

NONLOCAL EQUATIONS WITH DEGENERATE WEIGHTS

LINUS BEHN, LARS DIENING, JIHOON OK, AND JULIAN ROLFES

ABSTRACT. We introduce fractional weighted Sobolev spaces with degenerate weights. For these spaces we provide embeddings and Poincaré inequalities. When the order of fractional differentiability goes to 0 or 1, we recover the weighted Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with Muckenhoupt weights, respectively. Moreover, we prove interior Hölder continuity and Harnack inequalities for solutions to the corresponding weighted nonlocal integro-differential equations. This naturally extends a classical result by Fabes, Kenig, and Serapioni to the nonlinear, nonlocal setting.

1. INTRODUCTION

Research on fractional nonlocal integro-differential equations has become one of the most prominent topics in the field of partial differential equations. In particular, regularity theory for nonlocal equations associated with the fractional energy functional given by

$$(1.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \right)^p k(x, y) dx dy$$

have been extensively studied over the last decade. In (1.1), $s \in (0, 1)$ denotes the fractional differentiability parameter, $1 < p < \infty$, and $k(x, y)$ is a nonnegative kernel on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that, if $k(x, y) = |x - y|^{-n}$, then the Euler-Lagrange equation of (1.1) corresponds to the fractional p -Laplace equation $(-\Delta)_p^s u = 0$ and when $p = 2$ it corresponds to a linear equation. The main purpose of this paper is to establish regularity theory for weak solutions to specific classes of degenerate or singular nonlocal equations that do not satisfy the standard ellipticity condition $k(x, y) \asymp |x - y|^{-n}$.

The energy functional in (1.1) is the fractional counterpart to the classical energy functional $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a(x) |\nabla v|^p dx$, where $a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation is the following p -Laplace type equation:

$$(1.2) \quad \operatorname{div}(a(x) |Du|^{p-2} Du) = 0.$$

Specifically, when $p = 2$, this reduces to the linear equation

$$(1.3) \quad \operatorname{div}(A(x) Du) = 0$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J60, 35R09, 35R11, 35R05, 35J70, 35B65.

Key words and phrases. degenerate equations, De Giorgi, regularity, nonlocal, p -Laplace, Muckenhoupt weights, fractional.

This work was partially funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - SFB 1283/2 2021 - 317210226 (project A7) and IRTG 2235 (Project 282638148). J. Ok was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea by the Korean Government (NRF-2022R1C1C1004523).

with the matrix valued function $A(x) = a(x)I_n$, where I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. In general, for the linear equation (1.3), it is well-known that if $A(x)$ satisfies the uniform ellipticity condition

$$(1.4) \quad \lambda|\xi|^2 \leq A(x)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda|\xi|^2$$

for some $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$, then the weak solution to (1.3) is Hölder continuous, and satisfies Harnack's inequality by the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser theory (see, e.g., [Gio57]). These results extend to the p -Laplace case, see [LU68, Chapters 4.7 and 5.3]. An interesting and important question is the development of regularity theory when the coefficient $A(x)$ does not satisfy the uniform ellipticity condition. For the linear equation (1.3), Fabes, Kenig and Serapioni [FKS82] proved Hölder continuity and Harnack's inequality for weak solutions to (1.3) when $A(x)$ satisfies that

$$\lambda w(x)|\xi|^2 \leq A(x)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda w(x)|\xi|^2,$$

with a weight function w belonging to the Muckenhoupt A_2 class. This result is sharp in the sense that there exists a weight w with $w \in A_p$ for every $p > 2$, such that the equation (1.3) has non-Hölder continuous solution (see [FKS82, Section 2.3]). We also refer to [MS68; Tru71; Tru73; BS21] for regularity results for degenerate linear equations, [CMN13; Mod85; MRW15; BS23; CS24] for the extension to p -Laplace type problems, and [BDGP22; BBDL23; CMP18; Str84] for gradient estimates for degenerate equations.

For fractional nonlocal equations with energy functional (1.1), the condition corresponding to the uniform ellipticity is that $k(x, y) \approx |x - y|^{-n}$. Under this condition, regularity results have been explored for instance in [CS07; CCV11; BK05; Kas07] for linear equations and [DKP14; DKP16; Coz17] for fractional p -Laplace type equations. In particular, in [DKP16; DKP14], the authors obtain sharp local Hölder estimates and Harnack inequality using nonlocal tail terms, by applying De Giorgi's approach to nonlocal problems. Since then there have been extensive research activities on regularity theory for fractional nonlocal equation. For further regularity results for fractional nonlocal problems of the p -Laplace type, we refer to [KMS15; Sch16; BL17; BLS18; IMS16; DN23; BK23; DKLN24; GL24; BDLBS24] and for related results on fractional equations with more general growth conditions to [BKO23; CKW22; BDNS24].

In this paper, we focus on fractional nonlocal problems with degenerate kernels $k(x, y)$. Our main model for the kernel in (1.1) is

$$(1.5) \quad k(x, y) = \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} = c_n \frac{w(x)w(y)}{\int_{B_{x,y}} w(z) dz} \frac{1}{|x - y|^n},$$

where $w(x)$ is a weight, $w(B) = \int_B w(z) dz$ and $B_{x,y} := B_{\frac{1}{2}|x-y|}(\frac{x+y}{2})$. We will make the assumption that w is in the Muckenhoupt class A_p , which is natural in this context. Some background on Muckenhoupt weights is collected in Section 2.3. Note that the kernel k in (1.5) does not satisfy the uniform ellipticity condition since $k(x, y) = 0$ when $w(x) = 0$ or $w(y) = 0$. Function spaces related to the energy (1.1) with $k(x, y)$ as given in (1.5) have been studied as interpolation spaces between Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces in the Euclidean space equipped with the measure $d\mu(x) = w(x)dx$. See [GKS10; CDM19] for further details. However, fractional nonlocal equations associated with these energy functionals have not been systematically studied yet. To the best of our knowledge, even in the linear

case, this is the first paper to investigate regularity theory for nonlocal equations with degenerate weights.

The paper consists of two major parts. In the first part, Section 2, we introduce and study fractional weighted Sobolev spaces with degenerate weights. We explore various properties, including the density of smooth functions and Sobolev-Poincaré estimates, directly without relying on interpolation. We emphasize that the estimates obtained in this section are stable as the order of fractional differentiability s approaches 1. To this end, we develop a novel Riesz-type potential estimate in Appendix A, which is of independent interest.

The second part, Sections 3, focuses on regularity theory for associated degenerate nonlocal equations. We prove local boundedness (Theorem 3.4), interior Hölder regularity (Theorem 3.5), and Harnack's inequality (Theorem 3.6) for their weak solutions. This exactly corresponds to the results in [FKS82] for the classical linear equation (1.3). We highlight that, thanks to the s -stable Sobolev-Poincaré inequality from Section 2, we can apply the nonlocal version of De Giorgi's approach, as developed in [DKP14; DKP16], and derive relevant regularity estimates that remain stable as s approaches 1. Finally, we would like to remark that although we prove interior local Hölder continuity for homogenous problems, we expect that by the same approach we can also show global Hölder continuity for nonhomogeneous problems.

2. FRACTIONAL WEIGHTED SOBOLEV SPACES

In this section we introduce nonlocal energies with degenerate weights and their corresponding function spaces. We show density of smooth, compactly supported functions and investigate compact embeddings. Moreover, we see that local weighted spaces are recovered if the order of fractional differentiability s goes to 0 resp. 1. Finally, we prove a Sobolev-Poincaré inequality which is stable as $s \nearrow 1$.

2.1. Fractional, weighted energies. In this section we introduce our nonlocal energies. We start with a bit of standard notation.

From now on let $n \geq 2$. By $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we denote the locally integrable functions. A function $w \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $w > 0$ almost everywhere is called a *weight*. Then for a measurable set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the measure with respect to $w(x) dx$ by $w(U) := \int_U w(x) dx$. By $|U|$ we denote the Lebesgue measure of U . By $L^p_w(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we denote the usual weighted Lebesgue space with norm $(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v|^p w dx)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Let $C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $C^\infty(\Omega)$ denote the smooth, compactly supported functions on \mathbb{R}^n and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, respectively. By $B_r(x)$ we denote a ball with center x and radius r . For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ let $B_{x,y} := B_{\frac{1}{2}|x-y|}(\frac{x+y}{2})$. Then $\overline{B_{x,y}}$ is the smallest (closed) ball containing x and y . For a ball B and $\lambda > 0$ we denote by λB the ball with the same center and λ times the radius. For quantities A and B , we write $A \lesssim B$ if $A \leq cB$ for some universal constant $c > 0$, and $A \approx B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$.

From now on we will always assume that $s \in (0, 1)$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Let w be a weight on \mathbb{R}^n . We define the *fractional, weighted energy* $\mathcal{J}^s_{p,w} : L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$(2.1a) \quad \mathcal{J}^s_{p,w}(v) := c_s \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \right)^p k(x, y) dx dy,$$

where $k : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies

$$(2.1b) \quad \lambda \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \leq k(x, y) \leq \Lambda \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})}$$

for some $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$ and $c_s := s(1-s)$. Note that strictly speaking the energy depends on k and only indirectly on w . This will not play any role for the function spaces investigated in this section. However, it will become important for the minimizers studied in Section 3.

For $w = 1$ and $\lambda = \Lambda$ we therefore obtain the energy corresponding to the usual fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The constant $c_s = s(1-s)$ will be used to keep track of the stability for $s \nearrow 1$ and sometimes also for $s \searrow 0$.

2.2. Fractional weighted Sobolev spaces. In this section we introduce the fractional, weighted Sobolev spaces. The energy $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s$ from (2.1) is strictly convex and can be used to define the fractional, weighted Sobolev space

$$W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) := \{v \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n) : \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) < \infty\}.$$

Note that

$$|v|_{W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := (\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v))^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

defines a semi-norm on $W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $|v|_{W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0$ if and only if v is constant. To obtain a norm, one could either take the quotient space or add a norm like $\|v\|_{L_w^p(B_1(0))}$.

Furthermore, for an open and bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we define

$$W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega) := \{v \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) : v|_{\Omega^c} = 0\}.$$

Then $(W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega), |\cdot|_{W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)})$ is a normed space. Note that in this case we still integrate over $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. In some situations we consider functions that are only defined on some open set Ω . For this we set for a measurable set $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and measurable function v

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|M) := c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{(x,y) \in M\}} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p k(x, y) dx dy.$$

For example, we have $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) = \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Suppose in the following that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open and bounded. At this step, we could include more general Ω , but for simplicity we restrict ourselves to the case that we need later in the application. We then define

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|\Omega) := \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|\Omega \times \Omega),$$

and $W_w^{s,p}(\Omega) := \{v \in L^p(\Omega) : \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|\Omega) < \infty\}$. We now investigate the properties of the space $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $s \in (0, 1)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded. Then $(W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega), |\cdot|_{W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)})$ is a uniformly convex Banach space.*

Proof. We can map every $u \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ to $\bar{u}(x, y) := u(x) - u(y)$. This defines a (non-bijective) isometry T from $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ to the weighted space $L_{|x-y|^{-s}k(x,y)}^p(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n) =: Z$. Note that Z is a uniformly convex Banach space. Let $u_m \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ be a Cauchy sequence. Then $\bar{u}_m := Tu_m$ is Cauchy in Z and there exists a limit $\bar{u} \in Z$. Moreover, by passing to a subsequence, we have $\bar{u}_m \rightarrow \bar{u}$ almost everywhere. Since

$\tilde{u}_m(x, \zeta) = \tilde{u}_m(x, z)$ for almost all $\zeta, z \in \Omega^c$, we have $\tilde{u}(x, \zeta) = \tilde{u}(x, z)$ for almost all $\zeta, z \in \Omega^c$. This allows to define $u(x) := \tilde{u}(x, z)$ for (arbitrary) $z \in \Omega^c$. Moreover, $\bar{u} = \tilde{u}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(x, y) &= u(x) - u(y) = \bar{u}(x, z) - \bar{u}(y, z) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{u}_m(x, z) - \bar{u}_m(y, z)) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (u_m(x) - u_m(y)) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}_m(x, y) = \tilde{u}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{u}_m \rightarrow \bar{u}$ and T is an isometry, we conclude that $u_m \rightarrow u$ in $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Thus, $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space. Since Z is uniformly convex, so is $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $s \in (0, 1)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded. Then $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. Let B be a ball with radius r containing Ω . For $v \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) &\gtrsim c_s \int_B \int_{3B \setminus 2B} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ &\gtrsim c_s r^{-sp} \int_B \int_{3B \setminus 2B} |v(y)|^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(3B)} dx dy \\ &\gtrsim c_s r^{-sp} \frac{w(3B \setminus 2B)}{w(3B)} \int_B |v(y)|^p w(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

Note that the embedding constant in Lemma 2.2 deteriorates for $s \nearrow 1$. This is in contrast to our Poincaré type inequality of Theorem 2.10, which however requires more assumptions on our weight.

2.3. Basic embedding. In this section we show the $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \subset W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. For this inclusion it would be sufficient to assume that our weight is doubling. However, in view of our application we already now make the stronger assumption that w is of *Muckenhoupt class* A_p . We therefore recall now the class of Muckenhoupt weights, which is the assumption on our weights that we will use for the rest of this paper. For this let $p \in (1, \infty)$. A weight w on \mathbb{R}^n is said to be an A_p -weight (in short $w \in A_p$) if and only if

$$(2.4) \quad [w]_{A_p} := \sup_{B \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_B w dx \left(\int_B w^{\frac{1}{1-p}} dx \right)^{p-1} \right) < \infty.$$

The class A_p contains exactly the weights that make the maximal operator continuous on $L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. A standard example is given by $|x|^\gamma \in A_p$ for all $-n < \gamma < (p-1)n$. Note that every A_p weight w is *doubling*, i.e., that for some $c_w > 0$ we have

$$(2.5) \quad w(2B) \leq c_w w(B) \quad \text{for all balls } B,$$

see Remark 2.7. Let us recall a few standard properties of Muckenhoupt weights, see [Gra14a]. It is often useful, to define the dual weight $\sigma := w^{\frac{1}{1-p}}$. Then $\sigma \in A_{p'}$, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$ and $[w]_{A_p} = [\sigma]_{A_{p'}}^{p-1}$. Moreover, w and σ are doubling with

doubling constants $c_w = 2^{np}[w]_{A_p}$ and $c_\sigma = 2^{np'}[w]_{A_p}^{1/(p-1)}$, respectively. For every ball B , (2.4) and Jensen's inequality imply

$$1 \leq \int_B w \, dx \left(\int_B \sigma \right)^{p-1} \leq [w]_{A_p}.$$

Hence, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$(2.6) \quad |B_{x,y}| \leq w(B_{x,y})^{\frac{1}{p}} \sigma(B_{x,y})^{\frac{1}{p'}} \leq [w]_{A_p} |B_{x,y}| \approx [w]_{A_p} |x-y|^n,$$

where the implicit constant only depends on n .

Lemma 2.3. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$. Then for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$ with $r \leq |x-y| \leq 2r$ we have*

$$(2.7) \quad w(B_{x,y}) \leq 2^{np}[w]_{A_p} w(B_r(x)), \quad \text{and} \quad w(B_{2r}(x)) \leq 5^{np}[w]_{A_p} w(B_{x,y}).$$

Proof. For every $\lambda > 1$ and all balls B we have $w(\lambda B) \leq \lambda^{np}[w]_{A_p} w(B)$, see [Gra14b, Proposition 9.1.5]. With this we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} w(B_{x,y}) &\leq w(B_{2r}(x)) \leq 2^{np}[w]_{A_p} w(B_r(x)), \\ \text{and} \quad w(B_{2r}(x)) &\leq w(5B_{x,y}) \leq 5^{np}[w]_{A_p} w(B_{x,y}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$. Then for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\alpha| \leq \alpha_0$ and every ball $B_r(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{B_r(x)} |x-y|^\alpha \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \, dy \approx \frac{r^\alpha}{\alpha} \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0,$$

$$(2.9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(x)} |x-y|^\alpha \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \, dy \approx \frac{r^\alpha}{|\alpha|} \quad \text{for } \alpha < 0.$$

The hidden constants depend continuously on n, p, α_0 , and linearly on $[w]_{A_p}$.

Proof. Let $B = B_r(x)$. Splitting $B_r(x)$ into annuli, we estimate with Lemma 2.3 for $\alpha > 0$.

$$\int_{B_r(x)} |x-y|^\alpha \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \, dy \lesssim [w]_{A_p} \sum_{j \geq 0} (2^{-j\alpha} r^\alpha) \frac{w(2^{-j}B \setminus 2^{-j-1}B)}{w(2^{-j}B)} \leq \frac{[w]_{A_p} r^\alpha}{1-2^{-\alpha}}.$$

For the reverse estimate we have

$$(2.10) \quad \int_{B_r(x)} |x-y|^\alpha \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \, dy \geq \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-(j+1)\alpha} r^\alpha \int_{2^{-j}B \setminus 2^{-j-1}B} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \, dy$$

Let \tilde{B}_j be any ball of maximal radius contained in $2^{-j}B \setminus 2^{-j-1}B$. Then we have $B_{x,y} \subset 7\tilde{B}_j$. Thus

$$w(B_{x,y}) \leq w(7\tilde{B}_j) \leq 7^{np}[w]_{A_p} w(\tilde{B}_j).$$

Combining this with (2.10), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} [w]_{A_p} \int_{B_r(x)} |x-y|^\alpha \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy &\geq 7^{-np} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-(j+1)\alpha} r^\alpha \frac{w(2^{-j}B \setminus 2^{-j-1}B)}{w(\tilde{B}_j)} \\ &\geq 7^{-np} \frac{1}{2^\alpha} \frac{r^\alpha}{1-2^{-\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|1-2^{-t}| \approx t$ for all $t \in [0, \alpha_0]$ with constant depending on α_0 . Hence, $\frac{1}{1-2^{-|\alpha|}} \approx \frac{1}{|\alpha|}$. This proves the claim for $\alpha > 0$. The proof for $\alpha < 0$ follows by the same method. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, $w \in A_p$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded. Then $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let $v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Choose a ball B with radius r and $\text{supp } v \subset B$. Then $|v(x) - v(y)| \leq |x-y| \|\nabla v\|_\infty$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) &= c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ &\leq c_s \|\nabla v\|_\infty^p \int_{2B} \int_{2B} |x-y|^{p-sp} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx w(y) dy \\ &\quad + 2\|v\|_\infty^p \int_{2B} \int_{(2B)^c} |x-y|^{-sp} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx w(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4 we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) \lesssim \|\nabla v\|_\infty^p r^{p-sp} w(2B) + \|v\|_\infty^p r^{-sp} w(2B) < \infty.$$

This proves $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence, we also have $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \subset W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Suppose now that $v_m \rightarrow v$ in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then by the calculations above

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v_m - v) \lesssim \|\nabla(v_m - v)\|_\infty^p r^{p-sp} w(2B) + \|v_m - v\|_\infty^p r^{-sp} w(2B) \xrightarrow{m} 0,$$

which proves $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. \square

2.4. The limit as $s \rightarrow 0$ and $s \rightarrow 1$. In this section we investigate what happens if the order of fractional differentiability s converges to 0 or 1. We see that we recover the energies of the weighted Lebesgue space L_w^p and of the weighted Sobolev space $W_w^{1,p}$, respectively. This justifies the notation $W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that our model can be seen as the natural intermediate space. For the case of fractional Sobolev spaces, i.e., for $w = 1$, corresponding results were shown in [BBM01; MS02; FKV20].

Theorem 2.6. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, $w \in A_p$, and $v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{s \searrow 0} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) &\approx \limsup_{s \searrow 0} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) \approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(z)|^p w(x) dx, \\ \liminf_{s \nearrow 1} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) &\approx \limsup_{s \nearrow 1} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) \approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla v(z)|^p w(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

The implicit constants are only dependent on n , p , and $[w]_{A_p}$.

Proof. Recall that the normalizing constant of $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s$ is given by $c_s = s(1-s)$. Fix $v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Choose $r \geq 1$ such that $\text{supp } v \subset B_r(0) := B$. We begin with $s \nearrow 1$. We have $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) \approx I_1 + I_2 + I_3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_1(x)} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy dx, \\ I_2 &:= c_s \int_{2B} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(x)} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy dx, \\ I_3 &:= c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus 2B} \int_{B \setminus B_1(x)} \left(\frac{|v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

We first prove that $I_2, I_3 \rightarrow 0$ for $s \nearrow 1$. We estimate with Lemma 2.4

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq (1-s)(2\|v\|_\infty)^p \int_{2B} w(x) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(x)} |x-y|^{-sp} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy \right) dx \\ &\approx (1-s) \frac{1}{sp} \|v\|_\infty^p w(2B) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow 1} 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq (1-s) \|v\|_\infty^p \int_B \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus 2B} |x-y|^{-sp} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx w(y) dy \\ &\approx (1-s) \|v\|_\infty^p \frac{r^{-sp}}{sp} w(B) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow 1} 0. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to calculate the limit of I_1 . We obtain

$$I_1 = c_s \int_{B_{r+1}(0)} \int_{B_1(0)} \left(\frac{|v(x+h) - v(x)|}{|h|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(x+h)}{w(B_{x,x+h})} dh dx.$$

Let us put

$$I_{1,1} := c_s \int_{B_{r+1}(0)} \int_{B_1(0)} \left(\frac{|\langle \nabla v(x), h \rangle|}{|h|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(x+h)}{w(B_{x,x+h})} dh dx,$$

and define $I_{1,2} := I_1 - I_{1,1}$. By Talyor's theorem

$$|v(x+h) - v(x) - \langle \nabla v(x), h \rangle| \leq \|\nabla^2 v\|_\infty |h|^2.$$

Using this and the elementary inequality $|a^p - b^p| \leq p|a-b|(a^{p-1} + b^{p-1})$ for $a, b \geq 0$ and $p > 1$ we estimate a term appearing in the integrand of $I_{1,2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| |v(x+h) - v(x)|^p - |\langle \nabla v(x), h \rangle|^p \right| \\ & \lesssim |v(x+h) - v(x) - \langle \nabla v(x), h \rangle| (|v(x+h) - v(x)| + |\langle \nabla v(x), h \rangle|)^{p-1} \\ & \lesssim \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^\infty} |h|^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty}^{p-1} |h|^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$I_{1,2} \lesssim c_s \int_{B_{r+1}(0)} \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{\|\nabla^2 v\|_\infty \|\nabla v\|_\infty^{p-1} |h|^{p+1}}{|h|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(x+h)}{w(B_{x,x+h})} dh dx.$$

With Lemma 2.4 and $\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} c_s = 0$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,2} &\lesssim c_s \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty}^{p-1} \int_{B_{r+1}(0)} \int_{B_1(0)} |h|^{p+1-sp} \frac{w(x+h)}{w(B_{x,x+h})} dh w(x) dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{c_s}{p+1-sp} \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty}^{p-1} w(B_{r+1}(0)) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow 1} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now, with Lemma 2.3

$$I_{1,1} \approx c_s \int_{B_{r+1}(0)} \underbrace{\int_{B_1(0)} \left(\frac{|\langle \nabla v(x), h \rangle|}{|h|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x+h)}{w(B_{|h|}(x))} dh}_{:=g_s(x)} w(x) dx.$$

Again with Lemma 2.3 we estimate

$$|g_s(x)| \lesssim |\nabla v(x)|^p \int_{B_1(0)} |h|^{(1-s)p} \frac{w(x+h)}{w(B_{|h|}(x))} dh \approx \frac{1}{(1-s)p} |\nabla v(x)|^p.$$

Let S denote the sector $S := \{h : \langle \nabla v(x), h \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} |\nabla v(x)| |h|\}$. Then

$$|g_s(x)| \gtrsim |\nabla v(x)|^p \int_{S \cap B_1(0)} |h|^{(1-s)p} \frac{w(x+h)}{w(B_{|h|}(x))} dh \approx \frac{1}{(1-s)p} |\nabla v(x)|^p,$$

where the last step requires an argument similar to Lemma 2.4 but for sectors.

Overall, we have

$$I_{1,1} \approx \frac{c_s}{(1-s)p} \int_{B_{r+1}(0)} |\nabla v(x)|^p w(x) dx \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{p} \int_{B_{r+1}(0)} |\nabla v(x)|^p w(x) dx.$$

Combing all estimates proves the claim for $s \nearrow 1$.

Let us consider the case $s \searrow 0$. Then we have $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) \approx \Pi_1 + \Pi_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 &:= c_s \int_{2B} \int_{2B} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy dx, \\ \Pi_2 &:= c_s \int_B \int_{(2B)^c} \left(\frac{|v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Π_1 vanishes as $s \searrow 0$. Indeed, with Lemma 2.4 we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 &\lesssim c_s \|\nabla v\|_\infty^p \int_{2B} \int_{2B} |x-y|^{(1-s)p} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx w(y) dy \\ &\lesssim c_s \|\nabla v\|_\infty^p \frac{r^{(1-s)p}}{(1-s)p} w(2B) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using a modified version of Lemma 2.4 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_2 &\approx c_s \int_B |v(y)|^p w(y) \int_{(2B)^c} |x-y|^{-sp} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ &\approx c_s \int_B |v(y)|^p w(y) \frac{r^{-sp}}{sp} dy \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{p} \int_B |v(y)|^p w(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the case $s \searrow 0$. \square

Remark 2.7. All statements from Section 2.3 and Section 2.4 remain valid if the Muckenhoupt condition $w \in A_p$ is replaced by the weaker assumption that w is doubling. In this case the dependence of the (implicit) constants would no longer be on $[w]_{A_p}$, but instead on the doubling constant c_w (not necessarily in the same way). Indeed, $w \in A_p$ is used explicitly only in the proof of Lemma 2.3 which also holds with doubling weights (but with constants depending on c_w in a nonlinear fashion).

2.5. Poincaré inequality. In this section we establish a Poincaré type estimate for our function spaces. Our estimate is stable when $s \nearrow 1$. For $0 < \alpha < n$ the Riesz potential of $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y) |x - y|^{\alpha - n} dy.$$

If f is defined only on some $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote $\mathcal{I}_\alpha f(x) = \mathcal{I}_\alpha \bar{f}(x)$, where \bar{f} is the zero extension of f to \mathbb{R}^n .

To avoid proving similar estimates for the mollifiers now and for Poincaré's inequality later, we prove two auxiliary lemmas. We first prove an elementary estimate for the Riesz potential.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\alpha \in (0, n)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $w \in A_p$ and let $B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a ball with radius r . Then for every $f \in L_w^p(B_r)$ we have*

$$\left(\frac{1}{w(B_r)} \int_{B_r} (\mathcal{I}_\alpha |f|)^p w dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \frac{r^\alpha}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{w(B_r)} \int_{B_r} |f|^p w dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where the hidden constant depends continuously on p and n and $[w]_{A_p}$.

Proof. By (2.6), Hölder's inequality and Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} (\mathcal{I}_\alpha |f|)^p w dx &\approx \int_{B_r} \left(\int_{B_r} \frac{|f(y)| |x - y|^{\alpha} w(y)^{1/p} \sigma(y)^{1/p'}}{w(B_{x,y})^{1/p} \sigma(B_{x,y})^{1/p'}} dy \right)^p w(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_{B_r} \left(\int_{B_r} \frac{|f(y)|^p |x - y|^\alpha w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy \right) \left(\int_{B_r} \frac{|x - y|^\alpha \sigma(y)}{\sigma(B_{x,y})} dy \right)^{\frac{p}{p'}} w(x) dx \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{r^\alpha}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{p}{p'}} \int_{B_r} |f(y)|^p \left(\int_{B_{2r}(y)} \frac{|x - y|^\alpha w(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx \right) w(y) dy \\ &\approx \left(\frac{r^\alpha}{\alpha} \right)^p \int_{B_r} |f(y)|^p w(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$. Let B be a ball of radius $r > 0$ and $\psi \in L^\infty(B)$ be non-negative with $\|\psi\|_{L^1(B)} = 1$ and $\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(B)} \leq c_0 r^{-n}$. Then for every $\alpha \in (0, s)$, $x \in B$ and $v \in W_w^{s,p}(B)$ we have*

$$|v(x) - \langle v \rangle_\psi| \lesssim \frac{(1 - \alpha) r^{s - \alpha}}{(s - \alpha)^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \int_B \left[\int_B \frac{|v(y) - v(z)|^p w(y) dy}{|y - z|^{sp} w(B_{y,z})} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{n - \alpha}},$$

where the hidden constant depends continuously on n , p , c_0 and $[w]_{A_p}$.

This lemma is stable when $s \nearrow 1$ in the sense that for $s > \frac{1}{2}$ we can set $1 - \alpha := 2(1 - s)$ and thereby obtain a factor of $(1 - s)$ in front of the right hand side. To achieve this stability we apply our fractional Riesz type estimate (see Appendix A).

Proof of Lemma 2.9. We obtain by Lemma A.1

$$\text{I} := |v(x) - \langle v \rangle_\psi| \lesssim (1 - \alpha) \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(y) - v(z)|}{|y - z|^{n+\alpha}} \frac{dy}{|x - z|^{n-\alpha}}.$$

Using $w^{\frac{1}{p}} \sigma^{\frac{1}{p'}} = 1$ and (2.6) and Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \int_B \left[\int_B \frac{|v(y) - v(z)|^p}{|y - z|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{y,z})} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left[\int_B \frac{\sigma(y)}{\sigma(B_{y,z})} \frac{dy}{|y - z|^{(\alpha-s)p'}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p'}} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{n-\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.4 we get

$$\text{I} \lesssim \frac{(1 - \alpha)r^{s-\alpha}}{(s - \alpha)^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \int_B \left[\int_B \frac{|v(y) - v(z)|^p}{|y - z|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{y,z})} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{n-\alpha}}.$$

This proves the claim. \square

We are now ready to prove a version of Poincaré's inequality which is stable when $s \nearrow 1$.

Theorem 2.10 (Poincaré). *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a ball, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $w \in A_p$ and $v \in W_w^{s,p}(B)$. Then*

$$\int_B |v - \langle v \rangle_B|^p w(x) dx \lesssim (1 - s)r^{sp} \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy,$$

where the implicit constant depends continuously on n , p and $[w]_{A_p}$. Note that the mean value $\langle v \rangle_B$ on the left hand side can be replaced by other mean values, see Remark 2.12.

Proof. Start by assuming $s \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1)$. We begin by applying Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.8 to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_B |v - \langle v \rangle_B|^p w(x) dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{(1 - \alpha)^p}{(s - \alpha)^{p-1}} r^{(s-\alpha)p} \int_B \left[\int_B \left[\frac{|v(y) - v(z)|^p}{|y - z|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{y,z})} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{n-\alpha}} \right]^p w(x) dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{(1 - \alpha)^p}{\alpha^p (s - \alpha)^{p-1}} r^{sp} \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(y) - v(x)|^p}{|y - x|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)w(x)}{w(B_{y,x})} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing $\alpha = 2s - 1$ we have $\frac{(1-\alpha)^p}{\alpha^p(s-\alpha)^{p-1}} \approx c_s$, giving the desired estimate. For $s \in (0, \frac{2}{3})$ on the other hand, using $w^{\frac{1}{p}}\sigma^{\frac{1}{p'}} = 1$ and (2.6) and Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |v(x) - \langle v \rangle_B|^p \\ & \lesssim r^{-np} \int_B \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy \left[\int_B |x - y|^{(n+s)p'} \frac{\sigma(y)}{\sigma(B_{x,y})} dy \right]^{\frac{p}{p'}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.4 we get

$$|v(x) - \langle v \rangle_B|^p \lesssim r^{sp} \int_B \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dy,$$

and therefore

$$\int_B |v - \langle v \rangle_B|^p w(x) dx \lesssim r^{sp} \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)w(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy.$$

Since for this range of s we have $s^{-1}c_s \approx 1$, this finishes the proof. \square

We can use the decomposition technique of [DRS10] to extend our Poincaré inequality to *John domains*. A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called an α -John domain if there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such for all $x \in \Omega$ there exists a path γ from x to x_0 within Ω parameterized by its arclength such that the carrot $\text{car}(x, \alpha)$ is contained in Ω , where $\text{car}(x, \alpha) := \bigcup_{t \in [0, \text{length}(\gamma)]} B_{t/\alpha}(\gamma(t))$.

Corollary 2.11. *Let Ω be a bounded α -John domain, $1 < p < \infty$, $w \in A_p$. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} |v - \langle v \rangle_{\Omega}|^p w(x) dx \lesssim (1-s)r^{sp} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy,$$

where the implicit constant depends on $n, p, [w]_{A_p}$ and α . The mean value $\langle v \rangle_{\Omega}$ on the left hand side can be replaced by other mean values, see Remark 2.12.

Proof. It has been shown in [DRS10] that Ω can be decomposed into a locally finite, countable family of Whitney cubes Q_i such that

$$(2.11) \quad \|f - \langle f \rangle_{\Omega}\|_{L_w^p(\Omega)} \approx \left(\sum_i \|f - \langle f \rangle_{Q_i}\|_{L_w^p(Q_i)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Indeed, this follows from the decomposition theorem [DRS10, Theorem 4.2] together with the duality argument in the beginning of [DRS10, Theorem 5.1]. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |v - \langle v \rangle_{\Omega}|^p w(x) dx & \lesssim \int_{Q_i} |v - \langle v \rangle_{Q_i}|^p w(x) dx \\ & \lesssim (1-s)r^{sp} \sum_j \int_{Q_j} \int_{Q_j} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ & \lesssim (1-s)r^{sp} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

Remark 2.12. For $w \in A_p$ and $v \in L_w^p(B)$ there holds

$$\int_B |v - \langle v \rangle_B|^p w(x) dx \approx \inf_{v_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \int_B |v - v_0|^p w(x) dx \approx \int_B |v - \langle v \rangle_\psi|^p w(x) dx,$$

where either $\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(B)} \lesssim \frac{1}{|B|}$ and $\int_B \psi dx = 1$, or $\psi(x) = \frac{w(x)}{w(B)}$. This allows us to replace the mean values in Theorem 2.10, 2.19 and Corollary 2.11, 2.21 by other mean values.

We conclude this section by showing $W_w^{1,p}(B) \hookrightarrow W_w^{s,p}(B)$.

Lemma 2.13. Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a ball, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $w \in A_p$ and $v \in W_w^{1,p}(B)$. Then

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|B) \lesssim \int_B |\nabla v|^p w(x) dx,$$

where the implicit constant depends on n , p and $[w]_{A_p}$.

Proof. By [MZ97, Chapter 1] we have for almost $x, y \in B$

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \lesssim |x - y| (M(\mathbb{1}_B \nabla u)(x) + M(\mathbb{1}_B \nabla u)(y)),$$

where M is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. This enables us to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} c_s \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ \lesssim c_s \int_B \int_B \frac{M(\mathbb{1}_B \nabla u)(x)^p + M(\mathbb{1}_B \nabla u)(y)^p}{|x - y|^{sp-p}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ \lesssim c_s \int_B M(\mathbb{1}_B \nabla v(x))^p w(x) \int_B \frac{w(y)}{|x - y|^{sp-p} w(B_{x,y})} dy dx \\ \lesssim sr^{(1-s)p} \int_B |\nabla v(x)|^p w(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants depend on p , n and $[w]_{A_p}$. \square

Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.13 enable us to show embeddings on general bounded domains:

Corollary 2.14. If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open and bounded, then

$$W_{w,0}^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_w^p(\Omega).$$

Proof. Let B be a ball with $\Omega \subset B$. Using Lemma 2.13 and Theorem 2.10 we have

$$W_{w,0}^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_{w,0}^{1,p}(2B) \hookrightarrow W_{w,0}^{s,p}(2B) \hookrightarrow L_w^p(2B).$$

This finishes the proof. \square

2.6. Mollification. In this section we investigate mollification on $W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For this let $\rho \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a standard Lipschitz-mollifier in the sense that $\rho \geq 0$, $\text{supp } \rho \subset \overline{B_1(0)}$, $\|\rho\|_1 = 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ let $\rho_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-n} \rho(x/\varepsilon)$. Then $\|\rho_\varepsilon\|_\infty + \varepsilon \|\nabla \rho_\varepsilon\|_\infty \lesssim \varepsilon^{-n}$.

It is well known that if $w \in A_p$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $v \in L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then

$$(a) \|v * \rho_\varepsilon\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|v\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

(b) $v * \rho_\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ in $L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

This follows, e.g., from [Ste70, III.2 Theorem 2] and the boundedness of the maximal operator. The same conclusion holds if we replace $L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $W_w^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The goal of this section is to extend these properties to $W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Next, we will show stability of the energy under mollification.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$. Let ρ_ε be the standard Lipschitz mollifiers as before. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $v \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v * \rho_\varepsilon) \lesssim \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v)$$

where the hidden constant depends continuously on p and $[w]_{A_p}$.

Proof. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v * \rho_\varepsilon) \\ & \approx c_s \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq \varepsilon\}} \left(\frac{|(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - (v * \rho_\varepsilon)(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ (2.12) \quad & + c_s \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| > \varepsilon\}} \left(\frac{|(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - (v * \rho_\varepsilon)(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ & =: \text{I} + \text{II}. \end{aligned}$$

We start with the term I. Suppose that $|x-y| \leq \varepsilon$. Then using $\|\nabla \rho_\varepsilon\|_\infty \lesssim \varepsilon^{-n-1}$ and $w \in A_p$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - (v * \rho_\varepsilon)(y)| & \lesssim \frac{|x-y|}{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} |v(z) - \langle v \rangle_{B_\varepsilon(x)}| dz \\ & \lesssim \frac{|x-y|}{\varepsilon} \left(\int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} |v(z) - \langle v \rangle_{B_\varepsilon(x)}|^p \frac{w(z) dz}{w(B_{2\varepsilon}(x))} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

We plug this into I and apply Lemma 2.4 to the integration over y to get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} & \lesssim c_s \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq \varepsilon\}} \frac{|x-y|^{-sp+p}}{\varepsilon^p} \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} |v(z) - \langle v \rangle_{B_\varepsilon(x)}|^p \frac{w(z)w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{2\varepsilon}(x))w(B_{x,y})} dz dx dy \\ & \lesssim c_s \frac{\varepsilon^{-sp}}{p-sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} |v(z) - \langle v \rangle_{B_\varepsilon(x)}|^p \frac{w(z) dz}{w(B_{2\varepsilon}(x))} w(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

First assume that $s < \frac{2}{3}$. Then, by Jensen's inequality and $w(B_{z,\xi}) \lesssim w(B_\varepsilon(x))$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} & \lesssim c_s \frac{\varepsilon^{-sp}}{1-s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |v(z) - v(\xi)|^p \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))} d\xi dz \frac{w(x)}{w(B_{2\varepsilon}(x))} dx \\ & \lesssim c_s \frac{\varepsilon^{-sp}}{1-s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|z-\xi| \leq 4\varepsilon\}} |v(z) - v(\xi)|^p \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_{z,\xi})} d\xi dz \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(z)} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_{2\varepsilon}(x))} dx \\ & \lesssim c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|z-\xi| \leq 4\varepsilon\}} \frac{|v(z) - v(\xi)|^p}{|z-\xi|^{sp}} \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_{z,\xi})} d\xi dz. \end{aligned}$$

Now for the case $s \geq \frac{2}{3}$. Then we can use Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.8 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{I} &\lesssim \frac{c_s \varepsilon^{-\alpha p} (1-\alpha)^p}{(1-s)(s-\alpha)^{p-1}} \\
&\cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} \left[\int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} \left[\int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} \frac{|v(y)-v(\zeta)|^p}{|y-\zeta|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{y,\zeta})} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{d\zeta}{|y-\zeta|^{n-\alpha}} \right]^p w(z) dz \frac{w(x) dx}{w(B_{2\varepsilon}(x))} \\
&\lesssim \frac{c_s (1-\alpha)^p}{\alpha^p (1-s)(s-\alpha)^{p-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(x)} \frac{|v(y)-v(z)|^p}{|y-z|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{y,z})} dy w(z) dz \frac{w(x) dx}{w(B_{2\varepsilon}(x))} \\
&\lesssim \frac{c_s (1-\alpha)^p}{\alpha^p (1-s)(s-\alpha)^{p-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|y-z| \leq 4\varepsilon\}} \frac{|v(y)-v(z)|^p}{|y-z|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)w(z)}{w(B_{y,z})} dy dz.
\end{aligned}$$

By choosing $\alpha = 2s-1$ we have $1-\alpha \approx 1-s \approx s-a$, leading to $\frac{c_s(1-\alpha)^p}{\alpha^p(1-s)(s-\alpha)^{p-1}} \lesssim c_s$. This gives the needed estimate. It remains to estimate II. We define the ball

$$\tilde{B}_{x,y} := B_{\frac{|x-y|}{4}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} B_{x,y}.$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
|(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - (v * \rho_\varepsilon)(y)|^p &\lesssim |(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - \langle v \rangle_{\tilde{B}_{x,y}}|^p + |(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(y) - \langle v \rangle_{\tilde{B}_{x,y}}|^p \\
&=: \text{II}_1 + \text{II}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For II_1 , using $w \in A_p$, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{II}_1 &\lesssim \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_\varepsilon(x-z) (v(z) - \langle v \rangle_{\tilde{B}_{x,y}}) dz \right|^p \\
&\lesssim \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} |v(z) - \langle v \rangle_{\tilde{B}_{x,y}}|^p \frac{w(z)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))} dz \\
&\lesssim \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \int_{\tilde{B}_{x,y}} |v(z) - v(\xi)|^p \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))w(\tilde{B}_{x,y})} d\xi dz.
\end{aligned}$$

The same estimate holds for II_2 if we exchange the roles of x and y . Plugging this into the original term II and using symmetry in x and y we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{II} &\lesssim 2c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \int_{\tilde{B}_{x,y}} |v(z) - v(\xi)|^p \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))w(\tilde{B}_{x,y})} d\xi dz \\
&\cdot \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| > \varepsilon\}}}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, since $|x - y| > \varepsilon \geq |x - z|$, and by the definition of ξ we have $|z - \xi| \lesssim |x - y|$ and $w(B_{z,\xi}) \lesssim w(B_{x,y})$. We therefore conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} &\lesssim c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \int_{\tilde{B}_{x,y}} \frac{|v(z) - v(\xi)|^p}{|z - \xi|^{sp}} \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_{z,\xi})} d\xi dz \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y|>\varepsilon\}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))w(\tilde{B}_{x,y})} dx dy \\ &\lesssim c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|v(z) - v(\xi)|^p}{|z - \xi|^{sp}} \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_{z,\xi})} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{B_\varepsilon(z)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{4|x-\xi| \geq |x-y| \geq \frac{4}{3}|x-\xi|\}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))w(\tilde{B}_{x,y})} dy dx d\xi dz. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate both inner integrals. Using doubling properties of Muckenhoupt weights, it holds uniformly in z and ξ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_\varepsilon(z)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{4|x-\xi| \geq |x-y| \geq \frac{4}{3}|x-\xi|\}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))w(\tilde{B}_{x,y})} dy dx \\ &= \int_{B_\varepsilon(z)} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{4|x-\xi| \geq |x-y| \geq \frac{4}{3}|x-\xi|\}} \frac{w(y)}{w(\tilde{B}_{x,y})} dy dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{B_\varepsilon(z)} \frac{w(x)}{w(B_\varepsilon(z))} dx = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into the previous estimate leads to

$$\text{II} \lesssim c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|v(z) - v(\xi)|^p}{|z - \xi|^{sp}} \frac{w(z)w(\xi)}{w(B_{z,\xi})} d\xi dz.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Next we will establish a bound for the difference between a function and its mollification.

Lemma 2.16. *Let $0 < s < 1$ and $w \in A_p$. Let ρ_ε be the standard Lipschitz mollifiers as before. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $v \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v * \rho_\varepsilon - v) \lesssim (1-s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq 4\varepsilon\}} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy,$$

where the hidden constant depends continuously on p , n and $[w]_{A_p}$. In particular, $\rho_\varepsilon * v \rightarrow v$ in $W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

To make the estimate stable we would wish to produce a factor of $c_s = s(1-s)$ in front of the right hand side and thus our estimate seems to miss a factor of s . However, this factor can not be expected here, since the limiting case $s \searrow 0$ needs a tail term.

Proof of Lemma 2.16. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v * \rho_\varepsilon - v) \\
& \lesssim c_s \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq \varepsilon\}} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\
& \quad + c_s \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq \varepsilon\}} \left(\frac{|(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - (v * \rho_\varepsilon)(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\
& \quad + 2c_s \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| > \varepsilon\}} \left(\frac{|(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - v(x)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\
& =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned}$$

The term I_1 has already the correct form. For the term I_2 notice that it is identical with the term I appearing (2.12). The bound established in that proof also suffices here. It remains to bound I_3 . With Lemma 2.4 and the fact $w \in A_p$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 & \lesssim \frac{c_s \varepsilon^{-sp}}{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(v * \rho_\varepsilon)(x) - v(x)|^p w(x) dx \\
& = \frac{c_s \varepsilon^{-sp}}{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_\varepsilon(x-z)(v(z) - v(x)) dz \right|^p w(x) dx \\
& \lesssim \frac{c_s \varepsilon^{-sp}}{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-z| \leq \varepsilon\}} |v(z) - v(x)|^p \frac{w(z)}{w(B_\varepsilon(x))} dz w(x) dx \\
& \lesssim \frac{c_s}{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-z| \leq \varepsilon\}} \frac{|v(z) - v(x)|^p w(z)w(x)}{|x-z|^{sp} w(B_{x,z})} dz dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used $|x-z| \lesssim \varepsilon$ as well as $w(B_{x,z}) \leq w(B_\varepsilon(x))$.

Combining all estimates concludes the proof. \square

2.7. Density of smooth functions. In this section we will show the density of $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ in $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

Theorem 2.17. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, bounded with fat complement, i.e. there exists $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that for every $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $r > 0$ we have*

$$|B_r(x) \setminus \Omega| \geq \beta |B_r(x)|.$$

Then $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

Proof. We split the proof in two steps. In the first step we will first show that every $v \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ can be approximated by functions with compact support in Ω . Afterwards, we show in the second step that we can make these functions smooth.

Step 1: Fix $v \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. We define the set

$$A_\varepsilon := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \Omega^c) < \varepsilon\},$$

and $\Omega_\varepsilon := \Omega \setminus A_\varepsilon$. Let ρ_ε be the mollifier as in Section 2.6. Then $\psi_\varepsilon := \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\varepsilon/2} * \rho_{\varepsilon/4} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ fulfills

$$\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \leq \psi_\varepsilon \leq \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{\varepsilon/4}}, \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla \psi_\varepsilon| \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon}.$$

Let $g_\varepsilon := v - v\psi_\varepsilon$. Then $g_\varepsilon = 0$ on A_ε^c and

$$(2.13) \quad |g_\varepsilon(x) - g_\varepsilon(y)| \lesssim |v(x) - v(y)| + \min \left\{ \frac{|x-y|}{\varepsilon}, 1 \right\} (|v(x)| + |v(y)|).$$

We will later show that $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v - v\psi_\varepsilon) = \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(g_\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$. We estimate

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(g_\varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(g_\varepsilon|_{A_{2\varepsilon} \times A_{2\varepsilon}}) + 2\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(g_\varepsilon|_{A_{2\varepsilon}^c \times A_\varepsilon}) =: \text{I} + \text{II}.$$

Then, by (2.13) and Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &\lesssim \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|_{A_{2\varepsilon}}) + \int_{A_{2\varepsilon}} \int_{A_{2\varepsilon}} \left(\min \left\{ \frac{|x-y|^{1-s}}{\varepsilon^{1-s}}, \frac{\varepsilon^s}{|x-y|^s} \right\} \frac{|v(x)|^p}{\varepsilon^s} \right) \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|_{A_{2\varepsilon}}) + \int_{A_{2\varepsilon}} \frac{|v(x)|^p}{\varepsilon^{sp}} w(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We have, using $g_\varepsilon(y) = 0$ and $|x-y| \geq \varepsilon$ for $x \in A_\varepsilon$ and $y \in A_{2\varepsilon}^c$, and Lemma 2.4

$$\text{II} \lesssim \int_{(A_{2\varepsilon})^c} \int_{A_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{|v(x)|^p}{|x-y|^s} \right) \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy \lesssim \int_{A_\varepsilon} \frac{|v(x)|^p}{\varepsilon^{sp}} w(x) dx$$

Overall,

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v - v\psi_\varepsilon) \lesssim \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|_{A_{2\varepsilon}}) + \int_{A_{2\varepsilon}} \frac{|v|^p}{\varepsilon^{sp}} w dx.$$

We then find a family of balls B_j with midpoints $x_j \in \partial\Omega$ and radius 4ε that cover $A_{2\varepsilon}$, such that $\sum_j \mathbb{1}_{B_j} \leq c(n)$. By the fat complement condition on Ω we can use the Poincaré inequality Theorem 2.10 in B_j where we take the average $\langle u \rangle_{B_j \setminus \Omega} = 0$. We then have

$$\int_{A_{2\varepsilon}} \frac{|v|^p}{\varepsilon^{sp}} w dx \lesssim \sum_j \int_{B_j} \frac{|v|^p}{\varepsilon^{sp}} w dx \lesssim \sum_j \frac{1}{s} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|_{B_j}) \lesssim \frac{1}{s} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|_{\tilde{A}_{4\varepsilon}}),$$

where $\tilde{A}_{4\varepsilon} := \{x : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < 4\varepsilon\}$. Thus, by (2.14) we can conclude

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v - v\psi_\varepsilon) \lesssim \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|_{\tilde{A}_{4\varepsilon}}) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Step 2: By Step 1 we can find a function in $W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with support compactly contained in Ω , which is arbitrarily close to v (in $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$). Then, by Lemma 2.16 we can approximate this function by a $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ function. This finishes the proof. \square

2.8. Sobolev-Poincaré inequality. The following Lemma 2.18 is an improved version of Lemma 2.8.

Lemma 2.18. *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $w \in A_p$ and $\alpha_0 \in (0, n)$. Then there exists $q < p$ such that for every $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$, every ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \in L_w^p(B)$ we have*

$$\left(\frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B (\mathcal{I}_\alpha |f|)^{\frac{np}{n-\alpha \frac{p}{q}}} w dx \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha \frac{p}{q}}{np}} \lesssim [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{np-\alpha}{nq(p-1)}} \frac{r^\alpha}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |f|^p w dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The hidden constant depends only on n , p and α_0 .

Proof. The proof can be found in [ACS09, Theorem 1.1]. The additional restriction $1 < p < \frac{n}{\alpha}$ in their result is only used for the other parts of that theorem. We additionally keep track on the dependence of all constants on α and p by providing some detail on how the constants C_1, \dots, C_6 in [ACS09] depend on them: First we have $C_1 = 2^n/\alpha$, $C_2 = C(n, p)$, $C_3 = C(n, p, \alpha_0)$ and we can choose $C_4 = C(n, p, \alpha_0)/\alpha$. Then, replacing (7) in [ACS09] by [Gra14b, Theorem 9.1.9] combined with [Gra14a, Theorem 1.3.2], we get $C_5 = C_4(2 \cdot 24^n \cdot p')^{(n-\alpha)/n}$. Finally, we can put $C_6 = 2C_5$. This finishes the proof. \square

Theorem 2.19 (Sobolev-Poincaré). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$. For every ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $v \in W_w^{s,p}(B)$ it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |v - \langle v \rangle_B|^{\frac{np}{n-s}} w dx \right)^{\frac{n-s}{n}} \\ & \lesssim s^{1-2p} (1-s) \frac{r^{sp}}{w(B)} \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant depends on n , p and $[w]_{A_p}$. Note that the mean value $\langle v \rangle_B$ on the left hand side can be replaced by other mean values, see Remark 2.12.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in (0, s)$. We will choose the exact value of α later. For $z \in B$ we define the function f by

$$f(z) := \frac{1-\alpha}{(s-\alpha)^{1/p'}} \left(\int_B \frac{|v(z) - v(y)|^p}{|z-y|^{sp}} \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{z,y})} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.9 we have

$$|v(x) - \langle v \rangle_B| \lesssim r^{s-\alpha} \mathcal{I}_\alpha f(x).$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.18 implies that we can find a q independent of α such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |v - \langle v \rangle_B|^{\frac{np}{n-\alpha \frac{p}{q}}} w dx \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha \frac{p}{q}}{n}} \\ (2.15) \quad & \lesssim \frac{r^{sp}}{\alpha^p} \frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B f^p w dx \\ & = \frac{(1-\alpha)^p}{\alpha^p (s-\alpha)^{p-1}} \frac{r^{sp}}{w(B)} \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{w(x)w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

We could now choose α to be any value in $[\frac{q}{p}s, s)$ and (2.15) would imply the claimed inequality except for the precise dependence of the constant on s . To achieve this we have to choose $\alpha = \alpha(s) \in [\frac{q}{p}s, s)$ in such a way that

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{(1-\alpha)^p}{\alpha^p(s-\alpha)^{p-1}} \leq c(1-s)s^{1-2p},$$

for some constant c independent of s and α . We distinguish two cases: If $s \leq (2 - \frac{q}{p})^{-1}$, then we set $\alpha = \frac{q}{p}s$. This yields $(1-s) \approx (1-\alpha) \approx 1$ and $\alpha \approx s - \alpha \approx s$. Therefore (2.16) holds. If $s > (2 - \frac{q}{p})^{-1}$, then we set $\alpha = 2s - 1$. This gives us $1 - \alpha \approx 1 - s \approx s - \alpha$ and $\alpha \approx s \approx 1$. Thus (2.16) holds in this case, too. \square

Remark 2.20. *For every fixed weight w , it is possible to improve the exponent $np/(n-s)$ on the left hand side of the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality in Theorem 2.19 slightly. This can be done choosing the parameter α in the proof above to be closer to s than to $\frac{q}{p}s$. However, the exponent $np/(n-s)$ is optimal in the sense that it is the largest one that works for all $w \in A_p$.*

The Sobolev-Poincaré inequality extends to bounded John domains. This can be shown exactly as in Corollary 2.11.

Corollary 2.21. *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $w \in A_p$ and Ω be a bounded α -John domain. Then for every $v \in W_w^{s,p}(B)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{w(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} |v - \langle v \rangle_{\Omega}|^{\frac{np}{n-s}} w \, dx \right)^{\frac{n-s}{n}} \\ & \lesssim s^{1-2p} (1-s) \frac{r^{sp}}{w(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p w(x)w(y)}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{1}{w(B_{x,y})} \, dx \, dy, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant depends on n , p , $[w]_{A_p}$ and α . Note that the mean value $\langle v \rangle_B$ on the left hand side can be replaced by other mean values, see Remark 2.12.

2.9. Compact embedding. In this section we show that $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ embeds compactly into $L_w^p(\Omega)$. In the non fractional case, it is well known that for $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$

$$\|v - v * \rho_{\varepsilon}\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \varepsilon \|\nabla v\|_{L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

This follows from the pointwise estimate $|v - v * \rho_{\varepsilon}| \lesssim \varepsilon M(\nabla v)$ and the boundedness of the maximal operator. The details can be found, e.g., in [MZ97, Lemma 1.50, Theorem 1.32]. The following lemma is a fractional analog of this.

Lemma 2.22. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $w \in A_p$ and $v \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Then we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v - v * \rho_{\varepsilon}|^p w(x) \, dx \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{sp}}{s} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v),$$

where the implicit constant depends continuously on n , p and $[w]_{A_p}$.

Proof. Let B_j be a locally finite family of balls with radius ε that cover \mathbb{R}^n . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v - v * \rho_\varepsilon|^p w \, dx &\lesssim \sum_j \int_{B_j} |v - v * \rho_\varepsilon|^p w \, dx \\
&\lesssim \sum_j \int_{B_j} |v - \langle v \rangle_{2B_j}|^p w \, dx + \sum_j \int_{B_j} |(v - \langle v \rangle_{2B_j}) * \rho_\varepsilon|^p w \, dx \\
&\lesssim \sum_j \int_{2B_j} |v - \langle v \rangle_{2B_j}|^p w \, dx \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{s} \sum_j \varepsilon^{sp} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v|_{2B_j}) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{sp}}{s} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we used the boundedness of the convolution in L_w^p and in the fourth step we used Poincaré inequality. This finishes the proof. \square

We are now ready to show the compactness result.

Theorem 2.23. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $w \in A_p$. Then the embedding $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_w^p(\Omega)$ is compact.*

Proof. Let $v_m \rightharpoonup v$ in $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. We have to show that $v_m \rightarrow v$ in $L_w^p(\Omega)$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we have by Lemma 2.22

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} |v_m - v|^p w \, dx &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} |v_m - v_m * \rho_\varepsilon|^p w \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |(v_m - v) * \rho_\varepsilon|^p w \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |v - v * \rho_\varepsilon|^p w \, dx \\
&\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{sp}}{s} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v_m) + \int_{\Omega} |(v_m - v) * \rho_\varepsilon|^p w \, dx + \frac{\varepsilon^{sp}}{s} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v).
\end{aligned}$$

By the embedding $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_w^p(\Omega)$ (Corollary 2.14) we have $v_m \rightharpoonup v$ in $L_w^p(\Omega)$.

This implies that $|(v_m - v) * \rho_\varepsilon| \xrightarrow{m} 0$ everywhere. Note that

$$|(v_m - v) * \rho_\varepsilon(x)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-n} \sup_m \|v_m - v\|_{L_w^p(\Omega)} \|\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}}\|_{L_{w^{1-p}}^{p'}} < \infty,$$

where $\tilde{\Omega} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d(x, \Omega) \leq \varepsilon\}$. Thus, by dominated convergence, we have

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |v_m - v|^p w \, dx \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{sp}}{s} \left(\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v_m) + \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) \right).$$

Since $v_m \rightharpoonup v$ in $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ we have $\sup_m \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v_m) < \infty$. Thus, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have shown that $v_m \rightarrow v$ in $L_w^p(\Omega)$. \square

3. REGULARITY THEORY FOR DEGENERATE NONLOCAL PROBLEMS

In this section we study minimizers of the energy (2.1) with degenerate weights. We define the concept of weak (sub-)solutions and show local boundedness, Hölder continuity, and a nonlocal Harnack inequality.

For this section we fix $0 < s_0 \leq s < 1$, $p \in (1, \infty)$ and a weight $w \in A_p$.

3.1. Degenerate nonlocal problems. We now define nonlocal problems with degenerate weights. Recall from (2.1) that for $v \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we set

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v) = c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \right)^p k(x, y) dx dy,$$

where k satisfies (2.1b). We note that $k(x, y) = 0$ when $w(x) = 0$ or $w(y) = 0$, hence the coefficient function k can be degenerate. A typical example of k can be seen in Example 3.3 below.

We say that $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ minimizes $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s$ on Ω if $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(u) \leq \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v)$ for all $v \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $u = v$ in Ω^c .

Note that even though u minimizes $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s$ only on Ω , the nonlocal nature of our model makes it necessary that u is defined on all of \mathbb{R}^n . It is possible to change the domains of integration in (2.1) from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ to the smaller set $(\Omega^c \times \Omega^c)^c$. We will expand further on this in Remark 3.7.

The following theorem asserts that for given complement data g a unique minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s$ exists.

Theorem 3.1 (Existence of minimizer). *Let $g \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. There exists a unique minimizer u of $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s$ on Ω with complement data g , i.e. it is the minimizer among all $v \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v = g$ in Ω^c .*

Proof. Set $M := \min_{v \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v + g)$. Note that $M > 0$ and pick a sequence $v_k \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v_k + g) \searrow M$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since

$$|v_k|_{W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \left(\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v_k + g) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + |g|_{W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

we have that v_k is bounded in $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. By Lemma 2.1 we can pick a subsequence that converges weakly to some $v^* \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. By the compact embedding (Lemma 2.23) we can pick a further subsequence which converges to v^* in $L_w^p(\Omega)$. From this we can extract a final subsequence that converges to v^* pointwise almost everywhere. Let us thus assume without loss of generality that $v_k \rightarrow v^*$ pointwise almost everywhere. Using Fatou's Lemma, this implies

$$M \leq \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v^* + g) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(v_k + g) = M.$$

Thus $u := v^* + g$ is a minimizer. The uniqueness follows by the strict convexity from Lemma 2.1. \square

We notice that if $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the unique minimizer from Theorem 3.1, then it satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x, y) \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) (\eta(x) - \eta(y))}{|x - y|^{sp}} dx dy = 0$$

for every $\eta \in W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$. This follows directly from the equation $\left. \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s(u + t\eta) \right|_{t=0} = 0$. Moreover, if $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies (3.1), then it is the minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s$ with respect to the complement data g .

Note that by symmetry, (3.1) is equivalent to the equation

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y))}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{k(x, y)}{w(x)} dy \right) \eta(x) w(x) dx = 0,$$

if the inner integral is finite for almost every $x \in \Omega$. Then the last integral implies that for almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{p,w}^s u(x) := c_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) k(x,y)}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{1}{w(x)} dy = 0.$$

Note that $\lambda \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \leq \frac{k(x,y)}{w(x)} \leq \Lambda \frac{w(y)}{w(B_{x,y})}$. Therefore, (3.1) can be regarded as a weak form of the following degenerate nonlocal integro-differential equation:

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{p,w}^s u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Definition 3.2. We say that $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a weak sub-(super-)solution to (3.2) if

$$(3.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x,y) \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) (\eta(x) - \eta(y))}{|x-y|^{sp}} dx dy \leq (\geq) 0$$

for every $\eta \in W_w^{s,p}(\Omega)$ with $\eta \geq 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . If u is both a weak subsolution and a weak supersolution, the u is called a weak solution.

Note that if u is a weak solution to (3.2), then it satisfies (3.1).

Example 3.3. Let $w(z) = |z|^\gamma$ with $\gamma \in (-n, n(p-1))$. Then $w \in A_p$. We claim that

$$(3.4) \quad k(x,y) = \frac{|x|^\gamma |y|^\gamma}{(|x| + |y|)^\gamma} |x-y|^{-n}$$

with $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the assumption (2.1b). To verify this, we have to show that

$$(3.5) \quad w(B_{x,y}) \approx (|x| + |y|)^\gamma |x-y|^n.$$

To prove this we distinguish two cases. Firstly, suppose that $0 \notin 2B_{x,y}$. Then $\frac{1}{6}(|x| + |y|) \leq |z| \leq |x| + |y|$ for all $z \in B_{x,y}$ and therefore

$$w(B_{x,y}) \approx \int_{B_{x,y}} (|x| + |y|)^\gamma dz \approx (|x| + |y|)^\gamma |x-y|^n.$$

This proves (3.5) for $0 \notin 2B_{x,y}$. Secondly, suppose that $0 \in 2B_{x,y}$. Then $|x-y| \leq |x| + |y| \leq 3|x-y|$. Using that w is doubling, $B_{x,y} \subset 3B_{|x-y|}(0)$ and $B_{|x-y|}(0) \subset 4B_{x,y}$ we calculate

$$w(B_{x,y}) \approx \int_{B_{|x-y|}(0)} |z|^\gamma dz \approx |x-y|^{n+\gamma} \approx (|x| + |y|)^\gamma |x-y|^n.$$

This proves (3.5) for $0 \in 2B_{x,y}$. Overall, we have proved that w and k satisfy (2.1b).

For simplicity, we denote

$$d\mu(x) = w(x) dx, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_U f d\mu = \frac{1}{\mu(U)} \int_U f d\mu,$$

and define the nonlocal tail term with respect to the measure μ by

$$(3.6) \quad \text{Tail}(f; \rho) = \text{Tail}(f; x_0, \rho) := \left((1-s)\rho^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\rho(x_0)} \frac{|f(x)|^{p-1}}{|x-x_0|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,x_0})} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

Note that if $f \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ then $\text{Tail}(f; x_0, \rho) < \infty$ at every x_0 and ρ such that $B_\rho(x_0) \subset \Omega$. Moreover, if $s \nearrow 1$ then $\text{Tail}(f; x_0, \rho)$ vanishes.

We further recall the following density property of A_p weights (see [Gra14a, Theorem 7.2.7]): For every ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and every measurable $D \subset B$,

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{[w]_p} \left(\frac{|D|}{|B|} \right)^p \leq \frac{w(D)}{w(B)} \leq c \left(\frac{|D|}{|B|} \right)^\sigma$$

for some $c, \sigma > 0$ depending on p and $[w]_{A_p}$.

Let us state three fundamental regularity results for the weak solution to (3.2). They are the main results of the regularity part of this paper.

Theorem 3.4 (Local boundedness). *Let $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak subsolution to (3.2). For every $\delta > 0$ and $B_r = B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$, there holds*

$$(3.8) \quad \text{ess sup}_{B_{r/2}} u \leq c_b \delta^{-\frac{p-1}{p} \frac{n}{s_0}} \left(\int_{B_r} u_+^p d\mu \right)^{1/p} + \delta \text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, r/2)$$

for some $c_b = c_b(n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0, [w]_{A_p}) > 0$. Moreover, if u is a weak solution to (3.2), then we have

$$(3.9) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2})} \leq c_b \delta^{-\frac{p-1}{p} \frac{n}{s_0}} \left(\int_{B_r} |u|^p d\mu \right)^{1/p} + \delta \text{Tail}(u; x_0, r/2),$$

and thus $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$.

Theorem 3.5 (Hölder continuity). *Let $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution to (3.2). Then $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^\alpha(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and for every $B_r = B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$, there holds*

$$[u]_{C^\alpha(B_{r/2})} \leq c r^{-\alpha} \left\{ \left(\int_{B_r} |u|^p d\mu \right)^{1/p} + \text{Tail}(u; x_0, r/2) \right\},$$

where $c = c(n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0, [w]_{A_p}) > 0$.

Theorem 3.6 (Harnack's inequality). *Let $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution to (3.2). If $u \geq 0$ in some $B_{2r} = B_{2r}(x_0) \Subset \Omega$, then there holds*

$$(3.10) \quad \sup_{B_r} u \leq c \left(\inf_{B_r} u + \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, r) \right)$$

for some $c = c(n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0, [w]_{A_p}) > 0$.

In the following subsections, we will prove the three theorems above.

Remark 3.7. *In Theorem 3.4, Theorem 3.5, and Theorem 3.6 the assumption $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ can be weakened. It is not necessary to assume any regularity on the complement data $g = u|_{\Omega^c}$ other than some weighted integrability. Instead, it is sufficient to assume that $\mathcal{J}_{p,w}^s((\Omega^c \times \Omega^c)^c) < \infty$, which also implies that $\text{Tail}(u; x_0, r) < \infty$ for every $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$. This approach has been introduced in [SV12; FKV15]. It is also possible to give an intrinsic definition of the complement data g via nonlocal trace spaces defined only on Ω^c . For this approach see [GH24; GK23]. Our results remain valid with all those adaptations.*

3.2. Local boundedness. In this section we prove Theorem 3.4. We start with a Caccioppoli type estimate.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a weak subsolution to (3.2). Then for any $k \in \mathbb{R}$, $B_r \equiv B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$ and $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_r)$ with $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, we have*

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \right)^p \min\{\varphi(x)^p, \varphi(y)^p\} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\ & \leq c \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \left(\frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \max\{v(x), v(y)\} \right)^p \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\ & \quad + c \left(\int_{B_r} v \varphi^p d\mu \right) \left(\sup_{y \in \text{supp } \varphi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r} \frac{v(x)^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $v := (u - k)_+$ and $c > 0$ depends on λ , Λ and p .

Moreover, if $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a weak supersolution to (3.2), then the same estimate holds for $v = (u - k)_-$.

Proposition 3.8 can be shown almost exactly as in the nondegenerate case, i.e., $w \equiv 1$, where the proof can be found in [DKP16, Theorem 1.4]. The proof utilizes the test function $\varphi^p(u - k)_+$, which is in $W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ due to Poincaré's inequality Theorem 2.10.

Later on we need the following iteration lemma, see e.g. [Giu03, Lemma 7.1].

Lemma 3.9. *Let $(a_j)_{j \geq 0}$ be a sequence of nonnegative real numbers satisfying $a_{j+1} \leq b_1 b_2^j a_j^{1+\beta}$ for all $j \geq 0$, for some $b_1, \beta > 0$ and $b_2 > 1$. If $a_0 \leq b_1^{-1/\beta} b_2^{-1/\beta^2}$, then $a_j \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.*

We are now ready to prove the local boundedness result Theorem 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Suppose that u is a weak subsolution. Fix $B_r = B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$ and let $k > 0$ be a constant to be determined in the last part of the proof. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, write

$$\begin{aligned} r_j &= (1 + 2^{-j}) \frac{r}{2}, \quad \tilde{r}_j = \frac{r_j + r_{j+1}}{2}, \quad B_j = B_{r_j}(x_0), \quad \tilde{B}_j = B_{\tilde{r}_j}(x_0), \\ k_j &= (1 - 2^{-j})k, \quad \tilde{k}_j = \frac{k_j + k_{j+1}}{2}, \quad v_j = (u - k_j)_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}_j = (u - \tilde{k}_j)_+. \end{aligned}$$

Note from the above setting that

$$(3.12) \quad B_{j+1} \subset \tilde{B}_j \subset B_j, \quad k_j \leq \tilde{k}_j \leq k_{j+1} \quad \text{and} \quad v_{j+1} \leq \tilde{v}_j \leq v_j.$$

We take any cut-off functions $\varphi_j \in C_c^\infty(\tilde{B}_j)$ such that $0 \leq \varphi_j \leq 1$, $\varphi_j \equiv 1$ in B_{j+1} and $|\nabla \varphi_j| \lesssim 2^j/r$. Putting φ_j into the Caccioppoli inequality (3.11) with $v = \tilde{v}_j$

and dividing the inequality by $w(B_{j+1})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.13) \quad & \int_{B_{j+1}} \int_{B_{j+1}} \left(\frac{|\tilde{v}_j(x) - \tilde{v}_j(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
& \leq c \int_{\tilde{B}_j} \int_{\tilde{B}_j} \left(\frac{|\varphi_j(x) - \varphi_j(y)|}{|x-y|^s} \max\{\tilde{v}_j(x), \tilde{v}_j(y)\} \right)^p \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
& \quad + c \left(\int_{B_j} \tilde{v}_j \varphi_j^p d\mu \right) \left(\sup_{y \in \text{supp } \varphi_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_j} \frac{\tilde{v}_j(x)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} \right) \\
& =: cI_1 + c(I_2)(I_3).
\end{aligned}$$

We first look at I_1 . Since $|\varphi_j(x) - \varphi_j(y)| \leq \|\nabla \varphi_j\|_{L^\infty} |x-y| \leq c2^j |x-y|/r$, and with Lemma 2.4, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.14) \quad & I_1 \leq c2^{pj} \int_{B_j} \int_{B_j} \max\{\tilde{v}_j(x), \tilde{v}_j(y)\}^p \frac{|x-y|^{(1-s)p}}{r^p} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
& \lesssim 2^{pj} \int_{B_j} \tilde{v}_j(x)^p \left[\int_{B_{2r}(x)} \frac{|x-y|^{(1-s)p}}{r^p} \frac{d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \right] d\mu(x) \\
& \lesssim \frac{2^{pj}}{1-s} \int_{B_j} \left(\frac{\tilde{v}_j}{r^s} \right)^p d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

For I_2 , since $v_j \geq \tilde{k}_j - k_j$ in $\{u \geq \tilde{k}_j\}$, we have that $v_j^p \geq \tilde{v}_j (\tilde{k}_j - k_j)^{p-1}$ and hence

$$(3.15) \quad I_2 \leq \frac{1}{(\tilde{k}_j - k_j)^{p-1}} \int_{B_j} v_j^p d\mu = \frac{2^{(p-1)(j+2)}}{k^{p-1}} \int_{B_j} v_j^p d\mu.$$

In order to estimate I_3 , we notice that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_j$ and $y \in \tilde{B}_j$, $B_{x,y} \cup B_{x,x_0} \subset B_{3|x-x_0|}(x_0)$, $\frac{|x-x_0|}{|x-y|} \leq \frac{|x-y|+|y-x_0|}{|x-y|} \leq 1 + \frac{\tilde{r}_j}{r_j - \tilde{r}_j} \leq 2^{j+4}$. Hence by (3.7),

$$\frac{w(B_{3|x-x_0|}(x_0))}{w(B_{x,y})} \leq c \left(\frac{|x-x_0|}{|x-y|} \right)^{np} \leq c2^{npj} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{w(B_{x,x_0})}{w(B_{3|x-x_0|}(x_0))} \leq c,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{w(B_{x,y})} \leq c2^{npj} \frac{1}{w(B_{x,x_0})}.$$

This and (3.12) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.16) \quad & I_3 \leq c2^{(n+s)pj} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r/2}} \frac{v_0(x)^{p-1}}{|x-x_0|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,x_0})} \\
& \leq \frac{c2^{(n+1)pj}}{(1-s)r^{sp}} \text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, r/2)^{p-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let now $\kappa := \frac{n}{n-s} \in (1, 2)$. Combining (3.13), (3.14), (3.15) and (3.16), using the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality in Theorem 2.19, and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.17) \quad & \left(\int_{B_{j+1}} \tilde{v}_j^{p\kappa} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \lesssim \left(\int_{B_{j+1}} |\tilde{v}_j - \langle \tilde{v}_j \rangle_{w, B_{j+1}}|^{p\kappa} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} + \left(\int_{B_{j+1}} \tilde{v}_j d\mu \right)^p \\
& \lesssim (1-s)r^{sp} \int_{B_{j+1}} \int_{B_{j+1}} \frac{|\tilde{v}_j(x) - \tilde{v}_j(y)|^p d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{|x-y|^{sp} w(B_{x,y})} + \int_{B_{j+1}} \tilde{v}_j^p d\mu \\
& \lesssim 2^{2npj} \left(1 + \frac{\text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, r/2)^{p-1}}{k^{p-1}} \right) \int_{\tilde{B}_j} v_j^p d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$v_{j+1}(x) > 0 \implies \tilde{v}_j(x) > k_{j+1} - \tilde{k}_j = 2^{-j-2}k.$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.18) \quad & \left(\int_{B_{j+1}} v_{j+1}^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \leq \left(\int_{B_{j+1}} \tilde{v}_j^p \left(\tilde{v}_j \frac{2^{j+2}}{k} \right)^{p(\kappa-1)} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \\
& = k^{-p \frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa}} 2^{(j+2)p \frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa}} \left(\int_{B_{j+1}} \tilde{v}_j^{p\kappa} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now define the quantity we want to iterate by

$$a_j := k^{-p} \int_{B_j} v_j^p d\mu.$$

With this, our findings so far can be summarized by combining (3.17) and (3.18) to get

$$a_{j+1} \leq c 2^{4npj} \left(1 + \frac{\text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, r/2)^{p-1}}{k^{p-1}} \right)^\kappa a_j^\kappa.$$

If for some $\delta > 0$ we have $k \geq \delta \text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, r/2)$, then this turns into

$$(3.19) \quad a_{j+1} \leq c_1 \delta^{-\kappa(p-1)} 2^{4npj} a_j^\kappa,$$

for some $c_1 > 0$ depending on n, p, λ, Λ and $[w]_{A_p}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.9, if

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{k^p} \int_{B_r} u_+^p d\mu \leq c_1^{-\frac{1}{\kappa-1}} \delta^{(p-1)\frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}} 2^{\frac{-4np}{(\kappa-1)^2}},$$

i.e.,

$$k^p \geq c_1^{\frac{1}{\kappa-1}} \delta^{-(p-1)\frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}} 2^{\frac{4np}{(\kappa-1)^2}} \int_{B_r} u_+^p d\mu,$$

then we obtain $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = 0$, which implies that

$$u \leq k \quad \text{a.e. in } B_{r/2}.$$

Finally, choosing

$$k := c_1^{\frac{1}{p(\kappa-1)}} \delta^{-\frac{p-1}{p} \frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}} 2^{\frac{4n}{(\kappa-1)^2}} \left(\int_{B_r} u_+^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \delta \text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, r/2),$$

we have the estimate (3.8), which also implies (3.9). \square

3.3. Hölder continuity. We start with a logarithmic estimate. This will be used in the density improvement result in Lemma 3.11.

Proposition 3.10 (Logarithmic estimate). *Let $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak supersolution to (3.2) with $u \geq 0$ in $B_R \equiv B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega$. Then for any $d > 0$ and $0 < r \leq \frac{R}{2}$, we have*

$$(3.20) \quad r^{sp} \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \frac{|\log(u(x) + d) - \log(u(y) + d)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\ \leq c \left[\frac{1}{s(1-s)} + d^{1-p} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{sp} \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, R)^{p-1} \right]$$

for some $c = c(n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, [w]_{A_p}) > 0$.

Proof. Write $v(x) := u(x) + d$ and fix a cut-off function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{3r/2})$ such that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, $|\nabla \varphi| \leq 4/r$ and $\varphi \equiv 1$ in B_r . Since $\eta := v^{-(p-1)} \varphi^p$ is nonnegative in Ω and belongs to $W_{w,0}^{s,p}(\Omega)$, we can take it as a test function to find

$$(3.21) \quad 0 \leq \int_{B_{2r}} \int_{B_{2r}} k(x, y) \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2} (v(x) - v(y)) (\eta(x) - \eta(y))}{|x - y|^{sp}} dx dy \\ + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2r}} \int_{B_{2r}} k(x, y) \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) \eta(x)}{|x - y|^{sp}} dx dy \\ =: I_1 + 2I_2.$$

We first consider I_1 . Set for $x, y \in B_{2r}$,

$$F(x, y) := |v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2} (v(x) - v(y)) (v(x)^{-(p-1)} \varphi(x)^p - v(y)^{-(p-1)} \varphi(y)^p).$$

We start by establishing a pointwise estimate for $F(x, y)$. For this we distinguish the following two cases: $v(y) \leq v(x) \leq 2v(y)$ (Case 1) and $2v(y) < v(x)$ (Case 2). By symmetry, we have $F(x, y) = F(y, x)$ and it is thus sufficient to consider these two cases.

Case 1 $v(y) \leq v(x) \leq 2v(y)$: We first assume $\varphi(x) \geq \varphi(y)$. Using the mean value theorem and Young's inequality, we get

$$(3.22) \quad F(x, y) = (v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} \left(v(x)^{-(p-1)} - v(y)^{-(p-1)} \right) \varphi(x)^p \\ + (v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} v(y)^{-(p-1)} (\varphi(x)^p - \varphi(y)^p) \\ \leq -(p-1)(v(x) - v(y))^p (2v(y))^{-p} \varphi(x)^p \\ + p(v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} v(y)^{-(p-1)} \varphi(x)^{p-1} (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) \\ \leq -\frac{p-1}{2^{p+1}} \left(\frac{v(x) - v(y)}{v(y)} \right)^p \varphi(x)^p + c_p (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))^p,$$

for some $c_p > 0$ depending on p . We next assume $\varphi(x) < \varphi(y)$. Again using the mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y) &\leq (v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} (v(x)^{-(p-1)} - v(y)^{-(p-1)}) \varphi(y)^p \\ &\leq -(p-1) \left(\frac{v(x) - v(y)}{v(y)} \right)^p \varphi(x)^p. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\log t \leq t - 1$ and $|\nabla\varphi| \leq 4/r$, we have that for every $x, y \in B_{2r}$ with $v(y) \leq v(x) \leq 2v(y)$,

$$(3.23) \quad F(x, y) \leq -\tilde{c}[(\log v(x) - \log v(y)) \min\{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\}]^p + c \left(\frac{|x - y|}{r} \right)^p$$

for some small $\tilde{c} > 0$ and large $c > 0$ depending on p .

Case 2 $2v(y) < v(x)$: We recall the following elementary inequality (see [DKP16, Lemma 3.1]): For any $p \geq 1$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$|a|^p \leq (1 + c_p \varepsilon) |b|^p + (1 + c_p \varepsilon) \varepsilon^{1-p} |a - b|^p,$$

where $c_p > 0$ depends only on N and p . Using this inequality together with $2v(y) < v(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y) &= (v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} \left(v(x)^{-(p-1)} - v(y)^{-(p-1)} \right) \varphi(y)^p \\ &\quad + (v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} v(x)^{-(p-1)} (\varphi(x)^p - \varphi(y)^p) \\ &\leq - \left(1 - 2^{-(p-1)} \right) (v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} v(y)^{-(p-1)} \varphi(y)^p \\ &\quad + c(v(x) - v(y))^{p-1} v(x)^{-(p-1)} (\varepsilon \varphi(y)^p + \varepsilon^{1-p} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|^p) \\ &\leq \left(-1 + 2^{-(p-1)} + c\varepsilon \right) \left(\frac{v(x) - v(y)}{v(y)} \right)^{p-1} \varphi(y)^p + c\varepsilon^{1-p} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$F(x, y) \leq -\tilde{c} \left(\frac{v(x) - v(y)}{v(y)} \right)^{p-1} \varphi(y)^p + c |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|^p.$$

Therefore, since

$$\log v(x) - \log v(y) \leq \log \left(\frac{2(v(x) - v(y))}{v(y)} \right) \leq \frac{p}{p-1} \left(\frac{2(v(x) - v(y))}{v(y)} \right)^{(p-1)/p},$$

where we have used the facts that $2v(y) < v(x)$ and $\log t < \frac{p}{p-1} t^{(p-1)/p}$ for $t > 0$, and since $|\nabla\varphi| \leq 4/r$, we also obtain (3.23) for $x, y \in B_{2r}$ with $2v(y) < v(x)$. Thus the pointwise estimate (3.23) holds for all $x, y \in B_{2r}$.

We are now ready to estimate I_1 in (3.21). Using (3.23) and the facts that $\varphi \equiv 1$ in B_r and $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ in B_{2r} , and applying (2.8) and (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.24) \quad I_1 &\leq -\tilde{c} \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \frac{|\log v(x) - \log v(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
&\quad + cr^{-p} \int_{B_{2r}} \int_{B_{4r}(x)} |x-y|^{(1-s)p} \frac{d\mu(y) d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
&\leq -\tilde{c} \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \frac{|\log v(x) - \log v(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} + c \frac{w(B_r)}{(1-s)r^{sp}} \\
&\leq -\tilde{c} \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \frac{|\log v(x) - \log v(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} + c \frac{w(B_r)}{(1-s)r^{sp}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c} > 0$ depends on p and λ and $c > 0$ depends on n, p, Λ and $[w]_{A_p}$.

We next estimate I_2 . Observe that for $x \in B_R$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y)) \leq ((u(x) - u(y))_+)^{p-1} \leq c(u(x)^{p-1} + u_-(y)^{p-1}).$$

Using this and the fact that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_{3r/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq c \int_{B_R \setminus B_{2r}} \int_{B_{3r/2}} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))_+^{p-1} v(x)^{-(p-1)}}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
&\quad + c \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} \int_{B_{3r/2}} \frac{(u(x)^{p-1} + u_-(y)^{p-1}) v(x)^{1-p}}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
&\leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2r}} \int_{B_{3r/2}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} + cd^{1-p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} \int_{B_{3r/2}} \frac{u_-(y)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\
&=: cI_{2,1} + cd^{1-p}I_{2,2},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we used the facts that $u \geq 0$ and $v = u + d \geq d$ in B_R , which implies $(u(x) - u(y))_+ \leq u(x) \leq v(x)$ for $x, y \in B_R$. By (2.9) and (2.5) we have

$$I_{2,1} \leq c \int_{B_{3r/2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r/2}(x)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \right) d\mu(x) \leq \frac{c}{sr^{sp}} w(B_{3r/2}) \leq \frac{c}{sr^{sp}} w(B_r).$$

Next we observe that for any $x \in B_{3r/2} = B_{3r/2}(x_0)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2r}(x_0)$,

$$B_{x,y} \cup B_{y,x_0} \subset B_{3|y-x_0|}(x_0)$$

and

$$\frac{|y-x_0|}{|x-y|} \leq 1 + \frac{|x-x_0|}{|x-y|} \leq 1 + \frac{3r/2}{2r - (3r/2)} = 4.$$

Hence by (3.7)

$$\frac{w(B_{3|y-x_0|}(x_0))}{w(B_{x,y})} \leq c \left(\frac{|y-x_0|}{|x-y|} \right)^{np} \lesssim 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{w(B_{y,x_0})}{w(B_{3|y-x_0|}(x_0))} \lesssim 1,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{w(B_{x,y})} \leq \frac{c}{w(B_{y,x_0})}.$$

This enables us to estimate

$$I_{2,2} \leq cw(B_r)R^{-sp}\text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, R)^{p-1}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$I_2 \leq cw(B_r)r^{-sp} \left[\frac{1}{s} + d^{1-p} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{sp} \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, R)^{p-1} \right].$$

Inserting this estimate and (3.24) into (3.21), we get (3.20). \square

We next show a density improvement result.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $0 < s_0 \leq s < 1$, $\nu > 0$, $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak supersolution to (3.2) which is nonnegative in $B_R = B_R(x_0) \Subset \Omega$. Let $r \leq R \leq 4r$. Then for every $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, there exists a constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ depending only on $n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0, [w]_{A_p}$ and σ such that if*

$$(3.25) \quad \frac{w(\{x \in B_{2r} : u(x) \geq \nu\})}{w(B_{2r})} \geq \sigma$$

and

$$(3.26) \quad d := \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{\frac{sp}{p-1}} \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, R) \leq \varepsilon\nu,$$

then

$$(3.27) \quad \inf_{B_r} u \geq \varepsilon\nu.$$

Proof. Step 1. We first prove

$$(3.28) \quad \frac{w(\{x \in B_{2r} : u(x) \leq 2\varepsilon\nu\})}{w(B_{2r})} \leq \frac{\bar{c}}{\sigma \log(1/3\varepsilon)}$$

holds for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, where $\bar{c} \equiv \bar{c}(n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0, [w]_{A_p}) > 0$. For $x \in B_{2r}$ set

$$h(x) := \min \left\{ \left[\log \left(\frac{\nu + d}{u(x) + d} \right) \right]_+, \log \left(\frac{1}{3\varepsilon} \right) \right\}.$$

Note that $h(x) = 0$ if and only if $u(x) \geq \nu$. Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} |h(x) - h(y)| &\leq \left| \log \left(\frac{\nu + d}{u(x) + d} \right) - \log \left(\frac{\nu + d}{u(y) + d} \right) \right| \\ &= |\log(u(x) + d) - \log(u(y) + d)|. \end{aligned}$$

By the Poincaré inequality Theorem 2.10 and Proposition 3.10 with d as in (3.26) we have

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{2r}} |h - \langle h \rangle_{w, B_{2r}}|^p d\mu \\ &\leq c(1-s)r^{sp} \int_{B_{2r}} \int_{B_{2r}} \frac{|\log(u(x) + d) - \log(u(y) + d)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\ &\leq c. \end{aligned}$$

We note from assumption (3.25) and $0 \leq h \leq \log(1/3\varepsilon)$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(\frac{1}{3\varepsilon}\right) &= \frac{1}{w(\{x \in B_{2r} : h(x) = 0\})} \int_{\{x \in B_{2r} : h(x) = 0\}} \left[\log\left(\frac{1}{3\varepsilon}\right) - h \right] d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left[\log\left(\frac{1}{3\varepsilon}\right) - \langle h \rangle_{w, B_{2r}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating both sides with the measure $d\mu$ over the set $\{x \in B_{2r} : h(x) = \log(1/3\varepsilon)\}$ and using (3.29), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{w(\{x \in B_{2r} : h(x) = \log(1/3\varepsilon)\})}{w(B_{2r})} &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma \log(1/3\varepsilon)} \int_{B_{2r}} |h - \langle h \rangle_{w, B_{2r}}| d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{c}}{\sigma \log(1/3\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of h we have the following implications

$$u(x) \leq 2\varepsilon\nu \implies u(x) + d \leq 3\varepsilon(\nu + d) \implies h(x) = \log\left(\frac{1}{3\varepsilon}\right).$$

hence we get (3.28) from the above inequality.

Step 2. Now, we prove (3.27) by applying the De Giorgi iteration and choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$\rho_j := (1 + 2^{-j})r, \quad \tilde{\rho}_j := \frac{\rho_j + \rho_{j+1}}{2}, \quad B_j := B_{\rho_j}(x_0)$$

and then choose cut-off functions $\varphi_j \in C_0^\infty(B_{\tilde{\rho}_j})$ such that $0 \leq \varphi_j \leq 1$, $\varphi_j \equiv 1$ in B_{j+1} and $|\nabla \varphi_j| \leq 2^{j+1}/r$. We further define

$$\ell_j := (1 + 2^{-j})\varepsilon\nu, \quad v_j := (\ell_j - u)_+, \quad A_j := \frac{w(\{x \in B_j : u(x) < \ell_j\})}{w(B_j)}.$$

Note that

$$(3.30) \quad \rho_j, \tilde{\rho}_j \in (r, 2r), \quad d \leq \varepsilon\nu \leq \ell_j \leq 2\varepsilon\nu, \quad \ell_j - \ell_{j+1} = 2^{-j-1}\varepsilon\nu \geq 2^{-j-2}\ell_j.$$

Furthermore, (3.28) implies

$$(3.31) \quad A_0 = \frac{w(\{x \in B_0 : u(x) < 2\varepsilon\nu\})}{w(B_0)} \leq \frac{\bar{c}}{\sigma \log(1/3\varepsilon)}.$$

Set $\kappa = \frac{n}{n-s_0}$. Using the definitions of A_j and ℓ_j with the fact that $v_j \geq (\ell_j - \ell_{j+1})\mathbb{1}_{\{u < \ell_{j+1}\}}$, the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality in Theorem 2.19, Hölder's inequality and (2.5), we have

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} A_{j+1}^{1/\kappa} (\ell_j - \ell_{j+1})^p &= \left(\frac{1}{w(B_{j+1})} \int_{\{x \in B_{j+1} : u(x) < \ell_{j+1}\}} [\ell_j - \ell_{j+1}]^{p\kappa} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{B_{j+1}} v_j^{p\kappa} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \\ &\lesssim (1-s)r^{sp} \int_{B_{j+1}} \int_{B_{j+1}} \frac{|v_j(x) - v_j(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} + \int_{B_{j+1}} v_j^p d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate each term on the right-hand side of (3.32). First we have that

$$(3.33) \quad \int_{B_{j+1}} v_j^p d\mu \leq c \int_{B_j} v_j^p d\mu \leq \frac{1}{w(B_j)} \int_{\{x \in B_j : u(x) \leq \ell_j\}} \ell_j^p d\mu \leq \ell_j^p A_j$$

Next, we apply the Caccioppoli estimate from Proposition 3.8 to v_j , B_j and φ_j and the same approach used in the estimate of (3.17), to obtain

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{j+1}} \int_{B_{j+1}} \frac{|v_j(x) - v_j(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\ & \leq c \int_{B_j} \int_{B_j} \left(\frac{|\varphi_j(x) - \varphi_j(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \max\{v_j(x), v_j(y)\} \right)^p \frac{d\mu(x) d\mu(y)}{w(B_{x,y})} \\ & \quad + c \left(\int_{B_j} v_j \varphi_j^p d\mu \right) \left(\sup_{y \in B_{\bar{\rho}_j} \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_j} \int \frac{v_j(x)^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,y})} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{c2^{jp}}{(1-s)r^{sp}} \ell_j^p A_j + c2^{j(n+sp)} \ell_j A_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_j} \frac{(\ell_j + u_-(x))^{p-1}}{|x - x_0|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,x_0})} \\ & \leq \frac{c2^{j(n+sp)}}{(1-s)r^{sp}} (\ell_j^p + \ell_j d^{p-1}) A_j \leq \frac{c2^{j(n+p)}}{(1-s)r^{sp}} \ell_j^p A_j. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all the estimates (3.32), (3.33) and (3.34), and using (3.30)₃, we obtain

$$A_{j+1}^{1/\kappa} \leq c_2 2^{j(n+2p)} A_j$$

for a constant $c_2 \equiv c_2(n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0, [w]_{A_p}) > 0$. Therefore, if choose ε small so that

$$(3.35) \quad A_0 \leq \frac{\bar{c}}{\sigma \log(1/3\varepsilon)} \leq c_2^{-\frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}} 2^{-\frac{(n+2p)\kappa}{(\kappa-1)^2}},$$

by Lemma 3.9, we obtain $A_j \rightarrow 0$. This implies the desired inequality (3.27). \square

Now, we prove the Hölder continuity of the weak solution to (3.2).

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Let $B_r \equiv B_r(x_0) \Subset \Omega$. Set

$$(3.36) \quad \nu_0 := 2 \left\{ c_b \left(\int_{B_r} |u|^p d\mu \right)^{1/p} + \text{Tail}(u; x_0, r/2) \right\},$$

where $c_b > 0$ is the constant given in Theorem 3.4. It is sufficient to show that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(3.37) \quad \text{osc}_{B_{\tau^j r/2}} \leq \tau^{\alpha j} \nu_0 \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

We prove this by induction. The case $j = 0$ follows directly from Theorem 3.4. We suppose now that (3.37) holds for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, i\}$ and aim to show (3.37) for $j = i + 1$.

For $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$(3.38) \quad r_j := \tau^j \frac{r}{2}, \quad B_j = B_{r_j}(x_0), \quad \nu_j := \left(\frac{r_j}{r_0} \right)^\alpha \nu_0 = \tau^{\alpha j} \nu_0,$$

as well as

$$M_j := \sup_{B_j} u \quad \text{and} \quad m_j := \inf_{B_j} u,$$

where α and τ are small positive constants to be determined later. In particular, we assume that $0 < \tau \leq 1/4$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{s_0 p}{2(p-1)}$

Then we have the following two cases:

$$\text{(Case 1)} : \quad w(\{x \in 2B_{i+1} : u - m_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\nu_i\}) \geq \frac{1}{2}w(2B_{i+1}),$$

$$\text{(Case 2)} : \quad w(\{x \in 2B_{i+1} : \nu_i - (u - m_i) \geq \frac{1}{2}\nu_i\}) \geq \frac{1}{2}w(2B_{i+1}).$$

We further define

$$u_i := \begin{cases} u - m_i & \text{(Case 1),} \\ \nu_i - (u - m_i) & \text{(Case 2),} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad d_i := \tau^{\frac{sp}{p-1}} \text{Tail}((u_i)_-; x_0, r_i).$$

Note that, in both cases, u_i is also a weak solution to (3.2) and nonnegative in B_i , and satisfies that $|u_i| \leq M_j - m_j + \nu_i \leq \nu_j + \nu_i \leq 2\nu_j$ in B_j for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, i\}$ and $|u_i| \leq |u| + 2\nu_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_0$.

Using these estimates, (2.9) and (3.36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(1-s)r_i^{sp}} \text{Tail}((u_i)_-; x_0, r_i)^{p-1} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^i \int_{B_{j-1} \setminus B_j} \frac{|u_i(x)|^{p-1}}{|x-x_0|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,x_0})} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_0} \frac{|u_i(x)|^{p-1}}{|x-x_0|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,x_0})} \\ (3.39) \quad &\leq \sum_{j=1}^i \int_{B_{j-1} \setminus B_j} \frac{(2\nu_{j-1})^{p-1}}{|x-x_0|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{w(B_{x,x_0})} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_0} \frac{(|u(x)| + 2\nu_0)^{p-1}}{|x-x_0|^{sp}} \frac{dw(x)}{w(B_{x,x_0})} \\ &\leq c \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{\nu_{j-1}^{p-1}}{r_j^{sp}} + c \frac{\nu_0^{p-1}}{r_0^{sp}} + \frac{c}{(1-s)r_0^{sp}} \text{Tail}(u_0; x_0, r_0)^{p-1} \\ &\leq \frac{c}{1-s} \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{\nu_{j-1}^{p-1}}{r_j^{sp}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, from the above inequality and the definitions of r_i and ν_i , we have

$$d^{p-1} \leq c\nu_i^{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^i \tau^{(1+i-j)\{sp-\alpha(p-1)\}} \leq c\nu_i^{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^i \tau^{jsp_0/2} \leq c \frac{\tau^{s_0 p/2}}{1-\tau^{s p_0/2}} \nu_i^{p-1}.$$

Here we choose τ small so that

$$d \leq \left(c \frac{\tau^{s_0 p/2}}{1-\tau^{s p_0/2}} \right)^{1/(p-1)} \nu_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \nu_i,$$

where ε is the constant in Lemma 3.11 when $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$.

Therefore, in light of Lemma 3.11 for $\nu = \nu_i/2$, $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ and $B_r = B_{i+1}$, we have $m_{i+1} = \inf_{B_{i+1}} u_{i+1} \geq \varepsilon \nu_i/2$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Case 1)} \quad & m_{i+1} - m_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \nu_i, \\ \text{(Case 2)} \quad & M_i - M_{i+1} \leq \nu_i + m_i - M_{i+1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \nu_i, \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $M_i - m_i \leq \nu_i$, $M_{i+1} \leq M_i$ and $m_i \leq m_{i+1}$, we have in both cases

$$M_{i+1} - m_{i+1} \leq (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\nu_i = (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\tau^{-\alpha}\nu_{i+1}.$$

Finally, choosing α sufficiently small such that $(1 - \varepsilon/2) \leq \tau^\alpha$, we obtain (3.37) when $j = i + 1$. \square

3.4. Harnack's inequality. We start with recalling the following Krylov-Safonov type [KS80] covering lemma for a doubling measure w . We use the version stated by Kinnunen and Shamugalingam [KS01, Lemma 7.2].

Lemma 3.12. *Let w be a doubling measure, $E \subset B_r(x_0)$ be a w -measurable set, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Define*

$$E_\delta := \bigcup_{0 < \rho \leq 3r/2} \{B_{3\rho}(x) \cap B_r(x_0) : x \in B_r(x_0), w(E \cap B_{3\rho}(x)) \geq \delta w(B_\rho(x))\}.$$

Then, either $E_\delta = B_r(x_0)$, or else $w(E_\delta) \geq (c_w \delta)^{-1} w(E)$, where $c_w \geq 1$ is the doubling constant of w .

Using this covering lemma and Lemma 3.11, we obtain the following weak Harnack inequality.

Theorem 3.13. *(Weak Harnack inequality) Let $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak supersolution to (3.2). There exist constants $p_0 > 0$ and $c > 0$ depending on $n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0$ and $[w]_{A_p}$ such that if u is nonnegative in $B_{2r} = B_{2r}(x_0) \Subset \Omega$, then there holds*

$$\left(\int_{B_r} u^{p_0} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \leq c \inf_{B_r} u + c \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, 2r).$$

Proof. Set $\delta := \frac{1}{2c_w}$ and $T := c_3 \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, 2r)$, where the constant $c_3 > 0$ will be determined in (3.40) below. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $t > 0$, we define

$$A_t^i := \left\{ x \in B_r : u(x) > t\varepsilon^i - \frac{T}{1 - \varepsilon} \right\},$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ is the constant determined in Lemma 3.11 when $\sigma = \frac{\delta}{6^{np}[w]_{A_p}}$.

Obviously, $A_t^{i-1} \subset A_t^i$. For $x \in B_r$ suppose that

$$w(A_t^{i-1} \cap B_{3\rho}(x)) \geq \delta w(B_\rho(x)).$$

Then by (3.7) we have

$$\frac{w(A_t^{i-1} \cap B_{6\rho}(x))}{w(B_{6\rho}(x))} \geq \frac{1}{6^{np}[w]_{A_p}} \frac{w(A_t^{i-1} \cap B_{3\rho}(x))}{w(B_\rho(x))} > \frac{\delta}{6^{np}[w]_{A_p}}.$$

In light of Lemma 3.11, to $r = 3\rho$, $\nu = t\varepsilon^{i-1} - \frac{T}{1 - \varepsilon}$, $\sigma = \frac{\delta}{3^{np}[w]_{A_p}}$ and $d = 2^{sp/(p-1)} \text{Tail}(u_-; x, 6\rho)$, we have

$$\inf_{B_{3\rho}} u \geq \varepsilon \left(t\varepsilon^{i-1} - \frac{T}{1 - \varepsilon} \right) - d.$$

Moreover, using the same argument as in the estimation of (3.16) and the facts that $\rho \leq 2r/3$ and $u \geq 0$ in B_{2r} , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^{p-1}}{1-s} &= (3\rho)^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{6\rho}(x)} \frac{u_-^{p-1}(y)}{|y-x|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(y)}{w(B_{y,x})} \\
(3.40) \quad &\leq (2r)^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2r}} \frac{u_-^{p-1}(y)}{|y-x|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(y)}{w(B_{y,x})} \\
&\leq c_3^{p-1} (2r)^{sp} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2r}} \frac{u_-^{p-1}(y)}{|y-x_0|^{sp}} \frac{d\mu(y)}{w(B_{y,x_0})} = \frac{T^{p-1}}{1-s}
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_3 > 0$ depending on $n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0$ and $[w]_{A_p}$. Therefore,

$$\inf_{B_{3\rho}} u \geq \varepsilon \left(t\varepsilon^{i-1} - \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon} \right) - T = t\varepsilon^i - \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

This implies $B_{3\rho}(x) \cap B_r(x_0) \subset A_t^i$, and hence, by the definition E_δ , $(A_t^{i-1})_\delta \subset A_t^i$. Finally, by Lemma 3.12 we have that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t > 0$, either $A_t^i = B_r$ or else $w(A_t^i) \geq 2w(A_t^{i-1})$.

We claim that if

$$(3.41) \quad w(A_t^0) > 2^{-m} w(B_r)$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $A_t^m = B_r$ and so

$$u(x) > t\varepsilon^m - \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{in } B_r.$$

Indeed, if $A_t^i = B_r$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ then $B_r = A_t^i \subset A_t^m \subset B_r$, and if $w(A_t^i) \geq 2w(A_t^{i-1})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ then

$$w(A_t^{m-1}) \geq 2w(A_t^{m-2}) \geq \dots \geq 2^{m-1} w(A_t^0) > 2^{-1} w(B_r),$$

which implies $A_t^m = B_r$, since if $w(A_t^m) \geq 2w(A_t^{m-1})$ we have the contradictory inequality $w(A_t^m) > w(B_r)$.

We next claim that for each $t > 0$,

$$(3.42) \quad \frac{w(\{u > t\} \cup B_r)}{w(B_r)} \leq \frac{w(A_t^0)}{w(B_r)} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^\beta t^\beta} \left(\inf_{B_r} u + \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^\beta,$$

where $\beta = \log_\varepsilon(1/2)$. If $w(A_t^0) = 0$, then the inequality is trivial. Suppose $w(A_t^0) > 0$. Choose m as the smallest positive integer satisfying (3.41), i.e.

$$m > \log_{1/2} \left(\frac{w(A_t^0)}{w(B_r)} \right) \geq m-1.$$

Therefore, we have from the previous claim that

$$\inf_{B_r} u > t\varepsilon \left(\frac{w(A_t^0)}{w(B_r)} \right)^{1/\beta} - \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon},$$

which yields (3.42).

Finally, choosing $p_0 = \beta/2$ and $a = \inf_{B_r} u + \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} u^{p_0} d\mu &= p_0 \int_0^\infty t^{p_0-1} \frac{w(\{u > t\} \cup B_r)}{w(B_r)} dt \\ &\leq p_0 \int_0^a t^{p_0-1} dt + \frac{p_0}{\varepsilon^\beta} \left(\inf_{B_r} u + \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^{2p_0} \int_a^\infty t^{-1-p_0} dt \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^\beta} \right) \left(\inf_{B_r} u + \frac{T}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^{p_0}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

The following lemma implies that the tail of u_+ is controlled by the supremum of u and the tail of u_- . The proof is almost the same as the one in [DKP14, Lemma 4.2] involving the tracing of the constant s and consideration of the A_p weight w as in the estimation of (3.13). Hence we omit the proof.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $u \in W_w^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution to (3.2) which is nonnegative and bounded in $B_R \equiv B_R(x_0)$. Then for any $0 < r \leq R$, there holds*

$$\text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, r) \leq c \sup_{B_r} u + c \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{sp/(p-1)} \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, R).$$

holds whenever, where $c \equiv c(n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, s_0, [w]_{A_p}) > 0$.

Finally, we are in a position to prove Theorem 3.6.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. Note that from the supremum estimate in Theorem 3.4, using standard interpolation and covering arguments, we have

$$\sup_{B_{\sigma_1 r}} u_+ \leq c_q \frac{\delta^{-\frac{p-1}{p} \frac{n}{s_0}}}{(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)^{n/q}} \left(\int_{B_{\sigma_2 r}} u_+^q dw \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} + c\delta \text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, \sigma_2 r),$$

for every $q > 0$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 \leq 1$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. This together with Theorem 3.13 and Lemma 3.14 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{B_{\sigma_1 r}} u_+ &\leq c \frac{\delta^{-\frac{p-1}{p} \frac{n}{s_0}}}{(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)^{n/\varepsilon_0}} \left(\int_{B_{\sigma_2 r}} u_+^{p_0} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon_0}} + c\delta \text{Tail}(u_+; x_0, \sigma_2 r) \\ &\leq \frac{c\delta^{-\frac{p-1}{p} \frac{n}{s_0}}}{(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)^{n/\varepsilon_0}} \left(\inf_{B_{\sigma_2 r}} u + c\text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, 2\sigma_2 r) \right) + c\delta \sup_{B_{\sigma_2 r}} u + c\delta \text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, 2r). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, choosing δ sufficiently small, we obtain for any $1/2 \leq \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 \leq 1$

$$\sup_{B_{\sigma_1 r}} u_+ \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{B_{\sigma_2 r}} u^{p-1} + \frac{c}{(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)^{n/\varepsilon_0}} \inf_{B_r} u + c\text{Tail}(u_-; x_0, 2r).$$

From here, a standard iteration argument yields the Harnack inequality (3.10). \square

APPENDIX A. RIESZ POTENTIAL ESTIMATE

In this section we prove a nonlocal replacement of the Riesz type estimate

$$|v(x) - \langle v \rangle_B| \lesssim \int_B \frac{|\nabla v(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-1}} dy.$$

In particular, we prove the following estimate:

Lemma A.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, B be a ball and $\psi \in L^\infty(B)$ be non-negative with $\|\psi\|_{L^1(B)} = 1$ and $\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(B)} \leq c_0 r^{-n}$. Then we have for all $v \in L^1(B)$ and every Lebesgue point $x \in \overline{B}$ of v*

$$(A.1) \quad \begin{aligned} |v(x) - \langle v \rangle_\psi| &\lesssim (1-\alpha) \iint_{B \times B} \frac{|v(\zeta) - v(z)|}{|\zeta - z|^{n+\alpha} (|x-z| + |x-\zeta|)^{n-\alpha}} d\zeta dz \\ &\leq (1-\alpha) \iint_{B \times B} \frac{|v(\zeta) - v(z)|}{|\zeta - z|^{n+\alpha}} d\zeta \frac{1}{|x-z|^{n-\alpha}} dz. \end{aligned}$$

The hidden constant depends only on n and c_0 .

Proof. For fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we define the radial weakly singular weight

$$\eta_1(x) := \frac{(1-\alpha)n}{\omega_{n-1}(n-1+\alpha)} \mathbb{1}_{B_1(0)} (|x|^{-n-\alpha+1} - 1),$$

where $\omega_{n-1} = 2\pi^{n/2}/\Gamma(n/2)$ is the surface area of the n -ball. Then $\eta_1 \geq 0$, $\eta_1 \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$ and

$$\int \eta_1(x) dx = \frac{(1-\alpha)n}{(n-1+\alpha)} \int_0^1 r^{-\alpha} - r^{n-1} dr = \frac{(1-\alpha)n}{(n-1+\alpha)} \left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha} - \frac{1}{n} \right) = 1.$$

We then define $\eta_r(x) := r^{-n} \eta_1(x/r)$.

Let $B_1 = B_1(0)$ and $B_2 = B_2(0)$. By scaling and translation it suffices to prove the claim for B_2 . We assume that x is a Lebesgue point of v . Set $\omega := |B_1(0)|^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{B_1(0)} * \eta_1$. Note that ω is supported in B_2 , $\omega \geq 0$ and $\|\omega\|_1 = 1$.

We prove the statement in two steps: First we show the estimate in the case $\psi = \omega$ and then we reduce the case of a general weight ψ to that. Throughout the proof, we make sure that all (implicit) constants depend only on n but not on α .

Step 1: We have that

$$|v(x) - \langle v \rangle_\omega| = \left| \int_{B_1} (v(x) - (v * \eta_1)(y)) dy \right| \leq \int_{B_1} |v(x) - (v * \eta_1)(y)| dy.$$

We split the integral into

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} |v(x) - (v * \eta_1)(y)| dy &\leq \int_{B_1} |v(x) - (v * \eta_{\frac{|x-y|}{2}})(y)| dy \\ &\quad + \int_{B_1} |v(y) - (v * \eta_{\frac{|x-y|}{2}})(y)| dy \\ &\quad + \int_{B_1} |v(y) - (v * \eta_1)(y)| dy =: \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}. \end{aligned}$$

We start by estimating I. Since x is a Lebesgue point of v , we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
& v(x) - (v * \eta_{\frac{|x-y|}{2}})(y) \\
&= - \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \left((v * \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}})(x + t(y-x)) \right) dt \\
&= - \int_0^1 \int v(z) \frac{d}{dt} \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}}(x + t(y-x) - z) dz dt. \\
&= \int_0^1 \int (v(x + t(y-x)) - v(z)) \frac{d}{dt} \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}}(x + t(y-x) - z) dz dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last step that $\int \frac{d}{dt} \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}}(x + t(y-x) - z) dz = 0$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}}(x + t(y-x) - z) \\
&= \frac{d}{dt} \left(\left(\frac{|x-y|}{2} t \right)^{-n} \eta_1 \left(2 \frac{x + t(y-x) - z}{t|x-y|} \right) \right) \\
&= - \frac{d}{t} \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}}(x + t(y-x) - z) - \left(\frac{|x-y|}{2} t \right)^{-n} \nabla \eta_1 \left(2 \frac{x + t(y-x) - z}{t|x-y|} \right) \cdot \frac{2(x-z)}{|x-y|t^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, with $[x, y]_t := x + t(y-x)$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{d}{dt} \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}}([x, y]_t - z) \right| \\
&\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{|[x, y]_t - z| \leq t \frac{|x-y|}{2}\}} \left((1-\alpha)t^{-1} |[x, y]_t - z|^{-n+1-\alpha} (t|x-y|)^{\alpha-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (|x-y|t)^{-n} (1-\alpha) |[x, y]_t - z|^{-n-\alpha} (t|x-y|)^{n+\alpha} \frac{|x-z|}{|x-y|t^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that if $|[x, y]_t - z| \leq t \frac{|x-y|}{2}$, then

$$|x-z| \geq |x - [x, y]_t| - |[x, y]_t - z| = t|x-y| - |[x, y]_t - z| \geq |[x, y]_t - z|.$$

This and the previous estimate imply

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \eta_{t \frac{|x-y|}{2}}([x, y]_t - z) \right| \lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{|[x, y]_t - z| \leq t \frac{|x-y|}{2}\}} (1-\alpha) t^{\alpha-2} \frac{|x-y|^{\alpha-1} |x-z|}{|[x, y]_t - z|^{n+\alpha}}.$$

Overall, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |v(x) - (v * \eta_{\frac{|x-y|}{2}})(y)| \\
&\lesssim (1-\alpha) \int_0^1 \int \mathbb{1}_{\{|[x, y]_t - z| \leq t \frac{|x-y|}{2}\}} |v([x, y]_t) - v(z)| \frac{t^{\alpha-2} |x-y|^{\alpha-1} |x-z|}{|[x, y]_t - z|^{n+\alpha}} dz dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$I \lesssim (1-\alpha) \int \int \int_{B_1} \mathbb{1}_{\{|[x, y]_t - z| \leq t \frac{|x-y|}{2}\}} |v([x, y]_t) - v(z)| t^{\alpha-2} \frac{|x-y|^{\alpha-1} |x-z|}{|[x, y]_t - z|^{n+\alpha}} dt dz dy$$

We now substitute $\zeta = x + t(y - x) = [x, y]_t$. Then $dy = t^{-n}d\zeta$ and $t = \frac{|\zeta - x|}{|y - x|} \geq \frac{|\zeta - x|}{2}$. Using additionally Fubini, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2} \int_{\frac{|\zeta - x|}{2}}^1 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\zeta - z| \leq \frac{|\zeta - x|}{2}\}} |v(\zeta) - v(z)| t^{-n-1} \frac{|\zeta - x|^{\alpha-1} |x - z|}{|\zeta - z|^{n+\alpha}} dt d\zeta dz \\ &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\zeta - z| \leq \frac{|\zeta - x|}{2}\}} |v(\zeta) - v(z)| \frac{|\zeta - x|^{-n+\alpha-1} |x - z|}{|\zeta - z|^{n+\alpha}} d\zeta dz. \end{aligned}$$

Finally notice that if $|\zeta - z| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta - x|$, then

$$\frac{1}{2}|x - \zeta| \leq |x - z| \leq \frac{3}{2}|x - \zeta|.$$

This yields

$$\text{I} \lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2 B_2} \frac{|v(\zeta) - v(z)|}{|\zeta - z|^{n+\alpha} (|x - z| + |x - \zeta|)^{n-\alpha}} d\zeta dz.$$

This finishes our estimates for I. Next we estimate II. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} &\lesssim \iint_{B_1} |v(y) - v(z)| \eta_{\frac{|x-y|}{2}}(y - z) dz dy \\ &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2 B_2} \mathbb{1}_{\{|y-z| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x-y|\}} |v(y) - v(z)| |y - z|^{-n+1-\alpha} |x - y|^{\alpha-1} dz dy \\ &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2 B_2} \frac{|v(y) - v(z)|}{|y - z|^n} dz dy \\ &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2 B_2} \frac{|v(y) - v(z)|}{|y - z|^{n+\alpha} (|x - y| + |x - z|)^{n-\alpha}} dz dy. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we estimate III. Here we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III} &\lesssim \iint_{B_1} |v(y) - v(z)| \eta_1(y - z) dz dy \\ &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2 B_2} |v(y) - v(z)| |y - z|^{-n+1-\alpha} dz dy \\ &\lesssim (1 - \alpha) \iint_{B_2 B_2} \frac{|v(y) - v(z)|}{|y - z|^{n+\alpha} (|x - y| + |x - z|)^{n-\alpha}} dz dy. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof in the case $\psi = \omega$.

Step 2: Let now ψ be a general weight as in the statement of the lemma and ω as in Step 1. Then

$$|v(x) - \langle v \rangle_\psi| \leq |v(x) - \langle v \rangle_\omega| + |\langle v \rangle_\omega - \langle v \rangle_\psi|.$$

We already estimated the first summand in Step 1. For the second term we have again by Step 1 and the bound on ψ

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle v \rangle_\omega - \langle v \rangle_\psi| &\leq \int_{B_2} |v(y) - \langle v \rangle_\omega| \psi(y) dy \\
&\lesssim (1-\alpha) \int_{B_2} \int_{B_2} \int_{B_2} \frac{|v(z) - v(\zeta)|}{|z - \zeta|^{n+\alpha} (|y - z| + |y - \zeta|)^{n-\alpha}} dz d\zeta \psi(y) dy \\
&= (1-\alpha) \int_{B_2} \int_{B_2} \frac{|v(z) - v(\zeta)|}{|z - \zeta|^{n+\alpha}} \int_{B_2} \frac{1}{(|y - z| + |y - \zeta|)^{n-\alpha}} dy dz d\zeta \\
&\lesssim \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \int_{B_2} \int_{B_2} \frac{|v(z) - v(\zeta)|}{|z - \zeta|^{n+\alpha}} dz d\zeta \\
&\lesssim \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \int_{B_2} \int_{B_2} \frac{|v(z) - v(\zeta)|}{|z - \zeta|^{n+\alpha} (|x - z| + |x - \zeta|)^{n-\alpha}} dz d\zeta.
\end{aligned}$$

This is the desired estimate for $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}$, since in this case we have $\frac{1}{\alpha} \approx 1$. If $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, then the factor $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}$ blows up. In this case we can proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle v \rangle_\omega - \langle v \rangle_\psi| &\lesssim \int \int |v(z) - v(y)| \omega(z) \psi(y) dz dy \\
&\lesssim \int_{B_2} \int_{B_2} |v(z) - v(y)| dz dy \\
&\lesssim (1-\alpha) \int_{B_2} \int_{B_2} \frac{|v(z) - v(y)|}{|z - y|^{n+\alpha} (|x - z| + |x - y|)^{n-\alpha}} dz dy,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $(1-\alpha) \approx 1$, $|\psi| \lesssim 1$ and $|\omega| \leq 1$. This finishes the proof. \square

Remark A.2. *The estimate in Lemma A.1 can be replaced by the estimate*

$$(A.2) \quad |v(x) - \langle v \rangle_\psi| \lesssim \int_B \int_B \frac{|v(\zeta) - v(z)|}{(|x - z| + |x - \zeta|)^{2n}} d\zeta dz$$

using a much simplified proof. However, only the factor $(1-\alpha)$ in (A.1) allows to prove s -stable estimates.

REFERENCES

- [ACS09] T. Alberico, A. Cianchi, and C. Sbordone. “Fractional integrals and A_p -weights: a sharp estimate”. In: *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 347.21-22 (2009), pp. 1265–1270. DOI: [10.1016/j.crma.2009.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2009.09.001).
- [BBDL23] A. K. Balci, S.-S. Byun, L. Diening, and H.-S. Lee. “Global maximal regularity for equations with degenerate weights”. In: *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* 177 (2023), pp. 484–530. DOI: [10.1016/j.matpur.2023.07.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2023.07.010).
- [BBM01] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis, and P. Mironescu. “Another look at Sobolev spaces”. In: (2001), pp. 439–455.
- [BDGP22] A. K. Balci, L. Diening, R. Giova, and A. Passarelli di Napoli. “Elliptic equations with degenerate weights”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 54.2 (2022), pp. 2373–2412. DOI: [10.1137/21M1412529](https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1412529).

- [BDLBS24] V. Bögelein, F. Duzaar, N. Liao, G. M. Bisci, and R. Servadei. *Regularity for the fractional p -Laplace equation*. 2024. arXiv: [2406.01568 \[math.AP\]](#).
- [BDNS24] L. Behn, L. Diening, S. Nowak, and T. Scharle. *The De Giorgi method for local and nonlocal systems*. 2024. arXiv: [2404.04063 \[math.AP\]](#).
- [BK05] R. F. Bass and M. Kassmann. “Hölder continuity of harmonic functions with respect to operators of variable order”. In: *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 30.7-9 (2005), pp. 1249–1259. DOI: [10.1080/03605300500257677](#).
- [BK23] S.-S. Byun and K. Kim. *L^q estimates for nonlocal p -Laplacian type equations with BMO kernel coefficients in divergence form*. 2023. arXiv: [2303.08517 \[math.AP\]](#).
- [BKO23] S.-S. Byun, H. Kim, and J. Ok. “Local Hölder continuity for fractional nonlocal equations with general growth”. In: *Math. Ann.* 387.1-2 (2023), pp. 807–846. DOI: [10.1007/s00208-022-02472-y](#).
- [BL17] L. Brasco and E. Lindgren. “Higher Sobolev regularity for the fractional p -Laplace equation in the superquadratic case”. In: *Adv. Math.* 304 (2017), pp. 300–354. DOI: [10.1016/j.aim.2016.03.039](#).
- [BLS18] L. Brasco, E. Lindgren, and A. Schikorra. “Higher Hölder regularity for the fractional p -Laplacian in the superquadratic case”. In: *Adv. Math.* 338 (2018), pp. 782–846. DOI: [10.1016/j.aim.2018.09.009](#).
- [BS21] P. Bella and M. Schäffner. “Local boundedness and Harnack inequality for solutions of linear nonuniformly elliptic equations”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 74.3 (2021), pp. 453–477. DOI: [10.1002/cpa.21876](#).
- [BS23] P. Bella and M. Schäffner. “Local boundedness for p -Laplacian with degenerate coefficients”. In: *Math. Eng.* 5.5 (2023), Paper No. 081, 20.
- [CCV11] L. Caffarelli, C. H. Chan, and A. Vasseur. “Regularity theory for parabolic nonlinear integral operators”. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 24.3 (2011), pp. 849–869. DOI: [10.1090/S0894-0347-2011-00698-X](#).
- [CDM19] M. E. Cejas, I. Drelichman, and J. C. Martínez-Perales. “Improved fractional Poincaré type inequalities on John domains”. In: *Ark. Mat.* 57.2 (2019), pp. 285–315. DOI: [10.4310/ARKIV.2019.v57.n2.a3](#).
- [CKW22] J. Chaker, M. Kim, and M. Weidner. “Regularity for nonlocal problems with non-standard growth”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 61.6 (2022), Paper No. 227, 31. DOI: [10.1007/s00526-022-02364-8](#).
- [CMN13] D. Cruz-Uribe, K. Moen, and V. Naibo. “Regularity of solutions to degenerate p -Laplacian equations”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 401.1 (2013), pp. 458–478. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmaa.2012.12.023](#).
- [CMP18] D. Cao, T. Mengesha, and T. Phan. “Weighted- $W^{1,p}$ estimates for weak solutions of degenerate and singular elliptic equations”. In: *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 67.6 (2018), pp. 2225–2277. DOI: [10.1512/iumj.2018.67.7533](#).
- [Coz17] M. Cozzi. “Interior regularity of solutions of non-local equations in Sobolev and Nikol’skii spaces”. In: *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* 196.2 (2017), pp. 555–578. DOI: [10.1007/s10231-016-0586-3](#).
- [CS07] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. “An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian”. In: *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 32.7-9 (2007), pp. 1245–1260. DOI: [10.1080/03605300600987306](#).
- [CS24] A. Cianchi and M. Schäffner. “Local boundedness of minimizers under unbalanced Orlicz growth conditions”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 401 (2024), pp. 58–92. DOI: [10.1016/j.jde.2024.04.016](#).
- [DKLN24] L. Diening, K. Kim, H.-S. Lee, and S. Nowak. *Higher differentiability for the fractional p -Laplacian*. 2024. arXiv: [2406.16727 \[math.AP\]](#).
- [DKP14] A. Di Castro, T. Kuusi, and G. Palatucci. “Nonlocal Harnack inequalities”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 267.6 (2014), pp. 1807–1836. DOI: [10.1016/j.jfa.2014.05.023](#).

- [DKP16] A. Di Castro, T. Kuusi, and G. Palatucci. “Local behavior of fractional p -minimizers”. In: *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* 33.5 (2016), pp. 1279–1299. DOI: [10.1016/j.anihpc.2015.04.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anihpc.2015.04.003).
- [DN23] L. Diening and S. Nowak. *Calderón-Zygmund estimates for the fractional p -Laplacian*. 2023. arXiv: [2303.02116](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.02116) [[math.AP](#)].
- [DRS10] L. Diening, M. Růžička, and K. Schumacher. “A decomposition technique for John domains”. In: *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 35.1 (2010), pp. 87–114. DOI: [10.5186/aasfm.2010.3506](https://doi.org/10.5186/aasfm.2010.3506).
- [FKS82] E. B. Fabes, C. E. Kenig, and R. P. Serapioni. “The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations”. In: *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 7.1 (1982), pp. 77–116. DOI: [10.1080/03605308208820218](https://doi.org/10.1080/03605308208820218).
- [FKV15] M. Felsinger, M. Kassmann, and P. Voigt. “The Dirichlet problem for non-local operators”. In: *Math. Z.* 279.3-4 (2015), pp. 779–809. DOI: [10.1007/s00209-014-1394-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00209-014-1394-3).
- [FKV20] G. F. Foghem Gounoue, M. Kassmann, and P. Voigt. “Mosco convergence of nonlocal to local quadratic forms”. In: *Nonlinear Anal.* 193 (2020), pp. 111504, 22. DOI: [10.1016/j.na.2019.04.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2019.04.003).
- [GH24] F. Grube and T. Hensiek. “Robust nonlocal trace spaces and Neumann problems”. In: *Nonlinear Anal.* 241 (2024), Paper No. 113481, 35. DOI: [10.1016/j.na.2023.113481](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2023.113481).
- [Gio57] E. D. Giorgi. “Sulla differenziabilità e l’analiticità delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari”. In: *Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. (3)* 3 (1957), pp. 25–43.
- [Giu03] E. Giusti. *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003, pp. viii+403. DOI: [10.1142/9789812795557](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812795557).
- [GK23] F. Grube and M. Kassmann. *Robust nonlocal trace and extension theorems*. 2023. arXiv: [2305.05735](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.05735) [[math.AP](#)].
- [GKS10] A. Gogatishvili, P. Koskela, and N. Shanmugalingam. “Interpolation properties of Besov spaces defined on metric spaces”. In: *Math. Nachr.* 283.2 (2010), pp. 215–231. DOI: [10.1002/mana.200810242](https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.200810242).
- [GL24] P. Garain and E. Lindgren. “Higher Hölder regularity for the fractional p -Laplace equation in the subquadratic case”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* (May 2024). DOI: [10.1007/s00208-024-02891-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-024-02891-z).
- [Gra14a] L. Grafakos. *Classical Fourier analysis*. Third. Vol. 249. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2014, pp. xviii+638. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4939-1194-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1194-3).
- [Gra14b] L. Grafakos. *Modern Fourier analysis*. Third. Vol. 250. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2014, pp. xvi+624. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4939-1230-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1230-8).
- [IMS16] A. Iannizzotto, S. Mosconi, and M. Squassina. “Global Hölder regularity for the fractional p -Laplacian”. In: *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 32.4 (2016), pp. 1353–1392. DOI: [10.4171/RMI/921](https://doi.org/10.4171/RMI/921).
- [Kas07] M. Kassmann. “The theory of De Giorgi for non-local operators”. In: *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 345.11 (2007), pp. 621–624. DOI: [10.1016/j.crma.2007.10.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2007.10.007).
- [KMS15] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, and Y. Sire. “Nonlocal equations with measure data”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 337.3 (2015), pp. 1317–1368. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-015-2356-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-015-2356-2).
- [KS01] J. Kinnunen and N. Shanmugalingam. “Regularity of quasi-minimizers on metric spaces”. In: *Manuscripta Math.* 105.3 (2001), pp. 401–423. DOI: [10.1007/s002290100193](https://doi.org/10.1007/s002290100193).

- [KS80] N. V. Krylov and M. V. Safonov. “A certain property of solutions of parabolic equations with measurable coefficients”. In: *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* 44 (1 1980). DOI: [10.1070/IM1981v016n01ABEH001283](https://doi.org/10.1070/IM1981v016n01ABEH001283).
- [LU68] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya and N. N. Ural'tseva. *Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations*. Translated from the Russian by Scripta Technica, Inc, Translation editor: Leon Ehrenpreis. Academic Press, New York-London, 1968, pp. xviii+495.
- [Mod85] G. Modica. “Quasiminima of some degenerate functionals”. In: *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* 142 (1985), pp. 121–143. DOI: [10.1007/BF01766591](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01766591).
- [MRW15] D. D. Monticelli, S. Rodney, and R. L. Wheeden. “Harnack’s inequality and Hölder continuity for weak solutions of degenerate quasilinear equations with rough coefficients”. In: *Nonlinear Anal.* 126 (2015), pp. 69–114. DOI: [10.1016/j.na.2015.05.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2015.05.029).
- [MS02] V. Maz’ya and T. Shaposhnikova. “On the Bourgain, Brezis, and Mironescu theorem concerning limiting embeddings of fractional Sobolev spaces”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 195.2 (2002), pp. 230–238. DOI: [10.1006/jfan.2002.3955](https://doi.org/10.1006/jfan.2002.3955).
- [MS68] M. K. V. Murthy and G. Stampacchia. “Boundary value problems for some degenerate-elliptic operators”. In: *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* 80 (1968), pp. 1–122. DOI: [10.1007/BF02413623](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02413623).
- [MZ97] J. Malý and W. P. Ziemer. *Fine regularity of solutions of elliptic partial differential equations*. Vol. 51. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997, pp. xiv+291. DOI: [10.1090/surv/051](https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/051).
- [Sch16] A. Schikorra. “Nonlinear commutators for the fractional p -Laplacian and applications”. In: *Math. Ann.* 366.1-2 (2016), pp. 695–720. DOI: [10.1007/s00208-015-1347-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-015-1347-0).
- [Ste70] E. M. Stein. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*. Vol. No. 30. Princeton Mathematical Series. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970, pp. xiv+290.
- [Str84] E. W. Stredulinsky. *Weighted inequalities and degenerate elliptic partial differential equations*. Vol. 1074. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984, pp. iv+143. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0101268](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0101268).
- [SV12] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci. “Mountain pass solutions for non-local elliptic operators”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 389.2 (2012), pp. 887–898. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmaa.2011.12.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2011.12.032).
- [Tru71] N. S. Trudinger. “On the regularity of generalized solutions of linear, non-uniformly elliptic equations”. In: *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 42 (1971), pp. 50–62. DOI: [10.1007/BF00282317](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00282317).
- [Tru73] N. S. Trudinger. “Linear elliptic operators with measurable coefficients”. In: *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)* 27 (1973), pp. 265–308.

LINUS BEHN, UNIVERSITY BIELEFELD, UNIVERSITÄTSSTR. 25, 33615 BIELEFELD, GERMANY
Email address: linus.behn@math.uni-bielefeld.de

LARS DIENING, UNIVERSITY BIELEFELD, UNIVERSITÄTSSTR. 25, 33615 BIELEFELD, GERMANY
Email address: lars.diening@uni-bielefeld.de

JIHOON OK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOGANG UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 04107, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Email address: jihoonok@sogang.ac.kr

JULIAN ROLFES, UNIVERSITY BIELEFELD, UNIVERSITÄTSSTR. 25, 33615 BIELEFELD, GERMANY
Email address: julian.rolfes@uni-bielefeld.de