

# THE LANDIS CONJECTURE FOR NONLOCAL ELLIPTIC OPERATORS: POLYNOMIAL DECAY

SEBASTIÁN FLORES SEPÚLVEDA<sup>1,†</sup> AND GABRIELLE NORNBORG<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

ABSTRACT. We obtain a unique continuation result at infinity for fully nonlinear elliptic integro-differential operators of order  $2s$  which satisfy the maximum and minimum principles in bounded subdomains, under the decay assumption  $o(|x|^{-(N+2s)})$  at infinity.

Our result is new even in the case of the fractional Laplacian, as it unveils the nonlocal nature of the decay in Landis conjecture, evolving from exponential to polynomial.

**Keywords.** Landis conjecture; integro-differential elliptic operators; polynomial decay.

**MSC2020.** 47G20, 45K05, 35B40, 35D40.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In [13], Landis and Kondratiev ask if an exponentially fast decaying solution to a linear Schrödinger equation in an exterior domain should be the trivial solution. This is known as the Landis conjecture and can be stated in the following manner:

**Conjecture 1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be either  $\mathbb{R}^N$  or an exterior domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  with  $\|V\|_\infty \leq 1$ . If  $u$  is a solution to*

$$\Delta u + Vu = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

*with  $u(x) = O(e^{-\kappa|x|})$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $\kappa > 1$ , then  $u \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ .*

A weaker version of this conjecture claims that if the solution  $u$  decays faster than exponentially at infinity, that is, if  $|u(x)| \leq Ce^{-|x|^{1+\varepsilon}}$  for some  $C, \varepsilon > 0$ , then  $u \equiv 0$ . These questions are a kind of unique continuation principle at infinity.

The conjecture was negatively answered by Meshkov in [16], where he showed a complex-valued potential and a nontrivial solution with decay  $O(e^{-\kappa|x|^{4/3}})$  at infinity, for some  $\kappa > 0$ . He also proved that  $4/3$  is optimal in the sense that if a solution behaves at infinity as  $O(e^{-\kappa|x|^{4/3+\varepsilon}})$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , it must be the trivial solution. The question for a real-valued potential has been widely studied in the last years. For the planar case, in [15] the so called weak Landis conjecture is proven: if a solution decays at infinity with order  $O(e^{-\kappa|x|(\log|x|)^{1/2}})$  then it must be trivial; see also [7, 8, 11, 12].

In higher dimensions, the question remains open. It has been studied in [3] using Carleman estimates, and in [20] with comparison arguments. In [23], Sirakov and Souplet established a Landis-type result up to unbounded coefficients for fully nonlinear second order operators which satisfy the maximum principle in bounded subdomains. A sharp

<sup>1</sup> DEPARTAMENTO DE INGENIERÍA MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE, SANTIAGO, CHILE

<sup>2</sup> CENTRO DE MODELAMIENTO MATEMÁTICO (CNRS IRL2807), UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE, SANTIAGO, CHILE

<sup>†</sup> SEBASTIAN.FLORES@DIM.UCHILE.CL

\* GNORNBORG@DIM.UCHILE.CL

decay using criticality theory was addressed in [6], in which polynomial decay appears in the presence of Hardy type decaying potentials.

The aim of this note is to address an analogous of the Landis conjecture for a class of integro-differential elliptic operators. These operators are defined by

$$(1) \quad Lu(x) = \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x+y) - u(x))K(y)dy$$

where  $0 < \frac{\lambda}{|y|^{N+2s}} \leq K(y) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|y|^{N+2s}}$ , for some fixed constants  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$ . In particular, when  $\lambda = \Lambda = 1$  then  $L$  is just the fractional Laplacian  $(-\Delta)^s$  of order  $2s$ . For  $s, \lambda, \Lambda$  fixed, we denote  $\mathcal{L}$  to be the class of all operators  $L$  in the form (1).

The Landis conjecture for the fractional Laplacian has been studied by Ruland and Wang in [21], where they conclude a unique continuation principle at infinity for solutions of  $(-\Delta)^s u + Vu = 0$  under the assumption

$$(2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{|x|^\alpha} |u(x)| dx \leq C < \infty$$

for some  $\alpha > 1$ , whenever  $V$  satisfies a regularity hypothesis given by  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} |x \cdot DV(x)| \leq 1$ . In [14], Kow and Wang studied the question for  $(-\Delta)^{1/2} u + b \cdot Du + Vu = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , and get a decay of  $O(e^{-k|x|})$  under boundedness of the drift and potential terms, as well as  $|DV|$ . Note that this case is especially delicate since both  $(-\Delta)^{1/2}$  and  $b \cdot Du$  are of order 1. The proof of these results rely on the extension problem for the fractional Laplacian, together with the application of Carleman estimates.

In this paper we extend the results in [14, 21] to fully nonlinear operators of order  $2s$  which generalize the class  $\mathcal{L}$ . Somewhat surprisingly, we are able to relax condition (2), by allowing the solution to have polynomial decay, without assuming any decaying properties of the potential.

We consider an operator  $I$  of the form:

$$(3) \quad Iu(x) = \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} L_a u(x), \text{ or } Iu(x) = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} L_a u(x),$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set and  $L_a \in \mathcal{L}$  for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . By solution we mean a viscosity solution in the sense of Definition 1 ahead. As it is customary in the theory of integral operators, those solutions belong to the space of measurable functions  $u$  such that  $\|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} < \infty$ , where

$$\|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x)|}{1 + |x|^{N+2s}} dx;$$

such a space is denoted by  $L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ .

Lastly, as in [6, 20, 23], an assumption on the sign of the operator  $I + V$  will be pivotal. In the sequel,  $\lambda_1^\pm(I + V, G) > 0$  stands for the validity of both maximum and minimum principles for the operator  $I + V$  in the bounded subdomain  $G$  of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , see Definition 2.

Within the vocabulary established, our main result reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $s \in (0, 1)$ ,  $I$  be an operator as in (3), and  $V : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded continuous function. Assume  $\lambda_1^\pm(I + V, G) > 0$  for each bounded subdomain  $G$  of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . If  $u \in L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a viscosity solution to  $Iu + Vu = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , such that*

$$(4) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |u(x)| |x|^{N+2s} = 0,$$

*then  $u \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .*

**Remark 1.** We have stated Theorem 1 for the whole space  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$  for ease of notation, but under minor modifications its proof may also address the case when  $\Omega$  is an exterior domain, as in [23], by asking additionally that  $u$  has a sign in  $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$  in order to conclude that  $u \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ .

Theorem 1 unveils the difference of decay rate of the Landis conjecture, evolving from exponential to polynomial in the presence of a nonlocal operator. This result is new even in the context of the fractional Laplacian, and it is consistent with the polynomial decay rate of the nonlocal nonlinear Schrödinger equation in [9, Theorem 1.5], see also [4, Chapter 7].

Hypothesis (4) seems to be sharp. For instance, regarding the fractional Laplacian, Lemma 2.1 in [2] says that a  $C^2$  function  $u$  defined in the whole space, which is positive radial and decreasing for  $|x| \geq 1$ , and  $u(x) \approx |x|^{-(N+2s)}$  for large  $|x|$ , satisfies  $|(-\Delta)^s u| \approx |u|$  in a neighborhood of infinity. Besides, when  $V \equiv -\frac{1}{2}$ , Lemma 4.3 in [9] shows the existence of a classical solution  $w$  to problem  $(-\Delta)^s w + \frac{1}{2}w = 0$  in the exterior of the ball  $B_1$  such that  $0 < w(x) \leq \frac{c_0}{|x|^{N+2s}}$  for some  $c_0 > 0$ .

The remaining of the text splits as follows. In Section 2 we recall some definitions and auxiliary tools, while in Section 3 we give the proof of Theorem 1. The latter relies on a nonlocal weak Harnack estimate by Ros-Oton and Serra [19], properly adapted for equations with zero order terms, which in turn gives a lower decay bound for positive supersolutions. This approach can be seen as a kind of nonlocal counterpart of techniques in [23], slightly improved due to the nonlocal character of the estimates.

**Aknowlegments.** We are indebted with Prof. Alexander Quaas for interesting discussions on the topic, and for bringing references [2, 9] to our attention.

S. Flores was supported by ANID Magíster Nacional grant 22241020.

G. Nornberg was supported by Centro de Modelamiento Matemático (CMM) BASAL fund FB210005 for center of excellence from ANID-Chile; and by ANID Fondecyt grant 1220776.

## 2. AUXILIARY RESULTS

Throughout this paper,  $s \in (0, 1)$ ,  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$  will be fixed quantities. First we recall the definition of viscosity solution, as given in [10].

**Definition 1** (Viscosity solution). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be any open set,  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $f, c \in C(\Omega)$ , and consider the equation*

$$(5) \quad Iu + V(x)u = f(x)$$

- i. We say that  $u \in USC(\Omega) \cap L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a viscosity subsolution to (5) if for any  $x \in \Omega$  and any neighborhood of  $x$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $N_x$ , and for any test function  $\psi \in L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  such that  $\psi \in C^2(N_x)$ ,  $\psi(x) = u(x)$  and  $\psi \geq u$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  we have that  $I\psi(x) + V(x)u(x) \geq f(x)$ . We denote this by  $Iu(x) + V(x)u(x) \geq f(x)$ .
- ii. We say that  $u \in LSC(\Omega) \cap L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a viscosity supersolution to (5) if for any  $x \in \Omega$  and any neighborhood of  $x$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $N_x$ , and for any test function  $\phi \in L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  such that  $\phi \in C^2(N_x)$ ,  $\phi(x) = u(x)$  and  $\phi \leq u$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  we have that  $I\phi(x) + V(x)u(x) \leq f(x)$ . We denote this by  $Iu(x) + V(x)u(x) \leq f(x)$ .
- iii. A function  $u \in C(\Omega) \cap L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a viscosity solution to (5) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and viscosity supersolution.

We define the Pucci extremal operators associated to  $\mathcal{L}$  by

$$\mathcal{M}^+u(x) = \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} Lu(x), \quad \mathcal{M}^-u(x) = \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} Lu(x),$$

and note that, for any operator  $I$  of the form (3) and any smooth bounded functions  $u, v$ , we have

$$\mathcal{M}^-(u - v) \leq Iu - Iv \leq \mathcal{M}^+(u - v).$$

This inequality also holds for viscosity solutions, accordingly to the next lemma.

**Lemma 2** (Proposition 3.2.15 in [10]). *Let  $I$  be as in (3) and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be an open set. If  $u \in L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is lower semicontinuous,  $v \in L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is upper semicontinuous,  $f, g \in C(\Omega)$ , and  $Iu \leq f$ ,  $Iv \geq g$  holds in  $\Omega$  in the viscosity sense, then  $\mathcal{M}^-(u - v) \leq f - g$ , in  $\Omega$  also holds in the viscosity sense.*

Note that if a function  $u \in L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is of class  $C^{1,1}$  in a neighborhood of a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , then  $Lu(x)$  is well defined. On the other hand, the next lemma says that, if  $u$  is nonsmooth but is a viscosity supersolution (subsolution) to  $Iu = f$ , we only need for  $u$  to be touched from below (above) by some test function at  $x$ .

**Lemma 3** (Pointwise evaluation, Lemma 3.3 in [5]). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be an open set,  $f \in C(\Omega)$ , and  $I$  an operator of the type (3). If  $u \in LSC(\Omega) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a viscosity solution to  $Iu \leq f$  and there exists a test function  $\psi$  touching  $u$  from below at  $x$ , then for each  $L \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $Lu(x)$  is well defined and  $Iu(x) \leq f(x)$ .*

The stability of viscosity sub and supersolutions under suitable limits is given by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4** (Proposition 3.2.12 in [10]). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be an open set,  $\{f_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C(\Omega)$ ,  $f \in C(\Omega)$  be such that  $f_k \rightarrow f$  locally uniformly in  $\Omega$ , and  $I$  an elliptic operator of the form (3). Let  $u_k \in C(\Omega) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be a sequence of functions such that*

- (1)  $Iu_k \leq f_k$  in the viscosity sense in  $\Omega$ ,
- (2)  $u_k \rightarrow u$  locally uniformly in  $\Omega$ ,
- (3)  $u_k \rightarrow u$  in  $L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,

then  $Iu \leq f$  in the viscosity sense.

We will also need the following result on the solvability of the Dirichlet problem in bounded domains. It is a special case of Corollary 5.7 in [17].

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $G \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded  $C^2$  domain,  $I$  as in (3),  $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  continuous, and assume  $V \leq 0$ . Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} Iu + Vu = f & \text{in } G \\ u = g & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus G \end{cases}$$

admits a viscosity solution  $u \in C(\overline{G}) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  for any  $g : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded and continuous.

Throughout the text, a key half-Harnack inequality based on the following proposition will come into play. Proposition 6 below is essentially that of Theorem 2.2 in [19], with some minor modifications to account for the zero order term.

**Proposition 6** (Weak Harnack inequality). *Let  $V \in C(B_1) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , with  $\|V\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq 1$ , let  $u \in LSC(B_1) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^-u + Vu \leq C_0 & \text{in } B_1 \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases}$$

with  $C_0 > 0$ . Then there exists  $C = C(N, s, \Lambda, \lambda) > 0$  such that

$$\|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C(\inf_{B_{1/2}} u + C_0)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{3/4})$ ,  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$  and  $\eta \equiv 1$  in  $B_{1/2}$ . Now,  $\inf_{B_{3/4}} u \geq 0$ , so for  $x \in B_{3/4}$

$$u(x) \geq \inf_{B_{3/4}} u \geq \eta \inf_{B_{3/4}} u$$

and, as  $\eta \equiv 0$  outside  $B_{3/4}$ , we actually have  $u \geq \eta \inf_{B_{3/4}} u$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . We can then define

$$t := \sup\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} : u(x) \geq \tau \eta(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N\} \geq \inf_{B_{3/4}} u.$$

Note that by taking  $x \in B_{1/2}$ , we have  $u(x) \geq t$ , so that  $\inf_{B_{1/2}} u \geq t$ .

By the lower semicontinuity of  $u - t\eta$ , there exists  $x_0 \in B_{3/4}$  such that  $\inf_{B_{3/4}}(u - t\eta) = (u - t\eta)(x_0) \geq 0$ . If we had  $u(x_0) - t\eta(x_0) > 0$ , we would get  $u > t\eta$  in  $B_{3/4}$ , so there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $u > (t + \varepsilon)\eta$  in  $B_{3/4}$ . Since  $\eta \equiv 0$  outside  $B_{3/4}$ ,  $u \geq 0 = (t + \varepsilon)\eta$ . This means  $t + \varepsilon > t$  satisfies  $u \geq (t + \varepsilon)\eta$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , contradicting the maximality of  $t$ . Thus, we must have  $u(x_0) - t\eta(x_0) = 0$ .

This means that  $t\eta$  touches  $u$  from below at  $x_0$ , then by Lemma 3,  $\mathcal{M}^-u(x_0)$  is well defined and we have

$$\mathcal{M}^-u(x_0) + V(x_0)u(x_0) \leq C_0$$

Since  $u - t\eta$  can be touched from below by a constant function, then  $\mathcal{M}^-[u - t\eta](x_0)$  is also classically defined.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^-[\eta](x_0) &= \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\eta(y) - \eta(x_0))K(x_0 - y)dy \\ &= \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \int_{B_{3/4}} (\eta(y) - \eta(x_0))K(x_0 - y)dy \\ &\geq \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \int_{B_{3/4}} (\eta(y) - 1)K(x_0 - y)dy \\ &\geq \Lambda \int_{B_{3/4}} \frac{\eta(y) - 1}{|x_0 - y|^{N+2s}} dy \geq -c_1 \end{aligned}$$

with  $c_1 = c_1(N, s, \lambda) > 0$  because  $\eta \leq 1$ .

Now, since  $(u - t\eta)(x_0) = 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^-[u - t\eta](x_0) &\leq \mathcal{M}^-[u](x_0) - t\mathcal{M}^-[\eta](x_0) + V(x_0)u(x_0) - tV(x_0)\eta(x_0) \\ &\leq C_0 - t\mathcal{M}^-[\eta](x_0) - tV(x_0)\eta(x_0) \\ &\leq C_0 + tc_1 + t \end{aligned}$$

because  $V(x_0) \geq -1$  and  $\eta \leq 1$ .

On the other hand, using again  $(u - t\eta)(x_0) = 0$ , a lower bound is produced

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^- [u - t\eta](x_0) &\geq \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(z) - t\eta(z)}{|z - x_0|^{N+2s}} dz \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^{N+2s}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(z)}{1 + |z|^{N+2s}} dz - t \|1\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \right) \\ &= \tilde{C} \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} - tc_2 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{C} := \frac{1}{2^{N+2s}}$  and  $c_2 := \tilde{C} \|1\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)}$  depend only on  $N$ ,  $s$  and  $\lambda$ .

Combining the above inequalities, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C} \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} - tc_2 &\leq C_0 + tc_1 + t \\ \implies \tilde{C} \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} &\leq C_0 + t(1 + c_1 + c_2) \\ \implies \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} &\leq C(\inf_{B_{1/2}} u + C_0), \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that  $t \leq \inf_{B_{1/2}} u$  and by setting  $C := \frac{1+c_1+c_2}{\tilde{C}}$ . □

We also recall a global regularity result.

**Proposition 7** (Theorem 3.6 in [18]). *Let  $G$  be a bounded  $C^2$  domain,  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $f \in L^\infty(G)$ . If  $u \in C(G) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a viscosity solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -I[u] = f & \text{in } G \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus G, \end{cases}$$

then  $u \in C^\alpha(\bar{G})$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

Now we highlight the definition of maximum/minimum principle holding in a bounded domain. In the sequel we consider an operator  $F = I + V$ , where  $I$  has the form (3).

**Definition 2.** *We say the operator  $F$  satisfies the maximum principle (resp. minimum principle) in the bounded domain  $G$ , and we denote it by  $\lambda_1^+(F, G) > 0$  (resp.  $\lambda_1^-(F, G) > 0$ ), if for every function  $v \in LSC(\Omega) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  ( $v \in USC(\Omega) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ) that satisfies*

$$F[v] \geq 0 \quad (F[v] \leq 0) \text{ in } \Omega \text{ in the viscosity sense, with } v \leq 0 \quad (v \geq 0) \text{ outside } G,$$

one has  $v \leq 0$  (resp.  $v \geq 0$ ) in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

Our notation on the validity of the maximum and minimum principles in terms of the first eigenvalue quantities  $\lambda_1^\pm(F, G)$  comes from the equivalences proved in [18]. See those equivalences and analogous definitions in [22] for the local case, in which

$$\lambda_1^-(\mathcal{M}^-, G) = \lambda_1^+(\mathcal{M}^+, G) \leq \lambda_1^-(\mathcal{M}^+, G) = \lambda_1^+(\mathcal{M}^-, G).$$

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

In this section we turn to prove a weak Harnack inequality in balls of arbitrarily large radius. Special care must be taken on the dependence of the constant on the radius  $R$ , as this will ultimately give us the lower polynomial bound on the decay of positive supersolutions.

**Theorem 8.** *Let  $R \geq 1$ ,  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $V \in C(B_{R+1}) \cap L^\infty(B_{R+1})$ . There exists a positive constant  $C = C(N, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \|V\|_{L^\infty(B_{R+1})})$  such that for any viscosity solution  $u \in C(\overline{B_{R+1}}) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  to*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^-u + Vu \leq C_0 & \text{in } B_{R+1} \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases}$$

we have

$$(6) \quad \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C(1 + R^{N+2s}) \left( \inf_{B_R} u + C_0 \right)$$

*Proof.* The first step is to derive a weak Harnack inequality in small balls.

Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,

$$(7) \quad 0 < r_0 \leq (1 + \|V\|_{L^\infty(B_{2r_0}(x_0))})^{-1/2s},$$

and let  $u \in \text{LSC}(B_{r_0}(x_0)) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^-u + Vu \leq C_0 & \text{in } B_{r_0}(x_0) \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases}$$

We claim that

$$(8) \quad \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C(1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}) \left( \inf_{B_{r_0/2}(x_0)} u + r_0^{2s} C_0 \right)$$

for some  $C = C(N, s, \lambda, \Lambda, r_0) > 0$ .

Indeed, if we define

$$(9) \quad v(y) = u(x_0 + r_0 y), \quad \tilde{V}(y) = r_0^{2s} V(x_0 + r_0 y),$$

we get  $\mathcal{M}^-v(y) = r_0^{2s} \mathcal{M}^-u(x_0 + r_0 y)$ , and so  $v$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^-v + \tilde{V}v \leq r_0^{2s} C_0 & \text{in } B_1 \\ v \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases}$$

in the viscosity sense. Furthermore,

$$\|\tilde{V}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} = r_0^{2s} \|V\|_{L^\infty(B_{r_0}(x_0))} \leq \frac{\|V\|_{L^\infty(B_{r_0}(x_0))}}{1 + \|V\|_{L^\infty(B_{2r_0}(x_0))}} \leq 1$$

thus by Proposition 6, we obtain

$$\|v\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \left( \inf_{B_{1/2}} v + r_0^{2s} C_0 \right).$$

Now we need to compare the  $L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ -norms of  $v$  and  $u$ . We pause the proof of Theorem 8 to provide such an estimate.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $u \in L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $r_0 \in (0, 1]$ . If one defines  $v(y) = u(x_0 + r_0 y)$ , then there exists  $C$  that depends on  $N$ ,  $s$  and  $r_0$ , such that*

$$\frac{C^{-1}}{1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}} \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \|v\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C(1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}) \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 9.* Note that

$$\|v\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = r_0^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s} + |z - x_0|^{N+2s}} \frac{|u(z)|}{1 + |z|^{N+2s}} dz.$$

Thus, it suffices to prove

$$\frac{3^{-N-2s}}{1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}} \leq \frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s} + |z - x_0|^{N+2s}} \leq \left(\frac{2}{r_0}\right)^{N+2s} (1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}).$$

If  $|z| \leq 2|x_0|$ ,

$$\frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s} + |z - x_0|^{N+2s}} \leq \frac{1 + 2^{N+2s}|x_0|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s}} \leq \left(\frac{2}{r_0}\right)^{N+2s} (1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}),$$

and, as  $r_0 \leq 1$  and  $|z - x_0| \leq |z| + |x_0| \leq 3|x_0|$ ,

$$\frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s} + |z - x_0|^{N+2s}} \geq \frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{1 + 3^{N+2s}|x_0|^{N+2s}} \geq \frac{1}{3^{N+2s}} \frac{1}{1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}}.$$

If  $|z| > 2|x_0|$ , we have, by the triangle inequality,

$$|z - x_0| \geq |z| - |x_0| \geq |z| - \frac{|z|}{2} = \frac{|z|}{2} \geq r_0 \frac{|z|}{2},$$

which gives

$$\frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s} + |z - x_0|^{N+2s}} \leq \frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s}(1 + (|z|/2)^{N+2s})} \leq \left(\frac{2}{r_0}\right)^{N+2s} \leq \left(\frac{2}{r_0}\right)^{N+2s} (1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}).$$

On the other hand,  $|z - x_0| \leq |z| + |x_0| \leq 2|z|$ . This implies

$$\frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{r_0^{N+2s} + |z - x_0|^{N+2s}} \geq \frac{1 + |z|^{N+2s}}{1 + 2^{N+2s}|z|^{N+2s}} \geq \frac{1}{2^{N+2s}} \geq \frac{1}{2^{N+2s}} \frac{1}{1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}}.$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 8, continued:* In view of the above lemma, we get

$$\|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C(1 + |x_0|^{N+2s}) \left( \inf_{B_{r_0/2}(x_0)} u + r_0^{2s} C_0 \right)$$

which is exactly (8).

Next, we set  $r_0 = (1 + \|V\|_\infty)^{-2s} \leq 1$ . We then take a cover of  $B_R$  by balls  $\{B_{r_0/2}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ ,  $x_i \in B_R$ , which satisfies  $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \overline{B_{r_0}(x_i)} \subset B_{R+1}$ . By continuity of  $u$  in  $B_{R+1}$ ,  $u$  achieves a minimum and a maximum in  $\overline{B_R}$ , so we can take  $x_i$  such that

$$(10) \quad \inf_{B_{r_0/2}(x_i)} u \leq \inf_{B_R} u.$$

Applying (8) at  $x_i$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} &\leq C(1 + |x_i|^{N+2s}) \left( \inf_{B_{r_0/2}(x_i)} u + r_0^{2s} C_0 \right) \\ &\leq C(1 + R^{N+2s}) \left( \inf_{B_{r_0/2}(x_i)} u + C_0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (10) gives (6), for  $R \geq 1$ .  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 8 gives a short proof of the strong minimum principle, assuming the minimum principle holds.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $G \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded domain, and  $F = I + V$ , where  $I$  has the form (3) and  $V \in L^\infty(G)$ , such that  $\lambda_1^-(F, G) > 0$ ,  $s \in (0, 1)$ . If  $u \in LSC(\overline{G}) \cap L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} F[u] \leq 0 & \text{in } G \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus G, \end{cases}$$

then either  $u > 0$  or  $u \equiv 0$  in  $G$ .

*Proof.* We first apply the minimum principle to get  $u \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Next, if  $u(x_0) = 0$  for some  $x_0 \in G$ , we take  $r_0 > 0$  such that  $B_{r_0}(x_0) \subset G$  and such that (7) holds. We define  $v$  as in (9), then inequality (8) holds with  $C_0 = 0$ . This implies  $\|u\|_{L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 0$ , so  $u \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

We need a viscosity supersolution which is positive in the whole space in order to apply a comparison principle and then conclude the unique continuation result at infinity. The next proposition is a nonlocal version to Proposition 4.2 in [23], and will give us a positive bound from above to our solution.

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $V \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be such that  $\lambda_1^\pm(I + V, G) > 0$  for each bounded subdomain  $G$  of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Then there exists  $\psi \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L_{\omega_s}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  a viscosity solution to*

$$I\psi + V\psi = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

with  $\psi > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

*Proof.* Let  $F := I + V$ ,  $G \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a smooth bounded domain, and  $g \in C(\overline{G})$ . Since we are assuming  $V \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , there exists  $\sigma > 0$  such that  $V - \sigma \leq 0$  in  $G$ . By Proposition 5, for every  $v \in C(\overline{G})$ , there exists a unique viscosity solution  $u \in C(\overline{G})$  such that  $F[u] = g - \sigma v$  in  $G$  and  $u = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus G$ . So we can define an operator  $S : C(\overline{G}) \rightarrow C(\overline{G})$  such that  $S[v] = u$  is the solution to this problem.

Now, taking  $C_0 = \|g\|_{C(\overline{G})} + \sigma\|v\|_{C(\overline{G})} + \|V - \sigma\|_{C(\overline{G})}\|u\|_{C(\overline{G})}$ , we get

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^+ u \geq -C_0 & \text{in } G \\ \mathcal{M}^- u \leq C_0 & \text{in } G \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus G \end{cases}$$

so, by Proposition 7, there exists  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , depending only on  $G$ ,  $N$ ,  $s$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ , such that  $u \in C^\alpha(\overline{G})$ . This implies that, if  $A \subset C(\overline{G})$  is a bounded set, then  $S(A)$  is bounded in  $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  and, by the compact inclusion of  $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$  in  $C(\overline{\Omega})$ , it is a relatively compact set in  $C(\overline{G})$ . This means that  $S : C(\overline{G}) \rightarrow C(\overline{G})$  is a compact operator.

We will apply the Leray-Schauder alternative below to conclude that  $S$  has a fixed point.

**Proposition 12** (Corollary 1.19 in [1]). *Let  $X$  be a Banach space, and  $S : X \rightarrow X$  a compact operator. Then the following alternative holds:*

- (1) either  $x - tS(x) = 0$  has a solution for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ;
- (2) or the set  $\{x \in X : \exists t \in [0, 1] : x - tS(x) = 0\}$  is unbounded.

Aiming for a contradiction, let us suppose that there exist  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C(\overline{G})$  and  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, 1]$  such that  $u_n - t_n S[u_n] = 0$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\|u_n\|_{C(\overline{G})} \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that by compactness we can assume that  $t_n \rightarrow t \in [0, 1]$ . Now, by definition of  $S$ , it holds that

$$F[u_n] - \sigma u_n = t_n(g - \sigma u_n).$$

By defining  $\tilde{u}_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|_{C(\overline{G})}}$ , we get  $\|\tilde{u}_n\|_{C(\overline{G})} = 1$  and also

$$F[\tilde{u}] - \sigma \tilde{u} = t_n \left( \frac{g}{\|u_n\|_{C(\overline{G})}} - \tilde{u}_n \right)$$

which means, again by Holder regularity, that

$$\|\tilde{u}_n\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{G})} \leq C(1 + \|u_n\|_{C(\overline{G})}^{-1} \|g\|_{C(\overline{G})}) \leq C.$$

Therefore,  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in  $C^\alpha(\overline{G})$ , which implies that there exists a convergent subsequence (which will not be relabeled)  $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow \tilde{u} \in C(\overline{G})$  with  $\tilde{u}$  a viscosity solution to

$$F[\tilde{u}] - \sigma(1-t)\tilde{u} = 0.$$

Hence  $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$ , because we know that if  $F$  satisfies the maximum principle, then  $F - \sigma(1-t)$  also does for  $\sigma(1-t) \geq 0$ . But this contradicts the fact that  $\|\tilde{u}\|_{C(\overline{G})} = 1$ .

We conclude that for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ , there exists a viscosity solution  $u$  for  $u - tS[u] = 0$  in  $G$ ,  $u = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus G$ . Take  $g = -V \in C(\overline{G})$  and  $t = 1$  and we have found a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} F[v] = -V & \text{in } G \\ v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus G. \end{cases}$$

By setting  $u = v + 1$  we derive

$$F[u] = I[v + 1] + Vv + V = F[v] + V = 0 \text{ in } G$$

and  $u = 1$  outside of  $G$ . By the strong minimum principle (Lemma 10),  $u > 0$  in  $G$ .

Take  $\{G_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  an increasing sequence of smooth bounded domains such that  $G_j \nearrow \mathbb{R}^N$ , and define, for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u_j$  as the unique viscosity solution (given by Proposition 5) to

$$\begin{cases} Iu_j + Vu_j = 0 & \text{in } G_j \\ u_j = 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus G_j. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 10,  $u > 0$  in  $G_j$  and by the maximum principle we get  $u_j \leq 1$ . Moreover, fix a  $x_0 \in G_1$  and redefine  $u_j$  by posing  $\tilde{u}_j = \frac{u_j}{u_j(x_0)} =: mu_j$ .

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  a compact set with  $K \subset\subset G_j$  for  $j \geq j_0$ . As  $\tilde{u}_j = m$  outside of  $G_j$ , by the maximum principle we have  $\tilde{u}_j \leq m$  in  $K$ , so  $\|\tilde{u}_j\|_{C(K)} \leq m$ . By Proposition 7 we get that  $\|\tilde{u}_j\|_{C^\alpha(K)} \leq \tilde{C}$ , so  $(\tilde{u}_j)$  converges strongly in  $C(K)$  to a function  $\psi \in C(K)$ . This means that  $(\tilde{u}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $\psi$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ .

Now, we have to check  $\tilde{u}_j \rightarrow u$  in  $L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Note that we must have  $0 \leq \psi \leq m$  by the maximum and minimum principles. As constant functions are in  $L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , we conclude  $\tilde{u}_j \rightarrow \psi$  in  $L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  by the dominated convergence theorem.

Finally, by Lemma 4,  $\psi$  is a viscosity solution to  $I\psi + V\psi = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Since  $\psi(x_0) = 1$ , again by the strong minimum principle we must have  $\psi > 0$  everywhere.  $\square$

We now turn to the proof of our main theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* First, let us assume  $I$  is of the form  $Iu(x) = \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} L_a u(x)$ . In this case, for any  $u, v$

$$I(u - v) \geq Iu - Iv.$$

Denote also  $I^*u = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} L_a u$ .

Let  $\psi > 0$  a positive viscosity solution given by Proposition 11, which we normalize to have  $\|\psi\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1$ . Note that, for any  $R \geq 1$ , by Theorem 8 we have

$$(11) \quad 1 = \|\psi\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq CR^{N+2s} \inf_{B_R} \psi.$$

Let  $\delta > 0$  be arbitrary. By hypothesis, there exists  $R \geq 1$  such that

$$(12) \quad |u(x)| \leq \delta |x|^{-(N+2s)}, \text{ for all } |x| \geq R,$$

so, for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R$ , we can replace  $|x| = R$  in (11) and combine it with (12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &\leq C\delta \inf_{B_{|x|}} \psi \\ &\leq C\delta \psi(x), \end{aligned}$$

so we have  $|u| \leq C\delta\psi$  outside  $B_R$ .

Defining  $w_+(x) = u - C\delta\psi$ , we have  $w_+ \in C(\overline{B_R}) \cap L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,  $w_+ \leq 0$  outside  $B_R$  and

$$Iw_+ + Vw_+ \geq Iu + Vw_+ - C\delta(I\psi + V\psi) = 0 \text{ in } B_R$$

in the viscosity sense. We then apply the maximum principle to get  $w_+ \leq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , which means that  $u \leq C\delta\psi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Taking  $\delta \searrow 0$  yields  $u \leq 0$ .

Next, we observe that  $-u$  satisfies  $I^*(-u) + V(-u) = 0$  in the viscosity sense. Moreover,  $-u \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , therefore we can apply Theorem 8 to obtain

$$\|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq CR^{N+2s} \inf_{B_R} (-u).$$

If  $u \not\equiv 0$ , then  $\|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \neq 0$ , so actually

$$C^{-1}\|u\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} R^{-(N+2s)} \leq \inf_{B_R} (-u) = \inf_{B_R} |u|$$

which is a contradiction with hypothesis (4). Thus  $u \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

Assume now that  $I$  is of the form  $Iu = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} L_a u$ . It holds that

$$I(u + v) \geq Iu + Iv.$$

Let  $\varphi$  be the solution obtained by applying Proposition 11 to the operator  $\tilde{F}[u] := -F[-u]$ , where  $F = I + V$ , normalized such that  $\|\varphi\|_{L^1_{\omega_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1$ . Whence we apply Theorem 8 and get the decay estimate (11) for  $\varphi$ .

Proceeding as in the sup case, we derive, for every  $\delta > 0$ , that  $|u| \leq C\delta\varphi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R$  for  $R > 0$  sufficiently large. Defining  $w_+ = u - C\delta\varphi$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} Iw_+ + Vw_+ &\geq Iu + I(-C\delta\varphi) + Vu - C\delta V\varphi \\ &= -C\delta(-I[-\varphi] + V\varphi) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

in  $B_R$ , in the viscosity sense. By the maximum principle,  $w_+ \leq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , and so  $u \leq C\delta\varphi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Taking  $\delta \searrow 0$  we obtain  $u \leq 0$ , and by replicating the former argument we conclude  $u \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bandle and W. Reichel. “Solutions of Quasilinear Second-Order Elliptic Boundary Value Problems via Degree Theory”. In: *Handbook of Differential Equations: Stationary Differential Equations*. Ed. by M. Chipot and P. Quittner. First. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2004, pp. 1–70.
- [2] M. Bonforte and J. L. Vázquez. “Quantitative local and global a priori estimates for fractional nonlinear diffusion equations”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 250 (2014), pp. 242–284.
- [3] J. Bourgain and C. Kenig. “On localization in the continuous Anderson-Bernoulli model in higher dimension”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 161.2 (2005), pp. 389–426.
- [4] C. Bucur, E. Valdinoci, et al. *Nonlocal diffusion and applications*. Vol. 20. Springer, 2016.
- [5] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. “Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 62.5 (2009), pp. 597–638.
- [6] U. Das and Y. Pinchover. “The Landis conjecture via Liouville comparison principle and criticality theory”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11695* (2024).
- [7] B. Davey, C. Kenig, and J.-N. Wang. “The Landis conjecture for variable coefficient second-order elliptic PDEs”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 369.11 (2017), pp. 8209–8237.
- [8] B. Davey, C. Kenig, and J.-N. Wang. “On Landis’ conjecture in the plane when the potential has an exponentially decaying negative part”. In: *St. Petersburg Mathematical Journal* 31.2 (2020), pp. 337–353.
- [9] P. Felmer, A. Quaas, and J. Tan. “Positive solutions of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with the fractional Laplacian”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics* 142.6 (2012), 1237–1262. DOI: 10.1017/S0308210511000746.
- [10] X. Fernández-Real and X. Ros-Oton. *Integro-Differential Elliptic Equations*. Vol. 350. Progress in Mathematics. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024.
- [11] C. Kenig, L. Silvestre, and J.-N. Wang. “On Landis’ Conjecture in the Plane”. In: *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 40.4 (2015), pp. 766–789.
- [12] C. Kenig and J.-N. Wang. “Quantitative uniqueness estimates for second order elliptic equations with unbounded drift”. In: *Mathematical Research Letters* 22.4 (2015), pp. 1159–1175.
- [13] V. A. Kondratiev and E. M. Landis. “Qualitative theory of second order linear partial differential equations”. In: *VINITI, Moscow. Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki. Ser. Sovrem. Probl. Mat. Fund. Napr.* 32 (1988), pp. 99–215.
- [14] P.-Z. Kow and J.-N. Wang. “Landis-type conjecture for the half-Laplacian”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 151.7 (Apr. 13, 2023), pp. 2951–2962.
- [15] A. Logunov, E. Malinnikova, N. Nadirashvili, and F. Nazarov. *The Landis conjecture on exponential decay*. 2020. arXiv: 200.07034.
- [16] V. Z. Meshkov. “On the possible rate of decay at infinity of solutions of second order partial differential equations”. In: *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik* 72.2 (1992), pp. 343–361.
- [17] C. Mou. “Perron’s method for nonlocal fully nonlinear equations”. In: *Analysis & PDE* 10.5 (2017), pp. 1227–1254.

- [18] A. Quaas, A. Salort, and A. Xia. “Principal eigenvalues of fully nonlinear integro-differential elliptic equations with a drift term”. In: *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations* 26 (2020), p. 36.
- [19] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. “The Boundary Harnack Principle for Nonlocal Elliptic Operators in Non-divergence Form”. In: *Potential Analysis* 51.3 (2019), pp. 315–331.
- [20] L. Rossi. “The Landis conjecture with sharp rate of decay”. In: *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 70 (2020), pp. 301–324.
- [21] A. Rüländ and J.-N. Wang. “On the fractional Landis conjecture”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 277.9 (2019), pp. 3236–3270.
- [22] E. Moreira dos Santos, G. Nornberg, D. Schiera, and H. Tavares. “Principal spectral curves for Lane-Emden fully nonlinear type systems and applications”. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 62.49 (2023).
- [23] B. Sirakov and P. Souplet. “The Vázquez maximum principle and the Landis conjecture for elliptic PDE with unbounded coefficients”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 387 (2021), p. 107838.