

# Local Hölder regularity for nonlocal parabolic $p$ -Laplace equations

Karthik Adimurthi<sup>a</sup>, Harsh Prasad<sup>a</sup>, Vivek Tewary<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Centre for Applicable Mathematics, Bangalore, Karnataka, 560065, India

---

## Abstract

We prove local Hölder regularity for a nonlocal parabolic equations of the form

$$\partial_t u + \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x,t) - u(y,t)|^{p-2} (u(x,t) - u(y,t))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}} dy = 0,$$

for  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $s \in (0, 1)$ .

*Keywords:* Nonlocal operators; Weak Solutions; Hölder regularity

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

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	A brief history of the problem . . . . .	2
1.2	On historical development of intrinsic scaling . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Notations and Auxiliary Results</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Notations . . . . .	3
2.2	Function spaces . . . . .	4
2.3	Definitions . . . . .	4
2.4	Auxiliary Results . . . . .	5
2.5	Main results . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Preliminary Results</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Energy estimates . . . . .	6
3.2	Shrinking Lemma . . . . .	9
3.3	Tail Estimates . . . . .	10
3.4	De Giorgi iteration Lemma . . . . .	11
3.5	De Giorgi lemma: Forward in time version . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Qualitative expansion of positivity in time</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Expansion of positivity for Nonlocal Degenerate Equations</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Expansion of positivity for Nonlocal Singular Equations</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Hölder regularity for parabolic fractional <math>p</math>-Laplace equations</b>	<b>25</b>

---

\*Supported by the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no. 12-R&D-TFR-5.01-0520 and SERB grant SRG/2020/000081

\*\*Supported by the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no. 12-R&D-TFR-5.01-0520  
*Email addresses:* karthikaditi@gmail.com and kadimurthi@tifrbng.res.in (Karthik Adimurthi\*),  
harsh@tifrbng.res.in (Harsh Prasad\*\*), vivektewary@gmail.com and vivek2020@tifrbng.res.in (Vivek Tewary\*\*)

## 1. Introduction

In this article, we prove local Hölder regularity for a nonlocal parabolic equation whose prototype equation is the parabolic fractional  $p$ -Laplacian of the form

$$\partial_t u + \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2} (u(x, t) - u(y, t))}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dy = 0,$$

with  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $s \in (0, 1)$ . The main tools in our investigation are

- the exponential change of variable in time discovered by E.DiBenedetto, U.Gianazza and V.Vespri, which they used to prove Harnack's inequality for the parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equations. The standard references for these works are [20, 21]. The exponential change of variable in time leads to an expansion of positivity result which is suitable for proving Hölder regularity results. N.Liao in [30] has effected a direct proof of Hölder regularity for parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equation by using the expansion of positivity. It has also been used to give the first proofs of Hölder regularity for sign-changing solutions of doubly nonlinear equations of porous medium type in [4, 9, 31].

A recent work that employs the exponential change of variable to deduce regularity for elliptic anisotropic equations is [32]. It has also been used in the paper [37] for a mixed local and nonlocal parabolic equation. Our work differs from [37] in two important directions: the presence of the local term in [37] allows them to rely on the standard De Giorgi isoperimetric inequality (which we cannot use) and their estimates undergo a significant simplification due to their assumption of global boundedness on the solutions (we only assume local boundedness of solutions).

- the energy estimate for fractional parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equations containing the "good term" which substitutes the De Giorgi isoperimetric inequality in the so-called "shrinking lemma". The "good term" has been used to great effect in the works [11, 10]. It has been used to define a novel De Giorgi class by M. Cozzi in [13] to prove Hölder regularity for fractional  $p$ -minimizers. Earlier, the absence of De Giorgi isoperimetric inequality was tackled by Di Castro et. al. through a logarithmic estimate [18]. See [14, 1] for discussions on fractional versions of De Giorgi isoperimetric inequalities.

We demonstrate two purely nonlocal phenomenon - one at a technical level which has implications for what the corresponding DeGiorgi conjectures related to the "best" Holder exponent in the nonlocal case should be (see Remark 3.6) and another at the level of regularity which says that in certain cases, time regularity can beat space regularity when we are working with nonlocal equations (see Remark 7.3).

Previously, local boundedness for fractional parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equations is proved in the papers [39, 23, 35]. Regarding Hölder regularity for fractional parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equations in the spirit of DeGiorgi-Nash-Moser, the only result that we are aware of is for the case  $2 \leq p < \infty$  which was studied in [23], though we were unable to verify some of the calculations pertaining to the logarithmic estimates in their paper. Explicit exponents for Hölder regularity for fractional parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equations with no coefficients appears in [7]. Existence has been studied in [33, 36].

### 1.1. A brief history of the problem

Much of the early work on regularity of fractional elliptic equations in the case  $p = 2$  was carried out by Silvestre [38], Caffarelli and Vasseur [11], Caffarelli, Chan, Vasseur [10] and also Bass-Kassmann [2, 3, 29]. An early formulation of the fractional  $p$ -Laplace operator was done by Ishii and Nakamura [28] and existence of viscosity solutions was established. DiCastro, Kuusi and Palatucci extended the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser framework to study the regularity of the fractional  $p$ -Laplace equation in [18]. The subsequent work of Cozzi [13] covered a stable (in the limit  $s \rightarrow 1$ ) proof of Hölder regularity by defining a novel fractional DeGiorgi class. An alternate proof of Hölder regularity based on a differential inequality was given in [1]. Explicit exponents for Hölder regularity were found in [6, 7]. Other works of interest are [16, 8, 12, 24, 15] and in the parabolic context, some works of interest are [23, 36, 35].

## 1.2. On historical development of intrinsic scaling

The method of intrinsic scaling was developed by E.DiBenedetto in [17] to prove Hölder regularity for degenerate quasilinear parabolic equations modelled on the  $p$ -Laplace operator. A technical requirement of the proof was a novel logarithmic estimate which aids in the expansion of positivity. Subsequently, the proof of Hölder regularity for the singular case was given in [40] by switching the scaling from time variable to the space variable. These results were collected in E.DiBenedetto's treatise [19]. After a gap of several years, E.DiBenedetto, U.Gianazza and V.Vespri [20, 21] were able to prove Harnack's inequality for the parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equations by a new technique involving an exponential change of variable in time. This proof relies on expansion of positivity estimates and does not involve logarithmic test functions. Then, a new proof of Hölder regularity was given with a more geometric flavour in [25]. This theory was extended to generalized parabolic  $p$ -Laplace equations with Orlicz growth in [27, 26].

**Remark 1.1.** *In this paper, we assume that solutions to the nonlocal equation are locally bounded. Local boundedness for the nonlocal elliptic equations is proved in [18, Theorem 1.1] and [13, Theorem 6.2]. In the parabolic case, local boundedness is proved in [39, 23, 35].*

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Prashanta Garain for helpful discussions regarding the techniques from [22].

## 2. Notations and Auxiliary Results

In this section, we will fix the notation, provide definitions and state some standard auxiliary results that will be used in subsequent sections.

### 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 and by  $z = (x, t)$  to be a point in  $\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T)$ .
- We shall alternately use  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}, \partial_t f, f'$  to denote the time derivative of  $f$ .
- Let  $\Omega$  be an open bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  with boundary  $\partial\Omega$  and for  $0 < T \leq \infty$ , let  $\Omega_T := \Omega \times (0, T)$ .
- We shall use the notation
 
$$B_\rho(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x - x_0| < \rho\}, \quad \overline{B}_\rho(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x - x_0| \leq \rho\},$$

$$I_\theta(t_0) = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : t_0 - \theta < t < t_0\}, \quad Q_{\rho, \theta}(z_0) = B_\rho(x_0) \times I_\theta(t_0).$$
- The maximum of two numbers  $a$  and  $b$  will be denoted by  $a \wedge b := \max(a, b)$ .
- 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  $\iint$ .
- We will use  $\iiint$  to denote integral over  $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T)$ . More specifically, we will use the notation  $\iiint_Q$  and  $\iiint_{B \times I}$  to denote the integral over  $\iiint_{B \times B \times I}$ .
- The notation  $a \lesssim b$  is shorthand for  $a \leq Cb$  where  $C$  is a universal constant which only depends on the dimension  $N$ , exponents  $p, q$ , and the numbers  $M, s_1$  and  $s_2$ .
- For a function  $u$  defined on the cylinder  $Q_{\rho, \theta}(z_0)$  and any level  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  we write  $w_\pm = (u - k)_\pm$

- For any fixed  $t, k \in \mathbb{R}$  and set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , we denote  $A_{\pm}(k, t) = \{x \in \Omega : (u - k)_{\pm}(\cdot, t) > 0\}$ ; for any ball  $B_r$  we write  $A_{\pm}(k, t) \cap (B_r \times I) = A_{\pm}(k, r, t)$ .
- For any set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , we denote  $C_{\Omega} := (\Omega^c \times \Omega^c)^c = (\Omega \times \Omega) \cup (\Omega \times (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega)) \cup ((\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega) \times \Omega)$ .

Let  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $p > 1$  be fixed, and  $\Lambda \geq 1$  be a given constant. For almost every  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , let  $K : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a symmetric measurable function satisfying

$$\frac{(1-s)}{\Lambda|x-y|^{N+ps}} \leq K(x, y, t) \leq \frac{(1-s)\Lambda}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}. \quad (2.1)$$

In this paper, we are interested in the regularity theory for the equation

$$\partial_t u + \mathcal{L}u = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the operator formally defined by

$$\mathcal{L}u = \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y, t) |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2} (u(x, t) - u(y, t)) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

## 2.2. Function spaces

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

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

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  $\Omega$ . We will use the notation  $W_{(u_0)}^{s,p}(\Omega)$  to denote the space of functions in  $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  such that  $u - u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ .

Let  $I$  be an interval and let  $V$  be a separable, reflexive Banach space, endowed with a norm  $\|\cdot\|_V$ . We denote by  $V^*$  to be 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  $L^p(I; V)$  provided  $\int_I \|v(t)\|_V^p dt < \infty$ . It is well known that the dual space  $L^p(I; V)^*$  can be characterized as  $L^{p'}(I; V^*)$ .

Since the boundedness result requires some finiteness condition on the nonlocal tails, we define the tail space for some  $m > 0$  and  $s > 0$  as follows:

$$L_s^m(\mathbb{R}^N) := \left\{ v \in L_{\text{loc}}^m(\mathbb{R}^N) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|v(x)|^m}{1+|x|^{N+sm}} dx < +\infty \right\}.$$

Then a nonlocal tail is defined by

$$\text{Tail}_{m,s,\infty}(v; x_0, R, I) := \text{Tail}_{\infty}(v; x_0, R, t_0 - \theta, t_0) := \sup_{t \in (t_0 - \theta, t_0)} \left( R^{sm} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(x_0)} \frac{|v(x, t)|^{m-1}}{|x-x_0|^{N+sm}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}},$$

where  $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (-T, T)$  and the interval  $I = (t_0 - \theta, t_0) \subseteq (-T, T)$ . From this definition, it follows that for any  $v \in L^{\infty}(-T, T; L_{sm}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ , there holds  $\text{Tail}_{m,s,\infty}(v; x_0, R, I) < \infty$ .

## 2.3. Definitions

Now, we are ready to state the definition of a weak sub(super)-solution.

**Definition 2.1.** A function  $u \in L^p(I; W_{loc}^{s,p}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(I; L_{loc}^2(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(I; L_{sp}^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^N))$  is said to be a local weak sub(super)-solution to (2.2) if for any closed interval  $[t_1, t_2] \subset I$ , the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} u(x, t_2) \phi(x, t_2) dx - \int_{\Omega} u(x, t_1) \phi(x, t_1) dx - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} u(x, t) \partial_t \phi(x, t) dx dt \\ & + \iint_{C_{\Omega}} K(x, y, t) |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2} (u(x, t) - u(y, t)) (\phi(x, t) - \phi(y, t)) dy dx dt \leq (\geq) 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\phi \in L^p(I, W^{s,p}(\Omega)) \cap W^{1,2}(I, L^2(\Omega))$ , where  $C_{\Omega} := (\Omega^c \times \Omega^c)^c = (\Omega \times \Omega) \cup (\Omega \times (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega)) \cup ((\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega) \times \Omega)$  and the spatial support of  $\phi$  is contained in  $\Omega$ .

#### 2.4. Auxiliary Results

We collect the following standard results which will be used in the course of the paper. We begin with the Sobolev-type inequality [23, Lemma 2.3].

**Theorem 2.2.** Let  $t_2 > t_1 > 0$  and suppose  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Then for any  $f \in L^p(t_1, t_2; W^{s,p}(B_r)) \cap L^\infty(t_1, t_2; L^2(B_r))$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_r} |f(x, t)|^{p(1+\frac{2s}{N})} dx dt & \leq C(N, s, p) \left( r^{sp} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} \frac{|f(x, t) - f(y, t)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{B_r} |f(x, t)|^p dx dt \right) \\ & \times \left( \sup_{t_1 < t < t_2} \int_{B_r} |f(x, t)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{sp}{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

We also list a number of algebraic inequalities that are customary in obtaining energy estimates for nonlinear nonlocal equations.

**Lemma 2.3.** ([13, Lemma 4.1]) Let  $p \geq 1$  and  $a, b \geq 0$ , then for any  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , the following holds:

$$(a + b)^p - a^p \geq \theta p a^{p-1} b + (1 - \theta) b^p.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** ([13, Lemma 4.3]) Let  $p \geq 1$  and  $a \geq b \geq 0$ , then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the following holds:

$$a^p - b^p \leq \varepsilon a^p + \left( \frac{p-1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{p-1} (a-b)^p.$$

Finally, we recall the following well known lemma concerning the geometric convergence of sequence of numbers (see [19, Lemma 4.1 from Section I] for the details):

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $\{Y_n\}$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , be a sequence of positive number, satisfying the recursive inequalities

$$Y_{n+1} \leq C b^n Y_n^{1+\alpha},$$

where  $C > 1$ ,  $b > 1$ , and  $\alpha > 0$  are given numbers. If

$$Y_0 \leq C^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}},$$

then  $\{Y_n\}$  converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

#### 2.5. Main results

We prove the following main theorem.

**Theorem 2.6.** Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and let  $u \in L^p(I; W_{loc}^{s,p}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(I; L_{loc}^2(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(I; L_{sp}^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^N))$  be a bounded local solution to (2.2). Then  $u$  is locally Hölder continuous in  $\Omega_T$ , i.e., there exist constants  $\gamma > 1$ ,  $C_0 > 1$ , and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  depending only on the data, such that, for every cylinder

$$B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - L^{-p} R^{sp}, t_0) \subset B_{C_0 R}(x_0) \times (t_0 - L^{-p} (C_0 R)^{sp}, t_0) \subset \Omega_T,$$

$$|u(x_1, t_1) - u(x_2, t_2)| \leq \gamma \left( \frac{|x_1 - x_2| + L^{\frac{p-2}{sp}} |t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{sp}}}{R} \right)^\alpha L,$$

for every pair of points  $(x_1, t_1), (x_2, t_2) \in B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - L^{2-p} R^{sp}, t_0)$ , where

$$L := \|u\|_{L^\infty(Q_{C_0 R})} + \text{Tail}_\infty(u; C_0 R, x_0, (t_0 - (C_0 R)^{sp}, t_0)).$$

### 3. Preliminary Results

#### 3.1. Energy estimates

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $u$  be a local, weak sub(super)-solution. Let  $B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - \theta, t_0) \Subset E_T$  and  $k, \tau_1, \tau_2$  with  $0 < r < R, t_0 - \theta < t_0 - \tau_2 < t_0 - \tau_1 \leq t_0 - \frac{\theta}{2}$ . Then there are positive universal constants  $\gamma, C$  such that for every level  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  and every piecewise smooth cutoff function  $\xi(x, t) = \xi_1(x)\xi_2(t)$  vanishing on  $\partial K$  with  $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess sup}_{t_0 - \tau_1 < t < t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} w_\pm^2 \xi^p(x, t) dx + \int_{t_0 - \tau_1}^{t_0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} w_\pm(x, t) \int_{B_R(x_0)} \frac{w_\mp^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy dx dt \\ & + \iiint_{B_r(x_0) \times B_r(x_0) \times (t_0 - \tau_1, t_0)} |w_\pm(x, t)\xi_1(x) - w_\pm(y, t)\xi_1(y)|^p |\xi_2(t)|^p d\mu dt \\ & \leq \gamma \int_{B_R(x_0)} w_\pm^2 \xi^p(x, t_0 - \tau_1) dx \\ & + \gamma \int_{t_0 - \tau_2}^{t_0} \iint_{B_R(x_0) \times B_R(x_0)} \max\{w_\pm(x, t), w_\pm(y, t)\}^p |\xi_1(x) - \xi_1(y)|^p |\xi_2(t)|^p d\mu dt \\ & + \gamma \iint_{(t_0 - \tau_2, t_0) \times B_R(x_0)} w_\pm^2(x, t) |\partial_t \xi(x, t)| dx dt \\ & + C \text{ess sup}_{\substack{t \in (t_0 - \tau_2, t_0) \\ x \in \text{spt } \xi_1}} \int_{B_r(x_0)^c} \frac{w_\pm^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \left( \iint_{(t_0 - \tau_2, t_0) \times B_R(x_0)} w_\pm(x, t) dx dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $w_\pm = (u - k)_\pm$ ,  $\xi_2 \in C^1(t_0 - \theta, t_0)$  be a test function such that  $\xi_2 = 0$  on  $(t_0 - \theta, t_0 - \tau_2)$ ,  $\xi_2 = 1$  on  $(t_0 - \tau_1, t_0)$  and  $0 \leq \xi_2 \leq 1$ . Also,  $\xi_1 \in C_0^\infty(B_R(x_0))$  and  $d\mu = \frac{dx dy}{|x - y|^{N+ps}}$ .

*Proof.* All the heavy-lifting pertaining to time regularization has already been performed in [23, Lemma 3.3]. In fact, the proof of our theorem is the same as their proof except for their estimate for the terms  $I_2$  and  $I_3$ . For this reason and in the interest of brevity, we only present below the part of their proof with the subheadings “**The estimate of  $I_2$** ” and “**The estimate of  $I_3$** ” with different estimates that produce the “good term”. To this end, we follow [13, Prop. 8.5]. Moreover, we only write the calculation for sub-solutions since those for super-solutions are similar and we assume without loss of generality that  $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$ . Let  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  be positive numbers such that  $0 < r \leq \rho_1 < \rho_2 \leq R$ . We take  $\xi_1$  such that  $0 \leq \xi_1 \leq 1$  and  $\text{spt}(\xi_1) = B_{\frac{\rho_1 + \rho_2}{2}} := B_{\frac{\rho_1 + \rho_2}{2}}(0)$ .

**The estimate of  $I_2$ :** Recall that

$$I_2 := \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\tau_2}^0 \iint_{B_{\rho_2} \times B_{\rho_2}} |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2} (u(x, t) - u(y, t)) (w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) \xi_2^p(t) d\mu dt.$$

To estimate the nonlocal terms, we consider the following cases pointwise for  $(x, t)$  and  $(y, t)$  in  $C_{B_{\rho_2}} \times I$  where  $I = (-\tau_2, 0)$ . For any fixed  $t \in I$ , we claim that

- If  $x \notin A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$  and  $y \notin A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$  then
$$|u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2}(u(x, t) - u(y, t))(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

- If  $x \in A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$  and  $y \notin A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$  then
$$\begin{aligned} & |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2}(u(x, t) - u(y, t))(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) \\ & \geq \min\{2^{p-2}, 1\} [|w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t)|^p + w_-(y, t)^{p-1}w_+(x, t)] \xi_1(x)^p. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

- If  $x, y \in A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$  then
$$\begin{aligned} & |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2}(u(x, t) - u(y, t))(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}|w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t)|^p \max\{\xi_1(x), \xi_1(y)\}^p \\ & \quad - C \max\{w_+(x, t), w_+(y, t)\}^p |\xi_1(x) - \xi_1(y)|^p, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

for some  $C \geq 1$  depending only on  $p$ .

The estimate (3.1) follows from the fact that  $(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) = 0$  when  $x \notin A_+(k, t)$  and  $y \notin A_+(k, t)$ .

To obtain estimate (3.2) we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2}(u(x, t) - u(y, t))(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) = \\ & \quad (w_+(x, t) + w_+(y, t))^{p-1}w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x), \end{aligned}$$

when  $x \in A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$  and  $y \notin A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$ . Now, (3.2) follows by an application of Lemma 2.3, with  $\theta = 0$  when  $p \geq 2$  and Jensen's inequality when  $p < 2$ .

Finally, to obtain estimate (3.3), we begin by assuming without loss of generality that  $u(x, t) \geq u(y, t)$ . Since  $x, y \in A_+(k, \rho_2, t)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2}(u(x, t) - u(y, t))(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) = \\ & \quad (w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t))^{p-1}(\xi_1^p(x)w_+(x, t) - \xi_1^p(y)w_+(y, t)). \end{aligned}$$

Now, if  $\xi_1(x) \geq \xi_1(y)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2}(u(x, t) - u(y, t))(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) = \\ & \quad (w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t))^p (\xi_1(x))^p, \end{aligned}$$

and (3.3) is immediate. However, if  $\xi_1(x) < \xi_1(y)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2}(u(x, t) - u(y, t))(w_+(x, t)\xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t)\xi_1^p(y)) = \\ & \quad (w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t))^p (\xi_1(y))^p - (w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t))^{p-1}w_+(x, t)(\xi_1^p(x) - \xi_1^p(y)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

We apply Lemma 2.4 with  $a = \xi_1(y)$  and  $b = \xi_1(x)$  and

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \frac{w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t)}{w_+(x, t)},$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t))^{p-1}w_+(x, t)(\xi_1^p(x) - \xi_1^p(y)) \\ & \quad \frac{1}{2}(w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t))^p \xi_1^p(y) + [2(p-1)]^{p-1}w_+(x, t)(\xi_1(y) - \xi_1(x))^p. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Combining (3.4) and (3.5), we obtain (3.3) when  $\xi_1(x) < \xi_1(y)$ .

As a consequence of these cases and (2.1), we have

$$I_2 \geq C_{11} \left[ \int_I \iint_{B_{\rho_1} \times B_{\rho_1}} \frac{|w_+(x, t) - w_+(y, t)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} \max\{\xi_1(x), \xi_1(y)\}^p \xi_2^p(t) dx dy dt \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_I \int_{B_{\rho_1}} w_+(x, t) \left( \int_{B_{\rho_2}} \frac{w_-(y, t)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right) dx dt \Big] \\
& - C_{22} \int_I \iint_{B_{\rho_2} \times B_{\rho_2}} \max\{w_+(x, t), w_+(y, t)\}^p \frac{|\xi_1(x) - \xi_1(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} \xi_2^p(t) dx dy dt.
\end{aligned}$$

**The estimate of  $I_3$ :** Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 & := \int_{-\tau_2}^0 \iint_{(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\rho_2}) \times B_{\rho_2}} |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2} (u(x, t) - u(y, t)) (w_+(x, t) \xi_1^p(x) - w_+(y, t) \xi_1^p(y)) \xi_2^p(t) d\mu dt \\
& = \int_{-\tau_2}^0 \int_{B_{\rho_2}} \xi_1^p(x) w_+(x, t) \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\rho_2}} |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^{p-2} (u(x, t) - u(y, t)) K(x, y, t) dy \right] dx dt \\
& \geq C_{33} \underbrace{\int_{-\tau_2}^0 \int_{A^+(k, \rho_1, t)} w_+(x, t) \left[ \int_{(B_R(x) \cap \{u(x, t) \geq u(y, t)\}) \setminus B_{\rho_2}} \frac{(u(x, t) - u(y, t))^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right]}_{T_1} dx dt \\
& \quad - C_{44} \underbrace{\int_{-\tau_2}^0 \int_{A^+(k, \frac{\rho_1 + \rho_2}{2}, t)} w_+(x, t) \left[ \int_{\{u(y, t) > u(x, t)\} \setminus B_{\rho_2}} \frac{(u(x, t) - u(y, t))^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right]}_{T_2} dx dt. \tag{3.6}
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate  $T_1$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 & \geq \int_I \int_{B_{\rho_1}} w_+(x, t) \left[ \int_{(B_R(x) \cap A^-(k, t)) \setminus B_{\rho_2}} \frac{(w_+(x, t) + w_+(y, t))^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right] dx dt \\
& \geq \int_I \int_{B_{\rho_1}} w_+(x, t) \left[ \int_{B_R(x) \setminus B_{\rho_2}} \frac{w_+(y, t)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right] dx dt \tag{3.7}
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate  $T_2$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 & \leq \int_{-\tau_2}^0 \int_{B_{\frac{\rho_1 + \rho_2}{2}}} w_+(x, t) \left[ \int_{\substack{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\rho_2} \\ x \in \text{spt } \xi_1}} \frac{w_+(y, t)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right] dx dt \\
& \leq \iint_{I \times B_R} w_+(x, t) dx dt \left( \text{ess sup}_{t \in I} \left[ \int_{\substack{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\rho_2} \\ x \in \text{spt } \xi_1}} \frac{w_+(y, t)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right] dx dt \right). \tag{3.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.7) and (3.8) in (3.6), we obtain

$$I_3 \geq C_{33} \int_I \int_{B_{\rho_1}} w_+(x, t) \left[ \int_{B_R(x) \setminus B_{\rho_2}} \frac{w_+(y, t)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right] dx dt$$



$$- C_{44} \iint_{I \times B_R} w_+(x, t) dx dt \left( \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in I} \left[ \int_{\substack{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\rho/2} \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \xi_1}} \frac{w_+(y, t)^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \right] dx dt \right).$$

As mentioned earlier, the rest of the proof of [Theorem 3.1](#) is the same as in [[23](#), Lemma 3.3], however, we do not have the term  $I_4$  since we are not considering source terms.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *This energy estimate first appears in [[35](#)] under the assumption that  $\partial_t u \in L^2(E_T)$  (see Lemma 3.1 and Remark 3.2 in [[35](#)]). This assumption is generally dropped by working with regularizations in time, such as Steklov averages [[19](#)]. In fact, the estimate in [[35](#)] is proved for parabolic minimizers, however the same method works for solutions of equations.*

Henceforth, excepting the final section, we will let  $u$  denote a nonnegative, locally bounded supersolution.

### 3.2. Shrinking Lemma

One of the main difficulties we face when dealing with regularity issues for nonlocal equations is the lack of a corresponding isoperimetric inequality for  $W^{s,p}$  functions. Indeed, since such functions can have jumps, a generic isoperimetric inequality seems out of reach at this time (see [[14](#), [1](#)]). One way around this issue is to note that since we are working with solutions of an equation, which we expect to be continuous and hence have no jumps, we could try and cook up an isoperimetric inequality for solutions. Such a strategy turns out to be feasible due to the presence of the ‘‘good term’’ or the isoperimetric term in the Caccioppoli inequality.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $k < l < m$  be arbitrary levels and  $A \geq 1$ . Then,*

$$(l-k)(m-l)^{p-1} |[u > m] \cap K_\rho| |[u < k] \cap K_\rho| \leq C \rho^{N+sp} \int_{K_\rho} (u-l)_-(x) \int_{K_{A\rho}} \frac{(u-l)_+^{p-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy dx,$$

where  $C = C(N, s, p, A) > 0$ .

*Proof.* We estimate from below

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K_\rho} (u-l)_-(x) \int_{K_{A\rho}} \frac{(u-l)_+^{p-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy dx &\geq \frac{C}{\rho^{N+sp}} \int_{K_\rho} (u-l)_-(x) \int_{K_\rho} (u-l)_+^{p-1}(y) dy dx \\ &\geq \frac{C}{\rho^{N+sp}} \int_{K_\rho \cap \{u < k\}} (u-l)_-(x) \int_{K_\rho \cap \{u > m\}} (u-l)_+^{p-1}(y) dy dx \\ &\geq \frac{C}{\rho^{N+sp}} \int_{K_\rho \cap \{u < k\}} (l-k) \int_{K_\rho \cap \{u > m\}} (m-l)^{p-1} dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We now prove the shrinking lemma using [Lemma 3.3](#). It is usually proved in the local case using the De Giorgi isoperimetric inequality.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $u$  be a super-solution of (2.2). Suppose that for some level  $m$ , some constant  $\nu \in (0, 1)$  and all time levels  $\tau$  in some interval  $J$  we have*

$$|[u(\cdot, \tau) > m] \cap K_\rho| \geq \nu |K_\rho|,$$

and we can arrange that for some  $A \geq 1$ , the following is also satisfied:

$$\int_J \int_{K_\rho} (u-l)_-(x, t) \int_{K_{A\rho}} \frac{(u-l)_+^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy dx dt \leq C_1 \frac{l^p}{\rho^{sp}} |Q|, \quad (3.9)$$

where

$$l = \frac{m}{2^j}, \quad j \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Q = K_\rho \times J,$$

then we have the following conclusion:

$$\left| \left[ u < \frac{m}{2^{j+1}} \right] \cap Q \right| \leq \left( \frac{C}{2^j - 1} \right)^{p-1} |Q|,$$

where  $C = (C_1, A, N, \nu) > 0$ .

*Proof.* In the conclusion of [Lemma 3.3](#) we put  $k = \frac{m}{2^{j+1}}$  and  $l = \frac{m}{2^j}$ , use the hypothesis and then integrate over the time interval  $J$  to get

$$\frac{m}{2^{j+1}} m^{p-1} \left( \frac{2^j - 1}{2^j} \right)^{p-1} \left| \left[ u < \frac{m}{2^{j+1}} \right] \cap Q \right| \leq \frac{C}{\nu} \left( \frac{m}{2^j} \right)^p |Q|,$$

where  $C$  depends on  $C_1, A$  and  $N$ . The conclusion follows after a simple rearrangement.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** *In applying the shrinking lemma in proving the expansion of positivity lemmas, in order to get the smallness condition [\(3.9\)](#), we shall need to impose the smallness condition on the Tail term - this is one of the ways in which the Tail alternatives enter the picture.*

**Remark 3.6.** *An intriguing aspect of our lemma is the fact that the dependence between the levels in the conclusion and how small we can make the corresponding level set is not exponential; such a dependence is reflected in the best known lower bound for the Hölder exponent for solutions to second order linear nonlocal equations [\[34\]](#), whereas, in the local case, this lower bound is much worse [\[5\]](#).*

### 3.3. Tail Estimates

In this section, we shall outline how the estimate for the tail term is made and we shall refer to this section whenever a similar calculation is required in subsequent sections.

For any level  $k$  we want to estimate

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in J; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta K_\rho^\zeta(y_0)}} \int \frac{(u - k)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy,$$

where  $J$  is some time interval and  $\zeta$  is a cutoff function. We will typically choose  $\zeta$  to be supported in  $K_{\vartheta\rho}$  for some  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$ . In such cases,

$$|y - y_0| \leq |x - y| \left( 1 + \frac{|x - y_0|}{|x - y|} \right) \leq |x - y| \left( 1 + \frac{\vartheta}{(1 - \vartheta)} \right),$$

so we can make a first estimate

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in J; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta K_\rho^\zeta(y_0)}} \int \frac{(u - k)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \vartheta)^{N+sp}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in J} \int_{K_\rho^\zeta(y_0)} \frac{(u - k)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|y - y_0|^{N+sp}} dy.$$

In the local case, we could always estimate  $(u - k)_- \leq k$  because we take  $u \geq 0$  locally. However, in the Tail term we are on the complement of a cube and so unless we make a global boundedness assumption (for e.g.  $u \geq 0$  in full space), the best we can do is

$$(u - k)_- \leq u_- + k,$$

which leads us to the next estimate

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in J} \int_{K_\rho^\zeta(y_0)} \frac{(u - k)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|y - y_0|^{N+sp}} dy \leq C(p) \frac{k^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}} + C(p) \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in J} \int_{K_\rho^\zeta(y_0)} \frac{u_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|y - y_0|^{N+sp}} dy$$

Putting together the above estimates yield

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in J; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta K_\rho^\zeta(y_0)}} \int \frac{(u - k)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \leq \frac{C(p)}{\rho^{sp}} [k^{p-1} + \operatorname{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}(u_-; y_0, \rho, J)].$$

Finally we usually want an estimate of the form

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in J; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta K_\rho^c(y_0)}} \int \frac{(u-k)_-^{p-1}(y,t)}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \leq C \frac{k^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}},$$

and so we impose the condition that

$$\operatorname{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}(u_-; y_0, \rho, J) \leq k^{p-1}.$$

This is the origin of the various Tail alternatives.

**Remark 3.7.** *We will see that it is the Tail that captures the nonlocality of our equation in the sense that if it is small then the proofs become local. In fact, when dealing with nonnegative supersolutions, we only need the Tail of the negative part of the solution to be small and so if we assume that it is nonnegative in full space (as in [37]) then the Tail alternatives are automatically verified and our proofs become “local proofs”.*

### 3.4. De Giorgi iteration Lemma

Let

$$\mu_- \leq \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{(x_0, t_0) + Q_{2\rho}^-(\theta)} u$$

and  $M > 0$ . Let  $\xi \in (0, 1]$  and  $a \in (0, 1)$  be fixed numbers.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $u$  be a locally bounded, local, weak supersolution of (2.2) in  $E_T$ . Then there exists a number  $\nu_-$  depending only on the data and the parameters  $\theta, \xi, M$  and  $a$  such that if the following is satisfied*

$$|[u \leq \mu_- + \xi M] \cap (x_0, t_0) + Q_{2\rho}^-(\theta)| \leq \nu_- |Q_{2\rho}^-(\theta)|,$$

then one of the following two conclusion holds:

$$\operatorname{Tail}_\infty((u - \mu)_-; x_0, 2\rho, (t_0 - \theta(2\rho)^{sp}, t_0]) > \xi M,$$

or

$$u \geq \mu_- + a\xi M \text{ a.e. in } [(x_0, t_0) + Q_\rho^-(\theta)].$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we will assume that  $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$  and for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , we set

$$\rho_n = \rho + 2^{-n}\rho, \quad K_n = K_{\rho_n} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_n = K_n \times (-\theta\rho_n^{sp}, 0].$$

We apply the energy estimates over  $K_n$  and  $Q_n$  to  $(u - k_n)_-$  for the levels

$$k_n = \mu_- + \xi_n M \quad \text{where} \quad \xi_n = a\xi + \frac{1-a}{2^n}\xi.$$

We take the following cutoff function  $\zeta(x, t) = \zeta_1(x)\zeta_2(t)$  where  $\zeta_1$  is supported in  $K_{\bar{n}}$ ,  $\zeta_2(t) = 0$  for  $t < -\theta\rho_n^{sp}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1 &\equiv 1 \text{ on } K_{n+1}, & |\partial\zeta_1| &\lesssim \frac{1}{\rho}, \\ \zeta_2(t) &= 1 \text{ for } t \geq -\theta\rho_{n+1}^{sp}, & 0 \leq \partial_t(\zeta_2) &\leq \frac{2^{p(n+1)}}{\theta\rho^{sp}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $K_{\bar{n}}$  is the cube with radius  $(\rho_n + \rho_{n+1})/2$ .

The energy inequality from [Theorem 3.1](#) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0} \int_{K_n} (u - k_n)_-^2 \zeta^p(x, t) dx + \iiint_{Q_n} \frac{|(u - k_n)_-(x, t)\zeta(x, t) - (u - k_n)_-(y, t)\zeta(y, t)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt \\ &\leq \gamma \frac{2^{np}}{\rho^{sp}} \left( (\xi M)^p + \frac{1}{\theta} (\xi M)^2 \right) |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n| \\ &\quad + C \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta_1}} \int_{K_n^c} \frac{(u - k_n)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \int_{-\theta\rho_n^{sp}}^0 \int_{K_n} (u - k_n)_-(x, t) \zeta_1(x) dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

To estimate the tail term, we first note that if  $x \in K_{\bar{n}}(0)$  and  $y \in K_n^c(0)$  then

$$|y| \leq |x - y| \left(1 + \frac{|x|}{|x - y|}\right) \leq c2^n |x - y| \implies \frac{1}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} \leq c2^{n(N+sp)} \frac{1}{|y|^{N+sp}}.$$

Next, we note that the following

$$(u - k_n)_- \leq \xi_n M - (u - \mu_-) \leq \xi M + (u - \mu_-)_-,$$

holds globally. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta_1}} K_n^c} \int \frac{(u - k_n)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \\ & \leq c2^{n(N+sp)} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0} \int_{K_n^c} \frac{(u - \mu_-)_-^{p-1}(y, t) + (\xi M)^{p-1}}{|y|^{N+sp}} dy \\ & \leq c2^{n(N+sp)} \frac{(\xi M)^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}} + c2^{n(N+sp)} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0} \int_{K_{2\rho}^c} \frac{(u - \mu_-)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|y|^{N+sp}} dy \\ & \leq c2^{n(N+sp)} \left( \frac{(\xi M)^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}} + \frac{1}{(2\rho)^{sp}} \operatorname{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}((u - \mu_-)_-; 0, 2\rho, (-\theta(2\rho)^{sp}, 0]) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $u - \mu^- \geq 0$  in  $Q_{2\rho}^-(\theta)$ . Thus, we can estimate the last term appearing on the right hand side of (3.10) by

$$\begin{aligned} & C \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta_1}} K_n^c} \int \frac{(u - k_n)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \int_{-\theta\rho_n^{sp}}^0 \int_{K_n} (u - k_n)_-(x, t) \zeta_1(x) dx dt \\ & \leq cC2^{n(N+sp)} \left( \frac{(\xi M)^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}} + \frac{1}{(2\rho)^{sp}} \operatorname{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}((u - \mu_-)_-; 0, 2\rho, (-\theta(2\rho)^{sp}, 0]) \right) (\xi M) |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n| \\ & \leq 2cC2^{n(N+sp)} \frac{1}{\rho^{sp}} \left( (\xi M)^{p-1} + \operatorname{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}((u - \mu_-)_-; 0, 2\rho, (-\theta(2\rho)^{sp}, 0]) \right) (\xi M) |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n| \\ & \leq C2^{n(N+sp)} \frac{(\xi M)^p}{\rho^{sp}} |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n|, \end{aligned}$$

provided the following is satisfied:

$$\operatorname{Tail}_\infty((u - \mu_-)_-; 0, 2\rho, (-\theta(2\rho)^{sp}, 0]) \leq \xi M.$$

Putting the above estimates together with (3.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0} \int_{K_n} (u - k_n)_-^2 \zeta^p(x, t) dx + \iiint_{Q_n} \frac{|(u - k_n)_-(x, t) \zeta(x, t) - (u - k_n)_-(y, t) \zeta(y, t)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt \\ & \leq C \frac{2^{n(N+p)}}{\rho^{sp}} (\xi M)^p \left( 2 + \frac{1}{\theta} (\xi M)^{2-p} \right) |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n|. \end{aligned}$$

We now apply the fractional parabolic Sobolev embedding from [Theorem 2.2](#) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{Q_n} [(u - k_n)_- \zeta]^p \frac{N+2s}{N} dx dt & \lesssim \iiint_{Q_n} \frac{|(u - k_n)_-(x, t) \zeta(x, t) - (u - k_n)_-(y, t) \zeta(y, t)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt \\ & \times \left( \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{-\theta\rho_n^{sp} < t < 0} \int_{K_n} [(u - k_n)_- \zeta(x, t)]^2 dx \right)^{\frac{sp}{N}} \\ & \lesssim \left[ \frac{2^{n(N+p)}}{\rho^{sp}} (\xi M)^p \left( 2 + \frac{1}{\theta} (\xi M)^{2-p} \right) \right]^{\frac{N+sp}{N}} |[u < k_n] \cap Q_n|^{\frac{N+sp}{N}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Let us now estimate the term appearing on the left hand side of (3.11) from below

$$\iint_{Q_n} [(u - k_n)_- \zeta]^p \frac{N+2s}{N} dx dt \geq \left( \frac{(1-a)\xi M}{2^{n+1}} \right)^p \frac{N+2s}{N} |[u < k_{n+1}] \cap Q_{n+1}|. \quad (3.12)$$

Finally, setting

$$Y_n = \frac{|[u < k_n] \cap Q_n|}{|Q_n|},$$

and combining (3.11) and (3.12), we get

$$Y_{n+1} \leq \frac{Cb^n}{(1-a)^{\frac{N+2s}{N}}} \left( \frac{\theta}{(\xi M)^{2-p}} \right)^{\frac{sp}{N}} \left( 2 + \frac{(\xi M)^{2-p}}{\theta} \right)^{\frac{N+sp}{N}} Y_n^{1+\frac{sp}{N}},$$

where  $b = b(N, s, p) > 1$  and  $C > 0$  depends only on the data. By Lemma 2.5,  $Y_\infty = 0$  provided

$$Y_0 \leq C^{-\frac{N}{p}} b^{-\left(\frac{N}{p}\right)^2} (1-a)^{N+2s} \frac{\left(\frac{(\xi M)^{2-p}}{\theta}\right)^s}{\left(2 + \frac{(\xi M)^{2-p}}{\theta}\right)^{\frac{N+sp}{p}}} =: \nu_-,$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 3.9.** *An analogous result holds for subsolutions.*

### 3.5. De Giorgi lemma: Forward in time version

Let  $u$  denote a nonnegative, local, weak supersolution of (2.2) in  $E_T$  and let  $K_R \times I \subset E_T$  denote our reference cylinder. Suppose that we have the following information at a time level  $t_0$ :

$$u(x, t_0) \geq \xi M \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in K_{2\rho}(y), \quad (3.13)$$

for some  $M > 0$  and  $\xi \in (0, 1]$ . Then in the energy inequality from Theorem 3.1, for any level  $k \leq \xi M$  over  $[(x_0, t_0) + Q_{2\rho}^+(\theta)]$ , the first term on the right hand side of Theorem 3.1 over  $K_{2\rho} \times \{t_0\}$  vanishes.

Moreover, taking a test function independent of time also kills the integral on the right involving the time derivative of the test function. Therefore we may repeat the same arguments as in Lemma 3.8 for  $(u - \xi_n M)_-$  over the cylinders  $Q_n^+$  where

$$\xi_n = a\xi + \frac{1-a}{2^n} \xi \quad \text{and} \quad Q_n^+ = K_n \times (0, \theta(2\rho)^{sp}],$$

to get

$$Y'_{n+1} \leq \frac{Cb^n}{(1-a)^{\frac{N+2s}{N}}} \left( \frac{\theta}{(\xi M)^{2-p}} \right)^{\frac{sp}{N}} Y_n'^{1+\frac{sp}{N}},$$

provided

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; x_0, 2\rho, (t_0, t_0 + \theta(2\rho)^{sp}]) \leq \xi M,$$

where we have set

$$Y'_n = \frac{|[u < \xi_n M] \cap Q_n^+|}{|Q_n^+|}. \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.5, we have  $Y'_\infty = 0$  if

$$Y'_0 \leq \nu_0 \left( \frac{(\xi M)^{2-p}}{\theta} \right)^s =: \tilde{\nu}. \quad (3.15)$$

for a constant  $\nu_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $a$  and data. The foregoing discussion leads to the following variant of the DeGiorgi lemma.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $u$  denote a nonnegative, local, weak supersolution to (2.2) in  $E_T$ . Let  $M$  and  $\xi$  be positive numbers and suppose (3.13) holds at time  $t = t_0$ , then there exists a constant  $\tilde{\nu}$  (see (3.15)) depending on data,  $a$  and  $\zeta, M, \theta$  such that if  $Y'_0 \leq \tilde{\nu}$  (see (3.14)), then either of the two alternatives hold:*

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; x_0, 2\rho, (t_0, t_0 + \theta(2\rho)^{sp}]) > \xi M,$$

or

$$u \geq a\xi M \quad \text{a.e. in } K_{2\rho}(x_0) \times (t_0, t_0 + \theta(2\rho)^{sp}).$$

#### 4. Qualitative expansion of positivity in time

Let  $u$  denote a nonnegative, local, weak supersolution to (2.2) in  $E_T$ . In this section, we shall prove a general expansion of positivity estimate that will be used in Section 5 and Section 6.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Assume that for some  $(x_0, t_0) \in E_T$  and some  $\rho > 0$ ,  $M > 0$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the following hypothesis is satisfied:*

$$|[u(\cdot, t_0) \geq M] \cap K_\rho(x_0)| \geq \alpha |K_\rho(x_0)|,$$

then there exist  $\delta$  and  $\epsilon$  in  $(0, 1)$  depending only on the data and  $\alpha$  such that either

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; x_0, \rho, (t_0, t_0 + \delta\rho^{sp}M^{2-p})) > M,$$

or

$$|[u(\cdot, t) \geq \epsilon M] \cap K_\rho(x_0)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha |K_\rho(x_0)|,$$

holds for all  $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \delta\rho^{sp}M^{2-p})$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we will assume that  $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$ . For  $k > 0$  and  $t > 0$ , we set

$$A_{k,\rho}(t) = [u(\cdot, t) < k] \cap K_\rho,$$

then the hypothesis of the lemma can be restated as:

$$|A_{M,\rho}(0)| \leq (1 - \alpha)|K_\rho|.$$

We consider the energy estimate from Theorem 3.1 for  $(u - M)_-$  over the cylinder  $K_\rho \times (0, \theta\rho^{sp})$  where  $\theta > 0$  will be chosen later. Note that  $(u - M)_- \leq M$  in  $K_\rho$  because  $u$  is nonnegative in  $E_T$ . For  $\sigma \in (0, 1/8)$  to be chosen later, we take a cutoff function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ , nonnegative such that it is supported in  $K_{(1-\sigma/2)\rho}$ ,  $\zeta = 1$  on  $K_{(1-\sigma)\rho}$  and  $|\partial\zeta| \leq 2(\sigma\rho)^{-1}$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K_{(1-\sigma)\rho}} (u - M)_-^2(x, t) dx &\leq M^2 |A_{M,\rho}(0)| + \frac{2\gamma M^p}{(\sigma\rho)^{sp}} \theta \rho^{sp} |K_\rho| \\ &\quad + C \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in (0, \theta\rho^{sp}); \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta}} \int_{K_\rho^c} \frac{(u - M)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \int_0^{\theta\rho^{sp}} \int_{K_\rho} (u - M)_-(x, t) \zeta(x, t) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the tail term we first note that when  $x \in K_{(1-\sigma/2)\rho}(0)$  and  $y \in K_\rho^c(0)$  then

$$|y| \leq |x - y| \left( 1 + \frac{|x|}{|x - y|} \right) \leq \frac{2}{\sigma} |x - y|.$$

In particular, this implies

$$\frac{1}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} \leq c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} \frac{1}{|y|^{N+sp}}.$$

Next, we note that the following holds globally:

$$(u - M)_- \leq M - u \leq M + u_-.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{0 < t < \theta\rho^{sp}; \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta}} \int_{K_\rho^c} \frac{(u - M)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy &\leq c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} \int_{0 < t < \theta\rho^{sp}} \int_{K_\rho^c} \frac{(u)_-^{p-1}(y, t) + (M)^{p-1}}{|y|^{N+sp}} dy \\ &\leq c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} \frac{M^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}} + c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{0 < t < \theta\rho^{sp}} \int_{K_\rho^c} \frac{(u)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|y|^{N+sp}} dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} \left( \frac{M^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}} + \frac{1}{\rho^{sp}} \text{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}(u_-; 0, \rho, (0, \theta\rho^{sp})) \right).$$

Thus, the tail term can be estimated to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess sup}_{\substack{t \in (0, \theta\rho^{sp}]; \\ x \in \text{spt } \zeta \cap K_\rho^c}} \int \frac{(u-M)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \int_0^{\theta\rho^{sp}} \int_{K_\rho} (u-M)_-(x, t) \zeta(x, t) dx dt \\ & \leq c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} \left( \frac{M^{p-1}}{\rho^{sp}} + \frac{1}{\rho^{sp}} \text{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}(u_-; 0, \rho, (0, \theta\rho^{sp})) \right) (M) |K_\rho| \theta\rho^{sp} \\ & \leq c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} M^p \theta |K_\rho|, \end{aligned}$$

provided

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, \rho, (0, \theta\rho^{sp})) \leq M.$$

Putting the above estimates together we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K_{(1-\sigma)\rho}} (u-M)_-^2(x, t) dx & \leq M^2 |A_{M, \rho}(0)| + \frac{2\gamma M^p}{(\sigma\rho)^{sp}} \theta\rho^{sp} |K_\rho| + c\sigma^{-(N+sp)} M^p \theta |K_\rho| \\ & \leq M^2 \left( (1-\alpha) + C \frac{\theta M^{p-2}}{\sigma^{N+sp}} \right) |K_\rho|, \end{aligned}$$

holds for all  $t \in (0, \theta\rho^{sp}]$  and a universal constant  $C > 0$ .

On the other hand, we have

$$\int_{K_{(1-\sigma)\rho}} (u-M)_-^2(x, t) \geq \int_{K_{(1-\sigma)\rho} \cap [u < \epsilon M]} (u-M)_-^2(x, t) \geq M^2 (1-\epsilon)^2 |A_{\epsilon M, (1-\sigma)\rho}(t)|,$$

where  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  will be chosen below depending only on  $\alpha$ . Next, we note that

$$|A_{\epsilon M, \rho}(t)| \leq |A_{\epsilon M, (1-\sigma)\rho}(t)| + |K_\rho - K_{(1-\sigma)\rho}| \leq |A_{\epsilon M, (1-\sigma)\rho}(t)| + N\sigma |K_\rho|.$$

Thus, combining everything, we have

$$|A_{\epsilon M, \rho}(t)| \leq \frac{1}{(1-\epsilon)^2} \left( (1-\alpha) + C \frac{\theta M^{p-2}}{\sigma^{N+sp}} + N\sigma \right) |K_\rho|.$$

First, we set  $\theta = \delta M^{2-p}$  and then choose

$$\sigma = \frac{\alpha}{8N}, \quad \epsilon \leq 1 - \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{3}{4}\alpha}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \frac{\alpha^{N+sp+1}}{C 8^{N+sp+1} N^{sp+N}},$$

to get the desired conclusion.  $\square$

## 5. Expansion of positivity for Nonlocal Degenerate Equations

We will assume that  $u$  is a nonnegative, local, weak supersolution to (2.2) in  $E_T$  and  $p > 2$ . For  $(x_0, t_0) \in E_T$  and some given positive number  $M$  we consider the cylinder

$$K_{8\rho}(x_0) \times \left( t_0, t_0 + \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp} \right] \subset K_R(x_0) \times [t_0 - R^{sp}, t_0 + R^{sp}] \subset E_T,$$

where  $K_R(x_0) \times [t_0 - R^{sp}, t_0 + R^{sp}] = K_R(x_0) \times I$  is our reference cylinder. The constants  $b, \eta, \delta$  are constants given by Proposition 5.1 and  $\rho > 0$  is chosen small enough.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Assume that for some  $(x_0, t_0) \in E_T$ ,  $\rho > 0$ ,  $M > 0$  and some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  the following assumption is satisfied:*

$$|[u(\cdot, t_0) \geq M] \cap K_\rho(x_0)| \geq \alpha |K_\rho(x_0)|.$$

Then there exist constants  $\eta, \delta, \sigma \in (0, 1)$  and  $b > 0$  depending only on the data and  $\alpha$  such that either

$$\text{Tail}_\infty \left( u_-; x_0, \rho, \left( t_0, t_0 + \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp} \right) \right) > \eta M,$$

or

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq \eta M \quad \text{a.e. in } K_{2\rho}(x_0),$$

holds for all times

$$t_0 + \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \sigma \delta \rho^{sp} \leq t \leq t_0 + \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp}.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we will assume that  $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$ . The proof of the proposition is split into the following steps:

**(Step 1): Changing the time variable.** For  $\tau \geq 0$ , let us set

$$\sigma_\tau = \exp \left( -\frac{\tau}{p-2} \right) \leq 1,$$

then the hypothesis of the proposition implies the following holds

$$|[u(\cdot, 0) \geq \sigma M] \cap K_\rho| \geq \alpha |K_\rho| \quad \forall \sigma \leq 1.$$

Assuming

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, \rho, J_1) \leq \sigma_\tau M \quad \text{where } J_1 := (0, \delta \rho^{sp} (\sigma_\tau M)^{2-p}), \quad (5.1)$$

and making use of the calculations from [Section 4](#), we get

$$\left| \left[ u \left( \cdot, \frac{\delta \rho^{sp}}{(\sigma_\tau M)^{p-2}} \right) \geq \epsilon \sigma_\tau M \right] \cap K_\rho \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha |K_\rho|, \quad (5.2)$$

for universal constants  $\epsilon, \delta$  in  $(0, 1)$ . Let us perform the change of variable

$$w(x, \tau) := \frac{1}{\sigma_\tau M} (\delta \rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}} u \left( x, \frac{e^\tau}{M^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp} \right), \quad (5.3)$$

then for all  $\tau \geq 0$ , [\(5.2\)](#) can be written as

$$\left| \left[ u \left( \cdot, \frac{e^\tau}{M^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp} \right) \geq \epsilon M \sigma_\tau \right] \cap K_\rho \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha |K_\rho|,$$

which in the new variable translates to

$$|[w(\cdot, \tau) \geq k_0] \cap K_\rho| \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha |K_\rho| \quad \text{for all } \tau > 0, \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$k_0 := \epsilon (\delta \rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}}. \quad (5.5)$$

We can rewrite [\(5.4\)](#) as

$$|K_{4\rho} - [w(\cdot, \tau) < k_0]| \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha 4^{-N} |K_{4\rho}| \quad \text{for all } \tau > 0. \quad (5.6)$$

**(Step 2): Relating  $w$  to the evolution equation.** Since  $u \geq 0$  in  $E_T$ , by formal calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_\tau &= \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_\tau M} (\delta \rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \right)^{p-1} u_t + \frac{1}{p-2} \frac{1}{M \sigma_\tau} (\delta \rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}} u \\ &\geq - \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_\tau M} (\delta \rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \right)^{p-1} Lu \\ &\geq -L_1 w, \end{aligned}$$



in  $E \times \mathbb{R}_+$  where

$$\begin{cases} L_1\varphi(x, t) = P.V. \int K_1(x, y, t) J_p(\varphi(x, t) - \varphi(y, t)) dy, \\ K_1(x, y, t) = K \left( x, y, \frac{e^\tau}{M^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp} \right), \\ \frac{\Lambda^{-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} \leq K_1(x, y, t) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}. \end{cases}$$

The formal calculation can be made rigorous by appealing to the weak formulation and the energy estimates for  $u$  can be transferred to energy estimates for  $w$  by change of variable.

For any level  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , the energy estimate for  $(w - k)_-$  in  $Q_{8\rho}^+(\theta)$  yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\theta(8\rho)^{sp}} \int_{K_{8\rho}} (w - k)_-(x, t) \int_{K_{8\rho}} \frac{|(w - k)_+(y, t)|^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt \\ & \leq \gamma \int_0^{\theta(8\rho)^{sp}} \int_{K_{8\rho}} \int_{K_{8\rho}} \max\{(w - k)_-(x, t), (w - k)_-(y, t)\}^p |\xi(x, t) - \xi(y, t)|^p d\mu dt \\ & \quad + \gamma \int_0^{\theta(8\rho)^{sp}} \int_{K_{8\rho}} (w - k)_-^2(x, t) |\partial_t \xi(x, t)| dx dt \\ & \quad + C \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in (0, \theta(8\rho)^{sp}); \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \xi}} \int_{K_{8\rho}^c} \frac{(w - k)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \left( \int_0^{\theta(8\rho)^{sp}} \int_{K_{8\rho}} (w - k)_-(x, t) \xi(x, t) dx dt \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

for any non-negative piecewise smooth cutoff vanishing on the parabolic boundary of  $Q_{8\rho}^+(\theta)$ . In particular, we choose  $\zeta = 1 \mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta) = K_{4\rho} \times ((4\rho)^{sp}\theta, (8\rho)^{sp}\theta]$  with support in  $K_{6\rho} \times (0, (8\rho)^{sp}\theta]$  and satisfying

$$|\nabla \zeta| \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad |\zeta_\tau| \leq \frac{1}{\theta(4\rho)^{sp}}.$$

**(Step 3): Shrinking lemma for  $w$ .** We claim that for every  $\nu > 0$  there exist  $\epsilon_\nu \in (0, 1)$  depending only on the data and  $\alpha$ , and  $\theta = \theta(k_0, \epsilon_\nu) > 0$  depending only on  $k_0$  and  $\epsilon_\nu$  such that if

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J_2) & \leq 2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon M \exp \left( -\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)(2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon)^{p-2}\delta} \right), \\ J_2 & \left( M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp}, \exp \left( \frac{8^{sp}}{(2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon)^{p-2}\delta} \right) M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

then the following conclusion holds:

$$|[w < \epsilon_\nu k_0] \cap \mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)| \leq \nu |\mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)|.$$

*Proof of Claim:* In (5.7) we work with the levels  $k_j$  and the parameter  $\theta$  as follows

$$k_j = \frac{1}{2^j} k_0 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq j \leq j_* \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = k_{j_*}^{2-p},$$

where  $k_0$  is given by (5.5) and  $j_*$  is to be chosen in (5.9). We first note that since  $u \geq 0$  in  $Q_{8\rho}^+(\theta)$ , all the local integrals on the right in (5.7) can be estimated using

$$(w - k_j)_- \leq k_j.$$

Thus, by our choice of the test function and (5.7), we get

$$\int_0^{\theta(8\rho)^{sp}} \int_{K_{8\rho}} (w - k_j)_-(x, t) \int_{K_{8\rho}} \frac{|(w - k_j)_+(y, t)|^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt$$

$$\leq C \frac{k_j^p}{\rho^{sp}} |\mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)| + C k_j |\mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)| \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in (0, \theta(8\rho)^{sp}); \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta}} \int_{K_{8\rho}^c} \frac{(w - k_j)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy.$$

We recall from [Subsection 3.3](#) on Tail estimates to conclude that

$$\int_0^{\theta(8\rho)^{sp}} \int_{K_{8\rho}} (w - k_j)_-(x, t) \int_{K_{8\rho}} \frac{|(w - k_j)_+(y, t)|^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt \leq C \frac{k_j^p}{\rho^{sp}} |\mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)|,$$

holds provided

$$\operatorname{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}(w_-; 0, 8\rho, (0, \theta(8\rho)^{sp})) \leq k_{j_*}^{p-1}.$$

We now invoke [Lemma 3.4](#) and [\(5.6\)](#) to conclude that

$$|[w < k_{j+1}] \cap \mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)| \leq \left( \frac{C}{2^j - 1} \right)^{p-1} |\mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)|,$$

for a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $\alpha$  and data. This proves the claim once we choose  $j_*$  such that

$$\epsilon_\nu = \frac{1}{2^{j_*+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \frac{C}{2^{j_*} - 1} \right)^{p-1} \leq \nu. \quad (5.9)$$

To conclude, we rewrite the Tail alternative in terms of  $u_-$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in (0, \theta(8\rho)^{sp})} \int_{K_{8\rho}^c} \frac{w_-^{p-1}(y, \tau)}{|y|^{N+sp}} dy &= (\delta\rho^{sp})^{\frac{p-1}{p-2}} \frac{1}{M^{p-1}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in (0, \theta(8\rho)^{sp})} \int_{K_{8\rho}^c} \frac{u_-^{p-1}(y, e^\tau M^{2-p} \delta\rho^{sp})}{|y|^{N+sp}} e^{\tau \frac{p-1}{p-2}} dy \\ &\leq (\delta\rho^{sp})^{\frac{p-1}{p-2}} \frac{\exp\left(\theta(8\rho)^{sp} \frac{p-1}{p-2}\right)}{M^{p-1}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in J_2} \int_{K_{8\rho}^c} \frac{u_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|y|^{N+sp}} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_2 = (M^{2-p} \delta\rho^{sp}, \exp((8\rho)^{sp} \theta) M^{2-p} \delta\rho^{sp}).$$

Thus, the Tail alternative is verified provided

$$\operatorname{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J_2) \leq \frac{k_{j_*}}{(\delta\rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}}} \frac{M}{\exp\left(\theta(8\rho)^{sp} \frac{1}{p-2}\right)}.$$

Recalling that

$$k_{j_*} = \frac{k_0}{2^{j_*}} = \frac{\epsilon(\delta\rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}}}{2^{j_*}} = 2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon (\delta\rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}} = \theta^{\frac{1}{2-p}},$$

we get

$$\exp\left(\theta(8\rho)^{sp} \frac{1}{p-2}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)(2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon)^{p-2} \delta}\right),$$

and

$$\frac{k_{j_*}}{(\delta\rho^{sp})^{\frac{1}{p-2}}} \frac{M}{\exp\left(\theta(8\rho)^{sp} \frac{1}{p-2}\right)} = 2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon M \exp\left(-\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)(2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon)^{p-2} \delta}\right),$$

which completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

**(Step 4): Expansion of positivity for  $w$ .** We claim that there exists a  $\nu \in (0, 1)$  which depends only on the data and  $\alpha$  such that either

$$\operatorname{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J_2) > 2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon M \exp\left(-\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)(2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon)^{p-2} \delta}\right)$$

or

$$w(\cdot, \tau) \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_\nu k_0 \quad \text{a.e. in } K_{2\rho} \times \left( \frac{(8\rho)^{sp} - (2\rho)^{sp}}{(2\epsilon_\nu k_0)^{p-2}}, \frac{(8\rho)^{sp}}{(2\epsilon_\nu k_0)^{p-2}} \right]$$

holds, where  $\epsilon_\nu$  is the number corresponding to  $\nu$  in **(Step 3)**.

*Proof of the claim.* We apply **Lemma 3.8** to  $w$  over the cylinder

$$\mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta) = (0, \tau^*) + \mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}^-(\theta) \quad \text{for } \tau_* = \theta(8\rho)^{sp}.$$

We work with  $\epsilon_\nu k_0$  instead of  $\xi\omega$ ,  $a = 1/2$  and  $\mu_- \geq 0$  is dropped to get that either

$$\text{Tail}_\infty((w)_-; 0, 4\rho, (\tau_* - \theta(4\rho)^{sp}, \tau_*]) > \epsilon_\nu k_0 \quad (5.10)$$

holds or

$$w(x, \tau) \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_\nu k_0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, \tau) \in [(0, \tau^*) + \mathcal{Q}_{2\rho}^-(\theta)],$$

holds provided

$$\frac{|[w < \epsilon_\nu k_0] \cap \mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)|}{|\mathcal{Q}_{4\rho}(\theta)|} \leq \frac{1}{C} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{N+2s} \frac{[\theta(\epsilon_\nu k_0)^{p-2}]^{\frac{N}{p}}}{[1 + 2\theta(\epsilon_\nu k_0)^{p-2}]^{\frac{N+sp}{p}}} = \nu,$$

for a universal constant  $C > 1$  and the Tail alternative as in **(Step 3)** holds. Choosing  $\nu$  from **(Step 3)** (see (5.9)) determines  $\epsilon_\nu$  and therefore  $\theta = (2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon)^{2-p}$  quantitatively. The tail alternative (5.10) can be reformulated in terms of  $u$  as in **(Step 3)** to get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J_3) &\leq 2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon M \exp\left(-\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)(2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon)^{p-2}\delta}\right), \\ J_3 &= (\exp((8\rho)^{sp}\theta) - (4\rho)^{sp}\theta)M^{2-p}\delta\rho^{sp}, \exp((8\rho)^{sp}\theta)M^{2-p}\delta\rho^{sp}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Since  $J_2 \supset J_3$ , the Tail alternative in **(Step 3)** subsumes the Tail alternative from (5.10) as reflected in the claim.  $\square$

**(Step 5): Expanding the positivity for  $u$ .** Assume that the Tail alternatives from (5.1), (5.8) and (5.11) hold. As  $\tau$  ranges over the interval in **(Step 4)**,  $\exp(\tau/(p-2))$  ranges over the interval

$$b_1 := \exp\left(\frac{8^{sp} - 2^{sp}}{(p-2)[2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon\delta^{\frac{1}{p-2}}]^{p-2}}\right) \leq f(\tau) \leq \exp\left(\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)[2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon\delta^{\frac{1}{p-2}}]^{p-2}}\right) =: b_2.$$

Rewriting the conclusion of **(Step 4)** in terms of  $u$ , we get that

$$u(x, t) \geq \frac{\epsilon_\nu\epsilon M}{2b_2} =: \eta M \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in K_{2\rho}, \quad (5.12)$$

holds for all times

$$\frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}}\sigma\delta\rho^{sp} \leq t \leq \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}}\delta\rho^{sp}.$$

Here  $b > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\alpha$  and data and  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  is a fraction depending only on  $\alpha$  and data. In fact, we have

$$b = \frac{\epsilon_\nu\epsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma = \left(\frac{b_1}{b_2}\right)^{p-2}.$$

**(Step 6): Pulling the Tail alternatives together.** We need the following Tail alternatives going from **(Step 1)** and **(Step 3)** noting that (5.8) implies (5.11). In particular, we recall

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, \rho, J_1) &\leq \sigma_\tau M, \\ \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J_2) &\leq 2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon M \exp\left(-\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)(2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon)^{p-2}\delta}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have taken

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= (0, \delta\rho^{sp}(\sigma_\tau M)^{2-p}), \\ J_2 &= \left[M^{2-p}\delta\rho^{sp}, \exp\left(\frac{8^{sp}}{(2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon)^{p-2}\delta}\right)M^{2-p}\delta\rho^{sp}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have  $\tau \leq \theta(8\rho)^{sp}$  which implies the following inclusion holds:

$$J_1 \subset (0, \delta\rho^{sp}M^{2-p}\exp(\theta(8\rho)^{sp})) = (0, \delta\rho^{sp}M^{2-p}\exp(8^{sp}\delta^{-1}(2\epsilon_\nu\epsilon)^{2-p})).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon M \exp\left(-\frac{8^{sp}}{(p-2)(2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon)^{p-2}\delta}\right) = \frac{2\epsilon_\nu \epsilon M}{b_2} \stackrel{(5.12)}{=} 4\eta M.$$

Hence, from the fact that  $\eta \leq \sigma_\tau$ , the final Tail alternative which subsumes all others is

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, \rho, J) \leq \eta M \quad \text{where} \quad J := \left(0, \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp}\right].$$

□

**Remark 5.2.** *The conclusion of Proposition 5.1 can also be written without Tail alternatives as*

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq \eta M - \text{Tail}_\infty\left(u_-; x_0, \rho, \left(t_0, t_0 + \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp}\right)\right) \quad \text{a.e. in } K_{2\rho}(x_0),$$

holds for all times

$$t_0 + \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \sigma \delta \rho^{sp} \leq t \leq t_0 + \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta M)^{p-2}} \delta \rho^{sp},$$

because we are working with nonnegative solutions.

## 6. Expansion of positivity for Nonlocal Singular Equations

We will assume that  $u$  is a nonnegative, local, weak supersolution to (2.2) in  $E_T$  for  $1 < p < 2$ . For  $(x_0, t_0) \in E_T$  and some given positive numbers  $M > 0$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , we consider the cylinder

$$(x_0, t_0) + Q_{16\rho}(\delta M^{2-p}) = K_{16\rho}(x_0) \times (t_0, t_0 + \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp}) \subset K_R(x_0) \times [t_0 - R^{sp}, t_0 + R^{sp}] \subset E_T,$$

where  $K_R(x_0) \times [t_0 - R^{sp}, t_0 + R^{sp}] = K_R(x_0) \times I$  is our reference cylinder and  $\rho > 0$  is chosen small enough.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Assume that for some  $(x_0, t_0) \in E_T$  and some  $\rho > 0$ ,  $M > 0$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the following hypothesis holds*

$$|[u(\cdot, t_0) \geq M] \cap K_\rho(x_0)| \geq \alpha |K_\rho(x_0)|.$$

Then there exist constants  $\eta, \delta$  and  $\varepsilon$  in  $(0, 1)$  depending only on the data and  $\alpha$  such that either

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; x_0, \rho, (t_0, t_0 + \delta \rho^{sp} M^{2-p})) > \eta M,$$

or

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq \eta M \quad \text{a.e. in } K_{2\rho}(x_0),$$

holds for all times

$$t_0 + (1 - \varepsilon) \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp} \leq t \leq t_0 + \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp}.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we will assume that  $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$ .

**(Step 1): Changing variables.** From Section 4 we get that there exist  $\delta$  and  $\epsilon$  in  $(0, 1)$  depending only on the data and  $\alpha$  such that one of the following two possibilities must hold:

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, \rho, (0, \delta \rho^{sp} M^{2-p})) > M,$$

or

$$|[u(\cdot, t) > \epsilon M] \cap K_\rho| \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha |K_\rho| \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in (0, \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp}]. \quad (6.1)$$

Let us now define

$$z = \frac{x}{\rho}, \quad -e^{-\tau} = \frac{t - \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp}}{\delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp}}, \quad \text{and} \quad v(z, \tau) = \frac{1}{M} u(x, t) e^{\frac{\tau}{2-p}}. \quad (6.2)$$

Then the cylinder  $Q_{16\rho}(\delta M^{2-p})$  in  $(x, t)$  coordinates is mapped into  $K_{16} \times (0, \infty)$  in the  $(z, \tau)$  coordinates. By formal calculations (which can be made rigorous using the weak formulation), we have

$$v_\tau = \frac{1}{2-p} v + \frac{e^{\frac{p-1}{2-p}\tau} \delta \rho^{sp}}{M^{p-1}} u_t(z\rho, \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp} (1 - e^{-\tau})) = \frac{1}{2-p} v + \delta L_1 v, \quad (6.3)$$

in  $K_{16} \times (0, \infty)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 \varphi(z, \tau) &= P.V. \int K_1(z, z', \tau) J_p(\varphi(z, \tau) - \varphi(z', \tau)) dz', \\ K_1(z, z', \tau) &= \rho^{N+sp} K(z\rho, z'\rho, \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp} (1 - e^{-\tau})), \end{aligned}$$

satisfying

$$\frac{\Lambda^{-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} \leq K_1(x, y, t) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}.$$

We rewrite (6.1) as

$$|[v(\cdot, \tau) \geq \epsilon e^{\frac{\tau}{2-p}}] \cap K_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha |K_1| \quad \text{for all } \tau \in (0, \infty). \quad (6.4)$$

For constants  $\tau_0 > 0$  and  $j_* \in \mathbb{N}$  to be chosen, we take

$$k_0 = \epsilon e^{\frac{\tau_0}{2-p}} \quad \text{and} \quad k_j = k_0 2^{-j} \quad \text{for } j \geq 1. \quad (6.5)$$

Then from (6.4), we get

$$|[v(\cdot, \tau) \geq k_j] \cap K_8| \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha 8^{-N} |K_8| \quad \text{for all } \tau \in (\tau_0, \infty) \text{ and } \forall j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Consider the cylinders

$$Q_{\tau_0} = K_8 \times (\tau_0 + k_0^{2-p}, \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{\tau'_0} = K_{16} \times (\tau_0, \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}),$$

and a nonnegative, piecewise smooth cutoff in  $Q_{\tau'_0}$  of the form  $\zeta(z, \tau) = \zeta_1(z)\zeta_2(\tau)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1 &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{in } K_8 \\ 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus K_{12} \end{cases} \quad |\partial \zeta_1| \leq \frac{1}{4}, \\ \zeta_2 &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } \tau < \tau_0 \\ 1 & \text{for } \tau \geq \tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} \end{cases} \quad 0 \leq \partial_t \zeta_2 \leq \frac{1}{k_0^{2-p}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the energy estimates for  $(v - k_j)_-$  over  $Q_{\tau'_0}$  with the cutoff  $\zeta$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}} \int_{K_{16}} (v - k_j)_-(x, t) \int_{K_{16}} \frac{|(v - k_j)_+(y, t)|^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt \\ & \leq \gamma \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}} \int_{K_{16}} \int_{K_{16}} \max\{(v - k_j)_-(x, t), (v - k_j)_-(y, t)\}^p |\xi(x, t) - \xi(y, t)|^p d\mu dt \\ & + \gamma \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}} \int_{K_{16}} (v - k_j)_-^2(x, t) |\partial_t \xi(x, t)| dx dt \\ & + C\gamma \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in (\tau_0, \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}); \\ x \in \operatorname{spt} \zeta_1}} \int_{K_{16}} \frac{(v - k_j)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dy \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}} \int_{K_{16}} (v - k_j)_-(x, t) \xi(x, t) dx dt, \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where  $\gamma = \gamma/\delta$  (note the  $\delta$  in (6.3)) is a constant depending only on data and  $\delta$  (which came from Section 4 and depended only on  $\alpha$  and data.) To obtain the above estimate, we tested (6.3) with  $-(v - k_j)_-\zeta^p$  and discarded the nonpositive contribution on the right-hand side from the nonnegative term  $\frac{1}{2-p}v$ .

**(Step 2): Shrinking lemma for  $v$ .** For any  $j \geq 2$ , we claim that either of the following two possibilities

hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 16\rho, J'_2) &> \exp\left(-2k_0^{2-p} \frac{1}{2-p}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^j}, \\ J'_2 &= (M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp} (1 - e^{-\tau_0}), M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp} (1 - e^{-\tau_0 - 2k_0^{2-p}})], \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

or

$$|[v < k_j] \cap Q_{\tau_0}| \leq \nu |Q_{\tau_0}| \quad \text{where} \quad \nu = \left(\frac{C}{2^{j-1} - 1}\right)^{p-1},$$

for a universal constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $\alpha$  and data.

*Proof of Claim.* In (6.6), we work with levels  $k_j$  defined by

$$k_j = \frac{1}{2^j} k_0 \quad \text{for} \quad j \geq 1,$$

where  $k_0$  is given by (6.5). We first note that since  $v \geq 0$  in  $Q_{\tau'_0}$  in all the local integrals on the right in (6.6), we can estimate

$$(v - k_j)_- \leq k_j,$$

and so by our choice of the test function we get

$$\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}} \int_{K_{16}} (v - k_j)_-(x, t) \int_{K_{16}} \frac{|(v - k_j)_+(y, t)|^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy dx dt \leq C |Q_{\tau'_0}| \left( k_j^p + k_j \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\substack{t \in (\tau_0, \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}); \\ x \in \text{spt } \zeta_1}} \int_{K_{16}^c} \frac{(v - k_j)_-^{p-1}(y, t)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \right)$$

where  $C > 0$  is a universal constant (note that we are on  $K_{16}$  and so the  $\rho^{sp}$  term is absorbed into the constant.) We recall the section on Tail estimates (Subsection 3.3) to get

$$\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}} \int_{K_{16}} (v - k_j)_-(x, t) \int_{K_{16}} \frac{|(v - k_j)_+(y, t)|^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy dt \leq C k_j^p |Q_{\tau'_0}|,$$

holds provided

$$\text{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}(v_-; 0, 16, (\tau_0, \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p})) \leq k_j^{p-1}.$$

We now invoke Lemma 3.4 and (6.4) to conclude that

$$|[u < k_{j+1}] \cap Q_{4\rho}(\theta)| \leq \left(\frac{C}{2^j - 1}\right)^{p-1} |Q_{\tau'_0}|,$$

for a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $\alpha$  and data. This proves the claim for the choice

$$\nu = \left(\frac{C}{2^j - 1}\right)^{p-1}.$$

We now rewrite the Tail alternative in terms of  $u_-$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in (\tau_0, \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p})} \int_{K_{16}^c} \frac{v_-^{p-1}(z', \tau)}{|z'|^{N+sp}} dz' &\leq \frac{\exp((\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}) \frac{p-1}{2-p})}{M^{p-1}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in J'_2} \int_{K_{16}^c} \frac{u(z', \rho, t)_-^{p-1}}{|z'|^{N+sp}} dy \\ &\leq \frac{\exp((\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}) \frac{p-1}{2-p})}{M^{p-1}} \rho^{sp} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in J'_2} \int_{K_{16\rho}^c} \frac{u(y, t)_-^{p-1}}{|y|^{N+sp}} dy \\ &\leq \frac{\exp((\tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}) \frac{p-1}{2-p})}{M^{p-1}} \text{Tail}_\infty^{p-1}(u_-; 0, 16\rho, J'_2), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J'_2 = (M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp} (1 - e^{-\tau_0}), M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp} (1 - e^{-\tau_0 - 2k_0^{2-p}})],$$

and we used the change of variables from (6.2). Thus, the Tail alternative is verified provided

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 16\rho, J'_2) \leq \exp\left(\left(-\tau_0 - 2k_0^{2-p}\right) \frac{1}{2-p}\right) M k_j.$$

Recalling (6.5), we get

$$\exp\left(\left(-\tau_0 - 2k_0^{2-p}\right) \frac{1}{2-p}\right) M k_j = \exp\left(-2k_0^{2-p} \frac{1}{2-p}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^j},$$

which completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

**(Step 3):** *Obtaining a good time slice for  $v$ .* We claim that there exists a  $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$  and  $j_* \in (1, \infty)$  depending only on the data such that either

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J'_2) > \exp\left(-2k_0^{2-p} \frac{1}{2-p}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^{j_*}},$$

holds (recall (6.7)) or there exists a time level

$$\tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} < \tau_1 < \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p},$$

such that the following holds:

$$v(z, \tau_1) \geq \sigma_0 e^{\frac{\tau_0}{2-p}}.$$

*Proof of the claim.* Suppose that  $j_*$  and hence  $\nu$  have been determined according to (Step 2). By increasing  $j_*$  if required to be not necessarily an integer we can assume without loss of generality that  $2^{j_*(2-p)}$  is an integer. Next, we subdivide  $Q_{\tau_0}$  into  $2^{j_*(2-p)}$  cylinders each of length  $k_{j_*}^{2-p}$  given by

$$Q_n = K_8 \times (\tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} + n k_{j_*}^{2-p}, \tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} + (n+1) k_{j_*}^{2-p}) \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, 2^{j_*(2-p)} - 1.$$

Then either the tail alternative in (Step 2) holds or for at least one of the sub-cylinders, we must have

$$|[v < k_{j_*} \cap Q_n]| \leq \nu |Q_n|.$$

We now apply to Lemma 3.8 to  $v$  over  $Q_n$  with

$$\nu_- = 0, \quad \xi\omega = k_{j_*}, \quad a = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = k_{j_*}^{2-p},$$

to get that if the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tail}_\infty(v_-; 0, 8, (\tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} + n k_{j_*}^{2-p}, \tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} + (n+1) k_{j_*}^{2-p})) &\leq k_{j_*}, \\ \frac{|[v < k_{j_*} \cap Q_n]|}{|Q_n|} &\leq 3^{-\frac{N+sp}{p}} \gamma_0(\text{data}) = \nu, \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

then the following conclusion follows

$$v(z, \tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} + (n+1) k_{j_*}^{2-p}) \geq \frac{1}{2} k_{j_*} \quad \text{a.e. in } K_4.$$

We choose  $j_*$  and hence  $\nu$  from this and (Step 2) which implies the conclusion holds with  $\sigma_0 = \epsilon 2^{-(j_*+1)}$ . We note that because  $n+1 \leq 2^{j_*(2-p)}$  and

$$(\tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} + n k_{j_*}^{2-p}, \tau_0 + k_0^{2-p} + (n+1) k_{j_*}^{2-p}) \subset (\tau_0 + k_0^{2-p}, \tau_0 + 2k_0^{2-p}),$$

the Tail alternative in (6.8) can be reformulated in terms of  $u$  as in (Step 2) to read

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J'_2) \leq \exp\left(-2k_0^{2-p} \frac{1}{2-p}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^{j_*}},$$

which completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

**(Step 4):** *Expanding the positivity for  $u$ .* We switch back to the  $(x, t)$  coordinates and assume that Tail alternatives in (Step 2) and (Step 3) hold. Then,

$$u(\cdot, t_1) \geq \sigma_0 M e^{-\frac{\tau_1 - \tau_0}{2-p}} =: M_0 \quad \text{in } K_{4\rho},$$

where  $t_1$  corresponds to  $\tau_1$  via the change of variables (6.2). We now apply Lemma 3.10 with  $M_0$  in place of  $M$  and  $\xi = 1$  over the cylinder

$$K_{4\rho} \times (t_1, t_1 + \theta(4\rho)^{sp}].$$

By choosing

$$\theta = \nu_0^{\frac{1}{s}} M_0^{2-p} \quad \text{where } \nu_0 = \nu_0(\text{data}),$$

the smallness assumption (3.15) is satisfied and so we get that the following holds

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq \frac{1}{2} M_0 \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{2}{2-p} e^{\tau_0}\right) M \quad \text{in } K_{2\rho},$$

for all times

$$t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + \nu_0^{\frac{1}{s}} M_0^{2-p} (4\rho)^{sp},$$

provided that the following Tail alternative is satisfied:

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 4\rho, (t_1, t_1 + \theta(4\rho)^{sp})) \leq M_0.$$

We now fix  $\tau_0$  by stipulating

$$\delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp} e^{-\tau_1} = \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp} - t_1 = \nu_0^{\frac{1}{s}} \sigma_0^{2-p} M^{2-p} (4\rho)^{sp} e^{-(\tau_1 - \tau_0)},$$

which gives

$$\tau_0 = \ln\left(\frac{\delta}{4^{sp} \nu_0^{\frac{1}{s}} \sigma_0^{2-p}}\right).$$

This determines  $\tau_0$  in terms of  $\alpha$  and data. Note that by increasing  $j_*$  is necessary we can always ensure that  $\tau_0 > 0$ . Finally, taking

$$\eta := \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{2}{2-p} e^{\tau_0}\right),$$

to be a constant in  $(0, 1)$  depending only on  $\alpha$  and data, we get that

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq \eta M \quad \text{a.e. in } K_{2\rho},$$

holds for all times

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp} \leq t \leq M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp} \quad \text{where } \varepsilon = \exp(-\tau_0 - 2e^{\tau_0}). \quad (6.9)$$

**(Step 5): Pulling the Tail alternatives together.** We needed the following Tail assumptions going from (Step 1) to (Step 4) (recall  $j \leq j_*$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, \rho, (0, \delta \rho^{sp} M^{2-p})) &\leq M, \\ \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 16\rho, J'_2) &\leq \exp\left(-2k_0^{2-p} \frac{1}{2-p}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^j}, \\ \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 8\rho, J'_2) &\leq \exp\left(-2k_0^{2-p} \frac{1}{2-p}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^{j_*}}, \\ \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, 4\rho, (t_1, t_1 + \theta(4\rho)^{sp})) &\leq M_0. \end{aligned}$$

We note that in all the Tail alternatives,  $\rho$  is the smallest radius and  $(0, \delta \rho^{sp} M^{2-p})$  is the largest time interval. We estimate

$$\exp\left(-2k_0^{2-p} \frac{1}{2-p}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^j} = \exp\left(-\frac{2}{2-p} \epsilon^{2-p} e^{\tau_0}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^j} \geq \exp\left(-\frac{2}{2-p} e^{\tau_0}\right) \frac{\epsilon M}{2^j} = \frac{2\eta}{\sigma_0} \frac{\epsilon M}{2^j} \geq 4\eta M,$$

and

$$M_0 \geq \sigma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{2}{2-p} e^{\tau_0}\right) M = 2\eta M,$$

where we recall  $\epsilon$  is from (6.9) and  $\sigma_0 = \frac{\epsilon}{2^{j_*+1}}$ .

Therefore all the Tail assumptions are satisfied if we require

$$\text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; 0, \rho, (0, \delta \rho^{sp} M^{2-p})) \leq \eta M,$$

because  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ .

This completes the proof of the proposition. □



**Remark 6.2.** The conclusion of [Proposition 6.1](#) can also be written without Tail alternatives as

$$u(\cdot, t) \geq \eta M - \text{Tail}_\infty(u_-; x_0, \rho, (t_0, t_0 + \delta \rho^{sp} M^{2-p})) \quad \text{a.e. in } K_{2\rho}(x_0),$$

for all times

$$t_0 + (1 - \varepsilon) \delta M^{2-p} \rho^{sp} \leq t \leq t_0 + M^{2-p} \delta \rho^{sp},$$

because we are working with  $u$  nonnegative.

**Remark 6.3.** In the degenerate case the final time level depends on the final lower level  $\eta M$  that is achieved during the expansion whereas in the singular case, the final time level depends on the starting level  $M$ .

## 7. Hölder regularity for parabolic fractional $p$ -Laplace equations

In this section, we present the proof of [Theorem 2.6](#). The induction argument is similar to the one in [\[13\]](#) and the covering argument is taken from [\[27, 26\]](#)

*Proof of [Theorem 2.6](#).* We assume without loss of generality that  $(x_0, t_0) = (0, 0)$ . Take

$$0 < \alpha < \min \left\{ \frac{sp}{p-1}, \log_{C_0} \left( \frac{2}{2-\eta} \right) \right\}, \quad (7.1)$$

so that

$$\int_{C_0}^{\infty} \frac{(\rho^\alpha - 1)^{p-1}}{\rho^{1+sp}} d\rho < \frac{\eta^{p-1} 2^{-p}}{C_I C_0^{sp}}, \quad (7.2)$$

where  $\eta$  is the constant that appears in [Proposition 5.1](#) for  $p > 2$  and in [Proposition 6.1](#) for  $p < 2$  and  $C_I$  appears in [\(7.12\)](#). The constant  $C_0 > 0$  will be determined in a later step. The integral can be made small enough by taking small  $\alpha$ . Also define

$$j_0 := \left\lceil \frac{1}{sp - \alpha(p-1)} \log_{C_0} \left( \frac{2(C_{III} + 2^{p-1})}{\eta^{p-1}} \right) \right\rceil, \quad (7.3)$$

where  $\eta$  is the constant that appears in [Proposition 5.1](#) for  $p > 2$  and in [Proposition 6.1](#) for  $p < 2$  and  $C_{III}$  appears in [\(7.8\)](#).

**Claim 7.1.** *With these choices, we claim that there exist a non-decreasing sequence  $\{m_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  and a non-increasing sequence  $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  such that for any  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , we have*

$$m_i \leq u \leq M_i \quad \text{in } Q_{R_i}(d_i) := B_{R_i} \times (-d_i R_i^{sp}, 0), \quad (7.4)$$

where we have taken

$$\begin{aligned} M_i - m_i &= C_0^{-\alpha i} L, \\ R_i &:= C_0^{1-i} R, \\ L &:= 2 \cdot C_0^{\frac{sp}{p-1} j_0} \|u\|_{L^\infty(Q_{C_0 R})} + \text{Tail}_\infty(u; C_0 R, 0, (-(C_0 R)^{sp}, 0)), \\ d_i &:= \begin{cases} \frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta C_0^{-\alpha i} L)^{p-2}} \delta, & p > 2, \\ (C_0^{-\alpha i} L)^{2-p} \delta, & p < 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

The proof of [\(7.4\)](#) is by induction on  $i$ . If we set  $m_i := -C_0^{-\alpha i} L/2$  and  $M_i := C_0^{-\alpha i} L/2$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, j_0$ , then, by [\(7.1\)](#) and [\(7.5\)](#), we see that [\(7.4\)](#) holds for this range of  $i$ . Now, suppose that the sequences  $m_i$  and  $M_i$  have been defined for  $i \leq j$  for some  $j \geq j_0$ . Hölder regularity will be proved once we prove the induction step, that is, we define  $m_{j+1}$  and  $M_{j+1}$  so that [\(7.4\)](#) is satisfied.

Define the function

$$v := 2u - (M_j + m_j).$$

We have by [\(7.4\)](#) and monotonicity properties of  $M_j$  and  $m_j$  that

$$(M_j - M_0) + (m_0 - m_j) \leq M_j + m_j \leq (M_0 - M_j) + (m_j - m_0),$$

which implies

$$|M_j + m_j| \leq (1 - C_0^{-\alpha j})L.$$

Using this, we have

$$(C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v)_-^{p-1} \leq 2^{p-1} |u|^{p-1} + L^{p-1} \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{C_0 R} \text{ and } t \in (0, (C_0 R)^{sp}). \quad (7.6)$$

Let  $I_j := (-d_j R_j^{sp}, 0)$  and  $B_j := B_{R_j}(0)$ , then we wish to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tail}_\infty((C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v)_-; C_0^{1-j} R, I_j)^{p-1} &= C_0^{(1-j)sp} R^{sp} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{I_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_j} \frac{(C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v)_-^{p-1}}{|x|^{N+ps}} dx \\ &= C_0^{(1-j)sp} R^{sp} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{I_j} \left[ \int_{B_0 \setminus B_j} \frac{(C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v)_-^{p-1}}{|x|^{N+ps}} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_0} \frac{(C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v)_-^{p-1}}{|x|^{N+ps}} dx \right] \\ &\stackrel{(7.6)}{\leq} C_0^{(1-j)sp} R^{sp} \left[ \underbrace{\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{I_j} \int_{B_0 \setminus B_j} \frac{(C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v)_-^{p-1}}{|x|^{N+ps}} dx}_I \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \underbrace{2^{p-1} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{I_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_0} \frac{|u|^{p-1}}{|x|^{N+ps}} dx}_{II} + \underbrace{L^{p-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_0} \frac{1}{|x|^{N+ps}} dx}_{III} \right]. \quad (7.7) \end{aligned}$$

The estimate for  $III$  is given by

$$III \leq C_{III} \frac{L^{p-1}}{(C_0 R)^{sp}}, \quad (7.8)$$

which is immediate after conversion to polar coordinates. The estimate for  $II$  is given by

$$II \leq 2^{p-1} \frac{L^{p-1}}{(C_0 R)^{sp}}, \quad (7.9)$$

which follows from the definition of  $L$  in (7.5).

To estimate  $I$ , for given  $x \in B_0 \setminus B_j$ , there is  $l \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, j-1\}$  such that  $x \in B_l \setminus B_{l-1}$  so that by the monotonicity of the sequence  $m_i$  and by the induction hypothesis, for a.e.  $t \in I_j$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v(x, t)}{2} &\leq M_l - m_l + m_l - \frac{M_j + m_j}{2} \\ &\leq M_l - m_l + m_j - \frac{M_j + m_j}{2} \\ &= M_l - m_l - \frac{M_j - m_j}{2} = \left( C_0^{-\alpha l} - \frac{C_0^{-\alpha j}}{2} \right) L \\ &\leq \left( \left( \frac{|x|}{R} \right)^\alpha - \frac{C_0^{-\alpha j}}{2} \right) L. \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$v(x, t) \geq - \left( 2 \left( \frac{|x|}{R} \right)^\alpha - C_0^{-\alpha j} \right) L. \quad (7.11)$$

Combining (7.10) and (7.11), we get

$$(C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v(x, t))_-^{p-1} \leq 2^{p-1} \left[ \left( \frac{|x|}{R} \right)^\alpha - C_0^{-\alpha j} \right]^{p-1} L^{p-1}.$$

We use this to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\leq C_0^{-\alpha j(p-1)} 2^{p-1} L^{p-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{C_0^{1-j} R}} \frac{\left( \left( \frac{C_0^j |x|}{R} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right)^{p-1}}{|x|^{N+ps}} dx \\
&= \frac{C_0^{-\alpha j(p-1)} 2^{p-1} L^{p-1} C_0^{jps}}{R^{sp}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{C_0}} \frac{(|y|^\alpha - 1)^{p-1}}{|y|^{N+ps}} dy \\
&\leq C_I \frac{C_0^{-\alpha j(p-1)} 2^{p-1} L^{p-1} C_0^{jps}}{R^{sp}} \int_{C_0}^{\infty} \frac{(\rho^\alpha - 1)^{p-1}}{\rho^{1+ps}} d\rho.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

Combining (7.12), (7.9) and (7.8) in (7.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Tail}_\infty((C_0^{-\alpha j} L \pm v)_-; C_0^{1-j} R, I_j)^{p-1} \\
&\leq C_0^{-\alpha j(p-1)} L^{p-1} \left( C_I 2^{p-1} C_0^{sp} \int_{C_0}^{\infty} \frac{(\rho^\alpha - 1)^{p-1}}{\rho^{1+ps}} d\rho + (C_{III} + 2^{p-1}) C_0^{-(sp-\alpha(p-1))j} \right) \\
&\leq C_0^{-\alpha j(p-1)} L^{p-1} \eta^{p-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{7.13}$$

where the last inequality follows from (7.2) and (7.3) and the fact that  $j \geq j_0$ . Now, one of the following two alternatives must hold:

$$\left| \{v(\cdot, s_j) \geq 0\} \cap B_{C_0^{-j} R/2} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \left| B_{C_0^{-j} R/2} \right|, \tag{7.14}$$

$$\left| \{v(\cdot, s_j) \geq 0\} \cap B_{C_0^{-j} R/2} \right| < \frac{1}{2} \left| B_{C_0^{-j} R/2} \right|, \tag{7.15}$$

where we have set

$$s_j := \begin{cases} -\frac{b^{p-2}}{(\eta C_0^{-\alpha j} L)^{p-2}} \delta R_j^{sp} & p > 2, \\ -(C_0^{-\alpha j} L)^{2-p} \delta R_j^{sp} & p < 2. \end{cases}$$

For  $p > 2$ , the choice of  $C_0$  is determined by the condition

$$s_{j+1} > (-1 + \sigma) d_j R_j^{sp} \implies C_0 > \left( \frac{1}{1 - \sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha(2-p)+sp}}.$$

For  $p < 2$ , the choice of  $C_0$  is determined by the condition

$$s_{j+1} > -\varepsilon d_j R_j^{sp} \implies C_0 > \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha(2-p)+sp}}.$$

When (7.14) holds, we define  $w = C_0^{-\alpha j} L + v$ , then (7.14) becomes

$$\left| \{w(\cdot, s_j) \geq C_0^{-\alpha j} L\} \cap B_{C_0^{-j} R/2} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \left| B_{C_0^{-j} R/2} \right|.$$

We have  $w \geq 0$  in  $Q_{R_j}(d_j)$  so due to (7.13) we are in a position to apply the expansion of positivity lemma, viz.,

$$w \geq \eta C_0^{-\alpha j} L \quad \text{a.e. } (x, t) \in Q_{R_{j+1}}(d_{j+1}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
u(x, t) &= \frac{M_j + m_j}{2} + \frac{v}{2} \\
&= \frac{M_j + m_j}{2} + \frac{w - C_0^{-\alpha j} L}{2} \\
&\geq \frac{M_j + m_j}{2} - \frac{C_0^{-\alpha j} L}{2} (1 - \eta)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= M_j - \frac{M_j - m_j}{2} - \frac{C_0^{-\alpha j} L}{2} (1 - \eta) \\
&= M_j - \frac{C_0^{-\alpha j} L}{2} (2 - \eta) \\
&\geq M_j - C_0^{-\alpha(j+1)} L,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (7.1). So if we define  $m_{j+1} := M_j - C_0^{-\alpha(j+1)} L$ , then the induction hypothesis will be satisfied. For the second alternative (7.15), we shall define  $w = C_0^{-\alpha j} L - v$  and retrace the steps to obtain  $M_{j+1}$ .

A consequence of (7.4) is the following oscillation decay:

$$\text{osc}_{Q_{R_i}(d_i)} u := \sup_{Q_{R_i}(d_i)} u - \inf_{Q_{R_i}(d_i)} u \leq C_0^{-\alpha i} L.$$

Let  $(x_1, t_1), (x_2, t_2) \in B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - L^{2-p} R^{sp}, t_0)$  such that  $x_1 \neq x_2$  and  $t_1 \neq t_2$ , then there exist non-negative integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that

$$R_{n+1} < |x_1 - x_2| \leq R_n, \quad \text{and} \quad d_{m+1} R_{m+1}^{sp} < |t_1 - t_2| \leq d_m R_m^{sp}. \quad (7.16)$$

As a result, we obtain

$$|u(x_1, t_1) - u(x_2, t_2)| \leq \max\{C_0^{-\alpha n} L, C_0^{-\alpha m} L\}. \quad (7.17)$$

From the first inequality in (7.16), we deduce

$$\frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{R} > C_0^{-n} \quad \implies \quad \left(\frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{R}\right)^\alpha L > C_0^{-\alpha n} L. \quad (7.18)$$

On the other hand, from the second inequality in (7.16), we get

$$C' L^{\frac{p-2}{sp}} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{sp}}}{R} > \left(C_0^{-\alpha(m+1)}\right)^{\frac{2-p}{sp}} C_0^{-m},$$

where  $C'$  is a constant depending only on data. In order to further estimate the lower bound, we split into two cases:

**Case  $p > 2$ :** Using  $C_0 > 1$  we get

$$C' L^{\frac{p-2}{sp}} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{sp}}}{R} > C_0^{-m} \quad \implies \quad C_0^{-\alpha m} \leq \left(C' L^{\frac{p-2}{sp}} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{sp}}}{R}\right)^\alpha. \quad (7.19)$$

**Case  $p < 2$ :** Using  $p > 1$  and  $C_0 > 1$  we get

$$C' L^{\frac{p-2}{sp}} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{sp}}}{R} > \left(C_0^{-\alpha(m+1)}\right)^{\frac{1-p}{sp}} \left(C_0^{-\alpha(m+1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{sp}} C_0^{-m} > \left(C_0^{-\alpha(m+1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{sp}} C_0^{-m},$$

which implies

$$C'' L^{\frac{p-2}{sp}} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{sp}}}{R} > C_0^{-m(1+\frac{\alpha}{sp})},$$

so that

$$C_0^{-\alpha m} = \left(C_0^{-m(1+\frac{\alpha}{sp})}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1+\frac{\alpha}{sp}}} \leq \left(C'' L^{\frac{p-2}{sp}} \frac{|t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{sp}}}{R}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1+\frac{\alpha}{sp}}}, \quad (7.20)$$

where  $C'' = C' C_0^{\frac{\alpha}{sp}}$  is a constant depending only on data.

The argument in the case when either  $x_1 = x_2$  or  $t_1 = t_2$  is similar. The conclusion follows from (7.17), (7.18), (7.19) and (7.20).  $\square$

**Remark 7.2.** We note that the proof provides the following relationship between the Holder exponents for space and time:

	$x$	$t$
<i>Degenerate</i>	$\alpha$	$\frac{\alpha}{sp}$
<i>Singular</i>	$\alpha$	$\frac{\frac{\alpha}{sp}}{1 + \frac{\alpha}{sp}}$

In the degenerate case, the condition  $\alpha(p - 1) < sp$  forces  $\alpha < sp$ .

**Remark 7.3.** We further note that in the degenerate case, the space Holder exponent is  $\alpha$  while the time exponent is  $\alpha/sp$ . In particular, if we start with  $sp < 1$  time regularity beats space regularity - such a thing does not occur in the local case and is an instance of a purely nonlocal phenomena.

## References

- [1] Karthik Adimurthi, Harsh Prasad, and Vivek Tewary. Hölder regularity for fractional  $p$ -laplace equations. *arXiv:2203.13082 [math]*, March 2022. [2](#), [9](#)
- [2] Richard Bass and Moritz Kassmann. Harnack inequalities for non-local operators of variable order. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 357(2):837–850, 2005. [2](#)
- [3] Richard F. Bass and Moritz Kassmann. Hölder Continuity of Harmonic Functions with Respect to Operators of Variable Order. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 30(8):1249–1259, July 2005. [2](#)
- [4] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, and Naian Liao. On the Hölder regularity of signed solutions to a doubly nonlinear equation. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 281(9):109173, November 2021. [2](#)
- [5] E. Bombieri and E. Giusti. Harnack’s inequality for elliptic differential equations on minimal surfaces. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 15(1):24–46, March 1972. [10](#)
- [6] 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. [2](#)
- [7] Lorenzo Brasco, Erik Lindgren, and Martin Strömqvist. Continuity of solutions to a nonlinear fractional diffusion equation. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, June 2021. [2](#)
- [8] Sun-Sig Byun, Jihoon Ok, and Kyeong Song. Hölder regularity for weak solutions to nonlocal double phase problems. *arXiv:2108.09623 [math]*, August 2021. [2](#)
- [9] Verena Bögelein, Frank Duzaar, Naian Liao, and Leah Schätzler. On the hölder regularity of signed solutions to a doubly nonlinear equation. part ii. *arXiv:2108.02749 [math]*, August 2021. [2](#)
- [10] 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. [2](#)
- [11] Luis 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. [2](#)
- [12] Jamil Chaker, Minhyun Kim, and Marvin Weidner. Regularity for nonlocal problems with non-standard growth. *arXiv:2111.09182 [math]*, November 2021. [2](#)
- [13] 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. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [25](#)

- [14] Matteo Cozzi. Fractional De Giorgi Classes and Applications to Nonlocal Regularity Theory. In Serena Dipierro, editor, *Contemporary Research in Elliptic PDEs and Related Topics*, Springer INdAM Series, pages 277–299. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. [2](#), [9](#)
- [15] Cristiana De Filippis and Giuseppe Mingione. Gradient regularity in mixed local and nonlocal problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06590*, 2022. [2](#)
- [16] Cristiana De Filippis and Giampiero Palatucci. Hölder regularity for nonlocal double phase equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 267(1):547–586, June 2019. [2](#)
- [17] E. Di Benedetto. On the local behaviour of solutions of degenerate parabolic equations with measurable coefficients. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Scienze*, 13(3):487–535, 1986. [3](#)
- [18] 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. [2](#), [3](#)
- [19] Emmanuele DiBenedetto. *Degenerate Parabolic Equations*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993. [3](#), [5](#), [9](#)
- [20] Emmanuele DiBenedetto, Ugo Gianazza, and Vincenzo Vespri. Harnack estimates for quasi-linear degenerate parabolic differential equations. *Acta Mathematica*, 200(2):181–209, January 2008. [2](#), [3](#)
- [21] Emmanuele DiBenedetto, Ugo Gianazza, and Vincenzo Vespri. *Harnack's Inequality for Degenerate and Singular Parabolic Equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2012. [2](#), [3](#)
- [22] Martin Dindoš, Jungang Li, and Jill Pipher. The  $p$ -ellipticity condition for second order elliptic systems and applications to the Lamé and homogenisation problems. *arXiv:2007.13190 [math]*, June 2021. [3](#)
- [23] 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. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [9](#)
- [24] Prashanta Garain and Erik Lindgren. Higher hölder regularity for mixed local and nonlocal degenerate elliptic equations. *arXiv:2204.13196 [math]*, April 2022. [2](#)
- [25] Ugo Gianazza, Mikhail Surnachev, and Vincenzo Vespri. A new proof of the Hölder continuity of solutions to  $p$ -Laplace type parabolic equations. *3(3):263–278*, July 2010. [3](#)
- [26] Sukjung Hwang and Gary M. Lieberman. Hölder continuity of bounded weak solutions to generalized parabolic  $p$ -laplacian equations I: degenerate case. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, pages No. 287, 32, 2015. [3](#), [25](#)
- [27] Sukjung Hwang and Gary M. Lieberman. Hölder continuity of bounded weak solutions to generalized parabolic  $p$ -laplacian equations II: singular case. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, pages No. 288, 24, 2015. [3](#), [25](#)
- [28] 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. [2](#)
- [29] Moritz Kassmann. A priori estimates for integro-differential operators with measurable kernels. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 34(1):1–21, January 2009. [2](#)

- [30] Naian Liao. A unified approach to the Hölder regularity of solutions to degenerate and singular parabolic equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 268(10):5704–5750, May 2020. [2](#)
- [31] Naian Liao and Leah Schätzler. On the Hölder Regularity of Signed Solutions to a Doubly Nonlinear Equation. Part III. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, page rnab339, December 2021. [2](#)
- [32] Naian Liao, Igor I. Skrypnik, and Vincenzo Vespri. Local regularity for an anisotropic elliptic equation. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 59(4):116, June 2020. [2](#)
- [33] José M. Mazón, Julio D. Rossi, and Julián Toledo. Fractional  $p$ -Laplacian evolution equations. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 105(6):810–844, June 2016. [2](#)
- [34] Sunra J. N. Mosconi. Optimal elliptic regularity: A comparison between local and nonlocal equations. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - S*, 11(3):547, 2018. [10](#)
- [35] Harsh Prasad and Vivek Tewary. Local boundedness of variational solutions to nonlocal double phase parabolic equations. *arXiv:2112.02345 [math]*, December 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [9](#)
- [36] Harsh Prasad and Vivek Tewary. Existence of variational solutions to nonlocal evolution equations via convex minimization. *arXiv:2112.00402 [math]*, January 2022. [2](#)
- [37] Bin Shang and Chao Zhang. Hölder regularity for mixed local and nonlocal  $p$ -laplace parabolic equations. *arXiv:2112.08698 [math]*, December 2021. [2](#), [11](#)
- [38] Luis Silvestre. Hölder Estimates for Solutions of Integro-differential Equations Like The Fractional Laplace. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 55(3):1155–1174, 2006. [2](#)
- [39] 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. [2](#), [3](#)
- [40] Chen Ya-zhe and Emmanuele Di Benedetto. On the local behavior of solutions of singular parabolic equations. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 103(4):319–345, December 1988. [3](#)