

Wolff potentials and nonlocal equations of Lane-Emden type

Quoc-Hung Nguyen* Jihoon Ok† Kyeong Song‡

Abstract

We consider nonlocal equations of the type

$$(-\Delta_p)^s u = \mu \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is either a bounded domain or the whole \mathbb{R}^n , μ is a Radon measure on Ω , $0 < s < 1$ and $1 < p < n/s$. Especially, we extend the existence, regularity and Wolff potential estimates for SOLA (Solutions Obtained as Limits of Approximations), established by Kuusi, Mingione, and Sire (Comm. Math. Phys. 337:1317–1368, 2015), to the strongly singular case $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$. Moreover, using Wolff potentials and Orlicz capacities, we present both a sufficient and a necessary conditions for the existence of SOLA to nonlocal equations of the type

$$(-\Delta_p)^s u = P(u) + \mu \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $P(\cdot)$ is either a power function or an exponential function.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 31C15; 31C45; 35R06; 35R09; 46E30.

Key words. Nonlocal equation; Measure data; Wolff potential; Orlicz capacity.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction and main results | 1 |
| 2 | Preliminaries | 10 |
| 3 | SOLA (Solutions Obtained as Limits of Approximations) | 16 |
| 4 | Wolff potential estimates for nonlocal equations | 21 |
| 5 | Nonlocal equations of Lane-Emden type | 33 |

1 Introduction and main results

In this paper, we study existence and Wolff potential estimates for SOLA (Solutions Obtained as Limits of Approximations) to the following nonlocal elliptic problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = P(u) + \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

*E-mail address: qhnguyen@amss.ac.cn, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

†E-mail address: jihoonok@sogang.ac.kr, Department of Mathematics, Sogang University, Seoul 04107, Republic of Korea

‡E-mail address: kyeongsong@kias.re.kr, School of Mathematics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 02455, Republic of Korea

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is either a bounded domain or the whole \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, μ is a Radon measure in Ω (we can always extend μ to \mathbb{R}^n by letting $\mu \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$) and $P(\cdot)$ is either the zero function, a power function or an exponential function. The nonlinear integro-differential operator $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ is defined by

$$\langle -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u, \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi(u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))K(x, y) dx dy \quad (1.2)$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, where $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function satisfying the monotonicity property

$$\Lambda^{-1}|t|^p \leq \Phi(t)t \leq \Lambda|t|^p \quad (1.3)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $K : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable kernel satisfying the ellipticity/coercivity properties

$$\frac{\Lambda^{-1}}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} \leq K(x, y) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} \quad (1.4)$$

for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x \neq y$, and $\Lambda \geq 1$ is fixed. In this paper we assume that

$$0 < s < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 < p < \frac{n}{s}. \quad (1.5)$$

Note that when $\Phi(t) = |t|^{p-2}t$ and $K(x, y) = |x - y|^{-(n+sp)}$, the operator $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ reduces to the (s -)fractional p -Laplacian $(-\Delta_p)^s$. In particular, we obtain Wolff potential estimates for SOLA to the following nonlocal problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

In the case of local measure data problems involving the classical p -Laplace operator Δ_p , Boccardo and Gallouët [8, 9] introduced the notion of SOLA to the following Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{with } p > 2 - \frac{1}{n}, \quad (1.7)$$

and proved its existence. Note that, since SOLA to (1.7) are $W^{1,1}$ -distributional solutions, the lower bound $p > 2 - 1/n$ is not avoidable when considering SOLA to the local problem (1.7). On the other hand, Dal Maso, Murat, Orsina and Prignet [15] systematically developed the notion of renormalized solution to (1.7) with $p > 1$ and a general measure μ . For other notions of solutions to (1.7), we refer to [3, 10, 13, 41]. Kilpeläinen and Malý [28, 29] obtained pointwise estimates for solutions to (1.7) by using the (truncated) Wolff potential $\mathbf{W}_{1,p}^T[\mu]$ of μ , see (2.4) below for the definition. We further refer to [22, 23, 31, 34, 35, 36, 43, 54] for pointwise estimates for solutions, and their gradient, to local problems of the type (1.7).

Subsequently, the existence of renormalized solutions to the Lane-Emden type problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = P(u) + \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

was studied by Phuc and Verbitsky [52] and by Nguyen and Véron [49], where they obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of renormalized solutions in terms of Bessel capacities or Wolff potentials. For instance, when $P(u) = u^\gamma$ and Ω is bounded, Phuc and

Verbitsky [52] proved that if μ is nonnegative and has a compact support in Ω , then it is equivalent to solve

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = u^\gamma + \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad u \geq 0,$$

or to have

$$\mu(E) \leq c \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{p, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1-p}}}(K) \quad \text{for any compact set } K \subset \Omega,$$

where $c > 0$ is a universal constant and $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{p, \gamma/(\gamma+1-p)}}$ is the Bessel capacity, or to have

$$\int_B \left(\mathbf{W}_{1,p}^{2\text{diam}(\Omega)}[\chi_B \mu](x) \right)^\gamma dx \leq c\mu(B) \quad \text{for any ball } B \text{ with } B \cap \text{supp } \mu \neq \emptyset,$$

where $\text{diam}(\Omega)$ is the diameter of Ω and $\text{supp } \mu$ is the support of μ . On the other hand, when $P(u)$ is an exponential function, Nguyen and Véron [49] obtained a sufficient condition expressed in terms of fractional maximal functions and a necessary condition expressed in terms of Orlicz capacities. The constructions in both papers are based upon sharp pointwise estimates for (1.7) with a nonnegative measure μ , obtained in [28, 29]. We further refer to [4, 5, 6, 7] and also [56] for existence results for (1.8).

In recent years, there have been dramatically growing interest in nonlocal problems. Not only various physical applications but also mathematical interest for related fractional Sobolev spaces motivate people to study this field. We refer to [18, 53] and references therein for earlier works in this direction. Accordingly, the attention in the nonlocal counterparts of regularity results for local equations has been rapidly increasing. In this paper, we deal with nonlocal Dirichlet problems involving fractional p -Laplace type equations:

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = g & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

Consider first the case when $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $g \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in W^{-s,p'}(\Omega)$, where $p' = p/(p-1)$ and the space $\mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$\mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f|_\Omega \in L^p(\Omega), \iint_{\mathcal{C}_\Omega} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy < \infty \right\}$$

with $\mathcal{C}_\Omega := (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n) \setminus ((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega))$. Recalling (1.2), we say that $u \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to (1.9) if u satisfies

$$\langle -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u, \varphi \rangle = \int_\Omega \varphi d\mu$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, and $u = g$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. Note that, in this setting, u is a weak solution to (1.9) if and only if it is a minimizer of the following functional

$$\{w \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) : w = g \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega\} \ni w \mapsto \iint_{\mathcal{C}_\Omega} \Psi(w(x) - w(y))K(x, y) dx dy - \int_\Omega w d\mu,$$

where $\Psi(t) = \int_0^{|t|} \Phi(\tau) d\tau$. In turn, under assumptions (1.3) and (1.4), existence and uniqueness of weak solutions to (1.9) in the case $\mu \in W^{-s,p'}(\Omega)$ follow from direct method of the calculus of variations, see for instance [17, Theorem 2.3]. For various results concerning such energy functionals with fractional order, see [11, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27, 32, 33, 38, 55] and references therein. We also refer to [50] for a summary on related topics.

On the other hand, in this paper, we deal with the situation where μ is merely a measure, so μ does not belong to $W^{-s,p'}(\Omega)$ in general. Thus, we need to consider a weaker concept of solution

than the usual weak solution. As mentioned above, there are various notions of solutions to local measure data problems, such as entropy solution, renormalized solution, approximable solution, and SOLA. Among these, the notion of SOLA was extended to nonlocal measure data problems involving fractional p -Laplace type operators by Kuusi, Mingione, and Sire [37, 39] when $p > 2 - s/n$. They proved the existence of SOLA to (1.9) and obtained crucial pointwise potential estimates via $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^T[\mu]$. Similar estimates were obtained for $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ -superharmonic functions with $1 < p < n/s$ and corresponding nonnegative measures in [30]. Recently, Gkikas [25] extended the notion of approximable solution to (1.6) and obtained a sufficient condition for the existence of nonnegative distributional solutions to (1.1) when μ is nonnegative, $P(u) = u^\gamma$ and Ω is a bounded domain. Indeed, when $p > 2 - s/n$, the existence of approximable solutions implies that of SOLA, see [25, Proposition 2.8]. However, it seems unclear when $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$ due to the lack of compactness for the fractional Sobolev space $W^{h,q}$ with $h, q \in (0, 1)$. We also mention that first-order regularity and gradient potential estimates for SOLA to nonlocal measure data problems were established in the linear case [40] and the nonlinear nondegenerate ($p = 2$) case [19]. However, the validity of such gradient regularity results in the case $p \neq 2$ is not known, and only fractional estimates are obtained in the case $p > 2$, see [20].

The aim of this paper is twofold. First, we extend the notion of SOLA to (1.6) with $1 < p < n/s$ and prove the existence of SOLA. Moreover, we obtain pointwise and oscillation estimates via Wolff potentials for SOLA to (1.6), thereby completing the low order regularity theory for nonlocal measure data problems. Second, by using such potential estimates, we establish both a necessary and a sufficient conditions for the existence of nonnegative SOLA to a large class of nonlocal Lane-Emden type equations with nonnegative measure data. Namely, we deal with both power and exponential reaction terms, and both bounded domains and the whole \mathbb{R}^n . These are the exact nonlocal analogs of the results for the local Lane-Emden type equation (1.8) developed in [49, 52].

1.1 Wolff potential estimates for nonlocal equations

We obtain pointwise upper and lower bounds of SOLA to (1.6) in terms of the Wolff potential of μ when $1 < p < n/s$. Note that those estimates were obtained in [37] when $p > 2 - s/n$. Therefore, in this paper we cover the case $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$. To the best of our knowledge, this case has not been treated in any literature on nonlocal equations with general measure data.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$) the set of all Radon measures (resp. nonnegative Radon measures) with finite total mass on Ω . Also, given $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote its nonlocal tail by

$$\text{Tail}(f; x, r) := \left(r^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(x)} \frac{|f(y)|^{p-1}}{|y-x|^{n+sp}} dy \right)^{1/(p-1)}.$$

For simplicity, we write $\text{Tail}(f; r) = \text{Tail}(f; x, r)$ if the center x is obvious.

The first result is a pointwise upper bound. Note that this result extends [37, Theorem 1.2] to the range $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$.

Theorem 1.1 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a SOLA to (1.6). Then there exists a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$|u(x)| \leq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu](x) + c \left(\int_{B_R(x)} |u|^{p-1} dy \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \text{Tail}(u; x, R)$$

holds whenever $B_R(x) \subset \Omega$ and the right-hand side is finite.

We next introduce a pointwise lower bound for nonnegative SOLA in Ω , for which we recall the result in [37, Theorem 1.3]. We note that the paper [37] primarily assumes $p > 2 - s/n$ in the definition of SOLA [37, Definition 2]. This condition is crucial for the proof of [37, Theorem 1.2]. However, it is not a prerequisite for the proof of [37, Theorem 1.3]. Consequently, we refer to the lower bound result established in [37, Theorem 1.3] and extend the range of p to $1 < p < n/s$ without any modification of the proof.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a nonnegative SOLA to (1.6) such that the approximating sequence $\{\mu_j\}$ for μ as described in Definition 3.1 is made of nonnegative functions. Then there exists a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{R/8}[\mu](x) \leq cu(x)$$

holds whenever $B_R(x) \subset \Omega$ and $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{R/8}[\mu](x)$ is finite.

We will obtain Theorem 1.1 as a consequence of another new result, which is an oscillation estimate for (1.6). Note that, in particular, the following result gives back the De Giorgi type estimate for the homogeneous equation $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi v = 0$ obtained in [14, 17].

Theorem 1.3 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a SOLA to (1.6), and let $B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega$ be a ball. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| \leq c \left[\mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](x) + \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](y) \right] |x - y|^\alpha \\ + c \left[\left(\int_{B_R(x_0)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \text{Tail}(u; x_0, R) \right] \left(\frac{|x - y|}{R} \right)^\alpha \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

holds for a.e. $x, y \in B_{R/8}(x_0)$, provided the right-hand side is finite and $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_0$. Here, $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(n, s, p, \Lambda)$ is the Hölder continuity exponent for the homogeneous equation

$$-\mathcal{L}_\Phi v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

see Lemma 4.3 below. Moreover, whenever $\tilde{\alpha} \in [0, \alpha_0)$ is fixed, the dependence of the constant c is uniform for $\alpha \in [0, \tilde{\alpha}]$, in the sense that c depends only on n, s, p, Λ and $\tilde{\alpha}$.

Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, along with well-known mapping properties of Wolff potentials, yield the following corollary.

Corollary 1.4 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a SOLA to (1.6).*

(1) *If $1 < q < n/sp$, then*

$$\mu \in L_{\text{loc}}^q(\Omega) \implies u \in L_{\text{loc}}^{nq(p-1)/(n-spq)}(\Omega).$$

(2) *If $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, then*

$$\mu \in L_{\text{loc}}^{n/(sp-\alpha(p-1)),\infty}(\Omega) \implies u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega).$$

In the proof of Theorem 1.3, we further have the following continuity criteria, which extends [37, Theorem 1.5] to the case $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$. Its proof is completely similar to that of [37, Theorem 1.5] once we obtain Lemma 4.9 below.

Corollary 1.5 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a SOLA to (1.6). If*

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu](x) = 0 \quad \text{locally uniformly in } \Omega \text{ with respect to } x,$$

then u is continuous in Ω . In particular, if one of the following two conditions holds:

(i) $\mu \in L_{\text{loc}}^{n/sp, 1/(p-1)}(\Omega),$

(ii) $|\mu|(B_r) \leq h(r)r^{n-sp}$ for any ball $B_r \subset \Omega$, with $h(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$\int_0^\infty h(r) \frac{dr}{r} < \infty,$$

then u is continuous in Ω .

We also obtain global pointwise estimates for nonnegative SOLA without tail terms, which will be used in the existence results for nonlocal Lane-Emden type problems. The first result deals with (1.6) in a bounded domain, while the second one considers the same equation in the whole domain \mathbb{R}^n .

Corollary 1.6 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a nonnegative SOLA to (1.6) such that the approximating sequence $\{\mu_j\}$ for μ as described in Definition 3.1 is made of nonnegative functions. Then there exists a constant $C_0 \geq 1$, depending only on n, s, p, Λ , such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)/8}[\mu](x) \leq u(x) \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{2\text{diam}(\Omega)}[\mu](x) \quad (1.11)$$

holds for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, whenever $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{2\text{diam}(\Omega)}[\mu](x)$ is finite.

Corollary 1.7 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a nonnegative SOLA to (1.6) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the approximating sequence $\{\mu_j\}$ for μ as described in Definition 3.3 is made of nonnegative functions. Then, with the constant $C_0 \geq 1$ determined in Corollary 1.6,*

$$\frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu](x) \leq u(x) \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu](x) \quad (1.12)$$

holds for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, whenever $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu](x)$ is finite.

In the same way, by letting $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (1.10), we also have the following:

Corollary 1.8 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let u be a SOLA to (1.6) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, with the constant c determined in Theorem 1.3,*

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq c \left[\mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}[\mu](x) + \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}[\mu](y) \right] |x - y|^\alpha$$

holds for a.e. $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, provided the right-hand side is finite and $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_0$.

1.2 Nonlocal equations of Lane-Emden type

We now state the existence results for the nonlocal Lane-Emden type equation (1.1), where μ is a nonnegative measure and Ω is either a bounded domain or the whole \mathbb{R}^n .

We start with existence results for the case $P(u) = u^\gamma$, see (2.6) and (2.7) for the definitions of $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, \gamma / (\gamma - p + 1)}$ and $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, \gamma / (\gamma - p + 1)}$, respectively.

Theorem 1.9 *Let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5), and let $\gamma > p - 1$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$.*

(1) *If the following problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = u^\gamma + \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

admits a nonnegative SOLA u such that the approximating sequence $\{\mu_j\}$ for μ as described in Definition 3.1 is made of nonnegative functions, then for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, Λ, γ and $\text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$, such that

$$\int_E u^\gamma dx + \mu(E) \leq C \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - p + 1}}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset K. \quad (1.14)$$

(2) *Conversely, there exists a small constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, Λ, γ and $\text{diam}(\Omega)$, such that if the inequality*

$$\mu(K) \leq \delta \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - p + 1}}(K) \quad (1.15)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then problem (1.13) admits a nonnegative SOLA u which satisfies

$$u(x) \leq \frac{\gamma \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{2\text{diam}(\Omega)}[\mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad (1.16)$$

where $C_0 \geq 1$ is the constant determined in Corollary 1.6.

Theorem 1.10 *Let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5), and let $\gamma > p - 1$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

(1) *If the following problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = u^\gamma + \mu & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} u = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.17)$$

admits a nonnegative SOLA u such that the approximating sequence $\{\mu_j\}$ for μ as described in Definition 3.3 is made of nonnegative functions, then there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, Λ, γ , such that

$$\int_E u^\gamma dx + \mu(E) \leq C \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - p + 1}}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.18)$$

(2) *Conversely, there exists a small constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, Λ, γ , such that if the inequality*

$$\mu(K) \leq \delta \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - p + 1}}(K) \quad (1.19)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then problem (1.17) admits a nonnegative SOLA u which satisfies

$$u(x) \leq \frac{\gamma \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.20)$$

where $C_0 \geq 1$ is the constant determined in Corollary 1.6.

We next state the results for the case $P = P_{l,a,\beta}$ is an exponential function given in (2.8); see (2.5), (2.9) and (2.10) for the definitions of $\mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{(p-1)(\beta-1)/\beta}$, $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp,Q_p^*}}$ and $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp,Q_p^*}}$, respectively. In this case, we need an extra assumption that μ has a compact support in \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem 1.11 *Let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $a > 0$, $\beta \geq 1$ with $l\beta > p - 1$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$.*

(1) *If the following problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = P_{l,a,\beta}(u) + \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.21)$$

admits a nonnegative SOLA u such that the approximating sequence $\{\mu_j\}$ for μ as described in Definition 3.1 is made of nonnegative functions, then for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, \Lambda, l, a, \beta$ and $\text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$, such that

$$\int_E P_{l,a,\beta}(u) dx + \mu(E) \leq C \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp,Q_p^*}}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset K. \quad (1.22)$$

(2) *Conversely, there exists a small constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, \Lambda, l, a, \beta$ and $\text{diam}(\Omega)$, such that if*

$$\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,2\text{diam}(\Omega)}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[\mu] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \delta, \quad (1.23)$$

then, with $c_p = \max\{1, 4^{(2-p)/(p-1)}\}$, $C_0 \geq 1$ determined in Corollary 1.6 and

$$\omega_1 := \delta \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,2\text{diam}(\Omega)}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[1] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} + \mu,$$

we have

$$\int_\Omega P_{l,a,\beta}(4c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{2\text{diam}(\Omega)}[\omega_1]) dx \leq C$$

for a constant $C = C(n, s, p, \beta, \text{diam}(\Omega)) > 0$, and the problem (1.21) admits a nonnegative SOLA u satisfying

$$u(x) \leq 2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{2\text{diam}(\Omega)}[\omega_1](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \quad (1.24)$$

Theorem 1.12 *Let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $a > 0$, $\beta \geq 1$ with $l\beta > \frac{n(p-1)}{n-sp}$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset B_R(0)$ for some $R > 1$.*

(1) If the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = P_{l,a,\beta}(u) + \mu & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} u = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.25)$$

admits a nonnegative SOLA u such that the approximating sequence $\{\mu_j\}$ for μ as described in Definition 3.3 is made of nonnegative functions, then there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, \Lambda, l, a, \beta$, such that

$$\int_E P_{l,a,\beta}(u) dx + \mu(E) \leq C \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, Q_p^*}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.26)$$

(2) Conversely, there exists a small constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, \Lambda, l, a, \beta$ and R , such that if

$$\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[\mu] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \delta, \quad (1.27)$$

then, with $c_p = \max\{1, 4^{(2-p)/(p-1)}\}$, $C_0 \geq 1$ determined in Corollary 1.6 and

$$\omega_2 := \delta \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[\chi_{B_R}] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} \chi_{B_R} + \mu,$$

we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P_{l,a,\beta}(4c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\omega_2]) dx \leq C$$

for a constant $C = C(n, s, p, \beta, R) > 0$, and the problem (1.25) admits a nonnegative SOLA u satisfying

$$u(x) \leq 2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\omega_2](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.28)$$

1.3 Novelties and techniques

In this paper, we provide a new approach to obtain Wolff potential estimates for the nonlocal measure data problem (1.6) in the subquadratic case; the main novelty here is especially related to the range $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$. Here we briefly explain our approach, with emphasis on some considerable differences compared to those available in the literature.

In the case of local measure data problems like (1.7) with $1 < p \leq 2 - 1/n$, solutions (in any sense) do not in general belong to the Sobolev space $W^{1,1}$. Thus, usual excess functionals are not available in this case. Moreover, it is well known that Sobolev-Poincaré type inequalities do not hold for general $W^{1,q}$ -functions when $q \in (0, 1)$, see for instance [12]. This is a main difficulty in establishing comparison estimates between (1.7) and related homogeneous problems.

On the other hand, in this paper we show a somewhat surprising fact that Sobolev-Poincaré type inequalities and compact embeddings for the fractional Sobolev space $W^{h,q}$, $h \in (0, 1)$, continue to hold for $q \in (0, 1)$, see Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 below. This is a notable difference between classical and fractional Sobolev spaces. To our knowledge, such results in a precise form do not appear in the literature. We believe that they are of their own interest and can be applied to other topics on nonlinear fractional problems.

We also emphasize that, in the proof of the Wolff potential estimates presented in Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, we employ new local and nonlocal excess functionals given in (4.3) and (4.4) below, respectively. In particular, our nonlocal excess functional differs from the one considered in [37] and is motivated from the modified (local) excess functionals used to prove potential estimates for singular p -Laplace type equations, see [21, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48].

With all these ingredients at hand, we can extend the basic comparison estimates and excess decay estimates given in [37, 39] to the case $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$, thereby showing the existence and potential estimates for SOLA to (1.6) in this case as well. These results completely extend the Wolff potential estimates for local problems in [22, 23, 28, 29, 34, 45, 47, 48] to nonlocal problems. Moreover, by applying global pointwise estimates for (1.6), modifying the approaches in [49, 52] and then performing a delicate two-step approximation procedure, we finally show the existence and potential estimates for SOLA to (1.1).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Fractional Sobolev spaces

Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. For $h \in (0, 1)$ and $q \in (0, \infty)$, we say that a function f belongs to the fractional Sobolev space $W^{h,q}(U)$ if and only if

$$\|f\|_{W^{h,q}(U)}^q := \int_U |f|^q dx + \int_U \int_U \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy < \infty.$$

Note that when $q \in (0, 1)$, $\|\cdot\|_{W^{h,q}(U)}$ is not a norm but a quasinorm. Nevertheless, we will use this notation for any $q \in (0, \infty)$. Also, we say that a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset W^{h,q}(U)$ converges to f in $W^{h,q}(U)$ if $f \in W^{h,q}(U)$ and $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{h,q}(U)} \rightarrow 0$.

Embedding theorems and Sobolev-Poincaré type inequalities for $W^{h,q}$ with $q \geq 1$ can be found in [18, Section 6], see also [14, Section 4]. Surprisingly, they continue to hold for the case $q < 1$ as well, which is a difference between classical and fractional Sobolev spaces. To show this, we first recall an elementary inequality.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $q \in (0, 1)$. There exists a constant $c(q) > 0$ such that*

$$\left| |a|^{q-1}a - |b|^{q-1}b \right| \leq c(q)|a - b|^q \quad \text{for any } a, b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Lemma 2.2 *Let $h \in (0, 1)$, $q \in (0, n/h)$ and define $q_h^* := nq/(n - hq)$. For $f \in W^{h,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have*

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|^{q_h^*} dx \right)^{1/q_h^*} \leq c \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \quad (2.2)$$

for a constant $c = c(n, h, q) > 0$. In particular, if $f \in W^{h,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $f = 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r$, then we have

$$\left(\int_{B_r} |f|^{q_h^*} dx \right)^{1/q_h^*} \leq cr^h \left(\int_{B_{2r}} \int_{B_r} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \quad (2.3)$$

for a constant $c = c(n, h, q) > 0$.

Proof. We may consider the case $q \in (0, 1)$ only. Then note that $hq \in (0, 1)$. Applying (2.1) and the fractional Sobolev inequality to $|f|^{q-1}f \in W^{hq,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have (2.2) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| |f|^{q-1}f \right|^{n/(n-hq)} dx \right)^{(n-hq)/nq} &\leq c \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\left| |f(x)|^{q-1}f(x) - |f(y)|^{q-1}f(y) \right|}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq c \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we can also prove (2.3). ■

We also have the following compact embedding.

Lemma 2.3 *Let U be a bounded Lipschitz domain, $h \in (0, 1)$ and $q \in (0, n/h)$. Then for any $\tilde{q} \in [q, q_h^*)$, the embedding of $W^{h,q}(U)$ into $L^{\tilde{q}}(U)$ is compact.*

Proof. In the case $q \geq 1$, the proof of the lemma can be found in [18, Section 7]; we thus consider the case $q \in (0, 1)$ only. Assume that $\{f_j\}$ is bounded in $W^{h,q}(U)$. Then from (2.1), it follows that $\{|f_j|^{q-1}f_j\}$ is bounded in $W^{hq,1}(U)$. Therefore, there exists a function g such that $\{|f_j|^{q-1}f_j\}$ converges (up to subsequences) to g in $L^t(U)$ for any $1 \leq t < n/(n-hq)$. We now set $f := |g|^{(1-q)/q}g$, i.e., $g = |f|^{q-1}f$. Then we see that $\{f_j\}$ converges (up to subsequences) to f a.e. in U . Moreover, it holds that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_U |f_j|^{qt} dx = \int_U |f|^{qt} dx.$$

Hence, Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem implies that $\{f_j\}$ converges to f in $L^{\tilde{q}}(U)$ for any $q \leq \tilde{q} < nq/(n-hq) = q_h^*$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

The following inequality is obtained by using Hölder's inequality, see [14, Lemma 4.6].

Lemma 2.4 *Let $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be two bounded open sets, $0 < h < s < 1$ and $0 < q < p < \infty$. Then we have*

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega'} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq c |\Omega'|^{\frac{p-q}{pq}} [\text{diam}(\Omega)]^{s-h} \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega'} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy \right)^{1/p}$$

for some $c = c(n, s, h, p, q) > 0$. In particular, $W^{s,p}(\Omega) \subset W^{h,q}(\Omega)$.

2.2 Auxiliary results for potentials and capacities

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For $s > 0$, $1 < p < n/s$ and $0 < T \leq \infty$, we define the T -truncated Wolff potential with order s of μ by

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^T[\mu](x) = \int_0^T \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}, \quad (2.4)$$

the T -truncated Riesz potential with order s of μ by

$$\mathbf{I}_s^T[\mu](x) = \int_0^T \frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-s}} \frac{dt}{t},$$

and, for $\eta \geq 0$, the T -truncated η -fractional maximal function (with order s) of μ by

$$\mathbf{M}_{s,T}^\eta[\mu](x) = \sup_{0 < t \leq T} \frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-s} h_\eta(t)}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $h_\eta(t) = (-\ln t)^{-\eta} \chi_{(0,2^{-1}]}(t) + (\ln 2)^{-\eta} \chi_{[2^{-1}, \infty)}(t)$. When $\eta = 0$, we have $h_\eta = 1$ and in this case we denote by $\mathbf{M}_{s,T}[\mu]$ the corresponding T -truncated fractional maximal function of μ . When $T = \infty$, we denote by $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu]$ (resp. $\mathbf{I}_s[\mu]$, $\mathbf{M}_s^\eta[\mu]$) the (∞ -truncated) Wolff potential (resp. Riesz potential, η -fractional maximal function) of μ . When the measures are only defined in an open subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, they are naturally extended by 0 in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$.

The following lemma shows a relationship between fractional maximal functions and potentials, see [34, Lemma 4.1].

Lemma 2.5 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $s \in [0, n]$, $p > 1$, and $B_T(x) \subset \Omega$. Then we have*

$$[\mathbf{M}_{s,\sigma T}[\mu](x)]^{1/(p-1)} \leq \frac{\max\{\sigma^{(s-n)/(p-1)}, 1\}}{-\log \sigma} \mathbf{W}_{s/p,p}^T[\mu](x)$$

and

$$\mathbf{M}_{s,\sigma T}[\mu](x) \leq \frac{\max\{\sigma^{s-n}, 1\}}{-\log \sigma} \mathbf{I}_s^T[\mu](x).$$

Let $P \in C([0, \infty))$ be a nondecreasing positive function and $s > 0$. For each Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the (s, P) -Orlicz-Bessel capacity by

$$\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_s, P}(E) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P(f) dx : \mathbf{G}_s * f \geq \chi_E, f \geq 0, P(f) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \right\}, \quad (2.6)$$

and the (s, P) -Orlicz-Riesz capacity by

$$\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_s, P}(E) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P(f) dx : \mathbf{I}_s * f \geq \chi_E, f \geq 0, P(f) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \right\}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_s(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}((1 + |\cdot|^2)^{-s/2})(x)$ and $\mathbf{I}_s(x) = (n-s)^{-1}|x|^{-(n-s)}$. For more details, see [1, Section 2.6]. When $P(t) = t^p$, we simply write $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_s, p} = \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_s, P}$ and $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_s, p} = \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_s, P}$. We also define the Bessel potential with order s of μ by $\mathbf{G}_s[\mu] := \mathbf{G}_s * \mu$.

For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the l -truncated exponential function

$$H_l(t) = e^t - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \frac{t^j}{j!}.$$

Then, for $a > 0$ and $\beta \geq 1$, we set

$$P_{l,a,\beta}(t) = H_l(a|t|^{\beta-1}t) \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$Q_p(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{q=l}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q!} \left(\frac{t}{q}\right)^{\beta q/(p-1)} & \text{if } p \neq 2, \\ H_l(t^\beta) & \text{if } p = 2, \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0.$$

As usual, the complementary function of Q_p is defined by

$$Q_p^*(t) = \sup \{ t\tilde{t} - Q_p(\tilde{t}) : \tilde{t} \geq 0 \}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

We then define corresponding Bessel and Riesz capacities respectively by

$$\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, Q_p^*}(E) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Q_p^*(f) dx : \mathbf{G}_{sp} * f \geq \chi_E, f \geq 0, Q_p^*(f) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \right\} \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, Q_p^*}(E) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Q_p^*(f) dx : \mathbf{I}_{sp} * f \geq \chi_E, f \geq 0, Q_p^*(f) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \right\}. \quad (2.10)$$

The following two propositions are general versions of [52, Theorem 2.3], whose proof can be found in [7, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2].

Proposition 2.6 *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < n/s$, $\gamma > p-1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *The inequality*

$$\mu(K) \leq C_1 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(K) \quad (2.11)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some $C_1 > 0$.

(2) *The inequality*

$$\int_K (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu](y))^\gamma dy \leq C_2 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(K) \quad (2.12)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some $C_2 > 0$.

(3) *The inequality*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\chi_{B_t(x)}\mu](y))^\gamma dy \leq C_3 \mu(B_t(x)) \quad (2.13)$$

holds for any ball $B_t(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some $C_3 > 0$.

(4) *The inequality*

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,p} [(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu])^\gamma] \leq C_4 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu] < \infty \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

holds for some $C_4 > 0$.

Proposition 2.7 *Let $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < n/s$, $\gamma > p - 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset B_R(0)$ for some $R > 1$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *The inequality*

$$\mu(K) \leq C_1 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(K) \quad (2.14)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for some $C_1 = C_1(R) > 0$.

(2) *The inequality*

$$\int_K (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4R}[\mu](y))^\gamma dy \leq C_2 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(K) \quad (2.15)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for some $C_2 = C_2(R) > 0$.

(3) *The inequality*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4R}[\chi_{B_t(x)}\mu](y))^\gamma dy \leq C_3 \mu(B_t(x)) \quad (2.16)$$

holds for any ball $B_t(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for some $C_3 = C_3(R) > 0$.

(4) *The inequality*

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4R} [(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4R}[\mu])^\gamma] \leq C_4 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4R}[\mu] \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{2R} \quad (2.17)$$

holds for some $C_4 = C_4(R) > 0$.

Remark 2.8 In the two propositions above, an inspection of their proof reveals that for each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, one can choose a small constant $C_i > 0$ in such a way that all other constants C_j , $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $j \neq i$, can be made sufficiently small. Specifically, for instance, when $i = 2$, for any small $C_1, C_3, C_4 > 0$, there exists a corresponding $C_2 > 0$ such that **(2)** implies the others.

To prove the existence of SOLA to nonlocal equations of Lane-Emden type, we will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.9 Let $\alpha \in (0, n)$, $\beta > 1$ and let \mathbf{P} be either \mathbf{I}_α or \mathbf{G}_α . For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and a sequence $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of standard mollifiers in \mathbb{R}^n , set $\mu_j = \mu * \rho_j$. Assume that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\mu(K) \leq c \text{Capp}_{\mathbf{P}, \beta}(K)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a constant $c_0 = c_0(c, n, \alpha, \beta) > 0$ such that

$$\mu_j(K) \leq c_0 \text{Capp}_{\mathbf{P}, \beta}(K)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. In the special case that $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{G}_1$, the proof can be found in [51, Lemma 5.7]. In the same way, we can also obtain the lemma for general \mathbf{P} . \blacksquare

Lemma 2.10 Let μ and μ_j be as in Lemma 2.9, $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < n/s$ and $\gamma > p - 1$. If $(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu])^\gamma \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu_j])^\gamma\}$ is equi-integrable in $B_M(0)$ for any $M > 1$.

Proof. All the balls will be centered at the origin. We notice that, since $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2M}} \mu_j])^\gamma\}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(B_M)$, it suffices to show that $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j])^\gamma\}$ is equi-integrable in B_M . When $1 < p < 2$, Hölder's inequality and Fubini's theorem imply that

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j] \leq \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{4M}} \mu] * \rho_j,$$

from which the conclusion follows. We now consider the case $p \geq 2$. Since

$$\mathbf{I}_{sp}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j] \leq \mathbf{I}_{sp}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{4M}} \mu] * \rho_j \leq c (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{8M}[\chi_{B_{4M}} \mu])^{p-1} * \rho_j,$$

$\{\mathbf{I}_{sp}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu] * \rho_j\}$ is convergent locally in $L^{\gamma/(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and so $\{(\mathbf{I}_{sp}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j])^{\gamma/(p-1)}\}$ is equi-integrable in B_R for any $R > 0$. Thus, by [2, Proposition 1.27], we can find a nondecreasing function $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\Phi(t)/t \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\int_0^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{I}_{sp}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j])^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} > t \right\} \right| dt = \int_{B_{8M}} \Phi \left((\mathbf{I}_{sp}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j](x))^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} \right) dx \leq 1,$$

where $\phi(t) = \Phi'(t)$. Moreover, we may assume the Δ_2 -condition: $\phi(2t) \leq C\phi(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ and for some $C \geq 1$, see [42]. On the other hand, by [6, Proposition 2.2] and Lemma 2.5, there exist $c, \varepsilon_0, t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j](x) > 3t, (\mathbf{I}_{sp}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j](x))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \leq \varepsilon t \right\} \right| \\ & \leq c\varepsilon \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}} \mu_j](x) > t \right\} \right| \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $t > t_0$. Using the above two inequalities and the Δ_2 -condition of ϕ , and then choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}](x))^\gamma > t \right\} \right| dt \\
& \leq c \int_0^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}](x))^\gamma > 3^\gamma t \right\} \right| dt \\
& \leq c \int_{t_0^{1/\gamma}}^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}])^\gamma > 3^\gamma t \right\} \right| dt + c \\
& \leq c\varepsilon \int_0^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}])^\gamma > t \right\} \right| dt \\
& \quad + c \int_0^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{I}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}])^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} > \varepsilon^\gamma t \right\} \right| dt + c \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}])^\gamma > t \right\} \right| dt + c,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\int_{B_{8M}} \Phi \left((\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}])^\gamma \right) dx = \int_0^\infty \phi(t) \left| \left\{ x \in B_{8M} : (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}](x))^\gamma > t \right\} \right| dt \leq c.$$

Hence, $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4M}[\chi_{B_{2M}\mu_j}])^\gamma\}$ is equi-integrable in B_M for any $M > 1$. The proof is complete. \blacksquare

Lemma 2.11 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be either a bounded domain or the whole \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\{\mu_j\} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$, $0 < R \leq \infty$, $0 < s < 1$, $1 < p < n/s$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $a > 0$, $\beta \geq 1$ and $l\beta > p - 1$. If $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j])\}$ is bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$ for some $c > 0$, then $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(c'\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j])\}$ is equi-integrable in Ω for any $c' \in (0, c)$.*

Proof. By the definition of $P_{l,a,\beta}$ given in (2.8), we have for $\kappa = (c - c')/4$

$$P_{l,a,\beta}(c't) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{10^{2+\beta}}\kappa^\beta at_0^\beta\right) \exp\left((\kappa + c')^\beta a|t|^{\beta-1}t\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{10^{2+\beta}}\kappa^\beta at_0^\beta\right) P_{l,a,\beta}(ct)$$

for any $t \geq t_0$, where t_0 is large enough. This implies

$$P_{l,a,\beta}(c't) \leq \varepsilon P_{l,a,\beta}(ct) + C(\varepsilon, c, c')$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $c' \in (0, c)$ and $t > 0$. Let

$$\sup_j \int_\Omega P_{l,a,\beta}(c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j]) dx = M.$$

Then for any $E \subset \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_E P_{l,a,\beta}(c'\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j]) dx & \leq \varepsilon \int_E P_{l,a,\beta}(c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j]) dx + |E|C(\varepsilon, c, c') \\
& \leq M\varepsilon + |E|C(\varepsilon, c, c').
\end{aligned}$$

This implies the equi-integrability of $P_{l,a,\beta}(c'\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j])$ for any $c' < c$. \blacksquare

3 SOLA (Solutions Obtained as Limits of Approximations)

Now, we introduce the definitions of SOLA in Ω or \mathbb{R}^n . Let $P(u)$ be either the zero function, a power function $|u|^{\gamma-1}u$ or an exponential function $P_{l,a,\beta}(u)$ defined in (2.8).

Definition 3.1 Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). We say that a function $u \in W^{h,q}(\Omega)$ with

$$h \in (0, s) \quad \text{and} \quad p-1 \leq q < \bar{q} := \frac{n(p-1)}{n-s} \quad (3.1)$$

is a SOLA to (1.1) if $P(u) \in L^1(\Omega)$ and u is a distributional solution to $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = P(u) + \mu$ in Ω , that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi(u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))K(x, y) dx dy = \int_{\Omega} P(u)\varphi dx + \int_{\Omega} \varphi d\mu \quad (3.2)$$

holds whenever $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, and $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. Moreover, it has to satisfy the following approximation property: there exists a sequence of weak solutions $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ to the approximate Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = P(u_j) + \mu_j & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \end{cases}$$

such that u_j converges to u a.e in Ω and locally in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $P(u_j) \rightarrow P(u)$ locally in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Here the sequence $\{\mu_j\} \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ converges to μ weakly in the sense of measures in Ω and moreover satisfies

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\mu_j|(B) \leq |\mu|(\bar{B}) \quad (3.3)$$

whenever $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a ball.

Remark 3.2 We note that [37] considered SOLA under the assumption

$$p > 2 - \frac{s}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{p-1, 1\} \leq q < \bar{q}.$$

However, in contrast with the local case, we use the terminology SOLA for any $p > 1$. This is because the strong convergence of u_j in $W^{h,q}$ is not required, already in the case $p > 2 - s/n$. In turn, the definition of SOLA in [37] can be extended to the case $1 < p \leq 2 - s/n$, by considering fractional Sobolev spaces $W^{h,q}$ with $q \in (0, 1)$.

In this paper, we extend the existence result in [37, Theorem 1.1] to the ranges of p and q stated in Definition 3.1. Furthermore, we also discuss SOLA in the whole domain \mathbb{R}^n . Here we introduce the definition of SOLA in \mathbb{R}^n .

Definition 3.3 Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). We say that a function $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{h,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with (3.1) is a SOLA to

$$-\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = P(u) + \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad (3.4)$$

if $P(u) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\text{Tail}(u; 0, r) < \infty \quad \text{for any } r \geq 1 \quad (3.5)$$

and u is a distributional solution to (3.4), that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi(u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))K(x, y) dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P(u)\varphi dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\mu \quad (3.6)$$

holds whenever $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, it has to satisfy the following approximation property: there exist a sequence of open sets $\{\Omega_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ with $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega_2 \Subset \dots \Subset \Omega_j \Subset \dots$ and $\cup_{j=1}^\infty \Omega_j = \mathbb{R}^n$ and a sequence of weak solutions $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ to the approximating Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = P(u_j) + \mu_j & \text{in } \Omega_j, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_j \end{cases}$$

such that u_j converges to u a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n and locally in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $P(u_j) \rightarrow P(u)$ locally in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Here the sequence $\{\mu_j\} \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ converges to μ weakly in the sense of measures in B and satisfies (3.3) whenever $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a ball.

3.1 Existence of SOLA

In this subsection, we prove the existence of SOLA to (1.6). We start with the following global estimates.

Lemma 3.4 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $\mu \in L^1(\Omega) \cap W^{-s,p'}(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumption (1.3)–(1.5). Let $u \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be the weak solution to (1.6). Then we have the following:*

(1) *There exists a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^{q_0}, \infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq c[|\mu|(\Omega)]^{1/(p-1)}, \quad \text{where } q_0 = \frac{n(p-1)}{n-sp}. \quad (3.7)$$

(2) *There exists a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$ such that, for any $\xi > 1$ and $d > 0$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{(d + |u(x)| + |u(y)|)^\xi |x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy \leq c \frac{d^{1-\xi}}{\xi - 1} |\mu|(\Omega). \quad (3.8)$$

(3) *For any $q \in (0, \bar{q})$ and $h \in (0, s)$, where \bar{q} is given in (3.1), there exists a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, h, q) > 0$ such that*

$$\left(\int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq cr^{-h} \left[\frac{|\mu|(\Omega)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \quad (3.9)$$

for any ball $B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. In particular,

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq c[\text{diam}(\Omega)]^{\frac{n}{q}-h} \left(\frac{|\mu|(\Omega)}{[\text{diam}(\Omega)]^{n-sp}} \right)^{1/(p-1)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. The estimates (3.7), (3.8) and (3.10) are obtained in [25, Propositions 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8], respectively. Moreover, an inspection of the proof of [25, Proposition 2.8] also gives (3.9). ■

This lemma and the compactness result in Lemma 2.3 imply the existence of SOLA.

Theorem 3.5 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Then there exists a SOLA u to (1.6) satisfying (3.10).*

Proof. Consider $\mu_j = \mu * \rho_j$, where $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of standard mollifiers, and let $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be the sequence of weak solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = \mu_j & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then $\{\mu_j\}$ converges to μ weakly in the sense of measures in \mathbb{R}^n and satisfies (3.3) for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Now, for any $h \in (0, s)$ and $q \in (0, \bar{q})$, Lemma 3.4 and the construction of $\{\mu_j\}$ imply

$$\left(\int_\Omega |u_j|^q dx \right)^{1/q} + \left(\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|u_j(x) - u_j(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq c[|\mu_j|(\Omega)]^{1/(p-1)} \leq c[|\mu|(\Omega)]^{1/(p-1)}$$

whenever $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, \text{diam}(\Omega), h, q) > 0$. Namely, $\{u_j\}$ is bounded in $W^{h,q}(\Omega)$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.3, there exists $u \in W^{h,q}(\Omega)$ with $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ such that

$$\begin{cases} u_j \rightarrow u & \text{in } L^q(\Omega), \\ u_j \rightarrow u & \text{a.e. in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty \text{ (up to subsequences).}$$

Accordingly, Fatou's lemma implies

$$\left(\int_\Omega |u|^q dx \right)^{1/q} + \left(\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq c[|\mu|(\Omega)]^{1/(p-1)}.$$

It remains to show that u satisfies (3.2), but its proof is exactly same as the one of [37, Theorem 1.1] (see [37, pp. 1352–1354] with $g_j = g = 0$). Hence we omit the details here. \blacksquare

Theorem 3.6 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5). Then there exists a SOLA u to (1.6) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. Consider $\mu_j = \mu * \rho_j$, where $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of standard mollifiers, and let $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(B_j(0))$ be the sequence of weak solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = \mu_j & \text{in } B_j(0), \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_j(0). \end{cases}$$

Then $\{\mu_j\} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ converges to μ weakly in the sense of measures in B and satisfies (3.3) for every ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

We now fix any $r \geq 1$. Then for any $h \in (0, s)$ and $q \in (0, \bar{q})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{B_r(0)} \int_{B_r(0)} \frac{|u_j(x) - u_j(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} &\stackrel{(3.9)}{\leq} \frac{c}{r^{h+n/q_0}} [|\mu_j|(B_j(0))]^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq \frac{c}{r^{h+n/q_0}} [|\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n)]^{1/(p-1)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\left(\int_{B_r(0)} |u_j|^q dx \right)^{1/q} \stackrel{(3.7)}{\leq} \frac{c}{r^{n/q_0}} [|\mu_j|(B_j(0))]^{1/(p-1)} \leq \frac{c}{r^{n/q_0}} [|\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n)]^{1/(p-1)} \quad (3.12)$$

whenever $j \geq r$, where $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, h, q) > 0$. That is, $\{u_j\}_{j \geq r}$ is bounded in $W^{h,q}(B_r(0))$. Since $r \geq 1$ was arbitrary, by Lemma 2.3, there exists $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{h,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} u_j \rightarrow u & \text{locally in } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n), \\ u_j \rightarrow u & \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n \end{cases} \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty \text{ (up to subsequences).} \quad (3.13)$$

In particular, applying Fatou's lemma to (3.11) and (3.12), we also have

$$\left(\int_{B_r(0)} |u|^q dx \right)^{1/q} + r^h \left(\int_{B_r(0)} \int_{B_r(0)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq \frac{c}{r^{n/q_0}} [|\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n)]^{1/(p-1)}. \quad (3.14)$$

Next, in order to show (3.5), we consider the weighted Lebesgue and Marcinkiewicz spaces with the weight

$$\omega(x) := \frac{1}{(1 + |x|)^{n+sp}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^{p-1}(E, d\omega)} &\leq c(p, q_0) [\omega(E)]^{1/(p-1)-1/q_0} \|f\|_{L^{q_0, \infty}(E, d\omega)} \\ &\leq c(p, q_0) [\omega(E)]^{1/(p-1)-1/q_0} \|f\|_{L^{q_0, \infty}(E)} \end{aligned}$$

holds for any Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \in L^{q_0, \infty}(E)$, where for the last inequality we have used the fact that $\omega(E) \leq |E|$. Applying this inequality with $E = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(0)$ and $f = u_j$, we have

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(0)} \frac{|u_j(x)|^{p-1}}{(1 + |x|)^{n+sp}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} = \|u_j\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(0), d\omega)} \leq cr^{-sp \left(\frac{1}{p-1} - \frac{1}{q_0} \right)} \|u_j\|_{L^{q_0, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Then (3.7) along with an elementary manipulation gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(0)} \frac{|u_j(x)|^{p-1}}{|x|^{n+sp}} dx \leq cr^{-(sp)^2/n} [|\mu_j|(B_j)] \leq cr^{-(sp)^2/n} [|\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n)] \quad (3.15)$$

for some $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$, whenever $r \geq 1$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, Fatou's lemma implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(0)} \frac{|u(x)|^{p-1}}{|x|^{n+sp}} dx \leq cr^{-(sp)^2/n} [|\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n)], \quad (3.16)$$

which in particular yields (3.5).

It remains to show that u satisfies (3.6) with $P(\cdot) \equiv 0$. We follow the argument in [37, Section 4.2]. Fix $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $T_0 > 0$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_{T_0} = B_{T_0}(0)$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi(u_j(x) - u_j(y)) (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) K(x, y) dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\mu_j$$

for all $j > 2T_0$. By the weak convergence of μ_j , we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\mu_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\mu.$$

Now, denoting

$$\psi_j(x, y) = (\Phi(u_j(x) - u_j(y)) - \Phi(u(x) - u(y))) (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) K(x, y),$$

it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_j(x, y) dx dy = 0. \quad (3.17)$$

Let $T > 2T_0$. Then, with $B_T = B_T(0)$ and $B_{T_0} = B_{T_0}(0)$, we split

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_j(x, y) dx dy &= \int_{B_{T_0}} \int_{B_{T_0}} (\dots) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_T} \int_{B_{T_0}} (\dots) + \int_{B_{T_0}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_T} (\dots) \\ &=: I_{1,j,T} + I_{2,j,T} + I_{3,j,T}. \end{aligned}$$

For $I_{1,j,T}$, we choose $h \in (0, s)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon n + [p(s-h) + h - 1](1 + \varepsilon) \leq 0$ and $q = (p-1)(1 + \varepsilon) < \bar{q}$, where \bar{q} is given in (3.1). Then, since

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_j(x, y)|^{1+\varepsilon} &\leq c \frac{[(|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-1} + |u_j(x) - u_j(y)|^{p-1}) |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|]^{1+\varepsilon}}{|x - y|^{(n+sp)(1+\varepsilon)}} \\ &\leq c \|D\varphi\|_{L^\infty}^{1+\varepsilon} \frac{[|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-1} + |u_j(x) - u_j(y)|^{p-1}]^{1+\varepsilon}}{|x - y|^{n+h(p-1)(1+\varepsilon)} |x - y|^{\varepsilon n + [p(s-h) + h - 1](1+\varepsilon)}} \\ &\leq c(T_0, \varphi) \left[\frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{(p-1)(1+\varepsilon)}}{|x - y|^{n+h(p-1)(1+\varepsilon)}} + \frac{|u_j(x) - u_j(y)|^{(p-1)(1+\varepsilon)}}{|x - y|^{n+h(p-1)(1+\varepsilon)}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

whenever $x, y \in B_{T_0}$, (3.11) and (3.14) imply that $\psi_j(x, y)$ is equi-bounded in $L^{1+\varepsilon}(B_{T_0} \times B_{T_0})$ and hence $\psi_j(x, y)$ is equi-integrable in $B_{T_0} \times B_{T_0}$. In turn, Vitali's convergence theorem with (3.13) implies that $|I_{1,j,T}| \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. As for $I_{2,j,T}$ and $I_{3,j,T}$, we have from (3.12), (3.14), (3.15) and (3.16) that for $j > T$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{2,j,T}| + |I_{3,j,T}| &\leq c(T_0, \varphi) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_T} \int_{B_{T_0}} (|u_j(x)|^{p-1} + |u(x)|^{p-1} + |u_j(y)|^{p-1} + |u(y)|^{p-1}) \frac{dx dy}{|y|^{n+sp}} \\ &\leq c(T_0, \varphi) \left(T^{-sp} \int_{B_{T_0}} [|u_j(x)|^{p-1} + |u(x)|^{p-1}] dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_T} [|u_j(y)|^{p-1} + |u(y)|^{p-1}] \frac{dy}{|y|^{n+sp}} \right) \\ &\leq c(T_0, \varphi, |\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n)) \left(T^{-sp} + T^{-(sp)^2/n} \right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain (3.17) and the proof is complete. \blacksquare

We end this section with the following comparison principle.

Proposition 3.7 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $-\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ be defined in (1.2) under assumptions (1.3)–(1.5), and u_1 be a SOLA to (1.6) with data $\mu = \mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. For any $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ satisfying $\mu_2 - \mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$, there exists a SOLA u_2 to (1.6) with data $\mu = \mu_2$ satisfying*

$$u_1 \leq u_2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Proof. There exists a sequence of weak solutions $\{u_{1,k}\} \subset \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ to (1.6) with data $\mu = \mu_{1,k} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $u_{1,k} \rightarrow u_1$ in $L^q(\Omega)$ for any $q \in (0, \bar{q})$, where \bar{q} is given in (3.1), and $\mu_{1,k} \rightarrow \mu_1$ in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. We consider $\mu_{2,k} = \phi_k * (\eta_{1/k}(\mu_2 - \mu_1)) + \mu_{1,k} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where ϕ_k is a standard mollifier with $\text{supp}(\phi_k) \subset B_{1/4k}(0)$ and η_k is a smooth function such that $\eta_k = 1$ for all $x \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > 2/k$ and $\eta_k = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < 1/k$. Clearly, $\mu_{2,k} \geq \mu_{1,k}$ for any k and $\mu_{2,k} \rightarrow \mu_2$ in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. Let $u_{2,k} \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be the weak solution to (1.6) with data $\mu = \mu_{2,k}$. Then, it suffices to show $u_{1,k} \leq u_{2,k}$ a.e. in Ω . Indeed, one can take

$\varphi = (u_{1,k} - u_{2,k})_+ := \max\{u_{1,k} - u_{2,k}, 0\}$ as a test function in (1.6). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d(\mu_{2,k} - \mu_{1,k}) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\Phi(u_{2,k}(x) - u_{2,k}(y)) - \Phi(u_{1,k}(x) - u_{1,k}(y))) (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) K(x, y) dx dy \\
&\leq -\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\{u_{1,k} > u_{2,k}\}} \int_{\{u_{1,k} > u_{2,k}\}} A_p(u_{2,k}(x) - u_{2,k}(y), u_{1,k}(x) - u_{1,k}(y)) K(x, y) dx dy \\
&\quad + 2 \int_{\{u_{1,k} \leq u_{2,k}\}} \int_{\{u_{1,k} > u_{2,k}\}} (\Phi(u_{2,k}(x) - u_{2,k}(y)) - \Phi(u_{1,k}(x) - u_{1,k}(y))) \\
&\quad \quad \quad \times (u_{1,k}(x) - u_{2,k}(x)) K(x, y) dx dy \\
&=: -\Lambda^{-1} I_1 + 2I_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_p(f, g) = (|f| + |g|)^{p-2} |f - g|^2$. It is clear to see that

$$\Phi(u_{2,k}(x) - u_{2,k}(y)) - \Phi(u_{1,k}(x) - u_{1,k}(y)) \leq 0$$

provided $(u_{2,k}(x) - u_{2,k}(y)) - (u_{1,k}(x) - u_{1,k}(y)) \leq 0$, which implies $I_2 \leq 0$ and so $I_1 = 0$. This means $u_{1,k} \leq u_{2,k}$ a.e. in Ω . Therefore the proof is complete. \blacksquare

4 Wolff potential estimates for nonlocal equations

4.1 Regularity for homogeneous equations

Here we recall various local regularity results for the homogeneous equation

$$-\mathcal{L}_\Phi v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (4.1)$$

Such results were first obtained in [16, 17] (see also [14]) and later modified in [37] to match the setting of measure data problems.

We start with a local sup-estimate and a Caccioppoli type estimate. The following two lemmas with $q = 1$ are considered in [37, Corollary 2.1 and Lemma 2.3], and the case of other values of q can be obtained in the same way.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $v \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to (4.1). Then for any $B_r \Subset \Omega$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in (0, p)$, we have*

$$\sup_{B_{\sigma r}} |v - k| \leq \frac{c}{(1 - \sigma)^{np'/q}} \left[\left(\int_{B_r} |v - k|^q dx \right)^{1/q} + \text{Tail}(v - k; r/2) \right]$$

whenever $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, where $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, q) > 0$.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $v \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to (4.1). Then for any $B_r \Subset \Omega$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\int_{B_{\sigma r}} \int_{B_{\sigma r}} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \leq \frac{c}{(1 - \sigma)^{\theta q r h q}} \left[\left(\int_{B_r} |v - k|^q dx \right)^{1/q} + \text{Tail}(v - k; r/2) \right]^q$$

whenever $q \in (0, p)$, $h \in (0, s)$, and $\sigma \in [1/2, 1)$, where $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, h, q) > 0$ and $\theta = \theta(n, p) > 0$.

We further note an oscillation estimate for v , which in turn implies local Hölder regularity of v , see for instance [37, Theorem 2.3]. In the same spirit as in the above lemmas, we can actually obtain the following:

Lemma 4.3 *Let $v \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to (4.1). Then v is locally Hölder continuous. In particular, there exists $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(n, s, p, \Lambda) \in (0, \min\{sp/(p-1), 1\})$ such that*

$$\operatorname{osc}_{B_\rho} v \leq c \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\alpha_0} \left[\left(\int_{B_{2r}} |v - k|^q dx \right)^{1/q} + \operatorname{Tail}(v - k; r/2) \right]$$

holds whenever $B_{2r} \Subset \Omega$, $0 < \rho \leq r$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in (0, p]$, where $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, q) > 0$.

One of the main features in [37, 39] is to consider the following nonlocal excess functional

$$\left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - (f)_{B_r(x_0)}|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \operatorname{Tail}(f - (f)_{B_r(x_0)}; x_0, r), \quad (4.2)$$

where the first term is the traditional excess functional and the second one is concerned with long-range interactions. However, we cannot directly consider the same excess functional for our problem, since SOLA to (1.6) may not be locally integrable when $1 < p \leq 2n/(n+s)$. In the local case, modified excess functionals of the form

$$\operatorname{av}(f; x_0, r) := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - k|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \quad (4.3)$$

have been considered in [21, 47, 48] to obtain potential estimates for singular p -Laplace type equations. In this point of view, we consider the following modified nonlocal excess functional:

$$E(f; x_0, r) := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - k|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \operatorname{Tail}(f - k; x_0, r) \right]. \quad (4.4)$$

We simply write $\operatorname{av}(f; x_0, r) = \operatorname{av}(f; r)$ and $E(f; x_0, r) = E(f; r)$ when the point x_0 is not important or clear from the context. Obviously, we have

$$\operatorname{av}(f; x_0, r) \leq E(f; x_0, r).$$

We also note that when $p \geq 2$, the new excess functional in (4.4) is equivalent to the previous one in (4.2), i.e.,

$$E(f; x_0, r) \approx \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - (f)_{B_r(x_0)}|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \operatorname{Tail}(f - (f)_{B_r(x_0)}; x_0, r). \quad (4.5)$$

However, when $p < 2$ our excess functional is different from (4.2).

If $f \in L^{p-1}(B_r(x_0))$, then there exists a number $\mathcal{P}_{B_r(x_0)}(f) \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{av}(f; x_0, r) = \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - \mathcal{P}_{B_r(x_0)}|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)}. \quad (4.6)$$

Such a number is not uniquely determined in general, but we use any possible value of it. Here we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{P}_{B_r(x_0)}(f) - k_0| &= \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\mathcal{P}_{B_r(x_0)}(f) - k_0|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\
&\leq c \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\mathcal{P}_{B_r(x_0)}(f) - f|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - k_0|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\
&\leq c \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - k_0|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

holds for any $k_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, where $c = c(p) > 0$. Similarly, if $f \in L^{p-1}(B_r(x_0))$ satisfies $\text{Tail}(f; x_0, r) < \infty$, then there exists a number $\mathcal{Q}_{B_r(x_0)}(f) \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$E(f; x_0, r) = \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r(x_0)}(f)|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \text{Tail}(f - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r(x_0)}(f); r). \tag{4.8}$$

We further establish an excess decay estimate for (4.1), which will play a key role in this paper. The following estimate is analogous to the one in [39, Theorem 8.11]. In particular, when $p \geq 2$, it can be directly obtained from [39, Theorem 8.11] by the above equivalent relation (4.5).

Lemma 4.4 *Let $v \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to (4.1). Then we have the inequality*

$$E(v; \rho) \leq c \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{\alpha_0} E(v; r)$$

whenever $B_\rho \subset B_r \Subset \Omega$ are concentric ball, where α_0 is the exponent given in Lemma 4.3 and $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$.

Proof. We may assume $\rho \leq r/4$ without loss of generality. Recalling the definition of $E(\cdot)$ given in (4.4), we have

$$E(v; \rho) \leq \left(\int_{B_\rho} |v - (v)_{B_\rho}|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \text{Tail}(v - (v)_{B_\rho}; \rho),$$

and we estimate each term in the right-hand side. Observe that Lemma 4.3 implies

$$\text{osc}_{B_t} v \leq c \left(\frac{t}{r} \right)^{\alpha_0} E(v; r) \tag{4.9}$$

for any $t \in [\rho, r/4]$. In particular,

$$\left(\int_{B_\rho} |v - (v)_{B_\rho}|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \leq \text{osc}_{B_\rho} v \stackrel{(4.9)}{\leq} c \left(\frac{\rho}{r} \right)^{\alpha_m} E(v; r). \tag{4.10}$$

In order to estimate the tail term, we split the integral as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tail}(v - (v)_{B_\rho}; \rho)^{p-1} &= \rho^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\rho} \frac{|v(x) - (v)_{B_\rho}|^{p-1}}{|x - x_0|^{n+sp}} dx \\
&= \rho^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r/4}} \frac{|v(x) - (v)_{B_\rho}|^{p-1}}{|x - x_0|^{n+sp}} dx + \rho^{sp} \int_{B_{r/4} \setminus B_\rho} \frac{|v(x) - (v)_{B_\rho}|^{p-1}}{|x - x_0|^{n+sp}} dx \\
&=: I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying (4.8) with $f = v$ and $B_r(x_0) = B_r$. Then Lemma 4.1 implies

$$|(v)_{B_\rho} - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v)| \leq \int_{B_\rho} |v - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v)| dx \leq \sup_{B_{r/2}} |v - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v)| \leq cE(v; r).$$

Using this, we estimate I_1 as

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq c\rho^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r/4}} \frac{|v(x) - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v)|^{p-1}}{|x - x_0|^{n+sp}} dx + c \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{sp} |(v)_{B_\rho} - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v)|^{p-1} \\ &\leq c\rho^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r} \frac{|v(x) - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v)|^{p-1}}{|x - x_0|^{n+sp}} dx + c \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{sp} \int_{B_r} |v - \mathcal{Q}_{B_r}(v)|^{p-1} dx + c \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{sp} [E(v; r)]^{p-1} \\ &\leq c \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{sp} [E(v; r)]^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As for I_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq c \int_\rho^{r/4} \left(\frac{\rho}{t}\right)^{sp} \left(\operatorname{osc}_{B_t} v\right)^{p-1} \frac{dt}{t} \stackrel{(4.9)}{\leq} c[E(v; r)]^{p-1} \int_\rho^{r/4} \left(\frac{\rho}{t}\right)^{sp} \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^{\alpha_0(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\leq \frac{c}{sp - \alpha_0(p-1)} \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\alpha_0(p-1)} [E(v; r)]^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Connecting the above two displays to (4.10), and using the fact that $\alpha_0 < sp/(p-1)$, we conclude with the desired estimate. \blacksquare

4.2 Comparison estimates

Here we derive some comparison estimates. We fix a ball $B_{2r} = B_{2r}(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and consider the weak solution $u \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(B_{2r})$ to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u = \mu \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) & \text{in } B_{2r}, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2r}. \end{cases}$$

In order to take advantage of symmetric properties, we consider the operator $-\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_u$ defined by

$$\langle -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_u w, \varphi \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |w(x) - w(y)|^{p-2} (w(x) - w(y)) (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) \tilde{K}_{u,\Phi}(x, y) dx dy,$$

where

$$\tilde{K}_{u,\Phi}(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} (\bar{K}_{u,\Phi}(x, y) + \bar{K}_{u,\Phi}(y, x))$$

and

$$\bar{K}_{u,\Phi}(x, y) := \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi(u(x) - u(y))K(x, y)}{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y))} & \text{if } x \neq y \text{ and } u(x) \neq u(y), \\ |x - y|^{-n-sp} & \text{if } x \neq y \text{ and } u(x) = u(y). \end{cases}$$

We then see that $\tilde{K}_{u,\Phi}(x, y) = \tilde{K}_{u,\Phi}(y, x)$, $\Lambda^{-2}|x - y|^{-(n+sp)} \leq \tilde{K}_{u,\Phi}(x, y) \leq \Lambda^2|x - y|^{-(n+sp)}$, and u solves

$$\begin{cases} -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_u u = \mu \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) & \text{in } B_{2r}, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2r}, \end{cases}$$

We next consider the unique weak solution $v \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(B_r)$ to the following Dirichlet problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_u v = 0 & \text{in } B_r, \\ v = u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r, \end{cases}$$

and set

$$w := u - v.$$

Under the above setting, we have the following comparison lemma, see [39, Lemma 8.4.1].

Lemma 4.5 *There exists a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$ such that, for any $\xi > 1$ and $d > 0$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{(|u(x) - u(y)| + |v(x) - v(y)|)^{p-2} |w(x) - w(y)|^2}{(d + |w(x)| + |w(y)|)^\xi} \frac{dxdy}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} \leq c \frac{d^{1-\xi}}{\xi - 1} |\mu|(B_r).$$

Using the above lemma, we obtain preliminary comparison estimates between u and v in Lemma 4.6 below. The estimate is exactly the same as the one in [39, Lemma 8.4.4] (see also [37, Lemma 3.4]) except the range of q and p . In both [39, Lemma 8.4.4] and [37, Lemma 3.4], q satisfies

$$q \in [1, \bar{q}), \quad \bar{q} := \min \left\{ \frac{n(p-1)}{n-s}, p \right\}.$$

Note that the range is sensible since the papers [37, 39] initially assume that $p > 2 - s/n$, and the lower bound $q \geq 1$ is used in order to apply the well-known fractional Sobolev inequality with the exponent $q \geq 1$. However, by applying the fractional Sobolev inequality with exponent $q \in (0, 1)$ in Lemma 2.2, the proof of [39, Lemma 8.4.4] can go through by allowing $q \in (0, 1)$. Consequently, we can extend the range of q and p .

Lemma 4.6 *Assume that $1 < p < 2$. Then for any $q \in (0, \bar{q})$, where \bar{q} is given in (3.1), there exists $h_0 = h_0(n, s, p, q) \in (0, s)$ such that if $h \in (h_0, s)$, then the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B_{2r}} \int_{B_{2r}} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dxdy \right)^{1/q} \\ & \leq \frac{c}{r^h} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} + \frac{c}{r^{h(p-1)}} \left(\int_{B_{2r}} \int_{B_{2r}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dxdy \right)^{(2-p)/q} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

holds for a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, h, q) > 0$.

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the one of [39, Lemma 8.4.4] by using the fractional Sobolev inequality (2.3). \blacksquare

We need to handle the second term appearing in the right-hand side of (4.11). The case $2 - s/n < p < 2$ was treated in [37, Lemma 3.5], but we have to modify the approach for lower values of p .

Lemma 4.7 *Assume that $1 < p < 2$. Then for any $q \in (0, \bar{q})$, where \bar{q} is given in (3.1), there exists $h_0 = h_0(n, s, p, q) \in (0, s)$ such that if $h \in (h_0, s)$, then the estimate*

$$\left(\int_{B_{2r}} \int_{B_{2r}} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dxdy \right)^{1/q} \leq \frac{c}{r^h} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} + \frac{c}{r^h} [E(u; x_0, 2r)]^{2-p} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]$$

holds for a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, h, q) > 0$.

Proof. We may consider the case $q \geq p - 1$ only, since the lemma for lower values of q follows from Lemma 2.4. For $\varphi \in W^{h,q}(B_t)$ with $t \in (0, 2r)$, we denote

$$F(\varphi; t) := \left(\int_{B_t} \int_{B_t} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dxdy \right)^{1/q}.$$

For $1 \leq \sigma' < \sigma \leq 2$, we consider the weak solution $v_\sigma \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(B_{\sigma r/2})$ to

$$\begin{cases} -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_u v_\sigma = 0 & \text{in } B_{\sigma r/2}, \\ v_\sigma = u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\sigma r/2}. \end{cases}$$

We start with the obvious estimate

$$F(u; \sigma' r) \leq cF(v_\sigma; \sigma' r) + cF(u - v_\sigma; \sigma' r). \quad (4.12)$$

Lemma 4.6 directly implies

$$F(u - v_\sigma; \sigma r) \leq \frac{c}{r^h} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} + c \frac{[F(u; \sigma r)]^{2-p}}{r^{h(p-1)}} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]. \quad (4.13)$$

We then apply Lemma 4.2 to v_σ to have

$$F(v_\sigma; \sigma' r) \leq \frac{c}{(\sigma - \sigma')^\theta r^h} \inf_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\left(\int_{B_{\sigma r}} |v_\sigma - k|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \text{Tail}(v_\sigma - k; \sigma r/2) \right].$$

In order to estimate the right-hand side, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B_{\sigma r}} |v_\sigma - k|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ & \leq c \left(\int_{B_{\sigma r}} |u - v_\sigma|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \left(\int_{B_{2r}} |u - k|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ & \leq cr^h F(u - v_\sigma; \sigma r) + c \left(\int_{B_{2r}} |u - k|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.2 for the last inequality. We then recall that $v_\sigma = u$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\sigma r/2}$, which implies

$$F(v_\sigma; \sigma' r) \leq \frac{c}{(\sigma - \sigma')^\theta} \left[r^{-h} E(u; 2r) + F(u - v_\sigma; \sigma r) \right]. \quad (4.14)$$

Connecting (4.13) and (4.14) to (4.12), we arrive at

$$F(u; \sigma' r) \leq \frac{cr^{-h}}{(\sigma - \sigma')^\theta} \left\{ E(u; 2r) + \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \right\} + \frac{c}{(\sigma - \sigma')^\theta} \frac{[F(u; \sigma r)]^{2-p}}{r^{h(p-1)}} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right].$$

We apply Young's inequality to the last term in the right-hand side, with conjugate exponents $1/(2-p)$ and $1/(p-1)$, in order to see that

$$F(u; \sigma' r) \leq \frac{1}{2} F(u; \sigma r) + \frac{cr^{-h}}{(\sigma - \sigma')^{\theta/(p-1)}} \left\{ E(u; 2r) + \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \right\}$$

holds for some $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, q)$, whenever $1 \leq \sigma' \leq \sigma \leq 2$. Then, applying a standard iteration argument (see for instance [24, Lemma 6.1]), we can drop the first term on the right-hand side. Recalling the definition of $F(\cdot)$, we conclude with

$$\left(\int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq \frac{c}{r^h} \left\{ E(u; 2r) + \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \right\}.$$

Plugging the last inequality into (4.11), we obtain the desired estimate. \blacksquare

The above lemma, along with Lemma 2.2, implies the following comparison estimate.

Lemma 4.8 *Assume that $1 < p < 2$, and let $\tilde{q} \in (0, q_0)$, where q_0 is given in (3.7). Then there exists a constant $c = c(n, s, p, \tilde{q}, \Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$\left(\int_{B_r} |u - v|^{\tilde{q}} dx \right)^{1/\tilde{q}} \leq c \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} + c [E(u; 2r)]^{2-p} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_r)}{r^{n-sp}} \right].$$

4.3 Pointwise and oscillation estimates for SOLA

We first obtain an excess decay estimate for u .

Lemma 4.9 *Let u be a SOLA to (1.6). Then there exist positive constants c and τ , both depending only on n, s, p, Λ , such that*

$$E(u; \sigma\rho) \leq c\sigma^{\alpha_0} E(u; \rho) + c\sigma^{-\tau} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_\rho)}{\rho^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \quad (4.15)$$

holds whenever $B_{\sigma\rho} \subset B_\rho \subset \Omega$ are concentric balls, where α_0 is the exponent given in Lemma 4.3.

Proof. Note that (4.15) for $p \geq 2$ follows from [39, Lemma 8.5.2] and (4.5); we thus consider the case $1 < p < 2$ only. Moreover, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$.

Step 1. Let $\{u_j\}$ be an approximating sequence for u with corresponding source term μ_j , as described in Definition 3.1. We consider the weak solution v_j to

$$\begin{cases} -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_u v_j = 0 & \text{in } B_{\rho/2}, \\ v_j = u_j & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\rho/2}. \end{cases}$$

Since $v_j = u_j$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\rho/2}$, we have for any $t \leq \rho/2$

$$E(u_j - v_j; t) \leq c \left(\frac{\rho}{t} \right)^{n/(p-1)} \left(\int_{B_{\rho/2}} |u_j - v_j|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)}.$$

Also, note that

$$\begin{aligned} E(u_j; t) &\leq \left(\int_{B_t} |u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j - v_j) - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(v_j)|^{p-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \\ &\quad + c \text{Tail}(u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j - v_j) - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(v_j); t) \\ &\leq c \left(\int_{B_t} |u_j - v_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j - v_j)|^{p-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + c \left(\int_{B_t} |v_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(v_j)|^{p-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \\ &\quad + c \text{Tail}(u_j - v_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j - v_j); t) + c \text{Tail}(v_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(v_j); t) \\ &= cE(u_j - v_j; t) + cE(v_j; t). \end{aligned}$$

These two displays and Lemma 4.4 imply

$$\begin{aligned} E(u_j; \sigma\rho) &\leq cE(v_j; \sigma\rho) + c\sigma^{-n/(p-1)} \left(\int_{B_{\rho/2}} |u_j - v_j|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq c\sigma^{\alpha_0} E(v_j; \rho/2) + c\sigma^{-n/(p-1)} \left(\int_{B_{\rho/2}} |u_j - v_j|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq c\sigma^{\alpha_0} E(u_j; \rho/2) + c\sigma^{-n/(p-1)} \left(\int_{B_{\rho/2}} |u_j - v_j|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the last term in the right-hand side, we apply Lemma 4.8 and Young's inequality with conjugate exponents $1/(2-p)$ and $1/(p-1)$ to have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{B_{\rho/2}} |u_j - v_j|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} &\leq c \left[\frac{|\mu_j|(B_\rho)}{\rho^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} + c[E(u_j; \rho)]^{2-p} \left[\frac{|\mu_j|(B_\rho)}{\rho^{n-sp}} \right] \\ &\leq \varepsilon E(u_j; \rho) + c_\varepsilon \left[\frac{|\mu_j|(B_\rho)}{\rho^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Choosing $\varepsilon = \sigma^{\alpha_0 + n/(p-1)}$, we obtain (4.15) for u_j .

Step 2. We now show that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} E(u_j; t) = E(u; t) \quad (4.16)$$

for any ball $B_t \subset \Omega$. Since

$$E(u_j; t) \leq \left(\int_{B_t} |u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u)|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \text{Tail}(u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u); t),$$

we have

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} E(u_j; t) \leq E(u; t).$$

On the other hand, using the inequalities $(a+b)^\beta \leq a^\beta + b^\beta$ and $(a+b)^{\tilde{\beta}} - a^{\tilde{\beta}} = \int_a^{a+b} \tilde{\beta} t^{\tilde{\beta}-1} dx \leq \tilde{\beta}(a+b)^{\tilde{\beta}-1}b$ for any $a, b > 0$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\tilde{\beta} > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(u; t) &\leq \left(\int_{B_t} |u - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j)|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \text{Tail}(u - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j); t) \\ &\leq \left(\int_{B_t} |u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j)|^{p-1} dx + \int_{B_t} |u - u_j|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\quad + ([\text{Tail}(u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j); t)]^{p-1} + [\text{Tail}(u - u_j; t)]^{p-1})^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{B_t} |u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j)|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} + [\text{Tail}(u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j); t)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p-1} \left(\int_{B_t} |u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j)|^{p-1} dx + \int_{B_t} |u - u_j|^{p-1} dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}} \int_{B_t} |u - u_j|^{p-1} dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p-1} ([\text{Tail}(u_j - \mathcal{Q}_{B_t}(u_j); t)]^{p-1} + [\text{Tail}(u - u_j; t)]^{p-1})^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}} [\text{Tail}(u - u_j; t)]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in the last display, we obtain

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} E(u_j; t) \geq E(u; t).$$

Thus we have (4.16), and the proof of (4.15) is complete. \blacksquare

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.3. The theorem is in fact related to pointwise estimates for certain fractional sharp maximal functions of u . Here we define the *R-truncated nonlocal fractional sharp maximal function (with order α)* of u by

$$\mathbf{N}_{\alpha, R}^\sharp[u](x) := \sup_{0 < r \leq R} r^{-\alpha} E(u; x, r).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Step 1. Let us first show that

$$\mathbf{N}_{\alpha, R}^\sharp[u](x) \leq c [\mathbf{M}_{sp-\alpha(p-1), R}[\mu](x)]^{1/(p-1)} + cR^{-\alpha} E(u; x, R) \quad (4.17)$$

holds for any $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_0$ and any ball $B_R(x) \subset \Omega$, where $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda, \alpha) > 0$.

We fix any radius $\rho \in (0, R]$. Then, with $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ being a free parameter to be chosen in a few line, we apply Lemma 4.9 to concentric balls $B_{\sigma\rho}(x) \subset B_\rho(x)$. Multiplying both sides of the resulting inequality by $(\sigma\rho)^{-\alpha}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma\rho)^{-\alpha} E(u; x, \sigma\rho) &\leq c_* \sigma^{\alpha_0 - \alpha} \rho^{-\alpha} E(u; x, \rho) + c \sigma^{-\eta - \alpha} \rho^{-\alpha} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_\rho(x))}{\rho^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \\ &= c_* \sigma^{\alpha_0 - \alpha} \rho^{-\alpha} E(u; x, \rho) + c \sigma^{-\eta - \alpha} \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_\rho(x))}{\rho^{n-sp+\alpha(p-1)}} \right]^{1/(p-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where c and c_* are positive constants depending only on n, s, p, Λ . We now choose $\sigma = \sigma(n, s, p, \Lambda, \alpha) > 0$ so small that $c_*\sigma^{\alpha_0 - \alpha} = 1/2$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma\rho)^{-\alpha} E(u; x, \sigma\rho) &\leq \frac{1}{2}\rho^{-\alpha} E(u; x, \rho) + c \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_\rho(x))}{\rho^{n-sp+\alpha(p-1)}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{N}_{\alpha,R}^\sharp[u](x) + c [\mathbf{M}_{sp-\alpha(p-1),R}[\mu](x)]^{1/(p-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho \leq R$ was arbitrary, we have

$$\sup_{0 < r \leq \sigma R} r^{-\alpha} E(u; x, r) \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{N}_{\alpha,R}^\sharp[u](x) + c [\mathbf{M}_{sp-\alpha(p-1),R}[\mu](x)]^{1/(p-1)}.$$

On the other hand, a direct calculation gives

$$\sup_{\sigma R < r \leq R} r^{-\alpha} E(u; x, r) \leq c\sigma^{-\alpha-n/(p-1)} R^{-\alpha} E(u; x, R).$$

From the last two displays, we conclude with

$$\mathbf{N}_{\alpha,R}^\sharp[u](x) \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{N}_{\alpha,R}^\sharp[u](x) + cR^{-\alpha} E(u; x, R) + c [\mathbf{M}_{sp-\alpha(p-1),R}[\mu](x)]^{1/(p-1)},$$

from which (4.17) follows.

Step 2. Let $B_R = B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega$ and $x, y \in B_{R/8}$ be as in the statement of Theorem 1.3. Let r be a radius such that $r \leq R/8$. We start by integrating (4.15) with respect to Haar measure and then making an elementary manipulation, to get

$$\int_\rho^r E(u; x, \sigma t) \frac{dt}{t} \leq c_{**}\sigma^{\alpha_0} \int_\rho^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} + c\sigma^{-\tau} \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}$$

for any $\rho \in (0, r]$, where c and c_{**} are positive constants depending only on n, s, p, Λ . Thus, taking the constant $\sigma = \sigma(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$ so small that $c_{**}\sigma^{\alpha_0} = 1/2$, and then changing variables, the above inequality becomes

$$\int_{\sigma\rho}^{\sigma r} E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\rho^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} + c \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}.$$

We thus have

$$\int_{\sigma\rho}^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\sigma\rho}^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} + \int_{\sigma r}^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} + c \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}$$

and, after reabsorbing terms,

$$\int_{\sigma\rho}^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \leq 2 \int_{\sigma r}^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} + 2c \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Using the fact that $E(u; x, t) \leq cE(u; x, r)$ for any $t \in [\sigma r, r]$, we arrive at

$$\int_\rho^r E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \leq cE(u; x, r) + c \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \quad (4.18)$$

for some $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$.

We now fix any two radii $\rho, \tilde{\rho}$ satisfying $0 < \tilde{\rho} \leq \rho/2 \leq r/8$, and then choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta \in (1/4, 1/2]$ such that $\tilde{\rho} = \theta^k \rho$. We recall (4.6). Then, since

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{\theta^j \rho}(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{\theta^{j+1} \rho}(x)}(u) \right| &\stackrel{(4.7)}{\leq} c \left(\int_{B_{\theta^{j+1} \rho}(x)} \left| u - \mathcal{P}_{B_{\theta^j \rho}(x)}(u) \right|^{p-1} dx \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq c \theta^{-n/(p-1)} \text{av}(u; x, \theta^j \rho), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{P}_{B_\rho(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)}(u) \right| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{\theta^j \rho}(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{\theta^{j+1} \rho}(x)}(u) \right| \\ &\leq c \theta^{-n/(p-1)} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \text{av}(u; x, \theta^j \rho) \leq c \theta^{-n/(p-1)} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} E(u; x, \theta^j \rho). \end{aligned}$$

We also recall the elementary inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} E(u; x, \theta^j \rho) &= \frac{1}{\log(1/\theta)} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_{\theta^j \rho}^{\theta^{j+1} \rho} E(u; x, \theta^j \rho) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\leq c \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_{\theta^j \rho}^{\theta^{j+1} \rho} E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \leq c \int_{\tilde{\rho}}^{\rho/\theta} E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} &\leq r^\alpha \int_\rho^r \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp+\alpha(p-1)}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\leq r^\alpha \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p, p}^R[\mu](x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, using (4.18), we have

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{B_\rho(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)}(u) \right| \leq c \int_{\tilde{\rho}}^{\rho/\theta} E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \quad (4.19)$$

and therefore

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{B_\rho(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)}(u) \right| \leq cE(u; x, r) + cr^\alpha \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p, p}^R[\mu](x). \quad (4.20)$$

Here we note that, by the absolute continuity of the integral, (4.19) implies that $\{\mathcal{P}_{B_\rho(x)}(u)\}$ is a Cauchy net. In turn, the limit

$$u(x) := \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{P}_{B_\rho(x)}(u)$$

exists and therefore defines the precise representative of u at x . Now we let $\tilde{\rho} \rightarrow 0$ in (4.20) and take $\rho = r/4$ to have

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{r/4}(x)}(u) - u(x) \right| \leq cE(u; x, r) + cr^\alpha \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p, p}^R[\mu](x).$$

Combining this with the elementary estimate

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{B_r(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{r/4}(x)}(u) \right| \stackrel{(4.7)}{\leq} c \text{av}(u; x, r) \leq cE(u; x, r),$$

we arrive at

$$|u(x) - \mathcal{P}_{B_r(x)}(u)| \leq cE(u; x, r) + cr^\alpha \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](x).$$

Writing this estimate with y instead of x , i.e.,

$$|u(y) - \mathcal{P}_{B_r(y)}(u)| \leq cE(u; y, r) + cr^\alpha \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](y)$$

and merging the last two displays, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| &\leq c|\mathcal{P}_{B_r(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_r(y)}(u)| + cE(u; x, r) + cE(u; y, r) \\ &\quad + cr^\alpha \left[\mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](x) + \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](y) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now take $r = |x - y|/2$. Then, since $B_r(y) \subset B_{3r}(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}_{B_r(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_r(y)}(u)| &\leq |\mathcal{P}_{B_r(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{3r}(x)}(u)| + |\mathcal{P}_{B_{3r}(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_r(y)}(u)| \\ (4.7) \quad &\leq c \left(\int_{B_r(x)} |u - \mathcal{P}_{B_{3r}(x)}(u)|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \left(\int_{B_r(y)} |u - \mathcal{P}_{B_{3r}(x)}(u)|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq c \operatorname{cav}(u; x, 3r) \leq cE(u; x, 3r), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E(u; x, r) + E(u; y, r) \leq cE(u; x, 3r).$$

Therefore we obtain

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq cr^\alpha \left[\mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](x) + \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](y) \right] + cE(u; x, 3r). \quad (4.21)$$

To estimate the last term, we proceed as

$$\begin{aligned} E(u; x, 3r) &\leq cr^\alpha \mathbf{N}_{\alpha, R/2}^\sharp[u](x) \\ (4.17) \quad &\leq cr^\alpha \left\{ [\mathbf{M}_{sp-\alpha(p-1), R/2}[\mu](x)]^{1/(p-1)} + R^{-\alpha} E(u; x, R/2) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Here we have

$$E(u; x, R/2) \leq cE(u; x_0, R) \leq c \left[\left(\int_{B_R(x_0)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} + \operatorname{Tail}(u; x_0, R) \right] \quad (4.23)$$

and, by Lemma 2.5,

$$[\mathbf{M}_{sp-\alpha(p-1), R/2}[\mu](x)]^{1/(p-1)} \leq c \mathbf{W}_{s-\alpha(p-1)/p,p}^R[\mu](x). \quad (4.24)$$

Connecting (4.22), (4.23) and (4.24) to (4.21), we conclude with (1.10). \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We recall the proof of Theorem 1.3, with r being replaced by R . Letting $\rho = R/4$ and $\tilde{\rho} = \theta^k \rho$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} &\leq c \left(\int_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)} |u - \mathcal{P}_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)}(u)|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)}(u) \right| \\ &\leq cE(u; x, \tilde{\rho}) + c \left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(x)}(u) - \mathcal{P}_{B_{R/4}(x)}(u) \right| + c \left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{R/4}(x)}(u) \right| \\ (4.19) \quad &\leq cE(u; x, R) + c \int_{\tilde{\rho}}^R E(u; x, t) \frac{dt}{t} + c \left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{R/4}(x)}(u) \right| \\ (4.18) \quad &\leq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu](x) + c \left(\int_{B_R(x)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \operatorname{Tail}(u; x, R), \end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality, we have also used the inequalities

$$\int_{\tilde{\rho}}^R \left[\frac{|\mu|(B_t(x))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \leq \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu](x)$$

and

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{B_{R/4}(x)}(u) \right| \stackrel{(4.7)}{\leq} c \left(\int_{B_{R/4}(x)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} \leq c \left(\int_{B_R(x)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)}.$$

Since k was arbitrary, we deduce

$$\left(\int_{B_r(x)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} \leq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu](x) + \left(\int_{B_R(x)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \text{Tail}(u; x, R)$$

for any $r \in (0, R]$, and the proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete. \blacksquare

Remark 4.10 *In the above proof, we actually proved that*

$$[\mathbf{M}_R[|u|^{p-1}](x)]^{1/(p-1)} \leq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu](x) + c \left(\int_{B_R(x)} |u|^{p-1} d\tilde{x} \right)^{1/(p-1)} + c \text{Tail}(u; x, R)$$

holds whenever $B_R(x) \subset \Omega$ and the right-hand side is finite, where $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$.

4.4 Global pointwise estimates for nonnegative SOLA

Proof of Corollary 1.6. The lower estimate in (1.11) directly follows from Theorem 1.2. We now prove the upper estimate. Fix any $x \in \Omega$, and set $B = B_{R_0}(x)$ with $R_0 = \text{diam}(\Omega)$. By Proposition 3.7, there exists a nonnegative SOLA \tilde{u} to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi \tilde{u} = \mu & \text{in } B, \\ \tilde{u} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B \end{cases}$$

satisfying $u \leq \tilde{u}$ a.e. in Ω . Also, Theorem 1.1 implies

$$\tilde{u}(x) \leq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{R_0}[\mu](x) + c \left(\int_B \tilde{u}^{p-1} dy \right)^{1/(p-1)} \quad (4.25)$$

for some $c = c(n, s, p, \Lambda) > 0$. On the other hand, by (3.10) and (2.3),

$$\left(\int_B \tilde{u}^{p-1} dy \right)^{1/(p-1)} \leq c \left[\frac{\mu(B)}{R_0^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)}.$$

Combining this and (4.25), we get

$$u(x) \leq \tilde{u}(x) \leq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{R_0}[\mu](x) + c \left[\frac{\mu(\Omega)}{R_0^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \leq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{2R_0}[\mu](x)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, and the proof is complete. \blacksquare

Proof of Corollary 1.7. As described in Definition 3.3, there exist a sequence of open subsets $\{\Omega_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in \mathbb{R}^n and a sequence of weak solutions $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega_j)$ to the Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = \mu_j & \text{in } \Omega_j, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_j, \end{cases}$$

such that $\{u_j\}$ converges to u a.e in \mathbb{R}^n and locally in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $q \in (0, \bar{q})$. Here the sequence $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ converges to μ in \mathbb{R}^n weakly in the sense of measure with (3.3). By Corollary 1.6, we have

$$\frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_j)/8} [\mu_j](x) \leq u_j(x) \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p} [\mu_j](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega_j,$$

which implies for any $j > j_1 > j_0$

$$\frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\text{dist}(\Omega_{j_0}, \partial\Omega_{j_1})/8} [\mu_j](x) \leq u_j(x) \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p} [\mu_j](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega_{j_0}.$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$, an approximation argument as in the proof of [37, Theorem 1.3] yields

$$\frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\text{dist}(\Omega_{j_0}, \partial\Omega_{j_1})/8} [\mu](x) \leq u(x) \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p} [\mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega_{j_0}.$$

Letting $j_1 \rightarrow \infty$ and then $j_0 \rightarrow \infty$, we finally obtain (1.12). \blacksquare

5 Nonlocal equations of Lane-Emden type

5.1 Auxiliary lemmas

We obtain pointwise estimates for a sequence of functions satisfying recurrence inequalities involving Wolff potentials. We start with the case of power function $P(u) = u^\gamma$.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $\gamma > p - 1$, $C_* > 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset B_R(0)$ for some $R > 1$. There exists a small constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, γ, C_* and R , such that if the inequality*

$$\mu(K) \leq \delta \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{s,p, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}}(K) \tag{5.1}$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then the following holds:

- (1) *There exists a constant $C = C(n, s, p, \gamma, R, C_*) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_K (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu](x))^\gamma dx \leq C \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{s,p, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}}(K) \tag{5.2}$$

for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

- (2) *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\{u_m\}_{m=0}^k$ is a sequence of nonnegative measurable functions in \mathbb{R}^n that satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} u_m \in L_{\text{loc}}^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{m+1} \leq C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [u_m^\gamma + \mu] \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq m \leq k-1, \\ u_0 \leq C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu], \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

then

$$u_k \leq \frac{\gamma \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu] \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{2R}, \tag{5.4}$$

hence $u_k \in L_{\text{loc}}^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. The assertion (1) follows from Proposition 2.7; note that (2.14) is satisfied by (5.1). Hence, (2.15) implies (5.2).

We now prove (2). Set $c_0 = C_*$, then we have from (2.17) and (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &\leq C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [u_0^\gamma + \mu] \\ &\leq C_* \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\} (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [u_0^\gamma] + \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu]) \\ &\leq C_* \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\} \left(c_0^{\gamma/(p-1)} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R \left[(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu])^\gamma \right] + \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu] \right) \\ &\leq c_1 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu], \quad \text{where } c_1 = C_* \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\} \left(c_0^{\gamma/(p-1)} C_4 + 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and, for $m = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$,

$$u_{m+1} \leq c_{m+1} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu], \quad \text{where } c_{m+1} = C_* \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\} \left(c_m^{\gamma/(p-1)} C_4 + 1 \right).$$

Therefore, if $C_4 > 0$ satisfies

$$C_4 \leq \left(\frac{\gamma - p + 1}{\gamma C_* \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} \left(\frac{p-1}{\gamma - p + 1} \right). \quad (5.5)$$

we obtain

$$c_m \leq \frac{\gamma \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_* \quad \text{for all } m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}.$$

In view of Remark 2.8, we can assure that (5.5) holds by taking $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small in (5.1), which leads to (5.4). \blacksquare

Lemma 5.2 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\gamma > p-1$, and assume that there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that the inequality*

$$\mu(K) \leq \delta \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(K)$$

holds for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu](x))^\gamma dx \leq C \mu(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof. By (1) and (3) of Proposition 2.6, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\chi_{B_t(y)}\mu](x))^\gamma dx \leq C \mu(B_t(y)) \leq C \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

for any ball $B_t(y) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where $C = C(\delta) > 0$. Then the conclusion follows by applying the monotone convergence theorem. \blacksquare

We next consider the case of exponential function $P = P_{l,a,\beta}$.

Lemma 5.3 *Let $a, R, C_* > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \geq 1$ with $l\beta > p-1$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$. There exists a small constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, l, a, \beta, C_*$ and R , such that if*

$$\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}} [\mu] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \delta, \quad (5.6)$$

then the following holds:

(1) For any $M > 0$, there exists a constant $C = C(n, s, p, \beta, M) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_M(0)} P_{l,a,\beta} (4c_p C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\omega_1]) dx \leq C, \quad \text{where } \omega_1 = \delta \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}} [1] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} + \mu.$$

(2) For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\{u_m\}_{m=0}^k$ is a sequence of nonnegative measurable functions in \mathbb{R}^n that satisfies

$$P_{l,a,\beta}(u_m) \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{m+1} \leq C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [P_{l,a,\beta}(u_m) + \mu] \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq m \leq k-1, \\ u_0 \leq C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\mu],$$

then

$$u_k \leq 2c_p C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\omega_1], \quad \text{hence } P_{l,a,\beta}(u_k) \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof. The proof of (2) can be found in [49, Theorem 2.5], so we give the proof of (1) only. It suffices to show the inequality for $M > R$. Note that (5.6) implies

$$\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}} [\omega_1] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 2\delta.$$

We then estimate

$$P_{l,a,\beta}(4c_p C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\omega_1]) = H_l \left(a(4c_p C_*)^\beta (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\omega_1])^\beta \right) \leq \exp \left(a(4c_p C_*)^\beta (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\omega_1])^\beta \right) \\ \leq \exp \left(a(4c_p C_*)^\beta (2\delta)^{\beta/(p-1)} \frac{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\omega_1])^\beta}{\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{(p-1)(\beta-1)/\beta} [\omega_1] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{\beta/(p-1)}} \right).$$

Note that $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\omega_1](x) = \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\chi_{B_{2M}(0)} \omega_1](x)$ for $x \in B_M(0)$. Then, by [49, Theorem 2.2], we can choose $\delta > 0$ so small that

$$\int_{B_M(0)} \exp \left(a(4c_p C_*)^\beta (2\delta)^{\beta/(p-1)} \frac{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\chi_{B_{2M}(0)} \omega_1])^\beta}{\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{(p-1)(\beta-1)/\beta} [\chi_{B_{2M}(0)} \omega_1] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{\beta/(p-1)}} \right) dx \leq c(M) |B_M|.$$

The last two displays imply the desired conclusion. \blacksquare

Lemma 5.4 Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $a, C_* > 0$, $\beta \geq 1$ with $l\beta \geq \frac{n(p-1)}{n-sp}$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset B_R(0)$ for some $R > 1$ and

$$\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}} [\chi_{B_R}] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} |B_R| + \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) \leq T.$$

There exists a small constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, l, a, \beta, C_*$ and R , such that if

$$\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}} [\mu] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \delta, \tag{5.7}$$

then there exists a constant $C = C(n, s, p, \beta, R, C_*, T) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P_{l,a,\beta} (4c_p C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p} [\omega_2]) dx \leq C, \quad \text{where } \omega_2 = \delta \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}} [\chi_{B_R}] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} \chi_{B_R} + \mu.$$

Proof. We first split

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P_{l,a,\beta}(4c_p C_* \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\omega_2]) dx = \int_{B_{2R}(0)} (\dots) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2R}(0)} (\dots) dx =: I_1 + I_2.$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 5.3, we can estimate $I_1 \leq C(n, s, p, \beta)$ by choosing δ sufficiently small. As for I_2 , observe that

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\omega_2](y) = \int_{|y|/2}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\omega_2(B_t(y))}{t^{n-sp}} \right]^{1/(p-1)} \frac{dt}{t} \leq cT^{1/(p-1)} \int_{|y|/2}^{\infty} t^{-\frac{n-sp}{p-1}} \frac{dt}{t} \leq C|y|^{-\frac{n-sp}{p-1}}$$

for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2R}(0)$. We thus have

$$I_2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2R}(0)} H_l \left(C|y|^{-\frac{\beta(n-sp)}{p-1}} \right) dy \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2R}(0)} |y|^{-l\beta \frac{n-sp}{p-1}} dy \leq CR^{n-l\beta \frac{n-sp}{p-1}},$$

and the conclusion follows. ■

Finally, we obtain relations between pointwise estimates and capacities conditions.

Lemma 5.5 *Let $\gamma > p - 1$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

- (1) *Let $0 < R \leq \infty$. Let u be a nonnegative measurable function in \mathbb{R}^n such that u^γ is locally integrable in \mathbb{R}^n and*

$$u(x) \geq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[u^\gamma + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (5.8)$$

for some $c > 0$. Then the following holds:

- (i) *If $R < \infty$, then there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, γ, R and c , such that*

$$\int_E u^\gamma dx + \mu(E) \leq C_1 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.9)$$

- (ii) *If $R = \infty$, then there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, γ and c , such that*

$$\int_E u^\gamma dx + \mu(E) \leq C_2 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.10)$$

- (2) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$. Let u be a nonnegative measurable function in Ω such that u^γ is locally integrable in Ω and*

$$u(x) \geq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}[u^\gamma + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega \quad (5.11)$$

for some $c > 0$. Then for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, \gamma, \varepsilon_0, \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$ and c , such that

$$\int_E u^\gamma dx + \mu(E) \leq C_3 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset K. \quad (5.12)$$

Proof. (1) Let us set

$$d\omega := u^\gamma dx + d\mu.$$

Then (5.8) directly implies

$$(c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\omega])^\gamma dx = (c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[u^\gamma + \mu])^\gamma dx \leq u^\gamma dx \leq d\omega.$$

In addition, considering the centered maximal function with the weight ω denoted by

$$M_\omega f(x) := \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{\omega(B_t(x))} \int_{B_t(x)} |f| d\omega,$$

we have for any Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (M_\omega \chi_E)^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} (c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\omega])^\gamma dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (M_\omega \chi_E)^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} d\omega \leq c_1 \omega(E)$$

for some $c_1 > 0$ depending only on n, p, γ , where in the second inequality we have used the fact that the maximal operator M_ω is bounded on $L^t(\mathbb{R}^n, d\omega)$ for any $t \in (1, \infty)$. Moreover, since

$$(M_\omega \chi_E)^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\omega])^\gamma \geq (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\chi_E \omega])^\gamma,$$

we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\chi_E \omega])^\gamma dx \leq c_1 \omega(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

From this last inequality and [49, Theorem 2.1], we have

$$\begin{aligned} c^\gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{G}_{sp}[\chi_E \omega])^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} dx &\leq c_2 \omega(E) \quad \text{if } 0 < R < \infty, \\ c^\gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{I}_{sp}[\chi_E \omega])^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} dx &\leq c_3 \omega(E) \quad \text{if } R = \infty \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

for some positive constants c, c_2 and c_3 , all depending only on n, s, p, γ . We now consider any $f \in L^{\gamma/(\gamma-p+1)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $f \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{G}_{sp} * f \geq \chi_E$. In the case $0 < R < \infty$, by Fubini's theorem and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(E) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{G}_{sp} * f) \chi_E d\omega = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{G}_{sp}[\chi_E \omega]) f dx \\ &\leq \frac{c^\gamma}{2c_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{G}_{sp}[\chi_E \omega])^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} dx + c_4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, this together with (5.13) and the definition of the Orlicz-Bessel capacity gives (5.9). In the case $R = \infty$, we can also show (5.10) by a similar argument.

(2) Let us set $r_K := \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$ and $\Omega_K := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, K) < r_K/2\}$. We follow the same argument as in (1). Since

$$(c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}[\omega])^\gamma dx \leq d\omega \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

by (5.11), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (c\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}[\chi_E \omega])^\gamma dx \leq \int_{\Omega} (M_\omega \chi_E)^{\frac{\gamma}{p-1}} d\omega \leq c_4 \omega(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset K.$$

Note that if $x \in \Omega$ satisfies $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq r_K/8$, then $B_t(x) \subset \Omega \setminus \Omega_K$ for all $t \in (0, r_K/8)$, and so $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 r_K/8}[\chi_E \omega](x) = 0$. From this observation, we have

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 r_K/8}[\chi_E \omega](x) \leq \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}[\chi_E \omega](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 r_K/8}[\chi_E \omega] \right)^\gamma dx \leq c_4 \omega(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset K.$$

Therefore, in the same way as in (1), we obtain (5.12). \blacksquare

The next lemma can be found in [49, Theorem 2.7]. Recall that $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, Q_p^*}$ and $\text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, Q_p^*}$ have been defined in (2.9) and (2.10), respectively.

Lemma 5.6 *Let $a > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \geq 1$ with $l\beta > p - 1$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

- (1) *Let $0 < R \leq \infty$. Let u be a nonnegative measurable function in \mathbb{R}^n such that $P_{l,a,\beta}(u)$ is locally integrable in \mathbb{R}^n and*

$$u(x) \geq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[P_{l,a,\beta}(u) + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

for some $c > 0$. Then the following holds:

- (i) *If $R < \infty$, then there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, l, a, β, R and c , such that*

$$\int_E P_{l,a,\beta}(u) dx + \mu(E) \leq C_1 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, Q_p^*}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

- (ii) *If $R = \infty$, then there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, l, a, β and c , such that*

$$\int_E P_{l,a,\beta}(u) dx + \mu(E) \leq C_2 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{I}_{sp}, Q_p^*}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

- (2) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$. Let u be a nonnegative measurable function in Ω such that $P_{l,a,\beta}(u)$ is locally integrable in Ω and*

$$u(x) \geq c \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\varepsilon_0 \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}[P_{l,a,\beta}(u) + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

for some $c > 0$. Then for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, l, a, \beta, \varepsilon_0, \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$ and c , such that

$$\int_E P_{l,a,\beta}(u) dx + \mu(E) \leq C_3 \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{sp}, Q_p^*}(E) \quad \text{for any Borel set } E \subset K.$$

5.2 Proof of the existence results

Now, we shall prove our main results.

Proof of Theorem 1.9.

- (1) Assume that (1.13) admits a nonnegative SOLA u . Then, by Corollary 1.6 and a standard approximation procedure, there holds

$$u(x) \geq \frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)/8}[u^\gamma + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Hence, we achieve (1.14) from (2) of Lemma 5.5.

(2) Suppose that (1.15) holds with $\delta = \tilde{\delta} > 0$ which will be determined in a few lines.

Step 1. We first consider the case $0 \leq \mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let u_0 be the weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_0 = \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then Proposition 3.7 and Corollary 1.6 imply that

$$0 \leq u_0 \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \text{where } R = 2\text{diam}(\Omega).$$

In particular, since $\mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, this inequality implies $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We inductively find a sequence $\{u_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of weak solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_m = \mu_m & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_m = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{where } \mu_m := u_{m-1}^\gamma + \mu.$$

Note that $\{u_m\}$ is nondecreasing by Proposition 3.7. Also, again by Corollary 1.6, we have for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$u_m \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[u_{m-1}^\gamma + \mu] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

We now fix $\tilde{\delta} > 0$, depending only on n, s, p, γ, C_0 and R , in a way that (5.1) holds with $\delta = \tilde{\delta}$ in the case $C_* = C_0$. Then, applying Lemma 5.1, we have for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$u_m \leq \frac{\gamma \max\left\{2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1\right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \quad (5.14)$$

Thus, by the monotone convergence theorem, there exists a measurable function u such that $u_m \rightarrow u$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n and u satisfies (1.16); in particular, $0 \leq u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By (5.14) and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, $u_m^\gamma \rightarrow u^\gamma$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, applying (3.10), we have for any $q \in (0, \bar{q})$ and $h \in (0, s)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_m(x) - u_m(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} &\leq c \left(\int_{\Omega} u_{m-1}^\gamma dx + \mu(\Omega) \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq c \left(\int_{\Omega} u^\gamma dx + \mu(\Omega) \right)^{1/(p-1)} \end{aligned}$$

whenever $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $c > 0$ is independent of m . In turn, Fatou's lemma and Lemma 2.3 imply that $u \in W^{h,q}(\Omega)$ and $u_m \rightarrow u$ locally in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (up to subsequences). Then a similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.5 shows that u is a nonnegative distributional solution to (1.13). Moreover, by the standard energy estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_m(x) - u_m(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy &\leq c \int_{\Omega} (u_{m-1}^\gamma + \mu) u_m dx \\ &\stackrel{(5.14)}{\leq} c \int_{\Omega} ((\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu])^{\gamma+1} + (\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu])^\gamma \mu) dx \end{aligned}$$

and Fatou's lemma, we see that $u \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is indeed a weak solution to (1.13).

Step 2. We now consider any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$. Assume that (1.15) holds with $\delta = \tilde{\delta}/c_0$, where $\tilde{\delta}$ and c_0 are the constants determined in **Step 1** and Lemma 2.9, respectively. Then, with $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ being a sequence of standard mollifiers in \mathbb{R}^n , $\mu_j = \mu * \rho_j \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\mu_j(K) \leq \tilde{\delta} \text{Cap}_{\mathbf{G}_{s,p}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-p+1}}(K) \quad (5.15)$$

for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, applying the conclusion of **Step 1** to $\mu = \mu_j$, we find a sequence of nonnegative weak solutions $\{u_j\} \subset \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = u_j^\gamma + \mu_j & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \end{cases}$$

satisfying, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$u_j \leq \frac{\gamma \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \quad (5.16)$$

Since (5.15) holds for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from (1) of Lemma 5.1 and (5.16) that $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j])^\gamma\}$ is bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$ and so is $\{u_j^\gamma\}$. Using this fact and (3.10), we have

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_j(x) - u_j(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq c \left(\int_{\Omega} u_j^\gamma dx + \mu_j(\Omega) \right)^{1/(p-1)} \leq c$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $c > 0$ is independent of j . Therefore, by Lemma 2.3, there exists $u \in W^{h,q}(\Omega)$ such that $u_j \rightarrow u$ a.e. in Ω and locally in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (up to subsequences). Moreover, since $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu] \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$ by Proposition 2.7, it follows from Lemma 2.10 and (5.16) that $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu_j])^\gamma\}$ is equi-integrable in Ω and so is $\{u_j^\gamma\}$. Hence, by Vitali's convergence theorem, $u_j^\gamma \rightarrow u^\gamma$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ (up to subsequences). Then a similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.5 shows that u is a nonnegative SOLA to (1.13). Also, (1.16) follows by letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.16). \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1.10.

(1) Assume that (1.17) admits a nonnegative SOLA u . Then, by Corollary 1.6 along with an approximation argument as in the proof of Corollary 1.7, there holds

$$u(x) \geq \frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[u^\gamma + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Hence, we achieve (1.18) from (1) of Lemma 5.5.

(2) Suppose that (1.19) holds for some $\delta > 0$, and consider $\mu_j = \mu * \rho_j$ for a sequence $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of standard mollifiers in \mathbb{R}^n . In view of Propositions 2.6 and 2.7, in particular (2.11), (2.13), (2.16) and (2.14), we can choose $\delta > 0$ so small that (1.15) with μ replaced by μ_j holds for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ (recall Remark 2.8 and Lemma 2.9). Thus, applying the conclusion of **Step 1** in the proof of Theorem 1.9, along with (2.11) and (2.12) in Proposition 2.6, we find a sequence $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of nonnegative weak solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = u_j^\gamma + \mu_j & \text{in } B_j(0), \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_j(0) \end{cases}$$

satisfying, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$u_j \leq \frac{\gamma \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4j}[\mu_j] \leq \frac{\gamma \max \left\{ 2^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}, 1 \right\}}{\gamma - p + 1} C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu_j] \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.17)$$

Fix any $r > 0$. Since (1.15) holds with μ replaced by μ_j holds for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from Lemma 5.2 and (5.17) that $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu_j])^\gamma\}$ is bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and so is $\{u_j^\gamma\}$. Using this fact and (3.9), we have

$$\left(\int_{B_r(0)} \int_{B_r(0)} \frac{|u_j(x) - u_j(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} \leq \frac{c}{r^{h+n/q}} \left(\int_{B_j(0)} u_j^\gamma dx + \mu_j(B_j(0)) \right)^{1/(p-1)} \leq c$$

whenever $j \geq r$, where $c > 0$ is independent of j . Namely, for any $r > 0$, $\{u_j\}_{j \geq r}$ is bounded in $W^{h,q}(B_r(0))$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.3, there exists $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{h,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $u_j \rightarrow u$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n and locally in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (up to subsequences). Moreover, since $\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu] \in L_{\text{loc}}^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by Proposition 2.6, it follows from Lemma 2.10 and (5.17) that $\{(\mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\mu_j])^\gamma\}$ is equi-integrable in $B_M(0)$ for any $M > 1$, and so is $\{u_j^\gamma\}$. Hence, by Vitali's convergence theorem, $u_j^\gamma \rightarrow u^\gamma$ locally in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (up to subsequences). Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.6, we see that u is a nonnegative SOLA to (1.17). Also, (1.20) follows by letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.17). \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1.11.

(1) Assume that (1.21) admits a nonnegative SOLA u . Then, by Corollary 1.6 and a standard approximation procedure, there holds

$$u(x) \geq \frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{\text{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)/8} [P_{l,a,\beta}(u) + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Hence, we achieve (1.22) from (2) of Lemma 5.6.

(2) Suppose that (1.23) holds with a constant $\delta > 0$ which will be determined in a few lines.

Step 1. We first consider the case $0 \leq \mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let u_0 be the weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_0 = \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then by Proposition 3.7 and Corollary 1.6, we have that

$$0 \leq u_0 \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\mu] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \text{where } R = 2\text{diam}(\Omega).$$

In particular, since $\mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, this inequality implies $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We inductively find a sequence $\{u_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of weak solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_m = \mu_m & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_m = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{where } \mu_m := P_{l,a,\beta}(u_{m-1}) + \mu.$$

Note that $\{u_m\}$ is nondecreasing by Proposition 3.7. Also, again by Corollary 1.6, we have for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$u_m \leq C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [P_{l,a,\beta}(u_{m-1}) + \mu] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

We now fix the constant $\delta > 0$, depending only on $n, s, p, l, a, \beta, C_0$ and R , in a way that (5.6) holds with $C_* = C_0$. Then, applying Lemma 5.3, we have

$$u_m \leq 2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R [\omega_1] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \tag{5.18}$$

whenever $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\omega_1 = \delta \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}} [1] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} + \mu.$$

Thus, by the monotone convergence theorem, there exists a measurable function u such that $u_m \rightarrow u$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n and u satisfies (1.24); in particular, $0 \leq u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By (5.18) and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, $P_{l,a,\beta}(u_m) \rightarrow P_{l,a,\beta}(u)$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, applying (3.10), we have for any $q \in (0, \bar{q})$ and $h \in (0, s)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_m(x) - u_m(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{n+hq}} dx dy \right)^{1/q} &\leq c \left(\int_{\Omega} P_{l,a,\beta}(u_{m-1}) dx + \mu(\Omega) \right)^{1/(p-1)} \\ &\leq c \left(\int_{\Omega} P_{l,a,\beta}(u) dx + \mu(\Omega) \right)^{1/(p-1)} \end{aligned}$$

whenever $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $c > 0$ is independent of m . In turn, Fatou's lemma and Lemma 2.3 imply that $u \in W^{h,q}(\Omega)$ and $u_m \rightarrow u$ locally in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (up to subsequences). Then, similarly to **Step 1** in the proof of Theorem 1.9, we see that $u \in \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and it is a weak solution to (1.21).

Step 2. We now consider any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ and assume that (1.23) holds with the constant $\delta > 0$ determined in **Step 1**. Then, with $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ being a sequence of standard mollifiers, $\mu_j = \mu * \rho_j \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[\mu_j] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[\mu] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \delta$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, applying the conclusion of **Step 1** to $\mu = \mu_j$, we find a sequence of nonnegative weak solutions $\{u_j\} \subset \mathbb{W}^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = P_{l,a,\beta}(u_j) + \mu_j & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \end{cases}$$

satisfying for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$u_j \leq 2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\omega_{1,j}] \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \text{where } \omega_{1,j} = \delta \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp,R}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[1] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} + \mu_j. \quad (5.19)$$

Moreover, since $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(4c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\omega_{1,j}])\}$ is bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$ by (1) of Lemma 5.3, it follows from Lemma 2.11 and (5.19) that $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^R[\omega_{1,j}])\}$ is equi-integrable in Ω and so is $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(u_j)\}$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.9, we conclude that $\{u_j\}$ converges (up to subsequences) to a nonnegative SOLA u to (1.21) which satisfies (1.24). \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1.12.

(1) Assume that (1.25) admits a nonnegative SOLA u . Then, by Corollary 1.6 along with an approximation argument as in the proof of Corollary 1.7, there holds

$$u(x) \geq \frac{1}{C_0} \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[P_{l,a,\beta}(u) + \mu](x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Hence, we achieve (1.26) from (1) of Lemma 5.6.

(2) Suppose that (1.27) holds with $\delta > 0$, which is the minimum of the two constants determined in (1.23) and (5.7) (with $C_* = C_0$). Consider $\mu_j = \mu * \rho_j$ for a sequence $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of standard mollifiers in \mathbb{R}^n ; note that $\mu_j(\mathbb{R}^n) = \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then (1.23) with μ replaced by μ_j holds for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, applying the conclusion of **Step 2** in the proof of Theorem 1.11, we find a sequence $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of nonnegative weak solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_\Phi u_j = P_{l,a,\beta}(u_j) + \mu_j & \text{in } B_j(0), \\ u_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_j(0) \end{cases}$$

satisfying for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$u_j \leq 2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}^{4j}[\omega_{2,j}] \leq 2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\omega_{2,j}] \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (5.20)$$

where

$$\omega_{2,j} = \delta \left\| \mathbf{M}_{sp}^{\frac{(p-1)(\beta-1)}{\beta}}[\chi_{B_R}] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} \chi_{B_R} + \mu_j.$$

Since $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(4c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\omega_{2,j}])\}$ is bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by Lemma 5.4, it follows from Lemma 2.11 and (5.20) that $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(2c_p C_0 \mathbf{W}_{s,p}[\omega_{2,j}])\}$ is equi-integrable in \mathbb{R}^n and so is $\{P_{l,a,\beta}(u_j)\}$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.10, this time using (5.20), we conclude that $\{u_j\}$ converges (up to subsequences) to a nonnegative SOLA u to (1.25) which satisfies (1.28). \blacksquare

Acknowledgements

Q.-H. Nguyen was supported by the Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences startup fund; CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research, Grant No. YSBR-031; and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12288201); and the National Key R&D Program of China under grant 2021YFA1000800. J. Ok was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea by the Korean Government (NRF-2022R1C1C1004523). K. Song was supported by a KIAS individual grant (MG091701) at Korea Institute for Advanced Study.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Data availability

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

References

- [1] D. R. Adams, L. I. Hedberg, *Function Spaces and Potential Theory*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 31, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, D. Pallara, *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [3] P. Bénilan, L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, R. Gariepy, M. Pierre, J. L. Vázquez, *An L^1 -theory of existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, **Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa** 22 (1995), 241–273.
- [4] M. F. Bidaut-Véron, *Necessary conditions of existence for an elliptic equation with source term and measure data involving p -Laplacian*, in: Proc. 2001 Luminy Conf. on Quasilinear Elliptic and Parabolic Equations and Systems, **Electron. J. Differ. Equ. Conf.** 8 (2002), 23–34.
- [5] M. F. Bidaut-Véron, *Removable singularities and existence for a quasilinear equation with absorption or source term and measure data*, **Adv. Nonlinear Stud.** 3 (2003), 25–63.
- [6] M. F. Bidaut-Véron, Q.-H. Nguyen, L. Véron, *Quasilinear Lane-Emden equations with absorption and measure data*, **J. Math. Pures Appl.** (9) 102 (2014), 315–337.
- [7] M. F. Bidaut-Véron, Q.-H. Nguyen, L. Véron, *Quasilinear elliptic equations with a source reaction term involving the function and its gradient and measure data*, **Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations** 59 (2020), Art. 148, 38 pp.
- [8] L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, *Nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations involving measure data*, **J. Funct. Anal.** 87 (1989), 149–169
- [9] L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, *Nonlinear elliptic equations with right-hand side measures*, **Commun. Partial Differ. Equ.** 17 (1992), 641–655.

- [10] L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, L. Orsina, *Existence and uniqueness of entropy solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations with measure data*, **Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire** 13 (1996), 539–551.
- [11] L. Brasco, E. Lindgren, A. Schikorra, *Higher Hölder regularity for the fractional p -Laplacian in the superquadratic case*, **Adv. Math.** 338 (2018), 782–846.
- [12] S. M. Buckley, P. Koskela, *Sobolev-Poincaré inequalities for $p < 1$* , **Indiana Univ. Math. J.** 43 (1994), no. 1, 221–240.
- [13] A. Cianchi, V. Maz'ya, *Quasilinear elliptic problems with general growth and merely integrable, or measure, data*, **Nonlinear Anal.** 164 (2017), 189–215.
- [14] M. Cozzi, *Regularity results and Harnack inequalities for minimizers and solutions of non-local problems: a unified approach via fractional De Giorgi classes*, **J. Funct. Anal.** 272 (2017), 4762–4837.
- [15] G. Dal Maso, F. Murat, L. Orsina, A. Prignet, *Renormalized solutions of elliptic equations with general measure data*, **Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa** 28 (1999), 741–808.
- [16] A. Di Castro, T. Kuusi, G. Palatucci, *Nonlocal Harnack inequalities*, **J. Funct. Anal.** 267 (2014), 1807–1836
- [17] A. Di Castro, T. Kuusi, G. Palatucci, *Local behavior of fractional p -minimizers*, **Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire** 33 (2016), 1279–1299.
- [18] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci, E. Valdinoci, *Hitchhiker's guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces*, **Bull. Sci. Math.** 136 (2012), 521–573.
- [19] L. Diening, K. Kim, H.-S. Lee, S. Nowak, *Nonlinear nonlocal potential theory at the gradient level*, [arXiv:2402.04809](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.04809)
- [20] L. Diening, S. Nowak, *Calderón-Zygmund estimates for the fractional p -Laplacian*, [arXiv:2303.02116](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.02116)
- [21] H. Dong, H. Zhu, *Gradient estimates for singular p -Laplace type equations with measure data*, **J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)**, [DOI:10.4171/JEMS/1400](https://doi.org/10.4171/JEMS/1400)
- [22] F. Duzaar, G. Mingione, *Gradient estimates via linear and nonlinear potentials*, **J. Funct. Anal.** 259 (2010), no. 11, 2961–2998.
- [23] F. Duzaar, G. Mingione, *Gradient estimates via non-linear potentials*, **Amer. J. Math.** 133 (2011), no.4, 1093–1149.
- [24] E. Giusti, *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003.
- [25] K. T. Gkikas, *Nonlinear nonlocal equations involving subcritical or power nonlinearities and measure data*, **Math. Eng.** 6 (2024), no. 1, 45–80.
- [26] A. Iannizzotto, S. Liu, K. Perera, M. Squassina, *Existence results for fractional p -Laplacian problems via Morse theory*, **Adv. Calc. Var.** 9 (2016), 101–125.
- [27] A. Iannizzotto, S. Mosconi, M. Squassina, *Global Hölder regularity for the fractional p -Laplacian*, **Rev. Mat. Iberoam.** 32 (2016), 1353–1392.

- [28] T. Kilpeläinen, J. Malý, *Degenerate elliptic equations with measure data and nonlinear potentials*, **Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Cl. Sci.** 19 (1992), 591–613.
- [29] T. Kilpeläinen, J. Malý, *The Wiener test and potential estimates for quasilinear elliptic equations*, **Acta Math.** 172 (1994), 137–161.
- [30] M. Kim, K.-A. Lee, S.-C. Lee, *The Wiener criterion for nonlocal Dirichlet problems*, **Comm. Math. Phys.** 400 (2023), no. 3, 1961–2003.
- [31] R. Korte, T. Kuusi, *A note on the Wolff potential estimate for solutions to elliptic equations involving measures*, **Adv. Calc. Var.** 3 (2010), 99–113.
- [32] J. Korvenpää, T. Kuusi, G. Palatucci, *A note on fractional supersolutions*, **Electron. J. Differential Equations** (2016), Paper No. 263, 9 pp.
- [33] J. Korvenpää, T. Kuusi, G. Palatucci, *Fractional superharmonic functions and the Perron method for nonlinear integro-differential equations*, **Math. Ann.** 369 (2017), 1443–1489.
- [34] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, *Universal potential estimates*, **J. Funct. Anal.** 262 (2012), no. 10, 4205–4269.
- [35] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, *Linear potentials in nonlinear potential theory*, **Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.** 207 (2013), no. 1, 215–246.
- [36] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, *Guide to nonlinear potential estimates*, **Bull. Math. Sci.** 4 (2014), 1–82.
- [37] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, Y. Sire, *Nonlocal equations with measure data*, **Comm. Math. Phys.** 337 (2015), 1317–1368.
- [38] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, Y. Sire, *Nonlocal self-improving properties*, **Anal. PDE** 8 (2015), no. 1, 57–114.
- [39] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, Y. Sire, *Regularity issues involving the fractional p -Laplacian*, Recent developments in nonlocal theory, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018, pp. 303–334.
- [40] T. Kuusi, S. Nowak, Y. Sire, *Gradient regularity and first-order potential estimates for a class of nonlocal equations*, [arXiv:2212.01950](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.01950)
- [41] P. Lindqvist, *On the definition and properties of p -superharmonic functions*, **J. Reine Angew. Math. (Crelles J.)** 365 (1986), 67–79.
- [42] P.-A. Meyer, *Sur le lemme de la Valle Poussin et un théorème de Bismut*, (French) Séminaire de Probabilités, XII (Univ. Strasbourg, Strasbourg, 1976/1977), pp. 770–774, Lecture Notes in Math., 649, Springer, Berlin, 1978.
- [43] G. Mingione, *Gradient potential estimates*, **J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)** 13 (2011), no. 2, 459–486.
- [44] Q.-H. Nguyen, N. C. Phuc, *Good- λ and Muckenhoupt-Wheeden type bounds in quasilinear measure datum problems, with applications*, **Math. Ann.** 374 (2019), 67–98.
- [45] Q.-H. Nguyen, N. C. Phuc, *Pointwise gradient estimates for a class of singular quasilinear equations with measure data*, **J. Funct. Anal.** 278 (2020), no. 5, 108391, 35.
- [46] Q.-H. Nguyen, N. C. Phuc, *Existence and regularity estimates for quasilinear equations with measure data: the case $1 < p \leq (3n - 2)/(2n - 1)$* , **Anal. PDE** 15 (2022), no. 8, 1879–1895.

- [47] Q.-H. Nguyen, N. C. Phuc, *A comparison estimate for singular p -Laplace equations and its consequences*, **Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.** (2023), no. 3, Paper No. 49, 24.
- [48] Q.-H. Nguyen, N. C. Phuc, *Universal potential estimates for $1 < p \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n}$* , **Math. Eng.** 5 (2023), no. 3, Paper No. 057, 24.
- [49] Q.-H. Nguyen, L. Véron, *Quasilinear and Hessian type equations with exponential reaction and measure data*, **Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.** 214 (2014), 235–267.
- [50] G. Palatucci, *The Dirichlet problem for the p -fractional Laplace equation*, **Nonlinear Anal.** 177 (2018), 699–732.
- [51] N. C. Phuc, *Nonlinear Muckenhoupt-Wheeden type bounds on Reifenberg flat domains, with applications to quasilinear Riccati type equations*, **Adv. Math.** 250 (2014), 387–419.
- [52] N. C. Phuc, I. E. Verbitsky, *Quasilinear and Hessian equations of Lane-Emden type*, **Ann. of Math.** 168 (2008), 859–914.
- [53] L. Silvestre, *Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator*, **Comm. Pure Appl. Math.** 60 (2007) 67–112.
- [54] N. S. Trudinger, X. J. Wang, *On the weak continuity of elliptic operators and applications to potential theory*, **Amer. J. Math.** 124 (2002), 369–410.
- [55] J. L. Vázquez, *The Dirichlet problem for the fractional p -Laplacian evolution equation*, **J. Differential Equations** 260 (2016), 6038–6056.
- [56] L. Véron, *Elliptic equations involving measures*, **Stationary Partial Differential Equations, vol. I, Handbook of Equations**, Elsevier B.V., pp. 593-712 (2004).