

ON THE HARNACK INEQUALITY FOR ANTISYMMETRIC s -HARMONIC FUNCTIONS

SERENA DIPIERRO, JACK THOMPSON, AND ENRICO VALDINOCI

ABSTRACT. We prove the Harnack inequality for antisymmetric s -harmonic functions, and more generally for solutions of fractional equations with zero-th order terms, in a general domain. This may be used in conjunction with the method of moving planes to obtain quantitative stability results for symmetry and overdetermined problems for semilinear equations driven by the fractional Laplacian.

The proof is split into two parts: an interior Harnack inequality away from the plane of symmetry, and a boundary Harnack inequality close to the plane of symmetry. We prove these results by first establishing the weak Harnack inequality for super-solutions and local boundedness for sub-solutions in both the interior and boundary case.

En passant, we also obtain a new mean value formula for antisymmetric s -harmonic functions.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Since the groundbreaking work [Har87], Harnack-type inequalities have become an essential tool in the analysis of partial differential equations (PDE). In [ABR99; CMV16; CMS16], Harnack inequalities have been applied to antisymmetric functions—functions that are odd with respect to reflections across a given plane, for more detail see Section 2—in conjunction with the method of moving planes to obtain stability results for local overdetermined problems including *Serrin's overdetermined problem* and the *parallel surface problem*; see also [CR18].

In recent years, there has been consolidated interest in overdetermined problems driven by nonlocal operators, particularly the fractional Laplacian; however, standard Harnack inequalities for such operators are incompatible with antisymmetric functions since they require functions to be non-negative in all of \mathbb{R}^n . In this paper, we will address this problem by proving a Harnack inequality for antisymmetric s -harmonic functions with zero-th order terms which only requires non-negativity in a halfspace. By allowing zero-th order terms this result is directly applicable to symmetry and overdetermined problems for semilinear equations driven by the fractional Laplacian.

1.1. Background. Fundamentally the original Harnack inequality for elliptic PDE is a quantitative formulation of the strong maximum principle and directly gives, among other things, Liouville's theorem, the removable singularity theorem, compactness results, and Hölder estimates for weak and viscosity solutions, see [GT01; Eva10]. This has led it to be extended to a wide variety of other settings. For local PDE these include: linear parabolic PDE [Eva10; Lie96]; quasilinear and fully nonlinear elliptic PDE [Ser64; Tru67; CC95]; quasilinear and fully nonlinear parabolic PDE [AS67; Tru68]; and in connection with curvature and geometric flows such as Ricci flow on Riemannian manifolds [Yau75; LY86; Mü06]. An extensive survey on the Harnack inequality for local PDE is [Kas07].

Date: April 11, 2023.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35R11; 47G20; 35B50.

For equations arising from jump processes, colloquially known as nonlocal PDE, the first Harnack inequality is due to Bogdan [Bog97] who proved the boundary Harnack inequality for the fractional Laplacian. The fractional Laplacian is the prototypical example of a nonlocal operator and is defined by

$$(1.1) \quad (-\Delta)^s u(x) = c_{n,s} \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy$$

where $s \in (0, 1)$, $c_{n,s}$ is a positive normalisation constant (see [Gar19] for more details, particularly Proposition 5.6 there) and P.V. refers to the Cauchy principle value. The result in [Bog97] was only valid for Lipschitz domains, but this was later extended to any bounded domain in [SW99].

Over the proceeding decade there were several papers proving Harnack inequalities for more general jump processes including [BL02; BKK15], see also [BKK08]. For fully nonlinear nonlocal PDE, a Harnack inequality was established in [CS09], see also [CS11]. More recently, in [RS19] the boundary Harnack inequality was proved for nonlocal PDE in non-divergence form.

As far as we are aware, the only nonlocal Harnack inequality for antisymmetric functions in the literature is in [Cir+23] where a boundary Harnack inequality was established for antisymmetric s -harmonic functions in a small ball centred at the origin. Our results generalise this to arbitrary symmetric domains and to equations with zero-th order terms.

1.2. Main results. Let us now describe in detail our main results. First, we will introduce some useful notation. Given a point $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we will write $x = (x_1, x')$ with $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and we denote by x_* the reflection of x across the plane $\{x_1 = 0\}$, that is, $x_* = (-x_1, x')$. Then we call a function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *antisymmetric* if

$$u(x_*) = -u(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We will also denote by \mathbb{R}_+^n the halfspace $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ s.t. } x_1 > 0\}$ and, given $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we let $A^+ := A \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Moreover, we will frequently make use of the functional space $\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which we define to be the set of all antisymmetric functions $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$(1.2) \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{x_1 |u(x)|}{1 + |x|^{n+2s+2}} dx$$

is finite. The role that the new space $\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ plays will be explained in more detail later in this section.

Our main result establishes the Harnack inequality¹ in a general symmetric domain Ω .

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tilde{\Omega} \Subset \Omega$ be bounded domains that are symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = 0\}$, and let $c \in L^\infty(\Omega^+)$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^+.$$

¹The arguments presented here are quite general and can be suitably extended to other integro-differential operators. For the specific case of the fractional Laplacian, the extension problem can provide alternative ways to prove some of the results presented here. We plan to treat this case extensively in a forthcoming paper, but in Appendix C here we present a proof of (1.3) specific for the fractional Laplacian and $c := 0$ that relies on extension methods.

Then there exists $C > 0$ depending only on Ω , $\tilde{\Omega}$, $\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega^+)}$, n , and s such that

$$(1.3) \quad \sup_{\tilde{\Omega}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} \leq C \inf_{\tilde{\Omega}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}.$$

Moreover, $\inf_{\tilde{\Omega}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ and $\sup_{\tilde{\Omega}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ are comparable to $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

Here and throughout this document we use the convention that if $\beta > 0$ and β is not an integer then $C^\beta(\Omega)$ denotes the Hölder space $C^{k,\beta'}(\Omega)$ where k is the integer part of β and $\beta' = \beta - k \in (0, 1)$.

One can compare the Harnack inequality in Theorem 1.1 here with previous results in the literature, such as Proposition 6.1 in [Fel21], which can be seen as a boundary Harnack inequality for antisymmetric functions, in a rather general fractional elliptic setting. We point out that Theorem 1.1 here holds true without any sign assumption on c (differently from Proposition 6.1 in [Fel21] in which a local sign assumption² on c was taken), for all $s \in (0, 1)$ (while the analysis of Proposition 6.1 in [Fel21] was focused on the case $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$), and in every dimension n (while Proposition 6.1 in [Fel21] dealt with the case $n = 1$).

We would like to emphasise that, in contrast to the standard Harnack inequality for the fractional Laplacian, Theorem 1.1 only assumes u to be non-negative in the halfspace \mathbb{R}_+^n which is a more natural assumption for antisymmetric functions. Also, note that the assumption that $\tilde{\Omega} \Subset \Omega$ allows $\tilde{\Omega}^+$ to touch $\{x_1 = 0\}$, but prevents $\tilde{\Omega}^+$ from touching the portion of $\partial\Omega$ that is not on $\{x_1 = 0\}$; it is in this sense that we will sometimes refer to Theorem 1.1 (and later Theorem 1.4) as a *boundary* Harnack inequality for antisymmetric functions.

Interestingly, the quantity $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ arises very naturally in the context of antisymmetric functions and plays the same role that

$$(1.4) \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x)|}{1 + |x|^{n+2s}} dx$$

plays in the non-antisymmetric nonlocal Harnack inequality, see for example [RS19]. To our knowledge, $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is new in the literature.

A technical aspect of Theorem 1.1, however, is that the fractional Laplacian is in general not defined if we simply have u is $C^{2s+\alpha}$ and $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} < +\infty$. This leads us to introduce the following new definition of the fractional Laplacian for functions in $\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which we will use throughout the remainder of this paper.

Definition 1.2. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and suppose that $u \in \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is $C^{2s+\alpha}$ in a neighbourhood of x for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer. The fractional Laplacian of u at x , which we denote as usual by $(-\Delta)^s u(x)$, is defined by

$$(1.5) \quad (-\Delta)^s u(x) = c_{n,s} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_\varepsilon(x)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_*-y|^{n+2s}} \right) (u(x) - u(y)) dy + \frac{c_{1,s}}{s} u(x) x_1^{-2s}$$

where $c_{n,s}$ is the constant from (1.1).

²The sign assumption on c in Proposition 6.1 of [Fel21] is required since the result was for unbounded domains. On the other hand, our result is for bounded domains which is why this assumption is no longer necessary.

We will motivate Definition 1.2 in Section 2 as well as verify it is well-defined. We also prove in Section 2 that if $\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is finite, u is $C^{2s+\alpha}$ in a neighbourhood of x , and antisymmetric then Definition 1.2 agrees with (1.1).

See also [JW16; CDP20; FS20; Fel21] where maximum principles in the setting of antisymmetric solutions of integro-differential equations have been established by exploiting the antisymmetry of the functions as in (1.5).

It is also worth mentioning that the requirement that u is antisymmetric in Theorem 1.1 cannot be entirely removed. In Appendix A, we construct a sequence of functions that explicitly demonstrates this. Moreover, Theorem 1.1 is also false if one only assumes $u \geq 0$ in Ω^+ as proven in [Dip+22, Corollary 1.3].

To obtain the full statement of Theorem 1.1 we divide the proof into two parts: an interior Harnack inequality and a boundary Harnack inequality close to $\{x_1 = 0\}$. The interior Harnack inequality is given as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho(e_1)) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu = 0 \quad \text{in } B_\rho(e_1).$$

Then there exists $C_\rho > 0$ depending only on $n, s, \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, and ρ such that

$$\sup_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u \leq C_\rho \inf_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u.$$

Moreover, both the quantities $\sup_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u$ and $\inf_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u$ are comparable to $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

For all $r > 0$, we write $B_r^+ := B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Then the following result is the antisymmetric boundary Harnack inequality.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\rho > 0$ and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho^+)$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu = 0 \quad \text{in } B_\rho^+.$$

Then there exists $C_\rho > 0$ depending only on $n, s, \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}$, and ρ such that

$$\sup_{x \in B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} \leq C_\rho \inf_{x \in B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}.$$

Moreover, both the quantities $\sup_{x \in B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ and $\inf_{x \in B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ are comparable to $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

To our knowledge, Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 are new in the literature. In the particular case $c \equiv 0$, Theorem 1.4 was proven in [Cir+23], but the proof relied on the Poisson representation formula for the Dirichlet problem in a ball which is otherwise unavailable in more general settings.

The proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 are each split into two halves: for Theorem 1.3 we prove an interior weak Harnack inequality for super-solutions (Proposition 3.1) and interior local boundedness of sub-solutions (Proposition 3.4). Analogously, for Theorem 1.4 we prove a boundary weak Harnack inequality for super-solutions (Proposition 4.1) and boundary local boundedness of sub-solutions

(Proposition 4.5). The proofs of Propositions 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.5 make use of general barrier methods which take inspiration from [RS19; CS09; CS11]; however, these methods require adjustments which take into account the antisymmetry assumption.

Once Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 have been established, Theorem 1.1 follows easily from a standard covering argument. For completeness, we have included this in Section 5.

Finally, in Appendix B we provide an alternate elementary proof of Theorem 1.4 in the particular case $c \equiv 0$. As in [Cir+23], our proof relies critically on the Poisson representation formula in a ball for the fractional Laplacian, but the overall strategy of our proof is entirely different. This was necessary to show that $\sup_{x \in B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ and $\inf_{x \in B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ are comparable to $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ which was not proven in [Cir+23]. Our proof makes use of a new mean-value formula for antisymmetric s -harmonic functions, which we believe to be interesting in and of itself.

The usual mean value formula for s -harmonic functions says that if u is s -harmonic in B_1 then we have that

$$(1.6) \quad u(0) = \gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r} \frac{r^{2s} u(y)}{(|y|^2 - r^2)^s |y|^n} dy \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, 1]$$

where

$$(1.7) \quad \gamma_{n,s} := \frac{\sin(\pi s) \Gamma(n/2)}{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}+1}}.$$

From antisymmetry, however, both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of (1.6) are zero irrespective of the fact u is s -harmonic. It is precisely this observation that leads to the consideration of $\partial_1 u(0)$ instead of $u(0)$ which is more appropriate when u is antisymmetric.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_1) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\alpha > 0$ and $2s + \alpha$ not an integer. Suppose that u is antisymmetric and $r \in (0, 1]$. If $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$ in B_1 then*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(0) = 2n\gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_r^+} \frac{r^{2s} y_1 u(y)}{(|y|^2 - r^2)^s |y|^{n+2}} dy,$$

with $\gamma_{n,s}$ given by (1.7).

1.3. Organisation of paper. The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we motivate Definition 1.2 and establish some technical lemmata regarding this definition. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.3 and, in Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.4. In Section 5, we prove the main result Theorem 1.1. In Appendix A, we construct a sequence that demonstrates the antisymmetric assumption in Theorem 1.1 cannot be removed. Finally, in Appendix B, we prove Proposition 1.5, and with this, we provide an elementary alternate proof of Theorem 1.4 for the particular case $c \equiv 0$.

2. THE ANTISYMMETRIC FRACTIONAL LAPLACIAN

Let n be a positive integer and $s \in (0, 1)$. The purpose of this section is to motivate Definition 1.2 as well as prove some technical aspects of the definition such as that it is well-defined and that it coincides with (1.1) when u is sufficiently regular. Recall that, given a point $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we will write $x = (x_1, x')$ with $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and we denote by x_* the reflection of x across the plane $\{x_1 = 0\}$, that is, $x_* = (-x_1, x')$. Then we call a function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *antisymmetric* if

$$u(x_*) = -u(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is common in the literature, particularly when dealing with the method of moving planes, to define antisymmetry with respect to a given hyperplane T ; however, for our purposes, it is sufficient to take $T = \{x_1 = 0\}$.

For the fractional Laplacian of u , given by (1.1), to be well-defined in a pointwise sense, we need two ingredients: u needs enough regularity in a neighbourhood of x to overcome the singularity at x in the kernel $|x - y|^{-n-2s}$, and u also needs an integrability condition at infinity to account for the integral in (1.1) being over \mathbb{R}^n . For example, if u is $C^{2s+\alpha}$ in a neighbourhood of x for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer and $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ where $\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the set of functions $v \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|v\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} < +\infty$ (recall $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is given by (1.4)) then $(-\Delta)^s u$ is well-defined at x and is in fact continuous there, [Sil07, Proposition 2.4].

In the following proposition, we show that if $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is antisymmetric and u is $C^{2s+\alpha}$ in a neighbourhood of x for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer then u satisfies (1.5). This simultaneously motivates Definition 1.2 and demonstrates this definition does generalise the definition of the fractional Laplacian when the given function is antisymmetric.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be an antisymmetric function that is $C^{2s+\alpha}$ in a neighbourhood of x for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer. Then (1.1) and Definition 1.2 coincide.*

Proof. Let $x = (x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and take $\delta \in (0, \frac{x_1}{2})$ such that u is $C^{2s+\alpha}$ in $\overline{B_\delta(x)} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Furthermore, let

$$(2.1) \quad (-\Delta)_\delta^s u(x) := c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\delta(x)} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy.$$

By the regularity assumptions on u , the integral in (1.1) is well-defined and

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} (-\Delta)_\delta^s u(x) = c_{n,s} \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy = (-\Delta)^s u(x).$$

Splitting the integral in (2.1) into two integrals over $\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_\delta(x)$ and \mathbb{R}_-^n respectively and then using that u is antisymmetric in the integral over \mathbb{R}_-^n , we obtain

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (-\Delta)_\delta^s u(x) &= c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_\delta(x)} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy + c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} \frac{u(x) + u(y)}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_\delta(x)} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \right) (u(x) - u(y)) dy \\ &\quad + 2c_{n,s} u(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_\delta(x)} \frac{dy}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} + c_{n,s} \int_{B_\delta(x)} \frac{u(x) + u(y)}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy. \end{aligned}$$

We point out that if $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ then $|x_* - y| \geq x_1$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_\delta(x)} \frac{u(x) + u(y)}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy \right| &\leq \int_{B_\delta(x)} \frac{2|u(x)| + |u(y) - u(x)|}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &\leq \int_{B_\delta(x)} \frac{2|u(x)| + C|x - y|^{\min\{1, 2s+\alpha\}}}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy \leq C(|u(x)| + \delta^{\min\{1, 2s+\alpha\}}) \delta^n, \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on n, s, x , and the norm of u in a neighbourhood of x .

As a consequence, sending $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ in (2.2) and using the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s u(x) &= c_{n,s} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_\delta(x)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_*-y|^{n+2s}} \right) (u(x) - u(y)) dy \\ &\quad + 2c_{n,s} u(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dy}{|x_*-y|^{n+2s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, making the change of variables $z = (y_1/x_1, (y' - x')/x_1)$ if $n > 1$ and $z_1 = y_1/x_1$ if $n = 1$, we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dy}{|x_*-y|^{n+2s}} = x_1^{-2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dz}{|e_1+z|^{n+2s}}.$$

Moreover, via a direct computation

$$(2.3) \quad c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dz}{|e_1+z|^{n+2s}} = \frac{c_{1,s}}{2s}$$

see Remark 2.2 below for details.

Putting together these considerations, we obtain the desired result. \square

Remark 2.2. Let

$$(2.4) \quad \tilde{c}_{n,s} := c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dz}{|e_1+z|^{n+2s}}.$$

The value of $\tilde{c}_{n,s}$ is of no consequence to Definition 1.2 and so, for this paper, is irrelevant; however, it is interesting to note that $\tilde{c}_{n,s}$ can be explicitly evaluated and is, in fact, equal to $(2s)^{-1}c_{1,s}$ (in particular $\tilde{c}_{n,s}$ is independent of n which is not obvious from (2.4)). Indeed, if $n > 1$ then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dz}{|e_1+z|^{n+2s}} = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \frac{dz_1 dz'}{((z_1+1)^2 + |z'|^2)^{\frac{n+2s}{2}}}$$

so, making the change of variables $\tilde{z}' = (z_1+1)^{-1}z'$ in the inner integral, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dz}{|e_1+z|^{n+2s}} = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(z_1+1)^{1+2s}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \frac{d\tilde{z}'}{(1+|\tilde{z}'|^2)^{\frac{n+2s}{2}}} \right) dz_1.$$

By [Gar19, Proposition 4.1],

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \frac{d\tilde{z}'}{(1+|\tilde{z}'|^2)^{\frac{n+2s}{2}}} = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1+2s}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s}{2}\right)}.$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{dz}{|e_1+z|^{n+2s}} = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1+2s}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s}{2}\right)} \int_0^\infty \frac{dz_1}{(z_1+1)^{1+2s}} = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1+2s}{2}\right)}{2s \Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s}{2}\right)}.$$

This formula remains valid if $n = 1$. Since $c_{n,s} = s\pi^{-n/2}4^s\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s}{2}\right)/\Gamma(1-s)$, see [Gar19, Proposition 5.6], it follows that

$$\tilde{c}_{n,s} = \frac{2^{2s-1}\Gamma\left(\frac{1+2s}{2}\right)}{\pi^{1/2}\Gamma(1-s)} = \frac{c_{1,s}}{2s}.$$

In particular, this proves formula (2.3), as desired. \square

The key observation from Proposition 2.1 is that the kernel $|x - y|^{-n-2s} - |x_* - y|^{-n-2s}$ decays quicker at infinity than the kernel $|x - y|^{-n-2s}$ which is what allows us to relax the assumption $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Indeed, if $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ then $|x_* - y| \geq |x - y|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} &= \frac{n + 2s}{2} \int_{|x-y|^2}^{|x_*-y|^2} t^{-\frac{n+2s+2}{2}} dt \\ &\leq \frac{n + 2s}{2} (|x_* - y|^2 - |x - y|^2) \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s+2}} \\ (2.5) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= 2(n + 2s) \frac{x_1 y_1}{|x - y|^{n+2s+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$,

$$(2.6) \qquad \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \geq 2(n + 2s) \frac{x_1 y_1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s+2}}.$$

Hence, if $|x| < C_0$ and if $|x - y| > C_1$ for some $C_0, C_1 > 0$ independent of x, y , we find that

$$(2.7) \qquad \frac{C^{-1} x_1 y_1}{1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}} \leq \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \leq \frac{C x_1 y_1}{1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}}$$

which motivates the consideration of $\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Our final lemma in this section proves that Definition 1.2 is well-defined, that is, the assumptions of Definition 1.2 are enough to guarantee (1.5) converges.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $r \in (0, x_1/2)$ be sufficiently small so that $B := B_r(x) \Subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$. If $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer then $(-\Delta)^s u(x)$ given by (1.5) is well-defined and there exists $C > 0$ depending on n, s, α, r , and x_1 such that*

$$|(-\Delta)^s u(x)| \leq C (\|u\|_{C^\beta(B)} + \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)})$$

where $\beta = \min\{2s + \alpha, 2\}$.

We remark that the constant C in Lemma 2.3 blows up as $x_1 \rightarrow 0^+$.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Write $(-\Delta)^s u(x) = I_1 + I_2 + s^{-1} c_{1,s} u(x) x_1^{-2s}$ where

$$I_1 := c_{n,s} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B \setminus B_\varepsilon(x)} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \right) (u(x) - u(y)) dy$$

$$\text{and} \qquad I_2 := c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \right) (u(x) - u(y)) dy.$$

For I_1 : If $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ then $|x - y|^{-n-2s} - |x_* - y|^{-n-2s}$ is only singular at x , so we may write

$$I_1 = c_{n,s} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B \setminus B_\varepsilon(x)} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy - \int_B \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy.$$

If χ_B denotes the characteristic function of B then $\bar{u} := u\chi_B \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, so $(-\Delta)^s \bar{u}(x)$ is defined and

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s \bar{u}(x) &= c_{n,s} \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(y)\chi_B(y)}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= c_{n,s} \text{P.V.} \int_B \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} dy + c_{n,s} u(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B} \frac{dy}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} \\ &= c_{n,s} \text{P.V.} \int_B \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} dy + \frac{1}{2s} c_{n,s} n |B_1| r^{-2s} u(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$I_1 = (-\Delta)^s \bar{u}(x) - \frac{1}{2s} c_{n,s} n |B_1| r^{-2s} u(x) - c_{n,s} \int_B \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy$$

which gives that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq |(-\Delta)^s \bar{u}(x)| + C \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)} + 2 \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)} \int_B \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &\leq |(-\Delta)^s \bar{u}(x)| + C \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if $\alpha < 2(1-s)$ then by a Taylor series expansion

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)^s \bar{u}(x)| &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|2\bar{u}(x) - \bar{u}(x+y) - \bar{u}(x-y)|}{|y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &\leq C [\bar{u}]_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B)} \int_{B_1} \frac{dy}{|y|^{n-\alpha}} + C \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{dy}{|y|^{n+2s}} \\ &\leq C (\|\bar{u}\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B)} + \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}) \\ &= C (\|u\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B)} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)}). \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha \geq 2(1-s)$ then this computation holds with $[\bar{u}]_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B)}$ replaced with $\|u\|_{C^2(B)}$.

For I_2 : By (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq C x_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B} \frac{y_1 (|u(x)| + |u(y)|)}{|x-y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(B)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B} \frac{y_1}{|x-y|^{n+2s+2}} dy + C \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C (\|u\|_{L^\infty(B)} + \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates for I_1 and I_2 immediately gives the result. \square

3. INTERIOR HARNACK INEQUALITY AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. Its proof is split into two parts: the interior weak Harnack inequality for super-solutions (Proposition 3.1) and interior local boundedness for sub-solutions (Proposition 3.4).

3.1. The interior weak Harnack inequality. The interior weak Harnack inequality for super-solutions is given in Proposition 3.1 below.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \in (0, 1)$, and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho(e_1)) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu \geq -M \quad \text{in } B_\rho(e_1).$$

Then there exists $C_\rho > 0$ depending only on n , s , $\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, and ρ such that

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\rho \left(\inf_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u + M \right).$$

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is a simple barrier argument that takes inspiration from [RS19]. We will begin by proving the following proposition, Proposition 3.2, which may be viewed as a rescaled version of Proposition 3.1. We will require Proposition 3.2 in the second part of the section when we prove the interior local boundedness of sub-solutions (Proposition 3.4).

Proposition 3.2. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \in (0, 1)$, and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho(e_1)) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu \geq -M \quad \text{in } B_\rho(e_1).$$

Then there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n , s , and $\rho^{2s}\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, such that

$$\frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u(x) dx \leq C \left(\inf_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u + M\rho^{2s} \right).$$

Moreover, the constant C is of the form

$$(3.1) \quad C = C' (1 + \rho^{2s}\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))})$$

with $C' > 0$ depending only on n and s .

Before we give the proof of Proposition 3.2, we introduce some notation. Given $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$T_\rho := \left\{ x_1 = -\frac{1}{\rho} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad H_\rho := \left\{ x_1 > -\frac{1}{\rho} \right\}.$$

We also let Q_ρ be the reflection across the hyperplane T_ρ , namely

$$Q_\rho(x) := x - 2(x_1 + 1/\rho)e_1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

With this, we establish the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and ζ be a smooth cut-off function such that*

$$\zeta \equiv 1 \text{ in } B_{1/2}, \quad \zeta \equiv 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3/4}, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \zeta \leq 1.$$

Define $\varphi^{(1)} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$\varphi^{(1)}(x) := \zeta(x) - \zeta(Q_\rho(x)) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then $\varphi^{(1)}$ is antisymmetric with respect to $T_\rho := \{x_1 = -1/\rho\}$ and there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n and s (but not on ρ) such that $\|(-\Delta)^s \varphi^{(1)}\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} \leq C$.

Proof. Since $Q_\rho(x)$ is the reflection of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ across T_ρ , we immediately obtain that $\varphi^{(1)}$ is antisymmetric with respect to the plane T_ρ . As $0 \leq \zeta \circ Q_\rho \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}^n and $\zeta \circ Q_\rho = 0$ in $B_{3/4}$, from (1.1) we

have that

$$|(-\Delta)^s(\zeta \circ Q_\rho)(x)| = C \int_{B_{3/4}(-2e_1/\rho)} \frac{(\zeta \circ Q_\rho)(y)}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} dy \leq C \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{3/4}$$

using also that $|x-y| \geq 2(1/\rho - 3/4) \geq 1/2$. Moreover,

$$\|(-\Delta)^s \zeta\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} \leq C(\|D^2 \zeta\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} + \|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}) \leq C,$$

for example, see the computation on p. 9 of [BV16]. Thus,

$$\|(-\Delta)^s \varphi^{(1)}\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} \leq \|(-\Delta)^s \zeta\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} + \|(-\Delta)^s(\zeta \circ Q_\rho)\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} \leq C,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Now we give the proof of Proposition 3.2.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Let $\tilde{u}(x) := u(\rho x + e_1)$ and $\tilde{c}(x) := \rho^{2s} c(\rho x + e_1)$. Observe that $(-\Delta)^s \tilde{u} + \tilde{c} \geq -M\rho^{2s}$ in B_1 and that \tilde{u} is antisymmetric with respect to T_ρ .

Let $\varphi^{(1)}$ be defined as in Lemma 3.3 and suppose that³ $\tau \geq 0$ is the largest possible value such that $\tilde{u} \geq \tau\varphi^{(1)}$ in the half space H_ρ . Since $\varphi^{(1)} = 1$ in $B_{1/2}$, we immediately obtain that

$$(3.2) \quad \tau \leq \inf_{B_{1/2}} \tilde{u} = \inf_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u.$$

Moreover, by continuity, there exists $a \in \overline{B_{3/4}}$ such that $\tilde{u}(a) = \tau\varphi^{(1)}(a)$. On one hand, using Lemma 3.3, we have that

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s(\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)})(a) + \tilde{c}(a)(\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)})(a) &\geq -M\rho^{2s} - \tau(C + \|\tilde{c}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) \\ &\geq -M\rho^{2s} - C\tau(1 + \rho^{2s}\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)}$ is antisymmetric with respect to T_ρ , $\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)} \geq 0$ in H_ρ , and $(\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)})(a) = 0$, it follows that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &(-\Delta)^s(\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)})(a) + c_\rho(a)(\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)})(a) \\ &\leq -C \int_{B_{1/2}} \left(\frac{1}{|a-y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|Q_\rho(a)-y|^{n+2s}} \right) (\tilde{u}(y) - \tau\varphi^{(1)}(y)) dy. \end{aligned}$$

For all $y \in B_{1/2}$, we have that $|a-y| \leq C$ and $|Q_\rho(a)-y| \geq C$ (the assumption $\rho < 1$ allows to choose this C independent of ρ), so

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s(\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)})(a) + c_\rho(a)(\tilde{u} - \tau\varphi^{(1)})(a) &\leq -C \int_{B_{1/2}} (\tilde{u}(y) - \tau\varphi^{(1)}(y)) dy \\ &\leq -C \left(\frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u(y) dy - \tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

³Note that such a τ exists. Indeed, let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a nonnegative function and let $\varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that there exists $x_0 \in U$ for which $\varphi(x_0) > 0$. Then define

$$I := \{\tau \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } u(x) \geq \tau\varphi(x) \text{ for all } x \in U\}.$$

It follows that I is non-empty since $0 \in I$, so $\sup I$ exists, but may be $+\infty$. Moreover, $\sup I \leq u(x_0)/\varphi(x_0) < +\infty$, so $\sup I$ is also finite.

Rearranging (3.3) and (3.5) then using (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u(y) dy &\leq C \left(\tau (1 + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}) + M \rho^{2s} \right) \\ &\leq C (1 + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}) \left(\inf_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u + M \rho^{2s} \right) \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

A simple adaptation of the proof of Proposition 3.2 leads to the proof of Proposition 3.1 which we now give.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Follow the proof of Proposition 3.2 but instead of (3.4), we write

$$\begin{aligned} &(-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(1)})(a) + c_\rho(a) (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(1)})(a) \\ &= -C \int_{H_\rho} \left(\frac{1}{|a-y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|Q_\rho(a)-y|^{n+2s}} \right) (\tilde{u}(y) - \tau \varphi^{(1)}(y)) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for all $x, y \in H_\rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.6) \quad \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|Q_\rho(x)-y|^{n+2s}} &= \frac{n+2s}{2} \int_{|x-y|^2}^{|Q_\rho(x)-y|^2} t^{-\frac{n+2s+2}{2}} dt \\ &\geq C \left(|Q_\rho(x)-y|^2 - |x-y|^2 \right) |Q_\rho(x)-y|^{-(n+2s+2)} \\ &= C \frac{(x_1 + 1/\rho)(y_1 + 1/\rho)}{|Q_\rho(x)-y|^{n+2s+2}}, \end{aligned}$$

so using that $\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(1)} \geq 0$ in H_ρ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &(-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(1)})(a) + c_\rho(a) (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(1)})(a) \leq -C \int_{H_\rho} \frac{(y_1 + 1/\rho)(\tilde{u}(y) - \tau \varphi^{(1)}(y))}{|Q_\rho(a)-y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \\ &\leq -C_\rho \left(\int_{H_\rho} \frac{(y_1 + 1/\rho)\tilde{u}(y)}{|Q_\rho(a)-y|^{n+2s+2}} dy + \tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

Making the change of variables $z = \rho y + e_1$, we have that

$$\int_{H_\rho} \frac{(y_1 + 1/\rho)\tilde{u}(y)}{|Q_\rho(a)-y|^{n+2s+2}} dy = \rho^{-n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{z_1 u(z)}{|Q_\rho(a) - z/\rho + e_1/\rho|^{n+2s+2}} dz.$$

Thus, since $|Q_\rho(a) - z/\rho + e_1/\rho|^{n+2s+2} \leq C_\rho (1 + |z|^{n+2s+2})$, we conclude that

$$\int_{H_\rho} \frac{(y_1 + 1/\rho)\tilde{u}(y)}{|Q_\rho(a)-y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \geq C_\rho \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{z_1 u(z)}{1 + |z|^{n+2s+2}} dz = C_\rho \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

As a consequence,

$$(3.7) \quad (-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(1)})(a) + \tilde{c}(a) (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(1)})(a) \leq -C_\rho \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_\rho \tau.$$

Rearranging (3.3) and (3.7) then using (3.2) gives

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\rho (\tau + M) \leq C_\rho \left(\inf_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u + M \right),$$

as desired. \square

3.2. Interior local boundedness. The second part of the proof of Theorem 1.3 is the interior local boundedness of sub-solutions given in Proposition 3.4 below.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $M \geq 0$, $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$, and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho(e_1)) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, and u satisfies*

$$(3.8) \quad (-\Delta)^s u + cu \leq M \quad \text{in } B_\rho(e_1).$$

Then there exists $C_\rho > 0$ depending only on $n, s, \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, and ρ such that

$$\sup_{B_{\rho/2}(e_1)} u \leq C_\rho (\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} + M).$$

The proof of Proposition 3.4 uses similar ideas to [CS09, Theorem 11.1] and [CS11, Theorem 5.1]. Before we prove Proposition 3.4, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $R \in (0, 1)$ and $a \in \overline{B_2^+}$. Then there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n and s such that, for all $x \in B_{R/2}^+(a)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_R^+(a)$,*

$$\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \leq CR^{-n-2s-2} \frac{x_1 y_1}{1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}}.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{x} := (x - a)/R \in B_{1/2}$ and $\tilde{y} = (y - a)/R \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1$. Clearly, we have that $|\tilde{y} - \tilde{x}| \geq 1/2$. Moreover, since $|\tilde{x}| < 1/2 < 1/(2|\tilde{y}|)$, we have that $|\tilde{y} - \tilde{x}| \geq |\tilde{y}| - |\tilde{x}| \geq (1/2)|\tilde{y}|$. Hence,

$$|\tilde{y} - \tilde{x}|^{n+2s+2} \geq \frac{1}{2^{n+2s+2}} \max\{1, |\tilde{y}|^{n+2s+2}\} \geq C(1 + |\tilde{y}|^{n+2s+2})$$

for some C depending only on n and s . It follows that

$$(3.9) \quad |x - y|^{n+2s+2} = R^{n+2s+2} |\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^{n+2s+2} \geq CR^{n+2s+2} (1 + R^{-n-2s-2} |y - a|^{n+2s+2}).$$

Finally, we claim that there exists C independent of R such that

$$(3.10) \quad |y - a| \geq CR|y| \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(a).$$

Indeed, if $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_4$ then

$$|y - a| \geq |y| - 2 \geq \frac{1}{2}|y| > \frac{R}{2}|y|,$$

and if $y \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(a)) \cap B_4$ then

$$|y - a| \geq R > \frac{R}{4}|y|$$

which proves (3.10).

Thus, (3.9) and (3.10) give that, for all $x \in B_{R/2}(a)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_R(a)$,

$$|x - y|^{n+2s+2} \geq CR^{n+2s+2} (1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}).$$

Then the result follows directly from (2.5). \square

With this preliminary work, we now focus on the proof of Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. We first observe that, dividing through by $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} + M$, we may assume that $(-\Delta)^s u + cu \leq 1$ in $B_\rho(e_1)$ and $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$.

We also point out that if $u \leq 0$ in $B_\rho(e_1)$, then the claim in Proposition 3.4 is obviously true. Therefore, we can suppose that

$$(3.11) \quad \{u > 0\} \cap B_\rho(e_1) \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus, we let $\tau \geq 0$ be the smallest possible value such that

$$u(x) \leq \tau(\rho - |x - e_1|)^{-n-2} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_\rho(e_1).$$

Such a τ exists in light of (3.11) by following a similar argument to the one in the footnote at the bottom of p. 11.

To complete the proof, we will show that

$$(3.12) \quad \tau \leq C_\rho$$

with C_ρ depending only on n , s , $\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, and ρ (but independent of u). Since u is uniformly continuous in $B_\rho(e_1)$, there exists $a \in B_\rho(e_1)$ such that $u(a) = \tau(\rho - |a - e_1|)^{-n-2}$. Notice that $u(a) > 0$ and $\tau > 0$.

Let also $d =: \rho - |a - e_1|$ so that

$$(3.13) \quad u(a) = \tau d^{-n-2},$$

and let

$$U := \left\{ y \in B_\rho(e_1) \text{ s.t. } u(y) > \frac{u(a)}{2} \right\}.$$

Since $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$, if $r \in (0, d)$ then

$$C_\rho \geq \int_{B_\rho(e_1)} |u(x)| dx \geq \int_{U \cap B_r(a)} u(x) dx \geq \frac{u(a)}{2} \cdot |U \cap B_r(a)|.$$

Thus, from (3.13), it follows that

$$(3.14) \quad |U \cap B_r(a)| \leq \frac{C_\rho d^{n+2}}{\tau} \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, d).$$

Next, we make the following claim.

Claim. *There exists $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on n , s , $\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, and ρ such that if $\theta \in (0, \theta_0]$ there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n , s , $\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, ρ , and θ such that*

$$|B_{\theta d/8}(a) \setminus U| \leq \frac{1}{4}|B_{\theta d/8}| + C \frac{d^n}{\tau}.$$

In particular, neither θ nor C depend on τ , u , or a .

We will withhold the proof of the claim until the end. Assuming the claim is true, we complete the proof of the Proposition 3.4 as follows. By (3.14) (used here with $r := \theta_0 d/8$) and the claim, we have that

$$\frac{C_\rho d^{n+2}}{\tau} \geq |B_{\theta_0 d/8}| - |B_{\theta_0 d/8}(a) \setminus U| \geq \frac{3}{4}|B_{\theta_0 d/8}| - C \frac{d^n}{\tau}.$$

Rearranging gives that $\tau \leq C(d^2 + 1) \leq C$, which proves (3.12).

Accordingly, to complete the proof of Proposition 3.4, it remains to establish the Claim. For this, let $\theta \in (0, 1)$ be a small constant to be chosen later. We will prove the claim by applying

Proposition 3.2 to an appropriate auxiliary function. For $x \in B_{\theta d/2}(a)$, we have that $|x - e_1| \leq |a - e_1| + \theta d/2 = \rho - (1 - \theta/2)d$, so, using (3.13),

$$(3.15) \quad u(x) \leq \tau \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} d^{-n-2} = \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} u(a) \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{\theta d/2}(a).$$

Let ζ be a smooth, antisymmetric function such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $\{x_1 > 1/2\}$ and $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and consider the antisymmetric function

$$v(x) := \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} u(a)\zeta(x) - u(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Since $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $\{x_1 > 1/2\} \supset B_{\theta d/2}(a)$ and $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n , it follows easily from (1.5) that $(-\Delta)^s \zeta \geq 0$ in $B_{\theta d/2}(a)$. Hence, in $B_{\theta d/2}(a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s v + cv &\geq -(-\Delta)^s u - cu + c \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} u(a) \\ &\geq -1 - C \|c^-\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} u(a). \end{aligned}$$

Taking θ sufficiently small, we obtain

$$(3.16) \quad (-\Delta)^s v + cv \geq -C(1 + u(a)) \quad \text{in } B_{\theta d/2}(a).$$

The function v is almost the auxiliary function to which we would like to apply Proposition 3.2; however, Proposition 3.2 requires $v \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n but we only have $v \geq 0$ in $B_{\theta d/2}(a)$ due to (3.15). To resolve this issue let us instead consider the function w such that $w(x) = v^+(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $w(x) = -w(x_*)$ for all $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_-}$. We point out that w coincides with v in $B_{\theta d/2}(a)$, thanks to (3.15), and therefore it is as regular as v in $B_{\theta d/2}(a)$, which allows us to write the fractional Laplacian of w in $B_{\theta d/2}(a)$ in a pointwise sense.

Also we observe that we have $w \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n but we no longer have a lower bound for $(-\Delta)^s w + cw$. To obtain this, observe that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$,

$$(w - v)(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for all } x \in \{v > 0\} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n \\ u(x) - (1 - \theta/2)^{-n-2} u(a)\zeta(x), & \text{for all } x \in \{v \leq 0\} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n. \end{cases}$$

In particular, $w - v \leq |u|$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n . It follows that for all $x \in B_{\theta d/2}(a)$,

$$(-\Delta)^s (w - v)(x) \geq -C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_{\theta d/2}(a)} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \right) |u(y)| dy.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, for all $x \in B_{\theta d/4}(a)$,

$$(3.17) \quad (-\Delta)^s (w - v)(x) \geq -C(\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \geq -C(\theta d)^{-n-2s-2}.$$

Thus, by (3.16) and (3.17), for all $x \in B_{\theta d/4}(a)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s w(x) + c(x)w(x) &= (-\Delta)^s v(x) + c(x)v(x) + (-\Delta)^s (w - v)(x) \\ &\geq -C(1 + u(a) + (\theta d)^{-n-2s-2}) \\ (3.18) \quad &\geq -C((\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} + u(a)) \end{aligned}$$

using that $\theta d < 1$.

Next let us consider the rescaled and translated functions $\tilde{w}(x) := w(a_1x + (0, a'))$ and $\tilde{c}(x) := a_1^{2s}c(a_1x + (0, a'))$ (recall that $a' = (a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$). By (3.18) we have that

$$(-\Delta)^s \tilde{w} + \tilde{c} \geq -Ca_1^{2s}((\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} + u(a)) \quad \text{in } B_{\theta d/(4a_1)}(e_1).$$

On one hand, by Proposition 3.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\theta d}{8}\right)^{-n} \int_{B_{\theta d/8}(a)} w(x) dx &= \left(\frac{\theta d}{8a_1}\right)^{-n} \int_{B_{\theta d/(8a_1)}(e_1)} \tilde{w}(x) dx \\ &\leq C \left(\tilde{w}(e_1) + (\theta d)^{-n-2} + u(a)(\theta d)^{2s} \right) \\ &= C \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) u(a) + C(\theta d)^{-n-2} + u(a)(\theta d)^{2s}. \end{aligned}$$

We note explicitly that, by (3.1), the constant in the above line is given by

$$C = C'(1 + (\theta d)^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}),$$

so using that $\theta d < 1$ it may be chosen to depend only on n, s , and $\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$. On the other hand,

$$B_{\theta d/8}(a) \setminus U \subseteq \left\{ w \geq \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) u(a) \right\} \cap B_{\theta d/8}(a),$$

so we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta d)^{-n} \int_{B_{\theta d/8}(a)} w(x) dx &\geq (\theta d)^{-n} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) u(a) \cdot |B_{\theta d/8}(a) \setminus U| \\ &\geq C(\theta d)^{-n} u(a) \cdot |B_{\theta d/8}(a) \setminus U| \end{aligned}$$

for θ sufficiently small. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{\theta d/8}(a) \setminus U| &\leq C(\theta d)^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) + C(u(a))^{-1}(\theta d)^{-2} + (\theta d)^{n+2s} \\ &\leq C(\theta d)^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) + C \frac{\theta^{-2} d^n}{\tau} \end{aligned}$$

using (3.13) and that $d^{n+2s} < d^n$ since $d < 1$. At this point we may choose θ sufficiently small such that

$$(\theta d)^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4} |B_{\theta d/8}|.$$

This proves the claim, and thus completes the proof of Proposition 3.4. \square

4. BOUNDARY HARNACK INEQUALITY AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.4. Analogous to the proof of Theorem 1.3, the proof of Theorem 1.4 is divided into the boundary Harnack inequality for super-solutions (Proposition 4.1) and the boundary local boundedness for sub-solutions (Proposition 4.5). Together these two results immediately give Theorem 1.4.

4.1. The boundary weak Harnack inequality. Our next result is the antisymmetric boundary weak Harnack inequality.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho > 0$, and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho^+)$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n and satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu \geq -Mx_1 \quad \text{in } B_\rho^+.$$

Then there exists $C_\rho > 0$ depending only on n , s , $\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}$, and ρ such that

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\rho \left(\inf_{B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} + M \right).$$

As with the interior counter-part of Proposition 4.1, that is Proposition 3.1, we will prove the following rescaled version of Proposition 4.1, namely Proposition 4.2. This version is essential to the proof of the boundary local boundedness for sub-solutions. Once Proposition 4.2 has been proven, Proposition 4.1 follows easily with some minor adjustments.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho > 0$, and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho^+)$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n and satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu \geq -Mx_1 \quad \text{in } B_\rho^+.$$

Then there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n , s , and $\rho^{2s}\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{B_{\rho/2}^+} y_1 u(y) dy \leq C \left(\inf_{B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} + M\rho^{2s} \right).$$

Moreover, the constant C is of the form

$$C = C'(1 + \rho^{2s}\|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)})$$

with C' depending only on n and s .

Before we prove Proposition 4.2, we require some lemmata.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $M \geq 0$, $k \geq 0$, and suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_1) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer.*

(i) If u satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^s u + ku \geq -Mx_1 \quad \text{in } B_1^+$$

then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small there exists $u_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ antisymmetric and such that

$$(4.1) \quad (-\Delta)^s u_\varepsilon + ku_\varepsilon \geq -(M + \varepsilon)x_1 \quad \text{in } B_{7/8}^+.$$

(ii) If u satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^s u + ku \leq Mx_1 \quad \text{in } B_1^+$$

then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small there exists $u_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ antisymmetric and such that

$$(-\Delta)^s u_\varepsilon + ku_\varepsilon \leq (M + \varepsilon)x_1 \quad \text{in } B_{7/8}^+.$$

In both cases the sequence $\{u_\varepsilon\}$ converges to u uniformly in $B_{7/8}$.

Additionally, if u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n then u_ε is also non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n .

For the usual fractional Laplacian, Lemma 4.3 follows immediately by taking a mollification of u and in principle, this is also the idea here. However, there are a couple of technicalities that need to be addressed. The first is that here the fractional Laplacian is defined according to Definition 1.2 and it remains to be verified that this fractional Laplacian commutes with the convolution operation as the usual one does. As a matter of fact, Definition 1.2 does not lend itself well to the Fourier transform which makes it difficult to prove such a property. We overcome this issue by first multiplying u by an appropriate cut-off function which allows us to reduce to the case $(-\Delta)^s$ as given by the usual definition.

The second issue is that directly using the properties of mollifiers, we can only expect to control u_ε in some $U \Subset B_1^+$ and not up to $\{x_1 = 0\}$. We can relax this thanks to the antisymmetry of u .

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $R > 1$ and let ζ be a smooth radial cut-off function such that

$$\zeta \equiv 1 \text{ in } B_R, \quad \zeta \equiv 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2R}, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \zeta \leq 1.$$

Let also $\bar{u} := u\zeta$.

Now let us define a function $f : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows: let $f(x) = (-\Delta)^s u(x) + ku(x)$ for all $x \in B_1^+$, $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in B_1 \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$, and $f(x) = -f(x_*)$. We also define $\bar{f} : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ analogously with u replaced with \bar{u} . By definition, both f and \bar{f} are antisymmetric⁴, but note carefully that, *a priori*, there is no reason to expect any regularity of f and \bar{f} across $\{x_1 = 0\}$ (we will in fact find that $\bar{f} \in C^\alpha(B_1)$).

We claim that for R large enough (depending on ε),

$$(4.2) \quad |\bar{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon x_1 \quad \text{for all } x \in B_1^+.$$

Indeed, if $x \in B_1^+$ then

$$\bar{f}(x) - f(x) = (-\Delta)^s(\bar{u} - u)(x) = C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_R} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \right) (u - \bar{u})(y) dy.$$

From (2.5), it follows that

$$|\bar{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq Cx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_R} \frac{y_1 |u(y) - \bar{u}(y)|}{|x - y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \leq Cx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_R} \frac{y_1 |u(y)|}{1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}} dy.$$

Since $u \in \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, taking R large we obtain (4.2).

Next, consider the standard mollifier $\eta(x) := C_0 \chi_{B_1}(x) e^{-\frac{1}{1-|x|^2}}$ with $C_0 > 0$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(x) dx = 1$ and let $\eta_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-n} \eta(x/\varepsilon)$. Also, let $u_\varepsilon := \bar{u} * \eta_\varepsilon$ and $f_\varepsilon := \bar{f} * \eta_\varepsilon$.

Notice that $u_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and it is antisymmetric. Additionally, we show that (4.1) holds true in case (i) (case (ii) being analogous).

To this end, we observe that, since \bar{u} has compact support, we have that $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, so by Proposition 2.1, $(-\Delta)^s \bar{u}$ can be understood in the usual sense in B_1 , that is, by (1.1). Moreover, by [Sil07, Propositions 2.4-2.6], we have that $(-\Delta)^s \bar{u} \in C^\alpha(B_1)$ which gives that $\bar{f} \in C^\alpha(B_1)$ and

$$(-\Delta)^s \bar{u} + k\bar{u} = \bar{f} \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

⁴Note that the definition of antisymmetric requires the domain of f and \bar{f} to be \mathbb{R}^n . For simplicity, we will still refer to f and \bar{f} as antisymmetric in this context since this technicality does not affect the proof.

In particular, we may use standard properties of mollifiers to immediately obtain

$$(-\Delta)^s u_\varepsilon + k u_\varepsilon = f_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } B_{7/8}.$$

Also, since \bar{f} is antisymmetric, it follows that

$$f_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \bar{f}(y) \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \bar{f}(y) (\eta_\varepsilon(x-y) - \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y)) dy.$$

Observe that, since η is monotone decreasing in the radial direction and $|x-y| \leq |x_*-y|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$,

$$(4.3) \quad \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) - \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

Moreover, by (4.2), we see that $\bar{f}(x) \geq -(M+\varepsilon)x_1$ for all $x \in B_1^+$, so if $x \in B_{7/8}^+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small (independent of x) then it follows that

$$(4.4) \quad f_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{B_\varepsilon^+(x)} \bar{f}(y) (\eta_\varepsilon(x-y) - \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y)) dy \geq -(M+\varepsilon) \int_{B_\varepsilon^+(x)} y_1 (\eta_\varepsilon(x-y) - \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y)) dy.$$

Next, we claim that

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{B_\varepsilon^+(x)} y_1 (\eta_\varepsilon(x-y) - \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y)) dy \leq x_1.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\varepsilon^+(x)} y_1 (\eta_\varepsilon(x-y) - \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y)) dy &= \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} y_1 \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy \\ &\quad - \int_{B_\varepsilon^-(x)} y_1 \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy - \int_{B_\varepsilon^+(x)} y_1 \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y) dy \\ &= \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} y_1 \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy - \int_{B_\varepsilon^+(x) \setminus B_\varepsilon^+(x_*)} y_1 \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y) dy \\ &\leq \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} y_1 \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using that $z \mapsto z_1 \eta(z)$ is antisymmetric and $\int_{B_\varepsilon} \eta(z) dz = 1$, we obtain that

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} y_1 \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy = \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} (y_1 - x_1) \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy + x_1 \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \eta_\varepsilon(x-y) dy = x_1$$

which gives (4.5).

From (4.4) and (4.5), we obtain that

$$f_\varepsilon(x) \geq -(M+\varepsilon)x_1$$

for all $x \in B_{7/8}^+$, as soon as ε is taken sufficiently small. This is the desired result in (4.1).

Finally, it follows immediately from the properties of mollifiers that $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ uniformly in $B_{7/8}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Moreover, if $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n then from antisymmetry,

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \bar{u}(y) (\eta_\varepsilon(x-y) - \eta_\varepsilon(x_*-y)) dy \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$$

using (4.3). □

Our second lemma is as follows.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is an antisymmetric function satisfying $\partial_1 v(0) = 0$. Then*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(-\Delta)^s v(h e_1)}{h} = -2c_{n,s}(n+2s) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{y_1 v(y)}{|y|^{n+2s+2}} dy.$$

Note that since $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the fractional Laplacian is given by the usual definition as per Proposition 2.1.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. We will begin by proving that

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(-\Delta)^s v(h e_1)}{h} = (-\Delta)^s \partial_1 v(0).$$

For this, consider the difference quotient

$$\partial_1^h v(x) := \frac{v(x + h e_1) - v(x)}{h}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $|h| > 0$ small. Since v is antisymmetric, $v(0) = 0$, so

$$\frac{2v(h e_1) - v(h e_1 + y) - v(h e_1 - y)}{h} = 2\partial_1^h v(0) - \partial_1^h v(y) - \partial_1^h v(-y) - \frac{v(y) + v(-y)}{h}$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, the function $y \mapsto v(y) + v(-y)$ is odd with respect to y' , and so

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v(y) + v(-y)}{|y|^{n+2s}} dy = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(-\Delta)^s v(h e_1)}{h} &= \frac{c_{n,s}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(2\partial_1^h v(0) - \partial_1^h v(y) - \partial_1^h v(-y) - \frac{v(y) + v(-y)}{h} \right) \frac{dy}{|y|^{n+2s}} \\ &= (-\Delta)^s \partial_1^h v(0). \end{aligned}$$

From these considerations and the computation at the top of p. 9 in [BV16], we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{(-\Delta)^s v(h e_1)}{h} - (-\Delta)^s \partial_1 v(0) \right| &= |(-\Delta)^s (\partial_1^h v - \partial_1 v)(0)| \\ &\leq C \left(\|\partial_1^h v - \partial_1 v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|D^2 \partial_1^h v - D^2 \partial_1 v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain (4.6) by sending $h \rightarrow 0$, using that $\partial_1^h v \rightarrow \partial_1 v$ in $C_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

To complete the proof, we use that $\partial_1 v(0) = 0$ and integration by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s \partial_1 v(0) &= -c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial_1 v(y)}{|y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(y) \partial_1 |y|^{-n-2s} dy \\ &= -c_{n,s}(n+2s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{y_1 v(y)}{|y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \\ &= -2c_{n,s}(n+2s) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{y_1 v(y)}{|y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from antisymmetry of v . □

We are now able to give the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Since u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , we have that $(-\Delta)^s u + \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)} u \geq -Mx_1$ in B_ρ^+ . Define $\tilde{u}(x) := u(\rho x)$ and note that

$$(-\Delta)^s \tilde{u} + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)} \tilde{u} \geq -M\rho^{2s+1}x_1 \quad \text{in } B_1^+.$$

By way of Lemma 4.3 (i), we may take a $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ sequence of functions approximating \tilde{u} which satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 4.2 with M replaced with $M + \varepsilon$, obtain the estimate, then pass to the limit. In this way we may assume $\tilde{u} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let ζ be a smooth radially symmetric cut-off function such that

$$\zeta \equiv 1 \text{ in } B_{1/2}, \quad \zeta \equiv 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3/4}, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \zeta \leq 1,$$

and define $\varphi^{(2)} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by $\varphi^{(2)}(x) := x_1 \zeta(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$ is the largest possible value such that $\tilde{u} \geq \tau \varphi^{(2)}$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n . For more detail on the existence of such a τ , see the footnote at the bottom of p. 11. Since $\varphi^{(2)}(x) = x_1$ in $B_{1/2}$, we have that $x_1 \tau \leq \tilde{u}(x)$ for all $x \in B_{1/2}$, so

$$(4.7) \quad \tau \leq \inf_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{\tilde{u}(x)}{x_1} = \rho \inf_{B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}.$$

Since \tilde{u} is C^1 in B_1 , there are two possibilities that can occur: either there exists $a \in B_{3/4}^+$ such that $\tilde{u}(a) = \tau \varphi^{(2)}(a)$; or there exists $a \in B_{3/4} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ such that $\partial_1 \tilde{u}(a) = \tau \partial_1 \varphi^{(2)}(a)$.

First suppose that there exists $a \in B_{3/4}^+$ such that $\tilde{u}(a) = \tau \varphi^{(2)}(a)$. Since $\varphi^{(2)} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and is antisymmetric, $(-\Delta)^s \varphi^{(2)}$ is antisymmetric and $\partial_1 \varphi^{(2)} = 0$ in $\{x_1 = 0\}$, we can exploit Lemma 4.4 to say that $(-\Delta)^s \varphi^{(2)}(x)/x_1$ is bounded in \mathbb{R}^n .

On one hand, using that $(\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) = 0$, we have that

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) &= (-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)} (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) \\ &\geq -M\rho^{2s+1}a_1 - \tau(C + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)})a_1 \\ &\geq -M\rho^{2s+1}a_1 - C\tau(1 + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)})a_1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)}$ is antisymmetric, non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and $(\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) = 0$, we have by Definition 1.2 that

$$(-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) = -C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \left(\frac{1}{|a-y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|a_*-y|^{n+2s}} \right) (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(y) dy.$$

It follows from (2.6) that

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) &\leq -Ca_1 \int_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{y_1 (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(y)}{|a_* - y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \\ &\leq -Ca_1 \left(\int_{B_{1/2}^+} y_1 \tilde{u}(y) dy - \tau \right) \\ &= -Ca_1 \left(\frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \int_{B_{\rho/2}^+} y_1 u(y) dy - \tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging (4.8) and (4.9), and recalling (4.7) gives

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \int_{B_{\rho/2}^+} y_1 u(y) dy &\leq C \left(\tau(1 + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}) + \rho^{2s+1} M \right) \\ &\leq C \rho (1 + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}) \left(\inf_{B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} + M \rho^{2s} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired result in this case.

Now suppose that there exists $a \in B_{3/4} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ such that $\partial_1 \tilde{u}(a) = \tau \partial_1 \varphi^{(2)}(a)$. Let $h > 0$ be small and set $a^{(h)} := a + h e_1$. On one hand, as in (4.8),

$$(-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a^{(h)}) \geq -M \rho^{2s+1} h - C \tau (1 + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}) h.$$

Dividing both sides by h and sending $h \rightarrow 0^+$, it follows from Lemma 4.4 (after a translation) that

$$\begin{aligned} -M \rho^{2s+1} - C \tau (1 + \rho^{2s} \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}) &\leq -C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{y_1 (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(y)}{|y - a|^{n+2s+2}} dy \\ &\leq -C \left(\frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \int_{B_{\rho/2}^+} y_1 u(y) dy - \tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging as before gives the desired result. \square

Next, we give the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $\varphi^{(2)}$, τ , and a be the same as in the proof of Proposition 4.2. The proof of Proposition 4.1 is identical to the proof of Proposition 4.2 except for the following changes.

In the case $a \in B_{3/4}^+$ and $\tilde{u}(a) = \tau \varphi^{(2)}(a)$, we use (2.6) to obtain

$$(-\Delta)^s (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(a) \leq -C a_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{y_1 (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(y)}{|a_* - y|^{n+2s+2}} dy \leq -C_\rho a_1 (\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} - \tau)$$

where we have also used that

$$(4.11) \quad |a_* - y|^{n+2s+2} \leq C(1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}) \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

Moreover, in the case $a \in B_{3/4} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ and $\partial_1 \tilde{u}(a) = \tau \partial_1 \varphi^{(2)}(a)$, we have that $a = a_*$ so (4.11) also gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{y_1 (\tilde{u} - \tau \varphi^{(2)})(y)}{|y - a|^{n+2s+2}} dy \geq C_\rho (\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} - \tau). \quad \square$$

4.2. Boundary local boundedness. We now prove the boundary local boundedness for sub-solutions.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $M \geq 0$, $\rho \in (0, 1)$, and $c \in L^\infty(B_\rho^+)$. Suppose that $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_\rho) \cap \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer, and u satisfies*

$$(-\Delta)^s u + cu \leq M x_1 \quad \text{in } B_\rho^+.$$

Then there exists $C_\rho > 0$ depending only on $n, s, \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)}$, and ρ such that

$$\sup_{x \in B_{\rho/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} \leq C_\rho (\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} + M).$$

Before we prove Proposition 4.5, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be an odd function such that $\varphi(t) = 1$ if $t > 2$ and $0 \leq \varphi(t) \leq 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Suppose that $\varphi^{(3)} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the solution to*

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s \varphi^{(3)} = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ \varphi^{(3)}(x) = \varphi(x_1) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1. \end{cases}$$

Then $\varphi^{(3)}$ is antisymmetric and there exists $C > 1$ depending only on n and s such that

$$C^{-1}x_1 \leq \varphi^{(3)}(x) \leq Cx_1$$

for all $x \in B_{1/2}^+$.

Proof. Via the Poisson kernel representation, see [Gar19, Section 15], and using that φ is an odd function, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{(3)}(x) &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \left(\frac{1 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - 1} \right)^s \frac{\varphi(y_1)}{|x - y|^n} dy \\ &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1^+} \left(\frac{1 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - 1} \right)^s \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^n} \right) \varphi(y_1) dy. \end{aligned}$$

From this formula, we immediately obtain that $\varphi^{(3)}$ is antisymmetric (this can also be argued by the uniqueness of solutions to (4.12)). Then, by an analogous computation to (2.5) (just replacing $n + 2s$ with n),

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{(3)}(x) &\leq Cx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1^+} \frac{y_1 \varphi(y_1)}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s |x - y|^{n+2}} dy \\ &\leq Cx_1 \left[\int_{B_2^+ \setminus B_1^+} \frac{y_1}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_2^+} \frac{y_1}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s (|y| - 1)^{n+2}} dy \right] \\ &\leq Cx_1 \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in B_{1/2}^+$. Similarly, using now (2.6) (replacing $n + 2s$ with n), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{(3)}(x) &\geq Cx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1^+} \frac{y_1 \varphi(y_1)}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s |x_* - y|^{n+2}} dy \\ &\geq Cx_1 \int_{\{y_1 > 2\}} \frac{y_1}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s (|y| + 1)^{n+2}} dy \\ &\geq Cx_1 \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in B_{1/2}^+$. □

Now we can give the proof of Proposition 4.5.

Proof of Proposition 4.5. Dividing through by $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} + M$, we can also assume that $(-\Delta)^s u + cu \leq x_1$ in B_ρ^+ and $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$. Moreover, as explained at the start of the proof of Proposition 4.2, via Lemma 4.3 (ii) (after rescaling), it is not restrictive to assume $u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and it is antisymmetric.

Furthermore, we point out that the claim in Proposition 4.5 is obviously true if $u \leq 0$ in B_ρ^+ , hence we suppose that $\{u > 0\} \cap B_\rho^+ \neq \emptyset$.

Let $\varphi^{(3)}$ be as in Lemma 4.6 and let $\zeta(x) := \varphi^{(3)}(x/(2\rho))$. Suppose that $\tau \geq 0$ is the smallest value such that

$$u(x) \leq \tau \zeta(x)(\rho - |x|)^{-n-2} \quad \text{in } B_\rho^+.$$

The existence of such a τ follows from a similar argument to the one presented in the footnote at the bottom of p. 11. Notice that $\tau > 0$. To complete the proof we will show that $\tau \leq C_\rho$ with C_ρ independent of u . Since u is continuously differentiable, two possibilities can occur:

Case 1: There exists $a \in B_\rho^+$ such that

$$u(a) = \tau \zeta(a)(\rho - |a|)^{-n-2}.$$

Case 2: There exists $a \in B_\rho \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ such that

$$\partial_1 u(a) = \tau \partial_1 \Big|_{x=a} (\zeta(x)(\rho - |x|)^{-n-2}) = \tau (\partial_1 \zeta(a))(\rho - |a|)^{-n-2}.$$

Let $d := \rho - |a|$ and define $U \subset B_\rho^+$ as follows: if Case 1 occurs let

$$U := \left\{ x \in B_\rho^+ \text{ s.t. } \frac{u(x)}{\zeta(x)} > \frac{u(a)}{2\zeta(a)} \right\};$$

otherwise if Case 2 occurs then let

$$U := \left\{ x \in B_\rho^+ \text{ s.t. } \frac{u(x)}{\zeta(x)} > \frac{\partial_1 u(a)}{2\partial_1 \zeta(a)} \right\}.$$

Since $u(a) = \tau \zeta(a)d^{-n-2}$ in Case 1 and $\partial_1 u(a) = \tau \partial_1 \zeta(a)d^{-n-2}$ in Case 2, we may write

$$(4.13) \quad U = \left\{ x \in B_\rho^+ \text{ s.t. } u(x) > \frac{1}{2} \tau d^{-n-2} \zeta(x) \right\}$$

which is valid in both cases.

Then, we have that, for all $r \in (0, d)$,

$$C_\rho \geq \int_{B_r^+} y_1 |u(y)| dy \geq \frac{1}{2} \tau d^{-n-2} \int_{U \cap B_r(a)} y_1 \zeta(y) dy.$$

As a consequence, by Lemma 4.6, we have that

$$(4.14) \quad \int_{U \cap B_r(a)} y_1^2 dy \leq C_\rho \int_{U \cap B_r(a)} y_1 \zeta(y) dy \leq \frac{C_\rho d^{n+2}}{\tau} \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, d).$$

Next, we make the following claim.

Claim. *There exists $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on $n, s, \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}$, and ρ such that if $\theta \in (0, \theta_0]$ there exists $C > 0$ depending only on $n, s, \|c\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(e_1))}, \rho$, and θ such that*

• *In Case 1:*

(i) *If $a_1 \geq \theta d/16$ then*

$$|B_{(\theta d)/64}(a) \setminus U| \leq \frac{1}{4} |B_{(\theta d)/64}| + \frac{C d^n}{\tau}.$$

(ii) *If $a_1 < \theta d/16$ then*

$$\int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a)} x_1^2 dx + \frac{C d^{n+2}}{\tau}.$$

• *In Case 2:*

$$\int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a)} x_1^2 dx + \frac{Cd^{n+2}}{\tau}.$$

In particular, neither θ nor C depend on τ , u , or a .

We withhold the proof of the claim until the end. Assuming that the claim is true, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.5 as follows.

If Case 1(i) occurs then for all $y \in B_{(\theta d)/64}(a)$ we have that $y_1 > a_1 - (\theta d)/64 \geq Cd$, and so

$$\int_{U \cap B_{(\theta d)/64}(a)} y_1^2 dy \geq Cd^2 \cdot |U \cap B_{(\theta d)/64}(a)|.$$

Hence, from (4.14) (used here with $r := (\theta d)/64$), we have that

$$|U \cap B_{(\theta d)/64}(a)| \leq \frac{C_\rho d^n}{\tau}.$$

Then using the claim, we find that

$$\frac{C_\rho d^n}{\tau} \geq |B_{(\theta d)/64}| - |B_{(\theta d)/64}(a) \setminus U| \geq \frac{3}{4} |B_{(\theta d)/64}| - \frac{Cd^n}{\tau}$$

which gives that $\tau \leq C_\rho$ in this case.

If Case 1(ii) or Case 2 occurs then from (4.14) (used here with $r := (\theta d)/64$) and the claim, we have that

$$(4.15) \quad \frac{C_\rho d^{n+2}}{\tau} \geq \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a)} x_1^2 dx - \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1^2 dx \geq \frac{3}{4} \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a)} x_1^2 dx - \frac{Cd^{n+2}}{\tau}.$$

We now observe that, given $r \in (0, d)$, if $x \in B_{r/4}(a + \frac{3}{4}re_1) \subset B_r^+(a)$ then $x_1 \geq a_1 + \frac{3}{4}r - \frac{r}{4} \geq \frac{r}{2}$, and thus

$$(4.16) \quad \int_{B_r^+(a)} x_1^2 dx \geq \int_{B_{r/4}(a + (3r)/4e_1)} x_1^2 dx \geq \frac{r^2}{4} |B_{r/4}(a + (3r)/4e_1)| = Cr^{n+2},$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on n . Exploiting this formula with $r := (\theta d)/64$ into (4.15), we obtain that

$$\frac{C_\rho d^{n+2}}{\tau} \geq C \left(\frac{\theta d}{64} \right)^{n+2} - \frac{Cd^{n+2}}{\tau},$$

which gives that $\tau \leq C_\rho$ as required.

Hence, we now focus on the proof of the claim. Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$ be a small constant to be chosen later. By translating, we may also assume without loss of generality that $a' = 0$ (recall that $a' = (a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$).

For each $x \in B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)$, we have that $|x| \leq |a| + \theta d/2 = \rho - (1 - \theta/2)d$. Hence, in both Case 1 and Case 2,

$$(4.17) \quad u(x) \leq \tau d^{-n-2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \zeta(x) \quad \text{in } B_{\theta d/2}^+(a).$$

Let

$$v(x) := \tau d^{-n-2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \zeta(x) - u(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We have that v is antisymmetric and $v \geq 0$ in $B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)$ due to (4.17). Moreover, since ζ is s -harmonic in $B_\rho^+ \supset B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)$, for all $x \in B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s v(x) + c(x)v(x) &= -(-\Delta)^s u(x) - c(x)u(x) + c(x)\tau d^{-n-2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \zeta(x) \\ &\geq -x_1 - C\tau d^{-n-2} \|c^-\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho^+)} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \zeta(x). \end{aligned}$$

Taking θ sufficiently small and using that $\zeta(x) \leq Cx_1$ (in light of Lemma 4.6), we obtain

$$(4.18) \quad (-\Delta)^s v(x) + c(x)v(x) \geq -C(1 + \tau d^{-n-2})x_1 \quad \text{in } B_{\theta d/2}^+(a).$$

Next, we define $w(x) := v^+(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $w(x) := -w(x_*)$ for all $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_-}$. We point out that, in light of (4.17), w is as regular as v in $B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)$, and thus we can compute the fractional Laplacian of w in $B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)$ in a pointwise sense.

We also observe that

$$(w - v)(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap \{v \geq 0\}, \\ u(x) - \tau d^{-n-2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \zeta(x), & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap \{v < 0\}. \end{cases}$$

In particular, $w - v \leq |u|$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n . Thus, for all $x \in B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)$,

$$(-\Delta)^s (w - v)(x) \geq -C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_{\theta d/2}^+(a)} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^{n+2s}} \right) |u(y)| dy.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, for all $x \in B_{\theta d/4}^+(a)$,

$$(4.19) \quad (-\Delta)^s (w - v)(x) \geq -C(\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} x_1 \geq -C(\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} x_1.$$

Hence, by (4.18) and (4.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s w + cw &= (-\Delta)^s v + cv + (-\Delta)^s (w - v) \\ &\geq -C \left(1 + \tau d^{-n-2} + (\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} \right) x_1 \\ (4.20) \quad &\geq -C \left((\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} + \tau d^{-n-2} \right) x_1 \end{aligned}$$

in $B_{\theta d/4}^+(a)$.

Next, let us consider Case 1 and Case 2 separately.

Case 1: Suppose that $a \in B_\rho^+$ and let $\tilde{w}(x) = w(a_1 x)$ and $\tilde{c}(x) = a_1^{2s} c(a_1 x)$. Then from (4.20), we have that

$$(4.21) \quad (-\Delta)^s \tilde{w}(x) + \tilde{c}(x)\tilde{w}(x) \geq -Ca_1^{2s+1} \left((\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} + \tau d^{-n-2} \right) x_1$$

for all $x \in B_{\theta d/(4a_1)}^+(e_1)$.

As in the proof of Proposition 3.4, we wish to apply the rescaled version of the weak Harnack inequality to \tilde{w} ; however, we cannot immediately apply either Proposition 3.2 or Proposition 4.2 to (4.21). To resolve this, let us split into a further two cases: (i) $a_1 \geq \theta d/16$ and (ii) $a_1 < \theta d/16$.

Case 1(i): If $a_1 \geq \theta d/16$ then $B_{\theta d/(32a_1)}(e_1) \subset B_{\theta d/(4a_1)}^+(e_1)$ and for each $x \in B_{\theta d/(32a_1)}(e_1)$ we have that $x_1 < 1 + \theta d/(32a_1) \leq 1 + 1/4 = 5/4$. Therefore, from (4.21), we have that

$$(-\Delta)^s \tilde{w}(x) + \tilde{c}(x)\tilde{w}(x) \geq -Ca_1^{2s+1}((\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} + \tau d^{-n-2})$$

for all $x \in B_{\theta d/(32a_1)}(e_1)$.

On one hand, by Proposition 3.2 (used here with $\rho := \theta d/(32a_1)$),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\theta d}{64}\right)^{-n} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}(a)} w(x) dx \\ &= \left(\frac{\theta d}{32a_1}\right)^{-n} \int_{B_{\theta d/(64a_1)}(e_1)} \tilde{w}(x) dx \\ &\leq C(\tilde{w}(e_1) + a_1(\theta d)^{-n-2} + \tau a_1 \theta^{2s} d^{-n+2s-2}) \\ &\leq C\tau d^{-n-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) a_1 + Ca_1(\theta d)^{-n-2} + C\tau a_1 \theta^{2s} d^{-n+2s-2} \end{aligned}$$

using also Lemma 4.6 and that $u(a) = \tau d^{-n-2} \zeta(a)$.

On the other hand, by the definition of U in (4.13),

$$(4.22) \quad B_r(a) \setminus U \subset \left\{ \frac{w}{\zeta} > \tau d^{-n-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} \cap B_r(a), \quad \text{for all } r \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\theta d\right),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta d)^{-n} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}(a)} w(x) dx &\geq \tau \theta^{-n} d^{-2n-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_{B_{\theta d/64}(a) \setminus U} \zeta(x) dx \\ &\geq C\tau \theta^{-n} d^{-2n-2} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}(a) \setminus U} \zeta(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

for θ sufficiently small. Moreover, using that $x_1 > a_1 - \theta d/64 > Ca_1$ and Lemma 4.6, we have that

$$\int_{B_{\theta d/64}(a) \setminus U} \zeta(x) dx \geq C \int_{B_{\theta d/64}(a) \setminus U} x_1 dx \geq Ca_1 \cdot |B_{\theta d/64}(a) \setminus U|.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{\theta d/64}(a) \setminus U| &\leq C(\theta d)^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) + \frac{C\theta^{-2}d^n}{\tau} + C(\theta d)^{n+2s} \\ &\leq C(\theta d)^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) + \frac{C\theta^{-2}d^n}{\tau}, \end{aligned}$$

using also that $d^{n+2s} < d^n$.

Finally, we can take θ sufficiently small so that

$$C(\theta d)^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4} |B_{\theta d/64}|$$

which gives

$$|B_{\theta d/64}(a) \setminus U| \leq \frac{1}{4} |B_{\theta d/64}| + \frac{Cd^n}{\tau}.$$

This concludes the proof of the claim in Case 1(i).

Case 1(ii): Let $a_1 < \theta d/16$ and fix $R := \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{(\theta d/(4a_1))^2 - 1} + 2)$. Observe that

$$2 < R < \sqrt{\left(\frac{\theta d}{4a_1}\right)^2 - 1}.$$

Hence, $e_1 \in B_{R/2}^+$. Moreover, if $x \in B_R^+$ then

$$|x - e_1|^2 < 1 + R^2 < (\theta d/(4a_1))^2,$$

so $B_R^+ \subset B_{\theta d/(4a_1)}^+(e_1)$.

Thus, applying Proposition 4.2 to the equation in (4.21) in B_R^+ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & a_1^{-n-1} \left(\frac{R}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{a_1 R/2}^+} x_1 w(x) dx \\ &= \left(\frac{R}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{R/2}^+} x_1 \tilde{w}(x) dx \\ &\leq C \left(\inf_{B_{R/2}^+} \frac{\tilde{w}(x)}{x_1} + a_1^{2s+1} R^{2s} (\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} + \tau d^{-n-2} a_1^{2s+1} R^{2s} \right) \\ &\leq C \tau d^{-n-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) \zeta(a) + C a_1^{2s+1} R^{2s} (\theta d)^{-n-2s-2} + C \tau d^{-n-2} a_1^{2s+1} R^{2s} \end{aligned}$$

using that $e_1 \in B_{R/2}^+$.

Since $R \leq C\theta d/a_1$ and $\zeta(a) \leq C a_1$ by Lemma 4.6, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & a_1^{-1} \left(\frac{R}{2a_1}\right)^{-n} \int_{B_{a_1 R/2}^+} x_1 w(x) dx \\ &\leq C \tau d^{-n-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) a_1 + C a_1 (\theta d)^{-n-2} + C \tau a_1 \theta^{2s} d^{-n+2s-2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we claim that

$$(4.23) \quad B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a) \setminus U \subset B_{a_1 R/2}^+.$$

Indeed, if $x \in B_{(\theta d)/64}^+ \setminus U$ then

$$|x| \leq |x - a| + |a| \leq \frac{\theta d}{64} + a_1 \leq a_1 \left(\frac{\theta d}{64a_1} + 1 \right).$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} R &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\theta d}{4a_1}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{\theta d}{16a_1}\right)^2} + 1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{15}\theta d}{32a_1} + 1 \geq \frac{3\theta d}{32a_1} + 1 \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{3\theta d}{64a_1} + \frac{1}{2} \right) = 2 \left(\frac{\theta d}{64a_1} + \frac{\theta d}{32a_1} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \geq 2 \left(\frac{\theta d}{64a_1} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

From these observations we obtain that if $x \in B_{(\theta d)/64}^+ \setminus U$ then $|x| \leq a_1 R/2$, which proves (4.23).

Hence, by (4.22) (used with $r := \theta d/64$), (4.23), and Lemma 4.6, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1^{-1} \left(\frac{R}{2a_1} \right)^{-n} \int_{B_{a_1 R/2}^+} x_1 w(x) dx &\geq a_1^{-n-1} R^{-n-2} \tau d^{-n-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1 \zeta(x) dx \\ &\geq C \tau a_1 \theta^{-n-2} d^{-2n-4} \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

for θ sufficiently small. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1^2 dx &\leq C(\theta d)^{n+2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) + \frac{C d^{n+2}}{\tau} + C(\theta d)^{n+2s+2} \\ &\leq C(\theta d)^{n+2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) + \frac{C d^{n+2}}{\tau} \end{aligned}$$

using that $d^{n+2s+2} < d^{n+2}$. Recalling formula (4.16) and taking θ sufficiently small, we obtain that

$$C(\theta d)^{n+2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_{(\theta d)/64}^+(a)} x_1^2 dx.$$

which concludes the proof in Case 1(b).

Case 2: In this case, we can directly apply Proposition 4.2 to (4.20). When we do this we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{\theta d}{64} \right)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}^+(a)} x_1 w(x) dx \\ &\leq C \left(\partial_1 w(0) + (r\theta)^{-n-2} + \tau \theta^{2s} d^{-n+2s-2} \right) \\ &= C \tau d^{-n-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) \partial_1 \zeta(0) + C(r\theta)^{-n-2} + C \tau \theta^{2s} d^{-n+2s-2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, (4.22) is still valid in Case 2 so

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta d)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}^+(a)} x_1 w(x) dx &\geq \tau \theta^{-n-2} d^{-2n-4} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_{B_{\theta d/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1 \zeta(x) dy \\ &\geq C \tau \theta^{-n-2} d^{-2n-4} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 4.6 and taking θ sufficiently small. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}^+(a) \setminus U} x_1^2 dx &\leq C(\theta d)^{n+2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - 1 \right) + \frac{C d^{n+2}}{\tau} + C(\theta d)^{n+2s+2} \\ &\leq C(\theta d)^{n+2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) + \frac{C d^{n+2}}{\tau} \end{aligned}$$

using that $d^{n+2s+2} < d^{n+2}$. Then, by (4.16), we may choose θ sufficiently small so that

$$C(\theta d)^{n+2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{-n-2} - 1 + \theta^{2s} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_{\theta d/64}^+(a)} x_1^2 dx$$

which concludes the proof in Case 2.

The proof of Proposition 4.5 is thereby complete. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this short section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. This follows from Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 along with a standard covering argument which we include here for completeness.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Recall that $\Omega^+ = \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and let $B_{2R}(y)$ be a ball such that $B_{2R}(y) \Subset \Omega^+$. We will first prove that there exists a constant $C = C(n, s, R, y)$ such that

$$(5.1) \quad \sup_{B_R(y)} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} \leq C \inf_{B_R(y)} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}.$$

Indeed, if $\tilde{u}(x) := u(y_1 x + (0, y'))$ and $\tilde{c}(x) := y_1^{2s} c(y_1 x + (0, y'))$ then

$$(-\Delta)^s \tilde{u}(x) + \tilde{c}\tilde{u} = 0, \quad \text{in } B_{2R/y_1}(e_1).$$

By Theorem 1.3,

$$\sup_{B_R(y)} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} \leq C \sup_{B_R(y)} u = C \sup_{B_{R/y_1}(e_1)} \tilde{u} \leq C \inf_{B_{R/y_1}(e_1)} \tilde{u} = C \inf_{B_R(y)} u \leq C \inf_{B_R(y)} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$$

using that $B_R(y) \Subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Next, let $\{a^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty, \{b^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \tilde{\Omega}^+$ be such that

$$\frac{u(a^{(k)})}{a_1^{(k)}} \rightarrow \sup_{\Omega'} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{u(b^{(k)})}{b_1^{(k)}} \rightarrow \inf_{\Omega'} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. After possibly passing to a subsequence, there exist $a, b \in \overline{\tilde{\Omega}^+}$ such that $a^{(k)} \rightarrow a$ and $b^{(k)} \rightarrow b$. Let $\gamma \subset \tilde{\Omega}^+$ be a curve connecting a and b . By the Heine-Borel Theorem, there exists a finite collection of balls $\{B^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^M$ with centres in $\tilde{\Omega} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ such that

$$\tilde{\Omega} \cap \{x_1 = 0\} \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^M B^{(k)} \Subset \Omega.$$

Moreover, if $\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^M B^{(k)}$ then there exists a further collection of balls $\{B^{(k)}\}_{k=M+1}^N$ with centres in $\tilde{\gamma}$ and radii equal to $\frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(\tilde{\gamma}, \partial(\Omega^+))$ such that

$$\tilde{\gamma} \subset \bigcup_{k=M+1}^N B^{(k)} \Subset \Omega^+.$$

By construction, γ is covered by $\{B^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^n$. Thus, iteratively applying Theorem 1.4 (after translating and rescaling) to each $B^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, M$, and (5.1) to each $B^{(k)}$, $k = M + 1, \dots, N$, we obtain the result. \square

APPENDIX A. A COUNTEREXAMPLE

In this appendix, we demonstrate that Theorem 1.1 is in general false if we do not assume anti-symmetry. We will do this by constructing a sequence of functions $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset C^\infty(B_1(2e_1)) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $(-\Delta)^s u_k = 0$ in $B_1(2e_1)$, $u_k \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and

$$\frac{\sup_{B_{1/2}(2e_1)} u_k}{\inf_{B_{1/2}(2e_1)} u_k} \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

The proof will rely on the mean value property of s -harmonic functions.

Suppose that $M \geq 0$ and ζ_1, ζ_2 are smooth functions such that $0 \leq \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \leq 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(2e_1)$, and

$$\zeta_1(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1(2e_1), \\ 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_-^n \setminus \{x_1 > -1\} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_2(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1(2e_1), \\ 1 & \text{in } B_{1/2}(-2e_1). \end{cases}$$

Then let v and w_M be the solutions to

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s v = 0 & \text{in } B_1(2e_1), \\ v = \zeta_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(2e_1) \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s w_M = 0 & \text{in } B_1(2e_1), \\ w_M = -M\zeta_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(2e_1), \end{cases}$$

respectively. Both v and w_M are in $C^\infty(B_1(2e_1)) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ owing to standard regularity theory. We want to emphasise that w_M depends on the parameter M (as indicated by the subscript) but v does not. Define $\tilde{u}_M := v + w_M$. Since $w_M \equiv 0$ when $M = 0$ and, by the strong maximum principle, $v > 0$ in $B_1(2e_1)$, we have that

$$\tilde{u}_0 > 0 \quad \text{in } B_1(2e_1).$$

Hence, we can define

$$\bar{M} := \sup\{M \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } \tilde{u}_M > 0 \text{ in } B_1(2e_1)\}$$

though \bar{M} may possibly be infinity. We will show that \bar{M} is in fact finite and that

$$(A.1) \quad \inf_{B_1(2e_1)} \tilde{u}_{\bar{M}} = 0.$$

Once these two facts have been established, we complete the proof as follows: set $u_k := \tilde{u}_{\bar{M}-1/k}$. By construction, $u_k \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n and $(-\Delta)^s u_k = 0$ in $B_1(2e_1)$. Moreover, by the maximum principle, $v \leq 1$ and $w_M \leq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n , so $u_k \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}^n . Hence,

$$\frac{\sup_{B_{1/2}(2e_1)} u_k}{\inf_{B_{1/2}(2e_1)} u_k} \leq \frac{1}{\inf_{B_1(2e_1)} u_k} \rightarrow +\infty$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us show that \bar{M} is finite. Since w_M is harmonic in $B_1(2e_1)$, the mean value property for s harmonic functions, for example see [Gar19, Section 15], tells us that

$$w_M(2e_1) = -CM \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(2e_1)} \frac{\zeta_2(y)}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s |y|^n} dy.$$

Then, since $\zeta_2 \equiv 1$ in $B_{1/2}(-2e_1)$ and $\zeta_2 \geq 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(2e_1)} \frac{\zeta_2(y)}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s |y|^n} dy \geq \int_{B_{1/2}(-2e_1)} \frac{dy}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s |y|^n} \geq C.$$

It follows that $w_M(2e_1) \leq -CM$ whence

$$\tilde{u}_M(2e_1) \leq 1 - CM \leq 0$$

for M sufficiently large. This gives that \bar{M} is finite.

Now we will show (A.1). For the sake of contradiction, suppose that there exists $a > 0$ such that $\tilde{u}_{\bar{M}} \geq a$ in $B_1(2e_1)$. Suppose that $\varepsilon > 0$ is small and let $h^{(\varepsilon)} := \tilde{u}_{\bar{M}+\varepsilon} - \tilde{u}_{\bar{M}} = w_{\bar{M}+\varepsilon} - w_{\bar{M}}$. Then $h^{(\varepsilon)}$ is s -harmonic in $B_1(2e_1)$ and

$$h^{(\varepsilon)}(x) = -\varepsilon \zeta_2(x) \geq -\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(2e_1).$$

Thus, using the maximum principle we conclude that $h^{(\varepsilon)} \geq -\varepsilon$ in $B_1(2e_1)$, which in turn gives that

$$\tilde{u}_{\bar{M}+\varepsilon} = \tilde{u} + h^{(\varepsilon)} \geq a - \varepsilon > 0 \quad \text{in } B_1(2e_1)$$

for ε sufficiently small. This contradicts the definition of \bar{M} .

APPENDIX B. ALTERNATE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4 WHEN $c \equiv 0$

In this appendix, we will provide an alternate elementary proof of Theorem 1.4 in the particular case $c \equiv 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. More precisely, we prove the following.

Theorem B.1. *Let $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_1) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $2s + \alpha$ not an integer. Suppose that u is antisymmetric, non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n , and s -harmonic in B_1^+ .*

Then there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n and s such that

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1} \leq C \inf_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}.$$

Moreover, $\inf_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ and $\sup_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ are comparable to $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

Except for the statement $\inf_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ and $\sup_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ are comparable to $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, Theorem B.1 was proven in [Cir+23]. Both the proof presented here and the proof in [Cir+23] rely on the Poisson kernel representation for s -harmonic functions in a ball. Despite this, our proof is entirely different to the proof in [Cir+23]. This was necessary to prove that $\inf_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ and $\sup_{B_{1/2}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$ are comparable to $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ which does not readily follow from the proof in [Cir+23]. Our proof of Theorem B.1 is a consequence of a new mean-value formula for antisymmetric s -harmonic functions (Proposition 1.5) which we believe to be interesting in and of itself.

We first prove an alternate expression of the Poisson kernel representation formula for antisymmetric functions.

Lemma B.2. *Let $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_1) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $r \in (0, 1]$. If u is antisymmetric and $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$ in B_1 .*

Then

$$(B.1) \quad u(x) = \gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_r^+} \left(\frac{r^2 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - r^2} \right)^s \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_*-y|^n} \right) u(y) dy$$

for all $x \in B_1^+$. Here $\gamma_{n,s}$ is given in (1.7).

We remark that since $y \mapsto \frac{1}{|x-y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_*-y|^n}$ is antisymmetric for each $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we can rewrite (B.1) as

$$(B.2) \quad u(x) = \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r} \left(\frac{r^2 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - r^2} \right)^s \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_*-y|^n} \right) u(y) dy.$$

Proof of Lemma B.2. The Poisson representation formula [Rie38] gives

$$(B.3) \quad u(x) = \gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r} \left(\frac{r^2 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - r^2} \right)^s \frac{u(y)}{|x-y|^n} dy$$

where $\gamma_{n,s} = \frac{\sin(\pi s) \Gamma(n/2)}{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}+1}}$; see also [Lan72, p.112, p.122] and [Gar19, Section 15]. Splitting the integral in (B.3) into two separate integrals over $\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_r^+$ and $\mathbb{R}_-^n \setminus B_r^-$ respectively, then making the change

of variables $y \rightarrow y_*$ in the integral over $\mathbb{R}_-^n \setminus B_r^-$ and using that u is antisymmetric, we obtain

$$u(x) = \gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_r^+} \left(\frac{r^2 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - r^2} \right)^s \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^n} \right) u(y) dy. \quad \square$$

Now that we have proven the Poisson kernel formula for antisymmetric functions in Lemma B.2, we now establish Proposition 1.5.

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Let $h \in (0, 1)$. It follows from Lemma B.2 that

$$(B.4) \quad \frac{u(he_1)}{h} = \frac{1}{h} \gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_r^+} \left(\frac{r^2 - h^2}{|y|^2 - r^2} \right)^s \left(\frac{1}{|he_1 - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|he_1 + y|^n} \right) u(y) dy$$

for all $r > h$. Taking a Taylor series in h about 0, we have the pointwise limit

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{1}{|he_1 - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|he_1 + y|^n} \right) = \frac{2ny_1}{|y|^{n+2}}.$$

Moreover, by a similar argument to (2.5),

$$\left| \frac{1}{(|y|^2 - r^2)^s} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^n} \right) \right| \leq \frac{2nh|y_1|}{(|y|^2 - r^2)^s |he_1 - y|^{n+2}} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r).$$

Thus, we obtain the result by taking the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ in (B.4) and applying the Dominated Convergence Theorem to justify swapping the limit and the integral on the right-hand side. \square

From Proposition 1.5, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary B.3. *Let $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_1) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\alpha > 0$ and $2s + \alpha$ not an integer. Suppose that u is antisymmetric and $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$ in B_1 .*

Then there exists a radially symmetric function $\psi_s \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying

$$(B.5) \quad \frac{C^{-1}}{1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}} \leq \psi_s(y) \leq \frac{C}{1 + |y|^{n+2s+2}} \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for some $C > 1$, such that

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} y_1 \psi_s(y) u(y) dy.$$

In particular, if u is non-negative in \mathbb{R}_+^n then

$$C^{-1} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(0) \leq C \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Proof. Let

$$\psi_s(y) := n(n+2)\gamma_{n,s} \int_0^{\min\{1/|y|, 1\}} \frac{r^{2s+n+1}}{(1-r^2)^s} dr.$$

It is clear that $\psi_s \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that there exists $C > 1$ such that (B.5) holds. Since $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have that $\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} < +\infty$, so it follows that

$$(B.6) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} y_1 \psi_s(y) u(y) dy \right| \leq C \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} < +\infty.$$

If we multiply $\partial_1 u(0)$ by r^{n+1} then integrate from 0 to 1, Proposition 1.5 and (B.2) give that

$$(B.7) \quad \frac{1}{n+2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(0) = \int_0^1 r^{n+1} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(0) dr = n\gamma_{n,s} \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r} \frac{r^{2s+n+1} y_1 u(y)}{(|y|^2 - r^2)^s |y|^{n+2}} dy dr.$$

At this point, let us observe that if we formally swap the integrals in (B.7) and then make the change of variables $r = |y|\tilde{r}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& n\gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \int_0^1 \frac{r^{2s+n+1} y_1 u(y)}{(|y|^2 - r^2)^s |y|^{n+2}} dr dy + n\gamma_{n,s} \int_{B_1} \int_0^{|y|} \frac{r^{2s+n+1} y_1 u(y)}{(|y|^2 - r^2)^s |y|^{n+2}} dr dy \\
&= n\gamma_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \left(\int_0^{1/|y|} \frac{\tilde{r}^{2s+n+1}}{(1 - \tilde{r}^2)^s} d\tilde{r} \right) y_1 u(y) dy + n\gamma_{n,s} \int_{B_1} \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\tilde{r}^{2s+n+1}}{(1 - \tilde{r}^2)^s} d\tilde{r} \right) y_1 u(y) dy \\
\text{(B.8)} \quad &= \frac{1}{n+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} y_1 \psi_s(y) u(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

By (B.6), equation (B.8) is finite. Hence, Fubini's theorem justifies changing the order of integration in (B.7) and that the right-hand side of (B.7) is equal to (B.8) which proves the result. \square

At this point, we can give the proof of Theorem B.1.

Proof of Theorem B.1. We will begin by proving that

$$\text{(B.9)} \quad u(x) \geq Cx_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{1/2}^+.$$

To this end, we observe that since $|x_* - y|^{n+2} \leq C|y|^{n+2}$ for all $x \in B_1$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1$, (2.6) gives that

$$\frac{1}{|x - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^n} \geq C \frac{x_1 y_1}{|y|^{n+2}} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_1^+ \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1^+.$$

Hence, by Lemma B.2, for all $x \in B_{1/2}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
u(x) &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \left(\frac{1 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - 1} \right)^s \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^n} \right) u(y) dy \\
&\geq Cx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{y_1 u(y)}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s |y|^{n+2}} dy
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $(-y_1)u(y_*) = y_1 u(y)$ and that $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n . Then Proposition 1.5 with $r = 1$ gives that

$$u(x) \geq Cx_1 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(0) \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{1/2}^+.$$

Finally, Corollary B.3 gives (B.9).

Next, we will prove that

$$\text{(B.10)} \quad u(x) \leq Cx_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{1/2}^+.$$

Similar to above, for all $x \in B_{1/2}^+$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1^+$, we have that $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2}|y|$, so (2.5) gives that

$$\frac{1}{|x - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^n} \leq \frac{Cx_1 y_1}{|y|^{n+2}} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{1/2}^+ \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_1^+.$$

As before, using Lemma B.2, we have that, for all $x \in B_{1/2}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
u(x) &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \left(\frac{1 - |x|^2}{|y|^2 - 1} \right)^s \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x_* - y|^n} \right) u(y) dy \\
&\leq Cx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{y_1 u(y)}{(|y|^2 - 1)^s |y|^{n+2}} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Then Proposition 1.5 and Corollary B.3 give that

$$u(x) \leq Cx_1 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(0) \leq Cx_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{1/2}^+,$$

which is (B.10).

From (B.9) and (B.10) the result follows easily. \square

APPENDIX C. A PROOF OF (1.3) WHEN $c := 0$ THAT RELIES ON EXTENSION METHODS

We consider the extended variables $X := (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Then, a solution u of $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$ in Ω^+ can be seen as the trace along $\Omega^+ \times \{0\}$ of its a -harmonic extension $U = U(x, y)$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{div}_X(|y|^a \nabla_X U) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1},$$

where $a := 1 - 2s$, see Lemma 4.1 in [CS07].

We observe that the function $V(x, y) := x_1$ is also a solution of the above equation. Also, if u is antisymmetric, then so is U , and consequently $U = V = 0$ on $\{x_1 = 0\}$.

As a result, by the boundary Harnack inequality (see [FKJ83]),

$$(C.1) \quad \sup_{\tilde{\Omega}^+ \times (0,1)} \frac{U}{V} \leq C \inf_{\tilde{\Omega}^+ \times (0,1)} \frac{U}{V}.$$

In addition,

$$\sup_{\tilde{\Omega}^+ \times (0,1)} \frac{U}{V} \geq \sup_{\tilde{\Omega}^+ \times \{0\}} \frac{U}{V} = \sup_{\tilde{\Omega}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}$$

and similarly

$$\inf_{\tilde{\Omega}^+ \times (0,1)} \frac{U}{V} \leq \inf_{\tilde{\Omega}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_1}.$$

From these observations and (C.1) we obtain (1.3) in this case.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All the authors are members of AustMS. SD is supported by the Australian Research Council DECRA DE180100957 ‘‘PDEs, free boundaries and applications’’. JT is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship. EV is supported by the Australian Laureate Fellowship FL190100081 ‘‘Minimal surfaces, free boundaries and partial differential equations’’.

JT would also like to thank David Perrella for his interesting and fruitful conversations.

REFERENCES

- [ABR99] Amandine Aftalion, Jérôme Busca, and Wolfgang Reichel. ‘‘Approximate radial symmetry for overdetermined boundary value problems’’. In: *Adv. Differential Equations* 4.6 (1999), pp. 907–932. ISSN: 1079-9389.
- [AS67] D. G. Aronson and James Serrin. ‘‘Local behavior of solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations’’. In: *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 25 (1967), pp. 81–122. ISSN: 0003-9527. DOI: 10.1007/BF00281291. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00281291>.

- [BKK08] Krzysztof Bogdan, Tadeusz Kulczycki, and Mateusz Kwaśnicki. “Estimates and structure of α -harmonic functions”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 140.3-4 (2008), pp. 345–381. ISSN: 0178-8051. DOI: 10.1007/s00440-007-0067-0. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-007-0067-0>.
- [BKK15] Krzysztof Bogdan, Takashi Kumagai, and Mateusz Kwaśnicki. “Boundary Harnack inequality for Markov processes with jumps”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 367.1 (2015), pp. 477–517. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9947-2014-06127-8. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-2014-06127-8>.
- [BL02] Richard F. Bass and David A. Levin. “Harnack inequalities for jump processes”. In: *Potential Anal.* 17.4 (2002), pp. 375–388. ISSN: 0926-2601. DOI: 10.1023/A:1016378210944. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016378210944>.
- [Bog97] Krzysztof Bogdan. “The boundary Harnack principle for the fractional Laplacian”. In: *Studia Math.* 123.1 (1997), pp. 43–80. ISSN: 0039-3223. DOI: 10.4064/sm-123-1-43-80. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4064/sm-123-1-43-80>.
- [BV16] Claudia Bucur and Enrico Valdinoci. *Nonlocal diffusion and applications*. Vol. 20. Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana. Springer, [Cham]; Unione Matematica Italiana, Bologna, 2016, pp. xii+155. ISBN: 978-3-319-28738-6; 978-3-319-28739-3. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-28739-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28739-3>.
- [CC95] Luis A. Caffarelli and Xavier Cabré. *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. Vol. 43. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995, pp. vi+104. ISBN: 0-8218-0437-5. DOI: 10.1090/coll/043. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/coll/043>.
- [CDP20] Matteo Cozzi, Juan Dávila, and Manuel del Pino. “Long-time asymptotics for evolutionary crystal dislocation models”. In: *Adv. Math.* 371 (2020), pp. 107242, 109. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2020.107242. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2020.107242>.
- [Cir+23] Giulio Ciraolo, Serena Dipierro, Giorgio Poggesi, Luigi Pollastro, and Enrico Valdinoci. “Symmetry and quantitative stability for the parallel surface fractional torsion problem”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* (2023).
- [CMS16] Giulio Ciraolo, Rolando Magnanini, and Shigeru Sakaguchi. “Solutions of elliptic equations with a level surface parallel to the boundary: stability of the radial configuration”. In: *J. Anal. Math.* 128 (2016), pp. 337–353. ISSN: 0021-7670. DOI: 10.1007/s11854-016-0011-2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11854-016-0011-2>.
- [CMV16] Giulio Ciraolo, Rolando Magnanini, and Vincenzo Vespri. “Hölder stability for Serrin’s overdetermined problem”. In: *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* 195.4 (2016), pp. 1333–1345. ISSN: 0373-3114. DOI: 10.1007/s10231-015-0518-7. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-015-0518-7>.
- [CR18] Giulio Ciraolo and Alberto Roncoroni. “The method of moving planes: a quantitative approach”. In: *Bruno Pini Mathematical Analysis Seminar 2018*. Vol. 9. Bruno Pini Math. Anal. Semin. Univ. Bologna, Alma Mater Stud., Bologna, 2018, pp. 41–77.

- [CS07] Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre. “An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian”. In: *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 32.7-9 (2007), pp. 1245–1260. ISSN: 0360-5302. DOI: 10.1080/03605300600987306. URL: <https://doi-org.pros1.lib.unimi.it/10.1080/03605300600987306>.
- [CS09] Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre. “Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 62.5 (2009), pp. 597–638. ISSN: 0010-3640. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.20274. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.20274>.
- [CS11] Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre. “The Evans-Krylov theorem for nonlocal fully nonlinear equations”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 174.2 (2011), pp. 1163–1187. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.4007/annals.2011.174.2.9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2011.174.2.9>.
- [Dip+22] Serena Dipierro, Giorgio Poggesi, Jack Thompson, and Enrico Valdinoci. *The role of antisymmetric functions in nonlocal equations*. 2022. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2203.11468. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11468>.
- [Eva10] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*. Second. Vol. 19. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010, pp. xxii+749. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4974-3. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/gsm/019>.
- [Fel21] Juan-Carlos Felipe-Navarro. “Uniqueness for linear integro-differential equations in the real line and applications”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60.6 (2021), Paper No. 220, 25. ISSN: 0944-2669. DOI: 10.1007/s00526-021-02084-5. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-021-02084-5>.
- [FKJ83] E. B. Fabes, C. E. Kenig, and D. Jerison. “Boundary behavior of solutions to degenerate elliptic equations”. In: *Conference on harmonic analysis in honor of Antoni Zygmund, Vol. I, II (Chicago, Ill., 1981)*. Wadsworth Math. Ser. Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, 1983, pp. 577–589.
- [FS20] Juan-Carlos Felipe-Navarro and Tomás Sanz-Perela. “Semilinear integro-differential equations, I: Odd solutions with respect to the Simons cone”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 278.2 (2020), pp. 108309, 48. ISSN: 0022-1236. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfa.2019.108309. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2019.108309>.
- [Gar19] Nicola Garofalo. “Fractional thoughts”. In: *New developments in the analysis of nonlocal operators*. Vol. 723. Contemp. Math. Amer. Math. Soc., [Providence], RI, 2019, pp. 1–135. DOI: 10.1090/conm/723/14569. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/conm/723/14569>.
- [GT01] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Reprint of the 1998 edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, pp. xiv+517. ISBN: 3-540-41160-7.
- [Har87] Axel Harnack. *Die Grundlagen der Theorie des logarithmischen Potentials und der eindeutigen Potentialfunktion in der Ebene*. BG Teubner, 1887.
- [JW16] Sven Jarohs and Tobias Weth. “Symmetry via antisymmetric maximum principles in nonlocal problems of variable order”. In: *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* 195.1 (2016), pp. 273–291. ISSN: 0373-3114. DOI: 10.1007/s10231-014-0462-y. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-014-0462-y>.

- [Kas07] Moritz Kassmann. “Harnack inequalities: an introduction”. In: *Bound. Value Probl.* (2007), Art. ID 81415, 21. ISSN: 1687-2762. DOI: 10.1155/2007/81415. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2007/81415>.
- [Lan72] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of modern potential theory*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 180. Translated from the Russian by A. P. Doohovskoy. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972, pp. x+424.
- [Lie96] Gary M. Lieberman. *Second order parabolic differential equations*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996, pp. xii+439. ISBN: 981-02-2883-X. DOI: 10.1142/3302. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/3302>.
- [LY86] Peter Li and Shing-Tung Yau. “On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator”. In: *Acta Math.* 156.3-4 (1986), pp. 153–201. ISSN: 0001-5962. DOI: 10.1007/BF02399203. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02399203>.
- [Mül06] Reto Müller. *Differential Harnack inequalities and the Ricci flow*. EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2006, pp. viii+92. ISBN: 978-3-03719-030-2. DOI: 10.4171/030. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4171/030>.
- [Rie38] Marcel Riesz. “Intégrales de Riemann—Liouville et potentiels.” In: *Acta Sci. Math. Szeged* 9 (1938), pp. 1–42.
- [RS19] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. “The boundary Harnack principle for nonlocal elliptic operators in non-divergence form”. In: *Potential Anal.* 51.3 (2019), pp. 315–331. ISSN: 0926-2601. DOI: 10.1007/s11118-018-9713-7. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11118-018-9713-7>.
- [Ser64] James Serrin. “Local behavior of solutions of quasi-linear equations”. In: *Acta Math.* 111 (1964), pp. 247–302. ISSN: 0001-5962. DOI: 10.1007/BF02391014. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02391014>.
- [Sil07] Luis Silvestre. “Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 60.1 (2007), pp. 67–112. ISSN: 0010-3640. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.20153. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.20153>.
- [SW99] Renming Song and Jang-Mei Wu. “Boundary Harnack principle for symmetric stable processes”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 168.2 (1999), pp. 403–427. ISSN: 0022-1236. DOI: 10.1006/jfan.1999.3470. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jfan.1999.3470>.
- [Tru67] Neil S. Trudinger. “On Harnack type inequalities and their application to quasilinear elliptic equations”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 20 (1967), pp. 721–747. ISSN: 0010-3640. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.3160200406. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160200406>.
- [Tru68] Neil S. Trudinger. “Pointwise estimates and quasilinear parabolic equations”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 21 (1968), pp. 205–226. ISSN: 0010-3640. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.3160210302. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160210302>.
- [Yau75] Shing Tung Yau. “Harmonic functions on complete Riemannian manifolds”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 28 (1975), pp. 201–228. ISSN: 0010-3640. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.3160280203. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160280203>.

SERENA DIPIERRO: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA, 35 STIRLING HIGHWAY, CRAWLEY, PERTH, WA 6009, AUSTRALIA

Email address: `serena.dipierro@uwa.edu.au`

JACK THOMPSON: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA, 35 STIRLING HIGHWAY, CRAWLEY, PERTH, WA 6009, AUSTRALIA

Email address: `jack.thompson@research.uwa.edu.au`

ENRICO VALDINOCI: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA, 35 STIRLING HIGHWAY, CRAWLEY, PERTH, WA 6009, AUSTRALIA

Email address: `enrico.valdinoci@uwa.edu.au`