

AN OBSTACLE PROBLEM ARISING FROM AMERICAN OPTIONS PRICING: REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS

HENRIQUE BORRIN AND DIEGO MARCON

ABSTRACT. We analyse the obstacle problem for the nonlocal parabolic operator

$$\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - b \cdot \nabla u - \mathcal{I}u - ru,$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, and \mathcal{I} is a nonlocal lower order diffusion operator with respect to the fractional Laplace operator $(-\Delta)^s$. This model appears in the study of American options pricing when the stochastic process governing the stock price is assumed to be a purely jump process. We study the existence and the uniqueness of solutions to the obstacle problem, and we prove optimal regularity of solutions in space, and almost optimal regularity in time.

Keywords: Obstacle problem, fractional Laplacian, nonlocal operators, optimal regularity, free boundary problems.

AMS Subject Classifications (2020): 35K55, 35R11, 35R35, 35S10.

1. INTRODUCTION

Problems with nonlocal and fractional diffusion have been extensively studied in recent years. One of many motivations is the model of a discontinuous variation of stock prices, incorporated by Merton [12], into the celebrated Black-Scholes equation [7]. Recall that American options allow the holder to exercise option rights before the maturity date, in contrast to European options; see [7]. Let u be the rational price of an American option with payoff ψ . We may split the domain of u into $\{u > \psi\}$ and $\{u = \psi\}$, which are known as continuation and exercise regions, respectively. These names suggest that the first time we enter the exercise region, it is optimal to exercise the option; otherwise, that is, when we are in the continuation region, we should continue the evolution of u . This information is encapsulated in the following obstacle problem:

$$\begin{cases} \min \{ \partial_t u - \frac{1}{2} \sigma : D^2 u - b \cdot \nabla u - ru - \mathcal{K}u, u - \psi \} = 0; \\ u(0, \cdot) = \psi, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $r \in \mathbb{R}$ is known as the short rate, $b = (d_1 + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{11} - r, \dots, d_n + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{nn} - r) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with d being the continuously compounded dividend rate of the stock, σ is the volatility matrix of the stock, and

$$\mathcal{K}v(t, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[v(t, x + y) - v(t, x) - \sum_{i=1}^n (e^{y_i} - 1) x_i \partial_{x_i} v(t, x) \right] d\mu(y)$$

with μ being the associated jump measure.

If there is no jump term, that is, if $\mu \equiv 0$, the regularity of (1.1) is well-known; see, for instance, [10]. In this paper, we assume $\sigma \equiv 0$ so that all the regularity comes from the jump term. As in [3], we further assume that $d\mu(y)$ behaves as $|y|^{-n-2s} dy$ as leading order, so that

$$\mathcal{K}v(t, x) \approx -(-\Delta)^s v(t, x) + \mathcal{I}v(t, x),$$

where $(-\Delta)^s$ is the fractional Laplacian (with respect to x) defined by

$$-(-\Delta)^s f(x) := c_{n,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y) - f(x)}{|y - x|^{n+2s}} dy,$$

and \mathcal{I} is a non-local operator of lower order diffusion with respect to $(-\Delta)^s$. Under this assumption, the regularity of the solution of (1.1) depends on the parameter s :

- if $s < 1/2$, the gradient term is of greater order with respect to $(-\Delta)^s$, and we do not expect any regularity result for u ;
- the case $s = 1/2$ is critical in the sense that both the gradient and the fractional Laplacian have the same order, and the problem becomes very delicate;
- if $s > 1/2$, we expect the diffusion provided by the fractional Laplacian to dominate and u should be as regular as the solution of the obstacle problem for the fractional heat operator.

Our main goal is to show that the expected regularity in fact holds when $s > 1/2$. More precisely, we prove optimal regularity in space and almost optimal regularity in time for continuous viscosity solutions of

$$\begin{cases} \min\{\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - b \cdot \nabla u - \mathcal{I}u - ru, u - \psi\} = 0 & \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(0, x) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where

- (i) the obstacle $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is assumed to be a function of class $W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$;
- (ii) $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a constant vector;
- (iii) $r \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant¹;
- (iv) \mathcal{I} is a non-local, convex², translation-invariant, uniformly elliptic operator with respect to \mathcal{L}_0 . The latter means that for all $v, w \in C^{2\sigma+0^+}(x)$ which satisfy³

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|v(y)| + |w(y)|}{1 + |y|^{n+2\sigma}} dy < \infty,$$

we have that $\mathcal{I}v(x)$ and $\mathcal{I}w(x)$ are well defined and

$$M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^-(v - w)(x) \leq \mathcal{I}v(x) - \mathcal{I}w(x) \leq M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+(v - w)(x), \quad (1.3)$$

where \mathcal{L}_0 is the set of operators L such that

$$Lu(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta u(x, y) K(y) dy, \quad \frac{\lambda}{|y|^{n+2\sigma}} \leq K(y) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|y|^{n+2\sigma}}, \quad \text{and} \quad K(y) = K(-y). \quad (1.4)$$

The extremal operators $M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+$ and $M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^-$ are analogous to Pucci operators

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ u(x) &:= \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_0} Lu(x) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\Lambda(\delta u(x, y))^+ - \lambda(\delta u(x, y))^-}{|y|^{n+2\sigma}} dy, \\ M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^- u(x) &:= \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}_0} Lu(x) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\lambda(\delta u(x, y))^+ - \Lambda(\delta u(x, y))^-}{|y|^{n+2\sigma}} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta u(x, y) := u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x)$. For simplicity, we assume $\mathcal{I}(0) = 0$. We assume further that \mathcal{I} is a lower order diffusion operator when compared to the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^s$ in the sense that $s > \sigma > 0$. Notice that since $Lu \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ whenever $u \in C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$, we have $\mathcal{I}u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Quintessential examples of \mathcal{I} include linear operators as $-(-\Delta)^\sigma$ and L , as well as more sophisticated nonlinear examples studied in [5], such as

$$\mathcal{I}u = \sup_{\beta} L_{\beta} u, \quad \mathcal{I}u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{G(u(x+y) - u(x))}{|y|^{n+2\sigma}} dx,$$

¹Although the condition $r \geq 0$ might seem natural, see [3], our main result holds even for $r < 0$.

²The convexity of \mathcal{I} is only used in Lemma 2.8. Thus, if u is a semiconvex solution of (1.2) for a possibly nonconvex operator \mathcal{I} , the results of this paper still hold.

³We recall that ϕ is said to be $C^{2\sigma+0^+}$ punctually at x if there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M > 0$ such that $|\phi(x+y) - \phi(x)| \leq M|y|^{2\sigma+0^+}$ if $2\sigma+0^+ \leq 1$ and $|\phi(x+y) - \phi(x) - v \cdot y| \leq M|y|^{2\sigma-1+0^+}$ if $2\sigma+0^+ > 1$ for small y .

where K_β satisfy (1.4) uniformly with respect to β and G is a convex monotone Lipschitz function with $G(0) = 0$.

In light of [14, Section 2], we remark that since we need the well posedness of the inverse of the fractional Laplacian and we assume that $s > 1/2$, we consider throughout the paper that the dimension satisfies $n \geq 2$. The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that ψ , b , r , and \mathcal{I} satisfy conditions (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively. Then, there exists a unique (continuous) viscosity solution u of (1.2). Moreover, u is globally Lipschitz on $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, and we have*

$$\partial_t u \in C_{t,x}^{\frac{1-s}{2s}-0^+, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad (-\Delta)^s u \in C_{t,x}^{\frac{1-s}{2s}, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

We were unable to find the existence of solutions for the obstacle problem (1.2) in the literature and we present a proof in Section 2. Nevertheless, in the elliptic case, Petrosyan and Pop [13] prove existence and regularity results when $\mathcal{I} \equiv 0$, $b \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $r \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is negative bounded away from zero, and $\psi \in C^{3s}$.

Our regularity in time would be optimal if we did not have 0^+ in the Hölder exponent of $\partial_t u$. It is natural to expect that

$$\partial_t u \in C_{t,x}^{\frac{1-s}{2s}, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n);$$

however, this is unknown even for the fractional heat operator. In fact, the same type of regularity of solutions has been addressed by Caffarelli and Figalli [3] when $b \equiv 0$, $\mathcal{I} \equiv 0$, and $r \equiv 0$. In the setting of [3], the regularity of the free boundary for the obstacle problem has been investigated by Barrios, Figalli, and Ros-Oton [2], where they show the free boundary is of class $C^{1,\alpha}$ in space-time. Their techniques, however, heavily depend on the scale invariance of the operator, do not readily extend to the general problem (1.2), and can be the subject of a future work.

Acknowledgements. Henrique is partially supported by CAPES through a Master's scholarship. Diego is partially supported by CNPq-Brazil through grant 311354/2019-0.

2. COMPARISON RESULTS AND FIRST REGULARITY ESTIMATES

We first recall the general definition of a viscosity solution for a nonlocal problem $\mathcal{L}u = f$, where f is a bounded continuous function and $\mathcal{L}u = \partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - b \cdot \nabla u - \mathcal{I}u - ru$:

Definition 2.1. *An upper semicontinuous function u on $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subsolution of $\mathcal{L}u = f$ at (t_0, x_0) if for all functions $\phi \in C^{1,2}(\overline{B_R(t_0, x_0)})$ such that $0 = (u - \phi)(t_0, x_0) > (u - \phi)(t, x)$ for all $(t, x) \in B_R(t_0, x_0) \setminus \{(t_0, x_0)\}$ for some $R > 0$, the function*

$$v(t, x) := \begin{cases} \phi(t, x) & \text{in } B_R(t_0, x_0); \\ u(t, x) & \text{at } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(t_0, x_0) \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

satisfies $\mathcal{L}v(t_0, x_0) \leq f(t_0, x_0)$.

Analogously, a lower semicontinuous function u on $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is a supersolution of $\mathcal{L}u = f$ at (t_0, x_0) if for all functions $\varphi \in C^{1,2}(\overline{B_R(t_0, x_0)})$ such that $0 = (u - \varphi)(t_0, x_0) < (u - \varphi)(t, x)$ for all $(t, x) \in B_R(t_0, x_0) \setminus \{(t_0, x_0)\}$ for some $R > 0$, the function

$$v(t, x) := \begin{cases} \varphi(t, x) & \text{in } B_R(t_0, x_0); \\ u(t, x) & \text{at } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(t_0, x_0) \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

satisfies $\mathcal{L}v(t_0, x_0) \geq f(t_0, x_0)$.

A solution of $\mathcal{L}u = f$ is a continuous function that is both a subsolution and a supersolution for all $(t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Observe the definition of the auxiliary function v is necessary due to the nonlocal nature of the operators $(-\Delta)^s$ and \mathcal{I} .

We now give the notion of a continuous viscosity solution of the obstacle problem (1.2):

Definition 2.2. *An upper semicontinuous, bounded function u on $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subsolution of (1.2) if $\mathcal{L}u(t, x) \leq 0$ in the viscosity sense, for all $(t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $u(t, x) > \psi(x)$, and $u(0, \cdot) \leq \psi$.*

Analogously, a lower semicontinuous, bounded function u on $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is a supersolution of (1.2) if $u(t, \cdot) \geq \psi$ for all $t \in (0, T]$, $\mathcal{L}u(t, x) \geq 0$ in viscosity sense for all $(t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, and $u(0, \cdot) \geq \psi$.

A solution of (1.2) is a bounded continuous function that is both a subsolution and a supersolution.

We remark that the definitions of subsolution and supersolution are not symmetric. Moreover, we can relax Definition 2.2 by dropping the hypothesis $u(t, \cdot) \geq \psi$ (but assuming that a supersolution also has an empty semi-jet set, see [1, Definition 2] for the classical case).

Since the fractional Laplacian is the leading term, we now define a lower order operator \mathcal{R} as

$$\mathcal{R}u(t, x) := (\mathcal{I} + b \cdot \nabla + r)u(t, x) = \mathcal{I}u(t, x) + b \cdot \nabla u(t, x) + ru(t, x).$$

We now prove the existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions of equation (2.3) below (see Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2, and Lemma 2.3). We need these tools in order to prove existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions for a penalized equation, see (2.9). Although the techniques are fairly standard, we were unable to find these results elsewhere, and we present details here for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.1 (Uniqueness). *Assume ψ , b , r , and \mathcal{I} satisfy (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively, and let $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$. For continuous functions $f \in L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u \in L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n) \cap C_{t,x}^{1,2}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, which satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u &= f \quad \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n; \\ u(0, \cdot) &= \psi \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

we have

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right),$$

where $C = C(r, T)$. In particular, the solution is unique.

Proof. It suffices to prove the first claim for functions u for which

$$\left(\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - M_{\mathcal{Z}_0}^+ - b \cdot \nabla - r \right) u \leq f \leq \left(\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - M_{\mathcal{Z}_0}^- - b \cdot \nabla - r \right) u.$$

The result follows by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - M_{\mathcal{Z}_0}^- - b \cdot \nabla + \gamma - r \right) (\pm e^{-\gamma t} u + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}) &\geq \pm e^{-\gamma t} f + (\gamma - r) \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\geq e^{-\gamma t} (\pm f + e^{\gamma t} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma := r + 1$. Thus, by the minimum principle,

$$\pm e^{-\gamma t} u + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \geq - \max_{\{t=0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} (\pm e^{-\gamma t} u + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)})^- = - \max_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\pm \psi + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)})^-,$$

which gives

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq e^{\gamma T} (\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \max_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\pm \psi + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)})^-) \leq 2e^{\gamma T} (\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

Now, if u and v satisfy (2.3), then

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - b \cdot \nabla - r)(u - v) + \mathcal{I}v - \mathcal{I}u &= 0; \\ (u - v)(0, \cdot) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

By the ellipticity of \mathcal{I} (see (1.3)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^- - b \cdot \nabla + \gamma - r)e^{-\gamma t}(u - v) &\geq 0 \\ (\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ - b \cdot \nabla + \gamma - r)e^{-\gamma t}(u - v) &\leq 0 \\ (u - v)(0, \cdot) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By minimum and maximum principles, respectively, we conclude $u \equiv v$. \square

Next, we need a regularity result for the fractional heat equation. Namely, by [11, Theorems 2.3 and 3.1], if v satisfies

$$\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v = f$$

with $f \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\|\partial_t v\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T]; \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s v\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T]; \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(1 + \|f\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T]; \mathbb{R}^n)}\right). \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, since \mathcal{R} is a lower order operator with respect to $(-\Delta)^s$, we can perform an interpolation inequality. Recall that $\max\{1, 2\sigma\} < 2s$. Given a bounded function u , by classical Hölder interpolation inequalities (see, for instance, [9, Lemma 6.32] and/or [14, Propositions 2.1.8 and 2.1.9]), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}u\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \|u\|_{C^{\alpha+\max\{1, 2\sigma\}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \epsilon \|u\|_{C^{\alpha+2s}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq \epsilon \|(-\Delta)^s u\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}; \\ \|\mathcal{R}u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \|u\|_{C^{\max\{1, 2\sigma+0^+\}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \epsilon \|u\|_{C^{2s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We now prove a priori estimates for classical solutions of (2.3) (see [13, Lemma 2.6] for a proof in the elliptic case).

Lemma 2.2 (A priori Schauder estimates). *Assume ψ , b , r , and \mathcal{I} as in (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively. Then, there exists a constant $C(n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \sigma, T, r, b)$ such that for any $f \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha,\beta}$ and $u \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2}$ bounded functions which satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u &= f \quad \text{on } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(0, \cdot) &= \psi \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned}$$

we have the estimate

$$\|\partial_t u\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s u\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|f\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \right).$$

In particular, we have $u(t, \cdot) \in C^{2s+\beta}$.

Proof. We first notice that $v := u - \psi \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ - b \cdot \nabla - r)v &\leq \tilde{f} \leq (\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^- - b \cdot \nabla - r)v; \\ v(0, \cdot) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{f} := f - ((-\Delta)^s - \mathcal{R})\psi$. By (2.5), there exists a constant C such that

$$\|\partial_t v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C(1 + \|\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have $\|v\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}$ for a constant $C = C(T, r)$. Moreover, by interpolation inequalities, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\epsilon = C(\epsilon, n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \sigma, T, r, b)$ such that

$$(1 - \epsilon) \left(\|\partial_t v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \right) \leq C_\epsilon \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)},$$

hence the estimative follows by choosing $\epsilon = 1/2$. By the regularity of the fractional Laplacian, see [14], we have $u(t, \cdot) \in C^{2s+\beta}$. \square

We use the previous results to prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions of (2.3).

Lemma 2.3. *In the same setting as above, there exists a unique bounded solution $u \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ of (2.3) for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta \in (2 - 2s, 1)$, with the bound*

$$\|\partial_t u\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s u\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. Uniqueness and boundedness follow from Lemma 2.1. We first assume that $\psi \in C_c^\infty$ and $f \in C^\infty$, with compact support in space. We define the operator \mathcal{L}_0 as the fractional heat operator, that is, $\mathcal{L}_0 := \partial_t + (-\Delta)^s$. We claim that a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 u &= f \text{ on } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(0, \cdot) &= \psi, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

is smooth with compact support in space. Indeed, denoting $\mathcal{F}u$ the Fourier transform of u in space, we have

$$u(t, x) := \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(e^{-|\xi|^{2s} t} \mathcal{F}\psi \right) + \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\int_0^t e^{-|\xi|^{2s}(t-s)} \mathcal{F}f(s, \xi) ds \right).$$

By the regularity of ψ and f , we obtain $u \in C^\infty$, with compact support in space, concluding the claim. By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we obtain (2.6) for \mathcal{L}_0 .

Now, note that functions $f \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\psi \in C^2$ can be approximated by $\{f_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset C^\infty$, with compact support in space, and $\{\psi_k\}_{k \geq 0} \subset C_c^\infty$, respectively. More precisely, we have $f_k \rightarrow f$ and $\psi_k \rightarrow \psi$ pointwise, and the sequences are uniformly bounded. Define $u_k \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ (vanishing as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$) as a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 u_k &= f_k \text{ on } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u_k(0, \cdot) &= \psi_k. \end{aligned}$$

By the Arzelá-Ascoli Theorem, we obtain a subsequence $u_{k_j} \rightarrow u$ in $C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$; thus, u is a solution of (2.7). By assumptions (ii), (iii), and (iv), the operator $\mathcal{L} : C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta} \rightarrow C_{t,x}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is well defined. Now, we proceed by the continuity method: we write $\mathcal{L}_t = \mathcal{L}_0 - t\mathcal{R}$. By Lemma 2.1, \mathcal{L} is an injective operator. Since we have proven that \mathcal{L}_0 is a surjective operator, we conclude that \mathcal{L}_0 is a bijective operator, and the inverse \mathcal{L}_0^{-1} is well-defined. Hence,

$$\mathcal{L}_t u = f \iff u = \mathcal{L}_0^{-1}(f + t\mathcal{R}u) =: \mathcal{S}_0 u.$$

If we show that \mathcal{S}_0 is a contraction map, we have that \mathcal{L} is bijective and the claim will be proven. Indeed, by Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, for any $u, v \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ such that $(u - v)(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$, we conclude

$$\|\mathcal{S}_0 u - \mathcal{S}_0 v\|_{C^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq t C \|\mathcal{R}u - \mathcal{R}v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}$$

where C is a universal constant. Now, by the regularity of u and v , we have

$$t C \|\mathcal{R}u - \mathcal{R}v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq t C_0 \|u - v\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta+\max\{1, 2\sigma\}}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad (2.8)$$

where C_0 does not depend on t . Since $\max\{1, 2\sigma\} < 2s$, we obtain \mathcal{S}_0 is a contraction map for $t_0 < C_0^{-1}$. Hence, \mathcal{L}_{t_0} is bijective, and the lemma follows by iterating the same argument for the map $\mathcal{S}_{t_0} u := \mathcal{L}_{t_0}^{-1}(f + (t - t_0)\mathcal{R}u)$. \square

Once the Hölder regularity of solutions of (2.3) is established, we can prove the existence of solutions to the penalized equation

$$\begin{cases} u_t^\epsilon + (-\Delta)^s u^\epsilon - b \cdot \nabla u^\epsilon - \mathcal{I}u^\epsilon - ru^\epsilon = \beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) & \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n; \\ u^\epsilon(0, x) = \psi^\epsilon(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that ψ , b , r , and \mathcal{I} as in (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively. Then, there exists a solution $u^\epsilon \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ to the penalized problem (2.9), where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta \in (2 - 2s, 2)$.*

Proof. Let $\psi^\epsilon := \eta_\epsilon * \psi$, where η_ϵ is the standard mollifier and $\epsilon > 0$. We construct $u_k \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ iteratively as the unique solution to the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}u_k &= \beta_\epsilon(u_{k-1} - \psi^\epsilon) \quad \text{on } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u_k(0, \cdot) &= \psi^\epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where $u_0 \equiv 0$. Indeed, for $k = 1$, $u_1 \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ since $\beta_\epsilon(-\psi^\epsilon) \in C^\infty$. Assuming the regularity holds for u_{k-1} , $u_k \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ since $\beta_\epsilon(u_{k-1} - \psi^\epsilon) \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ (by the regularity of u_{k-1} and ψ^ϵ).

By (2.6) and the regularity above, we have for $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u_k\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s u_k\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ \leq C \left(\|\beta_\epsilon(u_{k-1} - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\psi^\epsilon\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

We now claim that, for $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_\epsilon(u_{k-1} - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C_\epsilon, \\ \|\beta_\epsilon(u_{k-1} - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C_\epsilon(1 + \|u_{k-1}\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where C_ϵ depends on ϵ (but does not depend on k). Indeed, for $k = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_\epsilon(u_0 - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq e^{\epsilon^{-1}} \|\psi^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\epsilon; \\ \|\beta_\epsilon(u_0 - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|\beta_\epsilon(u_0 - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \|\psi^\epsilon\|_{C^\beta(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose that (2.12) holds for $k \geq 2$. Then by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_\epsilon(u_k - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq e^{\epsilon^{-1}(\|\psi^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\beta_\epsilon(u_{k-1} - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)})} \leq C_\epsilon; \\ \|\beta_\epsilon(u_k - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|\beta_\epsilon(u_k - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \|u_k - \psi^\epsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C_\epsilon(1 + \|u_k\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the claim follows. Combining (2.11) and (2.12), we have

$$\|\partial_t u_k\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s u_k\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\epsilon(1 + \|u_{k-1}\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

We finally claim that

$$\|u_{k-1}\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\epsilon. \quad (2.13)$$

Once the claim is proved, we have a uniform (with respect to k) bound of

$$\|\partial_t u_k\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(-\Delta)^s u_k\|_{C^{\alpha,\beta}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

The claim follows by the regularity of the fractional heat equation with a bounded source term (see (A.1)):

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{k-1}\|_{C^{1-0^+}((0,T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|u_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty((0,T]; C^{2s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ \leq C \left(\|(\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s)u_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By interpolation inequalities (see, for instance, [9, Lemma 6.32]) and Lemma 2.1, we obtain, for a constant C depending on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \sigma, T, r, b, \|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, that

$$\|u_{k-1}\|_{C^{1-0+}((0,T];L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|u_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty((0,T];C^{2s-0+}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C(1 + \|\beta_\epsilon(u_{k-1} - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

Hence, by (2.12), we conclude our claim.

Now, by the uniform bound of $\{u_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ in $C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$, we have a convergent subsequence in compact subsets of $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ in $C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ to a function $u^\epsilon \in C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{L}u_k \rightarrow \mathcal{L}u_\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(u_k - \psi^\epsilon) \rightarrow \beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}u^\epsilon &= \beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) \quad \text{on } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u^\epsilon(0, \cdot) &= \psi^\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We now prove a uniform bound of $\beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)$ with respect to ϵ , which combined with Lemma 2.1, gives a uniform bound of u^ϵ .

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that $\psi, b, r,$ and \mathcal{I} as in (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively. Then, there exists a constant $C = C(n, s, \sigma, \lambda, \Lambda, T, \|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, b, r) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C \\ \|u^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Proof. We remark that we only need an upper bound, since $\beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) \geq 0$. We assume for $\gamma \geq 0$

$$\inf_{(0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} (e^{-\gamma t} u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) < 0,$$

for otherwise $u^\epsilon \geq e^{\gamma t} \psi^\epsilon \geq \psi^\epsilon$, hence $\beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) \leq 1$. Take φ a nonnegative smooth function that grows as $|x|^\sigma$ at infinity. Now, we claim that for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\min_{(0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left(e^{-\gamma t} u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon + \frac{\delta}{T-t} + \delta \varphi \right) < 0, \quad (2.15)$$

and the minimum is a interior point of $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Indeed, since u^ϵ is bounded⁴, we may take δ small enough so that we can consider $(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon)$ the minimizer of $e^{-\gamma t} u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon + \frac{\delta}{T-t} + \delta \varphi$. Now, since $\inf_{(0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} (e^{-\gamma t} u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) < 0$, we may assume (2.15) (taking δ smaller if necessary). To prove that the minimizer is at the interior, we remark that the function blows up as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and $t \rightarrow T^-$. Moreover, if the minimum were at $t = 0$, then

$$0 < \delta \left(\frac{1}{T} + \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi \right) = \inf_{(0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left(e^{-\gamma t} u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon + \frac{\delta}{T-t} + \delta \varphi \right) < 0.$$

Hence, the claim is proven. Thus,

$$\partial_t u^\epsilon(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) - \gamma u^\epsilon(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) + \frac{\delta e^{\gamma t_\delta^\epsilon}}{(T - t_\delta^\epsilon)^2} = 0, \quad \nabla u^\epsilon(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) - e^{\gamma t_\delta^\epsilon} \nabla \psi^\epsilon(x_\delta^\epsilon) + e^{\gamma t_\delta^\epsilon} \delta \nabla \varphi(x_\delta^\epsilon) = 0,$$

$$\text{and} \quad (-\Delta)^s u^\epsilon(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) - e^{\gamma t_\delta^\epsilon} (-\Delta)^s \psi^\epsilon(x_\delta^\epsilon) + \delta e^{\gamma t_\delta^\epsilon} (-\Delta)^s \varphi(x_\delta^\epsilon) \leq 0.$$

Furthermore, by (1.3), we have

$$-\mathcal{I}u^\epsilon(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) \leq -M_{\mathcal{Z}_0}^- u^\epsilon(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) \leq e^{\gamma t_\delta^\epsilon} (\delta M_{\mathcal{Z}_0}^+ \varphi(x_\delta^\epsilon) - M_{\mathcal{Z}_0}^- \psi^\epsilon(x_\delta^\epsilon)).$$

⁴By Lemma 2.1 and taking the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ at (2.12), we conclude $\|u^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_\epsilon$. However, we do not have a uniform bound with respect to ϵ .

Hence, choosing $\gamma := r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) &\leq e^{\gamma t_\delta^\epsilon} \left(-\frac{\delta}{(T - t_\delta^\epsilon)^2} - b \cdot \nabla \psi^\epsilon(x_\delta^\epsilon) + \delta b \cdot \nabla \varphi(x_\delta^\epsilon) + (-\Delta)^s \psi^\epsilon(x_\delta^\epsilon) \right. \\ &\quad - \delta (-\Delta)^s \varphi(x_\delta^\epsilon) + \delta M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ \varphi(x_\delta^\epsilon) - M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^- \psi^\epsilon(x_\delta^\epsilon) + (\gamma - r) \psi^\epsilon(x_\delta^\epsilon) \\ &\quad \left. - (\gamma - r) \frac{\delta}{(T - t_\delta^\epsilon)^2} - \delta (\gamma - r) \varphi(x_\delta^\epsilon) \right) \leq C + O(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where $C(n, s, \sigma, \lambda, \Lambda, T, b, r, \|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}) > 0$. Since

$$(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) \longrightarrow \inf_{(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} (u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and β_ϵ is decreasing, we obtain

$$\sup_{(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} \beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)(t_\delta^\epsilon, x_\delta^\epsilon) \leq C \|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

For the second inequality in (2.14), by Lemma 2.1 and the previous result, we conclude

$$\|u^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C(\|\beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}) \leq C\|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \quad \square$$

We finally prove that u^ϵ , a solution of (2.9), converges to u , a solution of (1.2).

Theorem 2.1 (Approximation by Penalization Method). *Assume that ψ , b , r , and \mathcal{I} as in (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively. Then, there exists a viscosity solution of (1.2) which is an approximation of a solution u^ϵ of (2.9), i.e., $u^\epsilon \rightarrow u$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, and $u \in C^{1-0^+}((0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty((0, T]; C^{2s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.*

Proof. We know by Lemma 2.4 that, for each $\epsilon > 0$, u^ϵ is a $C_{t,x}^{1+\alpha, 2s+\beta}$ function. By (A.1) and interpolation inequalities (see, for instance, [9, Lemma 6.32]), we have

$$\|u^\epsilon\|_{C^{1-0^+}((0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|u^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty((0, T]; C^{2s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C(\|\beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

By Lemma 2.5, we conclude that $u^\epsilon \rightarrow u$ in both $C_t^{1-0^+}; L_x^\infty$ and $L_t^\infty; C_x^{2s-0^+}$ norms as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, and $u \in C^{1-0^+}((0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty((0, T]; C^{2s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Moreover, $\psi^\epsilon \rightarrow \psi$ in C^2 norm. To show that in fact u is a viscosity solution of (1.2), let $\phi \in C_{t,x}^{1,2}$ such that $u - \phi$ has a strict local maximum at (t_0, x_0) . Choose $R > 0$ such that $0 = (u - \phi)(t_0, x_0) > (u - \phi)(t, x)$ for $(t, x) \in B_R(t_0, x_0) \setminus \{(t_0, x_0)\}$ and consider (t^ϵ, x^ϵ) the maximum of $u^\epsilon - \phi$ at $K := B_{R/2}(t_0, x_0)$. By the compactness of K , we have (up to a subsequence) $(t^\epsilon, x^\epsilon) \rightarrow (s, y)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. By the definition of (t^ϵ, x^ϵ) and its limit, we have

$$(u - \phi)(t_0, x_0) \leq (u - \phi)(s, y).$$

Since (t_0, x_0) is a strict local maximum, $(s, y) = (t_0, x_0)$. Now, since u^ϵ solves (2.9) classically and the definition of (t^ϵ, x^ϵ) , we have

$$(\partial_t v^\epsilon + (-\Delta)^s v^\epsilon - \mathcal{I}v^\epsilon - b \cdot \nabla v^\epsilon - r u^\epsilon)(t^\epsilon, x^\epsilon) \leq \beta_\epsilon(u^\epsilon - \psi^\epsilon)(t^\epsilon, x^\epsilon),$$

where v^ϵ as in (2.1), replacing u by u^ϵ . By the uniform bound (2.14), we have that $u(t, \cdot) \geq \psi$ for all $t \in (0, T]$. By letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ at the above inequality, we conclude

$$(\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v - \mathcal{I}v - b \cdot \nabla v - r v)(t_0, x_0) \leq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v(t_0, x_0) = \psi(x_0); \\ 0, & \text{if } v(t_0, x_0) > \psi(x_0). \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v - \mathcal{I}v - b \cdot \nabla v - r v)(t_0, x_0) \leq 0 & \text{if } u(t_0, x_0) > \psi(x_0); \\ u(0, x) = \psi(x) & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

Since (t_0, x_0) is arbitrary, we conclude that u is a viscosity subsolution. To show that u is also a viscosity supersolution, we remark that by the same ideas as above that for $0 = (u - \varphi)(t_0, x_0) < (u - \varphi)(t, x)$ for $(t, x) \in B_R(t_0, x_0) \setminus \{(t_0, x_0)\}$, we obtain that

$$(\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v - \mathcal{I}v - b \cdot \nabla v - rv)(t_0, x_0) \geq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v(t_0, x_0) = \psi(x_0); \\ 0, & \text{if } v(t_0, x_0) > \psi(x_0), \end{cases}$$

where v as in (2.2). Thus,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v - \mathcal{I}v - b \cdot \nabla v - rv(t_0, x_0) \geq 0; \\ u(0, \cdot) = \psi, \end{cases}$$

and it follows that u is a viscosity supersolution, and hence u is a viscosity solution of (1.2). \square

We now want to establish the uniqueness of solutions of (1.2). In order to do so, we introduce, in the parabolic case, the sup-convolution and inf-convolution and the Γ -convergence; see [5, Section 5] for the elliptic case.

Definition 2.3. *Given an upper semicontinuous function u , the sup-convolution approximation u^ϵ is given by*

$$u^\epsilon(t, x) = \sup_{(s, y) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ u(t + s, x + y) - \frac{|(s, y)|^2}{\epsilon} \right\}.$$

Analogously, if u is lower semicontinuous, its inf-convolution u_ϵ is given by

$$u_\epsilon(t, x) = \inf_{(s, y) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ u(t + s, x + y) + \frac{|(s, y)|^2}{\epsilon} \right\}.$$

Observe that u bounded implies u^ϵ and u_ϵ bounded.

Definition 2.4. *A sequence of lower semicontinuous functions u_k Γ -converges to u in $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ if the following two conditions hold:*

- For every sequence $(t_k, x_k) \rightarrow (t, x)$, $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k(t_k, x_k) \geq u(t, x)$.
- For every (t, x) , there exists a sequence $(t_k, x_k) \rightarrow (t, x)$ such that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k(t_k, x_k) = u(t, x)$.

In the next proposition, we show that we are allowed to change the set of test functions ϕ in the Definition 2.1 of a viscosity solution by the set of functions that touch from above (below) and that are punctually $C_{t,x}^{1;1,1}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let u be an upper semicontinuous function such that $\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in the viscosity sense. Let ϕ be a bounded function such that $\phi \in C_{t,x}^{1;1,1}$ punctually at (t, x) . Assume that ϕ touches u from above at (t, x) . Then $\mathcal{L}\phi(t, x)$ is defined in the classical sense and $\mathcal{L}\phi(t, x) \leq f(t, x)$.*

Proof. By the assumed regularity of ϕ , $\mathcal{L}\phi(t, x)$ is classically defined. Moreover, there exists a polynomial q , quadratic in space and linear in time, that touches ϕ from above at (t, x) . Let

$$v_r := \begin{cases} \phi & \text{in } B_r(t, x), \\ u & \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(t, x). \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in the viscosity sense, $\mathcal{L}v_r(t, x) \leq f(t, x)$, and $\mathcal{L}v_r(t, x)$ is well-defined. Let

$$u_r := \begin{cases} q & \text{in } B_r(t, x), \\ \phi & \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(t, x). \end{cases}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}\phi(t, x) &\leq \mathcal{L}u_r(t, x) + (M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ - (-\Delta)^s)(u_r - \phi)(t, x) \\
&\leq \mathcal{L}u_r(t, x) \\
&\leq \mathcal{L}v_r(t, x) + (M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ - (-\Delta)^s)(v_r - u_r)(t, x) \\
&\leq f(t, x) + \Lambda \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{(\delta(\phi - q)(x, y, t))^+}{|y|^{n+2\sigma}} dy + \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{(\delta(\phi - q)(x, y, t))}{|y|^{n+2s}} dy \\
&\leq f(t, x) + \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, since both integrands are bounded by $|y|^{2-2\sigma-n}$. The proposition follows. \square

Of course, an analogue of [Proposition 2.1](#) holds for supersolutions, and its proof is similar. Analogously to [[5](#), Propositions 5.4 and 5.5], in our setting we have the following:

Proposition 2.2. *If u is bounded and lower-semicontinuous in $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, then u_ϵ Γ -converges to u . Likewise, if u is bounded and upper-semicontinuous in $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, then $-u^\epsilon$ Γ -converges to $-u$. If u satisfies $\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in the viscosity sense, then $\mathcal{L}u^\epsilon \leq f + d_\epsilon$ in the viscosity sense; if v satisfies $\mathcal{L}v \geq f$ in the viscosity sense, then $\mathcal{L}v_\epsilon \geq f - d_\epsilon$ in the viscosity sense, where $d_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and depends on the modulus of continuity.*

Proof. The first claim is just a generalization $u^\epsilon \rightarrow u$ locally uniformly if u is continuous. For the second claim, suppose that the f has modulus of continuity ω . Let (t_0, x_0) be such that $u^\epsilon(t, x) - \phi(t, x) < u^\epsilon(t_0, x_0) - \phi(t_0, x_0) = 0$ for all $(t, x) \in B_R(t_0, x_0) \setminus \{(t_0, x_0)\}$, $\phi \in C_{t,x}^{1,2}$. Define

$$\eta(s, y) := \phi(s - s_0 + t_0, y - y_0 + x_0) + \frac{|(s_0 - t_0, y_0 - x_0)|^2}{\epsilon},$$

where (s_0, y_0) is such that

$$u^\epsilon(t_0, x_0) = u(s_0, y_0) - \frac{|(s_0 - t_0, y_0 - x_0)|^2}{\epsilon}.$$

Then, $u(s, y) - \eta(s, y) < u(s_0, y_0) - \eta(s_0, y_0) = 0$ for all $(s, y) \in B_R(s_0, y_0) \setminus \{(s_0, y_0)\}$, and so

$$\mathcal{L}v^\epsilon(t_0, x_0) = \mathcal{L}v(s_0, y_0) \leq f(s_0, y_0),$$

where v is as in [\(2.1\)](#), and v^ϵ as in [\(2.1\)](#), replacing u by u^ϵ . Since f has a modulus of continuity ω , we have $f(s_0, y_0) \leq f(t_0, x_0) + \omega(|(t_0 - s_0, x_0 - y_0)|)$. Noticing that $u^\epsilon \geq u$, one has

$$\frac{|(s_0 - t_0, y_0 - x_0)|^2}{\epsilon} \leq u(s_0, y_0) - u(t_0, x_0) \leq 2\|u\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)},$$

and we conclude

$$\mathcal{L}v^\epsilon(t_0, x_0) \leq f(t_0, x_0) + d_\epsilon,$$

where $d_\epsilon := \omega(2\|u\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}\epsilon^{1/2})$. The proof for supersolutions is analogous. \square

The next lemma is a straightforward adaptation of [[5](#), Lemma 5.8], since the main difficulty of the operator \mathcal{L} is the nonlocal part $(-\Delta)^s - \mathcal{I}$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let u and v be bounded functions such that u is upper-semicontinuous with $\mathcal{L}u \leq f$ in the viscosity sense, and v is lower-semicontinuous with $\mathcal{L}v \geq g$ in the viscosity sense. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}^+(u - v) := (\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s - b \cdot \nabla - r - M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+)(u - v) \leq f - g \text{ in the viscosity sense.}$$

Proof. By [Proposition 2.2](#) and the stability of viscosity solutions under Γ -limits (see [[5](#), Lemma 4.5]), it is enough to show that $\mathcal{L}^+(u^\epsilon - v_\epsilon) \leq f - g + 2d_\epsilon$ in the viscosity sense for every $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\phi \in C_{t,x}^{1,2}$ touching from above $u^\epsilon - v_\epsilon$ at (t, x) . Since u and v are bounded, then u^ϵ and v_ϵ are also bounded. Since $u^\epsilon - v_\epsilon$ is touched by above at (t, x) by a $C_{t,x}^{1,2}$ function, then both u^ϵ and $-v_\epsilon$

must be $C_{t,x}^{1,2}$ punctually at (t, x) . Moreover, by (2.1), we can evaluate $\mathcal{L}u^\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{L}v_\epsilon$ at (t, x) in the classical sense. Thus, by Proposition 2.2,

$$\mathcal{L}^+(u^\epsilon - v_\epsilon)(t, x) \leq \mathcal{L}u^\epsilon(t, x) - \mathcal{L}v_\epsilon(t, x) \leq f(t, x) - g(t, x) + 2d_\epsilon.$$

Hence, $\mathcal{L}^+\phi(t, x) \leq f(t, x) - g(t, x) + 2d_\epsilon$ since ϕ touches $v_\epsilon - u^\epsilon$ by above. Thus, $\mathcal{L}^+(u^\epsilon - v_\epsilon) \leq f - g + 2d_\epsilon$ in the viscosity sense. \square

We now prove a maximum principle for $\mathcal{L}^+u \leq f$. This is the key result for our comparison principle of Theorem 2.2 below.

Lemma 2.7. *Let u be a bounded upper-semicontinuous function defined in $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, in the viscosity sense, $\mathcal{L}^+u \leq f$ in an open set $\Omega \subset (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\Omega} u \leq C \left(\|f^+\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \sup_{\Omega^c} u \right).$$

Proof. For $t \in (0, T]$, set

$$\phi_M(t) := e^{\gamma t} (M + \epsilon + \|f^+\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}),$$

where $\gamma := r + 1$, and $\epsilon > 0$. Note that $\mathcal{L}^+\phi_M(t, x) = (\gamma - r)\phi_M(t) > \|f^+\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}$. Let M_0 be the smallest value of M for which $\phi_M \geq u$ in $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. We assume by contradiction that $M_0 > \sup_{\Omega^c} u$. Then, there exists $(t_0, x_0) \in \Omega$ such that $u(t_0, x_0) = \phi_{M_0}(t_0)$ (by the minimality of M_0), and so ϕ touches u from above at (t_0, x_0) . Since u is a viscosity subsolution at Ω , we would have $\mathcal{L}^+\phi_{M_0}(t_0, x_0) \leq f(t_0, x_0)$, a contradiction. Therefore, for $(t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, x) &\leq \phi_{M_0}(t) \leq e^{\gamma T} (M_0 + \epsilon + \|f^+\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}) \\ &\leq e^{\gamma T} \left(\sup_{\Omega^c} u + \epsilon + \|f^+\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we conclude the proof. \square

We now prove the comparison principle for (1.2):

Theorem 2.2 (Comparison Principle). *Let u, v be bounded viscosity subsolution and supersolution of (1.2), respectively. Then $u \leq v$ in $(0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. We first notice that $u(0, \cdot) \leq \psi \leq v(0, \cdot)$. For $t > 0$, if $u(t, x) \leq \psi(x)$, then $v(t, x) \geq \psi(x) \geq u(t, x)$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.6 we have $\mathcal{L}^+(u - v) \leq 0$ in the viscosity sense at $\{u > \psi\}$. By Lemma 2.7, we conclude $u \leq v$. \square

As a direct consequence (combined with Theorem 2.1), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1 (Existence, Uniqueness and Regularity). *There exists a unique bounded viscosity solution u of (1.2). Moreover, $u \in C_{t,x}^{1-0^+, 2s-0^+}$ and u is approximated by a solution of the penalized equation (2.9).*

Once the Comparison Principle is established, we are able to adapt preliminary regularity properties of solutions analogous to [3, Lemma 3.2]. We implicitly use that \mathcal{L} is translation invariant, since b and r are fixed and \mathcal{I} is assumed to be translation invariant; see assumption (iv).

Lemma 2.8. *Let u be a solution of (1.2). Then, for any fixed $t > 0$, $u(t, \cdot)$ is globally Lipschitz and uniformly semiconvex. Moreover, for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the function $t \mapsto u(t, x)$ non-decreasing.*

Proof. Fix $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and define $\tilde{u}(t, x) := u(t, x + v) + C|v|$. Hence, \tilde{u} solves

$$\begin{cases} \min\{\mathcal{L}\tilde{u} + rC|v|, \tilde{u} - \tilde{\psi}\} = 0 & \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \tilde{u}(0, x) = \tilde{\psi} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(x) := \psi(x + v) + C|v|$. Choosing $C := \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, if $u(t, x) = \psi(x)$, then $u(t, x) \leq \tilde{\psi}(x) \leq \tilde{u}(t, x)$. If $u(t, x) > \psi(x)$, then by [Lemma 2.7](#), we have $\mathcal{L}^+(u - \tilde{u})(t, x) \leq C|v|$, and by [Theorem 2.2](#), $(u - \tilde{u})(t, x) \leq Cre^{\gamma T}|v|$, hence $u(t, \cdot)$ is globally Lipschitz⁵.

Moreover, for any fixed $\eta \geq 0$, the function $\tilde{u}(t, x) := u(t + \eta, x)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \min\{\mathcal{L}\tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - \psi\} = 0 & \text{in } (-\eta, T - \eta] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \tilde{u}(0, x) = u(\eta, x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

We know $u(t, x) \geq \psi(x)$ so that, in particular, $u(\eta, x) \geq \psi(x)$; therefore, by [Theorem 2.2](#),

$$u(t + \eta, x) \geq u(t, x) \quad \text{for every } \eta, t \geq 0.$$

Finally, denoting $C := 2\|D^2\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, for a fixed $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\tilde{u}(t, x) := \frac{u(t, x + v) + u(t, x - v) + C|v|^2}{2} \geq \frac{\psi(x + v) + \psi(x - v) + C|v|^2}{2} \geq \psi(x).$$

If $u(t, x) = \psi(x)$, then u is semiconvex. Moreover, since \mathcal{I} is convex, \tilde{u} satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}\tilde{u}(t, x) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}u(t, x + v) + \mathcal{L}u(t, x - v) - rC|v|^2) \geq -\frac{rC}{2}|v|^2.$$

Hence, if $u(t, x) > \psi(x)$, then by [Lemma 2.7](#), $\mathcal{L}^+(u - \tilde{u})(t, x) \leq rC/2|v|^2$, and by [Theorem 2.2](#), $(u - \tilde{u})(t, x) \leq Cre^{\gamma T}/2|v|^2$. Since x, v are arbitrary, the C_0 -semiconvexity of $u(t, \cdot)$ follows, where $C_0 := \|D^2\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}(1 + re^{\gamma T})$. \square

Our next lemma deals with basic estimates of our parabolic operator, which gives a Lipschitz regularity in spacetime (see [Corollary 2.2](#)) and a comparison between $(-\Delta)^s u$ and $\mathcal{R}u$ at the contact set $\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$ and the open set $\{u(t, \cdot) > \psi\}$ (see [Lemma 2.9](#)).

As a direct consequence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.2. *If u solves (1.2), then u is Lipschitz in space-time with*

$$\|\partial_t u\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C(s, n, \lambda, \Lambda, r, b, T, \|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

Proof. The Lipschitz regularity in space is just a restatement of [Lemma 2.8](#). Now, since u solves (1.2), by [Corollary 2.1](#), u is the limit of solutions u^ϵ of (2.9). We denote by ∂_t^h the difference quotient with respect to the time variable. Hence, $w^\epsilon(t, x) := e^{-rt} \partial_t^h u^\epsilon(t, x)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w^\epsilon + (-\Delta)^s w^\epsilon - b \cdot \nabla w^\epsilon - M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ w^\epsilon + \epsilon^{-1} \beta_\epsilon(\xi) w^\epsilon \leq 0 & \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ |w^\epsilon(0, \cdot)| \leq |(b \cdot \nabla + \mathcal{I} + r - (-\Delta)^s) \psi^\epsilon| + \delta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

where $\xi \in L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ is nonnegative, and $|\partial_t^h u^\epsilon(0, \cdot) - \partial_t u^\epsilon(0, \cdot)| \leq \delta$ for h small for $\delta > 0$. Hence, by the maximum principle, we have

$$\|\partial_t^h u^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq e^{rT} (C\|\psi\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \delta).$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ and $h \rightarrow 0^+$, we conclude the proof. \square

⁵Notice that, by [Theorem 2.1](#), we already know $u(t, \cdot)$ is globally Lipschitz, but we have improved its Lipschitz constant with [Lemma 2.8](#).

We notice that, since $u \in C^{1-0^+}((0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^\infty((0, T]; C^{2s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ (see [Corollary 2.1](#)), we have

$$\mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)) \quad \text{with} \quad \gamma := s - \max\{\sigma, 1/2\}. \quad (2.16)$$

Here, we choose this exponent for simplicity, but the following general regularity holds:

$$\mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{2\gamma-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Lemma 2.9. *For a solution u of (1.2) and a fixed $t_0 > 0$, we have*

$$0 \leq (-\Delta)^s u(t_0, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t_0, \cdot) < +\infty \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \{u(t_0, \cdot) = \psi\}; \quad (2.17)$$

$$(-\Delta)^s u(t_0, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t_0, \cdot) \leq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \{u(t_0, \cdot) > \psi\}. \quad (2.18)$$

Proof. Combining [Corollary 2.2](#) and [Lemma 2.8](#), we have that $\partial_t u \geq 0$ a.e. Also, $\partial_t u = 0$ almost everywhere on the contact set $\{u = \psi\}$ so that

$$\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \{u > \psi\} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t u = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad \{u = \psi\}.$$

This can be rewritten as

$$\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u = ((-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u) \chi_{\{u=\psi\}}. \quad (2.19)$$

This can be understood not only in the almost everywhere sense, but also in the distributional sense; incidentally, the right hand side is well defined by [Lemma 2.5](#) and [Corollary 2.2](#) implies that $(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u$ is a bounded function.

Notice that (2.19) implies $\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u$ is globally bounded and vanishes in the open set $\{u > \psi\}$, so that we can infer u is smooth inside $\{u > \psi\}$. We are then allowed to write, for a fixed $t_0 > 0$,

$$(-\Delta)^s u(t_0, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t_0, \cdot) = -\partial_t u(t_0, \cdot) \leq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \{u(t_0, \cdot) > \psi\},$$

which is (2.18).

Next, since $\partial_t u = 0$ a.e. on the contact set $\{u = \psi\}$, we have (see [Lemma 2.5](#) and [Corollary 2.2](#)) that

$$0 \leq (-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u < \infty. \quad (2.20)$$

for almost every $(t, x) \in \{u = \psi\}$.

However, we need the same bound to hold for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for every $t_0 \in (0, T]$. Note that Lipschitz continuity of u , see [Corollary 2.2](#), implies that the map $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot) \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is uniformly continuous. In turn, by (2.17), this implies weak continuity of the map

$$t \mapsto (-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot) \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (2.21)$$

Now, consider $\epsilon > 0$, $A \subset \{u(t_0, \cdot) = \psi\}$ a bounded Borel set, multiply (2.20) by $\chi_{[t_0-\epsilon, t_0]} \chi_A$, and integrate to obtain

$$0 \leq \int_{[t_0-\epsilon, t_0] \times A} [(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u] \leq C |A| \epsilon,$$

because, by [Lemma 2.8](#), $\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$ is decreasing in time and thus so is $[t_0 - \epsilon, t_0] \times A \subset \{u = \psi\}$. Since the map in (2.21) is weakly continuous, we obtain as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$0 \leq \int_A [(-\Delta)^s u(t_0, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t_0, \cdot)] \leq C |A|,$$

for all bounded Borel set $A \subset \{u(t_0, \cdot) = \psi\}$. This concludes the proof. \square

3. HÖLDER-SPACE DECAY OF FRACTIONAL LAPLACIAN

For a fixed $t > 0$, we assume, without loss of generality, that $0 \in \partial\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$ and consider the L_a -harmonic function $v : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by⁶

$$v(x, y) := u(t, x, y) + \frac{\mathcal{R}u(t, 0)}{1-a}y^{1-a},$$

where $u(t, x, y)$ denotes the harmonic extension of $u(t, x)$ to the upper half space, that is,

$$\begin{cases} L_a u(t, x, y) := \operatorname{div}_{x,y} [y^a \nabla_{x,y} u(t, x, y)] = 0 & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } y > 0, \\ u(t, x, 0) = u(t, x). \end{cases}$$

See, for instance, Caffarelli-Silvestre [4] where the authors characterize the fractional Laplacian as⁷

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a u_y(t, x, y) = -(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) \quad \text{with } a = 1 - 2s. \quad (3.1)$$

By Lemma 2.8, we have

$$u(t, x+h, 0) + u(t, x-h, 0) - 2u(t, x, 0) \leq -2C_0|h|^2 \quad \text{for every } h \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

so that the maximum principle implies

$$u(t, x+h, y) + u(t, x-h, y) - 2u(t, x, y) \leq -2C_0|h|^2 \quad \text{for every } h \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } y > 0.$$

This means that $u(t, x, y)$ is C_0 -semiconvex with respect to x for all $y \geq 0$ and, in particular,

$$\partial_y (y^a u_y(t, x, y)) \leq nC_0 y^a.$$

Now, consider the function

$$\tilde{v}(x, y) := v(x, y) - \psi(x)$$

and set $\Lambda := \{\tilde{v}(x, 0) = 0\} = \{v(x, 0) = \psi(x)\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *The following properties hold.*

(a) *We have $\tilde{v} \geq 0$ in the set $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \Lambda \times \{0\}$;*

(b) *The function \tilde{v} is $2C_0$ -semiconvex with respect to x for all $y \geq 0$ and*

$$\partial_y (y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y)) \leq 2nC_0 y^a;$$

(c) *For a.e. $x \in \Lambda$,*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y) \leq C_1 |x|^\gamma$$

and, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y) \geq -C_1 |x|^\gamma;$$

(d) *For all $x \in \Lambda$,*

$$\tilde{v}(x, y) - \tilde{v}(x, 0) \leq \frac{nC_0}{1+a}y^2 + \frac{C|x|^\gamma}{1-a}y^{1-a};$$

Proof. The first item only restates that $u(t, x) \geq \psi(x)$. Next, (b) follows from the semiconvexity of v and ψ : we obtain that \tilde{v} is $2C_0$ -semiconvex with respect to x for all $y \geq 0$, which implies

$$\partial_y (y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y)) \leq 2nC_0 y^a.$$

In order to show (c), we first use (2.17) and (2.16) to conclude that, for a.e. $x \in \Lambda$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y) = -(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) + \mathcal{R}u(t, 0) \leq |\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(t, 0)| \leq C_1 |x|^\gamma.$$

⁶By $\mathcal{R}u(t, 0)$ we mean the evaluation of the function $\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)$ at the point $x = 0$.

⁷Actually, we have $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \partial_y u(t, x, y) = -c_{n,a}(-\Delta)^s u(t, x)$, and so we are taking the normalization constant as $c_{n,a} = 1$ for simplicity.

Then, we use (2.18) (and again (2.16)) to obtain that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y) = -(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) + \mathcal{R}u(t, 0) \geq \mathcal{R}u(t, 0) - \mathcal{R}u(t, x) \geq -C_1 |x|^\gamma.$$

Now we prove (d). For a.e. $x \in \Lambda$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}(x, y) - \tilde{v}(x, 0) &= \int_0^y \frac{s^a \tilde{v}_y(x, s)}{s^a} ds = \int_0^y \frac{1}{s^a} \left(\int_0^s \partial_y(\tau^a \tilde{v}_y(x, \tau)) d\tau + \lim_{z \rightarrow 0^+} z^a \tilde{v}_y(x, z) \right) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^y \frac{1}{s^a} \left(\frac{2nC_0 s^{a+1}}{a+1} + C|x|^\gamma \right) ds = \frac{nC_0}{1+a} y^2 + \frac{C|x|^\gamma}{1-a} y^{1-a}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality relies in (b) and (c) above. Moreover, by continuity, the estimate holds for every $x \in \Lambda$. \square

Now, let us analyze a first decay property of $y^a \tilde{v}_y$.

Proposition 3.1. *There exists $c > 0$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$ for which*

$$\inf_{\Gamma_{4^{-k}}} y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y) \geq -c\mu^k, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\Gamma_r := B_r \times [0, \eta r]$ and $\eta := \sqrt{\frac{1+a}{2n}}$.

Proof. The result follows by induction. To obtain the case $k = 0$, we note

$$\begin{aligned} L_{-a}(y^a \tilde{v}_y) &= \operatorname{div}_{x,y} (y^{-a} \nabla_{x,y} (y^a \tilde{v}_y)) = \operatorname{div}_{x,y} (y^{-a} \nabla_{x,y} (y^a u_y)) \\ &= \Delta_x (u_y) + \partial_y (y^{-a} \partial_y (y^a u_y)) = \partial_y (\Delta_x u + y^{-a} \partial_y (y^a u_y)) \\ &= \partial_y (y^{-a} L_a u(t, x, y)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y) = -(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) + \mathcal{R}u(t, 0)$$

is a bounded function, we obtain that $y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y)$ remains bounded, for $y > 0$, by the maximum principle. This is enough for the case $k = 0$.

Now, assume that (3.2) holds for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where c and μ are to be chosen later. Set

$$\tilde{V}(x, y) := \frac{4^{2sk}}{c\mu^k} \tilde{v} \left(\frac{x}{4^k}, \frac{y}{4^k} \right).$$

The induction hypothesis (recall $a = 1 - 2s$ and $v_y = \tilde{v}_y$) reads

$$\inf_{\Gamma_1} (y^a \tilde{V}_y) = \inf_{\Gamma_1} (y^a \bar{V}_y) = \frac{1}{c\mu^k} \inf_{\Gamma_1} \left[\frac{y^a}{4^{ka}} \tilde{v}_y \left(\frac{x}{4^k}, \frac{y}{4^k} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{c\mu^k} \inf_{\Gamma_{4^{-k}}} y^a \tilde{v}_y(x, y) \geq -1. \quad (3.3)$$

So, in this renormalized notation, it is enough to show that

$$\inf_{\Gamma_{1/4}} y^a \tilde{V}(x, y) > -\mu.$$

In order to do that, consider the auxiliary function

$$\bar{V}(x, y) := \frac{4^{2sk}}{c\mu^k} \bar{v} \left(\frac{x}{4^k}, \frac{y}{4^k} \right) \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{v}(x, y) := v(x, y) - \left(\psi(0) + \nabla \psi(0) \cdot x \right). \quad (3.4)$$

Both \bar{v} and \bar{V} are L_a -harmonic functions. Also, by using the C_0 -semiconvexity of v , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{V}(x, y) - \bar{V}(x, y)| &\leq \frac{4^{2sk}}{c\mu^k} \left| \tilde{v}\left(\frac{x}{4^k}, \frac{y}{4^k}\right) - \bar{v}\left(\frac{x}{4^k}, \frac{y}{4^k}\right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{4^{2sk}}{c\mu^k} |\psi(0) - \psi(4^{-k}x) + \nabla\psi(0) \cdot (4^{-k}x)| \\ &\leq \frac{C_0 4^{2(s-1)k}}{2c\mu^k} |x|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, [Lemma 3.1\(b\)](#) yields

$$\partial_y(y^a \tilde{V}_y) = \partial_y(y^a \bar{V}_y) \leq \frac{2nC_0}{c4^{2(1-s)k}\mu^k} y^a. \quad (3.6)$$

Furthermore, both \tilde{V} and \bar{V} are semiconvex in the set Γ_1 with constant $\frac{2C_0}{c4^{2(1-s)k}\mu^k}$.

Let us fix $L \gg C_0$ yet to be chosen. As can be checked below, we can assume this constant depends only n , a , and C_0 . Set

$$\bar{W}(x, y) := \bar{V}(x, y) + \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k}\mu^k(1-a)} y^{1-a} - \frac{L}{c4^{2(1-s)k}\mu^k} \left(|x|^2 - \frac{n}{1+a} y^2 \right).$$

We have the following properties:

- (i) By a straightforward computation, \bar{W} is an L_a -harmonic function.
- (ii) The semiconvexity of ψ implies that, for every $x \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{W}(x, 0) &= \frac{4^{2sk}}{K_1\mu^k} \left[v\left(\frac{x}{4^k}, 0\right) - \psi(0) - \nabla\psi(0) \cdot \frac{x}{4^k} - L \left| \frac{x}{4^k} \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{4^{2sk}}{K_1\mu^k} \left[v\left(\frac{x}{4^k}, 0\right) - \psi\left(\frac{x}{4^k}\right) - (L - C_0) \left| \frac{x}{4^k} \right|^2 \right] < 0. \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) By the continuity of v ,

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (0,0)} \bar{W}(x, y) = \frac{4^{2sk}}{c\mu^k} [v(0, 0) - \psi(0)] = 0.$$

- (iv) By [Lemma 3.1\(c\)](#), we have, for $|x| < B_{1/8} \setminus \Lambda$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{W}_y(x, y) > 0.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y^a \bar{W}_y &= y^a \bar{V}_y + \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k}\mu^k} + \frac{2nL}{c4^{2(1-s)k}\mu^k(1+a)} y^{1+a} \\ &= \frac{1}{c\mu^k} \left[\left(\frac{y}{4^k}\right)^a \tilde{v}_y\left(\frac{x}{4^k}, \frac{y}{4^k}\right) + \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{4^{\gamma k}} + \frac{2nL}{4^{2(1-s)k}(1+a)} y^{1+a} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $y \rightarrow 0^+$ and recall that C_1 is a Hölder constant for $\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)$ to infer that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{W}_y \geq \frac{1}{c4^{\gamma k}\mu^k} [-C_1|x|^\gamma + \|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}] > 0.$$

In particular, (iv) implies that for a fixed $x \in B_{1/8} \setminus \Lambda$, $\bar{W}(x, y) > \bar{W}(x, 0)$ for all $(x, y) \in (B_{1/8} \setminus \Lambda) \times (0, \delta)$, once $\delta > 0$ is small enough so that $\bar{W}_y(x, y) > 0$ for all $y \in [0, \delta)$.

These properties and Hopf's Lemma (see, for instance, [\[9, Theorem 3.5\]](#)) imply that the maximum of \bar{W} is non-negative and attained on $\partial\Gamma_{1/8} \setminus \{y = 0\}$. Hence, this maximum is achieved either at

a point on the top $\partial\Gamma_{1/8} \cap \{y = \eta/8\}$ of the cylinder or at a point on the side $\partial B_{1/8} \times (0, \eta/8)$. In what follows, we analyze each case separately.

If the maximum is attained on $\partial\Gamma_{1/8} \cap \{y = \eta/8\}$, there exists $x_0 \in B_{1/8}$ for which $\bar{W}(x_0, \eta/8) \geq 0$. Thus, we have

$$\bar{V}(x_0, \eta/8) + A \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} \geq -B \frac{L}{c4^{2(1-s)k} \mu^k},$$

where $A := \frac{\eta^{1-a}}{(1-a)8^{1-a}}$ and $B := \frac{n\eta^2}{64(a+1)}$. Since η depends only of n and a , so do the positive constants A and B . By the semiconvexity of \bar{V} , see (3.6), we can write

$$\bar{V}(x, \eta/8) \geq \bar{V}(x_0, \eta/8) + \langle \nabla_x \bar{V}(x_0, \eta/8), x - x_0 \rangle - \frac{2C_0}{c4^{2(1-s)k} \mu^k} |x - x_0|^2,$$

so that, in the half-ball

$$\text{HB}_{1/2}(x_0, \eta/8) := \{z \in B_{1/2}(x_0); \langle \nabla_x \bar{V}(x_0, \eta/8), z - x_0 \rangle \geq 0\},$$

there holds

$$\bar{V}(x, \eta/8) + A \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} \geq -\frac{BL + C_0}{c4^{2(1-s)k} \mu^k} \geq -\frac{2BL}{c4^{2(1-s)k} \mu^k}. \quad (3.7)$$

In the last inequality, we use the fact that L is chosen much larger than C_0 . Now, recall $\bar{V}_y = \tilde{V}_y$; hence, Lemma 3.1(c) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) &\leq \frac{C_1}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} |x|^\gamma \quad \text{if } \tilde{V}(x, 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) &\geq -\frac{C_1}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} |x|^\gamma \quad \text{if } \tilde{V}(x, 0) > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Integrate (3.6) with respect to y in the interval $[0, y]$, with $y < \eta/8$ to obtain

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) + \frac{2nC_0\eta^{a+1}}{c4^{2(1-s)k} \mu^k (a+1)8^{a+1}} \geq \frac{\eta^a \bar{V}_y(x, y)}{8^a}.$$

Integrating the inequality above with respect to y in the interval $[0, \eta/8]$ combined with (3.7) and (3.8) yield, for all $x \in \text{HB}_{1/2}(x_0, \eta/8)$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) + A \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} \geq -B' \frac{L}{c(4^{2(1-s)} \mu)^k}$$

where $A' = \frac{\eta^{a-1}A}{8^{a-1}}$ and $B' = \frac{2B\eta^{a-1}}{8^{a-1}} + \frac{2n\eta^{a+1}}{(a+1)8^{a+1}} + \frac{1}{4}$ are positives constants that depend only on a and n . This is again possible because of the choice $L \gg C_0$.

On the other hand, suppose the non-negative maximum of \bar{W} is attained on a point $(x_0, y_0) \in \partial B_{1/8} \times (0, \eta/8)$. The definition of η implies $0 \leq y_0^2 \leq \frac{1+a}{2n8^2} = \frac{1+a}{2n} |x_0|^2$. Thus, since $\bar{W}(x_0, y_0) \geq 0$,

$$\bar{V}(x_0, y_0) + D' \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} \geq \frac{L}{2^7 c4^{2(1-s)k} \mu^k},$$

where $D' = \frac{\eta^{2(1-a)}}{(1-a)8^{2(1-a)}}$. We can repeat the argument of the previous case to obtain that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) + D'' \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} \geq -B'' \frac{L}{c(4^{2(1-s)} \mu)^k},$$

for all $x \in \text{HB}_{1/2}(x_0, y_0)$, where $D'' = D' + \frac{\eta^{a-1}}{8^{a-1}}$, and $B'' = \frac{2B\eta^{a-1}}{8^{a-1}} + \frac{1}{4}$.

In any case, there exist $C > 0$, $D > 0$, $\bar{y} \in [0, \eta/8]$, and $\bar{x} \in B_{1/8}$ such that, for all $x \in \text{HB}_{1/2}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) \geq -D \frac{\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)}}{c4^{\gamma k} \mu^k} - \frac{C}{c4^{2(1-s)k} \mu^k}.$$

We observe the constants above depend only on n , a , and C_0 . The choices

$$\max\{4^{-\gamma}, 4^{-2+2s}\} \leq \mu < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad c > 2(C + D\|\mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^\gamma(B_1)})$$

then provides us with

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) > -\frac{1}{2}. \quad (3.9)$$

As in case $k = 1$, we have that $y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y)$ solves $L_{-a}(y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y)) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$. From this, we now show that (3.9) and (3.3) imply that there exists $\theta < 1$ such that, for every $x \in B_{1/4}$,

$$\left(\frac{\eta}{4}\right)^a \bar{V}_y(x, \eta/4) \geq -\theta. \quad (3.10)$$

Indeed, by the minimum principle, we have

$$\inf_{x \in B_{5/8}} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) \leq \inf_{(x, y) \in \Gamma_{5/8}} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{4}\right)^a \bar{V}_y(x, \eta/4) \quad (3.11)$$

for all $x \in B_{1/4}$. Then, (3.3) and Harnack's inequality yield

$$1 + \sup_{x \in B_{5/8}} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) \leq C \left(\inf_{x \in B_{5/8}} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) + 1 \right),$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on s and n . Since $\text{HB}_{1/2}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \subset B_{5/8}$, by (3.9), we have

$$\inf_{x \in B_{5/8}} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{C} \sup_{x \in \text{HB}_{1/2}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) - 1 + \frac{1}{C} \geq \frac{1}{2C} - 1 =: -\theta.$$

By the above and (3.11), we conclude (3.10).

Next, integrate (3.6) with respect to y in the interval $[y, \eta/4]$ to obtain

$$\left(\frac{\eta}{4}\right)^a \bar{V}_y(x, \eta/4) - y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) \leq \frac{2nC_0}{c4^{2(1-s)k}\mu^k(a+1)} \left[(\eta/4)^{a+1} - y^{a+1} \right] \leq \frac{\hat{C}}{c},$$

where $\hat{C} = \frac{2nC_0\eta^{a+1}}{(a+1)4^{a+1}}$ is a positive constant that depends only on n , a , and C_0 . We thus have

$$y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) \geq -\theta - \frac{\hat{C}}{c}.$$

First enlarge, if necessary, c so that $\theta + \hat{C}/K_1 < 1$; then, enlarge μ (if necessary) so that $\theta + \hat{C}/K_1 < \mu < 1$. Therefore,

$$y^a \tilde{V}_y(x, y) = y^a \bar{V}_y(x, y) > -\mu,$$

for every $x \in B_{1/4}$ and every $y \in [0, \eta/4]$, which is what we wanted. \square

Once Proposition 3.1 is established, we show in a standard manner (see, for instance, [3, Lemma 4.4]) how a bound from below of the form $\inf_{\Gamma_r} y^a \tilde{v}_y \geq -Cr^\alpha$ provides control of the L^∞ -norm of \tilde{v} in a smaller cylinder.

Lemma 3.2. *For $C > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $r \in (0, 1]$ such that $\inf_{\Gamma_r} y^a \tilde{v}_y \geq -Cr^\alpha$, there exists $M > 0$ for which*

$$\sup_{\Gamma_{r/8}} |\tilde{v}| \leq Mr^{\alpha+2s}.$$

Moreover, the constant M is independent of r and depends only on C, α, a , and C_0 .

Proof. We consider only the case where $r > 0$ is small, for \tilde{v} is globally bounded. By Lemma 3.1(a) and by our assumption, we have, for every $(x, y) \in \Gamma_r$,

$$\tilde{v}(x, y) \geq \tilde{v}(x, 0) - Cr^\alpha \int_0^y \tau^{-a} d\tau \geq -\frac{C\eta^{1-a}}{1-a} r^{\alpha+2s}.$$

This provides a lower bound on \tilde{v} .

Let us assume, by contradiction, that the upper bound does not hold, that is, for any $M > 0$, there exists $(x_0, y_0) \in \Gamma_{r/8}$ such that $\tilde{v}(x_0, y_0) \geq Mr^{\alpha+2s}$. Our assumption, by integration, yields

$$\tilde{v}(x_0, \eta r/2) \geq \tilde{v}(x_0, y_0) - \frac{C\eta^{2s}}{(1-a)2^{2s}} r^{\alpha+2s} + \frac{Cy_0^{2s}}{1-a} r^\alpha \geq \left(M - \frac{C\eta^{2s}}{(1-a)2^{2s}} \right) r^{\alpha+2s}.$$

In particular, for sufficiently large $M > 0$, namely $M \geq \frac{4C\eta^{2s}}{3(1-a)2^{2s}}$, we can write

$$\tilde{v}(x_0, \eta r/2) \geq \frac{M}{4} r^{\alpha+2s}.$$

Next, denote \bar{v} as in (3.4) and observe that the semiconvexity of ψ implies $|\bar{v} - \tilde{v}| \leq C_0 r^2$ in Γ_r . Then, the lower bound above gives

$$\bar{v}(x, y) + \frac{Cr^{\alpha+2s}}{1-a} + C_0 r^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } (x, y) \in \Gamma_r.$$

Now, $B_{\eta r/2}(x_0, \eta r/2) \subset \Gamma_r$ and $(0, \eta r/2) \in B_{\eta r/4}(x_0, \eta r/2)$, so that Harnack inequality, applied in $B_{\eta r/2}(x_0, \eta r/2)$, gives

$$\frac{M}{4} r^{\alpha+2s} \leq \sup_{B_{\eta r/4}} \left[\bar{v} + \frac{Cr^{\alpha+2s}}{1-a} + C_0 r^2 \right] \leq c \left(\bar{v}(0, \eta r/2) + \frac{Cr^{\alpha+2s}}{1-a} + C_0 r^2 \right).$$

Hence, there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{v}(0, \eta r/2) + C_0 r^2 \geq \bar{v}(0, \eta r/2) \geq c_0 M r^{\alpha+2s} - \frac{Cr^{\alpha+2s}}{1-a} - C_0 r^2.$$

Recall $0 \in \Lambda$; then, by Lemma 3.1(d),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \tilde{v}(0, 0) &\geq \tilde{v}(0, \eta r/2) - \frac{nC_0\eta^2}{4(1+a)} r^2 \\ &\geq c_0 M r^{\alpha+2s} - \frac{Cr^{\alpha+2s}}{1-a} - \frac{nC_0\eta^2}{4(1+a)} r^2 - 2C_0 r^2. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have a bound for M :

$$M \leq \frac{1}{c_0 r^{\alpha+2s}} \left(\frac{Cr^{\alpha+2s}}{1-a} + \frac{nC_0\eta^2}{4(1+a)} r^2 + 2C_0 r^2 \right).$$

This is in contradiction to our assumption because the constant $M > 0$ should be arbitrary. \square

We are now in a position to prove a first regularity estimate at a free boundary point.

Theorem 3.1. *Let u be a solution of (1.2), and ψ , b , r , and \mathcal{I} as in (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively. Then, there exist $\bar{C} > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, \gamma)$ such that, for every $r \in (0, 1)$ and every $x_0 \in \partial\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$,*

$$\sup_{B_r(x_0)} |u(t, \cdot) - \psi| \leq \bar{C} r^{\alpha+2s} \quad \text{and} \quad (3.12)$$

$$\sup_{B_r(x_0)} \left| [(-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)] \chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}} \right| \leq \bar{C} r^\alpha. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. The estimate in (3.12) is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.2. In order to prove (3.13), we assume, as before, $x_0 = 0$. Recall that, by the definition of \tilde{v} ,

$$(-\Delta)^s u(t, x') - \mathcal{R}u(t, 0) = - \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha \tilde{v}_y(x', y) = - \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha v_y(x', y)$$

and so

$$(-\Delta)^s u(t, x') - \mathcal{R}u(t, x') = - \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha v_y(x', y) + \mathcal{R}u(t, 0) - \mathcal{R}u(t, x').$$

By (2.17) and (2.16) we have that

$$\sup_{B_r} \left| [(-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)] \chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}} \right| \leq -\inf_{B_r} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha v_y(\cdot, y) + C_1 r^\gamma.$$

Now, if $1/4 < r < 1$, then by Proposition 3.1 for $k = 0$ we have that

$$-\inf_{B_r} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha v_y(x', y) \leq c \leq 4cr;$$

on the other hand, if $r \leq 1/4$, by taking β such that $\beta \leq \log_4 \mu^{-1}$ combined with Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$-\inf_{B_r} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha v_y(x', y) \leq -\inf_{B_{1/4}} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha v_y(x', y) \leq c\mu \leq c\mu^k \leq c4^{-k\beta}.$$

Hence, choosing k large enough so that $4^{-k} < r$ gives (3.13) for $\alpha = \min\{\beta, \gamma\}$. \square

Corollary 3.1. *In the same setting of Theorem 3.1, there exist $\bar{C}' > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, \gamma)$ such that*

$$\left\| [(-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)] \chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \bar{C}',$$

that is,

$$[(-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)] \chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}} \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof. Let α obtained in Theorem 3.1. Over the set $\Lambda = \{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$, recall that the function $(-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot)$ is bounded, by (2.17). It is then enough to show that, for $|x_1 - x_2| \leq 1/4$ with $x_1, x_2 \in \Lambda$,

$$\left| (-\Delta)^s u(t, x_1) - (-\Delta)^s u(t, x_2) - \mathcal{R}u(t, x_1) + \mathcal{R}u(t, x_2) \right| \leq C|x_1 - x_2|^\alpha.$$

Given $x \in \Lambda$, let $d(x, \partial\Lambda)$ denote the distance from x to $\partial\Lambda$. We then analyze two possible situations.

- Suppose first that

$$|x_1 - x_2| \leq \frac{1}{4} \max \{d(x_1, \partial\Lambda), d(x_2, \partial\Lambda)\}.$$

By Theorem 3.1, we have, for any $r \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{B_r(x_i)} |u(t, \cdot) - \psi| \leq \bar{C}r^{\alpha+2s}.$$

In particular, $u(t, \cdot) = \psi$ in the set $S := B_{4|x_1 - x_2|}(x_1) \cap B_{4|x_1 - x_2|}(x_2)$. Also, we trivially have

$$|u(t, \cdot) - \psi| \leq M := \|u(t, \cdot) - \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

outside the set $B_1(x_1) \supset B_{1/2}(x_2)$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} & |(-\Delta)^s f(x_1) - (-\Delta)^s f(x_2) - \mathcal{R}f(x_1) + \mathcal{R}f(x_2)| \leq C_1|x_1 - x_2|^\gamma \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S} |f(x')| \left| \frac{1}{|x' - x_1|^{n+2s}} - \frac{1}{|x' - x_2|^{n+2s}} \right| dx' \\ & \leq C_1|x_1 - x_2|^\gamma + C \left[\bar{C} \int_{|x_1 - x_2|}^1 \tau^{\alpha'-2} d\tau + M \right] |x_1 - x_2| \leq C|x_1 - x_2|^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where $f := u(t, \cdot) - \psi$. Because $\|(-\Delta)^s \psi\|_{C_x^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is bounded, this gives the result.

- If, on the other hand,

$$|x_1 - x_2| \geq \frac{1}{4} \max \{d(x_1, \partial\Lambda), d(x_2, \partial\Lambda)\},$$

we take $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2 \in \partial\Lambda$ for which $|x_1 - \bar{x}_1| = d(x_1, \partial\Lambda)$ and $|x_2 - \bar{x}_2| = d(x_2, \partial\Lambda)$. Therefore, by [Theorem 3.1](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |(-\Delta)^s f(x_1) - (-\Delta)^s f(x_2) - \mathcal{R}f(x_1) + \mathcal{R}f(x_2)| \leq C_1 |x_1 - x_2|^\gamma \\ & + \sup_{B_{4|x_1-x_2|}(\bar{x}_1)} |(-\Delta)^s f| + \sup_{B_{4|x_1-x_2|}(\bar{x}_2)} |(-\Delta)^s f| \leq \bar{C}' |x_1 - x_2|^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

□

4. MONOTONICITY FORMULA AND OPTIMAL REGULARITY IN SPACE

We recall a regularity property provided by the fractional heat operator (see, for instance, [\[3, Appendix A\]](#)); namely, if v satisfies

$$\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v = f$$

with $f \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^\beta(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\|\partial_t v\|_{L^\infty((0, T]; C^{\beta-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|(-\Delta)^s v\|_{L^\infty((0, T]; C^{\beta-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C \left(1 + \|f\|_{L^\infty((0, T]; C^\beta(\mathbb{R}^n))}\right). \quad (4.1)$$

Incidentally, we have shown in [Corollary 3.1](#) and [\(2.16\)](#) that

$$\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u = [(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u] \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} + \mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n))$$

so that [\(4.1\)](#) holds for our solution u . Hence, $(-\Delta)^s u \in C^{\alpha-0^+}$, and since u is bounded [Lemma 2.5](#), by [\[14, Proposition 2.1.8\]](#), we have

$$u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{2s+\alpha-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Moreover, the lower order term has the regularity

$$\mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{\alpha+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^n)). \quad (4.2)$$

Next, we consider $0 \in \partial\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$. Moreover, let $w : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function which solves, with fixed $t > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} L_{-a} w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ w(x, 0) = [(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(t, 0)] \chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}}(x) & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

By the boundedness obtained in [Lemma 2.9](#), the maximum principle for w , and the regularity $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of $w(x, 0)$ (given by [Corollary 3.1](#)), we have

$$\sup_{|x|^2 + y^2 \leq r^2} w(x, y) \leq Cr^\alpha,$$

for a uniform constant $C > 0$. Our goal is to obtain the estimative above with $1 - s$ replacing α . In particular, without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha < 1 - s$.

We begin with the following lemma, which is the analogue of [\[3, Lemma 4.5\]](#).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\bar{C} > 0$ and α be as in [Theorem 3.1](#) and set*

$$\delta = \delta(\alpha, s) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2s} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \right).$$

Then, there exists $r_0 > 0$, depending on α, s, \bar{C} , and C_0 , such that $\text{co}(\Omega \cap B_r)$ does not contain the origin for any $r \in (0, r_0)$, where

$$\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; w(x, 0) \geq r^{\alpha+\delta}\}$$

and $\text{co } A$ stands for the convex hull of the set A .

Proof. Let $x \in \Omega$ and assume, by contradiction, that $0 \in \text{co}(\Omega \cap B_r)$. By the definition of w , we must have $u(t, x) = \psi(x)$, or equivalently, $\tilde{v}(x, 0) = 0$. Note that, for $x \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^\alpha \tilde{v}_y(x, y) = -(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) + \mathcal{R}u(t, 0) = -w(x, 0) \leq -r^{\alpha+\delta}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.1(b),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}(x, y) &= \int_0^y \tilde{v}_y(x, \tau) d\tau = \int_0^y \frac{1}{\tau^a} \left(\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \rho^a \tilde{v}_y(x, \rho) + \int_0^\tau \rho^a \tilde{v}_y(x, \rho) d\rho \right) d\tau \\ &\leq -\frac{r^{\alpha+\delta} y^{2s}}{2s} + \int_0^y \frac{2nC_0}{\tau^a} \int_0^\tau \rho^a d\rho d\tau \\ &= -\frac{r^{\alpha+\delta} y^{2s}}{2s} + \frac{2nC_0}{1+a} \int_0^y \tau d\tau \\ &= -\frac{r^{\alpha+\delta} y^{2s}}{2s} + \frac{nC_0 y^2}{1+a}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Theorem 3.1, we know $\tilde{v}(0, y) \geq -\bar{C}y^{\alpha+2s}$. Also, by the semiconvexity of \tilde{v} , given by Lemma 3.1(b), we have

$$\tilde{v}(0, y) + \nabla_x \tilde{v}(0, y) \cdot x \leq \tilde{v}(x, y) + C_0 r^2.$$

Thus, since $0 \in \text{co}(\Omega \cap B_r)$,

$$\sup_{x \in \text{co}(\Omega \cap B_r)} \nabla_x \tilde{v}(0, y) \cdot x \geq -|\nabla_x \tilde{v}(0, y)| \inf_{x \in \text{co}(\Omega \cap B_r)} |x| = 0$$

and we have

$$\tilde{v}(0, y) \leq \sup_{x \in \text{co}(\Omega \cap B_r)} \tilde{v}(x, y) + C_0 r^2.$$

Putting all these together, we have, for any $r, y \in (0, 1)$,

$$\bar{C}y^{\alpha+2s} + \frac{nC_0}{1+a} y^2 + C_0 r^2 \geq \frac{r^{\alpha+\delta} y^{2s}}{2s}. \quad (4.4)$$

In order to get a contradiction, we relate y and r by the formula $y^\alpha = r^{\alpha+2\delta}$, so that (4.4) implies

$$\bar{C}r^\delta + \frac{nC_0}{1+a} r^{4\delta\alpha-1+\delta+\gamma} + C_0 r^{\delta+\gamma} \geq \frac{1}{2s},$$

where $\gamma := 2 - \alpha^{-1}(\alpha + 2s)(\alpha + 2\delta)$ which is positive by the definition of δ . Now, the left hand side goes to zero as $r \rightarrow 0$ and we have a contradiction for small values of r . \square

We remark that $\delta < \gamma$, since $2s > 1$ and $\alpha < \gamma$. The next two technical lemmas are key ingredients to prove the monotonicity formula of Lemma 4.4.

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $C > 0$ such that, for every $r \geq 0$,*

$$\limsup_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r} \frac{y^{-a} \partial_y (w(x, y)^2)}{(|x|^2 + y^2)^{(n-1-a)/2}} dx \geq -Cr^{\alpha+1+a}.$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r} \partial_y \left((|x|^2 + y^2)^{-(n-1-a)/2} \right) y^{-a} w(x, y)^2 dx = 0.$$

Proof. To show the first estimate, we begin by noticing the following properties:

- (i) From Lemma 2.9, we have $w(x, 0) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$ and $w(x, 0) \geq 0$ for $x \in \Lambda$. Hence, by the maximum principle $w(x, y) \geq 0$, that is, $w(x, y) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$ and $y > 0$.

(ii) From Lemma 3.1, we have

$$y^a v_y(x, y) \leq \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \tau^a v_y(x, \tau) + \frac{nC_0}{1+a} y^{1+a},$$

with the limit well-defined since $(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) + \mathcal{R}u(t, 0)$ is Hölder continuous on Λ and smooth outside (by Lemma 2.9).

(iii) The function $y^a v_y$ is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} L_{-a}(y^a v_y) = 0; \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a v_y(x, y) = -(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) + \mathcal{R}u(t, 0). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, from Lemma 2.9, we have that $w(x, 0) \geq (-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(t, 0)$ and then, by the maximum principle, $w(x, y) \geq -y^a v_y(x, y)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$. Since

$$w(x, 0) = - \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^a v_y(x, y) \text{ in } \Lambda,$$

the previous item implies that, for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $y > 0$,

$$w(x, y) \geq w(x, 0) - \frac{nC_0}{1+a} y^{1+a}. \quad (4.5)$$

From (i) and (iii), we have that (4.5) actually holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y > 0$. Furthermore, since w is non-negative and C_x^α , we conclude

$$w(x, y)^2 - w(x, 0)^2 \geq -\frac{nC_0}{1+a} y^{1+a} [w(x, y) + w(x, 0)] \geq -Ky^{1+a}(r+y)^\alpha,$$

for all $x \in B_r$, $y > 0$, and a uniform constant $K > 0$.

We now use the change of variable $\tau(y) := \left(\frac{y}{1+a}\right)^{1+a}$ and define $\tilde{w}(x, \tau) := w(x, y)$. Then, the above inequality can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{w}(x, y)^2 - \tilde{w}(x, 0)^2 \geq -K'\tau(r + \tau^{1/(1+a)})^\alpha, \quad (4.6)$$

for all $x \in B_r$, $y > 0$, and a uniform constant $K' > 0$. Using that $y^{-a} \partial_y (w(x, y)^2) = \partial_\tau (\tilde{w}(x, \tau)^2)$, we have that

$$\limsup_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r} \frac{y^{-a} \partial_y (w(x, y)^2)}{(|x|^2 + y^2)^{(n-1-a)/2}} dx = \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r} \frac{\partial_\tau (\tilde{w}(x, \tau)^2)}{(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2 \tau^{2/(1+a)})^{(n-1-a)/2}} dx.$$

To estimate the right hand side above, we consider the average with respect to $\tau \in [0, \epsilon]$ and we use Fubini's Theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_\epsilon &:= \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_0^\epsilon \int_{B_r} \frac{\partial_\tau (\tilde{w}(x, \tau)^2)}{(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2 \tau^{2/(1+a)})^{(n-1-a)/2}} dx d\tau \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{B_r} \left(\frac{\tilde{w}(x, \epsilon)^2}{(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2 \epsilon^{2/(1+a)})^{(n-1-a)/2}} - \frac{\tilde{w}(x, 0)^2}{|x|^{n-1-a}} \right) dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_0^\epsilon \int_{B_r} \tilde{w}(x, \tau)^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} \left(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2 \tau^{2/(1+a)} \right)^{-(n-1-a)/2} dx d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \left(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2 \tau^{2/(1+a)} \right)^{-(n-1-a)/2} \leq 0.$$

Hence, by (4.6) and the fact that $w(\cdot, 0) = \tilde{w}(\cdot, 0) \in C_x^\alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\epsilon &\geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{B_r} \left(\frac{\tilde{w}(x, 0)^2 - K'\epsilon(r + \epsilon^{1/(1+a)})^\alpha}{(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2\epsilon^{2/(1+a)})^{(n-1-a)/2}} - \frac{\tilde{w}(x, 0)^2}{|x|^{n-1-a}} \right) dx \\ &\geq \int_{B_r} \frac{-K'(r + \epsilon^{1/(1+a)})^\alpha}{|x|^{n-1-a}} dx + \frac{C}{\epsilon} \int_{B_r} \left[\frac{|x|^{2\alpha}}{(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2\epsilon^{2/(1+a)})^{(n-1-a)/2}} - \frac{|x|^{2\alpha}}{|x|^{n-1-a}} \right] dx \\ &=: I_{1\epsilon} + I_{2\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_{1\epsilon} = -\frac{K'n\omega_n}{a+1} r^{\alpha+1+a} = -K'C_{n,a}r^{\alpha+1+a}.$$

For the second term $I_{2\epsilon}$, we split the integral over B_{ϵ^β} and over $B_r \setminus B_{\epsilon^\beta}$, denoting these by $I_{2\epsilon}^1$ and $I_{2\epsilon}^2$, respectively, and the exponent $\beta > 0$ is yet to be chosen. On the one hand, to estimate $I_{2\epsilon}^1$, we choose $\beta \in (\frac{1}{2\alpha+a+1}, \frac{1}{a+1})$, and we have that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_{2\epsilon}^1 \geq -\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{C}{\epsilon} \int_{B_{\epsilon^\beta}} \frac{|x|^{2\alpha}}{|x|^{n-1-a}} dx = -\frac{Cn\omega_n}{2\alpha+a+1} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon^{\beta(2\alpha+a+1)-1} = 0.$$

On the other hand, for all $|x| \geq \epsilon^\beta$, we have $\epsilon^{2/(1+a)} \leq |x|^2$, so that

$$\left(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2\epsilon^{2/(1+a)} \right)^{(n-1-a)/2} \leq C \left(|x|^{n-1-a} + C\epsilon^{2/(1+a)}|x|^{n-3-a} \right)$$

and the term $I_{2\epsilon}^2$ can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2\epsilon}^2 &\geq \frac{C}{\epsilon} \int_{\epsilon^\beta}^r \left[\frac{\rho^{n-1+2\alpha}}{\rho^{n-1-a} + C\epsilon^{2/(1+a)}\rho^{n-3-a}} - \frac{\rho^{n-1+2\alpha}}{\rho^{n-1-a}} \right] d\rho \\ &= -\frac{C}{\epsilon} \int_{\epsilon^\beta}^r \rho^{2\alpha+a} \frac{\epsilon^{2/(1+a)}}{\rho^2 + C\epsilon^{2/(1+a)}} d\rho \\ &\geq -\frac{C\epsilon^{2/(1+a)}}{\epsilon} \int_{\epsilon^\beta}^r \rho^{2\alpha+a-2} d\rho \\ &\geq -C_r\epsilon^{2/(1+a)-1} \left[1 + \epsilon^{\beta(2\alpha+a-1)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $2 > 1+a$, and so we only need to consider the case $2\alpha+a-1 < 0$, since otherwise we clearly have $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_{2\epsilon}^2 \geq 0$. Moreover, since $\beta < 1/(1+a)$, we have

$$\frac{2}{1+a} - 1 + \beta(2\alpha+a-1) \geq \frac{2\alpha}{1+a} > 0,$$

which also gives $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_{2\epsilon}^2 \geq 0$, so that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_{2\epsilon} \geq 0$. Hence, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_\epsilon \geq -K'C_{n,a}r^{\alpha+1+a}.$$

From this, we deduce

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_r} \frac{\partial_\tau(\tilde{w}(x, \epsilon)^2)}{(|x|^2 + (1+a)^2\epsilon^{2/(1+a)})^{(n-1-a)/2}} dx \geq \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} I_\epsilon \geq -K'C_{n,a}r^{\alpha+1+a},$$

which is what we wanted.

To show the second claim of the lemma, we observe that, by the C_x^α -regularity of w , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_r} \partial_y \left((|x|^2 + y^2)^{-(n-1-a)/2} \right) y^{-a} w(x, y)^2 dx \right| &\leq \int_{B_r} \frac{y^{1-a}}{(|x|^2 + y^2)^{(n+1-a)/2-\alpha}} dx \\ &\leq C y^{1-a} \int_0^r \frac{\rho^{n-1}}{(\rho^2 + y^2)^{(n+1-a)/2-\alpha}} d\rho \\ &\leq C y^{1-a} \int_0^r \frac{\rho^{n-1}}{(\rho + y)^{n+1-a-2\alpha}} d\rho \\ &\leq C_r \frac{y^{1-a}}{y^{1-a-2\alpha}} = C_r y^{2\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r} \partial_y \left((|x|^2 + y^2)^{-(n-1-a)/2} \right) y^{-a} w(x, y)^2 dx = 0. \quad \square$$

The next lemma is the result [3, Lemma 4.7] on the first eigenvalue of a weighted Laplacian on the half-sphere. The result applies to our modified function w as proved below.

Let us denote by $\mathbb{S}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ the n -dimensional sphere, and set

$$\mathbb{S}_+^n := \mathbb{S}^n \cap \{x_{n+1} \geq 0\}.$$

Let us also denote

$$\mathcal{H}_0^{1/2} := \left\{ h \in H^{1/2}(\partial(\mathbb{S}_+^n)); h = 0 \text{ on } \partial(\mathbb{S}_+^n) \cap \{x_{n+1} = 0\} \cap \{x_n \geq 0\} \right\}.$$

In other words, $h \in \mathcal{H}_0^{1/2}$ when it is Sobolev in the boundary $\partial\mathbb{S}_+^n \simeq \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ of the upper sphere, and it vanishes on the upper part of the $(n-1)$ -dimensional sphere $\partial(\mathbb{S}_+^n) \cap \{x_{n+1} = 0\}$.

Lemma 4.3. [3, Lemma 4.7] *We have*

$$\inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}_0^{1/2}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}_+^n} |\nabla_\theta h|^2 y^{-a} d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}_+^n} h^2 y^{-a} d\sigma} = (1-s)(n-1+s),$$

where ∇_θ is the derivative with respect to the angular variables.

Proof. For convenience of the reader, we reproduce the proof by Caffarelli and Figalli. Let

$$\bar{H}(x, y) := (\sqrt{x_n^2 + y^2} - x_n)^{1-s}$$

and denote by $\bar{h}(\theta)$ its restriction to \mathbb{S}_+^n , which gives $\bar{H} = r^{1-s} \bar{h}(\theta)$. As shown in [6, Proposition 5.4], \bar{h} is the first eigenfunction related to the minimization problem above. If λ_1 is the corresponding eigenvalue, our goal is to show that $\lambda_1 = -(1-s)(n-1+s)$.

First, we claim that \bar{H} satisfies $L_{-a} \bar{H} = 0$ for $y > 0$. Indeed, the function

$$G(x_n, y) := (\sqrt{x_n^2 + y^2} - x_n)^{1/2}$$

is harmonic in $y > 0$ as the imaginary part of $z \mapsto z^{1/2}$. Since $\bar{H} = G^{1+a}$, direct computation yields

$$L_{-a} \bar{H} = L_{-a} G^{1+a} = (1+a)y^{-a} G^a \Delta_{x,y} G + (1+a)ay^{-a} G^{a-1} \left(|\nabla_{x,y} G|^2 - \frac{GG_y}{y} \right) = 0.$$

Next, since \bar{h} is an eigenfunction, we have $\operatorname{div}_\theta(y^{-a} \nabla_\theta \bar{h}) = \lambda_1 \bar{h}$. In particular,

$$\Delta_\theta \bar{h}(0, 1) = \lambda_1 \bar{h}(0, 1).$$

Moreover, in spherical coordinates,

$$0 = L_{-a}\bar{H} = \Delta_r\bar{H} + \frac{n}{r}\bar{H}_r + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_\theta\bar{H} - \frac{a}{y}\bar{H}_y,$$

and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Delta_r\bar{H}(0,1) + n\bar{H}_r(0,1) + \Delta_\theta\bar{H}(0,1) - a\bar{H}_y(0,1) \\ &= -(1-s)s\bar{h}(0,1) + (1-s)(n-a)\bar{h}(0,1) + \Delta_\theta\bar{h}(0,1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda_1\bar{h}(0,1) = \Delta_\theta\bar{h}(0,1) = -(1-s)(n-1+s)\bar{h}(0,1). \quad \square$$

We now prove the monotonicity formula: the result and its proof are found in [3, Lemma 4.8]. For the convenience of the reader, we reproduce the proof.

Lemma 4.4 (Monotonicity Formula). *Let w be given by (4.3) and denote*

$$B_r^+ := \{z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+; |z| < r\}.$$

For $r \in (0, 1]$, define

$$\varphi(r) := \frac{1}{r^{2(1-s)}} \int_{B_r^+} \frac{|\nabla_z w(z)|^2 y^{-a}}{|z|^{n-1-a}} dz.$$

Then, there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$\varphi(r) \leq C \left(1 + r^{2\alpha+\delta-a-1}\right).$$

Proof. Set

$$\varphi_\epsilon(r) := \frac{1}{r^{2(1-s)}} \int_{B_r^+ \cap \{y > \epsilon\}} \frac{|\nabla_z w(z)|^2 y^{-a}}{|z|^{n-1-a}} dz.$$

By the Monotone Convergence Theorem, we can bound φ by $\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi_\epsilon$. Moreover, we note that $\varphi(r)$ is bounded by $\varphi(1)$. Hence, we only need to bound $\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi_\epsilon(1)$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth compactly supported function with $\chi \equiv 1$ in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus,

$$\varphi_\epsilon(r) \leq \int_\epsilon^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla_z w(z)|^2 y^{-a}}{|z|^{n-1-a}} \chi(x) dx dy.$$

The definition of w in (4.3) gives $L_{-a}w = 0$ and so we have $L_{-a}(w^2) = 2|\nabla_z w|^2 y^{-a}$. Then, integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\epsilon(r) &\leq - \int_\epsilon^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla_z(w^2) \cdot \nabla_z \left(\frac{1}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} \right) y^{-a} \chi(x) dx dy \\ &\quad - \int_\epsilon^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla_x(w^2) \cdot \nabla_x \chi(x) \frac{y^{-a}}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} dx dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_y(w^2) \frac{y^{-a}}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} dx \Big|_{y=\epsilon}^{y=1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $L_{-a}|z|^{-n+1+a} = C\delta_{(0,0)}$, we can integrate by parts once more to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\epsilon(r) &\leq \int_\epsilon^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^2 \Delta_x \chi(x) \frac{y^{-a}}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} dx dy + \int_\epsilon^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^2 \nabla_x \chi(x) \cdot \nabla_x \left(\frac{1}{|z|^{n-1-a}} \right) y^{-a} dx dy \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^2 \partial_y \left(\frac{1}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} \right) y^{-a} \chi(x) dx \Big|_{y=\epsilon}^{y=1} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_y(w^2) \frac{y^{-a} \chi(x)}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} dx \Big|_{y=\epsilon}^{y=1}, \end{aligned}$$

since $(0, 0) \notin [\epsilon, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Recall that $\chi \equiv 1$ in B_1 , that w is of class C_x^α , and that $\text{supp } \chi \subseteq B_R$ for some $R > 0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\epsilon^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(w^2 \Delta_x \chi(x) \frac{y^{-a}}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} + w^2 \nabla_x \chi(x) \cdot \nabla_x \left(\frac{1}{|z|^{n-1-a}} \right) y^{-a} \right) dx dy \\ & \leq C \int_\epsilon^1 y^{-a} \int_1^R \left(|r^2 + y^2|^{\alpha+a/2} + |r^2 + y^2|^{\alpha+(1+a)/2} \right) dr dy < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since w is smooth for $y > 0$, we obtain

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^2 \partial_y \left(\frac{1}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} \right) y^{-a} \chi(x) dx \Big|_{y=1} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_y (w^2) \frac{y^{-a} \chi(x)}{2|z|^{n-1-a}} dx \Big|_{y=1} < +\infty.$$

Using [Lemma 4.2](#), we conclude that

$$\varphi(r) \leq \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi_\epsilon(1) \leq C.$$

Hence, we have that $\varphi_\epsilon(r) \rightarrow \varphi(r)$ locally uniformly in $(0, 1]$. This shows, in particular, that $\varphi(r)$ is well-defined. Now, take $\epsilon < r$ and use again that $L_{-a}|z|^{-n+1+a} = C\delta_{(0,0)}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_\epsilon(r) &= -\frac{1-s}{r^{3-2s}} \int_{B_r^+ \cap \{y>\epsilon\}} \frac{L_{-a}(w^2)}{|z|^{n-1-a}} dz + \frac{1}{r^n} \int_{\partial B_r^+ \cap \{y>\epsilon\}} |\nabla_z w(z)|^2 y^{-a} d\sigma \\ &= -\frac{2(1-s)}{r^{1+2(1-s)}} \int_{\partial(B_r^+ \cap \{y>\epsilon\})} w \nabla_z w \cdot \nu \frac{y^{-a}}{|z|^{n-1-a}} d\sigma \\ &\quad + \frac{1-s}{r^{1+2(1-s)}} \int_{B_r^+ \cap \{y>\epsilon\}} \nabla_z (w^2) \cdot \nabla_z \left(\frac{1}{|z|^{n-1-a}} \right) y^{-a} dz \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^n} \int_{\partial B_r^+ \cap \{y>\epsilon\}} |\nabla_z w(z)|^2 y^{-a} d\sigma =: A_\epsilon + B_\epsilon + C_\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate each of these three terms. By [Lemma 4.2](#) and the Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} A_\epsilon &= -\frac{1-s}{r^{n+1}} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial B_r^+ \cap \{y>\epsilon\}} (w^2)_r y^{-a} d\sigma + \frac{1-s}{r^{1+2(1-s)}} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r^+ \cap \{y=\epsilon\}} (w^2)_y \frac{y^{-a}}{|z|^{n-1-a}} d\sigma \\ &\geq -\frac{(1-s)^2}{r^{n+2}} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} w^2 y^{-a} d\sigma - \frac{1}{r^n} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} (w_r)^2 y^{-a} d\sigma - Cr^{\alpha-1} \\ &\geq -\frac{(1-s)^2}{r^{n+2}} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} w^2 y^{-a} d\sigma - \frac{1}{r^n} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} |\nabla_z w(z)|^2 y^{-a} d\sigma \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^{n+2}} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} |\nabla_\theta w|^2 y^{-a} d\sigma - Cr^{\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} B_\epsilon &= -\frac{(1-s)(n-1-a)}{r^{n+2}} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial B_r^+ \cap \{y>\epsilon\}} w^2 y^{-a} d\sigma \\ &\quad - \frac{1-s}{r^{1+2(1-s)}} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{B_r^+ \cap \{y=\epsilon\}} w^2 \partial_y \left(\frac{1}{|z|^{n-1-a}} \right) y^{-a} d\sigma \\ &= -\frac{(1-s)(n-1-a)}{r^{n+2}} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} w^2 y^{-a} d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using that φ_ϵ converges uniformly as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, we have that the distributional derivative $D_r\varphi$ satisfies

$$D_r\varphi \geq \frac{1}{r^{n+2}} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} |\nabla_\theta w|^2 y^{-a} d\sigma - Cr^{\alpha-1} + \frac{\lambda_1}{r^{n+2}} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} w^2 y^{-a} d\sigma,$$

where λ_1 as in (the proof of) [Lemma 4.3](#). Consider $\bar{W} := (w - r^{\alpha+\delta})^-$. By [Lemma 4.1](#), \bar{W} is admissible for the eigenvalue problem in [Lemma 4.3](#). We compute

$$|\nabla_\theta \bar{W}|^2 \leq |\nabla_\theta w|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad (w - \bar{W})^2 + 2\bar{W}(w - \bar{W}) + \bar{W}^2 = w^2,$$

to conclude that

$$D_r\varphi \geq \frac{\lambda_1}{r^{n+2}} \int_{\partial B_{r,+}} [(w - \bar{W})^2 + 2\bar{W}(w - \bar{W})] y^{-a} d\sigma - Cr^{\alpha-1} \geq -Cr^{2\alpha+\delta-a-2} - Cr^{\alpha-1},$$

since $|\bar{W}| \leq |w| \leq Cr^\alpha$ and $|w - \bar{W}| \leq r^{\alpha+\delta}$. Therefore, integration in the interval $[r, 1]$ yields

$$\varphi(r) \leq \varphi(1) + Cr^{2\alpha+\delta-a-1} + C \leq C(1 + r^{2\alpha+\delta-a-1})$$

for all $r \in (0, 1]$, since $1 + a > 0$ and $\varphi(1)$ is universally bounded. \square

Now, we are able to obtain the optimal modulus of continuity of w . In particular, we obtain an improved regularity and the optimal regularity of the lower order and free boundary terms, respectively.

Proposition 4.1. *Let u be the solution of (1.2). Then,*

$$[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u]_{\chi_{\{u=\psi\}}} \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{1-s+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Proof. Let η_ϵ be a mollifier, define $w_\epsilon := \eta_\epsilon * w$, and observe $L_{-a}w_\epsilon = (L_{-a}w) * \eta_\epsilon = 0$. Moreover,

$$w_\epsilon(x, y) - w_\epsilon(x, 0) \geq -\frac{nC_0}{1+a} y^{1+a}.$$

Set $\bar{W}_\epsilon := (w_\epsilon - r^{\alpha+\delta})^+$, which satisfies $L_{-a}\bar{W}_\epsilon \leq 0$ in the set $\{y > 0\}$ and

$$\bar{W}_\epsilon(x, y) - \bar{W}_\epsilon(x, 0) \geq -\frac{nC_0}{1+a} y^{1+a}.$$

We now consider, for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$\tilde{w}_\epsilon(x, y) := \bar{W}_\epsilon(x, |y|) + \left(1 + \frac{nC_0}{1+a}\right) |y|^{1+a}.$$

Note that $L_{-a}\tilde{w}_\epsilon \leq 0$ in the set $\{y \neq 0\}$, and

$$\tilde{w}_\epsilon(x, y) - \tilde{w}_\epsilon(x, 0) \geq |y|^{1+a}.$$

Since \tilde{w}_ϵ is smooth in x , we conclude \tilde{w}_ϵ is a subsolution for L_{-a} in the whole $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Then, let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ so that

$$\tilde{w}(x, y) := (w(x, |y|) - r^{\alpha+\delta})^+ + \left(1 + \frac{nC_0}{1+a}\right) |y|^{1+a}$$

is a subsolution globally. By [Lemma 4.1](#), the convex hull of the set where $\tilde{w}(\cdot, 0) \geq 0$ does not contain the origin and it is thus contained in ‘‘some half’’ of B_r . In particular, $\tilde{w}(\cdot, 0) \equiv 0$ in a set

which is bigger than the other half of B_r . So, by a weighted Poincaré inequality (see [8, Theorem 1.5]) and the definition of φ (see Lemma 4.4), we obtain, for all $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r^+} \tilde{w}(z)^2 y^{-a} dz &\leq Cr^2 \int_{B_r^+} |\nabla_z \tilde{w}(z)|^2 y^{-a} dz \\ &\leq Cr^2 \left[\int_{B_r^+} |\nabla_z w(z)|^2 y^{-a} dz + r^{n+1+a} \right] \\ &\leq Cr^{n+2} (\varphi(r) + r^{1+a}) \\ &\leq Cr^{n+2} (1 + \varphi(r)), \end{aligned}$$

since $|\nabla_z \tilde{w}|^2 \leq |\nabla_z w|^2 + C|y|^{2a}$. Then, since \tilde{w} is L_{-a} -subharmonic, we use Lemma 4.4 and get

$$\sup_{B_{r/2}^+} \tilde{w}^2 \leq \frac{C}{r^{n+1-a}} \int_{B_r^+} \tilde{w}(z)^2 y^{-a} dz \leq C(r^{1+a} + r^{2\alpha+\delta}).$$

Hence, for all $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$\sup_{B_r} w \leq C \left(\sup_{B_{r/2}^+} \tilde{w} + r^{\alpha+\delta} + r^{1+a} \right) \leq C(r^{1-s} + r^{\alpha+\delta/2}). \quad (4.7)$$

We conclude by the same argument as Corollary 3.1 that

$$\|w\|_{C_x^{\beta_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C, \quad \text{where} \quad \beta_\alpha := \min\{1-s, \alpha + \delta/2\}.$$

As remarked previously, $\delta < \gamma$, thus $\beta_\alpha < \gamma$. Hence, by (4.2), we have

$$\left[(-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) - \mathcal{R}u(t, \cdot) \right] \chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}} \in C^{\beta_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u = \left[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u \right] \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} + \mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{\beta_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Hence, by (4.1), $(-\Delta)^s u(t, \cdot) \in C^{\beta_\alpha - 0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and by [14, Proposition 2.1.8], we have $u(t, \cdot) \in C^{\beta_\alpha + 2s - 0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, thus

$$\mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{\beta_\alpha + \gamma}(\mathbb{R}^n)). \quad (4.8)$$

By the definition of δ (see Lemma 4.1), given $\alpha_0 > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\delta \geq \delta_0 > 0$ for all $\alpha' \in [\alpha_0, 1-s]$. If $\beta_\alpha = 1-s$, the proposition follows. Otherwise, we apply the monotonicity formula (as in (4.7)) k times and the argument above to obtain

$$\sup_{B_r} w \leq C(r^{1-s} + r^{\alpha+k\delta_0/2}), \quad \mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{\min\{1-s, \alpha+k\delta_0/2\} + \gamma}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Choosing k large enough and using the same argument as Corollary 3.1, the proposition follows. \square

5. ALMOST OPTIMAL REGULARITY IN TIME

We note that Proposition 4.1 implies that

$$\partial_t u + (-\Delta)^s u = \left[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u \right] \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} + \mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^n)),$$

which gives (see (4.1))

$$\partial_t u \text{ and } (-\Delta)^s u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{1-s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n)). \quad (5.1)$$

From this, we are able to show the first step of the iteration procedure that eventually grants us the optimal regularity of the solution. We remark that by (2.16) and Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\mathcal{R}u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{1-s+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Lemma 5.1. *We have $\left[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u \right] \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} \in C_{t,x}^{\frac{1-s}{1+s} - 0^+, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. We need to estimate

$$[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u](t, x)\chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}} - [(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u](s, x)\chi_{\{u(s, \cdot) = \psi\}}.$$

We notice that we only need to consider $x \in \{u(\tau, \cdot) = \psi\}$ for some τ (otherwise the expression vanishes). Let $0 < s < t \leq T$. By Lemma 2.8, $\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\} \subseteq \{u(s, \cdot) = \psi\}$, we can assume, without loss of generality, that $x \in \{u(s, \cdot) = \psi\}$. If $x \in \{u(s, \cdot) = \psi\} \setminus \{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$, by Lemma 2.9, the left hand side below vanishes and we can find $\tau \in (s, t)$ such that $x \in \partial\{u(\tau, \cdot) = \psi\}$

$$[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u](\tau, x)\chi_{\{u(\tau, \cdot) = \psi\}} = [(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u](t, x)\chi_{\{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}}.$$

Then, we can estimate the free boundary part replacing t with τ . Hence, we need only consider $x \in \{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\}$. In other words, we only need to estimate both terms

$$|(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, x)|, \quad (5.2)$$

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)|. \quad (5.3)$$

By the same strategy as in [3, Lemma 4.12], we bound the (5.2) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(t, z)] \phi_r(x - z) dz \right| \\ & + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [(-\Delta)^s u(t, z) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, z)] \phi_r(x - z) dz \right| \\ & + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [(-\Delta)^s u(s, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, z)] \phi_r(x - z) dz \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where ϕ is a normalized smooth cutoff function supported in B_1 , and $\phi_r(x) := r^{-n}\phi(x/r)$. Then, the first and third terms can be controlled by Cr^{1-s-0^+} . For the second term, we integrate by parts $(-\Delta)^s$ and recall the Lipschitz-in-time regularity of u (see Corollary 2.2), so that

$$|(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, x)| \leq C \left(r^{1-s-0^+} + \frac{(t-s)}{r^{2s}} \right).$$

The choice $r := (t-s)^{1/(1+s)}$ thus yields

$$|(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, x)| \leq C(t-s)^{\frac{1-s}{1+s}-0^+}.$$

Analogously, we bound (5.3) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(t, z)] \phi_r(x - z) dz \right| \\ & + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\mathcal{R}u(t, z) - \mathcal{R}u(s, z)] \phi_r(x - z) dz \right| \\ & + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\mathcal{R}u(s, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, z)] \phi_r(x - z) dz \right|, \end{aligned}$$

By the space regularity of $\mathcal{R}u$ (see (4.8)), the first and third terms can be controlled by $Cr^{1-s+\gamma}$. By Corollary 2.2 and performing an integration by parts, we can bound the second term by

$$C \left((t-s) + \frac{(t-s)}{r} + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+(u(t, z) - u(s, z)) \phi_r(x - z) dz \right| \right).$$

Recalling that $M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ v := \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_0} Lv$, we have that for all $\epsilon > 0$, $M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ v - \epsilon \leq Lv$. Since $\|\phi_r\|_{L^1(B_r)} = 1$ and the fact that L is an integrable by parts operator, we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+(u(t, z) - u(s, z)) \phi_r(x - z) dz \right| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, z) - u(s, z)| |M_{\mathcal{L}_0}^+ \phi_r(x - z)| dz + \epsilon.$$

Now, by the explicit form of Pucci operator (see (iv)) and the Lipschitz in time regularity of u , we can bound the integral above by $\frac{(t-s)}{r^{2\sigma}}$ after letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Thus,

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left(r^{1-s+\gamma} + (t-s) + \frac{(t-s)}{r} + \frac{(t-s)}{r^{2\sigma}} \right).$$

Assume without loss of generality that $r \leq 1$ (otherwise, we have Lipschitz regularity in time). Now, if $2\sigma \leq 1$, we have $\gamma = s - 1/2$, and so

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left(r^{1/2} + (t-s) + \frac{(t-s)}{r} \right),$$

and so the choice $r := (t-s)^{2/3}$ gives

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C(t-s)^{1/3}.$$

Now, if $2\sigma > 1$, we have $\gamma = s - \sigma$ and so

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left(r^{1-\sigma} + (t-s) + \frac{(t-s)}{r^{2\sigma}} \right),$$

and so the choice $r := (t-s)^{1/(1+\sigma)}$ gives

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C(t-s)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma}}.$$

Finally, observe that since $s > 1/2$,

$$\frac{1}{3} > \frac{1-s}{1+s} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma} > \frac{1-s}{1+s}. \quad (5.4)$$

□

Thus, by (2.5), Lemma 5.1 and interpolation inequalities (see, for instance, [9, Lemma 6.32]), we obtain

$$\partial_t u \quad \text{and} \quad (-\Delta)^s u \in C_{t,x}^{\frac{1-s}{1+s}-0^+, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n). \quad (5.5)$$

The next lemma is the key ingredient to create a bootstrap in Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1-s}{2s})$ and assume*

$$\partial_t u \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad (-\Delta)^s u \in L^\infty((0, T]; C^{1-s}(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Then, with a uniform bound,

$$[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u] \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} \in C_{t,x}^{(1+\alpha)\frac{1-s}{1+s}, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof. As in the proof of the previous lemma, we first consider $x \in \{u(\tau, \cdot) = \psi\}$ for some τ , thus without loss of generality, $x \in \{u(t, \cdot) = \psi\} \subseteq \{u(s, \cdot) = \psi\}$, where $0 < s < t < T$, and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, x)| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(t, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [(-\Delta)^s u(t, z) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [(-\Delta)^s u(s, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Again, the first and third terms can be controlled by Cr^{1-s} . The second term we integrate by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [(-\Delta)^s u(t, z) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\partial_t u(s, z)| |(-\Delta)^s \phi_r(x-z)| dz \right) (t-s) \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u(t, z) - u(s, z) - \partial_t u(s, z)(t-s)] (-\Delta)^s \phi_r(x-z) dz \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\partial_t u(\cdot, z)$ is of class C^α in time and $\|(-\Delta)^s \phi_r\|_{L^1(B_r)} \leq C/r^{2s}$, the last term on the right hand side above is bounded by $C(t-s)^{1+\alpha}/r^{2s}$. For the integral in the first term, we use that $\partial_t u$ is of class C^{1-s} in space and that $\partial_t u$ vanishes at $(t, x) \in \{u = \psi\}$ to show it is bounded by

$$C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|x-z|^{1-s}, 1\} |(-\Delta)^s \phi_r(x-z)| dz. \quad (5.6)$$

Since ϕ is compactly supported, $|(-\Delta)^s \phi(w)| \leq C|w|^{-n-2s}$ when $|w|$ is large enough. Hence, scaling yields, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$|(-\Delta)^s \phi_r(w)| \leq \frac{C}{r^{n+2s} + |w|^{n+2s}}.$$

Thus, (5.6) can be controled, up to a constant, by

$$\int_{B_1} \frac{|w|^{1-s}}{r^{n+2s} + |w|^{n+2s}} dw + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{1}{|w|^{n+2s}} dw \leq \frac{C}{r^{n+2s}} \int_{B_r} |w|^{1-s} dw + C \int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} |w|^{1-3s-n} dw + C.$$

This implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|x-z|^{1-s}, 1\} |(-\Delta)^s \phi_r(x-z)| dz \leq C(1+r^{1-3s}).$$

Finally, we obtain

$$|(-\Delta)^s(u(t, x) - u(s, x))| \leq C \left[r^{1-s} + \frac{(t-s)^{1+\alpha}}{r^{2s}} + C(t-s)(1+r^{1-3s}) \right].$$

Also, since $\alpha < (1-s)/2s$, we have

$$\alpha \leq \frac{(1-s)(1+\alpha)}{1+s} \leq 1 + \frac{(1-3s)(1+\alpha)}{1+s}$$

Therefore, the choice $r := (t-s)^{(1+\alpha)/(1+s)}$ ensures

$$|(-\Delta)^s u(t, x) - (-\Delta)^s u(s, x)| \leq C(t-s)^{(1+\alpha)\frac{1-s}{1+s}}.$$

Analogously, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(t, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\mathcal{R}u(t, z) - \mathcal{R}u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\mathcal{R}u(s, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right|, \end{aligned}$$

Once again, the first and third integrals are bounded by $Cr^{1-s+\gamma}$. For the second integral, we split the integral into

$$\begin{aligned} C \left(\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\mathcal{I}u(t, z) - \mathcal{I}u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\nabla u(t, z) - \nabla u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| \right. \\ \left. + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u(t, z) - u(s, z)] \phi_r(x-z) dz \right| \right). \quad (5.7) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the third term in (5.7) is Lipschitz-in-time, thus there is nothing to prove. For the remaining terms, we proceed analogously and bound them by

$$C(t-s) \left(1 + \frac{(t-s)^\alpha}{r} + \frac{(t-s)^\alpha}{r^{2\sigma}} + \frac{1}{r^{n+1}} \int_{B_r} |w|^{1-s} dw + \int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} |w|^{-s-n} dw \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{r^{n+2\sigma}} \int_{B_r} |w|^{1-s} dw + \int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} |w|^{1-2\sigma-s-n} dw \right).$$

Now, we estimate the integrals above:

$$\frac{1}{r^{n+1}} \int_{B_r} |w|^{1-s} dw + \int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} |w|^{-s-n} dw \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{r^s} \right), \\ \frac{1}{r^{n+2\sigma}} \int_{B_r} |w|^{1-s} dw + \int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} |w|^{1-2\sigma-s-n} dw \leq C \left(\frac{1}{r^{2\sigma+s-1}} \right. \\ \left. + \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma < (1-s)/2; \\ 1 + |\log(r)| & \text{if } \sigma = (1-s)/2; \\ 1 + r^{1-2\sigma-s} & \text{if } \sigma > (1-s)/2. \end{cases} \right)$$

Hence, we conclude that, for $\sigma \geq 0$,

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq Cr^{1-s+\gamma} + C(t-s) \left(\frac{(t-s)^\alpha}{r} + \frac{(t-s)^\alpha}{r^{2\sigma}} + \frac{1}{r^s} + \frac{1}{r^{2\sigma+s-1}} \right. \\ \left. + \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma < (1-s)/2; \\ 1 + |\log(r)| & \text{if } \sigma = (1-s)/2; \\ 1 + r^{1-2\sigma-s} & \text{if } \sigma > (1-s)/2. \end{cases} \right)$$

If $0 \leq \sigma < (1-s)/2$, then (recall that $\gamma = s - 1/2$)

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left(r^{1/2} + (t-s) + \frac{(t-s)^{1+\alpha}}{r} + \frac{(t-s)}{r^s} \right).$$

Then, by choosing $r := (t-s)^{2(1+\alpha)/3}$, we have

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left((t-s)^{\frac{1}{3}(1+\alpha)} + (t-s)^{1-\frac{2s}{3}(1+\alpha)} \right).$$

We claim that $\frac{1}{3}(1+\alpha) \leq 1 - \frac{2s}{3}(1+\alpha)$. Indeed, the claim holds if, and only if $(1+\alpha)(1+2s) \leq 3$. Now, since $\alpha < (1-s)/2s$, we have $(1+\alpha)(1+2s) \leq \frac{3}{2} + s + \frac{1}{2s}$. Moreover, $s + \frac{1}{2s} \leq \frac{3}{2} \iff 2s^2 + 1 - 3s < 0$, and the latter holds since $1/2 < s < 1$. Hence, we conclude

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C(t-s)^{(1+\alpha)/3}.$$

If $(1-s)/2 \leq \sigma \leq 1/2$, then

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left(r^{1/2} + (t-s)(1 + |\log(r)|) + \frac{(t-s)^{1+\alpha}}{r} + \frac{(t-s)}{r^s} \right).$$

Once again, by choosing $r := (t-s)^{2(1+\alpha)/3}$, we obtain

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C(t-s)^{(1+\alpha)/3}.$$

Finally, if $\sigma > 1/2$, then

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left(r^{1-\sigma} + (t-s) + \frac{(t-s)^{1+\alpha}}{r^{2\sigma}} + \frac{(t-s)}{r^{2\sigma+s-1}} \right).$$

Choosing $r := (t - s)^{(1+\alpha)/(1+\sigma)}$, we obtain

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C \left((t - s)^{(1+\alpha)\frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma}} + (t - s)^{1-(1+\alpha)\frac{2\sigma+s-1}{1+\sigma}} \right).$$

We claim that $(1+\alpha)\frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma} \leq 1 - (1+\alpha)\frac{2\sigma+s-1}{1+\sigma}$. Indeed, the claim holds if, and only if $(1+\alpha)(\sigma+s) \leq 1 + \sigma$. Once again, since $\alpha < (1-s)/2s$, we have $(1+\alpha)(\sigma+s) \leq \frac{1+\sigma}{2} + \frac{s}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2s}$. Moreover, $\frac{s}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2s} \leq \frac{1+\sigma}{2} \iff s^2 - (1+\sigma)s + \sigma \leq 0$, and the latter holds since $1/2 < \sigma < s$. Hence, we conclude

$$|\mathcal{R}u(t, x) - \mathcal{R}u(s, x)| \leq C(t - s)^{(1+\alpha)\frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma}}.$$

Thus, by (5.4), we conclude the lemma. \square

We are now ready to prove our main regularity result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The global Lipschitz regularity follows from Corollary 2.2. Given $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1-s}{2s})$, denote by Φ the affine function

$$\Phi(\alpha) := (1 + \alpha) \frac{1 - s}{1 + s}$$

which is strictly increasing and satisfies $\Phi(\frac{1-s}{2s}) = \frac{1-s}{2s}$. By (5.5), we can apply Lemma 5.2, which gives

$$[(-\Delta)^s u - \mathcal{R}u] \chi_{\{u=\psi\}} \in C_{t,x}^{\Phi(\frac{1-s}{1+s}-0^+), 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Then, by (2.5) and interpolation inequalities, we have

$$\partial_t u, (-\Delta)^s u \in C_{t,x}^{\Phi(\frac{1-s}{1+s}-0^+), 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n),$$

since $\Phi(\alpha) < \frac{1-s}{2s}$ for $\alpha < \frac{1-s}{2s}$. Next, we apply Lemma 5.2 and (2.5) iteratively to obtain

$$\partial_t u, (-\Delta)^s u \in C_{t,x}^{\Phi^n(\frac{1-s}{1+s}-0^+), 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n),$$

which combined with [3, Estimate A.5] gives

$$(-\Delta)^s u \in C_{t,x}^{\frac{1-s}{2s}, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Since $\Phi^n(\frac{1-s}{1+s} - 0^+) \rightarrow \frac{1-s}{2s}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we also conclude

$$\partial_t u \in C_{t,x}^{\frac{1-s}{2s}-0^+, 1-s}((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n). \quad \square$$

APPENDIX A. REGULARITY RESULTS FOR $\partial_t + (-\Delta)^s = f$ WITH $f \in L^\infty$

We now address the approximation of a solution of (1.2) by a solution of (2.9). The main ideas are found in [13]. We already used the regularities (4.1) and (2.5) of the fractional heat equation. However, in both cases the source f is Hölder continuous. Nonetheless, we need a regularity result when f is merely a bounded function in spacetime. Namely, for $\partial_t v + (-\Delta)^s v = f$, we have

$$\|v\|_{C^{1-0^+}((0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|v\|_{L^\infty((0, T]; C^{2s-0^+}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C(1 + \|f\|_{L^\infty((0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In order to show (A.1), we proceed as in [3]: we notice that

$$v(t, x) = \Gamma_s(t) * v(0) + \int_0^t \Gamma_s(t - \tau) * f(\tau) d\tau,$$

where $\Gamma_s(t, y)$ is fundamental solution of the fractional heat equation and it behaves as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_s(t, y)| &\sim \frac{t}{t^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + |y|^{n+2s}}, & |\partial_t \Gamma_s(t, y)| &\leq C \frac{1}{t^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + |y|^{n+2s}}, \\ |\nabla_y \Gamma_s(t, y)| &\leq C \frac{1}{|y|} \frac{t}{t^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + |y|^{n+2s}}, & |D_y^2 \Gamma_s(t, y)| &\leq C \frac{1}{|y|^2} \frac{t}{t^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + |y|^{n+2s}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Since the initial condition of (1.2) is well-behaved (namely, it satisfies (i)), the first term is smooth. Thus, we only need to estimate the source term. In order to do it, we will need the following estimates:

- there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $h > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{h}{h^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + |z|^{n+2s}} dz \leq C(1+h); \quad (\text{A.3})$$

- there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $h > 0$,

$$\int_0^t \frac{t-\tau}{(t-\tau)^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + h^{n+2s}} d\tau \leq C \min\{h^{-n-2s}, h^{-n+2s}\}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The proof of both are very simple: for (A.3), one splits the integral into $B_{h^{1/2s}}$ and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{h^{1/2s}}$, thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{h}{h^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + |z|^{n+2s}} dz \leq \frac{1}{h^{n/2s}} |B_{h^{1/2s}}| + h \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{h^{1/2s}}} \frac{1}{|z|^{n+2s}} dz \leq C(1+h).$$

For (A.4), if $h \geq 1$, the bound is trivial, since the integrand is bounded by h^{-n-2s} ; otherwise, if $h \in (0, 1]$, we split the integral into $[0, t - h^{2s}]$ and $[t - h^{2s}, t]$, thus for $n \geq 2$ we have

$$\int_0^t \frac{t-\tau}{(t-\tau)^{\frac{n+2s}{2s}} + h^{n+2s}} d\tau \leq \int_0^{t-h^{2s}} (t-\tau)^{-n/2s} d\tau + \frac{1}{h^{n+2s}} \int_{t-h^{2s}}^t (t-\tau) d\tau \leq Ch^{-n+2s}.$$

For the time regularity of (A.1), notice that for $u < t$, we have

$$|v(t) - v(u)| \leq C \left(\int_u^t |\Gamma_s(t-\tau) * f(\tau)| d\tau + \int_0^u |(\Gamma_s(t-\tau) - \Gamma_s(u-\tau)) * f(\tau)| d\tau \right).$$

By (A.2) and (A.3) with $h = t - \tau$, the first term can be bounded by

$$C \|f\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \int_u^t [1 + (t-\tau)] d\tau \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} (t-u),$$

while the second term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &C \|f\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \int_0^u \min\{t-u, u-\tau\} (1 + (u-\tau)^{-1}) d\tau \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \left((t-u) \int_0^{u-(t-u)} (1 + (u-\tau)^{-1}) d\tau + \int_{u-(t-u)}^u (1 + (u-\tau)) d\tau \right) \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} (t-u) |\log(t-u)|. \end{aligned}$$

For the space regularity of (A.1), since $2s > 1$, we evaluate

$$|\nabla v(x) - \nabla v(z)| \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty((0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla \Gamma_s(t-\tau, x-y) - \nabla \Gamma_s(t-\tau, z-y)| dy d\tau.$$

We split the space integral into $\{|x - z| \leq |x - y|/2\}$ and $\{|x - z| \geq |x - y|/2\}$. For the first region, by (A.2) and (A.4) with $h = |x - y|$, we can bound the integral ($n \geq 2$) by

$$\begin{aligned} & C|x - z| \int_{\{|x-z| \leq |x-y|/2\}} |x - y|^{-2} \min\{|x - y|^{-n-2s}, |x - y|^{-n+2s}\} dy \\ & \leq C|x - z|^{1+2s-2} \int_{\{|x-z| \leq |x-y|/2 \leq 1\}} |x - y|^{-n} dy + C|x - z| \int_{\{|x-y|/2 \geq 1\}} |x - y|^{-2-n-2s} dy \\ & \leq C|x - z|^{2s-1} |\log |x - z||, \end{aligned}$$

while For the second region, by (A.2), (A.4) with $h = |x - y|$ and noticing that $\{|x - z| \geq |x - y|/2\} \subset B_{3|x-z|}(x) \cap B_{3|x-z|}(z)$, we can bound the integral by

$$\int_{B_{3|x-z|}(x)} \frac{1}{|x - y|} |x - y|^{-n+2s} dy \leq |x - z|^{2s-1}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Anna Lisa Amadori. Obstacle problem for nonlinear integro-differential equations arising in option pricing. *Ric. Mat.*, 56(1):1–17, 2007.
- [2] Begoña Barrios, Alessio Figalli, and Xavier Ros-Oton. Free boundary regularity in the parabolic fractional obstacle problem. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 71(10):2129–2159, 2018.
- [3] Luis Caffarelli and Alessio Figalli. Regularity of solutions to the parabolic fractional obstacle problem. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 680:191–233, 2013.
- [4] Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre. An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32(7-9):1245–1260, 2007.
- [5] Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre. Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(5):597–638, 2009.
- [6] Luis A. Caffarelli, Sandro Salsa, and Luis Silvestre. Regularity estimates for the solution and the free boundary of the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian. *Invent. Math.*, 171(2):425–461, 2008.
- [7] Rama Cont and Peter Tankov. *Financial modelling with jump processes*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Financial Mathematics Series. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2004.
- [8] Eugene B. Fabes, Carlos E. Kenig, and Raul P. Serapioni. The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 7(1):77–116, 1982.
- [9] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [10] Peter Laurence and Sandro Salsa. Regularity of the free boundary of an american option on several assets. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 62(7):969–994, 2009.
- [11] W. R. Madych and N. M. Rivière. Multipliers of the Hölder classes. *J. Functional Analysis*, 21(4):369–379, 1976.
- [12] Robert C. Merton. Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(1):125 – 144, 1976.
- [13] Arshak Petrosyan and Camelia A. Pop. Optimal regularity of solutions to the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian with drift. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 268(2):417–472, 2015.
- [14] Luis Silvestre. Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(1):67–112, 2007.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL, PORTO ALEGRE - RS, BRAZIL.

Email address: henrique.borrrin@ufrgs.br

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL, PORTO ALEGRE - RS, BRAZIL.

Email address: diego.marcon@ufrgs.br