

# SCHAUDER ESTIMATES FOR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS DEGENERATING ON LOWER DIMENSIONAL MANIFOLDS

GABRIELE CORA, GABRIELE FIORAVANTI, STEFANO VITA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we begin exploring a local regularity theory for elliptic equations having coefficients which are degenerate or singular on some lower dimensional manifold

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A(x, y) \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F) \quad \text{in } B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $2 \leq n \leq d$  are two integers and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Such equations are a prototypical example of elliptic equations spoiling their uniform ellipticity on the (possibly very) thin characteristic manifold  $\Sigma_0 = \{|y| = 0\}$  of dimension  $0 \leq d - n \leq d - 2$ , having

$$\lambda |y|^a |\xi|^2 \leq |y|^a A(x, y) \xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda |y|^a |\xi|^2.$$

Whenever  $a + n > 0$ , the weak solutions with a homogeneous conormal boundary condition at  $\Sigma_0$  are provided to be  $C^{0,\alpha}$  or even  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regular up to  $\Sigma_0$ . Our approach relies on a regularization-approximation scheme which employs domain perforation, very fine blow-up procedures and a new Liouville theorem in the perforated space, of independent interest. Our theory extends to inhomogeneous conormal boundary conditions, to the case of suitably smooth curved manifolds and also applies - whenever  $a + n < 2$  - to solutions with prescribed homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition at  $\Sigma_0$  by a boundary Harnack type principle. Finally, we establish the connection with fractional Laplacians on very thin flat manifolds via Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps, as a higher codimensional analogue of the extension theory developed by Caffarelli and Silvestre.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Aim of this work is the study of the local regularity properties, Hölder  $C^{0,\alpha}$  and Schauder  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates, of weak solutions to

$$(1.1) \quad -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A(x, y) \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F) \quad \text{in } B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Here  $z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $2 \leq n \leq d$  are two integers and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . The second order equation in divergence form above is uniformly elliptic far from a characteristic flat manifold of low dimension  $0 \leq d - n \leq d - 2$

$$\Sigma_0 = \{z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |y| = 0\},$$

and the weight term is a power of the distance to  $\Sigma_0$ ; that is,  $|y| = \operatorname{dist}(z, \Sigma_0)$ . In other words, there exist  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$  such that the symmetric  $(d \times d)$ -dimensional matrix  $A(z) = (a_{ij}(z))_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$  satisfies

$$\lambda |y|^a |\xi|^2 \leq |y|^a A(z) \xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda |y|^a |\xi|^2 \quad \text{for almost any } z \in B_1, \text{ for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B65, 35J70, 35J75, 35B40, 35B44, 35B45, 35B53.

*Key words and phrases.* Weighted elliptic equations; Degenerate ellipticity; Schauder regularity estimates; Lower dimensional boundaries; Liouville Theorems; Perforated domains.

The weak solutions to the above problem are elements of the weighed Sobolev space  $H^{1,a}(B_1) := H^1(B_1, |y|^a dz)$  which satisfy

$$(1.2) \quad \int_{B_1} |y|^a A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi = \int_{B_1} |y|^a (f \phi - F \cdot \nabla \phi) \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(B_1).$$

The equation is satisfied *across* the thin manifold  $\Sigma_0$ , and this implies a formal homogeneous conormal condition at  $\Sigma_0$

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{|y| \rightarrow 0} |y|^{a+n-1} (A \nabla u + F) \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} = 0,$$

see Remark 4.2 for the precise meaning of the above expression. Notice also that, when  $A = \mathbb{I}$  and  $F = 0$ , (1.3) corresponds to a vanishing weighted radial derivative with respect to the degenerate variables.

The weighted  $H^{1,a}$ -capacity of the thin manifold  $\Sigma_0$  is key to understanding what kind of solutions one may face. Depending on the value of the parameter  $a + n \in \mathbb{R}$ , the local weighed capacity of the characteristic manifold is infinite when  $a + n \leq 0$ , positive and finite when  $a + n \in (0, 2)$  and zero when  $a + n \geq 2$ . Consequently, weak solutions must vanish at  $\Sigma_0$  in the *supersingular* case  $a + n \leq 0$ , and naturally satisfy (1.3) in the *superdegenerate* case  $a + n \geq 2$ . Finally, in the *mid-range* case  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ , many different boundary conditions can be prescribed at  $\Sigma_0$ , and this corresponds to inhomogeneous Dirichlet and inhomogeneous conormal boundary problems (oblique derivative type conditions).

In this paper, we mostly work under the assumption  $a + n > 0$  - which makes the weight term locally integrable - and deal with functions which solve (1.1) across  $\Sigma_0$  in the sense of (1.2); that is, we study the homogeneous conormal boundary problem. We will see that the regularity for the inhomogeneous conormal problem in the mid-range  $a + n \in (0, 2)$  follows as a consequence of the theory for the homogeneous one. Concerning Dirichlet type boundary conditions, the inhomogeneous problem in the mid-range  $a + n \in (0, 2)$  is studied in the companion paper [33], while the analysis of the homogeneous case, when  $a + n < 2$ , is partially carried out in the present paper via a boundary Harnack type principle.

**Background and motivations.** The local regularity theory for weighted degenerate elliptic equations starts with the seminal works by Fabes-Jerison-Kenig-Serapioni [28, 29, 30]. Among their motivations for such a regularity theory, the connection with the study of fine qualitative properties of harmonic functions at the boundary of rough domains through quasiconformal mappings from a ball. In [30], the authors extend the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser theory to degenerate elliptic equations where the degeneracy/singularity is carried out by a weight term  $\omega$  which arises either from quasiconformal mappings or belongs to the  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt class. The latter indicates a combined local integrability property between the weight and its reciprocal. Their regularity theory includes Harnack inequalities and local Hölder continuity of solutions. These results rely primarily in the validity of a general functional framework in weighted Sobolev spaces comprehending Poincaré-Wirtinger and Sobolev inequalities. Later, the conditions which provide this setting have been summarized into three main properties of the weight, characterizing the so-called 2-admissible weights, see for instance [38] and later discussions in Section 2.6. The general regularity theory for weighted equations also ends with [30], since

Hölder continuity is the optimal regularity if no further geometric assumption on the zero/infinity set  $\Sigma_0 = \{\omega(z) = 0 \vee \omega(z) = \infty\}$  is done.

In recent years, there have been significant contributions to the study of degenerate elliptic equations where the weight behaves like a power of the distance from a  $(d-1)$ -dimensional manifold. The model equation is

$$(1.4) \quad -\operatorname{div}(y^a A(x, y) \nabla u) = RHS \quad \text{in } B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}_+^d.$$

Here  $z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+ = \mathbb{R}_+^d$ ,  $B_1^+ = B_1 \cap \{y > 0\}$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\Sigma_0 = \{y = 0\}$  is an hyperplane, i.e. it has codimension  $n = 1$ . This theory has profound connections with the edge calculus developed in [47, 48], see also [44, 36, 37] and the references therein. However, the recent interest in this problem primarily relies in the connection with fractional Laplacians due to an extension theory via Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps [8]; that is, for  $a \in (-1, 1)$

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(y^a \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^d \\ -\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \partial_y u(x, y) = C_{a,d} (-\Delta)^{\frac{1-a}{2}} u(x, 0) & \text{in } \Sigma_0, \end{cases}$$

see also [11] for the curved analogous in conformal geometry.

Concerning the general equation (1.4), it is crucial to comment here its possible connection with Grushin operators. As it is highlighted in [8], a change of coordinates moves the operator into a Grushin type one. However, this is true only for a particular small range of the exponent  $a$ , and in any case both the transformation and the power term in the Grushin operator are not smooth. So, hypoellipticity and the Hörmander regularity theory are not valid in general. In fact, the indicial root  $y^{1-a}$  always solves the homogeneous ( $RHS = 0$ ) isotropic ( $A = \mathbb{I}$ ) equation (1.4) whenever  $a < 1$ . This prevents general *harmonic functions for the degenerate operator* from being smooth.

However, the regularity of the solutions may strongly improve by imposing certain boundary conditions at  $\Sigma_0$ . In fact, solutions with a homogeneous conormal boundary condition at  $\Sigma_0$  enjoy a Schauder theory in  $C^{k,\alpha}$  spaces whenever  $a > -1$ , which in turns leads to smoothness if data are smooth. The full regularity theory in Hölder spaces is carried out in [55, 56, 57, 24], see also [2, 3] for the parabolic case and [25, 26] for regularity estimates in Sobolev spaces. Notably, this theory finds nice applications in higher order boundary Harnack principles [22] for uniformly elliptic equations [57, 58, 61]. The literature on the regularity in the mid-range case  $a \in (-1, 1)$  is extensive, primarily due again to the connection with fractional Laplacians. We cannot provide a comprehensive list of all contributions on this topic here; however, concerning Schauder type estimates, a notable reference can be found in [9].

Let us consider now the higher codimensional case presented in the present paper. The study of (1.1) can be seen at a first glance as a natural continuation of the codimension 1 theory. However, there are many other motivations for developing such a regularity theory. We would like to focus our attention on some topics which strongly relates to the degenerate equation (1.1) and may have further developments due to our results and approach. Some of them are known topics, and have a literature: harmonic maps with prescribed singularities in general relativity, the Dirichlet problem and harmonic measure on lower dimensional boundaries. Some other connections are new: critical points for Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities, higher codimensional extensions of fractional Laplacians, very thin free boundary problems. We will spend some other words on these topics in the last part of

this introduction. Finally, we would like to mention some unique continuation results for Grushin-type operators which are degenerate on lower dimensional manifolds, see for instance [1, 34, 39] and many references therein.

**Main results and strategies.** In the present section, we would like to state our main results and discuss the strategies involved in their proofs.

*The homogeneous conormal problem.* The main results we are presenting here concern the homogeneous conormal problem for (1.1) in the range  $a + n > 0$ . The solutions we are referring to are elements of  $H^{1,a}(B_1)$  which weakly solve (1.2). Our main objectives are certain Hölder  $C^{0,\alpha}$  and Schauder  $C^{1,\alpha}$  local regularity estimates up to  $\Sigma_0$  for this class of weak solutions. In order to state precisely our main results, we need to be more specific regarding the uniform ellipticity properties of the variable coefficient matrix  $A$ . The latter is a symmetric  $(d \times d)$ -dimensional matrix satisfying the *global* uniform ellipticity condition

$$(1.5) \quad \lambda|\xi|^2 \leq A(z)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda|\xi|^2, \quad \text{for a.e. } z \in B_1 \text{ and for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

for some ellipticity constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$ . Moreover,  $A$  satisfies the *restricted-to-* $\Sigma_0$  uniform ellipticity condition

$$(1.6) \quad \lambda_*|\xi|^2 \leq A_3(x, 0)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda_*|\xi|^2, \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, 0) \in B_1 \cap \Sigma_0 \text{ and for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with ellipticity constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ , where  $A_3$  is the  $(n \times n)$ -dimensional block located in the lower-right corner of the matrix  $A$ , see (1.19). Then, let us introduce the exponent

$$(1.7) \quad \alpha_* = \alpha_*(a, n, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*) = \frac{2 - a - n + \sqrt{(2 - a - n)^2 + 4\mu_*}}{2},$$

with

$$\mu_* = \mu_*(a, n, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\lambda_*}{\Lambda_*}\right)^{\frac{|a|}{2}}(n-1) & \text{if } n \geq 3, \\ \left(\frac{4}{\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{\lambda_*}{\Lambda_*}\right)^{\frac{|a|}{4}}\right)^2 & \text{if } n = 2. \end{cases}$$

Notice that both  $\alpha_*$  and  $\mu_*$  are monotone increasing with respect to  $0 < \lambda_*/\Lambda_* \leq 1$ . Notice also that in case  $\lambda_*/\Lambda_* = 1$  (which happens in particular if  $A = \mathbb{I}$ ),  $\mu_* = n - 1$  which corresponds to the first positive eigenvalue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . Then, our first main result is the following.

**Theorem 1.1** (Hölder  $C^{0,\alpha}$  estimate). *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $p > (d + a_+)/2$ ,  $q > d + a_+$ . Let  $A$  be a uniformly elliptic matrix satisfying (1.5) and (1.6) with constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ . Let  $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(n, a, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*)$  be defined as in (1.7). Let*

$$(1.8) \quad \alpha \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \alpha_*) \cap (0, 2 - (d + a_+)/p] \cap (0, 1 - (d + a_+)/q].$$

*Let  $A$  be continuous with  $\|A\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq L$ ,  $f \in L^{p,\alpha}(B_1)$ ,  $F \in L^{q,\alpha}(B_1)^d$  and  $u$  be a weak solution to (1.1) in  $B_1$ .*

Then,  $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, q, L$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{L^{q,a}(B_1)}).$$

Let us notice here that Hölder regularity for some small implicit exponent follows by [30] in the  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt range  $a + n \in (0, 2n)$  or by the 2-admissibility of the weight (see [38]) even in the full range  $a + n > 0$  again by [30], once the 2-admissibility condition is established in Section 2.6. The latter is true even when the variable coefficient matrix is only assumed to be bounded measurable. However, the above result proves an estimate which comes with an explicit Hölder exponent. As we will see, this additional information is due to the homogeneity property of the weight term together with the peculiar geometry of its nodal set  $\Sigma_0$ .

Then, our second result, which is actually the main core of the paper, is the following Schauder estimate, which holds true any time the exponent  $\alpha_*$  exceeds 1, see Remark 1.5.

**Theorem 1.2** (Schauder  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimate). *Let  $a+n > 0, p > d+a_+$ . Let  $A$  be a uniformly elliptic matrix satisfying (1.5) and (1.6) with constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ . Assume that  $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(n, a, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*)$  defined as in (1.7) is such that  $\alpha_* > 1$ . Let*

$$(1.9) \quad \alpha \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \alpha_* - 1) \cap (0, 1 - (d + a_+)/p].$$

Let  $A$  be  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous with  $\|A\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \leq L, f \in L^{p,a}(B_1), F \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$  and  $u$  be a weak solution to (1.1) in  $B_1$ .

Then,  $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$  and satisfies

$$(1.10) \quad (A\nabla u + F) \cdot e_{y_i} = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_0 \cap B_1, \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Moreover, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, L$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$(1.11) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Let us now comment on the above results and explain the techniques involved. The main idea is to take advantage of a  $\varepsilon$ -regularization-approximation scheme, which aims to address the loss of uniform ellipticity on the characteristic manifold by approximating with uniformly elliptic problems. In this way, the estimates become available for the  $\varepsilon$ -approximating problems, and the goal is to prove their uniformity (stability) as the regularization parameter  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Returning to the codimension 1 case, in [55] the regularization proposed is at the level of the weight term. Specifically, replacing  $|y|^\alpha$  with  $\rho_\varepsilon^\alpha(y) = (\varepsilon^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$  one immediately obtains a uniformly elliptic problem, and stability can be established as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This approach is not the most effective in this context. To approximate a given solution with a possible boundary condition at  $\Sigma_0$ , the same boundary condition must be prescribed at the level of the regularized equation. However, the local  $H^1(\rho_\varepsilon^\alpha)$ -capacity of  $\Sigma_0$  - which coincides with the classical local unweighted  $H^1$ -capacity - is always zero. As a result, no boundary condition can be imposed on the thin set. This fact becomes particularly evident in the mid-range  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ , especially in case of inhomogeneous conditions.

Next, we propose a general strategy suitable for any boundary value problem and valid across different capacity ranges. The regularization we introduce is performed at the domain level, using

$\varepsilon$ -perforations around  $\Sigma_0$ . In the isotropic case  $A = \mathbb{I}$ , the approximating problems are described as follows

$$(1.12) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F) & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon \\ (\nabla u + F) \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } B_1 \cap \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon = \{|y| \leq \varepsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon = \{|y| = \varepsilon\}.$$

As one can see, the conormal boundary condition is now prescribed on a codimension 1 boundary that shrinks toward  $\Sigma_0$ . Given a particular solution of the limiting problem, one can construct an approximating sequence of solutions for the regularized problems as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . If the regularity estimates for (1.12) are shown to be uniform in  $\varepsilon$ , the same regularity is transferred to the limit.

Adding variable coefficients makes things harder, as anisotropy directly affects the approximation. As we will see, the stability of the estimates relies on Liouville theorems on the complementary of a hole, after blow-up. For general variable coefficients, adjusting the shape of this hole to the anisotropy proves to be convenient, and this requires the domain to be perforated accordingly at a macroscopic scale; that is,

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon^A = \{A_3^{-1}(x, y)y \cdot y \leq \varepsilon^2\} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A = \{A_3^{-1}(x, y)y \cdot y = \varepsilon^2\}.$$

However, a preliminary regularization of the coefficients through convolution with mollifiers is also needed at this point. In fact, the approximating problems

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F) & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ (A \nabla u + F) \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } B_1 \cap \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A, \end{cases}$$

enjoy the desired Hölder  $C^{0,\alpha}$  and Schauder  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates only requiring additional regularity of coefficients, respectively  $C^1$  and  $C^{1,\alpha}$ , since the latter ensures the right regularity of the shrinking boundaries (see Remark 3.2). This is suboptimal when compared with the requirements stated in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. However, this additional regularity is necessary to ensure stability of the estimates with respect to domain perforation. On the other hand, stability with respect to mollification does not require any perforation and holds true under the optimal requirements on coefficients; that is, respectively the  $C^0$  and  $C^{0,\alpha}$  regularity imposed by the natural scaling of the equation.

The validity of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 is based on the following main result.

**Theorem 1.3** (Stable regularity estimates in perforated domains). *Let  $a+n > 0$ . Let  $A$  be a uniformly elliptic matrix satisfying (1.5) and (1.6) with constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ . Let  $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(n, a, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*)$  be defined as in (1.7). Then the following points hold true:*

- i) Let  $p > (d+a_+)/2$ ,  $q > d+a_+$ . Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.8). Let  $A$  be  $C^1$  with  $\|A\|_{C^1(B_1)} \leq L$ ,  $f \in L^{p,a}(B_1)$  and  $F \in L^{q,a}(B_1)^d$ . Then there exists  $\varepsilon_0 < 1$  and a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, q, L, \varepsilon_0$  and  $\alpha$  such that for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$  and for every solution  $u_\varepsilon$  to (1.13) it holds*

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq C \left( \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{L^{q,a}(B_1)} \right).$$

ii) Let  $p > d + a_+$ . Let assume that  $\alpha_* > 1$ . Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.9). Let  $A$  be  $C^{1,\alpha}$  with  $\|A\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)} \leq L$ ,  $f \in L^{p,\alpha}(B_1)$  and  $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$ . Then there exists  $\varepsilon_0 < 1$  and a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, L, \varepsilon_0$  and  $\alpha$  such that for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$  and for every solution  $u_\varepsilon$  to (1.13) it holds

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq C(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Moreover, for every points  $z \in \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_{1/2}$  and for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , it holds

$$(1.14) \quad |(A\nabla u_\varepsilon + F)(z) \cdot e_{y_i}| \leq C\varepsilon^\alpha(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

First of all, we would like to point out that the above result remains valid even if the additional  $C^1$  or  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity is only assumed for the block  $A_3$ , see Remark 3.1. However, to simplify the notation, we assume the higher regularity for all entries of the matrix  $A$ .

Let us also observe that the quantitative condition (1.14) is the key for obtaining the effective conormal boundary condition (1.10) in Theorem 1.2, which is a much stronger information compared to the weighted conormal condition (1.3) enjoyed by weak solutions.

The above result, as far as we know, is new even in the case of the Laplacian ( $a = 0$  and  $A = \mathbb{I}$ ), and provides stability of classical Hölder estimates in perforated domains with Neumann boundary condition on the boundary of the hole. Since our estimates can be extended to second order elliptic equations with general lower order terms, Theorem 1.3 i) has a remarkable link with the quantitative spectral stability for the Laplacian in domains with holes with prescribed Neumann boundary conditions, see for instance [31, 51, 53] and many references therein. In particular, we can imply stable  $\alpha$ -Hölder bounds (for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ) for eigenfunctions in the Neumann-perforated domains, see Remark 6.1.

Notice that the stability of the Schauder estimate can not be valid for the Laplacian, since the effective conormal condition that would follow, i.e.  $\nabla_y u = 0$  on  $\Sigma_0$ , is not a general property of harmonic functions. The latter fact is not in contradiction with our result, since one needs  $a < 0$  in order to make  $\alpha_* > 1$ , see Remark 1.5.

In the spirit of the work of Simon [54], the stable estimates are obtained, in both the regularization procedures (Theorem 1.3 and Proposition 7.1), by a contradiction argument involving a fine blow-up procedure and the classification of entire profiles. The latter is expressed in terms of rigidity results; that is, Liouville type theorems for both uniformly and degenerate elliptic problems on the blow-up domain, which can be the entire space, the half-space, or the space minus an unbounded cylinder around  $\Sigma_0$ . The latter result is of independent interest and can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.4** (Liouville). *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , and let  $A$  be a constant coefficient ( $d \times d$ )-dimensional matrix which satisfies (1.5). Let us denote*

$$\gamma_1^+ = \gamma_1^+(a, n, A) = \frac{2 - a - n + \sqrt{(2 - a - n)^2 + 4\mu_1}}{2},$$

where  $\mu_1 = \mu_1(a, n, A)$  is a constant, which will be precisely defined in Lemma 5.2. Let  $u$  be an entire solution (see Definitions 4.1 and 4.3) to

$$(1.15) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ |y|^a A \nabla u \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A, \end{cases}$$

and assume that there exist two constants  $c > 0$  and  $\gamma \in (0, \gamma_1^+)$  such that

$$(1.16) \quad |u(z)| \leq c(1 + |z|^\gamma).$$

If  $\gamma < 2$ , then  $u$  is linear. Moreover, if  $\gamma < 1$ , then  $u$  is constant.

The above result is derived by using spherical coordinates with respect to the degenerate variable  $y$  and expressing the solution through a Fourier-type decomposition. This approach requires the anisotropy of the coefficients to align with the geometry of the hole, as radial-in- $y$  (axial) symmetry must emerge after a linear change of coordinates.

Let us elaborate on the regularity results in connection with the Liouville theorem discussed above. The exponent  $\alpha_*$  is a threshold for local regularity. It represents the lower bound of the possible homogeneity degrees  $\gamma_1^+$  that one may encounter at the microscopic scale of the blow-up. Then, we would like to highlight the unexpected similarity between  $\alpha_*$  and the optimal Hölder continuity exponent of solutions to equations with bounded measurable (possibly discontinuous) coefficients, see [52]. In the present case, the (restricted-to- $\Sigma_0$ ) ellipticity ratio  $\lambda_*/\Lambda_*$  also plays a role in the expression for  $\alpha_*$ , reducing its value compared to the isotropic case  $A = \mathbb{I}$ . It remains an open question whether this interference is intrinsic or not, as we currently lack examples of solutions with such reduced regularity.

Let us now comment on the possible higher regularity of solutions.

**Remark 1.5.** The exponent  $\alpha_*$  is always strictly positive. In general, given an integer  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\alpha_* > k$  if and only if  $\mu_* > k(k+a+n-2)$ . This implies in particular that  $\alpha_* > 1$  if and only if  $a < \mu_* + 1 - n \leq 0$ , since  $0 < \mu_* \leq n - 1$ .

As  $a$  becomes more and more negative, depending also on an increasing codimension  $n$ ,  $\alpha_*$  can be made larger than any integer  $k \geq 2$ . Therefore,  $C^{k,\alpha}$  regularity of solutions is expected for any  $k \geq 2$ , under suitable assumptions on the data and within certain ranges of  $(a, n)$ .

Unfortunately, we currently lack a general strategy for higher order Schauder estimates, which remains an open problem. On one hand, the regularity estimates obtained in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 cannot be directly iterated on derivatives, since the operator is translation invariant only in the tangential directions to  $\Sigma_0$  (the  $x$  variables). This implies that the operator commutes only with the derivatives in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n}$  and not in  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . However, if one knows additionally that the solution is axially symmetric with respect to  $\Sigma_0$  (radial-in- $y$ ), i.e.  $u(x, y) = u(x, |y|)$ , the iteration procedure works and one can prove smoothness at least in the isotropic homogeneous case, see Theorem 7.4.

On the other hand, one could attempt to construct a regularization-approximation scheme for any order  $k$ , by smoothing the data, perforating the domain and finally shrinking at the characteristic manifold. However, this strategy also fails, as the stability of the  $C^{2,\alpha}$  estimate with respect to  $\varepsilon$ -perforation does not hold, see Remark 6.2.

*The inhomogeneous conormal problem.* In the mid-range  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ , the positive weighted capacity of the thin set  $\Sigma_0$  enables the imposition of inhomogeneous conormal boundary conditions; that is,



solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } B_1, \\ -\lim_{|y| \rightarrow 0} |y|^{a+n-1} \nabla u \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} = g(x), & \text{on } \Sigma_0 \cap B_1, \end{cases}$$

are well defined (see Definition 7.5) as elements of  $H^{1,a}(B_1)$  which satisfies

$$\int_{B_1} |y|^a \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi dz = \omega_n \int_{\Sigma_0 \cap B_1} g(x) \phi(x, 0) dx, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(B_1).$$

Then, we prove some regularity results for solutions of the above problem, as a corollary of our main theorems, together with the regularity of axially symmetric solutions, see Proposition 7.6.

*Curved characteristic thin manifolds.* As a second corollary of our main theorems, we can deal with the case of curved regular characteristic thin manifolds. Let  $2 \leq n < d$  and consider a  $(d-n)$ -dimensional  $C^{1,\alpha}$  manifold  $\Gamma$  locally embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . Then Corollaries 8.4 and 8.5 provide the extension of the main Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to weak solutions (see Definition 8.3) to

$$(1.17) \quad -\operatorname{div}(\delta^a A \nabla u) = \delta^a f + \operatorname{div}(\delta^a F), \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

where the weight  $\delta$  behaves as a particular distance function to  $\Gamma$ , chosen in accordance to the local parametrization of the thin manifold. See Definition 8.1 for detailed assumptions on the *defining function*  $\delta$ .

*The homogeneous Dirichlet problem.* As another corollary of our main theorems, whenever  $a+n < 2$ , one can provide regularity results for solutions to the homogeneous Dirichlet problem

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0 \\ u = 0 & \text{on } B_1 \cap \Sigma_0. \end{cases}$$

As we will explain later in the introduction, the problem above has connections with the work of Nguyen on harmonic maps with prescribed singularities in general relativity [50]. Moreover, it has also profound connections with the works of David-Feneuil-Mayboroda on the Dirichlet problem on lower dimensional boundaries [19, 20], see also [18, 21].

In the same spirit of [56], as  $a+n < 2$  one can provide regularity results for solutions  $u$  to (1.18) by considering the ratio  $w = u/u_0$  between  $u$  and the characteristic Dirichlet solution

$$u_0(y) = |y|^{2-a-n},$$

which solves again (1.18). The ratio  $w$  is a solution of a degenerate problem  $-\operatorname{div}(|y|^b \nabla w) = 0$  with exponent  $b = 4-a-2n$  which lies in the superdegenerate range since  $b+n = 4-a-n > 2$ . Hence,  $C^{0,\alpha}$  and  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates for  $w$  are implied by Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, see Corollary 9.2. This improves some results in [50], and also slightly improves some regularity results in [33], ensuring the sharp  $C^{2-a-n}$  regularity of solutions under additional requirements on the codimension  $n$ . For instance, in the case  $a+n = 1$  and whenever  $n \geq 4$ , solutions to (1.18) are provided to be Lipschitz continuous, see Remark 9.3.

*Higher codimensional extensions of fractional Laplacians.* Motivated by [8], one might wonder whether it is possible to extend functions  $u$  defined in  $\mathbb{R}^{d-n}$  having a well-defined  $s$ -fractional Laplacian ( $s \in (0, 1)$ ) to the whole of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , introducing  $n$  additional variables. Under the assumption  $d - n > 2s$ , which allows for the definition of suitable energy spaces, in Section 10 we show that such an extension is given by the convolution  $u * P$  with the Poisson-type kernel

$$P(x, y) = P(|x|, |y|) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d-n+2s}{2})}{\pi^{\frac{d-n}{2}} \Gamma(s)} \frac{|y|^{2s}}{(|x|^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d-n+2s}{2}}}, \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The extension is a radial-in- $y$  solution (axisymmetric with respect to  $\Sigma_0 = \mathbb{R}^{d-n}$ ) to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_0 \\ -\lim_{|y| \rightarrow 0} |y|^{a+n-1} \nabla u \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} = d_{a,n} (-\Delta)^s u(x, 0) & \text{on } \Sigma_0, \end{cases}$$

where  $a + n = 2 - 2s \in (0, 2)$ , and  $d_{a,n}$  is an explicit positive constant. As it can be seen through the change of variables  $|y| = r$ , we recover exactly the classical Caffarelli-Silvestre  $s$ -harmonic extension.

**Some further motivations and applications.** In the final part of this introduction, we aim to elaborate further on some noteworthy motivations and significant applications of our theory.

*Harmonic maps with prescribed singularities in general relativity.* The study of axially symmetric stationary multi-black-hole configurations and the force between co-axially rotating black holes involves an analysis on the boundary regularity of the reduced singular harmonic maps, see [59, 60, 41, 42, 43]. In [50], this analysis is carried out by considering those harmonic maps as solutions to some homogeneous divergence systems of partial differential equations with singular coefficients. Then, the model single equation of the system is given by

$$-\operatorname{div}(\omega(z) \nabla u) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0,$$

where  $\Sigma_0$  is a  $(d - n)$ -dimensional submanifold with  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\omega$  is a weight that satisfies

$$\frac{1}{C} \operatorname{dist}(z, \Sigma_0)^a \leq \omega(z) \leq C \operatorname{dist}(z, \Sigma_0)^a$$

for some negative power  $a < 0$  and some constant  $C > 0$ . It is worth noting here that the weight's singularity, caused by the negative exponent  $a$ , does not confine us to a particular capacity range. Instead, all three ranges may be crossed since  $a + n$  might be any real number.

*The Dirichlet problem and harmonic measure on lower dimensional boundaries.* In a series of works, see [18, 19, 20, 21] and many references therein, David-Feneuil-Mayboroda and collaborators start an elliptic theory on weighted non uniformly elliptic operators which naturally catch the capacity of very thin boundaries. The peculiar operator considered in these works has a weight behaving as  $\omega(z) = \operatorname{dist}(z, \Sigma_0)^{1-n}$  where  $\Sigma_0$  is a  $(d - n)$ -dimensional manifold, i.e. the power of the weight belongs to the mid-range since  $a + n = 1$ . Notice that with this choice of the exponent and when  $n = 1$  one recovers the classic Laplacian. The main target of the works quoted above is the study of the Dirichlet problem on the lower dimensional boundary, the associated harmonic measure, and its reciprocal absolute continuity with the  $(d - n)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure [19], in the spirit of

Dahlberg [17]. Although in general the interest in these works relies on rough boundaries, i.e. Lipschitz or less, if the manifold is more regular,  $C^1$  or more, one may infer almost Lipschitz type regularity for the solutions of the inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem [33], or even the sharp Lipschitz regularity for the homogeneous one when  $n \geq 4$ , see Corollary 9.2 and Remark 9.3.

*Critical points for Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities.* In the particular case  $n = d$ , semilinear equations involving degenerate weights appear in connection with Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities [7], i.e. for certain values of  $\alpha, \beta, p$  equations like

$$-\operatorname{div}(|z|^{-2\alpha}\nabla u) = |z|^{-p\beta}|u|^{p-2}u.$$

Here  $-2\alpha + n > 2$ , and so the weight is superdegenerate and solutions naturally satisfy a homogeneous conormal boundary condition at  $\Sigma_0 = \{0\}$ . Even if the minimizers in the space  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are classified and they are bubbles, the study of the above degenerate equation allows us to imply regularity properties for sign-changing solutions too and for minimizers in domains attaining the singularity at the boundary of a domain [12]. We will study these problems in a forthcoming paper [13].

*Very thin free boundary problems.* Due to the natural property of these degenerate operators of capturing the capacity of very thin sets in the mid-range  $a+n \in (0, 2)$ , it is possible to formulate obstacle-type free boundary problems with an obstacle that has arbitrary dimension  $d-n \in \{0, \dots, d-2\}$ . In other words, it is possible to minimize the energy functional

$$\int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz,$$

where  $u$  satisfies a trace condition  $u = g$  on  $\partial B_1$  and the obstacle condition  $u \geq \psi$  on the  $(d-n)$ -dimensional set  $\Sigma_0$ . We refer to the seminal works of Caffarelli [5, 6] for classical obstacle problems and to the more recent [32], where the authors propose an alternative definition of a *very thin obstacle problem* (obstacles of dimension  $d-2$ ), related to the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension operator in the regime  $a \in (-1, 0)$ .

**Structure of the paper.** In Section 2 we introduce the weighted functional framework for the problem, and we provide many functional inequalities. In Section 3, we extend the results of the previous section to a setting for perforated domains. In Section 4 we introduce the notion of solutions, and we provide some approximation lemmas for both the regularization procedures. Moreover, we provide stable  $L^\infty$  bounds of solutions in perforated domains. Section 5 is dedicated to the proof of the main Liouville Theorem 1.4. Section 6 is the main core of the paper: it contains the proofs of the main  $C^{0,\alpha}$  and  $C^{1,\alpha}$  stable estimates in perforated domains, i.e. Theorem 1.3. In Section 7 we prove the a priori estimates of Proposition 7.1, which imply stable estimates with respect to standard smoothing of data. This leads to the proof of the main Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In Theorem 7.4, we improve the regularity of axially symmetric solutions, achieving smoothness. Finally, in Proposition 7.6, we extend the regularity theory to the case of inhomogeneous conormal boundary problems in the mid-range. Then, in Section 8 we generalize our results to the case of curved characteristic thin manifolds and in Section 9 we prove some regularity results for the homogeneous Dirichlet problem by a boundary Harnack type principle. Finally, in Section 10 we establish the connection with fractional Laplacians

through Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps, as a higher codimensional analogue of the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension theory. In Appendix A we collect many important technical results concerning the geometry of the perforated domains.

**Notation.** We establish the notation that will be used throughout the paper.

- Let  $2 \leq n \leq d$  be two integers and consider the coordinates  $z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ .
- We denote by  $\{e_{z_\ell}\}$ , where  $\ell = 1, \dots, d$ , the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . To distinguish between the variables  $x$  and  $y$ , we will often denote the basis as  $\{e_{x_j}, e_{y_i}\}$ , where  $j = 1, \dots, d-n$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
- For a vector  $G = (G_x, G_y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , we write  $G = G_1 + G_2$ , where  $G_1 = (G_x, 0)$  and  $G_2 = (0, G_y)$ .
- We express  $d$ -dimensional symmetric uniformly elliptic matrix  $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d,d}$  in block form as

$$(1.19) \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_2^\top & A_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $A_1 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-n, d-n}$ ,  $A_2 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-n, n}$  and  $A_3 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n, n}$ .

- For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote by  $B_R^m(\zeta)$  the open  $m$ -dimensional ball of radius  $R > 0$  centered at  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . To ease the notation, we simply write  $B_R^m = B_R^m(0)$  when  $\zeta = 0$ , and  $B_R(\zeta) = B_R^d(\zeta)$ , when the dimension  $m = d$ . In particular,  $B_R = B_R^d(0)$ .
- We write  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  to denote that there exists a small  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ .
- Throughout the paper, any positive constant whose value is not important is denoted by  $c$ . It may take different values at different places.

## 2. FUNCTIONAL SETTING

**2.1. Weighted Sobolev spaces.** Given a smooth domain  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , we define the Sobolev space  $H^{1,a}(\Omega) = H^1(\Omega, |y|^a dz)$  as the completion of  $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  with respect to the norm

$$(2.1) \quad \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(\Omega)} = \left( \int_{\Omega} |y|^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Here,  $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  consists of the restrictions to  $\bar{\Omega}$  of smooth functions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For our purposes,  $\Omega$  will be mostly a ball  $B_R$  with radius  $R > 0$ . Therefore, from now on we will focus on the space  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$ . Moreover, we say that  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  if  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$  for every  $R > 0$ .

Next, we define the homogeneous space  $H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$  as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(B_R)$  with respect to the norm given above. In light of the Poincaré inequality (see Proposition 2.3),  $H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$  can be equivalently defined as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(B_R)$  with respect to the Dirichlet seminorm

$$[u]_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} = \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)} = \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The weight term  $|y|^a$  is locally integrable at  $\Sigma_0$  whenever  $a + n > 0$ . Conversely, when  $a + n \leq 0$  the weight is *supersingular*; that is, it is not integrable at  $\Sigma_0$ . As we will see in Proposition 2.5, this lack of integrability forces elements in the Sobolev space to vanish on the characteristic manifold in order to maintain finite energy.

**Remark 2.1.** We recall that a weight  $\omega \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\omega \geq 0$  is said to belong to the  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt class if and only if

$$M_\omega := \sup_{z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, R > 0} \left( \frac{1}{|B_R(z_0)|} \int_{B_R(z_0)} \omega dz \right) \left( \frac{1}{|B_R(z_0)|} \int_{B_R(z_0)} \omega^{-1} dz \right) < \infty.$$

It is straightforward to verify that the weight  $\omega = |y|^a$  belongs to the  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt class if and only if  $0 < a + n < 2n$ .

**2.2. Hardy-Poincaré and Poincaré inequalities.** The following Hardy-Poincaré-type inequality is well known (see, for instance, [46, §2.1.7, Corollary 2]). The proof of this result is postponed, as it will be included in the proof of the more general Proposition 3.4.

**Proposition 2.2** (Hardy-Poincaré inequality). *Let  $R > 0$  and  $\delta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-n\}$ . Then*

*i) if  $\delta + n > 0$ , then for every  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$  it holds that*

$$\left( \frac{\delta + n}{2} \right)^2 \int_{B_R} |y|^\delta |u|^2 dz \leq \frac{\delta + n}{2} \int_{\partial B_R} |y|^{\delta+1} |u|^2 ds + \int_{B_R} |y|^{\delta+2} |\nabla u|^2 dz;$$

*ii) if  $\delta + n < 0$ , then for every  $u \in C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  it holds that*

$$\left( \frac{\delta + n}{2} \right)^2 \int_{B_R} |y|^\delta |u|^2 dz \leq \int_{B_R} |y|^{\delta+2} |\nabla u|^2 dz.$$

As a corollary, we also recover the Poincaré inequality. The proof of this result is similarly postponed, as it will be included in the proof of the more general Proposition 3.5.

**Proposition 2.3** (Poincaré inequality). *Let  $R > 0$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then*

*i) if  $a + n > 0$  and  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ , it holds that*

$$\left( \frac{a + n}{2R} \right)^2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a |u|^2 dz \leq \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz,$$

*ii) if  $a + n < 2$  and  $u \in C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$ , it holds that*

$$\left( \frac{a + n - 2}{2R} \right)^2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a |u|^2 dz \leq \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz.$$

**2.3. Weighted capacity.** In this section, we examine how the properties of the weighted Sobolev space  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$  depend on the natural weighted capacity of the characteristic manifold.

Given  $R > 0$  and a bounded domain  $\Omega$  such that  $\Sigma_0 \cap B_R \subset \Omega$ , we define the local weighted capacity of  $\Sigma_0$  in the box  $\Omega$  as

$$\text{Cap}_a(\Sigma_0 \cap B_R; \Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz \mid u \in C_c^\infty(\Omega), u = 1 \text{ on } \Sigma_0 \cap B_R \right\}.$$

Thanks to Proposition 2.3, one could equivalently consider, in the definition above, the minimization of the full norm in (2.1). As next Lemma shows, we can identify three distinct capacity ranges: when the weighted capacity of the characteristic manifold is infinite, i.e.  $a + n \leq 0$ , we call the weight  $|y|^a$  *supersingular*, as we said before; when the weighted capacity is zero, i.e.  $a + n \geq 2$ , we call

the weight  $|y|^a$  *superdegenerate*; finally, when the weighted capacity is locally finite and positive, i.e.  $0 < a + n < 2$ , we call the weight  $|y|^a$  *mid-range*. Notice that, since  $n \geq 2$ , the  $A_2$ -Muckenhoupt range  $0 < a + n < 2n$  intersects both the mid-range and the superdegenerate intervals. We also note that, within the mid-range interval, the capacity depends significantly on both the radius  $R$  and the diameter of the box  $\Omega$ .

**Lemma 2.4** (Capacitary ranges). *Let  $R > 0$ , and let  $\Omega$  be a open set such that  $\Sigma_0 \cap B_R \subset \Omega$ .*

*i) if  $a + n \leq 0$ , then*

$$\text{Cap}_a(\Sigma_0 \cap B_R; \Omega) = \infty;$$

*ii) if  $a + n \geq 2$ , then*

$$\text{Cap}_a(\Sigma_0 \cap B_R; \Omega) = 0;$$

*iii) if  $0 < a + n < 2$ , then*

$$0 < c \text{diam}(\Omega)^{a+n-2} R^{d-n} \leq \text{Cap}_a(\Sigma_0 \cap B_R; \Omega) < \infty,$$

*for a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $a, d, n$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of *i)* is straightforward since, when  $a + n \leq 0$ , it holds that

$$\int_{\Omega} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz = \infty \quad \text{for all } u \in C_c^\infty(\Omega), u = 1 \text{ on } \Sigma_0 \cap B_R.$$

Indeed, assume by contradiction that there exists  $u \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  such that  $u = 1$  on  $\Sigma_0 \cap B_R$  and  $\int_{\Omega} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz < \infty$ . Since  $a + n \leq 0$  implies that  $|y|^a \notin L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ , we infer that  $\nabla u = 0$  on  $\Sigma_0 \cap \Omega$ . Therefore,  $u = 1$  on  $\Sigma_0 \cap \Omega$ , which means that  $u$  can not be compactly supported on  $\Omega$ , leading to a contradiction.

Let now prove *ii)*. Call  $\Omega_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \mid (x, 0) \in \Omega\}$ , and take  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_0)$  such that  $\varphi(x) = 1$  for every  $x \in B_R^{d-n} \subset \Omega_0$ . Moreover, let  $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  be such that  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ ,  $\eta(t) = 1$  for  $t \in (2, \infty)$  and  $\eta(t) = 0$  for  $t \in (-\infty, 1)$ . For  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ , we introduce

$$(2.2) \quad \Psi_h(z) = \varphi(x) \eta_h(y) \quad \text{where} \quad \eta_h(y) = \eta\left(\frac{-\log |y|}{h}\right).$$

One can readily see that, for  $h$  sufficiently large,  $\Psi_h \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $\Psi_h(x, y) = 1$  if  $|x| \leq R$  and  $|y| \leq e^{-2h}$  (and in particular  $\Psi_h = 1$  on  $\Sigma_0 \cap B_R$ ) and  $\Psi_h(x, y) = 0$  if  $|y| \geq e^{-h}$ . Moreover,

$$|\nabla_y \Psi_h(z)| = |\varphi(x)| \left| \eta'\left(\frac{-\log |y|}{h}\right) \frac{y}{h|y|^2} \right| \leq \frac{\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})} \|\eta'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}}{h|y|} \chi_{\{e^{-2h} \leq |y| \leq e^{-h}\}}.$$

Using cylindrical coordinates we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |y|^a |\nabla \Psi_h|^2 dz &= \int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla_x \varphi|^2 dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^a |\eta_h|^2 dy + \int_{\Omega_0} |\varphi|^2 dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^a |\nabla \eta_h|^2 dy \\ &\leq c \int_0^{e^{-h}} r^{a+n-1} dr + \frac{c}{h^2} \int_{e^{-2h}}^{e^{-h}} r^{a+n-3} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since  $a + n \geq 2$ , it holds that  $\|\Psi_h\|_{H^{1,a}(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow \infty$ , which proves *ii)*.

Finally, we prove *iii*). Let  $u \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  be such that  $u = 1$  on  $\Sigma_0 \cap B_R$ , that is,  $u(x, 0) = 1$  whenever  $|x| \leq R$ . Since  $|y|^a \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$  it is clear that  $\|u\|_{H^{1,a}} < \infty$ , and thus  $\text{Cap}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_R) < \infty$ .

Next, let  $\rho = \text{diam}(\Omega)$ , so that  $\Omega \subset B_\rho$ . Fix  $x \in B_R^{d-n}$ . By the fundamental theorem of calculus and Hölder's inequality we have that, for every  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= |u(x, \rho\sigma) - 1|^2 = |u(x, \rho\sigma) - u(x, 0)|^2 = \left| \int_0^\rho \nabla u(x, s\sigma) \cdot \sigma ds \right|^2 \leq \left( \int_0^\rho |\nabla u|(x, s\sigma) ds \right)^2 \\ &\leq \int_0^\rho s^{n+a-1} |\nabla u|^2(x, s\sigma) ds \int_0^\rho s^{1-a-n} ds \leq c\rho^{2-a-n} \int_0^\rho s^{a+n-1} |\nabla u|^2(x, s\sigma) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c > 0$  depends only on  $a, n$ . As a consequence we have that

$$n\omega_n = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} d\sigma \leq c\rho^{2-a-n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_0^\rho s^{n+a-1} |\nabla u|^2(x, s\sigma) ds d\sigma = c\rho^{2-a-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dy,$$

and finally, integrating over  $x \in B_R^{d-n}$  we find

$$n\omega_n |B_R^{d-n}| \leq c\rho^{2-a-n} \int_{B_R^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz \leq c\rho^{2-a-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz.$$

The conclusion readily follows.  $\square$

As we have previously remarked, in the supersingular setting  $a + n \leq 0$ , the weight term is not locally integrable. This phenomenon leads to the following result.

**Proposition 2.5** (Density of smooth functions in the supersingular setting). *Let  $a + n \leq 0$ . The space  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$  can be equivalently defined as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  with respect to the norm given in (2.1).*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for every  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R}) \cap H^{1,a}(B_R)$ , there exists a sequence  $\{u_\varepsilon\}$  in  $C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  such that  $\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$  be such that  $\|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty$ . Since  $|y|^a \notin L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R)$ , it follows that  $u = 0$  on  $B_R \cap \Sigma_0$ .

Now, let  $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  be such that  $\eta(t) = 0$  for  $|t| < 1$ ,  $\eta(t) = t$  for  $|t| > 2$ , and  $|\eta(t)| \leq |t|$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define

$$u_\varepsilon(z) = \varepsilon \eta(\varepsilon^{-1} u(z)).$$

Clearly,  $u_\varepsilon = 0$  whenever  $|u| < \varepsilon$ , which implies that  $u_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$ . Moreover,  $u_\varepsilon = u$  whenever  $|u| > 2\varepsilon$ , and  $\nabla u_\varepsilon = \eta'(\varepsilon^{-1} u) \nabla u$ . Thus

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a |u_\varepsilon - u|^2 dz \leq 4 \int_{B_R \cap \{|u| < 2\varepsilon\} \setminus \{u=0\}} |y|^a |u|^2 dz \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

since  $|B_R \cap \{|u| < 2\varepsilon\} \setminus \{u=0\}| \rightarrow 0$ . We can estimate the gradient part as

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla(u_\varepsilon - u)|^2 dz \leq c \int_{B_R \cap \{|u| < 2\varepsilon\} \setminus \{u=0, |\nabla u|=0\}} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

since  $|B_R \cap \{|u| < 2\varepsilon\} \setminus \{u=0, |\nabla u|=0\}| \rightarrow 0$ , given that  $B_R \cap \{u=0, |\nabla u| \neq 0\}$  is a set of Hausdorff dimension at most  $d-1$ .

To prove this, assume  $u \in C^1$  and define  $\Omega_k := \overline{B_R} \cap \{u = 0, |\nabla u| \geq \frac{1}{k}\}$ , which is a compact set. For each  $z \in \Omega_k$ , there exists  $r_z > 0$  such that  $B_{r_z}(z) \cap \Omega_k$  is a  $(d-1)$ -dimensional regular hypersurface by the implicit function theorem. Then, selecting a finite subcovering of  $\Omega_k \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_0} B_{r_{z_i}}(z_i) \cap \Omega_k$ , we have that for any arbitrarily small  $\delta > 0$  it holds

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1+\delta}(\Omega_k) = 0.$$

Thus, since  $\overline{B_R} \cap \{u = 0, |\nabla u| \neq 0\} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Omega_k$ , we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{d-1+\delta}(\overline{B_R} \cap \{u = 0, |\nabla u| \neq 0\}) = 0.$$

The arbitrariness of  $\delta > 0$  implies that  $\overline{B_R} \cap \{u = 0, |\nabla u| \neq 0\}$  is  $(d-1)$ -dimensional. Notice that the  $(d-1)$ -Hausdorff measure could be infinite.  $\square$

Similarly to the supersingular setting, i.e. Proposition 2.5, whenever the weight is superdegenerate one has the following density result.

**Proposition 2.6** (Density of smooth functions in the superdegenerate setting). *Let  $a + n \geq 2$ . Then the space  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$  can be equivalently defined as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  with respect to the norm in (2.1).*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that for every  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R}) \cap H^{1,a}(B_R)$  there exists a sequence  $u_h \in C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  such that  $\|u_h - u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $\Psi_h \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$  be the family of functions introduced in (2.2). We recall that  $\Psi_h = 1$  in  $B_R \cap \{|y| \leq e^{-2h}\}$  and  $\Psi_h = 0$  in  $B_R \cap \{|y| \geq e^{-h}\}$ . Moreover, if  $a + n \geq 2$  then  $\|\Psi_h\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let us define

$$u_h = u(1 - \Psi_h).$$

Since obviously  $u_h \in C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  and

$$\|u_h - u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \leq c \|\Psi_h\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)},$$

for a constant  $c > 0$  which depends on  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}$ ,  $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

**2.4.  $\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{W}$  property.** Sobolev spaces can be defined in terms of weak derivatives in  $L^p$  spaces. In the unweighted case, this definition is equivalent to the one based on the density of smooth functions (which we used to introduce  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$ ). However, establishing this equivalence in the context of weighted Sobolev spaces is not as straightforward.

Following the approach of [62], we introduce the set

$$\tilde{W} = \{u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R) \mid \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty\}.$$

We then define

$$W^{1,a}(B_R) := \text{the completion of } \tilde{W} \text{ with respect to } \|\cdot\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)}.$$

We have the following characterization. Note that the two cases intersect.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $R > 0$ . It holds*



*i)* if  $a + n < 2n$ , then

$$W^{1,a}(B_R) = \{u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R) \mid \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty\},$$

*ii)* if  $a + n \geq 2$ , then

$$W^{1,a}(B_R) = \{u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0) \mid \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty\}.$$

*Proof.* Let us prove *i)*. The inclusion  $\tilde{W} \subset W^{1,a}(B_R)$  is straightforward.

To prove the reverse inclusion, let us take a Cauchy sequence  $u_k \subset \tilde{W}$ . We note that  $u_k$  and  $\nabla u_k$  are Cauchy sequences in  $L^{2,a}(B_R)$  and  $L^{2,a}(B_R)^d$ , respectively. Due to the completeness of  $L^{2,a}(B_R)$ , there exist  $u \in L^{2,a}(B_R)$  and  $V \in L^{2,a}(B_R)^d$  such that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} u_k &\rightarrow u && \text{in } L^{2,a}(B_R) \\ \nabla u_k &\rightarrow V && \text{in } L^{2,a}(B_R)^d. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we note that

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a |u|^2 dz + \int_{B_R} |y|^a |V|^2 dz < \infty.$$

By Hölder inequality, we have that for every compact set  $K \subset B_R$  it holds that

$$\int_K |u| dz \leq \left( \int_K |y|^a |u|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_K |y|^{-a} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Here we used that  $|y|^{-a} \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R)$  due to the assumption  $a + n < 2n$ . Performing the same computation for  $V$ , we obtain that  $u, V \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R)$ .

To conclude, it remains to show that  $V$  is the weak gradient of  $u$ . Fix  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ . Using (2.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_R} (u_k - u) \nabla \varphi dz \right| &\leq \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^a |u_k - u|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^{-a} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0, \\ \left| \int_{B_R} (\nabla u_k - V) \varphi dz \right| &\leq \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u_k - V|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^{-a} |\varphi|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since  $u_k \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R)$ , we have

$$\int_{B_R} (u \nabla \varphi + \varphi V) dz = \int_{B_R} (u_k \nabla \varphi + \varphi \nabla u_k) dz + o(1) = o(1).$$

Therefore,  $V = \nabla u$ , and *i)* is proved.

Let us now prove *ii)*. To show that

$$W^{1,a}(B_R) \subset \{u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0) \mid \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty\}$$

we can proceed in a manner similar to the proof of *i)*, with a few minor modifications. Note that if  $a + n \geq 2$ , then in general  $|y|^{-a} \notin L^1(B_R)$ ; however, it is always true that  $|y|^{-a} \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$ .

Next, let us prove that

$$\{u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0) \mid \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty\} \subset W^{1,a}(B_R).$$

Let  $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$  with  $\|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty$  be fixed. Moreover, let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , consider the sequence  $u_k$  defined as

$$u_k = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } u > k \\ u & \text{if } -k \leq u \leq k \\ -k & \text{if } u < -k \end{cases}$$

It is standard to see that  $u_k \in L^\infty(B_R) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$  and  $\|u - u_k\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular, there exists  $\hat{u} := u_{k_0}$  for some sufficiently large  $k_0$  such that  $\|u - \hat{u}\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \varepsilon/2$ .

Let  $\Psi_h \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$  be the family of functions introduced in (2.2). We recall that  $0 \leq \Psi_h \leq 1$ ,  $\Psi_h = 1$  in  $B_R \cap \{|y| \leq e^{-2h}\}$  and  $\Psi_h = 0$  in  $B_R \cap \{|y| \geq e^{-h}\}$ . Moreover, since  $a + n \geq 2$  then  $\|\Psi_h\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow \infty$ .

Define

$$u_h = \hat{u}(1 - \Psi_h).$$

We point out that  $\text{spt}(u_h) \subset \{|y| \geq e^{-h}\}$ . As a consequence,  $u_h, |\nabla u_h| \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R)$ , even when  $|y|^{-a} \notin L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R)$ . Moreover, for every  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$  it holds

$$\int_{B_R} (u_h \nabla \varphi + \varphi \nabla u_h) dz = \int_{B_R} \hat{u} \nabla [(1 - \Psi_h)\varphi] + [(1 - \Psi_h)\varphi] \nabla \hat{u} dz = 0,$$

where we used that  $(1 - \Psi_h)\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$  and  $\hat{u} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$ . Hence,  $u_h \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R)$ .

By Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem (recall that  $|\Psi_h| \leq 1$  and  $\Psi_h \rightarrow 0$  a.e. on  $B_R$  as  $h \rightarrow \infty$ ) and since  $\|\Psi_h\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$  we obtain, as  $h \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{u} - u_h\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)}^2 &\leq 2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a (|\nabla \hat{u}|^2 + |\hat{u}|^2) |\Psi_h|^2 dz + 2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\hat{u}|^2 |\nabla \Psi_h|^2 dz \\ &\leq o(1) + 2 \|\hat{u}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \|\Psi_h\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, fix  $h_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|\hat{u} - u_{h_0}\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ .

Since  $u_h \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R)$  and

$$\|u - u_{h_0}\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \leq \|u - \hat{u}\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} + \|\hat{u} - u_{h_0}\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \varepsilon,$$

thanks to the arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$  we conclude that  $u$  belongs  $W^{1,a}(B_R)$ , thus completing the proof.  $\square$

It is now straightforward to show that the  $H = W$  property holds, at least when  $a + n > 0$ .

**Lemma 2.8** (H=W). *If  $a + n > 0$ , then*

$$H^{1,a}(B_R) = W^{1,a}(B_R).$$

*Proof.* If  $0 < a + n < 2n$  the weight  $|y|^a$  belongs to the Muckenhoupt class  $A_2$ , see Remark 2.1. Therefore, the result is classical; see for instance [40, Theorem 2.5] or [62, §4].

If  $a + n \geq 2$ , we first note that every  $u \in W^{1,a}(B_R)$  can be approximated by functions  $u_h \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R)$  which are supported away from  $\Sigma_0$ ; see the proof of Lemma 2.7, *ii*). In turn, the functions  $u_h$  can be approximated by functions in  $C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  using a standard mollification technique. Thus, the proof is complete.  $\square$

**2.5. Trace inequalities and compact embeddings.** Next we show a trace-type inequality. To this aim, we introduce the projection

$$\Pi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \quad \Pi(z) = y,$$

and we notice that, using polar coordinates, for any  $z = r\sigma$ ,  $r = |z| > 0$ ,  $\sigma = \frac{z}{|z|} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ , it holds

$$y = r\Pi\sigma.$$

**Lemma 2.9** (Trace inequality). *Let  $R > 0$  and  $a + n > 0$ . Then for any  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$  and  $0 < r \leq R$  it holds*

$$c \int_{\partial B_r} |y|^a |u|^2 ds \leq r \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz + r^{-1} \int_{B_R} |y|^a |u|^2 dz,$$

for a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d$  and  $a$ .

*Proof.* Let  $0 < \rho < r \leq R$ . By fundamental theorem of calculus and Hölder's inequality we have that for any  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  it holds

$$|u(r\sigma) - u(\rho\sigma)|^2 \leq \left( \int_\rho^r |\nabla u|(\tau\sigma) d\tau \right)^2 \leq \int_\rho^r \tau^{1-a-d} d\tau \int_\rho^r \tau^{a+d-1} |\nabla u|^2(\tau\sigma) d\tau.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\Pi\sigma|^a |u(r\sigma) - u(\rho\sigma)|^2 d\sigma &\leq \int_\rho^r \tau^{1-a-d} d\tau \int_{B_r \setminus B_\rho} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz \\ &\leq \int_\rho^r \tau^{1-a-d} d\tau \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} r^{1-a-d} \int_{\partial B_r} |y|^a |u|^2 ds &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\Pi\sigma|^a |u(r\sigma)|^2 d\sigma \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\Pi\sigma|^a |u(r\sigma) - u(\rho\sigma)|^2 d\sigma + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\Pi\sigma|^a |u(\rho\sigma)|^2 d\sigma \\ &\leq 2(r - \rho) \max\{r^{1-a-d}, \rho^{1-a-d}\} \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\Pi\sigma|^a |u(\rho\sigma)|^2 d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we multiply both sides by  $\rho^{a+d-1}$  and integrate over  $\rho \in [0, r]$ , using that  $a + d \geq a + n > 0$ . Since

$$\int_0^r \rho^{a+d-1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |\Pi\sigma|^a |u(\rho\sigma)|^2 d\sigma d\rho = \int_{B_r} |y|^a |u|^2 dz,$$

the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.10** (Compact embedding  $H^{1,a} \hookrightarrow L^{2,a}$ ). *Let  $R > 0$  and  $a + n > 0$ . Let  $\{u_k\}, u$  in  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$  be such that  $u_k \rightharpoonup u$  in  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$ . Then, up to subsequences,  $u_k \rightarrow u$  in  $L^{2,a}(B_R)$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $u_k \rightharpoonup 0$  in  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$ . Moreover, since  $u_k$  is weakly convergent in the Hilbert space  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$ , it is bounded.

Let  $\delta > 0$  be fixed, and consider  $\varphi_\delta \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$  such that  $0 \leq \varphi_\delta \leq 1$  with  $\varphi = 1$  when  $|y| \leq \delta$  and  $\varphi = 0$  when  $|y| \geq 2\delta$ . In particular, on the support of  $\varphi_\delta$  and for every  $\sigma > 0$  it holds  $1 \leq 2^\sigma \delta^\sigma |y|^{-\sigma}$ .

We compute

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a |u_k|^2 dz \leq 2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a (1 - \varphi_\delta)^2 |u_k|^2 + 2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a \varphi_\delta^2 |u_k|^2.$$

Fix  $0 < \sigma < 2$  such that  $a - \sigma + n > 0$ . Using Proposition 2.2, *i*) with  $\delta = a - \sigma$ , we find

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a \varphi_\delta^2 |u_k|^2 \leq \delta^\sigma \int_{B_R} |y|^{a-\sigma} |u_k|^2 \leq c \delta^\sigma R^{2-\sigma} \|u_k\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)},$$

where in the last inequality we also used Lemma 2.9.

In particular, since  $\{u_k\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$ , we infer that

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a |u_k|^2 dz \leq 2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a (1 - \varphi_\delta)^2 |u_k|^2 + c \delta^\sigma,$$

for a constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $k$ .

Next, we notice that  $(1 - \varphi_\delta)u_k$  is a sequence supported in  $\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_\delta$ , where the weight  $|y|^a$  is bounded and bounded away from zero. Thus, via a standard argument, we can see that  $(1 - \varphi_\delta)u_k \rightarrow 0$  in the unweighted Sobolev space  $H^1(B_R)$ , and therefore

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a (1 - \varphi_\delta)^2 |u_k|^2 \leq c \int_{B_R} (1 - \varphi_\delta)^2 |u_k|^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

by the classical Rellich-Kondrakov theorem.

Summing up, we have proved that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R} |y|^a |u_k|^2 dz \leq c \delta^\sigma,$$

and the conclusion easily follows due to the arbitrariness of  $\delta$ . □

As a consequence of the previous two results we have the following trace theorem.

**Lemma 2.11** (Trace operator). *Let  $R > 0$  and  $a + n > 0$ . Then there exists a unique bounded linear operator*

$$T_R : H^{1,a}(B_R) \rightarrow L^{2,a}(\partial B_R),$$

*such that for all  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$*

$$T_R u = u|_{\partial B_R}.$$

*Moreover, the following characterization holds*

$$H_0^{1,a}(B_R) = \{u \in H^{1,a}(B_R) \mid T_R u = 0\}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $C^\infty(\overline{B_R})$  is dense in  $H^{1,a}(B_R)$ , the first part of the lemma is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.9 and a density argument.

As for the second part, it is obvious by the above definition that every  $u \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$  satisfies  $T_R(u) = 0$ . Let then  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$  be such that  $T_R u = 0$ . Since  $T_R u = 0$ ,  $u$  can be trivially extended to zero outside of  $B_R$ .

Now let us consider, for  $\lambda \in (1, 2)$  the functions

$$u_\lambda(z) = u(\lambda z),$$

which, by construction, are such that  $u_\lambda(z) = 0$  if  $\frac{R}{\lambda} \leq |z| \leq R$ . As a consequence, one can easily see that  $\|u_\lambda\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \leq c\|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)}$  for a constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $\lambda$ . Thus  $u_\lambda \in W^{1,a}(B_R)$  by Lemma 2.7, and in fact  $u_\lambda \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$  by Lemma 2.8. Moreover, since  $u_\lambda(z) = 0$  if  $\frac{R}{\lambda} \leq |z| \leq R$ , each  $u_\lambda$  can be approximated by functions in  $C_c^\infty(B_R)$ , that is,  $u_\lambda \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$ .

Since  $H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$  is complete, to conclude it suffices to show that  $\|u_\lambda - u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 1^+$ . Since  $u_\lambda$  is bounded in  $H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$ , it converges weakly to  $v \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$  and, thanks to Lemma 2.10, it also holds  $u_\lambda \rightarrow v$  a.e. in  $B_R$ . In fact, since  $u_\lambda \rightarrow u$  a.e. in  $B_R$  by definition,  $v = u$ . Finally, we observe that  $\|u_\lambda\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} \rightarrow \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)}$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 1^+$ , and this is enough to obtain strong convergence. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**2.6. Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality and 2-admissible weights.** In this section we establish the 2-admissibility of the weight term  $|y|^a$  whenever  $a + n > 0$ . The definition of 2-admissible weights can be found in [38, §1.1], and can be resumed into four properties, in order: the doubling condition on the measure  $d\mu = |y|^a dz$ , a condition on the well-definedness of the weak gradient, a Sobolev inequality, which is proved later in Lemma 3.7 in a more general form, and the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality, which is stated and proved below. Checking the first two conditions is easy and we omit the proofs.

**Proposition 2.12** (Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality). *Let  $a + n > 0$  and  $R > 0$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d$ , such that for any  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$*

$$(2.4) \quad c \int_{B_R} |y|^a |u - \langle u \rangle_R^a|^2 dz \leq R^2 \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz$$

where

$$\langle u \rangle_R^a := \frac{1}{\mu_a(B_R)} \int_{B_R} |y|^a u dz, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_a(B_R) = \int_{B_R} |y|^a dz.$$

The proof is classical and can be found for instance in [27, §5.8.1]. However, we report it in order to show why the inequality holds true whenever the weight is locally integrable and the codimension  $n \geq 2$  while it does not hold in the superdegenerate setting when  $n = 1$ .

*Proof.* Let us prove the inequality in the unitary ball; that is,

$$(2.5) \quad c \int_{B_1} |y|^a |u - \langle u \rangle_1^a|^2 dz \leq \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz.$$

Then, one can recover (2.4) by scaling. Assume by contradiction that (2.5) does not hold. Then, along a sequence  $\{u_k\} \subset H^{1,a}(B_1)$

$$\|u_k - \langle u_k \rangle_1^a\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} > k \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)}.$$

Let

$$v_k = \frac{u_k - \langle u_k \rangle_1^a}{\|u_k - \langle u_k \rangle_1^a\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)}}.$$

Then

$$\|v_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} = 1, \quad \langle v_k \rangle_1^a = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla v_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} < 1/k.$$

By Lemma 2.10, there exists  $v \in H^{1,a}(B_1)$  such that,  $v_k \rightharpoonup v$  in  $H^{1,a}(B_1)$  and  $v_k \rightarrow v$  in  $L^{2,a}(B_1)$  up to subsequences, with  $\|v\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} = 1$ ,  $\langle v \rangle_1^a = 0$  and  $\nabla v = 0$  almost everywhere in  $B_1$ . Since the weak gradient is defined as a  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(B_1)$  function whenever  $a + n < 2n$  and as a  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0)$  function whenever  $a + n \geq 2$ , in any case, due to the connectedness respectively of  $B_1$  or  $B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0$ , one can conclude that  $v$  must be constant almost everywhere in  $B_1$ . Then, the two conditions  $\|v\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} = 1$  and  $\langle v \rangle_1^a = 0$  are in contradiction.  $\square$

Notice that, when  $n = 1$  and in the superdegenerate setting, i.e.  $a \geq 1$ ,  $B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0$  is not connected. Then, the proof above is not valid. In fact, the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality is not valid too. Consider the jump function  $u = 1$  on  $B_1^+$ ,  $u = 0$  on  $B_1^-$ , see [55, Example 1.4]. However, we would like to stress the fact that in the codimension 1 case, the weight  $|y|^a$  is still 2-admissible from one or the other side of the hyperplane  $\Sigma_0$ .

### 3. FUNCTIONAL SETTING WITH STABILITY IN PERFORATED DOMAINS

In this section, we provide the functional setting in perforated domains.

Let us consider a symmetric matrix  $A \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$  which satisfies the uniform ellipticity condition (1.5) and express  $A$  in blocks form as in (1.19); that is,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_2^\top & A_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $A_1 \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d-n,d-n})$ ,  $A_2 \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d-n,n})$  and  $A_3 \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{n,n})$ .

**Remark 3.1.** Throughout the paper, the regularity assumptions stated above can be relaxed as follows:  $A_1 \in C^0(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d-n,d-n})$ ,  $A_2 \in C^0(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d-n,n})$  and  $A_3 \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{n,n})$ . In other words, the only block that actually requires one additional degree of regularity is  $A_3$ . However, since we will smooth the original coefficients by convolution with standard mollifiers and to simplify the notation, we will assume the stronger condition  $A \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$ . In the same way, when we assume  $A \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  we could instead assume  $A_1 \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d-n,d-n})$ ,  $A_2 \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d-n,n})$  and  $A_3 \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{n,n})$ .

Let us consider a small  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that Lemma A.1 holds true. The latter depends on  $R$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $\Lambda$  and  $L$  where  $\|A\|_{C^1(B_R)} \leq L$ . For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ , let us define the  $(\varepsilon, A)$ -neighborhood of  $\Sigma_0$  as

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon^A = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid A_3^{-1}(x, y)y \cdot y \leq \varepsilon^2\},$$

and its boundary

$$\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid A_3^{-1}(x, y)y \cdot y = \varepsilon^2\}.$$

When  $A = \mathbb{I}$  we simply write

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon := \Sigma_\varepsilon^\mathbb{I} = \{|y| \leq \varepsilon\} \quad \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon := \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^\mathbb{I} = \{|y| = \varepsilon\}.$$

Moreover, let us point out that for every matrix  $A$  one has that  $\{y = 0\} = \Sigma_0^A = \partial\Sigma_0^A$ .

**Remark 3.2.** The choice of  $\varepsilon_0$ , given by Lemma A.1, ensures that the normal vector to  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  is continuous and well defined in  $B_R$ . Hence, the boundary  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  is locally of class  $C^1$  whenever  $A \in C^1(B_R)$  and of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$  whenever  $A \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_R)$  for any given  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

In the rest of the paper we write  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  to denote that there exists a possibly small  $\varepsilon_0$  such that we consider  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ . Moreover, in the context of perforated domains, we always assume that the matrix  $A$  is at least  $C^1$  to guarantee that the boundary  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  is  $C^1$ .

### 3.1. Functional spaces on perforated domains.

3.1.1. *Smooth functions.* For  $R > 0$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , we define the following spaces of smooth functions.

$$\begin{aligned} C^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &= \{u|_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} \mid u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\}, \\ C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &= \{u|_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} \mid u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } \text{spt}(u) \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A\}, \\ C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^A) &= \{u|_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} \mid u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } \text{spt}(u) \subset\subset B_R\}, \\ C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &= \{u|_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} \mid u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } \text{spt}(u) \subset\subset B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A\}. \end{aligned}$$

3.1.2. *Weighted  $L^p$  spaces.* For  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , we define the space

$$L^{p,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) := L^p(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A, |y|^a dz),$$

and for fields

$$L^{p,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)^d := L^p(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A, |y|^a dz)^d.$$

In both cases we denote the norm as  $\|\cdot\|_{L^{p,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)}$ , for sake of simplicity.

3.1.3. *Weighted Sobolev spaces.* Let us define the norm

$$(3.1) \quad \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} = \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a (u^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We define the following Sobolev spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &= \text{the completion of } C^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) \text{ with respect to the norm in (3.1);} \\ \tilde{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &= \text{the completion of } C_c^\infty(\overline{B_R} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) \text{ with respect to the norm in (3.1);} \\ \hat{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &= \text{the completion of } C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^A) \text{ with respect to the norm in (3.1);} \\ H_0^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &= \text{the completion of } C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) \text{ with respect to the norm in (3.1).} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the following inclusion of spaces hold true

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &\subset \hat{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) \subset H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A), \\ H_0^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) &\subset \tilde{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A) \subset H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 3.3.** We point out that for every  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0) &= H^{1,a}(B_R), \quad \tilde{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0) = \tilde{H}^{1,a}(B_R) \\ \hat{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0) &= H_0^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0) = H_0^{1,a}(B_R). \end{aligned}$$

If  $a + n \in (-\infty, 0] \cup [2, \infty)$ , by Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.6 we also have

$$H^{1,a}(B_R) = \tilde{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0), \quad H_0^{1,a}(B_R) = H_0^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0).$$

### 3.2. Stable Hardy-Poincaré and Poincaré inequalities.

**Proposition 3.4** ( $\varepsilon$ -stable Hardy-Poincaré inequality). *Let  $R > 0$ ,  $0 \leq \varepsilon \ll 1$  and  $\delta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-n\}$ . Then*

*i) if  $\delta + n > 0$ , for every  $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  it holds*

$$\left(\frac{\delta + n}{2}\right)^2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^\delta |u|^2 dz \leq \frac{\delta + n}{2} \int_{\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+1} |u|^2 ds + \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+2} |\nabla u|^2 dz$$

*ii) if  $\delta + n < 0$ , for every  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$  it holds*

$$\left(\frac{\delta + n}{2}\right)^2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^\delta |u|^2 dz \leq \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+2} |\nabla u|^2 dz$$

*Proof.* First we prove *i)*. Let  $\delta + n > 0$ ,  $\delta \neq -2$ . Using that  $\Delta |y|^{\delta+2} = (\delta+2)(\delta+n)|y|^\delta$  and integrating by parts, we find that for every  $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta + n) \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^\delta |u|^2 dz &= -2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^\delta u \nabla u \cdot y dz \\ (3.2) \quad &+ \int_{\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+1} |u|^2 d\sigma - \int_{\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_R} |y|^\delta y \cdot \nu(z) |u|^2 d\sigma \\ &\leq 2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+1} |u| |\nabla u| dz + \int_{\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+1} |u|^2 d\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\nu(z) \cdot y > 0$  on  $\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  by *ii)* in Lemma A.1. In fact, letting  $\delta \rightarrow -2$  we see that (3.2) holds also for  $\delta = -2$ .

Next we apply Hölder and Young inequalities to get

$$2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+1} |u| |\nabla u| dz \leq \frac{\delta + n}{2} \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^\delta |u|^2 dz + \frac{2}{\delta + n} \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+2} |\nabla u|^2 dz,$$

and *i)* follows.



Let now  $\delta + n < 0$  and  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$ . Arguing exactly as in the proof of (3.2) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta + n| \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^\delta |u|^2 dz &= - \int_{\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+1} |u|^2 d\sigma + 2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^\delta u \nabla u \cdot y dz \\ &\leq 2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^{\delta+1} |u| |\nabla u| dz, \end{aligned}$$

and thus we obtain *ii*) via Hölder's inequality.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.5** ( $\varepsilon$ -stable Poincaré inequality). *Let  $R > 0$ ,  $0 \leq \varepsilon \ll 1$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then*

*i) if  $a + n > 0$  and  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$  it holds*

$$(3.3) \quad \left(\frac{a+n}{2R}\right)^2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a u^2 \leq \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2.$$

*ii) if  $a + n < 2$  and  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$  it holds*

$$\left(\frac{a+n-2}{2R}\right)^2 \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a u^2 \leq \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2.$$

*Proof.* Case *i*) follows from *i*) in Proposition 3.4 with  $\delta = a$ , while case *ii*) follows from *ii*) in Proposition 3.4 with  $\delta = a - 2$ .  $\square$

### 3.3. Stable trace inequalities on the boundary of the hole.

**Lemma 3.6** ( $\varepsilon$ -stable trace inequality on the boundary of the hole). *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$  given by Lemma A.3 and  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . There exists a constant  $c = c(a, n, R, \lambda, \Lambda) > 0$  such that it holds*

$$c \int_{\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_R} |y|^a |u|^2 d\sigma \leq G_\varepsilon \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz, \quad u \in \hat{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A),$$

where

$$G_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & a + n > 2 \\ \varepsilon \log \varepsilon & a + n = 2 \\ \varepsilon^{a+n-1} & 0 < a + n < 2. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* First, we consider the case  $A = \mathbb{I}$ . The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.9, so we omit some details.

By density, it suffices to prove the result for  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}_\varepsilon)$ . Let  $x \in B_{\frac{d-n}{\sqrt{R^2-\varepsilon^2}}}$  be fixed, and notice that  $(x, y) \in B_R \setminus \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}_\varepsilon$  if and only if  $\varepsilon \leq |y| < R_x$ , where  $R_x = \sqrt{R^2 - |x|^2} \leq R$ . We point out that  $u(x, R_x \sigma) = 0$  for any  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . Thus, using the fundamental theorem of calculus and the Hölder inequality we get

$$|u(x, \varepsilon \sigma)|^2 = |u(x, R_x \sigma) - u(x, \varepsilon \sigma)|^2 \leq \int_\varepsilon^{R_x} \tau^{a+n-1} |\nabla u|^2(\tau \sigma) d\tau \int_\varepsilon^{R_x} \tau^{1-a-n} d\tau.$$

Integrating over  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  we find

$$(3.4) \quad \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^a |u|^2 d\sigma = \varepsilon^{a+n-1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |u(x, \varepsilon\sigma)|^2 d\sigma \leq \left( \varepsilon^{a+n-1} \int_\varepsilon^R \tau^{1-a-n} d\tau \right) \int_{B_{R^x}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dy.$$

Notice that

$$\varepsilon^{a+n-1} \int_\varepsilon^R \tau^{1-a-n} d\tau \leq c G_\varepsilon$$

for a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $a, n$  and  $R$ . To conclude, we integrate (3.4) over  $x \in B_{\frac{d-n}{\sqrt{R^2-\varepsilon^2}}}$ .

Let us now consider the general case. Let  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \mathring{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^A)$ , and define  $\tilde{u} = u \circ \Phi^{-1}$ , where  $\Phi$  is the  $C^1$ -diffeomorphism from Lemma A.3. For every  $z \in B_R$ , we have  $|\Phi(z)| \leq cR$  with  $c > 0$  depending only on  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ . Thus  $\tilde{u} \in C_c^1(B_{cR} \setminus \mathring{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^A)$ . Moreover, taking into account *ii*) and *iii*) from Lemma A.3, and using the change of variables  $(x, \tau) = \Phi(z)$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |\tau|^a |\nabla \tilde{u}(x, \tau)|^2 dx d\tau = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)y|^a (J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi)^{-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla u |\det J_\Phi| dz \leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz.$$

On the other hand, by taking the same change of variables in the integration over  $\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon$ , for instance see [45, §11], and using Lemma A.3, *iv*), we get

$$\int_{\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon} |\tau|^a |\tilde{u}(x, \tau)|^2 d\sigma(x, \tau) = \int_{\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)y|^a |u|^2 |\det(\Pi_\varepsilon \circ J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi \circ \Pi_\varepsilon)| d\sigma(z) \geq c \int_{\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |u|^2 d\sigma(z).$$

To conclude, apply to  $\tilde{u}$  the previous step, which holds also for functions in  $C_c^1(B_{cR} \setminus \mathring{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^A)$ .  $\square$

### 3.4. Stable Sobolev inequalities.

**Lemma 3.7** ( $\varepsilon$ -stable Sobolev embeddings). *Let  $a+n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$  given by Lemma A.3 and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \ll 1$ . Set*

$$2_a^* = \frac{2(a_+ + d)}{a_+ + d - 2}.$$

*i) if  $a_+ + d > 2$ , then for any  $2 \leq q \leq 2_a^*$  it holds*

$$c \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |u|^q dz \right)^{\frac{2}{q}} \leq \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz, \quad u \in \hat{H}^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon),$$

*for a constant  $c$  not depending on  $\varepsilon$  nor  $q$ .*

*ii) if  $d = n = 2$  and  $a \leq 0$ , the same result holds true for every  $q \in [2, \infty)$ .*

The proof is a consequence of some lemmas. The first lemma is an  $\varepsilon$ -stable  $L^1$ -version of the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequality.

**Lemma 3.8** ( $\varepsilon$ -stable  $L^1$ -CKN). *Let  $a+n > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ . Then for any  $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-1}$  it holds*

$$c \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^a |u|^q dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla u| dy, \quad u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

*for a constant  $c > 0$  that does not depend on  $\varepsilon$  or  $q$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-1}$  be fixed. Set, for  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ ,

$$S_{q,\varepsilon} = \inf_{u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla u| dy}{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^a |u|^q dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}}.$$

Our aim is to show that  $S_{q,\varepsilon} \geq c > 0$ , for a constant  $c$  not depending on  $\varepsilon$  or  $q$ .

First, we notice that by a standard scaling argument it holds that  $S_{q,\varepsilon} = S_{q,1}$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . In fact, given  $u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , it suffices to consider  $v \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  as  $v(y) = u(\varepsilon y)$ .

Next we show that  $S_{q,0} \leq c S_{q,1}$  for a constant  $c > 0$  independent from  $q$ . Let  $u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be fixed. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 (take  $|u|$  instead of  $|u|^2$  in (3.2)), we see that the following Hardy-type inequality holds:

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{a+n}{q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - n} |u| dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla u| dy.$$

Next, we extend  $u$  in the unitary ball  $B_1^n$  by the Kelvin transform

$$\tilde{u}(y) = \begin{cases} u(y) & |y| \geq 1 \\ |y|^{-\frac{2(a+n)}{q}} u(I(y)) & |y| \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $I(y) = |y|^{-2}y$  is the inversion map. Clearly,  $\tilde{u} \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Since  $J_I J_I = |y|^{-4} \mathbb{I}_n$  and thus  $|\det J_I| = |y|^{-2n}$ , a standard computation yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^a |\tilde{u}|^q dy = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^a |u|^q dy$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla \tilde{u}| dy &\leq c \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla u| dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - n} |u| dy \right) \\ &\leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla u| dy. \end{aligned}$$

where we also used (3.5). Notice that the constant  $c > 0$  can be taken independent of  $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-1}$ .

Thus we infer that

$$S_{q,0} \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla \tilde{u}| dy}{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^a |\tilde{u}|^q dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}} \leq c \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla u| dy}{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n} |y|^a |u|^q dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}},$$

for any  $u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , that is,  $S_{q,0} \leq c S_{q,1}$ . Since by the classical Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequality [7] we have  $S_{q,0} > 0$  uniformly in  $q$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

The second lemma we need is an equivalence between weighted Sobolev-type inequalities and the  $L^1$ -Moser weighted inequality. The unweighted version of this equivalence for functions defined on all the space is well known; see, e.g., [4] and the references therein. The presence of the weights and the

restriction to subsets does not add any difficulty; nevertheless, we present the proof for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $d \geq 1$  and let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a set with smooth boundary and non empty interior. Let  $\mu, \nu \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(A)$ ,  $\mu, \nu \geq 0$ . Moreover, let  $q \geq 1$ . Then*

$$(3.6) \quad c_0 \left( \int_A \mu(z) |f|^q dz \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \int_A \nu(z) |\nabla f| dz, \quad \text{for every } f \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

if and only if

$$(3.7) \quad c_0 \int_A \mu(z) |f|^{1+\frac{q-1}{q}} dz \leq \left( \int_A \mu(z) |f| dz \right)^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \int_A \nu(z) |\nabla f| dz \quad \text{for every } f \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

for the same constant  $c_0 > 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $q = 1$  the two inequalities coincide. Then, let  $q > 1$ .

Since (3.6) $\Rightarrow$ (3.7) simply follows by the Hölder inequality, we only need to show (3.7) $\Rightarrow$ (3.6). Assume then that (3.7) holds, and fix  $f \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $\delta > 1$ , and for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  define

$$f_k(z) = \begin{cases} \delta^k & |f| \geq \delta^{k+1} \\ |f| - \delta^k & \delta^k \leq |f| < \delta^{k+1} \\ 0 & |f| < \delta^k. \end{cases}$$

Notice that  $f_k \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $f_k \geq 0$ . Next we define

$$a_k = \delta^{qk} \int_{A \cap \{\delta^k \leq |f|\}} \mu(z) dz, \quad \text{and} \quad b_k = \int_{A \cap \{\delta^k \leq |f| < \delta^{k+1}\}} \nu(z) |\nabla f| dz.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A \mu(z) |f_k|^{1+\frac{q-1}{q}} dz &\geq \delta^{k+k\frac{q-1}{q}-k(q-1)} a_{k+1}, \\ \int_A \mu(z) |f_k| &\leq \delta^{k+1-qk} a_k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying (3.7) to  $f_k$  we infer

$$a_{k+1} \leq c_0^{-1} \delta^{\frac{q^2+q-1}{q}} b_k a_k^{\frac{q-1}{q}}.$$

Summing over  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and using the Hölder inequality we get

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{k+1} \leq c_0^{-1} \delta^{\frac{q^2+q-1}{q}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k a_k^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \leq c_0^{-1} \delta^{\frac{q^2+q-1}{q}} \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k \right)^{\frac{q-1}{q}},$$

hence

$$\left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq c_0^{-1} \delta^{\frac{q^2+q-1}{q}} \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq c_0^{-1} \delta^{\frac{q^2+q-1}{q}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k = c_0^{-1} \delta^{\frac{q^2+q-1}{q}} \int_{\Omega} \nu(z) |\nabla f| dz.$$

Finally, since

$$\int_{\Omega} \mu(z) |f|^q dz = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{A \cap \{\delta^k \leq |f| < \delta^{k+1}\}} \mu(z) |f|^q dz \leq \delta^q \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k,$$

we infer that

$$c_0 \left( \int_A \mu(z) |f|^q dz \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \delta^{\frac{q^2+2q-1}{q}} \int_A \nu(z) |\nabla f| dz.$$

Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 1$  we obtain (3.6) and complete the proof.  $\square$

The final preparatory lemma is an  $L^1$ -version of Lemma 3.7, in the case  $A = \mathbb{I}$ . In its proof, a technique introduced in [16] is crucial; see also [35]. This allows us to recover  $L^1$ -Sobolev inequalities on weighted spaces which are Cartesian products of weighted spaces.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon \in [0, R)$ , and  $1 \leq q \leq \frac{a_+ + d}{a_+ + d - 1}$ . It holds*

$$c \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u|^q dz \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |\nabla u| dz, \quad u \in C_c^\infty(B_R),$$

for a constant  $c$  not depending on  $q$  or  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* The case  $d - n = 0$  derives directly from Lemma 3.8 by noticing that for

$$1 \leq q \leq \min \left\{ \frac{n}{n-1}, \frac{a+n}{a+n-1} \right\} = \frac{a_+ + n}{a_+ + n - 1}$$

it holds

$$|y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} \leq |y|^a |R|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (a+n-1)} \leq c |y|^a,$$

where  $c > 0$  depends only on  $a, n, R$ .

Let then  $d - n \geq 1$ . By classical and well known results (one can use, for instance, the classical Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequality when  $d - n > 1$  and [10, Proposition 1] for the case  $d - n = 1$ ) we have that for every  $p \geq 1$ ,  $(d - n - 1)p \leq d - n$ , it holds

$$c_1 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |f|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |x|^{\frac{d-n}{p} - (d-n-1)} |\nabla f| dx, \quad f \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^{d-n}),$$

for a constant  $c_1 > 0$  not depending on  $p$ . Thus, using Lemma 3.9 we get that

$$(3.8) \quad c_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |f|^{1+\frac{p-1}{p}} dx \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |f| dx \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |x|^{\frac{d-n}{p} - (d-n-1)} |\nabla_x f| dx, \quad f \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^{d-n}),$$

whenever  $p \geq 1$ ,  $(d - n - 1)p \leq d - n$ .

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.9 we have that for every  $g \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  it holds

$$(3.9) \quad c_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^a |g|^{1+\frac{q-1}{q}} dy \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^a |g| dy \right)^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q} - (n-1)} |\nabla_y g| dy,$$

whenever  $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-1}$ , where the constant  $c_2 > 0$  does not depend neither on  $q$  nor  $\varepsilon$ .

The inequalities (3.8) and (3.9) are equivalent, respectively, to the  $F$ -Sobolev and  $G$ -Sobolev inequalities

(3.10)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |f| F \left( \frac{|f|}{\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})}} \right) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |x|^{\frac{d-n}{p}-(d-n-1)} |\nabla_x f| dx \quad \text{for every } f \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^a |g| G \left( \frac{|g|}{\|g\|_{L^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n)}} \right) dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q}-(n-1)} |\nabla_y g| dy \quad \text{for every } g \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

where

$$F(s) = c_1 s^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad G(t) = c_2 t^{\frac{q-1}{q}}.$$

Let  $u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Arguing as in the proof of [16, Proposition 3.3] with minor modifications, thanks to (3.10) we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u| H \left( \frac{|u|}{\|u\|_{L^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)}} \right) dx dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} (|x|^{\frac{d-n}{p}-(d-n-1)} |y|^a + |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q}-(n-1)}) |\nabla u| dx dy,$$

where

$$H(r) = \inf_{st=r} [F(s) + G(t)].$$

After some standard computations, we see that for  $p \geq 1$ ,  $(d-n-1)p \leq d-n$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-1}$ , it holds

$$H(r) \geq \min\{c_1, c_2\} r^{\frac{\gamma_{p,q}-1}{\gamma_{p,q}}},$$

where

$$\gamma_{p,q} = \frac{p(q-1) + q(p-1)}{pq-1}, \quad \gamma_{1,1} = 1.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{c_1, c_2\} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u|^{1+\frac{\gamma_{p,q}-1}{\gamma_{p,q}}} dx dy \\ \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u| dy \right)^{\frac{\gamma_{p,q}-1}{\gamma_{p,q}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} (|x|^{\frac{d-n}{p}-(d-n-1)} |y|^a + |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q}-(n-1)}) |\nabla u| dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.9 once again, we infer that, for every  $u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  it holds

$$(3.11) \quad c \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u|^{\gamma_{p,q}} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{p,q}}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} (|x|^{\frac{d-n}{p}-(d-n-1)} |y|^a + |y|^{\frac{a+n}{q}-(n-1)}) |\nabla u| dz,$$

for some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $p, q, \varepsilon$ .

Now, let us take  $1 \leq \tau \leq \frac{d}{d-1}$ , and put  $q = \frac{(d-n)-(d-n-1)\tau}{(d-n+1)-(d-n)\tau}$  in (3.11). Further, let  $p = \frac{d-n}{d-n-1}$  if  $d-n > 1$  or take the limit  $p \rightarrow \infty$  if  $d-n = 1$ . We find that for every  $1 \leq \tau \leq \frac{d}{d-1}$  and  $u \in C_c^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  it holds

$$c \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u|^\tau dz \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a \left( 1 + |y|^{\frac{a+d-\tau(a+d-1)}{d-n-\tau(d-n-1)}} \right) |\nabla u| dz.$$

Let now  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ . To conclude it suffice to notice that for

$$1 \leq \tau \leq \min \left\{ \frac{d}{d-1}, \frac{a+d}{a+d-1} \right\} = \frac{a_+ + d}{a_+ + d - 1}$$

it holds

$$|y|^{\frac{a+d-\tau(a+d-1)}{d-n-\tau(d-n-1)}} \leq R^{\frac{a+d-\tau(a+d-1)}{d-n-\tau(d-n-1)}} \leq c,$$

for a constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $\varepsilon$  nor  $q$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.7.* The proof is divided in two steps.

*Step 1: The case  $A = \mathbb{I}$ .* Fix  $q$  such that  $2 \leq q \leq 2_a^*$  if  $a_+ + d > 2$  or  $q \geq 2$  if  $a_+ + d = 2$ . Let us denote

$$r = \frac{2q}{q+2},$$

and notice that  $r < q$  and  $1 \leq r \leq \frac{a_+ + d}{a_+ + d - 1}$ .

We fix  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$  and define  $v = |u|^{\frac{q}{r}}$ . Since  $q > r$ , then  $v$  is smooth and we can compute

$$\int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u|^q dz = \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |v|^r dz \leq c \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |\nabla v|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{r}{2}},$$

where the last inequality holds true thanks to Lemma 3.10.

Next we use that  $|\nabla v| = \frac{q}{r} |u|^{\frac{q-r}{r}} |\nabla u|$  and the Hölder inequality to obtain

$$c \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u|^q dz \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a |u|^{\frac{2(q-r)}{r}} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and since

$$\frac{2(q-r)}{r} = q \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{q},$$

we readily conclude.

*Step 2: the general case.* Let  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ , and define  $\tilde{u} = u \circ \Phi^{-1}$ , where  $\Phi$  is the  $C^1$ -diffeomorphism from Lemma A.3. For every  $z \in B_R$ , we have  $|\Phi(z)| \leq cR$  with  $c > 0$  depending only on  $\lambda, \Lambda$ . Thus  $\tilde{u} \in C_c^1(B_{cR})$ . Moreover, taking into account *ii)* and *iii)* from Lemma A.3, and using the change of variables  $(x, \tau) = \Phi(z)$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |\tau|^a |\tilde{u}(x, \tau)|^q dx d\tau = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z) y|^a |u|^q |\det J_\Phi| dz \geq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |u|^q dz,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |\tau|^a |\nabla \tilde{u}(x, \tau)|^2 dx d\tau = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z) y|^a (J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi)^{-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla u |\det J_\Phi| dz \leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz.$$

The conclusion follows applying to  $\tilde{u}$  the previous step. Notice that the latter holds true for functions in  $C^1$  by a standard density argument.  $\square$

4. SOLUTIONS, STABLE  $L^\infty$  ESTIMATES AND APPROXIMATION RESULTS

In this section, we provide the notion of weak solutions to (1.1). We define the regularized problems for (1.1), and we prove some approximation lemmas. Moreover, we prove local stable  $L^\infty$  estimates for the regularized solutions.

## 4.1. Notions of solutions.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$  and  $A$  satisfying (1.5). Let  $f \in L^{2,a}(B_R)$  and  $F \in L^{2,a}(B_R)^d$ . We say that  $u$  is a weak solution to

$$(4.1) \quad -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), \quad \text{in } B_R$$

if  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$  and satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad \int_{B_R} |y|^a A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi = \int_{B_R} |y|^a (f \phi - F \cdot \nabla \phi),$$

for every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ .

We say that  $u$  is an entire solution to

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

if  $u$  is a weak solution to (4.1) for every  $R > 0$ .

**Remark 4.2.** We highlight that our notion of weak solution implies a *weighted conormal boundary condition* on the lower-dimensional set  $\Sigma_0$ . This is a consequence of the fact that the weak formulation (4.2) involves test functions whose support may touch the thin manifold  $\Sigma_0$ . We refer to these solutions as *solutions across*  $\Sigma_0$ . Let us assume for sake of simplicity that  $f = 0$ ,  $F = 0$ , and fix  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ . Multiplying (4.1) by  $\phi$  and integrating by parts in  $B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon$ , we obtain

$$0 = \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u) \phi \, dz = \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |y|^a A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dz - \int_{\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon \cap B_R} |y|^a \phi A \nabla u \cdot \nu \, d\sigma.$$

Formally, taking the limit as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ , we find

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dz = \int_{B_R^{d-n}} \mathcal{D}_u(x) \phi(x, 0) \, dx,$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_u(x) := -\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^n} |y|^{a+n-2} A \nabla u \cdot y \, d\sigma(y).$$

Hence, in the weak formulation of (4.1), we are assuming that  $\mathcal{D}_u = 0$ . It is worth noting that if  $a + n \geq 2$ , due to the zero weighted capacity of the thin manifold, only solutions to (4.1) make sense, since one could not impose any different boundary condition at  $\Sigma_0$ . Conversely, when  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ , the weighted capacity of  $\Sigma_0$  is positive and locally finite, allowing the imposition of both inhomogeneous Dirichlet and inhomogeneous conormal boundary conditions, respectively  $u = g$  and  $\mathcal{D}_u = h$  on  $\Sigma_0$ .



**Definition 4.3.** Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $A \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$  satisfying (1.5) and  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . Let  $f \in L^{2,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$  and  $F \in L^{2,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)^d$ . We say that  $u$  is a weak solution to

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), & \text{in } B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ (A \nabla u + F) \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_R \end{cases}$$

if  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$  and satisfies

$$\int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dz = \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a (f \phi - F \cdot \nabla \phi) \, dz,$$

for every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ .

We say that  $u$  is an entire solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ (A \nabla u + F) \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \end{cases}$$

if  $u$  is a weak solution to (4.3) for every  $R > 0$ .

Moreover, we adopt the convention that solutions to (4.3) with  $\varepsilon = 0$  coincide with those of (4.1).

**Remark 4.4.** Fixed  $\bar{u} \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$ , a weak solutions to (4.1) satisfying the boundary condition  $u - \bar{u} \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$  is a minimizer of the functional

$$\mathcal{E}(v) := \int_{B_R} |y|^a \left( \frac{A \nabla v \cdot \nabla v}{2} - f v + F \cdot \nabla v \right) dz,$$

over  $X := \{v \in H^{1,a}(B_R) \mid v - \bar{u} \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)\}$ .

By the Poincaré inequality, see Proposition 2.3, we obtain that the functional  $\mathcal{E}$  is coercive, so by the Weierstrass theorem, we have existence and uniqueness of solutions to (4.1) with prescribed trace on  $\partial B_R$  (see also Lemma 2.11).

**4.2. Caccioppoli inequality and local boundedness of solutions.** In this section we provide local  $L^2 \rightarrow L^\infty$  estimates for weak solutions to (4.3) that are uniform with respect to  $\varepsilon$ . We note that, since the weight  $|y|^a$  is 2-admissible, the local  $L^\infty$  bounds for weak solutions to (4.1) (when  $\varepsilon = 0$  and  $A \in L^\infty$ ) follows from [30].

Furthermore, assuming that the matrix  $A \in C^1(B_R)$ , where the radius  $R > 0$  is taken small enough in order to ensure that the  $\varepsilon$ -stable Sobolev embedding holds true (see Lemma 3.7), we obtain  $\varepsilon$ -stable  $L^\infty$  bounds for weak solutions to (4.3) (when  $\varepsilon > 0$ ). This result is established through a standard argument based on an iteration technique involving the Caccioppoli-type inequality below and Sobolev embeddings. The proof is omitted here, as it has been carried out in a similar context in [33, §2.4].

**Lemma 4.5** (Caccioppoli inequality). *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $0 \leq \varepsilon \ll 1$ ,  $p, q \geq 2$ , and let  $A \in C^1(B_R)$  satisfy (1.5). Let  $f \in L^{p,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$ ,  $F \in L^{q,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)^d$ , and let  $u$  be a weak solution to (4.1) if  $\varepsilon = 0$  or to (4.3) if  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then, there exists a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  such that*

for every  $0 < R_1 < R_2 < R$  it holds

$$(4.4) \quad \int_{B_{R_1} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz \leq c \left[ \frac{1}{(R_2 - R_1)^2} \int_{B_{R_2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |u|^2 dz + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_{R_2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \|u\|_{L^{p',a}(B_{R_2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \right. \\ \left. + \|F\|_{L^{q,a}(B_{R_2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{q',a}(B_{R_2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \right].$$

Moreover, if  $\varepsilon = 0$  it is enough to assume that  $A \in L^\infty(B_R)$ .

**Proposition 4.6** ( $\varepsilon$ -stable  $L^\infty$  bounds). *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $0 \leq \varepsilon \ll 1$ , and  $A \in C^1(B_R)$  satisfy (1.5), where  $R > 0$  is given by Lemma A.3. Furthermore, let  $p, q \geq 2$  be such that  $p > (a_+ + d)/2$ ,  $q > a_+ + d$ . Let  $f \in L^{p,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$  and  $F \in L^{q,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)^d$  and let  $u$  be a weak solution (4.3).*

*Then, for every  $0 < r < R$  given by Lemma A.3, there exists a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, q, r$  and  $R$  such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_r \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq c(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|F\|_{L^{q,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)}).$$

*In addition, if  $\varepsilon = 0$  and  $u$  is a weak solution to (4.1), the same estimate holds under the assumption that  $A \in L^\infty(B_R)$ .*

**4.3. Approximation results.** In this section, we establish two approximation results. The first one, inspired by [55, Lemma 2.15] and [2, Lemma 4.3], asserts that any solution  $u$  of (4.1) ( $\varepsilon = 0$ ) can be approximated by a family of solutions  $u_\varepsilon$  of the conormal problem on  $\varepsilon$ -perforated domains (4.3) ( $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ ). Here, we assume that the matrix  $A \in C^1$ , in order to have a  $C^1$  boundary  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ , see Remark 3.2. The second result shows that any solution  $u$  of (4.1) ( $\varepsilon = 0$ ) can be approximated by a family of solutions to the same problem but with smooth coefficients, via a standard mollification technique.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $r \in (0, R)$  and  $A \in C^1(B_R)$  satisfying (1.5). Let  $f \in L^{2,a}(B_R)$ ,  $F \in L^{2,a}(B_R)^d$  and let  $u$  be a weak solution to (4.1).*

*Then, there exists a family  $\{u_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon \ll 1}$ , such that  $u_\varepsilon$  are weak solutions to*

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u_\varepsilon) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), & \text{in } B_r \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ (A \nabla u + F) \cdot \nu = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_r, \end{cases}$$

$$(4.5) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{1,a}(B_r \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq c(\|f\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)} + \|F\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)} + \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)}),$$

*for some constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, r, R$ , and there exists a sequence  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$  such that*

$$u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow u \text{ in } H_{\text{loc}}^1(B_r \setminus \Sigma_0).$$

*Proof.* We divide the proof in several steps.

*Step 1. Cut-off solution  $\tilde{u}$ .*

Let us consider a cut-off function  $\xi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$  such that

$$\xi = 1 \text{ on } B_r, \quad \operatorname{spt}(\xi) \subset B_{\frac{R+r}{2}}, \quad 0 \leq \xi \leq 1, \quad |\nabla \xi| \leq c_0,$$

for some  $c_0 > 0$  depending only on  $d$ ,  $r$  and  $R$ . Define  $\tilde{u} := \xi u$ , and notice that  $\tilde{u} \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$  by construction.

Fix  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_R} |y|^a A \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \, dz &= \int_{B_R} |y|^a \left( \xi A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi + u A \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla \phi \right) dz \\
&= \int_{B_R} |y|^a \left( A \nabla u \cdot \nabla (\phi \xi) - \phi A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi + u A \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla \phi \right) dz \\
&= \int_{B_R} |y|^a \left( f \phi \xi - F \cdot \nabla (\phi \xi) - \phi A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi + u A \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla \phi \right) dz \\
&= \int_{B_R} |y|^a \left( f \phi \xi - \xi F \cdot \nabla \phi - \phi F \cdot \nabla \xi - \phi A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi + u A \nabla \xi \cdot \nabla \phi \right) dz,
\end{aligned}$$

that is,  $\tilde{u}$  is a weak solution to

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla \tilde{u}) = |y|^a \tilde{f} + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a \tilde{F}) & \text{in } B_R, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R \end{cases}$$

where we have set

$$\tilde{f} = f \xi - F \cdot \nabla \xi - A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi, \quad \tilde{F} = F \xi - u A \nabla \xi.$$

We have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_R} |y|^a |\tilde{f}|^2 \, dz &\leq c \int_{B_R} |y|^a \left( |\xi f|^2 + |F \cdot \nabla \xi|^2 + |A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi|^2 \right) dz \\
(4.7) \quad &\leq c \int_{B_R} |y|^a \left( |f|^2 + c_0^2 |F|^2 + |A \nabla \xi|^2 |\nabla u|^2 \right) dz \\
&\leq c \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^a |f|^2 \, dz + \int_{B_R} |y|^a |F|^2 \, dz + \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 \, dz \right),
\end{aligned}$$

for some  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d$ ,  $R$  and  $\Lambda$ . By performing similar computations, we get

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{B_R} |y|^a |\tilde{F}|^2 \, dz \leq c \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^a |F|^2 \, dz + \int_{B_R} |y|^a |u|^2 \, dz \right),$$

for some  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d$ ,  $R$  and  $\Lambda$ .

*Step 2. Construction of the approximating solutions  $u_\varepsilon$  in perforated domains.*

Let us consider the family of weak solution  $\{u_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon \ll 1}$  to

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u_\varepsilon) = |y|^a \tilde{f} + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a \tilde{F}), & \text{in } B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ u_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ (A \nabla u_\varepsilon + \tilde{F}) \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_R. \end{cases}$$

By testing (4.9) with  $u_\varepsilon$ , using (1.5), the Poincaré inequality (3.3), Hölder and Young inequalities, (4.7) and (4.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dz \leq \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a A \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon dz = \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a \left( \tilde{f} u_\varepsilon - \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon \right) dz \\
& \leq \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\tilde{f}|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |u_\varepsilon|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\tilde{F}|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dz + c \int_{B_R} |y|^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + |f|^2 + |F|^2) dz,
\end{aligned}$$

for some  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda$  and  $R$ . Hence, combining this inequality and the Poincaré inequality (3.3), we have

$$(4.10) \quad \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a (|u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2) dz \leq c \int_{B_R} |y|^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + |f|^2 + |F|^2) dz.$$

*Step 3. Strong convergence of the sequence  $u_{\varepsilon_k}$  in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$ .*

Let us fix two compact sets  $K \subset K' \subset B_R \setminus \Sigma_0$ . Then, for every  $\varepsilon$  small enough, we have  $K' \subset B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ . Since  $|y|^a$  is uniformly bounded and bounded away from zero on  $K'$ , by (4.10) we have that  $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(K')} \leq c$  for some constant  $c > 0$  that does not depend on  $\varepsilon$ . This implies that there exists a sequence  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $\bar{u} \in H^1(K')$  such that

$$(4.11) \quad u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(K'),$$

$$(4.12) \quad u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \bar{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(K').$$

By testing the equation (4.9) with  $\phi^2(u_\varepsilon - \bar{u})$ , where  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(K')$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{K'} |y|^a \phi^2 A \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon dz &= \int_{K'} |y|^a \left( \phi^2 A \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \bar{u} - 2(u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}) \phi A \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \phi + \tilde{f} \phi^2 (u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \phi^2 \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla (u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}) - 2\phi (u_\varepsilon - \bar{u}) \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla \phi \right) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.11) and (4.12) we can take the limit as  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$  in the right hand side and obtain

$$(4.13) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0} \int_{K'} |y|^a \phi^2 A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} dz = \int_{K'} |y|^a \phi^2 A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} dz.$$

Fix  $\delta > 0$ . Take  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(K')$  such that  $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ ,  $\phi = 1$  in  $K$  and  $|\text{spt}(\phi) \setminus K| \ll 1$  so that, noticing that  $|y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} \in L^1(B_R)$ , we have  $\| |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} \|_{L^1(\text{spt}(\phi) \setminus K)} < \delta$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
c \int_K |\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} - \nabla \bar{u}|^2 dz &\leq \int_K |y|^a A (\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} - \nabla \bar{u}) \cdot (\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} - \nabla \bar{u}) dz \\
&= \int_K |y|^a A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} + |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} - 2 |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} dz \\
&\leq \int_{K'} |y|^a A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi^2 + |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} \phi^2 dz - 2 \int_K |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} dz \\
&\leq \left| \int_{K'} |y|^a A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi^2 dz - \int_{K'} |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} \phi^2 dz \right| + 2 \int_{K' \setminus K} |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} \phi^2 dz \\
&\leq \left| \int_{K'} |y|^a A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi^2 dz - \int_{K'} |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u} \phi^2 dz \right| + 2\delta \rightarrow 2\delta, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to (4.13). By to the arbitrariness of  $\delta$ , we infer that  $\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \nabla \bar{u}$  in  $L^2(K)^d$ , and thus  $u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \bar{u}$  strongly in  $H^1(K)$ . Finally, a standard diagonal argument yields that

$$(4.14) \quad u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \bar{u} \quad \text{strongly in } H_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0).$$

*Step 4. The limit function  $\bar{u} \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$ .*

Let us now prove that  $\bar{u} \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$ . Let us fix  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$  if  $a+n \in (0,2)$  or  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$  if  $a+n \geq 2$ . For every  $\varepsilon_k$  fixed, one has that  $u_{\varepsilon_k} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)$ , so it holds

$$(4.15) \quad \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} \partial_{z_\ell} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi dz = - \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} u_{\varepsilon_k} \partial_{z_\ell} \phi dz + \int_{\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_R} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi d\sigma,$$

for every  $\ell = 1, \dots, d$ .

If  $a+n \geq 2$ ,  $\text{spt}(\phi) \subset B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  for every  $\varepsilon_k$  small enough, so

$$\int_{\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_R} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi d\sigma = 0.$$

On the other hand, let us fix a measurable set  $E \subset B_R$ . By using (4.10) and observing that  $|y|^{-a} \in L^\infty(\text{spt}(\phi))$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_E \partial_{z_\ell} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi dz \right| &\leq \left( \int_{E \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} |y|^a |\partial_{z_\ell} u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{E \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} |y|^{-a} |\phi|^2 dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq c \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + |f|^2 + |F|^2) dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} C_\phi |E|^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant  $C_\phi$  depends on  $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty}$  and  $\text{spt}(\phi)$ , which implies that  $\partial_{z_\ell} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi$  is uniformly integrable. By the a.e. convergences  $\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \nabla \bar{u}$  and  $\chi_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} \rightarrow \chi_{B_R}$ , the Vitali convergence theorem

yields

$$\int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} \partial_{z_\ell} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi \, dz \rightarrow \int_{B_R} \partial_{z_\ell} \bar{u} \phi \, dz .$$

By employing a similar argument, one has that

$$\int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} u_{\varepsilon_k} \partial_{z_\ell} \phi \, dz \rightarrow \int_{B_R} \bar{u} \partial_{z_\ell} \phi \, dz ,$$

so, by taking the limit as  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$  in (4.15) we have

$$(4.16) \quad \int_{B_R} \partial_{z_\ell} \bar{u} \phi \, dz = \int_{B_R} \bar{u} \partial_{z_\ell} \phi \, dz ,$$

which means that  $\bar{u} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$ .

If  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ , by using Lemma 3.6 combined with (4.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_R} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi \, d\sigma \right| &\leq \left( \int_{\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_R} |y|^a |u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2 \, d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_R} |y|^{-a} |\phi|^2 \, d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq c \varepsilon_k^{n-1} \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2 \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^{-a} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq c \varepsilon_k^{n-1} \left( \int_{B_R} |y|^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + |f|^2 + |F|^2) \, dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} , \end{aligned}$$

and taking the limit  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$  we get that the term  $\int_{\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_R} u_{\varepsilon_k} \phi \, d\sigma$  vanishes.

Using the same argument as for the case  $a + n \geq 2$  and noting that  $|y|^{-a} \in L^1(B_R)$ , we can take the limit as  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$  in (4.15). This allows us to conclude that (4.16) holds true, which means that  $\bar{u} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(B_R)$ .

Now, using the Fatou Lemma and (4.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R} |y|^a (|\bar{u}|^2 + |\nabla \bar{u}|^2) \, dz &= \int_{B_R} \lim_{\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+} |y|^a (|u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2 + |\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2) \chi_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} \, dz \\ &\leq \liminf_{\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a (|u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2 + |\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2) \, dz \leq c \int_{B_R} |y|^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + |f|^2 + |F|^2) \, dz , \end{aligned}$$

which means that  $\|\bar{u}\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} < \infty$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8, we conclude that  $\bar{u} \in H^{1,a}(B_R)$ .

*Step 5.  $\bar{u}$  has zero trace on  $\partial B_R$ .*

Finally, we prove that  $\bar{u}$  has zero trace on  $\partial B_R$ , meaning that  $T_R \bar{u} = 0$ . First, notice that for any fixed  $\delta \ll 1$ , it follows from (4.14) that  $u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \bar{u}$  strongly in  $H^1(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\delta^A)$ . Consequently, we also have  $T_R u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow T_R \bar{u}$  strongly in  $L^2(\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\delta^A)$ . Since  $T_R u_{\varepsilon_k} = 0$  by construction, we immediately get that  $T_R \bar{u} = 0$   $L^2$ -a.e. in  $\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_0$ .

Now, let us fix  $\nu > 0$ . Since, by Lemma 2.11, it holds  $|y|^a |T_R \bar{u}|^2 \in L^1(\partial B_R)$ , the absolute continuity of the integral ensures that there exists a sufficiently small  $\mu$  such that

$$\int_{\partial B_R \cap \Sigma_\mu^A} |y|^a |T_R \bar{u}|^2 ds \leq \nu.$$

Thus

$$\int_{\partial B_R} |y|^a |T_R \bar{u}|^2 ds \leq \nu + \int_{\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\mu^A} |y|^a |T_R \bar{u}|^2 ds \leq \nu + c \int_{\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_\mu^A} |T_R \bar{u}|^2 ds = \nu,$$

where in the last equality holds because  $T_R \bar{u} = 0$   $L^2$ -a.e. on  $\partial B_R \setminus \Sigma_0$ . Since  $\nu$  is arbitrary, we conclude that  $T_R \bar{u} = 0$ . Therefore, again by Lemma 2.11, we have  $u \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$ .

*Step 6.  $\bar{u} = \tilde{u}$  and conclusion.*

Next, we prove that  $\bar{u} = \tilde{u}$ . Let us test (4.9) with  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ . Then, we have

$$(4.17) \quad \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla \phi dz \rightarrow \int_{B_R} |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \phi dz, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+.$$

In fact, let us fix  $E \subset B_R$  measurable. By using (1.5), (4.10) and  $|y|^a \in L^1(B_R)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{E \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a |A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla \phi| dz &= \int_E |y|^a |A \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla \phi| \chi_{E \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} dz \\ &\leq c \|u_{\varepsilon_k}\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \int_E |y|^a dz \leq \delta(|E|), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta(|E|) \rightarrow 0$  as  $|E| \rightarrow 0$ . Combining this with the a.e. convergence  $\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \nabla \bar{u}$  we can conclude that (4.17) holds true by applying the Vitali convergence theorem. With similar computations, we get

$$(4.18) \quad \int_{B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a (\tilde{f} \phi - \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla \phi) dz \rightarrow \int_{B_R} |y|^a (\tilde{f} \phi - \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla \phi) dz, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+.$$

Combining (4.17) and (4.18) we get

$$\int_{B_R} |y|^a A \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \phi dz = \int_{B_R} |y|^a (\tilde{f} \phi - \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla \phi) dz,$$

and since  $\bar{u} \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$ , we get that  $\bar{u}$  is a weak solution to (4.6). By uniqueness of solutions (see Remark 4.4), we get that  $\bar{u} = \tilde{u}$  a.e. in  $B_R$ . Since  $\tilde{u} = u$ ,  $\tilde{f} = f$  and  $\tilde{F} = F$  in  $B_r$ , and by using (4.10), (4.14) we obtain that our statement holds true.  $\square$

The next approximation lemma provides the convergence of solutions of equations with regularized coefficients through convolution with standard mollifiers.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $r \in (0, R)$ , and  $A \in C^0(B_R)$  satisfying (1.5). Let  $f \in L^{2,a}(B_R)$ ,  $F \in L^{2,a}(B_R)^d$ , let  $u$  be a weak solution to (4.1). For  $\delta > 0$ , let  $\{\rho_\delta\}$  be a family of smooth mollifiers and let us define  $A_\delta := A * \rho_\delta$ . Then, there exists a family  $\{u_\delta\}_{0 < \delta \leq 1}$ , such that  $u_\delta$  are weak solutions to*

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A_\delta \nabla u_\delta) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), \quad \text{in } B_r,$$

$$\|u_\delta\|_{H^{1,a}(B_r)} \leq c(\|f\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)} + \|F\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)} + \|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)}),$$

for some constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, r, R$ , and there exists a sequence  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$u_{\delta_k} \rightarrow u \text{ in } H^{1,a}(B_r).$$

*Proof.* Let us fix  $0 < r < R' < R$  and consider a smooth cut-off function  $\xi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$  such that

$$\xi = 1 \text{ in } B_r, \quad 0 \leq \xi \leq 1, \quad \text{spt}(\phi) \subset B_{R'}.$$

Arguing as in Lemma 4.7, the function  $\tilde{u} := \xi u$  is a weak solution to

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla \tilde{u}) = |y|^a \tilde{f} + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a \tilde{F}), & \text{in } B_{R'} \\ \tilde{u} = 0, & \text{on } \partial B_{R'}, \end{cases}$$

where, we set

$$\tilde{f} = f\xi - F \cdot \nabla \xi - A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi, \quad \tilde{F} = F\xi - u A \nabla \xi,$$

which satisfy

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^{2,a}(B_{R'})} + \|\tilde{F}\|_{L^{2,a}(B_{R'})} \leq c(\|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} + \|f\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)} + \|F\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)}),$$

for some  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, R$  and  $\Lambda$ .

For  $\delta > 0$ , let  $\{\rho_\delta\}$  be a family of smooth mollifiers and let us define  $A_\delta := A * \rho_\delta$ , which is a uniformly elliptic matrix in  $B_{R'}$  (choosing  $\delta$  small enough). For every  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ , recalling Remark 4.4, let  $u_\delta$  be the unique weak solution to

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A_\delta \nabla u_\delta) = |y|^a \tilde{f} + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a \tilde{F}), & \text{in } B_{R'} \\ u_\delta = 0, & \text{on } \partial B_{R'}. \end{cases}$$

By testing (4.20) with  $u_\delta$  and using the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a A_\delta \nabla u_\delta \cdot \nabla u_\delta &= \int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a (\tilde{f} u_\delta - \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla u_\delta) \\ &\leq \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^{2,a}(B_{R'})} \|u_\delta\|_{L^{2,a}(B_{R'})} + \|\tilde{F}\|_{L^{2,a}(B_{R'})} \|\nabla u_\delta\|_{L^{2,a}(B_{R'})}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|u_\delta\|_{H^{1,a}(B_{R'})} \leq c(\|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_R)} + \|f\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)} + \|F\|_{L^{2,a}(B_R)}),$$

for some  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, \lambda, \Lambda$  and  $R$ . Hence,  $\{u_\delta\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $H_0^{1,a}(B_{R'})$  and by using Lemma 2.10, we get

$$(4.21) \quad u_\delta \rightarrow v \text{ strongly in } L^{2,a}(B_{R'}), \quad \nabla u_\delta \rightharpoonup \nabla v \text{ weakly in } L^{2,a}(B_{R'})^d,$$

for some  $v \in H_0^{1,a}(B_R)$ . Taking  $u_\delta - v$  as test function in (4.20), using (4.21) and recalling that  $A_\delta \rightarrow A$  uniformly, we get

$$\int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a A_\delta \nabla u_\delta \cdot \nabla u_\delta = \int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a (A_\delta \nabla u_\delta \cdot \nabla v + \tilde{f}(u_\delta - v) - \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla(u_\delta - v)) \rightarrow \int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a A \nabla v \cdot \nabla v.$$

Hence, since  $A_\delta$  satisfies (1.5), we have that  $\nabla u_\delta \rightarrow \nabla v$  strongly in  $L^{2,a}(B_{R'})^d$ .



Finally, let us fix  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_{R'})$ . Then,

$$\int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a (\tilde{f}\phi - \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla \phi) = \int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a A_\delta \nabla u_\delta \cdot \nabla \phi \rightarrow \int_{B_{R'}} |y|^a A \nabla v \cdot \nabla \phi,$$

that is,  $v$  is a weak solution to (4.19) and by uniqueness of solutions (see Remark 4.4), it follows that  $v = \tilde{u}$ . Next, since  $\tilde{f} = f$ ,  $\tilde{F} = F$  and  $\tilde{u} = u$  in  $B_r$ , we have proved that  $u_\delta \rightarrow u$  in  $H^{1,a}(B_r)$  and  $u_\delta$  solves

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A_\delta \nabla u_\delta) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), \text{ in } B_r.$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

## 5. LIOUVILLE THEOREMS

The aim of this section is to prove the Liouville Theorem 1.4 for entire solutions to (1.15), see Definition 4.3.

First, we need some preliminary results. The first result addresses the unweighted tangential variables  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n}$ , for which the operator is invariant under translations. Its proof uses a standard difference quotients technique and involves an iterative argument based on the Caccioppoli inequality in Lemma 4.5 (see for example [57, Corollary 4.2, Lemma 4.3]), and is therefore omitted here.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $u$  be an entire solution to (1.15). Then*

- i) for every  $j = 1, \dots, d-n$ , the weak derivative  $\partial_{x_j} u$  is also an entire solution to (1.15);*
- ii) if there exists constants  $c, \gamma > 0$  such that*

$$|u(z)| \leq c(1 + |z|^\gamma),$$

*then  $u$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $\lceil \gamma \rceil$  in the variable  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n}$ , with coefficients depending only on the variable  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .*

In the following crucial lemmas we provide a characterization of the solutions to (1.15) with polynomial growth at infinity in the case  $n = d$ . The first lemma gives us a basis of  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  which depends on the matrix  $A$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$  be a constant matrix which satisfies (1.5). The following holds:*

- i) there exists an increasing, diverging sequence of eigenvalues  $\{\mu_k(A)\}_{k \geq 0}$ , corresponding to critical levels of the quotient*

$$\mathcal{R}(g) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |\nabla_\sigma g|^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |g|^2 d\sigma}.$$

*Each eigenvalue has finite multiplicity, denoted by  $m(\mu_k(A))$ ;*

ii) let  $g_{k,j}$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, m(\mu_k(A))$ , be the normalized eigenfunctions associated to  $\mu_k(A)$ . The eigenfunctions  $g_{k,j}$  satisfy the following properties:

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a \nabla_{\sigma} g_{k,j} \cdot \nabla_{\sigma} \eta \, d\sigma &= \mu_k(A) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a g_{k,j} \eta \, d\sigma, \quad \eta \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}), \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a g_{k,j} g_{k',j'} \, d\sigma &= \delta_{kk'} \delta_{jj'}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta.

Moreover,  $g_{k,j}$  provides a basis of  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ , which is also orthonormal with respect to the scalar product  $\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a u v \, d\sigma$ . Thus, for every  $u \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  it holds

$$u(\sigma) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{m(\mu_k(A))} \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a u(\eta) g_{k,j}(\eta) \, d\eta \right) g_{k,j}(\sigma);$$

iii) the eigenvalue  $\mu_0(A) = 0$  is simple and  $g_0 = g_{0,1}$  is constant;  
iv) the first nontrivial eigenvalue  $\mu_1(A)$  is such that

$$\mu_1(A) \geq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{\frac{|a|}{2}} (n-1) & \text{if } n \geq 3, \\ \left(\frac{4}{\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}\right)^{\frac{|a|}{4}}\right)^2 & \text{if } n = 2. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By condition (1.5), we have that

$$(5.2) \quad \lambda \leq |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^2 \leq \Lambda, \quad \text{for every } \sigma \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}.$$

Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a (|\nabla_{\sigma} g|^2 + |g|^2) \, d\sigma$$

provides a norm equivalent to the standard one in  $H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ . Keeping this in mind, we obtain *i*), *ii*) by a standard application of Hilbert-Schmidt theorem.

Since *iii*) is trivial, it remains to prove *iv*). Given  $g \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ , let us denote

$$\langle g \rangle_A = \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a \, d\sigma \right)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a g \, d\sigma,$$

and recall that

$$(5.3) \quad \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a |g - \xi|^2 \, d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a |g - \langle g \rangle_A|^2 \, d\sigma.$$

We have that

$$(5.4) \quad \mu_1(A) = \inf_{g \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \setminus \{0\}, \langle g \rangle_A = 0} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a |\nabla_{\sigma} g|^2 \, d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a |g|^2 \, d\sigma}.$$

Notice that the eigenvalues  $\mu_k(\mathbb{I})$  of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the sphere are well known, and in particular  $\mu_1(\mathbb{I}) = n - 1$ . Now, set

$$m := \min \left\{ \left( \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right)^{\frac{a}{2}}, \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{a}{2}} \right\} = \left( \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right)^{\frac{|a|}{2}}$$

and let  $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  be an eigenfunction associated to  $\mu_1(A)$ . Notice that  $\langle \psi \rangle_A = 0$ . Thus, by (5.3) we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |\psi|^2 d\sigma \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |\psi - \langle \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{I}}|^2 d\sigma$$

As a consequence, thanks to (5.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(A) &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |\nabla_{\sigma} \psi|^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |\psi|^2 d\sigma} \geq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |\nabla_{\sigma} (\psi - \langle \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{I}})|^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |\psi - \langle \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{I}}|^2 d\sigma} \\ &\geq m \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_{\sigma} (\psi - \langle \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{I}})|^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\psi - \langle \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{I}}|^2 d\sigma} \geq m(n-1), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used that  $\langle \psi - \langle \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{I}} \rangle_{\mathbb{I}} = 0$  and (5.4) with  $A = \mathbb{I}$ .

The improved estimate in the case  $n = 2$  is a consequence of [52, Lemma 1].  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , and let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$  be a constant matrix which satisfies (1.5). Let  $\mu_k(A)$ ,  $g_{k,j}$  be as in Lemma 5.2, and define*

$$\gamma_k^{\pm} = \frac{2 - a - n \pm \sqrt{(a + n - 2)^2 + 4\mu_k(A)}}{2}.$$

Let  $u$  be such that  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon}^A)$  for any  $R > 0$  and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon}^A} |y|^a A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi = 0, \quad \text{for any } \phi \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Assume there exist constants  $c, \gamma > 0$  such that

$$(5.5) \quad |u(y)| \leq c(1 + |y|^{\gamma}).$$

Then there exist  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\hat{k} = \hat{k}(\gamma) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(5.6) \quad u(y) = C + \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{k}} \sum_{j=1}^{m(\mu_k^A)} (c_{k,j}^+ |A^{-\frac{1}{2}} y|^{\gamma_k^+} + c_{k,j}^- |A^{-\frac{1}{2}} y|^{\gamma_k^-}) g_{k,j} \left( \frac{A^{-\frac{1}{2}} y}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}} y|} \right),$$

for some constants  $c_{k,j}^+, c_{k,j}^- \in \mathbb{R}$ . In particular, if  $\varepsilon = 0$ , then

$$(5.7) \quad u(y) = C + \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{k}} \sum_{j=1}^{m(\mu_k^A)} c_{k,j}^+ |A^{-\frac{1}{2}} y|^{\gamma_k^+} g_{k,j} \left( \frac{A^{-\frac{1}{2}} y}{|A^{-\frac{1}{2}} y|} \right).$$

Moreover, if  $\gamma < \gamma_1^+$ , then  $u$  is constant.

*Proof.* Since the proof we assume  $d = n$ , we will simply write  $B_R$  instead of  $B_R^n$  to denote general balls in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let us define  $v(\xi) = u(A^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi)$ . Performing some standard computations using the change of variables  $\xi = A^{-\frac{1}{2}}y$  and the uniform ellipticity of  $A$ , we see that  $v \in H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)$  for any  $R > 0$  and satisfies

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi|^a \nabla v \cdot \nabla \phi = 0, \quad \text{for any } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

The remaining part of the proof is divided in three steps.

*Step 1: Spectral decomposition.*

In the following we extensively use polar coordinates  $\xi = r\sigma$ , where  $r = |\xi| > 0$  and  $\sigma = |\xi|^{-1}\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . Since  $v \in H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)$  for any  $R > 0$ , then by the Fubini-Tonelli theorem it holds that  $v(r\cdot) \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  for a.e.  $r > \varepsilon$ . Thus, for a.e.  $r > \varepsilon$ , we can decompose  $v(r\cdot)$  via the basis  $\{g_{k,j}\}$  (see Lemma 5.2, *ii*)), obtaining

$$v(r\sigma) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{m(\mu_k^A)} v_{k,j}(r) g_{k,j}(\sigma),$$

where the coefficients  $v_{k,j}$  depend on  $r \in [\varepsilon, \infty)$ , and are such that

$$(5.9) \quad v_{k,j}(r) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a u(r\sigma) g_{k,j}(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

By previous discussions, the functions  $v_{k,j} : [\varepsilon, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are well defined for a.e.  $r \geq \varepsilon$ . Moreover, using once again that  $v \in H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)$  for any  $R > 0$  we can see that

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{k,j} &\in H^1((\varepsilon, R), r^{a+n-1} dr) \quad \text{for any } R > 0, \\ v'_{k,j}(r) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a \nabla v(r\sigma) \cdot \sigma g_{k,j}(\sigma) d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

*Step 2: Solutions of an associated ODE.*

Let us rewrite (5.8) in polar coordinates as

$$(5.11) \quad \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} r^{a+n-1} |A^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma|^a \left( \partial_r v \partial_r \phi + r^{-2} \nabla_\sigma v \cdot \nabla_\sigma \phi \right) dr d\sigma = 0, \quad \text{for any } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Now, let us take any  $f \in C_c^\infty([0, \infty))$  such that

$$(5.12) \quad \mu_k(A) \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} r^{a+n-3} |f|^2 dr < \infty.$$

Notice that (5.12) is always satisfied if  $\varepsilon > 0$ , or if  $k = 0$  (by Lemma 5.2, *iii*). Thanks to (5.1) and (5.12) we have that  $\phi(r\sigma) = f(r)g_{k,j}(\sigma) \in H^{1,a}(B_R \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)$  for any  $R > 0$ . Moreover,  $\phi$  is compactly supported, and we can use it as a test function in (5.11). Recalling also (5.9) and (5.10), we obtain that  $v_{k,j}$  satisfies

$$(5.13) \quad \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} r^{a+n-1} (f' v'_{k,j} + r^{-2} \mu_k(A) f v_{k,j}) dr = 0, \quad \text{for every } f \in C_c^\infty([\varepsilon, \infty)) \text{ satisfying (5.12)}.$$

Now, let us take any  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ , and test (5.13) with  $f(r) = \varphi(\log(r))$ . Notice that such  $f$  is admissible. Performing the change of variables  $r = e^\tau$ , we find that the function  $w_{k,j}(\tau) = v_{k,j}(e^\tau)$  satisfies

$$\int_{\log \varepsilon}^{\infty} e^{\tau(a+n-2)} (w'_{k,j} \varphi' + \mu_k(A) w_{k,j} \varphi) d\tau = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}).$$

Equivalently, we have that  $w_{k,j}$  is a solution to the elementary equation

$$w''_{k,j} + (a+n-2)w'_{k,j} - \mu_k(A)w_{k,j} = 0 \quad \text{in } [\log \varepsilon, \infty).$$

Recalling that the multiplicity of the first eigenvalue  $m(\mu_0(A)) = 1$ , one has that

$$(5.14) \quad v_{0,1}(r) = \begin{cases} c_1 + c_2 r^{2-a-n}, & \text{if } 2-a-n \neq 0, \\ c_1 + c_2 \log r, & \text{if } 2-a-n = 0, \end{cases}$$

for some constants  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, defining

$$\gamma_k^\pm = \frac{2-a-n \pm \sqrt{(a+n-2)^2 + 4\mu_k(A)}}{2},$$

we readily get that  $v_{k,j}$  is in the form

$$v_{k,j}(r) = c_{k,j}^+ r^{\gamma_k^+} + c_{k,j}^- r^{\gamma_k^-}, \quad \text{if } k \geq 1,$$

for some constant  $c_{k,j}^+, c_{k,j}^- \in \mathbb{R}$ . We point out that

$$(5.15) \quad \gamma_0^\pm = \pm(2-a-n)_\pm, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_k^+ > 0, \quad \gamma_k^- < 0 \quad \text{if } k \geq 1.$$

*Step 3: Conclusion.*

First, let us show that  $v_{0,1}$  is constant. Since  $\mu_0(A) = 0$ , condition (5.12) is always satisfied. Thus, we can take  $f \in C_c^\infty([\varepsilon, \infty))$  such that  $f(\varepsilon) = 1$  in (5.13) and recalling (5.14), we find

$$0 = \int_\varepsilon^\infty r^{a+n-1} (f' v'_{0,1} + r^{-2} \mu_0(A) f v_{0,1}) dr = c_2 (2-a-n) \int_\varepsilon^\infty f' dr = c_2 (a+n-2),$$

if  $2-a-n \neq 0$ , which implies that  $c_2 = 0$ . Instead, if  $2-a-n = 0$ , we find

$$0 = \int_\varepsilon^\infty r^{a+n-1} (f' v'_{0,1} + r^{-2} \mu_0(A) f v_{0,1}) dr = c_2 \int_\varepsilon^\infty f' dr = -c_2,$$

and we conclude as well.

Let us now focus on the case  $k \geq 1$ . First, let us assume  $\varepsilon = 0$ . By (5.10) we have that  $v'_{k,j} \in L^2((0,1), r^{a+n-1} dr)$ . As a consequence,

$$(c_{k,j}^- \gamma_k^-)^2 \int_0^1 r^{a+n-3+2\gamma_k^-} dr < \infty.$$

Thanks to (5.15), this readily implies  $c_{k,j}^- = 0$ . Now, by condition (5.5) and thanks to (1.5) we have that

$$|v_{k,j}| \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma|^a |v(r\sigma)| |g_{k,j}| d\sigma \leq c(1+r^\gamma).$$

Therefore, since for every  $\gamma$  there exists  $\hat{k}$  such that  $\gamma_{\hat{k}}^+ > \gamma$ , we easily infer that  $c_{k,j}^+ = 0$  for every  $k \geq \hat{k}$ , that is,  $v_{k,j} \equiv 0$  for every  $k \geq \hat{k}$ . Recalling that  $u(y) = v(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}y)$ , we readily get (5.7).

Let now consider the case  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Arguing as before, we find that condition (5.5) implies that there exists  $\hat{k}$  such that for every  $k \geq \hat{k}$  it holds  $\gamma_k^+ > \gamma$  and

$$v_{k,j} = c_{k,j}^- r^{\gamma_k^-}.$$

Let  $k \geq \hat{k}$  be fixed. Since  $\varepsilon > 0$ , condition (5.12) is always satisfied. Thus we can take  $f \in C_c^\infty([\varepsilon, \infty))$  such that  $f(\varepsilon) = 1$  in (5.13) and we find, integrating by parts and performing some standard computations

$$c_{k,j}^- \gamma_k^- \varepsilon^{a+n-2+\gamma_k^-} = 0.$$

Since  $k \geq 1$ , then  $\gamma_k^- \neq 0$  and we infer that  $c_{k,j}^- = 0$ , that is,  $v_{k,j} \equiv 0$ . Also in this case we use  $u(y) = v(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}y)$  to complete the proof of (5.6).

Finally, we notice that if  $\gamma < \gamma_1^+$  then in both cases it holds  $v_{k,j} \equiv 0$  for every  $k \geq 1$ . Since we have already proved that  $v_{0,1}$  is constant, then  $v$  is also constant, and  $u$  too.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $A$  be as in the assumptions, and recall the notation (1.19). We first assume that  $\gamma < 1$ . Thus, by Proposition 5.1 we have that  $u = u(y)$  does not depend on  $x$ , which implies that  $u$  is an entire solution to (1.15) with  $d = n$  and  $A = A_3$ . Hence,  $u$  satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 5.3, and using that  $\gamma < \gamma_1^+$ , we conclude that  $u$  must be constant.

Let now assume that  $\gamma < 2$ . By Proposition 5.1 we have that  $u$  is a polynomial of degree at most 1 in the  $x$  variable; that is,  $u$  can be written in the form

$$u(x, y) = u^0(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{d-n} u^j(y) x_j.$$

First, we notice that by (1.16) it holds

$$|u^0(y)| = |u(0, y)| \leq c(1 + |y|^\gamma).$$

Thus

$$(5.16) \quad |u^j(y)| = |u(e_{x_j}, y) - u^0(y)| \leq c(1 + |y|^\gamma);$$

that is, each component  $u^0, u^j$  still satisfies the growth condition (1.16).

On the other hand, we have that  $u^j(y) = \partial_{x_j} u$  for  $j = 1, \dots, d-n$  and thus, again by Proposition 5.1, they are entire solutions to (1.15). Keeping (5.16) into account, and using that any  $u^j$  does not depend on  $x$ , we can argue as in the previous part of the proof and conclude that they are constant.

Summing up, we proved that there exists  $\alpha = \alpha(u) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n}$  constant such that

$$u(x, y) = u^0(y) + \alpha \cdot x.$$

We claim that the function  $u^*$  given by

$$u^*(x, y) = \alpha \cdot x - (A_3^{-1} A_2^\top \alpha) \cdot y$$

is an entire solution to (1.15). Indeed, we can easily compute

$$A\nabla u^* = (A_1\alpha - A_2A_3^{-1}A_2^\top\alpha, 0),$$

and thus for every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A} |y|^a A\nabla u^* \cdot \nabla \phi \, dz = \int_{|A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}y| \geq \varepsilon} |y|^a (A_1\alpha - A_2A_3^{-1}A_2^\top\alpha) \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} \nabla_x \phi \, dx \right) dy = 0,$$

where in the last equality we used the divergence theorem.

By linearity, the function  $\hat{u} = u - u^*$  is an entire solution to (1.15). Moreover, since we are assuming  $\gamma \in [1, 2)$ , it holds

$$|\hat{u}| \leq |u| + |u^*| \leq c(1 + |z|^\gamma) + c|z| \leq c(1 + |z|^\gamma),$$

that is,  $\hat{u}$  satisfies (1.16). Since by construction  $\hat{u} = \hat{u}(y)$  does not depend on  $x$ , we can argue as in the  $\gamma < 1$  case and infer that  $\hat{u}$  is constant, by Lemma 5.3 and using that  $\gamma < \gamma_1^+$ . In conclusion, we showed that

$$u = \hat{u} + u^* = c + \alpha \cdot x + \beta \cdot y,$$

as needed.  $\square$

## 6. STABLE REGULARITY ESTIMATES IN PERFORATED DOMAINS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3, namely, the stable regularity estimates in perforated domains for weak solutions to (1.13), that is, for the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A\nabla u) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F) & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ (A\nabla u + F) \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } B_1 \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A. \end{cases}$$

We divide the proof into two parts, obtaining first the Hölder estimate for solutions and then the Hölder estimate for their gradient.

### 6.1. Stable Hölder estimates.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3, i), stable  $C^{0,\alpha}$ -estimates.* Let  $u_\varepsilon$  be a family of solutions to (1.13). Since the weight  $|y|^a$  is uniformly elliptic away from  $\Sigma_0$  and the boundary  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  is of class  $C^1$  by the assumption  $A \in C^1$  (see Remark 3.2), well-known results in elliptic regularity imply that for every  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , there exists a constant  $C_\varepsilon$  (depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, q, \alpha, L$  and  $\varepsilon$ ) such that for any solution  $u_\varepsilon$  to (1.13) the following estimate holds:

$$(6.1) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq C_\varepsilon (\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{L^{q,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Our goal is to show that  $C_\varepsilon$  remains uniformly bounded as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . The proof proceeds by contradiction and is divided into several steps.

*Step 1. Contradiction argument and blow-up sequences.*

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there exist two sequences  $\varepsilon_k$  and  $u_k$  such that  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the functions  $u_k$  are non trivial, satisfy (1.13) with  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$  and it holds that

$$(6.2) \quad \|u_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \geq k (\|u_k\|_{L^{2,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{L^{q,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

By Proposition 4.6, inequality (6.2) implies the existence of a constant  $c > 0$ , independent of  $k$ , such that

$$[u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \geq ck \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}.$$

Now, let  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{3/4})$  be a function satisfying  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$  and  $\eta = 1$  on  $B_{1/2}$ . We define

$$M_k = [\eta u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)},$$

and observe that

$$(6.3) \quad M_k \geq [u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \geq ck \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}.$$

Consider two sequences of points  $z_k = (x_k, y_k)$ ,  $\hat{z}_k = (\hat{x}_k, \hat{y}_k) \in B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  such that

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{|(\eta u_k)(z_k) - (\eta u_k)(\hat{z}_k)|}{|z_k - \hat{z}_k|^\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2} M_k.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that  $z_k \in B_{3/4}$ . Define  $r_k = |z_k - \hat{z}_k|$ . Using (6.3) and (6.4), we obtain

$$ck \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq \frac{|(\eta u_k)(z_k) - (\eta u_k)(\hat{z}_k)|}{r_k^\alpha} \leq \frac{2 \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}}{r_k^\alpha}.$$

This implies

$$r_k \leq ck^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let us define  $d_k = \text{dist}(z_k, \partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)$ . From now on we distinguish three cases:

- Case 1:**  $\frac{d_k}{r_k} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- Case 2:**  $\frac{d_k}{r_k} \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ , and  $\frac{|y_k|}{r_k} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .
- Case 3:**  $\frac{|y_k|}{r_k} \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ .

Define

$$Z_k = (x_k, Y_k) = \left( x_k, \tau \frac{y_k}{|y_k|} \right),$$

where  $\tau$  is chosen such that  $Z_k \in \partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ . Such a point exists, is unique, and satisfies  $\tau < |y_k|$ , thanks to Lemma A.1 point *ii*). Therefore,

$$|y_k| > |y_k| - \tau = |y_k - Y_k| = |z_k - Z_k| \geq d_k.$$


As a result, the three cases are mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, covering all possible scenarios. Heuristically, in **Case 1**, the blow-up scale does not capture  $\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ ; in **Case 2**,  $\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  is visible, but  $\Sigma_0$  is not; and in **Case 3**, both  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  are visible (although they may or may not coincide in the rescaled limit).




Let  $z_k^0 = (x_k^0, y_k^0)$  denote a chosen projection of  $z_k$  onto  $\partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ , and define

$$\tilde{z}_k = (\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k) = \begin{cases} (x_k, y_k), & \text{in Case 1,} \\ (x_k^0, y_k^0), & \text{in Case 2,} \\ (x_k, 0), & \text{in Case 3.} \end{cases}$$

We observe that, by construction,  $|z_k - \tilde{z}_k| \leq cr_k$ .



**Figure 1.** This image describes **Case 1** when  $n = d = 2$ . In this case we have  $d_k/r_k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\tilde{z}_k = z_k$ .



**Figure 2.** The images on the left and on the right describe respectively **Case 2** and **Case 3** when  $n = d = 2$ . In **Case 2** we have  $d_k/r_k \leq c$ ,  $|y_k|/r_k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\tilde{z}_k = z_k^0$ . In **Case 3** we have  $|y_k|/r_k \leq c$  and  $\tilde{z}_k = 0$ .

We introduce the sequence of rescaled domains

$$\Omega_k = \frac{B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k} = \left\{ z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |\tilde{z}_k + r_k z| < 1, A_3^{-1}(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)(\tilde{y}_k + r_k y) \cdot (\tilde{y}_k + r_k y) \geq \varepsilon_k^2 \right\},$$

and the limit blow-up domain

$$(6.5) \quad \Omega_\infty = \{z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \text{exists } \hat{k}, r > 0 \text{ s.t. } B_r(z) \subset \Omega_k \text{ for every } k \geq \hat{k}\}.$$

Note that, by this definition,  $\Omega_\infty$  is an open set.

Then, we introduce the sequences of functions

$$v_k(z) = \frac{(\eta u_k)(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - (\eta u_k)(z_k)}{r_k^\alpha M_k}, \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega_k,$$

and

$$w_k(z) = \frac{\eta(z_k)(u_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - u_k(z_k))}{r_k^\alpha M_k}, \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega_k.$$

*Step 2. Blow-up limit domains.*

Our goal is to characterize  $\Omega_\infty$  along a suitable subsequence. As previously noted, the three distinct regimes described in **Cases 1, 2, 3** correspond to different scenarios, leading to distinct limit blow-up domains. In **Case 1**, we *do not see* the rescaled boundary of the perforation at any scale of the blow-up. Thus, the hole moves farther and farther away from the blow-up centers and the limit domain  $\Omega_\infty$  coincides with the entire space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In **Case 2**, we *see* the rescaled boundary of the perforation at all scales, whereas the rescaled center of the perforation remains invisible and increasingly distant. As a result, the rescaled boundary flattens progressively and the limit domain  $\Omega_\infty$  becomes a half-space. Finally, in **Case 3**, both the rescaled boundary and the center of the perforation are visible at all scales, leading, as limit domain, to a (potentially) perforated space. In the next part, we will rigorously justify this visual intuition, suggested by Figures 1 and 2.

Notice that for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we have  $|\tilde{z}_k + r_k z| < 1$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Indeed, since  $|z_k - \tilde{z}_k| \leq cr_k$  and  $r_k \rightarrow 0$ , then

$$|\tilde{z}_k + r_k z| \leq |z_k| + |z_k - \tilde{z}_k| + r_k |z| \leq \frac{3}{4} + cr_k < 1.$$

Thus, to characterize  $\Omega_\infty$ , it suffices to determine, for a given  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , whether a neighborhood of the point  $z_k + r_k z$  lies inside or outside  $\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ .

We claim that  $\Omega_\infty = \mathbb{R}^d$  in **Case 1**, that is, for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , a neighborhood of  $z_k + r_k z$  lies outside of  $\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Indeed, let  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be fixed, and assume by contradiction that  $z_k + r_k z \in \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ . Since  $z_k \notin \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ , there exists a point  $P_k = t_k z_k + (1 - t_k)(z_k + r_k z)$  with  $t_k \in [0, 1)$ , such that  $P_k \in \partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ . As a consequence,

$$\infty \leftarrow \frac{d_k}{r_k} \leq \frac{|z_k - P_k|}{r_k} = \frac{|(1 - t_k)r_k z|}{r_k} \leq |z|,$$

which leads to a contradiction.

Let us now consider **Case 2**. Recall that  $\tilde{z}_k = z_k^0$  and  $d_k = |z_k - z_k^0| \leq cr_k$ . Furthermore, note that by the uniform ellipticity condition,

$$\infty \leftarrow \frac{|y_k|}{r_k} \leq \frac{|y_k - y_k^0|}{r_k} + \frac{|y_k^0|}{r_k} \leq \frac{d_k}{r_k} + c \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k} \leq c \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k}\right).$$

Therefore, in this case, we have  $\varepsilon_k/r_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since  $z_k^0 \in \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ , a point  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfies  $z_k^0 + r_k z \notin \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  if and only if

$$(6.6) \quad \frac{\sqrt{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0 + r_k z)(y_k^0 + r_k y) \cdot (y_k^0 + r_k y)} - \sqrt{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0 \cdot y_k^0}}{r_k} > 0.$$

To proceed, we must analyze the behavior of (6.6) as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

We define the function  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$\Psi(z) = \sqrt{A_3^{-1}(z)y \cdot y}.$$

It follows that

$$\Psi(z) = \varepsilon_k, \quad \text{for every } z \in \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A.$$

Moreover, the gradient of  $\Psi$  is given by

$$\nabla\Psi(z) = \frac{(0, A_3^{-1}(z)y)}{\Psi(z)} + \frac{G(z)}{\Psi(z)},$$

where the function  $G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is given by

$$G(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^n \partial_{z_\ell} b_{i,j}(z) y_i y_j \right)_{\ell=1,\dots,d}, \quad \text{with } A_3^{-1}(z) = (b_{i,j}(z))_{i,j=1,\dots,n}.$$

As a result,  $\Psi \in C^{0,1}(B_1) \cap C^1(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0)$ , and it satisfies  $\|\nabla\Psi\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq cL$ . Next we show that, for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , it holds

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{\Psi(z_k^0 + r_k z) - \Psi(z_k^0)}{r_k} - \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0}{\Psi(z_k^0)} \cdot y \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

By the mean value theorem, there exists a point  $z_k^* = (x_k^*, y_k^*) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  of the form  $z_k^* = z_k^0 + \theta_k r_k z$  with  $\theta_k \in [0, 1]$ , such that

$$(6.8) \quad \frac{\Psi(z_k^0 + r_k z) - \Psi(z_k^0)}{r_k} = \nabla\Psi(z_k^*) \cdot z = \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^*)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^*)} \cdot y + \frac{G(z_k^*)}{\Psi(z_k^*)} \cdot z.$$

Using (1.5), we estimate

$$(6.9) \quad \left| \frac{G(z_k^*)}{\Psi(z_k^*)} \cdot z \right| \leq cL|y_k^*| \leq cL(|y_k^0| + cr_k) \leq c(\varepsilon_k + r_k),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.10) \quad & \left| \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^*)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^*)} - \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0}{\Psi(z_k^0)} \right| \leq \left| \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^*)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^*)} - \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^0)} \right| + \left| \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^0)} - \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0}{\Psi(z_k^0)} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^*)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^*)} - \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^*)} \right| + \left| \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^*}{\Psi(z_k^*)} - \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0}{\Psi(z_k^0)} \right| + \frac{c}{\varepsilon_k} |y_k^* - y_k^0| \\
& \leq c|z_k^* - z_k^0| \frac{|y_k^*|}{|\Psi(z_k^*)|} + c|y_k^*| \left| \frac{\Psi(z_k^0) - \Psi(z_k^*)}{|\Psi(z_k^0)| |\Psi(z_k^*)|} \right| + c \frac{r_k}{|\varepsilon_k|} \leq cr_k + c \frac{r_k}{\varepsilon_k}.
\end{aligned}$$

By combining (6.8), (6.9), and (6.10), we obtain

$$\left| \frac{\Psi(z_k^0 + r_k z) - \Psi(z_k^0)}{r_k} - \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0}{\Psi(z_k^0)} \cdot y \right| \leq c(r_k + \varepsilon_k + \frac{r_k}{\varepsilon_k}) \rightarrow 0,$$

since  $r_k/\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ . This completes the proof of (6.7).

Since  $z_k^0 \in B_1$ , we can define, up to subsequences,

$$\bar{e} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0}{|A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0|} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{\bar{e}} = \{z = (x, y) \mid \bar{e} \cdot y > 0\}.$$

We claim that  $\Omega_\infty = \Pi_{\bar{e}}$ , which corresponds to a half-space.

Fix  $z \in \Pi_{\bar{e}}$ . Suppose by contradiction that (6.6) does not hold. Then, by (6.7), we have

$$0 \geq \frac{\Psi(z_k^0)}{|A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0|} \frac{\Psi(z_k^0 + r_k z) - \Psi(z_k^0)}{r_k} = o(1) + \frac{A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0}{|A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0|} \cdot y \rightarrow \bar{e} \cdot y > 0,$$

where we used that, by the uniform ellipticity condition,

$$\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \frac{\Psi(z_k^0)}{|A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0|} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Therefore we reach a contradiction, and we infer that  $\Pi_{\bar{e}} \subset \Omega_\infty$ .

Now, fix  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Pi_{\bar{e}}$ , that is, such that  $\bar{e} \cdot y < 0$  and assume that (6.6) holds. Then,

$$0 \leq \frac{\Psi(z_k^0)}{|A_3^{-1}(z_k^0)y_k^0|} \frac{\Psi(z_k^0 + r_k z) - \Psi(z_k^0)}{r_k} \rightarrow \bar{e} \cdot y < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence  $\Omega_\infty \subset \Pi_{\bar{e}}$  and the claim is proved.

Finally, let us consider **Case 3**. Recall that in this case  $\tilde{z}_k = (x_k, 0)$ , and  $|y_k| \leq cr_k$ . Moreover, we note that

$$\varepsilon_k < |A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z_k)y_k| \leq \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}|y_k| \leq cr_k.$$

Thus we define the following limits

$$(\bar{x}, 0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (x_k, 0), \quad \bar{A} = A(\bar{x}, 0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A(\tilde{z}_k), \quad \bar{\varepsilon} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k} \in [0, \infty).$$

We claim that  $\Omega_\infty = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}$ . Let us fix  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}$ , that is, such that  $\bar{A}_3^{-1}y \cdot y > \bar{\varepsilon}^2$ . Assume by contradiction that  $\tilde{z}_k + r_k z \in \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ , that is,

$$A_3^{-1}(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)r_k y \cdot r_k y \leq \varepsilon_k^2.$$

Dividing the previous inequality by  $r_k^2$  and taking the limit as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain

$$\bar{\varepsilon}^2 < \bar{A}_3^{-1}y \cdot y \leq \bar{\varepsilon}^2,$$

a contradiction. Thus  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}} \subseteq \Omega_\infty$ . By performing similar computations, we get that every  $z \in \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}$  does not belong to  $\Omega_k$ . Therefore,  $\Omega_\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}$  and the claim is proved.

To summarize, we have shown that

$$(6.11) \quad \Omega_\infty = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^d, & \text{in Case 1,} \\ \Pi_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, & \text{in Case 2,} \\ \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}, & \text{in Case 3.} \end{cases}$$

*Step 3. Hölder estimates and convergence of the blow-up sequences.*

Let us fix a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, for all  $z, z' \in K \cap \Omega_k$ , it holds

$$|v_k(z) - v_k(z')| = \frac{|(\eta u_k)(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - (\eta u_k)(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z')|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \leq |z - z'|^\alpha.$$

Therefore,

$$(6.12) \quad [v_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(K \cap \Omega_k)} \leq 1.$$

Now, consider the sequence of points

$$\xi_k = \frac{z_k - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}.$$

Note that  $\xi_k \in \Omega_k$ ,  $|\xi_k| \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ , and  $v_k(\xi_k) = 0$  for every  $k$ . Moreover, for any  $z \in K \cap \Omega_\infty$ , we have that  $z \in K \cap \Omega_k$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Therefore, by (6.12) we get

$$|v_k(z)| = |v_k(z) - v_k(\xi_k)| \leq |z - \xi_k|^\alpha \leq c(K),$$

which implies that  $\|v_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(K \cap \Omega_\infty)} \leq c(K)$ . Note that the constant  $c(K)$  only depends on the diameter of  $K$ .

Hence, we can apply the Arzelá-Ascoli theorem to conclude that  $v_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$  uniformly in  $K$ . By a standard diagonal argument, we extend  $\bar{v}$  to the entire  $\Omega_\infty$  and obtain that  $\bar{v}$  satisfies

$$(6.13) \quad [\bar{v}]_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega_\infty)} \leq 1.$$

Let us now show that  $w_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$  uniformly on compact sets. Fix a compact set  $K \subset \Omega_\infty$ , so that  $K \subset \Omega_k$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . We claim that

$$(6.14) \quad \sup_{z \in K} |v_k(z) - w_k(z)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let  $z \in K$  be fixed. Since  $z \in \Omega_k$  for large  $k$ , we have  $\tilde{z}_k + r_k z \in B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  for some  $\tau < 4/5$  depending only on  $K$ . Thus, recalling also that  $|z_k - \tilde{z}_k| \leq cr_k$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |v_k(z) - w_k(z)| &= \frac{|u(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)| |\eta(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - \eta(z_k)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \\ &\leq \frac{c \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} (|z_k - \tilde{z}_k| + r_k |z|)}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \leq ck^{-1} r_k^{1-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used (6.3). Since  $\alpha < 1$ , we immediately get (6.14). Therefore, since  $v_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$  uniformly, we conclude that  $w_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$  uniformly as well.

*Step 4. The limit function is not constant.*

Let us consider the sequences of points

$$\xi_k = \frac{z_k - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}, \quad \hat{\xi}_k = \frac{\hat{z}_k - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}.$$

As already pointed out,  $\xi_k \in \Omega_k$ ,  $|\xi_k| \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ , and  $v_k(\xi_k) = 0$  for every  $k$ . In fact, it also holds  $\hat{\xi}_k \in \Omega_k$  for every  $k$ , and since  $|\xi_k - \hat{\xi}_k| = 1$ , we also have  $|\hat{\xi}_k| \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ . Thus there exists  $\xi, \hat{\xi} \in \bar{\Omega}_\infty$  such that  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$ ,  $\hat{\xi}_k \rightarrow \hat{\xi}$  and  $\xi \neq \hat{\xi}$ .

Thanks to the local uniform convergence  $v_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$ , it holds  $\bar{v}(\xi) = 0$ . On the other hand, by (6.4) (recall that  $r_k = |z_k - \hat{z}_k|$ ) we get

$$|v_k(\hat{\xi}_k)| = |v_k(\xi_k) - v_k(\hat{\xi}_k)| = \frac{|\eta u_k(z_k) - \eta u_k(\hat{z}_k)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Also in this case we can pass to the limit and obtain  $\bar{v}(\hat{\xi}) \neq 0$ , which implies that  $\bar{v}$  is not constant.

*Step 5. The limit function is an entire solution to a homogeneous equation.*

Let us denote  $A_k(z) = A(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)$ . Since  $\tilde{z}_k \in B_1$ , and  $A$  is continuous, up to subsequences we have

$$\bar{z} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{z}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{A} = A(\bar{z}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_k(z),$$

where  $\bar{A}$  is a constant coefficients symmetric matrix satisfying (1.5). Next, we define

$$\rho_k(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{|\tilde{y}_k + r_k y|}{|\tilde{y}_k|}, & \text{in Case 1 and Case 2,} \\ |y|, & \text{in Case 3,} \end{cases}$$

noticing that, in **Case 1** and **Case 2**,  $r_k/|\tilde{y}_k| \rightarrow 0$ , and thus  $\rho_k \rightarrow 1$  a.e. in every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Let us fix  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and notice that for  $k$  large,  $\text{spt}(\phi) \subset \frac{B_1 - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}$ . Since  $u_k$  is solution to (1.13) with  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$ , we obtain that  $w_k$  satisfies

$$(6.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) A_k(z) \nabla w_k(z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz &= \frac{\eta(z_k) r_k^{2-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) f(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \phi(z) dz \\ &\quad - \frac{\eta(z_k) r_k^{1-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) F(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

First, we prove that the right-hand side of (6.15) vanishes as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) f(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \phi(z) dz \right| \\ & \leq \left( \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) |f(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)|^p dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \int_{\text{spt}(\phi)} \rho_k^a(y) |\phi(z)|^{p'} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ & \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left( \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) |f(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)|^p dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.2) and (6.3), and using that  $r_k \leq c|\tilde{y}_k|$  in **Case 1** and **Case 2**, we get

$$\left( \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) |f(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)|^p dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq ck^{-1} r_k^{-\frac{d+a_+}{p}} M_k.$$

Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{\eta(z_k) r_k^{2-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) f(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \phi(z) dz \right| \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} k^{-1} r_k^{2-\alpha-\frac{d+a_+}{p}} \rightarrow 0,$$

thanks to the assumption  $\alpha \leq 2 - \frac{d+a_+}{p}$ .

Performing similar computations, we see that

$$\left| \frac{\eta(z_k) r_k^{1-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) F(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \right| \leq c \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \rho_k^a dz)} k^{-1} r_k^{1-\alpha-\frac{d+a_+}{q}} \rightarrow 0,$$

thanks to the assumption  $\alpha \leq 1 - \frac{d+a_+}{q}$ . Thus, the right hand side in (6.15) vanishes as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

It is useful to keep explicit track of the dependence of  $\phi$  in the previous computation. Let  $R$  be such that  $\text{spt}(\phi) \subset R$ . Previous part of the proof can be reformulated in the following way: there exists  $\delta_k > 0$  such that  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  and

$$(6.16) \quad \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) A_k(z) \nabla w_k(z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \leq \delta_k (\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \rho_k^a dz)}).$$

We are now in position to show that the left hand side of (6.15) satisfies

$$(6.17) \quad \int_{\Omega_k \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} \rho_k^a A_k \nabla w_k \cdot \nabla \phi dz \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_\infty \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} \bar{\rho}^a \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v} \cdot \nabla \phi dz,$$

where

$$\bar{\rho}(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{in Case 1 and Case 2,} \\ |y| & \text{in Case 3.} \end{cases}$$

First, we note that since  $u_k \in H^{1,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)$ , it follows that  $w_k \in H^1(\Omega_k, \rho_k^a dz)$ . Fixing  $R > 0$ , by *Step 3* we have that the sequence  $w_k$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(\Omega_k \cap B_{2R})$ , and thus also in  $L^2(\Omega_k \cap B_{2R})$ .

Fix  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2R})$  such that  $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$  and  $\varphi = 1$  in  $B_R$ . Testing (6.16) with  $\phi = w_k \varphi^2$  and using (1.5), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a \varphi^2 |\nabla w_k|^2 dz + \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a w_k \varphi A_k \nabla w_k \cdot \nabla \varphi dz \leq c \delta_k (\|\varphi^2 w_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a |\nabla(\varphi^2 w_k)|^2 dz).$$

By some standard computations we get

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a |\nabla(\varphi^2 w_k)|^2 dz \leq c (\|w_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_k \cap B_{2R})}^2 + \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a \varphi^2 |\nabla w_k|^2 dz),$$

and, by Hölder and Young inequalities,

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a w_k \varphi A_k \nabla w_k \cdot \nabla \varphi dz \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a \varphi^2 |\nabla w_k|^2 dz + c \|w_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_k \cap B_{2R})}^2.$$

Therefore, recalling that  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a \varphi^2 |\nabla w_k|^2 dz \leq c \|w_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_k \cap B_{2R})}^2.$$

Using that  $\{w_k\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(\Omega_k \cap B_{2R})$ , we obtain that  $\{w_k\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $H^1(\Omega_k \cap B_R, \rho_k^a dz)$ .

Finally, arguing as in Lemma 4.7 with minor differences, and using that  $A_k(z) \rightarrow \bar{A}$ ,  $\rho_k^a \rightarrow \bar{\rho}^a$  almost everywhere, we conclude that (6.17) holds true and  $\bar{v}$  belongs to  $H^1(\Omega_\infty \cap B_R, \bar{\rho}^a dz)$  for every  $R > 0$ . Summing up, we proved that

$$\int_{\Omega_\infty} \bar{\rho}^a \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v} \cdot \nabla \phi dz = 0 \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Hence, recalling the definition of the limit blow-up domain  $\Omega_\infty$ , see (6.11), we infer that  $\bar{v}$  is an entire solution to:

**Case 1**

$$-\operatorname{div}(\bar{A} \nabla \bar{v}) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d;$$

**Case 2**

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\bar{A} \nabla \bar{v}) = 0, & \text{in } \Pi_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \\ \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v} \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Pi_{\bar{\varepsilon}}; \end{cases}$$

**Case 3**, if  $\bar{\varepsilon} = 0$

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v}) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

**Case 3**, if  $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v}) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}, \\ \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v} \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}. \end{cases}$$

*Step 6. Liouville theorems and contradiction.*

From (6.13) we have that  $\bar{v}$  satisfies

$$|\bar{v}(z)| \leq C(1 + |z|)^\alpha,$$



for every  $z \in \Omega_\infty$ , where  $\alpha < \min\{\alpha_*, 1\}$ , by the assumption (1.8). By invoking appropriate Liouville-type Theorems we get that  $\bar{v}$  must be constant. In **Case 1**, we use the classical Liouville Theorem in the whole space; in **Case 2**, we use the Liouville Theorem in an half space with an homogeneous conormal boundary condition (for instance, see [57, Theorem 1.6]); in **Case 3**, we use Theorem 1.4. Hence, we reach a contradiction, since  $\bar{v}$  is not constant by *Step 4*.

Thus, (6.1) holds with a constant  $C$  uniformly bounded in  $\varepsilon$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 6.1.** We point out that our theory can be extended to equations including lower order terms. In particular, we highlight its connection to the study of eigenvalue problems for the Laplacian in domains with small holes (see [31, 51, 53] and the references therein) - which corresponds to our case  $d = n$ . More generally, for  $2 \leq n \leq d$ , let us consider the eigenvalue problem

$$(6.18) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon, & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon, \\ \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon \cap \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.3, *i*), which establishes local  $\varepsilon$ -stable Hölder estimates, extends naturally to equations like (6.18), yielding

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(K \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)} \leq C \lambda_\varepsilon \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)},$$

for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and compact set  $K \subset \Omega$ . The constant  $C > 0$  depends only on  $d, n, \alpha, \text{dist}(K, \partial \Omega)$ .

## 6.2. Stable Schauder estimates.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3, ii), stable  $C^{1,\alpha}$ -estimates.* Let  $u_\varepsilon$  be a family of solutions to (1.13). Since the weight  $|y|^a$  is uniformly elliptic away from  $\Sigma_0$ , well-known results in elliptic regularity imply that for every  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  (so that  $\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_1$  is of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$  being  $A \in C^{1,\alpha}$ , see Remark 3.2), there exists a constant  $C_\varepsilon$  (depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, \alpha, L$  and  $\varepsilon$ ) such that for any solution  $u_\varepsilon$  to (1.13) the following estimate holds

$$(6.19) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq C_\varepsilon (\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Our goal is to show that  $C_\varepsilon$  remains uniformly bounded as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . The proof proceeds by contradiction and is divided into several steps.

*Step 1. Contradiction argument, preliminary estimates and blow-up sequences.*

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there exist two sequences  $\varepsilon_k$  and  $u_k$  such that  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the functions  $u_k$  are non trivial, satisfy (1.13) with  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$  and it holds that

$$(6.20) \quad \|u_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \geq k (\|u_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Consider  $\zeta_k \in B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq |\nabla u_k(\zeta_k)|,$$

and compute

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla u_k(\zeta_k)|^2 &= \left( \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a dz \right)^{-1} \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_k(\zeta_k)|^2 dz \\
&\leq c \left( \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_k(z) - \nabla u_k(\zeta_k)|^2 dz + \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_k|^2 dz \right) \\
&\leq c \left( [\nabla u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a |\nabla u_k|^2 dz \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two inequalities with the Caccioppoli inequality (4.4), we conclude that there exists a constant  $c > 0$  independent on  $k$  such that

$$\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq c \left( [\nabla u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + \|u_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \right).$$

Therefore, by also applying Proposition 4.6, we deduce that inequality (6.20) implies the existence of a constant  $c > 0$ , independent of  $k$ , such that

$$[\nabla u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \geq ck \left( \|u_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \right).$$

Now, let  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{3/4})$  be a function such that  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$  and  $\eta = 1$  on  $B_{1/2}$ . We define

$$M_k = [\nabla(\eta u_k)]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)},$$

and observe that

$$(6.21) \quad M_k \geq [\nabla u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \geq ck \left( \|u_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \right).$$

It is worth noting that, by combining (6.21) with Theorem 1.3, *i*), for every  $\tau < 1$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  it holds

$$(6.22) \quad \|u_k\|_{C^{0,\beta}(B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq ck^{-1} M_k.$$

Additionally, since  $\eta u_k \equiv 0$  in  $B_1 \setminus B_{3/4}$ , we also have

$$(6.23) \quad \|\nabla(\eta u_k)\|_{L^\infty(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq c M_k.$$

As a consequence of (6.21), (6.22), and (6.23), we immediately infer that

$$(6.24) \quad \|\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq c M_k.$$

Crucially, the boundary condition satisfied by  $u_k$  on  $\partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  gives us an estimate on the  $y$ -components of the field  $\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F$ . In fact, by Lemma A.2 and (6.24), for every point  $z_k^* \in \partial \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_1$  and for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , it holds

$$(6.25) \quad |(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^*) \cdot e_{y_i}| \leq c \varepsilon_k^\alpha \|\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq c \varepsilon_k^\alpha M_k.$$

Next, consider two sequences of points  $z_k = (x_k, y_k)$ ,  $\hat{z}_k = (\hat{x}_k, \hat{y}_k) \in B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  such that

$$(6.26) \quad \frac{|\nabla(\eta u_k)(z_k) - \nabla(\eta u_k)(\hat{z}_k)|}{|z_k - \hat{z}_k|^\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2} M_k.$$

Without loss of generality, we can always assume that  $z_k \in B_{3/4}$ . Let  $r_k = |z_k - \hat{z}_k|$ . Unlike the proof of Theorem 1.3, *i*), establishing that  $r_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  is not straightforward here, so we have to proceed more carefully. Let us denote  $d_k = \text{dist}(z_k, \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)$ . From now on, we distinguish three cases.

- Case 1:**  $\frac{d_k}{r_k} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- Case 2:**  $\frac{d_k}{r_k} \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ , and  $\frac{|y_k|}{r_k} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .
- Case 3:**  $\frac{|y_k|}{r_k} \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ .

We refer to the proof of Theorem 1.3, *i*) for remarks on these cases. We recall that  $d_k \leq |y_k|$ , and we note that in **Case 1** and **Case 2**,  $r_k \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $z_k^0 = (x_k^0, y_k^0)$  denote a chosen projection of  $z_k$  onto  $\partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ , and define

$$\tilde{z}_k = \begin{cases} z_k, & \text{in Case 1,} \\ z_k^0, & \text{in Case 2} \\ (x_k, 0) & \text{in Case 3.} \end{cases}$$

We observe that, by construction,  $|z_k - \tilde{z}_k| \leq cr_k$ . Moreover, in **Case 2** and **Case 3** it holds

$$|z_k^0| \leq |z_k| + d_k \leq \frac{3}{4} + cr_k,$$

so that for sufficiently large  $k$  there exists  $\tau < 4/5$  such that  $z_k^0 \in B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ .

As done in Theorem 1.3, *i*) let us define the sequence of domains

$$\Omega_k = \frac{B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}$$

and the limit domain  $\Omega_\infty$  as in (6.5). Next we introduce the points

$$\xi_k = \frac{z_k - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}.$$

Notice that  $\xi_k \in \Omega_k$  for every  $k$ , and  $|\xi_k| \leq c$ . Thus, up to subsequences,  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi \in \bar{\Omega}_\infty$ .

Finally, we introduce the sequences of functions

$$v_k(z) = \frac{\eta(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)(u_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - u_k(z_k)) - \eta(z_k)\nabla u_k(z_k) \cdot r_k(z - \xi_k)}{r_k^{1+\alpha} M_k}, \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega_k,$$

and

$$w_k(z) = \frac{\eta(\tilde{z}_k)(u_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - u_k(z_k)) - P_k \cdot r_k(z - \xi_k)}{r_k^{1+\alpha} M_k}, \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega_k.$$

where

$$P_k = \begin{cases} \eta(z_k)\nabla u_k(z_k), & \text{in Case 1,} \\ \eta(z_k^0)\nabla u_k(z_k^0), & \text{in Case 2,} \\ A^{-1}(\tilde{z}_k)((\eta A \nabla u_k)_1(z_k^0) - (\eta F)_2(z_k^0)), & \text{in Case 3.} \end{cases}$$

Thanks to (6.21), (6.22), and (6.23), we readily infer

$$(6.27) \quad |P_k| \leq \|\nabla(\eta u_k)\|_{L^\infty(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + c\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} + c\|F\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq cM_k,$$

where, in **Case 2** and **Case 3**, we used that  $z_k^0 \in B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  for some  $\tau < 4/5$ .

*Step 2. Hölder gradient estimates and convergence of  $v_k$ .*

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a compact set. For every  $z, z' \in K \cap \Omega_k$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla v_k(z) - \nabla v_k(z')| &\leq \frac{|\nabla(\eta u_k)(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - \nabla(\eta u_k)(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z')|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \\ &\quad + \frac{|u(z_k)| |\nabla \eta(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - \nabla \eta(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z')|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \\ &\leq |z - z'|^\alpha + c \frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}}{M_k} r_k^{1-\alpha} |z - z'| \leq (1 + ck^{-1} |z - z'|^{1-\alpha}) |z - z'|^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used (6.22). Thus, for every  $K$ , we can choose a sufficiently large  $k$  such that

$$[\nabla v_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(K \cap \Omega_k)} \leq 2.$$

Since  $v_k(\xi_k) = \nabla v_k(\xi_k) = 0$ , arguing as in *Step 3* of the proof of Theorem 1.3, *i*), we deduce that for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists a constant  $c(K)$ , depending only on the diameter of  $K$ , such that

$$\|v_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(K \cap \Omega_\infty)} \leq c(K).$$

Therefore, employing Arzelá-Ascoli theorem and using a standard diagonal argument, we conclude that, for every  $\gamma \in (0, \alpha)$ ,  $v_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\gamma}(\Omega_\infty)$  and satisfies

$$(6.28) \quad |\bar{v}(z)| \leq c(1 + |z|^{1+\alpha}).$$

*Step 3. Convergence of  $w_k$ .*

First, we show that for sufficiently large  $k$ , there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$(6.29) \quad \frac{|\eta(z_k) \nabla u_k(z_k) - P_k|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \leq c.$$

In **Case 1**, this result is straightforward. In **Case 2**, recall that  $z_k, z_k^0 \in B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  for some  $\tau < 4/5$  and  $|z_k - z_k^0| \leq cr_k$ . By (6.22) and (6.23), we have

$$(6.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{|(\eta \nabla u_k)(z_k) - (\eta \nabla u_k)(z_k^0)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} &\leq \frac{|\nabla(\eta u_k)(z_k) - \nabla(\eta u_k)(z_k^0)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} + \frac{|(u_k \nabla \eta)(z_k) - (u_k \nabla \eta)(z_k^0)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \\ &\leq \frac{|z_k - z_k^0|^\alpha}{r_k^\alpha} + c \frac{\|u_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}}{M_k} \frac{|z_k - z_k^0|^\alpha}{r_k^\alpha} \leq c. \end{aligned}$$

For **Case 3**, note first that  $|z_k^0 - \tilde{z}_k| \leq d_k + |y_k| \leq cr_k$ ,  $\varepsilon_k \leq cr_k$ , and

$$A^{-1}(\tilde{z}_k)(\eta A \nabla u_k)(z_k^0) - P_k = (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(z_k^0).$$

Therefore, using (6.30), (6.23) and (6.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|(\eta \nabla u_k)(z_k) - P_k|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} &\leq \frac{|(\eta \nabla u_k)(z_k) - (\eta \nabla u_k)(z_k^0)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} + \frac{|A^{-1}(z_k^0) - A^{-1}(\tilde{z}_k)| |(\eta A \nabla u_k)(z_k^0)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \\ &+ \frac{|A^{-1}(\tilde{z}_k)(\eta A \nabla u_k)(z_k^0) - P_k|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \leq c \left( 1 + \frac{|(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(z_k^0)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \right) \leq c \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k} \right)^\alpha \right) \leq c. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in all three cases, (6.29) is satisfied.

As a consequence, up to subsequences we can define

$$(6.31) \quad V = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\eta(z_k) \nabla u_k(z_k) - P_k}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}(z) = \bar{v}(z) - V \cdot (z - \xi).$$

where  $\xi \in \bar{\Omega}_\infty$  is such that  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$ . To conclude, we show that for every compact set  $K \subset \Omega_\infty$ , we have  $w_k \rightarrow \bar{w}$  uniformly on  $K$ . Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in K} |v_k(z) - V \cdot (z - \xi) - w_k(z)| &\leq \frac{|\eta(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - \eta(\tilde{z}_k)| |u_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - u_k(z_k)|}{r_k^{1+\alpha} M_k} \\ &+ \left| \frac{\eta(z_k) \nabla u_k(z_k) - P_k}{r_k^\alpha M_k} - V \right| |z - \xi_k| + |V| |\xi - \xi_k| \\ &\leq c \left( \frac{\|u_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_\tau \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}}{M_k} + o(1) \right) \leq c(k^{-1} + o(1)) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we note that by (6.28) and (6.31), it follows that

$$(6.32) \quad |\bar{w}(z)| \leq c(1 + |z|^{1+\alpha}).$$

*Step 4. The limit function is not linear.*

Let us consider the sequences of points

$$\xi_k = \frac{z_k - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}, \quad \hat{\xi}_k = \frac{\hat{z}_k - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}.$$

As previously noted,  $\xi_k \in \Omega_k$ ,  $|\xi_k| \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ ,  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi \in \bar{\Omega}_\infty$  and  $v_k(\xi_k) = \nabla v_k(\xi_k) = 0$  for every  $k$ . In fact, it also holds that  $\hat{\xi}_k \in \Omega_k$  for every  $k$ , and since  $|\xi_k - \hat{\xi}_k| = 1$ , we have  $|\hat{\xi}_k| \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ . Therefore, there exists  $\hat{\xi} \in \bar{\Omega}_\infty$  such that  $\hat{\xi}_k \rightarrow \hat{\xi}$  and  $\xi \neq \hat{\xi}$ .

Thanks to the local uniform convergence  $\nabla v_k \rightarrow \nabla \bar{v}$  (see *Step 3*), it holds  $\bar{v}(\xi) = \nabla \bar{v}(\xi) = 0$ . On the other hand, by (6.26) (recall that  $r_k = |z_k - \hat{z}_k|$ ) we get

$$|\nabla v_k(\hat{\xi}_k)| \geq \frac{|\nabla(\eta u_k)(z_k) - \nabla(\eta u_k)(\hat{z}_k)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} - \frac{|u_k(z_k)| |\nabla \eta(z_k) - \nabla \eta(\hat{z}_k)|}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \geq \frac{1}{2} - ck^{-1} > \frac{1}{4}.$$

Also in this case we can pass to the limit and obtain  $\nabla \bar{v}(\hat{\xi}) \neq 0$ , which implies that  $\nabla \bar{v}$  is not constant. Therefore, by (6.31), we conclude that  $\nabla \bar{w}$  is also not constant.

*Step 5.  $r_k \rightarrow 0$  in Case 3.*

By contradiction, let us suppose that, up to a subsequences,  $r_k \rightarrow \bar{r} \in (0, 2]$ . Since  $\bar{r} > 0$ , it is straightforward to see that  $\Omega_\infty = B_{1/\bar{r}}(\zeta)$  for some  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $K$  be a compact set,  $K \subset \Omega_\infty$ . For every  $z \in K$ , using (6.22) we compute

$$\left| \frac{\eta(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)(u_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - u_k(z_k))}{r_k^{1+\alpha} M_k} \right| \leq 2 \frac{\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)}}{r_k^{1+\alpha} M_k} \leq ck^{-1},$$

where in the last inequality we used that  $r_k \geq c > 0$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Moreover, by (6.22) and (6.23), we have

$$\left| \frac{\eta(z_k) \nabla u_k(z_k)}{r_k^\alpha M_k} \right| \leq \frac{c}{\bar{r}^\alpha} \leq c.$$

Thus, recalling the definition of  $v_k$  and thanks to *Step 2*, we infer that

$$\bar{v}(z) = -W \cdot (z - \xi),$$

for some  $W \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . This is in contradiction with the fact that  $\bar{v}$  has not constant gradient by *Step 4* and then we conclude that  $r_k \rightarrow 0$ .

At this point, arguing exactly as in Theorem 1.3, *i*), *Step 2*, the limit domain  $\Omega_\infty$  is defined by (6.11).

*Step 6. The limit function is an entire solution to a homogeneous equation.*

Let us denote  $A_k(z) = A(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)$ . Since  $\tilde{z}_k \in B_{3/4}$ , and  $A$  is continuous, we have, up to subsequences

$$\bar{z} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{A} = A(\bar{z}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_k(z),$$

where  $\bar{A}$  is a symmetric matrix with constant coefficients that satisfies (1.5). Next, let us define

$$\rho_k(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{|\tilde{y}_k + r_k y|}{|\tilde{y}_k|}, & \text{in **Case 1** and **Case 2**,} \\ |y|, & \text{in **Case 3**,} \end{cases}$$

noting that, in **Case 1** and **Case 2**,  $\rho_k \rightarrow 1$  uniformly on every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let us fix  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and observe that for sufficiently large  $k$ ,  $\text{spt}(\phi) \subset \frac{B_{1-\tilde{z}_k}}{r_k}$ . Since  $u_k$  is solution to (1.13), we find that  $w_k$  satisfies

$$(6.33) \quad \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) A_k(z) \nabla w_k(z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz = I_1 - I_2 - I_3 - I_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \frac{r_k^{1-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) \eta(\tilde{z}_k) f(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \phi(z) dz, \\
I_2 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) \eta(\tilde{z}_k) (F(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - F(\tilde{z}_k)) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz, \\
I_3 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) (A(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - A(\tilde{z}_k)) P_k \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz, \\
I_4 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) (A(\tilde{z}_k) P_k + \eta(\tilde{z}_k) F(\tilde{z}_k)) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Following the same argument as in *Step 5* of the proof of Theorem 1.3, *i*), we observe that as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$|I_1| \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} k^{-1} r^{1-\alpha-\frac{d+a_+}{p}} \rightarrow 0,$$

due to the assumption  $\alpha \leq 1 - \frac{d+a_+}{p}$ .

Next, using (6.21), we find that as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2| &\leq \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} \rho_k^a(y) |F(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - F(\tilde{z}_k)| |\nabla \phi(z)| dz \\
&\leq \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \rho_k^a dz)} \frac{\|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}}{M_k} \leq ck^{-1} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $I_3$ , using (6.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_3| &\leq \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} \rho_k^a(y) |A(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - A(\tilde{z}_k)| |P_k| |\nabla \phi(z)| dz \\
&\leq \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \rho_k^a dz)} L r_k^{1-\alpha} \frac{|P_k|}{M_k} \leq cr_k^{1-\alpha} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it remains to prove that  $I_4$  vanishes as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let us first examine **Case 1**. Here, recall that  $\tilde{z}_k = z_k$ ,  $r_k/|y_k| \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\rho_k^a \rightarrow 1$ , and  $\Omega_\infty = \mathbb{R}^d$ . Notice that  $|y_k + r_k y| \geq c|y_k|$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Using this, we estimate

$$|\nabla \rho_k^a(y)| = \left| \frac{ar_k \rho_k^a(y) (y_k + r_k y)}{|y_k + r_k y|^2} \right| \leq c \frac{r_k}{|y_k|} \rho_k^a(y).$$

Moreover, we know that  $\text{spt}(\phi) \subset \subset \Omega_k$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_4| &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \left| \int_{\text{spt}(\phi)} \rho_k^a(y) (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \right| \\
&= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \left| \int_{\text{spt}(\phi)} \nabla \rho_k^a(y) \cdot (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k) \phi(z) dz \right| \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{r_k^{1-\alpha}}{|y_k| M_k} |(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(z_k)|.
\end{aligned}$$

As pointed out in Theorem 1.3, *i*), *Step 1*, there exists  $Z_k = (x_k, Y_k) \in \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$  such that  $|Y_k| < |y_k|$  and  $y_k \cdot Y_k = |y_k||Y_k|$ . Moreover, it holds

$$d_k \leq |z_k - Z_k| \leq |y_k|,$$

and, by construction,  $Z_k \in B_{3/4}$ . By using (6.25) and (6.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(z_k)| &\leq |(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k) - (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(Z_k)| + |(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(Z_k)| \\ &\leq M_k |z_k - Z_k|^\alpha + c M_k \varepsilon_k^\alpha \leq c M_k |y_k|^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence we have

$$|I_4| \leq c \left( \frac{r_k}{|y_k|} \right)^{1-\alpha} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

as needed.

Let us now turn to **Case 2**. Here, recall that  $\tilde{z}_k = z_k^0$ , where  $z_k^0$  is such that  $d_k = \text{dist}(z_k, \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A) = |z_k - z_k^0| \leq cr_k$ ,  $|y_k|/r_k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\rho_k^\alpha \rightarrow 1$ . Additionally, since  $|y_k| \leq |z_k - z_k^0| + |y_k^0| \leq cr_k + |y_k^0|$ , it follows that both  $|y_k^0|/r_k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon_k/r_k \rightarrow \infty$  in this case.

Integrating by parts we find

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \nabla \rho_k^\alpha(y) \cdot (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(z_k^0) \phi(z) dz \\ &\quad + \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\partial\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot \nu(z_k^0 + r_k z) \phi(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\nu(z)$  is the normal vector to  $\partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ . Using (6.25) and arguing as in **Case 1**, we readily obtain

$$\left| \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \nabla \rho_k^\alpha(y) \cdot (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(z_k^0) \phi(z) dz \right| \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left( \frac{r_k}{|y_k|} \right)^{1-\alpha} \rightarrow 0.$$

Next, using that  $u_k$  satisfy a conormal boundary condition on  $\partial\Omega_k$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot \nu(z_k^0 + r_k z) &= (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot (\nu(z_k^0 + r_k z) - \nu(z_k^0)) \\ &= (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_2(z_k^0) \cdot (N(z_k^0 + r_k z) - N(z_k^0)) \\ &\quad + (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot (\tilde{\nu}(z_k^0 + r_k z) - \tilde{\nu}(z_k^0)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $N(z)$  and  $\tilde{\nu}(z)$  are as in (A.4).

As in [2, 55], here we split the proof into two parts. Assume to restart the present proof, keeping exactly the same assumptions, but aiming to prove estimates in the form

$$(6.34) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,\alpha'}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq C (\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,\alpha}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}),$$

with a suboptimal exponent  $\alpha' < \alpha$ . Then, at this point of the proof, using (6.24), (6.25) and Lemma A.1, that is,  $\|N\|_{C^{0,1}(\partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_1)} \leq c\varepsilon_k^{-1}$  and  $\|\tilde{\nu}\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A \cap B_1)} \leq c$ , we would obtain

$$(6.35) \quad |(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot \nu(z_k^0 + r_k z)| \leq c M_k \frac{r_k}{\varepsilon_k^{1-\alpha}} + c M_k r_k^\alpha,$$



which implies that

$$\left| \frac{r_k^{-\alpha'}}{M_k} \int_{\partial\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot \nu(z_k^0 + r_k z) \phi(z) dz \right| \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left( \left( \frac{r_k}{\varepsilon_k} \right)^{1-\alpha'} + r_k^{\alpha-\alpha'} \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, we conclude that  $|I_4| \rightarrow 0$ , as required. From this point on, we can complete the proof of the theorem and obtain stable  $C^{1,\alpha'}$  estimates. This, in turn, implies a uniform  $L^\infty$  bound for  $\nabla u_k$  in  $B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}$ .

We can now return to our previous computation with  $\alpha' = \alpha$ . Thanks to (6.34) and (6.3), we get

$$\|\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq ck^{-1} M_k.$$

Thus we can improve (6.35) and get

$$|(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot \nu(z_k^0 + r_k z)| \leq c M_k \frac{r_k}{\varepsilon_k^{1-\alpha}} + c M_k k^{-1} r_k^\alpha.$$

As a consequence,

$$\left| \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\partial\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)(z_k^0) \cdot \nu(z_k^0 + r_k z) \phi(z) dz \right| \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left( \left( \frac{r_k}{\varepsilon_k} \right)^{1-\alpha} + k^{-1} \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

and we can conclude that  $|I_4| \rightarrow 0$ .

Finally, we address **Case 3**. Recall that  $\tilde{z}_k = (x_k, 0)$ ,  $\rho_k = |y|$ , and  $\varepsilon_k \leq c|y_k| \leq cr_k$ . Let us call

$$I'_4 = \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} |y|^\alpha (A(\tilde{z}_k) P_k + (\eta F)(z_k^0)) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_4 - I'_4| &= \left| \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} |y|^\alpha ((\eta F)(\tilde{z}_k) - (\eta F)(z_k^0)) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \right| \\ &\leq c \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d, |y|^\alpha dz)} \frac{\|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}}{M_k} |\tilde{z}_k - z_k^0|^\alpha r_k^{-\alpha} \leq ck^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that in **Case 3** it holds

$$|\tilde{z}_k - z_k^0| \leq |\tilde{z}_k - z_k| + |z_k - z_k^0| = |y_k| + d_k \leq cr_k.$$

Due to our choice of  $P_k$ , an integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} I'_4 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} |y|^\alpha (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_1(z_k^0) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \\ &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\partial\Omega_k} |y|^\alpha (\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_1(z_k^0) \cdot \nu(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \phi(z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that at a point  $z \in \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A$ , the normal vector is given by  $\nu(z) = (0, N(z)) + \tilde{\nu}(z)$ , see (A.4), where  $|\tilde{\nu}(z)| \leq c\varepsilon_k$ . Therefore, by (6.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I'_4| &\leq \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\partial\Omega_k} |y|^a |(\eta A \nabla u_k + \eta F)_1(z_k^0)| |\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)| |\phi(z)| dz \\ &\leq c \left( \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k} \right) r_k^{1-\alpha} \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\text{spt}(\phi) \cap \partial\Omega_k} |y|^a dz. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that there exists  $\bar{R} > 0$  such that

$$\text{spt}(\phi) \cap \partial\Omega_k = \text{spt}(\phi) \cap \left\{ \sqrt{A_3^{-1}(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) y \cdot y} = \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k} \right\} \subset (B_{\bar{R}}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \frac{\partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}.$$

Thus, denoting  $E_k = B_{r_k \bar{R}}^{d-n}(-r_k^{-1} \tilde{z}_k) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , we have

$$\int_{\text{spt}(\phi) \cap \partial\Omega_k} |y|^a dz \leq \int_{(B_{\bar{R}}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \frac{\partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k}} |y|^a dz = r_k^{1-d-a} \int_{E_k \cap \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a dz.$$

On the other hand, using Lemma A.3, *iv*) and performing the change of variables  $(x, \tau) = \Phi(z)$  (for instance see [45, §11]), we obtain

$$\int_{E_k \cap \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}} |\tau|^a d\sigma(x, \tau) = \int_{E_k \cap \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} (A_3^{-1}(z) y \cdot y)^{\frac{a}{2}} |\det(\Pi_{\varepsilon_k} \circ J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi \circ \Pi_{\varepsilon_k})| d\sigma(z) \geq c \int_{E_k \cap \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A} |y|^a d\sigma(z).$$

Summing up, we have that

$$\int_{\text{spt}(\phi) \cap \partial\Omega_k} |y|^a dz \leq c r_k^{1-d-a} \int_{E_k \cap \partial\Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}} |\tau|^a d\sigma(x, \tau) = c r_k^{1-n-a} \int_{B_{\varepsilon_k}^n} |\tau|^a d\sigma(\tau) = c \left( \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k} \right)^{a+n-1}.$$

Therefore

$$|I'_4| \leq c \left( \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r_k} \right)^{a+n} r_k^{1-\alpha} \leq c r_k^{1-\alpha} \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies that  $|I_4| \rightarrow 0$  also in **Case 3**. Hence, the right hand side of (6.33) vanishes as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

From this point on, arguing as in Theorem 1.3, *i*), *Step 5*, we obtain that the left hand side of (6.15) satisfies

$$\int_{\Omega_k \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} \rho_k^a A_k \nabla w_k \cdot \nabla \phi dz \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_\infty \cap \text{spt}(\phi)} \bar{\rho}^a \bar{A} \nabla \bar{w} \cdot \nabla \phi dz,$$

where

$$\bar{\rho}(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{in Case 1 and Case 2,} \\ |y| & \text{in Case 3,} \end{cases}$$

and  $\bar{w}$  belongs to  $H^1(\Omega_\infty \cap B_R, \bar{\rho}^a dz)$  for every  $R > 0$ . Hence, recalling the definition of the limit domain  $\Omega_\infty$ , see (6.11), we infer that  $\bar{w}$  is an entire solution to:

**Case 1**

$$-\text{div}(\bar{A} \nabla \bar{w}) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d;$$

**Case 2**

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\bar{A}\nabla\bar{w}) = 0, & \text{in } \Pi_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \\ \bar{A}\nabla\bar{w} \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Pi_{\bar{\varepsilon}}; \end{cases}$$

**Case 3**, if  $\bar{\varepsilon} = 0$

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \bar{A}\nabla\bar{w}) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

**Case 3**, if  $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \bar{A}\nabla\bar{w}) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}, \\ \bar{A}\nabla\bar{w} \cdot \nu = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^{\bar{A}}. \end{cases}$$

*Step 7. Liouville theorems and contradiction.*

Since  $\bar{w}$  satisfies the growth condition (6.32), with  $1 + \alpha < \min\{2, \alpha_*\}$ , by the assumption (1.9), by invoking the classical Liouville Theorem in **Case 1**, the Liouville Theorem in an half space with an homogeneous conormal boundary condition (for instance, see [57, Theorem 1.6]) in **Case 2**, and the Liouville Theorem 1.4 in **Case 3**, we get that  $\bar{w}$  must be a linear function: this is a contradiction with the *Step 3*, since  $\nabla\bar{w}$  is not constant. Thus, (6.19) holds with a constant  $C$  uniformly bounded in  $\varepsilon$ . Moreover, recalling (6.25), we get that (1.14) holds true. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 6.2.** In certain ranges of the parameters  $a$  and  $n$ , the exponent  $\alpha_*$  given by (1.7) can be greater than 2 (see Remark 1.5). Hence, the regularity of solutions to (1.1) is expected to be higher than  $C^{1,\alpha}$  ( $C^{2,\alpha}$  or even more). In this remark, we give a simple example which shows that our method fails to prove higher order Schauder estimates which are stable in  $\varepsilon$  with respect to domain perforation.

For  $a + n \neq 2$  such that  $\alpha_* > 2$ , let us consider the family of functions

$$u_\varepsilon(x, y) := (a + n)x_1^2 - |y|^2 + \frac{2}{2 - a - n} \varepsilon^{a+n} |y|^{2-a-n},$$

which are solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u_\varepsilon) = 0, & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon, \\ \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon \cap B_1, \end{cases}$$

and satisfy  $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon)} \leq c$ .

Fixed  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ , we compute

$$\partial_{y_i y_j}^2 u_\varepsilon(x, y) = -2(a + n) \varepsilon^{a+n} |y|^{-2-a-n} y_i y_j.$$

Let us fix the points

$$z_1 = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}(e_{y_i} + e_{y_j}), \quad z_2 = \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{\sqrt{2}}(e_{y_i} + e_{y_j}),$$

where  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . One has that  $z_1, z_2 \in \overline{B_{1/2}} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon$ . Then, for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\frac{|\partial_{y_i y_j}^2 u_\varepsilon(z_1) - \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 u_\varepsilon(z_2)|}{|z_1 - z_2|^\alpha} = (a + n) \frac{1 - \varepsilon^{(a+n)(1-\beta)}}{\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} |1 - \varepsilon^{1-\beta}|^\alpha} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

since  $1 - \beta > 0$  and  $a + n > 0$ . Then, we have proved that  $\varepsilon$ -uniform  $C^{2,\alpha}$  estimates fail.

7. A PRIORI ESTIMATES, MAIN RESULTS, SMOOTHNESS OF AXIALLY SYMMETRIC SOLUTIONS AND THE INHOMOGENEOUS CONORMAL PROBLEM

In this section we prove a priori regularity estimates, which imply stable estimates with respect to standard smoothing of data. This leads to the proof of the main Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Then, in Theorem 7.4, we improve the regularity of axially symmetric solutions, achieving smoothness. Finally, Proposition 7.6 provides some regularity results for inhomogeneous conormal boundary value problems.

7.1. A priori estimates.

**Proposition 7.1** (A priori estimates). *Let  $a + n > 0$ . Let  $A$  be a uniformly elliptic matrix satisfying (1.5) and (1.6) with constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ . Let  $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(n, a, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*)$  be defined as in (1.7). Then the following points hold true:*

*i) Let  $p > (d+a_+)/2$ ,  $q > d+a_+$ . Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.8). Let  $A$  be  $C^0$  with  $\|A\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq L$ ,  $f \in L^{p,a}(B_1)$  and  $F \in L^{q,a}(B_1)^d$ . Let  $u \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$  be a weak solution to (1.1) in  $B_1$ . Then, there exist a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, q, \alpha$  and  $L$  such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{L^{q,a}(B_1)}).$$

*ii) Let  $p > d + a_+$ . Let assume that  $\alpha_* > 1$ . Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.9). Let  $A$  be  $C^{0,\alpha}$  with  $\|A\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \leq L$ ,  $f \in L^{p,a}(B_1)$  and  $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$ . Let  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$  be a weak solution to (1.1) in  $B_1$  such that*

$$(7.1) \quad (A\nabla u + F) \cdot e_{y_i} = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_0 \cap B_1, \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

*Then, there exist a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, \alpha$  and  $L$  such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

We provide the proof only for the estimates in  $C^{1,\alpha}$ -spaces, as the proof for the other case follows the same argument and is easier to establish.

*Proof of Proposition 7.1, ii).* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1.3, *ii)*, so we omit some details.

By contradiction, let us suppose that there exist sequences  $\{u_k\}_k$ ,  $\{f_k\}_k$ ,  $\{F_k\}_k$  and  $\{A_k\}_k$ , such that  $A_k \in C^{0,\alpha}$  with  $\|A_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \leq L$ ,  $f_k \in L^{p,a}(B_1)$ ,  $F_k \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$ , and every  $u_k$  is a weak solution to

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A_k \nabla u_k) = |y|^a f_k + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F_k), \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

which satisfies the boundary condition (7.1) and

$$\|u_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} > k(\|u_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f_k\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Let us fix a smooth cut-off function  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{3/4})$  such that  $\eta = 1$  in  $B_{1/2}$  and  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ . Then, arguing as in *Step 1* in Theorem 1.3, *ii)*, we have

$$M_k = [\nabla(\eta u_k)]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \geq [\nabla u_k]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \geq ck(\|u_k\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f_k\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Take two sequences of points  $z_k = (x_k, y_k)$ ,  $\hat{z}_k = (\hat{x}_k, \hat{y}_k) \in B_1$  such that

$$\frac{|\nabla(\eta u_k)(z_k) - \nabla(\eta u_k)(\hat{z}_k)|}{|z_k - \hat{z}_k|^\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2}M_k,$$

and define  $r_k = |z_k - \hat{z}_k|$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $z_k \in B_{3/4}$ . From now on, we distinguish two cases:

- Case 1:**  $\frac{|y_k|}{r_k} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- Case 2:**  $\frac{|y_k|}{r_k} \leq c$  uniformly in  $k$ .

Unlike the proofs of the stable estimates in Section 6, here we do not introduce any perforation around  $\Sigma_0$ . Consequently, we have only two blow-up regimes: in **Case 1**, the blow-up scale does not capture  $\Sigma_0$ , whereas in **Case 2**, it does.

Let  $\zeta_k = (x_k, 0)$  be the projection of  $z_k$  onto  $\Sigma_0$ . Let us define

$$\tilde{z}_k = (\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k) = \begin{cases} z_k, & \text{in Case 1,} \\ \zeta_k, & \text{in Case 2,} \end{cases} \quad \xi_k = \frac{z_k - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k},$$

the sequence of rescaled domains

$$\Omega_k = \frac{B_1 - \tilde{z}_k}{r_k},$$

and the sequences of functions

$$v_k(z) = \frac{\eta(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z)(u_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - u_k(\tilde{z}_k)) - \eta(z_k)\nabla u_k(z_k) \cdot r_k(z - \xi_k)}{r_k^{1+\alpha}M_k}, \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega_k,$$

$$w_k(z) = \frac{\eta(\tilde{z}_k)(u_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - u_k(\tilde{z}_k)) - (\eta\nabla u_k)(\tilde{z}_k) \cdot r_k z}{r_k^{1+\alpha}M_k}, \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega_k,$$

and set the limit blow-up domain  $\Omega_\infty$  as in (6.5).

By arguing as in Theorem 1.3, *ii*), *Step 2* one has that  $[v_k]_{C^{1,\alpha}(K \cap \Omega_k)} \leq 2$  and  $\|v_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(K \cap \Omega_k)} \leq c(K)$  for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Therefore, by applying the Arzelá-Ascoli theorem, we infer that  $v_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\gamma}(\Omega_\infty)$  for every  $\gamma \in (0, \alpha)$  and

$$|\bar{v}| \leq c(1 + |z|^{1+\alpha}).$$

Moreover, employing a similar argument as in Theorem 1.3, *ii*), *Step 3*, it follows that also  $w_k \rightarrow \bar{v}$  uniformly on compact set of  $\Omega_\infty$ . Next, repeating the argument of Theorem 1.3, *ii*), *Step 4*, *Step 5*, we conclude that  $\nabla \bar{v}$  is not constant and  $r_k \rightarrow 0$ , which immediately implies that  $\Omega_\infty = \mathbb{R}^d$  in both **Case 1** and **Case 2**.

Finally, we prove that  $\bar{v}$  is an entire solution to a homogeneous equation with constant coefficients. Since  $\|A_k\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \leq L$ , we have that  $A_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \rightarrow A(\bar{z}) = \bar{A}$ , which is a constant matrix satisfying

(1.5) and  $\bar{z} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{z}_k$ . Let us define

$$\rho_k^\alpha(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{|y_k + r_k y|^\alpha}{|y_k|^\alpha}, & \text{in **Case 1**,} \\ |y|^\alpha, & \text{in **Case 2**.} \end{cases}$$

Fixed  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have that

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) A_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \nabla w_k(z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz = I_1 - I_2 - I_3 - I_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{r_k^{1-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) \eta(\tilde{z}_k) f_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \phi(z) dz \\ I_2 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) \eta(\tilde{z}_k) (F_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - F_k(\tilde{z}_k)) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \\ I_3 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) \eta(\tilde{z}_k) (A_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - A_k(\tilde{z}_k)) \nabla u_k(\tilde{z}_k) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \\ I_4 &= \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) \eta(\tilde{z}_k) (A_k \nabla u_k + F_k)(\tilde{z}_k) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

The terms  $I_1, I_2$  vanishes as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  exactly as in Theorem 1.3, *Step 6*.

To show that the term  $I_3$  vanishes, we proceed in two steps, as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, *ii*), *Step 6*. First, we establish local  $C^{1,\alpha'}$  estimates for some suboptimal  $\alpha' \in (0, \alpha)$ . Once this is done, we can then obtain the regularity with the optimal exponent  $\alpha$ , using as additional information a  $L^\infty$  bound for the gradient of the solutions. Hence, in the first step, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_3| &= \left| \frac{r_k^{-\alpha'}}{M_k} \int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^\alpha(y) \eta(\tilde{z}_k) (A_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) - A_k(\tilde{z}_k)) \nabla u_k(\tilde{z}_k) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \right| \\ &\leq \frac{cL r_k^{\alpha-\alpha'} (\|\eta u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|\nabla(\eta u_k)\|_{L^\infty(B_1)})}{M_k} \leq cL r_k^{\alpha-\alpha'} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Next, restarting the proof with the optimal exponent  $\alpha$ , a priori estimates with a suboptimal exponent imply that  $\|\nabla(\eta u_k)\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq M_k/k$  and we can conclude in the following way

$$|I_3| \leq \frac{cL (\|\eta u_k\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|\nabla(\eta u_k)\|_{L^\infty(B_1)})}{M_k} \leq cL k^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Finally, we show that the term  $I_4$  goes to zero. Let us consider the **Case 1**, recalling that  $\tilde{z}_k = z_k$ ,  $r_k/|y_k| \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\rho_k^\alpha \rightarrow 1$  and  $\zeta_k = (x_k, 0) \in \Sigma_0 \cap B_1$ . Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, *ii*), *Step 6*, and using the boundary condition (7.1), we have that

$$|(\eta A_k \nabla u_k + \eta F_k)_2(z_k)| = |(\eta A_k \nabla u_k + \eta F_k)_2(z_k) - (\eta A_k \nabla u_k + \eta F_k)_2(\zeta_k)| \leq cM_k |y_k|^\alpha,$$

and thus

$$|\nabla \rho_k^\alpha(y) \cdot (\eta A_k \nabla u_k + \eta F_k)(z_k)| \leq c \frac{r_k}{|y_k|^{1-\alpha}} M_k.$$

Hence, by using the divergence theorem, one has that

$$|I_4| = \frac{r_k^{-\alpha}}{M_k} \left| \int_{\Omega_k} \nabla \rho_k^a(y) \cdot (\eta A_k \nabla u_k + \eta F_k)(z_k) \phi(z) dz \right| \leq c \left( \frac{r_k}{|y_k|} \right)^{1-\alpha} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

In **Case 2**, since  $u_k$  satisfies (7.1) and  $\tilde{z}_k = (x_k, 0)$ , the divergence theorem allows us to conclude directly that  $I_4 = 0$ . In fact,

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) (A_k \nabla u_k + F_k)(\tilde{z}_k) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz = - \int_{\Omega_k} \nabla \rho_k^a(y) \cdot (A_k \nabla u_k + F_k)(\tilde{z}_k) \phi(z) dz = 0.$$

From this point on, arguing as in Theorem 1.3 *i*), *Step 6*, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Omega_k} \rho_k^a(y) A_k(\tilde{z}_k + r_k z) \nabla w_k(z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{\rho}^a(y) \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v}(z) \cdot \nabla \phi(z) dz,$$

where

$$\bar{\rho}(y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{in Case 1,} \\ |y|, & \text{in Case 2.} \end{cases}$$

Then, we have proved that  $\bar{v}$  is an entire solution to

$$-\operatorname{div}(\bar{A} \nabla \bar{v}) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \text{in Case 1}$$

and  $\bar{v}$  is an entire solution to

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \bar{A} \nabla \bar{v}) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \text{in Case 2.}$$

Finally, as in Theorem 1.3, *ii*), *Step 7*, by invoking appropriate Liouville type theorems we get a contradiction and the thesis follows.  $\square$

**7.2. Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.** We will prove Theorem 1.2 only, as the proof of Theorem 1.1 follows by a similar argument.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* We divide the proof into two steps.

*Step 1.* First, we prove that if the matrix  $A \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$ , then  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4})$  and satisfies (1.10) in  $B_{3/4}$ .

Let  $u$  be a weak solution to (1.1). By applying Lemma 4.7 there exists a family of functions  $\{u_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon \ll 1}$ , such that every  $u_\varepsilon$  is a weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A \nabla u_\varepsilon) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), & \text{in } B_{4/5} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \\ (A \nabla u_\varepsilon + F) \cdot \nu = 0, & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_{4/5}, \end{cases}$$

and a sequence  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$  such that  $u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow u$  in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(B_{4/5} \setminus \Sigma_0)$ .

By applying Theorem 1.3, *ii*) to the sequence  $\{u_{\varepsilon_k}\}$ , combined with (4.5) and (4.4), we get

$$\|u_{\varepsilon_k}\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_{\varepsilon_k}^A)} \leq c(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}),$$

for some  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, \alpha$  and  $L$ . By using the Arzelá-Ascoli Theorem and the a.e. convergence  $u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow u$ , we get that  $u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow u$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\gamma}(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_0)$ , for every  $\gamma \in (0, \alpha)$ . Moreover, by taking  $z, z' \in B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_0$  such that  $z \neq z'$ , we have that

$$\frac{|\nabla u(z) - \nabla u(z')|}{|z - z'|^\alpha} = \lim_{\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{|\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k}(z) - \nabla u_{\varepsilon_k}(z')|}{|z - z'|^\alpha} \leq c(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Hence, by taking the supremum, we get

$$[\nabla v]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_0)} = \sup_{z, z' \in B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_0} \frac{|\nabla u(z) - \nabla u(z')|}{|z - z'|^\alpha} \leq c(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

By continuity, we can extend  $v$  in the whole  $B_{3/4}$  in such a way that  $[\nabla v]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{3/4})} = [\nabla v]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_0)}$ , hence, we have that  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4})$ .

Further, let us prove that  $u$  satisfies the boundary condition (1.10). Fix  $z = (x, y) \in B_{3/4} \setminus \Sigma_0$  and let  $z^\varepsilon$  be a chosen projection of  $z$  onto  $\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \cap B_{3/4}$ . For every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , by using (1.14), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(A\nabla u + F)(z) \cdot e_{y_i}| &\leq |(A\nabla u)(z) - (A\nabla u_\varepsilon)(z)| + |(A\nabla u_\varepsilon + F)(z) - (A\nabla u_\varepsilon + F)(z^\varepsilon)| \\ &\quad + |(A\nabla u_\varepsilon + F)(z^\varepsilon) \cdot e_{y_i}| \\ &\leq \Lambda |\nabla u(z) - \nabla u_\varepsilon(z)| + c(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)})(|z - z^\varepsilon|^\alpha + \varepsilon^\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  in the previous inequality, we get

$$|(A\nabla u + F)(z) \cdot e_{y_i}| \leq c(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)})|y|^\alpha,$$

therefore, by taking  $|y| \rightarrow 0$  it follows that  $(A\nabla u + F)(x, 0) \cdot e_{y_i} = 0$ , that is, (1.10) holds true.

*Step 2.* Finally, we prove that if  $A \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$ , then  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})$ , satisfies (1.11) and (1.10).

Let  $u$  be a weak solution to (1.1). For  $\delta > 0$ , let  $\{\rho_\delta\}_{\delta>0}$  be a family of smooth mollifiers and let us define  $A_\delta = A * \rho_\delta$ . Choosing  $\delta$  small enough, we have that  $A_\delta \in C^\infty(B_{4/5})$ , satisfies (1.5) and  $\|A_\delta\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{4/5})} \leq \|A\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}$ . By using the approximation Lemma 4.8, we have that there exists a family  $\{u_\delta\}$  such that every  $u_\delta$  is a weak solution to

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a A_\delta \nabla u_\delta) = |y|^a f + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a F), \text{ in } B_{4/5},$$

satisfies

$$\|u_\delta\|_{H^{1,a}(B_{4/5})} \leq c(\|u\|_{H^{1,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)}),$$

and, up to consider a subsequence,  $u_\delta \rightarrow u$  in  $H^{1,a}(B_{4/5})$ .

By applying *Step 1*, we have that  $u_\delta \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4})$  and satisfies (1.10). Hence, by using Proposition 7.1, *ii*), it follows that

$$(7.2) \quad \|u_\delta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq c(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^{p,a}(B_1)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}),$$

for some  $c > 0$ , depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, \alpha$  and  $L$ . Hence, we can apply the Arzelá-Ascoli theorem to get that  $u_\delta \rightarrow u$  in  $C^{1,\gamma}(B_{1/2})$  (for every  $\gamma \in (0, \alpha)$ ) and passing to the limit as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  in (7.2) we obtain that  $u$  satisfies (1.11). Moreover, by *Step 1* every  $u_\delta$  satisfies (1.10), so  $u$  also satisfies (1.10), and our statement follows.  $\square$



**7.3. Smoothness of axially symmetric solutions.** In this section, we prove that axially symmetric - with respect to  $\Sigma_0$  - solutions (radial-in- $y$ ) are locally smooth, by establishing a one-to-one correspondence with solutions to an equation that degenerates on a hyperplane.

**Definition 7.2.** We say that a function  $u : B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is axially symmetric in  $y$  (i.e. with respect to  $\Sigma_0$ ) if there exists a function  $\tilde{u} : B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $u(x, y) = \tilde{u}(x, |y|)$ , where  $B_1^+ := B_1^{d-n+1} \cap \{(x, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R} \mid r > 0\}$  denotes the unitary upper half ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{d-n+1}$ .

**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $a+n > 0$  and let  $u$  be an axially symmetric in  $y$  function. Then,  $u$  is a weak solution to*

$$(7.3) \quad -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u) = 0, \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

*if and only if the function  $\tilde{u}(x, r)$  is a weak solution to*

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(r^{a+n-1} \nabla \tilde{u}) = 0, & \text{in } B_1^+, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{a+n-1} \partial_r \tilde{u} = 0, & \text{on } B_1 \cap \{r = 0\}, \end{cases}$$

*in the sense that  $\tilde{u} \in H^1(B_1^+, r^{a+n-1} dx dr)$  and*

$$\int_{B_1^+} r^{a+n-1} \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx dr = 0, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(B_1).$$

*Proof.* First, we notice that, by taking the spherical-in- $y$  change of variable, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1^+} r^{a+n-1} (\tilde{u}^2 + |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2) \, dx dr &= c_n \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{B_1^+} r^{a+n-1} (\tilde{u}^2 + |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2) \, dx dr d\sigma \\ &= c_n \int_{B_1} |y|^a (u^2 + |\nabla u|^2) \, dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_n = |\mathbb{S}^{n-1}|^{-1}$ . Then,  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_1)$  if and only if  $\tilde{u} \in H^1(B_1^+, r^{a+n-1} dx dr)$ .

Next, let us suppose that  $u$  is a weak solution to (7.3). Fix  $\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{\phi}(x, r) \in C_c^\infty(B_1^{d-n+1})$  and call  $\phi(x, y) := \tilde{\phi}(x, |y|)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1^+} r^{a+n-1} \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi} \, dx dr &= c_n \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{B_1^+} r^{a+n-1} \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi} \, dx dr d\sigma \\ &= c_n \int_{B_1} |y|^a \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx dy = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\tilde{u}$  is a weak solution to (7.4).

Instead, let us suppose that  $\tilde{u}$  is a weak solution to (7.4), fix  $\phi = \phi(x, y) \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$  and define  $\tilde{\phi}(x, r) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \phi(x, r\sigma) d\sigma$ . Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} |y|^a \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx dy &= \int_{B_1^+} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} r^{a+n+1} (\nabla_x \tilde{u}, \partial_r \tilde{u}) \cdot (\nabla_x \phi, \partial_r \phi) \, d\sigma dx dr \\ &= \int_{B_1^+} r^{a+n+1} (\nabla_x \tilde{u}, \partial_r \tilde{u}) \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (\nabla_x \phi, \partial_r \phi) d\sigma \right) dx dr \\ &= \int_{B_1^+} r^{a+n-1} (\nabla_x \tilde{u}, \partial_r \tilde{u}) \cdot (\nabla_x \tilde{\phi}, \partial_r \tilde{\phi}) dx dr = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $u$  is a weak solution to (7.3). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Theorem 7.4** (Smoothness of axially symmetric solutions). *Let  $a + n > 0$  and let  $u$  be an axially symmetric in  $y$  weak solution to (7.3). Then,  $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^\infty(B_1)$ .*

*Proof.* By definition  $u(x, y) = \tilde{u}(x, |y|)$ , for some function  $\tilde{u} : B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and by using Lemma 7.3 one has that  $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(x, r)$  is a weak solution to (7.4). By using the regularity theory of weighted equations degenerating on a hyperplane (see [57]), noting that  $a+n-1 > -1$ , we get that  $\tilde{u} \in C_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\overline{B_r^+})$ , for every  $r \in (0, 1)$ .

Next, by using [55, Lemma 7.3], the function  $\tilde{v}(x, r) := r^{-1} \partial_r \tilde{u}(x, r)$  is a weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(r^{a+n+1} \nabla \tilde{v}) = 0, & \text{in } B_{3/4}^+, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{a+n+1} \partial_r \tilde{v} = 0, & \text{on } B_{3/4} \cap \{r = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Applying again Lemma 7.3, the function

$$v(x, y) := \tilde{v}(x, |y|) = \frac{\nabla u(x, y) \cdot y}{|y|^2},$$

is a weak solution to

$$(7.5) \quad -\operatorname{div}(|y|^{a+2} \nabla v) = 0, \quad \text{in } B_{3/4}.$$

Next, we prove that  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(B_{1/2})$ . For every  $j = 1, \dots, d-n$ , Proposition 5.1 ensures that  $\partial_{x_j} u$  is a weak solution to (7.3). By using Theorem 1.1 we get that  $\partial_{x_j} u \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})$  and then  $\partial_{x_j} u \in L^\infty(B_{1/2})$ . On the other hand, since  $u$  is an axially symmetric in  $y$  function, one has that

$$\nabla_y u(x, y) = \partial_r \tilde{u}(x, |y|) \frac{y}{|y|} \in L^\infty(B_{1/2}),$$

so  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(B_{1/2})$ . Hence, we have proved that  $u \in C^{0,1}(B_{1/2}) \subset H^1(B_{1/2})$  and we can rewrite equation (7.3) as

$$(7.6) \quad -\Delta u = av, \quad \text{in } B_{1/2}.$$

Since  $v$  is a weak solution to (7.5), by using Theorem 1.1 one has that  $v \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Then, by applying classical Schauder regularity theory to (7.6), we get that  $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/3})$ .

Resuming, we have shown that if  $u$  is an axially symmetric in  $y$  weak solution to (7.3), then  $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/3})$ . Therefore, since  $v$  is an axially symmetric in  $y$  weak solution to (7.5), we get that  $v \in C^{2,\alpha'}(B_{1/3})$ , for some  $\alpha' \in (0,1)$  and, by using again classical Schauder regularity theory to (7.6), this implies  $u \in C^{4,\alpha'}(B_{1/4})$ . By iterating this procedure and using a covering lemma our statement follows.  $\square$

**7.4. Inhomogeneous conormal boundary condition on the characteristic thin set.** In this section, we extend our regularity results by considering equations that satisfy a non-homogeneous conormal condition on the thin set  $\Sigma_0$  in the case  $A = \mathbb{I}$ . As discussed in Remark 4.2, the weak formulation of equation (4.1), which holds across  $\Sigma_0$ , implies the fact that the solutions formally satisfy a homogeneous conormal condition on  $\Sigma_0$ . In the mid-range  $a+n \in (0,2)$ , it is possible to impose inhomogeneous conormal boundary conditions on  $\Sigma_0$ .

**Definition 7.5.** Let  $2 \leq n < d$  and  $a+n \in (0,2)$ . We say that  $u$  is a weak solution to

$$(7.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } B_1, \\ -\lim_{|y| \rightarrow 0} |y|^{a+n-1} \nabla u \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} = g(x), & \text{on } \Sigma_0 \cap B_1, \end{cases}$$

if  $u \in H^{1,a}(B_1)$  and satisfies

$$\int_{B_1} |y|^a \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi dz = \omega_n \int_{\Sigma_0 \cap B_1} g(x) \phi(x, 0) dx, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(B_1),$$

where  $\omega_n = |\mathbb{S}^{n-1}|$ .

Before stating the main result of this section, we first discuss the expected regularity for the solutions of the equation. Specifically, the function  $|y|^{2-a-n}$  solves equation (7.7) with  $g(x) = \text{const}$ , and this provides an upper bound on the regularity. In particular, when  $a+n \in (1,2)$ , we expect Hölder continuity of solutions, and when  $a+n \in (0,1)$ , we expect Hölder continuity of their gradient. Let us remark that  $|y|^{2-a-n}$  also solves the homogeneous Dirichlet problem (9.1) whenever  $a+n < 2$ , see Section 9.

**Proposition 7.6.** Let  $2 \leq n < d$ ,  $a+n \in (0,2)$  and  $u$  be a weak solution to (7.7). Then, the following holds true.

- i) Let  $g \in L^p(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)$ , with  $p > \frac{d-n}{2-a-n}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 2-a-n - \frac{d-n}{p}] \cap (0,1)$ . Then,  $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$  and there exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, p$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|g\|_{L^p(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)}).$$

- ii) Let us suppose that  $a+n \in (0,1)$ . Let  $g \in L^p(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)$ , with  $p > \frac{d-n}{1-a-n}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1-a-n - \frac{d-n}{p}]$ . Then,  $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$  and there exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a, p$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|g\|_{L^p(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)}).$$

iii) Let us suppose that  $a + n \in (0, 1)$  and let  $\alpha \in (0, 1 - a - n)$ . Let  $g \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)$ . Then,  $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$  and there exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)} + \|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)}).$$

*Proof.* We provide the proof of iii) only, as the proofs of i) and ii) follow from the same arguments.

Let us consider the weak solution  $\tilde{u}_1 = \tilde{u}_1(x, r) : B_1^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(r^{a+n-1}\nabla\tilde{u}_1) = 0, & \text{in } B_1^+, \\ -\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{a+n-1}\partial_r\tilde{u}_1 = g(x), & \text{on } B_1 \cap \{r = 0\}, \\ \tilde{u}_1 = 0, & \text{on } \partial B_1 \cap \{r > 0\}. \end{cases}$$

By [55, Theorem 8.4], it follows that  $\partial_r\tilde{u}_1 = 0$  on  $\Sigma_0 \cap B_1$  and

$$\|\tilde{u}_1\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2}^+)} \leq C\|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)},$$

where  $C > 0$  depends only on  $d, n, a$  and  $\alpha$ . Hence, by applying Lemma 7.3 with a minor modification, one has that  $u_1(x, y) := \tilde{u}_1(x, |y|)$  is an axially symmetric in  $y$  solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a\nabla u_1) = 0, & \text{in } B_1, \\ -\lim_{|y| \rightarrow 0} |y|^{a+n-1}\nabla u_1 \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} = g(x), & \text{on } \Sigma_0 \cap B_1, \\ u_1 = 0, & \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\partial_r\tilde{u}_1 = 0$  in  $\Sigma_0 \cap B_1$ , following computations analogous to those in [55, Lemma 7.5] and [3, Lemma 2.9], we conclude that  $u_1$  inherits the same regularity as  $\tilde{u}_1$ ; that is,

$$\|u_1\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C\|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1)}.$$

Next, let us define  $u_2 := u - u_1$ , which is a weak solution in the sense of Definition 4.1 to

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a\nabla u_2) = 0, \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Noticing that  $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(n, a, 1)$  given by (1.7) satisfies  $\alpha_* - 1 > 1 - a - n > \alpha$ , Theorem 1.2 yields that

$$\|u_2\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C\|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)}.$$

Hence,  $u = u_1 + u_2$  satisfies the desired estimate and the proof is complete.  $\square$

## 8. EQUATIONS DEGENERATING ON CURVED MANIFOLDS

This section is devoted to the extension of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to a class of equations whose weights are degenerate/singular on lower-dimensional curved manifolds.

Let  $2 \leq n < d$  and consider a  $(d - n)$ -dimensional  $C^1$ -manifold  $\Gamma$  which is locally embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and parametrized by  $\varphi \in C^1(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1; \mathbb{R}^n)$ , in the sense that, up to perform a dilation, a translation and a rotation, one has

$$(8.1) \quad \Gamma \cap B_1 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid y = \varphi(x)\} \cap B_1, \quad 0 \in \Gamma, \quad \varphi(0) = 0, \quad J_\varphi(0) = 0.$$

Let us define the diffeomorphism

$$(8.2) \quad \Phi(x, y) := (x, y + \varphi(x)),$$

which satisfies  $\Phi(\Sigma_0 \cap B_R) \subset \Gamma \cap B_1$  for some  $R > 0$ ,  $\Phi(0) = \Phi^{-1}(0) = 0$  and the Jacobian associated to  $\Phi$  is

$$J_\Phi(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{d-n} & \mathbf{0} \\ J_\varphi(x) & \mathbb{I}_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad |\det J_\Phi| \equiv 1, \quad J_\Phi(0) = \mathbb{I}_d.$$

Next, we define the class of admissible weights with respect to the parametrization  $\varphi$ .

**Definition 8.1** ( $\alpha$ -defining function). Let  $2 \leq n < d$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  and  $\varphi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1; \mathbb{R}^n)$  be a parametrization in the sense of (8.1). We say that  $\delta$  is an  $\alpha$ -defining function with respect to the parametrization  $\varphi$  if  $\delta \in C^{0,1}(B_1)$  and the two following condition holds true:

i) there exist two constants  $0 < c_0 \leq c_1$  such that

$$c_0 \leq \frac{\delta}{\text{dist}_\Gamma} \leq c_1;$$

ii)

$$(8.3) \quad \tilde{\delta}(x, y) := \frac{\delta(\Phi(x, y))}{|y|} \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1).$$

**Remark 8.2.** Let us consider a variable coefficient matrix  $A \in C^0(B_1)$  satisfying the global uniform ellipticity condition (1.5) with ellipticity constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$  and satisfying the restricted-to- $\Gamma$  uniform ellipticity condition

$$(8.4) \quad \lambda_* |\xi|^2 \leq A(z)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda_* |\xi|^2, \quad \text{for a.e. } z \in B_1 \cap \Gamma \text{ and for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

for some constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ . Given a 0-defining function  $\delta$ , let  $\tilde{\delta}$  as in (8.3) and define the matrix

$$(8.5) \quad \tilde{A} := \tilde{\delta}^\alpha (J_\Phi^{-1})(A \circ \Phi)(J_\Phi^{-1})^\top,$$

which is symmetric, continuous and satisfies the global uniform ellipticity condition (1.5). The latter condition follows by *i*) and *ii*) in Definition 8.1, which implies  $\tilde{\delta} \geq c > 0$ . In addition, since  $J_\Phi(0) = \mathbb{I}$ , one has that  $\tilde{A}(0) = \tilde{\delta}^\alpha(0)A(0)$  has ellipticity constants restricted to  $\Sigma_0$  given by

$$0 < \tilde{\delta}^\alpha(0)\lambda_* \leq \tilde{\delta}^\alpha(0)\Lambda_*.$$

By using the continuity of  $\tilde{A}$ , for every  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  there exists a small radius  $\bar{r} \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\tilde{A}$  has ellipticity constants restricted to  $B_{\bar{r}} \cap \Sigma_0$  given by

$$\tilde{\delta}^\alpha(0)\lambda_* - \sigma \leq \tilde{\delta}^\alpha(0)\Lambda_* + \sigma.$$

That is, in a local scale,  $\tilde{A}$  and  $A$  have the same ellipticity ratio restricted to the thin space, up to an error

$$\frac{\tilde{\delta}^\alpha(0)\lambda_* - \sigma}{\tilde{\delta}^\alpha(0)\Lambda_* + \sigma} = \frac{\lambda_*}{\Lambda_*} + \tilde{\sigma},$$

where  $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$  is arbitrarily small.

As done in Section 2.1, we can define the spaces  $L^p(B_1, \delta^a)$ ,  $L^p(B_1, \delta^a)^d$  and  $H^1(B_1, \delta^a)$ . Then, we provide the definition of weak solution to (1.17).

**Definition 8.3.** Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $A$  satisfying (1.5) and  $\delta$  be a 0-defining function in the sense of Definition 8.1. Let  $f \in L^2(B_1, \delta^a)$  and  $F \in L^2(B_1, \delta^a)^d$ . We say that  $u$  is a weak solution to (1.17) if  $u \in H^1(B_1, \delta^a)$  and satisfies

$$\int_{B_1} \delta^a A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi dz = \int_{B_1} \delta^a (f \phi - F \cdot \nabla \phi) dz,$$

for every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ .

The main results of this section are the following corollaries, which establish local  $C^{0,\alpha}$  and  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates for weak solutions to (1.17).

**Corollary 8.4.** Let  $a + n > 0$ ,  $p > (d + a_+)/2$  and  $q > d + a_+$ . Let  $f \in L^p(B_1, \delta^a)$ ,  $F \in L^q(B_1, \delta^a)^d$ ,  $A \in C^0(B_1)$  be a continuous matrix satisfying (1.5) and (8.4) with constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ ,  $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(n, a, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*)$  defined in (1.7) and  $\alpha$  satisfying (1.8). Let  $\varphi \in C^1(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1; \mathbb{R}^n)$  be a parametrization in the sense of (8.1). Let  $\delta$  be a 0-defining function with respect to  $\varphi$  in the sense of Definition 8.1 and set  $\tilde{\delta} \in C^0(B_1)$  as in (8.3).

Let  $u$  be a weak solution to (1.17) in the sense of Definition 8.3 and let us suppose that

$$\|A\|_{C^0(B_1)} + \|\tilde{\delta}\|_{C^0(B_1)} + \|\varphi\|_{C^1(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1; \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq L.$$

Then, there exists  $\bar{r} \in (0, 1/2)$ , depending only on  $\alpha$  and  $L$ , such that  $u \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{\bar{r}})$  and there exists a constant  $c > 0$ , depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, q, \alpha$  and  $L$  such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{\bar{r}})} \leq c(\|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \delta^a)} + \|f\|_{L^p(B_1, \delta^a)} + \|F\|_{L^q(B_1, \delta^a)}).$$

**Corollary 8.5.** Let  $a + n > 0$  and  $p > d + a_+$ . Let  $A$  be a matrix satisfying (1.5) and (8.4) with constants  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_* \leq \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda$ ,  $\alpha_* = \alpha_*(n, a, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*)$  defined in (1.7) and  $\alpha$  satisfying (1.9). Let  $\varphi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1; \mathbb{R}^n)$  be a parametrization in the sense of (8.1). Let  $\delta$  be a  $\alpha$ -defining function with respect to  $\varphi$  in the sense of Definition 8.1 and set  $\tilde{\delta} \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$  as in (8.3). Let us suppose that  $A$  is  $C^{0,\alpha}$ -continuous,  $f \in L^p(B_1, \delta^a)$ ,  $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$ .

Let  $u$  be a weak solution to (1.17) in the sense of Definition 8.3 and let us suppose that

$$\|A\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} + \|\tilde{\delta}\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} + \|\varphi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Sigma_0 \cap B_1; \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq L.$$

Then, there exists  $\bar{r} \in (0, 1/2)$ , depending only on  $\alpha$  and  $L$ , such that  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_{\bar{r}})$  and there exists a constant  $C > 0$ , depending only on  $d, n, a, \lambda, \Lambda, p, \alpha$  and  $L$  such that

$$(8.6) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{\bar{r}})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \delta^a)} + \|f\|_{L^p(B_1, \delta^a)} + \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}).$$

Moreover, denoting by  $T_z \Gamma$  the tangent space to  $\Gamma$  at the point  $z \in \Gamma$ , we have that  $u$  satisfies the following boundary condition for every  $z \in \Gamma \cap B_{\bar{r}}$ ,

$$(8.7) \quad (A \nabla u + F)(z) \cdot \nu(z) = 0, \quad \text{for every } \nu(z) \perp T_z \Gamma.$$

Since the proofs of Corollaries 8.4 and 8.5 are quite similar, we merely provide the proof of the Corollary 8.5. Additionally, we refer to [33], where the same results are proved in a closely related context.

*Proof.* The proof relies on making changes of variables to reduce the problem to the *flat* case, where the weight becomes  $|y|^a$ . The desired result then follows by applying Theorem 1.2.

Let  $\Phi$  be as in (8.2), and define  $\tilde{u} = u \circ \Phi$ . Let  $\bar{r} \in (0, 1)$  to be chosen later, and let  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\bar{r}})$ . Using the change of variable  $z = \Phi(z)$ , we obtain that

$$0 = \int_{B_1} \delta^a (A \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi - f \phi + F \cdot \nabla \phi) dz = \int_{B_1} |y|^a (\tilde{A} \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi} - \tilde{f} \tilde{\phi} + \tilde{F} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi}) dz,$$

where  $\tilde{A}$  is defined in (8.5) and

$$\tilde{f} := \tilde{\delta}^a f \circ \Phi \in L^{p,a}(B_{2\bar{r}}), \quad \tilde{F} := \tilde{\delta}^a (J_\Phi^{-1}) F \circ \Phi \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2\bar{r}}), \quad \tilde{\phi} := \phi \circ \Phi.$$

By using the properties of the defining function (see Definition 8.1), one has that  $\tilde{A} \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2\bar{r}})$ . Moreover, by Remark 8.2, for every  $\sigma > 0$  there exists  $\bar{r} > 0$  such that  $\tilde{A}$  has ellipticity constant restricted to  $B_{2\bar{r}} \cap \Sigma_0$  given by

$$0 < \tilde{\delta}^a(0) \lambda_* - \sigma \leq \tilde{\delta}^a(0) \Lambda_* + \sigma.$$

Let us consider  $\bar{r}$  small enough such that

$$\alpha < \alpha_* \left( n, a, \frac{\tilde{\delta}^a(0) \lambda_* - \sigma}{\tilde{\delta}^a(0) \Lambda_* + \sigma} \right) - 1,$$

where  $\alpha_*$  is defined in (1.7). This choice is always possible since  $\tilde{A}(0)$  has ellipticity constant  $\tilde{\delta}^a(0) \lambda_* \leq \tilde{\delta}^a(0) \Lambda_*$  on  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\alpha < \alpha_*(n, a, \lambda_*/\Lambda_*) - 1$  (see Remark 8.2).

Resuming, we have shown that  $\tilde{u}$  is a weak solution to

$$-\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \tilde{A} \nabla \tilde{u}) = |y|^a \tilde{f} + \operatorname{div}(|y|^a \tilde{F}), \quad \text{in } B_{2\bar{r}}.$$

By the choice of  $\bar{r}$ , after rescaling the domain, the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 are satisfied. Hence, we have that  $\tilde{u}$  satisfies (1.11) and (1.10) and composing back with  $\Phi^{-1}$  we get that  $u$  satisfies (8.6) and (8.7) in  $B_{\bar{r}}$ .  $\square$

## 9. HOMOGENEOUS DIRICHLET PROBLEM VIA A BOUNDARY HARNACK PRINCIPLE

In this section, we prove Hölder  $C^{0,\alpha}$  and Schauder  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity for solutions to the homogeneous Dirichlet problem

$$(9.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|y|^a \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0 \\ u = 0 & \text{on } B_1 \cap \Sigma_0, \end{cases}$$

whenever  $a + n < 2$ . The solutions we are referring to are elements of  $\tilde{H}^{1,a}(B_1)$ , which is defined as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\overline{B_1} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{H^{1,a}(B_1)}$  and satisfies

$$\int_{B_1} |y|^a \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi dz = 0, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_0).$$

We remark that in the supersingular case  $a + n \leq 0$ , any function in  $H^{1,a}(B_1)$  is forced to have trace  $u = 0$  on  $\Sigma_0$  (see Proposition 2.5). Instead, in the mid-range  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ , the trace condition  $u = 0$  on  $\Sigma_0$  is well-defined, since  $\Sigma_0$  has positive local weighted capacity. See also [49] for some trace type theorems on lower dimensional sets.

The idea is to obtain regularity as a corollary of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 via a boundary Harnack principle, in the same spirit as [56]. In fact, the ratio  $w := u/u_0$  between a solution  $u$  to (9.1) and the *characteristic solution* to (9.1)

$$u_0(y) = |y|^{2-a-n}$$

solves the equation

$$(9.2) \quad -\operatorname{div}(|y|^b \nabla w) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1$$

with exponent  $b = 4 - a - 2n$  lying in the superdegenerate range since  $b + n = 4 - a - n > 2$ .

**Lemma 9.1.** *Let  $a + n < 2$ ,  $u$  be a solution to (9.1) and  $u_0 = |y|^{2-a-n}$ . Then,  $w = u/u_0$  solves (9.2).*

*Proof.* The equation is trivially satisfied far from  $\Sigma_0$  in a classic sense. Moreover, due to the superdegeneracy of the weight  $|y|^b$ , and combining Lemma 2.8 with the density of  $C_c^\infty(\overline{B_1} \setminus \Sigma_0)$  in  $H^{1,b}(B_1)$ , the result is trivially true if one shows that the  $H^{1,b}(B_1)$ -energy of  $w$  is finite. Recalling the Hardy inequality (see Proposition 2.2), we easily compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} |y|^b |\nabla w|^2 dz &\leq c \int_{B_1} |y|^b \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|u_0|^2} + \frac{u^2 |\nabla u_0|^2}{|u_0|^4} \right) dz \\ &= c \left( \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz + \int_{B_1} |y|^{a-2} u^2 dz \right) \leq c \int_{B_1} |y|^a |\nabla u|^2 dz. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,  $\|w\|_{L^{2,b}(B_1)} = \|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)}$ , hence  $w \in H^{1,b}(B_1)$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

Let us recall that the homogeneity degree appearing (1.7), related to the new exponent  $b$ , is given by

$$(9.3) \quad \alpha_*(b, n) := \alpha_*(b, n, 1) = \frac{2 - b - n + \sqrt{(2 - b - n)^2 + 4(n - 1)}}{2}.$$

Then, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 imply the following result.

**Corollary 9.2.** *Let  $a + n < 2$  and  $b = 4 - a - 2n$ . Let  $\alpha_*(b, n) > 0$  be the homogeneity exponent in (9.3) and*

$$\alpha \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \alpha_*(b, n)).$$

*Let  $u$  be a weak solution to (9.1) in  $B_1$  and  $u_0 = |y|^{2-a-n}$ . Then,  $u/u_0 \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(B_1)$  and there exists a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a$  and  $\alpha$  such that*

$$\left\| \frac{u}{u_0} \right\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq c \|u\|_{L^{2,a}(B_1)}.$$

*If moreover  $\alpha_*(b, n) > 1$  and*

$$\alpha \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \alpha_*(b, n) - 1),$$



then  $u/u_0 \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,\alpha}(B_1)$  and there exists a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, a$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$\left\| \frac{u}{u_0} \right\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq c \|u\|_{L^{2,\alpha}(B_1)}.$$

**Remark 9.3.** The previous result improves [50, Theorem 1] in the flat case, which corresponds to a  $L^\infty$ -bound of  $u/u_0$ . Moreover, it slightly improve [33, Theorems 1.2 and 1.3] in the present homogeneous case. The exponent  $\alpha_*(b, n)$ , given by (9.3), satisfies  $\alpha_*(b, n) > 2 - a - n$  whenever

$$(9.4) \quad n - 1 > 2(2 - a - n)^2.$$

In particular this implies that, under (9.4), one can imply the sharp  $C^{2-a-n}$  regularity of solutions to (9.1). In fact, if  $w = u/u_0$  has  $C^\beta$  regularity with  $\beta \geq 2 - a - n$ , then

$$u = wu_0 \in C^{2-a-n}.$$

In particular, when  $a + n = 1$ , which corresponds to the exponent studied by David, Feneuil and Mayboroda (see [19] and its related works), one can prove the sharp Lipschitz continuity of solutions whenever the codimension  $n \geq 4$ .

## 10. HIGHER CODIMENSIONAL EXTENSIONS OF FRACTIONAL LAPLACIANS

The aim of this section is to establish a connection between the degenerate equations discussed in this paper and fractional Laplacians on the very thin set  $\Sigma_0$ , in the sense of Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps, in the spirit of [8]. Let  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $2 \leq n < d$ . The  $s$ -fractional Laplacian of sufficiently regular functions can be defined in  $\mathbb{R}^{d-n}$  equivalently as a integro-differential operator

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) = C_{d-n,s} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n} \setminus B_\varepsilon(x)} \frac{u(x) - u(\xi)}{|x - \xi|^{d-n+2s}} d\xi,$$

or via Fourier transform

$$\widehat{(-\Delta)^s u}(\xi) = |\xi|^{2s} \widehat{u}(\xi).$$

Assuming  $d - n > 2s$ , and using the fractional Hardy inequality, we can set fractional problems in  $\mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$ , defined as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$  with respect to the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |(-\Delta)^{s/2} u(x)|^2.$$

Let  $a = 2 - n - 2s$ , which satisfies  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ . This corresponds to the mid-range regime, where the local weighted capacity of  $\Sigma_0$  is positive and finite, see Lemma 2.4. Next, we define  $\mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with respect to

$$\|U\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a |\nabla U|^2,$$

which is a norm due to an Hardy-type inequality, see for instance [15, Theorem 1]. In the following result, we establish the existence of a trace operator from  $\mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to  $\mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$ . We refer also to [49] for some related local trace type results.

**Lemma 10.1.** *Let  $2 \leq n < d$  and  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ . Then, there exists a constant  $C_{a,n} > 0$  such that*

$$(10.1) \quad C_{a,n} \|\phi|_{\Sigma_0}\|_{\mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})} \leq \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

for any  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $s = (2 - a - n)/2 \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover, if  $d + a > 2$  (i.e.  $d - n > 2s$ ), (10.1) defines the continuous trace operator

$$\text{Tr} : \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n}).$$

*Proof.* The proof is an adaptation of [14, Theorem 3.8], so we omit most of the details. Let  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and let  $\hat{\phi}$  denote the Fourier transform of  $\phi$  with respect to the  $x$  variables. Then we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a |\nabla \phi|^2 dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^a (|\xi|^2 |\hat{\phi}|^2 + |\nabla_y \hat{\phi}|^2) dy d\xi.$$

Next, define  $v(\xi, t) = \hat{\phi}(\xi, |\xi|^{-1}t)$ , and perform the change of variables  $y = |\xi|^{-1}t$  in the integral above. This leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a |\nabla \phi|^2 dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |\xi|^{2-a-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |t|^a (|v|^2 + |\nabla_t v|^2) dt d\xi.$$

We now claim that

$$\inf_{v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), v(0)=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |t|^a (|v|^2 + |\nabla_t v|^2) dt = C_{a,n} > 0.$$

Assume that this claim is true. Then, recalling that  $v(\xi, 0) = \hat{\phi}(\xi, 0)$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a |\nabla \phi|^2 dz \geq C_{a,n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |\xi|^{2-a-n} |\hat{\phi}(\xi, 0)|^2 d\xi = C_{a,n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} |(-\Delta)^{s/2} \phi(x, 0)|^2 dx,$$

with  $s = (2 - a - n)/2 \in (0, 1)$ . This completes the proof of (10.1). The rest of the proof follows in a standard way.

Let us now prove the claim. To do this, we argue by contradiction. Assume that  $C_{a,n} = 0$ . Then, for every  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $v_\delta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $v_\delta(0) = 1$  and

$$(10.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |t|^a (|v|^2 + |\nabla_t v|^2) dt < \delta.$$

Using computations similar to those in the proof of part *iii*) of Lemma 2.4, we find that for every  $\rho > 0$ ,

$$n\omega_n = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |v_\delta(0)|^2 d\sigma \leq c\rho^{2-a-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |t|^a |\nabla_t v_\delta|^2 dt + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |v_\delta(\rho\sigma)|^2 d\sigma.$$

Multiplying by  $\rho^{a+n-1}$ , integrating over  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , and using (10.2), we obtain

$$\frac{n\omega_n}{a+n} \leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |t|^a |\nabla_t v_\delta|^2 dt + 2 \int_{B_1} |t|^a |v_\delta|^2 dt \leq c\delta,$$

which is a contradiction for sufficiently small  $\delta$ . Therefore, the claim holds true and the proof is complete.  $\square$

As a dual result, we define a unique minimal energy extension in  $\mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for functions in  $\mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$ .

**Lemma 10.2.** *Let  $2 \leq n < d$  with  $d + a > 2$  and  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ . Let  $s = (2 - a - n)/2$ . Then, for any  $u \in \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$  the minimization problem*

$$(10.3) \quad \inf_{U \in \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d), \text{Tr}U=u} \|U\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2$$

*admits a unique minimizer. Moreover, (10.3) defines an extension operator*

$$\text{Ext} : \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $u \in \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$ . The existence of a minimizer  $\bar{U}$  for (10.3) follows from standard variational arguments. In particular,  $\bar{U}$  satisfies

$$(10.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a \nabla \bar{U} \cdot \nabla \phi \, dz = 0, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d), \text{Tr}\phi = 0.$$

Finally, to prove the uniqueness of  $\bar{U}$ , it is sufficient to use a standard contradiction argument to show that (10.4) admits a unique solution in the set  $\{U \in \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \text{Tr}U = u\}$ .  $\square$

Then, the extension result can be summarized as below.

**Proposition 10.3.** *Let  $2 \leq n < d$  with  $d + a > 2$  and  $a + n \in (0, 2)$ . Let  $s = (2 - a - n)/2 \in (0, 1)$ . Then for any  $u \in \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$ , the extension  $U = \text{Ext}(u)$  is given by*

$$U(x, y) = u * P(x, y), \quad P(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d-n+2s}{2})}{\pi^{\frac{d-n}{2}} \Gamma(s)} \frac{|y|^{2s}}{(|x|^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d-n+2s}{2}}},$$

*and is solution to*

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div}(|y|^a \nabla U) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Sigma_0 \\ -\lim_{|y| \rightarrow 0} |y|^{a+n-1} \nabla U \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} = d_{a,n} (-\Delta)^s u & \text{on } \Sigma_0, \end{cases}$$

*in the sense that  $U \in \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and satisfies*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a \nabla U \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \, dy = d_{a,n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} (-\Delta)^s u \phi(x, 0) \, dx, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

*where  $d_{a,n} = 2^{a+n-1} \Gamma(\frac{a+n}{2}) / \Gamma(\frac{2-a-n}{2})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Notice that  $P(x, y) = P(|x|, |y|)$ , and hence  $U(x, y) = \tilde{U}(x, |y|)$ , where  $\tilde{U}(x, r) = u * P(x, r)$  for  $r > 0$ . From the codimension 1 extension theory in [8], we have that  $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{D}^{1,1-2s}(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$ , and

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div}(r^{1-2s} \nabla \tilde{U}) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{d-n+1} \\ -\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{1-2s} \partial_r \tilde{U} = 2^{1-2s} \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{\Gamma(s)} (-\Delta)^s u & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^{d-n}, \end{cases}$$

or, equivalently, that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{d-n+1}} r^{a+n-1} \nabla \tilde{U} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\phi} \, dx \, dr = d_{a,n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} (-\Delta)^s u \tilde{\phi}(x, 0) \, dx, \quad \text{for every } \tilde{\phi} \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d-n+1}}),$$

where we used that  $s = (2 - a - n)/2$ . Thus, adapting the argument of the proof of Lemma 7.3 we infer that  $U \in \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\text{Tr}U = u$  and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a \nabla U \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \, dy = d_{a,n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} (-\Delta)^s u \phi(x, 0) \, dx, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

In particular,  $U$  is the unique solution of (10.4) in the set  $\{U \in \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{Tr}U = u\}$ , and thus, the unique minimizer of (10.3). It immediately follows that  $U = \text{Ext}(u)$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 10.4.** Let  $u \in \mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})$ . As shown in Proposition 10.3, it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^a \nabla \text{Ext}(u) \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \, dy = d_{a,n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-n}} (-\Delta)^s u \phi(x, 0) \, dx, \quad \text{for every } \phi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

By taking  $\phi = \text{Ext}(u)$ , we immediately infer  $\|\text{Ext}(u)\|_{\mathcal{D}^{1,a}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = d_{a,n} \|u\|_{\mathcal{D}^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-n})}$ . As a consequence,  $C_{a,n} = d_{a,n}$ , where  $C_{a,n}$  is the constant in Lemma 10.1.

#### APPENDIX A. GEOMETRY OF PERFORATED DOMAINS

Let  $R > 0$  and  $A \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$  (see Remark 3.1 for the sharp requirement) be a symmetric matrix satisfying the uniform ellipticity condition (1.5), and recall the notation (1.19). The block  $A_3$  is still symmetric and satisfies

$$\lambda |\zeta|^2 \leq A_3(z) \zeta \cdot \zeta \leq \Lambda |\zeta|^2, \quad \text{for a.e. } z \in B_R \quad \text{and every } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  are the uniform ellipticity constants of  $A$ . By the ellipticity condition,  $A_3$  is invertible, and  $A_3^{-1} \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{n,n})$ . The matrix  $A_3^{-1}$  is also symmetric and satisfies

$$(A.1) \quad \Lambda^{-1} |\zeta|^2 \leq A_3^{-1}(z) \zeta \cdot \zeta \leq \lambda^{-1} |\zeta|^2, \quad \text{for a.e. } z \in B_R \quad \text{and every } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The square root of  $A_3^{-1}$ , denoted by  $A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , is well-defined and belongs to  $C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{n,n})$  (see for instance [23, Theorem 2.5]). It is also symmetric and satisfies

$$(A.2) \quad \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\zeta|^2 \leq A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z) \zeta \cdot \zeta \leq \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\zeta|^2, \quad \text{for a.e. } z \in B_R \quad \text{and every } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We will frequently use the following properties, which follow directly from (A.1) and (A.2).

$$(A.3) \quad \begin{aligned} |A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)y| &= \sqrt{A_3^{-1}(z)y \cdot y}, \\ \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} |y| &\leq |A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)y| \leq \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} |y|, \\ \Lambda^{-1} |y| &\leq |A_3^{-1}(z)y| \leq \lambda^{-1} |y|. \end{aligned}$$

In the following lemma, we describe some properties of the  $(\varepsilon, A)$ -neighborhood of  $\Sigma_0$

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon^A = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid A_3^{-1}(z)y \cdot y \leq \varepsilon^2\},$$

and its boundary

$$\partial \Sigma_\varepsilon^A = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{d-n} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid A_3^{-1}(z)y \cdot y = \varepsilon^2\}.$$

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $R > 0$ ,  $A \in C^1(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$  and  $L := \|A_3^{-1}\|_{C^1(B_R)}$ . There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , depending only on  $d, n, L, R, \lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ , such that for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$  the following properties hold:*

i) the normal vector  $\nu(z)$  to  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  at  $z \in B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  is well-defined. In particular,

$$(A.4) \quad \nu(z) = (0, N(z)) + \tilde{\nu}(z),$$

where

$$(A.5) \quad N(z) = \frac{A_3^{-1}(z)y}{|A_3^{-1}(z)y|} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1},$$

and

$$|\tilde{\nu}(z)| \leq c\varepsilon,$$

for some constant  $c = c(d, n, \Lambda, L, \varepsilon_0) > 0$ ;

ii) it holds

$$(A.6) \quad \nu(z) \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} \geq \frac{\lambda}{2\Lambda};$$

iii) there exists a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $L, d, n, R, \lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  such that

$$[N]_{C^{0,1}(B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq c\varepsilon^{-1};$$

iv) if in addition  $A \in C^{1,\beta}(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , then

$$[\tilde{\nu}]_{C^{0,\beta}(B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq c,$$

where  $c > 0$  depends only on  $\|A_3^{-1}\|_{C^{1,\beta}(B_R)}$ ,  $d, n, R, \lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ .

*Proof.* Define the function

$$(A.7) \quad \Psi(z) = \sqrt{A_3^{-1}(z)y \cdot y}.$$

From (A.3), we have  $\Psi \in C^{0,1}(B_R) \cap C^1(B_R \setminus \Sigma_0)$ , and  $\Psi(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $y = 0$ .

Since  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A = \{\Psi(z) = \varepsilon\}$ , the normal vector  $\nu(z)$  at a point  $z \in \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  is given by

$$\nu(z) = \frac{\nabla\Psi(z)}{|\nabla\Psi(z)|} = \frac{\nabla(A_3^{-1}(z)y \cdot y)}{|\nabla(A_3^{-1}(z)y \cdot y)|}.$$

Let  $A_3^{-1}(z) = (b_{ij}(z))_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$ . We define the functions  $G : B_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $H : B_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows

$$G(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^n \partial_{z_\ell} b_{ij}(z) y_i y_j \right)_{\ell=1,\dots,d},$$

$$H(z) = |A_3^{-1}(z)y| - |(0, A_3^{-1}(z)y) + G(z)|.$$

Using this notation, the normal vector can be expressed as

$$\nu(z) = \frac{(0, A_3^{-1}(z)y) + G(z)}{|A_3^{-1}(z)y| - H(z)}.$$

There exists a constant  $c_1 = c_1(d, n) > 0$  such that

$$(A.8) \quad |H(z)| \leq |G(z)| \leq c_1 L |y|^2, \quad \text{for every } z \in B_R.$$

Fix  $\varepsilon_0$  such that  $\Lambda^{-1}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} - c_1L\Lambda\varepsilon_0 > 0$ . Thus, if  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$  and  $z \in B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ , thanks to (A.3) and (A.8) we have

$$(A.9) \quad |A_3^{-1}(z)y| - H(z) \geq \Lambda^{-1}|y| - cL|y|^2 \geq \varepsilon(\Lambda^{-1}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} - cL\Lambda\varepsilon) \geq c\varepsilon.$$

Therefore,  $\nu$  is well-defined.

Define  $\tilde{\nu}(z) := \nu(z) - (0, N(z))$ , where  $N(z)$  is as in (A.5). Then

$$\tilde{\nu}(z) = \frac{H(z)N(z)}{|A_3^{-1}(z)y| - H(z)} + \frac{G(z)}{|A_3^{-1}(z)y| - H(z)}.$$

It follows that

$$|\tilde{\nu}(z)| \leq c\varepsilon,$$

where  $c = c(d, n, \Lambda, \lambda, L, \varepsilon_0) > 0$ . Thus *i*) is proved.

To prove *ii*), we compute

$$\nu \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} = N(z) \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} + \tilde{\nu} \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} \geq \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} - |\tilde{\nu}|.$$

Taking if necessary a smaller  $\varepsilon_0$ , so that  $|\tilde{\nu}| \leq \lambda/2\Lambda$ , we obtain (A.6).

For *iii*), note that for every  $z = (x, y), z' = (x', y') \in B_R$  it holds

$$(A.10) \quad |A_3^{-1}(z)y - A_3^{-1}(z')y'| \leq |A_3^{-1}(z) - A_3^{-1}(z')||y| + |A_3^{-1}(z')||y - y'| \leq L(R+1)|z - z'|.$$

Therefore, for all  $z, z' \in B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ , we have

$$|N(z) - N(z')| \leq 2 \frac{|A_3^{-1}(z)y - A_3^{-1}(z')y'|}{|A_3^{-1}(z')y'|} \leq c\varepsilon^{-1}|z - z'|,$$

where  $c > 0$  depends only on  $L, \Lambda, \lambda$ .

Finally, we prove *iv*). Assume that  $A_3^{-1} \in C^{1,\beta}(B_R; \mathbb{R}^{n,n})$ . Using similar computations as before, we obtain

$$(A.11) \quad |G(z) - G(z')| \leq c\varepsilon|z - z'|^\beta, \quad \text{for every } z, z' \in B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A,$$

where  $c$  depends on  $d, n, \lambda, \Lambda, \|A_3^{-1}\|_{C^{1,\beta}(B_R)}, \varepsilon_0$ .

Define the function

$$h(z) = 2 \frac{N(z) \cdot G(z)}{|A_3^{-1}(z)y|} + \frac{|G(z)|^2}{|A_3^{-1}(z)y|^2}.$$

By combining (A.8), (A.10), (A.11), and *iii*), we deduce

$$(A.12) \quad |h(z)| \leq c|y| \text{ for all } z \in B_R, \quad \text{and} \quad |h(z) - h(z')| \leq c|z - z'|^\beta \text{ for all } z, z' \in B_R.$$

Thus, when  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small, we can apply the Taylor expansion for  $(1+t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  to  $|(0, A_3^{-1}(z)y) + G(z)|$ , yielding for every  $z \in B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ ,

$$H(z) = |A_3^{-1}(z)y| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j h^j(z),$$

where  $c_j$  are the coefficients of the expansion. Using (A.8) and (A.12), we infer that

$$(A.13) \quad |H(z) - H(z')| \leq c\varepsilon|z - z'|^\beta.$$

Finally, combining (A.8), (A.9), (A.10), (A.11) and (A.13), we obtain

$$|\tilde{\nu}(z) - \tilde{\nu}(z')| \leq c(|z - z'| + \varepsilon^{-1}|H(z) - H(z')| + \varepsilon^{-1}|G(z) - G(z')|) \leq c|z - z'|^\beta.$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $G : B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be such that  $G \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1 \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and  $G(z) \cdot \nu(z) = 0$  for every  $z \in B_1 \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ . Then, there exist a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on  $d, n, \lambda, \Lambda, \alpha$  and  $L := \|A_3^{-1}\|_{C^1(B_R)}$  such that for every  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , it holds*

$$\|G \cdot e_{y_i}\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \leq c\varepsilon^\alpha \|G\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)}.$$

*Proof.* We recall that by Lemma A.1, for  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ , the normal vector to the surface  $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  at  $z = (x, y) \in B_1 \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  is given by  $\nu(z) = (0, N(z)) + \tilde{\nu}(z)$ , where  $\tilde{\nu}(z) \leq c\varepsilon$  and

$$N(x, y) = \frac{A_3^{-1}(z)y}{|A_3^{-1}(z)y|} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In what follows, we show that there exist  $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\varepsilon_0, \Lambda)$ ,  $\delta_2 = \delta_2(L, \Lambda)$ , such that for every  $x \in B_{1/2}^{d-n}$  and for  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$  there exist  $\bar{x} \in B_{1/2}^{d-n}$  and  $n$  vectors  $\{y_j\}_{j=1, \dots, n} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  (depending on  $\bar{x}$ ) such that, defined  $\tau_j = N(\bar{x}, y_j)$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |x - \bar{x}| &\leq \delta_1 \varepsilon, \\ (\bar{x}, y_j) &\in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A, \\ |\tau_i \cdot \tau_j| &\leq \delta_2 \varepsilon, \text{ for every } i \neq j. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this implies that  $\text{span}\{\tau_j\} = \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Take  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that  $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} < \delta_1 < (2\varepsilon_0)^{-1}$ . Define

$$\bar{x} = (1 - 2\delta_1 \varepsilon)x.$$

Notice that by construction  $1 - 2\delta_1 \varepsilon > 0$  and  $|x - \bar{x}| \leq \delta_1 \varepsilon$ . Moreover, let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be such that  $(\bar{x}, y) \in \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ . It holds

$$|(\bar{x}, y)| \leq |\bar{x}| + |y| = (1 - 2\delta_1 \varepsilon)|x| + |y| \leq \frac{1}{2} - (\delta_1 - \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}})\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence  $(\bar{x}, y) \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ , as needed.

Now, let us fix any point  $(\bar{x}, y_1) \in \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ , and define  $\tau_1 = N(\bar{x}, y_1)$ . One can choose  $\sigma_2 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  such that  $\sigma_2 \cdot A_3^{-2}(\bar{x}, y_1)y_1 = 0$  (where  $A_3^{-2} = (A_3^{-1})^2 = (A_3^2)^{-1}$ ), and define  $y_2 = r_2 \sigma_2$ , where  $r_2$  is chosen in such a way that  $(\bar{x}, y_2) \in \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ .

To show that such  $r_2$  exists, consider the function  $f(r) = \Psi(x, r\sigma)$ , where  $\Psi$  is defined in (A.7). Since  $f$  is continuous,  $f(0) = 0$ , and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) = \infty$ , there exists  $r_2$  such that  $f(r_2) = \varepsilon$ , that is,  $y_2 = r_2 \sigma$ .

Let us define  $\tau_2 = N(\bar{x}, y_2)$ . Note that, by construction,

$$A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_1)y_1 \cdot A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_1)y_2 = r_2 A_3^{-2}(\bar{x}, y_1)y_1 \cdot \sigma_2 = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2| &= |N(\bar{x}, y_1) \cdot N(\bar{x}, y_2)| = \frac{|A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_1)y_1 \cdot A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_2)y_2|}{|A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_1)y_1| |A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_2)y_2|} \\ &\leq \frac{|A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_2) - A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_1)| |y_2|}{|A_3^{-1}(\bar{x}, y_2)y_2|} \leq L\Lambda |y_2 - y_1| \leq \delta_2 \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_2$  depends only on  $L, \Lambda$ .

Next, fix  $y_3$  such that  $(x, y_3) \in \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$  and  $y_3$  is orthogonal to both  $A_3^{-2}(\bar{x}, y_1)y_1$  and  $A_3^{-2}(\bar{x}, y_2)y_2$ , and define  $\tau_3 = N(\bar{x}, y_3)$ . Performing the same computation as before, we find that  $\tau_3 \cdot \tau_1 \leq \delta_2 \varepsilon$ ,  $\tau_3 \cdot \tau_2 \leq \delta_2 \varepsilon$ . To conclude, it suffices to iterate this argument a finite number of times.

We are now in position to prove the lemma. Fix  $z = (x, y) \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ . Recall that  $\tau_j = N(\bar{x}, y_j)$ , where  $(\bar{x}, y_j) \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ . Let  $T = (t_{ij})$  denote the matrix with entries  $t_{ij} = \tau_i \cdot \tau_j$ . Let  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n,n}}$  be a chosen matrix norm. By construction, we have  $\|T - \mathbb{I}_n\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n,n}} \leq c\varepsilon$ , where  $c$  depends only on  $n, \delta_2$ . Thus, for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small,  $\det T > 0$  and  $T$  is invertible.

Fix  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We can decompose  $e_{y_i} = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \tau_j$  with respect to the basis  $\tau_j$ , where the coefficients  $\alpha = (\alpha_j)_{j=1, \dots, n}$  satisfy the linear system  $T\alpha = \beta$ , with  $\beta = (e_{y_i} \cdot \tau_j)_{j=1, \dots, n}$ . Since  $T$  is invertible, it follows that  $|\alpha_i| \leq c$ , where  $c$  does not depend on  $\varepsilon$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |G(z) \cdot e_{y_i}| &= |G(z) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \tau_j| \leq c \sum_{j=1}^n |G(z) \cdot (0, N(\bar{x}, y_j))| \\ &\leq c \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |G(z) \cdot \nu(\bar{x}, y_j)| + \sum_{j=1}^n |G(z) \cdot \tilde{\nu}(\bar{x}, y_j)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, using that  $G(z) \cdot \nu(z) = 0$  for every  $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ , and that  $\tilde{\nu}(z) \leq c\varepsilon$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |G(z) \cdot e_{y_i}| &\leq c \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |(G(z) - G(\bar{x}, y_j)) \cdot \nu(\bar{x}, y_j)| + \varepsilon \|G\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \right) \\ &\leq c \left( [G]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \sum_{j=1}^n (\delta_1 \varepsilon + |y - y_j|)^\alpha + \varepsilon \|G\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that, by construction,  $(\bar{x}, y_i) \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ . Finally, since  $|y|, |y_j| \leq c\varepsilon$  by the uniform ellipticity condition, we obtain

$$|G(z) \cdot e_{y_i}| \leq c\varepsilon^\alpha \|G\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_\varepsilon^A)}.$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$



**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $A \in C^1(B_1; \mathbb{R}^{d,d})$ , and let  $\Phi \in C^1(B_1; \mathbb{R}^d)$  given by*

$$\Phi(z) = (x, A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)y).$$

*Then, there exists  $0 < R \leq 1$  such that the following holds:*

*i) the function  $\Phi : B_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is injective. Moreover, there exists  $c > 0$  such that*

$$(A.14) \quad c^{-1}|z_1 - z_2| \leq |\Phi(z_1) - \Phi(z_2)| \leq c|z_1 - z_2|, \quad \text{for every } z_1, z_2 \in B_R;$$

*ii)  $\Phi : B_R \rightarrow \Phi(B_R)$  is a  $C^1$ -diffeomorphism and it holds*

$$\frac{1}{2}\Lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}} \leq \det J_\Phi(z) \leq \frac{3}{2}\lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}};$$

*iii) the matrix  $J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi$  is symmetric and uniformly elliptic. In particular*

$$\frac{1}{2} \min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\} |\zeta|^2 \leq J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi(z) \zeta \cdot \zeta \leq 2 \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\} |\zeta|^2 \quad \text{for every } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d;$$

*iv) Let  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ , where  $\varepsilon_0$  is as in Lemma A.1. Given  $z \in B_R \cap \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A$ , consider the projection map  $\Pi_\varepsilon(z) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow T_z \partial\Sigma_\varepsilon^A \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  given by*

$$\Pi_\varepsilon(z)\xi = \xi - (\xi \cdot \nu(z))\nu(z), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

*Then*

$$\frac{(2^{-1} \min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\})^d}{2 \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\}} \leq \det(\Pi_\varepsilon \circ J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi \circ \Pi_\varepsilon) \leq \frac{(2 \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\})^d}{2^{-1} \min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\}}.$$

*Proof.* Let us prove *i)*. To ease the notations, we call  $P = A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Denote  $P = (p_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$  and  $L = \|P\|_{C^1(B_1)}$ . Let  $z_1, z_2 \in B_{R_1}$ , where  $0 < R_1 \leq 1$  will be specified later. Obviously

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(z_1) - \Phi(z_2)| &\leq |x_1 - x_2| + |(P(z_1) - P(z_2))y_1| + |P(z_2)(y_1 - y_2)| \\ &\leq |x_1 - x_2| + L|z_1 - z_2| + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}|y_1 - y_2| \leq c|z_1 - z_2|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c > 0$  depends only on  $L, \lambda$ .

By similar computations,

$$|P(z_1)y_1 - P(z_2)y_2| \geq |P(z_1)(y_1 - y_2)| - |(P(z_1) - P(z_2))y_2| \geq \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}|y_1 - y_2| - L|z_1 - z_2||y_2|,$$

hence,

$$|\Phi(z_1) - \Phi(z_2)| \geq \min\{1, \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}|z_1 - z_2| - LR_1|z_1 - z_2| \geq c^{-1}|z_1 - z_2|,$$

by choosing  $R_1 > 0$  small enough, such that  $\min\{1, \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\} - LR_1 > c^{-1}$ . Then, (A.14) follows and the map  $\Phi$  is injective.

Let us prove *ii)*. The Jacobian of  $\Phi$  is given by

$$J_\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{d-n} & 0 \\ P_x & P + P_y \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$P_x = (p_{ij}^x)_{i=1,\dots,n,j=1,\dots,d-n} \quad p_{ij}^x = \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_{x_j} p_{i,k}(z) y_k,$$

$$P_y = (p_{ij}^y)_{i,j=1,\dots,n} \quad p_{ij}^y = \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_{y_j} p_{i,k}(z) y_k.$$

We compute (recall that  $P = A_3^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  is invertible)

$$(A.15) \quad \det J_\Phi = \det(P + P_y) = \det(P) \det(\mathbb{I}_n + P^{-1}P_y).$$

First we notice that, thanks to (A.2), it holds

$$(A.16) \quad \Lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}} \leq \det P(z) \leq \lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Let now  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n,n}}$  be a chosen matrix norm. We have

$$\|P^{-1}P_y\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n,n}} \leq \|P^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n,n}} \|P_y\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n,n}} \leq cL^2|y|.$$

Since the determinant is continuous with respect to any matrix norm, we infer that there exists  $R_2 \leq R_1$  such that for every  $z \in B_{R_2}$  it holds

$$(A.17) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \det(\mathbb{I}_n + P^{-1}P_y) \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

By (A.15), (A.16) and (A.17) we readily get that

$$(A.18) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}} \leq \det J_\Phi(z) \leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda^{-\frac{n}{2}}$$

holds for every  $z \in B_{R_2}$ , thus proving *ii*).

Let now prove *iii*). Call  $M = J_\Phi^\top J_\Phi$ . Obviously,  $M$  is symmetric and thanks to (A.18) is invertible in  $B_{R_2}$ . Moreover, via a straightforward computation (recall that  $P$  is symmetric and  $P^2 = A_3^{-1}$ ) we find that  $M = M_1 + M_2$  where

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{d-n} & 0 \\ 0 & A_3^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} P_x^\top P_x & (P + P_y)^\top P_x \\ P_x^\top (P + P_y) & P^\top P_y + P_y^\top P + P_y^\top P_y \end{pmatrix}.$$

We immediately see that there exists a constant  $c = c(L) > 0$  such that

$$\|M_2\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d,d}} \leq c|y|.$$

Moreover, thanks to (A.1) we have

$$\min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\} |\zeta|^2 \leq M_1(z) \zeta \cdot \zeta \leq \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\} |\zeta|^2.$$

Thus

$$(\min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\} - c|y|) |\zeta|^2 \leq M(z) \zeta \cdot \zeta \leq (\max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\} + c|y|) |\zeta|^2.$$

Hence, there exists  $R \leq R_2$  such that for every  $z \in B_R$  the matrix  $M$  satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} \min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\} |\zeta|^2 \leq M(z) \zeta \cdot \zeta \leq 2 \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\} |\zeta|^2 \quad \text{for every } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

As for *iv*), let us call  $N = \Pi_\varepsilon \circ M \circ \Pi_\varepsilon$ . We can represent  $\Pi_\varepsilon$  via a  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1,d}$  matrix  $Q$ . Thus,  $N = QMQ^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1,d-1}$ . By the Cauchy interlacing theorem (also known as Poincaré separation theorem), the eigenvalues  $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1,\dots,d}$  of  $M$  are related to the eigenvalues  $\{\tilde{\mu}_i\}_{i=1,\dots,d-1}$  of  $N$  via the formula

$$\mu_{i+1} \leq \tilde{\mu}_i \leq \mu_i.$$

Therefore, using *iii*), we infer

$$\frac{(2^{-1} \min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\})^d}{2 \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\}} \leq \frac{\det M}{\mu_1} \leq \det N \leq \frac{\det M}{\mu_d} \leq \frac{(2 \max\{1, \lambda^{-1}\})^d}{2^{-1} \min\{1, \Lambda^{-1}\}}.$$

This completes the proof of *iv*) and of the lemma. □

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Susanna Terracini for many fruitful discussions on the topic. The authors are research fellows of Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica INDAM group GNAMPA and supported by the GNAMPA project E5324001950001 *PDE ellittiche che degenerano su varietà di dimensione bassa e frontiere libere molto sottili*. G.C. is supported by the PRIN project 20227HX33Z *Pattern formation in nonlinear phenomena*. S.V. is supported by the PRIN project 2022R537CS *NO<sup>3</sup> - Nodal Optimization, Nonlinear elliptic equations, Nonlocal geometric problems, with a focus on regularity*.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] L. Abatangelo, A. Ferrero and P. Luzzini, *On solutions to a class of degenerate equations with the Grushin operator*, Preprint (2024), arXiv:2410.12637.
- [2] A. Audrito, G. Fioravanti and S. Vita, *Schauder estimates for parabolic equations with degenerate or singular weights*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **63** (2024), no. 8, Paper No. 204, 46 pp.
- [3] A. Audrito, G. Fioravanti and S. Vita, *Higher order Schauder estimates for parabolic equations with degenerate or singular weights*, to appear in Rev. Mat. Iberoam. (2024), arXiv:2403.08575.
- [4] D. Bakry, T. Coulhon, M. Ledoux and L. Saloff-Coste, *Sobolev inequalities in disguise*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **44** (1995), no. 4, 1033–1074.
- [5] L. Caffarelli, *The regularity of free boundaries in higher dimensions*, Acta Math. **139** (1977), no. 3-4, 155–184.
- [6] L. Caffarelli, *Further regularity for the Signorini problem*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **4** (1979), no. 9, 1067–1075.
- [7] L. Caffarelli, R. V. Kohn and L. Nirenberg, *First order interpolation inequalities with weights*, Compositio Math. **53** (1984), no. 3, 259–275.
- [8] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **32** (2007), no. 7-9, 1245–1260.
- [9] L. Caffarelli and P. Stinga, *Fractional elliptic equations, Caccioppoli estimates and regularity*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire **33** (2016), no. 3, 767–807.
- [10] H. Castro, *Hardy-Sobolev-type inequalities with monomial weights*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **196** (2017), no. 2, 579–598.
- [11] S.-Y. A. Chang and M. M. González, *Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry*, Adv. Math. **226** (2011), no. 2, 1410–1432.
- [12] J. L. Chern and C. S. Lin, *Minimizers of Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities with the singularity on the boundary*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **197** (2010), no. 2, 401–432.
- [13] G. Cora, G. Fioravanti and S. Vita. In preparation (2024).

- [14] G. Cora and R. Musina, *The  $s$ -polyharmonic extension problem and higher-order fractional Laplacians*, J. Funct. Anal. **283** (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 109555, 33 pp.
- [15] G. Cora, R. Musina and A. I. Nazarov, *Hardy type inequalities with mixed weights in cones*, to appear in Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (2024), DOI: doi.org/10.2422/2036-2145.202305\_013.
- [16] T. Coulhon, A. A. Grigor'yan and D. Levin, *On isoperimetric profiles of product spaces*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003), no. 1, 85–120.
- [17] B. Dahlberg, *Estimates of harmonic measure*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **65** (1977), no. 3, 275–288.
- [18] Z. Dai, J. Feneuil and S. Mayboroda, *The regularity problem in domains with lower dimensional boundaries*, J. Funct. Anal. **284** (2023), no. 11, Paper No. 109903, 72 pp.
- [19] G. David, J. Feneuil and S. Mayboroda, *Dahlberg's theorem in higher co-dimension*, J. Funct. Anal. **276** (2019), no. 9, 2731–2820.
- [20] G. David, J. Feneuil and S. Mayboroda, *Elliptic theory for sets with higher co-dimensional boundaries*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **274** (2021), no. 1346, vi+123 pp.
- [21] G. David and S. Mayboroda, *Approximation of Green functions and domains with uniformly rectifiable boundaries of all dimensions*, Adv. Math. **410** (2022), Paper No. 108717, 52 pp.
- [22] D. De Silva and O. Savin, *A note on higher regularity boundary Harnack inequality*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **35** (2015), no. 12, 6155–6163.
- [23] L. Dieci, A. Papini and A. Pugliese, *Decompositions and coalescing eigenvalues of symmetric definite pencils depending on parameters*, Numer. Algorithms **91** (2022), no. 4, 1879–1910.
- [24] H. Dong, S. Jeon and S. Vita, *Schauder type estimates for degenerate or singular elliptic equations with DMO coefficients*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **63** (2024), no. 9, Paper No. 239, 42 pp.
- [25] H. Dong and T. Phan, *Parabolic and elliptic equations with singular or degenerate coefficients: the Dirichlet problem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **374** (2021), no. 9, 6611–6647.
- [26] H. Dong and T. Phan, *On parabolic and elliptic equations with singular or degenerate coefficients*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **72** (2023), no. 4, 1461–1502.
- [27] L. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, second edition, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 19, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [28] E. Fabes, D. Jerison and C. Kenig, *The Wiener test for degenerate elliptic equations*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **32** (1982), no. 3, vi, 151–182.
- [29] E. Fabes, D. Jerison and C. Kenig, *Boundary behavior of solutions to degenerate elliptic equations*, In Conference on harmonic analysis in honor of Antoni Zygmund, Vol. I, II (Chicago, Ill., 1981), 577–589, Wadsworth Math. Ser., Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, 1983.
- [30] E. Fabes, C. Kenig and R. Serapioni, *The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **7** (1982), no. 1, 77–116.
- [31] V. Felli, L. Liverani and R. Ognibene, *Quantitative spectral stability for the Neumann Laplacian in domains with small holes*, J. Funct. Anal. **288** (2025), no. 6, Paper No. 110817.
- [32] X. Fernández-Real and Y. Jhaveri, *On the singular set in the thin obstacle problem: higher order blow-ups and the very thin obstacle problem*, Anal. PDE **14** (2021), no. 5, 1599–1669.
- [33] G. Fioravanti, *The Dirichlet problem on lower dimensional boundaries: Schauder estimates via perforated domains*, Preprint (2024) arXiv:2412.11294.
- [34] N. Garofalo, *Unique continuation for a class of elliptic operators which degenerate on a manifold of arbitrary codimension*, J. Differential Equations **104** (1993), no. 1, 117–146.
- [35] A. A. Grigor'yan, *Isoperimetric inequalities for Riemannian products*, Math. Notes **38** (1985), 849–854.
- [36] Q. Han and J. Xie, *Optimal boundary regularity for uniformly degenerate elliptic equations*, Preprint (2024) arXiv:2411.16418
- [37] Q. Han and J. Xie, *Uniformly degenerate elliptic equations with varying characteristic exponents*, Preprint (2024) arXiv:2411.17016
- [38] J. Heinonen, T. Kilpeläinen and O. Martio, *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*, Dover, Mineola, NY, 2006.

- [39] Y. Hu, W. Wu, D. Yang and J. Zhong, *Approximation of elliptic equations with interior single-point degeneracy and its application to weak unique continuation property*, Preprint (2025) arXiv:2501.10923.
- [40] T. Kilpeläinen, *Weighted Sobolev spaces and capacity*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. **19** (1994), no. 1, 95–113.
- [41] Y.-Y. Li and G. Tian, *Nonexistence of axially symmetric, stationary solution of Einstein Vacuum Equation with disconnected symmetric event horizon*, Manuscripta Math. **73** (1991), no. 1, 83–89.
- [42] Y.-Y. Li and G. Tian, *Regularity of harmonic maps with prescribed singularities*, Comm. Math. Phys. **149** (1992), no. 1, 1–30.
- [43] Y.-Y. Li and G. Tian, *Harmonic maps with prescribed singularities*, in *Differential geometry: partial differential equations on manifolds (Los Angeles, CA, 1990)*, 317–326, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 54, Part 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- [44] F.-H. Lin, *On the Dirichlet problem for minimal graphs in hyperbolic space*, Invent. Math. **96** (1989), no. 3, 593–612.
- [45] F. Maggi, *Sets of Finite Perimeter and Geometric Variational Problems: An Introduction to Geometric Measure Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 135, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [46] V. G. Maz'ya, *Sobolev spaces with applications to elliptic partial differential equations*, second, revised and augmented edition, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 342, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [47] R. Mazzeo, *Elliptic theory of differential edge operators I*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **16** (1991), no. 10, 1615–1664.
- [48] R. Mazzeo and B. Vertman, *Elliptic theory of differential edge operators, II: boundary value problems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **63** (2014), no. 6, 1911–1955.
- [49] A. Nekvinda, *Characterization of traces of the weighted Sobolev space  $W^{1,p}(\Omega, d_M^{\epsilon})$  on  $M$* , Czechoslovak Math. J. **43(118)** (1993), no. 4, 695–711.
- [50] L. Nguyen, *Singular harmonic maps and applications to general relativity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **301** (2011), no. 2, 411–441.
- [51] S. Ozawa, *Asymptotic property of an eigenfunction of the Laplacian under singular variation of domains - the Neumann condition*, Osaka J. Math. **22** (1985), 639–655.
- [52] L. C. Piccinini and S. Spagnolo, *On the Hölder continuity of solutions of second order elliptic equations in two variables*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3) **26** (1972), 391–402.
- [53] J. Rauch and M. Taylor, *Potential and scattering theory on wildly perturbed domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **18** (1975), 27–59.
- [54] L. Simon, *Schauder estimates by scaling*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **5** (1997), no. 5, 391–407.
- [55] Y. Sire, S. Terracini and S. Vita, *Liouville type theorems and regularity of solutions to degenerate or singular problems part I: even solutions*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **46** (2021), no. 2, 310–361.
- [56] Y. Sire, S. Terracini and S. Vita, *Liouville type theorems and regularity of solutions to degenerate or singular problems part II: odd solutions*, Math. Eng. **3** (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 5, 50 pp.
- [57] S. Terracini, G. Tortone and S. Vita, *Higher order boundary Harnack principle via degenerate equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **248** (2024), no. 2, Paper No. 29, 44 pp.
- [58] S. Terracini, G. Tortone and S. Vita, *A priori regularity estimates for equations degenerating on nodal sets*, Preprint (2024) arXiv:2404.06980.
- [59] G. Weinstein, *On rotating black holes in equilibrium in general relativity*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **43** (1990), no. 7, 903–948.
- [60] G. Weinstein, *The stationary axisymmetric two-body problem in general relativity*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **45** (1992), no. 9, 1183–1203.
- [61] C. Zhang, *On higher order boundary Harnack and analyticity of free boundaries*, Nonlinear Anal. **240** (2024), Paper No. 113471, 16 pp.
- [62] V. V. Zhikov, *Weighted Sobolev spaces*, Sb. Math. **189** (1998), no. 7-8, 1139–1170.

GABRIELE CORA  
DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUE  
UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES  
BOULEVARD DU TRIOMPHE 155, 1050, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM  
*Email address:* gabriele.cora@ulb.be

GABRIELE FIORAVANTI  
DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA "G. PEANO"  
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO  
VIA CARLO ALBERTO 10, 10124, TORINO, ITALY  
*Email address:* gabriele.fioravanti@unito.it

STEFANO VITA  
DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA "F. CASORATI"  
UNIVERSITÀ DI PAVIA  
VIA FERRATA 5, 27100, PAVIA, ITALY  
*Email address:* stefano.vita@unipv.it