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Abstract. In this paper, we are concerned with the fractional and higher order Hénon-Hardy equations
\[
(-\Delta)^\alpha u(x) = |x|^a u^p(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \text{ or } \mathbb{R}_+^n
\]
with \(n \geq 2, 0 < \alpha < 2 \) or \( \alpha = 2m \) with \( 1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}, -\alpha < a < +\infty \) and \( 0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-a} \). By developing a method of scaling spheres, we prove Liouville theorems for nonnegative classical solutions to the above Hénon-Hardy equations in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) (Theorem 1.2 and 1.4). When \( a > 0 \), our results extend the known Liouville type theorems for \( 1 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-a} \) to the full range \( 0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-a} \). In particular, when \( m = 1 \), our results give a complete and affirmative answer to the open conjecture posed by Q. Phan and P. Souplet [41]. As other applications of the method of scaling spheres, we also establish the Liouville theorem for fractional order and second order Hénon-Hardy equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions on \( \mathbb{R}_+^n \) for all \( 1 \leq p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) (Theorem 1.7), and Liouville theorem for higher order Lane-Emden equations (i.e., \( \alpha = 2m \) and \( a = 0 \)) with Navier boundary conditions on \( \mathbb{R}_+^n \) for all \( 1 < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) (Theorem 1.9). Then as an immediate application, we derive a priori estimates and existence of positive solutions to higher order Lane-Emden equations in bounded domains for all \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) (Theorem 1.13, Corollary 1.15 and Theorem 1.17). Our theorems extend the results in W. Chen, Y. Fang and C. Li [3] and W. Dai, S. Peng and G. Qin [19] remarkably to the maximal range of \( p \). For bounded domains, we also apply the method of scaling spheres to derive Liouville theorems for super-critical problems (Theorem 1.19). We believe the method of scaling spheres developed here can be applied to various fractional or higher order problems without translation invariance or in the cases Kelvin transforms in conjunction with the method of moving planes do not work.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Liouville theorems in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). In this paper, we first investigate the Liouville property of nonnegative solutions to the following fractional or higher order Hénon-Hardy equations
\[
\begin{aligned}
(-\Delta)^\alpha u(x) &= |x|^a u^p(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\
u(x) &\geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\end{aligned}
\]
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where \( n \geq 2 \), \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \) or \( \alpha = 2 \) with \( 1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2} \), \( -\alpha < a < +\infty \) and \( 0 < p < \frac{n + \alpha + 2a}{n - \alpha} \). When \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \), the nonlocal fractional Laplacians \((-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\) is defined by

\[
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = C_{\alpha,n} \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{n+\alpha}} \, dy := C_{\alpha,n} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int_{|y-x| \geq \epsilon} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{n+\alpha}} \, dy
\]

for functions \( u \in C^{1,1}_{\text{loc}} \cap \mathcal{L}_n(\mathbb{R}^n) \), where the constant \( C_{\alpha,n} = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1 - \cos(2\pi \zeta_1)}{|\zeta|^{n+\alpha}} \, d\zeta \right)^{-1} \) and the function spaces

\[
\mathcal{L}_n(\mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x)|}{1 + |x|^{n+\alpha}} \, dx < \infty \right\}.
\]

For \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \), we assume the solution \( u \in C^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{L}_n(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( 0 \leq a < +\infty \), \( u \in C^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{L}_n(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( -\alpha < a < 0 \). For \( \alpha = 2m \) with \( 1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2} \), we assume the solution \( u \in C^{2m}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( 0 < a < +\infty \), \( u \in C^{2m}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C^{2m-2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( -2m < a < 0 \). For \( 0 < \alpha \leq n \), PDEs of the form

\[
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = |x|^a u^p(x)
\]

are called the fractional order or higher order Hénon, Lane-Emden, Hardy equations for \( a > 0 \), \( a = 0 \), \( a < 0 \), respectively. These equations have numerous important applications in conformal geometry and Sobolev inequalities. In particular, in the case \( a = 0 \), (1.4) becomes the well-known Lane-Emden equation, which models many phenomena in mathematical physics and in astrophysics.

We say equations (1.4) have critical order if \( \alpha = n \) and non-critical order if \( 0 < \alpha < n \). The nonlinear terms in (1.4) is called critical if \( p = p_\alpha(a) := \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha} (:= \infty \text{ if } n = \alpha) \) and subcritical if \( 0 < p < p_\alpha(a) \). Liouville type theorems for equations (1.4) (i.e., nonexistence of nontrivial nonnegative solutions) in the whole space \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and in the half space \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) have been extensively studied (see [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 23, 27, 32, 33, 37, 39, 41, 42, 46, 47] and the references therein). For Liouville type theorems and related properties on systems of PDEs of type (1.4) with respect to various types of solutions (e.g., stable, radial, nonnegative, sign-changing, ⋯), please refer to [1, 21, 25, 31, 36, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45] and the references therein. These Liouville theorems, in conjunction with the blowing up and re-scaling arguments, are crucial in establishing a priori estimates and hence existence of positive solutions to non-variational boundary value problems for a class of elliptic equations on bounded domains or on Riemannian manifolds with boundaries (see [2, 7, 28, 40]).

(i) The cases \( 0 < \alpha \leq 2 \).

We first consider the case \( \alpha = 2 \). For \( a = 0 \), \( \alpha = 2 \) and \( 1 < p < p_\alpha := \frac{n+2}{n-2} (:= \infty \text{ if } n = 2) \), Liouville type theorem was established by Gidas and Spruck in their celebrated article [27]. Later, the proof was remarkably simplified by Chen and Li in [6] using the Kelvin transform and the method of moving planes. The cases \( a \neq 0 \) have not been fully understood. If \( a \leq -2 \), [27] also proved that that (1.4) possesses no positive solution in any domain \( \Omega \) containing the origin. For \( a > -2 \), in the case of radial solutions, we have known that if \( 1 < p < p_\alpha(a) := \frac{n+2+2a}{n-2} (:= \infty \text{ if } n = 2) \), then (1.4) has no positive radial solution in \( \mathbb{R}^n \); if \( p \geq p_\alpha(a) \), then (1.4) possesses bounded positive radial solution in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) (see [1, 27]). It was naturally conjectured that (1.1) has no positive solution in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) if \( a > -2 \) and \( 1 < p < p_\alpha(a) \).

The condition \( p < p_\alpha(a) \) is the best possible due to the results on radial solutions in [1, 27].
Theorem 1.2. Assume $\alpha \geq 2$, $a > -2$ and $1 < p < p_s(a)$, then (1.4) has no positive solutions in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

However, apart from the radial case, the above conjecture is less completely solved. The nonexistence of positive entire solution was first established by Bidaut-Véron and Giacomini [1] for $1 < p < \min\{p_s, p_h(a)\}$ and Mitidieri and Pohozaev [37] for $1 < p < \frac{n+a}{n-2}$. Subsequently, Phan and Souplet [11] proved the conjecture for dimension $n = 3$ in the class of bounded solutions, using the integral estimates and feedback estimates arguments based on Pohozaev identities which were introduced by Serrin and Zou [45] and further developed by Souplet [44]. Dai and Qin [21] derived Liouville theorem for (1.4) for $a < 0$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+2+a}{n-2}$ using the method of moving planes in integral forms. One should observe that, if $a > 0$, there is still a gap between $\frac{n+2+a}{n-2}$ and the critical exponent $p_s(a)$.

As to the cases $0 < \alpha < 2$, (1.4) is a fractional equation of nonlocal nature. For $a = 0$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$, Liouville theorem for fractional order Lane-Emden equation (1.4) was established by Chen, Li and Li [10] using a direct method of moving planes (see also [13, 18]). There are only a few known results for $a \neq 0$. For $a > 0$ and $\frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha} < p < \frac{2+\alpha+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$, Dou and Zhou [23] proved Liouville theorem for fractional order Hénon equation (1.4) using the method of moving planes in integral forms.

By applying the method of scaling spheres, we will first establish Liouville theorem for nonnegative solutions of (1.1) in cases $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$ and $0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$. One should note that, our results extend the range $p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$ in the literatures mentioned above to the full range $p \in (0, p_s(a))$.

The method of scaling spheres is essentially a frozen variant of the method of moving spheres, that is, we only dilate or shrink the spheres with respect to one fixed center. The method of moving spheres was invented by Li and Zhu in [35]. Later, it was further developed by Li [34], Chen and Li [8] and Jin, Li and Xu [29]. Recently, Chen, Li and Zhang developed a direct method of moving spheres on fractional order equations in [13]. One should note that, the method of scaling spheres can be applied to various problems without translation invariance, while the method of moving spheres only works on translation invariant equations. The method of scaling spheres developed in this paper, in conjunction with the integral representation formulae of solutions and a “Bootstrap” iteration process, will provide useful lower bound estimates for solutions as $|x| \to \infty$, which will lead to a contradiction with the integrability of solutions unless the solution $u \equiv 0$.

Our Liouville type result for (1.1) with $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. Assume $n \geq 2$, $n > \alpha$, $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$, $0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$. Suppose $u$ is a nonnegative solution of (1.1), then $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Combining Theorem 1.2 for $\alpha = 2$ and $a > 0$ with the results in Bidaut-Véron and Giacomini [1], we conclude immediately the following corollary.

Corollary 1.3. Conjecture 1.1 is true.

(ii) The higher order cases $\alpha = 2m$ with $2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$.

The case $a \leq 0$ has been widely studied by many authors. For $a = 0$, $\alpha = 4 < n$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+4}{n-4}$, Lin established the Liouville type theorem for all the nonnegative $C^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$ smooth solutions of (1.4) in [33]. When $a = 0$, $\alpha = 2m < n$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+2a}{n-2m}$, Wei and
For $\sigma$ nonnegative $C^{+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ smooth solutions of (1.1). For $\alpha = 2m < n$, $-2m < a \leq 0$, $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$ if $-2 < a \leq 0$, $1 < p < \infty$ if $-2m < a \leq -2$, Dai, Peng and Qin [19] derived Liouville type theorem for all the nonnegative classical solutions of (1.4) under assumptions that either $-2p - 2 \leq a \leq 0$ or $u(x) = o(|x|^2)$ at $\infty$ holds. Under the same assumptions, they also obtained Liouville theorem for all the nonnegative $C^{2m}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ solutions in the range $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$ and $-2m < a \leq 0$. Similar results for critical order Hénon-Hardy equations have been established by Chen, Dai and Qin in [2].

The cases $a > 0$ have not been fully understood. For $\alpha = 4$, $a > 0$ and $n = 5$, Cowan [15] has proved that there are no positive bounded classical solutions to (1.4) provided $1 < p < \frac{n+4+2a}{n-4}$ using the integral estimates and feedback estimates arguments based on Pohozaev identities which were introduced by Serrin and Zou [45] and further developed by Souplet [44]. Under some assumptions, Fazly [24] and Phan [39] derived nonexistence of bounded identities which were introduced by Serrin and Zou [45] and further developed by Souplet [44].

One should note that, our results extend the range $\sigma \equiv \frac{\alpha}{p-1} > 0$.

Our Liouville type result for (1.1) in cases $\alpha = 2m$ with $2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$, $0 \leq a < +\infty$ and $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$.

Suppose $u$ is a nonnegative solution of (1.1), then $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Remark 1.5. In Theorem 1.2 and 1.4, the smoothness assumption on $u$ at $x = 0$ is necessary. For $p > 1$, equation (1.1) admits a distributional solution of the form $u(x) = C|x|^{-\sigma}$ with $\sigma = \frac{a+\alpha}{p-1} > 0$.

Remark 1.6. In the cases $a > 0$ and $\frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha} \leq p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$, equations (1.1) are not translation invariant. Liouville theorems without global boundedness assumptions (i.e., Theorem 1.2 and 1.4) can not be deduced from the method of moving planes combining with Kelvin transforms, the method of moving spheres, and the integral estimates and feedback estimates arguments based on Pohozaev identities. We will use the method of scaling spheres to overcome these difficulties. The method of scaling spheres developed here, in conjunction with the integral representation formulae of solutions and a “Bootstrap” iteration process, will provide useful lower bound estimates for solutions as $|x| \to \infty$ (Theorem 2.6 3.1 4.3 and 5.1), which will lead to a contradiction on integrability unless the solution $u \equiv 0$. As a consequence, Theorem 1.2 and 1.4 are proved. We believe the method of scaling spheres developed here can be applied to various fractional or higher order problems in $\mathbb{R}^n$ or $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ without translation invariance or in the cases Kelvin transforms in conjunction with the method of moving planes do not work. Potentially possible applications also include problems on angular domains, fan-shaped domains and exterior domains.

1.2. Liouville theorems on a half space $\mathbb{R}^n_+$. Applying the method of scaling spheres, we can also study the Liouville properties for Hénon-Hardy equations on a half space $\mathbb{R}^n_+$. 

Xu [27] proved Liouville type theorem for all the nonnegative $C^{+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ smooth solutions of (1.1).
(i) The cases $0 < \alpha \leq 2$.

We will first prove the Liouville theorem for the following Hénon-Hardy equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions on a half space $\mathbb{R}_+^n$:

$$
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = |x|^a u^p(x), & u(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\
u(x) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^n,
\end{cases}
$$

(1.5)

where $n \geq 2$, $n > \alpha$, $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$, $1 \leq p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > 0\}$ be the upper half Euclidean space. We assume the solution $u \in L_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^{1,1}_\text{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap C(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ if $0 < \alpha < 2$, $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap C(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ if $\alpha = 2$.

For $a = 0$, there are many works on the Liouville type theorems for Lane-Emden equations on half space $\mathbb{R}_+^n$, for instance, see [3] [4] [13] [14] [35] [42] and the references therein. In [3], Chen, Fang and Li established Liouville theorem for Navier problem of Lane-Emden equation (1.5) on $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ in the higher order cases $\alpha = 2m$ with $1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{n}{n-2m} < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}$. For the fractional cases $0 < \alpha < 2$, Chen, Fang and Yang [4] established Liouville theorem for Dirichlet problem of Lane-Emden equation (1.5) on $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ in the cases $1 < p \leq \frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}$ using the method of moving planes in integral forms. Subsequently, Chen, Li and Zhang [13] reproved the Liouville theorem in [4] via a quite different and much simpler approach - a combination of direct methods of moving spheres and moving planes.

In this paper, we will extend these known results for $a = 0$ to general cases $-\alpha < a < +\infty$ and $1 \leq p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$ by applying the method of scaling spheres.

Our Liouville type result for (1.5) is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.7.** Assume $n \geq 2$, $n > \alpha$, $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$ and $1 \leq p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$. Suppose $u$ is a nonnegative classical solution of PDE (1.5) on $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$, then $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}_+^n$.

**Remark 1.8.** When $a \neq 0$, it remains an open problem to prove the Liouville theorem for nonnegative classical solutions of (1.5) with critical exponent $p = \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$.

(ii) The higher order cases $\alpha = 2m$ with $2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$.

As another application of the method of scaling spheres, we will also study the Liouville theorem for the following higher order Lane-Emden equations with Navier boundary conditions on a half space $\mathbb{R}_+^n$:

$$
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^m u(x) = u^p(x), & u(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\
u(x) = 0, & x \in \partial \mathbb{R}_+^n,
\end{cases}
$$

(1.6)

where $n \geq 5$, $2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$, $1 < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}$ and $u \in C^{2m}(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \cap C^{2m-2}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$. In [3], Chen, Fang and Li established Liouville theorem (Theorem 5 in [3]) for PDE (1.6) in the cases $\frac{n}{n-2m} < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}$ and $1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$. We will extend their results to $1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}$ by applying the method of scaling spheres.

Our Liouville type result for (1.6) is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.9.** Suppose $n \geq 5$, $2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$, $1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}$. If $u$ is a nonnegative classical solution of Navier problem (1.6) on $\mathbb{R}_+^n$, then $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Combining Theorem 1.7 for $\alpha = 2$ and $a = 0$, Theorem 1.9 with Theorem 5 in [3], we get Liouville theorem for PDE (1.6) in the full range $1 < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}$ and $1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$.
Theorem 1.10. Suppose \( n \geq 3, 1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}, 1 < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \). If \( u \) is a nonnegative classical solution of Navier problem (1.6) on \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \), then \( u \equiv 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \).

Remark 1.11. It follows from Theorem 1.7 for \( \alpha = 2 \) and \( a = 0 \) that, when \( \alpha = 2 \), Theorem 1.10 also holds for \( p = 1 \).

Remark 1.12. We would like to mention other applications of the method of scaling spheres. For instance, it is an interesting open problem to extend the Liouville theorem for higher order Lane-Emden equations (Theorem 1.9) to general higher order Hénon-Hardy equations with Navier or Dirichlet boundary conditions on a half space \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \).

1.3. A priori estimates and existence of positive solutions in bounded domains. As an immediate application of the Liouville theorems (Theorem 1.7 for \( \alpha = 2 \) and Theorem 1.9), we derive a priori estimates and existence of positive solutions to higher order Lane-Emden equations in bounded domains for all \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \).

In general, let the higher order uniformly elliptic operator \( L \) be defined by

\[
L := \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right)^m + \sum_{|\beta| \leq 2m-1} b_{\beta}(x)D^\beta,
\]

where the coefficients \( b_{\beta} \in L^\infty(\Omega) \) and \( a_{ij} \in C^{2m-2}(\Omega) \) such that there exists constant \( \tau > 0 \) with

\[
\tau |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x)\xi_i \xi_j \leq \tau^{-1} |\xi|^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \in \Omega.
\]

Consider the Navier boundary value problem:

\[
\begin{cases}
Lu(x) = f(x,u), & x \in \Omega, \\
u(x) = Au(x) = \cdots = A^{m-1}u(x) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( n \geq 3, 1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}, u \in C^{2m}(\Omega) \cap C^{2m-2}(\bar{\Omega}) \) and \( \Omega \) is a bounded domain with boundary \( \partial\Omega \in C^{2m-2} \).

By virtue of the Liouville theorem in \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) (Theorem 5 in [3]) and Liouville theorem in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) in [47], using the blowing-up and re-scaling methods, Chen, Fang and Li [3] obtained a priori estimates for the Navier problem (1.9) in the cases \( \frac{n}{n-2m} < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) (Theorem 6 in [3]). Since Theorem 1.7 for \( \alpha = 2 \) and Theorem 1.9 extends Theorem 5 in [3] from \( \frac{n}{n-2m} < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) to the full range \( 1 < p \leq \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \), through entirely similar blowing-up techniques, we can derive the following a priori estimate for classical solutions (possibly sign-changing solutions) to the Navier problem (1.9) in the full range \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \).

Theorem 1.13. Assume \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) and there exist positive, continuous functions \( h(x) \) and \( k(x) \): \( \Omega \rightarrow (0, +\infty) \) such that

\[
\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(x,s)}{s^p} = h(x), \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{f(x,s)}{|s|^p} = k(x).
\]
uniformly with respect to \( x \in \Omega \). Then there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) depending only on \( \Omega \), \( n \), \( m \), \( p \), \( h(x) \), \( k(x) \), such that

\[
\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C
\]

for every classical solution \( u \) of problem (1.9).

**Remark 1.14.** The proof of Theorem 1.13 is entirely similar to that of Theorem 6 in [3]. We only need to replace Theorem 5 in [3] by Theorems 1.7 and 1.9 in the proof. Thus we omit the details of the proof.

One can immediately apply Theorem 1.13 to the following higher order Navier problem

\[
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^m u(x) = u^p(x) + t & \text{in } \Omega, \\
u(x) = -\Delta u(x) = \cdots = (-\Delta)^{m-1}u(x) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( n \geq 3, 1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}, \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a bounded domain with \( C^{2m-2} \) boundary \( \partial\Omega \) and \( t \) is an arbitrary nonnegative real number.

We can deduce the following corollary from Theorem 1.13.

**Corollary 1.15.** Assume \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \). Then, for any nonnegative solution \( u \in C^{2m}(\Omega) \cap C^{2m-2}(\Omega) \) to the higher order Navier problem (1.12), we have

\[
\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C(n, m, p, \Omega).
\]

**Remark 1.16.** In Theorem 1.5 in Dai, Peng and Qin [19], using the method of moving planes in local way and blow-up arguments, the authors have derived the a priori estimates for the higher order Navier problem (1.12) under the assumptions that either \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) and \( \Omega \) is strictly convex, or \( 1 < p \leq \frac{n+2}{n-2} \). One can easily observe that Corollary 1.15 also extends Theorem 1.5 in [19].

As a consequence of the a priori estimates (Corollary 1.15), by applying the Leray-Schauder fixed point theorem (see Theorem 4.1 in [19]), we can derive existence result for positive solution to the following Navier problem for higher order Lane-Emden equations

\[
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^m u(x) = u^p(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\
u(x) = -\Delta u(x) = \cdots = (-\Delta)^{m-1}u(x) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( n \geq 3, 1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2} \) and \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a bounded domain with \( C^{2m-2} \) boundary \( \partial\Omega \).

By virtue of the a priori estimate (Theorem 6 in [3] and Theorem 1.5 in [19]), using the Leray-Schauder fixed point theorem, Dai, Peng and Qin [19] obtained existence of positive solution for the Navier problem (1.14) in the cases \( p \in \left(1, \frac{n+2}{n-2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{n}{n-2m}, \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}\right) \) or \( p \in \left(1, \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}\right) \) and \( \Omega \) is strictly convex (Theorem 1.6 in [19]). For other existence results on second order or critical order Hénon-Hardy equations on bounded domains, please also see [2, 16, 26, 38] and the references therein. Since Theorem 1.13 and Corollary 1.15 extend Theorem 6 in [3] and Theorem 1.5 in [19] from \( p \in \left(1, \frac{n+2}{n-2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{n}{n-2m}, \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}\right) \) to the full range \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \) through entirely similar arguments, we can improve Theorem 1.6 in [19] remarkably and derive the following existence result for positive solution to the Navier problem (1.14) in the full range \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \).
Remark 1.18. The proof of Theorem 1.17 is entirely similar to that of Theorem 1.6 in [19]. We only need to replace Theorem 6 in [3] and Theorem 1.5 in [19] by Corollary 1.15 in the proof. Thus we omit the details of the proof.

1.4. Liouville theorems in bounded domains. We also study the following fractional and higher order super-critical problems in balls $B_R(0)$ with arbitrary $R > 0$, that is, the Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{align*}
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) &= |x|^\alpha u^p(x), \quad u(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_R(0), \\
u(x) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0)
\end{align*} \tag{1.15}$$

with $0 < \alpha < 2$, and the Navier problems

$$\begin{align*}
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) &= |x|^\alpha u^p(x), \quad u(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_R(0), \\
u(x) &= (-\Delta) u(x) = \ldots = (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1} u(x) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_R(0)
\end{align*} \tag{1.16}$$

with $\alpha = 2m$ and $1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$, where $n \geq 2$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$ and $p_s(a) := \frac{n+a+2a}{n-a} < p < +\infty$. For $0 < \alpha < 2$, we assume $u \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(B_R) \cap C(\overline{B_R})$ if $0 \leq a < +\infty$, and $u \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(B_R \setminus \{0\}) \cap C(\overline{B_R})$ if $-\alpha < a < 0$. For $\alpha = 2m$ with $1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$, we assume $u \in C^{2m}(B_R) \cap C^{2m-2}(\overline{B_R})$ if $0 \leq a < +\infty$, and $u \in C^{2m}(B_R \setminus \{0\}) \cap C^{2m-2}(\overline{B_R})$ if $-\alpha < a < 0$.

Our Liouville type result for super-critical problems (1.15) and (1.16) is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.19. Assume $n \geq 2$, $0 < \alpha < 2$ or $\alpha = 2m$ with $1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$ and $\frac{n+a+2a}{n-a} < p < +\infty$. Suppose $u$ is a nonnegative solution to super-critical problems (1.15) or (1.16), then $u \equiv 0$ in $B_R(0)$.

Our theorem seems to be the first result on Liouville properties for fractional and higher order super-critical problems in bounded domains.

Remark 1.20. Theorem 1.17 and Theorem 1.19 indicate that the exponent $p_s(a) := \frac{n+a+2a}{n-a}$ is optimal for existence of positive solutions to Hénon-Hardy equations in bounded domains.

Remark 1.21. We will prove Theorem 1.19 in fractional and higher order cases via a unified approach - the method of scaling spheres in local way, that is, shrinking the spheres up to the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The method of scaling spheres in local way, in conjunction with the integral representation formulæ of solutions and a “Bootstrap” iteration process, will provide useful lower bound estimates for the asymptotic behaviour of solutions as $|x| \to 0$ (Theorem 6.1), which will lead to a contradiction on integrability near the origin unless the solution $u \equiv 0$.

Remark 1.22. We would also like to mention other applications of the method of scaling spheres. For instance, it is an interesting open problem to extend the Liouville theorems, a priori estimates and existence of solutions for non-critical higher order Hénon-Hardy equations (Theorems 1.9, 1.10, 1.13, 1.17, 1.19 and Corollary 1.15) to critical order Hénon-Hardy
equations with Navier or Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ or bounded domains $\Omega$. The method of scaling spheres can also be applied to solve various problems on systems of PDEs or IEs.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we develop the method of scaling spheres and prove Theorem 1.2. In section 3, we prove Theorem 1.4. Section 4 and 5 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.9 respectively. In section 6, we prove Theorem 1.19 using the method of scaling spheres in local way.

In the following, we will use $C$ to denote a general positive constant that may depend on $n$, $\alpha$, $a$, $p$ and $u$, and whose value may differ from line to line.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.2 by using contradiction arguments and the method of scaling spheres. Now suppose on the contrary that $u \geq 0$ satisfies equation (1.1) but $u$ is not identically zero, then there exists some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $u(\bar{x}) > 0$.

2.1. Equivalence between PDE and IE. In order to get a contradiction, we first need to show that the solution $u$ to (1.1) also satisfies the equivalent integral equation

\begin{equation}
\tag{2.1}
u(x) = C_{n,\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} u^p(y)dy.
\end{equation}

Theorem 2.1. Assume $n \geq 2$, $n > \alpha$, $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$ and $0 < p < \infty$. Suppose $u$ is nonnegative solution to (1.1), then it also solves the integral equation (2.1), and vice versa.

Proof. The following lemma concerning the removable singularity is necessary for our proof.

Lemma 2.2. Assume $n \geq 2$, $n > \alpha$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 2$. Suppose $u$ is $\alpha$-harmonic in $B_R(0) \setminus \{0\}$ and satisfies

\[ u(x) = o(|x|^{\alpha-n}), \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \to 0. \]

Then $u$ can be defined at 0 so that it is $\alpha$-harmonic in $B_R(0)$.

Lemma 2.2 can be proved directly by using the Poisson integral formula and maximum principles (Lemma 2.3), so we omit the details.

For arbitrary $R > 0$, let

\begin{equation}
\tag{2.2}v_R(x) = \int_{B_R(0)} G^\alpha_R(x,y)|y|^a u^p(y)dy,
\end{equation}

where the Green’s function for $(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ with $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ on $B_R(0)$ is given by

\begin{equation}
\tag{2.3}G^\alpha_R(x,y) := \frac{C_{n,\alpha}}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \int_0^{\frac{4}{s_R}} \frac{b^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{(1+b)^\frac{n}{2}} db \quad \text{if} \quad x, y \in B_R(0)
\end{equation}

with $s_R = \frac{|x-y|^2}{R^2}$, $t_R = \left(1 - \frac{|x|^2}{R^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{|y|^2}{R^2}\right)$, and $G^\alpha_R(x,y) = 0$ if $x$ or $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0)$ (see [30]). Then, we can derive from $-\alpha < a < +\infty$ that $v_R \in C^{1,1}_l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ($v_R \in C^{2}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $\alpha = 2$) and satisfies

\begin{equation}
\tag{2.4}\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v_R(x) = |x|^a u^p(x), & x \in B_R(0) \setminus \{0\}, \\
v_R(x) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0).
\end{cases}
\end{equation}
Let \( w_R(x) = u(x) - v_R(x) \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_0(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( \alpha = 2 \). By Lemma 2.2, 1.1 and 2.4, we have \( w_R \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_0(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( \alpha = 2 \) and satisfies

\[
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} w_R(x) = 0, & x \in B_R(0), \\
w_R(x) \geq 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0).
\end{cases}
\]

(2.5)

Now we need the following maximum principle for fractional Laplacians.

**Lemma 2.3.** (Maximum principle, [10],[43]) Let \( \Omega \) be a bounded domain in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \). Assume that \( u \in L_0(\Omega) \cap C^{1,1}(\Omega) \) and is l.s.c. on \( \overline{\Omega} \). If \(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \geq 0 \) in \( \Omega \) and \( u \geq 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \), then \( u \geq 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Moreover, if \( u = 0 \) at some point in \( \Omega \), then \( u = 0 \) a.e. in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). These conclusions also hold for unbounded domain \( \Omega \) if we assume further that

\[
\liminf_{|x| \to \infty} u(x) \geq 0.
\]

By Lemma 2.3 and maximal principles, we deduce that for any \( R > 0 \),

\[
w_R(x) = u(x) - v_R(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \, x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

(2.6)

Now, for each fixed \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), letting \( R \to \infty \) in (2.6), we have

\[
u(x) \geq C_{n,\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|y|^a}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} u^p(y)dy =: v(x) \geq 0.
\]

(2.7)

Take \( x = 0 \) in (2.7), we get that \( u \) satisfies the following integrability

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u^p(y)}{|y|^{n-\alpha-a}}dy \leq C_{n,\alpha}^{-1} u(0) < \infty.
\]

(2.8)

One can observe that \( v \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_0(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( \alpha = 2 \) is a solution of

\[
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} v(x) = |x|^a u(x), \quad \forall \, x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}.
\]

(2.9)

Define \( w(x) = u(x) - v(x) \), then by Lemma 2.2, 1.1 and 2.9, we have \( w \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_0(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n) \) if \( \alpha = 2 \) and satisfies

\[
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} w(x) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\
w(x) \geq 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\end{cases}
\]

(2.10)

Now we need the following Liouville type theorem for \( \alpha \)-harmonic functions in \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

**Lemma 2.4.** (Liouville theorem, [43]) Assume \( n \geq 2 \) and \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \). Let \( u \) be a strong solution of

\[
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\
u(x) \geq 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\end{cases}
\]

then \( u \equiv C \geq 0 \).

From Lemma 2.4 and Liouville theorem for harmonic functions, we get \( w(x) = u(x) - v(x) \equiv C \geq 0 \). Thus, we have proved that

\[
u(x) = C_{n,\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|y|^a}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} u^p(y)dy + C \geq C \geq 0.
\]

(2.11)
Now, by combining (2.8) with (2.11), we get

\[ C^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{|y|^{n-a}} dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u^p(y)}{|y|^{n-a}} dy < \infty, \]

from which we can infer immediately that \( C = 0 \). Therefore, we arrived at

\[ u(x) = C_{n,\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-a}} u^p(y) dy, \]

that is, \( u \) satisfies the integral equation (2.1).

Conversely, assume that \( u \) is a nonnegative classical solution of integral equation (2.1), then

\[ (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \left( \frac{C}{|x-\xi|^{n-a}} \right) \right) |\xi|^a u^p(\xi) d\xi \]

\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta(x-\xi)|\xi|^a u^p(\xi) d\xi = |x|^a u^p(x), \]

that is, \( u \) also solves the PDE (1.1). This completes the proof of equivalence between PDE (1.1) and IE (2.1).

\[ \square \]

Remark 2.5. Lemma 2.3 has been established first by Silvestre [43] without the assumption \( u \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(\Omega) \). In [10], Chen, Li and Li provided a much more elementary and simpler proof for Lemma 2.3 under the assumption \( u \in C^{1,1}_{loc}(\Omega) \).

Since the nonnegative solution \( u \) with \( u(\bar{x}) > 0 \) also satisfy the integral equation (2.1), it is actually a positive solution in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), that is,

\[ u(x) > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n. \]

Moreover, there exist a constant \( C > 0 \), such that the solution \( u \) satisfies the following lower bound:

\[ u(x) \geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-a}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq 1. \]

Indeed, since \( u > 0 \) also satisfy the integral equation (2.1), we can deduce that

\[ u(x) \geq C_{n,\alpha} \int_{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-a}} u^p(y) dy \]

\[ \geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-a}} \int_{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}} |y|^a u^p(y) dy =: \frac{C}{|x|^{n-a}} \]

for all \( |x| \geq 1 \).

2.2. The method of scaling spheres. In this subsection, we will apply the method of scaling spheres to show the following lower bound estimates for positive solution \( u \), which contradict with the integral equation (2.1) for \( 0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha} \).

**Theorem 2.6.** Assume \( n \geq 2, \ n > \alpha, \ 0 < \alpha \leq 2, \ -\alpha < a < +\infty \) and \( 0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha} \). Suppose \( u \) is a positive solution to (1.1), then it satisfies the following lower bound estimates:

for \( |x| \geq 1 \),

\[ u(x) \geq C_{\kappa} |x|^\kappa \quad \forall \kappa < \frac{\alpha + a}{1-p}, \quad \text{if} \quad 0 < p < 1; \]
For this purpose, we need some definitions. We define the reflection of $x$ centered at 0 by
\[ u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right) \]
for arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. It’s obvious that the Kelvin transform $u_\lambda$ may have singularity at 0 and $\lim_{|x| \to \infty} |x|^{n-\alpha}u_\lambda(x) = \lambda^{n-\alpha}u(0) > 0$. By (2.19), one can infer from the regularity assumptions on $u$ that $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ if $0 < \alpha < 2$ and $u_\lambda \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ if $\alpha = 2$. Furthermore, we can deduce from (1.1) and (2.19) that (for the invariance properties of fractional or higher order Laplacians under the Kelvin type transforms, please refer to [5, 6, 10, 12, 33, 47])
\[ (-\Delta)\frac{2}{n-\alpha} u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n+\alpha} \lambda^{2a} \frac{|x|^2}{|x|^2}^{\alpha} u_\lambda^p(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \]
where $\tau := n + \alpha + 2a - p(n - \alpha) > 0$.

Next, we will carry out the process of scaling spheres with respect to the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For this purpose, we need some definitions.

Let $\lambda > 0$ be an arbitrary positive real number and let the scaling sphere be
\[ S_\lambda := \partial B_\lambda(0) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| = \lambda \}. \]
We define the reflection of $x$ about the sphere $S_\lambda$ by $x^\lambda := \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2}$ and define
\[ \tilde{B}_\lambda(0) := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^\lambda \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\} \}. \]
Let $\omega^\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x)$ for any $x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}$. By the definition of $u_\lambda$ and $\omega^\lambda$, we have
\[ \omega^\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u(x^\lambda) - u(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \left( u(x^\lambda) - \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x^\lambda|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u((x^\lambda)^\lambda) \right) = -\left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \omega^\lambda(x) = -\left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \omega^\lambda(x), \quad x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}. \]
for every $x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}$.

We will first show that, for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small,
\[ \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \, x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}. \]
Then, we start dilating the sphere $S_\lambda$ from near the origin 0 outward as long as (2.24) holds, until its limiting position $\lambda = +\infty$ and derive lower bound estimates on $u$. Therefore, the scaling sphere process can be divided into two steps.

**Step 1. Start dilating the sphere from near $\lambda = 0$.** Define
\[ B^-_\lambda := \{ x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\} \mid \omega^\lambda(x) < 0 \}. \]
We will show through contradiction arguments that, for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small,
\[ B^-_\lambda = \emptyset. \]
Suppose \( \text{(2.26)} \) does not hold, that is, \( B_{\lambda}^0 \neq \emptyset \) and hence \( \omega^\lambda \) is negative somewhere in \( B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus \{0\} \). For arbitrary \( x \in B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus \{0\} \), we get from \( \text{(2.20)} \) that

\[
(\Delta) \hat{\omega}^\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^\tau |x|^a u_\lambda^p(x) - |x|^a u^p(x)
\]

\[
\geq |x|^a (u_\lambda^p(x) - u^p(x)) = p|x|^a \psi_{\lambda}^{-1}(x) \omega^\lambda(x),
\]

where \( \psi_{\lambda}(x) \) is valued between \( u(x) \) and \( u_{\lambda}(x) \) by mean value theorem. Therefore, for all \( x \in B_{\lambda}^- \),

\[
(\Delta) \hat{\omega}^\lambda(x) \geq p \lambda^a \max \{ u_{\lambda}^{p-1}(x), u_{\lambda}^{\prime-1}(x) \} \omega^\lambda(x) =: c_{\lambda}(x) \omega^\lambda(x).
\]

Now we need the following Theorem, which is a variant and generalization of the Narrow region principle (Theorem 2.2 in \[13\]).

**Theorem 2.7.** (Narrow region principle) Assume \( n \geq 2, n > \alpha, 0 < \alpha \leq 2, -\alpha < a < +\infty \) and \( 0 < p < +\infty \). Let \( \lambda > 0 \) and \( A_{\lambda,l} := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n | \lambda - l < |x| < \lambda \} \) be an annulus with small thickness \( 0 < l < \lambda \). Suppose \( \omega^\lambda \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(A_{\lambda,l}) \) if \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \) (\( \omega^\lambda \in C^2(A_{\lambda,l}) \) if \( \alpha = 2 \)) and satisfies

\[
(\Delta) \hat{\omega}^\lambda(x) - c_{\lambda}(x) \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } A_{\lambda,l} \cap B_{\lambda}^0,
\]

negative minimum of \( \omega^\lambda \) is attained in the interior of \( B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus \{0\} \) if \( B_{\lambda}^0 \neq \emptyset \),

negative minimum of \( \omega^\lambda \) cannot be attained in \( (B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus \{0\}) \setminus A_{\lambda,l} \),

where \( c_{\lambda}(x) := p \lambda^a \max \{ u_{\lambda}^{p-1}(x), u_{\lambda}^{\prime-1}(x) \} \). Then, we have

(i) there exists a sufficiently small constant \( \delta_0 > 0 \), such that, for all \( 0 < \lambda \leq \delta_0 \),

\[
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in A_{\lambda,l};
\]

(ii) there exists a sufficiently small \( l_0 > 0 \) depending on \( \lambda \) continuously, such that, for all \( 0 < l \leq l_0 \),

\[
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in A_{\lambda,l}.
\]

**Proof.** Suppose on contrary that \( \text{(2.30)} \) and \( \text{(2.31)} \) do not hold, we will obtain a contradiction for any \( 0 < \lambda \leq \delta_0 \) with constant \( \delta_0 \) small enough and any \( 0 < l \leq l_0(\lambda) \) sufficiently small respectively. By \( \text{(2.29)} \) and our hypothesis, there exists \( \tilde{x} \in A_{\lambda,l} \cap B_{\lambda}^- \subset \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n | \lambda - l < |x| < \lambda \} \) such that

\[
\omega^\lambda(\tilde{x}) = \min_{B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus \{0\}} \omega^\lambda(x) < 0.
\]

For \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \), our proof is similar to Theorem 2.2 in \[13\]. The key ingredient is, the same calculations as in the proof of formulae \( (2.18) \) and \( (2.19) \) in \[13\] will yield the following estimate at the negative minimum point \( \tilde{x} \):

\[
(\Delta) \hat{\omega}^\lambda(\tilde{x}) \leq \frac{C}{l^\alpha} \omega^\lambda(\tilde{x}).
\]

For \( \alpha = 2 \), we can also obtain the same estimate as \( \text{(2.33)} \) at some point \( x_0 \in A_{\lambda,l} \cap B_{\lambda}^- \). To this end, we define

\[
(2.34) \quad \zeta(x) := \cos \frac{|x| - \lambda + l}{l},
\]
then it follows that $\zeta(x) \in [\cos 1, 1]$ for any $x \in A_{\lambda,l} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \lambda - l \leq |x| \leq \lambda\}$ and $-\frac{\Delta \zeta(x)}{\zeta(x)} \geq \frac{1}{l^2}$. Define

$$\omega^\lambda(x) := \frac{\omega^\lambda(x)}{\zeta(x)}$$

for $x \in \overline{A_{\lambda,l}}$. Then there exists a $x_0 \in A_{\lambda,l} \cap B^-_\lambda$ such that

$$\omega^\lambda(x_0) = \min_{A_{\lambda,l}} \omega^\lambda(x) < 0.$$ 

Since

$$-\Delta \omega^\lambda(x_0) = -\Delta \omega^\lambda(x_0) \zeta(x_0) - 2\nabla \omega^\lambda(x_0) \cdot \nabla \zeta(x_0) - \omega^\lambda(x_0) \Delta \zeta(x_0),$$

one immediately has

$$-\Delta \omega^\lambda(x_0) \leq \frac{1}{l^2} \omega^\lambda(x_0).$$

In conclusion, we have proved that for both $0 < \alpha < 2$ and $\alpha = 2$, there exists some $\hat{x} \in A_{\lambda,l} \cap B^-_\lambda$ such that

$$(-\Delta)^\alpha \omega^\lambda(\hat{x}) \leq C_{\lambda} \omega^\lambda(\hat{x}) < 0.$$ 

At the same time, by (2.29), we also have

$$(-\Delta)^\alpha \omega^\lambda(\hat{x}) \geq c_\alpha(\hat{x}) \omega^\lambda(\hat{x}),$$

where $c_\alpha(\hat{x}) := p\lambda^a \max \{u^{p-1}(\hat{x}), u^{p-1}_\lambda(\hat{x})\}$. It follows immediately that

$$0 \leq c_\alpha(\hat{x}) \leq p\lambda^a u^{p-1}(\hat{x}) \leq p\lambda^a M^{p-1}_{\lambda} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq p < +\infty,$$

$$0 \leq c_\alpha(\hat{x}) \leq p\lambda^a u^{p-1}_\lambda(\hat{x}) \leq p\lambda^a N^{1-p}_{\lambda} \quad \text{if } 0 < p < 1,$$

where

$$M_\lambda := \sup_{x \in B_\lambda(0)} u(x) < +\infty, \quad N_\lambda := \left(\inf_{x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}} u_\lambda(x)\right)^{-1} < +\infty,$$

more precisely, by (2.15), one easily verifies $N_\lambda \leq C \max \{1, \lambda^{n-\alpha}\} < +\infty$. Therefore, we can deduce from (2.39), (2.40) and (2.41) that

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{C}{\lambda^\alpha} & \leq \frac{C_\lambda}{l^p} \leq p\lambda^a M^{p-1}_{\lambda} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq p < +\infty,
\frac{C}{\lambda^\alpha} & \leq \frac{C_\lambda}{l^p} \leq p\lambda^a N^{1-p}_{\lambda} \quad \text{if } 0 < p < 1.
\end{array}\right.$$ 

Note that $a > -\alpha$, we can derive a contradiction from (2.43) directly if $0 < \lambda \leq \delta_0$ for some constant $\delta_0$ small enough, or if $0 < l \leq l_0$ for some sufficiently small $l_0$ depending on $\lambda$ continuously. Thus (2.30) and (2.31) must hold.

Furthermore, by (2.29), we can actually deduce from $\omega^\lambda \geq 0$ in $A_{\lambda,l}$ that

$$\omega^\lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}.$$ 

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.7. \hfill $\square$
In order to apply Theorem\ref{thm:scaling} to show \eqref{eq:2.26}, we first prove that there exists a sufficiently small \(\eta_0 > 0\) such that if \(0 < \lambda \leq \eta_0\), then
\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 1, \quad \forall x \in B_{\chi^2}(0) \setminus \{0\}.
\end{equation}
In fact, \eqref{eq:2.15} implies that
\begin{equation}
u^\lambda(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n-\alpha} u \left(\frac{\chi^2 x}{|x|^2}\right) \geq \left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n-\alpha} \frac{C}{\lambda^{n-\alpha}} \geq \frac{C}{\lambda^{n-\alpha}}
\end{equation}
for all \(x \in B_{\chi^2}(0) \setminus \{0\}\). Therefore, we have if \(0 < \lambda \leq \eta_0\) for some \(\eta_0 > 0\) small enough, then
\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) = \nu^\lambda(x) - u(x) \geq \frac{C}{\lambda^{n-\alpha}} - \max_{|x| \leq \lambda^2} u(x) \geq 1, \quad \forall x \in B_{\chi^2}(0) \setminus \{0\},
\end{equation}
so we arrive at \eqref{eq:2.45}.

Now define \(\epsilon_0 := \min\{\delta_0, \eta_0\}\). If \(0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0\), let \(l := \lambda - \lambda^2 \in (0, \lambda)\), then it follows from \eqref{eq:2.28} and \eqref{eq:2.45} that the conditions \eqref{eq:2.29} in Theorem\ref{thm:scaling} are satisfied, hence we can deduce from (i) in Theorem\ref{thm:scaling} that
\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in A_{\lambda,l}.
\end{equation}
Therefore, we have proved for all \(0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0\), \(B_{\chi}(0) = \emptyset\), that is,
\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\chi}(0) \setminus \{0\}.
\end{equation}
This completes Step 1.

Step 2. Dilate the sphere \(S_\lambda\) outward until \(\lambda = +\infty\) to derive lower bound estimates on \(u\).

Step 1 provides us a start point to dilate the sphere \(S_\lambda\) from near \(\lambda = 0\). Now we dilate the sphere \(S_\lambda\) outward as long as \eqref{eq:2.24} holds. Let
\begin{equation}
\lambda_0 := \sup\{\lambda > 0 | \omega^\mu \geq 0 \text{ in } B_\mu(0) \setminus \{0\}, \quad \forall 0 < \mu \leq \lambda \in (0, +\infty]\}
\end{equation}
and hence, one has
\begin{equation}
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\chi_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}.
\end{equation}
In what follows, we will prove \(\lambda_0 = +\infty\) by contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that \(0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty\). In order to get a contradiction, we will first prove
\begin{equation}
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\chi_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}
\end{equation}
by using the Narrow region principle (Theorem\ref{thm:scaling}) and contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that \eqref{eq:2.52} does not hold, that is, \(\omega^{\lambda_0} \geq 0\) but \(\omega^{\lambda_0}\) is not identically zero in \(B_{\chi_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}\), then there exists a \(x^0 \in B_{\chi_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}\) such that \(\omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0\). We will obtain a contradiction with \eqref{eq:2.50} via showing that the sphere \(S_\lambda\) can be dilated outward a little bit further, more precisely, there exists a \(\varepsilon > 0\) small enough such that \(\omega^\lambda \geq 0\) in \(B_{\chi}(0) \setminus \{0\}\) for all \(\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon]\).

For that purpose, we will first show that
\begin{equation}
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\chi_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}.
\end{equation}
Indeed, since we have assumed there exists a point \(x^0 \in B_{\chi_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}\) such that \(\omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0\), by continuity, there exists a small \(\delta > 0\) and a constant \(c_0 > 0\) such that
\begin{equation}
B_{\delta}(x^0) \subset B_{\chi_0}(0) \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\delta}(x^0).
\end{equation}
Since the positive solution $u$ to (1.1) also satisfies the integral equation (2.1), through direct calculations, we get

$$u(x) = C \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} u^p(y) dy + C \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|x-y|} \right)^\tau u_{\lambda^0}^p(y) dy$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\tau := n + \alpha + 2a - p(n - \alpha) > 0$. By direct calculations, one can also verify that $u_{\lambda^0}$ satisfies the following integral equation

$$u_{\lambda^0}(x) = C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau u_{\lambda^0}^p(y) dy$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, and hence, it follows immediately that

$$u_{\lambda^0}(x) = C \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} u^p(y) dy + C \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau u_{\lambda^0}^p(y) dy.$$

From the integral equations (2.55) and (2.57), one can derive that, for any $x \in B_{\lambda^0}(0) \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\omega^\lambda(x) = u_{\lambda^0}(x) - u(x)$$

$$= C \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right) \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau u_{\lambda^0}^p(y) - u^p(y) \right) dy$$

$$\geq C \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right) \min \left\{ u^{p-1}(y), u_{\lambda^0}^{p-1}(y) \right\} \omega^\lambda_0(y) dy$$

$$\geq C \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right) \min \left\{ u^{p-1}(y), u_{\lambda^0}^{p-1}(y) \right\} \omega^\lambda_0(y) dy > 0,$$

thus we arrive at (2.53). Furthermore, (2.58) also implies that there exists a $0 < \eta < \lambda_0$ small enough such that, for any $x \in B_{\eta}(0) \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\omega^\lambda_0(x) \geq C \int_{B_{\eta}(x^n)} c_2 c_1 \int_{B_{\lambda^0}(0) \setminus \{0\}} \omega^\lambda_0(x) dy =: \tau_0 > 0.$$

Now we define

$$\hat{t}_0 := \min_{\lambda \in [\lambda_0, 2\lambda_0]} l_0(\lambda) > 0,$$

where $l_0(\lambda)$ is given by Theorem 2.7. For a fixed small $0 < r_0 < \frac{1}{2} \min\{\hat{t}_0, \lambda_0\}$, by (2.53) and (2.59), we can define

$$m_0 := \inf_{x \in B_{\lambda^0}(0) \setminus \{0\}} \omega^\lambda_0(x) > 0.$$

Since $u$ is uniformly continuous on arbitrary compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (say, $K = \overline{B_{\lambda^0}(0)}$), we can deduce from (2.61) that, there exists a $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \frac{1}{2} \min\{\hat{t}_0, \lambda_0\}$ sufficiently small, such that, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1]$,

$$\omega^\lambda(x) \geq \frac{m_0}{2} > 0, \quad \forall x \in \overline{B_{\lambda^0}(0) \setminus \{0\}}.$$
In order to prove (2.62), one should observe that (2.61) is equivalent to

\[ |x|^{n-\alpha}u(x) - \lambda_0^{n-\alpha}u(x^{\lambda_0}) \geq m_0\lambda_0^{n-\alpha}, \quad \forall |x| \geq \frac{\lambda_0^2}{\lambda_0 - r_0}. \]

Since \( u \) is uniformly continuous on \( B_{3\lambda_0}(0) \), we infer from (2.63) that there exists a \( 0 < \varepsilon_1 < \frac{1}{2}\min\{\tilde{t}_0, \lambda_0\} \) sufficiently small, such that, for any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1] \),

\[ |x|^{n-\alpha}u(x) - \lambda^{n-\alpha}u(x^\lambda) \geq m_0^{\frac{2}{\lambda_0 - r_0}} \lambda^{n-\alpha}, \quad \forall |x| \geq \lambda^{2\lambda_0 - r_0}. \]

which is equivalent to (2.62), hence we have proved (2.62).

For any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1] \), let \( l := \lambda - \lambda_0 + r_0 \in (0, \tilde{t}_0) \), then it follows from (2.28) and (2.62) that the conditions (2.29) in Theorem 2.7 are satisfied, hence we can deduce from (ii) in Theorem 2.7 that

\[ \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in A_{\lambda,l}. \]

Therefore, we get from (2.62) and (2.64) that, \( B^{-}_{\lambda} = \emptyset \) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1] \), that is,

\[ \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}, \]

which contradicts with the definition (2.50) of \( \lambda_0 \). As a consequence, in the case \( 0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty \), (2.52) must hold true, that is,

\[ \omega^{\lambda_0} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}. \]

However, by the second equality in (2.58) and (2.67), we arrive at

\[ 0 = \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x) \]

\[ = C \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^\alpha}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{|y|^\alpha}{|y|^{\lambda_0} |x - \lambda_0 y|^{n-\alpha}} \right) \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{-\tau} - 1 \right) u^p(y)dy > 0 \]

for any \( x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\} \), which is absurd. Thus we must have \( \lambda_0 = +\infty \), that is,

\[ u(x) \geq \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right), \quad \forall |x| \geq \lambda, \quad \forall 0 < \lambda < +\infty. \]

For arbitrary \( |x| \geq 1 \), let \( \lambda := \sqrt{|x|} \), then (2.69) yields that

\[ u(x) \geq \frac{1}{|x|^\frac{n-\alpha}{2}} u \left( \frac{x}{|x|} \right), \]

and hence, we arrive at the following lower bound estimate:

\[ u(x) \geq \left( \min_{x \in S_1} u(x) \right) \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} := \frac{C_0}{|x|^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \forall |x| \geq 1. \]

The lower bound estimate (2.71) can be improved remarkably for \( 0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha} \) using the “Bootstrap” iteration technique and the integral equation (2.1).
In fact, let $\mu_0 := \frac{n - \alpha}{2}$, we infer from the integral equation (2.1) and (2.71) that, for $|x| \geq 1$,

\begin{equation}
(2.72) \quad u(x) \geq C \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}|y|^{p\mu_0-a}} dy \\
\geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-\alpha}} \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|} \frac{1}{|y|^{p\mu_0-a}} dy \\
\geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-\alpha}} \int_{2|x|}^{4|x|} r^{n-1-p\mu_0+a} dr \\
\geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^{p\mu_0-(a+\alpha)}},
\end{equation}

where we have used the fact $n - p\mu_0 + a > 0$ since $0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$. Let $\mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (a + \alpha)$. Due to $0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$, our important observation is

\begin{equation}
(2.73) \quad \mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (a + \alpha) < \mu_0.
\end{equation}

Thus we have obtained a better lower bound estimate than (2.71) after one iteration, that is,

\begin{equation}
(2.74) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^\mu_1}, \quad \forall |x| \geq 1.
\end{equation}

For $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, define

\begin{equation}
(2.75) \quad \mu_{k+1} := p\mu_k - (a + \alpha).
\end{equation}

Since $0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$, it is easy to see that the sequence $\{\mu_k\}$ is monotone decreasing with respect to $k$ and $n - p\mu_k + a > 0$ for any $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Continuing the above iteration process involving the integral equation (2.1), we have the following lower bound estimates for every $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$,

\begin{equation}
(2.76) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{C_k}{|x|^\mu_k}, \quad \forall |x| \geq 1.
\end{equation}

Now Theorem 2.6 follows easily from the obvious properties that as $k \to +\infty$,

\begin{equation}
(2.77) \quad \mu_k \to -\frac{a + \alpha}{1 - p} \quad \text{if } 0 < p < 1; \quad \mu_k \to -\infty \quad \text{if } 1 \leq p < \frac{n + \alpha + 2a}{n - \alpha}.
\end{equation}

This finishes our proof of Theorem 2.6.

\[ \square \]

We have proved the nontrivial nonnegative solution $u$ to (1.1) is actually a positive solution which also satisfies the integral equation (2.1). For $0 < p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}$, the lower bound estimates in Theorem 2.6 contradicts with the following integrability

\begin{equation}
(2.78) \quad C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u^p(x)}{|x|^{n-\alpha-a}} dx = u(0) < +\infty
\end{equation}

indicated by the integral equation (2.1). Therefore, we must have $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that is, the unique nonnegative solution to PDE (1.1) is $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.2.
3. Proof of Theorem 1.4

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.4 by applying contradiction arguments and the method of scaling spheres. Now suppose on the contrary that \( u \geq 0 \) satisfies equation (1.1) but \( u \) is not identically zero, then there exists some \( \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( u(\bar{x}) > 0 \).

Assume \( n \geq 5 \), \( \alpha = 2m \) with \( 2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2} \), \( 0 \leq a < +\infty \), \( 1 < p < +\infty \). By Theorem 2 in [9] and Theorem 2.1 in [19], we already have the super poly-harmonic properties of solution \( u \):

\[
(3.1) \quad u_i(x) := (-\Delta)^i u(x) \geq 0
\]

for every \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, m - 1 \) and all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Furthermore, we can deduce from \(-\Delta u \geq 0\), \( u \geq 0 \), \( u(\bar{x}) > 0 \) and maximum principle that

\[
(3.2) \quad u(x) > 0, \quad \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\]

i.e., \( u \) is actually a positive solution in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Then, by maximum principles and induction, we can also infer further from \((-\Delta)^i u \geq 0 \) \( (i = 1, \ldots, m - 1) \), \( u > 0 \) and equation (1.1) that

\[
(3.3) \quad u_i(x) := (-\Delta)^i u(x) > 0, \quad \forall \ i = 1, \ldots, m - 1, \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

From Theorem 1 in [9] and Theorem 2.2 in [19], we have also known the equivalence between PDE (1.1) and the following integral equation

\[
(3.4) \quad u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{C_{n,m}}{|x - y|^{n-2m}} |y|^a u^p(y) dy,
\]

that is, the positive classical solution \( u \) to (1.1) also satisfies the equivalent integral equation (3.4), and vice versa. Therefore, there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), such that the solution \( u \) satisfies the following lower bound:

\[
(3.5) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2m}} \text{ for } |x| \geq 1.
\]

Indeed, since \( u > 0 \) also satisfy the integral equation (3.4), we can infer that

\[
(3.6) \quad u(x) \geq C_{n,m} \int_{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{|y|^a}{|x - y|^{n-2m}} u^p(y) dy
\]

\[
\geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2m}} \int_{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}} |y|^a u^p(y) dy =: \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2m}}
\]

for all \( |x| \geq 1 \).

Next, we will apply the method of scaling spheres to show the following lower bound estimates for positive solution \( u \), which contradict with the integral equation (3.4) for \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m} \).

**Theorem 3.1.** Assume \( n \geq 5 \), \( \alpha = 2m \) with \( 2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2} \), \( 0 \leq a < +\infty \), \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m} \). Suppose \( u \) is a positive solution to (1.1), then it satisfies the following lower bound estimates: for \( |x| \geq 1 \),

\[
(3.7) \quad u(x) \geq C_\kappa |x|^\kappa \quad \forall \ \kappa < +\infty.
\]

**Proof.** Given any \( \lambda > 0 \), we first define the Kelvin transform of a function \( u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) centered at 0 by

\[
(3.8) \quad u_\lambda(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n-2m} u \left(\frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2}\right)
\]
for arbitrary \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \). It’s obvious that the Kelvin transform \( u_\lambda \) may have singularity at 0 and \( \lim_{|x| \to \infty} |x|^{n-2m} u_\lambda(x) = \lambda^{n-2m} u(0) > 0 \). By (3.3), one can infer from the regularity assumptions on \( u \) that \( u_\lambda \in C^{2m}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \). Furthermore, we can deduce from (1.1) and (3.3) that

\[
(3.9) \quad (-\Delta)^m u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n+2m} \frac{\lambda^{2a}}{|x|^a} u_\lambda^{\tau} \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{\tau} |x|^a u_\lambda^p(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\},
\]

where \( \tau := n + 2m + 2a - p(n - 2m) > 0 \).

Next, we will carry out the process of scaling spheres with respect to the origin \( 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

Let \( \lambda > 0 \) be an arbitrary positive real number and let

\[
(3.10) \quad \omega^\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x)
\]

for any \( x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\} \). By the definition of \( u_\lambda \) and \( \omega^\lambda \), we have

\[
(3.11) \quad \omega^\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x) = -\left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-2m} \omega^\lambda(x^\lambda) = -\left( \omega^\lambda \right)^\lambda(x)
\]

for every \( x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\} \).

We will first show that, for \( \lambda > 0 \) sufficiently small,

\[
(3.12) \quad \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \ x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}.
\]

Then, we start dilating the sphere \( S_\lambda \) from near the origin \( 0 \) outward as long as (3.12) holds, until its limiting position \( \lambda = +\infty \) and derive lower bound estimates on \( u \). Therefore, the scaling sphere process can be divided into two steps.

**Step 1. Start dilating the sphere from near \( \lambda = 0 \).** Define

\[
(3.13) \quad B^-_\lambda := \{ x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\} \mid \omega^\lambda(x) < 0 \}.
\]

We will show that, for \( \lambda > 0 \) sufficiently small,

\[
(3.14) \quad B^-_\lambda = \emptyset.
\]

Since the positive solution \( u \) to (1.1) also satisfies the integral equation (3.4), through direct calculations, we get

\[
(3.15) \quad u(x) = C \int_{B_\lambda(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} u^p(y)dy + C \int_{B_\lambda(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^2 - \lambda |y|^2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u^p_\lambda(y)dy
\]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), where \( \tau := n + 2m + 2a - p(n - 2m) > 0 \). By direct calculations, one can also verify that \( u_\lambda \) satisfies the following integral equation

\[
(3.16) \quad u_\lambda(x) = C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u^p_\lambda(y)dy
\]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \), and hence, it follows immediately that

\[
(3.17) \quad u_\lambda(x) = C \int_{B_\lambda(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u^p_\lambda(y)dy + C \int_{B_\lambda(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^2 - \lambda |y|^2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u^p_\lambda(y)dy.
\]
From the integral equations (3.15) and (3.17), one can derive that, for any \( x \in B_\lambda^- \),
\[
0 > \omega^\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x)
\]
\[
= C \int_{B_\lambda(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} \right) \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^\tau \left( u_\lambda^p(y) - u^p(y) \right) dy
\]
\[
\leq C \int_{B_\lambda^-} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} \right) u^{p-1}(y) \omega^\lambda(y) dy
\]
\[
\leq C \int_{B_\lambda^-} \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} u^{p-1}(y) \omega^\lambda(y) dy.
\]

Now we need the following Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality.

**Lemma 3.2. (Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality)** Let \( n \geq 1, 0 < s < n \) and \( 1 < p < q < \infty \) be such that \( \frac{n}{q} = \frac{n}{p} - s \). Then we have
\[
\left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{n-s}} dy \right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_{n,s,p,q} \| f \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}
\]
for all \( f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \).

By Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality and (3.18), we have, for any \( \frac{n}{n-2m} < q < \infty \),
\[
\| \omega^\lambda \|_{L^q(B_\lambda^-)} \leq C \left\| |x|^a u^{p-1} \omega^\lambda \right\|_{L^{\frac{nq}{n+2m}}(B_\lambda^-)}
\]
\[
\leq C \left\| |x|^a u^{p-1} \right\|_{L^{\frac{nm}{n+2m}}(B_\lambda^-)} \| \omega^\lambda \|_{L^q(B_\lambda^-)}.
\]

Since \( a > -2m \), there exists an \( \epsilon_0 > 0 \) small enough, such that
\[
C \left\| |x|^a u^{p-1} \right\|_{L^{\frac{nm}{n+2m}}(B_\lambda^-)} \leq \frac{1}{2}
\]
for all \( 0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0 \), and hence (3.20) implies
\[
\| \omega^\lambda \|_{L^q(B_\lambda^-)} = 0,
\]
which means \( B_\lambda^- = \emptyset \). Therefore, we have proved for all \( 0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0, B_\lambda^- = \emptyset \), that is,
\[
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\}.
\]
This completes Step 1.

**Step 2. Dilate the sphere \( S_\lambda \) outward until \( \lambda = +\infty \) to derive lower bound estimates on \( u \).**

Step 1 provides us a start point to dilate the sphere \( S_\lambda \) from near \( \lambda = 0 \). Now we dilate the sphere \( S_\lambda \) outward as long as (3.12) holds. Let
\[
\lambda_0 := \sup\{ \lambda > 0 \mid \omega^\mu \geq 0 \text{ in } B_\mu(0) \setminus \{0\}, \forall 0 < \mu \leq \lambda \} \in (0, +\infty],
\]
and hence, one has
\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}.
\]
In what follows, we will prove \( \lambda_0 = +\infty \) by contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that \( 0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty \). In order to get a contradiction, we will first prove
\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}
\]
by using contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that (3.26) does not hold, that is, \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \geq 0 \) but \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \) is not identically zero in \( B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\} \), then there exists a \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\} \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0 \). We will obtain a contradiction with (3.24) via showing that the sphere \( S_{\lambda} \) can be dilated outward a little bit further, more precisely, there exists a \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough such that \( \omega^{\lambda} \geq 0 \) in \( B_\lambda(0) \setminus \{0\} \) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon] \).

For that purpose, we will first show that

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}. \tag{3.27}
\]

Indeed, since we have assumed there exists a point \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\} \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0 \), by continuity, there exists a small \( \delta > 0 \) and a constant \( c_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
B_\delta(x^0) \subset B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\delta(x^0).
\]

From (3.28) and the integral equations (3.15) and (3.17), one can derive that, for any \( x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\} \),

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x)
= C \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|y|^{n-2m}} \right) \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau u_{\lambda_0}^p(y) - u^p(y) \, dy
\geq C \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|y|^{n-2m}} \right) u^{p-1}(y) \omega^{\lambda_0}(y) dy
\geq C \int_{B_\delta(x^0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|y|^{n-2m}} \right) u^{p-1}(y) \omega^{\lambda_0}(y) dy > 0,
\]

thus we arrive at (3.27). Furthermore, (3.29) also implies that there exists a \( 0 < \eta < \lambda_0 \) small enough such that, for any \( x \in B_\eta(0) \setminus \{0\} \),

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq C \int_{B_\delta(x^0)} c_3 c_2 c_1^{p-1} c_0 \, dy =: \tilde{c}_0 > 0. \tag{3.30}
\]

We fixed \( 0 < r_0 < \frac{1}{2} \lambda_0 \) small enough, such that

\[
C \left\| |x|^a u^{p-1} \right\|_{L^p(B_{\lambda_0} + r_0, x^0)} \leq \frac{1}{2}
\]

where the constant \( C \) is the same as in (3.20) and the narrow region

\[
A_{\lambda_0 + r_0, 2r_0} := \{ x \in B_{\lambda_0 + r_0}(0) \mid |x| > \lambda_0 - r_0 \}.
\]

By (3.18), one can easily verify that inequality as (3.20) (with the same constant \( C \)) also holds for any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + r_0] \), that is, for any \( \frac{n}{n-2m} < q < \infty \),

\[
\| \omega^{\lambda} \|_{L^q(B_{\lambda}^-)} \leq C \left\| |x|^a u^{p-1} \right\|_{L^p(B_{\lambda}^-)} \| \omega^{\lambda} \|_{L^q(B_{\lambda}^-)}.
\]

From (3.27) and (3.30), we can infer that

\[
m_0 := \inf_{x \in B_{\lambda_0 - r_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}} \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) > 0.
\]
Since $u$ is uniformly continuous on arbitrary compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (say, $K = B_{\lambda_0}(0)$), we can deduce from (3.34) that, there exists a $0 < \varepsilon_2 < r_0$ sufficiently small, such that, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2]$,

$$(3.35) \quad \omega^\lambda(x) \geq \frac{m_0}{2} > 0, \quad \forall x \in \overline{B_{\lambda_0-r_0}(0)} \setminus \{0\}.$$  

The proof of (3.35) is entirely similar to that of (2.62), so we omit the details.

By (3.35), we know that for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2]$, (3.36)

$$B_{\lambda}^- \subset A_{\lambda_0 + r_0, 2r_0},$$

and hence, estimates (3.31) and (3.33) yields

$$(3.37) \quad \|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q(B_{\lambda}^-)} = 0.$$  

Therefore, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2]$, we deduce from (3.37) that, $B^-_{\lambda} = \emptyset$, that is,

$$(3.38) \quad \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B(0) \setminus \{0\},$$

which contradicts with the definition (3.24) of $\lambda_0$. As a consequence, in the case $0 \leq \lambda_0 < +\infty$, (3.26) must hold true, that is,

$$(3.39) \quad \omega^\lambda_{|_{\lambda,0}} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}. $$

However, by the second equality in (3.29) and (3.39), we arrive at

$$(3.40) \quad 0 = \omega^\lambda_{|_{\lambda,0}}(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x)$$

$$= C \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0)} \left( \frac{|y|^a}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{|y|^a}{|\lambda_0 x - \lambda y|^{|n-2m|}} \right) \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau - 1 \right) u^p(y)dy > 0$$

for any $x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \{0\}$, which is absurd. Thus we must have $\lambda_0 = +\infty$, that is,

$$(3.41) \quad u(x) \geq \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-2m} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right), \quad \forall \ |x| \geq \lambda, \quad \forall \ 0 < \lambda < +\infty.$$  

For arbitrary $|x| \geq 1$, let $\lambda := \sqrt{|x|}$, then (3.41) yields that

$$(3.42) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{1}{|x|^{n-2m}} u \left( \frac{x}{|x|} \right),$$

and hence, we arrive at the following lower bound estimate:

$$(3.43) \quad u(x) \geq \left( \min_{x \in S_1} u(x) \right) \frac{1}{|x|^{n-2m}} := \frac{C_0}{|x|^{\frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}}}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1.$$  

The lower bound estimate (3.43) can be improved remarkably for $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$ using the “Bootstrap” iteration technique and the integral equation (3.4).
In fact, let $\mu_0 := \frac{n-2m}{2}$, we infer from the integral equation (3.4) and (3.43) that, for $|x| \geq 1$,

\begin{equation}
\begin{split}
u(x) \geq C \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2m}|y|^{p\mu_0-a}} dy \\
\geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2m}} \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|} \frac{1}{|y|^{p\mu_0-a}} dy \\
\geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2m}} \int_{2|x|}^{4|x|} r^{n-1-p\mu_0+a} dr \\
\geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^{p\mu_0-(a+2m)}},
\end{split}
\end{equation}

where we have used the fact $n - p\mu_0 + a > 0$ since $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$. Let $\mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (a+2m)$. Due to $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$, our important observation is

\begin{equation}
\mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (a+2m) < \mu_0.
\end{equation}

Thus we have obtained a better lower bound estimate than (3.43) after one iteration, that is,

\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^{\mu_1}}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1.
\end{equation}

For $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, define

\begin{equation}
\mu_{k+1} := p\mu_k - (a+2m).
\end{equation}

Since $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$, it is easy to see that the sequence $\{\mu_k\}$ is monotone decreasing with respect to $k$ and $n - p\mu_k + a > 0$ for any $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Continuing the above iteration process involving the integral equation (3.4), we have the following lower bound estimates for every $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$,

\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \frac{C_k}{|x|^{\mu_k}}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1.
\end{equation}

Now Theorem 3.1 follows easily from the obvious properties that as $k \to +\infty$,

\begin{equation}
\mu_k \to -\infty \quad \text{if} \quad 1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}.
\end{equation}

This finishes our proof of Theorem 3.1.

We have proved the nontrivial nonnegative solution $u$ to (1.1) is actually a positive solution which also satisfies the integral equation (3.4). For $1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m}$, the lower bound estimates in Theorem 3.1 contradicts with the following integrability

\begin{equation}
C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u^p(x)}{|x|^{n-2m-a}} dx = u(0) < +\infty
\end{equation}

indicated by the integral equation (3.4). Therefore, we must have $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that is, the unique nonnegative solution to PDE (1.1) is $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.4.
Remark 3.3. Since (3.6) implies \( u_\lambda \) has positive lower bound near the origin 0, thus it is clear from the proof that, Liouville theorem can still be proved for the integral equation (3.4) in sub-linear cases \( 0 < p \leq 1 \). Once we have established the equivalence between PDE (1.1) and IE (3.4) for \( 0 < p \leq 1 \), then Liouville theorem for higher order PDE (1.1) follows immediately.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.7

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.7 via contradiction arguments and the method of scaling spheres. Now suppose on the contrary that \( u \geq 0 \) satisfies equation (1.5) but \( u \) is not identically zero, then there exists some \( \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) such that \( u(\bar{x}) > 0 \).

4.1. Equivalence between PDE and IE. In order to get a contradiction, we first need to show that the solution \( u \) to PDE (1.5) also satisfies the equivalent integral equation

\[
(4.1) \quad u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} G^+(x, y)|y|^a u^p(y)dy,
\]

where the Green’s function associated with \((-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\) on \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) is given by

\[
G^+(x, y) := \frac{C_{n, \alpha}}{|x - y|^{n - \alpha}} \int_0^{\frac{s_R}{t_R}} \frac{b^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1}}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n}{2}}} db.
\]

Theorem 4.1. Assume \( n \geq 2, n > \alpha, 0 < \alpha \leq 2, -\alpha - a < +\infty \) and \( 1 \leq p < \infty \). Suppose \( u \) is nonnegative solution to (1.5), then it also solves the integral equation (4.1), and vice versa.

Proof. First, assume \( u \) is a nonnegative solutions to PDE (1.5), our goal is to show that \( u \) also satisfies IE (4.1). For arbitrary \( R > 0 \), let \( P_R := (0, \ldots, 0, R) \) and

\[
(4.3) \quad \tilde{u}_R(x) = \int_{B_R(P_R)} G^+_R(x, y)|y|^a u^p(y)dy,
\]

where the Green’s function \( G^+_R \) for \((-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\) on \( B_R(P_R) \) is given by

\[
G^+_R(x, y) := \frac{C_{n, \alpha}}{|x - y|^{n - \alpha}} \int_{\frac{s_R}{t_R}}^{t_R} \frac{b^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1}}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n}{2}}} db,
\]

where \( t_R := \left(1 - \frac{|x - P_R|^2}{R^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{|y - P_R|^2}{R^2}\right) \) and \( s_R := \frac{|x - y|^2}{R^2} \).

Then, we can derive

\[
(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \tilde{u}_R(x) = |x|^a u^p(x), & x \in B_R(P_R), \\ \tilde{u}_R(x) = 0, & x \notin B_R(P_R). \end{cases}
\]

Let \( U_R(x) = u(x) - \tilde{u}_R(x) \), by PDE (1.5), we have

\[
(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} U_R(x) = 0, & x \in B_R(P_R), \\ U_R(x) \geq 0, & x \notin B_R(P_R). \end{cases}
\]

By Lemma 2.3 and maximum principles, for any \( x \in B_R(P_R) \), we deduce

\[
(4.7) \quad U_R(x) \geq 0.
\]
Letting $R \to \infty$, we have

\[(4.8) \quad u(x) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} G^+(x, y) |y|^\alpha u^p(y) dy =: \tilde{u}(x).\]

One can observe that $\tilde{u}$ is a solution of

\[(4.9) \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) = |x|^\alpha u^p(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \tilde{u}(x) = 0, & x \notin \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \]

Define $U := u - \tilde{u}$, we have

\[(4.10) \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} U(x) = 0, & U(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ U(x) = 0, & x \notin \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \]

Now we need the following Lemma from [14] on Liouville theorem for $\alpha$-harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$.

**Lemma 4.2.** ([14]) Assume $0 < \alpha < 2$, $u \in L_\alpha$ satisfies the following equation in the sense of distribution:

\[(4.11) \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = 0, & u(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ u(x) \equiv 0, & x \notin \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \]

Then, either $u \equiv 0$ or

\[(4.12) \quad \begin{cases} u(x) = C x_n^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ u(x) = 0, & x \notin \mathbb{R}^n_+, \end{cases} \]

for some positive constant $C > 0$.

The Liouville theorem for harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ (i.e., Lemma 4.2 with $\alpha = 2$) also holds (see e.g. [17]). It can also be proved by using the Kelvin transform, asymptotic harmonic expansions in conjunction with the method of moving planes, we omit the details here. For generalizations to Liouville theorems for poly-harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, please refer to [22].

From Lemma 4.2 and Liouville theorem for harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, we can deduce that either

\[(4.13) \quad U(x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \]

or there exist two positive $C_0$ such that

\[(4.14) \quad \begin{cases} U(x) = C_0 x_n^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ U(x) = 0, & x \notin \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \]

We can obtain a contradiction in the second case by deriving a lower bound estimates of the Green’s function $G^+$. In fact, for each fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$, by (4.2), there exists a $R_x > 0$
sufficiently large, such that, for any $|y| \geq R$, one can derive

$$G^+(x, y) = \frac{C_{n, \alpha}}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \int_0^{\frac{4\pi n y_n}{|x - y|^2}} b^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1} \frac{db}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \geq \frac{C}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \int_0^{\frac{4\pi n y_n}{|x - y|^2}} b^{\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1} \frac{db}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \geq \frac{C(x_n y_n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{|x - y|^n}.$$  

(4.15)

Therefore, for each fixed $x = (0, \cdots, 0, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we get from (4.15) and $a > -\alpha$ that

$$u(x) \geq \tilde{u}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} G^+(x, y)|y|^a u^p(y) dy \geq C_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} G^+(x, y)|y|^a (y_n^*)^p dy \geq C_1 x_n^\frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus B_R(0)} \frac{|y|^a}{|x - y|^n} dy \geq C_2 x_n^\frac{\alpha}{2} \int_R^\infty y_n^{\alpha (p+1)} \int_R^\infty \frac{r^{n-2} (r^2 + y_n^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{(r^2 + |x_n - y_n|^2)^{\frac{n}{2}}} drdy_n \geq C_3 x_n^\frac{\alpha}{2} \int_R^\infty y_n^{\alpha (p+1) + a - 1} \int_1^\infty \frac{s^{n-2} (s^2 + 1)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{s^2} dsdy_n = +\infty,$$

which is absurd. This implies that the second case (4.14) can not happen. Therefore, we can derive from (4.13) that

$$u(x) = \tilde{u}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} G^+(x, y)|y|^a u^p(y) dy,$$

(4.17)

that is, $u$ also satisfies the integral equation (4.1).

Conversely, assume that $u$ is a nonnegative classical solution of integral equation (4.1) on $\mathbb{R}_+^n$, then

$$(-\Delta)^\frac{\alpha}{2} u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \left[(-\Delta)^\frac{\alpha}{2} G^+(x, y)\right] |y|^a u^p(y) dy \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \delta(x - y)|y|^a u^p(y) dy = |x|^a u^p(x),$$

defining $u(x) > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Since the nonnegative solution $u$ with $u(\bar{x}) > 0$ also satisfy the integral equation (4.1), it is actually a positive solution in $\mathbb{R}_+^n$, that is,

$$u(x) > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

(4.18)
Moreover, there exist a constant \( C > 0 \), such that the solution \( u \) satisfies the following lower bound:

\[
(4.19) \quad u(x) \geq C \frac{x^n}{|x|^n} \quad \text{for } |x| \geq 1, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

Indeed, since \( u > 0 \) also satisfy the integral equation (1.11), we can deduce that

\[
(4.20) \quad u(x) = C_{n,\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \frac{|y|^a}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \left( \int_0^{4x_n y_n} b^\frac{\alpha}{2-1} \frac{b^\frac{\alpha}{2-1} \, db}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \right) u^p(y) \, dy
\]

\[
\geq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cap \{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}x_n\}} \frac{|y|^a}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \left( \int_0^{4x_n y_n} b^\frac{\alpha}{2-1} \, db \right) u^p(y) \, dy
\]

\[
\geq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cap \{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}x_n\}} \frac{|y|^a}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \left( \frac{4x_n y_n}{|x - y|^2} \right)^\frac{\alpha}{2} u^p(y) \, dy
\]

\[
\geq C \frac{x^n}{|x|^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cap \{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}x_n\}} |y|^a u^p(y) \, dy =: C \frac{x^n}{|x|^n}
\]

for all \( |x| \geq 1 \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \).

### 4.2. The method of scaling spheres.

In this subsection, we will apply the method of scaling spheres to show the following lower bound estimates for positive solution \( u \), which contradict with the integral equation (1.1) for \( 1 \leq p < \frac{n + \alpha + 2\alpha}{n - \alpha} \).

**Theorem 4.3.** Assume \( n \geq 2, \, n > \alpha, \, 0 < \alpha \leq 2, \, -\alpha < \alpha < +\infty \) and \( 1 \leq p < \frac{n + \alpha + 2\alpha}{n - \alpha} \).

Suppose \( u \) is a positive solution to (1.5), then it satisfies the following lower bound estimates: for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) satisfying \( |x| \geq 1 \) and \( x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}} \),

\[
(4.21) \quad u(x) \geq C_\kappa \, |x|^\kappa \quad \forall \kappa < +\infty.
\]

**Proof.** Given any \( \lambda > 0 \), we first define the Kelvin transform of a function \( u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) centered at 0 by

\[
(4.22) \quad u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right)
\]

for arbitrary \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \). It’s obvious that the Kelvin transform \( u_\lambda \) may have singularity at 0 and \( \lim_{|x| \to \infty} |x|^{n-\alpha} u_\lambda(x) = \lambda^{n-\alpha} u(0) = 0 \). By (1.22), one can infer from the regularity assumptions on \( u \) that \( u_\lambda \in C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n_+) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{0\}) \) if \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \) and \( u_\lambda \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n_+) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus \{0\}) \) if \( \alpha = 2 \). Furthermore, we can deduce from (1.5) and (4.22) that

\[
(4.23) \quad (-\Delta)^\frac{\alpha}{2} u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n+\alpha} \frac{\lambda^{2a}}{|x|^a} u_p \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^\tau |x|^\alpha u_\lambda^p(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+.
\]

where \( \tau := n + \alpha + 2a - p(n - \alpha) > 0 \).

Next, we will carry out the process of scaling spheres in \( \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \) with respect to the origin \( 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \). For this purpose, we need some definitions.

Let \( \lambda > 0 \) be an arbitrary positive real number and let the scaling half sphere be

\[
(4.24) \quad S^+_\lambda := \{ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} : |x| = \lambda \}.
\]
We define the reflection of $x$ about the half sphere $S^+_{\lambda}$ by $x^\lambda := \frac{x^2}{|x|^2}$ and define

$$B^+_{\lambda}(0) := B_{\lambda}(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \overline{B}^+_{\lambda}(0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^\lambda \in B^+_{\lambda}(0)\}.$$ 

Let $\omega^\lambda(x) := u_{\lambda}(x) - u(x)$ for any $x \in \overline{B}^+_{\lambda}(0) \setminus \{0\}$. By the definition of $u_{\lambda}$ and $\omega^\lambda$, we have

$$\omega^\lambda(x) = u_{\lambda}(x) - u(x) = -\left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n-\alpha} \omega^\lambda(x^\lambda) = -\left(\omega^\lambda\right)^\lambda(x)$$

for every $x \in \overline{B}^+_{\lambda}(0) \setminus \{0\}$.

We will first show that, for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B^+_{\lambda}(0).$$

Then, we start dilating the half sphere $S^+_{\lambda}$ from near the origin $0$ outward as long as (4.27) holds, until its limiting position $\lambda = +\infty$ and derive lower bound estimates on $u$ in a cone. Therefore, the scaling sphere process can be divided into two steps.

**Step 1. Start dilating the half sphere $S^+_{\lambda}$ from near $\lambda = 0$.** Define

$$(B^+_{\lambda})^- := \{x \in B^+_{\lambda}(0) \mid \omega^\lambda(x) < 0\}.$$ 

We will show through contradiction arguments that, for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\lambda < \lambda_{l_1,l_2}(x,\lambda) := \left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n-\alpha} u^p(x) - u(x).$$

Suppose (4.29) does not hold, that is, $(B^+_{\lambda})^- \neq \emptyset$ and hence $\omega^\lambda$ is negative somewhere in $B^+_{\lambda}(0)$. For arbitrary $x \in B^+_{\lambda}(0)$, we get from (4.23) that

$$(-\Delta)^{n} \omega^\lambda(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n} |x|^p u^p(x) - |x|^p u^p(x)$$

$$\geq |x|^p (u^p(x) - u^p(x)) = p|x|^p \xi_{\lambda}^{-1}(x) \omega^\lambda(x),$$

where $\xi_{\lambda}(x)$ is valued between $u(x)$ and $u_{\lambda}(x)$ by mean value theorem. Therefore, for all $x \in (B^+_{\lambda})^-$,

$$(-\Delta)^{n} \omega^\lambda(x) \geq p|x|^p \xi_{\lambda}^{-1}(x) \omega^\lambda(x) =: c_{\lambda}(x) \omega^\lambda(x).$$

Now we need the following Theorem on the Narrow region principle in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

**Theorem 4.4.** (Narrow region principle) Assume $n \geq 2$, $n > \alpha$, $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $-\alpha < a < +\infty$, and $1 \leq p < +\infty$. Let $\lambda > 0$ and $A^+_{\lambda,l_1,l_2} := \{x \in B^+_{\lambda}(0) \mid |x| > \lambda - l_1 \text{ or } x < l_2 \}$ be an narrow region in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with small $l_1 > l_2 > 0$ and $l_1 + l_2 < \lambda$. Suppose $\omega^\lambda \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(A^+_{\lambda,l_1,l_2})$ if $0 < \alpha < 2$ ($\omega^\lambda \in C^2(A^+_{\lambda,l_1,l_2})$ if $\alpha = 2$) and satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^{n} \omega^\lambda(x) - c_{\lambda}(x) \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } A^+_{\lambda,l_1,l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^-,$$

negative minimum of $\omega^\lambda$ is attained in the interior of $B^+_{\lambda}(0)$ if $(B^+_{\lambda})^- \neq \emptyset$, negative minimum of $\omega^\lambda$ cannot be attained in $B^+_{\lambda}(0) \setminus A^+_{\lambda,l_1,l_2}$, where $c_{\lambda}(x) := p|x|^p \xi_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)$. Then, we have

1. there exists a sufficiently small constant $\delta_0 > 0$, such that, for all $0 < \lambda \leq \delta_0$,

$$\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in A^+_{\lambda,l_1,l_2};$$
(ii) there exists a sufficiently small \( l_0 > 0 \) depending on \( \lambda \) continuously, such that, for all \( 0 < l_1, l_2 \leq l_0 \),

\[
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in A^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2}.
\]

**Proof.** The idea of proof is similar to that of the Narrow region principle in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) (Theorem 2.2 in [13] and Theorem 2.7). The key difference and ingredient is that, since

\[
A^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} = R^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cup L^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} := \{ x \in B^+_{\lambda}(0) \mid \lambda - l_1 < |x| < \lambda \} \cup \{ x \in B^+_+(0) \mid 0 < x_n < l_2 \},
\]

we need to discuss two different cases in order to get a contradiction, that is, the negative minimum point \( \bar{x} \in R^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^- \) or \( \bar{x} \in L^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^- \), respectively.

For \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \), the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.2 in [13]. The main difference is, we use the following identity

\[
(-\Delta)^2 \omega^\lambda(\bar{x}) = C \left\{ \int_{B^+_1(0)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B^+_1(0)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{R}^n_+} \right\} \frac{\omega^\lambda(\bar{x}) - \omega^\lambda(x)}{|\bar{x} - y|^{\alpha+n}} dy
\]

instead of the identity (2.15) in [13]. Then, by similar calculations as in (2.16) and (2.17) in [13], we will get the following estimate

\[
(-\Delta)^2 \omega^\lambda(\bar{x}) \leq C \omega^\lambda(\bar{x}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{R}^n_+} \frac{1}{|\bar{x} - y|^{\alpha+n}} dy \leq \frac{C}{l_1^\alpha} \omega^\lambda(\bar{x});
\]

if \( \bar{x} \in L^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^- \), then one gets from (4.37) that

\[
(-\Delta)^2 \omega^\lambda(\bar{x}) \leq C \omega^\lambda(\bar{x}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{R}^n_+} \frac{1}{|\bar{x} - y|^{\alpha+n}} dy \leq \frac{C}{l_2^\alpha} \omega^\lambda(\bar{x}).
\]

The rest of the proof is entirely similar to Theorem 2.7, we omit the details.

For \( \alpha = 2 \), if \( \bar{x} \in R^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^- \), then we define

\[
\zeta_1(x) := \cos \frac{|x| - \lambda + l_1}{l_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{1}^\lambda(x) := \frac{\omega^\lambda(x)}{\zeta_1(x)}
\]

for any \( x \in R^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \), and consider the negative minimum point \( x_1 \in R^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^- \) of the function \( \omega_{1}^\lambda \); if \( \bar{x} \in L^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^- \), then we define

\[
\zeta_2(x) := \cos \frac{x_n - l_2}{l_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{2}^\lambda(x) := \frac{\omega^\lambda(x)}{\zeta_2(x)}
\]

for any \( x \in L^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \), and consider the negative minimum point \( x_2 \in L^+_{\lambda, l_1, l_2} \cap (B^+_{\lambda})^- \) of the function \( \omega_{2}^\lambda \). In both these two different cases, we can obtain the key inequalities as (2.38)
The rest of the proof is entirely similar to Theorem 2.7, we omit the details.

This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.4. □

In order to apply Theorem 4.4 to show (4.29), we first prove that there exists a sufficiently small $\eta_0 > 0$ such that if $0 < \lambda \leq \eta_0$, then it follows from (4.31), (4.43) and (4.45) that

$$\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 1, \quad \forall x \in B^\lambda_\chi(0) \setminus A^\lambda_{\lambda, l_1, l_2},$$

where $l_1 := \lambda - \lambda^2$ and $l_2 := \lambda^2$. In fact, (4.19) implies that

(4.44)  
$$u_\lambda(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n-\alpha} u \left(\frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2}\right) \geq C \left(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\right)^{n-\alpha} \frac{\lambda^\omega x}{|x|^\alpha} \geq \frac{C x^\omega}{\lambda^n}$$

for all $x \in B^\lambda_\chi(0) \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore, we have if $0 < \lambda \leq \eta_0$ for some $\eta_0 > 0$ small enough, then

(4.45)  
$$\omega^\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x) \geq \frac{C x^\omega}{\lambda^n} - \max_{x \in B^\lambda_\chi(0)} u(x) \geq C \frac{\lambda^\omega x}{\lambda^n} - \max_{x \in B^\lambda_\chi(0)} u(x) \geq 1$$

for all $x \in B^\lambda_\chi(0) \setminus A^\lambda_{\lambda, l_1, l_2}$, so we arrive at (4.43).

Now define $\epsilon_0 := \min\{\delta_0, \eta_0\}$. If $0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0$, let $l_1 := \lambda - \lambda^2 \in (0, \lambda)$ and $l_2 := \lambda^2 / \lambda \in (0, \lambda)$, then it follows from (4.31), (4.43) and

(4.46)  
$$\liminf_{x \to 0} \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0$$

that the conditions (4.32) in Theorem 4.4 are satisfied, hence we can deduce from (i) in Theorem 4.4 that

(4.47)  
$$\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in A^\lambda_{\lambda, l_1, l_2}.$$

Therefore, we have proved for all $0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0$, $(B^\lambda_\chi)^- = \emptyset$, that is,

(4.48)  
$$\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B^\lambda_\chi(0).$$

This completes Step 1.

Step 2. Dilate the half sphere $S^\lambda_\chi$ outward until $\lambda = +\infty$ to derive lower bound estimates on $u$ in a cone. Step 1 provides us a start point to dilate the half sphere $S^\lambda_\chi$ from near $\lambda = 0$. Now we dilate the half sphere $S^\lambda_\chi$ outward as long as (4.27) holds. Let

(4.49)  
$$\lambda_0 := \sup\{\lambda > 0 \mid \omega^\mu \geq 0 \text{ in } B^\mu_\chi(0), \forall 0 < \mu \leq \lambda\} \in (0, +\infty],$$

and hence, one has

(4.50)  
$$\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B^{\lambda_0}_\chi(0).$$

In what follows, we will prove $\lambda_0 = +\infty$ by contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that $0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty$. In order to get a contradiction, we will first prove

(4.51)  
$$\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0, \quad \forall x \in B^{\lambda_0}_\chi(0)$$

by using the Narrow region principle (Theorem 4.4) and contradiction arguments.
Suppose on contrary that (4.51) does not hold, that is, \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \geq 0 \) but \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \) is not identically zero in \( B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \), then there exists a \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0 \). We will obtain a contradiction with (4.49) via showing that the half sphere \( S_{\lambda_0}^+ \) can be dilated outward a little bit further, more precisely, there exists a \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough such that \( \omega^\lambda \geq 0 \) in \( B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon] \).

For that purpose, we will first show that

\[
(4.52) \quad \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0).
\]

Indeed, since we have assumed there exists a point \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0 \), by continuity, there exists a small \( \delta > 0 \) and a constant \( c_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
(4.53) \quad B_\delta(x^0) \subset B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\delta(x^0).
\]

Since the positive solution \( u \) to (1.5) also satisfies the integral equation (4.1), through direct calculations, we get

\[
(4.54) \quad u(x) = \int_{B_{\lambda_0}^+(0)} G^+(x, y) |y|^a u^p(y) dy + \int_{S_{\lambda_0}^+} G^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{\tau+n-\alpha} |y|^a u_{\lambda_0}^p(y) dy
\]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), where \( \tau := n + \alpha + 2a - p(n - \alpha) > 0 \). By direct calculations, one can also verify that \( u_{\lambda_0} \) satisfies the following integral equation

\[
(4.55) \quad u_{\lambda_0}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} G^+(x, y) \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} |y|^a u_{\lambda_0}^p(y) dy
\]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \), and hence, it follows immediately that

\[
(4.56) \quad u_{\lambda_0}(x) = \int_{B_{\lambda_0}^+(0)} G^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} |y|^a u^p(y) dy
\]

\[
+ \int_{S_{\lambda_0}^+} G^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} |y|^a u_{\lambda_0}^p(y) dy.
\]

Observe that for any \( x, y \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \),

\[
(4.57) \quad |x - y| < \left| \frac{|y|}{\lambda_0} x - \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} y \right|,
\]

and the Green’s function \( G^+(x, y) \) is monotone decreasing about the distance \( |x - y| \) provided the product \( x_n y_n \) remains unchanged, one easily verifies

\[
(4.58) \quad G^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) = G^+(x, y) - G^+ \left( \frac{|y|}{\lambda_0} x, \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} y \right) > 0.
\]
for any \( x, y \in B^+(0) \). Therefore, from the integral equations (4.54) and (4.56), one can derive that, for any \( x \in B^+_{\lambda_0}(0) \),

\begin{equation}
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \int_{B^+_{\lambda_0}(0)} \left( G^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \right) |y|^{\alpha} \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u_{\lambda_0}^p(y) - u^p(y) \right) dy
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\geq p \int_{B^+_{\lambda_0}(0)} \left( G^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \right) u^{p-1}(y) |y|^{\alpha} \omega^{\lambda_0}(y) dy
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\geq p \int_{B^+(x_0)} \left( G^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \right) u^{p-1}(y) |y|^{\alpha} \omega^{\lambda_0}(y) dy > 0,
\end{equation}

thus we arrive at (4.52).

Now we define

\begin{equation}
\tilde{l}_0 := \min_{\lambda \in [\lambda_0, 2\lambda_0]} l_0(\lambda) > 0,
\end{equation}

where \( l_0(\lambda) \) is given by Theorem 4.4. For a fixed small \( 0 < r_0 < \frac{1}{4} \min\{\tilde{l}_0, \lambda_0\} \), by (4.52), we can define

\begin{equation}
m_0 := \inf_{x \in B^+_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus A^+_{\lambda_0, r_0, r_0}} \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) > 0.
\end{equation}

Since \( u \) is uniformly continuous on arbitrary compact set \( K \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) (say, \( K = B^+_{2\lambda_0}(0) \)), we can deduce from (4.61) that, there exists a \( 0 < \varepsilon_3 < \frac{1}{4} \min\{\tilde{l}_0, \lambda_0\} \) sufficiently small, such that, for any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_3] \),

\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq m_0 > 0, \quad \forall \ x \in B^+_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus A^+_{\lambda_0, r_0, r_0}.
\end{equation}

The proof of (4.62) is completely similar to that of (2.62), so we omit the details.

For any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_3] \), let \( l_1 := \lambda - \lambda_0 + r_0 \in (0, \tilde{l}_0) \) and \( l_2 := r_0 \in (0, \tilde{l}_0) \), then it follows from (4.31), (4.62) and

\begin{equation}
\liminf_{x \to 0} \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0
\end{equation}

that the conditions (4.32) in Theorem 4.4 are satisfied, hence we can deduce from (ii) in Theorem 4.4 that

\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \ x \in A^+_{\lambda_1, l_1, l_2}.
\end{equation}

Therefore, we get from (4.62) and (4.64) that, \((B^+_\lambda)^- = \emptyset\) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_3] \), that is,

\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \ x \in B^+_{\lambda}(0),
\end{equation}

which contradicts with the definition (4.49) of \( \lambda_0 \). As a consequence, in the case \( 0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty \), (4.51) must hold true, that is,

\begin{equation}
\omega^{\lambda_0} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B^+_{\lambda_0}(0).
\end{equation}
However, by the second equality in \((4.59)\) and \((4.66)\), we arrive at
\begin{equation}
0 = \omega_{\xi_n}(x) = u_{\xi_n}(x) - u(x)
= \int_{B_{\xi_n}^+(0)} \left( G^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G^+(x, y) \right) \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau - 1 \right) |y|^\alpha u^p(y) dy > 0
\end{equation}
for any \(x \in B_{\xi_n}^+(0)\), which is absurd. Thus we must have \(\lambda_0 = +\infty\), that is,
\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right), \quad \forall \ |x| \geq \lambda, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \ \forall \ 0 < \lambda < +\infty.
\end{equation}
For arbitrary \(|x| \geq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+\), let \(\lambda := \sqrt{|x|}\), then \((4.68)\) yields that
\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \frac{1}{|x|^\frac{n-\alpha}{n}} u \left( \frac{x}{|x|} \right),
\end{equation}
and hence, we arrive at the following lower bound estimate:
\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \left( \frac{\min_{x \in S^*_1, x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}} \nu(x)}{|x|^\frac{n-\alpha}{n}} \right) \frac{1}{|x|^\frac{n-\alpha}{n}} := \frac{C_0}{|x|^\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1, \ x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}.
\end{equation}
The lower bound estimate \((4.70)\) can be improved remarkably for \(1 \leq p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}\) using the “Bootstrap” iteration technique and the integral equation \((4.1)\).
In fact, let \(\mu_0 := \frac{n-\alpha}{2}\), we infer from the integral equation \((4.1)\) and \((4.70)\) that, for any \(|x| \geq 1\) and \(x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}\),
\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq C \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|, y_n \geq \frac{|y|}{\sqrt{n}}} \frac{1}{|x-n-\alpha|} \left( \int_0^{\frac{4|x|y_0}{|x-y|^2}} \frac{b^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}} - 1}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} db \right) \frac{1}{|y|^\mu_0-a dy}
\geq \frac{C}{|x|^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|, y_n \geq \frac{|y|}{\sqrt{n}}} \left( \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}} \frac{b^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}} - 1}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} db \right) \frac{1}{|y|^\mu_0-a dy}
\geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^\mu_0-(a+\alpha)},
\end{equation}
where we have used the fact \(n - p\mu_0 + a > 0\) since \(1 \leq p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}\). Let \(\mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (a + \alpha)\). Due to \(1 \leq p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}\), our important observation is
\begin{equation}
\mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (a + \alpha) < \mu_0.
\end{equation}
Thus we have obtained a better lower bound estimate than \((4.70)\) after one iteration, that is,
\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^\mu_1}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1, \ x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}.
\end{equation}
For \(k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots\), define
\begin{equation}
\mu_{k+1} := p\mu_k - (a + \alpha).
\end{equation}
Since \(1 \leq p < \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha}\), it is easy to see that the sequence \(\{\mu_k\}\) is monotone decreasing with respect to \(k\) and \(n - p\mu_k + a > 0\) for any \(k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots\). Continuing the above iteration.
process involving the integral equation (4.1), we have the following lower bound estimates for every \( k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \),

\[
(4.75) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{C_k}{|x|^\mu_k}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1, \ x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}.
\]

Now Theorem 4.3 follows easily from the obvious properties that as \( k \to +\infty \),

\[
(4.76) \quad \mu_k \to -\infty \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq p < \frac{n + \alpha + 2a}{n - \alpha}.
\]

This finishes our proof of Theorem 4.3.

We have proved the nontrivial nonnegative solution \( u \) to (1.5) is actually a positive solution which also satisfies the integral equation (4.1). For \( 1 \leq p < \frac{n + \alpha + 2a}{n - \alpha} \), the lower bound estimates in Theorem 4.3 contradicts with the following integrability indicated by the integral equation (4.1), that is,

\[
(4.77) \quad +\infty > \int_{|y| \geq 2, y_n \geq \frac{|y|}{\sqrt{n}}} C \left( \int_0^{\frac{4\pi}{|e_n - y|^2}} \frac{b_2^k - 1}{(1 + b)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \ |y|^a u^p(y) \, dy \right) \left( \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}|y|^2}} \frac{b_2^k - 1}{(1 + b)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \ |y|^a u^p(y) \, dy \right) \ |y|^a u^p(y) \, dy.
\]

where \( e_n := (0, \cdots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \). Therefore, we must have \( u \equiv 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}_+^n \), that is, the unique nonnegative solution to PDE (1.5) is \( u \equiv 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}_+^n \).

This concludes our proof of Theorem 1.7.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.9

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.9 via contradiction arguments and the method of scaling spheres. Now suppose on the contrary that \( u \geq 0 \) satisfies the Navier problem for Lane-Emden equation (1.6) but \( u \) is not identically zero, then there exists some \( \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \) such that \( u(\bar{x}) > 0 \).

Assume \( n \geq 5 \), \( 2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2} \), \( 1 < p < +\infty \). By Theorem 3 in [3], we already have the super poly-harmonic properties of solution \( u \):

\[
(5.1) \quad u_i(x) := (-\Delta)^i u(x) \geq 0
\]

for every \( i = 1, 2, \cdots, m - 1 \) and all \( x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \). Furthermore, we can deduce from \( -\Delta u \geq 0 \), \( u \geq 0 \), \( u(\bar{x}) > 0 \) and maximum principle that

\[
(5.2) \quad u(x) > 0, \quad \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n,
\]

i.e., \( u \) is actually a positive solution in \( \mathbb{R}_+^n \). Then, by maximum principles and induction, we can also infer further from \( (-\Delta)^i u \geq 0 \) (\( i = 1, \cdots, m - 1 \)), \( u > 0 \) and equation (1.6) that

\[
(5.3) \quad u_i(x) := (-\Delta)^i u(x) > 0, \quad \forall \ i = 1, \cdots, m - 1, \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n.
\]
From Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 in [3], we have also known the equivalence between PDE (1.6) and the following integral equation

\[(5.4) \quad u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} G^+_m(x, y) u^p(y) dy,\]

where the Green’s function \(G^+_m(x, y)\) for \((-\Delta)^m\) with Navier boundary conditions on the half space \(\mathbb{R}^n_+\) is given by

\[(5.5) \quad G^+_m(x, y) := C_{n,m} \left( \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{1}{|\bar{x}-y|^{n-2m}} \right)\]

and \(\bar{x} := (x_1, x_2, \ldots, -x_n)\) is the reflection of \(x\) with respect to the boundary \(\partial \mathbb{R}^n_+\). This means, the positive classical solution \(u\) to \((1.6)\) also satisfies the equivalent integral equation \((5.4)\), and vice versa. As a consequence, there exist a constant \(C > 0\), such that the solution \(u\) satisfies the following lower bound:

\[(5.6) \quad u(x) \geq C \frac{x_n}{|x|^{n-2m+2}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq 1, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+.\]

Indeed, since \(u > 0\) also satisfy the integral equation \((5.4)\), we can deduce that

\[(5.7) \quad u(x) = C_{n,m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \left( \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{1}{|\bar{x}-y|^{n-2m}} \right) u^p(y) dy \geq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cap \{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}\}} \frac{x_n y_n}{|x-y|^{n-2m+2}} u^p(y) dy \geq C \frac{x_n}{|x|^{n-2m+2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cap \{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}\}} y_n u^p(y) dy =: C \frac{x_n}{|x|^{n-2m+2}}\]

for all \(|x| \geq 1\) and \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+\).

Next, we will apply the method of scaling spheres to show the following lower bound estimates for positive solution \(u\), which contradict with the integral equation \((5.4)\) for \(1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}\).

**Theorem 5.1.** Assume \(n \geq 5\), \(2 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}\) and \(1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}\). Suppose \(u\) is a positive solution to \((1.6)\), then it satisfies the following lower bound estimates: for all \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+\) satisfying \(|x| \geq 1\) and \(x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}\),

\[(5.8) \quad u(x) \geq C_\kappa |x|^\kappa \quad \forall \kappa < +\infty.\]

**Proof.** Given any \(\lambda > 0\), we first define the Kelvin transform of a function \(u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) centered at 0 by

\[(5.9) \quad u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-2m} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right)\]

for arbitrary \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}\). It’s obvious that the Kelvin transform \(u_\lambda\) may have singularity at 0 and \(\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^{n-2m} u_\lambda(x) = \lambda^{n-2m} u(0) = 0\). By \((5.9)\), one can infer from the regularity assumptions on \(u\) that \(u_\lambda \in C^{2m}(\mathbb{R}^n_+) \cap C^{2m-2}(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{0\})\). Furthermore, we can deduce from \((1.6)\) and \((5.9)\) that

\[(5.10) \quad (-\Delta)^m u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n+2m} u^p \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right)^\tau u_\lambda^\tau(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+.\]
where \( \tau := n + 2m - p(n - 2m) > 0 \).

Next, we will carry out the process of scaling spheres in \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) with respect to the origin \( 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \).

Let \( \lambda > 0 \) be an arbitrary positive real number and let

(5.11) \[ \omega^\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x) \]

for any \( x \in B_\lambda^+(0) \setminus \{0\} \). By the definition of \( u_\lambda \) and \( \omega^\lambda \), we have

(5.12) \[ \omega^\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x) = -\left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-2m} \omega^\lambda(x^\lambda) = -(\omega^\lambda)^\lambda(x) \]

for every \( x \in B_\lambda^+(0) \setminus \{0\} \).

We will first show that, for \( \lambda > 0 \) sufficiently small,

(5.13) \[ \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\lambda^+(0). \]

Then, we start dilating the half sphere \( S^+_\lambda \) from near the origin \( 0 \) outward as long as (5.13) holds, until its limiting position \( \lambda = +\infty \) and derive lower bound estimates on \( u \) in a cone.

Therefore, the scaling sphere process can be divided into two steps.

**Step 1. Start dilating the half sphere \( S^+_\lambda \) from near \( \lambda = 0 \).** Define

(5.14) \[ (B^+_\lambda)^- := \{ x \in B^+_\lambda(0) \mid \omega^\lambda(x) < 0 \}. \]

We will show that, for \( \lambda > 0 \) sufficiently small,

(5.15) \[ (B^+_\lambda)^- = \emptyset. \]

Since the positive solution \( u \) to (1.6) also satisfies the integral equation (5.4), through direct calculations, we get

(5.16) \[ u(x) = \int_{B^+_\lambda(0)} G^+_m(x, y)u^\lambda(y)dy + \int_{B^+_\lambda(0)} G^+_m(x, y^\lambda)\left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau+n-2m} u^\lambda(y)dy \]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \), where \( \tau := n + 2m - p(n - 2m) > 0 \). By direct calculations, one can also verify that \( u_\lambda \) satisfies the following integral equation

(5.17) \[ u_\lambda(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} G^+_m(x, y)\left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^\tau u^\lambda(y)dy \]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{0\} \), and hence, it follows immediately that

(5.18) \[ u_\lambda(x) = \int_{B^+_\lambda(0)} G^+_m(x, y^\lambda)\left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau+n-2m} u^\lambda(y)dy \]

\[ + \int_{B^+_\lambda(0)} G^+_m(x, y)\left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u^\lambda(y)dy. \]

Observe that for any \( x, y \in B^+_\lambda(0) \),

(5.19) \[ |x - y| < \frac{|y|}{\lambda} |x - \frac{\lambda}{|y|} x|, \]
and the Green’s function $G_m^+(x, y)$ is monotone decreasing about the distance $|x - y|$ provided the product $x_n y_n$ remains unchanged, one easily verifies
\begin{equation}
G_m^+(x, y) - \left(\frac{\lambda}{|y|}\right)^{n-2m} G_m^+(x, y^\lambda) = G_m^+(x, y) - G_m^+\left(\frac{|y|}{\lambda} x, \frac{\lambda}{|y|} y\right) > 0
\end{equation}
for any $x, y \in B_\lambda^+(0)$. Therefore, from the integral equations (5.16) and (5.18), one can derive that, for any $x \in B_\lambda^+(0)$,
\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x) = \int_{B_\lambda^+(0)} \left(G_m^+(x, y) - \left(\frac{\lambda}{|y|}\right)^{n-2m} G_m^+(x, y^\lambda)\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{|y|}\right)^{\tau} u_\lambda^{p}(y) - u^{p}(y)\right) dy
\geq p \int_{(B_\lambda^+)^-} \left(G_m^+(x, y) - \left(\frac{\lambda}{|y|}\right)^{n-2m} G_m^+(x, y^\lambda)\right) u^{p-1}(y)\omega^\lambda(y) dy
\geq p \int_{(B_\lambda^+)^-} \frac{C_{n,m}}{|x - y|^{n-2m}} u^{p-1}(y)\omega^\lambda(y) dy.
\end{equation}

By Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality and (5.21), we have, for any $\frac{n}{n-2m} < q < \infty$,
\begin{equation}
\|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q((B_\lambda^+)^-)} \leq C \|u^{p-1}\omega^\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{pq}{n-pq}}((B_\lambda^+)^-)} \leq C \|u\|^p_{L^{\frac{n(p-1)}{2m}}((B_\lambda^+)^-)} \|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q((B_\lambda^+)^-)}. \tag{5.22}
\end{equation}

Since $u \in C^{2m-2/(2m^\prime)}(\mathbb{R}_+^m)$, there exists a $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough, such that
\begin{equation}
C \|u\|^p_{L^{\frac{n(p-1)}{2m}}((B_\lambda^+)^-)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tag{5.23}
\end{equation}
for all $0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0$, and hence (5.22) implies
\begin{equation}
\|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q((B_\lambda^+)^-)} = 0, \tag{5.24}
\end{equation}
which means $(B_\lambda^+)^- = \emptyset$. Therefore, we have proved for all $0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon_0$, $(B_\lambda^+)^- = \emptyset$, that is,
\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \, x \in B_\lambda^+(0). \tag{5.25}
\end{equation}
This completes Step 1.

\textit{Step 2. Dilate the half sphere $S_\lambda^+$ outward until $\lambda = +\infty$ to derive lower bound estimates on $u$ in a cone.} Step 1 provides us a start point to dilate the half sphere $S_\lambda^+$ from near $\lambda = 0$. Now we dilate the half sphere $S_\lambda^+$ outward as long as (5.13) holds. Let
\begin{equation}
\lambda_0 := \sup\{\lambda > 0 \mid \omega^\mu \geq 0 \text{ in } B_\mu^+(0), \forall \, 0 < \mu \leq \lambda \} \in (0, +\infty], \tag{5.26}
\end{equation}
and hence, one has
\begin{equation}
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \, x \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0). \tag{5.27}
\end{equation}
In what follows, we will prove $\lambda_0 = +\infty$ by contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that $0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty$. In order to get a contradiction, we will first prove
\begin{equation}
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0, \quad \forall \, x \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \tag{5.28}
\end{equation}
by using contradiction arguments.
Suppose on contrary that (5.28) does not hold, that is, \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \geq 0 \) but \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \) is not identically zero in \( B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \), then there exists a \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0 \). We will obtain a contradiction with (5.26) via showing that the half sphere \( S^+_x \) can be dilated outward a little bit further, more precisely, there exists a \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough such that \( \omega^\lambda \geq 0 \) in \( B^+_x(0) \) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon] \).

For that purpose, we will first show that

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0).
\]

Indeed, since we have assumed there exists a point \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) > 0 \), by continuity, there exists a small \( \delta > 0 \) and a constant \( c_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
B_{\delta}(x^0) \subset B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\delta}(x^0).
\]

From (5.30) and the integral equations (5.16) and (5.18), one can derive that, for any \( x \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \),

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x)
\]

\[
= \int_{B_{\lambda_0}^+(0)} \left( G_m^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-2m} G_m^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \right) \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau u_{\lambda_0}^p(y) - u^p(y) \right) dy
\]

\[
\geq p \int_{B_{\lambda_0}^+(0)} \left( G_m^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-2m} G_m^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \right) u^{p-1}(y)\omega^{\lambda_0}(y) dy
\]

\[
\geq p \int_{B_{\delta}(x^0)} \left( G_m^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-2m} G_m^+(x, y^{\lambda_0}) \right) u^{p-1}(y)\omega^{\lambda_0}(y) dy > 0,
\]

thus we arrive at (5.29).

Now, we choose a \( 0 < r_0 < \frac{1}{4}\lambda_0 \) small enough, such that

\[
C \|u\|^{p-1}_{L^\frac{n(p-1)}{n-2m}(A_{\lambda_0+r_0,2r_0,r_0}^+)} \leq \frac{1}{2},
\]

where the constant \( C \) is the same as in (5.23) and the narrow region

\[
A_{\lambda_0+r_0,2r_0,r_0}^+ := \{ x \in B_{\lambda_0+r_0}^+(0) \mid |x| > \lambda_0 - r_0 \quad \text{or} \quad x_n < r_0 \}.
\]

By (5.21), one can easily verify that inequality as (5.22) (with the same constant \( C \)) also holds for any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + r_0] \), that is, for any \( \frac{n}{n-2m} < q < \infty \),

\[
\|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q((B^+_x)^-)} \leq C \|u\|^{p-1}_{L^\frac{n(p-1)}{n-2m}((B^+_x)^-)} \|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q((B^+_x)^-)}.
\]

By (5.29), we can define

\[
m_0 := \inf_{x \in B_{\lambda_0}^+(0) \setminus A_{\lambda_0+r_0,r_0}^+} \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) > 0,
\]

where the narrow region

\[
A_{\lambda,l_1,l_2}^+ := \{ x \in B_{\lambda}^+(0) \mid |x| > \lambda - l_1 \quad \text{or} \quad x_n < l_2 \}
\]
with \( l_1 > 0, l_2 > 0 \) and \( l_1 + l_2 < \lambda \). Since \( u \) is uniformly continuous on arbitrary compact set \( K \subset \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) (say, \( K = B_{2\lambda_0}(0) \)), we can deduce from (5.35) that, there exists a \( 0 < \varepsilon_4 < r_0 \) sufficiently small, such that, for any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_4] \),

\[
(5.37) \quad \omega^\lambda(x) \geq \frac{m_0}{2} > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus A_{\lambda_0, r_0, r_0}^+.
\]

The proof of (5.37) is completely similar to that of (2.62), so we omit the details.

For any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_4] \), it follows from (5.37) that

\[
(5.38) \quad (B_{\lambda}^+)^- \subset A_{\lambda_0+\lambda_0+r_0, r_0}^+ \subset A_{\lambda_0+r_0, 2r_0, r_0}^+.
\]

As a consequence of (5.32), (5.34) and (5.38), we get

\[
(5.39) \quad \|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q((B_{\lambda_0}^+)^-)} = 0,
\]

and hence \((B_{\lambda}^+)^- = \emptyset\) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_4] \), that is,

\[
(5.40) \quad \omega^\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda}(0),
\]

which contradicts with the definition (5.26) of \( \lambda_0 \). As a consequence, in the case \( 0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty \), (5.28) must hold true, that is,

\[
(5.41) \quad \omega^{\lambda_0} \equiv 0 \text{ in } B_{\lambda_0}(0).
\]

However, by the second equality in (5.31) and (5.41), we arrive at

\[
(5.42) \quad 0 = \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x) = \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0)} \left( C_m^+(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{n-2m} C_m^+(x, \lambda_0 y) \right) \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} - 1 \right) u^p(y) dy > 0
\]

for any \( x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \), which is absurd. Thus we must have \( \lambda_0 = +\infty \), that is,

\[
(5.43) \quad u(x) \geq \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{-2m} u \left( \frac{x^2}{|x|^2} \right), \quad \forall \ |x| \geq \lambda, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \ \forall \ 0 < \lambda < +\infty.
\]

For arbitrary \( |x| \geq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \), let \( \lambda := \sqrt{|x|} \), then (5.43) yields that

\[
(5.44) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{n-2m}{2}}} u \left( \frac{x}{|x|} \right),
\]

and hence, we arrive at the following lower bound estimate:

\[
(5.45) \quad u(x) \geq \left( \min_{x \in S_{\lambda_0}^+, |x| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}} u(x) \right) \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{n-2m}{2}}} := \frac{C_0}{|x|^{\frac{n-2m}{2}}}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1, \ x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}.
\]

The lower bound estimate (5.45) can be improved remarkably for \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m+2a}{n-2m} \) using the “Bootstrap” iteration technique and the integral equation (5.4).
In fact, let \( \mu_0 := \frac{n-2m}{2} \), we infer from the integral equation (5.4) and (5.45) that, for any \( |x| \geq 1 \) and \( x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}} \),

\[
(5.46) \quad u(x) \geq C \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|, y_n \geq \frac{|y|}{\sqrt{n}}} \left( \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-2m}} \right) \frac{1}{|y|^{p\mu_0}} dy \\
\geq C \int_{2|x| \leq |y| \leq 4|x|, y_n \geq \frac{|y|}{\sqrt{n}}} \frac{x_n y_n}{|x-y|^{n-2m+2}} \frac{1}{|y|^{p\mu_0}} dy \\
\geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2m}} \int_{2|x|}^{4|x|} x^{n-1-p\mu_0} dr \\
\geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^{p\mu_0-2m}},
\]

where we have used the fact \( n - p\mu_0 > 0 \) since \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \). Let \( \mu_1 := p\mu_0 - 2m \). Due to \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \), our important observation is

\[
(5.47) \quad \mu_1 := p\mu_0 - 2m < \mu_0.
\]

Thus we have obtained a better lower bound estimate than (5.45) after one iteration, that is,

\[
(5.48) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^{\mu_1}}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1, \ x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}.
\]

For \( k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \), define

\[
(5.49) \quad \mu_{k+1} := p\mu_k - 2m.
\]

Since \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \), it is easy to see that the sequence \( \{\mu_k\} \) is monotone decreasing with respect to \( k \) and \( n - p\mu_k > 0 \) for any \( k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \). Continuing the above iteration process involving the integral equation (5.4), we have the following lower bound estimates for every \( k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \),

\[
(5.50) \quad u(x) \geq \frac{C_k}{|x|^{\mu_k}}, \quad \forall \ |x| \geq 1, \ x_n \geq \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{n}}.
\]

Now Theorem 5.1 follows easily from the obvious properties that as \( k \to +\infty \),

\[
(5.51) \quad \mu_k \to -\infty \quad \text{if} \quad 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m}.
\]

This finishes our proof of Theorem 5.1 \( \square \)

We have proved the nontrivial nonnegative solution \( u \) to the Navier problem for Lane-Emden equation (1.6) on \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) is actually a positive solution which also satisfies the integral equation (5.4). For \( 1 < p < \frac{n+2m}{n-2m} \), the lower bound estimates in Theorem 5.1 contradicts
with the following integrability indicated by the integral equation (6.3), that is,

\[(5.52) \quad +\infty > u(e_n) \geq C \int_{|y| \geq 2, y_n \geq |y| \sqrt{\alpha}} \left( \frac{1}{|e_n - y|^{n-2m}} - \frac{1}{|e_n - y|^{n-2m+2}} \right) u^p(y)dy \]

\[\geq C \int_{|y| \geq 2, y_n \geq |y| \sqrt{\alpha}} \frac{y_n}{|e_n - y|^{n-2m+2}} u^p(y)dy \]

\[\geq C \int_{|y| \geq 2, y_n \geq |y| \sqrt{\alpha}} \frac{u^p(y)}{|y|^{n-2m+1}} dy, \]

where \(e_n := (0, \cdots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+\). Therefore, we must have \(u \equiv 0\) in \(\mathbb{R}^n_+\), that is, the unique nonnegative solution to PDE (1.6) is \(u \equiv 0\) in \(\mathbb{R}^n_+\).

This concludes our proof of Theorem 1.9.

6. Proof of Theorem 1.19

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.19 via contradiction arguments and the method of scaling spheres in local way. Without loss of generality, we may assume the radius \(R = 1\).

Now suppose on the contrary that \(u \geq 0\) satisfies the super-critical problems (1.15) and (1.16) for Hénon-Hardy equations but \(u\) is not identically zero, then there exists some \(\bar{x} \in B_1(0)\) such that \(u(\bar{x}) > 0\). Then, by maximum principles and induction, we can infer from (1.15) and (1.16) that \(u(x) > 0\) in \(B_1(0)\), and derive the equivalence between PDEs (1.15), (1.16) and the following integral equation

\[(6.1) \quad u(x) = \int_{B_1(0)} G_\alpha(x, y)|y|^\alpha u^p(y)dy, \]

where

\[(6.2) \quad G_\alpha(x, y) := \frac{C_{n, \alpha}}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \int_0^{(1-|x|^2)(1-|y|^2)} \frac{b^{\frac{n-1}{2}} - 1}{(1 + b)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} db \quad \text{if } x, y \in B_1(0), \]

and \(G_\alpha(x, y) := 0\) if \(x\) or \(y\) \(\in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(0)\) is the Green’s function in \(B_1(0)\) for \((-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\) with Dirichlet boundary conditions when \(0 < \alpha \leq 2\), and

\[(6.3) \quad G_\alpha(x, y) := C_{n, \alpha} \left( \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x|^{n-\alpha}} \right) \quad \text{if } x, y \in B_1(0), \]

and \(G_\alpha(x, y) := 0\) if \(x\) or \(y\) \(\in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(0)\) is the Green’s function in \(B_1(0)\) for \((-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\) with Navier boundary conditions when \(\alpha = 2m\) and \(1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}\). This means, the positive classical solution \(u\) to (1.15) and (1.16) also satisfies the equivalent integral equation (6.1), and vice versa.

Next, we will apply the method of scaling spheres in local way to show the following lower bound estimate for asymptotic behaviour of positive solution \(u\) as \(x \to 0\), which contradicts with the integral equation (6.1) for \(\alpha(a) < p < +\infty\).

**Theorem 6.1.** Assume \(n \geq 2\), \(0 < \alpha < 2\) or \(\alpha = 2m\) with \(1 \leq m < \frac{n}{2}\), \(-\alpha < a < +\infty\) and \(\frac{\alpha + a + 2n}{n-\alpha} < p < +\infty\). Suppose \(u\) is a positive solution to super-critical problems (1.15) or
\[ u(x) \geq \frac{C_\kappa}{|x|^\kappa} \quad \forall \kappa < +\infty. \]

**Proof.** Given any \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \), we define the Kelvin transform of \( u \) centered at 0 by

\[ u_\lambda(x) = \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right) \]

for arbitrary \( x \in \{ x \in \overline{B_1(0)} \mid \lambda^2 \leq |x| \leq 1 \} \).

Now, we will carry out the process of scaling spheres in \( B_1(0) \) with respect to the origin 0 \( \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

Let \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \) be an arbitrary positive real number and let \( \omega^\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x) \) for any \( x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2(0)} \). By the definition of \( u_\lambda \) and \( \omega^\lambda \), we have

\[ \omega^\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x) = -\left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \omega^\lambda \left( \frac{x}{\lambda} \right) = -\left( \omega^\lambda \right)_\lambda(x) \]

for every \( x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2(0)} \).

We will first show that, for \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \) sufficiently close to 1,

\[ \omega^\lambda(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2(0)}. \]

Then, we start shrinking the sphere \( S_\lambda \) from near the unit sphere \( S_1 \) inward as long as (6.7) holds, until its limiting position \( \lambda = 0 \) and derive lower bound estimates on asymptotic behaviour of \( u \) as \( x \to 0 \). Therefore, the scaling sphere process can be divided into two steps.

**Step 1.** Start shrinking the sphere \( S_\lambda \) from near \( \lambda = 1 \). Define

\[ (B_\lambda \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2})^+ := \{ x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2(0)} \mid \omega^\lambda(x) > 0 \}. \]

We will show that, for \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \) sufficiently close to 1,

\[ (B_\lambda \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2})^+ = \emptyset. \]

Since the positive solution \( u \) to super-critical problems (6.15) and (6.16) also satisfies the integral equation (6.7), through direct calculations, we get, for any \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \),

\[ u(x) = \int_{B_\lambda(0)} G_\alpha(x,y) |y|^\alpha u^p(y) dy + \int_{B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2(0)}} G_\alpha(x,y^\lambda) \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau + n - \alpha} |y|^\alpha u^p_\lambda(y) dy \]

for any \( x \in \overline{B_1(0)} \), where \( \tau := n + \alpha + 2a - p(n - \alpha) < 0 \). By direct calculations, one can also verify that \( u_\lambda \) satisfies the following integral equation

\[ u_\lambda(x) = \int_{B_\lambda(0)} G_\alpha(x^\lambda,y) \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} |y|^\alpha u^p(y) dy \]

for any \( x \in \{ x \in \overline{B_1(0)} \mid \lambda^2 \leq |x| \leq 1 \} \), and hence, it follows immediately that

\[ u_\lambda(x) = \int_{B_\lambda(0)} G_\alpha(x^\lambda,y) \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} |y|^\alpha u^p(y) dy + \int_{B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda^2(0)}} G_\alpha(x^\lambda,y^\lambda) \left( \frac{\lambda^2}{|x| \cdot |y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^\tau |y|^\alpha u^p_\lambda(y) dy. \]
Therefore, we have, for any \( x \in B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda(0)} \),
\[
\omega_\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x)
= \int_{B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda(0)}} \left[ \left( \frac{\lambda^2}{|x| \cdot |y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x, y^\lambda) - \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x, y^\lambda) \right] |y|^{\alpha} \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u_\lambda^p(y) \, dy
- \left[ G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x, y^\lambda) \right] |y|^{\alpha} u_\lambda^p(y) \, dy
+ \int_{B_\lambda(0)} \left[ \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x^\lambda, y^\lambda) - G_\alpha(x, y) \right] |y|^{\alpha} u_\lambda^p(y) \, dy,
\]
where \( \tau := n + \alpha + 2\alpha - p(n - \alpha) < 0 \).

Now we need the following Lemma on properties of the Green’s function \( G_\alpha(x, y) \).

**Lemma 6.2.** The Green’s function \( G_\alpha(x, y) \) satisfies the following point-wise estimates:

(i) \( 0 \leq G_\alpha(x, y) \leq \frac{C'}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \), \( \forall \ x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \);

(ii) \( G_\alpha(x, y) \geq \frac{C''}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \), \( \forall 0 \leq |x|, |y| \leq \frac{1}{10} \);

(iii) \( \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x^\lambda, y) - G_\alpha(x, y) \leq 0 \), \( \forall \lambda^2 < |x| < \lambda, 0 \leq |y| < \lambda \);

(iv) \( \left( \frac{\lambda^2}{|x| \cdot |y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x^\lambda, y^\lambda) - \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x, y^\lambda) \leq G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x^\lambda, y^\lambda) \), 
\( \forall \lambda^2 < |x|, |y| < \lambda \).

Lemma 6.2 can be proved by direct calculations, so we omit the details here.

From Lemma 6.2 and the integral equations (6.13), one can derive that, for any \( x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda(0)} \),
\[
\omega_\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x)
\leq \int_{B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda(0)}} \left[ G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x^\lambda, y^\lambda) \right] |y|^{\alpha} \left( \frac{\lambda}{|y|} \right)^{\tau} u_\lambda^p(y) - u^p(y) \, dy
\leq \int_{B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda(0)}} \left[ G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x^\lambda, y^\lambda) \right] |y|^{\alpha} u_\lambda^p(y) - u^p(y) \, dy
\leq C \int_{B_\lambda(0) \setminus \overline{B_\lambda(0)}} \frac{|y|^{\alpha}}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} u_\lambda^{p-1}(y) \omega_\lambda(y) \, dy.
\]

By Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality and (6.14), we have, for any \( \frac{n}{n-\alpha} < q < \infty \),
\[
\|\omega_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1 \setminus \overline{B_\lambda})} \leq C \left\| |x|^{\alpha} u_\lambda^{p-1} \omega_\lambda \right\|_{L^{\frac{nq}{n+\alpha q}}(B_1 \setminus \overline{B_\lambda})} \leq C \left\| |x|^{\alpha} u_\lambda^{p-1} \right\|_{L^\infty(B_\lambda \setminus \overline{B_\lambda})} \cdot \|\omega_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1 \setminus \overline{B_\lambda})}.
\]
Since \( u \in C(B_1(0)) \), there exists a \( \epsilon_0 > 0 \) small enough, such that

\[
C \left\| |x|^a u^{p-1}_\lambda \right\|_{L^\infty((B_\lambda \setminus B_{\lambda^2})^+)} \leq \frac{1}{2}
\]

for all \( 1 - \epsilon_0 \leq \lambda < 1 \), and hence (6.15) implies

\[
\|\omega^\lambda\|_{L^q((B_\lambda \setminus B_{\lambda^2})^+)} = 0,
\]

which means \((B_\lambda \setminus B_{\lambda^2})^+ = \emptyset\). Therefore, we have proved for all \( 1 - \epsilon_0 \leq \lambda < 1 \), \((B_\lambda \setminus B_{\lambda^2})^+ = \emptyset\), that is,

\[
\omega^\lambda(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus B_{\lambda^2}(0).
\]

This completes Step 1.

**Step 2. Shrink the sphere \( S_\lambda \) inward until \( \lambda = 0 \) to derive lower bound estimates on asymptotic behaviour of \( u \) as \( x \to 0 \).** Step 1 provides us a start point to shrink the sphere \( S_\lambda \) from near \( \lambda = 1 \). Now we shrink the sphere \( S_\lambda \) inward as long as (6.7) holds. Let

\[
\lambda_0 := \inf\{0 < \lambda < 1 \mid \omega^\mu \leq 0 \text{ in } B_\mu(0) \setminus B_{\mu^2}(0), \forall \lambda \leq \mu < 1\} \in [0, 1),
\]

and hence, one has

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0).
\]

In what follows, we will prove \( \lambda_0 = 0 \) by contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that \( 0 < \lambda_0 < 1 \). In order to get a contradiction, we will first prove

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0)
\]

by using contradiction arguments.

Suppose on contrary that (6.21) does not hold, that is, \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \leq 0 \) but \( \omega^{\lambda_0} \) is not identically zero in \( B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0) \), then there exists a \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0) \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) < 0 \). We will obtain a contradiction with (6.19) via showing that the sphere \( S_\lambda \) can be shrunk inward a little bit further, more precisely, there exists a \( 0 < \epsilon < \lambda_0 \) small enough such that \( \omega^\lambda \leq 0 \) in \( B_\lambda(0) \setminus B_{\lambda^2}(0) \) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \epsilon, \lambda_0] \).

For that purpose, we will first show that

\[
\omega^{\lambda_0}(x) < 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0).
\]

Indeed, since we have assumed there exists a point \( x^0 \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0) \) such that \( \omega^{\lambda_0}(x^0) < 0 \), by continuity, there exists a small \( \delta > 0 \) and a constant \( c_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
B_\delta(x^0) \subset B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{\lambda_0}(x) \leq -c_0 < 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\delta(x^0).
\]
From (6.23), Lemma 6.2 and the integral equations (6.10) and (6.12), one can derive that, for any \( x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0) \),
\[
\omega_{\lambda_0}(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x) \\
\leq \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0)} \left[ G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \right] G_\alpha(x, y) \left| y \right|^q \left[ \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^\tau u_{\lambda_0}^q(y) - u^q(y) \right] dy \\
\leq \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0)} \left( G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \right) G_\alpha(x, y) \left| y \right|^q (u_{\lambda_0}^q(y) - u^q(y)) dy \\
\leq p \int_{B_{\lambda}(0)} \left( G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} \right) G_\alpha(x, y) \left| y \right|^q u_{\lambda_0}^{q-1}(y) \omega_{\lambda_0}(y) dy < 0,
\]
thus we arrive at (6.22).

Now, we choose a \( 0 < r_0 < \frac{1}{4} \min \{ \lambda_0 - \lambda_0^2, \lambda_0^2 \} \) small enough, such that
\[
C \| |x|^{\alpha} u_{\lambda}^{p-1} \|_{L^q(A_{\lambda_0-r_0} \cup A_{\lambda_0^2+r_0-x}^+)} \leq \frac{1}{2},
\]
where the constant \( C \) is the same as in (6.16) and the narrow region
\[
A_{r,l} := \{ x \in B_r(0) \mid |x| > r - l \}
\]
for \( r > 0 \) and \( 0 < l < r \). By (6.14), one can easily verify that inequality as (6.15) (with the same constant \( C \)) also holds for any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \frac{\lambda_0^2}{2}, \lambda_0] \), that is, for any \( \frac{n}{n-\alpha} < q < \infty, \)
\[
\| \omega^\lambda \|_{L^q(B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2})^+} \leq C \| |x|^{\alpha} u_{\lambda}^{p-1} \|_{L^q(A_{\lambda_0-r_0} \cup A_{\lambda_0^2+r_0-x}^+)} \cdot \| \omega^\lambda \|_{L^q(A_{\lambda_0-r_0} \cup A_{\lambda_0^2+r_0-x}^+)}.
\]

By (6.22), we can define
\[
M_0 := \sup_{x \in B_{\lambda_0-r_0}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2+r_0}(0)} \omega_{\lambda_0}(x) < 0,
\]
Since \( u \) is uniformly continuous on arbitrary compact set \( K \subset \overline{B_1(0)} \) (say, \( K = \{ x \in \overline{B_1(0)} \mid \lambda_0^2 + r_0 \leq |x| \leq \frac{\lambda_0^2}{2} + r_0 \} \)), we can deduce from (6.28) that, there exists a \( 0 < \varepsilon < \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \) sufficiently small, such that, for any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0] \),
\[
\omega^\lambda(x) \leq \frac{M_0}{2} < 0, \quad \forall x \in \overline{B_{\lambda_0-r_0}(0)} \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2+r_0}(0).
\]
The proof of (6.29) is completely similar to that of (2.62), so we omit the details.

For any \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0] \), it follows from (6.29) that
\[
\overline{B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}}^+ \subset A_{\lambda_0-r_0} \cup A_{\lambda_0^2+r_0},
\]
As a consequence of (6.25), (6.27) and (6.30), we get
\[
\| \omega^\lambda \|_{L^q((B_{\lambda}(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2})^+)} = 0,
\]
and hence \((B_{\lambda} \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2})^+ = \emptyset\) for all \( \lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0] \), that is,
\[
\omega^\lambda(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_\lambda(0) \setminus B_{\lambda_0^2}(0),
\]
which contradicts with the definition (6.19) of $\lambda_0$. As a consequence, in the case $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$, (6.21) must hold true, that is,

\begin{equation}
\omega^\lambda_0 \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\lambda_0}}(0).
\end{equation}

However, by the first inequality in (6.24) and (6.33), we arrive at

\begin{equation}
0 = \omega^\lambda_0(x) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) - u(x)
\end{equation}

\[ \leq \int_{B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\lambda_0}}(0)} \left[ G_\alpha(x, y) - \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} G_\alpha(x^{\lambda_0}, y) \right] |y|^a \left[ \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{|y|} \right)^r - 1 \right] u^p(y) dy < 0 \]

for any $x \in B_{\lambda_0}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\lambda_0}}(0)$, which is absurd. Thus we must have $\lambda_0 = 0$, that is,

\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \left( \frac{\lambda}{|x|} \right)^{n-\alpha} u \left( \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} \right), \quad \forall \lambda^2 \leq |x| \leq \lambda, \quad \forall 0 < \lambda < 1.
\end{equation}

For arbitrary $0 < |x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, let $0 < \lambda := \sqrt{\frac{|x|}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then (6.35) yields that

\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \left( \frac{1}{2|x|} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}} u \left( \frac{x}{2|x|} \right),
\end{equation}

and hence, we arrive at the following lower bound estimate on asymptotic behaviour of $u$ as $x \to 0$:

\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \left( \min_{x \in S_{\frac{1}{2}}} u(x) \right) \left( \frac{1}{2|x|} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}} := \frac{C_0}{|x|^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \forall 0 < |x| \leq \frac{1}{2}.
\end{equation}

The lower bound estimate (6.37) can be improved remarkably for $p_\alpha := \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha} < p < +\infty$ using the “Bootstrap” iteration technique and the integral equation (6.1).

In fact, let $\mu_0 := \frac{n-\alpha}{2}$, we infer from the integral equation (6.1), Lemma 6.2 and (6.37) that, for any $0 < |x| \leq \frac{1}{100}$,

\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq C \int_{\frac{1}{4}|x| \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x|} G_\alpha(x, y) |y|^a \frac{1}{|y|^{\mu_0}} dy
\end{equation}

\[ \geq C \int_{\frac{1}{4}|x| \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x|} \frac{1}{x-y}^{n-\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{|y|^{\mu_0-a}} dy
\]

\[ \geq \frac{C}{|x|^{\mu_0-(\alpha+a)}} \int_{\frac{|x|}{4}}^{\frac{|x|}{2}} r^{n-1-\mu_0+a} dr
\]

\[ \geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^{\mu_0-(\alpha+a)}}.
\]

Now, let $\mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (\alpha + a)$. Due to $p_\alpha := \frac{n+\alpha+2a}{n-\alpha} < p < +\infty$, our important observation is

\begin{equation}\mu_1 := p\mu_0 - (\alpha + a) > \mu_0.
\end{equation}

Thus we have obtained a better lower bound estimate than (6.37) after one iteration, that is,

\begin{equation}
u(x) \geq \frac{C_1}{|x|^{\mu_1}}, \quad \forall 0 < |x| \leq \frac{1}{100}.
\end{equation}
For \( k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \), define
\[
\mu_{k+1} := p\mu_k - (\alpha + a).
\]
(6.41)

Since \( p_s(a) := \frac{n + \alpha + 2a}{n - \alpha} < p < +\infty \), it is easy to see that the sequence \( \{\mu_k\} \) is monotone increasing with respect to \( k \). Continuing the above iteration process involving the integral equation (6.1), we have the following lower bound estimates for every \( k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \),
\[
u(x) \geq C_k \frac{1}{|x|^\mu_k}, \quad 0 < |x| \leq 1, 100.
\]
(6.42)

Now Theorem 6.1 follows easily from the obvious properties that as \( k \rightarrow +\infty \),
\[
\mu_k \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{n + \alpha + 2a}{n - \alpha} < p < +\infty.
\]
(6.43)

This finishes our proof of Theorem 6.1.

We have proved the nontrivial nonnegative solution \( u \) to the super-critical problems (1.15) and (1.16) for Hénon-Hardy equations in \( \overline{B_1(0)} \) is actually a positive solution which also satisfies the integral equation (6.1). For \( p_s(a) := \frac{n + \alpha + 2a}{n - \alpha} < p < +\infty \), one can easily observe that the lower bound estimates on asymptotic behaviour of \( u \) as \( x \rightarrow 0 \) in Theorem 6.1 indicate strong singularity of \( u \) at the origin 0, which obviously contradicts with the integral equation (6.1). Therefore, we must have \( u \equiv 0 \) in \( B_1(0) \), that is, the unique nonnegative solution to the super-critical problems (1.15) and (1.16) is \( u \equiv 0 \) in \( B_1(0) \).

This concludes our proof of Theorem 1.19.
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