

GLOBAL FRACTIONAL CALDERÓN–ZYGmund REGULARITY

BOUMEDIENE ABDELLAOUI, ANTONIO J. FERNÁNDEZ, TOMMASO LEONORI AND ABDELBADIE YOUNES

ABSTRACT. We obtain a global fractional Calderón–Zygmund regularity theory for the fractional Poisson problem. More precisely, for $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$, a bounded domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$ of class C^2 , $s \in (0, 1)$ and $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m \geq 1$, we consider the problem

$$(-\Delta)^s u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega,$$

and, according to m , we find the values of $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and of $1 < p < +\infty$ such that $u \in L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and such that $u \in W^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

KEYWORDS: Fractional Poisson Problem, Calderón–Zygmund, Regularity theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of the present paper is to obtain a global fractional Calderón–Zygmund regularity theory for the fractional Poisson problem with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, namely

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = f, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (P)$$

We assume here and in the rest of the paper that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$, is a bounded domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$ of class C^2 and that $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m \geq 1$. Also, for $s \in (0, 1)$, we denote by $(-\Delta)^s$ the fractional Laplacian which, for all $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, is defined by

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) := a_{N,s} \text{ p.v. } \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dy = a_{N,s} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_\varepsilon(0)} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dy,$$

where $a_{N,s} := 2^{2s} \pi^{-\frac{N}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2} + s)}{\Gamma(1-s)}$ is a normalization constant and Γ denotes the Euler’s gamma function.

Let us rephrase our main goal as follows: we want to find the fractional regularity of the (unique) solution to (P) according to the values of m . In particular, we focus our attention on the regularity in suitable function spaces such as the Bessel potential spaces $L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and the fractional Sobolev spaces $W^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and $1 < p < +\infty$ (see *Function spaces* below for a reminder of their definitions).

Before stating and describing our main results, we want to illustrate what kind of regularity can be expected through an example. Let us consider the *fractional torsion problem*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = 1, & \text{in } B_1(0), \\ u = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0). \end{cases} \quad (T)$$

It is well known (see e.g. [15, Theorem 1]) that the unique solution to (T) is

$$\mathbf{u}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{2^{-2s} \Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2} + s) \Gamma(1 + s)} (1 - |x|^2)^s, & \text{in } B_1(0), \\ 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0). \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Having at hand this explicit expression, it is easy to verify (see Proposition 2.1 below) that $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if and only if $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-s}$. This result tells us that, even if the right hand side f (as well as the boundary of the domain Ω) in the fractional Poisson problem (P) is smooth, one cannot expect in general the solution to be smooth up to the boundary. This is in striking contrast with the classical regularity results for the Poisson problem associated to the Laplacian operator (see for example the classical book by D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger [20]). Regardless, such peculiarity of the fractional Laplacian does not exclude the possibility of having a global Calderón–Zygmund regularity theory in fractional Sobolev spaces and Bessel potential spaces. For instance, using the explicit expression of \mathbf{u} given in (1.1) and a result by B. Dyda (see Theorem 2.2), we obtain the following picture of the regularity of \mathbf{u} .

Proposition 1.1.

- i) If $0 < t < s$, then $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.
- ii) $(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$, but $(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathbf{u} \notin L^\infty(B_1(0))$.
- iii) If $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, then $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{\frac{1}{t-s}}$, but $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u} \notin L^p(B_1(0))$ for any $\frac{1}{t-s} \leq p \leq \infty$.

The analysis of the solution to the *fractional torsion problem* (T) deeply relies on the explicit expressions of \mathbf{u} and $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u}$. However, in general, we do not explicitly know the expression neither of the solution to (P) nor of its $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian. Keeping in mind Proposition 1.1, we aim to derive a global Calderón–Zygmund regularity theory for more general domains Ω and data functions f , where no explicit expression of the solution is known. We first deal with f “very integrable” and prove the following sharp result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and let u be the (unique) weak solution to (P) with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m > \frac{N}{2s-t}$. Then:*

i) *For all $1 \leq p < \infty$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

ii) *For all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Here, $C > 0$ are constants depending only on N, s, t, p, m and Ω .

Remark 1.

- a) Proposition 1.1 guarantees that the previous result (see also Theorem 5.2) is sharp. We address the reader to Sect. 2 for a more detailed analysis of the *fractional torsion problem* (T).
- b) In the case where $t = s$ we use the convention $\frac{1}{t-s} = +\infty$. Hence, in that situation, i) and ii) of the previous result coincide.
- c) The previous result is a particular case of the more general Theorem 5.2, where we also analyse the (somehow simpler) case where $0 < t < s$.

The analysis of the global Calderón–Zygmund regularity we perform goes beyond the case of “regular” right hand side. Next, we pursue this analysis with a right hand side with “low summability”. To such a purpose, let us introduce some notation. For $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ arbitrary small and $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$, we define

$$m_*(s, t) := \max\left\{1, \frac{N}{N + s - N(t-s)} + \varepsilon\right\}, \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$p^*(m, s, t) := \begin{cases} \frac{mN}{N - ms}, & \text{for } t = s, \\ \min\left\{\frac{mN}{N - ms + mN(t-s)}, \frac{1}{t-s}\right\}, & \text{for } t > s. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Our main global Calderón–Zygmund regularity result concerning a “low summability” f reads then as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and let u be the (unique) weak solution to (P) with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m_*(s, t) \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$. Then, for all $1 \leq p < p^*(m, s, t)$, there exists $C > 0$ (depending only on N, s, t, p, m and Ω) such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

As a byproduct of our approach to prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, we also obtain the precise rate of explosion of the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of the solution to (P) at the boundary of the domain Ω .

Theorem 1.4. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and let u be the (unique) weak solution to (P) with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m \geq 1$.*

i) *If $m > \frac{N}{2s-t}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|\log \delta|^{-1}(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + (t-s)\|\delta^{t-s}(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

ii) *If $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{mN}{N-ms}$ and $1 \leq q < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-t)}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|\log \delta|^{-1}(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + (t-s)\|\delta^{t-s}(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Here, $\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ and $C > 0$ are constants depending only on N, s, t, p, q, m and Ω .

Remark 2.

- a) A straightforward outcome of the above result is the following local version of the Calderón–Zygmund regularity theory. For any $\omega \subset\subset \Omega$, it follows that:

i) *If $m > \frac{N}{2s-t}$, there exists $C_\omega > 0$ such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} + (t-s)\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} \leq C_\omega\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

ii) If $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{mN}{N-ms}$ and $1 \leq q < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-t)}$, there exists $C_\omega > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\omega)} + (t-s)\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^q(\omega)} \leq C_\omega \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

b) The above theorem is a particular case of the slightly more general Theorem 5.7.

As a consequence of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, we get the following regularity in fractional Sobolev spaces.

Corollary 1.5. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and let u be the unique (weak) solution to (P) with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$.*

i) *If $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{s}$, then, for all $1 < p < \frac{mN}{N-ms}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

ii) *If $m > \frac{N}{s}$, then, for all $1 < p < +\infty$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Here, $C > 0$ are positive constants depending only on N, s, p, m and Ω .

Remark 3. The above result is a particular case of the more general results Corollary 5.4 and Corollary 5.6.

Now that our main regularity results are stated, let us locate our work with respect to the existing literature. To that end, let us denote by u the (unique) solution to (P). Regarding the regularity of u , there exist mainly two different subjects: *local (or interior)* regularity and *global (or up to the boundary)* regularity.

Let us first focus in the existing literature concerning *local* regularity. This direction is nowadays rather well understood so we just mention a few works dealing with different issues. On one hand, let us mention that the $W_{loc}^{2s-\varepsilon, 2}(\Omega)$ and $L_{loc}^{2s,p}(\Omega)$ regularity of u have been respectively analysed in [13] (where the author deals with more general operators) and [8]. On the other hand, in the very recent paper [27], the *local* summability of the fractional derivatives of u of order t , with $s \leq t \leq \min\{1, 2s\}$, has been treated. Note that in [27] the authors deal with general operators, whose kernel is a C^α -perturbation of the fractional Laplacian one. Finally, we refer to [14, Proposition 4.3], where sharp Schauder type estimates have been proved. Let us also mention the recent work [17] for the analysis of more general operators.

As already observed, the *global* regularity is much more involved. Let us first recall that the *global* L^p -regularity of u have been completely understood, even for more general operators than the fractional Laplacian (see for instance [26]). Moreover, when the datum f is “regular” (say $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ with $m > \frac{N}{2s}$), sharp *global* Hölder-type regularity results have been obtained. We refer to [21, 30, 32] for fundamental contributions in this direction. Let us in addition mention that the behavior of u near the boundary of the domain has also been studied. We refer to [21, 30] for the analysis of the behaviour of $\delta^{-s}u$ and to [18] for the analysis of the behaviour of $\delta^{1-s}\nabla u$. Despite the above mentioned works, very few results dealing with the *global* summability of the fractional derivatives of u or with their behaviour near the boundary of the domain are available in the literature. Among these, let us point out [25], where the authors established *global* summability results for the fractional derivatives of order σ with $0 < \sigma < s$. Note that they deal with operators much more general than the fractional Laplacian and that their proofs rely on the use of the Wolff potential. The same type of results, using a completely different approach, has been proved in [2].

The main novelty of our results with respect to the existing literature is that we are able to understand the *global* summability of the fractional derivatives of u for any order t , with $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, and their precise rate of explosion near the boundary of the domain. On one hand, for the “particular case” of the fractional Laplacian, our results extend to *global* the recent *local* Calderón–Zygmund regularity theory established in [27]. On the other hand, we obtain sharp bounds for $\delta^{t-s}(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u$ near the boundary of the domain. Our analysis of $\delta^{t-s}(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u$ goes on the line of the works [18, 21, 30] but our results are new.

Next, we give some ideas of the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. Let us first specify the notion of weak solution to (P) that we use in this work. We denote by $G_s : \mathbb{R}_*^{2N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the Green kernel associated to $(-\Delta)^s$ in Ω and introduce the *solution map*

$$\mathbb{G}_s : L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow M^{\frac{N}{N-s}}(\Omega), \quad f \mapsto \mathbb{G}_s[f] := \int_{\Omega} G_s(x, y) f(y) dy,$$

where $M^p(\Omega)$ with $p \geq 1$ denotes the Marcinkiewicz space (see (1.10) for the definition). Note that the *solution map* is well-defined thanks to the existence and uniqueness of a weak solution to (P) with L^1 -data and by its representation formula (see e.g. [10]).

Definition 1. We say that $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to (P) if

$$u(x) = \mathbb{G}_s[f](x) = \int_{\Omega} G_s(x, y) f(y) dy, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \quad (1.4)$$

Remark 4.

- a) We will sometimes use the notation $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ to indicate that u is the weak solution to (P) .
 b) Let us define

$$\mathbb{X}^s(\Omega) := \left\{ \phi \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^N) : \phi(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } (-\Delta)^s \phi \in L^\infty(\Omega) \right\}. \quad (1.5)$$

It is more common in the literature to use the following notion of weak solution: $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ is a *weak solution* to (P) if $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ and

$$\int_{\Omega} u(-\Delta)^s \phi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \phi(x) f(x) \, dx, \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{X}^s(\Omega).$$

However, as explained for instance in [5, Remark 2.11], both notions are equivalent. If one prefers so, one could identify our definition of weak solution as the representation formula for the *weak solution* to (P) . This kind of *weak solutions* are sometimes referred in the literature as *very weak solutions*.

- c) For all $y \in \Omega$, let δ_y be the Dirac mass centred at y . It is well-known that the Green function $G_s(\cdot, y)$ is, at least formally, a weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_x^s G_s(x, y) = \delta_y, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ G_s(x, y) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Having at hand the notion of weak solution, we are now ready to describe the main ideas in the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and let u be the (unique) weak solution to (P) with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m \geq 1$. As a first step, we notice that the representation formula (1.4) provides a suitable representation formula for the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of u . More precisely, we have that

$$(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x) = \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y) f(y) \, dy, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \quad (1.6)$$

We are then lead to analyse the pointwise behaviour of the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of the Green kernel G_s . In fact, the core of our results relies on suitable pointwise estimates of the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of G_s . Our main result in that direction reads as follows.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ (depending only on N, s, t and Ω) such that*

$$\left| (-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y) \right| \leq \frac{C}{|x - y|^{N - (2s - t)}} \left(1 + |\log|x - y|| + |\log \delta(x)| + \frac{|x - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

Here, $\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$.

Once we have at hand the representation formula for the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian (1.6) and Theorem 1.6, the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are actually standard. Indeed, combining these two elements, we will obtain a pointwise estimate for the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of u (see Lemma 5.1 below) and then Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 will follow from classical tools of harmonic analysis. We refer to Sect. 5 for more details.

Let us also mention that the strategy to prove Theorem 1.4 follows the same lines. Certainly, looking carefully to the pointwise estimate established in Theorem 1.6, one can understand the role played by the distance function in Theorem 1.4.

In a slightly different direction, we also prove pointwise estimates for the *Riesz t -gradient* of the Green kernel G_s . Let us recall that, for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the *Riesz fractional gradient of order t* is given by

$$\nabla^t \phi(x) := \mu_{N,t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(x - y)(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+t+1}} \, dy, \quad (1.7)$$

where $\mu_{N,t} := 2^t \pi^{-\frac{N}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N+t+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1-t}{2})}$ is a normalization constant. Modifying appropriately the proof of Theorem 1.6, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ (depending only on N, s, t and Ω) such that*

$$\left| \nabla_x^t G_s(x, y) \right| \leq \frac{C}{|x - y|^{N - (2s - t)}} \left(1 + |\log|x - y|| + |\log \delta(x)| + \frac{|x - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

Here, $\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$.

Remark 5. Having at hand Theorem 1.7, one can argue as in the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 and obtain their counterpart for the *Riesz fractional gradient of order t* . We refer to Theorems 5.8 and 5.9 for the precise statements of these results.

We provide as well some ideas of the proofs of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7. Both proofs mainly rely on two ingredients. On one hand, we use some classical estimates on the Green kernel G_s and on its gradient (see Lemma 3.7). On the other hand, we use some new estimates for singular integrals with suitable weights that involve the distance function δ (see Lemma 3.4). Indeed, the proof of Theorem 1.6 follows combining these two ingredients with a suitable decomposition for the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian (and the t -gradient, as far as Theorem 1.7 is concerned) of the Green kernel G_s .

As an application of our *global* Calderón-Zygmund regularity theory, in the forthcoming paper [4], we get new existence results for nonlinear fractional Laplacian problems with nonlocal “gradient terms”. In other words, we prove new existence results for deterministic stationary KPZ-type equations involving nonlocal-nonlinear “gradient” terms. More precisely, we analyse equations of the form

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = \mu(x) \mathcal{G}[u] + \lambda h(x), & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (KPZ)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a real parameter, h belongs to a suitable Lebesgue space, $\mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and \mathcal{G} represents here different type of nonlocal-nonlinear “gradient” terms. These results provide (almost) complete answers to some of the open problems posed in [5, Section 6] and [3, Section 7].

Organization of the paper. In the rest of the introduction we gather some notation and recall the definition of the function spaces used in this work. In Sect. 2 we continue the analysis of the *fractional torsion Problem* initiated in the introduction. Sect. 3 is devoted to prove several integral estimates that will be key in the rest of the paper. We also state there some tools that will be useful in the subsequent sections. Having at hand the integral estimates of Sect. 3, we prove Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 in Sect. 4. In Sect. 5, we use Theorem 1.6 to establish a *global* Calderón-Zygmund regularity theory for the fractional Poisson problem. In particular, we prove Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 and Corollary 1.5.

Notation. We gather here some notation that will be used throughout the paper. For a set $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we define $\omega^c := \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \omega$. Also, we denote by δ the distance to $\partial\Omega$, i.e. $\delta(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$, and define

$$R := \frac{1}{3} + \frac{4}{3}(\text{diam}(\Omega) + \text{dist}(0, \Omega)) \quad \text{so that} \quad \Omega \subset\subset B_R(0). \quad (1.8)$$

Note that, with such a choice of R , we have the following inequality that we use widely in the sequel

$$|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{4}(1 + |x|) \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega \text{ and all } x \in B_R^c(0). \quad (1.9)$$

Since it will play a role in the proof of Theorem 1.6, we emphasize that, by $(-\Delta)_\Omega^\gamma$ we denote the regional fractional Laplacian which, for all $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, is defined by

$$(-\Delta)_\Omega^\gamma u(x) := a_{N,\gamma} \text{p.v.} \int_\Omega \frac{u(x) - u(z)}{|x - z|^{N+2\gamma}} dz.$$

It is also worth to emphasize here that, in the rest of the paper, we will omit the normalization constant $a_{N,\gamma}$ and the principal value sense (“p.v.”) appearing in the definitions of $(-\Delta)^\gamma$ and $(-\Delta)_\Omega^\gamma$. We will omit as well the normalization constant $\mu_{N,\gamma}$ appearing in the definition of ∇^γ .

Finally, let us define $\mathbb{R}_*^{2N} := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N} : x \neq y\}$ and stress that, by $\sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})$, we denote the $(N - 1)$ -dimensional measure of the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^N .

Function spaces. We collect here the definition of the functional spaces involved in our results. First of all, recall that, for all $s \in (0, 1)$ and $1 \leq p < +\infty$, the fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is defined as

$$W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) := \left\{ u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N) : \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy < +\infty \right\}.$$

It is a Banach space endowed with the usual norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \left(\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)}^p + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Next, we remind that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $1 \leq p < +\infty$, the Bessel potential space is defined as

$$L^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) := \overline{\{u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}},$$

where

$$\|u\|_{L^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \|(1 - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \quad \text{and} \quad (1 - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}((1 + |\cdot|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}u), \quad \forall u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Let us stress that, in the case where $s \in (0, 1)$ and $1 < p < +\infty$,

$$\|u\|_{L^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} := \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)}$$

is an equivalent norm for $L^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (see e.g. [1, page 5] for a precise explanation of this fact). Let us as well recall that, for all $0 < \varepsilon < s < 1$ and all $1 < p < +\infty$, by [6, Theorem 7.63, (g)], we have

$$L^{s+\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset L^{s-\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Finally, we emphasize that, for $1 \leq p < +\infty$, $M^p(\Omega)$ denotes the Marcinkiewicz space (or weak- L^p space). We recall here that

$$[f]_{M^p(\Omega)}^p := \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^p |\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| \geq \lambda\}|. \quad (1.10)$$

Acknowledgements. The second and third authors wish to thank Dr. Matteo Cozzi for very helpful discussions as well as Prof. Piotr Hajłasz for his kind help and for pointing out some useful references. The first author is partially supported by projects MTM2016-80474-P and PID2019-110712GB-I00, MINECO, Spain. The first and fourth authors are partially supported by the DGRSDT, Algeria.

2. AN ENLIGHTENING EXAMPLE: THE FRACTIONAL TORSION PROBLEM

Let \mathbf{u} be the solution of the *fractional torsion problem* (T), whose explicit expression has been given in (1.1). The aim of this introductory section is to analyse in detail the fractional regularity of \mathbf{u} . More precisely, we find the values of $0 < t \leq 1$ and $1 < p < +\infty$ such that $\mathbf{u} \in L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and such that $\mathbf{u} \in W^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Throughout this section we fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N \geq 2$ and $s \in (0, 1)$. Also, let us point out that, by B and Γ , we denote Euler's beta and gamma functions respectively and, by ${}_2F_1$, we denote the Gauss' hypergeometric function. We begin our analysis with an elementary result concerning local regularity.

Proposition 2.1. $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if and only if $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-s}$.

Proof. First observe that

$$|\nabla \mathbf{u}(x)| = \frac{2^{1-2s}\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})s}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}+s)\Gamma(1+s)} |x| (1-|x|^2)^{s-1} =: C_1 |x| (1-|x|^2)^{s-1}, \quad \text{if } |x| < 1.$$

Thus, using polar coordinates (see e.g. [19, Theorem 2.49]), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1(0)} |\nabla \mathbf{u}(x)|^p dx &= C_1^p \int_{B_1(0)} |x|^p (1-|x|^2)^{p(s-1)} dx = C_1^p \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_0^1 \rho^{N+p-1} (1-\rho^2)^{p(s-1)} d\rho \\ &= \frac{C_1^p}{2} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_0^1 t^{\frac{N+p}{2}-1} (1-t)^{1-(1-s)p-1} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

If $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-s}$, we infer that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} |\nabla \mathbf{u}(x)|^p dx = \frac{C_1^p}{2} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \text{B}\left(\frac{N+p}{2}, 1-(1-s)p\right) = \frac{C_1^p}{2} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N+p}{2})\Gamma(1-(1-s)p)}{\Gamma(\frac{N+p}{2}+1-(1-s)p)},$$

and so, that $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-s}$. It remains to show that $p \geq \frac{1}{1-s}$ implies $\mathbf{u} \notin W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 t^{\frac{N+p}{2}-1} (1-t)^{1-(1-s)p-1} dt &= \int_0^\infty \frac{r^{\frac{N+p}{2}-1}}{(1+r)^{\frac{N+p}{2}+1-(1-s)p}} dr \\ &\geq \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{2^{\frac{N+p}{2}+1-(1-s)p}}\right\} \int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{r^{2-(1-s)p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

If $p \geq \frac{1}{1-s}$, the last integral in the above chain of inequalities does not converge. Gathering (2.1) and (2.2) we conclude that $p \geq \frac{1}{1-s}$ implies $|\nabla \mathbf{u}| \notin L^p(B_1(0))$. \square

As explained in the introduction, although \mathbf{u} is not smooth up to the boundary, it is possible to obtain a global Calderón–Zygmund regularity theory in suitable fractional function spaces. In the rest of this section, using the following result by B. Dyda, we analyse the global fractional regularity of \mathbf{u} .

Theorem 2.2. ([15, Theorem 1]) *Let $0 < t < 2$, then*

$$(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u}(x) = \frac{2^{t-2s}\Gamma(\frac{N+t}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}+s)\Gamma(s+1-\frac{t}{2})} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{t+N}{2}, -s+\frac{t}{2}; \frac{N}{2}; |x|^2\right) \quad \text{for all } x \in B_1(0). \quad (2.3)$$

We first characterize the summability of $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u}$ for $0 < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$. In other words, we prove Proposition 1.1.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. We consider separately the three cases: $0 < t < s$; $t = s$ and $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$.

i) First note that $0 < t < s$ implies (see e.g. [29, Theorems 17 and 18]) that

$${}_2F_1\left(\frac{t+N}{2}, -s + \frac{t}{2}; \frac{N}{2}; |x|^2\right) \in L^\infty(B_1(0)).$$

Thus, having at hand (2.3), we immediately deduce that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(B_1(0))$. It then remains to show that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0))$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We first analyse the summability of $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u}$ in $B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)$. Using that $B_1(0) \subset B_3(x)$ for all $x \in B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u}(x)| &= \frac{2^{-2s}\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}+s)\Gamma(1+s)} \left| \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{(1-|y|^2)^s}{|x-y|^{N+t}} dy \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2^{-s}\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}+s)\Gamma(1+s)} \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{dy}{|x-y|^{N-(s-t)}} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{-s}\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}+s)\Gamma(1+s)} \int_{B_3(x)} \frac{dy}{|x-y|^{N-(s-t)}} \\ &= \frac{2^{-s}\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}+s)\Gamma(1+s)} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \frac{3^{s-t}}{s-t} =: \frac{C_2}{s-t}, \quad \text{for all } x \in B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Hence, it immediately follows that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^p(B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0))$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Secondly, observe that $|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{4}(1+|x|)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0)$ and all $y \in B_1(0)$. Hence, we have that

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u}(x)| = \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{\mathbf{u}(y)}{|x-y|^{N+t}} dy \leq \frac{2^{2(N+t)}}{(1+|x|)^{N+t}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(B_1(0))}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0),$$

and so, also that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0))} \leq 2^{2N+t} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(B_1(0))} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) t^{-1} =: \frac{C_1}{t}.$$

Thus, using the interpolation inequality

$$\|f\|_{L^p(X)}^p \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(X)}^{p-1} \|f\|_{L^1(X)}, \quad \forall f \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(X), \quad \forall 1 < p < \infty, \quad (2.5)$$

we get that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0))$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

ii) The fact that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$ is well known (see e.g. [30, Remark 2.11]). On the other hand, by [7, Theorem 2.1.3], we know that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{{}_2F_1\left(\frac{s+N}{2}, -\frac{s}{2}; \frac{N}{2}; |x|^2\right)}{-\ln(1-|x|^2)} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{s+N}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{s}{2})}.$$

Thus, taking into account (2.3), we conclude that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}\mathbf{u} \notin L^\infty(B_1(0))$.

iii) Since $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, we know (cf. [7, Theorem 2.1.3]) that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{{}_2F_1\left(\frac{t+N}{2}, -s + \frac{t}{2}; \frac{N}{2}; |x|^2\right)}{(1-|x|^2)^{s-t}} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})\Gamma(t-s)}{\Gamma(\frac{N+t}{2})\Gamma(-s + \frac{t}{2})}. \quad (2.6)$$

On one hand, note that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} (1-|x|^2)^{p(s-t)} dx = \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_0^1 \frac{\rho^{N-1}}{(1-\rho^2)^{p(t-s)}} d\rho \leq \frac{1}{2} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_0^1 \frac{dr}{r^{2-p(t-s)}}. \quad (2.7)$$

If $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$, the last integral in the above chain of inequalities is finite. Thus, gathering (2.3), (2.6) and (2.7), we conclude that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^p(B_1(0))$ for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$. On the other hand, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we get

$$\int_{B_1(0)} (1-|x|^2)^{p(s-t)} dx \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{2^{\frac{N}{2}+1-p(t-s)}}\right\} \int_1^\infty \frac{dr}{r^{2-p(t-s)}}. \quad (2.8)$$

If $p \geq \frac{1}{t-s}$, the last integral in the above chain of inequalities does not convergence. Gathering (2.3), (2.6) and (2.8), we conclude that $p \geq \frac{1}{t-s}$ implies $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \notin L^p(B_1(0))$. Hence, it follows that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^p(B_1(0))$ if and only if $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$.

It remains to show that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0))$ for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$. We first analyse the summability of $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\mathbf{u}$ in $B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)$. Using that $B_1(0) \subset \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x|-1 \leq |x-y| \leq 3\} =: A_x$ for all $x \in B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)$,

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u}(x)| &= \frac{2^{-2s} \Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2} + s) \Gamma(1 + s)} \left| \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{(1 - |y|^2)^s}{|x - y|^{N+t}} dy \right| \leq \frac{2^{-s} \Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2} + s) \Gamma(1 + s)} \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{N+t-s}} \\
&\leq \frac{2^{-s} \Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2} + s) \Gamma(1 + s)} \int_{A_x} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{N+t-s}} = \frac{2^{-s} \Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2} + s) \Gamma(1 + s)} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_{|x|-1}^3 \frac{d\rho}{\rho^{1+t-s}} \\
&\leq \frac{2^{-s} \Gamma(\frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2} + s) \Gamma(1 + s)} \frac{\sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})}{t-s} \frac{1}{(|x|-1)^{t-s}} =: \frac{C_5}{t-s} \frac{1}{(|x|-1)^{t-s}}, \quad \text{for all } x \in B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^p(B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0))}^p &\leq \frac{C_5^p}{(t-s)^p} \int_{B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)} \frac{dx}{(|x|-1)^{p(t-s)}} \\
&= \frac{C_5^p}{(t-s)^p} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_1^2 \frac{\rho^{N-1} d\rho}{(\rho-1)^{p(t-s)}} \leq \frac{C_5^p 2^{N-1}}{(t-s)^p} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_0^1 \frac{dr}{r^{p(t-s)}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

The last integral in the above chain of inequalities is finite for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$. Hence, $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u} \in L^p(B_2(0) \setminus B_1(0))$ for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$. Finally, arguing as in case *i*), we infer that $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} \mathbf{u} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0))$ for all $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$ and the proof of *iii*) is finished. \square

As a consequence of Proposition 1.1 it is immediate to prove the following regularity of \mathbf{u} in Bessel potential spaces.

Corollary 2.3.

- i)* If $0 < t \leq s$, then $\mathbf{u} \in L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < \infty$.
- ii)* If $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, then $\mathbf{u} \in L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < \frac{1}{t-s}$ and $\mathbf{u} \notin L^{t,q}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $\frac{1}{t-s} \leq q < \infty$.

Proof. The result immediately follows from Proposition 1.1 and the fact that, for $0 < t < 1$ and $1 < p < \infty$,

$$\|u\|_{L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} := \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)},$$

is an equivalent norm for $L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. \square

To conclude the picture of the regularity of the function \mathbf{u} , we also give a result that involves both Sobolev and Besov regularity. Let us stress that by $B_{p,q}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we denote the Besov space of order α and parameters p and q . We refer to [33, Chapter V, Sect. 5, page 150] for the precise definition and the basic properties.

Corollary 2.4.

- i)* If $0 < t < s$, then $\mathbf{u} \in W^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < \infty$.
- ii)* If $t = s$, then:
 - a)* $\mathbf{u} \in B_{p,2}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < 2$.
 - b)* $\mathbf{u} \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $2 \leq p < \infty$.
- iii)* If $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, then:
 - a)* $\mathbf{u} \in B_{p,2}^t(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < 2$.
 - b)* $\mathbf{u} \in W^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $2 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$.

Proof. The result follows from the combination of Corollary 2.3 with [6, Theorem 7.63 (g), page 221] and [33, Theorem 5, page 155]. \square

3. PRELIMINARY INTEGRAL ESTIMATES AND USEFUL TOOLS

We begin this section with some elementary (simple calculus) results.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\lambda > 0$, then*

$$\ln \frac{1}{\tau} \leq \frac{1}{\tau^\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1 \right), \quad \text{for all } \tau \in (0, +\infty).$$

Proof. Let us consider $f : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ given by $f(\tau) := \tau^{-\lambda} + \ln \tau + \frac{1}{\lambda} (\ln \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1)$ and observe that $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} f(\tau) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} f(\tau) = +\infty$. Moreover, f is differentiable and $f'(\tau) = 0$ if and only if $\tau = \lambda^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} =: \tau^*$. Thus, we infer that f has a global minimum on $(0, +\infty)$ at $\tau = \tau^*$. Since $f(\tau^*) = 0$, the desired inequality follows. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $N \geq 1$ and $\lambda > 1$, then:*

$$||u|^\lambda - |w|^\lambda| \leq \lambda \max\{1, 2^{\lambda-2}\} (|u-w|^{\lambda-1} + |u|^{\lambda-1}) |u-w|, \quad \text{for all } u, w \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Proof. Let us fix arbitrary $u, w \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and consider $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(\tau) = |\tau u + (1 - \tau)w|^\lambda$. Then, since $\lambda > 1$, observe that

$$f(1) = |u|^\lambda, \quad f(0) = |w|^\lambda, \quad \text{and} \quad f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

Thus, using the Mean Value Theorem, we get

$$||u|^\lambda - |w|^\lambda| \leq \sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} |f'(\tau)|. \quad (3.1)$$

On the other hand, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the triangular inequality and the fact that

$$(a + b)^p \leq \max\{1, 2^{p-1}\}(a^p + b^p), \quad \text{for all } a, b \geq 0 \text{ and } p > 0,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} |f'(\tau)| &= \lambda|\tau u + (1 - \tau)w|^{\lambda-2} |\langle \tau u + (1 - \tau)w, u - w \rangle| \\ &= \lambda|u - w| |(1 - \tau)(w - u) + u|^{\lambda-1} \leq \lambda|u - w| ((1 - \tau)|u - w| + |u|)^{\lambda-1} \\ &\leq \lambda \max\{1, 2^{\lambda-2}\} ((1 - \tau)^{\lambda-1} |u - w|^{\lambda-1} + |u|^{\lambda-1}) |u - w|, \quad \text{for all } \tau \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The result immediately follows combining (3.1) and (3.2). \square

3.1. Preliminary integral estimates.

The aim of this subsection is to prove integral estimates which will be of key importance to the proof of our main results. The following lemma is essentially contained in the proof of [22, Lemma 3.13]. For the benefit of the reader we give here a self-contained direct calculus proof.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $N \geq 1$, $\rho > 0$ and $\alpha, \beta \in (-\infty, N)$. There exists $C := C(N, \rho, \alpha, \beta) > 0$ such that:*

- If $N - \alpha - \beta \neq 0$, then

$$\int_{B_\rho(0)} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^\alpha |y - z|^\beta} \leq C \left(1 + |x - y|^{N - \alpha - \beta}\right), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in B_\rho(0) \text{ with } x \neq y.$$

- If $N - \alpha - \beta = 0$, then

$$\int_{B_\rho(0)} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^\alpha |y - z|^\beta} \leq C \left(1 + |\ln |x - y||\right), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in B_\rho(0) \text{ with } x \neq y.$$

Remark 6. Following the proof it is possible to obtain the explicit dependence of the constant C with respect to ρ . However, since it is not necessary to our purposes and it deteriorates the presentation, we prefer not to give the explicit dependence.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Let us fix arbitrary $x, y \in B_\rho(0)$ with $x \neq y$. We consider the map $T : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ given by $T(z) = \frac{z-x}{|x-y|}$ and note that $T(B_\rho(0)) = B_{\frac{\rho}{|x-y|}}\left(\frac{-x}{|x-y|}\right) =: A$. Hence, it follows that

$$\int_{B_\rho(0)} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^\alpha |y - z|^\beta} = |x - y|^{N - \alpha - \beta} \int_A \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w + p|^\beta}, \quad \text{with } p = \frac{x - y}{|x - y|}.$$

Since $|p| = 1$, we define

$$A_1 := A \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0), \quad A_2 := A \cap (B_2(0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)) \quad \text{and} \quad A_3 := A \cap (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0)),$$

and observe that

$$\int_{B_\rho(0)} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^\alpha |y - z|^\beta} = |x - y|^{N - \alpha - \beta} \int_A \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w + p|^\beta} = |x - y|^{N - \alpha - \beta} \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{A_i} \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w + p|^\beta}. \quad (3.3)$$

We treat the integral in each A_i separately. First, observe that $w \in A_1$ implies $|w + p| \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, using that $\alpha < N$, we get

$$\int_{A_1} \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w + p|^\beta} \leq 2^\beta \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)} \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha} = \frac{2^{\beta + \alpha - N}}{N - \alpha} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}). \quad (3.4)$$

Next, observe that $|w| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ in A_2 and that $B_2(0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0) \subset B_4(-p)$. Thus, using that $\beta < N$, we obtain

$$\int_{A_2} \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w + p|^\beta} \leq 2^\alpha \int_{B_4(-p)} \frac{dw}{|w + p|^\beta} = \frac{2^{2N - 2\beta + \alpha}}{N - \beta} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}). \quad (3.5)$$

Finally, note that $|w + p| \geq \frac{|w|}{2}$ in A_3 and that $A_3 \subset \{w \in \mathbb{R}^N : 2 \leq |w| \leq \frac{2\rho}{|x-y|}\}$. Thus, we get

$$\int_{A_3} \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w + p|^\beta} \leq 2^\beta \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_2^{\frac{2\rho}{|x-y|}} r^{N-1-\alpha-\beta} dr.$$

On one hand, if $N - \alpha - \beta = 0$, we get that

$$\int_{A_3} \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w+p|^\beta} \leq 2^\beta \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) (|\ln \rho| + |\ln |x-y||). \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand, if $N - \alpha - \beta \neq 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{A_3} \frac{dw}{|w|^\alpha |w+p|^\beta} \leq \frac{2^{N-\alpha}}{N-\alpha-\beta} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \left(1 + \frac{\rho^{N-\alpha-\beta}}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha-\beta}} \right). \quad (3.7)$$

The result follows gathering (3.4)–(3.7) and substituting in (3.3). \square

Our next result is inspired by [24, Lemma 2.5] and its proof relies on [24, Lemma 2.3]. We believe this result is of independent interest and will be useful to analyse the behaviour of solutions to non-local problems in bounded domains. Note that the C^2 -regularity imposed on the boundary of the domain $\partial\Omega$ is crucial here.

Lemma 3.4. *For any $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $0 < a < 1$, there exists $C := C(N, \lambda, a, \Omega) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} |x-y|^{\lambda-N} \delta^{-a}(y) dy \leq C(1 + \omega_{a,\lambda}(x)), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega,$$

where

$$\omega_{a,\lambda}(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \lambda > a, \\ |\ln \delta(x)|, & \text{if } \lambda = a, \\ \delta^{-(a-\lambda)}(x), & \text{if } \lambda < a. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. First observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |x-y|^{\lambda-N} \delta^{-a}(y) dy \\ &= \int_{B_{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}}(x)} \frac{dy}{\delta^a(y) |x-y|^{N-\lambda}} + \int_{\Omega \setminus B_{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}}(x)} \frac{dy}{\delta^a(y) |x-y|^{N-\lambda}} =: I_1(x) + I_2(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

We estimate each I_i separately. First, observe that $y \in B_{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}}(x)$ implies $\delta(y) \geq \frac{\delta(x)}{2}$. Hence, there exists $C := C(N, \delta, a, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(x) &\leq 2^a \delta^{-a}(x) \int_{B_{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}}(x)} \frac{dy}{|x-y|^{N-\lambda}} = 2^a \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \delta^{-a}(x) \int_0^{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}} \rho^{\lambda-1} \\ &= \frac{2^{a-\lambda}}{\lambda} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \delta^{\lambda-a}(x) \leq C(1 + \omega_{a,\lambda}(x)), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

To estimate I_2 , note that, since Ω is of class C^2 , there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\Omega) \in (0, 1)$ and a unique reflection map

$$\mathcal{R} : B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega), \quad x \mapsto \mathcal{R}(x) := x - 2(p(x) - x),$$

at the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Here, $B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \delta(x) < \varepsilon\}$ and $p(x)$ is the projection of $x \in B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega)$ onto $\partial\Omega$, i.e. the unique point on $\partial\Omega$ with $|x - p(x)| = \delta(x)$. We now consider separately two cases.

Case 1 : $x \in \Omega \setminus B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega)$.

In this case, $y \in \Omega \setminus B_{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}}(x)$ implies $|y-x| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Hence, it follows that

$$I_2(x) \leq \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right)^{N-\lambda} \int_{\Omega} \frac{dy}{\delta^a(y)} \leq C, \quad (3.11)$$

with $C = C(N, \lambda, a, \Omega) > 0$.

Case 2 : $x \in \Omega \cap B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega)$.

Note that, $x \in \overline{\Omega} \cap B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega)$ implies that

$$\mathcal{R}(x) \in B_\varepsilon(\partial\Omega) \setminus \Omega, \quad \delta(x) = \delta(\mathcal{R}(x)), \quad \text{and} \quad |x - \mathcal{R}(x)| = 2\delta(x).$$

Hence, we have that

$$|\mathcal{R}(x) - y| \leq 5|x - y|, \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega \setminus B_{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}}(x),$$

and thus

$$I_2(x) \leq 5^{N-\lambda} \int_{\Omega \setminus B_{\frac{\delta(x)}{2}}(x)} \frac{dy}{\delta^a(y) |\mathcal{R}(x) - y|^{N-\lambda}}.$$

Applying then [24, Lemma 2.3] to $\mathcal{R}(x) \in \Omega^c$, we get $C = C(N, \lambda, a, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$I_2(x) \leq C(1 + \omega_{a,\lambda}(x)). \quad (3.12)$$

Gathering (3.11)-(3.12), we get the existence of $C = C(N, \lambda, a, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$I_2(x) \leq C(1 + \omega_{\lambda,a}(x)), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega. \quad (3.13)$$

The result follows substituting (3.10) and (3.13) in (3.9). \square

3.2. Useful tools.

In this subsection we gather some known results that will be crucially used in this paper. Let us start with a classical (but difficult to find in the literature) *a.e.* fundamental Theorem of Calculus in Sobolev spaces.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then:*

$$\text{For a.e. } x, z \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad f(x) - f(z) = \int_0^1 \langle x - z, \nabla f(\tau x + (1 - \tau)z) \rangle d\tau.$$

Proof. The result follows from the combination of [23, Theorem 16] (applied with $k = p = 1$) with [16, Theorem 4.20] and [19, Theorem 3.35]. See also [34, Chapter 3, Exercise 3.15]. \square

The next tool we need is a classical result from harmonic analysis. It is crucial in the proofs of our main regularity results of Section 5.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$, be an open bounded domain and let $0 < \alpha < N$ and $1 \leq p < \ell < \infty$ be such that $\frac{1}{\ell} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{\alpha}{N}$. Moreover, for $g \in L^p(\omega)$, let*

$$J_\lambda(g)(x) := \int_\omega \frac{g(y)}{|x - y|^{N-\alpha}} dy.$$

It follows that there exists $C = C(N, \alpha, p, \sigma > 0, \ell, \Omega) > 0$ such that

- a) J_α is well defined (in the sense that the integral converges absolutely for a.e. $x \in \omega$).
- b) $[J_\alpha(g)]_{M^\ell(\omega)} \leq C \|g\|_{L^1(\omega)}$. In particular, $\|J_\alpha(g)\|_{L^\sigma(\omega)} \leq C \|g\|_{L^1(\omega)}$ for all $1 \leq \sigma < \ell$.
- c) If $1 < p < \frac{N}{\alpha}$, then $\|J_\alpha(g)\|_{L^\ell(\omega)} \leq C \|g\|_{L^p(\omega)}$.
- d) If $p = \frac{N}{\alpha}$, then $\|J_\alpha(g)\|_{L^\sigma(\omega)} \leq C \|g\|_{L^p(\omega)}$ for all $1 \leq \sigma < +\infty$.
- e) If $p > \frac{N}{\alpha}$, then $\|J_\alpha(g)\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} \leq C \|g\|_{L^p(\omega)}$.

Proof. Parts a), b), c) and d) follow from [33, Theorem I, Section 1.2, Chapter V, page 119]. Part e) is contained in [20, Lemma 7.12] (see also [28, Theorem 2.2]). \square

In the next lemma we collect some known estimates on the s -Green kernel G_s and its gradient $\nabla_x G_s$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $G_s(x, y)$ be the Green Function associated to Ω , then there exist $\mathcal{C}_1 := \mathcal{C}_1(N, s, \Omega) > 0$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 := N$ such that*

$$G_s(x, y) \leq \mathcal{C}_1 \min \left\{ \frac{1}{|x - y|^{N-2s}}, \frac{\delta^s(x)}{|x - y|^{N-s}}, \frac{\delta^s(y)}{|x - y|^{N-s}} \right\}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega, \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$|\nabla_x G_s(x, y)| \leq \mathcal{C}_2 G_s(x, y) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{|x - y|}, \frac{1}{\delta(x)} \right\}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \quad (3.15)$$

Remark 7. Under the assumptions of the previous lemma, sharp (two-sides) pointwise estimates for the s -Green function are available in the literature. See for instance [12, Corollary 1.3] or [11, Corollary 1.2].

Proof. The pointwise estimates for the Green function, namely (3.14), can be found in [12, Theorem 1.1], while (3.15) follows from [9, Corollary 3.3]. \square

The next proposition will be systematically used in this paper, too.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$. Then, for*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} r = \infty, & \text{if } m > \frac{N}{2s}, \\ r \in [1, \infty), & \text{if } m = \frac{N}{2s}, \\ r = \frac{mN}{N-2ms}, & \text{if } 1 < m < \frac{N}{2s}, \\ r \in [1, \frac{N}{N-2s}), & \text{if } m = 1, \end{array} \right. \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} q = \infty, & \text{if } m > \frac{N}{s}, \\ q \in [1, \infty), & \text{if } m = \frac{N}{s}, \\ q = \frac{mN}{N-ms}, & \text{if } 1 < m < \frac{N}{s}, \\ q \in [1, \frac{N}{N-s}), & \text{if } m = 1, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.16)$$

there exists $C := C(N, s, m, r, q, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{u}{\delta^s} \right\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. The L^r -regularity of the function u can be found in [26]. See also [31, Proposition 1.4] for a different proof. As far as the Hardy-type regularity is concerned, we observe that, thanks to (3.14),

$$\left| \frac{u(x)}{\delta^s(x)} \right| = \frac{1}{\delta^s(x)} \left| \int_{\Omega} G_s(x, y) f(y) dy \right| \leq C_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x - y|^{N-s}} dy, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Hence the L^q -summability of u/δ^s in (3.16)–(3.17) follows combining Lemma 3.6 with Lemma 3.7. \square

4. THE $\frac{t}{2}$ -LAPLACIAN AND THE t -GRADIENT OF THE s -GREEN FUNCTION

This section is devoted to prove Theorems 1.6 and 1.7. Moreover, we will provide pointwise estimates for the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of the s -Green function in Ω^c .

Let us begin with an elementary technical lemma that will be key in the proof of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $0 < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$: for any $y \in \Omega$, let $\alpha_y : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by*

$$\alpha_y(x) := |x - y|^{N-(2s-t)} G_s(x, y), \quad \text{if } x \neq y \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_y(y) = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Then

$$\alpha_y(x) - \alpha_y(z) = \int_0^1 \langle x - z, \nabla \alpha_y(\tau x + (1 - \tau)z) \rangle d\tau, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, z \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Proof. For any $y \in \Omega$, we want to prove that $\alpha_y \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ so that the result immediately follows from Lemma 3.5. We will actually show that $\alpha_y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 \leq p < \min\{\frac{1}{1-s}, \frac{1}{1-t}\}$. Using (3.14)–(3.15), we infer that

$$|\nabla \alpha_y(x)| \leq \frac{C_1(N - (2s - t) + C_2)}{|x - y|^{1-t}} + \frac{C_1 C_2 |x - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{1-s}(x)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta(x) \leq |x - y|\}}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

We now consider separately two cases:

Case 1 : $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$.

In this case we have that there exists $C := C(N, s, t, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \alpha_y(x)|^p dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_{d_{\Omega}}(y)} \frac{dx}{|x - y|^{p(1-t)}} + \int_{\Omega} \frac{dx}{\delta^{p(1-s)}(x)} \right),$$

where $d_{\Omega} := \text{diam}(\Omega)$. Thus, we immediately deduce that $\alpha_y \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-s}$, and so that $\alpha_y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-s}$.

Case 2 : $0 < t < s$.

In this case we have that there exists $C := C(N, s, t, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \alpha_y(x)|^p dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_{d_{\Omega}}(y)} \frac{dx}{|x - y|^{p(1-t)}} + \int_{\Omega} \frac{dx}{\delta^{p(1-t)}(x)} \right).$$

Thus, we immediately deduce that $\alpha_y \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-t}$, and so that $\alpha_y \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{1-t}$. \square

Having at hand the previous lemma we can now provide the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. First of all, observe that

$$(-\Delta)_{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y) = G_s(x, y) \int_{\Omega^c} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t}} + (-\Delta)_{\frac{t}{2}, x} G_s(x, y), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \quad (4.2)$$

Now, observe that,

$$\int_{\Omega^c} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\delta(x)}(x)} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t}} = \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_{\delta(x)}^{\infty} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^{1+t}} = t^{-1} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \delta^{-t}(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.$$

Hence, using that $G_s(x, y) \geq 0$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_*^{2N}$, it follows that,

$$G_s(x, y) \int_{\Omega^c} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t}} \leq t^{-1} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) G_s(x, y) \delta^{-t}(x), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

In particular, taking into account (3.14), we infer that

$$G_s(x, y) \int_{\Omega^c} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t}} \leq \frac{C_1 t^{-1} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})}{|x - y|^{N-s}} \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \quad (4.3)$$

On the other hand, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & |x - y|^{N-(2s-t)} (-\Delta)_{\Omega, x}^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y) \\ &= (-\Delta)_{\Omega, x}^{\frac{t}{2}} \alpha_y(x) + \int_{\Omega} G_s(z, y) \frac{|z - y|^{N-(2s-t)} - |x - y|^{N-(2s-t)}}{|x - z|^{N+t}} dz, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where we recall that α_y has been defined in (4.1). Using that $G_s(x, y) \geq 0$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_*^{2N}$ and Lemma 3.2 with $\lambda = N - (2s - t)$, $u = z - y$ and $w = x - y$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega} G_s(z, y) \frac{|z - y|^{N-(2s-t)} - |x - y|^{N-(2s-t)}}{|x - z|^{N+t}} dz \right| \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega} G_s(z, y) \left(|x - z|^{-2s} + \frac{|z - y|^{N-(2s-t)-1}}{|x - z|^{N+t-1}} \right) dz, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $C := [N - (2s - t)] \max\{1, 2^{N-(2s-t)-2}\} > 0$. Thus, taking into account (3.14) and applying Lemma 3.3 with $\rho = R$ (recall that R has been chosen in (1.8)), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega} G_s(z, y) \frac{|z - y|^{N-(2s-t)} - |x - y|^{N-(2s-t)}}{|x - z|^{N+t}} dz \right| \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{2s} |y - z|^{N-2s}} + \int_{\Omega} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t-1} |y - z|^{1-t}} \right) \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_R(0)} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{2s} |y - z|^{N-2s}} + \int_{B_R(0)} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t-1} |y - z|^{1-t}} \right) \\ & \leq C \left(1 + \left| \ln \frac{1}{|x - y|} \right| \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Here, and in the rest of the proof, we denote by C any constant depending only on N, s, t and Ω and whose value may change from line to line.

Next, we deal with $(-\Delta)_{\Omega, x}^{\frac{t}{2}} \alpha_y(x)$. First, using Lemma 4.1, we write

$$(-\Delta)_{\Omega, x}^{\frac{t}{2}} \alpha_y(x) = \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_0^1 \langle x - z, \nabla \alpha_y(\tau x + (1 - \tau)z) \rangle d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t}}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

Then, let us introduce the shortened notation $\theta_{\tau} := \tau x + (1 - \tau)z$ and define $I_{\Omega} := \{\tau \in [0, 1] : \theta_{\tau} \in \Omega\} \subset [0, 1]$. By direct computations, taking into account (3.14)–(3.15), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)_{\Omega, x}^{\frac{t}{2}} \alpha_y(x)| & \leq \int_{\Omega} \left([N - (2s - t)] \int_0^1 |\theta_{\tau} - y|^{N-(2s-t)-1} G_s(\theta_{\tau}, y) d\tau \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^1 |\theta_{\tau} - y|^{N-(2s-t)} |\nabla_x G_s(\theta_{\tau}, y)| d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t-1}} \\ & \leq \mathcal{C}_1 ([N - (2s - t)] + \mathcal{C}_2) \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{I_{\Omega}} |\theta_{\tau} - y|^{-(1-t)} d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t-1}} \\ & \quad + \mathcal{C}_1 \mathcal{C}_2 \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{I_{\Omega}} \frac{|\theta_{\tau} - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta_{\tau})} d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t-1}} \\ & =: \mathcal{C}_1 ([N - (2s - t)] + \mathcal{C}_2) J_1(x, y) + \mathcal{C}_1 \mathcal{C}_2 J_2(x, y), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

We treat each J_i for separately. Tanks to the choice of R (see (1.8)) we have that $\Omega \subset B_R(0)$ and that $\theta_{\tau} \in B_R(0)$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$. Thus, by Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.1 applied with $0 < \lambda < t$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(x, y) & \leq \int_{B_R(0)} \left(\int_0^1 |\theta_{\tau} - y|^{-(1-t)} d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t-1}} = \int_0^1 \left(\int_{B_R(0)} \frac{dz}{|y - \theta_{\tau}|^{1-t} |x - z|^{N+t-1}} \right) d\tau \\ & = \int_0^1 \left(\int_{B_R(0)} \frac{dz}{|(1 - \tau)^{-1}(y - \tau x) - z|^{1-t} |x - z|^{N+t-1}} \right) \frac{d\tau}{(1 - \tau)^{1-t}} \\ & \leq C \int_0^1 \frac{1}{(1 - \tau)^{1-t}} \left(1 + \left| \ln \left(\frac{|x - y|}{1 - \tau} \right) \right| \right) d\tau \\ & \leq C (1 + |\ln |x - y||), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

We now deal with J_2 . First, let us define $\Omega_{\tau,x} := \{z \in \Omega : \tau x + (1-\tau)z \in \Omega\}$ and $T(z) = \theta_\tau = \tau x + (1-\tau)z$, and observe that $T(\Omega_{\tau,x}) \subseteq \Omega$. Hence, using the change of variable $\theta = T(z)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(x, y) &= \int_0^1 \left(\int_{\Omega_{\tau,x}} \frac{|\theta_\tau - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta_\tau)} \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{N+t-1}} \right) d\tau = \int_0^1 \left(\int_{T(\Omega_{\tau,x})} \frac{|\theta - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{(1-\tau)^{t-1}}{|\theta-x|^{N+t-1}} d\theta \right) d\tau \\ &\leq \int_0^1 (1-\tau)^{t-1} d\tau \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\theta - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-x|^{N+t-1}} \right) = \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\theta - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-x|^{N+t-1}}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, notice that $|\theta - y|^{t-s} \leq |\theta - x|^{t-s} + |x - y|^{t-s}$ for all $x, y, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Thus, we actually have that

$$J_2(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-x|^{N+s-1}} + \frac{|x-y|^{t-s}}{t} \int_{\Omega} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-x|^{N+t-1} \delta^{1-s}(\theta)}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

Then, applying Lemma 3.4 with $\lambda = 1-s$ and $a = 1-s$ in the first integral and with $\lambda = 1-t$ and $a = 1-s$ in the second one, we get

$$J_2(x, y) \leq C \left(1 + \frac{|x-y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} + |\log \delta(x)| \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \quad (4.8)$$

Having at hand (4.7) and (4.8), we plug them into (4.6) and infer that

$$|(-\Delta)_{\Omega,x}^{\frac{t}{2}} \alpha_y(x)| \leq C \left(1 + |\log |x-y|| + |\log \delta(x)| + \frac{|x-y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \quad (4.9)$$

Consequently, gathering (4.4), (4.5) and (4.9), we obtain that

$$|(-\Delta)_{\Omega,x}^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{|x-y|^{N-(2s-t)}} \left(1 + |\log |x-y|| + |\log \delta(x)| + \frac{|x-y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

The result follows combining the above inequality with (4.2) and (4.3). \square

Remark 8. Modifying the proof of Theorem 1.6, we can cover also the case $0 < t < s$. Indeed, to cover this case, we just have to modify (4.8). Note that, in the case where $0 < t < s$,

$$J_2(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|\theta-y|^{s-t} \delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-x|^{N+t-1}}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

Then, splitting Ω into $\{\theta \in \Omega : |\theta-y| \geq |\theta-x|\} =: \Omega_1$ and $\{\theta \in \Omega : |\theta-y| < |\theta-x|\} =: \Omega_2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(x, y) &\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Omega_1} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-x|^{N+s-1}} + \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Omega_2} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-y|^{N+s-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-x|^{N+s-1}} + \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{|\theta-y|^{N+s-1}}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Applying twice Lemma 3.4 with $\lambda = 1-s$ and $a = 1-s$, we get a constant $C := C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$J_2(x, y) \leq C \left(1 + |\log \delta(x)| + |\log \delta(y)| \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

Then, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.6, one can easily conclude that, if $0 < t < s$, there exists a constant $C := C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that, for almost every $x, y \in \Omega$,

$$|(-\Delta)_{\Omega,x}^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{|x-y|^{N-(2s-t)}} \left(1 + |\log |x-y|| + |\log \delta(x)| + |\log \delta(y)| + \frac{\delta^{s-t}(x)}{|x-y|^{s-t}} \right).$$

We believe that the estimate we have obtained in the case $0 < t < s$ is far from being sharp when x approaches the boundary of Ω .

As already announced, we also obtain pointwise estimates for the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of G_s in Ω^c .

Proposition 4.2. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and R as in (1.8). There exists $C := C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that*

$$|(-\Delta)_{\Omega^c}^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{|x-y|^{N-2s}} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^t} + \frac{1}{\delta^t(x)} \right), \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega, x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega. \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$|(-\Delta)_{\Omega^c}^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{(1+|x|)^{N+t}}, \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega, x \in B_R^c(0). \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. First of all, observe that

$$|(-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| = \int_{\Omega} \frac{G_s(z, y)}{|x - z|^{N+t}} dz, \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega, x \in \Omega^c.$$

Now, according to the choice of R , we notice that $|x - z| \geq \frac{1}{4}(1 + |x|)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)$ and all $z \in \Omega$. Hence, taking into account (3.14), we get the existence of $C = C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$|(-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| \leq \frac{2^{2(N+t)}}{(1 + |x|)^{N+t}} \int_{\Omega} G_s(z, y) dz \leq \frac{C}{(1 + |x|)^{N+t}}, \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega, x \in B_R^c(0). \quad (4.12)$$

On the other hand, for $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$, we split Ω into

$$\Omega_1 = \left\{ z \in \Omega : |y - z| > \frac{1}{2}|x - y| \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_2 = \left\{ z \in \Omega : |y - z| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - y| \right\},$$

and we note that

$$|x - z| \geq |y - x| - |y - z| \geq \frac{1}{2}|x - y|, \quad \text{for all } z \in \Omega_2.$$

Thus, using (3.14), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| &\leq C_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|z - x|^{N+t}} \frac{dz}{|z - y|^{N-2s}} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{N-2s} C_1}{|x - y|^{N-2s}} \int_{\Omega_1} \frac{dz}{|z - x|^{N+t}} + \frac{2^{N+t} C_1}{|x - y|^{N+t}} \int_{\Omega_2} \frac{dz}{|z - y|^{N-2s}}, \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega, x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_1} \frac{dz}{|z - x|^{N+t}} &\leq \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_{\delta(x)}^R \frac{d\rho}{\rho^{1+t}} \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \left[\delta^{-t}(x) - R^{-t} \right] \leq \frac{C}{\delta^t(x)}, \quad \text{for all } x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_2} \frac{dz}{|z - y|^{N-2s}} \leq \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}|x-y|} \frac{1}{\rho^{1-2s}} = \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \frac{1}{2^{1+2s}} |x - y|^{2s}, \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega, x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega.$$

Hence, there exists $C := C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$|(-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{|x - y|^{N-2s}} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^t} + \frac{1}{\delta^t(x)} \right), \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega, x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega. \quad (4.13)$$

The result follows from (4.12) and (4.13). \square

We now prove Theorem 1.7. As mentioned in the introduction, this result follows modifying in a suitable way the proof of Theorem 1.6. For the benefit of the reader we provide some details.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. First of all, we notice that

$$\nabla_x^t G_s(x, y) = G_s(x, y) \int_{\Omega^c} \frac{x - z}{|x - z|^{N+t+1}} dz + \int_{\Omega} \frac{(x - z)(G_s(x, y) - G_s(z, y))}{|x - z|^{N+t+1}} dz =: \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \quad (4.14)$$

The first integral can be treated exactly as before, so that we deduce that

$$|\mathcal{I}_1(x, y)| \leq G_s(x, y) \int_{\Omega^c} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{N+t}} \leq \frac{C_1 t^{-1} \sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})}{|x - y|^{N-s}} \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega.$$

As far as \mathcal{I}_2 is concerned, we observe that, for a.e. $x, y \in \Omega$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &|x - y|^{N-(2s-t)} \mathcal{I}_2(x, y) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{(x - z)(\alpha_y(x) - \alpha_y(z))}{|x - z|^{N+t+1}} dz + \int_{\Omega} (x - z) G_s(z, y) \frac{|z - y|^{N-(2s-t)} - |x - y|^{N-(2s-t)}}{|x - z|^{N+t+1}} dz, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where we recall that $\alpha_y(\cdot)$ has been defined in (4.1). On one hand, arguing as in the proof of (4.5), we get $C > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} (x - z) G_s(z, y) \frac{|z - y|^{N-(2s-t)} - |x - y|^{N-(2s-t)}}{|x - z|^{N+t+1}} dz \right| \leq C \left(1 + \left| \ln \frac{1}{|x - y|} \right| \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \quad (4.16)$$

Here, and in the rest of the proof, we denote by C any constant depending only on N, s, t and Ω and whose value may change from line to line. On the other hand, to deal with the first integral in (4.15), we apply Lemma 4.1 and obtain that, for a.e. $x, y, z \in \Omega$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{(x-z)(\alpha_y(x) - \alpha_y(z))}{|x-z|^{N+t+1}} dz = \int_{\Omega} (x-z) \left(\int_0^1 \langle x-z, \nabla \alpha_y(\tau x + (1-\tau)z) \rangle d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{N+t+1}}$$

With the same notation used in the proof of Theorem 1.6 and thanks to (3.14)–(3.15), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} \frac{(x-z)(\alpha_y(x) - \alpha_y(z))}{|x-z|^{N+t+1}} dz \right| &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left([N - (2s-t)] \int_0^1 |\theta_{\tau} - y|^{N-(2s-t)-1} G_s(\theta_{\tau}, y) d\tau \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^1 |\theta_{\tau} - y|^{N-(2s-t)} |\nabla_x G_s(\theta_{\tau}, y)| d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{N+t-1}} \\ &\leq C_1([N - (2s-t)] + C_2) \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{I_{\Omega}} |\theta_{\tau} - y|^{-(1-t)} d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{N+t-1}} \\ &\quad + C_1 C_2 \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{I_{\Omega}} \frac{|\theta_{\tau} - y|^{t-s}}{\delta^{1-s}(\theta_{\tau})} d\tau \right) \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{N+t-1}} \\ &=: C_1([N - (2s-t)] + C_2) J_1(x, y) + C_1 C_2 J_2(x, y), \quad \text{for a.e. } x, y \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Using the estimates (4.7) and (4.8) for J_1 and J_2 respectively, we conclude the proof as in Theorem 1.6. \square

5. THE FRACTIONAL POISSON PROBLEM: GLOBAL FRACTIONAL CALDERÓN–ZYGmund REGULARITY

In this section we apply the pointwise estimates for the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of the s -Green kernel G_s (namely, Theorem 1.6) to obtain (global) Calderón–Zygmund regularity results for the fractional Poisson problem (P). As explained in the introduction, the main idea in the proofs of these results relies on the use of a suitable representation formula. Note that, during the rest of this section, we use the shortened notation $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ to indicate that u is the (unique) weak solution to (P).

Let us begin with a preliminary technical (but very useful) lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and let u be the (unique) weak solution to (P) with $f \in L^1(\Omega)$. Then, there exists $C := C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that*

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x)| \leq C \left[g_1(x) + |\log \delta(x)| g_2(x) + \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} g_3(x) \right], \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \quad (5.1)$$

Here, the functions g_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy:

- For all $0 < \lambda < 2s - t$, there exists $C := C(\lambda) > 0$ s.t. $g_1(x) \leq C \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{N-(2s-t-\lambda)}} dy$, (5.2)

- $g_2(x) := \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{N-(2s-t)}} dy$, (5.3)

- $g_3(x) := (t-s) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{N-s}} dy$. (5.4)

Proof. Observe that, by the representation formula (1.4) and thanks to Fubini's Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\mathbb{G}_s[f](x) - \mathbb{G}_s[f](z)}{|x-z|^{N+t}} dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|x-z|^{N+t}} \left(\int_{\Omega} G_s(x, y) f(y) dy - \int_{\Omega} G_s(z, y) f(y) dy \right) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{G_s(x, y) - G_s(z, y)}{|x-z|^{N+t}} f(y) dy \right) dz = \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y) f(y) dy, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x)| \leq \int_{\Omega} |(-\Delta)_x^{\frac{t}{2}} G_s(x, y)| |f(y)| dy \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Applying then Theorem 1.6, we get $C := C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x)| \leq C \left[g_1(x) + |\log \delta(x)| g_2(x) + \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} g_3(x) \right], \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Here,

$$g_1(x) := \int_{\Omega} \frac{1 + |\log |x-y||}{|x-y|^{N-(2s-t)}} |f(y)| dy,$$

$g_2(x)$ is given by (5.3) and $g_3(x)$ is given by (5.4) (observe that $g_3(x) \equiv 0$ if $t = s$). Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, it is easy to verify that g_1 satisfies (5.2). \square

Remark 9. Let us recall some classical results about the distance function that will be very useful hereafter. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$, be a bounded domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$ of class C^2 . It is well-known that:

- For all $\mu(0, 1)$, $\delta^{-\mu} \in L^\rho(\Omega)$ if and only if $1 \leq \rho < \frac{1}{\mu}$; (5.5)

- $\log \delta \in L^\rho(\Omega)$ if and only if $1 \leq \rho < +\infty$. (5.6)

The first result that we prove turns out to be a generalization of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $s, t \in (0, 1)$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m > \max\{\frac{N}{s}, \frac{N}{2s-t}\}$. Then:*

i) *If $0 < t < s$, for all $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

ii) *If $t = s$, for all $1 \leq p < +\infty$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

iii) *If $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Here, $C > 0$ are constants depending only on N, s, t, p, m and Ω .

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Let us start with two preliminary observations that will be very useful in the rest of the proof. First, since $m > \min\{\frac{N}{s}, \frac{N}{2s-t}\}$, by [31, Proposition 1.4, (iii)], we know that there exists a positive constant $C_1 = C_1(N, s, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C_1\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.7)$$

Moreover, for any $0 < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, we can easily estimate the $\frac{t}{2}$ -Laplacian of u “far away” from Ω . Indeed, thanks to the choice of R (cf. (1.8) and (1.9)), we have that $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{4}(1 + |x|)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)$ and all $y \in \Omega$. Hence, using (5.7) and the definition of $(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}$, we get a constant $C := C(N, s, t, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u(x)| = \int_{\Omega} \frac{u(y)}{|x - y|^{N+t}} dy \leq C \frac{\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}}{(1 + |x|)^{N+t}}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0). \quad (5.8)$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^\infty(B_R^c(0))} + \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^1(B_R^c(0))} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}, \quad (5.9)$$

for some $C = C(N, s, t, m, \Omega) > 0$. Furthermore, using the interpolation inequality (2.5), for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we get $C := C(N, s, t, m, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^p(B_R^c(0))} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}, \quad (5.10)$$

We now consider separately three cases.

Case 1 : $0 < t < s$.

Taking into account (5.7), we get $C = C(N, s, t, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u(x)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{N+t}} = \int_{B_1(x)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{N+t}} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(x)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{N+t}} dy \\ &\leq C_1\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \int_{B_1(x)} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{N-(s-t)}} + 2C_1\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(x)} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{N+t}} \\ &= C_1\sigma(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \left(\int_0^1 \frac{d\rho}{\rho^{1-(s-t)}} + 2 \int_1^\infty \frac{d\rho}{\rho^{1+t}} \right) = C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimate with (5.9) and the interpolation inequality (2.5) the proof of i) is concluded.

Case 2 : $t = s$.

In order to obtain the estimate in Ω , we apply Lemma 5.1 and obtain that

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u(x)| \leq C \left[g_1(x) + |\log \delta(x)|g_2(x) \right], \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Since $m > \frac{N}{s}$, we can choose $0 < \lambda < s - \frac{N}{m}$ and, by Lemma 3.6, e), we get $C := C(N, s, m, \Omega) > 0$

$$g_1(x) + |\log \delta(x)|g_2(x) \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}(1 + |\log \delta(x)|), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.$$

Thus, recalling (5.6), we infer that, for all $1 \leq p < \infty$, there exists $C := C(N, s, m, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.11)$$

Finally, using Lemma 3.8 and the fact that $|x - y| \geq \min\{\delta(y), \delta(x)\}$ for all $y \in \Omega$ and $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$, we obtain $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ (depending only on N, s, m and Ω) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u(x)| &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{|x - y|^{N+s}} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{\delta^s(y)} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^N} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^N} \\ &\leq C_2 \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \int_{\delta(x)}^{2R} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} (1 + |\log \delta(x)|), \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

It is then clear that, for all $1 \leq p < \infty$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u\|_{L^p(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.13)$$

Gathering (5.10), (5.11) and (5.13) we get *ii*).

Case 3 : $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$

By Lemma 5.1 we know that

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x)| \leq C \left[g_1(x) + |\log \delta(x)| g_2(x) + \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} g_3(x) \right], \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

On the other hand, since $m > \frac{N}{2s-t}$, we can choose $0 < \lambda < 2s - t - \frac{N}{m}$ and, once again by Lemma 3.6, e), we know there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, \Omega) > 0 > 0$ such that

$$g_1(x) + |\log \delta(x)| g_2(x) + \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} g_3(x) \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \left(1 + |\log \delta(x)| + \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} \right), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.$$

Thus, recalling (5.5), we infer that, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$, there exists $C := C(N, s, t, m, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.14)$$

Finally, using Lemma 3.8 and the fact that $|x - y| \geq \min\{\delta(y), \delta(x)\}$ for all $y \in \Omega$ and $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$, we obtain $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ (depending only on N, s, t, m and Ω) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x)| &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{|x - y|^{N+t}} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{\delta^s(y)} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{N+(t-s)}} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{N+(t-s)}} \\ &\leq C_2 \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \int_{\delta(x)}^{2R} \frac{d\rho}{\rho^{1+(t-s)}} \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s}(x)} \right), \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

It then follows that, for all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u\|_{L^p(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.16)$$

Gathering (5.10), (5.14) and (5.16) the result follows also in this case. \square

Corollary 5.3. *Let $s, t \in (0, 1)$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m > \max\{\frac{N}{s}, \frac{N}{2s-t}\}$:*

- i) If $0 < t \leq s$, then $u \in L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < \infty$ and $\|u\|_{L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}$.*
- ii) If $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, then $u \in L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < \frac{1}{t-s}$ and $\|u\|_{L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}$.*

Here, $C > 0$ are constants depending only on N, s, t, p, m and Ω .

Proof. The result follows arguing exactly as in the proof of Corollary 2.3 using Theorem 5.2 instead of Proposition 1.1. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Let $s, \gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m > \max\{\frac{N}{s}, \frac{N}{2s-\gamma}\}$:*

- i) If $0 < \gamma \leq s$, then $u \in W^{\gamma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < \infty$ and $\|u\|_{W^{\gamma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}$.*
- ii) If $s < \gamma < \min\{1, 2s\}$, then $u \in W^{\gamma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 < p < \frac{1}{\gamma-s}$ and $\|u\|_{W^{\gamma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}$.*

Here, $C > 0$ are positive constants depending only on N, s, γ, m, p and Ω .

Proof. In the case where $0 < \gamma < s$, the result immediately follows combining Corollary 5.3, *i*), with the embedding $L^{\sigma+\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset W^{\sigma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < \sigma < 1$ and all $1 < p < \infty$ (see [6, Theorem 7.63, (g)]).

To deal with the case where $s \leq \gamma < \min\{1, 2s\}$, let us define

$$\bar{p}(s, \gamma) := \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{for } \gamma = s, \\ \frac{1}{\gamma - s}, & \text{for } \gamma > s, \end{cases}$$

and fix an arbitrary $1 < p < \bar{p}(s, \gamma)$. Since $m > \frac{N}{2s-\gamma}$ and $1 < p < \bar{p}(s, \gamma)$, we can choose

$$\varepsilon \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \min\{1, 2s\} - \gamma, 2s - \gamma - \frac{N}{m}, \frac{1}{p} - (\gamma - s) \right\} \right)$$

and, by Corollary 5.3, *ii*) applied with $t = \gamma + \varepsilon$, it follows that

$$\|u\|_{L^{\gamma+\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.17)$$

The result in this case follows combining (5.17) with the fact that $L^{\gamma+\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset W^{\gamma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < \gamma < 1$ and all $1 < p < +\infty$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.2 so we omit some details. First of all, let us fix g_1 , g_2 and g_3 as in (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) respectively. Also, arguing as (5.10), for all $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, we easily get $C := C(N, s, t, m, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u\|_{L^p(B_R^c(0))} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.18)$$

Now, we consider separately two cases.

Case 1 : $m_*(s, t) \leq m < \frac{N}{s}$.

On one hand, combining Lemma 3.6, b) and c) with (5.6) and Hölder inequality, we infer that, for all $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-t)}$, there exists $C > 0$ (depending only on N, s, t, m, α and Ω) such that

$$\|g_1 + |\log \delta| g_2\|_{L^\alpha(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.19)$$

On the other hand, combining Lemma 3.6, b) and c) with (5.5) and Hölder inequality, we get (we recall that if $t = s$, then $g_3 \equiv 0$) that, for all $1 \leq \beta < \frac{mN}{N-ms+mN(t-s)} = p^*(m, s, t)$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, \beta, \Omega) > 0$

$$\left\| \frac{g_3}{\delta^{t-s}} \right\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.20)$$

Combining (5.19) and (5.20) with Lemma 5.1, we conclude that, for all $1 \leq p < p^*(m, s, t)$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.21)$$

Having at hand (5.18) and (5.21), it just remains to deal with $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$. Since $|x - y| \geq \min\{\delta(y), \delta(x)\}$ for all $y \in \Omega$ and $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$, for almost every $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$, it follows that

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x)| \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{|x-y|^{N+t}} dy \leq \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s+\varepsilon}(x)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{\delta^s(y)} \frac{dy}{|x-y|^{N-\varepsilon}}, \quad \text{for any } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.8, for all $1 \leq \gamma < \frac{mN}{N-ms}$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, \gamma, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{u}{\delta^s} \right\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.23)$$

Combining (5.22) and (5.23) with Lemma 3.6, b) and c), (5.5) and Hölder inequality, we get that, for all

$$0 < \varepsilon < \frac{N}{m} - s \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq q < \frac{mN}{N - ms + mN(t-s) + \varepsilon m(N-1)},$$

there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, \varepsilon, q, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u\|_{L^q(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.24)$$

Having at hand (5.24) we consider $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{s}$ and $1 \leq p < p^*(m, s, t)$ fixed but arbitrary and choose

$$\varepsilon \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \frac{N}{m} - s, \frac{1}{m(N-1)} \left(\frac{mN}{p} - (N - ms + mN(t-s)) \right) \right\} \right).$$

Then, by (5.24), we know there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, p, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u\|_{L^p(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.25)$$

Gathering (5.18), (5.21) and (5.25) the result follows in the case where $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{s}$.

Case 2 : $\frac{N}{s} \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$.

Let us point out that, in this case, it is implicitly assumed that $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$. By Lemma 3.6, b) and c) combined with (5.6) and Hölder inequality, it follows that, for all $1 \leq \alpha < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-t)}$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, \alpha, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|g_1 + |\log \delta| g_2\|_{L^\alpha(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.26)$$

Moreover, combining Lemma 3.6, d) with (5.5) and Hölder inequality, we get that, for all $1 \leq \beta < \frac{1}{t-s} = p^*(m, s, t)$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, \beta, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{g_3}{\delta^{t-s}} \right\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.27)$$

Since $m \geq \frac{N}{s}$ implies $\frac{mN}{N-m(2s-t)} > p^*(m, s, t)$, combining (5.26) and (5.27) with Lemma 5.1, we conclude that, for all $1 \leq p < p^*(m, s, t)$, there exists $C = C(N, s, \gamma, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.28)$$

Having at hand (5.18) and (5.28), it remains to deal with $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$. Recall that, for almost every $x \in B_R(0) \setminus \Omega$, it follows that

$$|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u(x)| \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{|x-y|^{N+t}} dy \leq \frac{1}{\delta^{t-s+\varepsilon}(x)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(y)|}{\delta^s(y) |x-y|^{N-\varepsilon}}, \quad \text{for any } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (5.29)$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.8, we know that, for all $1 \leq \gamma < +\infty$, there exists $C = C(N, s, \gamma, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{u}{\delta^s} \right\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.30)$$

Combining (5.29) and (5.30) with Lemma 3.6, b) and c), (5.5) and Hölder inequality, we get that, for all

$$1 \leq \gamma < \infty, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \frac{N}{\gamma}, \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq q < \frac{N\gamma}{N + N\gamma(t-s) + \varepsilon\gamma(N-1)},$$

there exists $C = C(N, s, t, \gamma, \varepsilon, q, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^q(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.31)$$

Having at hand (5.31) we consider $\frac{N}{s} \leq m < \infty$ and $1 \leq p < p^*(m, s, t)$ fixed but arbitrary and choose

$$\gamma \in \left(\frac{p}{1-p(t-s)}, +\infty \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \frac{N}{\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma(N-1)} \left(\frac{N\gamma}{p} - (N + N\gamma(t-s)) \right) \right\} \right).$$

Then, by (5.31), we know there exists $C = C(N, s, t, p, m, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}u\|_{L^p(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.32)$$

Gathering (5.18), (5.28) and (5.32) the result follows also in this case. \square

As a consequence of the above result, we deduce the following global regularity in Bessel potential spaces.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m_*(s, t) \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$. Then, for all $1 < p < p^*(m, s, t)$, there exists $C = C(N, s, t, m, p, \Omega)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^{t,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. The result follows arguing again as in the proof of Corollary 2.3 using now Theorem 1.3 instead of Proposition 1.1. \square

Next, we deal with the global Sobolev regularity.

Corollary 5.6. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m_*(s, t) \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$. Then, for all $1 < p < p^*(m, s, \gamma)$, there exists $C = C(N, s, \gamma, m, p, \Omega)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{W^{\gamma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Let $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-\gamma}$ and $1 < p < p^*(m, s, \gamma)$ fixed but arbitrary. Since $p < p^*(m, s, \gamma)$, we can choose

$$\varepsilon \in \left(0, \min \left\{ s, \min\{1, 2s\} - \gamma, \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p^*(m, s, \gamma)} \right\} \right)$$

and, by Corollary 5.5, applied with $t = \gamma + \varepsilon$, it follows that

$$\|u\|_{L^{\gamma+\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}. \quad (5.33)$$

The result follows combining (5.33) with the fact that $L^{\gamma+\varepsilon,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset W^{\gamma,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < \gamma < 1$ and all $1 < p < +\infty$ (see e.g. [6, Theorem 7.63, (g)]). \square

Proof of Corollary 1.5. It immediately follows from the combination of Corollaries 5.4 and 5.6. \square

Next, we prove the global weighted estimates.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m \geq 1$ and*

- $p = \infty$, if $m > \frac{N}{2s-t}$,
- $1 \leq p < \infty$, if $m = \frac{N}{2s-t}$,
- $1 \leq p < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-t)}$, if $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$.

Then:

i) If $t = s$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\| |\log \delta|^{-1} (-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

ii) If $s < t < \min\{1, 2s\}$, there exist $C > 0$ such that

$$\| \delta^{t-s} (-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Here, $C > 0$ are constants depending only on N, s, t, p, m and Ω .

Proof. We only detail the proof in the case where $t > s$, since the other estimates follows arguing on the same way. By Lemma 5.1 we know there exists $C = C(N, s, t, \Omega) > 0$ such that

$$\delta^{t-s}(x) |(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u(x)| \leq C [g_1(x) + g_2(x) + g_3(x)], \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Here, g_1, g_2 and g_3 are as in (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) respectively. Having at hand the above inequality, the result immediately follows from Lemma 3.6. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. It is a particular case of Theorem 5.7. \square

Remark 10. The technique developed in this section allows to prove also estimates in Ω^c . Indeed, suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 5.7 hold true and let R be as in (1.8). As a byproduct of the proofs of Theorems 5.2 and 1.3, we infer that, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\| (-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u \|_{L^p(B_R^c(0))} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)},$$

On the other hand, taking into account (5.12), (5.15), (5.22) and (5.29) and arguing as in the proofs of Theorems 5.2 and 1.3, one can infer that, for

- $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, if $m > \frac{N}{s}$,
- $1 \leq p < \infty$, if $m = \frac{N}{s}$,
- $1 \leq p < \frac{mN}{N-ms}$, if $1 \leq m < \frac{N}{s}$,

there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\| |\log \delta|^{-1} (-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u \|_{L^p(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} + (t-s) \| \delta^{t-s} (-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} u \|_{L^p(B_R(0) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Finally, let us provide the precise statement of the Calderón–Zygmund regularity results for the *Riesz fractional gradient*.

Theorem 5.8. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m > \frac{N}{2s-t}$. Then:*

i) For all $1 \leq p < \infty$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\| \nabla^s u \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

ii) For all $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{t-s}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\| \nabla^t u \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Here, $C > 0$ are constants depending only on N, s, t, p, m and Ω .

Theorem 5.9. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq t < \min\{1, 2s\}$ and $u := \mathbb{G}_s[f]$ with $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $m_*(s, t) \leq m < \frac{N}{2s-t}$. Then, for all $1 \leq p < p^*(m, s, t)$, there exists $C > 0$ (depending only on N, s, t, p, m and Ω) such that*

$$\| \nabla^t u \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Abatangelo and M. Cozzi. An Elliptic Boundary Value Problem with Fractional Nonlinearity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(3):3577–3601, 2021.
- [2] B. Abdellaoui, A. Attar, and R. Bentfour. On the fractional p-laplacian equations with weight and general datum. *Advances in Nonlinear Analysis*, 8(1):144–174, 2019.
- [3] B. Abdellaoui and A. J. Fernández. Nonlinear fractional Laplacian problems with nonlocal ‘gradient terms’. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 150(5):2682–2718, 2020.
- [4] B. Abdellaoui, A. J. Fernández, T. Leonori, and A. Younes. Deterministic KPZ equations with nonlocal “gradient terms”. *Preprint*, 2021.
- [5] B. Abdellaoui and I. Peral. Towards a deterministic KPZ equation with fractional diffusion: the stationary problem. *Nonlinearity*, 31(4):1260–1298, 2018.
- [6] R. A. Adams. *Sobolev spaces*. Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- [7] G. E. Andrews, R. Askey, and R. Roy. *Special functions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [8] U. Biccari, M. Warma, and E. Zuazua. Local Elliptic Regularity for the Dirichlet Fractional Laplacian. *Advanced Nonlinear Studies*, 17(2):387–409, 2017.
- [9] K. Bogdan, T. Kulczycki, and A. Nowak. Gradient estimates for harmonic and q -harmonic functions of symmetric stable processes. *Illinois J. Math.*, 46(2):541–556, 2002.

- [10] H. Chen and L. Véron. Semilinear fractional elliptic equations involving measures. *J. Differential Equations*, 257(5):1457–1486, 2014.
- [11] Z.-Q. Chen, P. Kim, and R. Song. Heat kernel estimates for the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 12(5):1307–1329, 2010.
- [12] Z.-Q. Chen and R. Song. Estimates on Green functions and Poisson kernels for symmetric stable processes. *Math. Ann.*, 312(3):465–501, 1998.
- [13] M. Cozzi. Interior regularity of solutions of non-local equations in Sobolev and Nikol’skii spaces. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, 196(2):555–578, 2017.
- [14] S. Dipierro, O. Savin, and E. Valdinoci. Definition of fractional Laplacian for functions with polynomial growth. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 35:41079–1122, 2019.
- [15] B. Dyda. Fractional calculus for power functions and eigenvalues of the fractional Laplacian. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 15(4):536–555, 2012.
- [16] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, Revised edition, 2015.
- [17] M. M. Fall. Regularity results for nonlocal equations and applications. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 59(5):Paper No. 181, 53, 2020.
- [18] M. M. Fall and S. Jarohs. Gradient estimates in fractional Dirichlet problems. *Potential Anal.*, 54(4):627–636, 2021.
- [19] G. B. Folland. *Real analysis: Modern techniques and their applications*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2nd edition, 1999.
- [20] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [21] G. Grubb. Fractional Laplacians on domains, a development of Hörmander’s theory of μ -transmission pseudodifferential operators. *Adv. Math.*, 268:478–528, 2015.
- [22] T. Grzywny and M. Ryznar. Estimates of Green functions for some perturbations of fractional Laplacian. *Illinois J. Math.*, 51(4):1409–1438, 2007.
- [23] P. Hajlasz. Sobolev mappings, co-area formula and related topics. In *Proceedings on Analysis and Geometry (Russian) (Novosibirsk Akademgorodok, 1999)*, pages 227–254, 2000.
- [24] S. Jarohs, A. Saldaña, and T. Weth. A new look at the fractional Poisson problem via the logarithmic Laplacian. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 279(11):108732, 50, 2020.
- [25] T. Kuusi, G. Mingione, and Y. Sire. Nonlocal equations with measure data. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 337:1317–1368, 2015.
- [26] T. Leonori, I. Peral, A. Primo, and F. Soria. Basic estimates for solutions of a class of nonlocal elliptic and parabolic equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(12):6031–6068, 2015.
- [27] T. Mengesha, A. Schikorra, and S. Yeepo. Calderon-Zygmund type estimates for nonlocal PDE with Hölder continuous kernel. *Adv. Math.*, 383:107692, 2021.
- [28] Y. Mizuta. *Potential theory in Euclidean spaces*. Gakkotosho Co., Ltd., Tokyo, 1996.
- [29] E. D. Rainville. *Special functions*. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1960.
- [30] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 101(3):275–302, 2014.
- [31] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. The extremal solution for the fractional Laplacian. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 50(3-4):723–750, 2014.
- [32] L. Silvestre. Holder estimates for solutions of integro differential equations like the fractional laplace. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 55:1155–1174, 2006.
- [33] E. M. Stein. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
- [34] W. P. Ziemer. *Weakly differentiable functions*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.

Boumediene Abdellaoui

LABORATOIRE D’ANALYSE NONLINÉAIRE ET MATHÉMATIQUES APPLIQUÉES, DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES,
UNIVERSITÉ ABOU BAKR BELKAÏD, TLEMCEM, 13000, ALGERIA
Email address: boumediene.abdellaoui@inv.uam.es

Antonio J. Fernández

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITY OF BATH, BATH BA2 7AY, UNITED KINGDOM
Email address: ajf77@bath.ac.uk

Tommaso Leonori

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE DI BASE E APPLICATE PER L’INGEGNERIA,
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA “SAPIENZA”. VIA ANTONIO SCARPA 10, 00161 ROMA, ITALY
Email address: tommaso.leonori@sbai.uniroma1.it

Abdelbadie Younes

LABORATOIRE D’ANALYSE NONLINÉAIRE ET MATHÉMATIQUES APPLIQUÉES, DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES,
UNIVERSITÉ ABOU BAKR BELKAÏD, TLEMCEM, 13000, ALGERIA
Email address: abdelbadieyounes@gmail.com