

# REGULARITY OF KINETIC FOKKER-PLANCK EQUATIONS IN BOUNDED DOMAINS

YUZHE ZHU

ABSTRACT. We obtain the existence, uniqueness and regularity results for solutions to kinetic Fokker-Planck equations with bounded measurable coefficients in the presence of boundary conditions, including the inflow, diffuse reflection and specular reflection cases.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Theory of weak solutions	7
3. Regularity for inflow boundary problems	16
4. Well-posedness and regularity for nonlocal reflection boundary problems	26
5. Regularity for specular reflection boundary problems	31
Appendix A. Optimality of the Hölder class	34
References	35

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this work is to investigate the a priori regularity estimates for solutions to kinetic Fokker-Planck equations when supplemented with one of the following boundary conditions: inflow injection, diffuse reflection, and specular reflection. Of concern is the equation of the hypoelliptic form

$$(1.1) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)f = \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v f) + B \cdot \nabla_v f + cf + s,$$

for an unknown function  $f = f(z)$  with  $z := (t, x, v) \in (0, T) \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $T > 0$ ,  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and the  $d \times d$  real symmetric matrix  $A = A(z)$ , the  $d$ -dimensional vector  $B = B(z)$  and the scalar functions  $c = c(z), s = s(z)$  are given. We are always under the assumption that there is some constant  $\Lambda > 1$  such that in  $(0, T) \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$(1.2) \quad \Lambda^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq A \xi \cdot \xi \leq \Lambda |\xi|^2 \text{ for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad |B| + |c| \leq \Lambda.$$

**1.1. Main results.** Before stating the results, let us first make the notion of boundary conditions precise.

---

*Date:* June 10, 2022.

1.1.1. *Phase boundaries.* For  $x \in \partial\Omega$ , the unit outward normal vector of  $\partial\Omega$  at  $x$  is denoted by  $n_x$ . Let  $\mathcal{O} := \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$  denote the phase domain. We split the phase boundary  $\Gamma := \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$  into the outgoing part  $\Gamma_+$ , incoming part  $\Gamma_-$ , and grazing (characteristic) part  $\Gamma_0$ , which are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\pm} &:= \{(x, v) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d : \pm n_x \cdot v > 0\}, \\ \Gamma_0 &:= \{(x, v) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d : n_x \cdot v = 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Denote the traces of a function  $f : \overline{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\gamma f := f|_{\Gamma}$  and  $\gamma_{\pm} f := \gamma f \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_{\pm}}$ . For  $t \in (0, T]$ , we abbreviate

$$\Sigma_t^{\pm} := [0, t] \times \Gamma_{\pm}, \quad \Sigma_t := [0, t] \times \Gamma, \quad \mathcal{O}_t := (0, t) \times \mathcal{O}.$$

1.1.2. *Inflow boundary condition.* Given a function  $g : \Sigma_T^- \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as the boundary data, we impose the condition, with the notation of the single-valued operator  $\mathcal{G}$  for convenience,

$$f(t, x, v) = \mathcal{G}f := g(t, x, v) \quad \text{in } \Sigma_T^-.$$

In particular, the case  $g = 0$  corresponds to the so-called *absorbing* boundary condition.

1.1.3. *Nonlocal reflection boundary condition.* The nonlocal boundary condition of a generalized diffuse reflection type to be concerned with is as follows,

$$f(t, x, v) = \mathcal{N}f := \mathcal{M}(t, x, v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t, x, v') (n_x \cdot v')_+ dv' \quad \text{in } \Sigma_T^-,$$

where the function  $\mathcal{M} \in C^{\beta}(\Sigma_T)$  with  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  is given, and satisfies that for any  $q \geq 0$ , there exists some constant  $\Lambda_q > 0$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad \|\langle v \rangle^q \mathcal{M}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Sigma_T)} + [\mathcal{M}]_{C^{\beta}(\Sigma_T)} \leq \Lambda_q.$$

Here the bracket  $\langle \cdot \rangle := (1 + |\cdot|^2)^{1/2}$ , and  $C^{\beta}$  with  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  denotes the classical Hölder space with exponent  $\beta$ . When  $\mathcal{M}$  has a form of the boundary Maxwellian, that is  $\mathcal{M} = (2\pi)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} \Theta^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} e^{-\frac{|v|^2}{2\Theta}}$  for some (uniformly positive and bounded) boundary temperature function  $\Theta : [0, T] \times \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , the operator  $\mathcal{N}$  is called *diffuse reflection*.

1.1.4. *Specular reflection boundary condition.* The boundary condition with respect to the specular reflection operator  $\mathcal{R}$  reads

$$f(t, x, v) = \mathcal{R}f := f(t, x, v - 2(n_x \cdot v)n_x) \quad \text{in } \Sigma_T^-.$$

1.1.5. *Statement of the main theorem.* Our results provide well-posedness and Hölder a priori bounds for solutions of (1.1) supplemented with one of the above three boundary conditions.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let the domain  $\Omega$  be bounded with  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ , and let  $\mathcal{B} \in \{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R}\}$  be the boundary operator. Assume that (1.2) and (1.3) hold.*

• (well-posedness) *For any  $m \geq 0$ , we have some constant  $l > 0$  depending only on  $d, m$  such that, for any given functions  $f_{\text{in}}, s, g$  satisfying  $\langle v \rangle^l f_{\text{in}} \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^l s, \langle v \rangle^l g \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O}_T)$ , there exists a unique bounded weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) such that  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  and  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{B}f$ , and such that for some constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $d, T, \Lambda, m, \Omega, \mathcal{M}$ , we have*

$$\|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O}_T)} \leq C(\|\langle v \rangle^l s\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^l f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})} + \mathcal{B}),$$

where  $\mathcal{B} = \|\langle v \rangle^l g\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_T^-)}$  when  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{G}$ , and  $\mathcal{B} = 0$  when  $\mathcal{B} \in \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R}\}$ .

• (Hölder regularity) If additionally  $f_{\text{in}} \in C^\beta(\mathcal{O})$  and  $g \in C^\beta(\Sigma_T^-)$  with  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ , and the compatibility condition  $\gamma_- f_{\text{in}} = \gamma_- \mathcal{B} f_{\text{in}}$  holds, then there are some constants  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $C' > 0$  depending only on  $d, T, \Lambda, m, \beta, \Omega, \mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{O}_T)} \leq C' (\|\langle v \rangle^l s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^l f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + [f_{\text{in}}]_{C^\beta(\mathcal{O})} + \mathcal{B}'),$$

where  $\mathcal{B}' = \|\langle v \rangle^l g\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_T^-)} + [g]_{C^\beta(\Sigma_T^-)}$  when  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{G}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}' = 0$  when  $\mathcal{B} \in \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R}\}$ .

**Remark 1.2.** The theorem consists in Propositions 3.11, 4.3, 5.2. The estimates can be localized; see Propositions 3.7, 4.2, 5.1. More precisely, under the same assumption as in the above theorem, we have the following local-in-time estimates written in a unified way with the abbreviation  $\mathcal{O}_t^\tau := [\max\{0, \tau - t\}, \tau] \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}$  for  $\tau, t \in (0, T]$ . For any  $m > 0$ , there exist some constants  $l, C > 0$  such that for any  $\tau \in (0, T]$ , we have

$$\|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_1^\tau)} \leq C (\|\langle v \rangle^l f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_2^\tau)} + \|\langle v \rangle^l s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_2^\tau)} + \|\langle v \rangle^l f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{O}_2^\tau)} + \mathcal{B}_\tau),$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_\tau = \|\langle v \rangle^l g\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_T^- \cap \mathcal{O}_2^\tau)}$  when  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{G}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}_\tau = 0$  when  $\mathcal{B} \in \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R}\}$ ; and

$$\|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_1^\tau)} + [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{O}_1^\tau)} \leq C (\|\langle v \rangle^l f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_2^\tau)} + \|\langle v \rangle^l s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_2^\tau)} + [f]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{O}_2^\tau)} + \mathcal{B}'_\tau),$$

where  $\mathcal{B}'_\tau = \|\langle v \rangle^l g\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_T^- \cap \mathcal{O}_2^\tau)} + [g]_{C^\beta(\Sigma_T^- \cap \mathcal{O}_2^\tau)}$  when  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{G}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}'_\tau = 0$  when  $\mathcal{B} \in \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R}\}$ .

## 1.2. Backgrounds and related work.

1.2.1. *Kinetic boundary value problems.* As a formulation of stochastic processes, the equation (1.1) appears naturally in the Langevin theory of Brownian motion; see the review [9]. It describes the system constituted of a large number of interacting particles in the phase space, arising from the study of plasma physics and galactic dynamics for instance. The solution  $f(t, x, v)$  to (1.1) is interpreted as the density evolution of particles at time  $t$  occupying the phase state of position  $x$  and velocity  $v$ . In addition, the equation was also introduced as a kinetic deformation of geometric constructions on the cotangent bundle of a Riemannian manifold in [3], and the setting for manifolds with boundary was discussed in [33].

When the interacting particles are confined in a bounded domain, the equation has to be supplemented with physically relevant boundary conditions that take into account how particles behave at the boundary; see [30], [7]. As its name suggests, the inflow boundary condition means that the density of the particles flowing inward the domain is prescribed. We can see from this viewpoint that boundary conditions are free from prescriptions whenever the particles exit from the boundary. The reflection boundary conditions take the form of balance relations between the densities at the incoming and outgoing boundaries. The diffuse reflection as a nonlocal model describes that the striking particles are thermalized and then re-emitted inside the domain according to the boundary state. The interaction of particles with perfect solid boundaries is modeled by the specular reflection, meaning that particles are re-emitted elastically with postcollisional angles equal to the precollisional angles, as if light rays are reflected by a perfect mirror in optics. Despite the importance of the treatment of boundary conditions in the study of boundary value problems, limited results on boundary regularity for (1.1) are known.

The assumption (1.2) without requirement of regularity is a bridge to the nonlinearity of various collisional kinetic models such as the Landau equation proposed in [29]. Combining

Theorem 1.1 with the result of interior estimates in [20], we know that any bounded positive solution to the Landau equation is smooth inside and Hölder continuous up to the boundary in a general bounded domain, where its boundary regularity cannot be improved in some sense as we will discuss in § 1.2.4 below. In contrast, the Boltzmann equation with angular cutoff has different regularizing effects; its regularity property in convex domains was investigated in [18], and discontinuities of the solutions were shown to be created at nonconvex parts of the boundary and propagate inside the domain along characteristics in [25].

**1.2.2. Trace problem in kinetic equations.** It is of importance to make sense for the trace of solutions when dealing with boundary value problems. In the kinetic setting, the transport part  $\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x$  of equations is hyperbolic and therefore lacks regularity. Even if taking advantage of the diffusion in velocity in (1.1), the lack of regularity forbids direct characterization of traces in the space where the solutions of (1.1) exist; see [1] for some discussions and references. This suggests that it is necessary to utilize the equation itself rather than a variational framework in general functional spaces. Some progress has been made since the earlier fundamental work on the trace problem, such as [2], [8] for transport equations, and [19] for the Boltzmann equation. Through regularization method based on the theory of renormalized solutions developed in [12], general treatments for the traces with the aid of Green's renormalization formula for solutions to a large class of kinetic equations were studied in [31], [32].

We will exploit the regularization method related to a renormalization technique, in combination with the classical energy method for parabolic equations, to develop the weak theory of initial-boundary value problems for (1.1) under the  $L^2$ -framework in Section 2. The renormalization formula established in Subsection 2.1 plays a role not only in deducing the uniqueness of solutions to (1.1), but also in shedding light on the trace for general bounded solutions. In Subsection 2.2, we construct solutions to the inflow boundary problems by solving a sequence of approximating parabolic equations, and then derive solutions to the specular reflection boundary problems through an iterative scheme of inflow problems.

**1.2.3. Hypoellipticity.** Let us discuss here (and also in § 1.2.4) the equation (1.1) with smooth coefficients in  $(0, T) \times \Omega \times \mathcal{V}$ , for some open sets  $\Omega, \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . The main part of (1.1) subject to (1.2) can be written as Hörmander's summation form (of type II)

$$\mathcal{L} := X_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d X_i^* X_i = \partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x - \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v \cdot),$$

where the vector fields  $X_0 := \partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x$  and  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d)^T := \sqrt{A} \nabla_v$  with the formal adjoint  $X_i^*$  for  $X_i$ . As a basic observation, the commutator  $[\nabla_v, X_0] = \nabla_x$ . The notion of *hypoellipticity* refers that the Lie algebra generated by the system  $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^d$  span the full tangent space. An anisotropic diffusion in the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  was first noticed by Kolmogorov in [27] through the explicit calculation of its fundamental solution. It was then shown by Hörmander in [21] that the hypoelliptic structure of  $\mathcal{L}$  ensures a (interior) regularization effect that the smoothness of  $\mathcal{L}f$  implies the smoothness of  $f$ .

**1.2.4. Characteristic points.** It is a classical difficulty when concerned with the regularity up to the boundary for solutions to degenerate elliptic equations, especially due to the presence of characteristic points. A boundary point associated to  $\mathcal{L}$  is called *characteristic*

if every vector field  $X_i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq d$  is tangent to the boundary at this point. The boundary points of the phase domain  $\Omega \times \mathcal{V}$  is thus classified as  $\Omega \times \partial\mathcal{V}$ ,  $\{(x, v) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V} : \pm n_x \cdot v > 0\}$ , and the characteristic portion  $\{(x, v) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V} : n_x \cdot v = 0\}$ . When  $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{R}^d$ , characteristic set coincides with  $\Gamma_0$ .

As a historical remark, on the one hand, there have been several results on the issue of boundary regularity for degenerate elliptic equations since [24], [14], where the phenomena of loss of boundary conditions resulting from the degeneracy was noticed. The study of boundary regularity near certain non-characteristic points in a general setting can be found in [26], [34]. On the other hand, it was discovered that the loss of regularity occurs for some particular hypoelliptic problem (of type I) at characteristic points. Indeed, an explicit solution to the Dirichlet problem associated with the Kohn Laplacian acting on the Heisenberg group was constructed in [23], which was shown to be vanishing on the boundary and not better than Hölder continuous. However, none of the above results address full boundary issues for  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Under the assumption of a simple structure with constant coefficients for the operator  $\mathcal{L}$ , the concern of continuity for solutions associated with the absorbing boundary condition was analyzed in [22], based on the barrier argument and the study of self-similar behaviors of solutions. Despite the lack of a complete description in [22], by following their argument, one is able to obtain a solution to (1.1) equipped with constant coefficients and the absorbing boundary condition, that is at most in a Hölder class near the characteristic point. Its elaboration is presented in Appendix A.

**1.2.5. De Giorgi's technique.** One of the main parts of the proof for the regularity result in Section 3 relies primarily on the technique pioneered by De Giorgi in [11] for elliptic equations with bounded measurable coefficients. Its basic idea is to build up an oscillation decay of solutions at the unit scale; as a consequence of the scaling-translation invariance of equations, the oscillation control holds at each scale and hence yields interior Hölder estimates for solutions. Based on its hypoelliptic nature, the counterpart of regularization effect for  $\mathcal{L}$  with rough coefficients was first obtained in [37]. An alternative approach with more comprehensive descriptions of properties for subsolutions to (1.1) was proposed in [16].

For the elliptic case, the boundary estimate of solutions depends on certain geometric condition on domains. The interior regularity result extended to boundary for domains satisfying the exterior cone condition is well-known; see for instance [15]. Indeed, the combination of the cone condition and the Hölder continuous boundary data implies the same oscillation decay at each scale as in the interior case. In a similar manner, for (1.1), on the portions of boundary where the values are specified, that is  $\Gamma_-$ , one can deduce the boundary estimate from the interior regularization mechanism.

**1.2.6. Extension method.** The regularity of inflow boundary problems for (1.1) is fully treated in Section 3. To overcome the difficulty of regularity due to the loss of boundary conditions on  $\Gamma_+$  and the characteristic set  $\Gamma_0$ , we develop an extension method that reduces the singular boundary problems to a manageable scope. The proper extension across the boundary portion  $\Gamma_+ \cup \Gamma_0$  is guaranteed by the existence result of general inflow problems established in Section 2. This will lead to modified boundary value problems with fully specified boundary conditions. Provided that the inflow data is Hölder

continuous, the treatment of oscillation controls on the boundary yields Hölder estimates for the extended solutions.

The formulation of the nonlocal reflection condition is essentially the same as the one of inflow problems. Although the incoming data is self-induced, we will show in Section 4 that the macroscopic boundary quantity  $\mathcal{N}f$  with the solution  $f$  to (1.1) is actually Hölder continuous. The regularity estimate in such nonlocal reflection boundary problems is then obtained from the result of the inflow injection case in Section 3. Moreover, the boundary a priori estimate is also used in Section 4 to show the existence and uniqueness for this kind of reflection boundary problems.

As for specular reflection problems, the boundary regularity for solutions is proved in Section 5 through a mirror extension method studied in [17] with the aid of the trace result obtained in Section 2. There have been some development in certain special cases of (1.1) in [17], [13]. Their key observation is that the solution can be extended through this extension trick outside of the domain continuously even near the characteristic set, which gives a direct reduction to interior issues. A similar mirror extension trick has been widely used in the Neumann problem for elliptic equations; see for instance [35], [10].

### 1.3. Notations.

**1.3.1. Boundary conventions.** We recall that the phase domain  $\mathcal{O} = \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and the phase boundary  $\Gamma = \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d = \Gamma_+ \cup \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_-$ . Let the time-space domain  $\Omega_T := [0, T] \times \Omega$ , and  $n_{t,x}$  be the unit outward normal vector of  $\partial\Omega_T$ , and  $d\sigma_{t,x}$  be the surface measure on  $\partial\Omega_T$ . We define the measure  $d\mu$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}_T$  by

$$d\mu := |n_{t,x} \cdot (1, v)| d\sigma_{t,x} dv.$$

We abbreviate the effective initial-boundary portion  $\Gamma_e$  of the domain  $(0, T) \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$\Gamma_e := (\{0\} \times \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cup ([0, T] \times \Gamma_-) = (\{0\} \times \overline{\mathcal{O}}) \cup \Sigma_T^-,$$

where the initial-boundary condition for (1.1) can only be specified.

**1.3.2. Invariant transformation.** For  $z_0 = (t_0, x_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+2d}$  and  $r > 0$ , we define the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{z_0, r} : \mathbb{R}^{1+2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1+2d}$  by the prescription:

$$\mathcal{T}_{z_0, r} : (\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{v}) \mapsto (t, x, v) := (t_0 + r^2\tilde{t}, x_0 + r^3\tilde{x} + r^2\tilde{t}v_0, v_0 + r\tilde{v}).$$

We abbreviate the cylinder centered at the origin of radius  $r > 0$  as  $Q_r := (-r^2, 0] \times B_{r^3}(0) \times B_r(0)$ . The general cylinder centered at  $z_0$  with radius  $r$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_r(z_0) &:= \{\mathcal{T}_{z_0, r}(\tilde{z}) : \tilde{z} \in Q_1\} \\ &= \{(t, x, v) : t_0 - r^2 < t \leq t_0, |x - x_0 - (t - t_0)v_0| < r^3, |v - v_0| < r\}. \end{aligned}$$

Loosely speaking, (1.1) is invariant under the transformation, as the composition  $f \circ \mathcal{T}_{z_0, r}$  of a solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $Q_r(z_0)$  will solve an equation with the same structure in  $Q_1$ .

**1.3.3. Other notations.** Throughout the article,  $B_R(\zeta)$  with  $R > 0$ ,  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$  denotes the Euclidean ball in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  centered at  $\zeta$  with radius  $R > 0$ .

Let  $e_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be the  $d$ -th coordinate vector.

We write the positive part  $a_+ := \max\{a, 0\}$  and negative part  $a_- := \max\{-a, 0\}$  for any real-valued function  $a$ .

A constant  $C$  is called *universal* if it depends only on  $d, T, \Lambda, m, \beta, \Omega$  specified in context. The symbol  $X \lesssim Y$  designates  $X \leq CY$  for some universal constant  $C > 0$ , and the symbol  $X \approx Y$  means that  $X \lesssim Y$  and  $Y \lesssim X$ .

**1.4. Organization of the paper.** The outline of the article is as follows. In Section 2, we study the well-posedness of weak solutions to the equation with the inflow and specular reflection conditions. Section 3, 4, 5 are devoted to the study of the regularity issues in the inflow, nonlocal reflection and specular reflection boundary problems, respectively. The well-posedness result with the nonlocal reflection condition is also derived in Section 4. We finally present in Appendix A an example showing that the Hölder class is optimal near the boundary even for classical solutions.

**Acknowledgement.** The author is indebted to François Golse and Cyril Imbert for helpful discussions. This work has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 754362.

## 2. THEORY OF WEAK SOLUTIONS

This section is devoted to the theory of weak solutions to initial-boundary problems of the kinetic Fokker-Planck type equation in bounded domains. We find neither the results nor the arguments known in the literature are not complete.

Let  $T > 0$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{R}_x^d \times \mathbb{R}_v^d$ . Assume that the boundary  $\partial\mathcal{D}$  is piecewise  $C^1$  and consists only of the finite portions: the boundary  $\partial_x\mathcal{D}$  with respect to  $x$  and the boundary  $\partial_v\mathcal{D}$  with respect to  $v$ . The boundary  $\partial_v\mathcal{D}$  can be empty, for instance  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . We abbreviate  $\mathcal{D}_t := (0, t) \times \mathcal{D}$  for  $t \in (0, T]$ . The component of the unit outward normal vector at  $x \in \partial_x\mathcal{D}$  in  $\mathbb{R}_x^d$  are denoted by  $n_x$ . The effective boundary portion  $\Gamma$  of  $\mathcal{D}_T$  is defined by

$$\Gamma := (\{0\} \times \overline{\mathcal{D}}) \cup ((0, T) \times \{(x, v) \in \partial_x\mathcal{D} : n_x \cdot v < 0\}) \cup ((0, T) \times \partial_v\mathcal{D}).$$

In this section, we consider a larger class of equations

$$(2.1) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)f = \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v f) + B \cdot \nabla_v f + cf + \nabla_v \cdot G_1 + G_0 \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_T,$$

where  $G_1, G_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  are given, and the measurable coefficients  $A, B, c$  satisfy the condition (1.2) in  $\mathcal{D}_T$ .

Let us now make the notion of weak solutions precise.

**Definition 2.1.** A pair of functions

$$(f, \gamma_x f) \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{D})) \times L_{loc}^2([0, T] \times \partial_x\mathcal{D}, |n_x \cdot v|)$$

is said to be a *weak solution* to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{D}_T$ , if  $\nabla_v f \in L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$ , and for any  $t \in (0, T]$  and  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}_t})$  with  $\varphi = 0$  on  $[0, t] \times \partial_v\mathcal{D}$ , we have

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} f \varphi - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{D}} f \varphi + \int_{[0, t] \times \partial_x\mathcal{D}} (n_x \cdot v) \gamma_x f \varphi - \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} f (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (-A \nabla_v f \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v f + c f \varphi - G_1 \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + G_0 \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 2.2.** For fixed  $f$  in the above definition, the function  $\gamma_x f$  satisfying (2.2) is unique, which is named as the trace of  $f$  on  $[0, T] \times \partial_x\mathcal{D}$ . We will thus also refer to  $f$  as the weak solution to (2.1) for simplicity.



**2.1. Renormalization formula and uniqueness of weak solutions.** To establish the uniqueness of weak solutions to (2.1) by energy estimates combined with a Grönwall-type argument, we have to approximate the weak solution not only in  $\mathcal{D}_t$  but also on its boundary  $\partial\mathcal{D}_t$ . The argument of regularizing approximation stemmed from a renormalization technique is patterned after that of [32]. In this subsection, we deal with the case that the phase domain  $\mathcal{D}$  is a product space of domains  $\Omega, \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  so that  $\partial_x \mathcal{D} = \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V}$  and  $\partial_v \mathcal{D} = \Omega \times \partial\mathcal{V}$ .

**Lemma 2.3** (renormalization formula). *Let  $(f, \gamma_x f)$  be a weak solution to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{D}_T$  with  $\mathcal{D} = \Omega \times \mathcal{V}$ , for the domains  $\Omega, \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and the boundaries  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ ,  $\partial\mathcal{V} \in C^{0,1}$ . Then, for any  $\chi \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\chi'(f) = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \Omega \times \partial\mathcal{V}$  and  $\chi(\iota) = O(\iota^2)$  as  $|\iota| \rightarrow \infty$ , and any  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}_t})$  with  $t \in (0, T]$ , we have*

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f) \varphi - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f) \varphi + \int_{[0,t] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V}} (n_x \cdot v) \chi(\gamma_x f) \varphi \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} [\chi(f)(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi - A \nabla_v \chi(f) \cdot \nabla_v \varphi - \varphi \chi''(f)(A \nabla_v f + G_1) \cdot \nabla_v f \\ & \quad + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v \chi(f) + c f \chi'(f) \varphi - \chi'(f) G_1 \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + \chi'(f) G_0 \varphi]. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, provided that the weak solution  $f$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_T$ , the same result holds when  $\partial\Omega \in C^{0,1}$ , and the trace  $\gamma_x f$  satisfies

$$\|\gamma_x f\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D})} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)}.$$

*Proof.* We show the formula (2.3) by an approximation argument only in the space variable for the sake of simplicity, as the approximation in other variables is standard. Let  $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_+} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be a mollifier sequence such that

$$\rho_1 \geq 0, \quad \text{supp } \rho_1 \subset B_1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_1(x) dx = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k(x) = k^d \rho_1(kx).$$

We take the domain  $\Omega_\delta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $C^{1,1}$ -boundary, where the (small) parameter  $\delta > 0$  is intended to regularize and approximate  $\Omega$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Define the unit vector  $n_x^\delta := |\nabla_x \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_\delta)|^{-1} \nabla_x \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_\delta)$ . If  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ , then we set  $n_x^\delta = n_x$ .

For a function  $h \in L^2(\Omega)$ , we define the convolution-translation regularization,

$$(2.4) \quad h_{\star k}(y) := \int_{\Omega} h(x) \rho_k(y - 2k^{-1}n_y^\delta - x) dx \quad \text{for any } y \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Since the weak solution  $f$  satisfies  $f \in C^0([0, t]; L^2(\mathcal{D}))$  and  $\nabla_v f \in L^2(\mathcal{D}_t)$ , for fixed small  $\delta$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & f_{\star k} \rightarrow f \quad \text{in } C^0([0, t]; L^2(\mathcal{D})), \\ & \nabla_v f_{\star k} \rightarrow \nabla_v f, \quad (A \nabla_v f)_{\star k} \rightarrow A \nabla_v f, \quad (B \cdot \nabla_v f)_{\star k} \rightarrow B \cdot \nabla_v f \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{D}_t), \\ & (cf)_{\star k} \rightarrow cf, \quad (G_1)_{\star k} \rightarrow G_1, \quad (G_0)_{\star k} \rightarrow G_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{D}_t), \end{aligned}$$

where we remark that these convergences depend only on the exterior cone condition of  $\Omega$  (see for instance [4, Theorem 2.4]), and hence they are independent of  $\delta$ . For any fixed  $y \in \Omega$  and  $\phi \in C_c^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}_t})$  such that  $\phi = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \Omega \times \partial\mathcal{V}$ , we pick the test function



$\phi(t, y, v)\rho_k(y - 2k^{-1}n_y^\delta - x)$  for (2.1). Observing that this function vanishes on  $[0, t] \times \partial\mathcal{D}$ , we derive

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} f_{\star k} \phi - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{D}} f_{\star k} \phi - \int_{t, y, v} f_{\star k} \partial_t \phi - \int_{t, y, v} v f_{\star k} \cdot \nabla_y \phi + r_k \\ &= \int_{t, y, v} \left[ - (A \nabla_v f + G_1)_{\star k} \cdot \nabla_v \phi + \phi (B \cdot \nabla_v f)_{\star k} + (cf)_{\star k} \phi + (G_0)_{\star k} \phi \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the remainder term  $r_k$  is defined by

$$r_k := \int_{t, y, v} v f_{\star k} \cdot \nabla_y \phi - \int_{t, x, y, v} \phi(t, y, v) f(t, x, v) (v \cdot \nabla_x) \rho_k(y - 2k^{-1}n_y^\delta - x).$$

To acquire the equation satisfied by  $f_{\star k}$ , we use integration by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned} r_k &= \int_{[0, t] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V}} (n_y \cdot v) f_{\star k}(t, y, v) \phi(t, y, v) \\ &\quad - \int_{t, x, y, v} \phi(t, y, v) f(t, x, v) (v \cdot \nabla_y + v \cdot \nabla_x) \rho_k(y - 2k^{-1}n_y^\delta - x). \end{aligned}$$

By the smoothness of  $n_y^\delta$ , and Young's inequality, we deduce that for fixed  $\delta$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_x f(t, x, v) (v \cdot \nabla_y + v \cdot \nabla_x) \rho_k(y - 2k^{-1}n_y^\delta - x) \\ &= -k^{-1} \int_x f(t, x, v) (\nabla_y \otimes n_y^\delta) v \cdot (\nabla_y \rho_k)(y - 2k^{-1}n_y^\delta - x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L_{loc}^2(\overline{\mathcal{D}_T}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.5), we are able to pass to the limit in (2.6) except for the boundary term. Indeed, we conclude that, there are some functions  $R_{1k}, R_{0k} \in L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  such that  $R_{1k}, R_{0k} \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  as  $k \rightarrow 0$ , and

$$(2.7) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f_{\star k} = \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v f_{\star k} + R_{1k} + G_1) + B \cdot \nabla_v f_{\star k} + cf_{\star k} + G_0 + R_{0k}.$$

Consider the test function  $\phi = \chi'(f_{\star k})\varphi$ , where  $\chi \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\chi'(f) = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \Omega \times \partial\mathcal{V}$  and  $\chi(\iota) = O(\iota^2)$  as  $|\iota| \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}_t})$ . As  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we derive the renormalization formula

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f) \varphi - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f) \varphi + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0, t] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V}} (n_x \cdot v) \chi(f_{\star k}) \varphi \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} [\chi(f) (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi - A \nabla_v \chi(f) \cdot \nabla_v \varphi - \varphi \chi''(f) (A \nabla_v f + G_1) \cdot \nabla_v f \\ &\quad + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v \chi(f) + cf \chi'(f) \varphi - \chi'(f) G_1 \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + G_0 \chi'(f) \varphi]. \end{aligned}$$

It thus suffices to show the convergence from  $\gamma_x f_{\star k}$  to  $\gamma_x f$ . To this end, we integrate the equation satisfied by  $f_{\star j} - f_{\star k}$  (see (2.7)) against  $n_x^\delta \cdot v \eta_R(v) (f_{\star j} - f_{\star k})$ , where the cut-off function  $\eta_R(v) \in C_c^\infty(B_{2R})$  valued in  $[0, 1]$  satisfies  $\eta_R|_{B_R} \equiv 1$  with the constant  $R > 0$ . Then, for any fixed  $\delta, R > 0$ , the passage to limit  $j, k \rightarrow \infty$  yields that

$$(2.9) \quad \lim_{j, k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0, T] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V}} [(n_x \cdot v)^2 + (n_x^\delta - n_x) \cdot v (n_x \cdot v)] (f_{\star j} - f_{\star k})^2 \eta_R = 0.$$

Provided that  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ , we have  $n_x^\delta = n_x$  so that  $f_{\star k}$  converges in  $L_{loc}^2([0, T] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V}, (n_x \cdot v)^2)$ . From the uniqueness of the trace, we see that the limiting function is  $\gamma_x f$ .

Therefore, by choosing the constant  $R$  such that  $\{v : \varphi \neq 0\} \subset B_R$ , the formula (2.8) is recast as (2.3).

If additionally  $f \in L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)$ , then we have, for any  $t \in (0, T]$ ,

$$\|f_{\star k}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq \|f_{\star k}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)}.$$

After extracting a subsequence in  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , there is some function  $f_\partial \in L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)$  such that

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{\star k} &\xrightarrow{*} f_\partial \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t), \\ \|f_\partial\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{\star k}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\mathcal{D}_t)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any fixed  $\delta > 0$ ,  $(n_x \cdot v)(f_{\star j} - f_{\star k})^2$  is weakly convergent in  $L^1_{loc}([0, T] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V})$  as  $j, k \rightarrow \infty$ . We also notice that  $(n_x^\delta - n_x) \cdot v$  is locally bounded and converges to 0 almost everywhere in  $[0, T] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V}$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . We thus conclude the convergence of  $(n_x \cdot v)f_{\star k}$  in  $L^2_{loc}([0, T] \times \partial\Omega \times \mathcal{V})$  by sending  $j, k \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  in (2.9). Together with (2.10), the same passage to limit in (2.8) leads to (2.3). We point out that  $f_\partial$  coincides with  $\gamma_x f$  on  $[0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}$  owing to the uniqueness of the trace. The proof is complete.  $\square$

We are also able to get the uniqueness result to weak solutions when  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O} = \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , even if the boundedness of their traces in  $L^2(\Sigma_T, |n_x \cdot v|)$  is not known.

**Corollary 2.4** (uniqueness). *Let  $f_1, f_2$  be two weak solutions to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  such that  $f_1 = f_2$  on  $\{0\} \times \mathcal{O}$  with  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ . Then,  $f_1 = f_2$  in  $\mathcal{O}_T$ , provided that either they coincide on  $\Sigma_T^-$ , or they both satisfy the specular reflection boundary condition. Besides, provided that  $f_1, f_2$  are bounded in  $\mathcal{O}_T$ , the same result holds when  $\partial\Omega \in C^{0,1}$ .*

*Proof.* By subtraction, it suffices to consider the weak solution  $f := f_1 - f_2$  to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  with  $|G_1| = G_0 = f|_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{O}} = 0$ . Let  $R > 0$ , and  $\eta_R(v) \in C_c^\infty(B_{2R})$  be a radial function valued in  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\eta_R|_{B_R} \equiv 1$ . In view of Lemma 2.3, we pick  $\chi(\iota) = \iota^2$  and  $\varphi = \eta_R$  in the formula (2.3), where the boundary term reads

$$(2.11) \quad \int_{\Sigma_t} (n_x \cdot v)(\gamma f)^2 \eta_R.$$

If  $f|_{\Sigma_T^-} = 0$ , then (2.11) is nonnegative. If the specular reflection condition holds for  $f_1, f_2$ , then so do  $f^2 \eta_R$ ; and thus (2.11) vanishes. Hence, as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce that

$$\int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} f^2 \leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} (-A \nabla_v f \cdot \nabla_v f + f B \cdot \nabla_v f + c f^2).$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Grönwall’s inequality, we have  $f = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}_T$ , and hence the uniqueness follows. The proof is thus complete.  $\square$

## 2.2. Existence of weak solutions.

**2.2.1. Inflow boundary value problems.** The proof of the existence result for inflow problems of (2.1) is inspired from [5] which adopted the idea of vanishing viscosity associated with an appropriate boundary condition for transport equations.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let the function  $g : \overline{\mathcal{D}_T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $g, \nabla_v g, (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)g \in L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$ ,  $g|_{t=0} \in L^2(\mathcal{D})$  and  $g|_{[0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}} \in L^2([0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}, (n_x \cdot v)_-)$ . Then, there exists a weak solution  $f$  to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{D}_T$  associated with  $f = g$  on  $\mathbb{T}$ , meaning that  $f|_{t=0} = g|_{t=0}$  and  $\gamma_x f|_{\{[0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D} : n_x \cdot v < 0\}} = g|_{\{[0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D} : n_x \cdot v < 0\}}$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume  $g = 0$ ; otherwise, we consider the function  $f - g$ . Let us fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and consider the weak solution  $f_\varepsilon$  to the initial-boundary problem for parabolic equation,

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \Delta_x f_\varepsilon + \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v f_\varepsilon) + B \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon + c f_\varepsilon + \nabla_v \cdot G_1 + G_0 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}_T, \\ f_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } (\{0\} \times \mathcal{D}) \cup ([0, T] \times \partial_v \mathcal{D}), \\ \varepsilon n_x \cdot \nabla_x f_\varepsilon + (n_x \cdot v)_- f_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } [0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}. \end{cases}$$

One may refer to [28, III. §5] for the classical existence result of the above problem. In the weak formulation, for any  $\varphi \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}_t})$  with  $t \in (0, T]$  such that  $\varphi = 0$  on  $[0, t] \times \partial_v \mathcal{D}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.12) \quad & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} f_\varepsilon \varphi + \int_{[0, t] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}} (n_x \cdot v)_+ f_\varepsilon \varphi - \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} f_\varepsilon (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} (-A \nabla_v f_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_v \varphi - \varepsilon \nabla_x f_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x \varphi + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon + c f_\varepsilon \varphi - G_1 \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + G_0 \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

The energy estimate is derived by choosing the solution  $f_\varepsilon$  itself for testing, and applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Grönwall’s inequality, which reads

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} f_\varepsilon^2 + \int_{[0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}} |n_x \cdot v| f_\varepsilon^2 + \int_{\mathcal{D}_T} (|\nabla_v f_\varepsilon|^2 + \varepsilon |\nabla_x f_\varepsilon|^2) \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{D}_T} (|G_1|^2 + G_0^2).$$

Similarly, for  $\varepsilon_k := k^{-2}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , choosing test function  $f_{\varepsilon_k} - f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}}$  in the weak formulations satisfied by  $f_{\varepsilon_k}$  and  $f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}}$  yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} (f_{\varepsilon_k} - f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}})^2 + \int_{[0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}} |n_x \cdot v| (f_{\varepsilon_k} - f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}})^2 + \int_{\mathcal{D}_T} |\nabla_v (f_{\varepsilon_k} - f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}})|^2 \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{D}_T} |\nabla_x (\sqrt{\varepsilon_k} f_{\varepsilon_k} - \sqrt{\varepsilon_{k+1}} f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}})|^2 \lesssim (\sqrt{\varepsilon_k} - \sqrt{\varepsilon_{k+1}})^2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_T} |\nabla_x f_{\varepsilon_k}| |\nabla_x f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}}| \\ &\leq (\sqrt{\varepsilon_k} - \sqrt{\varepsilon_{k+1}})^2 \sqrt{\varepsilon_k \varepsilon_{k+1}}^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{D}_T} (\varepsilon_k |\nabla_x f_{\varepsilon_k}|^2 + \varepsilon_{k+1} |\nabla_x f_{\varepsilon_{k+1}}|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\sqrt{\varepsilon_k} - \sqrt{\varepsilon_{k+1}})^2 \sqrt{\varepsilon_k \varepsilon_{k+1}}^{-1} = k^{-1} (k+1)^{-1}$  tends to zero as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, there is some function  $f \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{D}))$  satisfying  $\nabla_v f \in L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  and  $f|_{t=0} = f|_{[0, T] \times \partial_v \mathcal{D}} = 0$ , and some function  $\gamma_x f \in L^2((0, T); L^2(\partial_x \mathcal{D}, |n_x \cdot v| dx dv))$ , such that as  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.13) \quad & f_\varepsilon \rightarrow f \quad \text{in } C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{D})), \\ & \nabla_v f_\varepsilon \rightarrow \nabla_v f, \quad \varepsilon \nabla_x f_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{D}_T), \\ & f_\varepsilon \rightarrow \gamma_x f \quad \text{in } L^2((0, T); L^2(\partial_x \mathcal{D}, |n_x \cdot v|)). \end{aligned}$$

Sending  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in (2.12), we deduce that the weak formulation (2.2) holds for the limiting function  $f$ .

Now we have to show that  $\gamma_x f|_{\{n_x \cdot v < 0\}} = 0$ . To this end, we rewrite (2.12) and its limit in  $L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{div}(f_\varepsilon, v f_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \nabla_x f_\varepsilon, -A \nabla_v f_\varepsilon - G_1) = B \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon + c f_\varepsilon + G_0 \\ & \rightarrow B \cdot \nabla_v f + c f + G_0 = \operatorname{div}(f, v f, -A \nabla_v f - G_1). \end{aligned}$$

It implies the convergence in  $H^{-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{D}_T)$  that

$$n_z \cdot (f_\varepsilon, v f_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \nabla_x f_\varepsilon, -A \nabla_v f_\varepsilon - G_1) \rightarrow n_z \cdot (f, v f, -A \nabla_v f - G_1),$$

where  $n_z \in \mathbb{R}^{1+2d}$  is the unit outward normal vector at  $z \in \partial\mathcal{D}_T$ . Combining this with the boundary condition of  $f_\varepsilon$  on  $[0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}$  and the limiting process of  $\gamma_x f$  above, we arrive at  $\gamma_x f|_{\{n_x \cdot v < 0\}} = 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Furthermore, one is able to show that the weak solution constructed above satisfies the renormalization formula and thus the maximum principle.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $f$  be the weak solution constructed in Lemma 2.5. Then, for any convex  $\chi \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\chi'(f) = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \partial_v \mathcal{D}$  and  $\chi(\iota) = O(\iota^2)$  as  $|\iota| \rightarrow \infty$ , and any nonnegative  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}_t})$  with  $t \in (0, T]$ , we have*

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f) \varphi - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f) \varphi - \int_{[0, t] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}} (n_x \cdot v) \chi(\gamma_x f) \varphi \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} [\chi(f)(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi - A \nabla_v \chi(f) \cdot \nabla_v \varphi - \varphi \chi''(f)(A \nabla_v f + G_1) \cdot \nabla_v f \\ & \quad + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v \chi(f) + c f \chi'(f) \varphi - \chi'(f) G_1 \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + \chi'(f) G_0 \varphi]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if additionally  $g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{F})$ , then

$$(2.15) \quad \|f\|_{C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{D}))} \lesssim \|G_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} + \|G_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{F})};$$

moreover, if  $G_1 = 0$  and  $G_0 \in L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)$ , then

$$(2.16) \quad \|\gamma_x f\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D})} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)} \lesssim \|G_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{F})}.$$

*Proof.* Based on the same approximation mechanism of  $f$  through  $f_\varepsilon$  as in the proof of Lemma 2.5 above, the renormalization formula for the solution  $f_\varepsilon$  of the parabolic equation (see its weak formulation (2.12)) is given by choosing the test function  $\chi'(f_\varepsilon) \varphi$ , with  $\chi \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\chi'(f) = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \partial_v \mathcal{D}$  and  $\chi(\iota) = O(\iota^2)$  as  $|\iota| \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\overline{\mathcal{D}_t})$ . More precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f_\varepsilon) \varphi - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{D}} \chi(f_\varepsilon) \varphi + \int_{[0, t] \times \partial_x \mathcal{D}} (n_x \cdot v) \chi(f_\varepsilon) \varphi \\ & = \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} [\chi(f_\varepsilon)(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi - A \nabla_v \chi(f_\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla_v \varphi - \varepsilon \nabla_x \chi(f_\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi \\ & \quad - \chi''(f_\varepsilon) \varphi (A \nabla_v f_\varepsilon + G_1) \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \chi''(f_\varepsilon) \varphi |\nabla_x f_\varepsilon|^2 \\ & \quad + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v \chi(f_\varepsilon) + c f_\varepsilon \chi'(f_\varepsilon) \varphi - \chi'(f_\varepsilon) G_1 \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + \chi'(f_\varepsilon) G_0 \varphi]. \end{aligned}$$

Provided that  $\chi$  is convex and  $\varphi$  is nonnegative, the passage to limit  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  with the aid of (2.13) then implies (2.14).

To show the estimates (2.15) and (2.16), we may assume  $c \leq 0$ ; otherwise, we consider the equation solved by  $e^{\Lambda t} f$ . Let the constant  $M := \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{F})}$ . Taking  $\chi(\iota) := (\iota - M)_+^2$  and  $\varphi = 1$  in (2.14), and applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{D}} (f - M)_+^2 & \leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} [-\chi''(f)(A \nabla_v f + G_1) \cdot \nabla_v f + \chi'(f) B \cdot \nabla_v f] \\ & \quad + 2 \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} [c f \chi'(f) + \chi'(f) G_0] \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{D}_t} [(f - M)_+^2 + |G_1|^2 + G_0^2], \end{aligned}$$

where we also used the fact that  $cf\chi'(f) \leq 2c(f-M)_+^2$  to produce the second inequality. By Grönwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\|(f-M)_+\|_{C^0([0,T];L^2(\mathcal{D}))}^2 \lesssim \|G_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}^2 + \|G_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}^2.$$

In particular, when  $|G_1| = G_0 = 0$ , it turns out that  $(f-M)_+ = 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}_T$ . These two consequences provide the upper bounds for  $f$  in  $L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  and in  $L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)$ , respectively. Choosing the function  $(-f-M)_+$  for testing with a reduction to nonnegative  $c$ , we then arrive at (2.15), and also get (2.16) in the case that  $G_0 = 0$ .

As far as (2.16) with general  $G_0 \in L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)$  is concerned, one may consider the equation solved by the function  $\pm f - e^t \|G_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)}$ . We finally remark that the estimate about the trace  $\gamma_x f$  in (2.16) can be achieved by the same approximation argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.3; see (2.10). This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ , and the function  $g \in L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)$ . Then, there exists a unique weak solution  $f$  to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T = (0, T) \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$  associated with  $f = g$  on  $\Gamma_e$ ; and it satisfies*

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|f\|_{C^0([0,T];L^2(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\nabla_v f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|f\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{O}_T, d\mu)} \\ & \lesssim \|G_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|G_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we abbreviate the trace of  $f$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}_T$  by  $f$  itself. Besides, if additionally  $G_1 = 0$ ,  $G_0 \in L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_T)$ , and  $g \in L^\infty(\Gamma_e)$ , then the same result holds when  $\partial\Omega \in C^{0,1}$ , and

$$(2.18) \quad \|\gamma_x f\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_T)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \lesssim \|G_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_e)}.$$

*Proof.* The existence of weak solutions follows from the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.5, provided that  $g$  is regular in the sense that  $g \in L^2(\Omega_T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$  and  $(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)g \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$ . On account of this, we pick an approximating sequence of compactly supported smooth functions  $g_j$  such that  $g_j \rightarrow g$  in  $L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)$ . Let  $f_j$  be a weak solution to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f_j = g_j$  on  $\Gamma_e$ . In view of Lemma 2.3 or Lemma 2.6, by taking  $\chi(\iota) = \iota^2$  and  $\varphi = 1$  in the renormalization formula (2.3) or (2.14), and using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Grönwall's inequality, we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} f_j^2 + \int_{\Sigma_T} |n_x \cdot v| f_j^2 + \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} |\nabla_v f_j|^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} (G_1^2 + G_0^2) + \int_{\Gamma_e} g_j^2 d\mu,$$

which is the estimate (2.17) for  $f_j$ . As a consequence of the linear structure of the equation, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} (f_{j+1} - f_j)^2 + \int_{\Sigma_t} |n_x \cdot v| (f_{j+1} - f_j)^2 + \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} |\nabla_v (f_{j+1} - f_j)|^2 \\ \lesssim \int_{\Gamma_e} (g_{j+1} - g_j)^2 d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Sending  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , we acquire a limiting function  $f$  of  $f_j$  such that  $f|_{\partial\mathcal{O}_t} \in L^2(\partial\mathcal{O}_t, d\mu)$  and  $f|_{\Gamma_e} = g$ ; furthermore, it is a weak solution to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  and satisfies (2.17). The uniqueness of weak solutions and the estimate (2.18) are direct consequences of Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.6, respectively. The proof is thus complete.  $\square$

**2.2.2. Specular reflection boundary value problems.** Based on the existence result in § 2.2.1 above, we construct through an iterative method patterned after [6], whose argument also works for a certain class of elastic reflection problems but is of limited use for general diffuse reflection problems.

Let us recall the specular reflection operator  $\mathcal{R}f(t, x, v) = f(t, x, v - 2(n_x \cdot v)n_x)$  for  $(t, x, v) \in \Sigma_T$ .

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ ,  $G_1, G_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$ , and  $f_{\text{in}} \in L^2(\mathcal{O})$ . For any constant  $a \in [0, 1)$ , there exists a unique weak solution to (2.1) associated with the initial-boundary condition  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\gamma_- f = a\mathcal{R}f$  in  $\Sigma_T^-$ ; furthermore, it satisfies*

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|f\|_{C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\nabla_v f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + (1-a)\|f\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{O}_T, d\mu)} \\ & \lesssim \|G_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|G_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $c \leq -C_0$  for a fixed constant  $C_0 > 0$ ; otherwise, we consider the equation solved by  $e^{(\Lambda+C_0)t}f$ . In view of Corollary 2.7, we acquire a sequence of weak solutions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  to (2.1) through the iterative scheme of inflow boundary value problems associated with

$$f_n|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_- f_{n+1} = a\mathcal{R}f_n \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \gamma_- f_0 = 0.$$

By the definition of the reflection operator, we have

$$(2.20) \quad \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_- f_n^2 = \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_- (a\mathcal{R}f_{n-1})^2 = a^2 \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_+ f_{n-1}^2.$$

Taking  $\chi(\iota) = \iota^2$  and  $\varphi = 1$  in the renormalization formula (2.3) of Lemma 2.3, and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} f_n^2 - \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_{\text{in}}^2 + \int_{\Sigma_t} (n_x \cdot v) f_n^2 \\ & = 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} (-A \nabla_v f_n \cdot \nabla_v f_n + f_n B \cdot \nabla_v f_n + c f_n^2 - G_1 \cdot \nabla_v f_n + G_0 f_n) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} \left[ -\frac{1}{2\Lambda} |\nabla_v f_n|^2 + (\Lambda^3 + c + 1) f_n^2 + |G_1|^2 + G_0^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows by picking  $C_0 := 1 + \Lambda^3$  that

$$(2.21) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} f_n^2 + \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} |\nabla_v f_n|^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} (|G_1|^2 + G_0^2) + \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_{\text{in}}^2 + \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_- f_n^2,$$

and

$$(2.22) \quad \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_+ f_n^2 \leq \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} (|G_1|^2 + G_0^2) + \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_{\text{in}}^2 + \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_- f_n^2.$$

Applying (2.20) and (2.22) iteratively yields that

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_+ f_n^2 & \leq \sum_{i=0}^n a^{2i} \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} (|G_1|^2 + G_0^2) + \sum_{i=0}^n a^{2i} \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_{\text{in}}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{1-a^2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} (|G_1|^2 + G_0^2) + \frac{1}{1-a^2} \int_{\mathcal{O}} f_{\text{in}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the function  $f_n - f_{n-1}$  solves (2.1) associated with  $|G_1| = G_0 = 0$ ,

$$(f_n - f_{n-1})|_{t=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_-(f_{n+1} - f_n) = a\mathcal{R}(f_n - f_{n-1}) \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}_+,$$

we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} (f_n - f_{n-1})^2 + \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} |\nabla_v (f_n - f_{n-1})|^2 + \int_{\Sigma_T} |n_x \cdot v| (f_n - f_{n-1})^2 \\ \lesssim \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_- (f_n - f_{n-1})^2 \leq a^{2n} \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v)_- (f_1 - f_0)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we derive a limiting function  $f$  of  $f_n$ , which solves (2.1) associated with  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  and  $\gamma_- f = a\mathcal{R}f$ . We point out that (2.19) is a consequence of the estimates (2.21) and (2.23) under the limit process  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The uniqueness of weak solutions follows from the same argument of the proof in Lemma 2.4. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

One disadvantage in the above argument is the lack of information on the trace of solutions as  $a \rightarrow 1$ . With the aid of the trace result from Lemma 2.4, we achieve the well-posedness for (2.1) under the reflection boundary condition  $\gamma_- f = a\mathcal{R}f$  for the full range  $a \in [0, 1]$ .

**Corollary 2.9.** *Let  $\partial\Omega \in C^{0,1}$ ,  $G_1 = 0$ ,  $G_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$ , and  $f_{\text{in}} \in L^2 \cap L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ . For any constant  $a \in [0, 1]$ , there exists a unique weak solution to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\gamma_- f = a\mathcal{R}f$  in  $\Sigma_T^-$ ; furthermore, it satisfies*

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{O}_T))} + \|\nabla_v f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} &\lesssim \|G_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})}, \\ \|\gamma f\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_T)} &\leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \lesssim \|G_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $c$  and  $G_0$  are nonpositive in  $\mathcal{O}_T$ ; otherwise, we consider the equation solved by  $e^{\Lambda t} f - e^{(1+\Lambda)t} \|G_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)}$ . Based on the proof of Lemma 2.8 with the boundedness estimate given by Lemma 2.6, for any  $a \in [0, 1)$ , there exists a unique bounded weak solution  $f_a$  to (2.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f_a|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  and  $\gamma_- f_a = a\mathcal{R}f_a$ . In the light of Lemma 2.3, we take  $\chi(\iota) = (\iota - M)_+^2$  and  $\varphi = 1$  in the formula (2.3), for the constant  $M := \|f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}$ . Taking the boundary condition into account, applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that  $f_a(f_a - M)_+ \geq (f_a - M)_+^2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} (f_a - M)_+^2 &\leq \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} (f_a - M)_+^2 + \int_{\Sigma_t} (n_x \cdot v)(f_a - M)_+^2 \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} [(f_a - M)_+^2 + c f_a (f_a - M)_+] \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} (f_a - M)_+^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Grönwall's inequality, we acquire the upper bound that  $\|(f_a)_+\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \leq M$ . Similarly, by taking  $\chi(\iota) = (-\iota - M)_+^2$  with a reduction to nonnegative  $c$  and  $G_0$ , we get the lower bound that  $\|(f_a)_-\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \leq M$ . Together with Lemma 2.4, we arrive at the estimates (2.24) for  $f_a$  with  $a \in [0, 1)$ .

It remains to deal with the case  $a = 1$ . In order to do so, we argue by approximation. Let the constants  $a_1, a_2 \in [0, 1)$ ,  $R > 0$ , and  $\eta_R(v) \in C_c^\infty(B_{2R})$  be a radial function valued in  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\eta_R|_{B_R} \equiv 1$ . Picking  $\chi(\iota) = \iota^2$  and  $\varphi = \eta_R$  in the renormalization



formula (2.3) satisfied by  $f_{a_1}$  and  $f_{a_2}$ , as well as using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} (f_{a_1} - f_{a_2})^2 + \int_{\Sigma_t} (n_x \cdot v)(f_{a_1} - f_{a_2})^2 \eta_R + \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} |\nabla_v (f_{a_1} - f_{a_2})|^2 \\ \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} (f_{a_1} - f_{a_2})^2 + o(1) \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Owing to (2.24) for  $f_{a_1}, f_{a_2}$ , the boundary term above tends to zero as  $a_1, a_2 \rightarrow 1$  for any fixed  $R$ , and the asymptotics  $o(1)$  is independent of  $a_1, a_2$ . Sending  $a_1, a_2 \rightarrow 1$  and  $R \rightarrow \infty$  in order, we conclude that the limiting function  $f$  of  $f_a$  as  $a \rightarrow 1$  also satisfies (2.24), and solves (2.1) associated with  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  and  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{R}f$ . Finally, the uniqueness of weak solutions follows from Lemma 2.4. The proof is now complete.  $\square$

### 3. REGULARITY FOR INFLOW BOUNDARY PROBLEMS

We prove in this section the regularity of solutions to (1.1) associated with the inflow boundary condition. Throughout this section we assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$ .

Let us first introduce the notion of subsolution we will use intensively.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . We say a function  $f$  is a *subsolution* to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{D}_T = (0, T) \times \mathcal{D}$ , if it satisfies  $f \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{D}))$  and  $\nabla_v f \in L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$ , and for any convex nondecreasing  $\chi \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\chi(\iota) = O(\iota^2)$  as  $|\iota| \rightarrow \infty$ , and any nonnegative  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathcal{D}_T)$ , we have

$$0 \leq \int_{\mathcal{D}_T} [\chi(f)(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)\varphi - A \nabla_v \chi(f) \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v \chi(f) + c f \chi'(f) \varphi + s \chi'(f) \varphi].$$

**Remark 3.2.** Suppose the boundary  $\partial\mathcal{D} \in C^{0,1}$  consists only of finite boundary portions with respect to  $x$  and  $v$ . In view of Lemma 2.6, one can check by approximation that if  $f$  is a weak solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{D}_T$  with nonpositive value on  $\partial\mathcal{D}_T$ , then after zero extension outside of  $\mathcal{D}_T$ , the function  $f_+$  is a subsolution to (1.1) in  $\mathbb{R}^{1+2d}$  with the source term  $s$  replaced by  $s \mathbb{1}_{f>0}$ .

**3.1. Preliminary estimates.** This subsection is devoted to some a priori estimates serving as building blocks in the sequel. Let us first prove the basic energy estimate for weak solutions in the presence of spatial boundaries.

**Lemma 3.3** (local energy estimate). *For any weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$ , and any function  $\eta \in C_c^1([0, T] \times \bar{\Omega} \times B_2(v_0))$  valued in  $[0, 1]$  with  $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_T} |\nabla_v f|^2 \eta^2 \lesssim (1 + \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2) \int_{\text{supp } \eta} (\langle v_0 \rangle f^2 + s^2) + \int_{\Gamma_e} f^2 \eta^2 d\mu.$$

*Proof.* In view of the renormalization formula (2.3) in Lemma 2.3, picking  $\chi(\iota) = \iota^2$  and  $\varphi = \eta^2$  yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{T\} \times \mathcal{O}} f^2 \eta^2 - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{O}} f^2 \eta^2 + \int_{\Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v) f^2 \eta^2 + 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} \eta^2 A \nabla_v f \cdot \nabla_v f \\ = 2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} [-2f\eta A \nabla_v f \cdot \nabla_v \eta + f\eta^2 B \cdot \nabla_v f + c f^2 \eta^2 + s f \eta^2 + f^2 \eta (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \eta]. \end{aligned}$$

It then turns out that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} |\nabla_v f|^2 \eta^2 &\lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} (|f| |\nabla_v f| \eta |\nabla_v \eta| + |f| |\nabla_v f| \eta^2 + f^2 \eta^2 + |s| |f| \eta^2) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} f^2 \eta |(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \eta| + \int_{\Gamma_e} f^2 \eta^2 d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_T} |\nabla_v f|^2 \eta^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}_T} [f^2 |\nabla_v \eta|^2 + f^2 \eta^2 + s^2 \eta^2 + f^2 \eta |(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \eta|] + \int_{\Gamma_e} f^2 \eta^2 d\mu,$$

which implies the desired result.  $\square$

We then state three lemmas known in the literature. One of the main results in [16] is the following interior regularity estimate for solutions to (1.1); see [16, Theorem 1.4]. We have at our disposal its scaled version as follows.

**Lemma 3.4** (interior Hölder estimate). *There exists a universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that for any constants  $0 < r < R \leq 1$ , and any weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $Q_R(z_0)$  with  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{1+2d}$ , we have*

$$(R - r)^\alpha [f]_{C^\alpha(Q_r(z_0))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(Q_R(z_0))} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(Q_R(z_0))}.$$

The proof of such Hölder estimate essentially relies on the following two lemmas for subsolutions, that is, the local boundedness estimate [16, Theorem 3.1] and the oscillation reduction [16, Lemma 4.5]. The local boundedness estimate from  $L^p$  to  $L^\infty$  can be rephrased as follows.

**Lemma 3.5** (local boundedness). *Let the constant  $p > 0$  be universal. For any constant  $0 < r < R \leq 1$ , and any subsolution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $Q_R(z_0)$  with  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{1+2d}$ , we have*

$$\|f_+\|_{L^\infty(Q_r(z_0))} \lesssim (R - r)^{-(2+4d)/p} \|f_+\|_{L^p(Q_R(z_0))} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(Q_R(z_0))}.$$

The oscillation reduction states that if a subsolution is far away from its upper bound in a subset occupying some non-negligible space with a certain time lag, then it cannot get close to this bound in a localized region.

**Lemma 3.6** (oscillation reduction). *Let the constant  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  be universal, and the coefficient  $c = 0$ . Then, there exist some (small) universal constants  $\lambda, \varrho, \theta \in (0, 1)$  such that for any subsolution  $f$  to (1.1) with  $f \leq 1$  and  $|s| \leq \lambda$  in  $Q_1$  satisfying*

$$|\{f \leq 0\} \cap Q_{2\varrho}^-| \geq \delta |Q_{2\varrho}^-|,$$

for the shifted cylinder  $Q_{2\varrho}^- := Q_{2\varrho}(-1/2, 0, 0) \subset Q_1$ , we have

$$f \leq 1 - \theta \quad \text{in } Q_\varrho.$$

**3.2. Local estimates.** The following proposition lies at the core of our results.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Assume that the constants  $p \geq 2$  and  $\beta, \epsilon \in (0, 1]$  are universal, and the functions  $s \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$  and  $g \in L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu) \cap L^\infty(\Gamma_e)$ . Let  $f$  be a weak solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  such that  $f = g$  on  $\Gamma_e$ . Then, for any  $z_0 = (t_0, x_0, v_0) \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_T}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (3.1) \quad \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_1(z_0))} &\lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{\max\{1/2, (2+4d)/p\}} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} \\ &\quad + \|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_e \cap B_2(z_0), d\mu)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_e \cap B_2(z_0))}; \end{aligned}$$

if additionally  $g \in C^\beta(\Gamma_e)$ , then there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_1(z_0))} &\lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1/2+\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} \\ &+ \langle v_0 \rangle^\epsilon \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} + [g]_{C^\beta(\Gamma_e \cap B_2(z_0))}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 3.8.** Based on the similar derivation of the estimate (3.1), we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_1(z_0))} &\lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{2d} \|f\|_{L_t^\infty L_{x,v}^2(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} \\ &+ \|g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_e \cap B_2(z_0), d\mu)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_e \cap B_2(z_0))}. \end{aligned}$$

Before starting the proof, let us first set up an appropriate coordinate system, inspired by the one used in [17].

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,1}$  and  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ . There exists some constant  $R \in (0, 1]$  depending only on  $d$  and  $\partial\Omega$ , and some neighborhood  $U$  of  $x_0$ , and some  $C^{1,1}$ -function  $\psi : (-R, R)^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the map  $P : (-R, R)^d \rightarrow U$ , defined by*

$$(3.3) \quad P(\tilde{y}, y_d) := \mathbf{m}(\tilde{y}) + y_d \mathbf{n}(\tilde{y}),$$

is a diffeomorphism from  $(-R, R)^d$  to  $U$ , and from  $(-R, R)^{d-1} \times (-R, 0)$  to  $U \cap \Omega$ , where

$$\tilde{y} := (y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}) \in (-R, R)^{d-1}, \quad y_d \in (-R, R),$$

and the maps  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} : (-R, R)^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}(\tilde{y}) &:= (\tilde{y}, \psi(\tilde{y}))^T, \\ \mathbf{n}(\tilde{y}) &:= |(D\psi(\tilde{y}), 1)|^{-1} (-D\psi(\tilde{y}), 1)^T. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* In a local coordinate system, we can characterize the boundary portion of  $\partial\Omega$  near  $x_0$  by means of the epigraph of a function  $\psi \in C^{1,1}$  defined on  $(-R, R)^{d-1}$  for some (small) constant  $R \in (0, 1]$ . We now have to check that the map  $P$  is well-defined. Denoting by  $P'$  the Jacobian matrix of  $P$ , we know that

$$(3.4) \quad P' = (D\mathbf{m} + y_d D\mathbf{n}; \mathbf{n}).$$

Since  $\psi \in C^{1,1}$ , provided that  $|y_d|$  is small, the determinant of  $P'$  is

$$(3.5) \quad \det(P') = |(D\psi, 1)|^{-1} \det \begin{pmatrix} I_{d-1} & -(D\psi)^T \\ D\psi & 1 \end{pmatrix} + O(y_d) = |(D\psi, 1)| + O(y_d).$$

Hence, by taking  $R$  small enough (depending only on  $d$  and  $\|\psi\|_{C^{1,1}}$ ), we have

$$(3.6) \quad \kappa^{-1} \leq \det(P') \leq \kappa \quad \text{in } (-R, R)^d,$$

for some constant  $\kappa > 1$  depending only on  $d$  and  $\|D\psi\|_{L^\infty}$ . It follows from the inverse function theorem that the diffeomorphism  $P : (-R, R)^d \rightarrow U$ , with the neighborhood  $U$  of  $x_0$ , exists as asserted.  $\square$

We first remark that based on the interior Hölder estimate in Lemma 3.4 and the propagation of Hölder estimate forward in time [38, Corollary 4.6], it actually suffices to derive the estimate near the phase boundary. Armed with the way of boundary flattening presented in the above lemma, we are able to reduce general boundary problems to a one-dimensional space framework. After setting up the transformed boundary value problem and using some approximation argument if necessary, we will extend the transformed equation across the singular set  $\Gamma_0$  and the portion  $\Gamma_+$  where boundary conditions are

lost. The new problem with fully prescribed boundary conditions can be then treated though the analysis of properties for subsolutions with the aid of Lemmas 3.5, 3.6.

Let us now turn to the proof in detail.

*Proof of Proposition 3.7.* The proof will proceed in five steps.

*Step 1. Localization and boundary flattening.*

Let  $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}_0$  be two open neighborhoods of the point  $(x_0, v_0) \in \Gamma$  such that  $\overline{\mathcal{Q}} \subset U \times B_1(v_0)$  and  $\overline{U} \times \overline{B}_1(v_0) \subset \mathcal{Q}_0$ , for  $U$  given by Lemma 3.9. Take two fixed cut-off functions  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(U \times B_1(v_0))$  and  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{Q}_0)$  both valued in  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\phi|_{\mathcal{Q}} \equiv 1$  and  $\eta|_{U \times B_1(v_0)} \equiv 1$ . A direct computation yields that the function  $F := f\phi$  satisfies

$$(3.7) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)F = \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v F) + B \cdot \nabla_v F + cF + \nabla_v \cdot G_1 + G_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T,$$

where  $G_1, G_0$  are given by

$$G_1 := -Af \nabla_v \phi, \quad G_0 := -(A \nabla_v f + Bf) \cdot \nabla_v \phi + f v \cdot \nabla_x \phi + s \phi.$$

In particular,  $G_1, G_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$  are compactly supported in

$$\mathcal{U} := [0, T] \times (U \cap \overline{\Omega}) \times B_1(v_0),$$

and the localized equation (3.7) coincides with the original one (1.1) in  $\mathcal{U} \cap ((0, T) \times \mathcal{Q})$ . Applying the local energy estimate given by Lemma 3.3 with  $\eta$  picked above, we have

$$(3.8) \quad \|G_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} + \|G_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} \lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} + \|s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} + \|g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e, d\mu)}.$$

Let us abbreviate  $z = (t, x, v)$  and  $\bar{z} = (t, y, w)$ . Consider the function  $\overline{F}$  with respect to  $\bar{z}$  and the transformation  $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{W} := \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{U})$  defined by the prescriptions:

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{F} &:= \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) F \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}, \\ \mathcal{S}^{-1} : \bar{z} = (t, y, w) &\mapsto z = (t, x, v) := (t, P(y), P'(y)w). \end{aligned}$$

The Jacobian matrix  $\frac{\partial(x,v)}{\partial(y,w)} = \begin{pmatrix} P' & 0 \\ D_y v & P' \end{pmatrix}$ , thus  $\det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) = (\det(P'))^2$  depends only on the variable  $y$  and is nondegenerate in  $(-R, R)^d$  due to Lemma 3.9. Indeed, it follows from (3.6) that for some universal constant  $\kappa > 1$ ,

$$\kappa^{-2} \leq \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) \leq \kappa^2 \quad \text{for any } y \in (-R, R)^d.$$

This shows that  $\overline{F}$  is well-defined in  $\mathcal{W}$ . Moreover,  $F$  is supported in  $\mathcal{U}$  so that  $\overline{F}$  is supported in  $\mathcal{W}$ .

Regarding to the boundary condition, it now suffices to consider the data on  $\mathcal{U} \cap \Sigma_T^-$ . Let  $y_d := y \cdot e_d$  and  $w_d := w \cdot e_d$ . Notice that for any  $x \in \partial\Omega$ , the outward normal vector  $n_x = \mathbf{n}(\check{y})$ . Using (3.4) and the identity  $(D\mathbf{m})^T \mathbf{n} = 0$ , we have

$$n_x \cdot v = \mathbf{n}^T(D\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{n}) \cdot w = e_d \cdot w = w_d \quad \text{on } \{y_d = 0\},$$

which also means that

$$\{\pm n_x \cdot v < 0, z \in \mathcal{U} \cap \Sigma_T\} \iff \{\pm w_d < 0, y_d = 0, \bar{z} \in \mathcal{W}\}.$$

Therefore, the prescribed boundary value  $g$  for  $F$  on  $\mathcal{U} \cap \Sigma_T^-$  implies the prescribed value  $\bar{g} := \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) (g\phi) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}$  for  $\overline{F}$  on the boundary portion  $\{\bar{z} \in \mathcal{W} : y_d = 0, w_d < 0\}$ .

To derive the equation of  $\bar{F}$ , we take  $\bar{\varphi} \in C_c^1(\mathcal{W})$  and  $\varphi := \bar{\varphi} \circ \mathcal{S}$ . By a change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v \cdot \nabla_x \varphi &= P'w \cdot (P'^{-T} \nabla_y) \bar{\varphi} + P'w \cdot ((D_x w)^T \nabla_w) \bar{\varphi} \\ &= w \cdot \nabla_y \bar{\varphi} + (D_x w) v \cdot \nabla_w \bar{\varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{U} \cap (\{t\} \times \mathcal{O})} F \varphi - \int_{\mathcal{U} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})} F \varphi + \int_{\mathcal{U} \cap \Sigma_T} (n_x \cdot v) F \varphi - \int_{\mathcal{U}} F (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}(\{t\} \times \mathcal{O})} \bar{F} \bar{\varphi} - \int_{\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}(\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})} \bar{F} \bar{\varphi} + \int_{\mathcal{W} \cap \{y_d=0\}} w_d \bar{F} \bar{\varphi} - \int_{\mathcal{W}} \bar{F} (\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) \bar{\varphi} \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathcal{W}} \left[ \bar{\varphi} ((D_x w) v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \cdot \nabla_w \bar{F} + \nabla_w \cdot [((D_x w) v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}] \bar{F} \bar{\varphi} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we notice by its definition that

$$(3.10) \quad \left\| ((D_x w) v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{W})} + \left\| \nabla_w \cdot [((D_x w) v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{W})} \lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^2.$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{U}} (-A \nabla_v F \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + \varphi B \cdot \nabla_v F + c F \varphi - G_1 \cdot \nabla_v \varphi + G_0 \varphi) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{W}} \left[ - (P'^{-1} A P'^{-T}) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \nabla_w \bar{F} \cdot \nabla_w \bar{\varphi} + \bar{\varphi} (P'^{-T} B) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \cdot \nabla_w \bar{F} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + c \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \bar{F} \bar{\varphi} - (P'^{-T} G_1) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \cdot \nabla_w \bar{\varphi} + G_0 \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \bar{\varphi} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In brief, (3.7) is equivalent to the following equation

$$(3.11) \quad (\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) \bar{F} = \nabla_w \cdot (\bar{A} \nabla_w \bar{F}) + \bar{B} \cdot \nabla_w \bar{F} + \bar{c} \bar{F} + \nabla_w \cdot \bar{G}_1 + \bar{G}_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{W},$$

where the new coefficients are defined in  $\mathcal{W}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A} &:= P'^{-1} (A \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}) P'^{-T}, \\ \bar{B} &:= P'^{-T} (B \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}) - ((D_x w) v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}, \\ \bar{c} &:= c \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} - \nabla_w \cdot [((D_x w) v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}], \\ \bar{G}_1 &:= \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) P'^{-T} G_1 \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}, \\ \bar{G}_0 &:= \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) G_0 \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

*Step 2. Extension procedure.*

Consider the extended domain

$$\mathcal{W}^\natural := \mathcal{W} \cup \{ \bar{z} \in \mathcal{S}([0, T] \times U \times B_1(v_0)) : w_d \geq 0 \},$$

and its effective boundary portion

$$\partial_{\text{eff}} \mathcal{W}^\natural := \partial \mathcal{W}^\natural \cap (\{y_d = 0, w_d \leq 0\} \cup \{y_d > 0, w_d = 0\} \cup \{t = 0\}).$$

We denote by  $\partial_y \mathcal{W}^\natural$  and  $\partial_w \mathcal{W}^\natural$  the boundary portions of  $\partial \mathcal{W}^\natural$  with respect to  $y$  and  $w$ , respectively. Extend the coefficients  $\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{c}, \bar{G}_1, \bar{G}_0$  as  $A^\natural, B^\natural, c^\natural, G_1^\natural, G_0^\natural$ , respectively, by




FIGURE 1. The solid dark region is a section of  $\mathcal{W}$ . The corresponding section of  $\mathcal{W}^\natural$  consists of regions with dark color and checkerboard pattern.

setting them in  $\mathcal{W}^\natural \setminus \mathcal{W}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} A^\natural &:= P'^{-1} P'^{-T}, \\ B^\natural &:= -((D_x w)v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}, \\ c^\natural &:= -\nabla_w \cdot [((D_x w)v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}], \\ |G_1^\natural| &= G_0^\natural := 0. \end{aligned}$$

Taking note of (3.8) and (3.10), we see that  $G_1^\natural, G_0^\natural \in L^2(\mathcal{W}^\natural)$ , and there is some universal constant  $K > 1$  such that all the eigenvalues of  $A^\natural$  lie in  $[K^{-1}, K]$ , and  $|B^\natural|, |c^\natural|$  are bounded by  $K\langle v_0 \rangle^2$ .

As shown in Figure 1, this step is devoted to the extension of the solution  $\bar{F}$  from the dark region to the checkerboard area, whose boundary value is prescribed as  $\bar{g}$  on the black border lines (a section of the effective boundary  $\partial_{\text{eff}} \mathcal{W}^\natural$ ) and is identically zero near the gray border lines (due to the localization). This procedure relies on the existence result presented in Lemma 2.5 which will not be applied directly, since the result is valid only for some certain regular boundary data. On account of this, we assume  $g \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{O}_T})$ , which will be removed in the final step.

Based on the assumption that  $g \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{O}_T})$ , by taking  $\tilde{y} := (y_1, \dots, y_{d-1})$  and extending

$$\begin{aligned} g^\natural(\bar{z}) &:= \bar{g}(\bar{z}) = \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) (g\phi) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \quad \text{in } \{y_d \leq 0\} \\ g^\natural(\bar{z}) &:= \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) g \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}(t, \tilde{y}, 0, w) \phi \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \quad \text{in } \{y_d > 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

the function  $\bar{g}$  is extended to a Lipschitz function  $g^\natural \in \mathbb{R}^{1+2d}$ . In view of (3.11) and Lemma 2.5, we get a weak solution  $F^\natural \in L^2(\mathcal{W}^\natural)$  by means of solving the problem

$$(\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) F^\natural = \nabla_w \cdot (A^\natural \nabla_w F^\natural) + B^\natural \cdot \nabla_w F^\natural + c^\natural F^\natural + \nabla_w \cdot G_1^\natural + G_0^\natural \quad \text{in } \mathcal{W}^\natural$$

associated with the boundary condition

$$(3.12) \quad F^\natural = g^\natural \quad \text{on } \partial_{\text{eff}} \mathcal{W}^\natural \quad \text{and} \quad F^\natural = 0 \quad \text{on } (\partial_y \mathcal{W}^\natural \setminus \{y_d = 0\}) \cup (\partial_w \mathcal{W}^\natural \setminus \{w_d = 0\}).$$

Taking the localization  $\phi|_{\mathcal{Q}} \equiv 1$  into account, we achieve in  $\mathcal{W}^{\natural} \cap \mathcal{S}((0, T) \times \mathcal{Q})$  the equation

$$(3.13) \quad (\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) F^{\natural} = \nabla_w \cdot (A^{\natural} \nabla_w F^{\natural}) + B^{\natural} \cdot \nabla_w F^{\natural} + c^{\natural} F^{\natural} + s^{\natural}$$

associated with (3.12), where we set the new source term  $s^{\natural} := \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) s \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}$  in  $\mathcal{W}$  which is extended identically zero outside of  $\mathcal{W}$ .

*Step 3. Local boundedness estimate.*

We now observe that the function  $F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}$  in turn solves the following equation,

$$(3.14) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)(F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}) = \nabla_v \cdot (\underline{A} \nabla_v (F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S})) + \underline{B} \cdot \nabla_v (F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}) \\ + \underline{c} F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S} + \nabla_v \cdot \underline{G}_1 + \underline{G}_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\natural}),$$

where  $\underline{A} := A$ ,  $\underline{B} := B$ ,  $\underline{c} := c$ ,  $\underline{G}_1 := G_1$ ,  $\underline{G}_0 := G_0$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ ; meanwhile,  $\underline{A} := I_d$ , and  $\underline{B}$ ,  $\underline{c}$ ,  $\underline{G}_1$ ,  $\underline{G}_0$  are identically zero in  $\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\natural} \setminus \mathcal{W})$ .

By virtue of Lemma 2.6 and the estimate (3.8), we have

$$(3.15) \quad \|F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\natural}))} \lesssim \|\underline{G}_1\|_{L^2(\mathcal{W})} + \|\underline{G}_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{W})} + \|g^{\natural}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_e))} \\ \lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} + \|s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} + \|g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e, d\mu)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e)}.$$

By setting

$$\underline{F} := (F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S} - M)_+ \quad \text{with } M := \|g^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e)},$$

the function  $\underline{F}$  vanishes on the boundary portion  $\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\partial_{\text{eff}} \mathcal{W}^{\natural})$ . As a consequence of the zero extension for  $\underline{F}$  to the region  $((0, T) \times U \times B_1(v_0)) \setminus \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\natural})$ , and the localization property from  $\phi$ , the function  $\underline{F}$  becomes a subsolution verifying

$$(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) \underline{F} \leq \nabla_v \cdot (\underline{A} \nabla_v \underline{F}) + \underline{B} \cdot \nabla_v \underline{F} + |\underline{c}| \underline{F} + |\underline{c}| M + \underline{s} \quad \text{in } (-1, T) \times \mathcal{Q}.$$

In this manner, every boundary point reduces to the interior one. Let us take  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T \cup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})$ , and pick the constant  $R_0 \in (0, 1]$  such that  $R_0 \approx \langle v_0 \rangle^{-1}$  and  $Q_{2R_0}(z_0) \subset (-1, T] \times \mathcal{Q}$ . Applying Lemma 3.5, along with (3.15), we derive the boundedness of  $F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}$  from above that

$$\sup_{Q_{R_0}(z_0)} F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S} \leq \sup_{Q_{R_0}(z_0)} \underline{F} + M \\ \lesssim \|F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^{\natural}))} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})} + M \\ \lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})} + \|g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e, d\mu)} + M.$$

Similarly as regards the zero extension for the function  $(-F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S} - M)_+$ , we have the boundedness of  $F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}$  from below. Hence, for any  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T \cup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})$ ,

$$(3.16) \quad \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U} \cap Q_{R_0}(z_0))} \leq \|F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{R_0}(z_0))} \\ \lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})} + \|g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e, d\mu)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e)},$$

where we use the fact that  $F^{\natural} \circ \mathcal{S}$  coincides with the original solution  $f$  in  $\mathcal{U}$  owing to the uniqueness result given in Lemma 2.4.

Recalling that  $R_0 \approx \langle v_0 \rangle^{-1}$  and combining (3.16) with Lemma 3.5 applied to  $f$  in the interior region  $\{z \in \mathcal{O}_T : \text{dist}(z, \Sigma_T \cup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})) \geq R_0\}$ , we obtain the estimate (3.1) as claimed.



*Step 4. Zooming in and oscillation decay.*

Let us set  $\bar{z}_0 := \mathcal{S}(z_0) = (t_0, P^{-1}(x_0), P'^{-1}(x_0)v_0)$  for  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T$ , and pick the constant  $r_0 \in (0, 1]$  such that  $r_0 \approx \langle v_0 \rangle^{-2}$  and  $Q_{r_0}(\bar{z}_0) \subset \mathcal{S}(Q_{R_0}(z_0))$ , where we recall that  $Q_{2R_0}(z_0) \subset (-1, T] \times \mathcal{Q}$ . Taking  $\bar{z} := \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}(\tilde{z})$  with  $\tilde{z} := (\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{w}) \in Q_1$  and fixed  $r \in (0, r_0]$ , and regarding to (3.13), we deduce that the equation

$$(\partial_{\tilde{t}} + \tilde{w} \cdot \nabla_{\tilde{y}}) \tilde{F} = \nabla_{\tilde{w}} \cdot (\tilde{A} \nabla_{\tilde{w}} \tilde{F}) + \tilde{B} \cdot \nabla_{\tilde{w}} \tilde{F} + \tilde{c} \tilde{F} + \tilde{s}$$

holds in the defective region  $Q_1 \setminus \{\tilde{z} : y_d > 0, w_d < 0, \text{ or } t < 0\}$ , where we defined

$$\tilde{F} := F^\sharp \circ \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}, \quad \tilde{A} := A^\sharp \circ \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}, \quad \tilde{B} := rB^\sharp \circ \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}, \quad \tilde{c} := r^2 c^\sharp \circ \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}, \quad \tilde{s} := r^2 s^\sharp \circ \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}.$$

Due to the choice of  $r_0$ , the functions  $|\tilde{B}|, |\tilde{c}|, |\tilde{s}|$  are bounded by a universal constant.

For  $r \in (0, r_0]$ , we define

$$M_r := \sup_{\{\tilde{z} \in Q_1 : \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}(\tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_e)\}} \tilde{F}.$$

After extending the function  $(\tilde{F} - M_r)_+$  by zero to the region  $\{\tilde{z} \in Q_1 : y_d > 0, w_d < 0, \text{ or } t < 0\}$ , and normalizing it through

$$F_r := (\sup_{Q_1} (\tilde{F} - M_r)_+ + \lambda^{-1} \|\tilde{s}'\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)})^{-1} (\tilde{F} - M_r)_+ \quad \text{with } \tilde{s}' := \tilde{c} \tilde{F} + \tilde{s},$$

it turns out that the function  $F_r$  is valued in  $[0, 1]$  over  $Q_1$  and satisfies

$$(3.17) \quad (\partial_{\tilde{t}} + \tilde{w} \cdot \nabla_{\tilde{y}}) F_r \leq \nabla_{\tilde{w}} \cdot (\tilde{A} \nabla_{\tilde{w}} F_r) + \tilde{B} \cdot \nabla_{\tilde{w}} F_r + \lambda \quad \text{in } Q_1,$$

where the universal constant  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  is provided in Lemma 3.6.

For  $(x_0, v_0) \in \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_-$ , that is,  $P^{-1}(x_0) \cdot e_d = 0$  and  $P'^{-1}(x_0)v_0 \cdot e_d \leq 0$ , we have

$$y_d = r^3 \tilde{y} \cdot e_d + r^2 \tilde{t} P'^{-1}(x_0)v_0 \cdot e_d \geq 0,$$

whenever  $\tilde{y} \cdot e_d \geq 0$  and  $\tilde{t} \leq 0$ . According to the definition of  $F_r$ , for any  $\sigma, \tau \in (0, 1)$  such that  $Q_\sigma(-\tau, 0, 0) \subset Q_1$ , we derive

$$|\{F_r = 0\} \cap Q_\sigma(-\tau, 0, 0)| \geq \frac{1}{4} |Q_\sigma(-\tau, 0, 0)|.$$

Intuitively,  $F_r$  is extended as a subsolution to the light gray area, and thus vanishes at least a quarter of  $Q_1$ ; see Figure 1. Applying Lemma 3.6 with  $\delta = 1/4$  to the subsolution  $F_r$  of (3.17) then yields that there exist some constants  $\theta, \varrho \in (0, 1)$  such that  $F_r \leq 1 - \theta$  in  $Q_\varrho$ , which is recast as the decrease estimate of supremum that

$$\tilde{F} - M_r \leq (1 - \theta) \sup_{Q_1} \tilde{F} - (1 - \theta) M_r + \lambda^{-1} \|\tilde{s}'\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \quad \text{in } Q_\varrho.$$

Similarly as regards the setting  $(m_r - \tilde{F})_+$  with  $m_r := \inf_{\{\tilde{z} \in Q_1 : \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}(\tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_e)\}} \tilde{F}$ , we have the increase estimate of infimum that

$$m_r - \tilde{F} \leq -(1 - \theta) \inf_{Q_1} \tilde{F} + (1 - \theta) m_r + \lambda^{-1} \|\tilde{s}'\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \quad \text{in } Q_\varrho.$$

Adding them together, we obtain the oscillation decay

$$\begin{aligned} \text{osc}_{Q_\varrho} \tilde{F} &\leq (1 - \theta) \text{osc}_{Q_1} \tilde{F} + \theta (M_r - m_r) + 2\lambda^{-1} \|\tilde{s}'\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \\ &\leq (1 - \theta) \text{osc}_{Q_1} \tilde{F} + \theta \text{osc}_{\{\tilde{z} \in Q_1 : \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r}(\tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_e)\}} \tilde{F} + 2\lambda^{-1} \|\tilde{s}'\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Rescaling back, it reads for any  $r \in (0, r_0]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{osc}_{Q_{\varrho r}(\bar{z}_0)} F^\natural &\leq (1 - \theta) \text{osc}_{Q_r(\bar{z}_0)} F^\natural + \theta \text{osc}_{Q_r(\bar{z}_0) \cap \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_e)} g^\natural \\ &\quad + 2\lambda^{-1} r^2 (\Lambda \|F^\natural\|_{L^\infty(Q_r(\bar{z}_0))} + \|s^\natural\|_{L^\infty(Q_r(\bar{z}_0))}). \end{aligned}$$

According to the standard iterative procedure (see for instance [15, Section 8.10]), there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that for any  $r \in (0, r_0]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.18) \quad \text{osc}_{Q_r(\bar{z}_0)} F^\natural &\lesssim r_0^{-\alpha} r^\alpha \|F^\natural\|_{L^\infty(Q_{r_0}(\bar{z}_0))} + r^\alpha \|s^\natural\|_{L^\infty(Q_{r_0}(\bar{z}_0))} + \text{osc}_{Q_{\sqrt{r_0 r}(\bar{z}_0) \cap \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_e)} \bar{g}} \\ &\lesssim r_0^{-\alpha} r^\alpha \|F^\natural\|_{L^\infty(Q_{r_0}(\bar{z}_0))} + r^\alpha \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})} + r^{\beta/6} [\bar{g}]_{C^\beta(\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_e))}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $(x_0, v_0) \in \Gamma_+$ , that is,  $P^{-1}(x_0) \cdot e_d = 0$  and  $\bar{w}_d := P'^{-1}(x_0)v_0 \cdot e_d > 0$ , these boundary points for the solution  $F^\natural$  of (3.13) reduce to the interior ones directly, for the reason that the interior estimate given by Lemma 3.4 is applicable for solutions to (3.13) in the region  $\mathcal{W}^\natural \cap \mathcal{S}((0, T) \times \mathcal{Q})$ . More precisely, we have, for any  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T^+$  and  $r \in (0, r_0/2]$ ,

$$(3.19) \quad \text{osc}_{Q_r(\bar{z}_0)} F^\natural \lesssim \max\{r_0^{-\alpha}, \bar{w}_d^{-\alpha}\} r^\alpha \|F^\natural\|_{L^\infty(Q_{r_0}(\bar{z}_0))} + r^\alpha \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})}.$$

Applying (3.18) and (3.19) in the cases  $r_0 > \bar{w}_d$  and  $r_0 \leq \bar{w}_d$ , respectively, we see that the Hölder estimate (3.18) holds for any  $\bar{z}_0 = \mathcal{S}(z_0)$  with  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T^+$ . We remark that the estimate around the initial point  $z_0 \in \{0\} \times \mathcal{O}$  also holds through the same zero extension argument; see [38, Corollary 4.6].

We now translate the Hölder estimates for  $F^\natural$  into the ones for  $f$ . Let us abbreviate  $B_r^-(z_0) := (t_0 - r, t_0] \times B_r(x_0) \times B_r(v_0)$ . Since the transformation  $\mathcal{S}$  and its inverse are bounded, for any  $r \in (0, r_0]$ , we have  $B_{\nu^{-1}r}^-(z_0) \subset Q_r(z_0) \subset B_{\nu^{-1}r}^-(z_0)$ , for some universal constant  $\nu \in (0, 1)$ . Recalling the definitions of  $F^\natural$  and  $\bar{F}$  with the fact (3.5), we conclude that there is some constant  $r_1 \in (0, 1]$  such that  $r_1 \approx r_0 \approx \langle v_0 \rangle^{-2}$ , and for any  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T \cup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})$  and  $r \in (0, r_1]$ ,

$$\text{osc}_{\mathcal{U} \cap B_{r_1}^-(z_0)} f \lesssim r_1^{-\alpha} r^\alpha \|F^\natural \circ \mathcal{S}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{R_0}(z_0))} + r^\alpha \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})} + r^{\beta/6} [g]_{C^\beta(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e)}.$$

Gathering this with (3.16) and picking the constant  $\alpha \in (0, \beta/6]$  yield that

$$(3.20) \quad r^{-\alpha} \text{osc}_{\mathcal{U} \cap B_{r_1}^-(z_0)} f \lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1/2} r_1^{-\alpha} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})} + r_1^{-\alpha} \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{U})} + r^{\beta/6-\alpha} [g]_{C^\beta(\mathcal{U} \cap \Gamma_e)}.$$

Together with the interior Hölder estimate in Lemma 3.4, we know that the weak solution  $f$  is Hölder continuous in  $\overline{\mathcal{O}_T}$ . Indeed, for any  $z_0 \in \{z \in \mathcal{O}_T : \text{dist}(z, \Sigma_T \cup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})) \geq r_1\}$ ,

$$(3.21) \quad r_1^\alpha [f]_{C^\alpha(B_{\nu r_1}^-(z_0))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_{r_1}^-(z_0))} + \|s\|_{L^\infty(B_{r_1}^-(z_0))},$$

where we used the same notation of the (universal) constants  $\alpha, \nu \in (0, 1)$ . Now that  $r_1 \approx \langle v_0 \rangle^{-2}$ , we conclude from the above two estimates that for any  $z_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_T}$  and  $r \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} [f]_{C^{\alpha/3}(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_1^-(z_0))} &\lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1/2+2\alpha} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2^-(z_0))} \\ &\quad + \langle v_0 \rangle^{2\alpha} \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2^-(z_0))} + \langle v_0 \rangle^{2\alpha-\beta/3} [g]_{C^\beta(\Gamma_e \cap B_2^-(z_0))}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.2).

*Step 5. Approximation.*

We have to remove the additional assumptions used in the previous steps that the boundary data  $g$  is continuously differentiable. To this end, we approximate  $g$  by a sequence of smooth functions  $\{g_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , which preserves the same regularity as  $g$  on  $\Gamma_e$ . For each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we acquire a continuous weak solution  $f_j$  to (1.1). It follows that (3.20) and (3.21) hold for  $f_j$ , whose right hand sides are bounded independently of  $j$ . With the aid of the maximum principle given by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\|f_i - f_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \lesssim \|g_i - g_j\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_e)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i, j \rightarrow \infty.$$

After passing to a subsequence, the passage  $j \rightarrow \infty$  yields a bounded limiting function  $f_\infty$  of  $f_j$ . By the same argument as in the proof of Corollary 2.7, we know that  $f_\infty = f$  is the unique weak solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f = g$  on  $\Gamma_e$ . In particular, when  $g$  is continuous on  $\Gamma_e$ ,  $f$  is globally continuous over  $\mathcal{O}_T$ . The proof is now complete.  $\square$

### 3.3. Global estimates.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let the constants  $p \geq 1$ ,  $q \geq 0$  be universal, and the function  $f$  be a bounded weak solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  with  $\langle v \rangle^q s \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$  and  $\langle v \rangle^q f|_{\Gamma_e} \in L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)$ . Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle v \rangle^q f^p\|_{C^0([0,T];L^2(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q \nabla_v(f^p)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^q f^p\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{O}_T, d\mu)} \\ & \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q s^p\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^q f^p\|_{L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It is straightforward to check that  $F := f\phi$  and  $S := s\phi$  with  $\phi = \phi(v)$  verifies

$$(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)F = \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v F) + B \cdot \nabla_v F + cF + \nabla_v \cdot G_1 + G_0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T,$$

provided that  $f$  is a weak solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$ , where  $G_1$  and  $G_0$  are given by

$$G_1 := -Af \nabla_v \phi, \quad G_0 := -(A \nabla_v f + Bf) \cdot \nabla_v \phi + S.$$

Let  $\phi := \langle v \rangle^q$ . By noticing that  $\nabla_v \phi = \frac{qv}{\langle v \rangle^2} \phi$ , we acquire

$$f \nabla_v \phi = \frac{qv}{\langle v \rangle^2} F, \quad \frac{qv}{\langle v \rangle^2} \otimes \nabla_v F = \nabla_v \phi \otimes \nabla_v f + \frac{qv}{\langle v \rangle^2} \otimes \frac{qv}{\langle v \rangle^2} F,$$

so that  $G_1$  and  $G_0$  are recast as

$$G_1 = -\frac{qAv}{\langle v \rangle^2} F, \quad G_0 = -\frac{qAv}{\langle v \rangle^2} \cdot \nabla_v F + \frac{q^2 Av \cdot v}{\langle v \rangle^4} F - \frac{qB \cdot v}{\langle v \rangle^2} F + S.$$

According to the uniqueness of weak solutions, it is equivalent to consider the equation

$$(3.22) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x)F = \nabla_v \cdot (A \nabla_v F + B' F) + (B + B') \cdot \nabla_v F + c' F + S \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_T,$$

where the new coefficients  $B'$  and  $c'$ , defined by

$$B' := -\frac{qAv}{\langle v \rangle^2}, \quad c' := c + \frac{q^2 Av \cdot v}{\langle v \rangle^4} - \frac{qB \cdot v}{\langle v \rangle^2},$$

are bounded by a universal constant. By a similar version of Corollary 2.7, we have

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F^p\|_{C^0([0,T];L^2(\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}))} + \|\nabla_v(F^p)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|F^p\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{O}_T, d\mu)} \\ & \lesssim \|S^p\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|F^p\|_{L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)}, \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, taking  $\chi(\iota) = \iota^{2p}$  and  $\varphi = 1$  in the renormalization formula for (3.22) (see an analogue in Lemma 2.3) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathcal{O}} F^{2p} - \int_{\{0\} \times \mathcal{O}} F^{2p} + \int_{\Sigma_t} n_x \cdot v F^{2p} + 2p(2p-1) \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} A F^{2p-2} \nabla_v F \cdot \nabla_v F \\ = 2p \int_{\mathcal{O}_t} [(B + 2B' - 2pB') F^{2p-1} \nabla_v F + c' F^{2p} + S F^{2p-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

The claim then follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Grönwall’s inequality. Replacing  $q$  by  $q/p$  in (3.23) implies the desired result.  $\square$

The following global estimates are direct consequences of Proposition 3.7, with Remark 3.8, and Lemma 3.10.

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let the constants  $q \geq 2d$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  be universal, and the functions  $s$  and  $g$  satisfy  $\langle v \rangle^q s \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} s \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^q g \in L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} g \in L^\infty(\Gamma_e)$ . Then, there exists a unique weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f = g$  on  $\Gamma_e$ , which satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \\ &\quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_e)}. \end{aligned}$$

If additionally  $q > 1/2 + 2d$  and  $g \in C^\beta(\Gamma_e)$ , then there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{O}_T)} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \\ &\quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q g\|_{L^2(\Gamma_e, d\mu)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_e)} + [g]_{C^\beta(\Gamma_e)}. \end{aligned}$$

#### 4. WELL-POSEDNESS AND REGULARITY FOR NONLOCAL REFLECTION BOUNDARY PROBLEMS

This section is devoted to the regularity for solutions to nonlocal reflection problems of (1.1). Let us recall the reflection operator

$$\mathcal{N}f(t, x, v) := \mathcal{M}(t, x, v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t, x, v') (n_x \cdot v')_+ dv' \quad \text{in } \Sigma_T^-,$$

for  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying (1.3). The proof is patterned after the argument from the previous section. We always assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**4.1. A priori estimates.** Due to the same regularization procedure as the one used to deal with the inflow injection case, it is actually sufficient to prove the following lemma about the Hölder regularity of the macroscopic boundary quantity.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let the constants  $p = 2 + 4d$ ,  $q > 1 + d$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  be universal, and the functions  $s, f_{\text{in}}$  satisfy  $\langle v \rangle^q s \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^q f_{\text{in}} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ . Then, for any weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  such that  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\langle v \rangle^{q+1/2} f \in L^p(\mathcal{O}_T)$ , the quantity  $\Upsilon = \Upsilon[f]$ , defined by*

$$\Upsilon[f](t, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t, x, v) (n_x \cdot v)_+ dv, \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \partial\Omega,$$

satisfies that for any  $\tau \in (0, T]$  with  $\mathcal{I}_t^\tau := [\max\{0, \tau - t\}, \tau]$ , we have

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Upsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times \partial\Omega)} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{q+1} f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \\ &\quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap (\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O}))}; \end{aligned}$$

if additionally  $f_{\text{in}} \in C^\beta(\mathcal{O})$ , then there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$(4.2) \quad [\Upsilon]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times \partial\Omega)} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + [f]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap (\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O}))}.$$

*Proof.* We use the notation for the boundary flattening introduced in Lemma 3.9. Recall that the diffeomorphism  $P : (-R, R)^{d-1} \times (-R, 0] \rightarrow U \cap \bar{\Omega}$ ,  $y \mapsto x$ , with the constant  $R \in (0, 1]$ , is defined in (3.3); the transformation  $\mathcal{S} : (t, x, v) \mapsto (t, y, w)$  is defined in (3.9). Let us set

$$\bar{f} := f \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \quad \text{in } \bar{\mathcal{O}}_T.$$

For  $\xi = (t, \check{y}, 0) \in [0, T] \times (-R, R)^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ , the quantity  $\Upsilon$  can be expressed as

$$\Upsilon(t, P(\check{y}, 0)) = |(D\psi(\check{y}), 1)| \int_{\{w_d > 0\}} \bar{f}(\xi, w) w_d dw.$$

We thus have to acquire the regularity of the integrand above, which is expected due to the presence of the weight  $w_d$ . For fixed constant  $\tau \in (0, T]$ , we abbreviate the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z} &:= \mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times (U \cap \Omega) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \Xi &:= \mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times (-R/4, R/4)^{d-1} \times \{0\}, \\ \Pi &:= \mathcal{I}_{3/2}^\tau \times (-R/2, R/2)^{d-1} \times (-R/2, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

For  $y_d = 0$  and  $w_d \geq 1$ , we are away from the grazing set. By using the facts that  $q > 1 + d$  and the boundedness of  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{S}^{-1}$ , and applying Proposition 3.7 with  $p = 2 + 4d$ , we deduce that

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \int_{\{w_d \geq 1\}} |\bar{f}(\xi, w)| w_d dw &\lesssim \sup_{(\xi, w) \in \Pi, w_d \geq 1} |\langle w \rangle^q \bar{f}(\xi, w)| \\ &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{q+1} f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{Z})} + \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Z})} + \|\langle v \rangle^q f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{Z})}; \end{aligned}$$

moreover, there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{\xi \neq \xi' \in \Xi} \int_{\{w_d \geq 1\}} |\xi - \xi'|^{-\alpha} |\bar{f}(\xi, w) - \bar{f}(\xi', w)| w_d dw &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Z})} \\ &\quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Z})} + [f]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{Z})}. \end{aligned}$$

It now suffices to derive the regularity of  $\bar{f}(\xi, w)$ , with the weight  $w_d$ , near the grazing set, that is,  $y_d = 0$  and  $w_d \in (0, 1)$ . To this end, we consider an arbitrary fixed point  $\hat{z} := (\hat{\xi}, \hat{w}) \in \Xi \times \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\hat{w}_d := \hat{w} \cdot e_d \in (0, 1)$ . Based on the proof of Proposition 3.7 (see the derivation of the estimates (3.16), (3.19) and (3.20)) with the dilation argument, for  $r_0 := \hat{w}_d / (2\langle \hat{w} \rangle^2)$ , we know the local boundedness estimate from  $L^p$  to  $L^\infty$  with  $p = 2 + 4d$  that

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{f}\|_{L^\infty(\Pi \cap Q_{r_0}(\hat{z}))} &\lesssim \langle \hat{w} \rangle^{1/2} r_0^{-1} \|\bar{f}\|_{L^p(\Pi \cap Q_{2r_0}(\hat{z}))} \\ &\quad + \|s \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Pi \cap Q_{2r_0}(\hat{z}))} + \|f \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap \Pi \cap Q_{2r_0}(\hat{z}))}. \end{aligned}$$

and there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1/3)$  such that for any  $r \in (0, r_0]$ ,

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} r^{-3\alpha} \operatorname{osc}_{(\xi, w) \in \Pi \cap Q_r(\hat{z})} \bar{f}(\xi, w) &\lesssim \langle \hat{w} \rangle^{1/2} r_1^{-3\alpha} \|\bar{f}\|_{L^\infty(\Pi \cap Q_{2r}(\hat{z}))} \\ &+ r_1^{-3\alpha} \|s \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Pi \cap Q_{2r}(\hat{z}))} + [f \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap \Pi \cap Q_{2r}(\hat{z}))}. \end{aligned}$$

It turns out from (4.5) and the arbitrariness of  $\hat{z} \in \Xi \times \{\hat{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \hat{w}_d \in (0, 1)\}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \int_{\{\hat{w}_d \in (0, 1)\}} |\bar{f}(\xi, w)| w_d dw &\lesssim \sup_{(\xi, w) \in \Pi, w_d \in (0, 1)} |\langle w \rangle^{q-2} \bar{f}(\xi, w) w_d| \\ &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{q+1/2} f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{Z})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Z})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2} f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{Z})}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (4.3) then yields the boundedness estimate (4.1) for  $\Upsilon$ .

To obtain the Hölder estimate for  $\Upsilon$ , we apply (4.6) so that for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $w_d \in (0, 1)$  and  $r_1 := w_d/(2\langle w \rangle^2)$ , and any  $\xi, \xi' \in \Xi$  such that  $0 < |\xi - \xi'| \leq \nu r_1^3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w \rangle^{q-2} |\xi - \xi'|^{-\alpha} |\bar{f}(\xi, w) - \bar{f}(\xi', w)| w_d &\lesssim \sup_{(\xi, w) \in \Pi, w_d \in (0, 2)} |\langle w \rangle^{q-3/2+6\alpha} \bar{f}(\xi, w) w_d^{1-3\alpha}| \\ &+ \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2+6\alpha} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Z})} + [f]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{Z})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant  $\nu \in (0, 1)$  is universal. In addition, it is straightforward to check that for any  $w_d \in (0, 1)$  and  $|\xi - \xi'| > \nu r_1^3$ ,

$$\langle w \rangle^{q-2} |\xi - \xi'|^{-\alpha} |\bar{f}(\xi, w) - \bar{f}(\xi', w)| w_d \lesssim \sup_{(\xi, w) \in \Pi, w_d \in (0, 1)} |\langle w \rangle^{q-2+6\alpha} \bar{f}(\xi, w) w_d^{1-3\alpha}|.$$

Gathering the above two estimates and supposing  $\alpha \leq 1/6$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\xi \neq \xi' \in \Xi} \int_{\{\hat{w}_d \in (0, 1)\}} |\xi - \xi'|^{-\alpha} |\bar{f}(\xi, w) - \bar{f}(\xi', w)| w_d dw \\ \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{q-1/2} f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Z})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-1} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Z})} + [f]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{Z})}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.4), we arrive at (4.2). This concludes the proof.  $\square$

The following local-in-time estimate is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 4.1.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Assume that the constants  $q > 1 + d$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ ,  $m \geq 0$  are universal, and the functions  $s, f_{\text{in}}$  satisfy  $\langle v \rangle^{m+q} s \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^{m+q} f_{\text{in}} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ . Let  $f$  be a weak solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{N}f$  in  $\Sigma_T^-$ , and  $\langle v \rangle^{m+(1+2d)(q+1)} f \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$ . Then, for any  $\tau \in (0, T]$  with  $\mathcal{I}_t^\tau := [\max\{0, \tau - t\}, \tau]$ ,*

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(1+2d)(q+1)} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \\ &+ \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap (\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O}))}; \end{aligned}$$

*if additionally  $f_{\text{in}} \in C^\beta(\mathcal{O})$  satisfies the compatibility condition  $\gamma_- f_{\text{in}} = \gamma_- \mathcal{N}f_{\text{in}}$ , then there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that*

$$(4.8) \quad [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + [f]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap (\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O}))}.$$

*Proof.* The combination of Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 4.1 implies that for the constant  $p := 2 + 4d$  and for any  $\tau \in (0, T]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q+1} f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \\ & + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap (\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O}))}. \end{aligned}$$

To derive the estimate from  $L^2$  to  $L^\infty$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q+1} f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} & \leq \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})}^{(p-2)/p} \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(q+1)p/2} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})}^{2/p} \\ & \lesssim \epsilon \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + \epsilon^{-2/(p-2)} \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(q+1)p/2} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing  $\epsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, we obtain for some universal constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + C \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(q+1)p/2} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \\ & + C \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + C \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap (\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O}))}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\mathcal{I}_2^\tau = \mathcal{I}_1^\tau$  for  $\tau \in (0, 1]$ , and  $\mathcal{I}_2^\tau = \mathcal{I}_1^\tau \cup \mathcal{I}_1^{\tau-1}$  for  $\tau \in [1, T]$ . We thus conclude that for any  $\tau \in (0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(q+1)p/2} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} \\ & + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap (\mathcal{I}_2^\tau \times \mathcal{O}))}, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly (4.7) as asserted.

Besides, the Hölder estimate (4.8) is given by Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 4.1 directly. We point out that the compatibility condition  $\gamma_- f_{\text{in}} = \gamma_- \mathcal{N} f_{\text{in}}$  plays a role in verifying the Hölder continuity of  $f|_{\Gamma_e}$  near the initial time. The proof is complete.  $\square$

## 4.2. Well-posedness result.

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let the constants  $q > d + 2$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ ,  $m \geq q$ ,  $l > m + (1 + 2d)q + d/2$  be universal, and the functions  $s, f_{\text{in}}$  satisfy  $\langle v \rangle^l s \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^l f_{\text{in}} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ . Then, there exists a unique bounded weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{N} f$  in  $\Sigma_T^-$ , which satisfies*

$$(4.9) \quad \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(1+2d)q} f\|_{C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{O}))} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^l s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^l f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})};$$

*if additionally  $f_{\text{in}} \in C^\beta(\mathcal{O})$  satisfies  $\gamma_- f_{\text{in}} = \gamma_- \mathcal{N} f_{\text{in}}$ , then there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that*

$$(4.10) \quad [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{O}_T)} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^l s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^l f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + [f_{\text{in}}]_{C^\beta(\mathcal{O})}.$$

**Remark 4.4.** The range of the constants  $q, l$  above are not optimal.

*Proof.* The proof is based on the following iterative scheme of inflow boundary problems. By Corollary 2.7, we assume that  $f_n$  solves (1.1) in  $I_k \times \mathcal{O}$ , for the time interval  $I_k := [k\tau, (k+1)\tau] \cap [0, T]$  with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$f_n|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_- f_{n+1} = \mathcal{N} f_n \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \gamma_- f_0 = 0,$$

where the constant  $\tau \in (0, 1]$  is to be determined. Let us abbreviate  $\mathcal{O}^k := I_k \times \mathcal{O}$ . In addition, we set  $I_{-1} := \{0\}$  and  $\mathcal{O}^{-1} := \{0\} \times \mathcal{O}$  for convenience.



We first have to establish a priori estimates for  $f_n$ . For the constants  $p := 2 + 4d$ ,  $q > 2 + d$ ,  $q_1 > q + d/p$ , applying Lemma 3.10 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{n+1}\|_{C^0(I_k; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{n+1}\|_{L^p(I_k \times \Gamma, |n_x \cdot v|)} \\ & \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{q_1} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}^k)} + \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{n+1}\|_{L^p(\{k\tau\} \times \mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^q \mathcal{N}f_n\|_{L^p(I_k \times \Gamma_-, |n_x \cdot v|)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the operator  $\mathcal{N}$  and Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle v \rangle^q \mathcal{N}f_n\|_{L^p(I_k \times \Gamma_-, |n_x \cdot v|)} \lesssim \tau^{1/p} \|\langle v \rangle^{q_1+1/p} \mathcal{M}\|_{L^\infty(I_k \times \Gamma)} \|\Upsilon[f_n]\|_{L^\infty(I_k \times \partial\Omega)} \\ (4.11) \quad & \lesssim \tau^{1/p} \|\langle v \rangle^q f_n\|_{C^0(I_k \cup I_{k-1}; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \tau^{1/p} \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^\infty((I_k \cup I_{k-1}) \times \mathcal{O})} \\ & \quad + \tau^{1/p} \|\langle v \rangle^q f_n\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{O}^{k-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two estimates and choosing  $\tau$  sufficiently small yields that for some universal constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{n+1}\|_{C^0(I_k; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{n+1}\|_{L^p(I_k \times \Gamma, |n_x \cdot v|)} \\ (4.12) \quad & \leq C \|\langle v \rangle^{q_1} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + C \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{n+1}\|_{L^p(\{k\tau\} \times \mathcal{O})} + \frac{1}{2} \|\langle v \rangle^q f_n\|_{C^0(I_k; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} \\ & \quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q f_n\|_{C^0(I_{k-1}; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q f_n\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap \mathcal{O}^{k-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to derive the convergence for  $f_n$ , we observe that the function  $f_{n+1} - f_n$  also solves (1.1) in  $I_k \times \mathcal{O}$  associated with  $s = 0$ ,

$$(f_n - f_{n-1})|_{t=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_-(f_{n+1} - f_n) = \mathcal{N}(f_n - f_{n-1}) \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}_+.$$

It then follows from (4.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{C^0(I_k; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^p(I_k \times \Gamma, |n_x \cdot v|)} \\ (4.13) \quad & \leq C \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^p(\{k\tau\} \times \mathcal{O})} + \frac{1}{2} \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_n - f_{n-1})\|_{C^0(I_k; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} \\ & \quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_n - f_{n-1})\|_{C^0(I_{k-1}; L^p(\mathcal{O}))}. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, with the aid of the energy estimate given by Lemma 3.10 (with  $p = 1$  and  $q = 0$ ), as well as (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_v (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}^k)} \lesssim \|\mathcal{N}(f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^2(I_k \times \Gamma_-, |n_x \cdot v|)} + \|f_{n+1} - f_n\|_{L^2(\{k\tau\} \times \mathcal{O})} \\ (4.14) \quad & \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_n - f_{n-1})\|_{C^0(I_k; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^p(\{k\tau\} \times \mathcal{O})}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, from (4.13) and (4.14) with  $k = 0$ , we obtain by an iteration

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_v (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}^0)} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{C^0(I_0; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} \\ (4.15) \quad & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_n - f_{n-1})\|_{C^0(I_0; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_1 - f_0)\|_{C^0(I_0; L^p(\mathcal{O}))}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (4.12), the right hand side tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We conclude the convergence of  $f_n$  in  $C^0(I_0; L^p(\mathcal{O}, \langle v \rangle^{pq}))$  and in  $L^2(I_0 \times \Omega; H^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . We remark that the boundary identity  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{N}f$  as the limit of  $\gamma_- f_{n-1} = \mathcal{N}f_n$  on  $I_0 \times \Gamma_-$  make sense, owing to (4.13). To proceed the convergence of  $f_n$  in  $\mathcal{O}^1$ , we gather the estimates (4.13), (4.14), (4.15) to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_v (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}^1)} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_n - f_{n-1})\|_{C^0(I_1; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_{n+1} - f_n)\|_{L^p(\{\tau\} \times \mathcal{O})} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_{n-1} - f_{n-2})\|_{C^0(I_1; L^p(\mathcal{O}))} + \frac{C}{2^n} \|\langle v \rangle^q (f_1 - f_0)\|_{C^0(I_0; L^p(\mathcal{O}))}. \end{aligned}$$

By iterating and sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we acquire the solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $(I_1 \cup I_0) \times \mathcal{O}$ . The global solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  is then constructed by applying such arguments repeatedly.

Next, by Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 4.2, we get the global boundedness estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^m f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(1+2d)q} f\|_{C^0([0,T];L^2(\mathcal{O}))} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(1+2d)q} s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} \\ &+ \|\langle v \rangle^{m+(1+2d)q} f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{m+q} f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.9) with the constant  $l > m + (1 + 2d)q + d/2$ . The global Hölder estimate (4.10) is also given by Proposition 4.2.

Let us finally show the uniqueness for the weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  with  $s = f_{\text{in}} = 0$  and  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{N}f$ . Using Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 4.2 yields that for any  $t \in (0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^{(2+2d)q} f\|_{C^0([0,t];L^2(\mathcal{O}))} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{(2+2d)q} \mathcal{N}f\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t^-, |n_x \cdot v|)} \\ &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{(2+2d)q+(1+d)/2} \mathcal{M}\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_t)} \|\langle v \rangle^q f\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_t)} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^{(2+2d)q} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_t)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Grönwall's inequality, we get  $f = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  so that see the uniqueness of solutions in the class  $C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{O}, \langle v \rangle^{(4+4d)q}))$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. REGULARITY FOR SPECULAR REFLECTION BOUNDARY PROBLEMS

The proof of the regularity in the specular reflection problems for (1.1) is in the same spirit of that in [17] by means of a mirror extension technique. The solution to (1.1) can be extended outside of the domain directly as a solution to a modified equation. The treatment of this type of boundary condition is thus simpler than the cases that we have already addressed. As in the previous two sections, we still assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded  $C^{1,1}$ -domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Assume that the constants  $\beta, \epsilon \in (0, 1]$  are universal, and the functions  $s \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$ ,  $f_{\text{in}} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ . Let  $f$  be a weak solution to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{R}f$  in  $\Sigma_T^-$ . Then, for any  $z_0 = (t_0, x_0, v_0) \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_T}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_1(z_0))} &\lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^{1+2d} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} \\ &+ \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(\{t=0\} \cap B_2(z_0))}; \end{aligned}$$

*if additionally  $f_{\text{in}} \in C^\beta(\mathcal{O})$  satisfies the compatibility condition  $\gamma_- f_{\text{in}} = \gamma_- \mathcal{R}f_{\text{in}}$ , then there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_1(z_0))} &\lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} \\ &+ \langle v_0 \rangle^\epsilon \|s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T \cap B_2(z_0))} + [f]_{C^\beta(\{t=0\} \cap B_2(z_0))}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We first point out that the results of existence and uniqueness for the weak solution  $f$  have been proved in Corollary 2.9; moreover, we know that the trace  $\gamma f$  is well-defined in  $L^\infty(\Sigma_T)$ . Let us now reduce the regularity estimate near  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T$  to the interior one by means of the mirror extension technique. Recall the coordinates  $z = (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times U \times B_1(v_0)$ , and the transformation  $\mathcal{S} : z \mapsto \bar{z} = (t, y, w)$  defined in (3.9); see also Lemma 3.9. Let

$$\mathcal{U} := [0, T] \times (U \cap \bar{\Omega}) \times B_1(v_0), \quad \mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{S}([0, T] \times U \times B_1(v_0)).$$

To extend the solution  $f$  of  $z \in \mathcal{U}$ , we define the function  $\hat{f}$  of  $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Y}$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f} &:= \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) f \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d \leq 0\}, \\ \hat{f} &:= \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) f \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{R}_m \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d > 0\},\end{aligned}$$

where we set the mirror reflection operator

$$\mathcal{R}_m(t, y, w) := (t, \check{y}, -y_d, \check{w}, -w_d).$$

Regarding to the boundary condition, by recalling (3.4) and the identity  $(D\mathbf{m})^T \mathbf{n} = 0$ , we have, for any  $\check{y} \in (-R, R)^{d-1}$  and  $w = (\check{w}, w_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}P'(\check{y}, 0)(\check{w}, -w_d) &= (D\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{n})(\check{w}, -w_d)^T = D\mathbf{m} \check{w} - w_d \mathbf{n} \\ &= \mathcal{R}_x(D\mathbf{m} \check{w} + w_d \mathbf{n}) = \mathcal{R}_x(P'(\check{y}, 0)w),\end{aligned}$$

where the specular reflection operator  $\mathcal{R}_x$  on  $\partial\Omega$  is defined by  $\mathcal{R}_x u := u - 2(n_x \cdot u)n_x$  for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Together with the boundary condition for  $f$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(5.1) \quad f \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{R}_m(\bar{z}) &= f(t, P(\check{y}, 0), P'(\check{y}, 0)(\check{w}, -w_d)) \\ &= f(t, x, \mathcal{R}_x v) = f(t, x, v) = f \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\bar{z}),\end{aligned}$$

which roughly means that  $\hat{f}$  is continuous across  $\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d = 0\}$ .

We are now able to perform the same derivation as for (3.11) in Step 1 of Subsection 3.2. Indeed, it turns out that for any  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathcal{Y})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}& \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d < 0\} \cap (\{t\} \times \mathcal{O})} \hat{f} \varphi - \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d < 0\} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})} \hat{f} \varphi + \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d = 0\}} w_d \hat{f} \varphi \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d < 0\}} \left[ \hat{f}(\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) - \bar{A} \nabla_w \hat{f} \cdot \nabla_w + \bar{B} \cdot \nabla_w \hat{f} + \bar{c} \hat{f} + \bar{s} \right] \varphi,\end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients  $\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{c}, \bar{s}$  are defined in the region  $\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d \leq 0\}$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{A} &:= P'^{-1}(A \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1})P'^{-T}, \\ \bar{B} &:= P'^{-T}B \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} - ((D_x w)v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}, \\ \bar{c} &:= c \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} - \nabla_w \cdot [((D_x w)v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}], \\ \bar{s} &:= \det(\partial z / \partial \bar{z}) s \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

On account of this, applying change of variables twice with the relation that  $\mathcal{R}_m \circ \mathcal{R}_m = \text{id}$ , as well as using the boundary condition (5.1), yields that

$$\begin{aligned}& \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d > 0\} \cap (\{t\} \times \mathcal{O})} \hat{f} \varphi - \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d > 0\} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})} \hat{f} \varphi - \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d = 0\}} w_d \hat{f} \varphi \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d < 0\} \cap (\{t\} \times \mathcal{O})} \hat{f} \varphi \circ \mathcal{R}_m - \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d < 0\} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})} \hat{f} \varphi \circ \mathcal{R}_m + \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d = 0\}} w_d \hat{f} \varphi \circ \mathcal{R}_m \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d < 0\}} \left[ \hat{f}(\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) - \bar{A} \nabla_w \hat{f} \cdot \nabla_w + \bar{B} \cdot \nabla_w \hat{f} + \bar{c} \hat{f} + \bar{s} \right] \varphi \circ \mathcal{R}_m \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d > 0\}} \left[ \hat{f}(\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) - \hat{A} \nabla_w \hat{f} \cdot \nabla_w + \hat{B} \cdot \nabla_w \hat{f} + \hat{c} \hat{f} + \hat{s} \right] \varphi,\end{aligned}$$

where with the notation of the  $d \times d$  diagonal matrix  $J := \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, -1)$ , we extended the coefficients  $\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{c}, \bar{s}$  as  $\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{c}, \hat{s}$  to the region  $\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d > 0\}$  by setting

$$\hat{A} := J(\bar{A} \circ \mathcal{R}_m)J, \quad \hat{B} := J\bar{B} \circ \mathcal{R}_m, \quad \hat{c} := \bar{c} \circ \mathcal{R}_m, \quad \hat{s} := \bar{s} \circ \mathcal{R}_m.$$

In view of the above two formulations valid in  $\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d < 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \cap \{y_d > 0\}$ , we conclude

$$(5.2) \quad (\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla_y) \hat{f} = \nabla_w \cdot (\hat{A} \nabla_w \hat{f}) + \hat{B} \cdot \nabla_w \hat{f} + \hat{c} \hat{f} + \hat{s} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Y}.$$

By definition, it is readily checked that

$$\|((D_x w)v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Y})} + \|\nabla_w \cdot [((D_x w)v) \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1}]\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{Y})} \lesssim \langle v_0 \rangle^2.$$

We thus see that all the eigenvalues of  $\hat{A}$  lie in  $[K^{-1}, K]$ , and  $|\hat{B}|, |\hat{c}|$  are bounded by  $K\langle v_0 \rangle^2$ , for some universal constant  $K > 1$ .

We next sketch the remaining part of the proof. As with the previous inflow problems, we have to take care of the coefficients of lower order terms. To derive the equation with coefficients bounded independent of  $\langle v_0 \rangle$ , we consider the constant  $r_0 \approx \langle v_0 \rangle^{-2}$  such that  $Q_{2r_0}(z_0) \subset \mathcal{U}$ . Then, the function  $\hat{F} := \hat{f} \circ \mathcal{T}_{\bar{z}_0, r_0}$  with  $\bar{z}_0 := \mathcal{S}(z_0)$  solves the same type equation as (5.2) in  $Q_2$ ; see the same argument as in Step 4 of Subsection 3.2. Using the interior estimate given by Lemma 3.4 yields the Hölder estimate of  $\hat{f}$  in  $B_{r_0}(z_0)$  for any  $z_0 \in \Sigma_T \cup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})$ , which in turn gives the same regularity for  $f$ . Combining this with Lemma 3.4 applied to  $f$  in the interior region  $\{z \in \mathcal{O}_T : \text{dist}(z, \Sigma_T \cup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{O})) \geq r_0\}$ , we obtain the Hölder estimate of  $f$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{O}_T}$ . We finally remark that the treatment around the initial point  $z_0 \in \{0\} \times \mathcal{O}$  is the same as the one in Step 4 of Subsection 3.2; see also [38, Corollary 4.6]. The  $C^\beta$ -Hölder regularity of  $\hat{f}|_{t=0}$  requires the conditions  $f_{\text{in}} \in C^\beta(\mathcal{O})$  and  $\gamma_- f_{\text{in}} = \gamma_- \mathcal{R} f_{\text{in}}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

By the same derivations as Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 3.11 for the inflow boundary problems, we have the following global estimates for specular reflection boundary problems.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let the constants  $q > 0$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  be universal, and the functions  $s$  and  $f_{\text{in}}$  satisfy  $\langle v \rangle^q s \in L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)$  and  $\langle v \rangle^q f_{\text{in}} \in L^2(\mathcal{O})$ . Then, there exists a unique weak solution  $f$  to (1.1) in  $\mathcal{O}_T$  associated with  $f|_{t=0} = f_{\text{in}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\gamma_- f = \mathcal{R} f$  in  $\Sigma_T^-$ , which satisfies*

$$\|\langle v \rangle^q f\|_{C^0([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\langle v \rangle^q \nabla_v f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} \lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)}.$$

Furthermore, if  $q \geq 2d$ ,  $\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} s \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)$  and  $\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} f_{\text{in}} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \\ &\quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}; \end{aligned}$$

and if  $q > 2d$  and  $f_{\text{in}} \in C^\beta(\mathcal{O})$  with  $\gamma_- f_{\text{in}} = \gamma_- \mathcal{R} f_{\text{in}}$ , then there is some universal constant  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} + [f]_{C^\alpha(\mathcal{O}_T)} &\lesssim \|\langle v \rangle^q s\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_T)} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} s\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_T)} \\ &\quad + \|\langle v \rangle^q f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})} + \|\langle v \rangle^{q-2d} f_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + [f_{\text{in}}]_{C^\beta(\mathcal{O})}. \end{aligned}$$

## APPENDIX A. OPTIMALITY OF THE HÖLDER CLASS

We show the optimality of the Hölder class for classical solutions to (1.1) with constant coefficients and the absorbing boundary condition. Through the description in [22, Claim 3.7], we make the construction here for the sake of completeness.

Consider the steady Fokker-Planck equation

$$(A.1) \quad v \partial_x f(x, v) = \partial_v^2 f(x, v), \quad (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R},$$

with the absorbing boundary condition on  $\{x = 0, v > 0\}$ , that is,  $f(0, v) = 0$  for  $v > 0$ .

The goal is to construct the solution of the type  $f(x, v) = x^{\frac{1}{6}} \Psi(\tau)$  with  $\tau = -\frac{v^3}{9x}$ , for the ansatz  $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Plugging it into (A.1) yields so-called Kummer's equation

$$\tau \Psi''(\tau) + \left(\frac{2}{3} - \tau\right) \Psi'(\tau) + \frac{1}{6} \Psi(\tau) = 0,$$

whose two linearly independent solutions are  $M(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{2}{3}, \tau)$  and  $\tau^{\frac{1}{3}} M(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{4}{3}, \tau)$ , for Kummer's function  $M$ ; see [36, Chapter 6]. Tricomi's function  $\Psi(\tau) = \Psi(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{2}{3}, \tau)$  is then given by their linear combination,

$$(A.2) \quad \Psi(\tau) := \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{3})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{6})} M\left(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{2}{3}, \tau\right) + \frac{\Gamma(-\frac{1}{3})}{\Gamma(-\frac{1}{6})} \tau^{\frac{1}{3}} M\left(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{4}{3}, \tau\right),$$

where  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the Gamma function. We have to use the asymptotic expansion of  $M, \Psi$  when  $|\tau| \rightarrow \infty$ ; see for instance [36, Section 6.6]. On the one hand, for  $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} M\left(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{2}{3}, \tau\right) &= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2}{3})}{\Gamma(\frac{5}{6})} |\tau|^{\frac{1}{6}} [1 + O(|\tau|^{-1})], \\ \tau^{\frac{1}{3}} M\left(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{4}{3}, \tau\right) &= -\frac{\Gamma(\frac{4}{3})}{\Gamma(\frac{7}{6})} |\tau|^{\frac{1}{6}} [1 + O(|\tau|^{-1})]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Gamma(\frac{1}{3}) \Gamma(\frac{2}{3}) = -\Gamma(-\frac{1}{3}) \Gamma(\frac{4}{3})$  and  $\Gamma(\frac{1}{6}) \Gamma(\frac{5}{6}) = -\Gamma(-\frac{1}{6}) \Gamma(\frac{7}{6})$ , we see that the leading terms cancel out for  $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$  so that  $\Psi(\tau) = O(|\tau|^{-\frac{5}{6}})$ , which implies

$$f(x, v) = O(xv^{-\frac{5}{2}}), \quad \text{for } x^{-1}v^3 \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular,  $f(0, v) = 0$  for  $v > 0$ . On the other hand, for  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , the asymptotic expansion of Tricomi's function  $\Psi$  directly yields

$$\Psi(\tau) = |\tau|^{\frac{1}{6}} [1 + O(|\tau|^{-1})],$$

and hence

$$f(x, v) = 3^{-\frac{1}{3}} |v|^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(xv^{-\frac{5}{2}}), \quad \text{for } x^{-1}v^3 \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Besides, Kummer's functions  $M(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{2}{3}, \cdot)$  and  $M(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{4}{3}, \cdot)$  are analytic on  $\mathbb{R}$ . It then follows from (A.2) that the solution  $f(x, v) = x^{\frac{1}{6}} \Psi(-\frac{v^3}{9x})$  is analytic for  $x > 0$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}$ . It also turns out that for any  $x \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $v \rightarrow 0$  such that  $x^{-1}v^3$  is bounded, we have  $f(x, v) = O(x^{\frac{1}{6}})$ ; more precisely, supposing  $-\frac{v^3}{9x} \rightarrow c_0$ , then

$$f(x, v) = x^{\frac{1}{6}} \Psi(c_0) + o(x^{\frac{1}{6}}).$$

Therefore, we conclude that the solution  $f(x, v)$  to (A.1) is not of the class  $C_{x,v}^{\alpha_x, \alpha_v}$  near the boundary  $\{x = 0\}$  for any  $\alpha_x > \frac{1}{6}$  or  $\alpha_v > \frac{1}{2}$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Dallas Albritton, Scott Armstrong, Jean-Christophe Mourrat, and Matthew Novack. Variational methods for the kinetic Fokker–Planck equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04037*, 2021.
- [2] Claude Bardos. Problèmes aux limites pour les équations aux dérivées partielles du premier ordre à coefficients réels; théorèmes d’approximation; application à l’équation de transport. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 3:185–233, 1970.
- [3] Jean-Michel Bismut. The hypoelliptic Laplacian on the cotangent bundle. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18(2):379–476, 2005.
- [4] Adel Blouza and Hervé Le Dret. An up-to-the-boundary version of Friedrichs’s lemma and applications to the linear Koiter shell model. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 33(4):877–895, 2001.
- [5] Franck Boyer. Trace theorems and spatial continuity properties for the solutions of the transport equation. *Differential Integral Equations*, 18(8):891–934, 2005.
- [6] José A. Carrillo. Global weak solutions for the initial-boundary-value problems to the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 21(10):907–938, 1998.
- [7] Carlo Cercignani, Reinhard Illner, and Mario Pulvirenti. *The mathematical theory of dilute gases*, volume 106 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [8] Michel Cessenat. Théorèmes de trace pour des espaces de fonctions de la neutronique. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 300(3):89–92, 1985.
- [9] Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar. Stochastic problems in physics and astronomy. *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 15:1–89, 1943.
- [10] Björn E. J. Dahlberg and Carlos E. Kenig. Hardy spaces and the Neumann problem in  $L^p$  for Laplace’s equation in Lipschitz domains. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 125(3):437–465, 1987.
- [11] Ennio De Giorgi. Sulla differenziabilità e l’analiticità delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari. *Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. (3)*, 3:25–43, 1957.
- [12] Ronald J. DiPerna and Pierre-Louis Lions. Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 98(3):511–547, 1989.
- [13] Hongjie Dong, Yan Guo, and Timur Yastrzhembskiy. Kinetic Fokker-Planck and Landau equations with specular reflection boundary condition. *Kinetic & Related Models*, 15(3):467–516, 2022.
- [14] Gaetano Fichera. Sulle equazioni differenziali lineari ellittico-paraboliche del secondo ordine. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Mem. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Sez. Ia (8)*, 5:1–30, 1956.
- [15] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [16] François Golse, Cyril Imbert, Clément Mouhot, and Alexis F. Vasseur. Harnack inequality for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations with rough coefficients and application to the Landau equation. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 19(1):253–295, 2019.
- [17] Yan Guo, Hyung Ju Hwang, Jin Woo Jang, and Zhimeng Ouyang. The Landau equation with the specular reflection boundary condition. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 236(3):1389–1454, 2020.
- [18] Yan Guo, Chanwoo Kim, Daniela Tonon, and Ariane Trescases. Regularity of the Boltzmann equation in convex domains. *Invent. Math.*, 207(1):115–290, 2017.
- [19] Kamel Hamdache. Initial-boundary value problems for the Boltzmann equation: global existence of weak solutions. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 119(4):309–353, 1992.
- [20] Christopher Henderson and Stanley Snelson.  $C^\infty$  smoothing for weak solutions of the inhomogeneous Landau equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 236(1):113–143, 2020.
- [21] Lars Hörmander. Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Math.*, 119:147–171, 1967.
- [22] Hyung Ju Hwang, Juhi Jang, and Juan J. L. Velázquez. The Fokker-Planck equation with absorbing boundary conditions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 214(1):183–233, 2014.
- [23] David S. Jerison. The Dirichlet problem for the Kohn Laplacian on the Heisenberg group. II. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 43:224–257, 1981.
- [24] Mstislav V. Keldyš. On certain cases of degeneration of equations of elliptic type on the boundary of a domain. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)*, 77:181–183, 1951.
- [25] Chanwoo Kim. Formation and propagation of discontinuity for Boltzmann equation in non-convex domains. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 308(3):641–701, 2011.
- [26] Joseph J. Kohn and Louis Nirenberg. Non-coercive boundary value problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 18:443–492, 1965.

- [27] Andreï N. Kolmogoroff. Zufällige Bewegungen (zur Theorie der Brownschen Bewegung). *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 35(1):116–117, 1934.
- [28] Olga A. Ladyzhenskaia, Vsevolod A. Solonnikov, and Nina N. Ural'tseva. *Linear and quasi-linear equations of parabolic type. Translated from the Russian by S. Smith*, volume 23. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1968.
- [29] Lev D. Landau. Die kinetische gleichung für den fall coulombscher wechselwirkung. *Phys. Z. Sowjet.*, 10:154–164, 1936.
- [30] James Clerk Maxwell. On stresses in rarified gases arising from inequalities of temperature. *Philosophical Transactions of the royal society of London*, (170):231–256, 1879.
- [31] Stéphane Mischler. On the trace problem for solutions of the Vlasov equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 25(7-8):1415–1443, 2000.
- [32] Stéphane Mischler. Kinetic equations with Maxwell boundary conditions. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 43(5):719–760, 2010.
- [33] Francis Nier. Boundary conditions and subelliptic estimates for geometric Kramers-Fokker-Planck operators on manifolds with boundaries. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 252(1200):v+144, 2018.
- [34] Olga A. Oleïnik and Evgeniy V. Radkevič. Second order equations with nonnegative characteristic form. In *Mathematical analysis, 1969 (Russian)*, pages 7–252. (errata insert). 1971.
- [35] Giovanni Maria Troianiello. *Elliptic differential equations and obstacle problems*. The University Series in Mathematics. Plenum Press, New York, 1987.
- [36] Zhu Xi Wang and Dun Ren Guo. *Special functions*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., Teaneck, NJ, 1989.
- [37] Liqun Zhang. The  $C^\alpha$  regularity of a class of ultraparabolic equations. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 13(3):375–387, 2011.
- [38] Yuzhe Zhu. Velocity averaging and Hölder regularity for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations with general transport operators and rough coefficients. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(3):2746–2775, 2021.

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET APPLICATIONS, ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE - PSL  
 45 RUE D'ULM, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE  
 Email address: yuzhe.zhu@ens.fr