

BOUNDARY REGULARITY AND HOPF LEMMA FOR NONDEGENERATE STABLE OPERATORS

FLORIAN GRUBE

ABSTRACT. We prove sharp boundary Hölder regularity for solutions to equations involving stable integro-differential operators in bounded open sets satisfying the exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property. This result is new even for the fractional Laplacian. A Hopf-type boundary lemma is proven, too. An additional feature of this work is that the regularity estimate is robust as $s \rightarrow 1-$ and we recover the classical results for second order equations.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of boundary regularity for solutions to partial differential equations involving second order operators has been a consistent topic of research in the last hundred years.

In particular, it is well known that solutions to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= f \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

for a sufficiently regular domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ are Lipschitz continuous up to the boundary. However, the regularity of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ plays a key in this result. In particular, if $\partial\Omega$ is only Lipschitz continuous, then the solution u is at most Hölder continuous for some Hölder exponent, see [FR22, p.71]. This raises the question: what regularity of $\partial\Omega$ is required such that solutions are still globally Lipschitz? In the late 70s and 80s the optimal condition was found. In [KK73, KK74] it was shown that under the assumption that Ω satisfies an exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at every boundary point, the solution to (1.1) is Lipschitz continuous on $\bar{\Omega}$. Moreover, as is proven in [KK74, Theorem 2], this property is not just sufficient but also necessary.

In this article, we study nondegenerate $2s$ -stable integro-differential operators

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu^s u(x) &:= \text{p. v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u(x) - u(x+h)) \nu_s(dh) \quad \text{for } u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \nu_s(U) &:= (1-s) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{S^{d-1}} \mathbb{1}_U(x+r\theta) \mu(d\theta) dr \quad \text{for } U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Here, $s \in (0, 1)$, μ is a finite measure on the unit sphere S^{d-1} , i.e. there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that $\mu(S^{d-1}) \leq \Lambda$, and we assume that μ satisfies the nondegeneracy assumption

$$\lambda \leq \inf_{w \in S^{d-1}} \int_{S^{d-1}} |w \cdot \theta|^{2s} \mu(d\theta) \tag{1.3}$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47G20, 35B65, 35S15, 35R09, 60G52.

Key words and phrases. Nonlocal, boundary regularity, stable operator, fractional Laplace, Dini continuity.

for some positive λ . These operators are translation invariant, symmetric, and scale with a factor of power $2s$, i.e. $A_\mu^s[u(r\cdot)](x) = r^{2s}A_\mu^s u(rx)$. They are nonlocal in the sense that for a function $u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the support of $A_\mu^s u$ may not be a subset of the support of u itself.

The class of nondegenerate $2s$ -stable operators includes the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^s$, when μ is the uniform distribution. Moreover, the nondegeneracy condition (1.3) together with the finiteness of μ yields the comparability of the Fourier-symbol of A_μ^s with that of the fractional Laplacian, namely $|\xi|^{2s}$. Another example in the class of operators under consideration is the sum of 1-dimensional fractional Laplacians $\sum_{i=1}^d (-\partial_i^2)^s$. This example is recovered when choosing μ to be a sum of Dirac-measures in all coordinate directions.

We investigate the boundary regularity of solutions u to

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu^s u &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \Omega^c, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

In some of the following results, we need the following assumption on the Lévy-measure ν_s :

The measure ν_s has a density with respect to Lebesgue's measure and

$$\nu_s(x) \leq (1-s)\Lambda |x|^{-d-2s}. \tag{pUB}$$

Now, we state our main results.

Theorem 1.1 (Boundary regularity I). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded, open set that satisfies the uniform exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property. We fix some $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$ and assume (pUB) or $s_0 > 1/2$. There exists a positive constant C such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$, any measure μ on the sphere satisfying (1.3) and $\mu(S^{d-1}) \leq \Lambda$, any $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and any weak solution u to (1.4) the solution u is Hölder continuous, i.e. $u \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and satisfies the bound*

$$\|u\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \tag{1.5}$$

The definition of $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domains is given in Definition 2.1. The notion of the exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property is introduced in Definition 2.5.

Theorem 1.1 enhances existing results on boundary regularity which assume a stronger $C^{1,\alpha}$ -condition on the boundary of Ω , see [FR24, RS16b] and the detailed discussion in Subsection 1.1. Moreover, the estimate (1.5) is robust as $s \rightarrow 1-$.

Whenever s is smaller or equal $1/2$, we make an interesting observation in the case when the Lévy-measure ν_s is singular with respect to Lebesgue's measure, i.e. (pUB) does not hold. In this case, we need a slightly stronger assumption on the set Ω than the exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property. Instead, we introduce the concept of $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domains, see Definition 2.2. This class of domains is only slightly more restrictive than $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domains and, in particular, it includes $C^{1,\alpha}$ -domains for any $\alpha > 0$. This distinction between singular and non-singular Lévy-measures ν_s for $s \leq 1/2$ is in contrast to previous results on boundary regularity in [RS16b].

The following theorem is the resulting boundary regularity in this case.

Theorem 1.2 (Boundary regularity II). *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$. We fix a bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfies the exterior $2s_0$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property uniformly. There exists a positive constant C such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$, any measure μ on the sphere satisfying (1.3) and $\mu(S^{d-1}) \leq \Lambda$, any $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and any weak solution u to (1.4) the solution satisfies $u \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and the bound (1.5).*

Remark 1.3. Instead of weak solutions in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 we can also treat continuous distributional solutions. The common ingredient is the access to a maximum principle to compare the solutions to a barrier function, see e.g. [Sil07] and [FR24, Lemma 2.3.5].

Remark 1.4. The different assumptions on the boundary of the domain Ω in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are due to Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 5.3.

Remark 1.5. It is known that Theorem 1.1 is false for Lipschitz domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. More precisely, whenever the set Ω has an inward corner the solution u decays slower than $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)^s$ in the corner. This can be observed by studying s -harmonic functions in cones and their decay behavior near the apex, see [BB04] and [Mic06, Lemma 3.3].

Remark 1.6. It is an interesting problem for further research whether the assumptions on the domain Ω in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, i.e. the $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property respectively $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property, are necessary.

One phenomenon is of particular interest to us. After choosing appropriate normalization constants, the operators A_μ^s converge to constant-coefficient, second order operators $A \cdot D^2$ in the limit $s \rightarrow 1-$. Starting with the article [BBM01] and based on this observation, there has been considerable interest in Dirichlet problems like (1.4) and the study of the asymptotics as $s \rightarrow 1-$. A feature of this work is that the boundary regularity estimates are robust as $s \rightarrow 1-$, see e.g. (1.5) and (6.8).

In this article, we also prove a Hopf-type boundary lemma for super-solutions u to $A_\mu^s u \geq 0$. The classical Hopf boundary lemma, see [Hop52], says that a superharmonic, nontrivial function in a sufficiently regular domain has a positive inward normal derivative at the boundary, i.e.

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \frac{u(z + \varepsilon n_z) - u(z)}{\varepsilon} > 0$$

where z is a point in the boundary of the domain and n_z is the inward normal vector at z . We refer the interested reader to the exposition on classical Hopf boundary lemmata in [AN22]. Hopf boundary lemmata are known for solutions to equations involving second order operators in domains satisfying the interior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property, see [KK73], [KK74], [KK80], and [Lie85]. Within these references, it is also proven that the $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ assumption is sharp.

In the last decade, there have been several works in which Hopf-type boundary lemmata are proven for nonlocal operators. An early contribution in this regard is [CRS10, Proposition 2.7 ii)] which proves that a nonnegative, nontrivial s -harmonic function can be bounded from below by $C((x - z) \cdot n_z)^s$ at a boundary point z where u vanishes. The best known result for the class of nondegenerate $2s$ -stable operators in terms of boundary regularity is $C^{1,\alpha}$, see [FR24]. A more detailed exposition of nonlocal Hopf lemmata can be found in the Subsection 1.1.

Proposition 1.7 (Hopf boundary lemma). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$. We assume one of the following three properties:*

- (1) Ω satisfies the interior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Omega$ and (pUB),
- (2) Ω satisfies the interior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Omega$ and $s > 1/2$,
- (3) Ω satisfies the interior $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Omega$.

There exist positive constants C, ε_0 such that for any finite measure μ on the unit sphere satisfying (1.3) and any distributional super-solution $u \in C(B_1 \cap \Omega)$ to

$$\begin{aligned} A_s u &\geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega \cap B_1, \\ u &\geq 0 \text{ on } (\Omega \cap B_1)^c, \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

the function u is either zero or there exists a constant C such that $u(x) \geq C|x - z|^s$ for any $x \in B_{1/2} \cap \Omega$ inside of a non-tangential cone with apex at z .

We provide a greater variety of Hopf-type boundary estimates with a more detailed analysis of the constant C in Subsection 6.2.

1.1. Related literature. A typical approach to prove optimal boundary regularity entails the construction of appropriate barrier functions which describe the boundary behavior of solutions to (1.4). These functions were observed in [Get61], but we also refer to [Lan72], [CS98], [CKS10], [Dyd12], and [BGR15]. An early approach to boundary regularity, a boundary Harnack principle, was proved in [Bog97]. In [RS14], it was proved that given a bounded Lipschitz-domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the exterior ball property and an essentially bounded function f the solution u to

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s u &= f \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \Omega^c \end{aligned}$$

is C^s -Hölder-continuous on \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, this result is optimal in terms of global Hölder regularity of the solution u . This result was improved in [Gru14, Gru15] wherein a variety of regularity results was proved for equations involving pseudo-differential operators of fractional order. The Theorem 1.1 for the full class of nondegenerate stable operators in $C^{1,1}$ -domains was proved in [RS16b]. This was extended to $C^{1,\alpha}$ -domains in the recent book [FR24]. Fine boundary regularity properties for equations involving nonlinear nonlocal integro-differential operators were treated in [RS16a]. In [RS17], the authors considered $2s$ -stable operators where the measure μ has a bounded density with respect to the surface measure. They treated $C^{1,\alpha}$ as well as C^1 -domains. In the latter case, they proved solutions to be Hölder continuous for some Hölder exponent. Moreover, they treated extremal operators. In the articles [CK02, Che18, Fal22], the authors considered the regional fractional Laplacian and proved boundary regularity for solutions to equations involving it. In the articles [CS11, KKP16, AR20, FR24, RW24], the authors studied operators with kernels comparable to the fractional Laplacian, i.e.

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

where $\lambda|h|^{-d-2s} \leq k(h) \leq \Lambda|h|^{-d-2s}$. In particular, they proved boundary regularity of solutions to equations involving L_k . In [AR20], the authors proved optimal boundary regularity estimates of the quotient $u/\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)^s$ in $C^{k,\alpha}$ -domains. In [CS11, KKP16, FR24], it was proved that solutions u to $L_k u = f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $u = 0$ on Ω^c are globally Hölder-continuous with some Hölder exponent. This was extended in [RW24]. There, the optimal C^s -Hölder regularity was established. The case of non-translation invariant kernels $k(x, y)$ was treated in the article [KW24]. In $C^{1,\alpha}$ -domains and under the assumption that the kernel is Hölder continuous, see [KW24, (1.3)], the authors proved optimal C^s -regularity, see [KW24, Theorem 1.6]. The Dirichlet problem for the logarithmic Laplacian was studied in [CW19]. In particular, they proved boundary regularity by constructing appropriate barriers. This was improved in the recent article [HLS25] where optimal boundary regularity was shown. Boundary Hölder regularity for solutions to the Dirichlet problem involving the fractional p -Laplacian was studied in [IMS16]. In this context of nonlinear nonlocal operators and results on boundary regularity, we also refer to [KKP16], [FBSV22], [GKS23], and [IM24] and the references therein. Mixed local and nonlocal operators were treated in [BDVV22].

Higher order expansions and regularity of $u/\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)^s$ for solutions u to problems like (1.4) were studied in [RS14, Gru14, Gru15, RS16a, RS16b, RS17, Fal19, FR24, RW24].

The first Hopf lemma for equations involving nonlocal operators was proved in the article [CRS10, Proposition 2.7 ii)]. Therein, the Hopf lemma was observed for s -harmonic functions in smooth domains. The first inhomogeneous Hopf lemma for the fractional Laplacian was proved in [FJ15, Proposition 3.3], [IMS15, Lemma 2.7]. In the former, they treated equations with zeroth-order right-hand sides and domains satisfying the interior ball condition. In the latter article, the authors studied super s -harmonic functions in $C^{1,1}$ -domains. For domains with interior ball condition and super-solutions u to $(-\Delta)^s u(x) \geq c(x)u(x)$, the Hopf lemma was proved in [GS16]. The Hopf lemma for the fractional p -Laplacian was studied in [DQ17, CLQ20]. The class of nonlocal operators of the form $\psi(-\Delta)$ was considered in [BL21]. In [AC23], mixed local and nonlocal operators were treated. The Hopf lemma for the class of nondegenerate 2s-stable operators in $C^{1,\alpha}$ -domains was proved in the recent book [FR24]. In [RW24, Theorem 1.1] and [KW24, (1.8)], the authors considered operators with kernels which are comparable to $|\cdot|^{-d-2s}$ in $C^{1,\alpha}$ -domains. The former includes a Hopf lemma for translation invariant operators in $C^{1,\alpha}$ -domains and the latter non-translation invariant operators with Hölder continuous kernels.

1.2. The main obstruction in comparison to previous proofs. A typical proof of the C^s -boundary regularity combines known interior regularity estimates with a decay bound of the form $|u(x)| \leq C d_\Omega(x)^s = C \text{dist}(x, \Omega^c)^s$ for the solution u to (1.4). This bound can be proven with the help of appropriate barrier functions.

Usually the barrier is constructed as $d_\Omega^s - c d_\Omega^{s+\varepsilon}$, see [FR24, Section B.2]. Let us briefly explain why this choice does not work in $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domains.

In $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the main observations are

$$|(-\Delta)^s d_\Omega^s| \lesssim d_\Omega^{\alpha-s} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (\text{a})$$

$$(-\Delta)^s d_\Omega^{s+\varepsilon} \lesssim -d_\Omega^{\varepsilon-s} < 0 \text{ near } \partial\Omega \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (\text{b})$$

The property (a) is mainly due to t_+^s being an s -harmonic function in \mathbb{R}_+ . The property (b) essentially uses $(-\Delta)_\mathbb{R}^s t_+^{s+\varepsilon} \lesssim -t^{\varepsilon-s}$ in \mathbb{R}_+ . Now, choosing $\varepsilon < \alpha$ yields an appropriate subharmonic barrier.

If Ω is merely a $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain with a modulus of continuity ω , then one proves

$$|(-\Delta)^s d_\Omega^s| \lesssim d_\Omega^{-s} \omega(d_\Omega)$$

in place of (a). But, the estimate (b) remains the same. Since $\omega(t)$ may converge much slower to zero than t^ε as $t \rightarrow 0+$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, a sign of $(-\Delta)^s [d_\Omega^s - c d_\Omega^{s+\varepsilon}]$ cannot be guaranteed. Indeed, we need a replacement for $d_\Omega^{s+\varepsilon}$, see Proposition 5.7.

Outlook. In Section 2, we introduce basic notation, spaces, and, most importantly, the definition of domain regularities, see Definition 2.1, Definition 2.2, and Definition 2.5. Robust as $s \rightarrow 1-$ interior regularity estimates are proven in Section 3. Similar to the observations on the functions t_+^s and $t_+^{s+\varepsilon}$, see Subsection 1.2, we provide a new subharmonic function in \mathbb{R}_+ which replaces $t_+^{s+\varepsilon}$ in Section 4. In Section 5, we combine the one-dimensional observations with regularized distance functions to construct the barrier functions. In Section 6, we prove Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2, Proposition 1.7 and, additionally, provide a variety of related boundary estimates.

Acknowledgements. Financial support by the German Research Foundation (GRK 2235 - 282638148) is gratefully acknowledged. The author is grateful to Thorben Hensiek, Solveig Hepp, and Moritz Kassmann for valuable comments on the manuscript.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce basic definitions and notation used throughout this work. In particular, the concept of the interior-/exterior- $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property and $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domains are defined.

We use $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$. Moreover, a_+ denotes the positive part of a , i.e. $a \vee 0$. We write $A \lesssim B$ if there exists a positive constant C such that $A \leq CB$. We use the notation $x = (x', x_d)$ with $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $x_d \in \mathbb{R}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the distance of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to Ω^c via $d_\Omega(x) := \text{dist}(x, \Omega^c) = \inf\{|x - y| \mid y \in \Omega^c\}$. In Section 5, we need a regularized version of the distance function d_D for a fixed domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. This is denoted by \mathfrak{d} , see (5.4).

The space of Hölder continuous functions on $\overline{\Omega}$ for a given set Ω is written as $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover, it is equipped with the norm $\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{C^{\lfloor \alpha \rfloor}(\Omega)} + \max_{|\beta|=\lfloor \alpha \rfloor} [\partial^\beta u]_{C^{\alpha-\lfloor \alpha \rfloor}(\Omega)}$ where

$$[v]_{C^s(\Omega)} := \sup_{x, y \in \Omega} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^s}$$

for $s \in (0, 1)$. Here, we use the notation $\|u\|_{C^k(\Omega)} := \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |\partial^\beta u(x)|$.

The operators A_μ^s induce a bilinear form for a fixed set Ω given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\nu_s}(u, v) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{(\Omega^c \cap \Omega^e)^c}(x, x+h)(u(x) - u(x+h))(v(x) - v(x+h))\nu_s(dh)dx.$$

This is a direct consequence of a nonlocal Gauß-Green-type identity. The form \mathcal{E}_{ν_s} allows to study operators like A_μ^s with Hilbert-space methods, see e.g. [SV14], [FKV15], and [Rut18].

We say that a function u is a weak solution to the equation $A_\mu^s u = f$ in Ω and $u = 0$ on Ω^c , i.e. (1.4), if $u \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{E}_{\nu_s}(u, u) < \infty$, $u = 0$ on Ω^c , and the equation

$$\mathcal{E}_{\nu_s}(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} f(x)v(x)dx$$

holds for any function $v \in L^2(\Omega)$ with $v = 0$ on Ω^c and $\mathcal{E}_{\nu_s}(v, v) < \infty$.

We say that a function u is a distributional solution to the exterior value problem (1.4), if $u \in L^1(\Omega) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \nu_s^*(x)dx)$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x)A_\mu^s \eta(x)dx = \int_{\Omega} f(x)\eta(x)dx$$

for any $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$. Here, the function ν_s^* is a weight adapted to s, μ , and Ω introduced in [GH23, (12)] such that $uA_\mu^s \eta$ is integrable over \mathbb{R}^d . In [GHS24], the measure ν_s^* was considered. The authors proved Sobolev regularity for solutions to Dirichlet problems involving $2s$ -stable operators A_μ^s with $L^2(\Omega^c, \nu_s^*(x)dx)$ -exterior data.

Next, we introduce the properties on domains and their boundary used throughout this work.

Definition 2.1. We say an open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a uniform $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain if

- 1) there exists a modulus of continuity $\omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ that is continuous, nondecreasing, sublinear, i.e. $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega(t) < \infty$, satisfies $\omega(0) = 0$, and

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} dt < \infty, \quad (2.1)$$

- 2) there exists a uniform localization radius $\rho > 0$ and a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that for any $z \in \partial D$ there exists a rotation R , a translation T_z that maps z to the origin, and a C^1 -map $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\|\phi\|_{C^1} \leq C$ and

$$\begin{aligned} T_z R D \cap B_1 &= \{(x', x_d) \in B_1(0) \mid \phi(x') > x_d\}, \\ |\nabla \phi(y') - \nabla \phi(x')| &\leq \omega(|y' - x'|). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2. We say an open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a uniform $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain if D satisfies all assumptions from Definition 2.1 but (2.1) is replaced with

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} \frac{\omega(t)^{2s-1} - \omega(1)^{2s-1}}{1 - 2s} dt < \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

If $s = 1/2$, then this is to be understood as

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\omega(t)}{t} \ln \left(\frac{\omega(1)}{\omega(t)} \right) dt < \infty.$$

Remark 2.3. If $s > 1/2$, then the assumption (2.2) is equivalent to (2.1). For all $0 < s < 1$, the assumption (2.2) implies (2.1).

Lemma 2.4. *If the function ω satisfies (2.2) for some s_0 , then it also satisfies (2.2) for any $s \geq s_0$.*

Proof. For $s_0 \geq 1/2$ the statement is trivial. It remains to prove the statement for $0 < s_0 < s \leq 1/2$. In the case $s < 1/2$, notice that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\omega(t)^{2s_0-1} - \omega(1)^{2s_0-1}}{1 - 2s_0} \frac{1 - 2s}{\omega(t)^{2s-1} - \omega(1)^{2s-1}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1 - 2s}{1 - 2s_0} \frac{\omega(t)^{2s_0-1}}{\omega(t)^{2s-1}} = \infty$$

since $\omega(0) = 0$. Thus, there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\omega(t)^{2s_0-1} - \omega(1)^{2s_0-1}}{1 - 2s_0} \geq \frac{\omega(t)^{2s-1} - \omega(1)^{2s-1}}{1 - 2s}$$

for all $0 < t < t_1$. For $s = 1/2$ we argue similarly. \square

Definition 2.5. We say an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies the

- i) exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in \partial\Omega$ if there exists a uniform $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain $D \supset \Omega$ that touches Ω only in z ,
- ii) interior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in \partial\Omega$ if there exists a uniform $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain $D \subset \Omega$ that touches Ω only in z .
- iii) The respective interior / exterior $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property are equivalently defined using Definition 2.2.

- iv) An open set satisfies the interior / exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}/2s\text{-}C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property uniformly if there exists a uniform modulus of continuity, localization radius, and diameter of the $C^{1,\text{dini}}/2s\text{-}C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domains for the interior / exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at all boundary points.

The definitions *i*) and *ii*) from Definition 2.5 are just as in [Lie85, p.346].

3. ROBUST INTERIOR REGULARITY

In this section, we prove interior regularity results which, together with the boundary estimates in Section 6, prove the main boundary regularity estimate, see (1.5).

The proofs in this section are robust in s adaptations of [RS16b, Lemma 3.1, Proposition 3.3, Theorem 1.1 (a)]. Robust estimates like these for a different class of nonlinear problems were proved in [RS16a, Lemma 7.5].

The proof of the interior regularity is based on a compactness result and a Liouville-type theorem. For this, we need the following lemma to extract a weakly convergent subsequence from a blow up sequence constructed in Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.1 (Subsequence extraction). *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$ be fixed. Let $\{s_k\}$ be a sequence of real numbers in $[s_0, 1)$ and $\{\mu_k\}$ be a sequence of finite measures on the unit sphere S^{d-1} satisfying $\mu(S^{d-1}) \leq \Lambda$ and (1.3). There exists a subsequence $\{k_n\}$ such that the corresponding stable operators $\{A_{\mu_k}^{s_k}\}$ converge distributionally either to an operator A_μ^s of type (1.2), where μ satisfies $\mu(S^{d-1}) \leq \Lambda$ and the nondegeneracy assumption (1.3), or to an elliptic operator of second order with constant coefficient $-A \cdot D^2$ and ellipticity constants λ, Λ .*

Moreover, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain, $\{u_k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}, \{f_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ be sequences of functions satisfying $A_{\mu_k}^{s_k} u_k = f_k$ in the distributional sense in Ω . Assume further that these functions satisfy

- i*) $u_k \rightarrow u$ locally uniformly in \mathbb{R}^d ,
- ii*) $f_k \rightarrow f$ uniformly in Ω ,
- iii*) there exist C, ε independent of k such that u_k satisfies the uniform bound

$$|u_k(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{2s_k - \varepsilon}.$$

Then, the limit u satisfies either $A_\mu^s u = f$ or $A \cdot D^2 u = f$ in Ω in the distributional sense.

The proof is a minor adaption of [RS16b, Lemma 3.1]. Here, it is essential to know that operators like A_μ^s converge to second order operators as $s \rightarrow 1-$. This is discussed e.g. in [BBM01], [FKV20].

Proof. Every time we switch to a subsequence, we simply keep referring to it as the original sequence to ease notation.

Since $\{s_k\}$ is bounded, we find a convergent subsequence with limit $s \in [s_0, 1]$. We will need to distinguish the cases $s < 1$ and $s = 1$. Since the space of probability measures on the sphere is weakly compact, we find a subsequence of $\{\mu_k\}$ which converges weakly to a measure μ satisfying $\mu(S^{d-1}) \leq \Lambda$ and (1.3). We define the matrix $A := (a_{ij})$ via

$$a_{ij} := \frac{1}{2} \int_{S^{d-1}} \theta_i \theta_j \mu(d\theta).$$

If $s < 1$, then for any test function $\eta \in C_c^\infty$ the convergence $A_{\mu_k}^{s_k} \eta(x) \rightarrow A_\mu^s \eta(x)$ holds due to the weak convergence of the measures $\{\mu_k\}$. If $s = 1$, then we decompose $A_{\mu_k}^{s_k} \eta(x)$ as (I) + (II), where

$$(I) := (1 - s_k) \int_{(-1,1)} \int_{S^{d-1}} \frac{\eta(x) - \eta(x + r\theta)}{|r|^{1+2s_k}} \mu_k(d\theta) dr.$$

Thus, the term (II) vanishes in the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ since

$$|(II)| \leq (1 - s_k) 2 \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \mu(S^{d-1}) 2 \frac{1}{2s_k}.$$

For the term (I), we use a Taylor expansion of the test function η . Due to symmetry, the first order term vanishes. We find

$$(I) = -(1 - s_k) \frac{1}{2} \int_{(-1,1)} \int_{S^{d-1}} \frac{r\theta \cdot D^2 \eta(x) \cdot r\theta + R(r)}{|r|^{1+2s_k}} \mu_k(d\theta) dr.$$

The term with the remainder $R(r)$ vanishes with the same arguments as for (II). Thus, the term (I) converges to

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_{S^{d-1}} \theta \cdot D^2 \eta(x) \cdot \theta \mu(d\theta)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ due to the weak convergence of $\{\mu_k\}$ which is the desired result.

From now on we simply denote the limit operator of $A_{\mu_k}^{s_k}$ by L instead of switching between A_μ^s and $-A \cdot D^2$. Due to the regularity of η , the above arguments, and using dominated convergence, the sequence $A_{\mu_k}^{s_k} \eta$ converges locally uniformly to L . Finally, combining [GH23, (26), (12)] with the growth bound iii) and dominated convergence leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_k(x) A_{\mu_k}^{s_k}(x) dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u L \eta(x) dx.$$

Due to the uniform convergence of $\{f_k\}$ and $A_{\mu_k}^{s_k} u_k = f_k$ distributionally in Ω , the result follows. \square

The following proposition is an adaptation of [RS16b, Proposition 3.3]. Here, the dependencies of the constant in the estimate (3.1) are crucial. It is the main ingredient to prove Theorem 3.3.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$ be fixed. There exists a positive constant $C = C(s_0, \lambda, \Lambda)$ such that for all $s \in [s_0, 1)$, operators A_μ^s as in (1.2) satisfying (1.3), $f \in L^\infty(B_1)$, $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ solving $A_\mu^s u = f$ in B_1 in the pointwise sense the bound*

$$[u]_{C^{\alpha_i(s)}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|u\|_{C^{\beta_i(s, s_0)}(\mathbb{R}^d)}) \quad (3.1)$$

holds for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. Here, $\alpha_1(3/4) = 3/4$, $\alpha_2(3/4) = 5/4$, $\beta_1(s_0, 3/4) := s_0/2$, $\beta_2(s_0, 3/4) := 9/8$, and for both $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $s \in (s_0, 1) \setminus \{3/4\}$

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_i(s) := \begin{cases} s & \text{if } s \in [s_0, 3/4) \\ 5/3 s & \text{if } s \in (3/4, 1) \end{cases}, \quad \beta_i = \beta_i(s) = \beta_i(s, s_0) := \begin{cases} s_0/2 & \text{if } s \in [s_0, 3/4) \\ 9/8 & \text{if } s \in (3/4, 1) \end{cases}.$$

Proof. We prove the result by contradiction, very close to [RS16b, Proposition 3.3], and adapt whenever necessary. Assume that the statement is false. Thus, there exists $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$ and a sequence of real numbers $\{s_k\} \subset [s_0, 1)$, a sequence of measures $\{\mu_k\}$ on the unit

sphere satisfying (1.3) and $\mu(S^{d-1}) \leq \Lambda$, a sequence of functions $f_k \in L^\infty(B_1)$, $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ solving $A_{\mu_k}^{s_k} u_k = f_k$ in B_1 and

$$\|f_k\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|u_k\|_{C^{\beta_i(s_k)}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\|u_k\|_{C^{\alpha_i(s_k)}(B_{1/2})} \geq k. \quad (3.3)$$

for both $i = 1$ and $i = 2$.

Claim a. The expression

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{z \in B_{1/2}} \sup_{r > 0} r^{-\alpha_i(s_k) + \beta_i(s_k)} [u_k]_{C^{\beta_i(s_k)}(B_r(z))}$$

is infinite for both $i = 1$ and $i = 2$.

Assume the contrary, then there exists a positive constant c_1 such that for any $k, z, r, |h| < r$ we know

$$r^{-\alpha_i(s_k) + \beta_i(s_k)} \frac{|u_k(z+h) - u_k(z)|}{|h|^{\beta_i(s_k)}} \leq c_1.$$

Picking $|h| = r/2$ is a contradiction to (3.3). This proves claim a.

Now, we choose i . Since the sequence $\{s_k\}$ is bounded, we find a convergent subsequence with limit $s \in [s_0, 1]$. If $s \geq 3/4$, then we may pick another subsequence such that $s_k \geq 3/4$ for all k . If $s < 3/4$, then we pick another subsequence such that all s_k are strictly smaller than $3/4$. In both cases, we stick to the notation of the original sequence when referring to the aforementioned subsequence. Now, if $s \geq 3/4$, then we fix $i = 2$. Else we choose $i = 1$.

We define the function $\kappa(r) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ via

$$\kappa(r) := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{z \in B_{1/2}} \sup_{\tilde{r} > r} \tilde{r}^{-\alpha_i(s_k) + \beta_i(s_k)} [u_k]_{C^{\beta_i(s_k)}(B_{\tilde{r}}(z))}.$$

Notice that κ is nonincreasing and $\kappa(r)$ is finite for any $r > 0$ due to (3.2).

By the definition of κ , for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the term $\kappa(1/n)$ yields $\tilde{r}_n \geq 1/n$, $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $z_n \in B_{1/2}$ such that

$$\tilde{r}_n^{-\alpha_i(s_{k_n}) + \beta_i(s_{k_n})} [u_{k_n}]_{C^{\beta_i(s_{k_n})}(B_{\tilde{r}_n}(z_n))} \geq \frac{1}{2} \kappa(1/n) \geq \frac{\kappa(\tilde{r}_n)}{2}. \quad (3.4)$$

Now, we define a sequence of polynomials ρ_n of order i that are minimizing

$$\int_{B_{\tilde{r}_n}(z_n)} |u_{k_n}(x) - \rho_n(x - z_n)|^2 dx = \min_{\substack{q \text{ polynomial} \\ \text{of order } i-1}} \int_{B_{\tilde{r}_n}(z_n)} |u_{k_n}(x) - q(x - z_n)|^2 dx,$$

i.e. the projection of L^2 to the subspace of $(i-1)$ -th order polynomials. If $s < 3/4$, then $\rho_n = \int_{B_{r_n}(z_n)} u_{k_n}(x) dx$. If $s \geq 3/4$, then

$$\rho_n(x - z_n) = \int_{B_{r_n}(z_n)} u_{k_n}(y) dy + \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{d+2}{r_n^2} \int_{B_{r_n}(z_n)} u_{k_n}(y) (y_j - z_j) dy (x_j - z_j).$$

Furthermore, we define the sequence of functions $\{v_n\}$ via

$$v_n(x) := \frac{u_{k_n}(z_n - \tilde{r}_n x) - \rho_n(x - z_n)}{\tilde{r}_n^{\alpha_i(s_{k_n})} \kappa(\tilde{r}_n)}.$$

This sequence $\{v_n\}$ will be the blow up sequence to which we apply Lemma 3.1. By definition of the polynomial ρ_n , the functions v_n have zero mean over $B_1(0)$. Additionally, v_n is orthogonal to all polynomials of order 1. Moreover, by definition of v_n and $\kappa(\tilde{r}_n)$ we find

$$[v_n]_{C^{\beta_i(s_{k_n})}(B_1)} \geq \frac{\tilde{r}_n^{\beta_i(s_{k_n})} [u_{k_n}]_{C^{\beta_i(s_{k_n})}(B_{\tilde{r}_n}(z_n))}}{\tilde{r}_n^{\alpha_i(s_{k_n})} \kappa(\tilde{r}_n)} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (3.5)$$

Next, we derive an upper bound on the Hölder norm of v_n . Using the definition of κ we derive for any $R \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} [v_n]_{C^{\beta_i(s_{k_n})}(B_R)} &= R^{\alpha_i(s_{k_n}) - \beta_i(s_{k_n})} \frac{[u_{k_n}]_{C^{\beta_i(s_{k_n})}(B_{Rr_n}(z_n))}}{\kappa(r_n) (Rr_n)^{\alpha_i(s_{k_n}) - \beta_i(s_{k_n})}} \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa(Rr_n)}{\kappa(r_n)} R^{\alpha_i(s_{k_n}) - \beta_i(s_{k_n})} \leq R^{\alpha_i(s_{k_n}) - \beta_i(s_{k_n})}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Here, we used that κ is nondecreasing.

Claim b.1. If $i = 1$, then the functions $\{v_n\}$ are uniformly bounded on B_1 , i.e.

$$\|v_n\|_{C(B_1)} \leq 2^{s_0/2}.$$

Since the function v_n is continuous and has zero mean on B_1 there exists $y_0 \in B_1(0)$ such that $v_n(y_0) = 0$. Due to the previous upper bound on the $C^{s_0/2}$ -seminorm of v_n , see (3.6), we find for any $x \in B_1$

$$|v_n(x)| \leq 2^{s_0/2} \frac{|v_n(x) - v_n(y_0)|}{|x - y_0|^{s_0/2}} \leq 2^{s_0/2}.$$

This proves claim b.1.

Claim b.2. If $i = 2$, then the functions $\{v_n\}$ are uniformly bounded in $C^1(\overline{B_1})$.

Since $i = 2$, the constant β_i equals $9/8$. Now, we prove a uniform bound on the gradient of v_n . Let j be a natural number between 1 and d . Since $\partial_j v_n$ has zero mean over B_1 and is continuous, there exists $y_0 \in B_1$ such that $\partial_j v_n(y_0) = 0$. Just as in the proof of claim b.1 we deduce using the uniform bound of the $C^{9/8}$ -seminorm of v_n , see (3.6), that $|\partial_j v_n(x)| \leq 2^{9/8}$ for any $x \in B_1$. Since j was arbitrary, this yields a uniform bound on $[v_n]_{C^1(B_1)}$. Now, we repeat the arguments in the proof of claim b.1 but replace the seminorm $C^{s_0/2}$ with $C^{0,1}$ to deduce the claim b.2.

Claim c. The sequence $\{v_n\}$ converges in $C_{\text{loc}}^{\beta_i(s)/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to a function $v \in C_{\text{loc}}^{\beta_i(s)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The function v satisfies

$$[v]_{C^{\beta_i(s)}(B_R)} \leq R^{\alpha_i(s) - \beta_i(s)} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3.7)$$

$$Lv = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \text{ in the distributional sense.} \quad (3.8)$$

Here, L is either an operator of the type (1.2) or an elliptic second order operator with constant coefficients.

The convergence of a subsequence of $\{v_n\}$ to some function $v \in C_{\text{loc}}^{\beta_i(s)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ follows from the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem combined with claim b.1 respectively claim b.2. Note that we already picked a subsequence such that the sequence $\{s_{k_n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converges to $s \in [s_0, 1]$. Next, the equation (3.6) leads to

$$[v]_{C^{\beta_i(s)}(B_R)} \leq R^{\alpha_i(s) - \beta_i(s)} \quad (3.9)$$

for any $R \geq 1$. Furthermore, since v has zero mean on B_1 , there exists $y_0 \in B_1$ such that $v(y_0) = 0$. Thus, the bound

$$|v(x)| = |v(x) - v(y_0)| \leq (1 + |x - y_0|)^{\alpha_i(s) - \beta_i(s)} |x - y_0|^{\beta_i(s)} \leq (2 + |x|)^{\alpha_i(s)} \quad (3.10)$$

holds. Since $\|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq 1$, we estimate using the definition of v_n

$$|Lv_n(x)| = \frac{\|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}}{\kappa(\tilde{r}_n)} \leq \frac{1}{\kappa(\tilde{r}_n)} \text{ for any } |x| \leq 1/\tilde{r}_n.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{Lv_n\}$ converges locally uniformly to 0 in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Using Lemma 3.1, the sequence of operators $A_{\mu_{k_n}}^{s_{k_n}}$ converges weakly to L which is either A_μ^s or $A \cdot D^2$. Moreover, the function v satisfies $Lv = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^d distributionally due to the same lemma. This proves the claim c.

By the translation invariance, for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the function $w_h(x) := v(x+h) - v(x)$ also satisfies $Lw_h = 0$ in the distributional sense. Furthermore, it satisfies the growth bound

$$|w_h(x)| \leq |h|^{\beta_i(s)} [v]_{C^{\beta_i(s)}(B_{1+|h|+|x|})} \leq |h|^{\beta_i(s)} (1 + |h| + |x|)^{\alpha_i(s) - \beta_i(s)}. \quad (3.11)$$

Note that this bound is sublinear in the variable x since $\alpha_i(s) - \beta_i(s) < 1$. Now, we are in the position to apply Liouville's theorem. If $s = 1$, i.e. $L = A \cdot D^2$ where A is elliptic, then the classical Liouville theorem with the strict sublinear bound (3.11) proves that w_h is constant. If $s < 1$, i.e. $L = A_\mu^s$, then using the Liouville-type theorem [RS16b, Theorem 2.1] also leads to w_h being constant.

Let \tilde{c}_h be the constants obtained from the previous application of Liouville's theorem to the function w_h . It is easy to see that

$$v(x+h) - v(x) = w_h(x) = \tilde{c}_h = w_h(0) = v(h) - v(0).$$

Due to this and the growth bound (3.10), v is a polynomial of order at most 1. More precisely, if $i = 1$, then v is a constant. Since v has mean zero over B_1 , we find that v is zero if $i = 1$. If $i = 2$, then it is a polynomial of order 1. Since its partial derivatives have zero mean over B_1 , it is a constant. Then arguing as in the case $i = 1$ yields $v = 0$ in both cases.

Finally, $v = 0$ is a contradiction to (3.5) in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Theorem 3.3. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$ be fixed. There exists a positive constant $C = C(s_0, \lambda, \Lambda, d)$ such that for all $s \in [s_0, 1)$, operators A_μ^s as in (1.2) satisfying (1.3), $f \in L^\infty(B_{3/2})$, $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ a distributional solution to $A_\mu^s u = f$ in $B_{3/2}$ the function u satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{C^s(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} + \sup_{y \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u; y)) \quad (3.12)$$

where the tail is defined by

$$\text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u; y) := \int_{B_{1/2}(0)^c} |u(y + r\theta)| \nu_s(d\theta). \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. We extend f to \mathbb{R}^d by setting $f = 0$ on $B_{3/2}^c$. Let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a nonnegative smooth bump function with $\psi = 1$ in $B_{3/2}$ and $\psi = 0$ on B_2^c , $[\psi]_{C^{s_0/2}} \leq c_1$. Further, let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be nonnegative with $\text{supp } \eta \subset B_1(0)$ and $\|\eta\|_{L^1} = 1$, and $\eta_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{-d} \eta(\cdot/\varepsilon)$ an approximate

identity. We consider the functions $v_\varepsilon := (u * \eta_\varepsilon) \psi$. Due to the translation invariance of the operators A_μ^s this function satisfies for any $x \in B_1$

$$A_\mu^s v_\varepsilon(x) = f * \eta_\varepsilon(x) + \int_{B_{1/2}(0)^c} (1 - \psi(x+h)) u * \eta_\varepsilon(x+h) \nu_s(dh) =: f_\varepsilon(x).$$

Using Young's inequality, the new inhomogeneity f_ε may be bounded as

$$\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_{1+\varepsilon})} + \sup_{y \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u * \eta_\varepsilon; y).$$

An application of Lemma 3.2 yields a positive constant $C = C(s_0, \lambda, \Lambda, d)$ such that for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u * \eta_\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha_i(s)}(B_{1/2})} &= \|v_\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha_i(s)}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|v_\varepsilon\|_{C^{\beta_i(s, s_0)}(\mathbb{R}^d)}) \\ &\leq C(\|f\|_{L^\infty(B_{1+\varepsilon})} + \sup_{y \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u * \eta_\varepsilon; y)) \\ &\quad + c_1 \|u * \eta_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} + \|u * \eta_\varepsilon\|_{C^{\beta_i(s, s_0)}(B_2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Since $\beta_i(s, s_0) < \beta_i(s, s_0) + \min\{1/8, s_0/2\} \leq \alpha_i(s)$, scaling arguments just as in the proof of [RS16b, Theorem 1.1 (a)] allow us to absorb the term $\|u * \eta_\varepsilon\|_{C^{\beta_i(s, s_0)}(B_2)}$ in the inequality (3.14) to the left-hand side. Finally, we take the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+$ which yields $u \in C^{\alpha_i(s)}(\overline{B_{1/2}})$ and the desired regularity estimate since $\alpha_i(s) \geq s$. \square

Remark 3.4. Higher order interior regularity estimates, i.e. bounds on $\|u\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}}$, as in [RS16b, Proposition 3.2, Proposition 3.3] can be proved robust as $s \rightarrow 1-$ with the same adaptations as in Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2, and Theorem 3.3. But note that the respective constants blow up as $\alpha + 2s$ approaches an integer value. For this reason, we reduced the Theorem 3.3 to interior C^s -regularity.

4. A SUBHARMONIC FUNCTION IN ONE DIMENSION

In this section, we construct a sub-solution to the fractional Laplacian in one dimension. In contrast to [FR24], we need a function that is much closer to the well-known s -harmonic function $(\cdot)_+^s$ in the half line than $(\cdot)_+^{s+\varepsilon}$ as observed in Subsection 1.2. Rather, we will pick a small perturbation of $(\cdot)_+^s$, say $(\cdot)_+^s \zeta(\cdot)$. We will collect all the assumptions needed for ζ .

The function $\zeta \in C([0, \infty)) \cap C^2((0, \infty)) \cap C^3((0, 2))$ needs to satisfy:

(Z0) The function ζ is positive in $(0, \infty)$, increasing, concave, and $\zeta(0) = 0$.

(Z1) There exist constants $c_1 > 0$, $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$t^2 \zeta^{(3)}(t) \geq -c_1 \zeta'(t) \text{ for any } 0 < t < t_0. \quad (4.1)$$

(Z2) The map $t \mapsto t \zeta'(t)$ is nondecreasing.

(Z3) There exist positive constants ι , t_0 such that the map $t \mapsto \frac{\zeta(t)}{t^\iota}$ is monotonically decreasing in $(0, t_0]$.

(Z4) There exists a positive constant c_2 such that $\zeta(t) \leq c_2(1+t)^{s/2}$.

The next proposition proves that $(-\Delta)_\mathbb{R}^s [t_+^s \zeta(t)]$ has a sign near zero and a possibly stronger singularity than $t^{\varepsilon-s}$ at $t = 0$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\zeta \in C([0, \infty)) \cap C^2((0, \infty)) \cap C^3((0, 2))$ such that **(Z0)**, **(Z1)**, **(Z2)**, and **(Z4)** hold. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $s \in (0, 1)$ and all $0 < t < t_0$*

$$(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s[(\cdot)_+^s \zeta](t) \leq -s^6 C t^{1-s} \zeta'(t).$$

Here, the operator $(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s$ is the fractional Laplacian in one-dimension given by

$$(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s u(x) := (1-s) \text{p. v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{1+2s}} dy.$$

Remark 4.2. The constant $s^6 C$ in the previous proposition is not optimal in the limit $s \rightarrow 0+$.

Proof. Since $(\cdot)_+^s \zeta$ is locally C^2 and grows slower than $(1+|\cdot|)^{3s/2}$, the term $(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s[(\cdot)_+^s \zeta]$ exists in \mathbb{R}_+ . We fix $0 < t < 1$. Now, we use the change of variables $h = tr$ to find that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s[(\cdot)_+^s \zeta](t) &= (1-s) \text{p. v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{t^s \zeta(t) - (t+h)_+^s \zeta(t+h)}{|h|^{1+2s}} dh \\ &= (1-s) \frac{\zeta(t)}{t^s} \text{p. v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1 - (1+r)_+^s \frac{\zeta(t(1+r))}{\zeta(t)}}{|r|^{1+2s}} dr = \frac{\zeta(t)}{t^s} (-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s f_t(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the function f_t is given by

$$f_t(r) = (r)_+^s \frac{\zeta(tr)}{\zeta(t)}.$$

Just as in [FR24], we want to compare this function to a translated version of $(\cdot)_+^s$ which is s -harmonic in \mathbb{R}_+ . Note that, if $\zeta(r) = r^\alpha$, then f_t is independent of t . In our setup, this might not be the case, e.g. choose $\zeta(r) = 1/\ln(1/r)^2$. More precisely, we choose $\kappa \geq 1$, $0 < a < 1$ such that $g_{a,\kappa}(r) = \kappa(r-a)_+^s$ touches f_t at $r = 1$ and is smaller for any $r \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{1\}$, see claim A. Thus, the constants a and κ must be chosen such that

$$f_t(1) = g_{a,\kappa}(1), \quad f_t'(1) = g_{a,\kappa}'(1).$$

The first property is satisfied as soon as

$$\kappa(1-a)^s = 1.$$

The second one is true whenever

$$s + \frac{\zeta'(t)t}{\zeta(t)} = s\kappa(1-a)^{s-1} = s\kappa^{1/s-1} = s \frac{1}{1-a}.$$

We fix these choices, i.e.

$$a := \frac{\zeta'(t)t}{s\zeta(t) + \zeta'(t)t}, \quad \kappa := \left(1 + \frac{\zeta'(t)t}{s\zeta(t)}\right)^s.$$

Since ζ is concave and strictly increasing, we know that $t\zeta'(t) \leq \zeta(t)$, $\zeta' > 0$ and, thus, the inequalities

$$0 < \frac{1}{s+1} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} \leq a \leq \frac{1}{s+1} < 1 \tag{4.2}$$

and $1 < \kappa \leq (1 + 1/s)^s$ hold.

Claim A. With this choice of a and κ , we have $g_{a,\kappa} \leq f_t$ on \mathbb{R} .

Proof of claim A. If $r \leq a$, then $g_{a,\kappa}(r) = 0 \leq f_t(r)$. Since the two functions coincide at $r = 1$, it remains to prove the $g'_{a,\kappa}(r) \leq f'_t(r)$ for $r > 1$ and $g'_{a,\kappa}(r) \geq f'_t(r)$ for $a < r < 1$. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} f'_t(r) &= sr^{s-1} \frac{\zeta(tr)}{\zeta(t)} + r^{s-1} \frac{tr\zeta'(tr)}{\zeta(t)}, \\ g'_{a,\kappa}(r) &= s\kappa(r-a)^{s-1} = sr^{s-1}k(r) + \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)}r^{s-1}k(r), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$k(r) := \left(1 + (1 - 1/r) \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{s\zeta(t)}\right)^{s-1}.$$

We notice a few things. If $r > 1$, then $k(r) \leq 1$. If $r < 1$, then $k(r) \geq 1$. Since ζ is increasing, we know $\zeta(tr) \geq \zeta(t)$ if $r > 1$ and $\zeta(tr) \leq \zeta(t)$ if $r < 1$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} sr^{s-1}k(r) &\leq sr^{s-1} \leq sr^{s-1} \frac{\zeta(tr)}{\zeta(t)} && \text{if } r > 1, \\ sr^{s-1}k(r) &\geq sr^{s-1} \geq sr^{s-1} \frac{\zeta(tr)}{\zeta(t)} && \text{if } r < 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

By assumption **(Z2)**, the map $x \mapsto x\zeta'(x)$ is nondecreasing. Thus, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)}r^{s-1}k(r) &\leq \frac{tr\zeta'(tr)}{\zeta(t)}r^{s-1}k(r) \leq \frac{tr\zeta'(tr)}{\zeta(t)}r^{s-1} && \text{if } r > 1, \\ \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)}r^{s-1}k(r) &\geq \frac{tr\zeta'(tr)}{\zeta(t)}r^{s-1}k(r) \geq \frac{tr\zeta'(tr)}{\zeta(t)}r^{s-1} && \text{if } r < 1. \end{aligned}$$

These two observations yield $g'_{a,\kappa}(r) \leq f'_t(r)$ for $r > 1$ and $g'_{a,\kappa}(r) \geq f'_t(r)$ for $r < 1$. This proves the claim.

Claim A together with $g_{a,\kappa} \neq f_t$ immediately yields the negativity of $(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s[(\cdot)_+^s \zeta](t)$. Since $f_t - g_{a,\kappa}$ has a global minimum at 1 and $g_{a,\kappa}$ is s -harmonic in $(a, \infty) \ni 1$, we can write

$$(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s[(\cdot)_+^s \zeta](t) = \frac{\zeta(t)}{t^s}(-\Delta)^s[f_t](1) = \frac{\zeta(t)}{t^s}(-\Delta)^s[f_t - g_{a,\kappa}](1) < 0.$$

In contrast to [FR24], this observation is not sufficient. Since f_t may converge to $(\cdot)_+^s$ as $t \rightarrow 0+$, the previous inequality may become an equality in the limit $t \rightarrow 0$. Thus, we must analyze $(-\Delta)^s[f_t - g_{a,\kappa}](1)$ more carefully.

Claim B. There exists a constant $r_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < t < t_0$ and any $r \in (1, 1 + r_0)$

$$f_t(r) - g_{a,\kappa}(r) \geq \frac{c_0}{2} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)}(1 - r)^2. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof of claim B. First off, we assume $r_0 < 1$. From the construction of $g_{a,\kappa}$, we know that $h_t := f_t - g_{a,\kappa}$ satisfies $h'_t(1) = 0 = h_t(1)$. We expand the function h_t at the point $r = 1$. This yields

$$h_t(r) = \frac{1}{2}h''_t(1)(r-1)^2 + \iota(r, t).$$

Here ι is the error of the approximation. Next, let's calculate h''_t .

$$h''_t(1) = s(s-1) + 2s \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} + \frac{t^2\zeta''(t)}{\zeta(t)} - s(s-1) \left(\frac{s\zeta(t) + t\zeta'(t)}{s\zeta(t)} \right)^2$$

$$= 2 \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} + \frac{t^2\zeta''(1)}{\zeta(t)} + \frac{1-s}{s} \left(\frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} \right)^2 \geq \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} \left(2 + \frac{t\zeta''(t)}{\zeta'(t)} \right) \geq \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)}.$$

In the last equality we used **(Z2)**. Now, we bound the error term. By Taylor's theorem, we know that there exists $z_r \in (1, r)$ such that

$$\iota(r, t) = \frac{h^{(3)}(z_r)}{6} (r-1)^3.$$

We calculate the third derivative $h^{(3)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} h^{(3)}(z_r) &= s(s-1)(s-2)z_r^{s-3} \frac{\zeta(tz_r)}{\zeta(t)} + 3s(s-1)z_r^{s-2} \frac{t\zeta'(tz_r)}{\zeta(t)} + 3sz_r^{s-1} \frac{t^2\zeta''(tz_r)}{\zeta(t)} \\ &\quad + z_r^s \frac{t^3\zeta^{(3)}(tz_r)}{\zeta(t)} - s(s-1)(s-2)\kappa(z_r - a)^{s-3} \\ &= (\text{I}_1) + (\text{I}_2) + (\text{I}_3) + (\text{I}_4) + (\text{I}_5). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the second term is easily bound using the monotonicity of ζ' and $z_r > 1$ by

$$(\text{I}_2)(r-1)^3/6 \geq -\frac{s(1-s)}{2} 1^{s-2} r_0 \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} (r-1)^2.$$

If we pick r_0 so small such that $2s(1-s)r_0 < 2^{-4}$, then this term may be estimated as in the claim.

To estimate the third term, we use (4.1). This and again the monotonicity of ζ' yield

$$(\text{I}_3)(r-1)^3/6 \geq -\frac{s}{2} 1^{s-2} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} (r-1)^3.$$

Here, we need to ensure that r_0 is so small such that $2sr_0 < 2^{-4}$. The term (I_4) is estimated easily using the assumption (4.1). This together with the monotonicity of ζ' yields

$$(\text{I}_4)(r-1)^3/6 \geq -1^{s-2} \frac{c_1}{6} \frac{t\zeta'(tz_r)}{\zeta(t)} (r-1)^3 \geq -\frac{c_1 r_0}{6} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} (r-1)^2.$$

Thus, we pick $r_0 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $c_1 r_0/6 \leq 2^{-5}$. Now, we consider the terms (I_1) and (I_5) . Note that these terms admit additional cancellation. Using the monotonicity of ζ , the convexity of $x \mapsto x^{s-3}$, and $(1+x)^s \leq 1+sx$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{I}_1) + (\text{I}_5) &\geq s(1-s)(2-s) \left(z_r^{s-3} - (z_r - a)^{s-3} + (1-\kappa)(z_r - a)^{s-3} \right) \\ &\geq s(1-s)(2-s) \left(- (3-s)(z_r - a)^{s-4} a - s \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{s\zeta(t)} (z_r - a)^{s-3} \right) \\ &\geq -(1-s)(2-s) \frac{3s^{s-3}}{(1+s)^{s-3}} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

If we ensure that $(1-s)(2-s)3s^{s-3}/(1+s)^{s-3}r_0 < 2^{-5}$, then we find

$$\iota(r, t) \geq -2^{-4} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{\zeta(t)} (r-1)^2$$

which proves the claim.

Using this claim, we easily deduce an upper bound on $(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s[(\cdot)_+^s \zeta](t)$. Again, since $f_t - g_{a,\kappa}$ has a global minimum at 1, see claim A, we write for any $t < t_0$

$$(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s[(\cdot)_+^s \zeta](t) \leq -\frac{\zeta(t)}{t^s}(1-s) \int_1^{1+r_0} \frac{f_t(r) - g_{a,\kappa}(r)}{|1-r|^{1+2s}} dr \leq -\frac{c_0}{2} r_0^{2-2s} \frac{t\zeta'(t)}{t^s}.$$

In the last inequality we used claim B. \square

5. BARRIERS IN HIGHER DIMENSIONS

In this section, we construct explicit super and sub-solution which we will use as barrier functions in the proof of Proposition 6.6, Proposition 6.7, Proposition 6.1, and Proposition 6.3.

We fix a uniform $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain (respectively $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain) $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with a localization radius $\rho > 0$ and a modulus of continuity $\tilde{\omega}$, see Definition 2.1. Recall that the map $\tilde{\omega} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous, nondecreasing, sublinear, i.e. $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\omega}(t)/t \leq M$, $\tilde{\omega}(0) = 0$, and satisfies (2.1).

We need the following modification of $\tilde{\omega}$ which is slightly bigger and satisfies some further properties which are needed in the following estimates, see also Remark 5.2.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $0 < \iota < 1/3$ and $\bar{\omega} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ a nondecreasing, continuous, sublinear function satisfying (2.1) respectively (2.2). There exists a continuous, increasing, and concave function $\omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\omega \in C^2((0, \infty))$ such that $\omega \geq \bar{\omega}$, and ω satisfies (2.1) respectively (2.2). Furthermore, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{\omega(t)}{t^\iota} \text{ is decreasing in } (0, t_0), \quad (5.1)$$

$$t^2 \omega''(t) \geq -\omega(t) - 3t\omega'(t) \quad \text{for all } 0 < t < t_0. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Step 1. (Concavity of ω) By the sublinearity of $\bar{\omega}$, we fix two constants $M, t_0 > 0$ such that $\bar{\omega}(t) \leq Mt$ for $t \geq t_0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $t_0 < 1/2$ while, if needed, enlarging the constant M slightly. Now, set

$$\omega_1(t) = \inf\{\bar{\omega}(\delta) + \frac{Mt_0 t}{\delta} \mid 0 < \delta < t_0\}.$$

Next, we prove that ω_1 is not smaller than $\bar{\omega}$. Let $0 < \delta < t_0$ and $t > 0$ be arbitrary. If $0 < t \leq \delta$, then $\bar{\omega}(t) \leq \bar{\omega}(\delta) \leq \bar{\omega}(\delta) + Mt_0 t/\delta$ since $\bar{\omega}$ is nondecreasing. If $t \geq t_0$, then $\bar{\omega}(t) \leq Mt \leq Mt_0 t/\delta \leq \bar{\omega}(\delta) + Mt_0 t/\delta$ by the choice of M and t_0 . If $\delta < t < t_0$, then

$$\bar{\omega}(t) \leq \bar{\omega}(t_0) \leq Mt_0 \leq Mt_0 t/\delta \leq \bar{\omega}(\delta) + Mt_0 t/\delta.$$

Since δ was arbitrary, we find $\bar{\omega}(t) \leq \omega_1(t)$.

Obviously, the function ω_1 is also nondecreasing, continuous, and satisfies $\omega_1(0) = 0$. Furthermore, ω_1 is concave since

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) &= \inf\{\bar{\omega}(\delta) + \frac{Mt_0}{\delta}(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) \mid 0 < \delta < t_0\} \\ &\geq \lambda \inf\{\bar{\omega}(\delta) + \frac{Mt_0}{\delta}x \mid 0 < \delta < t_0\} + (1-\lambda) \inf\{\bar{\omega}(\delta) + \frac{Mt_0}{\delta}y \mid 0 < \delta < t_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we prove that ω_1 satisfies (2.1). For this, we use the trivial bound

$$\omega_1(t) \leq \bar{\omega}(t \ln(1/t)^2) + Mt_0 / \ln(1/t)^2$$

for any $0 < t < t_0$. Firstly, the second term is integrable with $1/t$ near zero. Secondly, using the substitution $y = t \ln(1/t)^2$, we find

$$\int_0^{e^{-4}} \frac{\bar{\omega}(t \ln(1/t)^2)}{t} dt \leq 2 \int_0^{4^2/e^4} \frac{\bar{\omega}(y)}{y} dy < \infty.$$

One checks that ω_1 satisfies (2.2) using the same bound and the same change of variables. Now, we regularize ω_1 by taking averaged means, say $\omega_2(t) = \int_t^{2t} \omega_1(r) dr$. This function inherits all previous properties of ω_1 .

Step 2. ((5.1)) We define the function $j_\iota : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ via

$$j_\iota(t) := (1 - \iota)t^\iota \int_t^\infty \frac{\min\{\omega_2(r), \omega_2(1)\}}{r^{1+\iota}} dr.$$

This function satisfies for any $t < 1$

$$tj'_\iota(t) = \iota j_\iota(t) - (1 - \iota)\omega_2(t). \quad (5.3)$$

Since ω_2 is nondecreasing, we also know

$$j_\iota(t) \geq (1 - \iota)t^\iota \int_t^\infty \frac{\omega_2(r)}{r^{1+\iota}} dr = \frac{1 - \iota}{\iota} \omega_2(t).$$

Plugging this bound into (5.3) reveals that j_ι is nondecreasing. Next, we prove that j_ι is also concave. Firstly, $j_\iota \in C([0, \infty)) \cap C_{\text{loc}}^3((0, \infty))$ is constant in $(1, \infty)$ and nondecreasing in \mathbb{R}_+ . It remains to prove that $j''_\iota(t) \leq 0$ for $t < 1$. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} t^2 j''_\iota(t) &= \iota(tj'_\iota(t) - j_\iota(t)) - (1 - \iota)(t\omega'_2(t) - \omega_2(t)) \\ &= -\iota(1 - \iota)j_\iota(t) - (1 - \iota)\omega'_2(t)t + (1 - \iota)^2\omega_2(t) \leq -(1 - \iota)\omega'_2(t)t. \end{aligned}$$

The function j_ι also satisfies (2.1). This follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \frac{j_\iota(t)}{t} dt &= (1 - \iota) \int_0^1 t^{\iota-1} \int_t^\infty \frac{\min\{\omega_2(r), \omega_2(1)\}}{r^{1+\iota}} dr dt = (1 - \iota) \left(\frac{\omega_2(1)}{\iota^2} + \int_0^1 t^{\iota-1} \int_t^1 \frac{\omega_2(r)}{r^{1+\iota}} dr dt \right) \\ &= (1 - \iota) \frac{\omega_2(1)}{\iota^2} + \frac{1 - \iota}{\iota} \int_0^1 \frac{\omega_2(r)}{r} dr < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Similarity, one proves that (2.2) is satisfied by j_ι . This allow us to define a new function ω_3 which is slightly bigger than ω_2 , is still nondecreasing and concave, and additionally satisfies (5.1). Set $\omega_3 := \omega_2 + j_\iota$. Then, for $t < 1$

$$t\omega'_3(t) = t\omega'_2(t) + tj'_\iota(t) = \iota(\omega_2(t) + j_\iota(t)) + t\omega'_2(t) - \omega_2(t) \leq \omega_3(t).$$

Here, we used the concavity of ω_2 . Therefore, $\omega_3(t)/t^\iota$ is decreasing in $(0, 1)$.

Step 3. ((5.2)) We regularize ω_3 by taking averaged means twice. Set $c = 1/(1 - 3\iota)$. We define

$$\omega_4(t) := c \int_{t/2}^t \int_{r/2}^r \omega_3(l) dl dr.$$

Then, we use the monotonicity of ω_3 and (5.1) to estimate $\omega_4(t)$ from below by $\omega_3(t)$, i.e.

$$\omega_4(t) \geq c\omega_3(t/4) \geq c(\omega_3(t) - \omega_3'(t/4)(3t/4)) \geq c(\omega_3(t) - 3\omega_3'(t/4)) \geq c(1 - 3\iota)\omega_3(t) = \omega_3(t).$$

A minor calculation reveals

$$\omega_4(t) = 4c \int_{1/2}^1 \int_{1/2}^1 \omega_3(tlr) dl dr.$$

From this representation, it is clear that ω_4 inherits all of the previous properties of ω_3 . We differentiate ω_4

$$t\omega_4'(t) = 4c \int_{1/2}^1 \int_{1/2}^1 l \partial_l \omega_3(tlr) dl dr = 4c \int_{1/2}^1 \left(\omega_3(tr) - \frac{1}{2}\omega_3(tr/2) - \int_{1/2}^1 \omega_3(tlr) dl \right) dr.$$

Thus, the term $t\omega_4'(t) + t^2\omega_4''(t)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} t\partial_t t\omega_4'(t) &= 4c \int_{1/2}^1 \left(r \partial_r \omega_3(tr) - \frac{r}{2} \partial_r \omega_3(tr/2) - \int_{1/2}^1 l \partial_l \omega_3(tlr) dl \right) dr \\ &= 4c \left(\omega_3(t) - \frac{1}{2}\omega_3(t/2) - \int_{1/2}^1 \omega_3(tr) dr - \frac{1}{2}\omega_3(t/2) + \frac{1}{4}\omega_3(t/4) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{1/2}^1 \omega_3(tr/2) dr \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{1/2}^1 \left(\omega_3(tr) - \frac{1}{2}\omega_3(tr/2) - \int_{1/2}^1 \omega_3(tlr) dl \right) dr \right) \\ &= 4c \left(\omega_3(t) - \frac{1}{2}\omega_3(t/2) - \int_{1/2}^1 \omega_3(tr) dr - \frac{1}{2}\omega_3(t/2) + \frac{1}{4}\omega_3(t/4) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{1/2}^1 \omega_3(tr/2) dr \right) \\ &\quad - t\omega_4'(t) \\ &\geq 4c \left(-\frac{1}{4} \frac{t\omega_3'(t/4)}{4} - \frac{\omega_3(t/2) - \omega_3(t/4)}{4} + \frac{3}{8} t\omega_3'(t) \right) - t\omega_4'(t) \\ &\geq -c \left(\omega_3(t/2) - 3/2 t\omega_3'(t) \right) - t\omega_4'(t). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use $\omega_3(t/2) \leq 1/c\omega_4(2t) \leq 1/c(\omega_4(t) + \omega_4'(t)t)$. This yields

$$t^2\omega_4''(t) \geq -c \left(\omega_3(t/2) - 3/2 t\omega_3'(t) \right) - 2t\omega_4'(t) \geq -\omega_4(t) - 3t\omega_4'(t).$$

Step 4. We set $\omega(t) := \omega_4(t) + t_+^{t/2}$ which is increasing. □

Remark 5.2. We apply Lemma 5.1 to the modulus of continuity $\tilde{\omega}$ which yields a function ω . Since $\omega \geq \tilde{\omega}$, we will assume without loss of generality that the modulus of continuity of the $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain (respectively $2s$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain) D satisfies all properties of ω .

Adapted to D , we pick a regularized distance function $\mathfrak{d} \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C_{\text{loc}}^2((\partial D)^c)$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^{-1}d_D(x) &\leq \mathfrak{d}(x) \leq C_1d_D(x), \\ |\nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) - \nabla\mathfrak{d}(y)| &\leq C_2\omega(|x - y|), \\ |D^2\mathfrak{d}(x)| &\leq C_3\frac{\omega(d_D(x))}{d_D(x)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

This exists by [Lie85]. Recall that $d_D(x) = \text{dist}(x, D^c)$.

The next lemma is an essential technical estimate used in both Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 5.7. It is needed whenever (pUB) is not available. In contrast, if (pUB) holds, then we can use [FR24, Lemma B.2.4] instead.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $a \in (0, 1/4)$, and D be a uniform $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain with a modulus of continuity ω as in Remark 5.2 that satisfies all properties from Lemma 5.1 with $\iota = \min\{1/6, s_0/4\}$ and a localization radius ρ . There exist $0 < \rho_1 < \rho$ and a constant $C = C(s_0, \omega, \rho, a) > 0$ such that for any $x \in D$ with $d_D(x) < \rho_1/2$ and $\theta \in S^{d-1}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{ad_D(x)}^{\rho_1} |\mathfrak{d}(x + r\theta)^s - (\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot r\theta)_+^s| \frac{dr}{r^{1+2s}} \\ \leq C \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x)))}{d_D(x)^s} \begin{cases} \frac{(\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x))))^{2s-1-1}}{1-2s} & , s \neq 1/2 \\ \ln\left(\frac{1}{\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x)))}\right) & , s = 1/2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $f(t) = t\omega(t)$.

Note that f is invertible since $t \mapsto t\omega(t)$ is strictly increasing and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t\omega(t) = \infty$.

Before we proceed with the lengthy and technical proof of this estimate, we give a remark on its importance.

Remark 5.4. Using the bound

$$|\mathfrak{d}(x + r\theta)^s - (\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot r\theta)_+^s| \leq C|r|^s\omega(r)^s$$

as in the proof of [FR24, Proposition B.2.1 (i)], we get, quite easily,

$$\int_{ad_D(x)}^{\rho_1} |\mathfrak{d}(x + r\theta)^s - (\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot r\theta)_+^s| \frac{dr}{r^{1+2s}} \leq C \frac{\omega(d_D(x))^s}{d_D(x)^s} \tag{5.5}$$

which is a weaker estimate than the one stated in Lemma 5.3. In particular, using only the bound (5.5) instead of Lemma 5.3 would require

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\omega(t)^s}{t} dt < \infty \tag{5.6}$$

in order to construct appropriate barriers in Proposition 5.13 and Proposition 5.11. But the assumption (5.6) on the modulus of continuity ω would be much stronger than the Dini-continuity (2.1), e.g. consider $\omega(t) = 1/\ln(1/t)^{(1+s)/(2s)}$. In [FR24], this is no obstruction as they deal with $C^{1,\alpha}$ -domains those modulus of continuity can be chosen as $\omega(t) = ct^\alpha$.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Since the problem is translation and rotation invariant, we assume the point $x = (x', x_d) \in D$ in the domain D is of the form $x = (0, x_d)$ and that $z = 0 \in \partial D$ is the minimizer of x to the boundary ∂D . Note that $d_D(x)$ simplifies to x_d . Since D is locally the epigraph of a $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -function, there exists ϕ such that $D \cap B_\rho(0) = \{(y', y_d) \in B_\rho(0) \mid y_d > \phi(y')\}$ and $\phi(0) = 0 = |\nabla\phi(0)|$. The function ϕ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(y')| &\leq |\phi(y') - \phi(0) - y' \cdot \nabla\phi(0)| \leq |y'| \omega(|y'|), \\ |\nabla\phi(y')| &= |\nabla\phi(y') - \nabla\phi(0)| \leq \omega(|y'|) \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

for any $y' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Now, fix any $\theta \in S^{d-1}$. We divide the integration domain into two parts

$$\left(\int_{f^{-1}(ax_d)}^{\rho_1} + \int_{ax_d}^{f^{-1}(ax_d)} \right) |\mathfrak{d}(x + r\theta)^s - (\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot r\theta)_+^s| \frac{dr}{r^{1+2s}} := \text{(I)} + \text{(II)}.$$

To estimate (I), we use the bound

$$|\mathfrak{d}(x + y) - (\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot y)_+| \leq \omega(|y|) |y|, \quad (5.8)$$

see [FR24, Lemma B.2.3.]. This and the concavity of $(\cdot)^s$ yield

$$\text{(I)} \leq \int_{f^{-1}(ax_d)}^{\rho_1} \omega(r)^s \frac{dr}{r^{1+s}} \leq \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))^s}{f^{-1}(ax_d)^{s\iota}} \int_{f^{-1}(ax_d)}^{\infty} \frac{dr}{r^{1+s(1-\iota)}} = \frac{1}{s(1-\iota)} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))^s}{f^{-1}(ax_d)^s}.$$

Here, we used (5.1). Since $f(t) = t\omega(t)$, we know

$$t = f^{-1}(t) \omega(f^{-1}(t)). \quad (5.9)$$

Because of this and since $\iota < 1/3$, the estimate of (I) reads

$$\text{(I)} \leq \frac{3}{2s} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))^{2s}}{a^s x_d^s} \leq \frac{3}{a2s} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(x_d))^{2s}}{x_d^s}.$$

Here, we used the monotonicity of both ω and f^{-1} . We notice that this implies the desired estimate if we assume ρ_1 to be so small such that $\omega(f^{-1}(x_d)) \leq \min\{1/e^2, s/2\}$. If $s = 1/2$, then this is obvious since $\ln(1/\omega(f^{-1}(x_d))) \geq \ln(e^2) = 2$. If $s \neq 1/2$, then it is due to

$$a^{2s-1} \leq \frac{a^{2s-1} - 1}{1 - 2s} \quad (5.10)$$

for any $a \leq s/2 \leq (2s)^{1/(1-2s)}$.

Now, we turn our attention to the more delicate term (II). The concavity of $(\cdot)^s$ and (5.8) yield

$$\text{(II)} \leq s \int_{ax_d}^{f^{-1}(ax_d)} \left((\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot r\theta)_+^{s-1} + \mathfrak{d}(x + r\theta)^{s-1} \right) \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr = \text{(II)}_1 + \text{(II)}_2.$$

Here, we use the convention $(0)_+^{s-1} = 0$. We begin by estimating the term (II)_1 .

Estimate of (II)_1 . We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. If $\nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta \geq 0$, then for any $r > 0$

$$(\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla\mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot r\theta)_+^{s-1} \leq \mathfrak{d}(x)^{s-1} \leq C_1^{1-s} x_d^{s-1}.$$

This observation yields

$$(II_1) \leq sC_1^{1-s}x_d^{s-1} \int_{ax_d}^{f^{-1}(ax_d)} \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr.$$

After scaling r by ax_d and using the monotonicity of ω , this equals

$$sC_1^{1-s}x_d^{-s}a^{1-2s} \int_1^{\frac{f^{-1}(ax_d)}{ax_d}} \frac{\omega(ax_d r)}{r^{2s}} dr \leq s \frac{C_1}{a} \frac{1-a}{a} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}{x_d^s} \int_1^{\frac{1}{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}} \frac{1}{r^{2s}} dr.$$

In the last inequality, we used (5.9) to rewrite the upper boundary of the integration domain. This is the desired estimate for the term (II_1) in the case $\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta \geq 0$.

Case 2. If $\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta < 0$, then the integrand of (II_1) is only nontrivial if $r < \mathfrak{d}(x)/|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|$. In this case, we estimate (II_1) as follows

$$(II_1) \leq s \int_{ax_d}^{f^{-1}(ax_d) \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}} (\mathfrak{d}(x) - r |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|)^{s-1} \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr = (II_{1,1}) + (II_{1,2}).$$

Here, the term $(II_{1,1})$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (II_{1,1}) &:= s \int_{ax_d}^{f^{-1}(ax_d)/2 \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{2|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}} (\mathfrak{d}(x) - r |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|)^{s-1} \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr \\ &\leq s \mathfrak{d}(x)^{s-1} 2^{1-s} \int_{ax_d}^{f^{-1}(ax_d)/2 \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{2|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}} \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr \leq s \frac{(2C_1)^{1-s}}{a^{2s-1}} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}{x_d^s} \int_1^{\frac{1}{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}} \frac{1}{r^{2s}} dr. \end{aligned}$$

As in the bound for the term (II_1) in the case 1, this is the desired estimate. Furthermore, the term $(II_{1,2})$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} &s \int_{f^{-1}(ax_d)/2 \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{2|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}}^{f^{-1}(ax_d) \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}} (\mathfrak{d}(x) - r |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|)^{s-1} \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr \leq \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d) \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|})}{(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2 \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{2|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|})^{2s}} \\ &\times \frac{\left((\mathfrak{d}(x) - \frac{f^{-1}(ax_d)|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}{2}) \vee \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{2} \right)^s - \left((\mathfrak{d}(x) - f^{-1}(ax_d) |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|) \vee 0 \right)^s}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

In the previous estimate, we used that ω is increasing, $r \mapsto r^{-2s}$ is decreasing, bounded them using the integration domain, and integrated the remaining term. We distinguish two more cases.

Sub-case 2.1. If $\mathfrak{d}(x)/|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta| \leq f^{-1}(ax_d)$, then the previous bound reduces to

$$(II_{1,2}) \leq \omega\left(\frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}\right) 2^{1-s} \left(\frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}\right)^{1-2s} \mathfrak{d}(x)^{s-1}. \quad (5.12)$$

Note that $ax_d \leq \mathfrak{d}(x)/|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta| \leq f^{-1}(ax_d)$ since otherwise the term $(II_{1,2})$ would not yield a contribution to (II_1) .

If $s \leq 1/2$, then $r \mapsto \omega(r) r^{1-2s}$ is increasing and, thus, using the above bound and (5.9) yield

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{II}_{1,2}) &\leq 2C_1 x_d^{s-1} \omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)) (f^{-1}(ax_d))^{1-2s} \\ &= 2C_1 \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))^{2s}}{x_d^s} \left(\frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)) f^{-1}(ax_d)}{x_d} \right)^{1-2s} = 2C_1 \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))^{2s}}{x_d^s}. \end{aligned}$$

By (5.10), the desired bound follows.

If $s > 1/2$, then using (5.12) we find

$$(\text{II}_{1,2}) \leq \omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)) 2^{1-s} (ax_d)^{1-2s} \mathfrak{d}(x)^{s-1} \leq C_1 2^{1-s} (a \wedge 1)^{-1} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(x_d))}{x_d^s}.$$

This is the desired estimate for $(\text{II}_{1,2})$ in the case $\mathfrak{d}(x)/|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta| \leq f^{-1}(ax_d)$.

Sub-case 2.2. If $\mathfrak{d}(x)/|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta| > f^{-1}(ax_d)$, then we bound $(\text{II}_{1,2})$ using (5.11) by

$$\frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}{(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2)^{2s}} \frac{(\mathfrak{d}(x) - \frac{f^{-1}(ax_d)|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}{2})^s - (\mathfrak{d}(x) - f^{-1}(ax_d)|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|)^s}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}.$$

Sub-case 2.2.1. If additionally $2f^{-1}(ax_d) < \mathfrak{d}(x)/|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|$, then $(\text{II}_{1,2})$ is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned} &s \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}{(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2)^{2s}} \frac{(\mathfrak{d}(x) - f^{-1}(ax_d)|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|)^{s-1} f^{-1}(ax_d) |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|}{2 |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|} \\ &\leq s \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}{(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2)^{2s}} 2^{-s} \mathfrak{d}(x)^{s-1} f^{-1}(ax_d) \leq s a^{1-2s} 2^s C_1^{1-s} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(x_d))^{2s}}{x_d^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used (5.11), (5.9), (5.4), and $t^s - r^s \leq sr^{s-1}(t-r)$, i.e. the concavity of $(\cdot)^s$.

Sub-case 2.2.2. If, additionally, $2f^{-1}(ax_d) \geq \mathfrak{d}(x)/|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|$, then $(\text{II}_{1,2})$ is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2)}{(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2)^{2s}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)^s}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|} \leq \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2)}{(f^{-1}(ax_d)/2)^{2s}} \mathfrak{d}(x)^{s-1} 2f^{-1}(ax_d) \leq 2^{1+2s} \frac{a C_1^{1-s} x_d^s}{f^{-1}(ax_d)^{2s}} \\ &= 2^{1+2s} a^{1-2s} C_1^{1-s} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))^{2s}}{x_d^s} \leq 2^{1+2s} a^{1-2s} C_1^{1-s} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(x_d))^{2s}}{x_d^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used (5.9), the bound on the regularized distance (5.4), and the monotonicity of ω and f^{-1} . This proves the desired bound on the term $(\text{II}_{1,2})$ in all cases.

We successfully estimated the term (II_1) . Now, we consider the term (II_2) .

Estimate of (II_2) . We distinguish two cases depending on the angle θ

Case 1. The line segment $\{x + r\theta \mid r \in (0, f^{-1}(ax_d))\}$ hits the boundary ∂D .

We call the smallest r such that $x + r\theta \in \partial D$ simply $r_0 \in [x_d, f^{-1}(ax_d)]$. Now, we prove a three intermediate results.

Claim a. There exists a global constant $c_1 > 0$ such that the distance to the boundary of D is bounded from below by a fraction of the vertical distance, i.e. $\text{dist}(y, \partial D) \geq c_1 |y_d - \phi(y')|$.

The claim a is standard. We provide the proof for self-containment. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |y_d - \phi(y')| &\leq \inf_{\tilde{y}'} |y_d - \phi(\tilde{y}')| + |\phi(y') - \phi(\tilde{y}')| \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}(1 + [\phi]_{C^{0,1}}) \inf_{\tilde{y}'} \|y - (\tilde{y}', \phi(\tilde{y}'))\| = \sqrt{2}(1 + [\phi]_{C^{0,1}}) d_y. \end{aligned}$$

This proves claim a.

Let $p := x + r_0\theta \in \partial D$, $q_r := (x' + r\theta', \phi(x' + r\theta'))$, and let z_r be the intersection point of the line going through p and q_r as well as the line going through 0 and x for all $r \in (0, r_0)$. That is $z_r := p + \frac{r_0}{r_0-r}(q_r - p)$, see Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Geometry close to ∂D in case 1.

Claim b. There exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that $|z_r - 0| \leq 1/2 |0 - x|$.

Now, we prove claim b. By (5.7) and the monotonicity of ω , we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |(z_r)_d| &= \left| \frac{r_0\phi(r\theta') - r \cdot \phi(r_0\theta')}{r_0 - r} \right| \leq |\phi(r\theta')| + \left| \frac{r}{r_0 - r} \int_{r_0}^r \theta' \cdot \nabla\phi(t\theta') dt \right| \\ &\leq \phi(r\theta') + r \sup_{r < t < r_0} |\nabla\phi(t\theta')| \leq r\omega(r) + r \sup_{r < t < r_0} \omega(t|\theta'|) \leq 2r_0\omega(r_0) = 2f(r_0). \end{aligned}$$

By $r_0 \leq f^{-1}(ax_d)$ and the previous bound on $(z_r)_d$, we find

$$|z_r - 0| = |(z_r)_d| \leq 2f(f^{-1}(ax_d)) \leq \frac{x_d}{2} = \frac{|0 - x|}{2}.$$

Here, we used $a < 1/4$. This proves the claim b.

Claim c. The line segment $\{x + r\theta \mid r \in (0, f^{-1}(ax_d))\}$ hits ∂D at most once.

Assume the claim is false. Then by intermediate value theorem, there exists a point $\xi = (t\theta', \phi(t\theta')) \in \partial D \cap (B_{f^{-1}(ax_d)} \setminus B_{x_d/2})$ such that the line $\{x + r\theta \mid r > 0\}$ is tangent to the surface ∂D at ξ . Thus, $\theta' \cdot \nabla\phi(\xi') = \theta_d$ which implies

$$|\theta_d| = |\theta' \cdot \nabla\phi(\xi')| \leq |\theta'| \omega(|\xi'|) \leq \omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)).$$

Using this bound on the angle θ , we can bound the distance of the line segment $\{x + r\theta \mid 0 < r < f^{-1}(ax_d)\}$ from ∂D as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x + r\theta, \partial D) &\geq c_1 |x_d + r\theta_d - \phi(r\theta')| \geq c_1 (x_d - r|\theta_d| - |\phi(r\theta')|) \\ &\geq c_1 (x_d - f^{-1}(ax_d)\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)) - r\omega(r)) \geq c_1(1 - 2a)x_d. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

This is a contradiction! Thus, claim c is proven.

Now, we proceed to estimate the term (II_2) in the case 1. By the intercept theorem, we find

$$\frac{|x + r\theta - q_r|}{|z_r - x|} = \frac{|p - (x + r\theta)|}{|p - x|}$$

which implies, using claim a, claim b, and (5.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(x + r\theta) &\geq C_1^{-1} \text{dist}(x + r\theta, \partial D) \geq \frac{c_1}{C_1} |x + r\theta - q_r| = \frac{c_1}{C_1} \frac{|p - (x + r\theta)|}{|p - x|} |z_r - x| \\ &\geq \frac{c_1}{C_1} \frac{(r_0 - r)}{r_0} (|0 - x| - |z_r - 0|) \geq \frac{c_1}{2C_1} \frac{r_0 - r}{r_0} x_d. \end{aligned}$$

Due to claim c, the domain of integration in the term (II_2) reduces to $[ax_d, r_0]$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{II}_2) &= s \int_{ax_d}^{r_0} \mathfrak{d}(x + r\theta)^{s-1} \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr \leq \omega(r_0) s \left(\frac{2C_1}{c_1}\right)^{1-s} x_d^{s-1} \int_{ax_d}^{r_0} \frac{(1 - r/r_0)^{s-1}}{r^{2s}} dr \\ &\leq s \left(\frac{2C_1}{c_1}\right)^{1-s} x_d^{s-1} \omega(r_0) \left(2^{1-s} \int_{ax_d}^{r_0/2} \frac{1}{r^{2s}} dr + \int_{r_0/2}^{r_0} (1 - r/r_0)^{s-1} \frac{2^{2s}}{r_0^{2s}} dr \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used the monotonicity of ω . In the first integral on the right-hand side of the previous estimate we scale r by ax_d , use $r_0 \leq f^{-1}(ax_d)$, and (5.9). In the second integral, we simply integrate. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{II}_2) &\leq s \left(\frac{2C_1}{c_1}\right)^{1-s} x_d^{s-1} \omega(r_0) \left(2^{1-s} (ax_d)^{1-2s} \int_1^{\frac{f^{-1}(ax_d)}{2ax_d}} \frac{1}{r^{2s}} dr + r_0^{1-2s} \frac{2^s}{s} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{4C_1}{c_1} \left(sa^{1-2s} x_d^{-s} \omega(f^{-1}(ax_d)) \int_1^{\frac{1}{2\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}} \frac{1}{r^{2s}} dr + x_d^{s-1} \omega(r_0) r_0^{1-2s} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be estimated as claimed in the lemma. We estimate the second term just as the term $(\text{II}_{1,2})$ in the sub-case 2.1. Here, we use $ax_d \leq r_0 \leq f^{-1}(ax_d)$ and (5.9).

Case 2. The ray $\{x + r\theta \mid r \in (0, f^{-1}(ax_d))\}$ does not hit the boundary ∂D .

We make a few more distinctions.

Sub-case 2.1. If $\theta_d \geq 0$, then just as in (5.13)

$$\text{dist}(x + r\theta, \partial D) \geq c_1 (x_d + r\theta_d - |\phi(r\theta')|) \geq c_1 (1 - a) x_d.$$

This yields

$$(\text{II}_2) \leq c_1^{s-1} C_1^{1-s} (1 - a)^{s-1} \int_{ax_d}^{f^{-1}(ax_d)} x_d^{s-1} \frac{\omega(r)}{r^{2s}} dr \leq \frac{4C_1}{3c_1} a^{1-2s} \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}{x_d^s} \int_1^{\frac{1}{\omega(f^{-1}(ax_d))}} \frac{dr}{r^{2s}}$$

which implies the desired estimate as in the bound for the term (II_1) in the case 1. Here, we used (5.9).

Sub-case 2.2. We assume $\theta_d < 0$. In this case, where $\tilde{\theta}$ is chosen such that $\tilde{\theta}'$ and θ' are linear dependent and $\tilde{\theta}_d < \theta_d$ such that $x + f^{-1}(ax_d)\tilde{\theta} \in \partial D$, see Figure 2.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ and D, ω, ι be as in Lemma 5.3. There exists a constant $C = C(d, s_0, \omega, \Lambda) > 0$ such that for any $s \in (s_0, 1)$*

$$|A_s(\mathfrak{d}^s)(x)| \leq C + C \frac{\omega(d_D(x))}{d_D(x)^s} + C \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x)))}{d_D(x)^s} \begin{cases} \frac{(\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x))))^{2s-1}-1}{1-2s} & , s \neq 1/2 \\ \ln\left(\frac{1}{\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x)))}\right) & , s = 1/2 \end{cases}, \quad (5.15)$$

for $x \in D \cap B_1$. Here, the function f is given by $f(t) = \iota\omega(t)$. If, additionally, the Lévy-measure ν_s satisfies the assumption (pUB), then

$$|A_s(\mathfrak{d}^s)(x)| \leq C + C \frac{\omega(d_D(x))}{d_D(x)^s} \quad \text{for } x \in D \cap B_1. \quad (5.16)$$

Proof. We fix $x \in D$ and set $\varepsilon := d_D(x) = \text{dist}(x, D^c)$. Let ρ_1 be the constant from Lemma 5.3. If $\varepsilon \geq \rho/2$, then $|A_s \mathfrak{d}^s| \leq C$ by the smoothness of the regularized distance function \mathfrak{d} . So, let's assume that $\text{dist}(x, \partial D) = \varepsilon < \rho/2$. We define the auxiliary function l by

$$l(y) = (\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot (y - x))_+. \quad (5.17)$$

Note that the s -th power of this function solves $A_s l^s(y) = 0$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $l(y) > 0$, see [FR24, Lemma 2.6.2]. This is easily seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_s l^s(x+y) &= (1-s) \int_{S^{d-1}} \text{p. v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)^s - (\mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta r)_+^s}{|r|^{1+2s}} dr \mu(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{S^{d-1}} |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta| (-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s [(\cdot)_+^s] \left(\frac{\mathfrak{d}(x)}{|\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot \theta|} \right) \mu(d\theta) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we used that $(\cdot)_+^s$ is an s -harmonic function on the half line, see e.g. [BV16, Theorem 2.4.1].

Depending on the size of y , we will derive estimates of $|\mathfrak{d}_{x+y}^s - l^s(x+y)|$. For this, we define

$$a := (\|\mathfrak{d}\|_{C^1} (1 + 2C_1) + 4)^{-1}.$$

Case $|y| < a\varepsilon$. Since $\mathfrak{d}(x) = l(x)$ and $\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) = \nabla l(x)$, we may make use of the higher regularity of both δ and l away from the boundary. We calculate

$$\mathfrak{d}(x+y) \geq C_1^{-1} \text{dist}(x+y, \partial D) \geq C_1^{-1} (\text{dist}(x, \partial D) - |y|) \geq \frac{1-a}{C_1} \varepsilon$$

and

$$l(x+y) \geq \mathfrak{d}(x) + \nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot y \geq C_1^{-1} \varepsilon - |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x)| a\varepsilon \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2C_1}.$$

Using this, (5.4), and the concavity of $(\cdot)_+^s$, we derive the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{d}(x+y)^s - l^s(x+y)| &\leq s |\mathfrak{d}(x+y) - l(x+y)| (\mathfrak{d}(x+y)^{s-1} + l^{s-1}(x+y)) \\ &\leq s 2(2C_1)^{1-s} \varepsilon^{s-1} |\mathfrak{d}(x+y) - l(x+y)| \\ &\leq s 2(2C_1 + 1) \varepsilon^{s-1} \|\mathfrak{d}\|_{C^2(B_{a\varepsilon}(x))} |y|^2 \leq s c_3 \omega(\varepsilon) \varepsilon^{s-2} |y|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Case $|y| \in [a\varepsilon, \rho_1]$. Using Taylor's theorem, there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$|\mathfrak{d}(x+y) - l(x+y)| \leq c_1 \omega(|y|) |y| \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (5.18)$$

see also [FR24, Lemma B.2.3]. Thus, for any $x + y \in D$ using the concavity of $(\cdot)_+^s$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{d}(x + y)^s - l^s(x + y)| &\leq s(\mathfrak{d}(x + y)^{s-1} + l(x + y)^{s-1}) |\mathfrak{d}(x + y) - l(x + y)| \\ &\leq sc_1(\mathfrak{d}(x + y)^{s-1} + l(x + y)^{s-1}) |y| \omega(|y|). \end{aligned}$$

Case $|y| \geq \rho_1$. Here, we use the trivial bounds $\delta_{x+y}^s \leq c_2 |y|^s$ and $l(x + y)^s \leq c_2 |y|^s$.

We estimate $A_s(\mathfrak{d}^s)(x)$ by splitting it into three parts.

$$\begin{aligned} |A_s(\mathfrak{d}^s)(x)| &= |A_s(\mathfrak{d}^s - l^s)(x)| \leq \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)} \\ &:= \left(\int_{B_{a\varepsilon}} + \int_{B_{\rho_1} \setminus B_{a\varepsilon}} + \int_{B_{\rho_1}^c} \right) |\mathfrak{d}^s(x + y) - l^s(x + y)| \nu_s(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Using the previous bound derived in the case $|y| < a\varepsilon$, we may estimate (I) by

$$sc_3 \omega(\varepsilon) \varepsilon^{s-2} \int_{B_{a\varepsilon}} |y|^2 \nu_s(dy) = 2s(1-s) \omega(\varepsilon) \varepsilon^{s-2} \int_{S^{d-1}} \int_0^{a\varepsilon} r^{1-2s} dr \mu(d\theta) \leq 2sa^{2-2s} \Lambda \frac{\omega(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^s}.$$

This is the desired bound. We continue by estimating the term (III) using the previous trivial growth bound of \mathfrak{d}^s and l^s . This leads to

$$\text{(III)} \leq 2(1-s) \Lambda c_2 \int_{\rho_1}^{\infty} r^{-1-s} dr \leq \frac{2(1-s) \Lambda c_2}{s} \rho_1^{-s}.$$

Now, we turn our attention to the term (II). Upon analyzing the term (II) with more care, one notices this term behaves differently depending on whether (pUB) holds or not. Thus, we make a case distinction.

Case ((pUB) holds). We assume that (pUB) holds. Since $r \mapsto \omega(r)/r^{s/2}$ is decreasing in a neighborhood of 0, we apply [FR24, Lemma B.2.4] to find that

$$\text{(II)} \leq s(1-s) \Lambda c_1 \frac{\omega(a\varepsilon)}{(a\varepsilon)^{s/2}} \int_{D \cap B_{\rho_1} \setminus B_{a\varepsilon}} (\delta_{x+y}^{s-1} + l(x+y)^{s-1}) |y|^{1-d-3s/2} dy \leq (1-s) c_3 \left(1 + \frac{\omega(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^s}\right).$$

This is the desired bound.

Case ((pUB) does not hold). Here, the bound follows directly from Lemma 5.3. \square

As announced above, in the following proposition we study the behavior of $\mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d})$ under appropriate assumptions on the function ζ , see Section 4. This will be the last tool needed to construct the barriers.

Proposition 5.7. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ and D, ω, ι be as in Lemma 5.3. Suppose the function ζ satisfies **(Z0)**, **(Z1)**, **(Z2)**, **(Z3)**, and **(Z4)**. There exist two positive constants C_4 and C_5 depending only on s_0, ω, ζ , and the constants from Proposition 4.1 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} A_s[\mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d})](x) &\leq -C_4 d_D(x)^{1-s} \zeta'(d_D(x)) + C_5 + C_5 \frac{\omega(d_D(x))}{d_D(x)^s} \\ &\quad + C_5 \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x)))}{d_D(x)^s} \begin{cases} \frac{(\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x))))^{2s-1} - 1}{1-2s} & , s \neq 1/2 \\ \ln\left(\frac{1}{\omega(f^{-1}(d_D(x)))}\right) & , s = 1/2 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

for all $x \in D \cap B_1$. If additionally (pUB) holds, then

$$A_s[\mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d})] \leq -C_4 d_D(x)^{1-s} \zeta'(d_D(x)) + C_5 + C_5 \frac{\omega(d_D(x))}{d_D(x)^s} \quad (5.20)$$

for all $x \in D \cap B_1$.

Proof. Again, we define the auxiliary function l as in (5.17). Fix $x \in D$ and $\varepsilon := \text{dist}(x, \partial D)$. If $\varepsilon \geq \rho/2$, then the estimate is trivial due to the regularity of $\mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d})$. So we assume the contrary. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $l(y) > 0$, by Proposition 4.1 there exists a positive constant c_1 depending only on ω, s_0, D such that

$$A_s[l^s \zeta(l)](x) \leq -\Lambda c_1 \varepsilon^{1-s} \zeta'(\varepsilon).$$

As in the proof of Proposition 5.6, it remains to prove an appropriate bound on

$$(I) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d}) - l^s \zeta(l)| (x+y) \nu_s(dy).$$

Since ζ is bounded and concave, the following claim holds true.

Claim 1. $|t^s \zeta(t) - r^s \zeta(r)| \leq 2 \frac{s+1}{s} \|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(0, t_1)} |t^s - r^s|$ for all $0 < r < t < t_1$.

We prove this claim. Without loss of generality we assume $t \geq r$, say $t = r + \varepsilon$. Now, it is left to show for any $r \geq 0, \varepsilon \geq 0$

$$(r + \varepsilon)^s \zeta(r + \varepsilon) - r^s \zeta(r) \leq 2 \|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(0, t_1)} ((r + \varepsilon)^s - r^s).$$

This inequality is true for $\varepsilon = 0$. We differentiate with respect to ε . Then it remains to prove

$$s \zeta(r + \varepsilon) + (r + \varepsilon) \zeta'(r + \varepsilon) \leq s 2 \frac{s+1}{s} \|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(0, t_1)}.$$

This is true since ζ is concave and, thus, $t \zeta'(t) \leq \zeta(t)$.

Now, we fix a very large constant t_1 . We will split the integration domain of (I) into $B_1(0)$ and its complement. If $y \in B_1(0)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(x+y) &\leq C_1 \text{dist}(x+y, D^c) \leq C_1(\rho/2 \wedge t_0 + 1), \\ l(x+y) &\leq \mathfrak{d}(x) + |\nabla \mathfrak{d}(x) \cdot y| \leq C_1 \rho/2 \wedge t_0 + \|\mathfrak{d}\|_{C^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used (5.4). If we set $c_2 := C_1(\rho/2 \wedge t_0 + 1) + \|\mathfrak{d}\|_{C^1}$, then, using the claim 1, we find

$$\int_{B_1(0)} |\mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d}) - l^s \zeta(l)| (x+y) \nu_s(dy) \leq 2 \frac{s+1}{s} \zeta(c_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathfrak{d}^s - l^s| (x+y) \nu_s(dy)$$

Now, an application of Proposition 5.6 yields the desired bound. Outside of the ball $B_1(0)$, we use the trivial bound $|\mathfrak{d}(x+y) - l(x+y)| \leq c_3(1 + |y|)$. This proves the result just as in the estimate of the term (III) in the proof of Proposition 5.6. \square

Next, we prove the existence of a function ζ as required in Proposition 5.7. We prove two results depending on whether (pUB) holds or not.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $0 < \iota < \min\{s, 1/3\}$, ω be the modulus of continuity modified as in Remark 5.2, and $C > 0$. Then there exists $t_0 > 0$ and $\zeta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ continuous on $[0, \infty)$ and in $C^2((0, \infty)) \cap C^3((0, 2))$ which satisfies **(Z0)**, **(Z1)**, **(Z2)**, **(Z3)**, and **(Z4)**. Furthermore, ζ satisfies*

$$C(t^s + \omega(t)) \leq t \zeta'(t). \quad (5.21)$$

for all $0 < t < t_0$.

Proof. Step 1. In the first step, we define the function ζ in a neighborhood of 0 such that **(Z0)**-**(Z3)** are satisfied.

We define the function $\zeta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ via

$$\zeta(t) := C \int_0^t \frac{r^\iota + \omega(r)}{r} dr. \quad (5.22)$$

Since $\omega \in C^2$ and satisfies (2.1), the function ζ is in $C([0, \infty)) \cap C^3((0, \infty))$. Now, we check all assumptions **(Z0)**-**(Z3)**.

Since ω satisfies (2.1), ζ is continuous and $\zeta(0) = 0$. Additionally, ζ is positive in $(0, \infty)$ since ω is nonnegative. Its derivative

$$\zeta'(t) = C \frac{t^\iota + \omega(t)}{t} \quad (5.23)$$

is positive and, thus, ζ is increasing. Its second derivative equals

$$\zeta''(t) = -C(1 - \iota)t^{\iota-2} - C \frac{\omega(t) - t\omega'(t)}{t^2} \quad (5.24)$$

which is negative since ω is concave. Thus, the function ζ is concave and **(Z0)** holds true.

A minor calculation reveals

$$t^2 \zeta'''(t) = (2 - \iota)(1 - \iota)Ct^{\iota-1} + C \frac{2\omega(t) - 2t\omega'(t) + t^2\omega''(t)}{t}.$$

Now using (5.2) and the previous calculations, the inequality **(Z1)** is satisfied if

$$\omega(t) - 2t\omega'(t) - 3t\omega''(t) \geq -c_1\omega(t).$$

Since ω is concave, the assumption **(Z1)** is satisfied with the constant $c_1 = 4$.

We calculate the derivative of $t\zeta'(t)$. It equals

$$C\iota t^{\iota-1} + C\omega'(t)$$

which is trivially positive. Thus, the assumption **(Z2)** holds true for our choice of ζ .

Finally, the derivative of $\zeta(t)/t^\iota$ reads

$$C \frac{t^\iota + \omega(t)}{t^{\iota+1}} - \iota \frac{\zeta(t)}{t^\iota + 1} \geq C \frac{t^\iota + \omega(t)}{t^{\iota+1}} - \iota \frac{C}{t^\iota} \int_0^t \frac{r^\iota + \frac{1}{t}r\omega'(r)}{r} dr \geq 0.$$

Here, we used (5.1). Thus, **(Z3)** follows.

Note that ζ as defined in step 1 may not have the correct growth bound **(Z4)**. In step 2, we will change ζ away from the origin. But first, we need the following claim.

Claim a. The function ζ from step 1 satisfies

$$\zeta'(t) \geq -t\zeta''(t). \quad (5.25)$$

The claim a is an easy consequence from the previous calculations (5.23) and (5.24).

Step 2. Now, we restrict the function ζ defined in step 1 to $[0, 1]$ and redefine it on $(1, \infty)$ such that **(Z0)**, **(Z2)**, and **(Z4)** remain true. This is achieved by choosing

$$\zeta(t) := a(t - 1 + b^{\frac{2}{2-s}})^{s/2} + (\zeta(1) - a b^{\frac{s}{2-s}}) \text{ for all } t \in (1, \infty)$$

where

$$b = \left(\frac{2-s}{2} \frac{\zeta'(1)}{-\zeta''(1)} \right)^{\frac{2-s}{6-2s}}, \quad a := \frac{2}{sb} \zeta'(1).$$

Note that a, b, c are both nonnegative. With this choice ζ is positive in $(0, \infty)$ and satisfies **(Z4)** by construction. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 1+} \zeta(t) &= a(0 + b^{\frac{2}{2-s}})^{s/2} + (\zeta(1) - a b^{\frac{s}{2-s}}) = \zeta(1), \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 1+} \zeta'(t) &= \frac{s}{2} a (0 + b^{\frac{2}{2-s}})^{s/2-1} = \frac{s}{2} a b^{-1} = \zeta'(1), \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 1+} \zeta''(t) &= -\frac{s}{2} \frac{2-s}{2} a (0 + b^{\frac{2}{2-s}})^{s/2-2} = -\frac{2-s}{2} \zeta'(1) b^{\frac{2s-6}{2-s}} = \zeta''(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the function ζ is in $C_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Due to the positivity of a and b the function ζ is globally increasing and concave. Lastly, we check that **(Z2)** is true. We differentiate the function for $t > 1$

$$\begin{aligned} t\zeta'(t) &= \frac{ast}{2} (t - 1 + b^{\frac{2}{2-s}})^{s/2-1}, \\ \frac{2}{as} \partial_t t\zeta'(t) &= (t - 1 + b^{\frac{2}{2-s}})^{s/2-1} - (1 - s/2)t(t - 1 + b^{\frac{2}{2-s}})^{s/2-2}. \end{aligned}$$

This is nonnegative for $t > 1$ if and only if the following term is positive.

$$\begin{aligned} (t - 1 + b^{2/(2-s)}) - (1 - s/2)t &\geq -(1 - s/2) + \left(\frac{2-s}{2} \frac{\zeta'(1)}{-\zeta''(1)} \right)^{\frac{2}{6-2s}} \\ &\geq -(1 - s/2) + \left(\frac{2-s}{2} \right)^{\frac{2}{6-2s}} \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

Here, we used claim a. □

Lemma 5.9. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $0 < \iota < \min\{s, 1/3\}$, ω be the modulus of continuity modified as in Remark 5.2, and $C > 0$. Then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for all $s_0 \leq s < 1$ there exists a function $\zeta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ continuous on $[0, \infty)$ and in $C^2((0, \infty)) \cap C^3((0, 2))$ which satisfies **(Z0)**, **(Z1)**, **(Z2)**, **(Z3)**, and **(Z4)**. Furthermore, ζ satisfies*

$$C \left(t^s + \omega(t) + \frac{\omega(f^{-1}(t))^{2s} - \omega(f^{-1}(t))}{1 - 2s} \right) \leq t\zeta'(t) \tag{5.27}$$

for all $0 < t < t_0$. Here, $f(t) = \omega(t)$. In the case $s = 1/2$ the assumption (5.27) reads

$$C \left(t^s + \omega(t) + \omega(f^{-1}(t)) \ln \left(\frac{1}{\omega(f^{-1}(t))} \right) \right) \leq t\zeta'(t)$$

for all $0 < t < t_0$.

Proof. Step 1. In the first step, we define the function ζ in a neighborhood of 0 such that **(Z0)**-**(Z3)** hold.

We split the definition of ζ into two parts. $\zeta = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2$. Now, we define, just as in Lemma 5.8,

$$\zeta_1(t) := C \int_0^t \frac{r^t + \omega(r)}{r} dr$$

for all $t \geq 0$. By Lemma 5.8, more precisely its proof, this function satisfies all the desired properties.

To define ζ_2 , we make a few observations. We fix $t_1 > 0$ such that $\omega(f^{-1})(t_1) \leq (2s)^{1/(1-2s)}$. In the interval $0 \leq r < 2s^{1/(1-2s)}$ the function $r \mapsto (r^{2s} - r)/(1 - 2s)$ is increasing. Note that h is increasing. Since

$$\frac{\omega(f^{-1}(t))}{t} = \frac{1}{f^{-1}(t)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

the function h is sublinear. Now, let γ the function obtained from Lemma 5.1 applied to the function $h : t \mapsto \omega(f^{-1}(t))$. Let $t_1 > 0$ be such that $\gamma(t_1) \leq 1/e \leq 1$ and

$$\gamma(t_1) \leq a_s := \begin{cases} \min\{(1-\iota)^{1/(1-2s)}, (2s)^{1/(1-2s)}\} & , s > 1/2, \\ \min\{(\frac{1-2s\iota}{1-\iota})^{1/(1-2s)}, (2s)^{1/(1-2s)}\} & , s < 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (5.28)$$

Note that a_s is bounded from below by a positive constant depending only on ι and s_0 .

We define for any $0 \leq t \leq t_1$

$$\zeta_2(t) := \begin{cases} C \int_0^t \frac{\gamma(r)^{2s} - \gamma(r)}{(1-2s)r} dr & , s \neq 1/2, \\ C \int_0^t \frac{\gamma(r)}{r} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\gamma(r)}\right) dr & , s = 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Now, we check the assumptions **(Z0)**-**(Z3)** in the interval $[0, t_1]$. Thereafter, we will extend ζ_2 to \mathbb{R}_+ appropriately.

In the regime $0 < t \leq t_1$, ζ_2 is positive since $0 < \gamma(t) \leq 1/e < 1$. Its derivative equals

$$\zeta_2'(t) = \begin{cases} C \frac{\gamma(t)^{2s} - \gamma(t)}{(1-2s)t} & , s \neq 1/2, \\ C \frac{\gamma(t)}{t} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\gamma(t)}\right) & , s = 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Again, by the same reasons as before, this is positive in $(0, t_1)$. To check the concavity, we calculate the second derivative.

$$\zeta_2''(t) = \frac{C}{1-2s} \frac{(2s\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1)t\gamma'(t) - \gamma(t)^{2s} + \gamma(t)}{t^2}.$$

If $s > 1/2$, then we estimate this from above by

$$\frac{C}{2s-1} \frac{\gamma(t)^{2s} - (1-\iota)\gamma(t)}{t^2} \leq 0$$

Here, we used (5.1) for γ and $\gamma(t) \leq \gamma(t_1) \leq (1-\iota)^{1/(1-2s)}$. If $s < 1/2$, then note that $(2s\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1) \geq 0$ due to $\gamma(t) \leq \gamma(t_1) \leq (2s)^{1/(1-2s)}$. Thus, we estimate the second derivative of ζ_2 by

$$\zeta_2''(t) \leq \frac{C}{1-2s} \frac{-(1-2s\iota)\gamma(t)^{2s} + (1-\iota)\gamma(t)}{t^2} \leq 0.$$

In the last inequality, we used

$$\gamma(t) \leq \gamma(t_0) \leq \left(\frac{1-2s\iota}{1-\iota}\right)^{1/(1-2s)}.$$

Lastly, if $s = 1/2$, then

$$\zeta_2''(t) = C \frac{-t + (t\gamma'(t) - \gamma(t)) \ln(1/\gamma(t))}{t^2} < 0.$$

Here, we used $\ln(1/\gamma(t))$ which follows from $\gamma(t) \leq \gamma(t_0) \leq 1$. Thus, the property **(Z0)** holds.

We calculate the third derivative of ζ_2 . First, we assume $s \neq 1/2$. The term $\zeta_2^{(3)}(t)$ equals

$$C \frac{-2(2s\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1)t\gamma'(t) + 2(\gamma(t)^{2s} - \gamma(t)) + \gamma''(t)t^2(2s\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1)}{(1-2s)t^3} - \frac{C2st^2(\gamma'(t))^2\gamma(t)^{2s-2}}{t^3} =: \frac{\text{(I)} + \text{(II)}}{t^2}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1}{1-2s} \geq \frac{2s\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1}{1-2s} \quad (5.29)$$

holds for all $t > 0$. Using (5.29), the concavity of γ , and the previous representation of ζ_2' , we can bound (I) from below by

$$-2\frac{t\gamma'(t)}{\gamma(t)}\zeta_2'(t) + 2\zeta_2'(t) + \frac{\gamma''(t)t^2}{\gamma(t)}\zeta_2'(t) \geq -5\frac{t\gamma'(t)}{\gamma(t)}\zeta_2'(t) + \zeta_2'(t) \geq -4\zeta_2'(t).$$

Here, we used (5.2) and the concavity of γ . Due to the previous representation of ζ_2' , the bound

$$\text{(II)} \geq -2s\zeta_2'(t)$$

follows from

$$\gamma(t)^{2s} \leq \frac{\gamma(t)^{2s} - \gamma(t)}{1-2s}.$$

This is true due to the assumption $\gamma(t) \leq \gamma(t_1) \leq (2s)^{1/(1-2s)}$. Thus, the property **(Z1)** follows in the case $s \neq 1/2$.

Now, we assume $s = 1/2$. In this case, the third derivative of ζ_2 reads

$$\frac{C}{t^3} \left(t + 2(\gamma(t) - t\gamma'(t)) \ln(1/\gamma(t)) + t \frac{\gamma(t) - t\gamma'(t)}{\gamma(t)} + t^2\gamma''(t) \ln(1/\gamma(t)) \right).$$

Since γ is concave and by (5.2), this is bounded from below by

$$\frac{C}{t^3} (-\gamma(t) - 3t\gamma'(t)) \ln(1/\gamma(t)) \geq -\frac{4}{t^2} \frac{C\gamma(t) \ln(1/\gamma(t))}{t} = -4\frac{\zeta_2'(t)}{t^2}.$$

This is the desired bound and, thus, the property **(Z1)** follows also in the case $s = 1/2$.

Now, we check property **(Z2)**. If $s \neq 1/2$, then the derivative of $t\zeta_2'(t)$ equals

$$\gamma'(t) \frac{2s\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1}{1-2s}$$

which is nonnegative if $\gamma(t) \leq (2s)^{1/(1-2s)}$. If $s = 1/2$, then

$$\partial_t(t\gamma'(t)) = \gamma'(t) \ln(1/\gamma(t)) - \gamma'(t)$$

which is nonnegative if $\gamma(t) \leq 1/e$. Thus, **(Z2)** is true.

For the moment, we assume $s \neq 1/2$. We calculate the derivative of $\zeta(t)/t^t$. It equals

$$\frac{1}{t^{t+1}} \left(\gamma(t) \frac{\gamma(t)^{2s-1} - 1}{1-2s} - t \int_0^t \frac{\gamma(r)^{2s-1} - \gamma(r)}{1-2s} \frac{\gamma(r)}{r} dr \right).$$

By (5.29) and (5.1) for γ , we conclude

$$\iota \frac{\gamma(r)^{2s-1} - \gamma(r)}{1-2s} \frac{\gamma(r)}{r} \geq \frac{2s\gamma(r)^{2s-1} - \gamma(r)}{1-2s} \gamma'(r) = \partial_r \left(\frac{\gamma(r)^{2s-1} - \gamma(r)}{1-2s} \gamma(r) \right).$$

This bound yields $\partial_t \zeta(t)/t^\iota \leq 0$ and, thus, the assumption **(Z3)** holds for the function γ_2 in the case $s \neq 1/2$. Now, if $s = 1/2$, then using (5.1)

$$\iota \frac{\gamma(r)}{r} \ln(1/\gamma(r)) \geq \gamma'(r) \ln(1/\gamma(r)) \geq \gamma'(r) (\ln(1/\gamma(r)) - 1) = \partial_r (\gamma(r) \ln(1/\gamma(r))).$$

This yields

$$t^{\iota+1} \partial_t \frac{\zeta(t)}{t^\iota} = \gamma(t) \ln(1/\gamma(t)) - \iota \int_0^t \frac{\gamma(r) \ln(1/\gamma(r))}{r} dr \geq 0$$

and, thus, **(Z3)** holds also for $s = 1/2$.

Step 2. Finally, we extend ζ to $[0, \infty)$ such that **(Z0)**, **(Z2)**, and **(Z4)** remain true. For this we refer to step 2 in the proof of Lemma 5.8. \square

The next four propositions provide super and sub-solutions function which we will use as barriers in Section 6.

Proposition 5.10. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded uniform $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain. Suppose (pUB) holds. For any $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ there exist constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$ there exists a function $b_+ \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} A_s b_+ &\geq 1 \text{ in } \{x \in D \mid \text{dist}(x, D^c) < \varepsilon_0\}, \\ C_1 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s &\leq b_+ \leq C_2 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let ω be the function obtained from Lemma 5.1 applied to the uniform modulus of continuity of the charts of ∂D . From Lemma 5.8, we deduce the existence of ζ satisfying **(Z0)**-**(Z4)** and (5.21) for the constant $C := (c_1 C_5 + \tilde{C} + 1)/(c_1 C_4)$ where \tilde{C} is taken from Proposition 5.6, C_4, C_5 from Proposition 5.7, and $c_1 := 1/(2\zeta(\text{diam}(D)))$. We define

$$b_+(x) := \mathfrak{d}(x)^s - c_1 \mathfrak{d}(x)^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d}(x)).$$

By the choice of c_1 , we know $b_+ > 0$ in D and $b_+(x) \leq \mathfrak{d}(x)^s \leq c_2^s \text{dist}(x, D^c)^s$ by (5.4) as well as $b_+(x) \geq 1/2 \mathfrak{d}(x)^s \geq c_2^{-s}/2 d_x^s$. Using these properties and [FR24, Lemma B.2.5], we know $b_+ \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 5.7 and the choice of ζ and the constant C , we find

$$A_s b_+(x) \geq -(c_1 C_5 + \tilde{C}) \left(\frac{\omega(d_x)}{d_x^s} + 1 \right) + c_1 C_4 \frac{\zeta'(d_x)}{d_x^{s-1}} \geq 1.$$

Here, we wrote $d_x := \text{dist}(x, D^c)$ for short. \square

Proposition 5.11. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded uniform $2s_0$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain. There exist constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$ there exists a function $b_+ \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} A_s b_+ &\geq 1 \text{ in } \{x \in D \mid \text{dist}(x, D^c) < \varepsilon_0\}, \\ C_1 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s &\leq b_+ \leq C_2 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof uses the same arguments as the previous one for Proposition 5.10 but instead of Lemma 5.8 we use Lemma 5.9. Here, note that Lemma 2.4. \square

The following two propositions provide appropriate sub-solutions which will be used as barriers to prove a Hopf lemma.

Proposition 5.12. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded uniform $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain. Suppose (pUB) holds. For any $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ there exist constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1]$ there exists a function $b_- \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} A_s b_- &\leq -1 \text{ in } \{x \in D \mid \text{dist}(x, D^c) < \varepsilon_0\}, \\ C_1 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s &\leq b_+ \leq C_2 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as the proof of Proposition 5.10 but instead of b_+ we consider

$$b_- := \mathfrak{d}^s + \mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d}).$$

□

Proposition 5.13. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded uniform $2s_0$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain. There exist constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$ there exists a function $b_- \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} A_s b_- &\leq -1 \text{ in } \{x \in D \mid \text{dist}(x, D^c) < \varepsilon_0\}, \\ C_1 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s &\leq b_+ \leq C_2 \text{dist}(\cdot, D^c)^s. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as the proof of Proposition 5.11 but instead of b_+ we consider

$$b_- := \mathfrak{d}^s + \mathfrak{d}^s \zeta(\mathfrak{d}).$$

□

6. BOUNDARY ESTIMATES

In this section, we prove both the C^s -boundary regularity, see Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, and the Hopf boundary lemma, see Subsection 6.2. We combine the barriers build in Section 5 with the interior regularity from Section 3.

6.1. Boundary regularity. The first step is an upper bound on $|u|$ in terms of the distance to a boundary point. This is done in the next proposition. The main ingredient are the barriers constructed in Proposition 5.10 respectively Proposition 5.11 combined with a maximum principle.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set such that $\Omega \cap B_2$ satisfies the exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Omega$. Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$. Assume (pUB) or $s_0 > 1/2$. There exists a positive constant C such that for any $f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)$, any $s \in [s_0, 1)$, and any weak solution u to*

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu^s u &= f \text{ in } \Omega \cap B_1, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \Omega^c \cap B_2, \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

the solution u satisfies the bound

$$|u(x)| \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{y \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u; y) + \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} \right) |x - z|^s \quad \text{for } x \in B_1, \tag{6.2}$$

where the tail-term is defined by (3.13).

Remark 6.2. The Proposition 6.1 is known to be false for Lipschitz domains. This can be seen using the theory on s -harmonic functions on infinite cones, see [BB04] and [Mic06, Lemma 3.3].

Proof. If the right-hand side of (6.2) is not finite, then the bound is trivial. We assume the contrary. We fix a smooth cutoff function ϕ with $\phi = 1$ in $B_{3/2}$ and $\phi = 0$ on B_2^c . Further, we define $\bar{u} := u\phi$. Then, \bar{u} satisfies

$$A_\mu^s \bar{u}(x) = f(x) + \int_{\{-x\} + B_{3/2}^c} (1 - \phi(x+h))u(x+h)\nu_s(dh) \text{ in } \Omega \cap B_1 \text{ in the weak sense.} \quad (6.3)$$

Let D_z be the $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain adapted to z and Ω by the exterior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property. Further, let b_+ be the function and ε_0, C_1, C_2 be the constants from Proposition 5.10 if (pUB) holds and the function from Proposition 5.11 if (pUB) is not true but $s_0 > 1/2$ holds. We define

$$\psi := \left(\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{y \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u; y) + \frac{\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty}}{C_1 \varepsilon_0^s} \right) b_+.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\text{dist}(x, D_z^c) \geq \varepsilon_0$ or $x \in \Omega^c \cap B_2$, we know

$$\psi(x) \geq \frac{\text{dist}(x, D_z^c)^s}{\varepsilon_0^s} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty} \geq \bar{u}(x)$$

by Proposition 5.10 or Proposition 5.11 respectively. Using the same propositions and (6.3), we find in $B_1 \cap \Omega$

$$A_\mu^s [\bar{u} - \psi](x) \leq 0$$

in $B_1 \cap \Omega$ in the weak sense. Thus, the maximum principle for weak solution, see e.g. [Rut18, Theorem 5.1], yields for any $x \in B_1$

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) = \bar{u}(x) &\leq \psi(x) \leq C_2 \left(\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{y \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u; y) + \frac{\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty}}{C_1 \varepsilon_0^s} \right) \text{dist}(x, D_z^c)^s \\ &\leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{y \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(u; y) + \frac{\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty}}{C_1 \varepsilon_0^s} \right) |x - z|^s. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, we may repeat this procedure for $-u$ instead of u . \square

Proposition 6.3. *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$. We fix an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\Omega \cap B_2$ satisfies the exterior $2s_0$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property with the same modulus of continuity at a boundary point $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Omega$. There exists a positive constant C such that for any $f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)$, any $s \in [s_0, 1)$, and any weak solution u to (6.1) the estimate (6.2) holds.*

Proof. After Lemma 2.4, the proof uses the same ideas as the one of Proposition 6.1 but with Proposition 5.11 instead of Proposition 5.10. \square

The next lemma yields an global L^∞ -bound. This result is well known, see e.g. [FR24, Lemma 2.3.9, Lemma 2.3.10], but note it is essential for us that the constant in (6.4) depends on s only through a lower bound $s_0 \leq s$. For this reason, we provide the proof here.

Lemma 6.4 (L^∞ -bound). *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, and $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$. There exists a positive constant $C = C(s_0, \lambda, \Lambda, d)$ such that for any $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $s_0 \leq s < 1$, and a weak solution u to (1.4) the function u satisfies the bound*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C(\text{diam}(\Omega))^{2s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (6.4)$$

Proof. We prove the result in two step. Without loss of generality we assume $0 \in \Omega$.

Step 1. We construct a super-solution. We define $\psi(x) := (1 - x^2)_+$ similar to [FR24, Lemma 2.3.10]. This function satisfies

$$A_\mu^s \psi(0) = \mu(S^{d-1})2(1-s) \left(\int_0^1 r^{1-2s} dr + \int_1^\infty r^{-1-2s} dr \right) = \frac{\mu(S^{d-1})}{s} \geq \lambda.$$

Since $A_\mu^s \psi$ is continuous, which is due to the regularity and boundedness of ψ , we find a positive radius $r_1 = r_1(s_0, \lambda, \Lambda, d)$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| \leq r_1$

$$A_\mu^s \psi(x) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}. \quad (6.5)$$

Now, we define a scaled version of ψ , $\psi_R(x) := c_1 \psi_1(x/R)$ for $R > 0$, $c_1 > 0$. This function satisfies

$$A_\mu^s \psi_R(x) = c_1 R^{-2s} A_\mu^s \psi_1(x/R) \geq c_1 \frac{R^{-2s} \lambda}{2}$$

for any $x \in B_{Rr_1}(0)$ by (6.5).

Step 2. We compare the super-solution from step 1 with u . Fix $R := \text{diam}(\Omega)/r_1$ and $c_1 := 2R^{2s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}/\lambda$. Then, $A_\mu^s[\psi_R - u] \geq 0$ in Ω and, since $u = 0$ on Ω^c , $\psi_R - u \geq 0$ on Ω^c . The weak maximum principle for weak solutions, see e.g. [Rut18, Theorem 5.1], yields $u \leq \psi_R$. Repeating this argument with $-u$ yields

$$|u(x)| \leq \psi_R(x) \leq c_1 = \frac{2}{\lambda r_1^{2s}} \text{diam}(\Omega)^{2s} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

□

Corollary 6.5 (Global boundary estimate). *Suppose either all assumptions from Theorem 1.1 or Theorem 1.2 hold. There exists a positive constant $C = C(s_0, \lambda, \Lambda, \Omega)$ such that any weak solution u to (1.4) with $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$|u| \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} d_\Omega^s$$

Proof. Firstly, note that the tail term in the bound (6.2) can be estimated by $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$. If (pUB) holds or $s_0 > 1/2$, then we use Proposition 6.1. Else, the Proposition 6.3 applied to all $z \in \partial\Omega$ yields

$$|u| \leq c_1 (\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}) d_\Omega^s.$$

Now, the result follows from Lemma 6.4. □

Using Theorem 3.3, Lemma 6.4, and Corollary 6.5, the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 follows with arguments very close to [RS14, Proposition 1.1].

Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. We prove the results in two steps.

Step 1. First we prove the bound

$$\frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^s} \leq c_1 \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (6.6)$$

for any $x, y \in \Omega$ such that $|x - y| \leq d_\Omega(x)/4$.

We consider the function $v(h) := u(x + d_\Omega(x)/2h)$. This function satisfies

$$A_\mu^s v(h) = \frac{d_\Omega(x)^{2s}}{2^{2s}} f(x + d_\Omega(x)/2h) =: \tilde{f}(h)$$

for $y \in B_{3/2}$ in the weak and, thus, also in the distributional sense. The function v is bounded due to Lemma 6.4. Therefore, the Theorem 3.3 applied to v yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^s} &\leq \frac{2^s}{d_\Omega(x)^s} [v]_{C^s(B_{1/2})} \\ &\leq c_1 \frac{2^s}{d_\Omega(x)^s} \left(\frac{d_\Omega(x)^{2s}}{2^{2s}} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} + \sup_{h \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(v; h) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

for any $x, y \in \Omega$ such that $|x - y| \leq d_\Omega(x)/4$. By Corollary 6.5, we know

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} = \|v\|_{L^\infty(B_{d_\Omega(x)}(x))} \leq c_2 \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} 2^s d_\Omega(x)^s.$$

Note that $d_\Omega(x + d_\Omega(x)/2h) \leq d_\Omega(x) + |x + d_\Omega(x)/2h - x| \leq d_\Omega(x)(1 + |h|)$ for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, again due to Corollary 6.5 applied to u we find

$$|v(h)| \leq c_2 \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} d_\Omega(x + d_\Omega(x)/2h)^s \leq c_2 d_\Omega(x)^s (1 + |h|)^s \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

This allows us to estimate the tail term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in B_1} \text{Tail}_{\nu_s}(v; h) &\leq c_2 d_\Omega(x)^s \sup_{h \in B_1} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)^c} (1 + |h + r\theta|)^s \nu_s(d\theta) \\ &= 2c_2 d_\Omega(x)^s (1 - s) \mu(S^{d-1}) \int_{1/2}^{\infty} \frac{(2 + |r|)^s}{|r|^{1+2s}} dr \\ &\leq 2^s 5^s d_\Omega(x)^s (1 - s) \Lambda \frac{(1/2)^{-s}}{s} \end{aligned}$$

These observations together with (6.7) yield the claim.

Step 2. Now, we prove that the inequality (6.6) with a slightly bigger constant holds for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

If $x \notin \Omega$ or $y \notin \Omega$, then this follows directly from Corollary 6.5. It remains to prove the bound for $x, y \in \Omega$ such that $|x - y| > \max\{d_\Omega(x), d_\Omega(y)\}/4$. In this, case the estimate again follows from Corollary 6.5. Using the triangle inequality and Corollary 6.5, we write

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq |u(x)| + |u(y)| \leq c_3 \|f\|_{L^\infty} (d_\Omega(x)^s + d_\Omega(y)^s) \leq 2c_3 4^s \|f\|_{L^\infty} |x - y|^s.$$

□

6.2. Hopf boundary lemma.

Proposition 6.6 (localized Hopf-type boundary lemma I). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set such that Ω satisfies the interior $C^{1, \text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Omega$. Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$. Assume (pUB) or $s_0 > 1/2$. There exist positive constants C, ε_0 such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$ and any distributional super-solution $u \in C(B_1 \cap \Omega)$ to (1.6) we know that*

$$u(x) \geq |x - z|^s C \inf\{u(y) \mid y \in B_{1/2} \cap \Omega, \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega) \geq \varepsilon_0\} \quad (6.8)$$

for any $x \in B_{1/2} \cap \Omega$ inside of a non-tangential cone with apex at z .

Proof. If $u = 0$, then there is nothing to show. So we assume the contrary. By the strong maximum principle for continuous solutions, see [FR24], we know $u > 0$ in $\Omega \cap B_1$. Due to another application of the maximum principle, we assume without loss of generality that $u = 0$ on $(\Omega \cap B_1)^c$. Let D_z be the $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -domain adapted to z and Ω by the interior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property. We assume that D_z fits into $B_{1/2} \cap \Omega$, i.e. after translation and scaling. Further, let b_- be the function and ε_0, C_1, C_2 be the constants from Proposition 5.12 if (pUB) holds and the function from Proposition 5.13 if $s_0 > 1/2$ but not (pUB). Recall Remark 2.3.

Since u is continuous and positive in $\Omega \cap B_1$, the constant

$$c_u := \inf\{u(y) \mid y \in B_{1/2} \cap D_z, \text{dist}(y, \partial D_z) \geq \varepsilon_0\}$$

is positive. We define $\psi := \frac{c_u}{C_2} b_-$. By the choice of c_u and the properties of b_- we deduce $\psi \leq u$ in $\{u(y) \mid y \in D_z, \text{dist}(y, \partial(D_z \cap B_1)) \geq \varepsilon_0\}$. This may be seen as follows. If $y \notin D_z$, then $b_- = 0$ and the estimate is trivial by the nonnegativity of u . If $y \in D_z$ but $\text{dist}(y, D_z^c) \geq \varepsilon_0$, then

$$u(y) \geq c_u \geq \frac{c_u}{C_2} C_2 (1/2)^s \geq \frac{c_u}{C_2} C_2 (\text{diam}(D_z))^s \geq \frac{c_u}{C_2} C_2 \text{dist}(y, D_z^c)^s \geq \frac{c_u}{C_2} b_-(y) = \psi(y).$$

Furthermore, using the properties of b_- from Proposition 5.12 respectively Proposition 5.13 we find

$$A_s[u - \psi](x) \geq 1 \text{ in } \{y \in D_z \mid \text{dist}(y, D_z^c) < \varepsilon_0\} \text{ in the distributional sense.}$$

The maximum principle, see [Sil07], [FR24, Lemma 2.3.5], yields $u \geq \psi$ which implies the statement. \square

Proposition 6.7 (localized Hopf boundary lemma II). *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$. We fix an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that Ω satisfies the interior $2s_0$ - $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at a boundary point $z \in B_{1/2} \cap \partial\Omega$. Then there exist positive constants C, ε_0 such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$ and any distributional super-solution $u \in C(B_1 \cap \Omega)$ to (1.6) satisfies (6.8).*

Proof. After acknowledging Lemma 2.4, the proof uses the same ideas as the one of Proposition 6.1 but always using Proposition 5.11 instead of Proposition 5.10. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.7. If u is zero, then there is nothing to show. If u is not zero, then u is positive in the interior of $\Omega \cap B_1$ by the strong maximum principle. Thus, the result follows from Proposition 6.6 or Proposition 6.7. \square

Corollary 6.8 (global Hopf boundary lemma I). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an bounded open set such that Ω satisfies the interior $C^{1,\text{dini}}$ -property at every boundary point $\partial\Omega$ with the same modulus of continuity. Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$. Assume (pUB) or $s_0 > 1/2$. There exist positive constants C, ε_0 such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$ and any distributional super-solution $u \in C(\Omega)$ to*

$$\begin{aligned} A_s u &\geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &\geq 0 \text{ on } \Omega^c, \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

we know that

$$u(x) \geq d_\Omega(x)^s C \inf\{u(y) \mid y \in \Omega, \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega) \geq \varepsilon_0\} \tag{6.10}$$

for any $x \in \Omega$.

Proof. Using the maximum principle for continuous distributional solutions [Sil07], [FR24, Lemma 2.3.5], we find $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Now, an application of Proposition 6.6 at every boundary point $z \in \partial\Omega$ yields the desired result. \square

Corollary 6.9 (global Hopf boundary lemma II). *Let $s_0 \in (0, 1)$. We fix an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that Ω satisfies the interior $2s_0$ - $C^{1, \text{dini}}$ -property uniformly at every boundary point in $\partial\Omega$. Then there exist positive constants C, ε_0 such that for any $s \in [s_0, 1)$ and any weak super-solution $u \in C(\Omega)$ to (6.9) satisfies (6.10).*

REFERENCES

- [AC23] Carlo Alberto Antonini and Matteo Cozzi. Global gradient regularity and a Hopf lemma for quasi-linear operators of mixed local-nonlocal type. *arXiv:2308.06075*, August 2023.
- [AN22] D. E. Apushkinskaya and A. I. Nazarov. The normal derivative lemma and surrounding issues. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 77(2(464)):3–68, 2022.
- [AR20] Nicola Abatangelo and Xavier Ros-Oton. Obstacle problems for integro-differential operators: Higher regularity of free boundaries. *Advances in Mathematics*, 360:106931, 2020.
- [BB04] Rodrigo Bañuelos and Krzysztof Bogdan. Symmetric stable processes in cones. *Potential Anal.*, 21(3):263–288, 2004.
- [BBM01] Jean Bourgain, Haïm Brezis, and Petru Mironescu. Another look at Sobolev spaces. In *Optimal control and partial differential equations*, pages 439–455. IOS, Amsterdam, 2001.
- [BDVV22] Stefano Biagi, Serena Dipierro, Enrico Valdinoci, and Eugenio Vecchi. Mixed local and nonlocal elliptic operators: regularity and maximum principles. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 47(3):585–629, 2022.
- [BGR15] Krzysztof Bogdan, Tomasz Grzywny, and Michał Ryznar. Barriers, exit time and survival probability for unimodal Lévy processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 162(1-2):155–198, 2015.
- [BL21] Anup Biswas and József Lőrinczi. Hopf’s lemma for viscosity solutions to a class of non-local equations with applications. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 204:Paper No. 112194, 18, 2021.
- [Bog97] Krzysztof Bogdan. The boundary Harnack principle for the fractional Laplacian. *Studia Math.*, 123(1):43–80, 1997.
- [BV16] Claudia Bucur and Enrico Valdinoci. *Nonlocal diffusion and applications*, volume 20 of *Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*. Springer, [Cham]; Unione Matematica Italiana, Bologna, 2016.
- [Che18] Huyuan Chen. The Dirichlet elliptic problem involving regional fractional Laplacian. *J. Math. Phys.*, 59(7):071504, 19, 2018.
- [CK02] Zhen-Qing Chen and Panki Kim. Green function estimate for censored stable processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 124(4):595–610, 2002.
- [CKS10] Zhen-Qing Chen, Panki Kim, and Renming Song. Heat kernel estimates for the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 12(5):1307–1329, 2010.
- [CLQ20] Wenxiong Chen, Congming Li, and Shijie Qi. A Hopf lemma and regularity for fractional p -Laplacians. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 40(6):3235–3252, 2020.
- [CRS10] Luis A. Caffarelli, Jean-Michel Roquejoffre, and Yannick Sire. Variational problems for free boundaries for the fractional Laplacian. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 12(5):1151–1179, 2010.
- [CS98] Zhen-Qing Chen and Renming Song. Estimates on Green functions and Poisson kernels for symmetric stable processes. *Math. Ann.*, 312(3):465–501, 1998.
- [CS11] Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre. Regularity results for nonlocal equations by approximation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 200(1):59–88, 2011.
- [CW19] Huyuan Chen and Tobias Weth. The Dirichlet problem for the logarithmic Laplacian. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 44(11):1100–1139, 2019.
- [DQ17] Leandro M. Del Pezzo and Alexander Quaas. A hopf’s lemma and a strong minimum principle for the fractional p -laplacian. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 263(1):765–778, 2017.
- [Dyd12] Bartłomiej Dyda. Fractional calculus for power functions and eigenvalues of the fractional Laplacian. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 15(4):536–555, 2012.
- [Fal19] Mouhamed Moustapha Fall. Regularity estimates for nonlocal Schrödinger equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 39(3):1405–1456, 2019.
- [Fal22] Mouhamed Moustapha Fall. Regional fractional Laplacians: boundary regularity. *J. Differential Equations*, 320:598–658, 2022.
- [FBSV22] Julián Fernández Bonder, Ariel Salort, and Hernán Vivas. Interior and up to the boundary regularity for the fractional g -Laplacian: the convex case. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 223:Paper No. 113060, 31, 2022.
- [FJ15] Mouhamed Moustapha Fall and Sven Jarohs. Overdetermined problems with fractional Laplacian. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 21(4):924–938, 2015.

- [FKV15] Matthieu Felsinger, Moritz Kassmann, and Paul Voigt. The Dirichlet problem for nonlocal operators. *Math. Z.*, 279(3-4):779–809, 2015.
- [FKV20] Guy Foghem, Moritz Kassmann, and Paul Voigt. Mosco convergence of nonlocal to local quadratic forms. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 193:111504, 22, 2020.
- [FR22] Xavier Fernández-Real and Xavier Ros-Oton. *Regularity theory for elliptic PDE*, volume 28 of *Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics*. EMS Press, Berlin, 2022.
- [FR24] Xavier Fernández-Real and Xavier Ros-Oton. *Integro-differential elliptic equations*, volume 350 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2024.
- [Get61] R. K. Gettoor. First passage times for symmetric stable processes in space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 101:75–90, 1961.
- [GH23] Florian Grube and Thorben Hensiek. Maximum principle for stable operators. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 296(12):5684–5702, 2023.
- [GHS24] Florian Grube, Thorben Hensiek, and Waldemar Schefer. The Dirichlet problem for Lévy-stable operators with L^2 -data. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 63(3):Paper No. 74, 28, 2024.
- [GKS23] Jacques Giacomoni, Deepak Kumar, and Konijeti Sreenadh. Interior and boundary regularity results for strongly nonhomogeneous p, q -fractional problems. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 16(2):467–501, 2023.
- [Gru14] Gerd Grubb. Local and nonlocal boundary conditions for μ -transmission and fractional elliptic pseudodifferential operators. *Anal. PDE*, 7(7):1649–1682, 2014.
- [Gru15] Gerd Grubb. Fractional Laplacians on domains, a development of Hörmander’s theory of μ -transmission pseudodifferential operators. *Adv. Math.*, 268:478–528, 2015.
- [GS16] Antonio Greco and Raffaella Servadei. Hopf’s lemma and constrained radial symmetry for the fractional Laplacian. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 23(3):863–885, 2016.
- [HLS25] Víctor Hernández-Santamaría, Luis Fernando López Ríos, and Alberto Saldaña. Optimal boundary regularity and a hopf-type lemma for dirichlet problems involving the logarithmic laplacian. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 45(1):1–36, 2025.
- [Hop52] Eberhard Hopf. A remark on linear elliptic differential equations of second order. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 3:791–793, 1952.
- [IM24] Antonio Iannizzotto and Sunra Mosconi. Fine boundary regularity for the singular fractional p -laplacian. *arXiv:2402.02448*, 2024.
- [IMS15] Antonio Iannizzotto, Sunra Mosconi, and Marco Squassina. H^s versus C^0 -weighted minimizers. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 22(3):477–497, 2015.
- [IMS16] Antonio Iannizzotto, Sunra Mosconi, and Marco Squassina. Global Hölder regularity for the fractional p -Laplacian. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 32(4):1353–1392, 2016.
- [KK73] L. I. Kamynin and B. N. Khimchenko. On Lipschitz boundary estimates for a solution of a second-order elliptic-parabolic equation. *Sov. Math., Dokl.*, 14:1407–1412, 1973.
- [KK74] L. I. Kamynin and B. N. Khimchenko. A maximum principle and Lipschitz boundary estimates for the solution of a second order elliptic-parabolic equation. *Sibirsk. Mat. Ž.*, 15:343–367, 461, 1974.
- [KK80] L. I. Kamynin and B. N. Khimchenko. An aspect of the development of the theory of the isotropic strict extremum principle of A. D. Aleksandrov. *Differentsial’nye Uravneniya*, 16(2):280–292, 381, 1980.
- [KKP16] Janne Korvenpää, Tuomo Kuusi, and Giampiero Palatucci. The obstacle problem for nonlinear integro-differential operators. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 55(3):Art. 63, 29, 2016.
- [KW24] Minhyun Kim and Marvin Weidner. Optimal boundary regularity and Green function estimates for nonlocal equations in divergence form. *arXiv:2408.12987*, August 2024.
- [Lan72] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of modern potential theory*, volume Band 180 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Translated from the Russian by A. P. Doohovskoy.
- [Lie85] Gary M. Lieberman. Regularized distance and its applications. *Pacific J. Math.*, 117(2):329–352, 1985.
- [Mic06] Krzysztof Michalik. Sharp estimates of the Green function, the Poisson kernel and the Martin kernel of cones for symmetric stable processes. *Hiroshima Math. J.*, 36(1):1–21, 2006.
- [RS14] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 101(3):275–302, 2014.
- [RS16a] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. Boundary regularity for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 165(11):2079–2154, 2016.
- [RS16b] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. Regularity theory for general stable operators. *J. Differential Equations*, 260(12):8675–8715, 2016.

- [RS17] Xavier Ros-Oton and Joaquim Serra. Boundary regularity estimates for nonlocal elliptic equations in C^1 and $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 196(5):1637–1668, 2017.
- [Rut18] Artur Rutkowski. The Dirichlet problem for nonlocal Lévy-type operators. *Publ. Mat.*, 62(1):213–251, 2018.
- [RW24] Xavier Ros-Oton and Marvin Weidner. Optimal regularity for nonlocal elliptic equations and free boundary problems. *arXiv:2403.07793*, March 2024.
- [Sil07] Luis Silvestre. Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(1):67–112, 2007.
- [SV14] Raffaella Servadei and Enrico Valdinoci. Weak and viscosity solutions of the fractional Laplace equation. *Publ. Mat.*, 58(1):133–154, 2014.

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD, POSTFACH 10 01 31, 33501 BIELEFELD, GERMANY

Email address: `fgrube@math.uni-bielefeld.de`