

BOUNDARY REGULARITY FOR NON-LOCAL OPERATORS WITH SYMMETRIC KERNELS AND VANISHING HORIZON

PHILIPP SVINGER

ABSTRACT. We prove optimal Hölder boundary regularity for a non-local operator with a singular, symmetric kernel that depends on the distance to the boundary of the underlying domain. Additionally, we prove higher boundary regularity of solutions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Non-local energy forms have long been used to define function spaces (see, e.g., [Leo23]) and have been intensively studied in recent years due to their connections with other fields, such as Markov processes (see [FOT10]) and peridynamics (see [Sil00]). The non-local nature of these energy forms leads to challenging questions regarding coercivity estimates and functional inequalities. In [Dyd06], Dyda proved the following comparability result for non-local energy forms defining the Sobolev-Slobodeckij space $H^s(\Omega)$. Given a bounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, there exists some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$ such that for any $u \in L^2(\Omega)$

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy dx \leq c \int_{\Omega} \int_{B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}(x)}(x)} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy dx \quad (1.1)$$

where $d_{\Omega}(x)$ denotes the distance from x to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. By setting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, v) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}(x)}(x)} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{y \in B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}(x)}(x)\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}(y)}(y)\}}}{2} dy dx, \end{aligned}$$

the estimate (1.1) establishes that $[u]_{H^s(\Omega)}$ is comparable to $\mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, u)$. This energy form has an associated integro-differential operator

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u(x) = \text{p. v.} \int_{\Omega} (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) dy = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \int_{\Omega \setminus B_{\epsilon}(x)} (u(x) - u(y)) \mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) dy. \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) = |x - y|^{-d-2s} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{y \in B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}(x)}(x)\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}(y)}(y)\}}}{2}. \quad (1.3)$$

This paper investigates the boundary regularity of solutions to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47G20, 35B65, 35S15, 35R09.

Key words and phrases. Nonlocal, boundary regularity, censored, regional, fractional Laplace, truncated, vanishing horizon.

Note that we need a restriction $s > 1/2$ to define a trace of u in the variational setup and impose boundary values $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

1.1. Main Results. For the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}$ from (1.2), we will prove the following boundary regularity result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain, $s \in (1/2, 1)$, and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Assume that $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to the Dirichlet problem (1.4) for some $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then $u \in C^{2s-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with*

$$\|u\|_{C^{2s-1}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq c\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad (1.5)$$

for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$.

In terms of higher boundary regularity, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain, $s \in (1/2, 1)$, and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Assume, that as in Theorem 1.1, $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ solves (1.4) for some $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then there exists some $\alpha = \alpha(d, s, \sigma) \in (0, 1)$ such that $u/d_\Omega^{2s-1} \in C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$ with*

$$\left\| \frac{u}{d_\Omega^{2s-1}} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} \leq c\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad (1.6)$$

for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$.

Remark 1.3. We start with some comments on these results.

- The associated operator to the H^s energy $[u]_{H^s(\Omega)}$ is the regional fractional Laplacian (see (1.10) for a definition), for which results corresponding to Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are known (see, e.g., [Fal22]). Note, that the comparability of energies $\mathcal{E}_{\Omega,\sigma}(u, u)$ and $[u]_{H^s(\Omega)}$ does not directly imply that Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 also hold true for the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}$.
- Given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, the comparability (1.1) implies the existence and uniqueness of weak solutions $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ to the Dirichlet problem (1.4).
- In the half-space, we can explicitly compute the action of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma}$ on the monomials $\varphi(x) = x_d^\gamma$. Indeed, as for the regional fractional Laplacian, the function $\varphi(x) = x^{2s-1}$ is a harmonic function in the half-line, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+,\sigma}\varphi = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+ (compare Proposition 2.7).
- The C^{2s-1} Hölder regularity from (1.5) is optimal. Even if $\partial\Omega$ and f would be smooth, in general $u \notin C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$ for any $\alpha > 2s - 1$. To see this, note that the weak solution $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ to (1.4) with $f \equiv 1$ satisfies $u \asymp d_\Omega^{2s-1}$ due to the bound $|u| \lesssim d_\Omega^{2s-1}$ (see (4.4)) and a Hopf type result (compare Remark 4.4). Hence, this solution is not in $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$ for any $\alpha > 2s - 1$.
- Due to the form of $\mathcal{K}_{\Omega,\sigma}$, the domain of integration of $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}$ is very different in the cases $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma = 1$. If we evaluate $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}u(x)$ at some point $x \in \Omega$, the operator integrates around x in two domains corresponding to the two summands in (1.3) (compare with Figure 1 and Figure 2 for examples in the case where Ω is the half-space). If $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, then both of these domains shrink down to the point x as x approaches the boundary. However, in the case $\sigma = 1$, the domain corresponding to the second summand in (1.3), will always include points far into the domain. This phenomena causes differences in the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 for the cases $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma = 1$.

Let us mention two related open problems.

- i) Due to the method of the proof, we have no control over α in Theorem 1.2. Hence, the optimal higher boundary regularity remains open.
- ii) In [KW22], a non-local operator with visibility constraint was introduced

$$Lu(x) = \text{p. v.} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} (\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_x}(y) + \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_y}(x)) \, dy \quad (1.7)$$

where $\Omega_x = \{y \mid tx + (1-t)y \in \Omega, \forall t \in (0, 1)\}$. This operator only considers tuples $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega$ if the line segment between x and y is contained in Ω . With the same methods as in this paper, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 could be proven for L . It would be interesting to find a general class of non-local operators on domains including $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ and L which allow the kernel to vanish, such that Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 still holds true. However, this seems more difficult because in the proof we heavily use that the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ has an associated version $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma}$ in the half-space, for which explicit computations are possible.

1.2. Related literature. Regularity theory for non-local equations has been an active field of research for the past 25 years. In particular, understanding regularity up to the boundary is of great interest since non-local equations give rise to phenomena that have no counterpart in the local setting. Indeed, let u solve the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} Lu &= f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

for $L = -\Delta$ on some bounded smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, if f is smooth up to the boundary, so is u (see, e.g., [FR22b, Thm. 2.35]). In contrast, if L is the fractional Laplacian

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) = c_{d,s} \text{p. v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \, dy,$$

for some $s \in (0, 1)$, solutions u to the exterior value problem

$$\begin{aligned} Lu &= f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \Omega^c \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

are in general only C^s Hölder continuous up to the boundary, even if f is smooth (see, e.g., [RS14]). Another type of non-local operator studied in the literature is the regional (or sometimes called censored) fractional Laplacian (see, e.g., [Che18], [Fal22])

$$(-\Delta)_{\Omega}^s u(x) = c_{d,s} \text{p. v.} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \, dy. \quad (1.10)$$

For $L = (-\Delta)_{\Omega}^s$ and $s \in (1/2, 1)$, solutions u to the Dirichlet problem (1.8) are in general only C^{2s-1} up to the boundary. As mentioned above, the restriction $s > 1/2$ is needed to define a trace of u in the variational setup and impose boundary values $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

A typical approach to study boundary regularity of solutions to (1.8) entails the characterization of non-trivial L -harmonic functions in the half-line \mathbb{R}_+ , i.e., solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} L\varphi &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \varphi(0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

Indeed, the function $\varphi_1(x) = x^{2s-1}$ solves (1.11) for the regional fractional Laplacian as well as for the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ from (1.2). For the fractional Laplacian, a harmonic solution in the half-line is given by $\varphi_2(x) := (x_+)^s$.

Closely related to this work is the paper [Cha23], where Hölder boundary regularity of the operator

$$L_\Omega u(x) = \text{p. v.} \int_{B_{d_\Omega(x)}(x)} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy \quad (1.12)$$

is studied. In comparison to $(-\Delta)_\Omega^s$, the domain of integration in the integro-differential operator L_Ω is further reduced to the ball around x inside Ω with maximal radius. The operator L_Ω has the property that $d_\Omega(x)^{2s-2} L_\Omega u(x) \rightarrow c_{d,s} (-\Delta)u(x)$ as $x \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ for smooth u (see [Cha23, Lem. A.1]). Furthermore, due to the symmetry of the integration domain in the operator (1.12), the function $\varphi_3(x) = x$ is $L_{\mathbb{R}_+}$ -harmonic in \mathbb{R}_+ . Note that φ_3 approaches the boundary linearly, indicating a different boundary behavior of solutions to the Dirichlet problem compared to the regional fractional Laplacian. Indeed, given a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $s \in (1/2, 1)$, it was proven in [Cha23], that

$$u \in C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ solves (1.8) for } L = L_\Omega \left. \vphantom{u} \right\} \Rightarrow u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ for some } \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (1.13)$$

The assumption $d_\Omega^{2s-2} f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ (compared to $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ as in Theorem 1.1) is a decay assumption on f at the boundary. However, it does not directly interfere with the result $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$. By adapting the proof in [Cha23], one could also prove (1.13) under the assumption $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

We can rewrite the operator from (1.12) as $L_\Omega u(x) = \text{p. v.} \int_\Omega (u(x) - u(y))K(x, y) dy$ where K is the kernel

$$K(x, y) = |x - y|^{-d-2s} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\sigma d_\Omega(x)}(x)}(y).$$

and σ is the fixed constant $\sigma = 1$. Note that this kernel is not symmetric. By symmetrizing the kernel K , we obtain the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$.

We want to stress the different boundary regularities for solutions to the Dirichlet problem involving the operators L_Ω and $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$. This effect is mainly due to the symmetry properties of the corresponding kernels. The operator L_Ω corresponds to an operator in non-divergence form whereas $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ corresponds to an operator in divergence form. We also want to mention that the effect that symmetric kernels of non-local operators may lead to different boundary behavior of solutions to (1.9) than corresponding non-symmetric kernels is known in the literature (see, e.g., [Dip+22] where boundary regularity results were proven for translational invariant non-local operators in terms of the corresponding Fourier symbols).

There has also been much interest recently in non-local operators of the form

$$Lu(x) = \int_\Omega (u(x) - u(y))(k(x, y) + k(y, x)) dy \quad (1.14)$$

with associated energy $\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} (u(x) - u(y))^2 k(x, y) dy dx$ where

$$k(x, y) = \frac{1}{|x - y|^\beta} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{y \in B_{\sigma d_\Omega(x)}(x)\}}}{(\sigma d_\Omega(x))^{d+2-\beta}}$$

for some $\beta \in [0, d+2)$ and $\sigma > 0$ (see, e.g., [TD17], [SD24], [SD25], [DMT22]). This kernel differs from the one studied in this work due to the factor $(d_\Omega(x))^{-d-2+\beta}$. As a result, the kernel not only has a possible singularity on the diagonal but also as x approaches the boundary. We also want to mention that, due to scaling properties, the action of this operator on monomials in the half-line can be explicitly computed (compare Remark 2.8).

For the fractional Laplacian, C^s regularity up to the boundary of solutions to (1.9) with right-hand side $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ in $C^{1,1}$ domains was proven in [RS14]. In multiple works ([Gru14],

[Gru15], [RS16a], [RS16b], [RS17]), this was generalized to a broader class of operators and less regularity assumptions on the boundary of the domain. In [FR24] C^s boundary regularity was proven for non-degenerate $2s$ -stable operators in $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains. Recently, in [Gru24], this result was generalized to domains satisfying a $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -condition.

There are also results on boundary regularity for operators

$$Lu(x) = \text{p. v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u(x) - u(y))k(x, y) dy$$

with a kernel k satisfying $0 < \lambda \leq k(x, y)|x - y|^{d+2s} \leq \Lambda$. If k is translational invariant, i.e., $k(x, y) = \tilde{k}(x - y)$, then it was shown in [RW24], that solutions to (1.9) with $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ are C^s up to the boundary. An additional assumption on the kernel is needed for the nontranslational invariant case. In [KW24], the optimal C^s Hölder regularity was proven for Hölder continuous kernels, which are not necessarily translational invariant.

The regional fractional Laplacian (see (1.10)) is the infinitesimal generator of the censored symmetric stable process, which was constructed in [BBC03]. For the regional fractional Laplacian, solutions to the Dirichlet problem (1.8) for $s > 1/2$ with $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ are in general only C^{2s-1} up to the boundary. This was proven in [Che18] using the Green function estimates from [CK02]. The result was optimized in [Fal22] for $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains and more general right-hand sides. Additionally, [Fal22] not only investigated the Dirichlet problem but also provided results on boundary regularity for the Neumann problem for the regional fractional Laplacian.

In terms of higher boundary regularity for the fractional Laplacian, there are many results which prove Hölder regularity for u/d_Ω^s by using various regularity assumptions on the right-hand side f (see, e.g., [RS14], [RS17], [Gru14], [Gru15], [AR20]). For the regional fractional Laplacian, regularity for u/d_Ω^{2s-1} was proven in [Fal22] and [FR22a].

In [Cho+24], Green function estimates and Boundary Harnack Principles were proven for operators with kernels decaying at the boundary (see also [KSV21] and [KSV23] for results in the half-space). However, their results do not cover the operator studied in this paper.

As discussed above, the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}$ can be seen as an operator with visibility constraint that was studied in [KW22]. In [KW22], energy forms associated with (1.7) were investigated, and Poincaré inequalities were proven.

Another type of operator similar to $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}$ is studied in [BO21] where the domain of integration in (1.10) is changed from Ω to some ball with fixed radius $B_{r_0}(x)$. For this operator, C^s boundary regularity of solutions to (1.9) can be obtained by writing the equation in terms of the fractional Laplacian (similar as in the proof of Lemma 2.5) and using the boundary regularity for $(-\Delta)^s$.

1.3. Strategy of the proof. In the proof of Theorem 1.1, we follow the typical approach of combining an estimate $|u| \lesssim d_\Omega^{2s-1}$ with interior regularity results. We deduce the interior regularity results from known results about the fractional Laplacian by writing $(-\Delta)^s u = f + (-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma} u$ and treating the difference $(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma} u$ as a right-hand side.

The key ingredient in the proof of the estimate $|u| \lesssim d_\Omega^{2s-1}$ is a barrier of the form $\varphi = cd_\Omega^{2s-1} - d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}$. In the half-space \mathbb{R}_+^d we can explicitly compute the action of the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma}$ on this barrier (see Proposition 2.7). In fact, the function $d_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}^{2s-1}$ is a $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma}$ -harmonic solution in the half-space. Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma} d_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}^{2s-1+\epsilon} = c_1 d_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}^{-1+\epsilon}$$

for some $c_1 < 0$.

In section 3, we follow the proof of [FR24, Appendix B.2] to conclude that $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}\varphi \gtrsim d_{\Omega}^{-1+\epsilon}$ close to $\partial\Omega$. However, herein, difficulties arise since the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}$ is not translational invariant and depends on the domain Ω . A precise analysis of the geometry of our operator in the half-space is needed.

To prove Theorem 1.2, we use a standard blow-up argument together with a Liouville type result in the half-space (see Proposition 6.1). The Liouville type result follows in two steps. First, using that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma}$ is translational invariant in the tangential direction \mathbb{R}^{d-1} , we obtain that a solution $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma}u = 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^d is a one-dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$. Next, we prove a boundary Harnack type result where we show that $\tilde{u}(y)/y^{2s-1}$ can be extended continuously up to 0 and is locally Hölder continuous (see Proposition 5.1). Finally, we use this to show that u is a constant multiple of the harmonic solution x_d^{2s-1} .

For the proof of the Liouville type result, we mostly follow the proof of [AFR23]. However, also here, difficulties arise. After we have proved that the harmonic solution u in the half-space \mathbb{R}_+^d is a one-dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$, we cannot directly conclude that also $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d,\sigma}\tilde{u} = 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+ . Instead, we must still work with the operator on \mathbb{R}_+^d . This leads to difficulties in proving the boundary Harnack type result since the operator degenerates as we approach the boundary. Especially in the case $\sigma = 1$, this causes a correction factor $x_d^{(d-1)/2}$ throughout section 5.

1.4. Outline. In section 2, we introduce some notation and the weak solution concept for our operator. Furthermore, we prove a first interior regularity result and provide explicit calculations in the half-space. Section 3 contains the construction of the barrier needed to prove Hölder regularity up to the boundary. An L^∞ estimate for u and the completion of the proof for Theorem 1.1 is contained in section 4. In section 5, we will prove a boundary Harnack type result in the half-space, which leads to a Liouville type result in section 6. Finally, in section 7, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

1.5. Acknowledgments. Financial support by the the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 317210226 – SFB 1283 is gratefully acknowledged. The author is grateful to Moritz Kassmann, Marvin Weidner, and Florian Grube for helpful discussions and for valuable comments on the manuscript.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we will introduce some notation and define the weak solution concept for Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. Additionally, we prove a first interior regularity result and present some explicit computations in the half-space.

We will write $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$. Furthermore, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we use the notation $a = a_+ - a_-$ where $a_+ := a \vee 0$ is the positive part and $a_- := -(0 \wedge a)$ is the negative part. In addition, we write $a \lesssim b$ if there exists a positive constant $c > 0$ such that $a \leq cb$. We will use the notation $a \asymp b$ if $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$. Throughout the paper, we use the letter c to denote some positive constant. However, note, that c might change from line to line. Moreover, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a domain in \mathbb{R}^d , then by

$$d_{\Omega}(x) = \inf\{|x - y| : y \in \Omega^c\},$$

we denote the distance from x to $\Omega^c = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$.

By $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we denote the space of smooth functions with compact support inside $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we will write $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$ to denote the space of Hölder continuous functions. This space is equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} = \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |u(x)| + \sup_{x, y \in \overline{\Omega}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha}.$$

For $s \in (0, 1)$, we define a seminorm

$$[u]_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dx dy.$$

Now, we can define the fractional Sobolev space $H^s(\Omega)$ as the space of L^2 functions on Ω with $[u]_{H^s(\Omega)} < \infty$. We equip this space with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + [u]_{H^s(\Omega)}^2.$$

By $H_0^s(\Omega)$, we will denote space we obtain by completion of $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ under the $H^s(\Omega)$ norm. Note that if $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain, there is an equivalent definition (see, e.g., [McL00, Thm. 3.33])

$$H_0^s(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid u = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Hence, throughout the paper, we will extend functions $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ by $u = 0$ on Ω^c . By $H_{loc}^s(\Omega)$, we will denote space of functions u such that the product $u\varphi \in H^s(\Omega)$ for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$.

Furthermore, to simplify notation throughout this paper, we will occasionally omit the underlying domain Ω or the parameter σ from the notation of the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$, the kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ and the bilinear form $\mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}$.

2.1. Weak solution concept. The operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ from (1.2) is defined in terms of the symmetric kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ (see (1.3)). Hence, we have an associated energy form

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} (u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y)) \mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) dy dx. \quad (2.2)$$

As mentioned in the beginning of the introduction, this energy is comparable to the H^s energy $[u]_{H^s(\Omega)}$ in the following sense (see [Dyd06, eq. (13)]).

Corollary 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then, there exists a constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, u) \leq [u]_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 \leq c \mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, u).$$

Definition 2.2 (Weak solution concept). Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain and let $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ be a bounded Lipschitz subdomain. Given $f \in L^2(\Omega')$ we say that a function u satisfying

$$\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega \setminus (\Omega'^c \times \Omega'^c)} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) dx dy < \infty \quad (2.3)$$

is weak solution to $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u = f$ in Ω' if

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega'} f(x) \varphi(x) dx \quad (2.4)$$

for all $\varphi \in H_0^s(\Omega')$.

Remark 2.3. Note, that in the definition above, $\mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, \varphi)$ is finite for all $\varphi \in H_0^s(\Omega')$.

Now assume, that as in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, $\Omega = \Omega'$. Then, using Corollary 2.1, the assumption in (2.3) is equivalent to $[u]_{H^s(\Omega)} < \infty$. Hence, we can give the following definition for a weak solution to the Dirichlet problem (1.4).

Definition 2.4. Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain. Given $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we say that a function $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to the Dirichlet problem (1.4) if (2.4) is satisfied for all $\varphi \in H_0^s(\Omega)$.

2.2. Interior regularity. We can rewrite the kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ of our operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma}$ from (1.2) as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) = \frac{\mathcal{B}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{y \in B_{\sigma d_\Omega(x)}(x)\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in B_{\sigma d_\Omega(y)}(y)\}}}{2}.$$

Notice that $0 \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) \leq 1$. Furthermore, for every $x \in \Omega$ in the interior, we have $\mathcal{B}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) = 1$ for all y in some small neighborhood around x . To be more precise:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\Omega, \sigma}(x, y) = 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad y \in B_{cd_\Omega(x)}(x) \quad (2.5)$$

where $c = \sigma/(1 + \sigma)$. Indeed, let $y \in B_{cd_\Omega(x)}(x)$. Then,

$$|x - y| \leq cd_\Omega(x) = \sigma(d_\Omega(x) - cd_\Omega(x)) \leq \sigma d_\Omega(y)$$

which implies $x \in B_{\sigma d_\Omega(y)}(y)$. Furthermore, $y \in B_{\sigma d_\Omega(x)}(x)$ since $c \leq \sigma$ which shows (2.5).

We continue by proving our first regularity result for our operator \mathcal{L} . For this, we define the weighted L^∞ norm

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_\kappa(\Omega)} := \left\| \frac{u(x)}{1 + |x|^\kappa} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Lemma 2.5. Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, $\epsilon \in (0, 2s)$ and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a domain with $B_{2+\frac{3}{\sigma}} \subset \Omega$. Assume that u is a weak solution of $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u = f$ in B_1 with $u \in L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $f \in L^\infty(B_1)$. Then $u \in C^{2s}(\overline{B_{1/2}})$ and

$$\|u\|_{C^{2s}(\overline{B_{1/2}})} \leq c \left(\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right)$$

for some constant $c = c(s, d, \epsilon) > 0$.

Proof. Rewriting our operator \mathcal{L}_Ω in terms of the fractional Laplacian, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s u(x) &= f(x) + u(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1 - \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u(y)(1 - \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &=: f(x) + h(x) \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in B_1$ in the weak sense.

Claim: $\mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y) = 1$ for all $x \in B_1$ and $y \in B_2$.

For $x \in B_1$ and $y \in B_2$ we have $y \in B_3(x) \subset B_{\sigma d_\Omega(x)}(x)$ where the last inclusion follows since

$$d_\Omega(x) \geq 2 + \frac{3}{\sigma} - 1 \geq \frac{3}{\sigma}$$

using the assumption $B_{2+3/\sigma} \subset \Omega$. Furthermore, $x \in B_3(y) \subset B_{\sigma d_\Omega(y)}(y)$ where we use that $d_\Omega(y) \geq 2 + \frac{3}{\sigma} - 2 = \frac{3}{\sigma}$. This proves the claim from above.

We continue by estimating $\|h\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$. For almost all $x \in B_1$, we have

$$|h(x)| \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \int_{B_2^c} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy + \int_{B_2^c} \frac{|u(y)|}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c \|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(B_1)} + c \int_{B_2^c} \frac{|u(y)|}{(1+|y|^{2s-\epsilon})|y|^{d+\epsilon}} dy \\
&\leq c \|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(B_1)} + c \|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(B_2^c)} \int_{B_2^c} \frac{1}{|y|^{d+\epsilon}} dy \\
&\leq c \|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \epsilon) > 0$. Using interior regularity results for the fractional Laplacian (see, e.g., [FR24, Theorem 2.4.3]), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{C^{2s}(\overline{B_{1/2}})} &\leq c \left(\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)} + \|f+h\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right) \\
&\leq c \left(\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c = c(d, s, \epsilon) > 0$. \square

By scaling (see Lemma A.1), we get the following interior regularity results on balls B_R with radius $R \leq 1$. The assumption $R \leq 1$ is used to get $\|u_R\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty} \leq \|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty}$ for the rescaled function $u_R(x) := u(Rx)$.

Corollary 2.6. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, $R \leq 1$ and some $\epsilon \in (0, 2s)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain with $B_{R(2+\frac{3}{\sigma})} \subset \Omega$. Assume that u is a solution of*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u = f \quad \text{in } B_R$$

with $u \in L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $f \in L^\infty(B_R)$. Then $u \in C^\gamma(\overline{B_{1/2}})$ for any $\gamma \in [0, 2s]$ and

$$[u]_{C^\gamma(\overline{B_{1/2}})} \leq cR^{-\gamma} \left(\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)} + R^{2s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \right)$$

for some constant $c = c(s, d, \epsilon, \gamma) > 0$.

2.3. Calculations in half-space. We will finish this section with some explicit calculations in the half-space \mathbb{R}_+^d . Throughout this paper, we will use the notation

$$x = (x', x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (2.6)$$

Recall that the kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}(x, y) = \mathcal{B}(x, y)|x-y|^{-d-2s}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{B}(x, y) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{y \in B_{\sigma x_d}(x)\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in B_{\sigma y_d}(y)\}}}{2}. \quad (2.7)$$

From the definition of \mathcal{B} , we directly get for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$

$$\mathcal{B}(x, y) = \mathcal{B}(y, x), \quad (2.8)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(x + (z', 0), y + (z', 0)) = \mathcal{B}(x, y), \quad (2.9)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(ax, ay) = \mathcal{B}(x, y) \quad (a \in \mathbb{R}_+). \quad (2.10)$$

Now, fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ and let us explicitly determine the two domains, corresponding to the two indicator functions in (2.7), where $\mathcal{B}(x, \cdot)$ is nonvanishing. These two domains are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 for the case $d = 2$, $x = e_2 = (0, 1)$ with $\sigma = 2/3$ and $\sigma = 1$.

The first domain is just a ball around x with radius σx_d , which is shaded in blue in Figure 1 and Figure 2. The second domain is more interesting. Notice, that $x \in B_{\sigma y_d}(y)$ if and only if $|x-y|^2 = |x' - y'|^2 + (x_d - y_d)^2 < \sigma^2 y_d^2$. This inequality describes different shapes in cases $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma = 1$.




FIGURE 1. Shows the support of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2_+, \sigma}(e_2, \cdot)$ for $\sigma = 2/3$.




FIGURE 2. Shows the support of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2_+, \sigma}(e_2, \cdot)$ for $\sigma = 1$.

For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, this inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{\left(y_d - \frac{x_d}{1-\sigma^2}\right)^2}{\frac{x_d^2}{1-\sigma^2} \left(\frac{1}{1-\sigma^2} - 1\right)} + \frac{|y' - x'|^2}{x_d^2 \left(\frac{1}{1-\sigma^2} - 1\right)} < 1 \quad (2.11)$$

which describes an ellipsoid (compare with the red shaded domain in Figure 1). We will denote this ellipsoid by $E(x)$.

For $\sigma = 1$, the above inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{|y' - x'|^2}{2x_d} + \frac{x_d}{2} < y_d \quad (2.12)$$

which describes the domain above a paraboloid (compare with the red shaded domain in Figure 2). We will denote this domain by $P(x)$.

Finally, we will compute the action of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d_+}$ on monomials of the form $u(x) = x_d^p$. We will follow the calculations from [BBC03, p. 120 f.] to obtain the following result.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Furthermore, let $u: \mathbb{R}^d_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $u(x) = x_d^p = (d_{\mathbb{R}^d_+}(x))^p$ for some $p \in (-1, 2s)$ when $\sigma = 1$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$ when $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d_+} u(x) = a(p, \sigma) x_d^{p-2s}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ and some constant $a(p, \sigma)$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} a(p, \sigma) &= 0 && \text{for } p = 2s - 1, \\ a(p, \sigma) &< 0 && \text{for } p > 2s - 1 \text{ or } p < 0, \\ a(p, \sigma) &> 0 && \text{for } 0 < p < 2s - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Proof. Let $x = (x', x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. By scaling and shifting (see Lemma A.1), we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d_+, \sigma} u(x) = x_d^{p-2s} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d_+, \sigma} u(e_d) =: a(p, \sigma) x_d^{p-2s}$$

where $e_d = (0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It remains to compute the sign of

$$\begin{aligned}
a(p, \sigma) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d \setminus B_\epsilon(e_d)} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{((1 - y_d)^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, y) \, dy' \, dy_d \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d \setminus I_\epsilon} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{((1 - y_d)^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, y) \, dy' \, dy_d \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{I_\epsilon \setminus B_\epsilon(e_d)} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{((1 - y_d)^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, y) \, dy' \, dy_d \right) \\
&=: \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (J_{1,\epsilon} + J_{2,\epsilon}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where $I_\epsilon = \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times (1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)$. By the change of variable $y' = |1 - y_d|u$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{1,\epsilon} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{1}{(1 + |u|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus (1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon)} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|1 - y_d|^{1+2s}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, (|1 - y_d|u, y_d)) \, dy_d \, du \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{1}{(1 + |u|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \tilde{J}_{1,\epsilon} \, du.
\end{aligned}$$

We further decompose $\tilde{J}_{1,\epsilon}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{J}_{1,\epsilon} &= \int_0^{1-\epsilon} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|1 - y_d|^{1+2s}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((1 - y_d)u, y_d)) \, dy_d \\
&\quad + \int_{1+\epsilon}^{(1-\epsilon)^{-1}} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|1 - y_d|^{1+2s}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((y_d - 1)u, y_d)) \, dy_d \\
&\quad + \int_{(1-\epsilon)^{-1}}^\infty \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|1 - y_d|^{1+2s}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((y_d - 1)u, y_d)) \, dy_d \\
&= \tilde{J}_{1,1,\epsilon} + \tilde{J}_{1,2,\epsilon} + \tilde{J}_{1,3,\epsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $1 + \epsilon < (1 - \epsilon)^{-1}$ for $\epsilon < 1$.

We start with $\tilde{J}_{1,3,\epsilon}$. Using the transformation $t = 1/y_d$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{J}_{1,3,\epsilon} &= \int_0^{1-\epsilon} \frac{1 - t^{-p}}{|1 - 1/t|^{1+2s}} t^{-2} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((1/t - 1)u, 1/t)) \, dt \\
&= - \int_0^{1-\epsilon} \frac{1 - t^p}{|1 - t|^{1+2s}} t^{2s-1-p} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((1/t - 1)u, 1/t)) \, dt \\
&= - \int_0^{1-\epsilon} \frac{1 - t^p}{|1 - t|^{1+2s}} t^{2s-1-p} \mathcal{B}(e_d, (-(1 - t)u, t)) \, dt
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used (2.10), (2.9) and the symmetry of \mathcal{B} to get

$$\mathcal{B}(e_d, ((1/t - 1)u, 1/t)) = \mathcal{B}(te_d, ((1 - t)u, 1)) = \mathcal{B}(-(1 - t)u, t, e_d) = \mathcal{B}(e_d, (-(1 - t)u, t)).$$

For $\tilde{J}_{1,2,\epsilon}$, we use that $|1 - y_d^p| \leq c\epsilon$ for all $y_d \in (1 + \epsilon, (1 - \epsilon)^{-1})$ and the fact that $\mathcal{B} \leq 1$. Furthermore, $(1 - \epsilon)^{-1} - (1 + \epsilon) \leq 2\epsilon^2$ for $\epsilon < 1/2$. Hence, we conclude

$$|\tilde{J}_{1,2,\epsilon}| \leq 2c\epsilon^2 \epsilon \epsilon^{-1-2s} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Together, we obtain

$$J_{1,\epsilon} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{1}{(1 + |u|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \left(\int_0^{1-\epsilon} \frac{(1 - t^p)(1 - t^{2s-1-p})}{|1 - t|^{1+2s}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((1 - t)u, t)) \, dt + \tilde{J}_{1,2,\epsilon} \right) \, du$$

$$\rightarrow \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t^p)(1-t^{2s-1-p})}{|1-t|^{1+2s}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{1}{(1+|u|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((1-t)u, t)) du \right) dt$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Note, that the last integral above is absolute convergent.

It remains to estimate $J_{2,\epsilon}$ from (2.14). Recall, that we can find $\eta = \eta(\sigma) > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\sigma) > 0$ such that $\mathcal{B}(e_d, y) = 1$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ satisfying $|y'| \leq \eta$ and $|1-y_d| \leq \epsilon$ for $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. Hence, for small ϵ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2,\epsilon} &= \int_{(I_\epsilon \setminus B_\epsilon(e_d)) \cap (B_\eta \times \mathbb{R})} \frac{1 - y_d^p + p(y_d - 1)}{((1 - y_d)^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} dy' dy_d \\ &\quad + \int_{(I_\epsilon \setminus B_\epsilon(e_d)) \cap (B_\eta^c \times \mathbb{R})} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{((1 - y_d)^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, y) dy' dy_d \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Note, that the absolute value of the first summand is bounded by

$$\int_{I_\epsilon \cap (B_\eta \times \mathbb{R})} \frac{|1 - y_d^p + p(y_d - 1)|}{((1 - y_d)^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} dy' dy_d$$

which is finite and, hence, converges to 0 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. It is also easy to see that the second summand in (2.15) converges to 0 since we are away from the singularity. Hence, $J_{2,\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. All together, we obtain

$$a(p, \sigma) = \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t^p)(1-t^{2s-1-p})}{|1-t|^{1+2s}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{1}{(1+|u|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} \mathcal{B}(e_d, ((1-t)u, t)) du \right) dt.$$

Finally, (2.13) follows, by evaluating the sign of $(1-t^p)(1-t^{2s-1-p})$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. \square

Remark 2.8. Note that in the proof of Proposition 2.7, we have not used the explicit form of the kernel \mathcal{B} . We only used the properties (2.8), (2.9), (2.10) (symmetry, translational invariance in the tangential direction \mathbb{R}^{d-1} and scaling of \mathcal{B}) as well as nice behavior of the kernel close to the diagonal in order to evaluate the principle value integral in a pointwise sense.

We also want to mention that if we replace the scaling property $\mathcal{B}(ax, ay) = \mathcal{B}(x, y)$ from (2.10) by the assumption

$$\mathcal{B}(ax, ay) = a^\gamma \mathcal{B}(x, y),$$

then one can still determine harmonic functions in the half-line, following the above calculations. Note that the operator from (1.14) has such a scaling property. Indeed, one can calculate that the function $\varphi(x) = x$ is a harmonic solution in the half-line for the operator L from (1.14).

3. BARRIERS

For this section, we will fix a $C^{1,1}$ domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and prove pointwise estimates on $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}\varphi$ where φ is a barrier function built from d_Ω . Note that the distance function d_Ω is not smooth on Ω . However, (see, e.g., [GT01, Lem 14.16]) d_Ω is $C^{1,1}$ close to the boundary. Hence, since all our estimates are close to the boundary, the pointwise evaluation of $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}\varphi$ will not cause problems.

The main result of this section is Proposition 3.1. For the proof, we will follow the construction of [FR24, Appendix B.2]. However, herein, difficulties arise since the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega,\sigma}$ is not translational invariant and depends on the domain Ω .

Proposition 3.1. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain, such that for every $z \in \partial\Omega \cap B_1$ we can find two balls of radius $r_0 > 0$ in Ω and Ω^c which both touch $\partial\Omega$ in z . Then for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\tilde{\varphi} \in H_{loc}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and constants $C = C(r_0, d, s, \sigma, \epsilon) > 1$, $\eta = \eta(r_0, d, s, \sigma, \epsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} \tilde{\varphi} \geq d_{\Omega}^{-1+\epsilon} \quad \text{in } \{0 < d_{\Omega}(x) < \eta\} \cap B_{4/5}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$d_{\Omega}^{2s-1} \leq \tilde{\varphi} \leq C d_{\Omega}^{2s-1} \quad \text{in } B_1, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\tilde{\varphi} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_2. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. W.l.o.g. assume that $\epsilon < \min\{2s-1, 1/2, 2-2s\}$ for the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon < \min\{2s-1, \mu, 2-2s\}$ with $\mu > 0$ from Lemma 3.4 when $\sigma = 1$. We set

$$\varphi := C d_{\Omega}^{2s-1} - d_{\Omega}^{2s-1+\epsilon'}$$

for $\epsilon' = \epsilon/2$ and some $C > 1$ so that (3.2) holds true. Using [FR24, Lemma B.2.5], we can verify that $\varphi \in H_{loc}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We first consider the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. With Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega} \varphi(x) \geq -c_1 d_{\Omega}^{\min\{2s-2, -\frac{1}{2}\}}(x) + c_2 d_{\Omega}^{-1+\epsilon'}(x) \geq \frac{c_2}{2} d_{\Omega}^{-1+\epsilon'}(x) \quad (3.4)$$

for all $x \in \Omega \cap B_{4/5}$ with $d_{\Omega}(x) \leq \eta'$ for some constant $\eta' > 0$. For the last inequality in (3.4), we have used that $-1 + \epsilon' < \min\{2s-2, -1/2\}$.

For $\sigma = 1$, we also use Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.5 and obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega} \varphi(x) \geq -c_1 d_{\Omega}^{\min\{2s-2, \mu-1\}}(x) + c_2 d_{\Omega}^{-1+\epsilon'}(x) \geq \frac{c_2}{2} d_{\Omega}^{-1+\epsilon'}(x) \quad (3.5)$$

for all $x \in \Omega \cap B_{4/5}$ close to the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

We will choose a cutoff function $\chi \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\mathbb{1}_{B_1} \leq \chi \leq \mathbb{1}_{B_2}$ and define $\tilde{\varphi} := \chi\varphi$. Then,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega} \tilde{\varphi}(x) = \mathcal{L}_{\Omega} \varphi(x) + \mathcal{L}_{\Omega}(\varphi(\chi-1))(x).$$

Furthermore, for all $x \in \Omega \cap B_{4/5}$, we have

$$|\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}(\varphi(\chi-1))(x)| \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\varphi(y)|(1-\chi(y))}{|x-y|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}(x, y) dy \leq c$$

since we are away from the singularity. Together with (3.4) and (3.5), we conclude that (3.1) holds true close to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain satisfying the exterior and interior ball condition with radius r_0 from Proposition 3.1. Then there exists some $0 < \rho_0 = \rho_0(r_0, s, d, \sigma)$ such that for all $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{4/5}$ with $d_{\Omega}(x_0) \leq \rho_0$ we have*

$$|\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} d_{\Omega}^{2s-1}(x_0)| \leq c d_{\Omega}^{-\gamma}(x_0) \quad (3.6)$$

for some constant $c = c(r_0, s, d, \sigma) > 0$, where $\gamma = \min\{2-2s, \frac{1}{2}\}$ for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma = \min\{2-2s, 1-\mu\}$ for $\sigma = 1$ with $\mu = \mu(d, s) \in (0, 1)$ from Lemma 3.4.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{4/5}$ and set $\rho := d_{\Omega}(x_0)$. We will prove (3.6) assuming that $\rho \leq \rho_0$ for some fixed constant $\rho_0 > 0$, which we will specify later. After rotation and shifting we may assume that $x_0 = (0, \dots, 0, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the nearest boundary point and furthermore $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, -r_0) \subset \Omega^c$.

We define $l: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $l(y) = (y_d)_+$ where we use the notation $y = (y', y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. Notice that $l(x_0) = d_\Omega(x_0)$ and $\nabla l(x_0) = \nabla d_\Omega(x_0)$ for ρ_0 small enough (choose ρ_0 small enough such that d_Ω is $C^{1,1}$ at x_0). We will write

$$\mathcal{L}_\Omega d_\Omega^{2s-1}(x_0) = \mathcal{L}_\Omega (d_\Omega^{2s-1} - l^{2s-1})(x_0) + \mathcal{L}_\Omega l^{2s-1}(x_0) \quad (3.7)$$

and start by estimating $|\mathcal{L}_\Omega (d_\Omega^{2s-1} - l^{2s-1})(x_0)|$.

Since $|a^{2s-1} - b^{2s-1}| \leq |a - b|(a^{2s-2} + b^{2s-2})$, we conclude

$$|d_\Omega^{2s-1}(y) - l^{2s-1}(y)| \leq |d_\Omega(y) - l(y)| (d_\Omega^{2s-2}(y) + l^{2s-2}(y)) \quad (3.8)$$

for all $y \in \Omega$. Using that $l(x_0) = d_\Omega(x_0)$, $\nabla l(x_0) = \nabla d_\Omega(x_0)$ and the fact that d_Ω is $C^{1,1}$ at x_0 we get

$$|d_\Omega(y) - l(y)| \leq c|y - x_0|^2 \quad (3.9)$$

for all $y \in \Omega$. Combining (3.8) and (3.9) yields

$$|d_\Omega^{2s-1}(y) - l^{2s-1}(y)| \leq c|y - x_0|^2 (d_\Omega^{2s-2}(y) + l^{2s-2}(y)) \leq c|y - x_0|^2 \rho^{2s-2}$$

for all $y \in B_{\rho/2}(x_0)$. Since $|a^{2s-1} - b^{2s-1}| \leq |a - b|^{2s-1}$, we also get

$$|d_\Omega^{2s-1}(y) - l^{2s-1}(y)| \leq |d_\Omega(y) - l(y)|^{2s-1} \leq c|y - x_0|^{2(2s-1)}$$

for all $y \in \Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}(x_0)$. All together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_\Omega (d_\Omega^{2s-1} - l^{2s-1})(x_0)| &\leq \text{p. v.} \int_\Omega \frac{|d_\Omega^{2s-1}(y) - l^{2s-1}(y)|}{|y - x_0|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &\leq c \int_{B_{\rho/2}(x_0)} \frac{|y - x_0|^2 \rho^{2s-2}}{|y - x_0|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &\quad + c \int_{\Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}(x_0)} \frac{|y - x_0|^{2(2s-1)}}{|y - x_0|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &\leq c\rho^{2s-2} \left(\frac{\rho}{2}\right)^{2-2s} + c(1 + \rho^{2s-2}) \\ &\leq c\rho^{2s-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we investigate the second summand $|\mathcal{L}_\Omega l^{2s-1}(x_0)|$ of (3.7). For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, we use Lemma 3.3 (recall that $a(2s-1, \sigma) = 0$) to get

$$|\mathcal{L}_\Omega l^{2s-1}(x_0)| \leq c\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For $\sigma = 1$, we use Lemma 3.4 and get

$$|\mathcal{L}_\Omega l^{2s-1}(x_0)| \leq c\rho^{-1+\mu}$$

for some $\mu > 0$. This finishes the proof of the Lemma. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain and $x_0 \in \Omega$ be a point such that $x_0 = (0, \dots, 0, \rho)$ for some $\rho > 0$ such that $0 \in \partial\Omega$ is the nearest boundary point of x_0 , i.e. $d_\Omega(x_0) = \rho$. Furthermore, assume that $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, -r_0) \subset \Omega^c$ for some fixed $r_0 > 0$. Let $l: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by $l(y) = y_d$.*

Then, there exists some $0 < \rho_0 = \rho_0(d, s, r_0, \sigma)$ such that whenever $0 < \rho \leq \rho_0$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\Omega l^p(x_0) = \rho^{p-2s} (a(p, \sigma) + R) \quad (3.10)$$

where $a(p, \sigma)$ is the constant from Proposition 2.7 and

$$|R| \leq c\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.11)$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, r_0, \sigma, p) > 0$.

Proof. By a change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\Omega l^p(x_0) &= \text{p. v.} \int_\Omega (l^p(x_0) - l^p(y)) \mathcal{K}_\Omega(x, y) dy \\ &= \rho^{p-2s} \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{p. v.} \int_{B_\sigma(e_d)} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy + \frac{1}{2} \text{p. v.} \int_{E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $e_d = (0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |e_d - y| < \sigma d_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}(y) \right\}.$$

using the notation $\rho^{-1}\Omega = \{\rho^{-1}y : y \in \Omega\}$. Recall from Proposition 2.7, that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} l^p(e_d) = a(p, \sigma)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \text{p. v.} \int_{B_\sigma(e_d)} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy + \frac{1}{2} \text{p. v.} \int_{E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} l^p(e_d) + \frac{1}{2} \text{p. v.} \int_{E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega} \setminus E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy - \frac{1}{2} \text{p. v.} \int_{E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \setminus E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &= a(p, \sigma) + R \end{aligned}$$

where

$$E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |y - e_d| < \sigma y_d \right\}$$

is the Ellipsoid from (2.11) with $x = e_d$ (compare with Figure 1). It remains to estimate the term R .

Claim: There exists some $c_1 = c_1(d, s, \sigma, r_0) > 0$, such that if we set $f(\rho) := c_1 \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$, the symmetric difference $E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}$ will be contained in the domain we obtain by thickening up the boundary of the Ellipsoid $\partial E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}$ in the following sense

$$E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega} \subset \left\{ y + z \mid y \in \partial E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \quad \text{and} \quad z = (z', 0) \text{ with } z' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, |z'| \leq f(\rho) \right\}. \quad (3.12)$$

Assume we have already shown the claim (3.12). Then $|E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}| \leq c \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence, we can estimate $|R|$ by

$$|R| \leq |E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}| \left\| \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} \right\|_{L^\infty(E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega})} \leq c \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, r_0, p) > 0$.

It remains to prove the claim (3.12). Note that we have

$$y = (y', y_d) \in E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \iff y_d \in ((1 + \sigma)^{-1}, (1 - \sigma)^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad |y'| < \sqrt{\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2}.$$

Using this characterization of $E_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}$, we will prove the claim (3.12) by showing the two implications (3.13) and (3.16). First, we will show that

$$y_d \in ((1 + \sigma)^{-1}, (1 - \sigma)^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad |y'| < \sqrt{\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2} - f(\rho) \implies (y', y_d) \in E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}. \quad (3.13)$$

Recall, that $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, r_0) \subset \Omega$, i.e. $B_{r_0 \rho^{-1}}(0, \dots, 0, r_0 \rho^{-1}) \subset \rho^{-1}\Omega$. Hence, we can estimate the distance to boundary by $d_\Omega(y', y_d) \geq r_0 \rho^{-1} - \sqrt{(y_d - r_0 \rho^{-1})^2 + |y'|^2}$ for points $(y', y_d) \in B_{r_0 \rho^{-1}}(0, \dots, 0, r_0 \rho^{-1})$. By choosing ρ_0 small, we see that elements (y', y_d) satisfying (3.14)

have the property $(y', y_d) \in B_{r_0\rho^{-1}}(0, \dots, 0, r_0\rho^{-1})$. So to get (3.13), it is enough to prove, that if

$$y_d \in ((1 + \sigma)^{-1}, (1 - \sigma)^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad |y'| < \sqrt{\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2} - f(\rho), \quad (3.14)$$

then we have

$$\sqrt{(y_d - 1)^2 + |y'|^2} < \sigma \left(r_0\rho^{-1} - \sqrt{(y_d - r_0\rho^{-1})^2 + |y'|^2} \right). \quad (3.15)$$

By squaring (3.15), we see that (3.15) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} (y_d - 1)^2 + |y'|^2 &\leq \sigma^2 \left(\frac{r_0^2}{\rho^2} + \left(y_d - \frac{r_0}{\rho} \right)^2 + |y'|^2 - 2\frac{r_0}{\rho} \sqrt{\left(y_d - \frac{r_0}{\rho} \right)^2 + |y'|^2} \right) \\ &= \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho \left(\frac{2r_0^2}{\rho^3} - \frac{2y_d r_0}{\rho^2} + \frac{|y'|^2}{\rho} - \frac{2r_0}{\rho^2} \sqrt{\left(y_d - \frac{r_0}{\rho} \right)^2 + |y'|^2} \right) \\ &= \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho \frac{\left(\frac{2r_0^2}{\rho^3} - \frac{2y_d r_0}{\rho^2} + \frac{|y'|^2}{\rho} \right)^2 - \frac{4r_0^2}{\rho^4} \left(\left(y_d - \frac{r_0}{\rho} \right)^2 + |y'|^2 \right)}{\frac{2r_0^2}{\rho^3} - \frac{2y_d r_0}{\rho^2} + \frac{|y'|^2}{\rho} + \frac{2r_0}{\rho^2} \sqrt{\left(y_d - \frac{r_0}{\rho} \right)^2 + |y'|^2}} \\ &= \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho \left(\frac{-4y_d r_0 |y'|^2 + \rho |y'|^4}{2r_0^2 - 2\rho y_d r_0 + \rho^2 |y'|^2 + 2r_0 \sqrt{r_0^2 - 2\rho r_0 y_d + \rho^2 y_d^2 + \rho |y'|^2}} \right) \\ &=: \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho A. \end{aligned}$$

Notice, that if (y, y_d) satisfies (3.14), both $|y'|$ and $|y_d|$ are bounded and hence, we can choose c_1 large enough and ρ_0 small enough such that $\sigma^2 \rho |A| \leq c_1^2 \rho = (f(\rho))^2$. So let us assume that (y, y_d) satisfies (3.14). Then, by using this assumption in the first two steps, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |y'|^2 + (y_d - 1)^2 &< \sigma^2 y_d^2 - 2f(\rho) \sqrt{\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2} + (f(\rho))^2 \\ &\leq \sigma^2 y_d^2 - 2f(\rho) (|y'| + f(\rho)) + (f(\rho))^2 \\ &= \sigma^2 y_d^2 - 2f(\rho) |y'| - (f(\rho))^2 \\ &\leq \sigma^2 y_d^2 - (f(\rho))^2 \\ &\leq \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho A \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.15) and therefore also the implication (3.13)

In the second step, we will show

$$(y', y_d) \in E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega} \quad \Rightarrow \quad y_d \in ((1 + \sigma)^{-1}, (1 - \sigma)^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad |y'| < \sqrt{\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2} + f(\rho). \quad (3.16)$$

First notice that if $y_d \notin ((1 + \sigma)^{-1}, (1 - \sigma)^{-1})$ then, we have $(y', y_d) \notin E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}$. Indeed, notice, that $y_d \notin ((1 + \sigma)^{-1}, (1 - \sigma)^{-1})$ implies $\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2 \leq 0$ which gives us

$$(\sigma d_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}(y))^2 \leq \sigma^2 (|y'|^2 + y_d^2) \leq \sigma^2 |y'|^2 + (y_d - 1)^2 \leq |e_d - y|^2,$$

i.e. $(y', y_d) \notin E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}$.

Furthermore, if $|y| > (1 - \sigma)^{-1}$, then we have $y \notin E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}$ since

$$\sigma d_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}(y) \leq \sigma |y| < |y| - 1 \leq |e_d - y|.$$

So to show (3.16), it is enough to prove, that if

$$|y| \leq \frac{1}{1-\sigma}, \text{ and } y_d \in ((1+\sigma)^{-1}, (1-\sigma)^{-1}), \text{ and } |y'| \geq \sqrt{\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2} + f(\rho) \quad (3.17)$$

then $y \notin E_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}$.

Recall that $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, -r_0) \subset \Omega^c$, i.e. $B_{r_0\rho^{-1}}(0, \dots, 0, -r_0\rho^{-1}) \subset (\rho^{-1}\Omega)^c$. Hence, we can estimate the distance to boundary by $d_\Omega(y', y_d) \leq \sqrt{(y_d + r_0\rho^{-1})^2 + |y'|^2} - r_0\rho^{-1}$. So it is enough to prove that if (3.17) is true, then we have

$$\sqrt{(y_d - 1)^2 + |y'|^2} > \sigma \left(\sqrt{(y_d + r_0\rho^{-1})^2 + |y'|^2} - r_0\rho^{-1} \right). \quad (3.18)$$

Notice that, as above, this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} (y_d - 1)^2 + |y'|^2 &> \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho \left(\frac{4y_d r_0 |y'|^2 + \rho |y'|^4}{2r_0^2 + 2\rho y_d r_0 + \rho^2 |y'|^2 + 2r_0 \sqrt{r_0^2 + 2\rho r_0 y_d + \rho^2 y_d^2 + \rho |y'|^2}} \right) \\ &= \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho B \end{aligned}$$

where again since $|y| \leq \frac{1}{1-\sigma}$ we can choose c_1 large enough and ρ_0 small enough so that $\sigma^2 \rho |B| \leq c_1^2 \rho = (f(\rho))^2$. So assuming (3.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |y'|^2 + (y_d - 1)^2 &> \sigma^2 y_d^2 + 2f(\rho) \sqrt{\sigma^2 y_d^2 - (y_d - 1)^2} + (f(\rho))^2 \\ &\geq \sigma^2 y_d^2 + (f(\rho))^2 \\ &\geq \sigma^2 y_d^2 + \sigma^2 \rho B. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (3.16). Note that (3.13) and (3.16) together prove (3.12) which finishes the proof of this lemma. \square

Lemma 3.4. Fix $\sigma = 1$ and $p \in (0, 2s)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain and $x_0 \in \Omega$ be a point such that $x_0 = (0, \dots, 0, \rho)$ for some small $\rho > 0$ and $0 \in \partial\Omega$ as the nearest boundary point of x_0 , i.e. $d_\Omega(x_0) = \rho$. Furthermore, assume that $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, r_0) \subset \Omega$ and $B_{r_0}(0, \dots, 0, -r_0) \subset \Omega^c$ for some fixed $r_0 > 0$. Let $l: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by $l(y) = y_d$.

Then there exists some $0 < \rho_0 = \rho_0(d, s, r_0)$ such that whenever $0 < \rho \leq \rho_0$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\Omega l^p(x_0) = \rho^{p-2s} (a(p, 1) + R) \quad (3.19)$$

where $a(p, \sigma)$ is the constant from Proposition 2.7 and

$$|R| \leq c\rho^\mu. \quad (3.20)$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, r_0, p) > 0$ and $\mu = \mu(d, s, p) \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\Omega l^p(x_0) &= \rho^{p-2s} \left(a(p, 1) + \frac{1}{2} \text{p.v.} \int_{P_{\rho^{-1}\Omega} \setminus P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \text{p.v.} \int_{P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \setminus P_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}} \frac{1 - y_d^p}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy \right) \\ &= \rho^{p-2s} (a(p, 1) + R) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P_{\rho^{-1}\Omega} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |e_d - y| < d_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}(y) \right\}.$$

and

$$P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |y - e_d| < y_d \right\}$$

is the domain above the paraboloid from (2.12) with $x = e_d$ (compare with Figure 2). It remains to estimate the error term R . Note that we have

$$y = (y', y_d) \in P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y_d \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } |y'| < \sqrt{2y_d - 1}.$$

We want to continue as in Lemma 3.3 and show that the symmetric difference $P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta P_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}$ is contained in some strip around the paraboloid $\partial P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}$ which is given by $|y'| = \sqrt{2y_d - 1}$. However, notice, that in the proof of Lemma 3.3 for the estimates $\sigma^2 \rho |A| \leq c_1 \rho$ and $\sigma^2 \rho |B| \leq c_1 \rho$, we have used that $|y|$ is bounded. We can replace this condition by the assumption that $\rho |y|^4$ converges to 0 uniformly in y , which holds if we assume $y \in B_{\rho^{-1/\kappa}}$ for some $\kappa > 4$.

Now, fix some $\kappa > \max\{d, 4\}$. Following the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, there exists some $c_1 > 0$, so that for $f(\rho) := c_1 \rho^{1/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & B_{\rho^{-1/\kappa}}(e_d) \cap \left(P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta P_{\rho^{-1}\Omega} \right) \\ & \subset B_{\rho^{-1/\kappa}}(e_d) \cap \left\{ y + z \mid y \in \partial P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \text{ and } z = (z', 0) \text{ with } z' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, |z'| \leq f(\rho) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

for all $\rho \leq \rho_0$ for some small $\rho_0 > 0$.

Let us denote the set on the righthand side of (3.21) by S . Then, we can estimate the measure of S by

$$\begin{aligned} |S| & \leq c \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\rho^{-1/\kappa}} \left((\sqrt{2z-1} + c_1 \sqrt{\rho})^{d-1} - (\sqrt{2z-1} - c_1 \sqrt{\rho})^{d-1} \right) dz \\ & \leq c \rho^{-\frac{1}{\kappa}} \left\| (\sqrt{2z-1} + c_1 \sqrt{\rho})^{d-1} - (\sqrt{2z-1} - c_1 \sqrt{\rho})^{d-1} \right\|_{L^\infty(1/2, \rho^{-1/\kappa})} \\ & = c \rho^{-\frac{1}{\kappa}} \left(\left(\sqrt{2\rho^{-1/\kappa} - 1} + c_1 \sqrt{\rho} \right)^{d-1} - \left(\sqrt{2\rho^{-1/\kappa} - 1} - c_1 \sqrt{\rho} \right)^{d-1} \right) \\ & \leq c \rho^{-\frac{1}{\kappa}} \left(\sqrt{\rho} \left(\sqrt{\rho^{-1/\kappa}} \right)^{d-2} + \mathcal{O} \left(\rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\sqrt{\rho^{-1/\kappa}} \right)^{d-4} \right) \right) \\ & \leq c \rho^{-\frac{1}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}(d-2)} \\ & = c \rho^{\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{d}{\kappa})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we see that $|S|$ converges to 0 since $\kappa > d$. All together, we can estimate $|R|$ by

$$\begin{aligned} |R| & \leq \int_{P_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \Delta P_{\rho^{-1}\Omega}} \frac{|1 - y_d^p|}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ & \leq \int_S \frac{|1 - y_d^p|}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\rho^{-1/\kappa}}(e_d)} \frac{|1 - y_d^p|}{|e_d - y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ & \leq c|S| + c \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{\rho^{-1/\kappa}}} \frac{|y|^p}{|y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ & \leq c \rho^{\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{d}{\kappa})} + c \rho^{\frac{1}{\kappa}(2s-p)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we finish the proof by choosing $\mu = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{d}{\kappa} \right), \frac{1}{\kappa} (2s - p) \right\} \in (0, 1)$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \min\{2 - 2s, 2s - 1\})$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain satisfying the exterior and interior ball condition with radius r_0 from Proposition 3.1. Then there exists some $0 < \rho_0 = \rho_0(r_0, d, s, \sigma, \epsilon)$ such that for all $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{4/5}$ with $d_\Omega(x_0) \leq \rho_0$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}(x_0) \leq -c d_\Omega^{-1+\epsilon}(x_0)$$

for some constant $c = c(r_0, d, s, \sigma, \epsilon) > 0$.

Proof. We will use the same geometric setting as in the proof of Lemma 3.2. Let us consider

$$\mathcal{L}_\Omega d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}(x_0) = \mathcal{L}_\Omega (d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon} - l^{2s-1+\epsilon})(x_0) + \mathcal{L}_\Omega l^{2s-1+\epsilon}(x_0) \quad (3.22)$$

where $l(y) = (y_d)_+$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we get

$$|d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}(y) - l^{2s-1+\epsilon}(y)| \leq c|y - x_0|^2 (d_\Omega^{2s-2+\epsilon}(y) + l^{2s-2+\epsilon}(y)) \leq c|y - x_0|^2 \rho^{2s-2+\epsilon}$$

for all $y \in B_{\rho/2}(x_0)$. Since $|a^\gamma - b^\gamma| \leq |a - b|^\gamma$ for $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, we also get

$$|d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}(y) - l^{2s-1+\epsilon}(y)| \leq (|d_\Omega(y) - l(y)|)^{2s-1+\epsilon} \leq c|y - x_0|^{2(2s-1+\epsilon)}$$

for all $y \in \Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}(x_0)$. All together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_\Omega (d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon} - l^{2s-1+\epsilon})(x_0)| &\leq \text{p. v.} \int_\Omega \frac{|d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}(y) - l^{2s-1+\epsilon}(y)|}{|y - x_0|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &\leq c \int_{B_{\rho/2}(x_0)} \frac{|y - x_0|^2 \rho^{2s-2+\epsilon}}{|y - x_0|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &\quad + c \int_{\Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}(x_0)} \frac{|y - x_0|^{2(2s-1+\epsilon)}}{|y - x_0|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &\leq c \rho^{2s-2+\epsilon} \left(\frac{\rho}{2} \right)^{2-2s} + c(1 + \rho^{2s-2+2\epsilon}) \\ &\leq c(1 + \rho^{2s-2+2\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ we can apply Lemma 3.3 and use the fact that $a(2s - 1 + \epsilon, \sigma) < 0$ to get

$$\mathcal{L}_\Omega l^{2s-1+\epsilon}(x_0) \leq \rho^{-1+\epsilon} (a(2s - 1 + \epsilon, \sigma) + R)$$

with $|R| \leq c\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$. All together, for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}(x_0) \leq a(2s - 1 + \epsilon, \sigma) \rho^{-1+\epsilon} + c\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} + c(1 + \rho^{2s-2+2\epsilon}) \leq -c\rho^{-1+\epsilon}$$

for $\rho_0 > 0$ small enough. For $\sigma = 1$ we can apply Lemma 3.4 and use the fact that $a(2s - 1 + \epsilon, \sigma) < 0$ to get

$$\mathcal{L}_\Omega l^{2s-1+\epsilon}(x_0) \leq \rho^{-1+\epsilon} (a(2s - 1 + \epsilon, \sigma) + R)$$

with $|R| \leq c\rho^\mu$. We obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}(x_0) \leq a(2s - 1 + \epsilon, \sigma) \rho^{-1+\epsilon} + c\rho^{-1+\mu+\epsilon} + c(1 + \rho^{2s-2+2\epsilon}) \leq -c\rho^{-1+\epsilon}$$

for $\rho_0 > 0$ small enough. \square

4. HÖLDER REGULARITY UP TO THE BOUNDARY

Using the fact that $\mathcal{E}_\Omega(v, v)$ is comparable to $[v]_{H^s(\Omega)}$ (see Corollary 2.1), we can apply [Fuk77, Thm. 1] to get an L^∞ bound of u . For completion, we present the proof from [Fuk77] here.

Proposition 4.1. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain. Assume that $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u &= f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

where $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then u is bounded with

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

for some $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \Omega) > 0$.

Proof. Set $v = (u - k)_+$ for some $k \geq 0$. Then $v \in H_0^s(\Omega)$. Testing the equation with $\varphi = v$ and using that $\mathcal{E}_\Omega(v, v) \leq \mathcal{E}_\Omega(u, v)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_\Omega(v, v) \leq \int_\Omega f v.$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_\Omega(v, v)$ is comparable to $[v]_{H^s(\Omega)}$ (see Corollary 2.1), we can use Sobolev's embedding theorem to get

$$\|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^2 \leq c \mathcal{E}_\Omega(v, v) \leq c \int_\Omega f v$$

where $p = \frac{2d}{d-2s} > 2$. Applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^2 \leq c \int_\Omega f v \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)} A(k)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$$

where $A(k) = |\{x \in \Omega : u(x) > k\}|$. Hence, for every $h > k \geq 0$, we get

$$A(h) \leq \frac{1}{(h-k)^p} \int_\Omega |v|^p \leq \frac{1}{(h-k)^p} c^p \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^p A(k)^{p-1}.$$

By Stampacchia's Lemma (see, e.g., [Sta65, Lemma 4.1]), we get that u is bounded from above

$$u \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Repeating the same proof for $-u$ and $-f$ completes the proof. \square

Proposition 4.2. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain, such that for every $z \in \partial\Omega \cap B_1$ we can find two balls of radius $r_0 > 0$ in Ω and Ω^c which both touch $\partial\Omega$ in z . Assume that u is a weak solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u &= f & \text{in } B_1 \cap \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1 \cap \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

with $u \in L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $d_\Omega^{1-\epsilon'} f \in L^\infty(B_1 \cap \Omega)$ for some $\epsilon' > 0$. We impose the boundary condition $u = 0$ on $B_1 \cap \Omega$ by assuming that $u\chi \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for every $\chi \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ where we extend u by $u = 0$ on Ω^c .

Then $u \in C^{2s-1}(B_{1/2} \cap \bar{\Omega})$ with

$$[u]_{C^{2s-1}(B_{1/2} \cap \bar{\Omega})} \leq c \left(\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)} + \|d_\Omega^{1-\epsilon'} f\|_{L^\infty(B_1 \cap \Omega)} \right) \tag{4.2}$$

for some constant $c = c(r_0, s, \sigma, \epsilon, \epsilon') > 0$.

Proof. W.l.o.g., we can assume that $|d_\Omega(x)| \leq c$ for all $x \in B_1$, for some constant $c = c(\sigma) > 0$, since otherwise we can use Lemma 2.5 to get (4.2). Furthermore, by dividing the equation by some constant, we can assume that $\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)} + \|d_\Omega^{1-\epsilon'} f\|_{L^\infty(B_1 \cap \Omega)} \leq 1$. We split the proof into three steps.

Step 1: Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a smooth cutoff function with $\mathbb{1}_{B_{3/4}} \leq \chi \leq \mathbb{1}_{B_{4/5}}$. Define $\tilde{u} := u\chi$. We want to bound $\mathcal{L}_\Omega \tilde{u}$ on $B_{4/5} \cap \Omega$. For $x \in B_{4/5} \cap \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\Omega \tilde{u}(x) &= u(x)\mathcal{L}_\Omega \chi(x) + \chi(x)\mathcal{L}_\Omega u(x) \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(\chi(x) - \chi(y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y) \, dy \\ &= u(x)\mathcal{L}_\Omega \chi(x) + \chi(x)\mathcal{L}_\Omega u(x) - 2\Gamma(u, \chi) \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $\Gamma(u, \chi)$ is the carré du champ operator. Notice, that for $x \in B_{4/5} \cap \Omega$ we have $|u(x)\mathcal{L}_\Omega \chi(x)| \leq c_1$ since $\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1$ and χ is smooth. Furthermore,

$$|\chi(x)\mathcal{L}_\Omega u(x)| \leq |\mathcal{L}_\Omega u(x)| \leq d_\Omega^{-1+\epsilon'}(x)$$

for $x \in B_{4/5} \cap \Omega$. It remains to estimate $\Gamma(u, \chi)$ from (4.3). Notice that $|\chi(x) - \chi(y)| \leq c|x - y|$ for $c = \|\chi\|_{C^1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 2|\Gamma(u, \chi)| &\leq c \int_{\Omega \cap B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}(x)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{d+2s-1}} \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y) \, dy \\ &\quad + c \int_{\Omega \cap B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}^c(x)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{d+2s-1}} \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y) \, dy \\ &= I_1 + I_2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa = (2(2 + 3/\sigma))^{-1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq c \int_{B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}^c(x) \cap \Omega} \frac{|u(x)| + |u(y)|}{|x - y|^{d+2s-1}} \, dy \\ &\leq c\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}^c(x)} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{d+2s-1}} \, dy + c \int_{B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}^c(0)} \frac{|u(x+y)|}{|y|^{d+2s-1}} \, dy \\ &\leq c(\kappa d_\Omega(x))^{1-2s} + c\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left(\int_{B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}^c \cap B_2} \frac{1}{|y|^{d+2s-1}} \, dy + \int_{B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}^c \cap B_2^c} \frac{|y|^{2s-\epsilon}}{|y|^{d+2s-1}} \, dy \right) \\ &\leq c_2 (d_\Omega(x))^{1-2s} \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in B_{4/5} \cap \Omega$. For I_1 , we will use the interior regularity result from Corollary 2.6. Notice, that by Corollary 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{C^1(B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}(x))} &\leq c(\kappa d_\Omega(x))^{-1} \left(1 + (\kappa d_\Omega(x))^{2s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_{2\kappa d_\Omega(x)}(x))} \right) \\ &\leq c(d_\Omega(x))^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used that $|f(y)| \leq d_\Omega^{-1+\epsilon'}(y) \leq c d_\Omega^{-1+\epsilon'}(x)$ for all $y \in B_{2\kappa d_\Omega(x)}(x)$. Hence, for all $y \in B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}(x)$

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq c|x - y|(d_\Omega(x))^{-1}.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq c(d_\Omega(x))^{-1} \int_{\Omega \cap B_{\kappa d_\Omega(x)}(x)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d+2s-2}} \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y) dy \\ &\leq c(d_\Omega(x))^{-1} (\kappa d_\Omega(x))^{2-2s} \leq c_3 (d_\Omega(x))^{1-2s}. \end{aligned}$$

All together, we obtain for $x \in B_{4/5} \cap \Omega$

$$|\mathcal{L}_\Omega \tilde{u}(x)| \leq c_1 + (d_\Omega(x))^{-1+\epsilon'} + (c_2 + c_3) (d_\Omega(x))^{1-2s} \leq c_4 (d_\Omega(x))^{-1+\epsilon'}$$

where in the last step, w.l.o.g., we have assumed that $\epsilon' < 2 - 2s$.

Step 2: By Proposition 3.1, there exists a barrier $\tilde{\varphi} \in H_{loc}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\Omega \tilde{\varphi} &\geq d_\Omega^{-1+\epsilon'} && \text{in } \{0 < d_\Omega(x) < d\} \cap B_{4/5} \\ d_\Omega^{2s-1} \leq \tilde{\varphi} &\leq c_5 d_\Omega^{2s-1} && \text{in } \Omega \cap B_2 \\ \tilde{\varphi} &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_3 \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c_5 > 1$ and $d > 0$. Then,

$$c_6 \mathcal{L}_\Omega \tilde{\varphi} \geq \mathcal{L}_\Omega \tilde{u} \quad \text{in } \{0 < d_\Omega(x) < d\} \cap B_{4/5} \quad \text{and} \quad c_6 \tilde{\varphi} \geq \tilde{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus (\{0 < d_\Omega(x) < d\} \cap B_{4/5})$$

for some large $c_6 > 0$ depending on c_4 and d . Hence, by the maximum principle (see Lemma A.2), this implies $\tilde{u} = u \leq c_6 \tilde{\varphi} \leq c_5 c_6 d_\Omega^{2s-1}$ in $\Omega \cap B_{3/4}$. Repeating the same argument for $-u$ yields

$$|u(x)| \leq c d_\Omega(x)^{2s-1} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{3/4} \cap \Omega. \quad (4.4)$$

Step 3: In the third step, we combine $|u| \lesssim d_\Omega^{2s-1}$ with interior regularity results to conclude $[u]_{C^{2s-1}(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2})} \leq c$.

Let $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega \cap B_{1/2}$ and assume that $r := d_\Omega(x_1) \leq d_\Omega(x_2)$ and set $\rho := |x_1 - x_2|$. We will distinguish between two cases.

Case 1: If $\rho \geq \frac{r}{2} (2 + \frac{3}{\sigma})^{-1}$, then

$$|u(x_1) - u(x_2)| \leq |u(x_1)| + |u(x_2)| \leq c r^{2s-1} + c(\rho + r)^{2s-1} \leq c \rho^{2s-1}$$

using (4.4).

Case 2: Now assume $\rho < \frac{r}{2} (2 + \frac{3}{\sigma})^{-1}$. Set $R := r (2 + \frac{3}{\sigma})^{-1}$, then $B_{R(2+\frac{3}{\sigma})}(x_1) \subset \Omega$ and $x_2 \in B_{\frac{R}{2}}(x_1)$. We define the rescaled function $\bar{u}: R^{-1}(\Omega - x_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{u}(x) = \tilde{u}(x_1 + Rx)$. By scaling of the operator \mathcal{L} (see Lemma A.1), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{R^{-1}(\Omega - x_1)} \bar{u}(x) = R^{2s} \mathcal{L}_\Omega \tilde{u}(x_1 + Rx) =: \bar{f}(x)$$

for $x \in B_1$ in the weak sense. By interior regularity (see Lemma 2.5), we have

$$[\bar{u}]_{C^{2s-1}(\overline{B_{1/2}})} \leq c \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{L_{2s-1}^\infty(R^{-1}(\Omega - x_1))} + \|\bar{f}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right).$$

Let $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $|x_0 - x_1| = d_\Omega(x_1) = r$. Using (4.4), we get for all $x \in B_{1/(4R)}$

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{u}(x)| &= |\tilde{u}(x_1 + Rx)| \leq c d_\Omega^{2s-1}(x_1 + Rx) \leq c |x_1 + Rx - x_0|^{2s-1} \leq c (|x_1 - x_0| + |Rx|)^{2s-1} \\ &\leq c (|x_1 - x_0|^{2s-1} + |Rx|^{2s-1}) = c (r^{2s-1} + R^{2s-1} |x|^{2s-1}) \leq c R^{2s-1} (1 + |x|^{2s-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using $\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 2$, we also obtain $|\bar{u}(x)| \leq cR^{2s-1}(1+|x|^{2s-1})$ for all $x \in B_{1/(4R)}^c$, i.e. $\|\bar{u}\|_{L_{2s-1}^\infty(R^{-1}(\Omega-x_1))} \leq cR^{2s-1}$. Since also $\|\bar{f}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq cR^{2s-1}$, we obtain

$$R^{2s-1}[u]_{C^{2s-1}(B_{R/2}(x_1))} = [\bar{u}]_{C^{2s-1}(\overline{B_{1/2}})} \leq cR^{2s-1},$$

i.e. $[u]_{C^{2s-1}(B_{R/2}(x_1))} \leq c$. Since $x_1, x_2 \in B_{R/2}(x_1)$, we get

$$|u(x_1) - u(x_2)| \leq c|x_1 - x_2|^{2s-1} = c\rho^{2s-1}.$$

Combining case 1 and case 2 yields $[u]_{C^{2s-1}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_{1/2}})} \leq c$ which finishes the proof. \square

Remark 4.3. Proposition 4.2 remains true for strong solutions $u \in C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\Omega \cap B_1) \cap C(\overline{\Omega \cap B_1}) \cap L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\Omega)$ to (4.1).

Remark 4.4. Following the proof of [FR24, Prop. 2.6.6], one can also prove a Hopf-type Lemma of the following form. If $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to (1.4) with $0 \leq f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then either $u \equiv 0$ in Ω or

$$|u(x)| \geq c(d_\Omega(x))^{2s-1} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \quad (4.5)$$

for some $c > 0$.

The main step to prove (4.5) consists of changing the barrier in Proposition 3.1 from $cd_\Omega^{2s-1} - d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}$ to a barrier of the form $cd_\Omega^{2s-1} + d_\Omega^{2s-1+\epsilon}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First we use Proposition 4.1 to see that u is bounded. Then, using Proposition 4.2 on finitely many balls which cover Ω , we finish the proof. \square

5. ONE DIMENSIONAL BOUNDARY HARNACK

We start by introducing some notation. For $R > 0$, we define the following subset of \mathbb{R}_+^d

$$I_R := \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times (0, R).$$

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 5.1. For the proof, we mostly follow [AFR23, Sec. 5]. However, difficulties arise since the operator degenerates as we approach the boundary.

In subsection 5.1, we construct specific one-dimensional barriers needed for the case $\sigma = 1$. However, they are not needed when $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ due to the effect described in the last bullet point of Remark 1.3. In subsection 5.2, we combine a Hopf type result (Lemma 5.4) with an interior Harnack inequality (Lemma 5.5) to get an oscillation decay at the boundary (Lemma 5.6). Finally, in subsection 5.3, we prove Proposition 5.1.

Proposition 5.1. *Fix $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, $s \in (1/2, 1)$, and $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that $u \in C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}_+^d) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d})$ is a one dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$, and u satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u &= 0 & \text{in } I_{2R}, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^d \end{aligned}$$

for some $R \geq 1$. Furthermore, assume that u satisfies the growth condition

$$|u(y)| \leq c_0(1+|y|^{2s-\epsilon_0}) \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d) \quad (5.1)$$

for some $c_0 \geq 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$.

Then there exists some $\alpha = \alpha(d, s, \sigma) > 0$ and $c = c(d, s, \sigma, c_0, \epsilon_0) > 0$ such that

$$\left[\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \right]_{C^\alpha(I_R)} \leq cR^{1-2s-\alpha} \|u\|_{L^\infty(I_{2R})}.$$

5.1. Barriers for $\sigma = 1$.

Lemma 5.2. Fix $\sigma = 1$ and $s \in (1/2, 1)$. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty([0, 2])$ with $\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]} \leq \eta \leq \mathbf{1}_{[0,2]}$ and define $\varphi: \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi(x) = \eta(x_d)x_d^{2s-1}$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} \varphi(x) \geq c(x_d)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \quad \text{for } x \in I_1, \quad (5.2)$$

for some $c = c(s, d) > 0$.

Proof. Let $x \in I_1$. By shifting (see Lemma A.1), we can assume that $x = (0, \dots, 0, x_d)$. Using that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} x_d^{2s-1} = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi(x) &= \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} x_d^{2s-1} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (x_d^{2s-1}(\eta - 1)) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (1 - \eta(y_d)) y_d^{2s-1} \mathcal{K}(x, y) \, dy \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d \cap \{y: y_d \in (2, 3)\}} (1 - \eta(y_d)) y_d^{2s-1} \mathcal{K}(x, y) \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$\mathcal{K}(x, y) = |x - y|^{-d-2s} \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{x_d}(x)}(y) + \mathbf{1}_{P(x)}(y) \right) \quad (5.3)$$

where

$$P(x) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y - x| < y_d \right\} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : y_d > \frac{x_d}{2} \text{ and } |y'| < \sqrt{x_d} \sqrt{2y_d - x_d} \right\}. \quad (5.4)$$

Here we will only use the $P(x)$ part of the kernel. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi(x) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{P(x) \cap \{y_d \in (2, 3)\}} (1 - \eta(y_d)) y_d^{2s-1} |x - y|^{-d-2s} \, dy \\ &\geq c \int_{P(x) \cap \{y_d \in (2, 3)\}} |x - y|^{-d-2s} \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Notice, that $\{y: y_d \in (2, 3), |y'| \leq \sqrt{x_d}\} \subset P(x) \cap \{y: y_d \in (2, 3)\}$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi(x) \geq c \int_{\{y: y_d \in (2, 3), |y'| \leq \sqrt{x_d}\}} |x - y|^{-d-2s} \, dy \geq c(\sqrt{x_d})^{d-1}.$$

□

Lemma 5.3. Fix $\sigma = 1$ and $s \in (1/2, 1)$. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty([0, 2])$ with $\mathbf{1}_{[0,5/4]} \leq \eta \leq \mathbf{1}_{[0,2]}$. Furthermore let $\zeta \in C_c^\infty((1, 2))$ with $\mathbf{1}_{[5/4, 7/4]} \leq \zeta \leq \mathbf{1}_{[1, 2]}$. Then, for every $N > 0$ there exists $M = M(s, N, d) > 1$ such that $\varphi: \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi(x) = \eta(x_d)x_d^{2s-1} + M\zeta(x_d)$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} \varphi(x) \leq -N(x_d)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \quad \text{for } x \in I_1. \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. Let $x \in I_1$. By Shifting (see Lemma A.1), we can assume that $x = (0, \dots, 0, x_d)$. Since $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} x_d^{2s-1} = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d (see Proposition 2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} y_d^{2s-1} (1 - \eta(y_d)) \mathcal{K}(x, y) \, dy - M \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \zeta(y_d) \mathcal{K}(x, y) \, dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d \cap \{y: 1 \leq y_d \leq 2\}} y_d^{2s-1} (1 - \eta(y_d)) \mathcal{K}(x, y) \, dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d \cap \{y: 2 \leq y_d < \infty\}} y_d^{2s-1} \mathcal{K}(x, y) \, dy \\ &\quad - M \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d \cap \{y: 1 \leq y_d \leq 2\}} \zeta(y_d) \mathcal{K}(x, y) \, dy \\ &= I_1(x) + I_2(x) - MI_3(x). \end{aligned}$$

First, we want to show that $I_1(x) \leq c_1 \sqrt{x_d}^{d-1}$ for some constant $c_1 = c_1(s, d) > 0$. Recall that

$$\mathcal{K}(x, y) = |x - y|^{-d-2s} \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{1}_{B_{x_d}(x)}(y) + \mathbb{1}_{P(x)}(y) \right)$$

where

$$P(x) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y - x| < y_d \right\} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : y_d > \frac{x_d}{2} \text{ and } |y'| < \sqrt{x_d} \sqrt{2y_d - x_d} \right\}.$$

Note that $\text{supp } \mathcal{K}(x, \cdot) \cap \{y: y_d \in [1, 2]\} \subset \{y: y_d \in [1, 2], |y'| \leq 2\}$. Furthermore, $1 - \eta(y_d) \leq c|1 - y_d|^2$ for all $y_d \in (1, 2)$. Hence,

$$I_1(x) \leq \int_{\{y: y_d \in [1, 2], |y'| \leq 2\}} c y_d^{2s-1} \frac{|1 - y_d|^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \, dy \leq \int_{\{y: y_d \in [1, 2], |y'| \leq 2\}} c y_d^{2s-1} |x - y|^{2-d-2s} \, dy \leq c$$

for some constant c independent of x . If $x_d < 1/2$ then $\text{supp } \mathcal{K}(x, \cdot) \cap \{y: y_d \in [1, 2]\} \subset \{y: y_d \in [1, 2], |y'| \leq 2\sqrt{x_d}\}$, so we get

$$I_1(x) \leq \int_{\{y: y_d \in [1, 2], |y'| \leq 2\sqrt{x_d}\}} y_d^{2s-1} c |x - y|^{2-d-2s} \, dy \leq c \sqrt{x_d}^{d-1}.$$

Hence, we have shown that $I_1(x) \leq c_1 \sqrt{x_d}^{d-1}$.

Next, we will estimate I_2 . Since $B_{x_d}(x) \cap \{y: y_d \geq 2\} = \emptyset$, we only have to deal with $P(x)$ as a domain for integration. By transforming in spherical coordinates, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{P(x) \cap \{y: y_d \geq 2\}} y_d^{2s-1} |x - y|^{-d-2s} \, dy \leq c \int_{P(x) \cap \{y: y_d \geq 2\}} |y|^{-d-1} \, dy \\ &\leq c \int_2^\infty \left| \{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y| = r\} \cap P(x) \right| r^{-d-1} \, dr. \end{aligned}$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} \{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y| = r\} \cap P(x) &= \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y| = r \text{ and } |y'| < \sqrt{2x_d y_d - x_d^2} \right\} \\ &\subset \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y| = r \text{ and } |y'| < \sqrt{2x_d y_d} \right\} =: A_r. \end{aligned}$$

By scaling the hypersurface A_r onto the unit sphere, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |A_r| &= r^{d-1} \left| \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y| = 1 \text{ and } |y'| < \sqrt{\frac{2y_d x_d}{r}} \right\} \right| \\ &\leq r^{d-1} \left| \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : |y| = 1 \text{ and } |y'| < \sqrt{2y_d x_d} \right\} \right| =: r^{d-1} |\tilde{A}_r| \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used that $r \geq 2$. We will estimate $|\tilde{A}_r|$ by using n dimensional spherical coordinates. The important coordinate is the polar angle $\theta = \arcsin(|y'|)$. By a direct calculation, for \tilde{A}_r we integrate over those θ such that $\sin \theta \in [0, h]$ where

$$h = \sqrt{x_d \left(\sqrt{x_d^2 + 4} - x_d \right)}.$$

By taylor expanding for small x_d , we obtain

$$|\tilde{A}_r| = c \int_0^{\arcsin(h)} \sin^{d-2}(\theta) d\theta \leq c\sqrt{x_d}^{d-1}.$$

Hence, we get

$$I_2(x) \leq c \int_2^\infty \sqrt{x_d}^{d-1} r^{-2} dr \leq c_2 \sqrt{x_d}^{d-1}$$

for some positive constant $c_2 = c_2(d, s)$.

For I_3 , notice, that $\{y: y_d \in [1, 2], |y'| \leq \sqrt{x_d}\} \subset \text{supp } \mathcal{K}(x, \cdot) \cap \{y: y_d \in [1, 2]\}$. Therefore

$$I_3(x) \geq c \int_{\{y: y_d \in [1, 2], |y'| \leq \sqrt{x_d}\}} \zeta(y_d) dy \geq c\sqrt{x_d}^{d-1} \int_1^2 \zeta(y_d) dy_d \geq c_3 \sqrt{x_d}^{d-1}$$

for some positive constant $c_3 = c_3(d, s)$. All together, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi(x) = I_1(x) + I_2(x) - MI_3(x) \leq (c_1 + c_2 - Mc_3) \sqrt{x_d}^{d-1}.$$

By choosing $M > 0$ large enough, we get (5.5). □

5.2. Oscillation decay. For $R > 0$ define the following subsets of \mathbb{R}_+^d

$$I_R^+ = I_{R,1}^+ := \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times (R/4, R/2)$$

and for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$

$$I_{R,\sigma}^+ := \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times (R(1-\sigma)^2/2, R(1-\sigma)/2).$$

Lemma 5.4. Fix $\sigma = 1$, $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\epsilon > 0$ and let $R > 0$. Assume that $u \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}_+^d) \cap L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ is a one dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$, and u satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u(x) &\geq -K_0 \left(\frac{x_d}{R} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} && \text{for } x \in I_{R/4}, \\ u &\geq 0 && \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+^d. \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $K_0 \geq 0$. Then

$$\inf_{x \in I_R^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq c \left(\inf_{x \in I_{R/4}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} + K_0 R \right) \tag{5.6}$$

for some constant $c = c(s, d) > 0$.

For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, assume that u satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u(x) &\geq 0 && \text{for } x \in I_{R(1-\sigma)^2/2}, \\ u &\geq 0 && \text{on } I_{R(1-\sigma)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\inf_{x \in I_{R,\sigma}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq \inf_{x \in I_{R(1-\sigma)^{2/2}}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}}. \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. We start with the proof of (5.6) for $\sigma = 1$.

Let us first consider the case $K_0 = 0$. By scaling, it is enough to prove (5.6) for $R = 4$. Define

$$m := \inf_{x \in I_4^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}}.$$

Then $u(x) \geq mx_d^{2s-1} \geq m$ for $x_d \in [1, 2]$. Let φ be the barrier from Lemma 5.3 (with $N = 0$ in Lemma 5.3), i.e. $\varphi(x) = \eta(x_d)x_d^{2s-1} + M\zeta(x_d)$ for some $M > 1$ and smooth cutoff functions η and ζ with $\mathbf{1}_{[0,5/4]} \leq \eta \leq \mathbf{1}_{[0,2]}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{[5/4,7/4]} \leq \zeta \leq \mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}$, such that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi \leq 0$ on I_1 . Then obviously $m(M+2)^{-1}\varphi \leq u$ on $[2, \infty)$ since $\varphi = 0$ on $[2, \infty)$ and

$$m(M+2)^{-1}\varphi(x) = m(M+2)^{-1}(\eta(x_d)x_d^{2s-1} + M\zeta(x_d)) \leq m \leq u(x)$$

for $x_d \in [1, 2]$ as well. Furthermore $m(M+2)^{-1}\varphi(0) = 0 \leq u(0)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} m(M+2)^{-1}\varphi \leq 0 \leq \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u$ on I_1 . Hence, by the maximum principle (Lemma A.3 is still applicable even though I_1 is not a bounded domain, since u and φ are one-dimensional functions), we deduce

$$m(M+2)^{-1}\varphi(x) \leq u(x)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times (0, 1)$, which proves (5.6) for $K_0 = 0$.

Now, let us consider the case $K_0 > 0$. Recall that $\sigma = 1$. Again, by scaling, it is enough to prove (5.6) for $R = 4$. Let φ be the barrier from Lemma 5.2, i.e. $\varphi(x) = \eta(x_d)x_d^{2s-1}$ for some smooth cutoff function η with $\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]} \leq \eta \leq \mathbf{1}_{[0,2]}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi \geq c_1(\sqrt{x_d})^{d-1}$ on I_1 for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Define

$$v(x) := \frac{K_0}{c_1}\varphi(x) + u(x).$$

Then $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v \geq 0$ on I_1 and $v \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^d . Hence, we can apply (5.6) to v , by the first part of the proof and get

$$\inf_{x \in I_4^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq \inf_{x \in I_4^+} \frac{v(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq c \inf_{x \in I_1} \frac{v(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq c \left(\inf_{x \in I_1} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} + K_0 \right).$$

This proves (5.6) also for $K_0 > 0$.

Finally we will prove (5.7) for the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. Again, by scaling, we can assume that $R = 1$. Set $m = \inf_{I_{1,\sigma}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \geq 0$ and $\varphi(x) := mx_d^{2s-1}$. Let $\kappa = (1-\sigma)/2$. By construction, we have

$$\varphi(x) \leq u(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in I_{1,\sigma}^+ = \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times ((1-\sigma)\kappa, \kappa).$$

By Proposition 2.7, we also have $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi = 0 \leq \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u$ on $I_{(1-\sigma)\kappa}$. Notice, that $\text{supp } \mathcal{K}(x, \cdot) \subset I_\kappa$ for all $x \in I_{(1-\sigma)\kappa}$. Hence, we can apply the maximum principle to conclude

$$mx_d^{2s-1} \leq u(x)$$

for all $x \in I_{(1-\sigma)\kappa}$ which proves (5.7). □

Lemma 5.5. Fix $\sigma = 1$, $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that $u \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap C^{2s+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}_+^d) \cap L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ is a one dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$, and u satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u(x)| &\leq K_0 & \text{for } x \in I_{3R/4} \\ u &\geq 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+^d \end{aligned}$$

for some $K_0 \geq 0$ and $R > 0$. Then

$$\sup_{x \in I_R^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq c \left(\inf_{x \in I_R^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} + K_0 R \right) \quad (5.8)$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s) > 0$.

For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, assume that u satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u(x) &= 0 & \text{for } x \in I_{R(1-\sigma)} \\ u &\geq 0 & \text{on } I_R. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\sup_{x \in I_{R, \sigma}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq c \inf_{x \in I_{R, \sigma}^+} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma) > 0$.

Proof. We start with the case $\sigma = 1$. By scaling, it is enough to prove the lemma for $R = 1$. The interior Harnack inequality (see, e.g., [Coz17] and adapt [DKP14, Lem. 4.2] with the assumptions [DKP14, (2.2), (2.3)] to obtain [Coz17, (6.47)]) gives us

$$\sup_{x \in I_{1, \sigma}^+} u(x) \leq c \left(\inf_{x \in I_{1, \sigma}^+} u(x) + K_0 \right).$$

Now (5.8) follows easily since $1/(x_d)^{2s-1}$ is bounded from above and below for $x \in I_{1, \sigma}^+$.

For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ we proceed similarly. Note, that for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, the assumption $u \geq 0$ on I_R is enough, since $\text{supp } \mathcal{K}(x, \cdot) \subset I_R$ for all $x \in I_{R(1-\sigma)}$. \square

Lemma 5.6. Fix $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that $u \in C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}_+^d) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ is a one dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$, and u satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u(x) &= 0 & \text{for } x \in I_2, \\ u(0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, assume that u satisfies the growth condition (5.1) for some $c_0 \geq 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Set $\theta = 4$ for $\sigma = 1$ and $\theta = 2(1 - \sigma)^{-2}$ for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$.

Then there exists a non-decreasing sequence (m_n) , a non-increasing sequence (M_n) and constants $\alpha = \alpha(s, d, \sigma) \in (0, 1)$ and $K = K(s, d, \sigma, c_0, \epsilon_0) > 0$ such that

$$m_n \leq \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq M_n \quad \text{for all } x \in I_{\theta^{-n}} \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$M_n - m_n = K\theta^{-n\alpha} \quad (5.10)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. We will first show how to prove (5.9) and (5.10) for $\sigma = 1$.

Step 1: We start with the case $n = 0$. Using step 2 from the proof of Proposition 4.2 (see (4.4)), we get $|u| \leq c_1 x_d^{2s-1}$ on I_1 for some constant $c_1 = c_1(d, s, c_0, \epsilon_0) > 0$. By setting $m_0 := \inf_{x \in I_1} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}}$ and $M_0 := K + m_0$ for a constant $K \geq 2c_1$ which we will choose later, (5.9) and (5.10) follow for $n = 0$.

Step 2: Assume that (5.9) and (5.10) holds for all $n \leq k$ for some $K \geq 2c_1$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ which we will choose later. We will now construct m_{k+1} and M_{k+1} . Set

$$v(x) := u(x) - m_k x_d^{2s-1}.$$

We decompose v into its positive and negative part $v = v_+ - v_-$. Notice that $v = v_+$ on $I_{4^{-k}}$ by (5.9).

Let $y \in I_1 \setminus I_{4^{-k}}$ and choose the integer $j \leq k-1$ such that $4^{-j-1} < y_d \leq 4^{-j}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} v(y) &\geq (m_j - m_k) y_d^{2s-1} \geq (m_j - M_j + M_k - m_k) y_d^{2s-1} \\ &= K(-4^{-j\alpha} + 4^{-k\alpha}) y_d^{2s-1} = -K 4^{-k(2s-1+\alpha)} \left(\frac{y_d}{4^{-k}}\right)^{2s-1} \left(\frac{4^{-j\alpha}}{4^{-k\alpha}} - 1\right) \\ &\geq -K 4^{-k(2s-1+\alpha)} \left(\frac{y_d}{4^{-k}}\right)^{2s-1} \left(\left(\frac{4y_d}{4^{-k}}\right)^\alpha - 1\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Now let $x \in I_{\frac{3}{4}4^{-k}}$. We want to bound $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_+(x)|$, so w.l.o.g. we can assume that $x = (0, \dots, 0, x_d)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq -\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_-(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{P(x)} \frac{v_-(y)}{|x-y|^{d+2s}} dy + \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{x_d}(x)} \frac{v_-(y)}{|x-y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &= J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

We will start with J_1 . Note, that

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{4^{-k}}^\infty \int_{\{|y'| \leq \sqrt{2x_d t - x_d^2}\}} \frac{v_-(t)}{((t-x_d)^2 + |y'|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} dy' dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{4^{-k}}^\infty \frac{v_-(t)}{|t-x_d|^{1+2s}} \int_{\{|u| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2x_d t - x_d^2}}{t-x_d}\}} \frac{1}{(1+|u|^2)^{\frac{d+2s}{2}}} du dt \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $v_- = 0$ on $I_{4^{-k}}$, as well as the explicit formula for the kernel \mathcal{K} (see (5.3) and (5.4)) and the transformation $y' = (t-x_d)u$. To bound the integral in the u variable, we will use that

$$\frac{\sqrt{2x_d t - x_d^2}}{t-x_d} = \sqrt{x_d} \frac{\sqrt{2t-x_d}}{t-x_d} \leq \sqrt{x_d} \frac{\sqrt{2t-x_d}}{t/4} = \sqrt{x_d} \frac{4}{\sqrt{t}} \sqrt{2 - \frac{x_d}{t}} \leq 8 \sqrt{\frac{x_d}{4^{-k}}}$$

for all $t \in (4^{-k}, \infty)$ and $x \in I_{\frac{3}{4}4^{-k}}$. Hence, we obtain

$$0 \leq J_1 \leq c \left(\frac{x_d}{4^{-k}}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \int_{4^{-k}}^\infty \frac{v_-(t)}{|t-x_d|^{1+2s}} dt.$$

Using (5.1) and (5.11), we get

$$0 \leq J_1 \leq c \left(\frac{x_d}{4^{-k}}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \int_{4^{-k}}^1 K 4^{-k(2s-1+\alpha)} \left(\frac{t}{4^{-k}}\right)^{2s-1} \frac{\left(\frac{4t}{4^{-k}}\right)^\alpha - 1}{|t-x_d|^{1+2s}} dt$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &+ c \left(\frac{x_d}{4^{-k}} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \int_1^\infty c_0 \frac{1+t^{2s-\epsilon_0}}{|t-x_d|^{1+2s}} dt \\
 &= c \left(\frac{x_d}{4^{-k}} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} (J_{2,1} + J_{2,2})
 \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in I_{\frac{3}{4}4^{-k}}$. By a direct computation, we see that $J_{2,2} \leq c_2$ for some constant $c_2 = c_2(d, s, c_0, \epsilon_0) > 0$. For $J_{2,1}$, we obtain for $x \in I_{\frac{3}{4}4^{-k}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 J_{2,1} &= K4^{-k(2s-1+\alpha)} \int_{4^{-k}-x_d}^{1-x_d} \left(\frac{t+x_d}{4^{-k}} \right)^{2s-1} \frac{\left(\frac{4(t+x_d)}{4^{-k}} \right)^\alpha - 1}{t^{1+2s}} dt \\
 &\leq K4^{-k(2s-1+\alpha)} \int_{4^{-k}/4}^1 \left(\frac{t+x_d}{4^{-k}} \right)^{2s-1} \frac{\left(\frac{4(t+x_d)}{4^{-k}} \right)^\alpha - 1}{t^{1+2s}} dt \\
 &\leq K4^{-k(2s-1+\alpha)} \int_{4^{-k}/4}^1 \left(\frac{4t}{4^{-k}} \right)^{2s-1} \frac{\left(\frac{16t}{4^{-k}} \right)^\alpha - 1}{t^{1+2s}} dt \\
 &= K4^{-k(\alpha-1)} \int_{1/4}^{4^k} (4t)^{2s-1} \frac{(16t)^\alpha - 1}{t^{1+2s}} dt \\
 &\leq K4^{-k(\alpha-1)} f(\alpha)
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f(\alpha) := \int_{1/4}^\infty (4t)^{2s-1} \frac{(16t)^\alpha - 1}{t^{1+2s}} dt.$$

Notice, that by the dominated convergence theorem, $f(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

Combining the estimates on $J_{2,1}$ and $J_{2,2}$, we obtain

$$J_1 \leq c(Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k(\alpha-1)} \left(\frac{x_d}{4^{-k}} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}. \quad (5.13)$$

Note, that by similar arguments, one can also proof the estimate (5.13) for J_2 from (5.12). Hence, together with $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v(x) = 0$, we get

$$|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_+(x)| \leq |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v(x)| + |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_-(x)| \leq c(Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k(\alpha-1)} \left(\frac{x_d}{4^{-k}} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}$$

for all $x \in I_{\frac{3}{4}4^{-k}}$.

Now, we apply Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 for v_+ with $R = 4^{-k}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{x \in I_{4^{-k}}^+} \left(\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - m_k \right) &\leq c \left[\inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}}^+} \left(\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - m_k \right) + (Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k\alpha} \right] \\
 &\leq c \left[\inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \left(\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - m_k \right) + (Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k\alpha} \right]
 \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Repeating the same arguments as above for $w(x) = M_k x_d^{2s-1} - u(x)$ yields

$$\sup_{x \in I_{4^{-k}}^+} \left(M_k - \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \right) \leq c \left[\inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \left(M_k - \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \right) + (Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k\alpha} \right]. \quad (5.15)$$

Summing up (5.14) and (5.15) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} M_k - m_k &\leq c \left[\inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \left(\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - m_k \right) + \inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \left(M_k - \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \right) + (Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k\alpha} \right] \\ &= c_3 \left[M_k - m_k + \inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - \sup_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} + (Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k\alpha} \right] \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_3 = c_3(d, s) > 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - \inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} &\leq \frac{c_3 - 1}{c_3} (M_k - m_k) + (Kf(\alpha) + c_2)4^{-k\alpha} \\ &= \left(\frac{c_3 - 1}{c_3} + f(\alpha) + \frac{c_2}{K} \right) K4^{-k\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing $K = \max\{3c_2c_3, 2c_1\}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that

$$f(\alpha) \leq \frac{1}{3c_3} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \frac{1}{3c_3} \leq 4^{-\alpha},$$

we get

$$\frac{c_3 - 1}{c_3} + f(\alpha) + \frac{c_2}{K} \leq \frac{c_3 - 1}{c_3} + \frac{1}{3c_3} + \frac{c_2}{3c_2c_3} = 1 - \frac{1}{3c_3} \leq 4^{-\alpha}.$$

By setting $m_{k+1} := \inf_{x \in I_{4^{-k}/4}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}}$ and $M_{k+1} := m_{k+1} + K4^{-\alpha(k+1)}$, both (5.9) and (5.10) follow for $n = k + 1$ in the case $\sigma = 1$.

Let us now consider the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. We will just comment on the differences in the proof. The case $n = 0$ follows from (4.4) as above. In step 2, we can leave out the estimate on $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_+(x)|$ since by the choice of θ we can directly apply Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 to $v(x) = u(x) - m_k x_d^{2s-1}$ and $R = \theta^{-k}$ to obtain

$$\sup_{x \in I_{\theta^{-k}, \sigma}^+} \left(\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - m_k \right) \leq c \inf_{x \in I_{\theta^{-k}, \sigma}^+} \left(\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - m_k \right) \leq c \inf_{x \in I_{\theta^{-(k+1)}}} \left(\frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - m_k \right).$$

Hence, as above, we get

$$\sup_{x \in I_{\theta^{-(k+1)}}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} - \inf_{x \in I_{\theta^{-(k+1)}}} \frac{u(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}} \leq \frac{c_3 - 1}{c_3} K\theta^{-k\alpha}.$$

By choosing $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $\frac{c_3 - 1}{c_3} \leq \theta^{-\alpha}$, we finish the proof. \square

5.3. Proof of 1-d boundary Harnack.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. By scaling, it is enough to prove the result for $R = 1$. Set $d: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $d(x) := x$ and $v: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $v := \tilde{u}/d^{2s-1}$. By dividing u by some constant, we can assume that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(I_2)} \leq 1$, so it remains to show that $[v]_{C^\alpha(0,1)} \leq c$ for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, c_0, \epsilon_0)$.

By Lemma 5.6, we have

$$\sup_{x \in (0, \theta^{-n})} v(x) - \inf_{x \in (0, \theta^{-n})} v(x) \leq K\theta^{-n\gamma} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (5.16)$$

for some constants $\theta = \theta(\sigma) > 1$, $K = K(s, d, \sigma, c_0, \epsilon_0) > 0$ and $\gamma = \gamma(s, d, \sigma, c_0, \epsilon_0) \in (0, 1)$. Hence, from (5.16), we know that v can be continuously extended to $x = 0$.

Set $\kappa = \frac{1}{2(2+3/\sigma)}$. Then, by Corollary 2.6, we have for all $y \in (0, 1)$

$$[\tilde{u}]_{C^{2s-1}(y-\kappa y, y+\kappa y)} \leq cy^{-2s+1} \quad (5.17)$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, c_0, \epsilon_0)$. Furthermore, by scaling, we obtain

$$[d^{-2s+1}]_{C^{2s-1}(y(1-\kappa), y(1+\kappa))} = y^{-4s+2} [d^{-2s+1}]_{C^{2s-1}(1-\kappa, 1+\kappa)} \leq cy^{-4s+2} \quad (5.18)$$

for some constant $c = c(s, \sigma) > 0$. Combining (5.17) and (5.18), together with $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,2)} \leq 1$ and $\|d^{-2s+1}\|_{L^\infty((y(1-\kappa), y(1+\kappa)))} \leq cy^{-2s+1}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} [v]_{C^{2s-1}(y(1-\kappa), y(1+\kappa))} &\leq \|d^{-2s+1}\|_{L^\infty((y(1-\kappa), y(1+\kappa)))} [\tilde{u}]_{C^{2s-1}(y-\kappa y, y+\kappa y)} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,2)} [d^{-2s+1}]_{C^{2s-1}(y(1-\kappa), y(1+\kappa))} \\ &\leq cy^{2-4s} \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

for all $y \in (0, 1)$ for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon_0, c_0) > 0$.

Now, fix some $p > 2$. Let $x, y \in (0, 1)$ with $x \leq y$ and $\rho = |y - x|$.

Case 1: Assume that $\rho \geq \kappa y^p$. We will choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta^{-(n+1)} < y \leq \theta^{-n}$ with $\theta > 1$ from Lemma 5.6. Then, by using (5.16), we obtain

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \leq |v(x) - v(0)| + |v(y) - v(0)| \leq 2K\theta^{-n\gamma} \leq c\rho^{\gamma/p}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon_0, c_0) > 0$.

Case 2: If $\rho < \kappa y^p$, then $\rho < \kappa y$ since $p > 1$, which implies $x \in (y(1 - \kappa), y(1 + \kappa))$. Using (5.19), we obtain

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \leq c\rho^{2s-1} y^{2-4s} \leq c\rho^{2s-1} \rho^{\frac{2-4s}{p}} = c\rho^{(2s-1)(1-\frac{2}{p})}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon_0, c_0) > 0$

We finish the proof by choosing $\alpha = \min\{\gamma/p, (2s - 1)(1 - 2/p)\} > 0$. □

6. LIOUVILLE TYPE RESULT IN HALF-SPACE

The goal of this section is to prove the following Liouville type result in the half-space using the boundary Harnack result from Proposition 5.1.

Proposition 6.1. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that $u \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^d, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^d. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Then there exists some $\alpha_ = \alpha_*(d, s, \sigma) > 0$ such that, if u satisfies the growth bound*

$$|u(x)| \leq c(1 + |x|^{2s-1+\alpha_*}) \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}_+^d) \quad (6.2)$$

for some $c > 0$, then $u(x) = Ax_d^{2s-1}$ for some $A \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Fix some $\alpha_* \in (0, \alpha)$ where $\alpha = \alpha(d, s, \sigma) \in (0, 1)$ is taken from Proposition 5.1. By Lemma 6.2, we know that u is a one dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$. Then, Proposition 5.1 gives us

$$\left[\frac{\tilde{u}(x)}{x^{2s-1}} \right]_{C^\alpha(0, R)} \leq cR^{1-2s-\alpha} \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(0, 2R)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq cR^{1-2s-\alpha}(1 + (2R)^{2s-1+\alpha_*}) \\ &\leq cR^{\alpha_*-\alpha} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\left[\frac{\tilde{u}(x)}{x_d^{2s-1}}\right]_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+)} = 0$. Hence, $\tilde{u}(x)/x_d^{2s-1}$ is constant, i.e. $u(x) = Ax_d^{2s-1}$ for some $A \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

We finish the proof of Proposition 6.1 by showing that the solution $u(x)$ only depends on x_d . Essentially, the proof only uses the translational invariance of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}$ in the tangential direction \mathbb{R}^{d-1} as well as the Hölder regularity bounds up to the boundary from Proposition 4.2.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $u \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ solve (6.1) from Proposition 6.1 and assume that (6.2) holds true for some $\alpha_* \in (0, \alpha)$ where $\alpha = \alpha(d, s, \sigma) \in (0, 1)$ is taken from Proposition 5.1. Then u is a one dimensional function, i.e. $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$ for some $\tilde{u}: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Set $\beta = 2s - 1 \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma = 2s - 1 + \alpha_* \in (0, 2s)$. We start with the following claim.

Claim: If v satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^d, \\ v &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^d \end{aligned}$$

with $\|v\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq R^\mu$ for all $R \geq R_0$ for some $\mu \in (0, 2s)$ and $R_0 \geq 1$. Then

$$[v]_{C^\beta(B_R)} \leq c_1 R^{\mu-\beta} \quad \text{for all } R \geq 1$$

for some constant $c_1 = c_1(R_0, d, s, \sigma, \mu) > 0$.

The claim can be proven by rescaling Proposition 4.2. Indeed, for $R \geq 1$ let $v_R(x) := v(Rx)$. Then,

$$|v_R(x)| = |v(Rx)| \leq R_0^\mu + R^\mu |x|^\mu \leq R_0^\mu R^\mu (1 + |x|^\mu) \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}_+^d),$$

i.e. $\|v_R\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq R_0^\mu R^\mu$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_R = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d . Hence, by Proposition 4.2

$$[v]_{C^{2s-1}(B_{R/2})} = R^{-\beta} [v_R]_{C^{2s-1}(B_{1/2})} \leq cR^{-\beta} \|v_R\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq cR_0^\mu R^{\mu-\beta}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma)$. This proves the claim.

Now let us prove Lemma 6.2. By dividing u by some constant, we can assume that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq R^\gamma$ for all $R \geq 1$. Hence, by the claim we know that $[u]_{C^{2s-1}(B_R)} \leq c_1 R^{\gamma-\beta}$.

Fix some $h \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$. We define

$$v_1^h(x) := \frac{u(x+h) - u(x)}{c_1 |h|^{2s-1}}.$$

Then, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_1^h = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d and

$$\|v_1^h\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq \frac{1}{c_1} [u]_{C^{2s-1}(B_{2R})} \leq R^{\gamma-\beta}$$

for all $R \geq \max\{1, |h|\}$.

Now, we repeat this argument inductively. For $k \geq 2$ define

$$v_k^h(x) = \frac{v_{k-1}^h(x+h) - v_{k-1}^h(x)}{c_1 |h|^{d+2s}}.$$

Then $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_k^h = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d , and by the above claim, $\|v_k\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq R^{\gamma-k\beta}$ for large R . Let \tilde{k} be the smallest positive integer such that $\gamma - \tilde{k}\beta < 0$. By sending $R \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $v_{\tilde{k}}^h = 0$.

Since this is true for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$, we know that u is polynomial of degree at most $\tilde{k} - 1$ in the first $d - 1$ variables. Using (6.2) and the fact that $2s - 1 + \alpha_* < 2$, we conclude that u is just a polynomial of degree at most 1 in the first $d - 1$ variables. Hence,

$$u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} u_i(x_d)x_i + \tilde{u}(x_d)$$

for some functions $u_i: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{u}: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Due to the symmetry of the integration domain in the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d}$ in the $\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ direction, we have

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u_i + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \tilde{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^d.$$

This implies $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u_i = 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^d for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$. Using the above prove of Proposition 6.1, we conclude that $u_i(x_d) = c_i x_d^{2s-1}$ for some constant $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$. However, if $c_i \neq 0$, this would contradict (6.2). This implies $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_d)$. \square

7. HIGHER BOUNDARY REGULARITY

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain. Recall that d_Ω is $C^{1,1}$ close to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. For convenience, we will replace d_Ω in the interior with a $C^{1,1}$ function. To be more precise, we fix $d_0 > 0$ and a function $\delta_\Omega \in C^{1,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$\delta_\Omega = d_\Omega \quad \text{on } \{0 \leq d_\Omega(x) \leq d_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2}d_\Omega \leq \delta_\Omega \leq d_\Omega \quad \text{on } \Omega.$$

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.2 using a standard blow-up argument together with the Liouville type result in the half-space. We mostly follow the proof of [FR24, Sec. 2.7].

Lemma 7.1. *Fix $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ and $s \in (1/2, 1)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain with $0 \in \partial\Omega$. Assume that $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u &= f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

where $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then there exists $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $\alpha = \alpha(d, s, \sigma) > 0$ such that

$$\|u - q_0 \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} \leq c (\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) r^{2s-1+\alpha} \quad (7.1)$$

for all $r \in (0, 1]$ for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$.

Proof. We will choose $\alpha = \min\{\alpha_*, 1 - \gamma\}$ with α_* from Proposition 6.1 and γ from Lemma 3.2. After dividing the equation by some constant, we can assume that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1.$$

Step 1: In the first step, we will show that we can replace q_0 in (7.1) by q_r depending on $r \in (0, 1)$. To be more precise, we claim that if

$$\forall r \in (0, 1), \quad \exists q_r \in \mathbb{R}: \quad \|u - q_r \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} \leq c_1 r^{2s-1+\alpha} \quad (7.2)$$

holds true, then $\|u - q_0 \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} \leq c c_1 r^{2s-1+\alpha}$ for some $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c = c(\Omega, d, s) > 0$ independent of r and $|q_0| \leq c(c_1 + 1)$.

To prove this claim, assume that (7.2) holds. Using that $r^{2s-1} \leq c\|\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)}$ for some constant $c > 0$ depending on Ω , we obtain for all $r \in (0, 1/2]$ and $\beta \in [1, 2]$

$$\begin{aligned} |q_{\beta r} - q_r| &\leq cr^{-2s+1}\|q_{\beta r}\delta_\Omega^{2s-1} - q_r\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} \\ &\leq cr^{-2s+1}\|u - q_r\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} + cr^{-2s+1}\|u - q_{\beta r}\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} \\ &\leq cc_1r^\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

Furthermore, using that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |q_r| &\leq cr^{-2s+1}\|q_r\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} \\ &\leq cr^{-2s+1}\|u - q_r\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} + cr^{-2s+1}\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)} \\ &\leq c(c_1 + 1) \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

for all $r \in (1/2, 1)$. Note that (7.3) and (7.4) imply that the limit

$$q_0 := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} q_r$$

exists. Summing up the following geometric sequence, we obtain

$$|q_0 - q_r| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |q_{2^{-j}r} - q_{2^{-j-1}r}| \leq cc_1r^\alpha \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j\alpha} \leq cc_1r^\alpha$$

for all $r \in (0, 1)$, which in particular implies $|q_0| \leq c(c_1 + 1)$. Finally, for all $r \in (0, 1)$ we get

$$\|u - q_0\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} \leq \|u - q_r\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} + |q_r - q_0|\|\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} \leq cc_1r^{2s-1+\alpha},$$

which proves the claim.

Step 2: By step 1, it is enough to prove (7.2). We will argue by contradiction. Assume that there exists sequences of functions $(u_m) \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ and $(f_m) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|u_m\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|f_m\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\Omega u_m &= f_m \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_m &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sup_{r \in (0,1)} r^{-2s+1-\alpha} \|u_m - q_{m,r}\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_r)} \geq m$$

for any $q_{m,r} \in \mathbb{R}$. We will extend u_m and f_m to functions on \mathbb{R}^d by setting $u_m = f_m = 0$ on Ω^c . Furthermore, we will choose

$$q_{m,r} = \frac{\int_{B_r} u_m \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}}{\int_{B_r} \delta_\Omega^{2(2s-1)}}. \quad (7.5)$$

Set

$$Q_{m,r} := \|u_m - q_{m,r}\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(\rho) := \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\rho \leq r < 1} r^{-2s+1-\alpha} Q_{m,r}.$$

Then $\theta(\rho)$ is non increasing, finite for any $\rho > 0$, and satisfies $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \theta(\rho) = \infty$. Hence, there exists sequences (m_k) and (r_k) with $m_k \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $r_k^{-2s+1-\alpha} Q_{m_k, r_k} \geq \frac{1}{2}\theta(r_k)$, in particular

$$r_k^{-2s+1-\alpha} Q_{m_k, r_k} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.6)$$

Step 3: Now, we define

$$v_k(x) := \frac{u_{m_k}(r_k x) - q_{m_k, r_k} \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}(r_k x)}{Q_{m_k, r_k}}.$$

By the definition of $Q_{m,r}$, we immediately get

$$\|v_k\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} = 1. \quad (7.7)$$

Furthermore, we claim that

$$\|v_k\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq cR^{2s-1+\alpha} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq R \leq \frac{1}{2r_k}. \quad (7.8)$$

Indeed, as in (7.3), we have for any $\beta \in [1, 2]$

$$|q_{m,\beta r} - q_{m,r}| \leq c\beta^{-2s+1} (Q_{m,r} + Q_{m,\beta r}) \leq c\beta^\alpha \theta(r).$$

Hence, if $1 \leq R \leq 1/(2r)$ then there exists $\beta \in [1, 2]$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $R = \beta 2^N$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned} |q_{m,Rr} - q_{m,r}| &\leq c \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (2^j r)^\alpha \theta(2^j r) + |q_{m,\beta 2^N r} - q_{m,2^N r}| \\ &\leq c r^\alpha 2^{N\alpha} \theta(r) + c r^\alpha 2^{N\alpha} \theta(2^N r) \\ &\leq c r^\alpha R^\alpha \theta(r). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_k\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} &= Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} \|u_{m_k} - q_{m_k, r_k} \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_{Rr_k})} \\ &\leq Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} \left(Q_{m_k, Rr_k} + |q_{m_k, Rr_k} - q_{m_k, r_k}| \|\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_{Rr_k})} \right) \\ &\leq Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} \theta(Rr_k) R^{2s-1+\alpha} r_k^{2s-1+\alpha} + c Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} R^\alpha r_k^\alpha \theta(r_k) (Rr_k)^{2s-1} \\ &\leq R^{2s-1+\alpha} \theta(Rr_k) 2 (\theta(r_k))^{-1} + c \theta(r_k) Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{2s-1+\alpha} R^{2s-1+\alpha} \\ &\leq c R^{2s-1+\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

which proves (7.8).

Using $|u_{m_k}| \lesssim \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}$ (see (4.4)) and (7.5), we get that $|q_{m_k, r_k}| \leq c$ for some constant c independent of k . Hence, with $\|u_{m_k}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1$, we get

$$|v_k(x)| \leq c Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{2s-1+\alpha} |x|^{2s-1+\alpha}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{1/(2r_k)}$. Hence, together with (7.6) and (7.8), we conclude

$$\|v_k\|_{L_{2s-1+\alpha}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c. \quad (7.9)$$

for some constant $c > 0$ independent of k .

Let $\Omega_k := \frac{1}{r_k} \Omega$. Then, by definition of $q_{m,r}$, we have

$$\int_{B_1} v_k(x) \delta_{\Omega_k}^{2s-1}(x) dx = Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{-2s+1} \int_{B_1} \left[u_{m_k}(r_k x) \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}(r_k x) - q_{m_k, r_k} \delta_\Omega^{2(2s-1)}(r_k x) \right] dx = 0. \quad (7.10)$$

Step 4: The function v_k satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega_k} v_k &= \tilde{f}_k \quad \text{in } \Omega_k, \\ v_k &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_k \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_k(x) = Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{2s} [f_{m_k}(r_k x) - q_{m_k, r_k} (\mathcal{L}_\Omega \delta_\Omega^{2s-1})(r_k x)].$$

Recall from Lemma 3.2 that $|\mathcal{L}_\Omega \delta_\Omega^{2s-1}| \lesssim d_\Omega^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Together with the fact that $d_\Omega(r_k x) = r_k d_{\Omega_k}(x)$, as well as $\|f_{m_k}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1$ and $|q_{m_k, r_k}| \leq c$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_k d_{\Omega_k}^\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_k)} &\leq Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{2s} \|d_{\Omega_k}^\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_k)} + Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{2s} |q_{m_k, r_k}| r_k^{-\gamma} \|d_{\Omega_k}^{-\gamma} d_{\Omega_k}^\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_k)} \\ &\leq c Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{2s-\gamma} \rightarrow 0 \quad (k \rightarrow \infty) \end{aligned} \quad (7.12)$$

where in the last step, we have used that $\alpha < 1 - \gamma$ and $Q_{m_k, r_k}^{-1} r_k^{2s-1+\alpha} \rightarrow 0$ (see (7.6)).

Step 5: Using Proposition 4.2 together with (7.9) and (7.12), we obtain

$$\|v_k\|_{C^{2s-1}(B_R)} \leq c \quad (7.13)$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant depending on R but not on k .

Hence, by compactness, up to a subsequence (v_k) converges locally uniformly (actually in C_{loc}^ν for any $\nu < 2s - 1$) in \mathbb{R}^d to some v_∞ . By taking limits in (7.7), (7.8) and (7.10), v_∞ satisfies

$$\|v_\infty\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} = 1, \quad v_\infty \in L_{2s-1+\alpha}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \int_{B_1} v_\infty(x) x_d^{2s-1} dx = 0$$

and $v_\infty = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Furthermore, all the v_k satisfy (7.11) in the weak sense. Therefore, they also satisfy the equation in the distributional sense, i.e.

$$\int_{\Omega_k} v_k \mathcal{L}_{\Omega_k} \varphi = \int_{\Omega_k} \tilde{f}_k \varphi, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_j). \quad (7.14)$$

Now, we claim that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_\infty = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d in the distributional sense, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_\infty \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d). \quad (7.15)$$

To prove this, we want to take limits in (7.14). Fix $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$. Note, that $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_k)$ for large k since $\Omega_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Since $\text{supp } \varphi$ is away from $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^d$, \tilde{f}_k converges to 0 uniformly on $\text{supp } \varphi$. Hence, by (7.12), we have

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \varphi \tilde{f}_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that $v_k(x) \mathcal{L}_{\Omega_k} \varphi(x) \rightarrow v_\infty(x) \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi(x)$ pointwise for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Since $|v_k(x)| \leq c(1 + |x|^{2s-1+\alpha})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$|\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_k} \varphi(x)| \leq c(1 + |x|)^{-d-2s} \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^d)$$

for some constant c depending on φ , we can apply dominated convergence theorem to conclude

$$\int_{\Omega_j} v_k \mathcal{L}_{\Omega_k} \varphi \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_\infty \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \varphi$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This proves (7.15).

By Lemma 7.2, v_∞ is actually a strong solution $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} v_\infty = 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^d . Hence, we can apply Proposition 6.1 to conclude that $v_\infty(x) = Ax_d^{2s-1}$ for some constant $A \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\int_{B_1} v_\infty(x) x_d^{2s-1} dx = 0$ implies $A = 0$. But this contradicts $\|v_\infty\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} = 1$. \square

Lemma 7.2. *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, $\epsilon > 0$, and set $\kappa = (2 + 3/\sigma)^{-1}$. Let $u \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a distributional solution to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} u = f$ in $B_\kappa(e_d)$, i.e.*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u(x) \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}_+^d, \sigma} \varphi(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} f(x) \varphi(x) dx \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_\kappa(e_d)),$$

for some $f \in C^\alpha(B_\kappa(e_d))$ where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ with $2s + \alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$.

Then $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_{\kappa/4}(e_d))$ with

$$\|u\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B_{\kappa/4}(e_d))} \leq c \left(\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(B_\kappa(e_d))} \right)$$

for some $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon, \alpha) > 0$.

Proof. After dividing by some constant, we can assume that $\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(B_\kappa(e_d))} \leq 1$. By Lemma 2.5, we know that $\|u\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2})} \leq c$ for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon) > 0$. As in Lemma 2.5, we rewrite our operator in terms of the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^s$ and then use interior regularity results for $(-\Delta)^s$. Notice that for all $x \in B_{\kappa/2}(e_d)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s u(x) &= f(x) + u(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1 - \mathcal{B}(x, y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u(y)(1 - \mathcal{B}(x, y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &= f(x) + u(x)h_1(x) + h_2(x) \end{aligned} \quad (7.16)$$

in the distributional sense. We want to show that the right-hand side of (7.16) is C^α . By assumption we have $\|f\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))} \leq 1$. It was shown in Lemma 2.5 that $\|h_1\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))} \leq c$ and $\|h_2\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))} \leq c$ for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon) > 0$. Assume that we have already shown that $[h_1]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))} \leq c$ and $[h_2]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))} \leq c$ for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon, \alpha) > 0$. Then (using that the product of two bounded Hölder continuous functions is Hölder continuous), we get that

$$\|f + uh_1 + h_2\|_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))} \leq c.$$

By interior regularity results for the fractional Laplacian (see, e.g., [FR24, Thm. 2.4.1.]), we conclude that $\|u\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B_{\kappa/4}(e_d))} \leq c$ for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon, \alpha) > 0$, which proves Lemma 7.2.

It remains to bound $[h_2]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))}$ ($[h_1]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))}$ can be bounded similarly by setting $u = 1$). Notice that

$$h_2(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{(B_{\sigma x_d}(x))^c} \frac{u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy + \frac{1}{2} \int_{R(x)^c} \frac{u(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy$$

where $R(x)$ is the ellipsoid $E(x)$ (from (2.11)) in the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ or the paraboloid $P(x)$ (from (2.12)) in the case $\sigma = 1$. Notice that by rescaling the claim from the proof of Lemma 2.5, we see that

$$\mathcal{B}(x, y) = 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in B_\kappa(e_d), y \in B_{2\kappa}(e_d).$$

As a consequence for $x, z \in B_\kappa(e_d)$, we have $|x - y| \geq \kappa$ for all $y \in (B_{\sigma z_d}(z))^c \cup R(z)^c$. Hence, in the arguments below, we are always away from the singularity.

Let us fix $x, z \in B_{\kappa/2}(e_d)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 2|h_2(x) - h_2(z)| &\leq \int_{(B_{\sigma x_d}(x))^c} |u(y)| \left| \frac{1}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} - \frac{1}{|z - y|^{d+2s}} \right| dy \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{(B_{\sigma x_d}(x))^c} \frac{u(y)}{|z - y|^{d+2s}} dy - \int_{(B_{\sigma z_d}(z))^c} \frac{u(y)}{|z - y|^{d+2s}} dy \right| \\ &\quad + \int_{R(x)^c} |u(y)| \left| \frac{1}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} - \frac{1}{|z - y|^{d+2s}} \right| dy \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{R(x)^c} \frac{u(y)}{|z - y|^{d+2s}} dy - \int_{R(z)^c} \frac{u(y)}{|z - y|^{d+2s}} dy \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4.$$

We start with I_1 . Notice that $|x - y|$ and $|z - y|$ in the integral of I_1 are both bounded from below. Hence, we can use the C^1 regularity from $|\cdot|^{-d-2s}$. To be more precise, using the mean value formula, for every $y \in (B_{\sigma x_d}(x))^c$ there exists $w_y \in B_{\kappa/2}(e_d)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq c|x - z| \int_{(B_{\sigma x_d}(x))^c} |u(y)| |w_y - y|^{-d-2s-1} dy \\ &\leq c|x - z| \|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{(B_{\sigma x_d})} (1 + |y|)^{-d-1-\epsilon} dy \\ &\leq c|x - z| \|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon)$. Similarly, we can bound $I_3 \leq c|x - z|$ for some constant $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon)$.

Notice that for I_2 , only those y in the integral remain, which are contained in the symmetric difference $(B_{\sigma x_d}(x))^c \Delta (B_{\sigma z_d}(z))^c$. By a direct computation, we see that

$$(B_{\sigma x_d}(x))^c \Delta (B_{\sigma z_d}(z))^c \subset B_{\sigma x_d+2|x-z|}(x) \setminus B_{\sigma x_d-2|x-z|}(x).$$

Hence, we can estimate I_2 by

$$I_2 \leq \int_{B_{\sigma x_d+2|x-z|}(x) \setminus B_{\sigma x_d-2|x-z|}(x)} \frac{|u(y)|}{|z - y|^{d+2s}} dy \leq c |B_{\sigma x_d+2|x-z|}(x) \setminus B_{\sigma x_d-2|x-z|}(x)| \leq c|x - z|$$

for some $c = c(d, s, \sigma, \epsilon) > 0$, where we have used $\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1$ and the fact that $|z - y|$ in the integral is bounded by positive constants from above and below.

For I_4 , also, only those y in the symmetric difference $R(x)^c \Delta R(z)^c$ remain. However, the geometric setting becomes much more complicated compared to I_2 .

We will view the symmetric difference $D := R(x)^c \Delta R(z)^c$ as the union

$$D \subset \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \partial R((1-t)x + tz)$$

of the topological boundaries of the ellipsoids or paraboloids $R((1-t)x + tz)$ of the points connecting x and z in a straight line. Then, using the coarea formula, we will write the integral over D as an iterated integral over $t \in [0, 1]$ and over the hypersurfaces $\partial R((1-t)x + tz)$.

We start with the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. Using the explicit inequality from (2.11), which describes the ellipsoid, we define a bijective function

$$\begin{aligned} g_t: \partial E(e_d) &\rightarrow \partial E((1-t)x + tz) \\ \begin{pmatrix} y' \\ y_d \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} ((1-t)x_d + tz_d)y' + (1-t)x' + tz' \\ ((1-t)x_d + tz_d) \left(y_d - \frac{1}{1-\sigma^2} \right) + \frac{((1-t)x_d + tz_d)}{1-\sigma^2} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

for every $t \in [0, 1]$, which maps $\partial E(e_d)$ onto $\partial E((1-t)x + tz)$ by scaling and shifting the ellipsoid.

By a direct computation, we can bound the derivative

$$|\partial_t g_t(y)| \leq c|x - z|(1 + |y|) \quad \text{for all } y \in \partial E(e_d) \quad (7.17)$$

for some constant $c = c(d, \sigma)$. Furthermore, notice that $1 + |y|$ is bounded for all $y \in \partial E(e_d)$ by some constant depending only on σ . Hence, $|\partial_t g_t(y)| \leq c|x - z|$ for all $y \in \partial E(e_d)$.

Using the coarea formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &\leq \int_D \frac{|u(y)|}{|z-y|^{d+2s}} dy \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \int_{g_t(\partial E(e_d))} \frac{|u(y)|}{|z-y|^{d+2s}} |\partial_t g_t(y)| dH_{d-1}(y) dt \\ &\leq c|x-z| \int_0^1 \int_{\partial E((1-t)x+tz)} \frac{|u(y)|}{|z-y|^{d+2s}} dH_{d-1}(y) dt \end{aligned}$$

where H_{d-1} is the $d-1$ dimensional Hausdorff measure. Notice that in the last integral, both the ellipsoids $H_{d-1}(\partial E((1-t)x+tz))$ and the integrand are bounded. This implies $I_4 \leq c|x-z|$ for some $c = c(d, s, \sigma) > 0$ in the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$.

Now we consider the case $\sigma = 1$. We will proceed similarly as above. The key differences are that both $\partial P((1-t)x+tz)$ as well as the right-hand side of (7.17) are not bounded anymore. Using the explicit description of $P(x)$ from (2.12), we define a bijective map

$$\begin{aligned} g_t: \partial P(e_d) &\rightarrow \partial P((1-t)x+tz) \\ \begin{pmatrix} y' \\ y_d \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} ((1-t)x_d + tz_d)y' + (1-t)x' + tz' \\ y_d - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{((1-t)x_d + tz_d)}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

A direct computation yields

$$|\partial_t g_t(y)| \leq c|x-z|(1+|y'|) \quad \text{for all } y \in \partial P(e_d)$$

for some constant $c = c(d) > 0$. Using the coarea formula, we get

$$I_4 \leq c|x-z| \int_0^1 \int_{\partial P((1-t)x+tz)} \frac{|u(y)|(1+|y'|)}{|z-y|^{d+2s}} dH_{d-1}(y) dt. \quad (7.18)$$

We claim that

$$\int_{\partial P(w)} \frac{|u(y)|(1+|y'|)}{|z-y|^{d+2s}} dH_{d-1}(y) \leq c \quad (7.19)$$

for any $w \in B_{\kappa/2}(e_d)$, for some constant $c = c(d, s) > 0$.

Notice, that $\partial P(w)$ is the graph of the function $h: \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$h(y') := \frac{|y' - w|^2}{2w_d} + \frac{w_d}{2}.$$

Since $h(y') \asymp |y'|^2 + 1$, we have $|(y', h(y'))| \asymp |y'|^2 + 1$. Using that $|\nabla h(y')| \asymp |y'| + 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial P(w)} \frac{|u(y)|(1+|y'|)}{|z-y|^{d+2s}} dH_{d-1}(y) &\leq c\|u\|_{L_{2s-\epsilon}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\partial P(w)} \frac{1+|y'|}{(1+|y|)^{d+\epsilon}} dH_{d-1}(y) \\ &\leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{|\nabla h(y')|}{(1+|(y', h(y'))|)^{d+\epsilon}} dy' \\ &\leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \frac{1}{(1+|y'|)^{2d+2\epsilon-2}} dy'. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above integral is finite. This proves (7.19). Combining (7.18) and (7.19), we conclude that $I_4 \leq c|x-z|$ for some $c = c(d, s, \sigma) > 0$ in the case $\sigma = 1$ as well. Hence, we have shown that $|h_2(x) - h_2(z)| \leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 \leq c|x-z|$, which proves that $h_2 \in C^\alpha(B_{\kappa/2}(e_d))$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ from Lemma 7.1. By dividing the equation by some constant, we can assume that $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1$. Furthermore, by Proposition 4.1, we can also assume that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1$. We will now show that $\|u/\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{C^\alpha(\Omega)} \leq c$ for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$. Note, that this implies (1.6), since by interior regularity results $u/d_\Omega^{2s-1} \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\Omega)$ and d_Ω coincides with δ_Ω close to the boundary.

Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ be a point with $\rho := d_\Omega(x_0)$, and choose $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $|x_0 - z_0| = \rho$. Set $\kappa = \frac{1}{2(2+3/\sigma)}$ and define

$$v(x) := u(x_0 + 2\kappa\rho x) - q(z_0)\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}(x_0 + 2\kappa\rho x)$$

where $q(z_0)$ is the constant q_0 from Lemma 7.1 when the point z_0 is shifted to $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note, that $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c$ for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$. Furthermore, using Lemma 7.1, we obtain the weighted L^∞ -bound

$$\|v\|_{L_{2s-1+\alpha}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c\rho^{2s-1+\alpha}$$

for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$.

Moreover, for $x \in B_1$, we have in the weak sense

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_{(2\kappa\rho)^{-1}(\Omega-x_0)}v(x)| &\leq c\rho^{2s}|f(x_0 + 2\kappa\rho x)| + c|q(z_0)|\rho^{2s}d_\Omega^{-\gamma}(x_0 + 2\kappa\rho x) \\ &\leq c\rho^{2s} + c\rho^{2s-\gamma} \leq c\rho^{2s-1+\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$, where we have used Lemma 3.2 and the fact that $\alpha < 1 - \gamma$.

By Lemma 2.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} [u - q(z_0)\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} &= c\rho^{-\alpha}[v]_{C^\alpha(B_{1/2})} \\ &\leq c\rho^{-\alpha} \left(\|v\|_{L_{2s-1+\alpha}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\mathcal{L}_{(2\kappa\rho)^{-1}(\Omega-x_0)}v(x)\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right) \\ &\leq c\rho^{2s-1} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$.

Since

$$\|\nabla\delta_\Omega^{-2s+1}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} \leq c\|\delta_\Omega^{-2s}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))}\|\nabla\delta_\Omega\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} \leq c\rho^{-2s}$$

we obtain by interpolation

$$[\delta_\Omega^{-2s+1}]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} \leq [\delta_\Omega^{-2s+1}]_{C^{0,1}(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))}^\alpha \|\delta_\Omega^{-2s+1}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))}^{1-\alpha} \leq c\rho^{-2s+1-\alpha}.$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{u}{\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}} \right]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} &= \left[\frac{u}{\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}} - q(z_0) \right]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} \\ &\leq \|u - q(z_0)\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} [\delta_\Omega^{-2s+1}]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} \\ &\quad + [u - q(z_0)\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}]_{C^\alpha(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} \|\delta_\Omega^{-2s+1}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\kappa\rho}(x_0))} \\ &\leq c\rho^{2s-1+\alpha}\rho^{-2s+1} + c\rho^{2s-1}\rho^{-2s+1} \leq c \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c = c(\Omega, d, s, \sigma) > 0$. However, this is enough to conclude $\|u/\delta_\Omega^{2s-1}\|_{C^\alpha(\Omega)} \leq c$ (see, e.g., [FR24, Lem. A.1.4]). \square

APPENDIX A. AUXILIARY LEMMAS

Lemma A.1 (Scaling and Shifting). *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $u \in C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\Omega)$ satisfy $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u = f$ in Ω and define $\tilde{u}(x) = u(x_0 + rx)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0), \sigma} \tilde{u}(x) = r^{2s} f(x_0 + rx)$$

where $r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0) := \{r^{-1}(y - x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid y \in \Omega\}$. This result remains true for weak solutions.

Proof. Note that

$$d_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)}(x) = r^{-1} d_{\Omega - x_0}(rx) = r^{-1} d_{\Omega}(x_0 + rx)$$

for all $x \in r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)$. Hence, by setting

$$\mathcal{B}_{\Omega}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{\{y \in B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}}(x)\}} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in B_{\sigma d_{\Omega}}(y)\}},$$

we also get

$$\mathcal{B}_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)}(x, y) = \mathcal{B}_{\Omega}(x_0 + rx, x_0 + ry).$$

By a change of variables, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)} \tilde{u}(x) &= \text{p. v.} \int_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)} \frac{\tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{u}(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)}(x, y) \, dy \\ &= \text{p. v.} \int_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)} r^{d+2s} \frac{u(x_0 + rx) - u(x_0 + ry)}{|(x_0 + rx) - (x_0 + ry)|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}_{\Omega}(x_0 + rx, x_0 + ry) \, dy \\ &= \text{p. v.} \int_{\Omega} r^{2s} \frac{u(x_0 + rx) - u(y')}{|x_0 + rx - y'|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}_{\Omega}(x_0 + rx, y') \, dy' \\ &= r^{2s} \mathcal{L}_{\Omega} u(x_0 + rx). \end{aligned}$$

For a weak solution, a similar calculation yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\varphi}) = r^{2s} \int_{r^{-1}(\Omega - x_0)} f(x_0 + rx) \tilde{\varphi}(x) \, dx$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}(x) = \varphi(x_0 + rx)$ for some $\varphi \in H_0^s(\Omega)$. \square

Lemma A.2 (Maximum principle for weak solutions). *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain and $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ be a bounded domain also with Lipschitz boundary. Assume that u is a weak supersolution $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u \geq 0$ in Ω' , i.e.*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Omega, \sigma}(u, \varphi) \geq 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^s(\Omega'), \varphi \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, assume $u \geq 0$ a.e. on $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega'$ in the sense that $u_- \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $u_- = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega'$. Then $u \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω .

Proof. We decompose u into its positive and negative part $u = u_+ - u_-$. Note that $u_- \in H_0^s(\Omega')$. Hence, $\varphi := u_-$ is an admissible test function. Using that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\Omega}(u_+, u_-) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} (u_+(x) - u_+(y))(u_-(x) - u_-(y)) \mathcal{K}_{\Omega}(x, y) \, dy \, dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} (u_+(x)u_-(y) + u_+(y)u_-(x)) \mathcal{K}_{\Omega}(x, y) \, dy \, dx \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$0 \leq \mathcal{E}_{\Omega}(u, \varphi) = \mathcal{E}_{\Omega}(u_+, u_-) - \mathcal{E}_{\Omega}(u_-, u_-) \leq -\mathcal{E}_{\Omega}(u_-, u_-) \leq 0.$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathcal{E}_\Omega(u_-, u_-) &= \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_-(x) - u_-(y))^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x, y) \, dx \, dy \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega' \times \Omega'} \frac{(u_-(x) - u_-(y))^2}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}_{\Omega'}(x, y) \, dx \, dy \\ &= \mathcal{E}_{\Omega'}(u_-, u_-) \asymp [u_-]_{H^s(\Omega')} \end{aligned}$$

where for the last step, we use the comparability from Corollary 2.1. Hence, $[u_-]_{H^s(\Omega')} = 0$ which implies that u_- is constant a.e. in Ω' . Since by assumption $u_- \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $u_- = 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega'$, we conclude that $u \geq 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^d . \square

Lemma A.3 (Maximum principle for strong solutions). *Fix $s \in (1/2, 1)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain and $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ be a bounded domain also with Lipschitz boundary. Assume that $u \in C_{loc}^{2s+\epsilon}(\Omega') \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ is a supersolution in Ω' , i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega, \sigma} u(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega'.$$

Furthermore, assume $u \geq 0$ on $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega'$. Then $u \geq 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$.

Proof. We will argue by contradiction. Let $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega'}$ such that $u(x_0) = \min_{x \in \overline{\Omega'}} u(x)$ and assume that $x_0 \in \Omega'$ with $u(x_0) < 0$. Then

$$0 \leq \mathcal{L}_\Omega u(x_0) = \text{p. v.} \int_\Omega \frac{u(x_0) - u(y)}{|x_0 - y|^{d+2s}} \mathcal{B}_\Omega(x_0, y) \, dy \leq 0 \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where for the last inequality we have used that $u(x_0) = \inf_{x \in \Omega} u(x)$, since $u \geq 0 > u(x_0)$ on $\Omega \setminus \Omega'$. Recall that there exists some $c = c(\sigma) > 0$ such that $\mathcal{B}_\Omega(x_0, y) > 0$ for all $y \in B_{cd_\Omega(x_0)}(x_0)$ (see (2.5)). Hence using (A.1), we conclude $u(y) = u(x_0) < 0$ for all $y \in B_{cd_\Omega(x_0)}(x_0)$.

Claim: $u(y) = u(x_0) < 0$ for all $y \in \Omega'$.

To see this, let $y_0 \in \Omega'$ and connect x_0 with y_0 by a path inside Ω' . Then choose x_1, \dots, x_n on this path such that the balls $B_{cd_\Omega(x_i)}(x_i)$ cover the path. Repeating the above argument n times yields that $u(y_0) = u(x_0)$.

However, the above claim contradicts the assumption $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ with $u \geq 0$ on $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega'$. \square

REFERENCES

- [AFR23] Alessandro Audrito, Juan-Carlos Felipe-Navarro, and Xavier Ros-Oton. “The Neumann problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary”. In: *ANNALI SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE - CLASSE DI SCIENZE* (June 2023), pp. 1155–1222.
- [AR20] Nicola Abatangelo and Xavier Ros-Oton. “Obstacle problems for integro-differential operators: Higher regularity of free boundaries”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 360 (Jan. 2020), p. 106931.
- [BBC03] Krzysztof Bogdan, Krzysztof Burdzy, and Zhen-Qing Chen. “Censored stable processes”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 127.1 (May 2003), pp. 89–152.
- [BO21] José C. Bellido and Alejandro Ortega. “A restricted nonlocal operator bridging together the Laplacian and the fractional Laplacian”. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 60.2 (Apr. 2021).
- [Cha23] Hardy Chan. “Boundary regularity of an isotropically censored nonlocal operator”. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 62.8 (Sept. 2023).

- [Che18] Huyuan Chen. “The Dirichlet elliptic problem involving regional fractional Laplacian”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 59.7 (July 2018).
- [Cho+24] Soobin Cho, Panki Kim, Renming Song, and Zoran Vondraček. *Markov processes with jump kernels decaying at the boundary*. 2024.
- [CK02] Zhen-Qing Chen and Panki Kim. “Green function estimate for censored stable processes”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 124.4 (Dec. 2002), pp. 595–610.
- [Coz17] Matteo Cozzi. “Regularity results and Harnack inequalities for minimizers and solutions of nonlocal problems: A unified approach via fractional De Giorgi classes”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 272.11 (June 2017), pp. 4762–4837.
- [Dip+22] Serena Dipierro, Xavier Ros-Oton, Joaquim Serra, and Enrico Valdinoci. “Non-symmetric stable operators: Regularity theory and integration by parts”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 401 (June 2022), p. 108321.
- [DKP14] Agnese Di Castro, Tuomo Kuusi, and Giampiero Palatucci. “Nonlocal Harnack inequalities”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 267.6 (Sept. 2014), pp. 1807–1836.
- [DMT22] Qiang Du, Tadele Mengesha, and Xiaochuan Tian. “Fractional Hardy-type and trace theorems for nonlocal function spaces with heterogeneous localization”. In: *Analysis and Applications* 20.03 (Jan. 2022), pp. 579–614.
- [Dyd06] Bartłomiej Dyda. “On comparability of integral forms”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 318.2 (June 2006), pp. 564–577.
- [Fal22] Mouhamed Moustapha Fall. “Regional fractional Laplacians: Boundary regularity”. In: *Journal of Differential Equations* 320 (May 2022), pp. 598–658.
- [FOT10] Masatoshi Fukushima, Yoichi Oshima, and Masayoshi Takeda. *Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes*. DE GRUYTER, Dec. 2010.
- [FR22a] Mouhamed Moustapha Fall and Xavier Ros-Oton. “Global Schauder theory for minimizers of the $H(\Omega)$ energy”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 283.3 (Aug. 2022), p. 109523.
- [FR22b] Xavier Fernández-Real and Xavier Ros-Oton. *Regularity Theory for Elliptic PDE*. EMS Press, Dec. 2022.
- [FR24] Xavier Fernández-Real and Xavier Ros-Oton. *Integro-Differential Elliptic Equations*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024.
- [Fuk77] Masatoshi Fukushima. “On an L^p -Estimate of Resolvents of Markov Processes”. In: *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences* 13.1 (Apr. 1977), pp. 277–284.
- [Gru14] Gerd Grubb. “Local and nonlocal boundary conditions for μ -transmission and fractional elliptic pseudodifferential operators”. In: *Analysis & PDE* 7.7 (Dec. 2014), pp. 1649–1682.
- [Gru15] Gerd Grubb. “Fractional Laplacians on domains, a development of Hörmander’s theory of μ -transmission pseudodifferential operators”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 268 (Jan. 2015), pp. 478–528.
- [Gru24] Florian Grube. “Boundary regularity and Hopf lemma for nondegenerate stable operators”. In: (Oct. 2024). arXiv: [2410.00829](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.00829) [math.AP].
- [GT01] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001.
- [KSV21] Panki Kim, Renming Song, and Zoran Vondraček. “On Potential Theory of Markov Processes with Jump Kernels Decaying at the Boundary”. In: *Potential Analysis* 58.3 (Aug. 2021), pp. 465–528.
- [KSV23] Panki Kim, Renming Song, and Zoran Vondraček. “Sharp two-sided Green function estimates for Dirichlet forms degenerate at the boundary”. In: *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* 26.6 (Jan. 2023), pp. 2249–2300.

- [KW22] Moritz Kassmann and Vanja Wagner. “Nonlocal quadratic forms with visibility constraint”. In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 301.3 (Mar. 2022), pp. 3087–3107.
- [KW24] Minhyun Kim and Marvin Weidner. “Optimal boundary regularity and Green function estimates for nonlocal equations in divergence form”. In: (Aug. 2024). arXiv: [2408.12987](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.12987) [math.AP].
- [Leo23] Giovanni Leoni. *A first course in fractional Sobolev spaces*. Graduate studies in mathematics 229. Includes bibliographical references and index. - Electronic reproduction; Providence, Rhode Island; American Mathematical Society; 2023. - Description based on print version record. Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society, 2023. 1586 pp.
- [McL00] William McLean. *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*. 1. publ. Literaturverz. S. 341 - 345. Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 357 pp.
- [RS14] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. “The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: Regularity up to the boundary”. In: *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 101.3 (Mar. 2014), pp. 275–302.
- [RS16a] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. “Boundary regularity for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 165.11 (Aug. 2016).
- [RS16b] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. “Regularity theory for general stable operators”. In: *Journal of Differential Equations* 260.12 (June 2016), pp. 8675–8715.
- [RS17] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. “Boundary regularity estimates for nonlocal elliptic equations in C^1 and $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains”. In: *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (1923 -)* 196.5 (Feb. 2017), pp. 1637–1668.
- [RW24] Xavier Ros-Oton and Marvin Weidner. “Optimal regularity for nonlocal elliptic equations and free boundary problems”. In: (Mar. 2024). arXiv: [2403.07793](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07793) [math.AP].
- [SD24] James M. Scott and Qiang Du. “Nonlocal Problems with Local Boundary Conditions I: Function Spaces and Variational Principles”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 56.3 (June 2024), pp. 4185–4222.
- [SD25] James M. Scott and Qiang Du. “Nonlocal Problems with Local Boundary Conditions II: Green’s Identities and Regularity of Solutions”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 57.1 (Jan. 2025), pp. 404–451.
- [Sil00] S.A. Silling. “Reformulation of elasticity theory for discontinuities and long-range forces”. In: *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 48.1 (Jan. 2000), pp. 175–209.
- [Sta65] Guido Stampacchia. “Le problème de Dirichlet pour les équations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus”. In: *Annales de l’institut Fourier* 15.1 (1965), pp. 189–257.
- [TD17] Xiaochuan Tian and Qiang Du. “Trace Theorems for some Nonlocal Function Spaces with Heterogeneous Localization”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 49.2 (Jan. 2017), pp. 1621–1644.