

Free boundary problem with a nonlocal kernel ^{*}

Xinfu Chen

Department of Mathematics, University of Pittsburgh,
Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA.

Fang Li [†]

School of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University,
No. 135, Xingang Xi Road, Guangzhou 510275, P. R. China.

Maolin Zhou

Chern Institute of Mathematics and LPMC, Nankai University,
Tianjin 300071, P. R. China.

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new nonlocal model for two-phase Stefan problem, where the nonlocal version of the one-phase Stefan problem arises naturally as a special case. Among other things, we obtain the optimal condition for the pointwise convergence between local and nonlocal one-phase Stefan problem and an equivalent characterization of this optimal condition. Moreover, we provide some sufficient criteria for the continuous expansion of free boundaries, and when the sufficient conditions are violated, we construct examples to demonstrate that the jumping phenomena could happen on the free boundaries. The jumping phenomena is essentially induced by the nonlocal diffusion and thus it does not appear in the classical Stefan problem.

Keywords: nonlocal Stefan problem, free boundary, jumping phenomena

MSC (2020): 35K57, 45K05, 35R35

1 Introduction

The *classical Stefan problem* is well known to describe the evolution of the interface between two phases of a substance undergoing a phase change, for example the melting of a solid, such as ice to water. *Latent heat*, defined as the heat or energy that is absorbed or released during a

^{*}M. Zhou was partially supported by National Key Research and Development Program of China (2021YFA1002400, 2020YFA0713300) and Nankai Zhide Foundation and NSF of China (No. 12271437, 11971498). F. Li was supported by NSF of China (No. 11971498).

[†]Corresponding author. E-mail: lifang55@mail.sysu.edu.cn

phase change of a substance, acts as an energy source or sink at a moving solid-liquid interface, and the resulting boundary condition is known as the *Stefan boundary condition*.

In this paper, we propose and study *the nonlocal version of two-phase Stefan problem*

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x) = a \int_{\{\gamma > 0\}} k(x-y)\gamma(t, y)dy - a\gamma(t, x)\chi_{\{\gamma > 0\}} \\ \quad + b \int_{\{\gamma < -\ell_0\}} \eta(x-y)(\gamma(t, y) + \ell_0)dy - b(\gamma(t, x) + \ell_0)\chi_{\{\gamma < -\ell_0\}} & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \gamma(0, x) = \gamma_0(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where χ_E denotes the characteristic function of E , the kernel functions k, η satisfy

$$(K) \quad k \in C(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), k \geq 0, k(0) > 0, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x)dx = 1.$$

For clarity, always assume that

$$\Omega_0 \text{ is a smooth and bounded domain in } \mathbb{R}^n, \ell_0 \text{ is a positive constant.} \quad (1.2)$$

For the initial data, we assume that

$$\gamma_0(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \gamma_0(x) = -\alpha_0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, \alpha_0 \in (0, \ell_0). \quad (1.3)$$

Also denote

$$\gamma^+(t, x) = \gamma(t, x)\chi_{\{\gamma > 0\}}, \quad (\gamma(t, x) + \ell_0)^- = (\gamma(t, x) + \ell_0)\chi_{\{\gamma < -\ell_0\}},$$

and

$$\Omega(t) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \gamma(t, x) \geq 0\}, \quad \Omega^-(t) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \gamma(t, x) \leq -\ell_0\}. \quad (1.4)$$

These notations will be used whenever it is more convenient.

To better elaborate the formulation of the model, we first consider the classical *one-phase Stefan problem*, which is the description, typically, of the melting of a body of ice, maintained at zero degree centigrade, in contact with a region of water initially in Ω_0 . Based on latent heat and conservation of energy, the model is formulated as follows

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t(t, x) = d\Delta\theta(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \{\theta(t, \cdot) > 0\}, \\ \nabla_x\theta \cdot \nabla_x s = -\ell_0 & t > 0, x \in \partial\{\theta(t, \cdot) > 0\}, \\ \theta = 0 & t > 0, x \in \partial\{\theta(t, \cdot) > 0\}, \\ \theta(0, x) = u_0(x) & x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where $\theta = \theta(t, x)$ denotes the water's temperature, the free boundary $\partial\{\theta(t, \cdot) > 0\}$ at the time t is given by the equation $s(x) = t$. Also set $s(x) = 0$ if $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$. There are many famous papers on the regularity of the free boundary, such as [6, 7, 10].

On the basis of latent heat, *the nonlocal version of one-phase Stefan problem* is proposed as follows

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x) = d \int_{\{\gamma > 0\}} k(x - y) \gamma(t, y) dy - d\gamma(t, x) \chi_{\{\gamma > 0\}} & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \gamma(0, x) = \gamma_0(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

where the kernel function k satisfies **(K)**, and for the initial data, we assume that

$$\gamma_0(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \gamma_0(x) = -\ell_0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, \quad \gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \geq 0, \quad \gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \not\equiv 0. \quad (1.7)$$

The essence of the nonlocal Stefan problem (1.6) is at the time t ,

- if $x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \gamma(t, x) \leq 0\}$, then only it can absorb energy from outside;
- if $x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \gamma(t, x) > 0\}$, then not only it can absorb energy from outside, but also transfer its energy outside.

Here, the value ℓ_0 is in the status of latent heat, γ equal to $-\ell_0$ corresponds to the status of ice at zero degree centigrade and γ reaching zero represents that there has already been sufficient energy accumulated here for the phase change.

The nonlocal version of the two-phase Stefan problem (1.1) is proposed in the same spirit. The phase change happens at either γ reaching zero or γ reaching $-\ell_0$ and the initial data $\gamma = -\alpha_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$, where $\alpha_0 \in (0, \ell_0)$, corresponds to the mixture of water and ice at zero degree centigrade. Different from the one-phase case, in the initial data, $\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}$ could change signs and in particular, when both $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \gamma(t, x) < -\ell_0\}$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \gamma(t, x) > 0\}$ are nonempty, in the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid -\ell_0 \leq \gamma(t, x) \leq 0\}$, the energy could be absorbed and released from outside simultaneously.

We point out that the nonlocal version of the one-phase Stefan problems was also proposed and studied in [5]. Some discussions will be placed when the results obtained in this paper are related to those derived in [5]. Moreover, the fractional two-phase Stefan problem was treated in [2], and more general, the two-phase Stefan problem with anomalous diffusion was investigated in [3].

The main purpose of this paper is to study effects of nonlocal diffusion operators on the evolution of free boundaries and explore connections and discrepancies between the local and nonlocal Stefan problems.

First of all, we establish results about local existence and global existence for the nonlocal Stefan problems.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that in the problem (1.1), the kernel functions satisfy the assumption **(K)**, the condition (1.2) is valid and the initial data satisfies (1.3). Then the problem (1.1) admits a unique classical solution $\gamma(t, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ defined for all $t > 0$, and γ satisfies the estimate*

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_0 \leq \gamma(t, x) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_0 \quad \text{for } t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.8)$$

Moreover, if $\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \in C(\bar{\Omega}_0)$, then $\gamma(t, \cdot)$ is continuous in $\bar{\Omega}_0$ and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$ for any $t > 0$.

Next, we investigate the convergence relations between local and nonlocal Stefan problems. For simplicity, for $\epsilon > 0$, denote

$$k_\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} k\left(\frac{x}{\epsilon}\right), \quad \eta_\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \eta\left(\frac{x}{\epsilon}\right).$$

Before we present the main results, we briefly explain what should be the natural and optimal assumptions on the nonlocal kernel functions in the studies of convergence relations between models with local and nonlocal diffusions. Define the Fourier transform of the kernel function k as follows

$$\hat{k}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} k(x) dx.$$

Based on the properties of the Fourier transform, one observes that for $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \phi(y) dy - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \phi(x) \right) dx = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\hat{k}(\epsilon\xi) - 1 \right) \hat{\phi}(\xi),$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} \Delta \phi(x) dx = -|\xi|^2 \hat{\phi}(\xi),$$

and for fixed ξ ,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\hat{k}(\epsilon\xi) - 1 \right) \hat{\phi}(\xi) = -A|\xi|^2 \hat{\phi}(\xi)$$

under the condition

$$\hat{k}(\xi) = 1 - A|\xi|^2 + o(|\xi|^2) \quad \text{as } \xi \rightarrow 0, \quad (1.9)$$

where $A > 0$ is a constant. This observation indicates that the condition (1.9) is optimal in the studies of nonlocal approximation of Laplacian operator. Indeed, the nonlocal approximation of heat equation is verified under this condition. See [1] for details.

We establish an important equivalent characterization of the condition (1.9).

Proposition 1.2. *Assume that k satisfies the assumption **(K)**. Then the following two statements are equivalent.*

$$(i) \text{ For } 1 \leq j, h \leq n, j \neq h, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j k(x) dx = 0, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j x_h k(x) dx = 0, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j^2 k(x) dx = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx < +\infty.$$

(ii) *The Fourier transform of k satisfies the assumption (1.9).*

$$\text{Moreover, } \frac{1}{2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx = A.$$

In order not to interrupt the main theme of this paper, we leave the proof of this proposition in the appendix.

We first establish the convergence result about the two-phase Stefan problem. Let γ_ϵ be the solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} (\gamma_\epsilon)_t(t, x) = \frac{a}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\{\gamma_\epsilon > 0\}} k_\epsilon(x-y)\gamma_\epsilon(t, y)dy - \frac{a}{\epsilon^2} \gamma_\epsilon(t, x)\chi_{\{\gamma_\epsilon > 0\}} \\ \quad + \frac{b}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\{\gamma_\epsilon < -\ell_0\}} \eta_\epsilon(x-y)(\gamma_\epsilon(t, y) + \ell_0)dy - \frac{b}{\epsilon^2} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) + \ell_0)\chi_{\{\gamma_\epsilon < -\ell_0\}} & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \gamma_\epsilon(0, x) = \gamma_0(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

Theorem 1.3. *In the problem (1.10), assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are valid. In addition, assume that the kernel functions satisfy Proposition 1.2(i) and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^3 k(x) dx < +\infty. \quad (1.11)$$

Then for any given $T > 0$, $0 < t < T$, $\gamma_\epsilon(t, \cdot)$ converges to $\gamma(t, \cdot)$ in $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, where $\gamma \in L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the generalized solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u \in \beta(u)_t, \\ \beta(u)(0, x) = \gamma_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

where $A = \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |z|^2 k(z) dz$, $B = \frac{b}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |z|^2 \eta(z) dz$,

$$u = \begin{cases} A\gamma & \text{for } \gamma > 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } -\ell_0 \leq \gamma \leq 0 \\ B(\gamma + \ell_0) & \text{for } \gamma < -\ell_0 \end{cases}$$

and $\beta(u)$ is a multivalued mapping defined as follows

$$\beta(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{B}u - \ell_0 & \text{for } u < 0 \\ [-\ell_0, 0] & \text{for } u = 0 \\ \frac{1}{A}u & \text{for } u > 0. \end{cases}$$

Thanks to Proposition 1.2, one sees that in Theorem 1.3, only the condition (1.11) is extra in the studies of convergence relations. Obviously, the kernel functions which are radially symmetric and compactly supported satisfy the extra condition (1.11).

Next, the convergence relations between local and nonlocal one-phase Stefan problems are verified under the optimal condition (1.9). Similar to (1.10), we rescale the problem (1.6) as follows

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_{\epsilon t}(t, x) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y)\gamma_\epsilon^+(t, y)dy - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \gamma_\epsilon(0, x) = \gamma_0(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

where for simplicity, set $d = 1$ and denote

$$\gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) = \gamma_\epsilon(t, x)\chi_{\{\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) > 0\}}.$$

Theorem 1.4. *In the problem (1.13), assume that the kernel function satisfies the assumption **(K)**, the condition (1.2) is valid and the initial data satisfies (1.7). Also, assume that the Fourier transform of k satisfies (1.9). Then for any given $T > 0$, γ_ϵ^+ converges to the solution θ of the one-phase Stefan problem (1.5) in the following sense:*

$$\int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) d\tau \rightarrow \int_{\min\{s(x), t\}}^t \theta(\tau, x) d\tau \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where we set $d = A$ in the problem (1.5).

The convergence relations between local and nonlocal one-phase Stefan problems is also studied in [5] under the additional conditions that the kernel function is radially symmetric and compactly supported.

From now on, we mainly focus on the nonlocal one-phase Stefan problem and derive some interesting and fundamental properties related to *expansion, boundedness and continuity* of free boundaries in the nonlocal one-phase Stefan problem (1.6). Due to the lack of regularity in the nonlocal Stefan problems, we will impose an extra condition that $\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \in C(\bar{\Omega}_0)$ on the initial data γ_0 when discussing the properties of free boundaries.

Theorem 1.5. *In the problem (1.6), assume that the kernel function satisfies the assumption **(K)**, the condition (1.2) is valid, and the initial data γ_0 satisfies (1.7) and the extra condition that $\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \in C(\bar{\Omega}_0)$. We have the following statements.*

- (i) Expansion: there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\Omega(t) = \Omega(0)$ for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$ and $\Omega(t_1) \subseteq \Omega(t_2)$ for $0 < t_1 < t_2$.
- (ii) Boundedness: there exists $R > 0$, which depends on the initial data only, such that $\Omega(t) \subseteq B_R(0)$ for all $t > 0$.

Theorem 1.5(i) is also proved in [5], where the kernel function is assumed to be compactly supported and radially symmetric. For the nonlocal two-phase Stefan problem (1.1), due to the interaction between $\Omega(t)$ and $\Omega^-(t)$ denoted in (1.4), Theorem 1.5(i) might not hold. However, thanks to the comparison principle, Theorem 1.5(ii) remains true for both $\Omega(t)$ and $\Omega^-(t)$.

We further investigate the continuity of the free boundary in the nonlocal one-phase Stefan problem. For convenience, we prepare an extra assumption about the kernel function as follows

(K1) $k(x)$ is radially symmetric, decreasing in $|x|$.

Theorem 1.6. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.5, if additionally assume that $\bar{\Omega}_0$ is convex and the assumption **(K1)** is valid, then $\Omega(t)$ expands continuously.*

In Theorem 1.6, extra conditions on the kernel function $k(x)$ and the initial domain Ω_0 are needed to guarantee the continuous expansion of the free boundary $\partial\Omega(t)$. A natural question is what happens without these extra conditions. Two examples are constructed to show that when either the extra condition on the kernel function or that on the initial domain Ω_0 in Theorem 1.6 is violated, the population range could generate at a distant place. This is so called *jumping*

phenomena. Since the nonlocal dispersal describes the movement between non-adjacent spatial locations, the jumping phenomena is natural. It also reflects the essential differences between local and nonlocal dispersal operators.

We also point out that, if allowing the initial data to be nonconstant outside $\bar{\Omega}_0$, similar to [5, Theorem 4.6], where the kernel function is assumed to be compactly supported and radially symmetric, jumping phenomena could happen by choosing initial data properly. Indeed, the conclusion is valid as long as the kernel function satisfies the assumption **(K)**. We omit the proof since it is similar.

At the end, the main features of our paper are summarized as follows.

- Formulation of a new nonlocal model for two-phase Stefan problem, where the nonlocal version of the one-phase Stefan problem arises naturally as a special case.
- The optimal condition (1.9) for the pointwise convergence between local and nonlocal one-phase Stefan problem in Theorem 1.4.
- An equivalent characterization between the conditions (i) about the kernel function and (ii), i.e., (1.9), about the Fourier transform of the kernel function in Proposition 1.2.
- For local and global existence in Theorem 1.1, expansion and boundedness of free boundaries in Theorem 1.5, we only require the basic assumption **(K)** on the kernel functions.
- The sufficient conditions derived in Theorem 1.6 for the continuous expansion of the free boundary when the initial data outside initial domain Ω_0 is assumed to be a negative constant. Counterexamples are constructed to demonstrate that the jumping phenomena could happen when the sufficient conditions are violated.

This paper is organized as follows. Theorem 1.1 and some preliminary results for the problem (1.1) are established in Section 2. In Section 3, we focus on the convergence relations between local and nonlocal Stefan problems and present the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. In Section 4, Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 related to properties about the free boundary of the nonlocal Stefan problem are verified. Moreover, we construct two examples where jumping phenomena happen, when one of the additional assumptions in Theorem 1.6 is violated. At the end, the proof of Proposition 1.2 is included in the appendix.

2 Wellposedness and preliminaries

2.1 Local and global existence

We first verify the local and global existence to the nonlocal version of the two-phase Stefan problem (1.1). The same arguments can be applied to the the nonlocal version of the one-phase Stefan problem (1.6) word by word.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Denote $M_0 = \|\gamma_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, $\mathbb{Y} = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, for $s > 0$,

$$\mathbb{X}_s = \left\{ \phi \in C([0, s], \mathbb{Y}) \mid \phi(0, \cdot) = \gamma_0(\cdot), \|\phi(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 2M_0, t \in [0, s] \right\},$$

and

$$\|\phi\|_{C([0, s], \mathbb{Y})} = \sup_{0 \leq t < s} \|\phi(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

For $\phi \in \mathbb{X}_s$, $0 < t < s$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}\phi &= \gamma_0(x) + a \int_0^t \int_{\{\phi > 0\}} k(x-y)\phi(\tau, y)dyd\tau - a \int_0^t \phi(\tau, x)\chi_{\{\phi > 0\}}d\tau \\ &+ b \int_0^t \int_{\{\phi < -\ell_0\}} \eta(x-y)(\phi(\tau, y) + \ell_0)dyd\tau - b \int_0^t (\phi(\tau, x) + \ell_0)\chi_{\{\phi < -\ell_0\}}d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Then it is routine to show that $\mathcal{T}\phi \in C([0, s], \mathbb{Y})$, $\mathcal{T}\phi(0, \cdot) = \gamma_0(\cdot)$ and

$$\|\mathcal{T}\phi\|_{C([0, s], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq M_0 + 2as\|\phi\|_{C([0, s], \mathbb{Y})} + 2bs\|\phi\|_{C([0, s], \mathbb{Y})} \leq M_0 + 4s(a+b)M_0.$$

Moreover, for $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathbb{X}_s$,

$$\|\mathcal{T}\phi_1 - \mathcal{T}\phi_2\|_{C([0, s], \mathbb{Y})} \leq 2as\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{C([0, s], \mathbb{Y})} + 2bs\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{C([0, s], \mathbb{Y})}.$$

Thus it is obvious that there exists $t_0 > 0$, which depends a , b and M_0 only and is sufficiently small, such that for $0 < s \leq t_0$, \mathcal{T} maps \mathbb{X}_s into \mathbb{X}_s and \mathcal{T} is a contraction mapping in \mathbb{X}_s . Hence by the contraction mapping theorem, for $0 < s \leq t_0$, there exists a unique $\gamma \in \mathbb{X}_s$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(t, x) &= \gamma_0(x) + a \int_0^t \int_{\{\gamma > 0\}} k(x-y)\gamma(\tau, y)dyd\tau - a \int_0^t \gamma(\tau, x)\chi_{\{\gamma > 0\}}d\tau \\ &+ b \int_0^t \int_{\{\gamma < -\ell_0\}} \eta(x-y)(\gamma(\tau, y) + \ell_0)dyd\tau - b \int_0^t (\gamma(\tau, x) + \ell_0)\chi_{\{\gamma < -\ell_0\}}d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < t < s$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, obviously γ is the unique solution to the problem (1.1).

Let $(0, T_{\max})$ denote the maximal time interval for which the solution $\gamma(t, x)$ of the problem (1.1) exists. It remains to show $T_{\max} = +\infty$. For this purpose, it suffices to show that $\|\gamma(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is bounded in $(0, T_{\max})$. To be more specific, we claim that γ satisfies the estimate (1.8) in $(0, T_{\max})$.

Fix any $0 < T < T_{\max}$. First, assume that the kernel functions k and η are compactly supported. Then since $\bar{\Omega}_0$ is bounded, it is standard to show that $\{\gamma(t, x) \geq 0\}$ and $\{\gamma(t, x) \leq -\ell_0\}$ remain bounded for $0 < t < T$.

Notice that if $|\{\gamma_0(x) > 0\}| = 0$, then by the equation satisfied by $\gamma(t, x)$, one has

$$\gamma(t, x) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_0, \quad 0 < t < T, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Now we consider the case that $|\{\gamma_0(x) > 0\}| > 0$. Based on the problem (1.1), for any $1 < p < +\infty$, $0 < t < T$, one has

$$(\gamma^+)^{p-1}\gamma_t(t, x) \leq (\gamma^+)^{p-1} \left(a \int_{\{\gamma>0\}} k(x-y)\gamma(t, y)dy - a\gamma(t, x)\chi_{\{\gamma>0\}} \right).$$

Then direct computation yields that for $0 < t < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\gamma^+(t, x))^p dx \leq a \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\gamma^+(t, x))^{p-1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y)\gamma^+(t, y)dy - \gamma^+(t, x) \right) dx \\ & \leq a \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\gamma^+(t, x))^{p-1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x, y)dy \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x, y)(\gamma^+(t, y))^p dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} dx - a \|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p \\ & \leq a \|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{p-1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x, y)(\gamma^+(t, y))^p dy dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} - a \|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for any $1 < p < +\infty$, $0 < t < T$,

$$\|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\gamma^+(0, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

and it follows that

$$\gamma(t, x) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_0, \quad 0 < t < T, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Similar arguments can be applied on $(\gamma(t, x) + \ell_0)^-$ to derive that

$$\gamma(t, x) \geq \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_0, \quad 0 < t < T, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The claim is proved for compactly supported kernel functions since $T \in (0, T_{\max})$ is arbitrary.

Now consider the case that the kernel functions k and η are not compactly supported. Then there exists a series of kernels k_j , η_j , $j \geq 1$, which are compactly supported, satisfy the assumption **(K)**, and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|k_j - k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0, \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_j - \eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Let γ_j denote the solution to the problem (1.1) with k replaced by k_j and η replaced by η_j . Set $w_j = \gamma - \gamma_j$, $j \geq 1$. Then w_j satisfies

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (w_j)_t(t, x) = a \int_{\{\gamma>0\}} k(x-y)\gamma(t, y)dy - a\gamma(t, x)\chi_{\{\gamma>0\}} \\ \quad - a \int_{\{\gamma_j>0\}} k_j(x-y)\gamma_j(t, y)dy + a\gamma_j(t, x)\chi_{\{\gamma_j>0\}} \\ \quad + b \int_{\{\gamma<-\ell_0\}} \eta(x-y)(\gamma(t, y) + \ell_0)dy - b(\gamma(t, x) + \ell_0)\chi_{\{\gamma<-\ell_0\}} \\ \quad - b \int_{\{\gamma_j<-\ell_0\}} \eta_j(x-y)(\gamma_j(t, y) + \ell_0)dy + b(\gamma_j(t, x) + \ell_0)\chi_{\{\gamma_j<-\ell_0\}} \\ w_j(0, x) = 0 \end{array} \right. \quad \begin{array}{l} 0 < t < T_{\max}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{array}$$

Then for $w_j > 0$, direct computation yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
(w_j)_t(t, x) &\leq a \int_{\{\gamma > 0\}} k(x-y) (\gamma(t, y) - \gamma_j(t, y)) dy + a \int_{\{\gamma > 0\}} k(x-y) \gamma_j(t, y) dy \\
&\quad - a \int_{\{\gamma_j > 0\}} (k_j(x-y) - k(x-y)) \gamma_j(t, y) dy - a \int_{\{\gamma_j > 0\}} k(x-y) \gamma_j(t, y) dy \\
&\quad + b \int_{\{\gamma < -\ell_0\}} \eta(x-y) (\gamma(t, y) + \ell_0) dy - b \int_{\{\gamma_j < -\ell_0\}} \eta(x-y) (\gamma(t, y) + \ell_0) dy \\
&\quad + b \int_{\{\gamma_j < -\ell_0\}} \eta(x-y) (\gamma(t, y) - \gamma_j(t, y)) dy \\
&\quad + b \int_{\{\gamma_j < -\ell_0\}} (\eta(x-y) - \eta_j(x-y)) (\gamma_j(t, y) + \ell_0) dy \\
&\leq (a+b) \|w_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + aM_0 \|k_j - k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + bM_0 \|\eta_j - \eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that γ_j satisfies the estimate (1.8). Similarly for $w_j < 0$, we have

$$(-w_j)_t(t, x) \leq (a+b) \|w_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + aM_0 \|k_j - k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + bM_0 \|\eta_j - \eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

The above two inequalities indicate that for $0 < t < T_{\max}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|w_j(t, x)| &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} [w_j^2(\tau, x) + \delta^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} d\tau \\
&= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \frac{w_j(\tau, x)}{[w_j^2(\tau, x) + \delta^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} w_j(\tau, x) d\tau \\
&\leq (a+b) \int_0^t \|w_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}(\tau) d\tau + aM_0 \|k_j - k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} t + bM_0 \|\eta_j - \eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} t. \quad (2.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$h_j(t) = \int_0^t \|w_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}(\tau) d\tau,$$

then (2.2) implies that for $0 < t < T_{\max}$,

$$h_j'(t) \leq (a+b)h_j(t) + aM_0 \|k_j - k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} t + bM_0 \|\eta_j - \eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} t.$$

Direct computation yields that for $0 < t < T_{\max}$,

$$h_j(t) \leq \frac{M_0}{(a+b)^2} e^{(a+b)t} (a \|k_j - k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + b \|\eta_j - \eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}),$$

which, together with (2.2), yields that for $0 < t < T_{\max}$,

$$\|w_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}(t) \leq M_0 \left(\frac{1}{a+b} e^{(a+b)t} + t \right) (a \|k_j - k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + b \|\eta_j - \eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}). \quad (2.3)$$

This, together with (2.1) and the fact that γ_j satisfies the estimate (1.8) for all $j \geq 1$, implies the desired claim for general kernel functions under the assumption **(K)**.

At the end, it is routine to verify that if $\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \in C(\bar{\Omega}_0)$, then $\gamma(t, \cdot)$ is continuous in $\bar{\Omega}_0$ and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$ for any $t > 0$. \square

2.2 Preliminaries

We first present the comparison principle for the nonlocal version of the two-phase Stefan problem (1.1) and omit the proof since it is standard. Similarly, the comparison principle is also valid for the nonlocal version of the one-phase Stefan problem (1.6).

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are valid. Also assume that $\gamma_0^* \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\gamma_0^*(x) = -\alpha_0^*$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$, $\alpha_0^* \in (0, \ell_0)$. Let γ^* denote the solution to the problem (1.1) with initial data γ_0^* . If $\gamma_0^* \geq \gamma_0$, then $\gamma^* \geq \gamma$ for all $t > 0$.*

Moreover, we present a type of strong maximum principle for the nonlocal version of one-phase Stefan problem (1.6).

Proposition 2.2. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.5, given $s \geq 0$, we have $\gamma(t, x) > 0$ in $\Omega(s)$ for $t \geq s$.*

Proof. First, we claim that if $x \in \{x \in \Omega(s) \mid \gamma(s, x) > 0\}$, then for $t > s$, $\gamma(t, x) > 0$. Due to the continuity of the solution in t , we only need consider the case that $s > 0$. According to

$$\gamma_t(t, x) = d \int_{\{\gamma > 0\}} k(x - y) \gamma(t, y) dy - d\gamma(t, x) \chi_{\{\gamma > 0\}} \geq -d\gamma(t, x) \chi_{\{\gamma > 0\}},$$

the claim follows immediately.

Next we consider the initial domain $\bar{\Omega}_0$. Set

$$\gamma_{0\delta}(x) = \begin{cases} \gamma_0(x) + \delta & x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ \gamma_0(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, \end{cases}$$

where $\delta > 0$, and let γ_δ denote the solution to the problem (1.6) with the initial data (1.7), where γ_0 is replaced by $\gamma_{0\delta}$. Thanks to the above claim, one sees that $\gamma_\delta(t, x) > 0$ for $t > 0$, $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$. By letting $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, it is routine to derive that $\gamma(t, x) \geq 0$ for $t > 0$, $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$, i.e., $\bar{\Omega}_0 \subseteq \Omega(t)$ for $t > 0$.

Moreover, since $\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \geq 0$, $\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0} \not\equiv 0$, the claim at the beginning indicates that $\{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0 \mid \gamma(t, x) > 0\}$ is not empty for $t > 0$. Suppose that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\gamma(t_0, x)$ touches zero somewhere in $\bar{\Omega}_0$. By choosing

$$x_0 \in \partial\{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0 \mid \gamma(t_0, x) > 0\} \cap \{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0 \mid \gamma(t_0, x) = 0\},$$

we have

$$0 \geq \gamma_t(t_0, x_0) = d \int_{\{\gamma(t_0, y) > 0\}} k(x_0 - y) \gamma(t_0, y) dy > 0,$$

where the strict inequality is due to the assumption **(K)** and the choice of x_0 . This is a contradiction and thus $\gamma(t, x) > 0$ for $t > 0$, $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$.

It remains to consider the set $\{x \in \Omega(s) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0 \mid \gamma(s, x) = 0\}$, when it is not empty. Fix $x^* \in \{x \in \Omega(s) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0 \mid \gamma(s, x) = 0\}$ and let s_1 denote the moment when $\gamma(t, x^*)$ first touches zero. Obviously $s_1 \leq s$ and by the equation satisfied by γ , we have

$$\ell_0 = \int_0^{s_1} d \int_{\{\gamma(t, y) > 0\}} k(x^* - y) \gamma(t, y) dy dt.$$

Then obviously there exists $t_1 \in (0, s_1)$ such that

$$\int_{\{\gamma(t_1, y) > 0\}} k(x^* - y) \gamma(t_1, y) dy > 0. \quad (2.4)$$

We claim that for any $t > t_1$, $\int_{\{\gamma(t, y) > 0\}} k(x^* - y) \gamma(t, y) dy > 0$. Suppose that the claim is not true, i.e., there exists $t_2 > t_1$ such that

$$\int_{\{\gamma(t_2, y) > 0\}} k(x^* - y) \gamma(t_2, y) dy = 0.$$

This implies that $\gamma(t_2, y) \leq 0$ in the set $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid k(x^* - y) > 0\}$. Again thanks to the claim at the beginning, we have $\gamma(t_1, y) \leq 0$ in the set $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid k(x^* - y) > 0\}$, which contradicts to (2.4). The claim is proved.

According to this claim and the choice of s, x^* , one sees that

$$\gamma_t(s, x^*) = d \int_{\{\gamma(s, y) > 0\}} k(x^* - y) \gamma(s, y) dy > 0.$$

Hence for $t > s \geq 0$, $\gamma(t, x^*) > 0$. □

At the end, some priori estimates are verified for the nonlocal version of the two-phase Stefan problem.

Lemma 2.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$, which depends on the initial data only, such that for given $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we have*

$$\|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_1, \quad \|(\gamma(t, \cdot) + \ell_0)^-\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_1, \quad t > 0.$$

Proof. Notice that if $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then for any $p > 1$, $\phi \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and

$$\|\phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \left(\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{p-1} \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq (\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + 1) (\|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + 1).$$

Hence it suffices to verify the statements for $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$.

Indeed, when $p = \infty$, the conclusion is obvious due to Theorem 1.1, i.e.,

$$\|\gamma(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\gamma_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \quad (2.5)$$

In order to estimate $\|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, we first consider the case that both k and η are compactly supported. Let $\hat{\gamma}(t, x)$ denote the solution to the problem (1.1) with the initial data replaced by

$$\hat{\gamma}(0, x) = \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}, \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, \quad \hat{\gamma}(0, x) = -\alpha_0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0.$$

By Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\hat{\gamma}(t, x) \geq \gamma(t, x), \quad -\alpha_0 \leq \hat{\gamma}(t, x) \leq \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}, \quad t > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.6)$$

Since $\bar{\Omega}_0$ is bounded and k, η are compactly supported, for $t > 0$, it is routine to show that $\{\hat{\gamma}(t, x) \geq 0\}$ remains bounded. Set

$$\Sigma^+(t) = \bigcup_{0 < \tau < t} \{\hat{\gamma}(\tau, x) \geq 0\}.$$

Then by direct computation, for $0 < \tau < t$,

$$\int_{\Sigma^+(t)} \hat{\gamma}_\tau(\tau, x) dx \leq a \int_{\Sigma^+(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) \hat{\gamma}^+(\tau, y) dy dx - a \int_{\Sigma^+(t)} \hat{\gamma}^+(\tau, x) dx \leq 0.$$

Thus

$$0 \leq \int_{\Sigma^+(t)} \hat{\gamma}(t, x) dx \leq \int_{\Sigma^+(t)} \hat{\gamma}(0, x) dx = -\alpha_0 |\Sigma^+(t) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0| + \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} |\bar{\Omega}_0|,$$

which implies that

$$|\{\hat{\gamma}(t, x) \geq 0\}| \leq |\Sigma^+(t)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}}{\alpha_0}\right) |\bar{\Omega}_0|.$$

Hence thanks to (2.6), for any given $t > 0$

$$\|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}}{\alpha_0}\right) |\bar{\Omega}_0|. \quad (2.7)$$

Now consider the case that the kernel functions k and η satisfy the assumption **(K)**, but are not compactly supported. Then there exists a series of kernel functions $k_j, \eta_j, j \geq 1$, which are compactly supported, satisfy the assumption **(K)**, and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|k_j - k_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0, \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_j - \eta_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0.$$

Let γ_j denotes the solution to the problem (1.1) with k replaced by k_j and η replaced by η_j . Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma_j^+ - \gamma^+\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma_j - \gamma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0.$$

This, together with (2.7), implies that for any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B_R(0)} \gamma^+(t, x) dx = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R(0)} \gamma_j^+(t, x) dx \leq \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}}{\alpha_0}\right) |\bar{\Omega}_0|.$$

Since R is arbitrary, for any given $t > 0$,

$$\|\gamma^+(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}}{\alpha_0}\right) |\bar{\Omega}_0|.$$

Obviously, $\|(\gamma(t, \cdot) + \ell_0)^-\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ can be estimated in a similar way. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)| dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x)| dx, \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. First of all, fix $x, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For $\delta \neq 0$, introduce $\mu_\delta(X) = (X^2 + \delta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

According to the problem (1.1) satisfied by γ , it is routine to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mu_\delta(\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)) \\ = & \frac{\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)}{[(\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x))^2 + \delta^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} (\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x))_t \\ \leq & \frac{|\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)|}{[(\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x))^2 + \delta^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \times \left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) |\gamma^+(t, y+h) - \gamma^+(t, y)| dy - a |\gamma^+(t, x+h) - \gamma^+(t, x)| \right) \\ & + \frac{|\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)|}{[(\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x))^2 + \delta^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot b \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(t, y+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(t, y)| dy \\ & - \frac{|\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)|}{[(\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x))^2 + \delta^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot b |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(t, x+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(t, x)|, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)| - |\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x)| \\ = & \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} [\mu_\delta(\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)) - \mu_\delta(\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x))] \\ = & \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \mu_\delta(\gamma(\tau, x+h) - \gamma(\tau, x)) d\tau \\ \leq & a \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) |\gamma^+(\tau, y+h) - \gamma^+(\tau, y)| dy - |\gamma^+(\tau, x+h) - \gamma^+(\tau, x)| \right) d\tau \\ & + b \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, y+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, y)| dy d\tau \\ & - b \int_0^t |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x)| d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for any $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(0)} |\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)| dx - \int_{B_R(0)} |\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x)| dx \\ \leq & a \int_0^t \int_{B_R(0)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) |\gamma^+(\tau, y+h) - \gamma^+(\tau, y)| dy - |\gamma^+(\tau, x+h) - \gamma^+(\tau, x)| \right) dx d\tau \\ & + b \int_0^t \int_{B_R(0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, y+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, y)| dy dx d\tau \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -b \int_0^t \int_{B_R(0)} |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x)| dx d\tau \\
\leq & a \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma^+(\tau, x+h) - \gamma^+(\tau, x)| dx - \int_{B_R(0)} |\gamma^+(\tau, x+h) - \gamma^+(\tau, x)| dx \right) d\tau \\
& + b \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x)| dx d\tau \\
& - b \int_0^t \int_{B_R(0)} |(\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x+h) - (\gamma + \ell_0)^-(\tau, x)| dx d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x)$ is compactly supported. Then thanks to Lemma 2.3, by letting $R \rightarrow \infty$, we have for $t > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma(t, x+h) - \gamma(t, x)| dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x)| dx.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 2.1. *The priori estimates in Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 are also valid for the nonlocal version of the one-phase Stefan problem based on the same arguments. In particular, these estimates play an important role in proving convergence relations between local and nonlocal Stefan problems.*

3 Convergence to the local Stefan problem

3.1 Convergence to the two-phase Stefan problem

Theorem 1.3 is about the convergence relations between local and nonlocal two-phase Stefan problems, where the additional assumptions that the kernel functions are radially symmetric and compactly supported are required.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Fix $T > 0$. For any test function $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T])$, it is routine to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_\epsilon \zeta_t dx dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_0(x) \zeta(0, x) dx \\
= & a \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \zeta(t, y) dy - \zeta(t, x) \right) \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) dx dt \\
& + b \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta_\epsilon(x-y) \zeta(t, y) dy - \zeta(t, x) \right) (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) + \ell_0)^- dx dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

First, thanks to the conditions imposed on the kernel functions k and η , and $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T])$, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \zeta(t, y) dy - \zeta(t, x) \right) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(z) (\zeta(t, x - \epsilon z) - \zeta(t, x)) dz$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |z|^2 k(z) dz \Delta \zeta(t, x) \quad (3.2)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, T)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and similarly,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta_\epsilon(x-y) \zeta(t, y) dy - \zeta(t, x) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |z|^2 \eta(z) dz \Delta \zeta \quad (3.3)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, T)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Now we focus on analyzing the convergence properties of γ_ϵ as ϵ goes to zero. According to the Fréchet-Kolmogorov theorem, Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, for any fixed $t \in (0, T)$ and bounded set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\{\gamma_\epsilon(t, \cdot) \mid 0 < \epsilon < 1\}$ is precompact in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then it is routine to derive that there exist a sequence $\{\epsilon_j\}$ with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_j = 0$ and $\gamma(t, \cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}$, such that for any $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot) = \gamma(t, \cdot) \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (3.4)$$

Due to the uniqueness of weak convergence, this implies that for any $1 < p < +\infty$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot) = \gamma(t, \cdot) \text{ weakly in } L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Thanks to Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\|\gamma(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\gamma_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

i.e., $\gamma(t, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}$.

Next, we claim that *there exists* $\gamma(t, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$ such that for any $1 < p < +\infty$, $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot) = \gamma(t, \cdot) \text{ weakly in } L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (3.5)$$

To prove this claim, fix $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$, $1 < p < \infty$ and a bounded set Ω in \mathbb{R}^n . Obviously, there exist a subsequence of the sequence $\{\epsilon_j\}$, denoted by $\{\epsilon_{j_\ell}\}$, and $\gamma_\Omega(t, \cdot) \in L^p(\Omega)$, such that

$$\lim_{j_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, \cdot) = \gamma_\Omega(t, \cdot) \text{ weakly in } L^p(\Omega). \quad (3.6)$$

We emphasize that the subsequence $\{\epsilon_{j_\ell}\}$ depends on $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$. Then fix $\phi(x) \in C_c(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, x) - \gamma_\Omega(t, x)) \phi(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, x) - \gamma_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, x)) \phi(x) dx + \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, x) - \gamma_\Omega(t, x)) \phi(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_j}(s, x) - \gamma_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(s, x)) \phi(x) dx + \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, x) - \gamma_\Omega(t, x)) \phi(x) dx \\ & \quad + \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, x) - \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(s, x)) \phi(x) dx - \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, x) - \gamma_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(s, x)) \phi(x) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where $s \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Notice that based on the problem (1.10), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) - \gamma_\epsilon(s, x)) \phi(x) dx \\ = & a \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \phi(y) dy - \phi(x) \right) \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) dx d\tau \\ & + b \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta_\epsilon(x-y) \phi(y) dy - \phi(x) \right) (\gamma_\epsilon(\tau, x) + \ell_0)^- dx d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (1.8) and (3.2), there exists a constant C , which is independent of $\epsilon > 0$, such that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) - \gamma_\epsilon(s, x)) \phi(x) dx \right| \leq C|t - s|.$$

Thanks to this estimate, we can choose $s \in \mathbb{Q}$ close enough to t to control the last two terms in (3.7). Hence, together with (3.4) and (3.6), it is standard to show that for any $\phi(x) \in C_c(\Omega)$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (\gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, x) - \gamma_\Omega(t, x)) \phi(x) dx = 0.$$

Thus

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot) = \gamma_\Omega(t, \cdot) \text{ weakly in } L^p(\Omega).$$

Since $1 < p < \infty$ is arbitrary, thanks to Theorem 1.1, one sees that

$$\|\gamma_\Omega(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\gamma_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Notice that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is any fixed bounded set, thus due to the uniqueness of weak convergence, we can define $\gamma(t, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting

$$\gamma(t, x) = \gamma_\Omega(t, x) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega.$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot) = \gamma(t, \cdot) \text{ weakly in } L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Since $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$ is arbitrary, the claim is proved.

Furthermore, we improve the weak convergence in (3.5) to the strong convergence in $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For this purpose, fix $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$ and a bounded set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Recall that due to the Fréchet-Kolmogorov theorem, Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, $\{\gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot)\}$ is precompact in $L^1(\Omega)$. Thus thanks to (3.5) and the uniqueness of weak convergence, it is routine to verify that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot) = \gamma(t, \cdot) \text{ in } L^1(\Omega),$$

i.e., for any $t \in (0, T) \cap \mathbb{Q}^c$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\epsilon_j}(t, \cdot) = \gamma(t, \cdot) \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (3.8)$$

Therefore, by letting $j \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from (3.1), (3.2), (3.3), (3.4) and (3.8) that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\gamma \zeta_t + (A\gamma^+ + B(\gamma + \ell_0)^-) \Delta \zeta) dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma_0(x) \zeta(0, x) dx = 0.$$

The uniqueness of generalized solution to the problem (1.12) yields the desired conclusion. \square

3.2 Convergence to the one-phase Stefan problem

This subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.4, where the convergence relations between local and nonlocal one-phase Stefan problems are verified under the optimal condition (1.9) imposed on the kernel function.

It is known that the classical one-phase problem (1.5) can be reduced to a parabolic variational inequality [11, Chapter 1.9]. To be more specific, define

$$v(t, x) = \begin{cases} \int_0^t \theta(\tau, x) d\tau & \text{if } x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, t \leq s(x), \\ \int_{s(x)}^t \theta(\tau, x) d\tau & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, t > s(x), \end{cases}$$

and then transform the problem (1.5) into a variational inequality for the function $v(t, x)$ as follows

$$\begin{cases} v_t - A\Delta v \geq \bar{f} & \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v \geq 0 & \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ (v_t - A\Delta v - \bar{f})v = 0 & \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

where $\bar{f} = \gamma_0$ defined in (1.7). It has been proved that there exists a unique solution of the problem (3.9), still denoted by $v(t, x)$, and

$$D_x v, D_x^2 v, D_t v \quad \text{belong to } L^\infty((0, T); L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)) \quad \text{for } p < \infty.$$

See [11, Chapter 1.9] for details.

Borrowing this idea, define

$$v_\epsilon(t, x) = \int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) d\tau, \quad (3.10)$$

Obviously, Theorem 1.4 is about the convergence relations between v_ϵ and v .

First we compute the equation satisfied by v_ϵ . For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$, let $s_\epsilon(x)$ denote the time if exists when $\gamma_\epsilon(t, x)$ first reaches zero. Thus

$$\ell_0 = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^{s_\epsilon(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x - y) \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, y) dy d\tau. \quad (3.11)$$

- if $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, t > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & v_{\epsilon t} - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x - y) v_\epsilon(t, y) dy + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} v_\epsilon(t, x) \\ &= \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x - y) \int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, y) d\tau dy + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^t \gamma_{\epsilon t}^+(\tau, x) d\tau + \gamma_\epsilon^+(0, x) - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x - y) \int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, y) d\tau dy + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) d\tau \\ &= \gamma_0(x); \end{aligned}$$

- if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$, $0 < t \leq s_\epsilon(x)$, then $v_\epsilon(t, x) = 0$. Thus

$$v_{\epsilon t} - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y)v_\epsilon(t, y)dy + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}v_\epsilon(t, x) = -\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y)v_\epsilon(t, y)dy;$$

- if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$, $t > s_\epsilon(x)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & v_{\epsilon t} - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y)v_\epsilon(t, y)dy + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}v_\epsilon(t, x) \\ &= \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, y)d\tau dy + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x)d\tau \\ &= \int_{s_\epsilon(x)}^t \gamma_{\epsilon t}^+(\tau, x)d\tau - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \int_{s_\epsilon(x)}^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, y)d\tau dy + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{s_\epsilon(x)}^t \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x)d\tau \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \int_0^{s_\epsilon(x)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, y)d\tau dy \\ &= -\ell_0, \end{aligned}$$

according to (3.11).

Hence one sees that v_ϵ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} v_{\epsilon t}(t, x) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y)v_\epsilon(t, y)dy - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}v_\epsilon(t, x) + f_\epsilon(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v_\epsilon(0, x) = 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$f_\epsilon(t, x) = \begin{cases} \gamma_0(x) & t > 0, x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, \\ -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} k_\epsilon(x-y)v_\epsilon(t, y)dy & 0 < t \leq s_\epsilon(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, \\ -\ell_0 & t > s_\epsilon(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0. \end{cases}$$

Secondly, we prepare some useful estimates about f_ϵ .

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that in the problem (1.13), the kernel function k satisfies the assumption **(K)**, the initial data satisfies (1.2) and $u_0 \geq 0$. Then for given $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $f_\epsilon(t, x)$ is uniformly bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, $t > 0$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3, if $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then for any $p > 1$, $\phi \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and

$$\|\phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \left(\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{p-1} \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq (\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + 1) (\|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + 1).$$

Hence it suffices to verify the conclusion for $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$.

Since $f_\epsilon(t, x) = \gamma_0$ for $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ and $t > 0$, we only need to estimate f_ϵ outside $\bar{\Omega}_0$. It mainly relies on the following estimates:

$$-f_\epsilon(t, x) \in [0, \ell_0] \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0} -f_\epsilon(t, x)dx \leq \int_{\Omega_0} \gamma_0 dx. \quad (3.13)$$

Assume that (3.13) holds. It immediately yields that

$$\|f_\epsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \max \{ \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}, \ell_0 \}, \quad \|f_\epsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 2 \int_{\Omega_0} \gamma_0 dx.$$

The desired conclusion follows.

Now it remains to verify (3.13). In fact, due to (3.11), the first estimate in (3.13) is obvious. Intuitively, the second estimate in (3.13) indicates that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0} -f_\epsilon(t, x) dx$ is less than the total energy absorbed outside $\bar{\Omega}_0$ from time 0 to t , which can not exceed the total energy at the initial time, i.e. $\int_{\Omega_0} \gamma_0 dx$. To be more precise, by (1.13), one has for any large $R > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) - \gamma_\epsilon(0, x)) dx \\ = & \int_{(B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0) \cap \{s_\epsilon(x) < t\}} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) - \gamma_\epsilon(0, x)) dx + \int_{(B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0) \cap \{s_\epsilon(x) \geq t\}} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) - \gamma_\epsilon(0, x)) dx \\ \geq & \int_{(B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0) \cap \{s_\epsilon(x) < t\}} \ell_0 dx + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \int_{(B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0) \cap \{s_\epsilon(x) \geq t\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, y) dy dx d\tau \\ = & \int_{B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0} -f_\epsilon(t, x) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(0)} \gamma_{\epsilon t}(t, x) dx = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{B_R(0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_\epsilon(x-y) \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, y) dy dx - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{B_R(0)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) dx \\ \leq & \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon(t)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) dx - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{B_R(0)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(t, x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the validity of the above inequality is due to the property that $\gamma_\epsilon^+(t, \cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ proved Lemma 2.3. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) - \gamma_\epsilon(0, x)) dx \\ \leq & - \int_{\bar{\Omega}_0} (\gamma_\epsilon(t, x) - \gamma_\epsilon(0, x)) dx + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \left(\int_{\Omega_\epsilon(\tau)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) dx - \int_{B_R(0)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) dx \right) d\tau \\ \leq & \int_{\Omega_0} \gamma_0 dx + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \left(\int_{\Omega_\epsilon(\tau)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) dx - \int_{B_R(0)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) dx \right) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (3.14), yields that

$$\int_{B_R(0) \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0} -f_\epsilon(t, x) dx \leq \int_{\Omega_0} \gamma_0 dx + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \left(\int_{\Omega_\epsilon(\tau)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) dx - \int_{B_R(0)} \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x) dx \right) d\tau,$$

and thus the second estimate in (3.13) follows immediately by letting $R \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Moreover, as mentioned in Remark 2.1, on the basis of Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, we establish some convergence results about v_ϵ defined in (3.10).

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that in the problem (1.13), the kernel function k satisfies the assumption (\mathbf{K}) , the initial data satisfies (1.7). Then for any fixed $t > 0$, there exist a sequence $\{\epsilon_\ell\}$, which depends on t and satisfies $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_\ell = 0$, and $\tilde{v}^t \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $v_{\epsilon_\ell}(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \tilde{v}^t(\cdot)$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n .*

Proof. Thanks to Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v_\epsilon(t, x+h) - v_\epsilon(t, x)| dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| \int_0^t (\gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x+h) - \gamma_\epsilon^+(\tau, x)) d\tau \right| dx \\ & \leq \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma_\epsilon(\tau, x+h) - \gamma_\epsilon(\tau, x)| dx d\tau \\ & \leq \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x)| dx d\tau = t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\gamma_0(x+h) - \gamma_0(x)| dx. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with the Fréchet-Kolmogorov theorem and Lemma 2.3, indicates that for any fixed $t > 0$ and bounded set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\{v_\epsilon(t, \cdot) \mid 0 < \epsilon < 1\}$ is precompact in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then it is easy to show that there exist a sequence $\{\epsilon_\ell\}$ with $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_\ell = 0$ and $\tilde{v}^t \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $v_{\epsilon_\ell}(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \tilde{v}^t(\cdot)$ in $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $v_{\epsilon_\ell}(t, \cdot) \rightarrow \tilde{v}^t(\cdot)$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . \square

We emphasize that so far the additional condition (1.9) has not been used yet. After previous preparations, we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. From now on, fix $T > 0$. Back to the problem (3.12) satisfied by v_ϵ , by the Fourier transform and the property $\hat{k}_\epsilon(\xi) = \hat{k}(\epsilon\xi)$, we derive that

$$\hat{v}_\epsilon(t, \xi) = \int_0^t e^{\frac{1}{2}(\hat{k}(\epsilon\xi)-1)(t-\tau)} \hat{f}_\epsilon(\tau, \xi) d\tau. \quad (3.15)$$

Due to the Parseval formula,

$$\|f_\epsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|\hat{f}_\epsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Then thanks to Lemma 3.1, there exists a sequence $\{\epsilon_j\}$ with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_j = 0$ and $f_0, G_0 \in L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f_{\epsilon_j} = f_0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n). \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}_{\epsilon_j} = G_0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n). \quad (3.17)$$

Notice that for any test function $\psi(t, \xi) \in C_c((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, on the one side, due to (3.16),

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hat{f}_{\epsilon_j}(t, \xi) \psi(t, \xi) d\xi dt$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} f_{\epsilon_j}(t, x) dx \right) \psi(t, \xi) d\xi dt \\
&= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} \psi(t, \xi) d\xi \right) f_{\epsilon_j}(t, x) dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} \psi(t, \xi) d\xi \right) f_0(t, x) dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hat{f}_0(t, \xi) \psi(t, \xi) d\xi dt.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other side, (3.17) yields that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hat{f}_{\epsilon_j}(t, \xi) \psi(t, \xi) d\xi dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G(t, \xi) \psi(t, \xi) d\xi dt.$$

Hence

$$G_0(t, \xi) = \hat{f}_0 \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

i.e.

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f_{\epsilon_j} = f_0, \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}_{\epsilon_j} = \hat{f}_0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n). \quad (3.18)$$

Introduce the following problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t = A\Delta v + f_0 & 0 < t \leq T, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v(0, x) = 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

where v_* denote the unique generalized solution in $V_2^{1,1/2}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T])$ [12, Chapter III.5]. By applying the Fourier transform to the problem (3.19), we derive that

$$\hat{v}_*(t, \xi) = \int_0^t e^{-A|\xi|^2(t-\tau)} \hat{f}_0(\tau, \xi) d\tau.$$

Fix $t \in (0, T)$. For any given $\phi(\xi) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hat{v}_{\epsilon_j}(t, \xi) \phi(\xi) d\xi = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_0^t e^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_j^2}(\hat{k}(\epsilon_j \xi) - 1)(t-\tau)} \hat{f}_{\epsilon_j}(\tau, \xi) d\tau \right) \phi(\xi) d\xi \\
&= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^t \left(e^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_j^2}(\hat{k}(\epsilon_j \xi) - 1)(t-\tau)} - e^{-A|\xi|^2(t-\tau)} \right) \hat{f}_{\epsilon_j}(\tau, \xi) \phi(\xi) d\tau d\xi \\
&\quad + \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^t e^{-A|\xi|^2(t-\tau)} \hat{f}_{\epsilon_j}(\tau, \xi) \phi(\xi) d\tau d\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\hat{f}_{\epsilon_j}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|f_{\epsilon_j}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, due to Lemma 3.1, the assumption (1.9) and (3.18), we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hat{v}_{\epsilon_j}(t, \xi) \phi(\xi) d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^t e^{-A|\xi|^2(t-\tau)} \hat{f}_0(\tau, \xi) \phi(\xi) d\tau d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hat{v}_*(t, \xi) \phi(\xi) d\xi. \quad (3.20)$$

Moreover, thanks to Lemma 2.3, there exists a subsequence of $\{\epsilon_j\}$, denoted by $\{\epsilon_{j_\ell}\}$, and v_0^t in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, such that $v_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup v_0^t(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then for any given $\phi(\xi) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\lim_{j_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hat{v}_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, \xi) \phi(\xi) d\xi$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{j_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} v_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, x) dx \right) \phi(\xi) d\xi \\
&= \lim_{j_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} \phi(\xi) d\xi \right) v_{\epsilon_{j_\ell}}(t, x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} \phi(\xi) d\xi \right) v_0^t(x) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} v_0^t(x) dx \right) \phi(\xi) d\xi.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Now (3.20) and (3.21) implies that

$$\hat{v}_*(t, \xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} v_0^t(x) dx \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Thus $v_*(t, x) = v_0^t(x)$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^n . Since $v_*(t, x)$ is the unique solution to the problem (3.19), it follows immediately that for any $0 < t < T$, $v_\epsilon(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup v_*(t, \cdot)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This, together with Lemma 3.2, implies that

$$v_\epsilon(t, x) \rightarrow v_*(t, x) \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \tag{3.22}$$

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.4, it remains to verify that v_* satisfies the parabolic variational inequality (3.9) as follows.

$$\begin{cases} v_t - A\Delta v \geq \bar{f} & \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v \geq 0 & \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ (v_t - A\Delta v - \bar{f})v = 0 & \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{f} = \gamma_0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Obviously $v_* \geq 0$ satisfies the first two inequalities in (3.9) since v_ϵ is always non-negative and $f_\epsilon \geq \bar{f}$ for all $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, thanks to Lemma 3.1, (3.16) and the uniqueness of weak convergence, it is standard to show that $f_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T])$ for any $p > 1$. Then by parabolic regularity theory and Sobolev embedding theorem, one obtains that $v_*(t, \cdot)$ is continuous in \mathbb{R}^n . Thus, the set $\{v_* > 0\}$ is open in $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Also notice that $f_\epsilon = \bar{f}$ if $v_\epsilon > 0$. Hence thanks to (3.22), it is standard to verify that

$$f_\epsilon(t, x) \rightarrow \bar{f}(t, x) \quad \text{a.e. in } \{v_* > 0\} \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus due to (3.18), $f_0 = \bar{f}$ a.e. in $\{v_* > 0\}$, i.e., v_* satisfies the third equality in (3.9).

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is complete. \square

4 Fundamental properties of nonlocal Stefan problem

In this section, we investigate the fundamental properties of the nonlocal version of one-phase Stefan problem (1.6)

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x) = d \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy - d\gamma^+(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \gamma(0, x) = \gamma_0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

4.1 Expansion and boundedness

Theorem 1.5(i) is about the expansion of $\Omega(t)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5(i). Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$. Let $t = s(x)$ denote the moment when $\gamma(s(x), x) = 0$ while $\gamma(t, x) < 0$ for $0 < t < s(x)$. By (1.6), one has

$$\ell_0 = d \int_0^{s(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x-y) \gamma^+(\tau, y) dy d\tau = d \int_0^{s(x)} \int_{\Omega(\tau)} k(x-y) \gamma^+(\tau, y) dy d\tau. \quad (4.1)$$

Also thanks to Theorem 1.1, $0 \leq \gamma^+ \leq \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)}$. This yields that

$$\ell_0 \leq d \int_0^{s(x)} \int_{\Omega(\tau)} k(x-y) \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)} dy d\tau \leq ds(x) \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)},$$

i.e. $s(x) \geq \ell_0 / (d \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)})$. Hence by choosing $t_0 < \ell_0 / (d \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)})$, one has $\Omega(t) = \Omega(0)$ for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$.

The rest follows directly from Proposition 2.2. \square

In the following, we prove Theorem 1.5(ii), which is about the uniform boundedness of $\Omega(t)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5(ii). The proof is lengthy. To begin with, we introduce the first auxiliary 1-dim problem

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x_1) = d \int_{\mathbb{R}} k_1(x_1 - y_1) \gamma^+(t, y_1) dy_1 - d\gamma^+(t, x_1) & t > 0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \gamma(0, x_1) = \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)} & 0 \leq x_1 \leq M, \\ \gamma(0, x_1) = -\ell_0 & x_1 < 0 \text{ or } x_1 > M, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where $k_1(x_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} k(x_1, x') dx'$, $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and choose the constant M such that

$$\bar{\Omega}_0 \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 0 < x_1 < M, \text{ where } x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)\}.$$

Such M exists since $\bar{\Omega}_0$ is bounded. Let $\gamma_1(t, x_1)$ denote the solution to the problem (4.2). Notice that $\gamma_1(t, x_1)$ also satisfies the n -dim problem (1.6) with initial data

$$\gamma_0(x) = \begin{cases} \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)} & 0 \leq x_1 \leq M, \\ -\ell_0 & x_1 < 0 \text{ or } x_1 > M, \end{cases} \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Denote

$$\Sigma_1(t) = \{x_1 \in \mathbb{R} \mid \gamma_1(t, x_1) \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_1^\infty = \bigcup_{t \geq 0} \Sigma_1(t).$$

By Proposition 2.1, $\gamma_1(t, x_1) \geq \gamma(t, x)$ in \mathbb{R}^n , where γ denote the solution to the n -dim problem (1.6) with initial data (1.7) and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

To prove Theorem 1.5(ii), it suffices to show that Σ_1^∞ is bounded, since the other $n - 1$ directions can be handled similarly and thus $\Omega(t)$ will be constrained by a bounded cube.

We first show that $|\Sigma_1^\infty|$ is bounded. Thanks to Lemma 2.3, $\gamma_1^+(t, \cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. By direct computation, for $0 < t < T$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma_1(T)} \gamma_{1t}(t, x_1) dx_1 \\ &= d \int_{\Sigma_1(T)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} k_1(x_1 - y_1) \gamma_1^+(t, y_1) dy_1 dx_1 - d \int_{\Sigma_1(T)} \gamma_1^+(t, x_1) dx_1 \\ &\leq d \int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma_1^+(t, y_1) dy_1 - d \int_{\Sigma_1(T)} \gamma_1^+(t, x_1) dx_1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$0 \leq \int_{\Sigma_1(T)} \gamma_1(T, x_1) dx_1 \leq \int_{\Sigma_1(T)} \gamma_1(0, x_1) dx_1 = -\ell_0 |\Sigma_1(T) \setminus [0, M]| + \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)} M,$$

which implies that

$$|\Sigma_1(T)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)}}{\ell_0}\right) M.$$

Since T is arbitrary, one has

$$|\Sigma_1^\infty| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)}}{\ell_0}\right) M. \quad (4.3)$$

Next we will show that $\gamma_1(t, x_1)$ decays exponentially as t goes to infinity. For this purpose, we introduce the second auxiliary 1-dim problem with periodic initial data

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t = d \int_{\mathbb{R}} k_1(x_1 - y_1) \gamma^+(t, y_1) dy_1 - d\gamma^+(t, x_1) & t > 0, \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \gamma(0, x_1) = \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)} & \kappa(M + L) \leq x_1 \leq \kappa(M + L) + M, \\ \gamma(0, x_1) = -\ell_0 & \kappa(M + L) + M < x_1 < (\kappa + 1)(M + L), \end{cases}$$

where $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}$, $L > 0$ is a constant to be determined later and let $\tilde{\gamma}_1(t, x_1)$ denote the solution. By Proposition 2.1,

$$\gamma_1(t, x_1) \leq \tilde{\gamma}_1(t, x_1) \quad \text{for } t > 0, \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.4)$$

Obviously, $\tilde{\gamma}_1(t, x_1)$ is periodic in x_1 with period $M + L$. Thus this problem can be rewritten as follows

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t = d \int_0^{M+L} k_*(x_1 - y_1) \gamma^+(t, y_1) dy_1 - d\gamma^+(t, x_1) & t > 0, \quad x_1 \in (0, M + L), \\ \gamma(0, x_1) = \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)} & 0 \leq x_1 \leq M, \\ \gamma(0, x_1) = -\ell_0 < 0 & M < x_1 < (M + L), \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$k_*(x_1) = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}} k_1(x_1 + \kappa(M+L)) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^{M+L} k_*(x_1) dx_1 = 1.$$

Denote

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_1(t) = \{x_1 \in \mathbb{R} \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1(t, x_1) \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Sigma}_1^\infty = \bigcup_{t \geq 0} \tilde{\Sigma}_1(t).$$

We claim that if $L > \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\tilde{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\tilde{\Omega}_0)}}{\ell_0} M$, then $|\tilde{\Sigma}_1^\infty \cap (0, M+L)| < M+L$.

In (4.5), fix $T > 0$, by direct computation, one has for $0 < t < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (0, M+L)} \tilde{\gamma}_{1t}(t, x_1) dx_1 \\ &= d \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (0, M+L)} \int_0^{M+L} k_*(x_1 - y_1) \tilde{\gamma}_1^+(t, y_1) dy_1 dx_1 - d \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (0, M+L)} \tilde{\gamma}_1^+(t, x_1) dx_1 \\ &\leq d \int_0^{M+L} \tilde{\gamma}_1^+(t, y_1) dy_1 - d \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (0, M+L)} \tilde{\gamma}_1^+(t, x_1) dx_1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (0, M+L)} \tilde{\gamma}_1(T, x_1) dx_1 \\ &\leq \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (0, M+L)} \tilde{\gamma}_1(0, x_1) dx_1 = -\ell_0 |\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (M, M+L)| + \|\gamma_0|_{\tilde{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\tilde{\Omega}_0)} M. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$|\tilde{\Sigma}_1(T) \cap (M, M+L)| \leq \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\tilde{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\tilde{\Omega}_0)}}{\ell_0} M. \quad (4.6)$$

Since T is arbitrary, it is easy to see that $|\tilde{\Sigma}_1^\infty \cap (0, M+L)| < M+L$ provided that

$$L > \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\tilde{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\tilde{\Omega}_0)}}{\ell_0} M.$$

The claim is proved.

Thanks to the strong maximum principle established in Proposition 2.2, $[0, M] \subseteq \tilde{\Sigma}_1^\infty$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_1^\infty$ is open in $(M, M+L)$. Thus when fix $L > \frac{\|\gamma_0|_{\tilde{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\tilde{\Omega}_0)}}{\ell_0} M$, by the previous claim, one sees that there exists an open interval $(a, b) \subset (0, M+L)$ satisfying $(a, b) \cap \tilde{\Sigma}_1^\infty = \emptyset$. If necessary, we could choose $b - a$ smaller such that $k_*(b - a) > 0$. Denote

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_D = (0, a) \cup (b, M+L) \subseteq \tilde{\Sigma}_1^\infty.$$

Under the condition that $k_*(b-a) > 0$, the proof of [13, Theorem 2.6 (i)] can be slightly modified to show that the eigenvalue problem

$$d \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_D} k_*(x_1 - y_1) \phi(y_1) dy_1 - d\phi(x_1) = \lambda \phi(x_1) \quad \text{for } x_1 \in \tilde{\Sigma}_D$$

admits a principal eigenvalue λ_p with the corresponding eigenfunction ϕ_p satisfying $\phi_p > 0$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}_D$ and then it is easy to see that $\lambda_p < 0$. Moreover, notice that $v(t, x_1) = \ell e^{\lambda_p t} \phi_p(x_1)$, $\ell > 0$, satisfies the following problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t(t, x_1) = d \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_D} k_*(x_1 - y_1) v(t, y_1) dy_1 - dv(t, x_1) & t > 0, x_1 \in \tilde{\Sigma}_D, \\ v(0, x_1) = \ell \phi_p(x_1) & x_1 \in \tilde{\Sigma}_D. \end{cases}$$

Choose ℓ large enough such that $v(0, x_1) > \|\gamma_0|_{\bar{\Omega}_0}\|_{C(\bar{\Omega}_0)}$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}_D$. By the comparison principle, it follows that

$$\tilde{\gamma}_1(t, x_1) \leq v(t, x_1) = \ell e^{\lambda_p t} \phi_p(x_1) \quad \text{for } t > 0, x_1 \in \tilde{\Sigma}_D.$$

Therefore by (4.4), the choice of $\tilde{\Sigma}_D$ and the fact that $\tilde{\gamma}_1(t, x_1)$ is periodic in x_1 with period $M + L$, we have

$$\gamma_1(t, x_1) \leq \ell e^{\lambda_p t} \|\phi_p\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Sigma}_D)} \quad \text{for } t > 0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.7)$$

i.e., $\gamma_1(t, x_1)$ decays exponentially at infinity since $\lambda_p < 0$.

Now we are ready to complete the last piece of the proof of Theorem 1.5(ii). Suppose that Σ_1^∞ is unbounded, i.e., there exists a sequence $\{x_{1i}\}_{i \geq 1} \subseteq \Sigma_1^\infty$ and $\{s_{1i}\}_{i \geq 1}$ with $|x_{1i}| \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\ell_0 = d \int_0^{s_{1i}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} k_1(x_{1i} - y_1) \gamma_1^+(\tau, y_1) dy_1 d\tau,$$

where $t = s_{1i}$ denote the moment when $\gamma_1(s_{1i}, x_{1i}) = 0$ while $\gamma_1(t, x_{1i}) < 0$ for $0 < t < s_{1i}$.

To derive a contradiction, we need the following property

$$\lim_{|x_1| \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma_1^\infty} k_1(x_1 - y_1) dy_1 = 0, \quad (4.8)$$

which follows from the facts that $k_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $|\Sigma_1^\infty| < +\infty$ due to (4.3).

Thanks to (4.7) and (4.8), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & d \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} k_1(x_{1i} - y_1) \gamma_1^+(\tau, y_1) dy_1 d\tau \\ & \leq d \int_0^\infty \int_{\Sigma_1(\tau)} k_1(x_{1i} - y_1) \ell e^{\lambda_p \tau} \|\phi_p\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Sigma}_D)} dy_1 d\tau \\ & \leq \frac{d\ell}{-\lambda_p} \|\phi_p\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Sigma}_D)} \int_{\Sigma_1^\infty} k_1(x_{1i} - y_1) dy_1 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts to the existence of s_{1i} when i is large enough. Therefore, Σ_1^∞ is bounded and the desired conclusion follows. \square

4.2 Continuous expansion and jumping phenomena

We first verify Theorem 1.6, which is about the continuous expansion of $\Omega(t)$ under the extra conditions that the initial domain $\bar{\Omega}_0$ is convex and the kernel function k satisfies **(K1)**.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Suppose that $\Omega(t)$ first jumps at time $t = T$, i.e., $\Omega(t)$ is connected for $t < T$ while $\Omega(T)$ is disconnected. Let $\Omega_1(T)$ denote the connected domain which contains $\Omega(t)$ for $t < T$. Choose $y_T \in \Omega(T) \setminus \Omega_1(T)$. Since $\Omega(0) = \bar{\Omega}_0$ is convex, there exists a unique $x_T \in \partial\Omega(0)$ such that

$$|x_T - y_T| = \text{dist}\{y_T, \Omega(0)\}.$$

Moreover, there exists z_T , which lies on the line segment $\overline{x_T y_T}$ and satisfies $z_T \notin \Omega(T)$. Let ℓ denote the line which passes through $(z_T + y_T)/2$ and perpendicular to the line segment $\overline{x_T y_T}$. W.l.o.g., assume that $\ell = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = 0\}$, where $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and $x_{T1} < 0$, where $x_T = (x_{T1}, x_{T2}, \dots, x_{Tn})$. Since $\Omega(0)$ is convex, obviously, $\text{dist}\{\ell, \Omega(0)\} > 0$.

For simplicity, denote

$$\mathbb{R}_-^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 < 0\}, \quad \mathbb{R}_+^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 > 0\}, \quad \tilde{x} = (-x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n),$$

and set

$$w(t, x) = \gamma(t, x) - \gamma(t, \tilde{x}), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_-^n.$$

Then $y_T = \tilde{z}_T$ and

$$w(T, z_T) = \gamma(T, z_T) - \gamma(T, y_T) < 0. \quad (4.9)$$

Next it is standard to compute that for $x \in \mathbb{R}_-^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_t(t, x) &= \gamma_t(t, x) - \gamma_t(t, \tilde{x}) \\ &= d \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(x - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy - d \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k(\tilde{x} - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy - d\gamma^+(t, x) + d\gamma^+(t, \tilde{x}) \\ &= d \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} k(x - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy + d \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} k(x - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy \\ &\quad - d \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} k(\tilde{x} - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy - d \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} k(\tilde{x} - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy - c(t, x) w(t, x) \\ &= d \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} k(x - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy + d \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} k(x - \tilde{y}) \gamma^+(t, \tilde{y}) dy \\ &\quad - d \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} k(\tilde{x} - y) \gamma^+(t, y) dy - d \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} k(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \gamma^+(t, \tilde{y}) dy - c(t, x) w(t, x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_-^n} [k(x - y) - k(\tilde{x} - y)] c(t, y) w(t, y) dy - c(t, x) w(t, x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c(t, x) = \frac{d\gamma^+(t, x) - d\gamma^+(t, \tilde{x})}{\gamma(t, x) - \gamma(t, \tilde{x})},$$

and $k(x - y) - k(\tilde{x} - y) \geq 0$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_-^n$ since $k(x)$ is decreasing in $|x|$. Moreover, for $x \in \ell$, $w(t, x) = 0$, and for $x \in \mathbb{R}_-^n$,

$$w(0, x) = \gamma(0, x) - \gamma(0, \tilde{x}) \geq 0,$$

since $\Omega(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_-^n$. Thus by the comparison principle, one has $w(t, x) \geq 0$ for $t > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_-^n$, which contradicts to (4.9). The proof is complete. \square

Notice that in Theorem 1.6, extra conditions on kernel functions and initial domains are needed to guarantee the continuous expansion of $\Omega(t)$. Now we construct two examples to show that when one of these two extra conditions in Theorem 1.6 is violated, *jumping phenomena* could happen.

Example 1. *This example is about the assumption **(K1)** on kernel functions.*

For simplicity, we focus on the the one dimensional case and assume that the initial domain is an interval. According to Theorem 1.6, if the kernel function $k(x)$ is decreasing in $|x|$, then $\Omega(t)$ expands continuously. On the contrary, in this example, we choose a kernel function, which is not decreasing in $|x|$, and jumping phenomena happens.

Define

$$k_*(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4\sigma} & 1 - \sigma \leq |x| \leq 1 + \sigma, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$ is small. Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} k_j(x - y)\gamma^+(t, y)dy - \gamma^+(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \gamma(0, x) = c_0 & x \in \left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right), \\ \gamma(0, x) = -\ell_0 & x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right), \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

where c_0, ℓ_0 are positive constants, k_j satisfies the assumption **(K)** and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|k_j - k_*\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0.$$

Let γ_j denote the solution to the problem (4.10). We claim that *if $2\ell_0 < c_0$, $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$, then the jumping phenomena happens for (4.10) when j is sufficiently large.*

To prove the claim, first consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} k_*(x - y)\gamma^+(t, y)dy - \gamma^+(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \gamma(0, x) = c_0 & x \in \left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right), \\ \gamma(0, x) = -\ell_0 & x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right). \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

The existence and uniqueness of the solution, denoted by γ_* , to this problem can be verified by similar arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Moreover, similar to the proof of (2.3) in the proof of Theorem 1.1, one has

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma_j - \gamma_*\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0.$$

Hence it suffices to show that the jumping phenomena happens in the limiting problem (4.11) if $2\ell_0 < c_0$, $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$.

Let t_1 denote the moment when γ_* first touches zero somewhere in $\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$. For $x \in (-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$, $0 < t < t_1$, it is easy to see that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} k_*(x-y)\gamma_*^+(t,y)dy = 0$ due to the definition of k_* and the choice of σ . Thus

$$\begin{cases} (\gamma_*^+)_t(t,x) = -\gamma_*^+(t,x) & 0 < t < t_1, x \in (-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}), \\ \gamma_*^+(0,x) = c_0 & x \in (-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}), \end{cases}$$

thus

$$\gamma_*^+(t,x) = c_0 e^{-t} \quad \text{for } 0 < t < t_1, x \in \left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right).$$

Then for any $x^* \in \{x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}) \mid \gamma_*(t_1, x) = 0\}$, we compute

$$\ell_0 = \int_0^{t_1} \int_{-\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{1}{4}} k_*(x^* - y) c_0 e^{-t} dy dt = c_0 (1 - e^{-t_1}) \int_{-\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{1}{4}} k_*(x^* - y) dy. \quad (4.12)$$

According to the definition of k_* , it is routine to verify that $\int_{-\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{1}{4}} k_*(x^* - y) dy \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{1}{4}} k_*(x^* - y) dy = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{if and only if } x^* \in \left[-\frac{5}{4} + \sigma, -\frac{3}{4} - \sigma\right] \cup \left[\frac{3}{4} + \sigma, \frac{5}{4} - \sigma\right].$$

Hence when $2\ell_0 < c_0$, one has

$$\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right) \mid \gamma(t_1, x) = 0\right\} = \left[-\frac{5}{4} + \sigma, -\frac{3}{4} - \sigma\right] \cup \left[\frac{3}{4} + \sigma, \frac{5}{4} - \sigma\right],$$

where

$$t_1 = -\ln \left(1 - \frac{2\ell_0}{c_0}\right).$$

Therefore, the jumping phenomena happens in the problem (4.11) provided that $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$ and $2\ell_0 < c_0$.

Example 2. *This example is about the conditions on the shape of initial domains.*

To emphasize the effect of initial domains, we still require that the kernel functions constructed in this example satisfy the requirements for kernel functions in Theorem 1.6. Then according to Theorem 1.6, if the initial domain is convex, $\Omega(t)$ expands continuously. However, in the following constructed example, the initial domain is non-convex and the jumping phenomena happens.

Define

$$\tilde{k}(x) = \begin{cases} 2^{-n} \omega_n^{-1} & |x| \leq 2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where ω_n denotes the volume of a unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n . Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{k}_j(x-y)\gamma^+(t, y)dy - \gamma^+(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \gamma(0, x) = c_0 & x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, \\ \gamma(0, x) = -\ell_0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

where c_0, ℓ_0 are positive constants, $n \geq 2$, $\bar{\Omega}_0 = \bar{B}_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)$, the kernel function \tilde{k}_j satisfies the conditions for kernel functions in Theorem 1.6 and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{k}_j - \tilde{k}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0.$$

The existence of such kernel functions is obvious. We claim that *if $(1 - 2^{-n})c_0 > \ell_0$, then for j sufficiently large, the jumping phenomena happens for (4.13).*

Similar to **Example 1**, to prove this claim, it suffices to show the jumping phenomena happens for the following model

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_t(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{k}(x-y)\gamma^+(t, y)dy - \gamma^+(t, x) & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \gamma(0, x) = c_0 & x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, \\ \gamma(0, x) = -\ell_0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0, \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

if $(1 - 2^{-n})c_0 > \ell_0$.

Now let $\tilde{\gamma}$ denote the solution to the problem (4.14) and t_2 , if exists, denote the moment when the solution $\tilde{\gamma}$ first touches zero somewhere in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$. When $0 < t < t_2$, thanks to the definition of \tilde{k} , it is easy to check that for $x \neq 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{k}(x-y)\tilde{\gamma}^+(t, y)dy = \int_{\bar{B}_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)} \tilde{k}(x-y)\tilde{\gamma}(t, y)dy < \int_{\bar{B}_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)} \tilde{k}(-y)\tilde{\gamma}(t, y)dy.$$

This indicates that if $t_2 < +\infty$, then at $t = t_2$, $\tilde{\gamma}$ touches zero only at $x = 0$, i.e., the jumping phenomena happens.

It remains to show the existence of $t_2 < +\infty$. Suppose that $t_2 = +\infty$. Based on the definition of \tilde{k} and the first equation in (4.14), it is easy to see that

$$\ell_0 \geq \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\bar{B}_2(0) \setminus B_1(0)} \tilde{k}(-y)\tilde{\gamma}^+(t, y)dydt > \int_0^{+\infty} (1 - 2^{-n})c_0e^{-t}dt = (1 - 2^{-n})c_0 > \ell_0.$$

This is impossible. The proof is complete.

A Important equivalent characterization

In this appendix, we include the proof of Proposition 1.2.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Assume that (i) holds. For clarity, set $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n) = \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}$. Then we compute as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1 - \hat{k}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} &= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \left(1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} k(x) dx \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ix \cdot w \int_0^{|\xi|} e^{-(ix \cdot w)\eta} d\eta k(x) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ix \cdot w \int_0^{|\xi|} (e^{-(ix \cdot w)\eta} - 1) d\eta k(x) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x \cdot w)^2 \int_0^{|\xi|} \int_0^\eta e^{-(ix \cdot w)\tau} d\tau d\eta k(x) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is due to the first equality in (i). Notice that thanks to the assumptions in (i), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x \cdot w)^2 k(x) dx = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx.$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1 - \hat{k}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} - \frac{1}{2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x \cdot w)^2 \int_0^{|\xi|} \int_0^\eta e^{-(ix \cdot w)\tau} d\tau d\eta k(x) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x \cdot w)^2 k(x) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x \cdot w)^2 \int_0^{|\xi|} \int_0^\eta (e^{-(ix \cdot w)\tau} - 1) d\tau d\eta k(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem yields that

$$\lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - \hat{k}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} - \frac{1}{2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx = 0.$$

Thus (ii) is verified and $\frac{1}{2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx = A$.

Assume that (ii) holds. First choose $\xi = (0, \dots, \xi_j, \dots, 0)$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, with $\xi_j > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1 - \hat{k}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} &= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \left(1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} k(x) dx \right) = \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 - e^{-ix_j \xi_j}) k(x) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 - \cos(x_j \xi_j) + i \sin(x_j \xi_j)) k(x) dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

For any $R > 0$, we have

$$\frac{|1 - \hat{k}(\xi)|}{|\xi|^2} \geq \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{B_R(0)} (1 - \cos(x_j \xi_j)) k(x) dx,$$

which yields that

$$\lim_{\xi_j \rightarrow 0} \frac{|1 - \hat{k}(\xi)|}{|\xi|^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R(0)} x_j^2 k(x) dx.$$

Since R is arbitrary and $1 \leq j \leq n$, one sees that

$$\frac{1}{2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx \leq A < +\infty. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This also indicates that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x| k(x) dx < +\infty. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Next still choose $\xi = (0, \dots, \xi_j, \dots, 0)$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, with $\xi_j > 0$. Notice that

$$\frac{1 - \hat{k}(\xi)}{|\xi|} = \frac{1}{\xi_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 - e^{-ix_j \xi_j}) k(x) dx = \frac{1}{\xi_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ix_j \int_0^{\xi_j} e^{-ix_j \eta} d\eta k(x) dx,$$

where $x = (0, \dots, x_j, \dots, 0)$. Due to (A.3), Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem can be applied and one sees that

$$0 = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - \hat{k}(\xi)}{|\xi|} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ix_j k(x) dx,$$

i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j k(x) dx = 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Now thanks to (A.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sin(x_j \xi_j) k(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j \int_0^{\xi_j} \cos(x_j \eta) d\eta k(x) dx = \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j \int_0^{\xi_j} (\cos(x_j \eta) - 1) d\eta k(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} -x_j^2 \int_0^{\xi_j} \int_0^\eta \sin(x_j \tau) d\tau d\eta k(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (A.2) and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem imply that

$$\lim_{\xi_j \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sin(x_j \xi_j) k(x) dx = 0.$$

Now in (A.1), letting $\xi_j \rightarrow 0$, again it follows from (A.2) and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \lim_{\xi_j \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 - \cos(x_j \xi_j)) k(x) dx = \lim_{\xi_j \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j \int_0^{\xi_j} \sin(x_j \eta) d\eta k(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{\xi_j \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j^2 \int_0^{\xi_j} \int_0^\eta \cos(x_j \tau) d\tau d\eta k(x) dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j^2 k(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j^2 k(x) dx = 2A = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 k(x) dx, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

At the end, it remains to show that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j x_h k(x) dx = 0$, $1 \leq j, h \leq n, j \neq h$. Choose $\xi = (0, \dots, \xi_j, \dots, \xi_h, \dots, 0)$ with $j < h$, $\xi_j > 0$ and $\xi_h = \lambda \xi_j$. Then thanks to (A.4) and (A.5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - \hat{k}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} &= \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \left(1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} k(x) dx \right) = \frac{1}{\xi_j^2 + \lambda^2 \xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 - e^{-i(x_j + \lambda x_h) \xi_j}) k(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\xi_j^2 + \lambda^2 \xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} i(x_j + \lambda x_h) \int_0^{\xi_j} e^{-i(x_j + \lambda x_h) \eta} d\eta k(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\xi_j^2 + \lambda^2 \xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} i(x_j + \lambda x_h) \int_0^{\xi_j} (e^{-i(x_j + \lambda x_h) \eta} - 1) d\eta k(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\xi_j^2 + \lambda^2 \xi_j^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x_j + \lambda x_h)^2 \int_0^{\xi_j} \int_0^{\eta} e^{-i(x_j + \lambda x_h) \tau} d\tau d\eta k(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\xi_j \rightarrow 0$, Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and (A.5) imply that

$$A = \frac{1}{2(1 + \lambda^2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x_j + \lambda x_h)^2 k(x) dx = A + \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j x_h k(x) dx.$$

This indicates that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_j x_h k(x) dx = 0,$$

since λ is an arbitrary constant. The proof is complete. \square

Data Availability Statement

The authors confirm that this manuscript has no associated data.

References

- [1] F. Andreu-Vaillio, J.M. Mazón, J.D. Rossi, and J.J. Toledo-Melero, *Nonlocal diffusion problems. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 165*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Real Sociedad Matemática Española, Madrid, 2010.
- [2] I. Athanasopoulos and L. Caffarelli, Continuity of the temperature in boundary heat control problems, *Adv. Math.* **224** (2010) 293–315.
- [3] I. Athanasopoulos, L. Caffarelli and E. Milakis, The two-phase Stefan problem with anomalous diffusion, *Adv. Math.* **406** (2022) 1–19.

- [4] P. Bates and G. Zhao, Existence, uniqueness and stability of the stationary solution to a nonlocal evolution equation arising in population dispersal, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **332** (2007) 428–440.
- [5] C. Brändle, E. Chasseigne and F. Quirós, Phase transitions with midrange interactions: a nonlocal Stefan model, *Siam J. Math. Anal.* **44** (2012) 3071–3100.
- [6] L. Caffarelli, The regularity of free boundaries in higher dimensions. *Acta Math.* **139** (1977) 155–184.
- [7] L. Caffarelli, A. Petrosyan, H. Shagholian, Regularity of a free boundary in parabolic potential theory. *J. Am. Math. Soc.* **17** (2004) 827–869.
- [8] J.-F. Cao, Y. Du, F. Li and W.T. Li, The dynamics of a Fisher-KPP nonlocal diffusion model with free boundaries, *J. Funct. Anal.* **277** (2019) 2772–2814.
- [9] Y. Du, F. Li and M. Zhou, Semi-wave and spreading speed of the nonlocal Fisher-KPP equation with free boundaries, *J. Math. Pures. Appl.* **154** (2021) 30–66.
- [10] A. Friedman, The Stefan problem in several space variables. *Trans. Ame. Math. Soc.* **132** (1968) 51–87.
- [11] A. Friedman, *Variational principles and free-boundary problems*, A Wiley-Interscience Publication. Pure and Applied Mathematics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1982.
- [12] O. A. Ladyženskaja, V. A. Solonnikov and N. N. Ural’ceva, *Linear and Quasilinear Equations of Parabolic Type*, Transl. Math. Monogr., vol. 23, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, U.S.A., 1968.
- [13] F. Li, J. Coville and X. Wang, On eigenvalue problems arising from nonlocal diffusion models, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **37** (2017), no. 2, 879–903.