

MAXIMUM PRINCIPLES AND THE METHOD OF MOVING PLANES FOR THE UNIFORMLY ELLIPTIC NONLOCAL BELLMAN OPERATOR AND APPLICATIONS

WEI DAI, GUOLIN QIN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish various maximum principles and develop the method of moving planes and the sliding method (on general unbounded domains) for equations involving the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator. As a consequence, we derive multiple applications of these maximum principles and the moving planes method. For instance, we prove symmetry, monotonicity and uniqueness results and asymptotic properties for solutions to various equations involving the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator in bounded domains, unbounded domains, epigraph or \mathbb{R}^n . In particular, the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator introduced by Caffarelli and Charro in [15] is a typical example of the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator.

Keywords: Uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator; Uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator; Maximum principles; Method of moving planes; Monotonicity, symmetry and uniqueness; Asymptotic properties.

2010 MSC Primary: 35R11; Secondary: 35B06, 35B53.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and setting of the problem. In this paper, we are concerned with the following nonlinear equations involving the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator:

$$(1.1) \quad -F_s u(x) = f(x, u(x), \nabla u(x)) \quad \text{in } \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$$

with $0 < s < 1$ and $n \geq 2$, where Ω is a bounded or unbounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n . The uniformly elliptic Bellman integro-differential operator is defined by

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} F_s u(x) &:= \inf \left\{ P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|A^{-1}(y - x)|^{n+2s}} dy \mid 0 < \theta I \leq A \leq \Theta I \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x + y) + u(x - y) - 2u(x)}{|A^{-1}y|^{n+2s}} dy \mid 0 < \theta I \leq A \leq \Theta I \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant and $\Theta \geq \theta$ is an arbitrarily large constant, P.V. stands for the Cauchy principal value and $B \leq A$ ($B < A$) means that $A - B$ is a non-negative (positive) definite square matrix. The condition $0 < \theta I \leq A \leq \Theta I$ is equivalent to $\lambda_{\min}(A) \geq \theta > 0$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A) \leq \Theta$. Let

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x)|}{1 + |x|^{n+2s}} dx < +\infty \right\}.$$

Wei Dai is supported by the NNSF of China (No. 11971049) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

Then, one can easily verify that for any $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1} \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the integral on the right hand side of the definition (1.2) is well-defined. Hence $F_s u$ makes sense for all functions $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1} \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

For any given unit vector $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we will also consider the uniformly elliptic Bellman operator \mathbf{F}_s ($s \in (0, 1)$) associated with vector \mathbf{e} defined by

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbf{F}_s u(x) := \inf \left\{ P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|A^{-1}(y - x)|^{n+2s}} dy \mid 0 < \theta I \leq A \leq \Theta I, \mathbf{e} \in EV(A) \right\}$$

for any $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1} \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $EV(A)$ denotes the set of all eigenvectors of matrix A . One should note that the restriction $\mathbf{e} \in EV(A)$ is much weaker than assuming A is diagonal.

By the definition (1.2), we get immediately the following comparison:

$$(1.5) \quad -F_s u(x) \geq C_{n,s,\theta,\Theta} (-\Delta)^s u(x).$$

The fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^s$ is also a nonlocal pseudo-differential operator, which is defined by (see e.g. [18, 25, 27, 30, 44])

$$(1.6) \quad (-\Delta)^s u(x) := C_{n,s} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy$$

for any $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1} \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. It can also be defined equivalently via the Caffarelli and Silvestre's extension method (refer to [31], see also [35, 66]). The constants $C_{n,s,\theta,\Theta}$ in (1.5) and $C_{n,s}$ in (1.6) satisfy $C_{n,s,\theta,\Theta} C_{n,s} = 1$ provided that $\theta \leq 1 \leq \Theta$.

In recent years, fractional order operators have attracted more and more attentions. Besides various applications in fluid mechanics, molecular dynamics, relativistic quantum mechanics of stars (see e.g. [36, 29]) and conformal geometry (see e.g. [18]), it also has many applications in probability and finance (see [6, 35]). The fractional Laplacians $(-\Delta)^s$ can be understood as the infinitesimal generator of a stable Lévy diffusion process (see [6]). The general pseudo-relativistic operators with singular potentials describes a spin zero relativistic particle of charge e and mass m in the Coulomb field of an infinitely heavy nucleus of charge Z .

However, the non-locality virtue of these fractional operators makes them difficult to be investigated. To overcome this difficulty, we basically have two approaches. One way is to define these fractional operators via Caffarelli and Silvestre's extension method (see [31]), so as to reduce the nonlocal problem into a local one in higher dimensions. Another approach is to derive the integral representation formulae of solutions (see [26, 27]). After establishing the equivalence between the fractional order equation and its corresponding integral equation, one can study the equivalent integral equations instead and consequently derive various properties of solutions to the PDEs involving nonlocal fractional operators. These two methods have been applied successfully to study equations involving nonlocal fractional operators, and a series of fruitful results have been derived (see [4, 26, 27, 31, 35, 51, 66] and the references therein).

Nevertheless, the above two approaches do not work for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator F_s and general fully nonlinear integro-differential operators (see e.g. [9, 33, 34, 64]), for instance, the fractional p -Laplacians $(-\Delta)_p^s$ (see e.g. [23, 24, 30, 37, 39, 43] for more details).

Therefore, it is desirable for us to develop the method of moving planes directly for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator F_s ($s \in (0, 1)$) without going through extension methods or integral representation formulae. Direct moving planes method and sliding method have been introduced for fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^s$ in [25, 38, 47], for fractional p -Laplacians $(-\Delta)_p^s$ in [23, 24, 37, 39] and for pseudo-relativistic Schrödinger operators $(-\Delta + m^2)^s$ in

[46]. These methods have been applied to obtain symmetry, monotonicity and uniqueness of solutions to various equations involving $(-\Delta)^s$, $(-\Delta)_p^s$ or $(-\Delta + m^2)^s$. Sliding method for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator D_s has been developed recently in [14], as applications, the authors derived the monotonicity of solutions to $-D_s u = f(u)$ in bounded domains and the whole space. The uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator D_s is a special case of the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator F_s .

The goal of this paper is to establish various maximum principles for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operators F_s and \mathbf{F}_s , as consequences, introduce *the method of moving planes* for \mathbf{F}_s and *the sliding method (on general unbounded domains)* for F_s and \mathbf{F}_s and derive *multiple applications*. For instance, under broad assumptions on the nonlinearity $f(x, u, \nabla u)$, we prove *symmetry*, *monotonicity* and *uniqueness* results, and *asymptotic properties* for solutions to equations (1.1) in *bounded domains*, *unbounded domains*, *epigraph* or \mathbb{R}^n . For related literatures on the nonlocal Bellman equations or the regular second order Bellman equations, please refer to e.g. [1, 48, 57, 62] and the references therein.

The methods of moving planes was invented by Alexandroff in the early 1950s. Later, it was further developed by Serrin [65], Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg [54], Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck [19], Chen and Li [22], Li [60], Lin [61], Chen, Li and Ou [26] and many others. For more literatures on the methods of moving planes, see [4, 5, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 30, 35, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 58, 59, 63, 68] and the references therein.

1.2. Main results. In this paper, inspired by the direct moving planes methods for $(-\Delta)^s$, $(-\Delta)_p^s$ and $(-\Delta + m^2)^s$ established in [23, 25, 39, 46], we will establish various maximum principles and introduce *the method of moving planes* for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operators \mathbf{F}_s and *the sliding method (on general unbounded domains)* for F_s and \mathbf{F}_s with $s \in (0, 1)$.

The main contents and results in our paper are arranged as follows.

In Section 2, we will establish various maximum principles for *anti-symmetric functions* and give some *immediate applications*. These maximum principles are *key ingredients* in applying the *method of moving planes* for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator \mathbf{F}_s .

In Section 3, by applying the maximum principles established in Section 2, we introduce the *method of moving planes* for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator \mathbf{F}_s . As applications, under broad assumptions on the nonlinearity $f(x, u, \nabla u)$, we derive *symmetry*, *monotonicity* and *uniqueness* results for solutions to equations (1.1) in *bounded domains*, *unbounded domains*, *coercive epigraph* and \mathbb{R}^n . The admissible choices of the nonlinearity $f(x, u, \nabla u)$ include: $u^p(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $p \geq 1$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, $e^{\kappa u}(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, $K(x)(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $K(x)$ satisfying certain assumptions including the case of $K(x) \equiv 1$, the De Giorgi type nonlinearity $u - u^3$ and the Schrödinger type nonlinearity $u^p - u$ with $1 < p < +\infty$.

Subsection 4.1 is devoted to proving various maximum principles in *unbounded open sets* for F_s and \mathbf{F}_s . As applications, in subsections 4.2-4.4, under broad assumptions on the nonlinearity $f(u)$, by applying the sliding method for F_s and \mathbf{F}_s and the method of moving planes for \mathbf{F}_s , we derive *monotonicity* and *uniqueness* results, and *asymptotic properties* for solutions to

$$(1.7) \quad -F_s u(x) = f(u(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad -\mathbf{F}_s u(x) = f(u(x))$$

in epigraph E and \mathbb{R}_+^n , where admissible choices of the nonlinearity $f(u)$ include: the De Giorgi type nonlinearity $u - u^3$ and $e^{\kappa u}$ with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$. Our results in subsections 4.2-4.3 can be regarded

as extensions of the applications of the sliding methods in [14] for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator D_s on bounded domain or \mathbb{R}^n to general nonlocal Bellman operator F_s on epigraph E .

The sliding method was developed by Berestycki and Nirenberg ([10, 11, 12]). It was used to establish qualitative properties of solutions for PDEs (mainly involving the regular Laplacian $-\Delta$), such as symmetry, monotonicity and uniqueness \dots . For more literatures on the sliding methods for $-\Delta$, $(-\Delta)^s$, $(-\Delta)_p^s$, $(-\Delta + m^2)^s$ or D_s , please refer to [2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 24, 37, 38, 46, 47].

Remark 1.1. By using similar ideas and arguments, one can also develop the method of moving planes and the sliding method for the following general fully nonlinear nonlocal operators:

$$(1.8) \quad G_s(u)(x) := \inf \left\{ P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{G(u(y) - u(x))}{|A^{-1}(y - x)|^{n+2s}} dy \mid 0 < \theta I \leq A \leq \Theta I \right\},$$

$$(1.9) \quad \mathbf{G}_s(u)(x) := \inf \left\{ P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{G(u(y) - u(x))}{|A^{-1}(y - x)|^{n+2s}} dy \mid 0 < \theta I \leq A \leq \Theta I, \mathbf{e} \in EV(A) \right\},$$

where G is a local Lipschitz continuous function satisfying $G(0) = 0$ and u belongs to some appropriate function space. If $G(t) = |t|^{p-2}t$ with $p \geq 2$, we denote $G_s := F_s^p$ and $\mathbf{G}_s := \mathbf{F}_s^p$. It is clear that, when $G(t) = t$, G_s and \mathbf{G}_s degenerate into the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator F_s and \mathbf{F}_s respectively. We leave these open problems to interested readers.

1.3. A typical example: the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operators D_s and \mathbf{D}_s . The uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator D_s was first introduced by Caffarelli and Charro in [15]:

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{aligned} D_s u(x) &:= \inf \left\{ P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|A^{-1}(y - x)|^{n+2s}} dy \mid A > 0, \det A = 1, \lambda_{\min}(A) \geq \theta \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x)}{|A^{-1}y|^{n+2s}} dy \mid A > 0, \det A = 1, \lambda_{\min}(A) \geq \theta \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant and $A > 0$ means that A is a positive definite square matrix. The conditions $\det A = 1$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A) \geq \theta$ imply that $\lambda_{\max}(A) \leq \theta^{1-n}$. Thus the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator D_s is actually a typical example of the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator F_s with $\Theta = \theta^{1-n}$. Therefore, all the results in Sections 2-4 in our paper are valid for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operators D_s and \mathbf{D}_s , where \mathbf{D}_s is defined by (1.10) with an extra restriction $\mathbf{e} \in EV(A)$ on matrices A for some arbitrarily given vector \mathbf{e} .

In [15], Caffarelli and Charro also introduced the fractional Monge-Ampère operator without uniformly elliptic condition:

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_s u(x) &:= \inf \left\{ P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|A^{-1}(y - x)|^{n+2s}} dy \mid A > 0, \det A = 1 \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x)}{|A^{-1}y|^{n+2s}} dy \mid A > 0, \det A = 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

They also proved in Theorem 3.1 in [15] that, under certain conditions, the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator D_s may coincide with the fractional Monge-Ampère operator \mathcal{D}_s . There is another nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator introduced by Caffarelli and Silvestre in [34].

The fractional Monge-Ampère operator \mathcal{D}_s is closely related to the geometrically and physically interesting second order Monge-Ampère operator. In fact, Caffarelli and Charro proved in Appendix A in [15] that, if u is convex, asymptotically linear, then

$$(1.12) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} ((1-s)\mathcal{D}_s u(x)) = \det(D^2 u(x))^{\frac{1}{n}}$$

up to a constant factor that depends only on the dimension n . For related literatures on the regular second order Monge-Ampère equation

$$(1.13) \quad \det D^2 u = f,$$

please refer to e.g. [13, 28, 41, 53, 55, 56, 67, 69, 70] and the references therein.

In what follows, we will use C to denote a general positive constant that may depend on n , s , θ and Θ , and whose value may differ from line to line.

2. MAXIMUM PRINCIPLES FOR ANTI-SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

In this section, we will establish various maximum principles for anti-symmetric functions w.r.t. hyper-planes T perpendicular to \mathbf{e} and give some immediate applications. These maximum principles are key ingredients in applying the method of moving planes for the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator \mathbf{F}_s associated with vector \mathbf{e} .

Let T be any given hyper-plane in \mathbb{R}^n perpendicular to \mathbf{e} and Σ be the half space on one side of the plane T hereafter. Denote the reflection of a point x with respect to T by \tilde{x} . For any symmetric matrix B such that $\mathbf{e} \in EV(B)$, one has

$$(2.1) \quad |B(x-y)| \leq |B(x-\tilde{y})|, \quad \forall x, y \in \Sigma.$$

We need some basic properties on the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operators F_s and \mathbf{F}_s .

Lemma 2.1. *For any $0 < s < 1$, the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operators F_s and \mathbf{F}_s satisfy:*

- a) F_s is invariant under translation and rotation, \mathbf{F}_s is invariant under translation and reflection w.r.t. T ;
- b) $F_s(u+v) \geq F_s u + F_s v$, $\mathbf{F}_s(u+v) \geq \mathbf{F}_s u + \mathbf{F}_s v$.

The proof of Lemma 2.1 follows directly from the definitions (1.2) and (1.4) of F_s and \mathbf{F}_s , we omit the details.

First, we can prove the following strong maximum principle for anti-symmetric functions.

Lemma 2.2. *(Strong maximum principle for anti-symmetric functions) Suppose that $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $w(\tilde{x}) = -w(x)$ and $w \geq 0$ in Σ . If there exists $x_0 \in \Sigma$ such that, $w(x_0) = 0$, w is $C^{1,1}$ near x_0 and $\mathbf{F}_s w(x_0) \leq 0$, then $w = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n .*

Proof. Since there exists $x_0 \in \Sigma$ such that $w(x_0) = \min_{x \in \Sigma} w(x) = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \mathbf{F}_s w(x_0) \\
&= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w(y) - w(x_0)}{|A^{-1}(x_0 - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w(y)}{|A^{-1}(x_0 - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&= \inf P.V. \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{|A^{-1}(x_0 - y)|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(x_0 - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} \right) w(y) dy \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we must have $w = 0$ a.e. in Σ and hence $w = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.2. \square

2.1. Maximum principles for anti-symmetric functions in bounded sets.

Theorem 2.3 (Maximum principle for anti-symmetric functions). *Let Ω be a bounded open set in Σ . Assume that $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and is lower semi-continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$. If*

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0 & \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) < 0 \\ w(x) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Sigma \setminus \Omega \\ w(\tilde{x}) = -w(x) & \text{in } \Sigma, \end{cases}$$

where $c(x) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}$. Then $w(x) \geq 0$ in Ω .

Furthermore, assume that

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) = 0,$$

then either $w > 0$ in Ω or $w = 0$ almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n .

These conclusions hold for unbounded open set Ω if we further assume that

$$\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} w(x) \geq 0.$$

Proof. If w is not nonnegative, then the lower semi-continuity of w on $\overline{\Omega}$ indicates that there exists a $\hat{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that

$$w(\hat{x}) = \min_{\overline{\Omega}} w < 0.$$

One can further deduce from (2.2) that \hat{x} is in the interior of Ω . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{F}_s w(\hat{x}) \\
 &= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w(y) - w(\hat{x})}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\
 &= \inf \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma} \frac{w(y) - w(\hat{x})}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - y)|^{n+2s}} dy - \int_{\Sigma} \frac{w(\hat{x}) + w(y)}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\
 &= \inf \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - y)|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} \right) (w(y) - w(\hat{x})) dy \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - 2w(\hat{x}) \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\
 &\geq -2w(\hat{x}) \inf \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \\
 &> 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2.2). Hence $w(x) \geq 0$ in Ω .

Now we have proved that $w(x) \geq 0$ in Σ . If there is some point $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ such that $w(\bar{x}) = 0$, then from (2.3) and Lemma 2.2, we derive immediately $w = 0$ almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3. \square

Remark 2.4. It is clear from the proof that, in Theorem 2.3, the assumptions “ w is lower semi-continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$ ” and “ $w \geq 0$ in $\Sigma \setminus \Omega$ ” can be weakened into: “if $w < 0$ somewhere in Σ , then the negative minimum $\inf_{\Sigma} w(x)$ can be attained in Ω ”, the same conclusions are still valid. One can also notice that, we only need to assume that $c(x) \geq 0$ at points $x \in \Omega$ where $w(x) = \inf_{\Sigma} w < 0$ in Theorems 2.3.

Theorem 2.5 (Narrow region principle). *Let Ω be a bounded open set in Σ which can be contained in the region between T and T_{Ω} , where T_{Ω} is a hyper-plane that is parallel to T . Let $d(\Omega) := \text{dist}(T, T_{\Omega})$. Suppose that $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and is lower semi-continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$, and satisfies*

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0 & \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) < 0 \\ w(x) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Sigma \setminus \Omega \\ w(\tilde{x}) = -w(x) & \text{in } \Sigma, \end{cases}$$

where $c(x)$ is uniformly bounded from below (w.r.t. $d(\Omega)$) in $\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}$. There exists a constant $C_{n,s,\theta} > 0$ such that, if we assume Ω is narrow in the sense that

$$(2.5) \quad d(\Omega)^{2s} \left(- \inf_{\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}} c(x) \right) < C_{n,s,\theta},$$

then, $w(x) \geq 0$ in Ω . Furthermore, assume that

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) = 0,$$

then either $w > 0$ in Ω or $w = 0$ almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n .

These conclusions hold for unbounded open set Ω if we further assume that

$$\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} w(x) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Without loss of generalities, we may assume that

$$\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_1 := (1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad T = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 < 0\},$$

and hence $\Omega \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid -d(\Omega) < x_1 < 0\}$.

If w is not nonnegative in Ω , then the lower semi-continuity of w on $\overline{\Omega}$ indicates that, there exists a $\bar{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that

$$w(\bar{x}) = \min_{\overline{\Omega}} w < 0.$$

One can further deduce from (2.4) that \bar{x} is in the interior of Ω . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}_s w(\bar{x}) \\ &= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w(y) - w(\bar{x})}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x} - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= \inf \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma} \frac{w(y) - w(\bar{x})}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x} - y)|^{n+2s}} dy - \int_{\Sigma} \frac{w(\bar{x}) + w(y)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\ (2.7) \quad &= \inf \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x} - y)|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} \right) (w(y) - w(\bar{x})) dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2w(\bar{x}) \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\ &\geq -2w(\bar{x}) \inf \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &\geq -C_{n,s,\theta} w(\bar{x}) \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|\bar{x} - \tilde{y}|^{n+2s}} dy \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$D := \{y = (y_1, y') \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid d(\Omega) < y_1 - (\bar{x})_1 < 2d(\Omega), |y' - (\bar{x})'| < 2d(\Omega)\}.$$

Denote $t := y_1 - (\bar{x})_1$, $\tau := |y' - (\bar{x})'|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|\bar{x} - \tilde{y}|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &\geq \int_D \frac{1}{|\bar{x} - y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ (2.8) \quad &= \int_{d(\Omega)}^{2d(\Omega)} \int_0^{2d(\Omega)} \frac{\sigma_{n-1} \tau^{n-2} d\tau}{(t^2 + \tau^2)^{\frac{n}{2}+s}} dt = \int_{d(\Omega)}^{2d(\Omega)} \int_0^{\frac{2d(\Omega)}{t}} \frac{\sigma_{n-1} (t\rho)^{n-2} t d\rho}{t^{n+2s} (1 + \rho^2)^{\frac{n}{2}+s}} dt \\ &= \int_{d(\Omega)}^{2d(\Omega)} \frac{1}{t^{1+2s}} \int_0^{\frac{2d(\Omega)}{t}} \frac{\sigma_{n-1} \rho^{n-2} d\rho}{(1 + \rho^2)^{\frac{n}{2}+s}} dt \geq \int_{d(\Omega)}^{2d(\Omega)} \frac{1}{t^{1+2s}} \int_0^1 \frac{\sigma_{n-1} \rho^{n-2} d\rho}{(1 + \rho^2)^{\frac{n}{2}+s}} dt \\ &\geq C_{n,s} \int_{d(\Omega)}^{2d(\Omega)} \frac{1}{t^{1+2s}} dt = \frac{C_{n,s}}{d(\Omega)^{2s}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the substitution $\rho := \tau/t$ and σ_{n-1} denotes the area of the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . Since $c(x)$ is uniformly bounded from below (w.r.t. $d(\Omega)$) in $\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}$, then, from (2.5), (2.7) and (2.8), we get

$$\mathbf{F}_s w(\bar{x}) - c(\bar{x}) w(\bar{x}) \geq \left[-\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{d(\Omega)^{2s}} - \inf_{\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}} c(x) \right] w(\bar{x}) > 0,$$

which contradicts (2.4).

Now we have proved that $w(x) \geq 0$ in Σ . If there is some point $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ such that $w(\bar{x}) = 0$, then from (2.6) and Lemma 2.2, we derive immediately $w = 0$ almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n . This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.5. \square

Remark 2.6. It is clear from the proof that, in Theorem 2.5, the assumptions “ w is lower semi-continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$ ” and “ $w \geq 0$ in $\Sigma \setminus \Omega$ ” can be weakened into: “if $w < 0$ somewhere in Σ , then the negative minimum $\inf_{\Sigma} w(x)$ can be attained in Ω ”, the same conclusions are still valid. One can also notice that, in Theorem 2.5, we only need to assume that $c(x)$ is uniformly bounded from below at the negative minimum points of w and $\inf_{\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}} c(x)$ can be replaced by the infimum of $c(x)$ over the set of negative minimum points of w in (2.5).

2.2. Maximum principles for anti-symmetric functions in unbounded sets and immediate applications.

Theorem 2.7 (Decay at infinity (I)). *Suppose $0 \notin \Sigma$. Let Ω be an unbounded open set in Σ . Assume $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is a solution of*

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0 & \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) < 0 \\ w(x) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Sigma \setminus \Omega \\ w(\tilde{x}) = -w(x) & \text{in } \Sigma \end{cases}$$

with

$$(2.10) \quad \liminf_{\substack{x \in \Omega, w(x) < 0 \\ |x| \rightarrow +\infty}} |x|^{2s} c(x) > -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{4},$$

where $C_{n,s,\theta}$ is the same constant as in the last inequality in (2.12). Then there exists a constant $R_0 > 0$ (depending only on $c(x)$, θ , n and s , but independent of w and Σ) such that, if $\hat{x} \in \Omega$ satisfying

$$w(\hat{x}) = \min_{\overline{\Omega}} w(x) < 0,$$

then $|\hat{x}| \leq R_0$.

Proof. Without loss of generalities, we may assume that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_1$ and for some $\lambda \leq 0$,

$$T = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = \lambda\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 < \lambda\}.$$

Since $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and $\hat{x} \in \Omega$ satisfying $w(\hat{x}) = \min_{\overline{\Omega}} w(x) < 0$, through similar calculations as (2.7), we get

$$(2.11) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w(\hat{x}) \geq -2w(\hat{x}) \inf_{\Sigma} \int \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy.$$

Note that $\lambda \leq 0$ and $\hat{x} \in \Omega$, it follows that $B_{|\hat{x}|}(\bar{x}) \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_1 > \lambda\}$, where $\bar{x} := (2|\hat{x}| + (\hat{x})_1, (\hat{x})')'$. Thus we derive that,

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.12) \quad & \inf_{\Sigma} \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \\
& \geq \inf_{B_{|\hat{x}|}(\bar{x})} \int_{B_{|\hat{x}|}(\bar{x})} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\hat{x} - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\
& \geq C_{n,s,\theta} \int_{B_{|\hat{x}|}(\bar{x})} \frac{1}{|\hat{x} - y|^{n+2s}} dy \\
& \geq C_{n,s,\theta} \int_{B_{|\hat{x}|}(\bar{x})} \frac{1}{3^{n+2s} |\hat{x}|^{n+2s}} dy \\
& \geq \frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{|\hat{x}|^{2s}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can deduce from (2.9), (2.11) and (2.12) that

$$(2.13) \quad 0 \geq \mathbf{F}_s w(\hat{x}) - c(\hat{x})w(\hat{x}) \geq \left[-\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{|\hat{x}|^{2s}} - c(\hat{x}) \right] w(\hat{x}).$$

It follows from $w(\hat{x}) < 0$ and (2.13) that

$$(2.14) \quad |\hat{x}|^{2s} c(\hat{x}) \leq -C_{n,s,\theta} < 0.$$

From (2.10), we infer that there exists a R_0 sufficiently large such that, for any $|x| > R_0$,

$$(2.15) \quad |x|^{2s} c(x) \geq -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{2}.$$

Combining (2.14) and (2.15), we arrive at $|\hat{x}| \leq R_0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.7. \square

Remark 2.8. It is clear from the proofs of Theorems 2.3, 2.5 and 2.7 that, the assumption “ $\mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0$ at points $x \in \Omega$ where $w(x) < 0$ ” can be weakened into: “ $\mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0$ at points $x \in \Omega$ where $w(x) = \inf_{\Sigma} w < 0$ ”, the same conclusions in Theorems 2.3, 2.5 and 2.7 are still valid.

Theorem 2.9 (Maximum principle for anti-symmetric functions in unbounded domains). *Assume that $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Sigma)$ is bounded from below in Σ and $w(\tilde{x}) = -w(x)$ in Σ , where \tilde{x} is the reflection of x with respect to T . Suppose that, at any points $x \in \Sigma$ such that $w(x) < 0$, w satisfies*

$$(2.16) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0,$$

where $c(x) \geq 0$ in $\{x \in \Sigma \mid w(x) < 0\}$. Then

$$(2.17) \quad w(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma.$$

Furthermore, assume that

$$(2.18) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{at points } x \in \Sigma \text{ where } w(x) = 0,$$

then either $w > 0$ in Σ or $w = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. Suppose that (2.17) is false, since w is bounded from below, we have $-\infty < m := \inf_{\Sigma} w(x) < 0$. Hence, there exists sequences $x^k \in \Sigma$ and $0 < \alpha_k < 1$ with $\alpha_k \rightarrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(2.19) \quad w(x^k) \leq \alpha_k m.$$

Without loss of generalities, we may assume that

$$\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad T = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = 0\}, \quad \Sigma = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 < 0\}.$$

Then $\tilde{x} = (-x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. We denote $d_k := \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x^k, T)$. Let

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} e^{\frac{|x|^2}{|x|^2-1}}, & |x| < 1 \\ 0, & |x| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

It is well known that $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, thus $|\mathbf{F}_s \psi(x)| \leq C_0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, $\mathbf{F}_s \psi(x) \sim |x|^{-n-2s}$ as $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$.

Set

$$(2.20) \quad \psi_k(x) := \psi\left(\frac{x - \widetilde{(x^k)}}{d_k}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}_k(x) = \psi_k(\tilde{x}) = \psi\left(\frac{x - x^k}{d_k}\right).$$

Then $\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k$ is anti-symmetric with respect to T . Now pick $\varepsilon_k = -(1 - \alpha_k)m$, then we have

$$w(x^k) - \varepsilon_k [\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k](x^k) \leq m.$$

We denote

$$w_k(x) := w(x) - \varepsilon_k [\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k](x).$$

Then w_k is also anti-symmetric with respect to T .

Since for any $x \in \Sigma \setminus B_{d_k}(x^k)$, $w(x) \geq m$ and $\tilde{\psi}_k(x) = \psi_k(x) = 0$, we have

$$w_k(x^k) \leq m \leq w_k(x), \quad \forall x \in \Sigma \setminus B_{d_k}(x^k).$$

Hence the infimum of $w_k(x)$ in Σ is achieved in $B_{d_k}(x^k)$. Consequently, there exists a point $\bar{x}^k \in B_{d_k}(x^k)$ such that

$$(2.21) \quad w_k(\bar{x}^k) = \inf_{x \in \Sigma} w_k(x) \leq m < 0.$$

By the choice of ε_k , it is easy to verify that $w(\bar{x}^k) \leq \alpha_k m < 0$.

Next, we will evaluate the upper bound and the lower bound of $\mathbf{F}_s w_k(\bar{x}^k)$.

We first obtain the upper bound by direct calculations:

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}_s w_k(\bar{x}^k) \\ &= \mathbf{F}_s \{w - \varepsilon_k [\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k]\}(\bar{x}^k) \\ &\leq \mathbf{F}_s w(\bar{x}^k) - \varepsilon_k \mathbf{F}_s [\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k](\bar{x}^k) \\ &\leq c(\bar{x}^k) w(\bar{x}^k) + \frac{2C_0 \varepsilon_k}{d_k^{2s}} \\ &\leq \frac{2C_0 \varepsilon_k}{d_k^{2s}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let

$$D_k := \{x = (x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid -d_k < x_1 < 0, |x' - (\bar{x}^k)'\} < 4d_k\},$$

then through similar calculations as in (2.8), we get the following lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{F}_s w_k(\bar{x}^k) \\
&= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w_k(y) - w_k(\bar{x}^k)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&= \inf \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma} \frac{w_k(y) - w_k(\bar{x}^k)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy - \int_{\Sigma} \frac{w_k(\bar{x}^k) + w_k(y)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\
(2.23) \quad &= \inf \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} \right) (w_k(y) - w_k(\bar{x}^k)) dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2w_k(\bar{x}^k) \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\
&\geq -2w_k(\bar{x}^k) \inf \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - \tilde{y})|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&\geq -C_{n,s,\theta} w_k(\bar{x}^k) \int_{\Sigma} \frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - \tilde{y}|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&\geq -C_{n,s,\theta} w_k(\bar{x}^k) \int_{D_k} \frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - \tilde{y}|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&\geq -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta} w_k(\bar{x}^k)}{d_k^{2s}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.22) and (2.23), we derive

$$-\frac{C_{n,s,\theta} w_k(\bar{x}^k)}{d_k^{2s}} \leq \frac{2C_0 \varepsilon_k}{d_k^{2s}}.$$

Noticing that $w_k(\bar{x}^k) \leq m < 0$ and $\varepsilon_k = -(1 - \alpha_k)m$, we have

$$C_{n,s,\theta} \leq 2C_0(1 - \alpha_k),$$

which will lead to a contradiction if we let $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus we have proved that $w(x) \geq 0$ in Σ .

If there is some point $\bar{x} \in \Sigma$ such that $w(\bar{x}) = 0$, then from (2.18) and Lemma 2.2, we derive immediately $w = 0$ almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n . This concludes our proof of Theorem 2.9. \square

From the proof of Theorem 2.9, we can deduce the following narrow region principle in unbounded open sets, which improves the *Narrow region principle* (Theorem 2.5).

Theorem 2.10 (Narrow region principle in unbounded open sets). *Let $\Omega \subseteq \Sigma$ be an open set (possibly unbounded and disconnected) which can be contained in the region between T and T_Ω , where T_Ω is a hyper-plane that is parallel to T . Let $d(\Omega) := \text{dist}(T, T_\Omega)$. Suppose that $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is bounded from below and satisfies*

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0 & \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) < 0 \\ w(x) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Sigma \setminus \Omega \\ w(\tilde{x}) = -w(x) & \text{in } \Sigma, \end{cases}$$

where $c(x)$ is uniformly bounded from below (w.r.t. $d(\Omega)$) in $\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}$. We assume Ω is narrow in the sense that

$$(2.25) \quad d(\Omega)^{2s} \left(-\inf_{\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}} c(x) \right) < 2^{2s-1} C_{n,s,\theta},$$

where $C_{n,s,\theta}$ is the same constant as in (2.23). Then, $w(x) \geq 0$ in Ω . Furthermore, assume that

$$(2.26) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) = 0,$$

then either $w > 0$ in Ω or $w = 0$ almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. Theorem 2.10 can be proved by using quite similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.9, we only mention some key ingredients.

Indeed, combining (2.22) and (2.23), we derive

$$(2.27) \quad -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta} w_k(\bar{x}^k)}{d_k^{2s}} \leq c(\bar{x}^k) w_k(\bar{x}^k) + \frac{2C_0 \varepsilon_k}{d_k^{2s}} \leq \left(\inf_{\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}} c(x) \right) w_k(\bar{x}^k) + \frac{2C_0 \varepsilon_k}{d_k^{2s}}.$$

For k sufficiently large such that $\alpha_k > 1 - \frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{4C_0}$, recall that $\varepsilon_k = -(1 - \alpha_k)m$ and $w_k(\bar{x}^k) \leq m$, we have $\frac{2C_0 \varepsilon_k}{d_k^{2s}} \leq -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta} w_k(\bar{x}^k)}{2d_k^{2s}}$. Then, we infer from (2.27) and $d_k \leq \frac{d(\Omega)}{2}$ that

$$\inf_{\{x \in \Omega \mid w(x) < 0\}} c(x) \leq -\frac{4^s C_{n,s,\theta}}{2d(\Omega)^{2s}},$$

which contradicts (2.25). This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.10. \square

Remark 2.11. In Theorem 2.10, we allow the open set Ω to be unbounded without the additional assumption $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} w(x) \geq 0$ in Theorem 2.5.

From the proof of Theorem 2.9, we can also deduce the following maximum principle in unbounded domains, which improves the *Decay at infinity (I)* (Theorem 2.7).

Theorem 2.12 (Decay at infinity (II)). *Let Ω be an unbounded open set in Σ . Assume $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ is bounded from below and satisfies*

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{F}_s w(x) - c(x)w(x) \leq 0 & \text{at points } x \in \Omega \text{ where } w(x) < 0 \\ w(x) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Sigma \setminus \Omega \\ w(\tilde{x}) = -w(x) & \text{in } \Sigma \end{cases}$$

with

$$(2.29) \quad \liminf_{\substack{x \in \Omega, w(x) < 0 \\ |x| \rightarrow \infty}} |x|^{2s} c(x) > -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{4},$$

where $C_{n,s,\theta}$ is the same constant as in (2.23).

Then there exists a $R_0 > 0$ large enough and $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ close enough to 1 (R_0 and α_0 are independent of w and Σ) such that, if $\hat{x} \in \Omega$ satisfying

$$w(\hat{x}) \leq \alpha_0 \inf_{\Omega} w(x) < 0,$$

then $|\hat{x}| \leq R_0$.

Proof. Theorem 2.12 can be proved via similar contradiction arguments as Theorem 2.9.

Indeed, suppose on the contrary that there exists sequences $\{x^k\} \in \Omega$ and $\{\alpha_k\} \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(2.30) \quad |x^k| \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \alpha_k \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{and} \quad w(x^k) \leq \alpha_k \inf_{\Omega} w(x) < 0.$$

Then, similar calculations as in the proof of Theorem 2.9 (see (2.22) and (2.23)) give that

$$(2.31) \quad -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}w_k(\bar{x}^k)}{d_k^{2s}} \leq c(\bar{x}^k)w_k(\bar{x}^k) + \frac{2C_0\varepsilon_k}{d_k^{2s}}.$$

Now we take k sufficiently large such that $\alpha_k > 1 - \frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{4C_0}$. Recall that $d_k := \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(x^k, T)$ and $\bar{x}^k \in B_{d_k}(x^k)$, we infer from (2.31) that, for k large enough,

$$c(\bar{x}^k) \leq -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{2d_k^{2s}} \leq -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{4|\bar{x}^k|^{2s}},$$

which contradicts (2.29) if we let $k \rightarrow +\infty$. \square

Remark 2.13. We say *Decay at infinity (II)* Theorem 2.12 improved *Decay at infinity (I)* Theorem 2.7 in the sense that, not only the positions of minimal points but also the positions of “almost” negative minimal points were controlled by a radius R_0 in Theorem 2.12. Theorem 2.12 also tell us that, if $\inf_{\Omega} w(x) < 0$, then $\Omega \cap B_{R_0}(0) \neq \emptyset$ and the negative minimum can be attained in $\Omega \cap B_{R_0}(0)$.

As an immediate application of Theorem 2.9, we can obtain the following Liouville type Theorem in \mathbb{R}^n in the direction \mathbf{e} , which indicates that the solution u only depends on $n-1$ variables. For Liouville theorem on s -harmonic functions in \mathbb{R}^n , please refer to [50] and the references therein.

Theorem 2.14. (*Liouville Theorem in the direction \mathbf{e}*) Assume that $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is bounded and satisfies

$$(2.32) \quad \mathbf{F}_s u(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then

$$u(x) \equiv u(x + t\mathbf{e}), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. Let T be any hyper-plane perpendicular to \mathbf{e} , Σ be the half space on one side of the plane T . Set $\tilde{u}(x) = u(\tilde{x})$ and $w(x) = \tilde{u}(x) - u(x)$ for all $x \in \Sigma$, where \tilde{x} is the reflection of x with respect to T . Then, $w \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is bounded, and at any points $x \in \Sigma$ where $w(x) < 0$, one has $\mathbf{F}_s w(x) \leq \mathbf{F}_s \tilde{u}(x) - \mathbf{F}_s u(x) = 0$. Therefore, applying Theorem 2.9, we arrive immediately $w \geq 0$ in Σ . Similarly, we can prove that $w \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Sigma$. Hence $w \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n , and u is symmetric with respect to T . Since the hyper-plane T (perpendicular to \mathbf{e}) is arbitrary, we must have $u(x) \equiv u(x + t\mathbf{e})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.14. \square

Next, let us consider the following equation

$$(2.33) \quad -\mathbf{F}_s u(x) = f(u(x)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Assume without loss of generalities that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_n := (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. As another application of Theorem 2.9, we derive the following monotonicity result on (2.33).

Theorem 2.15. Suppose $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a solution of (2.33), and

$$|u(x)| \leq 1, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$(2.34) \quad \lim_{x_n \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(x', x_n) = \pm 1 \quad \text{uniformly w.r.t. } x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Assume there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(2.35) \quad f(t) \text{ is non-increasing on } [-1, -1 + \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, 1],$$

then there exists $M > 0$ such that, $u(x)$ is strictly monotone increasing w.r.t. x_n provided that $|x_n| > M$.

Proof. For arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, let $T_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n = \lambda\}$, $\Sigma_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > \lambda\}$ be the region above the plane, and $x^\lambda := (x_1, x_2, \dots, 2\lambda - x_n)$ be the reflection of point x about the plane T_λ .

We only need to show that $w_\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x) \leq 0$ in Σ_λ for any λ with $|\lambda|$ sufficiently large, where $u_\lambda(x) := u(x^\lambda)$. By the assumption (2.34), there exists $M > 0$ such that $u(x) \in [-1, -1 + \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, 1]$ for any x with $|x_n| > M$. Consequently, for any $|\lambda| > M$, at any point $x \in \Sigma_\lambda$ where $w_\lambda(x) = u(x^\lambda) - u(x) > 0$, we infer from assumption (2.35) that $\mathbf{F}_s w_\lambda(x) \leq \mathbf{F}_s u_\lambda(x) - \mathbf{F}_s u(x) = -f(u(x^\lambda)) + f(u(x)) \geq 0$. Therefore, we deduce from Theorem 2.9 that $w_\lambda(x) \leq 0$ in Σ_λ for all λ with $|\lambda| > M$.

Now, suppose that there exists a $\tilde{\lambda} \in (-\infty, -M) \cup (M, +\infty)$ and a point $\hat{x} \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$ such that $w_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\hat{x}) = 0$. Then, it follows that

$$(2.36) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\hat{x}) \leq -f(u((\hat{x})^{\tilde{\lambda}})) + f(u(\hat{x})) = 0,$$

and hence we can derive from Lemma 2.2 immediately that $w_{\tilde{\lambda}}(x) = 0$ almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n , which contradicts assumption (2.34). Thus $w_\lambda(x) := u(x^\lambda) - u(x) < 0$ in Σ_λ for all λ with $|\lambda| > M$. This finishes our proof of Theorem 2.15. \square

Remark 2.16. One should note that the De Giorgi type nonlinearity $f(u) = u - u^3$ satisfies condition (2.35).

3. THE METHOD OF MOVING PLANES FOR \mathbf{F}_s AND ITS APPLICATIONS

In this Section, by using various maximum principles for anti-symmetric functions established in Section 2, we will apply the method of moving planes to investigate symmetry and monotonicity of solutions to various problems involving the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operators \mathbf{F}_s ($s \in (0, 1)$) associated with vector \mathbf{e} .

We investigate the monotonicity and symmetry properties of nonnegative solutions to the following nonlinear Dirichlet problem:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\mathbf{F}_s u(x) = f(x, u(x), \nabla u(x)) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \equiv 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a (bounded or unbounded) domain, coercive epigraph or the whole space \mathbb{R}^n .

3.1. Bounded domain. Assume without loss of generalities that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_1$ and let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n which is convex in x_1 -direction. We say that a domain Ω is convex in x_1 -direction, if and only if, (\bar{x}_1, x') , $(x_1, x') \in \Omega$ imply that $(t\bar{x}_1 + (1-t)x_1, x') \in \Omega$ for any $0 < t < 1$.

Let \mathcal{F} be the collection of functions $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly in \mathbf{p} and locally uniformly in x : for any $M > 0$ and any compact subset $K \subset \overline{\Omega}$, there exists $C_{K,M} > 0$ such that, $\forall u_1, u_2 \in [-M, M]$, $\forall x \in K$ and $\forall \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$|f(x, u_1, \mathbf{p}) - f(x, u_2, \mathbf{p})| \leq C_{K,M} |u_1 - u_2|.$$

By applying the method of moving planes for \mathbf{F}_s , we will prove the following monotonicity and symmetry results for (3.1) in bounded domain Ω . For related results for $-\Delta$, $(-\Delta)^s$,

$(-\Delta + m^2)^s$, $(-\Delta)_p^s$ or second order Monge-Ampère operator, please refer to [10, 11, 12, 20, 21, 23, 27, 43, 46, 54, 58, 59].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain which is convex in x_1 -direction and symmetric w.r.t. $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = 0\}$. Suppose that $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ solves (3.1) for $s \in (0, 1)$ and $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$. If $f(x, u, \mathbf{p})$ satisfies*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} f(x_1, x', u, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) \leq f(\bar{x}_1, x', u, -p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n), \\ \forall -x_1, p_1 \geq 0, x_1 \leq \bar{x}_1 \leq -x_1. \end{cases}$$

Then $u(x_1, x')$ is strictly increasing in the left half of Ω in x_1 -direction and

$$u(x_1, x') \leq u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall x_1 < 0, (x_1, x') \in \Omega.$$

Moreover, if $f(x_1, x', u, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = f(-x_1, x', u, -p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ for any $x_1 p_1 \leq 0$, then

$$u(x_1, x') = u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall x_1 < 0, (x_1, x') \in \Omega.$$

Proof. Since Ω is bounded, we may assume that $\Omega \subset \{|x_1| \leq 1\}$ and $\partial\Omega \cap \{x_1 = -1\} \neq \emptyset$.

In order to carry out the moving planes procedure, we need to define some useful notations. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, let T_λ be the hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n given by

$$(3.3) \quad T_\lambda := \{x = (x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = \lambda\},$$

and $x^\lambda := (2\lambda - x_1, x')$ be the reflection of x w.r.t. the plane T_λ . Denote

$$(3.4) \quad \Sigma_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 < \lambda\}, \quad \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 > \lambda\}$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad u_\lambda(x) := u(x^\lambda), \quad w_\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x).$$

Since Ω is convex in x_1 -direction and symmetric w.r.t. T_0 and u satisfies (3.1), one has $w_\lambda \geq 0$ in $\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Omega$ for any $\lambda \in (-\infty, 0]$ and $w_\lambda \not\equiv 0$ in $\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Omega$ for any $\lambda \in (-\infty, 0)$. Our goal is to show that $w_\lambda > 0$ in $\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega$ for any $\lambda \in (-1, 0)$.

We will carry out the proof of Theorem 3.1 by two steps.

Step 1. We will show via contradiction arguments that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that, for any $-1 < \lambda \leq -1 + \epsilon$,

$$(3.6) \quad w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega.$$

Suppose (3.6) is not true, there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_k\} \subset (-1, 0)$ satisfying $\lambda_k \rightarrow -1$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ such that

$$(3.7) \quad \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k} = \inf_{\lambda \in (-1, \lambda_k]} \inf_{x \in \Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0.$$

Consequently, there exists $x^k \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega$ such that

$$(3.8) \quad w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} w_{\lambda_k} < 0.$$

It follows directly from (3.7) and (3.8) that $\frac{\partial w_\lambda}{\partial \lambda}|_{\lambda=\lambda_k}(x^k) \leq 0$, and hence $(\partial_{x_1} u)[(x^k)^{\lambda_k}] \leq 0$. Note that x^k is the interior minimum of $w_{\lambda_k}(x)$, then one has $\nabla_x w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) = 0$, i.e.,

$$(3.9) \quad (\nabla_x u_{\lambda_k})(x^k) = (\nabla_x u)(x^k).$$

By the assumption (3.2) in Theorem 3.1 and (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{F}_s w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) &\leq \mathbf{F}_s u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - \mathbf{F}_s u(x^k) \\
 &= -f((x^k)^{\lambda_k}, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)((x^k)^{\lambda_k})) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\
 &\leq -f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\
 &=: c(x^k) w_{\lambda_k}(x^k),
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$c(x^k) := -\frac{f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) - f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k))}{u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - u(x^k)}
 \tag{3.11}$$

is uniformly bounded independent of k , since $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $u \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with compact support.

Note that $\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega$ is a narrow region for k large enough. From (3.10), (3.11) and the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 2.5 (see Remark 2.6 and 2.8), one can derive that, for k sufficiently large,

$$w_{\lambda_k} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega,
 \tag{3.12}$$

which yields a contradiction with (3.7). Hence there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that, (3.6) holds for any $-1 < \lambda \leq -1 + \epsilon$. Furthermore, suppose there exist $\hat{\lambda} \in (-1, -1 + \epsilon]$ and $\hat{x} \in \Sigma_{\hat{\lambda}} \cap \Omega$ such that $w_{\hat{\lambda}}(\hat{x}) = 0$, then similar to (3.10), we can deduce from the assumption (3.2) in Theorem 3.1 and (3.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{F}_s w_{\hat{\lambda}}(\hat{x}) &\leq \mathbf{F}_s u_{\hat{\lambda}}(\hat{x}) - \mathbf{F}_s u(\hat{x}) \\
 &= -f((\hat{x})^{\hat{\lambda}}, u_{\hat{\lambda}}(\hat{x}), (\nabla_x u)((\hat{x})^{\hat{\lambda}})) + f(\hat{x}, u(\hat{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\hat{x})) \\
 &\leq -f(\hat{x}, u_{\hat{\lambda}}(\hat{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\hat{x})) + f(\hat{x}, u(\hat{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\hat{x})) \\
 &= 0,
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.13}$$

then it follows from the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2 that $w_{\hat{\lambda}} = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n , which is absurd. Therefore, we have, for any $-1 < \lambda \leq -1 + \epsilon$,

$$w_{\lambda}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda} \cap \Omega.
 \tag{3.14}$$

Step 2. Move the plane continuously to the right until its limiting position. Step 1 provides a starting point for us to move planes. Next we will continue to move T_{λ} to the right as long as (3.14) holds.

To this end, let us define

$$\lambda_0 := \sup \{ \lambda \in (-1, 0] \mid w_{\mu} > 0 \text{ in } \Sigma_{\mu} \cap \Omega, \forall -1 < \mu < \lambda \}.
 \tag{3.15}$$

We aim to show that $\lambda_0 = 0$ via contradiction arguments.

Suppose on the contrary that $\lambda_0 < 0$, then we will be able to move T_{λ} to the right a little bit further while (3.14) still holds, which contradicts the definition (3.15) of λ_0 .

Indeed, due to $\lambda_0 < 0$, one can infer from (3.1) that $w_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in $(\Omega^{\lambda_0} \setminus \Omega) \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ (A^{λ} denotes the reflection of a set A w.r.t. T_{λ}), and hence the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2 yields that

$$w_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \cap \Omega.
 \tag{3.16}$$

Since $w_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in $\Omega^{\lambda_0} \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$, so there exists a compact subset $K \subset\subset \Omega^{\lambda_0} \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$(3.17) \quad w_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c > 0, \quad \forall x \in K \cap \Omega,$$

and $(\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega)$ is a narrow region. Due to the continuity of w_λ w.r.t. λ , we get, there exists a sufficiently small $0 < \epsilon < \min\{-\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + 1\}$ such that, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \epsilon]$,

$$(3.18) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in K \cap \Omega,$$

and $(\Sigma_{\lambda_0+\epsilon} \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega)$ is also a narrow region.

For any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \epsilon]$, note that $(\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega)$ is a narrow region, we will deduce from the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 4.4 that

$$(3.19) \quad w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in (\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega).$$

Indeed, by (3.18), if we suppose (3.19) does not hold, then there exists a $\tilde{\lambda} \in (\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \epsilon]$ (depending on ϵ) such that

$$(3.20) \quad \inf_{(\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega)} w_{\tilde{\lambda}} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \cap \Omega} w_{\tilde{\lambda}} = \inf_{\lambda \in (\lambda_0, \tilde{\lambda}]} \inf_{x \in \Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0.$$

Consequently, there exists $\tilde{x} \in (\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega)$ such that

$$(3.21) \quad w_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}) = \inf_{(\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega)} w_{\tilde{\lambda}} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \cap \Omega} w_{\tilde{\lambda}} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}} w_{\tilde{\lambda}} < 0.$$

Then, similar to (3.10) and (3.11), by the assumption (3.2) in Theorem 3.1 and (3.1), we have

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_s w_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}) &\leq \mathbf{F}_s u_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}) - \mathbf{F}_s u(\tilde{x}) \\ &= -f((\tilde{x})^{\tilde{\lambda}}, u_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}), (\nabla_x u)((\tilde{x})^{\tilde{\lambda}})) + f(\tilde{x}, u(\tilde{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\tilde{x})) \\ &\leq -f(\tilde{x}, u_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\tilde{x})) + f(\tilde{x}, u(\tilde{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\tilde{x})) \\ &=: c(\tilde{x}) w_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.23) \quad c(\tilde{x}) := -\frac{f(\tilde{x}, u_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\tilde{x})) - f(\tilde{x}, u(\tilde{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\tilde{x}))}{u_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\tilde{x}) - u(\tilde{x})}$$

is uniformly bounded (independent of ϵ and K), since $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $u \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with compact support. Note that, by choosing K larger and ϵ smaller if necessary, $(\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega)$ is a narrow region. From (3.22), (3.23) and the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 4.4 (see Remark 4.5), one can derive that, for ϵ sufficiently small,

$$(3.24) \quad w_{\tilde{\lambda}} > 0 \quad \text{in } (\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega),$$

which yields a contradiction with (3.20). As a consequence, we have, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \epsilon]$, (3.19) holds. Furthermore, it follows from the strong maximum principle that

$$(3.25) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in (\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega) \setminus (K \cap \Omega),$$

and hence, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \epsilon]$,

$$(3.26) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega.$$

This contradicts with the definition (3.15) of λ_0 . Thus $\lambda_0 = 0$, or more precisely,

$$(3.27) \quad u(x_1, x') \leq u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall (x_1, x') \in \Omega, \quad x_1 < 0.$$

Furthermore, from the definition of λ_0 , we can deduce that

$$w_\lambda > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega, \quad \forall \lambda < 0.$$

For any $(x_1, x'), (\bar{x}_1, x') \in \Omega$ with $0 > x_1 > \bar{x}_1$, one can take $\lambda = \frac{x_1 + \bar{x}_1}{2}$. Then we have

$$u(x_1, x') > u(\bar{x}_1, x'),$$

and hence $u(x_1, x')$ is strictly increasing in the left half of Ω in x_1 -direction.

Moreover, if $f(x_1, x', u, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = f(-x_1, x', u, -p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$, then one can easily verify that $\hat{u}(x_1, x') := u(-x_1, x')$ also solves (3.1). Thus we have derived that

$$(3.28) \quad \hat{u}(x_1, x') \leq \hat{u}(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall (x_1, x') \in \Omega, \quad x_1 < 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$(3.29) \quad u(x_1, x') \geq u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall (x_1, x') \in \Omega, \quad x_1 < 0.$$

Combining this with (3.27) yields that

$$(3.30) \quad u(x_1, x') = u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall (x_1, x') \in \Omega, \quad x_1 < 0,$$

that is, u is symmetric in the x_1 direction about $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = 0\}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

Remark 3.2. Typical forms of $f(x, u, \nabla u)$ which satisfies all the assumptions in Theorem 3.1 include: $f(x, u, \nabla u) = u^p(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $p \geq 1$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, $f(x, u, \nabla u) = e^{\kappa u}(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, and $f(x, u, \nabla u) = K(x)(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, $K(x) = K(|x|, x')$ and $K(r, x')$ is nonincreasing w.r.t. $r \in [0, +\infty)$.

As an immediate application of Theorem 3.1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. Assume $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(B_1(0)) \cap C(\overline{B_1(0)})$ solves

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{cases} -\mathbf{F}_s u(x) = f(u(x)) & \text{in } B_1(0), \\ u > 0 & \text{in } B_1(0), \\ u \equiv 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(0), \end{cases}$$

where $0 < s < 1$, and $f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. Then u must be symmetric and strictly monotone decreasing (along the direction \mathbf{e}) w.r.t. the hyper-plane $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \cdot \mathbf{e} = 0\}$.

One can easily verify the validity of Corollary 3.3, since all the assumptions in Theorem 3.1 are fulfilled and $f(u)$ satisfies the assumption (3.2) in the direction $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Remark 3.4. Typical forms of $f(u)$ satisfying the assumption in Corollary 3.3 include: $f(u) = u^p$ with $p \geq 1$ and $f(u) = e^{\kappa u}$ with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$.

3.2. Unbounded domain. Suppose without loss of generalities that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_1$. To state our monotonicity and symmetry results for unbounded domain Ω , we need to assume the following condition on $f(x, u, \mathbf{p})$: for some $\beta > 0$,

$$(3.32) \quad \frac{|f(x, u_1, \mathbf{p}) - f(x, u_2, \mathbf{p})|}{|u_1 - u_2|} \leq C(|u_1|^\beta + |u_2|^\beta) \quad \text{as } u_1, u_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Our monotonicity and symmetry results in unbounded domain Ω is the following theorem. For related results for $-\Delta$, $(-\Delta)^s$, $(-\Delta + m^2)^s$, $(-\Delta)_p^s$ or second order Monge-Ampère operator, please refer to [2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23, 27, 43, 46, 54, 58, 59].

Theorem 3.5. *Let Ω be a unbounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n which is convex in x_1 -direction and symmetric about $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = 0\}$. Suppose that $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ solves (3.1) for $s \in (0, 1)$ and $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$. If $f(x, u, \mathbf{p})$ satisfies (3.2), (3.32) and $u(x)$ satisfies the following asymptotic properties:*

$$(3.33) \quad \limsup_{\substack{|x| \rightarrow \infty \\ x \in \Omega, x_1 < 0}} |x|^{2s} [u(x)]^\beta < \frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{8C}.$$

where $C_{n,s,\theta}$ is the same constant as in (2.10) in Theorem 2.7 and C is the constant in assumption (3.32). Then we have

(i) *If there exists a line \mathcal{L} parallel to x_1 -axis satisfying $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$ such that $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega^c \neq \emptyset$, then $u(x_1, x')$ is strictly increasing in the left half of Ω in x_1 -direction and*

$$u(x_1, x') \leq u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall x_1 < 0, (x_1, x') \in \Omega.$$

(ii) *If any line \mathcal{L} parallel to x_1 -axis such that $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$ must satisfy $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega^c = \emptyset$, then there exists $\mu_0 \leq 0$ such that $u(x_1, x')$ is strictly increasing in $\Omega \cap \{x_1 < \mu_0\}$ in x_1 -direction and*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \mu_0 = 0, \quad & u(x_1, x') \leq u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall x_1 < 0, (x_1, x') \in \Omega, \\ \text{if } \mu_0 < 0, \quad & u(x_1, x') = u(2\mu_0 - x_1, x'), \quad \forall x_1 < \mu_0, (x_1, x') \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will use the same notations as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. The proof of Theorem 3.5 will be carried out by two steps.

Step 1. We first show that there exists $R_0 > 0$ large enough such that

$$(3.34) \quad w_\lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda \leq -R_0.$$

Indeed, since u satisfies (3.1), we infer from the asymptotic property (3.33) that, for any $\lambda \leq 0$, the negative minimum of w_λ can be attained in $\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega$. Suppose on the contrary that (3.34) is not true, then there exists a sequence $\lambda_k \rightarrow -\infty$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ such that

$$(3.35) \quad \inf_{x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k}(x) = \inf_{\lambda \leq \lambda_k} \inf_{x \in \Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0$$

for every $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, for every $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $\inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k}$ can be attained at some $x^k \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega$, that is,

$$(3.36) \quad w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} w_{\lambda_k} < 0.$$

Then, similar to (3.10) and (3.11) in Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.1, by the assumptions (3.2) in Theorem 3.5 and (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.37) \quad & \mathbf{F}_s w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) \leq \mathbf{F}_s u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - \mathbf{F}_s u(x^k) \\ & = -f((x^k)^{\lambda_k}, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)((x^k)^{\lambda_k})) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\ & \leq -f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\ & =: c_k(x^k) w_{\lambda_k}(x^k), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.38) \quad c_k(x) := \begin{cases} -\frac{f(x, u_{\lambda_k}(x), (\nabla_x u)(x)) - f(x, u(x), (\nabla_x u)(x))}{u_{\lambda_k}(x) - u(x)}, & \text{if } u_{\lambda_k}(x) \neq u(x), \\ 0, & \text{if } u_{\lambda_k}(x) = u(x). \end{cases}$$

By the assumption (3.32) on f and the asymptotic property (3.33), we have, for k large enough, at any points $x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega$ where $w_{\lambda_k}(x) < 0$,

$$(3.39) \quad |c_k(x)| \leq C(|u_{\lambda_k}(x)|^\beta + |u(x)|^\beta) \leq 2C[u(x)]^\beta,$$

and hence

$$(3.40) \quad \liminf_{\substack{x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega, w_{\lambda_k} < 0 \\ |x| \rightarrow +\infty}} |x|^{2s} c_k(x) \geq -2C \limsup_{\substack{x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega, w_{\lambda_k} < 0 \\ |x| \rightarrow +\infty}} |x|^{2s} [u(x)]^\beta > -\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{4}.$$

By the *Decay at infinity (I)* Theorem 2.7, we have, there exists a $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$(3.41) \quad |x^k| \leq R_0,$$

which yields a contradiction with $|x^k| > -\lambda_k \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. This establishes (3.34).

Since $u(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$ and $x \in \Sigma_0$, by choosing R_0 larger if necessary, we can actually deduce that $w_\lambda \not\equiv 0$ in Σ_λ for any $\lambda \leq -R_0$. Then, similar to (3.14) in Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.1, it follows from the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2 that

$$(3.42) \quad w_\lambda > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega, \quad \forall \lambda \leq -R_0.$$

Step 2. Let

$$\lambda_0 := \sup\{\lambda \in (-\infty, 0] \mid w_\mu > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \cap \Sigma_\mu, \quad \forall \mu \leq \lambda\} \in [-R_0, 0].$$

By the definition of λ_0 and the continuity of $u(x)$, we have $w_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$.

Next, we will carry out our proof by discussing two different cases.

Case (i). There exists a line \mathcal{L} parallel to x_1 -axis satisfying $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$ such that $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega^c \neq \emptyset$. In such case, we will show that

$$\lambda_0 = 0.$$

Now suppose on the contrary that $\lambda_0 < 0$. Note that $w_{\lambda_0} \not\equiv 0$ in Σ_{λ_0} , then from the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2, we can derive that

$$(3.43) \quad w_{\lambda_0} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}.$$

Next, we will show that, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$(3.44) \quad w_\lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda_0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0 + \varepsilon.$$

Suppose (3.44) is not true, then there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_k\} \subset (\lambda_0, 0)$ satisfying $\lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ such that

$$(3.45) \quad \inf_{x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k}(x) = \inf_{\lambda \leq \lambda_k} \inf_{x \in \Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0$$

for every $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, for every $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $\inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k}$ can be attained at some $x^k \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega$, that is,

$$(3.46) \quad w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} w_{\lambda_k} < 0.$$

Then, similar to (3.10) and (3.11) in Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.1, by the assumptions (3.2) in Theorem 3.5 and (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{F}_s w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) &\leq \mathbf{F}_s u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - \mathbf{F}_s u(x^k) \\
 &= -f((x^k)^{\lambda_k}, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)((x^k)^{\lambda_k})) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\
 &\leq -f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\
 &=: c_k(x^k) w_{\lambda_k}(x^k),
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

where

$$c_k(x^k) := -\frac{f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) - f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k))}{u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - u(x^k)}. \tag{3.48}$$

Suppose that $\{x^k\}$ is not bounded, then up to a subsequence (still denote by $\{x^k\}$), $|x^k| \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. By the assumption (3.32) on f and the asymptotic property (3.33), we have, for k large enough,

$$|c_k(x^k)| \leq C(|u_{\lambda_k}(x^k)|^\beta + |u(x^k)|^\beta) \leq 2C[u(x^k)]^\beta. \tag{3.49}$$

From (2.13) in *Decay at infinity (I)* Theorem 2.7, we infer that

$$0 \geq \mathbf{F}_s w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - c_k(x^k) w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) \geq \left[-\frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{|x^k|^{2s}} - c_k(x^k) \right] w_{\lambda_k}(x^k), \tag{3.50}$$

and hence

$$-2C|x^k|^{2s}[u(x^k)]^\beta \leq |x^k|^{2s}c_k(x^k) \leq -C_{n,s,\theta} < 0. \tag{3.51}$$

This leads to a contradiction to the asymptotic property (3.33). Thus there exists $R_* > 0$ such that $|x^k| < R_*$.

Indeed, due to $\lambda_0 < 0$, one can infer from (3.1) that $w_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in $(\Omega^{\lambda_0} \setminus \Omega) \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ (A^λ denotes the reflection of a set A w.r.t. T_λ), and hence (3.43) yields that $w_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in $\Omega^{\lambda_0} \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$. So there exists a compact subset $K \subset\subset \Omega^{\lambda_0} \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$w_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c > 0, \quad \forall x \in K \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0), \tag{3.52}$$

and $(\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0)) \setminus (K \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0))$ is a narrow region. Due to the continuity of w_λ w.r.t. λ , we get, there exists a sufficiently small $0 < \varepsilon < \min\{-\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + 1\}$ such that, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon]$,

$$w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in K \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0), \tag{3.53}$$

and $(\Sigma_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon} \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0)) \setminus (K \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0))$ is also a narrow region. By (3.53), we deduce that, for k large enough, $x^k \in (\Sigma_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon} \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0)) \setminus (K \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0))$.

Since $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$, u solves (3.1) and satisfies the asymptotic property (3.33), we have

$$c_k(x^k) := -\frac{f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) - f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k))}{u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - u(x^k)} \tag{3.54}$$

is uniformly bounded (independent of k and K). Note that, by choosing K and k larger if necessary, $(\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0)) \setminus (K \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0))$ is a narrow region. From (3.47), (3.54) and the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 4.4 (see Remark 4.5), one can derive that, for k sufficiently large,

$$w_{\lambda_k} > 0 \quad \text{in } (\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0)) \setminus (K \cap \Omega \cap B_{R_*}(0)), \tag{3.55}$$

which yields a contradiction with (3.46). Thus we have derived (3.44).

By the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2, we have either $w_\lambda > 0$ or $w_\lambda \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \cap \Sigma_\lambda$. Furthermore, since $w_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in $\Omega \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$, by continuity, choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ smaller if necessary, we actually have

$$(3.56) \quad w_\lambda > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap \Sigma_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda_0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_0 + \varepsilon.$$

This contradicts the definition of λ_0 . Thus $\lambda_0 = 0$ and hence

$$(3.57) \quad u(x_1, x') \leq u(-x_1, x'), \quad \forall (x_1, x') \in \Omega, \quad x_1 < 0.$$

The strict monotonicity follows from $w_\lambda > 0$ in $\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega$ for any $\lambda < \lambda_0$.

Case (ii). Any line \mathcal{L} parallel to x_1 -axis such that $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$ must satisfy $\mathcal{L} \cap \Omega^c = \emptyset$. We will show that either $\lambda_0 = 0$ or $\lambda_0 < 0$ and $w_{\lambda_0} \equiv 0$ in Σ_{λ_0} .

Assume that $\lambda_0 < 0$ but $w_{\lambda_0} \not\equiv 0$ in Σ_{λ_0} . Then, similar to (3.43), we can derive that

$$(3.58) \quad w_{\lambda_0} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}.$$

Next, similar to (3.56), we can show that, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$(3.59) \quad w_\lambda > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap \Sigma_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda_0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_0 + \varepsilon.$$

This contradicts the definition of λ_0 . Thus we must have $\lambda_0 = 0$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.5. \square

Remark 3.6. Typical forms of $f(x, u, \nabla u)$ which satisfies all the assumptions in Theorem 3.5 include: $f(x, u, \nabla u) = u^p(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $p > 1$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, and $f(x, u, \nabla u) = K(x)(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, $K(x) = K(|x_1|, x')$ and $K(r, x')$ is nonincreasing w.r.t. $r \in [0, +\infty)$.

As immediate consequences of Theorem 3.5, we have the following two corollaries below.

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a nonnegative solution to*

$$(3.60) \quad -\mathbf{F}_s u(x) = f(u(x)) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

with $0 < s < 1$, where $f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous and satisfies

$$(3.61) \quad \frac{|f(u_1) - f(u_2)|}{|u_1 - u_2|} \leq C(|u_1|^\beta + |u_2|^\beta) \quad \text{as } u_1, u_2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{for some } \beta > 0.$$

Moreover, assume that

$$(3.62) \quad \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^{2s} [u(x)]^\beta < \frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{8C},$$

where the constants $C_{n,s,\theta}$ and C are the same as in Theorem 3.5. Then $u(x)$ is symmetric and monotone decreasing (along the direction \mathbf{e}) w.r.t. some hyper-plane T perpendicular to \mathbf{e} .

One can easily verify the validity of Corollary 3.7, since all the assumptions in Theorem 3.5 are fulfilled and $f(u)$ satisfies (3.2) in the direction $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Remark 3.8. A typical type of nonlinearity which satisfies all the assumptions in Corollary 3.7 is $f(u) = u^p$ with $p > 1$.

Another typical example is the so-called infinite cylinder $\mathcal{C} := (-\infty, +\infty) \times D'$, where $D' \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is a bounded domain.

Corollary 3.9. *Suppose $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C(\overline{\mathcal{C}})$ solves (3.1) for $\Omega = \mathcal{C}$, where $s \in (0, 1)$ and $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies (3.32). If $f(x, u, \mathbf{p})$ satisfies*

$$(3.63) \quad f(x_1, x', u, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) \leq f(\bar{x}_1, x', u, -p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n), \quad \forall \bar{x}_1 \geq x_1, p_1 \geq 0,$$

and $u(x)$ satisfies the asymptotic property

$$(3.64) \quad \limsup_{\substack{x_1 \rightarrow -\infty, \\ x \in \mathcal{C}}} |x|^{2s} [u(x)]^\beta < \frac{C_{n,s,\theta}}{8C},$$

where the constants $C_{n,s,\theta}$ and C are the same as in Theorem 3.5. Then either there exists $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u(x)$ is monotone increasing in $\mathcal{C} \cap \{x_1 < \mu_0\}$ in x_1 -direction and $u(x_1, x') = u(2\mu_0 - x_1, x')$, or $u(x)$ is monotone increasing in \mathcal{C} in x_1 -direction.

Remark 3.10. Typical forms of $f(x, u, \nabla u)$ which satisfies all the assumptions in Corollary 3.9 include: $f(x, u, \nabla u) = u^p(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $p > 1$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, and $f(x, u, \nabla u) = K(x)(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $K(x)$ nondecreasing w.r.t. x_1 .

3.3. Coercive epigraph Ω . Assume without loss of generalities that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_n := (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. A domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a coercive epigraph if there exists a continuous function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$(3.65) \quad \lim_{|x'| \rightarrow +\infty} \varphi(x') = +\infty,$$

such that $\Omega = \{x = (x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > \varphi(x')\}$, where $x' := (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

In this setting, we can prove the following monotonicity result via the method of moving planes for \mathbf{F}_s .

Theorem 3.11. *Let Ω be a coercive epigraph, and let $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a solution to (3.1) with $s \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and satisfies*

$$(3.66) \quad \begin{cases} f(x', x_n, u, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) \leq f(x', \bar{x}_n, u, p_1, p_2, \dots, -p_n), \\ \forall x_n \geq \min_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \varphi, p_n \geq 0, \bar{x}_n \geq x_n. \end{cases}$$

Then u is strictly monotone increasing in x_n .

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\inf_{x \in \Omega} x_n = \min_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \varphi = 0.$$

For arbitrary $\lambda > 0$, let

$$T_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n = \lambda\}$$

be the moving planes,

$$(3.67) \quad \Sigma_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n < \lambda\}$$

be the region below the plane, and

$$x^\lambda := (x_1, x_2, \dots, 2\lambda - x_n)$$

be the reflection of x about the plane T_λ .

Assume that u is a solution to problem (3.1). To compare the values of $u(x)$ with $u_\lambda(x) := u(x^\lambda)$, we denote

$$w_\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x).$$

Since Ω is a coercive epigraph, $\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega$ is always bounded for every $\lambda > 0$. One can easily obtain that, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$(3.68) \quad w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad w_\lambda(x) \not\equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Omega.$$

We aim at proving that $w_\lambda > 0$ in $\Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega$ for every $\lambda > 0$, which gives the desired strict monotonicity.

We will carry out the method of moving planes in two steps.

Step 1. We will first show that, for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently close to 0,

$$(3.69) \quad w_\lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega.$$

Suppose (3.69) does not hold, then there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_k\}$ satisfying $\lambda_k > 0$ and $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ such that

$$(3.70) \quad \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k} = \inf_{\lambda \in (0, \lambda_k]} \inf_{x \in \Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0.$$

Consequently, there exists $x^k \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega$ such that

$$(3.71) \quad w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega} w_{\lambda_k} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} w_{\lambda_k} < 0.$$

It follows directly from (3.70) and (3.71) that $\frac{\partial w_\lambda}{\partial \lambda}|_{\lambda=\lambda_k}(x^k) \leq 0$, and hence $(\partial_{x_n} u)[(x^k)^{\lambda_k}] \leq 0$. Note that x^k is the interior minimum of $w_{\lambda_k}(x)$, then one has $\nabla_x w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) = 0$, i.e.,

$$(3.72) \quad (\nabla_x u_{\lambda_k})(x^k) = (\nabla_x u)(x^k).$$

By the assumption (3.66) in Theorem 3.11 and (3.1), we have

$$(3.73) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_s w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) &\leq \mathbf{F}_s u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - \mathbf{F}_s u(x^k) \\ &= -f((x^k)^{\lambda_k}, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)((x^k)^{\lambda_k})) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\ &\leq -f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) + f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) \\ &=: c(x^k) w_{\lambda_k}(x^k), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.74) \quad c(x^k) := -\frac{f(x^k, u_{\lambda_k}(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k)) - f(x^k, u(x^k), (\nabla_x u)(x^k))}{u_{\lambda_k}(x^k) - u(x^k)}$$

is uniformly bounded independent of k , since $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $u \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Note that $\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega$ is a narrow region for k large enough. From (3.73), (3.74) and the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 2.5 (see Remark 2.6 and 2.8), one can derive that, for k sufficiently large,

$$(3.75) \quad w_{\lambda_k} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_k} \cap \Omega,$$

which yields a contradiction with (3.70). Hence there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that, (3.69) holds for any $0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon$. Furthermore, it follows from (3.68) and the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2 that, for any $0 < \lambda \leq \epsilon$,

$$(3.76) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega.$$

Step 2. Inequality (3.76) provides a starting point for us to carry out the moving planes procedure. Now we increase λ from close to 0 to $+\infty$ as long as inequality (3.76) holds until its limiting position. Define

$$(3.77) \quad \lambda_0 := \sup \{ \lambda > 0 \mid w_\mu > 0 \text{ in } x \in \Sigma_\mu \cap \Omega, \forall 0 < \mu < \lambda \}.$$

We aim to prove that

$$\lambda_0 = +\infty.$$

Otherwise, suppose on the contrary that $0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty$, we will show that the plane T_{λ_0} can be moved upward a little bit more, that is, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$(3.78) \quad w_\lambda > 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega, \quad \forall \lambda_0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_0 + \varepsilon,$$

which contradicts the definition (3.77) of λ_0 .

First, by the definition of λ_0 , we have $w_{\lambda_0} \geq 0$ in $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \cap \Omega$. Since $u > 0$ in Ω and $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$, we have $w_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0$ for any $x \in \Omega^{\lambda_0} \setminus \Omega$, where the notation A^λ denotes the reflection of a given set A w.r.t. the plane T_λ . Then, we can obtain from the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2 that

$$(3.79) \quad w_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \cap \Omega.$$

Next, we choose $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $(\Sigma_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon_1} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega$ is a bounded narrow region. By the fact that $w_{\lambda_0} > 0$ in $\Omega^{\lambda_0} \cap \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ and the continuity of w_{λ_0} , there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$w_{\lambda_0}(x) > c_0, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}} \cap \Omega.$$

Therefore, we can choose $0 < \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1$ sufficiently small such that

$$(3.80) \quad w_\lambda(x) > \frac{c_0}{2} > 0, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}} \cap \Omega,$$

for every $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2$. For any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2]$, since $(\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega$ is a bounded narrow region, we will deduce from the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 2.5 that

$$(3.81) \quad w_\lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{in } (\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega.$$

Indeed, by (3.80), if we suppose (3.81) does not hold, then there exists a $\hat{\lambda} \in (\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2]$ (depending on ε_2) such that

$$(3.82) \quad \inf_{(\Sigma_{\hat{\lambda}} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega} w_{\hat{\lambda}} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\hat{\lambda}} \cap \Omega} w_{\hat{\lambda}} = \inf_{\lambda \in (\lambda_0, \hat{\lambda}]} \inf_{x \in \Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0.$$

Consequently, there exists $\bar{x} \in (\Sigma_{\hat{\lambda}} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega$ such that

$$(3.83) \quad w_{\hat{\lambda}}(\bar{x}) = \inf_{(\Sigma_{\hat{\lambda}} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega} w_{\hat{\lambda}} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\hat{\lambda}} \cap \Omega} w_{\hat{\lambda}} = \inf_{\Sigma_{\hat{\lambda}}} w_{\hat{\lambda}} < 0.$$

Then, similar to (3.73) and (3.74), by the assumption (3.66) in Theorem 3.11 and (3.1), we have

$$(3.84) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}_s w_{\hat{\lambda}}(\bar{x}) \leq \mathbf{F}_s u_{\hat{\lambda}}(\bar{x}) - \mathbf{F}_s u(\bar{x}) \\ & = -f((\bar{x})^{\hat{\lambda}}, u_{\hat{\lambda}}(\bar{x}), (\nabla_x u)((\bar{x})^{\hat{\lambda}})) + f(\bar{x}, u(\bar{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\bar{x})) \\ & \leq -f(\bar{x}, u_{\hat{\lambda}}(\bar{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\bar{x})) + f(\bar{x}, u(\bar{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\bar{x})) \\ & =: c(\bar{x}) w_{\hat{\lambda}}(\bar{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.85) \quad c(\bar{x}) := -\frac{f(\bar{x}, u_{\bar{\lambda}}(\bar{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\bar{x})) - f(\bar{x}, u(\bar{x}), (\nabla_x u)(\bar{x}))}{u_{\bar{\lambda}}(\bar{x}) - u(\bar{x})}$$

is uniformly bounded (independent of ε_2 and ε_1), since $f(x, u, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $u \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that, by choosing ε_1 and ε_2 smaller if necessary, $(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega$ is a bounded narrow region. From (3.84), (3.85) and the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 2.5 (see Remark 2.6 and 2.8), one can derive that, for $0 < \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1$ sufficiently small,

$$(3.86) \quad w_{\bar{\lambda}} > 0 \quad \text{in } (\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega,$$

which yields a contradiction with (3.82). As a consequence, we have, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2]$, (3.81) holds. Furthermore, it follows from the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2 that

$$(3.87) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in (\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_1}}) \cap \Omega,$$

and hence, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_2]$,

$$(3.88) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda \cap \Omega.$$

This contradicts the definition (3.77) of λ_0 . Thus, we must have $\lambda_0 = +\infty$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.11. \square

Remark 3.12. Typical forms of $f(x, u, \nabla u)$ which satisfies all the assumptions in Theorem 3.11 include: $f(x, u, \nabla u) = u^p(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $p \geq 1$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, $f(x, u, \nabla u) = e^{\kappa u}(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma \leq 0$, and $f(x, u, \nabla u) = K(x)(1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ with $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $K(x)$ nondecreasing w.r.t. x_n .

Remark 3.13. Theorem 3.11 is counterpart for the monotonicity results in Theorem 1.3 in Dipierro, Soave and Valdinoci [47] for $(-\Delta)^s$, Theorem 2.24 in Dai, Qin and Wu [46] for $(-\Delta + m^2)^s$, Theorem 1.3 in Berestycki, Caffarelli and Nirenberg [3] and Proposition II.1 in Esteban and Lions [49] for $-\Delta$.

3.4. Schrödinger equations in \mathbb{R}^n . Consider the *static Schrödinger equations* involving the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operator:

$$(3.89) \quad -\mathbf{F}_s u(x) + u(x) = u^p(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We will prove the following symmetry and monotonicity result for nonnegative solution to (3.89) via the method of moving planes for \mathbf{F}_s .

Theorem 3.14. *Assume that $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a nonnegative solution of (3.89) with $1 < p < +\infty$. If*

$$(3.90) \quad \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u(x) = l < \left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}},$$

then u must be symmetric and monotone decreasing (along the direction \mathbf{e}) w.r.t. some hyperplane T perpendicular to \mathbf{e} .

Proof. Without loss of generalities, we assume $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_1 := (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. In order to apply the method of moving planes, we need some notations. For arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$T_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_1 = \lambda\}$$

be the moving planes,

$$(3.91) \quad \Sigma_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_1 < \lambda\}$$

be the region to the left of the plane, and

$$x^\lambda := (2\lambda - x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

be the reflection of x about the plane T_λ .

Assume that u is a nonnegative solution of the Schrödinger equations (3.89). To compare the values of $u(x)$ with $u(x^\lambda)$, we define

$$w_\lambda(x) := u(x^\lambda) - u(x), \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda.$$

Then, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, at points $x \in \Sigma_\lambda$ where $w_\lambda(x) < 0$, we have

$$(3.92) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w_\lambda(x) - c(x)w_\lambda(x) \leq 0,$$

where $c(x) := 1 - pu^{p-1}(x)$. From the assumption (3.90), we infer that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(3.93) \quad \liminf_{\substack{x \in \Sigma_\lambda, w_\lambda(x) < 0 \\ |x| \rightarrow +\infty}} c(x) > 0.$$

We carry out the moving planes procedure in two steps.

Step 1. We use Theorem 2.12 (*Decay at infinity (II)*) to show that, for sufficiently negative λ ,

$$(3.94) \quad w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda.$$

In fact, from assumption (3.90), we know that u is bounded from above and hence w_λ is bounded from below for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda < 0$. By (3.92) and (3.93), we can deduce from Theorem 2.12 (*Decay at infinity (II)*) that, there exist $R_0 > 0$ large and $0 < \gamma_0 < 1$ close to 1 (independent of λ) such that, if $\hat{x} \in \Sigma_\lambda$ satisfying $w_\lambda(\hat{x}) \leq \gamma_0 \inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda < 0$, then $|\hat{x}| \leq R_0$. This will lead to a contradiction provided that $\lambda \leq -R_0$. Thus we have, for any $\lambda \leq -R_0$, $w_\lambda \geq 0$ in Σ_λ .

Step 2. Step 1 provides a starting point, from which we can now move the plane T_λ to the right as long as (3.94) holds to its limiting position.

To this end, let us define

$$(3.95) \quad \lambda_0 := \sup \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid w_\mu \geq 0 \text{ in } \Sigma_\mu, \forall \mu \leq \lambda \}.$$

It follows from Step 1 that $-R_0 \leq \lambda_0 < +\infty$. One can easily verify that

$$(3.96) \quad w_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}.$$

Next, we are to show via contradiction arguments that

$$(3.97) \quad w_{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}.$$

Suppose on the contrary that

$$(3.98) \quad w_{\lambda_0} \geq 0 \text{ but } w_{\lambda_0} \not\equiv 0 \text{ in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0},$$

then we must have

$$(3.99) \quad w_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}.$$

In fact, if (3.99) is violated, then there exists a point $\hat{x} \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ such that

$$w_{\lambda_0}(\hat{x}) = \min_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}} w_{\lambda_0} = 0.$$

Then it follows from (3.89) that

$$(3.100) \quad \mathbf{F}_s w_{\lambda_0}(\hat{x}) \leq 0,$$

and hence Lemma 2.2 implies that $w_{\lambda_0} \equiv 0$ in Σ_{λ_0} , which contradicts (3.98). Thus $w_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0$ in Σ_{λ_0} .

Then we will show that the plane T_λ can be moved a little bit further from T_{λ_0} to the right. More precisely, there exists an $\delta > 0$, such that for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \delta]$, we have

$$(3.101) \quad w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda.$$

In fact, (3.101) can be achieved by using the *Narrow region principle* Theorem 2.5 and the *Decay at infinity (II)* Theorem 2.12. First, since $c(x) := 1 - pu^{p-1}(x)$ is uniformly bounded, we can choose $\delta_1 > 0$ small enough such that $(\Sigma_{\lambda_0+\delta_1} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\delta_1}}) \cap B_{R_*}(0)$ is a narrow region, where $R_* := R_0 + |\lambda_0| \geq R_0$ with R_0 given by *Decay at infinity (II)* Theorem 2.12. From (3.99), we deduce that, there exists a $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$(3.102) \quad w_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\delta_1} \cap B_{R_*}(0)}.$$

As a consequence, due to the continuity of w_λ w.r.t. λ , there exists a $0 < \delta_2 < \delta_1$ sufficiently small such that, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \delta_2]$,

$$(3.103) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\delta_1} \cap B_{R_*}(0)}.$$

For any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \delta_2]$, if we suppose that $\inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0$, then the *Decay at infinity (II)* Theorem 2.12 implies that

$$w_\lambda(x) > \gamma_0 \inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x), \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)},$$

and hence the negative minimum $\inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x)$ can be attained in $B_{R_0}(0) \cap \Sigma_\lambda$. Then, from (3.103), we infer that, if $\inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x) < 0$, then the negative minimum $\inf_{\Sigma_\lambda} w_\lambda(x)$ can be attained in the narrow region $(\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\delta_1}}) \cap B_{R_*}(0)$. Therefore, from *Narrow region principle* Theorem 2.5 (see Remark 2.6), we get, for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \delta_2]$,

$$(3.104) \quad w_\lambda(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in (\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_0-\delta_1}}) \cap B_{R_*}(0),$$

and hence

$$(3.105) \quad w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda.$$

Thus (3.101) holds, which contradicts the definition (3.95) of λ_0 . Hence (3.97) must be valid. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.14. \square

Remark 3.15. If we use *Decay at infinity (I)* Theorem 2.7 in the proof of Theorem 3.14, then we will need the stronger assumption

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u(x) = l < \left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$$

instead of (3.90). One can observe that, by using *Decay at infinity (II)* Theorem 2.12 instead of Theorem 2.7, the “limit” can be weakened into “superior limit” in assumption (3.90).

4. MAXIMUM PRINCIPLES IN UNBOUNDED DOMAINS AND APPLICATIONS

In this section, we will establish various maximum principles for F_s and \mathbf{F}_s in unbounded domains. As applications, we will develop the sliding method (on general unbounded domains) for F_s and \mathbf{F}_s and apply the moving planes method for \mathbf{F}_s to investigate monotonicity, uniqueness and asymptotic property of solutions to various problems involving the uniformly elliptic nonlocal Bellman operators F_s and \mathbf{F}_s .

4.1. Maximum principles in unbounded domains. First, we can prove the following strong maximum principle.

Lemma 4.1. (*Strong maximum principle*) Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n . If there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, $u(x_0) = 0$, u is $C^{1,1}$ near x_0 and $F_s u(x_0) \leq 0$, then $u = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. Since there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $u(x_0) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} u(x) = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq F_s u(x_0) \\ &= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y) - u(x_0)}{|A^{-1}(x_0 - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y)}{|A^{-1}(x_0 - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we must have $u = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

Theorem 4.2. (*Maximum Principles in unbounded open sets*) Let D be an open set in \mathbb{R}^n , possibly unbounded and disconnected. Assume that \overline{D} is disjoint from an infinite open domain $\Gamma \subset \overline{D}^c$ satisfying

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{|\Gamma \cap (B_{c_1 r_x}(x) \setminus B_{r_x}(x))|}{|B_{c_1 r_x}(x) \setminus B_{r_x}(x)|} \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in D$$

for some constants $c_1 > 1$, $c_0 > 0$ independent of x and $r_x > 0$ possibly depending on x .

Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(D)$ is bounded from above, and satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} F_s u(x) - c(x)u(x) \geq 0 & \text{at points } x \in D \text{ where } u(x) > 0, \\ u(x) \leq 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D, \end{cases}$$

where $c(x)$ is nonnegative in the set $\{x \in D \mid u(x) > 0\}$. Then $u \leq 0$ in D .

Furthermore, assume that

$$(4.3) \quad F_s u(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{at points } x \in D \text{ where } u(x) = 0,$$

then we have

$$(4.4) \quad \text{either } u(x) < 0 \text{ in } D \quad \text{or} \quad u(x) = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that there exists one point $x \in D$ such that $u(x) > 0$, then we have

$$(4.5) \quad 0 < M := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} u(x) < \infty.$$

There exists sequences $x^k \in D$ and $0 < \beta_k < 1$ with $\beta_k \rightarrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad u(x^k) \geq \beta_k M.$$

Let

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} e^{\frac{|x|^2}{|x|^2-1}}, & |x| < 1 \\ 0, & |x| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

It is well known that $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, therefore $|F_s \psi(x)| \leq C_0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, $F_s \psi(x) \sim |x|^{-n-2s}$ as $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$.

Define

$$\Psi_k(x) := \psi\left(\frac{x - x^k}{r_{x^k}}\right).$$

Take $\epsilon_k := (1 - \beta_k)M$. Since $u \leq M$ and $\Psi_k = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k)$, we have

$$(4.7) \quad u(x^k) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(x^k) \geq M \geq u(x) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(x),$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k)$. Consequently, there exists $\bar{x}^k \in B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k)$ such that

$$(4.8) \quad u(\bar{x}^k) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k) = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} [u(x) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(x)] \geq M,$$

which also implies that

$$(4.9) \quad u(\bar{x}^k) \geq u(x^k) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(x^k) - \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k) \geq u(x^k) \geq \beta_k M > 0.$$

Therefore, we deduce from (4.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} & F_s[u + \epsilon_k \Psi_k](\bar{x}^k) \\ &= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(y) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(y) - u(\bar{x}^k) - \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= \inf \left[P.V. \int_{B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k)} \frac{u(y) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(y) - u(\bar{x}^k) - \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{(B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k))^c} \frac{u(y) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(y) - u(\bar{x}^k) - \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\ (4.10) \quad & \leq \inf \int_{(B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k))^c} \frac{u(y) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(y) - u(\bar{x}^k) - \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ & \leq \inf \int_{\Gamma \cap (B_{c_1 r_{x^k}}(x^k) \setminus B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k))} \frac{-u(\bar{x}^k) - \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ & \leq -C (u(\bar{x}^k) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k)) \int_{\Gamma \cap (B_{c_1 r_{x^k}}(x^k) \setminus B_{r_{x^k}}(x^k))} \frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - y|^{n+2s}} dy \\ & \leq -C (u(\bar{x}^k) + \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k)) \frac{1}{r_{x^k}^{2s}} \\ & \leq -\frac{CM}{r_{x^k}^{2s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will evaluate the lower bound of $F_s[u + \epsilon_k \Psi_k](\bar{x}^k)$.

Indeed, since (4.9) implies $u(\bar{x}^k) > 0$ and hence $\bar{x}^k \in D$, we conclude from (4.2) and $|F_s \Psi_k(x)| \leq C_0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.11) \quad & F_s[u + \epsilon_k \Psi_k](\bar{x}^k) \\
 & \geq F_s u(\bar{x}^k) + F_s \epsilon_k \Psi_k(\bar{x}^k) \\
 & \geq c(\bar{x}^k) u(\bar{x}^k) - \frac{C_0 \epsilon_k}{r_{x^k}^{2s}} \\
 & \geq -\frac{C_0 \epsilon_k}{r_{x^k}^{2s}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.10) and (4.11), we derive

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{C_0 \epsilon_k}{r_{x^k}^{2s}} \geq \frac{CM}{r_{x^k}^{2s}},$$

which implies

$$C_0(1 - \beta_k) \geq C.$$

This will lead to a contradiction for k sufficiently large.

Furthermore, if there exists a point $\tilde{x} \in D$ such that $u(\tilde{x}) = 0$, then it follows immediately from (4.3) and Lemma 4.1 that $u = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . Therefore, we have

$$\text{either } u(x) < 0 \text{ in } D \quad \text{or} \quad u(x) = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This completes our proof of Theorem 4.2. \square

Remark 4.3. For fractional Laplacians $(-\Delta)^s$ ($0 < s < 1$), Dipierro, Soave and Valdinoci proved in [47] Maximum Principles in unbounded open set D by using Silvestre's growth lemma ([66]) under the *exterior cone condition* that the complement of D contains an infinite open connected cone Σ . Subsequently, Chen and Liu [24], Chen and Wu [38] introduced new ideas in the proof and thus significantly weakens the *exterior cone condition* to the following condition:

$$(4.13) \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|D^c \cap (B_{2^{k+1}r}(q) \setminus B_{2^k r}(q))|}{|B_{2^{k+1}r}(q) \setminus B_{2^k r}(q)|} = c_0 > 0, \quad \forall q \in D$$

for some $c_0 > 0$ and $r > 0$. Typical examples of D which satisfy condition (4.13) but does not satisfy the *exterior cone condition* include: stripes, annulus and Archimedean spiral (refer to [24, 38] for details). Our assumption (4.1) is rather weaker than (4.13).

From the proof of Theorem 4.2, we can deduce the following narrow region principle in unbounded open sets.

Theorem 4.4 (Narrow region principle in unbounded open sets). *Let D be an open set in \mathbb{R}^n (possibly unbounded and disconnected) and $d(D) := \sup_{x \in D} \text{dist}(x, D^c)$ be the width of D . Assume that D satisfies (4.1) with $r_x = \text{dist}(x, D^c) \leq d(D)$. Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(D)$ is bounded from above and satisfies*

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{cases} F_s u(x) - c(x)u(x) \geq 0 & \text{at points } x \in D \text{ where } u(x) > 0, \\ u(x) \leq 0 & \text{in } D^c, \end{cases}$$

where $c(x)$ is uniformly bounded from below (w.r.t. $d(D)$) in $\{x \in D \mid u(x) > 0\}$. If we assume that

$$(4.15) \quad \inf_{\{x \in D \mid u(x) > 0\}} c(x) > -\frac{C}{4d(D)^{2s}},$$

where $C > 0$ is the same constant as in (4.10). Then

$$(4.16) \quad u(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } D.$$

Furthermore, assume that

$$(4.17) \quad F_s u(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{at points } u \in D \text{ where } u(x) = 0,$$

then we have

$$(4.18) \quad \text{either } u(x) < 0 \text{ in } D \quad \text{or} \quad u(x) = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

.

Proof. Indeed, we infer from (4.10) and (4.11) that

$$(4.19) \quad c(\bar{x}^k)u(\bar{x}^k) - \frac{C_0 \epsilon_k}{r_{x^k}^{2s}} \leq -\frac{CM}{r_{x^k}^{2s}}.$$

For k sufficiently large such that $\beta_k \geq \max\left\{1 - \frac{C}{2C_0}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}$, we derive from (4.9) and (4.19) that

$$(4.20) \quad c(\bar{x}^k) \leq -\frac{CM}{2r_{x^k}^{2s}u(\bar{x}^k)} \leq -\frac{C}{4d(\Omega)^{2s}},$$

which contradicts (4.15).

Furthermore, if there exists a point $\tilde{x} \in D$ such that $u(\tilde{x}) = 0$, then it follows immediately from (4.3) and Lemma 4.1 that $u = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . Therefore, we have

$$\text{either } u(x) < 0 \text{ in } D \quad \text{or} \quad u(x) = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This completes our proof of Theorem 4.4. \square

Remark 4.5. In Theorem 4.4, if the positive maximum of u is attained in D , then we only need to assume $F_s u(x) - c(x)u(x) \geq 0$ at points $x \in D$ where $u(x) = \sup_D u(x) > 0$, and

$\inf_{\{x \in D \mid u(x) > 0\}} c(x)$ in (4.15) can be replaced by the infimum of $c(x)$ over the set consisting of positive maximum points of u , the same conclusions are still valid. Indeed, if the positive maximum of u is attained at some points $\hat{x} \in D$, then in the proof of Theorem 4.4, we may simply replace \bar{x}^k by the positive maximum point \hat{x} and take $\epsilon_k = 0$, and we get

$$(4.21) \quad c(\hat{x})u(\hat{x}) \leq -\frac{CM}{r_{\hat{x}}^{2s}}$$

instead of (4.19), where $M := \sup_D u(x) > 0$. It follows that $c(\hat{x}) \leq -\frac{C}{d(\Omega)^{2s}}$, which yields a contradiction immediately.

Remark 4.6. Denote $D^+ := \{x \in D \mid u(x) > 0\}$. Theorem 4.4 implies that, if $c(x)$ is bounded from below, then there exists $r_0 > 0$ and $0 < \beta_0 < 1$ close to 1 such that

$$\text{if } x \in D \text{ satisfying } u(x) \geq \beta_0 \sup_D u > 0, \quad \text{then } \text{dist}(x, \partial D^+) > r_0.$$

This indicates that the “almost” positive maximal points must be away from the boundary of D^+ .

The maximum principles in Lemma 4.1, Theorems 4.2 and 4.4 are also valid for \mathbf{F}_s .

4.2. Monotonicity in Epigraph E .

$$E := \{x = (x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > \varphi(x')\},$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function. A typical example of epigraph E is the upper half-space \mathbb{R}_+^n ($\varphi \equiv 0$).

By applying the maximum principles established in subsection 4.1, we can show the following monotonicity result on the epigraph E via sliding method.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(E)$ be a bounded solution of*

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{cases} -F_s u(x) = f(u(x)), & x \in E, \\ u(x) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E, \end{cases}$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is nonincreasing in the range of u . Assume that there exists $l > 0$ such that

$$(4.23) \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \{x = (x', x_n) \in E \mid \varphi(x') < x_n < \varphi(x') + l\}.$$

Then, either $u \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n and $f(0) = 0$, or u is strictly monotone increasing in the x_n direction and hence $u > 0$ in E .

If, in addition, F_s in (4.22) is replaced by \mathbf{F}_s and E is contained in a half-space Σ such that $\mathbf{e} \perp \partial\Sigma$, the same conclusion can be reached without the assumption (4.23). Furthermore, if E itself is exactly a half-space with $\mathbf{e} \perp \partial E$, then

$$u(x) = u(\langle (x', x_n - \varphi(0')), \nu \rangle),$$

where $\nu = \pm \mathbf{e}$ is the unit inner normal vector to the hyper-plane ∂E and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product in Euclidean space. In particular, if $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_n$ and $E = \mathbb{R}_+^n$, then $u(x) = u(x_n)$.

Proof. For any $0 < \tau < l$, let

$$u^\tau(x) := u(x', x_n + \tau)$$

and

$$w^\tau(x) := u^\tau(x) - u(x).$$

Since $f(\cdot)$ is nonincreasing, we have

$$F_s w^\tau(x) \leq F_s u^\tau(x) - F_s u(x) = -f(u^\tau(x)) + f(u(x)) \leq 0$$

at points $x \in E$ where $w^\tau(x) < 0$. In addition, for any $0 < \tau < l$, we have

$$w^\tau(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D.$$

Thus it follows immediately from Theorem 4.2 that, for any $0 < \tau < l$,

$$w^\tau(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in E.$$

Now, suppose that $u \not\equiv 0$ in E , then there exists a $\hat{x} \in E$ such that $u(\hat{x}) > 0$. We are to show that, for any $0 < \tau < l$,

$$(4.24) \quad w^\tau(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in E.$$

If not, there exists a point $x^\tau \in E$ such that

$$w^\tau(x^\tau) = 0 = \min_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^\tau(x).$$

Then we have

$$F_s w^\tau(x^\tau) \leq f(u(x^\tau)) - f(u^\tau(x^\tau)) = 0,$$

it follows immediately from Lemma 4.1 that $w^\tau = 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . This contradicts $u(\hat{x}) > 0$ and $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$. Therefore, (4.24) holds and hence u is strictly monotone increasing in the x_N direction. In particular, $u > 0$ in E .

If, in addition, F_s in (4.22) is replaced by \mathbf{F}_s and E is contained in a half-space Σ with $\mathbf{e} \perp \partial E$, then the above sliding method is also valid for \mathbf{F}_s . We will prove that

$$u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } E$$

and hence the assumption (4.23) is redundant.

Without loss of generalities, we may assume that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$, let

$$(4.25) \quad T_0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_n = 0\},$$

$$(4.26) \quad \Sigma_0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_n > 0\}$$

be the region above the plane T_0 , and

$$x^0 := (x_1, x_2, \dots, -x_n)$$

be the reflection of x about the plane T_0 . We denote $u_0(x) := u(x^0)$ and $w_0(x) = u_0(x) - u(x)$. For $x \in \Sigma_0$ where $w_0(x) > 0$, we derive from (4.22) that, $x \in E$ and

$$\mathbf{F}_s w_0(x) \leq f(u_0(x)) - f(u(x)) \leq 0 \quad \text{at points } x \in E \text{ where } w_0(x) < 0.$$

Hence, we obtain from Theorem 2.9 that $w_0 \leq 0$ in Σ_0 , which implies immediately $u \geq 0$ in E .

Furthermore, suppose E itself is exactly a half-space with $\mathbf{e} \perp \partial E$. Without loss of generalities, we may assume that $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_n$ and $E = \mathbb{R}_+^n$. We will show that $u(x)$ depends on x_n only.

In fact, when $E = \mathbb{R}_+^n$, it can be seen from the above sliding procedure that the methods should still be valid if we replace $u^\tau(x) := u(x + \tau \mathbf{e}_n)$ by $u(x + \tau \nu)$, where $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ is an arbitrary vector such that $\langle \nu, \mathbf{e}_n \rangle = \nu_n > 0$. Applying similar sliding methods as above, we can derive that, for arbitrary such vector ν ,

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

Let $\nu_n \rightarrow 0+$, from the continuity of u , we deduce that

$$u(x + \tau \nu) \geq u(x)$$

for arbitrary vector ν with $\nu_n = 0$. By replacing ν by $-\nu$, we arrive at

$$u(x + \tau \nu) = u(x)$$

for arbitrary vector ν with $\nu_n = 0$, this means that $u(x)$ is independent of x' , hence $u(x) = u(x_n)$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.7. \square

Remark 4.8. A typical form of nonlinearity $f(u)$ satisfying the assumption in Theorem 4.7 is $f(u) = e^{\kappa u}$ with $\kappa \leq 0$.

4.3. Asymptotic behavior. As an application of Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 4.1, we can prove the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a solution of*

$$(4.27) \quad -F_s u(x) = f(u(x)), \quad \forall x \in \Omega$$

such that u is bounded from above and

$$u(x) = \phi(x) < \mu, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega.$$

Assume f satisfies the assumption:

(H₁) $f(t) > 0$ on $(0, \mu)$, $f(\mu) = 0$ and $f(t) \leq 0$ for $t \geq \mu$.

Then $u < \mu$ in Ω .

Proof. We first show that $u \leq \mu$ in Ω . To this end, define $w(x) = u(x) - \mu$, then w is bounded from above and $w(x) < 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. From equation (4.27), we infer that, at points $x \in \Omega$ where $u(x) > \mu$,

$$(4.28) \quad -F_s w(x) = f(u(x)) \leq 0.$$

It follows from Theorem 4.2 that $w(x) \leq 0$ in Ω . Thus we arrive at $u \leq \mu$ in Ω .

Furthermore, by strong maximum principle Lemma 4.1, we conclude that $u < \mu$ in Ω . This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.9. \square

Now we consider the following equation

$$(4.29) \quad \begin{cases} -F_s u(x) = f(u(x)), & u(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in E, \\ u(x) = \phi(x) \geq 0, & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E, \end{cases}$$

where $E := \{x = (x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > \varphi(x')\}$ is the epigraph and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function.

To derive the asymptotic behavior of solutions to (4.29), we need the following hypotheses on f :

(H₂) $f(t) \geq c_0 t$ on $[0, \delta_0]$ for some small $c_0 > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$.

(H₃) $f(t)$ is nonincreasing on $(\mu - \delta_1, \mu)$ for some small $0 < \delta_1 < \mu$.

We first prove the following Lemma by sliding method, which indicates that the solution of (4.29) is bounded away from zero at points far away from the boundary.

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose that $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(E) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a solution of (4.29) and $f(\cdot)$ satisfies (H₂). Then, there exist $0 < \varepsilon_0 < \mu$ and $M_0 > 0$ large such that*

$$(4.30) \quad u(x) > \varepsilon_0, \quad \forall x \in E, \text{ dist}(x, \partial E) > M_0.$$

Proof. Let λ_1 be the first eigenvalue of $-F_s$ in $B_1(0)$. Assume ψ is the corresponding eigenfunction satisfying $\psi(0) = \max_{B_1(0)} \psi = 1$ and

$$(4.31) \quad \begin{cases} -F_s \psi = \lambda_1 \psi, & \psi > 0, & \text{in } B_1(0), \\ \psi = 0, & & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

For eigenvalue and eigenfunction to F_s and general nonlinear integro-differential operators, please refer to Biswas [9] and the references therein.

By hypothesis (H_2) , for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta_0$ and $M_0 := \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{c_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{2s}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 -F_s \left(\varepsilon \psi \left(\frac{x}{M_0} \right) \right) &= \frac{\lambda_1}{M_0^{2s}} \varepsilon \psi \left(\frac{x}{M_0} \right) \\
 &= c_0 \varepsilon \psi \left(\frac{x}{M_0} \right) \\
 &\leq f \left(\varepsilon \psi \left(\frac{x}{M_0} \right) \right).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.32}$$

For an arbitrarily fixed point $y_0 \in E$ with $\text{dist}(y_0, \partial E) > M_0$, set

$$\varepsilon_0 := \min \left\{ \delta_0, \frac{1}{2} \inf_{B_{M_0}(y_0)} u \right\} > 0.
 \tag{4.33}$$

Then, we have

$$u(x) > \varepsilon_0 \psi \left(\frac{x - y_0}{M_0} \right) \quad \text{in } B_{M_0}(y_0).
 \tag{4.34}$$

For any other $y \in E$ with $\text{dist}(y, \partial E) > M_0$, we can link y_0 and y by a smooth curve $y(t) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \{x \in E \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial E) > M_0\}$ with $y(0) = y_0$ and $y(1) = y$. Denote

$$v_t(x) := u(x) - \varepsilon_0 \psi \left(\frac{x - y(t)}{M_0} \right).$$

It follows from (4.34) that $v_0(x) > 0$ for any $x \in B_{M_0}(y(0))$. We intend to prove, for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$v_t(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{M_0}(y(t)).
 \tag{4.35}$$

Suppose not, let $0 < t_* < 1$ be the smallest t such that (4.35) fails. Then, we must have $v_{t_*} \geq 0$ in $B_{M_0}(y(t_*))$ and there is some point $x^* \in B_{M_0}(y(t_*))$ such that $v_{t_*}(x^*) = 0$. On the one hand, we deduce from (4.29) and (4.32) that

$$-F_s v_{t_*}(x^*) \geq f(u(x^*)) - f \left(\varepsilon_0 \psi \left(\frac{x^* - y(t_*)}{M_0} \right) \right) = 0.$$

However, on the other hand, direct calculation shows

$$-F_s v_{t_*}(x^*) = \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{-v_{t_*}(y)}{|A^{-1}(x^* - y)|^{n+2s}} dy < 0.$$

This is a contradiction! Hence, we have (4.35) holds. In particular, for $t = 1$ and $x = y$, (4.35) gives

$$u(y) > \varepsilon_0.$$

Since $y \in E$ with $\text{dist}(y, \partial E) > M_0$ is arbitrary, we conclude the proof of Lemma 4.10. \square

Now, with the help of Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10, we can prove the following asymptotic property of solution $u(x)$ to (4.29) when x is far away from ∂E .

Theorem 4.11. *Assume $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(E) \cap \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a solution of (4.29) such that u is bounded from above and $u(x) = \phi(x) < \mu$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$. Suppose $f(\cdot)$ is continuous and satisfies assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) and (H_3) . Then, $u(x) \rightarrow \mu$ in E as $\text{dist}(x, \partial E) \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.9, we know that $0 < u < \mu$ in E . Let ψ denote the eigenfunction associated with the first eigenvalue λ_1 of $-F_s$ in $B_1(0)$ as in the proof of Lemma 4.10.

By the hypothesis (H_1) and the continuity of f , one has, there exists $c_1 > 0$ small such that

$$(4.36) \quad f(t) \geq c_1, \quad \forall t \in [\varepsilon_0, \mu - \delta_1].$$

For any $y \in E$ with $d_y := \text{dist}(y, \partial E)$ large enough such that $d_y > 2M_0$ and $\left(\frac{2}{d_y}\right)^{2s} < \frac{c_1}{\lambda_1 \mu}$, by Lemma 4.10, we have

$$u(x) > \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{d_y}{2}}(y).$$

Set $\psi^y(x) := \psi\left(\frac{2(x-y)}{d_y}\right)$, then

$$(4.37) \quad -F_s \psi^y(x) \leq \lambda_1 \left(\frac{2}{d_y}\right)^{2s}, \quad \forall x \in B_{\frac{d_y}{2}}(y).$$

Since $\max_{x \in B_{\frac{d_y}{2}}(y)} \psi^y(x) = \psi^y(y) = 1$, we have, for $0 < \eta \leq \varepsilon_0$,

$$\eta \psi^y(x) < u(x), \quad \forall x \in E.$$

Let

$$\eta_* := \sup\{\eta \mid \eta \psi^y(x) < u(x) \text{ in } E\}$$

be the least η such that $\eta \psi^y$ touches u in E . Since $u < \mu$, $\varepsilon_0 \leq \eta_* < \mu$ is well-defined.

By the definition of η_* , we have $u(x) \geq \eta_* \psi^y(x)$ in \mathbb{R}^n and there exists a point $x_0 \in B_{\frac{d_y}{2}}(y)$ such that $u(x_0) = \eta_* \psi^y(x_0)$. This means x_0 is the minimum point of the function $u(x) - \eta_* \psi^y(x)$, hence we obtain

$$-F_s(u - \eta_* \psi^y)(x_0) \leq 0,$$

which combined with (4.37), implies that

$$(4.38) \quad -F_s u(x_0) = f(u(x_0)) \leq \eta_* \lambda_1 \left(\frac{2}{d_y}\right)^{2s} < \eta_* \lambda_1 \frac{c_1}{\lambda_1 \mu} < c_1.$$

At the same time, we can conclude that

$$(4.39) \quad \varepsilon_0 < u(x_0) = \eta_* \psi^y(x_0) \leq \eta_* \psi^y(y) \leq u(y) < \mu.$$

Combining (4.36), (4.38) with (4.39) yields that $\mu - \delta_1 < u(x_0) \leq u(y) < \mu$. Then, we can deduce from (H_3) and (4.38) that

$$(4.40) \quad -F_s u(y) = f(u(y)) \leq f(u(x_0)) \leq \eta_* \lambda_1 \left(\frac{2}{d_y}\right)^{2s}.$$

Therefore, we have $\mu - \delta_1 < u(y) < \mu$ for any $y \in E$ with $d_y := \text{dist}(y, \partial E)$ sufficiently large, and $f(u(y)) \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{dist}(y, \partial E) \rightarrow +\infty$. Combining this with the hypothesis (H_3) implies immediately that

$$\lim_{\text{dist}(x, \partial E) \rightarrow +\infty} u(x) = \mu,$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 4.11. \square

Remark 4.12. If $\mu = 1$, then the De Giorgi type nonlinearity $f(u) = u - u^3$ satisfies all the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) and (H_3) in Theorem 4.11 and Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10.

Since the maximum principles in Lemma 4.1, Theorems 4.2 and 4.4 are valid for \mathbf{F}_s , we can apply the sliding method (on general unbounded domains) to \mathbf{F}_s and hence the results in Theorem 4.7, Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10 and Theorem 4.11 are still valid for \mathbf{F}_s .

4.4. Monotonicity in \mathbb{R}_+^n . Without loss of generalities, we assume $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_n$ and consider the following Dirichlet problem on half-space \mathbb{R}_+^n :

$$(4.41) \quad \begin{cases} -\mathbf{F}_s u(x) = f(u(x)), & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ u(x) = 0, & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^n, \end{cases}$$

where $0 < s < 1$ and $n \geq 1$.

By using the maximum principles established in Section 2 and subsection 4.1, we will prove the following monotonicity result for (4.41) via the method of moving planes for \mathbf{F}_s .

Theorem 4.13. *Let $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ be a nonnegative nontrivial bounded solution of (4.41). Assume that $f(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz in the range of u and satisfies either $f(0) \neq 0$ or (H_2) .*

Then, u is strictly monotone increasing in the x_n direction and hence $u > 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n .

Proof. We prove Theorem 4.13 via the method of moving planes for \mathbf{F}_s .

For arbitrary $\lambda > 0$, let

$$T_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_n = \lambda\}$$

be the moving planes,

$$(4.42) \quad \Sigma_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_n < \lambda\}$$

be the region below the plane,

$$D_\lambda := \Sigma_\lambda \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | 0 < x_n < \lambda\},$$

and

$$x^\lambda := (x_1, x_2, \dots, 2\lambda - x_n)$$

be the reflection of x about the plane T_λ .

Assume that u is a nonnegative nontrivial bounded solution to problem (4.41). To compare the values of $u(x)$ with $u_\lambda(x) := u(x^\lambda)$, we denote

$$w_\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x).$$

We aim at proving that $w_\lambda > 0$ in D_λ for any $\lambda > 0$, which gives the desired strict monotonicity.

The following Lemma is necessary in our proof of Theorem 4.13.

Lemma 4.14. *Assume that $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ satisfies (4.41) and $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n . If $w_\lambda \equiv 0$ in D_λ for some $\lambda > 0$, then $u \equiv 0$ and $f(0) = 0$.*

Proof. If $w_\lambda \equiv 0$ in D_λ for some $\lambda > 0$, by the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2, we have $w_\lambda \equiv 0$ in Σ_λ , and hence $u(x) = 0$ for $x_n \geq 2\lambda$. Suppose that $u \not\equiv 0$. For $t > 2\lambda$, by (4.41), we have

$$f(0) = -\mathbf{F}_s u(te_n) = \inf \int_{0 < y_n < 2\lambda} \frac{-u(y)}{|A^{-1}(te_n - y)|^{n+2s}} dy < 0.$$

However, we can deduce from $u \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ that

$$\inf \int_{0 < y_n < 2\lambda} \frac{-u(y)}{|A^{-1}(te_n - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty.$$

This is a contraction! □

Let $D_\lambda^- := \{x \in D_\lambda \mid w(x) < 0\}$. Then, for any $x \in D_\lambda^-$, we have

$$(4.43) \quad -\mathbf{F}_s w_\lambda(x) \geq f(u_\lambda(x)) - f(u(x)) = c_\lambda(x) w_\lambda(x),$$

where

$$c_\lambda(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{f(u_\lambda(x)) - f(u(x))}{u_\lambda(x) - u(x)}, & \text{if } u_\lambda(x) \neq u(x), \\ 0, & \text{if } u_\lambda(x) = u(x), \end{cases}$$

is bounded by the Lipschitz constant of f .

Now, we continue our proof of Theorem 4.13. The proof can be divided into two steps.

Step 1. We will first show that $w_\lambda > 0$ in D_λ for $\lambda > 0$ small.

For $\lambda > 0$ small, D_λ is an unbounded narrow region, it follows immediately from the *Narrow region principle in unbounded open sets* Theorem 2.10 that

$$w_\lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{in } D_\lambda,$$

and if $w_\lambda = 0$ at some point in D_λ , we have $w_\lambda \equiv 0$ in D_λ . Then, Lemma 4.14 implies $u \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n . This contradicts with the assumption that u is nontrivial. Therefore, we have, for $\lambda > 0$ small,

$$(4.44) \quad w_\lambda > 0 \quad \text{in } D_\lambda.$$

Step 2. Step 1 provides a starting point for us to carry out the moving planes procedure. Now we increase λ from close to 0 to $+\infty$ as long as inequality (4.44) holds until its limiting position. Define

$$(4.45) \quad \lambda_0 := \sup \{ \lambda > 0 \mid w_\mu > 0 \text{ in } D_\mu, \forall 0 < \mu < \lambda \}.$$

We aim to prove that

$$\lambda_0 = +\infty.$$

Otherwise, suppose on the contrary that $0 < \lambda_0 < +\infty$, by the definition of λ_0 and Lemma 4.14, we have

$$w_{\lambda_0} > 0 \quad \text{in } D_{\lambda_0}.$$

Thus there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_k\}$ such that $\lambda_k > \lambda_0$, $\lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and $D_{\lambda_k}^- \neq \emptyset$. Setting $m_k := \inf w_{\lambda_k} < 0$, then we have $m_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Let $v_k := w_{\lambda_k} \chi_{D_{\lambda_k}^-}$, we have, for any $x \in D_{\lambda_k}^-$,

$$(4.46) \quad \begin{aligned} -\mathbf{F}_s v_k(x) &= \inf \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v_k(x) - v_k(y)}{|A^{-1}(x - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= \inf \left[\int_{D_{\lambda_k}^-} \frac{w_{\lambda_k}(x) - w_{\lambda_k}(y)}{|A^{-1}(x - y)|^{n+2s}} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D_{\lambda_k}^-} \frac{w_{\lambda_k}(x)}{|A^{-1}(x - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\ &\geq \inf \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w_{\lambda_k}(x) - w_{\lambda_k}(y)}{|A^{-1}(x - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\ &= -\mathbf{F}_s w_{\lambda_k}(x) \geq f(u_{\lambda_k}(x)) - f(u(x)) \\ &= c_{\lambda_k}(x) v_k(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, applying Remark 4.6 to v_k , we deduce that there exist a sequence of points $\{x^k\}$, constants $0 < r_0 < \frac{\lambda_0}{4}$ small and $0 < \beta_0 < 1$ close to 1 satisfy

$$(4.47) \quad w_{\lambda_k}(x^k) \leq \beta_0 m_k \quad \text{and} \quad 2r_0 < (x^k)_n < \lambda_0 - 2r_0,$$

where $(x^k)_n$ denotes the n -th component of x^k .

Let

$$\gamma(x) = \begin{cases} e^{\frac{|x|^2}{|x|^2-1}}, & |x| < 1 \\ 0, & |x| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

It is well known that $\gamma \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, thus $|\mathbf{F}_s \gamma(x)| \leq C$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, $\mathbf{F}_s \gamma(x) \sim |x|^{-n-2s}$ as $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$.

Set

$$(4.48) \quad w_k(x) := w_{\lambda_k}(x) - \varepsilon_k \left[\gamma\left(\frac{x - x^k}{r_0}\right) - \gamma\left(\frac{x - (x^k)^{\lambda_k}}{r_0}\right) \right],$$

where $\varepsilon_k := -(1 - \beta_0)m_k$, then we have

$$w_k(x^k) \leq m_k.$$

Note that w_k is also anti-symmetric with respect to T_{λ_k} .

Since $w_k \geq m_k$ in $\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \setminus B_{r_0}(x^k)$, there exists $\bar{x}^k \in B_{r_0}(x^k)$ such that

$$w_k(\bar{x}^k) = \min_{x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k}} w_k(x).$$

On the one hand,

$$(4.49) \quad -\mathbf{F}_s w_k(\bar{x}^k) \geq f(u_{\lambda_k}(\bar{x}^k)) - f(u(\bar{x}^k)) - \frac{C\varepsilon_k}{r_0^{2s}} \geq Lw_k(\bar{x}^k) - \frac{C\varepsilon_k}{r_0^{2s}},$$

where L denotes the Lipschitz constant of f . It is easy to see that

$$(4.50) \quad Lw_k(\bar{x}^k) - \frac{C\varepsilon_k}{r_0^{2s}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\mathbf{F}_s w_k(\bar{x}^k) \\
&= \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w_k(\bar{x}^k) - w_k(y)}{|A^{-1}(\bar{x}^k - y)|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&\leq C \inf P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w_k(\bar{x}^k) - w_k(y)}{|\bar{x}^k - y|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&= C \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \frac{w_k(\bar{x}^k) - w_k(y)}{|\bar{x}^k - y|^{n+2s}} dy + \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \frac{w_k(\bar{x}^k) + w_k(y)}{|\bar{x}^k - y^{\lambda_k}|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\
(4.51) \quad &= C \left[P.V. \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \left(\frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - y^{\lambda_k}|^{n+2s}} \right) (w_k(\bar{x}^k) - w_k(y)) dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2w_k(\bar{x}^k) \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - y^{\lambda_k}|^{n+2s}} dy \right] \\
&\leq C \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k} \setminus B_{r_0}(\bar{x}^k)} \left(\frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|\bar{x}^k - y^{\lambda_k}|^{n+2s}} \right) (w_k(\bar{x}^k) - w_k(y)) dy \\
&= C \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k - (\bar{x}^k)_n} \setminus B_{r_0}(0)} \left(\frac{1}{|y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|y^{\lambda_k - (\bar{x}^k)_n}|^{n+2s}} \right) (w_k(\bar{x}^k) - w_k(y + \bar{x}^k)) dy \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Up to an subsequence, we may assume that $(\bar{x}^k)_n \rightarrow r_1 \in [r_0, \lambda_0 - r_0]$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

Since $-\mathbf{F}_s$ is uniformly elliptic and u is bounded, from the interior regularity in [34] and the boundary regularity in [64], we deduce that $\tilde{w}_k(x) := w_k(x + \bar{x}^k)$ is uniformly Hölder continuous. Therefore, by the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, there exists a function $w_{\lambda_0 - r_1}^\infty$ such that

$$\tilde{w}_k \rightarrow w_{\lambda_0 - r_1}^\infty \quad \text{uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

By the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.52) \quad & C \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_k - (\bar{x}^k)_n} \setminus B_{r_0}(0)} \left(\frac{1}{|y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|y^{\lambda_k - (\bar{x}^k)_n}|^{n+2s}} \right) (w_k(\bar{x}^k) - w_k(y + \bar{x}^k)) dy \\
& \rightarrow -C \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0 - r_1} \setminus B_{r_0}(0)} \left(\frac{1}{|y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|y^{\lambda_0 - r_1}|^{n+2s}} \right) w_{\lambda_0 - r_1}^\infty(y) dy \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

Combining (4.49), (4.50), (4.51) and (4.52), we obtain

$$C \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0 - r_1} \setminus B_{r_0}(0)} \left(\frac{1}{|y|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|y^{\lambda_0 - r_1}|^{n+2s}} \right) w_{\lambda_0 - r_1}^\infty(y) dy = 0,$$

which implies that

$$u_{\lambda_0 - r_1}^\infty(x) \equiv u^\infty(x), \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0 - r_1} \setminus B_{r_0}(0),$$

where $u_{\lambda_0 - r_1}^\infty(x)$ and $u^\infty(x)$ are the limits of $u_{\lambda_k - (\bar{x}^k)_n}(x + \bar{x}^k)$ and $u(x + \bar{x}^k)$ respectively. By regularity theory, $u^\infty(x)$ satisfies

$$(4.53) \quad \begin{cases} -\mathbf{F}_s u^\infty(x) = f(u^\infty(x)), & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n - r_1 e_n, \\ u^\infty(x) = 0, & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\mathbb{R}_+^n - r_1 e_n). \end{cases}$$

Then, by the strong maximum principle Lemma 2.2, we have $w_{\lambda_0-r_1}^\infty \equiv 0$. Consequently, we derive from Lemma 4.14 that $u^\infty \equiv 0$ and $f(0) = 0$. This leads to a contradiction if $f(0) \neq 0$.

If $f(0) = 0$ and f satisfies (H_2) , we infer from Lemma 4.10 that $u_{\lambda_0-r_1}^\infty(x) \geq \varepsilon_0$ for x with x_n sufficiently negative, while $u^\infty(x) = 0$. This is a contradiction!

Therefore, we must have $\lambda_0 = +\infty$ and hence $w_\lambda > 0$ in D_λ for any $\lambda > 0$. This finishes our proof of Theorem 4.13. \square

Remark 4.15. Typical kinds of nonlinearities $f(u)$ satisfying all the assumptions in Theorem 4.13 include: De Giorgi type nonlinearity $f(u) = u - u^3$ and $f(u) = e^{\kappa u}$ with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 4.16. For monotonicity of solutions to PDEs involving fractional Laplacians $(-\Delta)^s$ on half-space \mathbb{R}_+^n , please refer to Barrios, Del Pezzo, García-Melián and Quaas [5] and Barrios, García-Melián and Quaas [7].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to the referees for their careful reading and valuable comments and suggestions that improved the presentation of the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Abels and M. Kassmann, *An analytic approach to purely nonlocal Bellman equations arising in models of stochastic control*, J. Differential Equations, **236** (2007), no. 1, 29-56.
- [2] H. Berestycki, L. A. Caffarelli and L. Nirenberg, *Inequalities for second-order elliptic equations with applications to unbounded domains. I*, Duke Math. J., **81** (1996), 467-494.
- [3] H. Berestycki, L. A. Caffarelli and L. Nirenberg, *Monotonicity for elliptic equations in unbounded Lipschitz domains*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **50** (1997), 1089-1111.
- [4] C. Brandle, E. Colorado, A. de Pablo and U. Sanchez, *A concave-convex elliptic problem involving the fractional Laplacian*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh-A: Math., **143** (2013), 39-71.
- [5] B. Barrios, L. Del Pezzo, J. García-Melián and A. Quaas, *Monotonicity of solutions for some nonlocal elliptic problems in half-spaces*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **56** (2017), no. 2, Art. 39, 16 pp.
- [6] J. Bertoin, *Lévy Processes*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, **121**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [7] B. Barrios, J. García-Melián and A. Quaas, *A note on the monotonicity of solutions for fractional equations in half-spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **147** (2019), no. 7, 3011-3019.
- [8] H. Berestycki, F. Hamel and R. Monneau, *One-dimensional symmetry of bounded entire solutions of some elliptic equations*, Duke Math. J., **103** (2000), 375-396.
- [9] A. Biswas, *Principal eigenvalues of a class of nonlinear integro-differential operators*, J. Differential Equations, **268** (2020), no. 9, 5257-5282.
- [10] H. Berestycki and L. Nirenberg, *Monotonicity, symmetry and antisymmetry of solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Geom. Phys., **5** (1988), 237-275.
- [11] H. Berestycki and L. Nirenberg, *Some qualitative properties of solutions of semilinear elliptic equations in cylindrical domains*, Analysis, et Cetera, 115-164, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1990.
- [12] H. Berestycki and L. Nirenberg, *On the method of moving planes and the sliding method*, Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.), **22** (1991), 1-37.
- [13] L. A. Caffarelli, *Interior $W^{2,p}$ estimates for solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation*, Ann. of Math., **131** (1990), no. 1, 135-150.
- [14] X. Chen, G. Bao and G. Li, *The sliding method for the nonlocal Monge-Ampère operator*, Nonlinear Analysis, **196** (2020), 111786.
- [15] L. A. Caffarelli and F. Charro, *On a fractional Monge-Ampère operator*, Ann. PDE., **1** (2015), 4.
- [16] D. Cao and W. Dai, *Classification of nonnegative solutions to a bi-harmonic equation with Hartree type nonlinearity*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh-A: Math., **149** (2019), 979-994.
- [17] W. Chen, W. Dai and G. Qin, *Liouville type theorems, a priori estimates and existence of solutions for critical order Hardy-Hénon equations in \mathbb{R}^N* , preprint, submitted for publication, arXiv: 1808.06609.

- [18] S.-Y. A. Chang and M. d. M. González, *Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry*, Adv. Math., **226** (2011), 1410-1432.
- [19] L. A. Caffarelli, B. Gidas and J. Spruck, *Asymptotic symmetry and local behavior of semilinear elliptic equations with critical Sobolev growth*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **42** (1989), 271-297.
- [20] T. Cheng, *Monotonicity and symmetry of solutions of fractional Laplacian equations*, Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst. - A, **37** (2017), 3587-3599.
- [21] T. Cheng, G. Huang and C. Li, *The maximum principles for fractional Laplacian equations and their applications*, Commun. Contemp. Math., **19** (2017), no. 6, 1750018, 12 pp.
- [22] W. Chen and C. Li, *Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations*, Duke Math. J., **63** (1991), no. 3, 615-622.
- [23] W. Chen and C. Li, *Maximum principles for the fractional p -Laplacian and symmetry of solutions*, Adv. Math., **335** (2018), 735-758.
- [24] W. Chen and Z. Liu, *Maximum principles and monotonicity of solutions for fractional p -equations in unbounded domains*, preprint, 2019, arXiv: 1905.06493.
- [25] W. Chen, C. Li and Y. Li, *A direct method of moving planes for the fractional Laplacian*, Adv. Math., **308** (2017), 404-437.
- [26] W. Chen, C. Li and B. Ou, *Classification of solutions for an integral equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **59** (2006), 330-343.
- [27] W. Chen, Y. Li and P. Ma, *The Fractional Laplacian*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., 2020, 344 pp, <https://doi.org/10.1142/10550>.
- [28] L. A. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. I. Monge-Ampère equation*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math., **37** (1984), no. 3, 369-402.
- [29] P. Constantin, *Euler equations, Navier-Stokes equations and turbulence*, in *Mathematical Foundation of Turbulent Viscous Flows*, Vol. 1871 of Lecture Notes in Math., 1-43, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [30] W. Chen and S. Qi, *Direct methods on fractional equations*, Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst. - A, **39** (2019), 1269-1310.
- [31] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian*, Comm. PDEs, **32** (2007), 1245-1260.
- [32] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *A nonlocal Monge-Ampère equation*, Commun. Anal. Geom., **24** (2016), no. 2, 307-335.
- [33] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations*, Commun. Pure and Appl. Math., **62** (2009), no. 5, 597-638.
- [34] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *The Evans-Krylov theorem for nonlocal fully nonlinear equations*, Ann. of Math., **174** (2011), no. 2, 1163-1187.
- [35] X. Cabré and J. Tan, *Positive solutions of nonlinear problems involving the square root of the Laplacian*, Adv. Math., **224** (2010), 2052-2093.
- [36] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Vasseur, *Drift diffusion equations with fractional diffusion and the quasi-geostrophic equation*, Ann. of Math., **171** (2010), no. 3, 1903-1930.
- [37] W. Chen and L. Wu, *The sliding methods for the fractional p -Laplacian*, Adv. Math., **361** (2020), 106933, 26 pp.
- [38] W. Chen and L. Wu, *Monotonicity of solutions for fractional equations with De Giorgi type nonlinearities*, preprint, 2019, arXiv: 1905.09999.
- [39] W. Chen and L. Wu, *A maximum principle on unbounded domains and a Liouville theorem for fractional p -harmonic functions*, preprint, 2019, arXiv:1905.09986.
- [40] S.-Y. A. Chang and P. C. Yang, *On uniqueness of solutions of n -th order differential equations in conformal geometry*, Math. Res. Lett., **4** (1997), 91-102.
- [41] G. De Philippis and A. Figalli, *$W^{2,1}$ regularity for solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation*, Invent. Math., **192** (2013), no. 1, 55-69.
- [42] W. Dai, Y. Fang and G. Qin, *Classification of positive solutions to fractional order Hartree equations via a direct method of moving planes*, J. Differential Equations, **265** (2018), 2044-2063.
- [43] W. Dai, Z. Liu and P. Wang, *Monotonicity and symmetry of positive solutions to fractional p -Laplacian equation*, Commun. Contemp. Math., **24** (2022), Paper No. 2150005, 17 pp, DOI: 10.1142/S021919972150005X.

- [44] W. Dai and G. Qin, *Classification of nonnegative classical solutions to third-order equations*, Adv. Math., **328** (2018), 822-857.
- [45] W. Dai and G. Qin, *Liouville theorems for poly-harmonic functions on \mathbb{R}_+^n* , Archiv der Mathematik, 2020, 11 pp, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00013-020-01464-1>.
- [46] W. Dai, G. Qin and D. Wu, *Direct methods for pseudo-relativistic Schrödinger operators*, J. Geom. Anal., **31** (2021), no. 6, 5555-5618.
- [47] S. Dipierro, N. Soave and E. Valdinoci, *On fractional elliptic equations in Lipschitz sets and epigraphs: regularity, monotonicity and rigidity results*, Math. Ann., **369** (2017), 1283-1326.
- [48] L. C. Evans, *Classical solutions of fully nonlinear, convex, second-order elliptic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **35** (1982), no. 3, 333-363.
- [49] M. J. Esteban and P.-L. Lions, *Existence and nonexistence results for semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh-A: Math., **93** (1982/1983), no. 1-2, 1-14.
- [50] M. M. Fall, *Entire s -harmonic functions are affine*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **144** (2016), 2587-2592.
- [51] R. L. Frank, E. Lenzmann and L. Silvestre, *Uniqueness of radial solutions for the fractional Laplacian*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **69** (2013), no. 9, 1671-1726.
- [52] P. Felmer and Y. Wang, *Radial symmetry of positive solutions to equations involving the fractional Laplacian*, Commun. Contemp. Math., **16**(2014), no. 1, 1350023, 24 pp.
- [53] P. Guan, *C^2 a priori estimates for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations*, Duke Math. J., **86** (1997), no. 2, 323-346.
- [54] B. Gidas, W. Ni and L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry and related properties via maximum principle*, Comm. Math. Phys., **68** (1979), 209-243.
- [55] P. Guan, N. Trudinger and X. Wang, *On the Dirichlet problem for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations*, Acta Math., **182** (1999), no. 1, 87-104.
- [56] H. Jian and X. Wang, *Existence of entire solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation*, Amer. J. Math., **136** (2014), no. 4, 1093-1106.
- [57] N. V. Krylov, *Controlled Diffusion Processes*, Applications of Mathematics, vol. 14, Springer, New York, 1980.
- [58] C. Li, *Monotonicity and symmetry of solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on bounded domains*, Comm. PDEs, **16** (1991), 491-526.
- [59] C. Li, *Monotonicity and symmetry of solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on unbounded domains*, Comm. PDEs, **16** (1991), 585-615.
- [60] C. Li, *Local asymptotic symmetry of singular solutions to nonlinear elliptic equations*, Invent. Math., **123** (1996), no. 2, 221-231.
- [61] C. S. Lin, *A classification of solutions of a conformally invariant fourth order equation in \mathbb{R}^n* , Comment. Math. Helv., **73** (1998), 206-231.
- [62] P.-L. Lions, *Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. II. Viscosity solutions and uniqueness*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **8** (1983), no. 11, 1229-1276.
- [63] Z. Liu and W. Dai, *A Liouville type theorem for poly-harmonic system with Dirichlet boundary conditions in a half space*, Advanced Nonlinear Studies, **15** (2015), 117-134.
- [64] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra, *Boundary regularity for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations*, Duke Math. J., **165** (2016), no. 11, 2079-2154.
- [65] J. Serrin, *A symmetry problem in potential theory*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **43** (1971), 304-318.
- [66] L. Silvestre, *Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **60** (2007), 67-112.
- [67] N. Trudinger and X. Wang, *Boundary regularity for the Monge-Ampère and affine maximal surface equations*, Ann. of Math., **167** (2008), no. 3, 993-1028.
- [68] J. Wei and X. Xu, *Classification of solutions of higher order conformally invariant equations*, Math. Ann., **313** (1999), no. 2, 207-228.
- [69] S.-T. Yau, *On the Ricci Curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation. I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **31** (1978), 339-411.
- [70] Z. Zhang and K. Wang, *Existence and non-existence of solutions for a class of Monge-Ampère equations*, J. Differential Equations, **246** (2009), 2849-2875.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY (BUAA), BEIJING 100083, P. R. CHINA
Email address: weidai@buaa.edu.cn

INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, AND UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100049, P. R. CHINA
Email address: qinguolin18@mailsucas.ac.cn