local isometric immersions: rigid maps and origami*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **90** (2008), no. 1, 66–81. MR 2435215
- [Far03] Daniel Faraco, *Milton’s conjecture on the regularity of solutions to isotropic equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **20** (2003), no. 5, 889–909. MR 1995506
- [FLS21] Daniel Faraco, Sauli Lindberg, and László Székelyhidi, *Magnetic helicity, weak solutions and relaxation of ideal mhd*, arXiv:2109.09106, 2021.
- [FMCO18] Daniel Faraco, Carlos Mora-Corral, and Marcos Oliva, *Sobolev homeomorphisms with gradients of low rank via laminates*, Adv. Calc. Var. **11** (2018), no. 2, 111–138.
- [Gro86] M. Gromov, *Partial differential relations*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 9, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986. MR 864505
- [GT01] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, Reprint of the 1998 edition. MR 1814364
- [Kir03] Bernd Kirchheim, *Analysis and geometry of microstructure*, Habilitation thesis, University of Leipzig, <https://www.mis.mpg.de/preprints/ln/lecturenote-1603.pdf>, 2003.
- [KMSJX23] Bruce Kleiner, Stefan Müller, László Székelyhidi Jr, and Xiandong Xie, *Sobolev mappings of Euclidean space and product structure*, in preparation, 2023.
- [KMX20] B. Kleiner, S. Müller, and X. Xie, *Pansu pullback and rigidity of mappings between Carnot groups*, arXiv:2004.09271, 2020.
- [KŠM03] Bernd Kirchheim, Vladimir Šverák, and Stefan Müller, *Studying nonlinear pde by geometry in matrix space*, Geometric analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations, Springer, Berlin, 2003, pp. 347–395.
- [LM16] Zhuomin Liu and Jan Malý, *A strictly convex Sobolev function with null Hessian minors*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **55** (2016), no. 3, 19.

- [MŠ96] Stefan Müller and Vladimir Šverák, *Attainment results for the two-well problem by convex integration*, Geometric analysis and the calculus of variations, Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996, pp. 239–251. MR 1449410
- [MS01] S. Müller and M. A. Sychev, *Optimal existence theorems for nonhomogeneous differential inclusions*, J. Funct. Anal. **181** (2001), no. 2, 447–475.
- [MŠ03] S. Müller and V. Šverák, *Convex integration for Lipschitz mappings and counterexamples to regularity*, Ann. of Math. (2) **157** (2003), no. 3, 715–742. MR 1983780
- [Mül99] S. Müller, *Variational models for microstructure and phase transitions*, Calculus of variations and geometric evolution problems (Cetraro, 1996), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1713, Springer, Berlin, 1999, pp. 85–210. MR 1731640
- [Oli16] Marcos Oliva, *Bi-Sobolev homeomorphisms  $f$  with  $Df$  and  $Df^{-1}$  of low rank using laminates*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **55** (2016), no. 6, Art. 135, 38. MR 3566935
- [Ped93] Pablo Pedregal, *Laminates and microstructure*, European J. Appl. Math. **4** (1993), no. 2, 121–149. MR 1228114
- [Pom10] Waldemar Pompe, *Explicit construction of piecewise affine mappings with constraints*, Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math. **58** (2010), no. 3, 209–220. MR 2771571
- [Syc01] M. A. Sychev, *Comparing two methods of resolving homogeneous differential inclusions*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **13** (2001), no. 2, 213–229. MR 1861098
- [Szé07] L. Székelyhidi, Jr., *Counterexamples to elliptic regularity and convex integration*, The interaction of analysis and geometry, Contemp. Math., vol. 424, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007, pp. 227–245.