Existence of variational solutions to doubly nonlinear nonlocal evolution equations via minimizing movements

Suchandan Ghosh[a], Dharmendra Kumar[a], Harsh Prasad[a], Vivek Tewary[a,*]

[a] *Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Centre for Applicable Mathematics, Bangalore, Karnataka, 560065, India*

arXiv:2201.00634v1 [math.AP] 3 Jan 2022

Abstract

We prove existence of variational solutions for a class of doubly nonlinear nonlocal evolution equations whose prototype is the double phase equation

$$\partial_t u^m + P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x,t)-u(y,t)|^{p-2}(u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}} + a(x,y)\frac{|u(x,t)-u(y,t)|^{q-2}(u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^{N+qr}}\,dy = 0,\ m>0,\ p>1,\ s,r\in(0,1).$$

We make use of the approach of minimizing movements pioneered by DeGiorgi [30] and Ambrosio [4] and refined by Bögelein, Duzaar, Marcellini, and co-authors to study nonlinear parabolic equations with non-standard growth.

Keywords: Nonlocal operators with nonstandard growth, parabolic equations; Parabolic minimizers; Evolutionary variational solutions

2010 MSC: 35K51, 35A01, 35A15, 35R11.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 The problem . . . 2
1.2 Background . . . 3
1.3 Framework . . . 4
1.4 Definition . . . 5
1.5 Main Results . . . 6

2 Preliminaries **7**
2.1 Notations . . . 7
2.2 Sobolev spaces . . . 7
2.3 Mollification in time . . . 7

*Corresponding author
Email addresses: suchandan@tifrbng.res.in (Suchandan Ghosh), dharmendra2020@tifrbng.res.in (Dharmendra Kumar), harsh@tifrbng.res.in (Harsh Prasad), vivektewary@gmail.com and vivek2020@tifrbng.res.in (Vivek Tewary)

2.4 Auxiliary Results . . . 8
2.5 Technical Lemmas . . . 9
2.6 A lower bound on the nonlinear operator . . . 10
2.7 Regarding initial condition . . . 10
2.8 A discrete integration by parts formula . . . 11

3 Compactness Theorem **11**

4 Existence of variational solutions **14**
4.1 Approximating functionals . . . 14
4.2 Energy bounds . . . 15
4.3 Convergence to a limit function . . . 16
4.4 A variational inequality for approximate minimizers . . . 18
4.5 Passage to limit in variational inequality . . . 19

5 Variational inequality for weak solutions **22**

6 Variational solutions are distributional solutions **24**

Appendix A Mollification in Time **29**

1. Introduction

1.1. The problem

The notion of variational solutions was introduced by Lichnewsky and Temam in [45] to study parabolic equations by a variational approach, which has advantages when studying equations with unbalanced growth conditions where Lavrentiev phenomenon can prevent the existence of weak solutions. These methods were greatly refined and expaned upon by the group of Bögelein, Duzaar, Marcellini and coauthors in a series of papers such as [7, 20, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 62]. The group of Stefanelli has also conducted extensive work on variational methods in the existence theory of evolution equations starting from his early work on De Giorgi conjecture [64] and subsequent works [2, 59, 60].

In a recent preprint [56], the latter two authors extended the framework of variational solutions to parabolic fractional equations with time independent initial and boundary data. As an application, the latter two authors also studied the local boundedness of variational solutions to double phase nonlocal parabolic equations in [57].

In the present work, our aim is to study the fractional variant of the work of Bögelein et al [9]. We hope that this would open the path to studying boundedness and Hölder regularity for variational solutions of doubly nonlinear double phase nonlocal parabolic equations. In the recent work [5], regularity of non-negative weak solutions of doubly nonlinear nonlocal parabolic equations was studied.

To be precise, we will study the following equation

$$\partial_t b(u) + P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\mathrm{D}_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, dy = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_\infty$$
$$u = u_0 \text{ on } (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega) \times (0,\infty) \cup \Omega \times \{0\} \tag{1.1}$$

where Ω is an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, and $\Omega_\infty = \Omega \times (0,\infty)$. The function $H = H(x,y,\xi)$ satisfies the following structure condition

$$H(x,y,\xi) \geq A \left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \tag{1.2}$$

$$H \text{ is a Caratheodory function which is convex in the variable } \xi. \tag{1.3}$$

We assume $1 < p < \infty$, $s \in (0,1)$ and $A > 0$. The function $b : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a continuous, piecewise C^1 function. We may assume without loss of generality that $b(0) = 0$, by replacing $b(u)$ with $b(u) - b(0)$. As in [9], we make the following assumptions on the function b:

$$b(u) > 0 \text{ for } u > 0. \tag{1.4}$$

$$l \leq \frac{ub'(u)}{b(u)} \leq m, \text{ for } u > 0, \tag{1.5}$$

whenever $b'(u)$ exists and for $m \geq l > 0$. In particular, this implies the non-negativity of $b'(u)$ whenever it is defined.

These structure conditions admit a variety of problems with non-standard growth such as

- $H(x,y,\xi) = \left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p + a(x,y) \left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^r} \right)^q$, for $0 \leq a(x,y)$, $1 < p < q$ and $r, s \in (0,1)$.
- $H(x,y,\xi) = \left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^p \log \left(1 + \left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s} \right) \right)$.
- $H(x,y,\xi) = \left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s} \right)^{a+b\sin\left(\log\log\left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s}\right)\right)}$.

In particular, we would like to emphasize that in the double phase case, we obtain existence of variational solutions *without* any restrictions on the gap $q - p$.

1.2. Background

Regularity theory of fractional p-Laplace equations and their parabolic counterparts, along with other nonlinear variants has seen a lot of growth in recent years, particulary following the authoritative account of the associated functional frameworks in [32]. However, a theory for parabolic fractional equations with non-standard growth requires the development of an existence theory which can handle the possibility of the appearance of Lavrentiev phenomenon. The variational framework introduced in [7] proves to be particularly well-suited for such a study.

On the other hand, the existence of solutions for doubly nonlinear equations for local equations found a definitive treatment in [3]. A variational approach was introduced in [2] as well as [9], which differ in many specifics as described in the latter article, particularly as it eschews any growth condition from above. Other works tend to be based on the Galerkin method. Some recent works studying existence of solutions to nonlocal parabolic equations, including doubly nonlinear nonlocal equations, are [36, 37, 44, 43].

The regularity theory of p, q growth problems was started by Marcellini in a series of novel papers [46, 47, 48, 49]. There is a large body of work dealing with problems of (p, q)-growth as well as other nonstandard growth problems, for which we point to the surveys in [50, 51].

Regarding fractional p-Laplace equation, in the elliptic case, regularity theory of fractional p-Laplace equations has been studied extensively. An early existence result can be found in [39]. Local boundedness and Hölder regularity in the framework of De Giorgi-Nash-Moser theory was worked out in [31] and [29]. Moreover, explicit higher regularity of the gradient is obtained in [13]. On the other hand, explicit Hölder regularity of the solutions is obtained in [15]. Higher integrability by a nonlocal version of Gehring's Lemma was proved in [41]. Other works of interest are [52, 55, 54, 53]. For equations of nonstandard growth, the relevant works are [63, 19, 23, 26, 24, 25, 27, 35, 18]. For the case of linear equations, i.e., $p = 2$, we refer to [22, 21, 42, 28].

In the case of parabolic counterparts of the fractional p-Laplace equations, local boundedness was proved in [65]. Local boundedness and Hölder regularity has been proved in [33]. Explicit Hölder regularity has been obtained in [16]. The latter two authors have proved local boundedness estimates for the double phase nonlocal parabolic equation in [57].

1.3. Framework

In order to define the notion of weak solution, we need to set up the Orlicz spaces related to the function b. For details, we refer to the article of Bögelein et al [9] where these function spaces have been defined.

Let us denote by ϕ the primitive of the function b, i.e.,

$$\phi(u) := \int_0^u b(s)\, ds, \text{ for all } u \geq 0. \tag{1.6}$$

The function ϕ is C^1 and convex since b is an increasing function. Moroever $\phi(0) = 0$. We define the convex conjugate of ϕ by

$$\phi^*(x) := \sup_{v \geq 0}(xv - \phi(v)), \text{ for all } x \geq 0. \tag{1.7}$$

Due to the convexity of ϕ, we have

$$\phi^*(b(u)) = b(u)u - \phi(u) \text{ for all } u \geq 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Further, the Fenchel inequality holds

$$uv \leq \phi(u) + \phi^*(v) \text{ for all } u, v \geq 0. \tag{1.9}$$

Define the boundary terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}[u, v] &:= \phi(v) - \phi(u) - b(u)(v - u) \\ &= \phi(v) + \phi^*(b(u)) - b(u)v \text{ for all } u, v \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

where the second equality follows from the definition of the convex conjugate.

Also define the boundary integral

$$\mathfrak{B}[u, v] = \int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u, v]\, dx \text{ for all } u, v : \Omega \to [0, \infty). \tag{1.11}$$

For a domain A in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, define the Orlicz space

$$L^\phi(A) := \left\{ v : A \to \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable } : \int_A \phi(|v|)\, dx < \infty \right\}. \tag{1.12}$$

This definition is well-defined particularly since ϕ, ϕ^* satisfy the doubling condition or the Δ_2-condition. This will be a consequence of some technical lemmas which are proved in [9] and which we will list in a subsequent section. The Orlicz space $L^\phi(A)$ is equipped with the norm

$$||v||_{L^\phi(A)} = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_A vw\, dx \right| : \int_A \phi^*(w) \leq 1 \right\}. \tag{1.13}$$

More details on this restricted class of Orlicz spaces may be found in [1].

1.4. Definition

Definition 1.1. *Let Ω be an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Suppose that H satisfies the assumptions (1.2), (1.3) and b satisfies the assumptions (1.5) and (1.4). Let the time-independent Cauchy-Dirichlet data $u_0 : \mathbb{R}^N \to [0, \infty)$ satisfy*

$$u_0 \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N), u_{|\Omega} \in L^\phi(\Omega) \text{ and } \sup_{t \in (0,T)} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x, y, u_0(x) - u_0(y))}{|x - y|^N}\, dx\, dy < \infty. \tag{1.14}$$

By a variational solution to (1.1) we mean a function $u : (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^N \to [0, \infty)$ such that

$$u \in L^p(0, T; W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^0(0, T; L^\phi(\Omega)), u - u_0 \in L^p(0, T; W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t v\, (b(v) - b(u))\, dx\, dt + \int_0^\tau \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x, y, v(x,t) - v(y,t)) - H(x, y, u(x,t) - u(y,t))}{|x - y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt \\ &\geq \mathfrak{B}[u(\tau), v(\tau)] - \mathfrak{B}[u_0, v(0)], \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

for any $\tau \in [0,T]$ *and for all* $v : (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^N \to [0,\infty)$ *such that* $v \in L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ *and* $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(0,T;\Omega)$ *such that* $v - u_0 \in L^p(0,T;W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$ *and* $v(0) \in L^\phi(\Omega)$.

Remark 1.2. *In our definition of variational solution, both the solution and the comparison map have to match on* $\Omega^c\times(0,T)$ *and since we have assumed that the data on* Ω^c *is in* $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *we may cancel integrals of* H *over* $\Omega^c\times\Omega^c$ *on both sides to obtain the following equivalent form of the variational inequality:*

$$\int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \partial_t v\,(b(v)-b(u))\,dx\,dt + \int_0^\tau \iint_{C_\Omega} \frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t)) - H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt$$

$$\geq \mathfrak{B}[u(\tau),v(\tau)] - \mathfrak{B}[u_0,v(0)]$$

where $C_\Omega = (\Omega^c\times\Omega^c)^c$.

Remark 1.3. *Let us also mention that in the double phase case i.e. when* H *is of the form*

$$H(x,y,\xi) = \left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s}\right)^p + a(x,y)\left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^r}\right)^q$$

the condition on initial data (1.14) *is satisfied if* $u_0 \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $u_{|\Omega} \in L^2(\Omega)$ *and:*

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u_0(x)-u_0(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} + a(x,y)\frac{|u_0(x)-u_0(y)|^q}{|x-y|^{N+rq}}\,dx\,dy < \infty.$$

1.5. Main Results

The following existence theorem is the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.4. ***(Existence of variational solutions)*** *Let* Ω *be an open bounded subset of* $\mathbb{R}^N$. *Suppose that* H *satisfies the assumptions* (1.2) *and* (1.3) *and* b *satisfies the assumptions* (1.5) *and* (1.4). *Let the time-independent Cauchy-Dirichlet data* u_0 *satisfy* (1.14). *Then, there exists a variational solution to* (1.1) *in the sense of* (1.15), *with* $\partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)} \in L^2(\Omega_T)$. *The initial data is attained in the* L^ϕ *sense.*

Remark 1.5. *Time-dependent functions* H *can be studied in the manner of [61]. As a first step, one considers* H *that have a* p *growth condition from above and Lipschitz regularity in the time-variable. To consider more general* H *with only measurability in the time-variable, one needs to regularize* H *and then pass to the limit in the regularizing parameter. This last step, however, is not straightforward as it involves composition of weak limits and nonlinearity.*

Remark 1.6. *As remarked in [9], uniqueness is a delicate issue. However, for* H *with* p*-growth condition and* b *Lipschitz continuous, uniqueness may be proved in a manner similar to [3].*

Remark 1.7. *Existence in unbounded domains* Ω *is also proved in [9]. This requires construction of a suitable function space which has Poincaré inequality built in. This may be achieved by taking completion of* $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ *in the Gagliardo seminorm* $[\cdot]_{s,p}$.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Notations

We begin by collecting the standard notation that will be used throughout the paper:

- We shall denote N to be the space dimension. We shall denote by $z = (x, t)$ a point in $\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T)$.
- We shall alternately use $\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial t}, \partial_t f, f'$ to denote the time derivative of f.
- Let Ω be an open bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with boundary $\partial\Omega$ and for $0 < T \leq \infty$, let $\Omega_T := \Omega \times (0, T)$.
- Integration with respect to either space or time only will be denoted by a single integral $\int$ whereas integration on $\Omega \times \Omega$ or $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ will be denoted by a double integral $\iint$.

2.2. Sobolev spaces

Let $1 < p < \infty$, we denote by $p' = p/(p-1)$ the conjugate exponent of p. Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. We define the *Sobolev-Slobodekiĭ* space, which is the fractional analogue of Sobolev spaces.

$$W^{s,p}(\Omega) = \left\{ \psi \in L^p(\Omega) : [\psi]_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} < \infty \right\}, s \in (0, 1),$$

where the seminorm $[\cdot]_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)}$ is defined by

$$[\psi]_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} = \left(\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{|\psi(x) - \psi(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} \, dx \, dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The space when endowed with the norm $\|\psi\|_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} = \|\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + [\psi]_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)}$ becomes a Banach space. The space $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is the subspace of $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ consisting of functions that vanish outside Ω.

Let I be an interval and let V be a separable, reflexive Banach space, endowed with a norm $\|\cdot\|_V$. We denote by V^* its topological dual space. Let v be a mapping such that for a.e. $t \in I$, $v(t) \in V$. If the function $t \mapsto \|v(t)\|_V$ is measurable on I, then v is said to belong to the Banach space $L^p(I; V)$ if $\int_I \|v(t)\|_V^p \, dt < \infty$. It is well known that the dual space $L^p(I; V)^*$ can be characterized as $L^{p'}(I; V^*)$.

2.3. Mollification in time

Throughout the paper, we will use the following mollification in time. Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. For $T > 0$, $v \in L^1(\Omega_T)$, $v_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $h \in (0, T]$, we define

$$[v]_h(\cdot, t) = e^{-\frac{t}{h}} v_0 + \frac{1}{h} \int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{h}} v(\cdot, s) \, ds, \tag{2.1}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. The convergence properties of mollified functions have been collected in Appendix A.

2.4. Auxiliary Results

We collect the following standard results which will be used in the course of the paper. We begin with a general result on convex minimization.

Proposition 2.1. *([58, Theorem 2.3]) Let X be a closed affine subset of a reflexive Banach space and let $\mathcal{F} : X \to (-\infty, \infty]$. Assume the following:*

1. *For all $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the sublevel set $\{x \in X : \mathcal{F}[u] < \Lambda\}$ is sequentially weakly precompact, i.e., if for a sequence $(u_j) \subset X$, $\mathcal{F}[u_j] < \Lambda$, then u_j has a weakly convergent subsequence.*

2. *For all sequences $(u_j) \subset X$ with $u_j \rightharpoonup u$ in X-weak, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{F}[u] \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathcal{F}[u_j].$$

Then, the problem minimization problem: Minimize $\mathcal{F}[u]$ over all $u \in X$ has a solution.

We will need the following general result on weak lower semicontinuity of functionals.

Proposition 2.2. *([17, Corollary 3.9]) Assume that $\phi : E \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is convex and lower semicontinuous in the strong topology. Then ϕ is lower semicontinuous in the weak topology.*

We have the following Sobolev-type inequality [32, Theorem 6.5].

Theorem 2.3 ([32])**.** *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, $sp < N$ and let $\kappa^* = \dfrac{N}{N - sp}$, then for any $g \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\kappa \in [1, \kappa^*]$, we have*

$$\|g\|^p_{L^{\kappa p}} \leq C \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}}\, dx\, dy. \tag{2.2}$$

. If $g \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and Ω is an extension domain, then

$$||g||^p_{L^{\kappa p}(\Omega)} \leq C \, \|g\|_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)}. \tag{2.3}$$

If $sp = N$, then (2.2) holds for all $\kappa \in [1, \infty)$, whereas if $sp > N$, then (2.3) holds for all $\kappa \in [1, \infty]$.

We will require the compact embedding as follows.

Proposition 2.4. *([38, Proposition 2.1]) Assume $N \geq 2$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < s < 1$. Let Ω be a bounded extension domain. When $sp < N$, the embedding $W^{s,p}(\Omega) \mapsto L^r(\Omega)$ is compact for $r \in [1, p_*)$, and when $sp \geq N$, the same embedding is compact for $r \in [1, \infty)$. The theorem also holds for $W^{s,p}_0(\Omega)$ for any bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$.*

We end this section with a Poincaré inequality for Gagliardo seminorms.

Proposition 2.5. *([14, Lemma 2.4]) Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, $s \in (0,1)$ and Ω is an open and bounded set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Then, for every $u \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, it holds that*

$$||u||^p_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(N,s,p,\Omega)\,[u]^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}$$

2.5. Technical Lemmas

In this subsection, we collect some technical lemmas regarding the functions b and ϕ as proved in [9]. The inequalities hold for those arguments for which b' is defined.

Lemma 2.6. *([9, Lemma 2.1]) For $b : [0,\infty) \to [0\infty)$ which is continuous and piecewise C^1 and satisfies (1.5), the following estimates are true for every $\lambda > 1$ and $u > 0$:*

1. $\lambda^l b(u) \leq b(\lambda u) \leq \lambda^m b(u)$.
2. $b(1)\min\{u^l, u^m\} \leq b(u) \leq b(1)\max\{u^l, u^m\}$.
3. $\dfrac{l}{m}\lambda^{l-1}b'(u) \leq b'(\lambda u) \leq \dfrac{m}{l}\lambda^{m-1}b'(u)$.
4. $\lambda^{l+1}\phi(u) \leq \phi(\lambda u) \leq \lambda^{m+1}\phi(u)$.
5. $\lambda^{\frac{m+1}{m}}\phi^*(u) \leq \phi^*(\lambda u) \leq \lambda^{\frac{l+1}{l}}\phi^*(u)$.

Lemma 2.7. *([9, Lemma 2.3]) With the standard assumptions on b, we have*

$$\frac{1}{m+1}ub(u) \leq \phi(u) \leq \frac{1}{l}\phi^*(b(u)) \leq \frac{m}{l(m+1)}ub(u)$$

for any $u \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.8. *([9, Lemma 2.4]) With the standard assumptions on b, we have for all $u, v \geq 0$ the following estimates*

$$\phi^*(b(u)) \leq 2\mathfrak{b}[u,v] + 2^{m+2}\phi(v), \text{ and}$$

$$\phi(v) \leq 2\mathfrak{b}[u,v] + 2^{2+\frac{1}{l}}\phi^*(b(u)).$$

Lemma 2.9. *([9, Lemma 2.5]) With the standard assumptions on b, there exists a constant $c = c(m,l)$ such that for all $u, v \geq 0$, the following estimates are true:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{b}[u,v] &\leq (b(v)-b(u))(v-u)\\ &\leq |\sqrt{vb(v)} - \sqrt{ub(u)}|^2\\ &\leq c|\sqrt{\phi(v)} - \sqrt{\phi(u)}|^2 \leq c^2\mathfrak{b}[u,v].\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.10. *([9, Lemma 2.6]) Let the standard assumptions on b hold. Let $(u_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $L^\phi(\Omega)$ and $u_0 \in L^\phi(\Omega)$ such that $\phi(u_i) \to \phi(u_0)$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then, there holds $u_i \to u_0$ in $L^\phi(\Omega)$.*

Lemma 2.11. *([9, Lemma 2.7]) Let the standard assumptions on b hold. Let $v \in L^1(\Omega_T)$ is given with $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(\Omega)$. Then we have $v \in C^0([0,T]; L^\phi(\Omega))$.*

2.6. A lower bound on the nonlinear operator

In this subsection, we derive a lower bound on the nonlinear and nonlocal operator by the use of Poincaré inequality ([14, Lemma 2.4]).

Let $u \in W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$, then $u - u_0 \in W^{s,p}_0(\Omega)$. Therefore, by Poincaré inequality in the space $W^{s,p}_0(\Omega)$, we get for any $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
||u-u_0||^p_{L^p(\Omega)} &\le C[u-u_0]^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \\
&\le C[u]^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} + C[u_0]^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \\
&\le C \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + C[u_0]^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
||u||^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} &\le ||u-u_0||^p_{L^p(\Omega)} + ||u_0||^p_{(L^p(\mathbb{R}^N))} \\
&\le C_1 \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + C_2||u_0||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

for some positive constants C_1 and C_2.

Once again, due to (1.2), we get

$$||u||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \le C_1 \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + C_2||u_0||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}. \tag{2.5}$$

2.7. Regarding initial condition

In this subsection, we prove that variational solutions satisfy the initial condition in the sense of $L^\phi(\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.12. *Any variational solution as defined in (1.15) satisfies the initial condition $u(0) = u_0$ in the $L^\phi(\Omega)$ sense, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{\tau\downarrow 0} ||u(\tau) - u(0)||_{L^\phi(\Omega)} = 0$$

Proof. Taking the time-independent extension of $v(x,t) = u_0(x)$ as a comparision map in the definition of variational solutions (1.15), we get

$$\mathfrak{B}[u(\tau), u_0] \le \tau \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u_0(x)-u_0(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy \to 0 \text{ as } \tau \to 0.$$

On the other hand

$$\int_\Omega |\phi(u(\tau)) - \phi(u_0)|\,dx \le \left(\int_\Omega |\sqrt{\phi(u(\tau))} - \sqrt{\phi(u_0)}|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_\Omega |\sqrt{\phi(u(\tau))} + \sqrt{\phi(u_0)}|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2}$$
$$\le C\left(\mathfrak{B}[u(\tau), u_0]\right)^{1/2} \to 0 \text{ as } \tau \to 0.$$

where in the last inequality, we have used Lemma 2.9. As a result, we have $\phi(u(\tau)) \to \phi(u_0)$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Therefore, by an application of Lemma 2.10, we get $u(\tau) \to u_0$ in $L^\phi(\Omega)$. □

2.8. A discrete integration by parts formula

We state a discrete integration by parts formula as proved in [9]. For $h \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$, denote the difference quotient of a function w with respect to time by $\Delta_h w$ and define as

$$\Delta_h w(t) := \frac{1}{h}(w(t+h) - w(t)).$$

Lemma 2.13. *([9, Lemma 2.10]) Let $h \in (0,1]$, $u, v \in L^\phi(\Omega\times(-h, T+h))$ be two non-negative functions. Then, the following integration by parts formula is valid*

$$\iint_{\Omega_T} \Delta_{-h} b(u)(v-u)\,dx\,dt \le \iint_{\Omega_T} \Delta_h v(b(v) - b(u))\,dx\,dt$$
$$- \frac{1}{h}\iint_{\Omega\times(T-h,T)} \mathfrak{b}[u, v(t+h)]\,dx\,dt$$
$$+ \frac{1}{h}\iint_{\Omega\times(-h,0)} \mathfrak{b}[u, v]\,dx\,dt + \delta_1(h) + \delta_2(h),$$

where

$$\delta_1(h) := \frac{1}{h}\iint_{\Omega_T} \mathfrak{b}[v(t), v(t+h)]\,dx\,dt,$$
$$\delta_2(h) := \iint_{\Omega\times(-h,0)} \Delta_h v(b(v(t+h)) - b(u))\,dx\,dt.$$

If, in addition, $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(\Omega\times(-h_0, T+h_0))$ for some $h_0 > 0$, then

$$\lim_{h\downarrow 0}\delta_1(h) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{h\downarrow 0}\delta_2(h) = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

3. Compactness Theorem

We shall require the following compactness theorem in order to identify the limit function of the approximating minimizers. It is the fractional analogue of [9, Proposition 3.1].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain, $p > 1$, $T > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $h_k := \frac{T}{k}$*

piecewise constant functions $u^{(k)} : \mathbb{R}^N \times (-h_k, T] \to \mathbb{R}$ *are defined by*

$$u^{(k)}(\cdot, t) := u_i^{(k)} \text{ for } t \in ((i-1)h_k,\, ih_k) \text{ with } i = 0, 1, \ldots, k,$$

where $u_i^{(k)} \in L^\phi(\Omega) \cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$. *Suppose further that there exists a constant* $M > 0$ *such that the following energy estimate and continuity estimate hold true for all* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*:*

$$\max_{i\in\{0,1,\ldots,k\}} \left(\int_\Omega \phi(u_i^k)\, dx + \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u_i^{(k)}(x) - u_i^{(k)}(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}\, dx\, dy \right) \le M, \text{ and} \tag{3.1}$$

$$\frac{1}{h_k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_\Omega \left| \sqrt{\phi(u_i^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u_{i-1}^{(k)})} \right|^2 dx \le M. \tag{3.2}$$

Moreover, $u^{(k)} \rightharpoonup u$ *in* $L^p(0,T; W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega))$*-weak as* $k \to \infty$. *Then, there exists a subsequence such that as* $k \to \infty$, *we have*

$$\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})} \to \sqrt{\phi(u)} \text{ in } L^1(\Omega_T) - \text{strong},$$
$$u^{(k)} \to u \text{ a.e. in } (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Proof. Since we are working with subsequences, we may always begin with a subsequence where $k = 2^\beta$ for $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, we define another piecewise constant function where each piece is of length $\varepsilon_\alpha := \dfrac{T}{2^\alpha}$

$$w_{k,\alpha}(t) := \sum_{j=1}^{2^\alpha} u^{(k)}((j-1)\varepsilon_\alpha)\chi_{((j-1)\varepsilon_\alpha, j\varepsilon_\alpha]}(t).$$

Then, depending on whether $\alpha \le \beta$ or $\beta \le \alpha$, respectively ε_α is a multiple of h_k or h_k is a multiple of ε_α. For $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^\beta\}$, define

$$i_- := \left\lfloor \frac{h_k(i-1)}{\varepsilon_\alpha} \right\rfloor \frac{\varepsilon_\alpha}{h_k} + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{i-1}{2^{\beta-\alpha}} \right\rfloor 2^{\beta-\alpha} + 1.$$

Now, we claim that for a fixed $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. there is a subsequence of $k = 2^\beta$ labelled $k^{(\alpha)}$ for which $\sqrt{\phi(w_{k^{(\alpha)},\alpha})}$ converges in $L^1(\Omega_T)$ as $k^{(\alpha)} \to \infty$. For the proof, observe that by (3.1) and Poincaré inequality in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, the sequence $(u^{(k)}((j-1)\varepsilon_\alpha) - u_0)$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Therefore, by the fractional version of Rellich's compactness theorem (Proposition 2.4), there is a subsequence for which $(u^{(k)}((j-1)\varepsilon_\alpha) - u_0)$ converges in $L^p(\Omega)$, and for a further subsequence, $(u^{(k)}((j-1)\varepsilon_\alpha))$ converges pointwise a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^N$ for any $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^\alpha\}$. As a consequence, $(w_{k,\alpha})$, whose summands are exactly $(u^{(k)}((j-1)\varepsilon_\alpha))$, converges pointwise a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^N$ along a subsequence labelled $k^{(\alpha)}$. As a result, by a standard application of dominated convergence theorem (which will use the uniform bound from (3.1)), we will get convergence of $\sqrt{\phi(w_{k,\alpha})}$ in $L^1(\Omega_T)$ along the subsequence $k^{(\alpha)}$.

Hence we obtain convergence along a subsequence for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, we can extract a diagonal

subsequence $\varkappa$ of k such that

$$\sqrt{\phi(w_{k,\alpha})} \text{ converges in } L^1(\Omega_T) \text{ as } \varkappa \to \infty \text{ for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.3}$$

Now, we wish to prove $L^1(\Omega_T)$ convergence along a subsequence of the original sequence $\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}$. To achieve this, we start with the following estimate, which is a consequence of the continuity estimate (3.2):

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint\limits_{\Omega_T} \left|\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(w_{k,\alpha})}\right| dx\,dt &= h_k \sum_{i=1}^{2^\beta} \int\limits_{\Omega} \left|\sqrt{\phi(u_i^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u_{i_-}^{(k)})}\right| dx \\
&\le h_k \sum_{i=1}^{2^\beta} \sum_{j=i_-+1}^{i} \int\limits_{\Omega} \left|\sqrt{\phi(u_j^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u_{j-1}^{(k)})}\right| dx \\
&\le \varepsilon_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{2^\beta} \int\limits_{\Omega} \left|\sqrt{\phi(u_j^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u_{j-1}^{(k)})}\right| dx \\
&\le \varepsilon_\alpha |\Omega|^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{2^\beta} \left(\int\limits_{\Omega} \left|\sqrt{\phi(u_j^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u_{j-1}^{(k)})}\right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\
&\le \varepsilon_\alpha \sqrt{2^\beta |\Omega|} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{2^\beta} \int\limits_{\Omega} \left|\sqrt{\phi(u_j^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u_{j-1}^{(k)})}\right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\
&\le \varepsilon_\alpha \sqrt{M|\Omega_T|}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Now, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k, k' \in \varkappa$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u^{(k')})}\right\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)} &\le \left\|\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(w_{k,\alpha})}\right\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)} + \left\|\sqrt{\phi(w_{k,\alpha})} - \sqrt{\phi(w_{k',\alpha})}\right\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)} \\
&\quad + \left\|\sqrt{\phi(w_{k,\alpha})} - \sqrt{\phi(u^{(k')})}\right\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)} \\
&\overset{(3.4)}{\le} 2\varepsilon_\alpha \sqrt{M|\Omega_T|} + \left\|\sqrt{\phi(w_{k,\alpha})} - \sqrt{\phi(w_{k',\alpha})}\right\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, applying (3.3) to above, we get for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\limsup_{\varkappa \ni k,k' \to \infty} \left\|\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})} - \sqrt{\phi(u^{(k')})}\right\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)} \le 2\varepsilon_\alpha \sqrt{M|\Omega_T|}.$$

This estimate implies that the sequence $\left\{\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}\right\}_{k\in\varkappa}$ is Cauchy in $L^1(\Omega_T)$. Let $\Phi \in L^1(\Omega_T)$ be its limit. We clain that $\Phi = \sqrt{\phi(u)}$. To this end, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the truncation operator

$$T_N(s) := \begin{cases} -N & \text{if } s < -N, \\ s & \text{if } -N \le s \le N, \\ N & \text{if } s > N. \end{cases}$$

From the strong convergence of $\left\{\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}\right\}_{k\in\varkappa}$ in $L^1(\Omega_T)$ and the weak convergence of $u^{(k)}$ in $L^p(\Omega_T)$,

we get for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$0 \le \lim_{\varkappa \ni k \to \infty} \iint_{\Omega_T} T_N\left(\sqrt{\phi(v)} - \sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}\right)\left(v - u^{(k)}\right)\,dx\,dt = \iint_{\Omega_T} T_N\left(\sqrt{\phi(v)} - \Phi\right)(v-u)\,dx\,dt$$

for any $v \in L^p(\Omega_T)$. Now replace v by $u + \delta v$ for $\delta > 0$, followed by division by δ and take limit as $\delta \to 0$ to get for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$0 \le \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \iint_{\Omega_T} T_N\left(\sqrt{\phi(u+\delta v)} - \Phi\right)(v)\,dx\,dt = \iint_{\Omega_T} T_N\left(\sqrt{\phi(u)} - \Phi\right)(v)\,dx\,dt.$$

Replacing v by $-v$, we get equality above and since it holds for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we conclude that $\Phi = \sqrt{\phi(u)}$. Then, passing to a further subsequence, we get pointwise a.e. convergence of $u^{(k)}$ to u. □

4. Existence of variational solutions

The proof is based on the method of minimizing movements in which we discretize time and consider minimizers of time-discretized functionals. This results in the construction of piecewise constant functions as approximating solutions. As the number of steps in the discretization goes to infinity, we recover variational solutions of the original problem. Much of the calculation is analogous to [9, Section 4].

4.1. Approximating functionals

We fix a step size $h \in (0,1]$. We will inductively construct $u_i \in L^\phi(\Omega) \cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$ of non-negative minimizers to certain elliptic variational functionals whenever $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $ih \le T$. Suppose for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \le u_{i-1} \in L^\phi(\Omega) \cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$ has been defined. We initialize with $u_{i=0} = u_0$ where u_0 is the time-independent initial data. We define the variational functional

$$F_i[v] := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + \frac{1}{h}\int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u_{i-1}, v]\,dx, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}[u_{i-1}, v] = \phi(v) - \phi(u_{i-1})(v - u_{i-1})$. We choose u_i as the minimizer of F_i in the class of non-negative functions in $L^\phi(\Omega) \cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$. This class is non-empty since u_0 is an admissible function. The proof of existence of u_i is by the direct method of calculus of variations and relies on the convexity of H as well as the coercivity of the functional.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that u_0 satisfies the hypothesis (1.14) and $u_* \in L^\phi(\Omega)$ with $u_* \ge 0$ a.e. in Ω. Then there exists $u \in L^\phi(\Omega) \cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$ with $u \ge 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^N$ minimizing the functional*

$$F_i[w] := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,w(x,t)-w(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + \frac{1}{h}\int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u_*, w]\,dx,$$

in the class $L^\phi(\Omega) \cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $(u_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence in $\mathfrak{X} := \{v \in L^\phi(\Omega) \cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega) : v \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega\}$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} F[u_j] = \inf_{w\in\mathfrak{X}} F[w]$. By Lemma 2.8, we receive the following upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(u_j) &\leq 2\mathfrak{b}[u_*, u_j] + 2^{2+1/l}\phi^*(b(u_*))\\ &\leq 2\mathfrak{b}[u_*, u_j] + 2^{2+1/l} m\phi(u_*).\end{aligned}$$

Using the lower bound on the functional (2.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2h}\int_\Omega \phi(u_j) + \frac{1}{C_1}||u_j||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq &\iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u_j(x,t)-u_j(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\\ &+ \frac{C_2}{C_1}||u_0||_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \frac{1}{h}\int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u_*,u_j] + 2^{1+1/l} m\phi(u_*)\,dx\\ &< \infty\end{aligned}$$

independent of j. Therefore, the sequence $(u_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\phi(\Omega)\cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$. Hence, for a subsequence, there exists $u \in L^\phi(\Omega)\cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$ with $u \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω such that

$$\begin{aligned}u_j &\rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega) - \text{weak},\\ u_j &\rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^\phi(\Omega) - \text{weak},\end{aligned}$$

since weak convergence preserves non-negativity. Recall that $L^\phi(\Omega)\cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$ is reflexive due to doubling property of ϕ and since $p > 1$.

Due to Fatou's lemma, F is lower semicontinuous with respect to strong convergence in $L^\phi(\Omega)\cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$. Since F is convex, it is also lower semicontinuous with respect to weak convergence (see Proposition 2.2).

As a consequence, we have

$$F[u] \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} F[u_j] = \inf_{w\in\mathfrak{X}} F[w].$$

Hence u is a minimizer. □

4.2. Energy bounds

The non-negative function $u_{i-1} \in L^\phi(\Omega)\cap W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)$ is an admissible function for the functional F_i in (4.1) for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by minimality of u_i, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u_i(x,t)-u_i(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + \frac{1}{h}\int\limits_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u_{i-1},u_i]\,dx &= F[u_i]\\ \leq F[u_{i-1}] = \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} &\frac{H(x,y,u_{i-1}(x,t)-u_{i-1}(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy.\end{aligned}$$

By iterating the previous inequality, we obtain

$$\iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u_k(x,t)-u_k(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + \sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{1}{h}\int\limits_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u_{i-1},u_i]\,dx \tag{4.2}$$

$$\leq \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u_0(x,t)-u_0(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy, \tag{4.3}$$

whenever $h>0$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$ with $kh\leq T$.

By Lemma 2.9 and (4.2) and the non-negativity of H, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\sqrt{\phi(u_i)}-\sqrt{\phi(u_{i-1})}\right|^2 dx \leq C\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int\limits_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u_{i-1},u_i]\,dx \leq ChM, \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$M=\iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,u_0(x,t)-u_0(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{\Omega}\phi(u_k)\,dx &\leq 2\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\sqrt{\phi(u_k)}-\sqrt{\phi(u_0)}\right|^2 dx + 2\int\limits_{\Omega}\phi(u_0)\,dx\\ &\leq 2k\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\sqrt{\phi(u_i)}-\sqrt{\phi(u_{i-1})}\right|^2 dx + 2\int\limits_{\Omega}\phi(u_0)\,dx\\ &\leq CMT + 2\int\limits_{\Omega}\phi(u_0)\,dx,\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned}\iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{|u_k(x)-u_k(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}\,dx\,dy &\leq C_1\iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,u_k(x)-u_k(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + C_2||u_0||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}\\ &\leq C_1\iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,u_0(x)-u_0(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + C_2||u_0||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}\\ &\leq C_1M + C_2||u_0||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

4.3. Convergence to a limit function

In the sequel, we will consider such $h=h(k)\in(0,1]$ such that $h_k=\dfrac{T}{k}$ with $k\in\mathbb{N}$. We define the map

$$u^{(k)}(\cdot,t):=u_i \text{ for } t\in((i-1)h_k,ih_k) \text{ with } i\in\{0,1,\ldots,k\}$$

where $u_i=u_0$ for $i=0$.

From (4.5) and (4.6), we get

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\int_\Omega \phi(u^{(k)}(t))\,dx + \sup_{t\in[0,T]}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x)-u^{(k)}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy \tag{4.7}$$

$$\leq C_1 M + 2\int_\Omega \phi(u_0)\,dx + C_2||u_0||^p_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}. \tag{4.8}$$

The estimate in (4.7) guarantees boundedness in the space $L^\infty(0,T;W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega))$. Therefore, there exists a subsequence of $(u^{(k)})$ and a limit function $u\in L^\infty(0,T;W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega))$ such that as $k\to\infty$ for the not-relabelled sequence, we have

$$u^{(k)} \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^\infty(0,T;W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega)) - \text{weak} - *. \tag{4.9}$$

By (4.7), (4.4) and (4.9), the hypothesis of Proposition 3.1 are satisfied. As a result, for a further not-relabelled subsequence, we have

$$\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})} \to \sqrt{\phi(u)} \text{ in } L^1(\Omega_T) - \text{strong} \tag{4.10}$$

$$u^{(k)} \to u \text{ a.e in } \mathbb{R}^N\times(0,T). \tag{4.11}$$

Now, observe that by (4.4)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\int_\Omega |\Delta_{h_k}\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}|^2\,dx\,dt &= \int_0^T\int_\Omega \left|\frac{1}{h_k}\left(\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)}(t+h_k))}-\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)}(t))}\right)\right|^2 dx\,dt\\ &= \int_\Omega h_k\sum_{i=1}^k\left|\frac{1}{h_k}\left(\sqrt{\phi(u_i)}-\sqrt{\phi(u_{i-1})}\right)\right|^2 dx\\ &= \frac{1}{h_k}\int_\Omega\sum_{i=1}^k\left|\sqrt{\phi(u_i)}-\sqrt{\phi(u_{i-1})}\right|^2 dx \leq C.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for a further, not-relabelled subsequence, there exists $w\in L^2(\Omega_T)$ such that

$$\Delta_{h_k}\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})} \rightharpoonup w \text{ in } L^2(\Omega_T) - \text{weak}. \tag{4.12}$$

Now we calculate for any $\varphi\in C_0^\infty(\Omega_T)$

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\Omega_T}\sqrt{\phi(u)}\partial_t\varphi\,dx\,dt &= \lim_{k\to\infty}\iint_{\Omega_T}\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}\Delta_{-h_k}\varphi\,dx\,dt\\ &= -\lim_{k\to\infty}\iint_{\Omega_T}\Delta_{h_k}\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}\,\varphi\,dx\,dt\end{aligned}$$

$$= -\iint\limits_{\Omega_T} w\,\varphi\,dx\,dt,$$

where in the first equality we used pointwise a.e. convergence of $\sqrt{\phi(u^{(k)})}$ and strong convergence of $\Delta_{-h_k}\varphi$, in the second inequality, we used discrete integration by parts and in the last equality, we used (4.12).

The above calculation implies that $w = \partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)}$. Therefore, $\partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)} \in L^2(\Omega_T)$. As a result, $\partial_t\phi(u) = 2\sqrt{\phi(u)}\partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)} \in L^1(\Omega_T)$. This implies that $\phi(u) \in C^0([0,T];L^1(\Omega))$, which, by Lemma 2.11 implies that $u \in C^0([0,T];L^\phi(\Omega))$.

4.4. A variational inequality for approximate minimizers

Let us observe that the map $u^{(k)}$ minimizes the integral functional defined by

$$F^{(k)}[v] := \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt + \frac{1}{h_k}\int_0^T \int\limits_{\Omega} \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t-h_k), v(t)]\,dx\,dt \tag{4.13}$$

in the class of non-negative functions $v \in L^\phi(\Omega_T)\cap L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\mathbb{R}^N))$.

Justification. We have the following chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{(k)}[u^{(k)}] &:= \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x,t)-u^{(k)}(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt + \frac{1}{h_k}\int_0^T \int\limits_{\Omega} \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t-h_k), u^{(k)}(t)]\,dx\,dt\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \iiint\limits_{(\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N)\times((i-1)h_k,ih_k)} \frac{H(x,y,u_i(x)-u_{i-1}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{h_k}\iint\limits_{\Omega\times((i-1)h_k,ih_k)} \mathfrak{b}[u_{i-1},u_i]\,dx\,dt\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{(i-1)h_k}^{ih_k} F_i[u_i]\,dt \le \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{(i-1)h_k}^{ih_k} F_i[v]\,dt = F^{(k)}[v],
\end{aligned}$$

where the minimizing property of u_i on each time interval is used (Proposition 4.1).

Now, for a fixed comparision function $v \in L^\phi(\Omega_T)\cap L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega))$, observe that for any $s\in(0,1)$, the convex combination $w_s := u^{(k)} + s(v-u^{(k)})$ is also admissible. Therefore, by minimality of $u^{(k)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{(k)}[u^{(k)}] \le F^{(k)}[w_s] \le \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} (1-s)\frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x)-u^{(k)}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\\
+ \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} s\frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\\
+ \frac{1}{h_k}\int_0^T \int\limits_{\Omega} \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t-h_k), w_s]\,dx\,dt.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x)-u^{(k)}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy \le \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy$$
$$+\frac{1}{sh_k}\int_0^T\int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t-h_k),w_s]\,dx\,dt - \frac{1}{sh_k}\int_0^T\int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t-h_k),u^{(k)}]\,dx\,dt$$
$$= \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy + \frac{1}{h_k}\int_0^T\int_\Omega \frac{1}{s}\left(\phi(w_s)-\phi(u^{(k)})\right)$$
$$-\frac{1}{h_k}\int_0^T\int_\Omega b(u^{(k)}(t-h_k))(v-u^{(k)})\,dx\,dt.$$

The function $s\mapsto \frac{1}{s}\left(\phi(w_s)-\phi(u^{(k)})\right)$ is monotone and converges a.e. to $b(u^{(k)})(v-u^{(k)})$. Hence, passing to the limit as $s\to 0$ by dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x)-u^{(k)}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy \le \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v(x)-v(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy$$
$$+\int_0^T\int_\Omega \Delta_{-h_k} b(u^{(k)})(v-u^{(k)})\,dx\,dt. \tag{4.14}$$

The preceding inequality (4.14) can be localized to the time interval $(0,\tau)$ by choosing the comparision function $v=\chi_{(0,\tau)}v+\chi_{(\tau,T)}u^{(k)}$. This gives us

$$\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x)-u^{(k)}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy \le \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy$$
$$+\int_0^T\int_\Omega \Delta_{-h_k} b(u^{(k)})(v-u^{(k)})\,dx\,dt. \tag{4.15}$$

4.5. Passage to limit in variational inequality

To the inequality (4.15), we apply the discrete integration by parts lemma as in Lemma 2.13 to get

$$\int_0^\tau \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x)-u^{(k)}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy \le \int_0^\tau \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy$$
$$+\underbrace{\int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \Delta_{h_k} v\,(b(v)-b(u^{(k)}))\,dx\,dt}_{A} - B_\tau(h_k)+B_0(h_k)+\delta_1(h_k)+\delta_2(h_k) \tag{4.16}$$

for every $\tau\in(0,T]$.

The latter four terms are

$$B_\tau(h_k) := \frac{1}{h_k}\iint_{\Omega\times(\tau-h_k,\tau)} \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t),v(t+h_k)]\,dx\,dt,$$
$$B_0(h_k) := \frac{1}{h_k}\iint_{\Omega\times(-h_k,0)} \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)},v]\,dx\,dt,$$

$$\delta_1(h_k) := \frac{1}{h_k} \iint_{\Omega_\tau} \mathfrak{b}[v(t), v(t+h_k)]\, dx\, dt,$$

$$\delta_2(h_k) := \iint_{\Omega\times(-h_k,0)} \Delta_{h_k} v \, \Big(b(v(t+h_k)) - b(u^{(k)}) \Big)\, dx\, dt.$$

By Lemma 2.13, if $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(\Omega_T)$, then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \delta_1(h_k) = 0, \text{ and} \tag{4.17}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \delta_2(h_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \iint_{\Omega\times(-h_k,0)} \Delta_{h_k} v \, \left(b(v(t+h_k)) - b(u_0) \right)\, dx\, dt = 0. \tag{4.18}$$

The comparision map v in (4.16) is chosen to satisfy $v \in L^p(0,T; W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(\Omega_T)$ and $v(0) \in L^\phi(\Omega)$. Moreover, we extend v to negative times $t < 0$ by $v(t) = v(0)$.

Let us look at the term A. Notice that $\Delta_{h_k} v \to \partial_t v$ in $L^\phi(\Omega_T)$-strong. This can be proved in two steps. The mollification of v is strongly convergent by [1, Theorem 8.21] and the difference quotients converge strongly to derivative for smooth functions.

On the other hand, $b(u^{(k)})$ is bounded uniformly in $L^{\phi^*}(\Omega_T)$ by Lemma 2.7 and (4.7). The space $L^{\phi^*}(\Omega_T)$ is reflexive due to the doubling property of ϕ^* ([1, Theorem 8.20]). Therefore, for a subsequence $b(u^{(k)})$ converges weakly to some limit in $L^{\phi^*}(\Omega_T)$. However, due to (4.10), the limit can be readily identified as $b(u)$ by continuity of b.

As a result, we can pass to the limit:

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \iint_{\Omega_\tau} \Delta_{h_k} v \, (b(v) - b(u^{(k)}))\, dx\, dt = \iint_{\Omega_\tau} \partial_t v \, (b(v) - b(u))\, dx\, dt. \tag{4.19}$$

Now, let us look at $B_0(h_k)$. Since $u^{(k)}$ and v are constant over the interval $(-h_k, 0)$, we have

$$B_0(h_k) = \int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u_0, v(0)]\, dx. \tag{4.20}$$

Except for the expression $B_\tau(h_k)$, it is possible to pass to the limit as $k \to \infty$ in all the expressions in (4.16). To handle $B_\tau(h_k)$, we integrate over $\tau \in (t_0, t_0+\delta)$ for $t_0 \in [0, T-\delta]$ and $\delta \in (0,T)$ and divide by δ. As a consequence, (4.16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{t_0} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u^{(k)}(x) - u^{(k)}(y))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy \le \int_0^{t_0+\delta} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v(x)-v(y))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy \\
+ \fint_{t_0}^{t_0+\delta} \iint_{\Omega_\tau} \Delta_{h_k} v \, (b(v) - b(u^{(k)}))\, dx\, dt - \frac{1}{\delta} \iint_{\Omega\times(t_0,t_0+\delta-h_k)} \mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t), v(t+h_k)]\, dx\, dt \\
+ \int_\Omega \mathfrak{b}[u_0, v(0)]\, dx + \delta_1(h_k) + \delta_2(h_k)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Now, $u^{(k)} \to u$ pointwise a.e. by (4.10) and since $v \in C^0([0,T]; L^1(\Omega))$, we have $v(t+h_k) \to v(t)$ a.e.

in Ω_T as $k \to \infty$. By non-negativity of $\mathfrak{b}$, we can apply Fatou's lemma to conclude

$$\frac{1}{\delta}\int_{t_0}^{t_0+\delta}\int_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u(t),v(t)]\,dx\,dt \le \liminf_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{\delta}\iint_{\Omega\times(t_0,t_0+\delta-h_k)}\mathfrak{b}[u^{(k)}(t),v(t+h_k)]\,dx\,dt. \tag{4.22}$$

Using weak lower semicontinuity of the integral $\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}$ or by Fatou's lemma and the convergences (4.10), (4.22), (4.17), (4.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{t_0}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy &\le \int_0^{t_0+\delta}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\\ &+ \fint_{t_0}^{t_0+\delta}\iint_{\Omega_\tau}\partial_t v\,(b(v)-b(u))\,dx\,dt - \frac{1}{\delta}\int_{t_0}^{t_0+\delta}\int_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u(t),v(t)]\,dx\,dt\\ &+ \int_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u_0,v(0)]\,dx. \end{aligned}\tag{4.23}$$

It remains to pass to the limit in $\delta \to 0$. The first and the second term on the right hand side depends continuously on δ due to absolute continuity on integration in time. For the third term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \le \mathfrak{b}[u(t),v(t)] &\overset{(1.10)}{\le} \phi(v(t)) + \phi^*(b(u(t))) \overset{\text{Lemma 2.7}}{\le} \phi(v(t)) + \frac{m}{m+1}u(t)b(u(t))\\ &\overset{\text{Lemma 2.7}}{\le} \phi(v(t)) + m\phi(u(t)).\end{aligned}\tag{4.24}$$

Since $u, v \in C^0([0,T];L^\phi(\Omega))$, the right hand side of (4.24) is continuous in time. Therefore, by an application of dominated convergence theorem ([34, Theorem 1.20]), the function

$$[0,T] \ni t \mapsto \int_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u(t),v(t)]\,dx$$

is continuous.

Hence, now, we can pass to the limit as $\delta \to 0$ in (4.23) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{t_0}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy &\le \int_0^{t_0}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\\ &+ \iint_{\Omega_\tau}\partial_t v\,(b(v)-b(u))\,dx\,dt - \int_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u(t_0),v(t_0)]\,dx\,dt + \int_{\Omega}\mathfrak{b}[u_0,v(0)]\,dx,\end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(\Omega_T)$ and $v(0) \in L^\phi(\Omega)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4.

5. Variational inequality for weak solutions

In this section, we compare the notion of weak solutions to that of variational solutions. We will first show that if the function $\xi \mapsto H(x,y,\xi)$ is C^1 and satisfies a comparable growth condition from above namely

$$H(x,y,\xi) \le C\left(\frac{|\xi|}{|x-y|^s}\right)^p \text{ and } |D_\xi H(x,y,\xi)| \le C\frac{|\xi|^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{sp}} \tag{5.1}$$

then a variational solution is a weak solution in the sense given in the following theorem, which is analogous to [9, Theorem 6.1].

Theorem 5.1. *Let Ω be an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Suppose that H satisfies the assumptions (1.2) (1.3) and (5.1) and let the time-independent Cauchy-Dirichlet data $u_0 : \mathbb{R}^N \to [0,\infty)$ satisfy (1.14). Then the solution*

$$u \in L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^0(0,T;L^\phi(\Omega)), \text{ such that } u-g \in L^p(0,T;W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$$

as in Theorem 1.4 satisfies the following variational inequality for all $\tau \in [0,T]$:

$$\int_0^\tau \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))((v-u)(x,t)-(v-u)(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt + \int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \partial_t v(b(v)-b(u))\,dx\,dt \ge \mathfrak{B}[u(\tau),v(\tau)] - \mathfrak{B}[u_0,v(0)], \tag{5.2}$$

for all $v : (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^N \to [0,\infty)$ such that $v \in L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ and $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(0,T;\Omega)$ such that $v-u_0 \in L^p(0,T;W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$ and $v(0) \in L^\phi(\Omega)$.

Proof. For a comparison function v as stated in the theorem, let us test inequality (1.15) with the comparison maps

$$w_h = [u]_h + s(v-[u]_h),$$

where $s \in (0,1)$, $h>0$ and $[u]_h$ denotes the time mollification with initial values $v_0 = u_0$. This implies that

$$\mathfrak{B}[u(\tau),w_h(\tau)] + \int_0^\tau \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)) - H(x,y,w_h(x,t)-w_h(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt \le \mathfrak{B}[u_0,w_h(0)] + \int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \partial_t w_h(b(w_h)-b(u))\,dx\,dt \tag{5.3}$$

Let us re-write the integral involving the time derivative in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \partial_t w_h(b(w_h)-b(u))\,dx\,dt &= \int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \left[\partial_t w_h b(w_h) - (1-s)\partial_t[u]_h b(u) - s\partial_t v b(u)\right]dx\,dt \\ &= \int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \left[\partial_t(\phi(w_h)) - (1-s)\partial_t\phi([u]_h) - s\partial_t v b(u)\right]dx\,dt\end{aligned}$$

$$+ (1-s)\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t [u]_h \big(b([u]_h) - b(u)\big)\, dx\, dt.$$

By the monotonicity of b and the identity in Proposition A.1, the last integral is non-positive. Moreover, let us use the identity

$$\begin{aligned} s\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t v(b(v))\, dx\, dt &= s\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t(\phi(v))\, dx\, dt \\ &= s\int_{\Omega\times\tau} \phi(v)\, dx - s\int_{\Omega\times 0} \phi(v)\, dx \end{aligned}$$

and corresponding identities for w_h and $[u]_h$, to get the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t w_h(b(w_h) - b(u))\, dx\, dt \le\ & s\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t v(b(v) - b(u))\, dx\, dt \\ &+ \int_{\Omega\times\{\tau\}} \Big[\phi(w_h) - (1-s)\phi([u]_h) - s\phi(v)\Big]\, dx \\ &- \int_{\Omega\times\{0\}} \Big[\phi(w_h) - (1-s)\phi([u]_h) - s\phi(v)\Big]\, dx \end{aligned}$$

Since $u \in C^0([0,T]; L^\phi(\Omega))$ by construction of u and $L^\phi(\Omega) \subset L^1(\Omega)$, we can apply Lemma A.2 (iv). This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_h &\longrightarrow u \ \text{ a.e. } \Omega\times\{\tau\}, \\ [u]_h &\longrightarrow u \ \text{ a.e. } \Omega\times\{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using convexity of ϕ along with Jensen's inequality and Lemma A.2 (iv), we can invoke the dominated convergence theorem to get the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{h\downarrow 0} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t w_h(b(w_h) - b(u))\, dx\, dt \le\ & s\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t v(b(v) - b(u))\, dx\, dt \\ &+ \int_{\Omega\times\{\tau\}} \Big[\phi(u + s(v-u)) - \phi(u) + s(\phi(u) - \phi(v))\Big]\, dx \\ &- \int_{\Omega\times\{0\}} \Big[\phi(u + s(v-u)) - \phi(u) + s(\phi(u) - \phi(v))\Big]\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Using the same argument, we can show that

$$\lim_{h\downarrow 0} \Big[\mathfrak{B}[u_0, w_h(0)] - \mathfrak{B}[u(\tau), w_h(\tau)]\Big] = \int_{\Omega\times\{0\}} \mathfrak{b}\big[u, u + s(v-u)\big]dx - \int_{\Omega\times\{\tau\}} \mathfrak{b}\big[u, u + s(v-u)\big]dx. \tag{5.5}$$

For the term involving the nonlocal operator, we have pointwise a.e. convergence for w_h using Lemma A.2 (i). Then, by the p-growth condition (5.1) which allows us to use dominated convergence theorem, we get the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{h\downarrow 0} \int_0^\tau \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,w_h(x,t) - w_h(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt \\ &\quad\longrightarrow \int_0^\tau \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,[u + s(v-u)](x,t) - [u + s(v-u)](y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Taking limit $h \longrightarrow 0$ in (5.3) by way of (5.4), (5.5) and (5.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega\times\{\tau\}} \mathfrak{b}\big[u, u+s(v-u)\big]dx \\
&\quad + \int_0^\tau \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)) - H(x,y,[u+s(v-u)](x,t)-[u+s(v-u)](y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt \\
&\quad \le \int_{\Omega\times\{0\}} \mathfrak{b}\big[u, u+s(v-u)\big]dx + \int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \partial_t v(b(v)-b(u))\,dx\,dt \\
&\qquad + \int_{\Omega\times\{\tau\}} \Big[\phi(u+s(v-u)) - \phi(u) + s(\phi(u)-\phi(v))\Big]\,dx \\
&\qquad - \int_{\Omega\times\{0\}} \Big[\phi(u+s(v-u)) - \phi(u) + s(\phi(u)-\phi(v))\Big]\,dx.
\end{aligned}$$

We divide the inequality by $s \in (0,1)$ and using the definition of $\mathfrak{b}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \le \frac{1}{s}&\int_0^\tau \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,[u+s(v-u)](x,t)-[u+s(v-u)](y,t)) - H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt \\
&+ \int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \partial_t v(b(v)-b(u))\,dx\,dt + \mathfrak{B}[u_0,v(0)] - \mathfrak{B}[u(\tau),v(\tau)].
\end{aligned}$$

Making use of the growth assumptions on the derivatives of the H and dominated convergence theorem, we can pass to the limit $s \longrightarrow 0$ in the first integral. Finally, we get the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\tau \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))((v-u)(x,t)-(v-u)(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt + \\
&\qquad \int_0^\tau\int_\Omega \partial_t v(b(v)-b(u))\,dx\,dt \ge \mathfrak{B}[u(\tau),v(\tau)] - \mathfrak{B}[u_0,v(0)],
\end{aligned}$$

for all $v : (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^N \to [0,\infty)$ such that $v \in L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ and $\partial_t v \in L^\phi(0,T;\Omega)$ such that $v - u_0 \in L^p(0,T;W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$ and $v(0) \in L^\phi(\Omega)$. □

6. Variational solutions are distributional solutions

In this section, we want to check whether the variational solutions are also distributional solutions. We will show that this is the case when the nonlinearity b satisfies

$$l \le \frac{ub'(u)}{b(u)} \le m, \text{ for given constants } m \ge l \ge 1, \tag{6.1}$$

and for functions H satisfying, additionally,

$$H \ge 0 \text{ and } H(x,y,0) = 0 \text{ a.e. } x,y \in \mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N \tag{6.2}$$

We make a few comments about these assumptions.

The non-negativity of solutions can also be seen as solving an obstacle problem with 0 function as an obstacle. The assumption (6.2) corresponds to the 0 function being a minimum of the nonlocal functional with zero boundary values.

The assumption $l \geq 1$ is required so that $\partial_t b(u)$ does not become singular, that is, it is zero whenever u is zero. The assumption $l \geq 1$ also guarantees Lipschitz continuity of b which matches the assumption in the existence result of Alt & Luckhaus [3, Theorem 2.3]. However, we can relax their assumption of p-growth from above. The following theorem is analogous to [9, Theorem 7.1].

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that the function H satisfies (1.2), (1.3) and (6.2) and $\xi \to H(x,y,\xi)$ is C^1. For the function b, assume that (6.1) holds and the initial and boundary data satisfies (1.14). Let $u \in C^0([0,T];L^\phi(\Omega)) \cap L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}_{u_0}(\Omega))$ be as obtained in Theorem 1.4. If for every $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_T)$ there is a function $F \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times (0,T))$, which may depend on u and ψ, so that*

$$\frac{|D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)))|}{|x-y|^{N-\frac{N}{p}-s}} \leq F \tag{6.3}$$

holds almost everywhere for every $0<s<1$, then u is a solution in the sense of distributions, that is

$$\iint\limits_{\Omega_T} -b(u)\partial_t\psi \, dx\, dt + \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt = 0 \tag{6.4}$$

Remark 6.2. *In particular, the assumption (6.3) is satisfied when H satisfies the p-growth condition as in (5.1).*

Proof. Notice that for every $s \in (0,1)$ and every testing function $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_T)$, assumption (6.3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)))|}{|x-y|^N} &\leq \frac{|H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)|}{|x-y|^N} \\ &+ s\int_0^1 \frac{|D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s\sigma(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)))|\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)|}{|x-y|^N} d\sigma \\ &\leq \frac{|H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)|}{|x-y|^N} + \left(\frac{|\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)|}{|x-y|^{\frac{N}{p}+s}}\right) F(x,y,t)\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

holds a.e. $(x,y,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \times (0,T)$. We know that $\dfrac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \times (0,T))$, therefore by (6.5), (6.3) and Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)))|}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt < \infty \tag{6.6}$$

for all $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times (0,T))$ and uniformly in $s \in (0,1)$.

We would like to use $v = u + s\psi$ as a comparision function in the variational inequality, however it does not have the requisite time regularity. For this purpose, we consider $v_h := [u]_h + s[\psi]_h$ where the initial value for computing $[u]_h$ is taken to be u_0, while for $[\psi]_h$, we choose $\psi(0) = 0$. Moreover, we must choose $(v_h)_+$ as the comparison function in the variational inequality (1.15) since v_h might become negative. As usual, $\partial_t(v_h)_+ = (\partial_t v_h)_+$. Also recall that $(v_h)_+(0) = v_h(0) = u_0$. Therefore, there is no boundary term

at $t=0$ in the variational inequality. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B}[u(T),(v_h)_+(T)] &+ \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt \\ &\le \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,(v_h)_+(x,t)-(v_h)_+(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt \\ &\qquad + \int_0^T\int_\Omega \partial_t(v_h)_+(b((v_h)_+)-b(u))\,dx\,dt \\ &\le \underbrace{\int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,v_h(x,t)-v_h(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt}_{I} \\ &\qquad + \underbrace{\iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{v_h\ge 0\}} \partial_t v_h(b(v_h)-b(u))\,dx\,dt}_{II},\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

where the last inequality follows since the function $\xi\mapsto H(x,y,\xi)$ attains its minimum at $\xi=0$ by (6.2).

By Theorem A.3, we have

$$\frac{H(x,y,v_h(x,t)-v_h(y,t))}{|x-y|^N} \le \left[\frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y.t)))}{|x-y|^N}\right]_h, \tag{6.8}$$

where the initial value for computing the mollification is taken to be $\dfrac{H(x,y,u_0(x)-u_0(y))}{|x-y|^N}$. We know from (6.6) that $\dfrac{H(x,y,(u+s\psi)(x,t)-(u+s\psi)(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}\times\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}\times(0,T))$. Hence from Lemma A.2 (i), we receive

$$\limsup_{h\downarrow 0} I \le \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)))}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt. \tag{6.9}$$

We turn to the second term II. This part is handled exactly as in [9]. By the definition of v_h, the term II can be expanded to the following three terms:

$$II = \underbrace{-s\iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{v_h\ge 0\}} \partial_t[\psi]_h b(u)\,dx\,dt}_{II_1} \underbrace{-\iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{v_h\ge 0\}} \partial_t[u]_h b(u)\,dx\,dt}_{II_2} + \underbrace{\iint\limits_{\Omega_T} \partial_t(v_h)_+ b((v_h)_+)\,dx\,dt}_{II_3}. \tag{6.10}$$

For the integrand in II_2, we have the following chain of estimates

$$\begin{aligned}-\partial_t[u]_h b(u) &\overset{\text{Proposition A.1}}{=} \frac{1}{h}([u]_h-u)\phi'(u) \le \frac{1}{h}(\phi([u]_h)-\phi(u)) \\ &\le \frac{1}{h}([\phi(u)]_h-\phi(u)) \\ &\overset{\text{Proposition A.1}}{=} -\partial_t[\phi(u)]_h\end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

where the final inequality is a consequence of convexity of ϕ. The mollification of $\phi(u)$ is defined in the usual way with initial condition $\phi(u_0)$.

As a result, we receive

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 &\leq -\iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{v_h\geq 0\}} \partial_t[\phi(u)]_h\,dx\,dt \\ &= -\iint\limits_{\Omega_T} \partial_t[\phi(u)]_h\,dx\,dt + \iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{v_h\leq 0\}} \partial_t[\phi(u)]_h\,dx\,dt \\ &= \int_\Omega \phi(u_0)\,dx - \int_\Omega [\phi(u)]_h(T)\,dx + \iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{v_h\leq 0\}} \partial_t[\phi(u)]_h\,dx\,dt \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

For the integral II_3 we write

$$II_3 \overset{\phi'=b}{=} \iint\limits_{\Omega_T} \partial_t[\phi((v_h)_+)]\,dx\,dt = \int\limits_\Omega \phi(([u]_h + s[\phi]_h)_+)(T)\,dx - \int\limits_\Omega \phi(u_0)\,dx \tag{6.13}$$

Substituting (6.12) and (6.13) in (6.10), we receive

$$\begin{aligned} II \leq -s\iint\limits_{\Omega_T} \partial_t[\psi]_h b(u)\,dx\,dt + \underbrace{\iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{v_h\leq 0\}} [s\partial_t[\psi]_h b(u) + \partial_t[\phi(u)]_h]\,dx\,dt}_{III} \\ + \underbrace{\int\limits_\Omega [\phi(([u]_h + s[\psi]_h)_+)(T) - [\phi(u)]_h](T)\,dx}_{IV}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

By Theorem 1.4, we have $\partial_t\phi(u) = 2\sqrt{\phi(u)}\partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)} \in L^1(\Omega_T)$ therefore by Lemma A.2 (vi), we conclude that $\partial_t[\phi(u)]_h \to \partial_t\phi(u)$ in $L^1(\Omega_T)$ as $h \downarrow 0$.

We also have $\partial_t[\psi]_h \to \partial_t\psi$ uniformly on Ω_T and $\limsup\limits_{h\downarrow 0} \chi_{\{v_h\leq 0\}} \leq \chi_{\{u+s\psi\leq 0\}}$ almost everywhere in Ω_T.

Hence, we have

$$\limsup_{h\downarrow 0} III \leq \iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{u+s\psi\leq 0\}} [s|\partial_t\psi||b(u)| + |\partial_t\phi(u)|]\,dx\,dt \tag{6.15}$$

By Lemma A.2 (iv), we also have that $[u]_h(T) \to u(T)$ and $[\psi]_h(T) \to 0$ pointwise a.e. on Ω. Then by convexity of ϕ (which leads to $\phi(v_h) \leq [\phi(u + s\psi)]_h$), Lemma A.2 (i) and a version of dominated convergence theorem, we find that the integral IV vanishes in the limit $h \downarrow 0$. With this knowledge and (6.15), we obtain

$$\limsup_{h\downarrow 0} II \leq -s\iint\limits_{\Omega_T} \partial_t\psi\, b(u)\,dx\,dt + \underbrace{\iint\limits_{\Omega_T\cap\{u+s\psi\leq 0\}} [s|\partial_t\psi||b(u)| + |\partial_t\phi(u)|]\,dx\,dt}_{V} \tag{6.16}$$

For the term V in (6.16), the function u satisfies $u \leq s\,\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}$. Therefore, using monotonicity of ϕ and the property (4) in Lemma 2.6, we get

$$|\partial_t\phi(u)| \leq 2\sqrt{\phi(u)}|\partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)}| \leq \sqrt{\phi(\psi)}\,s^{\frac{l+1}{2}}|\partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)}| \tag{6.17}$$

for any $s \in (0,1)$.

Substituting (6.17) in (6.16), we conclude

$$\limsup_{h\downarrow 0} II \leq -s \iint_{\Omega_T} \partial_t\psi\, b(u)\, dx\, dt + cs \iint_{\Omega_T\cap\{u+s\psi\leq 0\}} [|b(u)| + |\partial_t\phi(u)|]\, dx\, dt, \tag{6.18}$$

where we use the fact that $l \geq 1$, $s \in (0,1)$ and the constant c depends on ψ.

Now, on dividing inequality (6.7) by s and substituting (6.9) and (6.18) in order to pass to the limit $h \downarrow 0$ while using the non-negativity of the boundary term, we receive

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\Omega_T} \partial_t\psi b(u)\, dx\, dt \leq & \frac{1}{s}\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,(u+s\psi)(x,t)-(u+s\psi)(y,t)) - H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt \\ & + c \iint_{\Omega_T\cap\{u+s\psi\leq 0\}} [|b(u)| + |\partial_t\phi(u)|]\, dx\, dt \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

By mean value theorem we write the first integral on the right-hand side of (6.19) as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{s}\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,(u+s\psi)(x,t)-(u+s\psi)(y,t)) - H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt \\ &= \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \int_0^1 \frac{D_\xi H(x,y,(u+s\sigma\psi)(x,t)-(u+s\sigma\psi)(y,t))\cdot(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, d\sigma\, dx\, dy\, dt \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

On account of (6.3) and Hölder's inequality, the integrand in the above integral satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{D_\xi H(x,y,(u+s\sigma\psi)(x,t)-(u+s\sigma\psi)(y,t))\cdot(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t))}{|x-y|^N} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{|\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)|}{|x-y|^{\frac{N}{p}+s}}\right) F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N\times(0,T)), \end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

independently of $s \in (0,1)$. On passing to the limit as $s \downarrow 0$ on the right-hand side of (6.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{s\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{s}\int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H(x,y,(u+s\psi)(x,t)-(u+s\psi)(y,t)) - H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, dx\, dy\, dt \\ &= \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \int_0^1 \frac{D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))\cdot(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\, d\sigma\, dx\, dy\, dt \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

We also have

$$\lim_{s\downarrow 0} \iint_{\Omega_T\cap\{u+s\psi\leq 0\}} [|b(u)| + |\partial_t\phi(u)|]\, dx\, dt = \iint_{\Omega_T\cap\{u=0\}} [|b(u)| + |\partial_t\phi(u)|]\, dx\, dt = 0 \tag{6.23}$$

since $b(0) = 0 = \phi(0)$ and $\partial_t\sqrt{\phi(u)} = 0$ almost everywhere where $\sqrt{\phi(u)} = 0$.

Substituting (6.22) and (6.23) in (6.19), we receive

$$\iint_{\Omega_T} \partial_t\psi\, b(u)\, dx\, dt \leq \int_0^T \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}.(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t))\, dx\, dy\, dt.$$

We obtain equality above by replacing ψ with $-\psi$ which is what we set out to prove. □

Remark 6.3. *The assumption (6.3) can be substituted with either of the following two conditions. It is not clear which among the three conditions is best. However, (6.3) subsumes (5.1).*

(H1). For every $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_T)$ there is a function $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times (0,T))$, which may depend on u and ψ, so that

$$\frac{|D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)))|}{|x-y|^N} \leq F$$

holds almost everywhere for every $0<s<1$.

(H2). For every $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_T)$ there is a function $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times (0,T))$, which may depend on u and ψ, so that

$$\frac{|D_\xi H(x,y,u(x,t)-u(y,t)+s(\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,t)))|}{|x-y|^{N-1}} \leq F$$

holds almost everywhere for every $0<s<1$

Appendix A. Mollification in Time

In the definition of variational solutions, the test functions or comparison functions have additional time regularity compared to the solutions, therefore the variational solutions themselves cannot be used as comparison functions. To fix this, we need a smoothening in time. Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. For $T>0$, $v \in L^1(\Omega_T)$, $v_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $h \in (0,T]$, we define

$$[v]_h(\cdot,t) = e^{-\frac{t}{h}} v_0 + \frac{1}{h}\int_0^t e^{\frac{s-t}{h}} v(\cdot,s)\,ds, \tag{A.1}$$

for $t \in [0,T]$. The basic properties of time mollification were proved earlier in [40, 6]. We state them below for easy reference and prove the ones that are new.

Proposition A.1. *([6, Lemma B.1]) Let X be a Banach space and assume that $v_0 \in X$, and moreover $v \in L^r(0,T;X)$ for some $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. Then, the mollification in time defined by (A.1) belongs to $L^r(0,T;X)$ and*

$$||[v]_h||_{L^r(0,T;X)} \leq ||v||_{L^r(0,t_0;X)} + \left(\frac{h}{r}\left(1-e^{-\frac{t_0 r}{h}}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} ||v_0||_X, \tag{A.2}$$

for any $t_0 \in (0,T)$. Moreover, we have

$$\partial_t [v]_h \in L^r(0,T;X) \text{ and } \partial_t [v]_h = -\frac{1}{h}([v]_h - v). \tag{A.3}$$

Lemma A.2. *([7, Lemma 2.2]) Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Suppose that $v \in L^1(\Omega_T)$ and $v_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$. Then, the mollification in time as defined in (A.1) satisfies the following properties:*

(i) Assume that $v \in L^p(\Omega_T)$ and $v_0 \in L^p(\Omega)$ for some $p \geq 1$. Then, it holds true that $[v]_h \in L^p(\Omega_T)$ and the following quantitative bound holds.

$$||[v]_h||_{L^p(\Omega_T)} \leq ||v||_{L^p(\Omega_T)} + h^{1/p}||v_0||_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{A.4}$$

Moreover, $[v]_h \to v$ in $L^p(\Omega_T)$ and pointwise a.e. in Ω_T as $h \to 0$.

(ii) Assume that $v \in L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\Omega))$ and $v_0 \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ for some $p > 1$ and $s \in (0,1]$. Then, it holds true that $[v]_h \in L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\Omega))$ and the following quantitative bound holds.

$$||[v]_h||_{L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\Omega))} \leq ||v||_{L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\Omega))} + h^{1/p}||v_0||_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)}. \tag{A.5}$$

Moreover, $[v]_h \to v$ in $L^p(0,T;W^{s,p}(\Omega))$ as $h \to 0$.

(iii) Suppose that $v \in L^p(0,T;W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$ and $v_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ for some $p > 1$ and $s \in (0,1]$. Then, it holds true that $[v]_h \in L^p(0,T;W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$.

(iv) Suppose that $v \in C^0([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$ and $v_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then, it holds true that $[v]_h \in C^0([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$, $[v]_h(\cdot,0) = v_0$. Moreover, $[v]_h \to v$ in $C^0([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$ as $h \to 0$ and pointwise a.e. in Ω for every $t \in [0,T]$.

(v) Suppose that $v \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ and $v_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then, it holds true that $[v]_h \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$. Moreover, $[v]_h = -\frac{1}{h}([v]_h - v)$.

(vi) Let $r \geq 1$. Suppose that $\partial_t v \in L^r(\Omega_T)$ then $\partial_t[v]_h \to \partial_t v$ in $L^r(\Omega_T)$ as $h \to 0$.

Proof. The proofs of statements $(i), (iv), (v)$ and (vi) are the same as in [6, Lemma B.2] and [9, Lemma 6.2]. The proofs for (ii) and (iii) are given in the appendix of [56]. □

We also note the following theorem.

Theorem A.3. *Let $T > 0$, and assume that $v \in L^1(0,T;W^{s,1}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ with*

$$\frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N} \in L^1(0,T;L^1(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N)),$$

and $v_0 \in W^{s,1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, with

$$\frac{H\left(x,y,v_0(x)-v_0(y)\right)}{|x-y|^N} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N).$$

Then, we have

$$\frac{H(x,y,[v]_h(x,t)-[v]_h(y,t))}{|x-y|^N} \leq \left[\frac{H(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t))}{|x-y|^N}\right]_h, \tag{A.6}$$

so that

$$\frac{H\left(x,y,[v]_h(x,t)-[v]_h(y,t)\right)}{|x-y|^N} \in L^1(0,T;L^1(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N)).$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H\left(x,y,[v]_h(x,t)-[v]_h(y,t)\right)}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt = \int_0^T \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{H\left(x,y,v(x,t)-v(y,t)\right)}{|x-y|^N}\,dx\,dy\,dt$$

Proof. The proof is the same as that of [7, Lemma 2.3]. The only difference is we use convexity of $\xi \to H(x,y,\xi)$ and use convergence in $L^1(0,T;L^1(\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N))$. □

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Karthik Adimurthi for suggesting this problem and helpful discussions. The authors were supported by the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no. 12-R&D-TFR-5.01-0520.

References

[1] Robert A. Adams and John J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*, volume 140 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam)*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second edition, 2003. ISBN 978-0-12-044143-3. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=2424078. 5, 20

[2] Goro Akagi and Ulisse Stefanelli. Doubly Nonlinear Equations as Convex Minimization. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 46(3):1922–1945, January 2014. ISSN 0036-1410. doi:10.1137/13091909X. URL https://epubs.siam.org/doi/10.1137/13091909X. 2, 4

[3] Hans Wilhelm Alt and Stephan Luckhaus. Quasilinear elliptic-parabolic differential equations. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 183(3):311–341, September 1983. ISSN 1432-1823. doi:10.1007/BF01176474. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01176474. 4, 6, 25

[4] Luigi Ambrosio. Minimizing movements. *Accademia Nazionale delle Scienze detta dei XL. Rendiconti. Serie V. Memorie di Matematica e Applicazioni. Parte I*, 19:191–246, 1995. ISSN 0392-4106. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=1387558. 1

[5] Agnid Banerjee, Prashanta Garain, and Juha Kinnunen. Some local properties of subsolution and supersolutions for a doubly nonlinear nonlocal p-Laplace equation. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (1923 -)*, November 2021. ISSN 1618-1891. doi:10.1007/s10231-021-01177-4. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-021-01177-4. 2

[6] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, and Paolo Marcellini. Parabolic Systems with p, q-Growth: A Variational Approach. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 210(1):219–267, October 2013. ISSN 1432-0673. doi:10.1007/s00205-013-0646-4. URL 10.1007/s00205-013-0646-4. 29, 30

[7] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, and Paolo Marcellini. Existence of evolutionary variational solutions via the calculus of variations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 256 (12):3912–3942, June 2014. ISSN 0022-0396. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2014.03.005. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022039614001144. 2, 3, 29, 31

[8] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, and Paolo Marcellini. A time dependent variational approach to image restoration. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 8(2):968–1006, 2015. doi:10.1137/140992771. URL 10.1137/140992771. 2

[9] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, Paolo Marcellini, and Christoph Scheven. Doubly Nonlinear Equations of Porous Medium Type. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 229(2):503–545, August 2018. ISSN 1432-0673. doi:10.1007/s00205-018-1221-9. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-018-1221-9. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 22, 25, 26, 30

[10] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, Christoph Scheven, and Thomas Singer. Existence of Variational Solutions in Noncylindrical Domains. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 50(3):3007–3057, January 2018. ISSN 0036-1410. doi:10.1137/17M1156423. URL https://epubs.siam.org/doi/10.1137/17M1156423. 2

[11] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, Leah Schätzler, and Christoph Scheven. Existence for evolutionary problems with linear growth by stability methods. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 266(11):7709–7748, May 2019. ISSN 0022-0396. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2018.12.012. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022039618307009. 2

[12] Verena Bögelein, Nicolas Dietrich, and Matias Vestberg. Existence of solutions to a diffusive shallow medium equation. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 21(1):845–889, March 2021. ISSN 1424-3202. doi:10.1007/s00028-020-00604-y. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00028-020-00604-y. 2

[13] Lorenzo Brasco and Erik Lindgren. Higher sobolev regularity for the fractional p-laplace equation in the superquadratic case. *Advances in Mathematics*, 304:300–354, 2017. ISSN 0001-8708. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2016.03.039. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=3558212. 4

[14] Lorenzo Brasco, Erik Lindgren, and Enea Parini. The fractional Cheeger problem. *Interfaces and Free Boundaries*, 16(3):419–458, September 2014. ISSN 1463-9963. doi:10.4171/IFB/325. URL https://www.ems-ph.org/journals/show_abstract.php?issn=1463-9963&vol=16&iss=3&rank=5. 9, 10

[15] Lorenzo Brasco, Erik Lindgren, and Armin Schikorra. Higher Hölder regularity for the fractional p-Laplacian in the superquadratic case. *Advances in Mathematics*, 338: 782–846, November 2018. ISSN 0001-8708. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2018.09.009. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870818303402. 4

[16] Lorenzo Brasco, Erik Lindgren, and Martin Strömqvist. Continuity of solutions to a nonlinear fractional diffusion equation. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, June 2021. ISSN 1424-3202. doi:10.1007/s00028-021-00721-2. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00028-021-00721-2. 4

[17] Haim Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2011. ISBN 978-0-387-70913-0. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=2759829. 8

[18] Sun-Sig Byun, Hyojin Kim, and Jihoon Ok. Local H\"older continuity for fractional nonlocal equations with general growth. *arXiv:2112.13958 [math]*, December 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.13958. 4

[19] Sun-Sig Byun, Jihoon Ok, and Kyeong Song. Hölder regularity for weak solutions to nonlocal double phase problems. *arXiv:2108.09623 [math]*, August 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2108.09623. 4

[20] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, and Paolo Marcellini. Parabolic equations with p, q-growth. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées. Neuvième Série*, 100(4):535–563, 2013. ISSN 0021-7824. doi:10.1016/j.matpur.2013.01.012. URL 10.1016/j.matpur.2013.01.012. 2

[21] Luis Caffarelli, Chi Hin Chan, and Alexis Vasseur. Regularity theory for parabolic nonlinear integral operators. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 24(3):849–869, July 2011. ISSN 0894-0347, 1088-6834. doi:10.1090/S0894-0347-2011-00698-X. URL https://www.ams.org/jams/2011-24-03/S0894-0347-2011-00698-X/. 4

[22] Luis A. Caffarelli and Alexis Vasseur. Drift diffusion equations with fractional diffusion and the quasi-geostrophic equation. *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series*, 171(3):1903–1930, 2010. ISSN 0003-486X. doi:10.4007/annals.2010.171.1903. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=2680400. 4

[23] Jamil Chaker. Regularity of solutions to anisotropic nonlocal equations. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 296(3):1135–1155, December 2020. ISSN 1432-1823. doi:10.1007/s00209-020-02459-y. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00209-020-02459-y. 4

[24] Jamil Chaker and Moritz Kassmann. Nonlocal operators with singular anisotropic kernels. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 45(1):1–31, January 2020. ISSN 0360-5302. doi:10.1080/03605302.2019.1651335. URL https://doi.org/10.1080/03605302.2019.1651335. 4

[25] Jamil Chaker and Minhyun Kim. Local regularity for nonlocal equations with variable exponents. *arXiv:2107.06043 [math]*, July 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.06043. 4

[26] Jamil Chaker and Minhyun Kim. Regularity estimates for fractional orthotropic p-laplacians of mixed order. *arXiv:2104.07507 [math]*, April 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.07507. 4

[27] Jamil Chaker, Minhyun Kim, and Marvin Weidner. Regularity for nonlocal problems with non-standard growth. *arXiv:2111.09182 [math]*, November 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09182. 4

[28] Héctor Chang-Lara and Gonzalo Dávila. Regularity for solutions of nonlocal parabolic equations II. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 256(1):130–156, January 2014. ISSN 0022-0396. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2013.08.016. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022039613003859. 4

[29] Matteo Cozzi. Regularity results and Harnack inequalities for minimizers and solutions of nonlocal problems: A unified approach via fractional De Giorgi classes. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 272(11):4762–4837, June 2017. ISSN 0022-1236. doi:10.1016/j.jfa.2017.02.016. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022123617300770. 4

[30] Ennio De Giorgi. New problems on minimizing movements. In *Boundary Value Problems for Partial Differential Equations and Applications*, volume 29 of *RMA Res. Notes Appl. Math.*, pages 81–98. Masson, Paris, 1993. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=1260440. 1

[31] Agnese Di Castro, Tuomo Kuusi, and Giampiero Palatucci. Local behavior of fractional p-minimizers. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 33 (5):1279–1299, September 2016. ISSN 0294-1449. doi:10.1016/j.anihpc.2015.04.003. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0294144915000451. 4

[32] Eleonora Di Nezza, Giampiero Palatucci, and Enrico Valdinoci. Hitchhiker's guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques*, 136(5): 521–573, July 2012. ISSN 0007-4497. doi:10.1016/j.bulsci.2011.12.004. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0007449711001254. 3, 8

[33] Mengyao Ding, Chao Zhang, and Shulin Zhou. Local boundedness and Hölder continuity for the parabolic fractional p-Laplace equations. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 60(1):38, January 2021. ISSN 1432-0835. doi:10.1007/s00526-020-01870-x. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-020-01870-x. 4

[34] Lawrence C. Evans and Ronald F. Gariepy. *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*. Textbooks in Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, revised edition, 2015. ISBN 978-1-4822-4238-6. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=3409135. 21

[35] J. Giacomoni, D. Kumar, and K. Sreenadh. Hölder regularity results for parabolic nonlocal double phase problems. *arXiv:2112.04287 [math]*, December 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.04287. 4

[36] Jacques Giacomoni, Tuhina Mukherjee, and Konijeti Sreenadh. Existence and stabilization results for a singular parabolic equation involving the fractional Laplacian. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - S*, 12(2):311, 2019. doi:10.3934/dcdss.2019022. URL https://www.aimsciences.org/article/doi/10.3934/dcdss.2019022. 4

[37] Jacques Giacomoni, Abdelhamid Gouasmia, and Abdelhafid Mokrane. Existence and global behavior of weak solutions to a doubly nonlinear evolution fractional p-Laplacian equation. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations, 2021, San Marcos, Texas: Texas State University and University of North Texas.*, February 2021. ISSN 1072-6691. URL https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877/14406. 4

[38] Qi Han. Compact Sobolev-Slobodeckij embeddings and positive solutions to fractional Laplacian equations. *Advances in Nonlinear Analysis*, 11(1):432–

453, January 2022. ISSN 2191-950X. doi:10.1515/anona-2020-0133. URL https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/anona-2020-0133/html. 8

[39] Hitoshi Ishii and Gou Nakamura. A class of integral equations and approximation of p-Laplace equations. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 37(3):485–522, March 2010. ISSN 1432-0835. doi:10.1007/s00526-009-0274-x. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-009-0274-x. 4

[40] Juha Kinnunen and Peter Lindqvist. Pointwise behaviour of semicontinuous supersolutions to a quasilinear parabolic equation. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 185(3):411–435, August 2006. ISSN 1618-1891. doi:10.1007/s10231-005-0160-x. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-005-0160-x. 29

[41] Tuomo Kuusi, Giuseppe Mingione, and Yannick Sire. A fractional Gehring lemma, with applications to nonlocal equations. *Rendiconti Lincei - Matematica e Applicazioni*, 25(4):345–358, November 2014. ISSN 1120-6330. doi:10.4171/RLM/683. URL https://www.ems-ph.org/journals/show_abstract.php?issn=1120-6330&vol=25&iss=4&rank=1. 4

[42] Héctor Chang Lara and Gonzalo Dávila. Regularity for solutions of non local parabolic equations. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 49(1):139–172, January 2014. ISSN 1432-0835. doi:10.1007/s00526-012-0576-2. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-012-0576-2. 4

[43] Chunyi Li, Chaoqun Song, LiYan Quan, Jianhao Xiang, and Mingqi Xiang. Global existence and asymptotic behavior of solutions to fractional (p,q)-Laplacian equations. *Asymptotic Analysis*, Preprint(Preprint):1–18, January 2021. ISSN 0921-7134. doi:10.3233/ASY-211731. URL https://content.iospress.com/articles/asymptotic-analysis/asy211731. 4

[44] Menglan Liao, Qiang Liu, and Hailong Ye. Global existence and blow-up of weak solutions for a class of fractional p-Laplacian evolution equations. *Advances in Nonlinear Analysis*, 9(1):1569–1591, January 2020. ISSN 2191-950X. doi:10.1515/anona-2020-0066. URL https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/anona-2020-0066/html. 4

[45] A Lichnewsky and R Temam. Pseudosolutions of the time-dependent minimal surface problem. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 30(3):340–364, December 1978. ISSN 0022-0396. doi:10.1016/0022-0396(78)90005-0. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022039678900050. 2

[46] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with nonstandard growth conditions. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 105(3):267–284, 1989. ISSN 0003-9527. doi:10.1007/BF00251503. URL 10.1007/BF00251503. 4

[47] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity and existence of solutions of elliptic equations with p, q-growth conditions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 90(1):1–30, 1991. ISSN 0022-0396. doi:10.1016/0022-0396(91)90158-6. URL 10.1016/0022-0396(91)90158-6. 4

[48] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity for Elliptic Equations with General Growth Conditions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 105(2):296–333, October 1993. ISSN 0022-0396. doi:10.1006/jdeq.1993.1091. URL 10.1006/jdeq.1993.1091. 4

[49] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity for some scalar variational problems under general growth conditions. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 90(1):161–181, July 1996. ISSN 1573-2878. doi:10.1007/BF02192251. URL 10.1007/BF02192251. 4

[50] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity under general and $p, q-$ growth conditions. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - S*, 13(7):2009, 2020. doi:10.3934/dcdss.2020155. URL 10.3934/dcdss.2020155. 4

[51] Giuseppe Mingione and Vicenţiu Rădulescu. Recent developments in problems with nonstandard growth and nonuniform ellipticity. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, page 125197, March 2021. ISSN 0022-247X. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2021.125197. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022247X21002766. 4

[52] Simon Nowak. Hs,p regularity theory for a class of nonlocal elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Analysis*, 195:111730, June 2020. ISSN 0362-546X. doi:10.1016/j.na.2019.111730. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0362546X19303839. 4

[53] Simon Nowak. Higher Hölder regularity for nonlocal equations with irregular kernel. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 60(1):24, January 2021. ISSN 1432-0835. doi:10.1007/s00526-020-01915-1. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-020-01915-1. 4

[54] Simon Nowak. Improved Sobolev regularity for linear nonlocal equations with VMO coefficients. *arXiv:2108.02856 [math]*, August 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2108.02856. 4

[55] Simon Nowak. Regularity theory for nonlocal equations with VMO coefficients. *arXiv:2101.11690 [math]*, October 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2101.11690. 4

[56] Harsh Prasad and Vivek Tewary. Existence of variational solutions to nonlocal evolution equations via convex minimization. *arXiv:2112.00402 [math]*, December 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.00402. 2, 30

[57] Harsh Prasad and Vivek Tewary. Local boundedness of variational solutions to nonlocal double phase parabolic equations. *arXiv:2112.02345 [math]*, December 2021. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.02345. 2, 4

[58] Filip Rindler. *Calculus of Variations*. Universitext. Springer, Cham, 2018. ISBN 978-3-319-77636-1 978-3-319-77637-8. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-77637-8. URL https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=3821514. 8

[59] Luca Scarpa and Ulisse Stefanelli. Doubly nonlinear stochastic evolution equations. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 30(05):991–1031, May 2020. ISSN 0218-2025. doi:10.1142/S0218202520500219. URL https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0218202520500219. 2

[60] Luca Scarpa and Ulisse Stefanelli. Stochastic PDEs via convex minimization. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 46(1):66–97, January 2021. ISSN 0360-5302. doi:10.1080/03605302.2020.1831017. URL https://doi.org/10.1080/03605302.2020.1831017. 2

[61] Leah Schätzler. Existence of variational solutions for time dependent integrands via minimizing movements. *Analysis*, 37(4):199–222, November 2017. ISSN 2196-6753. doi:10.1515/anly-2017-0047. URL https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/anly-2017-0047/html. 6

[62] Leah Schätzler. Existence for singular doubly nonlinear systems of porous medium type with time dependent boundary values. *Journal of Elliptic and Parabolic Equations*, 5 (2):383–421, December 2019. ISSN 2296-9039. doi:10.1007/s41808-019-00048-7. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s41808-019-00048-7. 2

[63] James M. Scott and Tadele Mengesha. Self-improving Inequalities for bounded weak solutions to nonlocal double phase equations. *arXiv:2011.11466 [math]*, November 2020. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2011.11466. 4

[64] Ulisse Stefanelli. The De Giorgi conjecture on elliptic regularization. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 21(06):1377–1394, June 2011. ISSN 0218-2025. doi:10.1142/S0218202511005350. URL https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0218202511005350. 2

[65] Martin Strömqvist. Local boundedness of solutions to non-local parabolic equations modeled on the fractional p-Laplacian. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 266 (12):7948–7979, June 2019. ISSN 0022-0396. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2018.12.021. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022039618307095. 4