

# ASYMPTOTICS AS $s \rightarrow 0^+$ OF THE FRACTIONAL PERIMETER ON RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

MICHELE CASELLI AND LUCA GENNAIOLI

ABSTRACT. In this work we find the asymptotic behaviour as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  of the fractional  $s$ -perimeter  $P_s(E, \Omega)$  of a set  $E$  in a domain  $\Omega \subset M$ , when the ambient space is any complete Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ .

Prior to the present work, the asymptotic was studied in only two very specific cases where the explicit form of the heat kernel is known: on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  in [11] and recently on the Gaussian space in [8]. The limit is different in these two cases. Somehow surprisingly, we show that the latter behaviours are the only two possible under very general assumptions.

In the case of complete manifolds with finite volume, we find that the limit is a sort of localized Riemannian volume invariant under complementation. Our proofs are robust and they apply verbatim to the case of weighted Riemannian manifolds, thus implying the result in [8].

On the other hand, for stochastically complete Riemannian manifolds with infinite volume and having the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property, we extend the classical result in [11] for the standard  $s$ -perimeter in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and we show an analogous behaviour in the limit. Our proof exploits a nice link between the asymptotics of the fractional perimeter and the existence of bounded harmonic functions on  $M$ .

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The heat kernel on Riemannian manifolds	6
3. Asymptotics: finite volume manifolds	9
3.1. Weighted manifolds	12
4. Asymptotics: infinite volume manifolds	12
5. Extension to RCD spaces	23
6. Appendix	30
6.1. Heat kernel estimates and $H^s(M)$ spaces.	30
6.2. On the equivalence and well-posedness of different fractional Laplacians.	32
6.3. Manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature.	36
References	38

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It was recently pointed out in [9] a canonical definition of the fractional  $s$ -perimeter on every closed Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ : this boils down to giving a canonical definition of the fractional Sobolev seminorm  $H^{s/2}(M)$  for  $s \in (0, 1)$ .

Consider a closed (even though we will deal with general complete ones), connected Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  with  $n \geq 2$ . In [9] the authors show that a canonical definition of the fractional Sobolev seminorm  $H^{s/2}(M)$  can be given in at least four equivalent (up to absolute constants) ways:

(i) By the *singular integral*

$$[u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 := \iint_{M \times M} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) := \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \int_0^\infty H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \quad (2)$$

and  $H_M(x, y, t) : M \times M \times (0, \infty)$  is the heat kernel of  $M$ , that is the minimal fundamental solution to the heat equation  $\partial_t u - \Delta_g u = 0$  on  $M$ .

(ii) Following the *Bochner definition* of the fractional Laplacian

$$(-\Delta)_B^{s/2} u = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty (e^{t\Delta} u - u) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}}, \quad (3)$$

via

$$[u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = 2 \int_M u (-\Delta)_B^{s/2} u d\mu.$$

(iii) By *spectral theory*, one can set

$$[u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k^{s/2} \langle u, \phi_k \rangle_{L^2(M)}^2 \quad (4)$$

where  $\{\phi_k\}_k$  is an orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator  $(-\Delta_g)$  and  $\{\lambda_k\}_k$  are the corresponding eigenvalues. Note that for  $s = 2$  this gives the usual  $[u]_{H^1(M)}^2$  seminorm.

(iv) Considering a *Caffarelli-Silvestre type extension* (cf. [3, 6, 10]), namely, a degenerate-harmonic extension problem in one extra dimension. One can set

$$[u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \inf \left\{ \int_{M \times [0, \infty)} z^{1-s} |\tilde{\nabla} U(x, z)|^2 d\mu(x) dz \quad \text{s.t. } U(x, 0) = u(x) \right\}.$$

Here  $\tilde{\nabla}$  denotes the Riemannian gradient of the manifold  $\tilde{M} = M \times [0, \infty)$ , with respect natural product metric, and the infimum is taken over all the extensions  $U \in X$ , where  $X = H^1(\tilde{M}; z^{1-s} d\mu dz)$  is the classical weighted Sobolev space of the functions  $U \in L^2(\tilde{M}; d\mu)$  with respect to the measure  $d\mu = z^{1-s} d\mu dz$  that admit a weak gradient  $\tilde{\nabla} U \in L^2(\tilde{M}; d\mu)$ .

The spectral definition (iii) can be extended to manifolds that are not closed, where the spectrum of the Laplacian is not discrete. Nevertheless, the equivalence between (i) and (iv) also holds on many (but not every) complete Riemannian manifolds, not necessarily compact. For example, a lower Ricci curvature bound is sufficient. See [3] for general conditions for which the equivalence of (i)  $\iff$  (iv) holds. Moreover, the equivalence between (i) and (ii) holds if and only if  $M$  is stochastically complete, we will treat this equivalence in [subsection 6.2](#).

Since in the present work we aim to study the asymptotics of the fractional  $s$ -perimeter on complete Riemannian manifolds (not necessarily closed or with curvature bounded below), we work with the singular integral definition (1) since it extends naturally to the case of general manifolds and weighted manifolds. Then, the fractional  $s$ -perimeter on a Riemannian manifold is naturally defined by means of the fractional Sobolev seminorm.

Here and in the rest of the work  $(M, g)$  will denote a general complete, connected Riemannian manifold, and hence also geodesically complete. We denote by  $d\mu$  its Riemannian volume form and by  $H_M(x, y, t)$  the heat kernel of  $(M, g)$ . To see how to build the heat kernel on a general

(weighted) manifold, see the classical reference [18]. Moreover, we denote by  $B_R(p) \subset M$  the geodesics ball on  $M$  and by  $\mathcal{B}_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  the one on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Definition 1.1.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold and  $s \in (0, 1)$ . Then, we set*

$$H^s(M) := \{u \in L^2(M) : [u]_{H^s(M)}^2 < \infty\},$$

where

$$[u]_{H^s(M)}^2 := \iint_{M \times M} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \mathcal{K}_{2s}(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y),$$

and  $\mathcal{K}_{2s}$  is defined as in (2).

Note that in Definition 1.1 the fractional Sobolev seminorm is equal to

$$[u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = 2 \int_M u (-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u d\mu,$$

where

$$(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u(x) := \text{P.V.} \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \int_M (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \quad (5)$$

is "the fractional Laplacian" on  $M$ . We stress that in a completely general setting (such as the one of complete Riemannian manifolds) this integro-differential operator could be far from being a fractional power of the Laplacian in any reasonable sense. In particular:

- If  $M$  is not stochastically complete (see Definition 2.1), then (i) and (ii) do not coincide. In this case, since  $e^{t\Delta} 1 \neq 1$ , the Bochner fractional Laplacian (ii) of a constant is not equal to zero. In particular, defining the fractional Sobolev seminorm with (ii) would imply that the  $s$ -perimeter is not invariant under complementation  $P_s(E) \neq P_s(E^c)$ . Nevertheless, with our definition via the singular integral (i), one has that the seminorm of a constant is always zero and hence in this work the fractional perimeter is always invariant under complementation.
- The semigroup property  $(-\Delta)^{\alpha+\beta} = (-\Delta)^\alpha \circ (-\Delta)^\beta$  also fails in general for our definition (5). Indeed, one can see that the equivalence (i)  $\iff$  (iv) above is sufficient for the semigroup property to hold. For example, a Ricci curvature lower bound would be sufficient. See [3] for many sufficient conditions for the equivalence (i)  $\iff$  (iv).
- All these definitions (the ones presented here and more) coincide for  $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$ .

In the present work, when we will write  $(-\Delta)^{s/2}$  without any subscript we will *always* mean the singular integral  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u$  defined in (5).

**Definition 1.2.** *For a measurable set  $E \subset M$ , we define the fractional  $s$ -perimeter of  $E$  on  $(M, g)$  as*

$$P_s(E) := [\chi_E]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = 2 \iint_{E \times E^c} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y),$$

where  $[\cdot]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2$  is defined by (1) and  $\chi_E$  is the characteristic function of  $E$ .

Apart from the above definition of the fractional perimeter of a set  $E$  on the entire  $M$ , we will also consider its localized version. For  $A, B \subset M$  disjoint and measurable sets, let

$$\mathcal{J}_s(A, B) := \iint_{A \times B} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y)$$

be the  $s$ -interaction functional between the sets  $A$  and  $B$ .

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold, and let  $\Omega \subset M$  be an open and connected set with Lipschitz boundary. We define the  $s$ -perimeter of  $E$  in  $\Omega$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E, \Omega) &:= \iint_{M \times M \setminus \Omega^c \times \Omega^c} (\chi_E(x) - \chi_E(y))^2 \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega, E^c \cap \Omega) + \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega, E^c \cap \Omega^c) + \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega^c, E^c \cap \Omega). \end{aligned}$$

For any measurable  $E \subset M$ , it is clear by the definition above that  $P_s(E, \Omega) = P_s(E^c, \Omega)$ , that  $P_s(E, M) = P_s(E) = [\chi_E]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2$  and also that  $P_s(E, \Omega) = P_s(E)$  if  $E \subset \Omega$  or  $E^c \subset \Omega$ .

The asymptotics as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  of the fractional perimeter has been previously studied in [11] and [8], where the authors deal with the case of ambient  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and the Gaussian space respectively. In these two cases, the result of the asymptotics is very different. Moreover, in the case of the Gaussian space the limit always exists (say, for sets with smooth boundary), but in the case of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  the limit may not exist even for smooth sets. An example of such a set can be found in [11]. This effect is due to the non-locality of the fractional perimeter and interactions coming from infinity.

In this work we deal with the asymptotics of the  $s$ -fractional perimeter as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  in general ambient spaces, generalizing both the results [11] and [8]. In doing so we decided to divide the paper in two parts: in the first one we study the asymptotics for Riemannian manifolds with finite volume, while in the second part we focus on Riemannian manifolds with infinite volume, where several techniques of the finite volume setting are not available.

On the one hand, in the case  $\mu(M) < +\infty$ , no interactions coming from infinity are present and the rescaled fractional perimeter always converges to a Riemannian volume invariant under complementation (as perimeters are). Our result is formally identical to the one for the Gaussian space in [8], and indeed the result in [8] follows from our techniques applied to weighted Riemannian manifolds. See subsection 3.1 for details.

The following are the main results of our work.

**Theorem 1.4** (Finite volume asymptotics). *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) < +\infty$ , and let  $\Omega \subset M$  be an open and connected set with Lipschitz boundary. If for some set  $E \subset M$  there exists  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $P_{s_0}(E, \Omega) < +\infty$ , then the limit  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E, \Omega)$  exists and*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E, \Omega) = \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \left( \mu(E)\mu(E^c \cap \Omega) + \mu(E \cap \Omega)\mu(E^c \cap \Omega^c) \right).$$

On the other hand, in the case of infinite volume we observe a behaviour analogous to the case of ambient  $\mathbb{R}^n$  studied in [11], under very mild assumptions.

**Theorem 1.5** (Infinite volume asymptotics). *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete, stochastically complete Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ . Let  $\Omega \subset M$  be an open, bounded, connected set with Lipschitz boundary. Let also  $E \subset M$  be a measurable set with  $P_{s_0}(E, \Omega) < +\infty$  for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ . Then*

(i) For  $R > 0$  and  $p \in M$  we have

$$\theta(M) := \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{M \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) = 1, \quad (6)$$

meaning that the limit exists, does not depend on the choice of  $R$  and  $p$  and is always equal to one.

(ii) If for some  $R > 0$ ,  $p \in M$ , the following limit exists

$$\theta_p(E) := \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) \in [0, 1], \quad (7)$$

then it is independent of the choice of  $R$ , and  $p \mapsto \theta_p(E)$  is harmonic with values in  $[0, 1]$ . In particular, if  $M$  has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property (see Definition 2.4) the limit is also independent of  $p$ . In this case, the limit  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega)$  exists and<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) &= (1 - \theta(E))\mu(E \cap \Omega) + \theta(E)\mu(E^c \cap \Omega) \\ &= \theta(E^c)\mu(E \cap \Omega) + \theta(E)\mu(E^c \cap \Omega). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Conversely, if  $\mu(\Omega \cap E) \neq \mu(\Omega \setminus E)$  and the limit  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega)$  exists, then the limit in (7) exists and there holds

$$\theta(E) = \frac{\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) - \mu(E \cap \Omega)}{\mu(\Omega \setminus E) - \mu(E \cap \Omega)}.$$

(iv) If  $\mu(\Omega \cap E) = \mu(\Omega \setminus E)$  then the limit  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega)$  always exists and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) = \mu(\Omega \cap E) = \mu(\Omega \setminus E).$$

Hence, with Theorem 1.4 and 1.5 we show that these two behaviours, the one of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and the Gaussian space, are essentially the only two possible also in this general setting.

**Remark 1.6.** The hypothesis  $P_{s_0}(E, \Omega) < +\infty$  for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$  cannot be removed in neither of these results. Indeed, in [11, Example 2.10] the authors exhibit a bounded set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $P_s(E) = +\infty$  for all  $s \in (0, 1)$ .

**Remark 1.7.** Note that for  $M = \mathbb{R}^n$  with its standard metric a direct computation gives  $\mathcal{K}_s(x, p) = \frac{\beta_{n,s}}{|x-p|^{n+s}}$ , where

$$\beta_{n,s} = \frac{s2^{s-1}\Gamma\left(\frac{n+s}{2}\right)}{\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(1-s/2)}.$$

Hence

$$\theta(\mathbb{R}^n) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \cap B_R^c(p)} \frac{\beta_{n,s}}{|x-p|^{n+s}} dx = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{2\pi^{n/2}} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \cap B_1^c(0)} \frac{1}{|x|^{n+s}} dx = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{2\pi^{n/2}} \alpha_{n-1} = 1,$$

where  $\alpha_{n-1}$  is the volume of the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . Moreover, analogously for  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  (if the limit exists)

$$\theta(E) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{E \cap B_1^c(0)} \frac{\beta_{n,s}}{|x|^{n+s}} dx = \frac{1}{\alpha_{n-1}} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{E \cap B_1^c(0)} \frac{1}{|x|^{n+s}} dx \in [0, 1],$$

which is (up to the absolute multiplicative constant  $\alpha_{n-1}^{-1}$ ) what is denoted by  $\alpha(E)$  in [11]. Hence, we see that in the case of the Euclidean space our result Theorem 1.5 recovers the one in [11].

**Remark 1.8.** Note that, as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ , the constant in (2) satisfies

$$\frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} = \frac{s/2}{\Gamma(1-s/2)} \sim \frac{s}{2}.$$

We will use this fact many times in the computations of the asymptotics.

The paper is divided as follows. In section 2 we recall some facts and definitions that we will need regarding the heat kernel and harmonic functions on general complete manifolds. Then, section 3 is devoted to proving the asymptotics for finite volume manifolds Theorem 1.4. Similarly, in section 4 we prove our main result Theorem 1.5 for infinite volume.

<sup>1</sup>Since  $\theta(E^c) = 1 - \theta(E)$  in this case.

Lastly, in [section 5](#) we explain why our results hold in a much more general setting than the one of Riemannian manifolds, namely RCD spaces. We could have proved our theorem directly in this generality, but we believe that a presentation for Riemannian manifolds is easier to follow and already captures all the possible (two) behaviours of the limit: this also allows us to present different proofs. For these reasons we have moved everything regarding non-smooth spaces to [section 5](#).

## 2. THE HEAT KERNEL ON RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

Let us start by recalling few classical definitions and results.

**Definition 2.1** (Stochastic completeness). *We call a Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  stochastically complete if, for every  $t > 0$  and for every  $p \in M$*

$$\int_M H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) = 1. \quad (8)$$

For equivalent definitions of stochastic completeness one can refer to the manuscript [\[19\]](#) or to the more recent [\[20\]](#) and [\[21\]](#).

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold, then for every  $p \in M$*

$$\mathcal{M}(t, p) = \int_M H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \text{ is nonincreasing in } t.$$

*Proof.* The proof is an easy consequence of the semigroup property. Indeed, for  $t > s$  we can write

$$H_M(z, p, t) = \int_M H_M(z, x, t-s) H_M(x, p, s) d\mu(x).$$

Integrating in  $d\mu(z)$ , using Fubini's theorem and the fact that  $\int_M H_M(z, x, t-s) d\mu(x) \leq 1$  we get

$$\int_M H_M(z, p, t) d\mu(z) \leq \int_M H_M(x, p, s) d\mu(x),$$

which is the thesis.  $\square$

Note that, because of [Lemma 2.2](#), being stochastically complete is equivalent to the fact that [\(8\)](#) holds for one single time  $t = t_0 > 0$ .

**Theorem 2.3** (Yau). *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then every  $L^2(M)$  harmonic function is constant.*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in L^2(M)$  be harmonic. It is a standard result by Yau (see for example [\[24, Lemma 7.1\]](#)) that, on every complete Riemannian manifold  $M$ , the Caccioppoli-type inequality

$$\int_{B_R(p)} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu \leq \frac{4}{R^2} \int_{B_{2R}(p)} |u|^2 d\mu \quad (9)$$

holds. Since  $u \in L^2(M)$ , letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$  gives that  $u$  is constant.  $\square$

**Definition 2.4** ( $L^\infty$  – Liouville property). *We say that a Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property if every bounded harmonic function on  $M$  is constant.*

Since the validity of the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property will be a key feature in our result for infinite volume, we shall recall few conditions that imply this property. See [\[16\]](#) for more general conditions under which the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property holds.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then, each of the following properties implies the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property for  $M$ :*

- (i)  $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$ .
- (ii)  $\mu(B_R(p))/R^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $R \rightarrow \infty$  for some (and hence any)  $p \in M$ .
- (iii) There exists a metric  $\tilde{g}$  on  $M$  and  $K \subset M$  compact such that  $\tilde{g} = g$  in  $M \setminus K$  and  $(M, \tilde{g})$  has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property.

*Proof.* To show (i) we just need to apply the  $L^\infty$  – Lip regularization of (26), that we state in general for RCD spaces in section 5 and we give a simple proof at the end of the Appendix. Indeed let  $u \in L^\infty(M)$  be such a function: we can clearly assume  $\|u\|_{L^\infty} = 1$  so that we have  $\|\nabla e^{t\Delta}u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C/\sqrt{t}$ . The previous estimate tells us that  $\|\nabla e^{t\Delta}u\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  so that  $e^{t\Delta}u \rightarrow \text{const}$  weakly star in  $L^\infty(M)$ . However we also know that  $e^{t\Delta}u = u$  for every  $t \in (0, \infty)$  because of the uniqueness of the solution of the heat equation (due to stochastical completeness which holds in the presence of a lower Ricci curvature bound) and this means that  $u$  has to be constant.

Part (ii) follows from Yau’s estimate (9) letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . Lastly, the proof of part (iii) is contained in [16, Proposition 4.2] and [16, Theorem 5.1].  $\square$

Notice that  $\text{Ric}_M \geq -K$  for some  $K > 0$  is not sufficient for the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property to hold, since there exist non-constant bounded harmonic functions on the hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^n$ . Since  $\mathbb{H}^n$  is stochastically complete, this means that stochastical completeness does not imply the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property. Moreover, quite surprisingly, stochastical completeness of  $M$  is not implied by the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property. The first example of such a manifold was constructed by Pinchover in [26], we briefly explain this construction in Example 4.11. We shall now prove a convergence result for the heat kernel which in the case  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , although being probably known to experts, seems to be new. We stress that these results easily extend to the context of weighted Riemannian manifolds.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a connected, complete, Riemannian manifold. Then*

- (i) *If  $\mu(M) < +\infty$ , then for all  $x, y \in M$*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} H_M(x, y, t) = \frac{1}{\mu(M)},$$

*and the convergence is uniform in every bounded  $\Omega \subset M$ , that is*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x, y \in \Omega} \left| H_M(x, y, t) - \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \right| = 0.$$

- (ii) *If  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , then for all  $x, y \in M$*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} H_M(x, y, t) = 0,$$

*and the convergence is uniform in every bounded  $\Omega \subset M$ , that is*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x, y \in \Omega} H_M(x, y, t) = 0.$$

*Moreover, for every fixed  $p \in M$  there holds also*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in M} H_M(x, p, t) = 0. \tag{10}$$

*Proof.* To prove the result in the case  $\mu(M) < +\infty$  we use standard spectral theory: indeed the spectrum of the Laplacian  $\sigma(-\Delta)$  is contained in  $[0, \infty)$  and  $0 \in \sigma(-\Delta)$  lies in the point spectrum

with eigenfunction  $\varphi_1(x) = \mu(M)^{-1/2}$ . Let  $\{E_\lambda\}_{\lambda \geq 0}$  be the spectral resolution of the Laplacian, then for every  $f \in L^2(M)$  (here  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the  $L^2$  scalar product):

$$\langle e^{t\Delta} f, f \rangle = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\lambda} d\langle E_\lambda f, f \rangle.$$

Since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda t} = \chi_{\{0\}}(\lambda)$  we can apply dominated convergence to deduce that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \langle e^{t\Delta} f, f \rangle = \langle E_0 f, f \rangle$$

and since  $E_0$  projects onto the eigenspace of  $\lambda = 0$  we get that for every  $f$  with unit norm we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle e^{t\Delta} f, f \rangle = \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \langle f, f \rangle.$$

This proves that  $e^{t\Delta} f \rightarrow \frac{f}{\mu(M)}$  weakly for every  $f$ . Now note that

$$|\langle e^{t\Delta} f, f \rangle| = |\langle e^{t/2\Delta} f, e^{t/2\Delta} f \rangle|,$$

therefore the weak convergence is actually strong in  $L^2(M)$ . This concludes the first part of (i). To show that the convergence is uniform in a bounded region, one can just apply the argument below (that we show in a moment for the case  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ ) with the local Harnack inequality to the function  $H_M(x, y, t) - 1/\mu(M)$ , which goes to 0 in  $L^2(M)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and it is still a solution of the heat equation.

If  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , we have again

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle e^{t\Delta} f, f \rangle = \langle E_0 f, f \rangle$$

but now via Theorem 2.3 we know that the eigenspace of  $\lambda = 0$  contains no constant function except for the function identically 0, meaning

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle e^{t\Delta} f, f \rangle = 0.$$

By a local parabolic Harnack inequality we are able to turn this convergence into pointwise convergence and actually locally uniform. Indeed for  $p \in M$ ,  $R \ll 1$  to be chosen depending on  $p$ , and  $t \geq 10$ , taking  $f = \chi_{B_R(p)}$  above gives

$$\langle e^{t\Delta} \chi_{B_R(p)}, \chi_{B_R(p)} \rangle = \int_{B_R(p)} \int_{B_R(p)} H_M(x, y, t) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \geq \mu(B_R(p))^2 \inf_{x, y \in B_R(p)} H_M(x, y, t).$$

By the parabolic Harnack inequality (see Remark 2.8 after this proof) applied two times

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x, y \in B_R(p)} H_M(x, y, t) &\geq C^{-1} \inf_{x \in B_R(p)} \sup_{y \in B_R(p)} H_M(x, y, t - 1/2) \\ &\geq C^{-1} \sup_{x \in B_R(p)} \inf_{y \in B_R(p)} H_M(x, y, t - 1/2) \\ &\geq C^{-2} \sup_{x, y \in B_R(p)} H_M(x, y, t - 1), \end{aligned}$$

for some  $C > 0$  depending on  $B_R(p) \subset M$  but independent of  $t$ . Hence

$$\sup_{x, y \in B_R(p)} H_M(x, y, t) \leq C(B_R(p)) \langle e^{(t+1)\Delta} \chi_{B_R(p)}, \chi_{B_R(p)} \rangle \rightarrow 0,$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Covering any bounded set with small balls allows us to infer the desired local uniform convergence.



We are left to prove (10). By the properties of the heat kernel we have

$$H_M(p, p, t) = \int_M H_M^2(p, z, t/2) d\mu(z) = \|H_M(p, \cdot, t/2)\|_{L^2(M)}^2.$$

Moreover

$$H_M(x, p, t) = \int_M H_M(x, z, t/2) H_M(p, z, t/2) d\mu(z) \leq \sqrt{H_M(p, p, t)} \|H_M(x, \cdot, t/2)\|_{L^2(M)},$$

which concludes the proof if we are able to show that  $\sup_{x \in M} \|H_M(x, \cdot, t/2)\|_{L^2(M)}$  is bounded as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . However since  $H_M(x, y, t) = e^{(t-1)\Delta}(H_M(x, \cdot, 1))(y)$  and we have the contraction estimate  $\|e^{s\Delta}(f)\|_{L^2(M)} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(M)}$  for every  $s \in (0, \infty)$  and for every  $f \in L^2(M)$  we can write

$$\|H_M(x, \cdot, t)\|_{L^2(M)} = \|e^{(t-1)\Delta}(H_M(x, \cdot, 1))\|_{L^2} \leq \|H_M(x, \cdot, 1)\|_{L^2} \quad \forall t > 1.$$

Therefore we reach the sought conclusion.  $\square$

**Remark 2.7.** *Being the heat kernel equibounded in  $L^1(M)$  and convergent to 0 in  $L^\infty(M)$ , it also converges to 0 in any  $L^p(M)$  with  $p \in (1, \infty]$ . The convergence is clearly prevented in  $L^1(M)$  if  $M$  is stochastically complete.*

**Remark 2.8.** *We emphasize that we have used only a local (non-uniform) Harnack inequality in  $B_R(p) \subset M$ , that is where the constant is allowed to depend on the point  $p$  and radius  $R$ . This is clear since, for fixed  $p \in M$  one can take  $R \ll 1$  such that, in normal coordinates at  $p$ , the metric coefficients satisfy  $\|g_{ij} - \delta_{ij}\|_{C^2(B_R(p))} \leq 1/100$ . Then, any solution  $u : B_R(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to the heat equation on  $M$  satisfies (in coordinates)*

$$u_t - Lu = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}_R(0) \times (0, +\infty),$$

where  $-L$  is a uniformly elliptic operator with uniformly bounded coefficients. Hence, by the standard Harnack inequality on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  one can conclude the local estimate.

On the other hand, for general Riemannian manifolds, a uniform Harnack inequality (that is, with the constant independent of  $R$  and the point  $p$ ) fails, and strong assumptions are required for it to hold. Actually, the validity of a Volume Doubling property and a uniform Poincaré inequality is equivalent to the uniform Harnack inequality, this was first proved in [27].

**Remark 2.9.** *One can turn the previous local uniform convergence in (10) into convergence of solutions of the heat equation. Indeed, in the case  $\mu(M) < +\infty$ , since  $H_M(\cdot, p, t)$  converges uniformly to zero we get (by dominated convergence)*

$$e^{t\Delta} f(y) = \int_M H_M(x, y, t) f(x) d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

for every  $y \in M$  and  $f \in L^1(M)$ .

### 3. ASYMPTOTICS: FINITE VOLUME MANIFOLDS

We first give a simple proof of our main theorem in the case  $\Omega = M$ , using our results from subsection 6.2 on the equivalence of the spectral fractional Laplacian and ours defined by the singular integral (5).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) < +\infty$  and let  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ . Then, for every  $u \in H^{s_0/2}(M)$  there holds*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 - \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \left( \int_M u d\mu \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{E_\lambda\}_{\lambda \geq 0}$  be the spectral resolution of the Laplacian  $-\Delta$  on  $L^2(M)$ , and let  $\sigma(-\Delta) \subset [0, \infty)$  be the spectrum of  $-\Delta$ . In particular, for every  $u \in L^2(M)$ ,  $d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle$  is a regular Borel (real valued) measure on  $[0, \infty)$  concentrated on  $\sigma(-\Delta)$ , and with

$$\|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 = \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle.$$

We refer to [18, Appendix A.5] for an introduction and properties of the spectral resolution. Since  $\mu(M) < +\infty$ , we have that  $0 \in \sigma(-\Delta)$  lies in the point spectrum with eigenfunction  $\phi_0 = \mu(M)^{-1/2}$ . Then

$$-\Delta = \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} \lambda dE_\lambda,$$

and

$$(-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2} = \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} \lambda^{s/2} dE_\lambda,$$

on

$$\text{Dom}((-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2}) := \left\{ u \in L^2(M) : \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} \lambda^s d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle < +\infty \right\}.$$

Hence, for all  $s < s_\circ$  by Corollary 6.8

$$\frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \int_M u (-\Delta)^{s/2} u d\mu = \int_{\sigma(-\Delta) \setminus \{0\}} \lambda^{s/2} d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle.$$

Taking the limit as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  gives

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \int_{\sigma(-\Delta) \setminus \{0\}} d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle = \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 - \langle E_0 u, u \rangle = \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 - \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \left( \int_M u d\mu \right)^2,$$

where in the last line we have used that  $E_0$  is the projector onto the eigenspace of  $-\Delta$  relative to the eigenvalue  $\lambda = 0$ , but by a result of Yau (see Theorem 2.3) on a complete manifold every  $L^2(M)$  harmonic function is constant and then  $\langle E_0 u, u \rangle = \langle \phi_0, u \rangle_{L^2(M)}^2 = \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \left( \int_M u d\mu \right)^2$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *This result allows to prove our main theorem in the case  $\Omega = M$ . Indeed, if  $E \subset M$  is such that  $P_{s_\circ}(E) < +\infty$  for some  $s_\circ \in (0, 1)$ , then taking  $u = \chi_E$  in Theorem 3.1 gives*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E) = \mu(E) - \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mu(E)^2 = \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mu(E) \mu(E^c).$$

Now we turn to the proof of the main theorem in its general (localized) form.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* First, we claim that for every  $A, B \subset M$  disjoint, measurable, and with  $\mathcal{J}_{s_\circ}(A, B) < +\infty$  there holds

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \mathcal{J}_s(A, B) - \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \iint_{A \times B} \int_{1/s}^\infty H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \right| = 0. \quad (11)$$

Indeed, since  $\int_M H_M(x, y, t) d\mu(x) = 1$  for all  $y \in M$  (this holds since every complete manifold with finite volume is stochastically complete) and  $t \in (0, \infty)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{J}_s(A, B) - \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \iint_{A \times B} \int_{1/s}^{\infty} H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \right| \\ &= \iint_{A \times B} \left( \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) - \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \int_{1/s}^{\infty} H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \iint_{A \times B} \left( \int_0^1 H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} + \int_1^{1/s} H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq C s \iint_{A \times B} \int_0^{\infty} H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s_0/2}} + C s \mu(M) \int_1^{1/s} \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &= C s \mathcal{J}_{s_0}(A, B) + C \mu(M) (1 - s^{s/2}), \end{aligned}$$

and taking  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  proves the claim.

Moreover

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \iint_{A \times B} \int_{1/s}^{\infty} H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) = \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mu(A) \mu(B). \quad (12)$$

Indeed

$$s \int_{1/s}^{\infty} H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} = s^{1+s/2} \int_1^{\infty} H(x, y, r/s) \frac{dr}{r^{1+s/2}},$$

and since by Lemma 2.6 as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  the heat kernel  $H_M(x, y, t)$  converges to  $1/\mu(M)$  for all  $x, y \in M$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \iint_{A \times B} \int_{1/s}^{\infty} H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) &= \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mu(A) \mu(B) \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} (s/2) s^{s/2} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{dr}{r^{1+s/2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mu(A) \mu(B). \end{aligned}$$

Then, putting together (11) and (12) readily implies

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{J}_s(A, B) = \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mu(A) \mu(B).$$

Lastly, since  $P_{s_0}(E, \Omega) < +\infty$  and

$$\frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) = \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega, E^c \cap \Omega) + \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega, E^c \cap \Omega^c) + \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega^c, E^c \cap \Omega),$$

the theorem follows letting  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ . □

In [8] the authors prove the following result regarding the  $s$ -perimeter of the Gaussian space. Since the total mass of the Gaussian space is one, we see that this is formally identical to our Theorem 1.4 for finite volume.

**Theorem 3.3** (Main Theorem in [8]). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open and connected set with Lipschitz boundary. Then, for any  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  measurable set such that  $P_{s_0}^\gamma(E, \Omega) < +\infty$  for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$  there holds*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} P_s^\gamma(E; \Omega) = \gamma(E) \gamma(E^c \cap \Omega) + \gamma(E \cap \Omega) \gamma(E^c \cap \Omega^c),$$

where  $P_s^\gamma(E, \Omega)$  is the fractional Gaussian perimeter

$$P_s^\gamma(E, \Omega) = \iint_{E \cap \Omega \times E^c \cap \Omega} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\gamma_x d\gamma_y + \iint_{E \cap \Omega \times E^c \cap \Omega} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\gamma_x d\gamma_y + \iint_{E \cap \Omega \times E^c \cap \Omega} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\gamma_x d\gamma_y,$$

and  $\mathcal{K}_s(x, y)$  is defined as in (2) with on the right-hand side the heat kernel  $H_\gamma$  of the Gaussian space  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \gamma)$ , where  $d\gamma(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} e^{-|x|^2/2} \mathcal{L}^n(dx)$ .

The proof in [8] follows the same lines as our proof of Theorem 1.4, but the authors heavily use the fact that they know the explicit form of the heat kernel  $H_\gamma$  for the Gaussian space. In the next subsection we briefly explain how our method, applied to weighted manifolds, implies their result.

**3.1. Weighted manifolds.** Our result for finite volume manifolds extends, with proofs mutatis mutandis, to the case of weighted manifolds with finite volume, implying the one in [8].

A weighted manifold is a Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  endowed with a measure  $\mu$  that has a smooth positive density with respect to the Riemannian volume form  $dV_g$ . The space  $(M, g, \mu)$  features the so called weighted Laplace operator  $-\Delta_\mu$ , generalizing the Laplace-Beltrami operator, which is symmetric with respect to measure  $\mu$ . It is possible to extend  $-\Delta_\mu$  to a self-adjoint operator in  $L^2(M, \mu)$ , which allows to define the heat semigroup  $e^{t\Delta_\mu}$  as one would on a classical Riemannian manifold. The heat semigroup has the integral kernel  $H_\mu(x, y, t)$ , which is called the heat kernel of  $(M, g, \mu)$ , and has completely analogous properties as the classical one. For every detail regarding the heat kernel on weighted manifolds, we refer to the survey [17].

In this case, we see that our proof applies since Lemma 2.6 also holds (with the same proof) on geodesically complete weighted manifolds, and also Theorem 3.1 holds with the same proof, since our results from subsection 6.2 are valid for weighted manifolds too.

Moreover, our method works also for manifolds with boundary and finite volume. Indeed, if  $(M, g)$  is a complete manifold with (possibly empty) boundary and finite volume, and one defines  $\mathcal{K}_s(x, y)$  by (2) with the heat kernel with Neumann boundary conditions on the right-hand side, then the same proof applies.

#### 4. ASYMPTOTICS: INFINITE VOLUME MANIFOLDS

First, we shall briefly comment on the following quantity

$$\alpha(E) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{E \setminus B_1(0)} \frac{1}{|y|^{n+s}} dy,$$

introduced by Dipierro, Figalli, Palatucci and Valdinoci in [11] as a measure of the behaviour of the set  $E$  near infinity, and which is (up to a dimensional constant) the limit in (6) in the case  $M = \mathbb{R}^n$  with its standard metric. This quantity is invariant by rescalings of  $E$  and it is a measure of "how conical" is  $E$  near infinity. Indeed, if the blow-down  $E/\lambda$  converges in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  to a regular cone  $E_\infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\alpha(E) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E_\infty \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ . Nevertheless, the fact that this limit exists is not equivalent to having a conical blow-down. Indeed, one can easily construct examples where the limit in  $\alpha(E)$  exists but the blow downs of  $E$  converge to two different cones along two different subsequences.

Finally the authors in [11] refer to  $\alpha(E)$  as the weighted volume towards infinity of the set  $E$ , however in light of our results and description it would be more appropriate to call this quantity *heat density over  $E$* . Indeed,  $\alpha(E)$  represents the fraction of heat kernel which flows through the set towards infinity (this explains why  $\theta(M) = 1$  on stochastically complete manifolds).

Because of this intuitive reason, the limit in the definition of  $\alpha(E)$  needs not to exist in general if  $E$ , for example, oscillates between two cones near infinity. See [11, Example 2.8] for the construction of such an example.

On a Riemannian manifold, a similar quantity is needed but, since no canonical origin (as in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) is present, the singular kernel  $1/|y|^{n+s}$  has to be replaced with  $\mathcal{K}_s(y, p)$  and it has to be proved if and when the limit (7) becomes independent of  $p \in M$ . On Riemannian manifolds, this property of the limit being independent of the base point  $p$  turns out to be quite delicate, and we will see in the proof of Proposition 4.4 below that is implied by the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property of Definition 2.4.

**Definition 4.1** (Heat density of a set). *Let  $E \subset M$  be a measurable set with  $P_{s_0}(E, \Omega) < +\infty$  for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ . We define, for every fixed  $p \in M$  and  $R > 0$ , the heat density of  $E$  as the following limit*

$$\theta_{p,R}(E) := \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x), \quad (13)$$

when it exists. At this level this may depend on  $p$  and  $R$ .

Note that, at this point, it is not even clear whether the limit (6) of the heat density  $\theta(M)$  of the whole  $M$  exists, or is different from zero. For example, if there were complete Riemannian manifolds with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$  and  $\theta(M) \neq 1$ , then we would see the asymptotic

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) = (\theta(M) - \theta(E))\mu(E \cap \Omega) + \theta(E)\mu(E^c \cap \Omega)$$

holding (even when  $\theta(M) \neq 1$ ), and if  $\theta(M) = 0$  this would mean that there are Riemannian manifolds where the asymptotic of the fractional  $s$ -perimeter of any set  $E$  is zero. These type of Riemannian manifolds actually do exist and, since  $\theta(M) \neq 1$  in this case, they are not stochastically complete. We will describe such a manifold in Example 4.11.

Now, we show that this does not happen if  $M$  is stochastically complete: the limit (6) always exists and it is equal to one. Actually more is true: if there is a point  $p \in M$  for which the limit is 1 then the manifold is stochastically complete.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a geodesically complete Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ . If  $M$  is stochastically complete, then*

$$\theta(M) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{M \setminus B_1(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) = 1 \quad \forall p \in M. \quad (14)$$

Conversely, if there exists  $p \in M$  such that

$$\theta_p(M) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{M \setminus B_1(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) = 1, \quad (15)$$

then  $M$  is stochastically complete.

*Proof.* Note that since  $\mu(M) = +\infty$  we have  $\mu(M \setminus B_1(p)) > 0$ . We want to compute the following

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{M \setminus B_1(p)} \int_0^\infty H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x).$$

**Claim 1.** There holds

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{M \setminus B_1(p)} \int_0^1 H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = 0.$$

Indeed, this directly follows by writing

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{M \setminus B_1(p)} \int_0^1 H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_0^1 e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{M \setminus B_r(p)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}}$$

and exploiting the estimate of Lemma 6.2.

**Claim 2.** There holds

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{B_1(p)} \int_1^\infty H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = 0. \quad (16)$$

By the uniform convergence of the heat kernel to zero (in particular, by the result contained in Remark 2.9) we get that  $e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{B_1(p)})(p) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $T = T(\varepsilon)$  such that  $e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{B_1(p)})(p) \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $t \geq T$ , whence

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_1^\infty e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{B_1(p)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_1^T \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} + \varepsilon \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_T^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \leq \varepsilon,$$

for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , proving the second claim.

Now, thanks to the first claim we can reduce ourselves to computing

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{M \setminus B_1(p)} \int_1^\infty H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x).$$

Then we can then add (16) to the previous limit, which gives zero contribution, and we end up with

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_M \int_1^\infty H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x).$$

Using Fubini and the stochastic completeness of  $M$  we get

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_M \int_1^\infty H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_1^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = 1,$$

and this concludes the proof.

Conversely assume that (14) holds, then since both the previous claims hold on any connected and geodesically complete Riemannian manifold we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_M \int_1^\infty H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = 1.$$

Setting  $\mathcal{M}(t, p) = \int_M H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \leq 1$  we can infer that, for every  $T > 0$

$$1 = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_T^\infty \frac{\mathcal{M}(t, p)}{t^{1+s/2}} dt \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_T^\infty \frac{1}{t^{1+s/2}} dt = 1.$$

Now, assume by contradiction that  $M$  is not stochastically complete. Then since  $\mathcal{M}(t, p)$  is nonincreasing in time and nonnegative, there holds  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(t, p) \leq 1 - \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , and we would have  $\mathcal{M}(t, p) \leq 1 - \delta/2$  for every  $t \geq T = T(\delta)$ . This gives

$$1 = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_T^\infty \frac{\mathcal{M}(t, p)}{t^{1+s/2}} dt \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_T^\infty \frac{1 - \delta/2}{t^{1+s/2}} dt = 1 - \delta/2,$$

reaching a contradiction, hence  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(t, p) = 1$  and thanks to Lemma (2.2) we conclude.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** *Following the proof of Proposition 4.2 one can see a clear picture of what happens to the limit in  $\theta_p(M)$  even when  $M$  is not stochastically complete. Let us write  $\theta_M(p) := \theta_p(M)$  as a function of  $p$  for  $M$  fixed. Indeed, for every Riemannian manifold (not necessarily stochastically complete) and  $p \in M$  the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(t, p)$  exists. This just follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot, p)$  is nonincreasing and nonnegative, see Lemma 2.2. Since*

$$\mathcal{M}(t, p) = \int_M H_M(p, x, t) d\mu(x) = e^{t\Delta} 1$$

*is a solution to the heat equation starting from the function equal to one, it follows from the proof above and from standard parabolic estimates that  $\mathcal{M}(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \theta_M$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^2(M)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\theta_M : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a bounded, nonnegative harmonic function on  $M$ . Therefore:*

- (i) *If  $M$  is stochastically complete we have  $\theta_M \equiv 1$  (in particular the value of  $\theta_M$  does not depend on the point) and the proof above shows  $\theta(M) = 1$ .*
- (ii) *If  $M$  is not stochastically complete but satisfies the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property (see Definition 2.4) we know that  $\theta_M \equiv \theta_\circ \in [0, 1)$  and, following the proof of the proposition, one finds that the limit in the definition of  $\theta(M)$  exists, does not depend on the point  $p$  and there holds  $\theta(M) = \theta_\circ$ . Note that such Riemannian manifolds actually exist and they were first constructed in [26]. We provide a description in Example 4.11 of one with  $\theta_\circ = 0$ .*
- (iii) *If  $M$  is not stochastically complete and does not satisfy the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property, then in general  $\theta_M$  is a nonconstant harmonic function on  $M$ , the value of  $\theta_p(M)$  can depend on the point  $p$  and there holds*

$$\theta_p(M) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{M \setminus B_1(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) = \theta_M(p). \quad (17)$$

We now show (among other things) that (13) is well-posed for manifolds with the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property, in the sense that it does not depend on the choice of  $p$  and  $R$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$  and let  $E \subset M$  a measurable set. Then*

- (i) *If for some  $p \in M$  and  $R > 0$ , the heat density  $\theta_{p,R}(E)$  in (13) exists, then the limit is independent of the radius  $R$ . That is, for every  $r > 0$*

$$\theta_{p,R}(E) = \theta_{p,r}(E) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{E \setminus B_r(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x). \quad (18)$$

*From now on we drop the dependence of  $\theta_{p,R}(E)$  from  $R$  and we denote it just by  $\theta_p(E)$ .*

- (ii) *If  $\theta_p(E) \in [0, 1]$  exists<sup>2</sup> for every  $p \in M$ , then  $p \mapsto \theta_p(E)$  is harmonic with values in  $[0, 1]$ .*
- (iii) *If  $M$  has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property then  $\theta_p(E) = \theta(E)$  does not depend on the point  $p$ . In this case, for every bounded  $F \subset M$  and  $R > 0$  there also holds*

$$\mu(F)\theta(E) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{J}_s(F, E \setminus B_R(p)) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_F \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

- (iv) *In case  $E \equiv M$ ,  $\theta_p(M)$  exists for every  $p \in M$  and equals*

$$\theta_p(M) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(t, p), \quad (19)$$

*and the function  $p \mapsto \theta_p(M)$  is harmonic with values in  $[0, 1]$ .*

---

<sup>2</sup>Recall that there are sets for which the limit does not exist.

*Proof.* With no loss of generality assume  $r < R$ . First, we show that the limit does not depend on the radius, that is

$$\theta_{p,R}(E) = \theta_{p,r}(E).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) - \int_{E \setminus B_r(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) \right| &\leq \int_{B_R(p) \setminus B_r(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq Cs \int_{B_R(p) \setminus B_r(p)} \int_0^1 H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + Cs \int_{B_R(p) \setminus B_r(p)} \int_1^\infty H_M(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral, by Lemma 6.2 as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$

$$I_1 \leq Cs \int_0^1 e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{M \setminus B_r(p)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \leq Cs \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-c/t}}{t^{1+s}} dt \rightarrow 0.$$

Regarding the second integral, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  by Lemma 2.6 there is  $T = T(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that  $|H_M(x, p, t)| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in B_R(p)$  and  $t \geq T$ , hence

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq Cs \int_1^T \int_{B_R(p)} H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} + Cs \int_T^\infty \int_{B_R(p)} H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &\leq Cs \int_1^T \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} + Cs\varepsilon\mu(B_R(p)) \int_T^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &= C(1 - T^{-s/2}) + C\varepsilon\mu(B_R(p))T^{-s/2}, \end{aligned}$$

letting  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  (and then  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) gives  $I_2 \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, taking  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  shows  $\theta_{p,R}(E) = \theta_{p,r}(E)$ , concluding the proof of (i). Note that what we have just proved already implies that if  $E$  is bounded then the limit exists and  $\theta(E) = 0$ , since one can just take  $R \gg 1$  so that  $E \setminus B_R(p) = \emptyset$ .

Now fix  $q \in M$ . For every  $p \in B_{1/2}(q)$  we can write

$$\theta_p(E) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{E \setminus B_1(q)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x).$$

This is possible because we always have independence on the radius. Indeed

$$\left| \int_{E \setminus B_{1/2}(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) - \int_{E \setminus B_1(q)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) \right| \leq \int_{B_1(q) \setminus B_{1/2}(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x),$$

hence

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \int_{E \setminus B_{1/2}(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) - \int_{E \setminus B_1(q)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) \right| \leq \theta(B_1(q)) = 0.$$

Now set

$$\Theta_s(p) := \frac{s}{2} \int_0^\infty e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{E \setminus B_1(q)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}},$$

so that  $\theta_p(E) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \Theta_s(p)$ . By Lemma 6.2 we have that  $0 \leq \Theta_s(p) \leq C$ , for some constant  $C$  independent of  $p$  and  $s$ . Now fix  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{1/2}(q))$ , by dominated convergence

$$\int_M \Delta \theta_p(E) \varphi d\mu = \int_M \theta_p(E) \Delta \varphi d\mu = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_M \Theta_s \Delta \varphi d\mu = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_M \Delta \Theta_s \varphi d\mu.$$



Note however that we can explicitly compute

$$\Delta\Theta_s(p) = \frac{s}{2} \int_0^\infty \Delta e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{E \setminus B_1(q)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} = \frac{s}{2} \int_0^\infty \partial_t e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{E \setminus B_1(q)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}},$$

which, for every  $p \in B_{1/2}(q)$ , after an integration by parts becomes (note that the boundary term at  $t = 0^+$  is zero due to Lemma 6.2) equal to

$$\frac{s}{2} \left(1 + \frac{s}{2}\right) \int_0^\infty e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{E \setminus B_1(q)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{2+s/2}}.$$

The latter quantity goes to 0 as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  for every  $p \in B_{1/2}(q)$  whence

$$\int_M \Delta\theta_p(E) \varphi d\mu = 0.$$

This means that  $p \mapsto \theta_p(E)$  is harmonic in  $B_{1/2}(q)$ , and since this holds for every  $q \in M$  this proves (ii).

If  $M$  has the  $L^\infty$ –Liouville property, the fact that  $p \mapsto \theta_p(E)$  is harmonic and bounded directly implies that is constant, and thus independent of the point  $p$ . Moreover, being  $F$  bounded, by dominated convergence

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |F| \int_{E \setminus B_1(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) - \int_F \int_{E \setminus B_1(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \right| \\ = \left| |F| \Theta_s(p) - \int_F \Theta_s(y) d\mu(y) \right| \leq \int_F |\Theta_s(p) - \Theta_s(y)| d\mu(y) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

since both  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \Theta_s(p) = \theta(E)$  and  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \Theta_s(y) = \theta(E)$  (recall that  $p \mapsto \theta_p(E)$  is constant). The same holds for any radius  $R$  instead of 1 since the limit of  $\Theta_s$  does not depends on  $R$ .

Lastly, (19) follows from the last part of the proof of Proposition 4.2, and the fact that  $p \mapsto \theta_p(M)$  is harmonic is verbatim the proof we did for  $E \subset M$  above.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be complete with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , and let  $A, B \subset M$  be two disjoint measurable sets one of which has finite measure and with  $\mathcal{J}_{s_0}(A, B) < +\infty$ , for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ . Then*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{J}_s(A, B) = 0.$$

*Proof.* First, being  $\mathcal{J}_{s_0}(A, B) < +\infty$ , arguing exactly as in the proof of (11) we have that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{J}_s(A, B) \leq \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{A \times B} \int_{1/s}^\infty H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

Now assume that  $A$  is the set with  $\mu(A) < +\infty$ , then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s}{2} \int_{A \times B} \int_{1/s}^\infty H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) &= C s^{1+s/2} \int_A \int_1^\infty e^{(\xi/s)\Delta}(\chi_B)(x) \frac{d\xi}{\xi^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C \int_A \left( s \int_1^\infty e^{(\xi/s)\Delta}(\chi_B)(x) \frac{d\xi}{\xi^{1+s/2}} \right) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

From here, by the convergence to zero of the heat kernel of Lemma 2.6, the result follows by Dominated convergence.  $\square$

The results above directly imply the following.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be complete with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , and let  $\Omega \subset M$  be bounded. Then, for every  $F \subset \Omega$  with  $P_{s_0}(F, \Omega) < +\infty$ , for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ , there holds*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{J}_s(F, E \cap \Omega^c) = \mu(F)\theta(E).$$

*Proof.* Let  $p \in M$  and  $R \gg 1$  be such that  $\Omega \subset B_R(p)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_s(F, E \cap \Omega^c) &= \mathcal{J}_s(F, E \cap \Omega^c \cap B_R(p)) + \mathcal{J}_s(F, E \cap \Omega^c \cap B_R^c(p)) \\ &= \mathcal{J}_s(F, E \cap \Omega^c \cap B_R(p)) + \mathcal{J}_s(F, E \cap B_R^c(p)). \end{aligned}$$

Now, as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  the first term tends to 0 by Lemma 4.5, and the second term tends to  $\mu(F)\theta(E)$  by Lemma 4.4 part (ii), and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

To prove our main result Theorem 1.4 one needs also to know the asymptotics as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  of the fractional  $s$ -perimeter on the entire  $M$ , that is when  $\Omega \equiv M$ . This is addressed by Theorem 4.8 below on the asymptotics of the fractional Sobolev seminorms. This result is the counterpart of Theorem 3.1 in the case of infinite volume. To prove this asymptotics we will need Lemma 4.7 (whose proof is postponed to the Appendix) which essentially says that for manifolds with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$  the singular kernel  $\mathcal{K}_s$  locally behaves like that of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ . This is not the case for finite volume manifolds<sup>3</sup>.

Recall the notation of Remark 1.7, where we denote by  $\frac{\beta_{n,s}}{|x-y|^{n+s}}$  the singular kernel of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with its standard metric. Note also that  $cs(2-s) \leq \beta_{n,s} \leq Cs(2-s)$  for some dimensional  $c, C > 0$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete  $n$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , and let  $p \in M$ . Assume that in normal coordinates at  $p$  there holds  $\frac{99}{100}|v|^2 \leq g_{ij}(q)v^i v^j \leq \frac{101}{100}|v|^2$  and  $|\nabla g_{ij}(q)| \leq 1/100$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $q \in B_1(p)$ . Then there exists  $\mathcal{K}'_s : B_1(p) \times B_1(p) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{x, y \in B_{1/8}(p)} |\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) - \mathcal{K}'_s(x, y)| = 0,$$

and for all  $x, y \in B_{1/8}(p)$

$$c \frac{\beta_{n,s}}{d(x, y)^{n+s}} \leq \mathcal{K}'_s(x, y) \leq C \frac{\beta_{n,s}}{d(x, y)^{n+s}}, \quad (20)$$

for some dimensional constants  $c, C > 0$ .

This lemma is a sharpening of [9, Lemma 2.11] for manifolds with infinite volume. Indeed, in [9] the authors are not interested in characterizing the sharp dependence from  $s$  of  $\mathcal{K}_s$  as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ . Moreover, in [9] the authors estimate  $\mathcal{K}_s$  locally on every complete Riemannian manifold  $M$  (both with finite and infinite volume), but the result stated in Lemma 4.7 is false for manifolds with finite volume.

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete, stochastically complete Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , and let  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ . Then for every  $u \in H^{s_0/2}(M)$  with bounded support there holds*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2.$$

*Proof.* First, let us assume that  $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$ . Since

$$\frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \int_M u(-\Delta)^{s/2} u \, d\mu,$$

<sup>3</sup>Indeed, for finite volume manifolds the same conclusion (20) holds with constants depending on  $s$ , but as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  the constants do not behave like the ones of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

it suffices to show that, as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ , there holds

$$(-\Delta)^{s/2}u(x) \rightarrow u(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in M.$$

Fix  $x \in M$ , and take  $R$  such that both  $\text{supp}(u) \subset B_R(x)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^{s/2}u(x) &= \int_M (u(x) - u(y))\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{B_R(x)} (u(x) - u(y))\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) + u(x) \int_{M \setminus B_R(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that being  $\mu(M) = +\infty$  we have

$$\int_{M \setminus B_R(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \neq 0.$$

**Claim.** As  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  there holds

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_R(x)} (u(x) - u(y))\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) = 0.$$

Indeed, let  $\rho \ll 1$  small that will be chosen later. We denote here by  $C$  a constant which does not depend on  $s$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{B_R(x)} (u(x) - u(y))\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{B_R(x) \cap B_\rho(x)} (u(x) - u(y))\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) + \int_{B_R(x) \setminus B_\rho(x)} (u(x) - u(y))\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right| \\ &\leq \text{Lip}(u) \int_{B_\rho(x)} d(x, y)\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) + 2\|u\|_{L^\infty} \int_{B_R(x) \setminus B_\rho(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

We estimate these two integrals separately. Let  $\mathcal{K}'_s$  be the singular kernel given by Lemma 4.7, applied with  $\rho$  sufficiently small and suitably rescaled. For the first integral, Lemma 4.7 gives

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_\rho(x)} d(x, y)(\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) - \mathcal{K}'_s(x, y)) d\mu(y) = 0. \quad (22)$$

But by the estimates for  $\mathcal{K}'_s$  in Lemma 4.7 and coarea formula

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho(x)} d(x, y)\mathcal{K}'_s(x, y) d\mu(y) &\leq Cs(2-s) \int_{B_\rho(x)} \frac{1}{d(x, y)^{n+s-1}} d\mu(y) \\ &\leq Cs \int_0^\rho \frac{1}{r^s} dr = \frac{Cs}{1-s} \rho^{1-s} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ . This, together with (22), gives that the first integral tends to zero.

For the second integral, one can note that we have proved in part (i) of Lemma 4.4 that, for every  $x \in M$  and  $r, R > 0$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_R(x) \setminus B_r(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) = 0,$$

and this concludes the proof of the Claim.

Since by Proposition 4.2 we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{M \setminus B_R(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) = \theta(M) = 1,$$

letting  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  in (21) gives

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} (-\Delta)^{s/2} u(x) = u(x),$$

for every  $x \in M$  and this concludes the proof in the case  $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$ .

The general case is proved by density. Let  $u \in H^{s_\circ/2}(M)$  with  $\text{spt}(u) \subset\subset K$ , where  $K$  is compact. Then, there exists  $(u_k)_k \subset C_c^\infty(K)$  such that  $u_k \rightarrow u$  in  $H^{s_\circ/2}(M)$ . Hence, for all  $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 - \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left| [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 - [u_k]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2} [u_k]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 - \|u_k\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right| + \left| \|u_k\|_{L^2(M)}^2 - \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By the interpolation inequality of Lemma 6.1

$$\begin{aligned} \left| [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 - [u_k]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 \right| & \leq [u - u_k]_{H^{s/2}(M)} ([u]_{H^{s/2}(M)} + [u_k]_{H^{s/2}(M)}) \\ & \leq C \|u - u_k\|_{H^{s_\circ/2}(M)} (\|u\|_{H^{s_\circ/2}(M)} + \|u_k\|_{H^{s_\circ/2}(M)}) \\ & \leq C \|u - u_k\|_{H^{s_\circ/2}(M)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  does not depend on  $k$  and we have used that  $\|u_k\|_{H^{s_\circ/2}(M)} \leq C$  since the sequence is convergent in  $H^{s_\circ/2}(M)$ . Hence, letting  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  and using the result proved for smooth functions with compact support

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 - \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right| \leq C \|u - u_k\|_{H^{s_\circ/2}(M)} + \left| \|u_k\|_{L^2(M)}^2 - \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right|,$$

with  $C$  independent of  $k$ . Since this holds for every  $k$ , taking  $k \rightarrow \infty$  gives the result.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $E \subset M$  be bounded and such that  $P_{s_\circ}(E) < +\infty$  for some  $s_\circ \in (0, 1)$ . Then*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E) = \mu(E).$$

*Proof.* Take  $u = \chi_E$  in Theorem 4.8.  $\square$

**Remark 4.10.** *Inspecting the proof of Theorem 4.8, one can note that the stochastic completeness of  $M$  is not necessary and the following holds true. Assume  $(M, g)$  is a geodesically complete Riemannian manifold with  $\mu(M) = +\infty$ , so that the heat kernel  $H_M$  tends to zero (as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ) pointwise and uniformly on bounded sets, and Proposition 4.2 and 4.4 hold. The limit  $\theta_M(x) := \theta_x(M)$  is an harmonic function with values in  $[0, 1]$ , and the same proof carried on above shows*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \int_M u^2 \theta_M d\mu,$$

for every  $u \in H^{s_\circ/2}(M)$  with bounded support. Consequently, if in particular  $\theta_M \equiv \theta_\circ \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E) = \theta_\circ \mu(E), \tag{23}$$

for every  $E$  bounded with  $P_{s_\circ}(E) < +\infty$ . This feature led us to note the following example.

**Example 4.11.** *There exists a complete Riemannian manifold  $N$  where the asymptotics of the fractional  $s$ -perimeter as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  is zero for every set, that is: for every bounded  $E$  with  $P_{s_\circ}(E) < +\infty$  for some  $s_\circ \in (0, 1)$  there holds*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} P_s(E) = 0.$$

By (23) above we see that it is enough to provide an example of a Riemannian manifold  $N$  with  $\theta_p(N) = \theta(N) = 0$ , meaning that the limit does not depend on the point  $p$  and is always zero. Moreover, by part (ii) of Remark 4.3 this is satisfied if  $N$  has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property, is not stochastically complete and


$$\mathcal{N}(t, p) = \int_N H_N(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

A Riemannian manifold  $N$  with these properties actually exists, and we now sketch how it is constructed. We want  $N$  such that

- (i)  $N$  has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property.
- (ii)  $N$  is not stochastically complete.
- (iii) For every  $p \in N$  we have  $\mathcal{N}(t, p) = \int_N H_N(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0$ .

The construction of  $N$  that satisfies (i), (ii) is taken from [16, Section 13.5], which in turn builds on the first such example found by Pinchover in [26]. Here, we note that it satisfies also (iii).

FIGURE 1. The two dimensional jungle-gym in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Picture taken from [16].



Start from the two dimensional jungle-gym  $JG^2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  as in Figure 1. This is done by smoothly connecting the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  with necks. Let  $g$  be the standard metric on  $JG^2$  induced by the embedding in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Fix  $o \in JG^2$  and let  $r := d(o, x)$ . One can show that then  $JG^2$  has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property. Moreover, there holds  $\mu(B_R(o)) \leq CR^3$ , and the Green function grows at most as  $G(o, x) \leq C/r$  for large  $r$ . Let  $\rho : JG^2 \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be a smooth positive function with  $\rho = 1$  in  $[0, 1]$  and  $\rho(r) \sim \frac{1}{r \log(r)}$  for large  $r$ , and consider the conformal metric  $\hat{g} := \rho^2(r)g$  on  $JG^2$ . We claim that  $N := (JG^2, \hat{g})$  has the desired properties. Since

$$\int_1^\infty \rho(r) dr = \infty,$$

then  $N$  is geodesically complete and hence complete. Moreover, as the Laplacian is conformally invariant in dimension two,  $JG^2$  with its standard metric and  $N$  have the same harmonic functions, and thus  $N$  also has the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property and satisfies (i). Denote by  $\hat{G}$  the Green's function of  $N$ . Then, by the choice of  $\rho$ , for  $R$  big

$$\int_{N \setminus B_R(o)} \hat{G}(o, x) d\hat{\mu}(x) = \int_{JG^2 \setminus B_R(o)} G(o, x) \rho^2(r) d\mu(x) < +\infty,$$

and by [16, Corollary 6.7] this implies (ii). Consequently, note that also

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \mathcal{N}(p, t) dt &= \int_0^\infty \int_N H_N(x, p, t) d\widehat{\mu}(x) dt = \int_N \left( \int_0^\infty H_N(x, p, t) dt \right) d\widehat{\mu}(x) \\ &= \int_N \widehat{G}(o, x) d\widehat{\mu}(x) = \int_{N \setminus B_R(o)} \widehat{G}(o, x) d\widehat{\mu}(x) + \int_{B_R(o)} \widehat{G}(o, x) d\widehat{\mu}(x) < +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

and since the function  $\mathcal{N}(p, \cdot)$  is also nonincreasing this implies that  $N$  also satisfies (iii).

Now, the proof of our main theorem in the infinite volume case is just a simple application of all the result that we have derived above.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* Part (i) is exactly one implication of Proposition 4.2, and the fact that the limit does not depend on the choice of the point  $p$  and radius  $R$  is addressed by Lemma 4.4 with  $E \equiv M$ . Write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) &= \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega, E^c \cap \Omega) + \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega, E^c \cap \Omega^c) + \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega^c, E^c \cap \Omega) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} P_s(E \cap \Omega) - \mathcal{J}_s(E \cap \Omega, E \cap \Omega^c) + \mathcal{J}_s(E^c \cap \Omega, E \cap \Omega^c). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 4.9 and by Corollary 4.6, applied with  $F = E \cap \Omega$  and  $F = E^c \cap \Omega$ , taking the limit as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) &= \mu(E \cap \Omega) - \theta(E) \mu(E \cap \Omega) + \theta(E) \mu(E^c \cap \Omega) \\ &= (1 - \theta(E)) \mu(E \cap \Omega) + \theta(E) \mu(E^c \cap \Omega), \end{aligned}$$

and this shows (ii).

To prove (iii) and (iv) we follow closely the proof of in [11, Theorem 2.7], which deals with the analogous property in the case of the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We just sketch the argument, since in the reference [11] the proof is carried on in full details and in our case it is analogous. Let us denote

$$\Theta_s(E) := \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x), \quad (24)$$

and fix  $R \gg 1$  such that  $\Omega \subset B_R(p)$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega \setminus E} \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) - \int_{\Omega \cap E} \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} P_s(E, \Omega) - \frac{1}{2} P_s(E \cap \Omega, \Omega) - \mathcal{J}_s(\Omega \setminus E, (E \setminus \Omega) \cap B_R(p)) + \mathcal{J}_s(\Omega \cap E, (E \setminus \Omega) \cap B_R(p)). \end{aligned}$$

Now, arguing exactly as in the proof of part (ii) of Lemma 4.4 we have that for every bounded  $F \subset M$  there holds

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \mu(F) \Theta_s(E) - \int_F \int_{E \setminus B_R(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \right| = 0.$$

But also by Lemma 4.5 we have both

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{J}_s(\Omega \setminus E, (E \setminus \Omega) \cap B_R(p)) = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{J}_s(\Omega \cap E, (E \setminus \Omega) \cap B_R(p)) = 0.$$

Hence, taking the limit as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  above gives

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \Theta_s(E)(\mu(\Omega \setminus E) - \mu(\Omega \cap E)) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}(P_s(E, \Omega) - P_s(E \cap \Omega, \Omega)).$$

But since  $E \cap \Omega \subset \Omega$  is bounded, by Corollary 4.9 we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E \cap \Omega, \Omega) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E \cap \Omega) = \mu(E \cap \Omega),$$

thus

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \Theta_s(E)(\mu(\Omega \setminus E) - \mu(\Omega \cap E)) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E, \Omega) - \mu(E \cap \Omega).$$

From here, the conclusion of the theorem easily follows. Indeed, if  $\mu(\Omega \setminus E) = \mu(\Omega \cap E)$  then the limit  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E, \Omega)$  always exists and is equal to  $\mu(E \cap \Omega)$ . On the other hand, if the limit  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E, \Omega)$  exists then from above the limit in  $\theta(E)$  also exists and there holds

$$\theta(E) = \frac{\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2}P_s(E, \Omega) - \mu(E \cap \Omega)}{\mu(\Omega \setminus E) - \mu(E \cap \Omega)},$$

and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. EXTENSION TO RCD SPACES

In this section we briefly explain how our results extend to the case of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces, which a generalization of Riemannian manifolds with upper bound on the dimension  $N$  and Ricci curvature bounded from below by the real number  $K$  (and they include weighted manifolds). While assuming the reader familiar with the theory of RCD spaces we have to mention at least some references: the introduction of a synthetic lower bound on the Ricci curvature (CD condition) has been done in the work of Lott and Villani [25] and in the works of Sturm [28], [29]. In a subsequent work Ambrosio, Gigli and Savarè introduced the RCD condition (see [1]) to rule out Finsler structures and enforce some Riemannian-like structure at small scales of the space (infinitesimal hilbertianity, see also [13]).

We stress that we won't reprove every result of the smooth case but only the ones presenting major changes which are needed to perform the asymptotic analysis. First of all, on any  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space with  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  it is possible to define a heat kernel and to do so we shall exploit the theory of gradient flows. We call the *heat flow*  $(e^{t\Delta})_{t>0}$  the gradient flow (in the sense of Komura-Brezis theory) of the Cheeger energy which displays the following properties: for an  $L^2$  function  $f$  the curve  $t \in (0, \infty) \rightarrow e^{t\Delta}f \in L^2$  is locally absolutely continuous, it is such that  $e^{t\Delta}f \in D(\Delta)$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} e^{t\Delta}f = f$  in  $L^2$  and moreover satisfies the *heat equation*

$$\frac{de^{t\Delta}}{dt} = \Delta e^{t\Delta}f \quad \forall t > 0.$$

We will now collect some other properties of the heat flow holding on infinitesimally hilbertian metric measure spaces which we will exploit (see [14] for a reference):

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an infinitesimally hilbertian metric measure space, then we have*

(i) (Weak maximum principle): *Given any  $f \in L^2(\mu)$  such that  $f \leq C$   $\mu$ -almost everywhere we have*

$$e^{t\Delta}f \leq C \quad \mu - \text{a.e.}$$

(ii) ( $e^{t\Delta}$  is self-adjoint): *For all  $f, g \in L^2(\mu)$  we have*

$$\int_X e^{t\Delta}f g d\mu = \int_X e^{t\Delta}g f d\mu \quad \forall t > 0.$$

(iii) ( $\Delta$  and  $e^{t\Delta}$  commute): For all  $f \in D(\Delta)$  we have

$$\Delta e^{t\Delta} f = e^{t\Delta} \Delta f \quad \mu - \text{a.e.}, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Moreover if  $(X, d, \mu)$  is an  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space we have the following additional properties:

(iv) (Bakry-Émery estimate): For all  $f \in W^{1,2}(X)$  and  $t > 0$  we have

$$|\nabla e^{t\Delta} f|^2 \leq e^{-2Kt} e^{t\Delta} (|\nabla f|^2) \quad \mu - \text{a.e.} \quad (25)$$

(v) ( $L^\infty$  – Lip regularization): For all  $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$  and  $t > 0$  we have

$$\|\nabla e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \frac{C(K)}{\sqrt{t}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mu)}. \quad (26)$$

We will give a simple proof of the  $L^\infty$  – Lip regularization for  $K = 0$  at the end of the Appendix.

It is then possible to define the heat flow for all probability measures with finite second moment as the  $EVI_K$  (again, we assume the reader to be familiar with the terminology) gradient flow of the entropy functional. More precisely for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ ,  $e^{t\Delta}\mu$  (with a little abuse of notation here) is the unique measure such that

$$\int_X \varphi d e^{t\Delta} \mu = \int_X e^{t\Delta} \varphi d \mu \quad \forall \varphi \in \text{Lip}_{bs}(X),$$

where  $\text{Lip}_{bs}(X)$  is the set of Lipschitz functions with bounded support and  $e^{t\Delta}\varphi$  is the Lipschitz continuous representative of its equivalence class (which is well-posed thanks to the  $L^\infty$  – Lip regularization property).

On  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  it is possible to define the heat kernel  $H_X(x, \cdot, t) := \frac{de^{t\Delta}\delta_x}{d\mu}$  and we have the following (see [22] for a reference):

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space with  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , then for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , for some  $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4$  nonnegative constants (possibly depending on  $\epsilon$  and  $N$ ) we have*

$$\frac{1}{C_1 \mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} \exp\left(-\frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 - \epsilon)t} - C_2 t\right) \leq H_X(x, y, t) \leq \frac{C_1}{\mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} \exp\left(-\frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 + \epsilon)t} + C_2 t\right) \quad (27)$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $t > 0$  and

$$|\nabla H_X(x, \cdot, t)|(y) \leq \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{t} \mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))} \exp\left(\frac{-d^2(x, y)}{(4 + \epsilon)t} - C_4 t\right) \quad (28)$$

$\mu \times \mu$ -a.e.  $(x, y) \in X \times X$ , for all  $t > 0$ .

Moreover, if  $K = 0$  then estimate (27) holds with  $C_2 = C_4 = 0$ .

On any  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space we have

$$\int_X H_X(x, y, t) d\mu(x) = 1$$

for all  $y \in X$ ,  $t > 0$ . That is,  $X$  is stochastically complete.

In the setting of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  (actually infinitesimal hiltbertianity is not required) we also have Bishop-Gromov's comparison theorem, holding both for the perimeter measure and the volume measure (see [29]). Finally it is possible to prove that the following version of the Harnack inequality holds (see [23] for the proof)



**Proposition 5.3** (Harnack inequality). *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space,  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $f \in L^1(\mu) \cap L^\infty(\mu)$ , then*

$$|(e^{t\Delta} f)(x)|^p \leq (e^{t\Delta} |f|^p)(y) \exp\left(\frac{pKd^2(x, y)}{2(p-1)(e^{2Kt} - 1)}\right)$$

for all  $x, y \in X \times X$  and  $t > 0$ .

From the previous Harnack inequality it is possible to prove the following Gaussian bound (see [30, Theorem 4.1]) for  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  spaces (compare with (27) above for  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces).

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space, then there exists  $C_K > 0$  and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $C_\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$H_X(x, y, t) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x))}\sqrt{\mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(y))}} \exp\left(C_\varepsilon(1 + C_K)t - \frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 + \varepsilon)t}\right). \quad (29)$$

If  $K \geq 0$  one can take  $C_K = 0$ .

The second ingredient we need is a generalization to  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  spaces of the  $L^2$  – Liouville property of Yau (our Theorem 2.3).

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space. Then, any  $L^2(\mu)$  harmonic function is constant.*

*Proof.* Denote  $w(t, x) := e^{t\Delta} u(x)$ . Assume  $u \in L^2(\mu)$  is harmonic, then by applying the heat flow to  $\Delta u = 0$  and using item (iii) of Proposition 5.1 we have

$$\Delta w = 0.$$

By gradient flow theory we have

$$\int_X |\nabla w|^2 d\mu \leq \frac{1}{2t} \int_X |u|^2 d\mu,$$

whence

$$0 = - \int_X w \Delta w d\mu = \int_X |\nabla w|^2 d\mu.$$

This means  $|\nabla w| = 0$   $\mu$ -a.e. and by the Sobolev to Lipschitz property this implies that  $w$  is constant, therefore there exists  $C = C(t)$  such that  $w(t, \cdot) = C(t)$ . Now if  $\mu(X) < \infty$  by using the stochastic completeness we can infer ( $u \in L^2(\mu)$  implies  $u \in L^1(\mu)$ )

$$\int_X w d\mu = \int_X u d\mu = \mu(X)C(t),$$

hence  $C$  does not actually depend on  $t$  and by taking the limit as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$  we infer that  $u$  is constant. If  $\mu(X) = \infty$  then for every  $t$  we have  $w = 0$  because the only constant in  $L^2(\mu)$  is zero and we conclude.  $\square$

**Remark 5.6.** *The previous proposition actually does not require a curvature condition: working in a space in which having zero weak upper gradient implies being constant is enough.*

We then have the following result, which is a non-smooth analogue of Proposition 2.6.

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space, then we have the following dicotomy:*

(i) *If  $\mu(X) < +\infty$  then*

$$H_X(t, x, y) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\mu(X)} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

(ii) If  $\mu(X) = +\infty$  we have

$$H_X(\cdot, \cdot, t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (30)$$

locally uniformly and  $H_X(p, \cdot, t) \rightarrow 0$  uniformly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $p \in M$ .

*Proof.* For the proof of (i) everything follows verbatim from the proof of Proposition 2.6. For what concerns the second point we shall exploit the Harnack inequality of Proposition 5.3. We repeat the first part of the proof for the sake of exposition: first let  $f = H_X(p, \cdot, \varepsilon)$ , then  $\max\{\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1}, \|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^\infty}\} \leq C$  due to the properties of the heat flow. Moreover by the semigroup property of it is easy to see that weak convergence in  $L^2(\mu)$  of  $e^{t\Delta} f$  is equivalent to strong convergence and we again have the inequality

$$|(e^{t\Delta} f, g)| \leq |(e^{t\Delta} f, f)| |(e^{t\Delta} g, g)| \leq \|g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 |(e^{t\Delta} f, f)|$$

for all  $t \in (0, \infty)$  and for all  $f, g \in L^2(\mu)$ . Now again using the spectral measure representation and Proposition 5.5 we infer the desired  $L^2$  convergence. This convergence can be upgraded to be locally uniform by the Harnack inequality (Proposition 5.3) with  $p = 2$  and by the fact that  $|f|^2 \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty} |f|$ , together with the maximum principle to get

$$|e^{t\Delta} f(x)|^2 \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty} e^{t\Delta} (|f|)(y) \exp\left(\frac{2KR^2}{2(e^{2Kt} - 1)}\right)$$

for every  $y \in B_R(x)$ . Integrating over the latter set in  $d\mu(y)$  and taking the supremum allows to conclude. The global uniform convergence follows along the same lines of the smooth case.  $\square$

**Remark 5.8.** As in the smooth case if  $\mu(x) = \infty$  we have that for every  $f \in L^1(\mu)$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{t\Delta} f(x) = 0$$

for every  $x \in X$ .

We refer to [4] for an introduction to  $H^s$  spaces on very general ambient space, like RCD spaces and more. We have the analogue of Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 5.9.** Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space with  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu(X) < +\infty$ . Let  $u \in H^{s_0/2}(X)$  for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$  with bounded support. Then

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^{s/2}(X)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(X)}^2 - \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \left( \int_X u d\mu \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* The proof is exactly the same as in the smooth case exploiting the  $L^2$  – Liouville property of Proposition 5.5.  $\square$

To prove the convergence result for the case of infinite volume we need a convergence result for the solution of the heat equation to the initial datum. We therefore recall the following (upper) Large Deviation Principle on proper  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  spaces (see [15, Theorem 5.3])

**Theorem 5.10.** Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be a proper  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space, then for every  $x \in X$  and closed set  $C \subseteq X$  we have, setting  $\mu_t[x] = H_X(\cdot, x, t)\mu$ ,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} t \log(\mu_t[x](C)) \leq - \inf_{y \in C} \frac{d^2(x, y)}{4}. \quad (31)$$

**Remark 5.11.** In (31) we can choose  $C = X \setminus B_r(p)$  and obtain the following estimate for small times (depending on  $r > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ )

$$|e^{t\Delta} (\chi_{X \setminus B_r(p)})(p)| \leq \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{(4 + \varepsilon)t}\right) \quad (32)$$

We are finally ready to prove the following proposition (analogue of Proposition 4.2)

**Proposition 5.12.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be a proper  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space with  $\mu(X) = +\infty$ . Then*

$$\theta(M) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \int_{X \setminus B_1(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) = 1.$$

*Proof.* As for the smooth case we first show that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{X \setminus B_1(p)} \int_0^1 H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = 0.$$

Indeed there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $t \leq \delta$  (32) holds, so that the previous integral can be estimated with the following

$$\frac{s}{2} \int_0^\delta e^{-r^2/5t} \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} + \frac{s}{2} \int_{X \setminus B_1(p)} \int_\delta^1 H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}}.$$

The first term clearly goes to zero as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  and to handle the second we use Fubini to deduce that (here stochastic completeness is not necessary but  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  spaces enjoy this property so we write the equality sign)

$$\frac{s}{2} \int_{X \setminus B_1(p)} \int_\delta^1 H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} = \frac{s}{2} \int_\delta^1 \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} - \frac{s}{2} \int_{B_1(p)} \int_\delta^1 H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x).$$

Again the first term trivially goes to zero while for the second we apply (29) and exploit properness of the space to infer that  $H_X(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  is equibounded in  $B_1(p) \times [\delta, 1]$  so that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{s}{2} \int_{B_1(p)} \int_\delta^1 H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) \right| \leq \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} C \frac{s}{2} \int_\delta^1 \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} = 0.$$

We now claim that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{B_1(p)} \int_1^\infty H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = 0.$$

Indeed, thanks to the local uniform convergence proved in (30) and reasoning as in the previous step the latter result easily follows.

Finally we can perform the same passages and write

$$\theta(M) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_X \int_1^\infty H_X(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x),$$

which equals 1 by using stochastic completeness.  $\square$

With the next proposition we show that the heat density of a set, whenever it exists, is independent of the radius and also on the point if the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property holds (analogue of Proposition 4.4)

**Proposition 5.13.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$  space with  $\mu(X) = \infty$  and let  $E \subset M$  such that  $\theta(E)$  exists, then*

$$\theta(E) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{X \setminus B_r(p)} \int_0^\infty \mathcal{K}_s(p, x) d\mu(x)$$

for all  $r > 0$ . If the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property holds then the latter quantity is independent also of the point  $p$ .

*Proof.* We first show the independence on the radius, therefore we fix any two  $0 < r < R$  and we show that

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_{\overline{B_R(p)} \setminus B_r(p)} \int_0^\infty H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) = 0.$$

We split the integral over the time in three pieces: one from 0 to  $\varepsilon$ , one from  $\varepsilon$  to  $T$  and the last one from  $T$  to  $\infty$ . The first piece goes to zero since  $\overline{B_R(p)} \setminus B_r(p)$  is a closed set and we can apply (32), the second piece goes to zero for every  $T \gg 1$  thanks to the properness of the space, the Gaussian upper bound (29) and easy calculations, while the last piece is such that, for all  $T \geq T_0(\varepsilon)$

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \int_T^\infty H_X(x, p, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since this holds for every  $\varepsilon$  we get the convergence to zero.

For what concerns the independence on the point we first take  $r$  (we can now set  $r = 1$ ) so big that  $q \in B_r(p)$  and wlog we assume  $E$  to be closed. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0} & \left| \int_{E \cap B_r^\varepsilon(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) d\mu(x) - \int_{E \cap B_r^\varepsilon(q)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, q) d\mu(x) \right| \\ & \leq \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{E \cap B_r^\varepsilon(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, p) - \mathcal{K}_s(x, q) d\mu(x) \right| \\ & + \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{E \cap B_r^\varepsilon(p)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, q) d\mu(x) - \int_{E \cap B_r^\varepsilon(q)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, q) d\mu(x) \right| =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

To handle  $I_1$  we write explicitly the expression of the kernel and divide the integral with respect to time in three pieces: the first one between 0 and  $\varepsilon$  (so that (32) applies), the second between  $\varepsilon$  and  $T$  and the third one between  $T$  and  $\infty$ . The first piece gives no contribution in the limit due to the exponential convergence, the second piece since  $\|e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{E \cap B_r^\varepsilon(p)})\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$  goes to zero in the limit for every  $T$  and for what concerns the third we have (using stochastical completeness)

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{s}{2} \left| \int_T^\infty e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{B_r^\varepsilon(p)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} - \int_T^\infty e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{B_r^\varepsilon(p)})(q) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right| \\ & = \frac{s}{2} \left| \int_T^\infty e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{B_r(p)})(p) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} - \int_T^\infty e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{B_r(p)})(q) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right| \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\chi_{B_r(p)} \in L^1 \cap L^\infty$  we have local uniform convergence and the lim sup as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  of the previous quantity is again arbitrarily small as  $T$  goes to infinity, proving that  $I_1 = 0$ .

To show that  $I_2 = 0$  we proceed in the same way by splitting both integrals over time in three pieces: the first one behaves as usual thanks to (32) and the second as well. The third one is handled again by using the stochastical completeness: indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{s}{2} \left| \int_{B_r^\varepsilon(p)} \int_T^\infty H_X(x, q, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) - \int_{B_r^\varepsilon(q)} \int_T^\infty H_X(x, q, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) \right| \\ & = \frac{s}{2} \left| \int_{B_r(p)} \int_T^\infty H_X(x, q, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) - \int_{B_r(q)} \int_T^\infty H_X(x, q, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(x) \right| \end{aligned}$$

and as usual the latter term goes to zero as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$  so  $I_2 = 0$  and we conclude the proof.

We shall now handle the independence of the point in the setting  $K = 0$ : first let  $r$  be so big that  $q \in B_r(p)$ . We can perform the same computations as the smooth case and reduce to prove,

setting  $f = \chi_{E \cap B_\varepsilon^c(p)}$ , the following

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{s}{2} \int_0^\infty (e^{t\Delta} f(p) - e^{t\Delta} f(q)) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} = 0.$$

The latter is clearly true for the usual reasons: from 0 and  $\varepsilon > 0$  we apply (31), from  $\varepsilon$  and  $T \gg 1$  we apply the maximum principle and from  $T$  to  $\infty$  we use the  $L^\infty$  – Liouville property.  $\square$

Finally we have the analogue of Theorem 4.8.

**Theorem 5.14.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be a proper RCD( $K, N$ ) space with  $\mu(X) = +\infty$  and  $N < +\infty$ , and let  $s_\circ \in (0, 1)$ . Then for every  $u \in H^{s_\circ/2}(X)$  with bounded support there holds*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(X)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(X)}^2.$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the smooth case, we just need to handle with a bit more care the computations and instead of estimating the singular kernel  $\mathcal{K}_s$  we shall work directly with the heat kernel. We advise the reader to first see the proof in the smooth case of Theorem 4.8.

We proceed with  $u \in \text{Lip}_b(X)$  with  $\text{spt} u \subseteq B_R(p)$  in such a way that  $x \in B_{R-2}(p)$  and we prove that, as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $(-\Delta)^s u \rightarrow u$   $\mu$ -a.e. with the same strategy of the smooth case. Fixing  $x \in X$  to be a regular point, we have

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) = \int_{B_R(x)} (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) + u(x) + u(x) \int_{B_R^c(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y)$$

and we are left to prove that the first term goes to zero as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ , as the second one in the limit is precisely  $u(x)$ . Now fix  $\rho > 0$  and let us split the first integral as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_R(p)} (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right| &= \left| \int_{B_\rho(x)} (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{B_R(p) \setminus B_\rho(x)} (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the second integral of the previous formula goes to zero as  $\theta(E)$  is zero for any  $E$  bounded, while for the first one we have (using the usual arguments, including (30))

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \int_{B_\rho(x)} (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right| \leq \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} \left( d(x, \cdot) \chi_{B_1(x)}(\cdot) \right) (x) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}}.$$

To handle the right hand side we shall apply the Gaussian estimates to deduce

$$e^{t\Delta} \left( d(x, \cdot) \chi_{B_\rho(x)}(\cdot) \right) (x) \leq \frac{C}{\mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x))} \int_0^\rho e^{-r^2/5t} r \text{Per}(B_r(x)) dr,$$

while exploiting that  $x$  is a regular point (see [2, Theorem 4.1] for what we need here) allows to write (for  $\rho, \varepsilon > 0$  small enough)

$$e^{t\Delta} \left( d(x, \cdot) \chi_{B_1(x)}(\cdot) \right) (x) \leq \frac{C}{t^{n/2}} \int_0^\rho e^{-r^2/5t} r^n dr.$$

Finally setting  $z = r^2/5t$  and agglomerating the constants leads to

$$e^{t\Delta} \left( d(x, \cdot) \chi_{B_1(x)}(\cdot) \right) (x) \leq C\sqrt{t} \int_0^{2\rho/5t} e^{-z} z^{n/2-1} dz \leq C\sqrt{t}$$

and clearly this latter estimate is enough to conclude the proof if  $u$  is a bounded Lipschitz function. The rest of the proof is the same as in the smooth case, arguing by density and with the interpolation inequality (which holds also in this setting).  $\square$

Thanks to the previous results we are in the position of stating and proving (which we won't do again since the proof doesn't change) the main theorems Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 also in this non-smooth setting.

## 6. APPENDIX

**6.1. Heat kernel estimates and  $H^s(M)$  spaces.** Here  $(M, g)$  denotes a complete, connected Riemannian manifold. First, we present a simple interpolation inequality for  $H^{s/2}(M)$  spaces.

This inequality is known in the case of  $M = \mathbb{R}^n$  or  $M = \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  for fractional Sobolev spaces  $W^{s,p}$ , also when  $p \neq 2$ . Here we carry on a structural proof using few properties of the heat kernel, and this gives the interpolation inequality on general ambient spaces.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $u \in H^\sigma(M)$  for some  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $0 < s < \sigma < 1$ . Then  $u \in H^s(M)$  and the following inequality holds*

$$[u]_{H^s(M)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^{1-s/\sigma} [u]_{H^\sigma(M)}^{s/\sigma}.$$

for some absolute constant  $C > 0$ .

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(-s)| [u]_{H^s(M)}^2 &= \iint_{M \times M} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \int_0^\infty H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \iint_{M \times M} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \int_0^\xi H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &\quad + \iint_{M \times M} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \int_\xi^\infty H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\xi \in (0, \infty)$  will be chosen at the end. Note that for all  $t \in (0, \xi)$  we have  $(\xi/t)^{1+s} \leq (\xi/t)^{1+\sigma}$  so that we can estimate from above the first integral of the previous inequality with

$$\xi^{\sigma-s} \iint_{M \times M} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \int_0^\xi H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+\sigma}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \leq \xi^{\sigma-s} |\Gamma(-\sigma)| [u]_{H^\sigma(M)}^2.$$

The symmetry of the heat kernel and the fact that  $\mathcal{M}(t, y) \leq 1$ , for all  $y \in M$ , together imply that the second integral can be bounded by

$$\iint_{M \times M} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \int_\xi^\infty H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s}} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \leq \frac{4}{s\xi^s} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2.$$

This two inequalities lead to

$$|\Gamma(-s)| [u]_{H^s(M)}^2 \leq \xi^{\sigma-s} |\Gamma(-\sigma)| [u]_{H^\sigma(M)}^2 + \frac{4}{s\xi^s} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2.$$

Optimizing the right-hand side in  $\xi$  gives that the optimal value is

$$\xi = \left( \frac{4 \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2}{(\sigma - s) |\Gamma(-\sigma)| [u]_{H^\sigma(M)}^2} \right)^{1/\sigma}.$$

Putting everything together gives

$$|\Gamma(-s)|[u]_{H^s(M)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{s} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^{2(1-s/\sigma)} [u]_{H^\sigma(M)}^{2s/\sigma},$$

and this implies

$$[u]_{H^s(M)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^{1-s/\sigma} [u]_{H^\sigma(M)}^{s/\sigma},$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2** ([9]). *Let  $(M^n, g)$  be a complete  $n$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold and let  $B_R(p) \subset M$ . Then*

$$e^{t\Delta}(\chi_{M \setminus B_R(p)})(p) = \int_{M \setminus B_R(p)} H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \leq C e^{-c/t},$$

for some  $C, c > 0$  depending on  $R$  and the geometry of  $M$  in  $B_R(p)$ .

*Proof.* This is essentially [9, Lemma 2.9]. Indeed, in [9, Lemma 2.9] the authors prove that if  $(M, g)$  is a complete Riemannian manifold and  $B_r(p) \subset M$  is a ball diffeomorphic to  $\mathcal{B}_r(0) \subset T_p M$  with metric coefficients  $g_{ij}$  (say, in normal coordinates) uniformly close to  $\delta_{ij}$ , then

$$\int_{M \setminus B_r(p)} H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \leq C e^{-cr^2/t},$$

for some  $C, c > 0$  dimensional. Then, taking  $r \ll 1$  very small and writing

$$\int_{M \setminus B_R(p)} H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x) \leq \int_{M \setminus B_r(p)} H_M(x, p, t) d\mu(x)$$

allows to bound the desired integral.  $\square$

Now we present the proof of Lemma 4.7, that we needed to prove the asymptotics of the full  $H^{s/2}(M)$  seminorm of Theorem 4.8.

*Proof of Lemma 4.7.* Let  $\varphi^{-1} : B_1(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be the inverse of the exponential map at  $p$ . Take  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{B}_{4/5}(0))$  with  $\chi_{\mathcal{B}_{2/5}(0)} \leq \eta \leq \chi_{\mathcal{B}_{4/5}(0)}$  and let  $g'_{ij} := g_{ij}\eta + (1-\eta)\delta_{ij}$ . This is a metric on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $g'_{ij} = g_{ij}$  in  $\mathcal{B}_{2/5}(0)$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{K}_s, \mathcal{K}'_s$  the singular kernels of  $(M, g)$  and  $M' := (\mathbb{R}^n, g')$  respectively. Let  $\Lambda := \sup_{x \in B_{1/5}(p)} H_M(x, x, 1)$  and  $\Lambda' := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}_{1/5}(0)} H_{M'}(x, x, 1)$ . Then, by [9, Lemma 2.10] applied to the Riemannian manifolds  $(M, g)$  and  $(\mathbb{R}^n, g')$  we have, for  $x, y \in \mathcal{B}_{1/5}(0)$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{K}_s(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) - \mathcal{K}'_s(x, y)| &\leq \frac{s/2}{\Gamma(1-s/2)} \int_0^\infty |H_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y), t) - H_{M'}(x, y, t)| \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &\leq Cs(2-s) \int_0^1 |H_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y), t) - H_{M'}(x, y, t)| \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &\quad + Cs(2-s) \int_1^{1/s} |H_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y), t) - H_{M'}(x, y, t)| \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &\quad + Cs(2-s) \int_{1/s}^\infty |H_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y), t) - H_{M'}(x, y, t)| \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &:= Cs(2-s) [I_1 + I_2 + I_3]. \end{aligned}$$

By [9, Lemma 2.10] there holds

$$I_1 = \int_0^1 |H_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y), t) - H_{M'}(x, y, t)| \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \leq C \int_0^1 e^{-c/t} \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \leq C,$$

for some dimensional  $C = C(n) > 0$ . Regarding the second integral

$$I_2 \leq \int_1^{1/s} (\Lambda + \Lambda') \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} = (\Lambda + \Lambda') \frac{1 - s^{s/2}}{s/2},$$

and lastly

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \int_{1/s}^{\infty} |H_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y), t) - H_{M'}(x, y, t)| \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &\leq s^{s/2} \int_1^{\infty} \left[ H_M(\varphi(x), \varphi(y), \xi/s) + H_{M'}(x, y, \xi/s) \right] \frac{d\xi}{\xi^{1+s/2}} = o_s(1) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ , since both  $M$  and  $M'$  have infinite volume and thus their heat kernel tends to zero as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  (see Lemma 2.6). Hence as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$

$$|\mathcal{K}_s(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) - \mathcal{K}'_s(x, y)| \leq Cs + C(\Lambda + \Lambda')(1 - s^{s/2}) + o_s(1) = o_s(1),$$

and note that this estimate is uniform in  $x, y \in \mathcal{B}_{1/5}(0)$ . This follows, for example, from the parabolic Harnack inequality since one can locally estimate the supremum of  $H_M$  and  $H_{M'}$  with the  $L^1$  norm at later times; see the end of the proof of Lemma 2.6. Then

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{B}_{1/5}(p)} |\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) - \mathcal{K}'_s(x, y)| = 0.$$

Lastly, by [9, Lemma 2.5] there exists dimensional constants  $c, C > 0$  such that

$$c \frac{\beta_{n,s}}{d(x, y)^{n+s}} \leq \mathcal{K}'_s(x, y) \leq C \frac{\beta_{n,s}}{d(x, y)^{n+s}},$$

and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

**6.2. On the equivalence and well-posedness of different fractional Laplacians.** In this subsection we shall prove some results concerning the equivalence between different definitions of the fractional Laplacian, and the fractional Sobolev seminorms on (possibly weighted) Riemannian manifolds.

Next we want to show that the fractional laplacian defined with the heat semigroup and the one defined via the singular kernel  $\mathcal{K}_s(x, y)$  coincide. Note that the two following propositions do not hold when  $M$  is not stochastically complete. Indeed, using definition (5) gives  $(-\Delta)^{s/2}(1) \equiv 0$ , while if  $M$  is not stochastically complete equation (3) gives  $(-\Delta)^{s/2}(1) \neq 0$ .

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a stochastically complete Riemannian manifold. Then, the singular integral  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u$  (defined in (5)) and the Bochner  $(-\Delta)_{\text{B}}^{s/2} u$  (defined in (3)) definition coincide for  $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$ . Moreover, the integral in  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u$  is absolutely convergent for  $s < 1$  and the principal value is not needed in this case.*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$  and let us define

$$\mathfrak{J}(t) := \frac{e^{t\Delta} u(x) - u(x)}{t^{1+s/2}} = \frac{1}{t^{1+s/2}} \int_M H_M(x, y, t) (u(y) - u(x)) d\mu(y),$$

where the second equality is due to the stochastic completeness. Note that  $\mathfrak{J} \in L^1(0, +\infty)$  since  $|e^{t\Delta} u(x) - u(x)| \leq Ct$ , where the constant  $C$  depends on  $\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty}$ . We can now define

$$\mathfrak{J}_k(t) := \frac{1}{t^{1+s/2}} \int_{M \setminus B_{1/k}(x)} H_M(x, y, t) (u(y) - u(x)) d\mu(y).$$



and observe that  $\mathfrak{J}_k(t) \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}(t)$  for all  $t \in (0, \infty)$ . Now if  $t \geq 1$  (estimating the mass of the heat kernel by 1) we get  $\mathfrak{J}_k(t) \leq 2\|u\|_{L^\infty}/t^{1+s/2}$ , while by [9, Lemma 2.11] we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{J}(t) - \mathfrak{J}_k(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{t^{1+s/2}} \int_{B_{1/k}(x)} H_M(x, y, t) |u(y) - u(x)| d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{t^{1+s/2+n/2}} \int_{B_{1/k}(x)} e^{-d^2(x, y)/5t} d(x, y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Coarea formula and using the fact that  $\text{Per}(B_r(x)) \leq Cr^{n-1}$  if  $k$  is big we get

$$|\mathfrak{J}(t) - \mathfrak{J}_k(t)| \leq \frac{C}{t^{1+s/2+n/s}} \int_0^{1/k} e^{-r^2/5t} r^n dr = \frac{C}{t^{s/2}} \int_0^{1/(5tk^2)} e^{-z} z^{n/2-1} dz \leq \frac{C}{t^{s/2}}.$$

Therefore if  $t \geq 1$  we have  $\mathfrak{J}_k(t) \leq C/t^{1+s/2} \in L^1(1, +\infty)$  while if  $t \leq 1$  we have  $\mathfrak{J}_k(t) \leq C/t^{s/2} + \mathfrak{J}(t) \in L^1(0, 1)$ . Hence by dominated convergence we can write

$$(-\Delta)_B^{s/2} u(x) = \int_0^\infty \mathfrak{J}(t) dt = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty \int_{M \setminus B_{1/k}(x)} (u(y) - u(x)) H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(y).$$

Now for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  fixed, by Lemma (6.2) and the fact that  $u$  is bounded, we get

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{M \setminus B_{1/k}(x)} |u(y) - u(x)| H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \leq 2\|u\|_\infty \int_0^1 e^{-c/t} \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} + 2\|u\|_\infty \int_1^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} < +\infty.$$

Therefore we can apply Fubini and infer

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)_B^{s/2} u(x) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{M \setminus B_{1/k}(x)} \int_0^\infty (u(y) - u(x)) H_M(x, y, t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\mu(y) \\ &= \text{P.V.} \int_M (u(y) - u(x)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

For what concerns the absolute convergence for  $s \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\int_M (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) = \int_{B_r(x)} (\dots) d\mu(y) + \int_{M \setminus B_r(x)} (\dots) d\mu(y) =: I_1 + I_2.$$

For  $r$  small, arguing exactly as in the proof of Theorem 4.8

$$I_1 \leq C \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{1}{d(x, y)^{n+s-1}} d\mu(y) \leq C \int_0^r \frac{1}{\rho^s} d\rho < +\infty.$$

On the other hand, for the second integral

$$I_2 \leq 2\|u\|_\infty \int_{M \setminus B_r(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y),$$

and thanks to Lemma 6.2 and Fubini

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M \setminus B_r(x)} \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t^{1+s/2}} \int_{M \setminus B_r(x)} H_M(x, y, t) d\mu(y) dt \\ &\leq C \int_0^1 e^{-c/t} \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} + \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{t^{1+s/2}} dt < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Remark 6.4.** One can note that the proof above of the absolute convergence of  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u$  for  $s \in (0, 1)$  actually shows that the integral is absolutely convergent if  $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^\alpha(M) \cap L^\infty(M)$ , for some  $\alpha > s$ .

Regarding the following two results, we couldn't find any proof in the case of an ambient Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ , even though they appear to be well-known in the community in the case  $M = \mathbb{R}^n$  or a domain  $M = \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . For example, a proof that  $\text{Dom}((-\Delta_\Omega)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2}) = H^s(\Omega)$  for the Dirichlet Laplacian on  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  can be found in [5, Section 3.1.3], but it heavily uses the discreteness of the spectrum and interpolation theory.

Our results are not sharp, in particular, we believe that Proposition 6.5 and 6.6 hold also for  $s = \sigma$  since this is the case for domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Here we focus on providing structural (and short) proofs that apply verbatim to the case of any weighted manifold, and we avoid using any local Euclidean-like structure of  $M$ .

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a stochastically complete Riemannian manifold,  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  and  $u \in H^\sigma(M)$  (as defined in Definition 1.1). Then, for every  $s < \sigma$  the singular integral  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2}u$  (defined in (5)) and the Bochner  $(-\Delta)_{\text{B}}^{s/2}u$  (defined in (3)) definition coincide a.e. Moreover  $(-\Delta)_{\text{B}}^{s/2}u = (-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2}u \in L^2(M)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in H^\sigma(M)$  and  $x \in M$ . Since  $M$  is stochastically complete, if we could exchange the order of integration we would have

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)_{\text{B}}^{s/2}u(x) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty (e^{t\Delta}u(x) - u(x)) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty \left( \int_M H_M(x, y, t)(u(y) - u(x)) d\mu(y) \right) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &= \int_M (u(y) - u(x)) \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) = (-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2}u(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now we shall justify the steps above, showing that the integral is absolutely convergent. Note that this will also justify the last equality, since we have defined  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2}$  with the Cauchy principal value. In particular, we show that

$$\int_M \left( \int_M |u(x) - u(y)| \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right)^2 d\mu(x) < +\infty.$$

This will prove at the same time that the integral above is absolutely convergent for a.e.  $x \in M$  and that  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2}u \in L^2(M)$ . Let us call

$$\mathfrak{I}(t) := \int_M |u(x) - u(y)| H_M(x, y, t) d\mu(y),$$

and denote by  $C$  a constant that depends only on  $\sigma$  and  $s$ .

Note that, by Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \mathfrak{I}(t)^2 \frac{dt}{t^{1+\sigma}} &= \int_0^\infty \left( \int_M |u(x) - u(y)| H_M(x, y, t) d\mu(y) \right)^2 \frac{dt}{t^{1+\sigma}} \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \int_M |u(x) - u(y)|^2 H_M(x, y, t) d\mu(y) \frac{dt}{t^{1+\sigma}} \\ &= C \int_M |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \mathcal{K}_{2\sigma}(x, y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_M \left( \int_M |u(x) - u(y)| \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= C \int_M \left( \int_0^\infty \mathfrak{I}(t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right)^2 d\mu \leq C \int_M \left( \int_0^1 \mathfrak{I}(t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right)^2 d\mu + C \int_M \left( \int_1^\infty \mathfrak{I}(t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right)^2 d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral, since  $s < \sigma$ , by Hölder's inequality and (33) we have

$$\int_M \left( \int_0^1 \mathfrak{I}(t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right)^2 d\mu \leq \int_M \left( \int_0^1 \mathfrak{I}(t)^2 \frac{dt}{t^{1+\sigma}} \right) \left( \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{t^{1-\sigma+s}} \right) d\mu \leq C[u]_{H^\sigma(M)}^2 < +\infty.$$

For the second integral, let us first renormalize the measure  $\nu := Cdt/t^{1+s/2}$  in a way that it becomes a probability measure on  $[1, \infty)$ . Then, by Jensen again (applied two times: to  $d\nu(t)$  and then  $H_M(x, y, t)d\mu(y)$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \left( \int_1^\infty \mathfrak{I}(t) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right)^2 d\mu &\leq C \iint_{M \times M} \int_1^\infty |u(x) - u(y)|^2 H_M(x, y, t) d\nu(t) d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq 4C \iint_{M \times M} \int_1^\infty |u(x)|^2 H_M(x, y, t) d\nu(t) d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq 4C \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have proved

$$\|(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \leq \int_M \left( \int_M |u(x) - u(y)| \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) d\mu(y) \right)^2 d\mu(x) \leq C \|u\|_{H^\sigma(M)}^2,$$

and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

Next, we address the equivalence of the spectral fractional Laplacian  $(-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2}$  with the other definitions. We refer to [18] and [12, Section 2.6] and the references therein for an introduction of the spectral theory of the fractional Laplacian on general spaces.

Let  $E_\lambda$  be the spectral resolvent of (minus) the Laplacian on  $(M, g)$ . Then, for  $s \in (0, 2)$  in the classical sense of spectral theory

$$\text{Dom}((-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2}) := \left\{ u \in L^2(M) : \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} \lambda^s d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle < +\infty \right\}.$$

**Proposition 6.6.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a stochastically complete Riemannian manifold,  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  and  $s < \sigma$ . Then  $H^\sigma(M) \subseteq \text{Dom}((-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in H^\sigma(M)$ , and let

$$\varphi(\lambda) := \lambda^{s/2} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda t} - 1) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}}.$$

Since  $u \in L^2(M)$ , by standard spectral theory (see [19] for example)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \lambda^s d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle &= \int_0^\infty |\varphi(\lambda)|^2 d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle = \|\varphi(-\Delta)u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \\ &= \left\| \int_0^\infty (e^{t\Delta} u - u) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \right\|_{L^2(M)}^2 = \|(-\Delta)_{\text{B}}^{s/2} u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 = \|(-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 < +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that by Proposition 6.5  $(-\Delta)_{\text{B}}^{s/2} u = (-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u \in L^2(M)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.7.** *Let  $u \in \text{Dom}((-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2})$ . Then*

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty (e^{t\Delta}u - u) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} = \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} \lambda^{s/2} d\langle E_\lambda u, \cdot \rangle,$$

where the equality is in duality with  $\text{Dom}((-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2})$ .

*Proof.* We follow [7, Lemma 2.2] which deals with the analogous proposition in the case of discrete spectrum in a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Recall the numerical formula

$$\lambda^{s/2} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda t} - 1) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}},$$

valid for  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $0 < s < 2$ . Let  $\psi \in \text{Dom}((-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2})$ , and write  $\psi = \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} dE_\lambda \langle \psi, \cdot \rangle$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} \lambda^{s/2} d\langle E_\lambda u, \psi \rangle &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda t} - 1) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} d\langle E_\lambda u, \psi \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty \left( \int_{\sigma(-\Delta)} (e^{-\lambda t} - 1) d\langle E_\lambda u, \psi \rangle \right) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s/2)} \int_0^\infty (\langle e^{t\Delta}u, \psi \rangle - \langle u, \psi \rangle) \frac{dt}{t^{1+s/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second-last inequality follows by Fubini's theorem since  $u, \psi \in \text{Dom}((-\Delta)_{\text{Spec}}^{s/2})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.8.** *Let  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ ,  $s < \sigma$  and  $u \in H^\sigma(M)$ . Then*

$$\frac{1}{2} [u]_{H^{s/2}(M)}^2 = \int_M u (-\Delta)_{\text{Si}}^{s/2} u \, d\mu = \int_0^\infty \lambda^{s/2} d\langle E_\lambda u, u \rangle.$$

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of Proposition 6.5, Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.7.  $\square$

**6.3. Manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature.** We recall a theorem of Yau which gives a lower bound on the growth of the volume of geodesic balls under the nonnegative Ricci curvature assumption. Note that the same holds with the same proof on  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  spaces.

**Theorem 6.9.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a complete non-compact Riemannian manifold with  $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$ . Then, there exists a constant  $C = C(n) > 0$  such that for every  $x \in M$  and  $\lambda > 0$*

$$V_x(r\lambda) \geq CrV_x(\lambda), \quad \forall r > 1.$$

*Proof.* By scaling invariance of the hypothesis  $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$  one can assume  $\lambda = 1$ . Then, the result is [24, Theorem 2.5].  $\square$

Next, we present here a result concerning the growth of the singular kernel  $\mathcal{K}_s$  in the case of nonnegative Ricci curvature. We will not use this result anywhere but we believe it can be interesting per se. For example, it implies that on cylinders  $M = \mathbb{S}^{n-k} \times \mathbb{R}^k$  (with their product metric) the singular kernel  $\mathcal{K}_s(x, y)$  decays like  $1/d(x, y)^{k+s}$  and not  $1/d(x, y)^{n+s}$  for large distances.

**Lemma 6.10.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be an  $n$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold with  $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$  and  $s \in (0, 2)$ . Then, there exists dimensional constants  $0 < c < C$  such that*

$$c \frac{s(2-s)}{r^s \mu(B_r(x))} \leq \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) \leq C \frac{s(2-s)}{r^s \mu(B_r(x))}$$

with  $r = d(x, y)$  for all  $y \in M$ .

*Proof.* In the definition of the singular kernel  $\mathcal{K}_s$  we first perform the change of variables  $r^2 t = k$  with  $r = d(x, y)$  so that we obtain

$$\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) = \frac{r^{-s}}{|\Gamma(-s/2)|} \int_0^\infty H_M(x, y, r^2 k) \frac{dk}{k^{1+s/2}}.$$

Now we employ the Gaussian estimates from above to get

$$\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) \leq \frac{Cs(2-s)}{r^s} \left[ \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\mu(B_{r\sqrt{k}}(x))} e^{-1/5k} \frac{dk}{k^{1+s/2}} + \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{\mu(B_{r\sqrt{k}}(x))} e^{-1/5k} \frac{dk}{k^{1+s/2}} \right] =: I_1 + I_2.$$

Using Bishop-Gromov's inequality we get

$$I_1 \leq \frac{Cs(2-s)}{\mu(B_r(x))} \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-1/5k}}{k^{n/2+1+s/2}} dk \leq \frac{Cs(2-s)}{\mu(B_r(x))},$$

while for  $k \in (1, \infty)$  we can use Theorem 6.9 to write

$$I_2 \leq \frac{Cs(2-s)}{\mu(B_r(x))} \int_1^\infty e^{-1/5k} \frac{dk}{k^{3/2+s/2}} \leq \frac{Cs(2-s)}{\mu(B_r(x))}$$

and this concludes the upper estimate. For the one from below we again use the Gaussian estimates to infer

$$\mathcal{K}_s(x, y) \geq \frac{cs(2-s)}{r^s} \left[ \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\mu(B_{r\sqrt{k}}(x))} e^{-1/3k} \frac{dk}{k^{1+s/2}} + \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{\mu(B_{r\sqrt{k}}(x))} e^{-1/3k} \frac{dk}{k^{1+s/2}} \right] =: I_3 + I_4.$$

We now get

$$I_3 \geq \frac{cs(2-s)}{\mu(B_r(x))} \int_0^1 e^{-1/3k} \frac{dk}{k^{1+s/2}} = \frac{cs(2-s)}{\mu(B_r(x))}.$$

Since  $I_4 \geq 0$  we infer the lower bound as well.  $\square$

**Remark 6.11.** *If we assume  $\text{AVR}(M) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(B_r(x))}{\omega_n r^n} = \theta > 0$  then we have the more Euclidean-like bounds*

$$\frac{cs(2-s)}{\theta r^{n+s}} \leq \mathcal{K}_s(x, y) \leq \frac{Cs(2-s)}{\theta r^{n+s}}.$$

*Note moreover that the same proof works in the singular setting of  $\text{RCD}(0, N)$  spaces.*

The following is a well-known result concerning the regularization of bounded functions via the heat flow whose proof is based on Bakry-Emery inequality. Here we shall present a direct proof exploiting Gaussian estimates, Yau's inequality and the following fact

$$\frac{\text{Per}(B_r(x))}{\mu(B_r(x))} \leq \frac{n}{r} \quad \forall r > 0, \quad (34)$$

which is an easy consequence of the Bishop-Gromov theorem. We stress that our proof is not fully general since it does not cover the case of  $\text{RCD}(0, \infty)$  spaces (our inequality is not dimension free).

**Proposition 6.12** ( $L^\infty$  – Lip regularization). *Let  $(M, g)$  be a geodesically complete Riemannian manifold with  $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$ , then for every  $u \in L^\infty(\mu)$  we have  $\text{Lip}(e^{t\Delta} u) \leq C/\sqrt{t}$  for some  $C = C(n) > 0$ , for all  $t > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Fix any  $u \in L^\infty(\mu)$  and  $p, q \in M$ . Then we have

$$|H_M(x, p, t) - H_M(x, q, t)| \leq d(p, q) \int_0^1 |\nabla H_M(x, \gamma_s, t)| ds \quad \forall x \in M, \forall t > 0$$

where  $\gamma$  is a constant speed geodesic joining  $p$  and  $q$ . Now we have

$$|e^{t\Delta}u(p) - e^{t\Delta}u(q)| \leq d(p, q)\|u\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^1 \int_M |\nabla H_M(x, \gamma_s, t)| d\mu(x) dt$$

which exploiting the Gaussian estimates for the gradient (28) and the Coarea formula becomes

$$|e^{t\Delta}u(p) - e^{t\Delta}u(q)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}} d(p, q)\|u\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty e^{-d^2(x, \gamma_s)/5t} \frac{\text{Per}(B_r(\gamma_s))}{\mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(\gamma_s))} dr ds.$$

Now we can multiply and divide the integrand by  $\mu(B_r(\gamma_s))$ , use Coarea formula and apply (34) to get

$$|e^{t\Delta}u(p) - e^{t\Delta}u(q)| \leq \frac{Cn}{\sqrt{t}} d(p, q)\|u\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty e^{-r^2/5t} \frac{\mu(B_r(\gamma_s))}{\mu(B_{\sqrt{t}}(\gamma_s))} \frac{1}{r} dr ds.$$

We now set  $r^2/5t = z$  and we get, applying Theorem 6.9 and relabeling constants,

$$|e^{t\Delta}u(p) - e^{t\Delta}u(q)| \leq \frac{Cn}{\sqrt{t}} d(p, q)\|u\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-z}}{\sqrt{z}} dz,$$

that is the thesis. □

**Acknowledgements.** We are much thankful to Diego Pallara and Nicola Gigli for useful discussions and comments on a draft of this work, and to Alexander Grigoryan for having shown us how to prove part (ii) of Proposition 2.6. We also thank the Fields Institute in Toronto, which is where the two authors first met, for the kind hospitality during the thematic program "Nonsmooth Riemannian and Lorentzian Geometry" in the fall semester 2022 .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(7):1405–1490, 2014. [23](#)
- [2] L. Ambrosio, S. Honda, and D. Tewodrose. Short-time behavior of the heat kernel and Weyl’s law on  $\text{red}^*(k, n)$  spaces. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 53(1):97–119, 2018. [29](#)
- [3] V. Banica, M. d. M. González, and M. Sáez. Some constructions for the fractional Laplacian on noncompact manifolds. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 31(2):681–712, 2015. [2](#), [3](#)
- [4] F. Baudoin, Q. Lang, and Y. Sire. Powers of generators on dirichlet spaces and applications to harnack principles. *arXiv preprint*, 2020. [26](#)
- [5] M. Bonforte, Y. Sire, and J. L. Vázquez. Existence, uniqueness and asymptotic behaviour for fractional porous medium equations on bounded domains. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(12):5725–5767, 2015. [34](#)
- [6] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32(7-9):1245–1260, 2007. [2](#)
- [7] L. A. Caffarelli and P. R. Stinga. Fractional elliptic equations, Caccioppoli estimates and regularity. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 33(3):767–807, 2016. [36](#)
- [8] A. Carbotti, S. Cito, D. A. La Manna, and D. Pallara. Asymptotics of the  $s$ -fractional gaussian perimeter as  $s \rightarrow 0^+$ . *Fractional Calculus and Applied Analysis*, pages 1388–1403, 2022. [1](#), [4](#), [11](#), [12](#)
- [9] M. Caselli, E. Florit Simon, and J. Serra. Yau’s conjecture for nonlocal minimal surfaces. —to appear—, 2023. [1](#), [18](#), [31](#), [32](#), [33](#)
- [10] S.-Y. A. Chang and M. d. M. González. Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry. *Adv. Math.*, 226(2):1410–1432, 2011. [2](#)
- [11] S. Dipierro, A. Figalli, G. Palatucci, and E. Valdinoci. Asymptotics of the  $s$ -perimeter as  $s \searrow 0$ . *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 33(7):2777–2790, 2013. [1](#), [4](#), [5](#), [12](#), [13](#), [22](#)
- [12] S. Eriksson-Bique, G. Giovannardi, R. Korte, N. Shanmugalingam, and G. Speight. Regularity of solutions to the fractional Cheeger-Laplacian on domains in metric spaces of bounded geometry. *J. Differential Equations*, 306:590–632, 2022. [35](#)
- [13] N. Gigli. On the differential structure of metric measure spaces and applications. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 236(1113):vi+91, 2015. [23](#)

- [14] N. Gigli and E. Pasqualetto. *Lectures on nonsmooth differential geometry*, volume 2 of *SISSA Springer Series*. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020. [23](#)
- [15] N. Gigli, L. Tamanini, and D. Trevisan. Viscosity solutions of hamilton-jacobi equation in  $\text{rcd}^*(k, \infty)$  spaces and applications to large deviations, 2022. [26](#)
- [16] A. Grigoryan. Analytic and geometric background of recurrence and non-explosion of the Brownian motion on Riemannian manifolds. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 36(2):135–249, 1999. [6](#), [7](#), [21](#), [22](#)
- [17] A. Grigoryan. Heat kernels on weighted manifolds and applications. In *The ubiquitous heat kernel*, volume 398 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 93–191. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006. [12](#)
- [18] A. Grigor'yan. *Heat kernel and analysis on manifolds*, volume 47 of *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Boston, MA, 2009. [3](#), [10](#), [35](#)
- [19] A. Grigor'yan. *Heat kernel and analysis on manifolds*, volume 47 of *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Boston, MA, 2009. [6](#), [35](#)
- [20] G. Grillo, K. Ishige, and M. Muratori. Nonlinear characterizations of stochastic completeness. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 139:63–82, 2020. [6](#)
- [21] G. Grillo, K. Ishige, M. Muratori, and F. Punzo. A general nonlinear characterization of stochastic incompleteness, 2023. [6](#)
- [22] R. Jiang, H. Li, and H. Zhang. Heat kernel bounds on metric measure spaces and some applications. *Potential Anal.*, 44(3):601–627, 2016. [24](#)
- [23] H. Li. Dimension-free Harnack inequalities on  $\text{rcd}^*(k, \infty)$  spaces. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 29(4):1280–1297, 2016. [24](#)
- [24] P. Li. *Geometric analysis*, volume 134 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. [6](#), [36](#)
- [25] J. Lott and C. Villani. Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 169(3):903–991, 2009. [23](#)
- [26] Y. Pinchover. On nonexistence of any  $\lambda_0$ -invariant positive harmonic function, a counterexample to Stroock's conjecture. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 20(9-10):1831–1846, 1995. [7](#), [15](#), [21](#)
- [27] L. Saloff-Coste. A note on Poincaré, Sobolev, and Harnack inequalities. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, pages 27–38, 1992. [9](#)
- [28] K.-T. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):65–131, 2006. [23](#)
- [29] K.-T. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):133–177, 2006. [23](#), [24](#)
- [30] L. Tamanini. From harnack inequality to heat kernel estimates on metric measure spaces and applications, 2019. [25](#)

(M. Caselli) SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE  
 PIAZZA DEI CAVALIERI 7, 56126 PISA, ITALY  
 Email address: [michele.caselli@sns.it](mailto:michele.caselli@sns.it)

(L. Gennaioli) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES  
 34136 TRIESTE, ITALY  
 Email address: [luca.gennaioli@sissa.it](mailto:luca.gennaioli@sissa.it)