

REGULARITY FOR NONLOCAL EQUATIONS WITH LOCAL NEUMANN BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

XAVIER ROS-OTON AND MARVIN WEIDNER

ABSTRACT. In this article we establish fine results on the boundary behavior of solutions to nonlocal equations in $C^{k,\gamma}$ domains which satisfy local Neumann conditions on the boundary. Such solutions typically blow up at the boundary like $v \asymp \text{dist}^{s-1}$ and are sometimes called large solutions. In this setup we prove optimal regularity results for the quotients v/dist^{s-1} , depending on the regularity of the domain and on the data of the problem. The results of this article will be important in a forthcoming work on nonlocal free boundary problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of nonlocal operators of the form

$$Lv(x) = \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v(x) - v(x+h))K(h) \, dh, \quad (1.1)$$

where $K : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a kernel satisfying for some $s \in (0, 1)$

$$K(h) = \frac{K(h/|h|)}{|h|^{n+2s}}, \quad 0 < \lambda \leq K(\theta) \leq \Lambda \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, \quad K(h) = K(-h) \quad (1.2)$$

has been an important area of research in analysis and probability for the past 30 years. Operators L of the type (1.1)-(1.2) arise naturally as generators of $2s$ -stable Lévy processes, and are used to model different kinds of real-world phenomena involving long range interactions, e.g. in mathematical finance and in physics. From a PDE perspective, it is of particular interest to study the effect of the nonlocality of L on the regularity of solutions to nonlocal equations. By now, the question of *interior* regularity of solutions is fairly well-understood, and there are several important works in this context, such as [CaSi09, CaSi11b, CaSi11a], [Sil06], [BaLe02], [Kas09], [DKP14, DKP16], [BFV14], [RoSe16b].

A much more delicate question is the one of *boundary* regularity of solutions to nonlocal problems. Previous works have mostly focused on nonlocal Poisson problems, given as follows

$$\begin{cases} Lv &= f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

The nonlocal Poisson problem (1.3) arises naturally as the Euler-Lagrange equation of a nonlocal energy minimization problem and can therefore be studied via variational methods, but also via non-variational methods. For (1.3) it was proved (see [RoSe14], [Gru15]) that weak solutions satisfy $v \in C^s(\overline{\Omega})$, once $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ and $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. The C^s regularity of solutions is optimal, as one can see from the following explicit example (see [Get61], [Lan72], [Dyd12]):

$$(-\Delta)^s(1 - |x|^2)_+^s = c_{n,s} > 0 \quad \text{in } B_1. \quad (1.4)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47G20, 35B65, 31B05, 35R53, 35B44.

Key words and phrases. nonlocal, regularity, boundary, large solution, Neumann condition.

However, it turns out that once the domain, the kernel, and the data are regular enough, also the quotient v/d^s will be regular, yielding a fine description of the behavior of the solution v at the boundary. The best known result in the literature, establishing optimal boundary regularity of weak solutions of (1.3) in terms of the regularity of the domain and the data was shown in [RoSe17, AbRo20, Gru15] (see also [RoSe16a, RoSe16b, AbGr23]) and reads as follows:

$$\partial\Omega \in C^{k+1,\gamma}, \quad f \in C^{k+\gamma-s}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{v}{d^s} \in C^{k,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \quad \gamma \in (0,1). \quad (1.5)$$

All the previously mentioned results on the nonlocal Poisson problem (1.3) address weak solutions for which one can prove that they must remain bounded in $\overline{\Omega}$ (see [SeVa14, KKP16]). However, explicit computations reveal that there also exist pointwise solutions of (1.3), which explode at the boundary of the domain behaving asymptotically like d^{s-1} . The following most prominent example goes back to a work by Hmissi [Hmi94] (see also [Bog99, Example 1, p.239], [BBKRSV09, Example 3.3], [Dyd12]):

$$(-\Delta)^s(1 - |x|_+^2)^{s-1} = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1. \quad (1.6)$$

The example (1.6) has initiated the conceptual study of boundary blow-up for solutions to nonlocal equations (see [Gru14, Gru15, Gru18, Gru23], [Aba15, Aba17, AGV23], [CGV21]). In this theory, solutions such as (1.6) are sometimes called “large solutions”. Note that due to the explosion at the boundary, the above function cannot be a weak solution, and clearly violates (1.5).

In order to have a unified framework which also allows for singular behavior at the boundary, it is necessary to keep track of the boundary behavior of the solution, or more precisely to prescribe somehow the behavior of the quotient v/d^{s-1} . In this spirit, the following Neumann problem, which was introduced in [Gru14] (see also [Gru18], [Gru23]), can be seen as a generalization of (1.3)

$$\begin{cases} Lv = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \left(\frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right) = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

where $\nu(x_0) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ denotes the unit normal at $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. The problem (1.7) is a natural *nonlocal Neumann problem* with inhomogeneous Neumann data g , and one can show that the problem is well-posed in suitable function spaces, at least if the domain is C^∞ (see [Gru14]). Moreover, the solutions blow up at every boundary point where v/d^{s-1} does not vanish.

Remark 1.1. The functions in (1.4) and (1.6), are both solutions to (1.7), with $g \equiv 1$ and $f = c_{n,s}$ and with $g \equiv s-1$ and $f = 0$, respectively, in case $\Omega = B_1$.

Note that the Neumann condition in (1.7) is purely local in nature in the sense that it is imposed only on the topological boundary $\partial\Omega$. Therefore, (1.7) is conceptually completely different from the nonlocal Neumann problem introduced in [DGLZ12], [DRV17] (see also [AlTo20], [Von21], [AFR23], [FoKa24], [GrHe24]). It is also of entirely different nature than [BCGJ14, BGJ14], and [BBC03, ChKi02], where local boundary conditions are imposed, but instead the operator is changed, depending on the domain.

1.1. Main result. The aforementioned regularity results (1.5) from [RoSe17, AbRo20] do not apply to (1.7) since solutions are in general not continuous and might even explode at the boundary. However, it is natural to expect fine regularity results for the quotients v/d^{s-1} depending on the regularity of the domain and the data.

When Ω is C^∞ and $K|_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ is C^∞ , the regularity theory for (1.7) was developed by Grubb in [Gru14] using an approach via pseudodifferential operators.

Our goal in this work is twofold: to establish sharp boundary regularity estimates for (1.7) in $C^{k,\gamma}$ domains, and at the same time to prove them for the first time as localized estimates in $\Omega \cap B_2$. This is new even for C^∞ domains, and it is crucial for our application to free boundary problems.

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $L, K, s, \lambda, \Lambda$ be as in (1.1)-(1.2). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a $C^{k+1,\gamma}$ domain, and $K \in C^{2k+2\gamma+3}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv = f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_2, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } B_2 \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \left(\frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right) = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_2, \end{cases}$$

where $\nu : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is the normal vector of Ω , and $f \in C(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{X}(\Omega \cap B_2)$, $g \in C^{k-1+\gamma}(\partial\Omega \cap B_2)$,

$$\mathcal{X}(\Omega \cap B_2) = \begin{cases} d^{s-\gamma} L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2), & \text{if } k + \gamma \leq 2s, \\ C^{k-2s+\gamma}(\Omega \cap B_2), & \text{if } k + \gamma > 2s. \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

Then, it holds $v/d^{s-1} \in C_{loc}^{k+\gamma}(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_2)$ and

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{C^{k,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_1)} \leq c \left(\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2)} + \|v\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_2)} + \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega \cap B_2)} + \|g\|_{C^{k-1+\gamma}(\partial\Omega \cap B_2)} \right),$$

for some $c > 0$, which only depends on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, k, \gamma, \Omega$, and $\|K\|_{C^{2k+2\gamma+3}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}$.

For the definition of $L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the notion of viscosity solutions, we refer to Section 2.

Note that the regularity we obtain for v/d^{s-1} depending on the regularity of the domain Ω and the data f, g is optimal. For f and g , this is an immediate consequence of interior Schauder theory (see [RoSe16b]), and the order of the equation. For the regularity of the domain, we observe that our results are in align with the ones in [AbRo20] once $v \in C(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_2)$. What concerns the regularity of K , we obtain optimal results in case Ω is a half-space (see Theorem 1.7).

Another key advantage of our approach is that it allows for localized results in $\Omega \cap B_2$. Nonetheless, if $\Omega \subset B_2$, and v is a solution to (1.7), by application of the maximum principle (see Lemma 3.4) to the estimate in Theorem 1.2 we can obtain a bound that is purely in terms of f and g . Thus, we have the following generalization of (1.5) to solutions of (1.7):

$$\partial\Omega \in C^{k+1,\gamma}, \quad f \in C^{k+\gamma-2s}(\overline{\Omega}), \quad g \in C^{k-1+\gamma}(\partial\Omega) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \in C^{k,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \gamma \in (0, 1). \quad (1.9)$$

1.2. A weak maximum principle and nonlocal problems with local Dirichlet conditions.

The example (1.6) of a non-trivial harmonic function that vanishes outside B_1 implies that the Poisson problem (1.3) for the fractional Laplacian is ill-posed even in the homogeneous case. Therefore, maximum principles are usually established under an additional assumption on the boundary behavior of the solution, ruling out “large” solutions such as (1.6) (see [Sil07], [SeVa14], [FKV15], [JaWe19], [FeJa23], [FeRo24a]). Note that a similar phenomenon occurs for local equations, where any constant function is a pointwise solution inside the solution domain.

In this paper, we prove the following nonlocal weak maximum principle, which allows for solutions that blow up at the boundary.

Proposition 1.3. *Let $L, K, s, \lambda, \Lambda$ be as in (1.1)-(1.2). Let $\gamma > 0$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a $C^{1,\gamma}$ domain. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} & \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then, $v \geq 0$.

The condition $v/d^{s-1} \geq 0$ in Proposition 1.3 includes solutions that blow up at the boundary, such as (1.6). Previously, maximum principles including large solutions have been established in [Aba15], and [GrHe23], [LiZh22, LiLi23]. Proposition 1.3 extends these results to general $2s$ -stable integro-differential operators, and to $C^{1,\gamma}$ domains, respectively.

Recall, that a natural way to make the nonlocal Poisson problem (1.3) well-posed is to impose Neumann boundary conditions as in (1.7). Another way would be to prescribe the limit of the quotient v/d^{s-1} directly, which leads to the following nonlocal problem with local Dirichlet data, which was introduced independently in [Gru14], [Aba15]:

$$\begin{cases} Lv & = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} & = h & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

The weak maximum principle in Proposition 1.3 implies that the problems (1.10) and (1.3) are equivalent, when $h \equiv 0$. Thus, (1.10) can be seen as an inhomogeneous nonlocal Dirichlet problem.

Another contribution of this article is the following Schauder-type boundary regularity estimate for solutions to nonlocal equations with local Dirichlet data:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $L, K, s, \lambda, \Lambda$ be as in (1.1)-(1.2). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a $C^{k+1,\gamma}$ domain, and $K \in C^{2k+2\gamma+3}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$.*

Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to (1.10) with $f \in C(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{X}(\Omega)$ and $h \in C^{k+\gamma}(\partial\Omega)$, where \mathcal{X} is as in (1.8). Then, it holds $v/d^{s-1} \in C_{loc}^{1+\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, and

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{C^{k,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq c \left(\|f\|_{\mathcal{X}(\Omega)} + \|h\|_{C^{k+\gamma}(\partial\Omega)} \right)$$

for some $c > 0$, which only depends on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, k, \gamma, \Omega$, and $\|K\|_{C^{2k+2\gamma+3}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}$.

We refer to [Gru15, Gru23] for similar results in the framework of pseudodifferential operators.

Note that (1.10) can always be reduced to the homogeneous problem (1.3). In fact, if Ω and h are regular enough, one can extend h to a smooth function in $\overline{\Omega}$ and consider $w := v - d^{s-1}h$. Then, w solves the homogeneous problem (1.3) with a new right hand side $\tilde{f} = f - L(d^{s-1}h)$. Since $L(d^{s-1}h)$ has good regularity properties (see Corollary 2.5), we can prove Theorem 1.4, by application of the results in [RoSe17, AbRo20].

1.3. Strategy of the proof: regularity for nonlocal problems with local Neumann data.

Since the nonlocal problem with inhomogeneous local Dirichlet data (1.10) can always be reduced to the homogeneous problem (1.3) for which the boundary regularity theory was already established (see [RoSe17], [AbRo20]), the proof of Theorem 1.4 is rather simple.

In sharp contrast to that, for the Neumann problem (1.7) there is no cheap way to obtain the boundary regularity results in Theorem 1.6 from the existing theory. In fact, it is already highly non-trivial to establish Hölder continuity of the quotient v/d^{s-1} up to the boundary.

Our proof of Theorem 1.6 goes in *three main steps*.

First, we establish a weak maximum principle for solutions to the Neumann problem (1.7).

Proposition 1.5. *Let $L, K, s, \lambda, \Lambda$ be as in (1.1)-(1.2). Let $\gamma > 0$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a $C^{1,\gamma}$ domain. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \left(\frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right) & \leq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then, $v \geq 0$.

Note that this result seems to be the first maximum principle for nonlocal problems with local Neumann boundary conditions in the literature. We believe it to be of independent interest and refer to Lemma 3.4 for a corresponding L^∞ bound in the case of inhomogeneous data.

The proof of Proposition 1.5 follows from a nonlocal Hopf-type lemma for solutions to the inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem (1.10) (see Lemma 3.3), which in turn follows from the weak maximum principle in Proposition 1.3. All of these results rely heavily on explicit barriers for (1.10) in $C^{1,\gamma}$ domains that are adapted to the geometry of the domain and blow up at the boundary like d^{s-1} . These barriers can be seen as perturbations of (1.6), or rather of 1D solutions such as

$$L(x_n)_+^{s-1} = 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}. \quad (1.11)$$

Note that (1.11) follows simply by differentiating the equation

$$L(x_n)_+^s = 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}.$$

The previous identity is a classical fact for nonlocal operators (1.1)-(1.2) (see [FeRo24a, Lemma 2.6.2]).

The *second* main step in the proof of Theorem 1.6 is to establish Hölder continuity of order α , for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ small enough, up to the boundary of v/d^{s-1} for solutions to (1.7) in $C^{1,\gamma}$ domains.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $L, K, s, \lambda, \Lambda$ be as in (1.1)-(1.2). Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a $C^{1,\gamma}$ domain. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & = f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_2, \\ v & = 0 & \text{in } B_2 \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \left(\frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right) & = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_2, \end{cases}$$

with $f \in C(\Omega \cap B_2)$ and $g \in C(\partial\Omega \cap B_2)$. Then, there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$, such that when $d^{s+1-\alpha}f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$, then it holds $v/d^{s-1} \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_2)$, and

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_1)} \leq c \left(\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2)} + \|v\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_2)} + \|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_2)} \right),$$

where $c > 0$ and α_0 depend only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω .

The proof of Theorem 1.6 uses the weak maximum principle in Proposition 1.5 and the interior weak Harnack inequality, to establish a weak Harnack inequality for v/d^{s-1} at the boundary (see Lemma 4.1). This allows us to deduce a so called “growth lemma” for v/d^{s-1} , stating that v/d^{s-1} must be large pointwise in a ball centered at the boundary, if v/d^{s-1} was large in a measure-theoretic

sense in a ball away from the boundary. Such growth lemma allows to establish oscillation decay for v/d^{s-1} at the boundary, and to deduce the Hölder estimate in Theorem 1.6. A similar proof for the classical Laplacian can be found in [LiZh23].

Once the boundary Hölder estimate is shown, we can establish the higher order boundary regularity in Theorem 1.2 via a blow-up argument. This is the *third*, and last step of the proof. Theorem 1.6 is crucial in order to deduce uniform convergence of the blow-up sequence.

The blow-up argument follows the scheme in [AbRo20] and relies on a Liouville theorem in the half-space with local Neumann data (see Theorem 5.1). However, major modifications have to be made in most of the steps due to the boundary blow-up of solutions. For instance, we need to show the following new result (see Corollary 2.5):

$$\partial\Omega \in C^{k+1,\gamma} \quad \Rightarrow \quad L(d^{s-1}) \in C^{k-1+\gamma-s}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{if } k + \gamma > 1 + s.$$

Moreover, the presence of a Neumann boundary condition complicates some of the arguments, such as the proof of a stability result for viscosity solutions (see Lemma 2.13). Finally, as in [AbRo20] we need to make use of a suitable notion of nonlocal equations up to a polynomial (see [DSV19], [DDV22]) in order to account for solutions that grow too fast at infinity (see Definition 2.8).

1.4. Applications to free-boundary problems. We end the discussion of the main results of this article by shedding some light on a, perhaps unexpected, connection between nonlocal problems with local Neumann boundary data and free boundary problems. This connection is a main motivation for us to study (1.7). Let us explain this phenomenon in the particular case of the fractional Laplacian.

The nonlocal one-phase free boundary problem, which was introduced in [CRS10] (see also [RoWe24a]), deals with the minimization of the following functional

$$\mathcal{I}(w) := \iint_{(B_1^c \times B_1^c)^c} (w(x) - w(y))^2 \frac{dy dx}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} + M |\{w > 0\} \cap B_1| \quad (1.12)$$

for some $M > 0$ and with prescribed values of w in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1$. One can show (see [CRS10, FeRo24b]) that local minimizers of (1.12) are $C^s(B_1)$ and that they are viscosity solutions to

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s w = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_1, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Omega, \\ \frac{w}{d^s} = c_{n,s} M & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

where $c_{n,s} > 0$ is a constant and $\Omega := \{w > 0\}$. An important question in the theory is to determine the regularity of the free boundary $\partial\Omega$ near so called “regular points”. These are the points $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap B_1$ for which blow-ups of w are half-space solutions, i.e., (up to rotations and multiplicative constants)

$$\frac{w(x_0 + rx)}{r^s} \rightarrow w_0(x) := (x_n)_+^s \quad \text{locally uniformly.}$$

One can show using the extension for $(-\Delta)^s$ (see [DeRo12, DeSa12, DSS14]) that once a sequence (w_ε) of viscosity solutions (1.13) is “ ε -close” to the half-space solution w_0 in the sense that

$$(x_n - \varepsilon)_+^s \leq w_\varepsilon(x) \leq (x_n + \varepsilon)_+^s,$$

then it holds, as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$:

$$\frac{w_\varepsilon(x) - (x_n)_+^s}{\varepsilon} \rightarrow (x_n)_+^{s-1} u(x),$$

where u solves the so called “linearized problem”

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s((x_n)_+^{s-1} u) = 0 & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\} \cap B_1, \\ \partial_n u = 0 & \text{on } \{x_n = 0\} \cap B_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

Hence, $(x_n)_+^{s-1}u$ is a solution to a nonlocal problem with local Neumann data (1.7) in the half-space, and it explodes at the boundary $\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_1$.

In order to establish regularity results for the free boundary $\Omega = \{w > 0\}$ near regular points, it is an important step to establish boundary regularity results for the solution to the linearized problem. For (1.14) this was done in [DeRo12], [DeSa12], [DSS14], using the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension. In the light of this connection, our main result Theorem 1.2 also makes a contribution to the theory of the nonlocal one-phase problem (1.12), and provides a completely new proof of the regularity for (1.14), even in the case of the fractional Laplacian.

We end this discussion by stating a variant of Theorem 1.2 in the special case $\Omega = \{x_n > 0\}$. This result holds true under optimal assumptions on K , and it will be helpful in the study of the nonlocal one-phase free boundary problem (1.13) with respect to general nonlocal operators (1.1)-(1.2), which we plan to investigate in a future work (see [RoWe24b]).

Theorem 1.7. *Let $L, K, s, \lambda, \Lambda$ be as in (1.1)-(1.2). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$. Let $u \in C(\{x_n \geq 0\} \cap B_2)$ with $(x_n)_+^{s-1}u \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} L((x_n)_+^{s-1}u) &= f & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2, \\ \partial_n u &= g & \text{on } \partial\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2. \end{cases}$$

with $f \in C(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2) \cap \mathcal{X}(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2)$, $g \in C^{k-1+\gamma}(\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2)$, and $K \in C^{k-2s+\gamma}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ if $k + \gamma > 2s$, where \mathcal{X} is as in (1.8). Then, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^{k,\gamma}(\{x_n \geq 0\} \cap B_1)} &\leq c \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2)} + \|(x_n)_+^{s-1}u\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2)} + \|g\|_{C^{k-1+\gamma}(\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some $c > 0$, which only depends on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, k, \gamma$, and (if $k + \gamma > 2s$) also on $\|K\|_{C^{k-2s+\gamma}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}$.

Finally, we make the following remark.

Remark 1.8. Note that the following two problems are equivalent if $v \in C(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_2)$, i.e., if solutions do not blow up on $\partial\Omega \cap B_2$:

$$\begin{cases} Lv &= f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_2, \\ v &= 0 & \text{in } B_2 \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \left(\frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right) &= g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_2, \end{cases} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} Lv &= f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_2, \\ v &= 0 & \text{in } B_2 \setminus \Omega, \\ \frac{v}{d^s} &= g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_2. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, since $v \equiv 0$ in $B_2 \setminus \Omega$, it holds for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap B_2$:

$$\partial_\nu \left(\frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\frac{v}{d^{s-1}}(x) - \lim_{z \rightarrow x_0} \frac{v}{d^{s-1}}(z)}{d(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{v}{d^s}(x).$$

Recall that the second problem is satisfied by minimizers to the nonlocal one-phase problem (1.13). Moreover, the above problem is the nonlocal counterpart of the over-determined Serrin's problem whenever $\Omega \subset B_2$ (see for instance [FaJa15, SoVa19, BiJa20, DPTV23]).

1.5. Acknowledgments. The authors were supported by the European Research Council under the Grant Agreements No. 801867 (EllipticPDE) and No. 101123223 (SSNSD), and by AEI project PID2021-125021NA-I00 (Spain). Moreover, X.R. was supported by the grant RED2022-134784-T funded by AEI/10.13039/501100011033, by AGAUR Grant 2021 SGR 00087 (Catalunya), and by the Spanish State Research Agency through the María de Maeztu Program for Centers and Units of Excellence in R&D (CEX2020-001084-M).

1.6. Organization of the paper. This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the notion of viscosity solutions to (1.7) and give some preliminary lemmas. Among them are already several new results of independent interest, such as the construction of explicit barriers exploding at the boundary (see Subsection 2.3), an analysis of the regularity of $L(d^{s-1})$ in terms of the regularity of the domain (see Corollary 2.5), and a stability result for viscosity solutions (see Lemma 2.13). In Section 3 we prove maximum principles for solutions to nonlocal problems with local Dirichlet- and Neumann data (see Proposition 1.3 and Proposition 1.5). Section 4 is devoted to the proof of the Hölder estimate up to the boundary (see Theorem 1.6). In Section 5 we prove a Liouville theorem in the half-space (see Theorem 5.1), and in Section 6 we carry out a blow-up argument to prove our main result, Theorem 1.2. Finally, Section 7 contains the proof of the regularity for the inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem (see Theorem 1.4).

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we give several important definitions, such as the definitions of viscosity solutions to (1.7). In Subsection 2.2 we establish the regularity of $L(d^{s-1})$ depending on the regularity of the domain and in Subsection 2.3 we use these results to construct barrier functions. In Subsection 2.4, we introduce the notion of nonlocal equations satisfied up to a polynomial, and in Subsection 2.5 we establish stability of viscosity solutions and prove that the sum of two viscosity solutions is again a viscosity solution.

From now on, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$ the class of operators (1.1) with kernels satisfying (1.2). Moreover, whenever we say $K \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\alpha > 0$, we mean that $\|K\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \leq \Lambda$. Sometimes, we denote the class of operators (1.1) satisfying (1.2) and $K \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ by $\mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda, \alpha)$.

Moreover, given an open, bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\partial\Omega \in C^\beta$ for some $\beta > 1$, $d := d_\Omega : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ will denote the regularized distance which satisfies $d \in C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^\beta(\overline{\Omega})$ and $d \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. Crucially, we have $\text{dist}(\cdot, \Omega) \leq d \leq C \text{dist}(\cdot, \Omega)$ in \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., the topological distance and the regularized distance are pointwise comparable. We will often use the fact that $|D^k d| \leq cd^{\beta-k}$ (see [FeRo24a, Definition 2.7.5]). Throughout this article, we will define $d^{s-1} \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$.

In the following, whenever $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, we write $v/d^{s-1}(x_0) := \lim_{\Omega \ni x \rightarrow x_0} v/d^{s-1}(x)$.

2.1. Function spaces and solution concepts. Let us introduce the following function space

$$L_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ u : \|u\|_{L_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(y)|(1+|y|)^{-n-\alpha} dy < \infty \right\}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

Typically, we will use the previous definition with $\alpha = 2s$. We are now in a position to give the notion of viscosity solution to (1.7).

Definition 2.1 (Viscosity solution). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$.

- (i) We say that $v \in C(\Omega) \cap L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a viscosity subsolution to

$$Lv = f \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_1, \tag{2.1}$$

where $f \in C(\Omega \cap B_1)$, if for any $x \in \Omega \cap B_1$ and any neighborhood $N_x \subset \Omega$ of x it holds

$$L\phi(x) \leq f(x) \quad \forall \phi \in C^2(N_x) \cap L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{s.t. } v(x) = \phi(x), \quad \phi \geq v. \tag{2.2}$$

We say that v is a viscosity supersolution to (2.2) if (2.2) holds true for $-v$ and $-f$ instead of v and f . Moreover, v is a viscosity solution to (2.2), if it is a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.

(ii) We say that $v \in L^1_{2s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ is a viscosity subsolution to

$$\partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1}) = g \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_1,$$

where $g \in C(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)$, if for any $x \in \partial\Omega \cap B_1$ and any neighborhood $N_x \subset \overline{\Omega} \cap B_1$ of x it holds

$$\partial_\nu \phi(x) \leq g(x) \quad \forall \phi \in C^2(N_x) \cap L^\infty(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{s.t. } v/d^{s-1}(x) = \phi(x), \quad \phi \leq v/d^{s-1}. \quad (2.3)$$

We say that v is a viscosity supersolution to (2.3) if (2.3) holds true for $-v$ and $-g$ instead of v and g . Moreover, v is a viscosity solution to (2.3), if it is a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.

Note that clearly, if in (i) $Lv(x)$, or if in (ii) $\partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1})(x) = \lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} (v/d^{s-1})(y)$ exists in the strong sense, then the notions of viscosity solutions coincide with the ones for strong solutions (see [FeRo24a, Lemma 3.4.13]).

2.2. Nonlocal operators and the distance function. The goal of this subsection is to establish several lemmas on the regularity of $L(d^{s-1})$ depending on the regularity of Ω . Lemma 2.3 will help us to establish barriers in $C^{1,\gamma}$ domains and Corollary 2.5 is crucial for domains that are more regular.

The following lemma is a slight modification of [FeRo24a, Lemma B.2.4].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain with Lipschitz constant L and $C^{0,1}$ radius $\rho_0 > 0$. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ with $\rho := d_\Omega(x_0)$, $\gamma > -1$ and $\gamma < \beta$. Then,*

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}} d_\Omega^\gamma(x_0 + y) |y|^{-n-\beta} dy \leq C(1 + \rho^{\gamma-\beta})$$

for some constant $C > 0$, depending only on $n, \gamma, \beta, \rho_0, L$, and, if $\gamma > 0$ or $\beta \leq 0$ also on $\text{diam}(\Omega)$.

Proof. We assume that $x_0 = 0$. There exists $\kappa > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0, \kappa)$:

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\{d = t\} \cap (B_{2^{j+1}\rho} \setminus B_{2^j\rho})) \leq C(2^j\rho)^{n-1}, \quad (2.4)$$

(we refer to [FeRo24a, Lemma B.2.4] for a reference of this fact). Note that

$$\int_{(\Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}) \cap \{d \geq \kappa\}} d^\gamma(y) |y|^{-n-\beta} dy \leq (\text{diam}(\Omega)^\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma > 0\}} + \kappa^\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma \leq 0\}}) \int_{(\Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}) \cap \{d \geq \kappa\}} |y|^{-n-\beta} dy \leq c$$

for some constant $c > 0$ depending on κ and, if $\gamma > 0$ or $\beta \leq 0$ also on $\text{diam}(\Omega)$, but independent of ρ . The independence of ρ is trivial if $\kappa \leq 2\rho$ since then $\Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2} \subset \Omega \setminus B_{\kappa/4}$, and otherwise, it follows from the fact that $B_r \cap \{d \geq \kappa\} = \emptyset$ once $r \leq \kappa/2 \leq \kappa - \rho$ (recall that $d(0) = \rho$), so also in this case, we can replace the domain of integration by $\Omega \setminus B_{\kappa/2}$. Moreover, using (2.4) and the co-area formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(\Omega \setminus B_{\rho/2}) \cap \{d \leq \kappa\}} d^\gamma(y) |y|^{-n-\beta} dy &\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((2^j\rho)^{-n-\beta} \int_{(B_{2^{j+1}\rho} \setminus B_{2^j\rho}) \cap \{d \leq \kappa\}} d^\gamma(y) |\nabla d(y)| dy \right) \\ &\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((2^j\rho)^{-n-\beta} \int_0^{\min\{2^j\rho, \kappa\}} t^\gamma \left[\int_{(B_{2^{j+1}\rho} \setminus B_{2^j\rho}) \cap \{d=t\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \right] dt \right) \\ &\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((2^j\rho)^{-\beta+\gamma} \right) \leq c\rho^{\gamma-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

for some $c > 0$, where we used that $\gamma - \beta < 0$. □

The following lemma will be of central importance for the proof of Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7

Lemma 2.3. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, s)$, there exists $c_1 > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \Omega, \gamma, \delta$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω , such that*

$$|L(d^{s-1})| \leq c_1 d^{\delta\gamma-s-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Moreover, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$, there exist $c_2, c_3 > 0$ depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \varepsilon$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω , such that

$$L(d^{s-1+\varepsilon}) \leq -c_2 d^{\varepsilon-s-1} + c_3 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Proof. The first part follows as in the proof of [FeRo24a, Proposition B.2.1]. Indeed, we let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and denote $\rho = d(x_0)$. Then, we denote

$$l(x) = (d(x_0) + \nabla d(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0))_+$$

and observe that

$$L(l^{s-1}) = 0 \quad \text{in } \{l > 0\},$$

as a consequence of $L(l^s) = 0$ and $\nabla l^s = s l^{s-1} \nabla l = s \nabla d(x_0) l^{s-1}$. Next, we claim that

$$|d^{s-1} - l^{s-1}|(x_0 + y) \leq \begin{cases} C \rho^{s+\gamma-3} |y|^2 & \text{in } B_{\rho/2}, \\ C |y|^{(1+\gamma)\delta} |d^{s-1-\delta}(x_0 + y) + l^{s-1-\delta}(x_0 + y)| & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\rho/2}. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Note that from here, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} |L(d^{s-1})(x_0)| &= |L(d^{s-1} - l^{s-1})(x_0)| \\ &\leq C \rho^{s+\gamma-3} \int_{B_{\rho/2}} |y|^{2-n-2s} dy \\ &\quad + C \int_{(x_0+\Omega) \setminus B_{\rho/2}} |y|^{-n-2s+(1+\gamma)\delta} |d^{s-1-\delta}(x_0 + y) + l^{s-1-\delta}(x_0 + y)| dy \\ &\leq C(1 + \rho^{\gamma-s-1} + \rho^{\gamma\delta-s-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Lemma 2.2 to d and to l with $s-1-\delta =: \gamma < \beta := 2s-(1+\gamma)\delta$ (choosing $\gamma \in (0, s)$ so small that $\beta > 0$), in order to estimate the third integral. Since this estimate implies the first result, it remain to verify the claim (2.5). In case $x \in B_{\rho/2}(x_0)$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |d^{s-1} - l^{s-1}|(x) &\leq |d - l|(x) |d^{s-2} + l^{s-2}|_{L^\infty(B_{\rho/2}(x_0))} \leq c \|D^2 d\|_{L^\infty(B_{\rho/2}(x_0))} |x_0 - x|^2 \rho^{s-2} \\ &\leq C \rho^{s+\gamma-3} |y|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $l \geq c\rho$ in $B_{\rho/2}(x_0)$, which follows by the same argument as in [FeRo24a], the estimates for $D^2 d$ from [FeRo24a, Lemma B.0.1], and the fact that $d(x_0) = l(x_0)$ and $\nabla d(x_0) = \nabla l(x_0)$ by construction.

Moreover, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\rho/2}(x_0)$, we make use of the following algebraic inequality

$$|a^{s-1} - b^{s-1}| \leq |a - b|^\delta |a^{s-1-\delta} + b^{s-1-\delta}|,$$

for $\delta \in (0, s)$, which allows us to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |d^{s-1}(x) - l^{s-1}(x)| &\leq |d(x) - l(x)|^\delta |d^{s-1-\delta}(x) + l^{s-1-\delta}(x)| \\ &\leq c |x_0 - x|^{(1+\gamma)\delta} |d^{s-1-\delta}(x) + l^{s-1-\delta}(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$|d(x) - l(x)| \leq C |x_0 - x|^{1+\gamma}$$

by [FeRo24a, Lemma B.2.2]. This proves the first claim.

Now, we turn to the proof of the second result. First, we observe that by similar arguments as in the first part of the proof, we obtain

$$|d^{\varepsilon+s-1} - l^{\varepsilon+s-1}|(x_0 + y) \leq \begin{cases} C\rho^{\varepsilon+s+\gamma-3}|y|^2 & \text{in } B_{\rho/2}, \\ C|y|^{(1+\gamma)\delta}||d^{\varepsilon+s-1-\delta}(x_0 + y) + l^{\varepsilon+s-1-\delta}(x_0 + y)|| & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\rho/2}. \end{cases}$$

and therefore

$$|L(d^{\varepsilon+s-1} - l^{\varepsilon+s-1})(x_0)| \leq C(1 + \rho^{\varepsilon+\gamma-s-1} + \rho^{\varepsilon+\gamma\delta-s-1}).$$

We claim that for any $e \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ it holds

$$\begin{cases} L((x \cdot e)_+^{\varepsilon+s-1}) &= -c_e(x \cdot e)_+^{\varepsilon-s-1} & \text{in } \{x \cdot e > 0\}, \\ (x \cdot e)_+^{s-1+\varepsilon} &= 0 & \text{in } \{x \cdot e \leq 0\} \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

for some $c_e \in [c_-, c_+]$, for some $c_+ > c_- > 0$, depending only on n, s, λ, Λ . Note that once we have shown the claim (2.6), we can conclude the proof, since it implies

$$\begin{aligned} L(d^{\varepsilon+s-1})(x_0) &\leq L(l^{\varepsilon+s-1})(x_0) + |L(d^{\varepsilon+s-1} - l^{\varepsilon+s-1})(x_0)| \\ &\leq -c\rho^{\varepsilon-s-1} + C(1 + \rho^{\varepsilon+\gamma-s-1} + \rho^{\varepsilon+\gamma\delta-s-1}) \leq -c\rho^{\varepsilon-s-1} + C. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it remains to prove (2.6). By the $2s$ -homogeneity of L , we have

$$L((x \cdot e)_+^{\varepsilon+s-1}) = c_1(-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s(x \cdot e)_+^{\varepsilon+s-1} = c_1 c_2 (x \cdot e)_+^{\varepsilon-s-1}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, so it remains to prove that $-c_1 c_2 \in [c_-, c_+]$ for some $c_+ > c_- > 0$. This will follow immediately, once we show $c_2 < 0$. To see this, we slide the function t_+^{s-1} from the left until we touch $t_+^{\varepsilon+s-1}$. Indeed, note that for $h > 0$ large enough, it holds $(t+h)_+^{s-1} < t_+^{\varepsilon+s-1}$ for any $t > 0$. Then, let us take $h_0 > 0$ to be the smallest positive number such that there exists some $t_0 > 0$ at which the two functions touch, i.e. $(t_0 + h_0)_+^{s-1} = (t_0)_+^{\varepsilon+s-1}$. Then, it holds

$$c_2(t_0)_+^{\varepsilon+s-1} = (-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s(t_+^{\varepsilon+s-1})(t_0) < (-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s((t+h_0)_+^{s-1})(t_0) = 0,$$

which implies $c_2 < 0$, as desired. This concludes the proof. \square

The following lemma is crucial in the proofs of Lemma 2.13, and in Section 6. It follows by differentiating the corresponding results in [AbRo20].

Lemma 2.4. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{k+1, \gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $0 \in \partial\Omega$. Assume that $K \in C^{2k+2\gamma+3}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Let $\eta \in C^{k, \gamma}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_1}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)$. Then, there exists $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \Omega, \gamma, k$, such that the following holds true:*

(i) *If $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, then*

$$|L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d)\eta)| \leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla\eta(0)|)d^{\gamma-s} \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2}.$$

(ii) *If $k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$, then*

$$[L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d)\eta)]_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_{1/2}})} \leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla\eta(0)|).$$

(iii) *If $k + \gamma > 2s$, then we have for any $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{1/2}$*

$$[L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d)\eta)]_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0))} \leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla\eta(0)|)d^{s-1}(x_0).$$

Proof. By [AbRo20, Corollary 2.3] (see also [Kuk21, Corollary 3.9] for $i > k + 1$), we deduce that

$$|D^i L(d^s \eta)| \leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)|)d^{k+\gamma-s-i} \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.7)$$

Note that by [AbRo20, Theorem 2.2] and the choice of ψ in the proof of [AbRo20, Corollary 2.3], it can be seen that the assumption $\eta \in C^{k,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_1}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)$ is sufficient for (2.7) to hold true. Let us now prove (i) and assume that $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$. Then, since $D^i \eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, another application of [AbRo20, Corollary 2.3] yields

$$\|L(d^s D^i \eta)\|_{C^{1+\gamma-s}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_{1/2}})} \leq C \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Since $\nabla(d^s \eta) = s d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta + d^s \nabla \eta$, a combination of the previous two estimates with $i = 1$ implies

$$|L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta)| \leq s^{-1} |\nabla L(d^s \eta)| + s^{-1} |L(d^s \nabla \eta)| \leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla \eta(0)|)d^{\gamma-s} \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2},$$

which yields the result in (i).

To see (ii) and (iii), we observe first that by application of (2.7), we have for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|D^i L(d^s(\nabla \eta))| \leq c(|\cdot| + |\nabla \eta(0)|)d^{k+\gamma-s-i} \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2}.$$

Next, by differentiation, we obtain

$$D^{i+1}(d^s \eta) = s D^i(d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta) + D^i(d^s \nabla \eta).$$

Thus, altogether for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} |D^i(L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta))| &\leq s^{-1} |D^{i+1} L(d^s \eta)| + s^{-1} |D^i L(d^s(\nabla \eta))| \\ &\leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)|)d^{k+\gamma-s-(i+1)} + c(|\cdot| + |\nabla \eta(0)|)d^{k+\gamma-s-i} \\ &\leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla \eta(0)|)d^{k+\gamma-s-i-1} \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

To conclude the proof of (ii) let $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{1/2}$, and note that if $k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$, then (2.8) applied with $i = k - 1 + \lceil \gamma - s \rceil$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} [L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta)]_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0))} &\leq \sup_{x, y \in B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0)} \frac{\|D^{k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}(L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta))\|_{L^\infty(B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0))}}{|x - y|^{\gamma-s-\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}} \\ &\leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla \eta(0)|)d^{\gamma-s-\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}(x_0)d^{s-\gamma+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}(x_0) \\ &\leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla \eta(0)|), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\gamma < 1$. From here, a standard covering argument (see [FeRo24a, Lemma A.1.4]) yields the desired regularity estimate in $\overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2}$.

To prove (iii), note that if $k + \gamma > 2s$, then (2.8) applied with $i = k + \lceil \gamma - s \rceil$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} [L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta)]_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0))} &\leq \sup_{x, y \in B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0)} \frac{\|D^{k+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}(L(d^{s-1}(\nabla d) \eta))\|_{L^\infty(B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0))}}{|x - y|^{\gamma-2s-\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}} \\ &\leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla \eta(0)|)d^{\gamma-s-1-\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}(x_0)d^{2s-\gamma+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}(x_0) \\ &\leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(0)| + |\nabla \eta(0)|)d^{s-1}(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\gamma < 1$. This implies (iii), and we conclude the proof. \square

As a corollary, we obtain the following result:

Corollary 2.5. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{k+1, \gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $0 \in \partial\Omega$. Assume that $K \in C^{2k+2\gamma+3}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Let $\eta \in C^{k, \gamma}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_1}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)$. Then, there exists $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \Omega, \gamma, k$, such that the following holds true:*

(i) *If $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, then*

$$|L(d^{s-1}\eta)| \leq c\|\eta\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega \cap B_{1/2}})} d^{\gamma-s} \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2}.$$

(ii) *If $k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$, then*

$$[L(d^{s-1}\eta)]_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_{1/2}})} \leq c \left(\|\eta\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega \cap B_{1/2}})} + \|\eta\|_{C^{k-1+s+\gamma}(\Omega \cap B_1)} \right).$$

(iii) *If $k + \gamma > 2s$, then we have for any $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{1/2}$*

$$[L(d^{s-1}\eta)]_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0))} \leq c \left(\|\eta\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega \cap B_{1/2}})} + \|\eta\|_{C^{k+\gamma}(\Omega \cap B_1)} \right) d^{s-1}(x_0).$$

Proof. Note that there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$, $\nu_i \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $x_i \in \partial\Omega \cap B_1$, depending only on Ω , such that $\partial_{\nu_i} d \geq 1/2$ in $\overline{\Omega \cap B_\delta(x_i)}$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and such that

$$\{x \in \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2} : d(x) \leq \delta/2\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N B_\delta(x_i).$$

Then, by application of Lemma 2.4(i) to $\eta := (\partial_{\nu_i} d)^{-1} \eta \in C^{k, \gamma}(\overline{\Omega \cap B_\delta(x_i)}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega \cap B_\delta(x_i))$, we deduce that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

$$|L(d^{s-1}\eta)| \leq c(|\cdot| + |\eta(x_i)| + |\nabla \eta(x_i)|) d^{\gamma-s} \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{\delta/2}(x_i).$$

Thus, we have proved (i) in $\overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2} \cap \{d(x) \leq \delta/2\}$. The result in $\overline{\Omega} \cap B_{1/2} \cap \{d(x) > \delta/2\}$ is immediate from the regularity of K (see [FeRo24a, Lemma 2.2.6]).

The proofs of (ii) and (iii) follow from Lemma 2.4 is an analogous way. \square

2.3. Barriers with boundary blow-up. Let us construct barrier functions that are suitable for establishing maximum principles for solutions that blow up at the boundary. We establish a subsolution and a supersolution in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1, \gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Then, for any $l \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{s, 1-s\})$, and $M > 0$ there exists $\phi_l \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} L\phi_l & \leq -d^{\varepsilon-s-1} - M & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \phi_l & = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \phi_l/d^{s-1} & = l & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(\phi_l/d^{s-1}) & = +\infty & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $l \geq 0$, then there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \text{diam}(\Omega), \varepsilon, M$, such that $\phi_l \geq 0$ in $\Omega \cap \{d \leq \delta\}$. And if $l < 0$, then for M large enough, depending on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \text{diam}(\Omega), \varepsilon$, it holds $\phi_l \leq 0$ in Ω .

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$ and $N > 1$ to be chosen small and large, respectively, later. We set

$$\phi_l(x) := ld^{s-1}(x) + d^{s-1+\varepsilon}(x) - N\mathbb{1}_\Omega(x).$$

Then, by Lemma 2.3,

$$L\phi_l \leq c_1 ld^{\delta\gamma-s-1} - c_2 d^{\varepsilon-s-1} + c_3 - NL\mathbb{1}_\Omega.$$

Note that since $L\mathbb{1}_\Omega \geq 0$, by taking any $\delta \in (0, s)$ and then $\varepsilon < \delta\gamma$, we see that there exists $\eta > 0$, depending on $s, l, \varepsilon, M, \delta, \gamma$, such that

$$L\phi_l \leq -d^{\varepsilon-s-1} - M \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap \{d < \eta\}.$$

Moreover, note that there exists $c_4 > 0$, depending on $\text{diam}(\Omega)$, such that $L\mathbb{1}_\Omega \geq c_4$ in $\Omega \cap \{d \geq \eta\}$. Thus, choosing $N = Mc_4^{-1}$, we deduce that

$$L\phi_l \leq -d^{\varepsilon-s-1} - M \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

as desired. Next, we observe that since $(\phi_l/d^{s-1})(x_0) = l$ for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap B_1$:

$$\partial_\nu(\phi_l/d^{s-1})(x_0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\frac{\phi_l(x)}{d^{s-1}(x)} - l}{d(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{d^\varepsilon - Nd^{1-s}}{d(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (d^{\varepsilon-1} - Nd^{-s}) = \infty,$$

if we choose $\varepsilon < 1 - s$. The remaining properties of ϕ_l follow immediately from its construction. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Then, there is $c_1 > 0$, depending only on n, s, λ, Λ , such that for any $l \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{s\gamma, 1-s\})$, and $M > 0$ there exists $\psi_l \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} L\psi_l & \geq c_1 d^{\varepsilon-s-1} + M & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi_l & = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \psi_l/d^{s-1} & = l & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(\psi_l/d^{s-1}) & = -\infty & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for any $M > 0$, if $l > 0$ is large enough, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \text{diam}(\Omega), \varepsilon$, it holds $\psi_l \geq 0$ in Ω .

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 2.6. We set

$$\psi_l(x) = ld^{s-1}(x) - d^{s-1+\varepsilon}(x) + C_2 \mathbb{1}_{\overline{\Omega}}(x)$$

for some $\varepsilon < \delta\gamma$ and $l, C_2 > 0$ to be chosen later. Note that by Lemma 2.3:

$$L\psi_l \geq -c_1 ld^{\delta\gamma-s-1} + c_2 d^{\varepsilon-s-1} - c_3 + c_4 C_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$, depending only on n, s, λ, Λ , and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω . Thus, if we choose $C_2 > 0$ large enough, depending on $M, l, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, \varepsilon, \text{diam}(\Omega)$, then we deduce

$$L\psi_l \geq cd^{\varepsilon-s-1} + M \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Moreover, note that for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ it holds since $\psi/d^{s-1} = l$ on $\partial\Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\nu(\psi_l/d^{s-1})(x_0) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\frac{\psi_l(x)}{d^{s-1}(x)} - l}{d(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{l - d^\varepsilon(x) + C_2 d^{1-s}(x) - l}{d(x)} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (-d^{\varepsilon-1}(x) + C_2 d^{-s}(x)) = -\infty, \end{aligned}$$

if we choose $\varepsilon < 1 - s$. Finally, we observe that upon choosing $l > 0$ large enough, depending only on $\varepsilon, \text{diam}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\psi_l \geq ld^{s-1} - d^{s-1+\varepsilon} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

\square

2.4. Nonlocal equations up to a polynomial. We will need the following definition of nonlocal equations that hold true up to a polynomial. It was introduced in [DSV19] for the fractional Laplacian and the theory was extended in [DDV22] to general nonlocal operators (see also [AbRo20]).

Definition 2.8. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $f \in C(\Omega)$, and $K \in C^{k-1+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\delta > 0$, we say that a function $u \in C(\Omega) \cap L^1_{2s+k}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ solves in the viscosity sense

$$Lu \stackrel{k}{=} f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

if there exist polynomials $(p_R)_{R>1} \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ of degree $k-1$, and functions $(f_R)_{R>1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} L(u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) &= f_R + p_R \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \forall R > \text{diam}(\Omega), \\ \|f_R - f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.9. • $Lu \stackrel{0}{=} f$ is equivalent to $Lu = f$ (see [DDV22, Corollary 2.13]).

- Instead of $K \in C^k(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, here we only assume $K \in C^{k-1+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\delta > 0$. It is easy to see that all the arguments in [DDV22] remain valid under this weaker assumption. We decided to make this change in order to have optimal assumptions on K in Theorem 1.7.
- As in [AbRo20], we assume uniform convergence $f_R \rightarrow f$. This is slightly different from [DSV19], where pointwise convergence was assumed.

The following lemma is a slight improvement of [AbRo20, Lemma 3.6] (see also [RTW23, Lemma 8.1]) in the sense that the estimate involves a weighted L^1 norm instead of a weighted L^∞ norm.

Lemma 2.10. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $u \in C(B_1)$ be a viscosity solution to

$$Lu = f \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Then, the following holds true:

- (i) Let $\beta \in (0, 2s]$ if $s \neq 1/2$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ if $s = 1/2$. If $f \in C(B_1)$ and $u \in L^1_{2s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then it holds $u \in C^\beta_{\text{loc}}(B_1)$ and

$$\|u\|_{C^\beta(B_{1/2})} \leq c \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s}} dy + \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right)$$

for some $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \beta$.

- (ii) If $f \in C^\alpha(B_1)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ such that $2s + \alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$, $K \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, and $u \in L^1_{2s+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ then $u \in C^{2s+\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(B_1)$ and

$$\|u\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq c \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s+\alpha}} dy + [f]_{C^\alpha(B_1)} \right)$$

for some $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \alpha$.

Remark 2.11. From the proof it is apparent, that Lemma 2.10(ii) remains true if $Lu \stackrel{k}{=} f$ for $k < \alpha$.

Proof. Statement (i) was proved in [FeRo24a, Theorem 2.4.3]. The L^∞ norm can be replaced by the $L^1_{2s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norm by a standard truncation argument. Let us now show (ii). We restrict ourselves to proving the result in case $\alpha < 1$. The case $\alpha > 1$ goes in the same way by considering higher order incremental quotients in the arguments below. Let us define $v = u \mathbb{1}_{B_1}$. We claim that v solves $Lv = \tilde{f}$ in $B_{3/4}$ for some $\tilde{f} \in C^{2s+\alpha}(B_{3/4})$ with

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})} \leq C \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s+\alpha}} dy + [f]_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})} \right). \quad (2.9)$$

Note that this claim is a slight improvement of [AbRo20, Lemma 3.6] (see also [RTW23, Lemma 8.1]) in the sense that the second term in the estimate is an L^1 norm instead of an L^∞ norm. This can be achieved as follows. First, observe that for any $h \in B_{3/4}$ and $x \in B_{\frac{3}{4}-|h|}$, using that $K \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$:

$$\begin{aligned} |L(u\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1})(x) - L(u\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1})(x+h)| &\leq |h|^\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} |u(y)| \frac{|K(x-y) - K(x+h-y)|}{|h|^\alpha} dy \\ &\leq c|h|^\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s+\alpha}} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since we can add and subtract constants to \tilde{f} without affecting the left hand side of the next estimate, for any $h \in B_{3/4}$ it holds:

$$\|\tilde{f} - \tilde{f}(\cdot + h)\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{3}{4}-|h|})} \leq C \left(\operatorname{osc}_{B_{3/4}} f + |h|^\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s+\alpha}} dy \right). \quad (2.10)$$

From here, proceeding as in the proof of [AbRo20, Lemma 3.6] (see also [RTW23, Lemma 8.1]), we deduce that we can write $\tilde{f} = g + p$ for some $g \in L^\infty(B_{3/4})$ and a polynomial p . By the same arguments as in [AbRo20, Lemma 3.6], [RTW23, Lemma 8.1] we deduce suitable estimates for p yielding after combination with (2.10):

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} \leq C \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s+\alpha}} dy + \operatorname{osc}_{B_{3/4}} f \right).$$

Finally, as a direct consequence of (2.10), we deduce

$$[\tilde{f}]_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})} \leq C \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s+\alpha}} dy + [f]_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})} \right),$$

which yields the claim (2.9).

Thus, by application of the interior regularity estimate [FeRo24a, Theorem 2.4.1] to v , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} &= \|v\|_{C^{2s+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq c \left(\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} \frac{|u(y)|}{|y|^{n+2s+\alpha}} dy + [f]_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Next, we provide a lemma stating that equations up to a polynomial can be differentiated in the same way as classical nonlocal equations. This lemma will be used in the proof of Lemma 5.3.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \in C^1(B_1)$, and $K \in C^{k+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\delta > 0$. Let $u \in C(B_1) \cap L_{2s+k+\delta}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\partial_i u \in L_{2s+k-1+\delta}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, it holds*

$$Lu \stackrel{k+1}{=} f \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

and $\partial_i f_R \rightarrow \partial_i f$, if and only if

$$L(\partial_i u) \stackrel{k}{=} \partial_i f \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Proof. Let us assume first that $\partial_i u \in L^1_{2s+k-1+\delta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and assume that $Lu \stackrel{k+1}{=} f$ in B_1 . Then, there exist polynomials $p_R \in \mathcal{P}_k$ and functions $f_R \in L^\infty(B_1)$ with $f_R \rightarrow f$ such that

$$L(u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = f_R + p_R \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Let us now consider difference quotients $D_i^h u(x) = \frac{u(x+e_i h) - u(x)}{|h|}$ and compute

$$L(D_i^h u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = L(D_i^h (u \mathbb{1}_{B_R})) - L(u D_i^h \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = D_i^h f_R + D_i^h p_R - L(u D_i^h \mathbb{1}_{B_R}),$$

where, by carefully following the proof of [DDV22, Theorem 2.1], we can decompose

$$-L(u D_i^h \mathbb{1}_{B_R})(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_3} u D_i^h \mathbb{1}_{B_R}(y) K(x-y) dy = d_{R,h}(x) + g_{R,h}(x)$$

for functions $g_{R,h}$ such that

$$g_{R,h}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} D_i^h (\mathbb{1}_{B_R})(y) u(y) \psi(x, y) dy = - \int_{B_R} (D_{-h}^i u(y) \psi(x, y) + u(y) D_{-h}^i \psi(x, y)) dy$$

for some function $\psi : B_1 \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in B_1} \psi(x, y) \leq C \sup_{x \in B_1} (1 + |x - y|)^{-(n+2s+k-1+\delta)}, \quad \sup_{x \in B_1} |\nabla_y \psi(x, y)| \leq C \sup_{x \in B_1} (1 + |x - y|)^{-(n+2s+k+\delta)},$$

and polynomials $d_{R,h} \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ with

$$d_{R,h}(x) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k-1} \kappa_{\alpha,h} x^\alpha, \quad \kappa_{\alpha,h} = c_\alpha \int_{B_R} D_{-h}^i [u(y) \partial_x^\alpha K(x-y)] dy, \quad c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Clearly, it holds $g_{R,h} \rightarrow g_R$, and $d_{R,h} \rightarrow d_R$, as $R \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$g_R(x) = \int_{B_R} \partial_i [u(y) \psi(x, y)] dy, \quad d_R(x) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k-1} \kappa_\alpha x^\alpha, \quad \kappa_\alpha = c_\alpha \int_{B_R} \partial_i [u(y) \partial_x^\alpha K(x-y)] dy.$$

Note that for the convergence $g_{R,h} \rightarrow g_R$ we are using that for any $x \in B_1$

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{1}_{B_R}(y) (D_{-h}^i u(y) \psi(x, y) + \mathbb{1}_{B_R}(y) u(y) D_{-h}^i \psi(x, y))| \\ & \leq C |\partial_i u(y)| \sup_{x \in B_1} (1 + |x - y|)^{-(n+2s+k-1+\delta)} + C |u(y)| \sup_{x \in B_1} (1 + |x - y|)^{-(n+2s+k+\delta)} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \end{aligned}$$

and dominated convergence. Moreover, from integrating by parts, we see that it holds for any $x \in B_1$

$$\int_2^\infty R^{-1} |g_R^{(2)}(x)| dR \leq \int_2^\infty R^{-1} \int_{\partial B_R} |u(y)| |x - y|^{-(n+2s+k-1+\delta)} dy dR \leq c \int_{B_2^c} |u(y)| |y|^{-(n+2s+k+\delta)} dy < \infty,$$

which implies that $g_R(x) \rightarrow 0$, as $R \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in x .

Altogether, we have shown

$$L(\partial_i u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} D_i^h f_R + \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} D_i^h p_R + \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} d_{R,h} + \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} g_{R,h} = \partial_i f_R + \partial_i p_R + d_R + g_R,$$

which implies that

$$L(\partial_i u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) \stackrel{k}{=} f \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

as desired.

Let us now show the other implication, i.e., assume that $L(\partial_i u) \stackrel{k}{=} \partial_i f$ in B_1 . Then, by [DDV22] we observe that there are $F_R : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $P_R \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that

$$L(u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = F_R + P_R \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Clearly, by the same arguments as above, we have

$$L((D_i^h u) \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = D_i^h L(u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) - L(u D_i^h \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = D_i^h F_R + D_i^h P_R + d_{R,h} + g_{R,h}$$

with $D_i^h P_R + d_{R,h} \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ and $g_{R,h} \rightarrow g_R$, as $h \rightarrow 0$ with $g_R \rightarrow 0$, as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, by the stability for viscosity solutions up to a polynomial (see [AbRo20]), we have that

$$f_R + p_R = L(\partial_i u \mathbb{1}_{B_R}) = \partial_i F_R + \partial_i P_R + d_R + g_R,$$

where $d_R, p_R, \partial_i P_R \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$. Hence, after integrating the previous identity in x_i and denoting $\tilde{F}_R(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x_i} (f_R - g_R)(x', y_i) dy$, we can deduce:

$$F_R = \tilde{F}_R + \tilde{P}_R \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

where $\tilde{P}_R \in \mathcal{P}_k$ is such that $\partial_i \tilde{P}_R = p_R - d_R - \partial_i P_R$. Then, since $f_R \rightarrow f$ and $g_R \rightarrow 0$, as $R \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce that $\tilde{F}_R \rightarrow F$, where $\partial_i F = f$, and the proof is complete. \square

2.5. Two lemmas on viscosity solutions. In this section, we prove two auxiliary lemmas for viscosity solutions to nonlocal equations with local Neumann boundary data, namely a stability result, and that sums of viscosity subsolutions are again viscosity subsolutions. Both results are standard for nonlocal equations in the interior of the solution domain (see [FeRo24a]). However, since we consider equations at the boundary, where solutions satisfy a Neumann condition in the viscosity sense, both results require a proof. Both proofs heavily rely on the interaction of nonlocal operators with the distance function and the results in Subsection 2.2.

First, we prove a stability result, which will be crucial in the blow-up argument of our proof of the higher boundary regularity.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, bounded domains with $\partial\Omega_j \in C^{2,\gamma}$ such that $0 \in \partial\Omega_j$, $\nu_0 = e_n$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that the $C^{2,\gamma}$ radii of Ω_j and $\text{diam}(\Omega_j)$ are uniformly bounded. Given a sequence $r_j \searrow 0$, we set $\tilde{\Omega}_j = r_j^{-1}\Omega_j$ and $\tilde{d}_j := d_{\tilde{\Omega}_j}$. Let $v_j \in L_{2s+k}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v_j/\tilde{d}_j^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\tilde{\Omega}_j})$ be viscosity solutions to*

$$\begin{cases} L_j v_j \stackrel{k}{=} f_j & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1, \\ v_j = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \tilde{\Omega}_j, \\ \partial_\nu(v_j/\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}) = g_j & \text{on } \partial\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1, \end{cases}$$

where $f_j \in C(\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1)$, $g_j \in C(\partial\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1)$, and $(L_j)_j \subset \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda, k-1+\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Moreover, assume that there are $v \in L_{2s+k}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/(x_n)_+^{s-1} \in C(\{x_n \geq 0\})$, $f \in C(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_1)$, $g \in C(\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_1)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda, k-1+\alpha)$, and $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$, $q_j \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} v_j/\tilde{d}_j^{s-1} &\rightarrow v/(x_n)_+^{s-1} && \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(B_1), \\ v_j &\rightarrow v && \text{in } L_{2s+k}^1(\mathbb{R}^n), \\ |f_j - p_j - f| &\rightarrow 0 && \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(B_1 \cap \{x_n > 0\}), \\ |g_j - q_j - g|(x) &\leq c\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0 && \forall x \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1, \\ K_j &\rightarrow K && \text{in } C^{k-1+\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, there exists $q \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that v is a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} Lv \stackrel{k}{=} f & \text{in } B_1 \cap \{x_n > 0\}, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{x_n > 0\}, \\ \partial_n(v/(x_n)_+^{s-1}) = g + q & \text{on } B_1 \cap \{x_n = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

If $k = 0$, the same result holds with $\tilde{d}_j^{s-\gamma} f_j \in L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1)$ and $(x_n)_+^{s-\gamma} f \in L^\infty(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_1)$.

Proof. Let us define $u_j := v_j / \tilde{d}_j^{s-1}$ and $u := v / (x_n)_+^{s-1}$. Note that since $u_j \rightarrow u$ in $L_{loc}^\infty(B_1)$ it follows that $v_j = \tilde{d}_j^{s-1} u_j \rightarrow (x_n)_+^{s-1} u = v$ in $L_{loc}^\infty(B_1 \cap \{x_n > 0\})$. This property is enough to apply the proof of the stability of viscosity solutions in [FeRo24a, Proposition 3.2.12] to v_j and v . The higher order version which we require here follows in the same way as in [AbRo20, Lemma 3.5]. Since $v_j \rightarrow v$ in $L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we also have that $v = 0$ in $B_1 \setminus \{x_n > 0\}$. Consequently, it only remains to prove the convergence of the Neumann boundary condition.

To do so, let $x_0 \in B_1 \cap \{x_n = 0\}$. In case $k \geq 1$, we first truncate v and v_j in $B_2(x_0)$ and apply [AbRo20, Lemma 3.6] to obtain the equations satisfied by $v \mathbb{1}_{B_2}(x_0)$ and $v_j \mathbb{1}_{B_2}(x_0)$. In order not to over-complicate the notation, let us denote the truncations still by v and v_j and the corresponding source terms by f and f_j . Then, let $\phi \in C^2(B_r(x_0))$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$ with $\phi \leq u$ in $B_r(x_0)$, $\phi(x_0) = u(x_0)$, and $\phi \equiv u$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_r(x_0)}$ be a test function. Given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$, we define now

$$\psi^{(\delta)}(x) = -\delta \mathbb{1}_{B_r(x_0)}(x) \left[(x_n)_+ - (x_n)_+^{1+\eta} \right], \quad \psi_j^{(\delta)}(x) = -\delta \mathbb{1}_{B_r(x_0)}(x) \left[\tilde{d}_j(x) - \tilde{d}_j^{1+\eta}(x) \right].$$

Note that there exist $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, r/2)$, independent of δ, j , such that

$$L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1} \psi_j^{(\delta)}) \leq -C\delta \tilde{d}_j^{\eta-s} \quad \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_\varepsilon(x_0). \quad (2.11)$$

This is due to [FeRo24a, Proposition B.2.1, Lemma B.2.6, Corollary B.2.8], and since $\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_R(x_0)$ and the respective $C^{2,\gamma}$ -radii of $\tilde{\Omega}_j$ are uniformly bounded. Indeed, the aforementioned results yield the existence of $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$-\delta L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1} [\tilde{d}_j - \tilde{d}_j^{1+\eta}]) \leq -c_1 \delta \tilde{d}_j^{\eta-s} \quad \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_{\varepsilon_0}(x_0).$$

Moreover, one computes by scaling from $\tilde{\Omega}_j$ to Ω_j , denoting $d_j = d_{\Omega_j}$, and applying Lemma 2.2

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1} [\tilde{d}_j - \tilde{d}_j^{1+\eta}] \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(x_0)}) &\leq c \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_j \setminus B_r(x_0)} (\tilde{d}_j^s(y) + \tilde{d}_j^{s+\eta}(y)) |y|^{-n-2s} dy \\ &\leq c\delta \int_{\Omega_j \setminus B_{rr_j}(x_0)} (r_j^s d_j^s(y) + r_j^{s-\eta} d_j^{s+\eta}(y)) |y|^{-n-2s} dy \\ &\leq c_2 \delta (1 + r^{-s} + r^{\eta-s}) \quad \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_{r/2}(x_0), \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where $c_2 > 0$ might depend on $\text{diam}(\Omega_j)$, which we assumed to be bounded, but not on j . Thus, by combination of the previous two computations, we deduce (2.11) upon choosing $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ if necessary.

Moreover, it is immediate by construction that

$$\psi^{(\delta)} \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.13)$$

Next, we set $\phi^{(\delta)} := \phi + \psi^{(\delta)}$. Note that for any $\delta > 0$, it still holds $\phi^{(\delta)} \leq u$ by (2.13), and $\phi^{(\delta)}(x_0) = u(x_0)$, however $u - \phi^{(\delta)}$ has a strict minimum at x_0 in $\overline{B_r(x_0)}$.

It suffices to prove for any $\delta > 0$ small enough

$$\partial_n \phi^{(\delta)}(x_0) \leq g(x_0) + q(x_0), \quad (2.14)$$

since then it follows that $\partial_n \phi(x_0) = \partial_n \phi^{(\delta)}(x_0) + \delta \leq g(x_0) + q(x_0) + \delta$, and we obtain the desired result upon taking the limit $\delta \searrow 0$.

Let us now construct test functions $\phi_j^{(\delta)}$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows

$$\begin{cases} \phi_j^{(\delta)} &= u_j = u_j + \psi_j^{(\delta)} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_r(x_0)}, \\ \phi_j^{(\delta)} &= \phi + c_j + \psi_j^{(\delta)} & \text{in } \overline{B_r(x_0)}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$c_j = \min \left\{ c \in \mathbb{R} : \phi + c + \psi_j^{(\delta)} \leq u_j \quad \text{in } \overline{B_r(x_0)} \right\}.$$

Since $\psi_j^{(\delta)} \rightarrow \psi^{(\delta)}$ (lower half-relaxed limits) in $\overline{B_r(x_0)}$, we obtain that $c_j \rightarrow 0$, and that there exist $x_j \in \overline{B_r(x_0)}$ with $x_j \rightarrow x_0$ such that $\phi_j^{(\delta)}(x_j) = u_j(x_j)$ and $\phi_j^{(\delta)} \leq u_j$ by [FeRo24a, Lemma 3.2.10 and Proof of Proposition 3.2.12].

Next, we argue that $x_j \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $x_j \in B_\varepsilon(x_0)$ upon taking $j \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. In fact, if $x_j \in \tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_\varepsilon(x_0)$, then we can compute using Corollary 2.5(i), and (2.11)

$$\begin{aligned} L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\phi_j^{(\delta)})(x_j) &= L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\phi \mathbb{1}_{B_r(x_0)})(x_j) + c_j L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\mathbb{1}_{B_r(x_0)})(x_j) \\ &\quad + L_j(v_j \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(x_0)})(x_j) + L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\psi_j^{(\delta)})(x_j) \\ &\leq L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\phi) + c_j L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}) \\ &\quad + L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}u \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(x_0)}) + c_j L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(x_0)}) \\ &\quad + c\|v_j\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} - C\delta\tilde{d}_j^{\eta-s}(x_j) \\ &\leq C_r\tilde{d}_j^{\gamma-s}(x_j) - C\delta\tilde{d}_j^{\eta-s}(x_j) \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

for some constant $C_r > 0$, depending also on $\|v_j\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ and $\|v\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. Note that to estimate the fourth term in the last estimate, we used an argument similar to (2.12).

Let us now recall that $\eta < \gamma$. Hence, upon making $\varepsilon > 0$ even smaller, we can have in $\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_\varepsilon(x_0)$:

$$C\delta\tilde{d}_j^{\eta-\gamma} > (C_r + \mathbb{1}_{\{k=0\}}\|\tilde{d}_j^{s-\gamma}f_j\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1)} + \mathbb{1}_{\{k \geq 1\}}\|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1)}).$$

Then it holds

$$L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\phi_j^{(\delta)})(x_j) < -\mathbb{1}_{\{k=0\}}\tilde{d}_j^{\gamma-s}(x_j)\|\tilde{d}_j^{s-\gamma}f_j\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1)} - \mathbb{1}_{\{k \geq 1\}}\|f_j\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1)} < f_j(x_j). \tag{2.16}$$

However, note that by construction, $\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\phi_j^{(\delta)}$ is a valid test function for the equation that is satisfied for $\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}u_j = v_j$ at x_j . Since we assumed that $x_j \in \tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1$, it must hold $L_j(\tilde{d}_j^{s-1}\phi_j^{(\delta)})(x_j) \geq f_j(x_j)$, which contradicts (2.16).

Therefore, it must be $x_j \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}_j \cap B_1$, as we claimed before. Thus, by the boundary condition

$$\partial_{\nu_{x_j}}\phi_j^{(\delta)}(x_j) \leq g_j(x_j).$$

Passing this inequality to the limit, and using the uniform convergence $|g_j - q_j - g| \rightarrow 0$, $\nu_{x_j} \rightarrow \nu_0 = e_n$, and $\tilde{\Omega}_j \rightarrow \{x_n > 0\}$, we obtain

$$\partial_n(\phi^{(\delta)}(x_0) - q(x_0)) \leq g(x_0),$$

where $q \in \mathcal{P}_k$ is the limit of the sequence of polynomials $(q_j)_j$. Thus, we have $\partial_n\phi^{(\delta)}(x_0) \leq g(x_0) + q(x_0)$, i.e., (2.14), as desired. This concludes the proof. \square

Second, we prove that the difference of two viscosity solutions is again a viscosity subsolution.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{2,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda, k-1+\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Let $v, w \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1}, w/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be*

viscosity solutions to

$$\begin{cases} Lv \stackrel{k}{=} f_1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ v/d^{s-1} = g_1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} Lw \stackrel{k}{=} f_2 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ w/d^{s-1} = g_2 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

for some $f_1, f_2 \in C(\Omega)$ and $g_1, g_2 \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Then, $v - w$ is a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} L(v - w) \stackrel{k}{=} f_1 - f_2 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v - w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ (v - w)/d^{s-1} = g_1 - g_2 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We will only demonstrate the proof in case $k = 0$. The general case follows immediately by combining the arguments with the definition Definition 2.8. For the nonlocal equation, the result follows for instance from [FeRo24a, Lemma 3.4.14]. For the boundary condition, one can proceed as follows. First, we define the sup- and inf-convolutions $(v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon$ and $(w/d^{s-1})^\varepsilon$ (see [FeRo24a, Lemma 3.2.16]) with $D \subset \Omega$ open, bounded such that $\overline{D} \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Then, by adapting the arguments in [FeRo24a, Proposition 3.2.17], one can show that for any $x \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{D}$ it holds in the viscosity sense

$$\partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon(x) \leq g_1(x) + \delta_\varepsilon, \quad \partial_\nu(w/d^{s-1})^\varepsilon \geq g_2(x) + \delta^\varepsilon, \quad (2.17)$$

where $\delta_\varepsilon, \delta^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Note that once (2.17) is proven, since $(v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon$ and $-(w/d^{s-1})^\varepsilon$ are both semi-concave, we have that at any point $x \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{D}$, where $(v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon - (w/d^{s-1})^\varepsilon$ can be touched by a paraboloid from below, the functions $(v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon$ and $-(w/d^{s-1})^\varepsilon$ must be in $C^{1,1}$. Hence, by the linearity of ∂_ν , and due to (2.17) it must hold $\partial_\nu((v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon - (w/d^{s-1})^\varepsilon)(x) \leq g_1(x) - g_2(x) + \delta_\varepsilon - \delta^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus, by the stability for viscosity solutions (which was provided in a significantly more general framework in Lemma 2.13), we deduce that $\partial_\nu((v - w)/d^{s-1}) \leq (g_1 - g_2)$ in the viscosity sense. In a similar way, one can prove $\partial_\nu((v - w)/d^{s-1}) \geq (g_1 - g_2)$, and thus, we obtain the desired result. Thus, it remains to give a proof of (2.17). To see it, for any test function $\phi \in C^2(B_r(x_0))$ touching $(v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon$ from below at $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{D}$, we define

$$\psi^{(\delta)}(x) = -\delta \mathbb{1}_{B_1(x_0)}(x) [d(x) - d^{1+\eta}(x)]$$

for some $\eta \in (0, \gamma)$ and observe that $\phi^{(\delta)} = \phi + \psi^{(\delta)}$ is still a valid test function, touching $(v/d^{s-1})_\varepsilon$ (strictly) from below, at x_0 . Then, by the same arguments as in [FeRo24a, Proposition 3.2.17], there exists $x_\varepsilon \in \overline{D}$ with $x_\varepsilon \in B_{c\varepsilon}(x_0)$ for some $c > 0$, depending only on the oscillation of v/d^{s-1} , such that $\phi^{(\delta)}(\cdot + x_0 - c + \varepsilon) - \varepsilon^{-1}|x_0 - x_\varepsilon|^2$ touches v/d^{s-1} from below at x_ε . We observe that $x_\varepsilon \notin \Omega$ since otherwise one would get a contradiction with the nonlocal equation satisfied by v , in the exact same way as in the proof of (2.16), if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. Thus, $x_\varepsilon \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{D}$, and from the boundary condition satisfied by v , it follows $\partial_\nu \phi^{(\delta)}(x_0) \leq g_1(x_\varepsilon)$. Thus, by the definition of $\phi^{(\delta)}$, we have $\partial_\nu \phi(x_0) = \partial_\nu \phi^{(\delta)}(x_0) + \delta \leq g_1(x_\varepsilon) + \delta$ for any $\delta > 0$. Thus, sending $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and recalling that $x_\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, this proves the first statement in (2.17) with $\delta_\varepsilon = g_1(x_\varepsilon) - g_1(x_0)$. Analogously, one proves the second claim in (2.17). \square

3. NONLOCAL MAXIMUM PRINCIPLES WITH LOCAL DIRICHLET- AND NEUMANN CONDITIONS

In this section, we establish weak maximum principles for nonlocal equations with local Dirichlet- and Neumann data (see Proposition 1.3 and Proposition 1.5).

First, we establish a weak maximum principle for solutions to the inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem in (1.10) (see Proposition 1.3). Its proof goes by sliding the barrier subsolution ϕ from Lemma 2.6 underneath v from below.

Proof of Proposition 1.3. By assumption on v , we have that $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ with $v/d^{s-1} \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Let $z \in \partial\Omega$ be such that $\min_{\partial\Omega} v/d^{s-1} = v/d^{s-1}(z) =: l \geq 0$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$ and $M > 1$ to be chosen later, and recall the subsolution $\phi_l \in C(\Omega)$ from Lemma 2.6. We define

$$c_0 := \inf\{c \in \mathbb{R} : \phi_l/d^{s-1} - c \leq v/d^{s-1} \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}\}.$$

Since also $\phi_l/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, the above set is nonempty and $c_0 < \infty$. In fact, recalling the definition of ϕ_l , it must be

$$c_0 \leq \|v/d^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\overline{\Omega})} + \|(\phi_l)_+/d^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\overline{\Omega})} \leq \|v/d^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\overline{\Omega})} + l + c|\text{diam}(\Omega)|^\varepsilon, \quad (3.1)$$

which is independent of M . Moreover, since $\phi_l/d^{s-1}(z) = l = v/d^{s-1}(z)$, we have that $c_0 \geq 0$. Then, in particular, we have

$$\phi_l/d^{s-1} - c_0 \leq v/d^{s-1} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_l/d^{s-1}(x_0) - c_0 = v/d^{s-1}(x_0) \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

In case $x_0 \in \Omega$, we have

$$\phi_l - c_0 d^{s-1} - v \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{and} \quad (\phi_l - c_0 d^{s-1} - v)(x_0) = 0,$$

so it must be

$$0 \leq L(\phi_l - c_0 d^{s-1} - v)(x_0) \leq L\phi_l(x_0) - c_0 L(d^{s-1})(x_0) \leq -d^{\varepsilon-s-1}(x_0) - M + (l + c_0)cd^{\delta\gamma-s-1}(x_0),$$

where we used Lemma 2.6 and that $|L(d^{s-1})| \leq cd^{\delta\gamma-s-1}$ for any $\delta \in (0, s)$ by Lemma 2.3. Next, we fix any $\delta \in (0, s)$, and take $\varepsilon < \delta\gamma$ and M so large, depending only on $c_0, l, \text{diam}(\Omega)$ (but not on x_0), such that

$$-d^{\varepsilon-s-1}(x_0) - M + (l + c_0)cd^{\delta\gamma-s-1}(x_0) < 0.$$

Since c_0 is independent of M (see (3.1)), we obtain a contradiction. Thus, it must be $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, which by construction yields that $c_0 = 0$, and therefore $\phi_l \leq v$ in Ω . Since $l \geq 0$, by Lemma 2.6, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\phi_l \geq 0$ in $\Omega \cap \{d \leq \delta\}$. Therefore, v is a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega \cap \{d > \delta\}, \\ v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\Omega \cap \{d > \delta\}). \end{cases}$$

Since $v \in C(\overline{\Omega \cap \{d > \delta\}})$, we can apply the standard maximum principle for viscosity solutions to v (see [FeRo24a, Lemma 3.2.19]) and deduce that $v \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n , as desired. \square

In particular, we have the following comparison principle:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $v, b \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1}, b/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be viscosity solutions to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \geq f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v/d^{s-1} & \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} Lb & \leq f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ b & \leq v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ b/d^{s-1} & \leq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

for some $f \in C(\Omega)$. Then, $v \geq b$ in \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. Since by [FeRo24a, Lemma 3.4.13] $w = v - b$ is a viscosity solution to $Lw \geq 0$ in Ω such that $w/d^{s-1} \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, and $w \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$, it satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.3. An application of this result concludes the proof. \square

As an application, we have the following version of a nonlocal Hopf lemma for viscosity solutions:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy in the viscosity sense:*

$$\begin{cases} Lv = f & \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ v/d^{s-1} & \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

for some $f \in C(\Omega)$. Then, either $v \equiv 0$ in Ω , or

$$v(x) \geq C \left(\inf_{\{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq \delta\}} v \right) d_\Omega^s(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

for some $C, \delta > 0$, which depend only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \text{diam}(\Omega)$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω .

Proof. The proof follows in the same way as [FeRo24a, Proposition 2.6.6]. First, by the weak maximum principle for viscosity solutions with boundary blow-up (see Proposition 1.3), we have $v \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n . In order to deduce $v > 0$ in case $v \not\equiv 0$, one uses the nonlocal weak Harnack inequality (see [FeRo24a, Theorem 3.3.1]). An appropriate comparison principle for our framework is stated in Lemma 3.1. Apart from these observations, the proof follows precisely along the lines of [FeRo24a, Proposition 2.6.6]. \square

As a corollary of the previous results, we obtain the following pointwise formulation of a nonlocal Hopf lemma for solutions with boundary blow-up.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy in the viscosity sense:*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ v/d^{s-1} & = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

for some $g \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Let $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ be such that $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} g = g(x_0) \leq 0$. Then, either $v \equiv 0$, or we have that in the viscosity sense

$$\partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1})(x_0) > 0.$$

Proof. Let $\phi = \phi_{-1}$ be the barrier function from Lemma 2.6 with respect to Ω for some $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$ and $M > 0$ so large that $\phi \leq 0$ in Ω . Note that since $g(x_0) \leq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(v + g(x_0)\phi) &\geq -g(x_0)(d^{\varepsilon-s-1} + M) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v + g(x_0)\phi &\geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ (v + g(x_0)\phi)/d^{s-1} &= g - g(x_0) \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, an application of Lemma 3.2 to $v + g(x_0)\phi$ yields that either $v + g(x_0)\phi \equiv 0$ in Ω , or

$$v + g(x_0)\phi \geq cd^s \quad \text{near } x_0. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that we cannot have $v + g(x_0)\phi \equiv 0$, unless $g(x_0) = 0$ (in which case $v \equiv v + g(x_0)\phi \equiv 0$), since then

$$Lv = -g(x_0)L\phi \leq g(x_0)(d^{\varepsilon-s-1} + M) < 0 \quad \text{near } \partial\Omega,$$

a contradiction. Thus, unless $v \equiv 0$, we have (3.2), and we compute, using that $\phi/d^{s-1}(x_0) = -1$

$$\partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1})(x_0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\frac{v(x)}{d^{s-1}(x)} - g(x_0)}{d(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\frac{v(x)}{d^{s-1}} + \frac{g(x_0)\phi(x)}{d^{s-1}(x)}}{d(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{v(x) + g(x_0)\phi(x)}{d^s(x)} \geq c > 0,$$

which concludes the proof. Note that if the limit in the previous estimate does not exist, we need to interpret the boundary condition in the viscosity sense, i.e., take any smooth ψ with $\psi(x_0) = (v/d^{s-1})(x_0) = g(x_0)$ and $\psi \geq v/d^{s-1}$. Then, the limit $\partial_\nu \psi(x_0)$ exists, and an analogous computation as above yields $\partial_\nu \psi(x_0) \geq c > 0$, i.e., $\partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1})(x_0) > 0$ in the viscosity sense. \square

Finally, we are in a position to prove the main result of this section, a maximum principle for nonlocal equations with local Neumann conditions.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy in the viscosity sense:*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \geq f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1}) & \leq g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

for some $f \in C(\Omega)$ with $d^{s+1-\varepsilon}f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1+s]$, and $g \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Then, there exists $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \varepsilon$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω and $\text{diam}(\Omega)$, such that

$$v/d^{s-1} \geq -c\|d^{s+1-\varepsilon}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} - c\|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Proof. The case $f \geq 0$ and $g \leq 0$ follows from the Hopf lemma (see Lemma 3.3). In fact, by Lemma 3.3 we deduce that either $v \equiv 0$, in which case we are done, or that $v/d^{s-1} > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. However, by the weak maximum principle (see Proposition 1.3), this implies $v \geq 0$, as desired.

Now, we explain how to get the result with general f, g . To do so, we apply the previous argument with v replaced by

$$w = v + (\|d^{s+1-\varepsilon}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)})\psi, \quad \text{where } \psi(x) = ld^{s-1}(x) - d^{s-1+\varepsilon_0}(x) + C_2\mathbb{1}_{\overline{\Omega}}(x)$$

for some $\varepsilon_0 < \min\{\gamma, 1-s, \varepsilon\}$, and $l, C_2 > 0$ to be chosen later, as in Lemma 2.7. Note that $\psi \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\psi/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, and from the proof of Lemma 2.7 we deduce that for any $M > 0$

$$\begin{cases} L\psi & \geq c_0d^{\varepsilon_0-s-1} + M & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(\psi/d^{s-1}) & = -\infty \leq 1, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \psi & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \end{cases}$$

for some $c_0 > 0$, if we choose $l > 0$ large enough, depending on ε_0 , and $\text{diam}(\Omega)$, and then $C_2 > 0$, large enough, depending on l, ε_0, M . Let us choose M so large that

$$c_0d^{\varepsilon_0-s-1} + M \geq d^{\varepsilon-s-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then, altogether, we have that in the viscosity sense:

$$\begin{cases} Lw \geq f + (c_0d^{\varepsilon_0-s-1} + M)(\|d^{s+1-\varepsilon}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}) & \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w \geq v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(w/d^{s-1}) \leq g - (\|d^{s+1-\varepsilon}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}) & \leq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Altogether, by the same argument as at the beginning of the proof, we have $w \geq 0$ in Ω . Let us now observe that by construction

$$\psi \leq ld^{s-1} + C_2 \leq (l + C_2)d^{s-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$v \geq -\psi(\|d^{s+1-\varepsilon}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}) \geq -(l + C_2)d^{s-1}(\|d^{s+1-\varepsilon}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Proposition 1.5 is a special case of Lemma 3.4. \square

4. HÖLDER ESTIMATES UP TO THE BOUNDARY

The previous maximum principle for nonlocal equations with local Neumann conditions (see Lemma 3.4) puts us in a position to establish a Harnack inequality for solutions to (1.7) at the boundary, which will eventually lead to the Hölder regularity estimate in Theorem 1.6.

To prove it, we adapt some of the ideas in [LiZh23] to the framework of solutions to nonlocal problems which blow up at the boundary.

For $\delta > 0$, let us define $\Omega_\delta = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq \delta\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \geq f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_1, \\ v & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1}) & \leq g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_1 \end{cases}$$

for some $f \in C(\Omega \cap B_1)$ with $d^{s+1-\alpha}f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1+s]$, and $g \in C(\overline{\partial\Omega \cap B_1})$. Assume that $0 \in \partial\Omega$. Then, there exist $\eta > 1$ and $c > 0$, depending only on n, s, λ, Λ , and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω , such that

$$\int_{\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} (v/d^{s-1}) \, dx \leq c \inf_{\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-1}}} (v/d^{s-1}) + c(\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)}),$$

where $c > 0$ depends only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \alpha$.

Proof. The interior weak Harnack inequality for viscosity supersolutions (see [FeRo24a, Theorem 3.3.1]) applied with v implies

$$\int_{\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} v(x) \, dx \leq c \inf_{x \in \Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} v(x) + c\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1)},$$

where $c > 0$ depends on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \eta, \alpha$. Moreover, since $1/2 \leq d \leq 1$ in $\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1$, it follows for $u := v/d^{s-1}$:

$$\int_{\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} u(x) \, dx \leq c \inf_{x \in \Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} u(x) + c\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1)}.$$

Thus, it remains to show

$$\inf_{x \in \Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} u(x) \leq c \inf_{x \in \Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-1}}} u(x) + c(\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)}). \quad (4.1)$$

Note that since $v \geq 0$, by the weak Harnack inequality, either $v \equiv 0$, or $\inf_{\Omega \cap B_1} v > 0$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\inf_{\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} u = 1$.

To prove (4.1), let us take a set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\partial D \in C^{1,\gamma}$ such that

$$\Omega \cap B_{1/2} \subset D \subset \Omega \cap B_1,$$

and take $w = \phi_1 = d_D^{s-1} + d_D^{s-1+\alpha} - N\mathbb{1}_D$ from Lemma 2.6, where $\alpha < 1 - s$ is chosen small enough and $N > 0$ is chosen large enough. Then, we have

$$Lw \leq 0 \quad \text{in } D \cap B_1, \quad (4.2)$$

$$w \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (D \cap B_1), \quad (4.3)$$

$$\partial_\nu(w/d_D^{s-1}) \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D \cap B_1, \quad (4.4)$$

$$w/d_D^{s-1} \geq c_1 \quad \text{in } (\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\eta^{-1}}) \cap B_{1/4} \quad (4.5)$$

for some constants $\eta > 4$, and $c_1 > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω (but not on $\text{diam}(\Omega)$, since we can assume without loss of generality that $\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-1}} \neq \emptyset$). Note that (4.5) relies on the fact that $\partial D \cap B_{1/2} = \partial\Omega \cap B_{1/2}$.

Moreover, note that for any $x_0 \in (\partial D \setminus \partial\Omega) \cap B_1$ it holds $(v/d_D^{s-1})(x_0) = 0$ on (recall that $v \in C(\Omega)$ and therefore $|v(x_0)| < \infty$). Thus, and using also that $w/d_D^{s-1} = 1$ on ∂D by construction:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\nu((v-w)/d_D^{s-1})(x_0) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\frac{v(x)-w(x)}{d_D^{s-1}(x)} - (-1)}{d_D(x)} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\frac{v(x)}{d_D^{s-1}(x)} - (1 + d_D^\alpha(x) - Nd_D^{1-s}(x)) + 1}{d_D(x)} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (-d_D^{\alpha-1}(x) + (N + v(x))d_D^{-s}(x)) = -\infty \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

since $\alpha < 1 - s$. Thus, altogether, extending g by zero on $(\partial D \setminus \partial\Omega) \cap B_1$, we have that $v - w$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L(v-w) & \geq f & \text{in } D \cap B_1, \\ v-w & \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (D \cap B_1), \\ \partial_\nu((v-w)/d_D^{s-1}) & \leq g & \text{in } \partial D \cap B_1. \end{cases}$$

While the first property is an easy consequence of $D \cap B_1 \subset \Omega \cap B_1$ and (4.2), for the second one we used (4.3) and the fact that $v \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n by assumption. The third property is immediate from the assumption on v combined with (4.4) and (4.6).

Thus, we are in a position to apply the maximum principle for the Neumann problem (see Lemma 3.4):

$$(v-w)/d_D^{s-1} \geq -c\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f_-\|_{L^\infty(D \cap B_1)} - c\|g_+\|_{L^\infty(\partial D \cap B_1)} \quad \text{in } D \cap B_1.$$

Since by (4.5) we also have that $w/d_D^{s-1} \geq c_1 = c_1 \inf_{\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} u$ in $(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\eta^{-1}}) \cap B_{1/4}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} v/d_D^{s-1} &= (w + v - w)/d_D^{s-1} \\ &\geq c_1 \inf_{\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} u - c\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f_-\|_{L^\infty(D \cap B_1)} - c\|g_+\|_{L^\infty(\partial D \cap B_1)} \\ &\geq c_1 \inf_{\Omega_{1/2} \cap B_1} u - c\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f_-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)} - c\|g_+\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)} \quad \text{in } (\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\eta^{-1}}) \cap B_{1/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $D \cap B_1 \subset \Omega \cap B_1$. Since $\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-1}} \subset (\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\eta^{-1}}) \cap B_{1/4}$, and moreover in this set $d_D = d_\Omega$ by construction, we obtain (4.1), as desired. \square

As a corollary of the previous weak Harnack inequality at the boundary, we obtain a growth lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $\eta > 1$ be as in Lemma 4.1. Assume that $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and let $0 < R \leq 1$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with*

$v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} Lv \geq f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_R(x_0), \\ \partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1}) \leq g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0), \\ v \geq 0 & \text{in } B_R(x_0), \\ v \geq d^{s-1}(1 - \eta^{j\beta}) & \text{in } B_{\eta^j R}(x_0) \cap \Omega \quad \forall j \geq 1, \\ v \geq (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) & \text{in } B_{\eta^j R}(x_0) \setminus \Omega \quad \forall j \geq 1, \\ |\Omega_{R/4} \cap B_{R/2}(x_0) \cap \{v/d^{s-1} \geq \frac{1}{4}\}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\Omega_{R/4} \cap B_{R/2}(x_0)| \end{array} \right.$$

for some $f \in C(\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))$ with $d^{s+1-\alpha}f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1+s]$, and $g \in C(\partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))$. Then, there exist $\delta > 0$, and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \alpha$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω , such that

$$\inf_{\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-1}R}(x_0)} (v/d^{s-1}) + R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha}f_-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))} + R\|g_+\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))} \geq \delta.$$

Proof. Let us assume without loss of generality that $x_0 = 0$. The proof follows from a standard application of the weak Harnack inequality (see Lemma 4.1) to v_+ . The only deviation of this proof from standard arguments comes from the more involved argument to estimate the tail term.

Indeed, we have

$$Lv_+(x) \geq f(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} v_-(y)K(x-y)dy =: \tilde{f}(x),$$

where we used that by assumption, $v \geq 0$ in B_R . Then, we obtain from Lemma 4.1 (after scaling), using the last assumption and setting $u := v/d^{s-1}$

$$\inf_{\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-1}R}} u + R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha}\tilde{f}_-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_{R/2})} + R\|g_+\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_{R/2})} \geq c_0 \int_{\Omega_{R/4} \cap B_{R/2}} u dx \geq \frac{c_0}{8}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is the constant from the weak Harnack inequality.

Next, we estimate $\|d^{s+1-\alpha}\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R)}$. To do so, we apply a similar reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 2.2. First, we recall that for any $x \in B_{R/2}$, there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0, \kappa)$:

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\{d=t\} \cap B_{\eta^j R} \setminus B_{\eta^{j-1}R}) \leq C(\eta^j R)^{n-1},$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω (we refer to [FeRo24a, Lemma B.2.4] for a reference of this fact). Next, we observe that by the co-area formula:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{1+s} \int_{\Omega \setminus B_R} v_-(y)K(x-y)dy &\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) R^{1+s} \int_{\Omega \cap (B_{\eta^j R} \setminus B_{\eta^{j-1}R})} d^{s-1}(y)|y|^{-n-2s} dy \\ &\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) R^{1+s} \left((\eta^j R)^{-n-2s} \int_{(B_{\eta^j R} \setminus B_{\eta^{j-1}R}) \cap \{d \leq \kappa\}} d^{s-1}(y)|\nabla d(y)| dy + \kappa^{s-1} (\eta^j R)^{-2s} \right) \\ &\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) R^{1+s} \left((\eta^j R)^{-n-2s} \int_0^{\min\{\eta^j R, \kappa\}} t^{s-1} \left(\int_{(B_{\eta^j R} \setminus B_{\eta^{j-1}R}) \cap \{d=t\}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \right) dt + (\eta^j R)^{-2s} \right) \\ &\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) R^{1+s} ((\eta^j R)^{-1-s} + (\eta^j R)^{-2s}) \leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) \eta^{-2sj} \end{aligned}$$

for some $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \kappa, C, \eta$, where we also used that $R \leq 1$. Similarly,

$$R^{1+s} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) \setminus B_R} v_-(y)K(x-y)dy \leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) R^{1+s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \cap (B_{\eta^j R} \setminus B_{\eta^{j-1}R})} |y|^{-n-2s} dy$$

$$\leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) R^{1+s} (\eta^j R)^{-2s} \leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) \eta^{-2js},$$

where we used that $R^{1-s} \leq 1$, and $c > 0$ depends only on n, s, Λ . Therefore, we obtain

$$R^{1+s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} d^{s-1}(y) v_-(y) K(x-y) dy \leq c \sum_{j \geq 1} (1 - \eta^{j\beta}) \eta^{-2js}.$$

Since this quantity vanishes as $\beta > 0$ goes to zero, we can make the whole expression smaller than $c_0/16$, which implies by recalling the definition of f

$$\begin{aligned} R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha} \tilde{f}_-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_{R/2})} &\leq R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha} f_-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_{R/2})} + R^{1+s} \left\| \int_{\Omega \setminus B_R} v_-(y) K(\cdot - y) dy \right\|_{L^\infty(B_{R/2})} \\ &\leq R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha} f_-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R)} + \frac{c_0}{16}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore by the estimate (4.7)

$$\inf_{\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-1}R}} u + R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha} f_-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R)} + R \|g_+\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_R)} \geq \frac{c_0}{8} - \frac{c_0}{16} = \frac{c_0}{16},$$

as desired. \square

We are now in a position to prove the boundary Hölder regularity.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Assume that $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and let $0 < R \leq 1$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv &= f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_R(x_0), \\ v &= 0 & \text{in } B_R(x_0) \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1}) &= g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0) \end{cases}$$

for some $f \in C(\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))$ and $g \in C(\overline{\partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0)})$. Then, there exist $c > 0$, and $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω , such that if $d^{s+1-\alpha} f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$, then it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} [v/d^{s-1}]_{C^\alpha(B_{R/2}(x_0))} &\leq cR^{-\alpha} (\|v/d^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)} \\ &\quad + R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha} f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))} + R \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us assume without loss of generality that $x_0 = 0$. We will prove the desired result in two steps. Let us denote by $\eta > 1$ the constant from Lemma 4.2.

Step 1: We claim that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$B_{\eta^{-k}R}^{\text{osc}}(v/d^{s-1}) \leq c\eta^{-\alpha k} (\|v/d^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)} + R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha} f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R)} + R^\alpha + R \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_R)}).$$

for some constant $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω . To prove it, we set $\alpha_0 := \min\{\beta, \gamma s, 1 - s[-\log_\eta(1 - \frac{\delta'}{2})]\}$, and $\delta := 1 - \eta^{-\alpha_0}$, where δ', β, η are the constants from Lemma 4.2. This yields

$$(1 - \delta) = \eta^{-\alpha_0}, \quad \alpha_0 \leq \min\{\beta, \gamma s, 1 - s\}, \quad \delta \leq \delta'/2. \quad (4.8)$$

Let us set $u = v/d^{s-1}$, take $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$, and

$$M := 4\delta^{-1}c_1 (\|v/d^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)} + R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha} f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))} + R^\alpha + R \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0))}),$$

where $c_1 > 0$ denotes the constant c_1 from Lemma 2.3.

The claim of Step 1 will follow immediately, once we construct an increasing sequence $(m_k)_k$ and a decreasing sequence $(M_k)_k$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$m_k \leq u \leq M_k \quad \text{in } B_{\eta^{-k}R}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$M_k - m_k = M\eta^{-\alpha k}. \quad (4.10)$$

We prove (4.9) and (4.10) by induction. Setting $m_0 = -\frac{\delta}{2c_1}M$, $M_0 = \frac{\delta}{2c_1}M$, we obtain the desired results for $k = 0$. Let us now assume that (4.9) and (4.10) hold true for any $j \leq k-1$.

We will now prove it for k . Clearly, one of the following two options always holds true:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Omega_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/4}} \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/2}} \cap \left\{ u \geq \frac{M_{k-1} + m_{k-1}}{2} \right\} \right| &\geq \frac{|\Omega_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/4}} \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/2}}|}{2}, \\ \left| \Omega_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/4}} \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/2}} \cap \left\{ u \geq \frac{M_{k-1} + m_{k-1}}{2} \right\} \right| &\leq \frac{|\Omega_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/4}} \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/2}}|}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

In the first case, and in the second case, we define

$$w = \frac{v - (d^{s-1} + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{m_{k-1} < 0\}})m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}}, \quad w = \frac{(d^{s-1} + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{k-1} > 0\}})M_{k-1} - v}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}}, \quad \text{respectively.}$$

Let us assume that we are in the first case. The proof of the second case goes via the same arguments, and we will skip it. Let us verify that w satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 4.2. First, note that if $u(x) \geq \frac{M_{k-1} + m_{k-1}}{2}$ for some $x \in \Omega$, it follows that

$$\frac{w}{d^{s-1}}(x) = \frac{u(x) - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq \frac{u(x) - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq \frac{\frac{M_{k-1} + m_{k-1}}{2} - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} = \frac{1}{2},$$

Thus, as an immediate consequence of being in the first case, we get

$$\left| \Omega_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/4}} \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/2}} \cap \left\{ \frac{w}{d^{s-1}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \right| \geq \frac{|\Omega_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/4}} \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R/2}}|}{2}.$$

Moreover, by (4.9) (for $k-1$), we have

$$w = \frac{v - d^{s-1}m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R}} \cap \Omega.$$

Non-negativity of w in $B_{\eta^{-(k-1)R}} \setminus \Omega$ follows by assumption and construction. Note that by Lemma 2.3 (applied with $\delta \in (0, s)$ such that $\delta\gamma = \alpha$, which is possible by the choice of α_0), we obtain

$$|L(d^{s-1} + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega})| \leq c_1(d^{\alpha-s-1} + d^{-2s}) \leq c_1d^{\alpha-s-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and therefore $d^{s+1-\alpha}L(d^{s-1} + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega}) \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R)$. Then, by (4.10) (for $k-1$) we have

$$Lw = \frac{f - L(d^{s-1} + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{m_{k-1} < 0\}})m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq \frac{f - c_1d^{\alpha-s-1}m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_R. \quad (4.11)$$

Moreover, clearly

$$\partial_\nu(w/d^{s-1}) = \frac{g - \partial_\nu(d^{s-1}/d^{s-1})m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} = \frac{g}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_R.$$

It remains to verify the fourth and fifth assumption of Lemma 4.2. Let us first consider $j \leq k-1$. In that case, for any $x \in B_{\eta^{-(k-1)+j}R} \cap \Omega$ it holds by (4.9) and (4.10):

$$\frac{w}{d^{s-1}}(x) = \frac{u(x) - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq \frac{m_{k-j-1} - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}}$$

$$\geq \frac{M_{k-1} - M_{k-j-1} + m_{k-j-1} - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} = 1 - \frac{M_{k-j-1} - m_{k-j-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} = 1 - \eta^{\alpha j}.$$

Clearly, for any $x \in B_{\eta^{-(k-1)+j}R} \setminus \Omega$ and in case $m_{k-1} < 0$, by the same arguments as above, using (4.9), we have

$$w(x) = \frac{v(x) - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq \frac{m_{k-j-1} - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq 1 - \eta^{\alpha j}.$$

If however $m_{k-1} \geq 0$, then we can use that $v = 0$ in $B_R \setminus \Omega$. Moreover, if $j > k - 1$ we compute for $x \in B_{\eta^{-(k-1)+j}R} \cap \Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{w}{d^{s-1}}(x) &= \frac{u(x) - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq \frac{m_0 - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{(M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}) - (M_0 - m_0)}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} = 1 - \eta^{\alpha(k-1)} \geq 1 - \eta^{\alpha j}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $x \in B_{\eta^{-(k-1)+j}R} \setminus \Omega$, again by the same arguments as above, and using that $v \geq m_0$ by construction, we have

$$w(x) = \frac{v(x) - m_{k-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{m_{k-1} < 0\}}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq \frac{m_0 - m_{k-1}}{M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}} \geq 1 - \eta^{\alpha j}.$$

Consequently, all assumptions of Lemma 4.2 are satisfied for w with $R := \eta^{-(k-1)}R$. Thus, we deduce from Lemma 4.2 and the choice of δ :

$$\begin{aligned} u - m_{k-1} &= (M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}) \frac{w}{d^{s-1}} \\ &\geq 2\delta(M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}) - (\eta^{-(k-1)}R)^\alpha \left(\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)}R})} + c_1 \right) \\ &\quad - (\eta^{-(k-1)}R) \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)}R})} \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-k}R}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (4.8), the choice of M , (4.10), and the estimate $|m_{k-1}| \leq M_0 = \frac{\delta}{2c_1}M$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &(\eta^{-(k-1)}R)^\alpha \left(\|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)}R})} + c_1 |m_{k-1}| \right) + (\eta^{-(k-1)}R) \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-(k-1)}R})} \\ &\leq \eta^{-\alpha(k-1)}\delta M = \delta(M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we deduce

$$m_k := \delta(M_{k-1} - m_{k-1}) + m_{k-1} \leq u \leq M_{k-1} =: M_k \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_{\eta^{-k}R},$$

which proves (4.9) for k . (4.10) for k follows from (4.8). The proof of Step 1 is complete.

Step 2: Now that we have established the claim of Step 1, let us show how to conclude the proof. Let us take $x, y \in B_{R/2}$. We define $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$\inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : |x - y| \geq \eta^{-k}(R/2)\}.$$

Then, $|x - y| \leq \eta^{-k+1}(R/2)$ and by Step 1, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} &\leq \eta^{k\alpha}(R/2)^{-\alpha} \operatorname{osc}_{B_{\eta^{-k+1}(R/2)}} u \\ &\leq cR^{-\alpha} (\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)} + R^\alpha \|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R)} + R^\alpha + R\|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_R)}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we can omit the additional summand $+R^\alpha$ by an additional scaling and normalization argument, i.e., by assuming that $R = 1$ and $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)} + \|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)} = 1$, applying the previous estimate, and rescaling to general R . This concludes the proof. \square

We are now in a position to deduce the boundary Hölder regularity estimate in $C^{1,\gamma}$ domains.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. The proof follows immediately by combination of Lemma 4.3 (with $R = 1/2$ and varying $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$), the interior regularity results from [FeRo24a, Theorem 2.4.3], and a covering argument. In order to produce the tail-term in the estimate, we employ a standard truncation argument (see also the proof of Corollary 4.4). \square

We end this section with a boundary Hölder regularity estimate for solutions that are defined up to a polynomial and might grow fast at infinity.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $f \in C(\Omega \cap B_4)$, $g \in C(\overline{\partial\Omega \cap B_4})$, and v with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & \stackrel{k}{=} f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_4, \\ v & = 0 & \text{in } B_4 \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1}) & = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_4. \end{cases}$$

Then, there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that if for some $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$ we have $d^{s+1-\alpha}f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)$, then the following holds true: If $k = 0$, and $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, it holds $v/d^{s-1} \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_4)$, and

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_4)} \leq c \left(\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} + \|v\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_4)} + \|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_4)} \right).$$

If $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \in C^{k-1+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, $v \in L_{2s+k-1+\delta}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\delta > 0$, it holds $v/d^{s-1} \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_4)$, and

$$\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_4)} \leq c \left(\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} + \|v\|_{L_{2s+k-1+\delta}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_4)} + \|d^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \cap B_4)} \right),$$

where $c > 0$ and α_0 , depend only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, k, \delta$, and the $C^{1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω .

Proof. In case $k = 0$, the proof follows by a standard truncation argument. Indeed, let us define $w = v\mathbb{1}_{B_4}$ and observe that

$$Lw = f - L(v\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_4}) =: \tilde{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_2.$$

Moreover, we can estimate

$$\|d^{s+1-\alpha}\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2)} \leq c\|d^{s-1+\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2)} + c\|v\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_4)}.$$

Thus, the desired result follows immediately by application of Theorem 1.6 to w , using that $v = 0$ in $B_4 \setminus \Omega$, by assumption.

Let now $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Again, we define $w = v\mathbb{1}_{B_4}$, but this time, since the equation only holds up to a polynomial, we obtain for any $R > 4$

$$Lw = f_R - L(v\mathbb{1}_{B_R \setminus B_4}) + p_R =: \tilde{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_3,$$

where $f_R \rightarrow f$ in $d^{s+1-\alpha}L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_3)$, as $R \rightarrow \infty$, and $p_R \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$. As in the proof of Lemma 2.10 (see also [AbRo20, Lemma 3.6] and [Kuk21, Lemma 4.8]), taking difference quotients of order $k-1+\delta$ of the equation for w , and using crucially that $K \in C^{k-1+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, we can find a polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}_{[k-1+\delta]}$ and h with $d^{s+1-\alpha}h \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_3)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} Lw & = h + p & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_3, \\ w & = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\Omega \cap B_4), \end{cases}$$

and moreover, h satisfies the estimate

$$\|d_\Omega^{s+1-\alpha}h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_3)} \leq C \left(\|d_\Omega^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_3)} + \left\| |v| \cdot |\cdot|^{-n-2s-(k-1+\delta)} \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_4)} \right). \quad (4.12)$$

Next, let us take a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\partial D \in C^{1,\gamma}$ such that $\Omega \cap B_2 \subset D \subset \Omega \cap B_3$. Moreover, we find w_1, w_2 such that $w_1/d_D^{s-1}, w_2/d_D^{s-1} \in C(\overline{D})$ and $w = w_1 + w_2$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} Lw_1 &= h & \text{in } D, \\ w_1 &= w & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D, \\ w_1/d_D^{s-1} &= v/d_D^{s-1} & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} Lw_2 &= p & \text{in } D, \\ w_2 &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D, \\ w_2/d_D^{s-1} &= 0 & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases}$$

Note that the existence of $w_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ follows by standard arguments, and we obtain $w_2/d_D^s \in C^\gamma(\overline{D})$ from [FeRo24a, Theorem 2.7.1], which yields $w_2/d_D^{s-1} = d_D(w_2/d_D^s) \in C^\gamma(\overline{D})$ since $\partial D \in C^{1,\gamma}$. Then, we can define $w_1 := w - w_2$. We claim that

$$\|w_1/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq c \left(\|v/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} + \|d_\Omega^{s+1-\alpha}h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_3)} \right). \quad (4.13)$$

To see this, let us recall the function ψ_1 (with respect to D) from Lemma 2.7, and observe that by Lemma 2.3, we can take it in such a way that

$$L(\psi_1 + d_D^{s-1}) \geq c_0 d_D^{\alpha-s-1} \quad \text{in } D \quad (4.14)$$

for some $c_0 > 0$. Moreover, recall $\psi_1/d_D^{s-1} = 1$ on ∂D . Then, let us define

$$\Psi(x) = c_1 \psi_1(x) \left(\|v/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\partial D)} + \|d_D^{s+1-\alpha}h\|_{L^\infty(D)} + \|w/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} \right) + c_1 d_\Omega^{s-1}(x) \|w/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)},$$

where $c_1 := \max\{c_0^{-1}, 1\}$, and observe that by (4.14) we have

$$\begin{cases} Lw_1 &\leq L\Psi & \text{in } D, \\ w_1 &\leq \Psi & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D, \\ w_1/d_D^{s-1} &\leq \Psi/d_D^{s-1} & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases}$$

which, recalling that $\psi_1 \leq c_1 d_D^{s-1}$ in D , and $d_D \leq d_\Omega$, as well as the definition of D , imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{w_1}{d_D^{s-1}} &\leq c_2 c_1 \left(\|v/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\partial D)} + \|d_D^{s+1-\alpha}h\|_{L^\infty(D)} + \|w/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} \right) + c_2 c_1 \frac{d_\Omega^{s-1}}{d_D^{s-1}} \|w/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} \\ &\leq c \left(\|v/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega \cap B_3)} + \|d_\Omega^{s+1-\alpha}h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_3)} + \|v/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which yields our claim in (4.13). As a direct consequence of (4.13), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_2/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(D)} &\leq \|w/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(D)} + \|w_1/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(D)} \\ &\leq c \left(\|v/d_\Omega^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_4)} + \|d_\Omega^{s+1-\alpha}h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_3)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Finally, we claim that

$$\|p\|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq c \|w_2/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(D)}. \quad (4.16)$$

Note that once we show (4.16), then the proof is complete after combination of (4.16), (4.15), (4.12), and application of the boundary Hölder regularity estimate (see Theorem 1.6) to w in Ω , as in the

case $k = 0$. We prove (4.16) by contradiction. Suppose there are sequences $(L_j)_j, (w_j)_j, (p_j)_j$ with

$$\|p_j\|_{L^\infty(D)} = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} L_j w_j & = p_j & \text{in } D, \\ w_j & = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D, \\ w_j/d_\Omega^{s-1} & = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|w_j/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(D)} & = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, up to subsequences, it holds $L_{j_m} \rightharpoonup L$, $w_{j_m}/d_D^{s-1} \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^\infty(D)$ for some $u_0 \in L^\infty(D)$, $p_{j_m} \rightarrow p_0$ in $L^\infty(D)$. While the first convergence statement follows from [AbRo20, Lemma 3.7], the second convergence statement follows from Theorem 1.6 and the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, and the third one is immediate from the boundedness of (p_{j_m}) in a finite dimensional space.

We can now make use of the stability result in [FeRo24a, Proposition 2.2.36], and deduce that for $w_0 = d_D^{s-1}u_0$, it holds

$$\|p_0\|_{L^\infty(D)} = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} Lw_0 & = p_0 & \text{in } D, \\ w_0 & = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D, \\ w_0/d_D^{s-1} & = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \\ \|w_0/d_D^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(D)} & = 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $w_0 = 0$ is not a solution to $Lw_0 = p_0$ in D , so we have obtained a contradiction, and conclude the proof of (4.16). \square

5. LIOUVILLE THEOREM IN THE HALF-SPACE

The proof of our main result (see Theorem 1.2) is based on a blow-up argument. A crucial ingredient in such proof is a suitable Liouville theorem in the half-space. In this section, we will establish such result for nonlocal problems with local Neumann boundary conditions:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $K \in C^{k-1+\gamma-s+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\delta > 0$. Let $u \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} L((x_n)_+^{s-1}u) & \stackrel{k-1+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil}{=} 0 & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}, \\ \partial_n u & = p & \text{in } \{x_n = 0\}, \\ |u(x)| & \leq C(1 + |x|)^{k+\gamma} & \forall x \in \{x_n > 0\} \end{cases}$$

for some $C > 0$, $p \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$. Then, there exist $a_\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $\beta \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^n$ with $|\beta| \leq k$ such that

$$u(x) = \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} a_\beta x_1^{\beta_1} \dots x_n^{\beta_n} \quad \forall x \in \{x_n > 0\}.$$

In order to prove Theorem 5.1, we first establish the following one-dimensional version, which can be proved by combination of the arguments in [RoSe16a, Lemma 6.2] and [AbRo20, Lemma 3.3].

Lemma 5.2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $u \in C(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s((x_+)^{s-1}u) & \stackrel{k-1+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil}{=} 0 & \text{in } (0, \infty), \\ |u(x)| & \leq C(1 + |x|)^{k+\gamma} & \forall x > 0 \end{cases}$$

for some $C > 0$. Then, there exist $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$u(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k a_j x^j \quad \forall x > 0.$$

Proof. In case $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, the proof is an application of [RoSe16a, Lemma 6.2] with $u(x) := (x_+)^{s-1}u(x)$, and $\delta = s > 0$, $\beta = s + \gamma \in (0, 2s)$.

In case $k > 1$ or $\gamma > s$, we have $k - 1 + \lceil \gamma - s \rceil \geq 1$, and we combine the ideas from [AbRo20, Proposition 3.11] with the ones from [RoSe16a, Lemma 6.2]. Indeed, let us define $v(x) = (x_+)^{s-1}u(x)$, let $V : \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the harmonic extension of v in the sense of [AbRo20, Lemma 3.3], and finally define $\tilde{V}(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^x V(z, y) dz$. Note that \tilde{V} satisfies (see [AbRo20, Lemma 3.3])

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla\tilde{V}(x, y)) &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty), \\ \tilde{V}(x, y) &= v(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}, \\ |\tilde{V}(x, y)| &\leq C(1 + |x|^{2(k-1+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil)+1+\gamma+s} + |y|^{(k-1+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil)+1+\gamma+s}) & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Next, by the proof of [RoSe16a, Lemma 6.2], we have the representation formula

$$\tilde{V}(x, y) = \tilde{V}(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j \Theta_j(\theta) r^{j+s}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in [0, \infty),$$

where $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$, and $(\Theta_j)_j$ is a complete orthogonal system in the subspace of even functions in $L^2((0, \pi), (\sin \theta)^{1-2s} d\theta)$. By the arguments in [RoSe16a, Lemma 6.2], the bounds on $|\tilde{V}|$ imply

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j^2 R^{2+2j} = \int_{\partial B_R \cap \{y>0\}} \tilde{V}(x, y)^2 y^{1-2s} d\sigma \leq C R^{4(k-1+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil)+2+2\gamma+2} = C R^{4(k+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil)+2\gamma}.$$

Therefore, it must be $a_j = 0$ for any $j > j_0$, where $j_0 = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : 2 + 2j > 4(k + \lceil \gamma - s \rceil) + 2\gamma\}$, which implies

$$\tilde{V}(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{j_0} a_j \Theta_j(\theta) r^{j+s} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in [0, \infty).$$

Upon recalling the definition of V and \tilde{V} , this implies

$$v(x) = (x_+)^s \sum_{j=0}^{j_0-1} b_j x^j$$

for some $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$, and since $|v(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{k+\gamma-1+s}$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ by assumption, it must be $b_j = 0$ for any $j \geq k$. Recalling that by definition $u(x) = v(x)(x_+)^{1-s}$, we deduce that u must be a polynomial of degree at most k in $\{x > 0\}$, as desired. \square

Moreover, we will need the following lemma (see also [Kuk21, Proposition 4.3]):

Lemma 5.3. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{\text{hom}}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \in C^{k-2+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\delta > 0$. Let $f \in \mathcal{P}_k$. Then,*

$$L((x_n)_+^{s-1} f) \stackrel{k-1}{=} 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}.$$

Proof. Let us first give a simple proof in case $k = 1$. Then, it suffices to prove that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$L((x_n)_+^{s-1} x_i) = 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}.$$

First, by integrating $x \mapsto (x_n)_+^{s-1}$ in x_i , and using that $L((x_n)_+^{s-1}) = 0$, we deduce

$$L((x_n)_+^{s-1} x_i) \equiv c \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}$$

for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, since $x \mapsto (x_n)_+^{s-1}x_i$ is homogeneous of degree s , we deduce that for any $\lambda > 0$ and $x \in \{x_n > 0\}$:

$$c = L((x_n)_+^{s-1}x_i)(\lambda x) = \lambda^{-2s}L((\lambda x_n)_+^{s-1}\lambda x_i)(x) = \lambda^{-s}L((x_n)_+^{s-1}x_i)(x) = \lambda^{-s}c.$$

This implies that $c = 0$, as desired.

For $k \geq 2$, we prove the result by induction. Assume that we know already

$$L((x_n)_+^{s-1}p) \stackrel{k-2}{=} 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\} \quad (5.1)$$

for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$. Now, let $q \in \mathcal{P}_k$. Then, by integrating (5.1) with $p := \partial_i q$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, by Lemma 2.12 we find that there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$L((x_n)_+^{s-1}q) \stackrel{k-1}{=} c \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}.$$

Since $c \stackrel{k-1}{=} 0$ for any $k \geq 2$, we conclude the proof. \square

Finally, we state a Hölder regularity estimate in the half-space, which follows from Corollary 4.4.

Corollary 5.4. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\gamma > 0$, and $K \in C^{k-1+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\delta > 0$. Let $f \in C(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2)$, $g \in C(\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2)$, and $u \in C(\{x_n \geq 0\})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} L((x_n)_+^{s-1}u) & \stackrel{k}{=} f & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2, \\ \partial_n u & = g & \text{on } \{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2. \end{cases}$$

Then, there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that if $(x_n)_+^{s+1-\alpha}f \in L^\infty(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$, then the following holds true: If $k = 0$ and $(x_n)_+^{s-1}u \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ it holds $u \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\{x_n \geq 0\} \cap B_2)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^\alpha(\{x_n \geq 0\} \cap B_1)} &\leq c(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_4)} + \|(x_n)_+^{s-1}u\|_{L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_4)} \\ &\quad + \|(x_n)_+^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2)}), \end{aligned}$$

and if $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(x_n)_+^{s-1}u \in L_{2s+(k-1+\delta)}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ it holds $u \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\{x_n \geq 0\} \cap B_2)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^\alpha(\{x_n \geq 0\} \cap B_1)} &\leq c(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_4)} + \|[(x_n)_+^{s-1}u] \cdot |^{-n-2s-(k-1+\delta)}\|_{L^1(\{x_n > 0\} \setminus B_4)} \\ &\quad + \|(x_n)_+^{s+1-\alpha}f\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2)}), \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ and α_0 depend only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, k, \delta$.

Proof. The result follows directly from Corollary 4.4 applied to some domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$, which satisfies $\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_2 \subset \Omega \subset \{x_n > 0\} \cap B_4$. \square

With the help of the one-dimensional Liouville theorem in the half-space and the Hölder regularity estimate up to the boundary (see Corollary 5.4), the proof of Theorem 5.1 follows by a standard procedure, which is explained in detail for instance in [AbRo20, Proof of Theorem 3.10].

Proof of Theorem 5.1. First, we observe that by scaling Corollary 5.4, we obtain that for any $R \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{C^\alpha(B_R)} &\leq cR^{-\alpha}[\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{4R})} + R^{1+s}\|(x_n)_+^{s-1}u\| \cdot |^{-n-2s}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{4R})} \mathbb{1}_{\{k=1 \text{ and } \gamma < s\}} \\ &\quad + R^{s+k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil + \eta} \left\| [(x_n)_+^{s-1}u] \cdot |^{-n-2s-(k-2+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil + \eta)} \right\|_{L^1(\{x_n > 0\} \setminus B_{4R})} \mathbb{1}_{\{k \geq 2 \text{ or } \gamma > s\}} \\ &\quad + R\|p\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_{4R})}] \leq cR^{k+\gamma-\alpha}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where we take $\eta = 1 + \gamma - s - \lceil \gamma - s \rceil + \delta$ and used in the last estimate the growth condition on u , the fact that $\|p\|_{L^\infty(\{x_n=0\} \cap B_R)} \leq cR^{k-1}$, and the following computation using polar coordinates with $y_n = r \cos \theta$ for some $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ (similar to the proof of Lemma 4.2), which is slightly different in case ($k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$) and ($k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$). In case $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{1+s} \|(x_n)_+^{s-1} u| \cdot |^{-n-2s}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{4R})} &\leq CR^{1+s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{4R}} (y_n)_+^{s-1} |y|^{-n-2s+1+\gamma} dy \\ &\leq cR^{1+s} \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(\theta)_+^{s-1} \left(\int_{4R}^\infty r^{s-1} r^{-1-2s+1+\gamma} dr \right) d\theta \\ &\leq cR^{1+s} R^{\gamma-s} \left(\int_0^{2\pi} \cos(\theta)_+^{s-1} d\theta \right) \leq cR^{1+\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

In case ($k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$), we obtain, using that $\eta > 1 + \gamma - s - \lceil \gamma - s \rceil$:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{s+k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+\eta} \|(x_n)_+^{s-1} u| \cdot |^{-n-2s-(k-2+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+\eta)}\|_{L^1(\{x_n>0\} \setminus B_4)} \\ \leq CR^{s+k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+\eta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{4R}} (y_n)_+^{s-1} |y|^{-n-2s-(k-2+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+\eta)+k+\gamma} dy \\ \leq cR^{s+k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+\eta} \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(\theta)_+^{s-1} \left(\int_{4R}^\infty r^{s-1} r^{-1-2s+2-\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+\gamma-\eta} dr \right) d\theta \\ \leq cR^{k+s} R^{\gamma-s} \left(\int_0^{2\pi} \cos(\theta)_+^{s-1} d\theta \right) \leq cR^{k+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, let us take any $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\tau_n = 0$ and $0 < h < R/2$. We consider the difference quotient

$$w_{1,\tau}(x) = \frac{u(x+h\tau) - u(x)}{h^\alpha}, \quad p_{1,\tau}(x) = \frac{p(x+h\tau) - p(x)}{h^\alpha}$$

and deduce from (5.2) (after applying the estimate to smaller balls of radius comparable to R inside B_R) that

$$\|w_{1,\tau}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq cR^{k+\gamma-\alpha} \quad \forall R \geq 1.$$

Clearly, since $\tau_n = 0$, $w_{1,\tau}$ satisfies in the viscosity sense

$$\begin{cases} L((x_n)_+^{s-1} w_{1,\tau}) & \stackrel{k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}{=} 0 & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}, \\ \partial_n w_{1,\tau} & = p_{1,\tau} & \text{on } \{x_n = 0\}. \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

Here, we are using that sums of viscosity solutions are again viscosity solutions by Lemma 2.14. Using (5.4) and also that $|p_{1,\tau}(x)| \leq c|x|^{k-1-\alpha}$ since $p \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$, we can apply the previous arguments to $w_{1,\tau}$. Eventually, this implies that $w_{2,\tau}(x) = \frac{w_{1,\tau}(x+h\tau) - w_{1,\tau}(x)}{h^\alpha}$ satisfies $\|w_{2,\tau}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq cR^{k+\gamma-2\alpha}$. This way, we obtain higher order difference quotients $w_{j,\tau}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and they satisfy

$$\begin{cases} L((x_n)_+^{s-1} w_{j,\tau}) & \stackrel{k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}{=} 0 & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}, \\ \partial_n w_{j,\tau} & = p_{j,\tau} & \text{on } \{x_n = 0\}, \\ \|w_{j,\tau}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} & \leq cR^{k+\gamma-j\alpha} & \forall R \geq 1, \\ \|p_{j,\tau}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} & \leq cR^{k-1-j\alpha} & \forall R \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then, taking $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ as the smallest number such that $j_0\alpha > k + \gamma$, and upon taking the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \|w_{j_0,\tau}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq c \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} R^{k+\gamma-j_0\alpha} = 0,$$

i.e., $w_{j_0, \tau} \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n . Thus, $w_{j_0-1, \tau}$ is a function that is constant in the τ -direction. Clearly, we can also take difference quotients of $w_{j_0-1, \tau}$ in other directions $\tau' \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ with $\tau'_n = 0$, and the same arguments as before apply. Therefore, $w_{j_0-1, \tau}(x) = w_{j_0-1, \tau}(x_n)$ is one-dimensional for any $\tau \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ with $\tau_n = 0$.

Unraveling the higher order difference quotients, we get that $w_{j_0-2, \tau}(x) = (V_1(x_n), x') + V_2(x_n)$ for some one-dimensional functions $V_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $V_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and continuing this argument $j_0 - 1$ times, we deduce that u must be a polynomial in x' with coefficients that are one-dimensional functions from $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in x_n .

Then, by the growth condition on u , for any multi-index $\beta \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^{n-1}$ with $|\beta| \leq k$, we obtain functions A_β in x_n such that

$$u(x) = \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} (x')^\beta A_\beta(x_n).$$

In particular, this implies that $D_{x'}^\beta u(x) = c(\beta) A_\beta(x_n)$ for any $|\beta| = k$ and some constant $c(\beta) > 0$, where $D_{x'}^\beta$ denotes an incremental quotient approximating the partial derivative $\partial_{x'}^\beta$ in the x' -variables. Therefore, discretely differentiating the equation for u , we deduce

$$c(\beta) L((x_n)_+^{s-1} A_\beta)(x) = L((x_n)_+^{s-1} D_{x'}^\beta u)(x) = L(D_{x'}^\beta [(x_n)_+^{s-1} u])(x) \stackrel{k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}{=} 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}.$$

By the growth condition on u , it must be $|A_\beta(x_n)| \leq c(1 + |x_n|)^{k-|\beta|+\gamma} = c(1 + |x|)^\gamma$, and since A_β was also one-dimensional, i.e., $LA_\beta = (-\Delta)_{\mathbb{R}}^s A_\beta$, we can apply Lemma 5.2 to A_β , which yields $A_\beta(x_n) = p_\beta(x_n)$ for some polynomial $p_\beta \in \mathcal{P}_{k-|\beta|} = \mathcal{P}_0$. Next, we recall from Lemma 5.3

$$L((x_n)_+^{s-1} (x')^\beta p_\beta(x_n)) \stackrel{k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}{=} 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}.$$

Thus, repeating the arguments from above, we deduce that, for every β with $|\beta| \leq k$ it holds

$$\begin{cases} L((x_n)_+^{s-1} A_\beta) & \stackrel{k-1+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil}{=} 0 & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}, \\ |A_\beta(x)| & \leq C(1 + |x|)^{k-|\beta|+\gamma} & \forall x \in \{x_n > 0\}, \end{cases}$$

and hence $A_\beta(x_n) = p_\beta(x_n)$ for some polynomial $p_\beta \in \mathcal{P}_{k-|\beta|}$. This implies $u(x) = p(x)$ for some polynomial p , and by the growth condition on u , it must be $p \in \mathcal{P}_k$, as desired. \square

6. HIGHER ORDER BOUNDARY REGULARITY

The goal of this section is to prove the desired higher order boundary regularity for nonlocal equations with local Neumann conditions (see Theorem 1.2). The proof goes by a blow-up argument and heavily uses the Liouville theorem in the half-space (see Theorem 5.1), as well as the boundary Hölder estimate (see Theorem 1.6).

Lemma 6.1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_s^{hom}(\lambda, \Lambda)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{k+1, \gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \neq s$, and $K \in C^{2k+2\gamma+3}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Let $v \in L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $v/d^{s-1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be a viscosity solution to*

$$\begin{cases} Lv & = f & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_1, \\ v & = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu(v/d^{s-1}) & = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_1. \end{cases}$$

- (i) If $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, $f \in C(\Omega \cap B_1)$ with $d^{s-\gamma}f \in L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)$, $g \in C^\gamma(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)$, then for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap B_{1/2}$ and $x \in \Omega \cap B_{1/2}$ it holds

$$\left| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}}(x) - \left(\frac{v}{d^{s-1}}(x_0) - A(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) \right) \right| \leq c \left(\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)} + \|d^{s-\gamma}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_1)} + \|g\|_{C^\gamma(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)} \right) |x - x_0|^{1+\gamma}$$

for some $c > 0$, which only depends on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma$, and the $C^{2,\gamma}$ radius of Ω . If in addition, it holds $g \equiv 0$, then $A(x_0) \cdot \nu_{x_0} = 0$.

- (ii) If $k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$, $f \in C^{(k-1)-s+\gamma}(\Omega \cap B_1)$, $g \in C^{k-1+\gamma}(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)$, then for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap B_{1/2}$, there is $Q(\cdot; x_0) \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that for any $x \in \Omega \cap B_{1/2}$ it holds

$$\left| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}}(x) - Q(x; x_0) \right| \leq c \left(\left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)} + \|f\|_{C^{(k-1)-s+\gamma}(\Omega \cap B_1)} + \|g\|_{C^{k-1+\gamma}(\partial\Omega \cap B_1)} \right) |x - x_0|^{k+\gamma}$$

for some $c > 0$, which only depends on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, k$, and the $C^{k+1,\gamma}$ radius of Ω .

Proof. Let us assume without loss of generality that $x_0 = 0 \in \partial\Omega$ with $\partial_{\nu_0} = e_n$. We set $u := v/d^{s-1}$. We will prove the desired result by a blow-up argument. To do so, we assume by contradiction that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $C^{k+1,\gamma}$ domains $\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $f_j \in C^{k-1}(\Omega_j \cap B_1)$, $g_j \in C^{k-1+\gamma}(\partial\Omega_j \cap B_1)$, $r_j > 0$, operators L_j with ellipticity constants λ, Λ , and $v_j \in C(\Omega_j) \cap L^1_{2s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ viscosity solutions to

$$\begin{cases} L_j v_j &= f_j & \text{in } \Omega_j \cap B_1, \\ v_j &= 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \Omega_j, \\ \partial_\nu(v_j/d_j^{s-1}) &= g_j & \text{on } \partial\Omega_j \cap B_1, \end{cases}$$

such that

$$|\text{diam } \Omega_j| + \|u_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)} + \|v_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_j)} + \mathbb{1}_{\{k=1 \text{ and } \gamma < s\}} \|d_j^{s-\gamma} f_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j \cap B_1)} + \mathbb{1}_{\{k \geq 2 \text{ or } \gamma > s\}} \|f_j\|_{C^{(k-1)-s+\gamma}(\Omega_j \cap B_1)} + \|g_j\|_{C^{k-1+\gamma}(\Omega_j \cap B_1)} + \|d_j\|_{C^{k+1,\gamma}(\Omega_j \cap B_1)} \leq C$$

for some $C > 0$, denoted $d_{\Omega_j} = d_j$, and used that $d_j \in C^{k+1,\gamma}$ by [FeRo24a, Definition 2.7.5]. Finally, we assume by contradiction

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{r > 0} r^{-k-\gamma} \|u_j - Q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j \cap B_r)} = \infty \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{P}_k.$$

Observe that up to a rotation, $r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}} \rightarrow \{x_n > 0\}$. Moreover, we will write $\tilde{d}_{j_m} \mathbb{1}_{r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m}} := \tilde{d}_{j_m} =: r_m^{-1}d_{j_m}(r_m \cdot)$ for the (regularized) distance with respect to $r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m}$.

We consider the $L^2(\Omega_j \cap B_r)$ -projections of u_j over \mathcal{P}_k , and denote them by $Q_{j,r} \in \mathcal{P}_k$. They satisfy the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_j - Q_{j,r}\|_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap B_r)} &\leq \|u_j - Q\|_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap B_r)} \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{P}_k, \\ \int_{\Omega_j \cap B_r} (u_j(x) - Q_{j,r}(x)) Q(x) dx &= 0 \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{P}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we introduce

$$\theta(r) := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\rho \geq r} \rho^{-k-\gamma} \|u_j - Q_{j,\rho}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j \cap B_\rho)}.$$

Observe that $\theta(r) \nearrow \infty$, as $r \searrow 0$. This follows in the same way as the proof of [AbRo20, Lemma 4.3].

As a consequence, there exist sequences $(r_m)_n$ and $(j_m)_m$ such that

$$\frac{\|u_{j_m} - Q_{j_m, r_m}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m})}}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)} \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.1)$$

Let us define for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$w_m(x) = \frac{u_{j_m}(r_m x) - Q_{j_m, r_m}(r_m x)}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)},$$

and observe that by construction, we have

$$\|w_m\|_{L^\infty(r_m^{-1} \Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \int_{r_m^{-1} \Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1} w_m(x) Q(r_m x) dx = 0 \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{P}_k. \quad (6.2)$$

Next, we claim that

$$\|w_m\|_{L^\infty(r_m^{-1} \Omega_{j_m} \cap B_R)} \leq c R^{k+\gamma} \quad \forall R \geq 1, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.3)$$

To see this, we estimate for any $R \geq 1$, using the definition of $\theta(Rr_m)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_m\|_{L^\infty(r_m^{-1} \Omega_{j_m} \cap B_R)} &\leq \frac{\|u_{j_m} - Q_{j_m, Rr_m}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{Rr_m})}}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)} + \frac{\|Q_{j_m, Rr_m} - Q_{j_m, r_m}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{Rr_m})}}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)} \\ &\leq \frac{(Rr_m)^{k+\gamma} \theta(Rr_m)}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)} + \frac{\|Q_{j_m, Rr_m} - Q_{j_m, r_m}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{Rr_m})}}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the same argument as in the proof of [AbRo20, Proposition 4.1], it follows that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $r > 0$, and $R \geq 1$:

$$\|Q_{j, Rr} - Q_{j, r}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j \cap B_{Rr})} \leq c \theta(r) (Rr)^{k+\gamma}.$$

Thus, combining the previous two estimates,

$$\|w_m\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_R)} \leq \frac{(Rr_m)^{k+\gamma} \theta(Rr_m)}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)} + c \frac{(Rr_m)^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)}{r_m^{k+\gamma} \theta(r_m)} \leq c R^{k+\gamma},$$

where we used in the last step that $t \mapsto \theta(t)$ is monotone decreasing, proving (6.3).

Next, using (6.3), we will estimate the $L_{2s+(k+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil-1)}^1$ norm of w_m . We have the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_{Rr_m}) \cap \{d_{j_m} \geq \kappa\}} d_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy &\leq \kappa^{s-1} \int_{(\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_{Rr_m})} |y|^{-n-s+\gamma-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} |y|^{1-s} dy \\ &\leq c \kappa^{s-1} \text{diam}(\Omega_{j_m})^{1-s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{Rr_m}} |y|^{-n-s+\gamma-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} dy \leq c (Rr_m)^{\gamma-s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that always $\gamma < s + \lceil\gamma - s\rceil < 0$. Moreover, by a similar computation as in Lemma 2.2 (with $\gamma := s - 1 < 2s + \lceil\gamma - s\rceil - 1 - \gamma =: \beta$), we have

$$\int_{(\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_{Rr_m}) \cap \{d_{j_m} < \kappa\}} d_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy \leq c (Rr_m)^{\gamma-s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil}.$$

Thus, altogether, using (6.3) and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1} w_m\| \cdot \|\cdot\|^{-n-2s-(k+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil-1)}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R)} \\
& \leq c \int_{r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_R} \tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy \\
& \leq c r_m^{1-s} \int_{r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_R} d_{j_m}^{s-1}(r_m y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy \\
& = c r_m^{s-\gamma+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} \int_{\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_{Rr_m}} d_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy \\
& \leq c r_m^{s-\gamma+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} \int_{(\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_R) \cap \{d_{j_m} \geq \kappa\}} d_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy \\
& \quad + c r_m^{s-\gamma+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} \int_{(\Omega_{j_m} \setminus B_R) \cap \{d_{j_m} < \kappa\}} d_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy \\
& \leq c r_m^{s-\gamma+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} (Rr_m)^{\gamma-s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} \leq R^{\gamma-s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Now, we investigate the equation that is satisfied by w_m . Clearly, upon writing

$$Q_{j_m, r_m}(x) = \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} a_{j_m, r_m}^{(\beta)} x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_n^{\beta_n},$$

and by the same arguments as in [AbRo20, Proposition 4.1], we get

$$\frac{a_{j_m, r_m}^{(\beta)}}{\theta(r_m)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty \quad \forall |\beta| \leq k. \tag{6.5}$$

Let us now distinguish between the cases ($k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$) and ($k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$). In case $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, we find that it holds in the viscosity sense

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-\gamma} L_{j_m}(\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1} w_m) &= r^{\gamma-s} d_{j_m}^{s-\gamma}(r_m \cdot) r_m^{1-s} L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1}(r_m \cdot) w_m) \\
&= d_{j_m}^{s-\gamma}(r_m \cdot) \frac{L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1} u_{j_m}(r_m \cdot)) - L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1} Q_{j_m, r_m}(r_m \cdot))}{r_m^{2s} \theta(r_m)} \\
&= d_{j_m}^{s-\gamma}(r_m \cdot) \frac{f_{j_m}(r_m \cdot) - L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1} Q_{j_m, r_m})(r_m \cdot)}{\theta(r_m)} \quad \text{in } r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Moreover, by Corollary 2.5(i), it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|d_{j_m}^{s-\gamma} L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1} Q_{j_m, r_m})(r_m \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}})} \\
& = \|d_{j_m}^{s-\gamma} L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1} Q_{j_m, r_m})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} \leq c \sum_{|\beta| \leq 1} |a_{j_m, r_m}^{(\beta)}|.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Therefore, recalling $\|d_{j_m}^{s-\gamma} f_{j_m}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} \leq C$, and combining (6.6), (6.7), and (6.5), we obtain

$$\|\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-\gamma} L_{j_m}(\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1} w_m)\|_{L^\infty(r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}})} \leq c \frac{\|d_{j_m}^{s-\gamma} f_{j_m}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} + \sum_{|\beta| \leq 1} |a_{j_m, r_m}^{(\beta)}|}{\theta(r_m)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \tag{6.8}$$

In case $k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$, we first deduce by an argument analogous to (6.6)

$$L_{j_m}(\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}w_m) = \frac{f_{j_m}(r_m \cdot) - L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1}Q_{j_m,r_m})(r_m \cdot)}{r_m^{(k-1)-s+\gamma}\theta(r_m)} \quad \text{in } r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}}. \quad (6.9)$$

Next, using again Corollary 2.5(ii), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-(k-1)+s-\gamma}[L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1}Q_{j_m,r_m})(r_m \cdot)]_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}})} \\ = [L_{j_m}(d_{j_m}^{s-1}Q_{j_m,r_m})]_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} \leq c \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} |a_{j_m,r_m}^{(\beta)}|, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

in analogy to (6.7). Finally, recalling

$$r^{-(k-1)+s-\gamma}[f_j(r_m \cdot)]_{C^{(k-1)-s+\gamma}(r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}})} = [f_j]_{C^{(k-1)-s+\gamma}(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} \leq C,$$

and combining (6.9), (6.10), and (6.5), we obtain

$$[L_{j_m}(\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}w_m)]_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}})} \leq c \frac{[f_j]_{C^{(k-1)-s+\gamma}(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} + \sum_{|\beta| \leq 1} |a_{j_m,r_m}^{(\beta)}|}{\theta(r_m)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, there exists a polynomial $p_m \in \mathcal{P}_{k-2+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil}$ such that

$$|L_{j_m}(\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}w_m) - p_m| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{in } L_{loc}^\infty(\{x_n > 0\}). \quad (6.11)$$

Next, considering again all values for γ, k at the same time, we treat the Neumann boundary condition:

$$\partial_\nu w_m = \frac{\partial_\nu u_{j_m}(r_m \cdot) - \partial_\nu(Q_{j_m,r_m})(r_m \cdot)}{r_m^{(k-1)+\gamma}\theta(r_m)} = \frac{g_{j_m}(r_m \cdot) - \partial_\nu(Q_{j_m,r_m})(r_m \cdot)}{r_m^{(k-1)+\gamma}\theta(r_m)} \quad \text{on } \partial r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}}.$$

We obtain

$$r_m^{-(k-1)-\gamma}[\partial_\nu Q_{j_m,r_m}(r_m \cdot)]_{C^{(k-1)+\gamma}(\partial r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}})} = [\partial_\nu Q_{j_m,r_m}]_{C^{(k-1)+\gamma}(\partial\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} \leq c \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} |a_{j_m,r_m}^{(\beta)}|,$$

and using also that $g_{j_m} \in C^{k-1+\gamma}(\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)$ by the boundary condition, we deduce

$$[\partial_\nu w_m]_{C^{(k-1)+\gamma}(\partial r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}})} \leq c \frac{[g_{j_m}]_{C^{(k-1)+\gamma}(\partial\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_1)} + \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} |a_{j_m,r_m}^{(\beta)}|}{\theta(r_m)} \leq c\theta(r_m)^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consequently, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a polynomial $q_m \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ such that

$$|\partial_\nu w_m(x) - q_m| \leq c \frac{|x|^\gamma}{\theta(r_m)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \forall x \in \partial r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \cap B_{r_m^{-1}}. \quad (6.12)$$

Finally, we are in a position to apply the stability theorem (see Lemma 2.13) to w_m . The convergence results in (6.8), (6.11) and (6.12) establish the required convergence of the source terms and the Neumann boundary data.

Moreover, the operators L_{j_m} converge to an operator L with the same ellipticity constants. By the boundary Hölder regularity estimate for solutions to the nonlocal Neumann problem (see Corollary 4.4 applied with $k := k + \lceil\gamma - s\rceil$, $\delta := 0$, $\Omega := r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m}$, $v := \tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}w_m$, $f := L_{j_m}(\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}w_m)$, and $g := \partial_\nu w_m$), together with the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, the sequence $(w_m)_m$ converges in $L_{loc}^\infty(\{x_n \geq 0\})$ to some $w \in C(\{x_n \geq 0\})$. Note that all the quantities on the right hand side of the estimate in Corollary 4.4 will be bounded uniformly in k , due to (6.4), (6.8), (6.11), and (6.12). Thus, in particular $\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}(r_m \cdot)w_m \rightarrow (x_n)_+^{s-1}w$ locally uniformly in $\{x_n > 0\}$. Finally, in order to apply the stability result

in Lemma 2.13, it remains to establish $\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}(r_m \cdot) w_m \rightarrow (x_n)_+^{s-1} w$ in $L_{2s+(k+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil-1)}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To see this, we also observe that by (6.3),

$$|w(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)^{k+\gamma} \quad \forall x \in \{x_n > 0\}. \quad (6.13)$$

Therefore, using also (6.4), and a computation based on polar coordinates (along the lines of (5.3)) we obtain since $\gamma < 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} |\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) w_m(y) - (y_n)_+^{s-1} w(y)| |y|^{-n-2s-(k+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil-1)} dy \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} (y_n)_+^{s-1} |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy + C \int_{(r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m}) \setminus B_R} \tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1}(y) |y|^{-n-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+1+\gamma} dy \\ & \leq CR^{\gamma-s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\tilde{d}_{j_m}^{s-1} w_m \rightarrow (x_n)_+^{s-1} w$ in $L_{2s+(k+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil-1)}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by combining it with the locally uniform convergence in $L_{loc}^\infty(\{x_n \geq 0\})$.

Thus, by stability of viscosity solutions (see Lemma 2.13), we deduce that in the viscosity sense

$$\begin{cases} L((x_n)_+^{s-1} w) & \stackrel{k-1+\lceil\gamma-s\rceil}{=} 0 & \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}, \\ \partial_n w & = p & \text{on } \{x_n = 0\}, \end{cases}$$

where $p \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ is a polynomial, and moreover, by (6.2), it must be

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty(B_1 \cap \{x_n > 0\})} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (6.14)$$

An application of the Liouville theorem (see Theorem 5.1, using (6.13)) yields now that $w \in \mathcal{P}_k$. Thus, we can choose $Q(x) = w(r_m^{-1}x)$ in (6.2). This implies that

$$0 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_1 \cap r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m}} w_m(x) Q(r_m x) dx = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_1 \cap r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m}} w_m(x) w(x) dx = \int_{B_1 \cap \{x_n > 0\}} w^2(x) dx,$$

where we used in the last step $w_m \rightarrow w$ and $r_m^{-1}\Omega_{j_m} \rightarrow \{x_n > 0\}$. This yields $w = 0$, which however contradicts (6.14), and thus, we conclude the proof of (ii).

Finally, note that if $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, then by the Liouville theorem (see Theorem 5.1), there exist $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$w(x) = (a, x) + b.$$

Moreover, if $g_j \equiv 0$, then also $g \equiv 0$. Thus, it must be $\partial_n w = 0$ in $\{x_n = 0\}$, which implies $a_n = 0$. \square

We are now in a position to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We define $u := v/d^{s-1}$. Let us assume that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|d^{s-\gamma} f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \cap B_2)} \mathbb{1}_{\{1+\gamma < 2s\}} + \|f\|_{C^{k-2s+\gamma}(\Omega \cap B_2)} \mathbb{1}_{\{1+\gamma > 2s\}} + \|g\|_{C^{k-1+\gamma}(\partial\Omega \cap B_2)} \leq 1.$$

First, we claim that for any $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{1/2}$ with $z \in \partial\Omega \cap B_{1/2}$ such that $|x_0 - z| = d(x_0) =: r \leq 1$, there exists a polynomial $Q \in \mathcal{P}_k$ of degree k such that

$$[u - Q]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq c \quad (6.15)$$

for some constant $c > 0$, depending only on $n, s, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \Omega, k$, where we assume without loss of generality that $\nu_z = e_n$. Note that this estimate already yields the desired result since it implies

$$[u]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq [u - Q]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} + [Q]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq c.$$

From here, a standard covering argument (see [FeRo24a, Lemma A.1.4]) together with Hölder interpolation (recall that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$) yields the desired regularity estimate in $\bar{\Omega} \cap B_1$. Note that improving the global L^∞ norm to the $L_{2s}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norm, or the $L_{k+\gamma}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_2)$ norm, respectively, in the estimate goes by the exact same arguments as in the proofs of Lemma 2.10 and Corollary 4.4.

To see (6.15), let us take $z \in \partial\Omega \cap B_{1/2}$ such that $|x_0 - z| = d(x_0) = r$, and apply Lemma 6.1 to see that there exists a polynomial $Q \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that the function

$$u_r(x) := \frac{u(x_0 + rx) - Q(x_0 + rx)}{r^{k+\gamma}} \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \|u_r\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq CR^{k+\gamma} \quad \forall R \in [1, r^{-1}].$$

Moreover, since $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$, and $Q \in \mathcal{P}_k$, we deduce

$$\|u_r\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq Cr^{-k-\gamma}(1 + (rR)^k) \leq CR^{k+\gamma} \quad \forall R \geq r^{-1}.$$

Together, this implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3/4}} \frac{d^{s-1}(x_0 + rx)|u_r(x)|}{|x|^{n+k+\gamma}} dx \leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3/4}} \frac{d^{s-1}(x_0 + rx)}{|x|^n} dx = c \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3/4}} \frac{d^{s-1}(x_0 + x)}{|x|^n} dx \leq c(1 + r^{s-1}),$$

where we used Lemma 2.2 with $\gamma := s - 1 < 0 =: \beta$. Moreover, we have by the definition of r

$$\|d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} \leq cr^{s-1}.$$

Now, we apply the interior regularity theory for nonlocal problems (see Lemma 2.10). To do so, we distinguish between the cases (i) $k = 1$ and $k + \gamma = 1 + \gamma \leq 2s$ and (ii) $k + \gamma > 2s$. In case (i), we apply Lemma 2.10(i) with $\beta = 1 + \gamma$, observe that automatically $\gamma < s$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [d^{s-1}(u - Q)]_{C^{1+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} &= [d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r]_{C^{1+\gamma}(B_{1/2})} \\ &\leq c \|d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} + c \left\| \frac{d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r}{|x|^{n+1+\gamma}} \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3/4})} \\ &\quad + c \|L(d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r)\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} \\ &\leq cr^{s-1} + cr^{2s-(1+\gamma)} \|Lv\|_{L^\infty(B_{3r/4}(x_0))} \\ &\quad + cr^{2s-(1+\gamma)} \|L(d^{s-1}Q)\|_{L^\infty(B_{3r/4}(x_0))} \\ &\leq cr^{s-1} + cr^{s-1} \|d^{s-\gamma}f\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))} + cr^{s-1} \leq cr^{s-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Corollary 2.5(i) and that $d \geq r/4$ in $B_{3r/4}(x_0)$ by construction, and $r \leq 1$.

In case (ii), we apply Lemma 2.10(ii) with $\alpha := k + \gamma - 2s > 0$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [d^{s-1}(u - Q)]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} &= [d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{1/2})} \\ &\leq c \|d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})} + c \left\| \frac{d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r}{|x|^{n+k+\gamma}} \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{3/4})} \\ &\quad + c [L(d^{s-1}(x_0 + r \cdot)u_r)]_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_{3/4})} \\ &\leq cr^{s-1} + c [Lv]_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_{3r/4}(x_0))} + c [L(d^{s-1}Q)]_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_{3r/4}(x_0))} \\ &\leq cr^{s-1} + cr^{s-1} \|f\|_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_r(x_0))} + cr^{s-1} \leq cr^{s-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Corollary 2.5(iii) in the second to last step.

Moreover, using again the L^∞ estimate for u_r with $R = 1$, we have

$$\|d^{s-1}(u - Q)\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{s-1} \|u - Q\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{s+(k-1)+\gamma} \|u_r\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq cr^{s+(k-1)+\gamma},$$

and hence by Hölder interpolation, we obtain that for any $\delta \in (0, k + \gamma)$ it holds

$$[d^{s-1}(u - Q)]_{C^\delta(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{s-1+k+\gamma-\delta}.$$

Therefore, altogether by the product rule

$$\begin{aligned} [(u-Q)]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} &= [D^k(d^{1-s}d^{s-1}(u-Q))]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \\ &\leq \sum_{|\beta|=k} \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} [(\partial^\alpha d^{1-s})(\partial^{\beta-\alpha} d^{s-1}(u-Q))]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \\ &\leq \sum_{|\beta|=k} \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \left(\|\partial^\alpha d^{1-s}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} [\partial^{\beta-\alpha} d^{s-1}(u-Q)]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\partial^{\beta-\alpha} d^{s-1}(u-Q)\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} [\partial^\alpha d^{1-s}]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \right) \\ &\leq c \sum_{|\beta|=k} \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \left(r^{1-s-|\alpha|} r^{s-1+k+\gamma-(k-|\alpha|+\gamma)} + r^{s-1+k+\gamma-(k-|\alpha|)} r^{1-s-|\alpha|-\gamma} \right) \\ &\leq c \sum_{|\beta|=k} \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \leq c, \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

where we used that $r \leq 1$, and the following observation based on the fact that $d \in C^{k+1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ together with corresponding estimates $|D^j d| \leq c_j d^{1-j}$, resp. $|D^j d^{1-s}| \leq c_j d^{1-s-j}$ in Ω for every $j \leq k$ (see [FeRo24a, Lemma B.0.1]):

$$[\partial^\alpha d^{1-s}]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq \|D^{|\alpha|+1} d^{1-s}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \sup_{x,y \in B_{r/2}(x_0)} |x-y|^{1-\gamma} \leq cr^{1-s-|\alpha|-\gamma} \quad \forall |\alpha| \leq k. \tag{6.17}$$

This proves our claim (6.15). Note that we can replace the L^∞ norm of u in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_2$ by the $L^1_{2s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norm via a standard truncation argument, as in the proof of Corollary 4.4. We conclude the proof. \square

Finally, we explain how to prove Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. The result follows immediately from Theorem 1.2, however it remains to prove that the result only requires $K \in C^{k-2s+\gamma}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ if $\Omega = \{x_n = 0\}$. First of all, we recall the Hölder estimate (see Corollary 5.4), which holds true without any regularity assumption on K if $k = 0$. Note that for the Liouville theorem (see Theorem 5.1), we only require $K \in C^{k-1-s+\gamma+\delta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for an arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$ and $k-1-s+\gamma < k-2s+\gamma$. In Lemma 6.1, additional regularity for K is assumed in order to apply Corollary 2.5. However, if $\Omega = \{x_n > 0\}$, we have

$$L(d^{s-1}Q) = L((x_n)_+^{s-1}Q) \stackrel{k-1}{=} 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_n > 0\}$$

for any $Q \in \mathcal{P}_k$. Hence, in case $k = 1$ and $\gamma < s$, the proof goes through exactly as before, without any restrictions on K . If $k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$, (6.9) needs to be interpreted as an equation up to a polynomial, but the rest of the proof remains the same. Moreover, we apply the Hölder estimate (see Corollary 5.4), which would force us to impose $K \in C^{k-1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ in case $k \geq 2$ or $\gamma > s$. Therefore, in this case, we need to proceed a little different. Indeed, we replace the computation in (6.4) by the following estimate, based on polar coordinates (see also (5.3)) for $\eta = 1 + \gamma - s - \lceil \gamma - s \rceil + \delta$ for some very small $\delta > 0$:

$$\|(x_n)_+^{s-1} w_m\| \cdot |^{-n-2s-(k-2+\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+\eta)} \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R)} \leq c \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R} (x_n)_+^{s-1} |x|^{-n-2s-\lceil \gamma-s \rceil+2+\gamma+\eta} dx$$

$$\leq c \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(\theta)_+^{s-1} \left(\int_R^\infty r^{s-1} r^{-1-2s-\lceil\gamma-s\rceil+2+\gamma+\eta} dr \right) d\theta = c \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(\theta)_+^{s-1} \left(\int_R^\infty r^{-1-\delta} dr \right) d\theta \leq cR^{-\delta} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Then, we can apply Corollary 5.4 with $k := k-1$ and $\delta := \eta$ and only need to assume that $K \in C^{k-2+\eta}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, which is fine by the same reasoning as for the Liouville theorem above. Moreover, the stability theorem (see Lemma 2.13) can still be applied since $k-2+\eta \leq k-1$ if we choose $\delta < s-\eta$. Finally, the proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on an application of the interior regularity result (see Lemma 2.10). In case $k = 1$ and $1 + \gamma \leq 2s$, we apply Lemma 2.10(i), so in this case, no regularity assumption on K is required, at all. In case $1 + \gamma > 2s$, we apply Lemma 2.10(ii) with $\alpha := k + \gamma - 2s$ (and interpret the equation up to a polynomial of degree $k-1$, which is possible due to Remark 2.11), so in this case, we need to assume only that $K \in C^{k-2s+\gamma}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, as desired. \square

7. NONLOCAL EQUATIONS WITH LOCAL DIRICHLET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

Finally, we give the proof of the boundary regularity for nonlocal equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions (see Theorem 1.4).

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let us first extend h in such a way that $h \in C^{k+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, we define $w := v - d^{s-1}h$ and observe that w solves

$$\begin{cases} Lw &= \tilde{f} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \\ w/d^{s-1} &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{f} := f - L(d^{s-1}h)$. Moreover, for $x_0 \in \Omega$ an application of Corollary 2.5 yields $|\tilde{f}(x_0)| \leq c_1 d^{s-\gamma}(x_0)$ in case $k + \gamma < 1 + s$, as well as $[\tilde{f}]_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq c_2$ in case $k + \gamma > 1 + s$, and also $[\tilde{f}]_{C^{k-2s+\gamma}(B_{d(x_0)/2}(x_0))} \leq c_3 d^{s-1}(x_0)$ in case $k + \gamma > 2s$. Note that since $w/d^{s-1} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, by the maximum principle (see Proposition 1.3) and a standard barrier argument (see for instance the proof of [FeRo24a, Lemma 2.3.9]) it holds $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (7.1)$$

Thus w is a solution in the setting of [RoSe17, AbRo20]. We assume without loss of generality

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|d^{s-\gamma}\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(\overline{\Omega})} \mathbb{1}_{\{k+\gamma < 1+s\}} + \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(\Omega)} \mathbb{1}_{\{k+\gamma > 1+s\}} \leq 1.$$

Then, [RoSe17, AbRo20] imply that for any $z \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a polynomial $Q_z \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ such that

$$|w(x) - Q_z(x)d^s| \leq c|x - z|^{k-1+\gamma+s} \leq c|x - z|^{k+\gamma}d^{s-1}(x) \quad \forall x \in B_1(z).$$

By adjusting the proof of [RoSe17, Proposition 3.2] in case $k + \gamma < 1 + s$, or the second part of the proof of [AbRo20, Proposition 4.1] in case $k + \gamma > 1 + s$, respectively, according to the slight modification of the upper bound in the previous estimate, we get that for any $x_0 \in \Omega \cap B_1(z)$, denoting $r := d(x_0)$,

$$\|w - Q_z d^s\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{k+\gamma+s-1}, \quad [w - Q_z d^s]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{s-1}. \quad (7.2)$$

Indeed, while the first estimate is immediate from the expansion, the second result follows by denoting

$$v_r(x) = r^{-k-\gamma}(u(x_0 + rx) - Q_z(x_0 + rx)d^s(x_0 + rx)),$$

and observing that by the previous estimate and the properties of \tilde{f} it holds

$$\|v_r\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq c(1 + r^{s-1}) \quad \forall R > 0, \quad [\tilde{f}]_{C^{k+\gamma-2s}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \mathbb{1}_{\{k+\gamma > 2s\}} \leq cr^{s-1}.$$

Plugging these findings into the remainder of [RoSe17, Proof of Theorem 1.2], [AbRo20, Proof of Theorem 1.4], we obtain (7.2). From there we can show, using Hölder interpolation, and also $d \in C^{k+1+\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ that for any $\delta \in (0, k + \gamma]$ it holds:

$$[w - Q_z d^s]_{C^\delta(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{k+\gamma+s-1-\delta}, \quad \|d^{s-1}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{1-s}, \quad [d^{s-1}]_{C^\delta(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leq cr^{1-s-\delta}.$$

Thus, proceeding in a similar way as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, and using (7.2) as well as the previous estimate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{w}{d^{s-1}} - Q_z d \right]_{C^{k+\gamma}(B_{r/2}(x_0))} &= \left[D^k(d^{1-s}(w - Q_z d^s)) \right]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \\ &\leq \sum_{|\beta|=k} \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \left[(\partial^\alpha d^{1-s})(\partial^{\beta-\alpha}(w - Q_z d^s)) \right]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \\ &\leq \sum_{|\beta|=k} \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \left(\|\partial^\alpha d^{1-s}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \left[\partial^{\beta-\alpha}(w - Q_z d^s) \right]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [\partial^\alpha d^{1-s}]_{C^\gamma(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \left\| \partial^{\beta-\alpha}(w - Q_z d^s) \right\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \right) \\ &\leq c \sum_{|\beta|=k} \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \left(r^{1-s-|\alpha|} r^{s-1+|\alpha|} + r^{1-s-|\alpha|-\gamma} r^{\gamma+s-1+|\alpha|} \right) \leq c. \end{aligned}$$

From here, by a standard covering argument, and using the continuity of the extension operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{v}{d^{s-1}} \right\|_{C^{k,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} &\leq c(\|v - d^{s-1}h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|f\|_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(\Omega)} + \|h\|_{C^{k+\gamma}(\partial\Omega)}) \\ &\leq c(\|f\|_{C^{k-1-s+\gamma}(\Omega)} + \|h\|_{C^{k+\gamma}(\partial\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [Aba15] N. Abatangelo. Large S -harmonic functions and boundary blow-up solutions for the fractional Laplacian. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(12):5555–5607, 2015.
- [Aba17] N. Abatangelo. Very large solutions for the fractional Laplacian: towards a fractional Keller-Osserman condition. *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.*, 6(4):383–405, 2017.
- [AGV23] N. Abatangelo, D. Gómez-Castro, and J. L. Vázquez. Singular boundary behaviour and large solutions for fractional elliptic equations. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 107(2):568–615, 2023.
- [AbRo20] N. Abatangelo and X. Ros-Oton. Obstacle problems for integro-differential operators: higher regularity of free boundaries. *Adv. Math.*, 360:106931, 61, 2020.
- [AbGr23] H. Abels and G. Grubb. Fractional-order operators on nonsmooth domains. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 107(4):1297–1350, 2023.
- [AlTo20] C. Alves and C. Torres Ledesma. Fractional elliptic problem in exterior domains with nonlocal Neumann condition. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 195:111732, 29, 2020.
- [AFR23] A. Audrito, J.C. Felipe-Navarro, and X. Ros-Oton. The Neumann problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 24(2):1155–1222, 2023.
- [BCGJ14] G. Barles, E. Chasseigne, C. Georgelin, and E. Jakobsen. On Neumann type problems for nonlocal equations set in a half space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 366(9):4873–4917, 2014.
- [BGJ14] G. Barles, C. Georgelin, and E. Jakobsen. On Neumann and oblique derivatives boundary conditions for nonlocal elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 256(4):1368–1394, 2014.
- [BFV14] B. Barrios, A. Figalli, and E. Valdinoci. Bootstrap regularity for integro-differential operators and its application to nonlocal minimal surfaces. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 13(3):609–639, 2014.
- [BaLe02] R. Bass and D. Levin. Harnack inequalities for jump processes. *Potential Anal.*, 17(4):375–388, 2002.
- [BiJa20] A. Biswas and S. Jarohs. On overdetermined problems for a general class of nonlocal operators. *J. Differential Equations*, 268(5):2368–2393, 2020.

- [Bog99] K. Bogdan. Representation of α -harmonic functions in Lipschitz domains. *Hiroshima Math. J.*, 29(2):227–243, 1999.
- [BBC03] K. Bogdan, K. Burdzy, and Z.Q. Chen. Censored stable processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 127(1):89–152, 2003.
- [BBKRSV09] K. Bogdan, T. Byczkowski, T. Kulczycki, M. Ryznar, R. Song, and Z. Vondraček. *Potential analysis of stable processes and its extensions*, Vol. 1980 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [CRS10] L. Caffarelli, J.M. Roquejoffre, and Y. Sire. Variational problems for free boundaries for the fractional Laplacian. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 12(5):1151–1179, 2010.
- [CaSi09] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(5):597–638, 2009.
- [CaSi11a] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. The Evans-Krylov theorem for nonlocal fully nonlinear equations. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 174(2):1163–1187, 2011.
- [CaSi11b] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. Regularity results for nonlocal equations by approximation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 200(1):59–88, 2011.
- [CGV21] H. Chan, D. Gómez-Castro, and J.L. Vázquez. Blow-up phenomena in nonlocal eigenvalue problems: when theories of L^1 and L^2 meet. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 280(7):Paper No. 108845, 68, 2021.
- [ChKi02] Z. Q. Chen and P. Kim. Green function estimate for censored stable processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 124(4):595–610, 2002.
- [DeRo12] D. De Silva and J. Roquejoffre. Regularity in a one-phase free boundary problem for the fractional Laplacian. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 29(3):335–367, 2012.
- [DeSa12] D. De Silva and O. Savin. $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity of flat free boundaries for the thin one-phase problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 253(8):2420–2459, 2012.
- [DSS14] D. De Silva, O. Savin, and Y. Sire. A one-phase problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity of flat free boundaries. *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.)*, 9(1):111–145, 2014.
- [DKP14] A. Di Castro, T. Kuusi, and G. Palatucci. Nonlocal Harnack inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 267(6):1807–1836, 2014.
- [DKP16] A. Di Castro, T. Kuusi, and G. Palatucci. Local behavior of fractional p -minimizers. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 33(5):1279–1299, 2016.
- [DDV22] S. Dipierro, A. Dzhugan, and E. Valdinoci. Integral operators defined “up to a polynomial”. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 25(1):60–108, 2022.
- [DPTV23] S. Dipierro, G. Poggesi, J. Thompson, and E. Valdinoci. Quantitative stability for the nonlocal overdetermined Serrin problem. *arXiv:2309.17119*, 2023.
- [DRV17] S. Dipierro, X. Ros-Oton, and E. Valdinoci. Nonlocal problems with Neumann boundary conditions. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 33(2):377–416, 2017.
- [DSV19] S. Dipierro, O. Savin, and E. Valdinoci. Definition of fractional Laplacian for functions with polynomial growth. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 35(4):1079–1122, 2019.
- [DGLZ12] Q. Du, Gunzburger, R. B. Lehoucq, and K. Zhou. Analysis and approximation of nonlocal diffusion problems with volume constraints. *SIAM Rev.*, 54(4):667–696, 2012.
- [Dyd12] B. Dyda. Fractional calculus for power functions and eigenvalues of the fractional Laplacian. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 15(4):536–555, 2012.
- [FaJa15] M. M. Fall and S. Jarohs. Overdetermined problems with fractional Laplacian. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 21(4):924–938, 2015.
- [FKV15] M. Felsinger, M. Kassmann, and P. Voigt. The Dirichlet problem for nonlocal operators. *Math. Z.*, 279(3-4):779–809, 2015.
- [FeRo24a] X. Fernández-Real and X. Ros-Oton. Integro-differential elliptic equations. *Progress in Mathematics 350*, Birkhäuser, 2024.
- [FeRo24b] X. Fernández Real and X. Ros-Oton. Stable cones in the thin one-phase problem. *Amer. J. Math.*, in press, 2024.
- [FeJa23] P. Feulefack and S. Jarohs. Nonlocal operators of small order. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 202(4):1501–1529, 2023.
- [FoKa24] G. Foghem and M. Kassmann. A general framework for nonlocal Neumann problems. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 22(1):15–66, 2024.
- [Get61] R. K. Gettoor. First passage times for symmetric stable processes in space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 101:75–90, 1961.
- [Gru14] G. Grubb. Local and nonlocal boundary conditions for μ -transmission and fractional elliptic pseudodifferential operators. *Anal. PDE*, 7(7):1649–1682, 2014.

- [Gru15] G. Grubb. Fractional Laplacians on domains, a development of Hörmander's theory of μ -transmission pseudodifferential operators. *Adv. Math.*, 268:478–528, 2015.
- [Gru18] G. Grubb. Green's formula and a Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator for fractional-order pseudodifferential operators. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 43(5):750–789, 2018.
- [Gru23] G. Grubb. Resolvents for fractional-order operators with nonhomogeneous local boundary conditions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 284(7):Paper No. 109815, 55, 2023.
- [GrHe23] F. Grube and T. Hensiek. Maximum principle for stable operators. *Math. Nachr.*, 296(12):5684–5702, 2023.
- [GrHe24] F. Grube and T. Hensiek. Robust nonlocal trace spaces and Neumann problems. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 241:Paper No. 113481, 35, 2024.
- [Hmi94] F. Hmissi. Fonctions harmoniques pour les potentiels de Riesz sur la boule unité. *Exposition. Math.*, 12(3):281–288, 1994.
- [JaWe19] S. Jarohs and T. Weth. On the strong maximum principle for nonlocal operators. *Math. Z.*, 293(1-2):81–111, 2019.
- [Kas09] M. Kassmann. A priori estimates for integro-differential operators with measurable kernels. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 34(1):1–21, 2009.
- [KKP16] J. Korvenpää, T. Kuusi, and G. Palatucci. The obstacle problem for nonlinear integro-differential operators. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 55(3):Art. 63, 29, 2016.
- [Kuk21] T. Kukuljan. The fractional obstacle problem with drift: higher regularity of free boundaries. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 281(8):Paper No. 109114, 74, 2021.
- [Lan72] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of modern potential theory*, volume Band 180 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972.
- [LiLi23] C. Li and C. Liu. Uniqueness and some related estimates for Dirichlet problem with fractional Laplacian. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 55(6):2685–2704, 2023.
- [LiZh23] Y. Lian and K. Zhang. Boundary pointwise regularity and applications to the regularity of free boundaries. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 62(8):Paper No. 230, 32, 2023.
- [LiZh22] C. Liu and R. Zhuo. On the Dirichlet problem for fractional Laplace equation on a general domain. *arXiv:2206.12546*, 2022.
- [RoSe14] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 101(3):275–302, 2014.
- [RoSe16a] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. Boundary regularity for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 165(11):2079–2154, 2016.
- [RoSe16b] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. Regularity theory for general stable operators. *J. Differential Equations*, 260(12):8675–8715, 2016.
- [RoSe17] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. Boundary regularity estimates for nonlocal elliptic equations in C^1 and $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 196(5):1637–1668, 2017.
- [RTW23] X. Ros-Oton, C. Torres-Latorre, and M. Weidner. Semiconvexity estimates for nonlinear integro-differential equations. *arXiv:2306.16751*, 2023.
- [RoWe24a] X. Ros-Oton and M. Weidner. Optimal regularity for nonlocal elliptic equations and free boundary problems. *arXiv:2403.07793*, 2024.
- [RoWe24b] X. Ros-Oton and M. Weidner. Regularity of the free boundary in the nonlocal one-phase problem. *in preparation*, 2024.
- [SeVa14] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci. Weak and viscosity solutions of the fractional Laplace equation. *Publ. Mat.*, 58(1):133–154, 2014.
- [Sil06] L. Silvestre. Hölder estimates for solutions of integro-differential equations like the fractional Laplace. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 55(3):1155–1174, 2006.
- [Sil07] L. Silvestre. Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(1):67–112, 2007.
- [SoVa19] N. Soave and E. Valdinoci. Overdetermined problems for the fractional Laplacian in exterior and annular sets. *J. Anal. Math.*, 137(1):101–134, 2019.
- [Von21] Z. Vondraček. A probabilistic approach to a non-local quadratic form and its connection to the Neumann boundary condition problem. *Math. Nachr.*, 294(1):177–194, 2021.

ICREA, PG. LLUÍS COMPANYS 23, 08010 BARCELONA, SPAIN & UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, GRAN VIA DE LES CORTS CATALANES 585, 08007 BARCELONA, SPAIN & CENTRE DE RECERCA MATEMÀTICA, BARCELONA, SPAIN

Email address: xros@icrea.cat

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, GRAN VIA DE LES CORTS CATALANES 585, 08007 BARCELONA, SPAIN

Email address: mweidner@ub.edu