

# A Wiener criterion for the fractional Laplacian

Jana Björn

*Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden*  
*jana.bjorn@liu.se, ORCID: 0000-0002-1238-6751*

**Abstract** We characterize regular boundary points for the fractional Laplace equation  $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$ ,  $0 < s < 1$ , in terms of a Wiener type criterion involving a Besov capacity. The Kellogg property and a decay estimate for the solutions near a regular boundary point are also obtained.

*Key words and phrases:* Besov capacity, Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian, Kellogg property, regular boundary point, Wiener criterion.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): Primary: 35R11; Secondary: 35B65, 35J25.

## 1. Introduction

We assume throughout the paper that  $0 < s < 1$  and that  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$  is an open set such that its complement  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  has positive Besov  $B_2^s$ -capacity, as given in (1.3) and Definition 2.3. Note that we do not require any additional assumptions about the regularity of  $\Omega$ , which is allowed to be unbounded.

Consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem in  $\Omega$  with respect to the fractional equation

$$(-\Delta)^s u = 0. \quad (1.1)$$

We study the *boundary regularity* for this equation, i.e. whether every solution of the Dirichlet problem for (1.1) in  $\Omega$ , with continuous boundary data  $f$ , attains its boundary value as the limit

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni x \rightarrow x_0} u(x) = f(x_0) \quad \text{at } x_0 \in \partial\Omega.$$

Recall that up to a multiplicative constant, the fractional Laplacian is given by the principle value integral

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) := C_{n,s} \text{ p. v. } \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy.$$

It is a nonlocal operator and hence the Dirichlet boundary data for (1.1) are prescribed on the complement  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ , rather than only on the boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . The above assumption that the complement has positive capacity is natural since otherwise the complement and the boundary data  $f$  are not seen by the Besov space  $B_2^s$ , associated with the fractional Laplacian.

The following sufficient and necessary condition for regular boundary points is our main result.

**Theorem 1.1.** (Wiener criterion) *A boundary point  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$  is regular for  $\Omega$  with respect to the fractional equation (1.1) if and only if*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\text{cap}_{B_2^s}(F_r, B(x_0, 2r))}{r^{n-2s}} \frac{dr}{r} = \infty, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $F_r = \overline{B(x_0, r)} \setminus \Omega$  and  $\text{cap}_{B_2^s}$  is the capacity defined by a Besov seminorm on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  as

$$\text{cap}_{B_2^s}(F_r, B(x_0, 2r)) = \inf_v \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dx dy, \quad (1.3)$$

where the infimum is taken over all  $v \in C_0^\infty(B(x_0, 2r))$  such that  $v \geq 1$  on  $F_r$ .

In particular,  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$  is regular if  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  has a *corkscrew* at  $x_0$ , i.e. if there are  $r_0 > 0$  and  $0 < c < 1$  such that  $F_r$  contains a ball of radius  $cr$  whenever  $0 < r \leq r_0$ , cf. Lemma 2.4. It follows from Theorem 1.1 that despite the nonlocal character of the operator  $(-\Delta)^s$ , regularity of a boundary point is a local property, i.e. that  $x_0$  is regular with respect to  $\Omega$  if and only if it is regular with respect to  $\Omega \cap B(x_0, r)$  for some (or equivalently all)  $r > 0$ .

We also prove the *Kellogg property*, saying that the set of irregular boundary points for equation (1.1) has zero  $B_2^s$ -capacity. For regular boundary points  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ , we obtain the pointwise decay estimate

$$\text{osc}_{B(x_0, \rho)} u \leq \text{osc}_{F_{2R}} f + \left( \text{osc}_{\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega} f \right) \exp\left(-C \int_\rho^R \frac{\text{cap}_{B_2^s}(F_r, B(x_0, 2r))}{r^{n-2s}} \frac{dr}{r}\right) \quad (1.4)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$  and all  $0 < \rho \leq R < \infty$ , see Proposition 3.4 for a more precise formulation.

Condition (1.2) is a fractional analogue of the famous Wiener criterion proved for the Laplace equation (i.e. (1.1) with  $s = 1$ ) by Wiener [29] in 1924. The Wiener criterion has been extended to various linear and nonlinear elliptic equations by e.g. Littman–Stampacchia–Weinberger [18], Maz'ya [19], Gariepy–Ziemer [13], Dal Maso–Mosco [8], [9], Lindqvist–Martio [17] and Kilpeläinen–Malý [15]. A weighted version of the Wiener criterion for degenerate elliptic equations, which will be of great importance in this paper, was proved by Fabes–Jerison–Kenig [11], Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [14] and Mikkonen [25].

Similar sufficient conditions were obtained for the boundary continuity of solutions with zero boundary data for the nonhomogeneous polyharmonic equation

$$(-\Delta)^m u = f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$$

with some integer powers  $m \geq 2$ , see Maz'ya [20], [21] and Maz'ya–Donchev [24]. Condition (1.2) (with a slightly different capacity) was shown to guarantee boundary continuity of solutions with zero boundary data for the nonhomogeneous fractional Laplace equation

$$(-\Delta)^s u = f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{with } s \in (0, 1) \cup \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1, \frac{n}{2}\right),$$

see Eilertsen [10]. Estimates similar to (1.4) were also proved in the above papers on higher order and fractional equations, but necessity does not seem to have been considered there. For an extensive exposition of results on boundary regularity and the Wiener criterion for a wide class of elliptic equations, see the monograph by Maz'ya [23].

For fractional equations such as (1.1), there are rather few papers on boundary regularity for the Dirichlet problem. In the literature, the Dirichlet problem is often considered with zero boundary data and for the nonhomogeneous equation  $(-\Delta)^s u = f$  as in [10]. Formally and for sufficiently smooth data, this formulation and the one considered in this paper (with zero right-hand side and general boundary data) can be transformed into each other.

The boundary Harnack inequality for the fractional Laplacian was proved by Bogdan [3] and Bogdan–Kulczycki–Kwaśnicki [4]. Optimal regularity up to the boundary was in sufficiently smooth bounded domains (Lipschitz or  $C^{1,1}$ ) proved

by Ros-Oton–Serra [26], [27] for solutions of  $(-\Delta)^s u = f$  with zero boundary data and various right-hand sides  $f$ .

In this paper, we treat general open sets (with complements of positive capacity). Our approach to boundary regularity is based on the following result due to Caffarelli–Silvestre [7]. Assume that  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  has compact support and is continuous on  $F := \mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ . It follows from [7, Section 4] that the solution  $u$  of (1.1) in  $\Omega$  with  $u = f$  on  $F$  coincides with the restriction

$$u(x) := U(x, 0)$$

of the bounded continuous solution  $U$  to the Dirichlet problem in

$$G := \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus (F \times \{0\})$$

for the weighted equation

$$\operatorname{div}(|t|^{1-2s} \nabla U(x, t)) = 0 \tag{1.5}$$

with boundary data  $f$  on  $\partial G = (F \times \{0\}) \cup \{\infty\}$ .

The above relation between (1.1) and (1.5) was used in [7] to derive the Harnack and boundary Harnack inequalities for (1.1). In particular, the local Hölder continuity of  $U$  in  $G$ , proved in e.g. Fabes–Kenig–Serapioni [12] or Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [14, Theorem 6.6], directly yields interior regularity for the solutions of the fractional equation (1.1). Since then, the lift from (1.1) to (1.5) has become a standard tool in the analysis of the fractional Laplacian. It has been successfully exploited by many authors in various contexts, including interior regularity and free boundaries, see e.g. Aimar–Beltritti–Gómez [1], Barrios–Figalli–Ros-Oton [2], Caffarelli–Roquejoffre–Sire [5], Caffarelli–Salsa–Silvestre [6], Koch–Rüland–Shi [16] and Silvestre [28]. We use the weighted equation (1.5) to study boundary regularity for (1.1).

## 2. Weights, capacities and degenerate equations

In this section we discuss properties of the degenerate equation (1.5) and its associated weighted capacity. More generally, we let  $p > 1$  and consider the weight  $w(x, t) = |t|^a$  in  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  with  $-1 < a < p - 1$ . Even though we only need the case  $p = 2$  in the rest of this paper, we state and prove the general results in this section for all  $p > 1$ , since the arguments are the same as for  $p = 2$  and may be of independent interest.

It can be verified by a direct calculation that  $w$  is a Muckenhoupt  $A_p$  weight on  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ , i.e. it satisfies for all balls  $B \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ ,

$$\int_B w(x, t) \, dx \, dt \left( \int_B w(x, t)^{1/(1-p)} \, dx \, dt \right)^{p-1} \leq C|B|^p,$$

where  $|B|$  stands for the  $(n + 1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure of  $B$  and  $C > 0$  is independent of  $B$ . It follows that  $w$  is admissible for the theory of degenerate elliptic equations in the sense of Fabes–Jerison–Kenig [11] ( $p = 2$ ) or Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [14, Chapter 20] ( $p > 1$ ). Equation (1.5) satisfies the assumptions (3.3)–(3.7) in [14] with  $p = 2$  and the tools therein are therefore at our disposal.

Here and in what follows, we use the notation  $z = (x, t) \in \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  and define the measure  $\mu_a$  on  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  by

$$d\mu_a(z) = |t|^a \, dx \, dt.$$

It follows from [14, p. 307] that  $\mu_a$  supports the  $(p, p)$ -Poincaré inequality

$$\int_B |v - v_B|^p d\mu_a \leq Cr^p \int_B |\nabla v|^p d\mu_a, \quad (2.1)$$

whenever  $B = B(z, r) \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  is a ball and  $v \in C^\infty(B)$  is bounded. Here

$$v_B := \int_B v d\mu_a := \frac{1}{\mu_a(B)} \int_B v d\mu_a$$

is the integral average of  $v$  and  $C > 0$  is independent of  $B$ . Since we consider balls both in  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  and  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , we adopt the convention that the dimension of a ball is determined by its centre, i.e. for  $z \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  and  $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,

$$B(z, r) := \{y \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : |y - z| < r\} \quad \text{and} \quad B(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : |y - x| < r\}.$$

Unless specified otherwise, we consider open balls.

The following definition of capacity follows [14, Chapter 2].

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $B \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  be a ball and  $K \subset B$  be a compact set. The *weighted variational capacity* of  $K$  with respect to  $B$  is

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(K, B) = \inf_v \int_B |\nabla v|^p d\mu_a,$$

where the infimum is taken over all  $v \in C_0^\infty(B)$  such that  $v \geq 1$  on  $K$ .

The weighted capacity  $\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}$  extends to all subsets of  $B$  as a Choquet capacity and in particular, for all Borel sets  $E \subset B$ ,

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(E, B) = \sup_{\text{compact } K \subset E} \text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(K, B).$$

A set  $E \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  is said to be of zero  $\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}$ -capacity if for all balls  $B \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ ,

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(E \cap B, B) = 0.$$

In [14], the variational capacity  $\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}$  is used to characterize boundary regularity for weighted equations of  $p$ -Laplace type and in particular for the equation (1.5).

Our aim is to formulate the Wiener criterion in terms of a capacity associated with the Besov space  $B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)$  and the fractional equation (1.1). Following Maz'ya [22, p. 512], we define the Besov seminorm

$$\|v\|_{B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)} := \left( \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy \right)^{1/p}, \quad 0 < s < 1 < p.$$

Theorem 1 in [22, p. 512] asserts that for all  $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$ ,

$$\|v\|_{B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)} \simeq \inf_{\tilde{v}} \| |t|^{1-s-1/p} \nabla \tilde{v} \|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})}, \quad (2.2)$$

where the infimum is taken over all extensions  $\tilde{v} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$  of  $v$ . Moreover, it follows from the proof of [22, Theorem 1 on p. 512] that

$$\|v\|_{B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)} \simeq \| |t|^{1-s-1/p} \nabla V \|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})}, \quad (2.3)$$

where the extension  $V \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$  is defined by

$$V(x, t) = \frac{1}{t^n} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \varphi\left(\frac{\xi - x}{t}\right) v(\xi) d\xi, \quad (2.4)$$

with  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1) \cap \mathbf{R}^n)$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \varphi(\xi) d\xi = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(-\xi) = \varphi(\xi),$$

see [22, (10.1.7) on p. 514]. Here, and in what follows, we use the notation  $X \simeq Y$  if there is a positive constant  $C$  independent of  $X$  and  $Y$  such that  $X/C \leq Y \leq CX$ . Similar one-sided inequalities are denoted  $\lesssim$  and  $\gtrsim$  in an obvious way.

The following lemma relates the weighted capacity  $\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}$  in  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  to a Besov type capacity in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , see Definition 2.3.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $z_0 = (x_0, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  and  $K \subset \overline{B(z_0, r)} \cap \mathbf{R}^n$  be a compact set. Then*

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(K, B(z_0, 2r)) \simeq \inf_v \|v\|_{B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)}^p, \quad \text{where } s = 1 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{a}{p},$$

and the infimum is taken over all  $v \in C_0^\infty(B(z_0, 2r) \cap \mathbf{R}^n)$  such that  $v \geq 1$  on  $K$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $a/p = 1 - s - 1/p$  coincides with the exponent in (2.2) and (2.3). Let  $\tilde{v} \in C_0^\infty(B(z_0, 2r))$  be admissible in the definition of  $\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(K, B(z_0, 2r))$  and set  $v(x) := \tilde{v}(x, 0)$  for  $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ . It then follows from (2.2) and the definition of  $\mu_a$  that

$$\int_B |\nabla \tilde{v}|^p d\mu_a \gtrsim \|v\|_{B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)}^p.$$

Since  $v \in C_0^\infty(B(z_0, 2r) \cap \mathbf{R}^n)$  and  $v \geq 1$  on  $K$ , taking infimum over all such functions  $\tilde{v}$  gives the  $\gtrsim$ -inequality in the statement of the lemma.

For the reverse inequality, let  $v \in C_0^\infty(B(z_0, 2r) \cap \mathbf{R}^n)$  be such that  $v \geq 1$  on  $K$ . Since  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1) \cap \mathbf{R}^n)$  in (2.4), it is then easily verified that the extension  $V \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ , given by (2.4), satisfies  $V(x, t) = 0$  whenever  $|x - x_0| \geq 2r + t$ .

To estimate  $\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(K, B(z_0, 2r))$ , let  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B(z_0, 2r))$  be a cut-off function such that  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$  in  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ ,  $\eta = 1$  in  $B(z_0, r)$  and  $|\nabla \eta| \leq 2/r$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(K, B(z_0, 2r)) &\leq \int_{B(z_0, 2r)} |\nabla(V\eta)|^p d\mu_a & (2.5) \\ &\leq 2^p \int_{B(z_0, 2r)} |\nabla V|^p d\mu_a + \frac{4^p}{r^p} \int_{B(z_0, 2r)} |V|^p d\mu_a. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.3), it therefore suffices to estimate the last term using the first integral on the right-hand side. To this end, we let  $B = B(z_0, 3r)$  and  $V_B := \int_B V d\mu_a$ . The Minkowski inequality then yields

$$\left( \int_B |V|^p d\mu_a \right)^{1/p} \leq \left( \int_B |V - V_B|^p d\mu_a \right)^{1/p} + |V_B|. \quad (2.6)$$

Note that, by the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |V_B| &\leq \int_B |V| d\mu_a \leq \left( \int_B |V|^p d\mu_a \right)^{1/p} \left( \frac{\mu_a(B \cap \text{supp } V)}{\mu_a(B)} \right)^{1-1/p} \\ &\leq \theta \left( \int_B |V|^p d\mu_a \right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $0 < \theta < 1$  depends only on  $n$ ,  $p$  and  $a$ . Inserting the last estimate into (2.6) and subtracting the last term from the left-hand side, we get

$$(1 - \theta) \left( \int_B |V|^p d\mu_a \right)^{1/p} \leq \left( \int_B |V - V_B|^p d\mu_a \right)^{1/p}.$$

Together with (2.5) and the  $(p, p)$ -Poincaré inequality (2.1) for  $\mu_a$ , this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(K, B(z_0, 2r)) &\leq 2^p \int_{B(z_0, 2r)} |\nabla V|^p d\mu_a + \frac{4^p C}{(1-\theta)^p} \int_B |\nabla V|^p d\mu_a \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n+1}} |\nabla V|^p d\mu_a. \end{aligned}$$

The comparison (2.3) now concludes the proof.  $\square$

In view of Lemma 2.2 and Definition 2.1, we make the following definition.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $B \subset \mathbf{R}^n$  be a ball and  $K \subset B$  be a compact set. The *variational Besov capacity* of  $K$  with respect to  $B$  is

$$\text{cap}_{B_p^s}(K, B) = \inf_v \|v\|_{B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)}^p,$$

where the infimum is taken over all  $v \in C_0^\infty(B)$  such that  $v \geq 1$  on  $K$ . For a Borel set  $E \subset B$ , we let

$$\text{cap}_{B_p^s}(E, B) = \sup_{\text{compact } K \subset E} \text{cap}_{B_p^s}(K, B).$$

We also say that a Borel set  $E \subset \mathbf{R}^n$  has zero  $B_p^s$ -capacity if

$$\text{cap}_{B_p^s}(E \cap B, B) = 0 \quad \text{for all balls } B \subset \mathbf{R}^n.$$

Lemma 2.2 now implies that whenever  $E \subset \overline{B(z_0, r)} \cap \mathbf{R}^n$  is a Borel set and  $z_0 = (x_0, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ ,

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(E, B(z_0, 2r)) \simeq \text{cap}_{B_p^s}(E, B(x_0, 2r)) \quad \text{where } s = 1 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{a}{p}. \quad (2.7)$$

In particular, this holds for the sets  $F_r$  in Theorem 1.1. Moreover, a Borel subset of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  has zero  $B_p^s$ -capacity if and only if it has zero  $\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}$ -capacity.

In order to consider the corkscrew condition for  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ , we need the following estimate.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $0 < \rho \leq r$ ,  $z_0 = (x_0, 0)$  and  $s = 1 - 1/p - a/p$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(B(z_0, \frac{1}{2}\rho), B(z_0, 2r)) &\lesssim \text{cap}_{B_p^s}(\overline{B(x_0, \rho)}, B(x_0, 2r)) \\ &\lesssim \text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(B(z_0, \rho), B(z_0, 2r)). \end{aligned}$$

*In particular,  $\text{cap}_{B_p^s}(\overline{B(x_0, cr)}, B(x_0, 2r)) \simeq r^{n-ps}$  with comparison constants depending only on  $n, p, s$  and  $0 < c \leq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $v \in C_0^\infty(B(x_0, 2r))$  be such that  $v \geq 1$  on  $\overline{B(x_0, \rho)}$ . Then

$$\|v\|_{B_p^s(\mathbf{R}^n)}^p \simeq \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n+1}} |\nabla V|^p d\mu_a,$$

where the extension  $V \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$  is given by (2.4). Note that in view of (2.4), we have

$$V(x, t) = 0 \text{ if } |x - x_0| \geq 2r + t \quad \text{and} \quad V(x, t) = 1 \text{ if } |x - x_0| \leq \rho - t.$$

In particular,  $V(x, t) = 1$  on  $B(z_0, \frac{1}{2}\rho)$  and hence, as in the proof of Lemma 2.2,

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(B(z_0, \frac{1}{2}\rho), B(z_0, 2r)) \lesssim \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n+1}} |\nabla V|^p d\mu_a.$$

Taking infimum over all functions  $v$  that are admissible in the definition of  $\text{cap}_{B_p^s}(B(x_0, \rho), B(x_0, 2r))$  proves the first inequality in the statement of the lemma. The second inequality follows from (2.7) and the inclusion  $B(x_0, \rho) \subset B(z_0, \rho)$ , together with

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(\overline{B(z_0, \rho)}, B(z_0, 2r)) = \text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(B(z_0, \rho), B(z_0, 2r)),$$

cf. [14, p. 32].

As for the last statement, it can be proved in the same way as in [14, Lemma 2.14] that the weighted capacity of balls in  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  satisfies

$$\text{cap}_{p,|t|^a}(B(z_0, cr), B(z_0, 2r)) \simeq \frac{1}{r^p} \int_{B(z_0, r)} |t|^a dx dt \simeq r^{n+1+a-p} = r^{n-ps}, \quad (2.8)$$

where the comparison constants in  $\simeq$  depend on  $n, p, s$  and  $c$ , but are independent of  $z_0$  and  $r$ . The first part of the lemma with  $\rho = cr$  then concludes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. The Dirichlet problem and boundary regularity

In this section, we let  $p = 2$  and  $a = 1 - 2s$ , where  $0 < s < 1$ . Note that  $s = \frac{1}{2}(1 - a)$  and so Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4, as well as the comparisons (2.7) and (2.8), apply with this choice of parameters. We write  $\text{cap}_{|t|^a}$  instead of  $\text{cap}_{2,|t|^a}$ .

As mentioned in the introduction, it follows from Caffarelli–Silvestre [7, Section 4] that the Dirichlet problem for the fractional equation (1.1) in  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$  can be seen as a restriction of the Dirichlet problem for the weighted equation (1.5) in  $G = \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus (F \times \{0\})$ , where  $F = \mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ .

More precisely, assume that  $f$  is continuous on  $F \times \{0\} = \partial G$  and vanishes outside some bounded set. The solution  $U$  of the Dirichlet problem in  $G$  for the weighted equation

$$\text{div}(|t|^a \nabla U(x, t)) = 0 \quad (3.1)$$

with boundary data  $f$  on  $\partial G$  then exists and can be obtained by the Perron method, as in Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [14, Definition 9.1]. We point out that the point at  $\infty$  in this Dirichlet problem is considered as a part of the boundary of  $G$  and that  $f$  is continuous also at  $\infty$ , with  $f(\infty) = 0$ . Recall that we assume that  $F$  has positive  $B_2^s$ -capacity. The estimate (2.7) then implies that also  $\text{cap}_{|t|^a}(F \times \{0\}) > 0$ . For simpler notation, we identify  $F$  with  $F \times \{0\} = \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus G = \partial G$ .

The *upper Perron solution* for an arbitrary bounded function  $f$  defined on  $\partial G \cup \{\infty\}$  is

$$\overline{P}_G f(z) := \inf_v v(z), \quad z \in G, \quad (3.2)$$

with the infimum taken over all lower semicontinuously regularized supersolutions  $v$  of (3.1) in  $G$ , which are bounded from below and satisfy

$$\liminf_{G \ni y \rightarrow z} v(y) \geq f(z) \quad \text{for all } z \in \partial G \cup \{\infty\},$$

see [14, Theorem 7.25 and Definition 9.1].

The *lower Perron solution* is defined similarly using upper semicontinuously regularized subsolutions of (3.1) or by  $\underline{P}_G f := -\overline{P}_G(-f)$ . It follows directly from the definition of Perron solutions that if  $f_1 \leq f_2$  on  $\partial G$  then the corresponding Perron solutions satisfy  $\overline{P}_G f_1 \leq \overline{P}_G f_2$  and  $\underline{P}_G f_1 \leq \underline{P}_G f_2$  in  $G$ . Moreover, the comparison principle between regularized sub- and supersolutions [14, p. 133] yields that  $\underline{P}_G f \leq \overline{P}_G f$  for every  $f$ .

Since  $\text{cap}_{|t|^a}(\mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus G) > 0$ , every continuous function  $f$  on  $\partial G \cup \{\infty\}$  is *resolutive*, i.e.  $\overline{P}_G f = \underline{P}_G f$ , see [14, Theorem 9.25]. The Perron solution will therefore be denoted  $P_G f$ .

By [7], the restriction  $u(x) := P_G f(x, 0)$  satisfies the fractional equation

$$(-\Delta)^s u = 0 \quad (3.3)$$

in  $\Omega$ . Moreover, by the Kellogg property [14, Theorem 9.11] and (2.7),

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow x} u(y) = \lim_{z \rightarrow (x, 0)} P_G f(z) = f(x)$$

holds for all  $x \in F$  outside a set of zero  $B_2^s$ -capacity. This function  $u$  is therefore a bounded solution of the Dirichlet problem for  $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$  with boundary data  $f$  on  $F$ , and we can make the following definition of regular boundary points.

**Definition 3.1.** A boundary point  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$  is *regular* for  $\Omega$  with respect to the fractional equation (3.3) if for each  $f \in C(\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega)$  vanishing outside some bounded set, the continuous solution  $u$  of (3.3) with boundary data  $f$  on  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  satisfies

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni x \rightarrow x_0} u(x) = f(x_0). \quad (3.4)$$

A point is *irregular* if it is not regular.

Following [14, p. 171], we say that a point  $z_0 \in \partial G$  is *regular* for  $G$  with respect to the equation (3.1) if for each boundary data  $f \in C(\partial G \cup \{\infty\})$ , the Perron solution  $P_G f$  satisfies

$$\lim_{G \ni z \rightarrow z_0} P_G f(z) = f(z_0). \quad (3.5)$$

The following equivalence is a first step in proving Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Assume that  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  has positive  $B_2^s$ -capacity. A boundary point  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$  is regular for  $\Omega$  with respect to the fractional equation (3.3) if and only if  $z_0 := (x_0, 0)$  is regular for  $G$  with respect to the weighted equation (3.1) with  $a = 1 - 2s$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $z_0$  is regular for  $G$  and let  $f$  be as in Definition 3.1. Then clearly, by the definition of  $u$  and by (3.5),

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni x \rightarrow x_0} u(x) = \lim_{G \ni z \rightarrow z_0} P_G f(z) = f(x_0).$$

Hence,  $x_0$  is regular for  $\Omega$ .

Conversely, assume that  $z_0$  is not regular for  $G$ . Then there exists a continuous function  $f$  on  $\partial G \cup \{\infty\}$  such that the corresponding Perron solution  $U = P_G f$  of the weighted equation (3.1) in  $G$  with boundary data  $f$  satisfies

$$\lim_{G \ni z \rightarrow z_0} U(z) \neq f(z_0).$$

By adding a constant and changing the sign, if needed, we can without loss of generality assume that  $f \geq 0$  on  $\partial G$  and

$$0 \leq \liminf_{G \ni z \rightarrow z_0} U(z) < f(z_0). \quad (3.6)$$

Multiplying  $f$  by a continuous cut-off function with compact support, we can moreover assume that  $f$  vanishes outside some bounded set. To conclude the proof, it suffices to show that (3.4) fails for the boundary data  $f$ . So, assume for a contradiction that (3.4) holds and define

$$\tilde{f}(z) = \begin{cases} f(z), & \text{if } z \notin G, \\ U(z), & \text{if } z \in G. \end{cases}$$



Let  $B$  be a ball centred at  $z_0$  and consider the upper half-ball

$$B_+ := \{(x, t) \in B : t > 0\}.$$

Then  $\tilde{f}$  is a bounded function on  $\partial B_+$ , which is continuous at  $z_0$ , because of the assumption (3.4).

We claim that the restriction to  $B_+$  of  $U$  is the Perron solution for  $\tilde{f}$  in  $B_+$ . Indeed, if  $v$  is admissible in the definition (3.2) of  $U = \bar{P}_G f$ , then by the definition of  $\tilde{f}$  and the continuity of  $U$  in  $G$ ,

$$\liminf_{B_+ \ni y \rightarrow z} v(y) \geq \begin{cases} f(z) = \tilde{f}(z), & \text{if } z \in \partial B_+ \cap \partial G, \\ \lim_{B_+ \ni y \rightarrow z} U(y) = \tilde{f}(z), & \text{if } z \in \partial B_+ \cap G. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$v \geq \bar{P}_{B_+} \tilde{f} \quad \text{in } B_+,$$

and taking infimum over all such  $v$  shows that  $U \geq \bar{P}_{B_+} \tilde{f}$  in  $B_+$ . Similarly,  $U = \underline{P}_G f \leq \underline{P}_{B_+} \tilde{f}$  in  $B_+$ . Since also  $\underline{P}_{B_+} \tilde{f} \leq \bar{P}_{B_+} \tilde{f}$ , we see that the function  $\tilde{f}$  is resolutive and  $U = P_{B_+} \tilde{f}$  is the Perron solution of (3.1) in  $B_+$  with boundary data  $\tilde{f}$ .

Now, by the corkscrew condition [14, Theorem 6.31] (with respect to  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ ),  $z_0$  is a regular boundary point for  $B_+$  and (3.1). Since  $\tilde{f}$  is bounded on  $\partial B_+$  and continuous at  $z_0$ , there is  $\hat{f} \in C(\partial B_+)$  such that  $\hat{f} \leq \tilde{f}$  and  $\hat{f}(z_0) = \tilde{f}(z_0)$ . By the regularity of  $z_0$  for the weighted equation (3.1), we therefore have

$$\liminf_{B_+ \ni z \rightarrow z_0} U(z) \geq \lim_{B_+ \ni z \rightarrow z_0} P_{B_+} \hat{f}(z) = \tilde{f}(z_0) = f(x_0).$$

A similar argument applied to  $B_- := \{(x, t) \in B : t < 0\}$ , together with the assumption that (3.4) holds, then gives

$$\liminf_{G \ni z \rightarrow z_0} U(z) \geq f(z_0),$$

which contradicts (3.6) and concludes the proof.  $\square$

We can now use the Wiener criterion for the weighted equation (3.1) in  $G \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ , provided by Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [14, Theorem 21.30] or Fabes–Jerison–Kenig [11].

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* By Theorem 3.2, the regularity of  $x_0$  is equivalent to the regularity of  $z_0$  for the weighted equation (3.1). This is in turn, by the Wiener criterion [14, Theorem 21.30 and (6.17)] with  $p = 2$ , equivalent to the condition

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\text{cap}_{|t|^\alpha}(F_r, B(z_0, 2r))}{\text{cap}_{|t|^\alpha}(B(z_0, r), B(z_0, 2r))} \frac{dr}{r} = \infty.$$

Here we have used the monotonicity of  $\text{cap}_{|t|^\alpha}$ , together with estimates similar to the proof of [14, Lemma 2.16], to replace  $\partial G \cap B(z_0, r)$  by the compact set  $F_r$  in the above integral. Finally, the estimates (2.7) and (2.8) (with  $p = 2$ ) conclude the proof.  $\square$

We conclude the paper with two additional properties of regular boundary points for the fractional equation  $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$ .

**Corollary 3.3** (Kellogg property). *The set of irregular boundary points for the fractional equation  $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$  has  $B_2^s$ -capacity zero.*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Theorem 3.2, together with (2.7) and the Kellogg property [14, Theorem 9.11] for the weighted equation (3.1).  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** *Assume that  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$  is regular for  $(-\Delta)^s u = 0$  and that  $f \in C(\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega)$  vanishes outside some bounded set. Let  $u$  be the continuous solution in  $\Omega$  of (3.3) with boundary data  $f$  on  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ . Then for all  $0 < \rho \leq R < \infty$ ,*

$$\sup_{\Omega \cap B(x_0, \rho)} u \leq \sup_{F_{2R}} f + \left( \sup_F f - \sup_{F_{2R}} f \right) \exp \left( -C \int_{\rho}^R \frac{\text{cap}_{B_2^s}(F_r, B(x_0, 2r))}{r^{n-2s}} \frac{dr}{r} \right),$$

where  $C$  depends only on  $n$  and  $s$ .

*Proof.* We shall use [14, Theorem 6.18], where a similar decay estimate is proved for the weighted equation (3.1) in bounded domains and with continuous Sobolev boundary data. Since  $G$  is unbounded and the Perron solution in general only belongs to a local Sobolev space, we proceed as follows.

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $m_\varepsilon = \sup_{F_{2R+\varepsilon}} f$  and  $M = \sup_F f$ . The Perron solution  $U = P_G f$  clearly satisfies  $U \leq M$ . Find a Lipschitz function  $\hat{f}_\varepsilon : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  such that

$$\hat{f}_\varepsilon = m_\varepsilon = \min_{\mathbf{R}^{n+1}} \hat{f}_\varepsilon \text{ in } B(z_0, 2R) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{f}_\varepsilon = M = \max_{\mathbf{R}^{n+1}} \hat{f}_\varepsilon \text{ outside } B(z_0, 2R + \varepsilon).$$

Then  $\hat{f}_\varepsilon \geq f$  on  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus G$ . Theorem 6.18 in [14], applied to  $\hat{f}$  and the bounded set  $G \cap B(z_0, 2R + \varepsilon)$ , gives as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{G \cap B(z_0, \rho)} U &\leq \sup_{G \cap B(z_0, \rho)} P_G \hat{f}_\varepsilon \\ &\leq \hat{f}_\varepsilon(z_0) + \text{osc}_{F_{2R}} \hat{f}_\varepsilon + (M - m_\varepsilon) \exp \left( -C \int_{\rho}^R \frac{\text{cap}_{|t|^a}(F_r, B(z_0, 2r))}{\text{cap}_{|t|^a}(B(z_0, r), B(z_0, 2r))} \frac{dr}{r} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\text{osc}_{F_{2R}} \hat{f}_\varepsilon = 0$  and  $\hat{f}_\varepsilon(z_0) = m_\varepsilon \rightarrow \sup_{F_{2R}} f$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the estimates (2.7) and (2.8) (with  $p = 2$ ) conclude the proof.  $\square$

## References

1. AIMAR, H., BELTRITTI, G. and GÓMEZ, I., Improvement of Besov regularity for solutions of the fractional Laplacian, *Constr. Approx.* **41** (2015), 219–229.
2. BARRIOS, B., FIGALLI, A. and ROS-OTON, X., Global regularity for the free boundary in the obstacle problem for the fraction Laplacian, *Amer. J. Math* **140** (2018), 415–447.
3. BOGDAN, K., The boundary Harnack principle for the fractional Laplacian, *Studia Math.* **123** (1997), 4–80.
4. BOGDAN, K., KULCZYCKI, T. and KWAŚNICKI, M., Estimates and structure of  $\alpha$ -harmonic functions, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **140** (2008), 34–381.
5. CAFFARELLI, L., ROQUEJOFFRE, J.-M. and SIRE, Y., Variational problems with free boundaries for the fractional Laplacian, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **12** (2010), 1151–1179.
6. CAFFARELLI, L., SALSA, S. and SILVESTRE, L., Regularity estimates for the solution and the free boundary of the obstacle problem for the fractional Laplacian, *Invent. math.* **171** (2008), 425–461.
7. CAFFARELLI, L. and SILVESTRE, L., An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **32** (2007), 1245–1260.
8. DAL MASO, G. and MOSCO, U., Wiener criteria and energy decay for relaxed Dirichlet problems, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **95** (1986), 345–387.

9. DAL MASO, G. and MOSCO, U., Wiener's criterion and  $\Gamma$ -convergence, *Appl. Math. Optim.* **15** (1987), 15–63.
10. EILERTSEN, S., On weighted positivity and the Wiener regularity of a boundary point for the fractional Laplacian, *Ark. Mat.* **38** (2000), 53–75.
11. FABES, E. B., JERISON, D. and KENIG, C. E., The Wiener test for degenerate elliptic equations, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **32:3** (1982), 151–182.
12. FABES, E. B., KENIG, C. E. and SERAPIONI, R. P., The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **7** (1982), 77–116.
13. GARIEPY, R. F. and ZIEMER, W. P., Behavior at the boundary of solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **56** (1974/75), 372–384.
14. HEINONEN, J., KILPELÄINEN, T. and MARTIO, O., *Nonlinear Potential Theory of Degenerate Elliptic Equations*, 2nd ed., Dover, Mineola, NY, 2006.
15. KILPELÄINEN, T. and MALÝ, J., The Wiener test and potential estimates for quasilinear elliptic equations, *Acta Math.* **172** (1994), 137–161.
16. KOCH, H., RÜLAND, A. and SHI, W., Higher regularity for the fractional thin obstacle problem, *New York J. Math.* **25** (2019), 745–838.
17. LINDQVIST, P. and MARTIO, O., Two theorems of N. Wiener for solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations, *Acta Math.* **155** (1985), 153–171.
18. LITTMAN, W., STAMPACCHIA, G. and WEINBERGER, H. F., Regular points for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **17** (1963), 43–77.
19. MAZ'YA, V. G., On the continuity at a boundary point of solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations, *Vestnik Leningrad. Univ. Mat. Mekh. Astronom.* **25:13** (1970), 42–55 (Russian). English transl.: *Vestnik Leningrad Univ. Math.* **3** (1976), 225–242.
20. MAZ'YA, V. G., Behaviour of solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the biharmonic operator at a boundary point, in *Equadiff IV* (Prague, 1977), pp. 250–262, Lecture Notes in Math. **703**, Springer, Berlin–Heidelberg, 1979.
21. MAZ'YA, V. G., On the Wiener type regularity of a boundary point for the polyharmonic operator, *Appl. Anal.* **71** (1999), 149–165.
22. MAZ'YA, V. G., *Sobolev Spaces with Applications to Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **342**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
23. MAZ'YA, V. G., *Boundary Behavior of Solutions to Elliptic Equations in General Domains*, EMS Tracts in Mathematics **30**, European Math. Soc., Zürich, 2018.
24. MAZ'YA, V. G. and DONCHEV, T., Regularity in the sense of Wiener of a boundary point for a polyharmonic operator, *C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci.* **36** (1983), 177–179 (Russian).
25. MIKKONEN, P., *On the Wolff Potential and Quasilinear Elliptic Equations Involving Measures*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. Dissertationes **104** (1996).
26. ROS-OTON, X. and SERRA, J., The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **101** (2014), 275–302.
27. ROS-OTON, X. and SERRA, J., The Pohozaev identity for the fractional Laplacian, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **213** (2014), 587–628.
28. SILVESTRE, L., Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **60** (2007), 67–112.
29. WIENER, N., The Dirichlet problem, *J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1924), 127–146.